UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 109—PART 10

JULY 16, 1963, TO AUGUST 2, 1963

(PAGES 12617 TO 14058)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1963

J
11
.R
v.109
pt.10

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, we are grateful for the unquenchable impulse for things high and holy which Thou hast planted within us. As in the heat and burden of this epochal day we are called to serve the Nation and all struggling humanity, lead us for Thy name's sake to the abiding springs of fresh hope and confidence for a better tomorrow, a new faith in Thy goodness which faileth never, and in the unrealized possibilities of Thy erring children, in spite of the stupid folly by which they have devastated the good earth Thou hast given and marred the costly works of their own hands.

We pray for fidelity not to shirk the issues of these momentous days. Where our deeds can help to make this a fairer world, where our words can keep despondent men on their feet, where our prayers can hasten the coming of a cleansed social order in which Thy will shall be done among men, let us speak and act and pray.

We lift our prayer in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 15, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The **VICE PRESIDENT** laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 546) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant easements for the use of lands in the Camp Joseph H. Pendleton Naval Reservation, Calif., for a nuclear electric generating station, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2664. An act to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service;

H.R. 4177. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of St. Paul, Minn., all right, title and interest of the United States in and to certain lands heretofore conveyed to such city;

H.R. 4818. An act to amend section 25 of title 13, United States Code, relating to the duties of enumerators of the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce;

H.R. 4823. An act to modify the flood control project for Rend Lake, Ill.;

H.R. 5543. An act to extend the provisions of the act of October 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 759, ch. 672; 32 D.C. Code 417), to authorize the commitment of persons of unsound mind found on Federal reservations in Loudoun County, Va., to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 6000. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps;

H.R. 6910. An act to provide for the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 375. Joint resolution providing for appropriate ceremonies in connection with the raising and lowering of the flags of the United States surrounding the Washington Monument.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 179) extending the appreciation of Congress to the American Association of State Highway Officials for its service to this Nation, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2664. An act to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service;

H.R. 4177. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of St. Paul, Minn., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands heretofore conveyed to such city;

H.R. 6000. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps; and

H.J. Res. 375. Joint resolution providing for appropriate ceremonies in connection with the raising and lowering of the flags of the United States surrounding the Washington Monument; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4818. An act to amend section 25 of title 13, United States Code, relating to the duties of enumerators of the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4823. An act to modify the flood control project for Rend Lake, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 5543. An act to extend the provisions of the act of October 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 759, ch. 672; 32 D.C. Code 417), to authorize the commitment of persons of unsound mind found on Federal reservations in Loudoun County, Va., to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia; and

H.R. 6910. An act to provide for the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 179) extending the appreciation of Congress to the American Association of State Highway Officials for its service to this Nation was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

Whereas the American Association of State Highway Officials, composed of the highway departments of all States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, and the United States Bureau of Public Roads, will in 1964 celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of its organization; and

Whereas said organization through its membership represents those States and Federal governmental agencies responsible for the planning, construction, and maintenance of a vast system of national public highways throughout the Nation, including those comprising the new National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; and

Whereas the association was founded in the city of Atlanta, Georgia, in 1914, to assemble in one group those State and Federal public officials responsible for administering the State and Federal-aid highway programs for the purpose of developing technical policies, standards, and specifications for the conduct of such programs, to develop improved administrative and engineering techniques, to encourage the use of best practices, and to counsel with the Congress on highway matters; and

Whereas the association will celebrate said fiftieth anniversary at an annual meeting to be held in the month of December 1964, in Atlanta, Georgia, the city of its origin: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States express to the American Association of State Highway Officials at said annual meeting its appreciation for half a century of service in the development and operation of a nationwide highway transportation system that has contributed so much to the Nation's growth and economic well-being; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be delivered to the said annual meeting of the American Association of State Highway Officials by a special committee of the Congress, to consist of two Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and two Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

REQUESTS FOR COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Cannon subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, which now is holding hearings on the military pay-raise bill, be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I object to the holding of any committee meeting today while the Senate is in session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Carolina will briefly withhold his objection, let me say that this subcommittee is holding long overdue hearings on the long overdue military pay-raise bill; and I would hope that the Senator from South Carolina would withhold his objection on this occasion and would discuss the matter with others who might be able to give more information.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I think it is a long overdue hearing; but at the same time I must insist on my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the special subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services under the chairmanship of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], which began hearings on the military pay-raise bill today, may be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I objected a few minutes ago to any committee meetings, but I have discussed this matter with the majority leader and also with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. At the time I objected I said that the hearings were long overdue. I think they are long overdue. Personally, I should be happy to see the bill reported. I believe it would in no way affect civil rights legislation, so I withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection of the request by the Senator from Montana?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not desire to object. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. The bill should be enacted before the first of October, which is the target date of the administration for the pay increase to become effective. That is the date included in the bill.

Whatever fate may befall all other proposed legislation on the calendar, simple decency and common justice demand that the Congress pay some attention to the disparity as between the pay of those who wear our country's uniform and of those who enjoy the emoluments of civilian office.

The civilian employees of our Government have received two pay increases since any has given to those serving in the military services; and, under existing law, some civilian employees will get another pay raise on the first of January.

Whatever might happen during the remainder of this session, in order to be fair to the people to whom we look to defend this country, it is imperative that the Congress redress this great imbalance.

I thank the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], who I know is fully aware of this situation and is as eager as anyone else to correct it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the request is granted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the objection to the meeting of this particular subcommittee has been withdrawn.

I express my appreciation, also. I believe the passage of the bill is long overdue, and that the disparity in pay as between those we train to serve in uniform and those we use in the civilian bureaucracy is so great that it is time for corrective legislation not only to be considered but also to be passed as rapidly as possible.

I point out that the Government spends a great deal of money in the training of the men who serve in uniform. Unless something is done, we are in danger of losing all this investment. Therefore, what we are to consider is not so much an increase in military pay as it is an economy measure, because of the savings which will be made, overall.

I hope that the bill will be passed by the committee, and that it will be better than the bill passed by the House. I hope most sincerely that we shall be able to have action as quickly as possible, so that this important matter can be debated and passed in this body.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I reiterate that the day the bill is supposed to be effective is the 1st day of October. If I can have the slightest cooperation from the leadership, I assure Senators that the bill will be passed by the Senate, and I think enacted into law, before the date it is supposed to be effective, October 1.

We have not delayed consideration of the bill. The pay increase is long overdue, but that cannot be attributed to any lack of interest in the Congress.

Last year, when the civilian pay increase proposal was before the Senate, I started to prepare an amendment to increase military pay, and I would have offered that amendment except for the fact that I was told that a commission was working on the problem. I knew that the commission probably could come forth with a better answer than I could without research and study.

But there has been no disposition to delay this matter. As a practical matter, the Senate Committee on Armed Services has been pushing the administration and the Department of Defense for 2 years now to rectify this inequality.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree with what the Senator has said. Certainly there has been no delay so far as the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate is concerned.

The chairman of the committee has mentioned the fact that if he can get the slightest cooperation from the leadership the bill will be before the Senate shortly. I assure the Senator that he will have a good deal more than the slightest cooperation; he will have full cooperation, 100 percent cooperation, as quickly as it can be done.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am delighted to hear that. I am sure the Senator speaks for the distinguished minority leader as well as for himself. I think we can all be assured that the bill will be enacted into law in ample time to have it become effective October 1, which is the date established in the original bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce, of the District of Columbia Committee, be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. Is there objection?

Mr. **JOHNSTON**. Mr. President, I object.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. Objection is heard.

AMENDMENT OF LEAD-ZINC SMALL PRODUCERS STABILIZATION ACT—PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. **CARLSON**. Mr. President, inasmuch as it will be necessary for me to be absent when the vote is taken on the Williams amendment, 30 minutes after the morning hour, I want the RECORD to show that had I been able to be present and to vote, I would have voted against the Williams amendment.

We do not produce enough lead and zinc in this country to take care of our needs; therefore, it is important that we pay the 3 or 4 cents per pound differential to supply some of the lead and zinc which is needed domestically.

Approximately two-thirds of the lead and zinc which we use is imported. Some will argue that we should increase the tariff on the lead and zinc which is imported. If we did, it would result in a price increase on two-thirds of these minerals which are used by American industry.

The lead and zinc subsidy is of great benefit to small businesses which, in good faith, purchased new machinery and equipment, following the enactment of the legislation last year. Certainly they have a right to expect that the program will be continued.

I hope the amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] will be defeated.

RESOLUTION OF VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, DEPARTMENT OF MARYLAND

Mr. **BREWSTER**. Mr. President, the 43d Annual Convention of the Department of Maryland, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States was held in Baltimore from June 20 to June 23, 1963.

My attention has recently been called to Resolution 45 of this convention—a resolution urging ratification by the U.S. Senate of the Genocide Convention.

I think that many of my colleagues will agree with me that such ratification would be timely. In fact, such ratification is long overdue.

The advice and consent of the Senate to this document during the current session would place the United States clearly on record with 64 other nations of the world, 58 organizations in the United States, and millions of leaders and citizens in all walks of life, in opposition to the mass murder of a people.

I urge that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee report this convention to the floor and ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Maryland Department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars be printed in the RECORD at this point, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 45

Resolution for ratification of the Genocide Convention by the U.S. Senate

Whereas from time to time it becomes the duty of the Veterans of Foreigns Wars of the United States, to acquaint the public with the fact that we, who have been privileged to serve our country in the Armed Forces in wartime, are not less interested in advancing the broad, humanitarian principles of human brotherhood and just and decent behavior toward all peoples, than we are in strengthening the security of our country and the advancement of veterans' objectives; and these concepts have always invited our active interest and support, not only while we were honored wearers of the uniform of our beloved land, but as civilian citizens of this great Nation; and

Whereas by our dedication to these great principles, we revere the memories and honor the pledges to our departed comrades, many of whom made the supreme sacrifice so that our flag and all that it stands for, may be forever recognized throughout the World, and in all ages, as the foremost champion of just and fair treatment of the poor, the oppressed, and the persecuted, of all lands, and of all peoples; and

Whereas there is pending before the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate for its consideration, a resolution of ratification of the Genocide Convention, which resolution has been languishing in the committee's files for such a long period of time, that it has become a blot upon the reputation of the United States; and

Whereas the passage of the Genocide Convention by the Senate of the United States would associate this country with an international pledge that horror of the kind perpetrated by the Nazis may never again be permitted: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the 43d annual convention of the Department of Maryland, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, convened in Baltimore, Md., June 20 to 23, 1963, That in commemoration of the Warsaw uprising against the slaughterers of millions of defenseless human beings, we call upon the President of the United States to urge the Senate of the United States to ratify the Genocide Convention, at the current session, thus joining the 64 nations of the world, the 58 organizations of the United States, former Presidents Truman and Eisenhower, and millions of other patriotic citizens of this country, from all walks of life, who endorse its aims of preventing mass murder of a people; we respectfully urge that this commemoration be converted from an act of heartbreaking recollection into a positive and meaningful basis for defining and protecting the basic human right of survival; and be it further

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution, properly verified copies thereof be sent to:

(1) National headquarters of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, for favorable consideration and adoption by the delegates to the next National Convention to be held in Seattle, Wash.;

(2) The President of the United States;

(3) U.S. Senators of Maryland J. GLENN BEALL, and DANIEL B. BREWSTER;

(4) The press.

Submitted by the resolutions committee.

Committee's report: approved.

Convention action: report adopted without objection.

EL PASO COUNTY COMMISSIONERS COURT (TEXAS) RESOLUTION ON COTTON PRODUCTION

Mr. **YARBOROUGH**. Mr. President, the State of Texas produces 32 percent of the cotton grown each year in the United States. The value of this cotton production is $809 million each year to Texas. It is obvious from these figures that a prosperous cotton industry is essential to the Texas economy.

The Commissioners' Court of El Paso County adopted a resolution on cotton legislation at its July 8, 1963, meeting in El Paso, Tex. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD, and that the names of the commissioners, judge and officers be printed with the resolution, and that the resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution, together with the names thereon, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AS TO COTTON LEGISLATION FOR EL PASO COUNTY, JULY 8, 1963

Monday, July 8, 1963, Commissioners' Court met in regular term at 10:30 a.m., with all members being present as follows: Hon. Glenn E. Woodard, county judge, presiding; Dick F. Davis, commissioner, precinct No. 1; Rogelio Sanchez, commissioner, precinct No. 3; Tom Mays, commissioner, precinct No. 4; J. W. Fields, county clerk; and Mary B. Province, deputy.

On this day, on motion of Commissioner Mays, seconded by Commissioner Davis, it is ordered by the court that the following resolution be adopted by Commissioners' Court of El Paso County, Tex.

Resolved, That Commissioners' Court of El Paso County hereby pledges its cooperation in assisting the cotton farmers of this county in securing favorable legislation for the administration of a profitable and efficient cotton farming program in El Paso County.

Vote: Yes—Davis, Sanchez, Mays.

Vote: No, none.

JULY 10, 1963

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of an extract from the minutes of a meeting of Commissioners' Court of El Paso County, Tex., held on the 8th day of July 1963. Recorded in volume 33, page 18, of the Commissioners' Court Minutes.

J. W. FIELDS,
County Clerk and Ex-Officio Clerk of the Commissioners' Court, El Paso County, Tex.
By: MARY B. PROVINCE,
Deputy.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McINTYRE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 646. A bill to prohibit the location of chanceries or other business offices of foreign governments in certain residential areas in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 360).

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of May 1963. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, MAY 1963 AND APRIL 1963, AND PAY, APRIL 1963 AND MARCH 1963

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for May 1963 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction on Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In May numbered	In April numbered	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In April was—	In March was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2, 491, 792	2, 495, 347	−3, 555	$1, 310, 897	$1, 260, 292	+$50, 605
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1, 437, 479	1, 438, 897	−1, 418	750, 391	718, 398	+31, 993
Department of Defense	1, 054, 313	1, 056, 45	−2, 137	560, 506	541, 894	+18, 612
Inside the United States	2, 322, 753	2, 326, 380	−3, 627			
Outside the United States	169, 039	168, 967	+72			
Industrial employment	561, 220	560, 914	+306			
Foreign nationals	164, 665	165, 579	−914	28, 017	[2] 28, 917	−900

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during May 1963, and comparison with April 1963, and pay for April 1963, and comparison with March 1963*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	May	April	Increase	Decrease	April	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	105, 985	105, 492	493		$50, 340	$46, 752	$3, 588	
Commerce	30, 971	31, 056		85	20, 227	18, 810	1, 417	
Health, Education, and Welfare	78, 564	78, 393	171		41, 342	39, 612	1, 730	
Interior	70, 375	68, 953	1, 422		36, 753	33, 967	2, 786	
Justice	31, 649	31, 787		138	21, 124	20, 165	959	
Labor	9, 247	9, 161	86		5, 689	5, 330	359	
Post Office	584, 217	584, 794		577	284, 221	274, 511	9, 710	
State [1] [2]	42, 018	41, 778	240		21, 718	20, 939	779	
Treasury	88, 082	91, 495		3, 413	52, 930	50, 001	2, 929	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	375	370	5		260	250	10	
Bureau of the Budget	477	465	12		397	406		$9
Council of Economic Advisers	42	38	4		32	36		4
Executive Mansion and Grounds	75	75			37	50		13
National Aeronautics and Space Council	29	29			27	27		
National Security Council	39	40		1	34	32	2	
Office of Emergency Planning	439	430	9		366	347	19	
Office of Science and Technology	46	67		21	32	29	3	
President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation	16	5	11		3		3	
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	33		5		23	21	2	
American Battle Monuments Commission	421	411	10		85	83	2	
Atomic Energy Commission	7, 038	7, 026	12		5, 388	5, 143	245	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	606	604	2		405	392	13	
Civil Aeronautics Board	827	828		1	649	617	32	
Civil Service Commission	4, 040	4, 084		44	2, 571	2, 467	104	
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5			5	4	1	
Commission of Fine Arts	7	7			6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	74	[2] 82		8	53	51	2	
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2			2	2		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	287	287			203	193	10	
Farm Credit Administration	238	238			187	170	17	
Federal Aviation Agency	45, 949	45, 831	118		31, 101	30, 544	557	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			5	4	1	
Federal Communications Commission	1, 416	1, 425		9	1, 022	961	61	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1, 252	1, 230	22		819	792	27	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1, 231	1, 227	4		842	801	41	
Federal Maritime Commission	238	240		2	175	162	13	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	390	391		1	347	342	5	
Federal Power Commission	1, 127	1, 112	15		831	756	75	
Federal Trade Commission	1, 147	1, 151		4	832	799	33	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	132	129	3		66	71		5
General Accounting Office	4, 504	4, 524		20	3, 019	2, 915	104	
General Services Administration	32, 212	32, 088	124		15, 421	15, 026	395	
Government Printing Office	7, 136	7, 110	26		4, 261	4, 112	149	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13, 973	13, 906	67		8, 847	8, 531	316	
Indian Claims Commission	21	23		2	21	21		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2, 384	2, 383	1		1, 696	1, 601	95	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	28, 013	27, 586	427		23, 662	20, 007	3, 655	
National Capital Housing Authority	455	449	6		210	207	3	
National Capital Planning Commission	63	61	2		43	41	2	
National Capital Transportation Agency	81	84		3	61	59	2	
National Gallery of Art	308	325		17	140	131	9	
National Labor Relations Board	1, 987	2, 001		14	1, 430	1, 366	64	
National Mediation Board	140	139	1		114	114		
National Science Foundation	961	928	33		631	645		14
Panama Canal	15, 036	15, 117		81	5, 166	7, 974		2, 808
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	52	49	3		35	37		2
Railroad Retirement Board	1, 964	1, 989		25	1, 120	1, 095	25	
Renegotiation Board	211	213		2	182	172	10	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	165	155	10		104	93	11	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1, 367	1, 379		12	967	922	45	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during May 1963, and comparison with April 1963, and pay for April 1963, and comparison with March 1963*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	May	April	Increase	Decrease	April	March	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued								
Selective Service System	6,933	6,879	54		$2,254	$2,150	$104	
Small Business Administration	3,266	3,267		1	2,161	2,026	135	
Smithsonian Institution	1,440	1,416	24		732	691	41	
Soldiers' Home	1,085	1,080	5		352	344	8	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	27	29		2	22	25		$3
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	26			22	22		
Tariff Commission	267	266	1		205	194	11	
Tax Court of the United States	154	155		1	123	120	3	
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,979	18,027		48	11,253	10,505	748	
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	139	134	5		105	106		1
U.S. Information Agency	11,691	[2] 11,657	34		5,249	5,001	248	
Veterans' Administration	173,139	173,536		397	79,430	76,227	3,203	
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,187	1,143	44		204	273		69
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,437,479	1,438,897	3,511	4,929	750,391	718,398	34,921	2,928
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			1,418				$31,993	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,190	2,123	67		1,737	1,620	117	
Department of the Army	379,092	[3] 379,768		676	195,000	187,790	7,219	
Department of the Navy	341,999	342,396		397	190,779	185,784	4,995	
Department of the Air Force	299,942	301,264		1,322	156,897	151,523	5,374	
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,018	2,011	7		1,015	978	37	
Defense Communications Agency	567	556	11		369	368	1	
Defense Supply Agency	25,314	25,193	121		12,721	12,143	578	
Office of Civil Defense	1,058	1,056	2		867	819	48	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	39	1		36	32	4	
Interdepartmental activities	14	14			9	8	1	
International military activities	59	58	1		44	47		3
Armed Forces information and education activities	422	423		1	216	202	14	
Classified activities	1,598	1,549	49		807	580	227	
Total, Department of Defense	1,054,313	1,056,450	259	2,396	560,506	541,894	18,615	3
Net change, Department of Defense			2,137				$18,612	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [4] [5]	2,491,792	2,495,347	3,770	7,325	1,310,897	1,260,292	53,536	2,931
Net change, including Department of Defense			3,555				$50,605	

[1] May figure includes 16,690 employees of the Agency for International Development, as compared with 16,655 in April and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The May figure includes 4,232 of these trust fund employees and the April figure includes 4,229.

[2] May figure includes 1,038 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 946 in April and their pay.

[3] Revised on basis of later information.

[4] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

[5] Includes employment by Federal agencies under the Public Works Acceleration Act (Public Law 87-658) as follows:

Agency	May	April	Change
Agriculture Department	5,268	6,568	−1,300
Interior Department	7,365	7,887	−522
Tennessee Valley Authority	148	62	+86
Veterans' Administration	144	146	−2
Department of the Army	642	753	−111
Total	13,567	15,416	−1,849

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during May 1963, and comparison with April 1963*

Department or agency	May	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	104,643	104,228	415	
Commerce	30,311	30,390		79
Health, Education, and Welfare	77,957	77,786	171	
Interior	69,780	68,360	1,420	
Justice	31,294	31,434		140
Labor	9,137	9,046	91	
Post Office	582,756	583,332		576
State [1] [2]	10,651	10,647	4	
Treasury	87,453	90,868		3,415
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	375	370	5	
Bureau of the Budget	477	465	12	
Council of Economic Advisers	42	38	4	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	75	75		
National Aeronautics and Space Council	29	29		
National Security Council	39	40		1
Office of Emergency Planning	439	430	9	
Office of Science and Technology	46	67		21
President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation	16	5	11	
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	33	28	5	
American Battle Monuments Commission	6	7		1
Atomic Energy Commission	7,006	6,994	12	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	606	604	2	
Civil Aeronautics Board	826	827		1
Civil Service Commission	4,036	4,080		44
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5		
Commission of Fine Arts	7	7		
Commission on Civil Rights	74	[3] 82		8
Independent agencies—Continued				
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	287	287		
Farm Credit Administration	238	238		
Federal Aviation Agency	44,906	44,796	110	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7		
Federal Communications Commission	1,414	1,423		9
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,250	1,228	22	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,231	1,227	4	
Federal Maritime Commission	238	240		2
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	390	391		1
Federal Power Commission	1,127	1,112	15	
Federal Trade Commission	1,147	1,151		4
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	90	86	4	
General Accounting Office	4,415	4,436		21
General Services Administration	32,199	32,076	123	
Government Printing Office	7,136	7,110	26	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,783	13,719	64	
Indian Claims Commission	21	23		2
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,384	2,383	1	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	28,002	27,575	427	
National Capital Housing Authority	455	449	6	
National Capital Planning Commission	63	61	2	
National Capital Transportation Agency	81	84		3
National Gallery of Art	308	325		17
National Labor Relations Board	1,954	1,967		13
National Mediation Board	140	139	1	
National Science Foundation	947	913	34	
Panama Canal	166	167		1
President's Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity	52	49	3	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during May 1963, and comparison with April 1963*—Continued

Department or agency	May	April	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued				
Railroad Retirement Board	1,964	1,989	--------	25
Renegotiation Board	211	213	--------	2
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	165	155	10	--------
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,367	1,379	--------	12
Selective Service System	6,781	6,726	55	--------
Small Business Administration	3,210	3,212	--------	2
Smithsonian Institution	1,423	1,399	24	--------
Soldiers' Home	1,085	1,080	5	--------
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	27	29	--------	2
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	26	--------	--------
Tariff Commission	267	266	1	--------
Tax Court of the United States	154	155	--------	1
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,978	18,026	--------	48
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	139	134	5	--------
U.S. Information Agency	3,236	[3] 3,238	--------	2
Veterans' Administration	172,143	172,527	--------	384
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,372,728	1,374,462	3,103	4,837
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense	--------	--------	1,734	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,124	2,056	68	--------
Department of the Army	327,223	[3] 327,798	--------	575
Department of the Navy	317,511	317,889	--------	378
Department of the Air Force	272,129	273,329	--------	1,200
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,018	2,011	7	--------
Defense Communications Agency	537	524	13	--------
Defense Supply Agency	25,314	25,193	121	--------
Office of Civil Defense	1,058	1,056	2	--------
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	39	1	--------
Interdepartmental activities	13	13	--------	--------
International military activities	38	38	--------	--------
Armed Forces information and education activities	422	423	--------	1
Classified activities	1,598	1,549	49	--------
Total, Department of Defense	950,025	951,918	261	2,154
Net decrease, Department of Defense	--------	--------	1,893	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,322,753	2,326,380	3,364	6,991
Net decrease, including Department of Defense	--------	--------	3,627	

[1] May figure includes 2,740 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 2,756 in April.

[2] May figure includes 681 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 665 in April.

[3] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during May 1963, and comparison with April 1963*

Department or agency	May	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,342	1,264	78	--------
Commerce	660	666	--------	6
Health, Education, and Welfare	607	607	--------	--------
Interior	595	593	2	--------
Justice	355	353	2	--------
Labor	110	115	--------	5
Post Office	1,461	1,462	--------	1
State [1] [2]	31,367	31,131	236	--------
Treasury	629	627	2	--------
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	415	404	11	--------
Atomic Energy Commission	32	32	--------	--------
Civil Aeronautics Board	1	1	--------	--------
Civil Service Commission	4	4	--------	--------
Federal Aviation Agency	1,043	1,035	8	--------
Federal Communications Commission	2	2	--------	--------
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2	--------	--------
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	42	43	--------	1
General Accounting Office	89	88	1	--------
General Services Administration	13	12	1	--------
Housing and Home Finance Agency	190	187	3	--------
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	11	11	--------	--------
National Labor Relations Board	33	34	--------	1
National Science Foundation	14	15	--------	1
Panama Canal	14,870	14,950	--------	80
Selective Service System	152	153	--------	1
Independent agencies—Continued				
Small Business Administration	56	55	1	--------
Smithsonian Institution	17	17	--------	--------
Tennessee Valley Authority	1	1	--------	--------
U.S. Information Agency	8,455	8,419	36	--------
Veterans' Administration	996	1,009	--------	13
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,187	1,143	44	--------
Total, excluding Department of Defense	64,751	64,435	425	109
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense	--------	--------	316	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	66	67	--------	1
Department of the Army	51,869	51,970	--------	101
Department of the Navy	24,488	24,507	--------	19
Department of the Air Force	27,813	27,935	--------	122
Defense Communications Agency	30	32	--------	2
Interdepartmental activities	1	1	--------	--------
International military activities	21	20	1	--------
Total, Department of Defense	104,288	104,532	1	245
Net decrease, Department of Defense	--------	--------	244	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	169,039	168,967	426	354
Net increase, including Department of Defense	--------	--------	72	

[1] May figure includes 13,950 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 13,899 in April. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The May figure includes 4,232 of these trust fund employees and the April figure includes 4,229.

[2] May figure includes 357 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 281 in April.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during May 1963, and comparison with April 1963*

Department or agency	May	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,851	3,858	--------	7
Commerce	5,568	5,542	26	--------
Interior	8,748	7,709	1,039	--------
Post Office	254	252	2	--------
Treasury	5,187	5,268	--------	81
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	256	256	--------	--------
Federal Aviation Agency	3,060	3,021	39	--------
General Services Administration	1,740	1,741	--------	1
Government Printing Office	7,136	7,110	26	--------
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	28,013	27,586	427	--------
Panama Canal	7,589	7,660	--------	71
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	159	155	4	--------
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,800	14,895	--------	95
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,187	1,143	44	--------
Total, excluding Department of Defense	87,548	86,196	1,607	255
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense	--------	--------	1,352	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 137,813	[2] 138,010	--------	197
Outside the United States	[1] 4,610	[2] 4,620	--------	10
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	195,446	195,677	--------	231
Outside the United States	1,285	1,286	--------	1
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	131,556	132,104	--------	548
Outside the United States	1,120	1,128	--------	8
Defense Supply Agency:				
Inside the United States	1,842	1,893	--------	51
Total, Department of Defense	473,672	474,718	--------	1,046
Net decrease, Department of Defense	--------	--------	1,046	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	561,220	560,914	1,607	1,301
Net increase, including Department of Defense	--------	--------	306	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of May 1963, and comparison with April 1963*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	May	April	May	April	May	April	May	April
Canada	33	32					33	32
Crete	62	62					62	62
England	3,031	3,060			115	111	2,916	2,949
France	20,932	21,010	17,571	17,628	11	11	3,350	3,371
Germany	80,075	80,563	67,828	68,320	86	86	12,161	12,157
Greece	250	252					250	252
Japan	51,513	51,670	18,391	18,374	14,468	[1] 14,389	18,654	18,907
Korea	6,206	6,207	6,206	6,207				
Morocco	1,958	2,115			753	761	1,205	1,354
Netherlands	52	54					52	54
Trinidad	553	554			553	554		
Total	164,665	165,579	109,996	110,529	15,986	15,912	38,683	39,138

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of May totaling 2,491,792 compared with 2,495,347 in April. This was a net decrease of 3,555, including a net decrease of 1,849 in temporary employment under the public works acceleration program authorized by Public Law 87–658.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1963, which began July 1, 1962, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July 1962	2,510,950	14,455	
August	2,512,199	1,249	
September	2,485,324		26,875
October	2,482,982		2,342
November	2,498,312	15,330	
December	2,486,628		11,684
January 1963	2,477,940		8,688
February	2,483,511	5,571	
March	2,485,738	2,227	
April	2,495,347	9,609	
May	2,491,792		3,555

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of May was 1,437,479, a decrease of 1,418 as compared with the April total of 1,438,897. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in May was 1,054,313, a decrease of 2,137 as compared with 1,056,450 in April.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger decreases were Treasury Department with 3,413, and Post Office Department with 577. Agencies reporting the larger increases were Interior Department with 1,422 and Agriculture Department with 493. Increases in Agriculture and Interior Departments and the decrease in the Treasury Department were largely seasonal.

In the Department of Defense the largest decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Air Force Department with 1,322, the Army Department with 676, and the Navy Department with 397.

Inside the United States civilian employment decreased 3,627 and outside the United States civilian employment increased 72. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in May totaled 561,220, an increase of 306.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies and compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,491,792 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed by U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 164,665 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during May who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in April was 165,579. A breakdown of this employment for May follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Canada	33			33
Crete	62			62
England	3,031		115	2,916
France	20,932	17,571	11	3,350
Germany	80,075	67,828	86	12,161
Greece	250			250
Japan	51,513	18,391	14,468	18,654
Korea	6,206	6,206		
Morocco	1,958		753	1,205
Netherlands	52			52
Trinidad	553		553	
Total	164,665	109,996	15,986	38,683

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1875. A bill for the relief of Thomas M. Talley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 1876. A bill to provide for the creation of an 11th judicial circuit to be comprised of Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington, and for the circuit judges constituting the 9th and 11th circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1877. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 1878. A bill to amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union in order to extend the time for the filing of applications for the selection of certain lands by such State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BARTLETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1879. A bill to provide for the payment of debt service constructions charges, and increased operation and maintenance charges when irrigable lands are taken for nonagricultural uses under Federal programs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 1880. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as amended, and the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act, as amended, with respect to certain foreign corporations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1881. A bill for the relief of Lydia Anne Foote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1882. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses for medical care paid pursuant to the requirements of State law for an institutionalized individual who is not a dependent; and

S. 1883. A bill to provide that tips received by an employee in the course of his employment shall be included as part of his wages for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1884. A bill to amend section 406(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to limit the right of certain air carriers to receive subsidy payments; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON) (by request):

S. 1885. A bill to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Indians of the Battle Mountain Colony certain lands which are used for cemetery purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HART:

S. 1886. A bill for the relief of Wladyslaw Adamczyk, his wife Regina Adamczyk, and their two minor children, Barbara and Theresa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 1887. A bill to amend section 212(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1888. A bill to amend section 11 of the act of April 1, 1942, in order to modify the retirement benefits of the judges of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1889. A bill for the relief of Marie Loray Legister; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1890. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to establish jurisdiction and venue for appeals from orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission in judicial reference cases;

S. 1891. A bill to amend sections 3288 and 3289 of title 18, United States Code, relating to reindictment after dismissal of a defective indictment; and

S. 1892. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of February 11, 1903 (32 Stat. 823, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 29, 49 U.S.C. 45), commonly known as the Expediting Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1893. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish programs for research, development, and sales to insure the increased use of mica and mica products; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. COTTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S.J. Res. 100. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the offering of prayers and the reading of the Bible in public schools in the United States, and relating to the right of a State to enact legislation on the basis of its own public policy on questions of decency and morality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

CREATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware submitted a resolution (S. Res. 171) to create a Select Committee on Surplus Agricultural Commodities to study matters relating to exchange or barter of surplus agricultural commodities under section 303 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, which appears under a separate heading.)

REMOVAL OF LIMITATION ON OUTSIDE INCOME UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which provides for complete removal of the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving social security.

The question of whether or not to remove social security earnings limitation has been before the Senate a number of times in the past. Each time the arguments for its removal have been explained and, for the most part, agreed with by the majority of the Senate. In 1960 and 1961 we were successful in increasing the limitation slightly. But, the job is not yet done. The inequity still exists.

The earnings limitation is discriminatory because it penalizes those who are least able to pay. Those people who have reached retirement age but who need extra income and desire to work are the ones who suffer. Under the present law, $1 of benefits is withheld for each $2 earned between $1,200 and $1,700. For each $1 earned over $1,700, $1 of benefits is withheld. This law sorely restricts the income potential of people over 65.

On the other hand, there is no limitation on income derived from the so-called unearned sources such as dividends, rents, et cetera. Therefore, people may have large investments from which they receive substantial income and yet they receive the full amount of their social security every month. If beneficiaries are allowed to receive unearned income from dividends and rents without a reduction in their social security benefits, then certainly those who wish to remain active and useful citizens should be allowed to earn additional income without such reductions.

Removal of the earnings limitation could and would have a great impact on the lives of millions of Americans. At the present time, there are approximately 17 million people over the age of 65. Of this number, 14.4 million are receiving benefits or could receive them if they were not working.

Our great social security program was enacted to provide some measure of security for our elderly citizens. So long as this earnings limitation remains we are rewarding the rich and penalizing those who really need this protection. The limitation is inequitable and unrealistic. Therefore, I am hopeful that the Senate will give early and favorable consideration to my bill to provide for its removal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1877) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING APPLICATIONS FOR THE SELECTION OF CERTAIN LANDS BY THE STATE OF ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I introduce, in behalf of the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and myself, a bill to amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union in order to extend the time for the filing of applications for the selection of certain lands by the State.

Under the Statehood Act, Alaska was authorized, within its land selection program, to choose areas already leased under the Federal Mining Leasing Act or the Alaska Coal Leasing Act. This authorization extends for 5 years after statehood. It ends January 3, 1964.

The bill which I introduce today provides for a 5-year extension to January 3, 1969.

This legislation is necessary in the interests of both the State and the Federal Governments. The 5-year period has not been sufficient to allow the completion of this aspect of the selection program. Were we to require that all selections of this type be completed by January 3, there would be an irresponsible and confusing rush which would result in poor land management, checkerboard jurisdictions, increased costs, redtape, and dispute for all concerned.

It was the intention of Congress in this section of the Statehood Act that giving the State mineral selection rights would avoid the confusions which would be caused by allowing differing mineral ownerships within a given geological unit. It is surely in the interest of an efficient economical public service and of an orderly development of mineral resources that such unity of ownership be assured.

For several reasons the State's land selection program has not proceeded as quickly as all hoped it might. The formulation of Federal regulations governing selections caused an initial delay of 18 months. Problems over withdrawal policies and cadastral surveys caused additional time-consuming delays.

As a result, as of the middle of June 1963, the State has selected 12,947,300 acres of the 103 million acres allowed it. It had received tentative approval of only 3,463,100 acres and final patent to but only 753,500 acres.

Recent agreements with BLM and the State of Alaska have made it possible for the State division of lands to prepare a program of selection plans so that both the State and the Bureau may proceed in an orderly and economic manner. Passage of the bill which I have introduced today is necessary if these plans are to become reality.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1878) to amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union in order to extend the time for the filing of applications for the selection of certain lands by such State, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN DEBT SERVICE CONSTRUCTION CHARGES

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide "for the payment of debt service construction charges, and increased operation and maintenance charges when irrigable lands are taken for nonagricultural uses under Federal programs."

Federal acquisition of lands has created problems for irrigation districts, irrigation companies, and other water supply agencies. Present Federal law governing land acquisition imposes two problems for such agencies. First, the water supply agency is not reimbursed for loss of revenue resulting from the transfer of land from private to public ownership; second, these water supply organizations suffer a burden of increased operation and maintenance costs due to other types of Federal installations. In many instances Federal aid highways have substantially reduced the taxable area within an irrigation district. The operation and maintenance costs that were formerly borne by these lands now become an increasing burden on the remaining membership of the water organization.

This particular problem is one facing the Washoe County Conservation District in my State of Nevada. Between airports, highways, and other types of Federal land acquisition programs, the acreage of the district assessable for operating purposes has been reduced to make the burden on the balance highly inequitable.

This measure has the support of the National Reclamation Association and is in accordance with their resolution 22, adopted at their annual meeting held last year.

I urge early consideration of this bill by the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1879) to provide for the payment of debt service constructions charges, and increased operation and maintenance charges when irrigable lands are taken for nonagricultural uses under Federal programs, introduced by Mr. Bible, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

BROADENING MEDICAL EXPENSE DEDUCTION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses for medical care paid pursuant to the requirements of State law for an institutionalized individual who is not a dependent.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record immediately following my remarks.

Mr. President, many State statutes impose a legal obligation upon relatives of varying degrees of consanguinity to contribute to the cost of maintaining a relative who is a patient, resident, or inmate of a hospital, sanitarium, asylum, or similar institution.

Quite often, the obligation is imposed upon a family member whose ties to the patient have been loose or nonexistent for many years, or who himself is hard pressed to meet his own living expenses.

A constituent of mine in New York, the father of a married daughter who is in an institution, recently advised me that under New York State mental hygiene law, he has been twice assessed for contributions toward her care, notwithstanding that the daughter's husband is alive and presumably assuming primary responsibility. The father's future liability could run as high as $1,800 a year.

And more recently, Mr. President, on July 5, 1963, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, in a case entitled Clarence N. Beach against Government of the District of Columbia, held that a father was liable to contribute $75 a month for the maintenance of his daughter in a mental institution. Here, the father was quite elderly, living on a meager retirement income, and had not had much contact with his daughter since 1935. The daughter left his home in 1935 as soon as she had attained her majority and had been twice married and twice divorced.

I ask unanimous consent that relevant excerpts from the court's opinion, discussing the policy behind the District of Columbia statute and upholding its constitutionality, be printed as an exhibit following the text of the bill I am introducing today.

Of course, Mr. President, as Federal legislators, we can have no quarrel with the policy or wisdom of the various State statutes on the subject. That is for the States to decide for themselves under their police powers and their ultimate responsibilities for the health, safety, and welfare of their citizens.

What I am concerned about, is the Federal income tax treatment of these maintenance payments. If the patient is either a spouse or a dependent of the person who is legally obligated to make the payments, then the tax laws allow the latter to claim the basic $600 exemption for spouse or dependent and, in addition, itemized deductions for such portion of the maintenance payments as represent medical expenses. However, if, as was true in the two cases I mentioned, the patient is neither the spouse nor a dependent of the taxpayer from whom the State exacts a contribution, then neither a personal exemption nor a medical expense deduction is permitted the taxpayer.

The bill I am introducing today, Mr. President, is designed to provide a modest degree of relief from any hardship that may be suffered by any taxpayer who is required by State law to make payments toward the upkeep of an institutionalized person who is neither the taxpayer's spouse nor dependent. For the limited purpose of the medical expense deduction, this bill merely puts the patient on the same basis as a dependent of the taxpayer, and allows the latter to take as a deduction such portions of payments required to be made to the State as represent medical care expenses within the meaning of existing law. The deduction would be subject to every limitation contained in existing law, except that a ceiling of $5,000 per taxable year would be placed upon any deduction attributable to payments made pursuant to State laws of the type to which I have referred.

It is virtually impossible to determine the extent to which the States exact maintenance contributions from the families of institutionalized persons. In an overwhelming majority of instances, however, it must be assumed that the person assessed either is the spouse of the patient or is one for whom the patient stands in a dependency relationship for Federal tax purposes. The bill I am introducing today, if enacted, would probably be applied only in a narrow minority of cases where, for example, the patient is not a spouse or minor child of the taxpayer, but rather a brother, sister, over-21 son or daughter, or even more distant relation.

The short of the matter is that if State law makes it a legal obligation for any relative to maintain a patient in an institution, State law, in effect, creates a dependency relationship between the two that ought to be recognized as a dependency relationship for at least the limited purposes of the Federal income tax deduction for medical expenses.

To judge from tentative decisions made by the tax-writing committee of the other body on the administration's program, it appears quite likely that there will be amendments to the medical expense provisions in tax revision legislation this year. I am hopeful, Mr. President, that the bill I am introducing today will receive favorable consideration as a possible further amendment to these provisions if and when such tax legislation reaches the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and excerpts will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1882) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses for medical care paid pursuant to the requirements of State law for an institutionalized individual who is not a dependent; introduced by Mr. Keating, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to medical, dental, etc. expenses) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Dependent Defined.—For purposes of this section, the term 'dependent' means—

"(1) an individual who is a dependent (as defined in section 152), and

"(2) an individual (other than an individual described in paragraph (1))—

"(A) who during the taxable year is a patient, resident, or inmate of a hospital, sanitarium, or similar institution, and

"(B) with respect to whom the taxpayer is required under a law of a State, a possession of the United States, or a political subdivision of a State or possession to make payments for his care while he is such a patient, resident, or inmate."

(b) Section 213 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to allowance of deduction for medical, dental, etc. expenses) is amended by striking out "a dependent (as defined in section 152)" and inserting in lieu thereof "a dependent (as defined in subsection (h))".

(c) Section 213(c) of such Code (relating to maximum limitations) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"The limitations prescribed by the preceding sentence (and by subsection (g)) shall not apply to amounts paid which are expenses for medical care solely within the meaning of the second sentence of subsection (e)(1), but the deduction under this section for such expenses shall not exceed $5,000."

(d) Section 213(e)(1) of such Code (relating to definition of medical care) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"With respect to an individual who is a dependent of the taxpayer solely within the meaning of subsection (h)(2), the term 'medical care' means only amounts described in the preceding sentence which are paid to a State, a possession of the United States, or a political subdivision of a State or possession for the care of such individual pursuant to the requirements of a law of such State, possession, or political subdivision."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1962.

The excerpts presented by Mr. KEATING are as follows:

[U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit—No. 17429]

CLARENCE N. BEACH, APPELLANT *v.* GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, APPELLEE

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, DECIDED JULY 5, 1963

Mr. Ford E. Young, Jr., for appellant.

Mr. Richard W. Barton, assistant corporation counsel for the District of Columbia, with whom Messrs. Chester H. Gray, corporation counsel, Milton D. Korman, principal assistant corporation counsel, and Hubert B. Pair, assistant corporation counsel, were on the brief, for appellee.

Before Bazelon, chief judge, and Fahy and Washington, circuit judges.

Fahy, circuit judge. This case, initiated by the District of Columbia against appellant, the father of Ellen J. Schuerger, calls for a decision regarding his liability for part of the expense of her maintenance and treatment at St. Elizabeths Hospital where she resides after commitment September 6, 1951, as of unsound mind. Appellant, who had no part in the commitment proceedings, has apparently had little contact with his daughter since 1935. In that year she was of age, left home and became twice married and twice divorced. She took her present name from the later of the marriages.

The case was instituted by a petition followed by a citation pursuant to 21 D.C. Code, section 318, set forth in the margin.[1] Appellant answered and there was a trial in the District Court as in equity. The court held that appellant was liable for $75 per month toward the expense of his daughter's maintenance. The ensuing judgment was for $8,700, computed at $75 per month from August 5, 1952,[2] through May 5, 1962, and also required payment of $75 per month beginning with May 1962, and continuing until the patient's discharge or the further order of the court.

Appellant's basic challenge to the judgment is that it deprives him of his property without due process of law.[3] He contends that he cannot be required to contribute to the maintenance of a daughter whose incapacity and need for public treatment and support arose after attainment of her majority.

Predecessor statutes have been enforced in this jurisdiction insofar as they imposed liability upon the estate of an incompetent for the costs of maintenance. *Hart* v. *Commissioners,* 81 U.S. App. D.C. 154, 155 F. 2d 877 (1946); *Fitzhugh* v. *District of Columbia,* 71 App. D.C. 290, 109 F. 2d 837 (1940); *Baker* v. *District of Columbia,* 39 App. D.C. 42 (1912). While these decisions may arguably be said to assure the validity of such a statute they do not discuss the constitutionality of imposing liability upon relatives. Since the relative involved in the present case is the father we limit our decision to one who bears that relationship to the incompetent.

State courts have upheld statutes requiring contribution by relatives more distantly related by consanguinity than a father. The legislative authority of Congress with respect to the District of Columbia is comparable to the police power of a State legislature. *Landsburgh* v. *District of Columbia,* 11 App. D.C. 512 (1897). State court decisions accordingly are persuasive of the validity of our statute. The subject is treated somewhat fully in *People* v. *Hill,* 163 Ill. 186, 46 N.E. 796 (1896), where it is said: "It can hardly be said that there is no moral duty whatever imposed upon a man, who has sufficient financial ability consistently with his duty to himself and to others, to supply the necessaries of life to a brother or sister who is unable to earn a livelihood in consequence of bodily infirmity, idiocy, lunacy, or other unavoidable cause, in cases where such brother or sister did not become a pauper from intemperance or other bad conduct. This being so, our statute stands upon the same footing, so far as legal principle is involved, that the statute of Elizabeth stands upon.[4] The support of the poor is a public duty, and, in case of the default of him upon whom is imposed a prior duty to afford such support, the cost of providing the same will be upon the body politic. The object of both the statute of Elizabeth and of our existing statute is to protect the public from loss occasioned by neglect of a moral or natural duty imposed on individuals, and to do this by transforming the imperfect moral duty into a statutory and legal liability." 46 N.E. at 798.

In *State* v. *Bateman,* 110 Kan. 546, 204 P. 682, 683 (1922), it is said such a statute "merely recognizes the imperfect moral obligation, and makes of it a legal one." And see *In re Idleman's Commitment,* 146 Ore. 13, 27 P. 2d 305 (1939); *Commonwealth* v. *Zommick,* 362 Pa. 299, 66 A. 2d 237 (1949). In relying upon these decisions, illustrative of rather widespread approval of comparable State legislation, we do not suggest any derogation of public responsibility for these unfortunates. St. Elizabeths itself is ample evidence of the assumption of such responsibility. But when the law turns also to the father for help, if he is able to give it, when the estate of the incompetent is insufficient, it does so only to supplement the public responsibility. Placing a secondary obligation upon the father finds its validity in the reasonableness of attaching legal significance to the natural bonds of consanguinity. It is not unreasonable, it is not a denial of due process, for the law to attach an enforceable obligation to the moral obligation which exists in the usual family relationship of father and daughter. Recognition by statute of this obligation is not at odds with recognition that the public in many cases is called upon to supply total support for such individuals, whose faculties or estates are unable to do so.

The magnitude of the liability is determined according to the father's ability, and this must be ascertained upon consideration of all the circumstances of his life, including his other obligations, so as not to cause undue hardship. As thus construed and applied to a father we think the statute is not violative of due process of law.

SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE OF TIPS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to include tips received by an employee in the course of his employment under the definition of wages for the purposes of the old-age, survivors, and disability program of the Social Security Act.

Mr. President, I introduce this bill to rectify a longstanding inequity in the Social Security Act. Title II of that act, the OASDI title, was enacted to provide the workers of this country with a basic retirement income related to their income from earnings during their working years. Survivor and disability benefits were later added to the program on similar wage-related bases.

The taxable wage base under the program has been increased three times since the act became law in 1935 in order to maintain the principle of wage-related benefits during a period of rising wages for the American worker. Maximum taxable earnings under the law were set initially at $3,000. They now stand at $4,800 and there is some question as to whether this amount, which was set by the social security amendments of 1958, is sufficient for the purpose of the program.

The Social Security Act has been broadened and refined in many other aspects over the years with the object of providing more benefits to more people. In the process of doing this the Social Security Act has become one of the most complex and technical laws on the books today.

---

[1] § 21–318. Liability of relatives for costs of maintenance and treatment.

The father, mother, husband, wife, and adult children of an insane person, if of sufficient ability, and the committee or guardian of his or her person and estate, if his or her estate is sufficient for the purpose, shall pay the cost to the District of Columbia of his or her maintenance, including treatment in Saint Elizabeths Hospital or in any other hospital to which the insane person may be committed. It shall be the further duty of said commission, to examine under oath, the father, mother, husband, wife, adult children, and committee, if any, of any alleged insane person whenever such relative live within the District of Columbia, and to ascertain the ability of such relatives or committee, if any, to maintain or contribute toward the maintenance of such alleged insane person: *Provided,* That in no case shall said relatives or committee be required to pay more than the actual cost to the District of Columbia of maintenance of such alleged insane person.

If any person hereinabove made liable for the maintenance of an insane person shall fail so to provide or pay for such maintenance, the court shall issue to such person a citation to show cause why he should not be adjudged to pay a portion or all of the expenses of maintenance of such patient. The citation shall be served at least ten days before the hearing thereon. If, upon such hearing, it shall appear to the court that the insane person has not sufficient estate out of which his maintenance may properly be fully met and that he has relatives of the degrees hereinabove mentioned who are parties to the proceedings, and who are able to contribute thereto, the court may make an order requiring payment by such relatives of such sum or sums as it may find they are reasonably able to pay and as may be necessary to provide for the maintenance of such insane person. Said order shall require the payment of such sums to the Board of Public Welfare annually, semiannually, or quarterly as the court may direct. It shall be the duty of the board to collect the said sums due under this section, and to turn the same into the treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia. Any such order may be enforced against any property of the insane person or of the person liable or undertaking to maintain him in the same way as if it were an order for temporary alimony in a divorce case. (Aug. 9, 1939, 53 Stat. 1298, ch. 620, § 9.)

[2] It was found that the patient's own estate was unable to bear any of the expense after August 5, 1952.

[3] Appellant was personally served, answered, and the matter was heard in a manner which raises no issue of procedural due process. See *Guthrie County* v. *Conrad,* 133 Iowa 171, 110 N.W. 454 (1907).

[4] In an earlier portion of the opinion the court had pointed out that the common law had not imposed upon a parent a duty to support his child after the latter's maturity, to remedy which "defect," along with others, the statute of 43 Eliz. c.2 § 7 was passed, enacting inter alia that the father of a lame, blind or impotent person, "being of sufficient ability" shall "relieve and maintain every such poor person."

Yet in spite of all of this development, the act still has a few shortcomings. One of these is the extent of coverage—or lack of it—accorded to employees who receive a large portion of their annual earnings in the form of tips.

Tips form the major source of livelihood for many workers who earn a small wage because of the prospect of receiving supplementary income in the form of tips. But the Social Security Act fails to recognize this arrangement and allows these workers to obtain credit only for the wages they receive directly from their employers—in spite of the fact, of course, that they are required to pay income tax on the tips they have received.

The bill I am introducing would meet this objection in a simple and, I believe, effective manner by requiring the worker to report the amount of his tips in writing to his employer. This report would be used for income tax withholding purposes as well as social security.

I believe that these workers have enough integrity and enlightened self-interest to make an accurate report of their tips. They are now required to pay income taxes on the amount of their tips. Most of them wish to have the law extended so that they and their dependents will be eligible for higher benefits under the law—benefits which they are anxious to purchase, knowing that this kind of prepaid insurance will provide security in their retirement.

The proposal to cover tips under the OASDI program was recommended as far back as 1948 by the Advisory Council on Social Security appointed by the Senate Finance Committee. In its report that year to the Finance Committee the Council stated the reason for its recommendation as follows:

> Adoption of this recommendation, the Council believes, would bring the contributions paid and the benefits received by a large number of people more nearly in line with their actual earnings, thus ending an inequity to persons whose employment is covered by the program but who receive much of their remuneration for such employment in a form not now considered wages. It would also result in greater uniformity in interpretation of wages in laws relating to income taxes, unemployment insurance, and old-age and survivors insurance. (Senate Doc. No. 208, 80th Cong., pp. 28–29.)

This proposal came up again in 1958 when the House Ways and Means Committee was considering the social security amendments that were passed that year. In its report on those amendments the committee stated that it had given serious consideration to the coverage of tips, commenting that:

> We are aware that because such tips are not now counted toward benefits, a large number of employees have inadequate protection under the system. The average wages, without tips, of employees who customarily receive tips are relatively low; their benefits reflect only this level of earnings rather than the true level of their earnings from work.
>
> There are, however, considerable difficulties in determining the amounts of tips to be counted and in securing reports of these amounts. Your committee considered plans relating to the problems involved, but was not able, in the time at its disposal, to satisfy itself that such plans would be workable on a national scale. (H. Rept. No. 2288, 85th Cong., p. 7.)

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Department of the Treasury were requested by the House Committee on Ways and Means in 1958 to study this problem and submit their recommendations to the committee.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare submitted a report to the committee in response to this request in 1960, with a plan, worked out jointly with the Treasury Department, to provide for the coverage of tips as wages under the OASDI program. No action, however, has been taken by Congress to date.

I think that the time has long passed when the minor administrative problem holding up the enactment of this just and fair proposal should have been resolved. I believe that my bill offers an adequate solution to this problem and I should like to see it considered by the proper committees at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1883) to provide that tips received by an employee in the course of his employment shall be included as part of his wages for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, introduced by Mr. Keating, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 209 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"For purposes of this title, tips received by an employee in the course of his employment shall be considered remuneration for employment, whether such tips are received by the employee directly from a person other than his employer and are reported by the employee pursuant to section 6052 of the Internal Revenue Code, or are paid over to the employee by his employer. Such tips shall be deemed to be paid to the employee by the employer, and shall be deemed to be so paid at the time they are received by the employee."

Sec. 2. (a) The first sentence of section 3102(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction of tax from wages) is amended by inserting "(including, in the case of tips which constitute wages, only such tips as are paid over to the taxpayer by the employer or are reported by the taxpayer pursuant to section 6052)" after "wages".

(b) Section 3121 of such Code (relating to definitions under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(q) For purposes of this title with respect to the taxes imposed by this chapter, tips received by an employee in the course of his employment shall be considered remuneration for employment, whether such tips are received by the employee directly from a person other than his employer and are reported by the employee pursuant to section 6052 of the Internal Revenue Code, or are paid over to the employee by his employer. Such tips shall be deemed to be paid to the employee by the employer, and shall be deemed to be so paid at the time they are received by the employee."

Sec. 3. (a) That portion of section 3041(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of wages for purposes of collecting income tax at source) which precedes the numbered paragraphs is amended by inserting "including tips received by an employee in the course of his employment, and" before "including".

(b)(1) Subsection (a) of section 3402 of such Code (relating to income tax collected at source) is amended by striking "subsection (j)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsections (j) and (k)".

(2) Section 3402 of such Code is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(k) Tips.—For purposes of this title with respect to the tax under this chapter, tips which are paid over to an employee by the employer in whose employ the services of the employee are performed, or which are reported by the employee to such employer pursuant to section 6052, shall be deemed to be paid by such employer to the employee, and shall be deemed to be so paid at the time they are received by the employee. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the case of tips so paid over or reported, such employer shall be required to deduct and withhold, upon any unpaid remuneration or funds of the employee under the employer's control, the tax required to be deducted and withheld under this chapter but not in excess of an amount equal to such remuneration and such funds minus any tax required by section 3102(a) to be collected from such wages."

Sec. 4 (a) Section 6051(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to receipts for employees) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In the case of tips received by an employee in the course of his employment, the amounts required to be shown by paragraphs (3) and (5) shall include only such tips as are paid over to the employee by the employer or are reported by the employee to the employer pursuant to section 6052."

(b)(1) Subpart C of part III of subchapter A of chapter 61 of such Code (relating to information regarding wages paid employees) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 6052. Statement of Tips.

"Every employee who receives tips which are considered remuneration for employment under section 3121(q) or section 3401(a) shall furnish written statements to his employer of all such tips, other than tips paid over to the employee by such employer. Such statements shall be furnished by the employee under such regulations, and at such times and in such form and manner, as may be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate."

(2) The table of sections for such subpart C is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 6052. Statement of tips."

(c) Section 6652 of such Code (relating to failure to file certain information returns) is amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c) and by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) Failure To Report Tips.—In any case where an employee required under authority of section 6052 to furnish a statement of tips received by him fails to furnish such statement as required by regulations prescribed under such section, or fails to include any such tip in such a statement as so required, unless it is shown that such failure is due to reasonable cause and not due to willful neglect, there shall be paid by the employee, in addition to the tax imposed by section 3101 with respect to the amount of tips not included in such a statement, an amount equal to such tax."

LIMITATION OF RIGHT OF CERTAIN AIR CARRIERS TO RECEIVE SUBSIDY PAYMENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 406(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to limit the right of certain air carriers to receive subsidy payments. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter from the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement of purpose and need for the proposed legislation, an analysis of the proposed amendments and a comparison with existing law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter, statement, analysis, and comparison will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1884) to amend section 406(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to limit the right of certain air carriers to receive subsidy payments, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter, statement, analysis, and comparison, presented by Mr. Magnuson are as follows:

Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C., July 1, 1963.
Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: The Civil Aeronautics Board recommends to the Congress for its consideration the enclosed draft of a proposed bill "to amend section 406(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to limit the right of certain air carriers to receive subsidy payments."

The Board has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that enactment of the draft bill would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,
Alan S. Boyd,
Chairman.

Statement of Purpose and Need for Proposed Legislation

A bill "to amend section 406(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to limit the right of certain air carriers to receive subsidy payments"—the proposed legislation would amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to make domestic trunkline air carriers ineligible for subsidy insofar as their operations in interstate or intrastate air transportation are concerned (excluding Alaska and Hawaii).

The President urged in his transportation message to the Congress on April 5, 1962, that favorable consideration be given to legislation submitted by the Board (S. 2297 and H.R. 10813) making domestic trunkline air carriers ineligible for operating subsidies in the future.

The legislation was based on the fact that although subsidy was no longer paid to any of the domestic trunkline carriers, all of whom had been self-sufficient for a number of years, such carriers had the right to petition for subsidy if they could show that it was needed to enable them to maintain and continue the development of air transportation. The Board believed that the posture of the domestic trunkline carriers with respect to their interstate operations had changed to such an extent that it was no longer realistic for them to assume that there was a Government subsidy to which they could return on any occasion when situations developed which caused them to have inadequate earnings. As the President pointed out in his transportation message, these carriers provided more passenger miles of transportation service than any of the other common carriers, and although they were experiencing temporary overcapacity and had recently sustained financial losses, they had bright prospects for longrun growth and prosperity which should make them permanently independent of Government support.

The Board continues to believe that the time has come for the Government to make it clear that it considers the domestic trunkline industry to have reached a state of self-sufficiency where it should no longer expect direct Government subsidy in connection with its domestic mainland operations.

Analysis of Proposed Amendments to Section 406(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958

Section 406(b) of the Federal Aviation Act directs the Board, in fixing and determining fair and reasonable rates of compensation for the transportation of mail, to consider, among other things, "(3) the need of each such air carrier (other than a supplemental air carrier) for compensation for the transportation of mail sufficient to insure the performance of such service, and, together with all other revenue of the air carrier, to enable such air carrier under honest, economical, and efficient management, to maintain and continue the development of air transportation to the extent and of the character and quality required for the commerce of the United States, the Postal Service, and the national defense."

The carriers referred to in section 406, and to which clause (3) applies, include "each holder of a certificate authorizing the transportation of mail by aircraft." Thus, any air carrier holding a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing the transportation of mail by aircraft (except for a supplemental air carrier or for such authorization as has been granted on a nonsubsidy basis) is eligible for payments based on need as set forth in such clause.

In order to achieve the objective of eliminating the trunkline air carriers from the right to receive need or subsidy payments with respect to mainland domestic operations, section 406(b) has been amended by adding a proviso that in determining the rates for any air carrier authorized to engage in air transportation for the primary purpose of furnishing long-haul or trunkline service for the transportation of persons, property, and mail the Board shall not take into consideration under clause (3) any need which arises from interstate or intrastate air transportation (other than transportation to, from, or within Alaska and Hawaii). Trunkline air carriers engaged in foreign or oversea air transportation will remain eligible for subsidy insofar as need therefor arises from such operations, but any profit of any such carrier from mainland operations over and above a reasonable return would be applied as other revenue in computing the subsidy for the foreign and oversea transportation. Air transportation of mail to, from, or within the States of Alaska and Hawaii has been specifically excepted, so that such operations would continue to be eligible for subsidy. Since the legislation applies only to air carriers authorized to engage in air transportation for the transportation of persons, property, and mail, the all-cargo carriers would not be deprived of eligibility for subsidy, providing they were otherwise entitled to receive it. However, at the moment no all-cargo carrier holds a certificate which makes it eligible to receive subsidy. While certain carriers hold authority to engage in the carriage of property and mail, this authority has been granted on a nonsubsidy basis. Such authorizations, together with authorizations to carry persons, property, and mail on a nonsubsidy basis, have been construed as making operations thereunder ineligible for subsidy.

The Board would consider the need for subsidy only with respect to those categories of operations which would remain eligible thereunder. For example, if a carrier operating from the west coast to Hawaii had a need for subsidy for operations over that route, the Board could consider only the need for subsidy over that route. It could not consider the carrier's need for subsidy on its domestic mainland routes. On the other hand, if the carrier had a profit on its domestic mainland route, anything over and above a reasonable return would, under the proposed legislation, be applied as "other revenue" in computing the subsidy on the west coast-Hawaii route.

In summary, the purpose of this legislation is to exclude from subsidy eligibility mainland operations of the 11 existing trunkline carriers who received grandfather certificates under section 401(e)(1) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as well as those of any other air carrier which may in the future be authorized to engage in air transportation for the primary purpose of providing long-haul or trunkline services of the type performed by the 11 existing trunklines. It is not intended to exclude from subsidy eligibility carriers certificated for the primary purpose of offering short haul local or feeder air transportation service. Thus, the rights of the 13 local service carriers would not be affected.

Comparison With Existing Law—Rates for Transportation of Mail

Ratemaking Elements

[New matter in black brackets]

Section 406(b). In fixing and determining fair and reasonable rates of compensation under this section, the Board, considering the conditions peculiar to transportation by aircraft and to the particular air carrier or class of air carriers, may fix different rates for different air carriers or classes of air carriers, and different classes of service. In determining the rate in each case, the Board shall take into consideration, among other factors, (1) the condition that such air carriers may hold and operate under certificates authorizing the carriage of mail only by providing necessary and adequate facilities and service for the transportation of mail; (2) such standards respecting the character and quality of service to be rendered by air carriers as may be prescribed by or pursuant to law; and (3) the need of each such air carrier (other than a supplemental air carrier) for compensation for the transportation of mail sufficient to insure the performance of such service, and, together with all other revenue of the air carrier, to enable such air carrier under honest, economical, and efficient management, to maintain and continue the development of air transportation to the extent and of the character and quality required for the commerce of the United States, the Postal Service, and the national defense **[: *Provided,* That the Board in fixing and determining rates for any air carrier authorized to engage in air transportation for the primary purpose of furnishing long-haul or trunkline service for the transportation of persons, property, and mail shall not take into consideration under clause (3) of this subsection any need of such carrier which may arise from the performance of air transportation between places in the same State of the United States, or between a place in any State of the United States, or the District of Columbia, and a place in any other**

State of the United States, or the District of Columbia (other than transportation to, from, or within the States of Alaska and Hawaii).]

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 212(e) OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 212(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the bill be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1887) to amend section 212(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. Allott, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The explanation presented by Mr. Allott is as follows:

Explanation of Bill To Amend Section 212 (e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act

The purpose of this amendment is to obviate the unnecessary hardships and difficulties which have arisen in connection with the administration of section 212(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act as it presently exists. Under that law, an exchange visitor may not obtain an immigrant visa for the purpose of immigrating to the United States, or to apply for permanent resident status, unless he has departed from the United States and remained outside of this country for at least 2 years. The law permits a waiver of this foreign residence requirement in the case of an "exceptional hardship" upon the alien's spouse or child.

There is no definition as to the meaning of such an "exceptional hardship" contained in the law; from the language of the statute it would seem that the act places an intolerable burden upon the administrators thereof. Seemingly, merely having a citizen spouse and child is not sufficient to entitle the alien to a waiver of the 2-year foreign residence requirement. If having a spouse and child in this country was sufficient for the granting of a waiver it would have been unnecessary to mention the hardship.

What is a hardship? As reasonable men it certainly appears that any separation of a person from his wife and children for 2 years is going to be a hardship. We are all familiar with the public outcries against forcible expulsion of such aliens who, after having come here as exchange visitors and marry, raise a family, and then seek special benefits to be permitted to remain in this country.

Something, however, should be done for those people who have completed the mission they had when they came here as exchange visitors, who do not wish to return, and whose return is not even demanded or insisted upon by the country of which they are nationals and whence they came. Such being the case, it seems wholly unnecessary for those people to be forced to depart, since a departure in their cases adds absolutely nothing to the spirit, purpose, and intent of the law under which they came here as exchange visitors.

Hence, this bill would make a moderate but important revision in section 212(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act by leaving the existing law exactly as it is, that is, permitting a waiver of the 2-year foreign residence requirement as a prerequisite to the procurement of a visa upon the basis of a proven hardship. In addition, the bill would add another ground upon which such a waiver could be granted by the Attorney General: If the country of which the alien is a national or citizen advises the Attorney General in writing that it does not demand or insist upon the alien's return to that country, the Attorney General will have discretionary authority in that case also to waive the 2-year foreign residence requirement if he finds that the admission to the United States of the alien would be in the public interest.

Such an amendment does no violence to the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, or its predecessors; it obviously cannot interfere with or harm the foreign relations of the United States; and it grants an avenue of relief in behalf of worthy aliens whose forcible departure from the United States after having come here as exchange visitors, ought not to be insisted upon.

PROGRAMS FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND SALES TO INSURE INCREASED USE OF MICA AND MICA PRODUCTS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I introduce a bill which I ask to be referred to the appropriate committee.

This bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to establish programs for research, development, and sales to insure the increased use of mica and mica products.

These programs would be financed by appropriating to the Secretary of the Interior each fiscal year, beginning July 1, 1964, an amount equal to 30 percent of all duties collected on imported mica and mica products. These revenues would be maintained in a separate fund to be used by the Secretary to conduct technological and research programs relating to mica and mica products, and to develop and increase markets for mica, including advertising and sales promotion programs.

The Secretary of the Interior would be directed to cooperate with agencies of the Federal, State and local governments, private agencies, organizations or individuals interested in mica and to appoint an advisory committee of the domestic mica industry to advise him in the formulation of policy, rules, and regulations necessary to achieving the goals of the program.

There is ample precedent for the establishment of this program. We are already giving the same type of aid to the fishing and the woolen textile industries.

This bill is identical to one introduced by my friend and colleague in the other body, Representative James C. Cleveland of New Hampshire's Second Congressional District. We introduce this proposed legislation, and urge its passage to save the once booming mica industry from the policies of the present administration.

For many years, New Hampshire's mica mines, rich in high grade mica and beryl, provided employment for hundreds of workers and millions of dollars to our economy. When mica imports began increasing a few years ago, the Federal Government, recognizing the defense requirements for mica, instituted a domestic subsidy program by which it stockpiled this ore.

In June of 1962, the administration claimed it had stockpiled all the mica and beryl it could use and discontinued the subsidy.

But just last month, the New Hampshire Sunday News of Manchester, N.H., disclosed the U.S. Department of Agriculture had arranged a barter deal with Brazil in which 200,000 tons of American wheat would be exchanged for 12,000 tons of Brazilian mica. And this Brazilian mica is destined for the national stockpile.

How can this administration possibly justify a program which takes away the jobs and incomes of American workers during 1 year and creates the same jobs for Brazilian workers the next year?

When the New Hampshire mines closed down, due to termination of the stockpile program, more than 150 workers in the small New Hampshire community of Franklin lost their jobs. In my home county of Grafton, the famed Ruggles mine—the Nation's oldest and largest—was forced to shut down and scores of workers were put out of work and many of them have been unable to find employment since. This administration explained to these workers that they had been thrown out of work because the Government no longer needed their product. But now—just a year later—this same administration barters for Brazilian mica which could have provided employment for 2½ years for thousands of miners in New Hampshire, North Carolina, and South Dakota if the Kennedy administration had chosen to "Buy American" rather than "Barter Brazilian."

Mr. President, I feel that the bill I have just introduced, if adopted, would be successful in revitalizing a once thriving industry and provide employment for thousands of workers whose skills, talents, and energies are now dormant because of the policies of the present administration. This bill gives us one opportunity to show we are really interested in solving the problems of unemployment; that we are vitally concerned because our skilled workers cannot find jobs, and we are trying to provide some sections of our country with the means for economic revival.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1893) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish programs for research, development, and sales to insure the increased use of mica and mica products, introduced by Mr. Cotton, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that yesterday the Senate received the nominations of Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., U.S. Navy, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to Portugal; Howard Rex Cottam, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the State of Kuwait; and Claude G. Ross, of California, to be Ambassador to the Central African Republic.

In accordance with the committee rule these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

TRIBUTES TO REPRESENTATIVE CARL VINSON, OF GEORGIA

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, Georgians have good reason to be proud of CARL VINSON, their venerable representative from the Sixth District of Georgia in the U.S. House of Representatives, for his long and distinguished service to his State and Nation.

But today we are exceedingly proud of him; and I am sure all the citizens of the United States share our feelings of respect for Congressman VINSON, who on this date has served in the House of Representatives longer than any other Member in the history of this country.

Congressman VINSON, who was sworn in as a Member of the House on November 3, 1914, when many of the present Members of Congress were still infants or not yet born, surpasses the record established by the beloved late Speaker Sam Rayburn, who served continually in the House for 48 years and 8 months before his death in 1961. No other present Member of the House approaches CARL VINSON's record of longevity.

For almost half a century, Congressman VINSON has served Georgia and the Nation with unswerving dedication to the high principles upon which this country was founded. He is devoted to the American way of life and the American system of government; and in the discharge of his public trust throughout his remarkable career, Congressman VINSON is without peer.

All the people of the United States owe CARL VINSON an abiding debt of gratitude. Though his activities have been many and his interests varied, his every deed has been calculated to further the welfare of the Nation.

Congressman VINSON has been chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and its predecessor, the Naval Affairs Committee, since 1931, with the exception of two 2-year terms when Republicans were in a majority of the House. More than any other Member of Congress, he was principally responsible for the development of our two-ocean Navy, and for this history will mark him the "Father of the Modern Navy."

No other man in history has served so long or so well in the House of Representatives.

He is truly one of the greatest statesmen of all time; and on this momentous occasion, I should like to congratulate him as the all-time dean of the House thank him for his outstanding service and contributions to the United States, and wish him Godspeed in all that he is to do in the future.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Georgia may be recognized for 2 additional minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield to my friend the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Georgia in commending and congratulating the dean of the House, Hon. CARL VINSON, of Georgia.

It was my personal pleasure and privilege to serve for 10 years with him in the House of Representatives. He is, in many respects, a Congressman's Congressman.

The Senator from Georgia has mentioned the contributions of Representative VINSON to the creation of a two-ocean Navy. I think that tribute could be expanded beyond two oceans, in view of today's developments, to emphasize the contributions which the distinguished Member of Congress from Georgia, Mr. VINSON, has made.

However, there is one other factor in the defense picture which I believe should be emphasized, and that is that through the efforts of the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, CARL VINSON, and the efforts of a distinguished Member of this body, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], Congress passed a law which made it possible to give to the Marine Corps a degree of stability which it enjoys today for the first time, but which for over 150 years it was not its good fortune to have; and under the Vinson-Douglas bill we find that the Marine Corps now is the only service with a floor of three divisions and three air wings. I think great credit should go to Congressman VINSON, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, for the contribution he made in this respect, among the many others which are to his credit during his long service in the Congress.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the distinguished majority leader; and I concur in what he has said.

Mr. CARLSON. I join the distinguished Senator from Georgia and our distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] in extending commendations and congratulations to Hon. CARL VINSON for his service in the House of Representatives.

It was my privilege to serve there with him for 12 years. Not only did I enjoy serving with him; I also learned to respect his great ability and his outstanding knowledge of our Government—and, as has been mentioned, particularly in connection with our defense program.

I, too, greatly appreciate the service which CARL VINSON has rendered the Nation during several trying periods in its history, including World War II, the Korean situation, and many others.

We are greatly indebted to him, and I wish to join in extending our congratulations and best wishes to him.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank my able friend the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief observation with respect to the unusual event which transpires in the other body today, when a distinguished Representative from my State, the Honorable CARL VINSON, will have served longer in the House of Representatives than any other American since the adoption of the Constitution in 1789.

I am proud of Congressman VINSON's accomplishments. The State of Georgia is proud of his accomplishments. The Nation, and indeed the entire free world, might well be grateful to him for his services over a period of almost half a century.

He has had few equals, and I predict that in the days to come, after he shall have passed from the scene of human affairs, he will take his place with the truly great and outstanding men who have served our Nation in the House of Representatives.

He has had complete appreciation of the fact that if this Nation is to remain free it must remain strong. He has labored, in and out of season, effectively, wisely, and prudently to see that the United States had a Military Establishment which was adequate to the needs of the time.

His foresight enabled us to have a Navy at the outbreak of World War II that we would not have had but for the fact that he sponsored the so-called Vinson-Trammell Act, which provided for the building of a Navy that at the time looked to be wholly unnecessary, but which, with the development of events, proved to be vital to our preservation.

It has been a high privilege for me to work with him in our respective capacities as chairmen of the Armed Services Committees of the House and of this body and I wish for him many more years of service.

According to all the indications of the times, "Uncle CARL," "Cousin CARL," "Mr. Chairman," or "Admiral VINSON" will be with us for many more years to come, and the country will be the beneficiary of his services.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona, who is the only man who has served in the two Houses of Congress longer than Representative VINSON, and who holds the world record in parliamentary bodies, having served in the two Houses of Congress longer than any other man has served.

Mr. HAYDEN. I was here when CARL VINSON came, and we have been friends throughout these years. I concur in everything the Senator from Georgia said about his capability and the services he has rendered to his country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator will yield, the Chair would like to make a brief statement associating himself with the remarks made by the senior Senator from Georgia and those made earlier by his colleague. When I came to the House in 1937, I was assigned as a member of the House Naval Affairs Committee, which was presided over by CARL VINSON. For my entire 12 years in the House, I worked under the leadership of Mr. VINSON. I found him to be a kind man, a fair man, an extremely influential man.

We all know that ever since there has been a Congress, the State of Georgia has contributed some of the most able and patriotic men who have ever served in either body, the House or the Senate. Mr. Vinson ranks high on the list of Georgia public servants.

I do not know of any man who ever served in the House who more thoroughly understood his bills, who brought them to the House with better preparation, or who succeeded in passing them with greater unanimity than the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

I am glad he has established this record, although there is another record, as always, which must yield to his.

I join the senior Senator from Georgia, the beloved chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, in wishing Mr. Vinson happiness and many more days in the Congress. The longer he serves here, the more the free world will benefit.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the kind remarks made by the Vice President of the United States. I know they will be gratifying to the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, coming from the one-time majority leader of the Senate, who has risen to the high office of Vice President of the United States. But the man we are discussing still thinks of him as one of the boys sitting along the table of the Naval Affairs and Armed Services Committee. I know he will be very grateful for the words that the distinguished Vice President has spoken.

RESOLUTIONS AT 47TH INTERNATIONAL CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR CONVENTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the 47th International Christian Endeavor Convention was held in Washington, D.C., July 2 to 6, 1963. Approximately 2,000 Christian Endeavorers, meeting in Washington, had as their convention theme "Through Christ I Can."

It was my privilege to address the convention and to speak on the subject "Our Heritage and Our Future."

The convention adopted several resolutions, and I ask unanimous consent that they be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

As Christian citizens we feel compelled to speak out especially in the following areas that demand consideration, concern, prayer, thoughtful discussion, and intelligent Christian action:

1. Race relations: A major imperative concern of the church and of the state is race relations. Oppressed and disinherited racial minorities demand equality of opportunities now, in consonance with our professed Christian faith and democratic ideals. We commit ourselves to a compelling Christian faith and Christian action until equality of opportunity and responsibility are realized by all without regard to race, color, or national origin. Through Christ we can.

2. Juvenile delinquency: We believe juvenile delinquency to be the result of sin which infects the human heart and of the emptiness which exists in the lives of many youth. We affirm that the solution to the problem comes through a saving relationship of an individual to Jesus Christ. We therefore resolve to use all spiritual resources at our command to show today's youth the fullness and satisfaction of life in Christ, and the uselessness of crime.

3. Church and state: We recognize and reaffirm our belief in the separation of church and state. At the same time, as Christians we need to make our voice heard in the state, to pray for those in authority over us, to take our stand even on controversial issues, to accept our democratic responsibility in such matters as voting and holding office, and, above all, to be Christian in the home, the school, the community, and in all of life.

4. Liquor and tobacco: We call upon Christians to abstain from the use of that which defiles and corrupts the body and weakens the Christian witness. Conscious of the harmful effects of the use of alcohol and tobacco both to individuals and to society, we urge that parents and youth make themselves aware of the dangers involved.

We further seek the elimination of false and misleading advertising and all that seeks to make liquor and tobacco socially acceptable.

5. The Lord's day: We call Christians to observe the Lord's day conscientiously for family and individual spiritual enrichment. Being aware of the increasing misuse and abuse of the Sabbath, we would urge that this day be set aside as a day of worship, rest, and gladness.

6. The sanctity of the home: We believe in the influence and the power of the Christian home. With the family as the basic unit of society it is of the utmost importance that the sanctity of the home be upheld. The breakdown of multitudes of homes in America is the cause of much individual unhappiness and many of the ills and problems of our day.

We urge that followers of Jesus Christ maintain homes with Christ as the head, where parents and children can mature in the faith as attention is given to prayer, the Holy Scriptures, and discipline in love.

7. Combating communism: We call upon all Christians to become aware of the true nature of the problem of communism and its threat to Christianity. We urge our youth to make a purposeful study of the basic technique and beliefs of communism in order to be aware of the vast difference between our Christian faith and the atheistic ideology of communism. We further urge a study of the principles and foundations of our own governments so that enlightened action can be taken to preserve and protect our democracies.

We believe that the strongest defense against communism is a vital personal relationship with Jesus Christ; therefore, bringing others into the Christian fellowship can be a strong positive effort in the current struggle for the minds and souls of men.

GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER'S CHALLENGE—NATION AS WELL AS PARTY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise today to invite the attention of Senators to a very important political document in the history of the Republican Party, and also in the history of the Nation. I refer to a statement which was made by Governor Rockefeller this weekend and which has already developed widespread comment and reaction.

Governor Rockefeller's statement marks a struggle for the soul of the Republican Party, which is vital to the Nation and therefore, worthy of thoughtful consideration without regard to parties. For the success of the radical right, which is boring from within the Republican Party and seeking to take it over or at the very least to make its principles and its 1964 platform ultraconservative using the imminent presidential campaign as a vehicle, will determine whether the two-party system in the United States can continue.

The Democratic Party has seen such a challenge, too, in the States' Rights Party of 1948; and even now, important legislation in the Congress is under the threat from some quarters of paralysis because of the imminent civil rights debate and the powerful positions held, as a result of seniority, within the congressional structure of the majority party.

To continue a viable two-party system, neither major party can leave the mainstream of American political thought—and this is without regard to liberal or conservative principles. The Republican Party has to be true to the principles which make it the party of Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Robert Taft, and Dwight Eisenhower, and other greats, just as the Democratic Party has to be true to the principles of Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, and its greats.

For this reason, the struggle within the Republican Party is not just an intraparty struggle. It is a national struggle.

Governor Rockefeller's statement is a challenge to the conscience of every Republican. But more than that, it is a call to all Americans to deal in a forthright manner with the grave threat to our political institutions posed by extremist elements, whether in the Democratic Party or the Republican Party.

Those who view the Governor's statement as merely a political gambit or an opening gun in the presidential sweepstakes are underestimating its importance. They are running away from the issues and the challenge which Governor Rockefeller has presented.

The party of Abraham Lincoln must be true to its heritage in the civil rights fight and in the coming presidential campaign; without such fidelity to principle and precedent, the civil rights fight cannot be won in the Congress and the presidential campaign could develop into a threat to the Nation's principles of justice and freedom.

The issue is joined. Governor Rockefeller is obviously enlisting for the duration.

In my view, that is a cause fully equal to the cause of the presidential nomination. Many other Republicans, including some of my colleagues in the Senate, are likewise enlisting for the duration as I am.

I ask unanimous consent that Governor Rockefeller's statement, together with editorial comments published in the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER

Over the past months, many leaders of the Republican Party, myself included, have been working to put the party in a position to face the challenge of the 1964 election as a strong and united fighting force.

A minority party must be united for principle to provide the effective opposition and constructive alternatives that our country sorely needs. It must be united for principle and reach beyond its own boundaries to win. It must be united for principle to command broad support.

The paralysis of government that we are witnessing today in Washington stems from the fact that the Democratic Party is not united for principle, but in effect is two parties of opportunism proceeding in opposite directions.

In making this effort toward unity for principle, it was my conviction that the activities of the radical right, while deeply disturbing in many ways, would represent an inconsequential influence on the Republican Party.

It was my conviction that despite differences in emphasis among the party's responsible elements, there was an overwhelming consensus within the party on the fundamental articles of Republican faith.

In broadest terms, these articles of faith are:

1. Unswerving dedication to the preservation of our own freedom and the extension of freedom throughout the world through a firm, resolute and positive foreign policy.

2. Equality of opportunity for a better life for all Americans regardles of economic status, geographic location, race, creed, color, or national origin.

3. Faith in our Federal system of government as the best assurance of freedom and equal opportunity and as the only hope of keeping democratic government close to the people and responsive to their will.

4. Faith in the private enterprise system as the dynamic, creative base for social progress in a free society and of freedom of individual initiative without which men cannot be really free or equal.

5. Faith in the fundamental importance of fiscal integrity in government as the indispensable political base for economic growth and the vitally needed expansion of job opportunities.

6. Faith in our heritage of freedom of speech and of information and in the right and need of the people to know all the facts on the issues confronting them as essential to the preservation of a free society.

While as a party and as a people, we have been keenly aware of the grave threat to these principles posed by international communism, I have now come to the conclusion that many of us have been taking too lightly the growing danger to these very same principles through subversion from the radical right.

I am now convinced that, unless the vast majority of Republicans who subscribe to these principles, are aroused from present inaction—whether this inaction stems from complacency, from fear or from a fantastically short-sighted opportunism—the Republican Party is in real danger of subversion by a radical, well-financed and highly disciplined minority.

For it has now become crystal clear that the vociferous and well-drilled extremist elements boring within the party utterly reject these fundamental principles of our heritage. They are, in fact, embarked on a determined and ruthless effort to take over the party, its platform and its candidates, on their own terms—terms that are wholly alien to the sound and honest conservatism that has firmly based the Republican Party in the best of a century's traditions, wholly alien to the sound and honest Republican liberalism that has kept the party abreast of human needs in a changing world, wholly alien to the broad middle course that accommodates the mainstream of Republican principle.

This cannot be allowed to happen. The continuing commitment of the Republican Party to its historic principles, including its fundamental dedication to equality of opportunity for all men, cannot and must not be betrayed. No temptation of political gain through cynical expediency can be permitted to becloud our commitment to principle and purpose.

No one could fail to be deeply disturbed by the proceedings at the recent Young Republican National Convention in San Francisco. I am completely confident that the overwhelming majority of young Republicans of this country respond today, as they always have, to the idealism of the party's tradition. I am confident that they want it to continue to be a positive and responsible party serving the best interests of all the people.

But every objective observer at San Francisco has reported that the proceedings there were dominated by extremist groups, carefully organized, well financed and operating through the tactics of ruthless, rough-shod intimidation. These are the tactics of totalitarianism.

Unfortunately, this cannot be brushed off as irresponsibility. For youth is responsible. The leaders of the Birchers and others of the radical right lunatic fringe—every bit as dangerous to American principles and American institutions as the radical left—who successfully engineered this disgraceful subversion of a great and responsible auxiliary of the Republican Party are the same people who are now moving to subvert the Republican Party itself. They claim initial success and predict ultimate victory for their efforts.

These people have no program for the Republican Party or the American people except distrust, disunity, and the ultimate destruction of the confidence of the people in themselves. They are purveyors of hate and distrust in a time when, as never before, the need of the world is for love and understanding.

They have no concern with and offer no solution for the problems of chronic unemployment, of education and training, of housing, of racial injustice and strife, of all the other problems which must have answers if our democratic ideals are to be translated into living reality.

And in the political sphere, they offer something equally sinister.

Completely incredible as it is to me, it is now being seriously proposed to the Republican Party that as a strategy for victory in 1964, that it write off the Negro and other minority groups, it deliberately write off the great industrial States of the North (representing nearly 50 percent of the country's population), that it write off the big cities, and that it direct its appeal primarily to the electoral votes of the South, plus the West and a scattering of other States.

The transparent purpose behind this plan is to erect political power on the outlawed and immoral base of segregation and to transform the Republican Party from a national party of all the people to a sectional party for some of the people.

No such plan ever has, or ever will succeed. It cannot stand the light of day. It will be rejected out of hand by the Republican Party. It will be rejected by the Nation. It will be rejected by the South.

The South has long pointed out that the racial problem is not a sectional problem, but a national problem. I know that there is southern leadership that wants to participate in a national solution.

A program based on racism or sectionalism would in and of itself not only defeat the Republican Party in 1964, but would destroy it altogether.

The Republican Party is the party of Lincoln. It was founded to make men free and equal in opportunity. It is the party of all men, the only truly national party in America. For that party to turn its back on its heritage and its birthright would be an act of political immorality rarely equaled in human history.

No cloak of so-called States rights can conceal the real purpose behind this strategy. The political rights of States are clear within the Federal system and their realization depends importantly upon the exercise of States responsibilities within that system. But a century ago, a great war decided for all time that in the area of human dignity, States rights must forever yield to the rights of the individual. And so in this area, the invocation of States rights can only be regarded as a pretext.

For the Republican Party, political success cannot be divorced from political morality and the fact is that the party's dedication to the equality of all men is still, and must, more than ever before, be its guide to leadership and to victory.

Far from abandoning this dedication, the whole burden of the distinguished 1961 report by Chairman Bliss, of Ohio, was that both the party's greatest challenge and its brightest opportunity lay in its willingness to deal with the great urban problems confronting our Nation, and the people of the cities, especially the minority groups.

The path to victory is not in running away from the people of this country. The path to victory is in seeking out the people in the areas where they live, in accepting the responsibilities of leadership in the solution of their problems and demonstrating to them, as the Republican Party has in many areas, that in it is to be found the will, the sincerity, the competence, and the drive to make this a better land for all its people.

The issue that confronts the Republican Party today is the gravest in its history.

I have no doubt whatever that responsibility, moderation and sound progress continue to be the spiritual allegiance of the overwhelming majority of the Republicans of this country.

But a complacent majority, or a fearful one, or a majority misled to betrayal of its principles in pursuit of political fantasies will be as surely subverted by militant extremism as such majorities always have been throughout all history.

No Republican can stand by idly in the face of this threat. No Republican can stand aloof from the issue that it presents. One must be either for or against these forces. The time for temporizing is over.

Some in the party have already spoken out against this threat. This is a responsibility for all of us. I for one will do everything in my power, working with others, to counter the influence of these forces and to defeat their purposes.

For the future of this great Nation lies not in the unprincipled extremism of the radical right any more than it lies in the unprincipled opportunism that has captured the Democratic Party.

It lies in the fiscally responsible, humanely principled mainstream of American thought and leadership that the party of Abraham Lincoln, of Theodore Roosevelt, of Robert Taft has always represented and will continue to represent.

It is said that in the next presidential election, the voter should be given a choice.

I agree.

There must be an alternative to a faltering administration that has suffered a Communist military base to be established 90 miles off our shores—the most visible symbol, but by no means the only one, of a general deterioration in our national security and our posture of leadership before the world.

There must be an alternative to an administration that is floundering in its fiscal management, that has been unable to settle on a program, let alone effect a solution, for our stagnant economy and our millions of unemployed.

There must be an alternative for an administration that by inaction has plunged our country into the most soul-searing racial strife of our history.

There must be an alternative. But, in the sound instincts of the American people, that alternative will never be found in a party of extremism, a party of sectionalism, a party of racism, a party that disclaims responsibility for most of the population before it even starts its campaign for their support.

Such an alternative is not a choice but a mockery.

The choice that must be provided to the American people is to be found only in a party of responsible Republicanism, truly faithful to its Lincolnian heritage, truly national in scope, concerned with the opportunity and well-being of every individual citizen and thus commanding the confidence of the country as a whole. Last but not least, it must be responsibly and constructively concerned with the strengthening of this country's leadership of the free world.

The choice as to whether such a party shall be presented to the electorate is a choice for all Republicans. In the days between now and the Republican convention, where the final decision will be made, that choice and these issues must be submitted to them. I have no doubt as to the outcome. And I have no doubt that out of this process will come the kind of moral strength, the strength of principle, that is needed to win and that is needed to govern.

The Republican Party stands today at the crossroads of its destiny. Its destiny is to save the Nation by first saving itself.

[From the New York Times]

Rockefeller to His Party

Governor Rockefeller in his weekend statement denouncing the "radical right lunatic fringe" wrote a 1964 Republican platform for his party and offered it some guidance on policy that could be read as advising against making Barry Goldwater the man for President.

The New York Governor is only rarely an eloquent man. But in this statement he spoke with an impressive depth of conviction about the party's traditions and principles. He performed a service to his party in demanding that it not base its appeal on a program of expedient sectionalism. If he also served himself, as a possible candidate, this was no accident, but born of political necessity in a dark hour.

The timing and to some extent the content of the Governor's manifesto were prompted by the recent proceedings of the Young Republican National Convention in San Francisco which Mr. Rockfeller felt were "dominated by extremist groups" with "tactics of totalitarianism." He has nothing but scorn for a party strategy that would write off the Negro, the big cities, the great industrial areas of the North, in favor of directing an appeal primarily to the South, the West, and a few other States. Such a program based on racism or sectionalism would, he rightly says, "not only defeat the Republican Party in 1964, but would destroy it altogether." He adds that there is no prospect for success in "a party that disclaims responsibility for most of the population before it even starts its campaign for their support."

So, while Mr. Rockefeller takes elaborate care not to abandon or discredit "sound and honest conservatism" or the "broad middle course," and equal care not to spell out in detail what he means by these phrases, he has now chosen and declared his position as a candidate on the most important of domestic problems, civil rights. In this area he has written a platform of "political morality" in which his party's "dedication to the equality of all men is still, and must more than ever before be, its guide to leadership and victory." This is a standard that may not win the nomination for Rockefeller, as he clearly hopes it will. But it is creditable, correct, and can be fought for unashamedly.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, July 16, 1963]

Rockefeller Accepts the Challenge

Governor Rockefeller has met the challenge of the Republican Party's extreme right. Whether he has done so as a candidate is, at the moment, irrelevant. He has, in any case, a distinguished place in party councils, and this newspaper welcomes his return to battle and his determination to be heard on a matter of supreme importance. It is an issue on which he is exceptionally qualified to express the thoughts and emotions of a great many of his fellow Republicans.

"A program based on racism or sectionalism," said Mr. Rockefeller, "would in and of itself not only defeat the Republican Party in 1964, but would destroy it altogether."

The United States will unquestionably suffer a period of wracking strains until it accords the Negro full equality. Those strains are now inevitable. They will frighten many and anger more—in every part of the country and among every racial group. And they will offer temptations to politicians to promise some easy way out; to shove the whole matter under the rug of States rights.

Some Republicans have already succumbed to this temptation. They have been taken up into a high mountain and shown all the kingdoms of this earth, or at least, the electoral votes of the Deep South—and they have not said: "Get thee behind me, Satan." Rather, they have shown a willingness to deny the very foundations of their party in the name of a "conservative" approach to the Nation's problems.

But what do they plan to conserve? Segregation? It is morally dead—but the longer Americans wrangle over the corpse, the bigger will be the bill for the funeral.

Most Americans are aware of this. And they will reject any party that makes the continuance of the struggle a national political issue. If the Republican Party does so, under any guise, under any candidate, it will bear the responsibility for prolonging and intensifying the pains of a process that must be painful under the best of circumstances. More, it will bear the shame of abandoning the cause of freedom and equality that gave it birth.

This newspaper, which is proud of the part it played in the great movement which saw Republicanism begin and slavery end, does not believe the party will be false to its destiny. That destiny, is, in Governor Rockefeller's words, to save the Nation by first saving itself. In this process, the Governor has demonstrated, his voice will be powerful, it will be heard, and it will be welcome.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Byrd of West Virginia in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS—REMEDIES CONSIDERED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record a letter dated July 5, 1963, from Secretary Dillon on the U.S. balance of payments, as well as an article from the July 12 issue of the New York Times, entitled "U.S. Payment Lag Analyzed in Paris."

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, July 5, 1963.

Hon. Jacob K. Javits,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Jack: I am glad to take this opportunity to reply to the further questions on our balance of payments posed in your letter of June 19.

1. A better distribution of the burden of Western defense has been a U.S. objective for some years. In addition to our continuing efforts in NATO to get our European allies to undertake a larger share of the common defense efforts, we have been successful in negotiating bilaterally with two of our principal allies with strong payments positions—Germany and Italy—arrangements which offset most or all of the foreign exchange cost of maintaining our forces in their countries. We are further reducing the net balance-of-payments cost of maintaining our forces overseas through sales of military goods and services to other allies, and we are actively seeking to increase these sales further. These offsets and other sales are mutually beneficial in that they assist our NATO partners to meet their defense commitments and improve the military strength of the alliance, and at the same time reduce the burden of defense on the U.S. balance of payments.

2. The U.S. Travel Service is actively at work in over 30 principal tourist markets seeking to promote travel to the United States. Both advertising in local magazines and newspapers and travel films in the local language are used in this effort. While it is impossible to demonstrate a direct relationship between such generalized advertising and tourist expenditures here, we believe this can pay off many times over in increased balance-of-payments receipts. In addition to these active promotional efforts, we believe that tourism to the United States is also being helped by our actions to simplify visa and entry requirements, and other efforts to make visits to the United States easier and more attractive.

3. The administration has placed export promotion high on the list of measures designed to help the balance of payments. The new financing and guarantee facilities provided by the Export-Import Bank and the Foreign Credit Insurance Association have improved the ability of American exporters to meet the terms of their competitors abroad in this respect. Services provided to American businessmen by the Department of Commerce and American embassies and consulates abroad have been sharply increased, and direct promotional efforts have also been intensified through trade fairs, trade centers, and trade missions. Many new firms have been induced and assisted to enter the export market. The administration has considered the feasibility of granting specific tax incentives to exporters along with other possible incentive measures, but has not felt it advisable to propose the substantial modification in our tax system that would be required if an effective incentive were not to conflict with our international commitments under GATT. We are, therefore, taking a very firm stand against the proliferation of special tax export incentives used by our European competitors. The United States has, of course, consistently allowed a full exemption of excise (and other indirect) taxes imposed on goods destined for export, the rebate of which forms the basis for the incentive system of most European countries. But the effect is less than that abroad since such taxes play a relatively smaller role in our tax system.

4. The major savings which might be anticipated from further reviews of Government expenditures affecting the balance of

payments would be in the two largest programs in this area—the expenditures necessary to maintain our forces in various oversea areas, and those expenditures under our foreign aid program which result in a dollar outflow. In these programs, considerable savings have been achieved already. I have already discussed the far-reaching program which has been developed by Secretary McNamara to reduce the net impact of defense expenditures abroad. In this connection, we have held gross expenditures down despite price rises abroad and the impact of the Berlin buildup. The substantial impact of offset agreements has been noted earlier.

The Agency for International Development and its predecessor agencies have taken a series of steps which will further reduce dollar outflows under its program—it is currently estimated that over 80 percent of AID commitments in fiscal year 1963 will be provided in the form of U.S. goods and services.

While the possible savings that can be brought about through the "gold budget" review of other agency programs will necessarily be relatively small, each agency is being required to justify the need for each oversea activity to the Budget Bureau, and any deviation from the approved expenditure targets must be thoroughly justified and approved.

5. Our attitude toward the various proposals for "broadening existing financial institutions into a truly international banking system" has been one, not of dogmatic opposition but rather one of willingness to undertake study and analysis. Many proposals which have been made have been of a far-reaching nature and all have involved great complexities and innumerable technicalities which would have to be satisfactorily resolved before even tentative support could be given. In the circumstances we have felt that we have a special responsibility that constrains us not to set off any premature hope or speculation concerning any of these proposals. We would, I think, be acting equally irresponsibly if we were either to reject proposals out of hand or to support them before they have been given rigorous analysis and been deemed reasonably practicable and useful. But this does not mean that we have been unwilling to study carefully suggestions which have been made; and, in fact, we do continue to study ways and means of improving the existing institutions.

You will recall that we actively participated in increasing the resources and utility of the International Monetary Fund in the negotiation in 1961 of the "General Arrangements to Borrow." However, there is at present no consensus among major financial countries that the functions of the International Monetary Fund or other financial institutions need to be broadened particularly in the sense of creating a "truly international banking system" and none is likely in the near future. Even were such consensus to develop, the negotiations would be protracted, and there is no certainty that they would eventually develop a greater volume of credit than that now being obtained by the United States through bilateral arrangements. These have been effected speedily and selectively, and they have proved mutually advantageous. They have been designed to facilitate financing of our deficits on a short- and medium-term basis. They have entailed innovations and experiments in international finance. They have also increased international liquidity and induced greater international monetary stability. But they are not designed to shore up indefinitely the consequences of a continuing deficit in the basic elements of our balance of payments. Adjustments to this end take time, and we conceive of the bilateral financial arrangements as the most practical and suitable ones available at the present time to bridge the gap.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

[From the New York Times, July 12, 1963]

U.S. PAYMENT LAG ANALYZED IN PARIS

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

PARIS, July 11.—A top-level economic policy meeting of the Atlantic nations failed today to produce any new remedies for the chronic deficit in the U.S. balance of payments.

The closed-door meeting of the members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, it is understood, heard no new proposals or impending decisions from the American delegation.

However, Robert V. Roosa, Under Secretary of the Treasury, reportedly pointed to the recent tightening of credit in the United States and the rise in short-term interest rates as a change in policy that will have a favorable effect on the balance of payments.

OPTIMISTIC FORECAST

It would do so by helping to check the outflow of short-term capital. Most of the European members have long urged higher U.S. interest rates.

The 2-day meeting of the OECD's economic policy committee also was reported to have heard a relatively optimistic forecast on the outlook for economic growth and expansion from continental Europe, Britain, and the United States.

Walter W. Heller, President Kennedy's chief economic adviser, told a press conference afterward that the picture in Europe was considerably more optimistic than had been anticipated 6 or 12 months ago.

The balance-of-payments problem will be taken up again tomorrow at a secret meeting of a subcommittee, known as Working Party Three, that deals with this question regularly.

SITUATION UNDER REVIEW

The meeting is believed to be routine, with no important decisions or proposals expected.

Mr. Heller said the United States had under continuing review all elements of the balance of payments in an effort to reduce the deficit. But he gave no hint of any policy changes, aside from the recent tightening of credit policy.

Today's meeting heard a West German assessment of the recent reemergence of a surplus in the German balance of payments.

The German delegation reportedly said that the outlook for this year was for a small surplus instead of a deficit, as expected earlier, but that the sudden inflow of funds to Germany in the past 2 months was not expected to continue at the recent level.

Mr. JAVITS. In the letter, Secretary Dillon answered five questions put to him by me on June 19 regarding allied burden sharing for Western defense, U.S. tourist promotion programs, the administration's position on direct incentives to U.S. exporters and the further broadening of international financial institutions and results obtained under the "gold budget" procedure.

I have already referred to points made by the Secretary in my statement on the U.S. balance of payments on July 10. I believe, however, that as the Secretary's letter contains important statements of administration policy, it should receive the serious attention of my colleagues.

In connection with the same subject, I would also like to call the attention of the Senate to the article which appeared in the New York Times on July 12 regarding the annual meeting of the OECD in Paris. According to the article, this top level meeting of the Atlantic nations failed to produce any new remedies for the chronic deficit in the U.S. balance of payments. I believe this is a significant development, particularly since Secretary Dillon, during the recent hearings of the JEC, preferred the consideration of the U.S. balance of payments problem in the private atmosphere of a forum such as the OECD in contrast to the broader, public forum of a world monetary conference that I have proposed.

FARM SLOWDOWN

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Rural Income Trails 1962 as Cattle Prices Fall, Some Crops Hit Snags," published in the Wall Street Journal on July 10, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 10, 1963]

RURAL INCOME TRAILS 1962 AS CATTLE PRICES FALL, SOME CROPS HIT SNAGS

(By James P. Gannon)

While most business barometers indicate continuing strength in the U.S. industrial economy, conditions aren't so healthy down on the farm in many areas.

Take the case of William Farr, who now is fattening some of the 20,000 or more cattle he prepares for market each year at his sprawling feedlots near Greeley, Colo. The operation seems much the same as the last 2 years, but there's a major difference: This year Mr. Farr's cattle will bring him enormous losses.

"This is one of these catastrophic years," he says. "We're taking our worst losses since 1953."

Though his case may be extreme, Mr. Farr's plight is far from unusual. It's shared by other cattle feeders in widely scattered sections of the country. Some other types of farmers, including hog raisers, winter wheat growers, cotton farmers, dairymen, and cherry producers, also are feeling a squeeze.

INCOME ESTIMATES LOWERED

Federal farm economists already have unofficially lowered their estimates of net farm income for this year. Late last year, they predicted farmers this year would earn roughly the $12.9 billion they made in 1962, which was the highest since 1953. But 2 months ago, Federal seers privately predicted a drop of about 3 percent to $12.5 billion. Now, one analyst says the figure could go lower.

Even if it doesn't, the slide from last year will be steeper than 3 percent in certain areas. Roby L. Sloan, agricultural economist for the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, forecasts: "Net farm income in our district (Iowa, Michigan and most of Illinois, Indiana and Wisconsin) is likely to be down 15 percent from last year."

None of this necessarily indicates a farm depression is in the making. However, the evidence suggests a tightening up in rural spending is possible in coming months. Farm equipment makers—currently enjoying brisk sales—rural merchants and others who cater to the farm market likely will feel some effects.

Farm economists have lowered their farm income estimates for three principal reasons: A sharp decline in prices of livestock, the most important farm product; a 19 percent drop in this year's drought-shriveled winter wheat crop from what they predicted last December; and another climb in the cost of farming, which is expected to rise some $500 million for all farmers this year.

The bleakest portion of the farm profit picture is livestock. Meat animals account for nearly one-third of all cash receipts from farming, bringing farmers as much as wheat, corn, cotton and soybeans combined. Prices of both cattle and hogs have declined this year.

CATTLE PRICES FALL

The top price for choice steers paid at the Chicago stockyards last month plunged to $22.75 a hundred pounds in May, $9.75 below a 4-year high set last November. Although prices have firmed recently, as they usually do in the summer, analysts predict that heavy beef supplies which caused the decline will hold prices at a low level through the rest of the year.

Effects of the price slide on some cattle feeders who buy range cattle and fatten them for the market can be seen in a chronology related by Greeley's Mr. Farr. Like other feeders he was buying range cattle at relatively high prices late last year. "We came off in January with a loss of around $10 a head," he says. "In February and March, it was around $20 to $25 a head and recently we've been selling cattle that we bought at the top of the market last December at a loss of $50 a head or more."

Irwin Dubbert, who feeds about 400 cattle a year near Laurens, Iowa, says he paid about $25.50 a hundred pounds for range cattle last fall, and sold them this spring, after fattening, at about $22. Despite the weight gains, "you can't make ends meet that way," he complains. The losses, cattlemen say, are erasing the profits they made last year when cattle prices climbed. "Last year was a pretty good year," says A. E. Ruser, a big Omaha cattle feeder, "but we've already wiped out all of those gains and then some."

The price drops have not greatly hurt ranchers who breed range cattle and sell them to feeders. In the first 5 months this year, while feed cattle dropped sharply in price, the average price for range cattle at 10 major markets was $24.04 a hundred pounds, less than 2 percent below a year ago. But livestock analysts say range cattle prices probably will decline in coming months, because feeders won't be so willing to pay high prices following their own big losses.

HOG EARNINGS OFF

Hog producers' fortunes recently have brightened a bit as prices have rebounded, but for the year to date their earnings are off. The corn-hog ratio, a rough measure of profits in fattening and selling hogs, averaged 13.5 in the 6 months ended June 15, down appreciably from 16.1 in the like year-earlier period. The 13.5 ratio means that 100 pounds of live hog would bring enough on the market to buy 13.5 bushels of corn. Livestock men figure the break-even point for most pig raisers is a corn-hog ratio of 12.

Other soft spots in the farm economy include some big income producers, such as winter wheat, dairying, and cotton, and some small ones, such as tart cherries.

This year's winter wheat crop, now being harvested, was slashed by a hot, dry spring following an abnormally cold winter in the Southwestern plains. Farmers plowed up thousands of acres of dead wheat in parts of Kansas, Colorado, Oklahoma, and Texas. A private forecaster predicts a crop of 836 million bushels of winter wheat, 192 million less than predicted by the Government last December. Of course, wheat in general may be a big farm headache next year unless Congress passes a price support law to replace the one wheat farmers vetoed this spring. Barring such action, wheat price supports will fall to $1.25 a bushel from $2, and wheat income can be expected to drop sharply.

Cotton income this year will be reduced by a 9-percent cutback from 1962 in acreage planted. The dairy industry is feeling the effects of rising feed costs. The milk-feed ratio, a dairy industry profit yardstick comparable to the corn-hog ratio, dropped to an average of 1.3 in the 6 months ended June 15 from 1.4 in the year earlier period. Great Lakes sour cherry growers expect their smallest crop since 1945—about 40 percent of 1962 output—because of freeze damage.

So far there has been little impact from the farm slowdown. Most farm machinery firms, while admitting some uneasiness, say their retail sales continue strong. Industry sales of farm equipment this year may rise about 5 percent from last year's $1.6 billion, largely on the strength of last year's high farm income, equipment makers say.

But Deere & Co., a large equipment producer based in Moline, Ill., reports there has been "some drawing back" in retail sales during recent weeks in big cattle feeding areas. Deere's findings, which it describes as "spotty," are backed up by talks with farm equipment retailers.

"Some farmers' purse strings are definitely being tightened on account of livestock prices," says Dan Schwitters, a Deere dealer in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. His retail sales in the past several weeks have taken "a downturn—not a critical one—but a definite slowdown," he says.

Earl Moss, an International Harvester dealer in New Lenox, Ill., says the profit pinch is showing up in increasing delinquencies in farmers' installment payments on machinery. "They can't repay their bank loans on cattle and make equipment payments at the same time, because there's no profit in cattle this year," he says. "I am afraid it will cause more repossessions this year then we've ever seen."

"We're more concerned about the effect of the wheat referendum than about cattle profits," says Andy Sherman, a Harvester dealer in Hastings, Nebr. "If wheat goes to $1.25 a bushel, you can bet farmers aren't going to buy much machinery."

But the farm outlook is by not means bleak on all fronts. Corn and soybeans are both selling at prices well above a year ago and plantings of these two major crops are above last year's levels. Many citrus producers, despite last winter's freezes, are doing well as a result of higher prices. Orange growers averaged $3.79 a box for their fruit in the month ended June 15, almost triple a year earlier. The gain more than offset a drop in production.

Mr. MILLER. The article will reveal the depressing effect that the decline in cattle price has had on the agriculture picture, particularly in the Middle West.

ENFORCEMENT OF RIGHTS AGAINST LABOR UNIONS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, notwithstanding the order for the 2-minute rule during the morning hour, I ask unanimous consent that I might proceed for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I offer for appropriate reference, several amendments to the pending civil rights bills (S. 1731, S. 1732, S. 1750) and ask unanimous consent that the text of these amendments be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Civil rights, Mr. President, seem to be the order of the day. Judging by the reactions of the Congress and the enormous scope of the press coverage devoted to the issue, it would seem that civil rights is the crucial problem facing American society today. If this be true, and it is widely asserted to be so, then I feel that we in the Senate have a duty to examine all the areas where basic human rights are being impaired or denied, instead of devoting all of our attention exclusively to one particular segment and ignoring the others.

Mr. President, in 1959, Congress passed the Landrum-Griffin Act and included as title I thereof a bill of rights for labor union members. These are simple and elementary rights, as they apply to union affairs. They consist of freedom of speech and assembly, of protection of the right to sue, of safeguards against improper disciplinary action by the union, and of equal rights of all members to nominate candidates for union office, to vote in union elections, to attend union meetings, and to participate in the business and deliberations of union membership meetings.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, the Senate seriously weakened, and for all practical purposes, nullified these fundamental safeguards by providing, as the only means of enforcement, that the union member himself bring a private suit to vindicate his rights instead of requiring an appropriate Federal official or agency to bring such suit in his behalf. This was originally provided in the proposal offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the chairman of the Senate's Special Labor Racketeering Committee, but rejected by the Senate which had previously approved it.

Mr. President, the requirement that the union member bring his own lawsuit when his statutory rights have been violated is the Achilles heel which renders the Bill of Rights a futile gesture, a meaningless scrap of paper for the average union member.

The reasons are obvious. The average union member is unable, either directly or through other interested persons or organizations, to bear the expense of the litigation or to obtain effective legal representation; moreover, in most cases, the foreseeable results of his instituting such a suit would be to jeopardize his job or subject him to the all too frequent risk of injury or economic damage to his person, his family, or his property. These considerations, as experience has shown, make it most unlikely that the average union member will challenge the union hierarchy by resorting to the procedure provided in the Landrum-Griffin Act.

The recognition of the difficulties which confront the average worker whose legal rights have been violated or denied led the Congress in enacting and subsequently amending the Fair Labor Standards Act, to provide that the Secretary of Labor bring suit in behalf of the employee who had not been paid the minimum wage or the overtime premium rate prescribed by that statute. But what Congress there granted the employee seeking to assert his rights against an employer, it refused to grant him when his rights were violated or denied him by his labor union.

Mr. President, all three of the pending civil rights bills contain provisions requiring the Attorney General, under certain specified conditions, to bring suit on behalf of persons who claim that their rights under those bills have been violated or denied. The reasons for such action by the Attorney General, as specified in the bills, are exactly those which I have described as discouraging union members from seeking to enforce their rights against labor unions under the Landrum-Griffin Act. In the language of the pending civil rights bills, the Attorney General is required to act upon the written request of a complainant if "such person or persons are unable, either directly or indirectly or through other interested persons or organizations to bear the expense of the litigation or to obtain effective legal representation; or when there is reason to believe that the institution of such litigation would jeopardize the employment or economic standing of, or might result in injury or economic damage to, such person or persons, their families, or property."

Mr. President, my amendment would simply add the requirement that the Attorney General institute a suit in behalf of a complainant who alleges that his rights under section 101 of the Landrum-Griffin Act have been violated or denied by the union if all the other conditions and requirements set forth in the civil rights bills have been met. The procedures to be followed are exactly the same as those provided in the pending bills.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the adoption of my amendment would demonstrate that the Congress is genuinely interested in protecting all the legal rights of all of the American people instead of merely those of one particular segment of the population.

But Mr. President, my amendment goes beyond requiring the Attorney General to act in behalf of union members whose statutory rights have been violated or denied. It is designed to correct serious deficiencies in our existing labor laws which make it possible for labor unions to engage in conduct of the most arbitrary kind with respect to employees whom the unions represent or seek to represent for purposes of collective bargaining.

Mr. President, as I have pointed out on many occasions both here in the Senate Chamber and elsewhere, labor unions enjoy many special rights, privileges, and immunities under Federal law. By far the most important of these is the exclusive right to represent all the employees in the unit for purposes of collective bargaining even if the union has been selected as bargaining agent by only a narrow majority, which in many circumstances under our existing law in fact constitutes merely a minority. Under the law, those employees who do not wish to join, as well as those whom the union for whatever reason excludes from membership, can neither bargain for themselves, nor select any person or agency, other than the union so designated, to bargain for them. They are, in reality, the involuntary principals of agents imposed upon them by law.

Mr. President, in granting unions this right, the Federal Government, in effect, has bestowed upon them the power of government itself. Although this provision of law has a certain usefulness in the area of collective bargaining, it results in the most serious injustice to those employees who wish to join the union but are excluded by the union itself. They have no voice in helping to determine the union's bargaining demands and policies, are not permitted to do their own bargaining, and they are compelled to accept and work under the terms and conditions of the agreement between the union and the employer, even if they find such terms and conditions highly unsatisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arizona may be recognized for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the Senator from Arizona may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Moreover, Mr. President, in certain industries there is a widespread practice whereby employers recruit their labor force through the local unions in the particular area. This is especially true in those industries where the most highly skilled, and consequently the most highly paid, employees are needed to perform the work. It is precisely in these industries where union membership exclusionary policies are most widely and persistently applied. As a result, untold numbers of completely qualified workers, who for one reason or another are denied admission to union membership, are excluded not only from many jobs, but particularly from the most highly paid jobs as well.

Mr. President, it is my profound conviction that this power of exclusion on the part of unions must, for the sake of justice and equity, be terminated. My amendment, therefore, also provides that no union shall be permitted to enjoy the unique and precious privilege of exclusive representation in collective bargaining, if it arbitrarily excludes from membership those qualified workers within the bargaining unit who wish to join the union.

Mr. President, these amendments of mine are not new; they have not been prepared hastily within the past few days for the sole purpose of getting them tacked onto the pending civil rights bill. They are measures which I have been advocating publicly for several years, and which I have lifted bodily from my "labor-management reform" bill (S. 87), which I introduced in the Senate on January 14 of this year. I regret to say that my bill has been pending before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for 6 months with not the slightest indication that any action thereon will be taken.

But, Mr. President, my proposals are completely relevant in any consideration of the civil rights issue, and I sincerely hope that the Senate will give them its most serious and earnest attention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the Record.

The amendments, submitted by Mr. Goldwater, were appropriately referred and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"(a) On page 24, at the end of line 8, add the word 'or,' and between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

" '(3) signed by one or more individuals to the effect that their rights under section 101 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 have been or are about to be violated by any labor organization,'.

"(b) On page 24, line 13, after the comma, insert the following: 'or protect the rights guaranteed in section 101 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959,'.

"(c) On page 25, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following: 'rights guaranteed in section 101 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act or of'.

"(d) On page 25, line 17, before the period, insert the following: 'or protect the rights guaranteed in section 101 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959'.

"(e) On page 26, line 7, before the period insert the following: 'or against any denial of rights guaranteed in section 101 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959'.

"(f) On page 26, line 19, after the word 'to' insert the following: 'violations of the rights guaranteed in section 101 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 or to'.

"(g) On page 37, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following new title:

" 'TITLE VIII—BARGAINING RIGHTS OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS WITH EXCLUSIONARY MEMBERSHIP POLICIES

" 'Section 9(a) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon, and the following: *"Provided further,* That no labor organization which does not admit to membership all of the employees it seeks to represent in a unit appropriate for that purpose, on the same terms and conditions generally and uniformly applicable to and with the same rights and privileges generally and uniformly accorded to all members thereof, shall be the exclusive representative of employees in such unit for the purpose of collective bargaining within the meaning of this section. Nothing in the foregoing sentence shall be construed to prevent a labor organization from denying membership to any person on the ground that such person is a member of the Communist Party or of an organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods".'

"(h) On page 37, line 20, strike out 'VIII' and in lieu thereof insert 'IX'."

To the Committee on Commerce:

"On page 7, line 21, after the comma, insert the following: 'or that any labor organization has engaged or there are reasonable grounds to believe that any labor organization is about to engage in any act or practice in violation of the rights guaranteed in section 101 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959,'.

"On page 9, following section 6, add the following new sections:

" 'BARGAINING RIGHTS OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS WITH EXCLUSIONARY MEMBERSHIP POLICIES

" 'SEC. 7. Section 9(a) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon, and the following: *"Provided further,* That no labor organization which does not admit to membership all of the employees it seeks to represent in a unit appropriate for that purpose, on the same terms and conditions generally and uniformly applicable to and with the same rights and privileges generally and uniformly accorded to all members thereof, shall be the exclusive representative of employees in such unit for the purpose of collective bargaining within the meaning of this section. Nothing in the foregoing sentence shall be construed to prevent a labor organization from denying membership to any person on the ground that such person is a member of the Communist Party or of an organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods".' "

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"(a) On page 17, at the end of line 4, add the word 'or' and between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

" '(3) signed by one or more individuals to the effect that their rights under section 101 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 have been or are about to be violated by any labor organization,'.

"(b) On page 17, line 9, after the comma, insert the following: 'or protect the rights guaranteed in section 101 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959,'.

"(c) On page 18, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following: 'rights guaranteed in section 101 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act or of'

"(d) On page 18, line 14, before the period, insert the following: 'or protect the rights guaranteed in section 101 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959'

"(e) On page 19, line 5, before the period, insert the following: 'or against any denial of rights guaranteed in section 101 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959'

"(f) On page 19, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following: 'violations of the rights guaranteed in section 101 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 or to'

"(g) On page 28, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following new title:

" 'TITLE VII—BARGAINING RIGHTS OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS WITH EXCLUSIONARY MEMBERSHIP POLICIES

" 'Section 9(a) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon, and the following: *"Provided further,* That no labor organization which does not admit to membership all of the employees it seeks to represent in a unit appropriate for that purpose, on the same terms and conditions generally and uniformly applicable to and with the same rights and privileges generally and uniformly accorded to all members thereof, shall be the exclusive representative of employees in such unit for the purpose of collective bargaining within the meaning of this section. Nothing in the foregoing sentence shall be construed to prevent a labor organization from denying membership to any person on the ground that such person is a member of the Communist Party or of an organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods'."

"(h) On page 28, line 15, strike 'VII' and in lieu thereof insert 'VIII' ".

DEDICATION OF CHAPELS AT THE NEW YORK INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, recently I witnessed a moving demonstration of the extent to which our Nation is committed to the observance of religious freedom and toleration.

Representatives of three of the major religions of the world gathered at New York International Airport to break ground for the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish Houses of Worship. This ceremony, in the midst of the hustle and bustle of one of our country's major airports, vividly underlined the importance which our Nation attaches to spiritual values. It was a historic moment and I was privileged to join in the dedication exercises.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the stirring address which Mr. Charles Silver, president of International Synagogue, gave at this dedication ceremony be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES H. SILVER, PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL SYNAGOGUE, AT JOINT GROUNDBREAKING CEREMONIES FOR CATHOLIC, PROTESTANT, AND JEWISH HOUSES OF WORSHIP AT NEW YORK INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, JUNE 23, 1963

The roar of hundreds of planes and the bustle of thousands of travelers, coming and going to and from all of the far places of the earth, make our meeting here today all the more meaningful.

The purpose for which we gather is dramatic proof that religion plays a dynamic part in mankind's progress.

Here, as we break ground to dedicate our shrines for the glory of God, we give evidence of religion's vitality in the world of today.

We join hands—Catholics, Protestants, and Jews—to affirm the unity of faith. We write a new chapter in the book of brotherhood.

The sages of old have said that religion is a bridge between heaven and earth, and we are demonstrating the truth that all men may walk upon it together in peace and understanding.

A feeling of pride must well up in your hearts, as it does in mine, that we are committed to the fulfillment of this noble project. An even better word would be "privileged," for we are breaking spiritual bread together even as we break ground for these tabernacles that will rise on the very crossroads of the heavens.

They will be citadels of mankind's better self, symbols of human dignity and eternal devotion to our Creator.

Their soaring walls will rise like wings of the spirit, stamping across the skyways of the world the seal of man's mutual faith in his Maker.

A new hope is growing in the world.

Only a few weeks ago, we witnessed an unprecedented and heartwarming expression of universal grief when two of our city's principal churches, Trinity and St. Thomas, held solemn services to mark the passing of Pope John. In a great Catholic cathedral, 15 Protestant and Greek Orthodox clergymen came to sit at the altar throughout the entire memorial mass.

These incidents are unique and extremely significant. In mourning together the loss of this great prince of goodness and peace, mankind showed veneration not only for his person but for the ideals he upheld. These things, like the declaration of grief issued by the New York board of rabbis and by other synagogue bodies throughout the Nation, indicate that a consummation in mankind's quest for understanding has finally been reached, and we are giving it noble expression in the sanctuaries we will build on this sacred ground.

We are proclaiming that we all seek the same God even though we take separate paths.

Through reverence, through worship, through the quest for truth, through the pursuit of peace, justice, freedom, and equality, we sanctify this day and dedicate ourselves to a better tomorrow.

We are in the midst of a relentless war with an implacable enemy. Our foe represents ruthless godlessness, masquerading as a political force, beyond conscience and beyond compromise. There is a great deal of talk about the need to combat communism with intercontinental missiles, and it is probably true that we must be prepared to do so if the future should bring such a fearful necessity.

But there is a more present challenge. This democracy which we cherish can survive only if the moral values and high principles on which it was created can still be sustained.

It is not going to be accomplished by men and women whose ethical and spiritual muscles have become flabby.

It will take tough-minded, clear-thinking, independent and responsible human beings inspired by qualified leadership in every category of human endeavor, in every community and of every race and color.

The vision and the vitality for this crusade against those who would undermine our way of life must come from a breed of leadership which has at least a once-a-week kinship with a church or synagogue.

For they will have to be men of charity and compassion as well as courage in order to weld a united front against the forces which threaten to plunge us back into the dark ages of civilization. We still have bigots and witch-burners in the world. We still have would-be Nazis, incipient Fascists and all-too-active Communists burrowing within our own borders.

And it is later than we think. We must develop throughout our land an immediate awareness of the truth that we are our brothers' keeper. We must stamp out poverty. We must curb the power-hungry. We must meet the basic human wants and needs of those who have less than we. We must shelter the homeless, welcome the wanderer and work to fashion a society in which none are despondent, dependent or deprived.

This is religion in its most positive and active sense. It imposes a permanent obligation upon us to concern ourselves with the welfare of others.

And we should not wait for the guns to be mounted or the threat of war from without, or among ourselves, before we develop this deep awareness of the things that God demands of us. Otherwise, His house which we each dedicate, today, can be nothing but an empty shell, and He will not live in it.

Since the signing of our Constitution and its Bill of Rights in 1791, throughout long eventful years and many important changes in our native life and customs, the right of every American to "worship God according to the dictates of his conscience" has never been threatened.

At no time in the history of this God-loved land has there ever been Government interference or persecution of any form of sacred worship.

As Americans and as human beings, we can rejoice in that record.

Religion's benefits have been legion, and they have served our Nation well. Religion has encouraged recognition of human rights. It has fostered the establishment of our great colleges and universities, schooling our youth to the advantages and responsibilities of their greatest privilege, citizenship in the United States.

Religion has inspired humanitarian projects in the foundation and support of hospitals and welfare institutions.

Religion has promoted the establishment of peace among men and nations and of harmonious and equal relations among citizens of every racial group.

Religion has acted as a check on human weakness, maintaining a solid and secure foundation for the ethics and morality of democracy. It has given us wisdom and a way of life in which to walk humbly with our God along paths that our children may follow.

Believing in these things, we will build with love and determination, inspired by our divine mission, by our hopes and dreams and our desire to renew the ageless lessons of faith.

All is not right with the world. In these hours of anxiety and peril we know, more than ever before in the history of mankind, that our hope is in the hands of the Almighty and our help must come from Him.

Religion may begin in the house of God, but it does not end there. It flourishes in the hearts of men of good will. It crosses the borders that separate us in small things to bring us together in our larger goals and closer to the mind of God.

So it is that we beseech His blessing on our unity of faith as we break ground to build His house.

Like the man-made wings that rise up to the skies around us, may the glory of God ascend from these altars, rising on the wings of our worship, to bring His word and His love to every corner of the earth.

It is appropriate, on such an interfaith occasion, that we dedicate this ground to:

"Our Father who art in heaven—
Hallowed be His name * * *
For His is the kingdom
And the power
And the glory forever."

Amen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ribicoff in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KEATING. I ask unanimous consent to have 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROBLEMS IN THE SHOE INDUSTRY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am concerned by the increasing problems faced by the shoe industry in the United States. A highly competitive industry in which a number of small firms supply a large part of the market, the shoe business is now pressed from abroad as well as at home.

Although the present extent of shoe imports is only 8.9 percent of domestic production, imports have increased more than 600 percent over the last 7 years while our own exports have decreased by 38 percent. I am informed by the Commerce Department that the percent of profits after taxes is only 1.1 percent. Moreover, the latest estimates indicate an 8-percent decline in shoe production during the first 6 months of 1963 compared to the same period last year.

It is clear that the shoe industry is in trouble and needs whatever assistance can be rendered. Quotas on shoe imports have been proposed and are now under study in various branches of the Government. Another proposal which also merits the full consideration of our Government is increased oversea promotion. Trade is a two-way street and it is a clear obligation on the part of our Government to press for new markets and for fairer tariff treatment in many countries which continue to discriminate against U.S. goods.

The Commerce Department informs me that U.S. shoe production per consumer is now 3.65. This figure has been relatively stable for the last 6 years. If the consumer would only buy one additional pair of leather shoes each year, the Commerce Department suggests, the problem would be solved.

Mr. President, I have called this situation to the attention of the executive agencies concerned and urged full and continuing consideration of the proposals put forward by the shoe industry and by other observers. There are many areas in which Government counsel and assistance can be important for this industry and I strongly urge our Government and in particular the Inter-Agency Shoe Committee to take all appropriate measures to meet these needs.

Mr. President, I have also joined with a number of other Senators in a letter to the President requesting more complete statistical data on the shoe industry. We are also asking the President to consider entering into negotiations with the principal foreign supplying nations to establish quantitative limits on shoe exports. Although this would be a drastic solution, it certainly must be considered if all other possibilities are not sufficient.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include following my remarks in the Record an article from the Christian Science Monitor and a report from the Department of Commerce on this subject.

There being no objection, the article and report were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 1, 1963]

U.S. Shoe Imports Criticized

(By Richard Neff)

Boston.—In Auburn, Maine, today more than 200 workers face the search for a new job.

The Wood & Smith Shoe Co. ended operations Friday after losing substantial sums in the past year. A principal reason for the losses, according to company officials, was competition from foreign imports.

On Thursday this week, a petition signed by 202 Congressmen went to President Kennedy urging quick action for protection of the U.S. shoe industry from imports.

The two events are obviously related; some 600 communities in the United States produce shoes, and many are increasingly concerned—just like Auburn, Maine—over the steady, rapid rise of foreign imports.

EXPORTS DECREASE

Imports of all types of shoes into the United States rose more than 600 percent from 1955 to 1962, until they now equal 8.9 percent of domestic production.

During the same period American exports decreased 38 percent.

The shoe industry—of which New England represents a major part—has gathered the support of the 202 Congressmen in urging President Kennedy to negotiate voluntary quota agreements with the major supplying nations.

Maxwell Field, executive director of the New England Shoe & Leather Association, confirmed that such an agreement is sought with Italy and Japan.

Japanese imports have risen more than 900 percent within the last 7 years, while Italian imports have jumped 1,100 percent.

COTTON PACT CITED

Mr. Field said that an agreement with either or both of these nations should be patterned after the long-term, 19-nation cotton textile agreement negotiated under President Kennedy's leadership. The cotton pact establishes voluntary quotas for each cotton textile-exporting nation in the agreement.

Appeals for higher tariffs, said Mr. Field, are of little value. The U.S. Tariff Commission is too greatly restricted by its rules in hiking tariffs, and most of all, "a doubling of the duties wouldn't do any good" because wages are so much lower in Italy and Japan, he stated.

ADVERTISING ADVOCATED

Average Japanese hourly wage in the footwear industry is 36 cents an hour; in Italy it is 49 cents. Average American hourly wage is $1.95.

It remains to be seen how responsive the Kennedy administration, which is committed to a freer trade policy, will be to the shoe producers' situation. Christian A. Herter, chief trade negotiator, and some State Department officials have so far maintained that no protection should be given the domestic woolen textile industry, if this protection means cutting back oversea sales to the United States.

Some observers within the shoe industry itself feel, additionally, that shoe firms must advertise and promote their products better within the United States. "The iIndustry must stop making shoes and start selling footwear," said one expert recently.

Moreover, some Department of Commerce officials feel the shoe industry could sell more overseas, despite the differences in wage scales, because of superior quality and styling in some types of American shoes.

Indeed, the Department of Commerce forecasts a decline this year in imports of lower quality footwear from Japan and Hong Kong. This is expected, said one official, primarily because American purchasers have found that domestic shoes, though they may cost more, often wear much better.

U.S. Department of Commerce,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., June 25, 1963.

Hon. Kenneth Keating,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Keating: This refers to your letter of May 17, 1963, to Secretary Hodges on the problems of the leather footwear industry: First, as a starting point, let me set forth certain known statistics of the industry and its import situation.

Year	U.S. production (million pairs)	Imports (million (pairs)	Production and imports (million pairs)	Percent of import to production and imports
1962	619.4	55.1	674.5	8.2
1961	599.1	36.8	635.9	5.8
1960	598.4	26.6	625.0	4.2
1959	637.4	22.3	659.7	3.4
1958	587.1	23.6	610.7	3.9
1957	597.6	11.0	608.6	1.8
1956	591.7	10.0	601.7	1.8

If we regard the U.S. production in pairs plus the imports in pairs as equal to the U.S. market, then the percentage figure shows the share of the potential market that imports have captured. Clearly, the percentage is growing as is the pairage. However, to stop here would be to overlook other salient points that put the import question in proper perspective.

The United States currently enjoys a favorable general trade balance with the major exporters of leather shoes to the United States; namely, Italy, and Japan, who alone account for 78 percent of the leather shoe imports. To raise tariffs (which the industry does not seek) or to install quotas (which the industry does seek) would be to jeopardize the exports to these and other areas, thereby transferring the damage of one industry to another industry presently gaining through free trade.

The shoe industry itself indicates that it is operating at only 60 to 70 percent of its capacity of 1 billion pairs of shoes. While imports compound the problem, nevertheless, it is not even the major cause of the 30 to 40 percent of unused capacity. Here, the industry places the blame on imports for a situation where (a) chronic overcapacity, (b) ease of entry into the industry (445 factories entered the industry between 1951 and 1962 out of 1,300 factories operating in 1962 or 34 percent), (c) chronic business failures (603 factories ceased operation between 1951 and 1962 out of 1,450 factories of 1951 or 41 percent) are more basic problems and ones which must be tackled before any lasting solution is found for this industry.

Furthermore, using our earlier production plus import figures, and also population statistics, we see little growth in pairage/consumer during a period of economic growth in the United States.

Year	Production and imports (million pairs)	Jan. 1 population (millions)	Pairs per person
1962	674.5	185	3.65
1961	635.9	182	3.48
1960	625.0	179	3.48
1959	659.7	176	3.75
1958	610.7	174	3.50
1957	608.6	171	3.55
1956	601.7	168	3.57

It appears that, in spite of economic prosperity, leisure time growth, new trends in discount merchandising, etc., the leather footwear industry has been unable to interest the consumer in greater leather shoe consumption. And yet the leather shoe industry says that the average price of a leather shoe at factory value was only $3.80 a pair or $6 (approximately) at retail. This brings us to the point where it is obvious that the large number of firms in the industry (with the following 1961 breakdown according to the Census Bureau:

Top four companies, 23.4 percent of industry.

Next 46 companies, 28.2 percent of industry.

Balance of industry, 48.4 percent of industry) makes it difficult to get coordinated market stimulation by the firms. Indeed, to increase consumer consumption by one and one-half pairs per person would virtually change the industry's picture from overcapacity to undercapacity.

Labor Department statistics do not show substantial job displacement. In fact, the decline in all shoe workers employed including production workers or the decline in shoe production workers alone between 1956 and 1961 can be attributed to laborsaving devices (i.e. faster assembly, faster conveyors) rather than imports, because the total leather shoe pairage produced increases from 591 million pairs in 1956 to 599 million pairs in 1961 in spite of a production worker decline of 7,800 persons.

	All shoe workers including production workers	All shoe production, workers alone
1961	239,300	213,700
1956	246,300	221,500
Decline	7,000	7,800

Finally, the argument that imports have caused a decline in percent profits after taxes in the whole leather industry including leather shoes or a return on stockholders equity correlate somewhat.

Year	Imports trend (million pairs)	Percent profits after taxes	Percent on stockholders equity
1961	36.8	1.1	4.4
1960	26.6	1.6	6.2
1959	22.3	2.2	8.2
1958	23.6	1.7	5.5
1957	11.0	2.0	6.9
1956	10.0	2.1	7.1

The percentage return on equity reflects less correlation with increased imports than does percentage profit after taxes. However, when the imports were at a lower point in 1956 (1.7 percent of U.S. production), the leather shoe industry profit picture was lower than the U.S. average of all manufacturers of 5.3 percent. Clearly, we are dealing with a low margin industry whose chronic problems are fully as significant or more so than its tariff problem.

The Commerce Department and the Inter-Agency Shoe Committee has been endeavoring to stimulate industry talks on these other areas of industry need rather than letting the tariff question bear the brunt of the pressure.

Sincerely,

J. F. Collins,
Director, Office of Trade Adjustment.

DEATH OF MRS. PAT McCARRAN

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, it is with a deep sense of sadness that I report the passing last night of Mrs. Pat McCarran, the widow of my illustrious predecessor. Mrs. McCarran was stricken with a heart attack and failed to rally, succumbing at approximately 6 p.m. As one who was privileged to know her for many years, I realized the important part she played in the long and colorful political career of her husband which spanned almost half a century. She preferred a background role, Mr. President, yet she was a guiding force in all of Pat McCarran's political battles, exulting with him at time of victory and offering comfort when an election was lost. She is survived by a son and four daughters and several grandchildren, and I extend to the family Mrs. Bible's and my heartfelt condolences.

THE EMERY COUNTY PROJECT IN UTAH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, recently I had the privilege of attending the groundbreaking ceremonies for the Joes Valley Dam, the major unit of the Emery County reclamation project. The damsite is located about 150 miles south of Salt Lake City, in a remote and water-short land in the State of Utah.

Located in a canyon between sagebrush clad hills, the site was chosen because a dam located there will hold and preserve every drop of water in the North Dragon area, Seeley Creek and the Swayze drainage which converge at this point. A lake a mile long and 3.5 miles wide will be created, and from it water will be released to supply the domestic needs of the towns of Huntington and Cleveland, in northwestern Emery County, and for the full irrigation of 770 new acres and the supplemental irrigation of 18,000 acres. The lake itself will be the center of a recreation complex, including good fishing and boating, and should attract hundreds of recreationists each year to this scenic mountain area.

It is difficult to express in words what the construction of the Joes Valley Dam, and the remaining works of the Emery County project, will mean to the people of this area. When the groundbreaking blast went off, and the burst of sound echoed through the valley, several moments of complete silence followed. I am sure there were few dry eyes among those on the temporarily erected wooden platform, or out among the people of the county who sat, row on row, on benches in the sun and the sagebush. It seems almost impossible that the Emery County project was on the way to becoming a reality. Everybody there had worked so long and hard for it that the prospect of the rich soil and the green fields and the flowing water taps that it would bring seemed almost too good to be true. Let me assure those of my colleagues who come from the water-blessed areas of the East and the South that there is nothing more dramatic in my part of the world—no moment more memorable or heartwarming—than the moment when a reclamation project is started.

A project like Emery County really starts, however, as the dream of forward-looking, civic-minded citizens who live in the area, love it, and seek some way to promote its interests. One of these men was Ronald J. Dyches, whose death only a few months before the groundbreaking ceremonies removed from the platform one of the dam's most dedicated proponents. For many years Mr. Dyches devoted himself unstintingly to the Emery County project. He received no compensation for his work—it was done entirely in the interest of the people of Emery County. He saw the project through its authorization by the Congress, as a part of the great Colorado River project, and then followed it through its planning stage, and the first construction funds, which, incidentally were written into the fiscal year 1963 Interior appropriations bill at my urging by the Senate Appropriations Committee. Mr. Dyches continued his strong interest in the Emery County project right through the closing days of his life, and it was most regrettable that he could not have seen the fruition of his dream.

Tribute should also be paid to the many other local citizens who worked so steadily and selflessly for the Emery County project, the county commissioners, and the many others whose names are too numerous to mention.

Even though the U.S. Congress must actually authorize a reclamation project, and provide the money to be loaned to the water users to build it, and even though a project must be planned and constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation, few of them ever get off the ground but for the vision and dedication of the local people who first conceive it, and who then hold and work for that concept until the project becomes a reality.

NEW YORK TIMES EDITORIAL "THE GLEN CANYON DAM"

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I was somewhat surprised to read in the redoubtable New York Times of July 5 an editorial which showed not only an awesome lack of understanding of the importance of water resource development in the West—but considerable bias.

I am referring to the editorial which called the closing of the floodgates of the Glen Canyon Dam a "tragedy" to conservation efforts because when the waters of the Colorado River are backed up in their channel they will flood out Glen Canyon, "one of the outstanding natural scenic places anywhere." There follow several paragraphs mourning the loss of Glen under the "silty waters of Lake Powell" (with never a word on the added beauty of a green lake in red canyons), and then the incredible conclusion that there is some very real doubt that the dam was ever really needed.

I hesitate, Mr. President, to brand editorial comment in this respected metropolitan daily as nonsense, but in this case I am afraid that is exactly what it is.

It is true, as the editorial points out, that Glen Canyon was a "gentle, intimate canyon" of considerable scenic interest, but we have dozens of canyons of equal gentleness and intimacy in Utah and Arizona, and many others which are equally spectacular examples of the type of erosional grandeur in which we specialize. The words "gentle" and "intimate" are usually reserved by us westerners for the lush green scenery of some parts of the eastern and southern regions of this country. Our red rock canyons are more flamboyant.

I always regret it when any area with any degree of scenic attractiveness is obliterated through the march of progress—through the onrush of civilization—but I know that inevitably some areas must change. If we preserved every section of Utah which has scenic value, we would have to erect a "no trespass" sign on at least half of our State.

We have been working for some time now to single out the choicest of our scenic wonders, the most breathtaking of our natural phenomena, and to open them up for the exhilaration of all of the people of America. We have already set aside Bryce Canyon and Zion National Parks, and it is through Utah that people reach the inspiring northern rim of the Grand Canyon. We have also established Cedar Breaks National Monument, Capitol Reef National Monument, Natural Bridges National Monument, Arches National Monument, Dinosaur National Monument, Rainbow Bridge National Monument, Timpanogas Cave National Monument, and the Hovenweep National Monument—each of them a scenic or archeological jewel in its own right.

Our Utah State Park Commission is moving to reserve other spectacular areas as State parks—Dead Horse Point, the Circle Cliffs Petrified Forest, Goosenecks of the San Juan, Cove Fort, Goblin Valley, the Coral Pink Sand Dunes, Kodachrome Flats, Dixie State Park, and the Wasatch Mountain State Park—to name only a few.

And last, but most certainly not least, I have a bill before Congress to encompass what is probably the most superb area of windswept sculpture and the finest series of entrenched river meanders in the world, in a Canyonlands National Park. This area is upstream from Glen Canyon on the Colorado River, and it has a veritable network of crimson, white, and purple walled canyons through which the river winds endlessly. Some of these canyons have oakset glens and grassy alcoves, while others are walled by sheer cliffs. But there is every kind of canyon scenery one could want. In addition, nature has fashioned a stately treasure trove of cathedrals, minarets, spires, needles, domes and mesas—fabulous in effect. Prehistoric Indian dwellings and petrographs are bonus attractions.

I am confident, Mr. President, that anyone who sees Canyonlands will agree that it contains the same charm and beauty and interest of Glen Canyon. Glen is all there in Canyonlands, and more so. Perhaps someone should offer to fly the New York Times editorial staff over the proposed Canyonlands area, so they can see how much of the beauty and grandeur of the Colorado River remains not only almost untouched, but unexplored. I am sure they would be at least as impressed as were my western senatorial colleagues who by a quirk of fate, were flying over Canyonlands on the same day the New York Times editorial appeared.

But it is not the fact that the New York Times editorial mourned the loss of Glen Canyon which concerned me. This is a natural reaction of the conservation minded—and I consider myself one—when we do not have enough knowledge for perspective. What worries me is the suggestion in the editorial that the construction of Glen Canyon Dam was unnecessary.

Proud as we are of our western scenery, and anxious as we are to show it off to the rest of the country, we can never forget for one moment that our great, overriding concern must always be to make the best and most beneficial use of our water resources. We cherish and conserve every drop of water, be it "silty" or crystal clear. Without continued water development, progress in the West would grind to a halt.

Were it not for the Federal reclamation program, many of the cases of settlement and development which dot the poorly watered areas of the West simply would not exist. Continued reclamation development is essential if this section of the country is to continue well populated, thriving, and self-supporting.

It so happens that the Glen Canyon Dam itself is not a diversion dam. It is a storage and power dam, one of several dams whose storage and power revenues will make feasible reclamation projects throughout the Upper Colorado River Basin. One of these projects is the central Utah project, now in the initial planning stage. When completed, central Utah will bring irrigation and municipal water to the very heartland of my State of Utah.

It is not as though we in the West were asking the East and the South to pay for our reclamation projects. Most of the money which goes into them is a loan, which is paid back by the water and power users to the U.S. Government. The projects which are built in this fashion are too big and too costly to be planned and constructed without Federal assistance.

From the moment a major reclamation dam is started, it has an influence on the business in practically every State. Only about one-fourth of the construction dollar is actually spent at the damsite—the rest goes into the remaining States. Once the dam is operating, the farms and towns and industries which are created in its wake pour tax dollars into the U.S. Treasury, and the wealth created spreads through commerce, and ultimately enriches everyone.

Surely the New York Times knows this. If doubts were raised about the necessity of the dam because of the misconception that more irrigated land brought into cultivation contributes to our massive farm surpluses, then they should be dispelled. Contrary to popular belief, farm surpluses are confined to a small number of crops, most of which are not grown on irrigated lands. By and large the crops produced under irrigation in the West are those which are in great demand and enjoy ready markets. And, of course, irrigation's contribution to our national diet through production of fresh fruits and vegetables and livestock products is well known.

It seems to me, therefore, that we must conclude that the New York Times editorial on the Glen Canyon Dam was ill conceived and unfortunate. I trust that it will be the last of its kind.

I ask that the full text of the editorial in question be carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GLEN CANYON DAM

Earlier this year the floodgates of Glen Canyon Dam were closed, signaling the completion of a major engineering feat to control the Colorado River for hydroelectric power and irrigation. Now the flow has been halted halfway up the nearly 200-mile-long Glen Canyon, from northern Arizona northeastward across southern Utah, as the waters fill in behind the dam.

Many who knew the Glen say it was the gentlest, most intimate of the mighty canyons of the Colorado, indeed one of the outstanding natural scenic places anywhere in America. In 1869, when the first survey boat trip was made down the river, John Wesley Powell (after whom the reservoir is to be named) found infinitely fascinating the variety of natural features of this unusual canyon: "past these towering monuments, past these mounded billows of orange sandstone, past these oak-set glens, past these fern-decked alcoves, past these mural curves, we glide hour after hour, stopping now and then, as our attention is arrested by some new wonder."

The eradication of so beautiful a land presents a puzzling commentary on the values of our society. Glen Canyon could have been placed beside Yosemite or Yellowstone to inspire future generations with its unsurpassed natural beauty. Instead, the loss of Glen beneath the silty waters of Lake Powell will surely become one of the tragedies of the conservation effort in the 20th century. Compounding the tragedy is the very real doubt that the dam is actually needed.

As the Sierra Club points out in its magnificent new book, "The Place No One Knew: Glen Canyon on the Colorado," the loss of Glen can become a lesson for the future, a lesson to Americans that our failure vigorously to protest the best of our scenic heritage means we are sure to lose a great deal of it.

FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR THE NATION'S SCHOOLS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in my home State of Utah, school controversy is in progress which has received national attention. Unfortunately, much of the national notice centers on the dispute between the Governor on the one hand, and the professional teachers organization on the other.

If we strip this controversy of its superficial aspects, and look beneath the surface, it becomes crystal clear that this is not a simple argument between the teachers and an unyielding Governor. It is a symptom of a basic failure of the Congress of the United States to face up to its responsibilities to the boys and girls of America. And what is happening today in Utah could happen tomorrow in many other States.

The State of Utah is a dramatic example of the need for Federal equalization support for the Nation's schools. No State exceeds Utah in the amount of effort it makes to support its schools. Yet this relatively great effort does not permit Utah to pay comparable salaries to its teachers, or to spend within $76 of the amount spent for the education of the average American boy or girl. How long can this country afford to permit the accidental location of wealth in the country to determine the degree to which our children shall be educated? How much longer can we afford to waste undeveloped brainpower of our citizens because of the unequal locations of our centers of wealth?

I find myself in agreement with my distinguished colleague from Wyoming, Senator GALE W. MCGEE, who said in a recent address in Lansing, Mich.:

> More lame alibis have been invented to do nothing about education than in any other field.

What is happening in Utah is only a sample of what we can expect in State after State unless we take the bit in our teeth and do what must inevitably be done to assure higher and more nearly equal school opportunities for the youth of America.

Certainly this great country has the ability to break the impasse which now delays our consideration of one of the most important problems demanding our attention in this session—the problem of Federal support to schools.

CONSTITUENT MAIL

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, as a Senator from a State of only 350,000 people, I was impressed early in the session with both the high quality and large quantity of constituent mail reaching my office. Unlike some Senators, I receive very little out-of-State mail, but there is daily a great amount of correspondence from rural and urban areas throughout Wyoming. One such letter from Laramie insurance executive, Donald W. Bunn, I should like to bring to my colleagues' attention.

Mr. Bunn expresses his concern over reports of a recent decrease in the quantity of proeconomy letters to Washington. He writes in part: "May I assure you that I am still very much opposed to all of our deficit spending programs." Among these he cites area redevelopment, the mass transit bill, youth unemployment, and public works proposals, all of which he quite correctly notes are deserving of a resounding defeat.

I want to assure Mr. Bunn and my colleagues that in the office of this Wyoming Senator there has been no decrease—indeed there has been an increase—in the correspondence from the proeconomy forces, from Americans concerned about the philosophy of this administration, and from those of us who see only a stronger Central Government resulting from much of the so-called must legislation facing the Congress.

Like most of my correspondence, this letter does not use extravagant language. It does not pontificate. It is not replete with hyperboles. It states in a concise matter-of-fact manner the concern of an American citizen for the course on which our ship of state is embarked.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Mr. Bunn's letter of July 9, pointing to it as an excellent example of the type of constituent correspondence which affects the course of legislation in this body.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 9, 1963.

Senator MILWARD SIMPSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: I have just been reading the latest Congressional Action Legislative Bulletin and I note therein an indication that an "increasing number of Congressmen and Senators among the proeconomy forces are puzzled by a recent decrease in the quantity of letters reflecting interest and concern about the need to right the slant toward greater deficit spending." May I assure you that I am still very much opposed to all our deficit spending programs most especially such ridiculous items as Area Redevelopment Administration which only takes jobs from a prosperous area and transfers them to a depressed area and evolves itself into a political tool with vastly unfavorable consequences. In the same category the mass transit, youth employment, and public works proposals are all deserving of a resounding defeat.

Please advise any of your fellow Members of the Senate, and most especially those on committees directly connected with spending bills of all kinds, that many of us believe the time has come to halt the trend toward socialism and its attendant ills. We must act strongly and courageously to defeat those who would "bury us" not only without but also within our country.

I see no reason that anyone should be "puzzled" by the "decrease in quantity of letters" as I am positive that many of us feel it necessary to express our opinion on the matter only once and that this opinion should then stand.

Please rest assured that I do appreciate that fact that you are opposed to these ridiculous spending proposals and have evidenced this opposition by your vote. Thank you for your attempts at sound government.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD W. BUNN.

ALASKA NATIVES SEEK SERVICE CORPS AID

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I have spoken before of S. 1321, the National Service Corps bill, of which I am a cosponsor. This proposal, designed to provide a ready means by which more fortunate Americans may assist their less-fortunate neighbor, is in the best tradition of our country. I support it without qualification.

The native people of Alaska are a brave, resourceful people. They are moving into modern American society at a rapid pace. It is not easy The hardships and adjustments have been most difficult for the people. There is no doubt in my mind but that the National Service Corps can be of very great help to the Alaska native people.

I am pleased to be able to state that this view is held, just as strongly, by the Honorable William R. Anderson, Special Consultant to the President on National Service Corps matters and Director of the President's Study Group.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that five letters, asking service corps assistance, may be printed into the RECORD at this point. The first is from the village of Ambler, written by Mr. Robert D. Cleveland, president of the village council. The second letter is written by Mr. Simeon Mountain, secretary of the city of Nulato. It is countersigned by Andrew Johnson, Dennis Silas, Jr., Elmer Manook, and Fred W. Sommer, also of Nulato. The third letter is written in behalf of the village council of Arctic Village by Mr. Andrew Williams. It is countersigned by Trimble Gilbert, Abraham John, James Gilbert, and the Reverend Isaac Tritt. The fourth letter is from John Kulowiyi, secretary of the native village of Savoonga. The fifth and last letter is from Mr. Alec Aloysius, president of the Council of Kalskag.

I also ask unanimous consent that the letter which I have addressed to Mr. Anderson, strongly supporting the applications of these Alaska native people, be made a part of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ambler, Alaska,
July 1, 1963.

Mr. William Anderson,
President's Study Group,
National Service Corps,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Anderson: I am very interested in Domestic Peace Corps, as it will be a benefit to the village of Ambler and other villages. The village of Ambler has started in the year of 1959, and is increasing rapidly every year—families moving from other villages and increasing in children.

Up to date, there are 44 adults and 60 children in the village of Ambler. Total of 104 people. There are 22 houses—average of five to each house. All the houses are built out of logs, very little lumber is used, as the local saw mill can't keep up with all the lumber we need here and other villages. Most of us have planned to build new houses, as we now live in temporary houses, to make this village better and make living better.

For the past few years we have had electricity, with the power of 1½ kilowatts, 110 volts, ac, generator. We have used it just for lights, no other hookup.

The water supply is poor in Ambler, as we use surface water from the Kobuk River, with two villages upstream from here. The village council has planned to test for underground water this summer with an aid of tools from the State department of health. If we find underground water, we will try to put up wells for the village.

Every spring people put up small gardens around their homes and grow vegetables enough for a month or two. I know they need help on how to use garden tools and study of soil.

To make a living, men work in the mines when they need laborers starting from the month of May 'till the last part of September. They don't do any trapping now since the fur prices are low.

The closest hospital from Ambler is 300 miles. The only means of travel in winter is by air, which stops here once a week on mail run. In summer you can get there by boat which gets there in 3 days' travel.

Here in Ambler we are looking forward for better sanitation, good health, and a happy life.

I will be looking forward to hear the happenings of Domestic Peace Corps. In the meantime, if more information is needed feel free to write to me.

Sincerely yours,
Robert D. Cleveland,
President.

Nulato, Alaska,
June 27, 1963.

Dear Sir: We would like very much to have someone from the Peace Corps come here to Nulato if it passes.

We prefer to have someone come here to help with community development. We are planning to move about a couple miles from here so we'll need all the help we can get. We're moving to a higher ground to get out of the flood. We sure had a big flood this year. We lost almost everything we had.

We have about 150 adults and 150 children here.

We have log cabins; about five people live in each house. We have lots of logs nearby to build new homes, but most of us don't have the money to buy windows, doors, and lumber. I think the Red Cross will send all their aid to us so we can build new homes at the new location.

We have electricity but not very strong.

We have to go about 1 mile to get our water.

There is good land around the city to grow vegetables.

We make our living by fishing and trapping.

The closest hospital from our city is Tanana about 200 miles away.

Good electricity, water, and lumber mill.

Sincerely yours,
Andrew Johnson,
Acting President.
Simion Mountain,
Secretary.
Simeon Mountain,
Secretary and Treasurer.
Fred W. Sommer,
Secretary of Labor.
Dennis Silas, Jr.,
Secretary of Law and Order.
Elmer Manook,
Secretary of Public Relations.

Arctic Village, Alaska,
July 1, 1963.

Mr. William Anderson,
President's Study Group,
National Service Corps,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Anderson: I have received very nice letter from Senator E. L. Bartlett, Washington, D.C., on date June 29, 1963, before I have received letter from him, I was very worry in my mind for our community. So when I received letter from E. L. Bartlett, my mind worry are turn normal. Now those council will write to you.

Sincerely your,
Andrew Williams.

Dear Mr. Anderson: We the Arctic Village Community Council write to you by Andrew Williams. First we like to explain to you back 1914 there we don't have any kind of study lesson. No school, so that why we sure like to have some Peace Corp come to Arctic Village for teach his some study and nursing. That what we like.

Also rural development board give us chance to build new houses close to old village, but part the time we are short of material, like Caterpiller part are broken and can't make it going. So we still behind with are work. We only build up four new houses. But that time cat were broke again. Now it run again. We are back to work, and short of hand. Help Peace Corp give us hand on that. So we are sure glad to hear from E. L. Bartlett.

Sincerely yours,
Village Government Body.
Trimble Gilbert.
Abraham John.
James Gilbert.
Rev. Isaac Tritt.

Now here is the information on list, which Senator E. L. Bartlett sent to us, and mail it to you:

1. Adults, 33; children, 55; total 88.

2. Log cabin with roof and dirt. Some are tent.

A. Most is 11 and list is 2.

B. Yes, But only short of part door's, nail, and need Caterpillar machanic for over haul. Also need some lumber planter, that been broke when deliver from Beaner, Alaska. Also need cable, 1 inch.

3. No. We only use gasoline lamp and oil. We sure needed, but can't afford to have one.

4. We do not have any water supply, we need one very badly. With hose and pump. New house will be three-quarters mile away from good water.

5. Vegetables is not grow in village, only one good place to grow good vegetables at 75 mile away from Arctic Village to Christian Village in reservation land.

6. Living is only by hunt caribou and moose. But no fur. And wages part the time. Also there few fish.

7. A.N.S. Hospital is Tanana, Alaska, 300 to 600 mile. Fairbanks is close, but no A.W.S. hospital.

8. Council plan is, build new houses and need Peace Corps workers.

July 5, 1963.

Senator E. L. Bartlett,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Bartlett: Enclosed is a copy of our letter to Mr. William Anderson concerning Domestic Peace Corps.

Like you said, we are very much interested in this measure which we hope to be of help to our village, and will do everything we can to support the passage of this bill.

We hope that you will succeed in your works toward this marvelous bill which you introduced to the native village of Savoonga.

At this time, any help from our Government will be more than welcome to this village, since some of our food supply has been cut which is interfering with our way of life, especially at this time of the year where fresh food is very, very scarce.

We the council members of Savoonga are thanking you for this chance, and hope all of us will succeed what we're trying to accomplish by working together and helping each other.

Best wishes to you, from the Savoonga council members and from all the people of Savoonga.

Sincerely yours,
Patrick Gologergen,
Secretary for John Kulowiyi.

Savoonga, Alaska,
July 5, 1963.

Mr. William Anderson,
President's Study Group,
National Service Program,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Anderson: We, the council members of Savoonga, have been informed by Senator E. L. Bartlett, that there is a bill now before Congress, which he has cosponsored, to establish a domestic Peace Corps.

We are very much interested in this measure, which will be a lot of help to our village, and we are writing this letter to you not only to help the passage of this bill but also, if it is passed, we are requesting help under the domestic Peace Corps program to come to the village of Savoonga.

At this time we have a total of 376 people, all residents of Savoonga, of whom 60 percent are adults and 40 percent are children. For the housing we use regular lumber to make a house, however, at this time, the cost of the lumber is very high, and we cannot afford to get a good grade of lumber other than scrap lumber which we manage to salvage from the Air Force old building. For this reason most of the houses are built with one room, and two families are living in most houses at this time. The material to build a new house is not available at all times, even near our village.

We are in need of electricity to improve our way of living; for example, washing could be done much easier by our wife, thus saving time and hard work, overwork causing bad health, and in some cases this is happening in our village.

Our water supply has been contaminated very badly, and we have tried to dig a well, and could not penetrate the rocks with the only tools we've had; that is, pick and shovel.

And for gardening we have bad soil, however if we have our soil analyzed we might be able to grow some of the vegetables, also we have the problem on our weather for gardening.

The nearest hospital to our village is 150 miles, and there is a sea water between our village and that hospital.

And for the only means to make our living is hunting, however, our Government is cutting some of our food supply, and this causes a lot in some cases, and the means for earning a living available at all times is, trapping and ivory carving. However these two don't supply our earning at all times, on trapping some trappers get only two foxes throughout the trapping season, and on ivory carving in most cases we run out of ivory until we buy gasoline at 75 cents a gallon to hunt with or buy shells to kill with, so those two incomes are not dependable at all time, just like steady jobs which you people always make your earnings for a living.

We feel that the Domestic Peace Corps worker can help us on our village development such as water supply, electricity, education for the people that are too old to go to school, helping us on our problems, how to do this and that.

Sincerely yours,

PATRICK GOLOGERGEN,
Secretary.

KALSKAG, ALASKA, *July 8, 1963.*

Senator E. L. BARTLETT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

If the bill passes for Domestic Peace Corps, our village here wants help from the Domestic Peace Corps.

1. There are 23 families here; 47 adults, and 89 children.
2. Our houses are made of logs. Each family lives in a 1-room house. Only material to build houses available is logs.
3. We have no electricity.
4. We have just one well to get our water for the whole village.
5. The ground here is not good for growing vegetables.
6. The means of earning our living are fishing and trapping.
7. The nearest hospital is Bethel, about 100 miles.
8. The plans the village councils have for community development: New housing; improve our water system to get electricity.

Sincerely,

ALEC ALOYSIUS,
President.

JULY 10, 1963.

Hon. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON,
Special Consultant to the President on National Service Corps Matters, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: You have by now received letters from the Alaska native villages of Arctic Village, Nulato, and Ambler. The officials of these three communities in these letters have applied for National Service Corps volunteers.

National Service Corps help in these villages is badly needed. The life of the Alaska native is as hard as any life anywhere.

The old way of life, reliance on the wolves, the whale and the caribou for food, clothing, and shelter is increasingly difficult. The new way, 20th-century life, with its money and education, is equally frustrating to the people raised on the arctic tundra. A constant in both the old way and the new way is sickness, hunger, and death.

The Attorney General, in his testimony before the Senate on S. 1321, the National Service Corps bill, recognized the great need for a Service Corps project with the Alaska natives. Officials of the President's Study Group time and again have spoken of the opportunities for the Service Corps in Alaska. I myself am deeply committed in my efforts to obtain Service Corps participation in Alaska native villages.

I note that many highly professional proposals have been submitted from across the country, proposals far more than anything the arctic villages could possibly provide.

It would be tragic if the appeals of the truly needy should lose out to the slick applications of other better organized, more worldly and Washington-wise groups.

For this reason I urge, and strongly, that Alaska natives be included in the list of projects for the first year's operation of the National Service Corps.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. BARTLETT.

MEDICAL RESEARCH SAVES 2.6 MILLION AMERICANS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the investment of Federal funds in medical research is paying dividends of inestimable value—in human lives. That is the theme of a recent report issued by the National Health Education Committee, a group of national leaders in various health fields.

The report made public last week emphasized that some 2,600,000 Americans are alive today as a result of medical advances achieved in our country since 1944. The report analyzes comparative death rates in 1944 and 1961. Diseases that were major killers in 1944 have been curtailed sharply in the relatively brief period. For instance, the report shows that tuberculosis and maternal deaths declined 86 percent each between 1944 and 1961.

The saving of more than two and a half million lives cannot be measured in dollars. But as Mrs. Albert Lasker, chairman of the committee, has remarked: "Human capital is the real wealth of the United States."

The National Health Education Committee has performed a commendable service in compiling this vital information and making it available to the public. I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks an article which appeared in the July 12, 1963, issue of the Washington Post, entitled "2.6 Million Seen Saved by Medicine Since 1944."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO MILLION SIX HUNDRED THOUSAND SEEN SAVED BY MEDICINE SINCE 1944

(By Nate Haseltine)

More than 2½ million Americans are alive today who otherwise would be dead were it not for medical advances since 1944.

The lifesaving and life-extending results of disease conquests since that year are disclosed in a new publication of the National Health Education Committee, Inc., of New York City.

Actually, the report compares disease death rates and populations in this country between 1944 and 1961, the last year for which full statistics are available. And the salvage total cited is 2,674,144.

That is the number of Americans who would have died had the 1944 death rate prevailed through 1961.

HEALTH STATISTICS

The committee is a foundation-financed, 28-member group of leaders in the health fields dedicated to the dissemination of factual information on American health. Its chairman, Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, is also president of the Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation.

Commenting on the report, Mrs. Lasker said:

"Human capital is the real wealth of the United States. The longer we can preserve our natural resource of healthy human beings, the greater the natural resources and true wealth of our country * * * we must always keep in mind that healthy human beings are our first line of defense."

The report entitled "Does Medical Research Pay Off? In Lives? In Dollars?" cited the major disease killers of 1944 and their comparative death rates in 1961.

These included:

Tuberculosis and maternal deaths, each of which has declined 86 percent during that period; influenza, with a decline of 93 percent; syphilis, 79 percent, and pneumonia, 31 percent during those same years.

Polio's death rate decline was placed at 90 percent; and hypertensive heart disease, 38 percent, from 1951 to 1961. Acute rheumatic fever deaths declined 83 percent from 1944 to 1959, the report showed.

OTHER DISEASES

Other diseases in which important declines in death rates were effected include: Whooping cough, 100 percent; dysentery, 86 percent; acute nephritis, 62 percent, and the anemias, 31 percent, all between 1951 to 1961; and appendicitis, which declined 81 percent from 1944 to 1961.

Disabilities, too, have been reduced, especially in the field of mental illnesses, the report stressed.

At the end of 1955, when the use of mind influencing drugs had begun, the report showed, there were 558,900 resident patients in State and local government mental hospitals. During that year there were 178,000 admissions to and 126,000 net releases from those hospitals.

By contrast, at the end of 1961, even though admissions had increased by 75,100 to a total of 253,100, there were 31,000 fewer resident patients in these same hospitals at the end of the year, and 88,700 more patient releases.

SEEKS HILL SUPPORT

In a direct bid for continued and greater congressional support, Mrs. Lasker said in a foreword to the report:

"The major health advances in the last 15 years have come largely from the United States, due to the greater effort and expenditure of funds, which was possible in the United States through funds voted to the National Institutes of Health and the great effort of the voluntary health agencies."

The special purpose committee annually sends members and other experts in the health fields to Washington to testify during Appropriations Committee hearings in Congress on budget goals for the National Institutes of Health.

Copies of the newest report may be obtained without charge from the National Health Education Committee, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York City, by doctors, health authorities and other interested groups.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK TIME TO PLAN FOR EUROPEAN CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, during the week of July 14–20, Americans will take part in the fifth observance of Captive Nations Week. It will be especially appropriate and worthwhile during the coming week for Americans everywhere to take the time to reflect upon the state of world civilization in this 63d year of the 20th century. We have come a long way, Mr. President. It is safe to say that a greater portion of mankind enjoys freedom today than ever before. If I can discern any pattern to the confusion of events that comprise what we call history, it is that the path of history leads, however circuitously, toward freedom.

We have come a long way, but we have a long way to go, when half of the world is shackled by Communist chains.

The trip before us will be the most difficult part of our journey. Indeed the roadblock of totalitarian military power may prompt one to ask whether, in observing Captive Nations Week and thus recommitting ourselves to the uprooting of tyranny, we are not making an empty gesture, devoid of substance. In answer to this question, I ask that we consider what is permanent and what is transitory in this world. Military might is ephemeral; guns, tanks, and missiles are made by man and can be destroyed by man. The mightiest military empires at any stage of history have never been powerful enough to withstand the march of time. But the spirit of freedom is permanent; the desire for freedom is man's basic political and social goal. This is as true today as it was during the Golden Age of Greece or during the American and French Revolutions. Military tyranny cannot extinguish the spark of liberty, because such power, imposed against the wills of the people, cannot withstand the encroachment of time.

Although the road we travel may be strewn with pitfalls, we are sure of our destination.

And so, I assure the captive peoples of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, East Germany, and all the other lands under Communist domination, as the eyes of America turn toward you during Captive Nations Week that, far from making an empty gesture, we are recommitting ourselves to a task which will inevitably be accomplished: the achievement of freedom for all mankind. To the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain, we say: Lift up your hearts and your hopes—the day of liberation will come. Until that day, be firm in your love of liberty. Your sufferings are great, your tribulations are many, your heartaches are severe and burning. We suffer with you, we hope with you, we pray with you. We believe with you, in a day of liberation and freedom. Let us be prepared to greet and preserve freedom when she crosses the threshold.

Since World War II, colonial nations in Asia and Africa have been freed by the scores. But as scores and scores of nations have been liberated in Africa and Asia, scores of them newly created nations that never existed before, half-a-score-old nations in Europe, with glorious histories and long traditions of freedom were overrun and enslaved by the Communist tyranny. If liberty is good for Asia and Africa, why is it not for Europe?

HOMER THORNBERRY, U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am very gratified at the prompt action which the Senate took yesterday in confirming the nomination of my good friend, HOMER THORNBERRY, to the Federal judgeship for the Western District of Texas. Representative THORNBERRY has been a valuable and highly regarded member of the Texas delegation in Congress from the 10th Texas District, and now is leaving to replace Judge Robert E. Thomason, who also was formerly one of the outstanding figures of the Texas delegation in Congress. Those of us in Congress who are acquainted with Representative THORNBERRY's fine record know that his temperament and intellect assure his making another fine record in this different field of service. Representative HOMER THORNBERRY served on the City Council of the City of Austin, Tex.; he has been a member of the Legislature of Texas. He served ably the judicial system as a district attorney of Travis County, Tex.

I regret that I was prevented from being present yesterday to commend this nominee, but I was called to Philadelphia to witness the final selection and approval of the models of the congressionally authorized gold medal honoring Sam Rayburn, the greatest legislative statesman Texas has ever produced, indeed, the greatest legislative craftsman in American history. It was my privilege to see the Philadelphia Bureau of the Mint at work, and observe the craftsmanship with which this recognition of Speaker Rayburn's service is being made. As first author of the resolution to strike the medal, I can report to the Senate that the skilled work of the artists and artisans of the mint are producing a beautiful medal, worthy of the great Speaker.

Speaker Rayburn and Representative THORNBERRY were two of a kind in their concern for their constituents; Texas will long remember their services in Congress. They were close personal friends. HOMER THORNBERRY was personally selected by the late Speaker Sam Rayburn for service in the House of Representatives Rules Committee, on which powerful body Judge THORNBERRY made an outstanding record.

HOMER THORNBERRY has been a member of the House of Representatives for 14 years. He was an officer in the U.S. Navy in World War II. He holds academic and law degrees from the University of Texas. His was the unique experience of serving as a deputy sheriff of Travis County, Tex., while working his way through the University of Texas Law School. He practiced law in Travis County, Tex., and out of this varied experience as a law student, in private law practice, as the State's attorney, and as an elected city, county, State and Federal official, I believe that HOMER THORNBERRY has been so molded in a pattern of concern for the people as to make an outstanding judge.

I have known him personally for over a quarter of a century and I have never heard of HOMER THORNBERRY speaking an unkind word of any man.

The esteem of the people of his city, county, and district has been proven by his election to every office he ever sought at the hands of the people. A powerful position on the House Rules Committee never lured him into any abuse of power. Even in the stress of legislative battle, he has shown a judicial temperament, the first and foremost attribute of a good judge.

I believe that HOMER THORNBERRY's service as Federal judge will be marked by such a consideration for people as to reflect credit on President John F. Kennedy for having appointed him.

STATE STOOD WATCH AS GORDON COOPER ORBITED THE EARTH

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I am sure that most Americans who followed Maj. Gordon Cooper's 22-orbit flight of last May 15 were well aware of the countless hours of preparation and planning that preceded that flight. However, I am sure that few people realized that one very important responsibility on this mission was carried out by the State Department.

That mission, Mr. President, was to effect the release and return to the United States of Major Cooper should he have had to make an emergency landing on foreign soil.

An article describing the preparation for that task appeared in the June issue of the Department of State News Letter. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE STOOD WATCH AS GORDON COOPER ORBITED THE EARTH

When Maj. Gordon Cooper splashed his capsule down safely in the Pacific on May 15 an extra measure of relief was shared by men at the Department of State and at Foreign Service posts around the world.

These were the men who had participated in the Department's most thoroughly planned operation of the Mercury program—a plan to provide rapid assistance and recovery of the astronaut in event of an unplanned emergency landing somewhere along 1 of his 22 orbits.

Cooperating foreign posts were prepared to react rapidly to a request from the Department to obtain host countries' assistance if the need arose.

It was expensive insurance which nobody wanted to collect. Here is the story:

In November 1962 the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) queried the Department as to how the release of the astronaut and his space capsule could be effected in event of an unplanned emergency landing. It was pointed out that his orbital path would range between 32° north and 32° south latitude and that as a result plans should be formulated to permit search and rescue operations (SAR) over all of the seas and land masses orbited.

This inquiry resulted in a coordinated planning effort under the aegis of the Department which includes NASA and the Department of Defense. It culminated in a circular instruction being issued to 85 embassies, 17 consulates, 8 regional telecommunication centers, and 16 major military commanders setting forth detailed contingency plans for rapid assistance and recovery.

Merchant ship control procedures were implemented on a worldwide basis so that U.S. merchant ship aid could have been quickly enlisted had an ocean search been necessary.

Based on the Department's instruction and in response to the requirements of NASA, the Joint Chiefs of Staff issued their own instructions to bring the full weight of Air

Force and Navy units to bear should the contingency arise. A number of friendly countries voluntarily offered to assist in any way possible.

Within the Department a quick-reaction plan was established, under the guidance of Deputy Under Secretary U. Alexis Johnson and the director of the operations center. Each interested Bureau cooperated in the planning phase and for the operational period designated a senior officer, whose duty it was to be thoroughly familiar with the contingency plans and to be instantly available for consultation during the 34 hours of flight. And finally, a special watch team, consisting of three officers, two from the Office of International Scientific Affairs (SCI) and one from FE, was established in the operations center. A third SCI officer relieved the watch officers during mealtimes.

In the field, posts in countries over which the spacecraft orbited maintained a watch officer and communications officer alert from 2 hours prior to and during the orbital period. Each post designated a control officer to handle any negotiations with the host government in the event of an emergency landing. Manila, Rabat, Lima, and Aden, the diplomatic coordinating posts, as well as some others were on an alert basis for the duration of the flight. Provision was made to keep all possible communications channels open to contact posts during the orbiting period. All posts responded immediately and completely to these requirements with the result that one of the greatest team efforts ever mounted by the Department of State was prepared to go into an alert status.

When all plans were completed, the Department's special Mercury watch team checked the whole system out with dry runs on Saturday and Sunday before the Cooper flight.

The planning, which was done by FSO's T. H. E. Nesbitt and E. P. Smith of Outer Space Affairs Section of the Office of International Scientific Affairs, with the assistance of Capt. Robert Wood, U.S.N., an exchange officer in FE, actually started in November 1962, and was intensified to a virtual 7-day-a-week operation commencing approximately 5 weeks before the flight.

Some of the highlights of the Cooper flight have been taken from the log kept by the special watch team.

THE FLIGHT

The disc jockey on the local radio station took time out at 5 a.m. Tuesday, May 14, the scheduled launch day for Major Leroy Gordon Cooper's projected 22-orbit MA–9 flight, to announce that the weather was good at Cape Canaveral and the countdown was proceeding on schedule. This information was the clue to the Department's MA–9 watch team that the day had finally come after weeks of intensive planning which was all directed to assist the globally dispersed Search and Rescue aircraft and ships in the event that an unplanned contingency landing took place.

At 7:35 a.m. the watch team made an entry in the log that it was aboard and that line check with NASA had been made and all was in order. The waiting continued until 11:20 at which time the watch team was informed by NASA that the flight had been postponed.

With the dawn Wednesday, May 15, came the announcement that the coundown had resumed, the weather was good and all systems were go * * *. Once again the team converged upon the Operations Center and took up station. The "hot line" to NASA headquarters and Mercury Control at Cape Canaveral was tested and all was proceeding to schedule.

According to a prearranged plan the senior control officer, Deputy Under Secretary U. Alexis Johnson, and the senior regional bureau duty officers were given a status report. Fingers remained crossed and breathing was heavy while the remaining countdown took place with a perfect lift off at 9:04 eastern daylight saving time. The initial phase of the lift was perfect and once again the senior control officer, his deputy, George Newman, and the regional bureau senior duty officers were notified.

A pretaped telegram was despatched by emergency precedence 2 minutes after lift-off advising all cooperating posts of the exact time of launch which would enable them to follow the flight and position of spacecraft throughout the following 34 hours and 21 minutes by referring to the orbital map with which they had been previously supplied. Seconds after lift-off it was apparent that the shot was proceeding as planned.

Twenty-five minutes after lift-off NASA reported successful injection into orbit. The first progress report sent the Senior Control Officer reported:

"Desired: Apogee 144 nautical miles, perigee 87 nautical miles.

"Achieved: Apogee 143.9 nautical miles, perigee 86.6 nautical miles.

"The speed of the spacecraft is 17,544 miles per hour (44 mph faster than predicted).

"NASA at this time estimates a minimum capability of 25 orbits for Faith 7 with a potential of at least 3 times this number were the spacecraft equipped for a flight beyond the planned 22 orbits."

At 10:40 a.m. NASA reported a firm decision to go for seven orbits. During the 7th orbit it would make a decision whether or not to go for 17. The first orbit took 93 minutes and the remaining orbits 88.7 minutes. The National Military Command Center, with whom the watch team had direct contact, reported an estimated landing time of 7:23 p.m., eastern daylight saving time, May 16 if the flight went for 22 orbits.

With all indications the flight was to be successful and proceed as planned, the watch team reviewed the bidding to ascertain if there were any loopholes in the planning and if all emergency procedures to be instituted in the event unforeseen contingencies arose were anticipated.

A careful review of the planning which involved much more paper than the 32-page basic plan sent to cooperating posts failed to reveal any voids as the most unlikely of unlikely circumstances was taken into consideration. However, with the spacecraft traveling at 17,544 miles per hour or 300 miles a minute, even the most unimaginable contingency had to be provided for and plans made accordingly.

Pretaped messages had been prepared and deposited with the DC/T duty officer for transmission by FLASH precedence in the event an unplanned contingency landing occurred. In the event an unplanned emergency landing were necessitated by mechanical or electronic failure in the spacecraft or overheating of the astronaut's suit, a reaction time of 20 minutes from the time that the retrorockets were fired until the astronaut reentered and landed 3,000 miles further on would be available.

If the spacecraft were in contact with the tracking station during the course of such an emergency NASA would have been in a position to advise the Department of exact time of retrofire and the Goddard computers would provide the exact latitude and longitude. This information would be furnished by the Department's watch team to DC/T for inclusion in the precut message which would request the Embassy or Embassies involved to facilitate overflight and landing clearance for the prepositioned search and rescue aircraft and then request the assistance of the host government in locating the spacecraft.

By comparison that contingency was relatively clean cut and simple compared to others which might have occurred. For example, on orbits Nos. 6 and 21 Major Cooper was out of contact with any tracking or communications station from the time he left Hawaii while he crossed over long reaches of the Pacific Ocean, Brazil, the South Atlantic, South Africa, Madagascar, the Indian Ocean, Laos and Vietnam and was finally picked up by John Glenn on the Coastal Sentry southwest of Japan near Hong Kong. Should an emergency have required Major Cooper to fire his retros after the cessation of contact with Hawaii, on either of those orbits, a fantastic search and rescue operation would have been mounted. Fortunately, such a happening did not take place.

Secretary Rusk who visited the Operations Center was impressed by the charts and aids used by the watch team and the fact that by virtue of the precision planning of NASA's operations staff, the exact location of the spacecraft was being plotted on a minute to minute basis throughout the flight.

From time to time throughout the first day of the flight, the Operations Center—which played a major role in the effort and which was well fortified with the addition of its own senior officers; an officer from the Defense Communications Agency and a senior duty officer from DC/T—was visited by Deputy Under Secretary Johnson (the senior control officer); Dr. Rollefson, Director of the Office of International Scientific Affairs; E. M. J. Kretzmann, the Deputy Director (SCI bore the brunt of the planning and operations responsibility); Assistant Secretary Manning and many others of senior rank. George Newman, the deputy control officer, spent the day commuting between the Operations Center and his office.

At 6:20 p.m. May 15 NASA advised that the spacecraft was one-third of the way through the seventh orbit and would be passing over Zanzibar very shortly. Minutes later word was received that the flight would continue for 17 and the flight was progressing as per plan.

The watchful waiting continued until 11:30 p.m. on the 15th at which time a message of congratulations to Astronaut Cooper was received from President Rivera of El Salvador with the request that it be relayed to Major Cooper as he passed over that country early the next morning. The message was delivered to Major Cooper on his 15th orbit at 7:15 a.m. on the 16th. His reply of appreciation to President Rivera was received by the Bermuda station and subsequently transmitted to the President by the American Ambassador.

A message of greetings was sent by Astronaut Cooper to the African Summit Conference at Addis Ababa at 9:12 a.m. May 16 as he passed over Zanzibar. Due to transmission eccentricities the message when received by Zanzibar was transmitted by high frequency radio to the tracking station at Kano, Nigeria, which in turn transmitted it by high frequency radio to the Goddard Space Flight Center in Maryland which in turn sent it by trans-Atlantic cable to London for retransmission by high-frequency radio to Addis Ababa.

Throughout the remainder of the morning, monitoring of the flight continued and at noon word was received that splash time would be at 7:23 p.m. following the termination of the 22 orbits at the preplanned location 70 miles southeast of Midway. NASA reported that the automatic fuel consumption was nominal and 89 percent of the manual fuel remained against an expected reserve of 78 percent. A heartening report indeed, since preentry positioning and reentry is a highly sensitive maneuver and on board fuel is vital.

The first indication of any possible trouble was reported by NASA at 4 p.m. when the gravitation light in the spacecraft flashed on. While the NASA technicians were assessing this unexpected development the Department's watch team carefully plotted the flight and estimated possible emergency landing areas. NASA subsequently reported that an automatic gyro relay had cut out and that Major Cooper had been requested to change from automatic to manual mode.

Needless to say the tension in the operations center at this point increased considerably. At 4:30 p.m. the Hawaii tracking station confirmed a malfunction in the automatic system and the Department was informed that the astronaut was on manual and would retro fire and reenter manually. The one heartening report was that there was more than enough fuel left for manual operation.

As Major Cooper passed over the coastal sentry an hour later Colonel Glenn reviewed the complete sequence to be followed for manual reentry which was subsequently checked out again as the spacecraft orbited over the Hawaii contact point. With the last orbit, which would orbit the same path of No. 7, taking the spacecraft over the southern Himalayas and China, the already large group standing by in the operations center was enlarged by the presence of Dick Usher from FE.

At 6:45 p.m. Zanzibar reported that it had gone through the checkoff list with Major Cooper and all was well. Five minutes later the automatic roll control went out forcing Major Cooper to adjust the roll of the space ship manually. Seventeen minutes after losing contact with Zanzibar, communications were acquired with Major Cooper by Colonel Glenn and 2 minutes later the manual retro-fire sequence began. In accordance with the prearranged plan the splash took place within 5 miles of the Carrier *Kearsarge* but at 7:24 p.m. rather than 7:23 as predicted 30 hours previously by the National Military Command Center.

It was with great relief and satisfaction that the watch team released its second pretaped message at 7:25 announcing the end of a successful flight. The rest is history.

Following 36 hours of continuous watch standing, the watch team which consisted of T. H. E. Nesbitt (SCI), the operations coordinator, with Emery P. Smith (SCI), and Capt. Robert R. Wood, USN (FE), as alternates made its final report to the senior control officer and secured the watch.

THE CORN TASSEL AS THE NATIONAL FLORAL EMBLEM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a concurrent resolution of the Iowa State Legislature endorsing the corn tassel as the national floral emblem.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 16

Whereas in recognition of the importance of corn to our Nation's Founding Fathers, present citizens, and future generations, and

Whereas in gratitude for nature's gift of this versatile and vital, life-giving plant, and

Whereas in view of the fact that this native plant of the United States grows in all 50 of the United States, and

Whereas in realization that this plain, homespun, simple and tough-of-fiber plant with its earthiness and unaffected genuineness will give the United States a truly unique floral symbol, and

Whereas in view of the fortunate geographical position of Iowa as heart of the Nation's great Corn Belt: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That the 60th General Assembly of the State of Iowa urges the Congress of the United States to adopt the corn tassel as the national floral emblem; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the Chief Clerk of the House to the President of the United States, and to each member of the Iowa delegation of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

RESOLUTION OF U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, at Honolulu, Hawaii, relating to youth opportunities.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the young people of our Nation constitute our most valuable national resource; and

Whereas the future strength and vitality of this country depends upon the qualifications and fitness of our youth to successfully cope with the responsibilities of life; and

Whereas the number of young people under the age of majority is increasing yearly at a greater rate than the population as a whole; and

Whereas extraordinarily heavy demands have been placed upon the resources of our cities in an effort to meet the needs of our youthful citizens; and

Whereas a constant and distressing rise in school dropouts, youth unemployment and juvenile delinquency compels the cooperation and assistance of all levels of government to find solutions for these problems; and

Whereas these problems cost the Nation billions of dollars annually which could be saved with concerted attacks on the causes of the problems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. Conference of Mayors support public and private programs designed to stop the spread of juvenile delinquency and explore new approaches and resources in facilitating the educational, vocational, and civic training needed by our youth; be it further

Resolved, That the conference, in pursuing these aims, support (1) establishment nationally of a Youth Conservation Corps, Home Town Youth Corps and National Service Corps; (2) enactment of a Youth Employment Act; and (3) extension of the Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1961.

STATE COMMERCIAL FISHERY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I would like to speak in support of S. 627 which will provide Federal funds for research and development of our commercial fisheries.

I cosponsored this legislation along with 30 of my colleagues who are greatly concerned, as I am, about the present condition of our commercial fishing industry.

I think the financial assistance provided in this bill is a first step, an exceedingly modest first step, in an effort to help a declining American industry. For example, Connecticut will receive only $25,000 per year, the statutory minimum, for its share of research project funds.

I am pleased to note, however, that section 4(b) of the bill provides an additional $500,000 per year for special projects of immediate urgency.

Connecticut, like so many other States, has seen a radical decline in its commercial fishery industry. In 1940, Connecticut landed in excess of 14 million pounds of fish; in 1960, the amount had dropped to 6 million pounds and continues to decline.

There are many reasons for this reduction, not the least of which is that foreign nations have a well-planned program of research and development and are fishing more economically with modern fishing vessels using the latest electronic and mechanical aids. As a result, these nations, with their governments subsidizing coordinated research, can harvest fish much more efficiently than can American commercial fishermen and they do this thousands of miles from their own shores in waters formerly dominated by the American fishing fleet.

Mr. President, the town of Stonington, formerly a major fishing harbor, is attempting to rejuvenate its commercial fishing industry by building a modern pier to service its vessels. The town itself has raised $50,000 toward the pier project and the State of Connecticut has agreed to participate up to $150,000 providing additional Federal assistance is available. S. 627 will provide a small measure of that assistance and will aid not only Stonington but, as time goes on, other Connecticut fishing ports which show initiative and interest in reviving their declining fishing industry.

I strongly urge passage of this legislation, when it is taken up later this week, and hope action will be possible in the House so that it can become law at the earliest possible moment.

DEATH OF DR. HARRY A. CURTIS, OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the people of the Tennessee Valley are profoundly saddened by the death on July 1 of one of the truly great men of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Dr. Harry A. Curtis.

The same may be said of those outside the valley who knew Dr. Curtis as a forthright, courageous man of conviction and dedication. I am thinking particularly of the people of Missouri, whose State university Dr. Curtis served with such distinction as dean of engineering from 1938 until he became a director of the TVA in 1948. He retired from the TVA when his term expired in 1957.

We of Tennessee and the valley loved Dr. Curtis, first, for his pioneering work in fertilizer development as the TVA's first chief chemical engineer and, later, as a stout defender of TVA principles at a time when the TVA needed every friend it could get, during the previous administration. He believed in the TVA with all his heart; he worked with all his might to make it succeed.

Mr. President, the greatness of Dr. Harry Curtis is very well portrayed in the obituary published by the Knoxville News-Sentinel. I ask that this article, together with an editorial from the same newspaper, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Sentinel]

Cancer Fatal to Crusader: Dr. Curtis, Former TVA Director, Dies

Dr. Harry A. Curtis, retired TVA director whose tongue was as sharp as his mind, died of abdominal cancer at 5:10 a.m., today at Presbyterian Hospital. He was 79.

Colorado-born Dr. Curtis, who came to Knoxville as TVA's first chief chemical engineer in 1933, left in 1938 to take the post of dean of the University of Missouri's Engineering College, and returned to the agency a decade later when President Harry Truman appointed him to one of the three policymaking directorships.

He retired when his term ended in 1957 and lived a full and active retirement life at his Sequoyah Hills home.

SERVICES WEDNESDAY

Only last March 22 the University of Missouri gave Dr. Curtis its Honor Award for Distinguished Service in Engineering. He went to Columbia, Mo., to receive the award, and apparently had his oldtime vigor, but his health failed rapidly after that trip. He entered the hospital several weeks ago.

Dr. Curtis received the John R. Kuebler Man of the Year in Chemical Engineering Award in May and would have participated in a formal presentation in September. The award is presented by Alpha Chi Sigma, national chemical engineering professional fraternity.

Services will be held at 11:30 a.m., Wednesday at Mann's Church Avenue, Dr. William Pollard officiating. The body will be sent to Rye, N.Y., home of a daughter, for burial.

One of the last of the New Deal-Fair Deal appointees to the TVA Board, Dr. Curtis was a fighting intellectual who decided years ago that he'd have a lot of fun by taking only jobs that intrigued him.

He was a chemical engineer by profession, an educator by practice, a TVA policymaker by Presidential call and a woodworker and gardener by avocation. But he was also a fiery thinker who fitted no conventional mold.

VIEWS DEFINED

A few weeks before ending his 9-year term on the TVA Board, on May 18, 1957, he told a Chattanooga audience in a swan-song speech called "Unfinished Business":

"If you like the kind of misnamed creeping socialism that you and the TVA are promoting here, let's have more of it."

He had been equally outspoken in 1949 when his appointment by President Truman was being considered for confirmation by the Senate.

Dr. Curtis, in describing himself to a newspaper reporter, said he was "a New Dealer, a little left of center, but not as wild-eyed as some."

NOT A CRUSADER

When Mrs. Curtis urged him to withdraw the description for fear it might hurt his chances before the Senate, he replied, "Why shouldn't I say it? It's true, isn't it?"

Born in Sedalia, Colo., February 16, 1884, Dr. Curtis was graduated from the University of Colorado with a bachelor of science degree in 1908. He got his master's there 2 years later and taught chemistry there until 1917. He received a Ph. D from the University of Wisconsin in 1914 and held several honorary degrees.

WORKED FOR UNITED STATES

Dr. Curtis got his first good look at the Tennessee Valley in World War I. He served in the Colorado National Guard, became a captain of Ordnance and was sent to Muscle Shoals, Ala., to do research experimentation at the Government's nitrate plant.

For a year after the war, he was professor of chemistry at Northwestern University. Then, in 1920 and 1921, he was chief chemist and later plant superintendent of the International Coal Products Corp., Irvington, N.J.

Back to the valley he came in late 1921, serving until 1923 as general manager of the Clinchfield Carbocoal Co. which operated a coal-carbonizing plant. After that, he spent a year as chief of the nitrogen survey of the U.S. Commerce Department.

STARTED YALE COURSE

Then he got and accepted an opportunity to go to Yale University to set up a course in chemical engineering, because "I thought being the granddaddy of chemical engineering at Yale would be something I'd like to have on my record."

Other items were added later to that record—chairman of the National Research Council's chemical division, a member of President Coolidge's Muscle Shoals Inquiry to outline practical uses and sound operating policies for the Federal properties there, and research director of the Socony Vacuum Oil Co.

Then, one day in 1933, he met Dr. Harcourt A. Morgan in Washington. Dr. Morgan, former U-T president, had shortly before been named a TVA director. He and Dr. Curtis "chewed the rag" all day and, at the end, Dr. Curtis decided he'd join in the "great new adventure" of TVA.

HELD 23 PATENTS

Dr. Morgan had had an idea that the Government's old munitions plant at Muscle Shoals might be used in some way to help the farmers of the valley. How, he didn't know, and in September 1933, Dr. Curtis, as TVA chief chemical engineer, started out to learn.

The rapid growth of farm prosperity in this onetime "No. 1 problem area of the Nation," together with the spread of green on once-eroded countrysides, soon began to testify to the good job that Dr. Curtis did.

Since 1933, fertilizer developed and produced by TVA at Muscle Shoals has been spread on millions of acres of more than 30,000 test demonstration farms in two-thirds of the States. Of the more than 150 TVA patents on new fertilizers and new processes for making fertilizers—all given royalty-free to the fertilizer industry—Dr. Curtis held 23, alone or in collaboration.

TAUGHT AGAIN

Time and again since Dr. Curtis moved into this TVA field, fertilizer consumption has doubled. But fertilizer was not all that Muscle Shoals, under TVA, was called upon to turn out. During World War II, it produced 60 percent of the elemental phosphorous used in incendiary and smoke bombs. It produced all used in the Korean conflict.

By the time the first shot of World War II was fired, however, Dr. Curtis and his wife, Polly, had moved on to something else that intrigued him, the engineering deanship at Missouri—again at less salary. While there, he told Mrs. Curtis:

"You've followed me all over the United States, and raised children in places where it is not very easy to raise children. You can pick out the last place and we'll settle down and call that home."

AIDED AT U-T

So she choose Knoxville and he agreed, and they decided they'd come here after his retirement from the university. But President Truman moved up the schedule by naming him to replace his friend, Dr. Morgan on the TVA board in 1949.

It wasn't long before Dr. Curtis was personally demonstrating his version of TVA "partnership" with the people and institutions of the valley.

Dr. James D. Hoskins, then U–T president, was dissatisfied with U–T's chemical engineering programs and asked Dr. Curtis for help. He delivered, bringing the late Dr. Robert M. Boarts here to head that department, together with Dr. J. D. Lindsay, now in comparable position at Texas A. & M. College.

VIEWS LED TO CONFLICT

Other southeastern universities also got help of this sort from Dr. Curtis. In addition, he helped North Carolina to set up a State minerals laboratory at Asheville and together with TVA foresters, played a leading role in persuading Bowaters Southern Paper Corp. to put its big newsprint plant at Calhoun, Tenn.

His pursuits in these directions led Dr. Curtis to believe that the valley's future prosperity will depend largely on its continued industrial growth, creating the need for land no longer farmed to be "protected" from erosion or trees "not worth cutting."

But his views on promoting growth of TVA power facilities, as well as other issues, eventually brought him into sharp conflict with Brig. Gen. Herbert D. Vogel, who succeeded Gordon Clapp as TVA chairman.

GIVEN FAREWELL PARTY

These conflicts came into the open particularly in connection with discussions between TVA and other Government agencies about the abortive Dixon-Yates contract and a TVA self-financing plan which Dr. Curtis helped to design.

As retirement neared, Dr. Curtis cut loose. He accused the Eisenhower administration of having an "unfriendly attitude" toward TVA. He said, too, that there would be "hell to pay, internally and externally," unless his successor on the board was a "sturdily independent man." Dr. Curtis was succeeded by A. R. Jones, former deputy director of the Budget Bureau and a present director.

In later years, however, Dr. Curtis' fears about TVA's future subsided. He told an interviewer 3 years after his retirement that he thought both General Vogel and Mr. Jones were then doing a top job for TVA.

ALWAYS STAYED BUSY

Retirement did not cause Dr. Curtis to go to seed. He loved to putter with both flowers and vegetables in his garden at the Curtis home, 3730 Dellwood Drive, or to turn out excellent work in his woodworking shop. He was also a persistent reader, averaging about one book a week in a pattern which usually called for reading several books in the same field.

However, in January 1960, a gardening accident damaged his left eye. More and more he turned to use of his right eye, the use of which had been impaired as a boy when he looked too long at a solar eclipse.

His reputation caused him to stay busy after retirement. A former associate in TVA once said Dr. Curtis was constantly called in as a consultant and was "one of the busiest men in retirement I've ever seen."

Dr. and Mrs. Curtis celebrated their golden wedding anniversary 2 years ago.

During breaks in this routine, he and Mrs. Curtis would visit their two daughters and five grandchildren, living in New York. The daughters are Mrs. Gordon Webber, Rye, N.Y., and Mrs. W. E. Palitz, New York City. He also leaves a sister, Mrs. William A. White, Los Gatos, Calif., whom he and Mrs. Curtis visited in January 1962.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) News Sentinel]

Dr. Harry Curtis

Because of his sharp tongue and his ultraliberal political views Dr. Harry A. Curtis made some enemies.

But his genius as a chemical engineer has immeasurably improved the lot of the American farmer. This remarkable record now serves as a memorial to Dr. Curtis, who died here yesterday in a local hospital at age 79.

He came to Knoxville shortly after TVA was created as chief chemical engineer, and after an interim of 10 years as dean of University of Missouri's Engineering College, he returned in 1948 to succeed his late friend Dr. Harcourt Morgan on the TVA Board. When his 9-year term ran out in the Eisenhower administration he retired to his Sequoyah Hills home. But he remained active, taking many assignments as a consulting engineer.

During his TVA tenure he developed many new procedures for making better fertilizer. Of the 150 patents TVA has obtained at Muscle Shoals, Dr. Curtis held 23, either alone or in collaboration. All TVA discoveries, incidentally, have been turned over free to the fertilizer industry.

The day before Dr. Curtis retired from TVA he was honor guest at a farewell party given by associates who called themselves jokingly the "Chastised by Curtis Club."

They had felt the bite of Dr. Curtis' caustic tongue, but all said they were aware there was nothing personal in his criticisms but were made in behalf of improving the agency.

INABILITY TO DISCHARGE POWERS AND DUTIES OF PRESIDENTIAL OFFICE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments has recently devoted a great deal of time and effort to a study of the difficult problems that arise when a President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. On June 25 the subcommittee unanimously approved a proposed constitutional amendment, which we believe offers a sound solution to this longstanding problem.

The subcommittee reported favorably Senate Joint Resolution 35, and recommended that it be reported to the Senate by the full Judiciary Committee. I have high hopes that the Judiciary Committee will consider Senate Joint Resolution 35 in the near future, and will recommend it favorably to the Senate.

Shortly before the subcommittee acted, the New York Daily News printed an excellent article written by Jack Metcalfe, which gives an interesting summary of the many arguments in favor of this proposal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Sunday News, June 23, 1963]

CAPITOL STUFF

(By Jack Metcalfe)

WASHINGTON.—The question of Presidential disability—or inability, as constitutional lawyers prefer to call it—long threatened to become a political dodo before an ostrichlike Congress ever bothered to solve it. This week, however, it suddenly and surprisingly began to show signs of life.

Bipartisan Senate support has developed behind a proposed constitutional amendment to prescribe what happens should a President become physically or mentally unable to do his job.

The 24th amendment, banning poll taxes, already has been ratified by 35 States. With only three more States approval needed, it is sure to be written into the Constitution.

That means that the inability amendment probably will be the 25th, if it manages, as its encouraged backers hope, to get through the cumbersome ratification machinery. The process could take up to 4 years.

With luck, the Nation won't need the amendment during that time. The United States has, after all, been fortunate enough to scrape along without a procedure for the orderly transfer of the President's powers and duties because of incapacity in the 174 years since the Constitution was adopted.

But anyone who recalls the anxious confusion during the periods of former President Eisenhower's three serious illnesses knows that lack of guidelines on incapacity is a very real problem. In an emergency, a time of civil or political strife or nuclear attack, it could mean national paralysis.

So developments in the Senate Judiciary subcommittee on Constitutional amendments should be heartening for Americans seriously concerned for the Nation's future well-being. What happened was, briefly, this:

The subcommittee, headed by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, wound up hearings on the three proposed Constitutional amendments now in the hopper. At the same time KEFAUVER and Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, won support of the Kennedy administration for their proposed solution.

IT GIVES CONGRESS POWER TO DECIDE

What's more, KEFAUVER lined up backing of the four other subcommittee members for his and KEATING's formula. All six, three Democrats and three Republicans, are expected to endorse it in a meeting next week, not later than Wednesday, starting it on its way toward the full Judiciary Committee and the Senate.

A subcommittee source reported that KEFAUVER also has done missionary work in the House for the proposed amendment. Sentiment there is generally favorable, he said.

KEFAUVER and KEATING are among the few who have tried individually to tackle the problem before an emergency arises, when it would be too late.

They got nowhere, partly because nobody could agree on a method for handling inability. So this year the two Senators came up with a compromise. It is not ideal, KEATING said, because it does not "set forth in detail exactly what should be done if a President becomes unable to discharge his duties." It is, however, something that sponsors hope all sides can get behind.

The amendment would simply authorize Congress to determine how the beginning and the end of Presidential disability shall be decided. Congress also would be empowered to pass a law saying what should be done if a President is out of commission.

NIXON CONSTRAINED TO TREAD WARILY

The formula, as KEATING put it, "would make it clear that the Vice President would not succeed to the office of the President but only to the powers and duties of that office."

This met with administration approval, expressed by Deputy Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach at last Tuesday's hearing. If the Vice President took over under these conditions and were given the title "acting President," Katzenbach said, "he would feel assured that no one would look upon him as a usurper."

Former Vice President Nixon, an early supporter of action on the inability problem, was acutely aware of this pitfall. Discussing the aftermath of Ike's heart attack in his book, "Six Crises," he said:

"My own position as Vice President called for maintaining a balance of the utmost delicacy. * * * Any move on my part which could be interpreted, even incorrectly, as an attempt to usurp the powers of the Presidency would disrupt the Eisenhower team, cause dissention in the Nation, and disturb the President."

KENNEDY HAS AGREEMENT WITH JOHNSON

Eisenhower too was deeply concerned with the inability problem. He and Nixon made a stopgap agreement providing that the Vice President would take over in case he determined that he was disabled. Ike reserved for himself the right to decide when his disability was ended. (President Kennedy and Vice President JOHNSON subsequently made the same arrangement.)

Ike also marshaled his administration behind corrective legislation. This, paradoxically, was torpedoed in the Democratic-controlled Congress, partly on account of the President's medical history. Because Eisenhower might be stricken again, Nixon foes opposed any law that might put the Vice President in the White House, from which they believed he would have been hard to dislodge.

But in these days of Presidential health and vigor, inability legislation has a better-than-fighting chance.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, after the subcommittee approved the proposal, the Washington Daily News published a fine editorial, which pointed out the urgent need to solve this problem now, while we are fortunate enough to have a young and healthy President in office. I agree completely with these statements, and I feel that we are finally moving toward a solution of this problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, July 13, 1963]

WHO WOULD KEEP STORE?

If a President of the United States dies or resigns while in office, the Vice President automatically becomes President. This is clear in the Constitution. There never has been any dispute about it.

The Constitution also says that in case of the President's "inability to discharge the powers and duties" of his office, the Vice President shall take charge. But who decides when a President is disabled? If he is completely disabled—as has happened at least twice—he himself would not be competent to judge the degree of his own disability.

The Constitution is unclear as to when a Vice President should step in. And there is no guiding law.

A subcommittee of the Senate has approved a constitutional amendment authorizing Congress to specify a method of determining when a President was incapacitated.

The Kennedy administration has endorsed this plan. President Eisenhower strongly urged such action.

Mr. Eisenhower and former Vice President Nixon had a written agreement that Mr. Nixon would take over if necessary. Mr. Kennedy and Vice President JOHNSON have a similar agreement. But this is no solution.

The plan for a takeover in such an emergency should be spelled out in law, so there is no doubt about it. This properly should be done now while, as Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach said, there is a young and healthy President in office. Before something happens, not after.

Now that the subcommittee has acted, we hope the full Senate Judiciary Committee and both Houses of Congress will take action—while it can be done objectively and thoughtfully.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF LEAD-ZINC SMALL PRODUCERS STABILIZATION ACT

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H.R. 3845.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3845) to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766).

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. May there be a quorum call without the time being taken out of the 30 minutes allowed for debate on the pending amendment?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** That may be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be not taken from the time of either side. The quorum call will notify absent Senators that morning business has been concluded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] such time as he may require.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is, in effect, a repeal of the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of 1961. What the Senator from Delaware proposes is to cut off a program, adopted by the 87th Congress after very careful deliberation, before it has begun to accomplish its purpose. It will be recalled that the very modest program was passed as the minimum program which could be enacted for the hard-pressed lead and zinc miners of the United States. Having repeatedly but unsuccessfully sought relief from competing imports through petitions to the Tariff Commission; and having attempted, also unsuccessfully, to obtain legislation to decrease imports of lead and zinc, or other legislative relief, the lead and zinc miners finally obtained the stabilization program as the only means of avoiding complete collapse of the industry. The program has always been regarded as a stopgap measure to prevent the complete extinction of the industry while other means for revitalizing it are found.

The termination of the lead and zinc mining stabilization program at the end of 1 year, cutting it off after 2 years, would not only be a disservice to the mining industry, and especially the small lead and zinc producers, but it would show complete bad faith on the part of the Government. It would work a hardship on many small producers who have invested in reopening their properties and purchased supplies and equipment in anticipation of a period of at least 4 years' operations. It would also result in more unemployment in the already distressed mining areas. Unemployment is a major problem facing our country. We must do nothing to increase it.

There are 96 small domestic producers now certified to participate in the program.

The cost for the calendar years ahead is estimated as follows: for 1963, $2 million; for 1964, $2 million; for 1965, $1.6 million.

This is a small amount to pay to offset the harm done to the domestic mining industry because of a lack of protection from imports of low-cost lead and zinc. It is also less than the cost of unemployment and the welfare costs to care for the many persons who otherwise would be unemployed without the support of stabilization payments for lead and zinc mining.

I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Delaware will be rejected.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Delaware desire to use some of his time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, first, I wish to modify my amendment, in line 5 of the amendment, by changing the date "December 31, 1963" to "February 15, 1964."

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator has the right to modify his amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the purpose of the modification is this: Certain Senators have suggested that Congress may wish to consider this measure in the early part of the next session of Congress. So rather than let the act lapse at the end of this year, as originally suggested, my proposal would allow it to lapse on February 15, 1964. Under existing law the act would expire December 31, 1965.

Under existing law, as enacted last year, producers of lead and zinc can sell their products on the open market at the prevailing price. In the case of lead they can bill the U.S. Government for 75 percent of the difference between the market price which they receive and 14½ cents a pound. In other words, if they sell the lead for 10 cents a pound, they can bill the Government for 75 percent of the 4½-cent differential. If the market rises above 14½ cents a pound, to 15, 16, 18, or 20 cents a pound, the producers will get all of the differential. It is a one-way street so far as the taxpayers are concerned.

In the case of zinc the producers can bill the Federal Government for 55 percent of the differential between whatever they may receive and the 14½ cents a pound.

Under existing law, the lead and zinc subsidy program will expire on December 31, 1965. The pending amendment merely advances the expiration date by approximately 2 years. It would let the entire subsidy program expire on February 15, 1964.

Without the adoption of my amendment it would be possible for the Federal Government to be committed for as much as $4 million in subsidies for 1964, and for the calendar year 1965 the subsidy would be $3,500,000. So there would be a potential saving under my amendment of $7,500,000 for the 2 years; however, during calendar year 1963, the appropriation could equal $4,500,000. I understand that in the first year in which the program was operating, which was only a part of a year, approximately $1,500,000 was paid out.

In my opinion the subsidy program is not justified because, first, the principle is wrong. Congress rejected the so-called Brannan principle for agriculture; I do not believe it should be extended to the mining industry. If it is continued to be made applicable to the lead and zinc industries it will only be a question of time before the producers of other minerals will ask to be included in the program.

In addition, there is already an inventory of approximately $8,500 million in the national stockpile, which is about double what is needed. In February 1962 the President stated that he was astonished to find that more than $8 billion was tied up in national stockpiles of which less than half was needed. He suggested that Congress should take appropriate steps to rectify that situation.

It is interesting to note that as of April 30, 1963, according to the most recent report which has been published, the administration has added $136 million worth of materials to the stockpile since the present administration took office. In other words, while many crocodile tears have been shed about the value and size of those inventories, we are at the same time continuing to accumulate larger amounts. To continue the subsidy program for lead and zinc would result in the production of more of those particular minerals, thereby indirectly increasing the stockpile.

As of the most recent date for which figures are available, there are in the stockpile 1,302,000 short tons of lead. The stockpile objective—the maximum need which could be foreseen in the event of a 3-year war, and the maximum amount which it was recommended that we carry—was 286,000 tons. In other words, we have on hand 1,016,000 short tons of lead more than we need even in the event of an all-out nuclear war.

We have $384 million tied up in that inventory of lead in our national stockpile, but it only has a market valuation of $267 million. So the taxpayers already have a loss of $117 million facing them on this one item. The market has declined even further since this tabulation was made; so the loss as of today is even greater.

There are in the national stockpile 1,580,000 short tons of zinc. The maximum needs under our defense recommendations total 178,000 tons. So we have 1,402,000 tons more than the Defense Department says we need. We have $443 million tied up in the zinc inventory—or a potential loss of $64.5 million facing us based on the figures compiled in April 1962.

I do not see why we should burden the taxpayers with a subsidy in order to increase the production of these two commodities when, based upon all the authoritative reports we have received, we have about five times as much in our inventories of either of them as we need.

Instead of continuing to accumulate the inventories, I believe we should be liquidating them; and certainly the first step is to stop buying and adding to the supply. After that, we can proceed to talk about an orderly liquidation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. First, Mr. President, let me ask how much time remains available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Ohio such time as he may need.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Two minutes will be sufficient.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Very well; I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, about 8 or 9 months ago, or perhaps longer ago than that, when one of the Senate committees began investigating the stockpile of metals, the newspapers of the Nation carried headlines and declarations were made about the need to reduce the excessive stockpiles. The administration, through its representative, made declarations about this unjustifiable condition, under which there are in the various stockpiles metals of different types. It was said there must be a liquidation of the excessive stockpiles, and that it would be begun. Citizens who wrote to the newspapers subscribed to the declarations which were made and praised the purpose to begin some economy plan and some plan to reduce—this is my recollection—$10 billion worth of metals.

In the various stockpiles were lead and zinc. The latest report shows there were 1,302,000 short tons of lead on hand, with a valuation of $384 million. That is what the lead cost the Government. The lead has fallen in value—according to the present appraisal—to $266,900,000—or a loss of $117 million.

As for zinc, we have 1,580,000 tons on hand, worth $443 million. 178,000 tons is the maximum need for a 3-year period if we were engaged in war. That means we have 1,402,000 tons more than we need.

So we have a sufficient supply for 15 years. Yet in the face of that situation we are providing a subsidy to the lead and zinc miners of the country—guaranteeing them a price of 14½ cents a pound, I believe, regardless of the price they receive for these metals when they sell them. We do not pay the full difference; we pay only a percentage.

Mr. President, I cannot understand the logic of subsidizing the lead and zinc mining industry and having it produce more lead and zinc, while we have on hand excessive quantities.

The amount involved in the bill which was passed 2 years ago is not large; I concede that, when compared with the $100 billion budget, the expenditure of $6 million or $7 million is insignificant. But a principle is involved. When are we to stop subsidizing? Why do we have to subsidize the miners of lead and zinc?

I know the answer will be, "To keep the mines operating, so that if anything untoward happens, they will be ready for use." But with the huge quantities of lead and zinc on hand, that argument is completely dispelled.

There is a rather astounding aspect of this situation: When the subsidization was announced, when the bill was passed, the miners immediately reopened the mines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I have 1 more minute?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 1 more minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, some mining companies which produce metals other than lead and zinc procured the benefits of the Act. I know that bills now pending contemplate curbing that evil. But we then reawakened the purpose to open the mines; and certainly we would reawaken that purpose if we were to tell the mine operators, "Open your mines; we will guarantee you a certain percentage of the difference between the price you receive for your metal and 14½ cents a pound"—no chance of loss, a guaranteed price, the Brannan agricultural program put into effect for the lead and zinc mining industry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time yielded to the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have 1 more minute?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 1 more minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, how long are we to continue the policy of subsidizing? If we subsidize lead and zinc, will not other segments of our economy ask for subsidies—for example, subsidies for the redevelopment of depressed areas, and subsidies to the tune of $6 billion for the operation of mass transit systems?

Subsidies are provided everywhere.

We talk about tax reduction. How are we to effect a tax reduction? Tax reduction cannot be effected by increasing expenditures and reducing revenues without running the country into catastrophe.

Mr. President, I am a sponsor of the amendment. I thank the Senator from Delaware for his ardent and alert opposition to expenditures of the type proposed. I call upon the President to recognize the problem and stop talking about tax reduction unless he is willing to talk about expense reduction. The backs of taxpayers are bent. Give them help. We shall never give it to them by fostering expenditures of the type proposed in the lead and zinc subsidy.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the bill was thoroughly studied and discussed by the Senate at the time it was passed in an effort to keep alive the interest of small producers in the lead and zinc areas of our country. The need was generated because of the fact that most of the larger producers of lead and zinc have vast holdings outside the country. At low cost they are able to bring into the U.S. lead and zinc concentrates from South American mines and mines in other parts of the world and refine them in domestic smelters. The small producer does not share in that type of operation because he must dig his lead and zinc out of the hard rock of Oklahoma, Missouri, Kansas, and our western mining States, and then he must attempt to sell his concentrates to the big producers that refine his product.

In an effort to save small business in the lead and zinc industry, which has been so severely hit by the low tariffs that have permitted the market to be flooded with imported lead and zinc and with the trading of agricultural surpluses for lead and zinc to the detriment of local small producers, the bill was introduced and passed.

We hear talk about the $8 billion stockpile. Let us not "hang the wrong man." It is not the small producer who is responsible for the $8 billion stockpile or the $443 million supply of lead and zinc which has been accumulated in the stockpile. He has sold none of it to the Government. Most of it came from imported ores brought in by either American-owned companies operating abroad, or it has come in as a result of trading surplus agricultural products for lead and zinc ores that have been brought in because such ores are easier to store and they do not deteriorate with the passage of time.

What is the extent of the authorization under the bill? A $4.5 million authorization was established to take care of the small producers for the year 1962. We were required to pay out only $1,012,000, because only 60 participants were eligible to qualify in that year for the small amount of the payment—about 4 cents a pound—that was made for the domestically mined ore from small mines.

However, the bill would decrease, rather than increase, the cost to the Government, because it would prohibit, under the terms of the law, mines in which lead and zinc are incidental byproducts. Unless over 50 percent of the total production of a mine is in lead and zinc, a company cannot qualify under the law. Thus there would be some saving, small though it might be, to the Federal Government in the passage of the bill.

The amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] would cut the term of the program by 2 full years, or slightly less than 2 full years. So the small mine operators—men who operate their own mines, some of whom have borrowed money on their homes and their other assets to rehabilitate their mines so they could go back to work—would have only 2 years in which to operate under the act instead of the 4 years contemplated by the bill when it was passed. Under the terms of the amendment upon which we are asked to vote today the program would end next February. So it would seem to me to be pennywise and pound foolish to cut off the program midway when it has been costing the Federal Government one-quarter of what we anticipated it would cost to carry out the maintenance of some semblance of domestic lead and zinc mining on the part of small producers.

Therefore I cannot agree that the ore mined under the provisions of the bill would add to our stockpile of lead and zinc, which the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has talked about repeatedly. He well knows—I am sure he would not want the Senate to misunderstand him on that point—that the ore would not go into the stockpile. It would go into private business. It would be sold on the open market. If it should sell for 10½ cents a pound, the price would be 4 cents below the cost of production. Then the lead miner could bill the Federal Government for 75 percent of the 4 cents a pound, which would give him about a 3-cent-per-pound cost in mining subsidy. He would be using American labor, and thus keeping his employees off the rolls of the unemployed or the rolls of those who would be drawing unemployment insurance.

I plead with the Senate not to be penny wise and pound-foolish by cutting off the program midway as we act on a bill to try to reduce the cost.

If the program had been a bad program or had been mishandled I would be in favor of abolishing the program in its entirety rather than cutting it off next February. It would be utterly unfair to expect that small miners who have so little should lose their homes. Some would do so because they have borrowed to install lift equipment, trucks, pneumatic equipment, and other devices necessary to carry on their hoped-for business in lead and zinc production.

We should realize that they are the victims of low tariff policies designed to help our friendly neighbors in Latin America. That program has been undertaken at the expense of unemployment in the small companies and small mines.

As I have said, the large mining companies in our country operate abroad. They can mine lead and zinc while unemployment soars in our own mining areas. They can bring in the ore and refine it in their smelters here.

The Federal Government has built up a stockpile not from ore that is indigenous to the United States, but largely ore which has been imported. To use that stockpile as an illustration of why we should kill the program is to "hang the wrong man."

I hope that the Senate will reject the amendment, which is against the interests of the small producer, and continue the program approved by the Senate 2 years ago.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 1 minute remaining. The Senator from Oklahoma has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I disagree with my friend from Oklahoma in his statement that the subsidy program would not affect the national stockpile. It is true that the lead and zinc which is produced under the Act does not go into a national stockpile but will be used in place of that which is already in the national stockpile. The money does involve the Federal Treasury to the extent that we are paying for the program. Whether the ore is shipped to the national stockpile or directed to industry is immaterial. Certainly we will not cut down our national stockpile as long as we keep paying for increased production.

I disagree completely that the barter agreement is responsible for all of the accumulation in our stockpile. Surely it is responsible for some of it. On the other hand, 1,050,000 tons of the 1,302,000 tons in our national stockpile were bought and put there not under a direct purchase agreement and was paid for with American dollars. That in itself is nearly five times as much as we would need even without the barter inventory. While one feature of the bill would cut down the cost of the program to some extent it does not stop the program. But I think we should go further and eliminate the entire unsound program as of the middle of next February. I point out that if we do not it will be the forerunner of expanding the subsidies. Immediately following the present bill on the calendar there is another bill which would bring in other companies under the subsidy umbrella.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized for 1 more minute.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 1 minute from my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The bill to be considered immediately following action on the pending bill was reported by the same committee and would change the definition whereby more companies would be eligible—several additional companies could qualify. One company in particular could qualify retroactively and could file claim for benefits of approximately $100,000. Later when that bill is before us I shall certainly try to send the bill back to the committee. It should be defeated by the Senate.

With respect to the pending bill, I think it would be wise for the Senate to accept the amendment and terminate the subsidy program. Let us stop trying to unload on the taxpayers the cost of accumulating more minerals when already there is in the stockpile, based on all reports, 5 or 6 times as much as we now need.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am unable to understand the logic of the distinguished Senator from Delaware, that we start unloading the stockpile, to drive American business out of business. I am sure the Senator does not mean that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. We have nearly everything in the stockpile, including agricultural products. There are minerals of all kinds, including aluminum. It has been the purpose of those who operate the stockpile to try to minimize the impact on business.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I have limited time. I am sorry.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. For only a question.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We can ask for additional time.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senate is operating under a unanimous consent agreement limiting debate. I do not think more time can be given to me.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oklahoma may be permitted 5 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Delaware? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am not advocating the dumping of the $8 billion worth of inventories on the market. That would be absurd. The President of the United States did not make any such recommendation. But the President did make the statement that he thought we should plan for an orderly liquidation of excess inventories. To that extent I wholeheartedly subscribe to his statement.

If the President meant what he said, let us stop buying and start planning for liquidation. Certainly we shall not be liquidating the stockpile if we keep adding to it as we would by adoption of the bill without the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. In the first place, the Government is not buying any lead or zinc. That ought to be clear. The Government is to pay an amount between the market price, as paid by the market—10½, 11½, 13½, 14½ cents whatever it may be—by paying 50 or 75 percent of the differential.

The only way damage could possibly result would be if the Government were determined to sell the stockpile. It has been the policy to sell from the stockpile when the market demanded more than was available in private production. I am sure that is what the Senator from Delaware would like to see.

I do not think we should drive small American producers out of business and close down their mines, after 2 years of operation, with a proposal to liquidate the program. This would be tragic for miners who invested their savings and mortgaged their automobiles and homes, to put in new equipment to get back into the lead and zinc business.

It is important to keep the small mines in operation. The big mines have no problem. Those mines make money on the importation of lead and zinc which they sell at 10½ cents a pound on the domestic market. They would like to have a higher price, but they can exist on that. They can keep their diggings in most of the mining areas. They can pump water out, so that the minerals will not be lost to future generations of Americans.

The man with a small mine has no income on which to rely. If the water takes over and the mine collapses, the timbers will rot out, and there will be totally destroyed an asset of great value.

The bill is not expensive. The cost has been a little more than $1 million in the first year of operation, 1962. It might cost a slight amount more, as others might come under the program. The cost cannot be more than $4 million.

To terminate the program now would do a great disservice to the miners who in good faith have trusted their Government in the belief that this was to be a 4-year program rather than a 2-year program.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been used or yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment. In view of the fact that there is not a sufficient number of Senators in the Chamber to order the yeas and nays I shall suggest the absence of a quorum; but first I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, a list of the payments of subsidies made under the program in calendar year 1962.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF MINERALS EXPLORATION

Lead and zinc mining stabilization program payments on 1962 production as of Mar. 31, 1963

Producer, name and address	Production (pounds)			Payments					
	Lead	Zinc	Total	Rate (cents per pound)			Amount		
				Lead	Zinc	Combined	Lead	Zinc	Total
Arizona Michigan Mining, Post Office Box 829, Prescott Ariz	57,785		57,785	3.75		3.75	$2,166.92		$2,166.92
Foreman & Foreman, 564 Cliff Dr., Laguna Beach, Calif	153,585		153,585	3.48		3.48	5,348.63		5,348.63
Celtor Chemical Corp., 1694 Union St., San Francisco, Calif		152,057	152,057		1.45	1.45		$2,208.69	2,208.69
Frank N. Marr, 611 Peyton Bldg., Spokane, Wash	1,116,417	84,286	1,200,703	3.62	1.58	3.48	40,463.20	1,332.78	41,795.98
Clayton Silver Mines, Box 890, Wallace, Idaho	1,163,650	52,437	1,216,087	3.67	1.65	3.59	42,741.45	865.21	43,606.66
Edward J. Bailey, Box 660, Kellogg, Idaho	559,416	108,434	667,850	3.58	1.57	3.25	20,017.80	1,701.95	21,719.75
Martin C. Thompson, Elizabeth Park, Kellogg, Idaho	510,045	32,433	542,478	3.65	1.64	3.54	18,651.53	532.68	19,184.21
McLine-Asher Lease, Box 641, Kellogg, Idaho	68,250		68,250	3.71		3.71	2,534.11		2,534.11
Sunshine Mining Co., West 300 Mission Ave., Spokane, Wash	2,301,496		2,301,496	3.63		3.63	83,644.83		83,644.83
Silver Star-Queen Mines, 1370 South 3d West, Salt Lake City, Utah	70,531	8,650	79,181	3.75	1.65	3.52	2,644.91	142.73	2,787.64
Silver Dollar Mining Co., 409 Radio Central Bldg., Spokane, Wash	395,313		395,313	3.64		3.64	14,376.66		14,376.66
Mountain Goat Lease, Post Office Box 469, Wallace, Idaho	752,218	2,587,139	3,339,357	3.65	1.57	2.04	27,476.84	40,721.17	68,198.01
Mid-Continent Lead & Zinc Co., Post Office Box 229, Baxter Springs, Kans	1,441,469	3,000,000	4,441,469	3.66	1.58	2.26	52,814.87	47,437.50	100,252.37
Helen H. Mining Co., Post Office Box 29, Baxter Springs, Kans	177,188	1,342,854	1,520,042	3.63	1.65	1.88	6,425.02	22,157.08	28,582.10
B. & I. Mining Co., Box 305, Picher, Okla	4,474	27,137	31,611	3.62	1.65	1.93	161.87	447.76	609.63
Trout Mining Co., 233 Broadway, New York, N.Y	403,587	2,185,624	2,589,211	3.69	1.56	1.89	14,902.65	34,000.30	48 902.95
The Taylor-Knapp Co., Box FF, Philipsburg, Mont	101,146	634,208	735,354	3.65	1.56	1.85	3,688.77	9,883.07	13,571.84
Percy Goodwin & C. A. Porte, Rural Route A, Helena, Mont	2,402		2,402	3.38		3.38	81.08		81.08
Hoco, Inc., Post Office Box O, White Sulphur Springs, Mont	265,511		265,511	3.68		3.68	9,774.17		9,774.17
Ida B. Hand, Argenta Star Route, Dillon, Mont	290,948		290,948	3.64		3.64	10,602.86		10,602.86
Lahey Leasing Co., Post Office Box 8, Jefferson City, Mont	220,782	39,842	260,624	3.60	1.65	3.30	7,943.96	657.39	8,601.35
Caeser Caviglia, 659 Mill St., Ely, Nev		56,514	56,514		1.65	1.65		932.49	932.49
Charles O. Vaccaro, Post Office Box 234, Eureka, Nev	40,674	292,548	333,222	3.75	1.65	1.91	1,525.28	4,827.04	6,352.32
Gold Note Group, 2452 Tyler Ave., Ogden, Utah	11,074		11,074	3.35		3.35	370.87		370.87
Hamilton Corp., Post Office Box 337, Ely, Nev	169,833		169,833	3.75		3.75	6,366.04		6,366.04
John D. Torres, Post Office Box 246, Magdalena, N. Mex	18,242		18,242	3.41		3.41	622.37		622.37
Tungsten Mining Corp., Henderson, N.C	427,099		427,099	3.64		3.64	15,541.59		15,541.59
Scotty Mining Co., Inc., Box 96, Picher, Okla	31,944	314,346	346,290	3.33	1.65	1.80	1,063.82	5,186.70	6,250.52
Max Mining Co., 400 North Francis St., Picher, Okla	268,537	954,694	1,223,231	3.69	1.58	2.04	9,914.43	15,096.10	25,010.53
Virgil Lee Mining Co., Post Office Box 216, Picher, Okla	338,604	1,477,131	1,815,735	3.62	1.58	1.96	12,253.19	23,290.13	35,543.32
C & M Mining Co., Post Office Box 229, Baxter Springs, Kans	226,684	806,185	1,032,869	3.69	1.57	2.03	8,354.88	12,662.18	21,017.06
Wesah Mining Co.—Tom Kiser, 1903 F St. NW., Miami, Okla	581,631	1,799,318	2,380,949	3.60	1.59	2.08	20,930.74	28,596.75	49,527.49
Mark Twain Mining Co., Post Office Box 187, Picher, Okla	152,157	2,436,257	2,588,414	3.67	1.62	1.74	5,579.40	39,377.50	44,956.90
Tuck Mining Co., Box 366, Picher, Okla	71,120	288,925	360,045	3.70	1.62	2.03	2,633.93	4,685.45	7,319.38
Charles Marie Mining Co., 212 North River St., Commerce, Okla	159,366	670,833	830,199	3.66	1.57	1.97	5,831.79	10,552.64	16,384.43
William H. Stone, Rural Route 2, Galena, Kans	288,072	659,311	947,383	3.64	1.57	2.20	10,476.50	10,360.46	20,836.96
Merit Mining Co., 409 South Maine St., Picher, Okla	24,101	106,646	130,747	3.58	1.59	1.96	863.90	1,693.59	2,557.42
Contack Mining Co., Inc., Post Office Box 849, Miami, Okla	22,262	920,011	942,273	3.75	1.65	1.70	834.85	15,180.17	16,015.09
Estate of Dewey S. Sims, 205 East Street NW., Miami, Okla	451,028	1,540,925	1,991,953	3.73	1.63	2.11	16,814.14	25,188.27	42,002.41
John Henderson, Post Office Box 281, Picher, Okla	290,520	1,110,961	1,401,481	3.58	1.55	1.97	10,398.49	17,228.57	27,627.06
The Quapaw Co., Post Office Box 187, Picher, Okla	9,676	46,723	56,399	3.38	1.65	1.95	$326.57	$770.93	$1,097.50
Keystone Mining Co., 163 South Main St., Salt Lake City, Utah	231,874	114,488	346,362	3.65	1.58	2.97	8,462.82	1,810.33	10,273.15
Peter S. Martin, Post Office Box 636, Milford, Utah	5,164	6,648	11,812	3.35	1.38	2.24	172.94	91.41	264.35
Cardiff Industries, Inc., 404 Boston Bldg., Salt Lake City, Utah	672,353	626,272	1,298,625	3.68	1.56	2.66	24,732.94	9,746.43	34,479.37
Arundel Mining Co., 1701 Greenhill Ave., Wilmington, Del	16,302	73,214	89,516	3.50	1.53	1.89	571.15	1,121.43	1,692.58
Bowman & Williams, 310 West 5300 South. Murray, Utah	236,564	301,816	538,380	3.67	1.58	2.50	8,673.50	4,774.88	13,448.38
Tony Bullock, Lark, Utah	35,397	36,749	72,146	3.66	1.65	2.64	1,296.85	606.37	1,903.22
George C. Duncan, 1471 Roberta St., Salt Lake City, Utah	104,486	65,891	170,377	3.68	1.58	2.87	3,849.02	1,038.56	4,887.58
Duncan & Sears, 1471 Roberta St., Salt Lake City, Utah	88,170	75,371	163,541	3.69	1.65	2.75	3,256.48	1,243.63	4,500.11
Jesus Avila, Lark, Utah	69,132	94,248	163,380	3.65	1.62	2.48	2,519.98	1,531.39	4,051.37
Leonard Steel, Lark, Utah	408,482	381,604	790,086	3.68	1.59	2.67	15,048.74	6,083.03	21,131.77
Gilbert Sears, Salt Lake City, Utah	17,945	21,613	39,558	3.49	1.38	2.33	625.85	297.18	923.03
Anton Kennikar, 393 West 6260 South, Murray, Utah	231,847	184,810	416,657	3.72	1.58	2.77	8,614.94	2,922.31	11,537.25
Roy Bendixon, 2820 East 7000 South, Salt Lake City, Utah	355,947	61,428	417,375	3.73	1.64	3.43	13,292.08	1,005.26	14,297.34
William Keller, 324 East 5900 South, Murray, Utah	370,461	40,415	410,876	3.71	1.44	3.48	13,727.67	581.41	14,309.08
Total	16,482,961	25,820,996	42,303,957	3.71	1.59	2.39	602,009.87	410,570.90	1,012,580.77

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, was it not a part of the agreement that the yeas and nays were ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; but I am about to ask for the yeas and nays prior to a vote.

I suggest the absence of a quorum, so that a sufficient number of Senators can be present to order the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. COTTON (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. MORTON (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a live pair with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. SMATHERS. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott].

If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

The respective pairs of the Senators from Kansas [Mr. Carlson and Mr. Pearson], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem], and that of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan] have been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 50, as follows:

[No. 113 Leg.]

YEAS—32

Aiken
Beall
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Case
Cooper
Curtis
Dodd
Douglas
Fong
Goldwater
Hruska
Javits
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
Miller
Mundt
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Ribicoff
Robertson
Saltonstall
Smith
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—50

Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Clark
Dominick
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Kefauver
Kennedy
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Neuberger
Proxmire
Randolph
Russell
Simpson
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Yarborough

NOT VOTING—18

Burdick
Carlson
Church
Cotton
Dirksen
Hickenlooper
Humphrey
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Long, Mo.
McCarthy
McGovern
Mechem
Morton
Nelson
Pearson
Scott
Williams, N.J.

So Mr. Williams' amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill is open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 3845) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EASEMENTS OR USE OF LANDS IN CAMP JOSEPH H. PENDLETON NAVAL RESERVATION, CALIF.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 546) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant easements for the use of lands in the Camp Joseph H. Pendleton Naval Reservation, Calif., for a nuclear electric generating station, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

> That the Secretary of the Navy be and he hereby is authorized and empowered to grant to Southern California Edison Company, a California corporation, and to San Diego Gas and Electric Company, a California corporation, and to each of them, their respective successors and assigns, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems necessary to protect the interests of the United States, an easement in, over, under and upon lands of the United States of America, approximately ninety acres in area, within the Camp Joseph H. Pendleton Naval Reservation, California, for the construction, operation, maintenance, and use of a nuclear electric generating station, consisting of one or more generating units, and appurtenances thereto and easements in, under, over, and upon such additional lands of the United States of America within the Camp Joseph H. Pendleton Naval Reservation, California, as are necessary or desirable for the purpose of constructing, operating, maintaining, and using electric transmission and communication lines, switchyards and substations, cooling water conduits, pipelines for water, gas and sewage, railroad spur tracks, access roads and other appurtenances to said facilities and to said nuclear electric generating station.
>
> Sec. 2. Upon such terms and conditions as he deems necessary to protect the interests of the United States and within the scope set forth in Section 1, the Secretary or his successors in interest, may amend any such easement by mutual agreement of the parties thereto, or their successors in interest, in such manner as to change the lands affected thereby, either by substitution, addition or deletion, as well as to change the terms and conditions of the grant.
>
> Sec. 3. A reasonable charge, which may be paid in installments or in a lump sum or in a combination thereof, as determined by the Secretary, or his successor in interest, based upon the fair value of each easement granted pursuant to the authority herein contained, shall be payable by the grantee or grantees thereof, their respective successors and assigns.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House. The amendment of the House is a very minor amendment making a few changes in the language. The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to permit the use of approximately 90 acres of land for the construction of an atomic energy electric producing plant in the Camp Pendleton area in California. It had been reported unanimously by the Senate committee. There is no objection to the bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in the national debate now underway on the civil rights issue, we have been concentrating on the legal rights involved. This is a natural reaction to the legislation we are now considering, for many innovations in our legal approach to this issue have been put forward.

Despite the great legal issues involved, Mr. President, I believe it is very important that we keep firmly in mind the fact that the key issue is basically one of human rights and morality. An excellent analysis of the human understanding that must accompany any effective legislation appeared in a column written for the July 8, 1963, issue of the Riverton (Wyo.) Ranger by a very perceptive writer, Margaret Peck.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> We're glad, aren't we, that we are living far from this summer's battlefield, far north and west of the Mason-Dixon Line?
>
> It's easier, this way, to pretend the whole situation was none of our doing. It is safe to take sides, to feel sympathy for those of our race whose way of life is being shaken, or to cheer those who are finally claiming their constitutional rights to the pursuit of happiness.
>
> Some of us can even feel for both sides. We can understand the fear of the white man at the upset of his established social order, and we can understand why "separate" can never be "equal" for a colored man living in a ghetto, North or South.
>
> The thing we have, of course, is called "tolerance." This is a fashionable virtue in our generation, and one without which we would hardly dare appear in enlightened society.
>
> It results in a rather bland and placid facial expression, much more pleasant than an expression created by hatred or vindictiveness or fear.
>
> The only trouble is that tolerance is a rather watery soup to offer those who are dying of hatred or vindictiveness or fear. It doesn't supply much nourishment.
>
> If you have ever been "tolerated" you know what I mean. If you have ever existed without love you know what it is to be tolerated. You know what a thin, cold virtue this "tolerance" can be. It isn't much to offer a warrior, white or black.
>
> As long as you and I aren't on the firing lines, I think the least we can do is beef up the thin soup of our tolerance with a little love. Only with our love, active and sincere, can the vanquished be soothed and sustained and the victor be guided toward mercy.
>
> Whether we take sides or stand in the middle, let's learn all we can about this struggle, let's come to understand why it is our struggle too, and let's thereby come to care deeply about the individual human beings who are directly involved.
>
> Across the miles let's make our countrymen feel not only our judgment and our indignation * * * but also our love.

SIMPLIFICATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF LEAD-ZINC SMALL PRODUCERS STABILIZATION ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 222, H.R. 3120.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 3120) to simplify administration of the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the primary purpose of H.R. 3120 is to enable certain bona fide small producers of lead and zinc to qualify for benefits under the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act (Public Law 87–347) from which they have been excluded. The persons that would be benefited are members of the very group the Stabilization Act was designed to help.

H.R. 3120 also would simplify administration of the Stabilization Act.

The bill would accomplish these objectives by establishing in section 1 the calendar year as the time unit within which the production limitation is established, rather than "any 12-month period" as in the present law.

Section 2 specifies the dates by which a producer shall file or have filed an application for participation in the program. This provision was written into the original bill by the House committee to correct an inequitable situation which resulted from the timelag between enactment of the authorizing legislation on October 3, 1961, and issuance of implementing regulations on July 28, 1962, after the appropriation was finally approved.

BACKGROUND OF LEGISLATION

The Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act was the result of intensive study by both Houses of Congress which showed conclusively that our domestic lead-zinc industry is in dire straits indeed, to no small extent as a result of foreign competition. Small independent producers have been, of course, the hardest hit, and Public Law 87–347 was enacted for the relief of such small producers by providing for a program of payments to them of specified percentages between the market price and a reasonable cost-of-production price. The term "small domestic producer" is defined in section 6(a)(2) as one who, during any 12-month period between January 1, 1956, and the beginning of the period for which payments are sought under the act, has not produced or sold more than 3,000 tons of lead and zinc combined.

The committee was advised that lead and zinc producers generally maintain their production records on a calendar year basis and report production to the Bureau of Mines, which maintains nationwide statistics, on a similar calendar year basis. In addition, it is burdensome to require the Government administrators to check every combination of 12-month periods since January 1, 1956, to make certain that during no 12-month period did an applicant produce over 3,000 tons of lead and zinc.

Furthermore, since a mining venture inevitably by its nature often is a peak and valley operation, several small producers who by all other criteria would rightfully have qualified for aid were excluded because their production on an any-12-month-period basis exceeded the designated 3,000 tons. Were the qualifying time unit a calendar year, as provided by H.R. 3120, they could receive the aid to which the committee believes they are entitled.

As to section 2, the act of October 3, 1961, authorized a program starting January 1, 1962. Regulations governing application for participation could not be issued until after the appropriations were made, and thus were not promulgated until July 28, 1962 (27 Fed. Reg. 7432). Meanwhile, prospective applicants under the program could do nothing until after regulations were issued. Nonetheless, section 501.5(i) of the regulations provided that applications for participation during the first three quarters had to be filed during those three quarters; that is, not later than September 30, 1962.

The committee believes that the requirement by which applications would be received during a 2-month period only—July 28 to September 30, 1962—was too restrictive, particularly in view of the obvious fact that the regulations were not available on the date of publication to the small businessman for whose benefit the act was designed. The committee also notes that participation in the program has fallen below prospects outlined to the committee when H.R. 84, 87th Congress, which became the act of October 3, 1961, was considered by this committee.

Although there were in 1956 a total of 574 small producers of lead and zinc, and in 1960 there were 273 small producers who apparently fall within the definition of small producers as set forth in the Stabilization Act, only 105 applications had been received by the time hearings were held by the Mines and Mining Subcommittee on H.R. 3120, with only 85 of these having been issued certificates of eligibility. However, the committee was advised that only 60 of those filing were found eligible to receive payments on their 1962 production. Of the 60 eligible participants, 55 submitted requests for payments and have received, in the aggregate, $1,002,781, although both authorization and appropriations provided $4,500,000 for 1962.

The committee concluded that small producers who made a serious reasonable effort, and otherwise qualify for payments, should not be deprived of the benefits of the 1962 program. Accordingly, the committee approved the House amendment which provides that any small producer who is otherwise eligible will be entitled to participate in the 1962 program if the application for participation was filed during the first 10 months of 1962. This has the effect of having allowed 3 months after publication of the regulations in the Federal Register.

In order to make the legislative intent clear, the amendment further provides that applicants who filed during November and December 1962 will be entitled to payments on sales made on and after January 1, 1963, only and that thereafter eligibility for participation in the program will be limited as follows:

First. Small domestic producers who file for participation during the first month of a quarter may participate and obtain payment on sales made on and after the first day of that quarter; and

Second. Small domestic producers who file applications for participation during the second or third month of a quarter will be entitled to obtain payment only on sales made during and after the next quarter thereafter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, at the appropriate time I shall move to recommit this bill. In effect, this bill is nothing more than a private bill for the benefit of one company, although the committee recognized that certain other companies may be able to qualify later. However, the passage of the bill would allow one company the right to file retroactively a claim to collect benefits for the preceding year under the subsidy program. I see no reason whatever why Congress should extend benefits in any such loose manner.

I shall move to recommit the bill and shall discuss further the particular company which, if the bill passes, will be able to collect $127,323 under the lead-zinc subsidy program.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the Senator identify by name the company concerned, and give whatever other information he has on the subject?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; we checked with Mr. George Fumich, Jr., Director of the Office of Minerals Exploration, Department of the Interior, who will administer the lead and zinc program. He states that his Office has found only one producer who would definitely qualify under the terms of the bill now before the Senate. That producer is Nash-McFarland flux trench mines, in Arizona. That company would be able to collect $127,323.

This is nothing more than a private bill for the benefit of one company although the director of the bureau stated that a few other companies might subsequently be able to qualify under the language definition provided in the bill.

I shall move to recommit the bill and shall also ask for the yeas and nays. I observe a large number of Senators in the Chamber; so I will make the motion to recommit at this time, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit the bill. Is there a sufficient second of the request for the yeas and nays?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware explain the basis for paying the Nash-McFarland Co. the money retroactively? Was there an error on the part of a Government agency in the administration of the subsidy program? What is the basis for the claim?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not know of any basis for it. The report indicated that the bill was for the benefit of one company and that possibly a few other companies could qualify. Later the information that was furnished to me by the Director of the Office of Minerals Exploration shows that this one company will collect the $127,323. Whether the claim results from an error on the part of the administration or a failure to file a timely claim I do not know. However, I do not believe there is any question that the bill is for the benefit of one company, at least according to the information furnished me.

I have just been advised that this retroactive payment will result from the new language provided in the pending bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without losing my right to the floor, I may now yield to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who wishes to make comments on the lead and zinc bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I shall support the motion of the Senator from Delaware that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I shall do so with reluctance, because I think this is as fine a committee as any the Senate has, and the committee very carefully examines the bills which come within its jurisdiction. But matters which have arisen in connection with this bill require an extra look by our committee.

I hasten to state that in supporting this motion, I intend no reflection on the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], who has reported the bill; he has followed the instructions of the committee.

In this connection, all of us who are interested in lead and zinc wish to call attention to the fact that the Interior Committee will hold hearings on S. 1534, a bill to stabilize the domestic lead and zinc industries on August 13 and 14. Therefore, I believe it would unduly complicate the situation if we were to pass this bill at this time.

We were told that the act to aid the small producers would be of great help to them and would be of help to all the States when it was enacted in 1961. There has been prepared, at my request, a table which shows the production in several States in 1950, in 1955, in 1960, in 1961, and in 1962, and also shows how much of that production in 1962 was under the subsidy program. Nineteen hundred and sixty-two was the first year of the small producers subsidy program. In 1950, Arizona produced 86,000 tons of lead and zinc; in 1955, 32,000 tons; in 1961, 35,000 tons; in 1962, 40,000 tons. But only 29 tons of that 1962 production came under the subsidy program.

My State of New Mexico produced 33,000 tons in 1950; 18,000 tons in 1955; 15,000 tons in 1960; 25,000 tons in 1961; and 22,000 tons in 1962. But only 9 tons of that 1962 production came under this subsidy program.

The essential point is that although some small producers in certain areas are operating now under subsidy, other well-recognized and well-organized firms which contribute substantially to the welfare of the country cannot produce lead and zinc, and are closing and have closed down their operations. This is a bad situation, and it should be corrected by good lead and zinc legislation. It should not be corrected by trying to put a few more patches on the roof, in an attempt to take care of a producer in Arizona or in some other State who happened to find that only on a calendar-year basis could he fit his production to this program, in order to qualify for the subsidy rather than "any 12-month period" as the law specifies. For example, if he figures on the period from March of one year to March of the next year, he is caught with more than 3,000 tons; or for a period from April of one year to April of the next he is caught by producing more than 3,000 tons. But on a calendar year basis he is able to qualify for the subsidy, and is able to receive a subsidy of $127,000. Certainly that is not the ground rules established by the original act.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is not true that the bill would also authorize a retroactive subsidy to one company which is not now eligible?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I think that is the company to which I am referring. This company does not qualify on the basis now provided by the law; so it is proposed that the basis of the law be changed, in order to permit this company to qualify and to receive a subsidy of $127,000.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. If that is done in connection with this bill, would not we be equally justified in changing the law in order to permit other companies to qualify, even though they have not qualified under the law thus far?

Mr. ANDERSON. Certainly. The Senator from Colorado and I have wrestled many times with that problem in the committee; and if we begin to make changes for the benefit of one company, others will have an equal right to ask to be included. So once we begin such changes, we are in deep trouble.

I believe the bill should be considered very carefully, in order to ascertain whether this program should be continued.

If a bill for the benefit of only one company is introduced, that is different; then everyone will understand it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield again to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think the Senator from New Mexico will recall that at the time when the Senate passed the bill, I said it was of very limited application, and would benefit only a very few, and in limited circumstances. A year later this is aptly illustrated by the figures the Senator from New Mexico read to us a moment ago; and they illustrate that what we need today, in this Congress, is to establish a minerals policy applicable to all minerals purchased for the Government, and then get to work to protect our minerals industry in accordance with that policy.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree completely with the Senator from Colorado. I say to him that he is not the only one who had doubts about this law. I had doubts about it, too. Therefore, we tried to report that act in connection with another bill which the then junior Senator from New Mexico had sponsored—a bill going to the root of the problems facing the whole lead and zinc situation, not just a subsidy program.

I know the State Department is opposed to that sort of program, which was based on a tariff approach, and, therefore, in the subsequent editions of the bill we have tried to provide for a quota system to restore some balance to the market. But at that time we thought a subsidy might work, if part of an overall package and therefore we reported that bill. Of course, it encountered opposition from the Finance Committee, because the able Senator from Virginia thought the bill should be referred to his committee for consideration; and there was also opposition from the State Department.

Therefore, we wound up with what all of us regarded as a very poor bill. I so regarded it, and so did the Senator from Colorado. But we passed the bill because we thought it would help a small band of producers across the country. However, the record does not show that that has been the effect of the bill. The record shows that of 22,000 tons produced in New Mexico, only 9 tons have received this assistance; that in California, only 153 tons of the original production in 1950 of 23,000 tons have received this assistance.

I am told—although I have not had an opportunity to check all the figures—that at this time very little lead and zinc is produced in Colorado; and practically none is produced in Arizona or in New Mexico.

One of the reasons is that it is a pattern which has not been fitted out to do any good. I therefore hope that the bill will be returned to the committee, which will give it careful study. We have a good Subcommittee on Minerals. The subcommittee can study the bill and find out what the situation actually is.

I also checked on the amount of payments made to the States involved. While it has been said that the bill would help a broad band of States, I noticed that $2,000 went to the State of Arizona and $622.37 went to the State of New Mexico. We do not happen to have extremely small producers in our States. We have some large firms, such as New Jersey Zinc, that have extensive interests. Those companies do not qualify under the bill; $129,000 went to Kansas; $316,000 went to Oklahoma.

I feel that a bill which would help industry in the State of Oklahoma to the extent of $316,000 and would help my own State to the extent of $622 was not a very carefully drawn bill.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table prepared by the Office of Minerals Exploration on the lead and zinc stabilization program for the calendar year 1962 and payments thereon as of March 31, 1963.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF MINERALS EXPLORATION, LEAD AND ZINC MINING STABILIZATION PROGRAM

Calendar year 1962 production and payments thereon as of Mar. 31, 1963 [1]

State	Number eligible	Number paid	Production (tons)			Payments		
			Lead	Zinc	Combined	Lead	Zinc	Combined
Arizona	1	1	28.8923		28.8923	$2,166.92		$2,166.92
California	2	2	76.7937	76.0286	152.8223	5,348.63	$2,208.69	7,557.32
Idaho	11	9	3,468.6678	1,436.6892	4,905.3570	252,551.33	45,296.52	297,847.85
Kansas	3	3	811.5656	2,184.9952	2,996.5608	59,401.76	70,042.34	129,444.10
Montana	6	6	642.1883	1,429.8371	2,072.0254	46,993.49	44,540.76	91,534.25
Nevada	5	4	110.7904	174.5309	285.3213	8,262.19	5,759.53	14,021.72
New Mexico	1	1	9.1210		9.1210	622.37		622.37
North Carolina	1	1	213.5494		213.5494	15,541.59		15,541.59
Oklahoma	16	14	1,457.8517	6,565.1326	8,022.9843	106,276.63	209,869.44	316,146.07
Utah	14	14	1,422.0613	1,042.2837	2,464.3450	104,844.96	32,853.62	137,698.58
Total (10)	60	55	8,241.4815	12,909.4973	21,150.9788	602,009.87	410,570.90	1,012,580.77

[1] Based upon information furnished by General Services Administration on Apr. 23, 1963.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a table showing the combined production and price of lead and zinc for the years 1950, 1955, 1960, 1961, and 1962.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Combined production in tons and price of lead and zinc [1]

State	Price and year					Combined lead zinc tonnage subsidized in 1962 under the act
	27.7 cents, 1950	27.2 cents, 1955	24.6 cents, 1960	21.8 cents, 1961	21.2 cents, 1962	
Arizona	86,866	32,501	44,306	35,522	40,200	29
California	23,290	14,934	576	94	650	153
Idaho	187,915	117,477	79,393	128,835	147,199	4,905
Kansas	36,663	33,109	2,898	3,895	5,9 0	2,997
Montana	87,295	85,616	17,430	12,905	45,386	2,072
Nevada	30,140	4,538	1,177	660	380	285
New Mexico	33,413	18,573	15,776	25,232	22,400	9
North Carolina					215	214
Oklahoma	67,463	55,669	3,268	4,128	13,650	8,023
Utah	76,431	94,008	74,874	78,133	73,500	2,464

[1] Department of the Interior figures.

Mr. ANDERSON. In closing, I desire to say that I am not being critical of what my colleagues in the committee did. The committee studied the situation. A representation was made that certain producers had been discriminated against. That usually happens. Someone does not get exactly what he wants, and therefore attempts to get a change in the rules in order to let himself in.

I think the bill works in a bad direction, and might be harmful in our effort to get through a decent lead and zinc program, which I am sure the committee plans to write. Many Senators who are members of that subcommittee are now present in the Chamber. They understand the lead and zinc industry thoroughly. A careful hearing will reveal that the bill is not the proper way to proceed. Another way would be better.

I thank the very able Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] for giving me an opportunity to speak on the subject.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his support of my motion. I join in his statement that the motion is not made with any thought of casting a reflection on the membership of the committee. It is my understanding that at the time the bill was considered the committee did not realize the effect it might have on this particular company. Nevertheless, the effect of the bill as written is that one company, the Nash-McFarland Flux Trench Mines, would draw $127,323 to which it would not be entitled under the existing law. We have just rejected a proposal to terminate the subsidy program in its entirety. But now there is before the Senate this bill which would not only extend the subsidy even beyond the time provided in existing law but give one company a $127,323 windfall profit. In the face of the multimillion-dollar inventory of these same minerals this proposal is ridiculous.

I hope that the motion will prevail. I understand that many Senators would like to vote on the question now, and although I was intending to discuss another subject before yielding the floor, if the Senate is ready to vote, and I will yield for that purpose with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I ask unanimous consent that if there is no further debate on the motion to recommit, the Senate proceed to the yea-and-nay vote on the motion heretofore ordered, with the understanding that the Senator from Delaware will not thereby lose his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to recommit the bill. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. SMATHERS. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM] has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 34, as follows:

[No. 114 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Boggs
Brewster
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Ellender
Fong
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Neuberger
Pastore
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—34

Bartlett
Bible
Byrd, W. Va.
Eastland
Edmondson
Engle
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Kefauver
Kennedy
Long, La.
Magnuson
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Pell
Randolph
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Yarborough

NOT VOTING—18

Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Ervin
Fulbright
Humphrey
Jordan, N.C.
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
Mechem
Nelson
Pearson
Scott
Williams, N.J.

So the motion of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware to recommit the bill (H.R. 3120) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield, without losing the floor?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 273, Senate bill 628; and that it be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 628) to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

IMPROPER DIVERSION OF GRAIN SHIPMENTS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, some time ago there appeared in the press an article to the effect that a substantial loss had resulted from what might be termed an improper diversion of grain that had been shipped to Austria under Public Law 480. I was interested and have been making inquiries of the Department. I discover that this goes far beyond what even the original report indicated for it seems that there has been illegal diversion of more than 24 million bushels of feed grains, valued at approximately $32 million.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCINTYRE in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I wish to suggest the absence of a quorum, in order to enable interested Members to hear the statement of the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield for that purpose?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Delaware retain his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The absence of a quorum has been suggested; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, recently there appeared in the Washington Daily News a story written by Mr. Marshall McNeil, entitled "$21 Million in Surplus Feed Involved—Grain Scandal in Austria Revealed." The article hinted that perhaps the grain had been improperly diverted.

I ask unanimous consent that the article appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY-ONE MILLION DOLLARS IN SURPLUS FEED INVOLVED—GRAIN SCANDAL IN AUSTRIA REVEALED

(By Marshall McNeil)

A long and methodical investigation by two U.S. inspectors general lies behind an Austrian grain scandal revealed in arrests by Vienna police. The suspects are charged with diversion and mislabeling of surplus American feed.

More than $21 million in surplus feed grain, shipped under barter contracts of 1959–62, is involved.

The United States bartered this grain for industrial diamonds, manganese, antimony and platinum.

J. K. Mansfield, inspector general, foreign assistance in the State Department, and Lester Condon, inspector general of the Agriculture Department, a former FBI agent, started work on the case late last year. Their inquiries are continuing.

Until the case is cleared up, the Agriculture Department has stopped barter deals with Austria.

FIRST TIP

The first tip came when in an early 1962 study of surplus grain shipments, Agriculture Department officials noticed a discrepancy between U.S. figures on exports to Austria, and Austrian figures on imports.

Norris Ellertson, Agriculture attaché at the U.S. Embassy in Vienna, was alerted. In the State Department the case was shifted to Mr. Mansfield's office. In Agriculture, Condon's office was assigned the investigation.

* * * * *

If the grain was diverted, perhaps to West Germany and maybe elsewhere, the United States may have lost an opportunity to sell other grain, and thus, in effect, missed a chance to acquire gold, thus affecting our critical international balance of payments.

The grain, roughly 750,000 tons of it, arrived. But apparently about 420,000 tons didn't reach its Austrian destination.

THE CONCERN

The concern of the Austrian Government was that its economic laws may have been violated, plus the fact that the grain did not arrive to help the economy of the country. Austrian currency laws were involved, as well.

Messrs. Mansfield and Condon decided the first thing to do was to check out the shipments from here and their arrival in Europe.

Last January, Mr. Mansfield sent his deputy, Francis Cotter, another former FBI agent to Vienna, and Mr. Cotter lately made a short return visit there. Mr. Mansfield himself went to Austria, and Mr. Condon has agents there now.

Finally, basic statistics compiled, American agents laid their case before Austrian economic police.

The Austrian police built their own case and in the latter part of April arrested four Austrians connected with prominent grain importing firms.

Dispatches from Vienna say they were charged with having imported in the last 5 years, within the U.S. barter program, fodder barley and having illicitly sold this barley which they declared as originating in Argentina.

They are also charged, Vienna dispatches say, with having cheated the Austrian state by false declaration of origin.

It is said here that because of various Austrian laws and practices, it is possible that feed grain labeled as coming from Argentina might bring the sellers about one-third more than American surplus grain.

In this country, Mr. Condon's office is checking on the receipt of the strategic materials, as is Mr. Mansfield. Both are seeking information about the final destination of the allegedly diverted grain. And Mr. Condon is inquiring into the responsibilities, in such a case, of the American shippers.

This is the first time news of Mr. Mansfield's operations has been in the papers. His office was created by Congress to police both economic and foreign military aid, the Peace Corps and the distribution of surplus American food. Mr. Mansfield or his investigators have visited foreign aid projects in more than 50 countries.

Mr. Condon's office was created within the Agriculture Department to coordinate several separate investigative offices. His authority to police and audit covers the whole Department. He has been inspector general since July 1962.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, following the release of the article on May 9, 1963, I placed inquiries with the appropriate department and asked for a complete report as to whether or not there had been any diversion of grains shipped under Public Law 480, and today I wish to discuss the disappearance or illegal diversion of over 24 million bushels of feed grains valued at around $32 million.

During the fiscal years 1960, 1961, and 1962, our Government entered into barter agreements with Austrian importers wherein we agreed to ship to Austria 1,010,379.62 metric tons of feed grains—approximately 40 million bushels—in exchange for certain minerals. In turn, the minerals were to be added to our already bulging stockpiles.

The records show that these 40 million bushels of feed grains were all shipped to Austria from American ports; however, of this 40 million bushels less than 40 percent ever arrived at its destination, actually 24,744,017 bushels—604,615.32 metric tons—never reached Austria. The 24 million bushels of grain which were illegally diverted had a market valuation of over $32 million.

Not only did 60 percent of the 40 million bushels of feed grains which were shipped during this 3-year period under Public Law 480 to Austria never reach its destination, but our Government does not even know where it went.

Some suggest that much of this grain may have been diverted and sold in Western Germany or in other European countries for dollars. If true this would represent a tremendous windfall to someone. To the extent that this is true it replaced our normal dollar exports of feed grains and thereby meant a further increase in our balance-of-payments deficit. A second suggestion is that it could have gone behind the Iron Curtain.

Just how 24 million bushels of feed grains, with a market valuation of over $32 million, disappeared over this 3-year period without someone in our Government discovering the diversion is as yet unexplained.

The first discovery of this shortage was made by Mr. J. K. Mansfield, the Inspector General of Foreign Assistance, Department of State, after someone in Austria had filed a complaint; and I compliment him upon the prompt manner in which he acted upon discovering the discrepancies. Mr. Mansfield did an excellent job in documenting the shortage. But I do not understand how the Department of Agriculture failed for 3 years to detect this shortage.

The actual breakdown of this grain which was originally shipped to Austria but which never arrived at its destination is as follows: 16,852,294 bushels of corn disappeared, 6,615,881 bushels of barley disappeared, and 1,275,842 bushels of grain sorghums vanished.

This makes a total of 24,744,017 bushels of feed grains, with a market valuation of over $32 million, that was shipped to Austria under Public Law 480 during the past 3 years that never arrived in that country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator know when this 3-year period began and when it ended?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It began in fiscal 1960. The first shipments I have documented were in July 1959. The period extends all the way through 1962, but I understand that after this situation was discovered the Department temporarily suspended further Public Law 480 sales to Austria.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So what the Senator is saying is that 40 million bushels of feed grains have been shipped under Public Law 480 and 24 million of the 40 million bushels have disappeared, and somehow there is no clue as to how what happened to them?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. The grain did not arrive in Austria. That point we have established. Whether the shipment was stopped and sold in Western Germany or other Western European countries has as yet not been established. Whether some of it went behind the Iron Curtain has likewise not been established, although the general impression is that it would have been more profitable, from a dollar standpoint, to have sold the grain in Western Europe. However, that is a guess. The significant point is that 24 million bushels of grain just disappeared.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator tell us what type of commodity these "barter boys," as we call them, were to buy for the grain? Was it minerals?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Minerals.

Mr. AIKEN. We went through the same situation a few years ago, and for a while shut down on them, the practice having been to offer our surplus commodities to a Western European dealer for less than the dollar market price, thereby cutting into the dollar market for our own grain, and then paying for the grain with metals which would be purchased from a third country and shipped into the United States duty free, meaning bartered-for, thus giving them an opportunity to cut into the market and cut under the market on sales here in the United States.

Does the Senator know whether that is going on? In all probability a certain pattern has been used. The Department of Agriculture, having been caught once about 10 or 12 years ago, ought to have known better than to be caught again.

I am sure that the Senator will give us more facts as time goes on, but he has given us enough to show that the Department of Agriculture ought to from this date on, cut out this barter business, because it cuts into and under our dollar market, and results in bringing metals into this country duty free, thus permitting certain mining interests in this country to get a subsidy.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not have a complete breakdown of all the minerals which have come in, but I have a few of them listed—silicon carbide, industrial diamonds, fluorspar, zinc, and various other metals.

Mr. AIKEN. Lead, zinc, and diamonds are the popular items.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. The interesting feature is that these minerals were not shipped from Austria but were bought from all over the world. A few shipments came in from Canada, but they also came in from all over the world. As the Senator from Vermont pointed out, it was quite an advantage to be able to pay for the feed grains with minerals, because they could come into this country under much more advantageous terms than they could if they were bought in direct.

So a tremendous windfall arises, particularly when grain can be diverted from its original destinations and sold in Western Europe It replaces our dollar sales in those countries. To the extent any of the grain can be diverted to Western Europe, it replaces dollar sales.

Mr. **AIKEN**. The subject was brought into focus 10 or so years ago, when the barterers made an offer of cotton to Western European sources at 10 percent below the market price. We were to be paid for the cotton with lead, zinc, diamonds, and so forth, purchased where they could be bought at the cheapest price anywhere in the world. At that time those minerals could be brought into the country duty free, because of the barter agreement.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. The mining industry in this country was disrupted. We have the situation where on one hand we get a request for subsidy to support our own mining industry and then under another program we destroy their markets. It is an endless chain that is costing our taxpayers millions.

Mr. **AIKEN**. It would be stupid to permit the Department of Agriculture or any other agency of Government to continue this practice, whereby in one deal it can cut the throats of our exporters and also our producers here at home.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Thus far 7 Austrian importers have been arrested for their part in this illegal diversion of 24 million bushels of American grain, but as yet no American official or exporter has been designated as having had any responsibility for this loss.

There appears to be an effort on the part of some bureaucratic officials to excuse this illegal diversion of $32 million worth of grain on the basis of carelessness or incompetence. I flatly refuse to accept any such explanation. No man can be so stupid or so incompetent as to lose completely 24 million bushels of grain without knowing it. I do not see how it could have happened without some collusion between someone in this country and the Austrian importers. This case definitely represents work for the Department of Justice.

Not only did 24 million bushels of feed grains out of a total of 40 million bushels disappear, but the record shows that of the 16 million bushels which did arrive in Austria a portion of the corn was relabeled and sold in Austria as Argentine grain. Argentine grain was selling at a premium over the American subsidized grain, and again someone pocketed a windfall.

Mr. **YOUNG** of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. **YOUNG** of North Dakota. Has the Senator any figures showing what portion of the 40 million bushels has been barter deals and what portion has been sales for foreign currency, or gifts?

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. All of the 40 million bushels represented barter deals. None of this grain was in the form of an outright grant; nor did it represent sales for local currencies. This was all a barter arrangement.

Mr. **YOUNG** of North Dakota. What materials were received in return?

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. I have a partial list of the materials. I do not have all of them at the moment. I have a list of some of them. They cover industrial diamonds, silicon carbide, manganese, fluorspar, zinc, and various other materials. They are all listed in the report.

Mr. **YOUNG** of North Dakota. I do not believe that all of the barter deals are bad, per se. I believe we would be better off for example to have industrial diamonds than to be loaded down with some foreign currencies, which are practically worthless. The industrial diamonds we now hold, I believe, are worth more than they were when we received them. I agree that some of the materials received were not necessary.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Yes; I am not at this point discussing the merits or demerits of the barter program. What I am discussing now is the fact that we entered into a barter agreement whereby we were to receive certain materials and the grain sold thereunder was improperly diverted. The grain in question was supposed to have gone to Austria. It did not go into Austria. It has gone elsewhere. No one in our Government, apparently, knows where it went. To the extent that it was diverted and sold in Western Europe, or anywhere else, where we make dollar sales normally, our balance of payments suffered. Someone got the dollars, and the taxpayers lost. If the grain is to go into Western Europe we should sell it ourselves for dollars. The law should not be circumvented in this way to profit a special group.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD two charts: Chart 1 showing a breakdown of approximately 40 million bushels—1,010,379.62 metric tons—of feed grains that were sold under a barter agreement to Austria. The second chart shows a breakdown of the over 24 million bushels—604,615.32 metric tons—of feed grains which while being shipped from American ports to Austrian importers were never received in that country.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHART I.—*Status of U.S. barter feed grain shipments to Austria, fiscal years 1960–62*

	Metric tons
Total U.S. grain not received in Austria	604, 615. 32
Total U.S. grain received in Austria (identified as U.S. grain)	374, 981. 72
Total U.S. grain received in Austria (relabeled as Argentine grain)	30, 683. 16
Quantity unaccounted for	99. 42
Total U.S. grain shipments destined for Austria	1, 010, 379. 62

CHART II.—*U.S. barter feed grains not received in Austria (by Austrian importer), fiscal years 1960–62*

[In metric tons]

Austrian importer	Corn	Barley	Grain sorghums	Total
No. 1	251, 052. 79	33, 386. 48	17, 425. 87	301, 865. 14
No. 2	98, 409. 21	74, 908. 13	2, 349. 63	175, 666. 97
No. 3	21, 531. 08	13, 918. 71		35, 449. 79
No. 4	29, 886. 89	13, 750. 01	12, 131. 18	55, 768. 08
No. 5	20, 272. 30	6, 365. 38		26, 637. 68
No. 6	2, 387. 73			2, 387. 73
No. 7	4, 617. 90	1, 714. 00	508. 03	6, 839. 93
Total	428, 157. 90	144, 042. 71	32, 414. 71	604, 615. 32

Mr. **BENNETT**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. **BENNETT**. The Senator has indicated that this was all handled as a barter transaction. Did we get the quid pro quo in terms of materials and other things of value for the 40 million bushels, or did we get it only for the 16 million bushels?

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Apparently, we got it for the 40 million bushels, but that point is being checked further. In conversation with the officials as recently as this morning I was given to understand that they believe the bulk of the minerals either have been shipped or are in the process of being shipped. Therefore, on that point I believe we have had a return. A barter agreement was made, but whether it was at the market price or below is something that can be checked. I understand that so so far as the materials are concerned we received all of it for the 40 million bushels—that is, we have received them or are in the process of receiving them.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. I understand that the burden of the Senator's argument is that the grain was loaded at American ports; that it was consigned to Austria; and that when the vessel arrived at the port of destination, that quantity of grain was not on the vessel, and was not unloaded; therefore, whereas 40 million bushels were loaded, only 16 million bushels were actually unloaded at the port of destination. Is that correct?

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. The Senator from Illinois is partly correct. When the vessel arrived at the port of destination, whether it be Hamburg, Rotterdam, or some other port to which the vessel sailed, the grain may well have all been unloaded at the port. However, while it was consigned to Austria, it was diverted elsewhere. Obviously it was diverted elsewhere since it never arrived in Austria. Whether it was unloaded at the port of embarkation or unloaded from the ships before it reached the port I do not know. We do know it did not get to Austria.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Whether there was a transshipment does not make any difference, does it?

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. The Senator is correct. The important point is that it never reached its destination.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The fact is that, whether or not two carriers were engaged to take the grain to the destination, 24 million bushels of feed grain disappeared. According to the Senator from Delaware, no one knows what happened to it. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It did not go to Austria where it was supposed to go. We are advised that in Austria seven individuals have been arrested and charged with their part in this illegal diversion of the grain. They have not named anyone on this side of the Atlantic who was in any way involved.

The point I am making is that this could not have happened accidentally. This was far more grain than any reasonable exporter or anyone in the Department of Agriculture who was familiar with the Austrian situation could possibly have expected Austria to need. Austria could not have used that much grain if it had arrived. Someone should have discovered this improper diversion long ago. I do not see how this kind of deal could have been carried on over a period of time without someone discovering it. I will discuss the individual transaction in a moment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I commend the Senator for his action in this case. This is one more instance in which he is performing a great service for the American taxpayers in saving many billions of dollars for them through his efforts. With respect to the indictments in Austria, does the Senator know whether our Government has obtained copies of the indictments or complaints or bills of particulars in those cases? They might throw some light on how the transactions were handled, and might also throw some light on whether or not the Austrians who have been indicted had any accomplices.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I cannot answer that question directly. However, it is my understanding that the Government has either obtained a copy of the indictments or is in the process of obtaining them. That point is being covered. I cannot give a definite answer, however. The Senator has raised a good point. Certainly if the Government has not obtained copies it should get them. However, I believe I would be safe in answering the Senator's question in the affirmative, but I am not sure.

This whole transaction is fantastic.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. From his information, is the Senator able to relate specific diversions and specific amounts and the specific exporters who participated in the barter deal?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Can the Senator say that a certain man acting as a barter agent for a certain company was connected with the disappearance of a certain volume of grain?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. Seven importers were involved. In a moment, I shall discuss two of the largest importers and their transactions. I shall place in the RECORD a chart which will show the date of the barter program, the name of the American commodity agent—that is the export firm—the date of the exportation, the ports from which the grain was shipped—Galveston, New Orleans, et cetera, the chart also gave the name of the vessel in which the grain was loaded, the port to which the vessel was destined—such as Trieste, Rotterdam, Hamburg, et cetera, the tonnage of the particular grain shipped, on the portion of the shipment that arrived in Austria, and the portion that did not arrive. The information is broken down by specific shipments.

The chart indicates that over a period of time importer No. 1 received 47 shipments of corn, totaling 277,216 metric tons. That is equivalent to more than 10 million bushels of corn. Of that amount, only 26,163 metric tons arrived in Austria. The other 251,052 metric tons, or about 90 percent of the cargo, never arrived at its destination.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Delaware has confused me slightly by his use of the word "importer." Does the chart show the name of the American who was the barter agent? Is he importer No. 1?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. Importer No. 1 is the Austrian importer.

Mr. BENNETT. That is the name of the barter agent in Europe. Is he a part of the combination?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; but I did not name him because he is now under indictment in Austria.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the chart show the names of the American barter agents who participated with barter importer No. 1 in that volume of shipments?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. So we have the information from both sides?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. We have the name of the American exporter who was the commodity agent on this side of the Atlantic.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. Can the Senator reveal the source of the information contained on the chart?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; the chart was prepared from information I received from the office of Mr. Mansfield of the Department of State.

Mr. SIMPSON. Then the Department of Agriculture has these figures?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, yes; these are official Department figures. This is no mysterious compilation of my own. The report which I am submitting is based upon information confirmed by the Department after I made inquiries on these transactions.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, before the Senator starts to discuss individual cases, will he yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator has already pointed out that to the extent of the disappearance of the grain, it displaced dollar sales of grain of the United States in Europe. Does it not also have another very important effect; namely, that it has permitted someone in Europe to dump minerals upon the stockpile of this country?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Certainly, and at prices far in excess of what they could have received had they tried to sell these minerals direct.

Mr. ALLOTT. And to dump minerals for which, perhaps, there might not otherwise be a sale.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. They are piled in our inventories. As I stated earlier in the discussion on the lead and zinc bill, about a year and a half ago the President expressed his astonishment over the fact that $8.5 billion in materials were tied up in the stockpile of so-called strategic materials of which he said more than one-half was not needed. I stated earlier today that $136 million worth of material has been added to these bulging inventories during the last 18 months, and we are continuing to add to them. The transactions which I am discussing at this moment are a part of that addition.

I shall next submit for the RECORD chart No. 3. This chart lists the feed grains as they were consigned to just one importer in Austria. It shows the amount of the different grains which were originally traded under this barter deal as well as that portion of each shipment which never arrived at its destination. Included are the name of the American exporting company, the port from which the grain was shipped, the date of the shipment, the name of the vessel, and the European port to which each was consigned. This chart shows that during this 3-year period of 47 different shipments of corn to this one importer totaling 10,911,225 bushels—277,216.10 metric tons—only 1,029,787 bushels—26,163.31 metric tons—ever arrived in Austria. This was less than 10 percent. The other 90 percent, representing 9,881,437 bushels of corn, disappeared. It was diverted either to Western Europe or behind the Iron Curtain.

Of 7 shipments of barley consigned to the same company, representing 1,658,973 bushels—36,127.48 metric tons—less than 10 percent, or only 125,866 bushels—2,741 metric tons—arrived in Austria. The other 1,533,107 bushels were diverted and sold elsewhere. Where it was sold or who got the extra money again no one knows, and the administration does not seem to care.

A total of 685,882 bushels—17,425.87 metric tons—of grain sorghums were sent to this same Austrian exporter under a barter agreement under Public Law 480. Not one grain ever arrived in Austria.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that chart No. 3 appear at this point.

There being no objection, chart No. 3 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

CHART 3.—*Shipments of feed grains from the United States under the barter program for fiscal years 1960–63 in which part or none were received in Austria*

IMPORTER NO. 1

[In metric tons]

Approximate date of sale	Commodity agent	Date of exportation	Port of exportation	Name of vessel	Port of embarkation	Quantity shipped from United States	Quantity received in Austria	Quantity short on arrival	Total quantity that did not arrive in Austria
	CORN								
	Continental Grain Co.	July 26, 1959	Galveston	Continental Pioneer	Trieste	3,900.00	3,900.00		
June 9, 1959	Bunge Corp.	July 31, 1959	New Orleans	Marli	Hamburg	508.03		508.03	
Sept. 1, 1959	do	Sept. 29, 1959	do	World Crusader	Rotterdam	203.21		203.21	
Do.	do	Oct. 13, 1959	Mobile	Marli	do	508.03		508.03	
Oct. 21, 1959	do	Nov. 23, 1959	New Orleans	Gatun Locks	Hamburg	1,016.04		1,016.04	
Oct. 27, 1959	Louis Dreyfus Corp.	Dec. 5, 1959	Baltimore	American Traveler	Bremen	2,032.11		2,032.11	
Jan. 11, 1960	do	Feb. 6, 1960	New Orleans	National Power	Hamburg	10,750.44		10,750.44	
Feb. 15, 1960	C. B. Fox	Mar. 10, 1960	do	Wild Ranger	do	1,100.06		1,100.06	
May 11, 1960	Louis Dreyfus Corp.	May 11, 1960	do	Blue Star	do	593.38		593.38	
May 4, 1960	Bunge Corp.	June 20, 1960	do	Atlantic Marchioness	do	12,403.56		12,403.56	
Do.	do	June 25, 1960	do	Golden Eagle	Rotterdam	1,313.19		1,313.19	
June 6, 1960	International Bartering Corp.	Aug 8, 1960	Mobile	Mary Livanos	Hamburg	10,228.12		10,228.12	
Aug. 8, 1960	Bunge Corp.	Sept. 1, 1960	New Orleans	Syane Holm	do	1,016.06		1,016.06	
Do.	do	Sept. 24, 1960	do	Blue Star	do	1,016.06		1,016.06	
Oct. 21, 1960	do	Nov. 8, 1960	do	Hoegh Eagle	Rotterdam	1,270.07		1,270.07	
Oct. 14, 1960	do	Nov. 26, 1960	do	Mary Livanos	Hamburg	2,159.12		2,159.12	
Oct. 21, 1960	do	Jan. 13, 1961	do	do	do	9,144.50		9,144.50	
Jan. 5, 1961	do	Feb. 28, 1961	do	do	do	8,787.06		8,787.06	
Jan. 17, 1961	Louis Dreyfus Corp.	do	do	do	do	2,972.64		2,972.64	
Feb. 7, 1961	do	Mar. 26, 1961	do	Betty	do	9,709.09		9,709.09	
Mar. 6, 1961	Bunge Corp.	do	do	Kollgeir	do	17,476.17		17,476.17	
Apr. 9, 1961	Louis Dreyfus Corp.	Apr. 9, 1961	do	Dagali	Bremen	12,677.45		12,677.45	
Mar. 9, 1961	do	Apr. 26, 1961	do	Atlantic Marchioness	do	16,377.82		16,377.82	
May 3, 1961	Bunge Corp.	May 10, 1961	do	Betty	do	12,999.93		12,999.93	
May 11, 1961	do	June 6, 1961	do	Atlantic Unity	Hamburg	5,194.59		5,194.59	
Do.	Louis Dreyfus Corp.	do	do	do	do	7,620.42		7,620.42	[1] 149,077.15
July 5, 1961	Bunge Corp.	Aug. 24, 1961	do	St. George Livanos	Rotterdam	6,096.34		6,096.34	
July 6, 1961	Louis Dreyfus Corp.	do	do	do	do	11,024.21		11,024.21	
July 13, 1961	do	Sept. 6, 1961	do	Bolette	do	16,256.86		16,256.86	
Aug. 8, 1961	Bunge Corp.	do	do	do	do	3,988.02		3,988.02	
Do.	do	Sept. 22, 1961	do	Storaas	do	6,172.54		6,172.54	
Aug. 28, 1961	do	do	do	do	Hamburg	7,036.19		7,036.19	
Oct. 23, 1961	do	Nov. 6, 1961	do	Needle River	do	3,429.19		3,429.19	
Sept. 15, 1961	Louis Dreyfus Corp.	Nov. 9, 1961	do	Storaas	do	3,048.17		3,048.17	
Oct. 26, 1961	Bunge Corp.	Dec. 2, 1961	do	Peter L.	do	9,652.53		9,652.53	
Oct. 23, 1961	do	Dec. 7, 1961	do	Antero	do	355.62		355.62	
Nov. 14, 1961	Louis Dreyfus Corp.	do	do	do	do	8,941.29		8,941.29	
Nov. 9, 1961	do	Jan. 13, 1962	do	Storaas	do	3,000.16		3,000.16	
Nov. 16, 1961	Bunge Corp.	do	do	do	do	3,149.77		3,149.77	
Jan. 4, 1962	do	Feb. 9, 1962	do	Carl Julian	do	8,610.81		8,610.81	
Feb. 5, 1962	do	Feb. 21, 1962	do	Storaas	do	6,173.30		6,173.30	
Jan. 8, 1962	Louis Dreyfus Corp.	do	do	do	do	5,040.64		5,040.64	
Mar. 28, 1962	Bunge Corp.	Mar. 28, 1962	Destrehan	Verbania	Trieste	3,687.37	3,662.59	(2)	
June 7, 1962	do	June 23, 1962	do	North Princess	do	6,261.44	6,261.44		[3] 101,975.64
June 8, 1962	do	July 16, 1962	do	Muhern Ruhr	Antwerp/ Hamburg(?)	139.71	[4] 139.71		
Do.	do	Aug. 2, 1962	do	Frederico Parodi	Trieste	5,194.59	5,194.59		
July 26, 1962	do	Aug. 27, 1962	do	Eugense S. Embircos	do	6,980.20	[4] 6,980.20		(5)
	Total					277,216.10	[4] 26,163.31	251,052.79	251,052.79
	BARLEY								
Apr. 20, 1960	Continental Grain Co.	May 29, 1960	Longview, Wash.	Resolute	Trieste	2,591.00	2,591.00		
Sept 11, 1959	Bunge Corp.	Sept. 22, 1959	Seattle	Bodenstein	Bremen	1,554.02	.54	1,554.02	
Apr. 14, 1960	Continental Grain Co.	May 24, 1960	Duluth	Catherine Sartori	Hamburg	150.00	147.46		
July 19, 1960	Bunge Corp.	Aug. 5, 1960	Duluth-Superior	London Spirit	do	2,112.36		2,112.36	
Aug. 23, 1960	do	Sept. 2, 1960	Duluth	Caibbean Wave	Brake	9,505.70		9,505.70	
Do.	do	Oct. 1, 1960	Superior	Etnefjell	One Safe Wescs.	10,561.88		10,561.88	
Jan. 17, 1961	Louis Dreyfus Corp.	Feb. 22, 1961	Tacoma	Mimina	Hamburg	9,652.52		9,652.52	
	Total					36,127.48	2,741.00	33,386.48	[1] 33,386.48
	GRAIN SORGHUMS								
Jan. 11, 1960	Louis Dreyfus Corp.	Feb. 6, 1960	New Orleans	National Power	Hamburg	3,551.99		3,551.99	
Mar. 22, 1960	do	Apr. 19, 1960	Corpus Christi.	Aquabelle	do	2,000.11		2,000.11	
July 11, 1960	Bunge Corp.	Aug. 5, 1960	Mobile	Mary Livanos	do	3,034.07		3,034.07	
Aug. 26, 1960	do	Sept. 21, 1960	New Orleans	do	do	6,096.34		6,096.34	
Oct 10, 1960	do	Nov. 26, 1960	do	do	do	1,219.27		1,219.27	
Nov. 30, 1960	do	Jan. 13, 1961	do	do	do	1,524.09		1,524.09	
	Total					17,425.87		17,425.87	[1] 17,425.87

---

[1] Fiscal year 1960–61.

[2] Possible shortage, 24.78 metric tons.

[3] Fiscal year 1962.

[4] Austrian records showing imports for fiscal year 1963 not yet available. Examination and experience for prior fiscal years indicates grain imported through port of Trieste arrived in Austria either as U.S. grain or was relabeled as Argentina grain. For shipment of grain on the *Parodi* we determined from importer's records that the grain reached Austria.

[5] Fiscal year 1963.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall next incorporate chart No. 4 showing our sales to a second Austrian importer.

This chart shows that over the 3-year period—fiscal years 1960 to 1963—our Government under Public Law 480 arranged for the shipment to this Austrian importer of 4,437,577 bushels—112,743.32 metric tons—of corn. Of this amount only 564,191 bushels—14,334.11 metric tons—of corn arrived in Austria. Here again 90 percent of the corn shipped, or 3,873,386 bushels, disappeared. It was diverted and sold, destination unknown.

A barter agreement was negotiated with the same company for 11 shipments of barley totaling 3,462,695 bushels—75,407.13 metric tons. Of this amount, less than 1 percent, or only 22,914 bushels—499 metric tons—of the barley ever reached Austria. The other 99 percent, representing 3,439,781 bushels, was diverted.

One shipment of 92,541 bushels—2,349.63 metric tons—of grain sorghums was made to this same Austrian importer, leaving Houston, Tex., on August 13, 1960, in the S.S. *Alblasserdyk*, destination Austria via the port of Bremen. Not a grain of this shipment ever arrived in Austria.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that chart No. 4, showing a breakdown of the shipments to this second exporter, be printed. The chart shows the date, the tonnage, the name of the American exporter, the name of the vessel, the port of exportation, and the port to which each shipment was consigned for ultimate delivery to Austria.

There being no objection, chart No. 4 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHART NO. 4.—*Shipments of feed grains to Austria under the barter program for fiscal years 1960–63 listed on U.S. data sheets but not received in Austria*

IMPORTER NO. 2

[In metric tons]

Approximate date of sale	Commodity agent	Date of exportation	Port of exportation	Name of vessel	Port of embarkation	Quantity shipped from United States	Quantity received in Austria	Quantity short on arrival	Total quantity that did not arrive in Austria
	CORN								
	C. B. Fox Co.	Dec. 28, 1959	New Orleans	Arnfinn Stange	Hamburg	2,032.00	616.72	1,415.28	
July 6, 1959	do	July 23, 1959	do	Vretaholm	Hamburg/ Bremen.	1,016.06		1,016.06	
Do	do	Aug. 25, 1959	Houston	Arnedyk	Hamburg	2,032.11		2,032.11	
Nov. 20, 1959	do	Nov. 20, 1959	Galveston	Rocroi	do	8,128.77		8,128.77	
Dec. 18, 1959	do	Jan. 23, 1960	do	Siam	do	6,420.46		6,420.46	
Dec. 11, 1959	do	Feb. 15, 1960	do	East River	do	1,600.29		1,600.29	
Feb. 15, 1960	do	Mar. 10, 1960	New Orleans	Wild Ranger	do	1,948.11		1,948.11	
Mar. 25, 1960	do	June 1, 1960	do	Andyk	do	3,556.20		3,556.20	
May 4, 1960	do	July 8, 1960	Duluth	Venture	do	4,027.94		4,027.94	
Oct. 4, 1960	do	Oct. 19, 1960	Superior	Point Lacre	Bremen	3,556.20		3,556.20	
Oct. 12, 1960	do	Oct. 26, 1960	Chicago-Montreal.	do	do	3,048.17		3,048.17	
Feb. 7, 1961	do	Mar. 22, 1961	New Orleans	Sun River	do	13,444.32		13,444.32	[1] 50,193.91
Nov. 14, 1961	do	Dec. 15, 1961	do	Pholegandros	Hamburg	20,571.58		20,571.58	
Dec. 29, 1961	do	Feb. 5, 1962	Galveston	North King	Bremen	370.04		370.04	
Feb. 12, 1962	do	Mar. 21, 1962	do	do	do	7,719.68		7,719.68	
Feb. 5, 1962	Bunge Corp	Mar. 28, 1962	Destrehan, La.	Verbania	Trieste	4,883.38	4,883.38		
Apr. 3, 1964	C. B. Fox Co.	Apr. 30, 1962	New Orelans	Canto	Hamburg	4,267.44		4,267.44	
Apr. 3, 1962	do	Apr. 3, 1962	do	Curro	Bremen	5,867.72		5,867.72	
Apr. 11, 1962	Bunge Corp	June 23, 1962	Destrehan	North Princess	Trieste	9,418.84		9,418.84	[2] 48,215.30
June 8, 1962	do	Aug. 2, 1962	do	Federico Parodi	do	4,572.25	[3] 8,834.01		
July 31, 1962	C. B. Fox Co.	Aug. 24, 1962	New Orleans	Giovanni Grimaldi	do	3,138.43			(4)
July 26, 1962	Bunge Corp	Aug. 27, 1962	Destrehan	Eugenie S. Embiricos	do	1,123.33			
	Total					112,743.32	14,334.11	98,409.21	98,409.21
	BARLEY								
June 2, 1959	C. B. Fox Co.	July 12, 1959	Seattle	Bartenstein	Brake	1,000.00	499.00	501.00	
Jan. 7, 1960	Cargill, Inc	Jan. 23, 1960	Galveston	Siam	Hamburg	5,080.27		5,080.27	
Dec. 11, 1959	C. B. Fox Co.	do	do	do	do	3,106.17		3,106.17	
Feb. 12, 1960	Cargill, Inc. (by C. B. Fox Co.)	Feb. 16, 1960	Portland	Knut Knutsen	do	22,404.00		22,404.00	
Apr. 13, 1960	do	May 1, 1960	New Orleans	Aardyk	do	3,017.37		3,017.37	
June 3, 1960	Cargill, Inc. (by Garnac Grain Co.)	July 6, 1960	Superior	Georgios Maniolakis	Bremen	9,144.49		9,144.49	
June 15, 1960	Garnac Grain Co	do	do	do	do	754.72		754.72	
June 2, 1960	C. B. Fox Co.	July 12, 1960	do	Venture	Antwerp/ Hamburg	4,555.48		4,555.48	
Sept. 7, 1960	do	Sept. 20, 1960	Duluth-Superior	North Lord	Bremen	10,350.24		10,350.24	
Do	do	Oct. 5, 1960	Superior	Madam Butterfly	do	9,294.46		9,294.46	
Sept. 16, 1960	do	Oct. 14, 1960	do	Point Lacre	do	6,699.93		6,699.93	
	Total					75,407.13	499.00	74,908.13	[1] 74,908.13
	GRAIN SORGHUMS								
July 19, 1960	C. B. Fox Co.	Aug. 13, 1960	Houston	Alblasserdyk	Bremen	2,349.63		2,349.63	[5] 2,349.63
	Grand total								175,666.97

[1] Fiscal year 1960–61.

[2] Fiscal year 1962.

[3] Austrian records showing imports for fiscal year 1963 not yet available. Examination and experience for prior fiscal years indicate grain imported through port of Trieste arrived in Austria either as U.S. grain or was relabeled as Austrian grain.

[4] Fiscal year 1963.

[5] Fiscal year 1961.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Do the figures show the dates on which the Department of Agriculture made the overall barter agreements with each of the American agents?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; that information is on the chart.

Smaller shipments to five other Austrian importers are listed in chart No. 4, and here again we find that grain which was earmarked for Austria in reality never arrived in that country but was being diverted and sold elsewhere.

The books of the U.S. Government show all of this 40 million bushels of grain as having been exported to Austria under barter agreements arranged under Public Law 480.

Summarizing this transaction, under Public Law 480 our Government negotiated barter agreements to sell approximately 40 million bushels of feed grains to Austria. Of this amount 60 percent, or 24,744,017 bushels, never arrived in that country, but was diverted and sold either in Western Europe or behind the Iron Curtain.

To what extent the American exporters or U.S. Government officials are responsible has as yet not been determined. But certainly someone is responsible for this illegal transaction. The American taxpayers over the years have been shouldered with the expensive cost of our foreign aid programs, and they have a right to know who is responsible for this fiasco.

Whether our Government received all of its minerals for which these goods were originally bargained is at this point undetermined.

Since the time of my preparation of this speech I have discussed the situation with the officials concerned and have been advised that they believe the bulk of the materials has either been received or is in the process of being delivered. To what extent the actual value of such minerals would cover the original cost of this grain is likewise undetermined. But certainly laws have been violated. To say the least this fiasco represents a multimillion-dollar loss to the American taxpayers and a corresponding multimillion-dollar windfall to those who participated in this illegal diversion of American feed grains.

The alarming part of this report is that in checking this $32 million diversion of feed grain shipments which have been made to Austria over this 3-year period there has developed a strong indication that this may represent but one of the many instances of illegal diversion of some of our shipments of agriculture products under Public Law 480.

For this reason I am sending to the desk a resolution calling for an investigation of all transactions under Public Law 480. This committee should check the value of minerals we receive and determine to what extent there has been any diversion of these commodities being traded.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. First of all, I commend the Senator from Delaware for making this contribution and for calling this matter to our attention. It would seem to warrant the attention called for by his resolution. I shall support the resolution in principle. I hope it is sufficiently definitive and specific to accomplish the desired result.

I wish to ask several questions. So far as the Senator from Delaware knows, do the barter agreements which are entered into require that the grain actually be delivered to the country which barters with us for the materials to be exchanged—in this case, Austria?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, the understanding is that the grain will go to the country affected. Whether the contracts are so loosely worded that the grain can be sent elsewhere I cannot say. I am not an attorney, and I do not know. But I believe that question must be answered.

In Austria seven individuals have been indicted and presumably they are being prosecuted for what is described as illegal diversion of this grain. So it is recognized as an illegal transaction.

If there is a weakness in our law we should ascertain that.

It was my understanding—and, I believe, the understanding of all Members of Congress—that such grain must go to the countries with which it is bartered. Otherwise we would lose the desired effect of the barter agreement because the grain could then go to any of the countries of Western Europe; and if that situation were allowed we would be unable to make dollar sales there.

There is no question in my mind but that there has been an illegal diversion of this grain.

Mr. HRUSKA. However, if there had been diversion from Hamburg or some other point of destination, so that the shipment was diverted to a country other than Austria, that fact should show in the records, should it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. But thus far it has not been possible to obtain adequate records in order to determine where the grain really went. The cooperation of the respective European governments is being requested, and after the reports are received perhaps we shall be able to ascertain to whom the grain was sold and where it actually went. But thus far no one has been able to inform me where the 24 million bushels of grain went. It is recognized that in most circumstances the grain would replace dollar-sales shipments to Europe. If the grain has gone behind the Iron Curtain that is even worse.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator's statement shows that after the grain arrived in Austria, it was sold to another country?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, it never reached Austria. Presumably it reached Hamburg, Rotterdam, or some other port for shipment to Austria, but before it reached Austria it disappeared.

Mr. HRUSKA. Was not some of the grain marked as having come from Argentina?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; some grain which did reach Austria was illegally marked as coming from Argentina and thus sold at a premium price.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Did the Austrian Government bring indictments against these people?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. So the Austrian Government is not culpably involved, but took that action when it ascertained what was occurring?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; it acted properly. I am not inferring that the Austrian Government acted improperly any more than I am saying that some American official may be involved. I make no such charge, nor do I make excuses for what happened. This is not an indictment against anyone, but I do say that someone had to be responsible. That is what I want to find out.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

When the Senator began his remarks, I stated that dealers would bring these commodities into the United States duty free, and thus undercut the price received by our own producers. However, I believe that technically that is not quite correct. These items are brought in, and they go into the stockpile; but the size of the stockpile has an effect on the price which our domestic producers receive for the various metals—largely metals—and minerals.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. And to that extent this operation does have the effect of depressing the price received by the American producer.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. We have about 1,500,000 tons of zinc in our stockpile—enough to last us approximately 15 years.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. A portion of it represents zinc which was bartered for under Public Law 480. Although it is in what we call the supplemental stockpile and is kept off the market, the fact that 1½ million tons are overhanging the market in effect depresses the market and therefore does have an effect on our domestic market and our domestic producers.

Mr. AIKEN. And very often when it is sold at depressed prices in countries other than the one to which it was consigned, that has the effect of undercutting the market for the legitimate and ethical exporters from this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. We are selling feed grains to Western European countries for dollars. We appreciate that business, and we need it. But to the extent that a competitor, by engaging in an illegal maneuver can get grain which originally was intended for Austria and was handled under the barter agreement, he has an advantage with which a legitimate competitor cannot compete. So, if this practice is recognized as proper we might as well write off all our dollar sales of agricultural commodities to all the countries of Western Europe. Certainly in that event they would proceed only through the barter agreements.

Mr. AIKEN. When someone defends such practices, which from our standpoint are illegal, does not that have the effect of forcing the others to do the same?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It does subject the legitimate dealer to the disadvantage of being unable to operate. And the recognized impropriety of this procedure is evidenced by the fact that the Department of Justice is being asked to review these sales.

Mr. AIKEN. It would also have the effect of placing the same temptation before others, would it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

I believe we have the responsibility to ascertain the extent to which this practice is being engaged in because in the course of checking on this particular transaction, which involves Austria, ample evidence has been developed to indicate that this may not be an isolated case but that there may be other countries with which the commodities were bartered but where the grains were never received.

Mr. AIKEN. Are we to assume that the shipper is the one who arranged the transaction?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The shipper could be involved. I am not familiar with exactly how such barter agreements are entered into; therefore, I do not know to what extent the shipper would be responsible. Where the responsibility of the Government ends and where the responsibility of the shipper begins I do not know. But I say that at some point someone must have known about this situation if he were attending to business; somewhere between the Government and the exporter, someone must have know it. As a part of the normal export transactions exporters have at their disposal reasonable estimates of the needs of each of the respective countries. So they can open their books and tell with reasonable accuracy what quantities of feed grains Austria, France, Germany or any other country will have to import during the next calendar year.

The Department of Agriculture likewise has this information.

The Department of Agriculture can tell us approximately how much grain we have in this country, how much it is estimated will be produced, and approximately how much we shall consume in the next 12 months. Those figures are available for every country. Someone should have known that entirely too much feed grain was being shipped to Austria. Had it all arrived there I do not believe it could have been stored.

Mr. AIKEN. From a glance at the Senator's charts, I notice he has listed the names of grain exporters. Does the Senator have available the names of those who are furnishing the other end of the barter—the minerals, metals, diamonds, or any other commodities?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not have any names beyond the exporter or commodity agent.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that information would be very important. Probably an investigation would bring it out.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. I have the list of countries from which the minerals are coming, but I do not have the names of the suppliers. So I could not give that information. The heading on one of the charts which I put in the RECORD is "U.S. Barter Feed Grains Not Received in Austria (by Austrian Importer) for the Fiscal Years 1960, 1961, and 1962."

That is the heading which the Department itself put on the chart. That is the chart which shows the breakdown of the seven Austrian importers that have improperly diverted over the 3-year period a total of 604,615 metric tons, or approximately 24 million bushels. I have omitted from the report the names of the Austrian importers because of the fact that they are already under arrest and are being charged by their government. For that reason, I have eliminated from the chart which I have put into the RECORD the names of the importers and have referred to them as No. 1, No. 2, and so forth.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. As usual, the Senator from Delaware has come forth with some very constructive research figures and a very constructive suggestion. The immensity of the problem is pointed up by the fact that from 1954 to 1962, under Public Law 480, we exported to 120 countries feed grains in the value of $1,575,630,000. I have a chart setting forth the tonnage or the dollar shipments to those 120 countries which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Value of agricultural commodity exports by country of destination[1] *(July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1962)*

	Thousands
Aden	$70
Algeria	881
Angola	19
Antigua	28
Australia	8,418
Austria	59,248
Azores	261
Bahamas	40
Bahrein	22
Belgium-Luxembourg	119,754
Bermuda	70
Bolivia	7,393
Brazil	32,381
British Guiana	$20
British Honduras	622
Cambodia	38
Cameroon	58
Canada	3,345
Canal Zone	144
Canary Islands	12,735
Cape Verde Islands	36
Ceylon	1,315
Chile	3,348
China (Taiwan)	8,012
Colombia	12,982
Congo (Léopoldville)	2,997
Costa Rica	983
Cuba	5,526
Cyprus	1,806
Denmark	10,621
Dominican Republic	523
Ecuador	33
El Salvador	831
Ethiopia	166
Finland	5,594
France	63,495
French Somaliland	183
French West Africa	3,250
Germany, West	143,404
Ghana	4,674
Greece	11,629
Greenland	35
Guam	53
Guatemala	3,082
Haiti	6,377
Honduras	203
Hong Kong	13,895
India	38,423
Indonesia	1,604
Iran	759
Iraq	2,838
Ireland	41,689
Israel	41,280
Italy	33,317
Japan	187,686
Jordan	1,697
Korea	3,679
Kuwait	148
Laos	46
Lebanon	4,321
Liberia	291
Libya	8
Madeira	160
Malaya, Federation of	898
Malta	624
Mauritius	15
Mexico	19,659
Morocco	3,014
Mozambique	4,627
Netherlands	142,517
Netherlands Antilles	37
New Zealand	271
Nicaragua	633
Nigeria	2,964
Norway	29,027
Okinawa	824
Pakistan	52
Panama	175
Peru	27,122
Philippines	9,814
Poland	3,161
Portugal	6,669
Portuguese India	54
Qatar	10
Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Federation of	466
Ruanda-Urundi	91
Sao Toma	46
Saudi Arabia	801
Sierra Leone	80
South Africa, Republic of	5,063
Spain	30,275
St. Pierre-Miquelon	88
Surinam	13
Sweden	14,478
Switzerland	3,318
Syrian Arab Republic	7,244
Thailand	4,536
Togo	$82
Trieste	1,371
Tunisia	938
Turkey	17,585
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	11,203
United Kingdom [2]	289,881
Uruguay	1,212
Venezuela	1,607
Virgin Islands	77
West Indies Federation [3]	1,853
Yugoslavia	19,049
Others [4]	27
Undistributed [5]	3,433

See footnotes at end of table.

See footnotes at end of table.

Total number of countries, 120.
Total value, $1,575,630,000.

[1] Contractors are not in all cases required to export agricultural commodities to the country of origin of materials.

[2] Includes data for other British Commonwealth countries for contracts entered into prior to July 1957. It is estimated that about 89 percent of the value shown covers shipments to the United Kingdom; the remaining 11 percent covers shipments to other countries of the British Commonwealth including Australia, Canada, and Union of South Africa.

[3] Includes Jamaica, Trinidad, and unidentified sections.

[4] Includes small quantities to Argentina, Barbados, British West Africa, Iceland, Mesqat and Oman, Paraguay, Portuguese Guinea, Puerto Rico, and Vietnam.

[5] Shipments for which documents showing country of destination have not been processed.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I do not see that Senators have any choice except to go along with the resolution submitted by the Senator from Delaware. On June 4 I wrote a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture in relation to the problem. In that letter I asked the following questions:

> How did this tremendous diversion of feed grains—referring to the feed-grain diversion in the case of Austria—contrary to the barter agreement, take place without being brought to light until now?
>
> What steps has the Department taken to see to it that there is no repetition of this diversion—either under our barter agreement with Austria or under a barter agreement with any other country?
>
> Has there been any similar diversion of feed grains or other agricultural commodities under any other barter program with any other country?
>
> In the case of any diversion, including the one involving Austria, where did the diverted commodities go. Specifically, did any of this go into Communist bloc countries, and to what extent did the diverted commodities have an adverse impact on our regular export trade?

That letter was dated June 4. It was sent by special messenger to the Department of Agriculture. So far the silence has been deafening. No reply has been received. As the Senator from Delaware has said, apparently those people do not care. At least they do not seem to have the gumption to want to find out.

I suggest that the only alternative we have is to conduct an investigation. I certainly intend to support the resolution submitted by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa for his comments. As I have stated, I desire to make it clear that I am not charging that any American official or exporter is involved in any criminal wrong-doing, but I do say it could not have happened by accident. We have a responsibility to find out who is guilty.

I do not see how it is possible that anyone in charge of this program could administer it over a 3-year period and let 24 million bushels of grain disappear. That in itself would justify an investigation. Certainly in light of the fact that the Austrian Government has recognized that seven of their citizens are involved in an illegal transaction adds further evidence of the fact that it was an illegal transaction. If it is allowed to continue all of our dollar exports of agricultural products would vanish because everyone would enter into illegal barter agreements.

Therefore I send to the desk a resolution asking for an investigation of all barter sales under Public Law 480. For the information of the Senate I ask that it be stated, following which it can be referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a Select Committee on Surplus Agricultural Commodities consisting of seven Members to be appointed by the Vice President is hereby established and authorized to made a comprehensive study and investigation of any and all matters relating to the exchange or barter of surplus agricultural commodities under authority of section 4(h) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act and section 303 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, with a view to determining—

(1) the extent to which shipments of surplus agricultural commodities used for barter under authority of such Acts have been diverted or transshipped to countries other than those for which they were originally intended, and specifically whether, and to what extent, any of such shipments have been diverted or transshipped to Communist-dominated or controlled countries;

(2) the effect that any such diversions or transshipments may have had on dollar sales of agricultural commodities produced in the United States;

(3) the extent, if any, to which the United States has failed to receive all goods and materials contracted to be paid to the United States in exchange for surplus agricultural commodities bartered under authority of such Acts, and whether the quantity and quality of the goods and materials which the United States has agreed to accept in exchange for surplus agricultural commodities bartered under authority of such Acts have represented a fair and reasonable payment for such commodities; and

(4) the extent, if any, to which there has been incompetence, gross negligence, or illegal or improper activity on the part of private citizens or officers or employees of the United States in carrying out barter transactions under authority of such Acts.

Sec. 2. On or before January 31, 1964, the committee shall report to the Senate the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations for legislation or other measures as it may deem appropriate.

Sec. 3. (a) For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, through January 31, 1964, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; and (2) employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants.

(b) Upon request made by the members of the committee selected from the minority party, the committee shall appoint one assistant or consultant designated by such members. No assistant or consultant appointed by the committee may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than $1,600 the annual gross rate of compensation of any individual so designated by the minority members of the committee.

(c) With the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, the committee may (1) utilize the services, information, and facilities of any such department or agency, and (2) employ on a reimbursable basis the services of such personnel of any such department or agency as it deems advisable.

Sec. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is my understanding correct that the resolution introduced by the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] to create a select committee to make an inquiry into the charges and allegations which have been made on the floor of the Senate today will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred. The Parliamentarian has informed me that the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. When the resolution is sent to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, what will the committee's function be before the resolution is referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution would have to be acted upon and reported to the Senate by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and then re-referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration for approval of funds that the resolution requests.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; if I am entitled to do so.

Mr. CURTIS. Do I correctly understand that a resolution calling for a select committee to investigate a matter would be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a matter dealing with Public Law 480. It would go to the committee having original jurisdiction over the subject matter to which it refers.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that this particular resolution would not call for empowering the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or a subcommittee thereof, to make an investigation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is immaterial. The resolution refers directly to subject matter over which the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has jurisdiction.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Delaware will yield further, I say to my distinguished friend the Senator from Delaware that it would be my hope that when the resolution is referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry the committee will give it speedy consideration so that the committee can, in due time, report its findings and give the Senate an opportunity to consider what should be done by way of appropriations, subpena power, and things of that sort, for a committee of this nature.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is my understanding correct that the only jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration would be to pass upon the amount of money involved?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. A further parliamentary inquiry. I raised this point with the Parliamentarian. I could envision that a subcommittee of such a committee might conceivably be required to go to Austria to look at court records and to examine the nature of the indictments, as well as to interview public officials. I would want to be sure that the text of the resolution was such as to bring within its purview foreign travel, if necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry could take care of that, if it so desired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I know the majority leader recognizes that this is a prima facie case made on the Senate floor. I feel certain he will undertake to expedite action in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate and to obtain action on the resolution as speedily as possible.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this is the usual procedure on resolutions of this type, as well as other kinds.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is quite correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am in complete agreement with the procedure suggested. I have called this situation to the attention of the Senate and put into the Record the information I have to support what I think is a need for an investigation. I have sent the resolution to the desk. I have every confidence that the majority leader will cooperate with us in expediting its consideration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall do my best.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is perfectly agreeable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 171) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1945

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 628) to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, this bill would provide clear legislative authority for the use of the urban renewal process in the redevelopment of commercial areas of the District of Columbia.

The authority of the existing District of Columbia Redevelopment Act is now limited to residential areas of the Nation's Capital.

The enactment of the bill would remove this limitation and place the District of Columbia on a par with the other major cities of the United States by permitting it to proceed with the orderly redevelopment of the downtown area.

Congress has long recognized the need to utilize the urban renewal process in the commercial area of our other cities.

In pursuance of this policy, the Congress in 1954 amended the Housing Act of 1949 so as to permit 10 percent of capital grant funds to be utilized for nonresidential projects. Subsequently, through two other amendments to the Federal Housing Act, authority was provided to utilize 30 percent of capital grant funds for nonresidential urban renewal purposes.

Many of the major cities in the United States have taken advantage of this provision of Federal law by undertaking extensive renovation and redevelopment of their deteriorating downtown areas.

The committee, in its consideration of S. 628, was informed by the Urban Renewal Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency that it does not know of any jurisdiction in this country, other than the District of Columbia, in which the local legislation limits urban renewal activities to a residential area or those predominantly residential in character.

Although Federal assistance has not been available for the redevelopment of the downtown area of the District of Columbia, nevertheless the community has been fortunate in that an active group, composed of members of the business community, has taken the initiative in providing a plan for the revitalization of downtown Washington.

This group is a nonprofit corporation known as the National Capital Downtown Committee, Inc. In the course of its activities, the organization has expended $637,677 of its own funds without reimbursement in order to develop its action plan for downtown.

Although the work of the downtown progress group is highly commendable, there is still a vital need for governmental action to carry out a program involving the purchase and assembly of land, relocation of residents and business, and the sale of land to redevelopers for use in accordance with an approved urban renewal plan.

Until the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 is amended to provide clear authority for redevelopment of commercial areas, the urban renewal in the District of Columbia will be seriously handicapped; and the District authorities will be precluded from acting on the plans of civic and public bodies for downtown redevelopment.

The bill will clear up an ambiguous situation whereby redevelopment authority may be used even if a portion of a substantially residential area is zoned for commercial purposes. We cannot be sure how far existing authority runs in such instances and this bill will remove all doubts on the subject.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I strongly urge the Senate to move toward the enactment of this important legislation.

Mr. BEALL and **Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware** addressed the Chair.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL].

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the bill the Senate is considering today, S. 628, presents nothing new or novel in the field of urban renewal. On the contrary, it merely permits the District of Columbia to engage in urban renewal activities in predominantly commercial areas. Testimony before the Business and Commerce Subcommittee of the Senate District Committee disclosed that the District of Columbia is the only jurisdiction which has legislation which prevents the use of the urban renewal process in the commercial areas of a city.

On three previous occasions Congress has approved the use of the urban renewal tool for commercial redevelopment. As originally enacted, the National Housing Act contained no provision for the redevelopment of commercial areas but, in 1954, Congress amended the National Housing Act to permit 10 percent of the Federal capital grant funds to be used in urban renewal projects. Two subsequent amendments to that act raised the authorized limit on capital grant funds for use in commercial urban renewal projects to its present level of 30 percent.

Other cities around the Nation have made good use of these Federal capital grant funds and have begun to upgrade their downtown areas. I am proud to say that in my own State, in Baltimore, the Charles Center project is moving ahead for the general betterment of not only the downtown area and its merchants but the citizens of the entire city. For not only do projects of this nature remove the blighted slum areas which breed the expensive problems of human delinquency and property deterioration but also they greatly increase the base for the real estate tax which is a most important revenue producer in most of our cities.

Many of the merchants now doing business in downtown Washington have recognized the need for renewal in that area. I am happy to say that they have not merely sat back and petitioned the Government to do something about their problem. Instead, they have, on their own, developed a plan which they call an action plan for downtown. To develop this plan, they formed a nonprofit corporation popularly referred to as Downtown Progress. To finance the activities of the corporation, they have raised and expended approximately $639,000 of their own funds without reimbursement. This is the kind of citizen participation which must be encouraged to make urban renewal a success. We must not allow these public-spirited citizens to be hampered by a law which is inadequate and so totally out of step with the philosophy expressed by Congress on three occasions and by all of the other jurisdictions who are moving ahead in this field. I, therefore, hope that the Senate will quickly approve S. 628 and send it on to the House.

Mr. McINTYRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Maryland, former chairman of the subcommittee, whose understanding of Washington and its downtown problems is well known to Members of the Senate, for his support of the bill.

I yield now to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator could comment on this particular point which has been called to my attention. It seems that in December 1958 the Redevelopment Land Agency paid the D.C. Transit System, of which Roy Chalk is president, $1,266,605 for some property. Then, I understand that on July 6, 1962, the Agency leased this same property back to Chalk House West, Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary of the District of Columbia Realty & Development Corp. for $43,221 per year over a 99-year period.

That $43,221 represents 6 percent for about three-fourths of what they paid for it. A 99-year lease was given.

If the Redevelopment Agency did not need this property, since it leased it back for 99 years, why did it buy it in the first place? And if the Agency did need the property why did it lease it back for 99 years on such favorable terms?

Mr. McINTYRE. Was this back in 1958?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The property was bought in 1958, and the lease was executed July 6, 1962. It would seem to me that either they did not need the property in the beginning; or, if they did, why did they change their plans and lease it back? To lease the property for 99 years is the equivalent of a sale. The mathematics of the situation is that they leased it back at about 4 percent of the sales price, which would be a very advantageous lease to the man from whom it was purchased.

I wondered if the Senator has any comments on the subject or can explain the transaction. The transaction may be perfectly in order, but it raised a question in my mind.

Mr. McINTYRE. The Senator from Delaware is apparently addressing a question to me. I do not have the answer. What I can do for the record is to attempt to discover why the transaction took place in the manner suggested.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That would be satisfactory.

Mr. McINTYRE. In the meantime, I will yield to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], who may have an answer.

Mr. BEALL. This particular question does not arise under this particular bill, but I think it would be well to obtain the facts for the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It may not come directly under the bill, but it is appropriate to raise the question as to the manner in which the money obtained under the provisions of the bill is being administered. I shall look forward to seeing the explanation.

Mr. McINTYRE. I think we will rest our case on providing the answer for the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McINTYRE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have not studied the original act, but reports have repeatedly come to me to the effect that in urban renewal programs buildings of economic use and value have been bought and torn down, driving the occupants out. My question is: Is there, in the proposal made for the amendment of this act, language that would curb the powers of those who seek to condemn, and confine their condemnation to properties that are not of economic use and ought to be destroyed? In many places good buildings have been torn down solely to promote the program. My question is: Are there safeguards in the bill against abuse of that power?

Mr. McINTYRE. No particular safeguards are written into the law under discussion, other than those already encompassed in the entire field of urban renewal. There will be certain cases in which, after the redevelopment has occurred, it will seem as if sound and substantial buildings were needlessly condemned. Such situations occur and are inherent in a program that is founded on public use for public good. The Senator or I might be outraged to learn the facts of a single case. However, I call attention to the fact that an integral part of the administration of the act requires a local public agency fully to justify the individual purchase of basically sound properties which involve high acquisition cost and may not be incompatible with planned land use. I am referring to the regulations of the FHHA which reach the exercise of urban renewal powers. Every possibility must be explored to develop a plan which permits the maximum number of sound structures to remain in an area slated for urban renewal.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I pose the question because I know of one Ohio city in which the General Accounting Office found that many buildings of usable quality were to be torn down. The bill before the Senate does not affect the language and definition in the original act dealing with the type of buildings that may be torn down. Is that correct?

Mr. McINTYRE. Not as I understand. There is an amendment pending by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] which would be more restrictive about what the planners can do.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Where is the slum area in downtown Washington? Has anybody pointed it out yet?

Mr. McINTYRE. I went all over it yesterday.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Where is it? Compared with many cities in Ohio, this is a monumental city. At least, the downtown area looks like a gold-plated town. As I drive down Pennsylvania Avenue all I see is monumental buildings.

Mr. McINTYRE. Far be it from me, as one who has been here only 6 months, to tell the Senator that one does not have to go very far in Washington to find slums and blighted areas and alleyways that are a disgrace. Generally speaking, whether we come from Baltimore, Boston, or a little town like Laconia, we feel that this city should be a shining example to the country. The downtown progress plan now covers the area from North Capitol Street on the east to 15th Street on the west and from Pennsylvania Avenue on the south to M Street on the north.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McINTYRE. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Before speaking on my amendment, I should like to point out, in connection with the colloquy between the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from New Hampshire, one reason why we should be concerned with this bill.

In the report to Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States in June 1963, entitled "Premature Approval of Large-Scale Demolition for Erieview Urban Renewal Project 1, Cleveland, Ohio, by the Urban Renewal Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency," there appear these statements, beginning at page 14:

> Although URA does not define the phrase "substandard requiring clearance," it would seem that the structural condition of the project buildings must be known in order to determine whether this standard has been met. After this standard has been met, a city must then demonstrate that there are blighting or other detrimental influences in the area.
>
> The city's inspection reports indicated, and the Administrator, HHFA, agreed, that the city inspectors had considered both structural and environmental factors in assigning an overall rating of "substandard" to 71 percent of the buildings. The inspection reports did not specify the extent to which structural deficiencies entered into the substandard classification of the buildings. Accordingly, the information provided by the city was not adequate to permit URA to make realistic judgments as to whether alternative urban renewal treatments (e.g., rehabilitation and spot clearance) would be more appropriate or whether sound structures could be retained and integrated into the project. Urban Renewal Administration regulations provide that "If conditions warranting clearance do not exist, the appropriate treatment will be conservation and rehabilitation which may include spot clearance."
>
> We reviewed the city's inspection reports for each of the 84 buildings which had been classified as "substandard." Many of the deficiencies described in the inspection reports appeared to constitute only minor violations of the city's building or housing code. Some reports appeared to contain inconsistencies in that buildings which were admittedly sound or in good condition received a "substandard" classification. In several instances, violations could have been overcome by installing inexpensive hardware, removing unauthorized storage, or installing better lighting. Many of the deficiencies would have been corrected if the city had effectively enforced its codes.
>
> Following are examples of the types of comments contained in the city's inspection reports relative to the 84 buildings classified as "substandard." The defects cited on the following pages were the only deficiencies noted in the inspection reports.

One example is given of an 8-story masonry building, which has an appraised value, including land, of $660,000. The city classified the building as substandard, and scheduled it for acquisition and demolition. What did it find out about it?

The report states:

> In one section of the city's inspection report the exterior condition of the building, including its foundation, walls, and roof, was given the highest possible rating of "good." In the same section of the report, the interior condition of the building also was rated "good," except for the cellar which was rated "fair"; doors and transoms were rated "fair"; and self-closing devices on doors were rated "poor." Another section of the report listed the following violations of the city code: (1) Ceiling of cellar in need of repairs where patches of plaster and lath are missing, (2) sanitation in cellar poor because trash and debris have accumulated, (3) no fire door to a rear entrance to cellar, (4) no self-closing devices on the boiler room door nor on front entrance door to cellar, (5) poor ventilation in cellar, (6) inoperative lights at some exits, and (7) no sanitary facilities in shoe repair shop on first floor.

The report continues:

> We reviewed the condition of 77 of the 84 buildings. During our review, the Housing and Home Finance Administration specialists, who defined a standard building as one that is structurally sound and does not warrant clearance for reasons of structural deficiency, determined that 60 of these buildings were standard structures.

I point out that this is not the only instance. I did not realize that the Senator from Ohio would be present and interested in the subject. I thought he would like to know what the report had to say about one of the cities in his State.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I knew of those findings. I have read the recommendation in the report to the effect that the Administrator of HHFA and the Commissioner of URA take the necessary steps to revise the criteria governing the eligibility of areas for large-scale demolition to more clearly define a condition "substandard requiring clearance" and to relate this condition solely to the structural condition of the specific buildings being considered.

I understand that this condition has arisen out of the original language in the original act, and is not at all involved in the language that is now before the Senate.

Mr. McINTYRE. The Senator is correct. The Senator from Ohio should understand that the bill under discussion would merely give to the District of Columbia the right to proceed to develop urban renewal processes in the commercial area, and to eliminate ambiguity in the law. This is something that Cleveland and other cities have a right to do now. The point that is being raised by my distinguished friends from Ohio and Iowa may well be worthy of consideration, but this is not the right bill to amend.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the hotel that was discussed in a newspaper recently, and which is contemplated for demolition, involved in this program? I refer to the Willard Hotel.

Mr. McINTYRE. I am told that there is no plan to demolish any hotel, but the famous Raleigh Hotel at 13th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue will be torn down by a private group.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McINTYRE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. If I may continue, this is not the only instance. Let me get a little closer to the District of Columbia. I have before me the report of the Comptroller General of the United States to Congress entitled "Audit of District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, Fiscal Years 1957 and 1958."

I start to read at page 35 of this volume, as follows:

> With some exceptions, the renewal of project area C will be accomplished by a strict clearance operation rather than by rehabilitation (demolishing only those structures which cannot be conserved). We were informed that certain commercial structures which during our site visit, seemed to be sound in appearance and condition would probably be demolished. These structures, located on 7th and 12th Streets between the Southwest Expressway and D Street in areas which are to be redeveloped for commercial uses, have an estimated total cost of about $2 million for acquiring and demolishing.
>
> The demolition of these structures was discussed with RLA's urban renewal planning officer and assistant executive director. They informed us that the structures would probably be demolished because (1) of the lack of space for off-street loading and unloading which is required by the redevelopment plan and the use of adjoining land would be limited and (2) large redevelopers may not be interested in redeveloping the area if the structures were retained.
>
> We noted instances in the southwest project areas where the RLA (1) does not plan to acquire certain sound commercial structures, (2) plans to acquire and resell certain structures to the redevelopers, (3) plans to obtain temporary title to a structure not scheduled for demolition and to require the owner to purchase additional land in order to comply with the redevelopment plan, and (4) supervised the sale of a commercial structure not scheduled for demolition in order to require the new owner to comply with the redevelopment plan. It would seem that any of these actions would be less costly than the demolition of sound structures. In line with other actions in the project areas, it was our belief that adequate loading and unloading space could be made available for these structures through purchase of adjacent or nearby real property and demolition of any buildings thereon.

The report quotes the Chairman of RLA as stating that "the achievement of urban renewal objectives does not always permit the retention of sound buildings, even though their use may be permitted by the urban renewal plan."

This is the point made by the Chairman of RLA. He stated further that "RLA intends to consider further the feasibility of the retention of additional commercial structures in areas which are to be redeveloped for commercial uses."

The report continues:

> In view of RLA's decision to consider the retention of additional sound commercial structures, we are making no recommendation.

The point I wish to make is that no one disagrees with the objective of the pending bill.

We all recognize that there are slum areas; that there is a problem of disease and crime; and that cities must make progress. We want to do something about that situation. There is no argument on that point at all. But there is a great difference between the objectives and the way they are achieved.

When I read the bill the first time, it caused me some concern, because it provides, in section 3:

> "Slum area" or "blighted area" is a residential or nonresidential area, or combination thereof, in which there exists one or a combination of factors of such extent or nature as to contribute substantially to the spread of disease or crime—

There is no problem there—

> impose severe public economic or social liabilities—

Who is to determine what is "severe"? Then—

> or impair, arrest, or prevent the sound growth, development, or redevelopment of the District of Columbia.

What, pray tell, is sound growth? It is what some nonelected public official determines in his mind is sound.

Since we are dealing with the properties of a great many persons, not only their homes but their places of business, some guidelines ought to be laid down. Apparently the Housing and Home Finance Administration agrees, and it has laid down guidelines in the form of regulations. Unfortunately, the regulations have not been complied with. That is why we have had reports from the Comptroller General.

I suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] that laudatory as the objectives of the bill are, the guidelines in this instance are not meaningful. They give carte blanche authority to the Redevelopment Land Agency and Housing and Home Finance Agency. Congress ought to provide some guidelines, so that there will not be any more reports from the Comptroller General about the District of Columbia.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. McINTYRE. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. I remind the Senator from Iowa that other cities have mayors and city councils elected by the people. If the District of Columbia, the Nation's Capital, had a mayor and a city council, as it should have had all these years, those elected officials would have the right to approve urban renewal plans. But the District of Columbia does not have a mayor and a city council, so it is necessary for the District to depend on the Board of Commissioners and the Redevelopment Land Agency to take the required action.

These District officials have recommended this proposal, so we are not doing anything that has not been done in an orderly fashion by officials who have been appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. In practically all cities, the mayor and city council have the right to approve the redevelopment of downtown areas. Pittsburgh and Baltimore are two cities with which I am most familiar. We can readily see what has been done in other cities; it is a shame that it cannot be done in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. McINTYRE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I agree with much of what the Senator from Maryland has said. He knows that I join with him in wishing that the District of Columbia had some measure of home rule. But it has not, so we must deal with the situation as it is.

If businessmen or homeowners in the District of Columbia are ousted because of a whim or fancy, or some abuse of discretion, or some blind ignorance of what the rules are, to whom can they turn? They cannot turn to anyone except Congress. While perhaps the bill does not affect us personally very much, we have an obligation to the people of the District of Columbia; we have an obligation to every individual property owner in the District, to make certain that his property is not taken away from him without due process of law or without just compensation. It is also our duty to make certain that the objective of the redevelopment plan is not used as an excuse to trample on the rights of the property owners. Unless we recognize that private property rights should be given protection, we do not legislate very well. Property owners have no one except Congress to turn to for safeguards of their rights. I do not think those rights are safeguarded by the bill. They have been safeguarded in the administration of the law in Cleveland, or in the District of Columbia in the Southwest project area.

We would be remiss if in our zeal to get moving with the redevelopment of the downtown area we on the floor of the Senate, did not write into the bill safeguards which would make certain that the people will have their property rights protected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. McINTYRE. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I highly commend the chairman of our subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], for his able leadership in guiding the bill through the subcommittee hearings, through the full committee, and to the floor of the Senate.

The legislative record of the issue before the Senate this afternoon is a long one. Hearings were held on the subject of this bill last year. Hearings were held on the measure this year. All the problems which have been referred to in the discussion this afternoon have been thoroughly considered by the committee and by the proponents of the bill.

Second, I support the contention made here this afternoon that the bill contains safeguards. I quite agree with the position of the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. I think the position he has taken is particularly important, because, after all, the Senator from Maryland is not a Senator from the District of Columbia, although I say to the people of the District of Columbia that the Senator from Maryland has been their de facto Senator for a long time, and necessarily so, because the problems of the District of Columbia constantly wash over into Maryland. What is done with respect to urban renewal policies in the District of Columbia affects Maryland.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], who is not in the Chamber at the moment, entered into the discussion earlier this afternoon. I told him a few moments ago that I wished to comment on some of his observations.

We are not dealing merely with the problem of so-called slum areas; we are dealing also with a problem of blighted business areas. Although the chairman has already done so, nevertheless I believe we should refer again to the committee report. The answers to all the objections that have been raised are to be found in the bill and the committee report. On page 1, in the third paragraph, we read:

> The Urban Renewal Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, has reported to the committee that it does not know of any jurisdiction other than the District of Columbia in which the local legislation limits urban renewal activities to residential areas.

That was the first part of the problem with which we had to deal. The bill seeks to correct that condition. It seeks to correct it with the support of the Urban Renewal Administration and the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The committee report continues:

> The District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 established the Redevelopment Land Agency and authorized it to conduct urban renewal activities in order to eliminate substandard housing conditions in blighted areas and to modernize the planning and development of such areas of the District of Columbia.

So the Redevelopment Land Agency has been at work since 1945. It has done a good job. Its personnel are good public servants. They constituted one check against any possible injustice that might accrue from a program such as the one we are talking about.

The report states:

> The language of that act and its legislative history appear to confine the acquisition and assembly of real property for redevelopment to land located in slum and blighted areas which are residential or predominantly residential in character prior to acquisition. Thus, the District of Columbia is denied this important tool for renovation of the commercial portions of the city.

I respectfully say to Senators that if they were doing business as small businessmen in the District of Columbia, they probably would have a better understanding of why the businessmen who appeared before us were begging for relief. They are not asking for handouts, as I shall show in a moment. They pointed out to the committee, in the first place, that the act is not broad enough to cover their economic plight. I say to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] that we are dealing with blighted business areas in the District of Columbia.

If he has any question as to whether there are such blighted areas in the District of Columbia—and in a moment I shall identify them from the report—let him talk with the District of Columbia businessmen, for it is they who are pleading for the program we are defending, and which this afternoon we urge the Senate to adopt; and they have made a good case for it.

I now read the next paragraph of the report:

> S. 628 would bring the law of the District of Columbia in line with that of other major cities in the country by permitting it to conduct redevelopment activities in commercial as well as residential areas.

I say to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] that the businessmen of the District of Columbia are entitled to his support, not his opposition.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am not in opposition.

Mr. MORSE. I know of no one who is a greater supporter, once he understands the problem of acting in accordance with legitimate rights of American business—although I do not yield to him on that score, even though I am afraid that sometimes he has doubts about that. I am joining the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] in pleading with the Senate for assistance to the businessmen of the District of Columbia, who have done remarkably fine work in this field. Of course, there will be dissidents here and there to any program of this scope; but I hope we shall not permit our programs to be determined by the position taken by the dissidents, unless they have a good case. I point out that they had their hearing before our committee, and did not make a case. But the businessmen did.

I read the next paragraph of the report:

> The District of Columbia is fortunate in that a very active group composed of members of the business community has taken the initiative in providing a plan for the revitalization of downtown Washington. This group has formed a nonprofit corporation known as the National Capital Downtown Committee, Inc. It is popularly referred to as Downtown Progress. It has been in existence for approximately 3 years and during that time through a staff of consultants hired at its own expense has conducted numerous studies out of which has grown its proposed "action plan for downtown." The area included in the plan—

This is the blighted business area of the District of Columbia, the area that is finding itself increasingly at a competitive disadvantage with the great supermarket retail areas in the suburbs of the city. This is the economic area in the District of Columbia—similar to those in many other cities, although other cities have gone ahead with urban redevelopment programs, to the benefit of their businesses—in which businesses are dying.

Many problems confront businessmen in downtown Washington, D.C. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] referred to some of their problems. They are at a great disadvantage; and I believe they have made a good case for the bill the Senator from New Hampshire is urging the Senate to adopt, because the area included in the plan lies between the White House and the Capitol, between 15th Street on the west and North Capitol Street and New Jersey Avenue on the east, between Pennsylvania Avenue on the south and M Street on the north. This is at least one of the economically blighted commercial areas in Washington, D.C., from the standpoint of operating successful businesses.

Some may ask whether I realize that business X and business Y, located in this area, are doing fairly well. Of course I do; but I also know that, in totality, this is a blighted area. I listened to these men testify, and I studied the voluminous exhibits they submitted. As the Senator from New Hampshire knows, they made an excellent case in support of the program.

I read further from the report:

> In the course of its activities, the National Capital Downtown Committee, Inc., has expended $638,677 of its own funds without reimbursement in order to develop its "action plan for downtown."

The area I just mentioned is so blighted that this group of businessmen, who find themselves in a very difficult position of economic hardship, have spent more than $600,000 of their own funds in the past 3 years, to come forward with a program of urban redevelopment in Washington, D.C., which they cannot process—and there are many checks in the course of that processing—until a bill is passed which gives them the same opportunities to come under the law that businessmen in city after city across the Nation have.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Basically, the Senator from Oregon and I are not at all in disagreement.

My point is that evidence which has developed throughout the country shows that in the execution of the program, in many instances buildings which have been condemned and torn down should not have been torn down. My point was—and I state it positively—that this aspect of the problem should be examined; and either by regulation or by law the guidelines should be tightened, so as to make certain that the spirit of the program will apply to the elimination of blighted areas and the establishment of redevelopment areas, and that only to that extent will the tearing down of buildings be permitted.

Mr. MORSE. In reply to the Senator from Ohio, I do not think this bill is the proper vehicle for such a program. The bill merely seeks to give District of Columbia businessmen the same opportunity under the law that is available to the businessmen in other cities. That is one of my objections—which I shall make later in greater detail—to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa. In my judgment, if Senators wish to amend the entire urban renewal program, they should bring their amendments before the Banking and Currency Committee, not before the Committee on the District of Columbia.

All we are doing as the District of Columbia Committee is to plead with the Senate to help us correct what we believe is an injustice being done to the businessmen of the District of Columbia. Such businessmen should be allowed to come under the law. If Senators think the general law needs amendment, this bill is not the proper legislative vehicle for the attachment of such amendments. Instead, let Senators submit their amendments to the proper committee, and have hearings held on the amendments.

Before I conclude, I shall state, as my reply to the Senator from Iowa, that in my judgment there are adequate checks in order to protect against the dissidents. I believe an economic injustice was implied by his remarks in support of the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree that the District of Columbia must be treated on a basis of equality with other metropolitan areas.

But let me read from a report to the U.S. Congress by the Comptroller General: Here are his recommendations:

> RECOMMENDATIONS
>
> We recommend that the Administrator, HHFA, and the Commissioner, URA, take the necessary steps to:
>
> 1. Revise the criteria governing the eligibility of areas for large-scale demolition to more clearly define the condition "substandard requiring clearance" and to relate this condition solely to the structural condition of the specific buildings being considered.
>
> 2. Clarify the criteria for Federal participation in proposed large-scale demolition projects to provide that, if an area does not have a significant number of structurally substandard buildings, expenditure of Federal funds shall be limited to other feasible but less costly forms of urban renewal (e.g., rehabilitation and spot clearance).
>
> 3. Obtain more effective administration, at all levels, of URA's established policy that the Government will not share in the cost of acquiring and demolishing properties which can be improved and successfully integrated into a project.
>
> 4. Require thorough examination by qualified HHFA personnel of the condition of structures in proposed project areas before such areas are approved for large-scale demolition.
>
> 5. Review the proposed demolition of buildings in Project I—Erieview with the view toward retaining those buildings that can be successfully integrated into the project.

Such action would be wrong unless we were to give heed to the views expressed. Perhaps it should not be done in the bill; but heed must be given.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall make an offer to the Senator from Ohio. If the Senator from Ohio will ask the legislative counsel to prepare a bill carrying out the recommendations of the Comptroller General, I shall go along as a cosponsor of the bill. It will then be before the Committee on Banking and Currency. But the provision has no place in connection with the subject before the Senate.

I point out to my friend from Ohio that that is the way to handle the question. There is a legal problem. This afternoon we are acting as a group of aldermen. We are acting as a city council, unfortunately, because under the present organization, Congress controls the District of Columbia. As the city council we ought to come to the relief of businessmen by giving them the jurisdictional help that they need.

The only way we can give it to them is to add to the existing legislation jurisdiction over blighted economic commercial areas which the Commissioners do not have, but which every other city in the United States has. That is my plea.

The Senator from New Hampshire has rendered a magnificent service in connection with the committee report. It is his report. I believe I am in a better position to appraise the report than the modesty of the Senator from New Hampshire would permit him to do. I ask Senators to look at what the Senator from New Hampshire states in the next paragraph:

> A program for renewing the central business district cannot be accomplished solely through the efforts of individual property owners although their cooperation is essential to any redevelopment program. There is need for governmental action to carry out a program involving the purchase of land, relocation of residents and businesses, and the sale of land to redevelopers for use in accordance with an approved urban renewal plan. Until the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 is amended to provide clear authority for redevelopment of commercial areas for nonresidential purposes, the urban renewal efforts of the District of Columbia are seriously handicapped and District authorities may not act on the plan of the National Capital Downtown Committee, Inc., or the plan of any other civic organization or governmental body for renewal of a predominantly commercial area.

What is the position of the officials of the District of Columbia? They came before the committee and supported this bill.

I come to my last point. We have not taken away a single due-process right of a single dissident who may not like any specific part of the blueprint that the redevelopment authorities may finally approve. They have not yet approved anything. All we are asking is the necessary authority so that the Commissioners can approve something. But they do not have the authority to make final decisions. If it should develop that any businessman or individual thinks that he is being denied any right, or that he is being denied due process, I can assure the Senator, that such an individual has recourse to the courts.

I close by saying that all the legal remedies are present in order to prevent any injustices. The issue is whether or not a bill will be passed that would merely provide for businessmen of the District of Columbia a remedy which is long overdue.

I say to my good friend the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] that I am embracing in advance the businessmen of the District of Columbia. We will go down the line together in support of doing justice to a long overdue need of the commercial interests of this city. We cannot sweep under the rug proof of the good faith of the National Capital Downtown Committee when they are willing to go into their pockets to the tune of more than $600,000, with no assurance whatever that they would recover any of the sum. This is a pretty good group of men, who have demonstrated their citizenship; and I wish to support them.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Oregon for his kind remarks. I value beyond measure his advice and counsel as a member of the subcommittee with me.

I point out also that the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, in adopting a definition of "slum areas" or "blighted areas," did not do so lightly. I refer to the definition about which the distinguished Senator from Iowa seems so much concerned. In drafting the definition the committee recognized that any definition included in the redevelopment statute must be sufficiently broad to carry out the basic concept of urban renewal. I invite the attention of Senators to the opinion of Mr. Justice Douglas in the majority opinion in the case of Berman against Parker, which recognized at the very inception of the program the need for a fairly broad definition of "slum" or "blight" in order that urban renewal might develop on an area basis. I quote from that decision:

> The particular uses to be made of the land in the project were determined with regard to the needs of the particular community. The experts—

He is now speaking, of course, of that decision and the state of facts in that case—

> concluded that if the community were to be healthy, if it were not to revert again to a blighted or slum area, as though possessed by a congenital disease, the area must be planned as a whole. It was not enough, they believed, to remove existing buildings that were unsanitary or unsightly. It was important to redesign the whole area so as to eliminate the conditions that cause slums—the overcrowding of dwellings, the lack of parks, the lack of adequate streets and alleys, the absence of recreational areas, the lack of light and air, the presence of outmoded street patterns. It was believed that the piecemeal approach, the removal of individual structures that were offensive, would be only a palliative. The entire area needed redesigning so that a balanced, integrated plan could be developed for the region, including not only homes but also schools, churches, parks, streets, and shopping centers. In this way it was hoped that the cycle of decay of the area could be controlled and the birth of future slums prevented.

The subcommittee and the full committee are of the view that the definition of "slum" or "blight" contained in the bill will implement the basic concepts of urban renewal as expressed in the leading case of Berman against Parker.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk. I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 6, it is proposed to strike "and".

On page 4, line 24, immediately following "in the foreseeable future." it is proposed to add the following: ", and (3) by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

> (s) "Substandard building" means any building other than a building (1) which can be economically improved or modified to meet the requirements reasonably established by the Agency for integration into a development plan or redevelopment plan, and (2) whose owner or lessee promptly agrees, and presents satisfactory evidence that he is able, to make such improvements or modifications within a reasonable time limit set by the Agency.

At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

> SEC. 4. Section 5 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 5-704) is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:
>
> "(c) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as permitting the acquisition and disposition of any building in a project area other than a substandard building."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of my distinguished colleagues to the amendment, and point out that the amendment would not change the bill, but would make an addition to the bill. It would provide, in effect, that there would not be any condemnation of any building except a building which is substandard. In order to determine what is a substandard building, my amendment would provide that a "substandard building" means any building other than a building, first, which can be economically improved or modified to meet the requirements reasonably established by the Agency for integration into a development plan or redevelopment plan, or, second, whose owner or lessee promptly agrees, and presents satisfactory evidence that he is able to make such improvements or modifications within a reasonable time limit set by the Agency.

I have tried very hard to devise an amendment which would be calculated to prevent some of the things occurring about which I have read in the General Accounting Office reports.

No one is questioning the dedication of our public servants; but to err is human. I fear that one reason we serve in Congress is to enact laws so that there will not be as many errors as there might otherwise be.

This amendment would not hamper development and redevelopment plans for downtown Washington, unless someone has a purpose to destroy property rights on a whimsical basis. It would not hamper them if those who are seeking to develop downtown Washington really want to give recognition to the fact that buildings which can be integrated into the plan would be preserved, even though they may require some modification. If modifications can be made economically, and if the owners are willing to do so within a reasonable time, and give prompt notice they are going to do so, what more can reasonably be asked?

It seems to me this is the least protection we should give a property owner. As the Senator from Oregon pointed out, if a property owner should feel that he was being "put upon" in a condemnation proceeding, he would go to court. The doors of the court would swing open.

I also point out that what happens after the doors swing open is very important. Who will have the burden of proof in a case like this? Under the bill, I do not see that there would be much recourse for an aggrieved property owner. What would he do? He would say, "I do not wish to be ousted from my property, for it is good property." I believe the court would have to find that there had been extreme abuse of discretion before it could give him any relief. I do not find very many condemnation cases which are decided on that ground.

If there were a guideline, such as I would establish, the aggrieved property owner, who did not think his property should be condemned, could go into court. Then what would happen, under the terms of my amendment? The Redevelopment Land Agency would have to show that the building was substandard. In that connection, the Agency would have to show that the building could not be economically improved or modified to meet the requirements, which it had reasonably established, for integration into the plan; or, if the building could be economically modified, the Agency would have to show that the owner refused to do so.

I do not think that is a very big burden of proof to put on an administrator who wishes to be fair.

I wish to point out that in our zeal for improvements for the public good we should never forget that Government exists primarily for the individual, and individual rights should be protected.

In the Washington Post for July 17, 1962, there was an editorial which I think merits our attention. The editorial was entitled "Policy for Adams-Morgan," which, although not a part of the downtown progress plan, is related to it.

> Wholesale demolition is a confession of failure—

The editorial states.

> Adams-Morgan will show us whether urban renewal can be used to preserve the healthy diversity that is, on a small scale, the reflection of the city itself.
>
> Adams-Morgan must succeed. It must be steered away from one dangerous error toward which it appears to be drifting. The easy way to improve a community is to eject the land uses, and the people, offensive to the majority's sense of aesthetics.

I do not think the amendment would hamper the bill. I think it would provide a minimum of safeguards, so that when the court doors swing open an aggrieved party would have some relief. If this amendment is made a part of the bill, I suggest that probably the court doors will not swing open, because the discretion of the administration will be sufficiently restricted so that abuses will not occur as they otherwise might.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, in answer to my distinguished colleague from Iowa I should like to make some further points.

Mr. President, the amendment offered by the very capable junior Senator from Iowa calls for new criteria in the use of urban renewal powers, which should not be adopted without considered attention and a public hearing.

The Senator from Iowa proposes to forbid condemnation without express findings that economical improvements could not integrate a building into a development plan. This is a reasonable suggestion on its face, which is already mirrored in the practice of urban renewal authorities. Let me repeat that the present policies of the Urban Renewal Administration require the local public agency to "fully justify the acquisition of individual parcels of basically sound property which involves high acquisition costs and might not be incompatible with land use proposals. Every possibility must be explored to develop an urban renewal plan which permits a maximum number of sound structures to remain in the area."

> HHFA will not concur in the acquisition for demolition of property that is:
>
> 1. Of such quality and potential use that its retention is compatible with the achievement of the urban renewal plan objectives for the project area.
>
> 2. Capable of being improved and successfully integrated into the project.

I have been quoting from a letter of July 15, 1963, addressed to the staff director of the Senate District Committee by Mr. William L. Slayton, the Urban Renewal Commissioner. This assurance as to the existing policy of the Urban Renewal Administration convinces me that there is no immediate danger of serious abuse in the acquisition of sound structures.

There is, however, Mr. President, a bare possibility of abuse. Consequently the proposal of the Senator from Iowa deserves consideration. But it need not be carried into effect without careful consultation with HHFA and other cognizant Government agencies and civic groups.

There is another danger in the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa which argues for fuller consideration of the proposal and its careful evaluation from the standpoint of legal practice and procedure. An owner may challenge an area plan on the ground that his building may be economically modified, while the local public agency argues that requisite improvements would not be economical. The owner could also challenge the entire plan while the courts tried to decide whether the integration requirements set by the local public agency for the integration of a specific building were reasonable or not. I am not sure the public interest requires the addition of these two points of contest in every urban renewal development.

Furthermore, the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act may not be an appropriate vehicle for suggesting changes in the Federal Housing Act itself, and I fear that amendment to this bill may be taken as an indication of congressional sentiment on broader questions of national urban renewal policy. If we are to make such changes, more time will be needed for consultation with the experts and to assess their practical effect.

As my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Oregon, pointed out, it seems to me that the proper course of action for the Senator from Iowa is to frame an amendment to the Federal Housing Act and present it to the Banking and Currency Committee, where it can be fully considered.

S. 628, Mr. President, does not provide for any innovations in urban renewal procedure. It merely applies the authority, created for parts of the District of Columbia given over to housing, to the portions zoned for commercial use. The bill makes no substantive or procedural changes. The need it meets is a District of Columbia need, without reference to broader questions of public policy in urban renewal. On these broader questions, I strongly urge more timely consideration. I recommend, therefore, that the amendment be rejected.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. **MILLER**. Mr. President, I have one last comment. I hope the Senator from Oregon will permit me to join him in such an amendment to the basic Housing Act, but I still think the amendment to this bill ought to be agreed to. Those downtown who will be affected under the terms of the bill will not be very impressed, if their property is being taken from them without a reasonable basis for going to a court for recourse, if hearings are being conducted on an amendment to some other bill.

I grant that the businessmen in downtown Washington should be given an opportunity to catch up with businessmen in other cities, but I suggest that there is another side to the coin. Property owners in downtown Washington who might be aggrieved ought to be protected. The mere fact that property owners are not being protected adequately in some other cities—and we know, from the General Accounting Office reports, that they have not been—does not mean that we should sit idly by and let the same thing happen in Washington.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. **McINTYRE**. Mr. President, I offer the technical amendment which I send to the desk, to change the date in the title of the bill; and I ask to have the amendment stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 4, strike out "1962" and insert in lieu thereof "1963."

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (S. 628) was read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Redevelopment Act Amendments of 1963".

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (D.C. Code, sec. 5-701) is amended to read as follows:

"FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS OF NECESSITY

"SEC. 2. It is hereby found and declared, as a matter of legislative determination that—

"(a) there exists in the District of Columbia residential and nonresidential slum areas and blighted areas which (1) contribute substantially to the spread of disease and crime, (2) impose severe public economic and social liabilities, and (3) impair, arrest, or prevent the sound growth, development, or redevelopment of the District of Columbia, thereby constituting serious and growing threats to the public health, safety, morals, and welfare of the inhabitants of the District of Columbia;

"(b) the elimination of such slum and blighted areas and the prevention of the creation, spread, or increase of such areas in the District of Columbia cannot be accomplished solely by regulatory processes in the exercise of the police power, and cannot be dealt with effectively through the normal operations of private enterprise or without the aids provided for herein;

"(c) in order to eliminate such areas, and to eliminate or prevent the occurrence of the conditions which create or contribute to the spread or increase of such areas, it is essential that the development or redevelopment of any such area shall be planned as an entirety, and that, to protect and promote the public health, safety, morals, and welfare, and to facilitate the sound growth, development, and redevelopment of the District of Columbia, the comprehensive plan for the National Capital, prepared by the National Capital Planning Commission, shall serve as the general framework and guide within which the development or redevelopment plans for such areas and for projects to be undertaken in such areas are to be reviewed and evaluated;

"(d) it is the public policy of the United States to promote and protect the public health, safety, morals, and welfare of the inhabitants of the District of Columbia, and the sound growth, development, and redevelopment of the District of Columbia, through the elimination of such slum and blighted areas as rapidly as feasible, including the elimination and prevention of buildings for human habitation in alleys, and prevention of the creation, spread, or increase of such areas, by the employment of the powers granted by this Act, for the accomplishment of such public purpose;

"(e) the acquisition and the assembly of real property and the leasing and sale thereof for redevelopment pursuant to a project area redevelopment plan, all as provided in this Act, is hereby declared to be a public use;

"(f) the powers conferred by this Act are for public uses and purposes for which public powers may be employed, public funds may be expended, and the power of eminent domain and the police power may be exercised, and the enactment of such provisions is necessary in the public interest."

SEC. 3. Section 3 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 5-702) is amended (1) by striking out "an area" in subsection (j) which defines "project area" and inserting in lieu thereof "a slum area or blighted area"; and (2) by amending subsection (r) to read as follows:

"(r) 'Slum area' or 'blighted area' is a residential or nonresidential area, or combination thereof, in which there exists one or a combination of factors of such extent or nature as to contribute substantially to the spread of disease or crime, impose severe public economic or social liabilities, or impair, arrest, or prevent the sound growth, development, or redevelopment of the District of Columbia, and as to result in a serious and growing threat to the public health, safety, morals, or welfare, which factors may include the following: Buildings which are deteriorating, dilapidated, obsolete, overcrowded, lacking light or adequate ventilation, inadequately provided with sanitary facilities, or in which there exist conditions endangering life or property by fire or other causes; and improved or unimproved land as to which there appears to be no reasonable prospect, without the aids herein provided, of development or redevelopment in the foreseeable future."

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. **McINTYRE**. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK AND YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. Mr. President, the Senate will not be in session tomorrow, July 17. That day in 1946, 17 years ago, Draja Mikhailovitch, of Yugoslavia, was put to death by the Yugoslav Communists. He was tried on July 16, 1946, by a people's court, summarily and without compliance with what we consider proper procedure in criminal cases. He was found guilty and ordered shot.

A grave mistake was made by our country back in 1946 when we abandoned Mikhailovitch and embraced Tito. Mikhailovitch was the original guerrilla fighter after World War II. He gathered his followers in the mountains and kept harassing the Nazis and the Fascists.

His spirit is best described by a statement which he made. It was suggested that he capitulate, and his answer was:

> I do not know what capitulation is. I have served in the army, I have served my Government, and I contemplate continuing to do so.

Draja Mikhailovitch is no more in life, but his spirit is, in the valleys and mountains of Yugoslavia, still speaking to those citizens. His spirit will not be destroyed. It will continue to live, and eventually it will marshal around it the voices and the demands of Yugoslavians for freedom.

The real crime of which Mikhailovitch is accused is that in the minds of 80 percent of the Yugoslav population he became, and remains, the symbol of the simple, sturdy Yugoslav peasant's resistance to tyranny, foreign and domestic.

What Mikhailovitch was is best depicted by an interpretation of a statement made by Hitler. This is what Hitler said:

> Having in view the danger contained in Mikhailovitch's movement, I have already, in anticipation of all eventualities, issued orders for the destruction of all his supporters on the territory occupied by my troops.

Hitler further said:

> The liquidation of Mikhailovitch's movement at the present time will no longer be an easy matter, because of the forces he has at his disposal.

Mikhailovitch was a thorn in Hitler's side. He was a thorn in the side of Mussolini. But, for expediency purposes, Mikhailovitch was abandoned. Now we are paying the price, dearly, for what was done to him.

This week is Captive Nations Week. We are supposedly celebrating it in the United States. From my standpoint, Captive Nations Week this year ought to be labeled as the week or year of tragedy for the captive nations. Hungary's patriots have been abandoned. With the abandonment of the cause of the Hungarian people, we have stated to the other nations in middle and eastern Europe, "You are doomed to domination by the Communist Government lying to your east."

Their hopes are dim. The people in the captive nations do not know what their ultimate position will be. Nevertheless, as a Member of this Congress, and as a citizen of the United States, it is my hope that those nations—13 of them—whose liberties have been taken away will eventually see the day when freedom will be restored to them and they will be permitted to have their independent sovereign governments.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, the pending business at the conclusion of the morning business on Thursday next will be Calendar No. 224, H.R. 2513, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes.

That will be followed by Calendar No. 312, S. 627, a bill to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects, and for other purposes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the concurrence and the assent of the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], who holds the floor, I should like to bring up three measures which I understand are not objected to. I ask unanimous consent that, in their consideration, I may be allowed to insert at the appropriate points excerpts from reports and other information pertaining to those bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S. SHARE OF EXPENSES OF INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SUPERVISION AND CONTROL IN LAOS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 332, Senate bill 1627.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Lausche in the chair). The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 1627) to enable the United States to contribute its share of the expenses of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos as provided in article 18 of the protocol to the declaration on the neutrality of Laos.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State such sums as may be necessary from time to time for the payment by the United States of its share of the costs of the operations of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos as provided in article 18 of the protocol to the declaration on the neutrality of Laos dated July 23, 1962.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain excerpts from the report (No. 357) in explanation of the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MAIN PURPOSE

S. 1627 authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary from time to time for the payment by the United States of its share of the costs of the operations of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos (ICC) as provided in article 18 of the protocol to the declaration on the neutrality of Laos dated July 23, 1962. This protocol provides that the United States contribute 17.6 percent of this cost. The budget of the ICC has not finally been agreed upon, but the estimated figure is $3,700,000 of which 17.6 percent would amount to approximately $650,000.

BACKGROUND

The ICC was first established by the 1954 Geneva agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Laos. Consisting of representatives of Canada, Poland, and India, the ICC existed until 1958 when, at the request of the Lao Government, it adjourned and departed from Laos.

By 1961, however, the situation in Laos had deteriorated so seriously that the British and Soviet cochairmen of the 1954 Geneva Conference called for a cease-fire in Laos, reconvened the ICC to supervise and control the cease fire, and convened the 14-Nation Conference at Geneva for the settlement of the Laotian question in May 1961. The reconvened ICC operated in Laos under its previous terms of reference throughout the Geneva Conference which concluded with the agreement of July 23, 1962.

The agreement signed by the 14 nations (Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Communist China, North Vietnam, France, India, Laos, Poland, South Vietnam, Thailand, the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, and the United States) consists of a declaration on the neutrality of Laos and a protocol to that declaration. The declaration incorporated the Laotian statement of neutrality and pledged the signatories not to introduce foreign troops into Laos or use Laotian territory for interference in the internal affairs of other countries. It also provided that in the event of a violation of the "sovereignty, independence, neutrality, unity, or territorial integrity of the kingdom of Laos," the signatories would consult with the Laotian Government and among themselves on measures to insure the observance of the principles of the declaration. The protocol provides for the withdrawal of all foreign regular and irregular troops, foreign paramilitary formations and foreign military personnel, for the prohibition of the introduction into Laos of armaments, munitions, and war material and for the functions of the International Control Commission.

According to the protocol, the principal tasks of the ICC are: (1) to supervise and control the withdrawal of foreign military personnel from Laos; (2) to supervise and control the cease-fire in Laos; (3) to investigate cases of illegal introduction of foreign military personnel into Laos; (4) to assist the Government of Laos in cases of illegal introduction of armaments into Laos; and (5) to investigate other possible violations of the provisions of the protocol and the agreement.

According to the Department of State, under these less restrictive terms of reference the ICC has "played an increasingly important role in thwarting Communist objectives in Laos." A review of developments in Laos is not within the scope of this report. These have been discussed by the committee in executive session and were considered also at the hearing on June 25 which is printed in the appendix.

One important change in the provisions governing the ICC's operations is in the voting procedures, which now allow the Commission to reach decisions on procedural questions and those relating to the initiation and carrying out of investigations by majority vote. Unanimity, however, is still required on questions relating to violations, conclusions on major questions sent to the cochairmen and all recommendations of the Commission.

The Geneva agreement also provides that at the end of 3 years, or earlier at the Laotian Government's request, the cochairmen are to present a report to the signatories, containing recommendations on the question of termination of the ICC. Since the life of the ICC is thus indefinite, S. 1627 represents a permanent authorization of appropriations.

FINANCIAL PROVISIONS

The expenses of the ICC during the period up to the July 23, 1962, agreement, amounting to about $2,250,000, are being shared equally by the five major countries to the agreement. That is $450,000 each for France, the United States, the United Kingdom, the U.S.S.R., and the Chinese Communists. These payments have all been made, except by the Chinese Communists who are $150,000 in arrears.

As of July 23, 1962, the costs of operations of the ICC are governed by article 18 of the protocol which reads as follows:

"Article 18

"The costs of the operations of the Commission shall be borne by the members of the Conference in accordance with the provisions of this article.

"(a) The Governments of Canada, India, and Poland shall pay the personal salaries and allowances of their nationals who are members of their delegations to the Commission and its subsidiary organs.

"(b) The primary responsibility for the provision of accommodation for the Commission and its subsidiary organs shall rest with the Royal Government of Laos, which shall also provide such other local services as may be appropriate. The Commission shall charge to the fund referred to in subparagraph (c) below any local expenses not borne by the Royal Government of Laos.

"(c) All other capital or running expenses incurred by the Commission in the exercise of its functions shall be met from a Fund to which all members of the Conference shall contribute in the following proportions:

"The Governments of the People's Republic of China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America shall contribute 17.6 percent each.

"The Governments of Burma, Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Laos, the Republic of Vietnam, and Thailand shall contribute 1.5 percent each.

"The Governments of Canada, India, and Poland as members of the Commission shall contribute 1 percent each."

The budget for the period July 23, 1962, to June 30, 1963, is still under discussion. The first budget, drawn up by the Indian representative, as Chairman of the Commission, estimated the costs at $8 million. After a review in the field, the British representative as cochairman of the Geneva Conference published a new budget setting the figure at $3,780,000. This figure has not yet been accepted by the Soviet Union, the other conference cochairman, who is arguing for a further reduction. However, of this tentative amount, $1,600,000 has already been paid in, representing full payments by the United States and the United Kingdom, partial payments of $150,000 by the French and the Soviets, and no payments by the others. The Department of State stressed, in this connection, that since the budget for this period has not been finally agreed upon, no formal requests for payment have been made to the 14 signatory nations. In effect, therefore, no one is in arrears for this period and the $1,600,000 already paid in constitutes a prepayment by the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and the Soviet Union. The sums paid or advanced by the United States to date have been funded from the Department of State's "International conferences contingencies" appropriation.

S. 1627 concerns the future financial obligations of the United States under the protocol. The ICC's budget for fiscal year 1964 is estimated to be in the neighborhood of the tenative fiscal year 1963 budget; namely, about $3,700,000. The U.S. 17.6-percent share of this amounts to approximately $650,000. Generally, the Committee on Foreign Relations has been unsympathetic to requests for permanent authorization of appropriations. In view of the indefinite duration of the ICC and the 17.6-percent ceiling on U.S. contributions clearly specified in the protocol itself, however, the committee approved the request embodied in S. 1627.

COMMITTEE ACTION AND RECOMMENDATION

S. 1627 was introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT on May 28 at the request of the Secretary of State contained in the letter to the Vice President, dated May 20, 1963. This letter is printed in appendix I.

On June 25, the committee, in a public session, heard favorable testimony from Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland and Assistant Secretary of State Roger Hilsman. This hearing is printed as appendix II.

On June 27, the committee discussed the bill further in executive session and ordered it reported favorably to the Senate, without amendments.

Although the committee feels that the Geneva agreement is not perfect, nor is the situation in Laos satisfactory, the fact remains that the United States has undertaken an international obligation as a signatory of the agreement to share in the expenses of the ICC. The fact also remains that it is in the U.S. national interest to have the ICC operate in Laos. For these reasons, the committee recommends that the Senate pass S. 1627.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 333, S. 1512.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1512) to authorize one additional Assistant Secretary of State, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments on page 2, line 2, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to insert "personal"; in line 3, after the word "of", where it appears the second time, to insert "nonpolitical"; in line 4, after the word "government", to strike out the quotation marks, the period, and the semicolon and insert "and provided further that the Secretary shall not grant such authorization within two years of the officer's retirement, and that the Secretary shall report each such authorization to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives."; and after line 9, to strike out:

SEC. 3. The first section of the Act of July 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 371), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) The benefits provided in subsection (a) of this section are hereby extended to not to exceed three participants who retire and become entitled to receive an annuity from the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund subsequent to June 30, 1962, and prior to June 30, 1963, whenever the Secretary of State determines it to be in the public interest to extend said benefits to any such participant."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1 of the Act of May 26, 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 151a), is amended by striking out "eleven" and inserting in lieu thereof "twelve".

(b) Section 106(a)(17) of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 738) is amended by striking out "(11)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(12)".

SEC. 2. Section 1002 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 804), is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting a colon and the following: "*Provided,* That a retired officer of the Service may, with the personal authorization of the Secretary, accept an offer of non-political employment made by a foreign government and provided further the the Secretary shall not grant such authorization within two years of the officer's retirement, and that the Secretary shall report each such authorization to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point certain extracts from the report (No. 358) in explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF BILL

The purpose of S. 1512 as reported by the committee is (1) to authorize one additional Assistant Secretary of State and (2) to authorize retired Foreign Service officers, under closely restricted conditions, to accept employment from foreign governments.

COMMITTEE ACTION

S. 1512 was introduced by Senator FULBRIGHT (by request) on May 13, 1963. On June 25, the Committee on Foreign Relations received testimony in public session in support of the bill from Mr. William J. Crockett, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration. The committee considered the bill in executive session on June 27 and agreed to report it favorably, with amendments, to the Senate.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

Section 1 of S. 1512 would authorize, subject to Senate confirmation, the appointment of one additional Assistant Secretary of State. This position would be filled by the Director of the Bureau of Intelligence and Research, whose functions, the committee believes, are as important as those of the geographic and functional bureaus in the Department of State which are currently headed by Assistant Secretaries of State. The creation of this position does not involve any additional cost to the U.S. Government.

Section 2 of the bill would authorize retired Foreign Service officers to accept, with the personal authorization in each case of the Secretary of State, nonpolitical employment with foreign governments. Under article I, section 9, of the Constitution, persons holding offices of profit or trust for the United States may not accept any present, emolument, office, or title from any government without the consent of Congress. The Department of State believes that retired Foreign Service officers, since they may be recalled to duty, continue to hold an office of trust and thus come under this restriction.

The pending legislation is designed primarily to enable newly independent nations, if they so desire, to employ retired Foreign Service officers in order to obtain their advice and counsel in setting up foreign service systems of their own and becoming familiar with international practices and protocol. The committee thinks such employment would be beneficial to the newly independent nations. The committee is of the opinion, however, that in no case should this authority be used to permit a retired Foreign Service officer to engage in political activities on behalf of a foreign government. Moreover, the committee felt that because of the type of employment contemplated, each case should be reviewed at the highest level in the Department of State to be sure that it is not inconsistent with the national interest. Accordingly, the committee tightened the provisions of section 2 of S. 1512 to provide that retired Foreign Service officers could accept only nonpolitical employment with a foreign government and that such employment must have the personal approval of the Secretary of State.

In addition, the committee amended section 2 of the bill to provide "that the Secretary shall not grant such authorization within two years of the officer's retirement, and that the Secretary shall report each such authorization to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives."

This is designed to avoid conflict-of-interest situations which the committee believes is desirable. The reporting requirement will insure that the appropriate committees in the Congress are informed in each case in which the Secretary of State approves a retired Foreign Service officer's employment with a foreign government.

As originally drafted by the Department of State, section 3 of S. 1512 would have authorized increased retirement benefits to three Foreign Service officers had they retired prior to June 20, 1963. However, because of some confusion with respect to this date, the committee agreed to delete section 3 of the bill with the understanding that the Department might submit separate legislation on the subject at a later date.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE WITH RESPECT TO AWARD OF CERTAIN MEDALS AND THE MEDAL OF HONOR ROLL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 334, H.R. 2998.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2998) to amend titles 10, 14, and 38, United States Code, with respect to the award of certain medals and the Medal of Honor Roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 359) explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would expand authority for award of the Medal of Honor, the Distinguished Service Cross, the Navy Cross, the Air Force Cross, and the Silver Star to permit award of these medals for heroism and gallantry that occur in cold war situations.

EXPLANATION

Under laws now in effect combat decorations generally may be awarded to persons who distinguish themselves in actual conflict with, or military operations against, an armed enemy of the United States. Consequently members of our Armed Forces who perform gallantly while serving in an advisory capacity with, or while assisting in the operation of, friendly foreign forces engaged in armed conflict to which the United States is not formally a party may not be awarded the decorations that are the subject of this bill.

More than 11,000 members of the Armed Forces of the United States are making outstanding contributions in assisting the Republic of Vietnam in its war against Communist aggression and infiltration. By Executive order, the award of the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star Medal have been authorized in appropriate cases for U.S. personnel engaged in Vietnam. There have been instances in which higher awards would have been made if there had been authority to award them.

The bill would continue authority for the award of these medals for distinguished service while engaged in action against an enemy of the United States. In addition, it would permit award of appropriate medals for persons whose heroism or gallantry occurs: (1) In military operations involving conflict with an opposing foreign force; or (2) while serving with friendly foreign forces engaged in an armed conflict against opposing armed forces in which the United States is not a belligerent party.

Another result of the bill would be to conform the criteria for awarding a Medal of Honor to a member of the Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard to that applicable to members of the other Armed Forces. The Medal of Honor may now be awarded to a member of the naval service or to a member of the Coast Guard not only for distinguished service in actual conflict with an armed enemy of the United States, but to a member who distinguishes himself "in the line of his profession." After enactment of this bill the criteria for the award of the Medal of Honor and the other medals that are the subject of this bill would be the same for all the Armed Forces.

Sections 560, 561, and 562 of title 38, United States Code, provide for a Medal of Honor Roll in the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, on which is recorded the names of the recipients of the Medal of Honor who have attained the age of 50 years. Persons whose name is on the Medal of Honor Roll may apply for and be awarded a pension of $100 monthly. Under statutory criteria for award of the Medal of Honor now in effect, members of the Coast Guard would have had to receive their medal while the Coast Guard was serving as a part of the Navy. Hence, there is now no Coast Guard Medal of Honor Roll. Under the expanded criteria this bill would establish that a member of the Coast Guard might receive a Medal of Honor for actions performed while the Coast Guard is not a part of the Navy but is still in the Department of the Treasury; consequently, the bill provides for a Coast Guard Medal of Honor Roll within the Department of the Treasury and eligibility of Coast Guard members for the same recognition and pension that is available to members of the other Armed Forces who may receive this medal for acts performed in cold war conditions.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

The committee has approved the bill in recognition that members of our Armed Forces now in locations such as Vietnam are often exposed to the same dangers and hazards as if the United States were formally involved in an action against an enemy. In these circumstances it is unreasonable to deny award of medals that are appropriate for the heroic and gallant acts performed by members of our Armed Forces.

This legislation is general in character. The committee considers that it is not intended as a vehicle for the award of a medal to any specific person, but that it merely permits continuation of the current procedures for evaluating acts of heroism under slightly expanded general criteria.

COST

The Department of Defense estimates that enactment of this bill will result in no significant increase in expenditures by the Department.

REQUIREMENTS FOR ARTICLES IMPORTED IN CONTAINERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 224, H.R. 2513; that it be laid down and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2513) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be no action on the bill today.

I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, as I have done many times, for his unfailing courtesy.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is always a pleasure to oblige the distinguished majority leader.

TONGUE POINT NAVAL FACILITY, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday I discussed at some length a highly desirable program which I have been urging upon the administration for some months; namely, that it find a Federal use for the Tongue Point facility, which it abandoned at Astoria, Oreg., several years ago. As a result of that abandonment, the administration must assume its full share of responsibility for the fact that Astoria, Oreg., is one of the most depressed economic municipal areas in the country. I wish to add to my comments of yesterday, before asking unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial from my State in support of my position, that the White House has the discretionary authority to put to Federal use the Tongue Point facility.

I am not impressed by reports or information to the effect that the White House wants to do something about it, but is experiencing difficulty in trying to find a use for the facility, because it is somewhat limited in discretion. If that should be the position of the White House—and I am sure it cannot be, in view of all the assurances I have had on this subject over the months, emanating not only from the aids of the President, but from the President himself—the White House had better seek the advice of counsel with regard to its discretionary authority.

I repeat that all that is needed is a directive that the waste at Tongue Point must be stopped and that a Federal use of those facilities be put into effect without further delay.

As I mentioned yesterday, the Portland Oregonian, has been somewhat critical of me because I have not fallen in line with various proposals to give away Tongue Point for a song. Its editorial to that effect was answered recently by the Register-Guard, of my hometown of Eugene. The Eugene Register-Guard in its editorial entitled "Worth the Gambit" supports my general position on this matter.

I appreciate it very much, because I suppose the Eugene Register-Guard must maintain a blood bank of my blood, which it has drawn over the years with its critical pen as it dipped that pen into my blood stream from time to time. It must have quite a blood bank of my blood. I am deeply moved; and I would be less than appreciative if I did not say thanks to the Eugene Register-Guard.

I have not looked over the list of editorial writers of the Register-Guard. Perhaps it has a new one. However, new or old, I appreciate very much the long-delayed support which I am now receiving from the Eugene Register-Guard, at least on one subject. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. I hope the editorial will be called to the attention of the President.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORTH THE GAMBIT

One of Portland's three daily newspapers, the Oregonian, seems to keep a special ax at hand to aim at the political neck of Senator WAYNE MORSE, sometimes for good reasons, but too often for highly questionable ones.

A case in point is an Oregonian accusation that the Senator's efforts to encourage the highest and best use of now-abandoned Tongue Point naval station "could well cost the taxpayers thousands of dollars."

Although the Government has some $14 to $15 million invested in this facility, the Oregonian is critical because MORSE recently blocked its sale to the city of Astoria for some $920,000. An effort to dispose of the Tongue Point properties at auction last week brought forth no bids for the whole: housing facilities, administrative buildings, training quarters, power system, etc. And separate bids for various parts of the package totaled only $430,000. No bids were received on many separately wrapped Tongue Point components.

This, the Oregonian concludes, is evidence that Senator MORSE erred, and badly, when he hollered "steal" because of the city of Astoria's effort to buy—and transfer to private owners—all of the Tongue Point properties.

In our view, Senator MORSE would not have served the public interest had he not tried, and were he not continuing to try, to interest some Federal agency in taking over and making full use of Tongue Point. At worst, it appears, the Senator's gambit will cost the taxpayers less than half a million dollars. If he does succeed in getting Tongue Point back in large-scale operation as a Peace Corps training center or some other important component of Federal operations for which new facilities might otherwise have to be built, he will have saved U.S. taxpayers a number of millions. And, he will have benefited Oregon by promoting additional economic returns on taxes paid from this State to the Federal treasury. In this last regard, the Oregonian, itself, has at times been critical of the disproportionately meager expenditures Uncle Sam makes within this State.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for some time I have been discussing the foreign aid bill in a series of almost daily speeches. I have been pointing out that the foreign aid bill should be analyzed item by item, money request by money request, and country by country. In respect to the latter type of analysis, I believe the record of each country which it is proposed to make a large beneficiary under the new foreign aid bill should be carefully studied by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. We should satisfy ourselves that the record of these countries justifies the aid the administration proposes to them.

In some of my speeches I have already referred to that group of nations receiving large sums of aid for the reason of their location on the perimeter of the Communist bloc. I refer to such countries as Pakistan, Taiwan, and Korea.

Today I wish to make some further comments on Turkey.

Earlier in my comments on the foreign aid bill, I alluded to the shortcomings and fallacies of our aid program in Turkey.

Those comments, however, were general and were directed to the purposes of our aid program, rather than to its specific details.

Today, I want to raise more specific questions, based on a memorandum furnished me by one American from the academic community who has studied our program there. He is Professor Alex N. Dragnich of Vanderbilt University. His memorandum outlines his own findings and observations of our aid to Turkey.

First, the question deserves to be asked of whether Turkey is able to absorb the amount of aid we have been extending. It is said that our AID Administrators in Turkey admit that of all AID projects there, only 10 percent are the result of initiative coming from the Turks.

We have been forcing aid on them, as we have been doing in many parts of the world. It ought to stop. It should have been stopped years ago.

In my judgment it must be stopped this year. I repeat, as I have said to my colleagues in the Senate in other speeches on the foreign aid bill, that I believe they will find out in the not too distant future that the American taxpayer will demand that it be stopped.

At long last, thank goodness, this has become a political issue. It is now understood by the American taxpayer; and the politicians will have to render an accounting in the precincts of America, starting now. I say to the people of America, "If the politicians are not willing to vote to cut the bill drastically, keep them at home, for, in my judgment, they do not deserve to represent you in Congress."

The allegation of Professor Dragnich that we are really imposing much aid on Turkey is serious. I should like to know what our officials in charge of the AID program and in the State Department have to say about it. If Professor Dragnich is wrong, I say now to Mr. Bell, head of AID, and Mr. Rusk, Secretary of State, "Give me a memorandum, and I will place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because I will always insist that both sides of an issue be spread on the RECORD." If the State Department and Mr. Bell have any answers to the allegations of Professor Dragnich, I invite them, from the floor of the Senate this afternoon, to give me forthwith a memorandum in answer to the allegations. I will see to it that they receive the same position of emphasis on the floor of the Senate that I am this afternoon giving to the criticisms of Professor Dragnich, with respect to our foreign aid program for Turkey.

But I am satisfied that this condition is widespread enough and extensive enough, even if it does not always reach the proportion of 90 percent of the initiative coming from us, to justify the amendment I suggested to the Senate yesterday, and which I shall press upon the Committee on Foreign Relations in the writeup of the bill.

My proposal would be to terminate all existing aid programs by June 30, 1965, and provide that all aid extended thereafter could only be at the request of the recipient. Other conditions would also be spelled out. But I think it is time we put an end to the policy of asking foreign countries what kind and how much aid they would be interested in having from us.

A second problem in Turkey, and it is certainly related to the first, is the apparent serious disadvantage of private industry in that country. It is my understanding that most industrial endeavors there are state-owned and operated. Many of their operations are very uneconomic, with costs of production far out of line and with top-heavy administrative bureaucracies.

Yet I am told that we lend 63 percent of the local currency we take in as the result of our aid to the Turkish Government at 4 percent interest and that in the future we will lend it at three-fourths of 1 percent. I am also told that local currencies are lent to U.S. businessmen in Turkey at 7 percent interest. If this differential is a fact, we are perpetuating ourselves the inefficiencies of these state enterprises.

A third allegation about aid in Turkey is that it suffers from inflated costs and political inspiration for many of the projects.

Do not forget that Professor Dragnich is an American professor who was sent to Turkey to teach, on a leave-of-absence arrangement, and that he has returned to this country. He is entitled to the presumption of objectivity until there is a successful rebuttal of this allegation.

In the memorandum to which I have referred, he indicates that construction contracts often go to the highest, rather than to the lowest bidder, and that payoffs and inflated profits are added all along the line. I am also informed that there is little direct inspection of projects by U.S. officials. He quotes one American official in Turkey as saying that the U.S. personnel in Turkey, both civilian and military, are subject to the whims of their Turkish counterparts, and if they are critical of any part of the aid operation, if they ask too many questions, or if they fail to support the expenditure of U.S. dollars, they will be recalled. That leaves the implication that they were not doing a good job. It is very unfair and unjust to them.

Fourth, it would appear that despite our heavy financial and military aid to Turkey and participation in two alliances with her, Turkey finds it more advantageous to take advantage of the United States than to cooperate with us. For example, I understand that despite a NATO agreement to the contrary, our defense facilities in Turkey are taxed. The estimate is offered that we have paid about $800,000 in taxes on gasoline and utilities used by American NATO forces in Turkey.

I thought—or am I wrong, Mr. President—that what we sent to Turkey was to help to defend Turkey and defend freedom under the NATO alliance.

It is also pointed out in the memorandum that the Turks charge $9 for each nonimmigrant visa, while we charge the Turks nothing.

I have previously said that there is too little reciprocity in American foreign policy vis-a-vis the United States and NATO. If anyone thinks that I was mistaken—and this is an argument I have made on the floor of the Senate for years—I shall be very much interested in having an explanation of the failure of France, Belgium, Portugal, and the Low Countries, Great Britain, and now, Turkey, to extend reciprocity to the United States on one economic matter after another, and also in connection with other matters.

A more serious allegation is that we are asked to pay customs on the commodities brought into Turkey under the AID program. Specifically, this memorandum quotes a report that the contractor, World Services of Pittsburgh, for a steel plant near the Black Sea, has had to pay customs duties on the materials and machinery brought in to build the plant. This would amount to paying taxes on our own aid.

Of course, it is completely unjust, but it warrants the kind of examination of our aid program to Turkey for which the senior Senator from Oregon is asking. In other instances in Turkey, we have apparently refused aid when attempts were made to collect customs duties. That ought to be our standard policy. If any country in the world tries to impose upon us customs duties on mutual defense facilities and aid goods, we not only should not pay the customs duties, but we should get out. All we are doing, I say to the administration, is putting our hands into the pockets of the American taxpayers and cheating them.

The time has come to "lay it on the line" to the countries receiving foreign aid. The 365-day Christmas period is over. Uncle Sam no longer should play the part of Santa Claus, but should protect the American taxpayer in the AID program. The American taxpayer is not being protected, in section after section and item after item. That is why I shall fight the AID program to a finish. I shall not support this kind of AID program. The administration should proceed, without further delay, to rewrite the AID program, for the hearings that have already been held on the program show, in my judgment, that it is in need of amendment. Such amendments ought to come from the administration, and quickly. I want to support my administration. It should put Senators in a position where they can support it. I am not the only Democrat who is criticizing the aid program—although I am the only one who is criticizing it so much on the floor of the Senate. But the spokesmen for the administration should go into the cloakrooms and sit with us around the dinner tables when this subject is discussed. They would find that the aid bill needs to be redrafted. Senators should do so now, rather than walk into the Donnybrook into which they will walk when debate on the aid bill begins on the floor of the Senate, and with which they will be faced from platforms from coast to coast in the weeks ahead. The American taxpayers are mad—through and through—about this aid bill; and they want it revised, reformed, and ventilated, and they want some economy written into it. They think the time has come to say to the beneficiaries under the aid program, "What are you willing to pay now, in defense of your own freedom?" After all, a good many of them are better able to pay for the defense of their own freedom than the United States is; and this aid bill should be cut, not by the inadequate amount suggested by a House committee, but by a minimum of 25 percent, which means more than $1 billion. It would be a better aid bill, and would do a better job of foreign aid around the world if more than $1 billion were taken out of it. In my judgment, such action would strengthen our prestige and the cause of freedom around the world.

In some instances, apparently, we have refused to pay the aid when attempts to collect customs duties were made. I know of no case in which an exception could be justified. But the memorandum I have received indicates that on some occasions we have made such payments to Turkey.

In his conclusion drawn from the body of his memorandum, Professor Dragnich quotes a Turkish author, Mahumt Makal, as saying that the Turkish peasants believe that only members of the government and the parliament benefit from U.S. aid.

It is my own conclusion from our aid program in Turkey that we have promoted only the power of the military element in Turkey to seize control of the country. I see little improvement in the economic or social condition of the Turkish people. There is evidence that the military establishment in Turkey is playing a more and more active role in ruling the country.

Certainly Turkey is one of the prime examples of a nation into which billions of our dollars have been poured on the justification that because she lies on the perimeter of the Communist bloc, we must spend unlimited amounts of money to support her. Turkey is also a prime example of that fallacy of that kind of expenditure. We have the least to show for the money we put into the countries on the perimeter. In nearly every case, the governments we are supporting are undemocratic; often they lack the support of their own people; they are not much interested in improving the lot of their people, so long as the United States supports the status quo; and I suspect that if any real pressure is put on them by their Communist neighbors, they will quickly collapse unless they are defended directly and on the spot by American military forces.

A defense which commonly is made of this kind of aid is that in the age of the power struggle with the Communist countries, we must play the game with whatever tools we have; that money is one of the tools we can use to gain the ends of American foreign policy; that these ends are not necessarily the improvement of economic conditions in other nations or their progress toward political freedom; but that our purpose is only the frustration of Communist designs.

Mr. President, the big trouble with this defense is that money spent in this way still does not do the job. If I thought our foreign aid program in these perimeter areas would relieve the United States of having to put its own forces into their defense, I would agree that there is much to be said for it. But I think the evidence is to the contrary. That is why I think it is time for some real conditions along the lines of the proposal I made yesterday on the Senate floor to be put into our aid program in all parts of the world.

Secretary Rusk, Mr. Bell, of AID, and Mr. McNamara, of the Pentagon, made an exceedingly weak case for any such amounts of aid to Turkey as those recommended to us, in view of the allegations such as those I have brought out this afternoon and other criticisms of our aid policy in Turkey, about which I have spoken before.

NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have prepared a speech on the National Cultural Center, but I shall not deliver it today. Copies of the speech have been sent to the Press Gallery; but I ask that they be held until the next session of the Senate, for I do not care to deliver the speech at so late an hour.

In the speech I have set forth my views in regard to the need for a National Cultural Center in Washington, D.C. I shall ask the leadership of the Senate to make it possible for me to deliver this speech at an early hour at the next session of the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

WHY BLAME THE REPUBLICANS?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an editorial from the Portsmouth Ohio Times of July 6 entitled "Always Blame the Republicans." Many Republicans in the Senate have fought assiduously and with as great determination and belief in civil rights as anyone else. Yet it seems that the attempt is once more being made to place the burden of proposed civil rights legislation upon the Republicans, despite the fact that the Republicans in the Senate are outnumbered by Democrats 2 to 1. The article states—

> There are 67 Democratic Senators and 33 Republican Senators. It takes 67 votes to break a filibuster. Writing off the 2 dozen Southern Democrats, needed votes for cloture will have to come from the party of Lincoln. But the outlook is not too encouraging for the necessary GOP votes.

What would be wrong about demanding that for once the 67 Democratic votes line up for cloture and line up for civil rights? The burden should not be placed upon the Republican Party, which is the minority party. But despite the fact that we are outnumbered 2 to 1, it is a fact that the burden again is, by editorial, by recrimination, by speeches, attempted to be placed on the back of the Republican Party. When the time comes and the chips are down, I assure the Senate and the United States that the Republicans will do our share and more, as we always have, to assure that there are no second-class citizens in any respect either as to accommodations, courts, or liberties in our country. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ALWAYS BLAME THE REPUBLICANS

When Chicago Mayor Richard J. Daley was jeered off the platform at a rally of National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in Chicago on Independence Day, he blamed Republicans.

It was the kind of comment that could be expected from the boss of one of the country's key Democratic bastions. And unfortunately it was the kind of comment that can be expected from many quarters as the Democratic Party faces its moment of truth on the problem of Negro rights.

The Ohio AFL–CIO house organ, "News and Views," produced this twist of logic on the same subject:

"There are 67 Democratic Senators and 33 Republican Senators. It takes 67 votes to break a filibuster. Writing off the two dozen Southern Democrats, the needed votes for cloture will have to come from the party of Lincoln. But the outlook is not too encouraging for the necessary GOP votes."

What would be wrong about demanding that the 67 Democratic votes should line up to break a filibuster?

This is a Democratic showdown. Northern Democrats are hoping to win even stronger Negro support than they have had in the past by going for Negro rights. They will give no credit to Republicans for helping them, nor is there any reason to think Negro voters have any plans to help Republicans either.

Yet, Southern Democrats refuse to let Negroes have full citizenship. Southern Democrats keep the Democratic party in power. Southern Democrats will block civil rights legislation. They are irreconcilable.

Can Republicans be blamed for not wanting to help the Democratic Party continue its Jekyll-Hyde existence in national politics? This is the long-awaited moment of truth for Democratic leaders who have had two faces—one for the North, another for the South.

CUBAN LIBERATION

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on June 17, and more recently, in response to the constant demands of the administration that the Republicans offer a concrete proposal with respect to Cuba, we have made suggestions. The questions which we constantly hear are as follows: What would they do? What is their plan? I offered a plan to the administration and have received no reply from it, except one by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], who, I must say, avoided the questions very nicely and did not come to grips with the issues I presented. I answered that statement.

In the Pueblo Chieftain and the Pueblo Star Journal of Pueblo, Colo., on Thursday, June 20, Mr. Frank S. Hoag in an editorial discussed the subject very logically and clearly. The title of the editorial is "Senator Allott's Cuban Liberation Policy Deserves Studied Attention." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SENATOR ALLOTT'S CUBAN LIBERATION POLICY DESERVES STUDIED ATTENTION

Senator Gordon Allott, of Colorado, proposed to the Senate Monday that the United States make the Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba available as the site for the creation and recognition of a free Cuban government. It would exist only until such time as the Cuban people in a general election would be able to elect their own officers and legislators.

After reviewing the developments of the last 2 years during which time the United States lost its hold and its influence in Cuba by the fiasco at the Bay of Pigs and also by failing to follow through last October on getting the Communists, their specialists and military equipment completely out of Cuba, Senator Allott concludes that the Congress should initiate consideration of what to do about Cuba in the absence of executive leadership.

Senator Allott quotes the words of the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee's Interim Report on Cuban Military Buildup in which it is stated that Cuba is "an advance Soviet base for subversive, revolutionary, and agitational activities in the Western Hemisphere and affords the opportunity to export agents, funds, arms, ammunition and propaganda throughout Latin America." The subcommittee report concludes: "This evil threat must be eliminated at an early date."

Senator Allott points out that Cubans, who are dedicated and ready to spearhead liberation, must have U.S. encouragement and support. They must have a home for their government. This should be on Cuban soil and the "Naval Station at Guantanamo Bay is perfectly located to become a free Cuban outpost upon the very island of Cuba. It can serve as a moral rallying point for all Cuban patriots. It is exactly what the Bay of Pigs operation was meant to secure; a territorial beachhead on Cuban soil, place for a seat of government for provisional officials upon the very sands of their homeland, and a focus for eventual liberation operations."

The use of Guantanamo for the free Cuban government under their 1940 Constitution would also be in full recognition of our treaty rights and our perpetual leasehold, Senator Allott explained.

Development of the proposal would be done with the "fullest possible collaboration and support of the Organization of American States in recognizing an interim government, in branding the Castro Communists a regime of usurpers, and in training the nucleus of a free Cuban army."

Cuban liberation should be the core of our policy and not the indefinable and ineffective course we have been following in recent years.

Senator Allott recognizes that such a step has inherent legal problems and that there will be accustations of "warmongering." There will be dire threats about "escalating" the crisis and blustering warnings about "rocking the boat."

But "this is precisely the time when the boat needs rocking—right on out of the shoals of procrastination and indecision." We can no longer afford "to permit this advance base of Communist imperialism to harden into a permanent enemy outpost barely beyond our own mainland. These are the realities of an intolerable situation. Our purposes are entirely honorable."

His proposal, without question, deserves the studied attention of our State Department and our Chief Executive, as well as the Congress. We must get our ship of freedom off the shoals where it has been washed because of inept leadership.

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I suppose it is the experience of all who engage in politics when we go home to encounter people who are frustrated with what they consider to be the failure of our country to achieve our goals in many ways. One of the most thoughtful articles I have seen in a long time was written by Frank F. Brown, Jr., a very good friend of mine, residing in Leadville, Colo. Mr. Brown has written an editorial for the Colorado Episcopalian. Among other things, he said:

> The basic reason for both forms of inactivity is, I believe, a lack of awareness of the importance of the issues involved, whether from an absence of opportunity to learn, a self-induced lethargy and ignorance, or a developed preoccupation with material things and creature comforts. Except for the infant or young child, I cannot accept the proposition that people have not had an exposure to the issues at stake. Certainly, if one has had the opportunity, and ignored or rejected it, then the responsibility for the consequences are his and his alone.

In conclusion he said:

> We can hardly whimper justifiably at the efforts and sacrifices now necessary to do something about the conduct of our Government when Christians at one time had to be lion fodder to do something about it.
>
> Life is politics. Anytime anyone tries to do anything about anything with more than just themselves involved, they are in politics, influencing a course of action. To the extent that it is "messy" or "dirty," is only a reflection of the frailties of the human participants, and these frailties are not peculiar to activities relating to the Government. You can't do much to influence a football game just sitting in the grandstand, and they don't call off the game just because the field is muddy.

Mr. President, I recommend to my colleagues a reading of this very thoughtful editorial by Frank F. Brown, Jr. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION URGED

(By Frank F. Brown, Jr.)

When I hear a person excusing himself from participating in political activity with a comment such as "politics is too dirty for me," I find myself yielding to the frail human emotions of annoyance, disgust, and even anger. Such a comment is very similar to rationalizations people make to excuse themselves from worshiping God because they feel some one or more members of the congregation have a particular sin which they apparently feel might cast a shadow on their own unblemished character.

Both situations of course involve readily transparent rationalizations—statements giving a supposedly acceptable reason for avoiding a course of conduct one does not wish to pursue for another reason, the real one, which in his mind is not acceptable. It would be highly damaging to the ego, for example, overtly to admit that one did not go to church because they'd rather sleep or fish—or ski—and it is just as ego damaging to admit that becoming informed on political issues or candidates or ringing doorbells to get out the vote requires more effort than one desires to put forth. The risks, I submit, in both forms of rationalization are great; in the one is loss of one's soul and salvation, and in the other is the loss of one's rights and freedoms.

The basic reason for both forms of inactivity is, I believe, a lack of awareness of the importance of the issues involved, whether from an absence of opportunity to learn, a self-induced lethargy and ignorance, or a developed preoccupation with material things and creature comforts. Except for the infant or young child, I cannot accept the proposition that people have not had an exposure to the issues at stake. Certainly, if one has had the opportunity, and ignored or rejected it, then the responsibility for the consequences are his and his alone. In the case of religion, one's actions in endangering his own salvation cannot endanger another, but in politics this is not true—one's lack of action can affect the rights of many, and such a disregard of responsibility may in itself be a breach of moral conduct.

What is politics? Let's start with Webster: "Of or pertaining to the conduct of government; of or pertaining to the exercise of the rights and privileges or the influence by which the individuals of a State seek to determine or control its public policy."

As Christians, I'm sure there is not one among us who would deny we have the duty of spreading the word of God and advancing His Kingdom. I do not recall anything in the Bible or religious teaching that would circumscribe our efforts to the quiet and secure cloisters of our parish house or any other similarly safe and secure habitation away from the rough and tumble reality of human existence. In fact, I recall words like "Go forth," which He commanded, which would indicate we are to do all we can, whenever and wherever.

The Biblical story of the talents has much to offer; wasting them, we of course all realize is bad, but just holding them static is no accomplishment—we are to use them.

We are certainly not doing much to work God's will, "on earth, as it is in Heaven," if we consider our practice of religion only a personal, private thing, or just a 1-hour-on-Sunday exercise. We are not "going forth" if we are not doing anything to influence the composition or activities of our government, or if we sit idly by not caring. Especially in a democratic society, with a republican form of government we have a great deal to do with who the government is, and what it does. The government is merely a convenient vehicle through which we govern our affairs and is necessary only because of the sheer number of individuals and the increasing complexity of relationships which currently exists. When there is only one person, he can manage his affairs; when there are two, if both are equal, they must jointly share the management of their affairs; and as their members increase, they must delegate this management through the sheer technical requirements of communication.

The Government then, even in this area of decreasing individual influence, is in reality us, managing our own affairs. What it is, how it is composed, and what it does is a reflection of ourselves. To the extent we have opportunity to exert influence, however small, its actions are ours, its sins are ours. And having opportunity, and not exercising it, we have sinned twice—once by not having availed ourselves of a talent we possess, and once in having perhaps contributed to a wrong by our inaction.

Our guilt of nonparticipation in politics (the influencing of the composition or activities of Government) is not mitigated with the fact that the extent of our influential participation is less than what it was in Lincoln's or Teddy Roosevelt's era. To the extent that our disinterest and lethargy and inaction have contributed to the waning of the individual as a force in society, our guilt is increased.

Nor will we be judged less harshly because participation is more difficult or seems to require more endurance, more effort, or sacrifice—if anything, the difficulties only measure our sincerity and devotion. We can hardly whimper justifiably at the efforts and sacrifices now necessary to do something about the conduct of our Government when Christians at one time had to be lion fodder to do something about it.

Life is politics. Any time anyone tries to do anything about anything with more than just themselves involved, they are in politics, influencing a course of action. To the extent that it is "messy" or "dirty," is only a reflection of the frailties of the human participants, and these frailties are not peculiar to activities relating to the Government. You can't do much to influence a football game just sitting in the grandstand, and they don't call off the game just because the field is muddy.

Our responsibility and the risks of shirking it are clear. At the last day, it will not be us who will judge our rationalizations.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY, JULY 18

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday, July 18.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, July 18, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 16, 1963:

THE JUDICIARY

Abraham L. Marovitz, of Illinois, to be U.S. District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois vice Julius H. Miner, deceased.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following U.S. Coast Guard officers for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Capt. George D. Synon
Capt. John B. Oren

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 16, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The Master's Golden Rule: Matthew 7: 12: *Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.*

Almighty God, in these days when our democracy is being severely tried, may we have the faith and courage to believe that better times are coming, for we trust in Thee.

Grant that the ideals and aspirations of our Republic may be in accord with the democracy of our blessed Lord and may they include all the members of our social order.

Inspire our minds and hearts to go out with enthusiasm to proclaim and practice that equality of opportunity which will give all our citizens a chance to achieve and enjoy the blessings of the more abundant life.

Show us how we may gain greater national unity and may the Lord's Golden Rule and His high priestly prayer be fulfilled when all men shall become one as Thou and the Master art one, eternally.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 793. An act to promote the conservation of the Nation's wildlife resources on the Pacific flyway in the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, Upper Klamath, and Clear Lake Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California and to aid in the administration of the Klamath reclamation project.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF EXPRESSION OF SORROW ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES UPON THE DEATH OF HIS HOLINESS POPE JOHN XXIII

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

DAL VATICANO, LI, *July 6, 1963.*

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: The House of Representatives of the United States of America, over whose proceedings you preside, has passed, on June 4, 1963, a "resolution of sorrow * * * upon the death of His Holiness Pope John XXIII," copy of which I have received through the good offices of the Department of State.

It has been my honored duty to submit this resolution to His Holiness Pope Paul VI who, warmly appreciative of the sentiments which prompted its proposal and approval, directs me to assure you, sir, and to request that you kindly inform the honorable Members of the House, that he is sincerely grateful for this kind expression of sorrow on the death of his predecessor, and would convey his cordial thanks to each Representative of the House.

I willingly seize the opportunity to assure you of my sentiments of high esteem and regard, and I remain

Sincerely yours,

A. G. CARDINAL CICOGNANI.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE CARL VINSON

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, this is a memorable day in the history of this body. This is CARL VINSON day. Today the distinguished gentleman from Georgia becomes the dean of deans of the House of Representatives. The great chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has broken the all-time record for service in this House. His 48 years, 8 months and 13 days of continuous service today surpassed that of the great, late Speaker of the House, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, of Texas. Henceforth, with each passing day, the gentleman from Georgia will be eclipsing his own matchless record. Along with every Member of this body I extend to the gentleman my warmest and sincerest heartfelt congratulations. His service in the House is an inspiration to his colleagues and a blessing to this body and to the country.

Mr. Speaker, important as seniority is in Congress or elsewhere, its deeper connotations are well worth examining. Mr. VINSON has represented the Sixth District of Georgia for close to half a century. Twenty-five times he has placed his record on the line for examination by his constituents. Twenty-five times they have approved his stewardship and returned him to the House. Both his constituents and his colleagues know the size and scope of the talents of this great man. His repeated reelections are not only a tribute to himself but, in the words of the Speaker at his press conference yesterday, they are a tribute to the intelligence and the judgment of the people of his congressional district.

The gentleman from Georgia came to the House after service in the Georgia legislature and on the bench. It was 1914 and he was only 30 years old at that time, the youngest Member of the House, a freshman in terms of both age and service. In 1917 he was assigned to the then House Naval Affairs Committee and by 1931 became its chairman and subsequently chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. He is now in his 29th year of service as a committee chairman. So far as I know, no other committee chairman in the history of this House has a comparable record.

After 46 years his military expertise is such that it makes every Defense Secretary wish for a good refresher course. His encyclopedic knowledge of strategy, tactics, and weapons is nothing short of phenomenal.

Chairman VINSON has played a major role in the Nation's defense program throughout four decades encompassing two world wars, the Korean conflict, numerous police actions, and a long and protracted cold war.

In World War II he shouldered the very heavy responsibility of gauging the country's military needs, of providing the trained men and weapons needed to insure the national security, guided by his firm conviction that peace must rest firmly on the foundation of military preparedness.

In the 1920's the gentleman from Georgia voted for the creation of the Army Air Corps. In the 1930's he was instrumental in launching our first two-ocean Navy. Before Pearl Harbor he battled for funds to train pilots, to construct aircraft and air bases. In post World War II he fought for the construction of the strategic bomber, the stockpiling of nuclear-armed missiles and the strategic assignment of nuclear submarines in case of enemy attack. He has played a major role in increasing our Army combat divisions, our Air Force tactical wings, in bolstering the U.S. Marine Corps, in adding to our Army special guerrilla action forces. We have him to thank for better trained, better equipped troops, and increased missile production.

Chairman VINSON's Committee on Armed Services turns out the most prodigious volume of legislation, bills which are almost never defeated on the floor. These significant measures shape U.S. defense strategy and posture.

Yet the weight of his obligations to the national defense have never caused the gentleman from Georgia to lose touch with his district.

The problem of those whom he represents are close to his heart; their solution is his first thought, and his service to his constituents is his primary concern.

Chairman VINSON's soaring prestige has been built on the solid rock of long and capable service. Its composition is his faultless integrity, great skill, in-depth understanding of the legislative process, and the wisdom acquired through half a century of awesome responsibility.

The honor we pay him is coupled with the warmest affection. The gentleman from Georgia has been to me personally an inspiration, a kindly mentor, and an invaluable friend. I extend the distinguished dean of the House my personal congratulations upon adding another star to his already crowded roster of accomplishments. I join every Member of the House, Mr. Speaker, in wishing him many more years of useful service to this House, to his constituents, and to his country.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to our distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma in his usual fashion has spoken so eloquently and so well of our colleague, CARL VINSON, that there is very little that any one of us might add. However, I certainly want to join in what he has said and to say for myself, and I am sure for all of us on this side of the aisle, that his last statement, in which he wishes the gentleman from Georgia well through the years to come, is seconded by all of us.

The gentleman from Oklahoma spoke of the very obvious affection which the people of the Georgia district who sent CARL VINSON here and who have kept him here through the years, have for him. Obviously, as I say, the fact that he has been reelected from time to time speaks for itself but, beyond that, I would say for myself, and again may I say I am sure for my colleagues on this side, that CARL VINSON has earned the respect and the admiration of all of us who have had the privilege to serve with him here. He has certainly become and is one of the greatest experts on military affairs that the country has ever seen. I have felt that his service and experience and that of the others who have served on the committees once known as Military Affairs and Naval Affairs, and now merged as the Committee on Armed Services, have contributed immensely to the continuity, the greatness, the progress, and the effectiveness of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Beyond this I just want to say a personal word for CARL VINSON. There have been times when I have come to him on matters of great personal concern to me and to my constituents and to the people I have represented. Always have I found him to be as understanding and helpful as anyone could possibly be. That I have appreciated.

So, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely join in this expression of thanks that we have had CARL VINSON here with us, and to wish for him long and continued service here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, there is little I can add to the remarks made by the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader.

I am certain that the outstanding record of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia will be cataloged in the RECORD by many who speak here today. It is a record that well may stand as long as this Republic.

I should like to add only a few personal observations.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, not only has the gentleman from Georgia been the guiding light in building the strongest might that any nation has ever had in its armed forces, but he has also built an Army, a Navy, and an Air Force with the finest morale that Armed Forces have ever had, because he has been aware of the human problems confronted by the men and women who make up our Armed Forces.

Second I should like to compliment him on his humanity, on his deep understanding of the problems of people. That is why his interest has ranged far beyond the military.

Those of us who have had some responsibility for leadership here have found him always in the forefront of progressive legislation on matters that he considers vital to the welfare of all the people: conservation measures, flood control, highway building, housing, and farm legislation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, one of the great characteristics of CARL VINSON is that, despite the fact that today he establishes a new record for service, he invariably through the years has maintained his interest in the future, in young people. As we grow old some of us are inclined to look backward, to be nostalgic, to talk about the "good old days." I have never heard CARL VINSON talk about the "good old days." I have always seen him looking forward to the future with confidence.

Just the other day my wife told me that she happened to be in a grocery store in Chevy Chase and whom should she see there, shopping, with a youngster about 3 or 4, but our distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee. There he was, going through, with a cart, with a youngster on the upper deck of it, so to speak, talking to the child with the same humanity that he has shown to the younger Members of Congress who have come here during his years.

The British parliamentarian who holds the record for length of service is the former Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Honorable Winston Churchill. It seems to me that the words of Mr. Churchill, commenting on his predecessor as prime minister, are appropriate at this moment. Mr. Churchill said this:

> At the lychgate we may all pass our own conduct and our own judgments under a searching review. It is not given to human beings, happily for them, for otherwise life would be intolerable, to foresee or to predict to any large extent the unfolding course of events.
>
> In one phase men seem to have been right, in another they seem to have been wrong. Then again, a few years later, when the perspective of time has lengthened, all stands in a different setting. There is a new proportion. There is another scale of values.
>
> History with its flickering lamp stumbles along the trail of the past, trying to reconstruct its scenes, to revise its echoes, and kindle with pale gleams the passion of former days.
>
> What is the worth of all this?
>
> The only guide to a man is his conscience; the only shield to his memory is the rectitude and sincerity of his actions. It is very imprudent to walk through life without this shield, because we are so often mocked by the failure of our hopes and the upsetting of our calculations; but with this shield, however the fates may play, we march always in the ranks of honour.

Our distinguished colleague has marched always in the ranks of honor.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished Republican whip, the ranking member on the Committee on Armed Services, and a long-time colleague of the chairman of that committee.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in congratulating our colleague from Georgia on today having broken a record. It has often been said that records are made only to be broken. This is one such instance. The distinguished gentleman from Georgia has done what no other individual has accomplished; he has served in this great legislative body longer than any other person. What a wonderful record that is.

There must surely be a very satisfying feeling in the heart of our chairman to know he has served so long in this great deliberative body. The uncertainties and vicissitudes of life and politics being what they are it is hard to believe that anyone could serve in this body for 50 years. If I were to express a hope today, I would that my great chairman could be privileged to stay here another 50 years.

Ever since the Legislative Reorganization Act was passed and I, as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, became a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I have had the great privilege of serving with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] on the Armed Services Committee. Many times I have differed with him on matters before our committee, but always objectively. Whatever our differences of opinion on defense questions our sole interest was to do what would best serve our country in having a sound national defense.

Since I became ranking member of this committee and have been privileged to sit next to the chairman I have had opportunity to see more closely his presiding techniques and to work more intimately with him on matters before our committee. I hope in the next 50 years that he serves here he will have the opportunity to see how much I have learned from him, but I do not know whether the time will ever come when I might, as ranking minority member, take over the chairman's seat on the committee.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has been a great builder of the defense of our country. That is all-important to our security and continued freedom. Many of us remember what happened after World War I in the matter of defense, and we did more than simply demobilize. We virtually disarmed. We will remember what happened after World War II; how unprepared we were when the Korean war broke out. At that time many of us determined that never again will this great land of ours come face to face with an international crisis without our being ready to meet it and whatever might arise. So today we can thank the great chairman of our Committee on Armed Services that we can meet any challenge to our security and freedom at any time, anywhere, under any circumstances. It has been a great privilege to have served with and under the gentleman from Georgia for many years.

My personal congratulations and personal best wishes always to my distinguished chairman—the dean not only of this Congress but of all the Congresses that have gone before.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my able and articulate friend, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], who is a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, all of us are witnessing an occasion which we will never see again in our lifetimes. Not one Member here this morning within the sound of my voice will ever look upon another man who has served in this body 48 years, 8 months, and 13 days as has the architect of the greatest defense force in the history of the world, CARL VINSON, of Georgia.

This man with whom it has been my great honor to be associated for 22 years, 8 months, and roughly 15 days, had been here over 26 years before I came here. As St. Paul sat at the feet of our Master, it has been my honor to sit at the feet of CARL VINSON. His wisdom, his patience, and his incomparable capacity to impart his unsurpassable knowledge on the military affairs of this Nation have been given generously to me and to others who have the pleasure and the honor to serve with him on his committee, first on the Committee on Naval Affairs and now on the Committee on Armed Services.

The records are replete, Mr. Speaker, with stories about the gentleman from Georgia. History has no equal. His effectiveness is unparalleled in the history of parliamentary government. He has one creed and one creed alone—to serve his country and to make the defenses of his country second to none.

One of the greatest men to serve in this or any other body was John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina. Here is what John C. Calhoun said, and Mr. VINSON has lived with this admonition all his life:

> The very essence of a free government consists in considering offices as public trusts, bestowed for the good of the country and not for the benefit of an individual or a party.

Mr. VINSON has lived this admonition. Two hundred and twenty years ago Voltaire, a very wise man, had this to say:

> He who serves the country well has no need of ancestors.

I might paraphrase that, Mr. Speaker, by saying that he who serves his country well needs no descendants. Mr. VINSON needs no descendants. They begin and they end with his illustrious record. It is good that we pay tribute and take note of the record of this great man. We could talk until time is no more about him. The history books are full of his wonderful record in the State of Georgia. A resolution was adopted by the chamber of commerce in Macon, Ga., which reads:

> Whereas the Honorable CARL VINSON has served in the Congress of these United States for virtually a half century; and
>
> Whereas throughout his entire tenure of office he has served the people of middle Georgia, and of the State, and of the Nation with honor and distinction; and
>
> Whereas his public service has reflected all of the ideals of ancient culture and the advantages of modern progress; and

Whereas by virtue of his devotion to duty, sound judgment, eminent stature and alertness to the needs of the times he has long been a leader in the column of progress: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the members of the greater Macon Chamber of Commerce do, by these presents, acknowledge, and express their gratitude and appreciation for these services which are unparalleled in duration and invaluable and incomparable in magnitude.

(Signed by 200 members of the Macon Chamber of Commerce.)

This sums it all. I am grateful that I have had the privilege, like you, to serve with this incomparable American.

Once Charles Hanson Towne said this, and I think we ought to remember this today, while Mr. VINSON is still living, and I hope he lives a million years, in fact, I hope I never live to see the day that I succeed him as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services; we do not want him to be succeeded; we want him to live forever; but let me quote what Charles Hanson Towne said:

AROUND THE CORNER

Around the corner I have a friend,
In this great city that has no end;
Yet days go by, and weeks rush on,
And before I know it a year is gone,
And I never see my old friend's face,
For Life is a swift and terrible race.
He knows I like him just as well
As in the days when I rang his bell
And he rang mine. We were younger then,
And now we are busy, tired men:
Tired with playing a foolish game,
Tired with trying to make a name.
"Tomorrow," I say, "I will call on Jim,
Just to show that I'm thinking of him."
But tomorrow comes—and tomorrow goes,
And the distance between us grows and grows.
Around the corner—yet miles away—"Here's a telegram, sir—" "Jim died today."
And that's what we get, and deserve in the end;
Around the corner, a vanished friend.

(Source: "Selected Poems of Charles Hanson Towne," 1925, p. 100.)

Mr. Speaker, it is good to talk about those whom we love, while they are living. The encomiums which we could heap upon the shoulders of those we love like CARL VINSON are endless. I am privileged that I can say a word in complimenting the State of Georgia for having sent him here and for the privilege I enjoy in serving with him, my hope for him is that he will be here to advise us and counsel us with his patience for many, many years to come.

I thank the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma very much for yielding to me.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, at a ceremony similar to this when we were paying tribute to the late Speaker Sam Rayburn on his 50th year of service in the House of Representatives I said this of Speaker Rayburn:

> He performed a miracle. Any man who could be elected 25 times performed a miracle.

For a man from any one of the 48 States or 50 States to be elected 25 times did perform a miracle.

But, Mr. Speaker, today we are paying tribute to another great American who has broken the long record of service of the late Speaker Rayburn in the House of Representatives, that great and noble gentleman, CARL VINSON, of Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, down through the years CARL VINSON has taken the well of the House, adjusted his glasses, and has told the Members of the House exactly what was contained in the legislation which he was presenting to the House for its consideration. There were very few who opposed him, and if they did oppose him their nerve was better than their judgment because CARL VINSON always put forth good things which helped all of us.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that sticks out in my memory was when our back was to the wall the night of Pearl Harbor, and we had a sunken fleet at Pearl Harbor in Hawaii, the President of the United States said that America should thank CARL VINSON for having this country prepared to defend ourselves after that sneak attack. Oh, yes; not only the Congress, but the whole Nation is grateful to CARL VINSON for the many, many great things which he put forth for the defense of America. He had that quality in him. Why? He comes from the State of Georgia. Let me call the attention of the Members to the State of Georgia. It is the first State in the Union which sent two of the minority group to the U.S. Senate, long before the turn of the century. They sent a man to the U.S. Senate from Georgia of Jewish extraction, and one a Catholic. Georgia was the first State in the Union to do that, showing us that down in that State the man whom they sent to the Halls of the Congress had to have something on the ball, like CARL VINSON.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and pleasure for me today to say a few words of tribute in honor of that great gentleman and to express the hope that as time marches on God will confer upon him His greatest gift and blessing to mankind, health in the years to come.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we are honoring today one of the great Americans of our history and one of the greatest legislators that has ever sat in the Congress of the United States, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. For today he occupies a most unique place in the history of this body, having served in this body longer than any other Member in the entire history of our country.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to our paying him homage, America pays this great man homage, for there is no man in the entire history of the country who has contributed more to the welfare of our people, particularly to the national interest and the national defense of our country than has our dear friend, CARL VINSON. One could talk for hours about this great man, this great American. You can talk about him as CARL VINSON, the legislator; CARL VINSON, the American; CARL VINSON, the man, with his fine, noble outlook on life, with a mind of understanding and nobility of character.

In honoring and in congratulating CARL VINSON I want to honor and congratulate the people of his district who have kept him here for so many years, enabling him to give to our country the great services he has rendered during the past several decades. The people in his district have kept him here. They saw in CARL VINSON a man of great ability, CARL VINSON, the American, CARL VINSON, one of God's noblemen. The district that he has represented throughout the years has made their contribution to the greatness of America by having elected and reelected so many times this great American, this great legislator, this great man.

So in congratulating my dear, close, and valued friend, CARL VINSON, on the record he has made, I know he will understand my state of mind when I go further and congratulate the people of his district for having sent him here so many times.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Speaker. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor and privilege for me to pay tribute today to Mr. VINSON, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. It has been a pleasure for me to have served with him in the House over the past 20 years.

To me he is a dedicated American, who has spent his life in the service of his country. His contributions to our national defense have been great and many. We are proud of this opportunity to honor him. Members on both sides of the aisle have great respect and admiration for him and his work. He has not only won the hearty commendation of the Members of Congress but the people of the United States as well.

Mr. Speaker, I have the deepest respect and admiration for CARL VINSON. I am of the opinion that without question he has been one of the most outstanding Members that the Congress has ever had. He is a humble man, kind, generous, cooperative, always a great help to us. He has turned in a magnificent performance over a long period of time, of which he can well be proud.

We pay our respects to you today, Uncle CARL, and my wish for you is good health, happiness, and all the good things in life during the years ahead.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, in expressing congratulations to my great chairman, I shall not undertake to discuss his rare accomplishments in behalf of our country. Others have spoken of these much more eloquently than I can, and the history books will record them.

There is another aspect of this great Georgia statesman about which I would like to comment. It is the human side which we, who have had the privilege of serving on the Committee on Armed Services, know so well. It has been a great privilege for me to sit at his feet and learn, or to drop in his office and absorb some of his words of wisdom. We who have enjoyed this association are the beneficiaries of his experience, his wisdom, his knowledge, but most of all his genuine friendliness and helpfulness. Our chairman is a great man. He reaches a milestone today in length of service. Despite the number of years during which he has rendered to the people of the United States and of the free world such outstanding service, we who have been close to him have been particularly happy to observe that in recent years he seems to be growing more youthful. I hope that trend continues because we need him, because we revere him, and because his qualities of leadership are so outstanding.

It has been a great privilege to me to serve on the Armed Services Committee during his chairmanship, and I want to express my appreciation to him, along with my congratulations and best wishes.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, as one who was born 1 year and about 3 months and some-odd days before my chairman, Mr. VINSON, came to this body, I want to join with all of those who are doing him honor today. In the brief years I have had the privilege of serving on his committee it has been enormously impressive to me to see the impartiality, the thoroughness, and the patience with which he has presided over what is an outstanding committee, conducting work of tremendous importance to the security of the United States and peace of the world. I bear for him great affection as others do, and I want to take this opportunity to wish him many more years as the most distinguished dean of the House and the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Georgia not only for his ability in this House, but for the kindness and forbearance with which he has treated every single Member. I am sure these qualities have won for him his seat in Congress, and I am sure that all of us appreciate the decency with which he has treated us all as Members.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentlewoman for her fine contribution.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON].

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it perhaps would be unnecessary for me to add anything in praise of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], who so long has served his State, his Nation, and this body. From almost any standpoint he has been an outstanding representative of each. Certainly, the usual standards of measuring greatness in statesmanship would establish the gentleman as unique. No one, in the long history of this body, has served so long; no one has served with greater distinction, and no one has so skillfully and devotedly managed the legislative direction of the greatest military and naval force ever known.

Today, as the gentleman from Georgia becomes the all-time dean of the House, it would be superfluous for me to say here that he is beloved by many, but it may be well to point out that among his thousands of admirers are those who at times have vigorously disagreed with him. Among these are the many champions of special defense projects which were voted down or of systems which were opposed at some levels of Government but which were approved legislatively because of his acute understanding of and long experience in strengthening our national security. I may add that just about always, those who oppose the gentleman from Georgia later found that his was the greater wisdom and their affection for him increased out of earlier adversity.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman from California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a tribute from me to CARL VINSON, Representative of the Sixth District in my neighboring State of Georgia, has a certain personal and sentimental significance which I like to think is unique. We honor him today because he has achieved a milestone in his long and remarkable service in this House. For me there is a personal note, for which I hope this House will pardon me, in an intimate and a legislative relationship that goes back across the greatest crises this country has had to confront in almost a half century of world upheavals. For there is only a handful of men in the highest posts of national leadership who, it seems to me, match the legislative statesmanship and the wisdom, that has been displayed in the decades of national and international turmoil by the steady and sound guidance and management of our beloved Representative from Georgia.

By the personal note I mean that in CARL VINSON's background and in mine there are certain parallels even apart from the fact that we were both born in the previous century. I know something about the posts he has held as a young man and how this equipped him for the massive performances that now establish him forever in the pages of American history. Emerging from Milledgeville in Georgia back in the eighties, he loved and understood and never forgot his grassroots beginning. It is good for the country he was to serve on so high a level and with such efficiency that he was educated at a military institution—the Georgia Military College at Milledgeville. And this training combined with his graduation from the Mercer University Law School in 1902 provided him with the basis educationally upon which his great career—initially—was founded. After that in the practice of the law, in his duty as solicitor or prosecuting attorney for Baldwin County, and in his service in the General Assembly of Georgia where he was speaker pro tempore, he built up and extended those brilliant talents that have meant so much to the legislative record this House has established during his tenure here.

For he is without a doubt one of the greatest legislators of this century.

It is not so much that we honor him today—July 16—for having completed the longest continuous period of House service of any member in the annals of this legislative institution. We honor him much more for the character of this service, and for the decency that invested his judgments. Nor does it matter with whom he agreed or disagreed, so much as the style and tone, the informativeness, and the integrity of his position in the many controversies that engulfed him, and the country. CARL VINSON never spoke just to make an impression. CARL VINSON never persisted on an angle of approach on a major issue just to endear himself to this or to that faction. The element of political opportunism which seems so inescapable in certain avenues of political life was a quality foreign to his nature. When he fought as hard as he did for a point of view on the all-powerful Armed Services Committee, as its chairman, he fought from the best motives that involved not CARL VINSON's preferment, but that involved the highest interests of his country.

This is why this tribute we pay him today is so richly earned.

More than that, I think it may be said that in the monumental events of his service in the House when the Nation faced two World Wars, Korea, and a depression more devastating even than war, many surpassed him in pyrotechnics and spectacular appearances on the world stage, but few in rugged wisdom and substantive contribution to the world's freedom.

For when CARL VINSON spoke he addressed himself to the fact in an analysis that was clear, and in language that was persuasive and powerful. What he did for posterity and for legislators of the future is to set an example that I believe is unmatched. For CARL VINSON had to deal with the most complex and perplexing problems of our times, the problems of military affairs emerging with scientific sophistication and with imponderables that were new and fresh every hour. Overall there were questions of administration that went to the roots of our Military Establishment and involved, in fact, a proposed radical modification of the Pentagon organization itself. There was in military science a whole culture of uncertainties. He taught his generation of legislators and the legislators who are to come after us the value of knowledge in depth. For CARL VINSON could speak and inquire and approve or criticize an admiral or a general on the professional's own ground.

And that helped to make him a true representative of the people, not just a showman, and it rendered him an invaluable and objective decisionmaker where literally billions of the people's money was at stake.

Another facet of his political personality is his recognition of the obligation he owes to his own constituency. It may seem that the profound respect which attaches to his views on military matters do little in themselves to help his constituents in the Sixth Georgia District. But the truth is that his enormous prestige as a legislator forms part of the strength that enables him to do things for the district he represents, when that help promotes not only a sectional benefit, but helps the State and the country as well. And this remarkable prestige derives in considerable part from the respect he has earned as an authority of the first magnitude of validity in the field where his influence is so great.

Historians will look back at the twenties and the thirties and the forties and fifties, and now the sixties of our time, and seek a true evaluation of the men who played the principal roles. They will marvel on how a man born in the eighties of the previous century so precisely matched the qualifications of the modern legislator. For CARL VINSON never aged in the sense that revolutions in military science, or revolutions in administration, or in the processes of this House, left him standing in some previous decade, unaware or blind to the new order of society. This steadying hand, this sound maker of the great decisions, this acute and brilliant analyst, never reached out too far into the unknown, or remained too far behind, frozen in the past. This is the legislator whom historians will evaluate as topdrawer because he was the master of his subject and the leader in his field of legislation. They will mark him out because he left an impression on the greatest issues of his time and because he advanced the interests of his country and the free world and is a model for the legislator of the future to try to emulate.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, on this historic occasion, I wish to associate myself with all the good things that have been said about this distinguished Member from Georgia, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

As America's foremost champion of military strength and preparedness, CARL VINSON undoubtedly has done more than any other one man during the time he has served in this body in behalf of national defense. Having served during three major wars, the hand and the guidance of CARL VINSON directed the Congress in the mammoth preparedness programs which ultimately resulted in victory for America and the free world.

On this historic day, Mr. VINSON will have served in the Congress longer than any man in American history. His true greatness, however, is not in his longevity of service but rather in the high quality of leadership, vision, energy, and statesmanship, which he has provided and exemplified.

I join with my colleagues in saluting our great leader today, and wish for him all the blessings of life during the years ahead.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE].

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to join in this well-deserved tribute to our distinguished colleague from Georgia who this day establishes a new record for service in the Congress.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee I have had the privilege of glimpsing at close range his dedicated leadership as its chairman. His vast experience spans the most critical periods of our Nation's history; the two World Wars, the Korean conflict, and the extended cold war.

Working long hours, he has tirelessly shaped the legislative background of our Nation's defenses, acquiring a vast knowledge of all aspects of military responsibilities. His service not only sets a record quantitatively but also qualitatively. His sound judgment and keen vision have made possible vast strides in our Nation's defense posture.

We are proud and happy that, despite the phenomenal period of service, our chairman remains so vigorously alert that he sets a fast pace for many of us to follow.

We all congratulate CARL VINSON on his great service to the Nation. We are proud that he has been able so effectively to serve the people of his district, and we wish that this service may continue for a long time in the future.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I could not possibly let this occasion pass without joining my colleagues in paying my respects and showing my affection and admiration for our distinguished friend, Admiral VINSON. Let us get his title right and have it right in the RECORD. This is Admiral VINSON. I look back 20 or 25 years, when I was much younger, and the admiral has not changed very much in the last 25 years. If he has changed at all, he seems to be getting younger and more handsome, and better able to handle this committee and work with his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, we could write many books, at least a half a dozen should be written, about the admiral. He goes into the top echelon of the great men of character who have served in this body since its inception. He will be right at the top of the list.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about Admiral VINSON, the man; that good old Georgia blood has come out, and those wonderful Georgians have kept him here, trained him, and he in turn has trained the rest of us.

Admiral, Lord bless you. I hope you live to be at least a hundred, and when you finally pass on that I am right there singing your praises. Lord bless you.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman, and I yield at this time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, this is a great day for CARL VINSON, as his service for so many years has been great for the country. I think perhaps the rules of the House will permit me to refer to another gentleman who is with us today, who was sitting here a few moments ago; I refer, of course, to the orator of the Ozarks, Dewey Short, a former chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. I wish that the rules of the House today did not forbid him to speak, because anything we can say are feeble words compared with what the golden voice of Dewey Short could say on such a wonderful occasion as this.

To me, Mr. Speaker, today is one of great personal significance, because I knew the name of CARL VINSON long before I knew the man himself. For 13 years it has been my pleasure to serve with him on the House Committee on Armed Services, and for an equal number of years before that my father served with CARL VINSON both on the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Naval Affairs, which preceded the reorganization of the House in 1947. So sitting here as I have at his feet for all of these years, I have admired the man and his great mind.

I have gained much by serving with him. I am grateful to him for all the considerations he has accorded me. I sincerely trust that his life ahead will be as long as the years that have preceded this day. I hope to have him as the chairman of our committee for many years to come.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, in view of what has been said about the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, anything that I might add would merely be an echo and redundant and certainly less eloquent and less adequate. Superlatives become meaningless and insignificant when placed alongside the saga of his accomplishment and achievement in establishing this great record of service.

The greatest tribute or compliment that could be paid to an individual is that he has become a legend in his own lifetime. The legend of CARL VINSON is being written while he serves here with us. Those of us who have been privileged to serve with him will never forget that legend, and in years to come the name of CARL VINSON and his deeds will be recounted often in the cloakrooms of this body.

I have one thing very much in common with CARL VINSON. We both came to Washington at the same time. I was a boy then. Little did I know as I sat in the gallery of this body as a young schoolboy visiting and looking down into the well that sitting here was the man, newly arrived, who was going to have such a great influence over my life in future years.

Together with my distinguished and dear friend from South Carolina, MENDEL RIVERS, we enjoy the distinction of being the oldest students in Vinson College. I, too, with MENDEL have sat at the feet of the master and have learned from him so many things that I have put into practice today as the years move by. There is no valedictorian in Vinson College because nobody ever graduates from it. We are always there to learn, but never to finally meet the test and the measure of the master, the dean himself.

So today to you, CARL, let me say personally I am better for having known you. I have learned much from you. It has been a privilege to have served here some 20 years with you. May I suggest that the quantity of words of affection spoken here today pales when compared to the quality of the love sealed in our hearts for you.

May I further suggest we cross the aisle now, Republicans, and Democrats together, and pay tribute and salute you, for we shall not look upon the likes of you again—the noblest American of them all.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN].

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in the fine remarks made about the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, Mr. CARL VINSON. I am the minority-est of the minority on this committee, and I must say I have been treated as fairly and as graciously as any member of the committee. I am pleased to have the honor to serve on the Committee on Armed Services with the distinguished gentleman from Georgia. A lot of folks here have been telling how young they were when the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, Mr. CARL VINSON, became a Member of this body. He was the youngest Member of the Congress when he came here and I am pleased, as the youngest Member of this Congress, to extend these congratulations and say that Mr. CARL VINSON had already been serving here for over 21 years before I was even born. He had served a good and normal tenure of service, so to speak, at the time I was born, and I am pleased to have the opportunity to join in the comments and compliments that are being paid to Mr. CARL VINSON here today.

Being on this side of the aisle does not take anything from the compliments I have to pay him either. Although I do not agree with all the votes he has cast while I have watched him, maybe if I were here as long as he has been and had taken the walks in the rose garden that he has taken, I would look at things a little differently too. So I say with the very highest respect, Mr. Chairman, Mr. CARL VINSON, Uncle CARL, I am pleased to have the opportunity to serve with you, and I hope some day I, too, may look back as a former youngest Member of Congress to just a portion of the accomplishments that you have achieved while you have been a Member of this body.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, this is a great day for the Congress. It is a great day for America. It is a day like none that has ever happened before. Indeed, there has never been anyone before like CARL VINSON. Here, indeed, is a living legend of greatness. To me, and to many others, he has been an inspiration, a teacher, a counselor and a leader beyond parallel. I could go even further—I served on his committee in my early years here. It was an unforgettable experience and even though I left that great committee 15 years ago, he still tells me what to do, as he does everybody else who serves or has served on his committee. Fortunately, his is a benevolent dictatorship. It is the kind that benefits all of us, and benefits the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, service in the Congress is a rare, a great, and an unforgettable experience. Nowhere else is the voice of democracy expressed so clearly as in these Halls. Nowhere else are the people as close to their Government as they are in these United States; and the Congress is their voice in Government. In CARL VINSON the reason for all of this is expressed in clearest form. He typifies representative government. His life's work is one of the finest examples of democracy in action.

No man should offer to serve in the Congress or to serve the people who does not love people—nor can he serve successfully. No one has served more successfully in public office than CARL VINSON. The love which he gives to his fellow man is returned with confidence, and inspiration. His example teaches devotion to all the things which make America great.

There is no greater reward than the confidence which the people bestow upon those who are chosen for positions of public trust. No man among us is more richly deserving of that confidence than is CARL VINSON. His career provides an inspiration, a warm inspiration, for every American. I compliment his State for having contributed this truly great man whose outstanding services have so wonderfully benefited the entire Nation.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER].

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief and say only a very few words. I have served with our distinguished chairman, CARL VINSON, for quite a number of years on the Committee on Armed Services. Like all the others who have served with him, we enjoy him and we appreciate him.

Mr. Speaker, I pray to the Almighty God who has given him the years before will give him many, many more years ahead to continue to serve his country as he has in the past, with great distinction and honor both to himself and his country.

I wish you, Uncle CARL, all the best in the world for many years ahead.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure and an honor for me to join with the other Members of the House of Representatives in commemoration of the man who has today made history.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas referred to him as Admiral VINSON. We all know him as Admiral VINSON because we recognize the leadership that he has exerted throughout the years. Then, in addition to that, we also know him as Uncle CARL; Uncle CARL because he has the humility and the understanding to analyze each problem on the basis of what is right for his country.

Mr. Speaker, we in America have indeed been fortunate to have a man of this type and of this character. He has contributed much in the last three armed conflicts of our country. He has helped make American history. CARL VINSON is a man who stands by the flag and who steps up and casts each vote as he sees it for the benefit of his own country.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that he will live many more years during which we shall continue to appreciate the leadership that he has exerted and which I know he will exert in the future.

Good luck to you, Admiral VINSON, because we all love you.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Colorado.

I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to join in the chorus of congratulations for our distinguished Armed Services Committee chairman, the Honorable CARL VINSON of Georgia's Sixth Congressional District, on the occasion of his surpassing the record of service set by all others in the history of this House. If Members of Congress could wear campaign ribbons on their breast as do the members of the military, I suspect that our committee commander in chief would be covered from neckline to waistline. He has waged a thousand battles, fought a thousand campaigns, and stood "eyeball to eyeball" with Presidents, generals, admirals, and, on a few rare occasions, even with opposing Congressmen, like me. Through all this he has undoubtedly always had the best interests and the security of the Nation at heart, excepting the rose-garden walks, of course; and his record of service is an enviable goal for anyone embarking on a political career. Today, under floor privileges of the House of Representatives, I am privileged to be seated by my predecessor and his intimate friend, the Honorable Dewey Short, who joins me in congratulations to this indestructible and great man. I hope he will be with us for many more years, sparkly eyed, forceful, and nimble of wit. I, for one, do not believe that the State of Georgia will sink under the weight of the benefits which "quite naturally" accrue from his superb leadership.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that he continue in health and service with everything "coming up rosy," and with fair winds and following seas, but at least on some occasions, a ranking minority Member.

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Defense, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, it has never been my great honor to serve on the Committee on Armed Services under the leadership of the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr.

Vinson], but I do know about his profound contribution to the defense and security of the Nation. I am pleased to join in paying tribute to the fine record of service of Carl Vinson. I know very well from firsthand experience just how tough he is and just how strong he is, just how absorbed he is in matters involving the security and welfare of this country. I say to you as one American who serves here among you that this Nation can well be proud that for the past 48 years it has had in its legislative body a man of the stature of Carl Vinson, of Georgia. I salute you, Mr. Chairman, and I shall continue to rely upon your wise counsel and good judgment.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman. I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have this opportunity to pay tribute briefly to the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Armed Services on this occasion of having surpassed every other record of service in the House of Representatives. I speak as one relatively junior member of the Committee on Armed Services in paying my tribute to Mr. Vinson as chairman, as a legislator, and as a man.

As has already been stated here, in spite of the things that you read in the newspapers, this great man has indeed ruled his committee with a kindly and an understanding hand. Certainly, no member who desired to be heard or to speak has been turned down or rejected.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that the results of the great committee which he heads have on many occasions been unanimous, and probably no committee of the House has ever had less of a narrow partisanship in its findings than has the Committee on Armed Services. But this is a tribute to the leadership of our great chairman. In analyzing that you learn something about the nature of congressional influence and congressional leadership, because Carl Vinson has achieved his verdicts in the House and in the committee not by hitting people over the head or by twisting arms but by a quality of understanding, of persuasion, and perhaps best of all by knowing the facts. His ability to get support in his committee has been an ability to persuade his colleagues in the committee and the Congress and to deal with them always with courtesy and with deep personal regard. This is a record which anybody who has been fortunate enough to become a Member of this body could well try to emulate.

Mr. Speaker, may I also say something else. This, perhaps, is a fitting time to pay tribute to another accomplishment of this distinguished gentleman. We all know the role he has played in the defense of the Nation, in preserving a stronger defense in a time of trouble. He has also been a leader of this House in other matters besides defense. Although it has not been recognized publicly as much as it should have been recognized, he has, in fact, been one of the real bulwarks in this House in supporting the legislative program of the President of the United States, because as a true American he has recognized that a record of accomplishment and constructive achievement is something that must rise above any considerations of narrow sectional concern. When the record of the Kennedy administration in the halls of Congress has been written, certainly one of the great leaders, one of the men who will have been most responsible for that record, will be the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, Mr. Carl Vinson, whom we honor today.

Mr. Speaker, there was a word that applied many years ago to a distinguished American, a statesman in my own State of New York, who was beloved by all people wherever they might reside, who was one of the typical sons of American public life—Al Smith—which I think also applies today on this historic occasion to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

> This is the Happy Warrior,
>   This is he,
> Whom every man in arms
>   Would wish to be!

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Bennett].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on this great occasion I would like to say that although we are giving primary consideration today to the fact that a great attainment in longevity has occurred, it is well to think primarily upon the quality in the terrific service that has been rendered by this great man. No man has ever done more for his country and its defenses than has Carl Vinson. No man has ever in the history of our country kept younger in spirit than Carl Vinson, although he has many years upon his shoulders.

Mostly what we think about today is the fact that we are paying tribute at this time to a man with a great and kind heart, whom we are delighted to have as a true and treasured friend.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a few words to what has been said about Carl Vinson today. When I first came here 23 years ago I had the happy privilege of serving my apprenticeship in Congress in the old Committee on Naval Affairs of which he was then chairman. I found him to be one of the fairest and one of the most able men in the Congress and one of the best chairmen of any committee I have served on. I do not know of anyone who has done more for this country than the Honorable Carl Vinson.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our esteemed fellow Member, the Honorable Carl Vinson, of Georgia.

I envy those of my colleagues who have the benefit of association with him over the many years he has served in this body. I have had that pleasure for only a short time, but in that relatively brief span of time, I have come to recognize him as a pillar of strength, a vast storehouse of knowledge and tradition and a dedicated servant of the people of this Nation.

He is neither a summer soldier nor a sunshine patriot.

He has stood, steadfast and resolute, for all the things that are good in this land.

We have needed him in the past. We need him today. We will sorely need him in the future.

I pay all honor and respect to our distinguished colleague, Representative Carl Vinson.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that I have been on the Armed Services Committee for the last 11 years, and I am proud of our chairman, the Honorable Carl Vinson. I want to say this: That in committee sessions with Uncle Carl as chairman our work is always interesting and never dull. Everyone on the committee has the right to express his views but if those views are contrary to that of our chairman he can get a good argument. Usually, but not always, the views of the chairman are adhered to and I must say, with all frankness, that a great percentage of the time the views expressed by the chairman are right for he is as great an authority on our military needs as anyone in our Nation. I have at times been on the other side of views expressed by the chairman and have usually but not always lost. I learned to respect Carl Vinson years before I came to Congress. On June 25, 1941, I assumed command of Company A, 193d Tank Battalion which came from Forsyth, Ga., which was in Uncle Carl's district. Without an exception those young men were deeply proud of the gentleman that we are now honoring. I do want to say with all seriousness that I do not think there is a man in Congress, at least since the time I have been here, who has been any more sincere, capable, or unselfish a patriot than has the gentleman from Georgia. I am proud to call him chairman.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I picked up the Washington Post this morning and a quick reading of an article about the gentleman from Georgia indicated to me that he beats his staff. This did not particularly surprise me when I recall the way he cut me up the last time I had the temerity to stand on this floor and disagree with him. However, in reading the article a little further it simply went on to say that he beats his staff to work every morning. This did not surprise me either. He walks faster than I do, and thinks faster than most of us do, and works harder perhaps than anybody in this body.

I am not the youngest member of his committee. I have been on the Armed

Services Committee for 3 years now. So rapid is the advancement there that already I have risen to the rank of seaman second class in this tight little ship that the admiral runs over there. It is a tight ship but it is a happy ship. I do not know where all these rumors came from to the effect that junior members were not allowed to speak their piece in there. Why, within 6 months I had been recognized one or two times and things have improved a great deal since then. It is a wonderful committee to work on and he is a wonderful chairman to serve under. I do not know that I relish more the role of being a seaman second class in the admiral's ship or that of being a student at the foot of the master in the admiral's private college. I do know that all of us who are privileged to serve under him serve under a man who is devoted to that committee, devoted to this Congress and devoted to this Nation. I congratulate both the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Oklahoma for having taken the time to show that this Congress and this Nation are devoted to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman; Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for 25 years, a quarter of a century, I have had the high privilege of serving in the Congress with the man we are honoring today, CARL VINSON. For most of those years I have served on the Committee on Rules where, time after time, CARL VINSON, as chairman, first of the Naval Affairs Committee and later of the Armed Services Committee, has come to us with important legislation. Each time he has amazed me and the other members of the committee with the great grasp that he had of all the details, all of the information dealing with our national defense, and all of the various portions of each of the legislative bills he has presented to us. Never was a question asked of Chairman VINSON in the Rules Committee about any legislation he was presenting there that he was not able to answer promptly and accurately; not by referring to some printed record, but from the recesses of his own mind and from his own knowledge of the subject.

I have watched him, too, on the floor of the House. In fact, I have engaged him once or twice, or a few times, in debate here on the floor, and there has been no man who ever served in this House more highly skilled, more able in parliamentary combat, than CARL VINSON. He has been an adversary worthy of any man's steel in congressional debate. He has always been fair, but he has always hit hard, and at times had been so adroit and so adept that his opponent did not even know that his throat had been cut, legislatively speaking, until he shook his head on the way out of the well.

CARL, if I may call you thus, because we have been friends for so many years, it is to be hoped you will serve another 50 years in the Congress of the United States. Our good wishes are with you always.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman; I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate our colleague, Chairman VINSON, senior Member of this body, on his historical accomplishment of serving longer in our House of Representatives than any man in the history of our Nation. Today he breaks the record of long service formerly held by our beloved former Speaker Sam Rayburn.

I doubt whether in the future this Congress will ever have the satisfaction of honoring an incumbent Member who will have served as long as the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

When I first came to Congress, in my second term, I was a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. I received a vast education in those days, just observing the legislative ability of Chairman VINSON. I think the education that I received has aided me in staying in this House for 21 years. I remember reading, before I came to this House, of the great battle that CARL VINSON waged to start the construction of a Navy in 1937 several years before World War II. That was 3 or 4 years before Pearl Harbor. It was CARL VINSON, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, alone who led the fight to build an adequate Navy. The majority of the Congress was more or less opposed to large naval expenditures because they thought it cost too much money. If it had not been for CARL VINSON we would not have had much of a Navy at the time of Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941.

One of the reasons I am in this House, I believe, was because my predecessor voted against the extension of the Draft Act, in August, of 1941. CARL VINSON was one of the leaders, along with our present Speaker who led the fight to extend the draft law and keep our Army strong. They won that legislative battle by one vote. On roll call vote was 202 to 201 to extend the selective service law. If it had not been for CARL VINSON and our Speaker, 3 months before Pearl Harbor, carrying on that fight we probably would not have had much of an Army on Sunday, December 7, 1941.

So I will say to our distinguished colleague from Georgia that he has a record to be proud of, not only extending through World War II, but in working to preserve and expand our military defenses both in peace and war.

I sat in this House, during the dark war days of 1944 and admired the ability of Chairman VINSON's success in passing defense appropriations by the billions in order to win that world struggle. Chairman VINSON and his committee one day in 1944 recommended a $31 billion appropriation bill for the military; it passed after an hour's debate without a dissenting vote. This Congress has had confidence in the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. He has made a great record and on many occasions supported legislation to benefit the economy of our Nation when his vote might not have been too popular with most of his constituents back home.

I will say to our distinguished colleague that it is my fervent hope that he serves many more years in Congress.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE].

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the Honorable CARL VINSON's having achieved a length of service unparalleled in the history of this body, I am reminded of what I firmly believe the historians, when they review this service, will say, that it is remarkable not only because of its length but because of the quality of that service over the years. He has a quality of character, a combination of experience and political sagacity that have kept him here that long, an ability which has caused him to earn the titles he bears, the titles by which he is referred to as "Mr. Chairman," "Admiral," as a "tactician," "The Swamp Fox," and as a beloved Member of this body, "Uncle CARL."

I would say to him not as a junior member of this committee and not as his colleague but as a fellow American that on this occasion not only do I congratulate him but I say to him with humility and deep appreciation, I thank you, Uncle CARL, as one American to another for a lifetime of dedicated service which, perhaps more than that of any other man, has preserved the integrity and the quality of the Republic.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma, yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct honor for me to join with my colleagues in this richly deserved tribute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. It is amazing to contemplate that he has been here since the first presidential term of Woodrow Wilson. I recall a conversation I had with the gentleman from Georgia, Chairman VINSON, while we were briskly walking through the subway from the Capitol to the House Office Building. This was early in my first term and I was just getting to learn the ropes. I could not help but be amazed at the time and effort which this wise man took to extend the friendly hand of assistance. This was something which I shall never forget, and I am sure there are many other Members who have shared similar experiences.

Several years ago, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] was tendered an award by the American Political Science Association. If my memory serves me correctly, he was singled out as the first winner of this award which went to an outstanding member of the House of Representatives. This was the understatement of a generation, for he has left his imprint so deeply on the House of Representatives that it will be a long time before Congress ever finds his equal.

But it is not alone in the House of Representatives that he should be honored. Above all, this wonderful gentleman deserves and will receive the thanks of a grateful nation for his long and successful years in constructively building the military security of the United States of America.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Watson].

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, although my contact with the illustrious gentleman from Georgia has not included the privilege of serving with him on the Armed Services Committee, and since I am a new Member I have not had an opportunity to observe his service over the many years, I do want to say that there is no man in this body who has more ability and dedication to the cause of his country than my distinguished neighbor from Georgia.

As I heard the well-deserved comments concerning Mr. Carl Vinson my eyes were directed to the only quotation we have on the walls of this House Chamber, the words of Daniel Webster directly above the Speaker's desk, "See whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

Carl Vinson has done that. The American people are both indebted to and grateful for his long years of outstanding service. As I travel throughout the United States visiting various military installations, time and time again the men in the service of all ranks have said that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services is a friend of the man in uniform. He has provided them with the means, the inspiration and the example of public service so indispensable in the defense of our country.

As we contemplate the dangers ahead in the battle for the minds of men, I predict that the role he has played in the past and the role he will continue to play for many years in the future will be the primary contributive factor in the ultimate victory of the forces of freedom over the forces of communism and enslavement.

I am happy to share these moments with others in paying tribute and honor to a truly great legislator and American, my distinguished friend from Georgia.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Andrews].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, one of the first men I met when I came to the Congress 20 years ago was the gentleman whom we are honoring today, Carl Vinson. Frankly, he looks younger to me today than he did when I first met him. I would gather from some of these speeches, that some Members feel like he is retiring from the House. But I think he will be here when many of us are gone. As a matter of fact, there was an announcement in Georgia last year, after he had been nominated as Representative from his district to the 88th Congress, that he was going to make a career out of his congressional service. I hope he does stay here, because he is a great American. He possesses what I consider to be the three essential qualifications for good public service.

First and foremost, he is honest. He is just as honest as Paul. And he is able—one of the ablest men in this House today, and he has been one of the ablest men over the period of 20 years that I have served.

And then he is courageous. I think the greatest monument that can be found as a result of his service in the Congress is the fact that today the military strength and might of the United States is greater than ever before in history. Our military strength is so great, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion we will have no trouble with our potential enemies. No man has contributed to the military strength that we enjoy today more than has Carl Vinson. He has been referred to as the old fox, the admiral, Uncle Carl—but the truth of the matter is, the real way to address him is "Dr. Vinson." Many universities in this country have recognized his ability and the great contribution he has made to the welfare of this Nation by conferring honorary degrees upon him. He has more degrees than a thermometer—honorary degrees. I call him doctor, and I think he likes to be addressed by that title. He is a hard worker. He always has the interest of his district and his country at heart. It has been said here that he goes to work early. I know that to be a fact. He is in his office every morning at 7 o'clock or earlier. I hope he is with us many, many years because the country can ill afford to lose a man of the stature of Carl Vinson. I say to you, Carl, that I am one of the many, many Members of this House who really loves you and I hope you are with us a long, long time.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the dean of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Carl Vinson, for his record of having served in the House longer than any other Representative in Congress—a period of 48 years, 8 months and 13 days—from November 3, 1914 to today. It is my privilege to serve under his distinguished chairmanship on the House Armed Services Committee.

The record of Congressman Vinson started long before he ever became a Member of Congress. He moved ably up the ranks from prosecuting attorney of Baldwin County, Ga.; member of the Georgia House of Representatives; Speaker pro tem of that body; and judge of the county court before beginning his illustrious career in the U.S. Congress. He has become not only a great leader in the House and our committee, but also a symbol to all for his devotion to duty and his unending and tireless efforts toward serving his constituency and the people of the whole Nation.

I have known Congressman Vinson only since 1961 when I came to Washington, but in that comparatively short time, it is my impression that his love for people and of people has, for the most part, made him the able and conscientious public servant that he is. His many characteristics and traits of human tolerance and sincere understanding have made him an individual of quality and have endeared him to all who come in daily contact with him. Engendered in Congressman Vinson is all that is best in American public life. A courageous legislative technician, he surely is.

His record of service in this House will probably stand forever.

Congratulations, Mr. Chairman, and may your good and knowledgeable constituency send you back to Congress for as long as you want to serve in the House of Representatives.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in paying tribute to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, Carl Vinson. It gives me great personal pleasure to congratulate him on serving longer in this House than any other Member in history.

When I first came to Congress, the gentleman from Georgia, Carl Vinson, was chairman of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, and was recognized at that time as one of our outstanding military authorities. He has rendered a most valuable service to his country, both in time of war and peace.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a great privilege to serve in this House with the gentleman from Georgia, Carl Vinson. I have greatly enjoyed my association with him and appreciate the many courtesies he has extended over the years.

I want to wish the gentleman from Georgia, Carl Vinson, good health and much happiness for many years to come. I am sure his people in Georgia appreciate the great service he has rendered, and will keep him in Congress as long as he wants to stay.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the honorable Carl Vinson is a dedicated leader with many capabilities—foremost is the poltical success that he has enjoyed in being returned to Washington each successive session since 1914 by the electorate of his district.

His many years of service on the Armed Services Committee has given him a national recognition as an authority on the policies and problems confronting the military services. His research for factual and scientific data touching upon all phases of the military science of arms has established him as one of the most astute diagnosticians of the changing military methods of operation and organization.

Although Mr. Vinson has mellowed with the years of experience in this body—let no one misconstrue this gentleness of disposition as a basic characteristic—you can rub him a little the wrong way, but not too far—believe me he will bristle like a wolverine and the regrets are all yours. Just as a note of warning the generals and admirals salute his campaign picture. In an all out-and-out fight for a principle, there is no greater champion in the public lists.

Mr. Vinson is truly a man of the common people. He is kindly and considerate of the problems of his fellow Congressmen and the gentle ladies of the House—his help is there for the asking. And we all appreciate the real aid that he willingly gives to us.

The American people are indebted to Chairman Vinson for the progress made by the armed services in their development into the strongest military organization of the world. It is the threat of these strong deterrent forces that keep our enemies at bay.

Mr. Vinson is a strong party stalwart and supports the administration in its legislative program even at times when his personal viewpoint was in disagreement.

Mr. Vinson has used his power as chairman to develop a solid committee strength behind the bills that are recommended to the House for passage. He has no time for obstructions or dissenters. He adheres to the principle that our Government in its legislative life is a work of majorities—and he feels that where the responsibilities lie, the control should rest. Mr. Vinson is worthy of the great respect and admiration of his colleagues.

May our people and the Congress enjoy the high privilege of his dedicated services for many more years, as chairman of one of the most important functioning committees of this body—the trustees of the security of our defense and the promulgators of our future preparedness—that we may defend the liberty loving nations of the world and insure the protection of our Constitution and our Nation.

We, the members of the Illinois delegation congratulate Mr. Carl Vinson on his long and valued service to God, the Congress, and our country. We are proud to salute our friend, Carl Vinson.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, today heralds in a new and proud achievement for the diary of this august Chamber—the arrival of Carl Vinson, of Georgia's Sixth District, at the eminent station of alltime dean of the House of Representatives. It is only fitting that the inimitable "Swamp Fox" should be the recipient of such an honor and distinction: for more than 48 years he has engaged his energies in the genuinely altruistic task of helping to legislate the public interest. His continued tenure of office serves as an excellent testimonial to the discriminating political taste and sophistication of his Georgian constituency.

Because of their sustained confidence in him, the Nation has been, since 1917, the fortunate benefactor of Chairman Carl Vinson's military acumen. First as chairman of the old Naval Affairs Committee, and later of the Armed Services Committee, it has become demonstrably clear that Carl Vinson is the foremost authority on national defense matters. A long-time proponent of increased military spending, the chairman has repeatedly gone on record declaring that the price of maintaining the peace is not an inexpensive business, that peace depends above all on a strong military posture.

The importance and contribution of Carl Vinson in the realm of U.S. military matters would be hard to overemphasize. Since 1917, he has been in the thicket, and often has been the decisive force, of the final resolve of every major defense issue. His membership on the 1925 Coolidge-appointed Morrow Board was the direct cause of the enactment of numerous laws affecting the function of aviation in the national defense apparatus. Long a leading advocate of the importance of seapower, in 1934 he authored the famous Vinson-Trammell Act, the essence of which was to provide for the genesis of a U.S. two-ocean Navy, one that was destined to be called upon to resist the naval yoke of Hitler's nazism and Tojo's samurai shintoism. The chairman's part in the growth of naval seapower led Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz to remark:

> I do not know where this country would have been after December 7, 1941, if it had not had the ships and the know-how to build more ships fast, for which one Vinson bill after another was responsible.

During the past 16 years Vinsonian leadership has been responsible in very large measure for the preservation of the Marine Corps, the establishment of the Air Force as a separate entity along with its Colorado Springs Academy, continued expansion of the naval complex, coordinated military purchasing and improvements in service housing, revised pay and promotion schedules, and improved medical care and survivor benefits.

Over the years Carl Vinson has been singled out for the visitation of sundry epithets, of which the most favorite has been "Backstage Boss of the Pentagon." Of course, we know that the chairman does not run the Department of Defense, but at the same time, his assertion of Congress constitutional authority to provide for the national defense has evoked the idea that self-determination by the Department of Defense is wishful thinking.

Mr. Speaker, I regard it a rich and rewarding experience to have been associated with Chairman Vinson on the Armed Services Committee. As long as the Nation continues to enjoy the peerless legislative capacities of Congressman Vinson on that committee, it can rest assured that steadfast and resolute devotion to our military might will continue to flourish.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would not want this occasion to pass without my joining with other Members of the House in paying tribute to our distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. Vinson].

There is little in the way of compliments left for anyone to add to what already has been said. Rather I will only say I share the admiration of those who have spoken and feel proud to have served with the great American who is being honored on the floor of the House today. Also with others I wish him continued mental vigor and good health. May he continue to win approval for the legislation he reports to the House by his grasp of facts, brilliant powers of debate, and also his understanding and good humor.

Mr. Vinson truly holds the respect of all of us—equally wholesome and sincere from both sides of the aisle. Any partisanship fades away when he supports a measure.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a great honor and privilege to serve in the House with the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. May this privilege and pleasure continue for many years to come.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the tribute being paid to Congressman Carl Vinson of Georgia. This distinguished statesman and legislator has done his Nation great service during some of the most perilous periods of its past.

As chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Carl Vinson's wisdom and courage have guided many vital decisions affecting this Nation's security and welfare. He has set the example for many junior Members to follow, and has contributed greatly to many momentous actions taken by the Congress.

Carl Vinson's character has helped shape America's destiny. His vast knowledge and experience will undoubtedly continue to be felt throughout her future course in history.

I congratulate him on this occasion, wish him many years of good life.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in congratulating our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman Carl Vinson, on this historic occasion as he wins new honors and adds new distinctions to his illustrious career and his already distinguished record of service to our country.

We have been calling the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee the "Dean of the House" but today, as you know, he establishes a record of having served in the Congress longer than any other man in the history of our country. He has served continuously since he was elected to Congress in 1914 and sworn in as a Member of this body on November 3 of that year.

During this period of service, Congressman Vinson has been concerned with matters of our country's defense, as he was first assigned as a member of the House Naval Affairs Committee. He has served under eight Presidents. He is truly "Dean of the House" and "Dean of the Congress." He is one of the greatest of the great men of all times who have served in the Congress—and a statesman in the truest sense of the term.

Mr. Speaker, as Carl Vinson sets a new record of service in the Congress he will be remembered not only for his length of service in this body, but remembered for his many great contributions to our country—his significant and valuable service to his district, the State of Georgia, and the Nation. He is truly an outstanding legislator, a man of great ability, keen mind and boundless energy, and a gallant southern gentleman.

As "dean of the House," he is one of the true leaders of the Congress on all legislative matters.

As chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, he is the recognized authority on matters of defense and considered the real "boss" of the Pentagon. No man has contributed more to improving our country's armed services and assuring the defense of our country than Chairman Vinson, and no Congressman has given greater effort to assuring that our vast military budget is spent wisely and efficiently in the best interest of the United States.

He stands today as our country's foremost authority on matters of national defense.

Mr. Speaker, as we observe this truly significant occasion, I must say that the House would not be the same without Carl Vinson. We need him here and we needed his services, and I want to wish for him many more years of continued service in this body and to our country.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, "like an armed warrior, like a plumed knight, CARL VINSON marched down the Halls of the American Congress and threw his shining lance full and fair against the brazen forehead of every traitor to his country and every malinger of its fair reputation."

About 63 years ago, Robert G. Ingersoll paid this tribute to another Member of Congress, but I have inserted the name of CARL VINSON because they apply to him with even more justification and applicability than when they were first uttered. Mr. VINSON has marched down the Halls of Congress longer than any other man and no man in our legislative history has flung so many well-directed lances at the enemies of our country.

The American people can congratulate themselves today as they heap congratulations and thanks on CARL VINSON. It seems almost providential that we have been given the exact talents and experience needed by one of the great leaders of our Government during the most perilous periods of our national life, beginning with 1914, when he came to the House. He had a military and a law education before he came to Washington. He was a seasoned legislator, expert and conversant with complex problems affecting every strata of our society when he assumed the chairmanship of the Naval Affairs Committee in 1931. When he became chairman of the Armed Services Committee in the 81st Congress, no man before had better qualifications for the post.

It has been remarked that any man in an exhalted public position is thrice a servant. He serves the state, he serves the public business and he serves fame.

CARL VINSON'S service to state and public business is so unanimously acclaimed that I can add nothing to it.

Knowing CARL VINSON as I do, he has never been fond of fame. But it will be given to him, not because he ever sought it, but because it was earned.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honored to have this opportunity today to pay tribute to Hon. CARL VINSON of Georgia, who today establishes an all time record for length of service in the U.S. House of Representatives.

We in Florida are especially proud of this great American from our neighboring State of Georgia who today sets a mark for having served longer in the U.S. House of Representatives than any other.

I am mindful in paying tribute to this great statesman that I do so not merely because he has served for so many years, but rather because he has served his State and Nation so well in his 48 years, 8 months and 13 days in the Congress.

When I came to the Congress in January as a freshman Member of this body, I knew full well that one of the great statesmen in the history of this Nation served in this House—Congressman VINSON. And my experience as a Member of the Congress has fully borne out that impression I had of him as an able, dynamic, forceful leader who places the strength and welfare of this great Nation ahead of any other consideration.

On November 3, 1914 when Representative VINSON took his seat in the House, he was the youngest Member, and the record he has made since that time in the Congress becomes a bright page in American history. It would seem to me that if we were to compile a list of the 10 greatest men to serve in this House, then surely that list would not be complete without the name of CARL VINSON of Georgia.

Before the end of his present term he will have served half a century as a Member of the House of Representatives. His has been a record of dedication and devotion that is well to be studied and remembered by all of those who will come after us, and by those of us who have the privilege of serving with him today.

I know I share the feelings of Americans everywhere as I extend my sincere congratulations to a forceful legislator, a distinguished Georgian, a great American—CARL VINSON of Georgia.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from Virginia in paying tribute to an outstanding American. CARL VINSON has served his country well. He is and through the years has been one of the most valuable and effecting Members of this distinguished body. We praise the Almighty who has given him health and strength and permitted him to serve this long and eventful tenure in office. May the wisdom, judgment, and indomitable spirit of this great and good man continue to permeate this Chamber for many years to come.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, after the eloquent tributes by the Speaker, the majority leader, and other senior Members of the House, it is difficult to add words of substance to the well-earned salute being extended to our great and beloved colleague, the Honorable CARL VINSON.

I count it a great privilege to have known and served with Congressman VINSON for nearly 11 of the nearly 50 years of his distinguished service. To know CARL VINSON is to respect him and to love him. He is indeed one of our greatest living Americans, and very probably the greatest living symbol of the strong national defense which is equally essential to world peace and American security.

I congratulate Congressman VINSON upon his unparalleled record of public service, and congratulate also the informed electorate of Georgia responsible for his service to America.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest honors and privileges that comes to one who is elected to the House of Representatives is the opportunity to meet and work with men and women who have contributed much to the growth of our country and the well-being of its citizens. This occasion where tribute is being paid to one of the great Members of the House for all time well exemplifies this privilege.

Anyone who knows anything about the record of service that CARL VINSON, the gentleman from Georgia, has given to the United States realizes that he is entitled to a place among the outstanding Americans of all time. With his penetrating mind, his indefatigable enthusiasm, his devotion to high principles of citizenship and his indomitable will, he has written a record of service over the years which few, if any, can equal.

I feel sure that the glory of his past and the knowledge that he has carried out to conclusion with zeal and fidelity whatever assignments may have been his will bring to him a sense of contentment and satisfaction in the knowledge that he has done well and is recognized by his colleagues as a leader without peer.

My congratulations, which come from the heart, go to him and I am indeed grateful for having had the privilege of his friendship and the honor of working with him in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am happy to pay my own sincere recognition of CARL VINSON, as a man, as an American, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, as the holder of a now unique record for length of service in the Congress, but especially as a long and effective member of the House Office Building Commission.

There is more to this seemingly obtuse Commission than meets the eye. For, in a very great sense, it is the keeper of the conscience, the dignity, the reputation, and the peace of the House of Representatives. As an organized body it can well be called the keeper of the "mace"—for that is the only symbol of authority in this great Nation. Its home is in the House of Representatives.

Specifically, as its name implies this Commission holds jurisdiction over all of the buildings on the House side including the House side of the Capitol.

CARL has served on this body, in addition to his considerable other duties, for a long time.

He served, for instance, with the late, great Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, and shared Mr. Rayburn's desire that the Capitol, the grounds, the working conditions of the House Members be of the best. They knew that the House of Representatives, more than the White House, more than any of the Departments, more than the Supreme Court or the other body, represented the entire people. They wanted the surroundings of this body to be commensurate with the true dignity of such a body.

Under the Commission, since and during the tenure of Mr. VINSON, the surrounding slums and unrelated buildings have been removed, the grounds are in the process of improvements and enhancement, and the Capitol has been extended and improved and the physical facilities have been bettered.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee close to this work I know that this program has had its critics.

Yet such has been CARL VINSON'S devotion to the full meaning of this House of Representatives that he has persevered and it is my prediction that future generations of Americans who may serve here—or visit here to see us at work in our offices or in this Chamber—will applaud the work of this true gentleman from Georgia for his astute understanding and clear vision.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, today a tremendous record has been set—a tremendous record of accomplishment for and service to America. Uncle CARL, my heartfelt congratulations, my sincerest best wishes for the many years that I know still lie ahead of you.

No Member of this body has served America longer or with greater loyalty or with more courage—few have accomplished so much.

I am looking forward to November 18, the Congressman's 80th birthday, with great anticipation. Also to the day, not too distant, when he will celebrate his golden wedding with the American people—their Representative for 50 years.

Perhaps, more than any other man, CARL VINSON is responsible for the defense shield that now protects our country. His key role in developing U.S. commercial and defense aviation is known to all of us. It was he who helped convince this body that a two-ocean Navy was essential to our safety. It was he who finally overrode the battleship admirals and convinced them that the day of the battleship was over. His strength of purpose, his fortitude, his courage underscore the attributes of this great American. I salute you, Mr. VINSON.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join in paying tribute to the service and personality of CARL VINSON.

The gentleman from Georgia has now exceeded in time the service of any other Member in the history of the House of Representatives. This is a notable achievement, but it is not solely to the length of service that we call attention today, remarkable though that may be. It is to the type and caliber of the service that has been rendered by our friend and colleague.

Through a period which involved three major conflicts in which the United States was engaged, Mr. VINSON has devoted himself to the problems of the armed services of the United States with gradually increasing responsibility. It is not an exaggeration to say that the present state of readiness of our defense services is due in substantial measure to the interest and efforts of CARL VINSON.

It is gratifying, indeed, to all of us to know that CARL VINSON gives evidence of continuing, for many years, as chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services and thereby makes us all the more confident that these services will remain strong and ready and will provide the valuable and necessary influence to preserve the peace of the world.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the experiences which I cherish most, as a Member of Congress, is the privilege of having served on the Armed Services Committee under the chairmanship of Congressman CARL VINSON.

He is a kindly, considerate, yet an exacting taskmaster. Those of us who had the pleasure of serving on the committee he so ably chairs learned much from him.

He knows the House of Representatives. He knows how it thinks and how it acts. I suggest that new Members of Congress study the way he conducts himself, the way he handles bills on the floor and the clever way in which he maneuvers them through the House, they can learn much.

CARL VINSON is particularly known for his loyalty to his friends and his great tolerance. I salute him and I thank him for the privilege of being able to serve with him.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to join in paying honor to Representative CARL VINSON.

Nine brief years ago I was paid the honor by my constituents of being elected to the Congress of the United States. I was assigned to room 312 in the Cannon Office Building. Across the hall, a doorway bore the name of Representative CARL VINSON of Georgia. I had, of course, long before known of the excellent legislative reputation of Mr. VINSON. But as a "neighbor" I found that Mr. VINSON personally rendered to me, a freshman, much valuable advice. He was kind and generous in his counsel. It was a warming experience, a harbinger of many kindred experiences from other Members of this great body, the House of Representatives.

I am most grateful and indebted to Congressman VINSON that from the lode of his experience and competence he chose to help and guide a freshman Member. Many times he has repeated this gesture. I am certain that other colleagues of mine have reaped the benefit of his counsel. I am privileged to join in making my small contribution to the richly deserved tributes that are being bestowed upon Representative VINSON this day. May we all live forever and may Representative VINSON live 10 minutes longer.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, CARL VINSON came to Congress on November 3, 1914. It is not given to many men to shape history for almost five decades. Consider the span. Through all of the crucial years of World War I, of the depression, of World War II, of the cold war, of the release of atomic energy, CARL VINSON, with the penetrating intelligence and authority which are uniquely his, participated in shaping our destiny. His is the strength and the wisdom that link past to future and which we call the present. He has given all of us, those who had the privilege of serving with him, and to the country, the benefit of his unmatched years of service. Lesser men would have faltered before the kind of responsibility that has fallen upon his shoulders. But our beloved and respected colleague strode forward to meet the challenge of each era, and no two challenges were the same.

We have leaned heavily upon CARL VINSON and with every good reason. We hope that we will have his strength and his leadership with us for many, many years to help us in the new challenges that inevitably we must face.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the others who have preceded me to pay tribute to the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable CARL VINSON.

As a freshman Member of this House, I have had the enviable opportunity of working with and observing our Nation's great leaders in action. An experience which stands uppermost in my memory is that of having watched the chairman of the Armed Services Committee debate on the floor of the House. Here was a man who in a few months would be an octogenarian, yet one who argued with the vigor and vitality of a man 50 years his junior. The clarity of his presentation, his quick-witted rebuttal, his attention to meticulous details which mattered, and his inimitable oratory will forever remain in my memory, forming the image of a great legislator.

I am struck with awe when I consider the fact that I was not even born when CARL VINSON started his career as a Congressman almost a half a century ago. I am reminded of the Reader's Digest editor who only last month said in Williamsburg, Va., that as a small boy he had shaken, with awe, the hand of a man who in his youth had shaken the hand of George Washington. I am as certain as I can ever be that I will have occasion when I have become an octogenarian, God willing, to boast that I served in the Congress with CARL VINSON.

Hawaii, our westernmost State, is our Nation's bastion of defense in the broad Pacific. This CARL VINSON has recognized as chairman of the Armed Services Committee over the years. Hawaii's citizens are grateful to him for this. As their representative, I congratulate my colleague, CARL VINSON, and extend to him Hawaii's fondest aloha on his attaining the signal honor of having the longest service in this great body in its entire history. May his term long continue.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, today marks not only a milestone in the life of our beloved colleague, CARL VINSON, of Georgia, but a milestone in the history of this country. Today our colleague has served longer in the U.S. House of Representatives than any other man.

What a challenge his life, his record, his dedication and his performance of duty is to each of us. If we could but, in some small measure contribute so much to our country's welfare; if we could but serve our constituents so well and if we could but take upon ourselves but a portion of the kindness, compassion, clarity of reason and sense of urgency of this man, we could indeed be proud.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to this man who has written, with his life, so much of the history of this country in this past half century.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. VINSON has been my friend since I first served in the Congress in 1933. I have been blessed by his kindly guidance and have profited innumerable times from his words of wisdom. Sitting here today I have been wondering just what combination of attributes have gone to make up this outstanding statesman. The words of the late Speaker Sam Rayburn, come to mind. He said that success in this body generally results from 5-percent brains and 95-percent hard work. Of course, nobody would suggest that CARL VINSON has only 5-percent brains except for one particular circumstance. The entire makeup of the man—the 100 percent—is so overwhelmingly great that 5 percent of it would give him a whole lot more brains than whoever you might suggest in the Congress is the brainiest of us all. There is no question about CARL VINSON's hard work. My office is directly across the hall from his. I like to get to work early but he is always here ahead of me. Who is the first to leave is something else again but I know for sure that he is never gone until the work is done.

Other attributes of greatness include a willingness to help. There are few of us who have been here any length of time that cannot recall occasions when we have asked him for help. Always he has responded. Naturally if we can reciprocate, we do so.

I am happy that I could be here today to pay these tributes to a great man whose clear vision and great ability have meant so much to the country as a whole and particularly to its defense, and to pay them to him as he looks forward to a long continuation of his service. Too often we do not think of these things until a man retires but here we are paying a humble tribute to a great man with whom we may confidently expect to be associated for many years.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to extend my warmest congratulations to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. VINSON] in establishing a new record for longevity in the House of Representatives.

Chairman VINSON is indeed a most outstanding American, a great patriot, and statesman. All of America is most fortunate to have such a distinguished and effective legislator on the scene for a half century and we are all the richer for it.

In my judgment, the beloved "Admiral" is the "noblest Roman of them all."

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, today is a memorable day for our beloved colleague and dear friend, Chairman CARL VINSON of the House Armed Services Committee. On this day, the very able and distinguished gentleman from Georgia has completed 48 years, 8 months and 13 days of illustrious serv-in the House of Representatives.

This marks for our great Georgia friend the longest period of continuous service that any Member has ever served in the House. It is, of course, a day of warm, deeply felt congratulations for Chairman VINSON. Few men indeed have ever served the Nation so faithfully and with such great distinction.

It is difficult to describe properly, let alone evaluate and laud, the magnificent and memorable contributions of this great American for the cause of God and country. His devoted service, honored by rare quality, as well as by time, is one of the greatest and most illustrious in our history.

Chairman VINSON was inoculated early in life with the potent, unfilterable virus that affects those who select the active public service as their career. At the age of 20, he was a Georgia county court solicitor; at 25, a member of the Georgia General Assembly; at 29, a county judge; at 30, a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives; and at 49, chairman of the all-important major House Committee on Naval Affairs.

His great career embraces several world conflicts in which he played a highly responsible part in building the strength, the weapons, and instrumentalities to forge the victories we achieved in those terrible holocausts of internecine strife.

Endowed with remarkable personal dynamism and a seemingly insatiable capacity for perpetual motion, this gifted leader and inspired representative of the people today is going just as strong as ever, working around the clock, attending to multiple duties and responsibilities and handling the affairs of his committee with the sure grasp of the experienced pilot and the indomitable leader. Nimble of mind, rugged of body, buoyant and unflagging of spirit, stubbornly dedicated to his vital tasks, he has enlisted Father Time as a loyal ally.

CARL VINSON is primarily a man of action, impatient with delay, eager literally to spring at every task, great or small, that presents itself in the course of his busy life. He cuts through redtape with lusty gusto, steers unhesitatingly into roughest political weather, yet never falters in changing course when legislative seas get stormy or strange landmarks are sighted.

His brilliant mind is razor-sharp; his eloquent tongue rises to every occasion, whether in personal conversation, committee or House, and his gavel is an ever-present lethal weapon for keeping strict order and insuring speedy action on any bill in which he is interested. He sees to it that "Study Group 1" comprised of himself and staff, pushes his desired programs through the committee with maximum speed and minimum debate.

His long experience has taught him the lurking danger and futility of long, drawn-out proceedings and confused councils. He strives to hammer through his committee program without the stagnating repression of towers of Babel or useless, dilatory discussion.

In his very busy lifetime and career, he has enjoyed many successes and honors, enduring fame, deepest gratitude for his many contributions to national defense and the various armed services, and the security and safety of the Nation.

Chairman VINSON has enjoyed the greatest respect and confidence of Members of the House and his legislative measures are almost invariably adopted by overwhelming vote. He also enjoys the deep affection of the House and those who know him for his kindly, personal qualities and generosity of impulse. A master politician and acknowledged leader, his district and people have, time and time again, returned him to the House without opposition. For them he is a faithful and omniscient pater familias, wisely deciding all questions and settling all problems, and that is about the way the House regards him.

The passage of time has made little impress upon the chairman's vigor, energy, and activity. He loves his work and pursues it as energetically as ever. His keen, alert mind is always prepared to cope with every situation, and usually enables him to point his finger directly at the heart of any problem.

He is not only the dean of the House, but a great paragon of the public service to whom we of the Armed Services Committee and Congress, the Nation, and the world must forever be greatly indebted for his striking, monumental service to national security and peace through strength.

On this great day for him, I am pleased as a warm friend, admirer, and colleague to extend to our beloved Chairman VINSON, my very heartiest congratulations upon the honor of longevity of service, which he now adds to his many other honors.

I am sure this epochal day will not change him in any way. But I hope it may serve to make him resolve to remain with us in this House as long as he can. We need his ripe experience, his valued counsel, his inspiring patriotism, his august presence and dignity, the melody of his vibrant voice and his power of sound decision.

May the good Lord keep, bless, and guide him for many years to come.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, today I salute our colleague, Representative CARL VINSON of Georgia for his long and distinguished career in the House of Representatives. He has been a Member of the House longer than any other man in history. For 48 years, 8 months, and 13 days, Representative VINSON has served his country with courage and leadership through periods of peace and war. As chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, he has directed the course of our Nation in the vital areas of national defense and preparedness.

All of us are proud of CARL VINSON's record of accomplishment, and wish him success and many more years of service to his district, his State, and his Nation.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of great personal pleasure to join in these tributes to our illustrious colleague, CARL VINSON. No one can really evaluate his outstanding service to our country during two World Wars and other times of stress. As a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs during World War I, he began a career of achievement with the Armed Forces, which has been of untold benefit to this Nation. It is no exaggeration to say that he knows more about our military forces, and particularly our naval forces, than any civilian over a span of two generations. The affection by the Navy is attested to by the name "Uncle CARL," by which he is known throughout that service. We in the Congress fully share that great affection for him. We know him not only as the outstanding authority on naval matters, but also as a parliamentarian of the highest order. His precongressional experience as Speaker pro tempore of the Georgia State Legislature, after only 2 years service in that body, gave him an unusual insight into legislative problems, which has served him and the Congress well.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in wishing to our beloved CARL VINSON everything that is good.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it is not within my ability to outdo any who have spoken before me in paying due honor to CARL VINSON. Suffice it is for me to assure my colleagues in the House that I fully support every tribute paid to this great American, whose contributions to the security of the country makes him a national institution.

In the tradition of his native State of Georgia he is an outstanding statesman whose life efforts have been dedicated to the service of his State and his country. I need not mention the other greats from the State of Georgia whose impact has been felt on our national scene, but in the highest place among them will forever be the name of CARL VINSON.

A great legislator, because he is a great man—whose wisdom has been drawn upon by many of the Members of this House to make them more effective in their work—CARL VINSON is a symbol of America's strength.

His reservoir of knowledge of state affairs is invaluable to his colleagues in the Congress as they call upon him for advice as they ponder difficult problems. Dean of the House in point of continuous service he is fresh and young in ideas for the good of his country.

The most rewarding part of my 19 years in the House is the fact that for 16 of those years I have served on the Committee of Armed Services with CARL VINSON.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, to serve in the Congress of the United States is a very high honor.

To be associated with great, dedicated, and patriotic Americans is indeed a privilege that I humbly cherish.

But to have the rare honor and privilege of serving directly under the dean of the House of Representatives and one of the greatest Americans to ever serve in the Halls of Congress, is indeed a part of my life that I would not trade for any distinction that may ever be offered to me.

Of course I refer to the inimitable, the incomparable, the unique, the amazing CARL VINSON of Georgia.

It is difficult to find adjectives to describe a man of his ability, his integrity, his sincerity, his sagacity, and his leadership. Indeed, he is beyond a doubt as much a part of our American heritage as our late and beloved Sam Rayburn.

Possessed of an inherent native intelligence, this truly great and wise man has led not only the Naval Affairs Committee, but the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives through the tribulations of wars and police actions, and the vicissitudes of false eras of peace. In my judgment, his contributions to the defense establishments of the country are without parallel.

There have been times when I at first questioned his decision, but never, upon reflection, have I ever ultimately doubted his judgment in matters of our national security.

It is not pure chance that has made him dean of deans in the House of Representatives—it is long, able, and faithful service to his district, his State, and his Nation that has earned him this great and highly deserved honor.

It is my honor and privilege to serve with CARL VINSON as his colleague, but I can say in all sincerity that it is an even greater honor to serve under his outstanding leadership as chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I join with other Members of this great deliberating body to pay tribute to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Honorable CARL VINSON from Georgia, a great State neighboring my own State of Alabama.

While I have not had the privilege of serving on the committee with CARL VINSON, I well know of his great leadership for I am fortunate to come from a State blessed with a number of military installations. Therefore, I have sought the counsel of this distinguished leader on many occasions. He has always been honest, straightforward, and consoling at times when he could not agree or approve a suggestion.

When I first came to the Congress some 12 years ago I had already heard a great deal about the man we honor today for having served longer in this body than any other man, the Honorable CARL VINSON, better known as "the admiral."

Having been elected to Congress after the Reorganization Act and the Naval Affairs Committee and the Military Affairs Committee had been merged into the Armed Services Committee it seemed to me to be somewhat out of place to address the distinguished gentleman from Georgia as "the admiral." As a matter of fact, being a junior Member of the House I felt it more appropriate to address the gentleman as "Mr. Chairman."

Today, in joining with our other colleagues in paying tribute to his long and honorable career in the House of Representatives where the defense of this great country of ours has always been foremost in his heart and mind I would like to suggest that we, as a body, confer a new title on "the admiral." I believe it appropriate to bestow upon the distinguished gentleman the title of "the defender," for it is unquestioned that without his unswerving loyalty and guidance we could never have developed the greatest defense force in the world. His foresight and ability to legislate has truly molded the armed services into the greatest military power in the universe.

I am proud to serve with such a fine gentleman as "the defender," the Honorable CARL VINSON.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues this afternoon in paying my respects to our beloved dean of the House of Representatives, the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia. No other man in American history has served as long as he has in this House. Down through the years, in peace and in war, in depression and in prosperity, CARL VINSON has been a tower of strength to all who have had the privilege of serving with him.

When he was elected on November 3, 1914, as a Member of the 63d Congress, the world stood in the shadow of a great war. In the decades since he took his oath of office on December 7, 1914, he has labored unceasingly in behalf of the people of his State, district, and Nation. The contributions he has made to our free institutions and the services he has rendered to our people stand as a lasting monument to CARL VINSON's statesmanship and high Christian character.

During the difficult and trying days of World War II our Nation was fortunate indeed in having him as chairman of the powerful Naval Affairs Committee. His vast knowledge of military affairs and his dedication to duty were prime factors in creating our great military machine.

As the chairman of the Armed Services Committee he was to a great extent responsible for the success of American arms in the Korean conflict. CARL VINSON has become identified for all time with the military prestige of the United States.

To this great Congressman, who so ably exemplifies the highest traditions of the House of Representatives and the finest traits of our American character, our Nation owes a debt of gratitude. I salute him on this most auspicious occasion in his life and wish for him many more years of service in the House of Representatives.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join my distinguished colleague and South Carolinian, the Honorable MENDEL RIVERS, of Charleston, S.C., in doing honor to and speaking praise of the great statesman from Georgia, the Honorable CARL VINSON, Member of Congress from the Sixth District of Georgia. Directly he exemplifies the ultimate in qualities desirable in a legislator charged with the heavy responsibility that he has shouldered so well for so many years.

It has always appeared to me that Chairman VINSON, distinguished leader of the Armed Services Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, is a man possessing the secret of eternal youth. Not only is he young in his physical appearance and activity, but intellectually he displays all the talents, all the sagacity of a man half his age. Then, too, his outlook is so youthful, optimistic, and inspiring as to challenge the thinking and the attitudes of all of us who are his juniors.

I did not know this great man until I came to Congress 7 years ago. I had heard of him and often wondered what kind of man he was. I found him to be a delightful, courteous southern gentleman of the old school, a great Democrat, a fearless leader, and a dedicated public servant. Along with others I wish for him not only many more years of fruitful service, but, should he ever leave the Halls of the Congress for a retirement in which he would deserve the blessings of good health and happiness, the happy privilege of reflection on a great life of service to a great Nation whose integrity, whose strength, and whose freedom he so ably helped to preserve.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great feeling of pride that I join with my fellow Members of the U.S. House of Representatives in saluting my good friend and a most distinguished American, the Honorable CARL VINSON.

By his presence here today, CARL VINSON sets a record for the longest continuous service to his country of any person in the history of our Nation who was ever elected to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman VINSON over these past years has not only served well the people of his district, but he has also made many outstanding contributions to the welfare of all of the residents of this country. He was formerly chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee and became chairman of the Committee on Armed Services following the enactment of the Congressional Reorganization Act. He has long held dear the best interests of our Armed Forces and has been the guiding figure behind some of the most important legislation in that area ever to come out of the Congress. Included in the vast array of laws are measures which have preserved the Marine Corps; established a separate Air Force with its own Academy; provided for continued growth of the Navy; set standard procurement practices, and consolidated military purchasing. The Pentagon has been organized and reorganized. Field commands have been unified and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been given broader authorities. Service housing, pay promotion, medical care, and survivor benefits have been enormously improved to assure a career military force.

CARL VINSON is revered not only for his knowledge, his ability, and his tremendous interest in his State and Nation, but also for the willing cooperation he so often extends to each of us. I am more than happy to add my tributes to his many outstanding contributions, to wish him well, and to express the hope which I am sure we all feel that he will be with us for many more years yet to come.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, few legislators in the history of our country so richly deserve the tributes that are being paid today to Representative CARL VINSON of the Sixth District of Georgia. Here is a Representative from a great Southern State who has, through almost 50 years of devoted service in the House, won for himself the respect, the admiration, and the affection of his colleagues from all over the Union. I do not hesitate to say that for me and for many of my colleagues, he has been a mentor, a friend, and a guide in whom we see the ideal legislator.

What particularly strikes me is that this elder statesman is more representative in the boldness of his judgment and in the practice of modern statesmanship than legislators half his age. We have but to scan his record as chairman of the Armed Services Committee and as chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee to recognize how much this Nation owes to him for the preeminence of our defense posture. To study the career of Representative VINSON is to familiarize oneself with a statesman who, though born in a previous century, belongs more to the present and indeed to the future than he does to the past.

I am delighted to look forward to many more years of close legislative association with this wise and knowledgeable gentleman, one of the greatest legislators of our time.

On this occasion of Representative VINSON's recordbreaking service in the House—longer than any Representative in history—we all salute him and hope that there will be many more years of wise and conscientious service that he has to give to his district, his State, and his country.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have included with my remarks the following interesting story about Congressman VINSON's record length of service in the House of Representatives, which was printed in the Springfield (Mass.) Sunday Republican on July 14:

CRUSTY, JAUNTY "UNCLE CARL" PASSES MILESTONE ON TUESDAY

WASHINGTON.—A jaunty, crusty, 79-year-old Democratic Congressman from Georgia with bright, blue eyes and a long, sagacious nose is about to add an imposing official title to his many nicknames.

ALL-TIME DEAN

Representative CARL VINSON's new distinction: All-time dean of the House of Representatives. On Tuesday, according to Library of Congress records, VINSON will have been a Member longer than anyone else in history.

Specifically, on that date, he will pass the record established by his dear friend and ally, the late Speaker Sam Rayburn, whose death in 1961 ended 48 years, 8 months continuous service.

VINSON was sworn in as a Member of Congress on November 3, 1914.

No other House Member comes close, although Senator CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, of Arizona, still occupies a special sanctum in the seniority-worshiping Congress. HAYDEN has 51 years of service, but it is divided between House and Senate.

"Admiral" VINSON, otherwise "the Georgia swamp fox," "the backstage boss of the Pentagon," or more generally "Uncle CARL," has lived long enough to chuckle over the legends in which he figures.

The flag-draped, old-fashioned Armed Services Committee room, spittoon-equipped—the chairman chews—is VINSON's castle on the Hill. He has headed that powerful committee, and the predecessor Naval Affairs Committee, since 1931, except two 2-year periods when Republicans controlled the House.

PLAYS HIS ROLE

In this room VINSON plays to the hilt the role of seniority-buttressed chairman, supremely assured against any challenge from the executive branch or his own colleagues. A ribbon-decorated officer is put in his place with a stare over the ever-sliding VINSON glasses, and, "What did you say your name was, admiral?"

A hapless Member-witness who remarks ingratiatingly that others have said well what he had in mind to say hears the gavel bang in midsentence: "Thank you for being so considerate. Next witness."

VINSON's other role, as one of the little group of strong men who run the scrambling, 435-Member House, is not to be seen so casually.

But it's a good bet President Kennedy knows all about it. Since Kennedy took office with a hairbreadth majority of popular votes and an uncomfortably close division in the House, he has had VINSON's help in one key vote after another.

Over and over, at least until the recent months when civil rights issues came to the fore, VINSON has helped deliver solid support from Georgia and assistance from nearby on the kind of proposals that often send conservative Southern Democrats into a coalition with Republicans.

FULLY KNOWLEDGEABLE

Anyone who would take VINSON's rustic air and spoonbread pronunciations to mean he is an innocent among the experts in uniform could be reeducated at a single committee meeting. The master of River Ridge plantation, 600 cattle and feed crop acres on Vinson Highway near Milledgeville, Ga., is fully knowledgeable on the industrial marvels of 1963 weapons systems and can converse with anyone in Pentagonese, Georgia-accented.

This most durable of House Members was born on a farm a few miles from Milledgeville, November 18, 1883. He went into politics by a purely conventional route—delivering newspapers, jerking soda, studying law, practicing in town, serving as prosecuting attorney and in the legislature—then as a judge briefly before his election to Congress to fill an unexpired term.

Shortly after he was sworn into Congress in 1914, VINSON served as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee and, during World War I, found a friend and fellow thinker in the Assistant Secretary of the Navy Franklin D. Roosevelt.

When Roosevelt became President, VINSON was chairman of the committee and advocating a Navy "second to none." The Roosevelt-Vinson entente helped to produce a two-ocean Navy before U.S. entry into World War II and to expand it vastly afterward.

The military budget cuts of the early postwar years brought VINSON into dispute with President Harry S Truman and his Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson—who resigned—but VINSON backed Truman when the President asserted his authority to relieve Gen. Douglas MacArthur from command in Japan.

During the years when the executive department under President Dwight D. Eisenhower was Republican and the Congress Democratic, VINSON maintained smooth relations in his sphere. The dispute over service reorganization ended in an accommodation praised both by the President and the chairman.

Then the Democrats recaptured the White House and VINSON was one of the first congressional leaders to predict that Kennedy would be "a great President."

When the man he was talking about was just born, VINSON was already a Congressman with 2½ years' seniority.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, today marks the date upon which the most eminent and distinguished gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON, begins his period of service in this House over and beyond that of any other Member of Congress of all time.

I think it is peculiarly fitting that this great honor comes to our friend from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. One who has the pleasure of knowing CARL VINSON immediately recognizes his great traits of leadership. As someone has so well said, "when CARL VINSON arrives on the scene things begin to happen."

During his period of service many wonderful things have happened. CARL VINSON, long ago, literally made himself the legislative guardian of the armed services of our country. Not only have his fellow citizens benefitted from his watchful care, but all the free people around the world owe a debt of gratitude to his dedication to building armed forces that have kept freedom alive on earth.

CARL VINSON, himself, is one of the masters of all time of the legislative art. He loves the House as few men have loved it. His dedication to making the processes of democracy work here are not only well known to every Member but the quality of those efforts themselves have already been encased in the history of our times.

What we say here today will not change—could not change—the place in our civilization that Mr. Vinson has carved for himself. But, we can graciously convey to our distinguished colleague the deep feeling of love and appreciation which we hold for him. That is the purpose of my little speech. It has been my privilege to benefit from his wisdom and sage advice. I have taken this means of formally expressing my appreciation and the high regard in which I hold him. I hope for many years he may continue in good health and strength to make his great abilities available to our country.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with my colleagues in their tributes to this outstanding American, Hon. Carl Vinson, of Georgia.

Affable, able, hard-working, a gentleman always, Carl Vinson has not only served longer in the House of Representatives than any other Member, but in that time has become perhaps the most influential Member we have.

In debate he is without peer. In his handling of his committee he is unsurpassed. In his imprint on the Nation, none will have a stronger or deeper mark.

Truly, in these troubled times we must look to our veteran Members to turn the tide of disastrous turmoil, with attendant mobs, to the high principles of orderly government which was intended by the Founders of our beloved Republic.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I think upon occasion each of us has a touch of depression when we feel that age is catching up with us and that perhaps time is treating us unfairly. These moods pass and we know that we are as vigorous as ever and fully able to take on the manifold chores and diversions of the busy times in which we live. We, who serve in this great House, are more immune than most from brooding upon the ageing process for we have the built-in example and inspiration of our distinguished colleague whom we honor today as he, without loss of vigor or vitality, surpasses all previous records of service in the Congress.

It has been the highest honor and privilege to me to have served as a colleague of Carl Vinson of Georgia, the great and distinguished Chairman of the Armed Services Committee. I am proud to join with the many, many others of his colleagues in paying tribute to him on this occasion which bespeaks so eloquently his outstanding service to his district and his country.

When I came to Washington in 1924 as secretary to the distinguished former Member of Congress from my district in North Carolina, Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, Carl Vinson was a veteran with 10 years of seniority. Long before I came to Congress as a Member his wisdom and example provided valuable lessons in my education. Over the ensuing years his friendship has been among the most meaningful that I have enjoyed and profited from in this body where I have been privileged to know and develop warm friendships with many of the greatest Americans of this century.

I shall not repeat what has been so well said by others about "Admiral" Vinson's tremendous, unmeasurable contributions to the security of our country in all of its facets. I agree with all who have said it in the same or other ways that the scope and sureness of his knowledge and instinct of military and naval affairs have been the salvation of this country in times of its greatest peril.

Speaking as Chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, it has always been a comfort to me to know that Carl Vinson fully and intimately knows the lessons of the history of sea power, upon which nations have risen and fallen depending upon their appreciation of the complementary roles of a strong Navy and a strong Merchant Marine. His support has always been firm on matters that have come to the floor of the House involving the maintenance of an adequate American Flag Merchant Marine as a continuing element with his beloved Navy, and the Army and the Air Force as bastions of our strength as a world power.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished life of the man whose splendid achievements we take time out to recognize today is indeed inspirational. America will grow in stature with each day of his continued service.

God bless you, Carl.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, on November 3, 1914, almost 49 years ago, the citizens of the then 10th District of Georgia made a fateful choice—a choice whose wisdom would be reenforced with succeeding decades. It was on that day, Mr. Speaker, that Carl Vinson, then in his 31st year was elected to serve in this body.

Today, the distinguished dean of our delegation passes a milestone of service, and achieves the distinction of serving longer in the House of Representatives than any other American.

The world of today is vastly different from that world of 1914—altered and tempered by two World Wars, a great depression, and worldwide social upheaval. Carl Vinson has occupied a place of authority and leadership through it all. Notwithstanding the significant part that he has played in shaping the past, his thoughts, talents, and unbounded energies have ever been dedicated to the future.

Georgia, and the Nation, remain the beneficiary of the wisdom shown in that election so many years ago. It is with a deep sense of pride that I, as a new member of the Georgia delegation, pay tribute to the dean of the House on this significant occasion.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a high honor to have this opportunity to add my congratulations to the many others offered here today to one of the greatest men who has ever served in this body, the Honorable Carl Vinson, of Georgia. Carl is now the dean of all this House and I am indeed proud and happy to have been privileged to serve with such a great and dedicated American for almost 20 years.

For 46 years our able chairman of the Armed Services Committee of this House of Representatives has shouldered the heavy responsibilities of assisting in having our U.S. defenses adequately prepared for action. It has been a most difficult task to keep our defenses strong in a world of ever changing and developing of new and modern weapons. Chairman Vinson has fulfilled his responsibilities with the ability and intelligence of one who knows more about our Nation's defense program than any other single person.

I am glad to be able to call Carl Vinson my friend and to have the privilege of paying tribute to him. He is a truly great legislator, an outstanding American who has served his district and the Nation longer than any other Member in the long history of the House of Representatives. May Carl continue to break his own record for many, many more years to come.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, may I congratulate Mr. Vinson on his great honor which has come to no other American in history. I congratulate the wonderful people of Georgia for having the good judgment to permit Mr. Vinson to remain in Congress where he could serve with such patriotism and devotion. I thank the people of Georgia for sharing with us his genius and leadership. The entire Nation and the whole free world are grateful to the people of Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, when the textile industry and its employees were threatened, as never before, from a flood of unfair foreign imports, Mr. Vinson accepted the chairmanship of our informal Textile House Committee.

Mr. Vinson kindly consented to lead our group in addition to his other overwhelming burdens and responsibilities. I sat with Mr. Vinson through many conferences with the President, the Textile Cabinet Committee, and those leaders representing the textile industry and its employees. Without Mr. Vinson's leadership, our voice would never have been heard. As a direct result of Mr. Vinson's untiring efforts, the Geneva agreement limiting imports was signed and became effective last fall. The textile industry, its employees, and the cotton farmer will be eternally grateful for Mr. Vinson's outstanding and successful championship of their cause.

Mrs. Dorn, the children, and my staff join me in wishing for Mr. Vinson many more years of magnificent service, success, and every happiness.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I respectfully include therein an editorial in the Washington Daily News.

This editorial epitomizes Carl Vinson. Those of us who know this great American do not try to understand him all of the time. This we know: Carl Vinson wears no man's collar. His interest is America. Americans have accepted Carl Vinson because he has done more than anybody in our lifetime to make this country the safest on the face of the earth. Yes, Mr. Speaker, all of us accept Carl Vinson as the gospel because he is dedicated to his country.

Uncle Carl

Shortly after Representative Carl Vinson, Democrat of Georgia, came to Washington

48 years, 8 months, and 14 days ago, an influential Georgian sent him a stack of private bills he wanted introduced.

Representative Vinson—then the youngest Member of the House—sent them back by return mail.

"I wear no man's collar," he said.

Today—officially having served longer than any other Representative in the Nation's history—Uncle Carl at 79 is still collarless. As far back as most of us can recollect he has presided over the defense of this country through the chairmanship of the House Naval Affairs and then the House Armed Services Committees. We have not always agreed with the old boy—and Uncle Carl would scorn us if we had—but we have respected him. And he has been right far more often than he has been wrong.

Yesterday, Carl Vinson sat in embarrassed silence while his colleagues heaped praise and plaudits on him. On a similar occasion a few years back he was moved to remark:

"I disclaim all these gentlemen say, but I hope everybody else accepts it as gospel."

We do, Uncle Carl, we do.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, one of my cherished memories as a Representative of the House of Representatives is to have known and served with the Honorable Carl Vinson. I am sure he will be recorded in history as one of the "great" legislators of the Congress, one who steered our ship of state through the "rough and stormy seas" of these tumultuous years.

Our colleague has reached another milestone in his distinguished career. He has now served in the House of Representatives for a longer period of time than any other person. Elected 25 times, Chairman Vinson has had continuous service of 46 years, 8 months, and 13 days.

As chairman of the Committee on Armed Services he, perhaps more than any other individual, has been responsible for our military posture. He was one of those primarily responsible for the United States having a two ocean Navy, and our development of airpower.

The people of the United States are indebted to Carl Vinson and on this notable day in his life I, on behalf of the people I represent and myself, wish him continued health so that he may continue his important work.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I seek the privilege of joining with my colleagues in congratulating the Honorable Carl Vinson on his matchless record of service to this House.

Almost 50 years of continuous service to the Nation—no Member has held a seat in this Chamber so long. Almost 30 years as chairman of a major committee of the House of Representatives—no Member has held a chairmanship so long. This is a record, Mr. Speaker, that may never be surpassed.

The residents of the Sixth Congressional District of the State of Georgia chose wisely and well when they first elected young Carl Vinson in the year 1914. They could not, of course, see into the future. They could not foresee the long and historic service that lay ahead, but they did choose a Representative that was qualified and able to serve his district, his State, and the Nation in whatever capacity the needs of the times would dictate.

Chairman Vinson has been honored by the leadership from both sides of the aisle this past week, but the greatest honor has been done to him by his own constituents. Twenty-five times they have reaffirmed their confidence in him, and this perhaps is the greatest honor of all.

When one thinks back over the events of the past half-century he is staggered by the onrush of great historical achievements. America was a second-class power when Carl Vinson first came to Washington—today we stand first in power and first in prestige. It has taken two world wars and a scientific and technological revolution to bring this change about, and Carl Vinson has played a major role in shaping events.

The America of 1914 seems a far and distant place to us now. The raw frontier of the West was still not finally tamed—our Nation still lived by the principles of McGuffey's Reader and the stories of Horatio Alger. Young Carl Vinson was a product of that America and it lives within him still.

He represents all that is best in the American tradition. The rugged, pioneering spirit, and the strong streak of independence. The realistic mind that judges other men on what they can do, and not on what others say. These traits are characteristic of the America of 50 years ago, and we are the losers as we move away from that point in time. I wish we could capture that youthful exuberance again.

If the honorable chairman of our Armed Services Committee was to retire today his place in our history books would be secure. Fortunately, we can expect to have his experience and talent with us for a long time to come. Mr. Speaker, it is right and proper that we pause this week to pay him the homage he has so richly earned.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the youngest man in this body, in spirit and in the drive of dedicated public service, today becomes the oldest in continuous tenure in all the long history of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. I feel, with my colleagues, the thrill of being participants when history is being written. It is unlikely that ever again will a member of this body complete 48 years 8 months and 13 days of service in this Chamber.

Carl Vinson is one of the great Americans of all times. When the test of battle came, on sea, on land and in the air, the vision and the planning of Carl Vinson were reflected in the victories that came to the cause of freedom. When the challenges and the tensions of the cold war enveloped us, and the dangers in a nuclear age could not be fathomed, the knowledge and the determined leadership of Carl Vinson were vital factors in safeguarding our security.

After all of us are gone, and other generations have come and been replaced by later generations, the name and fame of this unassuming man of giant stature in ability and in patriotic devotion will live, a vibrant part of the history of this land of our Carl Vinson so magnificently helped to guide in safety through the most perilous of times.

To have known him as a friend, to have worked with him as a colleague, has been to every Member of the House a treasured enrichment.

Mr. Speaker, for myself, for my constituents and for Lt. Gen. Charles G. Dodge, his officers and enlisted personnel of the 5th Army, headquartered in the district I have the honor to represent, I extend to the distinguished and beloved son of Georgia, the chairman of the great Committee on Armed Services, the champion and the friend of all who serve with the Armed Forces, the peerless statesman and patriot who has established a tenure record that is unlikely ever to be broken, the Honorable Carl Vinson, I extend warmest congratulations and sincerest wishes for continuing good health and brilliant accomplishment for God and country for many, many years to come.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply honored to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the dean of deans of the House of Representatives, the distinguished chairman of the committee on which I have the privilege to serve, and a great American, the Honorable Carl Vinson, of Georgia.

Carl Vinson has served 48 years, 8 months, and 19 days in the House, thus eclipsing the record set by the late, great Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn. He has served as chairman of the Armed Services Committee and its predecessor, the Naval Affairs Committee, for 29 years—a record for a committee chairman. The members of his constituency have expressed their faith in him and in his judgment 25 times and he has wisely and consistently justified their decision.

But years by themselves are not important, and this is especially true with Carl Vinson. As chairman of the Armed Services Committee he has been a guiding light in building the strongest defense any nation of the world has known. It has been my honor and privilege, since being elected to Congress, to serve on that committee; to reap the benefit of Chairman Vinson's vast wisdom and knowledge; to appreciate his dedication and enormous abilities. At the same time his concern with our national defense has not diminished the attention he pays to the needs of his constituency or his commitment to the total health and welfare of our country.

Mr. Speaker, our country has indeed been fortunate to have had this remarkable man in his position of great responsibility for so many years, and I know that I echo my colleagues' wishes in the thought that he continue to serve with honor and distinction for many years to come.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this occasion pass without joining with my colleagues in paying my respects to the venerable and respected senior Member and dean of the House of Representatives, the beloved, admired, and respected Carl Vinson.

As the late Speaker Rayburn used to remind us, it is a high honor and responsibility to be elected once to this House. Carl Vinson has been sent here 25 successive times by his constituents of the

Sixth District of Georgia. This record speaks eloquently for itself.

Among all the distinguished individuals who have served in this body I know of no one whose contributions to the public interest and the Nation's defenses have been greater than those of Carl Vinson. He towers like a mighty oak. His legislative achievements span a half century, and cover a multitude of subjects, because his interests have been as broad as our great Nation.

I sincerely want to say that during the entire course of my service in the House of Representatives I have never seen Chairman Vinson unprepared on any piece of legislation. We have all learned from his high example. We have tried to follow the pattern he has set.

I extend to you my most heartfelt respects and congratulations on this memorable occasion.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the gentleman from Georgia on the occasion of his becoming the only man in history to serve longer in the House of Representatives than the late beloved Sam Rayburn. I became a member of the Armed Services Committee during this session of Congress totally briefed on the legendary Carl Vinson. My senior colleagues described colorfully and in detail this great personality.

I looked forward to service on that committee with eagerness and anticipation. There was no disappointment. After a few sessions, it was clear why the people of his district chose to keep him here longer than any other Member in the history of the United States.

I can now bear witness to his incredible depth of perception and understanding; to his incomparable wealth of background; to his magnetic charm and wit; to his devotion to his country; to his affection for his fellow man; to his skillful handling of legislation; and to his complete fairness and inspiring sense of justice.

I am honored and proud to be a Member of this body as a colleague of the Honorable Carl Vinson.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, all Georgians and all Americans are proud of the service rendered to his country by Congressman Carl Vinson.

Besides the sterling representation that he has given his own district—being returned to office by them a total of 25 times—Chairman Vinson has been an architect of the defense setup for our entire country.

Chairman Vinson has the respect of this body and of the entire Nation for his role in shaping our American supremacy in the world today. Our military superiority has seldom been seriously questioned, and he has always had the vision and courage which have helped make this possible.

The seniority system used here in Congress has been criticized from time to time, but when it allows a man of Chairman Vinson's caliber to render such service to his country, the seniority system is functioning at its finest.

The people of the First District of Georgia are grateful for the leadership of this great American citizen. I personally am grateful for the many courtesies and kindnesses which he has shown me as the Representative of the people in the First District. And all America is grateful that he has had such a vital role in the defense of the Nation through World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, numerous police actions, and the present cold war.

I commend Chairman Vinson for his patriotic devotion to duty, and I commend the people of his own Sixth District of Georgia for the excellent judgment they have shown in 25 elections.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the Record on the service of our great and distinguished dean.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks and that all Members who spoke may revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the dean of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my deep appreciation and sincere gratitude to the people of my district who have made this occasion possible. Throughout the years they have reposed their confidence in me. I am deeply grateful for that friendship and for their repeated expression of approval of the service I have rendered to them.

Finally, I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart, my colleagues, for your most gracious, kind, and complimentary remarks.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

[Applause, Members rising.]

ANNOUNCEMENT THAT CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL WILL BE CALLED UP WEDNESDAY, JULY 17

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, before yielding the floor, may I announce to the Members of the House that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan] has advised that the conference report on the Interior appropriation bill will be called up tomorrow.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS OF THE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I could not hear the request of the gentleman, or the gentleman preceding him.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. Haley] asks unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may sit during general debate today.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I again insist that Members transacting business for committees go to the microphone so that we may hear when business is being transacted.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

PROPOSING NAME OF SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today for the consideration of the House of Representatives a proposal to name the $60 million, multipurpose dam and reservoir at McGee Bend on the Angelina River in Jasper County, Tex., the "Sam Rayburn Dam and Reservoir."

No man in the history of this Nation did more to preserve our priceless natural resources than Sam Rayburn; this is particularly true of the critically important project now being completed in the Angelina-Neches Watersheds of southeast Texas.

Sam Rayburn temporarily laid down his gavel, stepped down to the floor and worked shoulder to shoulder with me to get funds for this project. It would be entirely fitting and appropriate that we commemorate the work of our late Speaker by naming this project after him.

I hope the appropriate committees and our colleagues here in the House will give this proposal to honor the name of Speaker Rayburn their favorable consideration and I offer to be spread on the Record at this point a copy of this legislation.

H.R. 7594

A bill to designate the McGee Bend Dam and Reservoir on the Angelina River, Tex., as the Sam Rayburn Dam and Reservoir

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the McGee Bend Dam and Reservoir on the Angelina River, Tex., hereafter shall be known and designated as the "Sam Rayburn Dam and Reservoir." Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which McGee Bend Dam and Reservoir is referred to shall be held to refer to such dam and reservoir as the "Sam Rayburn Dam and Reservoir."

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO ROLL CALL

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is the ninth birthday of Roll Call and I am sure all of my colleagues join me in warm congratulations to Sidney Yudain, its founder and continuing editor and publisher. Roll Call has been a credit to Capitol Hill and it has made a large contribution to the neighborliness and the spirit of cooperatively working together of the people, Members of the Congress and members of their staffs, who do the legislative work of the greatest and most powerful Nation in the world.

Sid Yudain started with a capital about sufficient to meet the printer's bill for the first edition. What he has accomplished in 8 years with Roll Call is a modern success story in the Horatio Alger pattern. Today Roll Call circulates in all the 50 States of the Union and it has many readers in foreign lands. It claims to be the most quoted newspaper in America and I would say there is a good deal of truth in this statement.

I count it among the treasured honors that have come to me in my congressional service that Sid Yudain invited me to be the contributor of an article in volume I, No. 1, of his journalistic venture. I advanced the thought in that article that we all do too much talking, that the only two words that count are "yes" and "no" and all the others words are filler-in. In the 8 years that have passed since I penciled that bit of philosophy I have listened to millions of words and I am more than ever convinced that the only two words that really count are the "ayes" and "nays" with which we respond to rollcalls.

To Sid Yudain and Roll Call, many happy returns of the day.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION AND PEACEFUL DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution calling on the Congress and the committees thereof to stop all hearings on civil rights bills until the so-called peaceful demonstrations in America have ceased for at least 30 days.

This resolution is in order. I do not think there has been a time in the history of Congress when open threats to Members of Congress have been made as they have been in the past few weeks.

"You either pass civil rights legislation in a hurry or we will demonstrate."

What do those demonstrations amount to? Shootings, bombings, breaking windowpanes, breaking automobile glass. In no sense of the word could they be considered peaceful demonstrations.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the sound of Independence Day bells still echoes as the Members of this eminent body commemorate Captive Nations Week. It is by this continuing observance that we demonstrate our sustained fidelity to those principles of freedom and self-determination which were enunciated by our forefathers 187 years ago in Philadelphia.

Were we now to turn our backs on that historic "Declaration of Independence" as an outdated paper, relevant to bygone days, we would have no reason to be concerned with today's captive nations. Were we to deny that the ideals of 1776 any longer apply to all men—under all circumstances—then surely our interest of 1963 in the captive nations would not exist. And, were we to file away with other dusty documents of the past the Fourth of July pronouncement, then certainly the 88th Congress and the American people might well not sound their sympathy for captive peoples.

But we cannot be cynical and forgetful of—or faithless to—the brave men who preceded us and endowed us with the blessings of a free country. No. As we turn to the observance of Captive Nations Week, we dedicate ourselves anew to the noble theme that all men are created equal and are truly entitled to their inalienable rights; not by the tolerance of some beneficent government, but as God-given to be enjoyed by every individual. We declare again that the "right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" carries with it the challenge to break loose from oppressive rule. We assert again the belief that, although established systems should not be cast aside for light or transient causes, the love of liberty inspires people to dissolve all political bonds imposed through the deceit of dictators or the treachery of tyrants.

We say now to enslaved people everywhere—whether in our neighboring islands or in some remote area of this world—that the United States of America is not only conscious of their deplorable conditions but greatly concerned. We announce to these people that the highest hope in the hearts of every American citizen is that freedom, independence, and self-government shall be enjoyed by all.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that on tomorrow we will consider the conference report on the Department of Interior appropriation bill. I should like to call attention to the fact that bill contains an appropriation for planning which will eventually amount to the sum of $39.5 million for an air museum to be built down on the Mall opposite the Capitol. I do not believe that this air museum is needed.

At the proper time tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, I intend to submit a motion to recommit this conference report to the conferees with instructions to delete this appropriation item that this country cannot afford at this time and does not need, because we already have air museums. We do not need any more free tourist attractions down here in front of the Capitol.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day for the call of the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill.

OUTLET STORES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2300) for the relief of the Outlet Stores, Inc.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

DR. AND MRS. ABEL GORFAIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2706) for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Abel Gorfain.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CHARLES WAVERLY WATSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2728) for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

REAPPOINTMENT OF WALTER SOWA, JR., AS MIDSHIPMAN

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 2192) authorizing the readmittance of Walter Sowa, Jr., to the U.S. Naval Academy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That, notwithstanding sections 6954 and 6958(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, the President is authorized to reappoint Walter Sowa, Junior, a former midshipman at the United States Naval Academy, as a midshipman in the appropriate class at such Academy.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

WARTIME SEDITION ACT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 433 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4897) to repeal subsection (d) of section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 433 provides for consideration of H.R. 4897, a bill to repeal subsection (d) of section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 4897 is to extend the geographical application of section 2388 and title 18, United States Code, relating to seditious activities affecting Armed Forces.

The existing geographical limitation upon the application of the wartime sedition law to acts committed either in the United States, or on the high seas, or within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States, prevents the prosecution for acts of sedition committed against the United States in foreign countries by citizens and its nationals, or permanent resident aliens.

The extension of the sedition law is proposed to be achieved by the repeal of subsection (d) of section 2388, supra, which limits the application of the statute to crimes committed within the United States, or within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States, or on the high seas.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 433.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 433 provides for 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 4897. This is an open rule. H.R. 4897 is a bill to repeal subsection (d) of section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the effect of H.R. 4897 is to remove the existing geographical limitation from the wartime sedition statute (18 U.S.C. 2388) and thus enable the U.S. Government to prosecute U.S. citizens, nationals, or permanent resident aliens for acts of sedition committed on foreign soil, as well as within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States, or on the high seas, or within the United States.

This bill was introduced at the request of the Department of Justice and parallels the rationale under which Public Law 87-369 was enacted on October 4, 1961, eliminating geographical limitations in the enforcement of the espionage law.

The report contains minority views by a Member, and additional views by another Member. Undoubtedly there will be some discussion as to whether or not the war is over and as to whether a sedition statute is actually needed.

So far as I am concerned I favor the bill. I know of no objection to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 94]

Abernethy
Ashbrook
Auchincloss
Barry
Boland
Buckley
Burkhalter
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clawson, Del
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Diggs
Dulski
Evins
Fogarty
Forrester
Fuqua
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Hagan, Ga.
Healey
Hoffman
Karth
Kee
Kilburn
Knox
Lesinski
Long, La.
McCulloch
Macdonald
Martin, Mass.
May
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Moore
Morrison
Mosher
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
Passman
Pepper
Pilcher
Pillion
Rains
Robison
Rostenkowski
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Sisk
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Trimble
Tuten
Vanik
Weltner
Whitten
Wickersham

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 367 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS AND POWER OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have permission to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

WARTIME SEDITION ACT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4897) to repeal subsection (d) of section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 4897, with Mrs. GREEN of Oregon in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Madam Chairman, this bill, H.R. 4897, presents an opportunity for Congress to enact legislation that is needed. In the last session a bill of our colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF], who is the author of this bill, was enacted into law, providing that acts of espionage committed overseas by U.S. citizens could be prosecuted. The bill before us today provides that acts of sedition likewise could be properly prosecuted. I take this occasion to commend our able colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF], on the careful study he has given to this matter and for the valuable insights he provided during the course of the hearing on this bill. This bill, H.R. 4897, seeks to repeal the geographical or jurisdictional limitations on the prosecution of acts of sedition that are committed by Americans in foreign lands. It would extend jurisdiction to acts of sedition committed in foreign lands. The sedition statute prohibits the willful making or conveying of false reports while the United States is at war with the intent to interfere with the operation or success of its military and naval forces, or willfully causing or attempting to cause insubordination, disloyalty or mutiny in the military and naval forces of the United States or willfully obstructing the enlistment services of the United States to the injury of the United States.

I might add also that under section 2391 there is a provision that the sedition statute is applicable during the time of the present national emergency and until 6 months thereafter unless it is terminated earlier by a concurrent resolution of the Congress.

At present, under the terms of the subsection of section 2388, title 18, United States Code which is sought to be repealed in this bill the sedition statute's applicability is geographically limited to acts committed within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States and on the high seas as well as within the United States. This, of course, presently makes the statute inapplicable to seditious conduct committed in foreign countries by persons who are citizens of the United States or who have permanent residence here. There appears to be no sound reason for exempting a violator of the sedition law from prosecution just because he committed his crime in a foreign country. Actually, many seditious activities if committed in a foreign country could be more injurious to the defense of the United States than if those acts were committed within the United States.

As an example, there is the case of Powell, his wife and an accomplice who, during the Korean war, circulated among American prisoners of war clearly seditious material in their publication entitled "China Monthly Review." Although this magazine evidently contained lies calculated to interfere with the success of our military effort, no successful prosecution was possible because the China Monthly Review was circulated abroad, that is, in Korea. The Court refused to permit evidence of circulation in Korea where the magazine was used as an instrument of psychological warfare against the American prisoners of war, like, for example, accusing the United States of conducting bacteria and poison gas warfare.

Hundreds of thousands, possibly a million or more Americans are traveling abroad. Many of our Armed Forces are deployed abroad. There is no justification for the limitation now contained in the existing law.

The Supreme Court of the United States has held in United States against Bowman that crime injurious to the United States, in the absence of any geographical or jurisdictional limitation, is punishable irrespective of where committed. So that there is no question as to the constitutionality of either the whole statute or the bill that is before us. The committee thoroughly examined the several pertinent cases with reference to constitutionality and is of the opinion that no constitutional question can effectively be raised.

The committee believes that repeal of the geographical limitation for this sedition statute is of paramount importance to keep pace with the requirements of the present times, fraught with international tension, if we are to protect and preserve the vital interest and the national security of the United States. We also feel that the enactment of this bill would provide a deterrent for action such as I have cited in the case of the Powells in the distribution of their China Monthly Review.

Madam Chairman, I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. POFF. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, as my distinguished colleague from Ohio has just explained, it is the purpose of H.R. 4897 to broaden the geographical application of and thereby to strengthen the so-called wartime sedition statute. That purpose will be achieved, as an examination of the content of the bill will disclose, by repealing subsection (d) of section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code. That subsection confines application of the statute to acts of sedition which are committed inside the United States, within the admiralty or maritime jurisdiction of the United States, or on the high seas. The repeal of the subsection would have the effect of extending the jurisdictional geographical reach of the statute to acts of sedition committed by U.S. citizens or permanent resident aliens of the United States on foreign soil.

Now what is the wartime sedition statute? Well, that is the statute which makes it a Federal crime for a person to commit any of three distinct and separate offenses specified in the statute:

First, for a person to make a false report with intent to interfere with the operation or success of our Armed Forces or to promote the success of the enemies of the Armed Forces;

Second, for a person to cause or to attempt to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty in the Armed Forces or to obstruct recruitment or enlist in the Armed Forces of the United States;

And, third, for a person to conspire with another to commit any of such offenses.

The statute also makes it a crime punishable by a fine of $10,000 or imprisonment for 10 years, either or both, for a person with wrongful intent or evil purpose to harbor or to conceal some person who has committed or is about to commit one of those offenses.

Now how can a criminal statute of the United States have extraterritorial effect?

The U.S. Supreme Court in the case of United States against Bowman decided that any U.S. citizen who commits a crime which is directly injurious to the Government of the United States may be punished whether that crime is committed at home or abroad.

You may inquire, well, what application does a wartime statute have in time of peace? In 1953, Congress passed section 2391 of title 18 of the Code which had the effect of extending the life of the statute until 6 months after the termination of the emergency proclaimed by President Truman on December 16, 1950, unless that emergency was sooner terminated by a concurrent resolution of the Congress.

That emergency has never been terminated either by the President or by the Congress and the statute remains in full effect.

The bill under debate, I would like to assure you, in no way alters the substantive content of the wartime sedition statute, but only extends its geographic application.

Last year the Congress passed, you may recall, and the President signed the bill that became Public Law 87-369. That bill accomplished with respect to the espionage statute the same thing which this bill would accomplish with respect to the sedition statute.

Does the sedition statute violate the free speech guarantee of the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States?

In at least four separate decisions, the Supreme Court has decided in its interpretation of the predecessor statute of the wartime sedition statute that there is no violation of the free speech guarantee. These decisions, I might add, have written new safeguards around the free speech guarantee, in context with the enforcement of the sedition statute.

Let me explain what I mean. In the case of Schenck against the United States, Mr. Justice Holmes enunciated what has come to be known by lawyers as the "clear and present danger" doctrine: No person can be convicted for an act of sedition unless the words he used were of such a nature and were uttered under such circumstances as to create a clear and present danger of causing the evils Congress denounced in the wartime sedition statute.

And, in the case of Hartzel against the United States another safeguard was written requiring proof of "specific intent or evil purpose." No person now can be convicted of sedition unless the Government presents evidence which proves beyond any reasonable doubt that that person specifically intended to do the acts and cause the evil consequences proscribed by Congress.

Madam Chairman, what need has been demonstrated to justify geographical extension of the statute?

Madam Chairman, the only witness who appeared before the subcommittee in opposition to this legislation was a spokesman for the American Civil Liberties Union. His chief complaint went to the substance of the statute itself and not to this bill, which only extends the geographical application of the statute. But during the course of his testimony, the witness questioned the need for an extension of the basic application of the statute. Well, had this bill been on the statute books during the so-called Korean police action, John William Powell and his coconspirators would have been in prison today paying a debt to American society which for the want of this legislation will go forever unpaid. Powell's China Monthly Review, which accused the United States of germ and gas warfare and other heinous acts during the Korean war, was circulated among American service men incarcerated in North Korean Communist prisoner-of-war camps. Since the offense was committed outside the geographical limits set by subsection (d), the Government could perfect no case against the Powells, and they are free today.

Madam Chairman, while such a flagrant case may never occur again, there is no guarantee, I suggest, that a similar case might not at any moment develop in South Vietnam where the United States today has American officers and troops actively deployed.

Mr. JOELSON. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia this question: Under the original act where there is a civil rights disturbance and the National Guard is activated, if the Governor of the State involved were to importune the National Guard or even order it to defy or do contrary to orders of the President of the United States, would the Governor of that State be chargeable with sedition under the original act?

Mr. POFF. In answer to the gentleman I would say that the decision as to whether prosecution should be initiated would lie with the Attorney General of the United States. I could not imagine that the Attorney General of the United States would so misinterpret the patent intent of the Congress.

Mr. JOELSON. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman mentioned South Vietnam. I was thinking of other sections of the world in the same respect. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. POFF. Well, I suggest to the gentleman that the situation in South Vietnam may somewhat in some ways parallel the situation in South Korea in 1950 and 1951.

Mr. JOELSON. I am not opposed to the act, I will say to the gentleman—the act under consideration. I merely asked the gentleman the question.

Mr. POFF. I am glad to know that the gentleman will support and vote for the bill.

Mr. MEADER. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. The hypothetical question proposed to the gentleman from Virginia by the gentleman from New Jersey of course would in no way be affected by the bill before the committee this afternoon since the gentleman is referring to acts which occur within the United States.

Mr. POFF. Well, of course, I might say to the gentleman I thought that was manifest. The act remains in full force today, whether the bill under debate is adopted or rejected. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his contribution.

Referring once again to the question of need for this legislation, it is a fact that unlike a generation ago, today the United States by reason of its diplomatic, military and commercial commitments all around the globe has U.S. citizens and permanent residents of the United States traveling or temporarily resident in every quarter of the world. We suggest that such a situation is materially different than it was a generation ago. We must anticipate the possibility that there may be some serious infringement of the sedition statute perpetuated on foreign soil.

May I illustrate what I am saying by calling your attention to the fact there are today in Cuba broadcasting regularly from Havana, every ingenious fabrication and distortion Communist mind can invent, three United States citizens, and I will name them specifically—Barbara Collins, Ilaeh Warner, and Robert Franklin Williams.

It cannot be determined at this point whether or not the statements they are making on those broadcasts constitute substantive violations of the sedition statute, but if we assume that such statements do constitute a violation or that some future statement by them may constitute a violation, it would, under the laws as they exist today, be impossible for the United States to prosecute any of those American citizens, even if they were to return to the United States tomorrow.

So I submit that there is a need for extending the geographic limitations of the sedition statute, and I trust that the House will move speedily in adopting the pending bill.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Madam Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER].

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Madam Chairman, I would like to thank the distinguished and new chairman of our Immigration and Nationality Committee for graciously yielding me this time.

Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4897, a bill to remove the territorial limitation on the operation of the Wartime Sedition Act of 1917.

My opposition is not based on the effect this amendment would have. I do not believe it would have a significant effect; it may in fact have no effect at all. My opposition is based on my belief in a principle, the principle of free speech. The Wartime Sedition Act limits free speech and is therefore, in my opinion, bad law. The bill before us would extend the operation of the Sedition Act and therefore should be opposed by all those who deplore a further limitation on the right of free speech.

Madam Chairman, I recognize that opposition to measures apparently designed to bolster the state in time of stress even at the expense of free speech is never popular. Yet that freedom is what stands between freemen and the authoritarian state.

A month ago on the floor of this House, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], in an admirable speech in behalf of retaining the equal time provisions of the Federal Communications Act, made the following statement:

> Mr. Chairman, if I had been told 20 years ago that there would be legislation before this House which had for its purpose a restriction on free speech, I would have thought such a suggestion completely fantastic.

The bill before us today has for its purpose a further restriction on free speech. I would hope that the gentleman from Mississippi and all others who are concerned with preserving the right to criticize government policy and to present dissenting views, will join me in opposing this bill.

Let us understand the nature of the act whose operation we are today asked to broaden. It is not the same order of offense as treason or espionage. Whereas treason and espionage involve direct and intentional acts to give aid and comfort and state secrets to enemies of our Nation, sedition involves no more than a public expression of opinion. This statement need neither be clandestine, nor taken on behalf of an enemy power. In fact, two of the three kinds of statements considered seditious need not even be false.

Every nation must protect itself against treason and espionage. But should a nation protect itself against free speech, even if that speech is highly critical of governmental policy? Totalitarian states say yes; free states must say no.

The Wartime Sedition Law of 1917 was passed during a time of war, when it was believed that to meet the emergency it was necessary to temporarily deprive citizens of some of their rights, particularly their right to freely criticize the conduct of the war. There is precious little evidence to support the view that seditious statements interfered with the war effort. Instead the major effect of the statute in World War I was to jail almost 900 people for terms of up to 20 years for making such dangerous statements as "War is against the teachings of Christ," or "No soldier ever sees these socks," or "I am for the people and the Government is for the profiteers."

Madam Chairman, the provisions of the Wartime Sedition Act of 1917 are in force today. We are not talking about some temporary measure taken in the stress of dire emergency. We are talking about a law that is in operation now by virtue of a law passed by Congress in 1953. That law extended the operation of the Sedition Act for the duration of the state of emergency proclaimed by President Truman in 1950. The state of emergency has never been lifted, and there is no prospect that it will be lifted in the foreseeable future.

It is said that the World War I cases represent excesses not likely to be repeated. Let us hope so, but let us not be blind to the dangers presented by this law even today.

The first section of the Sedition Act makes it a crime to willfully make a false report with intent to interfere with the operation or success of U.S. military and naval forces. Invariably the truth against which the report is measured has been the information put out by the Government. Today the American who says that Russian missiles remain in Cuba runs the risk of prosecution under this law, because that statement is false; it disagrees with official Government statements and may reasonably be interpreted as intending to interfere with the operation of U.S. military forces.

The third section of the Sedition Act makes it a crime to make statements, whether true or false, intended to interfere with the enlistment service of the United States. When an American today deplores the use of Federal troops to enforce integration in Birmingham, Ala., or Jackson, Miss., he runs the risk of prosecution under this law, because his statement may reasonably be interpreted as having a negative effect on the willingness of young men of those two States to enlist in the U.S. Armed Forces.

These may sound like far-fetched applications of this law, but far more unreasonable applications were made during the World War I period. What stands between free Americans and such prosecutions today is an Attorney General who does not seem inclined to use the provisions of this law.

I, for one, do not want to rely on the whims of some future Attorney General for the protection of right and the rights of free Americans to criticize those policies of the Government, including the conduct of military affairs, with which we disagree.

Today, this Nation faces dangers graver than any faced by any nation in history. Democracy and freedom itself are being challenged as never before. If we survive the current ordeal, it will be because of the superiority of democracy. This superiority resides in the right of every man to be heard, no matter how unpalatable his views. The advantage for the nation in free criticism is incalculable. It means that while our enemies are rigid with conformity and paralyzed by official doctrine, this Nation has the benefit of thoughtful criticism of thoughtful men. Without dissent, without the free interplay of ideas, this Nation is no better off than the totalitarian states that face us. We do not, Madam Chairman, need to emulate the police state.

Madam Chairman, this Nation should not tolerate a law such as the sedition law now on the books, and particularly it should not tolerate such a law in peacetime. The punishment of seditious speech is the technique of the totalitarian state. We did not tolerate such a law in the early days of this Republic. The infamous sedition law of 1798 was repealed at the insistence of President Jefferson. We should not tolerate it today.

We have before us today a small measure. Its effect would be negligible. But the principle involved is great. It is no less than the right of freemen to speak their minds, even when their views are unacceptable to the Government. If we persist in taking on the face of our adversaries, we will find we have lost the principles for which this Nation stands. Moreover, in attempting to silence irresponsible criticism we will inhibit those who would add to our knowledge and the maturity of our policy by providing responsible, thoughtful criticism. We can afford neither the loss of our principles nor the absence of dissent.

Mr. POFF. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. Madam Chairman, as I understand the gentleman's statement, he is opposed to the substance of the statute which is presently on the books in full force and effect; am I correct?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I am. It seems to me, in the absence of absolutely repealing the entire statute, I should think certainly it ought not to be in effect in a time of so-called emergency.

Mr. POFF. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, he made some reference to the Department of Justice and the Attorney General. I am sure he would want the Committee to understand that the Department of Justice endorses this legislation; indeed, that the Attorney General specifically requested the adoption of this legislation; is that not correct?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Yes, a representative of the Department of Justice appeared before the subcommittee.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Poff].

Mr. POFF. Madam Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay].

Mr. LINDSAY. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. I should like to compliment my colleague on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kastenmeier], on the strength of the minority report that he wrote and signed, and on his floor presentation today. I do not expect that those of us who are in opposition to the bill are going to win this fight. However, we think it is worth making.

I think Members ought to be very conscious of being a party to further legislative erosion of the right of free speech unless a compelling need is demonstrated. Let us remember that sedition punishes only speech. It accords words the status of acts. Therefore, you have an acute problem of definition, which has caused endless confusion in this country, indeed from the time when Thomas Jefferson battled to repeal the Alien and Sedition Act of 1798.

No need has been demonstrated for this expansion of the Sedition Act today. I am therefore astonished that this bill comes before us on the floor, promulgated by the administration and supported by a majority of the members of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Powell case is given as one example of demonstrated need. This was a case which occurred during the Korean war in which a citizen and his wife committed seditious acts abroad. They wrote and circulated literature to United States service groups in Korea telling them they were engaged in germ warfare, and made other fallacious, willful, statements, clearly punishable under the sedition laws if the act had been committed within the jurisdiction of the United States.

No one has yet told us why that case was not prosecuted under section 2387 of the U.S. Criminal Code, entitled "Activities Affecting Armed Forces Generally," which is almost identical to the act we are now talking about and which has no territorial limitation. Briefly, that act makes it a crime, with intent to interfere with the loyalty, morale, or discipline of the Armed Forces, to urge insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty, or to distribute written or printed matter which so urges. This is almost identical to the wartime sedition statute (sec. 2388).

No one has yet given us adequate answer to the question, of why this case was not prosecuted under the Treason Act. That statute would have covered the Powell case in my opinion. Although under the Constitution, the Treason Act requires two witnesses to the offense, we have never been able to establish that this was impossible of accomplishment in this particular case.

I hope all Members will take the trouble to read in pages 10 to 12 in the appendix to minority views of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kastenmeier] the excerpts from the book by Zachavoh Chafee, "Free Speech in the United States." This important book is regarded by scholars as the definitive work on this issue. On the problems raised by the Sedition Act Chafee says, on page 11 of the committee report:

> Many men were imprisoned for arguments or profanity used in the heat of private altercation, on a railroad train, in a hotel lobby, or at that battleground of disputation, a boardinghouse table. In one case, two strangers came to a farmhouse, and asked the owner if he could let them have some gasoline, saying that they had been stranded out in the country. He not only gave them the gasoline, but invited them to dinner.
>
> An argument arose during the meal, and the farmer used scurrilous and presumably unpatriotic language in the presence of his guests, two hired men, two nieces, and some children. The guests reported his language, and he was convicted of a willful attempt to cause disloyalty, insubordination, mutiny, and refusal of duty in the military and naval forces of the United States.

In the forthcoming issue of Look magazine, there is an article which attacks the draft laws of this country. The article presumably is seditious, if the Attorney General should wish to bring an action because it comes within the confines of this law. It may have false statements in it. It could discourage recruitment or induce people not to enlist.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson] a moment ago propounded a hypothetical question: What happens when a citizen denounces the federalization of the National Guard and urges members of the National Guard not to serve? That is a seditious statement.

What happens to the person who attacks our military policy with respect to Cuba? Possibly, if there are false statements contained in it, you have a seditious act.

I agree with the statement made by my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF], that some of the arguments advanced today have gone to the merits or demerits of the underlying statute and not necessarily to the broadening of the coverage of the statute to acts committed overseas. But we all agree, I think, that if there is danger in the underlying act, why then, do we have to take steps today to broaden coverage.

Madam Chairman, I take the position that the first amendment rights in the United States are the most sensitive and important rights that we have. The right of anyone to speak his mind is a very fundamental one and should not be abridged lightly.

One of our colleagues, said to me, on my way to the floor, you know, we really ought to have an amendment to this act exempting Members of Congress from its coverage because, believe me, about 5 days out of the week when we are away from the floor of this House and do not have the constitutional protections against arrest and suit that we have here, we are performing "acts by speech" and are making statements that in theory could be charged as seditious.

So, maybe for our own protection, my friends, there ought to be an amendment offered here before the debate is over to take care of our own interests.

Madam Chairman, by extending the geographic scope of the so-called wartime sedition statute, H.R. 4897, would impose an additional deterrent to the free exercise of criticism and dissent. Enactment of the bill would extend to our citizens, nationals, and permanent residents when they are abroad a restraint for which no need has been shown, a restraint which is termed a wartime measure but which nevertheless applies today and which seems likely to endure for the indefinite future.

In the current global struggle for men's minds, we must be vigilant to maintain and preserve the essential distinctions between our democratic society and the various brands of dictatorship with which we are competing. The very keystone of these distinctions is free speech—the constitutionally guaranteed right to criticize the Government and to dissent from its policies. I shall never knowingly participate in legislative erosion of the right of free speech unless compelling need for such action is demonstrated.

H.R. 4897 would amend the sedition statute, 18 U.S.C., section 2388, by repealing subsection (d) which limits the applicability of the statute to offenses committed within "the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States, and on the high seas, as well as within the United States." It would thus make the statute applicable to American citizens and permanent residents of the United States anywhere in the world. Section 2388 provides that (1) whoever willfully makes or conveys false reports while the United States is at war, with the intent to interfere with the operation or success of its military and naval forces, or (2) willfully causes or attempts to cause insubordination, disloyalty, or mutiny in the military and naval forces of the United States, or (3) willfully obstructs the enlistment service of the United States, to the injury of the service or of the United States, or attempts to do so, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 20 years or both. The statute also contains a conspiracy section covering two or more persons conspiring to do any of the prohibited acts. Further, the section penalizes anyone who harbors or conceals a person known to have committed or reasonably suspected of having committed or of being about to commit a violation.

Section 2391 of title 18 has "temporarily" extended the provisions of section 2388 beyond time of war. The section now remains in full force and effect "until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950 (Proc. 2914, 3 C.F.R., 1950 Supp., p. 71), or such earlier date as may be prescribed by concurrent resolution of the Congress."

Upon a summary reading, the prohibitions of section 2388 may appear to be reasonable enough, but it is necessary to recall that in times of national stress there is a tremendous pressure to apply such interdictions irrationally. It must always be borne in mind that sedition law punishes speech, that it accords words the status of acts, and that it therefore gives rise to acute problems of definition. Experience under the statute during World War I graphically illustrates the abuses to which a sedition law lends itself. The full scope of the prosecutions under this law is set forth in the foregoing extract from Zechariah Chafee's "Free Speech in the United States." Two instances will here suffice: An American jury found that a woman's words "I am for the people, and the Government is for the profiteers," was a false statement, known to be false, and intended and calculated to interfere with the success of our military and naval forces, that they were an attempt to cause insubordination in those forces, and that they obstructed recruiting. And under the Minnesota Espionage Act it was held a crime to discourage women from knitting by the remark, "No soldier ever sees these socks."

It is true that, after the war, many of the convictions were reversed. It is also true that in *Schenck* v. *United States* (249 U.S. 47) the Supreme Court enunciated the doctrine of "clear and present danger" as a criterion of allegedly seditious statements. What is more, in *Hartzel* v. *United States* (322 U.S. 680), a World War II case, the Supreme Court laid down the requirement of specific intent or evil purpose as a condition of conviction. But appellate correction of lower court abuses always comes years later. This means that in time of crisis, when freedom needs most urgently to be preserved, we run the risk of being without the benefit of free discussion, criticism, and dissent on which our ideological survival so vitally depends.

There is absolutely no need for this legislation. To demonstrate this we need only take note of the formidable array of similar and related prohibitions in addition to section 2388, which are already contained in our criminal law. Section 2388 is part of chapter 115 of the Criminal Code entitled "Treason, Sedition, and Subversive Activities."

Section 2381 of that chapter prohibits treason, a capital offense, and is worldwide in scope, but limited to wartime. Whoever owing allegiance to the United States, levies war against them or adhere to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort within the United States or elsewhere, is guilty of treason.

Section 2382 punishes misprision of treason, that is, requires disclosure of known treasonable acts. There is no territorial limitation.

Section 2383, also without territorial limitation, prohibits incitement or rebellion or insurrection.

Section 2384—seditious conspiracy—prohibits conspiracy "in any State or territory or in any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States," to use force against the United States or the execution of its laws, or by force to seize U.S. property.

Section 2385 prohibits advocating the overthrow of the Government by force or violence.

Section 2387, entitled "Activities Affecting Armed Forces Generally," makes it a crime, with intent to interfere with the loyalty, morale, or discipline of the Armed Forces, to urge insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty, or to distribute written or printed matter which so urges. It, too, contains no territorial limitation.

One is at once struck by the similarity between the "wartime" sedition statute—section 2388—and the prohibition of treason—section 2381—and with the substantial overlap between the "wartime" sedition statute and section 2387. The latter overlap, moreover, is heightened when it is borne in mind that although section 2388, by its own terms and title, is denominated a wartime prohibition, section 2391 "temporarily" extends the provisions of 2388 until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed in 1950, unless Congress by concurrent resolution provides an earlier terminal date.

We have so many statutory prohibitions on the books right now that there is no need for another.

Madam Chairman, I would like to ask the proponents of this legislation to cite some cases which could only be covered by section 2388 and would not either be covered by section 2381 or section 2387 of chapter 115 of the Criminal Code.

Not only is the bill unnecessary in view of the great web of statutory prohibitions already on the books, but absolutely no demonstrable need has been shown for the enactment of this legislation.

This bill comes to us from the Department of Justice in a letter from the Attorney General of January 14, 1963.

A portion of the letter reads as follows:

> The need for this legislation is emphasized by the fact that citizens of the United States, persons who owe allegiance to the United States, and aliens who are permanent residents in the United States but who are temporarily traveling outside the United States are located in the far corners of the

> world. Because of subsection (d), if any of these persons commit seditious acts against the United States other than within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States or on the high seas, or within the United States, they cannot be punished for such acts.

This says in effect that people who reside in the United States travel outside the United States. This does not establish any need for a further territorial extension of our criminal law.

What is more, cases arising under section 2388 can already be prosecuted under section 2387 which has no territorial limitation.

If this legislation were really necessary, the Department of Justice would have documented its case more substantially. The Department of Justice does not state what is happening at this time to require the enactment of this measure. A simple statement that national security demands this is totally inadequate. It must be much more specific than that.

The Justice Department representative admitted that it had no cases in mind that the Department wished to prosecute but was prevented from so doing by the absence of enabling legislation and could point to only a single case where the geographic limitation inhibited a prosecution.

When pressed by members of the subcommittee, the Justice Department representative frankly stated:

> I am not aware of and I do not think there are presently any pending investigations or matters in the Department which the repeal of this section would then make it possible for us to proceed with the case. We are not making a representation that if this repeal is adopted that we would then be able to proceed with some pending matters. I don't think that is the case at all.
>
> What, in our view, occasions the necessity for this repeal we think is demonstrated and was brought to the fore by the situation in which we find ourselves in the Powell case and it is just that that happened to be a case in point so as to speak where a weakness, if you want to put it that way, in the present statute was demonstrated.

It is far from clear that in the Powell case the Government could not have secured a conviction for treason. In all conscience, the showing that has been made before the committee for adding another strand to the existing dragnet for punishing disloyal speech is slight indeed.

This is pretty lame justification for the enactment of legislation.

I am also disturbed by the failure to consult the Department of State with respect to possible international repercussions. The effect of the enactment of this measure on our foreign relations and prestige should have been examined. If, for example, American newspapers could be indicted for critical statements made in France, while French newspapers could make identical statements with impunity, would this not cast doubt abroad upon our vaunted belief in freedom of speech?

The committee report makes an issue of the constitutionality of the bill. Madam Chairman, I have no question to raise on that score. I am not objecting to this bill because it is unconstitutional. As I have tried to point out, this measure is unnecessary, unjustified and has not been weighed as to its possible repercussions abroad. My reasons for opposing this bill are spelled out in my separate views in the committee report—House Report No. 442.

To continue: Even if it were assumed that we need to tighten our security against seditious utterances abroad, is it at all clear that this bill would serve that purpose? Regardless of where an offense is committed, it must still be prosecuted in our courts. Deliberate subversives are unlikely to return to the United States to take their punishment. While they remain abroad there is no way of subjecting them to prosecution. Each of the bilateral extradition treaties between the United States and the 14 other NATO nations expressly excludes "political" crimes and offenses from its operation. The result is that enactment of H.R. 4897 will catch, not the deliberate subversives, but the fringe dissenters who always operate on the periphery of public opinion.

I am fully aware that in 1961 the Congress repealed comparable territorial limitations affecting chapter 37 of the Criminal Code which prohibits espionage. I submit, however, that espionage is a much more readily definable offense, and that its prosecution does not comparably lend itself to the infringement of civil liberties.

In this morning's New York Times—July 16, 1963—there appears an article by the noted critic, Brooks Atkinson, entitled: "Congress Accused of Not Putting Trust in Intelligence of Its Citizenry."

Mr. Atkinson states:

> Do you realize that the Wartime Sedition Act of 1917 is still the law of the land?
>
> The Government puts such a high value on its protection that the Justice Department is now urging Congress to extend its jurisdiction to Americans overseas.
>
> Although constitutional guarantees exist in wartime as well as in time of peace, the Government in wartime is entitled to some protection against sedition. During World War I it prosecuted about 2,000 citizens for remarks considered seditious—although many of them were as mild as a clergyman's statement that wars are un-Christian. The clergyman served 1 year of a 15-year sentence in jail for stating a religious conviction.
>
> Now, 46 years later, the Wartime Sedition Act is still in force. Once a law infringing on freedom of speech gets on the books, it is next to impossible to remove it. For all governments lust after protection from the citizens. By extending the jurisdiction of the 1917 Wartime Sedition Act in peacetime to Americans overseas, the Government could prosecute an American in Berlin or Saigon for criticizing the Army. Under the terms of the act, the late Senator Robert A. Taft was seditious in his opposition to the Korean war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Madam Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

Mr. REUSS. Madam Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the subcommittee chairman, for yielding to me, a nonmember of the committee, this time. I wish I could be with the gentleman from Ohio this afternoon, but I rise to support the position so ably stated by my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY]. I was particularly pleased to hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] refer to my old equity teacher, Zechariah Chafee, with the warmth and praise that he did.

Madam Chairman, I intend to vote against this sedition bill. I am against its basic idea, that an American citizen abroad cannot speak or write freely. The bill would make it a crime, punishable by a $10,000 fine or 20 years' imprisonment or both, for an American citizen abroad to attempt to willfully cause "insubordination in the military and naval forces of the United States" or to attempt to willfully obstruct "the enlistment service of the United States."

One who betrays his country, at home or abroad, is guilty of treason or espionage and should pay the penalty. But I think that this country will do better if it distinguishes between treason and talk.

Let me give an example of the dangers of this bill. On May 24, 1963, the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS]—a subcommittee of which I have the honor to be a member—held a hearing into Government information policies in Vietnam. We are now engaged with the Vietnamese in a bloody guerrilla war. The Moss subcommittee, having heard complaints about their access to news by American correspondents in Vietnam, asked the State Department to come in and explain. The transcript of the May 24, 1963, executive session is still classified, but as to that which I am about to report, I have today secured its declassification.

American information policy in Vietnam—unless this has been altered since May 24—is governed by a cable sent within the last 2 years from the Secretary of State to the Ambassador to Vietnam. That cable carried as one of its principal guidelines the statement that critical articles by American newsmen on Diem and his government are likely to impede the war effort.

Now I set forth my own reaction to that guideline in the cable when I said, in the May 24 hearing:

> Mr. REUSS. What this [cable] implies is that if American correspondents find President Diem dragging his feet on land reform, as we found him to be dragging his feet on land reform, if American correspondents find that favoritism in the governmnet is destroying its mass base among the people, I think it is constructive to let those things be written, in the hope that the light of truth will cause them to be corrected, because whatever may be said about a counterguerrilla operation such as that we are jointly conducting with the Vietnamese in Vietnam today, I think everyone would agree that an important ingredient in success is the confidence of the people that they have something to fight for. And if they are fighting for something that is corrupt and reactionary, they are not going to fight very hard. They are simply going to be a conduit for giving their rifles to the Communists.

> Mr. Hilsman. On such an example, first of all, we have no control over information about such things. We have no control over the articles written, and I think this is just a fuzzily written cable. I don't think this was the intention of it.
>
> Mr. Reuss. Except this passage isn't fuzzy. Secretary Rusk says critical articles are likely to impede the war effort. Now the American Ambassador, in carrying that out, it seems to me has got to do his level best to suppress such articles, and I think that is an unfortunate role in which to cast our representatives. He does not want to say these things himself, but he certainly doesn't want to try to prevent correspondents of the free world from writing as they please on a matter like this.

So the official position of the U.S. Government appears to be that criticism of Diem, however justified, will impede the course of our operation there. Would this not be an attempt to cause insubordination, or to obstruct enlistment, in the U.S. Armed Forces? If it is, the newsman who writes about Diem's persecution of the Buddhists, or of his ofttimes curious administrative practices, would be liable for fine or imprisonment as a seditionist.

We ought to be enlarging the frontiers of freedom, at home and abroad, not contracting them. The bill should be defeated.

Mr. POFF. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman. In the hypothetical question the gentleman posed I believe he may be ignoring the effect of the Schenck against U.S. and the Hartzel against U.S. decisions, both of which throw additional safeguards around the free speech guarantee by requiring the Federal Government on the one hand to prove beyond a reasonable doubt the guilt of the individual and, on the other hand, a specific intent or evil purpose to cause the consequences proscribed by the Congress. In light of those decisions I think the answer to the gentleman's question would be no. If it were otherwise, a court of law has the power always to set aside the verdict of a jury if the court feels the evidence does not support the verdict.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman. I will reply to the gentleman by saying that while I am not familiar with the cases he cites, I know the general principle of present danger. It is up to this body, and to the House Committee on the Judiciary, to bring to the floor legislation which does not require an extraneous reference to various other doctrines. If there is a sedition law which can be worked out that does adequately protect the right of freedom of speech, bring it to the floor and I will vote for it. But here, in the plainest terms that the English language is capable of yielding, we find a statute that would subject anybody who attempts to do anything which may cause insubordination, or a lack of willingness to enlist, to 20 year's imprisonment. I cannot vote for such a bill.

Mr. POFF. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Meader].

Mr. MEADER. Madam Chairman, I would like to address myself to the remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] with reference to certain inquiries made by the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee on which he serves and on which I am the ranking Republican member.

I got the impression that the directive to which he referred was one which was directed to the news agencies in Vietnam. I think the Record should be corrected to show that the directive was not to newspaper reporters in Vietnam but to our officials who were thereby instructed so to manage the news that unfavorable comment on Mr. Diem's regime would not be made by the reporters.

In fact, I did not know until the gentleman referred to the directive on the House floor that the directive was released at all. The reporters did not even know of its existence, because it was a highly confidential directive instructing our officials to influence the news they gave out that the reporters would write stories in the fashion which was thought desirable by our State Department and other agencies.

Mr. REUSS. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman accurately states what happened, and if the gentleman will refer to the Record, in my original statement I did allude to this cable as a cable from the State Department to the American Ambassador to Vietnam. Just as the gentleman says, it was direct to our American establishment in Vietnam, and to the press only indirectly.

Mr. MEADER. In addition I would like to make this observation. I believe the remarks of those in opposition to this bill indicating that anything any citizen might say about his Government in reference to military procurement is sedition material is probably stretching the phrasing of the law pretty far. This being a criminal law, it must be strictly construed and the offense must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt.

Mr. POFF. Madam Chairman, if I may be recognized I yield back the balance of our time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Gill].

Mr. GILL. Madam Chairman, I take this time to concur with the sense of the remarks of Congressmen Kastenmeier and Lindsay in their minority views in the committee report on this bill.

The actual substance of the bill is relatively insignificant. To extend the geographic application of the sedition law will probably be a futile exercise because those persons outside of the jurisdiction of the United States who might be covered by the amendment proposed here would, if threatened with prosecution, merely evade jurisdiction. Further, there was no testimony on any present need to extend the act, and no testimony of actions pending or contemplated.

The nub of the problem is the sedition law itself. This law, passed as part of the Espionage Act of 1917, had a lurid and unsavory history during the hysteria which followed our country's entry into the First World War. This law is bad because it can be used to punish words, not acts. Our form of government is, by nature, a dangerous one. It is based on the premise that we protect the spoken and printed word regardless of how silly or abhorrent it may seem to us. This protection is based, in turn, on a fundamental faith in the reasonableness of man: That once the marketplace of ideas is given the opportunity to function, the foolish will be separated from the wise.

The sedition law has been subject to some incredible interpretations: The Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in 1917 expressed the view that speech was punishable under the law "if the natural and reasonable effect of what is said is to encourage resistance to law, and the words are used in an endeavor to persuade to resistance."

In another case under this law, a jury convicted a defendant in 1918 for the words: "I am for the people, and the Government is for the profiteers."

Many things are being said today which are highly questionable under the reasoning of these and other decisions. They are being said by people who can hardly be called Communists. Suffice it to ask ourselves these questions:

What about those in this country, including some State Governors, who advocate the doctrine of "interposition"? Are they not encouraging "resistance to law," particularly where Federal troops are involved?

How about those who sponsor the so-called freedom amendment to do away with the Federal income tax? Half of our budget is military spending; and most of our funds come from these taxes. Could not this advocacy be construed under certain conditions as "false statements with intent to interfere with the operation or success of the military or naval forces?"

In the same vein, might we not also fear for the freedom to speak of Kent and Phoebe Courtney because of their recent book entitled "Disarmament—a Blueprint for Surrender"? The whole premise of the book, written from an extreme rightwing viewpoint, is that the current policy of this administration in exploring the problem of disarmament is intended to "abolish America's means of self-defense" and to make this country "a mere satellite in a socialist-dominated world government." Certainly, this type of talk could be twisted into an "attempt to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty, in the military or naval forces of the United States." It could be plausibly argued that many loyal and well-meaning members of our Armed Forces could be misled into believing that the President, as Commander in Chief, was selling out the country. If you need an example of this frame of mind, remember General Walker.

I do not mention these examples out of any sympathy for the viewpoints expressed. I think they are silly. However, I would not deny these people the right to speak, to print their foolishness, and distribute it widely.

The greatest protection against political error are the free minds of a free people. This particular sedition law denies this faith. It is a vestigial remain which should be cut away, not perpetuated.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Madam Chairman, the opponents of this bill have raised three questions specifically. Let me examine them separately. First, constitutionality. The answer to that is that the constitutionality of the existing statute has been upheld by the Supreme Court in *Schenck* v. *The United States* (249 U.S. 47), and in other cases stemming from seditious activities during World War I, such as *Debs* (249 U.S. 211), and *Frohwerk* (249 U.S. 209).

Upholding the constitutionality of the statute in the Schenck case, Mr. Justice Holmes set forth the doctrine of "clear and present danger" as a criterion of the dangerousness of alleged seditious statements.

Mr. Justice Holmes said this:

> The question in every case is whether the words used are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils that Congress has a right to prevent. It is a question of proximity and degree. When a nation is at war many things that might be said in time of peace are such a hindrance to its effort that their utterance will not be endured so long as men fight and that no court could regard them as protected by any constitutional right.

Now, as to the second argument raised in opposition to the bill. This concerns the requirement of evidence. My answer to that is that in *Hartzel* v. *United States* (322 U.S. 680), the Supreme Court prescribing rigid evidentiary requirements, said that the defendant's acts, as to willfulness must be committed deliberately and with a specific purpose to do the acts proscribed by Congress or with a specific intent or evil purpose at the time of the alleged overt acts to cause insubordination or disloyalty in the Armed Forces or to obstruct the recruiting and enlistment service; that such intent may be proved "not only by the language actually used in the statements or writings themselves but also by the circumstances surrounding their preparation and dissemination.

The Court held, also, that the element of clear and present danger that the activities in question will bring about the substantive evils proscribed by the statute, as well as the element of specific intent, must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt.

So that the Supreme Court, in the Hartzel case, laid down very stringent requirements of proof that the Government must meet to substantiate a conviction.

The third argument against the bill is that although we might need the statute in time of war, we ought not have such a law in times of national emergency. It appears to me that it is up to the opponents of this legislation to make an attempt at making the law inapplicable at the present time by introducing and securing the passage of a concurrent resolution as envisaged in section 2391 of title 18, United States Code.

Of course, I might add that I would strenuously oppose such a concurrent resolution.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the pending legislation.

I believe that this is a good bill. Its effect is to make punishable seditious activity wherever it is carried out, thus doing away with the old—and in my opinion, logically indefensible—distinction between such conduct when performed within the jurisdiction of the United States, which heretofore has been an offense, and that performed abroad, which heretofore has not been an offense.

The basic statute involved in 18 U.S.C. 2388, and the bill in question is directed to subsection (d) thereof, which presently reads as follows:

> This section shall apply within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States, and on the high seas, as well as within the United States.

The bill derives from the old case of *U.S.* v. *Bowman* (260 U.S. 94), which established the principle that where an act is directly injurious to the United States, it is prosecutable even though not committed within the jurisdiction of the United States unless there is a statutory limitation to the contrary.

Critics of the bill made some point of the fact that there had not been a sufficient showing by the bill's proponents of need for this legislation. There may be some validity to this consideration, but I submit that in this case, the issue is one of consistency rather than necessity. Given the decision in the Bowman case, it simply does not make sense to differentiate between sedition carried on in New York and sedition of an identical sort carried on in Ontario. This, of course, assumes that sedition is directly injurious to the United States: I take it that most people would agree that it is.

The bulk of the opposition to this bill seems to have been aimed at the law itself rather than at the repeal of subsection (a): persons opposed to the statute naturally would not favor its extension. And in fairness, it must be conceded that this law has had a rather checkered career, being the one about which a good bit of the case law on free speech has grown up; for example, *Schenck* v. *U.S.* (249 U.S. 47), in which Mr. Justice Holmes articulated the clear and present danger test. Opponents of the present bill—a representative of the ACLU and two members of the committee who filed separate reports—ran through a whole catechism of injustices perpetrated under the law in the period during and shortly after World War I. Disgraceful as these old cases were and are, I think it must be borne in mind that fault lies not with the statute but with a hysterical public and a pliant bar and bench. The defect was not in the law itself, but in the system by which it was applied, and when the system breaks down, the best of laws can become an instrument of oppression.

A requisite element of the activities made punishable under the statute is a specific intent, for example, to be convicted, the defendant must knowingly have performed such-and-such an act with intent to accomplish such-and-such a result. I submit that the burden of proof which the Government must meet is sufficiently great to insure that rights of the public to discuss and to criticize Government policy will be protected.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Madam Chairman, I believe that H.R. 4897 poses a basic civil liberties question. While its stated purpose is to extend the application of 18 U.S.C. 2388 to include offenses committed in territory outside of the United States or beyond the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States, the effect of passage will be to breathe new life into a statute which infringes upon freedom of speech and to erode the first amendment guarantees of the Constitution. Although the bill has been called inconsequential, the principle involved is of major consequence.

Although nominally a wartime measure enacted in 1917, 18 U.S.C. 2388 is still in force today. 18 U.S.C. 2391 extended its applicability until 6 months after the termination of the state of national emergency proclaimed by President Truman at the outbreak of the Korean conflict in 1950. There is no end in sight for that state of emergency, so a temporary statute intended to meet a wartime emergency has become practically permanent.

The necessity for the extension of the geographical application of the statute has not been demonstrated. The only case relied upon is the Powell case which could have been prosecuted under other laws.

Kevin T. Maroney, the Justice Department's representative at the Judiciary Committee's hearings on H.R. 4897, admitted there were no cases pending in which the repeal of the geographical limit would assist the Government. Why, then, is the expansion of the Wartime Sedition Act suddenly necessary to our national security?

Further, section 2387 of the United States Code, which directly precedes the section we are discussing, makes it a crime to interfere with the loyalty, morale, or discipline of the Armed Forces, to urge insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty, or to distribute written or printed matter which so urges. It contains no territorial limit. The similarity between sections 2387 and 2388 is striking. Is it really necessary to expand a wartime statute, "temporarily" extended, while another law, covering much the same ground, already exists?

H.R. 4897 would be difficult to enforce. The Government could not demand extradition of the accused since each of our bilateral extradition treaties, which we have with all 14 NATO members among others, specifically exempt "political" crimes, like sedition.

Madam Chairman, the real problem lies not with an amendment to the 1917 statute, but with that act itself. A prolonged "temporary" extension of the act is a long step towards finding ourselves saddled with a permanent sedition act. Sedition deals with speech only, not overt acts like treason or espionage. Sedition, then, is in the ears of the listener. And to a listener living in a time of fear and uncertainty, the line between critical speech and seditious speech is often indistinguishable.

Nothing demonstrates this more clearly than the history of the very act we are asked to expand, the Wartime Sedition Act of 1917. There were over 2,000 prosecutions under this Act, most of them stemming from the war which was supposed to make the world safe for democracy. Two examples, which are cited on pages 10 to 11 of the report, will suffice.

In United States against Stokes a woman was convicted for sedition for saying "I am for the people and the government is for the profiteers." It did not matter that her audience was composed, not of soldiers and sailors, but of other women. The trial judge found that such statements might lessen the enthusiasm of wives, mothers, and sweethearts for the war effort, which might in turn influence the soldiers at the front.

And in a case with the ominous title of United States against the Spirit of '76 a movie producer, who had a part in the making of "Birth of a Nation," released a spectacle called "The Spirit of '76." It contained the scenes usually found in a Fourth of July pageant—Patrick Henry's speech, the winter at Valley Forge. But one scene, the Wyoming massacre, depicted British soldiers bayoneting women and children. The Government prosecuted the producer for intending to arouse antagonism, hatred, and enmity between the American people and our British allies. The producer's 10-year sentence was later commuted to 3 years.

These cases, and many others which strike us with repugnance today, were all tried under the very Act whose jurisdiction we are now asked to expand.

Certainly such incidents were a product of troubled times. But are our times less troubled? As my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER], points out in his well reasoned minority views on H.R. 4897, it is conceivable that criticism of the administration's policy in Cuba or disagreement with the use of Federal troops in Alabama or Mississippi might result in indictment and prosecution under this statute.

Madam Chairman, the founders of the United States almost two centuries ago spelled out guarantees in the Bill of Rights with full knowledge of the danger of Tories, treason and sedition. As Justice Black said:

> The framers knew that free speech might be the friend of change and revolution. But they also knew that it is always the deadliest enemy of tyranny.

And yet every generation of Americans has had to fight those who would weigh civil liberties against the need to deal with some philosophy, some tyranny or some sedition. Today we have seen the growth of a lot of fanatics of the right who see everything in red and white and who accuse former President Eisenhower and Rev. Martin Luther King of being Communists.

The cold war and the challenge of international communism have engendered constant pressures to restrict civil liberties. But true security rests in freedom. Free dialog and debate are the essence of a democratic society.

The survival of liberty is essential to the survival of the United States. And the first amendment guarantee for free speech is a vital safeguard of liberty. With our liberties intact we can and will survive. We do not need to fear free speech. We should defeat H.R. 4897.

Madam Chairman, I include at this point in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of July 15.

[From the Washington Post, July 15, 1963]

LIMITING SPEECH

The House Judiciary Committee has favorably reported, and the House is scheduled to consider on Tuesday, a bill to amend the so-called wartime edition statute by making it applicable to violations committeed by Americans abroad. The theory behind this statute, enacted in 1917, is that, despite the prohibition of the 1st amendment, speech may be abridged in time of war as a means of safeguarding security. Whatever the merit of this, the plain fact is that the United States is not now at war. The statute was brought into effect when President Truman proclaimed a national emergency in 1950 and will remain in effect until 6 months after that emergency is terminated.

Sedition is a frightening term. Essentially, however, it involves nothing more than speech. The sedition statute makes it a crime punishable by 20 years in prison willfully to make "false statements with intent to interfere with the operations or success of the military or naval forces of the United States" or to "attempt to cause insubordination * * * or to obstruct the recruiting or enlistment of these forces." In a compelling dissent from the Judiciary Committee report on the pending bill, Representative ROBERT KASTENMEIER pointed out some of the pitfalls of these provisions:

"Under the law in force today, a person could conceivably be convicted for criticizing the administration's policy toward Cuba. If he were to say that offensive missiles still exist in Cuba, he could be fined $10,000 and imprisoned 20 years under this statute for willfully making a false statement (i.e., one which conflicts with the information put forth by the Government—this was the standard used in the World War I cases) with intent to interfere with the operation of the U.S. military forces. Similarly, one who objected to the use of Federal troops in Mississippi or Alabama could be convicted under this statute for interfering with enlistment."

The United States does not need this kind of "protection" even in wartime, let alone when it is at peace. It can rely confidently, as its Founders did, upon healthy ideas to refute unhealthy ones. Extension of the statute to offenses committed abroad seems silly as well as needless, for extradition would be impossible for persons accused under it, sedition being a political offense not covered by any extradition treaty. If Congress wants to do something useful about sedition, let it erase this law entirely from the statute books and return to the reliance on free speech set forth by the 1st amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (d) of section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code is repealed.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4897) to repeal subsection (d) of section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code, pursuant to House Resolution 433, she reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LINDSAY. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LINDSAY moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4897 to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 40, nays 339, answered "present" 2, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

YEAS—40

Ashley
Bolling
Brock
Brown, Calif.
Burton
Conte
Corman
Curtis
Dingell
Edwards
Farbstein
Fraser
Gallagher
Gill
Green, Oreg.
Hawkins
Hechler
Holifield
Kastenmeier
King, Calif.
Leggett
Lindsay
McFall
Mathias
Matsunaga
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Nedzi
O'Hara, Ill.
Patten
Powell
Reuss
Rosenthal
Roybal
Ryan, N.Y.
Sickles
Staebler
Thompson, N.J.
Van Deerlin

NAYS—339

Abbitt
Abele
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Alger
Anderson
Andrews
Arends

Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Boggs
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burke
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Cooley
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Ford
Foreman
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Grant
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Keith
Kelly
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Lennon
Libonati
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morton
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
Nygaard
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Rains
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shelley
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Siler
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Tuck
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Keogh
Taft

NOT VOTING—52

Abernethy
Ashbrook
Barrett
Blatnik
Boland
Buckley
Burkhalter
Cameron
Celler
Chamberlain
Clawson, Del
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Diggs
Donohue
Dulski
Finnegan
Flynt
Forrester
Grabowski
Griffin
Hagan, Ga.
Hoffman
Kee
Kilburn
Landrum
Lesinski
Long, La.
Martin, Mass.
Miller, N.Y.
Moore
Morrison
O'Brien, Ill.
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pilcher
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Scott
Sheppard
Sisk
Stephens
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Trimble
Tuten
Vanik
Weltner
Whitten
Wickersham

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Taft for, with Mr. Moore against.
Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Pilcher.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Forrester.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Davis of Georgia.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Flynt.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Stephens.
Mr. Tuten with Mr. Weltner.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Hagan of Georgia.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.
Mr. Blatnik with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Vanik with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Perkins.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Thomas.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY]. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE]. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

A "CUBAN EXPERT" IN ANOTHER PLACE—OR THE CAT IS FINALLY OUT OF THE BAG

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware in this body of the fact that some months ago a self-appointed expert on Cuba located in another body had this Congress and the Nation as a whole pretty much in a tizzy as a result of his alleged special and private intelligence information on Cuba that was supposed to be so vastly much better than anything the Defense or other Government intelligence agencies were ever able to uncover.

Throughout all this unfortunate period I tried to point out to this body the nonsensical nature of the allegations of this individual in this other place. But there were many who attacked me for making this effort. They said they were glad we had this penetrating and all-wise Cuban expert around. They said they had lost faith in our Government intelligence efforts, and they said so in highly flammable letters to the Congress.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the cat is out of the bag. Two distinguished news reporters, Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, report in their column "Inside Report" on July 12, in the New York Herald Tribune, that this self-appointed expert had no special sources at all. He nimbly pieced the whole thing together with a scissors and a pastepot. And while the Nation rocked, this expert and his staff held their sides to keep from giggling out loud. It was all a gigantic hoax.

Mr. Speaker, people have tried to fool the American people before, but they had never succeeded for very long.

I trust the expert in that other place will either institute suit for libel against these two writers or else will apologize to the Congress and to the people of the United States for his deception.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article referred to from the July 12 issue of the New York Herald Tribune:

INSIDE REPORT: THE CUBA EXPERT

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

It was Washington at its wackiest when Senator KENNETH B. KEATING parlayed a few tips, a hard-working staff, and unlimited gall into overnight recognition as the Nation's No. 1 Cuba expert.

In fact, the source of the New York Republican's apparently endless inside knowledge about Soviet operations behind the Castro curtain remains Washington's best-kept secret. To this very day, the White House is dying to know about KEATING's Government leak.

The answer is hilariously simple; he had no direct Government informants.

KEATING's chief source was a friendly newspaper correspondent who gave his remarkably reliable tips to KEATING after—not before—the information appeared in his own newspaper back home. The full story of this magnificent political coup which brought national prominence to the Senator can now be told.

It began on Friday, August 31, last year, just before the Labor Day weekend. Though not regarded then as a Cuban specialist, KEATING was about to give a routine Senate speech pummeling President Kennedy for the Soviet presence in Cuba.

Then came a telephone call to KEATING from the friendly newsman, who works for an eastern newspaper not generally read in Washington. He told the Senator about a story he had written for the August 29 edition. Obviously based on official intelligence sources, his dispatch told of 1,200 Russian troops unloaded at the Cuban port of Mariel at a time when Mr. Kennedy was insisting that only Soviet technicians were on Cuban soil. This was a bombshell, and KEATING knew it. He shunted aside his prepared speech.

"This morning, after my comments had been prepared, new and extremely disturbing information came to my attention," KEATING told the Senate. "I believe it should be reported to this body at once." Without identifying the source, he then proceeded to paraphrase the newspaper story that had appeared 2 days earlier.

This won KEATING a quick invitation from NBC's "Today" show for Tuesday, September 4. On Labor Day morning, September 3, KEATING read a story in the New York Herald Tribune (by Keith Morfett of the London Daily Mail) reporting that 5,000 to 8,000 Russian soldiers had arrived in Cuba. Combining this material with his August 31 speech, KEATING was a smash hit on "Today."

The Kennedy administration panicked.

Within the next few months, John McCone, Director of Central Intelligence, made three special trips to KEATING's office. KEATING was invited to lunch with Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

"Who is KEATING's source" became Washington's favorite guessing game. Some liberal Democrats hinted darkly that McCone, a Republican, was the leak. Others assumed that Reserve Army General KEATING was tapping Pentagon sources.

Only KEATING's 30-member staff knew the truth. The KEATING intelligence agency was simplicity itself. It pruned published sources, checked through normal Government channels of communication, snared minor tidbits of information from refugee leaders. But above all, it scrutinized the stories of that eastern reporter.

Sometimes his staff broke down in paroxysms of giggling over the gullibility of Washington. Sometimes they worried about the balloon bursting.

But the balloon stayed up.

KEATING seemed even more omniscient when he told the Senate October 10 that "construction has begun on at least a half-dozen launching sites for intermediate range tactical missiles"—information confirmed by the President 12 days later when the Cuban crisis began. Actually, KEATING's speech was cribbed from an October 7 article by Hal Hendrix in the Miami Daily News, which a reader mailed to KEATING in time for his speech.

KEATING's record for accuracy was flawless until January 31, when he based a speech on a January 29 story by his eastern reporter friend. This time he went beyond the reporter's information in declaring that the Soviets were still maintaining concrete launching sites in Cuba.

KEATING was wrong—for the first time. But nobody really cared. In the wonderland of Washington, his credentials as a Cuba expert were by now impeccable.

NATIONAL YOUTH SCIENCE CAMP

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, a very inspiring development is taking place in the hills of West Virginia, near the National Radio Astronomy Center at Green Bank, W. Va.

For the past 2 weeks 100 outstanding young science students—high school seniors chosen in rigorous competition from every State in the Union—have been assembled at the National Youth Science Camp. These 100 young men, 2 from each of the 50 States, are studying radio astronomy and science with the assistance of the staff of the Green Bank Observatory and visiting faculty members from all over the State of West Virginia. In addition, an active recreation program is being carried out, including many trips to explore the countryside. One of the recreation directors is pole vault champion Dave Tork. Today, Astronaut M. Scott Carpenter is visiting the camp.

How did this idea get started? This is West Virginia's centennial year. Centennial Commission Director Carl R. Sullivan raised $75,000 in West Virginia among West Virginians. Although the State of West Virginia has suffered a great deal economically, we did not run to the Federal Government or to any foundation for this money—we raised it ourselves. Then what did we do with it? We did not spend it on West Virginians, but we went out to bring to West Virginia the outstanding science students from all over the country. In this way, West Virginia is making a great contribution to our Nation's strength by cultivating the scientific talent which will serve our Nation in the future. I would like to compliment Camp Director Charles Cochran and his able staff.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a list of these outstanding young men and their hometowns:

WEST VIRGINIA CENTENNIAL, NATIONAL YOUTH SCIENCE CAMP, STATE REPRESENTATIVES

Alabama: James Leland Miller, Potersville; H. Stanley Smith, Birmingham.

Alaska: Alan Gnad, Spenard; Michael J. Greaney, Juneau.

Arizona: John Devens Gust, Jr., Phoenix; Joel Vavich, Tucson.

Arkansas: James Allen Floyd (Jim), Fort Smith; Richard Lee Rolleigh, Bauxite.

California: Philip T. Cummings, Riverside; Larry Dillehay, Ventura.

Colorado: James Venette, Broomfield; Joe Vandepeute, Glenwood.

Connecticut: Theodore W. Ducas, Greenwich; Richard LaForge (Dick), Darien.

Delaware: Jules Martin Tanenbaum and Clarence W. Taylor, Jr., Wilmington.

Florida: Mark Weiss, Coral Gables; John Thomas Holloway, Hollywood.

Georgia: John Mayson III, Brunswick; James Thomas Beale, Savannah.

Hawaii: David Harold Mechler, Kaneohe; Harry Katsumi Otaguro, Honolulu.

Idaho: Paul Yokers, American Falls; William J. Venard, Bonners Ferry.

Illinois: Charles Paul Fisher, Evanston; Robert Lane Seiver, Aledo.

Indiana: Rand Nilsson, Elkhart; David Leroy Pitts, Columbus.

Iowa: James E. Kuhn, Lime Springs; James Clinton Shuman, Des Moines.

Kansas: Loren D. Nelson, Horton; John Nelson Howe, Topeka.

Kentucky: Shelby A. Sherrod, Lexington; Edward Eugene Kirby, Bowling Green.

Louisiana: Robert D. Aswell, Opelousas; Alan Charles Gravel, Alexandria.

Maine: Curtis Alan Knight and William H. Morong III, South Berwick.

Maryland: Michael E. Field, Baltimore; Lonnie Robert Jones, Mount Victoria.

Massachusetts: Peter R. Fredette, Springfield; Alfred M. Boyajian, Scituate.

Michigan: Barrington William Keist, Fenton; Michael Luxemberg, Detroit,

Minnesota: Eugene Ollila, Zim; Gary L. Grasdalen, Albert Lea.

Mississippi: Wayne Herrinton, Meridian; Robert Guyton, Jackson.

Missouri: Michael Ladd, Kansas City; Joel Herskowitz, University City.

Montana: Don Blair, Livingston; Alan Lacey, Drummond.

Nebraska: Michael L. Siemon, Omaha; William Cunningham Minier, Lincoln.

Nevada: John H. Winfrey, Las Vegas; Richard W. Harris, Reno.

New Hampshire: John Betz, Keene; Albert H. Leveille, Berlin.

New Jersey: Walter E. Diercks, Kenilworth; Joseph J. Maruca, Trenton.

New Mexico: Bruce Lites, Albuquerque; Dennis Wade Wootan, Carlsbad.

New York: Philip Kosinski, Troy; Gordon T. Bird, East Greenbush.

North Carolina: James C. Ballard, Winston-Salem; Fred W. Roush, Manteo.

North Dakota: Michael Sheridan, Wahpeton; Alan C. Lukes, Park River.

Ohio: Tedd Dawson, Plymouth; Steven J. Osterhus, Seven Hills.

Oklahoma: William Geffen, Tulsa; Joe P. Case, Oklahoma City.

Oregon: Milton James Bennett, McMinnville; John Oliver Aiken, Corvallis.

Pennsylvania: John J. Rehr, Jr., Carlisle; Howard E. Glavin, Jr., Allison Park.

Rhode Island: Wyit Wright, Esmond; Philip R. Gaudet, Jr., Middletown.

South Carolina: James Malcolm Heller, Jr., Sandy Springs; Robert Miller Ward, Jr., Rock Hill.

South Dakota: Theodore W. Herzog, Sioux Falls; Michael B. Davis, Igloo.

Tennessee: Alfred G. Kasselberg, Memphis; John Edward Kolemba, Nashville.

Texas: T. W. Jones, Midland; Neal McEwen, Hurst.

Utah: Ralph Maughan, Jr., Logan; Richard K. Harrison, Centerville.

Vermont: Warren Henry Taylor, Jr., Rutland; Gary Alan Cluff, Springfield.

Virginia: John Thomas Ward, Jr., Richmond; Robert Tyler Jackson, Chesapeake.

Washington: Bill Kring, Yakima; Eric Lindahl, Seattle.

West Virginia: Thomas Laqueur, Beckley; William Dan Barnhart, Moundsville.

Wisconsin: Richard James Rogers, Marion; Roger D. Whitmer, Beaver Dam.

Wyoming: Clayton E. Forbes, Torrington; Gary E. Gysel, Cheyenne.

DIRTY BOMBS OR CLEAN BOMBS

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, once again the United States is attempting to reach some kind of a test ban treaty with the Soviet Union. The Communists have been very consistent in their treaties and agreements with the free world—they have broken most of them. I believe it would be safe to say that the Communists can be relied upon to keep only those agreements which will benefit the Soviet Union.

I believe that the following editorial by Jenkin Lloyd Jones very graphically portrays the situation:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 15, 1963]

DIRTY BOMBS OR CLEAN BOMBS?—A-TEST BAN TALKS VIEWED AS FUTILE; U.S. URGED TO DEAL TOUGHLY WITH REDS

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

One of the most pernicious illusions abroad in the world today is the fond hope that if nations will give up testing atomic weapons the threat of an atomic holocaust will vanish.

We can close Pandora's box, but the pests are already out.

Furthermore, where do the ban-the-tests pickets get the idea that it would be good for humanity if the devilish art of atomic bomb-making were stopped at its present point of development?

For what we have now are dirty bombs. They suck up vast amounts of ground debris into a highly radioactive fireball and then distribute strontium 90 dust along a downwind path.

We have heard talk about dirtier bombs—bombs with cobalt or gold cases that will produce even deadlier fallout. So a lot of people have the idea that testing is being conducted with the sole idea of producing bombs that leave more dangerous aftereffects.

This isn't necessarily true. From a purely military point of view, clean bombs—that is, bombs with big wallop but with minimum radiation—could be more valuable. Dirty bombs have heightened terror value, but they invite retaliation. Neither side could profit from an unbreathable atmosphere, and generals breathe, too.

As in World War II, where both sides withheld the use of excellent gases and some rudimentary bacterial weapons, the next war may find both sides limiting their choice of weapons in their own self-interest.

But it would be a mistake to assume that this limitation would extend to all atomic weapons. If anyone can develop a clean atomic bomb it would be a marvelously cheap and efficient killer. And three U.S. administrations have tried to make it plain that if we face the choice between loosing atomic war and watching Russia's vast land armies crunch through to the Channel with conventional weapons we will choose the former.

Atomic war on any scale is a grim prospect. Too bad the bomb works. Too bad that energy does equal mass times the squared speed of light. Too bad Mr. Einstein and Madame Curie were born.

But this is an age in which those who want survival with liberty are going to have to be tough-minded. We are going to have to contemplate with calmness and courage pretty horrible possibilities.

We have the easy alternative of survival without liberty. If America and the Western nations disbanded their armies and handed all their atomic weapons over to Khruschev there would be no war and those of us who survived the firing squads could settle down to life under a Soviet world government.

But the delusion that there must be some happy middle ground between atomic preparedness and complete surrender continues to afflict the Miss Nancys who gather in Trafalgar Square, parade around Holy Loch, and wave banners in front of the White House. "Ban the bomb." "End the tests." "Call a conference."

There persists the quaint belief that the Communists are arming only because they fear our arms, that we must allay their suspicions much as F.D.R. tried to allay the suspicions of Stalin at the disastrous Yalta pow-wow.

Let us end the misunderstanding wall of the wailers. If the Russians will not agree to seven inspection stations for underground blasts let us agree to three, and if they do not want three let us agree to one or none.

Of course, there's no misunderstanding. What we are getting is the Pavlov dog treatment. The Russian scientist, Pavlov, discovered that you could break a dog down mentally by alternately giving it a promise of food and then disappointing it. That is why Mr. Khrushchev tries to keep building hopes for disarmament and then wrecking them and then building them again. And we accommodate him by sending at the insistence of the frightened, teams of negotiators to sit down to endless Panmunjoms.

We've got a new Panmunjom going now. And last month President Kennedy stated hopefully that world peace will be achieved by "a gradual evolution of human agreements which are in the interests of all concerned."

More talk. More one-way concessions?

Communists speak to Communists with considerable frankness. Perhaps someone should remind Mr. Kennedy of Mr. Khrushchev's statement in Tirana, Albania, in May, 1959: "We do not negotiate on the basis of 'give and take.' We have nothing whatsoever to give. We will not make any concessions because our proposals do not form the basis of a barter deal."

We ought to quit dispatching futile emissaries to face the familiar and bitter choice of frustration of surrender. Instead, we should send Mr. K. a simple note in nondiplomatic language:

"Look, Buster, we think tests in the atmosphere aren't even for the birds. We'll quit them if you will, but one more trick like the last time and we won't make this offer again.

"As to underground tests, we'll make them as often as we like and you are welcome to yours.

"If you ever want a moratorium on them send us a letter telling us how many monitors you'll allow and if we're interested we'll write you back."

THE RIGHT OF SELF-PROTECTION

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under date of June 11, 1963, Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, addressed a communication to the president of the New York City Council, commenting on proposed local laws which would prohibit the construction of nuclear reactors within the city of New York. Commissioner Seaborg told the New York Council that the Atomic Energy Act and its legislative history "makes it clear that Congress intended that the licensing and regulation of nuclear reactors, for purposes of control of radiation hazards, is to remain the exclusive responsibility of the Federal Government." He therefore expressed, on behalf of the Atomic Energy Commission, the belief that there is a serious legal question concerning the validity of municipal regulation prohibiting the construction of nuclear reactors within the city.

Because of the serious implications in Mr. Seaborg's conclusion, it would seem the obligation of Congress to provide a more lucid definition of the AEC's prerogatives in such matters. Was it actually the intent of Congress to empower the AEC to force a State and/or community to accept a plant, device, or contrivance to which that State and/or community vigorously object? I think not. While I recognize that in recent years America has been speeding along a dangerous roadway built by bureaucrats and designed to lead to complete centralized government, I cannot believe that Congress would be willing to ordain to a Federal commission or office the authority to ignore summarily and completely the feelings and temper of affected citizens. I know none of my colleagues who would choose—in the absence of an extreme emergence in which the security of the Nation were at stake—to inflict upon any neighborhood in our Nation an installation where a question of danger to health and safety is involved.

It was not too many years ago, Mr. Speaker, that the general public was excited at the prospect of the development of an atomic reactor which purportedly would bring vast cost savings to consumers of electric power. It is true that a number of Members of Congress had serious doubts about the practicability of using millions upon millions of dollars of U.S. Treasury funds merely to utilize a new source of energy for power generation. I recall that many of us stood on the floor of this House time and again as far back as 1956 to question the wisdom of such tremendous expenditures, particularly when the U.S. Geological Survey has established without qualification the existence of sufficient coal reserves to satisfy the power requirements of the entire Nation for at least a century to come. Congress also was reminded of warnings by distinguished scientists who believed that the safety issues entwined in the fission process should be resolved before the wholesale construction of nuclear facilities.

But caution and economy could not prevail in a climate of optimism and enthusiasm generated by wanton promises of miracle and magic through application of a glamorous rare element whose material value had previously been confined exclusively to its destructibility factor.

In less than a decade, however, it has become painfully clear that, for all the billions that have been spent on the promotion of civilian application of the atom, nuclear power is still a high-cost and possibly dangerous substitute for the energy available from conventional fuel sources. To induce private-investor utilities to proceed with a reactor program which these companies would not undertake if no Government-financed incentive were involved, the AEC is making a miscellany of subsidies available. In this connection, under unanimous consent, I include this point in the RECORD the following portion of the Washington Merry-Go-Round column by Drew Pearson in the Washington Post on Tuesday, July 9, 1963:

SUBSIDIES AND NUCLEAR REACTORS

(By Drew Pearson)

Important hearings will be held today regarding a series of Federal handouts which most taxpayers don't know anything about—namely, subsidies to private power companies and others to build nuclear reactors.

At a time when there is increasing public concern over constructing nuclear power plants near big city populations, three groups are asking for $42 million of the taxpayers' money to build nuclear plants—near Los Angeles, near San Diego, and in Connecticut.

Furthermore, the handouts have been recommended by the Atomic Energy Commission. The Joint Committee of Congress on Atomic Energy will pass on the AEC recommendation today.

Here are the proposed plants and the amount of money asked of Uncle Sam:

1. Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Co.: A 490,000-kilowatt reactor at Haddam Neck on the Connecticut River. This is one of the most beautiful spots in Connecticut. Subsidy requested: $13,195,000.

2. Southern California Edison and San Diego Gas & Electric: A 395,000 kilowatt reactor to be located at the famed U.S. Marines Camp Pendleton. Subsidy requested: $13,022,000.

3. City of Los Angeles: A 490,000-kilowatt reactor in the Rancho-Malibu area near Los Angeles. This is near one of the famous bathing beaches of southern California. Subsidy requested: $16,200,000.

A FEW QUESTIONS

Though not listed for congressional hearings as yet, Niagara-Mohawk Power has also filed for a reactor on Lake Ontario, and states that it does not want a subsidy. All it wants is free nuclear fuel from Uncle Sam for the first 5 years.

This is the equivalent of a railroad building a diesel locomotive and stating that all it wants from the Government is free oil for 5 years, or a new textile mill asking for free cotton from the Government for 5 years.

These proposed subsidies should inspire alert Congressmen on the Joint Atomic Committee to ask the following questions:

1. Why should certain industries get subsidies while others don't? It is chiefly because they hire better lobbyists who give more cocktail parties and exert more influence?

2. Why is a few hundred dollars to help older people pay medical bills socialism while several million dollars to private utilities is not socialism?

3. Why should West Virginia and Pennsylvania taxpayers who are trying to sell their coal help to pay for nuclear plants to compete against thir coal?

4. Why should New York or California residents who worry about the danger of nuclear reactors being built near them put up their tax money to increase the danger?

It will be interesting to see whether Congress digs into any of these questions.

Another project not mentioned in the Pearson column but significant of the receptive attitude to the AEC plan on the part of some utilities is the proposed 500,000-kilowatt reactor plant for Oyster Creek, N.J. As reported in Nucleonics Week for May 2, 1963, the Jersey Central project is predicated on getting financial assistance under AEC's power demonstration program. With such assistance, Jersey Central reported, the Oyster Creek station could be competitive with a fossil-fueled plant. By the same token, Jersey Central may have pointed out that old newspapers or imported Swedish timber would be competitive with coal if Government subsidies were sufficient to absorb the cost differences.

At this point in the record I believe that the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission's own intentions with respect to the subsidy program should be printed for the elucidation of all Members of Congress. It signifies very emphatically that there is no lid—no stopping point—for the volume of taxpayer funds that the AEC is ready to hand out in order to get its reactor program moving. Furthermore, the AEC cares not how many coal miners and railroaders will be deprived of work opportunities through the activation of the subsidized nuclear power complex. The following paragraph is quoted from the AEC report to the President, 1962:

> To encourage construction of full-scale power installations by utilities, the support of research and development and the temporary waiver of fuel charges have recently been augmented by the offer of reimbursement of design costs for fuel installations of 400 megawatts or more. Both public and investor-owned utilities are eligible. It is hoped that these forms of assistance will suffice to bring about a marked increase in the number of full-scale installations. If it does not, further efforts should be made to search for more attractive forms of incentives or other means to assure that such large-scale installations are actually constructed. Although a few examples should be enough to start the program going, it may well be necessary, in future years, to offer incentives to encourage industry to install newer and improved reactor types that have not yet had opportunity to prove themselves. An attractive incentive program may be needed to encourage timely use of breeder reactors when they reach the stage of full-scale application.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, although at least $1.3 billion has been poured into the civilian reactor program by the AEC in the past 9 years, the imbalance of costs between electricity generated by the atom and that generated by conventional fuels is still of such magnitude that even the current multi-million-dollar bestowals by the Federal Government to the investor-owned utilities may have to be increased in order to get the program moving at the rate desired by the AEC. Meanwhile, irrespective of the expensive research carried out since 1954, the degree of danger hovering over a nuclear powerplant remains a mystery. In this regard, the question asked in Drew Pearson's point 4 is one that Congress must ponder with profound deliberation.

Despite repeated assurances that a nuclear reactor cannot explode like a bomb, many scientists and engineers remain convinced that the location of a nuclear reactor in a populated area would constitute grave risk. Those of us not technically oriented are understandably confused about the safety aspects. If no serious danger exists, we ask, why was it necessary for the AEC to ask and obtain legislation providing half a billion dollars worth of indemnity per accident, with an anti-bankruptcy-without-recourse provision relieving the operator of a reactor from liability to the injured members of the public after the exhaustion of the Government indemnity? Here is the way David E. Lilienthal, first Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, explains it:

> The insurance industry in the United States refused to write insurance against so widespread a potential peril to human life and property damage that an atomic powerplant presents. So the Federal Government, by special statute, now underwrites this hazard. No such insurance problem exists as to nonatomic powerplants, of course.

Mr. Lilienthal states further:

> Moreover, the waste materials from atomic powerplants—the atomic ashes so to speak—are furiously radioactive. After all these years no entirely satisfactory technical way has been found to treat them so they will be safe, or even for their safe transportation from powerplants to underground storage. The underground storage of these deadly and massive wastes continues to constitute a potential source of danger to the population, and a source of considerable expense, as compared to the ashes of a conventional thermal electricity plant.

In view of this situation, Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which provides in substance that State and municipal regulations which prohibit the construction or maintenance of devices or facilities deemed to be inimical to the public health or safety shall not be deemed invalid because of Federal preemption of the field unless some Federal law contains an express provision to that effect or is in direct and positive conflict with the local regulation. Facilities maintained by the Department of Defense are exempted from the operation of the bill.

I am confident that my colleagues will support this reiteration of the inherent right of a State or community to protect itself against an unwarranted invasion on the part of the Federal Government. Even if an atomic reactor were proved beyond doubt to be as safe as a steam boiler, there is no sound reason why the Federal Government should be allowed to infringe upon a local prerogative. The violation is all the more objectionable when centralized government arrogantly decides to set up an instrument believed to be a source of serious danger—at the least, a source of mental cruelty to residents. Since many of the most enthusiastic supporters of a civilian nuclear program are themselves wary of the safety factor, this anxiety is most understandable.

In this regard, a paragraph from the remarks by Dr. Clifford K. Beck, Deputy Director of Regulations, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, on December 2, 1961, is cited herewith:

> On the other hand, however, it cannot be said that the probability is zero, i.e., that there is no likelihood at all that a serious

> accident will occur. For one thing, it is not possible to provide enough safeguards to insure completely that some potential accident will not occur by some unexpected combination of circumstances. For another, safeguards may fail; not only mechanical safeguards but also the human safeguards because, in the final analysis, a substantial element of safety depends on human factors, which are far from infallible. Finally, some potential accidents may have been overlooked. Hence, for any reactor, it must be recognized that some residual element of hazard can never be completely eliminated. As in all other human endeavors, some risk will remain; the only fully safe reactor is one that is never built.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, included these remarks in an address on January 15, 1960:

> Atomic reactors, despite our elaborate safeguards, are very dirty and dangerous gadgets. They produce hazardous fission products, and as their use increases the contamination from these products will gradually spread. They also produce huge quantities of highly dangerous wastes, wastes which we have not yet discovered how to dispose of. Right now, the United States has 65 million gallons of radioactive wastes stored in underground tanks—and they can not be kept there forever. Lastly, the atomic reactor utilizes a chain reaction, which means the ever-present danger of a "runaway." This happened at Windscale in England, you will recall, rendering the area uninhabitable for 200 years.

In an opinion delivered in 1961 by the Supreme Court on the issuance of an AEC construction permit for a nuclear reactor, Mr. Justice Douglas and Mr. Justice Black issued this cryptic comment:

> This legislative history makes clear that the time when the issue of safety must be resolved is before the Commission issues a construction permit. The construction given the act by the Commission (and today approved) is, with all deference, a lighthearted approach to the most awesome, the most deadly, the most dangerous process that man has ever conceived.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], another member of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, included this excerpt in a speech to the House on July 5 of this year:

> For instance, the great city of Richland, Wash., has a number of reactors. If there should be an accident in one of these reactors—and we do not think that there will be and we hope that there will not be—the health of the people of Washington, Oregon, and possibly California might be involved.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the comments of these outstanding authorities attest to the urgency of enactment of the bill which I have introduced today.

THE U.N. CHARTER AND THE CUBAN QUARANTINE

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion of the U.N. Charter and the Cuban blockade or quarantine of last fall.

I call the attention of my colleagues to an analysis of the legal foundations of last October's quarantine of Cuba, written by Capt. Joseph B. McDevitt, U.S. Navy, Director of the International Law Division of the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy. This paper is an excellent supplement to the article by Abram Chayes, legal adviser to the Department of State, which appeared in the April 1962 issue of Foreign Affairs. I call my colleagues' attention in particular to Captain McDevitt's conclusions. He points out that the real legal justification for the quarantine was self-defense, a right recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. It is important to bear this fact in mind in case future crises warrant a similar action by the United States.

Captain McDevitt's article follows:

THE U.N. CHARTER AND THE CUBAN QUARANTINE

(By Capt. Joseph B. McDevitt, U.S. Navy)

(NOTE.—Captain McDevitt is currently Director of the International Law Division of the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy. He holds the A.B. and LL.B. degrees from the University of Illinois and is a member of the Illinois Bar. Captain McDevitt is also a graduate of the senior course at the Naval War College and served for 3 years on the Joint Staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff before assuming his present duties.)

On October 18, 1962, a leading U.S. policymaker addressed a distinguished audience at the Free University of Berlin.[1] He drew a picture of how, in his belief, our foreign policy had unfolded during the 22 months since President Kennedy's administration came to Washington. Referring to the dangers represented by Cuba he said that, since the events of April 1961,[2] we and our friends in the Western Hemisphere had placed ourselves in a legal position to move together.

As he spoke in Berlin, Washington was alive with unusual activity. Two days previously, the President had received the first preliminary hard information that offensive missile sites were in preparation on Cuba.[3] A 24-hour schedule had become routine for many offices. There was widespread speculation as to what was about to happen. It was not confined to the press and general public. Even in the Pentagon only a few men had the full picture. Consequently, the President's announcement of the initiation of the world's first quarantine in the Caribbean had a tremendous psychological impact. From all indications it caught the Soviets by surprise.

It became effective at 10 a.m. eastern standard time on Wednesday, October 24.[4] During the ensuing 27 days[5] over 200 naval ships, and scores of planes, participated in its execution. Offers of assistance were received from the Latin American States and some of their ships and aircraft took part in the operation.

Thus, there can be no doubt that in the actual implementation of the quarantine the American States did move together. Disagreement has arisen, however, as to whether, as a matter of law, they acted as a regional agency under chapter VIII, articles 52–54 of the U.N. Charter or in exercise of the independent right of collective self-defense recognized in chapter VII, article 51 of the charter.[6]

POSITION OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT[7]

The legal basis relied on by the U.S. Government to sustain the quarantine may be summarized as follows. The fundamental source of authority was the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance (Rio Treaty), to which the United States, Cuba, and 19 other countries are parties. The arrangements under this and related treaties constitute the Inter-American system. The Rio Treaty provides for collective action, including use of armed force, both in case of armed attack and in case any American state is threatened "by aggression which is not an armed attack * * * or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America." On October 23, 1962, the organ of Consultation, a body established under article 12 of the Rio Treaty, recommended that members of the Organization of American States take all measures, individually and collectively, including the use of armed force, which they deem necessary to prevent the further introduction of military material and supplies into Cuba from the Sino-Soviet powers. This recommendation was authorized by sections 6 and 8 of the Rio Treaty. The quarantine, imposed in accordance with the recommendation, was, therefore, pursuant to the authority and procedures of that treaty.

The U.S. Government also stated that the quarantine was consistent with the United Nations Charter. Article 52(1) of the charter specifically contemplates the use of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action. The activities of regional organizations must be consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations. If they are, they do not contravene any limitation in article 2(4) which prohibits any threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. The charter provisions dealing with regional organizations were adopted with the Inter-American system specifically in mind. It was stressed during the debates at the San Francisco Conference that the arrangements of the system for the maintenance of peace and security in the hemisphere were consistent with the charter. The quarantine was imposed in accordance with one of the basic agreements forming the system and was designed to deal with a threat to peace and security. It was not, therefore, inconsistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations or in violation of article 2(4).

---

[1] Address by Mr. Walt W. Rostow, Counselor and Chairman Policy Planning Council, Department of State, before the Ernest Reuter Society, 47 Department of State Bulletin 675 (1962).

[2] Presumably a reference to the attempted invasion of Cuba at the Bay of Pigs, on Apr. 17, 1961.

[3] Radio-television address by the President on Oct. 22, 1962: "The U.S. Response to Soviet Military Buildup in Cuba." See Department of State publication No. 7449, released October 1962.

[4] Presidential Proclamation No. 3504, Oct. 23, 1962, 27 Federal Register 10401 (1962).

[5] The quarantine was lifted on Nov. 20, 1962, by Presidential Proclamation No. 3507, 27 Federal Register 11525 (1962).

[6] T.S. No. 993, Charter of the United Nations.

[7] Address by Abraham Chayes, legal adviser, Department of State, on the legal case for U.S. action on Cuba, 47 Department of State Bulletin 763 (1962); Chayes, "Law and the Quarantine of Cuba," Foreign Affairs, April 1963, p. 550; American Bar Association, Washington Letter (Nov. 9, 1962), containing a discussion entitled "Legal Basis for the Quarantine of Cuba" which is stated to reflect "the line of analysis of the Office of the Legal Adviser, Department of State."

Finally, the U.S. Government maintained that the quarantine was not enforcement action by a regional organization requiring Security Council "authorization" under article 53 of the charter. The Organ of Consultation did no more than recommend. The usage of the term "enforcement action" elsewhere in the charter and a recent advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice support the view that only an application of force required by a regional organization of its members can constitute enforcement action within the meaning of article 53. Furthermore, even if the quarantine were viewed as enforcement action, there is precedent for the position that Security Council authorization does not necessarily mean either prior or express approval. In this connection, it should be noted that the Security Council commenced debate on the quarantine before it went into effect, and although a Soviet Union resolution condemning the quarantine was introduced, the Security Council chose to work through the negotiating efforts of the Secretary General.

Some international law publicists have taken issue with the theory of the U.S. Government, although themselves upholding the legality of the quarantine on the grounds that it was purely an action of self-defense.[8] At no time, however, has the U.S. Government stated that the legal basis for the quarantine which it advanced was the only basis which could be set forth. Rather, the position of the U.S. Government was presented as a sound and sufficient basis but not necessarily an exclusive one.

Naval officers need not be concerned with choosing between different theories of legality. Of real concern, however, is the fact that some international law publicists are saying that the quarantine was without any legal foundation whatever.[9] That charge should be countered with all available arguments.

It is the purpose of this article to discuss two additional theories upholding the legality of the Caribbean quarantine under the U.N. Charter other than the publicly stated position of the U.S. Government. The first theory to be discussed will, like the Government's theory, also support the quarantine as an appropriate action by the members of the OAS as a regional agency under article 52 of the charter.[10] The second will support it as an act of collective self-defense under article 51 of the charter by members of a collective security organization, the Rio Pact.[11] While the member states are identical in both theories, there is a legal distinction between a regional agency and a collective security organization. Accordingly, each theory will be analyzed separately.

REGIONAL AGENCY THEORY

Article 52(1) of the U.N. Charter provides, in part, as follows: "(1) Nothing in the present charter precludes the existence of regional * * * agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided that such * * * agencies and their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations."

This article specifies four requisites for the existence of a regional agency: (1) it must deal with matters relating to the "maintenance of international peace and security"; (2) the matters must be "appropriate for regional action"; (3) its activities must be consistent with the purposes, and (4) the principles, of the United Nations.

Requisites (1) and (3) are closely related, since the cardinal purpose of the United Nations is to "maintain international peace and security."[12] For reasons stated in the previous summary of the Government position, the quarantine very clearly satisfied those requisites. As for requisite (4), it is a cardinal principle of the U.N. that all members "shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."[13] The quarantine countered an illegal threat of such force against the territorial integrity of the American States. Therefore, it was not inconsistent with the principles of the U.N. To determine whether the quarantine was "appropriate for regional action" it is necessary to review the historical background of article 52, and the practice of the OAS and the Security Council under that article.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals of 1944 were drafted by China, England, the United States and the U.S.S.R. Those proposals were the blueprint for an international organization and later evolved into the United Nations Charter.[14] However, they also envisaged the existence of regional agencies. They contemplated that all enforcement action after an international organization had come into being would be taken by, or under the authority of, the Security Council of that organization. The specific enforcement actions were set forth in two paragraphs of the proposals. Paragraph 3 of section B described "diplomatic, economic, or other measures not involving the use of armed force" which the Security Council should be empowered to employ to give effect to its decisions. Paragraph 4 of the same section provided that in the event the Security Council should consider the above measures inadequate it should be empowered "to take such action by air, naval, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security." All such measures, listed in both paragraphs, were viewed as enforcement actions requiring Security Council authorization.

The American States were fully aware of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals when they adopted the Act of Chapultepec in Mexico City on March 3, 1945.[15] Notwithstanding the supranational objective of the proposals, the America States provided in the Act of Chapultepec that they could, on their own initiative and without reference to any international organization, act to meet "threats and acts of aggression." They agreed that appropriate acts should extend to the "use of armed force to prevent or repel aggression" as well as the usual pacific measures.

About 2 months later, the same American States participated with other nations of the world in the drafting of the U.N. Charter at the San Francisco Conference. It has been fairly well established that the Latin American nations threatened to withhold support for the charter unless it provided greater autonomy for regional agencies than was contemplated by the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.[16]

They won their point. Two-pronged modifications were agreed upon. In one respect they concerned the right of self-defense which will be discussed later. But they also concerned the pacific settlement of disputes by regional agencies which we are presently considering.

The regional agency provisions of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals evolved into article 52 of the U.N. Charter. However, the proposals had not contained what is now article 52(2). This subparagraph represents one of the modifications made at the insistence of the Latin American nations. Article 52(2) provides, in part, that: "The Members of the United Nations * * * constituting such agencies shall make every effort to achieve pacific settlement of local disputes * * * by such regional agencies before referring them to the Security Council."

This compromise language broke the monopoly of power planned for the Security Council in the proposals. It made it possible for regional agencies to take at least some actions; i.e., "pacific settlement" actions, which do not require Council authorization.

Prior to the quarantine, the practice of the OAS under article 52(2) had two notable characteristics. It had involved only local disputes in the strict sense, that is only disputes exclusively involving states parties to the O.A.S.[17] Secondly, the measures taken had been clearly pacific in nature and had never extended to the application of armed force.

It is submitted that in practical effect and in the public consensus the quarantine was an action primarily aimed at illegal activities of the U.S.S.R. in this hemisphere. Cuba, as an entity, was only collaterally affected. Therefore, to hold that it was an appropriate measure for regional action under article 52(2) would require a broad interpretation of the term "local disputes." It would not seem unreasonable to regard it as including any dispute arising within the geographical area over which a regional agency exercises authority.[18] In this instance it would be the region described in article 4 of the Rio Pact. The 500-mile radius announced by the United States as the outer reach of the quarantine area from Cuba was within that geographic region.[19]

Whether the quarantine was a measure for pacific settlement of the dispute depends upon whether it can be held not to have been "enforcement action" within the meaning of article 53(1) of the charter. That article provides, in pertinent part, that: "The Security Council shall, where appropriate, utilize such regional * * * agencies for enforcement action under its authority. But no enforcement action shall be taken * * * by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council."

Clearly, any action qualifying as "enforcement action" is legally beyond the unilateral reach of a regional agency.

---

[8] Mallison, "Limited Naval Blockade or Quarantine-Interdiction: National and Collective Defense Claims Valid Under International Law," 31 George Washington Law Review 335 (1963); Seligman, "The Legality of the Cuban Quarantine," 49 ABA Journal 142 (February 1963). Other authorities supporting the theory of self-defense are: Professor Larson of Duke University in a letter to the New York Times, Nov. 12, 1962, p. 28, cols. 5, 6; Professors Dillard, Pugh, Lissitzyn, and Berle, Columbia Law School News, Nov. 7, 1962.

[9] View of Prof. Quincy Wright as reported in the Columbia Law School News, Nov. 7, 1962, p. 1, col. 4.

[10] T.I.A.S. No. 2361, Charter of the Organization of American States. The charter states, in part: "Within the United Nations, the Organization of American States is a regional agency."

[11] T.I.A.S. No. 1838, Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance (Rio Pact).

[12] Op. cit. supra, note 6, art. 1.

[13] Id., art. 2(4).

[14] Department of State Publication No. 2297, "Dumbarton Oaks Proposals for a General International Organization," Oct. 7, 1944.

[15] T.I.A.S. No. 1543, Act of Chapultepec.

[16] Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 81st Cong., 1st sess., on Executive L, North Atlantic Treaty, pt. 1, p. 268 (statement by Senator Vanderberg).

[17] See Goodrich and Hambro, "Charter of the United Nations, Commentary and Documents," 314 (2d ed. 1949), for the view that this was the intended meaning of the words "local disputes."

[18] But see note 23, infra.

[19] For the 500-mile zone see map shown in New York Times, Oct. 23, 1962, p. 32, col. 2-4.

Very definite views as to what would constitute enforcement action have been voiced in Security Council proceedings relating to OAS actions taken against the Dominican Republic and Cuba. In August 1960, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the OAS concluded that the Dominican Republic had committed acts of intervention and aggression against the Republic of Venezuela.[20] It was agreed, inter alia, that there should be a breaking of diplomatic relations by all member states, and a partial interruption of economic relations beginning with the immediate suspension of trade in arms and implements of war of every kind.[21] In September 1960 the U.S.S.R. sought, in a proposed resolution, to have the Security Council give its retroactive approval to this action of the OAS.[22] It did so on the theory that the measures taken were enforcement actions requiring Council approval under article 53(1) of the charter. The resolution was defeated in favor of one submitted by Argentina, Ecuador, and the United States which provided that the OAS action would merely be noted.

There is little difficulty in interpreting the Security Council's action as holding that the pacific measures taken against the Dominican Republic were appropriate actions for a regional agency and were not enforcement actions requiring Security Council approval.[23]

In the case of Cuba the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the OAS met at Punta del Este, Uruguay, in January 1962, and recommended, inter alia, a similar suspension of trade in arms, and the exclusion of the present Government of Cuba from participation in the Inter-American system.[24] In March 1962 Cuba sought Security Council adoption of a resolution which would have referred the following principal question to the International Court of Justice: [25] "[C]an the expression 'enforcement action' in article 53 of the United Nations Charter be considered to include the measures provided for in article 41 of the United Nations Charter?" [26] The Council rejected the Cuban resolution and thus again held, in effect, that pacific measures taken by a regional agency against one of its members are not enforcement actions requiring Security Council authorization.

The International Court of Justice has held that the use of armed force by the U.N. in the Suez and in the Congo pursuant to General Assembly recommendations did not constitute enforcement actions because member states were not obligated to carry out the recommendations.[27] Under the Rio Pact no member state is required to use armed force without its consent even though, as noted previously in the discussion of the Dominican Republic matter, other measures decided upon may be binding upon members.[28]

There is a link in the relationship between the Security Council and the General Assembly which has been missing in the relationship between the Security Council and a regional agency. The Uniting for Peace resolution [29] of the United Nations permits the Assembly to do much of what the Council was authorized to do under chapter 7 of the charter. Pursuant to that resolution the General Assembly has recommended the use of armed force in situations such as the Suez and the Congo. A similar specific basis for regional agency use of armed force without Security Council authorization does not exist. However, the Uniting for Peace resolution did not foreclose, and perhaps even contemplated, the establishment of such a basis. In part D of the resolution there was established a committee to study and report to the Security Council and the General Assembly methods "which might be used to maintain and strengthen international peace and security in accordance with the Purposes and Principles of the Charter, taking account of collective self-defense and regional arrangements (arts. 51 and 52 of the charter)."

The OAS resolution of October 23, 1962, which authorized the use of armed force (without prior Security Council authorization and merely providing for a report to the Security Council on action taken as required by article 54) can be compared with the Uniting for Peace resolution. If such a resolution by a regional agency is valid it would follow that in today's world a regional agency exists under the U.N. Charter as an organ of the United Nations for all peacekeeping purposes within its area including the use of armed force to whatever extent is required to maintain the peace. Such a concept appears to have been expressed by the Honorable Abram Chayes in his address on November 3, 1962, previously cited, when he said:

"[E]vents since 1945 have demonstrated that the Security Council, like our own electoral college, was not a viable institution. The veto had made it substantially useless in keeping the peace.

"The withering away of the Security Council has led to a search for alternative peacekeeping institutions. In the United Nations itself the General Assembly and the Secretary General have filled the void. Regional organizations are another obvious candidate." [30]

On the other hand, if the quarantine was not a measure involving the use of armed force, then it was clearly not enforcement action under previous Security Council practice and was appropriate for regional action. The question then becomes: "Did the quarantine involve the actual use of armed force?"

In choosing the quarantine the United States avoided resort to an immediate use of armed force. Force was present at all times. Its use was threatened by the President if it should become necessary.[31] But the need did not arise and force was never physically applied.

The United States did not intend a hostile or belligerent act but merely sought a peaceful resolution of the problem. The quarantine was specifically designed to meet a threat short of war. It was not a belligerent blockade. It was, at most, a limited blockade "for winning without killing." [32] Its very name, "quarantine," was chosen to impart its nonbelligerent character. No ships or materials were seized. While the procedure of visit and search was carried out on board the Soviet-chartered Lebanese-flag freighter *Marucla*, it took place with the full cooperation of the master of that vessel.[33] In effect, the entire operation amounted to no more than a partial interruption of sea communications with Cuba. Both article 41 of the charter and article 8 of the Rio Pact authorize the italicized measure as one separate and apart from the use of armed force.[34]

Upon the basis of the above reasoning it can be concluded that the quarantine was not an enforcement action within the meaning of article 53(1) of the charter. Rather, it was an appropriate measure for implementation by a regional agency (OAS) in the settlement of a local dispute in accordance with article 52(2) of the charter.

THEORY OF COLLECTIVE SELF-DEFENSE

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals were silent with respect to the right of self-defense. The drafters of the proposals had considered it unnecessary to set forth that right explicitly since it is universally regarded as the inherent right of every sovereign nation. In this respect, the proposals were similar to the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928 which contained no explicit reservation of the right. Explaining its omission in a letter to our Ambassador in France, the Secretary of State, Mr. Kellogg, said: "That right [of self-defense] is inherent in every sovereign state and is implicit in every treaty. Every nation is free at all times and regardless of treaty provisions to defend its territory from attack or invasion and it alone is competent to decide whether circumstances require recourse to war in self-defense. If it has a good case, the world will applaud and not condemn its action." [35]

The Latin American States were not content with similar assurances. They feared that under the Yalta formula for Security Council voting,[36] it would not be possible for a regional agency to take action except upon the affirmative vote of seven members of the Council including all of its five permanent members. Thus, in their view, the veto could effectively bar regional action in self-defense. In an effort to win their votes, Senator Vandenberg drafted compromise language which evolved into what is now article 51 of the charter.[37] That article provides that:

---

[20] Department of State Publication No. 7409, "Inter-American Efforts To Relieve International Tensions in the Western Hemisphere 1959–60," pp. 65–70.

[21] Under the Rio Pact the taking of these measures was obligatory on all members since there was a finding of aggression. Art. 6 provides that agreed measures "must be taken in case of aggression." In situations other than aggression, agreed measures are permissive, since the article merely provides that they "should be taken."

[22] U.N. Security Council Off. Rec. 15th year, 893d–895th meetings, Sept. 8–9, 1960 (S/PV. 893–5).

[23] The Tunisian representative questioned whether even such pacific measures could have been taken by the OAS against a nonmember state. While agreeing with the other members of the Security Council that the decision of the Organization of American States involved nonmilitary measures taken against one member of that Organization by its remaining members, he said: "The case would have been different had it been a question of measures taken against a state not a member of that regional organization."

[24] Resolutions II and VIII adopted unanimously in plenary session on Jan. 31, 1962, at the 8th Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, 46 Department of State Bulletin 279, 282 (1962).

[25] U.N. General Assembly Off. Rec. 17th sess., supp. No. 2 (A/5202), Report of the Security Council to the General Assembly July 16, 1961–July 15, 1962, chap. 6, 51–56.

[26] Article 41 lists measures not involving the use of armed force which "may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations."

[27] "Certain Expenses of the United Nations" (art. 17, par. 2, of the charter), advisory opinion, July 20, 1962, I.C.J. Rep. 151. The major point of disagreement between the majority of the Court and most of the dissenting judges was whether use of armed force is a valid action even for the General Assembly. The majority held it valid. However, the majority opinion also supports the proposition that even pacific measures, if they are coercive (i.e., if member states are obliged to enforce them, as in the instance of the actions taken by the OAS against the Dominican Republic (see note 21, supra)), would be enforcement actions.

[28] Op. cit. supra, note 22.

[29] U.N. General Assembly Off. Rec., 5th sess., supp. No. 20, at 10 (A/1775), adopted by the General Assembly, Nov. 3, 1950.

[30] Op. cit. supra, note 7, at p. 765.

[31] Op. cit. supra, note 4.

[32] See "Blockade: For Winning Without Killing" by Capt. (now Rear Adm.) Robert D. Powers, Jr., U.S. Navy, Naval Institute Proceedings, Aug. 1958, p. 61.

[33] Department of Defense News Release No. 1745–62, Oct. 26, 1962.

[34] See supra, note 26.

[35] "Foreign Relations of the United States," 1928, vol. I, 36–37.

[36] See "Voting in the U.N." by Rear Adm. Robert D. Powers, Jr., U.S. Navy, supra, p. 67.

"Nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security."

The article can be interpreted to limit the exercise of the right of self-defense to a situation in which there has been an armed attack. Since the adoption of the charter, and even since the recent Cuban crisis, some authorities have contended that the words should be given that interpretation.[38]

There are possible arguments to support that view. In 1945, only the United States possessed the atomic bomb. In our hands it was no threat to world peace. In fact, we were highly optimistic at the time that our soon-to-be-proposed Baruch plan[39] for the control of atomic energy would be adopted by the nations of the world. Under it there would have been no bomb—all atomic energy would have been devoted exclusively to peaceful uses.

Also, in 1945, a significant, surprise conventional military attack was unlikely. Preparations for any such attack would be known sufficiently in advance to permit consultation with, and a request for action by, the Security Council. Lesser conventional attacks, such as border-type incursions, would not cause irreparable injury and could be rectified by appropriate Security Council action to restore the peace. The belief that such action could be anticipated from the Security Council was nowhere more optimistically voiced than by U.S. spokesmen themselves. For example, the Honorable Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Chairman of the U.S. delegation to the San Francisco Conference, in his statement before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations advocating ratification of the charter, said: "I believe the five major nations proved at San Francisco beyond the shadow of a doubt that they can work successfully and in unity with each other and with the United Nations under this charter."[40]

However, in 1947, 2 years and 21 vetoes later, an Assistant Secretary of State observed: "[T]he original intentions which we thought were held by all the great powers at San Francisco about using the veto only in the most grave and important circumstances—and then only sparingly and with due regard to the purposes of the charter—have not been fulfilled."[41]

And in the course of the floor debate during December 1947 concerning the giving of Senate consent to ratification of the Rio Pact, Senator Vandenberg stated: "[T]he original unilateral authority of the United States stands where it always stood. Even under the language of section 51 of the United Nations Charter we simply become responsible to the United Nations as the result of our obligation to it for what we do in the exercise of the Monroe Doctrine; and wherever the Security Council takes adequate control of a situation into which we may have injected ourselves, then the final authority rests with the United Nations and not with us."[42]

Today's Congress, faced with a 1962-type threat to our security (and after more than 100 Soviet vetoes), follows Senator Vandenberg's interpretation. On October 3, 1962, it resolved that the United States "is determined * * * to prevent by whatever means necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere."[43]

The resolution very clearly envisages possible U.S. use of armed force in situations short of actual armed attack. Under any theory of legality, such unilateral action would be justifiable only as defensive.

The President, too, in his addresses, press conferences, and actions relating to the Cuban crisis, adopted a similar view. At his press conference on September 13, 1962, he resisted heavy domestic pressures for U.S. unilateral military intervention in Cuba saying that it was not then either required or justified. "But," he said, "let me make this clear once again: If at any time the Communist buildup in Cuba were to endanger or interfere with our security in any way * * * then this country will do whatever must be done to protect its own security and that of its allies."[44]

In his radio-television address on October 22, 1962, the President noted "this secret, swift and extraordinary buildup of Communist missiles * * * this sudden, clandestine decision to station strategic weapons for the first time outside of Soviet soil." He then said: "Acting, therefore, in the defense of our own security and of the entire Western Hemisphere * * * I have directed that * * * a strict quarantine on all offensive military equipment under shipment to Cuba * * * [be] initiated."[45]

In the same address, the President directed the taking of two additional steps each of which was consistent with the exercise of the right of self-defense. He asked the Organ of Consultation of the OAS to invoke articles 6 and 8 of the Rio Treaty "in support" of all necessary action. He had already directed the initiation of what, in the view of the United States, the "necessary action" consisted of; i.e., the quarantine. In addition, he asked for an emergency meeting of the Security Council of the United Nations "to take action" against the "Soviet threat to world peace." Article 51 provides that members exercising the right of self-defense shall immediately report their actions to the Security Council. They may continue such actions until the Security Council, to repeat Senator Vandenberg, "takes adequate control of a situation" into which they may have unilaterally injected themselves.

After the President's speech, sometime during the evening of October 22, 1962, Ambassador Stevenson handed to the President of the Security Council for the month of October (Mr. Zorin, of the U.S.S.R.) a letter[46] to which was attached a draft resolution.[47] The letter is pertinent to the present discussion in two respects. First, it served notice of defensive action being initiated by the United States in order to give effect to prior OAS determinations:

"In order to give effect to the determination of the countries of the Western Hemisphere which they have recently reaffirmed to safeguard and defend the peace and security of the region against external interference and aggression, the United States is initiating a strict quarantine of Cuba."[48]

Secondly, it referred to the need for "immediate" Security Council action, proposed "the prompt and effective discharge" of the Council's responsibility, and submitted a U.S. draft resolution under which, if adopted, the Council itself would take action. Again, this was consistent with article 51.

When the Security Council met in emergency session at 4 p.m. on October 23, 1962, Ambassador Stevenson said that "the President announced the initiation of a strict quarantine on all offensive military weapons under shipment to Cuba * * * because, in the view of my Government, the recent developments in Cuba—the importation of the cold war into the heart of the Americas—constitute a threat to the peace of this hemisphere and, indeed, to the peace of the world."[49]

Immediately after concluding his lengthy remarks, Ambassador Stevenson stated that he had just been informed of the resolution adopted that afternoon by the OAS. Up to the point of that resolution the quarantine, though not yet in effect, had been unilaterally undertaken by the United States. From that moment on it was an action authorized by all members of the Rio Pact and actively participated in by some.

At 7:06 p.m. the same evening the President formally proclaimed the "interdiction of delivery of offensive weapons to Cuba."[50] The proclamation read, in part: "Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, acting * * * to defend the security of the United States, do hereby proclaim that the forces under my command are ordered * * * to interdict * * * the delivery of offensive weapons and associated materiel to Cuba."

When the President announced the lifting of the quarantine at his press conference on November 20, 1962, he made clear that the defense of our security required continued U.S. surveillance of Cuba.[51] He said: "[I]f the Western Hemisphere is to continue to be protected against offensive weapons, this Government has no choice but to pursue its own means of checking on military activities in Cuba."

Furthermore, in response to a question from a member of the press, he clearly indicated that our exercise of the right of self-defense had been, and should continue to be, in accordance with existing treaties, but that it exists separate from and unrestricted by such treaties:

"The United States has the means as a sovereign power to defend itself. And, of course, exercises that power; has in the past; and would in the future.

---

[37] 93 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 11127 (remarks of Senator Vandenberg).

[38] See supra, note 9.

[39] Department of State Publication No. 7008, "Documents on Disarmament," vol. I, 1945–59, 7–16.

[40] S. Doc. No. 87, 83d Cong., 2d sess., Review of the United Nations Collection of Documents, 57–58.

[41] 17 Department of State Bulletin 634 (1947), address by Norman Armour, Assistant Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

[42] Op. cit. supra, note 37, 11134.

[43] For text, see 47 Department of State Bulletin 597.

[44] For text, see 47 Department of State Bulletin 481.

[45] Op. cit. supra, note 3.

[46] U.N. Security Council Document S/5181, 47 Department of State Bulletin 724.

[47] U.N. Security Council Document S/5182, 47 Department of State Bulletin 724.

[48] A reaffirmation such as that alluded to in the quoted excerpt was contained in the final communique issued at the conclusion of an informal meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics, at Washington, D.C., Oct. 2–3, 1962. For text see 47 Department of State Bulletin 598 (1962).

[49] U.N. Security Council verbatim record of 1,022d meeting of Security Council, Oct. 23, 1962 S/PV. 1022.

[50] Op. cit. supra, note 4.

[51] For text, see transcript of President's news conference, Washington Post, Nov. 21, 1962, p. A6.

"We would hope to exercise it in a way consistent without treaty obligations, including the U.N. Charter. But we, of course, keep to ourselves, and hold to ourselves, under the U.S. Constitution, and under the laws of international law, the right to defend our security. On our own, if necessary—though we, as I say, hope to always move in concert with our allies, but on our own, if that situation was necessary to protect our survival or integrity or other vital interests."

All of these statements and actions by the United States professed to be defensive in nature. They were covered by the umbrella of article 51 provided they were legitimate and not merely self-serving. In this regard, the views of the representative of Ghana, expressed before the Security Council on October 24, 1962,[52] are relevant. He stated that: "in this particular case, if it is recalled that the U.S. delegation, in previous debates, had expressed the view that enforcement action consists of coercive measures involving the use of air, sea, or land forces of the type falling within the scope of article 42, then it is clear that the action contemplated by the United States must be regarded as enforcement action, which is inadmissible in terms of article 53, without the authorization of the Security Council.

"That being so, are there grounds for the argument that such action is justified in exercise of the inherent right of self-defense? Can it be contended that there was, in the words of a former American Secretary of State [Daniel Webster] whose reputation as a jurist in this field is widely accepted, 'a necessity of self-defense, instant, overwhelming, leaving no choice of means and no moment for deliberation?' My delegation does not think so, for as I have said earlier incontrovertible proof is not yet available as to the offensive character of military developments in Cuba."

At the time he made those remarks the only proof before the Security Council consisted of verbal accusations by the U.S. representative, and similar denials by the U.S.S.R. and Cuban representatives. On the following day, Ambassador Stevenson presented aerial photographs unmistakably showing MRBM emplacements.[53] Whether the photographs were regarded as "incontrovertible proof" by the Ghanaian and other representatives is not disclosed by the record. Even before they were exhibited, the course which the Security Council was to take had already been set through negotiations conducted in the halls of the United Nations. The Council adjourned to give the Secretary General an opportunity to hold discussions with interested parties and report back.[54]

The principal question is whether the U.S. action was taken in legitimate self-defense. The Ghanaian representative argued (again, before he had seen the photographs) that the threat was not "of such a nature as to warrant action on the scale so far taken, prior to a reference to this Council."[55] In fact, when he made that assertion on the morning of October 24, the quarantine was just becoming effective; yet the problem had been presented to the Council over 36 hours before. Of controlling significance, however, is that the American action drew wide support from the world community. The discovery and public disclosure of the deliberately deceitful conduct of the U.S.S.R. coupled with clear photographic evidence disclosing the rapid and secret construction of sites which would place nuclear missiles on launchers only 4 minutes away from Washington, D.C., resulted in a threat to the peace. There was a clear consensus that such a threat, discovered in near-operational status, did not permit prior consultation with the Security Council and justified the action taken to counter it. Further, there was widespread agreement with the resolution of the Organ of Consultation of the OAS of October 23,[56] recommending that measures be taken, if necessary, which would have involved a far greater use of armed force than that which was employed in enforcing the quarantine. The Organ of Consultation recommended, in part, the use of armed force "to prevent the missiles in Cuba with offensive capability from ever becoming an active threat to the peace and security of the continent." This language clearly condoned not only the measured response of the quarantine, but also the actual elimination of the missiles in Cuba by the physical employment of armed force if this should be necessary to preclude their use.

It is submitted that a realistic test for the legitimacy of an action of individual and collective self-defense under article 51 of the U.N. Charter has evolved from the Caribbean crisis. It is a test which was considered necessary as long ago as 1946, only a year after the charter had been adopted. Mr. Bernard Baruch, arguing that the veto power should not be allowed to protect those who, having agreed, might thereafter violate their agreement not to develop or use atomic energy for destructive purposes, had observed: "The bomb does not wait upon debate. To delay may be to die. The time between violation and preventive action or punishment would be all too short for extended discussion as to the course to be followed."[57]

A U.S. memorandum of July 1946 dealing with the same subject had stated:

"An armed attack is now something entirely different from what it was prior to the discovery of atomic weapons. It would therefore seem to be both important and appropriate under present conditions that the treaty define armed attack in a manner appropriate to atomic weapons and include in the definition not simply the actual dropping of an atomic bomb, but also certain steps in themselves preliminary to such action."[58]

More recently, Prof. Julius Stone posed the following question:

"[S]uppose military intelligence at the Pentagon received indisputable evidence that a hostile state was poised to launch intercontinental ballistic missiles, at a fixed zero hour only 24 hours ahead, against New York, Boston, and Washington, would it be an aggressor under the charter if it refused to wait until those cities had received the missiles before it reacted by the use of force? We assume, of course, that it should exhaust its means of defense, and all means of aborting the attack by nonviolent means; but at a pinch, if these cannot give it assurance, is it bound by law to wait for its own destruction?"[59]

And in a footnote, he suggested the answer:

"It is easy enough to assert * * * that no threat or danger can possibly ground legitimate self-defense until actual aggression occurs, because preventive war cannot be legitimate. But under modern conditions we may yet have to distinguish between legitimate and illegitimate anticipatory self-defense."[60]

In much the same vein, President Kennedy, in his radio-television address on October 22, said:

"We no longer live in a world where only the actual firing of weapons represents a sufficient challenge to a nation's security to constitute maximum peril. Nuclear weapons are so destructive and ballistic missiles are so swift that any substantially increased possibility of their use or any sudden change in their deployment may well be regarded as a definite threat to peace."[61]

In these words the President made a clear distinction between the missile threat which existed in Cuba from that which had existed for some time from within the territory of the U.S.S.R. He went ahead to point out that prior to the establishment of nuclear missiles in Cuba, there had existed a precarious status quo which insured that the weapons would not be used by either side in the absence of some vital challenge. In effect, this meant that neither side suspected the other of harboring the intention to actually use the missiles without provocation. In Professor Stone's hypothetical question, the provocation consisted of indisputable evidence of a U.S.S.R. intent to launch. In the Cuban situation the sudden clandestine decision to plant strategic missiles outside the Soviet Union, and the secret, swift, and extraordinary buildup of those missiles in Cuba, were indicative of an ominous change in Soviet intent. They had never trusted such missiles even in the territories of their more reliable satellites. Yet here they were placing them within the reach of one of their most notoriously unstable puppets—a man well known to bear a strong personal antipathy for the United States.

Notwithstanding this evidence, and the President's considered decision that it posed a serious threat to our security, some persons have failed to grasp the underlying gravity of the situation and apparently have adopted the line of reasoning that the Soviet missiles could have been intended merely as a defensive deterrent to a U.S. invasion of Cuba. These individuals draw a complete analogy between those missiles and the Jupiters which were in Turkey to deter Soviet aggression there. The analogy is far from complete and is very one-sided. The U.S. Dewline warning system will provide adequate advance notice of the launching of missiles from the Soviet Union to permit the Strategic Air Command ground alert nuclear retaliatory forces to be airborne before the missiles impact in the United States. With the capability of launching missiles from Cuba, the Soviets would be able to by-pass the Dewline. Such a Soviet capability would have greatly imbalanced the precarious status quo which both sides had carefully maintained for several years.

In such circumstances no nation can be held to an interpretation of article 51 which would require that it refrain from acting until the missiles had landed on target. When, in 1928, Secretary Kellogg criticized the effort to define self-defense in the pact which bore his name, he said that "it is far too easy for the unscrupulous to mold events to accord with an agreed definition." [62] How simple it would have been for the Soviets (and how fatal for us) to have been able to hide behind a literal interpretation of article 51 while establishing the capability in Cuba of subduing us in a single surprise attack.

---

[52] U.N. Security Council verbatim record of 1,024th meeting of Security Council, Oct. 24, 1962, S/PV. 1024.

[53] U.N. Security Council verbatim record of 1,024th meeting of Security Council, Oct. 25, 1962, S/PV. 1025, 36–40.

[54] On Oct. 29, 1962, President Kennedy appointed Mr. John J. McCloy, Under Secretary of State George Ball, and Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric to carry on negotiations for a conclusion of the Cuban crisis with the U.N. Secretary General and Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vasily Kuznetsov. On Jan. 7, 1963, a joint United States-Soviet letter, signed by Ambassador Stevenson and Mr. Kuznetsov, informed the Secretary General of the conclusion of their negotiations, and their belief that "it is not necessary for this item to occupy further the attention of the Security Council at this time," 58 Department of State Bulletin 153 (1963).

[55] Op. cit. supra, note 52, at 51.

[56] OAS resolution of Oct. 23, 1962. For text, see 47 Department of State Bulletin 722 (1962).

[57] New York Times, June 15, 1946, p. 4, col. 5.

[58] Department of State Publication No. 2702, "International Control of Atomic Energy, Growth of Policy," p. 164.

[59] Stone, J., "Aggression and World Order," 99–100 (1958).

[60] Id., at 100.

[61] Op. cit. supra, note 3, 4.

However, no definition can infringe upon a natural and inalienable right. Article 51 does not do so. The right of self-defense is one which has not been yielded by any of the members who have signed the U.N. charter. Mr. Warren Austin expressed this very clearly in the hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the North Atlantic Treaty: "In my mind article 51 does not grant a power. It merely prohibits anything contained in the charter cutting across an existing power. This existing power is not dependent on the charter, it is dependent upon international law and the customs of people, and that is the inherent right of self-defense." [63]

Today, the right of self-defense exists in a modernized version which is in all respects in consonance with the advances of technology and science. When the threat is one involving the possible use of modern nuclear-armed missiles, the test of an action taken in defense against that threat is, as Prof. Myres McDougal has described it, "that most comprehensive and fundamental test of all law, reasonableness in particular context." [64] If, when viewed in its true perspective and after the tensions and exigencies of the moment have eased, the action is regarded by the consensus of the world's nations to have been justified, then it has qualified as a legitimate action of self-defense under article 51. Justification would consist of general agreement that the initially assumed threat did in fact, exist, and that the action taken was proportionate to the threat.

Even though the U.S. action countered a mere threat of missile aggression, it is clear from other events that it passed the test stated above with flying colors. One need but compare the world's condemnation of the Soviet repression of Hungary, India's capture of Goa, China's rape of Tibet, and China's invasion of India. In the Caribbean, we had a good case, and the responsible nations of the non-Communist world applauded.

RESOLUTION OF GREETING

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a resolution from the legislative assembly of the Republic of Costa Rica.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Speaker McCORMACK, several of our colleagues who are members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and I had the privilege of meeting with four representatives of the Congress of Costa Rica—Deputy Rafael Paris, president of the National Legislative Assembly; Deputy Alberto F. Cañas, leader of the majority party; Deputy Francisco Ruiz, leader of the National Union Party, and Deputy José Joaquin Muñoz, a member of the Republican Party.

During the course of our meeting, the Costa Rican legislators presented the following resolution extending the cordial greetings of the deputies of the Legislative Assembly of Costa Rica, in the name of the Costa Rican people, to the Congress and the people of the United States:

RESOLUTION 515

The Legislative Assembly of the Republic of Costa Rica considering, That the union and solidarity of the peoples of the Americas are essential for bringing about a coordinated effort by all the American nations for the purpose of meeting their fundamental needs for work, land, housing, health, and education, thus obtaining greater social benefits for all the inhabitants of the hemisphere;

Considering, That, in order to achieve the union and solidarity of the American peoples, it is necessary to strengthen the cultural and political ties and bonds of friendship between them;

Considering, That the Government and people of the United States of America have constantly manifested friendship and cordiality toward the people of Costa Rica and that, at an early date, Deputy Rafael Paris, Deputy Alberto F. Cañas, Deputy Francisco Ruiz, and Deputy José Joaquin Muñoz will visit your great country, accepting the kind invitation of your Government;

Considering, That such good-will visits are in the interest of the two countries and that it is desirable for the legislative branch of the Government of Costa Rica to use them for the benefit of the highest ideals of the people whom it represents; Hereby

Resolves, To confer the representation of the Legislative Assembly of Costa Rica on Deputy Rafael Paris, Deputy Alberto F. Cañas, Deputy Francisco Ruiz, and Deputy José Joaquin Muñoz in order that they may represent it before the House of Representatives of the United States of America for the purpose of conveying the cordial greetings of the Deputies of the Legislative Assembly of Costa Rica, in the name of the Costa Rican people, to the great American people, who have the same aspirations for a better, free, and democratic America: Let this be published.

Given in the hall of the Legislative Assembly. San José, the ninth of July, one thousand nine hundred sixty-three.

T. QUIRÓS C.,
Vice President.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, once again we pause to observe Captive Nations Week, and it is appropriate that this observance should come in the month of July when we celebrate two great milestones in the history of freedom—Independence Day and Bastille Day.

President Kennedy has issued a proclamation setting aside the week of July 14 as a time to consider anew the fate of our fellow men behind the Iron Curtain and we, in Congress, have a further opportunity during this week to consider the tragic plight of the citizens of these countries which have fallen under the control of the international Communist movement.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent to insert the proclamation of President Kennedy.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The proclamation is as follows:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1963—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212) the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation, designating the third week in July 1959 as Captive Nations Week, and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas the cause of human rights and dignity remains a universal aspiration; and

Whereas justice requires the elemental right of free choice; and

Whereas this Nation has an abiding commitment to the principles of national self-determination and human freedom:

Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 14, 1963, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this fifth day of July in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-eighth.

By the President:

JOHN F. KENNEDY.
[SEAL] DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy himself has recently given a special focus to our observance. Not only Americans, but lovers of freedom everywhere, including those behind the Iron Curtain must have thrilled to hear the brave and encouraging words which were spoken during his recent trip by the President in Berlin and in Dublin. In Berlin, President Kennedy viewed the wall itself and emphasized the restriction of freedom and the deprivation of personal rights which the wall graphically incorporates.

In stirring words, he pointed out the physical evidence in Berlin of the insuperable difficulties of those who seek to do business with the Communists. He praised the people of Berlin for their resistance to Communist aggression and emphasized his belief that Germany would one day be united and free.

In Dublin, before the Dail, the President again spoke of the right of self-determination of nations and pointed out that the people of Berlin might well remember the perseverance of the Irish and their hardihood under years of oppression. The President's words are so eloquent that I quote them here:

> For knowing the meaning of foreign domination, Ireland is the example and inspiration to those enduring endless years of oppression. It was fitting and appropriate that the nation played a leading role in censuring the suppression of the Hungarian revolution, for how many times was Ireland's quest for freedom suppressed, only to have that quest renewed by the succeeding generation.

---

[62] Op. cit. supra, note 35.

[63] Op. cit. supra, note 16, at 117.

[64] McDougal, M., "Law and Minimum World Public Order: The Legal Regulation of International Coercion," p. 218 (1961).

> Those who suffer beyond that wall I saw on Wednesday in Berlin must not despair of their future. Let them remember the constancy, the faith, the endurance, and the final success of the Irish, and let them remember, as I heard sung by your sons and daughters yesterday in Wexford, the words—
>
> "The boys of Wexford, who fought with heart and hand,
> To burst in twain the galling chain and free our native land."

The President went on to say that the central issue was "between those who believe in self-determination and those in the East who would impose upon others the harsh and repressive Communist system."

The President's moving and eloquent words have given great encouragement to those of us who forward the cause of the captive nations and I sincerely hope that our own Government will follow with acts the broad and encouraging statements which the President has made.

It is more difficult today than formerly to support the cause of the captive nations. When Stalinist tyranny was imposing its crushing grip and free and historic countries were being placed under the heel of the dictator, or when revolutionary movements were promptly suppressed with tanks and guns and overwhelming armed force, it was easy to rally support in the country, in the government and in the press.

Today, the same situation does not hold true. First of all, the brutal Stalin cruelty has given way to the Khrushchev relaxation and in countries such as Poland and Hungary. De-Stalinization is the order of the day. Secondly, time has passed since the oppression was fresh and, in our secure and comfortable lives, the very existence of the police state is difficult to believe. Therefore, the urgency of our public response has diminished with the passing of the years.

I should like to emphasize, however, that the need for active supporters of the people of the captive nations is a continuing and vital one. It is just as much so today as it was in the past. While it is true that there is a greater degree of freedom in some of these countries, with more opportunity for discussion and liberty of movement, nevertheless, the fact remains that these historic countries are as far removed from the freedoms guaranteed by our Constitution and enjoyed by us as a matter of course, as day from night.

In Poland, the church is harassed and freedom of religious worship is impeded while Government policy is oriented to inspiration from Moscow.

In Hungary, many political prisoners are still kept in jail, free practice of religion is restricted and two rings of Soviet troops stand as a constant threat to any who might think of separation from the Communist bloc or revolt against the Communist-imposed regime.

Of course, we welcome the news that conditions are less harsh for the people in some of these countries than they were in previous years, but we must not let the improvement blind us to the long distance which must still be traversed before the people of these countries reach their goals of freedom and self-determination.

Only recently, we celebrated the anniversary of our own Declaration of Independence. In that historic document, our Founding Fathers proclaimed the rights of individuals to liberty, and the rights of nations to decide their own fortunes. If these principles are valid, and we believe they are, they must be universal in application. They must apply to Warsaw as well as to New York and to Hungary as well as to the United States of America.

Surely, we sacrifice something of our own principles if we shirk the duty of insisting that they be applied in the face of tyranny and oppression, regardless of the source. The tyranny of Khrushchev is no different from that of George III, and we should be as eager to oppose it as were Kosciusko, Lafayette and Von Steuben.

I cannot say that I have always been happy about the course which our Government has taken in reference to the captive nations. While many of the official declarations of our Government have been irreproachable, some of the actions of our representatives have been difficult to justify.

I was happy, for example, when during the hearings on the captive nations, held by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs last year, Secretary Tyler stated the U.S. position as being opposed to any acceptance of the status quo in Eastern Europe and as holding out sympathy and support to the people of these captured countries. Secretary Tyler also emphasized the importance of speaking out against Soviet imperialism and Soviet oppression.

At the same time, in spite of these encouraging declarations, we find puzzling and contrary actions on the part of our Government.

First of all, we have had the gradual submission of our representatives at the United Nations to those who wanted to sweep the whole matter of the Hungarian resolution under the rug. Surely, oppression and tyranny and the presence of alien troops are as reprehensible today as they were in 1956 and our Nation should be in the forefront of those who condemn conditions in Hungary. Even if it meant a contrary majority vote in the U.N., I submit that we should have held out to the last, and even submitted to defeat, rather than let this blatant example of Soviet imperialism go unchallenged.

A second inconsistent phenomenon has been our willingness to condemn imperialism in other sections of the world even though those under attack may be our staunch friends in joint defense enterprises, while refusing to criticize the imperialism of the type practiced against the captive nations.

Today, there is a discrimination by Russia in trade with Czechoslovakia and Hungary, for example, that is just as real and as harmful as that practiced by the colonial powers of the past.

Another strange example of inconsistency in the policy of our Government is in the failure of our information agencies to spread abroad the word of congressional support of the captive nations.

Even though the committee, to which I referred, for many weeks held hearings, and Secretary Tyler, himself, testified that knowledge of this activity on the part of the Congress would be very encouraging to people behind the Iron Curtain, nevertheless, this information was entirely neglected and no broadcasts were made of these hearings and of the important evidence presented of conditions in Eastern Europe.

I fully appreciate that a substantial change is going on in Eastern Europe. Destalinization is bringing some relaxation of control and the Sino-Soviet conflict provides some opportunity for a greater degree of flexibility on the part of some of these governments. At the same time, I do not feel that this thaw provides any reason for us to hold back our support of those who struggle for freedom and independence, or to soften our criticism of tyranny and oppression. It is the people of the captive nations in whom we should be interested, and not the regimes which presently control them. Either our Government is dedicated to supporting the freedom of nations or it is not. If it is so dedicated, then we should in no case hesitate to speak our minds. Certainly, the Communists never hesitate to criticize us in sensitive areas and are doing so today and there is no reason why we should hesitate to do the same, particularly when stanch friends of the United States are involved.

I hope that the declaration by President Kennedy of Captive Nations Week, and the observance of this week here in the Congress of the United States, will be known to the people of the captive nations, as I am sure it will. I hope that this observance will convey to them the knowledge that the people of the United States strongly support their aspiration for a return to elected governments of their own free choice and the restoration of the personal liberties which are so dear to every human being.

Above all, I hope that our own Government will strengthen its support of the suppressed peoples of Eastern Europe; that it will continue to condemn the colonialism of which they are the hapless victims and that it will assert its bargaining power and its influence throughout the world and whenever possible in order to bring about the day when these great and friendly nations will enjoy the same freedom which we in the United States are fortunate to enjoy today.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Connecticut for taking time this afternoon to lead the Members of the House in this discussion of Captive Nations Week and the related issues. Especially I wish to commend the gentleman for his practical and forthright suggestion that our Voice of America broadcasts include a recognition of the growing congressional interest in this subject.

I also wish to commend the gentleman for his most practical observation that our interest must be in the people of the captive nations and not in their temporary regimes. I feel Members of the House and citizens of the United States who escape from the captive nations as well as those still entrapped there, owe a debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Connecticut for his leadership in this field.

Mr. Speaker, it is necessary for us to continue directing attention to the plight of the captive nations, especially this week which we nationally commemorate as Captive Nations Week.

At a time when Communist propaganda machinery is once again luring us with the false trap of coexistence, it is well for us to ponder this truism: that as long as any nation and its people are under Communist imperial domination, our own freedom remains in danger. Communists continue their dedication to world conquest. We in turn must maintain our dedication to the principle of self-determination of peoples and persevere until all the captive peoples of communism in Eastern Europe, Asia, and the island of Cuba are restored to the free family of nations.

The continued evidence developing concerning the nationwide interest in this year's observances of Captive Nations Week is exemplified by proclamations issued by governors and mayors throughout the country. I submit additional proclamations for the RECORD at this point.

STATE OF INDIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Indianapolis, July 10, 1963.

PROCLAMATION—CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 14–20, 1963

Whereas the President of the United States has proclaimed the week of July 14–20, 1963, as Captive Nations Week; and

Whereas these nations look to the United States for leadership in bringing about their liberation and restoring to them the enjoyment of their individual liberties and freedoms; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States are linked to them by bonds of family and in the common belief that freedom and justice must prevail throughout the world, and it is proper that we give expression of our support to the people of these nations who are striving for personal liberty and independence,

Now, therefore, I, Matthew E. Welsh, Governor of the State of Indiana, invite the citizens of Indiana to join with our sister States in observing Captive Nations Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and cause to be affixed the great seal of the State of Indiana, at the capitol, in the city of Indianapolis, this 10th day of July 1963.

MATTHEW E. WELSH,
Governor of Indiana.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] CHARLES O. HENDRICKS,
Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America have by resolution requested and authorized the President of the United States to designate the week of July 14 through July 20, 1963, as Captive Nations Week; and

Whereas we Americans are proud that many refugees from the oppressed countries have found asylum in the United States; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to many of the captive nations peoples; and

Whereas it is appropriate and proper to manifest to these people of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas the citizens of the village of Calumet Park, Ill., are fully aware of and grieve for the plight of those made captive under the heavy yoke of Russian communism:

Now, therefore, I, John J. Swalec, president, of the village of Calumet Park, do hereby designate the week of July 14–20, 1963, as Captive Nations Week in the village of Calumet Park, Ill., and urge the widest possible cooperation in the observance of this week.

JOHN J. SWALEC.

I wish to call to the attention of the House and include as part of my remarks two timely editorials which appeared in the Catholic Standard, Washington's Archdiocesan newspaper, Friday, July 12, one dealing with Captive Nations Week, the other discussing the recent betrayal by the U.S. Government of the cause of the Hungarian freedom fighters.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

A thoughtful observance of Captive Nations Week is good insurance against captivity. Although we welcome every whiff and vestige of evidence that Russian communism is turning toward the West, we must very soberly gage both the validity of these indications and our course. The plight of the captive nations is the best example for our guidance.

People must live on facts, not promises. People must enjoy the daily benefits of freedom—not party explanations of group freedom—before they can say they are free. Therefore the gage of what the Reds mean about human rights, including freedom, is what they are actually doing in the captive countries.

By any standard of civilized law and usage, the captive countries well deserve their name. The very foundation of human rights is not acknowledged, that men as creatures of God possess rights granted by the Creator. The state in the captive countries assumes the rights of God and man, presuming to parcel them out according to their desires. Even the reports that governments in these states have now relaxed their controls, granting some scant exercise of rights, confirms the inadmissible premise that the state, not the individual, possesses the rights.

The Reds can easily disprove that the satellite nations are not really captives—by free elections, by abolishing the secret police, by tearing down the barbed wire and mines at the frontiers, by granting freedom to the press and freedom of religion, by permitting freedom of education.

And until the enslaved nations are free, we shall continue to pray for them and to use all possible pressure to assure their freedom.

A BRAVE MAN DIES

A brave man was buried recently—the Hungarian freedom fighter. He was officially removed from the face of the earth when the United Nations Assembly accepted the credentials of the Hungarian delegation to the General Assembly on the same basis as those of the other members. Previously, at the urging of the United States, the Assembly has refused to rule on the Hungarian credentials one way or the other. While this was so the freedom fighter's hopes lingered on that something might be done about the Soviet Union's suppression of the Hungarian revolt in 1956. Now hope has turned to dust, and, as if to supervise the funeral, Secretary General U Thant has announced that he will soon visit Hungary.

Why this change in policy? Certainly the United Nations resolutions regarding Hungary have not been met. These resolutions, formulated in 1956, called for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary, free elections, the admission of United Nations observers and an amnesty for Hungarians who opposed Soviet control. To date, only the amnesty has been granted and this may only be a token since a number of patriots still remain in prison.

One reason for the change seems to be that Mr. Thant (along with a great many of the members of the United Nations) feels that the Hungarian question is a cold war issue. Consequently, Mr. Thant would want to drop the issue since it would only irritate the Russians without bringing any great practical result. The other reason for the change lies in the new attitude of the United States. The United States has decided to go along with the majority and accept the Hungarian Government since the necessary two-thirds vote to adopt a resolution to investigate the Hungarian revolt is now a virtual impossibility.

The United Nations decision to say no more about the Soviet suppression is tragic, nevertheless. Upon the conscience of the United Nations falls the lot of the freedom fighters—the dead in their graves, the living dead in Communist prisons.

The cause of the captive peoples remains the cause of the American people, just as the desire of the captive peoples for freedom represents the greatest weakness of the Soviet Union and Red China and is the reason why the social, economic plans of the Reds so consistently fail.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman and I say we appreciate too his work on our subcommittee and the great interest he has had in the particular subject of captive nations and the help he has given the committee in that respect.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONAGAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my colleagues in commemorating the observance of the Captive Nations Week.

I am happy that the President, in keeping with past practice and with the expressed sentiment of the Congress, has issued a proclamation calling on all Americans to observe the Captive Nations Week. This is one observance which should continue so long as the people of the Communist-dominated nations of Eastern Europe are deprived of their right freely to choose their governments and to direct the affairs of their countries.

Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat concerned a few weeks ago when I read the text of the President's speech at the American University, which speech dealt in part with the issue of the cold war. The President said that we must seek to avoid confrontations which may lead to a nuclear war, that we should avoid unnecessary irritants in our relations with the Communist bloc, and that we should avoid purely rhetorical hostility. Some people interpreted these remarks to signify a profound shift in the U.S. policy toward the Communist countries—a shift which would lead to our acceptance of the status quo in Eastern Europe.

The President's subsequent statements while he was in Europe, and his action in issuing the Captive Nations Week proclamation, encourage me to believe that this is not the case. Speaking in Frankfurt on June 25, the President reminded all of us:

> Unless liberty flourishes in all lands, it cannot flourish in one.

And speaking in Berlin the following day, he said:

> Police states [of Eastern Europe] are an anachronism.

And urged those who suffer behind the Iron Curtain not to despair of their future. He reaffirmed in no uncertain terms, our country's dedication to the cause of freedom and our determination to work for a world in which all the peoples may enjoy peace, justice, and liberty.

This remains our country's goal—a goal which has always found strong and enthusiastic support in the Congress.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have devoted considerable attention to the plight of the people of the captive nations. Through the many hearings on the captive nations chaired ably by our colleague from Connecticut, Mr. MONAGAN, through executive meetings and study missions, your subcommittee has endeavored to stay informed about developments in those countries, and to provide other Members of the House with factual information and recommendations relating to our foreign policy toward those countries. We will certainly continue in these efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I must comment on one other issue pertinent to today's observance.

A few days ago, in replying to our repeated invitation to discuss a nuclear test ban treaty, Khrushchev proposed to tie to it a nonaggression pact between the NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries.

On the surface, the proposal appears reasonable. We and our allies have repeatedly stated that NATO is a defensive—not an aggressive—alliance. We have also publicly admitted that any large-scale military confrontation between the West and the East may escalate into a nuclear war—holocaust—and that we, for one, wish to avoid this somber possibility. And so a case exists, at least on the surface, for a thoughtful consideration of Khrushchev's proposal.

This innocent looking proposal is, however, loaded with serious implications.

Would such a nonaggression treaty be construed, for instance, to indicate our acceptance of the status quo in Eastern Europe—our sanction of continued Soviet domination of those countries?

Would such a treaty involve official acceptance of a permanent division of Germany and recognition of the puppet East German regime as a government of a separate nation?

Would such a treaty bind the West to renounce all efforts to encourage and promote greater freedom from Moscow for the captive nations—while at the same time leaving the Communists free to use their favorite cold war weapons of infiltration and subversion for the purpose of bringing about our ultimate destruction?

These and other considerations warrant our careful thought. And I, for one, would vehemently oppose any treaty proposals which would try to foist these unacceptable conditions upon us.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate my hope that the people of the captive nations may soon regain freedom and independence. There is nothing that would please us more.

I compliment our colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN], and urge him to continue in the pursuit of these truths.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York and also express here, Mr. Speaker, the appreciation which all of us have of her efforts as chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, because she has been responsible for the reactivation of the subcommittee and for the study and the report which was made last year on this subject.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Connecticut on his forthright presentation in this House today and on his untiring efforts in this great cause. I rise today to join the gentleman and other Members of this House in paying tribute during Captive Nations Week to the heroic, courageous, and freedom-loving people behind the Iron Curtain and to call upon this Congress to give even more meaningful recognition to their cause.

I am privileged, Mr. Speaker, to be among the Members of this House who, 4 years ago, joined in sponsoring the joint resolution which established this significant annual national Captive Nations Week. In accordance with its terms the President has annually designated the third week of July for the commemoration of the occasion. I hope it will be heralded throughout the Nation and that all the public media at our command, especially the Voice of America, will convey to the world our observance of this week.

The commemoration represents a somewhat belated recognition of a somewhat tragic state of affairs which dates from World War II and its aftermath. I do not wish to imply though that the United States has not been concerned about the fate of some 100 million persons trapped behind the Iron Curtain. To the contrary, our policy has been consistent in support of their plight. I simply want to point out that Captive Nations Week is the first sustained attempt to focus public attention on this serious situation.

There should be other steps taken by Congress—by us, the representatives of the American people—not only to reaffirm our sympathy and support for these millions of people living under the yoke of suppression and tyranny, but to express this support overtly, through continuing constructive activity. We should give this matter the recognition it deserves—nothing short of a special committee of the House would accomplish these ends.

Such a committee has been proposed for three consecutive sessions and I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I have been honored to be identified with its sponsorship since its inception. Sadly, to date, the proposal has not been enacted—a situation which, I trust, will be corrected at this session.

This week provides a welcome opportunity to reemphasize the importance of creating such a special committee to deal with this question. The purpose of Captive Nations Week, as expressed in one of the annual Presidential proclamations is to urge the people of the United States "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations."

A special Captive Nations Committee would make great strides toward this goal by undertaking a careful and precise study of the conditions in the captive nations of the world so that definite steps could be taken to aid these peoples in their quest for freedom.

While much warranted emphasis has been given to the goal of freedom for these captive nations, and the outstanding issue of our era is the struggle between the totalitarian Communist slavery and the libertarian governments of the free world, one should not overlook the strategic location of these countries and their vast population of over 100 million people including the Estonians, the Latvians, the Lithuanians, Czechoslovaks, Germans, Poles, Albanians, Bulgarians, Hungarians, and Rumanians.

There is no question that we are helping ourselves when we look to the interests of these captive nations for east-central Europe lies between the Soviet Union proper and free Western Europe. Within this no man's land, where free people are now subject to the yoke of tyranny, lies a people who have for centuries attempted to resist hostile foreign rule. This love for the values of freedom and self-determination has demonstrated itself as recently as 1956 when the Hungarians and Poles vainly attempted to grasp at the hope of freedom and were crushed mercilessly by Soviet armor.

The instability of the area will undoubtedly cause Mr. Khrushchev to think twice before he would precipitate an all-out aggressive act against free Europe or the United States. It is unquestionably the case that the peoples of these captive nations cannot and will not fight with enthusiasm, if they would fight at all, for a foreign ideology that has been foisted upon them by an alien power. This fact is vividly brought out when one realizes that in not one of these countries did the Communists gain control of the government with the consent of the majority.

In no case were there ever free elections, and the Communists' path to power is marked by human misery, privation, and death. Thus, the political and military instability of the area will act as a deterrent to any Soviet aggression—in the strict sense of the word. For the Soviets know that the risks involved in depending on an unwilling and reluctant ally far outweigh the prospective gains. There is always the haunting fear in the minds of the Soviet military planners that the might of these captive nations could, in time of war, be used against them or prove to be so unreliable that they would be useless.

The uneasiness engendered by the unreliability of these oppressed countries is an important factor influencing the decisions on which peace or war, political defeat or victory, may hinge.

It is clear, then, that the peoples of east-central Europe are in an important position to influence the forthcoming events in Europe by their desire for freedom that makes them an Achilles heel in the Soviet military machine. The Communists cannot, therefore, unquestionably count on the face value of the military capacity of the captive nations, and they will be deterred from precipitating any aggressive act. The Polish, Czechoslovak, East German, Hungarian, Rumanian, and Bulgarian regimes have 63 regular divisions and about 3,000 airplanes; these satellite armed forces can do one of three alternative things: They can either turn their arms against the Soviets; they can appear so unreliable as to be useless; or, they can be an important military asset to the Red army.

It is then, incumbent upon us to insure ourselves that only the first two alternatives will really exist for these satellite nations and the third will remain outside their ken; and this can best be accomplished by establishing the Special Committee on Captive Nations. It will show the people of these countries that we have not forgotten them in a time of their political and spiritual bondage. The special committee would keep their heart attuned to the concept of freedom by determining the best course of action for the United States to take. The valuable information gathered by the committee would provide the basis for greater public awareness of the problems and for sound policy recommendations. In this way, the United States could better assist these unfortunate peoples by peaceful means, to regain their lost freedom and independence; and it would have the further advantage of insuring that these people do not become unquestioning slaves to the Communist machine, thus adding to their military might.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the careful reconsideration of this proposed committee as a vital step toward the realization of the ideal to which Captive Nations Week is dedicated—the universal reign of liberty and peace under law.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his observations.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Connecticut for his leadership in this discussion on captive nations and thank him for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, July 14, I was accorded the unique privilege and honor to deliver the principal address at a gathering of men and women and children in Grant Park, Chicago, opening the observance of Captive Nations Week. It is a sobering experience to watch the people who through very personal association of their own or of their loved ones have learned the harsh lessons of contemporary history that atheistic communism means tyranny, subjection, hardship, and the suffering of unbelievable indignities.

America is indeed the proud recipient of many who have come to its shores not to serve self and to seek personal glory but to serve the cause of freedom and to strengthen the hope of men and women everywhere that the cause of liberty and human dignity is not lost.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at the end of these remarks a copy of a resolution adopted by the group of 5,000 persons in Grant Park, an Appeal to the American Public by this same gathering of citizens and a portion of my own remarks made in Chicago on July 14.

As we look about us we are becoming strangely aware that the evil that confronts us in any one place follows us in all places—that we cannot leave behind the threats to our safety and our security and our freedom—for we are in a sense living in a shrunken world being made smaller each passing day by our abilities to travel faster and to communicate instantaneously with one another. What happens to any one of us is a threat to all of us. What happens to any one nation, be it large or small, brings with it the possibility others may soon become like victims. We cannot hide ourselves in a world which is under constant surveillance of a telstar nor can we rest in peace and in confidence in a world in which not one spot is secure from the threat of a nuclear blast. But this does not mean that men who believe in just causes should quiver before the uncertain future, and cave in to the threats of the bellicose and the bullies who would enslave us. As creatures of a God who is our partner in the right, we stand ready to meet any challenge in the full knowledge that nothing worthwhile is ever gained without effort and sacrifice.

God hath not promised skies always blue,
Flower-strewn pathways all our lives through;
God hath not promised sun without rain,
Joy without sorrow, peace without pain.
But God hath promised strength for the day,
Rest for the labor, light for the way,
Grace for the trials, help from above,
Unfailing sympathy, undying love.

In the world in which we live—a world in which there is planned violence and chaos where communism seeks full sway and power—we will become either the victim of circumstance or the master of it. We will be overcome by evil or we will overcome evil itself. We will either accept what we in our weakness fear we cannot change or we will change what we in conscience cannot accept. The threat to freedom posed by a worldwide, aggressive, moralless, atheist Communist movement of oppression is one which freemen cannot accept. We must labor diligently to eradicate it, or it will eradicate us.

The future of freedom lies in learning the true meaning of tolerance and not through unrealistic emotionalism that allows tolerance to give quarter to the intolerant who will take advantage of tolerance in order to destroy it.

In this world today, made smaller and smaller in terms of time and distance as they relate to transportation and communications, Abraham Lincoln's words take on a more expansive significance. Lincoln said:

> This Nation cannot survive half slave and half free.

So it is true of our world today. We cannot survive half slave and half free, and the sooner we learn it, the sooner Americans will awaken to the real threat of coexisting as equals with a ruthless totalitarian type of colonialism represented by the Communist ideology.

We have been told by Nikita Khrushchev that there can be no peace in the world until there is in fact a world Communist government. I disagree. There can be no peace until all the world is free. Freedom, not communism, is the wave of the future. I believe this because I believe we are right and communism is wrong; because freedom is on God's side and communism on the side of frail, futile, finite men.

Because I believe this, I believe we can win the cold war if we will pursue it with determination. If we will have the courage to see it through. If we will be willing to pay the price victory demands. If we will be patient and forward looking and understanding but firm and unapologetic for the demands freedom would make.

We have heard time and time again that the free world has only two choices—that we must choose either to coexist with Communist tyranny, which means corruption of freedom by erosion rather than surrender—or a nuclear holocaust in which neither side could win and perhaps in which both would be annihilated. I do not accept either of these choices.

There is yet another choice—in fact, the only real choice—and that is victory for freedom. Victory, however, does not come cheap. It will be acquired only through first, determination to meet the Communist threat for what it is; second, through informing the world of the true character of the threat; and third, through grasping the initiative by taking the advantage freedom has by virtue of the fact that freedom possesses truth and that freedom is on God's side and together we cannot fail.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

It is a humbling experience to be invited to address a group of great Americans such as are gathered here today, a gathering of people who by great personal sacrifice and sorrow have learned by their individual and collective experiences the lessons of history.

Some of you were born here in the United States. You have received a heritage of liberty and freedom which was wrested from another government by your political forbears only through costly sacrifice and pain and suffering and tortured concern. If those who had given themselves in this Nation's periods of peace and war could speak to us today I am sure their common voice would clearly indicate that they would, if they had yet another chance, give themselves today as they did in their day for the causes of freedom and the preservation of human dignity. One of our great national heroes, Patrick Henry, who spoke in the State House of Virginia prior to the great Revolutionary War that was fought to lay aside the yoke of bondage under British rule, spoke for all the freedom-loving patriots not only of his day but of the day that followed; spoke for us when he so eloquently and in complete and sincere passion asked, "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains?" And then followed his question with his answer which indeed is the answer of the freedom-loving of our day—attested to by those who sleep restfully beneath the sod as well as those who survived in their attempts to escape the prison bars of political bondage—"I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty, or give me death."

Others of you have adopted the United States as your country. You have come to know that this great country welcomes the downtrodden and oppressed for she has a tradition for having a heart for all who possess the spirit of good will and courage—for those who seek nothing for themselves but the privilege and opportunity to progress and in freedom to seek their own destiny. As one who was born a citizen of this Nation and whose parents were equally fortunate at birth I do not claim to be able to appreciate as fully as you the richness of my heritage for I like others have come to take for granted what I have received from the past. However, I am not wholly unaware of my privilege. Service in a World War which brought me face to face with the oppressed; the ability not only to read but to read between the lines and comprehend what is written and intended; several personal contacts with people like you, who know what oppression means because you or one of your family is or has been a victim of it; has made me deeply aware not only of my privilege but of my responsibility as a free man and especially as a representative of a free people.

I find myself at times reviewing the words of the poem by Emma Lazaruz graven on a tablet within the pedestal on which the Statue of Liberty is placed:

"Not like the brazen giant of Greek fame,
With conquering limbs astride from land to land;
Here at our sea-washed, sunset gates shall stand
A mighty woman with a torch, whose flame
Is the imprisoned lighting, and her name
Mother of Exiles. From her beacon-hand
Glows worldwide welcome; her mild eyes command
The air-bridged harbor that twin cities frame.
'Keep ancient lands, your storied pomp!' cries she,
With silent lips. 'Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door!'"

America is the proud recipient of many persons who have come to its shores not seeking personal glory and fame nor hoping in private comfort to forget the unpleasantness of the past but who have settled on our shores to seek in self-dedication to add strength and power, by the use of their talents and efforts and possessions to the struggle of their former countrymen to break their chains; to keep alive a hope for freedom in their eyes made dim by the darkness that surrounds them and in their hearts made heavy by the burdens they are forced to bear.

You have come also to serve the cause of freedom by warning us of dangers we are too naive to recognize; too busy to be disturbed about; over which we are too complacent to be concerned.

The answer to our social and economic and political problems that beset us is not in passive coexistence with any political system whose avowed aim it is to destroy free institutions nor is it in flaunting open warfare against others because we have neither the patience nor the ability to move constructively toward the strengthening of free institutions. The cure for the social disease of collectivism that has corrupted every muscle and nerve; eaten away at freedom's backbone and poisoned the blood that flows through the arteries that feed life into free institutions is not in the destruction of the identity of nations with a view in mind of creating one large worldwide super state in which the individual becomes but a small molecule on a tooth of a gear lost in the massiveness of a huge impersonal political machine—but, in the relative simplicity of strengthening individual nations in which the best of the traditions and hopes and aims of its people in trust and confidence and cooperation can be shared by each with the others.

To suggest that free and independent nations cannot survive the disease of communism unless the various individual parts of the larger body of world society—the independent nations—are eliminated and reduced to but a common glob is about as insane as to say that the hands, or head, or feet cannot survive unless they lose their identity and become an impersonal, formless mass of mere flesh.

The future of freedom in our world is not in denying it to individual nations and forcing them to accept the dictates of the larger state but in learning the lesson of cooperation. In gaining and preserving for people of each nation, large and small, the right of self-determination—the opportunity to select their own leadership in free and fair elections as well as to reject leadership when the people no longer have confidence in it.

The future of freedom is in developing a moral base which alone will assure a firm foundation upon which freedom can rest.

I am a bricklayer by trade. My dad, now 92 and long years past retired, was a stone mason and contractor. Time and time as I learned the trade and worked with him side by side, Dad would remind me that the most important part of a building was not above the ground but below it. It was the foundation, not the chimney top.

He would say, "You can have the most beautiful building man can conceive; it can be kept in perfect repair—the walls painted and the windows caulked; the roof can be watertight and door hinges kept oiled but if the footing, the foundation, crumbles the building in all of its beauty will topple to the ground. On the other hand, the building may be in need of paint, the caulking around the glass chipped; the roof may have an occasional leak and the door hinges squeak but if the footing—the foundation—is secure it will stand the test of time and resist successfully the forces of nature that beat against it."

How true this is of the structure of a free nation. If the footing—the foundation—is strong no force of evil can topple it. It may have to suffer privation and hardship and servitude for a time but it cannot be permanently subjugated. The only adequate foundation for a free nation is a moral and spiritual base. When a people are strong in morals and spirit the free institutions to which they give themselves shall surely survive.

I want to congratulate my fellow Americans for keeping alive your great traditions and customs. For sharing with us the best you have brought with you from your former homeland or learned from your elders—to mold it with the best you see around you in America. We cannot lose. We can only gain when we receive from you the riches of their great past.

This is a great Nation. I and a host of others in Congress will continue to labor to keep America the living symbol of freedom to a world caught in the backwash of the undercurrent of atheistic materialism and worldwide collective authoritarianism.

When this great Nation was locked in battle in the mid-19th century just 100 years ago to be exact in what is called the War Between the States, it was as President Abraham Lincoln said on many occasions "to preserve the Union." It was not, if you please, to create an all-powerful Federal authoritarian State but to preserve the unity of the group of individual States that made up this Nation, to preserve the unity that caused them in cooperation to labor toward a common goal. Lincoln believed there was a richness that was unmatched in each State sharing its best with the other States in friendliness and cooperation and in unity seeking together by mutual concern a common goal that could be enjoyed by the individual States within the framework of their own peculiar wishes and desires. When one or a group of States took leave to follow such practices that would tend to destroy freedom of individuals and the freedom in other States the desire of the President was not that they should be denied their identity and their privileges, should be swallowed up by a larger whole, but that they should be expected to fit into the community of States as a peaceful participant not as arrogant masters.

The War Between the States was fought to keep one section of the country from dominating the other; I repeat, to preserve the Union, not to impose upon the States and their respective citizens a Federal authoritarian dictatorship against which our forefathers through sad and costly experience and sacrifice had a natural aversion. This was to be a Nation in which independent States would find their dependence upon one another not in terms of physical geography or intangible government but in terms of a common bond of fellowship, a common spirit of helpfulness and cooperation—seeking a common goal and purpose.

This country has never failed to meet successfully a challenge in which our military might was called in to settle the issue; e.g. when we had the will to win. We have been successful in our military engagements because we have spared nothing in creating the physical weapons to win the war. We have been constantly engaged in the process of creating new weapons to meet new contingencies when they arose. The success in any military engagement is in large part due to the fact that we had that intangible—freedom—for which to sacrifice, but added to that we have always had available the most modern tools of weaponry with which to wage that war. In fact, it has been our history that more advanced weapons were already in production before the previous models were installed and used.

Now the same is true of waging a cold war. If we are to be successful we must design and produce the weapons adequate to wage this war; and tools with which to wage a cold war are far different from the tools with which a hot war is waged. These tools, too, become obsolete so it is necessary to fashion the most modern weapons and to be one step ahead of those against whom the weapons are aimed.

Captive Nations Week is a very important weapon with which we can effectively wage battle. But we must use this weapon if it is to be effective. It must be more than a mere observance. It must be a serious attempt to rededicate ourselves to the task, seeking short of war to unshackle the chains of the enslaved and to extend the boundaries of the free.

That is why in the 87th Congress and again in the 88th I introduced a bill to establish a House Committee on Captive Nations. I believe that no nation can win a war merely by remaining on the defense. We must take the offensive and if we will go on the offensive in waging the cold war it will in all probability make a hot war unnecessary.

I cannot believe that we can settle for merely holding the Communists in check. Far too many people and nations are smarting under the chaffing of their colonial yoke. It must be our intention to roll their offensive back. We are not a warlike people. We do not want war. We will neither provoke or start a war but neither can we continue to suffer the indignities of having our tolerance misinterpreted as weakness or our lack of belligerent charges to mean a lack of determination to preserve and extend man's God created right to be free.

I want to close my remarks with the words penned by William I. Nichols, editor and publisher of This Week magazine, penned in answer to the spiritually bankrupt and by those timid souls who believe that peace at any price—capitulation to communism—is preferable to struggle for freedom:

"'Better brave than slave.' This is freedom's true answer to all those who have been chanting 'better Red than dead'—or vice versa. It gives the lie to the notion that free men have no other choice than to be Red or dead.

"'Better brave than slave' are words to keep us from growing paralyzed by talk about the H-bomb. They remind us that life has always been a struggle, that the race is won by the strong and bold and that life on this earth is not meant to be easy or effortless or everlasting.

"Perhaps one of the basic troubles today is that many of us have come to believe too literally in our own slogans about 'inevitable progress.' We think miracle drugs will bring us eternal youth. Similarly, we hope that by some political miracles we can make our rivals or enemies go away and thus bring us perpetual—and painless—peace and prosperity. We forget that through the ages, such ends have been won by brave men, acting with faith, energy, and imagination. Often just by standing firm they have prevented war.

"Better brave than slave. These words, I believe, speak to us with the firm voice of history and hope. They speak, too, with the voice of morality, for they affirm the everlasting fact that for free men there are things in life worth living for, fighting for, and even dying for. They give us the courage, the manly gift to stand up, and be counted on the side of right, as God gives us to see the right. And in so doing, they unlock for us the greatest of life's secrets which is this: The minute you know that you are not afraid to die; that is the minute you begin to know how to live."

Friends, those of us who believe in freedom, who wish to preserve for all people of the world the right to self-determination and to live in peace with their neighbors although they may differ in cultural backgrounds and national traditions have just begun to fight. The battle will not be easy. Certainly, as you know by your own experience, it will not always be pleasant. We are going to have our disappointments and our reverses but let us be strengthened and encouraged by our successes. Let us learn by our mistakes. Let us rededicate ourselves to preserve for posterity the principles of freedom that have made this country great and are the God-given heritage of every man, woman, and child created by Him in His Image. And let us rededicate ourselves to the yet unfinished task of freeing from Communist colonialism those who against their will continue to suffer the agony and indignity of involuntary servitude.

CAPTIVE NATIONS RESOLUTION

Whereas the Senate and the House of Representatives have authorized the President of the United States to proclaim a Captive Nations Week each year, and the same has been done for the past four years; and

Whereas the Russian and Chinese Communist world continues on its road of persecution, aggression, and enslavement and through these means has succeeded to subjugate many nations and ethnic groups; namely, Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bohemia, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, mainland China, Cossackia, Croatia, Cuba, Estonia, Georgia, East Germany, Hungary, Idel-Ural, North Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Outer Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tibet, Turkestan, Ukraine, and North Vietnam thus depriving a great part of the world of freedom and its citizens of personal liberty, human rights and dignity and creating a vast colonial empire threatening the security and national existence of the countries of the free world; and

Whereas communism continues to threaten the peace, security and independence of Latin American countries and has succeeded to take over Cuba and to cause serious disturbances in many other countries; and

Whereas the people of the United States share with the enslaved nations their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Captive Nations Committee of Chicago, That it recommends the adoption by the United States of a national policy which would encourage the aspirations and movements for national self-determination of peoples, enslaved by the Communist imperialism by an expressed and unequivocal commitment of the United States of America to support, by all means possible, such aspirations for national freedom; be it further

Resolved, That the Ambassador of the United States to the United Nations put on the agenda of the United Nations the question:

(a) of free elections under the supervision of the United Nations in the whole territory of U.S.S.R., Yugoslavia, North Korea, and in all other enslaved nations.

(b) of the return to their homes and countries of all the deported and exiled who survived the Communist ordeal.

(c) of the abolishment of all concentration camps, slave labor, and mass deportations; be it further

Resolved, That this committee reiterates its support for the establishment of the permanent Captive Nations Committee (H. Res. 211) which would demonstrate to Moscow that the United States will not cease in its efforts until all captive nations are able to enjoy the God-given rights of all peoples to freedom and national sovereignty.

APPEAL TO THE AMERICAN PUBLIC ON THE OCCASION OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1963

The cause of freedom is gaining more and more ground in many parts of the world. The membership of the United Nations organization has almost doubled in numbers. Every year a few new members are added to the world family of free nations. Nevertheless our Congress could not fail to register in 1959 the sad fact that many ethnic groups and nations are deprived of their freedom and are subjugated by the Russian Communist imperialism which introduced a new type of colonialism far more subtle in its use of force and more degrading to the enslaved peoples than any previous one.

These conditions of oppression and slavery reached breaking point when in the spring of 1953 hundreds of thousands of inmates in the concentration camps of central Asia and Siberia rebelled en masse and raised the flag of freedom and human dignity—a truly inspiring example of the invincibility of human spirit. But this heroic uprising was crushed by the Soviet Army and secret police in a blood-bath unparalleled in the history of civilized world. There are reports that the number of the slaughtered prisoners reached the staggering figure of 100,000 victims.

We deemed it our sacred duty to commemorate the 10th anniversary of this great and heroic—yet so tragic—event in the never-ending struggle for freedom and human dignity. We take the opportunity at this great gathering on the occasion of this year's Captive Nations Week to pay our tribute of deepest respect to these fallen heroes and at the same time appeal to all our fellow citizens, Americans, who cherish the principles of freedom to join us in this act of homage to these noble souls.

There may be elements in this country which think that we should resign ourselves to a policy of peaceful coexistence, but there is almost daily evidence that the Communist world does not intend to give to such a policy more than lipservice. The most telling proof of it is the Communist takeover and control in Cuba. There is no doubt that this takeover was preceded both by careful planning and calculated infiltration and deception. This process did not stop. Even in our country communism finds ways to further its goal of conquest and gradual takeover through cunning infiltration, well organized spying and through "cultural exchange" which for the Soviets proved to be just another opportunity for spreading their propaganda.

All these facts and considerations call for action. The Communist world should not be allowed to think that the free nations of the world acquiesce to, or approve of, the present situation and that they can continue in peaceful and unchallenged possession of what they conquered or acquired. The Communist colonialism should be denounced both for depriving so many ethnic groups of their freedom and independence and for the criminal treatment of the subject peoples.

In the Soviet Union there still exist concentration camps, slave labor, and mass deportations of the undesirable to the Communist power. The civilized and free world cannot be indifferent to such facts. If at the present time it may be impossible or unfeasible to take a positive action to remove this shameful sore from the face of the earth, nevertheless all other steps which show disapproval and condemnation of such practices and of Soviet colonialism should be taken so that the subjugated peoples could be assured that their lot and plight are not forgotten but that the free world is actively concerned and interested in their present and their future.

In the eventual conflict with the Communist world we will not be able to find more dependable or useful allies than these subjugated peoples. Let this year's Captive Nations Week be another reminder that we think of them, that they can count on the support of the free world in their struggle for freedom and independence, and that we also count on them when the fateful moment comes.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his contribution and, particularly, compliment him on the high level of his remarks. I also express the appreciation of our committee for the aid he has given us during the hearings.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Daddario].

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, we in Connecticut are proud of the leadership that our colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Monagan], has shown in this field of human freedom. He has been constantly seeking ways to relieve the pressures upon those oppressed peoples who live behind the Iron Curtain. His work and leadership are recognized and appreciated not only at home in Connecticut but elsewhere throughout the United States.

Tomorrow night our colleague will receive an award in recognition of this service from the Assembly of Captive Nations. I am proud to stand here and to support him in his efforts and thank him, too, for the constant effort he is making in this very worthwhile struggle.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut, for his very kind remarks.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Libonati].

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Connecticut for his enthusiastic interest both as a Member of the Congress and as chairman of a subcommittee which in its investigations and inquiries determined and gave support to the determination of certain basic truths which confront those freemen living under captive rule. The informative discussions at the hearings furnished much enlightenment and information to the public as well as to Members of the House of Representatives and analytically defined the whole purpose of the captive nations observance week.

Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman from Connecticut will pursue this course of further study in the development of the public conscience in stimulating interest and support in realizing the purpose of the resolution passed by the House of Representatives in 1959. I join with you in your fine expressions relative to the future basic plan of operation formulated and determined by the members of your committee. Again, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate our colleague for his dedicated services in behalf of the cause of the millions of captive populations under the tyrannical rule of their oppressors and our enemies.

Mr. MONAGAN. I am grateful to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that our distinguished Speaker has left the chair before this point, but I should like to take this opportunity to point out in connection with this discussion on the observance of Captive Nations Week that it was our present Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], who was then majority leader, who first sponsored the resolution setting aside a week to be known as Captive Nations Week and who obtained passage of that resolution by unanimous consent of the House. I should have liked very much to congratulate our distinguished Speaker in person, but I do congratulate him for the Record now on his foresight and on the fact that he blazed the way for us to celebrate Captive Nations Week each year during this week in July and to review once again the tragic plight of our great friends—because the people of these countries are our great friends and allies even though they may not have arms. In fact they are allies who even though they are behind the Iron Curtain act in the role of supporters of our own cause. In return, the least we can do is to support theirs.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a speech made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bray] on July 14, before an assembly at a captive European nations flag-raising ceremony.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and respected colleague, Congressman William G. Bray of the Seventh Indiana District, delivered an address on Sunday, July 14, at the Assembly of Captive European Nations Building in New York City.

Congressman Bray's remarks eloquently described the tragic plight of millions of Europeans enslaved and living as conquered people under the crushing military might of the Communist criminal conspiracy.

I commend Congressman Bray's remarks to the entire Congress, and request unanimous consent for its publication in the Record. The speech follows:

Remarks of Hon. William G. Bray at Assembly of Captive European Nations Flag Raising Ceremony, July 14, 1963

Our country is failing to utilize our greatest and strongest weapon in the cold war. For too long we have allowed the Soviets to take the initiative, to keep on the offensive. For too long we have merely tried to answer their false charges, to repair the damage made by the Soviet blasts against the dike of freedom. We have remained on the defensive, gradually yielding to Russian aggression. Our leadership has apparently believed that if we yield and give enough to the Russians, the Kremlin would change and become exponents of freedom.

We have a weapon that will throw the Soviets on the defensive in the cold war if we have the courage to use that weapon to the fullest. This weapon is to demand that Russia give to the captive nations freedom of choice—allow these peoples to vote for the kind of government they want and to elect the officials they want.

Russia is constantly demanding that we negotiate with her. Our leaders apparently refuse to recognize that negotiations with the Kremlin mean that Russia will keep what she has and negotiate for what we have.

When Russia wants to negotiate, let us give her a strong answer. "Yes, we will negotiate. Let us negotiate as to when you will give freedom to the captive nations. When will you allow them the right to vote? When will you allow them the rights guaranteed in the Atlantic Charter and the Yalta Declaration, both of which you accepted?"

One of the greatest fallacies in international thinking today is that Russian control has benefited the various peoples that she holds by armed might. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Russia perhaps had a higher culture than some of the Asiatic tribes she overran during her early history, but at the time that she overran Georgia and Ukraine, these countries were free and had a higher standard of living than did Russia.

Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland also were further advanced than Russia at the time she first forced them into her empire. Between the time these countries gained their freedom after World War I and the time they were again overpowered by Russia in the World War II period, these countries rapidly outdistanced Russia economically and also acquired a higher standard of living and culture.

Ukraine and Georgia obtained their independence in 1917, which independence was recognized by Lenin. However, Russia again overran these countries with armed forces—Ukraine in 1918 and Georgia in 1921. Since that time more than 7 million Ukrainians have been murdered or removed to prevent them from regaining their independence.

East Germany, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Bulgaria all were free countries and had a stronger economy and culture than did Russia when she forced them to become satellites of the Kremlin. Russia still maintains control over them by the threat of armed force.

We should demand that these nations have freedom. This demand should not be stated just once; it must be repeated a million times—in the legislative forums of the free world, from the rostrum of the United Nations, by the press, radio, and television throughout the world. It should be beamed hourly to the captive nations. If we will publicize the truth with the same vigor that Russia publicizes her lies, truth will win.

This demand for freedom should not be an attack on the Russian people. We should point out that the only reason for the existence of such an empire as Russia's is for the glory of its leaders; that if such an empire as Russia's was ever of value to the people, that value has long ceased to exist. We only want for other people the freedom and dignity enjoyed by our own people.

The demand for free elections is one that Russia cannot openly refuse and yet one which she knows she can never accept and still keep the people of these captive nations under her dictatorship. Russia well knows that if freedom of choice were given the people of these nations that they would vote overwhelmingly for freedom. The demand that Russia allow her captive peoples the right of free choice will put her on the defensive as nothing else will. The right of the free ballot is inherent in the Atlantic Charter and in the Yalta Declaration, both of which Russia accepted and cannot repudiate.

Let us lead from our strength to Russia's weakness. Our greatest strength, the strength that has made America what it is today, is the recognition of the freedom and dignity of man. It is the recognition of freedom and dignity that has made America so strong economically that our problems are those of surplus while the Communists' programs are those of continuing scarcities.

Our freedom has been so successful that we must regulate the number of those who would come to America, while Russian communism must erect walls of stone and barbed wire backed up by bayonets to keep her inmates within.

The denial of the freedom and dignity of man is Russia's greatest weakness. As those behind the Iron Curtain become more aware of the advantages of freedom that have been denied them by Russian autocracy—first by the despotic actions of the tsars and later by the despotic actions of the commissars—the demands for freedom will become overwhelming and will rock the Communist world.

Where and how did Russia acquire these countries and peoples that she is holding by armed might? The history of Russia during the last 500 years, since the principality of Muscovy commenced its march of expansion, shows that Russia has devoured 46 nations speaking 61 distinct languages.

At the end of World War I many of these countries finally achieved their goal of freedom and independence. Among those nations were: Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Finland, Lithuania, Poland, and others. All of these countries had been forcibly captured by Russia in the past, but had regained their freedom at the close of World War I. Lenin himself in his decree of peace in the Soviet declarations of 1919–20 denounced the ruthless territorial acquisition concept of the Russian Empire and promised freedom to the peoples that Russia had enslaved by force, subterfuge, duplicity, and intrigue. These declarations caused the world, for a few months, to hope that the ravenous territorial appetite of the Russian bear had been appeased.

Whether these 1919–20 Soviet declarations were for a fleeting moment sincere or whether they were merely made to gain a breathing spell for reorganization after the revolution, we will never be sure. But sincere or not, they certainly were fleeting. Russia immediately began an aggressive, well-planned campaign, by armed forces and other devious means, to recapture these newly freed countries. Each of them, except for Poland and parts of Finland, were later forced back into the Russian empire. Poland, however, along with East Germany, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Bulgaria, has since World War II become a satellite of the Kremlin.

Russia is the last conglomerate empire, the last empire held together by force, composed of various nations and peoples with no racial, geographic, or linguistic reasons for their association. Within the 20th century the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the Turkish Ottoman empires broke up. The British Empire is no more. Some of the countries in the British Empire have today no connection with Britain, and others are merely voluntary members of the British Commonwealth.

The Spanish, French, Dutch, and Belgian empires have given way to the demands for freedom and nationalism. Only the Russian empire, successor to the Mongol empire, remains. It is not only the last, but one of the largest conglomerate empires of all time, ranking with the Persian Empire of Cyrus, the Roman Empire of the Caesars and the Arab Empire of the Abbassides.

Why is Russia the last of the conglomerate empires, an empire that exists for the gain and glory of the commissars? Djilas, a great Communist writer and former Vice Premier of Yugoslavia, described the new class commissars as follows:

"The seizure of property from other classes, especially from small owners, led to decreases in production and to chaos in the economy—the class profited from the new property it had acquired even though the nation lost thereby."

Djilas described collectivization as "a frightful and devastating war which resembled an insane undertaking—except for the fact that it was profitable for the new class by assuring its authority."

Djilas clearly indicts the failures and evils of the Russian Communist machine and prophesies its certain doom by saying:

"This is a class whose power over men is the most complete known to history. Its methods of rule fill some of the most shameful pages in history. When the new class leaves the historical scene—and this must happen—there will be less sorrow over its passing than there was for any other class before it. Smothering everything except what suited its ego, it has condemned itself to failure and shameful ruin."

There is perhaps a reason that Russia's people have allowed themselves to become enslaved by the Commissars. The renaissance of thought and the various social and political movements that swept Europe from the early 14th century never penetrated into what is now Russia, first because it was controlled by the Mongols, and later because the empire which grew from the principality of Muscovy followed the same Mongol philosophy of preventing freedom of thought.

When will Russia change? We have indications that the Russian people are changing as they become aware, through education and contacts, of a better and happier life among the people of the free nations. But the rulers of the Kremlin, operating an empire for their own greed and lust for power, will not change until the people, both Russian and captive, demand a government responsive to their own needs instead of a government which exists for the gain and glory of the new class, the Commissars.

Right now we have in Russia an envoy, sent there because Khrushchev indicated that he just might be willing to discuss a nuclear test ban, if we would go along with a so-called nonaggression pact between the NATO nations and the Communist-bloc countries. The purpose of such a pact is obviously to force us to recognize East Germany. Our duty to the captive nations is clear: We should refuse to discuss with the Kremlin any further promises until we have had some indication that they intend to fulfill the promise inherent in the Atlantic Charter and the Yalta Declaration—the promise that all the captive nations would be free.

Not only are we today failing to use the greatest weapon of the free world—encouraging the captive peoples to hope and work for freedom—we recently have actually downgraded this hope for freedom.

A shameful example was the action taken on December 20, 1962. On that day the U.S. delegation to the United Nations made a motion to eliminate the Leslie Munro reports in the future. Russia had maneuvered for more than 3 years to eliminate these reports because they were well-documented reports of the continuing Soviet persecution of the Hungarian people. The U.N. had appointed Sir Leslie Munro of Australia to make this investigation. He had assembled documents that each year proved that Hungary was not a free country but was controlled by the Kremlin, backed up by a heavy concentration of Russian armed forces.

These reports kept before the people of the captive nations as well as the free world the fact that, despite Russia's sweet talk and promises, Hungary was still a Russian police state.

On this fifth observance of Captive Nations Week we must dedicate ourselves anew to the freedom and liberation of the peoples of all the captive nations—those in central Europe, in the Soviet Union, in Asia, and in Cuba. Every observance since 1959 has been violently denounced by Moscow and its puppets because the Captive Nations Week Resolution—Public Law 86–90—points to the heart of the issue in the titanic struggle that engulfs all of us. Make no mistake on this score—the center of totalitarian power has been, is, and will continue to be for many years ahead, Russia's Moscow.

Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism has destroyed over the past 45 years the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Byelorussia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others. In these years it has annihilated the freedom of others with the exploited resources of preceding victims. Unless we face up to the cold war challenge of this reactionary imperialistic power, unless we expose in detail the whole family of captive nations from the Danube to the Pacific, and also in Cuba, unless we develop a cold war strategy aimed at all the captive nations on the principle of indivisible freedom, we will not only have to answer the question, "Who'll be next on the long list of captive nations?" but also we will have to prepare more than ever for the increasing chance of a hot global war.

The strategic weapon of the captive nations is available to us. Khrushchev seeks to deny its use by us. Will we have the vision, courage, and will to develop and deliver this weapon in the cold war? The answer to this question is the essence of Captive Nations Week and all its implications.

Freedom, like slavery, is contagious. The more people in the world who are free, the safer is our freedom.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, when the Second World War came to a close the Western allies, and all peoples of the world who had suffered during that most destructive time in all human history, believed that the stamping out of the fires of Axis tyranny would allow the process of nation-building to continue after its violent interruption. There seemed to be no reason why nations large and small, rich and poor, could not progress in freedom and independence within a new world organization. In a world exhausted by 6 years of conflict there were few who foresaw that in the very process of eliminating one ruthless imperialistic aggressor bloc, we were preparing the way for another one with even greater ambitions. No one was willing in those days to take the Communists at their word—that they intended, and had always intended, to force not only the nations of the world, but the minds of the world into the rigid Communist mold, a mold in which the human being is treated as a mere instrument in the ultimate goal of party-state domination of all political, social, economic, and spiritual life.

Thus the Western allies went into the postwar negotiations in a spirit of good faith, assuming the Soviet Union was also longing for a just peace. We even gave them the benefit of the doubt and were willing to recognize any reasonable security needs of the U.S.S.R. But our good faith was countered by deceit and treachery. Our willingness to let the nations of Europe decide their own destinies was countered by Communist imperialism. The great disarmament in the West was in contrast to a frantic arms buildup in the East. Economic assistance, offered by the United States to any country in need, was refused on behalf of their victims by the Soviets, who callously reinforced the military occupation of the Red army and proceeded to exploit, and even physically remove, the economic resources of their captive nations.

The tragic history of the past 18 years in the Communists' European empire is all too well known. Today there are nine potentially free and happy nations held captive by the Soviet Union, and part of another nation suffers the same degradation. These countries, lying between the Bay of Finland and the Black Sea, include Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania, Rumania, and the eastern portion of Germany. In fact, the Baltic states of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia had a taste of Russian subjugation even before the others. The Nazis and the Communists made a deal in 1939 to divide Poland and at the same time the Nazis sanctioned the Soviet takeover of the tiny Baltic countries.

When the Western allies went to war against Hitler, it was to liberate and defend freedom. When the Nazis and the Communists went to war in the East it was for the purpose of domination and the ending of freedom. Whoever won, the nations being fought over were doomed to slavery.

We now realize to our sorrow that the Communist form of slavery is at least as oppressive, if not more so, than the Nazi brand. Every aspect of life is tightly controlled. Agriculture was brutally collectivized, not for the purpose of improving production, for the failure is all too obvious, and has been admitted by the rulers, but for the purpose of improving control over that segment of the population which has so often in the past resisted totalitarian domination.

The working class in the cities has been forced under discipline and control unprecedented in the history of industrialization. How ironic that a movement that originally sought to make the working class dominant has developed into one that has made it into an impotent and passive tool of the party state, constantly harassed, prodded, and threatened to sacrifice more in return for less.

The absolute party control over all political activity makes the Communist facade of democracy with its rigged elections and puppet legislatures all the more farcical to behold. Communist rulers represent no one but themselves. They allow authority to no one unless they are sure he will slavishly support the ruling clique. The only interest represented is the party interest, which can be stated in one word—control.

Not content to control the lives of the unfortunate people of the captive nations, the Communist rulers also try to control their minds. They conduct a ceaseless campaign against the churches. Religious freedom, so cherished in the western countries, is considered by Communists to be a threat to party state domination. There have even been attempts to infiltrate the clergy with political hacks. The campaign against mental freedom is carried on in other ways as well. Party state control of art, research, education, communications media, and all sources of information is a standard requirement for any Communist regime wanting to keep power.

Those of us fortunate enough to live in freedom in the non-Communist world must never forget the plight of the captive peoples. Thus we set aside the third week of July each year so that the world shall not forget the shameful tyranny that is a blight on mankind.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the fourth anniversary of Captive Nations Week.

During the Second World War the Soviet Union rose to the status of a great power, and immediately used this increased strength to ruthlessly enslave a large number of smaller Eastern European nations. This brutal aggression is one of the most tragic examples of man's inhumanity to man.

Before the war Eastern Europe consisted of independent, sovereign nations. Many of these countries had long traditions of national independence; others had become independent more recently after centuries of alien domination. All had established their right to be full-fledged members of the international community.

War and power are seldom respecters of rights, however, and the Red Army rolled over and crushed the sovereignties of the Eastern European states, which were then absorbed into the Soviet Union or made satellites.

The fate of the 100 million people of these countries imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain for 20 years in some cases, is a matter of deep concern to freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

I have had opportunity to travel in some of these countries in recent years. I have observed life behind the Iron Curtain and have come away each time more impressed with the spirit of freedom that seems to grow stronger as time passes. The Soviet Union may possess the land and control governments, but it has failed to snuff out the spirit of freedom. This is the truly significant matter. The desire for freedom grows stronger, and one day, I am confident, these nations will again be free. The wall will crumble, and the will of freedom-loving men will prevail.

This is our hope as we mark another Captive Nations Week.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the fifth annual observance of Captive Nations Week, an important event in this troubled era of global East-West conflict. It was in 1959 that Congress passed a joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim the third week in July as Captive Nations Week "each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world." Five years constitute a relatively short period for the accomplishment of such a difficult task, but it must also be remembered that these captive peoples have been subjected to Communist domination for nearly 20 years. Some of them have even been enslaved by Soviet tyranny for a much longer period.

Captive Nations Week was established to protest the Soviet Government's ruthless attempt to uproot and eliminate the basic freedoms of the countries over which she illegally holds sway. In passing this resolution it was the clear intent of Congress to inform the free world that neither the people nor the Government of the United States would recognize the present status of these nations suffering under alien Communist rule in their homeland. I am both pleased and honored to participate in the observance of this important week.

It is a truism that all wars cause misery, death, and destruction to belligerents and neutrals, combatants and noncombatants, innocent and guilty alike. While all suffer the ravages of war, it is unfortunately true that some lose more than others and that the suffering of some extends beyond the war itself and its immediate sequel. Such was the case in Europe after the Second World War. All nations involved in that most violent of wars were devastated by its impact, but the consequences of the war split Europe in two and dealt different fates to the two parts. Western Europe was able to rebuild its economic, political, and social institutions in a free environment and with the helping hand of the United States. Eastern and Central Europe, on the other hand, came under the heel of Soviet aggression. The Russians' policy in their new satellites was one of rigid suppression of all basic human freedoms and one of colonial exploitation rather than reconstruction.

This unfortunate lot fell to various people with an aggregate population of some 100 million. These peoples had lived happily in their native lands under governments of their own choice until the shadow of World War II extended over Europe in the late 1930's. Then suddenly they were caught in the vise of two deadly tyrannies—Soviet communism from the east, nazism-fascism from the west. National socialism was a totalitarian ideology which impelled its adherents to aggrandizement; without national conquest the movement would wither and die, according to Hitler's tenets. Initially the Soviets' move westward was primarily defensive—an effort to protect themselves against the German onslaught. But as the tide of battle turned against Germany the basically aggressive character of Soviet intentions became clear. The withdrawal of German forces left a power vacuum in Eastern Europe, and the Soviet Union—greatly strengthened by the fortunes of war—moved swiftly to fill it.

Ravaged by war and foreign occupation, the peoples of these hapless countries never gave up hope that their independence would be restored after the war. They believed that the blessing of freedom would compensate for their staggering material losses and human sacrifices. But then as the war drew to a close they found themselves the victims of a tyranny as ruthless as that which the war had been fought to defeat. Communism swept into Eastern Europe behind the Red Army, and the peoples' hopes were dashed.

The Soviet take-over was aided by the illusory belief that Allied cooperation would continue after the end of hostilities. It was felt that the Soviets could be induced to withdraw from Eastern Europe through calm deliberations and friendly negotiations which were expected to follow the Allied victory. This tolerant view of Soviet expansion proved to be a grave error, for imperialist nationalism is never likely to relinquish its gains willingly.

As a result of the Soviet Union's treachery there are today in Europe alone nine nations which are under the Soviet yoke, and a part of another nation—Germany—shares the same fate. These peoples live in an area which extends from the Bay of Finland to the Black Sea. They include Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles, Czechoslovaks, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Albanians, and Rumanians, as well as the 18 million Germans living in East Germany. Many of these peoples have been suffering under Communist totalitarian dictatorship, imposed on them by the Kremlin and maintained with the aid of the Red Army, for almost two decades. The three Baltic countries have endured oppressive Communist rule longer than the other Eastern European nations. They suffer the added burden of having been annexed by the Soviet Union, thereby losing even the semblance of national independence accorded to the other satellites.

In the Soviet lexicon these countries are called independent and sovereign nations in order to mislead the free world about their real status. In Western terminology they are considered satellites. But perhaps the most accurate description is that of captive nations and captive peoples. In their foreign and domestic policies, in their political, economic, educational, and social structure, the governments of these countries and their helpless subjects are forced to follow the Kremlin-dictated line. It is fashionable now to regard the Soviet bloc as liberalized with greater autonomy for the satellites than under Stalin. But I believe that we tend to exaggerate the policy latitude which these captive nations really have. It is not realistic to describe a reduction of unnecessary terror and suppression, without a change in the essential nature of centralized totalitarian dictatorship, as liberalization. We are guilty of naivete to believe that the Soviets would not resort again to the methods of Budapest, 1956, if they were faced with a breakaway satellite.

Liberalization means at least an attempt to respect basic human rights, but such respect is still nonexistent in East-Central Europe. Basically, the changes since Stalin's death amount to the lessening of the irrational aspects of terror; the machinery of terror, however, is still intact. Criminal legislation is even harsher. The warning is clear: Long prison terms await any dissenter. With socialization, including collectivization of agriculture, almost completed, direct control of everybody's livelihood provides the rulers with an effective means of keeping the population in line. Under such conditions, the Communist regimes can give more attention to conditions of economic efficiency.

These measures of surface relaxation have not fooled the peoples of these captive nations, for they are aware that they can never expect any genuine freedom and independence from their Communist masters. Their memories of the Stalinist reign of terror are fresh enough to impress them with the real possibility of a return to such methods. They are thus no less desirous of throwing off the Communist yoke and reestablishing their national independence. They have not despaired of achieving this goal, despite the hardships and cruelties they have suffered. The uprisings in East Germany of 1953 and in Hungary and Poland of 1956 prove that these captive peoples are prepared to make the ultimate sacrifice in the cause of freedom. We can only hope that their sacrifices, like those of the liberal-nationalist revolutionaries in 1848, will someday be inscribed in the annals of the successful overthrow of the forces of tyranny and bondage.

The people of the United States have always shown great sympathy for the lot of these unfortunate peoples. Their fate has been, and continues to be, a matter of serious concern for our Government and for our allies. A continuing expression of this concern is the annual observance of Captive Nations Week. By establishing this event the Congress and the President followed the great American tradition of championing the cause of freedom and justice. We have always felt, and still feel, that the cause of the captive nations is a just, noble, and humanitarian one. The national observance of Captive Nations Week thus has a great significance for all Americans, and I am proud to have been able to contribute to the furtherance of the ideals and hopes for which it stands.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in observing Captive Nations Week. In this fourth annual observance by Congress, the foremost legislative body of the world takes the lead in dramatizing the plight of the captive nations of Eastern Europe. We must not become weary in this task, even if favorable changes in the condition of the captive nations may at times be very small. We must continue to speak for the right of self-determination of all peoples and we must continue to emphasize the undeniable fact that alien rule has been imposed on the nations of Eastern Europe. This is a situation which free men everywhere cannot accept as unalterable or hopeless.

History teaches us that the roots of nationalism run very deep and that determined people can rise again as free nations despite decades and even centuries of suppression. The spirit of independence, we may be sure, is being sustained in the hearts of the people of Eastern Europe. Even within the framework of the Communist Party network, the magnet of nationalism is producing divisions. Let us hope that these divisions will not only emphasize national differences, but will lead to the ultimate rejection of communism and the establishment of national independence.

Our observance of Captive Nations Week is in the best tradition of American respect for liberty and self-determination. It also reminds the world that a hundred million restive, unhappy people of Eastern Europe are the Achilles heel of the Soviet Union in the ideological struggle between East and West.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I join again with my colleagues in recognizing this week as Captive Nations Week, a time to pay tribute to the small nations of the world that have been absorbed against their will into the Communist system.

The observance of this week will not send any legions into battle, it will not unleash our atomic power, but it will accomplish much good if it reminds these captive peoples that their story has not been forgotten and that their love of liberty retains the respect of this Nation and the free world.

Individual liberty and political democracy have been cornerstones of our own system of government, since our colonial people threw off the yoke of English rule. We have believed that every citizen possesses certain inalienable rights, and we have labored even to this day to guarantee those rights to all our people. And in our governmental system, we have believed in and we have practiced majority rule, based upon freedom of expression and freedom of choice at the ballot box. We are sorry for those nations and those peoples today who do not enjoy those historic and priceless privileges.

But we send word to them through this Captive Nations Week observance that we shall not rest in this free land until all people everywhere enjoy the blessings of liberty.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, our annual observance of Captive Nations Week has had an impact on the great struggle between totalitarianism and the forces of freedom. This year again we are acknowledging the significance of the issue created by the physical occupation of non-Russian countries and the tyranny over non-Russian peoples exercised by the Soviet Union's rulers in Moscow.

By authority of the Congress voted in 1959 and at the request of the Congress, the President again has named this third week in July as a time for us to renew our interest in the captive peoples and to rededicate ourselves to supporting their just aspirations.

We need to remind ourselves, by this observance, that the Moscow imperialists have grossly mocked these aspirations. The propagandists sent all over the world by the Kremlin have raised a false issue of colonialism as a weapon against the free world. But the record shows that not one of the many powers that fought to put down Hitlerism sought to gain imperialist and colonial advantages except the Soviet Union itself.

Great Britain responded to the aspirations of men for freedom and self-determination by setting up a system by which her former empire could proceed on a swift and orderly march to independence. The remnants of European colonialism largely disappeared. The United States completed the process of acknowledging the rights to independence of the Philippine Commonwealth. A new statute gave Puerto Rico's people their choice of status and a new proposal to regularize relations by a further free choice is being developed.

The only power that obtained territorial aggrandizement and imperialist extensions from the second World War was the Soviet Union—and the list of peoples conquered and held in the Kremlin's grip by conquest and terrorism is long and grim.

The minority groups in the territorial grasp of Moscow were left over from the empire—but the fate of many has been more terrible than in the days of the czars. We have been learning, in recent years, from the mouths of the Kremlin's present rulers the frightful deeds of Stalin. These denunciations are eloquent indeed—yet none of those within the prewar grasp of Stalin have been set free. Not the Ukrainians, nor the Ruthenians, nor the Georgians, nor Kurdish peoples, nor any other group.

The empire Stalin inherited he extended, with equal cynicism, to take over the satellite nations of eastern Europe—nations in which puppet Communist regimes prevail today by force of the Red Army and the threat of active invasion. It is held today by an iron oppression and intervention no less brutal because the foreign ruler sometimes smiles instead of scowling constantly.

There is much talk of cracks in the Communist world—of rivalry between the Kremlin and Red China for preeminence as the true guardian of the Communist creed. If the rivalry is brutal, it should not surprise us, for it is an exercise in competition for dominion, a classic example in imperialist clashes between spokesmen of the same philosophy of total rule.

We need, in any case, to renew our exposures of the Soviet system recognizing that the imperialism that empire contains is a source of weakness rather than of strength. The captive nations and the captive peoples are a constant internal strain. These peoples, in their yearning for freedom are a prime potential asset to freedom as well as a deterrent to Soviet hot war adventurism.

It is my belief that the time has come for this House to take another step to express our interest in the captive nations. In a resolution I have proposed that the House create a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, to be composed of 10 members, and to conduct formal inquiries into the status of all peoples victimized by the Soviets, including those non-Russians and Russians alike who need the help of free peoples elsewhere.

It is my suggestion that not more than 6 of the 10 members should be members of the same political party and that the committee should make interim reports at such times as it deems proper and its first comprehensive report not later than January 31 of next year.

We must not make the mistake of believing that the Soviet monolith is impregnable; indeed, if there are cracks and strains apparent today it is because they were inherent. We must not think that the captive peoples do not hear us; the underground carries our words and concepts all over the world. There is no tyranny so absolute that it can shut out the voice of freedom and of encouragement to others boldly pronounced.

We seek no war. We seek to discover means by which the people of this land—of whom so many have their ancestral roots in the countries now seized by the Red totalitarians—can assist the present generations in the captive lands and can stimulate them by peaceful processes to know they are not forgotten.

The proposal of a special and formal committee of this House to work in this area offers no promise, perhaps, of the shortcut victories and easy liberations sometimes yearned for. But it proposes a steady and careful process of study of the liabilities to which the Soviets are exposed, of the assets on the side of freedom.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as the people of the nations of the free world enjoy the freedom to choose their representative in government and the freedom to state their beliefs, there are others in the world not so fortunate as we. Their lives, a drab existence in a totalitarian state, are lived in fear, fear to disagree with the policies of the government under which they reside. I speak of those people in Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Poland, in the Baltic States, Czechoslovakia, Albania, and East Germany, inhabitants of those states which we call captive nations.

Since 1959, when Congress empowered him to do so, the President of the United States has proclaimed annually the 3d week in July as Captive Nations Week, in order to pay tribute to the fortitude and courage of those oppressed nations behind the Iron Curtain. We hope that knowledge of this tribute by a free nation will reach their ears and will inform them that they are not alone in their suffering.

Resistance to Communist domination has continued throughout the years following the takeover of the Eastern European nations. The serious riots in East Germany in 1953 called attention to the economic ills of that Communist regime. Hungary and its Freedom Fighters of 1956 will go down in the annals of history as a valiant struggle of an oppressed people in their fight to overthrow a hated master. The recent protests in Czechoslovakia against the harsh measures used by that government are too current to be appraised. Yet, they designate that unrest does exist throughout the satellite nations and will continue to exist as long as freedom is denied to the common people.

It is the desire of our Government to bring about the conditions which will restore liberty to these subjugated nationals. The Voice of America programs, an integral part of U.S. policy, have been designed to encourage hope. Cultural exhibits in the Communist countries show the American way of life. Personnel who come to the United States through an exchange program take back with them the beliefs and ideas of America.

Recent signs of change in the captive nations denote that our efforts are showing success. There is greater demand for western products. Writers and playwrights are demanding that they be given the right to say what they think. The Government of Rumania has even gone so far as to defy the economic edicts emanating from the Soviet Union.

Now is the time for the western world to exert its greatest efforts in fostering freedom and liberty in the captive states. It must be our most earnest wish that these satellites will once again be free to proclaim their rights as democratic states in the world community.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy, in his speech at the city hall in West Berlin on June 26, 1963, spoke of the Berlin wall as an offense against humanity and as the most obvious and vivid demonstration of the failures of the Communist system. A view of the wall is worth a thousand words. It stands there, grim and stark, for all to see, a monument to injustice. On the one side live the free, on the other the enslaved, and for both there are strong feelings of anger, bitterness, and despair at the Communist regime that is responsible.

Across the Continent of Europe from the Baltic Sea to the Balkan Peninsula there is a wall. It is not made of stone, it is not even made of iron. It is only a line marked by the borders between the countries of the free world and the countries under the totalitarian rule of Communist regimes. Behind this line lie the captive nations of Eastern Europe where over 100 million people are forced to live without their freedom and their individual rights.

This week we are observing Captive Nations Week. It is in keeping with the United States position of leadership in the free world that 1 week be marked in special observance of the plight of the people in the world who are without freedom. There are many who live under Communist subjugation. In Eastern Europe the people of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, of Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and of Rumania, Bulgaria, and Albania, all are forced to submit to the tyranny of Communist regimes.

Tyranny fights a losing battle with freedom, because the spirit of freedom cannot be chained and confined for long. The heroic uprisings against the Communists in Poland, East Germany, and Hungary are poignant proof of this. The time will come when the captive peoples of Eastern Europe will taste freedom and when they do, the Communists who are responsible for the humiliation of so many millions of people will be swept away into the refuse bin of history.

In the United States it is important that we do our part to support and sustain the people who are living under Communist subjugation. They must not feel that they are without friends who care about their misery, otherwise their hope for freedom in the future may begin to fade. With tireless initiative the people of this great free country must show their sympathy and support for the captive peoples of the world. In this way the spark of hope may be kept alive to glimmer and glow until one day it will burst into a great purifying flame.

It is Captive Nations Week, and for us the meaning and summons of this week is a renewed affirmation of faith that the Communist regimes holding captive the nations of Eastern Europe are transitory, and that they too shall pass away.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, since the end of the last war the Soviet Union has become the captor and jailer, the oppressor and tormentor of more than 100 million peoples in Central and Eastern Europe. As a matter of historic fact, even before that war was over, some peoples in Eastern Europe and in the Baltics had already been drawn within the Soviet Union's deadly network. At the time, however, both these victim peoples and their sympathizers in the West had hoped that soon after the war these peoples would be freed. Unfortunately, events took a decidedly different and ominous turn, and the western statesmen, instead of succeeding in their attempt to free these peoples, witnessed the enslavement of more millions of peoples behind the Iron Curtain erected between East and West by the Soviet Union. Thus these helpless and unfortunate souls were effectively and once and for all cut off from the free West; they became Soviet satellites, the captive nations in Europe of today.

The statesmen of the West have made innumerable attempts to better the conditions under which these captive nations live, and have also worked through diplomatic negotiations for the welfare and well-being of these peoples. But all such attempts, often spearheaded by the Government of this Republic, have come up against the unbending and most unreasonable stand of the Soviet Government. But even against such ill-success, we have not ceased to work for the freedom and independence of these peoples. We have not allowed the world to forget that the Soviet Union is the cause of the misery and enslavement of these peoples, and until they are set free, Soviet leaders do not have the right to speak in behalf of these oppressed peoples. In the court of world public opinion the claims of Soviet authorities are most vulnerable, for there they are bitterly criticized, attacked, and condemned for the enslavement of these captive nations. During the Captive Nations Week which resolution I brought up in the House some years ago such criticism of Soviet policy and practice will reverberate from one end of this Republic to the other, and I am happy to take my stand by the side of all those who condemn Soviet totalitarian tyranny, and solemnly hope that these captive nations will soon attain their freedom.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we pause in our legislative duties one day each year to pay tribute to the people who have been shut behind the Iron Curtain in Eastern Europe since World War II. Despite the heavy oppression of Communist tyranny, these peoples have been continuing their resistance against the Communist tyrants. The demonstrations by workers in East Germany in 1953, the uprising of the Polish people in 1956, the Hungarian revolution in October of the same year—all these are indications of how the captive peoples feel about their rulers. In commemorating Captive Nations Week, we think also of the peoples of Tibet and China. Indeed, we find it imperative that the attention of the West remain focused on Soviet imperialism in all parts of the world. We must maintain a continuing American effort to remind the captive peoples that we have not forgotten them.

By our presence here today, we voice our concern for all the countries which fell under Soviet control. The peoples of Eastern Europe live behind the Iron Curtain, not because they gave up their struggles for independence, but because the Soviet Red Army never left the countries through which it marched westward at the end of World War II. In the case of Bulgaria, a Communist-dominated fatherland-front took over the country in 1944. A Communist republic was established 2 years later, under the leadership of the Communist Party leader, George Dimitrov, after an election in which the population was offered no alternatives. In Czechoslovakia, a Communist government, after gaining considerable power in a free election, engineered a one-slate vote in 1948 giving their party total control and bringing to an end the ill-fated Czechoslovak Republic, which had been proclaimed 30 years earlier by Thomas Massaryk and Eduard Benes. The three Baltic States, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, were similarly overrun by Soviet troops at the close of the Second World War, and these unfortunate nations were incorporated as union republics of the U.S.S.R. The United States has never recognized the legitimacy of the Soviet acts of brute force.

In Hungary, the popularly elected President was forced out of office by the Communists in 1947, and the Hungarian people demonstrated by their stirring rebellion 7 years ago that the regime which governs them today stays in power only through the support of Soviet arms. The executions of the leaders of the Hungarian revolt were condemned by unanimous votes of both houses of Congress on June 19, 1958. The Polish people also showed the world in 1956 that they had not lost the spirit of independence, despite 12 long years of Stalinist rule. Unfortunately, the increased freedoms which were permitted the Polish people after Wladyslaw Gomulka took over the Communist Party leadership in October 1956 have only partially been allowed to continue. In Rumania a Soviet-type government was also forced on the people after the Second World War.

Recently we have witnessed the spectacle of the Soviet Premier conferring with the puppet leaders of the eastern European nations in Berlin, in preparation for their coming conference with Communist China. In a sense, one might say that their choice of a conference site is appropriate. Nothing symbolizes the plight of the captive nations better than Herr Ulbricht's regime in East Germany, maintained in power only by the brute force of 20 Soviet divisions and the wall which he unashamedly built through the center of Berlin on August 13, 1961. With the construction of the Berlin wall, Ulbricht admitted that the people will stay in the Communist utopia only if they are locked in. As we pay tribute to the people of the captive nations in 1963, we reaffirm our commitment to the principles of freedom for all men.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, in the two World Wars of this century the Allied Powers accomplished their military objectives—the defeat of an enemy coalition seeking world domination—but they proved less able to fulfill the political goals which they had set for themselves. This is particularly true of the objective of national self-determination and independence—one of the cardinal tenets of liberal democracy.

Woodrow Wilson's 14 points, which represented the U.S. aims in World War I, urged that territorial settlements be made in accordance with this principle and that the peace be based on mutual respect for the "political independence and territorial integrity" of all nations, irrespective of size. The international guarantee of such respect was to be afforded by a "general association of nations"—the League of Nations. In the give-and-take of the peace negotiations the principle of national self-determination was not always adhered to. Even where the principle was applied fairly strictly—in the Balkans—the resulting fragmentation was not conducive to international stability. The League of Nations in time proved unable to guarantee the "political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike," as the Manchurian and Ethiopian episodes demonstrated.

Again during World War II the Allied Powers expressed their respect for "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live" in the Atlantic Charter and other wartime agreements. This principle was expressly applied to Europe in the "Declaration on Liberated Europe" issued by Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin at Yalta. The three governments pledged themselves to "the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those peoples who have been forcibly deprived of them by the aggressor nations." Stalin's participation in such a declaration was hypocritical to say the least, for he intended to "liberate" the east-central European areas from Axis control only in order to take them over himself. A new denial of national rights thus emerged directly from the attempt to redress previous wrongs.

In the postwar period we have seen a paradoxical situation arise. On the one hand, there has been an unprecedented application of the principle of national self-determination as great numbers of colonial territories achieve independence. On the other hand, this right continues to be denied to those peoples, some of which are among the world's oldest national entities, held captive by the Communist totalitarian system. During Captive Nations Week we rededicate ourselves to the task of the restoration to these peoples of the universal right of national independence and freely chosen institutions.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the subjugation and denial of the common rights of those people living behind the Iron Curtain enrage us and encourage us to take steps in order to mitigate this oppression. It is sometimes difficult to believe that, in the 20th century, such conditions could exist.

Mr. Speaker, under congressional authorization President Eisenhower in 1959 recognized the need to pay tribute to these captive people, to call attention to their plight, and to praise their unceasing resistance to the evils of the Communist regimes under which they labor.

This Captive Nations Week proclamation has been faithfully reissued each year by his successor, President Kennedy, who designated this year's statement with an invitation of the people of our country to observe the third week in July with appropriate ceremonies and give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all peoples for national independence and human liberty.

Our fight against communism must never lag; however, we should not be carried away with the thought that to fight communism we must go to the other extreme on the complete right. Our path, with sympathy, understanding, and help for all oppressed people is the path of American democracy.

Let it be the wish of every American that the nations behind the Iron Curtain may soon emerge once again into the world community as sovereign states.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, our Nation, strong and free, is again demonstrating solemn recognition of the courage, bravery, and faith of captive nations in two hemispheres. Until the day arrives when we can celebrate the freedom of the nations held captive by our announced enemy, Soviet Russia, we can honor these enslaved peoples and display our affection and sympathy for them by participating in Captive Nations Week, 1963.

For more than two decades, a group of countries in eastern and central Europe has been deprived of national independence and individual freedom, bound to Moscow by the chains of tyranny. Nine nations and Soviet East Germany are the victims of Communist dictatorship. When the Kremlin threw the Iron Curtain around them after World War II, the danger of Soviet dictatorship had not yet emerged as the ruthless and brutal force we now know it to be.

Since America's first tribute through Captive Nations Week in 1959, Cuba has also succumbed to Communist control, bringing the human misery and suffering of an all-for-the-state, nothing-for-the-individual totalitarian government into the heart of the Western Hemisphere, for all free nations to see. The plight of the Cuban people dramatizes the need for support by the President, the Congress, and the American public of the indomitable spirit of all peoples, yearning but unable to be free.

One day, the efforts of our great Republic to secure the freedom of these captive nations will at last be successful. This 1963 Captive Nations Week reflects our sympathy and support then, until captive nations ceremonies in the United States are replaced with independence celebrations throughout eastern Europe and Cuba.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join my colleagues on this occasion of the observance of Captive Nations Week. This observance was first initiated in July 1959, when Congress adopted the resolution to set up this week, thus proclaiming to the whole world our determination to support the cause of all captive and downtrodden nations seeking freedom.

Through this and similar observances we are able to bring to the attention of the rest of the world the full scope and ruthlessness of Communist imperialism and the extent of its subjugation of some two dozen captive nations. Their freedom has been destroyed, the churches were closed down, the culture of these nations is being suppressed, and many of their people were exiled to Siberian slave-labor camps.

If one desires to make a true and meaningful comparison between the free world and the Communist world, it can be done in a very simple manner. One has but to look at the Western World where many nations in Africa, Asia, and elsewhere have gained their freedom and independence in the last two decades. At the same time, communism has enslaved more than two dozen nations and has unjustly occupied their lands and has annexed them to its vast colonial empire. In the Western World we have some 50 new nations created, so that today Western colonialism is almost a thing of the past. About 850 million people in these 50 nations have benefited from this great process of national liberation. Under communism, a similar number of some 850 million people have been added to its list of victims.

The United States must never recognize the domination of Moscow over these captive nations. We must constantly focus the spotlight of world attention on the captive nations and their efforts for freedom and self-determination, and we must also show who is oppressing and tyrannizing them. By subjecting the rulers of the Kremlin to world criticism and condemnation, we shall put them on the defensive, expose them for what they really are, and weaken their hold over these nations.

We know that the peoples of the captive nations, whether in eastern Europe, the Far East, or even in Cuba, are cherishing dreams of genuine freedom and self-determination. They look to us for help and guidance. Let us encourage them in every way to attain their goals.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when the last war was over hundreds of millions of people who had suffered for more than 5 years thought that their freedom was in sight and their suffering over. And hundreds of millions of others who had sacrificed much and prayed for the quick conclusion of that war also hoped that peoples enslaved under totalitarianism would regain their richly deserved freedom. That was the general expectation in the West, and it was hoped that the Government of the Soviet Union would help its wartime allies to restore freedom to the countries of eastern Europe. But as we all learned the hard way, and as we pine over the events of wartime, the Soviet Union not only failed to aid and assist the oppressed peoples to regain their freedom, but it deliberately brought these peoples under its monolithic rule and imposed upon them Communist totalitarian tyranny.

That is the unfortunate and the almost unbelievably sad situation today in all east European and central European countries. From the Baltic to the Black Sea, the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians, Poles, Czechoslovaks, and Hungarians, Bulgarians, and Rumanians, and Germans in East Germany, some 100 million peoples in all, constitute the captive nations of Europe. In many ways their lot is far worse under Communist totalitarianism than under any other regime. Paradoxical as this sounds, the war which we waged to assure freedom to these peoples, ended by riveting the chain of Communist totalitarianism around their necks.

The fate of these unhappy and unfortunate peoples has been the most serious concern of the West. Western statesmanship has tried to regain their freedom through peaceful means, and our Government has done its utmost to that end. In order to assure the people of this country and others that we are in earnest in this matter, it has designated the third week of July each year as Captive Nations Week. Since 1959, by a concurrent congressional resolution and by subsequent Presidential proclamations, that week is set aside as the Captive Nations Week. We have always felt and still feel, that the cause of the captive nations is a righteous cause, one of freedom and humanity. I am happy that the Captive Nations Week is designated as the week in which to observe and commemorate events connected with the struggle of these nations for their freedom, and I gladly associate myself with the observance of Captive Nations Week.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, Americans all across the land, mindful of the liberty and independence they enjoy, have joined together in another observance of Captive Nations Week. Since the proclamation was first issued by President Eisenhower in 1959, one more nation has been added to the unfortunate rolls of Communist slavery. All of the subjugated peoples in Europe, in Asia, and now tragically in Cuba, still harbor a hope that one day they again will be free and independent.

It is my hope and the hope of men of good will everywhere that the leader of the free world, the United States, will reaffirm and strengthen its commitment to the eventual liberation of all captive peoples. Those living behind the walls and barbed wire of Eastern Europe, Asia, and Latin America must be assured that Communist slavery is not their settled fate. To this end I join with my colleagues in observing Captive Nations Week, 1963. The fervent hope of all freedom-loving peoples is that the necessity of observing a Captive Nations Week will soon become a dark page of past history.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the fact that the designation of this week as Captive Nations Week, to again call to the attention of the world the plight of the many non-Russian captive nations, is so obnoxious to the Russian Government, is, in my opinion, a definite indication of the benefits of observing such a week.

I believe that any action we may be able to take to encourage, to build up the morale of, these captive peoples, to let them know that we have not forgotten them, that we have not written them off as lost to communism, will serve a very useful cause.

Furthermore, by making use of every opportunity to bring to the attention of the uncommitted nations, the many newly organized nations, and the underdeveloped nations, the treachery and hypocrisy of Communist policy, intentions and actions, we help to advance the cause of freedom and of democracy.

To accomplish all of these purposes, I joined with many other members in the House in sponsoring a resolution for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Both the observance of Captive Nations Week, and the adoption of this resolution, will be instrumental in countering Russian propaganda with true facts, and finally, liberation of the captive nations, and the winning of the uncommitted and hesitant nations, to the side of democracy.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, our Nation this week is observing Captive Nations Week. The purpose of this nationwide observance is to dramatize the cruel and inhuman bondage which international communism has imposed on so many millions of the world's people and to reaffirm our intention to secure their hope of eventual freedom.

For many reasons, the unconscionable subjugation of the freedom-loving peoples in these captive nations is cause for great concern in the United States. To be less than bold in our desires to restore liberty and independence to these enslaved countries would weaken our role as the defender of international justice.

We who are the inheritors of the freedom for whom so many of our countrymen fought and died should never forget that among those valiant warriors were countless Americans whose national background was in the captive nations we are recognizing today. Both in peace and war, the United States has had its security defended, its culture enriched, its living standard elevated by the glorious contributions of those who have come to our shores from other countries.

It is our duty and obligation to expose for all the world to see the ruthless oppression the Soviet Union has employed in taking over and controlling the lives of millions of men, women, and children.

Earlier this year, Mr. Speaker, I offered a resolution, House Resolution 175, calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. This committee would be empowered to conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive nations, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Communist control over them. The committee also would be charged with the responsibility of seeking the means by which the United States can assist them in their present plight and in their aspirations to regain their national and individual freedoms.

During this Captive Nations Week, I again solicit my colleagues to give this resolution and others like it serious and expeditious consideration. I feel the work which such a committee could perform and the information it could offer is urgently needed in our desire to stop the advances of communism and restore self-determination to the captive peoples.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to announce that I am introducing today a concurrent resolution calling upon the President to instruct our mission to the United Nations to initiate discussion of the Baltic States question before this world body. Specifically, this resolution seeks a United Nations effort to, first, accomplish the withdrawal of all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and, second, the return of all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union.

Through personal acquaintance with those I represent whose national background is in these Communist-dominated lands, I am very aware of the just desires of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians to regain their freedom at the earliest opportunity.

Our support of the legitimate objectives of liberty and self-determination for these friendly peoples can exploit a woefully weak spot in the Soviet system.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in July 1959 Congress unanimously authorized the President to proclaim a Captive Nations Week each year until freedom is achieved for all the enslaved nations of the world. The purpose of this resolution was to show clearly to the subjugated peoples of the world that the United States shares their aspirations for the recovery of their liberty. Its aim was to sustain the hope and determination of the millions of freedom-loving people within Communist-dominated lands.

We are now commemorating the fifth Captive Nations Week. It is vital that we take this occasion to reaffirm our position on the satellite states of the Soviet Union. We must make it clear that we do not now, and that we never will, acquiesce in the tyranny which the Communists exercise in large parts of Europe and Asia. We must make it clear that we will never forget the illegal and immoral methods by which the Soviet Union expanded its empire and subjugated countless millions.

It might be easier to pretend that the problem of the captive nations did not exist. The strengthening of freedom in areas where international communism has already gained control is certainly one of the most difficult tasks confronting our foreign policy. The Soviet ambition to achieve world domination is certainly one of the most unpleasant facts which we must face.

Morality is not strengthened, however, by choosing the easy way if the easy way permits an injustice to continue. The longer an injustice prevails, the more used to it we become. If the injustice prevails for a lengthy period, it begins to appear normal.

Once an injustice appears normal, not only does it signify a warping of our own sense of values, but the injustice becomes more difficult than ever to eradicate. We must not allow that to happen in the case of the captive nations.

During this fifth Captive Nations Week, let us recall the methods by which the Communists came to power in the past. Let us review the conditions under which the people of these lands live in the present. Let us renew our determination that in the future they will see the light of liberty once again.

If we recall the methods the Communists have used to obtain control, the injustice on which the Communist empire is based becomes apparent. Aggression, subversion, deception—these have been the standard tactics by which the national independence of states has been subjugated to the Communist cause. The captive nations resolution cited 22 nations as having fallen through direct and indirect aggression. The will of the people in every one of these nations was ignored and not even a pretense was made of allowing national self-determination.

But the injustice does not lie only in the past. It continues today as the people of the Communist countries are denied basic civil liberties that are the heart of freedom. These rights include the right to vote, freedom of speech, the right to move about wherever one wants. The Communists even attempt to deny the truth reaching these peoples from outside.

During this Captive Nations Week, it is my hope that all those people in America who wish to hasten the fall of the Communist empire will stand up and be counted. It is my hope that literally thousands will voice their intention to do everything possible to restore freedom to those areas where it has been denied. It is my hope that all people everywhere wake up to the tyranny that exists wherever the Communists gain control.

If enough Americans raise their voices in concern, we may gain the necessary support to establish a special captive nations committee which could make a vital contribution to freedom by undertaking a continuous, systematic, and intensive study of the captive nations. I have introduced legislation setting up a special committee, and I shall continue to support such a measure.

In conclusion, I would like to add my personal greetings to the messages being sent to the captive peoples this week. The wrongs of which they have been the victim have not been forgotten by the free world, and the day will come when they will be able to join us in liberty and independence.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Communists to seriously consider making a major change in the appearance of their flag. Against the field of bright red, which symbolizes the blood which has been shed by men and women fighting bravely against Communist tyranny to regain their freedom and their rights, there should be placed a representation of the Berlin wall.

Is there any greater shame than the Berlin wall? Is there any more appropriate symbol of the oppression and injustice caused by communism's rule and domination? The answer is an emphatic and passionate "No." The Berlin wall stands alone as the symbol of the mutilated rights of the many people in eastern Europe who have been forced to submit to the cruel despotism of Communist regimes.

Behind the bullet-scarred and bloodstained wall live the captive peoples of Eastern Europe. It is in keeping with the United States position of leadership in the free world that this, the third week of July, is to be solemnly observed as Captive Nations Week. It is sometimes easy to forget that there are many people who do not enjoy the freedom and liberties that we, as American citizens, often take for granted. There must be no tendency on the part of the United States to forget the sad plight of the people living in countries under Communist subjugation.

It is important that the United States demonstrate its deep concern for the captive peoples of Eastern Europe. With tireless and persistent initiative the United States must assail the Communist totalitarian system. In this way, any fear that Communist tyranny is inevitable because no one is providing effective opposition will be dispelled once and for all.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to participate with my colleagues in this, the fifth observance of Captive Nations Week.

Approximately 100,000 people are now forced to live in the captive nations of Europe. They come from many countries and represent many cultures. Yet these Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians of the Baltics, these Poles, Czechoslovaks, and Hungarians of central and eastern Europe, and these Bulgarians and Rumanians of the Balkans have one thing in common with each other and with the 17 million Germans in the Soviet zone of Germany. They are all captives behind the Iron Curtain.

Nearly all these people had enjoyed some degree of freedom before the outbreak of the last war; but freedom was a prime casualty of that holocaust. Now they live under oppression, sustained only by the hope that someday, somehow, they will regain that precious freedom.

This week, we in this country observe Captive Nations Week. With the captive peoples, we hope and pray for the restoration of their dearly cherished freedom. Once again we pledge to support them morally and spiritually until this freedom is regained. Then the captive nations will be captive no longer, but ready to take their places in the family of free, sovereign, and independent nations.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on July 5 our President designated this week as Captive Nations Week, in accordance with a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, calling upon us to observe this week with fitting ceremonies and a rededication to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

This is a laudable goal and, indeed, a basic responsibility of every citizen of our great land whose fabric is interwoven with the moral principle of support for all individual and national efforts to achieve the freedom of action which we as a nation regard as a God-given, inherent right.

The recent dramatic emergence of young nations who have won their struggle for the right to develop their own destinies cannot be permitted to overshadow the fate of older nations who, once free, have been ruthlessly taken over by the U.S.S.R. and imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain.

It is wise to pause and refresh our memories of the tragic list of such nations: Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others. Let us recall the horrors endured by liberty-loving citizens of Poland and the blood bath of Hungary.

Even as I speak, the Soviet Union is continuing its ruthless policy of depopulating and communizing the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the merciless plundering of all private property, deprivation of the people of Lithuania of all human rights, and imprisonment or deportation to Siberia and the depths of Russia of all Lithuanian patriots and leaders. We need to remind ourselves, Mr. Speaker, that the captive nations are bereft of the freedoms they once knew and cherished, and their deep anguish is for rights long held and now obliterated by tyrant dictators.

Not only for reasons of common humanity toward those who have shared our democratic ideals should we aline ourselves with those forces working for freedom of the captive nations. By speaking out in their behalf, we are also striking a blow in behalf of our own freedom. The Communists are increasingly aware that the captive nations form the weakest link in the chain of cumulative aggressions we call the Soviet bloc; they scream loudly at any exposure of this innate weakness. My colleagues and I are, therefore, under a particular obligation to continue to draw attention to and plead the cause of the captive nations.

As for myself, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to fulfill my duty as a citizen and my responsibility as a Congressman by placing myself on record in support of all those who seek to free the captive nations.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is most appropriate that Congress again this year should give its attention to the sorry plight of peoples behind the Iron Curtain in this fifth observance of Captive Nations Week.

It is with new hope, however, that we greet Captive Nations Week this year as rumblings are heard in the countries captive behind the Iron Curtain. In recent weeks there have been renewed signs of protest against the Soviet regime in the tradition of the open defiance of the East Berlin workers in 1953, the valiant Poles of Poznan, and the Hungarian uprising of 1956.

These open acts of defiance against the regimes imposed by the world Communist movement and the Soviet Union are heartening signs of the true independence of spirit of the captive nations. It is unthinkable that this Nation—born as it was in bitter sacrifice and bloodshed for freedom and liberty—should not rally to the support of peoples and nations seeking a free way of life in their struggle to reestablish democratic institutions and I am pleased to join with my colleagues in the House today in this tribute to the cause of liberation, liberty, and peace.

The sad roll of the victims of the world Communist conspiracy includes Russia itself—the first to be conquered by the usual Communist pattern of brutality, tyranny, and flagrant disregard of the elementary God-given rights of human begins. By joint congressional resolution and Presidential proclamation these unhappy lands, among others, have been designated as captive nations: Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and Cuba.

The domination of the captive nations, was spawned in illegality, conducted in illegality, and continues in illegality, and this aggression against freedom-loving peoples constitutes a crime against the law of nations and is a violation of basic human rights.

It is the sacred obligation of this Nation to stand in a forthright, fearless manner for the perpetuation of the principles of freedom, democracy, and justice. If we are to be true to our own great heritage, Mr. Speaker, we must not only sympathize with the aspirations for liberation of oppressed peoples everywhere but we must indicate to the entire world our purpose to do everything in our power to assist them in realizing their objectives to return into the orbit of free, independent nations.

It is fitting and proper that the House today recall the plight of the captive nations, who share a common history of political domination, aggression, and tyranny, as we hail and salute those peoples whose national spirit has never succumbed, whose national characteristics have never been overcome, who still carry a torch lighted by the memory of past freedom and shining with hope for the future, who cherish and nurture an intense faith in the restoration of their once flourishing nationality despite all vicissitudes. Truly, their spirit to maintain their proud identity and heritage has been mightier than the sword.

We should make it clear to the world that we will never compromise our principles in seeking the fulfillment of the aspirations of those who are seeking to throw off the shackles of slavery. The task of Americans is to protect and preserve our great political and economic systems, not only as a cherished possession, but as a beacon light of hope and inspiration for millions of oppressed peoples throughout the world striving to be free.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to have the opportunity to join with so many of my colleagues in the observance of this year's Captive Nations Week. At the outset, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Connecticut and the numerous other Members who have done such a fine job in planning the observance of Captive Nations Week this year.

Captive Nations Week of course concerns a specific area of the world. It calls attention to the 90 million people in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, and the Ukraine. These people, once free and independent, now are under the heel of Communist tyranny. These people with their proud heritage and glorious past are a living example of the weakness of Soviet communism; weakness because they are proof that communism can maintain itself by force. The Soviets dare not risk the test of strength of free choice.

Captive Nations Week focuses attention on these people. But it focuses the attention of the United States and of all the world and so it concerns a much greater area than just Eastern Europe. Captive Nations Week offers the American people a chance to demonstrate to the people of Eastern Europe that we have not forgotten them. It offers the opportunity to demonstrate to the entire world that America will not accept the forced spread of communism anywhere in the world.

For these reasons, Captive Nations Week is an important time for the United States, for Eastern Europe, and for the world.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, more than 800 million people have fallen victim to Communist aggression since the end of World War II. Although the Iron and Bamboo Curtains have sealed these people off from liberty and independence, most of them have not given up hope that someday these precious universal rights will be restored to them. They know that this victory over tyranny will not come quickly or easily, but they are no less resolved to continue the struggle. At times it may seem to the West that these peoples have passively accepted the Communist way of life, but it is more accurate to say that they have recognized the futility of overt resistance to the overwhelming power of their Soviet or Communist Chinese masters. Behind their apparent acceptance of the status quo burns a fierce desire for national independence and freedom.

The United States, of course, supports these just aspirations of the captive peoples. The U.S. Government has continuously refused to accept the status quo of Communist domination of the captive nations and has insisted on the right of these peoples to live under institutions and governments of their own choice. As Assistant Secretary of State William Tyler has said: "The United States desires to see in Eastern Europe fully independent nations enjoying internal freedom and normal relations with all countries * * *." The pursuit of this goal is founded on America's traditional adherence to the principle of self-determination for all peoples.

It is, of course, necessary to embody these policies in concrete measures designed to encourage the evolution of these captive nations toward greater independence from their Communist rulers. The range of measures is limited by geographical and power factors which help maintain the Communists' grip on these peoples. There are various ways, however, by which we can enhance the spirit of resistance and independence in these captive nations. One important way is to insure that these peoples understand our policy and are thus encouraged by our support for their cause. Observances such as Captive Nations Week play a useful role in this respect. Another important measure is the maintenance of economic ties between the free world and those countries which have shown an independent spirit. By lessening their economic dependence on the Soviet Union and by encouraging their autonomous economic development we can strengthen those forces of resistance and independence in social, political, and cultural spheres. While such a policy can be pursued only with countries which have already shown an unwillingness to be a pawn of international communism, it may well encourage other captive peoples to follow a more independent course.

These methods may seem painfully slow, but they offer the only realistic hope of freeing the captive nations from the Communist tyranny. Captive Nations Week offers us the opportunity to rededicate ourselves and to rally the energies of free peoples everywhere to this task.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of the original resolution to establish this period of July as Captive Nations Week and as a sponsor of House Resolution 347, of this Congress, to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, I am, indeed, pleased and privileged to join with my colleagues here today in further recognition of this special week.

The essence of our previous and current actions is our conscientious attempt to influence the restoration of the fundamental freedoms and God-given rights of subjugated peoples now living a tyrannical existence as Communist captive nations.

By our recurring recognition of Captive Nations Week, the Communist rulers will be continuously and emphatically reminded that it is the sense of this Congress that no firm and lasting agreements for peace can be made while the world remains practically half free and half slave.

By our repeated action the rest of the free world can be concretely convinced this Nation will not abandon her traditional principles of free government for all peoples and the captive nations themselves will be further inspired to remain adamant in their determination to reject any Communist entreaties for cooperative existence under the Soviet system.

The fact and the truth is that the Russian Kremlin is solely responsible for the inhuman slavery being imposed upon the brave peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, and all the other captive countries.

The further fact and truth is that the Russian leaders can easily disprove their contention that the satellite nations are not really captives by simply permitting them to hold free elections, by abolishing the secret police, by tearing down the barbed wire and mines at the frontiers, by granting freedom to the press and freedom of religion, by permitting freedom of education.

That is the first and fundamental step that must be taken before there can be any reasonable hope for the achievement of a peaceful world. Let us then persevere in our common efforts to encourage the Soviet rulers to initiate this first, just, action as the foundation for the adoption of agreements for all of us to live in good will in a world at peace, and may God grant that this day soon comes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, for the fifth year in a row the U.S. Congress and the American people are commemorating Captive Nations Week. Each year since 1959 the Congress has adopted a joint resolution and the President has issued a proclamation setting aside one week out of 52 for a commemorative observance which is at one and the same time a reminder of tragedy and a symbol of hope.

The tragedy is the enslavement of the European heartland from the Baltic to the Black Sea by the Soviet Union. The captive nations comprise 100 million of Europe's population—Albanians, Bulgarians, Czechoslovaks, Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians, East Germans, Hungarians, Poles, and Rumanians. Prior to World War II the captive European nations were sovereign independent states. For 20 years now all have been under the sway of the Soviet hammer and sickle. No matter what the epithet—satellite, republic—the result has been the same. All are victims of Soviet imperialism.

The power center of this colonial empire is the Kremlin, for the Communist totalitarian system requires firm centralized control over the whole spectrum of life. The politics of the captive nations are the politics of the Kremlin's Communist hierarchy. Dissent is suicidal, as the Hungarian bloodbath and the Berlin wall attest. The economies of the captive nations are simply replicas of the planned economy of the Soviet Union. A totalitarianism which reaches into every aspect of life and every field of endeavor has been forced on an unwilling people. No form of repression—threats, arbitrary arrest, deportation, even death—has been left untried to force the captive peoples into the totalitarian mold. This is the human tragedy which we are commemorating this week.

And yet, our very act of commemoration is a symbol of hope. If we felt that a never-ending enslavement was the final fate of the captive European peoples, we would not bother to designate a Captive Nations Week. We would not bother to pick up our pens and raise our voices in speeches of encouragement to the captive peoples. We know that history is an ever-flowing tide, that the colony of today is the sovereign state of tomorrow. Events since World War II—the awakening of the Asian and then of the African Continent—have brought this truth ever closer to us. The African surge to independence, in particular, has made us ever more aware of the deep urge of nations to govern themselves.

Our knowledge of the human spirit also gives us cause for hope. History has taught us the value man places on freedom. Many a revolution has been fought for personal liberty and for representation in the councils of government. The slogan of our American patriots—"No taxation without representation"—is an example of the importance man attaches to having a say in governing himself. Our own Bill of Rights, and similar clauses in the constitutions of nations throughout the world, are evidence of man's desire that his personal liberties be guaranteed.

We even take hope from the thus far unsuccessful stirrings against totalitarianism in central Europe—in Hungary and Poland in 1956, in East Germany in 1953 and in incidents at the Berlin wall. The repression which the Communists have resorted to in order to crush these events is indeed tragic, but the fact that such events have occurred and are still occurring confirms the impression of the free world that the desire for liberty still exists in the European heartland. It is our sincere wish that one day soon that desire will be fulfilled.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, we are observing the fifth annual Captive Nations Week. Many of those we commemorate have suffered Communist totalitarian tyranny for more than 18 years. Since the end of World War II the U.S. Government has attempted through every device of diplomacy to improve the lot of these nations, always with the ultimate goal of their eventual freedom. Due to the consistent and deliberate resistance of the Soviet Union, however, our attempts have met with negligible success.

In 1959 Congress empowered the President to proclaim the third week of each July Captive Nations Week. Why did Congress take this action? Does it not seem quixotic to talk of freedom for people imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain who live always under the gun of Soviet military power?

The answer lies in the nature of freedom itself, an elusive, demanding but rarely abandoned goal. The spirit of freedom can and must be kept alive and nourished, even and especially under severe duress.

The nations now captive have known freedom. They have strong historic and cultural ties to the West. Captive Nations Week serves to remind the people of Eastern Europe that the West, and particularly this country, has not forgotten them nor their desire to be free. Its observance helps to keep alive the flame of hope which may one day flare into a new blaze of freedom.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, over 100 million people are still denied the right of national self-determination. Their rulers are not responsible to them but to Communist masters in Moscow and Peking. The predicament of the captive nations concerns all of us. Millions of American citizens are linked by bonds of family and heritage to the people of Poland, Hungary, the Baltic States, Cuba, and other subjugated countries. In a larger sense, every American and every person who loves liberty shares with the captive nations their aspirations for freedom and national independence. This week, pursuant to congressional resolve and Presidential proclamation we recognize and condemn the plight of these peoples. By so doing, we assure them and their Communist czars that we remain unalterably opposed to Red colonial domination and will work to lift the yoke of imperialism.

Especially deserving of tribute are organizations such as the Assembly of Captive Nations whose unstinting efforts help keep the flame of hope burning in the hearts of all who are denied the blessings of national freedom.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, nearly 20 years have passed since the Iron Curtain descended on Europe, sealing off some 100 million people from their birthright of freedom and independence. Through a combination of subversion and overt intimidation—backed up by the Red army—the Soviets accomplished one of the largest scale aggressions in modern history. All told, Russia gained control of nine formerly independent countries, split another—Germany—in half, and had a foot in the door of yet another country—Austria—until she withdrew in 1955. The Soviets hoped to make even greater inroads into Europe, but their advance was checked by the postwar recovery and stabilization of Western Europe, a process which was greatly facilitated by U.S. aid under the Marshall plan.

Russia again followed her traditional pattern of turning to other areas when her expansionist drives westward were thwarted. Greece, Turkey, Iran, and then Korea and Indo-China became the objectives of Communist aggression. The West's quick and firm responses to these challenges held the Communists to gains which amounted to a fraction of their previous territorial acquisitions in Eastern Europe.

In these underdeveloped areas the conflict is a continuing, wide-open affair. In Europe, on the other hand, the lines have been drawn for the moment, all of the territory has been claimed by one side or the other. An important exception to this relative stability, of course, is West Berlin—a free-world enclave in the heart of East Germany. But on the whole we have been faced with a clearly divided Europe for more than 15 years. This situation presents U.S. foreign policy with perhaps its most delicate and trying challenge. Here we are confronted with a Soviet-imposed status quo which we justly refuse to recognize as legitimate or permanent. Yet the Soviets have staked so much of their power and prestige in these captive nations that we cannot openly force a showdown and withdrawal, as we did last fall in the case of Soviet missiles in Cuba, lest it provoke world war III. Nor can we resort to Communist-style subversion tactics, for it would be futile to provoke internal crises in the satellites when we could not help the insurgents combat the likely repression of the Red army.

Clearly, then, our policy choices are limited to those which will favor a gradual evolution toward greater autonomy and freedom for the captive nations. Western contacts and influences provide one of the best liberalizing forces in this area, so we ought to take full advantage of our limited access beyond the Iron Curtain to utilize our communications, economic and cultural relations with the captive peoples. Trade is one important source of such contacts, and I would be inclined to consider carefully the administration's policy of wanting to continue favorable trade relations with countries such as Poland and Yugoslavia which have shown in varying degrees an unwillingness to be subjugated to Soviet rule.

It is equally necessary to keep ourselves well informed about developments in this sensitive area of foreign policy. This applies both to the Nation's leaders and to the people. One of the main instruments for focusing public attention on this vital issue is Captive Nations Week, which has been observed annually since 1959. The activities and ceremonies of Captive Nations Week provide a nationwide platform, as it were, from which we can again proclaim our commitment to furthering the hopes and aspirations of all people for liberty and independence.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my distinguished colleagues in paying tribute to those valiant people behind the Iron Curtain in the captive nations of the world who continue to struggle against the tyranny of Communist imperialism. On this occasion we express once again our admiration for the ideals, the fortitude, and the flaming spirit of resistance of those seeking to cast off this yoke despite seemingly insurmountable odds.

Our annual observance of Captive Nations Week should serve to remind all Americans how precious is our own freedom and make us ever alert to preserve it. This observance will also serve to remind those new nations which are listening to the siren song of communism what can and will befall them should they succumb to the Soviet call.

This observance by people of the free world is an inspiration to those in the captive nations to continue their fight knowing that they are not alone in seeking freedom. Furthermore, it should serve notice on those who would enslave the world that we have not abandoned those who are dominated by harsh dictatorships not of their own choosing.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, over the centuries the peoples of East and Central Europe have been caught in a tug of war between East and West. The East has been represented by czarist, now Soviet, Russia; the West by Western Europe, and now the United States as well. The peoples of this strategic middle ground have alternately swung their allegiances between these two polls of attraction, sometimes of their own will, more often as a result of conquest or intimidation by one of the neighboring powers.

Now they are caught in the iron grip of the East—the Soviet Union. But they have not always been in the Eastern camp, nor must we assume that the Soviets will be able to keep them in bondage. There are many historic and natural ties between East Central Europe and the West. Culturally much of the area has more affinities with the heritage of Western civilization than with Eastern traditions. Poland, for example, has been particularly affected by Western influences throughout its history; her ties with the West are illustrated by the fact that about 90 percent of the Polish population is Roman Catholic.

Czechoslovakia is another Eastern European country which had been a strongly pro-Western oriented nation before being forcibly absorbed into the Communist camp. The East-West tug of war is dramatically highlighted by the events of the Communist coup d'etat in 1948. The circumstances of World War II naturally gave Czechoslovakia's foreign policy a pro-Russian orientation, but she had important ties with the West. Left to itself, the Czechoslovak Republic would probably have worked out some middle way between East and West. Stalin, however, could not tolerate such a bridge between the two camps. The issue came to a head when the Western Powers invited Czechoslovakia to attend talks in July 1947, which would have probably resulted in Czechoslovak participation in the Marshall plan. Stalin pressured the Czech Government to decline the invitation, thereby triggering the long political crisis which culminated in the Communist takeover. Beside Poland and Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Albania, Idel-Ural, Cossackia, and Turkestan are also captives of Communist oppression.

Not only are the Eastern Europeans victims of Communist tyranny and imperialism; but the "Bamboo Curtain" of Red China has also enslaved the people of North Korea, Vietnam, Tibet, and others. Let us not forget our Cuban neighbors, the most recent captive of the Communist bloc who are victims of the treasonous ideologies of Fidel Castro, who upon winning victory over a dictatorship in behalf of freedom, betrayed his fellow countrymen and made them prisoners of the Iron Curtain.

These observations can be summed up easily: there are considerable nascent pro-Western forces in the Communist satellites. It is my firm conviction that free world policy must stimulate and develop these tendencies. In this way, these satellites may gradually veer from the Soviet orbit and attain progressively greater degrees of independence.

I have no illusions about the difficulty or long-range nature of this task. Its accomplishment will be the result of a slow evolution rather than some apocalyptic breakup of the Communist bloc. It would be wrong, however, to assume that this process will operate by itself and that we must have nothing to do with the satellite countries. Proponents of the policy of isolation argue that to have economic and diplomatic relations with Communist governments strengthens their grip on these countries and tends to reinforce the status quo. Certainly, it would not be advantageous to supply direct economic and military aid to the government under the domination of a hostile great power. But, short of this, there is a whole area of political and cultural relations which would reach beyond the Communist government to the people. These contacts and activities tend to maximize United States and Western influence in the Communist realm, to demonstrate our interest in the peoples' welfare, to help sustain their natural traditions and aspirations for independence and free institutions, to keep them in touch with Western thoughts and ideas, and to help them achieve a true perspective on world developments in all fields of human endeavor and achievement.

One of the tangible instrumentalities of this policy is Captive Nations Week, a national observance being celebrated during the week of July 14 to 20. This is the fifth consecutive year that this national observance has been held up for the purpose of focusing public attention on the plight of the captive peoples. We take this occasion to renew our devotion to the just aspirations of all peoples for national independence and human liberty.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, this year as we mark Captive Nations Week there is an aura of excitement and expectancy—tentative though it is—that stimulates our observance. One dare not call it hope, for that is too precious a word for those whose right to freedom and self-determination has been so long curtailed that only those with power to help should proffer hope. Yet there is an element of hope for all the captive nations in the stirring of a new mood in Eastern European countries.

This stirring has most recently made itself manifest in Rumania, where defiance of Moscow has been couched in terms of friendliness to Communist China during the open dispute between these two would-be leaders of the world into the Communist camp. Rumania has also made known directly its opposition to the Soviet Union proposal for its role in the economic plan for Eastern Europe.

In other Iron Curtain countries rumblings seem to be developing into the expression of definite views of their own, disapproving the way the Soviet Union is trying to run the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance—COMECON. In country after country, subject to prolonged austerity and very meager prospects of improvement in economic conditions, questions are beginning to be raised as to the right of the Soviet Government to dictate the nature and method of economic activity. They are not satisfied to contribute as colonies to the wealth of the U.S.S.R. to their own detriment, to be held back to agricultural pursuits for the benefit of industrial development elsewhere. It is their desire to build up industries for themselves to better their own and sorely needed sources of wealth.

These are but economic manifestations of the latent nationalism which characterizes all of the captive nations. For many of them these attempts as Russification and exploitation are all too familiar renewals of old tsarist policies intensified under the Soviet Union. The U.S.S.R., knowing that nationalism and democracy go hand in hand in modern times, is well aware of the truth of the great historian Toynbee's statement that "the introduction of democratic principles in the Soviet Union would immediately disintegrate the Red Russian empire and its whole sphere of influence." We believe, however, that democracy and nationalism cannot forever be defied.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues here will recall successful Captive Nations Weeks of earlier years. Data surrounding these events indicated that the U.S.S.R. feared the possibility that Captive Nations Day observance might become traditional with the United States and that the effects of the observance would probably one day dictate U.S. action and policy.

I am happy to lend my voice to the cause of Captive Nations Week because I sincerely believe that we must never let the world forget the hope these captive nations hold for ultimate freedom.

But I would also be among the first to acknowledge that constant congressional highlighting of the Captive Nations Week has not firmed up U.S. policy toward communism one iota.

Here is why: At the time I made a statement similar to this 2 years ago, communism had yet to gain a foothold in the Western Hemisphere. Since then, however, Cuba has openly succumbed to the hammer and sickle. And, if we can believe our news sources, other Latin American or South American Republics may follow suit.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the reason communism continues to make inroads into the Western Republics, instead of being halted by our Captive Nations Week observance, is because of our present official policy of accommodation. Only this week a national publication has indicated that our Department of State can hardly wait for Congress to adjourn because it intends to pursue such policy with Cuba as soon as Congress is out of the way. According to this magazine, our Department of State is of the opinion that by establishing diplomatic relations with Red Cuba, the United States will lessen tension in the Caribbean.

In addition, I would like to point out that we have dispatched an Under Secretary to Russia as an agent of the President. This agent will engage in special negotiations with the Soviet. Yet the American public is still to be informed on what is to take place. Again national publications speculate the deal may involve nuclear testing, Cuba, Berlin, and the future of the U.S. policy in East Europe. And they add that it may take place against a background of our accommodation to the present Soviet status.

This is most disturbing news and I would like to direct my colleagues' attention to it. In addition, I would suggest a much firmer stand against any sort of compromise with communism and to that, add that unless we ultimately assume a position that firm, we are going to find that we, too, are among the captive nations with only the winds to mourn our passing.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, this fifth observance of Captive Nations Week by the American people comes at a most fateful moment in our national history. No nation conceived in adversity under such concepts as ours could know a more intense and passionate identification with every peoples of the world who hold the rights of self-determination, individual freedom, dignity, and equality under law of inalienable God-foreordained inheritance. Throughout the history of this Nation, we have asserted and history has confirmed the deathless truth that the oppression of peoples under a doctrine counter to the concepts of freedom and dignity of man cannot endure. The human spirit can no more survive the alien status of subjugation than the human body can survive without air and food and water. And before death under these conditions, the dignity of man asserts itself in a phenomenal inspired strength which inevitably breaks the binding tyranny.

Today we reaffirm these truths and our commitment of heart and action to the captive peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and to captive peoples of the world wherever they are. We say to them we are more than involved in the life and death struggle for national independence, the life and death struggle for freedom that grips and circles the world—in Europe, in Africa, in Asia, in the United States, in East and West and North and South. We say the destiny of the principles on which we stand as a nation are linked and bound in your fate.

The gravity of that truth makes them our solemn reaffirmations to the captive nations of the world on this commemoration deeply critical, for within the boundaries of our own nation the struggles for freedom of an oppressed, yes captive, people has grown into fierce crisis, holding the eyes of the world. To the captive nations and all people of the world struggling for freedom, we will affirm our commitments of heart and our commitment to action as we take firm and unrelenting steps to unloose the shackles of tyranny existing in our own homeland and make available to all men the choices and rights and opportunities of freedom.

Even as we do this, I join my colleagues in urging the establishment of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations to study the ways in which we can help set the world free in peace, for our commitments can only be total.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is Captive Nations Week. It is a time when we turn to consider the sad plight of the people in this world who are living under Communist subjugation. At this very moment, more than 100 million people in the countries of Eastern Europe are without their freedom and their rights and are forced to submit to the tyranny of Communist regimes. These captive peoples share a fate which is surely one of the most conspicuous and enduring shames of the 20th century.

Not so very long ago, Europe was the scene of a world war. The war was bravely fought and won by men and women who were sustained by the belief that they were fighting to protect the rights and freedoms of the weak and oppressed and to preserve the democratic institutions cherished by the free world. But the tragic paradox is that at the end of the great war freedom was lost more completely than ever for many people in Eastern Europe. For them the great destruction and enormous human sacrifices was to be largely in vain. As the dust and the debris of the war began to settle, the armies of the Soviet Union swept into the countries of Eastern Europe. Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Albania, and other countries were occupied by Communist forces and added to the list of countries for which there was to be no new era of hope and freedom. Free at last from a grim and agonizing war, the people of the captive nations found themselves firmly locked in the iron grip of communism.

It is almost 20 years that have passed since the people of the captive nations of Eastern Europe fell victims to the treacherous tactics of the Soviet Union. These oppressed peoples still live in a state of subservience and inner misery that is unmatched almost anywhere else on the face of the globe. It is a sad commentary on the progress of justice in the world today that so many people have been compelled to submit for so long to such intolerable conditions of life.

There have been noble moments of resistance to the Communist tyranny by the captive peoples. In East Germany, in Poland, and in Hungary the passion for freedom and the rights of the individual surged up and burst into the open, momentarily breaking the cruel chains of communism. It is sad that these brave men and women protesting the injustices and the humiliation of many years of subservience were eventually crushed under the heavy heel of the Communist military machine. But the spirit of freedom can never completely be destroyed; it will always rise up to do battle with tyranny and the forces of oppression.

The fight for freedom in our world today is the responsibility of all people, not just of those who are struggling to escape from the tyranny of Communist regimes. It calls for vigilance and sacrifice on the part of those fortunate enough to already be free. For the United States the future course is clear and unmistakable. We must never give the impression that we are no longer aroused by the subjugation and oppression of the captive peoples in Eastern Europe. Day after day and night after night the United States must condemn with unrelenting vigor the injustice and abuse that is being done. The United States must keep before the conscience of the world the grim picture of the collective enslavement of the peoples in Eastern Europe. The force and intensity of our assault upon the injustices of Communist totalitarian rule must be so great that the captive peoples themselves will be aware of our support and will gain strength to sustain them in their fight for freedom.

This is Captive Nations Week. In the United States, where we have long enjoyed the benefits and blessings of freedom and democracy, these few solemn days serve to focus special attention upon the misfortune of those in bondage. It is only right and proper that the United States, as the leader of the free world, should solemnly observe Captive Nations Week. It must be remembered, of course, that the problem of the captive peoples is not of a single week's duration. It is a problem and concern from 1 day to the next and from 1 year to another. There can be no rest on the part of the free world until there is freedom in every country and for all peoples.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for the fifth time, the Congress of the United States is observing Captive Nations Week, a week to which Americans all over our Nation are giving increasing recognition. President Kennedy has proclaimed Captive Nations Week to remind all the world that the spirit of liberty and national independence is alive in Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, the Ukraine, the Baltic States, Armenia, Georgia, and Rumania. This focuses attention on our recognition of their captivity and our hope that their release from bondage is very near.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs held hearings on the captive nations in 1962 in which attention was focused on the control by the Russian Communists over the political, economic, and military life of nations behind the Iron Curtain. This control is accompanied by wholesale nationalization of industry, transportation and trade, forced collectivism of agriculture. Repression of individual liberties, suppression of religion, eradication of every vestige of religious education, Communist indoctrination of youth, systematic campaigns to destroy family loyalties and to replace them with blind obedience to the state; and a concerted effort to extend Communist orientation to every field of human endeavor; these are facts of everyday life in captive nations.

The first to fall victim to Russian Communist imperialism was the Ukraine. To wipe out all sense of national unity, its people were deported to Siberia while the country was colonized by Russian Communists. National language and culture were suppressed. Every technician of oppression and suppression was used to wipe out any vestige of national identity and make of it just a Russian province.

The same procedure was followed throughout other nations annexed to the Russian empire. Some states have been completely closed to Western observers. The result is that actual conditions can only be surmised. As Russian provinces they are governed directly from Moscow through political appointees and the Russian Army.

Poland, the first captive nation to gain some autonomy, is undergoing another change, a reversal of rights wrung as a result of the 1956 crisis. Although Warsaw conveys the picture of a modern metropolis, it is misleading. Recent demonstrations over the rise in the prices of coal and electricity have resulted in suppression of the workers; while journalists, poets, and playwrights have suffered severe censorship. This tightening of controls is an attempt by the Polish Government to obviate any revolutionary plots which may arise. Suppression is further proof of the economic ills which are current.

Hungary, a small country of beautiful landscapes with a history of national struggle reaching back almost a thousand years, still bears the scars and sad memories of the 1956 Revolution. This dramatic revolt against Soviet colonialism, with its suppression by guns and tanks told a story of defiance of Soviet might which gave the lie to the fabricated legend about the support by subject peoples of the Communist regimes.

The surprising move of the Rumanian Government, not to adhere to the strict economic dicta of the Soviet Union and to play a leverage role in the ideological struggle between Red China and the Soviet Union has cheered the Western World and brought hope to the people of the free world that yet another crack has appeared in the Eastern encampment. The development of rich oil fields has enabled Rumania to become independent from the Soviet bloc trade organization (CEMA) and to build a respectable trade balance with Western Europe. Prevented by Russia from industrialization, the Government has asked West Germany, Great Britain, France, and Italy to construct steel centers, oil-refining plants and other manufacturing industries in Rumania.

For all its signs of independent action, controls remain rigid. Agricultural output is low due to collectivism in all the Balkan countries.

Albania, governed by Strongman Ever Hoxha, continues as the most poverty-stricken nation in Europe with disease and malnutrition rampant. Although an important pawn in the ideological struggle between the Communist powers, forsaken by the Soviet Union and adopted by Red China, the situation of the people is unchanged; controlled by a strongly entrenched Communist regime isolated, it must rely for its existence on doles from Red China.

At a recent congress in Czechoslovakia, Czech writers and intellectuals demanded that a policy of de-Stalinization be inaugurated and that certain condemned writers and political figures, such as Benes and Masaryk, be rehabilitated. Demonstrations and demands from the Slovaks for increased autonomy for their nations show further signs of unrest. Novotony found himself obliged to give ground, to relinquish somewhat his suffocating grip. Nevertheless, life in Czechoslovakia remains drab. Consumer goods are scarce; the standard of living, low.

In East Germany, despite the fact that Russia is alleged to have poured vast amounts of capital into the country, to have converted it into the Eastern bloc's biggest industrial workshop, the wall stands as an attempt, not to keep other Europeans out but to keep the "contented" workers in.

Despite all the propaganda of assurance that these workers' paradises are a source of joy and satisfaction to the working people who strive for the highest possible profit for society, cracks continue to show in the Iron Curtain. Soviet propaganda continues to hammer on imperialism and colonialism while their own colonies which through suppression and oppression they have attempted to weld into a Communist empire continue to exhibit unrest. The cracks are showing; may they never grow less.

During the week of July 14 we extend the hand of friendship and sympathy to the captive nations, and we stand before the world as the continuing champion of the right of all nations to self-determination.

Mr. Speaker, I support and strongly urge the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. We cannot withhold any effort within our power to restore to the captive millions of men, women, and children the blessings of free government under which they may pass their days in contentment and dignity and in worship of the God and Creator of us all.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we have just completed another Captive Nations Week. It is a sad fact of our lives in the middle of the 20th century that, despite our enormous advances in technology and communications, 26 nations of this earth are held in some form of political captivity. Nine of these countries are in Europe, under total domination by the Communists.

As a result of this policy of enforced bondage, about one-third of Europe's land area and more than one-fourth of its inhabitants have seen their personal liberties denied during all the 17 years since the end of World War II.

Among the captive nations of Europe, Poland—with its population of 30 million—is the largest. Yet the fate of all these nations, large and small, behind the Iron Curtain is one and the same. All of them are denied the freedom they long for; and we are all sadly familiar with the results of their attempts to free themselves.

We in the Western Hemisphere, particularly in the United States, have been especially concerned with giving these people our encouragement and moral assistance in their efforts to become self-determining nations once more. Our efforts have not always been illuminated by immediate success, but thankfully, we do have reason to believe that our messages of hope are being received and understood.

As an example of the freedom of thought which somehow manages to survive behind the Iron Curtain, I would like to include a recent newspaper account of the courage of a young Polish Air Force officer who escaped from Communist-dominated Poland within the past few days with his wife and two small sons to the freedom of West Berlin. This young pilot, Maj. Richard Obacz, after flying his small propeller-driven plane across the frontier of Poland and East Germany, declared that he was fleeing the oppressive and stifling restrictions placed on him in present-day Poland.

He is looking for a better life for his children and, to find it, he risked his own life and the lives of his family in a heroic escape.

The newspaper article follows:

Pole Fed Up, Jams Family in Plane and Flies to Haven in West Berlin

Berlin, July 10.—A Polish air force pilot took a two-seat military plane this afternoon and with his wife and two children flew to freedom in West Berlin.

Maj. Richard Obacz circled Tempelhof Airdrome in West Berlin twice after his 1-hour flight across Communist Poland and East Germany.

After the plane taxied to a stop, the jet test pilot dashed into the arms of an astonished U.S. Air Force captain sobbing happily. He asked for political asylum.

As the 34-year-old pilot told of his escape, his wife, Mary, 27, and his sons, Lestow, 9, and Kristofer, 5, climbed from the rear cockpit. The boys had been tucked beneath the dashboard.

Obacz said he flew dangerously low—never above 150 feet—the entire distance to escape detection by Polish and East German watchtowers, observation posts, and radar.

He told a news conference that he planned the flight for weeks. He kept his plans so secret, he said, that his wife and boys thought the family was heading for a visit to relatives in Stettin when they took off from an air base at Nadarzyce, Poland.

He charted the flight to Stettin and told his air force superiors he was using the plane, which usually served as a courier craft, for the family flight. They brought only the clothes they wore.

The plane is expected to be returned if the Poles ask for it.

Obacz was in full uniform as he dashed up to Air Force Capt. Lionel Paternaud. His attractive wife wore gray slacks, a blue blouse, and a gray sweater. The boys wore shorts, sweaters, and tennis shoes.

Within 4 hours the major faced a news conference. By putting Obacz immediately before the press, the West undoubtedly gained a propaganda victory.

Obacz said he was fed up and that a majority of the officers he knew in Poland wanted to do just what he had done but they had few opportunities to flee. He said most people in Poland want to come to the free West.

The major made it clear that his knowledge of terrain and Communist defenses were of great help. He was challenged only once, by an East German installation. He disregarded the call, kept his plane low, and flew on.

Mr. Speaker, in 1959 this House of Representatives adopted a resolution empowering the President to proclaim the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week. Since that time, this Nation has observed the occasion annually and we shall continue to observe it solemnly, as long as there are people who are denied their fundamental rights to live in the dignity which their neighbors in free societies take as a matter of course.

During this week, we reaffirm our beliefs in the universal worth of each separate individual on this earth; we venerate those gallant souls who have given their lives in the unending quest for freedom; and we give thanks for the miracle of democracy which shields each of us in this country from tyranny and oppression.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, although the third week in July was established as Captive Nations Week several years ago, I think our observance this week is especially timely, for not only do we wish to reaffirm our support of these people enslaved behind the Iron Curtain but because we should also alert ourselves to the dangers of becoming complacent about their plight.

Frequently of late we have been hearing reports about the easing of tensions between the Communist and the free world; about the rifts between the Chinese and the Russian Communists; about the easing of conditions of those who live in the captive nations. It is reported that a most cordial reception is being accorded our Ambassador, Mr. Harriman, and the others who are in Moscow consulting with the Russian Communists on a nuclear test ban treaty.

I hear these reports, and I would like to believe that true and lasting peace may be on its way, but when I look at the record, I have my doubts.

We all know the old saying that a leopard cannot change his spots. I find it difficult to believe that the man who is known as the Butcher of the Ukraine, the man who sent the tanks into Budapest to crush the bodies of the freedom fighters, the man whose record is stained with blood, the man who has sworn to bury us, can at this late date change his spots. Remember that Lenin in his Communist manifesto specifically said that any means should be used to push communism, whether it be breaking treaties, lying, or whatever, so long as their objective of world domination was achieved.

The history of dealing with the Russians is filled with examples of broken promises and doublecrosses; and I hope our treaty representatives will keep that record in mind during the conferences.

Based on the record, I cannot put much faith in the words of the Communists. If they are sincere in their professed desire to live in peace with the rest of the world, they can take a positive step to show they mean what they say. They can let the over 100 million people in the captive nations hold free elections to choose the governments of their choice. Let the Russian Communists restore freedom to those nations, then perhaps the rest of the free world can afford to give some credence to their words.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week is not a week of celebration with festivity and gladness, but one to be commemorated solemnly with an expression of our longfelt sympathy for the more than 100 million people who are captives of totalitarian communism. In Europe alone there are eight of these nations, with one-fourth of its area and nearly an equal percentage of its population. These nations include Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, in the Baltic area; Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland in central and Eastern Europe; and Bulgaria and Rumania in the Balkan Peninsula. Nor can we exclude East Germany and Albania.

Today all of these countries suffer under dictatorial rule. Their fate has been a constant concern of the people and the Government of this country. Although nothing short of a nuclear war could bring these nations their freedom at this juncture in history, Congress has enacted legislation providing national observance of our continuing sympathy and concern during Captive Nations Week each year. For the fifth time the Presidential proclamation is in effect this week, and we observe Captive Nations Week this year as an expression of our faith in the inherent right to freedom possessed by our relatives and fellow human beings in the captive nations.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks following the discussion already had on observance of Captive Nations Week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY of New York). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT NYERERE OF TANGANYIKA

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this morning we were honored by a visit to the Capitol by Hon. Julius Nyerere, President of the Republic of Tanganyika and one of the great statesmen of Africa. President Nyerere talked at some length with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker McCORMACK, and the gentleman from Oklahoma, Majority Leader ALBERT, and the bonds of friendship between our country and the young Republic of Tanganyika were strengthened.

President Nyerere is a remarkable man. I first met him in my office in Washington in 1959. Again in 1960 when the Subcommittee on Africa visited Tanganyika and again in 1961 on the memorable and historic day that the Union Jack was lowered and the flag of Tanganyika raised over an independent and sovereign nation. President Nyerere is 41, a young man who has won universal recognition as one of the great statesmen of our times.

Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the address by President Nyerere at the Washington Press Club luncheon on July 15, 1963, as follows:

> Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, Tanganyika and all the other free states of Africa spend a considerable amount of time and energy on matters concerned with African unity, with racialism, and with the fight against colonialism. Although we have as much to gain as anyone, we break up useful technical meetings because we will not cooperate with South Africa and Portugal.
>
> Many people do not understand these things. They ask why we do not get on with the job of dealing with the social and economic problems facing our own countries, and why we do not leave the other matters alone until we have done so.
>
> The answer is quite simply that the nature of our own movement, and the nature of the modern world, does not allow us to do so. Twentieth century nationalism is the African and Asian expression of man's worldwide demand for equality, and the attainment of national independence is only the first—though an essential—step. If it is to have any meaning to mankind, our nationalism must go forward from that triumph; it must express itself in the struggle of the common man throughout the world for equality and justice. For 20th century nationalism is not, and cannot be, exclusive and isolationist. Modern technology prevents this. It is, and must be, both international and humanitarian.
>
> Our nationalist motivation, therefore, means that continuing colonialism anywhere—but particularly in Africa—is an affront to those of us who have won independence. We are not mollified by our own triumph any more than we are grateful to those who conceded it. We cannot be grateful for something which is ours by rights.
>
> Tanganyika cannot rest content while alien rule continues in the south of our continent. Even if we wished to ignore the just demands of our brothers, our own self-interest would prevent us from acquiescing in this situation. Many questions of regional economic development are held up because colonial governments on our borders do not have the same purposes in economic development as we do. We have the problem of refugees, and the ill treatment of Tanganyika citizens who cross the border to visit their tribal brothers on the other side of the line.
>
> Similar problems inevitably apply whether or not we have a border with the colonial country. Take the case of Southern Rhodesia: What am I supposed to do when refugees, or politicians who are supporting the things I know to be right, come to Tanganyika and start doing from there propaganda work against racial discrimination, or in support of universal suffrage? When I know that they have no opportunity of expressing those viewpoints in the colonial country, am I supposed to stop them?
>
> This is quite different from allowing hostile action against an independent country whose policies you happen to dislike—a policy which we do not approve of. During the last World War America supported resistance movements in occupied territories. Our position is not different just because the occupation took place many years ago. And in the same way that freed countries immediately became part of the general war effort from freedom in Europe, so we in Tanganyika, Ghana, Uganda, Congo, and so on, must carry the fight forward until the whole of Africa is free.
>
> It is true, of course, that the Union of South Africa is an independent country, but the policy of apartheid which it has adopted is in fact a particularly vicious, and particulary dangerous, form of colonialism. Racialism is based on the same assumption—that one man has the right to determine the limits of freedom for another simply because the latter is physically different in appearance. To the world it is even more dangerous than colonialism, because of all men everywhere racialism and group prejudice offer an easy escape from the real problems of life; it has a long history and appeals to the cowardice of men.
>
> We must face up to the world importance of this question. Whatever the provocation, or however great the rewards, a man cannot change his face or his color. For the sake of a cause a man may suffer all sorts of indignities to his person, or even his family, without loss of human dignity or self-respect; but what sort of cause is color? I cannot even choose it. And if I am humiliated merely for existing, then I have no alternative but to fight—with whatever weapons are available. Yet this sort of fighting prevents us all—the man who discriminates as well as me—from living a full life, or contributing to human progress.

There is no question, either, of isolating this problem. The prime sufferers in the South African situation are the nonwhites there. But all the world's colored people are insulted, because the only basis for the racial humiliation is something which is common between them and us. And all whites are involved because they are brought in by the justifications asserted by the South African authorities—the white skin. If white people elsewhere do not protest at this, and show disagreement by their actions, then they are agreeing with the tyranny which the argument supports. On this basic issue the whole world has to take sides. And we in Tanganyika believe that Africa has a right to demand support for its stand against South Africa. We are not disputing with another country about the organization of society; this dispute is about the humanity of man.

It is also true that no individuals can be neutral on this issue, and that the basic struggle goes on all over the world. It is for this reason that I dare speak on color while I am a guest here, knowing that you are currently engaged in finding a solution to your own color problem. By serving a man in a restaurant, or by refusing to educate a man's children, a person may be taking part in this fight about racialism, wherever he does it. For the struggle goes on everywhere, in the United States, and in Tanganyika—although there the relative positions of the colors would be reversed. To argue racial privilege anywhere is to talk the language of Verwoerd, whatever the transposition of words. We have taken our stand on what is one of the most inspiring documents of all time—the Preamble of the American Constitution. It says "All men are created equal, and are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights."

There is another aspect of equality which I must mention. Half the world's population suffers from malnutrition; the national incomes of our respective countries can hardly appear on the same graph—so different as they. You know these things, and I do not have to enlarge on them. But they have inescapable relevance to my major theme of equality. A beggar and a millionaire must be equal in their civil rights, but this does not really make them equal, even in opportunity. There are few greater truths than the Bible statement "To him that hath shall be given, but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath." Economic strength breeds strength; money breeds money. And without these things ill-health, ignorance and hunger prevent a man from standing upright and talking as an equal to his brother.

It is true that through internal unity we in Tanganyika, like other countries of Africa, are able to make some economic headway despite our poor starting point. Individually we cannot afford to buy a tractor; together we can—so it becomes common property. Individually we cannot undertake the investment necessary for economic development; together we can, and together we can afford to accept loans and other obligations from overseas. We do not do this for reasons of dogma—although our background does make us more receptive to the idea of common action. But basically this policy is a reflection of the fact that we must have development, and have it now. Therefore we cannot—and do not—restrict it on grounds of philosophy, nor color, nor anything else. The only restriction is, and must be, that development is for the service of our people and is not used as a new means of enslavement.

But for all this it is still true that in the world society we individual states of Africa are almost in the position of beggars talking to millionaires. And we don't like it. We are all endeavoring to develop our own economies, but the more we try the more we are forced to realize that only through African unity can we really make a breakout of the vicious circle of poverty. Only African unity will enable us to carry forward the work which the freedom movement began—only internationalism can take nationalism to its goal.

Individually all the African states are in the hands of economic forces much stronger than we. All of us have to grab at whatever development activity we can get, and we compete with one another offering the millionaires of this world better and better terms to come and invest in our particular country rather than the one next door. This is nonsense—and we all see it. We shall all gain economically from working together as a team, for together we ourselves will be a force in the world which is of some account. Separately—quite frankly—we are not.

But African unity will not come automatically; it is like any development—you have to invest before you can get any profit. We have to get to know one another across the boundaries with which Europe divided us; we have to make institutional arrangements which take into account our different history and inheritance from the colonial era. But the will is there, and I believe we shall succeed.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to explain some of the attitudes of Africa which are often misunderstood. Basically they are these. From our traditional culture we inherit a strong sense of community, a strong consciousness of the need for unity, and a recognition of man's interdependence. It is these lessons which we are now trying to apply to our needs in a new technological situation. And it is from them that stems our demand for human equality, and our desire for African unity in freedom.

I believe that these ambitions, and the attitudes which they cause us to adopt in the international arena, are an inherent part of the search for freedom and justice throughout the world. This is as it should be; for African nationalism sprang from the common man, and it can serve him only while it serves humanity.

NATIONWIDE RAIL STRIKE SHOULD BE AVOIDED

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, avoiding a nationwide rail strike by compulsory arbitration or Government seizure would be a hollow victory.

Let us hope that freemen can agree on a sensible settlement. If it comes to a Government-forced settlement, public welfare, as well as union and management welfare is apt to be lost in the shuffle.

Compulsory arbitration amounts to wage fixing by Government. Wage fixing is just a hair away from price fixing. Seizure is the first step toward socialized transportation — Government ownership. Avoiding a rail strike at this price would be a hollow victory.

We are faced with a possible nationwide railroad strike. Are American workers and American private enterprise able to work out their own problems? Or does the Government have to impose a settlement for the benefit of the general public?

If it comes to Government settlement, public welfare, as well as union and management welfare, is apt to be lost in the shuffle. The problems confronting labor and management are not easy in this dispute—but the alternatives are even more difficult.

The issues in the rail dispute are fundamental. Technological advance, automation, and progress exist in transportation just as in other fields. Rail management must be able to keep abreast of changing times, or rail transportation will slip behind its competitors. At best, consumers will pay more than needed for rail service.

Changing times have demanded more skilled workers and less unskilled workers. Yet unions have forced the railroads to retain firemen on diesel locomotives although few railroads have fires to stoke. Railroads want to cut their costs an estimated $600 million by eliminating unnecessary positions. Unions see that men forced off the job late in life may find it difficult getting new jobs.

The termination of unnecessary jobs with a generous compensation to affected workers was recommended by a Presidential Study Group. Those on the job with more than 10 years seniority could remain on the job until they died or retired. The others could receive retraining at company expense and 60 percent of their wages for 3 years. The courts have upheld the right of the railroads to change their work rules.

Ignoring the President's Study Group and the courts, the unions have vowed to strike if the railroads change their working rules. Bargaining between management and labor has come to a standstill.

A national railroad strike would cripple the economy and affect millions of Americans. Businesses would have to shut down. Workers would be laid off. Stores would suffer sales losses. Our defense would be imperiled. The country cannot tolerate a national rail strike.

Intolerable as the rail strike appears to be, the alternatives in Government action appear to be equally unacceptable.

Compulsory arbitration is an action which those who believe in free collective bargaining—myself included—have long resisted. It amounts to wage-fixing by Government decision. Wage-fixing is just a hair away from price-fixing. Compulsory arbitration is hard to isolate. We cannot say: this dispute and this only will we arbitrate.

The precedent would be established and the ice broken, so to speak, for further compulsion. Seizure by Government is equally ominous. It is the first step toward socialized transportation—Government ownership.

If the Federal Government creates and uses the power to dictate a strike settlement in this case, a precedent will be initiated for future economic disputes. Yet the United States cannot tolerate a national strike.

Let us hope that freemen can agree on a sensible settlement. Otherwise the Federal Government may become the master of the machine as individual and private initiative wither away.

Government would then be running our businesses, our economy, our lives and our decisions. Avoiding a rail strike at this price would be a hollow victory.

ANOTHER TASK UNMET BY THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, another example of the inability of the Area Redevelopment Administration to meet or even be interested in the primary task for which it was created has come to light. According to the syndicated column "Inside Report," written by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak and appearing in the July 16, 1963, issue of the Washington Post, the Commerce Department is considering a regional agency to deal with the truly depressed area of the Appalachian region. The only things holding the Department up are the reluctance of the Area Redevelopment Administration bureaucrats to give up a good thing, and the fear on the part of the Administration that this would be an acknowledgment of ineptitude on the part of one of its pet projects.

The region involved touches parts of Virginia, West Virginia, Alabama, Pennsylvania, Maryland, North Carolina, Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Georgia. It is just such a regional approach for just such a region that President Eisenhower advocated in turning down so-called depressed areas legislation. After 5 years of frustration, of trying to redevelop areas that have no development to begin with, the Kennedy administration is considering a new approach—the Eisenhower approach—not because it is correct, but because it may be more politically profitable. I wonder how the people of this 10-State region feel knowing they have been abandoned by a Democratic administration until their votes—not their needs—counted enough.

Mr. Evans and Mr. Novak contribute their usual penetrating analysis of facts and faults, but there is one statement, through no fault of the writers, that I must take with a grain of salt. The columnists conclude that acceptance of the regional approach would doom the Area Redevelopment Administration. Logically this should happen, but knowing the logic of the New Frontier I would not bet on it. The article follows:

INSIDE REPORT—HOPE FOR APPALACHIA?

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

After 2½ years of sloganeering and fumbling, there are signs within the Kennedy administration of a realistic attack against the economic misery of the Appalachian region.

The signs of hope come from an unlikely source: the Department of Commerce building, a citadel of standpat bureaucracy. But on its fifth floor now is the headquarters for the new and still unpublicized Appalachian Regional Commission, headed by Under Secretary of Commerce Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.

In 1 month of actual operation, the Roosevelt Commission has quietly accomplished a doctrinal breakthrough in defining the problem as regional—not national, State, or local. It sees a special kind of sickness in the mountain country slanting from central Alabama up to northern Pennsylvania and including parts of Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, North Carolina, Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Georgia.

Though seemingly cheek-by-jowl with the great Eastern cities, the 12 million residents of Appalachia are really isolated from the rest of the Nation by bad roads, poor rail service, and inadequate airports. It is a hard country that sustains more than its share of physical battering. Its coal and other natural resources are depleted. It is plagued by a shortage of public facilities—sewers, dams, above all, schools. The average white man in Appalachia has 4 years less schooling than his fellow Americans.

If this sounds like some poverty-stricken banana republic or one of the new African states, it is more than coincidence. Indeed, Appalachia is an underdeveloped nation that would qualify for large chunks of foreign aid—if it were foreign.

But the Kennedy approach to the depressed areas has been redevelopment. The Area Redevelopment Agency offers businessmen subsidies to reactivate idle factory smokestacks and rundown tourist hotels. That might be the right formula for an old Massachusetts textile town, but it's absolute nonsense for Appalachia.

Its problem is development, not redevelopment. It has no idle smokestacks or rundown tourist hotels because industries and tourists never wanted to go there.

So, the agonizing migration from Appalachia continues—2 million since 1940. Barring a new approach, 3 out of 4 remaining Appalachians will be on the Government welfare dole by 1975.

To avoid this, the Roosevelt Commission's 30-man staff is writing a development plan putting first things first. Highways, for instance. They would be built not on the conventional basis of highest traffic but where development potential is biggest. This and other Federal aid would conceivably be coordinated by a new regional agency.

This might seem like a left-wing planner's dream that would be the toast of Washington but fought to the death in the provinces. In fact, quite the contrary is true.

The Appalachian regional concept originated not here but in Frankfort, Ky., on the staff of Gov. Bert Combs. During a recent swing through Appalachian State capitals, F.D.R., Jr., found nearly universal enthusiasm from governors—even Gov. Albert S. Harrison, of Virginia, a conservative Byrd Democrat.

The hostility comes from entrenched Washington bureaucrats, particularly in the Area Redevelopment Agency. The well-intentioned ARA, which has built a legend of ineptitude during its 2-year life, would be doomed by the new plan.

Moreover, the White House itself has a political stake in the existing depressed areas program—a big campaign issue for John F. Kennedy in 1960 and the first major program he won from Congress. Even today, the President's lieutenants are fighting hard for congressional approval of more money for ARA to spend on its questionable program.

Yet the fact that this administration is so politically oriented may turn out to be a godsend for Appalachia. The Roosevelt Commission was formed, in fact, because of administration apprehension over the anti-Kennedy tide in Appalachia (largely because of negrophobia by poor whites). If President Kennedy is going to cut his losses there in 1964, he may have to admit the failure of all his past efforts to save Appalachia and get solidly behind the new approach.

LEGISLATION DESIGNED TO PROTECT THE INTEREST OF AMERICAN TUNA FISHERMEN

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today is designed to protect the interests of American tuna fishermen while the State Department negotiates with nations that do not observe accepted international maritime law.

Specifically, it calls for the withholding each fiscal year, out of foreign aid funds for Central and South American countries, of $200,000 from each country which has at any time during the preceding fiscal year seized, inspected, detained or required the licensing of vessels of U.S. registry and engaged in fishing more than 3 nautical miles offshore.

The fund withholding would be waived for any country which assures the President that it will not harrass U.S. fishing boats by imposing the restrictions I have listed.

The owners of boats would be reimbursed for costs of detention by a foreign government. Coverage would include fines, inspection fees, port fees, license fees, and the costs of idling the vessel. Should the total payments due U.S. fishermen from any one country's set-aside surpass $200,000, the Secretary of State would be directed to pay the claims in full and report to Congress that the set-aside was inadequate.

This bill is intended to provide financial protection for our fishermen against the marauding agents of other countries which defy convention and accepted practices to prey on boats engaged in justified usage of offshore fishing waters. It is regrettable that the United States has failed to secure cooperation with several countries which persist in extending territorial rights as much as 200 miles out to sea. The Congress can correct this failure best by providing some form of insurance against petty piracy.

What this legislation proposes is that our payments to these nations be reduced by the amount they extract from our fishing industry people by pursuing policies of declaring the open ocean as national property. It is not my purpose to question the moral propriety of bestowing money on those who by their actions qualify as international delinquents. My bill is realistic. We can only hope that in the foreseeable future the United States will assert its moral character and deal firmly with those countries which disregard the rules of international conduct.

Since it has been repeatedly voiced by the State Department to representatives of the tuna industry and myself that we must be permissive and patient, that we must cajole and plead, that we cannot send U.S. naval protection for our tuna boats, the only protection available for this important U.S. food-producing industry is monetary.

Events of the past few months have illustrated the necessity of some legislation to deal with this problem. After much study, conferences with the industry, and receipt of the opinions of the State Department, I have formulated this legislation as the simplest, most complete and under existing circumstances, the best way to handle this difficulty. It has been demonstrated that our Government is helpless under present policies to prevent seizure, detainment, and fining of our fishing boats.

No country can claim discrimination under this bill, since no set-aside will be initiated if they agree to abide by the internationally recognized conventions of the sea.

I am hopeful that the House will act favorably on my amendment. Its enactment would set at ease the minds of owners and crewmen of ships which travel thousands of miles and brave the dangers of the sea to earn a living and provide an important segment of the Nation's food supply.

WHO SHALL FINGER THE NUCLEAR TRIGGER?

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, at the end of World War II's chaos, Europe was entirely dependent upon the United States economically. The rising tide of communism posed a security threat which also firmly fixed Europe in a position of dependence upon the United States militarily.

During postwar years the Marshall plan, pouring billions into European reconstruction, and the determination of the Europeans themselves turned the economic tide. Today Europe again is an economic giant and a formidable competitor of the United States in the world's marketplaces. America's vision of a strong, stable, united Europe as a necessary ally in blocking Communist expansion foresaw this competition and readily accepted it. The problems of peaceful competition in trade were calculated as minuscule compared with the military-economic benefits of Western cooperation against Red challenge.

The powerful potentialities of this foresight are revealed by comparing the following estimates of annual gross national production levels which will be achieved by the East and the West at the end of this decade:

Western Europe, $800 billion—United States, $740 billion; $1,540 billion versus Soviet bloc $630 billion.

Despite Europe's emergence from economic dependence upon the United States to full and equal partnership, it remains militarily dependent no less, and perhaps more, than in 1945. The existence of nuclear weapons and their unprecedented destructive capacity, and the enormous cost of developing and delivering them, has changed the ways in which nations deal with each other. Now nations must possess a credible and reliable nuclear deterrent before they can deal with each other according to the traditional methods of diplomacy.

Only the United States and the Soviet Union possess this deterrent. Europe does not. The security of every Western European has been and is dependent, in the last analysis, on the decision of one man, the President of the United States.

In 1513 Machiavelli discussed this general situation in an essay entitled "Of Auxiliary, Mixed and Native Troops." His parting advice to those who would retain their powers was this:

> I conclude then by saying that no prince is secure without his own troops, on the contrary he is entirely dependent on fortune, having no trustworthy means of defense in time of trouble.

During a press conference on January 14, 1963, Charles de Gaulle discussed it specifically and in modern context as follows:

> No one in the world—particularly no one in America—can say if, where, when, how, and to what extent American military weapons would be employed to defend Europe.

Formerly Europe's proud, dynamic and self-sufficient peoples have both controlled their own destinies and played a dominant role in world affairs. Their present subordinate role of military and diplomatic dependence on the United States is psychologically and politically intolerable to them. Moreover, whether openly expressed, as in the case of President de Gaulle, or by thought held naggingly in the mind, most Europeans doubt that Americans are really willing to risk nuclear destruction of New York or Los Angeles to save Paris or Rome. They intensely want to regain control over their own security and their former place in the sun.

Said more bluntly, Europe wants its own nuclear deterrent and the independence to play a distinctive role in the world apart from the two great powers. De Gaulle's France wants to lead such a Europe. Adenauer's Germany visualizes its Franco-German domination. Other nations look hopefully for a tight federation in which leadership would be shared by all.

Under whatever ultimate arrangements, however, Europe wants either its own independent nuclear forces or to have its own finger on the trigger of the American nuclear deterrent. A finger on the safety catch just is not enough. But America wants neither the proliferation of nuclear warheads, nor the proliferation of control over who fires U.S. warheads.

Understanding American fears of proliferation and their cause/effect relationship with the complex most Europeans have about not controlling their own destiny helps us see more clearly what lies behind the current conflict between Europe and America.

This is what fires European suspicion of American insistence that commitments for NATO conventional forces be met. It is looked on more as a move to divert resources away from nuclear developments than to forward the common defense. It has lead to suspicion that American interest in the Common Market and investment in Common Market countries are devices somehow calculated to prolong Europe's status as an American military protectorate. American protests that they are calculated to weld together more securely the free world economy are largely ignored. Other tensions, large or small, while not created by this basic nuclear dilemma, are made more difficult because of it.

Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy both have sought to bolster European confidence that the United States of today is far different from the United States of 1917 or 1940. Again and again in private talks and public speeches they have reiterated that the United States is sincere when it declares the inseparable interdependence of Europe and America in a nuclear world. On July 4, 1962, at Independence Hall in Philadelphia in the very shadow of the Liberty Bell, President Kennedy dramatically spoke of a "Declaration of Interdependence" between the United States and a united Europe. This was the theme of his recent trip to Europe.

On occasion both Presidents have sought to match such oratory with action and have involved the Treasury in heavy expenditures in token of good faith.

The Eisenhower administration deployed tactical nuclear weapons systems to NATO ground units. Supratactical nuclear bombs were deployed to NATO aerial strike squadrons. Jupiter and Thor nuclear-tipped missiles were deployed to Greece, Turkey, and Great Britain. In all cases, however, warheads remained in U.S. custody and control pursuant to provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and by stipulation their use was subject to joint control by the United States and the host country. To the Europeans, this was just another way of saying America still reserved until the last possible moment its final decision of just how interdependent it is with Europe. These exercises in deploymentship did little to assure Europeans that when and if the chips were ever down, New York and Los Angeles would be side by side with Paris and Rome.

The Kennedy administration thus far has taken no steps to move Europe's finger from the safety catch to the trigger. Despite a serious outflow of gold reserves it continues the heavy expense of maintaining 400,000 American soldiers and their families in Europe as an implicit guarantee of our commitment to interdependence. A token paper assignment of Polaris submarines to NATO's Supreme Allied Commander was made. Otherwise it has offered only more exotic, but equally unconvincing, variations on the Eisenhower administration theme of unadulterated U.S. veto of nuclear weapons use.

Two such variations emerged from the mishandled Skybolt missile cancellation with its severe embarrassment to the

Macmillan government. The Nassau Pact between Kennedy and Macmillan of December 1962, committed U. S. Polaris missiles, less warheads and less the submarines, to Britain and France. Accepted as a facesaving maneuver by the British, the offer was spurned out of and by France which possessed essentially a zero capability to provide the missing components for this weapons system.

Nassau also produced the idea of an interallied NATO nuclear strategic deterrent force. In May 1963, the NATO Ministerial Council meeting in Ottawa implemented the scheme which places under NATO Supreme Command 3 U.S. Polaris submarines, 180 British Vulcan bombers, and 72 light bombers with British warheads, and U.S. nuclear-armed jet fighter-bomber squadrons of Canada, France, Greece, West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy, and Turkey.

France refused to contribute any squadrons armed with French warheads and for reasons of pride in its own national deterrent, such as it may be, forbade designating the force as interallied. The Ministers left Ottawa without deciding on a new name. Aside from the inclusion of eight European NATO officers in United States-United Kingdom strategic target decisions at SAC headquarters in Omaha, the nameless agreement of Ottawa amounts to little more than another paper regrouping and reinforcement of the Alliance's nuclear-strike forces already available for the defense of Europe.

It did nothing to dispel the beliefs of many Europeans that the Atlantic Alliance is not an equal partnership because its real power is in the United States nuclear arsenal over which the United States intends to release not one iota of absolute control. Anticipating the failure of Ottawa, Kennedy administration planners exhumed an old ploy of Eisenhower administration planners calculated to lull Europeans into a feeling of full partnership. Late in January, Ambassador Livingston T. Merchant was sent to European capitals to sell it. It was the concept of a multilateral nuclear force.

The retreaded plans now called for 200 Polaris missiles to be carried by a fleet of 20 or 25 surface ships instead of submarines. Otherwise provisions for crews of mixed nationalities and multinational financing and control remain substantially the same. At the beginning the big difference, emphasized by Merchant, was that if Europeans wanted majority control on triggering the fleet's firepower rather than unanimity, the United States was prepared to discuss it. But on March 11 our State Department declared the United States would not give up its veto power.

This quickly earned the scheme a new name—"multilateral farce"—and rained down on it a new spate of roadblocks.

Elections in Italy created a weak, caretaker government even less enthusiastic about diverting funds and effort to the multilateral force than before. President de Gaulle majestically regarded the State Department action as no more than further confirmation of the infallibility of his prophetic power.

On April 6 Britain agreed to purchase 100 Polaris missiles for its submarine fleet and promptly thereafter expressed worries about its ability to manage a submarine building program and at the same time finance a 10-percent share of the $5 to $6 billion surface fleet's cost and a $200 million annual operating expense. Miscegenistic rumblings were heard from the Admiralty about "that mongrel American nonsense of mixing 'Eyeties' and 'Huns' and 'who knows what' aboard the same ship." Less salty reservations emerged elsewhere along Whitehall over Soviet reaction to West German participation. The American Vice Chief of Naval Operations, Vice Adm. Claude V. Ricketts, was dispatched to London to spread argumentative oil on these troubled waters, but no evidence of success of his mission is yet apparent.

Meanwhile, in Bonn, German Defense Minister Kai-Uwe von Hassel took dead aim at control arrangements for the mixed-manned fleet. He pointed out that creation of the new force would in no way dilute the effective American monopoly on nuclear power so long as each member nation has a veto on using the new nuclear force. He also pointed up another debilitating minum feature of the "one nation one veto" system by drumming home the probability that Labor leader Harold Wilson might quite soon have a veto as British Prime Minister. In that case, Von Hassel remarked, heavy investment in the new force would hardly be justifiable. To Germany deferral to a U.S. President's decision as the entrance fee for associate membership in the nuclear club is one thing, but the paralyzing effect of the leaden fingers of a dozen other first ministers on the same safety catch is quite another.

It is abundantly clear that these "multilateral," "inter-allied" and predecessor schemes do not make deterrent sense militarily in view of America's overwhelming nuclear power. Their purposes are political in the context of European-American relations. But they can make no political sense either unless they provide some transfer of the substance of nuclear control from American hands rather than merely its shadow.

That is the heart of the issue.

We have consistently refused to deal forthrightly with it. Rather, since the inception of NATO in 1950, we have sought by one means or another to dodge it. We may delay facing it again by declaring the "multilateral force" to be the "germ of a European deterrent" and keep it alive by nebulously offering to alter control arrangements when Europe is "truly united." But a problem postponed is not a problem solved. Nor does postponement inevitably bring opportunity for a wise solution. It sometimes loses the opportunity for any solution at all.

Largely these delays have been based on the misconception that facing the issue necessarily means abandonment of American atomic weapons monopoly as the basic philosophy of our approach to the nuclear age. This philosophy was jarred hard, but not jarred loose, by Soviet achievement of nuclear capabilities. It remains U.S. national policy today and is tightly held to by most liberals and conservatives alike, albeit for divergent reasons.

Actually, facing up to the issue does not necessarily imply abandonment of our policy against proliferation. Rather, facing it well may show that despite devisive effects on the Atlantic alliance, the advantage of a single Western finger on the nuclear trigger far outweighs other considerations. If so, a firm, understandable and possibly acceptable "No" can be given to European desires for a change based on the highest security interests of both Europe and the United States.

Contrarily, if facing and examining the issue minutely shows these security interests best can be served by a "Yes" answer, then it can be delivered to the Europeans simultaneously with firm, understandable and possibly acceptable reasons to the American people for changing their historic attitude toward proliferation.

Both time and events seem to be on the side of sounding a clear "Yes" or "No" without further delay. It is likely that continuing to mumble "Maybe," like the futile flattery of offering triggerless weapons, will get us nowhere.

It is my intention to discuss the proliferation question here raised at a suitable time in the near future.

NINTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LANDING OF AMERICAN TROOPS ON THE BEACHES OF NORMANDY

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, the 6th of June 1963 was a memorable day. We celebrated on that day the 19th anniversary of the landing of American troops on the beaches of Normandy in the greatest invasion of history. Out of that invasion came battle, and death, and destruction; and out of that invasion came hope, and life, and freedom. The black hand of Hitler had held nearly a whole continent in terrible oppression and out of the invasion of June 6 came the blows of destruction that delivered nations from the hand of Hitler into the hands of the people. It was called the longest day. It may well be the most memorable day in the cause of freedom and we remembered that day on June 6, 1963.

But June 6, 1963, is also a day to remember. On that day Hungary presented its credentials to the United Nations and they were accepted unanimously with the United States abstaining. On June 6, 1963, we remembered freedom in Normandy and we forgot freedom in Hungary. I will not recall to you the incidents of the Hungarian rebellion. The memory of that terrible oppression, that ruthless destruction of the finest flower of a captive nation, is too fresh in the minds of all of us. They did not win freedom and all we could pledge to them was a testament of faith in their cause by refusing to recognize in the United Nations the government that had called upon the brute power of the Soviet Union to crush the life and hope of its own people beneath the treads of Soviet tanks. We have voted against the recognition of this government by voting against its credentials in the United Nations every year since the massacre in Hungary took place. This year on the day most devoted to the memory of freedom in the 20th century, we chose to turn our backs on other freemen.

It is altogether fitting, therefore, that we should gather in this great Hall of deliberation to reaffirm to the people of Hungary and to all other peoples of the captive nations that we have not, in truth, forgotten them.

In many ways we have become guilty of affirming by inference what we deny directly. We have become so awed by the monolithic structure of Soviet imperialism that we have spoken of the countries they have overrun as if somehow they have become the proper property of Moscow. We have tolerated the voice of Moscow shouting against imperialism without constantly reminding the world that Caesar, Alexander, Napoleon, or Hitler never so firmly practiced ruthless imperialism as does Moscow today. We have permitted the Soviet Union to so propagandize the world that we scarcely raise a murmur of protest when Moscow speaks of the Ukraine as Russia. It is not Russia. It was the nation of the Ukraine long before the word "Russia" even existed in our language. We have permitted Moscow to speak of Byelorussia when it, too, was a people with its own language completely distinct from the Muscovite language long before the name "Russia" even existed. But, if we permit these things, then tomorrow we will have forgotten that Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia were nations and they will disappear into a faceless union called Russia. And, if all these nations with so many millions of people can be wiped from the world's conscience as nations, then where shall it stop? Shall Yugoslavia, or Hungary, or Bulgaria, or Rumania or the Slovak people, the Czechs or the Polish people—shall any of these endure if we permit a monster called the Soviet Union to eat up the world in small or large bites and to digest the world into "Russia?"

We are honoring today only a hope and a memory. But out of memory and out of hope comes faith, and out of faith comes the power to move the mountains. We look to the captive nations and we say to them "We know you, we remember you, we wait for you in the communion of free men. You cannot join us now but we will wait and time is on our side. We remember that you comprehend some of the fairest parts of the earth and some of the most civilized portions of mankind. We will wait until once more, in glorious freedom, you may speak again your own thoughts in your own tongue."

This we say to the captive nations, and in so saying we look with a new and terrible sadness upon another name added to the dismal roll of captive nations. I speak of Cuba. It is a terrible and fearful thing, after having watched the horror of the Soviet chains of slavery in Europe and in Asia, to see new chains forged of the same metal lying heavily upon an American nation only 90 miles off our own coast. We send the same message to the people of Cuba that we send to the people of Hungary and all the other captive nations. This year, though, we speak our message with even greater hope.

We have watched the power of the Soviet Union build the power of Communist China. Now they must live with their own monster. In the 19th century Karl Marx said, "The world is haunted by the spector of communism." Now, in the 20th century, we may say communism is haunted by the specter of communism. It is not love of capitalism that makes Khrushchev speak in the voice of conciliation and friendship. It is fear of his own creature. He watches China and her satellites nibbling away at all of Asia and he knows that over the mountains from China, in the great Siberian plains, is the nibble that China would find most digestible. We see Albania laughing in the face of Khrushchev and see Rumania standing aloof from his philosophy. We see the beginning of the breakup of the imperialism of Moscow and, in seeing it, we cry, "courage" to the captive nations. What appeared hopeless 5 years ago appears hopeful today. We will make this same cry for courage next year as we did last year. Only this year our grounds for hope are greater than ever in the past.

I am happy, therefore, to join my voice with the voices of my colleagues here on the floor of this great hall of deliberation and legislation. The total darkness of the past is now only a dim light on the edge of the horizon, but at least there is a light. I join with my colleagues today in crying to the captive nations, be they European or American, that freedom is not dead but, like a tired giant, is only sleeping in their lands. There is, however, a distant tolling of the bells of freedom whose peal will grow louder until the sleeping giant awakes and I tell them all, "Send not out to ask for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHNEEBELI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, it is very fitting that the fourth annual anniversary of Captive Nations Week be properly observed by all freedom-loving Americans, and that we all join together in rededicating ourselves to the cause of individual freedom and national independence, reaffirming our support of the millions who are victims of Communist tyranny.

A colossal monument to this tyranny, and to the failure of the Communist system, which cannot tolerate diversity and freedom, is the Berlin wall. Although the wall has checked the flow of refugees into West Berlin, cutting it back from several thousands daily to a mere handful of people who manage to scale the border fortifications or crawl under them, nevertheless, in the broader sense of blocking Western influence on the thinking, aspirations, and convictions of the East German people, the Communist regime has failed. At least 90 percent of the population is believed to be hostile to the Communist regime. Nor is this the only example of captive nations' opposition to Moscow's imperiocolonial rule.

This annual national observance of Captive Nations Week during the third week of July provides us with another opportunity to reemphasize the challenge which the captive nations pose for the free world. Again, on this occasion, we voice our continuing determination to help these peoples to achieve their goals of national self-determination and freely chosen governments.

BILLS WOULD CHANGE THE DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS IN UTAH TO NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, of the 30 national parks and 83 national monuments, the State of Utah has been blessed with 13 national parks and monuments, far more than our proportional share. Among the most beautiful and significant from the historic and geological standpoint are the Arches and Capitol Reef National Monuments in southwest and south central Utah. The Arches National Monument was established by Presidential proclamation in April of 1929, and encompasses some 53 square miles. It contains more natural stone arches, windows, spires, and pinnacles, than any other known area in the Nation. There are 88 arches within the boundaries of the monument and other beautiful and scenic areas, designated as Courthouse Towers, the Windows, Devils Garden, and Klondike Bluffs. The Devils Garden contains the Landscape Arch, 291 feet in length, and believed to be the longest natural-stone span in the world.

The Capitol Reef Monument was established in 1937, and contains 61 square miles and resembles domed capitol buildings, with a white Navaho sandstone cap. It was named Capitol Reef because of the resemblance to actual Coral Reefs of the sea. This area contains prehistoric Indian ruins of the Fremont Basketmakers, with the accompanying Indian art, petroglyphs, and engravings on the smooth walls of the cliffs.

Both of these areas are outstanding tourist attractions, and present an excellent opportunity for the citizens of the Nation to see the wonders of nature.

Many, however, neglect to take advantage of this opportunity, because the areas are designated as national monuments rather than as national parks, and the designation misleads them to erroneously conclude that the attraction is not worthy of their efforts to visit these scenic wonders. The Arches and Capitol Reef areas are deserving of designation as National Parks. They present scenic attractions, consistent with national park criteria, and I am now asking Congress to lend the prestige of national park status to both the Arches and Capitol Reef National Monuments. I have today introduced separate bills that would effect this objective.

INFLATION PRODUCES MAKE-BELIEVE GROWTH

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means is now engaged in studying language in preparation for writing a tax bill. In presenting his recommendations for tax cuts earlier in the session, President Kennedy stressed the theory that a tax cut without a cut in Federal spending is possible and that such a course presents no danger to the economy.

The White House economists, among them, Dr. Heller, are of the opinion that wealth can be created by spending and deficit financing and that a "little inflation" is not a bad thing.

Mr. Speaker, it is this kind of economic theory, which has been disproved time and time again, that threatens a strong and healthy economy in the United States. One of the worst possible evils to befall our people is inflation. Inflation cheapens our money, robs those who are least able to pay, the old, the retired, those on fixed incomes, and reduces the paycheck of every workingman and woman in this country. There is no good in inflation and no good can come of encouraging it and yet, the President and his economic advisers still attempt to convince the American people to the opposite theory.

The effect of "a little inflation" on economic growth is ably discussed in a series of lectures by Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, chief economist under the previous administration. The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of July 16, "Growth in Disguise" in an apt comment on Dr. Saulnier's argument against basing economic growth on the fallacy of a "little inflation."

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 16, 1963]

GROWTH IN DISGUISE

Is a little inflation the inescapable price of economic growth?

According to the economic fashion of the moment, the answer is yes, even though inflation is not always called by its right name. Certainly the view of Government economists appears to be that only inflationary fuel can sufficiently activate the economy. Otherwise they would hardly be advocating, as simultaneous policies, larger Federal spending, bigger deficits, monetary ease and tax cuts.

Now a strong dissent is entered to this whole notion that a certain amount of inflation must be tolerated in order to achieve greater growth. The argument comes from Raymond J. Saulnier, chief economist under President Eisenhower, in a series of lectures collected in book form and published by Fordham University Press as "The Strategy of Economic Policy."

Plainly an inflation can produce symptoms of growth, or at least of frenetic activity. But as Dr. Saulnier makes clear, these manifestations are all too likely to be illusory and to lead to the opposite of real growth. Stable purchasing power, far from being somehow incompatible with growth, is a condition prerequisite to the attainment of vigorous and sustainable growth.

The key words are vigorous and sustainable, taken together. If no one cares what kind of growth is being brought about, just so long as it is something which can be called growth, then we are engaged in an exercise so self-deceptive it should not commend itself to adult minds.

For what inflation designed to produce make-believe growth actually does is not only rob the people of purchasing power, with the penalties falling most heavily on those least able to protect themselves. That is bad enough. It also causes a whole train of economic distortions which can grow increasingly violent.

Even the expectation of inflation, Mr. Saulnier notes, may impel businesses to expand buying beyond current requirements and normal needs. This has the appearance of growth for a while, but when the inventory accumulation significantly exceeds sales requirements, the danger of recession arises.

In the same way, anticipated price increases may cause consumers to step up their immediate buying. Again the appearance of growth for a time, but again an economic depressant when the artificially stimulated demands finally slacken.

The distortions can get much worse. Under a deliberately inflationary policy, Mr. Saulnier observes, "a speculative fever may affect financial markets, as people seek to 'hedge' against inflation. But like a business inventory buildup or anticipatory buying, a speculative movement in financial markets contains within itself the seeds of its own eventual reversal. And the more widespread and rapid the movement, the greater the retreat and retrenchment that must follow in the corrective phase."

Whether or when the dismal process might be played out in reality depends on a number of circumstances, including how unrestrained Government policy is permitted to become. The arrival of inflation cannot be precisely predicted even when policy seems geared to its creation.

What is beyond doubt is that it is risky to play around with. In Mr. Saulnier's words: "It is a fact that all the world's experience with inflation, and all the dialog on the subject, has failed as yet to show that a broad and persisting decline in the value of money is a good thing, even when it happens inadvertently."

Government policies designed to preserve purchasing power are essential for genuine growth without dangerous distortions. Inflation cannot qualify, however it is justified or disguised. It is not the price of growth but an exorbitant price exacted for political indiscipline.

BEYOND THE COMMA IN THE FIRST AMENDMENT

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, a most thoughtful article entitled "Beyond the Comma in the First Amendment" has been written recently by Mr. P. H. Williams, of Santa Clara, Calif.

I consider Mr. Williams' article to be so unusual and noteworthy that I felt it should be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article follows:

BEYOND THE COMMA IN THE FIRST AMENDMENT

"I have always thought the actions of men the best interpreters of their thoughts."

What the Founding Fathers thought and meant is clearly revealed in what they did. Their actions interpret their thoughts with reference to the meaning of that first amendment.

In this matter of the attitude of our Government, our courts, and our institutions toward the Great Ruler of the universe, the time has come for reentry of the atmosphere of reason and documented facts, and to "examine things as really they are, and not to conclude that they are, as we fancy of ourselves, or have been taught by others to imagine."

The above quotations are from Locke's "Human Understanding," a work which undoubtedly influenced the thinking of the founders of this Republic. (John Locke—"One of the most influential thinkers of modern times." Century Dictionary.)

That it never was the intent or design of the Founding Fathers to erect a wall between this Nation and Almighty God becomes increasingly evident as we consider, step by step, their work of building this Nation and framing its institutions.

We hear a babel of voices quoting a half sentence of that first amendment: "Congress shall make no laws respecting the establishment of religion," but those same voices are strangely muted by the first comma in that short sentence. They hesitate, stumble, stutter, before the remaining words of that sentence, or they ignore them altogether. Beyond that comma the framers of that amendment wrote: "or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The amendment is one; its intent and purpose one. To contend that the framers of that amendment intended to erect an atheistic state, or to shut God out of our Government, our schools, our elections, and our daily intercourse is rank nonsense, unsupported by document, word, resolution, or act of the founders of this free Republic.

What manner of men were these Nation builders, these architects of our institutions? What they did will reveal most clearly what they meant. Their actions will interpret their thought. Consider the record of their words and work. Living in times of peril and danger, they staked their all, their lives, their fortunes, their honor, their families, their hopes, upon the issue of the struggle which they had inaugurated. They dared imprisonment, starvation, the rigors of winter campaigns with insufficient clothing and meager rations, the abuse of their families by foreign mercenaries, the unspeakable torture of savages sent against their undefended homes, the threat of transportation to and imprisonment and death in a nation across the seas. No threat that a powerful and unscrupulous king could hurl at them deterred them for one instant. Their watchword, their defiance of that king, their declaration of high purpose, "Liberty or death."

Such men are in earnest. They say, they do, they live what they mean. They move by the most direct path—directly toward their objective. Their footprints, their bayonets, their actions, their prayers move ever in a straight line—directly toward their objective. Mostly they were educated men conversant with the language of their day. They quoted freely from the classics and cited the lessons of history. They were articulate, emphatic, plainspoken, clear-visioned men with a definite goal, and a well-thought-out plan for reaching that goal. There was no deviation, no evasion, no subterfuge, no ambiguity; they said what they meant, and meant what they said. Neither the King of England nor the nations of the world found it difficult to understand their words or interpret their actions.

If we are in accord with them, if we would perpetuate that of which they dreamed, that for which they sacrificed, dared and fought, and that which they eventually established, we may know what they meant. We may read their ideals clearly in their words and deeds. Turn then to the record for a demonstration of what they meant, and of what they intended that the Constitution which they left us should mean in our day, and in the centuries to come.

The Mayflower Compact, signed at Plymouth, November 11, 1620, begins with the words, "In the name of God, Amen," and states as the object of their voyage, "For the glory of God and the advancement of the Christian faith."

In the Hartford Constitution, by the citizens of Connecticut, 1639, the first sentence attributes their present state to: "The Almighty God by the wise disposition of His divine providence"; and the Constitution declares their purpose, "To form an orderly and decent government established according to God."

The Virginia Bill of Rights, partly the work of Patrick Henry, declares, "All men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience"; and that, "It is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forbearance, love, and charity."

The Declaration of Independence, the cornerstone of our Nation and of our liberties, declares the aim, the hopes, the faith, the ideals of those heroic men who pledged to each other for its support, their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. That their purpose might not be questioned, nor their words misconstrued, they wrote into that document what they meant: "To assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal state to which the laws of nature and of nature's god entitle them—that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights—with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence."

The Articles of Confederation, forerunner of the Constitution, acknowledging dependence upon Divine Providence, declares: "And whereas it hath pleased the Great Governor of the world to incline the hearts of the legislatures we respectively represent in Congress, to approve of, and to authorize us to ratify said Articles of Confederation and perpetual union."

George Washington, in the immortal words of his first Inaugural Address, expressed the faith, the trust, and the gratitude not only of our first President, but of a nation: "My fervent supplication to that Almighty Being who rules over the universe, who presides in the councils of nations, and whose providential aids can supply every human defect, that His benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States a Government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes, and may enable every instrument employed in its administration to execute with success the function allotted to his charge. No people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the Invisible Hand which conducts the affairs of men more than those of the United States. Every step by which they have advanced to the character of an independent nation seems to have been distinguished by some token of providential agency."

In 119 printed lines reporting that address 33 lines or 27 percent are given to a discussion of God's providence with regard to America.

And President Washington closed his first Inaugural Address with a prayer that, "His divine blessing may be equally conspicuous in the enlarged views, the temperate consultations and the wise measures" of the future.

Seven and one-half years later, in His Farewell Address, his trust in "that Almighty Being", unshaken, his ideals of government unchanged, sensing that there might have been defects in his administration, he said: "Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evil to which they may tend.

Thomas Jefferson, in his first Inaugural Address, prayed for divine aid in these words: "And may that Infinite Power which rules the destinies of the universe lead our councils to what is best."

In his first Inaugural Address Andrew Jackson assumed the leadership of his country with this testimony to the hand of God in our national history: "A firm reliance on the goodness of that Power whose providence mercifully protected our national infancy, and has since upheld our liberties in various vicissitudes—that He will continue to make our beloved country the object of His divine and gracious benediction."

While England's historian, Edward Freeman of Oxford, was writing his to-be-monumental work, "Federal Government From the Foundation of the Achaean League to the Disruption of the United States" (publication begun in 1863 but aborted by the failure of the United States to disrupt), Abraham Lincoln faced the frightening problems of his day with the same deep reverence for, trust in, and reliance upon divine providence that sent Washington to his knees amid the snows of Valley Forge, and those 56 militant pioneers of a New World (the 56 Members of the Second Continental Congress, signers of the Declaration of Independence) to their feet to pledge, in support of that to which they had just set their names, their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor: "Intelligence, patriotism, Christianity, and a firm reliance on Him who has never yet forsaken this favored land."

In that brief but historic classic, the Gettysburg Address, he who was to be our first martyred President rededicated America to the ideals of its founders with those sempiternal words that America must never forget if we are to continue as a nation of free men and women: "This Nation under God."

The lives of these men exemplified their ideal of government. They lived the thing they wished to perpetuate. Their ideal of a government was that wherein every man could, should, and would do just what they themselves were doing, or striving to do.

They did not seek to deny to posterity, but to perpetuate and insure for all time, the right to invoke the blessings of Almighty God upon all and every branch of our Government, and upon all and every act, singly or collectively, of the citizens thereof. To protect this right, which they held to be divinely bestowed, they denied to Congress for all time the power to pass laws which would in any way, or to any degree, restrict or curtail such rights. To contend that they sought to deny to the citizens of this Nation the right to invoke God's blessing upon their deliberative assemblies of the future, while they themselves were calling upon Almighty God to guide and rule and prosper their acts, is to charge them with hypocrisy and the assumption of special powers and privileges which they sought to deny to those who should come after them.

To plead that the first 10 words of the first amendment were intended to forbid, for all time, to the citizens of this Nation the very acts that characterized the framers of that amendment, is to take a position untenable in the light of the facts of record; and to charge the framers of our national institutions with insincerity and deception.

The founders of this Nation invoked the blessings of God upon all their endeavors to establish a free nation. They called upon Him to rule their minds and guide their hands in all that they undertook; and to overrule and rectify any mistakes that they might make. They attributed to Almighty God the blessings which they enjoyed, the success of their efforts, the defeat of their enemies, the ordering of events during their national infancy; and they besought Him to continue to bless and guide and preserve this Nation, by His providence, through all the centuries to come. While their every act and thought and word and deed testified to their firm belief that the fortunes of America depended upon just such guidance by the hand of providence, it is unthinkable that they sought to eliminate from the future of their country that which they believed to be the source of its good fortune in its struggling early years.

These men being such as they were, and their words and acts being what they were, but one conclusion is allowable—that they attributed to devine favor and providence the good fortune of the Nation in their day; and besought and desired that future citizens throughout the ages should continue to call upon Him to whom they gave the praise for a land of freedom. That they sought to curtail, in any degree, or restrict such reliance and such appeals to God is absolutely unthinkable, and such position, if taken, untenable.

It needs but a glance at history to reveal that which they saw, and from which they were endeavoring to shield the infant republic—the "established church." They had seen England, Ireland, Scotland, as well as all Europe, weltering in blood, shed in the interest of an "established church." They saw the "established church" of England groveling before the throne of the ignorant, arrogant, superstitious, liberty-hating, reactionary advocate of human slavery, George III, and lauding to heaven that monarch for his domestic virtues, his piety, and his loyalty to the established church. They wanted none of it.

The established church, the state-supported church, meant to them injustice, oppression, curtailment of rights, a threat to their liberties. It had already gained a foothold in America. Massachusetts had a strict alliance between church and state, and had written it into the Massachusetts Bill of Rights in 1780. Prior to the Revolution, Virginia had the problem; "But the law of religious freedom having put down the aristocracy of the clergy, and restored to the citizen the freedom of mind," Jefferson could boast to Adams of Massachusetts that Virginia had put an end to that threat to her liberties.

Seeing the evils inherent in State-supported religion—the established church—the Founding Fathers were determined to eliminate such from America forever. Their formula for such a safeguard to our liberties was to forever deprive Congress of the power to legislate an "established church," while at the same time making the citizen forever free to exercise and practice and live his religion according to the dictates of his own conscience.

It devolves upon the objector to show proof that the founders intended to form an atheistic state, or to eliminate all mention of or appeal to God for guidance, protection, or for material blessings for or on behalf of the Government. Seeing what manner of men these founders of the Republic were, what they said, wrote, and practiced, and the freedom and sincerity with which they besought Divine help and guidance for the Nation, such proof will be hard to come by. But by the plainest rules of evidence the burden of proof devolves upon the objector.

Since Congress may enact no law legalizing, in any degree, an alliance between church and state, nor any law restricting to any extent the free exercise of religion, it follows, logically, legally, inevitably, that the courts may not rule any act of any citizen a violation of such law—if such law be presumed to exist. The province of the court is clearly limited to declaring such a law—if such ever be enacted—unconstitutional. Not the citizen, but the law in such case is on trial before the court.

The words and deeds of the framers of the Constitution constitute an avowal of a faith, a conviction, an ideal, a purpose, to the support of which they pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor; and the pursuit of which they maintained with energy and determination and singleness of aim while they drew breath. Any attack upon the status quo in their names may be effectively met and countered with a plea of estoppel by conduct. Cited decisions in both American and English courts provide ample support for such defense.

NOTES FOR THE NONLEGAL READER

The notation above is a reference to citation of cases in "corpus juris" (a body of law) a law library, volume 21, page 1060, and following pages.

Estoppel means that after a man has, by his own word, deed, act, or conduct admitted or represented certain things to be true, the law will not permit him to come into court and contradict himself in the matter. Emphasis is placed upon the fact that his conduct may constitute an implied representation of the truth of certain things. In such case the law will not permit him to deny that which his conduct implied to be true.

Of the framers of our Constitution we may write that their conduct constituted an implied representation of the truth of that which their words avowed. Their words and their conduct stand as grounds for estoppel of any claims, in their names, that they meant other than that which they repeatedly declared—that this Nation owes its existence and well being to the providence of Almighty God; and that it is the privilege, the duty and the right of every citizen to acknowledge his gratitude to God, to honor Him, and to beseech His continued blessing and providence on behalf of this Nation, even as the framers of the Constitution honored Him and besought His providence for posterity for all time.

If they were living today the law of estoppel would preclude the framers of the Constitution from coming into court and pleading a contradiction of that which their words and conduct avowed and implied to be true. And there is a maxim in law to the effect that what one may not do on his own behalf another may not do in his name, or as successor in interest.

THE BRACERO PROGRAM

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, now that Public Law 78, commonly called the bracero program, has been defeated, it becomes increasingly apparent as each day passes that California farmers will reduce their acreage of tomatoes, asparagus, melons, strawberries, and other highly seasonal labor crops. I have been in my congressional district on two occasions since the House refused to extend the bracero program and, without exception, the growers of these crops have announced their intention of reducing their acreages.

It is obvious that the production of these crops will move to Mexico, resulting in competition with U.S. growers.

The June 3 newsletter of the Council of California Growers shows that this trend has already begun. It says:

> Compare Mexico's production and export of the following crops in 1955 with their status in 1960 as an indication of a trend which might well continue to expand more:
>
> 1955, winter tomatoes, 45,674,000 pounds; 1960, 151,999,000 pounds.
>
> 1955, spring tomatoes, 15,847,000 pounds; 1960, 64,765,000 pounds.
>
> 1955 strawberries, 10,030,000 pounds; 1960, 31,388,000 pounds.
>
> 1955, spring cantaloupes, 3,831,000 pounds; 1960, 14,032,000 pounds.

Mr. Speaker, if this continues, and I predict that it will unless the House reconsiders its decision on Public Law 78, the economic impact on industries allied with farming and the wage earners in those industries will be serious indeed.

ECONOMY AND FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, every once in a while a constituent writes a letter which is deserving of the attention of the entire membership.

I recently received such a letter from Mr. Frank Frederick of San Jose, Calif., who writes an eloquent case for economy in government and fiscal responsibility. I submit Mr. Frederick's letter herewith and commend it to the attention of the Congress.

SAN JOSE, CALIF., *June 24, 1963.*

CHARLES S. GUBSER,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you in hopes I might help guarantee a future of some kind for my children and the generations to follow.

The President of our country encourages every child to complete high school and in addition further his career with a college education in order to cope with the higher learning needed in these times but, he neglects to say how we should fulfill this obligation. He most certainly isn't going to present my three children with a free 4-year scholarship. It will have to come out of my earnings—that is, if there is any earnings left. Unfortunately, my pocket has worn thin by the many hands reaching into it to their portion for every kind of tax conceivable.

Our national symbol, the eagle, should instead depict the hand (an open palm). Imagine what a perfect symbol this would make, Mr. GUBSER, a hand in every pay envelope for taxes; one knocking at every door for continually soaring taxes (like those here in Santa Clara County); a huge finger pushing the tax button on every cash register in the businesshouses; hands across the sea for unappreciated handouts, and extremely high Government spending to satisfy the whims of every high general or admiral and, why not, it is not their money and there is always more available each year or it is appropriated by yet another tax.

In the meantime, and reverting to the original reason for submitting these most appropriate articles and letter, my friends and I work hard (too many have found one person can't possibly do it alone). We scrimp and save, drive old cars, restrict our credit buying and live in cheap tract homes all in a vain effort to send our children to college so they can better cope with the world of tomorrow.

Mr. GUBSER, government spending must be curtailed. If I as a citizen can't afford something I must wait before I can buy. Why shouldn't our government follow our example for a change? Just as every sale is not necessarily a saving, neither is every expenditure a necessity, I'm sure. There are entirely too many articles appearing in newspapers and magazines that prove this. Articles like Ordnance spending millions to perfect a gun over a 20-year period that is no better than our M-1—the $560,000 tomb of General MacArthur—a $12,696 a year job for Governor Brown's son-in-law and it doesn't appear in the State budget; a $3,500 bathroom in Sacramento for Assembly Speaker Jesse Unruh (that is roughly one-third the cost of my tract home) and, finally, Mr. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL of New York enjoying public office at the taxpayer's expense with trips to Puerto Rico in the company of two women.

Mr. GUBSER, this cow is about ready to kick. We have been taxed until we are just about working for taxes. We need your help to enable us to give our children a better future. I would like to be able to pay their way but it isn't likely unless something is done to curb government spending. I want to save toward my children's education, not just exist from one paycheck to another with a roof over my head, a meal and a bigger tax bill at the end of each week, month and year.

In closing, I sometimes wonder if perhaps the educated people are the unfortunates and the backwoods people the truly blessed. Reading day after day, article after article, about some governmental faux pas and the "big spenders" indifference toward the reactions of the majority (the wage earners) has only created ulcers for most of us and a negative attitude toward every bill whether it has merit or not. There are still some who follow—enough who unfortunately can't comprehend even what they read and even still, those who are always going to be complacent and say nothing because they feel one person alone cannot make the necessary noise to arouse action and, it is safer if one fears reaction and a good sound argument. I do not fall into any of these categories. I am only exercising the mind God gave me and the freedom of speech guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. I hope, I have at least been able to express myself in an intelligent manner and that it will need no clarification.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Sincerely,

FRANK FREDERICK.

OUR BEST FOREIGN AID PROGRAM—BRACEROS

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Talcott] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, there may be no better foreign aid program than the Mexican bracero program which supplies American farms with necessary supplemental labor for peak harvest demands.

The bracero earns what he receives. This is the most wholesome and appreciated attribute of any assistance—whether for a child, an employee or a country. It is not charity, a handout, or relief.

It is, therefore, not demeaning like much of our conventional aid. It is upgrading. No other foreign aid program has so many advantages and so few disadvantages. The aid goes directly to those who need it most—the head of a poor Mexican family. The recipient family decides how the aid will be spent—food, clothing, shelter, medical services. None of it is filtered off or dissipated by employment agencies, brokers, government officials or administrative red tape. The family is not given packages with many things he does not need—he receives wages with which he can purchase freely what he needs.

This type of aid is in the true tradition of America—for those who still respect the puritan ethic. It rewards industry, effort and responsibility.

The family of the bracero knows exactly from whom the assistance comes. It does not dribble down from petty officers who claim the credit.

It is people to people—not people to government to government and finally to people, which is so debilitating and ineffective and useless.

A little direct aid through wages is many, many more times as beneficial as the conventional indirect aid. This small amount is an important part of the national income of Mexico. It is the least expensive of our aid programs to administer.

Some important aspects of the bracero program are seldom mentioned—perhaps not appreciated. The participants have done much to strengthen United States-Mexican friendship. There are few better techniques for developing mutual respect and understanding than "walking together, talking together, working together." We spend millions of dollars, profitably, on various exchange programs. The bracero program exchanges more than any other. They learn to love America and Americans by seeing America, by working with Americans.

These young Mexican men come from all areas of Mexico; they enjoy a unique opportunity to study the most advanced methods and modes of agriculture in the world; they take this knowledge back to the farms throughout Mexico and apply it to the benefit of themselves, their neighbors, and their country.

The braceros become our best ambassadors. With the Communist influence and infiltration into the Central Americas, we need all the ambassadors we can develop. Conversely, the withdrawal of these ambassadors can certainly damage our international relations and good will with Mexico and its people. Throughout Mexico, the people like the bracero program.

Naturally, we should make certain that foreign labor does not take the job of a single American. The bracero program assures this protection.

Do we have a better foreign aid program anywhere? If so, I would like to hear of it.

SUPPLEMENTAL LABOR HAS BEEN IMPORTED SINCE 1870

Mr. Speaker, some of our colleagues have suggested that the bracero program is, or was intended as, a temporary program. This is only partially true—and certainly not a valid argument against an extension of the very effective system for providing absolutely necessary supplemental farm labor.

Ever since the row vegetable crops became more productive than a single family could harvest, there has been a need for supplemental labor. The more productive the crops, the greater need for supplemental labor.

Unfortunately for the farmer, the agricultural laborer and the consumer, many crops mature at the same time. Even worse, low growing ground fruit and vegetable crops mature at approximately the same time as true, bush and vine growing crops. Because similar skills are required for the harvest of all crops, the laborer chooses the tree, bush and vine crops because the work is easier. Anyone who has worked in the harvest of crops will attest to this. Employment statistics, every criterion bears this out.

It has always been impossible to obtain adequate domestic labor at harvest time. Supplemental labor has always been necessary to harvest the row crops.

As early as 1900 Japanese nationals did the fieldwork at peak periods. Filipino nationals worked in the fields from 1920 until the Philippine Independence. Chinese nationals were the first—as early as 1870—imported supplemental fieldworkers. Mexican nationals have done the supplemental farmwork since 1917. After World War II, Mexican "wetbacks"—illegal immigrants—constituted the principal source of the agricultural supplemental labor. During all these periods all domestic agricultural laborers were fully employed.

Naturally, the illegal entrant caused many problems. The growers, the State Departments of Employment, and the U.S. Department of Labor concocted the bracero program which was approved by Congress in 1951 by Public Law 78, and extended thereafter until now.

Ever since 1870 supplemental labor has been imported. This is one of the most permanent necessities of California agriculture. It is not temporary.

Importation of foreign labor was not started by Public Law 78—the importation was simply formalized and governmentally administered. Public Law 78 is self-terminating—in this respect only it is temporary. Public Law 78 clearly and wisely provides that there shall not be a single bracero imported if there is sufficient domestic labor. Public Law 78 also wisely provides that if a single domestic wants a job held by a bracero he gets it, the bracero can be "bumped."

As soon as a better solution is devised, as soon as a sufficient supply of supplemental labor can be furnished, the bracero program will be automatically terminated. Until a better solution is devised, is it fair, reasonable or practical to terminate a program upon which our most important industry has depended for more than 90 years?

THE PARADOX IN MAN'S QUEST FOR PEACE

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, since the advent of the cold war, the peoples of the world have seen the proliferation of terrible weapons of mass destruction. The failure of the major world powers to negotiate a nuclear test ban treaty has been a disillusioning experience. Happily, however, in the Moscow talks which opened this week we now have a new opportunity.

As I pointed out yesterday, we are indeed fortunate to have as our representative at the talks a man who, perhaps more than anyone in the world, understands the Russian mind, Governor Harriman.

In our own midst we have an esteemed colleague—and a dear friend of mine—the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Gallagher] who is extremely knowledgeable in the field of foreign affairs. A member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, he and I were cosponsors of the legislation which created the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and last year, like myself, he attended the Geneva Disarmament Conference.

Writing in the July 14 issue of the Newark Star Ledger, our colleague has brilliantly described what he calls the Paradox in Man's Quest for Peace. The current meeting in Moscow may well determine whether our civilization will continue in its present form. Because of the intrinsic importance of the meeting and because so few in this group may have been privileged to read the article, I would like at this point to include it in the Record and commend it to the attention of my colleagues and all who may read the Record.

The Paradox in Man's Quest for Peace

(By Representative Cornelius Gallagher)

Since the day when man possessed no weapon more deadly than the club, he has harbored a strong desire to live in peace. In his ingenuity, however, and despite his yearning for peace, he has advanced his weaponry to a point where he now possesses a capability to destroy his world.

Yet, his desire for peace has grown stronger.

This is perhaps the great paradox of history. Peace has escaped him and, as President Kennedy recently pointed out, world history records more periods of war than of peace.

As man has improved the devices of destruction from the club to the ICBM, his world has become vastly more complex, the problems and differences of nations have been compounded to a point of seeming to elude solution or settlement.

In this nuclear age, man in his quest for peace seeks first to control the devastating weapons he possesses and eventually to destroy them before they destroy him. In the United States this effort is formalized in the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency which is charged with carrying out what is unquestionably the least understood, most frustrating, and many would say, the most hopeless program in Government.

Another high-level try to bring about a ban on nuclear testing gets underway in Moscow tomorrow. The United States will be represented by Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman. This is perhaps the most trying diplomatic mission ever handled by Mr. Harriman, a man of vast experience in government and international affairs.

Having dealt with the Russians during World War II and later as our Ambassador in Moscow, he is probably the best equipped man in Government to seek a workable treaty on a test ban.

Consider again the paradox. As we develop and produce evermore deadly weapons and improve upon an already effective system by which to deliver them, we seek more earnestly a means to end the arms race—to totally disarm all nations.

Unless we succeed in this effort, the globe in our time may be just another charred and pocked planet idling through the heavens, devoid of life.

Yet to many disarmament is a "pie in the sky," an impractical and unrealistic effort, seeking an unattainable goal.

To others, disarmament is a dastardly scheme to have the United States unilaterally throw down its arms and deliver itself up to the mercy of the Communists.

To sell the American people on disarmament at a time when our own defense expenditures are soaring higher than ever before in peacetime is difficult enough in itself. To convince them, as President Kennedy seeks to do, that we must actively pursue disarmament at a time when a potential enemy, the Soviet Union, continues to allot the vastly greater portion of its total resources to building a more powerful armed force designed to annihilate us is next to impossible.

It is difficult for us to be genuinely concerned with disarmament when by instinct our attention centers on our own security and that of our families and our country from nuclear attack.

But, as the President made clear in his recent American University address, "we must * * * persevere in the search for peace in the hope that constructive changes within the Communist bloc might bring within reach solutions which now seem beyond us."

There is the thought, perhaps hope is a more apt word, that Communist leaders will agree to disarmament once they are convinced that total nuclear war would leave them no world to rule and the only practical means of achieving world domination is psychological and subversive warfare, techniques in which they excel.

If this reasoning should lead to disarmament, we and other freemen then would have to rely solely on our arsenal of moral courage, intelligence, and patriotism. These are the counterweapons to subversion.

Unfortunately, the approaches to disarmament are blocked at many turns by misunderstanding and fear; by the military who sense only the dangers of arms reduction and oppose even nuclear test bans. There are those who permit concern for the economic impact of curtailment of defense industry and resultant loss of employment to shadow their thinking.

Disarmament proposals are targets of opportunity for the merchants of fear and they make the most of them. Right wing elements of all shades cry out against disarmament and warn of the turnover of military power to a United Nations Army.

The President said in his American University address that world peace is a topic "on which ignorance too often abounds and the truth is too rarely perceived." Ignorance breeds fear as the peddlers of fear well know.

For many practical reasons we must continue the pursuit of disarmament, perhaps the most important being that the subject of disarmament is the most effective means of keeping open a communication channel with the Soviet Union.

While the discussions at Geneva are tedious and exasperating, they are, nevertheless, the gauge by which we constantly check the temperature of the cold war. Frequently there we are able to halt its upward pressure.

We perhaps would do better in many ways if we were to separate the term "arms control" from disarmament. The latter to any reasonable man, even though he may be carrying a placard to "ban the bomb", is a distant hope. But arms control is a more immediate, a more tangible objective. It is, in fact, an area in which some progress is being made, the best example being the "hot line" telephone, referred to in Geneva as the purple phone, that, we hope, will soon connect the White House and the Kremlin. The building-in of safeguards against the premature or accidental firing of nuclear weapons is certainly a form of arms control.

Indeed, talk itself between representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States is a form of arms control.

While it might be well to separate the two—control and disarmament—in our thinking, they are inseparable in fact. Control is a first step towards disarmament. A ban on nuclear testing would be a control that might well be extended to other weapons.

Any genuine agreement on nuclear testing would be attainment of a plateau from which we could more hopefully and more effectively pursue the disarmament goal.

The United States recognizes that any move towards disarmament must be gradual and that arms control is the first phase. Our negotiators in Geneva have been talking about the basics of arms control which hopefully would limit the intensity of the arms race and reduce the risks of accidental war, which are quite real. So, in effect, we have, consciously or otherwise, separated control from disarmament at this stage of negotiations. While the most immediate matter at the Geneva conference table is the test ban, the primary long range goal of the Western Powers remains general and total disarmament.

The plan for total disarmament has been well publicized, but it remains for many a fearsome and dangerous plan. Unquestionably, the ignorance of which the President spoke is the cause of such fear.

Any agreement on disarmament, of course, must provide for inspection and verification. It must be designed so a balance of force is retained during the phaseout period to assure that no nation would at any time have a military advantage over another in proportion to present capabilities.

But, the President conceded, there would be some risk involved no matter how many safeguards may be built into an agreement. The question is which is the greater risk—the consequence of an unbridled arms race that is bound to consume the world or the possibility of cheating on a disarmament agreement?

In this vein, the President warned, "Our hopes must be tempered with the caution of history * * * but with our hopes go the hopes of mankind."

When we speak of all men, we exclude none. Any disarmament agreement must encompass every nation. It would be one thing to bring about accord between the Soviet Union and its satellites and the Western countries, but what of that restless and aggressive giant of the East—Red China. It is part of the all.

How do we approach a country that will one day be a nuclear power but is not even a member of the United Nations and which differs so violently even with its own Communist allies?

Can man's yearning for peace overcome so much?

At some future date there will be a proliferation of nuclear weapons among many nations, large and small. At that time capability to wage nuclear war will no longer be limited to the two great powers of the world. If the world is not to be incinerated in our time or in our children's lifetime, a working disarmament agreement must be achieved. Even if this situation were not to be, surely both the United States and the Soviet Union cannot extend an arms race ad infinitum, each year spending more of their resources in the drive for total destructive capability.

The search for peace is no idle dream when we view the alternative in its proper perspective.

Although peace is an issue over which we tend to become emotional in one form or another, the President in his university address was not emotional. He was, as usual, logical. He spoke of the world's problems as being manmade and therefore subject to man's solutions. No problem of human destiny, he said, is beyond human beings. He said he was not referring to "the absolute, infinite conception of universal peace and good will of which some fantasies and fanatics dream." He urged that we focus instead on "a more practical, more attainable peace—based not on a sudden revolution in human nature but a more gradual evolution in human institutions—on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements."

Reduced to its simples form, the control and disarmament program is just that—a proposed series of phased actions and agreements that would over a period of years reduce the arsenals and military forces of every country; to leave, finally, only internal security units. As the weapons and troops of the individual nations were reduced, the military force of the United Nations would be increased.

Disarmament as a plan is so simple and so worthy, but man and his world are so complex.

Twice in his university address, the President warned that we must "persevere" in our search for peace. To do otherwise would be to abandon ourselves and the world to an alternative no words can describe.

It would be to abandon ourselves to a fate that seems preordained with only the time uncertain. A fate that demands the extinguishing of all life on this planet unless man uses the same intellectual resources in the search for peace that he has so greatly developed in his search for extinction.

IS THE BRACERO PROGRAM BENEFICIAL TO MEXICO AND TO MEXICAN WORKERS?

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, this House has often been told that the bracero program is beneficial to Mexico and to Mexican workers; I submit that this is not necessarily the case.

The Agency for International Development neither approves nor disapproves of the bracero program as a means of getting capital into Mexico. This means that there is a clear doubt as to the value of this program as a foreign aid device.

Furthermore, there is serious doubt that the program does Mexican workers much good. In a July 12th speech, Senator Fidel Velasques, of Mexico, blasted the bracero program. Senator Velasques knows what he is talking about; he is president of the Federation of Mexican Workers—and that organization has 2½ million members.

I include a newspaper account of Senator Velasques' speech:

[From the Corpus Christi (Tex.) Times, July 12, 1963]

MEXICAN BLASTS BRACERO PROGRAM—"EXPLOITATION" CONDEMNED IN SPEECH TO LABOR LEADERS

NUEVO LAREDO.—Senator Fidel del Velasques, of Mexico, speaking before a delegation of some 50 local labor leaders here, strongly criticized the bracero labor program and "exploitation of Mexican labor by some U.S. border businessmen."

The delegates were representatives of the 2½-million-member Federation of Mexican Workers of which Velasques is also president.

The Senator told the delegation, all of whom were from the Mexican State of Tamaulipas, that his organization is against Mexican citizens leaving the country to work in other parts of the world, specifically the United States.

He said the federation has always opposed the bracero program as well as what he called the exploitation of cheap Mexican commuter labor by some U.S. labor interests along the border.

"As long as the U.S. Government continues to issue visas to these people," Velasques told the delegation, "your problems will never be solved."

Velasques said he favored a planning conference between United States and Mexico labor leaders to discuss mutual problems. He particularly emphasized the need for international talks between the two nations concerning the bracero commuter situation along the border.

He repeatedly said, "I deplore the exploitation of cheap Mexican labor by some businessmen in U.S. border towns," and that the Federation of Mexican Workers has no control over this outflux of work-seeking citizens because they are not organized.

He did say, however, he was pleased over the recent announcement that the U.S. State Department has established new visa requirements for Mexican civilians seeking permanent residency in the United States under the new visa, those seeking residency based on job offers to come to the United States to work must have certification that the job is available and that no local labor can fill the position.

The requirement also states that bringing foreign labor into the area must not adversely affect local working conditions and wages. This, said Velasques, makes it more difficult for Mexican citizens to come into the United States to work.

The Senator also told the labor delegates that their representatives in Washington should insist on enforcement of existing labor laws applying to Mexican commuters.

"Just as we follow our laws in the field of labor," he stated, "the U.S. Government should stick to its own laws."

Under Mexican labor laws, no American citizen is allowed to enter Mexico to seek employment.

A CONGRESSIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE COUNSEL, ALONG THE LINES OF THE SCANDINAVIAN OMBUDSMAN, TO HELP CONGRESSMEN HELP CONSTITUENTS

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced for appropriate reference H.R. 7593, a bill to set up an Administrative Counsel as an agent of the Congress, to help Congressmen help their constituents in their relations with the bureaucracy.

The bill directs the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate to appoint, as an officer of their respective bodies, an Administrative Counsel "without reference to political affiliations and solely on the basis of his fitness to perform the duties of his office. His salary shall be at the top level of $22,500 a year, and appropriations are authorized for a necessary staff. While the 2-year constitutional life of the House requires a reappointment at 2-year intervals, it is anticipated that the Administrative Counsel would be repeatedly reappointed, and would thus have tenure comparable to that of the Comptroller General.

The duties of the Administrative Counsel would be to help Congressmen help their constituents in a variety of cases which are the traditional subjects of congressional-constituent relations—social security, Veterans' Administration, treatment and discharges in the military services, claims of discrimination in Government contracts, civil service matters, and so on.

The area of the Administrative Counsel's interest consists of departments, agencies, or instrumentalities of the United States generally. Specifically excluded are the President, the Congress and its employees, the Federal judiciary, the District of Columbia, and "any other officer or employee of the United States whose activities are of such a nature that, in the discretion of the Administrative Counsel, the application of this act thereto would be contrary to the public interest."

Though the Administrative Counsel would be an agent of Congress in much the same manner as the Comptroller General, his jurisdiction would not extend to matters included within the Comptroller General's, such as the legality of governmental expenditures.

In order that there be no impairment of the present congressional-constituent relationships, the offices of the Administrative Counsel can be invoked only by a Member of either House. When requested by a Member, the Administrative Counsel "shall review the case of any person who alleges that he believes that he is being subjected to any improper penalty, or that he has been denied any right or benefit to which he is entitled, under the laws of the United States, or that the determination of award of any such right of benefit has been, is being, or will be unreasonably delayed as a result of any action or failure to act on the part of any officer or employee of the United States."

The Administrative Counsel will then look into the controversy, either on the basis of the material submitted, or on the basis of a full investigation. All governmental officers and employees are required to give the Administrative Counsel full information, and access to any books and records.

The Administrative Counsel, after completing his investigation, "shall report his conclusions and recommendations, if any, to the Member by whom the claim was referred." If the Administrative Counsel's recommendation is one in favor of the constituent, in many instances the erring administrative agency would have rectified the matter in the course of the investigation. If the error has not been rectified, the Member would undoubtedly wish to transmit the Administrative Counsel's recommendations to the agency concerned, with his own request for remedial action.

My guess is that an administrative agency would be more likely to respond to a Member's request for relief accompanied by the Administrative Counsel's recommendation than if the Member's request were not so accompanied. A Member's request, by itself, can sometimes be laughed off as "political pressure"; this would be more difficult to do if it were accompanied by the objective findings of a quasi-independent Administrative Counsel.

The Member need not refer a matter to the Administrative Counsel at all, but may handle it himself as at present. Moreover, if he does refer a matter to the Administrative Counsel, and the Administrative Counsel uphold the administrative agency rather than the constituent, the Member may always, if he wishes, pursue the matter further on his own.

Finally, the Administrative Counsel is directed to make annual reports to the House and Senate, summarizing his activities, and making recommendations for additional legislation or further investigation as he may deem appropriate.

The Administrative Counsel created by H.R. 7593 is an adaptation to American conditions of the highly successful Ombudsman device, which has been operating in Sweden since 1809. Finland has had an Ombudsman since 1919. Similar offices were created in Japan in 1948, in Denmark in 1955, and in Norway and New Zealand in 1962. The Ombudsman has become a most successful adjunct of democratic government.

In my remarks here on February 11, 1963—Congressional Record, pages 2193–2199—I included material setting out fully the history and account of the Ombudsman in other countries. At that time, I threw out the suggestion that an adaptation of the Ombudsman might be well suited to our American institutions. Since then I have received hundreds of letters from around the country supporting the suggestion, including dozens from some of our leading political scientists. I offer H.R. 7593 therefore, with the hope that it will stimulate discussion, obtain hearings, and ultimately lead to an improvement in our legislative-administrative practices.

The purposes of the Administrative Counsel set up by H.R. 7593 are four:

First. To free Congressmen for decisionmaking legislative duties. We of the National Legislature are increasingly conscious of the time we and our staffs must spend on performing needed services for constituents. Staffs have been increased in recent years, but every colleague I talk to tells me that the burden of administrative work has increased even more. As long ago as 1940 Congressman Luther Patrick described a Congressman's duties:

> A Congressman has become an expanded messenger boy, an employment agency, getter-out of the Navy, Army, Marines, ward heeler, wound healer, troubleshooter, law explainer, bill finder, issue translator, resolution interpreter, controversy oil pourer, glad hand extender, business promoter, convention goer, civic ills skirmisher, veterans' affairs adjuster, ex-serviceman's champion, watchdog of the underdog.

Our former colleague, Representative Burr P. Harrison, of Virginia, said in a 1962 newspaper interview:

> The various activities of Congress are in progress at the same time, like a three-ring circus. If one duty is to be done properly, it is likely another must be content with a lick and a promise.
>
> Committees sit as the floor debate proceeds and constituents wait in the office. A Member busy in committee will be summoned by the bells to vote on the floor on a measure as to the merits of which he knows little, if anything, and as to the controversial aspects of which he has heard no debate.
>
> A Member occupied on the floor or in his office will hurry to committee to propound a series of questions to a witness on points which the witness has discussed fully prior to his arrival. * * * In general, no one knows this week what Congress is going to do next week. * * * [This] is an intolerably vexatious, inefficient management of the time of its Members.

The assistant majority leader of the Senate, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, in an April 7, 1963, New York Times magazine article, pointed out that "many Members of the Senate and the House spend up to 90 percent of their time—and the time of their staffs—answering mail, meeting with constituents and handling individual constituent complaints or requests." He went on to say:

> In 1949 I moved into an office of four rooms. My staff and I had the use of two telephone lines. An average of 50 letters a day were received. Thirty telephone calls a day were considered heavy. A personal visit to the office by a constituent on any day was a special event. In 1962, my office had doubled to eight rooms. Now, 12 telephone lines funnel an average of 500 calls into the office each day, and I keep two private lines just to be sure I will be able to get through the crowded switchboard to reach my staff. One hundred and twenty personal visitors—not counting large groups of students or tourists—come into the office each day, about half of them constituents from my home State.

While the administrative burden on Congress has been thus increased, the challenge of the Member's primary task—that of legislating—has likewise become greater. A Member today must be informed about details of the national economy and of international affairs which were undreamed of a few years ago.

The perceptive reporter for the Washington Star, David S. Broder, recently suggested a reason for much of the criticism we hear of our performance of duties as legislators and educators:

> Congress operates now very much as it has throughout its history.
>
> What has changed is the amount of time, energy, and brains Congressmen can devote to the tasks of devising legislation and overcoming the build-in obstacles to its enactment. The main reason, I suggest, that Congress does not legislate better is simply that most Congressmen can no longer afford to regard legislation as the most important part of their jobs.
>
> Indeed, many of them find it very difficult to sandwich legislative work into the busy schedule of what they describe—correctly—as their more important functions.
>
> Most Congressmen find the pleasures of their work lie mainly in the legislative world, in the personal relationships between competitors and cohorts in the insiders' world of Washington influentials, a world where strength and shrewdness, wit and will are savored as much as wealth in Dallas.
>
> But pleasurable as his life in the insiders' world may be for the Congressman, his job security and his political future depend chiefly on how well he serves the residents of the outsiders' world—the people of his State or district. Cultivating his relationship with them must be given first priority, no matter what his personal tastes dictate and no matter what the critics of Congress may think.
>
> The plain fact is that a man's legislative work is commonly a matter of indifference—if not outright suspicion—for his constituents. What can hurt politically is the charge that he has failed to look after his district. Neglect of correspondence, of constituent services or of vital local needs lies behind the defeat of a vast majority of those few in Congress who fail of reelection.
>
> There is no sense mourning the fact that the Congressman's constituent-service role is interfering ever increasingly with his work as a legislator. It is the inevitable result of the changes that have taken place in our society and Government in the past 175 years.
>
> The Founding Fathers knew the conflict would exist, but they misjudged the dimensions of the problem. In Federalist Paper No. 56, Madison recognized that the Congressman sought to be acquainted with the interests and circumstances of his constituents. But in a simple society under a government of limited powers, this requirement, he believed, could easily be met.
>
> "This principle," he argued, "can extend no farther than to those circumstances and interests to which the authority and care of the Representative relate. An ignorance of a variety of minute and particular objects, which do not lie within the compass of legislation, is consistent with every attribute necessary to a due performance of the legislative trust."
>
> The increase in our population, the growing complexity of our economy and the proliferation of government functions have made it far more burdensome than Madison ever dreamed for the Congressman to define and defend "the interests and circumstances of his constituents"—to serve as a mediator between them and their Government. This function is consistently undervalued by critics of Congress, particularly those who are Washington-based, who fail to comprehend the gulf between the constituencies and the capital.

With the Administrative Counsel, the Member could still remain in complete control of constituent relationships. But he would be able to delegate a large part of the backbreaking bulk of administering their relationships with the bureaucracy. The Member would retain the beginning and the end of a case—receiving the complaint, and telling the constituent the result. He would be relieved of much of the middle—determining the facts upon which the claim of injustice is based.

Of course, the mere setting up of an Administrative Counsel would not cure the heavy administrative workload of the average Member. Other reforms—home rule for the District of Columbia, the joint scheduling of committee hearings, better scheduling of floor action—are also needed.

Second. To assist the private citizen in his relations with his government. One of the reasons why so much of the Members' time now needs to be devoted to constituent-executive branch relationships is that the private citizen is frequently lost in his dealings with big government. An Administrative Counsel would centralize and professionalize the handling of most of the casework now done in 535 congressional offices. Dozens of different specialties frequently recur in constituent-executive branch relationships. No one congressional office can afford to maintain a true expert in each one of them. Much time is wasted by individual staff members who lack expertness in a particular subject, and thus cannot talk on an equal basis with the executive branch. Centralizing the operation in the Office of the Administrative Counsel would permit specialization, just as has been done by the Comptroller General in the General Accounting Office.

Third. To economize on the cost of maintaining congressional offices. The number and salaries of Members' staffs have gone up steadily in recent years. Today, a Representative can have as many as 10 staff members in his Washington office, a Senator as many as 30. Senatorial office space has recently been increased, and on the House side Members will soon have three, rather than two, offices. All of this presents endless new costs to the taxpayer. Setting up the Office of the Administrative Counsel could permit the leveling off of staff increments, and achieve efficiently on a centralized basis what is now often done inefficiently on a decentralized basis.

Fourth. To recommend measures to eliminate the root causes of constituents' difficulties with the Federal administration. A single defective law or administrative procedure may be the cause of hundreds of difficulties between citizens and the Federal bureaucracy. But with the complaints being funneled into 535 separate congressional offices, it may not be recognized that a vast amount of casework has a single source. The Administrative Counsel, on the other hand, would gain an unique insight into the cause of citizens complaints and could easily spot the sources of recurring problems. In his reports to Congress, he could recommend steps to eliminate part of the growing volume of casework at its sources.

The text of H.R. 7593 follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Administrative Counsel Act".

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the increasing complexity of the Federal Government has created difficulties on the part of private citizens in dealing with the Government, that there is a clear need for the Congress to be informed of the nature of such difficulties, particularly those of a recurrent nature, in order that remedial legislative action may be taken, and that, under existing procedures, such information is only sporadically available and frequently is inadequately developed or fails entirely to reach the appropriate legislative committees. The Congress further finds that the necessary and proper efforts of its individual Members to deal with these problems have increasingly become so burdensome as to constitute a serious impediment to the discharge of their other legislative duties.

SEC. 3. (a) There shall be an officer of the Senate and House of Representatives who shall be known as the Administrative Counsel of the Congress and shall perform such duties as are prescribed by this Act. He shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate, without reference to political affiliations and solely on the basis of his fitness to perform the duties of his office, for a term which shall expire upon the commencement of the Congress succeeding the Congress during which he was appointed, except that he may continue to act during such succeeding Congress until he has been reappointed or his successor has been appointed. He shall receive a salary at the rate of $22,500 per annum.

(b) Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Administrative Counsel may appoint such assistants, clerks, and other personnel as may be necessary to carry on the work of his office.

SEC. 4. Upon the request of any Member of either House of Congress, the Administrative Counsel shall review the case of any person who alleges that he believes that he has been subjected to any improper penalty, or that he has been denied any right or benefit to which he is entitled, under the laws of the United States, or that the determination or award of any such right or benefit has been, is being, or will be unreasonably delayed, as a result of any action or failure to act on the part of any officer or employee of the United States other than those exempted under section 6 of this Act. The Administrative Counsel may, in his discretion, confine his review of the case to the material submitted to him with the request for review, or may make such further investigation as he may deem appropriate. Upon the completion of his review, he shall report his conclusions and recommendations, if any, to the Member or committee by whom the claim was referred.

SEC. 5. All officers and employees of the United States, except those exempted pursuant to section 6, shall furnish to the Administrative Counsel such information regarding their activities within the scope of their official duties or employment as he may require of them, and the Administrative Counsel, or any of his assistants, when duly authorized by him, shall, for the purpose of securing such information, have access to and the right to examine any books, records, files, or other documents, and the right to consult directly any officers or employees of the United States without securing the permission of their superiors.

SEC. 6. (a) This Act shall apply to all officers and employees of the United States except the following:

(1) The President;

(2) Members, officers, and employees of the Senate, the House of Representatives, or any committee or joint committee thereof;

(3) Judges, clerks, commissioners, referees in bankruptcy, and other officers (other than attorneys as such) and employees of any court of the United States, regardless of whether such court is legislative or constitutional;

(4) Officers and employees of the District of Columbia or any other local governmental unit not under the supervision or control of some other department or agency of the United States; and

(5) Any other officer or employee of the United States whose activities are of such a nature that, in the discretion of the Administrative Counsel, the application of this Act thereto would be contrary to the public interest.

(b) For the purposes of this Act, the term "officers and employees of the United States" includes officers and employees of any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States.

SEC. 7. (a) The Administrative Counsel shall make an annual report to the Congress. Such report shall summarize his activities, shall include reviews of those individual cases which, in his judgment, should be brought to the attention of the Congress, and shall set forth such recommendations for legislation or further investigation as he may deem appropriate.

(b) The Administrative Counsel may, in his discretion, make an interim report on any occasion when he deems such action appropriate to carry out the purpose of this Act.

(c) Any report of the Administrative Counsel pursuant to this section shall be printed as a public document.

CANAL ZONE TERRITORY: PANAMANIAN CORRIDORS THROUGH U.S. JURISDICTION

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr Speaker, as all students of geopolitics have long recognized, the Isthmus of Panama, being a crossroads of the world, is a sensitive spot. Though significant developments about the Panama Canal are seldom reported adequately in the mass media of our country, there is seldom a ripple affecting the Panama Canal that I do not quickly learn about it from one source or another.

For example, one of my constituents sent me a very brief but significant news story filed on April 26, 1963, at Panama advising about a Panamanian ultimatum to the United States concerning current diplomatic discusssions between Panama and the United States. My experience in dealing with the canal question had made me suspicious and, on May 2, I sent it to the Secretary of State requesting an explanation of its meaning.

The result was an informative exchange of letters, including the text of an eight-point list of demands by Panama, one of them being for corridors under full Panamanian jurisdiction across both ends of the Panama Canal. The corridor across the Pacific end of the canal would include the new $20 million bridge at Balboa and the two highways leading to it, both wholly in the Canal Zone; the location of that at the Atlantic end has not been determined.

In the last letter dated June 14, the Department of State stated that it and various defense agencies have been examining the proposal with a view to safeguarding all U.S. interests and in due course, will have a comprehensive report. It further asserted that the Department of State had made clear to Panama that corridors would require a treaty revision and congressional authorization.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of what this comprehensive report may say, I must stress the point that the cession of any corridors across the Panama Canal in this vital defense area is unthinkable. In the light of recent experience, the best way, in fact, the only way to prevent such cession is to decline to discuss it, because not only would such surrender be in contravention of the 1903 treaty, but also it would impair the ability of the United States to maintain, operate, and protect the canal. Certainly, the present time of peril, with Soviet might ensconced on the northern flank of the Atlantic approaches to the canal, is no occasion to add to the danger through ill-advised measures that can have no purpose on our part except to placate radical demands and political opportunism on the part of Panamanian leaders. These perils were treated at length in my addresses to the House on April 9 and June 27, emphasizing that the Congress must save the Panama Canal.

In these connections, I cite the effective statement made by Secretary of State Hughes in 1923 in response to similar but far less serious demands by Panama for increased sovereignty and increased sovereignty attributes over the Canal Zone:

> Our country would never recede from the position which it had taken * * * in 1904. This Government could not, and would not, enter into any discussion affecting its full right to deal with the Canal Zone and to the entire exclusion of any sovereign rights or authority on the part of Panama ("Foreign Relations," 1923, vol. III, p. 684). It was an absolute futility for the Panamanian Government to expect any American administration, any President, or any Secretary of State, ever to surrender any part of these rights which the United States had acquired under the treaty of 1903.

In order that the Congress may be advised in the premises and the people of our country may know what has been transpiring with respect to the Panama Canal, I quote the entire exchange as part of my remarks and again urge

prompt action on House Concurrent Resolution 105 and H.R. 3999:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., May 2, 1963.

Hon. Dean Rusk,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: You will find enclosed a copy of a recent newspaper article from the Times Leader-Evening News of Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

What does this mean? What new treaty?

Thanking you, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Daniel J. Flood,
Member of Congress.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Evening News, Apr. 26, 1963]

World News Digest

Panama, April 26.—Panama has given the United States until mid-July to settle differences between the two countries or open negotiations for a new canal treaty.

Otherwise, Foreign Minister Galileo Solis told a news conference yesterday, Panama will quit the joint commission set up nearly a year ago to work out agreements on disputes.

Solis, who had just returned from Washington, said U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk assured him the United States will try to solve pending matters during June. Panama demands a number of rights in the U.S.-controlled Canal Zone and seeks economic development aid apart from what it is getting under the Alliance for Progress.

Department of State,
Washington, May 20, 1963.

Hon. Daniel J. Flood,
House of Representatives.

Dear Congressman Flood: Thank you for your letter of May 2, 1963 addressed to Secretary Rusk and referred to me for reply with which was enclosed a copy of a newspaper article from the Times Leader-Evening News, of Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

The newspaper clipping you enclosed concerns a news conference given in Panama on April 25 by Panamanian Foreign Minister Galileo Solis upon his return from a visit to Washington, D.C. Minister Solis conferred in Washington on April 23, 1963, with Secretary of State Rusk concerning a number of outstanding subjects with respect to the Canal Zone and United States-Panamanian relations. In particular, Minister Solis commented on the high-level talks being carried on in Panama between United States and Panamanian representatives. These discussions have been going on for about 1 year and were the subject of an earlier letter which I wrote to you on November 8, 1962. During his recent visit to Washington, Minister Solis stated that there seemed to be limitations on the number of outstanding problems which could be settled between our two countries; and for that reason, it might be best to suspend these talks sometime during this summer. In these circumstances Secretary Rusk agreed to do so with the understanding that an effort would be made to resolve some of the outstanding questions now pending. It was mutually agreed that a number of issues would have to remain without an immediate solution.

The news clipping you enclosed is written so as to indicate that Panama had given the United States until mid-July to settle differences or open negotiations for a new canal treaty. This was not the substance nor does it convey the moderate tone of the message transmitted by Minister Solis on behalf of President Chiari concerning the talks which are now being conducted in Panama within the context of present treaties. We are not discussing a new treaty with Panama nor is the Department of State negotiating a new or revised treaty with Panama. The nature of our talks with Panama remain the same as I described to you in my letter of November 8, 1962.

I hope this information will be useful to you. If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

Frederick G. Dutton,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

(Enclosures: (1) State Department memorandum on United States-Panamanian relations; (2) Panamanian list of points under discussion by United States-Panamanian representatives.)

Memorandum: United States-Panamanian Relations Concerning the Canal Zone

The Panamanian Foreign Minister Galileo Solis, met at his request with Secretary of State Rusk on April 23, 1963, in order to communicate the views of President Chiari of Panama and his government concerning various aspects of United States-Panamanian relations. The subjects of discussion pertained to the Canal Zone and the possibility of a future sea level canal in Panama. This conversation was in effect an extension of the dialogue which has been carried on between the United States and Panamanian representatives designated by President Kennedy and President Chiari immediately following the visit of President Chiari to Washington in June 1962.

Foreign Minister Solis upon his return to Panama gave a press interview on April 25, 1963, regarding his conversation with Secretary Rusk. The press coverage of this interview has been in some respects at variance with the actual conversations held. The United States was surprised that Foreign Minister Solis revealed in part to the press the contents of a memorandum which he left with Secretary Rusk which memorandum had been designated confidential by the Panamanians. We have informed the Government of Panama that the United States would expect reasonable advance notice and coordination of publicity on a matter so important to both the United States and Panama. Moreover, we pointed out to Panama the erroneous impression given by press stories indicating that the United States agreed with press statements attributed to Minister Solis which, of course, the United States did not agree to.

Foreign Minister Solis stated that it was the desire of President Chiari to conclude by June or July as many as possible of the matters pending before the joint United States-Panamanian Commission which now meets periodically in Panama. President Chiari desires to do this because (1) the election campaign in Panama would make it impossible to continue the bipartisan nature of the Panamanian delegation to the Commission and (2) because the United States had demonstrated that it does not desire to enter into any basic renegotiation of the present treaty relationship.

Secretary Rusk stated that he understood the problems raised in Panama by its forthcoming elections and that the United States would attempt to conclude where possible the matters pending before the Commission in order that it might adjourn as suggested by President Chiari.

Foreign Minister Solis left with the Department of State a memorandum dated April 24, 1963, which had attached a list of eight points which the Panamanian representatives had thus far presented to the Commission, some of which they hoped would be resolved by June or July 1963. There is attached an official translation of this list. The list included statements under each point which reflect the Panamanian view of the status of each of these proposals. However, the United States views differ in many respects from the comments of Panama concerning the eight points. This list is submitted for the information of the Congress.

The Government of Panama had been informed that a number of pending issues before the Commission necessitate consultations with the Congress and in some instances legislative action. These consultations have been carried on periodically during the past year and at the present time Ambassador Farland is in Washington in order to carry on additional consultations with the Congress and other agencies of the U.S. Government.

(Attachment: Copy of eight-point list.)

List of Points Proposed for Discussion by the Panamanian Representatives on the Joint Commission Created by Presidents Kennedy and Chiari in June 1963 [sic] [1962]

1. Flying of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone: With regard to this point, it has been agreed to have the Panamanian flag flown in the Canal Zone by the civil authorities in all appropriate places. The question regarding the flying of the Panamanian flag on military posts and vessels passing through the canal is pending.

2. Panamanian postage stamps in the Canal Zone: With regard to this point, the Panamanian representatives have requested the reinstatement of the provisions of the Taft agreement, which was in effect from 1904 until 1924. The American representatives have proposed conditions which are more burdensome to Panama than the Taft agreement; and the Panamanian representatives have proposed conditions which are to justify to public opinion, now in 1963, the conclusion of an agreement giving Panama less advantages than the Taft agreement.

3. Recognition by the Canal Zone of exequaturs issued by the Government of Panama: Satisfactory agreement was reached on this matter.

4. Corridors under full Panamanian jurisdiction through the Canal Zone: Panama has requested a corridor in the Pacific sector and another in the Atlantic sector that would allow residents under Panamanian jurisdiction to cross the Canal Zone without leaving the jurisdiction of Panama. In regard to the corridor on the Pacific side, the corridor that would take in the Avenida 4 de Julio, the Bridge of the Americas, and the Thatcher Highway is awaiting the approval of the American representatives. The location of the corridor on the Atlantic side has not yet been discussed.

5. Treatment of Panamanian workers in the Canal Zone: Some progress has been made on this point, consisting in a raise in the minimum wage, greater possibilities for Panamanian workers to be able to hold jobs to which they were not previously admitted, a reduction in the so-called security jobs, and the creation of a Joint Labor Commission to advise the Governor of the Canal Zone and the Government of Panama concerning the settlement of labor disputes to which Panamanian workers are parties.

But not all the labor questions brought up by Panama have been settled, and the measures that have been announced or put into practice in the Canal Zone in behalf of Panamanian workers have been undertaken by the Government of the Canal Zone as voluntary, unilateral acts and not by reason of agreements approved by the Joint Commission.

6. Opening of the Canal Zone market to all Panamanian products and services: The only commercial stores in the Canal Zone are the Panama Canal commissaries and the post exchanges of the Armed Forces in the Canal Zone. Panama maintains that the commissaries do not operate under any provision of the treaties in force, and consequently their maintenance stems exclusively from the American executive authorities.

Panama has also been maintaining that for the Government of the United States to hold a monopoly of all commercial and industrial activities in the Canal Zone runs counter to the basic American principle of free enterprise.

No Panamanian national may enter the Canal Zone to sell his products directly to the consumers. However, many persons who live in the Canal Zone enter territory under the jurisdiction of Panama in order to buy the things which the Panamanians may not go there to sell to them because they are not permitted to do so.

Panamanian merchants are not permitted to make home deliveries of products and merchandise in the Canal Zone because household services are a monopoly of the United States through its agencies in the Zone.

Panama's highest aspiration is that all commercial and industrial activities in the Canal Zone be abandoned by the Government of the United States and that private businesses paying the corresponding taxes to Panama be permitted, since there is no reason why a merchant should not pay taxes. But, until that maximum aspiration can be attained, private individuals established in Panama should be permitted to sell Panamanian products in the Canal Zone and also foreign articles on which Panamanian import duties have been paid.

The Panamanian representatives submitted a memorandum to the American representatives on these problems of opening of the Canal Zone market to Panamanian merchants but no reply has yet been received.

7. Withholding of income tax from Panamanian employees in the Canal Zone: A satisfactory arrangement has been reached on this point; but the President of Panama considers that it would not be fair to withhold the income tax from those Panamanian nationals until the wage increases that have been offered to them have gone into effect.

8. Port facilities in Panama and Colón: The ports of Panama on the Pacific and Colón on the Atlantic were dismantled during the construction of the Canal in order to favor the ports of Balboa and Cristóbal. The Panamanian representatives consider that Panama is entitled to the restoration to it of those port facilities of which it was deprived.

In Colón an agreement in principle has been reached to the effect that docks 6 and 7 be transferred to the free zone of Colón, and that part of the area known as Reserve of France Field also be transferred to it. In this way the question of the port facilities on the Atlantic could be settled; but no agreement has been reached on the details for implementing this solution.

Various possibilities with regard to port facilities on the Pacific have been discussed, but it has not yet been determined which is the most suitable.

In addition to the matters set forth above, the Joint Commission could also come to agreement on the following points:

(a) The widening of the Boyd-Roosevelt Highway, which was constructed and is maintained by the United States, and which is now proving to be too narrow for the traffic on it.

(b) The reconstruction of the highway from Arreiján to Chorrera, which is in very bad condition, is inadequate for the traffic on it, and is used constantly by the troops, vehicles, and heavy equipment of the American Armed Forces, which are constantly coming and going between the Canal Zone and the Río Hato military base.

(c) The recognition of Spanish as a language which Panamanians may use when they have to appear before Canal Zone authorities or officials.

(d) The problem of drinking water for the cities of Panama and Colón, which is a cause of constant friction between the Government of Panama and the Canal Zone.

(e) The return to Panama of large areas of land located in the Canal Zone which do not serve the Panama Canal in any way and which would be of help to Panama in agricultural and livestock development programs because they are close to the major consumer markets.

PANAMANIAN EMBASSY.
WASHINGTON, D.C., *April 24, 1963.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 27, 1963.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I acknowledge receipt of the letter of May 20, 1963, signed by Assistant Secretary of State Frederick G. Dutton with his two enclosures. The Panamanian "List of points under discussion contains the following paragraph:

"4. Corridor under full Panamanian jurisdiction through the Canal Zone: Panama has requested a corridor in the Pacific sector and another in the Atlantic sector that would allow residents under Panamanian jurisdiction to cross the Canal Zone without leaving the jurisdiction of Panama. In regard to the corridor on the Pacific side, the corridor that would take in the Avenida 4 de Julio, the Bridge of the Americas, and the Thatcher Highway, is awaiting the approval of the American representatives. The location of the corridor on the Atlantic side has not yet been discussed."

In view of the stand taken in the Department's letter of November 8, 1962, that cession of a corridor "would require approval by the U.S. Congress and in any event would require a treaty revision," I cannot conceal my astonishment upon reading the content of this paragraph. Its statement that the Panamanian request for a corridor across the Pacific sector to include Fourth of July Avenue, the Thatcher Ferry Bridge, and the Thatcher Highway "is awaiting the approval of the American representatives" implies that the Panamanian representatives on the Joint Commission feel that they have some basis for expecting the approval in question.

Most certainly, Mr. Secretary, no such agreement on the part of mere U.S. representatives to cede Canal Zone territory and U.S. property may conceivably transcend statutory and treaty provisions under which the Canal Zone was acquired and the Panama Canal constructed, and must be maintained, operated, and protected. Any such surrender could take place only in accordance with specific statutory provisions and an appropriate convention.

If any executive agency were deemed to have the power lawfully to give away any portion of the Canal Zone or the Panama Canal, then the same reasoning would support the relinquishment of all sovereignty over, and interest in, the entire canal enterprise. A corridor through a defense area and across the canal itself would assuredly give aid and comfort to an antagonist that has publicly proclaimed its determination to destroy us.

Since the Suez crisis of 1956, European nations have come to view with increasing concern the course of our policy on the Caribbean, especially that with respect to the Panama Canal. They interpret acts which diminish or surrender our sovereignty as direct evidence of weakness and retreat by the United States in the struggle for world power and as signals to act in the interest of their own security. Moreover, unless ended, the sustained erosion of U.S. rights, power, and authority over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal can only result in the final abandonment by the United States of the canal enterprise. This would have worldwide repercussions, including violent revolutionary takeovers throughout the Americas that would make the events in Cuba appear almost insignificant.

Because cession to Panama of a corridor across either the Pacific or Atlantic sectors raises important constitutional questions, the Congress will wish to know all the facts concerning the implied approval by the U.S. representatives of the indicated cessions.

I request that I be fully advised in the premises and look forward to your reply.

Sincerely yours,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., June 14, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Thank you for your letter of May 27, 1963, addressed to the Secretary of State acknowledging my letter to you of May 20, 1963, concerning the recent visit to Washington by Panamanian Foreign Minister Solis.

You commented further on the Panamanian aspirations to obtain a corridor under Panamanian jurisdiction through the Canal Zone. As stated in my letter to you of November 8, 1962 such a project would have to be carefully explored by the U.S. Government and in any event would require approval by the U.S. Congress and a treaty revision. There is no change in our views on this subject or the means for dealing with it.

During the past few months the Department of Defense, Caribbean Command (Canal Zone), Department of the Army and Department of State have been examining the Panamanian corridor proposal with a view to safeguarding all U.S. interests, especially those involving national security. In due course we expect to have a comprehensive report on the corridor proposal and will take up this subject with the Congress. The Department of State has repeatedly made clear to the Government of Panama that such a corridor constitutes a treaty revision and would require congressional authorization.

Your continued interest in United States-Panamanian relations and operation of the Panama Canal is greatly appreciated. If I may be of additional assistance in this matter, please do not hestiate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend our colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN], for setting aside this time to observe Captive Nations Week. It is a pleasure to associate myself with his remarks and to compliment him for the fine job he has done this year and in other years in bringing the subject of captive nations to the attention of the American people.

Those of us who came to the Congress in the 1st session of the 86th Congress had the privilege to participate in the passage of a joint resolution which was signed into law on July 17, 1959, exactly

5 years ago tomorrow. It is cited as Public Law 86-90 and the purpose of the resolution was to designate the third week of July of each year as Captive Nations Week.

Public Law 86-90 further authorized and requested that the President issue a proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall be achieved for all the captive nations of the world. President Kennedy did on July 5, 1963, as one of the first things upon his return to the United States from Europe, proclaim the third week in July as Captive Nations Week. Perhaps this year even more than in other years, the President at the very moment of his proclamation had learned after his trip abroad of the deep convictions of those in the free world outside the Iron Curtain that peoples in all parts of the free world were interested in and willing to uphold the "just aspirations of all people for independence and human liberty." The President's proclamation was quickly followed by similar proclamations of the Governors of many of our States and the mayors of all of our great cities. All of our columnists have written in approval of the observance of Captive Nations Week.

Public Law 86-90, provides for the annual observance of Captive Nations Week. Its real underlying purpose is to perpetuate this observance each year in order that we may continually call attention to the plight of these enslaved people. This observance serves as a regular reminder of the tragedy of the people enslaved by the Communists. There are millions of them held as slaves by the Communist regimes in Czechslovakia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania, North Vietnam, North Korea, Tibet, East Germany, and this year, we must add Cuba. This observance focuses attention that although the Allies won World War II, the defeated enemy countries are recognized as free and sovereign while many of these nations that fought on the side of the victorious allies are today subjugated satellites of Soviet Russia. These nations with a population in excess of 100 million people have been under the domination of the Soviet Union for 18 years. During all of these years, they have been under the yoke of Communist oppression and suffering from Communist totalitarian tryanny.

The Soviet Union does not like our practice of observing Captive Nations Week. Mr. Khrushchev denounced it in July 1959 and it is denounced annually because it means they are being reminded that there are millions of victims of Soviet aggression, but Mr. Speaker, the simple observance of this week may not be enough to help these captive peoples. As has been suggested by other speakers, this observance will give cause to us in the Congress to form a Special Committee on Captive Nations and to give the Congress an occasion to exercise its leadership in this vital field. We must offer something in the way of hope to those behind the Iron Curtain who look to the United States for the preservation of freedom. A special committee could determine the best means by which the United States could assist the captive nations by peaceful means to regain their national and individual freedoms.

Love of freedom in the captive nations has not died. To the contrary, it is growing just as the love, liberty, and freedom will grow everywhere even among those of us who still enjoy it.

Let us resolve to strengthen our determination to keep alive the knowledge of the injustice to these subjugated nations and what appears to be hopeless today may become a reality tomorrow because the free nations must keep this hope alive. If given the opportunity these enslaved people will rise up to fight the captors and once again become members of the free world community.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. SIKES), for Tuesday, July 16, 1963, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative programs and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN, for 1 hour, Thursday, July 18, 1963, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LAIRD (at the request of Mr. SIBAL), for 15 minutes, on Monday, July 22, 1963.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI), for 30 minutes, on Thursday, July 18, 1963.

Mr. EDWARDS (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI), for 60 minutes, on Thursday, July 18, 1963.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SIBAL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WIDNALL.
Mr. DAGUE.
Mr. FINO.
Mr. LINDSAY.
Mr. SAYLOR.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RODINO in two instances.
Mr. FLOOD.
Mr. HANNA.
Mr. MONAGAN.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 793. An act to promote the conservation of the Nation's wildlife resources on the Pacific flyway in the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, Upper Klamath, and Clear Lake Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California and to aid in the administration of the Klamath reclamation project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on July 15, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2461. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of Henderson, Nev., at fair market value, certain public lands in the State of Nevada;

H.R. 4946. An act to amend the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1959, to provide for reimbursement of transportation expenses for Members of the House of Representatives; and

H.J. Res. 405. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 17, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1039. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting the 42d Annual Report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962, pursuant to section 16 of the Civil Service Retirement Act (H. Doc. No. 140); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

1040. A letter from the Chairman, the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution entitled "A joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for the work of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week," approved July 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 409), as amended, is amended by striking out "$300,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$400,000"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1041. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Committee, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of May 31, 1963, pursuant to Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1042. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts and make grants for research and development in furtherance of the purposes of the act of May 16, 1910 (36 Stat. 369; 30 U.S.C. 1, 3, 5, and 7), as amended and supplemented"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1043. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the report of the Attorney General on the administration of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 for the year ending May 31, 1963, pursuant to the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1044. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 6, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on the Cashie River, N.C., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 513. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week beginning July 28, 1963, as Veterinary Medicine Week; without amendment (Rept. No. 555). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 440. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 6518, a bill to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution; without amendment (Rept. No. 556). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committe on Rules. House Resolution 441. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 7195, a bill to amend various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal aid highway systems; without amendment (Rept. No. 557). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 442. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 7356, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies; without amendment (Rept. No. 558). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5703. A bill granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy; without amendment (Rept. No. 554). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 7581. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to prohibit use of meat and meat products produced outside the United States in programs under such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 7582. A bill to amend section 748 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the payment of benefits under policies of U.S. Government life insurance for total disability arising after the insured reaches the age of 65; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 7583. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 7584. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 202) to provide donations of surplus food commodities to State and local penal institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7585. A bill to amend section 3102(a) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize waiver of recovery of overpayment if, in the judgment of the Administrator, such recovery would defeat the purpose of benefits or would be against equity and good conscience; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 7586. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act with respect to the interconnection of facilities for the transportation of natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7587. A bill to amend section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 7588. A bill to provide for enforcement of rules and regulations for the protection, development, and administration of the national forests and national grasslands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 7589. A bill to amend the Public Works Acceleration Act to increase the authorization for appropriations under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 7590. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit the waiver of the 2-year foreign residence requirement in the case of certain exchange visitors who cannot return to the country of their origin because of fear of persecution on account of political beliefs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7591. A bill to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 7592. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 7593. A bill to provide for an Administrative Counsel of the Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 7594. A bill to designate the McGee Bend Dam and Reservoir on the Angelina River, Tex., as the Sam Rayburn Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7595. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a further supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 7596. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 20 percent across-the-board benefit increase, to reduce from 72 to 70 the age at which deductions cease to be made from benefits on account of outside earnings, and to provide that the Federal Government shall contribute one-third of the additional cost of such changes (reducing the additional contributions required of workers and employers accordingly); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 7597. A bill to provide for issuance of a special U.S. postage stamp in commemoration of the crusade against cancer; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 7598. A bill to amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union in order to extend the time for the filing of applications for the selection of certain lands by such State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 7599. A bill to provide for increases in the uniform allowances of Government employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 7600. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for the sealing off of certain abandoned coal mines so as to prevent the pollution of waterways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 7601. A bill for the relief of the city of Winslow, Ariz.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 7602. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide for a method of reimbursing owners of certain fishing vessels which are subjected to harrassment by officials of countries of South and Central America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 7603. A bill to amend the criminal laws of the United States to prohibit any person from crossing State lines for the purpose of violating the laws of any State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 7604. A bill to establish Arches National Monument as Arches National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7605. A bill to establish Capitol Reef National Monument as Capitol Reef National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7606. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 7607. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the excise tax on automobiles certain vehicles which may be used both as an automobile and an airplane; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 7608. A bill to amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make urban planning grants thereunder for the provision of planning assistance to Indian reservations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 7609. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7610. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide a grant program for the prevention and control of dental diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7611. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 7612. A bill to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that persons defamed during broadcasts by political candidates shall be afforded an opportunity to answer; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 7613. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, by inserting a new title X to authorize aid in developing, constructing, and operating privately owned nuclear-powered merchant ships; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 7614. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 7615. A bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act to extend for an additional 3 years the period during which construction funds must be received and to increase the number of general trustees; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.J. Res. 556. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States pertaining to the offering of prayers in public schools and other public places in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.J. Res. 557. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the right to read from the Holy Bible and to offer nonsectarian prayers in the public schools or other public places if participation therein is not compulsory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.J. Res. 558. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the offering of prayers and the reading of the Bible in public schools in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.J. Res. 559. Joint resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba and the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.J. Res. 560. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting nonsectarian prayer in public schools or other public places if participation therein is not compulsory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.J. Res. 561. Joint resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba, to restate and implement the Monroe Doctrine, and to encourage adherence to the principles of self-determination and human freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.Con. Res. 197. Concurrent resolution to request the President to initiate discussion of the Baltic States question before the United Nations with a view to the liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia from Soviet occupation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. Res. 438. Resolution creating a standing Committee on Small Business in the House of Representatives, and to grant it full authority in certain legislative matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. Res. 439. Resolution to temporarily suspend further action on civil rights legislation; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 7616. A bill for the relief of Consuelo Guia Ramoso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 7617. A bill for the relief of Vula Roed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 7618. A bill for the relief of Vlasis Ritsinias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 7619. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joan Bramwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 7620. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude F. Moorhead; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 7621. A bill for the relief of Julio Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 7622. A bill for the relief of Jew Hing On; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 7623. A bill for the relief of Branka Mardessich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 7624. A bill for the relief of Natividad Encarnado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 7625. A bill for the relief of Andrija Horwath, his wife, Anka Horwath, his son, Adolfo Horwath, his mother, Elisabeta Horwath, and his sister-in-law, Elisabeta Horwath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 7626. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Myong Ok Han Negley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

205. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Floyd Byler, West Liberty, Ohio, relative to conflict that appears to exist between the law of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States and radio law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Captive Nations—Evasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, akin to damning with faint praise is the practice of condemning by failure to vigorously support. Such has been the case with the administration's weak pronouncement in behalf of the captive nations, as required by congressional mandate. The weakness of the New Frontier attitude is made all the more noticeable when compared with the forceful and forthright proclamations issued by President Eisenhower in 1959 and 1961 when he condemned Communist imperialism and called for the liberation of these enslaved peoples.

The vigor with which this administration opposes colonialism under certain circumstances has been emphasized by the pressure exerted to force Belgium out of the Congo, to compel the Dutch to give up Indonesia, to advise Britain to withdraw from British Guiana, and more recently to openly snub Salazar of Portugal because of his insistence in holding on to Angola. On the other hand, when it comes to Communist colonialism we must not utter a word that might enrage the Soviets or interfere in any way with another nonaggression treaty that will not be worth the paper it is written on.

And in our current obsession with the idea that we can woo communism from preoccupation with its basic designs to bury us we forget how our President got his fingers burned in the promise to neutralize Laos—an agreement that was broken almost as soon as it was made. No; we seem determined to rush into some new arrangement with an adversary who has told us in advance that he will concede nothing, while we continue to turn our backs on enslaved masses who are quite accurately called the captive nations, and showing our utter indifference toward the plight of people whose only offense was that they loved liberty and lived next door to a colossus that denies it.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of this Congress who does not want to get along with the Russians nor is there a member of either party who would not be willing to make almost any realistic concession necessary to the achievement of an honest nonaggression pact. The first test of sincerity, however, must be the attitude toward these captive populations who ask only to be allowed to work out their destiny without outside interference. And we make a mockery of our profession of equality for all races, at home and abroad, when we fail to endorse the bid for freedom for those who once enjoyed it but who are now prostrate. We can only hope that the citizens of these nations in captivity, as well as their compatriots among us, will realize that there are still some of us who want to help them.

The Merit System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the House will shortly be called upon to act on the independent offices appropriation bill which will contain appropriations for the Civil Service Commission. The Appropriations Committee, I understand, has not as yet reported this bill to the House. However, the administration made a request in its budget for some $22,180,000 for salaries and operational expenses of the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I question the necessity for this appropriation if action is to be taken as proposed and promulgated by Executive Order 10925. This order, among other things, established the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity and directed Federal agencies to take steps to eliminate any discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, I was informed that the Labor Department had sent Mr. Robert N. Merchant, Special Assistant to the Director of Personnel to Birmingham in conjunction with recruiting activities. I was further informed that Mr. Merchant had stated that he was there for the express purpose of hiring a Negro for an apprenticeship and training representative vacancy.

Subsequently, I was advised by the Secretary of Labor that this was an apparent misunderstanding and that he does not intend that civil service rules and regulations be circumvented. This, Mr. Speaker, is all well and good. However, other situations have arisen as a result of the Executive Order 10925 which I believe obviates the necessity for the Commission if the intent of the Executive order is followed.

For example, the Civil Service Commission has informed me that special efforts are now being made to let members of minority groups know that they can compete for Federal positions for which they are qualified and that special safeguards have been introduced by some agencies to assure that their selecting officials consider Negro candidates fairly. I have no argument with this as I believe that all should be treated fairly in accord with their qualifications. However, I have also been informed by the Civil Service Commission that a recent editorial implied that civil service requirements were not observed in the recent promotion to supervisory jobs of three Negroes in the Dallas post office, Dallas, Tex. The Commission attempts to justify the promotions on the basis that these candidates were fully qualified and had passed the supervisory examination over a year ago. The Commission goes on to say that the fact that 53 names were numerically scored higher in the eligibility list is not a primary index of qualification. I submit, Mr. Speaker, if this is true, then the Commission is not performing the function it was established to do by the Congress and as outlined in the U.S. Government Organizational Manual 1963-64—namely, to provide for examinations to test the fitness of applicants for positions in the competitive service, and to establish qualifications standards as a basis for reinstatement, promotion, and transfer of Federal employees. In addition, the Commission is charged with providing, in response to requests from appointing officers in the various Federal agencies, the best qualified available personnel to fill positions in those agencies.

Under the Post Office Department's merit program, the Commission states, other factors, which in my opinion should have been considered by the Commission under its authority are now considered by the Post Office Department.

In addition, it is stated by the Commission that the Post Office Department is now applying flexibility to the rules and regulations in order to rectify past inequities which, if they previously existed, was a result of inept action on the part of the Commission.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the Commission, in discussing the positions in the Dallas Post Office, states that the three Negroes selected to fill the supervisory vacancies had good performance records. This may be true, but I repeat, they should not have been moved over those individuals who were higher on the civil service register. The mere fact that the Commission apparently has not done the job assigned in the past cannot be condoned nor do I believe that retroactive action can accomplish harmonious employee relations.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that if the Commission is to function in accordance with its authority then the entire employment responsibility should be assumed by it and that the disruption of the merit system which will result in the type of action being taken by the Post Office Department under the Executive Order 10925 should be discontinued and the responsibility for equal opportunity should be vested solely in the Commission at this time.

To attempt to make up for mistakes of years gone by disregarding the merit system as previously established will obviate the need for the Civil Service Commission and we will be expending Federal funds without purpose.

Government-Run Lotteries of Haiti, India, Jamaica, and Trinidad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House the government-run lotteries in four more foreign countries. Haiti, India, Jamaica, and Trinidad are included among the 77 foreign nations which recognize the wisdom of a lottery.

Haiti, as we all know, is a tiny and poverty-ridden republic in the Caribbean. Revenue sources are few and the Haitian Government is thus well aware of the fiscal merits of a national lottery. In 1962, the gross receipts came almost to $3 million. The total annual net income to the Government was about $600,000. The proceeds are intended for social welfare and assistance work. The interesting part about the Haitian lottery is that the winner of the first prizes are expected to contribute 5 percent to charity.

India does not conduct a national lottery but rather operates a "prize bond" scheme. It is patterned after the British "premium bond lottery" which revolves around the issuance of Government bonds where instead of bearing interest, the buyer is offered a chance to win a prize. In 1962, the gross receipts from the sale of prize bonds came to almost $7 million. The benefit of the "prize bond" idea was that Government bonds were made more appealing through the presentation of an opportunity to win large cash prizes. India realizes that a recognition of the gambling urge can be a great help in handling the Nation's finances.

Jamaica is another Latin American country which utilizes a government lottery not only as a compromise with the gambling problem but as a revenue-raising device as well. The total gross annual receipts from running the lottery for the year 1962 came to over $850,000. The total annual net income to the Government was almost $180,000 which went to Jamaican hospitals.

Trinidad recognizes the success that may be had in bringing gambling under supervision and control of the Government. The total gross receipts from the sale of sweepstakes tickets for 1962 was about $1 million. The total net income to the government was almost $200,000. Most of the funds go into the general revenue accounts with a part going to charities.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that we here in the United States could benefit from the use of lottery money on behalf of similar goals. A national lottery in this country could raise over $10 billion a year in additional revenue which could be used to cut our personal income taxes and reduce our big and ever-growing national debt.

Mr. Speaker, why can we not profit from the example of our foreign friends? Why can we not show the same kind of wisdom as the State of New Hampshire? Why should we continue to blind ourselves to this tremendous revenue which can help our taxpayers from the heavy tax load? Why all of this reluctance and stubbornness? What are we afraid of?

Nutmeg State Potentate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to note the election of Harold C. Close as imperial potentate of the National Order of the Mystic Shrine.

Although he is no longer technically a resident of my district, he did reside there for many years and was well and favorably known as an outstanding citizen in our area.

He still is a resident of Connecticut. All his friends and all citizens of the State will be proud of the recognition which has come to him after his long years of service in this great national American, charitable, and fraternal organization. I am sure that all these good people will join me in wishing Harold Close every success and great achievement during his tenure as imperial potentate.

Interest Rates and Balance of Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, both the Senate and the House individually, and in joint hearings, are showing a proper and well-deserved concern over the balance-of-payment situation in the United States. A strong sentiment has been expressed in all the hearings relative to this subject, for an increase in interest rates as an effective device to stem the outflow of cash from the United States to other countries which might have, at a given moment, a more lucrative short-term interest rate. The argument has some semblance of plausibility and emanates from sources carrying a high degree of respectability.

However, as in most decisions made in these complex days, it is of the greatest importance that we analyze most critically such a suggestion on the basis of whether it will, in fact, get for us the results promised, and, on the basis of whether it carries a price tag we can afford to pay.

On the first of these questions, it is interesting that the Associated Press, on July 15 of this year, carried a story out of New York, from which I quote:

> There is no systematic relationships between interest rates on the availability of credit in the United States and the flow of money overseas, a study by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York concluded Wednesday.
>
> Evidence regarding the question of whether international capital and gold flows tend to be interest induced is becoming more abundant and more confusing, the survey found.

It had already occurred to some of us that the so readily accepted relationships between capital and gold outflow and interest rates might be subject to serious doubts. Contributing to this dubious attitude was the observation that a goodly number of European countries, which had interest rates substantially below those now current in the United States, were not experiencing any problem in balance of payments.

Now, about the price tag on to readily accepting the suggestion of increase in interest rates as a solution to our international money problems. Let us see how this would in fact work. The Federal Reserve Board, which has control of such matters, would authorize an increase in interest rates on short-term Government securities. This would in turn, immediately be reflected in all other fields of credit. I quote from the Wall Street Journal of June 26, 1963, to emphasize the point.

> Short-term interest rates rose on several fronts in the money market. Several big sales finance firms and commercial paper dealers increased rates by one-eighth of a percentage point on some maturities of paper. And dealers in bankers' acceptances announced a similar rise in all maturities. The increase followed a continuing upward trend in yields on Treasury bills, which tend to set the pattern for short-term rates.

What would the contemplated rise do to our domestic economy? Already, debt service load domestically is rather high. At present interest levels, over $10 billion is required just to pay the interest on the national debt, and this represents over 10 percent of the 1963 budget. For the average consumer the story is also not bright. Payments on installment paper and personal loans will amount to over $54 billion in 1963, which is a record high of 13.6 percent of all disposable income for the year. These figures are from the May 1963 issue of the Federal Reserve Bulletin. A previous issue points out that in 1962 individual income from interest was at $34 billion, and this does not reflect the interest income of corporate bodies.

There are two very important aspects of this interest load picture. One is that interest income represents a very significant shift of economic wealth in our economy. The other is that interest income siphons off dollar volume from more dynamic economic activity where dollar velocity plays such an important role in economic growth and expansion. Higher interest will endanger the economic advance. Finally, we could legitimately question the arbitrary increase in interest rates as a tool for international monetary control, when it is so contrary to the domestic economic facts. There is no shortage of lending funds. In fact, saving institutions have been hard pressed to find sound and remunerative investments for the funds now in hand. There is no possible incentive in such a situation for inflation. Quite to the contrary, with high savings, high unemployment, unused productive capacity, and a drive on to reduce Government spending all the factors to dictate an opposite move in the domestic scene are at work.

It is not demonstrated technically, by expert opinion, or ordinarily, by commonsense, that an increase in interest rates is either wise or necessary as a control move for international monetary balance for the United States.

What are some of the commonsense aspects of our gold outflow position? At the risk of over simplifying and stating the obvious, could we point out two:

First. We started out in the post World War II era with the giant share of the gold. By dint of being in the position of world banker during the war, and with a productive capacity which was never impaired by bombers or buzz bombs, the United States ended the war period with a substantial part of the world's gold.

It also is rather common knowledge that the output of gold from all the available sources in the world has only been a fraction of the requirements to back up a worldwide currency growth which could match the prewar growth in gross national production of all the nations. From 1950 to 1960, this growth of production which called for expansion of both credit and currency, was explosive. Naturally the heavy demand would be felt most where the gold was, that is, in the United States.

Second. At the risk of seeming disrespectful I think a little analogy to Las Vegas would be helpful. The housemen will tell you in a casino the money goes where the action is. That is you find a craptable with a crowd pressing to get in close enough to place a bet, and you will find one or more hot rollers, persons who are holding the dice for a period of time and rolling lots of numbers. This gives the evident possibility for bets which pay off—whether you are playing it close with the six-eight combinations, betting the line—the come—the field—or any craps. There is action for all and possible return commensurate with the odds. What we have been witnessing in international economics is not unlike the rush at the casino craptable. The action has been in West Germany, Italy, and France, and the Benelux countries. The action there has promised a wide variety of opportunity for returns and the money has gone with the action. It could only go from where it was to where it could get this action. And, we know where it was—in the vaults of Fort Knox.

We should realize from this that our best approach to the balance-of-payments problem is to increase the economic activity in the United States. An increase in interest will not do that. A reduction in taxes properly balanced between forces for consumption and forces for production could. Increase in support and encouragement for exports could.

We do have some limitations. We will have to maintain a leadership in technology. We will have to develop a flexibility in international credit which will take up the slack created by the continuing lag in gold production. Most burdensome of all, we have to continue to support and protect the dollar as the most popular medium of international exchange.

Another Worthy People-to-People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the peace of the world depends on many complex factors. However, in our quest for peace, it has always been my belief that greater direct contact amongst the peoples of the world helps accelerate understanding and breaks down barriers. For example, my son's project, "Little People to Little People," has given a way of promoting friendship and understanding between the children of the United States and those of other countries by letter writing.

In relation to these grassroots efforts toward greater world understanding, I was pleased to notice and I am honored to commend a family in my district, the Armbrusters of 44 Hamilton Road, Glen Ridge, N.J., who, for the month of August, will welcome to their home a 19-year-old German girl, Miss Petra Ruhnau, of the American Zone in Berlin.

A total of 12 German youths will be hosted by families in the Essex County area. The young people have already arrived in this country and have been in Putney, Vt., yesterday and today for orientation at the headquarters of "Experiment in International Living," which is sponsoring the program. After 2 weeks at the campus of the University of Maine, they will visit Washington and arrive in their American homes on the 5th of August.

I certainly hope that we shall have an opportunity to see these young men and women when they come to Washington. And I know that they and their hosts, and both their communities and nations will draw much satisfaction and benefit from this heartwarming experience in international understanding.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 3, pages 3518–3544, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee."

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MAY 31, 1963.

Re House Resolutions 14 and 15, bills To Establish Captive Nations Committee.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: We wish to commend you for introducing this above bill. No doubt there are many elected officials in Congress who recognize the need for the establishment of a Captive Nations Committee in these days of "cold war" throughout the world. We are happy to realize that you had the foresight and courage to introduce this bill and we will in every way help you to continue your good work.

Respectfully yours,
RICHARD JAFFARION.

RACINE, WIS.,
May 29, 1963.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The Racine Chapter of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation informs you that a resolution has been passed by our unit supporting passage of House Resolution 14, submitted by you, which calls for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Recent developments worldwide and in Washington make the formation of such a committee imperative to the security and welfare of the United States, and will bring added hope to the tyrannized people of the once free nations today in Soviet bondage.

We are in addition to this letter, contacting our Congressman as well as Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, head of the Rules Committee, urging him to release your resolution to the House floor for quick debate and passage.

May I take this opportunity to commend you for your stand in this regard, and to assure you of our every support of your measure.

Sincerely,
EDWARD SHAMSHOIAN.

HAVERHILL MASS.,
June 3, 1963.

Re House Resolution 14–15.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I would like to thank you for your House resolution which calls for a committee on captive nations; I add my support for such a bill.

May it be released soon to the floor and speedily passed by the House.

Very truly yours,
DIANA M. HANOIAN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1963.

Mr. WALTER TUSTANIWSKY,
Chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., 3407 Carpenter St., Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. TUSTANIWSKY: Thank you very much for your letter of May 25, 1963, in which you ask that I sponsor a resolution calling for the creation of a Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives.

I am pleased to inform you that I have introduced House Resolution 354, a copy of which I enclose, which would accomplish that purpose. You may be assured that I shall do all I can to obtain favorable action in this matter.

With best wishes, I am.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN LESINSKI,
Member of Congress.

OMAHA, NEBR.,
June 9, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am sending you a copy of my letter to the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives.

I also wrote to Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM asking to submit a resolution to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Thank you for your efforts and work to liberate enslaved people from the tyranny of Russia.

Sincerely yours,
J. NAVAHAS.

OMAHA, NEBR.,
June 9, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The unhappy captive nations living under Moscow tyranny know that only the United States can ease their present situation and bring liberation nearer. The rulers of Russia and her puppets are very touchy to any mention of the captive nations in the Congress of the United States and fear our efforts to expose the Soviet imperialist colonial system. I would appreciate your efforts very much in establishing a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. At this time I request your quick action on House Resolution 14 to establish such a committee.

With warm personal regards, I remain.

Sincerely yours,
G. NAVAKAS.

Bonneville's Multimillion-Dollar Annual Losses and Areas of Substantial and Persistent Unemployment Not Wanted in Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, when an all-powerful Federal bureaucracy attempts by Executive fiat to extend its power without regard to constitutional or congressional authority or the welfare of the area concerned, it is high time something is done about it.

The unilateral action of the Secretary of the Interior on May 21, 1963, to extend the Bonneville Power Administration power marketing area into southern Idaho and parts of Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada is a case in point. On July 8, 1963, I introduced a resolution, House

Resolution 430, relative to this highhanded and unwarranted action of the Secretary of the Interior.

This resolution should be supported by every Congressman in protest against this untenable action of the Kennedy administration to unilaterally extend its bureaucratic powers. House Resolution 430 reads as follows:

House Resolution 430

Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the extension of the Bonneville power marketing area in southern Idaho and parts of Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior, on May 21, 1963, by unilateral action extended the Bonneville Power Administration power marketing area into southern Idaho and parts of Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada; and

Whereas the Bonneville Power Administration will take over Bureau of Reclamation hydroelectric generating facilities which were authorized by Congress; and

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation found it necessary to charge an average of 5.26 mills for wholesale power to meet project repayment obligations established by Congress, it is proposed that wholesale power rates be reduced to the Bonneville Power Administration's wholesale rate of 3.10 mills; and

Whereas the Bonneville Power Administration is now operating at a substantial deficit and has been for the past 5 years; and

Whereas this extension of Bonneville's power marketing area will require the construction of an $80 million high-voltage transmission line at the taxpayers' expense; and

Whereas there seems to be substantial opposition among the people of southern Idaho to this unilateral administrative move by the Secretary of the Interior: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of the Interior and the Bonneville Power Administrator refrain from taking any action to implement the order of May 21, 1963, extending the Bonneville Power Administration marketing area into southern Idaho and parts of Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada unless and until the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has been supplied with detailed feasibility studies of the proposed extension, a full public hearing has been held by this committee where all interested parties may have the opportunity to submit their views, and positive approval of the policy of extending the Bonneville Power Administration's marketing area has been expressed by a resolution of the committee and the approval of the House of Representatives.

Back in April of this year I inserted in the Congressional Record a series of articles entitled "Bonneville Now Losing Millions Annually—Wants Larger Area To Lose More In." These articles pointed up the incongruity of spending some $80 million of the taxpayers' money to supply Federal electric power at less than cost to an area now amply served by taxpaying utilities at rates well below the national average.

Since the Secretary of the Interior's action of May 21, 1963, I have received numerous statements, articles, and editorials from southern Idaho, protesting the Secretary's unwarranted action. Starting today I am instituting a new series of articles for insertion in the Congressional Record, pointing out why the thinking people of Idaho object to the Federal Government's invasion of a market area now amply served by responsible taxpaying utilities at reasonable rates. I do this because I believe the majority of the Members of Congress and the people of the Nation are entitled to and want to know the facts in this matter.

Incidentally, the Bonneville Power Administration told the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on May 15, 1963:

> A carefully defined service area is essential to good management of any utility system. Only by reference to a specific marketing area can load growth accurately be forecast and the installation of efficient generating and transmission facilities to meet that load growth be properly planned.

I heartily agree with such a policy standard, but it is hypocrisy in the extreme for the Secretary of the Interior 6 days later to issue an order that specifically provides for Bonneville's invasion of the service area of private utilities that have an enviable record of service to the area wherein they have long operated.

As the initial presentation in my series of articles on why southern Idaho does not want Bonneville, I have selected the following satirical editorial from the Payette Lakes Star of McCall, Idaho:

[From the Payette Lakes Star, McCall, Idaho, June 6, 1963]

Bonneville Power Opposition

It's hard to imagine the reasoning behind the widespread opposition to Bonneville Power's invasion of southern Idaho.

In the first place, the public power advocates guarantee prosperity. The mere fact that the Portland area and sections of north Idaho, both served by the BPA, are chronically in a state of economic distress shouldn't bother us. After a few years of such prosperity we can qualify for a huge disaster loan from the Government and be as well off as they are.

The claim that opponents of Federal power make that cheap Federal power is not actually cheap should not be allowed to disturb us either. Actually Federal power isn't cheap; it's free. As long as Federal projects operate at a loss, which they seem to be amazingly successful at doing, the deficit can be added to the national debt, and as there seems to be absolutely no intention to pay off the debt this Federal power won't cost us a penny. As to what our grandchildren will face, that's their problem.

Some nit-pickers have pointed out that the BPA has no transmission lines into the area, and that a transmission line from Lewiston to Soda Springs would be expensive. This is no problem. As pointed out above the lines could be built for nothing, but in this case there is a better, quicker method. A private utility company does have lines through this area. The 1961 steel price crisis should serve to convince the private utility that it is to their best interests to cooperate with the Government in every way possible.

Troublemakers in the phosphate industry, one of the principal users of BPA power, have pointed out that not all processes use vast quantities of power in their manufacturing processes, and that the planned arrangements amount to a subsidy to certain producers. The obvious course for the producer not using an electrical process is to shut down his operation and turn to the manufacture of aluminum; it does require a lot of power, and a Federal loan will be available to make the conversion.

Dissident irrigation interests have expressed misgiving about the future of reclamation projects under the new arrangements. This is ridiculous, since we are assured that part of the surplus profits from the annual multimillion-dollar BPA operating deficit will be used to finance Idaho irrigation projects.

The final objection to the BPA extension is that it will decrease the tax base of the private utility companies. This, again, is no problem. Experience shows that no matter how much the base is decreased the Government is willing and able to raise the tax rate enough to more than make up the difference.

In summary, there is absolutely nothing to be feared from this action. After all, look at England. The Government has handled all electrical generation and distribution for years—and they get along very well with natural gas.

The Republican Summer Student Seminars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week the Republican National Committee inaugurated a series of programs for college students of every political persuasion working in the Nation's Capital. These presentations, in contrast to last year's White House efforts at public relations, are designed to present divergent views on the issues of the day, and allow for student participation through questioning. They are open to all. To provide for programs and speakers of interest to the students themselves, the committee works directly with an advisory group of students. Plans call for participation by members of both political parties, and members of the press and the academic community.

By this effort, a void created by the refusal of the White House to accept any constructive suggestions for its summer program, will be filled. Significantly enough, the same day this series started, the White House announced its own program, although barely a week earlier it seemed impossible to find anyone who could or would say what the program would be this summer or when it would start. According to newspaper and other sources, the White House plans to invite a few Republican Congressmen to participate, and to open meetings to other than the executive branch and the Democratic National Committee as was the case last year. This paucity of efforts to be constructive only illustrates the reluctance on the part of those in charge of the program to give up a favorite political plaything.

The Republican program this past week dealt with the future plans and prospects of the Republican Party in 1964, and had as contributing panelists Senator Thruston B. Morton of Kentucky, Congressman Charles McC. Mathias, Jr. of Maryland, Dr. William B. Prendergast of the Republican National Committee and myself. Neal Pierce, political editor of the Congressional Quarterly, contributed questions and comments. Questions from some of the several hundred students in attendance, a feature which the organizers of the series hope to expand in the weeks to come, concluded the program.

A great deal of the credit for this experiment in good government must go to Dr. Prendergast, as research director for the Republican National Committee, and his assistant, Charles Mack. Similar credit should go to the students themselves, particularly those comprising the advisory committee. They are: Mr. Wayne Kidwell, of the University of Idaho, who chaired the program on Monday; Miss Judith Hale of Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania; Miss Donna Herbst of Bradley University, Peoria, Ill.; Mr. Jimmie R. Hutchens of the University of North Carolina; Miss Jane Oegerle of the University of Kansas; Miss Ann Proctor of the University of California (Berkeley); Miss Harriette Rost of Washburn College, Kansas; and Mr. Lowell Willinger of Cornell University, New York.

As information to those interested in the development of this program and previous efforts made to interest the White House in a similar approach, I include the substance of my remarks introducing the program on Monday, July 15, as follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, REPUBLICAN, OF NEW JERSEY, JULY 15, 1963, BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN SUMMER INTERN PROGRAM

I have been asked to give a brief explanation of the genesis of this program, since I have been directly involved in its development. Some of you may recall that last year, a series of White House seminars were held, featuring such speakers as the Budget Director, the majority leadership in Congress and the President himself, addressing crowds of 3,000 to 6,000 students. While these appearances of public figures were of interest, they still left something to be desired in the way of adequate programing.

For one thing, no divergent views were offered and no Republican appeared on any program. For another, admittance was limited to those students working in the Executive branch, some students at the Democratic National Committee and the AFL–CIO, and in one instance, the interns in the National Center for Education in Politics program. A number of students felt that they were talked down to, and the subject matter made no attempt to present various sides of major issues, or to be educational.

With this in mind, I suggested, in December of last year, that the American Political Science Association offer its services to work with the White House in developing a program of substance and merit. As I said in my letter to the association, the White House program "lacked both political balance and the advantages of smaller group sessions directly concerned with the intellectual involvement of those participating." I also suggested that an early start in the program would provide coordination of speakers and dates with other seminar and intern projects, to avoid what last week the student newspaper here on the Hill, the Quorum, referred to as mounting "chaos."

The Political Science Association made a determined effort to interest the White House in joint cooperation. It was not, however, until the day after the story broke in the newspapers of possible political patronage control of summer jobs by the White House, that a White House spokesman became available for discussion of the ASPA proposal. The White House, in the latter part of February, asked for and received from the association a detailed program for the summer, featuring a coordination office, a bipartisan advisory committee and suggested small seminar sessions in fields of interest to particular students.

On April 8, the Civil Service Commission was forced to crack down on summer job hirings following a series of events which included memorandums from the White House to departmental personnel officers requesting names, colleges, et cetera of all prospective summer help, and instructions from the Young Democrats to chapters on college campuses to submit individual form 57's through the White House for summer jobs. In writing to Civil Service Chairman John Macy on this subject, I called his attention to the Political Science Association plan, and he requested a copy. I am quite certain that someone within Civil Service brought this up with the White House, but no action was taken. In fact, no White House program was announced until today and the Political Science Association has never received a direct rejection or affirmation of their plan. I would only note in passing on this fact, that when Chairman Macy testified before a House subcommittee back in March, he said it was his understanding that the White House only wanted the names of student interns to arrange another series of meetings with Federal officials.

This program today then was not developed until it became apparent, in June, that the White House had no intention of making use of the Political Science Association program. This program is an attempt to present issues, and more than one side of the issues, and is open to all summer student employees. With the cooperation of the academic and journalistic communities, and members of the Democratic Party, this program can achieve its goal.

I, myself, have every intention of seeking a coordinated, bipartisan program again next year. The latest White House move does not meet this test. Perhaps the most logical solution, now that Civil Service intends to use merit tests for hiring in the executive branch next summer, would be to have the Political Science Association and other like organizations work directly with the Office of Career Development. As Congressman WILLIAM E. MILLER of New York, the chairman of the Republican National Committee wrote to me last January, a Republican seminar might not be necessary if a proposal such as I have outlined gained acceptance.

In the meantime, I believe you will find this series of programs to be profitable and interesting, and I am sure that Mr. Kidwell and the other members of the student advisory group will welcome your constructive suggestions as to future programs and speakers.

Bloomfield Library Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, school, college, and community libraries all over the country are under great stress to meet the demands of students and general readers. The burgeoning population combined with the increasing numbers of citizens attending colleges and universities make for general readers as well as specialized readers to tax the services of libraries and their professional staffs.

Very often we take our library services for granted and we tend to forget those dedicated librarians who are working with great diligence to meet the demands on their facilities and who are also working to expand community interest in library services.

In this connection, I was extremely pleased to see that Kenneth McPherson, director of the Public Library in Bloomfield, N.J. was paid a great honor yesterday at the American Library Association's convention in Chicago, when the Bloomfield Library's 1962 Annual Report was selected as the best in the entire country.

When you consider that Bloomfield is a town of about 50,000, competing against more the 8,200 other communities, including all the great cities of our Nation, you will, I am sure, be as impressed as I by this award. Mr. McPherson, his assistant, Mrs. Rachel Diamond, and everyone connected with the preparation of the report can indeed be proud of their accomplishment.

And I know Mayor Conte and all the citizens of Bloomfield will join with me in congratulating Mr. McPherson and his associates.

The Republican Party and the Civil Rights Revolution—A Speech by Hon. Robert Taft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], recently delivered an important speech on civil rights in Newark, N.J. In his speech the gentleman from Ohio, BOB TAFT, boldly sets forth the role of the Republican Party on this vital question and traces the notable contribution which our party has made since the Presidency of Lincoln. In calling attention to the early and responsible Republican legislative proposals in the 88th Congress, he serves a timely warning to those who are under the impression that the message and legislation submitted by the President are the only proposals which have been put forward to deal with the ever-intensifying crisis in race relations which has gripped our Nation.

I am pleased to bring this address to the attention of my colleagues.

The text of the address follows:

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND THE CIVIL RIGHTS REVOLUTION

(By Hon. ROBERT TAFT, JR., of Ohio)

The civil rights revolution which is in process in this country presents all Americans and, particularly, the leadership of each of our political parties with a challenge of utmost importance. While it is still possible that the action and approach taken by Congress in attempting to deal with these problems may be a bipartisan one, this seems less likely as each day passes. The question is whether the leadership of the Democratic Party, divided for a century by an ever-deepening rift on the question of civil rights, is now attempting to find and cultivate company in its misery by claiming a split, or embarrassment, in the Republican Party on the same issues? If so, we Republicans must not allow it. With the help of pseudo-liberal columnists and big-Federal-Government advocates, we see daily charges of division among Republicans as to just how the Congress and the Nation should face up to the problems of racial discrimination that still exists in many parts of American life.

As on most issues, there is a basic unity within the Republican Party as to the principles which should guide us in dealing with these problems. In the spirit of Abraham Lincoln, the Republican Party has always stood, and will continue to stand, for true equality of opportunity for all citizens regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin. In accordance with this doctrine, the Republican Party has backed, and will continue to back, a legislative approach to the civil rights problems in a direct and forthright way. Claims that the Republican Party is catering to the South on the segregation issue are wholly baseless. No segregationist belongs on a Republican ticket or even in the party. The Democrats cannot say this, and won't say this. Perhaps the attacks show an attempt to explain away the final awakening of the South to the necessity of a two-party system for its well-being and a final recognition there that its best interests, along with those of the country, lie in the direction of a responsible fiscal policy and protection for, rather than a surrender to government of the individual liberty and equality of all citizens.

Accordingly, it is not surprising that most Republicans in Congress will support most of the proposals in President Kennedy's civil rights message and in the administration's bill, H.R. 7152, introduced as a result of that message. Particularly this is not surprising since most of the recommendations and provisions in the program were already included in the legislative proposals dealing with civil rights introduced by many Republican Members of Congress. For instance, before the President's message, there were already pending in the Congress (and with Democrat support there could have been enacted) Republican proposals dealing with the following areas:

1. In the field of voting rights, the President's proposal has now shifted to the approach already taken by the Cooper-Dodd bill, a far more realistic and legally sound approach toward literacy tests than had previously been backed by the administration as an irrebuttable presumption of literacy on a proof of 6 years of schooling. It still contains no provision requiring that votes be counted properly, a safeguard Republican measures seek for all Americans.

2. A specific authorization for suits by the Attorney General to enforce school desegregation had been backed by the Republican members of the Judiciary Committee as early as January. It has finally been endorsed by the administration.

3. Permanent status for the Civil Rights Commission had been backed, and is still backed, by the Republicans on the Judiciary Committee. The administration's proposal was, and apparently still is, one for a limited extension of life.

4. Republican proposals had suggested an equal employment opportunity commission to serve as a watchdog against discrimination on Government contracts or by Government agencies and, particularly, to check on labor practices in this connection. A similar proposal has now been backed by the administration.

5. Injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations had been backed by many Republicans before the President's message, but it is based on the sounder approach of protection of equal rights under the 14th amendment, rather than on an unlimited extension of Federal power under the Interstate Commerce clause.

6. Federally assisted programs in education and other fields have, in many cases, used Federal money to assist and aid programs which discriminated on account of race. Unfortunately, even today this is still true, although the President by Executive order could ban it in many programs, such as motels built with ARA help. Republican attempts to attach amendments to such legislation have been beaten down a considerable number of times by the Democratic Party in a coalition of northern urban Democrats and southern Democrats opposing such limitation. The payoff has been liberal grants and loans in southern congressional districts.

Certainly the Republicans claim no monopoly on these proposals for tackling the difficult problems of discrimination. But these examples should suffice to show that the Republican Party is sincere and active in its approach to the problem and that Republican support can, therefore, be expected for many of the provisions of the civil rights measures now finally receiving support from the administration. In view of the general backing that civil rights legislation seems sure to receive from the Republican side of the aisle, how do we account for the concentrated attempt to play up any disagreements or questions raised by Republican Members of Congress as to any facets of the program? The only answer is politics.

Before getting into any such criticisms or what the policies of the Republican Party should be, it might be well to examine at least three areas in the administration's civil rights proposals which raise serious questions as to the sincerity of the high-sounding pleas for a bipartisan approach to these problems.

The first provision of the President's civil rights proposal we might discuss is the section 601 provision. We will be hearing much on this in coming weeks. Section 601 of H.R. 7152 proposes that in lieu of specific mandatory provision prohibiting discrimination in programs granting Federal aid, we should enact a very general provision stating that no Federal aid law shall be interpreted as requiring that financial assistance shall be furnished in circumstances under which there is discrimination. It should be noted that this is merely a permissive provision under which the President, or the administrator of the particular program, may decide either to withhold Federal funds where there is discrimination, or to grant Federal funds notwithstanding the fact that there is discrimination. In other words, it is a license to the administrator of any Federal program to use Federal funds in a way that may well carry on or even promote discrimination. As compared to this approach, Republican members have been advocating specific prohibitions put into selected Federal aid bills and, particularly, into all Federal aid bills dealing with the various federally aided education programs, prohibiting the use of Federal funds under any such circumstances, unless it can be shown that the school or program in question is moving with all deliberate speed toward desegregation and elimination of discrimination. In testimony before the subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. Quigley, the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, this week specifically objected to any such mandatory provisions in the Gill bill, H.R. 6938, a measure proposed not only by all of the Republican members of the Education and Labor Committee, but also by many of the Democrat members of that committee. Moreover, in his testimony Mr. Quigley, for all practical purposes, admitted that he had not cut off Federal aid in spite of such discrimination and that this has not been done because he feels that the federally assisted programs were intended by Congress to be financed even if there was discrimination. On the basis of performance to date, with the powers already in the President and the administrators, it seems very doubtful whether discretionary power of this sort would be used unless there is included in the legislation a mandatory direction to use it. The language of the administration's proposal and the President's message would not override the directions to spend Federal moneys in specific programs. Nor are they intended to do so.

A second aspect of the administration's proposal that should be examined is the primary reliance put upon the interstate commerce power in the title II provisions seeking to eliminate discrimination in public accommodations. The inherent extension of Federal power not limited to the area of civil rights, which is implicit in reliances on the commerce power, seems certain to make it unacceptable to many Republican Members of Congress, and also to many Democrats, who would accept reliance on the 14th amendment, which deals with equal rights and would not be a precedent for extending Federal power over almost every aspect of private life by Federal governmental regulation. Likewise, the failure in the public accommodation section of the bill to prescribe some reasonable minimum limitation on size for application of the act seems designed to raise objections and to jeopardize the chance of its successful passage. This approach raises the question whether it is really desired by the administration to enact such a provision or whether they seek a political issue, or excuse of some sort, instead.

Finally, the attitude of the administration toward a fair employment practices bill is interesting. Apparently at the last moment the President decided to at least give lip service to the passage of a bill of this type such as is now pending before the Education and Labor Committee. This is interesting because apparently it was not included in earlier drafts of the civil rights message. It is also interesting in view of the fact that the Secretary of Labor and others speaking for the administration had earlier indicated that they did not advocate the passage of this legislation. Furthermore, the administration's civil rights bill itself makes absolutely no mention of fair employment practices and, apparently, is willing to leave the fate of this proposal to the Congress without any particular comments or instruction. I believe that I can say, however, that we do expect to ask the administration to comment on this measure and to state its position before the committee acts. This does not mean that we should ignore this problem of discrimination in employment, which is the most troublesome discrimination of all in our country today. Rather, working along with the other members of our Education and Labor Committee we hope to come out and propose to the Congress a reasonable and workable provision for the establishment of a fair employment practices commission and then to ask and expect support from the Democratic Party in backing such a proposal. Here, as elsewhere, it is important, through proper procedural requirements, to see that the rights of all citizens are properly protected and that State programs already making good progress in this area are not interfered with or supplanted.

In these three areas of federally assisted programs, public accommodations, and fair employment practices, one cannot help but wonder whether the administration is not still seeking to appease and play footsie with Southern Democrats in the hope of keeping them in line on other legislative proposals and in the 1964 elections. If a bipartisan approach to the civil rights problem in this country can work, and I believe that it can, then the President and other members of his administration will have to stop dodging the tough questions and indicate to the leadership of their party in the Congress and to the country generally what they believe a proper bipartisan approach should be. On these ticklish problems which I have outlined, they have not done so yet. Their failure is likely to create major difficulties for the enactment of sound laws facing up to these problems. These difficulties could result in defeat for much of the civil rights program. If it does so, regardless of the protestations, the responsibility will be the administration's.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 17, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Romans 13: 10: *Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.*

O Thou God of all grace, we are fervently praying that our beloved country may be safeguarded from the devastating blight of atheism and materialism, from the corrupting influences of greed and selfishness, and from the debasing moods of prejudice and hatred.

Grant that all the barriers which stand between the members of the human family may be broken down and may our democracy cause its radiant splendor of good will and brotherhood to find lodgment in every heart and every home.

May there be none in our social order who are aliens and outcasts to the blessings of freedom and justice, and show us how we may help them to cultivate and enjoy those blessings to the utmost by coordinating them with self-discipline.

Inspire us to seek for one another whatever is noblest and most worthy in human aspiration and achievement, and in all our relationships may there be that cardinal virtue of love which is the fulfillment of Thy law.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2998. An act to amend titles 10, 14, and 38, United States Code, with respect to the award of certain medals and the Medal of Honor Roll; and

H.R. 3845. An act to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 628. An act to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945;

S. 1512. An act to authorize one additional Assistant Secretary of State, and for other purposes; and

S. 1627. An act to enable the United States to contribute its share of the expenses of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos as provided in article 18 of the protocol to the declaration on the neutrality of Laos.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 546. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant easements for the use of lands in the Camp Joseph H. Pendleton Naval Reservation, Calif., for a nuclear electric generating station.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate today and the balance of the week.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. **KLUCZYNSKI**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, July 18, after all legislative business is concluded, I may address the House for a period of 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to eulogize Eugene T. Kinnaly, who has been a faithful servant here for 45 years.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL AIRPORT CEREMONIES

Mr. **VANIK**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. **VANIK**. Mr. Speaker, this morning 20 commercial airliners with a capacity of over 1,500 passengers remained stacked in flight for over 20 minutes at the National Airport while commercial operations were suspended for state ceremonies attending the departure of the distinguished leader of a friendly free world nation.

While the need for state ceremonies is well recognized, why should these functions take place at the already overloaded National Airport? Andrews Air Base is conveniently nearby with all of the resources for ceremonial pomp.

The stacking of commercial aircraft under the best conditions and controls imposes an unnecessary added risk to the passengers as well as the aircraft which must remain suspended in space for the duration of such ceremonies.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS AND POWER

Mr. **ROGERS** of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LIBERALIZING AMOUNT OF OUTSIDE EARNINGS OF RECIPIENTS OF OLD AGE ASSISTANCE

Mr. **STAFFORD**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. **STAFFORD**. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would permit recipients of old age assistance under social security to earn an additional $50 a month, or a total of $1,800 a year, before they are disqualified in any way from receiving social security benefits. I feel the advance in the cost of living makes this change in the basic law a necessity so that our senior citizens can earn sufficient sums of money that, together with social security benefits, will enable them to live in the dignity which they so well deserve.

DISCHARGE PETITION ON PRAYER IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. **BECKER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BECKER**. Mr. Speaker, we have heard thousands of times from the Gospel "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

At the Clerk's desk is my discharge petition to bring before the House a resolution providing a constitutional amendment that would permit prayer in schools and public places. I have asked the Members to sign that petition. I have sent letters to all the Members and shall continue to do so, and shall continue to exhort them to agree that we should give to God the things that are God's, the right to be heard in this Nation, as was stated in our Declaration of Independence and all of our public declarations through our history.

I agree that Members will not sign petitions having to do with things that are Caesar's, but I feel that when it comes to the area of Almighty God, no man can use the excuse that he does not sign discharge petitions. If we want to preserve our spiritual heritage in this Nation, the time to do so is now and not wait for more litigation before the Supreme Court, that is being prepared, to take from our currency and coins, "In

God we trust," and from our pledge of allegiance to the flag, "one nation under God," or to take our chaplains away from our armed services.

I say that the time to do it is now. We have waited 1 year for the committee to act on this resolution. They have not acted. I say we must do it now.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 5279) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 551)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5279) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 16, 17, 21, 25, 27, 34, and 39.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 9, 11, 13, 15, 23, 24, 32, 36, 38, 45, 47, 51, and 52, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$44,152,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$89,235,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$37,691,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$58,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "two hundred and thirty-three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$27,124,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$21,566,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$29,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,136,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "one hundred and twenty"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$29,404,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,075,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$615,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$17,832,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$30,589,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,243,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "one hundred and three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,858,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$147,312,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$962,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$25,893,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$63,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "one hundred and thirty-six"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$65,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$58,960,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 6, 7, and 10.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON,
BEN REIFEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
ALAN BIBLE,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5279) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Public land management

Bureau of Land Management

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $44,152,500 for management of lands and resources instead of $43,292,500 as proposed by the House and $44,652,500 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes $250,000 for reseeding of burned areas; $110,000 for rehabilitation of public land in Butte and Lawrence Counties, S. Dak.; $200,000 for rehabilitation in the Big Horn Basin, Wyo.; and $300,000 for cadastral surveys in Alaska.

The conferees are agreed that the directive included in the report of the Senate committee with regard to surveys of Alaska land selections made under the terms of the Alaska Statehood Act (Public Law 85–508) will be satisfied by surveys of the exterior boundaries of full townships (even if composed of as many as four land selections) with monumentation at an average of 2 miles around the perimeter.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $760,000 for public lands development roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization) as proposed by the Senate instead of $750,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $89,235,250 for education and welfare services instead of $88,350,000 as proposed by the House and $90,381,500 as proposed by the Senate. The net increase provided over the House bill consists of a decrease of $300,000 for survey of Indian education and increases as follows: $600,000 for educational assistance, facilities, and services; $132,000 for relocation and adult vocational training; $172,000 for maintaining law and order, and $281,250 for 1964 pay act costs. The conferees direct that the proposed survey of Indian education be conducted within available funds.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $37,691,300 for resources management instead of $37,239,300 as proposed by the House and $38,147,900 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes $50,000 for maintenance of roads used by school buses; $250,000 for repair and maintenance of buildings and utilities; and $152,000 for 1964 pay act costs.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $58,300,000 for construction instead of $55,500,000 as proposed by the House and $60,448,000 as proposed by the Senate. It is expected that the agency will undertake with the amount provided the construction of the complete budgeted program and in addition make provision for the following: replacement facilities for the Rosebud School Mission, S. Dak., $4,000,000; assistance to the public school district at Ignacio, Colo., $219,000; assistance to Newtown, N. Dak., Public School District No. 1, $450,000; assistance to the Grants, N. Mex., Municipal School District No. 3, $370,000; and for a jail at the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., $128,000.

Amendment No. 6: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 7: Reported in disagreement.

The conferees are in agreement that the Bureau of Indian Affairs should explore very carefully the return to road construction through contracts with private firms, in lieu of the use of force account, with the requirement that the successful bidder shall employ primarily Indians of the reservation on which the road is to be constructed.

The conferees are in agreement that the administrative expenses to be financed from program funds shall not exceed $1,375,000 for the headquarters and area offices, and $1,930,000 for reservation management.

Amendment No. 8: Provides for the purchase of not to exceed 233 passenger vehicles for replacement only instead of 250 as proposed by the House and 216 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Corrects printing error.

Amendment No. 10: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 11: Deletes House provision, as proposed by the Senate.

National Park Service

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $27,124,000 for management and protection instead of $27,068,000 as proposed by the House and $27,375,000 as proposed by the Senate. The net increase over the House bill includes: a decrease of $100,000 for new park areas now partially financed; a decrease of $110,000 for pre-Mission 66 areas; a decrease of $50,000 for the safety staff; and increases for the following: National Park Service training center requirements, $25,000; for additional U.S. Park Police, $80,000; employees' compensation fund payments, $46,000; purchase of a search and rescue aircraft for Lake Mead Recreational Area, $25,000; and 1964 Pay Act costs, $140,000.

Amendment No. 13: Provides travel limitation of $650,000 for management and protection as proposed by the Senate instead of $600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $21,566,750 for maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities instead of $21,375,000 as proposed by the House and $21,758,500 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: $75,000 for roads and trails; $100,000 for buildings, utilities, and other facilities; $16,750 for 1964 Pay Act costs.

Amendment No. 15: Provides a travel limitation of $187,500 for maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities as proposed by the Senate instead of $180,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: Provides limitation of $5,300,000 on the funds available for acquisition of lands as proposed by the House instead of $7,424,600 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided deletes the $300,000 contained in the House bill for acquiring lands in Civil War areas and includes $300,000 for acquiring lands in the Cape Cod National Seashore Area and $200,000 for the acquisition of lands for the Bad Lands National Monument, S. Dak.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $32,697,000 for construction as proposed by the House instead of $36,895,200 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided includes $2,379,000 for camping and picnicking facilities and $4,023,000 for employee housing.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $29,000,000 for construction (liquidation of contract authorization) instead of $28,000,000 as proposed by the House and $30,100,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided includes $2,020,000 for construction of the North Shore Road in the Lake Mead National Recreational Area.

Amendment No. 19: Provides a travel limitation of $500,000 for construction (liquidation of contract authorization) instead of $250,000 as proposed by the House and $528,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $2,136,750 for general administrative expenses instead of $2,120,000 as proposed by the House and $2,153,500 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill is for 1964 Pay Act costs.

Amendment No. 21: Provides a travel limitation of $103,000 for general administrative expenses as proposed by the House instead of $108,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments No. 22 and 23: Provide for the purchase of 120 passenger motor vehicles instead of 114 as proposed by the House and 124 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Provides for the purchase of one aircraft as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Territories

The conferees are in agreement that the pay act absorption under administration of territories shall be allocated proportionately among the various offices, including the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and general administration.

Mineral resources

Geological Survey

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $63,700,000 as proposed by the House instead of $64,808,500 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided reflects the following changes in the amounts carried in the House bill: a decrease of $355,000 for production of the National Atlas; a decrease of $325,000 for marine geology and hydrology; an increase of $350,000 for water resources investigations; an increase of $100,000 for preliminary design of a Geological Survey building in Washington, D.C.; and an increase of $230,000 for 1964 Pay Act costs. The conferees are in agreement that the construction funds for the Geological Survey building in Washington, D.C., shall be budgeted under the General Services Administration.

Bureau of Mines

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $29,404,000 for conservation and development of mineral resources instead of $29,054,000 as proposed by the House and $29,926,500 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes $250,000 for study of producing tars and oils from Utah and other western coals through carbonization and $100,000 for a comprehensive study of new uses for asphalt.

Amendment No. 27: Provides a travel limitation of $700,000 for conservation and development of mineral resources as proposed by the House instead of $746,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Coal Research

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $5,075,000 instead of $3,200,000 as proposed by the House and $6,575,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes $1,000,000 for project gasoline; $375,000 for planning and enginering a pilot plant in South Dakota for production of gas from lignite; and $500,000 for the development of a pilot plant in connection with coal gasification projects. The projects shall be subject to the provisions of the resolution of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs dated June 10, 1963.

Office of Oil and Gas

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $615,500 for salaries and expenses instead of $610,000 as proposed by the House and $621,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill is for 1964 Pay Act costs.

Fish and Wildlife Service

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates $17,832,900 for management and investigations of resources instead of $17,175,000 as proposed by the House and $18,682,500 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: $136,800 for initiation of a north Pacific gear research and development program; $87,600 for expansion of research on effects of pesticides; $6,500 for payment to employee's compensation fund; $50,000 for 1964 pay act costs; $92,000 for technical assistance on commercial fisheries in the Big Bend and other reservoir areas in South Dakota; $125,000 for biological studies of menhaden in the Gulf of Mexico; $60,000 for research on means of controlling the red tide phenomenon; and

$100,000 to promote the production of oysters by the propagation of disease-resistant strains.

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $4,450,000 for construction instead of $1,800,000 as proposed by the House and $4,458,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill is for construction of a fishery research vessel for use in the North Pacific and Bering Sea.

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $653,000 for general administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $640,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House bill is for replacement of an obsolete accounting machine.

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates $30,589,900 for management and investigations of resources instead of $29,879,400 as proposed by the House and $31,685,400 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: $120,500 for 1964 pay act costs; $200,000 for the Southeastern cooperative wildlife disease study at the University of Georgia; $55,000 for expansion of reservoir research program in the Missouri River Basin; $100,000 for research on improved and selective bird damage control measures; $45,000 for establishment of a sport fishery management project, eastern Tennessee; $30,000 for establishment of a sport fishery management project, West Virginia; $30,000 for a cooperative fishery unit at the University of Idaho; $30,000 for a cooperative fishery unit at Pennsylvania State University; and $100,000 for expanded research on methods of predator control. The amount provided for wildlife research includes provision for undertaking the program for propagation of endangered whooping cranes.

Amendment No. 34: Deletes language inserted by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $5,243,500 for construction instead of $3,678,000 as proposed by the House and $5,898,500 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: $80,000 for acquiring a surplus vessel for the Sandy Hook Marine Laboratory, N.J.; $72,000 for additional facilities, Fish Control Laboratory, Warm Springs, Ga.; $115,000 for surveys, plans, water supply, and building repair at the fish genetics facility, Beulah, Wyo.; $133,000 for impoundment facilities, Ouray National Wildlife Refuge, Utah; and construction at the following National Fish Hatcheries: Warm Springs, Ga., $116,500; Garrison Dam, N. Dak., $90,000; White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., $100,000; Hagerman, Idaho, $105,000; Ennis, Mont., $113,000; Greers Ferry, Ark., $188,000; Lyman, Miss., $104,000; Cheraw, S.C., $159,000; and Mescalero Indian Reservation, N. Mex., $190,000.

The conferees recommend that the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission give early consideration to initiating land acquisition to establish a National Wildlife Refuge in Pike County, Mo., in the vicinity of Annada, Mo.

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates $1,359,000 for general administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,325,000 as proposed by the House. The increase over the House bill is for automatic data processing of cost records and financial statements by commercial firms.

Amendments Nos. 37 and 38: Provides for purchase of not to exceed 103 passenger motor vehicles instead of 98 as proposed by the House and 108 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Solicitor

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates $4,000,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $4,010,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates $3,858,400 for salaries and expenses instead of $3,790,000 as proposed by the House and $3,893,400 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes $53,400 for two additional field committee chairmen and related expenses and $15,000 for the Division of Information.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

Department of Agriculture

Forest Service

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates $147,312,000 for forest land management instead of $143,609,000 as proposed by the House and $150,147,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: $200,000 for timber sales administration; $1,000,000 for recreation-public use; $250,000 for structural improvements for fire and general purposes; $491,000 for employee compensation payments; $1,000,000 for 1964 pay act costs; $300,000 for fire presuppression and prevention in southern California; and $462,000 for land acquisition including $200,000 for the Chattahoochee National Forest, Ga., and $262,000 for the Ouachita National Forest, Oklahoma and Arkansas.

Amendment No. 42: Provides limitation of $962,000 on land acquisition instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House and $1,162,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $25,893,000 for forest research instead of $23,948,000 as proposed by the House and $30,755,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: $250,000 for additional forest insect, disease and utilization research, Athens, Ga.; $75,000 for additional timber, watershed and wildlife research, Rapid City, S. Dak.; $250,000 for additional marketing research, Princeton, W. Va.; $275,000 for additional fire research, Riverside, Calif.; $100,000 for additional genetics and insect research, Corvallis, Oreg.; $25,000 for additional watershed, range, insect and disease research, Logan, Utah; $50,000 for expansion of timber management research, Alexandria, La.; $150,000 for expansion of research on restoration of strip-mined land in Appalachian region, Berea, Ky.; $35,000 for research on southern pine beetle control, Gulfport, Miss.; $100,000 for increased research and watershed management and timber production in Hawaii; $450,000 to complete construction of the Forest Protection and Wood Utilization Laboratory at Alexandria, La.; and $185,000 for preparation of designs and specifications for research facilities at the following locations: Morgantown, W. Va. ($31,500); Ft. Collins, Colo. ($79,000); Sewanee, Tenn. ($18,500); Missoula, Mont. ($28,000); and Houghton, Mich. ($28,000).

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates $63,200,000 for forest roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization) instead of $60,000,000 as proposed by the House and $66,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates $250,000 for acquisition of lands for Wasatch National Forest as proposed by the Senate instead of $20,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 46 and 47: Provide for the purchase of not to exceed 136 passenger motor vehicles instead of 126 as proposed by the House and 146 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review

Amendment No. 48: Appropriates $65,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House and $70,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Public Health Service

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates $58,960,750 for Indian health activities instead of $58,750,000 as proposed by the House and $59,171,500 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes $105,750 for 1964 Pay Act costs and $105,000 for the training of Indian women as nurse assistants and practical nurses in facilities available to the Indian Health Service in South Dakota.

Amendment No. 50: Appropriates $5,350,000 for construction of Indian health facilities instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House and $5,676,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Smithsonian Institution

Amendment No. 51: Appropriates $5,465,000 for remodeling of the Civil Service Commission building as proposed by the Senate. The conferees direct that the General Services Administrator transfer the building to the Smithsonian Institution as soon as it is vacated by the Civil Service Commission in order that the remodeling can be initiated without delay.

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates $511,000 for initiating preparation of plans and specifications for the National Air Museum Building as proposed by the Senate.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON,
BEN REIFEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, the conference action provides a total of $958,456,500 for fiscal year 1964 for the Department of the Interior—excluding the Bureau of Reclamation and the power agencies—and certain related agencies including the U.S. Forest Service and Indian health activities.

The conference total is a decrease of $70,052,500, or 7 percent, from the budget estimate. The final bill is $29,831,300 over the House bill and $27,236,900 under the Senate bill.

The appropriations allowed for 1964 represent an increase of $22,762,400, or 2 percent, over the 1963 appropriations. However, the effective increase is $37,622,400 when the 1963 figures are adjusted on a comparable basis to deduct the forest fire deficiencies appropriated in the 1963 Supplemental Appropriation Act.

Although we have made a significant reduction in the budget request, I believe the bill makes adequate provision for the essential additional requirements that must be provided for if we are to preserve and develop our great natural resources. It should be noted that appropriations for most of the activities covered by the bill have more than tripled since 1955. For that year comparable appropriations totaled only about $306 million as contrasted to the $958.5 million carried in this bill. I am convinced that effective use of the funds being appropriated in this bill will provide for all essential requirements in fiscal year 1964.

EXPANSION OF RESEARCH

I would like to again emphasize the concern of our committee over the rapid expansion proposed in the budget for many of the research programs funded by appropriations in the bill. We have made reductions in these requests, including oceanography and water resources research, as we do not feel that every action possible is being taken to eliminate duplication among the many agencies involved and to discontinue projects of lower priority in order to make personnel and resources available to undertake new research requirements. I hope there will be more progress in this regard during the current year and that it will be reflected in the budget requests for fiscal year 1965.

NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES

In line with this, our committee will continue to be concerned over the increasing number of employees being requested by the agencies. It is essential that the number of Federal employees, with few exceptions, be held to the current level. We have disallowed a majority of the new positions requested in the 1964 budget and will expect that new or expanded essential activities will be implemented through securing maximum productivity from existing personnel and the shifting of individuals from work of lower priority to higher priority work. In line with this policy, the bill requires generally an absorption of over 20 percent of the additional pay act costs in fiscal year 1964. It is expected that this reduction will be allocated to old line projects and activities of a less urgent character, helping to offset additional manpower requirements in more essential areas.

LAND OPPOSITE MOUNT VERNON

In disallowing the request of $724,600 to acquire additional land on the Potomac River shore opposite Mount Vernon the committee believes that the $213,000 appropriated last year to acquire the Mockley Point site of 133 acres, the primary reason for the passage of the authorization by Congress, is all that is warranted in these times when every effort must be made to reduce Federal expenditures.

The committee again carefully reviewed this proposition and found no evidence that any action is planned in this area that would in any way detract from the present view from Mount Vernon. The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission has formally advised the committee that the sewage treatment plant in question will be located outside the area covered by Public Law 87-362 and out of sight of Mount Vernon.

Considering that foundations currently own 350 acres of land opposite Mount Vernon, and have indicated their plans to donate these holdings to the Government; that 151 acres has already been donated; and that scenic easements are to be largely donated on about 2,600 acres, it does not appear that there is any real problem left in this area warranting further Federal expenditures.

It should be noted that Public Law 87-362 limited appropriations for acquiring the lands in question to $937,600. This limitation was based on the estimate that 586 acres would be acquired at a cost of only $1,600 per acre. It is evident from recent appraisals, averaging from $3,000 to $5,000 an acre, that a considerable increase in the authorization would be required if the Federal Government was to purchase the remaining acreage in question.

This area is presently under adequate planning and zoning controls by the Prince Georges County Commissioners, and the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission. This latter group has recently announced plans to acquire $30 million worth of park land in this general area and the committee feels that any additional land acquisition that may be found desirable for park purposes should appropriately be the responsibility of the local jurisdiction which enjoys some of the highest per capita incomes in the country.

APPROPRIATION SUMMARY

Major items in the bill include $270.9 million for the American Indian, including education, welfare, resource management, and health activities; $254.4 million for the U.S. Forest Service; $112.5 million for the National Park Service; $109.8 million for mineral resources, including Geological Survey, Bureau of Mines, and the Office of Coal Research; and $71.6 million for the Fish and Wildlife Service.

I will insert at this point a summary tabulation of the amounts in the bill:

Item	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House	Senate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							
Public land management	$415,579,000	$387,988,800	$404,269,100	$394,260,550	−$21,318,450	+$6,271,750	−$10,008,550
Mineral resources	122,062,000	107,538,000	112,905,000	109,768,500	−12,293,500	+2,230,500	−3,136,500
Fish and Wildlife Service	74,666,000	65,933,400	74,172,400	71,564,300	−3,101,700	+5,630,990	−2,608,100
Office of Saline Water	12,350,000	11,850,000	11,850,000	11,850,000	−500,000	--------	--------
Office of the Solicitor	4,083,000	4,000,000	4,010,000	4,000,000	−83,000	--------	−10,000
Office of the Secretary	4,084,000	3,790,000	3,893,400	3,858,400	−225,600	+68,400	−35,000
Total, definite appropriations	632,824,000	581,100,200	611,099,900	595,301,750	−37,522,250	+14,201,550	−15,798,150
Total, indefinite appropr.ations of receipts	10,845,000	10,760,000	10,760,000	10,760,000	−85,000	--------	--------
Total, borrowing authorization	13,000,000	6,000,000	6,000 000,	6,000,000	−7,000,000	--------	--------
Total, annual contract authority	17,500,000	--------	--------	--------	−17,500,000	--------	--------
Total, title I, Department of the Interior	674,169,000	597,860,200	627,859,900	612,061,750	−62,107,250	+14,201,550	−15,798,150
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES							
Department o. Agriculture, Forest Service:							
Total, definite appropriations	257,817,000	244,520,000	264,495,000	253,598,000	−4,219,000	+9,078,000	−10,897,000
Total, indefinite appropriations	770,000	770,000	770,000	770,000	--------	--------	--------
Total. Forest Service	258,587,000	245,290,000	265,265,000	254,368,000	−4,219,000	+9,078,000	−10,897,000
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	70,000	50,000	70,000	65,000	−5,000	+15,000	−5,000
Commission of Fine Arts	91,000	91,000	91,000	91,000	--------	--------	--------
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, Indian health activities	65,081,000	63,750,000	64,847,500	64,310,750	−770,250	+560,750	−536,750
Indian Claims Commission	313,000	297,000	297,000	297,000	−16,000	--------	--------
National Capital Planning Commission	717,000	650,000	650,000	650,000	−67,000	--------	--------
National Capital Transportation Agency	2,220,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	−1,200,000	--------	--------
Smithsonian Institution	24,174,000	16,537,000	22,513,000	22,513,000	−1,661,000	+5,976,000	--------
Transitional grants to Alaska	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	--------	--------	--------
Civil War Centennial Commission	107,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	−7,000	--------	--------
Total, definite appropriations	353,570,000	329,995,000	357,063,500	345,624,750	−7,945,250	+15,629,750	−11,438,750
Total, indefinite appropriations	770,000	770,000	770,000	770,000	--------	--------	--------
Total, title II, related agencies	354,340,000	330,765,000	357,833,500	346,394,750	−7,945,250	+15,629,750	−11,438,750
TITLE III—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION							
Limitation on administrative expenses, Virgin Island Corporation	(186,000)	(186,000)	(186,000)	(186,000)	--------	--------	--------
Total, title III, Virgin Islands Corporation	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Grand total:							
Definite appropriations	986,394,000	911,095,200	968,163,400	940,926,500	−45,467,500	+29,831,300	−27,236,900
Indefinite appropriations of receipts	11,615,000	11,530,000	11,530,000	11,530,000	−85,000	--------	--------
Borrowing authorization	13,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	−7,000,000	--------	--------
Annual contract authority	17,500,000	--------	--------	--------	−17,500,000	--------	--------
Total	1,028,509,000	928,625,200	985,693,400	958,456,500	−70,052,500	+29,831,300	−27,236,900

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce that I will not offer the motion to recommit that I had announced here on the floor yesterday I planned to introduce. I do this for the reason that I recognize that savings have been made over the budget estimate. I realize that our House conferees have succeeded in reducing the Senate bill, and that these savings must be justified and accepted in the Senate. I realize also the problem, if the motion to recommit carried, of maintaining the savings that this conference report already represents.

I am still opposed and very firmly opposed to spending any of our money for an air museum. I shall certainly vote against any appropriation for that purpose whenever it comes before this body. But, in view of the savings that have been made by our conferees, I will not offer my motion at this time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman a question or two concerning the conference report? Do I understand now that this is approximately $28 million or $29 million above the figure that the House voted?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, it is $29.8 million over the House bill and $27.2 under the Senate bill. It is about a split.

Mr. GROSS. Then instead of any economy in this conference report there is provided millions of dollars of increased spending?

Mr. KIRWAN. It is about $70 million, or 7 percent, below the budget.

Mr. GROSS. The budget figure was the bloated asking price. When are we going to have an appropriation bill that is cut below last year's spending? Let me ask the gentleman about the Civil Service Building. You have money in this bill for renovation of it. What is that building going to be used for now?

Mr. KIRWAN. That money is there to remodel the Civil Service Building which was formerly the old Patent Office Building. It is not to build a new building, but to remodel it. It is very much needed. It is one of the historic old buildings in the United States and it should be preserved.

Mr. GROSS. I asked the gentleman if he can tell me for what purpose the building is going to be used?

Mr. KIRWAN. It will be used to house the National Portrait Gallery and the National Collection of Fine Arts as authorized by the act of March 28, 1958.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, this is what I suspected: We are putting up brandnew buildings all over this Washington, D.C., to house the various agencies of the Federal Government and here we are going to renovate a Government-owned office building and put an art gallery in it or something of that kind.

Mr. KIRWAN. There is something that the gentleman has overlooked. There are some 7 million tourists coming to this city and they spend about $1 million a day here. They spend about $385 million a year and they are entitled to have an adequate building to see the best art in the world. Smithsonian now has no space to exhibit these priceless works of art.

Mr. GROSS. Well, there is a National Gallery of Art, and a big one, right here near the Capitol.

Mr. KIRWAN. This building is to house the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery of the Smithsonian Institution. This, you might say, is the anniversary of giving $100 billion to the rest of the world and, surely, you would give $5 million to 7 million Americans who are spending $385 million a year here.

Mr. GROSS. I have not been voting to give billions of dollars to the rest of the world. I thought I had some assurance with reference to this building matter when the bill was up before.

Well that still does not entitle you to spend money to convert that building to a portrait gallery in view of the fact that the Government is spending millions upon millions of dollars for rental space in privately owned buildings in Washington in addition to the millions for new buildings. I thought I had assurance when this bill was on the floor of the House that this would not be done.

Mr. KIRWAN. This old building is no longer adequate for office space and that is why they are constructing a new building for the Civil Service Commission. The act of 1958 provided for preserving the old building and converting it into a museum. It will be much cheaper than building a new museum.

Mr. GROSS. This is the old Civil Service Building, do I understand?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, and it is going to be remodeled. This is to finance what the Congress authorized in 1958 as soon as the Civil Service Commission moved out of the building. They are scheduled to transfer to their new building this fall.

Mr. GROSS. I opposed it when the bill was being considered here on the floor of the House until I had the assurance that this would not be done.

Mr. KIRWAN. If you opposed it, that does not alter the fact that the Congress passed the act. This Government is operated by a majority.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, well, I know that. Can the gentleman tell me where the tourists are going to park their automobiles while they are they are visiting this portrait gallery?

Mr. KIRWAN. I do not know about the question of parking but I assume some provision will be made for it.

Mr. GROSS. Are the tourists going to park their automobiles on the roof? That building is in the heart of the city. There is no parking space in that area.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the chairman of the committee in saying that I believe the conference committee did a very good job in this particular instance. I realize that we could not satisfy everyone and satisfy the ideas of everyone as to what should be done or what should be increased or decreased. But I think we made a very good decision with the Senate.

It is my opinion that the final result is a good one. It is 7 percent below the budget request. I think that the conference report represents a fine solution, and I do hope that the House will approve the conference report as submitted.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. As I interpret the conference committee report, there is not only an increase in the amount of about $30 million over what the House approved, but in addition the conference committee did restore an appropriation for extensive plans with regard to a National Air Museum which when completed will contemplate an additional appropriation for that structure of about $40 million. Therefore, by restoring that authorization or that appropriation we have to anticipate that there will be an additional $40 million to be appropriated which was not contemplated by the House at the time this appropriation bill was passed by the House.

I would like to ask this further question in addition to having made that observation. That question is this: We are not anticipating any additional revenue for the Federal Government; in fact, we are anticipating a reduced tax intake and possibly reduced revenue. How does this appropriation bill now stack up with the 1963 appropriation, which I feel should be a guiding influence insofar as the present appropriations of this Congress are concerned? Can the gentleman inform me how much above the 1963 appropriation bill these appropriations are?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes. Over the 1963 appropriations it is only 2 percent, and it is estimated the Federal revenue from this bill will be $787 million in 1964, an increase of $7 million over 1963. In answer to the first part of the gentleman's question we do not have a cost estimate on the building. That is why we should provide these planning funds to find out what an adequate building will cost. It will take 2 years to complete the planning and then the agency will have to report back to Congress and obtain an authorization for construction. There can be no appropriation for construction until Congress has had an opportunity to review the plans and the cost and authorizes construction.

Mr. McCLORY. Nevertheless, by committing the Congress today to the appropriation of $511,000 for initiating plans and specifications for a National Air Museum Building, we are, in effect, obligating a future Congress to the extent of many millions of dollars.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I think the managers on the part of the House are to be congratulated for their work in connection with the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, 1964.

I have been particularly interested in the plan to remodel the historic Patent Office Building, and have sponsored legislation to protect the National Collection of Fine Arts. I have been happy to work with a number of my colleagues in this connection, particularly the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Thompson], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rhodes], and, of course, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan].

The Patent Office Building was designed by Robert Mills, the famous American architect who designed the Washington Monument and the U.S. Treasury Building, in the Nation's Capital.

It is the intention of the Congress for both the National Portrait Gallery and the National Collection of Fine Arts to share occupancy of the building.

The Patent Office Building will make a fitting home for American art in years to come, and will be able to continue its service to our people.

The Congress directed the Smithsonian Institution, in 1846, to form a gallery of art for the Nation. In 1849 the Smithsonian Institution began the collection of paintings and sculpture, and art objects in general.

The Smithsonian Institution, because of its congressional sponsorship, has, through the National Collection of Fine Arts, been the keystone of the Federal outlook and concern for the arts. Through the expansion and development of the National Collection of Fine Arts the national concern for the arts will have its greatest flowering in the years ahead.

In 1930 the Smithsonian Institution struggled and failed to get funds to house its collections, and so it was not until the 75th Congress that steps were taken to provide a permanent home for the National Collection of Fine Arts.

The 75th Congress not only demonstrated its intention to provide a permanent home for the National Collection of Fine Arts but it also made it possible for private funds to be accepted for the purchase of works of art by living artists, and made possible the right to raise such funds for financing exhibitions of current and past works of art from the great store of such work in the National Collection of Fine Arts.

Today the National Collection works with the U.S. Information Agency in sending exhibits of American art overseas.

I have sponsored legislation, House Joint Resolution 241, with my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Thompson], to carry such exhibits to the smaller cities and towns of our country, and I hope that this legislation will be favorably considered, for it is an important step forward.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the action of the other body in setting out on page 10 of their bill that tribal funds derived from appropriations in satisfaction of awards to those tribes through the Indian Claims Commission and the Court of Claims shall not be further appropriated until a report of the purpose for which the funds are to be used has been submitted to both the Senate and the House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and those purposes have either been approved by resolution of each of said committees or have not been disapproved by resolution within 60 days from the date the report is submitted.

This provision is far better than the provision that was contained in the House bill which simply required the Department to submit to the committees a report on how the funds were to be used, which report should lay on the desk of the committees for 60 days, but which House provision did not require a resolution by the committees of both bodies, either approving or disapproving the plan for the disposition of these tribal funds.

I think it should be pointed out at this time, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress has completely abdicated its rights and duties with respect to these tribal funds which are derived from judgments obtained by the various tribes by simply permitting the Department to handle these funds in almost any manner they propose. The difficulty is, Mr. Speaker, that in every instance which has been called to my attention, the Department provides that the funds shall be used for the purchase of land to be taken by the Government and held in trust for the Indians to further perpetuate the Department of Interior and the Indian department for the next 50 years or more.

Tribes that are almost completely integrated, whose members are as competent as those employed by the Department of Interior, have been induced to set up land purchase programs to buy reservation areas for their people in an attempt to segregate the Indian and put him back under the regulation and control of the Indian department.

The Indian department is a very busy department of Government. Every year they come in for increased appropriations to hire more people to supervise less Indians, to handle less land, and to promulgate their own personal interests on down through the ages.

Congress has no business in turning these funds over to the Indian department to spend as they see fit to promote and promulgate their bureaucracy ad infinitum.

When an Indian tribe receives a judgment from the Court of Claims or from the Indian Claims Commission the disposition of those funds should be provided for by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the House and the Senate and by the Congress itself and not by the Indian Bureau. The provision in the Senate Appropriations Committee is actually too lenient and gives too much authority to the Bureau, but it is much better than simply having the Bureau report to the committees because it requires affirmative action on the part of the committees in either approving or disapproving the program.

I want to commend the Senate Appropriations Committee for making this provision possible, and I hope neither committee will take action until they have thoroughly studied a complete plan for the disposition of these funds.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. HALL. I am in this form.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Hall moves to recommit the conference report on the bill, H.R. 5279, to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on their disagreement to Senate amendment 52 which appropriates funds for initiating preparation of plans and specifications for the National Air Museum Building.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 144, nays 245, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

YEAS—144

Abbitt
Abele
Adair
Alger
Anderson
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Barry
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bray
Brock
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Bruce
Burton
Cahill
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Dwyer
Findley
Fino
Foreman
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Gary
Gathings
Gibbons
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hall
Halpern
Hardy
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hoeven
Horton
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Johansen
Jonas
Kastenmeier

King, N.Y.
Knox
Kunkel
Latta
Lennon
Lindsay
Lipscomb
McClory
McDade
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Meader
Milliken
Moore
Morton
Mosher
Murray
Norblad
O'Konski
Pelly
Poff
Pool
Pucinski
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Rich
Robison
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schweiker
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Stafford
Stinson
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Weaver
Weltner
Whalley
Wharton
Whitener
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wydler
Wyman
Younger

NAYS—245

Addabbo
Albert
Andrews
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Avery
Baring
Bass
Bates
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clark
Cohelan
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gavin
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Grant
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Holland
Horan
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Lankford
Leggett
Libonati
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
MacDonald
Madden
Mahon
Martin, Calif.
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Nygaard
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Price
Purcell
Quie
Rains
Randall
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staebler
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Westland
White
Whitten
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
  Charles H.
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—44

Abernethy
Barrett
Bonner
Buckley
Celler
Clawson, Del
Davis, Tenn.
Donohue
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Forrester
Garmatz
Giaimo
Grabowski
Gray
Hagan, Ga.
Hébert
Hoffman
Holifield
Kilburn
Landrum
Lesinski
Lloyd
Long, La.
McCulloch
Martin, Mass.
Miller, N.Y.
Morrison
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Neill
Philbin
Powell
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
St Germain
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Stephens
Thompson, La.
Trimble
Wickersham
Willis

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hoffman for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.

Mr. Abernethy for, with Mr. Garmatz against.

Mr. Del Clawson for, with Mr. O'Neill against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Bonner against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Stephens.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Forrester.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Gray.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Hagan of Georgia.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Wickersham.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Edmondson.

Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Lesinski.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Trimble.

Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Shelley.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Landrum.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Rogers of Texas.

Mr. HAWKINS and Mr. HERLONG changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. HALPERN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that the ayes had it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 333, nays 50, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

YEAS—333

Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Andrews
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolton,
  Oliver P.
Bow
Brock
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clark
Clausen,
  Don H.
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Grant
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Langen
Lankford
Leggett
Lennon
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McMillan
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
Nygaard
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Rains
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
  Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—50

Abbitt
Abele
Alger
Ashbrook
Becker
Beermann
Berry
Betts
Bolton,
  Frances P.
Bray
Bruce
Clancy
Curtin
Curtis

Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Findley
Foreman
Goodell
Goodling
Gross
Gurney
Hall
Harvey, Ind.
Hoeven
Hutchinson
Johansen
Kastenmeier
King, N.Y.
Laird
Latta
McClory
McLoskey
MacGregor
O'Konski
Poff
Robison
Rumsfeld
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schweiker
Skubitz
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Stinson
Taft
Tuck
Wharton

NOT VOTING—50

Abernethy
Barrett
Bolling
Bonner
Brademas
Buckley
Clawson, Del
Davis, Tenn.
Dingell
Donohue
Edmondson
Forrester
Garmatz
Giaimo
Grabowski
Gray
Hagan, Ga.
Hanna
Hansen
Hébert
Hoffman
Holifield
Jones, Ala.
Kilburn
Landrum
Lesinski
Long, La.
McCulloch
Martin, Mass.
Miller, N.Y.
Monagan
Morrison
O'Brien, Ill.
Philbin
Powell
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Sickles
Stephens
Sullivan
Thompson, La.
Trimble
Tupper
Utt
Wickersham
Willis

So the conference report was agreed to.

The clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Hoffman against.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Until further notice:

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Gray with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Jones of Alabama.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Edmondson.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Forrester.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Abernethy.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Stephens.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Wickersham.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Hagan of Georgia.
Mr. Shelley with Mrs. Hansen.
Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Sickles with Mr. Rogers of Texas.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Brademas.

The **SPEAKER.** The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 7, line 4, after the word "Colorado", insert the following: ": *Provided further,* That not to exceed $450,000 shall be for assistance to the Newtown, North Dakota, Public School District Numbered 1, for construction of an addition to the Newtown Public School."

Mr. **KIRWAN.** Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Kirwan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER.** The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: On page 7, line 7, insert the following: ": *Provided further,* That not to exceed $370,000 shall be for assistance to the Grants, New Mexico, Municipal School District Numbered 3, Valencia County, New Mexico, for construction of an addition to the public high school serving the Pueblos of Laguna and Acoma".

Mr. **KIRWAN.** Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Kirwan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER.** The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10: On page 9, line 20, insert the following: ", except that tribal funds derived from appropriations in satisfaction of awards of the Indian Claims Commission and the Court of Claims shall not be further appropriated until a report of the purposes for which the funds are to be used has been submitted to the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and those purposes either have been approved by resolution of each of said committees or have not been disapproved by resolution of either of said committees within sixty calendar days from the date the report is submitted, not counting days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain:".

Mr. **KIRWAN.** Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Kirwan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10 and concur therein.

Mr. **KIRWAN.** Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty].

Mr. **FOGARTY.** Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I just want to take a couple of minutes in which to say that I think this is one of the best bills that has been considered by this Congress, and to say that for the past 20 years I have been listening to Mike Kirwan talk about this bill as being an all-American bill, that this bill is for America and for Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know of anyone in the Congress who has done more to develop the natural resources of our country, to open up the national parks to all Americans, than has Mike Kirwan.

In political parlance we have back home, "Mr. Democrat" or "Mr. Republican." In the Halls of Congress, we have the same thing. On yesterday we had Mr. Carl Vinson as one of the great men in this Congress who has done so much for this country. Mike Kirwan knows as much about the Department of the Interior as Carl Vinson does about the U.S. Navy. I would like to suggest today, because of the tremendous time and effort that Mike Kirwan has put into the operations of the Department of the Interior over the years, all for Americans and all for America, that he be our "Mr. American" in the House of Representatives.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I think all of us remember over the years Mr. Kirwan's charge to the House that we were neglecting the original American in this country, the Indian. I do not think anyone in this House or in the other body has done so much for the real Americans, the Indian population, as has Mike Kirwan. Just in the last 5 years he has provided over a billion dollars in the Interior bill to provide urgently needed educational, welfare, and health services to the Indians, including new schools, hospitals, and roads. He has taken especial interest in promoting their economic development so that they may become self-sufficient.

I do not think any of us will forget the fight he made to stop mineral stockpiling and subsidies 4 or 5 years ago. Almost alone, he and his committee took on everyone and everything and cut off appropriations for the stockpiling program under Public Law 733, saving $70 million and defeated the new minerals subsidy bill which would have authorized new appropriations up to $650 million.

During the 18 years that Mike Kirwan has been chairman of the Interior Subcommittee over $6 billion has been appropriated for the activities of the Department of the Interior, exclusive of the Bureau of Reclamation and the power agencies. Just think where our Nation would be today but for the foresightedness of Mike Kirwan and others to provide for the development and preservation of our great natural resources including our forests, fish and wildlife, minerals, water, and the vast public lands.

A typical example that comes to mind is the action he took to improve conditions in our national parks. It was during one of his extensive field trips in 1955 to review activities in the field that he realized the deplorable conditions existing in the national parks. Construction of facilities had not kept pace with the great increase in the number of visitors. When he discovered that the budget request for construction for fiscal year 1956 was only for $5,200,000, he took immediate steps to have the construction appropriation increased to $15 million to provide immediately for expanded facilities, including picnic areas, comfort stations, visitors centers, etc. This was a whole year in advance of the time that the administration planned to begin its Mission 66 program.

We are also well aware of his ceaseless efforts over the years to provide adequate appropriations for reclamation, flood control, and navigation in the public works appropriation bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to Mike Kirwan today as "Mr. All American," because certainly he deserves that connotation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the Record on our distinguished colleague, Mr. Kirwan.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cannon].

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I must join my friend from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] in the eulogy of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan].

It has been my pleasure to have served with Mr. Kirwan for many years. Whenever he comes to the floor he always has my undivided attention—as he also has the attention of all Members of the House. It has been my privilege to observe—when you come to analyze his position—he is invariably for the average man—the man of the street and the field and the shop—the man who has daily financial problems, the family that sometimes is uncertain whether there will be breakfast on the table in the morning, or whether there will be sufficient money to buy shoes for the children. On one hand he is the idealist, the philanthropist, the humanitarian. And on the other hand he is the practical politician who knows how to implement his love of mankind in the drafting and management of his bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I must concur unqualifiedly in the gracious tribute of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] to the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan]. He is a benefactor and a credit to his State and to the House.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the very kind remarks of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] and the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. Cannon], and I want to thank them both. I am reminded of something Speaker Clark, of Missouri, in his book on his political career, quoted from a speech of a prominent man of an earlier day:

> The sweetest incense ever to greet the nostrils of a public man is the applause of the people.

THE HONORABLE CARL VINSON

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it was my misfortune to be in conference on the other side of the Capitol yesterday and so missed the opportunity to join in the recognition paid our beloved and distinguished colleague from Georgia, Carl Vinson, and his remarkable record in becoming the all-time dean of the American Congress.

Mr. Vinson has served longer than any other man in the 88 Congresses, longer than all the thousands of able and patriotic men who have been Members of the Congress, both in the House and the Senate. It is hardly to be expected that another such record will be established in the next 200 years.

It is not only remarkable for its length of tenure but also because it has been a continuous service.

The man who for many years held this record was Speaker Cannon of Illinois. Speaker Cannon for many years enjoyed the distinction of being the oldest Member of the House and the man with the longest continuous service. But, as he himself expressed it on one occasion, there were 2 years in which he took a vacation "at the suggestion of his constituency."

The gentleman from Georgia has not only been here longer but he has served consecutively and continuously for what amounts—and what will eventually constitute a full half-century—with the possible exception of the service of Gladstone in the British House of Commons—the longest continuous service in the history of world parliaments.

But the supreme distinction of the tenure of Carl Vinson in the House and the Congress lies not in length of service but in the quality of that service.

After all, the principal consideration is not how long he has served here but how well he has served here.

"Better 50 years of Europe than a cycle of Cathay." Therein lies the greatness of the man and the measure of his contribution to national welfare in the most critical years of the Republic.

Few Presidents of the United States have made in their 4 or 8 years of limited service as significant a contribution to the safety and security of the country and its international prestige as Carl Vinson in his half century on the quarterdeck of the ship of state.

I recall distinctly, and sometimes with no little feeling of trepidation, the situation which obtained at the close of the Second World War. We had thoroughly sold the country on the idea that this was a war to end all wars, and when victory was achieved, there was a stampede. And this Congress was largely responsible for it. We cannot be taken to task too harshly under the circumstances. Every wife, mother, and sister was importuning by telephone, telegram, and letter demanding that we "send their boy back home." American womanhood had gone through a war period of agonized anxiety and when the news of the armistice came they expected to see him come marching back with banners waving early the next morning. Tear-stained letters cried:

> The war is over. The war to end all wars has been won. We want our man back home. What's the use of keeping him over there? There will never be another war as long as time stands. We want him back now.

Under that tremendous pressure from every section of every congressional district in the Nation, Congress, almost overnight, severed all redtape, abandoned all precautions, and brought our vast armies back on record time. We practically abandoned national defense.

Over there, men dropped their guns where they stood and ran for the ship. We left billions of dollars worth of invaluable war materiel and weapons. The latest engines of war were left to rust in the jungles while other nations carefully conserved all implements and every lesson to be salvaged from the greatest of all world conflicts.

Our entire system of defense was disorganized, disintegrated, and dissipated. When we belatedly woke to the menace massing against us on the world frontier—shocked and bewildered to find the Nation in mortal danger—we lacked everything essential to survival. At this crisis Carl Vinson rose to the occasion. He had to start from a new base of operation. It was necessary to work from the ground up and in the tragically short time available build what amounted to a new system of defense.

Many wars have been won or lost through the invention or adaptation of some particularly effective weapon. Herein lay the burden of his task. Today every weapon of the last war is as obsolete and outmoded as the French .75's.

It is the duty of Congress—and therefore of the Committee on Armed Services to provide these weapons. We were all but hopelessly handicapped by incredible delay and inertia. In the renaissance of the last few crowded years no one or no one agency has had a larger part or a more critical responsibility than Carl Vinson and the Committee on Armed Services. Against heavy handicaps they have rehabilitated our defense.

This notable occasion in which an honored public servant of the people has established a record of 50 years devoted capacity and loyalty affords us an opportunity to lay our flowers and encomiums where they are most appropriate, and most deserved.

Modern warfare with its terrible forces of destruction and devastation is not merely a matter of victory or defeat. It is a question of survival. It threatens extinction—not only of the American Nation, but the extinction of Christian civilization throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is our earnest hope that Carl Vinson may serve another 50 years and continue to render the Nation the same distinguished service he has rendered the last 50 years.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

VETERINARY MEDICINE WEEK

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 513) authorizing the President to proclaim the week beginning July 28, 1963, as Veterinary Medicine Week.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning July 28, 1963, as Veterinary Medicine Week, and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, in recognition of the contributions which the veterinarians of this Nation have made through the eradication of diseases, the maintenance of high standards for food inspection, and research in various fields of veterinary medicine, and for services they have rendered to all lovers of pets.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PEANUTS FOR BOILING

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 401 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 101) to extend for two years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, for the legislative history, I would like to call the attention of the House to an apparent mistake in the committee report. On page 1 of the committee report, under the paragraph headed "Purpose" the next to the last sentence reads:

> The present law will expire after the 1961 crop of peanuts. This bill will extend the definition through the 1962 and 1963 crops.

I am advised that this is a mistake and that it should read:

> The present law will expire with the 1963 crop and this bill would extend it to the 1964 and 1965 crop.

This is academic, but I thought the record should be clear.

During the hearings on this bill there was no opposition, and I think it is quite understandable that there would be no opposition. If this commodity is not in surplus certainly it should not be under acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

I did note, however, that two of the minority members of the subcommittee signed minority views, and perhaps their position will be further enunciated in general debate.

The consideration of this bill today, Mr. Speaker, does bring into perspective several administration policies to which there is a great deal of opposition. Maybe this is not the proper forum for administration policies to be debated as we are the legislative branch of the Government and should assume our responsibility independent of administration influence. However, politics playing the role that it does in our system, it appears that our entire legislative role is regulated by administration positions and so therefore these same administration positions conveniently lend themselves to analysis and review in this legislative body.

What are the administration policies that are placed into perspective this afternoon? Certainly the one of greatest concern to me, and I think to people generally, is the lack of action by this House and the other body as well. This deadlock has come about by the administration's insistence on unacceptable legislative proposals. Presumably this statement would cause someone to arise and to observe that if the Rules Committee would only grant a rule on certain administration measures pending before that committee, Congress could proceed with the work. It is not my impression that there is any great urgency on the part of the leadership to bring certain administration bills to a vote in the Rules Committee and to the floor for debate. We have such well-known measures pending as the mass transit bill, the Youth Conservation Corps, and several other measures that generally have as their objective expanding the jurisdiction of the Federal Government and placing further burden on the Treasury.

For my part, I think it might be well for the administration to force a vote in the Rules Committee which it can do under the packed arrangement, and bring these bills to the floor for a decision. It is my conviction, Mr. Speaker, that the reluctance of this House to favorably consider these administration measures is a true reflection of the thinking of the citizens generally. Said another way, I do not believe that such proposals that will further project the influence of the Federal Government are in harmony with the mood of the electorate.

Therefore, I cannot understand why this House cannot dispose of these issues, complete its work and adjourn. Last week the biggest decision the House had to make was whether or not the Secretary of Commerce should prescribe the characteristics of seat belts, if such seat belts were to be sold in interstate commerce. And this week, it appears the most momentous decision will be whether or not approximately 1,500 farmers should be permitted to raise boiling peanuts without being subjected to acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

To those of us representing the Middle West, it is hard to understand why the Secretary of Agriculture schedules a trip to Russia just at the time farmers are making plans and preparations for their 1964 wheat crop. And again, someone may want to reply the farmers have by referendum already selected their wheat program for 1964 and therefore no further consideration of the problem is necessary. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is a rather irresponsible attitude. The choice that was given the farmer was really not a fair one and not one that came about by the usual legislative process.

May I remind the Members of the House that this same Kennedy program was rejected by the House on June 21, 1962. The House then passed a simple extension of the 1962 program that was generally acceptable to most of us in the Middle West. But when the bill went to the other body, they defied the will of the House and again inserted the so-called Freeman bushel management program. In conference the House conferees acquiesced as was expected, but even more than that, provision was made for certain compensatory payments that were not a part of either the House or the Senate bills. Then when the conference report came before the House, it is my contention that it was again rejected. The record will show that it passed by a vote of 202 to 197, but this vote was only possible after three Members of the majority had been persuaded by the leadership to change their votes from "nay" to "yea"—Rutherford, Magnuson, and Carey. This clearly indicates that again this so-called bushel management two-price system did not represent the thinking of the House, and therefore it should have come as no surprise that this concept was rejected by referendum by the Nation's wheat farmers.

Although it is not possible for me to determine what, if any, action the majority intends to take in regard to wheat legislation this year, there was a story in the Wall Street Journal this morning by a reliable reporter that certain conclusions were developing as to what should be provided for the 1965 crop, but the inference is a clear one that no action is anticipated for the crop next year. My correspondence and conversations do not reflect alarm on the part of the Kansas wheat farmers. My personal conversations have convinced me, however, that the rejection of the Freeman plan was not so much a rejection of the program itself as it was a rejection of the concept of Government management of privately owned farms.

It seems to me that there is an area of agreement that has commenced to evolve. This agreement appears to be discernible to some extent among the farmer organizations, between farmers themselves, and the story just referred to would indicate that even within the Department of Agriculture there has been a recognition of these areas of agreement. The Department, the story indicates, has finally concluded that a voluntary program will accomplish virtually as much control as a mandatory program and the cost could even be less. This is not to imply that there would be unlimited production, but it does suggest that compliance can be attained by incentives, and the result of the two different approaches would be comparable. I hope this story is well founded, as I think it represents a lot of fresh and realistic thinking in the Department of Agriculture.

I would also like to observe, Mr. Speaker, that this concept is very nearly like the one that was employed by approximately 20 Members from the Middle West in developing legislation for a wheat program, not for 1965 but for 1964. Would it be too much to ask, Mr. Speaker, that the Secretary of Agriculture return home and translate this new philosophy into legislation and submit it to the Congress? If our legislative schedule for the next few weeks is to be dominated by bills of comparable significance to the one we have today, the seat belt bill from last week, and the schedule that I anticipate for next week, certainly it would seem that any responsible leadership would want to utilize such time and effort as would be available to developing acceptable wheat legislation for 1964.

Although my view is obviously parochial because of the nature of the economy in my State of Kansas, this same dilemma apparently faces not only the cotton farmers but all of the industrial complexes with that commodity. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that you would employ your influence and prestige not only to expedite the work of this Congress but to improve the record of this Congress by favorably considering legislation needed for the Nation's agriculture.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DEVINE. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Avery] has very clearly pointed out the legislative schedule, or the lack thereof, pointing out that last week our major legislation had to do with setting standards for seat belts on Federal automobiles and that today the major legislation, in fact, the first legislation before the House since the Easter recess relates to boiling peanuts, and since that is an important matter facing the Congress and the Nation today, it seems to me that all Members should be present.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DEVINE. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 98]

Abernethy
Barrett
Bonner
Buckley
Cameron
Clawson, Del
Davis, Tenn.
Diggs
Donohue
Edmondson
Evins
Fisher
Foreman
Forrester
Giaimo
Grabowski
Hagan, Ga.
Harsha
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Hoffman
Holifield
Kee
Kilburn
King, Calif.
Knox
Landrum
Lesinski
Long, La.
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Meader
Miller, N.Y.
Monagan
Morrison
Morse
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
Philbin
Powell
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Smith, Calif.
Springer
Steed
Stephens
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, N.J.
Trimble
Wickersham

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 381 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PEANUTS FOR BOILING

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to hear the previous speaker, the gentleman from Kansas, complain of the insignificant nature of the bill under consideration because the gentleman is a member of the Rules Committee, which has consistently bottled up really important bills.

Mr. Speaker, it would be temptingly easy to be facetious about the pending bill concerning boiled peanuts. I, for one, shall not indulge in such ridicule because I am sure that the bill means much to the welfare of the districts of a few of my colleagues.

However, I do want to state that many of us in the House are eagerly awaiting the opportunity to vote on matters of more general interest and more urgent need.

We are fiddling in Congress while issues burn. I earnestly hope that we will soon get down to business, lest the symbol of the 88th Congress be one lonely, solitary boiled peanut.

Let us have done with peanut issues and try to tackle some giant ones.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 101) to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 101, with Mr. Flynt in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Matthews] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Belcher] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Matthews].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that it had not been my desire at all in the consideration of this legislation to have the attention of the House for such a long period of time. I am very grateful for the tremendous interest that so many wonderful ladies and gentlemen are expressing in this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, in 1957 this legislation was passed on the Consent Calendar. Two years later it was passed a second time on the Consent Calendar. After another 2 years, it was passed again on the Consent Calendar. This year this particular legislation was reported unanimously by a subcommittee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones] and in the full committee, as I recall, only three votes were cast against it. The statement was made by one of our colleagues on the full committee that he did not think we should pass the bill on the Consent Calendar. I was delighted to follow the suggestion that he made and so, of course, we made no effort to pass the bill on the Consent Calendar.

Then, on May 6 we brought this bill up under suspension of the rules. May I say it seemed for some unforeseen reason that there might be a little opposition and when it seemed that some of our colleagues thought maybe we ought to get a rule, I very gladly agreed to vacate the order by which we were discussing this bill under suspension, and then we went to the Committee on Rules and obtained a rule. Here we are today to ask for a simple extension of 2 years of a bill which would permit farmers to plant peanuts for boiling purposes without coming under the provisions of acreage allotments.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to belabor this issue. I should like to refresh the memory of those who are here this afternoon by saying the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer] and I were cointroducers of this legislation a number of years ago and in succeeding Congresses we passed this legislation on the Consent Calendar.

I would be delighted to answer any questions that any of you may have. We have at the present time only about 3,000 acres of these peanuts that are planted for boiling purposes. We find that there is no competition with other types of peanuts. There are 1,560,000 acres of peanuts that are planted under the acreage allotment provisions, but these 3,000 acres are planted by boys in school and by small farmers and are sold as a vegetable at football games and baseball games and so on.

They are sold green on the market, in the chainstores, and there are two or three small industrial plants that have been developed as a result of canning these peanuts to sell in the grocery stores.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am delighted to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. The last time our distinguished friend had this bill on the floor of the House he had some free samples. Did the gentleman bring any free samples today?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Sir, if one of the pages will get my black briefcase, I have them here. The reason I did not offer these samples is because some of my friends said after tasting them that they did not like them.

I am going to ask one of the pages if he will, please, to distribute these peanuts. I certainly hope, Mr. Chairman, we can pass this legislation because I am about out of free sample peanuts.

I have here, Mr. Chairman, a can. They are already open this time. The last time you had to get a can opener.

Mr. GROSS. If my friend will yield further——

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir, but just 1 minute, if you will let me get these ready for distribution in the cloakroom.

Mr. GROSS. I would suggest that they be eaten over there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it proper, sir, to suggest that the Members go in the cloakroom and sample them?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida will proceed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, may I say to my colleagues if you will go in the cloakrooms we will be delighted to furnish you these samples.

Mr. Chairman, I shall be glad to answer any other questions. However, I want to yield to my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fuqua] who comes from the great Suwannee River section of our State, and who is very familiar with this succulent article about which I am talking.

Mr. FUQUA. I thank the gentleman, my colleague from Florida, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I likewise introduced a companion bill to this bill, H.R. 101, which was introduced by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Matthews]. But I certainly want to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. Matthews. I come from an area of Florida where many of our small farmers are engaged in the peanut business. I know of no program in any other section of the country where they boil peanuts or where they have peanut boilers.

Mr. Chairman, if there is a need, and there certainly is, we want to help the little people in their efforts to try to grow a few acres of peanuts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Matthews] has expired.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FUQUA. These people grow a few acres of peanuts. Sometimes it is less than a half acre or a quarter of an acre, or just a small patch in their gardens. This is a method by which they can supplement their income. I know many people who make their living from selling roasted and boiled peanuts.

Mr. Chairman, this is an example of people who are trying to help themselves and who are not on the relief rolls, as we have in other areas. These people are trying to help themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I earnestly ask the House to favorably act on this bill today.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. Hagen].

Mr. HAGEN of California. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. Matthews] that I want to stipulate that these peanuts are not Yankee approved. In fact, the pigeons on Capitol Hill would not eat them. I threw some of them out to the pigeons and they would not eat them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The only consolations I can get from the gentleman is to say that since there will be no competition with the wonderful vegetables which come from the State of California, I know the gentleman will support my bill.

Mr. Chairman, the taste of a boiled peanut is unique. If the peanut were air conditioned, it would taste like an artichoke. It tastes like a dehumidified artichoke.

Mr. Chairman, during the depression days many of us remember having eaten swamp cabbage. I do not know whether the Members of the Committee are familiar with these huge palm trees, but when you cut them down you take out the heart of the palm tree, that is the cabbage. If a boiled peanut were dehumidified, you would have that swamp cabbage taste, a crunchy, delightful taste.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, in my district you can get this delightful swamp cabbage. And, if you go there you can get them at the Sea Island Hotel in Cedar Key, Fla. If you spend some money there, tell them that Congressman Billy Matthews sent you.

Mr. Chairman, if my friends on the other side will agree, I am willing to go ahead and pass this bill unanimously.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Is this a sort of supply management program?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I do not believe it would be any type of supply management program, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. DOLE. What it is is an attempt to avoid the supply management program and the controls that other peanut farmers have?

Mr. MATTHEWS. You may say yes, but, of course, there are many, many crops that do not have supply management control. The gentleman and I are agreed that many of these crops do not need a supply management control. I do not think anybody has suggested this type of boiled peanut is anything but a kind of an agricultural commodity that does not need supply management.

Mr. DOLE. I want to point out it is a very serious question from this standpoint: We talk about supply management and many people have supply management control for their commodities and this is an effort to avoid it by this peanut bill.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is the gentleman going to oppose this bill?

Mr. DOLE. I would try to make it applicable to all peanuts.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Does the gentleman think it is a good bill?

Mr. DOLE. I think it would probably be better if no peanuts were exempt.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I hope the gentleman will not put my people on the dole by opposing this bill.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida who is a cosponsor of this legislation, my friend, Mr. Cramer.

Mr. CRAMER. It may be of interest to the House to learn what was the genesis of this bill. At the outset, back in 1957, a number of farmers in my then district, now represented by the distinguished gentleman, Mr. Gibbons, of Hillsboro, Fla., came to me with a complaint about the fact they had penalties assessed against them. They had very small acreage at that time. It was 15.6 acres in these green peanuts to be used for boiled peanut purposes. We thought that was wrong. I am one who does not agree with the general program on peanuts and other Government-controlled programs. I was delighted to introduce the bill after discussions with the Department of Agriculture. As a matter of fact, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture was in the area at that time. He discussed this with the farmers and he felt this penalty, and it was a penalty, was not justified but they had no choice but to impose the penalty. There were substantial differences involved. In view of the present law, the Department of Agriculture, myself, and others drafted the bill now before us back in 1957, which was enacted then and has been twice since that time. The purpose was to prevent these unfair penalties being assessed against small farmers growing peanuts to be boiled.

We have heard a lot about civil rights in this session of the Congress. If you want to do something for the Negro down South, you will let him continue to grow these peanuts for boiling purposes. They consume about 95 percent of these peanuts. It is part of their staple foodstuffs. The farmers cannot grow them without this provision in the law excluding boiled peanuts and green peanuts from allotment of acreage.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ABBITT. Are we to understand this simply extends the present law 2 additional years?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. ABBITT. It is my understanding this legislation is not going to be made permanent?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 101 is about peanuts and in some ways, using the vernacular, it is peanuts. Involved are only 3,000 acres, only a tiny fraction of peanut land. The 3,000 acres also include, believe it or not, about 1,500 farmers. So, indeed, this involves presently few farmers. If it is regarded as a civil rights bill—a thought that had not occurred to me—then my effort to amend this bill would broaden the civil rights aspect of it to all peanut farmers—not just the 1,500 presently involved.

This bill is not a joke and it is not a circus we are involved in here. The bill involves a very serious principle, and we invite your attention to that principle.

Simply stated, it is this: Is it fair to force taxpayers to pick up the tab caused by special interest loopholes in Government-control programs? That is the issue in this bill.

We may properly consider the plight of the little peanut farmer, but I think we also ought to give some consideration to the plight of the poor, struggling little taxpayer.

CCC losses under the peanut program in the last 2 years have averaged over $25 million each year. That amount is not peanuts, even at the Federal level.

On May 31, 1963, which is the latest Department of Agriculture report, the taxpayers had $17,057,940 tied up in peanuts. It was tied up as follows: In inventory, in Commodity Credit storage stock, $15,530,207. Under CCC loan $1,527,733 additional, for a total of $17,057,940.

Those of you who are concerned about the cost of government should note the fact that the latest Department of Agriculture report predicted a "moderate surplus" in 1963.

So despite the fact that we are losing over $25 million a year on the peanut program, and despite the fact that we have now tied up over $17 million of our taxpayers' money in peanut stocks, taxpayers may reasonably expect to have to shell out still more dollars to make the Government stockpile of peanuts even higher.

If this bill is defeated, all peanuts for boiling, just like the peanuts processed for other purposes—and when they are planted there is no difference between peanuts for boiling and otherwise—all peanuts for boiling will have to come from Government-controlled acres. This, of course, would reduce the total production of peanuts in this country and would make supply management—Government control—more effective.

Of course, therefore, it would tend to reduce the buildup of peanut stocks. Every peanut produced on special-exemption acres, such as that proposed in this bill, adds to the surplus buildup and to load on the poor struggling taxpayer. Supply management is inefficient and terribly costly under the most ideal circumstances. Every loophole created in supply management, like the loophole proposed here, makes it more inefficient and most costly.

Cotton is in trouble today basically because controls have not really meant controls. We have kicked loophole after loophole into the cotton control program. Congress never really has had the guts to enforce controls.

Why? Our farmers are not willing to accept a police state in agriculture. The only way controls really will work is to go to the police state. In the absence of a police state the farmers are outwitting the bureaucrats and will outmaneuver them every time.

The uproar that followed the proposed jail sentences for dairy farmers shows neither the farmers nor Congress will accept a police state. This bill actually illustrates the breakdown of supply management and the high-price-support theory.

It has a basic pragmatic weakness. We want controls, but we do not really want them. We set up a control program then start creating loopholes in it.

Every Member who represents taxpayers, and I doubt if there are any exceptions, should vote "No" on this bill, to help the taxpayers, or aid me and my colleagues in my effort to amend this bill in order to extend the blessings of freedom and the opportunities of the marketplace to all peanut growers, not just the small circle who produce peanuts for boiling.

Let us either close the loopholes or pitch the whole expensive program.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The gentleman has just said that we should close the loopholes that now exist in this legislation. The gentleman lives in a corn producing area of the country. I wonder if he would be just as willing to close the loopholes which exist in the area of sweet corn from being carried as corn under controls.

Mr. FINDLEY. Corn is not produced under mandatory controls. There is no parallel between the present Government program for corn and the mandatory acreage control program for peanuts. I see no parallel. And I might say to the gentleman that I am just as willing to extend the exemption from Government control to all farmers, all producers of all commodities.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I think what the gentleman fails to see is the fact that sweet corn is close to his heart, peanuts are close to somebody else's heart and he is not quite willing to give the same consideration to somebody else.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's memory may be faulty, because he should recall that on many occasions on this floor I have consistently opposed Government-control programs involving commodities in my own backyard as well as control programs that touch other parts of the country.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the colloquy between the gentleman on the other side of the aisle and the gentleman from Illinois with reference to corn. Wheat happens to be very close to my heart. Yet I always find people from either the corn area or the peanut area or the cotton area seem to know more about wheat than the people who represent the wheat producing area. I do not follow the gentleman's line of argument when he says on the one hand that peanuts are close to him, wheat is close to me, and corn is close to the gentleman from Illinois. But yet we are telling one another what should be done with reference to each commodity. It does not make sense to me.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me for a moment, that is exactly the point that I was making.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. I just wonder whether the gentleman from Montana was saying that the gentleman from Illinois does not know anything about peanuts and yet he is telling us all about peanuts.

Mr. BATTIN. I have seen that same thing happen on the floor before, I will say to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Texas that while I have no peanut producers in my district, to my knowledge, I do have a great many taxpayers who are deeply concerned over expensive programs like this. I have many producers who have consistently over the years opposed control programs for themselves. They have witnessed the problems that have come to the cotton producers, the tobacco producers and others in control areas and they do not want any part of it themselves. And they are also willing to have their Representative in Congress, I might add, do his best to extend the blessings of freedom to all farmers.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to my friend who has just given us a very splendid talk that he realizes, of course, that this particular legislation we are considering does not cost the taxpayers any money. This is a program that does not cost the taxpayers a dime. This legislation clearly says that we are going to permit small farmers to continue to plant a few acres of peanuts for boiling without coming under the provisions of acreage allotments. We pointed out very definitely that the boiled peanut is a different type of commodity. And let me emphasize again that it has the same relationship to other peanuts that sweet corn has to field corn. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture, please let me say to my colleagues that there is that very clear-cut difference. There is the great precedent that we do not count sweet corn for cooking and eating as being in the same category with field corn. This is exactly the same situation. We divide peanuts for boiling from other peanuts.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I certainly hate to take issue with my friend from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS], but I believe this is a matter of principle. In this debate we may gain something, which is more than we have generally done in Congress this session. I think this is probably the turning point of the session. It has been a very hard year. We have had some very important legislation before us though I understand we have a few minor bills yet to consider. In line with the statement made by Gertrude Stein—who is not in my district—"A rose is a rose is a rose," it should follow that a peanut is a peanut is a peanut.

Nonetheless, we are asked today to extend a bill that says a peanut is not a peanut because it is a boiled peanut. These green or boiled peanuts are fed to hogs. The hogs consider them peanuts. We consider roasted peanuts as peanuts, and peanuts in peanut butter as peanuts, but by act of Congress we have declared a peanut not a peanut at all. This is a very fine distinction, in my opinion, and one that probably should be referred to some more philosophical committee than Congress, perhaps the group who delight in debating such unresolved questions as the classical one involving the number of angels who can dance on the point of a pin.

We have been in session now for over 6 months. In fact, we read, that is some of us newer Members, that we may be here until Christmas. I read just yesterday, it is not a question of when we adjourn, but is a question, if we adjourn, this year. So with 6½ months behind us, and having been described as a balk Congress, consistent with the slow moving 87th Congress, the legislative effort this year offers some hope to the taxpayer because of the old saying, "No legislation is good legislation."

It is a good thing that we set aside a day for heated debate on the boiled peanut because in just 6½ months we have already extended the draft; we have assured women equal pay for equal work; we have extended excise taxes. We passed a political feed grain program and now today we are trying to take up another very vital issue. I assume if this hot issue is disposed of, we can move on to such other minor programs as tax reduction and reform; wheat, cotton, and dairy legislation; civil rights; and a host of other important matters—not to mention later on, perhaps, adjournment.

The bill before us today, in my opinion, is symbolic of the ultimate folly of any controlled program in agriculture and should alert all Members on both sides of the aisle to the basic need of a complete overhaul of farm programs, perhaps starting with a sizable reduction in USDA personnel—maybe a 40- or 50-percent reduction. Some, including myself, doubt the advisability of Secretary Freeman leaving the country at this critical time, while others regret that he did not leave at an earlier date. But, nevertheless, he is gone. He is temporarily absent, I assume—not only at a time when peanuts are in hot water but when the wheat, cotton, and dairy farmers of America are demonstrating peacefully their interest in new voluntary legislation.

Those concerned may be interested in knowing that today Secretary Freeman is still visiting Russia. Upon landing in Moscow last Sunday, he was greeted by roving Ambassador Averell Harriman. Harriman traveled to Russia to negotiate a test ban. However, Freeman's trip may well be the forerunner of another ban soon to be imposed by the President. Nonetheless, while Orville studies progress in Russian agriculture and other world affairs, we just talk about peanuts. Shall we go down in history as a Congress that labored and labored and labored and finally brought forth the peanut—a boiled one at that? And do not forget the Latin proverb—remember this—"He that would eat the kernel must crack the nut."

Let me point out this is a serious matter. We have other commodities that are boiled before sale. We have wheat that is boiled before sale, called bulgur. Some people like it. I think, perhaps, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS] was saved by the rules of the House today because not many of you had a chance to sample the boiled peanut, but nonetheless the bill is a serious threat to those under controlled programs.

Let me tell you that in the first year this little exemption was in effect, the number of farmers raising boiled peanuts jumped from 1,285 to 1,861 and the total acreage jumped from 1,667 to 2,662. This is a sizable increase and not one we can laugh about and say is not important to agriculture generally.

It seems to me the nut of the whole thing is this. We have talked about supply management. Mr. Freeman talks about supply management. Efforts were made to force it upon the wheat farmers of America including those in the State of Kansas. They turned it down. Even Members of Congress who vote for supply management turn it down, in effect, when they come in and ask us to exempt their farmers from supply management. If it is good for some farmers, it should be good for all farmers. I think the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] goes to the very heart of the matter. The production of boiled peanuts is no less and no more than the production of other peanuts. I do not think anybody including the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS] can state any real difference between a boiled peanut and a regular peanut. We do have something at stake here today despite the fact that the bill does not affect many people for it does basically affect the American agricultural scene and the farmers desire for freedom.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNYDER. I would like to agree with what you said about the rules of the House saving the gentleman from Florida. I had the pleasure of tasting one of those things and I wonder if there is any possibility of calling up a public health bill later on?

Mr. DOLE. Well, there may be. I think, perhaps—I do not know—but some people like these peanuts. I understand they are a delicacy. They are eaten by many people and are raised in many States.

Mr. Chairman, I have read all the debate the past 6 years on boiled peanuts and apparently many people seem to eat them and survive.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. The gentleman and his predecessor referred to the cost of this program. I think it might be interesting to the Members of the Committee to know that the rate of loss under the peanut program of the Commodity Credit Corporation averages almost 14 percent of the total value of the peanut crop. The total value of the controlled peanut crop is $180 million. The realized losses to the Commodity Credit Corporation—and that does not include the administrative expenses and other hidden costs—is $25 million, or about 14 percent of the value of the crop.

Furthermore, the Members of the Committee might be interested to know that peanuts in foreign markets sell at about half price. They are supported at about 12 cents a pound here at home, but they sell for about 6 cents a pound abroad.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have the consumers of this country to think about.

Mr. DOLE. I agree with the gentleman. He is exactly correct. Many believed the 15-acre wheat producer was no problem, but today it is admitted the 15-acre wheat producer has created a problem for nearly everyone.

Mr. Chairman, let me point out also that if you have a 5-acre peanut allotment, you can plant it to peanuts and in addition to the 5-acre peanut planting, you can plant "boiled peanuts" outside your allotment without penalty. In other words, you can exceed your allotment and not be penalized. This bill permits an exemption from the present program and its controls.

Mr. Chairman, there has been opposition in the past from other peanut States. Perhaps the time will come when we will have 8,000, 9,000, or 10,000 farmers raising boiled peanuts, and then it may be too late for those in Virginia, South Carolina, and North Carolina, and California—to do anything about it.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last paragraph of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938", approved August 13, 1957, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1359 note), is amended by striking out "and 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "1963, 1964, and 1965".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY: On page 1, line 8, strike the period and insert the following: "and the first paragraph of such Act is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and by adding the following: ': *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of this subparagraph (C), the exemption provided for boiled peanuts shall also apply to all peanuts produced.' "

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, the bill simply deals with a class of peanuts. I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane. The bill simply deals with a class of peanuts. The amendment deals with an entirely different class, and is not in order, as it would change the entire concept of the legislation, as well as wipe out the peanut program.

For that reason, the amendment is not germane to this bill that is before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to be heard on the point of order.

My argument is based on the fact that my amendment is offered to a part of the act of April 13, 1957. The title of the bill itself states as its purpose to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. It states as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the last paragraph of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938", approved August 13, 1957, as amended, is amended—

And so on.

So I believe it follows this is truly an amendment to the act which the bill itself would amend. For the Chair's convenience, I quote the act of 1957, which states:

> The word "peanuts" for the purposes of this Act shall mean all peanuts produced, excluding any peanuts which it is established by the producer or otherwise, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, were not picked or threshed either before or after marketing from the farm, or were marketed by the producer before drying or removal of moisture from such peanuts either by natural or artificial means for consumption exclusively as boiled peanuts.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FLYNT). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Illinois has offered an amendment to the pending bill.

As a general rule, one individual proposition may not be amended by any other individual proposition, even though the two may belong to the same class.

The Chair quotes from volume 8, section 2948, the following:

> To a bill amendatory of one section of an existing law an amendment proposing further modification of the law was held not to be germane.
>
> On December 20, 1919, the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union was considering the bill (H.R. 11224) to amend section 1 of the act approved October 16, 1918, providing for deportation of alien anarchists.
>
> Mr. Benjamin F. Welty, of Ohio, offered an amendment proposing to add to the existing law a new section to be known as section 4.
>
> Mr. Albert Johnson, of Washington, made the point of order that the amendment while germane to the existing law was not germane to the pending bill.

Accordingly, the Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FINDLEY. Am I correct that the Chair's ruling was based on the point that the amendment I offered was confined to a paragraph instead of a section? I call the attention of the Chair to the fact the 1958 act added a new section to the 1930 act. This amendment is to that section.

The CHAIRMAN. In response to the parliamentary inquiry, the Chair ruled that the amendment was not germane to the pending bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOLE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. DOLE: On page 1, line 8, strike the period and insert the following: "and the first paragraph of such Act is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and by adding the following: ': *Provided,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the exemption from acreage allotments and marketing quotas as provided for herein for boiled peanuts shall also apply to any agricultural commodity, which prior to being marketed as a foodstuff is boiled and dried.' "

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this amendment is not germane and it is apparent on its face. This amendment deals not only with peanuts but with all commodities, therefore, it is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to be heard?

Mr. DOLE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Adopting the same argument of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], in reference to a certain commodity, which is boiled peanuts, I call attention again to the use of these peanuts, which is boiling. We have boiled potatoes, boiled apricots, and many other commodities boiled prior to sale. If we can do this for one commodity, I think we can do it for all commodities.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FLYNT). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas would extend the legislation to other commodities than those covered by the pending legislation. While the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas would amend the general law, the Chair rules that the amendment is not germane to the pending bill and, therefore, sustains the point of order.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it now appears my amendment to this bill, at least along the lines affording the blessings of freedom to all peanut farmers, is going to be difficult if not impossible. Assuming all efforts in this direction do fail, I would like to urge my colleagues to vote "No" on this bill in deference to our long-struggling taxpayers and consumers.

I would like to remind Members that we have presently $17,057,940 tied up in Government peanut stocks. The Department of Agriculture has predicted a rise in the surplus stocks as a result of this year's crop, and every peanut produced on exemption acres, such as provided in this bill, increases the burden on the taxpayers indirectly through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The peanut control program has been excessively costly. It has represented a cost of about $14 for every $100 worth of peanuts produced in the United States.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we are coming to the close of debate on this bill and I would just like again to point out that all we are talking about is the extension for a period of 2 years of a law that has been passed on the Consent Calendar for the past three Congresses. This is a bill that was approved by every member of the House Committee on Agriculture, some 35 in number, with the exception of 3 at the most; a bill that was unanimously reported by the subcommittee which considered it; a bill which will not cost the taxpayers one dime; a bill that, admitting it is not a bill of importance all over the country, is nevertheless of importance to many hundreds of people. I seriously hope that the House will unanimously approve the extension of this law.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. DOLE. Would you be inclined to support a bill that might do the same for boiled wheat?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Let me say to my friend if you will bring it before the Committee on Agriculture and get them to approve it, I will be delighted to support it. Now, will you approve my bill, which was approved by everybody on the committee except you and two other gentleman?

Mr. DOLE. Sir, I might do that if I do not have to eat the peanuts.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The gentleman has my permission never to eat the peanuts, although I hope he will change his mind.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I assume the gentleman is interested in getting votes for the bill. I want to support it. I understand there are 2,600 acres involved?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No, sir. About 3,000.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Only 3,000? Having sampled these peanuts, will you guarantee me that if I vote for this bill you will never plant over 3,000 acres?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The bill will come up for consideration in 2 years, and let me say in all sincerity that is the reason why we had a 2-year extension, that is, because at that time 2 years from now, I have the feeling if there are more acres planted the committee probably will not approve the bill.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I do not think we can stand over 3,000 acres.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I want to thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. Actually this matter of excepting boiled peanuts from the general law is not without precedent. We have excepted Durum wheat. For many years we excepted all wheat grown on tracts under 15 acres. If we had such an exception as that in this instance this bill certainly would not be necessary. We have excepted long staple cotton for many many years. We have excepted certain Flue-fired tobacco. This is really no exception. Peanuts for hogging purposes have been grown without reference to marketing quota laws for years and years. Wheat for grazing purposes, which is plowed under and never allowed to go to harvest, has been permitted under the law. This is a peculiar crop. It is just simply a matter of exempting a form of a product which is not in competition with and has nothing to do with the general product covered by marketing quota legislation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I want to thank our distinguished majority leader for those remarks.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, for a city fellow I have been following this debate with great fascination. I have listened to my handsome and able young friends from Illinois and Kansas who have covered the entire political waterfront. They have taken the peanut into the civil rights debate. They have rolled it over to Europe where Averell Harriman is in talks that may mean the security of this country from atomic warfare. And I am wondering if there is a historic significance in all of this, if today we are hearing for the first time that in the campaign next year the slogan and the insignia of the great Republican Party will no longer be the elephant, large and rampant, but the little boiled peanut.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FLYNT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 101) to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 pursuant to House Resolution 401, he reported the bill back to the House.

The **SPEAKER.** Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The **SPEAKER.** The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of an identical Senate bill (S. 582) to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last paragraph of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes", approved August 13, 1957, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1359 note), is amended by striking out "and 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "1963, 1964, and 1965".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 101) was laid on the table.

GRAVE QUESTIONS THE PRESIDENT SHOULD ANSWER FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, there has never been a more serious moment or a more grave occasion for me to take the floor of the House in behalf of the people of the Fifth District of Texas, whom I have the honor to represent, as well as all the people of the United States. In my opinion the very future of this Nation is hanging in the balance. In this perilous time I am trying to measure my words carefully so that the full impact of what is happening may be known to the people and in the hope that the President may clarify his ultimate objective in his attitude toward the revolution, armed revolution in some cases, which is now going on in the United States. Mr. President, are you now using the civil rights problem as an avenue for setting up a socialist dictatorship?

At this point in my remarks, I would like to include an article by David Lawrence, "Use of U.S. Troops a Question," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of July 15, 1963.

USE OF U.S. TROOPS A QUESTION

(By David Lawrence)

Is the administration about to acknowledge that it was wrong in sending Federal troops to Mississippi? If not, why were the military forces of the United States not sent to preserve order and prevent further bloodshed in the racial crisis in Cambridge, Md., as they were in Oxford, Miss.?

The argument made by the administration in ordering troops to Mississippi was that the entry of James Meredith to the University of Mississippi might cause disorder. None had previously occurred, but it was the mere threat of it which prompted the sending of a large number of Federal troops to the area and later to the university campus and the town of Oxford. Many of these soldiers are still there, presumably to protect against possible disorder.

In the case of Cambridge, "demonstrations" and racial clashes have been going on for more than a month. The Department of Justice had appealed in vain to the Negro leaders not to stir things up. The State militia had been on duty in the town for a while but was withdrawn when it seemed that mediation of some kind was in prospect. A Department of Justice official tried to bring the factions together, but without success. On Thursday night, new disorder erupted and the town was terrorized for several hours with shooting described by the commander of the State police on the scene as "almost on the scale of warfare." At least five persons were wounded by gunfire. Three were members of the Maryland National Guard, which has been called back to the scene, and limited martial law has been imposed.

The Federal Government had, of course, no legal right to send troops into Mississippi. There was no "insurrection," and the Governor of the State had not, as the Constitution requires, requested aid. He had forces ready to quell disturbances. But the administration, claiming it has the authority in law and in constitutional provisions, has kept troops at the University of Mississippi for many months now.

If the Federal Government has a lawful right to send troops anywhere in the United States during a racial crisis on the theory that the principles of the 14th amendment must be enforced, then it is difficult to understand why such troops have not been ordered as a preventive measure not only to Maryland but to New York City, where a reign of terror has prevailed in certain neighborhoods. The same kind of disturbances, with violence involved, have been reported also from other areas in different parts of the country where there is racial conflict.

Many lawyers have inspired that the preservation of law and order within a State is the function of the Governor and the State militia, only to be told that this is just a legal technicality. President Kennedy is quoted as having said, "After all, it's right." The doctrine expounded here is that "the end justifies the means," unfortunately, even this doctrine is not uniformly applied.

The Negro leaders, for instance, who sponsor the demonstrations are careful to emphasize in their public statements that they are proceeding on a nonviolent basis. But when feelings are aroused, nonviolence is superseded by violence. As the New York Times—supporter of integration—said in an editorial, "nonviolence that deliberately provokes violence is a logical contradiction."

In Cambridge, white persons sitting on the porch of their homes have been the targets of gunfire, and two men were wounded by blasts from an automatic shotgun during last Thursday night's disorder. Three National Guardsmen were wounded when the car in which they were returning from drill duty at a nearby armory was ambushed with rifle and shotgun fire. They were in uniform but unarmed.

Negro leaders are putting on demonstrations in various cities in memory of one of their colleagues, Medgar Evers, who was killed in Mississippi by a sniper's bullet. But there seems to be no public recognition by any group of the plight of those white persons—most of them innocent bystanders—killed or wounded in recent weeks in connection with racial disturbances. Nor have steps been taken to call a halt to the nonviolent demonstrations that are steadily producing the violence.

As for the further use of Federal troops to quell or prevent the outbreak of disorder, official Washington is mum. Will the people of the District of Columbia have the protection of Federal troops on August 28 when 100,000 Negroes are expected to participate in a nonviolent demonstration in Washington? Apparently only Arkansas, Mississippi, and Alabama get the benefit of the presence of Federal troops. The equal right to protection doesn't seem to extend to citizens elsewhere who may be threatened with nonviolent demonstrations in which violence can result in injury to innocent persons.

Mr. Speaker, there are several pertinent questions raised by Mr. Lawrence in his article: "Why did the President use Federal troops in Mississippi and Alabama because violence was threatened? Why has he failed to use troops in Cambridge, Md., Philadelphia, Pa., New York City, Savannah, Ga., and in North Carolina where there is violence and where people have been shot and killed?

The omissions and commissions of President Kennedy in the struggle now going on in America take on added significance when we review the history of his administration.

From the day of his inauguration President Kennedy has demanded and/or seized more and more power for the executive branch at the expense of the legislative branch. A review of Presidential messages and White House-sponsored legislation establishes this as a fact. Also a fact is that the delegation of such broad powers to the executive establishes an easy course to dictatorship.

One of the keymen around President Kennedy is Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. Mr. Schlesinger is an admitted advocate of what he calls "democratic socialism," and his views have never been contradicted by the President. Mr. President, I ask you now, Do you support a change in our form of society from a private enterprise system to that of a planned economy or democratic socialism?

With this background of boldly seeking new Executive powers and keeping as one of his counselors an advocate of a socialist system, the President now confronts us with the puzzle of his handling of the civil rights issue. There is no doubt that the Kennedy political machine used civil rights as an effective campaign technique in the 1960 election. There are none that I know of who will deny the Kennedy administration has manipulated the civil rights issue in an attempt to hog-tie the majority of the Negro vote in advance of the 1964 election. Can anyone deny the President's handling of the current mob action has not been weighted to encourage the Negroes and to discriminate against whites? Witness the haste with which Federal forces were sent to Mississippi against the authority of State officials and before any overt action had been taken. Witness the fact that Federal troops were mobilized in Alabama against the expressed desire of the Governor and before the scheduled entrance of Negroes into the university. Witness the absolute silence from the White House in even mildly condemning the destruction of property, the injuring and killing of white people by rock-throwing, car-burning, rifle-shooting Negroes. Why, Mr. President?

If your purpose in Mississippi and Alabama was to preserve law and order and to protect the lives and property of the people, why are you not concerned with the violation of law, the destruction of property, and murder in other States where violence has been engendered and carried out by Negroes? Is not such blatant partiality encouraging more rioting, more violence, more violation of law and order? What can the Nation hope to gain by an increase of such violence? What can you gain, Mr. President?

Now, let us go a step further in pointing out significant events and statements. On last Sunday evening on WTTG-TV there was a panel discussion of "Race Relations and Crisis." Four prominent Negro leaders, three of whom are now involved in the nationwide demonstrations, explained their purposes and objectives. They plainly stated we must have forced integration; they ridiculed legislative remedies; they insisted on compensatory treatment for the colored race by declaring that "unqualified Negroes must be given preferential treatment in hiring and that they be made qualified on the job." To achieve these objectives these leaders of the nonviolent movement said they intend to continue and to increase the tempo of the demonstrations until all the demands are met, they promised further violence and talked of the use of guns to strengthen their fight; they emphasized the size, strength and determination of the proposed march on Washington next month to obtain this ultimate objective. These Negro leaders made it plain their demands are paramount to the interest of the preservation of our system of society by stating it may be necessary to implement action on the demands of the Negroes for preferential treatment with a military dictatorship or some kind of Socialist state.

In view of these statements, Mr. President, I call upon you now to state your objectives in supporting these leaders. Are the American people to construe your silence in regard to the violent demonstrations now going on and the potential violence which lurks in the proposed march on Washington as encouraging an increase in the tempo of the demonstrations and the violence? If so, for what purpose? Will you disavow, now, that you intend to use a complete breakdown in law and order on August 28 or some subsequent date as an excuse for seizing complete power? Your failure to act, Mr. President, when the rights of whites are being assaulted and the speed with which you act when, in your opinion, Negro rights are threatened, are the basis for these questions which are now in the minds of many of our people.

For the security of the Nation, for the protection of the freedoms and the rights of all the people, for the preservation of our system of society, a republic within a democracy, Congress must know and the people must know, now, how far the President intends to go in seizing power or in changing our form of government in solving the civil rights issue.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out once more, as I have frequently reminded the Negro people that they will equally be the losers with the whites if, for whatever purpose it is achieved, they succeed in destroying this Republic. Under a dictatorship, they too, will be enslaved and they, too, along with the whites will lose all their freedoms and the God-given rights with which we are endowed.

I have made this statement, and posed these questions, not to charge President Kennedy with seeking to become a dictator, but to call to his attention, in the event he has failed thus far to recognize it, to the possible results of the course he is following. It is important, too, that these words of warning be given to the American people so that they will not lose their freedoms without ever having recognized that they were in danger of losing them.

The pressure of history is upon us at this moment and only a strong willed people and leaders dedicated to the preservation of this land of freedom with all its traditions of inherent liberty can save the cause of freedom in the world.

Mr. President, in the name of America, in the name of humanity, show the American people now, by your words and your deeds, that you intend to protect this Republic in keeping with the oath you took to preserve the Constitution against all its enemies, both foreign and domestic.

SOUND FEED GRAIN AND WHEAT LEGISLATION

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, this morning the members of the Indiana congressional delegation and our two Senators had the pleasure of having breakfast with the Indiana Farm Bureau leaders who are here for their convention and their legislative studies. Following breakfast, Mr. George Doup, our very distinguished president of the Indiana Farm Bureau, made some wonderful suggestions, which I insert in the RECORD at this point.

Passage of sound feed grain and wheat legislation this session of Congress is of paramount importance.

In view of this need, a very adequate bill has been introduced by my colleague from Indiana, Congressman RALPH HARVEY of the 10th Indiana District.

This proposed legislation has the full support and endorsement of the Indiana Farm Bureau which is holding a conference this week in Washington on farm legislation.

This cropland retirement proposal includes the following outstanding features:

First. An opportunity for U.S. farmers to retire up to some 60 to 80 million acres of cropland voluntarily and without Government coercion.

Second. Emphasis is placed upon the retirement of whole farms, so that the incentive to "push" the remaining acreage and in the long run increase total production is removed.

Third. Maximum limitations on land retirement in any State or county is provided to prevent depressed communities.

Fourth. Grazing or harvesting of crops from retired acres is prohibited.

Fifth. Retirement contracts between the farmer and the U.S. Government would be for a minimum of 3 years.

Sixth. The legislation provides for retirement of sufficient acreage to assure adjustment of production of farm products to demand.

Other important features of the cropland retirement proposal discussed by members of the Indiana congressional delegation and officials of the Indiana Farm Bureau at the farm legislation conference in Washington, D.C., this week.

Mr. George Doup, of Columbus, Ind., the very able and respected president of the Indiana Farm Bureau had some highly informative and useful comments on provisions of H.R. 6994.

Mr. Doup said the bill would terminate acreage allotments and marketing quotas on wheat and feed grains, and would repeal the 1964-65 feed grain diversion program, which is of little value.

This outstanding farm leader also reported that under the cropland retirement proposal, feed grain prices would be supported by the Government at a realistic level—90 percent of the past 3-year average market price, but not less than 50 percent of parity.

These provisions provide a floor under prices of these grains, but do not encourage unneeded production for the Government support price alone.

Mr. Doup also said:

> In order to keep the Commodity Credit Corporation from dumping surplus grain on the open market and driving that price which farmers receive to an unreasonably low figure, the Farm Bureau program provides that Government stocks could not be released for less than 115 percent of the support price, plus reasonable carrying charges. This means that if the price support under Farm Bureau's program were $1.35 per bushel, then farmers could receive from the open market as much as nearly $1.70 per bushel before the Government could sell surplus stocks and drive the market lower. There would probably be little wheat or feed-grains going to Government storage for the lower support price.
>
> The cost of the 1963 feed-grain program, and the certificate wheat program voted down so decisively by wheat farmers in May would have cost $1.5 billion and would have placed the management of U.S. farms under the control of USDA. Farm Bureau's cropland retirement will cost much less than that, and if the entire package is adopted will undoubtedly solve the problems which plague wheat and feed-grain producers.

The House Wheat Subcommittee has scheduled hearings on wheat legislation July 23, and it is hoped that they will give favorable consideration to H.R. 6994.

In addition to Mr. Doup, officials of the Indiana Farm Bureau meeting with the Indiana congressional delegation this week included Glenn W. Sample, Zionsville, vice president; Mrs. Guy E. Gross, Churubusco, second vice president; George R. Harvey, Speedway, secretary-treasurer; Charles E. Riddle, Argos; George Neff, Goshen; Lawrence Holloway, Colfax; Carlin Schoeff, Montpelier; Harmon Rogers, New Ross; Evan Wilson, Pendleton; Edward Kuhn, Bicknell; George Ruschhaupt, New Palestine; Warren Wheaton, Oakland City; Linville Bryant, Versailles, and C. W. Stall, Danville, director of information for Indiana Farm Bureau.

"ARC-54, WHERE ARE YOU?"

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is my duty to report the full details of one of the most brazen attempts to rob the public Treasury since the days of Teapot Dome.

At least $10 million has been saved for the taxpayers of the United States by cancellation of the most outlandish sole source—noncompetitive—procurement that it has been my duty to study during the last 2 years. I am able to report to my colleagues today that the savings has already been effected. The procurement has been stopped, and I think any future buy of the equipment—the airborne radio AN/ARC-54—will be opened to the force of competition.

In this one procurement:

I have found a development contract of over $2.6 million for the radio which was followed by an order canceling delivery of the very materials for which the Government paid dearly. Thus, the military set up procedures assuring a sole-source production contract to the developer and tried to keep its skirts clean so it could say "no technical material available" and escape the consequences.

I have found a secret $4.6 million sole-source production contract to the developer of the radio. This was carried out without any public announcement and safeguards were taken to see that industry didn't find out about the transaction.

I have found a false certification citing as the reason for the sole-source purchase that the radios are needed for mounting in aircraft between April and November of next year. The radios need not be available until 6 months before the planes are due for completion and that the contracts for the manufacture of the planes have not even been awarded as yet.

When the planes are ordered, they are to be delivered in December 1965, which means that the first radios would not be needed until June 1965—not November 1964 as stated by Army officials.

I have found a second proposed sole-source award for more of the radios which would have totaled at least $22 million. When I attacked the fallaciousness of this second proposed purchase, Brig. Gen. Allen T. Stanwix-Hay, commanding officer of the U.S. Army Electronics Agency, canceled it in entirety and is still looking into the matter.

I have found there is still no fixed price for the radio under the first sole-source contract. The radio is being built under terms of a "letter contract" which has yet to be finalized.

I have found that there are serious questions about the actions of military and civilian officials which should be resolved before this matter is closed.

Mr. Speaker, there, in brief, you have the details on which I shall now elaborate. I hope to paint a complete and easily understood picture for you.

Here is the cast of characters:

Brig. Gen. Allen T. Stanwix-Hay, commanding officer of the U.S. Army Electronics Materiel Command in Philadelphia, who is soon to move up to a higher position.

Mrs. Mary Regan, a contracting officer in Philadelphia, who has been employed by the Government for 21 years.

Maj. Herbert Sheer, who in 1960 was a contracting officer for the old U.S. Army Signal Supply Agency in Philadelphia.

There are various other names which will appear, but these are the people I shall deal with. Behind them are faceless electronics engineers who will come to light if and when this matter is delved into thoroughly by the proper committee of Congress.

Before I am through here today, Mr. Speaker, you might well be asking, "Can it be our Army doing this?" You will be shaking your head in frustration, cognizant of the fact that the so-called industrial-military complex of which a former great President warned us is, indeed, becoming a monolithic ogre which, unchecked, can threaten the very lifeblood of our existence.

Mr. Speaker, "Can it be our Army doing this?"

It is the same Army that wasted at least $17 million buying the tank-mounted AN/VRC-12 radio set by sole-source methods after promising faithfully to buy the same set competitively.

It is the same Army that wasted over $10 million buying the AN/PRC-25 walkie-talkie radio without competition before being pushed into competitive buying.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is the same Army that was planning to soak the taxpayer with at least a $10 million sole-source overcharge for the airborne AN/ARC-54, the third piece of equipment that makes up the VRC-12, PRC-25 communications complex.

This, of course, was before I uncovered the rotten foundations used to support a platform whose principal plank was, "We must, in the best interests of national defense and security, buy this radio from one supplier without competition."

Mr. Speaker, is the military-industrial complex growing in power? There can be no other conclusion when you see the way in which facts have been distorted, truth kicked into the ashcan and the well-being of the taxpayer thrown to the winds so that business could be channeled to a favored company.

Mr. Speaker, I look at the United States as a corporate entity. Robert S. McNamara, for example, is the Defense Department's chief executive officer. President Kennedy is our corporation's president. We here in Congress are members of the board of directors. The people are the shareholders.

As members of the board, we in Congress have a right and an obligation to object to and demand the elimination of waste in defense purchasing, particularly that kind of blatant waste and incredible logistic stupidity found in the at least $22 million sole-source contract I referred to a moment ago.

Thankfully, this particular procurement has been canceled because I was able to catch civilian and military servants in manipulations and falsifications before the waste was perpetrated.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed purchase that was stopped and the $4.6 million sole-source award for the same AN/ARC-54 radio that immediately preceded it, are the prime examples of what is rotten in the Pentagon today.

They are also meaningful examples of why this Congress needs a new blue-ribbon joint committee to act as a watchdog over all such negotiated defense and space contracts which make up such a staggering proportion of our annual defense budget.

Anyone who watches the TV program, "What's My Line," knows that the U.S. Government is not a profitmaking corporation. No one is more aware of that than we here in Congress who annually tangle with the red-ink budgets sent up for action by the White House.

But while the Government is not set up as a profitmaking institution, neither was it founded with long-range national bankruptcy in mind. Nevertheless, that seems to be the way we are headed under the impetus of ever-increasing expenditures for national defense which now takes almost half of every tax dollar.

While everyone agrees that we must stay strong to maintain the peace, there seems to have arisen a corollary axiom that "the more we spend the stronger we are," and I disagree strongly with that particular tenet.

I suppose that the converse of this theory is that anyone who opposes the constantly growing Defense budget weakens our defense posture and must be a subversive, a mercenary, or an odd-ball. During the 2 years that I have been successfully conducting an often lonely critique of waste in defense procurement, the Pentagon has openly but unsuccessfully tried to brand me as one or all of the foregoing.

Fortunately, none of the Pentagon's theories are true. The defense budget is so rife with waste, so padded with unneeded or overly expensive procurements that in most areas a cut of up to one-third could be made without diluting our military posture one drop.

Some of the waste is unintentional and results from a lack of coordination, bungling, and stupidity in our vast Defense Establishment. But some of the waste is not so accidental. This waste, under whatever guise, invariably enriches some who sell the Government the goods or services involved at a price, or in a quantity, in excess of what the Government needs.

In these latter situations—the same as at Arthur Murray's—it takes two to tango. And there are willing middle-grade civil or military servants ready to dance to a contractor's tune with the promise of immediate gain or a plush job in the future dangled as bait. All this has the end result of bilking the American taxpayer out of more and more of his already inflated dollars.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the broad picture. Now to the details of the AN/ARC-54, after which I shall leave it to the conclusion of Congress and the public as to which category of waste—intentional or unintentional—is involved.

As I mentioned before, the AN/ARC-54 is the airborne unit of what can best be described as a three-way communications system that includes the AN/VRC-12 vehicular radio and the AN/PRC-25 walkie-talkie radio. Utilizing these three newly produced units, soldiers in the field can communicate with each other, with mobile forces and with aerial support.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, all three radios have something in common besides their mission of intercommunication. As I have explained in this House in recent weeks, and as Congress confirmed by cutting $10.2 million from the Army's 1964 electronics appropriation, each of these units was developed at Government expense and then put out for first production to the developer on a sole-source basis involving millions of dollars in waste and penalty to the taxpayer.

When purchase of first the VRC-12 and later the PRC-25 was exposed to competition—as they should have been in the first place—the price to the Army—and the taxpayer—was cut in half or better. This same pattern will be repeated for the ARC-54. Fortunately, the chances are excellent this will occur faster than in the case of the VRC-12 and PRC-25.

Over $120 million was ladled out sole-source before the first two units experienced the fresh, clean breezes of competitive bidding. On the ARC-54 only one small contract for $4.6 million was secretly—and I want to emphasize the word "secretly"—pushed through at the end of fiscal 1963 before its stench reached my nostrils.

When the Army tried to follow up the $4.6 million sole-source deal with a second contract which could have gone to $22 million or higher, its justification was so spurious and its maneuvers to freeze out competition so flagrant that it was possible to demand—successfully—that the Army halt the procurement immediately.

Mr. Speaker, the ARC-54 was put out for development in 1956, under terms of a research and development contract awarded to Collins Radio Corp. of Dallas, Tex. Payments under that contract eventually totaled $2,633,481.

By October 1961 my sources in the Pentagon and industry told me development was virtually complete, so I wrote the Army asking what its plans were for production procurement of the unit. This letter was written because I knew only too well the Army's proclivity toward the award of wasteful sole-source first-run production contracts to developers of the equipment, and I wanted to start urging competition at the first possible moment.

In answer I was told that no procurement of the ARC-54 was planned in fiscal 1962 because of a shortage of funds.

On April 26, 1963, I again heard of the ARC-54 when I learned that the Army had, on March 26, 1963, secretly awarded the developer of the radio a letter contract for production of up to 900 of the radios—a figure later changed to 1,153—and had earmarked $4,643,400 for the purchase. Such a method of funding usually represents about half of the total price to be paid for the equipment, so we can look forward to paying over $9 million for the first run under normal circumstances. I say "under normal circumstances" because there is no way to tell how the price will be manipulated after the disclosures of today.

The Army did not at that time announce its letter contract in any of the usual media as procurement regulations normally require. It handed the letter contract to the manufacturer—fully committing the Government and authorizing Collins to proceed with production arrangements—even before it had received a quotation as to how much Collins would charge for the unit. In other words, the producer was given carte blanche with the taxpayers' money with the price to be agreed on in the future.

On May 23, after I had protested such an action, the Army Materiel Command's Chicago procurement district finally got around to putting out a request for proposal to Collins, raising the number to 1,153 and asking Collins to quote a price.

All copies of that document were stamped in red: "Do not display." This meant that no procurement official anywhere was to post this document so the public or other producers could see it. The reason, I think, should be obvious. The Army did not want the secrecy of this transaction further violated for fear competitors or anyone else knowledgeable in procurement would see it and raise the roof.

Mr. Speaker, some of the statements contained in that procurement document, the earlier justification for sole-source award, and some of the answers to my questions based on the procurement papers are so fallacious, so contrived and so unwarranted that I wonder that anyone in the Army would have the gall to pull this deal off. I can only conclude that the Army did not expect to have to answer for its actions—that it hoped to keep the whole deal under the table until it was too late to ask questions.

Here are a few examples of the statements made by the Army and the real facts: On the outside chance some contractor might learn of the impending procurement and ask for a bid set, the proposal states:

First. "Drawings are not available" which means that there are no blueprints to be looked at by anyone wanting to prepare a bid.

Second. That there is what is called a "service test model" but it is owned by Collins Radio. This means the model, which might be used to prepare an intelligent bid even in the absence of drawings, was Collins' private property and not available for inspection by any competitor.

Third. There is available a specification for the equipment, but there is page after page of "exceptions" to the specification and to the model. That specification is dated February 17, 1963, and was thus obviously prepared long after the exceptions to it were dictated by the Army. Yet it was not revised.

Mr. Speaker, how could all of this be true?

As a matter of fact, on page 3 of the development contract awarded in 1956, it is stated that drawings of the equipment are to be prepared and given to the Government. It is further specified that they are to be of sufficient detail, quality, and clarity to permit manufacture and assembly of the ARC-54 by any other manufacturer from those drawings alone.

And what of the model? An amendment to the development contract, attached in 1957, calls for production of 30—I repeat, 30—service test models, and they are all to be the property of the Government.

All this, of course, was standard procedure. Who ever heard of the Government's paying private industry $2.6 million to develop a piece of equipment with the end product—here a radio—to be owned by the contractor?

I will tell you one man who heard of it. Maj. Herbert Sheer, who, until April 30, 1961, was an Army officer. He is now retired.

My investigation disclosed that on February 17, 1960, the Army suddenly terminated most of this contract, eliminating the requirement for the manufacturing drawings, most of the test models and virtually every other item of benefit to be gained from the contract except a thick stack of reports useless to any competitor trying to break into competition for production of the radio. It was Major Sheer who signed the order literally "gutting" the produce of the development contract.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, after 3½ years, when development was near completion, and after $2.6 million had been spent by the Army, the project was canceled and Collins was permitted to keep the drawings and models it was paid to develop.

Why was this outrage perpetrated? The Army now blandly says that it "ran out of funds" at that time.

Since this radio was to be a vital link in an ultramodern battlefield communications system, was the contract revived once funds became available? With multimillion-dollar contracts being awarded for the other two radios, was development work on the ARC-54 started again? Of course it was not.

Although the Army knew of the impending need for the equipment, nothing was done until early this year. Then somebody in the Pentagon is supposed to have suddenly awakened to the fact that the Air Force was planning to build some planes and there had better be some ARC-54's to go in them so the pilots could talk to troops on the ground.

It is here that Mary Regan takes over. She is a contracting officer for the U.S. Army Materiel Support Agency in Philadelphia, the group that handles most of the procurement for the Army's new electronics command—the successor to most of the old Signal Corps' functions.

Mary Regan looked at papers submitted to her covering this problem. She made sure all the initials were in the proper places. She was positive all the names were signed to all the bundles of papers. Then she signed a "Determination and Findings (D. & F.)" calling for the sole-source award of a production contract for the ARC-54 to Collins Radio Corp.

In this incredible document, Mary Regan states the "required delivery schedule" demands first deliveries in April 1964 with the last of the 900 radios to be delivered in November 1964.

She stated:

> This delivery schedule is based on production of Army aircraft in which the radio sets must be installed. Failure to meet this schedule will be the direct cause of the aircraft's not being deployed to oversea tactical missions to assure full combat readiness of our oversea troops.

You would assume from this, as did I, that the Army or Air Force had outstanding contracts for air frames and that these radios were urgently needed so those planes could fly to protect our country. If that were true, it would be a serious logistics error. It takes much longer to build a plane than it does to build a radio to go inside it, so the radios should have been ordered long, long ago when aircraft production was first planned.

However farfetched this might seem, it could have happened that way.

However, I have learned in the last 2 years of my procurement study never to take anything for granted. I requested a report on specific airplane production for which these radios were intended. I asked for identification of the aircraft, copies of production contracts and delivery schedules.

Mr. Speaker, I was stunned by the answer I received.

You will recall, Mary Regan's D. & F. states that these radios have to start coming off production lines in April of 1964. Yet the report from Brig. Gen. Walter E. Lotz, Jr., deputy commanding general, U.S. Army Electronics Command, dated July 9, 1963, shows the following:

The radios do not have to be available until 6 months before the planes involved are due for completion—for delivery.

The contracts for production of the aircraft involved have not even been awarded as yet.

When they are awarded, the first aircraft into which these radios will be installed will not be scheduled for delivery until December 1965, which means that the first radios would not be needed for those aircraft until June 1965.

Yet, Mary Regan contended delivery was absolutely necessary in April 1964—14 months earlier.

Now, the logical question is, "Why would Mary Regan, or anyone else who advised her, state that the first of those radios were needed in April 1964 instead of 14 months later, June 1965?" I must state that I cannot directly answer that question. But I do know that setting a delivery date of April 1964 enabled Mary Regan, or someone, to have an excuse—justified or otherwise—for contending that only the developer—Collins—could produce the radios quick enough for the Army.

On the other hand, if that same 14 months additional leadtime for first deliveries had been permitted, dozens of other firms—responsible competitors—would have hustled in with bids that history proves would have been far lower than the sole-source price that will be demanded in negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, I was outraged when I read that report on the proposed airframe production and noted its relevance to the so-called "urgent requirement" used to justify the sole-source award. Imagine my feelings then when I later learned that was only half the story. On June 19 Mary Regan and company put out another request for proposal—this time on a contract calling for production of up to 2,964 units of the ARC-54 with an option of 50 percent. This means up to 4,500 radios could be ordered on that one contract. At estimated prices supplied me by the electronics industry, this could run between $22 million and $40 million.

This was an outrage even too blatant for the Pentagon. I relayed my thoughts and my facts and figures backing them up to General Stanwix-Hay, commanding officer of the U.S. Army Electronics Materiel Support Agency in Philadelphia, an officer who has been cooperative in my past studies. General Stanwix-Hay apparently agreed with me because he has informed me that he has canceled that second proposed procurement. That is where things now stand.

Since such heat has been generated regarding this procurement, the Army has still not negotiated prices for the ARC-54. That contract is still in a state of limbo, which leads me to wonder—in the fashion of the popular television program—"ARC-54, Where Are You?"

In order to find out where it is and to get to the bottom of this, I am ready to turn over my files in this case to Representative PORTER HARDY, JR., and his Special Investigations Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. With it, I can also turn over my strong recommendation that Mary Regan, Maj. Herbert Sheer, and everyone else involved in the development and production contracts for this radio—from the lowest engineer to the highest general, to officials of the contracting company—be brought to Washington for hearings to explain how an incredible sequence of events such as I have described can be allowed to occur.

Mr. Speaker, the conduct of public business should, as much as possible, be conducted in full view of the public. This under-the-table sole-source nonsense must be reduced to an absolute minimum. And the way to do this is to penalize those who make false justifications and certifications whether by design or error.

Mary Regan and ex-Maj. Herbert Sheer, together with hundreds of other civil servants in positions of trust, are slowly driving us down the road to bankruptcy. People such as these must be taught that when they spend $3 million for a development contract, they had better come up with a model, plans, and drawings to insure competitive bidding. As things now stand, the Mary Regans and the Maj. Herbert Sheers can act with impunity, make mistakes, or accomplish calculated deceptions and get away scot-free.

If there ever was a case that illustrates the need for the joint congressional watchdog committee I mentioned at the outset of my presentation, it is this one. The senior Senator from New Jersey, Clifford Case, has introduced similar legislation in the other body. My bill bears the No. H.R. 4409. Another bill I have introduced gives the General Accounting Office before-the-fact authority to upset just such sole-source crimes as this one. It is numbered H.R. 5258.

When these bills come up for hearings—and I am hopeful the Armed Services Committee will now take up H.R. 5258, using this case as a vehicle—I hope every Member will give them close scrutiny and study. I am also hopeful the Rules Committee will now schedule H.R. 4409 for hearings, since I feel I have demonstrated the need for this legislation.

Such a committee as I have suggested, such a change in procurement law as I have introduced, will be able to force countless contracts into healthy competition, opening the door for savings totaling billions of dollars. It will also help restore the power of Congress over the staggering military and space budgets, expenditures which are forcing our Government ever deeper into debt, even in these years of unprecedented prosperity.

Equally important, such legislation, as H.R. 4409 and H.R. 5258 will help win a return to propriety and force the reintroduction of conscience and ethics into this business of defense purchasing. These are qualities that are sadly lacking in both Government and industry in our defense purchasing today.

Mr. Speaker, my files are full and bulging with cases such as the one I have described here today. I am developing more new cases daily, and I will be glad to turn them over to the proper committee when hearings begin on my two bills.

FAKE RUSSIA-CHINA RIFT?

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the fanfare and ballyhoo has finally reached a climax. After years of planted stories and a careful buildup, the sham battle is on. Apparently American leadership is falling for this fake rift between Russia and China. Stories planted in the Communist Party mouthpiece Pravda and the Communist government-controlled Izvestiya, has suddenly become headline news throughout the United States and the free world.

The stage is set. The Chinese and Russian delegations are in Moscow. The scheme has been carefully concocted. At this psychological moment, when Khrushchev is putting on the greatest act of his life, Uncle Sam comes longingly and wistfully to Moscow seeking a test-ban agreement, possibly a nonaggression pact between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, maybe joint space exploration, and deals concerning Cuba and Berlin.

Mr. Speaker, are we about to engage in another Yalta, another Tehran, or another Potsdam with more secret concessions in which the Communist agreements are not worth 2 cents—agreements which are just scraps of paper to buy time or with which to deceive? Another Yalta will finish the United States and the free world and will assure the perpetual ascendency of communism. Those who know the elemental facts of communism know that there is no such thing as a Chinese Communist or Russian Communist or a Cuban Communist. They are all world Communists sworn to conquer and dominate the world for the party—the Communist world party. Any argument between Communist Russia and Communist China or between Communist Russia and Communist Yugoslavia is either a sham or only a disagreement as to when to bury the United States. It is extremely dangerous for the United States to make any agreements or commitments or to sign anything with Red Russia predicated upon a phony rift between Russia and China.

The trail of Communist Russia and Communist China is marked with broken promises, lies, murder, deception, and fraud. Basic Communist dogma calls for proclamations of peace, agreements, treaties, and negotiations all to be broken if it advances the cause of world communism. They will take two steps forward and one backward. Red China's attack on India last fall is a classic example. Russia's policy in Cuba is another.

Mr. Speaker, may I remind this House of the smiles of Khrushchev when he came to this Capitol, of his congeniality with the business groups, farmers, and his smiles to the children and women of America and his constant references to peace. Then, if I were an artist or cartoonist, I would like to paint for you the hard ruthless lines of his face as he took off his shoes and beat on his desk at the United Nations, screaming insults. Then I would draw for you the sinister recklessness of his bearing as he sat beside the glowering Malinovsky in Paris insulting the President of the United States and terminating the President's planned visit to Russia. This "Doctor Jekyll and Mr. Hyde" is now smiling again. The papers report that he is in a jovial mood and that Mikoyan is in a gala mood—yes, Mr. Speaker, the mood of the snake as he charms the victim.

I earnestly hope our leaders will enter into no agreement with this gangster, with this perpetrator of crime and murder, this racist who liquidated whole races of people. This rendezvous with Khrushchev could become a rendezvous with disaster, with liquidation and with slavery for the American people.

INTEREST RATES AND BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's move by the Federal Reserve Board to increase by five-tenths of 1 percent the interest rate in our Nation to slow the outflow of short-term capital was, in my judgment, a grave mistake. The Board has in effect asked the people of the United States to board an elephant for the employment of a mouse. The grave disparity between the cost of this move and the result we might hope to achieve is alarming. One must remember that an increase in interest rates affects our domestic financing equally as much as it affects our international financing.

According to the Washington Post editorial of this morning, last year's short-term capital outflow amounted to $507 million. In order to control, or seek to control this sum, the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board are asking the American consumer and taxpayer to carry this staggering burden. Consumer installment credit will amount to over $60 billion this year. This is a cost of $30 million in additional interest cost to the consumers. A substantial amount of the Federal debt will have to be originally financed or refinanced in this coming year. Since a substantial amount of our present debt is carried under short-term bills, at least $100 billion will have to be financed or refinanced on the new interest rates and this could cost another $50 million. On any commitments from the taxpayer and consumer over and above this consideration, it should be remembered that State, county, city, and district debt now amounts to well over $200 billion, and a substantial amount of this debt will be turned over in short-term obligations in the near future and it also will have to carry the added burden of a five-tenths of 1 percent. I am suggesting that the total cost for this rise could well reach the staggering sum of $100 million.

No one has suggested that any conditions intimating inflation exist in our present economy. Quite to the contrary, we are worried about increasing the activity, expansion, and growth of that economy. This move made by the Federal Reserve Board is calculated to go in the opposite direction of the policies being proposed by the administration and suggested by most responsible economists.

To my knowledge no one is suggesting that there is any unequitable squeeze on the money-lending segments of our economy. As a matter of fact and figures, exemplified in the June 1963 Economic Indicators prepared by the Joint Economic Committee, in the last 10 years while the gross national income was increasing approximately 50 percent, interest income increased over a 100 percent. Finally, I agree 100 percent with a statement out of, again, the Washington Post editorial of today:

> The "firming of interest rates" may at best slow the outflow of short-term capital, but the movement of short-term funds is not a principal problem.

That there is some confusion in the Federal Reserve Board position is also indicated by their release to the Associated Press on July 15 which I previously quoted in Tuesday's Congressional Record and which I here requote for emphasis:

> There is no systematic relationships between interest rates on the availability of credit in the United States and the flow of

money overseas, a study by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York concluded Wednesday.

Evidence regarding the question of whether international capital and gold flows tend to be interest induced is becoming more abundant and more confusing, the survey found, which leads us to again conclude that we are apt to be boarding an elephant and working a mouse, and it might be a sick mouse at that.

AMERICAN FARM LABORERS DO NOT CHOOSE TO "STOOP"; DOMESTIC LABORERS SCORN JOBS EAGERLY SOUGHT BY MEXICANS

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the body of the RECORD a letter of July 9, 1963, from the Grower-Shipper Vegetable Association of Central California. This letter should have been read by every Member of Congress before voting on the Mexican labor bracero bill. I ask of my colleagues, who voted to throw out the bracero program, these questions: Are they prepared to finance a staggering welfare "handout" to domestic farm families? How will they explain to the homemaker the soaring cost of fresh produce? Can they make an American farm laborer want to harvest "stoop" crops—such as lettuce, celery, carrots, broccoli, onions, brussels sprouts, radishes, cauliflower, beans, sugar beets and strawberries? Why toss aside the best foreign-aid program we have yet devised? The Mexican farmworker comes eagerly to earn American dollars. When the crops are picked, he returns to his homeland and family, richer and happier. Here is American money which is earned and goes directly to the little people—the people no other assistance reaches. Is this program taking work from our own farm laborers? It is not. By law every farmer is required to employ domestic help when it is available. The bracero program is strictly controlled by the U.S. Department of Labor. I ask of my colleagues—who loses? All transportation carriers and countless allied industries—fertilizer, insecticide, and farm machinery producers and distributors; seed, oil and freezer companies, canneries, and so forth. Again, I ask—who loses?

Mr. Speaker, every American stands to lose as we cast aside the bracero program. The following letter expresses all this and more.

GROWER-SHIPPER
VEGETABLE ASSOCIATION
OF CENTRAL CALIFORNIA,
Salinas, Calif., July 9, 1963.

Hon. MINOR C. MARTIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The failure of Congress to extend Public Law 78 came as a great surprise and shock to the California vegetable industry which will not be able to produce vegetables without a supplemental supply of agricultural workers. Vegetable production requires workers to stoop, and over the years we have attempted to recruit domestic workers from Texas and other areas, and although we were able to recruit some workers most of them only continued to work a few days or a few weeks.

Vegetable and berry production in the central coastal area of California is practically a year-round operation. We commence harvesting in April and are harvesting in large quantities from the first of May until the first of December. This area ships approximately 60,000 carloads of fresh vegetables throughout the Nation. Our major vegetable crops are lettuce, celery, carrots, broccoli, onions—dry and green, tomatoes, artichokes, Brussels sprouts, cauliflower, green and dry beans, sugarbeets and strawberries. Ninety percent of the fresh vegetables and berries are shipped out of the State and are distributed throughout the country for consumption.

We grow and ship from 20 to 45 percent of the Nation's supply for several of these commodities.

At the peak of our harvesting season, May and September, we have historically used approximately 12,000 supplemental workers. From March 20 until January 1, we use a minimum of 2,000 to 3,000. For the last 2 years the Department of Labor would not certify for supplemental workers for the months of January and February and it has been necessary for some of our growers to reduce their acreage during the winter months. We have recruited several thousand domestic workers from the San Francisco, Sacramento, and San Joaquin areas. These workers have proved quite unsatisfactory as they only worked a few hours to a few days and left.

If the growers are able to continue their historic production it will be necessary to recruit domestic agricultural workers. It is doubtful if there are available workers willing to go into agricultural production in numbers up to 12,000. Many of these people, of course, would be family people and we would be required to furnish suitable housing for families which we presently do not have to accommodate in such large numbers. Because of the vagaries of agriculture, we would not be able to afford them a continuity of employment as agricultural crop production does not permit continuous employment. Were we placed in a position to have to depend on domestic agricultural workers recruited from areas throughout the country, the cost would be prohibitive in that thousands of them may mentally think they can do the work but would not be able or care to do the work required. Obviously the welfare problem would be of staggering proportions. In the past we used workers from the British West Indies in small numbers and found that they would not do the stoop labor type of work. Domestic workers are satisfactory in cotton, tomato picking and in harvesting deciduous tree crops. However, they will not work in row crops requiring continuous stooping.

Prior to 1943 when the bracero program was first inaugurated, California had around 15,000 Filipinos and approximately 20,000 to 25,000 Japanese. In addition to these workers there were estimated to be over 100,000 Mexican "wetbacks." The central coastal area of California relied principally on the Filipino and Japanese workers. However, when the Philippines declared their Independence, large numbers of the Filipinos returned to the Philippines and most of the remainder have gone into the service industries.

The Japanese were removed during World War II and very few have returned to agriculture and of those who have, most of them are growers in their own right.

During the late 1940's and early 1950's, the Immigration Service increased their vigilance in preventing "wetback" Mexicans from coming into the United States. The growers who used the bracero program agreed with the Immigration Service and the Department of Labor that they would discontinue using "wetback" Mexicans and use only the legal bracero. Therefore, there are practically no "wetbacks" in California at the present time.

The bracero program has been very advantageous to the domestic workers as the Department of Labor and the State employment agencies would only permit the use of supplemental workers when their services determined that there were not sufficient domestic workers available to do the tasks required. The domestic workers had a right to any job a bracero had at any time. Whenever the Department of Labor or the State employment agencies found there were sufficient domestic agricultural workers, growers were required to release the braceros and repatriate them. The bracero program helped to minimize the welfare problem in California and other States requiring stoop labor.

Many industries depend and rely on agriculture—freezers, canneries, fertilizers, seeds, insecticides, farm machinery, oil companies, automobile and truck agencies, etc. The elimination of the bracero program will force growers to reduce their production considerably which in turn will throw many domestic workers in allied industries out of employment.

Agriculture in the central coastal areas of California grosses several hundred million dollars a year. At least 50 percent of this gross represents payrolls and obviously if these payrolls are curtailed or reduced, professional and business people in the agricultural communities of the State are going to suffer because of their curtailed business, so that the effect of the loss of the supplemental labor program will not only affect agriculturists, but will affect every segment of economic life.

I am enclosing herewith a chart which we compiled based on referrals from the California Department of Employment. This chart indicates the lack of desire of domestics to work in our type of stoop labor activity. And, if we were to have this type of experience from domestics that would be recruited from other areas of the United States, it would be practically impossible to carry on our present production schedules.

The vegetable growers of California must be assured of supplemental labor if they are to continue producing the fresh vegetables in the quantities they have been producing. These vegetables are distributed throughout the United States. For the sake of the general economy of California we urge you to consider extending the bracero program.

If California growers are going to be required to do without a supplemental labor program, the small grower is going to have to consolidate with the larger operators or will eventually be forced out of business. California has always had a basic agricultural labor force, but at the present time its entire economy is based on the supplemental use of braceros. I do not wish to leave the impression that braceros are the only workers in agricultural fieldwork for there are estimated to be over 400,000 agricultural workers in California, the bracero is only used as a supplemental force when needed.

Sincerely yours,

JACK E. BIAS,
Executive Vice President.

MIGRANT FAMILIES OFTEN DOUBLE THE SIZE OF SMALL COMMUNITIES

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, some Members of Congress who voted against the bracero program may have failed to consider thoroughly some of the hardships which will be imposed unnecessarily upon our rural communities.

Gilroy, Calif., is not in my district but their predicament is not untypical; as a Member of Congress, I feel some responsibility for them.

The population is about 7,800. For a few months during harvest, 2,500 supplemental laborers are required in the area. If these laborers are accompanied by their families at least 10,000 people must invade Gilroy. This means that all schools would have to be more than doubled in size, facilities, teachers. Does any Member know a community in the world which can afford to double its school system for a few months of the year.

History is clear that jails need to be more than doubled. Can any community afford to more than double its capacity of expensive facilities such as jails, hospitals, and so forth for a few months of the year.

Families must be housed in family-type dwellings. Not even the Federal Government in a most spendthrift fit of largesse could afford to build, maintain, and operate minimum family-type housing with only 2, 3, or 5 months occupancy expectancy. A migrant system for providing supplemental farm labor would require these fantastically enormous and wasteful expenditures for Gilroy and all other agricultural communities in California. Does any Member of Congress honestly advocate this?

A community and industry may afford housing, feeding, and public facilities for men without families—whether they are domestic migrants or foreign—for short periods. The farmer, employee and the community would prefer the domestic, if he is available. When a domestic is not available, labor must be imported to complete the harvest.

Is there any Member of Congress who honestly intended to impose upon Gilroy an influx of people twice its size. Most other small agricultural communities in California face the same problem. The bracero program was a decent, effective, economic and humane solution to this enormous problem of every agricultural town in California.

We need your understanding and help desperately.

HISTORY OF DEALS WITH COMMUNISTS SHOULD SERVE TO WARN US

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as the Kennedy administration prepares to make another deal with Khrushchev, perhaps it is not amiss to remind the Members of Congress and the American people what happened when President Roosevelt tried the same thing.

The results of Yalta and Teheran sent millions of people into Communist slavery and helped to advance the Soviet Union into a world power which now threatens freedom everywhere. Yet, President Kennedy, refusing to heed the lessons of history, is evidently preparing to follow exactly the same course with Khrushchev that Franklin Roosevelt took with Stalin.

The following column by Dr. Robert Morris, "Will 1963 Be 1943 Repeated?" is an apt lesson in history; I hope it will be read carefully and that enough people will be awakened in time to prevent further deals with the Communists.

WILL 1963 BE 1943 REPEATED?

(By Robert Morris)

History has a way of repeating itself. But for some reason men seem destined not to comprehend this elemental fact. Perhaps the solution lies in man's supreme confidence that he can do things better than his predecessors before him.

The late Forest Davis, a great reporter, was chosen by President Franklin D. Roosevelt to do a semiofficial report on the Teheran conference in December 1943. The President spent 2 hours describing his policy to Forest and then personally made changes in the finished account.

This read:

"To the President, an ingrained optimist who believes in the efficacy of cross-the-table confabulation, the fact that he and Stalin were face to face was at least half his battle. It marked, as he saw it, a long step forward in the accomplishment of his 'great design' for a peaceable, lawabiding world."

It was at Teheran that the President most clearly exhibited his tough minded determination to enroll the Soviet Union as a sincere and willing collaborator in postwar settlements. That determination, I am able to say, is at the center of his "great design."

In the interest of his objective, Mr. Roosevelt has avoided the slightest cause of offense to the Kremlin. The core of his policy has been the reassurance of Stalin. That was so, as we have seen, at Teheran. It has been so throughout the difficult diplomacy since Stalingrad. Our failure to renew our offer of good offices in the Russo-Polish controversies must be read in that light. Likewise our support, seconding Britain, of Tito, the Croatian Communist partisan leader in Yugoslavia. So it is also with the President's immediate and generous response to Stalin's demand for a share in the surrendered Italian fleet or its equivalent. Our bluntly reiterated advice to the Finns to quit the war at once without reference to Soviet terms falls under the same tactical heading.

Mr. Roosevelt, gambling for stakes as enormous as any statesman ever played for, has been betting that the Soviet Union needs peace and is willing to pay for it by collaborating with the West.

The late President mapped out the following four points in order to win over Stalin:

(1) To give Stalin without stint or limit everything he asked for the prosecution of war, and to refrain from asking Stalin for anything in return.

(2) To persuade Stalin to adhere to statements of general aims, like the Atlantic Charter.

(3) To let Stalin know that the influence of the White House was being used to encourage American public opinion to take a favorable view of the Soviet Government.

(4) To meet Stalin face to face and persuade him into an acceptance of Christian ways and democratic principles.

It is now 1963. The whole rationale of our policy today is basically a repetition of Roosevelt's "grand design."

We now know that Roosevelt's grand design was a colossal failure. Hundreds of millions of humans went into bondage as a result of Roosevelt's gamble.

This time however, the stakes are higher. It is no longer Poland, Yugoslavia, or Eastern Europe that are being pushed onto the gambling table. It is our National Defense Establishment, our sovereignty and our way of life itself.

I notice that Khrushchev just the other day in one of his reported ideological differences with the Red Chinese, reaffirmed his loyalty to Leninism. It was Lenin who said: "It was necessary to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, concealment of truth."

There is no evidence whatever to support the conclusion that Soviet power is mellowing or that Soviet nature is changing.

Will 1963 be 1943 all over again?

Mr. Speaker, reviewing the four points President Roosevelt used 20 years ago in a futile effort to appease the Communist dictator Stalin, is it not logical for us to conjecture what points President Kennedy is using for the same approach to Stalin's successor, Khrushchev? The whole story is so ridiculous it should be treated with laughter, but the results of the policy are so tragic we can do nothing but fear the outcome of any treaty negotiated now with Khrushchev by Averell Harriman who, you remember, also played an important part in Roosevelt's negotiations with Stalin.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the observance of Captive Nations Week each year will continue as long as 100 million people remain under ruthless Soviet Communist subjugation in Eastern and Central Europe. We will not forget these people.

They live behind the Iron Curtain, not because they gave up their struggles for independence, but because the Soviet red army never left the countries through which it marched westward at the end of World War II.

In fact, there are many undeniable indications that these unfortunate men and women are even continuing their struggle to gain their freedom. One example is the 20 divisions of the Soviet army and the wall through the center of Berlin that are needed to maintain Herr Ulbricht's East German regime.

Through the observance of this week we are able to bring to the attention of the peoples of the rest of the world the true nature of Communist imperialism.

Two dozen captive nations now feel the ruthless force of their Soviet rulers. They have seen their sons shipped off to prison camps in Siberia. They have seen their churches closed and their cultures suppressed.

Yet, their hope still remains—hope that one day they will be free to live as individual human beings and not as cogs in the wheel of an all-pervading state. America has carried on a continual effort to help these people. We will not stop until they are free. If proclamation of Captive Nations Week annoys the Soviet leadership—as may be seen by their constant angry statements concerning it—then I can only say to them, "Let these people go free."

The purpose of Captive Nations Week will have been fulfilled when the need to proclaim it no longer exists.

THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. REID] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Board of Trustees of the National Cultural Center, appointed by the Speaker of the House shortly after I became a Member of Congress this year, it is gratifying to note the excellent progress which has been made toward realization of a National Cultural Center here in our Nation's Capital.

I am told that when the Congress made possible this center through its generous donation of land and legislative action in the 85th Congress there were many who doubted that the center would ever come to fruition.

There were, and still are, many obstacles to the center's realization. For one thing, many great communities throughout the land are simultaneously building their own local centers. Competition in fund-raising is, therefore, keen. Secondly, the Nation's Capital does not have the broad industrial base from which many sizable corporate contributions can be solicited.

Notwithstanding these and other difficulties, the Board of Trustees of the center has proceeded in a vast nationwide fund-raising program which has achieved important results to date. I believe that the trustees and all those responsible for the collection of funds here in Washington, D.C., and in the 50 States should be commended for the important progress which they have made.

Further, I believe that since Congress originally approved this project it should now follow through by enacting legislation extending the necessary time period in which the fund collection may be completed if all efforts and funds expended to date are not to be wasted.

Mr. Richard L. Coe, drama editor, points out the need for extension of time most succinctly and effectively in the following article which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, July 14:

TIME NOW TOP NEED OF CENTER

(By Richard L. Coe)

Before New York's Lincoln Center even started to think about plans and fundraising, the Rockefeller brothers contributed $5 million as an operating fund.

When, after years of pleading—and you can go back to the 1870's for early murmurings—Congress created the National Cultural Center, there was not 1 red cent as an operating fund.

This is the basic fact to be kept in mind about the Center. Sometime in September, Congress must extend its 5-year limit on the Potomac site set aside for the center.

Center officials do not anticipate congressional failure to do this because, with absolutely no operating fund to start with, decisive progress has been made.

Contributions have come in at an increasing rate over the past 5 years, though only in the past year has the organization felt equipped to get its drive out of low gear. Last week's news that the Government of Italy has offered to give all the marble Architect Edward Durrell Stone's building will require was an immensely powerful boost. Then there is the pronounced success of RCA's recordings of the service bands as a source of income.

To L. Corrin Strong, the board's first executive vice chairman, goes the outspoken appreciation of Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the Center's board of trustees:

"Mr. Strong's contribution of overhead expenses for 2 years solved a vitally and usually unremarked problem in getting the ball rolling. Because we had no Rockefeller brothers to pay the bills as we got going, the first few years were based on nothing except good will and determination."

One hopes that in considering the legislation to extend the ground-breaking period, Congress will grasp this essentially unique characteristic: the pump had to be primed and it has been.

No clearer picture of the uniqueness of such an enterprise can be given than in the fascinating story of our city told by Constance McLaughlin Green in her Pulitzer Prize history "Washington: Village and Capital, 1800–1878." Here, in absolutely eerie detail, is a record like that of no other city.

Schooling, public health, sanitation, and road building, efforts to create a commercial or at the least a trading city have all required the most devious plotting, scheming and false starts. Originally two cities and a county, created from two States, Washington's existence always has depended on the whims of Congress. Never has a city had so exasperating a history.

This background must always be kept in mind as we consider the steps and progress of the National Cultural Center. It is a story never understood by outsiders and seldom grasped by unthinking residents. The problem of the center is essentially simple: stages, auditoriums, and theaters, never wholly adequate as Mrs. Green's references indicate, now have all but disappeared. To nourish the performing arts of past, present and future, the center is needed. Purely objective research reports done in the past decade are unanimous about this.

Now the point to keep in mind is that despite a long history of disappointments, stretching back decades, a considered plan is closer to fruition than at any other time. Chairman Stevens, having devoted the better part of 2 years to fund-raising, stated last week that "the money thus far raised or promised is closer to 15 than to 10 million and, by the end of the year 20 million may be in sight.

This could not have been said 1 year ago.

Yes, progress has been slow but no one aware that there was not a cent to start with can expect more rapid achievement. Meeting with his executive committee here last week, Stevens confided reasons for optimism. Not long ago he had remarked: "I have developed something of a death wish in the whole effort."

Long contemplated, the Italian gift, which President Kennedy announced from Rome, is immensely provocative, recalling Haiti's gift of wood to the American Stratford in Connecticut, the U.S. Government's indirect gift of Congress Hall to West Berlin, the American tax moneys which rebuilt the Viennese and other European operas and the American private citizens who reconstructed the burned theater at England's Stratford.

In view of history, tradition and present accomplishments, it is inconceivable that Congress will not overwhelmingly, proudly support the simple, inexpensive gift of time.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, this week Americans across the Nation are conducting the fifth observance of Captive Nations Week. This observance comes at a very opportune time when too many of our citizens are waxing the illusion that the Russian-Red Chinese split will mean better times internationally for the United States; when too many of our people mistakenly believe that the consummation of a limited nuclear test ban treaty will produce a real relaxation of international tensions, indeed, of the cold war itself. Captive Nations Week is a sobering exercise of mind and spirit that causes us to face up to the realities of close to a billion people held in basic Soviet Russian captivity and of Moscow's and Peiping's cold war pursuits in the free world.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

We, in the Congress, have an excellent opportunity to reinforce this sobering exercise by moving in this session to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. I take this occasion to call for the formation of this committee so that the realities of the vast captive world may be before the eyes of our people the whole year round, rather than just in 1 week. The serious troubles and problems confronting the Soviet Russian imperio-colonialists today are the paramount result of a whole decade of discontent, uprisings, and revolution on the part of the captive nations in Central Europe, the Soviet Union, and Asia. This is no time to help Khrushchev and his minions in their troubles by playing down the captive nations and the powerful surge of patriotic nationalism they represent. On the contrary, this is the time to concentrate more than ever before on this fundamental matter of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism and the captive nations.

Mr. Speaker, there are many unfortunate examples, both present and past, that can be cited as conclusive evidence of the pressing need for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. Secretary of State Rusk's letter on Georgia, Armenia, and Ukraine is, as we know, a classic in official misconception and misunderstanding of numerous captive nations. But in connection with Captive Nations Week let me cite another outstanding example.

Many observers cannot forget the Nixon example during the period of the first Captive Nations Week observance in 1959. Since the former Vice President has recently elected to speak on the goals of extending freedom and the like, I believe we should take a look at his record concerning Khrushchev and the Captive Nations Week resolution. In this bipartisan effort, I do this solely for purposes of constructive criticism and the most earnest hope that we may avoid such experiences in the future; no personal criticism is at all intended.

Based on Nixon's own testimony, it is a record that scarcely does credit to our past and present official understanding of the captive nations. In a documented analysis of the Nixon story, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, and the author of the Captive Nations Week Resolution, states:

> As his book on "Six Crisis" attests, he still doesn't understand what happened when Khrushchev unleashed his attack against the Captive Nations Week Resolution.

Because a careful study of this analysis, which appears as an article titled "Nixon and the Captive Nations Resolution" in the authoritative journal, the Ukrainian Quarterly, spring 1963 issue, will enable us to appreciate further the need for a special committee, I request that it be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

MOSCOW SEEKS U.S. ACQUIESENCE TO ITS EMPIRE

From 1959 to the present, Khrushchev and his propaganda machine have aimed above all at the crystallization of official U.S. acquiescence to Moscow's enormous empire. This is the implication of his latest proposal for a Warsaw Pact-NATO nonaggression treaty; this has been the steady implication of his deceptive peaceful coexistence gestures. In this we must never give in; and the best guarantee that we will not can be provided by our creation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

Mr. Speaker, the lead editorial of the Philadelphia Inquirer, in its July 15 issue, raises the pertinent question "Khrushchev, What Now?" The editorial bears on Captive Nations Week and shows that the basic, causal reasons underlying the cold war will still be ever present regardless of a test ban treaty or a Sino-Russian chasm. I ask that this illuminating editorial be printed in the RECORD following the Dobriansky analysis.

On this fifth observance of Captive Nations Week, originally made possible by the 86th Congress, I raise the question "Members of Congress, What Now?" And the answer which most of us share is a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. We, the people's representatives, have the opportunity to keep Khrushchev and his tyrannical minions on the defensive as concerns the all-important, the most fundamental matter in the cold war—the two dozen and more captive nations.

The analysis and editorial follow:

NIXON AND THE CAPTIVE NATIONS RESOLUTION

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

Conflicting stories about former Vice President Richard M. Nixon and the Captive Nations Week resolution will undoubtedly be told for many years to come. Since 1959, when the Vice President made his famous tour to the Soviet Union, numerous versions of his negative attitude toward the resolution have been given. In the 1960 presidential campaign, for example, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT demanded the release of the official text of the Nixon-Khrushchev conversations on the historic resolution which Congress had passed in July 1959. It was rumored then that the disclosure would have been devastating to Nixon. Many wonder today why this text hasn't been disclosed.

Another example is the account offered in 1962 by the columnist Drew Pearson. On the basis of his interview with the Russian dictator, Pearson maintains that Nixon "actually apologized to Khrushchev for the action of the American Congress." [1] The questionable story Pearson related goes as follows:

"Naturally I knew about the resolution," Khrushchev said, "but did not plan to mention it since Nixon was our guest. However, much to my surprise Nixon mentioned it himself and said that Congress was foolish to have passed the resolution.

"Do you mean to say that Members of Congress are fools?" Khrushchev said he asked Nixon.

"Oh, this is just a private conversation between us," Nixon said quickly.

One cannot but suspect the validity of this story when it is recalled that even before Nixon's plane landed in Moscow, Khrushchev had already brought up the resolution. In a stadium rally at the time he bellowed and railed against the resolution and its sponsors. However, part of Pearson's story appears quite plausible. As far as I know, Nixon has never denied his apologizing to Khrushchev for the passage of the resolution. And it is this point that continually emerges in the many different stories.

THE NIXON STORY

For an American to gage the damage that was done in Moscow it isn't at all necessary to depend on these many shifting stories of Nixon's behavior. Nixon's own qualified account is sufficient for this purpose. Whether the former Vice President has realized it or not, his story is a portrait of self-indictment.

Richard Nixon didn't know what struck him when he arrived in Moscow for the American Cultural Exhibition in July 1959. As his book on "Six Crises" attests, he still doesn't understand what happened when Khrushchev unleased his attack against the Captive Nations Week Resolution.

It is not, of course, my desire or intention to indulge in personalities or to cast any ill-light on their motivations. That unconstructive course never makes for objective discourse. I have the highest esteem for Mr. Nixon as I do for all public servants who have duties to perform and responsibilities to discharge in behalf of our national interest. I single out Nixon not because of Nixon but rather because of his direct official involvement in and his subsequent testimony to an event which continues to bewilder most Americans. Nixon's errors, omissions, and deficiencies may be viewed as a particular personification of the trained capacity for such behavior as demonstrated by the Kennans, the Bohlens and other well known Russian experts. As Nixon himself tells us, he was briefed extensively by such experts in the State Department, the U.S. Information Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency, and other Government bodies. What's more, his heavy entourage to Moscow consisted of top-level advisers.

The chapter on Khrushchev in Nixon's book demonstrates clearly the limitations and flaws in the understanding of too many of our leaders with regard to the Soviet Union and the nature of the threat facing us. The concepts and conceptions shown by Nixon reveal only too plainly some of the reasons why the United States has been losing the cold war since World War II. Throughout the book Nixon is under the illusion that the Soviet Union is populated only by the Russian people. The main prison house of nations is nonexistent for him. He seems to gloat over the fact that he was given the opportunity to speak directly to the "Russian people," although he is thoroughly unaware of the additional fact that the several things he had to say couldn't but have had an adverse effect on the majority of non-Russian nationals in the U.S.S.R. Adding imprecision of thought to factual inaccuracy, if Nixon is not talking about the "Russian people," he is employing the equally misleading notion, "the Soviets."

As to ideology and reality, Nixon exudes similar confusion. He reveals to us that "the most important single purpose" of his mission was to convince Khrushchev "that he could not hope to convert the United States to communism." [2] This is a rather fantastic conception of the problem. The Soviet Russian totalitarians haven't converted any nation to "communism," including the entire Russian nation. So why place the United States as an unwary, lamb-like object of mythical conversion?

If, instead of concentrating on the myths of communism and conversion, Nixon had viewed the problem in its true light, he would have regarded as his most important single purpose the conveyance of our knowledge to Khrushchev about Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism and also our determination to beat it in its tracks. This could have been done diplomatically and with knowledgeable resolve. Khrushchev would have respected Nixon for it. For respect from the Russian bear is not obtained by falling prey to his disseminated myths.

THE MAJOR SOVIET RUSSIAN IRRITANT

When it comes to the "major Soviet irritant" throughout Nixon's tour, as he himself phrases it, the limitations and defects come into full bloom. The evidence provided by the participant himself, and reflecting the advice and judgments of countless others, clearly shows how unprepared and short we are in coping with the claws of the bear. By this evidence Nixon confirms the fact that he fared rather poorly and feebly when he was confronted by Khrushchev's explosion over the Captive Nations Week resolution. The reader will recall the passage of this measure by our Congress immediately prior to the Vice President's departure.

Consider carefully the evidence supplied in Nixon's book. He reports that upon his arrival Khrushchev "was lambasting the United States generally and me personally for the captive nations resolution" which, according to him, "called for prayers for those behind the Iron Curtain." [3] He goes on to say how difficult it was for him to imagine "that the resolution truly disturbed the Soviet Premier because it was simply the expression of a well-known opinion in the United States, and not a call to action."

After reading this, one wonders whether Nixon himself had ever read the resolution. First, it should be pointed out that he had nothing whatever to do with its passage. If he was lambasted, it obviously wasn't personal but official. Second, the resolution does not explicitly call for prayers. It authorizes public observances which, in practice, include prayers in addition to numerous other activities. Moreover, the unique element in the resolution is its specific reference to the main prison house of nations and its inmates, namely, the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. It is this element that stunned Khrushchev, then and ever since. Contrary to Nixon's assertion, the emancipation of these nations is certainly not "a well-known opinion in the United States."

---

[1] Pearson, Drew, "Faked Photos in Golden State," The Washington Post, Nov. 12, 1962, p. D11.

[2] Nixon, Richard M., "Six Crises," New York, 1962, p. 244.

[3] Ibid., p. 247.

Finally, the whereas clauses leading up to and predicating the resolve in Public Law 86-90 unquestionably constitute a call to action. It is action for a cold war strategy to be pursued until all the specified and other captive nations become free and independent. It is a form of action that Nixon himself called for in his acceptance speech before the Republican National Convention, but never concretely spelled out.[4]

By no means is this all. Another highlight in Nixon's testimony of American bewilderment is his "pure protocol courtesy visit" to Khrushchev. He gives a vivid account of how the Russian leader immediately lunged into the resolution.[5] You can visualize the setting. Nixon tells us that the Russian jailer developed "a long harangue" and spoke in "a high-pitched voice," and frequently pounded the table.[6] Khrushchev is quoted as saying that "the Soviet Government regarded the resolution as a very serious 'provocation.'" He is also quoted on its supposed negative effects upon the Geneva Conference, a peace treaty for Germany, and a "general improvement in relations between our two countries," as though the U.S.S.R. is a country in the national sense.

Khrushchev, according to this testimony, set the stage for all that was to follow during Nixon's tour. He couldn't understand why President Eisenhower issued a Captive Nations Week Proclamation if he wanted Nixon "to have a good reception" in Moscow's main prison house of nations. Furthermore, the Russian leader suspected a plot by the U.S. Congress. Evidently, for his conspiratorial mind all of this was too neatly timed. As to be expected, he warned that it would mean war if we intended to "change anything in the U.S.S.R. or in any other country." He then brought out the warped fiction on "how the Russian people had repulsed what he called U.S. intervention at the time of the birth of the Soviet regime, during 1919-21, and certainly would do so now."

NIXON AT A DISADVANTAGE

In the course of this first meeting how did the Vice President present our case? First, from his account, he was apparently misinformed on the time Congress passed the resolution. It was not passed on July 6—the day it passed the Senate—but on July 9. Second, Nixon again was taken aback by Khrushchev's fury over the resolution. He didn't expect him to bring it up during this "pure protocol courtesy visit." As he puts it, "I had to make a quick decision of how to react to his attack." He actually thought that Khrushchev "was going through an act—that he was using the resolution as a pretext for taking the offensive against me, and that had it not been for this resolution, he would have found some other excuse for doing so." Why so?

Regarding our question, Nixon offers no logical explanation as to why this would have been so. Nor could he. Eisenhower's Paris experience in 1960 doesn't at all apply to his. It is perfectly sound for one to hold that had there been no resolution in July 1959, the Vice President would have been wined, dined, and swayed by typical Russian cold-war hospitality. There is no reanson to believe that a pretext was necessary at that time. Moscow was at its peak in its deceptive peace offensive, and Khrushchev himself was planning to visit the United States. Thus, the pretext argument used by Nixon is more of a post-rationalization for an unexpected attack than anything else.

Worse still is Nixon's admission of the two points he emphasized to Khrushchev. One point is that the resolution "was a decision made by the Congress over which Eisenhower had no control." The other point reads, "The resolution did not call for our intervention, or even for our support of a revolution in the satellite nations." Here are perfect examples of how not to approach a Soviet Russian totalitarian, even in the rarified realm of diplomacy. It is hard to believe that Nixon had to grovel with such low apology by intimating that Congress was wrong in passing the resolution. Equally incredible is the further apologetic note about our intervention. Despite his many assertions about a cold-war offensive, this type of feeble behavior spells the complete defensive in the presence of the prime cold-war instigator.

Again by Nixon's testimony, Khrushchev opened himself wide for some pointed retorts. The fiction about U.S. intervention in 1919-21 was a topic which could have been chewed on with particular reference to the reestablishment of the Russian prison house of nations. The jailer's ears could have been pinned back on this one. Concerning the resolution itself, the tactic that was made to order by Khrushchev's numerous utterances and should have been seized upon by Nixon is one of stressing competitive ideals and ways of life. Why this awful fear of a congressional resolution? But such an offensive presupposes knowledgeability. As Marx said, the Russian bear will continue to claw the other defenseless animals.

To be sure, as Nixon attests, Khrushchev kept clawing in this first meeting. He shook his finger at the Vice President, he threatened that Nixon would hear about the resolution for the duration of his stay, he shouted and pounded, he dubbed the resolution, and then "he spelled out what he meant in some earthy four-letter words."[7] Even Troyanovsky, his interpreter, had to blush "bright red." Still, at the close of this first meeting, Nixon was in the dark about all this. He completely misjudged the hospitable Moscow keeper and never understood the full import of the resolution.

Khrushchev also kept his word on Nixon hearing about the resolution during his tour. The frightened sought to frighten the innocent. To take a few instances, at the American exhibition in Sokolniki Park, where the superficial "kitchen debate" occurred, the Russian leader again denounced the resolution. He embraced a workman nearby and declared for all to hear, "Does this man look like a slave laborer?"[8] While Nixon was concerned with irrelevancies, such as the comparative merits of "the Soviet system" and our economy, his political climb and Khrushchev's, the jailer was very much obsessed by the meaning of the resolution for his compound of imprisoned nations.

THE RUSSIAN JAILER POTEMKINIZES

Later, at Khrushchev's dacha, the resolution came up again. The native Russian (Khrushchev isn't a Ukrainian nor is he, like Stalin, an adopted Russian) suggested a boat trip for the Vice President and his party "to see how the slaves live."[9] The 2-hour trip turned into a trip about captives. Mikoyan according to Nixon, characterized it as "fine river rallies." On eight occasions Khrushchev ordered the boat to be stopped so that he could shake hands with the bathers in the Moskva River and ask them, "Are you captives? Are you slaves?"[10] Naturally, the shouted reply was nyet, nyet. Whereupon Khrushchev would turn to Nixon, rib him a bit or two, and shout "See how our slaves live." Nixon was informed later by Ambassador Thompson that the only bathers allowed to use the river are the elite of the new class.

The typical Potemkin village tactics of fraud and fear as shown here by Khrushchev are modes of Russian political behavior which we shall observe time and time again in other contexts. The Potemkin village characterization goes back to the time of Catherine the Great in the 18th century and is synonymous with false appearances. The sorry aspect of all this is Nixon's almost naive interpretations of the clawing he received from the bear. He rationalized that protocol had to be maintained, that Khrushchev was his host and the like. This is no excuse for not demonstrating, ever so politely and shrewdly, one's own knowledgeability about the U.S.S.R., its makeup, its uncementable cracks.

When Nixon repeatedly speaks of the U.S.S.R. as a nation and groups the different national entities of this imperium into the mythical category of "Soviet people," the Russian totalitarian cannot but instantly scent his prey. When he regards Khrushchev as a "cold, hardheaded Marxist," the prime jailer cannot but recognize the solid effects of his smoke screening propaganda.[11] And when he publicly testifies that he was bewildered by Khrushchev's reaction to the Captive Nations Week resolution, we have a fair measure of the validity as well as the gravity of Marx's wisdom about the Russian bear and its victims.

From the viewpoint of psychopolitical impact there were many other errors committed by the Vice President. At the request of Herbert Klein, who was Nixon's press secretary, I submitted a memorandum citing several of these errors. Nixon's exclusive concentration on Russia as against the non-Russian countries in the U.S.S.R., his mythical monolithic terms, such as "Soviet nation" and "Soviet people," his reference to Ukraine as the Texas of this "nation," his comparison of Novosibirsk, long the hub of slave labor in Moscow's empire, with our free western frontier towns, and his rags-to-riches attribution to Khrushchev's rise to power, which was actually accelerated by genocide and other crimes in the thirties and forties—these were some of the inexcusable errors pointed out.[12]

We Americans might have contented ourselves with the superficialities of the "kitchen debate," but those in Moscow's primary empire who have long suffered the injustices and indignities of Soviet Russian domination over their homeland, must have been hurt deeply by the words and thoughts of America's second-ranking leader. Yes, the official text of the momentous Khrushchev-Nixon affair has yet to be released to the American public. As mentioned before, in the 1960 presidential campaign Senator FULBRIGHT urged its release when he accused the Vice President of expressing regrets to Khrushchev on the timing of the resolution.[13] Its release now should make for some interesting and instructive reading. After all, other texts on U.S. prestige abroad and other subjects have since been released.

The Nixon testimony of American bewilderment is only a meager parcel of the misunderstanding and misconceptions held in this country with regard to the Captive Nations Week Resolution. As emphasized earlier, Nixon simply gave high-level expression to this misunderstanding or lack of understanding. Innumerable examples can be cited from other spheres of our society. To mention one, in 1961 Stewart Alsop wrote an article in the Saturday Evening Post in which he stated: "When I was in Moscow during the October Party Congress, Khrushchev once again violently denounced the innocuous Captive Nations Week resolution which Congress passes every year to attract minority votes." [14]

---

[4] Ibid., p. 457.

[5] Ibid., p. 250.

[6] Ibid., p. 251.

[7] Ibid., p. 252.

[8] Ibid., p. 253.

[9] Ibid., p. 262.

[10] Ibid., p. 263.

[11] Ibid., p. 274.

[12] Memorandum to the Vice President, Oct. 30, 1959.

[13] "FULBRIGHT Cites Nixon Regrets," the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Oct. 19, 1960.

It's strange, to say the least, that this popular writer can compress into one sentence the admixture of truth, illogic and factual inaccuracy. It is a significant truth that Khrushchev has not ceased to denounce the resolution. He's been doing it since 1959. But logically, if this is so, then how could the resolution be deemed "innocuous"? And, in the realm of fact, Congress does not have to pass the resolution every year. Public Law 86–90 is on the books for an indefinite future. Moreover, the resolution, which was passed in a congressional off-year, was done so with far greater objectives than to attract minority votes. As a matter of fact, this consideration didn't even enter into it.

Evidently there's considerable room in this area for proper information and some education. The Nixon case is an excellent starting point for lessons to be learned. No area of our society is exempt in this regard.

KHRUSHCHEV, WHAT NOW?

The Moscow meeting of the Big Three Powers just as the disgruntled Chinese Communists seem to have brought themselves to admit they have been outgunned and outmaneuvered by their Soviet patrons in the Red intramural tug-of-war, is fraught with possibilities but no certainties whatever.

Our special negotiator, Averell Harriman, said before the talks that it would be several days before we could tell whether Nikita Khrushchev was serious—this time—about a nuclear testing ban, even the incomplete one now contemplated. Underground testing, with attendant inspection, still will remain for future haggling.

There is no doubt more than a grain of satisfaction for the West in the apparent fact that the Soviets did not yield to the Red Chinese demand for more belligerence, rigid Stalinism, and overt "exporting of revolutions." Coexistence, then, at least has a chance.

But there are many troubling factors still hanging fire—and needing settlement—before anything like a true "detente" between the Soviets and the West can take place. There are still thousands of Soviet troops in Cuba, where they have no business being. Germany remains divided, absolutely and completely at the insistence and by the power of the Soviets. Civil war still rages in Laos and divided Vietnam, where the Soviets had influence, whether or not they still do.

And this is Captive Nations Week, reminding us, if we need reminding, that the Duchy of Muscovy still holds unwonted sway over Armenia, the Ukraine, and many another so-called "SSR."

Khrushchev himself, in a new letter to Britain's egregious Bertrand Russell, has once more bluntly and specifically refused to pay any part of the United Nations' peacekeeping assessments, on the specious grounds that this would serve "the colonialists'" purposes. The only colonies enchained since the Second World War—Hungary, Poland, the Baltic States, Czechoslovakia, East Germany—go unmentioned, but not forgotten.

If Harriman can negotiate a partial test ban treaty which will at least spare the world the creeping horror of radioactive fallout, he will have accomplished much. If he can further open doors leading to sane discussion of some of the other outstanding differences, fine.

It is impossible at this time to know if Khrushchev fancies he is using the West as a counterweapon against his mutinous ally, China, but it is entirely possible that for home as well as foreign reasons the Kremlin boss really is ready for a meaningful thaw in the cold war. While we decline to be used, we can ourselves make good use of such a thaw for the extension of freedom and world security.

There is little reason to trust Khrushchev, "hot line" or no, but the next voice we hear will have to be his.

THE BRACERO PROGRAM

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, this House heard commentary yesterday that the bracero program was and is defensible as a foreign aid program.

I submit that there is a clear doubt as to the foreign aid value of the bracero program. The Agency for International Development neither approves of nor disapproves of the bracero program.

This is clearly pointed out in a press release which AID put out on the evening of July 1. I should like to include this release at this point in the Record:

Statement Phoned to Associated Press July 1

The Agency for International Development states that it takes no position on the merits of the bracero program. The statement furnished to the House Foreign Affairs Committee noted that the program should continue only if it is of net benefit to both countries. AID expresses no opinion as to whether or not it is of sufficient advantage to each country to merit discontinuing or continuing the program.

In its testimony on the foreign aid bill, AID merely attempted to set forth certain facts on the bracero program: that it does benefit the Mexican economy by providing a source of dollars and helping the Mexican balance of payments. The termination of the bracero program would, of course, have an adverse effect upon the Mexican economy that would have to be taken into account in considering whether or not any foreign assistance should be rendered to that country. But the continuation of the bracero program itself, which involves many factors other than the dollar earning capacity of Mexico, cannot be judged on this basis alone, and AID expresses no opinion on this program.

THE NEXT 5 YEARS

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as we all so well know, it is vitally important that we in Congress all be aware of the recent technical and strategic developments in the area of defense. In the modern world the United States faces a great challenge in this direction which demands an informed and prepared Nation.

A few days ago I referred you to the current issue of the General Electric Forum, which has selected as its topic "What's New in Defense?" Today I bring to your attention another excellent article from that magazine, "The Next 5 Years," an appraisal by our distinguished Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, on the world environment and its demand for defense contributions from the United States.

Here is the challenge and America's response as expressed by Secretary McNamara in congressional presentations and public statements on such issues as: the Communist design for world conquest; the free world response—including balance of strategic retaliatory and general purpose forces; research and development for an effective balance of military capability. The Secretary's statements have been compiled by the editors of the forum.

I strongly believe that those of us who are not members of the Armed Services Committee and have not had the opportunity to hear the Secretary's testimony directly can benefit from this article. It should, moreover, be read by all Americans. I am, therefore, inserting it at this point in the Record; and I recommend it in the highest possible terms to my colleagues and to all who read this Record.

Last year when our attention was focused particularly on the Berlin crisis, I pointed out that our defense program was geared to our global requirements over the long term, and not simply to the immediate situation. Since that time, the Nation, and indeed, the whole world has gone through another crisis, precipitated again by the Soviet Union, this time in Cuba. However, as acute as this crisis was—and the aftereffects have yet to be fully liquidated—it did not then and should not now distract our attention from the more fundamental and far-reaching challenge which communism poses to the free world.

COMMUNIST THREAT TO FREEDOM

The missiles in Cuba represented but a small part of the total Communist threat to freedom. Crises or probing actions all over the world—in Cuba, South Vietnam, India, Berlin, Africa—are simply more obvious manifestations of the Communist drive toward their basic objective of world domination.

In this regard, there has been no change in the policy of the Soviet Union to encourage what Mr. Khrushchev calls wars of national liberation or popular revolts—what we know as covert armed aggression, guerrilla warfare, and subversion. And the Soviet Union has not diminished its efforts through the more subtle means of economic and military aid, political intrigue, and propaganda to win over the neutral and emerging nations of the world to the cause of communism. From Africa to the Near East, from southeast Asia to Latin America, the pattern is the same.

LATIN AMERICA, AFRICA, THE NEAR EAST

In Latin America, as hunger and economic instability perisist, the danger of communism will be ever present. Indeed, it is not an overt-armed Communist attack that is the real danger in this part of the world, or even Communist sabotage and subversion. The real danger lies in the discouragement, disillusionment, and despair of the people as a result of the relatively slow rate of economic and social progress.

---

[14] Alsop, Stewart, "The Berlin Crisis; Khrushchev's Weakness," the Saturday Evening Post, Dec. 16, 1961.

Africa is another area in which the Communists will try to take advantage of any political and economic instability. The real danger there is quite similar to that in Latin America—namely, that the Communists could gain a foothold by subverting and overthrowing an existing government. When we consider the large number of newly independent countries on that continent, the many opportunities for troublemaking become readily apparent.

In the Near East we face quite a different kind of situation. While most of the countries in this area are still politically unstable and economically underdeveloped, some are much further along in their efforts to modernize. In general, our interest in this area is to help create an environment in which each of the nations can maintain internal stability and develop in its own way without fear of attack from its neighbors or from the Communist bloc.

CHINA'S PRINCIPAL THREAT IN ASIA

The situation in south Asia is now reaching the critical point. After several years of nibbling at the northern borders of India, the Chinese Communists last October launched an attack in strength and seized large areas of Indian territory. The security and independence of India are matters of urgent concern to the entire free world. We have already made massive investments in that country's economic development to help the people of India and to demonstrate to the people of all underdeveloped nations that there is a straighter and smoother road to economic and social progress than communism. Now we must consider what is required to help defend the fruits of our mutual efforts.

In southeast Asia, the Communists have for the present foregone the use of open armed aggression in favor of the more covert techniques of subversion, insurgency, and guerrilla warfare—popular revolts. Although the principal arena of the struggle at the moment is South Vietnam, it could easily spread to neighborhood areas.

The principal threat in the Far East, as well as in south and southeast Asia, is Communist China, for the Soviet Union is unlikely to initiate a war in the Pacific alone. It may well be that the logistic effort involved in the Chinese Communist attack on India will detract from their ability to undertake military adventures elsewhere. But we know from experience that the pressure can be quickly shifted from India to southeast Asia, even to Japan or the Philippines; we must continue to help guard all these areas.

BASTION AGAINST COMMUNISM

European NATO, with a population of more than a third of a billion and a gross national product of well over $350 billion a year, is still a principal bastion against the spread of communism. The six Common Market nations, plus the United Kingdom, by themselves have a total population, a military manpower pool, and a gross national product well in excess of that of the Soviet Union.

With the continued growth and extension of the Common Market, coupled with an increasing degree of political integration, in time there will inevitably develop in Europe a new power center, more nearly the equal of the Soviet Union and its European satellites. With the manpower, production capacity, and technical and scientific skills available to them, the nations of Europe should not only be able to provide larger contributions to their own defense, but should also be in a position to contribute more to the defense of freedom in other parts of the world.

In view of this growing strength, some basic changes in our present arrangements with our NATO partners would be very much in order. We have no desire to dominate NATO. In fact we would be very happy to share more equitably the heavy burdens we now carry in the collective defense of the free world. But as long as we do carry so great a share of the total burden, we cannot escape a proportionately large share of responsibility for leadership and direction.

The most critical problem at issue between East and West in Europe continues to be the fate of Berlin. Our sharp confrontation of the Soviets in the Caribbean no doubt upset their agenda for Berlin. Their stationing of nuclear-armed ballistic missiles in Cuba was directly related to that agenda. The psychological if not the military threat that these missiles would have posed to our own homeland was apparently the trump card which Mr. Khrushchev intended to play in the next round of negotiations on the status of Berlin.

THE SOVIET UNION

Although Communist China is the more reckless and belligerent of the two, the Soviet Union has by far the greater capability to cause us injury or otherwise damage the interests of the free world. There is no gainsaying that Soviet resources, industry, and technology have given that country the potential to challenge the primacy of U.S. military power in the world.

While the size, variety, and power of our strategic retaliatory forces still greatly exceed those of the Soviets, the Kremlin leaders have at their command the resources, production capacity, and technology to produce strong forces of their own. We believe they will continue to make great efforts to do so. The Soviet Union can also be expected to maintain large and well-equipped conventional forces to insure the internal security of the Soviet Union, to control its European satellites, to secure its Eastern frontiers and to threaten Western Europe.

In addition, we cannot preclude the possibility that the Soviet Union might seek to establish a direct military presence in other parts of the world, as they did in Cuba. But we believe that they are well aware of the dangers inherent in a direct confrontation between United States and Soviet military power in these areas where we hold a distinct military advantage.

Accordingly, we may anticipate that the Soviet Union will concentrate primarily on other means to extend its influence in these areas, including opportunistic political support, economic aid and military assistance to nonalined countries, and covert assistance to dissident elements in countries allied with the Western Powers.

COMMUNIST CHINA

Notwithstanding the attack on India, the economic prospects of the Communist Chinese are extremely bleak and will, at least during the next few years, serve to limit the size and character of their military adventures. Mainland China is essentially an agricultural economy, and when agriculture suffers, the entire economy suffers. The disastrous consequences of Communist China's agricultural policies are now clear for all to see. The masters of Peiping are having difficulty feeding their people, even at a bare subsistence level, and have had to resort to very large-scale procurements of foodstuffs from abroad.

SUMMING UP

To sum up, the Soviet Union will most likely pursue a strategy in which their military forces are designed to permit the Soviet Union to:

(a) Confront us with continuing political pressure, subversion, and various forms of unconventional warfare under the umbrella of their growing nuclear power.

(b) Capitalize on their conventional military power by the threat of bringing it to bear in situations where they have local conventional superiority.

(c) Deter the West from military action.

Communist China will most likely follow an independent policy designed to expand its own influence in the Communist camp and among the unalined nations, resorting to armed aggression to satisfy its ambitions only where this can be done without a direct confrontation of U.S. military forces.

U.S. RESPONSE

Our response to the Communist threat cannot be a simple one. The Soviet decision to concentrate on wars of covert aggression was not taken in a power vacuum. It rests on the fact of U.S. nuclear power, which is able to survive a nuclear surprise attack and strike back with sufficient power to destroy the enemy target system. But our superior nuclear power may not be a credible deterrent for the kind of conflict proposed by Khrushchev.

That power is essential to our strategy and tactics—indeed to our survival as a nation. But it is equally clear that we require a wider range of practical alternatives to meet the kind of military challenges that Khrushchev has announced he has in store for us. A nonnuclear buildup will increase our capacity to tailor our responses to a particular military challenge to that level of force which is both appropriate to the issue involved and militarily favorable to our side.

Nuclear and nonnuclear power complement each other—in our own military forces and within the NATO alliance—just as together they complement the nonmilitary instruments of policy. Either without the other is, overall, not fully effective. Our policy is aimed at achieving the best balance of military capabilities over the entire range of potential conflict, in the various areas of the globe where the free world has vital interests, and over the years as far ahead as we can reasonably plan. I firmly believe that the nonnuclear buildup will—by improving and expanding the alternatives open to the free world—reduce the pressures to make concessions in the face of Soviet threats.

As we develop a balanced, modern, nonnuclear force, ready to move rapidly against aggression in any part of the world, we continue to inhibit the opportunities for successful conduct of Khrushchev's local wars.

But we shall have to deal with these wars of liberation—often not wars at all. In these conflicts, the force of world communism operates in the twilight zone between political subversion and quasi-military action. Their political tactics are terror, exhortation, and assassination. We must help the people of threatened nations to resist these tactics. You cannot carry out a land reform program if the local peasant leaders are being systematically murdered.

THE COMMUNIST GUERRILLA THREAT

To deal with the Communist guerrilla threat requires some shift in our military thinking—combating guerrilla warfare demands more in ingenuity than in money or manpower. We have been used to developing big weapons and mounting large forces. Here we must work with companies, squads, and individual soldiers, rather than with battle groups and divisions. In all four services, we are training fighters who can in turn, teach the people of free nations how to fight for their freedom. At the same time that our strategic weapons are becoming more and more sophisticated, we must learn to simplify our tactical weapons so that they can be used and maintained by men who have never seen a machine more complicated than a well sweep.

The measures we propose to improve our limited war capabilities follow a number of well-defined lines. Our overall purpose here, as in our strategic buildup, is to augment our forces in a balanced fashion. We have increased the number of combat-ready divisions to meet the military contingencies with which we may have to deal. As we have increased manpower, we have modernized and expanded weapons procurement. We have increased our tactical air power to match our ground forces, and we have launched a program to provide sea and airlift tailored to the man and equipment.

EMPHASIS ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Research and development expenditures, whether measured in budget terms or in program terms, have been mounting steadily over the years. But too much of this effort is not producing useful results. What we want are weapons and equipment that the fighting man can use. If we are to make optimum use of our available scientific and engineering manpower resources, we must plan our program carefully and concentrate these resources where they will make the greatest contributions to our military posture.

Poor planning, unrealistics schedules, unnecessary design changes, and enormous cost increases over original estimates have continuously disrupted the efficient operation of our research and development program. Most of these difficulties have resulted from inadequate prior planning and unwarranted haste in undertaking large-scale development. We have often paid too little attention to how a proposed weapon system would be used, what it would cost, and whether the contribution the development could make to our forces would be worth the cost.

Accordingly, we are now inaugurating large system-development projects only after the completion of what we call a program definition phase. We want to do our thinking and planning before we start bending metal. Pencils and paper, and even the feasibility of pacing components are much cheaper than the termination of programs.

This is a general rule—one referring to developments which, if successful, would add only marginally to our combat strength. There have been and are exceptions—developments which can add a new and unique dimension to our capability, such as the A- and H-bomb developments and the ICBM. When the potential payoff is extremely great, correspondingly great costs and risks are justified. But developments which meet this test are rare. The typical development promises, if successful, to achieve a capability that can also be achieved in other ways, usually the more extensive or imaginative use of existing weapons. In such cases, the urgency is not as great. We believe that the substantial increase in the defense program initiated during the last 2 years has put us in a position where we can now afford to move more carefully in initiating new major weapon system developments.

THE MILITARY SPACE PROGRAM

Because the space effort is very costly, accounting for more than 20 percent of our total 1964 research and development program, and because we attach great importance to rapid progress along this new technological frontier, we consider it essential that the Defense Department space program meet two fundamental criteria.

First, it must mesh with the efforts of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in all vital areas. Second, projects supported by the Defense Department must promise, insofar as possible, to enhance our military power and effectiveness. Space technology is new and its implications, especially for the military mission, cannot be fully known or forseen at this time. It is these very uncertainties about the character and importance of space undertakings for military purposes that have led us to give such emphasis to space in the defense program.

PRESERVING FREE WORLD SECURITY

The security provided by military strength is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for the achievement of our foreign policy goals, including our goals in the field of arms control and disarmament.

We are approaching an era when it will become increasingly improbable that either side could destroy a sufficiently large portion of the other's strategic nuclear forces, either by surprise or otherwise, to preclude a devastating retaliatory blow.

Military security provides a base on which we can build free world strength through the economic advances and political reforms which are the object of the President's programs, such as the Alliance for Progress and the trade expansion legislation. Only in a peaceful world can we give full scope to the individual potential, which is for us the ultimate value.

A distinguished European—Andre Malraux, French Minister of State for Cultural Affairs and an eminent novelist and critic—visited the United States last year as a guest of the President. Malraux paid a moving tribute to our Nation when he said: "The only nation that has waged war but not worshipped it, that has won the greatest power in the world but not sought it, that has wrought the greatest weapon of death but has not wished to wield it. May it inspire men with dreams worthy of its action."

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY, for 30 minutes, on Monday, July 22.

Mr. MICHEL, for 15 minutes, on July 18.

Mr. EDWARDS, for 2 hours, on Thursday next, vacating his order for 1 hour on the same day.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. SIBAL), for 1 hour, on Wednesday, July 24.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ALBERT.

Mr. WINSTEAD and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SIBAL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WESTLAND.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATTHEWS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. WAGGONNER.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 628. An act to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1512. An act to authorize one additional Assistant Secretary of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 1627. An act to enable the United States to contribute its share of the expenses of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos as provided in article 18 of the protocol to the declaration on the neutrality of Laos; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3845. An act to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766).

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 546. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant easements for the use of lands in the Camp Joseph H. Pendelton Naval Reservation, Calif., for a nuclear electric generating station.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 18, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

JULY 16, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John J. Heimburger	General counsel	$9,442.50
Francis M. LeMay	Staff consultant	9,442.50
Christine S. Gallagher	Clerk	9,442.50
Hyde H. Murray	Assistant clerk	8,615.04
Lydia Vacin	Staff assistant	5,058.18
Betty M. Prezioso	do	5,058.18
Peggy Jean Lamm	do	4,711.50
Martha S. Hannah	do	4,711.50
Jane C. Wojcik	do	4,169.70
Lee Smith	Staff assistant (Jan. 1–3).	44.21
Carolyn Becker	Staff assistant (from Mar. 1).	2,057.48
Thomas J. Kraeft	Clerk (from June 14).	240.31
Robert C. Bruce	Assistant counsel	4,494.78
George Missibeck	Printing editor	5,361.60

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963, to June 30, 1963	11,185.13
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963 to June 30, 1963	11,185.13
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	13,814.87

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Kenneth Sprankle	Clerk and staff director.	$9,442.50
Paul M. Wilson	do	9,442.50
Carson W. Culp	Staff assistant	9,367.26
Robert M. Moyer	do	9,179.22
Jay B. Howe	do	9,179.22
Ross P. Pope	do	9,179.22
Frank P Sanders	do	9,179.22
G. Homer Skarin	do	9,179.22
Eugene B. Wilhelm	do	9,179.22
Robert L. Michaels	do	9,179.22
Robert P. Williams	Editor	7,768.86
George E. Evans	Staff assistant	7,674.84
Aubrey A. Gunnels	do	7,392.78
Francis G. Merrill	do	6,891.29
Earl C. Silsby	do	6,734.58
Samuel R. Preston	do	5,775.30
Keith F. Mainland	do	5,253.24
Lawrence C. Miller	Assistant editor	4,928.16
George A. Urian	Clerk-stenographer	4,169.70
Stephen B. Miller	do	4,169.70
James E. Moore	do	4,169.70
Austin G. Smith	do	3,627.96
Randolph Thomas	Messenger	2,580.59
Mabel E. Hammett	Clerk-stenographer	3,627.96
Grace W. Beirne	do	4,169.70
Patrick M. Hayes	do	4,169.70
Janice Newsom	do	2,084.85
William J. Neary	do	3,302.94
Harry E. Reynolds	do	4,169.70
Mary L. Schwarzmann.	do	4,169.70
Mary H. Smallwood	do	4,169.70
Jeanne C. Smith	do	4,169.70
Suzanne S. Thomas	do	1,651.47
Phyllis N. Troy	do	3,953.04
Mary F. Wilson	do	3,411.24
John A. Ringwald	do	1,813.98
George S. Green	Clerk to the minority.	8,615.04
Agnes Ainilian	Clerk-stenographer	3,801.96
James H. Bersie	do	3,429.34
William J. Baroody, Jr.	do	4,169.70
Alice Beach	do	3,844.68
Josephine Birdsall	do	4,169.70
Jessemine A. Falls	do	4,169.70
Catherine L. Kennett	do	3,627.96
Clara B. Posey	do	4,169.70
Paul D. Quinn	do	1,100.98
Virginia E. Stevens	do	514.37
Dorothy E. Sweeney	do	46.33
Daniel W. Fessler	do	1,696.28
Geoffrey L. Nichols	do	3,023.30

Amount of expenditures previously reported	$254,587.09
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963	254,886.22
Total amount expended from July 1, 1962, to June 30, 1963	509,473.31

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(INVESTIGATIONS STAFF)

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
William B. Soyars, Jr.	Director, surveys and investigations staff, to May 1, 196[illegible].	$5,232.52
Leonard M. Walters	Director, surveys, and investigations staff.	7,804.90
Rowland C. Halstead	Assistant director, surveys and investigations staff.	7,298.70
Leo E. Conroy	do	2,688.34
Lillian M. Mackie	Stenographer	3,772.44
William T. Roy	Consultant	2,000.00

REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Agriculture, Department of:		
Dorick, Stanley J	Investigator	$3,047.59
Wright, Ralph C	do	8,960.32
Air Force, Department of the:		
Brown, Robert M	do	2,118.48
Tuomey, J. C	do	4,006.08
Army Audit Agency:		
Lowcher A. T	do	3,419.05
Wagner, K. G	do	756.90
Atomic Energy Commission:		
Burke, John J	do	914.46
Bureau of the Budget:		
Falick, Lawrence	do	4,337.67
Civil Service Commission:		
Beecher, Richard S.	do	5,596.19
Coltrin, Marion J	do	2,317.97
Commerce, Department of:		
Steiwig, Nathan	do	4,527.99
Corps of Engineers:		
Crossman, C. C	do	1,074.40
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
Bennett, C. L	do	3,372.08
Bronstad, T. A	do	1,271.44
Carson, W. D	do	7,131.12
Conroy, L. E	do	5,008.64
Franklin, R. M	do	6,592.32
Garrett, C. F	do	4,536.96
Geiermann, F. H	do	1,640.16
Grealy, F. P	do	1,216.16
Hagan, P. V	do	2,060.32
Health benefits fund		643.25
Hosker, A. E	Investigator	2,045.92
Hutchison, L. S	do	4,698.80
Kaack, M. R	do	2,819.28
Lanphear, R. L	do	6,769.92
Law, W. C	do	5,608.96
Leen, M. P	do	714.56
Life insurance fund		336.65
Lueders, L. M	Investigator	1,689.12
McDowell, L. L	do	6,769.92
McGahey, H. B	do	4,522.56
Magee, E. H	do	6,025.52
Murphy, P. J	do	6,408.72
Neafsey, E. J	do	1,561.36
O'Brien, A. R	do	1,259.52
Reproduction of staff exhibits		47.25
Retirement fund		6,685.09
Roberts, R. S	Investigator	3,358.72
Shannon, A. J	do	3,648.48
Smith, M. A	Stenographer	3,023.76
Turner, P. A	Investigator	4,919.92
Vahey, E. W	do	5,030.48
Watkins, H. D	do	3,814.32
Wood, H. B	do	3,648.48
Federal Communications Commission:		
Evans, John	Investigator	4,445.27
Stanat, A. E	do	5,077.67
General Services Administration:		
Donohue, Leomon F.	do	6,336.02
Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of:		
Booher, Curtis O	do	7,268.48
Walker, Virgil R	do	5,988.72
Interior, Department of:		
Babb, A. G	Investigator	$8,010.30
Petersen, James M	Editorial assistant	2,070.61
Labor, Department of:		
Harbaugh, T. M	Investigator	6,902.89
National Bureau of Standards:		
Gautier, William K	do	4,553.00
National Aeronautics and Space Administration:		
Rachlin, H. H	do	3,007.28
National Institutes of Health:		
Cassidy, T. J	do	2,521.60
Navy, Department of:		
Rosen, Emanuel	do	39.98
Wilkenloh, C. E	do	3,721.23
Post Office Department:		
Larson, W. D	do	4,515.36
Small Business Administration:		
Harvith, A. J	do	7,427.84
Tennessee Valley Authority:		
Johnson, J. M	do	5,077.59
Kvaven, Sven	do	1,212.92
Veterans' Administration:		
Kosinski, A. L	do	2,562.37
Travel and miscellaneous expense.		41,858.32

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	[1] $638,108.16
Amount of expenditures previously reported	326,756.95
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963 to June 30, 1963	311,351.21
Total amount expended from July 1, 1962 to June 30, 1963	638,108.16

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

[1] Includes amount to be transferred pursuant to authority in legislative branch appropriation bill, 1964.

JULY 8, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert W. Smart	Chief counsel	$9,442.50
John R. Blandford	Counsel	9,414.30
Philip W. Kelleher	do	9,414.30
Frank M. Slatinshek	do	9,414.30
Oneta L. Stockstill	Committee secretary.	5,335.50
Berniece Kalinowski	Secretary	5,004.06
L. Louise Ellis	do	5,004.06
Edna E. Johnson	do	4,568.84
Dorothy R. Britton	do	4,711.50
James A. Deakins	Bill clerk	3,795.90

SUBCOMMITTEE FOR SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS (PURSUANT TO H. RES. 84 AND 146, 88TH CONG.)

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John T. M. Reddan	Counsel (from Feb. 1)	$7,335.95
Walton Woods	Investigator (from Feb. 1)	6,329.10
Phyllis Seymour	Secretary (from Feb. 1)	3,565.05
Adeline Tolerton	Clerk	3,418.34
Sam A. Nunn, Jr	Assistant counsel (to Feb. 28)	1,244.92
Barbara M. Tippett	Secretary (from Apr. 8)	1,572.96
Jane Wheelahan	Secretary (to Mar. 15)	1,479.36

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	
Amount expended from Jan. 4, to June 30, 1963	25,227.80
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, to June 30 1963	25,227.80
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1963	49,772.20

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

JULY 2, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John E. Barriere	Professional staff member.	$9,442.50
Marguerite Bean	Assistant clerk	6,452.52
Roger J. Brown	Editor	6,424.32
Orman S. Fink	Minority staff member.	9,442.50
Harrison F. Houghton.	Senior economist (EOD, Jan. 4, 1963).	9,285.12
William Summers Johnson.	Clerk and staff director (EOD, Feb. 1, 1963).	7,868.75
Mary W. Layton	Secretary to minority.	5,568.42
Robert R. Poston	General counsel	9,442.50
Elizabeth L. Ruth	Secretary	5,004.06
Baron I. Shacklette	Chief of research (EOD, Jan. 31, 1963, resigned, Feb. 28, 1963).	1,416.37

EMPLOYEES PURSUANT TO H. RES. 228, INVESTIGATING STAFF

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Gary Wayne Bach	Messenger (EOD Apr. 1, 1963, resigned May 31, 1963).	$646.60
Karl Brunner	Economist (EOD Apr. 1, 1963).	782.25
Paul W. Cootner	Senior economist (EOD May 28, 1963, resigned May 28, 1963).	52.46
John M. Culbertson	Professional staff member (EOD May 26, 1963).	1,836.04
Gerard Haase-Dubosc.	Assistant clerk (EOD June 17, 1963).	155.59
Helen E. Hayden	Assistant clerk (EOD Mar. 12, 1963).	2,272.40
George C. Hill	Assistant clerk (EOD Mar. 25, 1963).	$2,134.27
Charles B. Holstein	Professional staff member (EOD May 1, 1963).	3,147.50
Donald P. Jacobs	Senior economist (EOD June 17, 1963, resigned June 29, 1963).	728.56
Eugene M. Lerner	Senior economist (EOD June 20, 1963).	577.04
Harvey C. Mansfield.	Professional staff member (EOD June 26, 1963).	262.29
Thomas Mayer	Senior economist (EOD June 20, 1963).	577.04
David Meiselman	Senior economist (EOD May 20, 1963).	2,150.79
Allan H. Meltzer	Economist (EOD Apr. 1, 1963).	836.46
Janet Faye Minesinger.	Clerk-stenographer (EOD Mar. 1, 1963).	2,664.24
Lawrence B. McLemore.	Messenger (EOD June 1, 1963).	400.60
Donald L. Robinson	Professional staff member (EOD Apr. 1, 1963).	2,125.50
Richard T. Selden	Senior economist (EOD May 24, 1963, resigned May 31, 1963).	367.21
Ira Oscar Scott	Senior economist (EOD May 19, 1963).	2,203.25
Regina Swanner	Assistant clerk (EOD May 9, 1963).	1,213.97
Doris M. Young	Assistant clerk (EOD Apr. 1, 1963).	2,084.85

EMPLOYEE WHOSE SALARY IS REIMBURSABLE TO A GOVERNMENT AGENCY

Housing and Home Finance Agency: Arnold H. Diamond.	Senior economist (EOD Apr. 1, 1963).	$4,326.66

EMPLOYEES PURSUANT TO H. RES. 204, SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Frances Y. Burns	Secretary	$3,736.32
Kenneth W. Burrows	Housing economist	8,826.60
Jean Cameron	Research assistant (EOD June 1, 1963).	785.00
Royal L. Coburn	Minority counsel (resigned Apr. 7, 1963).	4,759.00
Eleanor Hamilton	Research assistant	3,795.90
Casey Ireland	Minority member (EOD Apr. 8, 1963).	4,108.06
John J. McEwan, Jr	Deputy staff director.	9,442.50
Helen B. O'Bannon	Research assistant (resigned Feb. 28, 1963).	1,156.64
Grady Perry, Jr	Clerk	6,584.16
John R. Stark	Professional staff member (EOD Mar. 11, 1963).	5,500.33
Margaret E. Tucker	Secretary	4,608.54

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$280,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963	92,847.71
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963	92,847.71
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	187,152.29

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

JULY 11, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Hayden S. Garber	Counsel (P)	$8,615.04
Clayton D. Gasque	Staff director (P)	7,016.64
Leonard O. Hilder	Investigator (P)	6,358.50
Donald J. Tubridy	Minority clerk (P)	6,452.52
James T. Clark	Clerk (C)	8,615.04
Ellen M. Coxeter	Assistant clerk (C)	4,500.18
Patricia Ann Dempsey.	Assistant clerk (C)	3,210.84
Jennie H. Owings	Assistant clerk (C) (employed Feb. 1, 1963).	2,344.39
James M. Earnest, Jr.	Assistant clerk (C) (resigned June 30, 1963).	2,587.80
John G. Sims	Assistant clerk (C) (employed June 1, 1963).	263.11
Total		49,964.06

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	[1] $25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963, to June 30, 1963	[2] 2,335.56
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963, to June 30, 1963	2,335.56
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	22,664.44

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman.

[1] Appropriated under H. Res. 202.

[2] Spent for clerk hire on RLA investigation.

JUNE 30, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Louise Maxienne Dargans.	Chief clerk	$9,442.50
Russell C. Derrickson.	Staff director	9,442.50
Deborah P. Wolfe	Education chief	9,442.50
Richard T. Burress	Minority clerk	9,430.36
Odell Clark	Chief investigator	6,845.07
Charles Radcliffe	Minority counsel, education.	3,501.27
Louise M. Wright	Administrative assistant.	4,548.96
Jeanne E. Thomson	do	3,538.08
Cabell Waller Berge	do	4,548.96
Donald F. Berens	do	4,548.96
Marvin R. Fullmer	Chief, investigative task force.	3,934.37
Howard G. Gamser	Chief counsel for labor-management.	3,672.08

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Olive Gibbons	Secretary	$356.76
Total		73,261.37

Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended from January 3 to June 30, 1963	$73,261.37

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Full committee staff:		
Alfredo Vidal	Assistant investigator.	$1,694.40
Olive M. Gibbons	Secretary	1,730.29
Corrine A. Huff	Receptionist	2,730.94
Cleomine B. Lewis	Administrative assistant.	3,019.14
Mary L. Shuler	Secretary	1,840.77
Michael Schwartz	Assistant clerk	213.65
E. Zelda McNeal	Secretary	1,016.77
Waldo E. Parrish	Administrative assistant.	1,186.61
Jeanne E. Thomson	do	1,693.22
Manuel Casiano	Investigator	401.98
Ruben Ortiz	do	401.98
Beverly Pearson	Minority secretary	3,946.66
Total		19,876.41

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures for salaries Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963	19,876.41
Amount expended for other expenses from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963	1,171.56
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963	21,047.97
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	28,952.03

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
General Subcommittee on Education, No. 1 (Chairman, Representative CARL D. PERKINS):		
Hartwell D. Reed	Counsel	$7,893.61
Freda Tuttle	Secretary	3,157.33
Earl McCoy Cornett	Assistant clerk	326.84
		11,377.78

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures, Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963, for salaries	11,377.78
Amount expended for other expenses from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963	3.30
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963	11,381.08
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	13,618.92

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR NO. 2

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jay H. Foreman	Assistant counsel	$2,749.12
Adrienne Fields	Clerk	3,349.63
Edmund D. Edelman	Counsel	3,879.91
Total		9,978.66

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
For salaries, Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963	9,978.66
Amount expended for other expenses, from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963	328.75
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963	10,307.41
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	14,692.59

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION NO. 3

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
William T. O'Hara	Counsel	$5,000.54
Betty R. Pryor	Clerk	6,053.75
Total		11,054.29

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures for salaries, Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963	11,054.29
Amount expended for other expenses, from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963	350.66
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963	11,404.95
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	13,595.05

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR NO. 4

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert E. McCord	Clerk	$7,130.86
Mary E. Corbin	Secretary	3,684.73
Cleveland Bush	Assistant clerk	100.77
Elizabeth Meyer	do	390.69
Lelia W. Throup	do	415.32
Total		11,722.37

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures for salaries, Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963	11,722.37
Amount expended for other expenses from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963	4.60
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963	11,726.97
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	13,273.03

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the

following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION NO. 5

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John C. Muntone	Counsel	$3,200.64
Rosaline M. Manley	Secretary	1,569.24
Barbara L. Rugito	do	1,411.89
Kassian A. Kovalcheck, Jr.	Assistant clerk	328.37
Total		6,510.14

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures for salaries, Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963	6,510.14
Amount expended for other expenses, from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963	6.90
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963	6,517.04
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	18,482.96

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR NO. 6

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Curtis C. Aller	Director	$2,667.98
Olive M. Gibbons	Secretary	1,070.28
Total		3,738.26

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures for salaries, Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963	3,738.26
Amount expended for other expenses from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963	433.72
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963	4,171.98
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	20,828.02

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JULY 8, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford	Staff administrator	$9,442.50
Roy J. Bullock	Senior staff consultant.	9,334.38
Albert C. F. Westphal	Staff consultant	9,334.38
Franklin J. Schupp	do	9,249.72
Robert F. Brandt	Investigator-consultant.	9,099.29
Harry C. Cromer	Staff consultant	8,887.74
Philip B. Billings	Special assistant	7,674.84
Marian A. Czarnecki	Staff consultant	8,563.38
Melvin O. Benson	Staff consultant (From Mar. 14, 1963).	4,905.99
June Nigh	Senior staff assistant	7,491.48
Helen C. Mattas	Staff assistant	6,424.32
Helen L. Hashagen	do	6,287.94
Mary Louise O'Brien	do	6,189.24
Mary Medsger	do	4,085.76
Doris B. McCracken	do	5,909.70
Robert J. Bowen	Clerical assistant	4,213.08

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$117,500.00
Amount expended from January 1 to June 30, 1963	40,335.22
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	77,164.78

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 4 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Expenses, Jan. 4 to June 30, 1963:	
Full committee	$780.37
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee	38,374.56
Military Operations Subcommittee	40,445.44
Government Activities Subcommittee	18,750.82
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee	43,705.98
Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee	35,087.08
Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee	42,956.39
Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee	21,357.04
Total	241,457.68

Salaries, full committee, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963:	
Christine Ray Davis, staff director	9,442.50
James A. Lanigan, general counsel	9,442.50
Miles Q. Romney, associate general counsel	7,594.92
Earle J. Wade, staff member	6,734.58
Dolores Fel'Dotto, staff member	4,754.82
Ann E. McLachlan, staff member	4,700.64
Patricia Maheux, staff member	4,533.59
Charlotte C. Bickett, staff member	4,047.81
Malcolm K. Edwards, minority professional staff member (Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963)	7,669.08
John Philip Carlson, minority counsel	7,919.28
Helen M. Boyer, minority professional staff member (Jan. 1–2, 1963)	95.72
Expenses, Jan. 4 to June 30, 1963:	
Full committee, travel, publications, telephone, stationery, supplies, etc., Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963, total	780.37

Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman:	
Elmer W. Henderson, counsel	8,735.01
Arthur Perlman, investigator	7,468.34
Francis J. Schwoerer, staff member (June 1–30, 1963)	891.79
Salig Lee Bendit, research assistant (Jan. 29 to June 30, 1963)	4,015.19
Veronica B. Johnson, clerk	4,206.76
Irene D. Manning, clerk-stenographer	4,206.76
Domingo E. Ulibarri, clerical staff	1,920.20
Ray Ward, staff member (Jan. 4 to Feb. 28, 1963)	2,876.98
Executive and Legislative, etc.—Con.	
Daniel A. Kavanaugh, legal research analyst (Jan. 4 to May 31, 1963)	$3,936.22
Expenses	117.31
Total	38,374.56

Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman:	
Herbert Roback, staff administrator	9,285.12
John Paul Ridgely, investigator	6,067.62
Douglas G. Dahlin, staff attorney	5,480.75
Robert J. McElroy, investigator	4,739.53
Mollie Jo Hughes, clerk-stenographer	4,206.76
Catherine L. Koeberlein, clerk-stenographer	4,206.76
Expenses	6,458.90
Total	40,445.44

Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. JACK BROOKS, chairman:	
Ernest Cornish Baynard, counsel	7,278.77
Daniel L. Power, investigator	4,212.16
Irma Reel, clerk	3,999.02
Lynne Higginbotham, clerk-stenographer (Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963)	2,971.53
Expenses	289.34
Total	18,750.82

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN, chairman:	
James R. Naughton, counsel	8,147.90
Delphis C. Goldberg, professional staff member	8,147.90
Herbert B. Warburton, minority counsel	7,787.29
George O. Serini, investigator	6,317.25
William Donald Gray, research analyst	4,739.53
Eileen M. Anderson, clerk-stenographer	4,206.76
Bebe B. Terry, clerk-stenographer	3,993.71
Expenses	365.64
Total	43,705.98

National Resources and Power Subcommittee, Hon. ROBERT E. JONES, chairman:	
Phineas Indritz, counsel	8,471.46
Sidney McClellan, professional staff member	7,209.45
Daniel A. Kavanaugh, legal research analyst (June 1–30, 1963)	803.31
Francis J. Schwoerer, staff member (Jan. 4 to May 31, 1963)	4,369.77
Maurice B. Tobin, assistant counsel (June 1–30, 1963)	750.03
George L. Milestead, investigator (Apr. 1 to June 30, 1963)	2,626.62
Catherine L. Hartke, stenographer	4,206.76
Susan Mann, clerk-typist (Apr. 15 to June 30, 1963)	1,056.02
David Glick, assistant counsel (Jan. 4 to Apr. 30, 1963)	5,385.90
Expenses	207.76
Total	35,087.08

Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN E. E. MOSS, chairman:	
Samuel J. Archibald, staff administrator	8,471.46
Vncent J. Augliere, chief adviser (Apr. 22 to June 30, 1963)	3,163.67
Jack Matteson, chief investigator (Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963)	7,403.61
David Glick, assistant counsel (May 1 to June 30, 1963)	2,373.37
Benny L. Kass, assistant counsel	3,936.64
William E. Barnaby, Jr., research assistant (Apr. 1 to June 30, 1963)	2,000.88
Helen K. Beasley, stenographer	4,206.76
Marguerite A. Gleason, clerk-stenographer	3,567.49
Harry S. Weidberg, assistant counsel (Jan. 4 to Apr. 30, 1963)	3,928.28
John T. M. Reddan, chief counsel (Jan. 3–31, 1963)	1,369.38
Walton Woods, investigator (Jan 4–31, 1963)	1,139.24
Phyllis M. Seymour, clerk (Jan. 4–31, 1963)	641.71
Expenses	753.90
Total	42,956.39

Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. DANTE B. FASCELL, chairman:	
M. Joseph Matan, staff administrator	7,362.02
Charles Rothenberg, counsel	6,807.24
Clara Katherine Armstrong, clerical staff	3,796.59
Millicent Y. Myers, stenographer	3,247.89
Expenses	143.30
Total	21,357.04

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	600,000.00
Amount expended from Jan. 4 to June 30, 1963	241,457.68
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	358,542.32

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman.

JULY 8, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Julian P. Langston	Chief clerk	$9,442.50
Marjorie Savage	Assistant clerk	8,144.94
Mary F. Stolle	do	4,169.70

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$5,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	----------
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1963	326.35
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1963	326.35
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	4,673.65

OMAR BURLESON,
Chairman.

JULY 10, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Professional staff:		
Sidney L. McFarland.	Professional staff director and engineering consultant.	$9,194.89
T. Richard Witmer	Counsel and consultant on national parks.	8,865.79
John L. Taylor	Consultant on territorial and Indian affairs.	8,865.79
Milton A. Pearl	Consultant on mining, minerals, and public lands.	8,865.79
Clerical staff:		
Nancy J. Arnold	Chief clerk	7,925.54
Dixie S. Barton	Clerk	4,526.36
Virginia E. Bedsole	do	4,314.20
Patricia B. Freeman	do	4,021.64
Patricia Ann Murray.	Clerk (from Feb. 1, 1963).	3,565.05
Susan A. Whitener	Clerk	3,772.40

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$30,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	----------
Amount expended from Jan. 3, 1963, to June 30, 1963	8,596.92
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1963, to June 30, 1963	8,596.92
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	21,403.08

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman.

JULY 5, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 4 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff:		
W. E. Williamson	Clerk	$9,442.48
Kenneth J. Painter	1st assistant clerk	7,834.66
Marcella Fencl	Assistant clerk	4,895.68
Glenn L. Johnson	Printing editor	6,640.55
Joanne C. Neuland	Clerical assistant	4,115.54
Mildred H. Lang	do	4,115.54
Mary Ryan	do	4,115.54
Roy P. Wilkinson	Assistant clerk	3,898.84
Elsie M. Karpowich	Clerical assistant (from Mar. 1).	2,743.68
Marion M. Burson	Staff assistant (from Mar. 1) (minority).	5,561.60
Professional staff:		
Andrew Stevenson	Expert	9,442.48
Kurt Borchardt	Legal counsel	9,442.48
Sam G. Spal	Research specialist (to May 10, deceased).	6,802.70
Martin W. Cunningham.	Aviation consultant (to Jan. 31, retired).	1,573.75
George W. Perry	Professional staff member (from Feb. 1, vice M. Cunningham).	7,453.45
James M. Menger, Jr.	Professional staff member (from June 1, vice Sam G. Spal).	1,490.69
Additional temporary employees under H. Res. 17 and H. Res. 226:		
Gladys Johnson	Clerical assistant	4,765.65
Margaret J. Robinson.	Staff assistant (to Jan. 31).	1,390.40
Marion M. Burson	Staff assistant (Feb. 1 to 28).	1,300.40
Elsie M. Karpowich.	Clerical assistant (to Feb. 28).	1,371.84
Kathleen Theresa Crowe.	Clerical assistant (from June 24).	90.51
William T. Denman III.	Staff assistant (from June 17).	466.76
Rosalee Ann Peterson.	Minority clerical assistant (from June 1).	458.39
Carolyn Sue Browning.	do	550.49
Happy Pierce	Messenger (to June 30).	387.96
Frank C. Ryburn	Staff assistant (to May 31).	5,001.00
Phillip Sikes	Messenger (to May 31).	387.96
Wallace L. Briscoe	Staff assistant	5,004.04
Thomas Duncan Wynne III.	Messenger (to Mar. 31).	387.96
Lewis E. Berry, Jr.	Minority counsel (from Mar. 12).	5,736.65
Bruce L. Sage	Messenger (to Apr. 30).	387.96
Special subcommittee on Investigations:		
Charles P. Howze, Jr.	Chief counsel	9,386.06
George W. Perry	Associate counsel (to Jan. 31).	1,279.14
Robert E. L. Richardson.	Associate counsel	5,551.62
Herman Clay Beasley.	Subcommittee clerk.	7,759.44
Stuart C. Ross	Consultant	8,629.17
Rex Sparger	Special assistant (to May 31).	5,353.50
Zelig Robinson	Staff attorney (from June 1).	1,000.20
Mary E. Bainbridge.	Stenographer-clerk (from Mar. 1).	2,527.00
Elizabeth G. Paola.	Clerical assistant	3,898.84
Special subcommittee on Investigations—Con.		
Betty J. Lantrip	Stenographer-clerk (to Feb. 28).	$1,263.50
Catherine C. Mclees.	Clerical assistant	4,115.54
Thomas D. Conway.	Special counsel (to Mar. 31).	4,693.02

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$245,950.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	----------
Amount expended from Jan. 4 to June 30, 1963	86,379.95
Total amount expended from Jan. 4 to June 30, 1963	86,379.95
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1963	159,570.05

OREN HARRIS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JULY 15, 1963.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bess E. Dick	Staff director	$9,442.50
William R. Foley	General counsel	9,442.50
Walter M. Besterman	Legislative assistant	9,442.50
Murray Drabkin	Counsel	9,099.30
Stuart H. Johnson, Jr.	do	9,099.30
Garner J. Cline	Assistant counsel	6,828.60
William H. Copenhaver.	do	5,889.06
Carrie Lou Allen	Clerical staff	4,422.54
Anne J. Berger	do	6,201.80
Jane C. Caldwell	do	4,675.38
Frances F. Christy	do	5,568.42
Mary DeMatties	Clerical staff (from Jan. 15, 1963).	4,045.25
Velma Smedley	Clerical staff	5,775.30

SALARIES PAID JAN. 4 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1963, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 36, H. RES. 100, 88TH CONG.

Appel, Leonard	Assistant counsel	$7,824.29
Beland, Lorraine W	Clerical staff	4,015.01
Benn, Donald G	Assistant counsel (as of Apr. 1, 1963)	3,028.80
Burak, Gertude C	Clerical staff	4,846.02
Cors, Allan D	Deputy associate counsel	4,338.95
Cuddy, Karen M	Clerical staff	3,131.13
Eisenberg, Roberta E	do	4,100.21
Haardt, Alma B	do	3,195.51
Hall, Patricia J	do	3,263.82
Hunter, Edwin K	Clerical staff (as of June 10, 1963)	206.17
Hyman, Joseph	Counsel	8,420.66
Jett, R. Frederick	Assistant counsel	7,362.02
Kelemonick, Michael	Clerical staff	3,780.60
Lee, Charles R	Messenger	2,502.01
Levy, Joseph M	Clerical staff	5,261.56
McCabe, Mary Wass	do	3,263.82
McGrady, Florence	do	3,567.49
Marcus Philip	Associate counsel	8,503.85
Meekins, Elizabeth G	Clerical staff	4,100.21
Moler, George P	Clerical staff (as of June 24, 1963)	47.34
Rosenman, Louis	Associate counsel	7,315.76

SALARIES PAID JAN. 4 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1963, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 36, H. RES. 100, 88TH CONG.—continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Sky, Theodore	Assistant counsel (through Apr. 8, 1963).	$3,405.50
Zelenko, Benjamin L.	Assistant counsel	5,679.05

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$200,000.00
Amount expended from Jan. 4, through June 30, 1963	109,822.28
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	90,177.72

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE TAXATION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE—SALARIES PAID JAN. 4 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1963, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 35, 88TH CONG.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Kenneth G. Ainsworth.	Economist	$5,790.91
Jerome W. Breslow	Assistant counsel	4,212.13
Astrid E. Gram	Clerical staff	3,263.82
Constance Greess	do	3,674.05
Martha G. Hammond	do	3,405.41
Esther C. Lane	do	3,060.98
Leland C. Lehman	Economist Jan. 4, through Feb. 15, 1963).	1,436.48
Julia M. May	Assistant counsel	3,423.65
Robert F. Melville	Senior economist	7,366.62
Anthony Partridge	Counsel	7,366.62
Norman M. Pharr	Clerical staff	2,914.30
David A. Sutherland	Counsel	7,366.62
Joel S. Wachs	Clerical staff (June 17 through June 30, 1963).	186.95
Anne Waggoner	Clerical staff	3,263.82
Jerome M. Zeifman	Counsel	5,790.91

Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditures	$113,000.00
Amount expended from Jan. 4, 1963 through June 30, 1963	64,072.59
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	48,297.41

FUNDS FOR PREPARATION OF UNITED STATES CODE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE, AND REVISION OF THE LAWS

A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year):	
Unexpended balance, Dec. 31, 1962	$78,021.30
Expended, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963	22,294.32
Balance, June 30, 1963	55,726.98
B. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code:	
Unexpended balance, Dec. 31, 1962	37,137.04
Expended, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963	14,259.99
Balance, June 30, 1963	22,877.05
C. Revision of the Laws 1963:	
Unexpended balance, Dec. 31, 1962	10,416.71
Expended, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963	9,972.50
Balance, June 30, 1963	444.21

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

JUNE 30, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Drewry	Chief counsel	$9,442.50
Bernard J. Zincke	Counsel	8,803.14
Ned P. Everett	Assistant counsel	6,903.84
W. B. Winfield	Chief clerk	9,000.54
Francis P. Still	Assistant clerk	5,382.30
Ruth A. Brookshire	do	4,278.06
Edith W. Gordon	Secretary	4,278.06
Vera A. Barker	do	4,278.06
E. M. Tollefson	Minority clerk	5,144.88

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$37,500.00
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963	8,813.71
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	28,686.29

H. C. BONNER,
Chairman.

JUNE 30, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles E. Johnson	Staff director	$9,442.50
George M. Moore	Counsel	9,442.50
B. Benton Bray	Professional staff member.	8,709.09
John H. Martiny	Associate counsel	8,709.09
William A. Irvine	Staff member	8,427.02
Lillian L. Hopkins	Assistant clerk	5,775.30
John B. Price	do	4,819.83
Lucy K. Daley	do	4,819.83
Elise K. Thornton	Secretary	4,711.48
Blanche M. Simons	do	4,332.25

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$62,500.00
Amount expended from Feb. 27 to June 30, 1963	24,201.15
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	38,298.85

TOM MURRAY,
Chairman.

JULY 11, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
T. M. Carruthers	Clerk, standing committee	$7,204.68
Mary Spencer Forrest	Assistant clerk	5,253.24
D. E. Lukens	Minority clerk	4,928.16
T. K. Leachman	Messenger (June 17, to June 30, 1963).	231.61

HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Charles F. Ducander.	Executive director and chief counsel.	$9,442.50
John A. Carstarphen, Jr.	Chief clerk	9,442.50
Philip B. Yeager	Counsel	9,442.50
Frank R. Hammill, Jr.	do	8,798.40
Mary Ann Robert	Secretary	4,066.80
Emily Dodson	do	3,915.12
Carol F. Rogers	do	3,747.18
Patricia B. Harford	do	3,503.34
June C. Stafford	do	3,254.12
Investigations subcommittee:		
W. H. Boone	Technical consultant.	8,563.38
Richard P. Hines	Staff consultant	8,295.36
Raymond Wilcove	Staff consultant (to Mar. 10, 1963).	3,450.86
Joseph M. Felton	Assistant staff consultant.	3,971.70
Katherine V. Flanigan.	Assistant clerk	4,928.16
Denis C. Quigley	Publications clerk	2,530.62
Mary Ann Temple	Secretary (to June 15, 1963).	3,431.91
Elizabeth Ann Rothman.	Clerical assistant (from June 17, 1963).	140.89
Stephen A. Zorn	Assistant publications clerk (from June 17, 1963).	140.89

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	
Amount expended from Feb. 27 to June 30	47,689.15
Total amount expended from Feb. 27 to June 30	47,689.15
Balance unexpended as of June 30	102,310.85

GEORGE P. MILLER,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person em-

ployed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

STANDING COMMITTEE

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Richard J. Sullivan	Chief counsel	$9,442.50
Joseph R. Brennan	Engineer-consultant	9,442.50
Clifton W. Enfield	Minority counsel	9,099.30
Ludwig J. Andolsek	Chiefclerk (through Apr. 30, 1963).	6,295.00
Stephen V. Feeley	Subcommittee clerk	6,734.58
Helen M. Dooley	Staff assistant	7,674.84
Helen A. Thompson	do	6,348.32
Dorothy A. Beam	do	5,568.42
S. Philip Cohen	do	4,819.86
Ester M. Saunders	Clerical assistant	3,312.86

STANDING COMMITTEE—SALARIES PAID, JAN. 1 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1963, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 236, 88TH CONG.

James L. Oberstar	Subcommittee clerk	$5,679.05
John A. O'Connor, Jr.	do	5,165.69
William B. Short, Jr.	do	5,165.69
Audrey G. Warren	Subcommittee clerk (as of Feb. 1, 1963).	4,377.70
Milton Weil	Staff assistant	5,763.07
Paul R. S. Yates	Minority staff assistant (as of Feb. 1, 1963).	5,001.00
Erla S. Youmans	Minority staff assistant.	4,473.14
Agnes M. GaNun	Staff assistant	3,759.24
Flavil Q. Van Dyke, Jr.	Minority clerical assistant.	3,460.94
Murray S. Pashkoff	Investigator	2,635.23
Sterlyn B. Carroll	Clerical assistant	3,258.35
Dorothy Ann Carpenter.	Research assistant (as of June 10, 1963).	315.18
James C. Healey, Jr.	Research assistant (June 1 to June 21, 1963).	291.80
Martin Baker	Research assistant (as of June 10, 1963).	210.20

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$110,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963	50,647.77
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963	50,647.77
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	59,352.23

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM—SALARIES PAID, JAN. 1 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1963, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 236, 88TH CONG.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Walter R. May	Chief counsel	$9,285.12
John P. Constandy	Assistant chief counsel.	8,612.29
Robert L. May	Minority counsel	8,619.43
James J. Fitzpatrick	Associate counsel	7,362.02
Robert A. McElligott	Associate counsel (through Mar. 15, 1963).	2,994.72
Salvatore D'Amico	Associate counsel	6,807.24
Patrick J. Cunningham.	do	3,951.05
George H. Martin	Administrative assistant.	7,868.01
George M. Kopecky	Chief investigator	8,200.85
John N. Dinsmore	Investigator	6,945.95
James P. Kelly	do	6,807.24
Sherman S. Willse	do	6,746.13
George E. Burgess	do	6,221.41
John P. O'Hara	do	6,221.41
Carl J. Lorenz, Jr.	do	5,576.19
Edward J. Gilhooly	do	3,951.05
Kathryn M. Keeney	Chief clerk	4,439.62
Harry A. Samberg	Research assistant (through Mar. 31, 1963).	2,070.37
Erwin Greenwald	Research assistant (as of Apr. 1, 1963).	$2,141.76
Mildred E. Rupert	Staff assistant	3,825.54
Dolores K. Dougherty	do	3,708.35
Sylvia H. Reppert	Minority staff assistant.	3,540.89
Sara L. Vollett	Staff assistant	3,298.14
Shirley R. Knighten	do	2,720.11
Anna S. Rosch	do	2,480.71

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM—SALARIES PAID, JAN. 1 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1963, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 236, 88TH CONG.—continued

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$340,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963	169,617.90
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963	169,617.90
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	170,382.71

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION—SALARIES PAID, JAN. 1 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1963, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 237, 88TH CONG.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Ruth M. Heritage	Chief clerk	$6,899.70
Henry H. Krevor	Chief counsel	8,947.64
Robert J. Bolger	Minority counsel	8,619.43
Joe W. Ingram	Associate counsel	6,839.63
Roy Markon	do	6,423.57
Dorothy S. Martin	Secretary	4,744.84
Ruth Butterworth	Minority staff assistant.	4,478.45
Florence C. Waters	Research assistant	4,212.13
Meriam R. Buckley	Staff assistant	3,354.39

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$125,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963	56,585.34
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963	56,585.34
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	68,414.66

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman.

JULY 11, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee staff:		
Oliver E. Meadows	Staff director (P)	$9,442.50
Edwin B. Patterson.	Counsel (P)	9,442.50
Standing committee staff—Continued		
John R. Holden	Professional staff member (P).	$7,822.15
Billy E. Kirby	Professional aid (P)	6,922.62
George W. Fisher	Chief clerk (C)	9,442.50
Helen A. Biondi	Assistant clerk (C)	5,521.92
Alice V. Matthews	Clerk-stenographer (C).	4,603.14
George J. Turner	Assistant clerk (C)	4,603.14
Joanne Doyle	Clerk-stenographer (C).	3,953.04
Investigative staff:		
Adin M. Downer	Staff member	7,190.58
Wilma Jean Johnson.	Clerk-stenographer	4,953.04
Kay N. Small	do	2,977.86
Mildred L. Blackwell.	do	2,977.86
Mark S. Connell	Clerk-messenger	387.96
Stafford Hutchinson.	do	271.57

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$60,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963	22,640.57
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963	22,640.57
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	37,359.43

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

JUNE 30, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Leo H. Irwin	Chief counsel (C)	$9,442.50
William H. Quealy	Minority counsel (P).	9,442.50
John M. Martin, Jr.	Assistant chief counsel (P).	9,273.24
John P. Baker	Professional assistant (P) (from Mar. 1, 1963).	5,016.28
Gerard M. Brannon	Professional assistant (P) (to May 12, 1963).	6,800.38
Raymond F. Conkling.	Professional assistant (P) (to Feb. 4, 1963).	1,677.91
Alfred R. McCauley	Professional assistant (P) (to Jan. 15, 1963).	735.95
Florence Burkett	Staff assistant (C)	3,882.60
Virginia Butler	do	5,031.12
William Byrd	do	2,571.54
Mary K. Daniel	Staff assistant (C) (from Jan. 3, 1963).	3,218.00
Frances E. Donovan	Staff assistant (C) (to Jan. 2, 1963).	54.70
Ann R. Fadeley	Staff assistant (C) (to Jan. 2, 1963).	36.88
William Goodrich	Staff assistant (C)	5,350.74
Olga Kay Greene	Staff assistant (C) (to Jan. 31, 1963).	713.01
Martha Sue Huitt	Staff assistant (C)	3,600.90
Grace Kagan	do	5,031.12
June Kendall	Staff assistant (C)	5,408.10
Elizabeth Price	Staff assistant (C) (from Feb. 1, 1963).	2,919.45
Dolores Rogers	Staff assistant (C) (from Jan. 7, 1963).	3,046.16
Gloria Shaver	Staff assistant (C) (from Jan. 3, 1964).	4,101.95
Eileen Sonnett	Staff assistant (C)	4,256.40

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Susan Taylor	Staff assistant (C)	$5,671.86
Irene Wade	Staff assistant (C)	4,689.78
David West	Staff assistant (C)	4,251.00
Hughlon Greene	Document clerk (C)	3,590.04
Walter Little	Document clerk (C)	3,590.04

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$12,500.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1963	824.51
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1963	824.51
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	11,675.49

Wilbur D. Mills,
Chairman.

July 8, 1963.

Committee on Un-American Activities

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

STANDING COMMITTEE

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Appell, Donald T	Investigator	$8,036.82
Joray, Julitte P	Recording clerk	6,076.44
McNamara, Francis J	Director	8,897.16
Nagel, Isabel B	Secretary to counsel	4,169.70
Purdy, Rosella A	Secretary to general counsel.	5,014.86
Tavenner, Frank S. Jr.	General counsel	9,442.50
Turner, Anne D	Chief of reference and files.	6,123.42
Veley, Lorraine N	Secretary to investigators.	3,953.04
Watts, Vera	Secretary	3,671.28
Wheeler, William A	Investigator	7,580.82

INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Arens, Margaret	Clerk-typist (appointed June 16, 1963).	$160.58
Baldwin, Beatrice P	Clerk-typist	2,869.49
Benedict, John R	Research analyst	4,819.86
Brown, Frances Rosalyn.	Information analyst	2,880.29
Buglio, Theresa J	Clerk-typist	2,327.76
Burke, Gerard F	do	2,652.78
Butler, Daniel	do	2,652.78
Carlson, Charlotte B	Research analyst (resigned Mar. 31, 1963).	1,854.60
Collins, Raymond T	Investigator	5,361.60
Courie, Kathleen	Clerk-stenographer	4,278.06
Cunningham, Anniel	Information analyst	3,980.09
Curll, Jean W	Clerk-stenographer	3,210.84
Edinger, Elizabeth L	Editor	4,272.66
Edmondson, Carol A	Clerk-typist	2,142.84
Ellsweig, Rochelle	do	2,035.02
Fantozzi, Ettorina	Clerk-stenographer	2,221.68
Francis, Emily R	Information analyst	2,652.78
Gittings, Helen M	Research analyst	4,928.16
Goldblatt, Herbert	Clerk-typist (appointed June 10, 1963).	224.82
Gredecky, Betty Ann	Clerk-stenographer (resigned Feb. 28, 1963).	999.84
Holton, Katherine R	Research clerk	2,977.86
Huber, Walter	Consultant	7,674.84
Kelly, Maura Patricia	Research analyst	3,172.86
King, Olive M	Editor	4,765.68
Kocis, Evelyn M	Secretary to director	3,264.96
Margetich, William	Investigator	3,812.15
Muffley, David E., Jr	Clerk-typist	2,945.34
Muller, Jane S	Information analyst	3,194.58
Nittle, Alfred M	Counsel	7,491.48
Pfaff, Alma T	Editor	2,988.66
Phillips, Katharine	Switchboard operator.	$2,734.08
Rainbolt, Doris S	Clerk-typist	2,409.00
Randolph, Josephins S.	Research clerk	3,086.22
Rogers, Brenda R	Clerk-stenographer	2,945.34
Russell, Louis J	Investigator	6,264.48
Shaw, Doris P	Clerk-typist	2,891.16
Stiles, Lela Mae	Information analyst	3,237.89
Stoddard, Pamela Ann.	Clerk-typist (appointed June 24, 1963).	74.94
Stone, Gertrude F	Clerk-stenographer (from Mar. 1, through May 20, 1963).	718.37
Sweany, Donald I	Research analyst	4,819.86
Vaccaro, Patience	Clerk-stenographer (appointed June 1, 1963).	269.39
Valente, Mary Myers	Secretary	4,809.00
Wetterman, Neil E	Investigator	5,296.56
Wheeler, Billie	Clerk-stenographer	2,123.16
Yohe, John A	Staff member	5,889.06

Funds authorized or appropriated for committed expenditures	$360,000.00
Amount expended from Jan. 4, to July 1, 1963	152,134.90
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1963	207,865.10

Edwin E. Willis,
Chairman.

July 1, 1963.

Select Committee on Small Business

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 4, to July 1, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles S. Beller	Counsel	$7,408.22
Jane M. Deem	Administrative assistant.	2,778.07
Myrtle Ruth Foutch	Clerk	2,344.53
Justinus Gould	Counsel	8,009.19
Helen C. Hitz	Secretary	3,684.73
Bryan H. Jacques	Staff director	5,724.44
Sylvia U. Keel	Secretary	3,684.73
Barbara Wright McConnell.	do	4,372.91
Richard L. Mitchell	General counsel	9,211.14
Charles E. O'Connor	Counsel	5,022.52
Harry Olsher	Consultant	8,918.89
Gregg R. Potvin	Counsel	8,009.19
Audrey R. Smith	Research analyst	4,260.04
Penelope Walcott	Secretary	3,684.73
Ned L. Wernet	Research analyst	4,402.86
John J. Williams	Minority counsel	5,009.90
Jean H. Cameron	Secretary (terminated May 31, 1963).	3,401.87
Linda Jackson	Secretary (appointed June 1, 1963).	527.91
Temporary employees whose employment with the committee has expired:		
Katherine C. Blackburn.	Research analyst (terminated Mar. 15, 1963).	1,732.90
Jean W. Fender	Administrative assistant (terminated Mar. 15, 1963).	1,891.10
Katherine F. Johnston.	Secretary (terminated Feb. 11, 1963.)	763.62
Gertrude W. Jonson	Secretary (terminated Feb. 28, 1963).	1,145.38
J. Brooks A. Robertson.	Staff director (terminated Feb. 6, 1963).	1,717.33
Temporary employees, etc.—Continued		
Marie M. Stewart	Clerk (terminated Mar. 15, 1963).	$1,891.10
Marjorie Anne Carpenter.	Secretary (employed approximately 6 weeks).	763.62

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$275,000.00
Amount expended from Jan. 4 to July 1, 1963	105,398.77
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	169,601.23

Joe L. Evins,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1045. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on ineffective maintenance and utilization of equipment furnished to Iran under the military assistance program; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1046. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the second segment of the Report of the Special Study of Securities Markets, containing chapters V, VI, VII and VIII, pursuant to Public Law 87–196 (H. Doc. No. 95, pt. II); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1047. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of the orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissable to the United States, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1048. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Tenth report of the Committee on Government Operations pertaining to military air transportation, 1963 (Rept. No. 559). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 7627. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 7628. A bill to provide for the control of mosquitoes and mosquito vectors of human disease through research, technical assistance, and grants-in-aid for control projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 7629. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 7630. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 7631. A bill to amend the Public Works Acceleration Act to increase the authorization for appropriations under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 7632. A bill to amend section 5 of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act to provide a definition of the term "age" as used in the labeling and advertising of whisky, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON (by request):

H.R. 7633. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 7634. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 7635. A bill to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 7636. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 7637. A bill to amend the criminal laws of the United States to prohibit any person from crossing State lines for the purpose of violating the laws of any State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 7638. A bill to authorize additional appropriations for prosecution of the comprehensive plan in the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. Res. 443. Resolution creating a standing Committee on Small Business in the House of Representatives with authority to report germane amendments to the Small Business Act, and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 444. Resolution to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 103; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. PRICE: House Joint Resolution 63 of the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois urging the Congress to enact the necessary amendments to the Federal Social Security Act or other Federal laws that may otherwise prevent the State of Illinois from acting to control excessive charges to public aid recipients, thereby contributing to the welfare of the recipients as well as reducing the increasing costs of public assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging passage of H.R. 2332, relating to paying pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 7639. A bill for the relief of Silverio Conte, his wife Lucia Conte, their son, Aniello Conte and their daughter, Silvanna Conte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 7640. A bill for the relief of Harry Dejur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 7641. A bill for the relief of Rose Kovacs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 7642. A bill for the relief of Sister Fara (Giuseppina Perrone); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Space Law and Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to inform my colleagues of the publication next month by Appleton-Century-Crofts of a most important book, "Space Law and Government," by Andrew G. Haley.

I have known Mr. Haley for many years, having served with him in the military during the Second World War. He is an author, scientist, and lawyer. He is outstanding in the field of communications law and possesses the finest of credentials to offer what is to my knowledge the first comprehensive study on space law and Government.

"Space Law and Government" examines the role of intergovernmental and nongovernmental agencies in focusing attention on scientific and legal aspects of space exploration, and proposes guides for their future contribution.

I have had the privilege of reading part of Mr. Haley's manuscript for "Space Law and Government." In the accurate words of his publisher, Mr. Haley's scientific and legal points are "deftly made, thoroughly authenticated, and represent a panoramic synthesis of the clearest thinking on space law, Government, and the relationship that should exist between the two."

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that "Space Law and Government" will be a major contribution to our emerging space age. Mr. Haley has devoted to the preparation of this work a matchless integrity and years of research and exhaustive study of the legal and sociological aspects of space flight.

I am personally awaiting the publication of "Space Law and Government" with great anticipation, and I commend this work to my colleagues with confidence.

Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, there are more than 100 million people in Europe who are kept in captivity behind the iron curtain of Communist totalitarianism. A wall in Berlin stands in silent testimony to the Soviet policy of inhumane slavery and of complete subjugation of mind and body to the state. The Communists are sadly mistaken if they feel, like the ostrich with his head in the sand, that the free world can be shielded from the facts of Red oppression by an iron curtain or a brick wall.

An effective American foreign policy should include discussions of Soviet colonialism in the United Nations. Just as Premier Khrushchev was not reluctant to bang his shoe at the United Nations, the United States should not be afraid to hammer the truth about captive nations in the General Assembly. Secondly, the United States must continue and expand our worldwide information programs to expose Communist desecration of human rights and liberties. Thirdly, Congress should establish a special Committee on Captive Nations which would give special attention to the moral and legal status of Communist control over nations and peoples. The Committee would devote its energies toward finding means by which the United States might assist these nations by peaceful processes. The gathering of facts about Communist tyranny would serve as a hard-hitting weapon to explode the myths of Communist unity and Soviet humanitarianism.

The captive peoples of the world properly look to the United States for help and guidance. The aim of this three-pronged program is to give heart to the brave people held in captivity, in the broadest sense of the word, in countries such as Poland, Armenia, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, and Hungary. The heroic uprisings against the Communist terrorists in Poland, East Germany, and Hungary are proof that the spirit of freedom cannot be chained and confined for long.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—Congressional Record, volume 107, part 3, pages 3518–3544, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee."

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Record.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Times, June 5, 1963]

WANTS COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

To the Editor of the Standard-Times:

Last January 9, Congressman Daniel J. Flood of Pennsylvania introduced in the House of Representatives H.R. 14, which calls for the establishment of a special House Committee on the Captive Nations. The Public Law 86-90 of 1959 enumerates 22 captive nations under communism, such as: Ukraine, Armenia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, Estonia, Georgia, and others. The proposed committee will handle all the matters concerning the captive nations and recommend peaceful means by which the United States can assist these nations to regain freedom.

More than 30 Congressmen introduced similar resolutions; others indicated their support for the passage of H.R. 14, including Massachusetts Congressmen John W. McCormack, Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., James A. Burke, Silvio O. Conte, Philip J. Philbin, and F. Bradford Morse.

Presently H.R. 14 is pending before the House Rules Committee. As with any other piece of legislation, the passage of the Flood resolution needs the widest public support.

Each of us can help the captive nations by writing letters to:

1. His Congressman, urging him to vote for the passage of H.R. 14 and,

2. Congressman Howard W. Smith, chairman of the House Rules Committee, urging him to spur action on the proposed legislation.

The Flood resolution injects a powerful tool into our fight with communism. The proposed committee will bring to full light the true nature of the new Soviet colonialism.

Please write a letter today to your Congressman Hastings Keith, House of Representatives, Washington 25, D.C., and to Howard W. Smith, chairman of the House Rules Committee, House of Representatives, Washington. Urge them to vote for the passage of H.R. 14.

O. Szczudluk,
Director of Public Relations, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Boston Branch.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Sunday Herald, June 9, 1963]

CAPTIVE NATIONS BILL NEEDS SUPPORT

To the Editor of the Herald:

Last January 9 Congressman Daniel J. Flood of Pennsylvania introduced in the House of Representatives H.R. 14, which calls for the establishment of a special House Committee on the Captive Nations, to handle all matters concerning these nations and to recommend means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful means to regain freedom.

Over 30 Congressmen introduced similar resolutions; others indicated their support for H.R. 14, including Congressmen John McCormack, Thomas O'Neill, James Burke, Silvio Conte, Philip Philbin and Bradford Morse.

Please write a letter today to your Congressman and to Hon. Howard W. Smith, chairman of the House Rules Committee, urging them to vote for H.R. 14.

O. Szczudluk,
Director, Public Relations, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Boston Branch.

ARF Apovian Committee,
May 28, 1963.

Congressman Daniel J. Flood,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Congressman: The Hollywood Apovian Committee of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation informs you that a resolution has been passed by our unit supporting passage of House Resolutions 14 and 15, submitted by you, which call for the formation of a special Committee on Captive Nations.

Recent developments worldwide and Washington make the formation of such a committee imperative to the security and welfare of the United States, and will bring added hope to the tyrannized peoples of the once free nations today in Soviet bondage.

We are, in addition to this letter, contacting our Congressman as well as Congressman Howard W. Smith, head of the Rules Committee, urging him to release your resolution to the House floor for quick debate and passage.

May we take this opportunity to commend you for your stand in this regard, and to assure you of our every support of your measure.

Sincerely,

Artoosh Satoorian,
Secretary, Hollywood Apovian Committee, ARF, Van Nuys, Calif.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1963.

Mr. Walter Tustaniwsky,
Chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Hamtramck and North Eastern Detroit Branch, Detroit, Mich.

Dear Mr. Tustaniwsky: Thank you for your communication of May 25 in regard to House Resolution 14.

I am pleased to advise you I am the sponsor of identical legislation to establish a special committee on the captive nations. A copy of my bill, House Resolution 196, is enclosed for your information.

You may be assured I shall continue to do all I can to have early and favorable consideration given this legislation.

With every good wish,

Sincerely yours,

John D. Dingell,
Member of Congress.

Ukrainian Congress
Committee of America,
Troy, N. Y., June 8, 1963.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: The United States cannot afford to ignore the many nations enslaved by the Russian Communist tyranny, since these constitute a major weakness of the Soviet empire.

On behalf of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, branch in Troy, we urge you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) before your committee and give it your support.

A special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a valuable source of information to our Government, especially in carrying out its foreign policy.

We therefore urge you, Congressman Smith, to give the Flood resolution your careful consideration in your Rules Committee and support it.

Respectfully yours,

William Kutzer,
Chairman of UCC of America, Branch in Troy, N.Y.

Iwan Durbak,
Secretary of UCCA Branch in Troy, N.Y.

July Newsletter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the power preference bill has been reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and soon will be considered on the floor of the House of Representatives. Because of the importance of this legislation to the State of Washington and my congressional district, I have made it the subject of my July newsletter.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the newsletter, which contains a paragraph entitled "As I See It" as well as an explanation of the bill, in the RECORD.

POWER PREFERENCE

Although Congress is proceeding down the legislative trail at a snail's pace, there is some progress being made in the committees which doesn't make front-page news very often, but which can affect you considerably. One area of progress is the Pacific Northwest power preference legislation.

The power preference bill, as it is called, was introduced by Senator HENRY JACKSON, Congresswoman JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, and myself. The Senate passed the bill and just last week the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, reported the bill to the House.

You might ask how this legislation could affect you. Well, it could affect your pocketbook. Second, it could affect the industrial future of the State of Washington.

As things stand now, Bonneville Power Administration, which markets all federally produced power in the Pacific Northwest, is falling behind in its repayment contracts at a rate of about $15 million a year. This has been going on for several years. Not too long ago, BPA had a $70 million surplus in the repayment kitty. Although Bonneville is still ahead $20 million on its payments to the Treasury, power rates will have to be raised unless something is done soon. Otherwise Bonneville will use up the kitty and fall behind in its payments. Any rate increase to meet this situation could seriously affect the industrial future of the State and damage our economy.

Had BPA been able to market surplus power in past years, it would have been operating in the black instead of the red. Advances in transmission techniques, however, now make it possible to wheel this power economically all the way from the Columbia River to Los Angeles.

Under the present law, a municipal or public body gets first call on power produced at federally constructed powerplants. If a line were constructed between Bonneville and southern California, it would be quite possible for Los Angeles to demand firm power from Bonneville, which it would be compelled to deliver even if it had to take the power away from industry in the State of Washington.

My bill says, in essence, that customers in the Pacific Northwest would get first call on this power over any customer outside the area. Well, I've been accused of "building a Chinese wall," of "Balkanising" and a lot of other things that aren't so nice. But, I got the bill through the committee nevertheless. I expect the bill to come before the House in 2 or 3 weeks where it will face a tough battle.

I also was able to put in an amendment which says in effect that the Secretary of Interior must get authorization from the Congress before he can build transmission lines from Bonneville to points outside the Pacific Northwest, under terms of this act.

Such a project might cost anywhere from $125 to $250 million, so it seems to me only right that the Secretary should come to Congress to justify his request for that much money. After all, they're your dollars. Also, Congress is supposed to control the purse strings. The Interior Committee supported my amendment 23 to 9. Yet, I've been accused of being "anti-Northwest," "anti-Southwest," and "antipublic interest."

What I'm really anti about is the spending of millions of dollars without congressional authorization. I hope you feel the same way.

Sincerely yours,
Congressman JACK WESTLAND.

AS I SEE IT

(By Helen Westland)

Have you ever wondered what sort of a conversation you might carry on if you found yourself sitting next to the Secretary of Defense of the United States of America? Imagine the broad range of subjects, such as the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, our astronauts, or our space program. Well, it happened to me the other night at a dinner. I was sitting to the right of Secretary McNamara. After giving it a little thought, I chose a subject I knew something about. Since he formerly was president of the Ford Motor Co., I asked him if he had ever heard of a Thunderbird mooing? I might just as well have asked him if he knew an atomic bomb was going to be dropped on Washington. He looked speechless, but reacted quickly by asking just exactly what I meant. I told him our car, when it was new a couple of years ago, made a noise that sounded just like a cow mooing. We finally found out it was the result of a faulty plastic bushing. He looked relieved to know the answer, and I had a rather satisfying feeling that I was better informed on one little thing than our Secretary of Defense.

Status of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following item from the Washington Post of July 2, 1963:

STATUS OF PUERTO RICO

I was amazed at the misstatement in Walter Lippman's article, "Free and Associated Puerto Rico," in your issue of June 18, that "Puerto Ricans * * * do not vote in elections outside of Puerto Rico."

Puerto Ricans coming to the mainland can and do vote in any State of the Union where they establish legal residence. They can then vote for all local, State, and National officials, including the President and Vice President of the United States. Thousands have done it in New York and elsewhere.

The article contains other errors. "Federal legislation," writes Mr. Lippmann, "apart from tax legislation may be, but need not be, applied to Puerto Rico. This includes Federal grants-in-aid, though usually Congress does make them applicable."

All Federal legislation applies to Puerto Rico except the tax laws. Uncle Sam has generously relieved Puerto Rico of all Federal taxes and even the customs receipts are covered into the Puerto Rican Treasury. Only one modification in the uniform applicability of all other Federal legislation took place in the administrative procedure of the minimum wage law.

As for the grants-in-aid, the unvarying custom to date has been to include with the States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, although Congress could, of course, change that in any given piece of legislation.

Nor is it correct to say, as Mr. Lippmann does, that if "a compact of permanent union is authorized by Congress and is ratified by a referendum of the Puerto Rican people, it will establish a union which neither country can unilaterally dissolve."

Granted that there might be and could be a moral obligation for Congress to adhere to such an arrangement if once authorized, no Congress can bind its successors, and there would be no constitutional authority for such a commitment. Only a constitutional amendment would establish "such a union which neither country could unilaterally dissolve."

ERNEST GRUENING,
Senator from Alaska.

WASHINGTON.

CommOnism and Conformity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, there are very few men in the United States today for whom I have greater admiration than Senator STROM THURMOND of South Carolina.

He is, I believe, one of the great men of our time.

In a recent newsletter to his constituents, the Senator, with a bare 500 words or so, incisively cut to the heart of the major decision facing, not only the Congress, but each individual in the Nation: do we, as a nation, choose commonness and conformity or do we choose, as we have traditionally chosen, the right to remain individuals.

All other questions before us waste to nothingness in comparison to this one. The answer we give will effect us for yet a thousand years. We are standing on the razor's edge of time. I cannot tell if the hour is midnight or if it is already Zero-Zero-Zero-One.

If there is still precious time left for us to make our own decision, I urge all my colleagues to read first the masterful summation in Senator THURMOND's newsletter before making that decision:

COMMONISM AND CONFORMITY

The age of individualism, when America forged its claim to greatness largely because of the independence and initiative of the individual, is gradually but significantly slipping from the scene. Individualism and independence have been replaced in large part with commOnism and conformity, as a result of a determined effort to level all men and nation-states to a common plane in life.

Individualism is the belief in the importance of the individual. Jesus Christ ordained the preeminence of the individual in his teachings, and the Founding Fathers of this country wrote this idea into the Constitution, principally into the Bill of Rights which set out specific guarantees of protection for the individual against the power of the central government. The founders realized that the individual would not last long in the new world they had settled, unless the ruling authorities were tied down, as Jefferson suggested, by the "chains of the Constitution."

Early in the 19th century, the wretched and depraved mind of Karl Marx stole a few economic and social theories and merged them together, to give birth to a new "ism" called commUnism. According to Marx, his aim was to establish an ideal world, in which each would "give according to his ability and receive according to his needs." It would, of course, be necessary to first establish a world dictatorship to bring about this worthy goal. Once established, however, this would evolve into an age called the millenium, when governmental authority would wither away and all the commoners would work together without discipline or authority, to share the wealth of the world.

A dispute then developed within the ranks of communism as to how this end should be attained. Some demanded revolution; others wanted to adopt the tactics of the Roman general Fabius Maximus, who supposedly conceived the military tactic of gradualism in wearing down the enemy. The gradualists, or fabians, as they have become known, have been particularly successful in commonizing the British Empire during this century, playing a significant part in the decline of this once-great empire. Unfortunately for America, the germ of commOnism spread from Britain to America, with particular vigor, within the past few decades.

The idea of "commOnism" is particularly noticeable today in American Government, with its paternalistic programs of aid and control. This paternalistic attitude has encouraged Negro leaders to make statements that they are seeking "a compensatory preferential highway" and that "the word equality has to be broadened." They are even making such rash and bold statements as: "America has to change its entire posture. I think it is an inevitable move toward some kind of socialism."

Today Americans will conform to central dictation not only because of the use of mass means of propaganda techniques and the habit which conformity breeds, but also because of the club of coercion which accompanies each "gimme" from the group or Government. Nowhere is the air of conformity felt stronger than in party and power politics in Washington. At the center of Government, there is little room for individualism or independence, and there is much power available to buy off or club down too many acts of independent action on the part of the individual public servant.

The day of the individualist is passing, and unfortunately, it is fading fast in the Halls of the Congress, where it ought to last longest if independence is to be preserved for every individual American. Unwarranted criticism by many Members of Congress, of their own institution, is adding to this downgrading of the legislative branch. Official Washington, influenced by its own propaganda, is under the false impression that the American people desire "commOnism" even with its features of conformity and control, rather than their right to be an individual and independent of unnecessary regulation and control.

By and large, the American people still agree with the Jeffersonian idea "that Government is best, which governs least."

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond.

Colmer Predicts Hard Fight on President's Civil Rights Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR WINSTEAD

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, when the President sent his new civil rights proposals to the Congress, the dean of my State's delegation, Hon. William M. Colmer, issued a statement predicting a long, hot summer on Capitol Hill.

My colleague, who has served with four Presidents in the course of his more than 30 years in the Congress, knows whereof he speaks. He is a wise and seasoned legislator and an able one.

In order to share his thoughts on these drastic proposals with the other Members of this body, I include below Mr. Colmer's statement:

Congressman William M. Colmer, dean of the Mississippi congressional delegation, today predicted a long summer, extending possibly to Thanksgiving Day, on the President's new proposal for civil rights. He said:

"I am confident that most Members of both the North and the South, Democrats and Republicans, would prefer to have no part of it. But the power of the Presidency, the Justice Department and the Negro bloc-vote appeal are powerful weapons.

"The administration has created a Frankenstein and is now hollering, 'wolf.' In fact, those responsible for the present racial unrest are even appealing to their pet whipping boy, the South, and their traditional enemy, the Republicans, to bail them out.

"We are told that we are faced with a revolution. What politicians, do-gooders and radical Negro leaders refuse to recognize is that the racial problem is one of evolution and not of revolution.

"The Negro race has made the greatest progress in this country that any race has ever made in a similar period of time. This has been accomplished under the guiding and helping hand of his white brother, particularly his southern white brother. He cannot be brought up overnight on a plane with the white race which has had the benefit of civilization, Christianity, and education for more than 2,000 years. He must trod the same slow path which has characterized the advancement of the white race.

"There are already ample and adequate laws on the books to protect the rights of all minority groups. No amount of appeasement, no law or no court decree can or will solve the problem.

"The President's proposals are more far-reaching than his stated objective of equal rights for Negroes. The racial angle is but one facet of the evils proposed. These new civil wrongs advocated by the administration strike at the very foundation stones of our system of constitutional Government.

"The enactment of the President's recommendations can only result in:

"1. The further tragic breakdown of good relations between the races.

"2. A step-up in more and more demands by the Negro agitators.

"3. More regimentation of the American people by a strong centralized Federal Government, with the resultant deprivations of the liberties of all American citizens.

"4. A further significant, if not fatal, assault upon the free enterprise system and the death knell of State sovereignty.

"5. The end of the one-party system in the South.

"These unwise and unconstitutional requests, with all of their dangerous implications, should be recognized by all Americans for what they are. They are purely political and should be treated as such. They are reminiscent of reconstruction days when the prostrated people of the South were governed by the carpetbaggers and the bayonet.

"While this is a national problem, our Southern Representatives in both the House and the Senate should take the lead in opposing these new and drastic assaults upon constitutional Government as envisioned by the Founding Fathers. Because of recent incidents in other sections of the country, it is possible that help may come from these sources. The South is historically the defender of States rights and sovereignty. It is also the greatest potential political minority in the country. Its Representatives in the Congress must make this final effort to close the ranks and, oblivious to party alinement and self-aggrandizement, say like the Spartans of old, 'They shall not pass.'"

Congressman Miller on Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am calling to the attention of the Congress and the American people, the excellent comments of the gentleman from California, Congressman Miller, on the development of the U.S. space programs under two administrations. It is a great credit to the gentleman from California, Congressman George Miller's leadership, that as far as the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress is concerned, there are as yet no politics in space. The 1964 authorization bill has been reported unanimously, I repeat unanimously, by the entire House Committee on Science and Astronautics of 31 members, after exhaustive hearings, personal checks at space installations, and 3,000 pages of testimony and careful questioning.

The comments follow:

Address of the Honorable George P. Miller, Chairman, Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives, to the National Rocket Club, Washington, D.C., on July 16, 1963.

I am pleased indeed to be with you today. It is always a pleasure for me to speak before the National Rocket Club, because in a true sense, we meet here as members of our national space team. We are all trying to contribute in some measure directly or indirectly to the great surging human effort we have committed to achieving success in peacefully exploring space. I think we share also a sense of dedication to a national purpose that exemplifies to the world as never before what this country is and what it stands for.

In looking back over the years since 1958, we have seen in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration an agency that, to put it mildly, has experienced a rate of growth which has truly been unprecedented in our history. Beginning with a budget of something more than $300 million and 8,000 employees transferred from the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, today, 5 years later it will be budgeted with considerably more than $5 billion and have 30,000 employees.

And this growth has been justified beyond question by the more than 100 unmanned satellites we have orbited, by the flights of the astronauts and by the great impetus almost every aspect of our national society has received. We have had the opportunity, through such programs as Tiros, Telstar, and Relay to demonstrate the promise in these early years of the tremendous benefits from space exploration that can help in no small measure the attainment of a peaceful world.

I know you have heard the same convictions expressed by many different people and in many different ways. But the choice of semantics does not make these convictions any less the unchangeable articles of faith under which we have taken the first infant steps to explore the universe that surrounds us.

I have reiterated these beliefs if only to underscore the realization that we have reached with the conclusion of Project Mercury and the undertaking of the Gemini program the first rung, if you will, of the spaceladder.

We have reached the point where congressional assessment of our space program is beginning to assume new perspectives. We have arrived at a level of experience which can give a clearer and more cogent evaluation of the resources that will be needed to carry forward NASA programs, particularly with regard to manned space flight.

As no doubt most of you already know, my committee concluded only a few days ago months of intense and exhaustive deliberations on the authorization of NASA's fiscal year 1964 budget. Actually, the committee and its subcommittees held more than 75 open and closed hearings. They heard from more than 100 witnesses, both military and civilian, which resulted in more than 3,000 pages of printed testimony, and they traveled the length and breadth of the country to determine at firsthand NASA's needs.

In all my experience in the House of Representatives, I know of no other committee whose members have expended more effort, often at personal expense, inconvenience, and often discomfort, than have those of my committee, in the evaluation of this year's space budget. And the results bear this out.

I should point out that the action of the committee was voted unanimously. But unanimity was not achieved without honest disagreement, not without soul-searching, and certainly not without a willingness of the members to adjust and compromise their views. I also want the record to show that at no time did partisanship or party interests play any part in influencing committee decision. Of that fact I am very proud.

I would suppose that the actions taken by my committee would provide some measure of satisfaction to the somewhat vocal critics in and out of government who have attacked the tempo of and indeed the need for the space program, or who have said that only the military has a role to play in space.

I would say that these critics suffer from a form of myopia that has resulted from an inability to raise their eyes from the road immediately ahead which prevents the recognition of facts and truth beyond the limits of their blurred vision.

First of all, the resources we are assigning to our national space program are well within our capacity to provide. We are not paying anywhere near the price for space exploration that is being paid by the average Soviet citizen to orbit Sputniks and Vostoks.

He is paying in terms of more bread on his table, better shoes on his feet, and less expensive clothes on his back.

I know of no evidence today that technological innovations developed by the Soviet space program is being fed back directly into Russia's economy to make life a little easier for her citizens.

Here, as you well know, it's a completely different story. Apart from the immediate value of the space program to the Nation and to the industrial community, it would be well for us at this time to review and to remind ourselves of the indirect but no less important benefits we are reaping.

To me, the most important indirect benefit we are gaining is probably the least tangible, the least measurable, and yet the most far reaching in effect insofar as our future national growth is concerned. I am referring to the impact our space program is having upon our educational programs and institutions. The fact that NASA places demands upon and draws from almost every academic discipline has produced a stimulus in universities and colleges that is unprecedented in peacetime.

In terms of dollars, my committee has authorized the expenditure of $18 million for facilities grants, $25 million for training grants, and $12 million for research grants—a total of $55 million. This is in addition to the direct contracts for research, development and design NASA will make with institutions of advanced learning throughout the country.

Can you think of any other investment that will have as far reaching and as beneficial an effect? I don't think you can.

In this age of international technological competition, our very survival in the years to come will depend literally upon the quality and the scholastic achievement of men and women we are training now. If our space program can materially contribute to our continued strength and leadership, then surely that can be a major justification for every cent Congress will appropriate for this effort.

Let us consider NASA's program for the dissemination of information, which, by the way, is a statutory requirement in the space act of 1958. I don't have to describe in detail to you what this program has done for our international prestige, especially in the scientific communities around the world.

I can speak from firsthand knowledge gained from personal contact with scientific and technical leaders both here and in Europe that world respect for American technology, as a direct result of our space program, has been enhanced many times over.

I am sure you recall the shock of Sputnik I and the effect it had upon our technical leadership in the eyes of people everywhere. Further, no one would question the fact that our political leadership of the Western World is based upon recognition and acceptance of our technological superiority.

Sputnik I was a very severe threat to that leadership. NASA's information program has been a major factor in reaffirming that leadership over the past 5 years. Believe me, it has been an investment that has paid off for us many times over.

The technological advances that have evolved from NASA research and development activities have implications to American industry and economy that are really beyond accurate evaluation. The indirect benefits that have already come and those of the future, however, have a real meaning for all of us.

It is important to realize that the United States is in international competition today with countries whose industries, especially those of Japan, France, and Germany, were either destroyed by the Allies, or were stripped to the bone by the Nazi war machine. The rebuilding of these nations, largely financed by us, has resulted in industrial complexes that are, for the most part, relatively new, based upon new plants, new equipment, and new processes.

It is obvious, therefore, that these factors, coupled with a much lower wage level than ours, could seriously affect our ability to compete for world markets, especially when our industrial base could not be renovated.

However, the evolution of our space industry, made possible by work already done in rocketry by the Armed Forces, demanded a response from industry that has resulted in a resurgence of technical ingenuity. Our space industry is our new industry, if you will. It is providing a new base from which, through achievements in research and development, we can compete with newer and better products.

This is an indirect benefit of major significance that is growing in dimension and impact on the general level. The specific benefits, too, are being pinpointed by NASA's office of industrial applications. The translation of NASA discoveries or innovations into useful economic tools is benefiting our people of almost every walk of life.

I can't think of any other aspect of our space program that could better justify our space expenditures to the average taxpayer than industrial applications. Here is the tangible evidence that he is getting something in return for his investment. His return will be a wide variety of new or better products, at reasonable cost, which in turn will give rise to greater consumer demand and economic stimulus.

I am not going to dwell upon the obvious import to our national economy that the $5 billion NASA budget represents. The fact that 90 percent of the money appropriated will be expended through contracts with private industry speaks for itself.

What is important to understand is that scientific research and development is for the first time in our peacetime history being organized within one agency to accomplish a national goal. The achievements of our immediate space objectives are, of course, of paramount importance. But, I have little patience with the critics who cry out that our tax money is being thrown away in the exploration of space, or that going to the moon will result in the neglect of our problems here on earth.

It should be obvious to those critics, if they take the time for a short historical review, that many years of experience have shown that the indirect payoff in human terms for technical innovation is many times more valuable than the original investment.

If our efforts in the biastronautics disciplines result in the improvement of the health of our people through greater knowledge of human anatomy, that alone could provide a major justification for our space expenditures.

If, by diverting national energies into the peaceful exploration of space, the nations of the world could avoid a cataclysmic war, then that alone is worth many times the cost.

If, by sending men into space, we can discover new and far reaching facts that can contribute to the elimination of hunger and abject poverty from the less favored portions of our globe, then that alone is worth the price that we, along with others, are paying.

It is not possible to review for you all of the indirect benefits we are garnering from our space program. I am sure that many of you here could probably cite in much more intimate detail than I can many instances of space technology that have been translated into daily use in business and industry.

The point is this: We are a highly integrated people. Any national effort we undertake, such as our space program, will affect directly every aspect of our national community, and will have to some degree an impact on every individual.

Our space program is in the hands of men of outstanding ability and patriotism, whose driving motivation is to bend every effort possible to fulfill the guiding principle of the 1958 Space Act, "that activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind."

I think the record shows that we have been true to our ideals. And you, and I, and our children will live in a better, more secure world because we have done so.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 18, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of all mercy, bowing at this altar of Thy sustaining grace, we come vividly conscious that we need not turn back to bygone centuries to hear Thy voice, as if Thou dost speak to men no longer in the living present. Give us receptive ears to hear Thy imperial imperatives above the noise of crashing human systems. In and through the change and confusion of these bewildering times, we are made confident by the divine promise, "As thy day, so shall thy strength be." Thou knowest that our needs are many, but our greatest need is of Thee. Through the lips that speak in this forum of freedom, above all differences of judgment, may there be heard by a listening world, smarting under its grievous, self-inflicted wounds, the solemn summons to men of good will of all races to a new commonwealth of now sundered peoples, in which power shall be held as a sacred trust dedicated to the common good.

In the dear Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 16, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 17, 1963, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

S. 292. An act for the relief of Yoo Chul Soo;

S. 312. An act for the relief of Danusia Radochonski;

S. 380. An act to amend the act of June 29, 1960 (Private Law 86-354);

S. 409. An act for the relief of Yeng Burdick;

S. 504. An act for the relief of Domenico Martino;

S. 686. An act for the relief of Millie Gail Mesa;

S. 735. An act for the relief of Peter Hopeton Maylor;

S. 762. An act to provide for increased wheat acreage allotments in the Tulelake area of California;

S. 787. An act for the relief of Zofia Miecielica;

S. 866. An act for the relief of Enrico Petrucci; and

S.J. Res. 60. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of an instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 141)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States on balance of payments. Since the message has been read in the House of Representatives, without objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD without being read, and appropriately referred.

The message was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Soon after my inauguration, I reported to the Congress on the problems presented to this Nation by 3 successive years, beginning in the late 1950's, of mounting balance-of-payments deficits accompanied by large gold outflows; and I announced a program designed to restore both confidence in the dollar and eventual equilibrium in our international accounts. The challenge posed by those pressures was heightened at that time by the need to halt and reverse the spread of unemployment and revive our faltering economy. Rejecting a choice between two equally unpalatable alternatives—improved employment at home at the cost of a weaker dollar abroad or a stronger dollar at the cost of a weaker economy and nation—we sought a new course that would simultaneously increase our growth at home, reduce unemployment and strengthen the dollar by eliminating the deficit in our international payments. It is appropriate now—nearly 2½ years later—to look back on the problems faced, to review the progress made, and to chart the course ahead.

There is much from which to take heart. Our economy has resumed its growth and unemployment has been reduced. The dollar remains strong, bulwarked by nearly 40 percent of the free world's monetary gold stock as well as by a newly constructed network of bilateral and multilateral financial arrangements. Our gold outflow has been halved. There are signs of longer run improvement in our world competitive position, as our prices and costs hold steady while others are rising. The deficit in our balance of payments has been reduced—from $3.9 billion in 1960 to $2.4 billion in 1961 and $2.2 billion in 1962.

Our basic strength, moreover, is vast, real, and enduring. Our payment deficits, measured in terms of our loss of gold and the increase in our short-term liquid liabilities to foreigners, have consistently been equaled or exceeded by the growth of our long-term high-yielding foreign assets—assets which have been and will continue to be an increasing source of strength to our balance of payments. Today, Americans hold more than $60 billion of private investments abroad, and dollar loans repayable to the U.S. Government total over $11 billion. At the end of 1962, all of these assets exceeded our liabilities to foreigners by an estimated $27 billion. And they have shown an increasing strength over the years: Our total income from these sources in 1959 was $3 billion; in 1962 it had risen to $4.3 billion; and we expect further substantial increases in the coming years.

These are all signs of progress. But unemployment is still too high; our growth rate is still too low; and it is now clear that, despite the favorable forces at work over the long run, more remains to be done today to eliminate the continuing payments deficit.

A significant portion of our progress so far has been due to special agreements with friendly foreign countries—for debt prepayments, advance payments for military equipment, and U.S. borrowings abroad. While similar arrangements may once again prove capable of covering a substantial amount of the gross deficit in 1963, such special transactions cannot be relied upon for the indefinite future. Moreover, while our commercial trade balance and Government expenditures overseas have shown modest improvement, capital outflows, both short-term and long-term, have increased.

Although there is urgent need for further effort I want to make it clear that, in solving its international payments problem, this Nation will continue to adhere to its historic advocacy of freer trade and capital movements, and that it will continue to honor its obligation to carry a fair share of the defense and development of the free world. At the same time, we shall continue policies designed to reduce unemployment and stimulate growth here at home—for the well-being of all free peoples is inextricably entwined with the progress achieved by our own people. I want to make it equally clear that this Nation will maintain the dollar as good as gold, freely interchangeable with gold at $35 an ounce, the foundation stone of the free world's trade and payments system.

But continued confidence at home and cooperation abroad require further administrative and legislative inroads into the hard core of our continuing payments deficit—augmenting our long-range efforts to improve our economic performance over a period of years in order to achieve both external balance and internal expansion—stepping up our shorter run efforts to reduce our balance-of-payments deficits while the long-range forces are at work—and adding to our stockpile of arrangements designed to finance our deficits during our return to equilibrium in a way that assures the continued smooth functioning of the world's monetary and trade systems.

Before turning to the specific measures required in the latter two categories, I must emphasize once again the necessity of improving this Nation's overall long-range economic performance—including increased investment and modernization for greater productivity and profits, continued cost and price stability and full employment and faster growth. This is the key to improving our international competitiveness, increasing our trade surpluses, and reducing our capital outflows.

That is why early enactment of the comprehensive tax reduction and revision program previously submitted is the single most important step that can be taken to achieve balance abroad as well as growth here at home. The increased investment incentives and purchasing power these personal and corporate tax reductions would create—combined with last year's actions giving special credits for new investment and more favorable depreciation treatment—will promote more employment, production, sales, and investment, particularly when accompanied by the continued ample availability of credit and reasonable long-term rates of interest. A prosperous, high-investment economy brings with it the rapid gains in productivity and efficiency which are so essential to the improvement of our competitive position abroad.

To gain new markets abroad and retain the gains of new growth and efficiency here at home, we must continue the price-cost stability of recent years, limiting wage and profit increases to their fair share of our improving productivity. That is why we have, for 2 years, been urging business and labor to recognize and use reasonable wage-price guideposts for resolving the issues of collective bargaining. Our success in holding down our price level relative to that of our major competitors is a powerful force working to restore our payments balance over the longer run. This fact should not be obscured by current short-run developments.

While these long-range forces are taking effect, a series of more immediate and specialized efforts are needed to reduce the deficit in our international transactions and defend our gold reserves:

1. Export expansion: Our commercial sales of goods and services to foreign countries in 1962 exceeded our purchases by $4.3 billion, and they are continuing at about the same rate this year. This is our greatest strength, but it is not enough. Our exports of goods have risen only moderately over the past 3 years, and have not kept pace with the rapid rise of imports which has accompanied our domestic expansion. As a result, rather than furnishing increased support for our other transactions, 1962 saw a decline in our commercial trade surplus.

The primary long-term means for correcting this situation is implementation of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The Special Representative for Trade Negotiations is preparing to use to the fullest extent the authority given to me by the act, in an across-the-board drive for lower tariffs and against other barriers to trade. This should open new markets and widen existing markets for American exports.

As mentioned above, our whole long-range domestic program—including increased investment, improved productivity and wage-price stability—is designed to better the competitive position of our products both at home and abroad. Continued price stability at home, contrasted with the upward trend in prices abroad, will create an increasingly favorable climate for American exports; and this administration is concentrating on six immediate measures to help American businessmen take advantage of our export potential.

First, the Export-Import Bank has created a wholly new program of export financing which now provides U.S. business with credit facilities equal to any in the world. The major element in this new program is the guarantee of short- and medium-term export credits by the Foreign Credit Insurance Association, composed of more than 70 private insurance companies in conjunction with the Export-Import Bank. I urge the Congress to act promptly to restore the Bank to full operating efficiency by renewing its charter and authorizing adequate financing.

Second, the Departments of State and Commerce have strengthened and expanded efforts overseas to probe for new markets and promote the sale and distribution of American products.

Third, the Department of Commerce has developed a broad program of education and assistance to present and potential American exporters. I have requested a relatively small amount of additional funds to strengthen the Department's efforts to stimulate our exports. These funds, amounting to $6 million, were not approved by the House of Representatives. It is essential, if we are to increase our trade surplus, that they be included in the final appropriation bill. This modest sum would pay for itself many times over in increased exports, lower payments deficits, and protection for our gold reserves.

Fourth, the Department of Agriculture announced last March a new auction program for direct sales of cotton abroad. It is expected that this new technique will insure competitive pricing for our cotton in export markets and will increase exports by as much as $100 million over last year's levels.

Fifth, present ocean freight rates discourage our exports as compared to imports. The freight charges on Atlantic crossings are far higher for eastbound freight than for comparable items bound for our shores. A similar situation prevails on other trade routes. While these substantial differentials may have been acceptable in the immediate postwar period of the dollar shortage when Europe was struggling to get on its feet, their magnitude is clearly unjustified today. Accordingly, I have directed the Secretary of Commerce to take corrective action through the Maritime Administration; and, I am urging the Federal Maritime Commission in its sole role as an independent regulatory agency to question those specific export rates which appear unduly high. Should legislation prove necessary, it will be sought.

Sixth, in order to give further momentum to the expansion of our export performance, I will convene a White House Conference on Export Expansion on September 17 and 18, to alert American firms, whether or not they are now exporting, to the opportunities and rewards of initiating or expanding export efforts. We shall use this opportunity to emphasize to American businessmen that vigorous action to increase their exports would serve their own private interests as well as the national interest.

2. Tourism: Another element that requires attention in our commercial transactions is the increase in our unfavorable net tourist balance. With increasing prosperity encouraging American travel abroad, total tourist spending in foreign countries rose another 10 percent last year, to nearly $2½ billion. This was partially offset by increased foreign tourist expenditures in the United States, but the net result was an outflow of $1.4 billion, or two-thirds of last year's overall balance-of-payments deficit. This year the cost is estimated to be still greater. That is why we have had to limit the duty-free exemption for returning tourists to $100 per person. Last year this measure achieved a saving of more than $100 million, and I am gratified that Congress has extended the limitation for another 2 years. We have also sought, through establishment of the U.S. Travel Service, to increase our income from visitors coming to our country. To further that effort, I strongly recommend that Congress approve the full amount of the appropriation requested for the U.S. Travel Service.

In addition, in cooperation with the appropriate Government agencies, I am asking the domestic travel and tourism industry to launch a more unified drive to encourage Americans to learn more about their own country and the glory of their heritage. A see-America-now program, to be in full operation by the spring of 1964, will make the most of our magnificent resources and make travel at home a more appealing alternative to travel abroad.

3. Federal expenditures abroad: Federal expenditures abroad go largely for defense and aid. These represent the obligations which flow from our position of world leadership and unrivaled economic strength. With the recovery of other economically advanced nations, particularly our allies in Western Europe, we have made vigorous and increasingly successful efforts to work out with them a better sharing of our common responsibilities. These efforts—combined with rigorous scrutiny of offshore expenditures—have enabled us, in spite of mounting worldwide requirements and costs, to reduce the overall total of our own oversea expenditures while we increase the security of the free world and maintain a high level of assistance to developing countries.

A continual process of modernizing our Armed Forces and increasing efficiency, resulting in heightened defense effectiveness, is reducing the requirements for oversea dollar expenditures. At the same time, by tying our aid more effectively to domestic procurement and cutting civilian expenditures sharply, we should be able to achieve further savings. In fact, by January 1965, these processes should result in a reduction of the rate of our Federal oversea dollar expenditures by approximately $1 billion from that of 1962.

(A) Military expenditures: The Defense Department has, since the beginning of this administration, been making vigorous efforts to restrain oversea expenditures, without reducing military effectiveness.

Thus, despite the Berlin buildup of 1961 and rising costs overseas, gross expenditures abroad by the Defense Department have been held below 1960 levels. As a result of the desire of our allies to acquire from us modern military equipment, which they need to strengthen free world defenses, at lower cost than they could produce the equipment themselves, substantial offsets to these expenditures have also been achieved, so that our net outlays abroad for defense have declined from $2.7 billion in 1960 to $1.9 billion in 1962.

In line with these continuing efforts, the Secretary of Defense has informed me that the annual rate of expenditures abroad by the Department of Defense will be reduced—by measures to be put into effect before the end of calendar year 1964—by more than $300 million from the 1962 level. At the same time the Department of Defense will continue to seek arrangements with major allied countries to increase their military procurement from the United States so as to reduce the net outflow still further. The Secretary has further assured me that this reduction will be accomplished without any reduction in the effectiveness of our military posture and with no impairment in our ability to meet our commitments to our allies in all parts of the world.

In addition to direct expenditures by the Defense Department, our defense expenditures abroad have for many years been increased by the cost of programs for the acquisition of strategic materials from foreign sources. The cost of these programs is now steadily declining since they have largely fulfilled their purpose and are no longer needed. Within 2 years they will be reduced by over $200 million as compared to 1962, insuring a total reduction in defense dollar expenditures well in excess of $500 million.

(B) Agency for International Development: During 1960 only about one-third of AID program expenditures were in the form of U.S. goods and services. Last year that proportion had risen to about 50 percent. But during the fiscal year which ended last month, fully 80 percent of AID's commitments were tied to the export of U.S. goods and services. The balance was virtually all committed for purchases in the less developed countries rather than in the developed nations where the payments surpluses exist which give rise to our deficit. During fiscal year 1964, for which funds are now being considered by the Congress, AID commitments tied to U.S. exports will rise beyond 80 percent of the total. I have directed the Administrator of AID to continue and intensify this policy so that AID expenditures entering our balance of payments in fiscal year 1965 may be further reduced by about $500 million as compared to fiscal year 1961, from about $1 billion to not over $500 million, the lowest practicable minimum.

(C) Other departments and agencies: The oversea disbursements of all other departments of Government have also been brought under special review and control by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Total Federal expenditures abroad (excluding Defense, AID, Treasury payments on foreign-held debt and Federal pension payments) coming within the scope of this review now amount to approximately $600 million per year. The Director of the Budget has assured me that vigorous screening of expenditures abroad by these other Federal departments and agencies will achieve further substantial balance-of-payments savings. These savings, together with those which may be expected from revisions of programs under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, should amount to some $100 million a year. This includes my request to the Congress to enact legislation permitting freer use of our present holdings of the currencies of a number of other countries.

4. Short-term capital flows: By skillful use of the tools of debt management and monetary policy, the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve System have substantially reduced the outflow of short-term capital through a series of carefully managed increases in short-term money rates, while maintaining ample credit availability and keeping both long-term rates and bank loan rates low and, in many cases, declining. Experience in the recovery underway over the past 2½ years provides a solid basis for expecting that a determined effort can succeed in keeping long-term investment and mortgage money plentiful and cheap while boosting short-term interest rates. From February 1961 through July 12, 1963, the rate on newly issued 3-month Treasury bills rose 76 basis points, while the rise in long-term Treasury bond yields was held to only 22 basis points and the yields on high-grade corporate bonds and mortgages actually declined.

However, the recorded outflows of short-term funds—together with unrecorded net outflows, a large portion of which undoubtedly represent short-term capital movements—still amounted to approximately $1.6 billion in 1962 and have continued on a substantial scale so far this year. A sizable reduction in this drain would do much to strengthen our overall balance of payments. It is for this reason that the Federal Reserve has decided to increase the rediscount rate from 3 to 3½ percent. At the same time, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation have raised the interest-rate ceilings on time deposits payable in 90 days to 1 year, in order to enable our banks to compete more effectively with those abroad and thus attract funds that might otherwise leave the country.

While none of us welcomes higher interest rates at a time when our economy is operating below capacity, an increase in short-term rates—at a time when liquid savings are growing rapidly, and when there are no accompanying restrictions on credit availability nor parallel increases in the interest rates on bank loans, home mortgages or other long-term obligations—should have little, if any, adverse effect on our economy. The unprecented flow of liquid savings should largely insulate the longer term markets from the effect of higher short-term rates. I have been assured by both Treasury and Federal Reserve officials that they intend to do everything possible through debt management policy and open market operations to avoid any reduction in domestic credit availability and any upward pressure on long-term interest rates while the economy operates below capacity without inflation. Other agencies of the Federal Government will work to maintain continued ready availability of private mortgage loans at stable interest rates. Nevertheless, the situation lends increased urgency to the fiscal stimulus that would be provided by the prompt enactment of the substantial tax reductions I have recommended.

5. Long-term capital outflows consisting of direct investment in productive plants abroad appear to have leveled off in recent years, whereas portfolio investments in the form of long-term loans or securities purchases have been rising rapidly. While our long-range program should increase the attractiveness of domestic investment and further reduce the outflow of direct investment, the rising outflow of long-term capital for portfolio investment abroad shows no sign of abating. It is up from $850 million in 1960 to $1.2 billion in 1962, and so far this year is running at an annual rate of well over $1.5 billion.

In view of the continued existence of direct controls and inadequate capital market mechanisms in many foreign countries, and the wide differential between the long-term rates of interest in the larger industrial countries and the United States, there appear to be only three possible solutions to this problem, two of which are unacceptable under present circumstances:

A substantial increase in our whole long-term interest rate structure would throw our economy into reverse, increase unemployment, and substantially reduce our import requirements, thereby damaging the economy of every free nation.

The initiation of direct capital controls, which are in use in most countries, is inappropriate to our circumstances. It is contrary to our basic precept of free markets. We cannot take this route.

A third alternative—the one which I recommend—would stem the flood of foreign security sales in our markets and still be fully consistent with both economic growth and free capital movements. I urge the enactment by the Congress of an interest equalization tax, which would, in effect, increase by approximately 1 percent the interest cost to foreigners of obtaining capital in this country, and thus help equalize interest rate patterns for longer term financing in the United States and abroad. The rate of tax should be graduated from 2.75 percent to 15 percent of the value of debt obligations, according to the remaining maturity of the obligation, and should be 15 percent in the case of equity securities. This tax should remain in effect through 1965 when improvements in both our balance of payments and in the operation of foreign capital markets are expected to permit its abandonment.

Under this alternative, the allocation of savings for investment in securities will continue to be the result of decisions based on market prices. There will be no limitations on the marketing of foreign issues and no governmental screening of borrowers. Reliance will be placed on price alone to effect an overall reduction in the outflow of American funds for stocks, bonds, and long-term loans—both new or outstanding, whether publicly marketed or privately placed.

The tax would not apply to direct investment. It would not apply to securities or loans that mature in less than 3 years. Nor would it apply to the loans of commercial banks. These exemptions will assure that export credit will remain fully available. Furthermore, purchases of the securities of less developed countries or of companies operating primarily in such countries will not be taxed.

Nor will the tax apply to transactions in foreign securities already owned by Americans, or to the purchase of securities by foreigners. Underwriters and dealers would be exempted from the tax on stock or securities resold to foreigners as part of the distribution of a new issue. But all Americans who purchase new or outstanding foreign securities from foreign issuers or owners would be subject to this tax. In order to avoid unfair burdens on transactions which are nearly complete, the tax should not apply to offerings of securities for which active registration statements are now on file with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Purchase commitments which have already been made should also not be affected.

The Secretary of the Treasury is submitting the details of this proposal to the Congress; and I have been assured that the House Ways and Means Committee will be prepared to give high priority to this proposal after action has been taken with respect to the overall program of tax reduction and reform now before it. Since the effectiveness of this tax requires its immediate application, I am asking Congress to make the legislation effective from the date of this message. The Internal Revenue Service will promptly make available all instructions necessary for interim fulfillment of the provisions of this recommendation, pending the enactment of legislation by the Congress.

6. Investment by foreign savers in the securities of U.S. private companies has fallen rapidly to less than $150 million in 1962. The better climate for investment that will flow from enactment of the program for tax reduction and reform now before the Congress will do much to improve this situation but a direct action program is also needed to promote oversea sales of securities of U.S. companies. Such a program should also be designed to increase foreign participation in the financing of new or expanded operations on the part of U.S. companies operating abroad.

To meet these two facets of a single problem, a new and positive program should be directed to the following areas of effort:

(a) The ildentification and critical appraisal of the legal, administrative, and institutional restrictions remaining in the capital markets of other industrial nations of the free world which prevent the purchase of American securities and hamper U.S. companies in financing their operations abroad from non-U.S. sources;

(b) A review of U.S Government and private activities which adversely affect foreign purchase of the securities of U.S. private companies; and

(c) A broad and intensive effort by the U.S. financial community to market securities of U.S. private companies to foreign investors, and to increase the availability of foreign financing for U.S. business operating abroad.

Such a program will necessarily involve a pooling of the know-how and efforts of the Government and the financial community. I have asked the Treasury Department, in consultation with the State Department, to develop an organization plan and program.

The increased freedom of capital movement and increased participation by foreign citizens and financial institutions in the ownership and financing of American business, toward which these efforts are directed, will serve to strengthen the economic and political ties of the free world as well as its monetary system. Securities of U.S. private firms could be and should be one of our best selling exports. An increasing foreign investment in these securities will encourage a more balanced two-way capital traffic between the United States and other capital markets and minimize the impact of net long-term capital outflows from the United States on our balance of payments.

7. Special Government transactions covered $1.4 billion of our deficit in 1962. These included prepayment of debt by foreign countries, advance payments on military purchases here, and the issuance by the Treasury of medium-term securities to foreign official holders of dollars. Further debt prepayment is expected in 1963—France has just announced a prepayment of $160 million—but it is clear that these are temporary gains which cannot be repeated for very long. Nor is it likely that advance payments on military purchases will again be large, as the pace of deliveries against purchases is now rising.

Therefore, as our continuing balance-of-payments deficit leads to accruals of dollars by foreign central banks, exceeding the size of the dollar balances which they normally carry, it has been particularly helpful that a number of foreign governments and central banks have begun purchasing a new type of nonmarketable medium-term Treasury security, denominated either in dollars or in their own currencies, as a convenient alternative to the purchase of gold. Some $610 million of such securities have been newly issued thus far in 1963.

Further debt prepayments and further sales of these securities during the remainder of this year will reflect the unprecedented degree of cooperation now prevailing in international finance and the growing recognition that correction of payments imbalances is a responsibility of the surplus as well as the deficit countries. In this spirit we shall also continue to press for a fuller and fairer sharing of the burdens of defense and aid and for the reduction or elimination of the trade barriers which impede our exports.

8. Gold sales and increased dollar holdings serve to finance what remains of our deficit after special governmental transactions. In 1962, this deficit amounted to approximately $2.2 billion. It was financed by the sale of $890 million in gold and $17 million of our holdings of foreign exchange as well as by an increase in foreign holdings of dollars and U.S. Government securities amounting to $653 million, and an increase of $626 million in the holdings of dollars by the International Monetary Fund.

The total outflow of gold for the 2 years 1961 and 1962 combined only slightly exceeded the outflow in the single year 1960; and the outflow in 1963 is running at a rate well below last year. Since the rise in short-term interest rates resulting from the recent action of the Federal Reserve will make it considerably more attractive for foreigners to hold their assets in dollars, including short-term U.S. Government securities, prospects are improved that increased foreign holdings of these assets instead of gold will finance a still larger share of our deficit.

9. The International Monetary Fund, however, presents a different situation. Last year the Fund's dollar holdings increased as other countries paid off their debts in dollars and concentrated new borrowings in other convertible currencies to the extent practicable. But the Fund's rules provide that, except in the case of a drawing—that is, a borrowing—it cannot hold more of any currency than was paid in at the time of original subscription (in effect, 75 percent); and the Fund's holdings of dollars have now nearly reached that level.

To meet this situation the United States has requested and the Executive Board of the IMF has approved a $500 million standby arrangement which authorizes us to draw on the Fund from time to time during the coming year. It is our intention to utilize this authority for the purpose of facilitating repayments which are expected to total about $500 million during the course of the next 12 months. When a country desires to repay the Fund, we will draw convertible foreign currencies from the Fund, paying for them with dollars. The country making the repayment will use its own dollars to buy these foreign currencies from us in order to repay the Fund. All transfers will take place at par. Thus the Fund will continue to finance a portion of our deficit by increasing its holdings of dollars and its various debtors will continue to have a simple and costless method by which they can redeem their obligations to the Fund. The alternative under present circumstances, now that they cannot pay off directly in dollars, would have been either to buy gold from the United States with which to repay the Fund, or to purchase other convertible currencies in the market with their dollars at extra cost and inconvenience.

Drawings by the United States under this new arrangement will be repayable in 3 years, with a 2-year extension available if needed. No interest will be payable, but the drawings will be subject to a one-time service charge of one-half of 1 percent.

10. Evolution of the international monetary system: During the past 2

years great progress has been made in strengthening the basic fabric of the international monetary system upon which the whole free world depends. Far closer cooperation among the central banks of the leading industrial countries has been achieved. Reciprocal credit arrangements have been established to meet instantly any disruptive disturbance to international payments—arrangements which successfully contained the monetary repercussions of the Berlin crisis in 1961, the heavy pressure on the Canadian dollar in the spring of 1962, the Cuban crisis last autumn, the reaction that followed the exclusion of the United Kingdom from the Common Market, and a number of less striking events that might, in other years, have set off dangerous rounds of currency speculation. An informal but highly effective operating relationship has grown up among a number of the same countries with respect to the London gold market, ruling out for the future any repetition of the alarming rise in the price of gold which created such uncertainty in October 1960. Finally, 10 of the leading industrial countries have established a $6 billion facility for providing supplemental resources to the International Monetary Fund, which will be available in the event of any threat to the stability of the international monetary system.

The net result has been to provide strong defenses against successful raids on a major currency. Our efforts to strengthen these defenses will continue. While this process is taking place, the United States will continue to study and discuss with other countries measures which might be taken for a further strengthening of the international monetary system over the longer run. The U.S. interest in the continuing evolution of the system inaugurated at the time to Bretton Woods is not a result of our current payments deficit—rather it reflects our concern that adequate provision be made for the growth of international liquidity to financing expanding world trade over the years ahead. Indeed, one of the reasons that new sources of liquidity may well be needed is that, as we close our payments gap, we will cut down out provision of dollars to the rest of the world.

As yet, this Government is not prepared to recommend any specific prescription for long-term improvement of the international monetary system. But we are studying the matter closely; we shall be discussing possible improvements with our friends abroad; and our minds will be open to their initiatives. We share their view that the problem of improving the payments mechanism is one that demands careful joint deliberation. At the same time, we do not pretend that talk of long-range reform of the system is any substitute for the actions that we ourselves must take now.

THE PROMISE OF THE FUTURE

Full implementation of the program of action I have outlined today should lead to substantial improvement in our international payments. The rate of Government expenditures abroad will drop by $900 million over the next 18 months, and the combined effect of the increase in short-term interest rates and the interest equalization tax should equal, and more probably exceed, this figure. Gains of this magnitude—approximately $2 billion—will give us the time our basic long-term program needs to improve our international competitive position, and increase the attraction for investment in the United States.

These two objectives must be the basis of any permanent closing of the payments gap, and this program will achieve them without threatening our growth at home. It will also do so without compromising our adherence to the principles of freer trade and free movements of capital. It will, in fact, help prevent pressures for more restrictive measures. In short, while we must intensify our efforts, we can do so with full confidence in the future.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 18, 1963*.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2192. An act authorizing the readmittance of Walter Sowa, Jr., to the U.S. Naval Academy; and

H.R. 4897. An act to repeal subsection (d) of section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 546. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant easements for the use of lands in the Camp Joseph H. Pendleton Naval Reservation, Calif., for a nuclear electric generating station; and

H.R. 3845. An act to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766).

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2192. An act authorizing the readmittance of Walter Sowa, Jr., to the U.S. Naval Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4897. An act to repeal subsection (d) of section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to be advised about what committees have permission to meet while the Senate is in session—and, specifically, whether the Foreign Relations Committee has received such consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that no requests of this sort have been made today; and that, to his knowledge, there is no outstanding authorization of this sort, other than for the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to advise the leadership that I shall object to any request for authorization for the Foreign Relations Committee to meet while the Senate is in session. There is before the Foreign Relations Committee the foreign-aid bill and I cannot be in two places at once. Furthermore, I know of no bill more important in that committee.

This morning there have been some comments to the effect that a small attendance in the committee has been noted. Some of us endeavor to be present when the committee meets; and I must insist that the committee not meet while the Senate is in session.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I wish to go a step further: I wish to object to the holding of any committee meeting while the Senate is in session, except a meeting of the Armed Services Committee. At the last session that was agreed to. I believe it is important for that committee to meet; but I object to the authorization of any committee—except the Armed Services Committee—to meet today while the Senate is in session.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in light of these statements, I ask unanimous consent that the Cannon subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON ACQUISITION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR ACCESS ROAD TO APOLLO PROPULSION TEST AREA, WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE, NEW MEXICO

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the acquisition of right-of-way for the access road to the Apollo propulsion test area, White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Report on Backlog of Pending Applications and Hearing Cases in Federal Communications Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of May 31, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Special Study of Securities Markets

A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the second segment of a report on the special study of securities markets, dated June 1963 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Interest Equalization Tax

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a summary of information on the proposed interest equalization tax (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

Report on Ineffective Maintenance and Utilization of Equipment Furnished to Iran Under Military Assistance Program

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on the ineffective maintenance and utilization of equipment furnished to Iran under the military assistance program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report Under Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report under the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 for the year ended May 31, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Admission Into the United States of Certain Defector Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Temporary Admission Into the United States of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Case of Kraemer Mills, Inc., *v.* The United States

A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the court's opinion and findings in the case of Kraemer Mills, Inc., *v.* The United States, Congressional 8-59 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Relief for Veterans' Administration From Paying Certain Interest on Funds

A letter from the Administrator, Office of Veterans Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to relieve the Veterans' Administration from paying interest on the amount of capital funds transferred in fiscal year 1962 from the direct loan revolving fund to the loan guarantee revolving fund (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Amendment of Act Relating to Appropriations for Work of President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week

A letter from the Chairman, the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for the work of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, approved July 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 409), as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Report of Board of Actuaries of Civil Service Retirement System

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law a report of the board of actuaries of the civil service retirement system, for fiscal year ended June 30, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Resolution 63

"Whereas the high and frequently excessive charges made for housing occupied by public assistance recipients, particularly in the metropolitan areas, are largely responsible for the inordinately high grants required by recipients living in such areas; and

"Whereas the housing accommodations provided for these high and excessive charges are sometimes severely substandard, menacing the cultural adaptation as well as the health of recipients living therein and contributing to the incidence and length of dependency upon public aid; and

"Whereas many individual recipients are not in a position to bargain for reduction in the charges or improvement in the standard of the accommodations, and continued acceptance and payment of the high and excessive charges results in no material benefit to the recipient; and

"Whereas other items in the assistance standard, such as utilities, may also be provided recipients at lower cost if the recipient himself is not solely responsible for bargaining for the rate of payment: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois* (*the Senate concurring herein*), That the Illinois Public Aid Commission be directed to provide for direct payment for rent, utilities, and such other items in its standard as may be indicated, where such direct payment will result in reduction in charges and costs and assist in improvement of the accommodations and services provided recipients of public aid, such action, however, to be taken only to the extent that it does not result in substantial reduction in Federal grants to this State for public aid purposes; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to enact any and all amendments necessary to the Federal Social Security Act or other Federal laws which may prevent Illinois and such other States as may have a like problem from acting as herein directed to control excesssive charges to public assistance recipients and, by controlling such charges, contributing to the welfare of recipients as well as reducing the increasing costs of public assistance; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the Secretary of State of Illinois to each member of Congress from this State, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, the President of the Senate of the U.S. Congress and to the President of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas Congressman DENTON has introduced House Resolution 2332 which would provide a pension for World War I veterans whose income is under $2,400 annually, if they are single, and $3,600 annually, if they have dependents; and

"Whereas one of the principal domestic problems in all areas of the Nation is the care of the aged, the importance of which is emphasized by the fact that there are now approximately 16 million men and women over the age of 65 years; and

"Whereas of this number, about 2 million are those whose who served in the Armed Forces of the United States during the First World War, and whose present circumstances are below the average for the Nation, which fact may be traced in part to the service rendered their country during that war; and

"Whereas these veterans have not enjoyed the extensive benefits accorded their younger brethren who served during World War II and who were given the opportunity for training at Government expense and assistance in securing home and business loans; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States has not given any general pension to the veterans of World War I: Therefore be it

"*Resolved* (*the House of Representatives concurring*), That the Congress of the United States is urged to enact H.R. 2332 to alleviate the dire conditions in which those who made the sacrifices for this country, in their youth, now find themselves; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Congressman from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"We recognize the innumerable contributions made to civilization by the Italian people and many of our endeavors bear the stamp of Italy's genius.

"Columbus is but the greatest of a long list of Italians who, in the service of the Western nations, sailed into the unknown and uncharted distant seas.

"Each year we turn with a keen sense of gratitude and admiration to Columbus by whom a new continent beyond the ocean was sought and found.

"The celebration of Columbus Day as a legal public holiday would fill the hearts of the citizens of this great Nation with justifiable dignity and pride: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to support and enact into legislation provisions to make October 12, being the day celebrated and known as Columbus Day, a legal public holiday; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officer of each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States."

RESOLUTION OF GENERAL BUSINESS CONVENTION OF THE CHURCHES OF GOD

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, at a meeting of the General Business Convention of the Churches of God, which was held recently in Overland Park, Kans., a resolution was unanimously adopted in opposition to the seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be made a part of these remarks and referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

The General Business Convention of the Churches of God (Holiness) meeting in annual session in Overland Park, Kans., unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"We continue to oppose the seating of Communist China in the United Nations, thus upholding international morality and keeping faith with the thousands of American youths who gave their lives fighting Communist aggression in Korea. To seat Communist China which defies, by word and deed, the principles of the U.N. Charter would be to betray the letter, violate the spirit, and subvert the purposes of the Charter. We further continue to oppose U.S. diplomatic recognition or any other steps which would build the power and prestige of the Chinese Communist regime, to the detriment of our friends and allies in Asia, and of our national security. Any such action would break faith with our dead and unfortunate Americans still wrongfully imprisoned by Communist China, and would dishearten our friends and allies in Asia whose continued will to resist Communist China's pressures and blandishments is so vital to our own security interests in that part of the world.

"BURL A. MCCLANAHAN,
"Convention Secretary."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 1652. A bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act to extend the termination date contained therein, and to enlarge the Board of Trustees; (Rept. No. 362); and

H.R. 4646. An act to declare a portion of the Benton Harbor Canal, Benton Harbor, Mich., a nonnavigable stream; (Rept. No. 361).

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

H.R. 6016. An act authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; (Rept. No. 363).

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 1604. A bill to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to the transfer of producer rice acreage allotments; (Rept. No. 364).

By Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed; (Rept. No. 365).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 994. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended; (Rept. No. 366);

S. 999. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925; (Rept. No. 367);

S. 1078. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act; (Rept. No. 368); and

H.R. 1933. An act to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," as amended, with respect to the minimum age limitation for registration (Rept. No. 369).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

H.R. 2485. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, as amended; (Rept. No. 370).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

H.R. 6177. An act to amend section 2(a) of article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 relating to the annual payment to the District of Columbia by the United States; (Rept. No. 371).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 1894. A bill to authorize additional appropriations for prosecution of the comprehensive plan in the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. ENGLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1895. A bill for the relief of George R. Lore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1896. A bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel cost for applicants invited by a department to visit it for purposes connected with employment; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 1897. A bill to repeal section 4 of the act of July 29, 1892, relating to the prohibition against flying kites, balloons, or parachutes in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. METCALF when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1898. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus personal property to State agencies for use by volunteer firefighting organizations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 1899. A bill to amend the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize and require reports of audits of the financial transactions of the Senate by the Comptroller General of the United States; and

S. 1900. A bill to require the use of competitive bidding to the greatest practicable extent in the procurement of property and services by all executive departments and agencies of the United States through the establishment of specific standards governing the use of negotiated contracts for such procurement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself and Mr. MCGEE):

S. 1901. A bill to provide for the allocation of a certain percentage of the proceeds from lands in the national park system, situated in Teton County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming for use by it in compensating Teton County; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. SIMPSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1902. A bill for the relief of Michael Bloch and his wife, Vera Bloch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 1903. A bill for the relief of Wladyslaw Lebiedzki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1904. A bill to establish Capitol Reef National Monument as Capitol Reef National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENNETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART:

S. 1905. A bill for the relief of Ellen Maude Galatr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 1906. A bill to prohibit the use of timing or measuring devices in the distribution of mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1907. A bill for the relief of Joal Claudio Pavao; and

S. 1908. A bill for the relief of Hong Sok Suh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 1909. A bill to amend the joint resolution establishing the Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission to authorize an appropriation to enable the Commission to carry out its functions under such joint resolution; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 1910. A bill to authorize certain retired and other personnel of the U.S. Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign governments; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1911. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON (by request):

S. 1912. A bill to simplify, modernize, and consolidate the laws relating to the employment of civilians in more than one position and the laws concerning the civilian employment of retired members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 1913. A bill for the relief of Zelik Zacharow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. Keating, Mr. Javits, and Mr. McIntyre):

S. 1914. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dirksen when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Jackson, and Mr. Hart):

S. 1915. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Proxmire when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 1916. A bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended; and

S. 1917. A bill to provide authority to protect heads of foreign states and other designated officials; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for Mr. Hartke):

S. 1918. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Douglas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1919. A bill to regulate private employment agencies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Case, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Proxmire, and Mr. Bayh):

S.J. Res. 101. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Douglas when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

INCREASED FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY UNDER SENATE RESOLUTION 14

Mr. ROBERTSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 172); which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That S. Res. 14, 88th Congress, 1st Session, which authorizes the Committee on Banking and Currency to undertake certain investigations, is amended by deleting from Section 3 "$83,700" and inserting in lieu thereof "$88,700".

COMMENDATION OF THE LATE REVEREND PETER POWERS

Mrs. SMITH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 173); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas the Reverend Peter Powers, pastor of the First Congregational Church of Newbury, Vermont, during the period of the War of the American Revolution, was a leading American patriot and an outspoken advocate of American freedom; and

Whereas in his historic sermon on September 10, 1780, he likened King George of Britain to the tyrants in the biblical book of Daniel and exposed the Tories as persons who would sacrifice the cause of freedom in order to make financial gain by trading with the British; and

Whereas, on that occasion and at many times afterward, he called for loyalty to America and proved to be an effective leader of the cause of American independence; and

Whereas, during the summer of 1963, the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution will honor his memory by marking his grave at Deer Island, Maine, with its official emblem: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Reverend Peter Powers is deserving of the highest possible commendation for the invaluable contributions he has made to the achievement of the independence of the American people.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to Frederick S. Powers of Camden, Maine, descendant of the Reverend Peter Powers.

STOPGAP AUTHORIZATION FOR THE LOS ANGELES RIVER BASIN

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, it already has been explained to the Senate that emergency stopgap authorization is necessary to avoid a wasteful shutdown of work on the comprehensive Los Angeles River Basin flood control program. Closer analysis of our initial temporary proposal, offered last week, reveals it to be inadequate. Accordingly, after conferring further this week with officials of both the Corps of Engineers and the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, I am introducing today a new bill with the stopgap authorization raised to $6,400,000. The Corps of Engineers advises me that this would carry the outstanding construction contracts for some weeks. Let me emphasize, however, that it does not change the urgency for prompt action—in July—to prevent the shutdown that is imminent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1894) to authorize additional appropriations for prosecution of the comprehensive plan in the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin, introduced by Mr. Engle, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 7 OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES ACT OF 1946

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel costs for applicants invited by a department to visit it for purposes connected with employment. The bill is being introduced at the request of the Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

According to the Chairman of the Commission, the purpose of this bill is to improve the ability of the Federal Government to attract able scientists and engineers. Its enactment is recommended by many Federal agencies, including the following major employers of scientists and engineers: National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Veterans' Administration, Federal Aviation Agency, and the Departments of Army, Navy, Air Force, Agriculture, Interior, Commerce, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

These agencies concluded, after a full year's study, that inability to pay travel expenses for applicants in shortage category fields is the governing factor in hundreds of declinations of job offers each year. If enacted, this legislation would place Government laboratories on a more equal footing with private industry, which for some time has provided expenses-paid plant visits to promising candidates, as an aid in recruitment.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate from the Chairman of the Commission, dated April 4, 1963, together with a section analysis and a statement of purpose which sets forth additional justification and background on the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record at this point, as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter, analysis, and statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S.1896) to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel cost for applicants invited by a department to visit it for purposes connected with employment introduced by Mr. Humphrey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter, analysis, and statement presented by Mr. Humphrey, are as follows:

U.S. Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1963.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate.

Dear Mr. President: The Commission is submitting for the consideration of the Congress proposed legislation "To amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel cost for applicants invited by a department to visit it for purposes connected with employment."

The proposed bill would significantly improve the ability of the Federal Government to attract able scientists and engineers. Its enactment is recommended by many Federal agencies, including the following major employers of scientists and engineers: National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Veterans' Administration, Federal Aviation Agency, and the Departments of Army, Navy, Air Force, Agriculture, Interior, Commerce, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

These agencies concluded, after a full year's study, that inability to pay travel expenses for applicants in shortage category fields is the governing factor in hundreds of declinations of job offers each year. If enacted, this legislation would place Government laboratories on a more equal footing with private industry, which for some time has provided expenses-paid plant visits to promising candidates as an aid in recruitment.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there would be no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to submission of the proposal.

A similar letter is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

By direction of the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,
Chairman.

SECTION ANALYSIS

The draft bill amends section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act (60 Stat. 808, as amended) by redesignating two subsections and by inserting a new subsection (c).

Subsections (c) and (d) are redesignated as subsections (d) and (e) respectively. Redesignation is necessary to permit insertion of the new subsection (c) in the most logical place in the section.

Newly designated subsection (e) serves to clarify that subsection (b) does not impair or otherwise affect the authority of any department to make payments under other laws. Subsection (e) is amended to extend this reference to the new subsection (c) described below.

The draft bill inserts a new subsection (c) in section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act which authorizes the payment of travel expenses of persons in shortage occupations who are invited to visit agencies or installations for purposes connected with employment. Such payments of travel expenses would be discretionary with the prospective employing agency, but could be made only after it was first determined that the person invited to visit the agency was found qualified (or students found tentatively qualified, subject to completion of education) by an appropriate civil service examining office, including agency boards of civil service examiners, to perform in a position in the competitive civil service for which there had been determined by the Civil Service Commission to be a manpower shortage, and when it was believed that providing such travel would be instrumental in getting the person to accept employment.

New subsection (c) does not provide authority for payment to applicants being considered for employment in the excepted service, or in those positions in the competitive service filled pursuant to Public Law 313, 80th Congress (5 U.S.C. 1161–63) and 10 U.S.C. 1581. The Comptroller General has ruled that in filling these positions, where the responsibility for recruitment and selection is vested in the agencies, the payment by them of any necessary expenses incident to the determination of qualification of applicants is proper if funds otherwise are available therefor.

Payment for travel expenses would be provided in accordance with the travel regulations currently applicable to Federal employees.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND JUSTIFICATION

PURPOSE

To increase further the ability of the Federal Government as an employer to attract persons in shortage occupations such as scientists and engineers.

JUSTIFICATION

The need in the Federal Government for well-qualified scientists and engineers continues at a high level and shows no sign of diminishing. Department of Labor manpower estimates for the 1960's predict a 40-percent increase in employment in professional and technical occupations. These anticipated changes during the coming decade will result from several major causes, including the rapid expansion in research and development activities, the tremendously rapid increase in application of technological improvements, and the increasing size and complexity of business organizations. Despite increased college enrollments in the 1960's, and even with greatly increased Federal recruiting efforts, it is quite likely the anticipated needs for scientific and technical personnel will not be met.

To the Federal Government recruiting officials, these forecasts can only mean that competition for highly trained and specialized peronnel will remain very high. Our Federal laboratories must have technically trained and highly skilled employees if we are to be successful in such critical endeavors as medical research, military preparedness, and space activities.

The Federal Government should be able to attract its fair share of the best talent that our colleges and universities are producing. In occupations in which there are numerical shortages, there often are even more serious shortages of quality. Industry makes special efforts to attract the superior quality graduate. The Government as an employer must do all that it can to attract the highly talented men and women. It must remove roadblocks in the way of recruiting the best person for the job. The enactment into law of authority to pay travel and transportation expenses of new employees to the first post of duty (Public Law 86–587) was definitely a stride forward in placing the Federal Government in a more competitive position with industry.

However, a large roadblock still exists. The major Federal employers of scientists and engineers (Departments of Army, Navy, Air Force, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Veterans' Administration, and Federal Aviation Agency) have recommended that legislation be sought to authorize payment for travel expenses of certain applicants for shortage category positions invited to visit the agency to discuss employment.

Why is this authority needed?

1. To more nearly meet competition from private industry: Private industry has recognized that the kind of equipment a man will have to work with, who his coworkers will be, and the kind of living conditions his family will have can all be important factors in selling him on a particular job. Twenty-five of twenty-six large AEC contractors pay the cost of travel to their plants or laboratories in connection with recruitment for important positions. Research and development contractors for the military services provide such travel expenses, and other private firms advertise that expenses of a visit to the company before employment will be paid.

The December 1960 Journal of College Placement, summarizing the results of a survey of 314 employers who stated they had hired a total of 33,759 college graduates during the year, reported that over 80 percent of these employers regularly provide for plant visits at company expense.

The following is quoted from a recent report on a seminar conducted by the Institute of Occupational Research.

"The crucial part of private industry's college recruitment program is the plant visit. The plant visit serves two purposes. First, operating officials are given an opportunity to see the candidates and play a vital role in the hiring process. Second, the visit enables the company to sell the student to the company. Participants were asked: 'Does anybody pay the expenses of those who visit the plant?' The reply was a chorus of 'Is there anybody who doesn't?' A hand count disclosed that of the 18 recruiters present at the time, 14 paid expenses. (The four employers who did not pay the student's expenses for a plant visit were not identified. One suspects, however, that they were the four public agencies represented at the seminar.)"

2. To acquaint applicants with opportunities presented by Government employment.

3. To obtain a greater number of the highly qualified applicants than we now obtain: The demand for technical talent is such that the scientist or engineer does not have to go looking for a job—the job goes looking for him. Recruiting such a person often becomes a "selling" job. Salary is important, but it is not always the determining factor which makes a scientist or engineer accept a job offer.

Well-qualified scientists and engineers don't buy a "pig in a poke" when it comes to deciding on a job. They don't have to in today's market. Today they want to know more about the challenge of the work, the other staff members with whom they will be working, the facilities which will be available to them, and the kind of living conditions their families will have. Federal laboratories, equipment, and physical plant often surpass the best in private industry, and these things can be a powerful inducement for able scientists and engineers. But this advantage is lost unless we are able to bring qualified persons in to see them, and in appropriate cases to pay their travel expenses.

Most scientists and engineers will not make a decision on their professional career without personally visiting the place of employment. It is only natural to accept an offer from industry, where the applicant has visited the plant and met the officials, in preference to an offer from a distant and unknown Federal laboratory, even though the work at the Federal agency may appear to be more interesting and offer more challenge.

Similarly, applicants on civil service lists of eligibles who appear to be well qualified, but who are not available for interview, are often passed over for persons not as well qualified, but who were interviewed. Federal employers also do not want to buy a "pig in a poke" but this may result in the Federal Government not selecting the best available person.

It has been the experience of Federal employers that inability to pay these expenses is the governing factor that results in numerous declinations to job offers. To cite some recent examples:

One Air Force command reported that 40 candidates stated specifically that they turned down job offers because payment of travel expenses for interview was not authorized.

One Army installation alone reported that 105 engineering candidates declined appointments because they were not given the opportunity to visit the worksite and meet employing officials.

Each of 17 chemist prospects interviewed without successful results at a recent Chemical Society meeting responded negatively when they found that Army could not pay the interview expense.

A naval activity reported 15 declinations to job offers in which the candidate had specified he was interested but would not accept without seeing the worksite.

Another naval activity made 57 offers of employment to scientists at GS–9 and higher levels. Seven accepted. Of those who declined, at least 15 indicated a desire to see the laboratory and hear more about it.

An Air Force installation, upon surveying its 1960 college recruiting program, found that of those college graduates who had applied for employment, but subsequently declined job offers, 75 percent stated that the lack of opportunity to visit the installation was an important factor in their decision.

A highly-qualified candidate living in Wisconsin did not accept an offer of a GS–13 physicist position in a Bureau of Mines facility in Texas because his travel expenses to Texas for interview could not be paid. He stated: "It looks as though the Government was not really interested in obtaining my services."

Agriculture Department knew of 85 specific instances where candidates declined appointment because they did not have the opportunity to visit the worksite and meet the employing officials.

While these illustrations are indicative of the genuine need for authority to pay preemployment interview expenses, truly accurate total figures would undoubtedly be much higher. We can only conclude from these examples that the Federal Government has lost opportunities to obtain professional talent of high quality by inability to pay these expenses.

4. To make a better placement in terms of placing the right man in the right position: This is particularly important for the higher grade, specialized, research positions, and is critical in the selection of a scientist to be a member of a research team where the ability to get along with others is extremely important. Such interviews enable a larger group to talk to the candidates and thereby provide a broader base for evaluating personal qualifications. Multiple evaluations may result in multiple consideration for alternative positions at the installation.

5. To eliminate misconceptions which we know exist in the minds of some applicants concerning Federal employment in general and the installation or laboratory in particular: The following examples will serve to illustrate: An Air Force activity conducts a tour of its research and development facilities for college representatives each year. After the 1960 tour, a number of representatives indicated surprise at the level and challenge of the research and development work being accomplished within Air Force. Some indicated the belief that most university professors are unaware of the operations being conducted at Air Force installations. Others indicated that prior to their visit, they had been reluctant to encourage students to accept positions with Government agencies of this type, but that after observing the activities felt that many opportunities existed for the engineer or science graduate. Similar benefits could be derived if applicants could be invited for preemployment interviews at Government expense.

The Indian Area Health Office, Aberdeen, S. Dak., reports: "Many candidates have heard lots of stories about the Indian Reservations and the prairies of this section of the country. Some of these stories have not been too complimentary resulting in unfavorable and incorrect opinions being formed. If a candidate could see first-hand what he was 'getting into' he might change his opinion and accept a position in this locale."

A Veterans' Administration installation in Kansas says: "A number of applicants who have read of the Kansas 'Dust Bowl' and were not acquainted with this area were amazed to find that we have beautiful green grounds and a staff of friendly people. These contrasting impressions could be extremely important in filling a critical position."

6. To keep turnover at a minimum, particularly at isolated locations: Despite agency efforts to give prospective employees complete and factual information about the working and living conditions at isolated installations, employees sometimes resign shortly after reporting for duty. This is very costly. Personal interviews at the worksite will tend to uncover these sources of potential dissatisfaction before the appointment is made.

What are Federal agencies doing in the absence of authority to pay for interview expenses?

Federal recruiters, when visiting colleges and through telephone calls and correspondence, make every reasonable effort to encourage prospects to visit the worksite at their own expense. The distance involved is an important factor in these efforts. Results are often disappointing. One naval activity reports: "We have in our files dozens of letters from applicants who have naively requested to visit the laboratory at Government expense. They assume that this is standard practice, as it is in industry. When we disillusioned them, their candidacy, with rare exception, came to an abrupt end."

In the absence of authority to pay expenses for preemployment interviews, some agencies now conduct essential interviews near the applicant's home. Interviews are conducted by agency officials who may be traveling in the area for other purposes or who may be making the trip for the sole purpose of conducting the interviews. "Courtesy" interviews are conducted by officials of a nearby installation of the same agency as the prospective employer. These latter interviews serve the very useful purpose of screening applicants. However, both kinds of interviews have the following serious disadvantages: (1) No opportunity for the applicant to meet supervisors and coworkers and to observe working and living conditions; (2) No opportunity for the supervisor to meet the candidate before entry on duty; (3) "Courtesy" interviewer is usually not familiar with actual working and living conditions at the recruiting installation; (4) Standards of the interviewer, whether higher or lower, are necessarily different from those of the selecting officials. Selecting officials are reluctant to depend on the judgment of a disinterested third party, particularly for high-level, specialized positions; (5) No opportunity to make multiple evaluations of a candidate; (6) Time delays and some expense are occasioned by the paper work needed to arrange with third parties to conduct interviews and to furnish results to recruiting installations; (7) Travel expenses of interviewing officials; (8) Temporary loss of services from his regular duties of the official conducting the interview. In research organizations, where much recruitment activity is geared at the Ph. D. degree level with extensive experience in a particular specialization, it is desirable that interviews be conducted by key scientific staff members having a thorough knowledge of the research programs, who can discuss such programs in terms of the technical knowledge of the candidates. When these key officials must travel extensively to conduct interviews, much of their time used for this purpose could otherwise have been profitably devoted to program duties at the worksite.

What has been the experience of Federal agencies now authorized to pay these expenses?

Federal agencies are authorized to pay preemployment interview expenses when considering candidates for employment to positions excepted from the competitive civil service. The Comptroller General has ruled that in filling excepted positions, where the responsibility for determining the qualifications of applicants is vested in the agencies, the payment by them of any necessary expenses incident to the determination is proper if funds otherwise are available therefor.

Tennessee Valley Authority: All positions in TVA are in the excepted service. TVA policy is that payment for interview expenses may be authorized when deemed by the division incurring the expense to be necessary in the conduct of official business. Experience of TVA has disclosed no applicant abuse of the authorization to pay such expenses.

Fifty-eight payments at a total cost of $2,400 were authorized during the 12-month period ending November 30, 1960. Of the 58 applicants, 39 were offered employment. Only one applicant indicated after completion of interview that he was not interested in employment with TVA.

Atomic Energy Commission: All positions in AEC are in the excepted service. AEC reports that the authority to pay these expenses has been used sparingly, but its use has not been found necessary in the current competitive market for quality candidates.

In 1960, for example, AEC issued invitations to travel at Government expense to about 250 candidates at an approximate cost of $26,000. In the opinion of AEC, the cost of preemployment interviews has been well justified in that: (1) Operating officials have been able to accomplish a better evaluation of the qualifications of candidates; (2) AEC has been able to interest better qualified candidates in its positions when they have been able to get a better understanding of AEC programs through a visit to an AEC installation; (3) invitational travel is not considered an additional cost. In most instances, in lieu thereof, AEC would have to send a representative to interview the candidate to accomplish an adequate evaluation of his qualifications. The cost then would include not only travel expenses for AEC's representative, but also his salary; (4) Candidates who have accepted invitational travel for interview have usually accepted offers of employment.

AEC is not aware of any abuse on the part of candidates, such as travel for their own pleasure or convenience.

Veterans' Administration: Physicians, dentists, and nurses in the Department of Medicine and Surgery are in the excepted service. Between October 1, 1960, and September 30, 1961, VA made payment for preemployment interview expenses to 20 prospective employees, all of whom were candidates for staff physician vacancies, at a cost of $1,635. Eleven of these candidates were appointed.

How would the proposed legislation be administered?

Regulations governing travel under the proposed legislation would be prescribed by the Director, Bureau of the Budget, who now has the responsibility for prescribing other travel regulations.

The Civil Service Commission already determines those positions which fall into the category of "manpower shortages" for purposes of payment of travel and transportation expenses of new employees to first post of duty (Public Law 86–587). Its determinations of manpower shortages for this latter purpose would automatically establish the manpower shortages for purposes of authorizing payments for preemployment interview expenses.

Funds to pay travel costs authorized by the draft bill would be secured by individual agencies through their appropriation requests to the Congress. Necessity for justifying funds to be used for this purpose and the generally limited amounts of agency travel funds in relation to travel needs will assure that individual agencies administer these provisions in the best interests of the agency and the Federal service. The requirement that applicants must first be found qualified by a civil service examining office is added assurance.

Students often express an interest in the Federal service some months before they are scheduled to complete their education. The proposed legislation has been drafted so as not to preclude from coverage this very important group of applicants who are considered tentatively qualified until they have satisfactorily completed their education. These applicants, still in school, but about to graduate or to complete graduate work and begin their working careers, comprise one of the Government's most important recruitment sources for engineer and scientific positions. Because of the intense competition with industry recruiters for this particular group of applicants, it is essential that Federal agencies be able to extend preemployment interview invitations to the students some weeks, or months, before graduation.

What will be the cost?

With an estimated average payment of $155 and an estimated total of 5,500 such payments per year, the cost of the proposed legislation would be $850,000 per year. These estimates are based on the current list of manpower-shortage occupations and agency estimates of cost and probable use of authority to pay preemployment interview expenses. These estimates do not take into account certain significant offsets that can be expected, as for example:

Decreases in travel expenses of agency administrative officials who would no longer find it necessary to go to the applicant to conduct essential interviews.

Decreases in travel expenses and loss of working time of key scientists who would not be taken from their regular duties to travel about the country conducting interviews.

Decreases in turnover (especially at isolated locations) because applicants will have a clearer view of actual living and working conditions and can better decide whether or not they wish to accept the job offered.

It is expected that costs would be absorbed in the regular travel budgets of the agencies concerned, and that no special appropriation would be needed.

The agency's ability to reimburse an applicant for his interview expenses might well tip the scale in favor of his accepting a manpower-shortage category position. In this event, the $155 would be well spent.

PROHIBITION AGAINST FLYING OF KITES, BALLOONS, OR PARACHUTES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, my friend and former distinguished colleague in the House of Representatives, Representative THOMPSON, of New Jersey, has today introduced a bill to repeal the prohibition against flying kites, balloons, or parachutes in the District of Columbia.

I commend my colleague for his remarks, as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and I am pleased to join in sponsoring this vital and important legislation, which I send to the desk, for appropriate reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1897) to repeal section 4 of the act of July 29, 1892, relating to the prohibition against flying kites, balloons, or parachutes in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. METCALF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SURPLUS PROPERTY TO VOLUNTEER FIREMEN

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus personal property to State agencies for use by volunteer firefighting organizations.

Mr. President, one of the strongest traditions of American life, with roots deep in colonial history, is that of voluntary community service—service which entails selfless and often dangerous activity rendered without expectation of recompense. In the forefront of groups which have rendered such service are the volunteer firefighters of our smaller towns. The days of the bucket brigade, of the hectic excitement of community firefighting, which I still remember with vivid clarity—as, I am certain, do many of my colleagues—are gone; the community response has been largely replaced by action on the part of an efficient and commendable professional firefighting corps.

Yet, in the smaller communities of my own State, as well as elsewhere across the Nation, volunteer service has not ended. Many communities have no professional firefighting forces of their own and all that separates a small fire from a disastrous conflagration, in these areas, is the work of volunteers. Such men risk their lives in the service of their communities. Many are hardworking workers or farmers who devote much of their limited leisure time to such service. Clearly their activities must be encouraged and assisted whenever possible.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, such encouragement and assistance is often not offered where it is most needed. In towns which already pay high tax rates for educational and public health improvements, many volunteer companies cannot acquire necessary funds to replace old, outmoded, potentially hazardous equipment. Often their equipment is all but unusable; in some cases, the needed sums of money for improvements are far in excess of those which the community can afford to provide.

There is, however, a simple answer to this problem, one that does not involve a large Federal outlay of money. The Federal Property Administration and Services Act of 1949, as amended, provides for the donation of certain classes of surplus Government property to the States, for the purposes of health, education, and civil defense. Included among these classes of donable property are materials and equipment—particularly truck chassis and water tanks—which would prove invaluable to our firefighting associations. Now, Mr. President, many volunteer organizations have repeatedly attempted to secure such equipment; these attempts have always been met with the disappointing response that firefighting does not qualify as a civil defense activity. If this is so, than it is a situation that should be corrected; if firefighting cannot legally be construed as civil defense, than it is time that the legal definition of civil defense be appropriately expanded. The costs involved in bringing volunteer firefighters under the 1949 act would be minimal; the benefits of modern, workable firefighting equipment in countless communities throughout the United States could hardly be greater.

Mr. President, it is Congress' responsibility "to promote the general welfare." This bill would clearly have that effect in the many communities where the lack of adequate firefighting equipment constitutes a critical need.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1898) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus personal property to State agencies for use by volunteer firefighting organizations, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (6) of section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(j)), is amended to read as follows:

"(6) As used in this subsection—

"(A) the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States; and

"(B) the term 'civil defense', when used with regard to any purpose for which equipment, materials, books, or other supplies may be donated under this subsection, includes the use of such supplies for the protection of life and property through the establishment, maintenance, or operation of any incorporated or unincorporated volunteer firefighting organization which is tax supported or has been held to be exempt from taxation under section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954."

COMPETITIVE BIDDING IN THE PROCUREMENT ACTIVITIES OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to greatly expand the use of competitive bidding in the procurement activities of all agencies of the Federal Government.

The great need for such legislation should be apparent to anyone who has taken the time to glance through the seemingly endless flow of reports from the Comptroller General in which he details instance after instance of totally unnecessary waste of the taxpayers' money which results from an overdependence on negotiated contracts for Government purchases.

On several occasions in the past I have offered and the Congress has accepted amendments dealing with this matter as it pertains to the Department of Defense. I was particularly pleased to note the news stories last week which quoted Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara as stating that he has been able to save $1.1 billion in defense procurement last year as a result of revised buying methods. One of the reasons cited for this great saving has been the wider use of competitive bidding rather than buying from a single contractor source.

It has been conservatively estimated that if all of our procurement contracts were awarded on a competitive bid basis the savings would exceed $3 billion annually.

Also last week the Comptroller General issued an all-too-rare report describing savings made by the Air Force during fiscal year 1962 through the increased use of competitive bidding. In his report to the Congress, the Comptroller General said, "We estimate that, during fiscal year 1962, the Air Force realized savings of about $41.8 million which appeared to be attributable in large part to increased competitive procurement."

These items represent good news, indeed, for they show what can be done when an effort is made to procure items on a competitive basis. They are especially welcome when we consider the huge deficits which have plagued our fiscal affairs and which are being planned for us for the future.

If competitive bidding on a greater basis can produce such worthwhile tangible results in the Department of Defense, it stands to reason that much can be gained by extending the principle to all other agencies of the Federal Government.

The bill which I am introducing today has been reviewed by the Comptroller General and contains revisions in accordance with the recommendations which he has made. I feel that in the light of the demonstrated value of the wider use of competitive bidding in Government procurement it is urgent that this legislation be considered as soon as possible and that all other agencies be required to make the greatest use possible of this sound business procedure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1900) to require the use of competitive bidding to the greatest practicable extent in the procurement of property and services by all executive departments and agencies of the United States through the establishment of specific standards governing the use of negotiated contracts for such procurement, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. **Williams** of Delaware, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

ALLOCATION OF PERCENTAGE OF PROCEEDS FROM CERTAIN LANDS TO STATE OF WYOMING

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would provide for the allocation of a percentage of the proceeds from lands in the national park system situated in Teton County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming for use by it in compensating Teton County.

Counties, which have within their boundaries lands which are administered by the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, or the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife receive 25 percent of all receipts, fees, and revenues from those managed Government lands. But, when the lands within a county are designated by the Congress as national park lands the county loses its source of revenue. Consequently, the county government is in a difficult financial position.

In Teton County 302,447 acres are now controlled by the National Park Service. The Federal Government also owns 1,416,485 acres of national forest lands in Teton County. In 1950 when the Congress established Grand Teton National Park it realized that the county government would have a difficult time in carrying on its responsibilities, thus Congress gave financial assistance to the county. This assistance was in lieu of taxes assessed on real estate. This compensation by reason of the legislative formula is now diminishing. It should be noted that the taxes received from the personal property supported by the lands which are now part of the national park system far exceeded the real estate assessments.

Thanks to the National Park Service's acquisition, this county now owns only 2.42 percent of its land and finds itself in a difficult position, because it does not have a satisfactory tax base.

Congress must realize that if it is going to take revenue-producing lands from the counties and reduce the tax base by condemnation of privately owned lands, a new source of revenue must be found or the county government will be unable to meet its responsibilities.

Mr. President, the bill which I have introduced would provide that new source of income. It would give Teton County, which has a large portion of its land designated as national park lands, an equal base with other counties which have Government lands other than national park lands within their boundaries.

I feel that this is a justified and needed approach to the problem which confronts Teton County.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1901) to provide for the allocation of a certain percentage of the proceeds from lands in the national park system, situated in Teton County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming for use by it in compensating Teton County, introduced by Mr. **Simpson** (for himself and Mr. **McGee**), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

NATIONAL PARK DESIGNATION FOR CAPITOL REEF

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would establish Capitol Reef National Monument in Utah as Capitol Reef National Park. The outstanding scenic and scientific values of this remarkable area make it a veritable wonderland of nature. It fully merits the recognition, standing, and prestige which will come from national park designation.

LAND OF SCENIC AND GEOLOGIC WONDERS

The striking Capitol Reef is in the heart of the famed Wayne Wonderland, a vast scenic region in south-central Utah. Here in the Capitol Reef region and eastward to the Green and Colorado Rivers, Nature has painted her handiwork in literally every color of the rainbow. At the same time, she has created an overwhelming world of strange and wonderful forms—of great cliffs and canyons, bridges and arches, domes and buttes, goblins, cathedrals and spires. Much of the region has never been explored. The national monument was established by Presidential proclamation on August 2, 1937, and covers more than 61 square miles, an area slightly larger than Bryce Canyon National Park.

The principal geologic spectacle of the region is a hugh shale and sandstone reef or cliff that has been eroded into a 20-mile-long buttressed sandstone cliff with a cap of white Navajo sandstone, which, because it resembles domed capitol buildings, was given the name of "Capitol Reef." Early geologists called such cliffs in this area reefs because of their visual resemblance to sea reefs composed of rock, or limestone skeletons of coral. Capitol Reef's architecture incorporates an astonishing medley of fluted red walls and sheer white cliffs, of great rock organs and immense rounded domes, multicolored shales, natural bridges, and profound narrow canyons.

Actually, Capitol Reef is but part of a huge monocline—the Waterpocket Fold, a great doubling up of the earth's crust, which was caused by an unusual geological movement. The western edge of this fold—of which Capitol Reef is a part—is exposed as a great cliff or escarpment of brilliantly colored rock layers. It extends from Thousand Lake Mountain southeastward about 150 miles to the Colorado River. The fold, or reef, fantastically eroded by rain and wind, can be crossed in only three places on horseback. One of these passages also allows automobiles to cross.

Visitors should not miss Capitol Reef itself, Twin Rocks, Chimney Rock, and the spectacular Sulphur Creek Gorge. In addition, there are Basket Maker petroglyphs about 1,200 years old and many other spectacular sites.

MISSION 66

I was pleased to work with the National Park Service to obtain a new highway across Capitol Reef National Monument from Fruita to the east boundary, paralleling the Fremont River. For many years previously, the main road crossed the reef through narrow, winding Capitol Gorge. The new highway was completed in the fall of 1962, and connects with recently completed Utah State Highway 24. It, of course, greatly enhances the tourist potential of this unique and beautiful area, an area which has been long neglected but has now begun to receive the developments to attract more visitors.

In fact, since the advent of the Eisenhower Mission 66 program for developing and publicizing the Nation's national parks and monuments, Capitol Reef has received its first real improvements since its establishment. The number of tourists visiting the area has climbed from 62,487 in 1956 to 163,500 in 1962, and the new road will attract a greater number this year. Yet, in comparison with the visitors to the nearby national parks—Bryce Canyon, Zion and Grand Canyon—the number of persons who visit Capitol Reef is relatively small.

Thus, the people of America are being denied and are denying themselves the thrilling experience of visiting this wonderland of nature.

MERITS NATIONAL PARK STATUS

I believe a principal reason for the relatively small number of visitors is the fact that in the public mind a national monument does not hold the prestige associated with a national park. I have described the scenic and geologic features of Capitol Reef National Monument. It fully merits the added prestige and increased national publicity which would result from national park recognition, recognition which is, in fact, long overdue.

I offered a bill in the last Congress to give national park status to Capitol Reef. However, the Department of the Interior at that time recommended against passage of such legislation on the grounds that Capitol Reef was one of the several national monuments in the so-called golden circle of national parks and monuments which the Department wished to study to determine those deserving of national park status.

More than sufficient time has elapsed for the Department to conclude its studies, and I am hopeful that without further delay it will bestow its full approval upon the elevation in status which Capitol Reef so richly merits.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1904) to establish Capitol Reef National Monument as Capitol Reef National Park, introduced by Mr. Bennett, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

GUIDELINES MUST GO

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to outlaw the use of timing or measuring devices in the distribution of mail. I understand such devices are utilized in the Post Office Department's work measurement systems or guidelines, which in one form or another have been in effect since 1958.

The objective in instituting these systems is certainly one I endorse. We all want to achieve maximum efficiency and economy in postal operations, as in all governmental activities. But from all I can learn, these systems are not accomplishing this objective, and in fact are helping to defeat it.

The systems do not lend themselves to accurate mail counts, so there is no true measurement of work content or performance, only time-consuming and service-disrupting paper work.

The guidelines systems are costing the Department, according to testimony before the House committee this session, between $11 and $12 million annually. Moreover, it could well be even more because of the additional personnel required to handle the staggering amount of paper work—employees who have nothing at all to do with any step in the mail distribution process. These resulting additional costs are included in the general category of personnel, and so are not directly charged as they should be to the "guidelines" program.

Mr. President, of particular concern to me is the disastrous effect of the guidelines systems in terms of human costs. The vast majority of our postal employees are capable, efficient, and dedicated workers. However, their dignity and respect as individuals are lost in the guidelines systems. Our postal service functions with human beings, not machines, and we should treat them as men and not robots.

Good morale, though it cannot be measured for cost accounting purposes, is an indispensable factor in real efficiency. Under the guidelines systems we have the opposite: Frustration, tension, and the high personnel turnover which lower morale and efficiency.

I was very heartened to learn that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee is holding hearings on the various proposals in this area. I hope that when the facts have been available for study the Senate will act to eliminate this unrealistic system which is so wasteful of human and material values.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1906) to prohibit the use of timing or measuring devices in the distribution of mail, introduced by Mr. Williams of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN RETIRED AND OTHER PERSONNEL TO ACCEPT AND WEAR DECORATIONS, ETC.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize certain retired and other personnel of the U.S. Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign governments.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

In fact, I would be glad to give serious consideration to an amendment which would authorize the Secretary of State on a permanent basis to deliver these awards, decorations, and other things, to the recipients after he has received certification of their retired status. I cannot imagine that the authors of our Constitution in providing that "No person holding any office of profit or trust" shall accept a present or a decoration from a foreign government without the consent of Congress, would have considered every single person, receiving a few dollars a year in retirement benefits, to be holding an "office of profit or trust" under the Constitution. It seems absurd that former Government officials and employees, who do not draw pensions, can get their decorations automatically, while those who do draw pensions, no matter how small, have to have congressional authorization. It does not appear to me that that is the point with which the Founding Fathers were concerned. In order to stimulate discussion of this approach I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point a draft of an amendment intended to be proposed by me.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. Fulbright was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SUGGESTED AMENDMENT

Sec. 3. The act of January 31, 1881 (5 U.S.C. 115), is amended as follows:

"Strike out the comma and insert a period after the word 'person', and add the following sentence:

" 'Such present, decoration, or other thing shall be delivered by the Department of State to the individual upon receipt of a certified affidavit stating that he has retired from the Office of Profit or Trust held by him under the Constitution of the United States.' "

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary of State, dated May 28, 1963, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

May 28, 1963.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate.

Dear Mr. Vice President: There is submitted herewith a draft bill "To authorize certain retired and other personnel of the U.S. Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign governments." This bill embodies and brings up to date the draft bill submitted to you on February 6, 1962, but not enacted.

The Department is required by the act of January 31, 1881 (5 U.S.C. 115), to hold in its custody awards for active and retired personnel of the U.S. Government. The growing accumulation of awards which the Department is required to hold presents an ever increasing problem and related workload to the Department, other Government agencies, and the Congress and results in thousands of inquiries from interested parties. Although the draft bill contains only the names of those persons who have retired within the last 5 years, it will provide substantial relief if favorable consideration is given by the Congress.

From the standpoint of the foreign relations of the United States, the Department perceives no objection to the acceptance by these persons of the decorations, presents, and other things tendered by the foreign countries indicated in the attached bill and recommends that it be given favorable consideration.

A similar communication has been forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Department that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Dean Rusk.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to point out that while the bill is very bulky, 133 pages of the 145 pages are devoted to the Military Establishment, 3 to the Department of State, and only three-quarters of a page to Members of Congress. The recognition by foreign governments is certainly not devoted to the civilian branches of the government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1910) to authorize certain retired and other personnel of the U.S. Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign governments, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

INCORPORATION OF CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS OF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk until Tuesday next for the addition of cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

The bill (S. 1914) to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CLASS I DAIRY BILL—AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT SUPPORT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a dairy bill. The bill is a class I base bill which has been worked out after comprehensive negotiations between the Milk Producers Federation, which is by far the largest dairy organization in the country, and the Department of Agriculture. That is just about as far as each of them can go. The bill has the enthusiastic support of the Milk Producers Federation. Mr. Charles Murphy, Under Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, in a letter to Mr. E. M. Norton, secretary of the National Milk Producers Federation, said:

> The draft of the class I base plan as it was worked out by the task force is acceptable to the Department. As you know, this draft omits certain features which we believe would improve the program; nevertheless, we believe that in the form of the task force draft it might achieve some improvement over the present situation, and we perceive no objection to it as far as it goes.

Mr. President, I introduce the bill for appropriate referral.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1915) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

TO AMEND FURTHER THE PEACE CORPS ACT (75 STAT. 612), AS AMENDED

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the President and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal from the President, dated July 4, 1963, and the text of the bill, together with an accompanying section-by-section analysis be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1916) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(b) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which authorizes appropriations to carry out the purposes of that Act, is amended by striking out "1963" and "$63,750,000" and substituting "1964" and "$108,000,000", respectively.

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to Peace Corps volunteers, is amended as follows:

(a) In subsection (b), insert the following sentence immediately after the first sentence: "Supplies or equipment provided volunteers to insure their capacity to serve effectively may be transferred to the government or to other entities of the country or area with which they have been serving, when no longer necessary for such purpose, and when such transfers would further the purposes of this Act."

(b) Strike out subsection (c) and substitute therefor the following: "(c) Volunteers shall be entitled to receive a readjustment allowance at a rate not to exceed $75 for each month of satisfactory service as determined by the President. The readjustment allowance of each volunteer shall be payable on his return to the United States: *Provided, however,* That, under such circumstances as the President may determine, the accrued readjustment allowance, or any part thereof, may be paid to the volunteer, members of his family or others, during the period of his service, or prior to his return to the United States. In the event of the volunteer's death during the period of his service, the amount of any unpaid readjustment allowance shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950, chapter 518, section 1 (5 U.S.C. 61f)."

(c) In subsection (f)(2), strike out "termination payments" and substitute therefor "readjustment allowance".

(d) In subsection (g), add immediately after "may determine" the following proviso: ": *Provided,* That not to exceed one hundred volunteers in the aggregate may be assigned to carry out secretarial or clerical duties on the staffs of the Peace Corps representatives abroad".

(e) In subsection (h), strike out "and for the purposes of" immediately after "tort liability statute," and substitute therefor "the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 (5 U.S.C. 2171 et seq.), the Act of June 4, 1954, chapter 264, section 4 (5 U.S.C. 73b-5), and".

(f) Add a new subsection at the end of section 5 as follows: "(k) In order to assure that the skills and experience which former volunteers have derived from their training and their service abroad are best utilized in the national interest, the President may, in cooperation with agencies of the United States, private employers, educational institutions, and other entities of the United States, undertake programs under which volunteers would be counseled with respect to opportunities for further education and employment."

SEC. 3. Section 6(1) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to Peace Corps volunteer leaders, is amended by striking out "termination payments" and substituting therefor "a readjustment allowance".

SEC. 4. Section 7(b) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to the compensation of persons engaged in the United States in activities authorized by the Act, is amended by striking out "so" in the first sentence thereof.

SEC. 5. Section 10 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to general powers and authorities, is amended as follows:

(a) In subsection (a), insert immediately after "shall be assigned" in the proviso to paragraph (2) "in fiscal year 1964, in addition to the number of assignments previously permitted," and strike out "or volunteer leaders" immediately after "Peace Corps volunteers".

(b) In subsection (a), insert immediately after "or otherwise" in paragraph (3) ", and transfer such property to the government or other entities of the country or area with which the volunteers are serving, when such transfers would further the general purposes of the Act".

SEC. 6. Section 13 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to the employment of experts and consultants, is amended as follows:

(a) In subsection (a), strike out "Peace Corps" and substitute therefor "President".

(b) In subsection (b), strike out all that appears between "shall not" in the first clause thereof and "be considered" in the second clause thereof.

SEC. 7. Section 19 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to the Peace Corps seal, is amended by striking out the short title and substituting therefor "Exclusive Right to Seal and Name", by inserting "(a)" before "the President may", and by adding a new subsection as follows:

"(b)(1) The use of the official seal or emblem and the use of the name 'Peace Corps' shall be restricted exclusively to designate programs authorized under this Act.

"(2) Whoever, whether an individual, partnership, corporation, or association, uses the seal for which provision is made in this section, or any sign, insignia, or symbol in colorable imitation thereof, or the words 'Peace Corps' or any combination of these or other words or characters in colorable imitation thereof, other than to designate programs authorized under this Act, shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both. A violation of this subsection may be enjoined at the suit of the Attorney General, United States attorneys, or other persons duly authorized to represent the United States."

SEC. 8. The Peace Corps Act, as amended, is amended to add after title II thereof a new title as follows:

"TITLE III—ENCOURAGEMENT OF VOLUNTARY SERVICE PROGRAMS

"SEC. 301. (a) The Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States and a further purpose of this Act to encourage countries and areas to establish programs under which their citizens and nationals would volunteer to serve in order to help meet the needs of less developed countries or areas for trained manpower, and to encourage less developed countries or areas to establish programs under which their citizens and nationals would volunteer to serve in order to meet their needs for trained manpower.

"(b) Programs carried out by the President in furtherance of the purposes of this title shall provide for the furnishing of knowledge and skills relating to the selection, training, and programing of volunteer manpower."

The letter and section-by-section analysis, presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT, are as follows:

JULY 4, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am pleased to transmit legislation which will authorize the appropriation of $108 million for the Peace Corps in fiscal year 1964. It is fitting that this request is made on the 187th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. For the Peace Corps exemplifies the spirit of that Revolution whose beginnings we celebrate today.

That Revolution was not only a revolution for American independence and freedom. It was, as Jefferson perceived and Lincoln proclaimed, a revolution unbounded by geography, race or culture. It was a movement for the political and spiritual freedom of man.

Today, two centuries later and thousands of miles from its origin, the men and women of the Peace Corps are again affirming the universality of that Revolution. Whether expressed by the community development projects of Latin America, or the panchayati raj program of India, the determination of people to be free, to govern themselves, and to share in the fruits of both the industrial and democratic revolutions, is one of the most profound forces at work in the world. To this revolution Peace Corps volunteers are giving the same qualities of energy and spirit to which the 21-year-old Lafayette and his equally youthful contemporaries gave as volunteer participants in our own Revolution.

In less than 2 years their accomplishments have already been impressive. They constitute more than one-third of all the qualified secondary teachers in Sierra Leone, Ethiopia, and Nyasaland; they have saved a three-quarter million dollar rice crop in Pakistan; they have vaccinated over 25,000 Bolivians; they are teaching in 400 Philippines schools; they have created a thriving poultry industry in the State of Punjab in India; they are teaching in every rural secondary school in Costa Rica and virtually every secondary school in British Honduras; they have contributed to the creation of a system of farm-to-market roads in Tanganyika. But these are only isolated examples; all over the world volunteers have surveyed roads, taught students and teachers, built schools, planted forests, drilled wells, and started local industries. In their off hours they have conducted adult education classes, organized athletic teams, and launched programs ranging from music clubs to debating teams.

As important as these achievements are, they are far less important than the contribution Peace Corps volunteers are making in building those human relations which must exist for a happy and peaceful understanding between people. The United States and a few other fortunate nations are part of an island of prosperity in a worldwide sea of poverty. Our affluence has at times severed us from the great proverty-stricken majority of the world's people. It is essential that we demonstrate that we continue to be aware of the responsibility we fortunate few have to assist the efforts of others at development and progress.

With Americans, Lord Tweedsmuir wrote, "the sense of common humanity is a warm and constant instinct and not a doctrine of the schools or a slogan of the hustings." By the careful selection and training of men and women in whom that instinct is a reality, the Peace Corps has already erased some stereotype images of America and brought hundreds of thousands of people into contact with the first Americans they have ever known personally. "When the Peace Corps came to my country," wrote the Minister of Development of Jamaica, "they brought a breath of fresh air. They came and mixed with the people. They worked closely with the people. They closed the gap and crashed the barrier. And because they did this, they have paved the way for our own people to understand."

It is not accident that Peace Corps volunteers have won this kind of acceptance. Nor is it a coincidence that they have been greeted—as the Ethiopian Herald stated—"with open arms." They have been warmly received because they represent the best traditions of a free and democratic society—the kind of society which the people of Africa, Asia, and Latin America long for as the ultimate end of their own revolution.

The Communist system can never offer men optimum freedom as human beings. The people of the world's emerging nations know this. Their aspirations for a free society are being stimulated by the presence of Peace Corps volunteers who have come not to usurp but to encourage the responsibility of local people and not to repress but to respect the individual characteristics and traditions of the local culture. "What is most remarkable about America," wrote German scholar Philip Schaff, "is that over its confused diversity there broods a higher unity." Because volunteers of different races and different religions nonetheless come from the same country, they represent the hope of building a community of free nations wherein each one, conscious of its rights and duties, will have regard for the welfare of all.

Already the Peace Corps idea has spread to other nations. Last week I attended the official inauguration of West Germany's own Peace Corps program. The first group of 250 young men and women will be ready for service next year and will eventually include more than a thousand young Germans working around the world. Three other European countries—the Netherlands, Denmark, and Norway—have started similar programs. Argentina and New Zealand have already established volunteer organizations. These efforts have been stimulated and assisted by the International Peace Corps Secretariat, established by the International Conference on Middle Level Manpower last fall in Puerto Rico. The bill I am transmitting would enable the United States to continue to encourage this movement.

The first American volunteers are already returning to the United States after 2 years of Peace Corps service. They are bringing home important skills and experience which will greatly enhance our knowledge of the world and strengthen our role in international affairs. More than one-third of the 700 volunteers returning this year have indicated a desire to work in international programs. Their ability and usefulness is attested to by the action of 35 universities in the United States which have established 200 scholarships for returning volunteers. One of these scholarships was created by the donations of the foreign students studying in California. I am also recommending a provision which would authorize the Peace Corps to assist these returning volunteers to make the most of their opportunities for further usefulness to the Nation.

The funds I am requesting will enable the Peace Corps to place some 13,000 volunteers in training or abroad by September 1964, a significant increase over the 9,000 who are expected to be enrolled before the end of this year.

Three thousand volunteers of next year's increase are destined for service in Latin America and one thousand in Africa. In both of these areas an historic opportunity is at hand for the United States. In Latin America, the Peace Corps can, within the span of a relatively few years, write an important chapter in the history of inter-American partnership and kindle faith in the possibilities of democratic action on the community level. In Africa the Peace Corps will concentrate its efforts on meeting a critical teacher shortage. The opportunity to teach hundreds of thousands of African students is unparalleled in our history.

It is my hope, therefore, that the Congress will enact this legislation making it possible for the Peace Corps to continue to share with the new nations of the world the experience of a democratic revolution committed to human liberty.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED ACT TO AMEND THE PEACE CORPS ACT AS SUBMITTED BY THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

The proposed act (the bill) to amend the Peace Corps Act, as amended (the act), has two main purposes. First, it authorizes new appropriations under the general authority in the act for appropriations to carry out the purposes of the act. The bill would accomplish this by striking out the amount and the reference to the fiscal year in that general authorization and substituting the new amount and the new fiscal year. Deletion of the amount and date in the general authorization, of course, has no effect on funds heretofore made available to carry out the purposes or provisions of the act. Second, the bill would affect 14 other amendments to the act. Some of these are of a substantive nature designed to promote more effective and efficient operation of the Peace Corps. Others are clarifying or technical changes.

Section 1: Amends section 3(b) of the act, which relates to authorizations, to authorize the appropriation of $108 million for fiscal year 1964. In 1962, the appropriation of $63,750,000 for fiscal year 1963 was authorized by amendment of this general authority. Fifty-nine million dollars was actually appropriated to carry out the provisions of the act.

Section 2: Amends section 5 of the act, which relates to Peace Corps volunteers, in six respects:

Section 2(a) of the bill amends section 5(b) of the act to permit supplies or equipment provided volunteers to insure their capacity to serve effectively and no longer required for the purpose for which provided to be transferred to the Government or other entities ("entities" is in effect a defined term of the act in view of the references in section 5(g) of the act to section 10(a)(1) thereof) of the country or area with which the volunteers are serving. This amendment is a limited version of an amendment to section 5(b) of the act requested last year by the executive branch. In order to make it clear that only work or "project" equipment or supplies provided volunteers may be transferred under the proposed authority, the limiting phrase "to insure their capacity to serve effectively" has been added and phrases descriptive of "logistic" supplies or equipment which are provided volunteers for their maintenance or health have been deleted. Also, the word "with" has been substituted for the word "in" to make it clear that transfers may be made only to the Government or other host country entities with which volunteers have been actually working.

The requested authority would apply only to work or "project" supplies or equipment and then only when Peace Corps representatives overseas determine that they are no longer required for use by the volunteers to which provided or by their replacements, if any. Examples of work supplies or equipment would include teaching aids, tools provided community action volunteers, and recreational equipment provided for teachers or other volunteers who supervise or participate in sports as well as for physical education volunteers. The requested authority would not apply to "logistic" supplies or equipment provided for the volunteers' health or maintenance, e.g., medicines, household furnishings, and vehicles.

It is to be emphasized that the authority requested does not augment the basic authority in section 5(b) of the act to provide equipment or supplies for the volunteers. This existing authority is limited to providing the supplies or equipment necessary for the maintenance of the volunteers or to insure their health or capacity to serve effectively. Moreover, the Peace Corps general policy is not to provide work equipment or supplies of a value in excess of roughly $1,000 per volunteer.

Section 2(b) of the bill makes two changes in section 5(c) of the act which authorizes the payment to each volunteer at the end of his service of not to exceed $75 for each month, or portion thereof, of satisfactory service. (1) As stated in the section-by-section analysis of the original Peace Corps bill, these payments "are intended primarily to assist volunteers during the period of transition back to life at home in the United States." The phrase "readjustment allowance" is thought to express more clearly than "termination payments" the purpose of these payments, and the former phrase is, therefore, substituted for the latter throughout the subsection. This amendment in no way changes the nature or amount of these payments, and the Treasury Department will consider the "readjustment allowance" as a "termination payment" for the purposes of sections 912 and 1303(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. (2) The second change, which consists of a rewriting of the second sentence of section 5(c), is intended to make clear, consistent with the basic purpose of the readjustment allowance, the Peace Corps authority to withhold payment of all or any part of the accrued readjustment allowance until the volunteer actually returns to the United States. Section 5(c) of the act now provides for payment "at the termination of * * * service" which in the large majority of cases will take place overseas.

Section 2(c) of the bill amends section 5(f) of the act, which relates to credit for Peace Corps service in connection with subsequent Federal employment, by substituting "readjustment allowance" for "termination payments" in paragraph 2 thereof. This change would conform this paragraph with the change in the terminology of section 5(c) of the act which would be effected by section 2(b) of the bill.

Section 2(d) of the bill amends section 5(g) of the act, which authorizes the assignment of volunteers, by authorizing the assignment of not more than a total of 100 volunteers to carry out secretarial and clerical duties on the staffs of Peace Corps representatives abroad. Many persons with secretarial and clerical skills and experience have volunteered for service in the Peace Corps, but projects in which they could serve abroad to meet the needs of interested countries and areas for this kind of trained manpower have developed only to a very limited extent. Rather than deny to these Americans the opportunity to serve their country in the Peace Corps, it is proposed to authorize the assignment on an experimental basis of a limited number (100) of such persons to duty on the staffs of Peace Corps representatives abroad. The requested authority would extend the voluntary service principle into the area of oversea administration and at the same time reduce the cost thereof.

Section 2(e) of the bill amends section 5(h) of the act, which specifies certain laws for the purposes of which volunteers shall be considered employees of the United States, by adding (1) the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 (5 U.S.C. 2171 et seq.) and (2) the act of June 4, 1954, chapter 264, section 4 (5 U.S.C. 73b-5). Except for purposes of the laws specified in section 5(h) or elsewhere in the act, volunteers are not considered persons holding an office of trust or profit under the United States, or officers or employees thereof.

(1) The Federal Voting Assistance Act, in general, authorizes Government officials to take reasonable measures to assist Federal employees absent from the States where they maintain voting residences to exercise absentee voting rights. It is to be emphasized that that act does not grant absentee voting rights. It merely provides for administrative assistance to Federal employees who wish to exercise such absentee voting rights as may be accorded by the States where they maintain voting residences.

(2) Section 4 of the act of June 4, 1954, chapter 264, authorizes, under such regulations as the President may prescribe (see Executive Order No. 10614 of May 26, 1955), the use of appropriations chargeable for transportation of baggage of Government employees for such payment of general average contributions as may be required in connection with authorized transportation of baggage. "General average contributions" are the contributions which each party to a sea venture may be required to make in order (1) to make good the loss sustained by any one of their number on account of sacrifices made of part of the ship or cargo to save the residue or the lives of those on board from impending peril, or (2) to share extraordinary expenses necessarily incurred for the common benefit and safety of all.

Section 2(f) of the bill adds a new subsection (k) to section 5 of the act. In order to assure that the skills and experience which former volunteers have derived from their training and their service abroad are best utilized in the national interest, this subsection authorizes the President, in cooperation with agencies of the United States, private employers, educational institutions and other entities of the United States, to undertake programs under which volunteers would be counseled with respect to opportunities for further education and employment.

The Peace Corps bill proposed by the executive branch in 1961 would have created a career planning board "to advise and consult with the President with regard to the development of policies and programs designed to assist the future careers of volunteers after conclusion of their service." This provision was not enacted. Nevertheless, from many sources have come requests for information from the Peace Corps about returning volunteers and requests that the Peace Corps make available to returning volunteers information about employment and educational opportunities they offer. Such sources include other Government agencies, such as the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, and the Public Health Service; private enterprises, such as the International Business Machines Corp., E. I. DuPont Co., and Standard Oil (New Jersey); State and local government agencies, such as the New York State Board of Education, the Chicago Board of Education, and the California School Districts; many private organizations engaged in public service work; and colleges and universities throughout the United States. The Peace Corps has felt free to respond to these requests for information about returning volunteers, as it would to any requests from the public for information about its program. Similarly, it has felt free to accede to requests from such entities to make available to volunteers information about employment and educational opportunities.

In view of the legislative history of the Career Planning Board proposal, however, the Peace Corps has not felt free to take the initiative in efforts to assure that returning volunteers, both collectively and individually, are fully apprised as to the opportunities available to them, to advise them of alternative opportunities, and to guide them in determining which opportunities will best utilize their Peace Corps training and experience.

The proposed amendment is intended to permit the Peace Corps to engage in such activities without which it is believed that the skills and experience of the returning volunteers will not be utilized to the maximum benefit of the United States. Under the requested authority, assistance will not be provided to a former volunteer if more than a year has elapsed since the termination of his service, unless he has been fulfilling U.S. military service obligations since the end of his service.

Section 3: Amends section 6 of the act, which relates to Peace Corps volunteer leaders, by substituting "a readjustment allowance" for "termination payments" in subsection (1). This change would conform this subsection with the change in the terminology of section 5(c) of the act which would be effected by section 2(b) of the bill.

Section 4: Amends section 7(b) of the act, which relates to the compensation of persons engaged in the United States in activities authorized by the act, by striking out the word "so." This is a technical change designed to correct an error in the drafting of the original act. It will remove a possible ambiguity which might unintentionally preclude the Peace Corps from compensating persons, such as Foreign Service or Public Health Service officers, assigned or detailed to supergrade positions in the Peace Corps at rates appropriate to their responsibilities in those positions. This change in wording will in no way increase the total number of supergrades authorized for the Peace Corps.

Section 5: Amends section 10 of the act, which relates to general powers and authorities, in two respects:

Section 5(a) of the bill amends the proviso in section 10(a)(2) of the act, which section generally authorizes the assignment of volunteers to duty with the United Nations or other intergovernmental organizations or agencies: (a) to permit 125 volunteers to be assigned in fiscal year 1964 under the authority of section 10(a)(2) in addition to the 125 now permitted thereunder and (b) to delete the reference to volunteer leaders. Volunteers would be assigned to international organizations under arrangements between the Peace Corps and the organization comparable to operating arrangements between the Peace Corps and voluntary agencies or universities made pursuant to sections 5(g) and 10(a)(1) of the act, except that such assignments may be made only in special cases where the Secretary of State has determined that the assignments would serve the purposes of the act.

Deletion of the reference to volunteer leaders is a technical change. Section 6 of the act provides that, except as otherwise provided, all provisions of the act applicable to volunteers shall be applicable to volunteer leaders and that volunteers shall include volunteer leaders. Hence, section 10 (a)(2), as amended, would continue to apply to volunteer leaders.

Section 5(b) of the bill amends section 10(a)(3) of the act, which relates to the acceptance and use of services, money or property donated to the Peace Corps, to permit the transfer of donated property to the government or other entities of the country or area with which volunteers are serving when such transfers would generally further the purposes of the act. In addition to providing an authority with respect to donated property comparable to that proposed in section 2(a) of the bill, this provision would permit selective acceptance, shipment, and transfer of donated property in situations where people wish to donate to the Peace Corps property which cannot readily be used by Peace Corps volunteers or employees in their work, but which can readily be used by the entities overseas which volunteers serve.

Section 6: Amends section 13 of the act, which relates to the employment of experts and consultants, in two respects:

Section 6(a) of the bill would amend section 13(a) of the act by striking out "Peace Corps" and substituting "President". This is a technical change to reflect the fact that the act does not create a Peace Corps agency, but confers authorities and functions upon the President who provides for the Peace Corps agency in the course of delegating these functions pursuant to section 4(b) of the act. Consistent with this structure of the act, the authority to employ experts or consultants, like the section 7 authorities to employ, appoint, or assign persons, should be conferred upon the President.

Section 6(b) of the bill would amend section 13(b) of the act by striking out the conflicts of interest statutes exemption for members of the Peace Corps National Advisory Council and for experts and consultants. At the last session, the Congress enacted comprehensive new legislation relating to conflicts of interest (Public Law 87-849, approved Oct. 23, 1962). Section 2 of Public Law 87-849 repealed all special exemptions from the conflicts of interest statutes for employees of the executive branch. The purpose of this amendment is to reflect this repealer.

Section 7: Amends section 19 of the act, which relates to the Peace Corps seal, by amending the short title to express better the subject matter of the section and by adding a new subsection which would provide that the Peace Corps shall have exclusive right to its name and its seal and that whoever uses either the Peace Corps name or the Peace Corps seal, or any colorable imitation thereof, other than to designate programs carried out under the act, shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both, and may be enjoined at the suit of the Attorney General or other persons authorized to represent the United States. The new subsection is similar to other prohibitions on the use of distinctive names and insignia contained in chapter 33 of title 18, United States Code, and is specifically based on 18 U.S.C. 707 which prohibits the unauthorized use of the 4-H Club name or insignia. Already there is some evidence of public confusion due to unauthorized use of the name "Peace Corps". This amendment is designed to prohibit such unauthorized use.

Section 8: Amends the act to add after title II thereof, which relates to Internal Revenue Code and Social Security Act amendments, a new title. Section 301(a) of the new title would, when read with section 3 of the act, authorize the carrying out of and appropriations for programs to encourage (1) countries and areas to establish programs under which their citizens and nationals would volunteer to serve abroad in order to help meet the needs of less developed countries for trained manpower and (2) less developed countries and areas to establish programs under which their citizens and nationals would volunteer to help meet the needs of their own and other less developed countries for trained manpower.

Section 301(b) is intended to limit programs authorized by section 301(a) to those under which there would be furnished knowledge and skills relating to the selection, training, and programing of volunteer manpower, including surveys, demonstrations, training, and other activities similar to those which were authorized under the point 4 authority in title III of the now repealed Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended. Thus, funds available to carry out programs authorized by the proposed title could be contributed by the Peace Corps to technical cooperation programs which are related to the utilization of voluntary manpower by the less developed countries and carried out by international organizations such as the International Peace Corps Secretariat, but could be expended by the Peace Corps to furnish assistance in the form of equipment or commodities only where necessary for instruction or demonstration purposes.

While this authority is intended to be the exclusive source of contributions of funds for the general operations of the Secretariat, it is not intended to preclude other Government agencies from procuring expert services from the Secretariat.

The requested authority is not intended to result in an increase in the amount of funds requested for the Peace Corps in fiscal year 1964. The fiscal year 1964 expenses of programs carried out under the requested authority are intended to be absorbed from funds available for Peace Corps volunteer and project costs. Personnel compensation and benefits expenses for Peace Corps personnel who are detailed to the International Peace Corps Secretariat on a nonreimbursable basis and who previously had been funded from funds available for administration and program support costs, however, would be absorbed from funds available for such costs.

PROTECTION OF HEADS OF FOREIGN STATES AND OTHER DESIGNATED OFFICIALS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide authority to protect heads of foreign states and other designated officials.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the Secretary of State, dated July 11, 1963, in regard to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1917) to provide authority to protect heads of foreign states and other designated officials, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first paragraph of section 112 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 112. Assaulting certain foreign diplomatic and other official personnel

"Whoever assaults, strikes, wounds, imprisons or offers violence to the person of any head of foreign state or foreign government, foreign minister, Ambassador or other public minister, in violation of the law of nations, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than three years or both.

"Whoever, in the commission of any such acts uses a deadly or dangerous weapon, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than ten years or both."

SEC. 2. The analysis in chapter 7 is amended by deleting

"112. Assaulting public minister."

and adding in lieu thereof

"112. Assaulting certain foreign diplomatic and other official personnel."

SEC. 3. Section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately before "while engaged in the performance of his official duties," the following: "security officers of the Department of State and the Foreign Service.".

SEC. 4. The Act of June 28, 1955, 69 Stat. 188, is amended by adding a new section at the end thereof, to read as follows:

"Security officers of the Department of State and the Foreign Service engaged in the performance of the duties prescribed in section 1 of this Act, are empowered to arrest without warrant and deliver into custody any person violating the provisions of section 111 or 112 of title 18, United States Code, in their presence or if they have reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing such felony."

The letter presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

JULY 11, 1963.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: In the conduct of foreign relations, perhaps no greater change has occurred in the past two decades than the increased emphasis on personal visits to the United States by heads of foreign states or foreign governments. Under international law and practice, it is the responsibility of the host government to assure the physical safety of such distinguished visitors while they are traveling or sojourning in its territory. The responsibility includes shielding these persons from all hazards, regardless of whether they be of personal design, accident or negligence. With respect to the U.S. Government's discharge of its responsibility, the Department of State was designated to perform this security protection function in the act of Congress approved June 28, 1955 (69 Stat. 188).

A recently completed review of existing Federal laws relating to this area of responsibility reveals an immediate need for the revision of certain statutes, to regularize the protection of visiting foreign dignitaries. The study indicates that section 112, title 18, United States Code (Assaulting Public Minister), should be amended to include, as indicated in the first and second sections of the attached draft bill, similar protection for the head of a foreign state or foreign government as well as foreign ministers. The study further reveals that the security officers of the Department of State with primary responsibility for the protection of the lives of such distinguished foreign visitors lack the necessary authority and Federal protection to perform their function adequately. A pertinent example is the fact that these officers are at present not legally empowered to intervene to prevent an assault or a similar gesture of violence directed against a distinguished foreign visitor until after the commission of the act. The authority requested in sections 3 and 4 of the attached draft bill has been devised to correct these deficiencies, and is acceptable to the Department of Justice.

The Department hopes that it may receive early favorable consideration by the Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation to the Congress for its consideration.

A similar letter has been submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

REGULATION OF PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to regulate private employment agencies in the District of Columbia.

Last year, I introduced a similar bill which was the basis for thorough hearings before the Subcommittee on Public Health, Welfare, Education, and Safety of which I have the privilege of being chairman. The Senate Committee on the District of Columbia reported favorably in the last few weeks of the session to the Senate an improved bill on the subject, upon my subcommittee's recommendation. Unfortunately, the Senate did not have an opportunity to take action on the measure before adjournment.

The bill which I am introducing today is the same bill which was reported favorably by the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia to the Senate last year.

The private employment agency industry informed the committee last year that it would take the necessary steps to bring its own house in order. However, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate, Mr. President, that there has been no evidence to this hour that any action has been taken by the industry to curb or curtail the malpractices which have developed in the industry in the Nation's Capital.

All that the local committee has done, as far as can be determined, is feed the press with news stories of what it has done or proposes to do. Proposing to do a thing or stating it has been done, doesn't necessarily mean it has been done, Mr. President.

What the industry here and throughout the Nation is doing is to bring political pressure to bear on Members of Congress to cut appropriations of the U.S. Employment Agency and to threaten to defeat candidates for political office who support legislation regulating the private employment agency industry which is contrary to the industry's wishes.

If that is the kind of fight they want, they will get it. Not all employment agency operators, of course, take the unenlightened position of some National and local associations. There are many private employment agency operators in the District of Columbia and elsewhere who have cooperated with the Committee in its investigation and who operate their agencies as a great public service at a high level of integrity and trust. They are to be commended for their fine public service.

In introducing this bill today, I serve public notice on the private employment agency industry that I shall hold hearings on the measure at an early date.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1919) to regulate private employment agencies in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, as used in this Act, the term—

(1) "Person" means an individual, firm, partnership, joint stock company, association, corporation, incorporated society, statutory or common-law trust, estatee, executor, administrator, receiver, trustee, conservator, liquidator, committee, officer, employee, principal, or agent;

(2) "Fee" means anything of value, including any monetary or other valuable consideration, paid or contracted to be paid, directly or indirectly, for any service or act performed by an employment agency;

(3) "Employment" means any service performed for remuneration or with the expectation of remuneration, whether in the form of salary, wages, or other consideration, and regardless of whether such service be performed under any contract for hire, written or oral, express or implied;

(4) "Employment agency" means any person other than an organization operated by or under the exclusive control of a bona fide educational, religious, or charitable institution who, for a fee, (A) procures or offers or attempts to procure employees for persons seeking the service of employees or employment for persons seeking employment; or (B) in seeking to perform any of the foregoing, gives information by any means as to where employees, workers, or employment may be obtained; and

(5) "Commissioners" means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (c) of section 10 of this Act, no employment agency shall do business in the District of Columbia unless it holds a valid license issued by the Commissioners under this Act.

(b) A license may be issued or renewed under this Act only upon the determination of the Commissioners that—

(1) the premises in which the business will be conducted are suitable for use as an employment agency;

(2) the applicant for such license is of good moral character, trustworthy, and intends to operate a bona fide employment agency; and

(3) the applicant for such license intends to make his services available to any person without discrimination as to race, creed, color, or national origin.

(c) Such license shall contain the name of the licensee, the name under which the business is to be conducted, and the specific place of business of the employment agency so licensed. Such license shall be valid only as to the person and place named therein. Any license issued under this Act shall contain an effective date and shall be valid for one year following such date, unless suspended or revoked. An application for the renewal of such license shall be made at such time and in such manner as the Commissioners may by regulations prescribe. Pending administrative action by the Commissioners on such an application, such license may be continued in effect for a period not to exceed sixty days beyond its expiration date.

(d) The Commissioners shall fix the fee for such license at such amount as, in their judgment, will be commensurate with the cost of the District of Columbia of inspecting, supervising, and regulating the licensed activity.

SEC. 3. (a) Each applicant for a license as an employment agency shall file with the Commissioners a bond in such form as may be prescribed and approved by the Commissioners, in the penal sum of $5,000 running to the District of Columbia, with corporate surety authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to title 6, United States Code, and by the Department of Insurance of the Government of the District of Columbia, to do business in the District of Columbia. In lieu of such bond, an applicant for a license as an employment agency may deposit with the Commissioners other security in a form and amount acceptable to them, but not exceeding the value of $7,500.

(b) Such bond shall be conditioned that—

(1) the licensee shall comply with the provisions of this Act, including applicable rules, regulations, or orders issued pursuant thereto, and shall pay any loss or damage occasioned to any person by reason of such failure to comply; and

(2) the suspension, revocation, surrender, or expiration of a license to operate an employment agency shall not affect the coverage of such bond as to a claim arising out of acts which occurred prior to the date of such suspension, revocation, surrender, or expiration.

(c) The Commissioners may at any time notify the licensee to file a new or supplementary bond, in a form and amount to conform with the provisions of this section, whenever they shall deem the surety of such bond to be unsatisfactory, or the amount of such bond to have become insufficient to satisfy all claims accrued or contingent against the licensee. In the event the bond is secured by cash, the cash shall not be released for a period of one year following the date of suspension, revocation, surrender, or expiration of the license.

(d) Any person aggrieved by the violation of any law or regulation applicable to the licensee's conduct of the licensed activity shall have, in addition to his right of action against such licensee, a right to bring suit against the surety on a bond required by this section, either alone or jointly with the principal thereon, and to recover in an amount not exceeding the penalty of such bond any damages sustained by reason of any act, transaction, or conduct of the licensee, or of any officer, agent, employee, or other person acting on behalf of said licensee, which is in violation of law or regulation in force in the District relating to the licensed activity. The provisions of the second, third, and the fifth subparagraphs of paragraph (b) of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to grant additional powers to the Commissioners, and for other purposes", approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 820; sec. 1-244(b), D.C. Code, 1961 edition), shall be applicable to each bond required by this section as if it were the bond required by the first subparagraph of such paragraph (b) of the first section of said Act approved December 20, 1944: *Provided*, That nothing in this subsection shall be construed to impose upon the surety on any such bond a greater liability than the total amount thereof or the amount remaining unextinguished after any prior recovery or recoveries.

SEC. 4. (a) No employment agency licensed under this Act shall—

(1) charge or receive a fee greater than that stated in the schedule established by the Commissioners pursuant to section 6(a) of this Act;

(2) engage or attempt to engage in the splitting or sharing of fees with any employer, any agent or other employee of an employer, or any other person to whom employment service has been furnished, or any other person not authorized to charge a fee under this Act;

(3) make, give, or cause to be made or given to any applicant for employees or employment any false promise, misrepresentation, or inaccurate or misleading statement or information of such agency had knowledge or should have had knowledge of such falsity, misrepresentation, or inaccurate or misleading statement or information;

(4) procure or attempt to procure the discharge of any person from his employment;

(5) knowingly induce or attempt to induce an employee to quit his employment for the purpose of obtaining other employment through such agency; except that nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as prohibiting any employment agency from assisting any employee in obtaining other employment if such agency has been so requested in writing by such employee;

(6) require applicants for employees or employment to subscribe to any publication or incidental service or contribute to the cost of advertising;

(7) refer any person to employment deleterious to health or morals if the agency had knowledge or should have had knowledge of such conditions;

(8) refer any employee, worker, or applicant for employment to a place where a strike or lockout exists without furnishing such employee, worker, or applicant with a written statement as to the existence of such strike or lockout, if the agency had knowledge or should have had knowledge of such facts or conditions, a copy of which statement signed by the employee, worker, or applicant shall be kept on file for one year after the date thereof;

(9) make any referral to an employment or occupation prohibited by law;

(10) refer any applicant for employment except upon order therefor and except upon furnishing such applicant with such statement in respect to the employment as the Commissioners may by rule or regulation prescribe;

(11) operate directly or indirectly in conjunction with the employment agency any lodging house, restaurant, small loan company, or any place where intoxicating liquors or beverages are sold or dispensed;

(12) except with the written consent of the Commissioners, conduct an employment agency business in a room or rooms used for eating, sleeping, or other living purposes;

(13) make or cause to be made or use any name, sign, or advertising device bearing a name which may be similar to or reasonably be confused with the name of a Government agency;

(14) receive or require any person to execute any paper or document relating to the liability of any applicant for employment except on such forms as shall have been approved by the Commissioners and every such paper or document made or executed contrary to the provisions of this Act shall be void and unenforceable both in law and in equity;

(15) use any contract form or other forms except as the Commissioners may by rule or regulation prescribe.

(b) Nothing contained in subsection (a) shall be construed as prohibiting the Commissioners, by regulation, from defining and prohibiting an activity or practice not set forth in such subsection.

SEC. 5. The Commissioners are authorized to establish such rules and regulations; minimum professional requirements for employees and officers of employment agencies in the District of Columbia; prescribe such forms of applications, reports, contracts, entries, and other papers; issue such instructions; delegate such functions; and perform such other acts as they may determine necessary in the administration or enforcement of the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 6. (a) The Commissioners shall establish a schedule of maximum fees which may be charged by employment agencies in the District of Columbia. Each employment agency shall issue a receipt acknowledging payment of any such fee received by it.

(b) Where any applicant for employees or employment who has paid a fee to any employment agency fails to secure or refuses to accept employees or employment, as the case may be, such fee shall be returned by the agency within three days after a written demand by the applicant. If, due to no fault of such applicant or because the employee or the employment is other than as represented by the employment agency, employment is discontinued within thirty days, all fees paid pursuant to subsection (a) of this section by such applicant in excess of the applicable maximum for the period worked shall be returned within three days, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays, after a written demand by the applicant.

SEC. 7. Each employment agency shall (1) keep and maintain such accurate and comprehensive records of all information, reports, and transactions relating directly or indirectly to the business of such agency as the Commissioners may by regulation require; (2) post or display conspicuously at each place it conducts business the license required under section 2 of this Act, together with other information as the Commissioners may by regulation require; (3) file a schedule of fees in duplicate with the Commissioners, who shall determine that the fees set in the schedule are not in excess of those established by the Commissioners pursuant to section 6(a) of this Act; and (4) post or display conspicuously a copy of such schedule of fees approved by the Commissioners at each place it conducts business.

SEC. 8. It shall be the duty of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to administer and enforce the provisions of this Act. In carrying out such duty the Commissioners shall be authorized—

(1) to make all necessary inspections and do all other things necessary to the proper effectuation and enforcement of this Act;

(2) to enter and inspect any premises where an employment agency carries on its business;

(3) to have access to, and the right to copy, information pertinent to the administration and enforcement of this Act from all records, documents, or other papers relating to the business of such agency;

(4) to hold hearings without being bound by the technical rules of evidence and prescribe rules of procedure therein;

(5) to take an assignment of any claim arising under this Act against any employment agency.

SEC. 9. (a) The Commissioners may, after reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard, refuse to issue a license to, or renew the license of, any applicant under this Act, if they determine that such applicant has failed to comply with any provision of this Act or any rule, regulation, or order issued pursuant thereto.

(b) The Commissioners may, after reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard, revoke or suspend for any period any license issued or renewed under this Act, if they determine that the holder of that license has failed to comply with any provision of this Act or any rule, regulation, or order issued pursuant thereto.

(c) Any person aggrieved by any final order of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia denying, refusing to renew, revoking, or suspending a license of a private employment agency under subsection (a) or (b) may obtain a review of such order as provided under subsections (e) and (f) of section 7 of the Act of April 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 195).

(d) Paragraph 5, of subsection (e) of section 7 of the Act of April 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 195), is amended to read as follows:

"(5) Any final order of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia denying, refusing to renew, revoking, or suspending a license of a private employment agency under the provisions of section 9 of the District of Columbia Private Employment Agency Act;".

SEC. 10. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, paragraphs 42 through 42l, inclusive, of section 7 of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and three, and for other purposes", approved July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 628), as amended, and any provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the keeping of employment agencies in the District of Columbia where fees are charged for procuring employment or situations", approved June 19, 1906 (34 Stat. 304), which are in effect on the effective date of this Act are hereby repealed.

(b) The repeal of such paragraphs and provisions shall not affect any warrant, prosecution, action, suit, proceeding, or liability of any kind or nature, civil or criminal, brought or existing on the day immediately preceding the date of such repeal. Any such warrant, prosecution, action, suit, proceeding, or liability shall be heard and determined in accordance with such paragraphs and provisions in the same manner and to the same extent as if they had not been repealed.

(c) Any individual who, on the effective date of this Act, holds a valid license issued under such paragraph 42 shall be permitted to continue to do business as authorized by that license for a period of not to exceed thirty days following the effective date of this Act; except that the holder of that license shall otherwise comply with the provisions of this Act. Any person holding such a license on such effective date shall receive a pro rata refund of the annual fee paid for such license based on the unexpired portion of such license remaining upon the expiration of such thirty-day period.

SEC. 11. Any person failing to comply with any provision of this Act or with any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder, or interfering with, impeding, or obstructing in any manner the Commissioners in the performance of their official duties under this Act, shall be guilty of a violation of this Act and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $2,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both. All prosecutions for violations of this Act, or regulations made pursuant thereto, shall be conducted in the name of the District of Columbia by the Corporation Counsel or any of his assistants. As used in this Act the term "Corporation Counsel" means the attorney for the District, by whatever title such attorney may be known, designated by the Commissioners to perform the functions prescribed for the Corporation Counsel in this Act.

SEC. 12. (a) There is hereby established an Employment Agency Advisory Board, which shall consist of three members appointed by the Commissioners as follows:

(1) one member to be appointed from the District of Columbia Department of Licenses and Inspections to represent the public;

(2) one member who shall be a person who owns and operates an employment agency in the District of Columbia to represent employment agencies in the District of Columbia;

(3) one member who shall be a personnel executive to represent employers in the District of Columbia.

(b) Members of the Board shall be appointed for terms of one year and may, in the discretion of the Commissioners, be reappointed for additional terms. The Commissioners shall designate one member to be Chairman. Any vacancy on the Board shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) Members of the Board shall serve without compensation as such. The Commissioners are authorized to pay reasonable expenses necessarily incurred by the Board in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act on vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(d) It shall be the duty of the Board, if requested by the Commissioners, to advise and make recommendations to the Commissioners with respect to all matters (including applications for licenses or complaints) relating to employment agencies in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 13. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Commissioners by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of the Commissioners may be delegated by them in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

SEC. 14. This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Private Employment Agency Act".

SEC. 15. This Act shall take effect on the sixtieth day following the date of its enactment.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1721) to amend the Small Business Act to prohibit certain discriminatory practices by business enterprises receiving assistance under such act, which I introduced on June 17, 1963 (on behalf of myself and other Senators).

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CREATION OF 11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the names of the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1876) to provide for the creation of an 11th judicial circuit to be comprised of Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington, and for the circuit judges constituting the 9th and 11th circuits, which I introduced on July 16, 1963, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTEREST RATES ON CERTAIN LOANS MADE BY THE TREASURY TO DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 10, 1963, the name of Mr. BENNETT was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 1855) relating to the interest rates on loans made by the Treasury to the Department of Agriculture to carry out the programs authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, introduced by Mr. DOMINICK on July 10, 1963.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF BRUCE R. THOMPSON TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, July 30, 1963, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Bruce R. Thompson, of Nevada, to be U.S. district judge, district of Nevada, Vice John R. Ross, deceased.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FRANK KOWALSKI TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, July 26, 1963, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, before the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and other internal security laws, on the nomination of Frank Kowalski, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, for term expiring August 9, 1966.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BREWSTER:

Statement prepared by him on the Washington, D.C., International Race.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 582) to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5279) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 7, and 10 to the bill and concurred therein.

The message further announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 513) authorizing the President to proclaim the week beginning July 28, 1963, as Veterinary Medicine Week, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 2998) to amend title 10, 14, and 38, United States Code, with respect to the award of certain medals and the Medal of Honor Roll, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

VETERINARY MEDICINE WEEK

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the House has passed House Joint Resolution 513, to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning July 28, 1963, as Veterinary Medicine Week. Because of the time factor involved, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be held at the desk until I can confer with the two other members of the subcommittee. I am sure that no controversy is involved in the joint resolution; and perhaps we can arrange to have it given immediate consideration by the Senate.

The joint resolution comes here with the support of a great and good veterinarian from the great State of Texas, who is the president of this association, which has some 17,000 members.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished minority leader in this connection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The joint resolution will be a recognition of the 100th anniversary of veterinary medicine in this country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I join in the request of the distinguished minority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will be held at the desk, as requested.

Mr. DIRKSEN subsequently said: Mr. President, there is a time factor involved in connection with a joint resolution which comes to us from the House. It is a House Joint Resolution 513.

The American veterinarians are observing their 100th anniversary. The celebration will be staged in New York in the week beginning July 28. This matter has the concurrence of the members of the subcommittee involved. It was unanimously passed by the House. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 513) authorizing the President to proclaim the week beginning July 28, 1963, as Veterinary Medicine Week, which was read twice by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 513) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MORTIMER CAPLIN, TAX AUTHORITY

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I know of no less likely a villain than Mortimer Caplin, whose distinction as a tax authority is matched only by the good grace with which he performs—and reforms—as the Nation's chief tax collector.

Nevertheless, many of the Nation's restaurateurs, nightclub owners, hotel keepers, and possibly even yacht builders would have us believe that Commissioner Caplin is the 20th century incarnation of the blackhearted royal tax collector whose excess of collecting zeal doubtless contributed to the vigor of the French Revolution. What has the Commissioner done to merit this abuse? Simply to require that business expense deductions be restricted to business expenses—that other taxpayers no longer be called upon to take up the taxes lost on "items which are essentially social or living expenses."

Victor Riesel, noted labor reporter, put to Commissioner Caplin the complaint that the new expense account regulations "have cut jobs and profits." The Commissioner's answer outlines, simply and clearly, the goals and basic standards of the new "T. & E."—travel and entertainment—regulations, and comments on the industry's fears:

I think it clear that certain expense account abuses are being curtailed. And, to the extent this is so, any hotel or restaurant which had previously received income from these violations of the tax law would experience a reduction in operations. But this is not the full story.

Part of the fall-off in receipts is due to an overreaction to the new law; and part, to the decisions of some employers to use this as an occasion to carefully monitor all travel and entertainment expenditures of their businesses.

Also, there is some misunderstanding and confusion over the operations of the new law. We have sought to explain the statute and regulations by various releases and speeches, and we plan to do more in the future.

The National Restaurant Association has taken the position that "the new expense account regulations, if they are understood, should not hurt restaurant sales."

So that these regulations may be more widely understood, and so that Commissioner Caplin will no longer be unjustly misunderstood, I ask unanimous consent that the article "Inside Labor" be reprinted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

INSIDE LABOR—INTERNAL REVENUE CHIEF ASSERTS NEW TAX RULES SHOULD NOT AFFECT INCOME OF THOSE CATERING TO TRAVEL AND ENTERTAINMENT

(By Victor Riesel)

Labor leaders, restaurateurs, and the modern innkeepers have complained that the new expense account rulings of the Internal Revenue Service have cut jobs and profits. No one is better equipped to know of these matters than Mortimer Caplin, Commissioner of Internal Revenue. I asked him to reply to such complaints. Here is his advice:

"BY MORTIMER M. CAPLIN, U.S. COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

"WASHINGTON, D.C.—Legitimate business activities of hotels and restaurants should not be hampered by the 1962 law on travel and entertainment deductions. This law and the accompanying regulations are aimed solely at curbing abuses of 'expense account living' that have plagued the country in recent years.

"Almost every tax specialist who has studied the legislation has concluded that the regulations are very fair and reasonable. They reflect a liberal approach, while remaining consistent with the statute passed by Congress. On record keeping, they approximate the requirements that well-run businesses have been using for years.

"The new travel and entertainment statute, enacted in October 1962, has two principal goals:

"1. To abolish the 'Cohan' rule, which permitted deductions based on estimations and uncorroborated statements of taxpayers.

"2. To deny deductions for items which are essentially social or living expenses.

"The new law provides that—so long as expenditures meet the old 'ordinary and necessary' business standard—travel and entertainment costs will be deductible if they fit into any one of three basic provisions of the statute:

"1. If there is an active, legitimate business discussion during the entertainment period; or

"2. If goodwill entertainment is being provided directly before or after a substantial and bona fide business discussion; or

"3. If food and beverage is being provided to a business associate for goodwill purposes in an atmosphere where there are no substantial distractions. (This is the 'quiet business meal exception' which is of such importance to restaurants and hotels.)

"To put it in plain language, business expenses at hotels and restaurants are deductible under the new statute as follows:

"1. The new law is virtually the same as the old with respect to entertaining business guests at a meal in a typical restaurant. This form of goodwill entertaining does not require an actual business discussion.

"2. When directly before or after (a) a substantial and legitimate business discussion, or (b) a business session of a typical convention, nightclub entertainment of business guests is deductible in virtually the same manner as under prior law.

"3. So long as the husband's entertainment expenses are deductible, there is no change in the law with respect to entertaining wives of the taxpayer and his business guests in restaurants or in nightclubs.

"4. The cost of banquets at the typical business convention is deductible whether entertainment is provided or not. Similarly, the cost of a 'hospitality suite' at a convention is deductible in the same manner as under prior law.

"The National Restaurant Association has publicly said: 'The new expense account regulations, if they are understood, should not hurt restaurant sales.'

"If this is so, it might be asked, 'Why are certain restaurants feeling the pinch?'

"In response, I think it clear that certain expense account abuses are being curtailed. And, to the extent this is so, any hotel or restaurant which had previously received income from these violations of the tax law would experience a reduction in operations. But this is not the full story.

"Part of the fall-off in receipts is due to an overreaction to the new law; and part, to the decisions of some employers to use this as an occasion to carefully monitor all travel and entertainment expenditures of their businesses.

"Also, there is some misunderstanding and confusion over the operation of the new law. We have sought to explain the statute and regulations by various releases and speeches, and we plan to do more in the future.

"Most of the restaurateurs I've spoken to follow the view recently expressed by the Florida Motel Association:

"'We want to see * * * (our) industry prosper—but we want more to see it successful, based on income and practices from legitimate and honest sources.'

"They want everything they're legitimately entitled to, and nothing more. This is all their responsible employees are asking for, too.

"These views provide a firm basis for our joining forces and working together:

"To make sure that legitimate business activity is not hampered;

"To communicate to the public on the business deductions legally allowable; and

"To communicate to Internal Revenue personnel on the need for fair, reasonable and commonsense administration of the new law and regulations.

"Cooperation and a reasonable approach by both tax administrator and taxpayer will assure curbing abuses, allowing proper business deductions, and serving the best interests of the Nation."

PRESBYTERIAN STAND ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the quest for Negro equality must not be made a partisan issue. Certainly, no political, economic, or religious segment of the American people can pretend to monopolize the pursuit of social justice.

This basic principle is expressed in the text of a forthright appeal which I received this week from the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church.

These church leaders write:

> In times of overriding national crisis in the past both our executive and legislative branches of Government have been able to put Government above party. The moral dimensions of our present crisis are sharp and clear. The consequences of failure are unmistakable.

The Presbyterian leadership vows its determination to go "beyond pronouncements" assuming "full responsibility for ending the discrimination and segregation affecting American citizens of color." They ask of us in Congress only that we do as much in accepting our "full responsibility."

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the leadership of the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church be printed at this point in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Philadelphia, Pa., July 15, 1963.

Hon. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The deepening moral crisis in all dimensions of our common life due to the exclusion of Negroes and other minority persons from full participation has erupted into a full-scale social revolution. This is a crucial hour for the U.S. Congress, as for all other institutions in our land.

The time for deploring, for placing blame, for temporizing, for seeking credit, has passed. If every segment of our national life does not now assume its full responsibility for ending the discrimination and segregation affecting American citizens of color, we may find that history has left us in its dust.

Recently, the major religious bodies have gone beyond pronouncements. They have allocated proportionately large sums of money and appointed special commissions with staff and budget to bring their own institutional practices in line with their public utterances. They have recognized that only a massive assault on segregation and discrimination within their own inner structure is equal to the urgent demands of God and the events of the times.

As we seek to correct our own failures, we appeal to the legislative branch of our government in these extraordinary circumstances to accept its crucial role in rectifying the injustices of 3 centuries.

We do not claim to be political statesmen. But we do believe the American people are politically sophisticated enough to recognize the temptation of both political parties to try to derive political advanage from the civil rights struggle. While this temptation is understandable as normal to the noble art of politics, it is obvious that our situation is not normal. It has changed drastically. There is no time for "politics as usual."

Neither party can pass effective civil rights legislation by itself. Therefore neither should attempt to claim credit if the effort is successful. But elements in either party can effectively block a major step in the solution of our Nation's most vital domestic problem. If meaningful and effective civil rights legislation is not enacted by this session of Congress in time to permit it to go on and deal with other vital issues, or if systematic efforts to make one party look "good" and the other "bad" are indulged in, irreparable damage will be done.

In times of overriding national crisis in the past both our legislative and executive branches of Government have been able to put country above party. The moral dimensions of our present crisis are sharp and clear and the consequences of failure are unmistakable. We have confidence that the vast majority of our legislators can rise to the demands of the present occasion.

The hour for greatness is upon the Congress of the United States, as it is upon all of us. We pray that you will do everything in your power to enable the Congress to be equal to that hour, and to enact promptly a program of civil rights that is both effectual and enforceable.

Yours sincerely,

EUGENE CARSON BLAKE,
Stated Clerk of the General Assembly.
THEOPHILUS M. TAYLOR,
Secretary of the General Council.
JOHN COVENTRY SMITH,
General Secretary,
Commission on Ecumenical Mission and Relations.
KENNETH G. NEIGH,
General Secretary,
Board of National Missions.
WILLIAM A. MORRISON,
General Secretary,
Board of Christian Education.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO AT LEOPOLDVILLE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, today the Senate is highly honored to have present in the Chamber the President of the Senate of the Republic of the Congo, Hon. Isaac Kalonji. On behalf of the Senate I welcome this distinguished gentleman to the Senate Chamber and to the United States. He is here on a tour of good will and observation that will take him to many areas of our country. We know that the people of the Congo have had many difficulties, and we rejoice in the fact that they have their independence and freedom. We rejoice in the fact that they maintain and cherish a democratic parliamentary system which was inaugurated with countrywide elections.

I take this occasion to express my feelings of great personal gratification that the United States has stood so firmly in support of the Central Government of the Congo during the first arduous years of national independence. Few countries in the world have endured such a storm of troubles immediately after the achievement of independent status—I am proud of the fact that our own Nation was one of those few. Yet the Republic of the Congo has faced and it has surmounted manifold separatist movements, constant external dangers, and crippling internal weaknesses resulting from the abrupt ending of a paternalistic colonial regime.

Much praise is due the United Nations Organization for its steadfast support of the struggling new member of the family of free nations. Within that context, the United States rightfully has a share in the credit for the preservation of a unitary state in the strategic central portion of Africa. But our praise and gratification should be directed in largest measure by far to the Congolese people themselves and to their leaders—of whom one of the foremost is here with us today.

Above all, we should honor Premier Adoula for his strength, patience, flexibility, and courage. I literally do not know how his country and the free world could have managed without him. And I hope the President of the Congolese Senate will convey to the Prime Minister of his country our respect and our admiration.

We extend to the President of the Senate of the Republic of the Congo our sincere good wishes and felicitations, and welcome him to our country and to the Congress.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago the United States celebrated the 187th year of her independence. Four days ago, the French commemorated the anniversary of Bastille Day. It seems altogether proper that, at this time of year, we should observe Captive Nations Week.

Mr. President, there are 300 million people living in captive nations. These are peoples with indigenous traditions, languages, and cultures. War has ravaged many of these lands for centuries. First by one power and then by another, their land has been partitioned and parceled out; their populations have been fragmented; their resources have been drained and depleted. In short, oppression and tyranny are not new to these peoples.

The Communist subjugation of these areas is far more repugnant than past despotism. More than just land and people and resources, the Communists also seek to consume the minds of their captives. This is the disgracefully distinguishing characteristic of Communist totalitarianism. Previous oppressors have demanded only submissive actions; the Communists demand servile minds. The Communists want not only the wealth of a nation, but also its spirit.

Now and again, to their immense credit, these captive nations have demonstrated that, though their lands are occupied and their borders closed, the Communists have neither consumed their spirit nor suppressed their longing for freedom.

Let us salute these noble people; let us hallow the enduring spirit of Kossuth and Kosciusko; and let us remind ourselves that, in the words of Thomas Paine, "those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it."

RESOLUTION OF JAMAICA PROGRESSIVE LEAGUE OF NEW YORK CITY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution unanimously adopted at a mass meeting held by the Jamaica Progressive League of New York City recently.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it has been the consistent policy of the United States to accord nonquota immigration status to all the independent countries of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas the dominions of Jamaica and Trinidad-Tobago, both located in the Western Hemisphere, became independent in August 1962; and

Whereas Jamaica, immediately after achieving independence, demonstrated its friendship for the United States by voluntarily offering military bases on its territory to the United States; and

Whereas despite being independent the two new dominions are still kept on colonial immigration quotas in contrast to the nonquota status of all the other independent nations of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas the application of two contrasting immigration policies to the independent nations of this hemisphere constitutes a departure from established American immigration policy, and is a humiliating discrimination against the two new dominions and damaging to inter-American unity: Be it

Resolved, That this mass meeting held at St. Luke's Episcopal Church, New York City, on June 9, 1963, fully supports Senate Resolution 747 and H.R. 6238 to amend the Walter McCarran Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 and accord uniform and equal immigration status to all the independent countries of the Western Hemisphere; be it further

Resolved, That copies of the above resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Department of Justice, the American and West Indian press, and to all such persons and media likely to secure support for the objectives of the resolution.

U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SUPPORT OF TRADE EXPANSION ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate an important statement of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in support of legislation under which tariffs on selected categories of industrial products here and abroad could be traded out up to 100 percent with great benefit to our own and free world trade.

Specifically, the chamber announced its support of an amendment to the Trade Expansion Act "which would grant U.S. tariff negotiators authority to bargain the total elimination of duties on specified industrial product categories with any other industralized nation or nations of the free world. The chamber specifically urges such negotiations between Canada and the United States under GATT." I introduced such an amendment to the Trade Expansion Act, S. 602, on January 30, which would provide the President with authority to eliminate duties on industrial products with any industralized country of the free world.

The authority under the Trade Expansion Act granted the President to eliminate duties under the act was specifically directed to trade between the United States and the European Common Market, which, due to the veto of the United Kingdom's admission to the EEC is now without meaning.

I believe the authority presently available to our negotiators—to lower U.S. tariffs by 50 percent over a 5-year period—will prove to be insufficient to the task of dealing with the EEC. This was already clear during the difficult negotiations encountered in May between the United States, and the EEC and once again is creating difficulties at current negotiations to deal with tariffs on agricultural products and other matters.

Therefore, I once more urge that Congress give my amendment serious and immediate consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that the announcement of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in support of authority to trade out reduction of duties on industrial products up to 100 percent between the United States and any free world industrial country, pursuant to my amendment, as well as the article discussing these current negotiating problems which appeared in the New York Times on July 17 and entitled "United States and France Still Sharply Split on Trade" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the announcement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES—ANNOUNCEMENT

WASHINGTON, July 4.—Legislation under which tariffs on selected categories of industrial products here and abroad could be eliminated has the support of the chamber of commerce of the United States, Robert P. Gerholz announced today.

Mr. Gerholz is chairman of the chamber's Canada-United States committee.

"The chamber supports an amendment to the Trade Expansion Act," Mr. Gerholz said, "which would grant U.S. tariff negotiators authority to bargain total elimination of duties on specified industrial product categories with any other industrialized nation or nations in the free world.

"The chamber specifically urges such negotiations between Canada and the United States under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade."

This recommendation, was approved by the chamber's board of directors when it met here last Friday.

The Trade Expansion Act, Mr. Gerholz explained, was written to permit elimination of some industrial product tariffs by the United States and Common Market nations. But the act was predicated on England's joining the Common Market. Since England's entry was blocked, the act must be amended, he said, if this authority is to be applied to any significant range of industrial products.

This and other recommendations for national chamber support of measures aimed at closer economic cooperation between the United States and Canada were made to the national chamber by the U.S. section of the Canada-United States Committee, a binational group of business leaders sponsored jointly by the Canadian and national chambers. The directors of the Canadian chamber on May 10 approved similar committee's recommendations.

The national chamber directors also approved a recommendation of the U.S. section calling for Canadian chamber support for Canadian membership in the Organization of American States (OAS), to further Western Hemisphere cooperation.

The two chambers, Mr. Gerholz said, joined in urging their Governments to establish a joint committee "to study ways and means of overcoming existing non-tariff trade barriers in the interest of stimulating the flow of trade between the two countries."

At their meeting Friday, the directors of the national chamber, Mr. Gerholz said, urged the U.S. Government to take "the most nonrestrictive position possible" in forthcoming GATT negotiations and avoid "actions which would restrict trade."

ARTICLE FROM THE CANADA-UNITED STATES COMMITTEE, NEW ORLEANS, LA., MARCH 21–22, 1963

The Canada-United States Committee strongly favors expanded trade between our two nations, and recommends the following steps toward this goal:

1. The respective chambers of commerce of the United States and Canada should urge upon their Governments the most nonrestrictive position possible at forthcoming international negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Specifically, the United States Chamber should urge the U.S. Government to place the most nonrestrictive possible interpretation upon the U.S. Trade Expansion Act of 1962, and avoid wherever possible the application of its authority to take actions which would restrict trade.
2. The United States Chamber should urge the U.S. Government to exercise its authority to negotiate up to 50 percent reductions in U.S. import duties in exchange for reciprocal and equitable concessions.
3. The Canada-United States Committee urges a study of the specific effects on Canadian and United States industries of tariff reductions on broad categories of goods rather than on an item-by-item basis, with a view toward determining United States and Canadian Chamber support for across-the-board cuts.
4. The United States Chamber should support an amendment to the Trade Expansion Act which would grant U.S. tariff negotiators authority to bargain total elimination of duties on specified industrial product categories with any other industrialized nation or nations in the free world, and should specifically urge such negotiations between Canada and the United States under the GATT. In turn, the Canadian Chamber should support Canadian Government encouragement of specialization within industrial groups in Canada in order to realize full benefit of tariff elimination.
5. The United States Chamber should support the Trade Expansion Act authority to negotiate zero tariffs on those products which carry 5 percent or lower ad valorem duty rates and study the results of this action.
6. The respective chambers should urge their governments to establish an official joint committee—preferably a subcommittee of the existing ministerial Canada-United States Committee—to study ways and means of overcoming existing nontariff trade barriers in the interest of stimulating the flow of trade between the two countries. Meanwhile, the two chambers should urge their local chambers to extend helpful services to United States and Canadian companies whose two-way trade is impaired by such restrictions, with a view toward minimizing the effects of these restrictions. The two chambers should urge their respective governments to study the effects on our countries of joining the intergovernmental customs cooperation council, if ratification of such membership is considered by the respective governments.

On its part, the U.S. section further urges to the Canadian section that:

The Canadian Chamber impress upon its government the need and desirability of joining the Organization of American States. The U.S. section recognizes Canada's unique position and its contributions to Western Hemisphere cooperation and, because of critical trends, views the time as now for Canada to assume its rightful role in the councils of hemispheric leadership. The U.S. section also urges both chambers to participate actively in current studies and discussions among leading nongovernmental experts who are working on ways and means to develop greater economic strength in the hemisphere and most especially on the critical problems facing Latin America.

[From the New York Times, July 17, 1963]

United States and France Still Sharply Split on Trade; Germany Accepts Paris Plan on Grain Prices—Herter Visit Fails To Result in Changes of Positions on Two Key Issues

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

Paris, July 16.—Sharp disagreement on two key trade issues between the United States and France remained today following the visit here of Christian A. Herter, President Kennedy's special representative for trade negotiations.

It was learned that, in a lengthy confrontation yesterday, there was little sign of movement in the position of either side. In the background lies the fate of the "Kennedy round" of tariff negotiations, with deep political overtones.

The first issue, directly connected with the Kennedy round, involved the technical, but important, question of a formula for reducing tariffs. The clash has come over the first of several problems to be solved—that of the disparities in the tariff structures of the United States and the Common Market.

The second issue concerned only France. It involves French import quotas—as distinct from tariff rates—on fruits and vegetables, fresh and canned.

On the tariff question, the two sides interpret entirely differently a vaguely worded compromise agreement reached at Geneva in May at a ministerial meeting of the member countries of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The issue concerns the existence in the U.S. tariff structure of several very high duties, as well as very low ones. Nearly all Common Market duties fall in a medium range, between 10 and 25 percent.

The Common Market, led by France, wants a formula that would cut the high American duties by a greater percentage than the general average of cuts in the Common Market duties.

CONDITION FOR REDUCTIONS

The agreement at Geneva said "disparities" should be reduced, by some general and automatic formula, when they were "meaningful in trade terms."

When negotiations resumed after the ministerial meeting the United States offered a formula whose effect, according to the French, would be to leave intact most of the disparities.

The Common Market countries will meet this week to try to agree on a counter formula, and negotiations will resume next week. The members of the Common Market, whose official name is the European Economic Community, are France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg.

France will stick firmly by her position that it is impossible to measure "meaningful in trade terms" and that nearly all disparities should be reduced by an automatic formula based on the size of the tariff. Mr. Herter continues to resist this view.

NO SIGN OF COMPROMISE

This issue must be solved before the Kennedy round can begin. Although a compromise is possible, there is still no sign of one.

On the fruit and vegetable question, the French freely admit that the legal case favors the United States. France is obliged, according to a strict interpretation of the GATT rules, to liberalize her quotas for imports of these products.

The French refuse to obey because of domestic difficulties with French farmers and because the import quotas against the United States are necessary to enable France to carry out trade agreements with Algeria and Morocco.

The French argue that the United States, too, violates at least the spirit of GATT when political pressures are strong, as in the case of the "voluntary" restrictions of imports of cotton textiles.

FRANCE MAKES OFFER

France has offered to liberalize a small number of quotas. Mr. Herter and President Kennedy have the choice of accepting this token offer or using the American right under GATT to raise the tariff on some products in which France is interested.

If the United States uses its retaliatory privilege and sharply raises several tariffs, the action would be bound to have bad psychological effects in advance of the Kennedy round, whose objective is to cut tariffs.

European countries take the view that the GATT rules have been violated by practically every country in the case of agricultural products, and there would probably not be much sympathy for an American retaliatory action.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the annual observance of Captive Nations Week must serve to reaffirm our dedication to work for the freedom of the millions of people who are presently under the domination of Soviet Russia. As one of the sponsors of the original Captive Nations Week resolution, I believe that this is a time when we must support with vigor the fight now being carried on by the men and women who seek self-determination and liberty.

As long as people are held captive under the yoke of totalitarianism our efforts must never cease. Just as the Berlin wall is a physical reminder of our responsibility, so is the Iron Curtain an equally forceful reminder of what must be accomplished in eastern Europe.

The right of national self-determination is a part of our larger foreign policy and also a basic tenet of international justice. Captive Nations Week is one of the ways that the United States demonstrates that it cannot and will not accept the enslavement by the Soviet Union of nations which once enjoyed independence and freedom.

The observance of Captive Nations Week serves notice on Communists everywhere that we will not weaken in our resolve to help free the subjugated people of Europe, and also reassures the brave men and women in the captive nations that they are not forgotten. We will not stand by idly when so many people depend on our reassurances in order to keep alive the hope that they too will one day be able to share with free Europe in the heritage of freedom, liberty, and the democratic tradition.

Our bonds with the captive nations of the world go beyond those of diplomacy and sympathy; they are rooted in the blood ties of many of our outstanding citizens. Throughout our history we have opposed the domination of one nation by another, and unless we keep alive the concept of freedom in the hearts of men everywhere we will not be fulfilling our obligation as a leader for freedom and liberty, and justice in the world.

ARTICLES BY IRVING DILLIARD OF CHICAGO'S AMERICAN ON THE "DISUNITY" OR "SILENT" AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on June 28 I discussed in the Senate the history of the effort, by alert journalists, attorneys, and other patriotic Americans to warn the public as to the dangers of the three proposed amendments to the Constitution which have come to be called the "disunity" amendments. They have been so called because they attack the foundations of our Federal system.

These amendments—which would change article V of the Constitution so as to make obligatory the submissions for ratification of amendments sponsored by two-thirds of the State legislatures, eradicate the Supreme Court's decision in *Baker* v. *Carr*, and establish a "Court of the Union" with power to overrule decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court—also have been called the "silent" amendments because they were pushed through the legislatures of quite a few States largely without public notice.

In my opinion, the thoughtful and watchful citizens who early warned the public about the campaign for these amendments deserve the thanks of all Americans. The well-known newspaper columnist of Chicago's American, Mr. Irving Dilliard, was one of the first to issue this warning, beginning his series of articles on this matter as early as January of this year. I ask unanimous consent that four of Mr. Dilliard's articles which appeared in Chicago's American for January 31, February 21, April 7, and May 26, 1963, be printed in the Record along with my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Chicago's American, Jan. 31, 1963]

Federal System Under Attack

(By Irving Dilliard)

It is hard to know whether to treat seriously or dismiss as absurd a group of proposals to amend the U.S. Constitution being advanced wherever a State legislature is in session this year.

These amendments, were they approved, would destroy the Union in spirit and might actually break up the handiwork of the Founding Fathers, who bound the separate sticks of the States into a strong bundle through application of the principle of federalism.

Since the amendment resolutions involve so much potential damage, the only safe approach is to take the movement seriously. The resolutions have been approved by at least one State legislature, that of Arkansas. They are pending in Illinois and perhaps more than half the States.

NO NATIONAL DEBATE

The first resolution proposes a procedure through which States could start the amending process without consultation with Congress, and that would mean without national debate.

The second would shut the Supreme Court out of any further consideration of the injustices and inequalities in congressional and legislative redistricting.

The third would form a super "Court of the Union," comprising the chief justices of the 50 States highest courts. The new court would review, on the initiative of five State legislatures, "any judgment of the Supreme Court relating to the rights reserved to the States or to the people by the Constitution."

Apparently the second proposal is the bait which is intended to induce disgruntled legislators to attack our historic Federal system without thinking about what they are doing.

What is worse, the proposals have arrived at the State legislatures via the Council of State Governments, one of the worthy organizations in the field of State and local administration at 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago. All three proposals were approved by varying votes last December 6 at the 16th biennial General Assembly of the States.

TWO CARRIED EASILY

The proposal to bar the Supreme Court in redistricting tests and the one to set up a procedure for detouring around Congress in adopting amendments carried by votes of 26 to 10 and 37 to 4, respectively. The one for the so-called "Court of the Union" carried, 21 to 20.

Fortunately, some outstanding legal authorities have been stirred. Prof. Charles L. Black, Jr. of Yale prepared a brilliant analysis in which he calls the proposals shocking in that they would turn the Nation back into a confederation or league. Dean Jefferson B. Fordham of the Pennsylvania law school speaks of them as being of immediate concern.

In Illinois, the proposals were presented by a former speaker, Warren Wood, and referred to the House as a Committee of the Whole. He says the purpose is "to halt the drift of power to Washington." But Massachusetts' State Senate turned the supercourt proposal down, 37 to 0.

The Massachusetts example is excellent.

[From the Chicago's American, Feb. 21, 1963]

Proposals Need Public Forum

(By Irving Dilliard)

Why is it so easy to get the wrong things done in government when it usually is so hard to get the right things done?

Take, for example, the strange move to change the method of amending the U.S. Constitution so as to destroy the spirit of the Federal nature of the Union of the States.

There are three companion resolutions before more than 40 State legislatures. One would set up a super-Supreme Court to override decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. One would create a method of amending the Constitution that would bypass Congress. One would take from the Supreme Court authority to deal with cases arising from inequities in the districts from which legislators are elected.

RECEIVE LITTLE ATTENTION

These are momentous proposals. Yet they have had little attention in the newspapers and almost none on radio and television.

Meantime, two of the three proposals have been approved in the Illinois Senate, the Republicans generally voting for them and the Democrats generally against them. The Missouri House of Representatives has also approved two; the vote for the anti-Federal plan for amending the Constitution was 104 to 31.

Two legislatures have approved all three resolutions already. Arkansas approved first and Florida second. Massachusetts defeated this threat to our Federal system, and in Maryland the resolutions were not reported out of committee. And somewhat to their credit, the Illinois and Missouri chambers which approved two of the three proposals dropped the one to create a super-Supreme Court of State chief justices.

Who is really behind these proposals? It has been very hard to find out. The general assembly of the Council of State Governments voted for all three. Observers at the assembly meeting are quoted as saying they are "the handiwork of such stanch conservatives as William Chappell, Florida legislator, and Fred Gulick of the Kansas legislative council."

THURMOND TO SPONSOR BILL

In Washington, Senator Strom Thurmond, Democrat of South Carolina, once Dixiecrat nominee for President, has said he will submit the proposals to Congress in the form of a bill. That may prove a benefit, since discussion in Washington will provide a public forum which is now so sadly lacking.

It is plain this is another assault on the Supreme Court by those extremists who are rankled by decisions in the field of race relations and freedom of speech. The proposal to make a forbidden area of legislative redistricting is the "come-on" for legislators who may lose their seats if legislative chambers are fairly redistricted according to population.

These proposals are not party or sectional matters. They concern us all. The bar, education leaders, law teachers, and political science authorities all ought to be leading a public discussion. And the origin and true sponsorship ought to be revealed.

[From the Chicago's American, Apr. 7, 1963]

The Courage of Governor Reynolds

(By Irving Dilliard)

Gov. John Reynolds of Wisconsin is a public official with courage, conviction, and devotion to the historic Federal system on which Government in the United States is based. These qualities show crystal clear in the statement the new Wisconsin executive issued in opposition to the proposal to degrade the Supreme Court by creating a so-called Court of the Union.

The Court of the Union scheme is one of three proposed constitutional changes that are floating around State capitals which have legislative sessions in process at this time. The others would deny the Supreme Court any part in legislative redistricting and set up a means of amending the Constitution that would leave Congress on the sidelines.

After the super court measure passed the Republican-controlled lower chamber in Wisconsin, Governor Reynolds issued this statement with the intent of helping forestall it in the State senate:

"That serious consideration could have been given to this proposal in our State seems incredible to me. Its approval would bring disgrace to Wisconsin. The authors offend our intelligence if they expect us to believe that a court of 50 different men and 50 different political views could possibly produce the kind of impartial and consistent judicial decisions rendered by the U.S. Supreme Court."

COULD HAVE TAKEN EASY COURSE

Governor Reynolds did not hesitate to put his finger squarely on the origin of this destructive set of proposals. He said the whole stealthy venture represented a "last ditch attempt on the part of frustrated southern segregationists to avoid the consequences of Supreme Court decisions forcing them to guarantee equal rights to all citizens."

Why did this stand take courage? Because, like many other Governors, Governor Reynolds has his legislative difficulties and the easy course in such a matter is to say nothing. The legislative sponsors of these proposals in the Wiconsin Legislature could be expected to be sorely displeased with Governor Reynolds' forthright description of the monkey-wrench amendments. But if the politician would keep quiet the statesman would speak out, just as Governor Reynolds has done.

A FIRM STAND NEEDED

It is most regrettable that more Governors have not done just what the Wisconsin executive has done. For this is a responsibility of Governors just as much as seeing that their budgets are passed and appropriations are approved.

Indeed, if 10 or a dozen Governors—equally divided between the Democrats and Republicans—had jointly prepared and issued a statement denouncing these vindictive proposals, they could not possibly get to first base. Yet, as it is, no one is pulling together the scattered facts about the actions in the many State capitals. There is nothing remotely approaching a national discussion of the merits and demerits.

Is there no member of the Senate Judiciary Committee in Washington with the devotion to the Federal system, displayed at risk to his program, of Governor Reynolds of Wisconsin? We cannot expect the Eastlands on the committee to expose these amendments for what they are, but what about the Kefauvers?

Here is where a courageous protector of the Federal Union, such as the late Senator Thomas C. Hennings of Missouri, is missed. You can bet your bottom dollar that long before now Tom Hennings would have taken the Senate floor and alerted the country to the sneak play that is taking place behind the legislative scenes.

[From Chicago's American, May 26, 1963]

Douglas Bares a Sneak Attack

(By Irving Dilliard)

Senator Paul Douglas earned his pay for the entire session when he became the first Member of Congress, so far as a careful check shows, to expose the sneak play to undermine the historic Federal Union through a series of three proposed constitutional amendments.

The Illinois Democrat put in a nutshell the case against the three amendments that have passed in a surprising number of State legislatures and are now pending in others. Recalling earlier assaults on the Supreme Court, primarily because of its public school desegregation decision 9 years ago, Senator Douglas told his colleagues:

"Now the anti-Court forces have been mounting another attack, this time through applications for a series of proposed amendments to the Constitution which they have been quietly pushing in the States. But this time the attack is not simply on the Supreme Court, but on the intricate balances of the American Federal system. They would help to make this country a confederacy instead of a nation."

The senior Illinois Senator called attention to one of the gravest aspects of the stealthy campaign to change the means of amending the Constitution, to shut the Supreme Court out of legislative redistricting cases and to set up a so-called Court of the Court with power to override the Supreme Court. This is the fact that the public does not know how far this scheme has gone in the legislatures since January.

STATE ACTIONS KEPT MYSTERY

Because of failure of the news agencies to keep track of the approvals at the various State capitals, Senator Douglas has asked the Senate to find out how many States have approved each of the amendment proposals. The Illinoisan noted the strange circumstances that apparently "no system of reporting action in the States on applications for constitutional amendments has ever been established."

It still is hard to understand why so little attention was paid to this scheme to subvert the Constitution until recently. The present commentator has written four articles on it since the first of the year, the first having been in January. It said, as plain as words can, that "the Federal system is under attack."

KENNEDY TAKES A STAND

Other aspects of the sneak play—the strategy was to get the resolutions approved by the required number of legislatures before public discussion could be effective—were treated in subsequent articles in this space in March and April.

Be that as it may, President Kennedy has now taken a stand against the amendments. Chief Justice Warren and several of the associate justices, including Brennan and Goldberg, have spoken out against the lack of public debate and the need for much more information in the press and over radio and television.

PLIGHT OF MIGRATORY FARMWORKERS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the National Catholic Rural Life Conference has long been one of the foremost advocates of legislation to improve the lot of migratory farm citizens. On June 19, a new policy statement on migratory labor was adopted by the executive committee of the N.C.R.L.C., which succinctly summarizes the progress we have made in the migratory labor field—most notably, the House's recent refusal to extend Public Law 78—and which also directs attention to the serious problem areas such as unemployment and annual income in which no gains have yet been realized. I ask unanimous consent that this policy statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIGRATORY FARMWORKERS

For many years the National Catholic Rural Life Conference has been urging that this Nation face up to the requirements of justice and decency in dealing with the desperate human needs of migratory farmworkers. At this time when changes, both favorable and unfavorable, in the migratory labor picture are occurring with great rapidity, it seems appropriate that the conference make a new assessment of the situation and make recommendations for meeting current needs.

ENCOURAGING DEVELOPMENTS

During the past few years some of the developments in the migratory labor situation have been encouraging. Only a few weeks ago, in what seasoned observers have characterized as an upset, the House of Representatives voted down a proposed extension of the Mexican farm labor program. This victory for the forces of reform is being attributed largely to church groups, and in particular to the conference. After years of waging what most people considered a hopeless battle against the continuation of the bracero program, the conference and its allies can rightly take pride in this victory.

Last year another legislative victory was won in the passage by Congress of the first bill ever directed toward the specific needs of migrants. This was a migrant health program, which, though small almost to the point of insignificance, still represents a minor breakthrough. It proves that legislative remedies for the most urgent needs of migrants are not impossible, despite well-organized opposition to any reform or welfare measures.

Moreover, through vigorous and at times even courageous action on the part of the U.S. Department of Labor, wages for migrants in some parts of the country have been moderately improved.

Through both Government programs and those conducted by private agencies, such as the conference itself, a certain number of migrants have been given practical assistance in job retraining and resettlement in more stable family and community life.

Organized labor in recent years has made some small but encouraging advances in organizing into responsible unions at least a handful of seasonal workers in California and Louisiana. Moreover, the AFL–CIO is now putting its considerable weight into the legislative battles for reform.

It is encouraging also to observe the increased interest and activity on the part of Catholic and other religiously motivated groups. Outstanding among these should be mentioned the National Council of Catholic Women and the National Federation of Catholic College Students, local affiliates of which have been doing dedicated and effective work in meeting the immediate physical and spiritual needs of migrant workers.

Finally, perhaps the most important development has been the work of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, headed by Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, of New Jersey. With great skill and perseverance this subcommittee has been digging out the facts, spotlighting the areas where reform and welfare legislation is needed, formulating and proposing such legislation, and working with energy and dedication for the passage of the bills. Only last week six of Senator WILLIAMS' bills were passed by the Senate. These are bills to provide for educational assistance for migrant adults and children, day-care service for migratory children, child labor protection, crew leader registration, establishment of a national advisory council on migratory labor, and adequate sanitation facilities in the fields and in the camps. In addition four other bills are pending, of which at least on one or two, action can be hoped for in this session of Congress.

OTHER DEVELOPMENTS ARE DISCOURAGING

On the other hand, in many ways the situation of the migrant workers, rather than improving, is deteriorating. Mechanization is eliminating many jobs, particularly in cotton, and cutting down on the days of labor in those jobs still available. Last year, both the days worked by migrants and their annual income dropped significantly.

Moreover, the retraining and resettlement of ex-migrants by no means matches the accelerated flow into the migrant labor pool of ex-tenants, sharecroppers, and marginal farmers. Squeezed off the land by the harsh workings of the agricultural revolution, these unskilled and generally poorly educated members of mostly minority groups have had little choice except to flee to the misery of city slums or to join the migrants in seeking seasonal farm work.

Furthermore, loopholes in the general immigration law, Public Law 414, have been exploited by employers to bring in tens of thousands of Mexicans, purportedly as permanent U.S. residents, to do agricultural jobs for which no citizen labor is said to be available. Still further tens of thousands of Mexican citizens commute daily from across the border to jobs which otherwise would be open to American citizens.

Despite the brightening of the legislative picture, opposition to reform is still well organized and financed and more politically active than advocates of reform. The latter, though potentially strong, as proved by the Public Law 78 victory, are in fact still largely disorganized, only fitfully active, and politically weak. Too many otherwise decent citizens are either unaware of the migrants' misery or too little concerned to make their demands for justice heard and heeded. Despite the fact that letters to Congressmen are a most effective way to let their view to be known, few citizens take the trouble to write.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This, then is the situation as we see it. On the basis of our analysis of the facts and needs, and in accord with the principles outlined in Pope John's encyclical "Christianity and Social Progress" we make the following recommendations:

TERMINATE PUBLIC LAW 78

Even though the House has once refused to extend the bracero program under Public Law 78, efforts are even now underway in both the House and the Senate to revive the program. We most emphatically urge Congress to reject these efforts and urge that all citizens communicate with their Senators and Representatives their insistence that Public Law 78 not be reinstated. At a time when countless and increasing numbers of our own citizens find farm jobs, or any jobs, few and far between, when the average migrant finds less than 130 days of work a year for a yearly income of less than $1,000, it would be simply intolerable that we should continue to import masses of directly competing workers from Mexico.

We urge, moreover, that the appropriate departments of Government close up the gaping loopholes in Public Law 414 which employers have been exploiting to bring in tens of thousands of Mexicans as immigrants and commuters.

NOT ANTI-MEXICAN

We wish to make it as clear as possible that we do not intend or consider such steps as being antibracero or anti-Mexican. We have a deep and active concern over the almost incredible poverty of many of our Mexican neighbors, but we insist that assistance to them should not be at the cost of the poorest of our own citizens. We urge rather that through our foreign aid program, and particularly, through the Alliance for Progress, a more direct and effective attack be made on the causes of poverty in Mexico. We recommend generous and continued expenditure on a scale appropriate to Mexico's needs and capacity. Only thus will be eased the pressure of abject poverty which drives so many Mexicans to seek relief on this side of the border.

SUPPORT WILLIAMS' BILLS

We also most urgently recommend that concerned citizens put their full and continued effort into the passage of the package of bills prepared and sponsored by Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS.

In addition to those already passed by the Senate as indicated above and now pending before the House, there are four other bills which deserve and need our support. These bills include a voluntary farm employment program for citizen migrants, in many ways similar to the bracero program for Mexicans; a minimum wage for agricultural workers; coverage of agricultural workers by the National Labor Relations Act; and housing help for migrants.

The passage of these four bills would go a long way toward rectifying the unjust and harmful exclusion of agricultural workers from the protections and help which for many years have been available to most other U.S. workers.

DOMESTIC PEACE CORPS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in yesterday's press conference, President Kennedy emphatically reaffirmed his belief in the need for a domestic Peace Corps to work with the isolated, often neglected groups of people. There is no doubt that this administration is firmly committed to the program detailed by the National Service Corps bill, S. 1321.

I salute the President's concern over this issue of national importance and his recognition of the serious need for a nationwide effort to illuminate and alleviate the causes of poverty, ignorance, and disease throughout this country. As the President stated yesterday:

> There is a good deal of poverty in the United States, but not many people see it. * * * There are a great many areas where we need to do a good deal more: Indian reservations, parts of this country where school dropouts, slums, chronic poverty exist. Millions of Americans experience it. But they are scattered and frequently not able to bring their views to bear; all of us move in a rather different atmosphere, so we are not as aware of it as we should be, except statistically.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on the National Service Corps, I have had the worthwhile experience in conducting hearings on legislation—S. 1321—to establish a National Service Corps. My belief in the potential benefit that the Corps can provide our Nation has been confirmed over and over again during the past 2 months of hearings. Eloquent testimony, concerning the hardships and despair of our fellow human beings in this Nation has come from witnesses from all parts of the country. Businessmen, religious leaders, youth groups, labor organizations, and the social service agencies seeking to promote the well-being of each citizen, have given the National Service Corps their strong support.

These statements provided eloquent testimony about how the Corps could be a valuable adjunct to the overall effort to provide each American with the opportunity that each citizen needs and deserves. The desperate conditions in which one-sixth of our population lives should be firmly imprinted on the conscience of every American citizen. Unfortunately, however, too many Americans have not come to grips with the realities of life. I have been particularly concerned with the problems of migrant workers for a number of years, and have sought to make a more rewarding way of life possible for these unfortunate citizens. Many of my colleagues here have had similar concern over other persons: the mentally handicapped, school dropouts, the Indians, residents of slum areas; but few of us have been able to concentrate our attention and energies on all these areas in the kind of coordinated, locally directed effort needed to bring a new ray of hope into the lives of those who have no share in our Nation's prosperity.

The National Service Corps bill (S. 1321) will establish a sound, inexpensive means of getting to work on the unfinished business in the areas of need. Dozens of witnesses have told me not only of miserable conditions in this country's pockets of distress, but also have outlined specific services the Corps could perform in their own communities. I can assure you that the American citizens aid agencies already working on the problems in their communities are vitally interested in having this Corps and have given it their strong endorsement. They have stressed over and over the need for more hands, more hearts, and the value of a program to continue the struggle against poverty, deprivation, and despair. I urge you to make this program a matter for sincere, bipartisan consideration and support. The program is needed, it is wanted, and more than 30 million American citizens are waiting for us to make it possible.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on July 14 the American people began observance of Captive Nations Week, proclaimed by President Kennedy in accordance with Public Law 86–90. We who deliberate here, under the Statue of Freedom on our Capitol's dome, did well when we passed this resolution in 1959 to proclaim the third week in July as Captive Nations Week.

This year there could not be a more appropriate date to reaffirm our belief in independence and self-determination for all peoples than July 14, the unforgettable day on which France's symbol of tyranny, the Bastille, fell before the forces of freedom. As in past years, we take this occasion to rededicate ourselves to the goal of freedom for the captive nations.

At the end of World War II, the Soviet Union used its brutal military might to seize control of the nations of Eastern Europe. Human beings who had just suffered the agony of a terrible war under one totalitarian regime were forced under another cruel yoke. The Western Powers, who had gone to war with fascism to honor their obligations to the Polish people, were forced to watch a Communist government succeed the Nazi dictatorship, instead of the free democratic government which Poland had enjoyed between the two World Wars.

All over Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union similarly exploited its military victory. The Baltic States, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, all the other captive nations, fell victim to the ruthless Communist system. Today, 18 years after the end of World War II, Soviet armies and Soviet systems of control still remain in Eastern Europe.

Yet these 18 years of suppression have not destroyed the hope for liberty in the captive nations and in this time the Soviet Union has not succeeded in wiping out their national aspirations. The Roman Catholic Church continues to hold the loyalty of the great majority of the Polish people. The peoples of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, despite an intensive "sovietization" effort, have not lost their national languages and traditions. The Hungarian revolution of 1956 is still a bitter memory to us all, but in the future it may prove to be a Pyrrhic victory for the Soviet Union.

The talons of Soviet imperialism still cruelly grasp the captive nations of Europe, but they have not destroyed the pulse of hope for a life in freedom. To these stirrings for liberty we respond this week, and we can remind the world that just as the medieval walls of the Bastille could not finally stand against the oppressed people of France, so the Iron Curtain will someday fall.

Fortunately for humanity, time and the technology that every day brings the peoples of our planet closer together are on the side of liberty. We can see the gleam of freedom behind the Curtain, and one day we hope there will be no need to proclaim a Captive Nations Week. But until that day the American people will continue to support the aspirations of the peoples of Eastern Europe for self-determination and freedom.

Mr. President, all across the Nation this week a great many individuals, organizations, and publications have been speaking out on this vital issue. Among the eloquent statements of belief expressed in New Jersey were the editorials appearing in the Paterson Morning Call and the Plainfield Courier-News, which I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call, July 16, 1963]

THE WORLD'S CAPTIVE NATIONS MUST BE LIBERATED

This is the fifth annual observance of Captive Nations Week.

It is a time set apart by President Kennedy urging our citizens to devote themselves anew to the emancipation and freedom of all captive nations.

The observance brings into bold relief once again that millions of people live behind iron and bamboo curtains, enslaved by despots who deprived them of basic human rights.

Captive Nations Week brought violent reaction from Russian Premier Khrushchev when it was first proclaimed in 1958. He denounced the observance, for it alerted the world to the menace of communism and its ambition to bring all nations under its cruel domination.

Khrushchev is anxious to obtain the acquiescence of the United States and the free world to the permanent captivity of the enslaved nations of Central Europe, the U.S.S.R., and Asia.

Of course, he will be frustrated in that ambition, for this country's positive role in the cold war is a major impediment to Moscow's goal.

Captive Nations Week serves as a mirror of the Soviet Russian colonial empire which Khrushchev and his stooges want to conceal from the world at large.

We dare not buy the peddled notion that for a dubious peace we must accommodate Khrushchev. On the contrary, Americans must let our leaders know that we will fight the enslavement of people in any nation.

We share with captive people everywhere their desire for liberty and independence, and should do all we can as a nation to further their hopes of liberation.

So long as there are enslaved lands, the free world must strive ceaselessly to restore to them self-government and the liberties to which everyone is entitled.

[From the Plainfield (N.J.) Courier-News, July 15, 1963]

CAPTIVE NATIONS REMEMBERED

The observance of Captive Nations Week, July 14–20, was started 4 years ago following the unanimous passage of a joint congressional resolution which has now become public law, adopted by Congress in July 1959. The law provides that each year this Nation shall renew its pledge and continue its effort "until such times as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

The enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by the Communists makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between the peoples of the United States and other peoples.

When the spokesmen for Soviet Russia make ridiculous charges of colonialism against nations of the free world, the United States and others are aware of the subjugation of nations behind the Iron Curtain in Eastern Europe and in Asia. We are aware of the wall in Berlin, the denial of freedom in East Germany, and the aggressive acts of communism in Cuba, Latin America, and Africa.

These submerged nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedoms.

Captive Nations Week provides the American people with a chance to show the peoples of Eastern Europe that they are not forgotten. It provides our Government with a chance to capitalize on Soviet weakness by taking the initiative in the cold war.

It can do so by (1) retaining the issue of Hungary on the agenda of the United Nations, (2) raising the question of Soviet treaty pledges to hold free elections in Eastern Europe in all negotiations with the Kremlin, (3) placing the question of the denial of the right of self-determination to the peoples of East-Central Europe on the agenda of every session of the United Nations.

In short, Captive Nations Week is an excellent way to tell the Communists that we refuse to be buried and that we shall not compromise our innermost principles; that we intend to preserve peace and finally to attain the victory of freedom for all people.

UNIVERSITY OF OMAHA—EDUCATIONAL PIONEER

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, an article in the July 19 issue of Time magazine describes the University of Omaha's pioneering in educational methods by its use of the Tele-Lecture system. The university, its president, Dr. Milo Bail, and Mr. Michel Beilis, former director of this program at University of Omaha, are to be commended for an outstanding job of program research by a small university.

The University of Omaha adjusted to the changing times by utilizing 20th century technology. Limited by geography and funds, but long on ingenuity and resourcefulness, the university solved the problem of making topflight lecturers available to its students by the linkup of telephone and pictures. Now that the basic format has been developed, universities and industries all across the nation are inquiring as to possible uses. As Dr. Bail says in a recent issue of the Bell Telephone magazine:

> Because of the faith we have in the potential, we are eager not only to continue but to extend our Tele-Lecture program.

Tele-Lecturing has gained wide acceptance. Anthropologist Margaret Mead thinks it is:

> A magnificient and imaginative use of the techniques of the modern world. It lets men be several places almost at once—what I am sure is almost everyone's dream in this high pressured world.

This new horizon for education has great possibilities for development.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both the Time article and Dr. Bail's remarks in the Bell Telephone magazine be printed in the RECORD as a tribute to this fine work.

There being no objection, the article and remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Time magazine, July 19, 1963]

TEACHING: LECTURES ON THE PHONE

A segregationist Mississippi law forbids Negro State colleges to hire white teachers. Last week Moses Hadas, the famed Columbia University classicist, slipped around the law without ever leaving Manhattan. Picking up the telephone, he lectured for an hour through his luxuriant white beard to 500 rapt students at four Negro colleges in Louisiana and Mississippi. His subject: the religious roots of Greek drama. The phone bill was $100, a pittance paid by the Fund for the Advancement of Education, which thus demonstrated one of education's cheapest, handiest new ideas.

"Tele-Lectures" were pioneered at the University of Omaha, where Linguist Michel Beilis was saddled with the problem of luring big time lecturers to a distant and none-too-rich campus. Author Harry Golden, for example, set his price at "$1,500 just to lecture, $1,700 if I have to answer questions, $2,000 if I have to have cookies with the ladies." But by phone Beilis got the Golden word from North Carolina for a cutrate $214—$64 for the call and $150 for Harry. Omaha has since staged telelectures with eminences all over, from Anthropologist Margaret Mead in Manhattan to Psychologist B. F. Skinner at Harvard.

The technique is what telephone men call a "glorified conference call." From any phone, operators can arrange a call involving as many as five parties at station-to-station rates. For lectures, the phone company hooks an amplifier ($30 a month maximum) to the phone at the audience end. A microphone hooked to the same phone allows the audience to ask questions. Innovator Beilis, who now works for A.T. & T., is swamped with requests by colleges from Dartmouth to U.C.L.A. that want to swap star scholars by phone.

Classicist Hadas spoke to Negro high school teachers in the first of 18 telelectures on "Great Ideas in Antiquity," a credit course that uses a paperback library of classical drama (cost: $5.70). Mississippi's Jackson State College suggested the theme; the Fund for the Advancement of Education will spend $10,000 for the series. At Louisiana's Southern University, students prepped for a month and a 1-hour exam before Hadas even opened his mouth. Hadas considers the idea not as good as "a flesh-and-blood teacher, even a bad one." But since even a bad Hadas is unavailable to the Louisiana and Mississippi students, Hadas ended his first talk feeling "quite elated."

So did the fund, which, to make an extra point, bounced part of the program off Telstar II and showed that telelectures could be transmitted to darkest Africa as well as the South.

[From Bell Telephone magazine]

SHARING THE PROFESSOR BY TELEPHONE

(By Dr. Milo Bail, president, University of Omaha)

(A member of the executive committee of the National Committee of Accrediting, and past president of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Dr. Bail knows the importance of quality instruction and the perils of teacher shortage. In the 14 years he has been president, the University of Omaha has had significant development and growth in its academic offerings, the caliber of the faculty as well as in enrollment. Before this post, Dr. Bail was dean of the college of education and director of the University College at Butler University. He has also been a high school teacher and principal and supervisor of secondary education.)

What can we do to help relieve the acute teacher shortages developing in higher education?

How can we increase the effectiveness of our present faculty members?

How do you multiply the audience of the superior instructor?

How do you afford students the opportunity of contact with the great teachers of the Nation?

As administrators, such questions are always in the forefront of our thinking because it is our responsibility to find the right answers.

One approach we have tried at Omaha University is a variation of the "share-the-professor" plan. We have hopes that this may enable several institutions to share an outstanding professor, one which none of the institutions could afford by itself.

Right now at Omaha University, we're enthusiastic about developing one aspect of this idea. It is the "tele-lecture" which the people at Northwestern Bell describe as a "glorified conference call." During the last 2 years, several of our faculty members have experimented with the technique with considerable success.

For example, two world-famous Elizabethan scholars—one in London and the other at Cornell, delivered lectures during a class at Omaha University, which was shared with audiences at three other Midwestern schools: Drake University at Des Moines, Iowa; Midland College at Fremont, Nebr., and Wayne State at Wayne, Nebr. Sir John Neale, Astor professor, University of London, spoke from his office near London, and Dr. Frederick G. Marcham, of Cornell, spoke from Ithaca. The chairman of our history department, Prof. A. Stanley Trickett, gave the first of the three lectures and was moderator for the others, including the question-and-answer periods that followed.

For most small- to medium-sized colleges and universities, it is impossible to staff every position in every department with these experts in the field. It is also far too costly to bring these speakers to the campus from such distances. However, we must think of the great opportunities offered our students by such a program even if only on an enrichment basis.

LECTURERS LIKE IT

Many lecturers have been quick to see the advantages of delivering their Tele-Lectures to hundreds of students in various colleges coast to coast from their offices, thereby avoiding the discomforts and inconveniences of travel. Many have done so at greatly reduced fees. Since Tele-Lecturers are carried on the Bell System's regular long-distance network, the participating schools pay only the station-to-station rates for the length of time used, plus monthly charges for whatever extensions or other extra equipment is involved (and, of course, such honoraria as the lecturers may expect).

On two occasions, Anthropologist Margaret Mead has spoken to Omaha University evening audiences via Tele-Lecture. Both were part of our adult education program and in each the two-way question-answer period following her talk was most enthusiastic.

In conferences that we have arranged for business and professional groups, national authorities in various fields have been included on the programs by means of the telephone technique. The Union Pacific Railroad sponsored a series of Tele-Lectures last year in their management development program. A similar program is scheduled for next semester.

When a management conference was scheduled for Blue Cross-Blue Shield representatives this year, one of the speakers obtained was Prof. Wesley Wiksell of the Louisiana State University speech faculty.

Dr. Wiksell had finished a speaking engagement in New Orleans shortly before Tele-Lecture time. The letter he wrote to us afterward is typical of the response we've had:

"It was a pleasure being on your Tele-Lecture program. While my presentation may not have been as effective as actual face-to-face communication, had it not been for your Tele-Lecture technique, it would have been absolutely impossible for me to address your group in Omaha at that time.

"I certainly like your audience reaction (question and answer) approach which helped me to get at the interests of the members of the group.

"The reception was so clear that it seemed as though the audience was in a nearby room."

Author-Humorist Harry Golden was one of our earliest boosters after he discovered he could loosen his necktie, prop his feet on his own desk and talk to an Omaha audience without ever leaving North Carolina. His characteristic reaction: "After this simple chore I could go to the kitchen and get me some ice cubes." Mr. Golden is writing an introduction to a booklet that will explain the Tele-Lecture technique. It is being prepared with the cooperation of the people at Northwestern Bell.

In December, we will host a Tele-Lecture Conference at Omaha University, at which the various Bell Telephone Co.'s will have representatives, meeting with many college officials who are interested in this new technique. The National University Extension Association will sponsor the conference because of its interest in techniques which will extend the effectiveness of the university faculty. During past months, the association has kept close tab on our Tele-Lecture experiments. We're proud that NUEA chose Omaha University's director of conferences and short courses, Michel Beilis, to be chairman of this conference. It was through his ideas and groundwork that the Tele-Lecture concept was brought to my attention. The idea came to him while using a conference call to bring a speaker's voice to a campus audience from a distant city. I understand there have been other isolated instances in which the technique has been used, but apparently no institution has developed a continuing program.

When we discussed the idea with people at Northwestern Bell, they were anxious to try it but lacked any direct experience. So we've cooperated with them in experimenting with Tele-Lectures. Equipment has been installed at the university which was specially designed by Northwestern Bell engineers to solve some of the technical problems.

HELPING OTHERS

Now we are finding somewhat the same situation is developing elsewhere. Since we were the first to work with Tele-Lecturing, we are receiving requests for information from all over the country. Two recent letters are typical: E. I. du Pont's Development Division has asked us for details on the arrangements required and the cost involved in using Tele-Lectures for intercity industrial meetings. The University of California desires information on "the new type of programing * * * which features guest speakers via long distance telephone."

Colleges and universities as well as telephone companies in other parts of the country want to know more about the technique. Mr. Beilis has made numerous calls to his counterparts in other institutions and to telephone people in other parts of the country to describe what we've done and how it corresponds with what some university in their territory would like to try.

We are most anxious to investigate the broader use of the Tele-Lecture as an instructional technique to determine its effectiveness in solving other problems involved in multiplying our instructional manpower.

We see these possibilities: the share-the-professor technique could be used to enrich practically any course offered by the university, simply by inviting knowledgeable "guest lecturers" to participate from their own campuses. Virtually every school has an outstanding professor in one field or another to share with other institutions. A group of schools might well organize to share their most outstanding talent via Tele-Lecture.

We will give the program a classroom test next semester when the University of Colorado and the University of Omaha share professors for two regular 3-hour college credit classes which will meet three times a week at both schools. As Dr. William E. Jaynes, chairman of the Psychology Department at the University of Omaha, teaches an industrial psychology class to students at his own university, he will also be teaching 35 students on the Colorado campus. Immediately following this class, Dr. Keith E. Davis, assistant professor of psychology at Colorado, will teach a course in social psychology to 70 students in Boulder and 35 students on the University of Omaha campus. And at least twice during the semester, each professor will lecture at the other campus. Identical examinations will be given both classes at the same time. We have high hopes that this pilot program will give us information that will be of value in helping to overcome the teacher shortage.

A second use of Tele-Lecture which we hope to explore is in the offering of special courses as the need arises. For example, a course in Far Eastern affairs. Rather than appoint a special instructor for a limited assignment, or use one with lesser qualifications, we would search out the best qualified man available in one of the leading universities and have him teach the course by long distance telephone with the help of local audiovisual and monitoring services.

A third use of Tele-Lecture might be to bring the comments of an expert to our campus at the time some event of worldwide significance is in the news.

Such possibilities have prompted us to approach some of the major education foundations, seeking a grant of funds to broaden our experiments. Because of the faith we have in the potential, we are eager not only to continue but to extend our Tele-Lecture program.

TRIBUTE TO DEAN SNODGRASS OF HASTINGS COLLEGE OF LAW

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, David E. Snodgrass, dean of the Hastings College of Law in San Francisco since 1941, died last week at the age of 68.

Dean Snodgrass was a brilliant, spirited man—and his loss will be deeply felt throughout the legal profession.

As a lawyer, a graduate of the Hastings College of Law and as an admirer of David Snodgrass, I join with many others today in mourning the passing of this great educator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the following article from the San Francisco Chronicle of Thursday, July 11, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HASTINGS' DEAN SNODGRASS DIES

Dean David E. Snodgrass, of Hastings College of Law, died yesterday after open-heart surgery at Presbyterian Medical Center. He was 68.

He had been under treatment for aortic stenosis—hardening of the valves of the heart.

During his 22 years as head of the college at 198 McAllister Street, the hard-working, resourceful dean created a law faculty acknowledged to be one of the finest in the Nation.

He achieved high academic excellence at Hastings through a combination of unrelenting demands for student attention to learning and ingenious employment of distinguished professors of law discarded as too old by other law schools.

APPOINTED

He was appointed dean and Isaias W. Hellman professor of law in May of 1941. Within a few years, he displayed a characteristic vigor in his quest for total excellence at the institution, which then was located at 515 Van Ness Avenue in overcrowded quarters where students sometimes fainted for lack of oxygen.

"If the air in the zoo was as despicable as it is in that building," he angrily told State officials, "the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals would have broken into the zoo and smashed its windows."

In the first decade of his deanship, he encountered stiff criticism from the president of the Hastings Alumni Association. But, as the years passed, the college faculty achieved a quality that caused a former Harvard Law School dean, Roscoe Pound, to single it out for high praise.

IMPROVEMENTS

Dean Snodgrass improved the teaching level at Hastings by retaining men with vigorous legal minds who had been forced into retirement at other schools.

"A man who is qualified, able, experienced and fit to continue work when 64 should be not disqualified merely because he has another birthday," he said.

One of his typical displays of executive firmness occurred only 3 years ago, where he suspended 17 third-year students for cutting classes. In the struggle to get students past the bar examination, he explained, "there is absolutely no substitute for class attendance."

He exhibited his independent spirit by strongly criticizing the American Bar Association's canon opposing news photographs in court rooms.

The fiery dean resided at 54 Mountain Springs Avenue.

He was born in Selma nearly 69 years ago—he would have had a birthday on September 11.

DEGREES

He received his bachelor's degree from Harvard University in 1917, and in 1921 received a degree from the Harvard School of Law.

In 1925 he began his academic career when he was appointed an instructor in contract law at the San Francisco Law School.

Dean Snodgrass was an attorney for Tidewater Associated Oil Co. from 1927 to 1936. During this period he joined the faculty of Hastings College as instructor, and after 8 years on the faculty was appointed a full professor of law in 1936.

In July 1940, he was named acting dean, upon the death of Dean William M. Simmons, and the following May was appointed permanently as dean.

During World War I, he served as an ensign in the U.S. Navy.

During World War II, he served on the Selective Service Board, and after the end of the conflict was a public-panel member of the War Labor Board for the 10th region.

From 1947 to 1949, he was a member of a statewide advisory commission to revise the Constitution of California.

He was a member of the American Bar Association, the State Bar of California, the Bar Association of San Francisco, the Lawyers Club of San Francisco, the American

Law Institute, the American Judicature Society, the Selden Society, the Order of the Coif, and a number of other organizations, including the American Legion, the Bohemian Club and the University Club of San Francisco.

Funeral services were pending last night.

TEST-BAN AGREEMENT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the question of the wisdom of our Government entering into a test-ban agreement with Communist leaders in the Soviet Union is one that is receiving considerable attention in this country today because of the negotiations now being conducted in Moscow on this subject. I have stated over and over again my objections to such an arrangement with the Communists, not only because they have proved that they cannot be trusted to keep their word, but also because our military leaders have made it plain that we need to test for national security reasons.

I have been impressed, Mr. President, with three recent news columns on this subject. One was written by Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones and appeared in the Evening Star of Washington, D.C., on July 15, 1963. The column is entitled "Dirty Bombs or Clean Bombs?—A-Test Ban Talks Viewed as Futile—U.S. Urged To Deal Toughly With Reds." Another was written by Messrs. Robert Allen and Paul Scott of the Hall syndicate and was published as the principal front page story in the State of Columbia, S.C., dated July 15, 1963. This column is entitled "Kennedy Proposes a Risky Controversial Maneuver." The third one was written by Mr. Richard Wilson and appeared in the Evening Star of July 17, 1963, and is entitled "Booby Traps in Test-Ban Talks: Need for Caution Called Never Greater Than Current Flirtation With Moscow."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both of these columns be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the columns were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 15, 1963]

DIRTY BOMBS OR CLEAN BOMBS?—A-TEST BAN TALKS VIEWED AS FUTILE—U.S. URGED TO DEAL TOUGHLY WITH REDS

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

One of the most pernicious illusions abroad in the world today is the fond hope that if nations will give up testing atomic weapons the threat of an atomic holocaust will vanish.

We can close Pandora's box, but the pests are already out.

Furthermore, where do the ban-the-tests pickets get the idea that it would be good for humanity if the devilish art of atomic bombmaking were stopped at its present point of development?

For what we have now are dirty bombs. They suck up vast amounts of ground debris into a highly radioactive fireball and then distribute strontium 90 dust along a downwind path.

We have heard talk about dirtier bombs—bombs with cobalt or gold cases that will produce even deadlier fallout. So a lot of people have the idea that testing is being conducted with the sole idea of producing bombs that leave more dangerous aftereffects.

This isn't necessarily true. From a purely military point of view, clean bombs—that is, bombs with big wallop but with minimum radiation—could be more valuable. Dirty bombs have heightened terror value, but they invite retaliation. Neither side could profit from an unbreathable atmosphere, and generals breathe, too.

As in World War II, where both sides withheld the use of excellent gases and some rudimentary bacterial weapons, the next war may find both sides limiting their choice of weapons in their own self-interest.

But it would be a mistake to assume that this limitation would extend to all atomic weapons. If anyone can develop a clean atomic bomb it would be a marvelously cheap and efficient killer. And three U.S. administrations have tried to make it plain that if we face the choice between loosing atomic war and watching Russia's vast land armies crunch through to the channel with conventional weapons we will choose the former.

Atomic war on any scale is a grim prospect. Too bad the bomb works. Too bad that energy does equal mass times the squared speed of light. Too bad Mr. Einstein and Madam Curie were born.

But this is an age in which those who want survival with liberty are going to have to be tough-minded. We are going to have to contemplate with calmness and courage pretty horrible possibilities.

We have the easy alternative of survival without liberty. If America and the Western nations disbanded their armies and handed all their atomic weapons over to Khrushchev there'd be no war and those of us who survived the firing squads could settle down to life under a Soviet world government.

But the delusion that there must be some happy middle ground between atomic preparedness and complete surrender continues to afflict the Miss Nancys who gather in Trafalgar Square, parade around Holy Loch, and wave banners in front of the White House. "Ban the bomb." "End the tests." "Call a conference."

There persists the quaint belief that the Communists are arming only because they fear our arms, that we must allay their suspicions much as F. D. R. tried to allay the suspicious of Stalin at the disastrous Yalta pow-wow.

Let's end the "misunderstanding," wail the wailers. If the Russians won't agree to seven inspection stations for underground blasts let's agree to three, and if they don't want three let's agree to one or none.

Of course, there's no misunderstanding. What we are getting is the Pavlov dog treatment. The Russian scientist, Pavlov, discovered that you could break a dog down mentally by alternately giving it a promise of food and then disappointing it. That is why Mr. Khrushchev tries to keep building hopes for disarmament and then wrecking them and then building them again. And we accommodate him by sending, at the insistence of the frightened, teams of negotiators to sit down to endless Panmunjoms.

We've got a new Panmunjom going now. And last month President Kennedy stated hopefully that world peace will be achieved by "a gradual evolution of human agreements which are in the interests of all concerned."

More talk. More one-way concessions?

Communists speak to Communists with considerable frankness. Perhaps someone should remind Mr. Kennedy of Mr. Khrushchev's statement in Tirana, Albania, in May 1959: "We do not negotiate on the basis of give and take. We have nothing whatsoever to give. We will not make any concessions because our proposals do not form the basis of a barter deal."

We ought to quit dispatching futile emissaries to face the familiar and bitter choice of frustration of surrender. Instead, we should send Mr. K. a simple note in nondiplomatic language:

"Look, Buster, we think tests in the atmosphere aren't even for the birds. We'll quit them if you will, but one more trick like the last time and we won't make this offer again.

"As to underground tests, we'll make them as often as we like and you are welcome to yours.

"If you ever want a moratorium on them send us a letter telling us how many monitors you'll allow and if we're interested we'll write you back."

[From the State, July 15, 1963]

KENNEDY PROPOSES A RISKY CONTROVERSIAL MANEUVER

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy has embarked on one of the most risky and controversial diplomatic maneuvers ever undertaken by an American President.

He is holding out to Premier Khrushchev "the prospects of fuller Soviet participation and influence in the community of free nations" in exchange for a general normalization of Russian-United States relations.

This secret offer is being presented to the Soviet leader by Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman, now in Moscow for talks on a treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere and underwater.

The extraordinary proposal, which is the dark heart of the President's new strategy for peace, provides for granting Russia the status of a great power in Western affairs.

This overture to Khrushchev has the full backing of Prime Minister Macmillan's Government, and was approved at a high-level strategy session of the National Security Council, top U.S. policymaking body.

At that White House meeting national security members, with President Kennedy presiding, approved an overall policy toward the Soviet Union of "increasing the chance of constructive evolution within that society which might eventually move it to participate in the community of free nations."

The President and his NSC advisers agreed that, "The growing Soviet-Chinese split, the natural forces of fragmentation within the Communist bloc, combined with certain trends within the Soviet society itself, make this objective now possible of being achieved."

To test the new policy, Under Secretary Harriman was given full authority by the President not only to reach an accord on barring nuclear tests, but to explore all proposals that would bring Russia and the Western nations into closer contact.

This limited objective of the administration and the general approach to be followed by U.S. negotiators under the new policy is outlined in a Security Council paper being circulated at the highest level of Government, stating:

"To the extent possible in the existing climate, we should grant to the U.S.S.R. the position that its status as a great power warrants.

"We should hold out, by word and deed, the prospect of fuller Soviet participation and influence in the community of free nations if and as the Soviet leaders show a genuine interest and will for such constructive participation."

The policy paper also calls for more United States-Russian cultural and scientific exchanges and joint ventures in certain fields, as follows:

"We should maintain continuing pressure on the U.S.S.R. to expand exchanges of persons on equitable terms and to reduce restrictions on the flow of information, and should exploit to the maximum those opportunities open to us. It may be somewhat difficult for Soviet leaders to maintain a closed society in the face of widening exposure to outside influence.

"We should press for expanded cooperative ventures in such fields as outer space, public health, communications, and peaceful uses of atomic energy. Such ventures might give the Soviets an expanding vested interest in respectability and perhaps even induce some of their officials to think increasingly in terms of business-like deals with the West on matters of mutual national advantage."

As reported on June 17, Harriman will also sound out Khrushchev on the creation of a new agency to conduct deliberations to ease the cold war.

This sensational proposal, under closely guarded consideration by the President and his top foreign policy advisers for several months, calls for the establishment of an East-West commission to "reduce tensions, promote stability, dampen military crises, and reduce the risk of war."

Like the President's newest offer to Russia, the commission plan is a key aspect of the administration's "grand design" for reaching an entente with Russia. The new international body would be used as a forum for giving "fuller Soviet participation and influence in the community of free nations."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 17, 1963]

BOOBYTRAPS IN TEST-BAN TALKS: NEED FOR CAUTION CALLED NEVER GREATER THAN CURRENT FLIRTATION WITH MOSCOW

(By Richard Wilson)

Never was greater caution called for than in the new negotiations opened by Premier Khrushchev's speech in East Berlin and his extensive secret correspondence with President Kennedy.

Boobytraps and ambuscades line the way. Nevertheless, in spite of all bitter lessons to the contrary, the Kennedy administration continues its flirtation with Moscow, so named in disapproval by former Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

The tendency here in Washington is to read only part of what Mr. Khrushchev said in East Berlin, to ignore the rest or to place an unjustifiably favorable construction on it. When the speech is read in full, it is found that Mr. Khrushchev is condemning President Kennedy for poisoning the atmosphere, for reneging on his American University speech and, for blocking a nuclear test-ban agreement.

Then at the end of his speech Mr. Khrushchev made a proposal, which if it means anything at all, would undermine a bipartisan American policy on Germany which has been in existence for 18 years. President Kennedy went to Europe to reaffirm that policy. Under the stimulus of crowd hysteria in Berlin he may have gone a little further in reaffirming this policy than he intended.

Mr. Khrushchev proposed an uncontrolled, uninspected suspension of nuclear testing in the atmosphere to take effect simultaneously with a nonaggression treaty between the NATO and Warsaw Pact powers. If a nonaggresison pact means anything at all, it means the de facto recognition of East Germany and acceptance as a fact that Germany will never be reunited. All the bravura sentiments recently expressed by Mr. Kennedy under conditions of mob hysteria in West Berlin would thus be meaningless.

The key word in Mr. Khrushchev's proposal was "simultaneously." (No de facto recognition of East Germany, no nuclear test ban.)

Even if there were to be a nuclear test-ban treaty growing out of the present discussions by Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman in Moscow, the one factor which makes the test ban so attractive has already been lost. This is the factor of onsite inspections, which the Eisenhower administration persisted in and which the Kennedy administration is retreating from.

Inspections inside Russia were never so important in themselves as for the principle involved. The inspections would have opened the door for the first time to the possibility that some international arrangements might someday be made for a safe program of disarmament. Mr. Khrushchev will have none of this. He is more determined than ever to keep the NATO spies out of his country.

So what is left? An unenforceable three-way agreement between the United States, Russia, and England (and not including Red China and France) to stop nuclear testing in the atmosphere, under water and in outer space. In exchange for this, a nonaggression treaty with the Warsaw powers which would have to be meaningless to be acceptable, and which in any case would weaken our resolve for a free and united Germany. All this lacks plausibility. Mr. Khrushchev, of course, does not conceal his resolve to destroy capitalism in West Germany and unite the whole country under communism.

Fortunately, there are some balancing factors against the emotionalists who place a test ban ahead of everything else. In a long career, Mr. Harriman has not made many mistakes in dealing with the Russians. He warned Roosevelt that Stalin would break the Yalta agreements.

Nor is Secretary of State Rusk to be found among those who find much to cheer about in Mr. Khrushchev's recent maneuvers. The skepticism of those two men is a valuable asset in the present atmosphere of rising hopes and expectations.

In the end, of course, Congress will have the last word, for Mr. Kennedy does not dare enter into a treaty with the Soviet Union by Executive action. For some months Members of Congress have been making a strong record against a test-ban agreement on the grounds that we are being ambushed again.

THE GOLD RESERVE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, our position now with respect to the gold reserves is grave. If the drain continues, at the most we will have only about 18 months at the end of which time because the free gold which we possess will all be gone, it will make it impossible to fulfill our international obligations to existing short-term international creditors.

Our people had been lulled into the belief that our international imbalance of payments has been getting better rather than worse. Each month the dollars that we owe to foreign countries on the basis of international trade and other expenditures are in excess of the dollars which those foreign countries owe to us. To meet the imbalance we have been drawing down our gold supply and inducing foreign central banks to be patient creditors. Only thus have we been able to live with these chronic balance-of-payment deficits.

There is a limit in financing these imbalances in this way—that limit is being approached.

To stop the problem from immediately getting worse than it is, certain other steps were taken; for example—arranging currency swaps and borrowing money abroad. However, these activities have only brought us technical relief and according to the words of Mr. Alan Sprowl, former president of the New York Federal Reserve Bank "have dug deeper the hole out of which we must eventually climb."

In 1961 when the declarations were made loudly of how this problem can be solved, a part of the program of solution involved the development of greater influx of tourists to the United States and greater exports of our merchandise to the foreign nations of the world. These efforts, of course, were laudable but they have not produced the results anticipated; in fact, even at the time of the promotion of the programs, reason indicated that excessive reliance should not have been placed on what these measures would produce.

There are a number of courses which, in my opinion, should be followed to help solve the problem:

First. The deficit operations of our Federal Government must be eliminated.

Second. The easy money program which has been in existence for nearly 3 years, ostensibly to operate as a stimulant in our domestic economy, must be stopped. The hope for a rate of economic growth because of easy money has not materialized. Foreigners, because of the cheap money in the United States, have borrowed our dollars for investment abroad and both American and foreign investors have loaned their moneys abroad where the interest rates are higher.

Third. We should recognize that to increase our exports we must keep our prices in a competitive advantage. Much could be done in this direction, having in mind that in some of the Western European countries wage costs are increasing. Keeping ourselves in an advantageous competitive position could be achieved by labor leaders dropping the attitude that each year increased wages had to be obtained regardless of an absence of increased productivity—featherbedding must be discontinued.

Fourth. Federal spending must be reduced enabling the granting of a tax cut.

Fifth. As a part of the reduction in spending, savings can be made through a reduction in foreign economic and military aid. While we are content to carry the main burden, our allies naturally will be slow in assuming their equitable share of the responsibility. Only if we cut down on the military and economic aid will our associates in the free world respond to the limits of their responsibility in carrying out this obligation.

Sixth. Interest rates should be increased to stop the outflow of our dollars to foreign countries where they produce greater earnings. This last week on the floor of the Senate certain Senators were urging all sorts of remedies but warning that under no circumstances should the remedy be one requiring our country to adopt an austerity program.

Arguments were made that the present law requiring that Federal Reserve notes be supported by 25 percent in gold possessed directly or indirectly by the Federal Reserve Bank could well be abandoned. This would mean that the issuance of paper currency by our Government would have no anchor. It is true that the holder of a Federal Reserve note cannot obtain a 25 percent payment of it with gold; the fact, however, is that the 25 percent gold coverage does constitute an anchor instead of having the right to print money anchored to the ever-changing winds.

I still believe that it is not too late to solve this problem if it is attacked with the implements we have at hand.

Mr. President, on Wednesday, April 24, 1963, I made a statement on the floor of this Senate: I ask unanimous consent that those remarks be reprinted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOLD RESERVE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, happily and approvingly I read that Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara has issued an order for global belt tightening in an effort to overcome the daily drain of U.S. gold to other nations of the world.

The relentless and constant drain upon our gold reserves has created a frightening monetary situation not only for the United States but also for practically all of the nations of the world. The gold possessed by our country now, in the amount of about $15.9 billion, is far below what we need to support and back up the paper dollar certificates issued by the Federal Reserve Bank and the dollar obligations that bank has to its depositors, and the ability of our Government to meet the approximately $20 billion in short-term obligations that it owes to foreign creditors around the world.

In the year of 1949, we reached the high mark of our gold possessions, amounting to $24.7 billion. The drain on our gold reserves resulting from the fact that at the end of each year the dollars which American citizens spend abroad in various ways are in excess of the dollars that foreign countries spend in the United States in various ways, has been one of the grave and concealed problems confronting our Nation.

While we export by way of dollar value more goods than we import, nevertheless, at the end of the year we have an adverse imbalance of dollar obligations because of the moneys that are expended by tourists, by our foreign aid program, by our military men situated practically in every country in the world, and by our constantly increasing capital investments in foreign industries.

The Secretary of Defense has given recognition to the grave contributions which the military aspects of our Government serving around the world are making in reducing our gold reserves. I commend him for what he is doing in attempting to strengthen our balance-of-dollar obligations—for which the foreign creditors can demand payment in gold. The dollar obligations of the United States to foreign creditors are increasing because tourists of the United States are visiting foreign countries in great numbers while tourists of foreign countries are visiting the United States in numbers inconsequential; because U.S. dollars under the foreign aid program are being spent in greater quantities in foreign nations than the currency of foreign nations is being spent in the United States; because the military men and the activities of the United States are spending dollars in about 70 nations of the world while few of those nations are spending their currency in the United States.

The problem is grave, relief must be found in solving it. Secretary McNamara is in a position to provide the greatest relief if he strikes at the causes with vigor and courage.

BILL FOR STATE COMMERCIAL FISHERIES RESEARCH BADLY NEEDED

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], and the others who have worked on S. 627, for bringing out of the committee such a meritorius bill. We need to increase our research in commercial fishing; the need has been convincingly demonstrated. This bill encourages the State to engage in this research. In the past 10 years the United States has slipped from second place to fifth among the fishing nations of the world, while we lead the world in importing fish for our domestic market.

The Congress for decades has supported an extensive program of agricultural research; look at the bounty our farmers have produced. We now need to do the same for our vastly important but often overlooked commercial fishing industry. As a coauthor of S. 627, I am hopeful that this measure will soon be reached on the calendar. The cost of the measure will be modest. The bill apportions the research funds among the States, and gives the States the aid, assistance, cooperation, and encouragement necessary to properly conserve and develop a great natural resource.

As our population increases rapidly, we will be going more often to the sea to draw on those great resources. We need to stimulate our research in fishing so that we shall always be able to rely on that great food supply.

The pending bill proposes only a modest program of research grants to be divided among the States. Texas, as one of the top four or five commercial fishing States, would receive some $324,000 to be matched in part by State and local interests. Texans are greatly interested in this proposal; I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD endorsements of it from O. M. Longnecker, Jr., executive secretary of the Texas Shrimp Association, and Dr. Henry Hildebrandt, chairman of the Conservation Committee of Corpus Christi Outdoor Club.

THE TEXAS SHRIMP ASSOCIATION,
Brownsville, Tex., April 20, 1963.
Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: The Texas Shrimp Association, representing the shrimp fishing and producing interests of the Texas gulf coast, is in favor of S. 627, the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1963, and desires that this statement regarding the proposed legislation be included in the record of the April 24-25, 1963, hearing by the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the Senate Committee on Commerce. As the association's executive secretary I plan to attend the hearing and intend to make a statement in support of the bill.

Fisheries must be viewed on a broader basis than in the past because the problems have become worldwide in view of the tremendous increase of fishing on the high seas of a number of world powers. The United States has reached a point where it must commit itself either to an expansion of its fishing operations on the high seas or withdraw to its own shores. In either case, research is a basic requirement and is of utmost importance.

While considerable research can and must be done by the Federal Government in view of the fact that most of our fishery resources are of the high seas variety, still much of the life cycle is found in the inside waters of the various coastal States and are considered to be resources of the States. While research is a responsibility of the States, in most cases they are without adequate funds to maintain the necessary programs for full development and utilization of fishery resources. The provision for a direct appropriation and for 25-percent participation by the States is more realistic than previous attempts to accomplish the objective of S. 627 and should stimulate greater participation by the States in the development of research programs.

The Texas Shrimp Association urges favorable consideration of this proposed legislation.

Respectfully,
O. M. LONGNECKER, Jr.,
Executive Secretary.

CORPUS CHRISTI OUTDOOR CLUB,
Corpus Christi, Tex., April 22, 1963.
Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Corpus Christi Outdoor Club wishes to add its endorsement of the Commercial Fisheries and Research Act, which is being studied by your committee.

We are vitally interested in conservation and development of our natural resources, and believe that the fish population should be expanded, if possible, to insure greater food supplies and improved sports fishing.

The danger threatening fishing through pollution, the destruction of spawning and feeding areas, and the extensive use of poisonous chemicals, including detergents, that find their way into streams and lakes, should be part of the research anticipated in the act.

We believe that the participation by the Federal Government and the States, with State control, is sensible, but specific directions should be established.

A 5-year program will at least demonstrate what is possible through this type of endeavor, and if it succeeds in carrying out the objectives of the act, even in part, the project can, no doubt, be extended.

Sincerely,
DR. HENRY HILDENBRANDT,
Chairman.
FRED JONES,
CASH ASHER,
GENE BLACKLOCK,
Conservation Committee.

Mr. President, I urge the approval of this worthwhile measure.

LAW IN A TOTALITARIAN SOCIETY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, it is easy for us to forget the tragic condition of millions of people around the world who are not free. We forget because these people's lives seem so remote from our own, and it is difficult for us to imagine what life is like for them. Therefore, it is appropriate that the President designated this week in accordance with congressional resolution "Captive Nations Week" in order to focus the attention of each of us upon our heritage of freedom, and to rededicate this Nation as a promise of liberty throughout the world.

The cornerstone of our freedom is the Constitution. Our Founding Fathers wrote that magnificent document to establish for this Nation a rule of law rather than a rule of men. Many times in the world's history the erosion or elimination of law has been the first step on the road to tyranny. The fundamental connection between law and freedom was dramatically demonstrated on May 1 of this year when the Nation observed Law Day, U.S.A.

As part of that observance, the Capitol Hill Chapter of the Federal Bar Association sponsored a special program. The Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights was asked to participate in this program, which took the form of a hearing on the subject of "Law in a Totalitarian Society." As chairman of that subcommittee, it was my pleasure to hear the testimony of three eminent attorneys, originally from other countries, each of whom had witnessed in his own country the perversion of its legal systems—Dr. Jacoby, in Nazi Germany; Dr. Solyom-Fekete, in Communist Hungary; and Dr. Aguillar, in Castro Cuba.

The statements of these men are most significant contributions to an understanding of what it means to become a subject of a captive nation. These are sobering statements and they will provide all Americans with a clearer realization of the role our laws play in making this truly the land of the free.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings of this program be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proceedings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator ERVIN. The subcommittee will come to order. Before we begin our hearing today, I want to take this opportunity to thank the Capitol Hill Chapter of the Federal Bar Association for sponsoring this hearing on the "Role of Law in a Totalitarian Society." The chapter is to be commended for conceiving a program which exemplifies so well the spirit of freedom under law which we commemorate today. It is especially fitting that lawyers who are in the service of the national legislature should sponsor such a program.

Today marks the sixth annual observance of Law Day, U.S.A. Every year since 1958, by Presidential proclamation, pursuant to a joint resolution of Congress, the country has commemorated the rule of law on the same date the Communist world conducts its traditional May Day celebrations. Here we venerate that rule which recognizes the dignity of the individual and assures equal justice for all in our democratic society—that rule which distinguishes our Nation's traditional concept of law from those of nations behind the curtain of communism where hearsay and innuendo are a part of judicial procedure. The contrast between that which we observe here and that which is observed in totalitarian societies is the subject of this hearing.

We are privileged today to have three great legal scholars, representing Germany, Hungary, and Cuba, who will give us the benefit of their knowledge and experience on the way that men are compelled to live, insofar as the form of law is concerned, in totalitarian states. I think it is fitting that we hold our ceremonies in an atmosphere worthy of this occasion. The carnival air and the displays of military might now taking place in Communist nations, are inappropriate to the greater goals on which our Nation has set its sights. Here in the United States men are speaking about our law without fear of censorship or reprisal. In the Communist world, speakers at the great parades also extoll the virtues of their legal systems; but those speakers must adhere to a strict party line or face serious consequences for deviating from it.

To understand the role of law in the Western World, and particularly in the United States, it is necessary to understand the heritage on which our law is based. William Gladstone said that "the Constitution of the United States was the greatest document ever struck off, at a given time, by the brain and purpose of man." Gladstone's statement is correct when it refers to the act of writing the Constitution. It is not correct, however, to state that the principles of the Constitution were suddenly discovered and struck off in a burst of divine revelation. Rather, the document was the product of a long hot summer's hard work and careful compromise by men familiar with the ancient Mosaic law of the Jews, with the works of the great Greek philosophers, with the natural law concepts of the early Christians, with the civil laws of the Romans, with the English common law, and with the enlightened teachings of the 17th and 18th English and French philosophers. Relying on this great knowledge, the Founding Fathers drafted what I believe to be the greatest document ever written by man, and one which is remarkable in a number of respects. It is remarkable for the fact that it represents the culmination of man's struggle for the right to have a system of laws which would be binding not only on the individual but on the Government itself. It is remarkable for the kind of government established; the powers delegated to it; and the Bill of Rights—an innovation which gave a written guarantee that individuals could enjoy certain basic rights which the government would be compelled to respect. Anyone who studies the Constitution of the United States is impressed with the fact that its overriding purpose was to make liberty secure, even against government. In one of the great Supreme Court cases, *ex-parte Milligan*, the Supreme Court said, "that the Constitution was a law for the rulers and people alike." It is a remarkable document in that an individual, regardless of his earthly possessions, social standing or educational attainments, can come into a court of the United States and compel the Government to respect his rights.

To assure the rule of law, American courts, since the earliest days of our Republic, have concerned themselves not only with the ends, but also with the means of securing justice. For instance, exclusionary rules of evidence have evolved and been enforced under which even relevant, credible evidence is rejected if the police obtained it by illegal means; thus, involuntary confessions or the products of unreasonable searches and seizures are excluded by the courts. As Mr. Justice Sutherland of the Supreme Court stated in *Berger* v. *U.S.*, 295 U.S. 78, 88 (1935), a prosecutor "may prosecute with earnestness and vigor—indeed, he should do so. But, while he may strike hard blows, he is not at liberty to strike foul ones."

Judge Learned Hand gave an unforgettable account of the spirit of liberty which is such an integral part of our American heritage, when he observed:

"The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs their interests alongside its own without bias. The spirit of liberty remembers that not even a sparrow falls to earth unheeded. The spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who, near 2,000 years ago, taught mankind that lesson it has never quite learned, but never quite forgotten: that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest."

In totalitarian societies—whether Communist, Nazi, or Fascist—law is viewed quite differently. It is not based on justice but on the will of the dictator or the party. Obedience to specific rules is compelled from above; it is not voluntarily granted by the governed. Instead of universality in its law, the totalitarian state distinguishes among the dictator, who is above all law; members of the elite group or party who enjoy special privileges with respect to the law; and the rest of the public. Indeed, there are certain groups who are virtually deprived of legal protection or subject to legal persecution, as were the Jews in Hitler's Germany or the kulaks in Stalin's Russia. Even today, the Soviet Union has special courts for political offenders. Instead of striking hard but fair blows, the prosecuting officials in totalitarian states are expert in coerced confessions and show trials. Then, as Mr. Vishinsky, who once served as Procurator General of the Soviet Union, they may write lengthy tomes seeking to justify their departures from fairplay in the name of necessity. For a vivid description of some of the degrading legal measures that have been employed by totalitarian governments with the purpose of preserving the state, one need only consult speeches of Mr. Khrushchev, who has referred to the numerous unjust convictions obtained in Russia during Stalin's reign. Tragically, this is the tradition in Russia where no free society has ever existed.

Fear is the only reason to give obedience to the law in a totalitarian society where it is so clearly the mere reflection of the will of a single individual, or at most of a small group. The dictator frequently attempts, through his controlled mass media, a virtual self-deification (or in the current Soviet terminology, he develops a cult of personality); he asks the public to believe that his wishes should be law because he is infallible. However, this myth of infallibility is difficult to perpetuate; to maintain obedience the dictator must resort to stringent police measures. And, as in Russia today, he has on occasion, even resorted to capital punishment for petty violations of economic legislation in order to sustain his position. Ultimately, though, the severe repression leads to ever-increasing resentment, which necessitates even tighter police controls, which sets into motion a vicious circle which ultimately will destroy the system the dictator seeks to perpetuate.

Although legal institutions in a totalitarian country sometimes display superficial resemblances to those in Western countries; the spirit of liberty, whereof Judge Learned Hand spoke, is totally alien to the totalitarian society and to its legal institutions and traditions. Indeed, whenever this spirit threatens to bloom, as it has recently in the Soviet Union with respect to some of the leading Russian artists and intellectuals, the state acts to destroy this spirit.

A great world task today is to achieve world peace through law; and the American Bar Association and other groups have been especially active to this end. One goal of Law Day, U.S.A. is to encourage this objective. However, as we will see from the testimony to be received today, the divergency between free and totalitarian societies in their concepts of law impedes progress in our pursuit of a viable structure for world peace.

Today, on Law Day, all Americans and all who revere the rule of law should rededicate themselves to the perpetuation and preservation of the keystone of American democracy—a Nation of laws, not of men. As Judge Learned Hand said, (that the) "love of liberty resides in the hearts and minds of the people and when that love is lost and dies, then no constitution or law can save it." It is, therefore, incumbent upon us to emphasize today the value of the rule of law, for it is the only thing which protects the liberties of men. No date could be more appropriate than May Day for pointing up the vast differences between the traditions and the administration of justice here and in Communist lands.

We are delighted, on this occasion, not only to hear legal scholars from Germany, Hungary, and Cuba, but to have present my colleague, the distinguished U.S. Senator Kenneth B. Keating, who is one of the country's great lawyers. I would like to call on Senator Keating for whatever remarks he may wish to make at this time.

Senator Keating. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I want to express to you my gratitude and that of the Senate for making it possible to arrange this special hearing which is peculiarly appropriate to Law Day.

Of course, we have the right to be proud—but we must never let this feeling of pride become an excuse for complacency. An inheritance can be squandered or it can be enhanced. Our heritage of freedom under law is precious. It is our obligation not only to prevent it from becoming tarnished by neglect, but to pass it on to future generations enriched and ennobled.

The concept of a society without justice is terrifying. But for many people, such a society is not an abstract horror but a daily reality. How do such conditions develop? What are the techniques which tyrants use to pervert the rule of law into a slogan for oppression?

We shall hear today from three men who witnessed this process in their own countries. This testimony, I know, will be strong medicine for some. It is not easy to accept the examples of man's inhumanity to man which history has provided for centuries. The theme in all these situations is that freedom can never be taken for granted—that there must be martyrs in courtrooms and universities and parliaments as well as on battlefields—that life and liberty can be destroyed by edicts as well as by guns.

The law must be regarded as more than a statement of legal principles. It is a way of life, and it must be nourished and protected in the manner of all living things. Hitler, Kadar, and Castro and many other tyrants have not hesitated to pay lip service to the letter of the law, at the very time they were defiling its spirit. Law in a totalitarian society is a cadaver, a lifeless institution bled to death by intimidation, purges, and fear. It serves no longer as a means of protecting the individual, but as a weapon for carrying out the will of the state. It stands no longer as a barrier against unfair treatment of the citizen by his government, but as a wall behind which every dissenting soul is imprisoned.

Law Day can be a period of rejoicing—but only if it inspires on the part of every American a rededication to the fundamental principles of our Republic. I hope that this hearing today will help awaken us to the obligations as well as the privileges which this tradition imposes upon us.

I commend the Federal Bar Association for the initiative it has taken in arranging this hearing. This is not a mere ceremonial observance of an annual event. It is a program which should stir within us all a new resolve to fulfill the obligations of our own heritage and to keep it secure against the dangers of neglect and expediency. It has been said a thousand times that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, but often without a real appreciation of what these words require of us. This proceeding, I am confident, will impart a deeper significance to these words to everyone here.

I may say to those who are here, that this hearing is presided over by one who has shown, in his entire Senate career, a deep knowledge of the law. He is one of the ablest lawyers with whom I have ever come in contact; and I know this from personal experience, having found myself on the other side from him on some issues. Lawyers in our group here will understand the best measure you can take of a lawyer is to find yourself opposed to him. I have always considered it complimentary when some lawyer, with whom I had a lawsuit, said, "You are a pretty tough guy," or words to that effect. Mr. Chairman, you are a pretty tough guy in your very fine, kind, nice way and we who serve with you respect you. Again, I want to express my gratitude to you for allowing me to participate today and to have the opportunity to join with you in hearing these three interesting witnesses.

Senator Ervin. I am deeply indebted to you for the compliment and I want to reciprocate. I consider you one of the greatest lawyers of my acquaintance, and as you suggested, I think the distinguished witnesses, will make it clear that tyranny uses this form of law to crush those who oppose it and in so doing, murders, one might say, the spirit of the law.

We are privileged at this time to hear Dr. Sidney B. Jacoby, who, in addition to being a professor of law at Georgetown University here in Washington, was a former teacher at the Berlin Law School in Berlin, Germany; former law clerk to a German judge; and former assistant counsel to a combined committee of Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish welfare organizations in Germany. He also served in 1945 on the legal staff of the late Mr. Justice Jackson.

Dr. Jacoby, would you have a seat at the witness table and tell us about the perversion of the legal machinery which Germany suffered under Hitler?

Dr. Jacoby. Thank you Mr. Chairman and Senator Keating. If I may, I would like to refer to the statement which I have filed and to emphasize a few of its highlights for Senator Keating and the chairman. In a way, I should say, the German experience of how the rule of law was perverted is perhaps more significant and more interesting than the perversion of the rule of law in the other countries for this reason: after the unconditional surrender, the American authorities were able to reach all the German documents. When we worked in Nuremberg I was with Mr. Justice Jackson then—we had the opportunity to study the destruction of the rule of law from the secret memoranda and files of the German Department of Justice. On that basis, I would merely like to emphasize a few points.

The first question of course, was how was it possible that under the Weimar constitution, which was a democratic constitution, a totalitarian government could assume power? Now I must explain that when Hitler became Chancellor in 1933, he did not become Chancellor by means of a revolt; rather, he became Chancellor by means of lawful devices under the Weimar Constitution. An election took place soon after he was appointed Chancellor and in that election, interestingly enough, the Nazi Party did not obtain a majority. Out of the 647 Members of the Parliament, only 288 were members of the Nazi Party. Nevertheless, within 2 or 3 months it was possible to establish a full, dictatorial power. Now the devices were lawful in the sense that they complied with the constitution. By means of excessive powers resting in Chancellor Hitler's hands, it was possible to suspend constitutional guarantees.

Mr. Justice Jackson, in one of his later opinions, specifically mentioned Germany as a terrible example of how constitutional guarantees can be perverted. When some Members of Parliament resisted, the so-called Enabling Act was passed which gave all legislative power to the Chancellor or executive. This was done by means of an amendment to the constitution, again following the legal formalities of the Weimar Constitution, which permitted amendments by a two-thirds vote. When that law was enacted, all legislative powers rested in the executive. He could issue all rules and was specifically authorized to deviate from the constitution.

Senator Keating. Would it interrupt your train of thought if I asked a question?

Professor Jacoby. No. Please go ahead.

Senator Keating. How was the Nazi Party able, with that number of deputies, to bring about a two-thirds vote in the Parliament for such a change in the Constitution?

Professor Jacoby. Well, Senator, in the first place, some of the opposition members were arrested. All Communist Party members were arrested. Of the Social Democrats, who had elected about 120 members, a very substantial number were arrested. Then others were threatened into voting or abstaining, so that the result was the "Enabling Act" was enacted by a vote of 441 to 94.

Senator Keating. Were the opposition arrested for crimes against the state?

Professor Jacoby. They were arrested through the use of the broad executive powers that were created.

The famous Reichstag fire, which the Nazis had instituted, was used as a pretext for arresting people and in that way, the membership of the Parliament was reduced; there was something in the Constitution which would expressly prohibit it. But the constitutional guarantees were disposed with the broad power of the delegations.

Now, how was the rule of law perverted in the history of the Nazi regime? I don't want to say too much here about the well-known fact that there was an entire system outside of any legal formalities—the system of the concentration camps, the murder of political opponents and the murder of 6 million Jews. Those matters were completely outside the legal system. But quite early in the history of Nazi Germany there was a case where some guards of a concentration camp were convicted by a regular court for extreme brutality in the concentration camp. Immediately, the President pardoned these people and thus they went unpunished.

What was the method by which the rule of law was perverted? In the first place, a law was passed depriving the opponents of all civil service jobs. While such a law would have been unconstitutional, as I have indicated, the Enabling Act gave the Executive the power to pass acts in violation of the Constitution. Judges who were political opponents were removed from the judiciary or excluded from civil service.

The Nazi Party, by law, was made to be the only permitted political party and was fused into the governmental machinery.

Senator Ervin. Excuse me. Senator Keating and I are going to have to go to the Senate to vote now. Those bells were the vote signal. We will be back as quickly as we can. We are sorry to have to interrupt the proceedings, but we cannot help it.

Professor Jacoby. Under the old laws, many steps had been taken to guarantee the independence of the judiciary by the Weimar Constitution. Special courts were set up and only Nazi members were appointed to those courts.

It is very interesting to observe the manner by which the Department of Justice exercised control even over the regular courts. A study, after the war, of secret, confidential communications revealed how the Department of Justice had generally commented on cases to the judges; telling them which cases were not decided by the Nazi theory and which cases were correctly decided. In this way, they exercised complete control over the judiciary.

I want to be very brief here—the criminal law was changed by making a matter punishable under the principle of analogy; the concept of criminality was broadened to the extent that any statement made showing disregard for the Nazi government was made a crime. For example, a mother was convicted for sending an anti-Nazi, confidential letter to her son.

Private law was perverted when access to the courts was taken away. In the closing days of the Nazi regime, there were secret letters sent out to all the lawyers telling them that any kind of independence left in the legal profession—by means of many formalistic fashions—would be suppressed. At the end of the Nazi regime there was, in reality, no legal profession. Thank you.

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE RULE OF LAW IN GERMANY BY THE NAZI DICTATORSHIP—STATEMENT OF DR. SIDNEY B. JACOBY

The destruction of the rule of law by the Nazi dictatorship was complete in Germany. That is particularly significant when it is realized that prior to the advent of Hitler, Germany had a fairly well-established rule of law under the life of the Weimar Constitution. While the form of democratic government established in Germany after World War I clearly had many drawbacks—especially speaking retrospectively—there was a desire to have law govern the affairs of the country. There was an effort to conduct public life in the form of a "Rechtsstaat" (country governed by law), and Germany had a rather highly developed legal system.

Within a short period of time the Nazis completely destroyed that system. How was it possible under the Weimar Constitution for the totalitarian Nazi Party to assume power, even though that Constitution had many provisions on the powers of the legislature and even though it contained a large catalog guaranteeing the constitutional rights and freedoms of the individuals?

(*A*) *Assumption of power*

Of course, from a broader viewpoint it should be stressed that the general political background of Germany was antidemocratic and that the rule of law had not as yet found popular acceptance. Nevertheless, it is true that, at least in a formal sense, the Nazi Party assumed control by lawful devices. True, there was a flagrant violation of the spirit of the Weimar Constitution, but the accession of the Nazi Party was not by means of a "putsch." On January 30, 1933, Hitler was appointed Chancellor of Germany by the President, in the manner provided for by the Constitution.

In an election held thereafter, on March 5, 1933, the Nazis elected only 288 out of 647 Members to the Parliament. Still, within a period of 4 months their totalitarian Government had been fully established.

The Weimar Constitution contained a provision (art. 48) which gave excessive powers to the President who, in case of danger, could take measures to restore order and, for that purpose, could suspend seven specified fundamental rights guaranteed in the Constitution: the constitutional right of the freedom of the person (art. 114), of the sanctity and inviolability of the home (art. 115), of the secrecy of the mail (art. 117), of freedom of expression of opinion and of freedom of the press (art. 118), of peaceful assembly (art. 123), of right of association (art. 124), and of the right to property (art. 153). Taking the Nazi-instituted Reichstag fire as a pretext, an order was issued by the President on February 28, 1933, specifically suspending these constitutional guaranties. All members of the Reichstag belonging to the Communist Party (81) and a substantial number of members of the Socialist Party (which totaled 120 members) were arrested.

Next, the Reichstag passed the infamous "Ermächtigungesgesetz" (enabling law) of March 24, 1933. That law in effect completely abolished the Weimar Constitution. The Constitution contained a provision (art 76) that it can be amended by acts of the Reichstag, but that to cast such a vote two-thirds of the members must be present and two-thirds of those present must vote affirmatively. By means of the above-mentioned arrests, by means of pressures and persuasion, Hitler succeeded in getting an affirmative vote of 441, as against 94 opposition votes.

By the Enabling Act the Cabinet was given the power to enact all laws, simply by publication, without any legislative process; and those laws, it was expressly stated, could deviate from the Weimar Constitution.

(*B*) *Abolition of the rule of law in all aspects of life*

(1) The Terroristic Acts Outside Any Legal Machinery

Of course, the extreme and widespread crimes committed by the Nazi regime outside any semblance of legal formalities are well-known. The concentration camps, the murders in those camps of political opponents, the extermination of 6 million Jews—all these matters are well-known history. Here, it should be mentioned only that all these activities occurred completely outside the formalities of legal proceedings. Early in the Nazi regime there had been a case where guards of a concentration camp were indicted and even punished by a regular court for acts of extreme violence in a concentration camp. Of course, they were immediately pardoned by Hitler, and no further prosecutions occurred.

(2) The Perversion of the Legal Machinery of Germany Under the Nazi Regime

That perversion was complete; it included the personnel administering the laws, the procedure by which the law was applied, and the substantive law governing their actions.

(a) Political parties, civil service, and members of the bar: By July 1933, all political parties, other than the Nazi Party, had been prohibited, and the party was fused by law into the governmental machinery. Leaders of the party were given top governmental positions, and at the lower level there was coordination between the governmental machinery and the various component parts of the Nazi Party. Specifically with respect to legal activities, Hans Frank, one of the defendants hanged at Nurenberg, the top lawyer of the Nazi Party and president of the Nazi-dominated German Academy of Law, could boast in 1939 that all judges and lawyers were organized in the Nazi Lawyers' Guild.

An early Nazi attack was directed against the German civil service, including all civil service at state, provincial, and municipal level. In Germany all judges, prosecutors, and university professors were civil servants, and public utilities were operated by civil servants. By early legislation Jews were dismissed from all civil service positions;[1] civil servants who because of prior political activity offered no assurance of loyalty to the new Government, were summarily discharged, including all persons who had belonged to any organization which had furthered the aims of social democracy. Proof of devotion to Nazi principles was required for any promotion. Ultimately, for the express reason that Hitler was still not fully satisfied with the loyalty of all ordinary judges, it was specifically decreed in 1942 that the Führer could remove any civil servant without regard to any rights or procedures.

Nazi doctrines were incorporated into the training of lawyers. Gradually, admission to the bar was limited to Nazis, and candidates were expected to possess certificates issued by one of the Nazi organizations.

(b) Judiciary: The Weimar Constitution had provided for the independence of judges (art. 102), had stated that they were appointed for life (art. 104) and had prohibited special courts. Nevertheless, judges were included in the above-mentioned discharge of civil servants. Judges were spied upon and made subject to the strongest pressure to join the Nazi Party as an alternative to being dismissed. By law Special Courts ("Sondergerichte"), directly subservient to the Nazi Party, were established and were given broad jurisdiction, without any right of appeal, even though by general law there was jurisdiction in the ordinary courts. Only members of the Nazi Party were made judges of the Special Courts. Not every German attorney, but only especially admitted attorneys, could be defense counsel before the special courts. And for political offenses the special "people's court" was created in 1934, consisting of five judges, only two of whom were professional lawyers; under the law, Hitler appointed the members of the people's court for a period of 5 years.

Many methods were specifically developed for the purpose of influencing judges. In important criminal cases, even in some of a nonpolitical nature, the district attorney would inform the judge in private prior to the trial of the punishment which would be expected of him. Individual complaints were made by the Reichs Minister of Justice to judges who had imposed sentences which the Nazis considered insufficient, and certain judges were removed from their positions. Beginning in 1942, periodic "Judges' Letters" were distributed by the Minister of Justice to all judges, commenting upon recent law cases as good or bad, according to Nazi standards. For example, describing certain convictions for crimes committed during a blackout, only the decisions which had imposed the death sentence were approved; all others were criticized as being too mild. In another case, a Jewish woman had received only a minor fine for her failure to add the initial "Sarah" to her name, as required of all Jewish women by Nazi laws; the leniency had been explained by the judge on the ground that some judges had not rendered more severe judgments. The Minister of Justice criticized the decision and emphasized that Hitler was the supreme judge and, therefore, his view was controlling. In another case some extenuating circumstances, consisting of family difficulties, were found by a court in the case of a foreign currency conviction of a Jew. This decision, too, was criticized by the Minister, on the ground that the most severe punishment must be inflicted on a Jew.

Also, the police and the party, acting completely outside of the law, arrested many persons and placed them into concentration camps for indeterminate periods, even after they had been acquitted by the regular judiciary; in fact, a person whose short-term conviction by a court Hitler had considered insufficient, was turned over by the Minister of Justice to the Gestapo for execution.

(c) Nazi perversion of substantive law:

1. Criminal law: New criminal provisions were enacted punishing severely, matters such as the making of statements showing disregard for members of the Government or the party. Under this provision there was, for example, a conviction, affirmed by the supreme court, of a mother who had made anti-Nazi statements in an entirely confidential letter to her son. Generally, the principle of punishment by analogy was introduced, making punishable every act "deserving of penalty according to the fundamental conceptions of the penal law and sound popular feeling," i.e., Nazi theories.

The law of criminal procedure was changed. Even after a judgment of acquittal had become final, the prosecutor could appear to a special group of supreme court judges, appointed by Hitler for a period of 2 years, who could order a new trial.

2. Private law: There was widespread interference with the right of access to the civil courts. In forcing the new political order on the business community, numerous breaches of the existing civil law had been

---

[1] I may exemplify the scope of that rule by my own experience. I then was a teaching assistant at the Berlin Law School, a law clerk to a judge, and assistant counsel to a combined committee of Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish welfare organizations. Since the latter committee received substantial government subsidies, it was by order equated in that respect to civil service. Accordingly, I was dismissed from all three positions.

committed: obligations of contract had been violated, and property had been confiscated under the pressure of party members and officials. When some civil courts, in accordance with existing laws, decided in favor of the dispossessed claimants, a Nazi statute empowered the Minister of the Interior to withdraw all such civil claims from the ordinary courts even after they had become res judicata.

Also, regular court procedures were misused for the accomplishment of Nazi doctrines. When parents, members of the Jehovah's Witnesses, forbade their children to join the Hitler Youth, a probate court deprived them of the right of custody over their children, and appointed a guardian to arrange for admission to the Hitler Youth. The legal process even was perverted to play a role in the Nazi program of sterilization of women who, in the Nazi view, were mentally defective, had given birth to weak offspring, or were enemies of the State. Such sterilization took place pursuant to a court order. These few examples demonstrate how complete the destruction of the rule of law was under the Nazi dictatorship.

Senator ERVIN. Our next witness is Dr. William Solyom-Fekete. Dr. Fekete is a former member of the Hungarian Parliament; former member of the Hungarian Bar and was a practicing attorney in that country until 1952. He served as an opposition member of the Parliament and subsequently was a political prisoner for 1 year. He served, at one time, as legal counsel for government enterprises and is now Hungarian legal specialist in the European Law Division of the Library of Congress.

Dr. Fekete, we wish to welcome you here today. Dr. Fekete was able to observe the rule of law in Hungary until the October Revolution, and its subsequent deterioration. Dr. Fekete, if you will, come forward and give us the benefit of your views on the rule of law in that very troubled area which is inhabited by great friends of this country.

Dr. Fekete, you may either read your statement or comment upon it, as you see fit.

Dr. FEKETE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Senator KEATING. May I refer to my written statement which I filed with the subcommittee?

THE ROLE OF LAW IN A COMMUNIST SOCIETY—STATEMENT OF DR. WILLIAM SOLYOM-FEKETE, MAY 1, 1963

The role of law in a Communist regime is to serve the goals and interests of the international Communist movement, and of its local representatives, the Communist Party and the government of the respective country. There is no need to study all legal systems under Communist rule to prove the validity of the above statement, because with slight variations, all systems are set up on the same pattern. In the following, therefore, I will restrict my testimony to the situation in Hungary, because I am familiar with it on the basis of personal experience up to the end of the revolution of October 1956, and I have had the opportunity to observe and analyze the developments in that country thereafter, as I am the Hungarian legal specialist in the European Law Division of the Library of Congress.

The basic principle of the prewar Hungarian legal system was, for centuries, as it is of all Western legal systems, "equal justice under law." The Communist regime discarded this principle and substituted therefor the concept of Socialist legality. What this means, in reality, nobody really knows. There are several different interpretations and definitions of this concept, the most authoritative of which is probably section 41 of the Constitution, which reads:

"The courts of the Hungarian People's Republic punish the enemies of the working people, protect and safeguard the state, the social and economic order, the institutions of the people's democracy, the rights of the workers, and educate the working people in the observance of the rules of the Socialist coexistence."

This provision may sound all right to the outsider who is not familiar with Communist semantics which usually gives the words meanings different from those generally accepted. If the phrases of this constitutional provision are translated into the practical meaning of plain, everyday words, it would read like this:

The carefully purged courts of the dictatorship of the proletariat punish the enemies of communism, safeguard and protect the Communist Party, and its subdivision, the government, the exploitation of the workers by the state, the institutions of state capitalism, such as: confiscated enterprises, agricultural cooperatives established through force, threat, or deceit, labor unions which represent the interests of the employer, the state, etc., and the rights of the party elite; these courts educate the workers not to complain about the poor living standards, the oppression and terror.

This is probably an accurate definition of Socialist legality, and to show that the courts in Hungary really live up to these standards, let me quote only one of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the Hungarian People's Republic: "Class affiliation is an important fact in civil cases and its ascertainment should not be neglected. * * * Justice administered in the interest of class warfare, therefore, necessarily presupposes the clarification of the class character of an action, and the class affiliation of the parties. This follows from the observance of the basic postulate of Socialist legality by every judge, because the laws and other legal provisions are instrumentalities which secure the class interest of our society's leading force."

But discrimination against people because of their class affiliation is not restricted to civil cases. Criminal actions topped with heavy sentences are even more effective tools of class warfare. To illustrate this, let me mention one case: A hardware dealer was sentenced by the lower courts to 3½ years in prison, for not wanting to sell out his stock, and, according to the court, by such action endangering the economic situation. The supreme court raised his sentence to 8 years, because "* * * the mild sentence defeats the realization of the objectives of class warfare and the protection of the society against the class enemy."

This is what happens when the role of the law is changed from being the governing force of society to the instrument of oppression and terror.

In criminal cases another means of class warfare is employed: To charge the defendants in political trials also with common crimes in order to turn the sympathy of the masses away from the defendants. This happened not only in the case of Cardinal Mindszenty, when he was convicted of violations of the foreign exchange regulations and of speculation, but also in almost every other published criminal case of a political nature.

An episode after the crushing of the Hungarian revolution which took place in November 1956, illustrates how the Communist regime was trying to create evidence of common crimes committed in connection with the revolution. It was well known that the Hungarian revolution was probably the only one in history which was free of looting and other offenses against property. However, the official Communist propaganda organs later published several pictures of looting and similar actions. The story behind these incidents is that after the Soviet troops took over the capital, in November, they resorted to raiding the stores, and distributing food from the looted stores to the people on the streets. They invited the passers-by to help them in handing out the food from the stores. At a given sign all the Soviet soldiers disappeared from the store, and Soviet photographers appeared at the same time to take pictures of the people lured there by the soldiers.

These, and other means of class warfare are very important, but probably the most important of all means are the new laws adopted by the present regime. For a period the Communist regime used the old criminal laws, with certain amendments, but recently they decided that the old laws are too precise for their purpose, therefore a new Criminal Code was created. This code, with its vagueness, will be the ultimate instrument of wiping out every opposition. To illustrate the vagueness I would like to quote the definitions of treason and espionage according to the new code.

"Any Hungarian citizen who enters into contact with a foreign government, foreign organization, or the representative thereof in order to jeopardize the independence, territorial integrity, political, economic, defensive or any other significant interests of the Hungarian People's Republic, commits the crime of treason."

Espionage is committed by anyone who "* * * obtains, collects, or hands out data usable to the detriment of the Hungarian People's Republic in order that the data may be made known to a foreign government, foreign organization or the representative thereof."

It should be mentioned that, according to Hungarian law, dual nationality is recognized, and no Hungarian citizen may unilaterally renounce Hungarian citizenship, thus making anyone who has renounced his former Hungarian citizenship and practiced his national loyalty to another country subject to criminal prosecution. The possible wide interpretation of this provision gives the Government the opportunity, in fact, to create ex post facto laws and regulations, because in the code itself no definition may be found as to which interests of the Government are protected by the provision. The Minister of Justice in his accompanying message to the Criminal Code stated that "any and every data concerning the country may be regarded as usable against the country," and only the Government will be the judge in this question. The definition of espionage covers for instance every librarian who obtains Hungarian books, regardless whether he was at any time a Hungarian citizen or not. I, at the present moment, testifying here, am committing both treason and espionage according to the Hungarian law.

I tried to illustrate the perversion of the law in a Communist-dominated country. Now, I would like to say something about the persons who administer this kind of justice.

Judges and attorneys in prewar Hungary were among the most respected professionals, because their independence and integrity was unquestionable. Judges were appointed by the head of the state, but could not be dismissed, transferred, or even promoted against their will. Attorneys had to be the members of the Chambers of Attorneys, an organization similar to the bars, which had complete autonomy in administrative matters, and had disciplinary power over their members, subject to review only by a special panel of the supreme court, consisting of four judges and three attorneys.

A Communist regime has no use for such people as dispensers of Communist justice. Therefore, from the very first day, they purged the ranks of judges. The first step was the so-called denazification, immediately after the end of the war. The procedure was, however, denazification only in name, because among the old judges there had been no extremists. In practice this process was a means of getting rid of known anti-Communist judges, the number of which was high, and of those who in prewar times had imposed sentences for Communist activities under the existing laws.

The second step was a general reduction in force whereby about half of the judges were summarily dismissed. At the same time the government established an academy for training new judges and government attorneys. In these courses workers, without regard to qualification, and in most cases only with a fourth- or sixth-grade elementary education, were trained to be judges and government attorneys in 6 months. The final step of the regimentation of the judges was the judiciary act which gave a free hand to the government to remove, transfer or dismiss any judge at will.

The attorneys did not have a better fate either. In this case the denazification process was also used with the safe effect as in the case of the judges. The denazification committees had the right to deny admission to or order the discontinuation of legal practice for anyone. This authority was used not for denazification but for political purposes as is shown in the following decision: "Hesitant political behavior during the time following the liberation makes the petitioner unworthy of the confidence necessary for the practice of the legal profession."

A more powerful weapon was the disciplinary power of the chambers of attorneys, and taxation. Hundreds were forced to resign because of the abuse of the latter.

The chambers constituted an autonomy which was granted to determine the membership fee and the income tax of its members. The determination of these contributions was arbitrary and failure to pay the assessed amounts resulted in the suspension and revocation of the membership. The assessments were determined in a lump sum, with complete disregard of the actual income.

The disciplinary power was also used to get rid of non-Communist members, and since the appellate jurisdiction was transferred from the supreme court to a government-appointed central committee of the chambers of attorneys, the Communist Party was free to use the disciplinary boards to decimate the ranks of the attorneys.

Attorneys were disbarred for the most various reasons. In one case a defense counsel exchanged a few words with a witness during the recess of a trial. He was accused of influencing the witness, thereby jeopardizing the success of the criminal proceedings, and disbarred.

In another case an attorney was accused of preparing a number of petitions for exempting certain properties from socialization. The decision of the appellate board was suspension from practice because "In class warfare a socialist lawyer, even within his formal rights, may not give regular legal aid to the class enemy. The violation of this rule constitutes a grave, disciplinable offense."

Discriminatory taxation and a gross abuse of disciplinary power was not enough to crush the resistance of the legal profession. The government therefore created the lawyer's cooperatives in order to collectivize the work of attorneys. Membership in these cooperatives was voluntary in the beginning, but this, in spite of the tremendous pressure and various tactics of the leadership, was unsuccessful. Not only did the attorneys resist joining these organizations, but the clients themselves turned away from those few attorneys who were forced or intimidated to join. As a result the government decided to do away with the so-called mild measures, and to use the most drastic step: to disbar by statute those who were not completely servile to the regime.

This was announced by the Minister of Justice on March 20, 1958, with the following remark:

"Politically, attorneys fell behind not only other groups within the legal profession, but also other strata of intellectuals. * * * A considerable number of practicing attorneys are not only unfit to perform their duties, but a portion of them actually impedes the successful operation of the courts and other authorities, as well as the realization of socialist legality. Largely because of the composition of the chambers, attorneys are presently unable fully to accomplish their tasks; therefore, * * * the composition of the chamber membership must be improved. This means that unsuitable elements must be removed from among the attorneys."

The official explanation to the new statute stated, among other things:

"The activity of attorneys was motivated in most cases by a desire for making money, and consequently was inspired by a commercial spirit. * * * In general, under such circumstances, it was certainly out of the question to practice law properly and render legal assistance in a manner in harmony with the public interest."

After such statements the provisions of the new statutes caused no surprise. Private practice was abolished, and attorneys could only practice if they were members of a cooperative. All attorneys who were members of the chambers at the time of the issuance of the edict were reexamined as to their suitability for the performance of the functions of the legal profession as defined in the basic statute, which reads:

"The duties of the attorneys as well as the character of their functions had been radically changed by the penetrating Socialist transformation to which the operation of our Government, economy, and society had been subject since the liberation. In our people's republic the function of attorneys is to enforce the interests of the working people, and at the same time to be also one of the significant guarantees of the effective work of courts, and to protect Socialist legality.

"In order that attorneys may best perform their duties regarding the construction of our socialist society * * * it shall be the function of attorneys to render—by furthering the judicial activities of the courts—legal assistance to their clients and, by conscientious work in the interest of socialist legality, to aid them in the enforcement of their rights. No attorney shall cooperate in the evasion or circumvention of law, or in the abuse of the same in any manner whatsoever."

The results of the reexamination were never officially announced, but, according to usually well informed sources, slightly less than one half of the attorneys were found unsuitable, and disbarred.

It is hard to believe that after such purges of the legal profession, the government still cannot trust the remaining lawyers, but this must be the case, because according to the provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure:

"In civil or military criminal proceedings, if the special protection of the interests of the government so requires, only those lawyers may act as authorized or officially appointed defense counsel, who are registered in the list drawn up for this purpose by the Minister of Justice."

Dr. William Solyom-Fekete,
European Law Division, Law Library,
Library of Congress.

Dr. Fekete. This is what happens when the rule of law is changed from being the governing force of society to the instrument of oppression and terror. Thank you.

Senator Ervin. Dr. Aguillar, we will be delighted to hear from you at this time. Dr. Aguillar was professor of the philosophy of law in Cuba's Oriente University, prior to the Castro regime. He is now professor of law at Georgetown University. He will give us the benefit of his observations and experience in witnessing the destruction of the rule of law in that unhappy country.

Dr. Aguillar. Mr. Chairman, Senator Keating, ladies and gentlemen, I cannot resist the temptation of beginning with a sad and grateful confession. I am grateful for the opportunity to speak about Cuba, and sad because—maybe I have not yet realized how sad—it is to speak of law among lawyers, of freedom among free people, and know that those words are considered criminal offenses in my country and that freedom no longer exists in the nation where I was born. In the Cuban case, it was more tragic, because the power of destruction came disguised as the word of justice. We Cubans thought we were fighting for democracy, legal order, for freedom of expression, and yet we were helping the forces that were ready and prepared to destroy democracy, freedom, and law.

STATEMENT OF DR. LUIS E. AGUILLAR

Today, more than any other time in history, it is essential that freemen be conscious of the dangers that threaten freedom.

In this contradictory era of cold war and seething peace, it is vital that the men who love freedom and law be fully aware that the Western World concept of legal order is being attacked everywhere by the same system and with the same methods. That the forces that restore injustice in East Germany are the same that crush the law in Hungary and deal death to freedom in Cuba. And if those forces are united in attack, we must be united in defense.

The totalitarian world is bound together by the iron discipline of the party; the free world must be bound together by the common love of freedom and law. Only thus, identified in a common cause, will we understand that today, in this gigantic struggle, there are no small countries and no isolated defeats. The collapse of one part makes a break in the line of all of us, a concession on the periphery weakens the center. Freedom and law must be defended with equal strength everywhere. One cannot fight in Berlin what one tolerates in Havana.

If I were asked what is the essential instrument employed in this general offensive against democratic order, the one used everywhere to impose totalitarian rule, I would reply: Fear. Civilization became possible when man was converted into a citizen; that is, when he became the subject of the laws and found himself protected in his activity and his thought by a shield of legal standard that he knew and approved of. When, for whatever reason, the governing group destroys the legal order and imposes its will over and above the laws, men immediately cease to be citizens and become defenseless creatures, in the face of the all-powerful state. Since no one can know for sure what his duties and his rights are, since whatever the ruler wishes to call a crime is a crime, and everything depends on his guiding will, the security of the individual disappears and fear begins to reign.

This is, of course, a special kind of fear, a fear that is typical of the 20th century, a pervading environmental fear that is perpetuated and administered in doses by the rulers, a fear that is injected into the body of society with the cold efficiency of a surgeon. The art of politics has advanced a great deal since the days of Machiavelli. In other times, the governments merely inspired fear; the dictatorships of today, much more scientific, know how to make use of fear.

On May 21, 1959, Fidel Castro said: "We want to free man from fear, we want to free man from dogma, to free the society, and its economy, without dictatorship of any kind."

But even while these beautiful words were being displayed in sight of everyone, at the same time, occultly, silently, the legal structure of the Cuban nation was being overturned and the foundations of dictatorship were being built. The fear of possible moral or physical destruction extended its shadow over every group and stilled criticism.

In the case of Cuba, in the beginning, the popular fervor, the elation produced by the fall of Batista, was made use of along with fear. Many of the initial antijuridical measures, such as the disappearance of the right of "habeas corpus" or the retroactivity character given to penal laws, when detrimental to the accused, were defended and presented as temporary measures, as "exceptional" laws required to liquidate violence and return rapidly to legality.

It was soon clear, however, that the exception became the law, and the law became the exception.

Offenses were defined in a vague and imprecise manner, so that the interpretation of them could be extended as might suit the purposes of the moment and cover any kind of activity.

All media of information, the newspapers, radio, television, were used to publicly defame the accused.

The accused defenders went to jail along with the people they were trying to defend. Cases of imprisonment without trial multiplied.

The most elementary principles of legal procedure were violated with impunity. There were cases of death sentences executed while the court of appeals was reviewing the sentence and of defense witnesses who were shot as "traitors" along with the defendant.

The judicial power was systematically purged, stripped of all freedom to make decisions, forced to wear uniform and to subject itself to military obedience.

The process of reducing and crushing all the institutions and freedoms of the Cuban people was stepped up day by day.

In September 1961, the public prosecutor of the supreme court declared in his speech opening the judicial term:

"A way of counterrevolutionary activity by the Cuban judiciary was the support given by most of its members to ancient theories about the separation of powers, and about independence and political neutrality of the judicial branch. This theory was an attempt to oppose the old conception of the judicial power to the revolutionary power. The power of the State is only one power. Today the political power is in the hands of the people."

When the public prosecutor was making these statements, the process of subjection had already been completed; the Cuban people had been stripped of all political power.

A trial that I had the sad privilege of observing in person is one of the earliest and clearest examples of where this process was leading.

It happened in March 1959. A group of pilots who had served in Batista's Air Force, but remained in Cuba after his downfall, was about to be judged by a revolutionary tribunal. The tribunal was made up of three honorable young officers of the rebel army who had recently come down from the mountains after fighting for the ideals that the revolution had proclaimed.

At the end of the trial, in view of the total absence of evidence against the defendants, the tribunal judged them innocent. By this, the revolution showed that it was applying justice even to its supposed enemies. At least that is what those idealistic officers believed.

But Fidel Castro thundered his displeasure in Havana. The final judgment was annulled with all haste, the usual campaign of hate was initiated and a new tribunal was set up immediately for the purpose of condemning, not of judging. The principles of the revolution's own law were completely violated and the will of one man swept aside all moral and legal objections.

What was the result? The presiding officer of the first tribunal, Maj. Felix Pena, one of the first boys to go up into the mountains to fight for the new Cuba, committed suicide shortly afterward under mysterious circumstances. Another member of the tribunal, Maj. Antonio Mitchel, who had suffered torture and imprisonment for fighting against Batista, had to take the road to exile. The third member of the tribunal sank into anonymity.

Of the four defense counsels—some of them professors at the university who had distinguished themselves defending the revolutionaries, two are still in prison in Cuba and the others are in exile.

The 22 prisoners were sentenced to 30 years imprisonment.

The ideal of achieving a democratic order and real justice for all Cubans was also condemned in that trial.

But the struggle for justice and for freedom has not ended either in Cuba or outside of Cuba. In the face of totalitarian arbitrary rule, we must close ranks in defense of the principles of law and human rights. In the face of the violation of all standards, democracy raises the standard of its respect for law and treaties.

Therefore, as a humble member of a community that is fighting for the same causes as all the free world, I would like to close by recalling the emotion with which we Cubans read the words of Joint Resolution 230 of the U.S. Congress, which so well expressed this solidarity.

That resolution stated the determination of the United States "(a) to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere; and (c) to work with the Organization of American States and with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination."

The Cubans who love freedom, those who are fighting for it within and outside of Cuba, have full confidence that the Nation that is the leader of democracy in this hemisphere has, in that resolution, expressed a firm will to save the situation, not merely a rhetorical desire.

The future of democracy in Latin America depends on that faith's proving well founded.

My view is that the process has been the same everywhere—in Hungary, in Germany, or in Cuba. Last year I was a professor at Columbia University and many times my students asked me about the laws of the revolutionary government; how they destroy the constitution, how they impose totalitarian regime. You cannot trust the President in Cuba through the laws of the revolutionary government because the real problem is that there is no law—they have written laws, but they will violate those laws whenever they want and in any occasion.

Under the Cuban revolutionary government, according to law, the owners of land have the right to appeal to a certain tribunal. They have the right to go to that tribunal and present their case. The owners of land have the right to receive some money for the confiscated land and solve the problem. That was the law—the revolutionary law—but in practice, it was never applied. Land was taken from the owner without any compensation—without any right to appeal—at the whim of one man or the will of the National Institute of Agrarian Reform. That was the only law.

One example was to look like a joke—but for many Cubans a tragic joke. The government could assign a debt of land to any criminal in Cuba and destroy any appeal or any right that you thought you had. They could ask whether you were an Indian. That was to show that they would not hear any appeal or give any legal procedure. In criminal cases and in constitutional cases involving freedom of expression, it was the same story; to uphold the law and then to violate it by revolutionary law and to oppose all legal institutions of the people.

That was followed by a practice of never defining clearly what constituted a criminal offense so that one would never know when he was committing a crime. That is why I would like to express in my statement only one point: That the system of attack is the same everywhere.

Men everywhere who love freedom, law and order and those forces of the Western World must be alert to fight together because in this struggle there are no isolated defeats, no little countries. What is happening in Cuba could endanger all the systems of the Western World. What happened in Europe will affect Latin America. We should defend those rights of the individual and fight back in earnest, not only to save the democracy, law, and freedom, but also to restore those principles in Cuba, in Germany, and in every other country that has loved those principles. Thank you.

Senator ERVIN. Senator KEATING, do you have any questions you would like to ask the witnesses?

Senator KEATING. No, I don't. I think it has been interesting and I assume that all three of the gentlemen would like to have their statements, in full, entered in the record.

Senator ERVIN. That will be done.

Senator KEATING. I have had the occasion to quote some of Dr. Aguillar's statements and am very happy to welcome these gentlemen here.

Senator ERVIN. I am delighted to know that many students from Lee High School, in Springfield, Va., are here. I am sure that our three distinguished panelists and Senator KEATING agree with me in the observation that the most precious thing we have as Americans is the government of laws.

I think we could draw some lessons of a uniform nature from the statements made by these three great legal scholars. It seems to me, Dr. Jacoby, that the fundamental problem which made possible what happened in Germany, under Hitler, was the fact that you had a constitution under which the right of the legislative body could be suspended and the powers of the legislature be placed in the chancellory. It seems to me too, that one of the great lessons taught there, and one which also has been experienced in other nations, is that one of the greatest threats to liberty is the concentration of all government powers in one man or one body. It shows the wisdom of the philosophy that there should be a separation in the powers of government. We can rejoice in the fact that those who drew our Constitution divided the powers of government in America on the National level and on a State level. The division on the national level was among the legislative body—the Congress, the President, and the courts.

You three gentlemen have indicated that when a dictatorship wishes to destroy the liberty of the people and abolish the rule of law, the first thing it does is to make the judge and the members of the bar subservient to the will of the state. In Hungary, there was an independent judiciary which was destroyed and the judges became instruments of the party. The same course was pursued in Germany and Cuba. If there is to be liberty in a country, there has to be an independent system of courts. Courts should be independent of the government, otherwise the courts can be used as instruments of oppression and tyranny rather than instruments of justice.

I have always been very much impressed by the oath which a superior court judge in North Carolina takes. He swears that he will do equal justice between the government and the individual and if he receives any directions from anyone as to how he should act, he will not give any heed to those instructions.

Now, in our country, only judges hold office for life. Prior to the founding of

America, there were many countries that had a great many offices with life tenure. But the only life tenure provided by the U.S. Constitution is that of the judges. Furthermore, an additional provision prevents judges' compensation from being diminished during their term of office. These provisions make our judiciary absolutely independent of the other two branches of government. I think that sometimes we tend to forget the importance of an independent bar—that is a bar where lawyers are independent of the Government and who have the power, if need be, to defy the Government. There is not only a need for independent judges, but there is also a need for lawyers who are independent of the Government, who can stand up in the court and defy all the powers of the Government, to uphold the rights of the humblest individual in the land.

We have heard dramatic accounts of what happened to the rule of law in three of the great countries of the earth. Of course, we can't say that it won't happen here. As I mentioned earlier, Judge Learned Hand said that liberty must live in the hearts of the people. If liberty ever dies in the hearts of the American people, we could go the same way that the rule of law went in Germany, Hungary, and Cuba. The finest resolution you can make as an American citizen and I address this particularly to the high school students here—is to resolve, come what may, that you will do everything in your power to see that a government of laws continues to exist in this country. Resolve that we maintain laws to define the rights of the individual which even the Government has to respect; resolve that we keep an independent judiciary and an independent bar because without either, these great rights we have can certainly be lost overnight.

Our written Constitution is based upon a great truth shown by the experience of all mankind—that you cannot safely trust any man, or any group of men, or any one body of men who possess unlimited governmental powers. A nation must, therefore, divide the powers of government among different branches, like the President, the Congress and the courts. As long as they are independent and not concentrated in one, you can expect the rule of law and liberty to endure; otherwise, you can expect to lose it.

I would like to recognize Mr. Thomas P. Kerester, president of the Capitol Hill Chapter of the Federal Bar Association, and thank him and his committee for the work they did in arranging what I think is a very instructive program about how the rule of law can be lost and how it can be preserved.

CARE OF ILLEGITIMATE CHILDREN

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one of the most nagging problems in our society is illegitimacy; like the poor, it seems to be always with us.

The prevailing policy of government at all levels in our country is that the innocent victims of illegitimacy, the children, should be cared for through welfare dollars. This is as it should be.

At the same time, such thoughtful authorities as the Tennessee State Commissioner of Welfare, Mr. Noble Caudill, recognize that welfare assistance, while essential to those who need it, when they need it, is by no means the final answer. As he puts it:

> The basic problem is one of a failure of someone, somewhere, to assume their proper responsibility.

How Commissioner Caudill is trying to overcome this failure by the "someones, somewhere" is related in an article appearing in the Nashville Tennessean on July 14. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Tragic Social Ill Needs New Attack

(By Bill Kovach)

For some 250,000 babies, life will begin this year with the sharp slap of a hand and the even sharper slap of a statistical notation more branding than a tattoo—illegitimate.

Whether born in a private nursing home, a home for "wayward" mothers, or the rumpled bed of a shack, these children, who greet no anxious father, will add to one of today's fastest growing domestic problems.

Illegitimacy has tripled in the United States in the past 25 years to the point that one of every 18 babies born this year will be born to an unwed mother. And, Tennessee has kept pace. In 1961, the latest period for which figures are available, 1 in 11 of the 82,067 born were listed as "born-out-of-wedlock."

Tennessee's percentage of illegitimates has climbed steadily from 3.7 percent in 1934 to 9.3 percent in 1961. Officials see no "reverse" trend in sight.

EXPECTANT BRIDES

The rate, in fact, is probably much higher than reported figures would indicate. There are at least 1 million illegal abortions in the Nation each year. One of every six brides is pregnant when she marries.

The cost of illegitimacy in aid dollars alone is climbing to staggering heights. Under only one phase of the aid program—Aid to Dependent Children—illegitimates and their mothers on welfare rolls will receive $180 million this year. In Tennessee, 29 percent of the $20 million ADC outlay will go to illegitimate children and their families.

But the cost to society does not end there, Commissioner of Welfare Noble C. Caudill points out. The other costs are incalculable, he said, through illegitimacy's contribution to the school dropout problem, rising juvenile delinquency, and unemployment.

TRAGIC CYCLE

"Illegitimates form an integral part of a vicious cycle of events that ends when the child grows to adulthood unprepared by schooling, family counseling, and experience to make their way in the world—they begin life on the welfare rolls and are just as likely to end up on the welfare rolls."

The noted anthropologist Margaret Mead says the illegitimate figures are not surprising. "In a society which permits and almost forces its members into extramarital situations there is bound to be a good deal of illegitimacy."

Social workers agree. Today's children are exposed daily to raw sex—in movies, on television, in all phases of advertising. Unchaperoned independence and popularity are the goal of all young girls. Access to the family car, early dating, and easy access to whisky are deadly to children who have insufficient direction at home.

"When you look at the statistics underlying the state's ADC rolls," says Roy Nicks, assistant welfare commissioner, "the illegitimate figures are not so surprising."

The median number of years of education of mothers on ADC is 7.8 years. For fathers the median is 4.5.

From these poorly educated parents spring the 16,898 illegitimate children which form 29 percent of the total number on the State's welfare rolls.

White parents account for 52.6 percent of the children drawing ADC. Negroes, with fewer children on the rolls, contribute more illegitimates, 22.9 percent as compared to 8.6 percent white. But, the problem is not entirely one of race.

Negroes contribute disproportionate numbers as a result of a society which forces more Negroes into the lowest economic groups where most reported illegitimates occur. Negroes cannot afford abortions. Studies of very poor, all white communities indicate their illegitimate rates are equal to that of similar Negro groups.

IGNORANCE AND CONFUSION

Public thinking on illegitimacy meets the rising problem with ignorance, misunderstanding, and confusion. Most people tend to dismiss the problem as the result of immoral Negroes, mental retardates, or "wild" youth.

Such rationalization makes it easier for the average citizen to accept charges like those voiced earlier by Tennessee Congressman Robert A. (Fats) Everett that we are "subsidizing immoral conduct," by paying welfare to illegitimates. It makes more appealing the violent calls for sterilization as the ultimate penalty for repeated illicit pregnancies.

Such rationalization makes it easier for the average citizen to shrug his shoulders and deny any direct responsibility.

Commissioner Caudill and his assistant, Roy Hicks, disagree.

"The basic problem is one of a failure of someone, somewhere to assume their proper responsibility * * * we get the problem when it's too late to correct. All we in welfare can do is administer to their needs and attempt to set things straight again," Caudill says.

FOUR REASONS

Assistant Commissioner Nicks lists four basic reasons for illegitimacy, all of which reflect a lack of responsibility:

1. Lack of religious training.
2. Broken homes and improper parental guidance.
3. Lack of formal education.
4. Lack of economic opportunity and discrimination.

Mounting an all-out effort to attack the problem at its roots, Commissioner Caudill has designed a two-part program.

First, he is establishing community advisory groups in each of the State's 95 counties. The groups are made up of civic leaders who, the commissioner hopes, will help bring the local communities to assume local responsibility to curb the growing problem.

Second, he has expanded investigative facilities to find the legal fathers of illegitimate children and, through court action, make them legally responsible.

AWARENESS NEEDED

"We need an awareness of the problem on the local level," Caudill says, "and we need it desperately. If the situation is not corrected soon the future could be frightening."

Caudill has high hopes for community groups.

"If we can stimulate interest; if we can get church groups to go out with a missionary desire and see that the proper religious foundation is laid with the parents and children who receive too little local attention; if we can get civic groups interested in the school dropout rate and act locally to keep youngsters in school; if we can educate parents to their responsibility; if we can get local groups to provide employment to those whose condition of color, poverty, or education is now blocking gainful employment—then we can begin to solve the problem and not just treat its results with welfare dollars."

Just as enthusiastically, Caudill and Nicks reported on their legitimation drive.

In June, 31 children had the illegitimate tattoo removed, when through court action, their fathers were made legally responsible.

"This is one program in which there can be no letup. If we can find the father of a child, we're going to prove he is the father in court and make him assume the responsibility that has been his from the very beginning," Caudill said.

This, he said, is a satisfying field.

A STATUS CHANGE

"When we legitimate a child it changes their entire status. Automatically the child assumes legal rights to the holdings or benefits of the father. With the signing of a court order they have been transformed from wandering waifs with no hope to the rightful heirs of a legal parent."

A third and more delicate approach has been mentioned by Commissioner Caudill—birth control. Early this year the commissioner delivered a speech in which he said it was time "we begin giving some thought to the possibilities of birth control education."

Treading cautiously, the commissioner has suggested that his department could act as a referral agency in the matter.

"I don't think the department should become a dispenser of birth control information," he said, "but with our knowledge of the problem we could refer those persons interested to some private agency which can make further information available."

HIGH HOPES

Although the commissioner has high hopes for his program, he admits it will solve no problems unless the average citizen becomes interested in a "constructive" program and actively works for one.

"Illegitimacy results from the failure of a father to assume his individual responsibility the community cannot solve the problm by passing responsibility to the State and Federal Government," the commissioner said.

Society created the idea of legitimacy and illegitimacy, society must find ways to treat its own creation.

DEATH OF J. LACEY REYNOLDS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I regret to announce to the Senate the passing of a well-known and respected figure on Capitol Hill, Mr. J. Lacey Reynolds.

Lacey Reynolds was a brilliant newspaperman who covered the Washington scene for many years. A native of Nashville, a member of a distinguished Tennessee family, he served as Washington correspondent for the Nashville Tennessean from 1938 to 1951, except for the period during World War II when he was in the Navy. He next became chief of the Washington bureau of the Block newspapers, including the Toledo Blade and Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. In later years, he worked for the Moss Subcommittee on Government Information of the House. At his death, he was a consultant to the House Small Business Committee. He was highly regarded by his fellow newspapermen, as evidenced by his election at one time to the board of governors of the National Press Club.

Those of us who knew him will miss Lacey Reynolds. He was a fine newspaperman and a good friend.

DIRECTOR OF NATION'S FIRST MINUTEMAN MISSILE PROJECT LEAVES MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the State of Montana is extremely proud to be the site of the first operational Minuteman missile wing in the Nation. As of the 4th of July, the missile complex was prepared to blast 150 nuclear-armed intercontinental missiles from hardened underground silos that dot the rolling lands of central Montana. The headquarters for the Minuteman wing are located at Malmstrom Air Force Base, at Great Falls, Mont.

During the 28-month construction period, this $510 million project has been under the very capable and knowledgeable guidance of Brig. Gen. Harry E. Goldsworthy of the Air Force. I wish to take this means of complimenting General Goldsworthy on a difficult job well done. The project was completed on schedule after many anxious moments. In addition, there was a minimum of labor difficulties. General Goldsworthy and the people of Montana got along famously, and we indeed regret the departure of so able a representative of our Nation's defense system.

The General has just completed another difficult job in a long list of accomplishments for the Nation and the Air Force. General Goldsworthy will now be coming to Washington, as Air Force deputy chief of staff for systems and logistics in the Pentagon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD news stories which appeared in the July 14, 1963, issue of the Great Falls Tribune, and the Montana Standard of June 15, 1963.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, July 14, 1963]

HIS MISSILE JOB DONE, GOLDSWORTHY LEAVES

A tall, black-haired Air Force general, who directed a vast project that involved locally administered contracts totaling $160 million in the last 28 months, will leave Great Falls today.

Brig. Gen. Harry E. Goldsworthy has been assigned to a key Air Force job in Washington, D.C., after having directed successful completion of the Nation's first Minuteman missile wing, now able to blast 150 nuclear-armed intercontinental missiles from hardened underground silos that dot the rolling lands of central Montana.

The $160 million worth of contracts General Goldsworthy administered locally does not include the cost of the three-stage solid-fueled missiles which are manufactured and assembled by the Boeing Airplane Co. Since defense experts place the cost of each operational missile at about $3.4 million including construction and the missile, the total cost of the Montana Minuteman wing would amount to about $510 million.

COST-PLUS FACTORS

Goldsworthy said he preferred not to list the amounts of the major contracts at this time because some contracts involved cost-plus factors and amounts are still being negotiated. The original construction contract, awarded to the Fuller-Webb combine, amounted to $61.7 million.

The Minuteman wing, which has its headquarters at Malmstrom AFB, was declared fully operational by Goldsworthy the day before the July Fourth holiday, giving the Nation an Independence Day present, making the Nation's defense position much stronger. Defense authorities consider the Minuteman missile their "instant ICBM" and the Nation's "ace in the hole."

Slender, soft-spoken Goldsworthy, who has gained the reputation of being able to do a critical job under difficult conditions without antagonizing those working with him, thinks it appropriate the three-stage solid-fueled Minuteman was named after the intrepid militiamen of 1776 who were able to go into action almost immediately. The Minuteman can roar from its virtually blast-proof silos within 32 seconds.

ON SCHEDULE

Goldsworthy can heave a sigh of relief now that his monumental job was completed on schedule but he spent many anxious hours from the time he was tapped as one of 18 Air Force colonels, then called the "18 angry men" to direct urgent missile projects.

A native of Spokane who had a brilliant World War II and postwar military record, Goldsworthy received word he was selected to be the Site Activation Force (SATAF) commander for the Nation's first Minuteman wing in mid-September of 1960.

When Goldsworthy, then a colonel, read Gen. Curtis LeMay's telegram about the assignment, he knew his military career depended upon success of the project. LeMay, now Chief of the Air Force, said, "I want it thoroughly understood that I hold each site commander personally responsible for successful activation of his site and its turnover to SAC in an acceptable operational condition at the earliest possible date."

The project suffered a blow in December of 1960 when bids for construction were rejected because they were about $20 million over estimates. Goldsworthy's spirits must have dropped when he realized one of the mildest winters in many years was being lost for construction work.

WORK RUSHED

A contract with the Fuller-Webb combine was announced in February of 1961 and the ground-breaking ceremony was held March 15. Work was rushed on the critical defense projects but the mild winter of 1960 was followed by a cruel, cold one of 1961 when frequent 20-below weather slowed the construction pace.

The first 20 missiles were declared operational last December and Air Force officers said the first 10 Minutemen were ready for firing at the height of the Cuban crisis last October.

A total of 4,616 persons were working on the project last September, the working peak of the job. Of a total of 14,111,648 man-hours devoted to the project, there were only 1,246 man-days lost because of labor trouble—an amazingly low percentage of 0.087, Goldsworthy points out proudly.

"We were fortunate in having five labor officials, excellent labor mediation officials, all working in a team effort dedicated to the job," he said.

Goldsworthy paid tribute to the "wonderful support" from Montanans in general, saying "it would have been impossible to make our schedules without that support." He cited the cooperation of landowners and said it was a credit to them to accept the missile project with the understanding and patience they did.

Lessons learned during the tough months on the project are making work easier on other Minuteman wings (with 800 missiles in addition to the 150 in Montana in North and South Dakota, Wyoming and Missouri).

OFFICERS BRIEFED

About 140 Air Force officers from the other missile projects gathered at Malmstrom Friday for another briefing on lessons learned on the project here.

"Considerable learning was passed on by contractors and the Air Force so work could go faster on the other wings," Goldsworthy said.

"We have devoted a lot of attention to passing on our experience," he added.

The most difficult problem on the project was the tremendous task of developing a system to keep track of the progress and needs of each of the 150 missile silos and 15 launch control centers.

"At one time, we had work going on at all 165 sites plus work on the 1,783-mile cable plan and we had to know the exact status of each phase of the work," Goldsworthy recalls.

"We finally developed a system that really worked," he said. "We established direct contact with each facility and had a report from each supervisor back at our headquarters at Malmstrom by 11 each night."

A staff of 35 to 40 worked each night to make sure tools and equipment needed at each site would be there when needed the next day. That meant a great deal because work of an entire crew could be halted if even one screw was not available when needed, he explained.

EIGHTEEN THOUSAND SQUARE MILES

The exact coordination was needed because the missile project covered 18,000 square miles, an area larger than the combined size of several New England States. To make matters worse, although some working sites were only 7 miles apart, it required 30 miles of driving over rough roads to cover that distance.

During the construction project, about 3 million cubic yards of earth and rock were moved—enough to excavate a ditch 10 feet wide and 10 feet deep for 106 miles, about the distance from Malmstrom AFB to Helena. About 120,000 cubic yards of concrete were used, enough to make a sidewalk 4 feet wide and 3 inches thick for 620 miles—greater than the distance from Helena to Seattle.

The project consumed 18,000 tons of reinforcing and 12,500 tons of structural steel, enough for 38,000 autos. Total depth of all silos totaled about 12,600 feet, equal to a mine shaft about 2½ miles deep.

The complicated job involved its share of paperwork and 100,000 sheets of paper were used every day and 2,000 pencils were worn down each month.

Goldsworthy, who has been credited by both military and civilian leaders here as one of the most popular officers ever stationed at Malmstrom, will become Air Force deputy chief of staff for systems and logistics in the Pentagon at Washington, D.C. He will be director of production for all Air Force weapon systems.

R. F. Kitchingman, former Malmstrom commander who retired July 1 as executive vice president of the chamber of commerce, probably summed up the feelings of many here about Goldsworthy.

"In order to get difficult jobs done on schedule, it is virtually unavoidable for an officer to be a tough SOB at times, but General Goldsworthy was able to work with people and get the job done without showing the slightest SOB sign," Kitchingman said.

[From the Butte (Mont.) Standard, July 15, 1963]

MALMSTROM AIRBASE'S GENIAL GENERAL TAKES NEW ASSIGNMENT

GREAT FALLS.—A genial general, once a member of a handpicked Air Force group known as "the 18 angry men," left Sunday for a new assignment after directing activation of the Nation's first Minuteman missile wing.

Brig. Gen. Harry E. Goldsworthy will become Air Force deputy chief of staff for systems and logistics. Stationed at the Pentagon, he also will serve as director of production for Air Force weapons systems.

The tall, dark-haired officer headed a project that involved locally administered contracts totaling $160 million in the past 28 months.

Goldsworthy's assignment in Montana: bring to an operational status the initial Minuteman missile wing, with headquarters at Malmstrom Air Force Base.

The wing, declared operational earlier this month, comprises 150 nuclear-tipped intercontinental missiles poised to fire within 32 seconds from underground sites.

Goldsworthy was tapped in 1960 as one of 18 Air Force colonels, then called "the 18 angry men," to head urgent missile projects.

In Great Falls, Goldsworthy paid tribute to wonderful support from Montanans.

"It would have been impossible to make our schedules without that support," he said. "We were fortunate in having fine labor officials, excellent labor mediation officials, all working in a team effort dedicated to the job."

Last September 4,616 persons were working at the Montana missile sites.

The general said 100,000 sheets of paper were used each day for the project and 2,000 pencils were worn down each month.

Goldsworthy was described as a highly popular officer by both civilian and military leaders at the missile complex.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

REQUIREMENTS FOR ARTICLES IMPORTED IN CONTAINERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2513) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may the Senate now proceed with the unfinished business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H.R. 2513) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RADICAL IDEAS OF THE NEW FRONTIER

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a few years ago we were told that when the New Frontier got underway in Washington we would hear of many new and radical ideas.

In the light of the three instances which I shall now cite who could say that the New Frontier is not carrying out that promise?

Under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare they have approved four interesting research grants:

A sum of $46,731 has been granted to study the "regulation of development of the mouse egg."

A grant of $9,740 has been made to study the "physiological adaptation in the Mexican free-tailed bat."

A grant of $4,120 has been made to promote the study of the "effects of frustration on a reflex response."

Now, who says that these Frontiersmen do not have imaginations?

COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES OF HIGHWAY BUILDERS AND CONSERVATIONISTS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, shortly after the great interstate highway program got underway, I became concerned with the unnecessary destruction to our Nation's rivers and streams as a result of inadequate planning of highway construction. Others interested in recreation, conservation, and preservation of America's resources were equally concerned. Hundreds of miles of interstate highways and primary and secondary roads were being constructed without regard to preservation of streams and fish and wildlife habitat. Inquiry elicited the information that the Coordination Act did not apply to Federal-aid highway projects.

It became apparent that some requirement for consultation between the highway commissions and fish and game commissions or conservation departments was necessary. In the 87th Congress, I introduced S. 2767, requiring clearance from the Secretary of Interior for Federal-aid highway projects. Acting through the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Secretary of Interior would satisfy himself that the plans and surveys for proposed highways were satisfactory in the interests of conserving fish and wildlife and recreation resources.

After the introduction of S. 2767 in the 87th Congress, evidence poured in from the North, South, East, and West that indiscriminate road construction was destroying an irreplaceable resource. Our natural rivers, streams, and lakes are vital to America, both from an esthetic and utilitarian standpoint.

When the 87th Congress adjourned without action on the SOS—Save Our Streams legislation, I decided to ask each State about its need for such legislation. I sent questionnaires to the fish and game management officials in each of the 50 States. The cooperation and response was tremendous. Forty-six of the fifty replied. A summary of the replies is printed in the 1963 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 24 beginning on page 872 as a part of my remarks when I reintroduced the SOS—Save Our Streams bill in the 88th Congress.

In addition, articles, editorials, resolutions from conservation organizations, and other material on the general subject of resource damage as a result of highway construction are there reprinted. In the 88th Congress, the SOS—Save Our Streams—bill is S. 468, cosponsored by the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON].

In the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] was seeking the same objective with a little different approach, an amendment to the Coordination Act.

When departmental reports were requested on these bills, both Mr. DINGELL and I were consulted. Our proposal received courteous and considerate treatment from both the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Interior. Representatives from these two agencies met several times with Mr. DINGELL and with me and with members of our staffs. The Commerce Department made an independent inquiry as to the needs for greater protection of rivers and streams in highway planning and construction.

As a result, the other day the Bureau of Public Roads issued the following instructional memorandum, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS,
Washington, D.C., June 12, 1963.

Instructional memorandum 21-5-63.

Subject: Coordination of public interests of highway improvements with those of fish and wildlife resources.

The information received in reply to our memorandums of January 17, 1963, to regional engineers revealed a degree of coordination between the State highway departments and the State fish and game departments ranging from formal agreements establishing close liaison in the planning, location, and design stages of highway projects to relatively nonexistent communication between the agencies.

Several State highway departments have formal agreements with the State fish and game departments which among other things provide that proposed highway construction projects will be reviewed by the conservation agency for possible effects on fish and game resources, and establish and encourage close liaison between the field offices of both departments.

The highway agencies must realize that fish and game are a natural resource belonging to all the people of the country and the preservation of their habitat must be taken into consideration along with other values of public interest to arrive at determinations which are economical for all public interests. Public Roads supports that every effort should be made in the planning, design, and construction of highway projects that cause a minimum of disturbance to and reasonable preservation of the Nation's wildlife and related natural resources.

Under existing statutes, the Secretary, before approving Federal-aid projects submitted to him in accord with section 106 of title 23, United States Code, is required by section 109 to consider the particular needs of each locality affected by the project. These needs may include the preservation of the fish and wildlife resources of the State or area through which a Federal-aid highway is planned for construction. In order that the Secretary may properly discharge his duties in this regard he should receive proper assurances from each State highway department submitting projects for approval that it has had sufficient opportunity to study the needs of the locality in terms of the preservation or protection of fish and wildlife; that such needs have been evaluated and considered in locating and designing the particular highway project, and that all feasible measures will be taken to avoid damage to fish and wildlife and their natural habitats in the construction of the project.

To accomplish this purpose, the State highway department of every State shall adopt, in a timely manner, a procedure to be followed in the locating, planning, design, and construction of Federal-aid highway projects so as to afford protection of fish and wildlife resources. This procedure shall contain provision for suitable coordination between the activities of the State highway department and the activities of the appropriate State agency charged with the responsibility for the conservation of fish and wildlife. To accomplish the desired coordination, this procedure, as a minimum, should provide that the State highway department shall (a) submit programs of proposed Federal-aid highway projects to the State fish and game agencies at an early stage with a request that the fish and game agencies indicate those projects of interest; (b) furnish notice of public hearings, where required by section 128 of title 23, United States Code, to the fish and game agencies; and (c) adopt such other methods as will afford the State fish and game agency full opportunity to study and make recommendations to the State highway department concerning the proposed project prior to its submission by the State to the Secretary.

As soon as possible, but not later than January 1, 1964, submission of surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates for each proposed Federal-aid project included in an approved program pursuant to section 106 of title 23, United States Code, shall contain a statement that the State highway department has considered all facts presented by the State fish and game agency and the effect the proposed construction may have on fish and wildlife resources. The statement should contain (1) a description of the measures planned as project expenditures to minimize the effect of the proposed construction on fish and wildlife resources; (2) a description of any measures proposed by the State fish and wildlife agency to accomplish this purpose, which differ from those proposed by the State highway department; and (3) to the extent that measures proposed by the State highway department and State fish and game agency differ, an explanation of the factors considered by the State highway department in arriving at its proposal.

The Secretary, in exercising his authority to approve projects pursuant to section 106 of title 23, United States Code, thereby obligating the Federal Government for the payment of its proportional contribution thereto, will take into account the effects of the proposed construction upon fish and wildlife, and the necessary measures to be incorporated into the project to provide for the protection of these resources.

The general principles of the foregoing procedures shall be followed by the States for secondary road projects undertaken pursuant to section 117 of title 23, United States Code, and the certified statements submitted by the States as required thereunder shall so provide.

To be certain that these objectives will be a part of the Federal-aid highway program, each division engineer is to require that the State highway department furnish Public Roads with record of agreement or memorandum of understanding between the State highway departments and the State game and fish agency as to the procedures for cooperation and coordination between such agencies in adopting plans for construction of highway projects which affect fish and wildlife resources. A copy of such record is to be forwarded to the Office of Engineering and Operations, Washington, D.C.

Each division engineer is to require that the State highway department, if operating under the secondary road plan, submit an amending statement to its presently approved plan advising that the procedures as outlined herein will be made applicable to Federal-aid secondary projects undertaken after date of understanding with the State agency charged with the responsibility for the conservation of fish and wildlife resources, which date shall not be later than January 1, 1964. Such amendatory statements are to be forwarded to the Office of Engineering and Operations for processing for approval and establishment of effective date as set forth in paragraph 4g of PPM 20-5.

REX M. WHITTON,
Federal Highway Administrator.

Mr. METCALF. This memorandum achieves the objective of Congressman DINGELL'S and my legislative proposal. With the added advantage of the flexibility of an administrative regulation, it recognizes the importance of preservation of fish and wildlife resources of the Nation and takes steps to insure that they are taken into consideration in planning and programing Federal-aid highway projects.

An example of the tragic results of failure to coordinate planning of highway projects with State conservation agencies is given by Arthur Grahame in his article in Outdoor Life, "Are You a Sap for the Ribbon Cutters?" A paragraph therein is:

> In California, construction of Interstate Route 80 ruined Donner Creek, a trout productive tributary of Truckee River in the beautiful Lake Tahoe country. The State department of fish and game didn't learn of the stream's danger until after roadbuilding had been started. Then it was too late to make changes in the contract.

Under the new regulations a procedure has to be established so that the State agency responsible for fish and game conservation will be notified in a timely manner of the Federal-aid projects. The memorandum provides for the coordination sought by Congressman DINGELL between the State highway commissions and the appropriate agency having responsibility for fish and wildlife. There will never again be a situation where the "State department of fish and game didn't learn of the stream's danger until it was too late."

Indeed, there is an appeal procedure built in. If the recommendations of the State fish and game agency are not adopted—and at times, they may not be feasible—then a statement containing, first, a description of the measures planned as project expenditures to minimize the effect of the proposed construction on fish and wildlife resources; second, a description of any measures proposed by the State fish and wildlife agency to accomplish this purpose, which differ from those proposed by the State highway department; and, third, to the extent that measures proposed by the State highway department and State fish and game agency differ, an explanation of the factors considered by the State highway department in arriving at its proposal must be filed with the Bureau of Public Roads.

Montana has already taken steps to qualify under the regulation.

Earlier this year the Montana Junior Chamber of Commerce mounted a campaign to win support for State legislation to help protect fish and game habitat from damage due to construction projects. I am happy to report that an amended version of the proposal supported by the Montana Jaycees is now on the lawbooks in my State.

The new Montana law establishes State policies for protection of fishing streams. It provides for review by the Montana Fish and Game Commission of plans for construction and hydraulic projects affecting such streams. The law also sets up provisions for arbitration of disagreements between the fish and game commission and the State, county, or municipal agency in charge of construction affecting fish and game habitat.

The Jaycees were not the only organization promoting passage of the new Montana law. Sportsmen and conservation groups were united in support of the law. Groups such as the Western Montana Fish & Game Association were instrumental in securing favorable action on the legislation. I join with many other conservation-minded Montanans in thanking these groups for their work on behalf of this proposal to help preserve fish and game habitat.

I would be remiss, of course, if I failed to congratulate the Montana Legislature for adopting this conservation legislation. Principal sponsor of the original bill was State Senator Robert A. Durkee, of Hill County. The measure finally adopted was a compromise version of a substitute for Senator Durkee's original bill. I think the legislature deserves the thanks of all Montanans for its willingness to act on the problem of construction damage to our fishing streams and wildlife habitat.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the new Montana State law, as amended and finally adopted, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Montana Conservation Law

An act to establish the policy of the State of Montana on protection of fishing streams; providing for submission of plans for construction and hydraulic projects affecting such streams to the Montana Fish and Game Commission and for review of such plans; and providing for arbitration of disagreements between the fish and game commission and the agency proposing such projects

Be it enacted by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana:

Section 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the State of Montana that its fish and wildlife resources and particularly the fishing waters within the State are to be protected and preserved to the end that they be available for all time, without change, in their natural existing state except as may be necessary and appropriate after due consideration of all factors involved.

Sec. 2. An agency of State government, county, municipality, or other subdivision of the State of Montana, hereafter called "applicant," shall not construct, modify, operate, maintain, or fail to maintain, any construction project or hydraulic project which may or will obstruct, damage, diminish, destroy, change, modify, or vary the natural existing shape and form of any stream or its banks or tributaries by any type or form of construction without first causing notice of such planned construction to be served upon the Montana Fish and Game Commission, on forms furnished by the fish and game commission as soon as preliminary plans are completed, but not less than 60 days prior to commencement of final plans for construction. Such notice shall include detailed plans and specifications of so much of said project as may or will affect in any manner specified above any such stream.

Sec. 3. The commission shall promptly examine and investigate all such plans. Should the commission determine the plans and specifications furnished with any such application technically insufficient the commission shall so notify the applicant, and may render aid in preparing adequate plans and specifications.

Sec. 4. Within 30 days after the receipt of such plans, the commission shall notify the applicant whether or not such construction project or hydraulic project will adversely affect any fish or game habitat. If the fish and game commission notifies the applicant that such construction will adversely affect any fish or game habitat, it shall accompany such notice with recommendations or alternative plans which will eliminate or diminish such adverse effect.

Sec. 5. (1) If the fish and game commission notifies the applicant that the construction will adversely affect fish or game habitat, the applicant, within 15 days after receiving the recommendations and alternatives of the fish and game commission, shall notify the fish and game commission if it refuses to modify its plans in accordance with such recommendations or alternatives. In the event of such refusal, the disagreement shall be arbitrated as provided in subsection (2) of this section.

(2) Upon receipt of such notice of refusal, the fish and game commission shall immediately determine if it wants the disagreement subjected to arbitration. Within 10 days after such determination, and after notice to the agency involved, the fish and game commission shall then designate one person as an arbitrator and the agency involved shall designate another person as an arbitrator. Within 5 days after appointment of such arbitrators, said arbitrators shall agree upon a third person who shall have no connection with either the agency involved or the Montana Fish and Game Department, and these three persons shall be considered the board of arbitration. Within 10 days after such board is designated, the arbitration board shall meet, hear testimony and issue a decision signed by at least two members of the arbitration board. Such decision shall be binding on all parties concerned. The expense of the third arbitrator shall be divided equally between the agency involved and the Montana Fish and Game Department. All other expenses of arbitration shall be borne by the fish and game department.

Sec. 6. This act shall not operate or be so construed as to impair, diminish, divest, or control any existing or vested water rights under the laws of the State of Montana or the United States, or in emergencies such as floods, ice jams or other conditions causing emergency handling.

Sec. 7. This act shall not apply to any State water conservation board irrigation project presently operating, or that may be constructed in the future or to any irrigation district project or any other irrigation project.

Sec. 8. This act shall be in full force and effect until June 30, 1965.

Mr. METCALF. Other States will adopt other means to carry out the directive. But from now on planning for preservation and conservation of the streams will be a component part of highway programing from the survey stage. I believe that this regulation will accomplish what we are seeking to do. Its effectiveness depends upon the cooperation and good will between State highway planning agencies and State fish and game or conservation commissions. Of course, there will be continued necessity for the same alertness and awareness on the part of sportsmen and conservationists, that has heretofore been demonstrated, but these groups will now have a forum for protest if the purpose of the regulation is not carried out.

I congratulate the Department of Commerce and the Department of the Interior for their excellent work in finding a solution to a rapidly growing national problem. I am grateful to them for their cooperation. Of course, I shall not press for further legislative action on S. 468 unless this administrative procedure does not do the job. I do not believe it will fail.

ECLIPSE OF THE SUN

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, there may be some here and elsewhere who will desire to know at what place in the United States the total eclipse of the sun next Saturday, July 20, will last the longest. I am prepared to supply that information.

The eclipse will be total at Talkeetna, Alaska, for 95 seconds. That will be for a longer period than anywhere else on the North American Continent, which, as we know, will be covered by the eclipse July 20. There will be complete darkness then in parts of Alaska, Canada, and Maine.

For those who are interested, it is not yet too late to secure an airplane ticket to Anchorage, Alaska, and to drive out to this charming and small community to Talkeetna, not far distant.

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I infer from the statement by the President yesterday at his press conference about sending to Congress on Monday a bill to protect the public from the disastrous effect of a nationwide railroad strike scheduled to start at midnight on July 29, that the President will ask Congress to quickly pass a bill for compulsory arbitration of the strike before its results become too painful.

This method of settling this strike is favored by the railroads because they do not feel than any Federal arbitrator or Board of Arbitrators could possibly deny to them the fruits of their Supreme Court victory on the featherbedding issue. By the same token, the brotherhoods strenuously object to compulsory arbitration.

To me, compulsory arbitration is a harsh and unsatisfactory remedy for nationwide strikes, that seriously harm the general welfare, for two reasons: First, it ignores the natural right, for some years recognized by law of those who labor, to protect the right to earn a decent living under humanistic work rules through the process of collective bargaining, including in appropriate instances the right to strike; and, second, it is likewise objectionable because it lends itself to partisan action by the Chief Executive. A Chief Executive who is prolabor could select prolabor arbitrators and one who was antilabor could select arbitrators more favorably inclined to industry. Who, for instance, could have been more prolabor than the man recently selected by President Kennedy to conduct a program of voluntary arbitration than Mr. Justice Goldberg? Most of his adult life has been spent as a union labor lawyer.

While a majority of the Senate may vote for the expected Presidential proposal for compulsory arbitration of the rail strike, it is quite likely that the duration of the bill will be limited to this calendar year and even more likely that no Member of the Senate will vote for such a bill with a feeling that it is a satisfactory remedy for crippling nationwide strikes that go beyond the proper scope of negotiating for wages and appropriate working conditions.

The only appropriate remedy for strikes of that kind is the bill that I introduced in January of 1950 to make certain types of strikes subject to our antitrust laws. In my opinion, that provision, which perhaps would be too late to be applied to the forthcoming railroad strike, should be included in any bill passed on that subject with a proviso, of course, that the law, making certain types of strikes subject to the antitrust laws, would not become effective until 90 days after its enactment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the text of the bill I introduced in the Senate on January 23, 1950, and also the testimony before a Senate Judiciary Committee in support of the bill by the late Edward H. Miller of St. Louis, Mo., a partner when he died, of Mr. Clark Clifford and, in my opinion, the ablest antitrust lawyer who has served in the Justice Department during the 30-odd years that I have been a Member of the Congress.

There being no objection, the bill and testimony were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 1 of the Act of July 2, 1890, entitled, "An Act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," as amended (U.S.C. title 15, sec. 1), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: *Provided further*, That when a labor organization or the members thereof have unreasonably restrained trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, in articles, commodities, or services essential to the maintenance of the national economy, health, or safety, or any substantial segment thereof, such conduct shall not be made lawful, and the jurisdiction of any court of the United States to issue an injunction against any such conduct shall not be restricted or removed, by the Act of October 15, 1914, entitled 'An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies and for other purposes,' as amended, or the Act of March 23, 1932, entitled 'An Act to amend the judicial code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes'."

(b) Section 3 of the Act of July 2, 1890, entitled "An Act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," as amended (U.S.C., title 15, sec. 1), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "*Provided*, That when a labor organization or the members thereof have unreasonably restrained trade or commerce between any such Territory and another, or between any such Territory or Territories and any State or States or the District of Columbia, or with foreign nations, or between the District of Columbia and any State or States or foreign nations, in articles, commodities, or services essential to the maintenance of the national economy, health, or safety, or any substantial segment thereof, such conduct shall not be made lawful, and the jurisdiction of any court of the United States to issue an injunction against any such conduct shall not be restricted or removed, by the Act of October 15, 1914, entitled 'An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies and for other purposes,' as amended, or the Act of March 23, 1932, entitled 'An Act to amend the judicial code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes'."

Statement of Edward H. Miller Before a Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee in Connection With S. 2912, an Amendment to the Sherman Antitrust Act

My name is Edward H. Miller. I am a practicing lawyer in Washington and am appearing before this subcommittee at the invitation of its chairman. I represent no one in presenting this statement, and the views I express are entirely my own.

Before I entered the private practice of law in Washington, I served for over 4 years as a special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States in the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. In the course of that experience, I was working constantly with problems arising under the Sherman Act and the other antitrust laws, an experience which, I believe, prompted Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON to ask me to testify during the course of the hearings he conducted on behalf of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee last July and August. I have given careful consideration to Senator ROBERTSON's proposed amendment to the Sherman Act embodied in S. 2912, as well as to other possible methods of approach to the problem with which this bill attempts to deal, and I am convinced that Senator ROBERTSON's approach is the soundest, fairest, and most practical solution for this difficult, but most urgent, problem.

I

Today the Sherman Antitrust Act is, for practical purposes, a nullity as far as labor union activities are concerned. Labor unions can do practically anything they please to impose unreasonable restraints on the interstate commerce of this Nation, free from any fear of injunction, criminal prosecution, or treble-damage suit. For whatever value it may have to this committee, I shall try to analyze some of the vagaries of the antitrust laws as they have been applied to labor unions, by sketching the evolution of these laws to their current state, and by pointing out how they immunize labor unions from all the normal legal sanctions applicable to other groups. Naturally any future antitrust legislation will be interpreted against the background of past experience under the Sherman, Clayton, and Norris-LaGuardia Acts. Therefore, it is necessary to examine the past application of these acts to unions, and thus gain a realization of the steps by which labor has achieved its present immunity from the antitrust laws.

Under the common law of England, all combinations of labor for any purpose were originally outlawed, and the cases so holding were the very cases relied on by our Supreme Court in defining and building up the nonstatutory concept of criminal monopoly by business. The British Parliament gradually liberalized by statute the common law restrictions on labor unions, just as the restrictions on combinations of capital were also eased. Thus restraints of trade and monopolies by labor were not entirely foreign to the antitrust problem when the Sherman Act was passed in 1890.

With this background in mind, it is not surprising that the Sherman Act was originally interpreted to apply to labor unions, although it was not passed with that specific purpose in mind. Section 1 of the Sherman Act[1] provides that "Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, is hereby declared to be illegal."

This language is unambiguous and unqualified. Read literally, it includes every combination and conspiracy in restraint of trade, whether engaged in by labor organizations or others. Thus, those who contend that the Sherman Act was not originally intended to apply to labor[2] are forced to rely chiefly on the Sherman Act's legislative history. In the debate in the Senate it was argued that the bill if enacted in its original form (for which Senator Hoar was largely responsible) would be employed to oppress labor and agricultural organizations. Senator Sherman offered a proviso exempting the activities of such organizations from the act. Senator Edmunds attacked this proviso on the floor of the Senate and the bill was then referred to the Judiciary Committee, of which Senator Edmunds was chairman. The language of the bill was materially altered by the committee and no proviso exempting labor was included. Senator Edmunds, who had vehemently opposed the exemption, professed himself satisfied, and no reference to the labor problem appears in the subsequent debates in either the Senate or the House.

It has been argued that the elimination of Senator Sherman's labor-exemption proviso clearly indicates that Senator Edmunds' view prevailed. If so why then did not the protagonists of labor voice their objection to it? On the other hand, it has been contended that the revised bill, by using language normally applicable only to business combinations, made any specific exemption of labor unions unnecessary, but the latter argument begs the question, and leaves Senator Edmunds' acquiescence unaccounted for. A solution which will explain the reconciliation of the conflicting senatorial positions is that while the revised bill was regarded as not exempting labor entirely, it was accepted as applying only to unlawful labor activities. The bill to which the proviso had been appended originally gave justifiable grounds for believing that activities of labor unions which had been previously regarded as lawful would be in violation of its terms. The removal of this threat by the revision of the bill sufficed to satisfy the advocates of the proviso, without giving to labor a blanket immunity which would have met with the continued opposition of Senator Edmunds.

The Supreme Court first applied the Sherman Act to labor unions in *Loewe* v. *Lawlor* (208 U.S. 274 (1908)), known as the Danbury Hatters case. This case was a treble-damage action again a union brought by a hat manufacturer employing about 230 people. Through a nationwide secondary boycott, pressure was brought by the union against wholesalers and retailers to keep them from buying the plaintiff's hats in order to compel the plaintiff to consent to a closed shop. The Supreme Court construed the Sherman Act to prohibit any combination whatever which essentially obstructed the free flow of commerce between the States, or restricted, in that regard, the liberty of a trader to engage in business. At common law, according to the Court "every person has individually, and the public has collectively, a right to require that the course of trade should be kept free from unreasonable obstruction," and the Sherman Act has a broader, not a narrower, application than the common-law rule. Thus any distinction between labor and business combinations was repudiated by the Supreme Court at its first opportunity. This holding was in accord with prior lower Federal court decisions.

---

[1] 15 U.S.C. 1.

[2] For statements of this view see Berman, Labor and the Sherman Act (1930), pt. 1; Boudin, the Sherman Act and Labor Disputes, 39 Col. L. Rev. 1283 (1939), 40 Col. L. Rev. 14 (1940).

Three years later the Supreme Court in *Standard Oil Co.* v. *United States* (221 U.S. 1 (1911)), held that illegal combinations could be dissolved under the Sherman Act. This caused union leaders to become apprehensive that unions might be dissolved under the act regardless of the extent of their activities. Concurrently—and of more immediate importance to labor—the labor injunction was assuming a more prominent role in labor disputes as a strikebreaking device. Organized labor trained its guns on both the labor injunction and the application of the Sherman Act to union status and activities, and protection against these threats was promised in the Democratic platform in the presidential campaign of 1912. These promises to labor were dealt with in the Clayton Act of 1914.

Section 20 of the Clayton Act[3] prevents the granting of injunctions by Federal courts against certain specific labor activities which even at that time were generally considered legal, such as peaceful picketing. By implication it left undisturbed the illegality attached to certain other conduct.

Section 6 of the Clayton Act[4] after declaring that "the labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce," provides that "Nothing contained in the antitrust laws shall be construed to forbid the existence and operation of labor * * * organizations * * * or to forbid or restrain individual members of such organizations from lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof; nor shall such organizations, or the members thereof, be held or construed to be illegal combinations or conspiracies in restraint of trade, under the antitrust laws." This section was the answer to the other promise made in 1912, following the apprehension engendered by the Standard Oil Co. decision. It removed all doubt of the right of labor to organize in unions, and affirmed the legality of their status. However, by the use of such language as "legitimate objects," and by legalizing not the acts of labor organizations or their members, but only the organizations and members themselves, it is plainly confined to an attempt to protect labor unions against a charge of an unlawful status.

With the Clayton Act, as with the Sherman Act, the legislative history shows that Congress did not intend to exempt all union activities from the act. In the course of the debates in the House, after a question had been raised as to the meaning of section 6, and particularly the meaning of the declaration that labor is not a commodity or article of commerce, a clear-cut labor exemption proviso was offered by way of amendment, and was rejected.

After the passage of the Clayton Act, the Supreme Court took the first opportunity to refute, in very explicit language, the suggestion that the Clayton Act had created any blanket immunity for labor unions. In *Duplex Printing Press Company* v. *Deering* (254 U.S. 443 (1921)), a majority of the Court held that section 6 of the Clayton Act protected only the existence of labor organizations. The act was said to be merely declaratory of the prior substantive law—merely declaratory of what the best practice always had been for the granting of injunctions. See *American Steel Foundries* v. *Tri-City Council* (257 U.S. 184, 203 (1921)). Further, section 20 was construed to apply only where an employer-employee relationship existed.

Since the Clayton Act allowed individuals as well as the Government to seek injunctions, the injunction problem became increasingly acute in the eyes of labor organizations. The question of what a union could or could not do legitimately to further its interests was frequently litigated in the twenties, and the now famous labor dissents of Justice Holmes, Brandeis, and Stone were mostly concerned with the question of the justifiable extent of a labor union's interest in industrywide conditions, in how far a union could go to further the welfare of its members.

The cases decided under the Clayton Act recognized that a union cannot be effective in raising the wages of its members without going outside a single employer's shop. As Chief Justice Taft expressed it, "It is helpful to have as many as may be in the same trade in the same community united, because in the competition between employers they are bound to be affected by the standard of wages of their trade in the neighborhood. Therefore, they may use all lawful propaganda to enlarge membership and especially among those who labor at lower wages and willingly injure their whole guild." *American Steel Foundries* v. *Tri-City Council* (257 U.S. at 209).

Some members of the Court went further. Mr. Justice Brandeis, in his dissenting opinion in *Hitchman Coal & Coke Co.* v. *Mitchell* (254 U.S. 229, 268 (1917)), stated that the desire of the United Mine Workers to unionize every mine on the American Continent, and especially those mines in competition with mines already unionized, was not unlawful but was part of a reasonable effort to improve the condition of workingmen engaged in the industry by strengthening their bargaining power through unions and extending the field of union power.

In spite of these favorable legal demonstrations, unions still found the Sherman and Clayton Acts embarrassingly restrictive, and the use of the injunction as a strikebreaking weapon increasingly onerous, as unions expanded and sought greater power.

The result of labor's hue and cry was the Norris-LaGuardia Act[5] of 1932, which broadly and unequivocably removed the jurisdiction of any Federal court to issue any restraining order or injunction in practically any case arising out of a labor dispute. Thus, labor finally secured immunity from the injunctions that had plagued so many of its organizing campaigns.

The main object of the Norris-LaGuardia Act was to remedy what was felt to be an existing evil; namely, a too liberal use by the Federal courts of their equity power to issue injunctions in labor disputes. Labor unions and their partisans had contended that whatever power labor might possess through collective action was effectively canceled by the ability of employers to secure temporary restraining orders against strikes, picketing, and other concerted activities, merely by filing an affidavit in a Federal district court, without notice to the opposing party. To remedy this situation, the act provided in substance that the Federal courts should no longer have jurisdiction to issue restraining orders or temporary or permanent injunctions in any case involving or growing out of a labor dispute.

It will be noted that to some extent the Norris-LaGuardia Act duplicates section 20 of the Clayton Act. Two significant distinctions between these statutes exist, however.

The first of these differences is that the term "labor dispute" is defined explicitly in the Norris-LaGuardia Act to cover more ground than was covered by section 20 of the Clayton Act. A labor dispute may exist within the meaning of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, whether or not the disputants stand in the proximate relation of employer and employee (sec. 13(c)).

The second major difference between the Clayton Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act is that the latter purported to do no more than regulate the issuance of injunctions by the Federal courts. Whereas section 20 of the Clayton Act contained the substantive provision that none of the labor activities therein mentioned should be considered or held to be violations of any law of the United States, the Norris-LaGuardia Act nowhere contains such a provision.

With the law in this posture, the Department of Justice in 1939 began a nationwide campaign against racketeers in the building trades, where labor unions were prohibiting the use of new building techniques, imposing wasteful featherbedding practices on employers, and, in general, restraining trade through callous abuse of their power. No clearer example of restraints of trade can be conceived than the policy of certain unions of excluding from a geographical area the products of companies in competition with local employers of union labor.

Criminal prosecutions under the Sherman and Clayton Acts were begun on a nationwide basis, and numerous indictments secured. The whole campaign, however, came to naught when the Supreme Court held in *United States* v. *Hutcheson* (312 U.S. 219 (1941)), that labor activities exempted from injunction by the Norris-LaGuardia Act were by implication exempted completely from the prohibitions of the Sherman Act. This case involved an employer caught in the middle of a jurisdictional dispute between the carpenters' union and the machinists' union. The carpenters' union called a strike, picketed the premises, requested its members throughout the Nation not to buy the employer's product, and attempted to foment sympathy strikes. The Government caused the head of the carpenters' union to be indicted. The holding in this case might well have been that the direct employer-employee relationship brought the case within the immunities provided by section 20 of the Clayton Act. Instead, the majority opinion by Mr. Justice Frankfurter was based on the theory that the Norris-LaGuardia Act had in effect amended both the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act to immunize all concerted labor activities where pursued by labor unions acting in their own interests and where such activities were involved in or grew out of labor disputes as defined in the Norris-LaGuardia Act. This bombshell was fatal to the Department of Justice's attempts to remove these logjams in the stream of interstate commerce and explains why the Department cannot adequately deal with problems like the present coal situation.

The licit and the illicit under section 20 of the Clayton Act were no longer, after the Hutcheson case, to be distinguished by any judgment regarding the wisdom or unwisdom, the rightness or wrongness, the selfishness or unselfishness, of the end which the particular union activities sought to achieve. And the case of *Hunt* v. *Crumboch* (325 U.S. 821 (1945)), underscored the holding in the Hutcheson case that motive and wisdom are immaterial. In that case the union's grievance stemmed wholly from a personal dislike for the employer, becaus of which the union withheld its labor from the employer in order to destroy him. Although the employer offered to sign a closed-shop contract, the union refused to let its members work for him, and forced his customers, with whom the union had closed-shop contracts, to cease doing business with him. Such conduct was held to be lawful under the doctrine of the Hutcheson case, on the theory that laborers can sell or not sell their labor on such terms as they please. The employer was destroyed but left without legal recourse.

---

[3] 29 U.S.C. 52.

[4] 15 U.S.C. 17.

[5] 29 U.S.C. 101 et seq.

Under the Hutcheson case the only apparent limitations upon the immunity accorded a union are that it must act to further its self-interest as a labor organization, and cannot combine with nonlabor groups. Thus, except in certain cases, where business conspires with labor, every conflict in which labor is involved can qualify as a labor dispute.

II

The Hutcheson case marked the practical realization of the complete immunity of labor from the antitrust laws. Between 1914 and 1941 the courts were considering the extent and scope of the statutory immunity of labor created by the Clayton and Norris-LaGuardia Acts. While the statutory immunity was still regarded as incomplete, the courts also were considering the companion problem of what types of union restraints were illegal under the Sherman Act itself. This is now a purely academic question to most lawyers, but peculiarly of interest to this committee, since the effect of removing by legislation part of labor's immunity will be to reinvigorate and rejuvenate the concept of unreasonable restraints of trade as developed prior to the Hutcheson case.

While the basic language of the Sherman Act is unchanged, the Supreme Court's version of its meaning has been subjected to modifications. The rule as to which restraints are illegal adopted in *Loewe* v. *Lawlor,* which held illegal a secondary nationwide boycott of a small hat manufacturer, was thus stated by the Court:

"In our opinion, the combination described in the declaration is a combination 'in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States,' in the sense in which those words are used in the act, and the action can be maintained accordingly.

"And that conclusion rests on many judgments of this Court, to the effect that the act prohibits any combination whatever to secure action which essentially obstructs the free flow of commerce between the States, or restricts, in that regard, the liberty of a trader to engage in business.

"The combination charged falls within the class of restraints of trade aimed at compelling third parties and strangers involuntarily not to engage in the course of trade except on conditions that the combination imposes; and there is no doubt that (to quote from the well-known work of Chief Justice Erle on trade unions) 'at common law every person has individually, and the public also has collectively, a right to require that the course of trade should be kept free from unreasonable obstruction" (208 U.S. at 292).

This concept was subjected to modification by the *Standard Oil* case (221 U.S. 1 (1911). That case first established the rule of reason, which declared that only those contracts which unreasonably restrained trade were outlawed by the Sherman Act. The opinion contains an elaborate analysis of the common law dealing with monopolies. Later, the rule of reason was declared applicable to labor restraints, in *National Association of Window Glass Manufacturers* v. *United States* (263 U.S. 403 (1923)).

Typical of the cases following the *Loewe* v. *Lawlor* concept of physical interference with interstate commerce is *Hitchman Coal & Coke Co.* v. *Mitchell* (245 U.S. 299 (1917)), an extremely controversial opinion by Mr. Justice Pitney, which upheld an injunction against an attempt by the United Mine Workers to organize nonunion mines in which the workers had agreed to quit work if they joined a union. In dealing with such an employer the unions naturally strove to keep the extent of their success in organizing secret until they were able to close the mine by strike. Also the members of the union kept working while awaiting the strike call. The opinion stressed the idea that the employer's action in imposing the condition of nonunion membership was reasonable due to the difficulties in operating with a union shop in the past. The union recognized these unorganized mines as a serious threat, since the competition produced by the unorganized field rendered it more difficult for the operators of union mines to grant concessions demanded by the union. Thus, in order to relieve the pressure on union members and their employers elsewhere a concerted organizing drive was undertaken in the unorganized West Virginia district.

On these facts the Court held that the employer was within its legal rights in employing its men only on terms of continuing nonmembership in the union. It was held that the employer had a property right in the employment relationship with its employees which could not be interfered with by a third person. The union had violated this property right by secretly soliciting among the employees in preparation for a strike, and therefore the union was not pursuing its object by lawful means.

Mr. Justice Brandeis' dissent was predicated on the proposition that the organizing campaign in West Virginia was part of a reasonable effort to improve the conditions of workingmen engaged in the industry by strengthening their bargaining power through unions, and extending the field of union power. According to his dissent, the employees were not induced to violate their contracts with the employer, but were merely solicited to join the union. This distinction the majority of the Court declined to recognize.

A different approach is reflected in *United Mine Workers* v. *Coronado Coal Co.* (259 U.S. 344 (1922)). Chief Justice Taft, speaking for a unanimous Court, reversed and remanded a judgment against a union entered as a result of a strike accompanied with considerable violence in the Arkansas coalfields. Some Arkansas mines which had been operating as union mines decided to operate as an open shop. The strike, fighting, and flooding of the mines followed. An injunction was secured, and nonunion miners were brought in from outside the State. Some of the strikebreakers were shot in an attack by the union forces.

The Court held that obstruction to coal mining is not a direct obstruction to interstate commerce in coal, although it may be affecting it by reducing the amount of coal to be carried in commerce. The UMW pressed the unionization of the mines not only as a direct means of bettering the conditions of the workers there, but also as a means of lessening interstate competition for union operators. But this latter was held to be only an ancillary motive, with the actuating force in a given case necessarily dependent upon the particular circumstances to which it is sought to make it applicable. According to the Court, if unlawful means had been used by the union to unionize miners whose product was important, actually or potentially, in affecting prices in interstate commerce, the union would be guilty of an actionable conspiracy under the Sherman Act, but here the evidence was held not to show any primary plan to control competition. *Loewe* v. *Lawlor* was distinguished on the ground that the direct subject of attack there was interstate commerce. The Supreme Court said that the capacity of the mines affected was not shown to be large enough to affect substantially the market price of coal, and the decision of the lower court was reversed.

A new trial was granted, which resulted in a directed verdict for the defendants, and the case was brought to the Supreme Court for a second time (268 U.S. 295 (1925)). New evidence was introduced at the second trial to show that a major purpose of the strike was to prevent the nonunion coal from competing with coal produced by union mines. Evidence about union meetings, and testimony by former union officials, indicated the great concern of the union over that part of the industry not covered by union contracts. New evidence also showed that the productivity of the mines in question was much greater than had been indicated in the first opinion of the Court, and could have an effect upon the general price level of coal. The Supreme Court held that there was substantial evidence at the second trial to show that the purpose of the strike was to stop the production of nonunion coal and to prevent its shipment to markets in other States where it would be in competition tending to reduce the price of the commodity and affect injuriously the maintenance of wages for union labor in competing mines.

United Leather Workers v. *Herkert & Meisel Trunk Co.* (265 U.S. 457 (1924)), involved a strike to secure a closed shop. Illegal picketing and violence followed and in consequence the employer was unable to fill orders from out of State. There was no evidence as to any attempt to impose a boycott or to prevent shipment in interstate commerce of already manufactured products. The Court held against the employer on the ground that only where there is a direct intention to restrict interstate commerce and thus to create inflated price structures or prevent price competition is there a violation. "It is only when the intent or the necessary effect upon such commerce in the article is to enable those preventing the manufacture to monopolize its supply or control its price or discriminate between its would-be purchasers, that the unlawful interference with its manufacture can be said directly to burden interstate commerce."

Important distinctions between the second Coronado and Herkert cases are hard to find since in both cases the unions acted with the object of either compelling unionization or forcing employers out of business. Although there was proof in the second Coronado case, as there was not in the Herkert case, of an intention on the part of the union later to gain the elimination of nonunion mined coal in the national markets, such proof was not required in the secondary boycott cases of *Loewe* v. *Lawlor* and *Duplex Printing Press Company* v. *Deering*. The confusion was enhanced when the Court in 1927 decided *Bedford Cut Stone Co.* v. *Journeymen Stone Cutters' Association* (274 U.S. 37 (1927)), which, following the two cases last named, held unlawful a nationwide secondary boycott.

This confusion remained relatively static until the Supreme Court decided *Apex Hosiery Co.* v. *Leader* (310 U.S. 469 (1940)), a civil action for treble damages under the Sherman Act against a union which had shut an employer down by use of sitdown strike tactics. The strike was marked by violence; and although the jury only found an intent by the union to conduct a sit-down strike, there was specific testimony that the strikers refused to permit the withdrawal of finished merchandise from the manufacturer's factory for shipment to fill out-of-State orders.

The union argued once again that union activities should be granted an immunity under the Clayton and Sherman Acts. Once again this was rejected. Stating that mere violent interference with interstate commerce, such as a train robbery, is not necessarily a violation of the Sherman Act, Mr. Justice Stone conceived the question as "whether a conspiracy of strikers in a labor dispute to stop the operation of the employer's factory in order to enforce their demands against the employer is the kind of restraint of trade or commerce at which the act is aimed, even though a natural and probable consequence of their acts and the only effect on trade or commerce was to prevent substantial shipments interstate by the employer" (310 U.S. at 487).

The Court held that the Sherman Act was not designed to police interstate commerce but was enacted for the prevention of restraints to free competition in business and commercial transactions which tended to restrict production, raise prices or otherwise control the market to the detriment of purchasers or consumers of goods and services, all of which had come to be regarded as a special form of public injury (310 U.S. 493). According to the opinion, the Sherman Act did not apply in any case, whether or not involving labor organizations or activities, unless there was some form of restraint upon commercial competition in the marketing of goods and services, and could not apply in cases of local strikes conducted by illegal means in a production industry except where it was shown that the restriction on shipments had operated to restrain commercial competition in some substantial way. In other words a restraint on competition in the course of trade in articles moving in interstate commerce is not enough unless the restraint is shown to have, or have been intended to have, an effect upon prices in the market, or otherwise to deprive purchasers or consumers of the advantages which they might derive from free competition. Although in order to render a labor combination effective it must eliminate the competition from non-union-made goods, and although the elimination of price competition based on differences in labor standards is the objective of many national labor organizations, this effect on competition was stated not to be considered the kind of curtailment of price competition prohibited by the Sherman Act. It was observed that in each of the cases where the act was held applicable to labor unions, the activities affecting interstate commerce were directed at the control of the market and were so widespread as to affect it substantially.

Mr. Justice Stone did not find it necessary to overrule any precedents. *Lowe* v. *Lawlor*, and the Duplex Printing Press Co. and the Bedford Cut Stone Co. cases, were all distinguished on the stated ground that in those cases—

"The effort of the union was to compel unionization of an employer's factory, not by a strike in his factory but by restraining by the boycott or refusal to work on the manufactured product, purchases of his product in interstate commerce in competition with the like product of union shops.

"In the Bedford Cut Stone Co. case it was pointed out that, as in the Duplex Printing Press Co. case, the strike was directed against the use of the manufactured product by consumers with the immediate purpose and effect of restraining future sales and shipments in interstate commerce and with the plain design of suppressing or narrowing the interstate market, and that in this respect the case differed from those in which a factory strike, directed at the prevention of production with consequent cessation of interstate shipments, had been held not to be a violation of the Sherman law.

* * * * *

"That the objectives of the restraint in the boycott cases was the strengthening of the bargaining position of the union and not the elimination of business competition—which was the end in the nonlabor cases—was thought to be immaterial because the Court viewed the restraint itself, in contrast to the interference with shipments caused by a local factory strike, to be of a kind regarded as offensive at common law because of its effect in curtailing a free market and it was held to offend against the Sherman Act because it affected and was aimed at suppression of competition with union-made goods in the interstate market" (310 U.S. at 506).

In the Apex case the Court found the elements of restraint of trade present in the second Coronado case, and alone to distinguish it from the first Coronado case and the Leather Workers case, were here lacking. The restraints imposed were said not to be within the Sherman Act unless they were intended to have or in effect have the effects on the market on which the Court had relied to establish the violations in the second Coronado case, and restraints not within the act when achieved by lawful means are not brought within its sweep merely because, without other differences, they are attended by violence.

Thus, after 13 years, an attempt at a definitive statement of the application to labor unions of the antitrust acts was finally given. Unfortunately, it has had little practical value yet, because the next year, in the Hutcheson case, labor unions were accorded the immunity from the Sherman Act, which they had been denied in the Apex case.

III

The Apex case shows that if this Congress should strip away from the Clayton and Norris-LaGuardia Acts a meaning which this Congress, in my judgment, never intended those acts to have—a meaning which was read into those acts by the majority opinion in the Hutcheson case—the Sherman Act would again emerge, not really amended but rather restored, to condemn restraints of trade in the same forceful and unequivocal language as in 1890. Labor unions are immune only because of the Supreme Court's construction of the subsequent statutes, and the Supreme Court has recently held[6] that there is no constitutional ground requiring the exemption of any group from the antitrust laws.

As I see it, Senator ROBERTSON's bill would accomplish only one result, but that result would be an extremely important one, from the standpoint of our national welfare. Today, under the Hutcheson case, labor has what amounts to an absolute immunity from criminal prosecution, injunction, or treble damage suit based on the Sherman Act. The Sherman Act, until the decision of the Supreme Court in the Hutcheson case in 1941, was the only really effective deterrent to unreasonable restraints imposed by labor unions on interstate commerce. If the Hutcheson case was nullified, as it would be by S. 2912, the Government could, in the event a labor union undertook to impose restraints on interstate commerce so unreasonable as to prejudice the national economy, health, or safety, move against the union either by a criminal prosecution or a suit for an injunction, or both. To bring about this change in the law would require no modification of the language of the Sherman Act. Congress would merely read out of it and out of the Clayton Act a meaning which this Congress, in my judgment, never intended either of those acts to have, a meaning which was read into those two acts by the Supreme Court's interpretation of the Norris-LaGuardia Act in the majority opinion in the Hutcheson case.

Today the courts of the United States are closed to the Government, as far as applying the Sherman Act to labor union activity is concerned. Senator ROBERTSON's bill would open the door. Once the Government had then come into a Federal court and named a labor union as a defendant, the Government would have the burden of convincing the court that the labor union activity complained of was not legitimate labor union activity, but was so unreasonable, and so unrelated to any legitimate labor union objective, that it fell within the prohibition of the Sherman Act as an unreasonable restraint of interstate commerce. The Government would have the further burden of showing that, however unreasonable the restraint the union had imposed, the restraint had been imposed on articles, commodities, or services essential to the maintenance of the national economy, health, or safety. Under these qualifications and this heavy burden of proof, the Government could not be expected to proceed against a labor union under the Sherman Act unless the union had gone far beyond what any fairminded citizen would believe was legitimate union activity, and unless the case was so important that the union activity was really seriously prejudicing the national welfare.

In each case it would be up to the court, or up to a jury under appropriate guidance from the court, to decide the ultimate question of whether or not an unreasonable recourse, a union could not come into court and successfully insist, no matter what it had been doing, that its primary purpose was to obtain better wages or working conditions and thus preclude the court or jury from looking behind that statement and determining whether such a motive was a primary one. On the other hand, neither could the Government preclude the court or jury from determining that the primary purpose of the union was to obtain better wages or better working conditions. In each case it would be a question of fact, although there are certain activities which any court would be obliged to hold, under controlling Supreme Court decisions, are per se violations of the Sherman Act, such as price fixing and nationwide secondary boycotts.

Nothing in Senator ROBERTSON's bill would prevent the right of labor to organize, to strike, or to work for legitimate union objectives, on a nationwide basis or otherwise. The sole purpose of this act, as I see it, is to give the Government a chance to go into a court and to convince that court that certain labor union activity had been so outrageous, so shocking to principles of rightness and wrongness, so unrelated to any legitimate union objective, and so far reaching as to prejudice the national economy, safety, or health, that the court, if it agrees with the Government, can take appropriate steps to stop conduct which carries with it all these elements of shocking unreasonableness. I have difficulty in understanding why anyone who has the welfare of this Nation at heart should object to entrusting his Government with this kind of power.

CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERTY

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the only explanation that I can give of the apparent lack of interest in vast areas of our great Nation in hearings now being conducted by Senate committees on the President's civil rights proposal is that the rank and file of the people outside of the area represented by 18 southern Senators are unaware of the fact that in his civil rights program the President is asking for unparalleled dictatorial powers which, if granted, could be used in future years to strike at the constitutional liberty of the people of every area of the Nation.

The press, while ridiculing the statements of two southern Governors who had been involved in racial disorders growing out of school integration cases, completely ignored all that they had to say on the subject of the unconstitutionality of the bill to make private roominghouses, as well as privately owned and operated motels, restaurants, and so forth, subject to Federal control and liable to be put completely out of business on a charge of discrimination to be determined by the ipse dixit of a Federal bureaucrat involving, of course, the taking of private property not only without due process of law as required by the Constitution, but without the constitutional right of trial by jury.

---

[6] *Giboney* v. *Empire Storage Co.* (336 U.S. 490 (1949)).

Assuming that the Governors in question made some statements directed primarily to their respective constituency, what possible excuse can be given by the press and the radio for virtually ignoring 2 days of wonderful testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee directed solely to the question of constitutionality of the civil rights proposals? That testimony was given by the Honorable SAM ERVIN of North Carolina, an honor graduate of the Harvard Law School, which is always cited if the lawyer comes from north of the Potomac; who for years was a leader of the North Carolina Bar and for 6 years a member of the supreme court of his native State. Ample copies of both the text and a summary of the text of the Senator's splendid statements before the Judiciary Committee on the constitutionality of four of the main sections of the President's omnibus bill were furnished to the Senate press and radio galleries and, as I already have said, were virtually ignored.

Evidently, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, who is reputed to have framed for the President his omnibus civil rights bill, is relying upon his ability to cajole, or ultimately pack if necessary, the U.S. Supreme Court into approving the extraordinary powers to be conferred upon the President in the event Congress should be so foolish as to write them into law.

In his recent radio talk, the former dean of the great Notre Dame Law School said:

> If the country is to be saved and constitutional government restored, the Warren Court's right to supervise national policy must be sidetracked until appropriate constitutional amendments have had time to catch up with its adjudicated eccentricities.

In other words, those who want our Constitution changed to eliminate the 10th amendment, to eliminate the right of trial by jury and to confer upon the President powers normally associated with a dictator, should openly and frankly propose the constitutional amendments necessary to make that change in our representative democracy. Otherwise, they fall into the general category described in the Richmond Times Dispatch of yesterday by its columnist, Ross Valentine, as "Wolf in Sheep's Clothing."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD that article by Mr. Valentine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOLF IN SHEEP'S CLOTHING

(By Ross Valentine)

Tyranny has outworn many faces. Its modern variations have one element in common: they appeal invariably to the herd instinct in man by stressing "security," "equality" and "welfare"—all of them good words, used cunningly to conceal the barbed hook of personal ambition angling for power over the lives of men.

If those who use this bait to snag the votes of the impressionable were completely cynical, it would be easier to expose their ulterior intent—especially in a country where press criticism remains uncurbed. Unfortunately, many of our misnamed liberals expediently delude themselves into half-believing what they preach. A half-truth is as hard to pin down as a greased pig.

Add to this the melancholy fact that the ignorant, the vengeful and the weak in faith are always eager to believe glib demagogic promises of utopia—and you have a sinister coalition determined to use freedom of speech to enthrone the tyranny of centralized coercion.

Nor is it the ignorant only who are victims of self-delusion. Prohibition, constitutionally imposed "with the consent of the governed," was passionately believed in by millions of the well meaning—who made the fatal mistake of overestimating the politicians' ability to reject a jackal's share in the illicit profits of the underworld.

Despite the Volstead era's shameful record of bribery and corruption, of lawlessness and crime—there are still thousands of persons in Virginia who would vote for prohibition tomorrow, if given a chance.

The founders of this country knew and feared the dangers of political duplicity and popular self-delusion— the ever present peril of centralized power. Jefferson warned us that—

"The germ of dissolution of our Federal Government is the constitution of the Federal judiciary, an irresponsible body (for impeachment is scarecly a scarecrow) working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step like a thief over the field of jurisdiction, until all shall be usurped from the States, and the government of all be consolidated into one * * * as venal and oppressive as the government from which we have separated."

"The government from which we have separated" was, despite the interposition of British Commons, still based on the "divine right of kings" and their power to bribe Members of Parliament—with political preferment of profit to come.

The memory of the humiliations suffered by the erstwhile colonies was still then painful in the minds of the American people of the several States, which is why the people, although far less numerous and more homogeneous than they are today, insisted on the inclusion of the 10th amendment (art. X of the Bill of Rights) as the condition on which they agreed to ratify the Constitution.

They had but recently tasted the indignities inflicted by a remote, centralized government. They wanted to make sure that the system of checks and balances—the self-protective diffusion of power—would not be destroyed by the executive, judiciary, or legislative power in Washington.

Jefferson was not the only one to foresee this chink in the armor of American freedom. De Toqueville, De Chambrun, Lord Bryce were aware of it.

Are the American people as a whole aware of it—now? I doubt it.

Dean Manion, in his Sunday evening broadcast, pointed a finger of warning. He recalled that 36 State chief justices, in 1958, "joined in an unprecedented and thoroughly documented remonstrance against the Warren court for its failure to promote certainty and stability in constitutional construction, and for raising considerable doubt that we still have a government of laws and not of men."

Whether the High Court was politically inspired in going beyond its invalidation of segregation laws is debatable. We do have reason to surmise because of the unanimous opinion of 1954 that it abused its power—in violation of the Constitution—"as an instrument of national policy" to win the goodwill of newly emerging colored nations.

But the Kennedy government's abuse of executive and judicial power in the hope of winning electorally powerful States in 1964 is much too obvious to permit doubt of its ulterior motives.

Its brazen appeal to racial feelings is comparable to the same gambit used by Hitler and his power clique—with this exception, that the Nazis appealed to the majority, while the Kennedys are gambling that a balance-of-power minority will reassure their return to office a year hence.

How else are we to explain the President's encouragement of demonstrations in violation of State and local laws—in the hope of intimidating Congress—to adopt civil rights coercion—in patent violation of article X?

No person of goodwill would deny the Negro minority equal rights guaranteed by the Constitution. What the people—of any race—should object to is the immoral means the Kennedys propose to use, in order to attain moral ends.

Dean Manion, in his Sunday radio talk, said:

"If the country is to be saved and constitutional government restored, the Warren court's right to supervise national policy must be sidetracked until appropriate constitutional amendments have had time to catch up with its adjudicated eccentricities."

Which is simply another way of saying that fundamental changes deemed necessary to assure economic and civil rights to all the people, should be enacted by amendment, and not imposed by the court, by the President or by the Attorney General.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, we are all aware of the serious balance-of-payments problem facing the United States. Beginning in the late 1950's, we have experienced mounting balance-of-payments deficits accompanied by large gold outflows. Most recently, our gold holdings are down to $15.7 billion, which leaves only about $3.5 billion of "free" gold above the $12.2 billion required to back our money supply of currency and demand deposits. Foreign claims on our gold totaled $25.4 billion, including claims of international agencies. In recognition of the seriousness of this problem, the President has submitted to the Congress today his special message on the balance of payments. This message answers many of the questions raised by the testimony of Secretary Dillon and Under Secretary Roosa before the Joint Economic Committee on July 8 and 9. It lays out the administration program for dealing with the balance of payments, and it indicates that the decisions concerning the balance of payments, which Messrs. Dillon and Roosa were not yet ready to give when they testified before the Joint Economic Committee, have now been made.

The administration, it would seem, is placing its primary reliance in setting new balance-of-payments policies upon an increase in short-term interest rates, a new tax on sales of foreign long-term bonds in the United States, a $500 million standby loan arrangement with the International Monetary Fund, and some new programs that would intensify Government efforts to encourage private activity favorable to our balance of payments. The administration plans to encourage export expansion through the

Departments of State and Commerce and through reducing ocean freight rate discrimination against U.S. exports. It plans to encourage American tourists to see America first and to strengthen the program of the U.S. Travel Service. It plans to reduce Federal expenditures abroad by continuing the program of having our allies buy military items in the United States, by reducing our purchase of strategic materials abroad, and by "tying" an increasing portion of our foreign aid program.

Of course, the administration is going to continue to press for a tax cut to increase investment spending, but its view is that the tax cut will have a favorable longrun balance-of-payments effect. It is going to continue the measures it has developed to strengthen the international monetary system. Closer cooperation between central banks, reciprocal credit arrangements between us and our allies, the cooperative central bank arrangements in the London gold market, and further sales of medium-term Treasury securities to nations that experience an increase in their dollar holdings are all measures already instituted by the administration that are to be continued.

There are many features of the administration's balance-of-payments proposals which I can strongly endorse. Certainly, we need to expand our exports by every device that is feasible. It will be a good thing if we can stimulate further travel in the United States by citizens from allied countries, not only for the balance of payments, but also for increased understanding among us. Certainly, the efforts by the administration to encourage closer cooperation between central banks have produced desirable temporary results, and the administration has made it clear that it recognizes that this cooperation does not go to the heart of the balance-of-payments problem.

But what about the new measures in the President's message? How should we evaluate them? The increase of the Federal Reserve discount rate from 3 percent to 3½ percent, along with the increase in the interest rate ceiling on short-term time deposits to 4 percent, is specifically directed, according to the Board of Governors, to the balance-of-payments problem. It is going to be important for the Federal Reserve and the Treasury to coordinate their monetary and debt management policies to assure that this increase in short-term rates does not spill over into the long-term area where it would threaten to stifle further economic expansion. But the Federal Reserve feels confident that this will not happen because of the record increase in savings flowing into the long-term market in recent months and because of the Treasury's policy of keeping the supply of short-term securities ample and marketing long-term securities only during periods of market slack. The challenge to the Federal Reserve and the Treasury is, of course, their ability to maintain a desirable relationship between short-term and long-term rates in the coming months.

The half-billion-dollar loan arrangement with the International Monetary Fund is, of course, the first such borrowing by the United States since the establishment of the Fund. Since the United States has contributed more money to the Fund's resources than any other member, it certainly seems only reasonable that the United States should avail itself of those resources like any other member when the United States finds that it is convenient. Furthermore, the terms of the arrangement allow the United States to take the initiative in drawing down whatever sums may be required, and the loan in no way is a reflection of any shortage of foreign reserves on our part. Thus, we are borrowing from the Fund while we have 40 percent of the free world's gold reserves in a period of relative strength rather than waiting until the very act of borrowing would suggest the weakness of the dollar.

While there is a sizable portion of the President's program with which I can agree, there are some other portions that I regret, and there are some omissions that I regret even more. When it comes to the new tax on foreign bond sales in the United States, I regret what may be a necessary limitation upon our vaunted free enterprise system, to curtail the right of U.S. investors to purchase foreign bonds carrying a greater rate of return than domestic bonds. But every time a U.S. individual buys a foreign bond, he gets the bond and the foreigner gets a claim upon our gold. Of course, other countries have restrictions on such capital transactions, many far more severe, but no other country has our system of free enterprise, to say nothing about our system of constitutional liberties. It could have been worse.

The administration could have imposed direct restrictions upon the sale of foreign bonds in the United States. Instead it chose to use this new tax somewhat like a rise in the discount rate on the short end; that is, the new tax is going to raise the interest cost to foreigners of borrowing on our market by about 1 percent. And it is not going to affect direct investment abroad or interest rates of domestic borrowers in the long-term market.

However, the administration does not know what the results of this new tax will be, and in my opinion, the tax on foreign bonds to slow their sales in this country is going to produce results that do not compare with a clear alternative the administration had before it. That alternative is to cut the foreign aid program $1½ to $2 billion, as I have repeatedly advocated. The foreign aid program involves the purchase of foreign bonds by the U.S. Government as well as giveaway programs. What boots it to deny the citizens of this Nation the right to invest several hundred million dollars in foreign bonds of private enterprises, which we all want to encourage, and then to let the Federal Government invest billions of dollars in the bonds of foreign governments which may use the proceeds to hinder or stifle the further development of free enterprise abroad.

As much as I regret the new tax on foreign bonds, I can see that it is an ingenious device that interferes as little as possible with the private capital market. And I am glad to see that the administration is going to study intensively the restrictions on capital transactions that exists in some of the industrial countries with balance-of-payments surpluses. I think the time has come for the administration to press harder in trying to remove some of these restrictions on the flow of capital, so that foreign borrowing in the United States may be reduced and so that foreigners can do a little more investing in perfectly good U.S. corporations.

But what I regret most about the balance-of-payments message is what it did not say about reducing Government spending abroad. Take military spending first. We now have military establishments in 52 nations of the world—and all of the military personnel, plus hundreds of thousands of their dependents, are spending dollars abroad. But as we rely increasingly upon missile deterrents, that grandiose display of military power is no longer necessary and it can and should be substantially reduced, including a reduction of our NATO forces, and a reduction of our military aid to our allies. The upshot of our present program is that we are selling our military assets abroad and selling military supplies and equipment abroad to offset these huge expenditures. I believe that a more direct approach of reducing the expenditures themselves is perfectly feasible and would not weaken the defense of the free world, now that we are able to rely so heavily upon new technological devices. Furthermore, since we are carrying by far the heaviest defense burden among our allies, it is not unreasonable to suggest that with their increased economic strength, they might be pursuaded to carry a little more of the burden themselves. But there is no emphasis on this approach in the President's message.

As for the foreign economic aid program, the question is whether, under present circumstances, facing a balance-of-payments problem that has proved to be so intractable to our past efforts, we can afford the level of commitments we have undertaken, particularly when the foreign aid program, according to the President's own adviser, General Clay, is confused in purpose, and scattered over nearly 100 countries. I do not believe that the United States is in so weak a position that we cannot more aggressively reduce and consolidate our own foreign aid program and at the same time more aggressively negotiate with our allies, particularly industrial countries with balance-of-payments surpluses, to share the burden of long-range foreign economic development.

Finally, we have heard a good deal about new initiatives in dealing with the balance of payments, but I regret that the President's message does not contain any new initiatives in regard to reducing budgetary expenditures of the Federal Government to offset the proposed tax cut which is highlighted in his message as an integral part of his program to deal with the balance of payments. Whether the budgetary deficit that is now expected by the administration is inflationary in its effect depends not only upon the amount of the deficit, but depends also on the effect that deficit has upon public psychology. In my opinion, the effect of such a deficit is potentially inflationary in the climate of wage and price negotiations of today. Even though the volume of savings is at a record level, and, therefore, the expected deficit may be financed in a technical sense without inflation, a record of deficits year after year, even in periods of economic advance such as 1963 that has seen record auto sales and rising incomes, has its cumulative effect also upon business confidence. In my opinion, if the deficit is expected to be only $7 or $8 billion, the effect on business confidence of eliminating the deficit by cutting expenditures is going to far outweigh the stimulative effect on consumer spending of the $7 or $8 billion amount. Therefore, if the President wishes to see the private enterprise system get moving again and free itself from the shackles of tax restriction, I believe that he would be well advised to seek out every means of reducing Government expenditures, including foreign military and economic aid. Not only would this be good for the balance of payments, it would be good for our system of free enterprise and limited constitutional government.

AID FOR DISCRIMINATION OVERSEAS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is increasingly evident that U.S. aid to Egypt's President Nasser is not fulfilling the goals by which this aid is annually justified to the American people and the American Congress. U.S. aid makes possible the diversion of Nasser's own resources for the purchase of Soviet weapons and for military buildups against neighboring nations.

What is more, it is also increasingly clear that, despite all the efforts of the Congress and the language that has been written into successive foreign aid bills, Nasser continues his discrimination against U.S. citizens and U.S. enterprises on the basis of religious considerations.

Mr. President, the language recently proposed by the President to promote nondiscriminatory treatment of all U.S. citizens in this country in projects assisted by the Federal Government is as follows:

> Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in any law of the United States providing or authorizing direct or indirect financial assistance for or in connection with any program or activity by way of grant, contract, loan, insurance, guarantee, or otherwise, no such law shall be interpreted as requiring that such financial assistance shall be furnished in circumstances under which individuals participating in or benefiting from the program or activity are discriminated against on the grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin or are denied participation or benefits therein on the grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin. All contracts made in connection with any program or activity shall contain such conditions as the President may prescribe for the purpose of assuring that there shall be no discrimination in employment by any contractor or subcontractor on the grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Surely it would not be inappropriate to supply at least these principles where U.S. funds are being used in foreign countries. Surely in our struggles for racial and religious equality at home, we must not be in the position of subsidizing the same type of inequality overseas that we are to some extent at least trying to prevent at home.

Milton Friedman of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency recently prepared an incisive article on the subject of President Nasser's deliberate efforts to stimulate anti-Jewish feeling in the Arab States while at the same time enjoying the fruits of U.S. aid and encouragement.

U.S. objectives are completely perverted when funds are denied to U.S. projects where discrimination occurs but continue to flow liberally to foreign dictators who discriminate even more severely.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Friedman's vigorous and penetrating article appear following my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALLS NASSER THE MIDDLE EAST "BULL" CONNER

(By Milton Friedman)

WASHINGTON.—The Federal Government has moved against racial segregation in Alabama but continues to appease Egypt's Nasser, the "Bull" Connor of the Middle East.

Nasser has emulated the ousted police bigot of Birmingham by blocking any moderation of anti-Jewish barriers in the Arab world. This came to light when Washington announced that Saudi Arabia, for the first time, would permit American Jewish personnel of U.S. military units to participate in training exercises there. Nasser immediately cried that Saudi Arabia had sold out the anti-Jewish segregation barrier. By appealing to anti-Jewish passions, Nasser forced Saudi Arabia to back down and renege on its agreement.

Egypt has denounced the United States for racial incidents in Alabama and elsewhere. But in blocking racist moderation in Saudi Arabia, Nasser has taken virtually the same role that Governor Wallace assumed against University of Alabama officials who were ready to cooperate with the Federal integration procedure.

The State Department still refuses to apply to American aid programs in Egypt the same antibias principles that President Kennedy has asked in his message to Congress on domestic civil rights. The Department ignores antibias clauses inserted by Congress into the foreign aid laws.

Rather than inject antibias measures into various laws, President Kennedy said: "It would be better at this time to pass a single comprehensive provision making it clear that the Federal Government is not required, under any statute, to furnish any kind of financial assistance—by way of grant, loan, contract, guaranty, insurance or otherwise—to any program or activity in which racial discrimination occurs." The President certainly cannot separate anti-Semitism from his concept of racial discrimination.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk recently testified before Congress that Egyptian-American relations had improved and that massive aid should again be handed out to Nasser. This came at a time when Congress was concerned about feeding America's unemployed millions including many Negro victims of job bias. Nasser was simultaneously denouncing Saudi Arabia for permitting entry of Americans of Jewish faith among U.S. Forces assigned there.

Saudi Arabia is high on Nasser's list of intended victims. He resents the presence of U.S. military units in a country he is seeking to overthrow. To undermine Saudi-American defense cooperation, Nasser exploited the first moderation in Saudi Arabia's previously rigid anti-Jewish stand.

Nasser hypocritically admits Jewish tourists to Egypt to get their dollars while maintaining a boycott and blockage against American Jewish businessmen who seek to sell to Egypt. He also bars American Jews from service on U.S. missions based in Cairo, including the agency which distributes American dollars.

Nasser's controlled press and radio carry an unrelenting stream of anti-Jewish diatribes. He has hired ex-Nazi propagandists and technicians, including some individuals wanted in West Germany as war criminals.

Nasser noted that the Arabian-American Oil Co. (after a ruling by American courts) agreed to employ Jews (in New York State only). His radio and television immediately charged that hordes of Jews were being shipped to Saudi Arabia by ARAMCO. A typical Cairo broadcast said the "presence of Jews among Arab employees and workers in ARAMCO is no less and perhaps even more serious than the infiltration of Jewish military men. * * * This is only a precedent. Oh, Arabs and Moslems, if you neglect this—do not rule out the possibility of seeing Jews soon in the outskirts of Medina."

Using transmission facilities and electrical current largely financed by American taxpayers, another Nasser broadcast charged "it has now become certain that American Jews are breathing the air (of Saudi Arabia). * * * The Palestine tragedy is being repeated now. The Jews have entered the Arabian peninsula under the guise of the American Army, American units, and American aid.

Secretary Rusk has not said a word to Nasser about these racist denunciations of Americans of Jewish faith who proudly serve in the military uniform of the United States.

The State Department is currently concerned lest Congress demand implementation of the antibias clause in the Foreign Assistance Law. The Department wants to continue aiding Nasser in hopes of buying his favor in the East-West struggle.

Policymakers have ignored compelling evidence that the American taxpayer is forced to indirectly subsidize, through aid to Egypt, Nasser's continued purchase of Soviet arms, the training of young Egyptian officers in Soviet military schools and the proliferation of the missile race.

American aid enables Egypt to exchange her entire cotton crop for offensive Soviet weapons, including jet bombers, rather than for food which is furnished by America.

Is America to continue combatting racism at home while subsidizing it abroad?

ROCHESTER'S CAPTIVE NATION WEEK, 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, numerous ceremonies, exhibitions and other means are being used all across the Nation this week to commemorate Captive Nations Week. This is, indeed, an observance of great significance and importance to all Americans who are hoping and praying for the day when our friends behind the Iron Curtain are delivered from Communist tyranny and once more take their rightful place in the world of the free.

It is fitting that my home city of Rochester, New York, which has benefited so greatly from people representing nations now under Soviet domination, should observe this week in special ways. Among other things, pictorial and model displays and choral presentations will be featured in an effort to remind everyone about the evils of communism and the plight of the people in the captive nations. William Andrushin, president of the American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, and other leaders have devoted much effort to these projects and to speaking out about the meaning of Captive Nations Week.

As a longtime advocate of observance of this week and dedicated friend of the noble peoples behind the Iron Curtain, I am delighted that my home community is observing this occasion in such vigorous style. It should serve well to encourage all of us to renew our pledge to strive for the restoration of freedom to the nations behind the Iron Curtain.

A fine editorial in the Rochester Times-Union of July 15 eloquently underscores the meaning of Captive Nations Week. I certainly endorse its sentiments and commend it to the attention of all Members of this body. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

One Day in the Life of a Captive European

> At 4:45 a.m. one recent day in Poland, Mrs. Jan Kozlowski wearily rose from her bed in the small Warsaw apartment she shares with her husband and his parents and got ready for work.
>
> Mrs. Kozlowski did not eat breakfast until the first coffee break in the state-owned factory where she works. Time was short. It took her nearly 40 minutes to get to work and another 40 minutes to prepare her machine for her 8-hour day.
>
> When she returned home, there was no chance to relax. She had to stand in line for nearly an hour to buy food. Cooking and washing took more time. She slept less than 6½ hours that night (she catches up with a nap on her one free day—Sunday—when possible).
>
> The children? She would have liked to have spent more than the bare few moments she snatched to talk with them, to help them with their homework. She would like to quit her job, in fact, but she and her husband cannot afford even a minimal living for the family unless both work.
>
> Privacy? There are no apartments or homes available, even if Mr. and Mrs. Kozlowski could afford to rent or buy. She must live double up with the in-laws. And there is the incessant blare of speeches and parade music from the state loudspeaker outside on the street. That night, Mrs. Kozlowski covered her ears with her pillow to escape the din.
>
> Kozlowski is not her real name; indeed, she is not an actual person. Rather, she is a composite of millions of citizens in captive European countries behind the Iron Curtain. The story of her day—an average day of an average East European—was gleaned from the Communist press by the Assembly of Captive European Nations, a distinguished refugee organization which refuses to give up hope.
>
> Life was not necessarily easy for all like Mrs. Kozlowski before the Communists came. But always there was enough to eat, time to talk, freedom to say what you felt, the chance of a better day.
>
> Now there is only the constant "there isn't any" from the stores, the everlasting work, the lurking fear of the state and the party apparatus.
>
> Nuclear war would be catastrophic. But the necessity of peace does not mean that free men and women must accept as permanent so bleak a life for the hundreds of millions under the Red thumb in Europe and elsewhere.
>
> That is why this week, in the United States, is observed as Captive Nations Week, annually proclaimed by the President of the United States in response to a resolution of Congress. Its purpose is to remind all who must live under dictatorship that they will not be forgotten by free peoples "until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."
>
> The annual proclamation always infuriates Nikita Khrushchev. So be it.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY PARLIAMENTARIANS FROM BRAZIL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have been accorded the privilege of presenting to the Senate today two good friends from the Republic of Brazil. They have been visiting in the Nation's Capital, and will be visiting in other parts of the United States. We welcome them. Both are parliamentarians, very active in the Parliamentary Union, and particularly in the Committee of the Americas.

I am hopeful that the visit of these two distinguished Brazilian parliamentarians will foreshadow a trend toward expanded contacts between North American parliamentarians and our Latin American colleagues.

I have just returned from a meeting held in Paris of the Economic Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference. I was impressed once again with the important role played by parliamentarians in promoting a united Europe and in enhancing U.S.-European harmony.

I believe I can say that most Members of the Senate know a number of their colleagues in the parliaments and legislative bodies of Europe. Unfortunately, I fear that the same is not true of Latin American. It is a strange situation that few American Congressmen and Senators have close ties with their parliamentary colleagues of this hemisphere. As I stated in my report on the Alliance for Progress several months ago:

> In our relationships with Latin American countries, we need to do more in terms of contacts with the legislative bodies, both at the State and National level. I, therefore, recommend that the program which has now been for several years with Mexico of the exchange of congressional delegations be expanded to other countries. Every Member of the Senate could be included in this program. There is no need for certain Senators to monopolize the opportunity of the exchange with other countries. For example, if 10 Senators are used for the Mexican trip, another 10 or more could go to Brazil.

I look forward to greeting other distinguished parliamentarians from the great Republic of Brazil in the months ahead. I would hope that new institutional means would be found to bring together more frequently the legislative leaders of the countries of this hemisphere whose futures are so intimately intertwined.

I therefore take the liberty and privilege of presenting Senator Men de Sa, a member of the Budget and Finance Committee of the Brazilian Congress; and the distinguished Congressman Carneiro. We welcome you to the Senate of the United States.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. We are happy indeed to welcome the distinguished parliamentarians from Brazil.

SOVIET PERSECUTION OF JEWS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate a matter which I think deserves our attention, which I have discussed on a number of previous occasions. There is continuing a Stalinist-type persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, according to a report from Moscow in the New York Herald Tribune of July 17, two Jewish women and two Jewish men have been placed on trial before a "people's court" charged with selling homemade matzoh for Passover. One of the defendants, the so-called ringleader, is an 82-year old invalid; the others are in their fifties and have been in prison since March. After a 1-day trial they were convicted and all but the invalid old man sent to jail.

This trial is another flagrant example of the Soviet Government's policies which have lent color to charges of anti-Semitism. Despite denials by Soviet leaders, this is bitter evidence that the Kremlin is continuing Stalinist policies against Jews even while condemning those policies. The civilized world cannot remain silent in the face of this act of the Soviet Government which is bound to stir up religious prejudice and dangers of religious persecution.

Protests should be made by leading citizens and organizations in all countries where men prize freedom and the right to worship God without restriction or restraint. Anti-Semitism is a crime against humanity, and in a country where this prejudice has the historic roots which it has in Russia, Soviet persecution can lead to even more widespread oppression and despotism.

The baking of matzoh, which is a ritual unleavened bread eaten during the Passover for hundreds of years before the Common Era, was discontinued in 1962 by the Soviet state bakeries after a widely publicized campaign begun in 1957 in which synagogues were accused of profiteering and other economic offenses.

Jews are being made the scapegoats for the Soviet Union's economic difficulties, and have been the prime targets of Soviet persecution. In 2 years ending April 1963, Soviet courts have sentenced 141 persons to death for alleged economic offenses and nearly 60 percent of those executed by firing squads have been Jews.

The Jewishness of the defendants is emphasized by the Soviet press and they are described in the crudest stereotypes generally utilized in anti-Semitic campaigns. Although all religions are subject to hostility and restrictions in the Soviet Union, Judaism is singled out in ways that add up to isolation and planned attrition. Jews are forbidden to make urgently needed religious and ritual articles; no Bible, prayer book, or religious calendars may be printed or imported; and even the one rabbinic school in the country has never been allowed to function properly and its enrollment has been whittled down only to three or four students.

Official Soviet actions have led to discrimination against Jews in all walks of Soviet life.

It will be recalled that the Soviet Union officially sought to answer this charge by me some time ago, but the answers themselves only pointed up the seriousness of the charge.

Nevertheless, the Soviet Union has shown sensitivity to world opinion on this issue and even within the Soviet Union certain writers and artists have been shocked by the realization that anti-Semitism is still in effect being actively fostered by action of the Soviet Government. Despite the Soviet Union's claim of having outlawed anti-Semitism by law, it stands before the bar of world opinion accused by its own policies and acts. Its rulers must not be permitted to believe that the world will either forget or condone.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the Moscow dispatch by David Miller, headlined, "Four Jews Tried—Sold Matzoh," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, July 17; and the Moscow dispatch in the same newspaper of July 18.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Four Jews Tried—Sold Matzoh

(By David Miller)

Moscow.—Four Moscow Jews went on trial in a "people's court" yesterday, charged with profiteering in the illegal sale of homemade matzoh before the festival of Passover in mid-April.

The Chief Rabbi of Moscow, Yehuda Leib Levine, called as a witness by the state, testified that the trial was the first of its type since the Soviet Union came into being 45 years ago.

Three of the defendants—a minor official at Rabbi Levine's Central Synagogue, and two illiterate women—have been in prison for months awaiting trial. The fourth, an 82-year-old invalid described as the ringleader, was permitted to live at home because of his weak physical condition.

The two men, Emil Katz, an aged pensioner who hobbled into court on a cane, and Golko Bogomolny, 49, a ritual slaughterer (shochet), at the synagogue, pleaded innocent. The two women, Klavdiy Blyakahman, 52, and Malka Brio, 59, both listed in court records as illiterate, admitted selling matzoh (unleavened bread) but denied making a profit.

Each of the defendants faces a maximum penalty of 4 years in prison with or without confiscation of property. Final arguments and a verdict by a woman and two men judging the case are expected today. The judgment may be appealed within 7 days.

NO STATE BAKERIES

[Before the Passover this year, Soviet authorities announced that state bakeries again would not be available for the baking of matzoh. A similar ban in 1962, the first in Soviet history, set off Western protests. The Jews of Moscow began making matzoh at home, and early in April reliable sources disclosed the arrest of eight Jews accused of illegally selling homemade matzoh. The Soviet press agency Novosti said at the time that matzoh was available in quantity in Moscow and denied any arrests had taken place.]

At the trial opening yesterday, 60 elderly men and women jammed into a third-floor courtroom to hear 7 prosecution and 8 defense witnesses. No prosecuting attorney took part. Instead, the judges themselves developed the case.

Introduced as evidence were 4-month-old pieces of matzoh, pictures of the wall stove and cutting table used and a list with the names and addresses of 18 would-be buyers. A number of those listed were called to testify.

The court, directed by Mrs. Valentina Tsygankova, was told that up to 1962 matzoh—a reminder of the Israelites flight from bondage in Egypt—was produced in a state bakery under the supervision of the Jewish community.

Prosecution witnesses said that Mrs. Katz bought matzoh from the women at 6 cents a pound and resold it for $1.38. The women insisted they distributed only what they could not use themselves and that most had baked matzoh for 3 or 4 days—not over a 2-month period, as charged.

"If the investigation organs had consulted with the rabbi," said Defense Attorney Matvey Sokolovich, "then this case wouldn't have got to court, because there is no crime.

"These people did it just for themselves, they are all believers and according to housewife Brio, matzoh 'is necessary for me like air.' It's necessary for her because of the old traditions."

Mr. Sokolovich said that in any event their activity was hardly a "large-scale" operation, as required under the accusation, section 2 of article 162 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation, largest of the Soviet Union's 15 republics.

"All churches sell candles and wafers at high prices," he said, "and nobody holds them for criminal responsibility."

Those accused, he said, "did it not for profit but for their religious beliefs; they used no hired labor, they distributed the production which they didn't use themselves.

FOUR MONTHS IN PRISON

"I am quite sure you will correct the fatal error of the investigation," he said. "I call this error fatal because my defendant Blyakhman spent 4 months in prison without committing any crime at all."

Mr. Katz' attorney, Mikhail Lozinsksy, said the investigative organ had taken a "dogmatic position" and had never proven what they stated. One witness, he added, had claimed Mr. Katz was responsible for selling 1,100 pounds of matzoh while Mr. Katz had admitted handling a third of that over an 8-day period.

Matzoh Sale: Prison for Three

(By David Miller)

Moscow.—A Soviet court yesterday sentenced a minor synagogue official to a year in prison and two Jewish housewives to 6 months each for profiteering in the sale of homemade Passover matzoh (unleavened bread) last March.

An 82-year-old invalid named as the alleged ringleader was set free, presumably because of his age and weak physical condition. The trial was the first of its type since the Soviet Union's creation in 1922.

Those imprisoned—Golko Bogomolny, 49, Mrs. Klavdiy Blyakhman, 52; and Mrs. Malka Brio, 59—will have the 4 months already spent in custody deducted from their sentences. The fourth defendant, Emil Katz, a pensioner who walks with a cane and crutches, was allowed to live at home until the trial.

The defendants took the decision stoically. Mr. Bogomolny, a ritual slaughterer at Moscow Central Synagogue, led the two women from the court under the guard of four policemen. A few friends yelled parting words in Yiddish.

Mr. Bogomolny, a stocky man who wore a stiff eight-sided hat all during the trial, chatted with a policeman as they made their way to a militia car for the return trip to prison. He wore black-rimmed round glasses with a broken right ear-piece fastened to his ear with a piece of string.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is for these reasons that I urge protests by leading citizens and organizations in all countries where men prize freedom and the right to worship God without restriction. Anti-Semitism is a crime against humanity. In a country where it has historic roots, as it has in Russia, Soviet persecution can lead to more widespread injustice and despotism.

ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION JUBILEE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the services performed by private philanthropic foundations in numerous areas of our Nation and their importance in our national development deserve careful study. This year the Rockefeller Foundation is celebrating its 50th anniversary and the record of its activities even in summary is a tribute to our free society.

Guided by the founder's statement on May 14, 1913, that the best philanthropy involves a "search for a cause, an attempt to cure evils at their source," the foundation has appropriated funds over the 50-year period for projects which held the potential of improving the state of mankind. Its encouragement spurred initiatives in public health, medical research, social sciences, humanities and the arts, agriculture, and educational development.

The achievements of the foundation, which has its offices in New York City, have been beneficial to man in all corners of the earth. In 1962, grants were received by institutions in 60 countries for research and development projects.

The record of the Rockefeller Foundation is unparalleled in the history of philanthropic giving and its achievements deserve wide recognition. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the statement by the trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation on the occasion of the foundation's 50th anniversary in May 1963, summarizing its activities.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Statement by the Trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation on the Occasion of the Foundation's Fiftieth Anniversary

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Barry Bingham, editor and publisher, the Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times.

Lloyd D. Brace, chairman of the board, First National Bank of Boston.

Detlev W. Bronk, president, the Rockefeller Institute.

Ralph J. Bunche, Under Secretary for Special Political Affairs, United Nations.

Lowell T. Coggeshall, vice president, University of Chicago.

John S. Dickey, president, Dartmouth College.

Orvil E. Dryfoos, president and publisher, the New York Times.

Lee A. Dubridge, president, California Institute of Technology.

Lord Franks of Headington, provost, Worcester College, Oxford University.

Clifford M. Hardin, chancellor, University of Nebraska.

J. George Harrar, president, the Rockefeller Foundation.

Theodore M. Hesburgh, president, University of Notre Dame.

Arthur A. Houghton, Jr., president, Steuben Glass.

Clark Kerr, president, University of California.

John R. Kimberly, chairman of the board, Kimberly-Clark Corp.

John D. Rockefeller, 3rd, chairman of the board, the Rockefeller Foundation.

Frank Stanton, president, Columbia Broadcasting System.

Henry P. Van Dusen, president, Union Theological Seminary.

W. Barry Wood, Jr., director, department of microbiology, the Johns Hopkins University.

George D. Woods, president, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The Rockefeller Foundation has now completed 50 years of activity in promoting "the well-being of mankind throughout the world."

As we look back at the record of those who preceded us, we note with pride the achievements that have flowed from the foundation's 50-year history. During this period the foundation has spent over $763 million—far more than its total income. This sum by itself could have accomplished relatively little. The real accomplishments have been brought about by the inspired and dedicated efforts of thousands of talented and learned men and women who needed financial support at critical moments in their determined endeavor to improve the lot of their fellow men. To these servants of human welfare we pay respectful tribute.

We note with further respect and admiration the contributions of the dedicated corps of officers who have implemented so ably the purposes of the foundation, and of our predecessor trustees—among them such noted public figures as John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Charles Evans Hughes, Owen D. Young, John Foster Dulles, John W. Davis, Simon Flexner, Raymond B. Fosdick, Dean Rusk, Robert A. Lovett, Henry Allen Moe, and John J. McCloy; and such distinguished educators as Eliot of Harvard, Angell of Yale, Dodds of Princeton, Compton of MIT, Sproul of California, Wilbur of Stanford, and Hopkins of Dartmouth.

In 1913 the foundation's first trustees decided to focus all efforts and resources on what John D. Rockefeller once called "a search for cause, an attempt to cure evils at their source." It was a time when life expectancy in this country was restricted to 52 years, compared with 70 years today; when 1 out of every 10 children died in the first year of life, compared with 1 in 40 today. Here was a place to start, for surely mankind could not move on toward creating a better life without physical well-being.

During those early years dedicated scientists on the foundation's staff sought out major infectious diseases—malaria, hookworm, and yellow fever—all over the world. Out of this persistent work, patterns for the improvement of public health began to emerge and, for the first time in history, protection against major diseases could be given to millions of human beings.

One aspect of this systematic approach to the whole problem of public health was the establishment by the foundation of public health schools—the first at the Johns Hopkins University, followed by similar undertakings here and in 21 countries all over the world. Governments and private organizations have now entered this field with greatly expanded resources. The foundation itself moved on to advance the general improvement of medical education, and with this concentrated effort went the encouragement of research in the belief that persistent probing for new knowledge must move hand-in-hand with education.

Combining its interest in public health and the medical and biological sciences, the foundation has also turned its attention to human nutrition, especially to the problem of increasing the world's food production. The foundation has just completed 20 years of work in Mexico in close cooperation with Mexican leaders, scientists, and agricultural producers. The deficit position of Mexico with respect to its basic crops has been corrected. Lessons learned and techniques evolved are now being applied to other areas of the world with comparable problems.

Meanwhile, the search for causes of disease, poverty, malnutrition, ignorance, and despair revealed pressing needs for new knowledge about man himself as a part of his whole environment. For the needs of mankind merely begin, and do not end, with physical well-being and an adequate diet—vital as these may be. Among the great ends and the great achievements of man are those that grow from inspirations of his intellect and his spirit. In the middle of its second decade, therefore, the foundation began its long and intensive support of work in the social sciences—economics, sociology, political science—and its increasingly broad interest in the humanities and the arts. In the natural sciences the foundation moved into the support of pioneering research in physics, chemistry, and biology, and then into biophysics, biochemistry, genetics, physiology, and microbiology.

The Rockefeller Foundation's 50-year record has helped demonstrate the role of a private foundation in meeting contemporary human need. A private foundation can take initiative; it can pioneer; and, by mustering available knowledge and human competence, it can identify causes and experiment with solutions. It can move without the political complications created when governments are involved with other governments. It can encourage cooperative effort across national and political boundaries. It can bring a high order of individuality and diversity of viewpoint into the field of human betterment. It can provide a decentralization of social initiative and responsibility. And it can enlist the interest and support of vigorous, enterprising, and public-spirited benefactors.

The Rockefeller Foundation has been a catalyst, undertaking operations of its own only when there was no existing organization ready to act. It has considered itself primarily a cooperating enterprise in situations both in the United States and abroad where people were ready to help themselves and needed aid, not only in funds, but also in developing their potentials for research and scholarship.

The foundation has always looked to the eventual assumption of total responsibility by local institutions and individuals, thus making continuing effort eventually self-sustaining. One way of achieving this has been through the financing of some 16,000 fellowships, which have enabled promising men and women to improve their professional knowledge and aptitudes. Twenty-eight fellows eventually won Nobel Prizes for their contributions to human welfare; an additional 68 Nobel laureates have received other forms of foundation assistance.

Where institutions exist for research, education, and training in fields of foundation interest, they have been aided by direct grants. In rare instances where such institutions have not existed, grants have been made toward their establishment. Because the foundation believes that it is difficult for one generation to foresee the needs of the next, grants have never been tied to rigid purposes. Once grants have been made, after careful exploration, to responsible groups or institutions, the foundation has never sought to direct or control the work supported. It has not assumed a permanent share of the expenses of any institution, because it does not want to influence the policy of recipients or detract from their responsibilities or their independence.

Whether acting as an operating institution or a grant-making institution, however, the foundation's characteristic procedure has been to identify the cause of the particular problem, to find realistic ways of dealing with it, to aid others as they carry out this effort, and then to move on to other opportunities in response to changing human needs.

Large new resources are becoming available on many academic and scientific fronts in the United States and elsewhere as worldwide attention is being given to the well-being of mankind. Public funds are being used in areas where 50 years ago almost nothing was being done, except the pioneering efforts of a small number of private foundations. In 1913 expenditures for social welfare by Federal, State, and local governments were less than $1 billion, compared with more than $55 billion today. And yet, despite these increased resources, the immensity of problems inhibiting "the well-being of mankind throughout the world" still dwarfs the forces involved—public and private.

We face the future in a world startingly different from that in which the Rockefeller Foundation was founded 50 years ago. It is a complex and intimately interdependent world, exploding in revolutionary change as man struggles to improve his conditions of life in many physical and social environments. Meanwhile, the great new force of a rapidly expanding population increasingly magnifies such problems as food supply, conservation of natural resources, urbanization, public health, education, the use of leisure, and world peace and security.

The opportunities for effective work toward the well-being of mankind through the systematic dispensing of private resources are today enormous. For in attacking the momentous problems he faces, civilized man has at hand means that were unavailable 50 years ago—a great improvement and broadening of education; a vast storehouse of new scientific knowledge and techniques for applying this knowledge; and a general awakening among the peoples of the earth to the fact that man can improve himself and his environment if he has the will and patient determination to do so.

As it begins its second half-century, the Rockefeller Foundation adds to these new means for human advancement an experienced faith in the validity and the vitality of the philanthropic idea. Those whose devotion to the betterment of mankind gave the foundation its first half-century of success have established, it seems to us, that private wealth can be responsibly and effectively expended by private institutions devoted solely to the public good.

To perform this urgent task with increasing effectiveness will be the continued aim of this foundation.

PRESIDENT'S BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS MESSAGE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, President Kennedy's message to Congress on the balance of payments represents at long last some measurable steps to correct this critical situation. The administration's effort to promote our exports should be fully supported by Congress, as should the proposals for further reduction of oversea U.S. Government expenditures. The major new proposal—enactment of an interest equalization tax by Congress on stock and bond issues of foreign borrowers—including foreign governments—floated in the United States—is an interesting proposal which, I believe, would not run counter to our obligations as bankers of the world. However, I have asked Treasury Secretary Dillon to give assurances that it does not in any way violate our longstanding tradition of not imposing direct controls on our international financial transactions, and I am awaiting these from him now. These assurances will be of great importance to the U.S. banking and financial community, which would otherwise be deeply concerned about this tax.

While the President's message shows a recognition of the seriousness of the international balance-of-payments problem, its plans still fall far short of what is needed. In the area of tourism, the administration offers nothing new. I regret the absence of any steps to urge removal of continued restrictions imposed by foreign countries on the dollar expenditures of their tourists. Also, the President should have recognized that steps must be taken now, while there is still time, to review the long-term future of the world monetary system. As I have suggested in a resolution introduced July 10 this could best be achieved by a world monetary conference.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day I addressed myself to the balance-of-payments message sent to us by the President, and stated that I was asking the Secretary of the Treasury to give us a statement of reassurance that the tax equalization proposal with respect to foreign long-term debts and foreign securities issued or floated in the United States did not mean or imply that we were going into some kind of controls over the flotation of foreign securities in the United States.

I now have that statement and desire to read it into the RECORD. My reason is that it is a very urgent subject with the financial and banking community of the United States which will be deeply concerned by this tax proposal. Perhaps they will oppose it. Certainly they will be deeply concerned if it means the initiation of controls over the marketing of foreign securities in this country, which would have a tendency to impair materially our role as the world's banker, which is not only a responsibility and burden, but also gives us an opportunity for leading the world financially and to occupy a place which is rightfully ours; therefore we have to carry it.

I am very glad to make this statement available generally. Secretary Dillon has sent the message to me, and I give it to the Senate, as being his statement. The Secretary states:

> In seeking to restrain the flood of foreign securities which are attracted to the U.S. capital market because of its better organization and lower interest rates than most markets abroad, we rejected as impractical and unacceptable two alternatives which had been urged upon us. The first was an increase in long-term interest rates. With the huge volume of savings in the United States today, an increase in long-term rates would probably not be possible; in addition, under present circumstances such a rise would not be desirable. The other avenue, which has been used in the past by other capital exporting countries and still exists in most, was exchange controls. Not only would such controls probably be ineffective, they would be totally at variance with our free market tradition. Direct Government control of private investment decisionmaking has been, and will continue to be, completely unacceptable to us. Our proposal for an interest equalization tax is the direct opposite of a system of exchange controls.
>
> Capital controls would require Government review and approval of each transaction. The proposal for an interest equalization tax does not do this. All that is implied in the tax is that the interest rate mechanism applied by the Federal Reserve in the short-term area is being extended to apply in the longer term area, without raising the level of long-term rates domestically. The cost of long-term money is increased, but to foreigners only.
>
> Capital controls would seek to limit administratively the volume of transactions—in effect saying arbitrarily, that we will permit so much in the way of security sales and no more. The tax merely raises the cost of foreign sales to about the international level and relies on market forces to operate. Our capital markets would remain completely open, but the large interest rate incentive for sales here which now exists would be narrowed by about 1 percent.
>
> In rejecting the alternative of capital controls we are again announcing to the world that we are not going down the path that we have opposed and will continue to oppose. Instead, we have found a device which preserves our way of doing business, and at the same time would cope with a serious problem we face in meeting the balance-of-payments challenge.

At first impression, I can see much in favor of this way of dealing with the problem, which is better than controls. However, I welcome the statement, because I think it must be evaluated by the entire financial and banking community, which will undoubtedly manifest its views to me and to the country generally.

I believe the statement puts the problem in focus as being clearly a way in which the flow of issues of both stocks and bonds from abroad would not be neglected, but by means of fixing interest rates on those issues to be made more clearly related to the interest rate on long-term issues abroad without affecting cost of long-term funds to the domestic borrowers. It may be a way out of the dilemma in which we find ourselves with respect to the unfavorable effects of the large outflows of private long-term capital on our balance of payments.

It is a fact that such flotations have risen materially, until the outflows of private long-term capital during the first quarter of this year totaled more than $1 billion—nearly double the amount in the first quarters of the past several years. However, I believe we need to have the reaction of the business and financial community, and this statement will get that reaction.

The Secretary of the Treasury, I am glad to say, expressly repudiates exchange controls and makes it clear that the tax is intended to stand in the way of any such controls.

STUDY OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would like to call to the Senate's attention this morning the fact that yesterday the Securities and Exchange Commission filed with the Congress the very important second segment of the report of the Special Study of the Securities Markets on the adequacies of investor protection in the securities markets. The first segment of the report was filed on April 3, 1963, pursuant to a congressional mandate, and it is expected that the final segment will be submitted to the Congress shortly.

I ask unanimous consent that the summary of this study, as contained in the New York Times, as well as editorials in the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune, may be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the summary and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 18, 1963]

SUMMARY BY COMMISSION

The report distinguishes between the broker-dealer community of "professional" participants on the one hand, and "public" participants on the other, drawing attention to the widely varying characteristics and activities of persons and firms within each group. It points out that the number of individual public participants has almost trebled in the past decade but that the proportion of the total volume of shares traded by individuals appears to be declining, while the proportion accounted for by institutions appears to be increasing.

The report refers to the two basic categories of trading markets—exchange markets and over-the-counter markets—and observes that the two are fundamentally similar in purpose and functions but substantially dissimilar in mechanics and practices.

Chapter V also examines various statutory and nonstatutory criteria of a good trading market, such as "fair," "honest," "free," "efficient," "orderly," "continuous," "liquid or fluid," noting that these terms must be interpreted and applied in light of congressional emphasis on the "public interest" and the "protection of investors" and that they at best supply guidelines within which there are large areas for definition of policy on concrete problems. The chapter also provides an introductory discussion on depth in relation to continuity and liquidity of a market.

As a reminder that no rule or practice is immutable, inevitable, or universal, chapter V concludes with a brief description of some of the distinguishing characteristics of foreign securities markets.

EXCHANGE MARKETS

The chapter focuses on the New York Stock Exchange in view of its dominance as the Nation's leading securities market. The American Stock Exchange has been the subject of a separate special study report; special problems of the regional exchanges are dealt with in chapter VIII.

Although the chapter points to a considerable number of specific areas where changes from existing practices are recommended, no legislative proposals are made. The report notes that the existing powers of the Commission, granted by the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, appear sufficiently broad to provide added controls or other remedies where the need is indicated.

The first three parts of the chapter include material relating to the diverse characteristics of securities traded on the NYSE, differences among its member commission firms, the mechanics of markets, and statistics on members trading as principals. The report points out that although the NYSE has relatively high listing standards, the securities bought and sold on the exchange differ considerably with respect to many significant features.

The study concludes that the basic dealer function of specialists, that of providing price continuity, is a useful one. The report states: "A market which moves in small fractions probably tends to discourage undue speculative activity" and that "a responsible dealer system can prevent sudden changes in prices caused not by changes in intrinsic worth of general market conditions but by vagaries of supply and demand at a particular moment."

However, the study also found that since the profit potential for specialists was greatest in the most active stocks, there was some tendency for specialists to neglect the inactive issues which are most in need of responsible dealer participation even though risks are greater and profit potentials are more limited. While the exchange has a policy of assigning certain issues to well-capitalized specialist units, there is no attempt to give each unit a balanced portfolio so that a more or less assured dealer profit and brokerage income in stable issues can be available for volatile stocks and inactive issues.

The special study's examination of the various specialist units discloses that NYSE specialist units show great diversity in size, number of specialty stocks, source of income, capital and rate of return. Larger units tend to have more than their proportionate share of capital, indicating a greater ability to service the market adequately.

In view of the fact that the exchange's minimum capital requirement, which has been unchanged for many years, requires each unit to have only that capital necessary to assume positions of 400 shares in each of its specialty stocks, the study recommends that the minimum be at least tripled.

With respect to problems of the dealer function generally, the report concludes that a more effective surveillance and regulatory pattern is needed: "The virtual disappearance of competing specialists make it particularly important that there be uniform standards as well as close supervision."

However, the report also notes that for several reasons competition does not seem to function effectively in the specialist system, and thus does not provide the key to adequate performance by all specialists. The present thrust of the NYSE's surveillance of the dealer function is criticized as having been generally marked by indiscriminate encouragement of a high level of participation, failure to take action with respect to inadequate encouragement, and an apparent desire to project the image of the specialist as a market stabilizer.

In its analysis of the activities of some 370 NYSE commission firms for the year 1960 the report notes that 43 percent of total income went to the top 5 percent of firms, while 9 percent was accounted for by the lower 50 percent of reporting firms. It found the greatest concentration occurred in income sources connected with the exchange—interest on customers' accounts and NYSE commissions—and the least concentration in over-the-counter income. While about 40 percent of total income of all reporting firms combined came from NYSE commissions and 13 percent from interest on customers' debit balances (customer borrowing), the composition of income differed among firms—the larger the firm the higher the proportion of income derived from NYSE commissions and interest on customers' accounts and the lower the proportion from over-the-counter activities.

In studying the growth of reporting firms' income between 1954 and 1960 the study found a general tendency for firms with the smallest income from each source to show the greatest growth rates for the same source. This was not true of NYSE commission income, however, in which there was a tendency for the largest firms to show relatively greater growth rates.

The report points out that the trading of exchange members falls into various patterns, and that trading by exchange members dealing for their own account represents a significant portion of all trading on the NYSE. It notes that while odd-lot dealers and specialists trade on the floor in connection with various auction market functions performed by them, floor traders trade primarily for quick in-and-out profits. Members who trade from off the floor are the least homogeneous group and their trading represents a broader mixture of personal investment, speculation, arbitrage transactions, etc.

In 1961, NYSE volume (shares sold) was about 1 billion shares; in that year members bought or sold about 500 million shares (viewed in terms of shares bought and sold, exchange members accounted for about 25 percent of all purchases and sales). In terms of the trading of each member class studied in 1961, specialist purchases and sales were equivalent to about 29 percent of NYSE volume, members off-floor 10 percent, odd-lot dealers 6 percent, and floor traders 4 percent. The report contains further breakdowns and refinements of these data showing the concentration of trading of each member class by the number of stocks in which they trade, by stock price, activity, and price range.

The report points out that in many instances this member participation in the market, especially by specialists and odd-lot dealers, improves the quality and usefulness of the exchange markets. However, the report also cautions that potential conflicts of interest between members and nonmembers, and the possible impact of member trading on market activity, raise fundamental problems of exchange regulation.

SPECIALISTS

There are about 350 NYSE members who are registered as specialists, organized into 110 firms or units.

Specialists are involved as brokers or dealers in about half the transactions which take place on the NYSE. In 1961, as principals, they bought or sold 312,190,000 shares or about $12.7 billion worth of securities (29 percent of volume) and, as brokers, they executed almost one-third of all round-lot orders executed on the exchange. The report notes that "no other class of exchange member is so intimately connected with the trading process and in so crucial a position to affect trading as to prices and as to manner and speed of execution."

THREE FUNDAMENTALS

The report states that three fundamentals are at the core of the problems of the specialist system:

The first is that in the last 25 years the specialist's dealer function has become at least as important as the brokerage function.

The second is that "the conflicts of interest inherent in any simultaneous combination of broker and dealer functions" have been intensified by the expansion of the dealer function and by certain extensions of the brokerage function beyond that of handling routine market orders and limited price orders.

And, third, wide variations in financial and other capacity, and in performance among the 110 different NYSE specialist units, result in considerable divergency in the nature and quality of markets for individual securities which indicates that the regulatory framework permits too wide a tolerance from acceptable norms.

In describing the specialist's brokerage function, the report observes that the accumulation of a large number of limited orders on his book affords to the specialist exclusively a powerful tool giving him insight into the possible course of the market. A limited price order is one which the broker is instructed to execute at a price no less favorable than that designated by the customer.

DESTABILIZING TRADING

With respect to the specialist's role in market stabilization, the special study found, on the basis of the analysis of about 100,000 separate specialist transactions, that for one test period in a normal market, most specialist trading appeared to have some stabilizing effect, but that in a significant group of stocks such trading tended to destabilizing in nature. In view of the significant quantity of such destabilizing trading, the report concludes that such activity "points to the need for developing methods of measuring specialist performance on a more valid and current basis" than those now used by the exchange.

In its analysis of specialist trading during the 1962 market break, the report concluded that: "Specialists as a group did not have a significant stabilizing effect on the market." However, the report also noted that "ordinarily the capacity of specialists to provide price stability is a distinctly limited one. No system of dealer trading can be expected to stabilize—in the sense of preventing price changes—in a market subjected to heavy public buying or selling."

The study found that the stabilizing role of specialists has been publicly presented by the NYSE in a confusing and conflicting manner. The report states: "As a public relations matter the exchange has sought to project the image of the specialist as a stabilizer, but the problems in this area are too deep for any confusion to exist in the public mind." Between the specialist's basic function of maintaining price continuity and market stabilization, the study found that some of the difficulties in this area were caused by the exchange's use of an inadequate test of stabilization. The exchange test is based on analyzing particular transactions in relation to the immediately preceding transaction—a measure which ignores significant market trends taking place over a longer period of time.

THE 1962 MARKET BREAK

On May 28, 1962, the day of greatest decline, in which the Dow-Jones industrial average fell an additional 34.95 points, specialists bought and sold 3,093,220 shares and had a net purchase balance of 206,400 shares or 6.7 percent of their total purchases and sales.

This percentage was not significantly different from specialist activity during normal periods and, as the report points out, contrasts sharply with specialists' activities on the first day after President Eisenhower's heart attack in 1955, when the trading of specialists as a group resulted in an unusually high purchase balance (595,550 shares) which "probably had a discernible market impact but the same cannot be said on May 28, 1962." The report speculates that the 1955 break was probably felt to be a temporary interruption in a strong bull market, a view which may have accounted for differing specialist activity in the two periods.

It was found on the basis of the available data that the dealer performance of the specialists in Avco, Brunswick, General Motors, and Standard Oil of New Jersey tended, if anything, to add reasonable depth to the market and to have a cushioning effect during the decline on May 28.

On the other hand, the trading of specialists in Telephone, IBM, and Korvette tended to be passive at best and possibly destabilizing in nature.

The report emphasized that while no one person has the capital to stem a selling wave such as that of May 28, the specialist is in a position to "cushion the public's selling by giving depth to the markets, and some specialists undertook this function. On the other hand, other specialists "confined their activity to providing technical price continuity and a few specialists seemed to contribute to the 'pounding' down of prices by their selling."

DAYLIGHT TRADING

Daylight trading, a term used to describe the tendency to end each day with as small a long or short position as possible, is another problem which has not been subjected to adequate surveillance, according to data analyzed by the study. The report states that such trading "is the antithesis of responsible dealer activity." It is concluded that the exchange's "failure to investigate for daylight trading has undoubtedly encouraged activity" and that the "surveillance policies of the exchange should be extended to this area."

SUBSTANTIAL BLOCKS

The study found that specialists vary considerably in their willingness and ability to buy and sell substantial blocks. When blocks are handled through the auction market they are generally bought or sold at fair prices but often a realistic discount is still insufficient to make block dealing attractive to specialists. Recommendations made by the study, designed to improve the ability of the exchange auction market to handle blocks, include a substantial increase in specialist minimum capital requirements, and exploration of the possibility of the establishment of a capital fund administered by the exchange from which specialists could borrow and/or which could partially insure specialists against loss when dealing in large blocks.

LONG-TERM INVESTMENT

One area of dealer activity which the report concludes is not consistent with the marketmaking function is the practice of specialists establishing long-term investment accounts in their specialty stocks to qualify for long-term capital gains treatment. The dimensions of the problem are indicated by the fact that on one sample day, June 16, 1961, of total specialist inventory of 3,229,556 shares, 890,733 shares were segregated into long-term accounts.

The report states that except in the more active stocks, "the specialist is in a position to, and does actually 'administer' the market and affirmatively influences price levels and trends—that the specialist may often be the market rather than a mechanism for linking buyers and sellers together."

OPENING PRICES

An area where the specialist's ability to influence prices is particularly great is in arranging openings. Most orders at openings are given to specialists and they set the opening prices. The exchange's main reliance in controlling specialists' activities in arranging openings is on certain technical rules limiting the amount of price movements without the approval of the Governor.

Pointing out that the opening price is "probably the most important price of the day," the special study urges that "there above all, the principle of a free and open market, with prices set by public supply and demand, should govern." To this end, the special study concludes that the specialist should not interfere in openings, except to maintain price continuity.

Other recommended changes in current practices are also in the direction of preserving the arm's-length quality of transactions—one of the prime indications of a free market. There should be public weekly reports of all specialists' purchases and sales. Specialist firms should not be permitted to have their own public customers.

The report also recommends that the exchange abandon its so-called specialist corporate liaison program, under which specialists are required to meet and consult with corporate officials, on the grounds that it is unrealistic to encourage such contacts while having a policy designed to prevent the disclosure of inside corporate information.

NYSE EVALUATED

The report observes that no hard and fast rules can be developed to eliminate these problems entirely since it is precisely by competing with his own customers—by outbidding or underoffering them—that the specialist is able to contribute to price continuity. The report notes that in recent months the NYSE's regulatory and surveillance program has improved in that at least one examiner has been assigned to work which may involve reconstructing specialist books. Despite this recent innovation and the fact that NYSE's surveillance procedures are in the hands of a "capable and sophisticated administration," the report concludes that : "In the area of the conflicts of interest which arise from the specialist's unique role as both broker and market maker the exchange's regulatory and surveillance program has been inadequate."

The report concludes that since there must be a large measure of judgment and discretion involved in the application of standards governing specialists "the administrators of the regulatory system—primarily the exchanges themselves—must exercise vigilance and discrimination in evaluating performance in particular situations," and that a "mechanical application" of any test used in surveillance does not "discharge the duty of surveillance which ultimately is the protection of individual investors in specific transactions."

ODD-LOT DEALERS

Trading in the regular auction market on the floor of the exchange is generally conducted in round lots of 100 shares, and orders to buy or sell in amount less than round lots are called odd lots. The total odd-lot volume on the exchange during 1961 exceeded 214 million shares or 9.1 percent of the total share volume. About 99 percent of all odd-lot transactions on the exchange are handled by two firms, Carlisle & Jacquelin and De Coppet & Doremus, through about 100 associate brokers working on the floor of the exchange.

The odd-lot dealers derive their compensation from a per share "odd-lot differential" which the public customer pays in addition to a brokerage commission. The differential amounts to one-eighth point for stock selling below $40 per share and one-quarter point for stocks selling at $40 above. The odd lot dealer, who transacts his business exclusively with other brokerage firms, fills odd-lot orders by buying and selling roundlots for his own account as principal.

NO PRICE COMPETITION

Competition between the odd-lot houses is according to the special study, limited to various services offered to other exchange members. These services are only indirectly and partially for the benefit of public odd-lot customers who bear the cost. The report observes that price competition has not existed between the two odd-lot firms for decades and that a uniform price policy adopted by the exchange in 1938 effectively discouraged limited price competition from other member firms or odd-lot business.

The exchange has clear statutory authority to regulate the differential, and in view of the domination of this large and important public business by two firms it would seem a classic case for rate regulation. The special study characterizes as unrealistic the exchange's position—that the differential for odd lots is purely a matter for negotiation between odd-lot dealers and other members. Negotiations between odd-lot dealers and other members do not assure that the public investor's interests will be represented. The report states that the exchange should recognize and meet its responsibility to regulate the odd-lot differential and the commission, whose regulation of odd-lot transactions in the past has been at a minimum, to undertake a more affirmative role of oversight.

FLOOR TRADERS

The report also reflects the special study's analysis of the nature and characteristics of floor trading—the activity of a member in trading for his own account on the floor of the NYSE except as a specialist or odd-lot dealer.

Although the number of members effecting floor trades on the exchange exceeds 300 per year, according to the report, the 15 most active floor traders each week account for roughly half of all floor trading volume, and only some 48 members or member firms are engaged primarily in floor trading. Total floor trader purchases and sales amounted to 44.7 million shares in 1961, or 2.1 percent of total exchange purchases and sales.

Floor trader participation in given stocks over given periods frequently is much higher than 2 percent, however; data for three 1-week periods studied show that between 35.8 and 51.5 percent of all floor trading in each week was concentrated in less than 38 issues and that in each of these issues floor traders accounted for more than 7.5 percent of all purchases and sales.

The report also notes a very high concentration of floor trading in active stocks; in each of the 3 weeks studied between 40 and 50 percent of all floor trading took place in the 25 most active stocks on the exchange.

NO RESPONSIBILITIES

The report notes that floor traders are the only members who enjoy access to the floor without any accompanying market responsibilities. This privilege, acquired through purchase of a seat, is described as providing substantial trading advantages, including the opportunity to observe and react to trading activity before it is reflected on the tape, a "feel of the market" which can come only from actual presence on the floor, and appreciably lower commission costs than for off-floor trading, whether by members or the public.

Noting that recent commission cases and NYSE disciplinary proceedings have emphasized the unfairness of permitting those in possession of nonpublic information to trade on the basis of such information, the report points out that although the advantages enjoyed by floor traders may differ, the basic regulatory principle—denial of special advantage—should apply. Accordingly, only some strong, demonstrable countervailing public benefit can justify the special advantages enjoyed by the floor trader.

TRADING DESTABILIZING

The report observes that proponents of floor trading claim that it serves as a stabilizing influence on prices and provides the market with added liquidity and continuity. As to stabilizing, the report notes that past studies on at least 15 different occasions since 1934, and a variety of statistical studies made by the special study itself, have shown that floor traders are generally buyers in rising markets and sellers in declining markets, with respect to both the market as a whole and to the individual stocks. Their trading, as a result, is inimical to the orderly functioning of the market, tending to accentuate rather than to stabilize price movements.

In assessing the contributions of floor trading to liquidity, the report points out that floor trading is heavily concentrated in the active stocks where added liquidity is needed least. With respect to the argument that market price continuity is enhanced by floor trading, the report observes that because floor traders concentrate their trading in the active stocks, the continuity they add is limited for the most part to the stocks that suffer least from lack of continuity.

There are occasions on which floor trader participation in the market has a negative impact on price continuity. Due to the tendency of floor traders to trade with price trends, their participation in auction proceedings often adds to the imbalance of buyers and sellers and thereby encourages more rapid and sizable price changes. The special study finds that while floor traders may occasionally improve liquidity and add continuity, thus performing the functions of a specialist, at no time do they incur the specialist's obligations.

The special study finds that past attempts to retain or expand the benefits of floor trading and at the same time curtail its undesirable characteristics have been nominally successful at best.

ABOLITION RECOMMENDED

The special study recommends that, as a vestige of the former private club character of exchanges, floor trading should not be permitted to continue on the NYSE of AMEX (American Stock Exchange). A termination date of January 2, 1964, is recommended for those members whose income from floor trading amounts to less than 25 percent of their total gross income from all activities in the securities business, and a final termination date of January 2, 1965, is recommended for all floor trading activities.

Having noted in its discussion of the specialist system that the financial capacity of some specialists is in need of strengthening, the special study further recommends that the NYSE, AMEX and commission study the feasibility and desirability of permitting present floor traders, or other members, to register as "auxiliary specialists" with permission to trade on the floor in any security, providing all transactions of such auxiliary specialist are either undertaken at the unsolicited request of a specialist and in accordance with rules similar to those governing specialists, or are effected for the purpose of reversing in whole or in part a transaction so undertaken.

Finally, the report recommends that since floor trading on regional exchanges in dually listed stocks does not appear to influence price movements or involve special advantages, such floor trading should be the subject of separate consideration by the commission.

MEMBERS' OFF-FLOOR TRADING

In a section of the report dealing with members' off-floor trading (transactions on the exchange for members' own accounts which originate away from or "off" the floor), the special study observes that the purpose, nature and significance of such trading remain concealed in the aggregate data reported by such members to the NYSE each week. "The propriety of expanding the present reporting requirements of members trading from off floor should be considered by the NYSE and the commission.

Data obtained from a special study questionnaire for three one-week periods in 1961 indicate that member purchases or sales initiated from off the floor on occasion account for more than 50 percent of all exchange purchases or sales in a given stock over a given day or week. The questionnaire data also indicate that member trading from off-floor tends to favor the more active stocks. Until more complete data are available, however, the special study finds that no conclusions as to the significance of such trading may be reached.

SHORT SELLING

"Short selling" is the practice of selling stock which the seller does not own or which he owns but delivers by borrowing stock. At some later date the short seller buys in the market to cover his short sale, realizing a profit if the price is lower. Speculation in anticipation of a price decline is but one of the many motivations for short selling. Other, nonspeculative types are the so-called technical short sales, e.g., by arbitragers, specialists and odd-lot dealers, and the hedging short sale for tax purposes.

Concentrating primarily on short selling of all types on the NYSE, the study analyzes short selling over an 8-year period and finds a tendency for the ratio of short sales to total sales to increase as a market decline progresses, for members as well as nonmembers. The report observes that this calls into question the classic argument that short selling has a stabilizing influence during market declines.

Although the volume of short selling by exchange members generally far exceeds that of nonmembers, the increase in times of price decline is usually attributable to nonmembers. The study shows that during the April through June 1962 decline nonmembers increased their proportion of short selling and accounted for more than 50 percent of all short selling during the drastic decline in the final days of May.

RULES INADEQUATE

The report finds that the substantial volume of short selling in prominent stocks during intervals of price weakness indicates an inadequacy of the current rules to cope with the harmful effect which they were designed to prevent.

The report concludes that there is a need for a rule of broader perspective focusing upon the underlying trend, to provide an effective limitation on short selling in a security when its market is under extraordinary selling pressure, or when the market generally is under severe pressure. Accordingly, the report recommends that present rules be amended to provide more effective control of short selling at such times.

The report also finds that the data on short selling presently compiled by the New York and American Stock Exchanges are inadequate for regulation, particularly with respect to determining the degree of short selling in individual issues, the effect of such short selling on the price stability of a security, and compliance with the Commission's rules. Accordingly, the study recommends reporting systems that will provide more frequent information improvements in the exchanges on the volume of short sales, in particular stocks classified as between the public and the principal classes of members.

In examining the Commission rate schedules of the exchanges, the special study was concerned with the structure of rate schedules and with the standards and procedures involved in the review of rates. It gave no consideration to the level of a particular Commission rate or rate schedule. Thus, its analysis and recommendations are not in any sense to be construed as comment on the reasonableness of the level of rates.

Under one set of arrangements, referred to as "reciprocal business" arrangements, exchange members who receive commission business from nonmember brokers direct business, in ratios favoring the NYSE member, to the nonmembers for transaction on regional exchanges or over the counter. The study reports that of 447 members of the four largest regional exchanges not members of the NYSE, 298 reported participation in such arrangements, and that 175 of these attributed a minimum of 20 percent of their income to such arrangements.

The study also describes the arrangements whereby exchange members reward both nonmember brokers and large-volume investors for commission business by furnishing such special services as installation and maintenance of wire services, special research, and promotional materials and displays. In addition, large-volume and block-transaction customers, chiefly mutual funds, are allowed to direct their brokers to give up a portion of the commission to other brokers in return for services rendered to the fund or, more usually, its underwriter or adviser.

Summarizing the consequences of these practices, the special study states that what the rate schedule fails to do, the industry accomplishes informally, unevenly and largely covertly by means of these arrangements.

OTHER SERVICES

The report also considers questions arising from the fact that the public commission rates include a charge for services performed by brokers in addition to the basic brokerage function. Such services include investment advice, safeguarding of securities, collection of dividends, and many other similar services. After stressing the lack of cost data necessary to evaluate the factors involved in this problem, the study recommends that "with the aid or in conjunction with the exchange and other interested parties the Commission should consider the feasibility and desirability of (1) a separate schedule of rates for the basic brokerage function and for ancillary services, or alternatively (2) a schedule of maximum rates, or minimum-maximum rates covering all services."

The public cost of an odd lot transaction, the study observes, represents the total of the commission paid to the customer's broker and the odd lot differential realized by the odd-lot dealer. It recommends that customers' confirmations of odd lot transactions should be required to show separately the odd lot differential and the brokerage commission.

AUTOMATION

Automation "seems certain to have an increasingly important impact on exchanges as trading markets and as self-regulatory agencies." Methods of executing orders have undergone no basic change since the NYSE floor took its present form over half a century ago. There are indications that volume data presently available are incomplete and unreliable and that accurate market information is extremely difficult to obtain and must be drawn from different sources for volume, the time of transaction and the identification of the buying and selling firm.

The report states that the automated reporting procedures recently announced by the NYSE will not result in more accurate reporting or the preservation of a significantly greater amount of data. Also, since the possibilities of modern technology may involve functional matters, e.g., execution of orders from off the floor, these possibilities deserve objective exploration in the public interest.

On the other hand, the study observes that some technological innovations are being utilized by the exchange community.

The report recommends that the NYSE promptly undertake to revise its floor reporting procedures to make volume data complete and accurate, and to restudy its recently announced automation plans to obtain and preserve more market data at the time orders are executed than is presently contemplated.

OVER-THE-COUNTER MARKETS

The special study concludes that essential disclosures to investors concerning individual markets and transactions are lacking. However, the report points out that its emphasis on problem areas rather than on areas of achievement should not obscure the vitality and strength of the over-the-counter markets for many securities and their importance to the economy.

NATURE AND GROWTH OF THE OVER-THE-COUNTER MARKETS

The report notes that the term "over-the-counter" encompasses all business in securities that is not done on organized exchanges. Two of the most important characteristics of the over-the-counter markets are their diffuseness—the absence of a central marketplace, and their diversity—the variety of securities traded, broker-dealer participants, and trading practices.

The report states that the dollar volume of over-the-counter trading has grown dramatically in recent years, increasing by approximately 700 percent from 1949 to 1961. It is estimated in the report that the dollar volume of over-the-counter stock sales in 1961 amounted to 61 percent of exchange sales. For some individual firms, according to the report, the pattern of growth has been even more impressive with several broker-dealers, including some of the larger ones, increasing their volume of over-the-counter sales by more than 20 times between 1949 and 1961.

This increase in volume was accompanied by a significant increase in the number of issues traded and in the number of broker-dealers participating. During a sample period in 1961–62, broker-dealers advertised markets in approximately 14,000 domestic over-the-counter stocks. Of the 4,964 broker-dealers registered with the commission, 3,303 participated in over-the-counter transactions in equity issues in 1961.

Because there is no central location (or "trading floor") where public orders can be collected, matched and executed, the participation of broker-dealers as principal is more important in the over-the-counter markets than in the exchange markets, according to the report.

Broker-dealers doing business in the over-the-counter markets may be broadly classified into wholesale dealers, retail firms and integrated firms. Wholesale dealers make markets by standing ready to buy or sell securities for their own account in transactions with other broker-dealers who may be acting for themselves or for public customers. Retail firms execute purchases and sales with or for public customers by dealing with wholesale dealers. Some firms—called "integrated firms"—combine both wholesale and retail activities.

The report notes that although over-the-counter business is done by a large number of broker-dealers, volume is concentrated at both the wholesale and retail levels in a small percentage of firms. It states that less than 2 percent of the broker-dealer firms accounted for over half of all over-the-counter dollar sales in 1961. Member firms of the New York Stock Exchange were responsible for 55 percent of the dollar volume of over-the-counter sales in 1961, primarily at the retail level. Seven of the nine largest wholesale dealers, however, were nonNYSE members.

WHOLESALE MARKETS

The report describes the dealer as "the key firm in the over-the-counter markets." By his willingness to buy or sell for his own account, the wholesale dealer makes it possible for a member of the public to dispose of his securities without attempting to locate an ultimate public buyer and for a buyer to acquire shares without searching out the ultimate public seller. To the extent that the wholesale dealer purchases or sells on balance for his own account, his participation adds "depth" to the market.

The report observes that information about the inter-dealer market in which over-the-counter trading is principally conducted is generally not available to the public as a result both if its trading mechanisms and of industry policy. Public investors ordinarily do not have access to quotations or prices in the wholesale markets, the number and identity of firms making markets in a security or the size of their "spreads."

Wholesale dealers, or market makers, generally advertise their willingness to buy or sell through the facilities (known as the "sheets"), offered by the National Quotation Bureau, Inc., a private service which publishes on a daily basis for the use of professionals, the names of broker-dealers making markets in specified securities and their quoted prices. The price at which a wholesale dealer announces it is willing to buy is known as the "bid" or "bid price"; the price at which it is willing to sell is known as the "offer" or "asked price." The difference in price between the bid and offer, known as the "spread," is the ordinary source of profit for the wholesale dealer.

The report notes that prices quoted by wholesale dealers to other broker-dealers are known as "inside" or wholesale prices; those quoted to the public are "outside" or retail prices. Although it is frequently said that transactions in over-the-counter markets are "negotiated," a quoting wholesale dealer who receives an inquiry from another firm may ordinarily expect to do business at his own quoted prices.

Without a central market place, communications are of vital importance in the over-the-counter markets in order to execute customer orders and for the exchange of information between wholesale dealers. The development and improvement of communication systems since World War II have had an enormous impact on organization, trading practices, and the growth of the markets," according to the report. Markets "for most securities can be located most instantaneously and transactions consummated within a matter of seconds" and at relatively small costs.

NO DISCLOSURE

"Some firms may commence to make markets upon the promise of reciprocal business or the grant of options or cheap stock by underwriters or issuers, which may result in a deceptive appearance of broadness of the market and may create incentives and possibilities for manipulation," the special study finds. There is no disclosure of whether a wholesale dealer is making a market for its correspondent or another firm or whether it is trading in a joint account with another firm.

The report notes that the termination of market making is not subject to standards other than the obligation sometimes felt by individual dealers toward their individual or professional customers. It is noted in the report that many securities in the over-the-counter market may have only one or two dealers quoting a market, in some cases only sporadically—facts which are not generally disclosed to public investors—and that if these dealers abandon market making, investors may have difficulty in finding markets in which they can sell their securities. For example, during and after the new issue phenomenon of 1959-61 investors frequently complained that the market for small issues which they had purchased at premium prices had disappeared.

The special study concludes that the practice of "backing away" (refusing to trade at the quoted price) appears to persist in sufficient degree to be of concern because of the misleading impression of prices and market depth which it creates. The report recommends that all quotations should be firm, when supplied, to the extent of the security's acknowledged trading unit; that the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., should establish appropriate surveillance and enforcement programs; and that broker-dealers be required to keep a timed record of changes in their quotations.

HANDHOLDING

Many securities by nature do not have competitive markets because of limited dealer or public interest; in others, the appearance of several dealers' interest in a security may not be a reliable indication of a competitive market because of practices which impair competition such as "handholding" (i.e., working in concert) between dealers.

The report quotes the testimony of several dealers who described cooperative practices among ostensibly competing dealers and concludes that "practices have come to be tolerated which are inconsistent with frequent emphasis on the competitive nature of the wholesale markets. A minimum need is to provide better means for the investor and the regulatory agencies to distinguish the latter situations."

The report concludes that specific regulatory standards governing the conduct of wholesale trading are largely lacking. The report states that greater attention should be given to the general subject of the conduct of wholesale trading by the NASD and the Commission, in some respects immediately and in others on a longer range basis.

It points out that the integrated firm may use its retail department to dispose of positions resulting from trading activities and its transactions are likely to be on a principal basis out of inventory, to customers who may be purchasing on the basis of the firm's recommendation. The report describes the trading activities of an integrated firm in stabilizing the aftermarket for an underwritten issue, illustrating the conflicts of interest that may be inherent in the combined roles of retailer, wholesaler, and underwriter.

After completion of a distribution, the report states, an integrated firm may sponsor an underwritten issue; that is, undertake to provide a continuous market in securities in which it has placed its customers.

The report observes that the prices of the sole or dominant marketmaker are not affected by competition but may be affected by the firm's own activity at the retail level.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The special study concludes with respect to firms engaged in both wholesale and retail business in the same security, "The potential conflict of interest inherent in the dual role, although normal in any merchandising activity including the securities business, may present particular difficulty where, as frequently occurs, the integrated firm is especially active in the immediate aftermarket of an underwriting which it has managed, or where it is the sole or dominant market maker in an issue at any later stage. Existing requirements for disclosures to retail customers at the time of solicitation and in confirmations do not appear adequate in light of possibilities of abuse."

THE 1962 MARKET BREAK

With respect to the market break of May 1962, the report says that many wholesale dealers quoted "subject" (i.e., "nominal" or not "firm") markets, widened their spreads, and reduced the number of shares for which they would bid or offer, so that a substantial loss of liquidity resulted.

NATIONAL QUOTATION BUREAU

The bureau is a private business, possessing monoply power, subject to no direct regulations. The bureau exercises final control over who may advertise their quotations, what minimum capital such firms need, what securities may be quoted, what kind of listings may be made, and what techniques of surveillance and sanctions are employed.

It notes that the bureau has operated with a conscientious regard for the responsibility which its function and dominant position entail, but points out the anomaly of private hands holding "such crucial powers without public regulation or review."

THE SHEETS

As a result of the bureau's limited authority as a private body, the growth of the markets and inadequate procedures, the bureau's exercise of its powers has not kept pace with the needs of the market. The bureau has been unable to do all that it might have desired in assuring the integrity and reliability of the sheets. For example, the sheets have been used by some firms in a manipulative and fraudulent manner.

In case after case broker-dealers have abused the wholesale quotation system through inserting fictitious quotations to facilitate a fraudulent or manipulative scheme. The report cites several examples of manipulations in which the insertion of quotations in the sheets by one firm at the request of another was utilized in the scheme. The exploitation of the sheets in this manner for manipulative purposes is a matter "which should be acted upon at once." It (the report) recommends that all quotations entered by one dealer on behalf of another be so designated.

The report concludes that "the power that lies in running a wholesale quotation system for the entire over-the-counter market is far too important to the industry, to investors and to the economy to be entrusted to the hazards of changing ownership or management." Recent electronic developments leading to the possibility of competing systems and the fact that the bureau will eventually pass into other hands emphasize the need for regulation. The report also notes the necessity for greater recognition of responsibility on the part of the NASD (National Association of Securities Dealers) in the surveillance, and supervision of its members" use of wholesale quotation systems.

The special study recommends that quotations systems be brought under appropriate supervisory control of the commission, and that the operator of any such system be vested with authority and responsibility to regulate the use of its system by broker-dealers. It states that the NASD and/or the commission should have the power and responsibility to suspend the right of broker-dealers to enter quotations in an inter-dealer system for willful abuse of a quotations system or of rules governing such system.

RETAIL MARKETS

The report notes that when dealing with the public a broker-dealer may act either as principal or agent. Where the firm acts as agent (or broker) it does not take title to the security and reveals its commission to the customer on the confirmation sent to him. Principal transactions, the study notes, are for the account of the firm and only a net price is revealed.

The study observes that principal transactions may be of two types: from an inventory position, or "riskless." In the latter type of transaction, the broker-dealer buys the security from a wholesale dealer, places the security in its own account and immediately resells it to the customer. This kind of principal transaction has been called a "riskless" transaction "since the risks of ownership are absent."

The special study's data show that broker-dealers in a majority of transactions with individual customers deal on an agency basis, and in most transactions with institutions and other non individual investors on a principal basis. According to the report, agency transactions are less prominent in active stocks than inactive ones, and NYSE firms tend to act as agents more often than non-NYSE firms.

REASONABLE DILIGENCE

The study finds that the obligation of a broker-dealer to use reasonable diligence to obtain the best available execution for a customer is not always recognized or fulfilled. Inferior executions for individuals, says the report, may be caused in particular instances by failure to negotiate and to check markets, by the channeling of business to certain firms on the basis of reciprocal obligations or patterns of doing business, or by indifference, incompetence, or venality of order clerks.

Without access to inside prices, public customers are unable to check the diligence and costs of their executions. While the NASD has recognized the principle of best execution, it has not prescribed specific guidelines or standards with respect to it.

The report recommends that rules and standards be adopted by the Commission and/or the NASD requiring broker-dealers executing retail transactions whether as principal or as agent, to make a reasonable effort to ascertain the best interdealer quotations.

NEWSPAPER QUOTATIONS

The report points out that the NASD-sponsored retail quotations published in the newspaper are the primary source of information for a public customer, other than direct inquiries to a broker-dealer, concerning the markets for over-the-counter securities. These quotations do not represent prices at which transactions have actually been effected, as in the case of exchange quotations, nor do they represent specific dealer interests in doing business as do wholesale quotations.

It is noted that retail quotations appearing in the newspapers purport to represent only the approximate range within which a public customer could have bought or sold at the time the underlying quotations were gathered. The study observes that quotations of over-the-counter securities appearing in newspapers are in most cases furnished by NASD committees which take wholesale quotations (not always the best available) and add predetermined amounts to the asked prices before supplying them to newspapers.

SYSTEM INDEFENSIBLE

The report states that a long history of discussing and revising the system and of rewording the explanatory legend has produced what appears to the special study to be an indefensible result—a "quotation" system that quotes neither actual bids and offers nor a range of actual prices. Such a system must be confusing if not deceptive to many investors, quite apart from the explanatory masthead that appears in some newspapers, and may be even more misleading with that masthead, which fails to explain what the bid and asked are, and ties them confusingly to a price range as if they related to a high and low in a trading way.

The NASD's tool for policing retail charges, the markup policy, has provided important protections but it cannot supply, nor is it designed to supply, material facts to investors about the over-the-counter trading markets. There have been confusions and misunderstandings in the application of the markup policy by broker-dealers and NASD examiners and district committees.

The report notes the failure of the NASD to articulate the bases used in applying the markup policy to integrate firms and the failure to come "to grips with the question of what standards are to be applied in judging the fairness of retail prices where there is no independent market." The report recommends that the markup policy be clarified and strengthened, especially in the case of securities for which there is no independent market.

The report observes that the Commission's regulation of over-the-counter markets has relied essentially on the fraud provisions of the statutes. Although this approach has been successful in dealing with flagrant situations it does not meet the basic need of the investor for timely disclosure of information useful in appraising the quality of markets and executions.

The study notes that three companies now disseminate retail quotations by means of electronic devices and points out that further improvements would make possible the central storing of all bids and offers and reports of transactions, thus making possible compilation of actual price and volume data as in the case of listed securities, and possibly assisting in the execution of orders.

The report describes the NASD as "the natural source of leadership and initiative in dealing with matters of automation in respect of over-the-counter markets," and accordingly the report recommends that it should carry forward the study of automation possibilities and report to the Commission from time to time as to the progress and programs of the industry in this area. In the absence of a completely automated system, the Commission and the NASD are urged to consider the feasibility of establishing a reporting system to obtain, without undue burden, actual price and volume data for some or all over-the-counter transactions.

The special study also urges that the Commission and the NASD "make it part of their continuous agendas to seek further possibilities for strengthening the mechanisms of interdealer markets and the protection of investors in relation thereto." Among other matters suggested for possible coverage either generally or in respect of specified categories of securities or broker-dealers are: rights and obligations of primary market makers in maintaining fair, competitive and orderly markets; the grant of cheap stock, options or warrants to market makers; the handling of limit orders, standards or supervision and methods of compensation of traders; intrafirm responsibility for and supervision of the insertion of quotations and variations in application of broker-dealer capital rules to primary market makers.

Just as an investor needs basic disclosures about over-the-counter securities themselves, the report states, he needs basic disclosures about their markets. He should be afforded information about the depth of dealer interest, the identity of the market-makers, price spreads and prices in the interdealer market—on which the retail market in which he deals is ultimately dependent in a most fundamental sense.

Such disclosures are needed not only for intelligent investment decision by the customer and as aids to his assessment of the quality of execution of his orders; as in all other areas of disclosure they serve the important prophylactic purpose of silently policing the performance of the broker-dealer himself.

The report recommends that the wholesale quotations system be made publicly available. It also recommends that retail quotations systems show the best prevailing interdealer bids and offers and the number of primary market makers for each security (with appropriate exceptions for categories of securities or situations).

DEALER DISCLOSURE

The study makes a number of other recommendations to provide customers at the time of their investment decision with information concerning the nature and quality of the markets for their securities. The report recommends that a broker-dealer soliciting a customer's purchase of (A) any security for which there is no independent market other than its own, or (B) any security out of its own inventory, or (C) any security in which there is a spread of 20 percent or more in prevailing interdealer bids and offers, should be required to disclose such facts at the time of solicitation.

The report concludes that "whatever the appropriate level of markup or commission for a particular transaction and assuming that it may vary in different circumstances, it is difficult to see why it should be necessary to conceal what elsewhere in the securities business is considered essential to be disclosed." For example, there is complete disclosure of the spread in underwritten offerings, often amounting to as much as 10 percent or more on common stock issues, and of the sales load on mutual fund shares, typically amounting to 8½ or 9 percent. "Disclosure in these situations has not discouraged merchandising activity or successful selling, and it is not apparent why it should do so in the over-the-counter markets generally."

TRADING MARKETS—INTERRELATIONSHIPS

In an analysis of the factors and forces which determine whether a specific security is to find its primary market on an exchange or over the counter, the special study focuses primarily on the significance of listing and delisting requirements of the various exchanges, the characteristics of securities traded in the different markets, and the criteria for determining the suitability of a security for trading in either of the two basic types of trading markets.

Noting that a crucial concept in allocation as between exchange and over-the-counter markets is that of "listing," the process by which securities are first admitted to trading on an exchange, the report observes that delisting standards, while paralleling the listing standards, are generally far less stringent. The study observes that the "wide discrepancy now found between listing and delisting yardsticks seems questionable," particularly with respect to the NYSE, where the most stringent listing requirements apply; and it recommends strengthening of delisting standards on that exchange.

The report also observes that for a security to be well suited for an exchange's continuous auction market, its market must have adequate "depth," a need that is generally recognized in listing and delisting standards. The depth of buying and selling, according to the report, is directly affected by the round-lot unit of trading; thus a reduction in the round-lot trading unit (100 shares) would tend to add to the flow of buy and sell orders constituting the depth of the market at any given time. Accordingly, the study recommends a "Government-industry study of the feasibility and desirability of reducing the round-lot unit for all or some securities."

INSTITUTIONAL PARTICIPATION AND BLOCK TRANSACTIONS

The report emphasizes the growing importance of institutions relative to individuals as investors in stocks, although pointing out that the holdings and trading of stocks by institutions are still considerably less important than those of individuals. The report also notes the "special importance" of institutions to the trading markets resulting from their large unit holdings and the concentration of decision making power in relatively few investor units.

Institutional transactions showed concentrations in issues listed on the NYSE. Transactions executed on the regional exchanges involve for the most part NYSE issues and most were by the open-end investment companies. While the NYSE is the most important market channel for institutional transactions in listed stocks, many institutions indicated that their use of the over-the-counter markets for listed stocks has been increasing in recent years.

The report also states that while the investment companies (mutual funds) have noticeably higher stock turnover rates than other institutions, the turnover of the institutional portfolios as a whole was lower than the NYSE market. The institutions lower turnover rates "raises questions concerning the consequences of possible further increase in institutionalization of the markets for stocks," which may include the possible further "thinning of the markets in particular issues."

Most institutions were found to have concentrated their commission business among relatively few brokers: no more than 10 firms tended to account for more than 20 percent of the business of each institution. NYSE member firms received more than two-thirds of the total institutional commission business for the period studied.

PENSION FUNDS

With respect to pension funds, the report observes that while they are one of the most important institutional-investor groups and are growing at the fastest rate, "they are notable for the dearth of information publicly available on their holdings." The report concludes the Commission should recommend that the Federal Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosures Act be amended to require "periodic" disclosures by pension funds of their holdings of individual corporate securities.

OVER-THE-COUNTER MARKETS IN EXCHANGE-LISTED SECURITIES

The special study reports that one of the most striking developments in the securities markets in recent years has been the growth of a market away from the floor of the stock exchanges for securities traded on the exchanges. Because of the market's unique character, combining elements of both the exchange markets and the over-the-counter markets, the study refers to it as "the third market."

The size of this third market may be judged, according to the report, by the fact that in 1961 markets were made for 270 common stocks traded on the NYSE. The study points out that while the volume of this market is approximately only 14 percent of NYSE volume, it has more than doubled in the past 20 years and appears to be continuing to expand. The percentage increase in volume of such trading between 1955 and 1961 was three times the percentage increase in volume on the NYSE. The list of stocks is described as large, diversified and steadily expanding.

Unlike the off-board trading of listed stocks of earlier years, which tended to concentrate in issues of high quality and low activity, the list now includes some of the most actively traded stocks on the NYSE, as well as those in the highest size ranges, whether measured by number of stockholders or of shares outstanding or dollar amount of assets.

A notable characteristic of the market is the stress on very large and very small transactions. The large transactions, it states, are hardly unexpected since the handling of block transactions by institutions has long been accepted as a prime function of the third market. The study also found, however, that the share volume transacted in odd lots, i.e., transactions of less than 100 shares, constituted about 73 percent of the transactions and 18 percent of share volume on the offboard market, or about double the corresponding percentages on the NYSE.

The study reports that institutions are the largest customers in the off-board market being responsible for 62 percent of the dollar volume of the third market in 1961.

INDIVIDUALS' ROLE SURPRISING

The relatively high percent of trading by individuals in the third market, 38 percent of dollar volume in 1961, is described by the report as surprising.

Off-board trading of listed securities takes place in many ways, according to the study, but the great bulk occurs in over-the-counter markets for listed securities "made" by broker-dealers specializing in such trading and referred to by the study as the "market makers." Some 17 firms were making these markets in 1961, with the largest part of the volume being transacted by only 7 firms.

The study reports that though off-board trading in listed stocks necessarily accounts for some diversion of volume from the primary exchange market, this diversion is relatively low in more than 70 percent of the 272 stocks traded in the third market in 1961. Furthermore, much of the trading is in large-size transactions which might create a temporary imbalance on the exchange so that the diversion may enhance rather than impair depth in the primary market. Also, to the institutional customers of this market, the off-board market has the effect of adding to the depth of market, because it makes available the benefit of the market maker's substantial resources in addition to the trading and resources available on the public market of the exchange.

MARKET BENEFICIAL

The third market has been, on balance, beneficial to investors and the public interest. By and large, the competition afforded is substantial and the impairment of depth limited. It declares "that the very existence of this market to satisfy needs not met by the exchange market is indeed affirmation of the inherent strength and viability of a system of free markets."

The study concludes, however, that the acute lack of data concerning this market must be corrected if the market is to be fully understood.

REGIONAL EXCHANGES

The regional stock exchanges are the 14 exchanges located outside of New York City. In 1962, a total dollar volume of $3,750 million was traded through the facilities of these exchanges, representing 6.9 percent of the total dollar volume of securities traded on all American stock exchanges during 1962. It is in the public interest to maintain a strong regional exchange system, the report concludes.

The report points out that there has been an accelerating trend for the regional exchanges to trade stocks listed on the NYSE, as an offset to a continuing and significant loss of their business to the over-the-counter market and to the two major New York exchanges.

Of 1,168 common stocks listed on the NYSE in 1961, about 750 were also traded on one or more of the regionals. The NYSE stocks selected for multiple trading by the regional exchanges tend to be the most active NYSE stocks. However, there is also a tendency for each regional exchange to concentrate on the dual trading of securities of companies in its vicinity.

The report discusses the factors which led to the decline of the regional exchanges as primary markets and observes that the major causes of the shift to multiple markets have included: (1) freedom from controls over issuers in the over-the-counter markets as compared with issuers of listed securities; (2) greater flexibility of trading, "merchandising" and pricing practices in the over-the-counter markets; and (3) improvements in communications accentuating the pull of the New York exchange markets and fostering the growth of the over-the-counter markets.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The special study concludes its chapter on the interrelationships of trading markets with recommendations that the commission improve its facilities for the continuous accumulation of data relating to trading markets and that the commission establish a permanent policy and planning unit with the responsibility of accumulating and analyzing data bearing on market patterns and practices.

The growth of multiple trading of NYSE securities raises two competing considerations, according to the report. One is the impairment of the depth of the primary market. On the other hand there are the general public benefits of competition that may be provided by multiple markets.

The study concludes, not that impairment of depth in the primary markets is irrelevant or inconsequential, but that, under present circumstances, the benefits of competition by and large outweigh any detriment attributable to that impairment.

[From the New York Times, July 18, 1963]

SEC Report—Part II

The second part of the Securities and Exchange Commission's special study of the markets is much more technical than the first. Its new recommendations are also considerably more drastic. William L. Cary, chairman of the SEC, has reiterated that the study should not impair confidence in Wall Street; but many of the proposed reforms involve basic changes in the structure of the securities industry.

In essence, the report calls for higher standards and stricter regulation in practically every area of the marketplace. It is evident that the rules governing the financial community are inadequate to cope with the present mass market. The need to protect the public demands elimination of every last vestige of the days when Wall Street was a closed shop of professional investors and speculators.

There can be no dispute with reforms that safeguard the interests of the public. Nor can there be any excuse for defending outmoded practices simply because they are well entrenched. The financial community cannot maintain privileges without responsibility.

This is the main burden of the report. It calls for stricter supervision of the vast over-the-counter market as well as increased regulation of the exchanges, including restrictions on specialists, short selling and commission business. Its stress on the public interest is also evident in the suggested reforms of the "odd lot" business. The study questions whether trading in odd lots (orders of less than 100 shares), which represents the transactions of small investors and comprises a significant amount of business on the listed exchanges, should be more costly than other transactions, now that automation is available.

Its odd lot reforms and its proposal completely to eliminate floor traders are the most controversial of the study's recommendations. The report regards floor traders as an anachronism in the present market. According to its evidence, floor traders are in a privileged position and often accentuate market fluctuations.

These specific recommendations call for further study and debate. The report is primarily motivated by the laudable desire of protecting the public; but the economy—and the public—is best served by a liquid and responsive market which requires a certain degree of speculative activity and a wide variety of competition. On this score there is some question that the study takes full account of what makes the market tick.

The detailed examination of the institutions involved in the trading of securities reveals that neither the listed exchanges nor the vast over-the-counter market, which has been pretty much of a mystery until now, has fully acknowledged its responsibilities. Wall Street has the most to gain from reforms that will strengthen the marketplace. Its responsiveness to the need for change is the key to increasing participation by the public.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, July 18, 1963]

The SEC's Bombshell

Yesterday's Securities and Exchange Commission report blistered the financial community, which had not expected anything nearly so severe. In essence, it holds that self-policing has not been as effective as it ought to be. It proposes some major tightening, aimed at wiping out the vestiges of what it sees as the "private club" atmosphere of the major securities exchanges, and hitting squarely at some well-established prerogatives.

There is no question but that a number of insiders in the securities business have profited by their knowledge, by being in a position to "feel" the market and to take quick advantage of its movement. But what the regulators have to weigh, primarily, is the effect of the various practices on the over-all functioning of a free securities market. Speculative activity, for example, widens the swings of the market, but also provides much of its vigor.

Back in 1934 a lot of financial men bitterly opposed the Securities Exchange Act, which they saw as a threat to market institutions. But instead of destroying the market it laid the basis for restored public confidence.

It's going to take time for the financial community to weigh in detail the five-volume report, and it's going to take more time to debate its recommendations adequately.

Meanwhile, it's worth bearing in mind SEC Chairman Cary's observation that, though certain "faults and defects" exist, these "do not call for public alarm as to the basic integrity" of the markets. The markets not only have served the public well, but they have made possible the phenomenal growth of American industry. This is no mean achievement. Whatever improvements may ultimately result from the SEC report will be improvements in a mechanism that already functions well.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I point out that the study shows we have strong institutions for trading in securities and, on the whole, they are doing their job well, but there are a few weaknesses, as shown by the study, in trading in over-the-counter accounts and in activities of specialists and traders for their own accounts which will require consideration. Moreover, it must be remembered that the SEC endorses the "general soundness" of this part of the report but has not endorsed specifically each finding or proposal.

I give this pledge to the securities industry: The hearings before the Subcommittee on Securities, of which I am the senior Republican, of the Committee on Banking and Currency on the SEC's recommendations based on the first part of the study report, and the legislation which will be coming to the floor, reflect a remarkable degree of unanimity and a very prudent and balanced point of view on the part of both the industry and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Chairman Cary, in sending the second segment of the special study report to the Congress, states that the recommendations for a solution to the problems described in this part of the report can be effected without legislation, through the medium of the rule-making power of the SEC, with the exception of controls over operators of "quotation bureaus," which handle price quotations of over-the-counter scientists. The securities industry will have a chance to express its views at hearings which the SEC is required to conduct prior to the adoption of new regulations.

Some legislation may be required. I think I can make the same pledge that should such legislation be introduced, it will be handled temperately, and that all elements of the securities industry, as well as the Securities and Exchange Commission, will have an opportunity to be heard.

I think the Securities and Exchange Commission and the study group have done a fine job. That does not mean I have to agree with everything they have said in part II of the study. The urgent thing is for the securities industry and the Commission to confer upon the special study's recommendations and to give us the full benefit of their thinking.

THE CUBAN MENACE TODAY—COMMUNISM'S BASE IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I am somewhat sorry that the two distinguished gentlemen from Brazil who were here a short time ago are not present to hear this address, because the subject I want to talk about today is Cuba as a Communist base in Latin America, which obviously involves Brazil as well as the other countries in South and Latin America.

In the past few weeks on the floor of the Senate, concrete plans have been offered by Senators Allott, Curtis, and Mundt for American policy toward liberation of Cuba. These have been constructive, carefully documented proposals designed to assist in the downfall of the Communist regime in Cuba without resort to war or invasion. Unfortunately, several people have asked publicly why we should do any of these things. They have said "communism will evolve peacefully," or "we cannot create crises for Khrushchev," or "any action is too dangerous and certainly Cuba does not menace the United States." How naive can we get? My purpose today, Mr. President, is to show why Cuba is a menace to us, to this hemisphere, and the degree of that menace. This will be carefully documented and should be a complete answer to the recent administration trial balloons that tensions are easing and that Khrushchev and Castro are at heart nice people interested in maintaining peace and order in the same way as we are.

The President said on September 4, 1962:

> It continues to be the policy of the United States that the Castro regime will not be allowed to export its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force. It will be prevented by whatever means may be necesssary from taking action against any part of the Western Hemisphere.

He further declared on September 13, 1962:

> If Cuba should ever attempt to export its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force against any nation in this hemi-

> sphere * * * this country will do whatever must be done to protect its own security and that of its allies.

These are the words of the President of the United States, speaking in formal statements on American policy with respect to Cuba on September 4 and 13 of last year. Lest anyone think that President Kennedy changed his tune after passing through the awesome experience of the October missiles crisis, let me quote from his policy statement of November 20:

> If Cuba is not used for the export of aggressive Communist purposes, there will be peace in the Caribbean.

Put in plain English, therefore, President Kennedy in those statements warned Castro and his cohorts that there can be no peace in the Caribbean if Cuba is used for the export of aggressive Communist purposes.

Mr. President, what is the meaning of these somber Presidential declarations of policy? Admittedly, the phrase "export of aggressive Communist purposes" is somewhat vague, as diplomatic language characteristically is. But the meaning of these warnings seem to have been clarified by the distinguished Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, a man whose discretion and tact are the hallmarks of his performance as this Nation's chief diplomat.

Listen to what he said, Mr. President:

> It has been made very clear that the Armed Forces of the hemisphere, including our own, are made available to insure that arms that are now in Cuba not be used outside of Cuba, either in terms of organized effort or through piecemeal infiltration of those arms into other countries of the hemisphere.

And again he said:

> President Kennedy has made it utterly clear * * * that we would not permit any arms that are in Cuba to be used outside of Cuba * * * that if and attempt were made to launch forays against any other countries, that those would meet the armed forces of the hemisphere, including those of the United States.

These statements, made in March of this year are even stronger than those made earlier by President Kennedy.

One would have thought, on the basis of such warnings as I have just quoted from the two key people in this country, who hold responsible positions, that Castro and his cohorts might have read the message loud and clear, the United States will take all steps necessary to prevent them from engaging in forcible and violent attempts to overthrow the non-Communist governments of Latin American countries. I would have supposed that Castro might have been deterred by these ringing declarations, threatening the use of the awesome power of the United States to enforce their intent.

Well, Mr. President, what has been happening since these warnings were uttered?

Item: On June 5, after first notifying a Caracas newspaper that they would attack the U.S. military mission building, a gang of eight gunman from the Armed Forces of National Liberation, or FALN, the Venezuelan Communist terrorist organization, invaded our mission at pistol point, overpowered four Venezuelan guards, forced six U.S. Army officers to strip, and stole their uniforms and sidearms. They then set fire to the building and left, chanting, "Down with Yanqui imperialism! Cuba, si! Yanquis, no!" after trampling and burning an American flag. Two days later, Havana's CMQ radio hailed the attackers as "patriots." Here is a clear example of the export from Cuba of "aggressive Communist purposes"—if these words really mean anything. What did we do to redress this humiliating attack on official U.S. representatives and our flag? Nothing. Absolutely nothing.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I commend the distinguished Senator from Colorado for what he is saying today. His statement continues with well documented facts. He has rendered outstanding public service. It seems to me that one of the great tragedies of the time would be to have the United States officially follow a policy which pretended that the Cuban problem, the Communist problem on our doorstep, did not exist.

The Senator has given time and effort and devoted his great talent to bringing not only to this body, but also to the country, every reason to repudiate such an idea. If our Government follows a policy of paying no attention to communism on our doorstep—and it matters not what the reason is, whether it is deliberate, or whether it is due to the greater amount of emphasis given to other problems, or whether it is goaded into such a procedure by Communist irritations around the globe—the fact remains that to have the communism in Cuba problem go without attention would be a great tragedy.

It has sometimes been said that committee hearings and committee reports are fine, but that once they are made they are put on the shelf and forgotten, unless some researcher or historian digs them out. I come back again to the investigation made by the Subcommittee on Preparedness of the Armed Services Committee, and its clear cut statement on the danger of the Russian Communists in Cuba and what will happen if it is not solved.

I believe that this is one committee report which not only should be required reading, but should be required reading weekly by responsible persons in our Government, until the problem is solved.

I commend the Senator on his statement. I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Colorado, and any colloquy that may appear hereafter, I may include in the RECORD an editorial broadcast over WKRC, of the Taft Broadcasting Co. of Cincinnati, Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska. I am glad he brought up the report of the Preparedness Subcommittee, because it is one of the things I will specifically refer to in my remarks. One of the reasons why I have undertaken to make these remarks is to try to detail abundant evidence of the need for the positive action which has been recommended by the Senator from Nebraska, by my distinguished colleague from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

I was discussing the items of Communist aggression which have occurred out of Cuba, the export of Communist aggression, since these statements of policy were made, in order to show that we are not, in fact, doing what we said we would do. I have already spoken about the first one, in Venezuela. I should like to take up the next one.

Item: The Minister of Interior of the Colombian Government recently charged that "Peasants' Leagues," similar to the militant Communist groups in northeastern Brazil, are operating in two Provinces of his country and are being financed, armed, and staffed by Castro's Cuba. Does this not constitute a clear case of the export from Cuba of "aggressive Communist purposes?"

Item: Excelsior, a Mexico City newspaper, recently reported the discovery of a cache of arms by a member of the Mexican road patrol in a place located on the Yucatan Peninsula, the part of Mexico nearest Cuba and reportedly a depository for arms shipped clandestinely from Cuba. The account of this incident did not describe its outcome, except to say that the patrolman left the scene when he saw that the cache was guarded by armed men "who spoke Spanish with a Cuban accent." In Washington, D.C., rumors have circulated for some time that similar arms cashes have been located by the CIA, but permission to destroy them has been denied by the State Department. Once again we have a clear case of the export of Communist aggression with nothing done about it despite our declarations of policy.

Item: On May 11 in Havana, the National Council of Culture staged ceremonies at the Roldan Theater publicly lauding Venezuelan communism's insurrectionary arm, the Armed Forces of National Liberation, the FALN. Around the same time in Caracas, FALN terrorists attacked a police post just 600 yards from the Miraflores Palace, which houses the offices of Venezuela's President Betancourt. Two police guards were taken as hostages, and quantities of small arms, including three machineguns, were stolen. Havana radio gleefully reported the incident. This is another clear example of the export from Cuba of "aggressive Communist purposes."

Item: On May 1 at a labor congress in Prague, the Cuban delegate told the assemblage that Cuba was striving primarily "to stimulate support for the people of Venezuela, Colombia, and Nicaragua—with the aim of overthrowing the governments of those countries." A plain, clear statement of intent and action to export from Cuba "aggressive Communist purposes."

Item: On May 20, Communist youths attacked Puerto Maldonado in southeast

Peru. Several were arrested by the authorities who subsequent discovered that this attack was part of a Castro-Communist plan to unleash guerrilla warfare, terror, and sabotage upon the area, and to initiate similar operations against Lima, the national capital, and the ancient Inca center of Cuzco. The captured guerrillas were part of a group of 69 young Peruvians who had received 6 months of training in Cuba in guerrilla warfare and related violent activities under the direction of Maj. Ernesto "Che" Guevara, Castro's guerrilla expert. This is further proof of the export from Cuba of "aggressive Communist purposes."

I need not remind Senators that Havana is not alone and unaided in engaging in such acts as I have just enumerated. Listen to this excerpt from a commentary beamed in Spanish to Latin America on June 16 by Radio Moscow:

> The presidency of Betancourt recalls the dictatorship of Perez Jimenez. Is it any wonder that the people have again taken up arms? For the patriots of Venezuela no other course has remained. They have been forced to rise up in defense of the freedoms which had already been won by the people and which President Betancourt has trampled upon.
>
> Not only do the Communists struggle against the police regime of Venezuela. The National Liberation Front created in the country includes the movement of the Revolutionary Left, the Democratic Republic Union, and many progressive organizations. It is natural that the order to arrest all Communists is an additional dictatorial measure against all democratic forces, among them the bourgeois parties of the left of the country.
>
> This is an impudent declaration of war against all Venezuelan people. Betancourt, in defending the interests of Nelson Rockefeller and company, as their loyal bulldog, is leading the country toward open dictatorship. History repeats itself, but it can only repeat itself until the end, and the puppet of the monopolists will have the same fate as his predecessor, who, for crimes against the people, is now passing his days behind bars in jail.

Mr. President, here is an example, of the export, not only from Havana but from Moscow as well, of "aggressive Communist purposes."

And so, I return to the warnings uttered by the high command of the Kennedy administration that I quoted earlier. How does one account for the Castro-Communist forces' apparent indifference to these warnings?

I think that a clue to what was really meant by these statements can be derived from an impromptu remark by the President at his news conference on April 24, when he said:

> We have made it very clear that we would not permit the movement of troops from Cuba to another country for offensive purposes.

Here is a clear statement by the President, but it alters substantially the meaning seemingly conveyed by the statements I quoted previously. Here, in effect, the President of the United States declared that the United States would not permit a conventional armed attack by Cuba upon any other state in this hemisphere. Here we come to the nub of our difficulties in failing to convince Castro and his cohorts that we are really determined to thwart their offensive to extend Communist powers in this hemisphere. For the problem is not the likelihood of conventional military aggression by Castro's Cuba. No one seriously expects Castro's Cuba to launch a major conventional attack on any other country because he would be slitting his own throat. If anything could goad Uncle Sam into finally waking up to what is going on south of his border, this would be it. So one reluctantly comes to the conclusion that the ringing declarations made by the President and his chief foreign affairs adviser are largely meaningless. Castro guessed it and is acting accordingly.

Our own Senate Committee on Armed Services, in the "Interim Report on the Cuban Military Buildup," issued May 9, 1963, by the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, states unequivocably among its findings:

> The evidence is overwhelming that Castro is supporting, spurring, aiding, and abetting Communist revolutionary and subversive movements throughout the Western Hemisphere and that such activities present a grave and ominous threat to the peace and security of the Americas.

Mr. President, Cuba is engaged in an extensive and unremitting campaign of forcible and violent subversion aimed at bringing down all non-Communist governments in Latin America. This campaign is being waged by Latin American Communists, supplied and led by Havana, which in turn is receiving advice and material and arms assistance from Moscow and other Communist capitals. The nature and extent of the Castro-Communist offensive is vividly described in a report issued June 4 by a special committee of the Organization of American States, established to recommend measures to all OAS member-states to combat this campaign.

Characterizing the Castro-Communist offensive as "a grave threat to continental unit and democratic institutions," this committee, of which the United States is a member, reported that "the Communist offensive in America has been intensified even more" during the year and a half since the foreign ministers of the American Republics meeting at Punta del Este officially took notice of the offensive and alerted the peoples of the hemisphere to the dangers it posed. The committee mentioned three factors as accounting for the intensification of the Castro-Communist offensive:

> 1. The increase in Soviet military power in Cuba;
>
> 2. The emplacement of Soviet offensive weapons with nuclear capability in that same country, which precipitated the crisis of October 1962; and
>
> 3. The campaign by the Castro regime to inspire armed insurrection in the hemisphere.

Remember, this report was issued on June 4 this year.

With respect to the third point, the committee declared its belief that "the Cuban regime has begun a new phase of promoting and encouraging violent subversion in other countries of the hemisphere." It traced the origins of this new phase to the aftermath of the October missiles crisis when "spokesmen of the Cuban Government began making a series of speeches openly advocating armed insurrection in Latin America as a means of introducing economic and social changes based on the Communist system." Fidel Castro laid down the general line of action in his important speech of January 16, 1963. Other Cuban leaders calling for armed insurrection include Ernesto "Che" Guevara, Minister of Industries; Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, president of the National Institute of Agrarian Reform; Blas Roca, a member of the executive board of the ORI, the Integrated Revolutionary Organizations of the Communist Party; and Armando Hart, Minister of Education.

The OAS special committee declared that the Castro-Communist offensive manifests itself in two forms: first, the bringing of hundreds of Latin Americans to Cuba for indoctrination and training in subversive tactics and techniques; and second, implementing a plan of sabotage, terrorism, and guerrilla action in several Latin American countries, notably Venezuela.

The committee declared itself convinced that "the Castro regime has selected Venezuela as its primary objective," and it quoted the following statement from a speech on January 24 by the old-line Cuban Communist, Blas Roca:

> When the people of Venezuela achieve victory, when they gain full independence from imperialism * * * then all America will be inflamed, all America will advance, all America will be freed once and for all from the ominous yoke of Yankee imperialism. If their struggle is a help to us today, their victory will be an even greater help. Then we shall no longer be a solitary island in the Caribbean confronting the Yankee imperialists, but rather we shall have a base of support on the mainland.

One of the most significant conclusions reached by the eight-nation OAS Committee was the following:

> Undoubtedly Cuba now constitutes the regional center for subversive action by international communism in American. This is true not only with regard to the spread of the Communist ideology, but also, and what is more dangerous, because it constitutes a nearby center for traning agents of every kind whose function it is to carry on subversion in the countries of the hemisphere.

Mr. President, that report was made by an OAS committee—not by a Senate committee, not by the Senator from Colorado who is speaking, not by the President of the United States, but by a Committee on the eight-nation OAS itself.

Thus, the finger is pointed clearly at Cuba as the staging area for this massive and sustained offensive against the free countries of Latin America.

The Central Intelligence Agency has frankly and unequivocably reported similar circumstances in a statement by its Director, John A. McCone, before the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, on February 19 of this year. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. McCone's statement printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks; but at the same time, Mr. President, I should like to emphasize certain portions of the statement, because I think them quite important.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The public pronouncements of Cuban leaders, the daily record of events in Latin America, and reports from our intelligence sources within Communist and other left-extremist elements throughout this hemisphere all agree on one salient conclusion: That Fidel Castro is spurring and supporting the efforts of Communists and other revolutionary elements to overthrow and seize control of the governments in Latin America.

Even before the October missile crisis—and with increasing rancor since then—Cuban leaders have been exhorting revolutionary movements to violence and terrorism, and supporting their activities.

Cuban support takes many different forms, but its main thrust is in the supply of the inspiration, the guidance, the training, and the communications and technical assistance that revolutionary groups in Latin America require.

In essence, Castro tells revolutionaries from other Latin American countries: "Come to Cuba; we will pay your way; we will train you in underground organization techniques, in guerrilla warfare, in sabotage, and in terrorism. We will see to it that you get back to your homeland.

"Once you are there, we will keep in touch with you, give you propaganda support, send you propaganda materials for your movement, training aids to expand your guerrilla forces, secret communications methods, and perhaps funds and specialized demolition equipment."

Castro probably also tells them: "If you succeed in establishing something effective by way of a revolutionary movement in your homeland, if your guerrillas come down out of the hills and confront regular armed forces, then we may consider more concrete forms of assistance." So far, it should be noted, none of the movements in South America has reached this final stage. In many ways, Cuba under Castro is the Latin version of the old Comintern, inciting, abetting, and sustaining revolution wherever it will flourish.

We have evidence of more concrete Cuban support. Cuban nationals, for example, took part in the La Oroya disorders in Peru in December. We know that some funds move, generally in cash by courier, from Cuba to the revolutionaries in other countries. We know that Cuba furnishes money to buy weapons, and that some guerrilla forces in Peru, for instance, are equipped with Czechoslovak weapons which most probably came from Cuba.

Before going into more detailed evidence of Cuban subversion in Latin America, I should note that Venezuela is apparently No. 1 on Cuba's priority list for revolution.

Fidel Castro said so to the recent meeting of Communist front organizations for Latin American women.

"Che" Guevara and Blas Roca both emphasized the outlook for revolution in Venezuela in speeches in January.

We have learned reliably that the Communist Party leadership in Venezuela feels a peaceful solution to the present situation is out of the question.

We also know that in late 1962 Communist guerrilla and terrorist operations in Venezuela were placed under a unified command which coordinates activities with the other militant extremist group in Venezuela, the MIR. The result has been the creation of the FALN, or Armed Forces of National Liberation.

The FALN is currently trying to publicize its existence by such acts as the hijacking of the freighter *Anzoategui*, and by acts of sabotage and indiscriminate shootings. These have also been designed to dissuade President Betancourt from his trip to Washington. In this, of course, they have failed.

I do not wish to minimize the violence in Venezuela. The sabotage is the work of experts, and is being done with advanced types of explosives. The shooting has reached the point in Caracas where it is not safe to go out at night in some sections of the capital. But unless the terrorists should undertake and accomplish the assassination of President Betancourt and other high officials, the present wave of sabotage and indiscriminate shooting is not the sort of activity which would pose a direct threat to the government. The Communists have not demonstrated the ability to stand up to the armed forces, or seize and hold government buildings.

Cuba has given guerrilla training to more nationals from Venezuela than from any other country. Our best estimate now is that more than 200 Venezuelans received such training in 1962.

Many of these are engaged in terrorism in the cities, and others were rounded up and given long prison sentences when they committed themselves prematurely last spring in a countryside where the rural population strongly supports the Betancourt administration.

For the past year Cuban spokesmen have been pushing the line that Cuba provides the example for Latin American revolution, with the implication that nothing more than guidance needs to be exported.

Castro actually sounded the keynotes for Cuban subversion on July 26, 1960, when he said, "We promise to continue making Cuba the example that can convert the Cordillera of the Andes into the Sierra Maestra of the American Continent."

In his speech on January 15, 1963, Castro said that if socialism in Cuba had waited to overturn Batista by peaceful means, Castro would still be in the Sierra Maestra.

Since the October missile crisis, "Che" Guevara and Education Minister Armando Hart, both in public speeches and in remarks to visiting Communists, have been insisting that what they call socialism can achieve power in Latin America only by force.

The Cuban effort at present is far more serious than the hastily organized and ill-conceived raids that the bearded veterans of the Sierra Maestra led into such Central American countries as Panama, Haiti, Nicaragua, and the Dominican Republic during the first 8 or 9 months Castro was in power.

Today the Cuban effort is far more sophisticated, more covert, and more deadly. In its professional tradecraft, it shows guidance and training by experienced Communist advisers from the Soviet bloc, including veteran Spanish Communists.

The ideas move fairly openly in a massive propaganda effort. The inflammatory broadcasts from Havana and the work of Prensa Latina are matters of public record I do not need to go into. It might be worth noting that the postal and customs authorities in Panama are destroying on the average of 12 tons a month of Cuban propaganda coming into their lands. Another 10 tons a month comes into Costa Rica, and most of it is spotted either at the airport or in the post office and destroyed.

The know-how is not only imparted to the guerrilla trainees who come to Cuba, but is exported in the form of booklets. There are thousands of copies of the texts on guerrilla warfare by Mao Tse-tung and by "Che" Guevara scattered over all of Latin America. There is also a little pocket booklet, about 2½ by 4 inches, called "150 Questions on Guerrilla Warfare," written by a Spanish civil war veteran, Alberto Bayo. This was apparently printed in Cuba, and turned up first in Peru.

Another version, with 100 questions and answers, based on Guevara's and Bayo's books, has been written especially for Peruvian use, and mimeographed in Peru. This is about 5 by 8, and includes drawings on how to place demolition charges, and charts for calculating the force of various explosives. There is a Portuguese text of Guevara's book in Brazil, and a mimeographed abridgment of Bayo's 150 questions prepared by a terrorist-guerrilla organization in Colombia.

All of these textbooks stress that the guerrilla must be self-sustaining. They not only tell him how to make Molotov cocktails, explosives, and incendiary preparations from materials that he can obtain easily and sometimes even openly at home; they stress that his weapons, his equipment, and supplies should come from the enemy; that is, from the security forces in his homeland.

At least 1,000 to 1,500 persons came to Cuba during 1962, from all the other Latin American countries with the possible exception of Uruguay, to receive ideological indoctrination or guerrilla warfare training or both. More have gone in 1963 despite the limited facilities for reaching Cuba at present.

The largest contingents have come from Venezuela, Peru, Ecuador, Argentina, and Bolivia.

Some of the courses are as short as 4 weeks, designed to let it appear that the trainees had merely attended some conference or celebration and done a little sightseeing.

Other courses last as long as a year, and may include intensive training in such things as sabotage, espionage, or psychological warfare.

The Cubans go to great lengths to conceal the movements of trainees. The Cuban Embassy in Mexico City gives the trainee a visa on a separate piece of paper, so that his passport, when he goes home, will only show that he has been in Mexico.

In other cases, particularly in the case of travel through Montevideo before the quarantine, the Cubans have furnished passports under other names for travel by way of Curacao.

However, in the case of Peru, for instance, we come up with a list of 235 names of individuals known to have made extended stays in Cuba in 1961 and 1962.

Some of the trainees arrive, and many go home, by way of the Iron Curtain and Western Europe, using Soviet, Czech, or Cuban aircraft and probably on ships as well for the trip between Cuba and the bloc. This is another attempt to conceal their movements, and in some cases permits further indoctrination and training in bloc countries.

We believe that the scope and volume of this training is being stepped up, just as we know that it increased in 1962 over 1961.

The basic training covers cross-country movement of guerrillas, firing, care of weapons, and general guerrilla tactics.

Some of the trainees remain indefinitely. The Cubans sometimes refer to these men as their "international brigade." Sometimes they are formed into national units from a particular country, in effect forming a packaged cadre which can be returned to the homeland at the appropriate time to lead a "liberation army."

One group of trainees was asked to mark bridges and other similar demolition targets on detailed maps of their country. These trainees were also required to fill out a lengthy questionnaire on sabotage targets, possibilities for subversion of police, methods for illegal entry and travel, suitable drop zones for air supply, possible points of attack against police, and military posts, and similar information necessary for direct subversion and insurrection.

Three Cuban nationals were involved in the strike violence at La Oroya, Peru, last December, which culminated in some $4 million worth of damage to the smelter of the American-owned Cerro de Pasco Mining Co.

One of these Cubans has also been directing the armed invasions of big ranches in the Andean highlands by land-hungry Indians. Information of this nature contributed to the decision of the Peruvian junta to crack down on Communists in January.

In Brazil, in fact, the complaint of guerrillas in training camps there was that they had been recruited by a promise of Cuban instructors, but found there were none. This came to light in the Brazilian press when the report of a Cuban intelligence agent, relaying their complaints to Havana, turned up in the wreckage of the Varig airliner which crashed in Peru in November.

With respect to weapons, in general the Cubans are following the textbook for guerrillas in regard to provision of arms. They are telling the guerrilla warfare students and their leaders to obtain their own weapons at home.

One trainee was trained exclusively in the use and maintenance of the Garand M-1 rifle and M-3 submachinegun, and the Browning and Hotchkiss machineguns. His group was told that these were the weapons guerrillas would be able to buy, steal, or capture from the security forces at home.

Other trainees were told that Cuba would not be sending weapons because there was a plentiful source of supply for any determined guerrilla movement in its own homeland.

Leaders of militant groups in Venezeuela, Brazil, and Peru who have gone to Cuba seeking assistance have been told by the Cuban leaders that Cuba is willing to furnish funds, training, and technical assistance. Reference to weapons is pointedly omitted.

We have within the past month again reviewed what evidence we have of military shipments from Cuba.

(1) In Peru, radio transmitters were admittedly brought in from Cuba. (In Venezuela so much radio equipment was stolen last fall this was unnecessary.)

(2) In Peru, the guerrilla trainees who were rounded up in the Huampani-Satipo incident last March had been issued kits containing a Czech rifle with a pistol grip, apparently of bloc origin.

Otherwise, however, in case after case guerrilla hardware turned out to have been bought or stolen locally, or smuggled in from the adjoining country. Latin America has a long tradition of smuggling, a long coastline, innumerable isolated landing fields and drop zones, and inadequate security forces to control all such channels.

In summary, then, we have evidence that in principle Cuba is not sending identifiable quantities of weapons to Latin American insurgents at present. But we have no reason to believe that they will not or cannot do so, when so doing serves their stated purpose of creating uprisings in Latin American countries.

Needless to say, this is a matter that we consider of most serious concern and we intensively trace every rumor that comes to us of the importation of arms from Cuba to Latin American countries.

Cuban financing of subversive operations in Latin America is generally effected by couriers carrying cash. A few examples of these operations are:

A Venezuelan politician, Fabricio Ojeda, returning from Cuba in March of 1962, was seen by several witnesses to have large quantities of U.S. currency stuffed in a false-bottomed compartment of his suitcase. There is no law against bringing currency into Venezuela, so that authorities could not even determine how much he brought in. Ojeda later was captured, tried, and sentenced to prison for guerrilla activity.

A Nicaraguan exile, Julio Cesar Mayorga Portocarrera, was flying from Mexico to Honduras in September 1961 when weather forced the plane to overfly Honduras and land in Nicaragua. He was found to be carrying $3,600 in cash, which he admitted he was bringing from Cuba for Nicaraguan rebels in Honduras.

Last April Ecuadoran troops raided a guerrilla training camp in the mountains west of Quito and arrested some 48 members of the URJE (Union of Revolutionary Ecuadoran Youth). The leaders of the group admitted having received guerrilla training in Cuba. They also received Cuban funds to support their activities; one item involving $44,000 reached the public press.

There are also involved bank transfers by which Cuban money eventually reached Latin American front groups to pay for political and propaganda activity.

The principle that guerrillas must be self-sustaining has obviously been applied to finances as well. Communist guerrillas have staged numerous bank robberies in Venezuela, Peru, and Argentina.

The most spectacular holdup, for instance, was that of a bank in a Lima suburb last year which netted almost $100,000. From the participants who have been caught we know that the holdup was carried out by a combination of guerrillas and ordinary criminals, who divided the loot 50–50.

Just last week a bank in an outlying Venezuelan town was robbed of $25,000 by men wearing FALN armbands.

Since the October crisis, Fidel Castro has obviously been trying to straddle the rift between Moscow and Peiping over global Communist strategy. As Mr. Martin aptly put it yesterday, Castro's heart is in Peiping but his stomach is in Moscow.

This same split between all-out militancy and a more cautious policy—call it coexistence or "two steps forward, one step back"—is reflected on the extreme left in many Latin American countries.

Thus Cuba at present not only seeks to serve two masters, but to choose among rival servants in its Latin American subversions.

Castro's views on what is good for socialism and revolution in Latin America are more in line with those of the Chinese Communists than the Soviets.

Only the Cuban and Venezuelan Communist Parties are totally committed to terror and revolution.

In spite of differences over tactics and timing between various Communist groups, all intend eventually to deliver the Latin American countries into the Communist-Socialist bloc. The so-called Soviet conservative view, as it is now espoused, is more intent on trying to achieve power by legal means if possible and by subversion rather than by force.

Direct Soviet interest in Latin America is clearly increasing. An excellent example of this was the setting up early in 1962 of a Latin American Institute in the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R.

The avowed purpose of this institute is to raise the study of the problems of Latin America, which in their own statements the Soviets claim they have neglected, to the highest possible level.

Teaching of Spanish and Portuguese languages is to be stressed in the institute and throughout the school system.

A list of subjects on which this institute intends to publish shows that it is to be used to attack the Alliance for Progess; it has already attacked the Alliance program in Colombia—a showpiece of the Alliance.

Posters have been placed in some Colombian universities referring to the problems of the "national liberation and workers' movements in Latin American countries" as topics which will be studied by the institute. Results of these studies will be published in the near future in a magazine called America Latina, intended especially for distribution in Latin America.

A pamphlet, apparently to be distributed by the institute, and entitled "Alianza Para el Progreso," will, in the words of its heralds, "unmask the economic expansion of the United States of America" in Latin America.

The institute expects to enter into close contact with the principal Latin American scientists and academicians during 1963.

One of the most important Communist assets in Latin America is a large number of bloc diplomatic and Cuban missions. These missions are used to further Communist subversive activities even in countries where there are no bloc diplomatic missions.

The Soviets and in some cases some satellites as well, have diplomatic missions in Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, and Uruguay. The U.S.S.R. maintains relations with Bolivia but has no resident mission there. Cuba maintains embassies in Mexico, Brazil, Bolivia, Uruguay, and Chile.

The Chinese Communists, of course, have no diplomatic ties in Latin America except with Cuba. That fact alone would make Cuban missions important to the Chinese. Only seven Latin American countries—Chile, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Paraguay, and Peru—have no official ties whatever with any bloc country.

Uruguay offers a good example of how the Communist misuse diplomatic missions and the importance the Communists attach to them.

Communist subversive activities in Uruguay are not now aimed at promoting revolutionary activity against the Government. In this case even the Cubans appear to be much more interested in retaining the good will of the government so that they can continue to use the country as a base of operations against Argentina, Paraguay, etc.

Communist diplomatic missions, however, are active in supporting local Communist and other pro-Castro groups to retain enough leverage within the country so as to prevent the anti-Castro groups from forcing a break in relations.

The U.S.S.R., most of the satellites, and Cuba all have diplomatic missions in Montevideo—some 70 or so bloc personnel. In addition, couriers and travelers can go back and forth between this city and the bloc countries and Cuba at any time.

In conclusion, on the whole, while Cuban-backed subversive pressure is great in all of Latin America, the Cubans have thus far been having only limited success. For example, Cuban attempts to organize a Communist-controlled Latin American labor movement have not yet gotten off the ground, despite the fact that the Cubans have been working at it for more than a year.

In Venezuela, despite the great subversive pressure, President Betancourt seems to be proving that his Government can control these subversive forces. Short of some disaster, there is every likelihood that he will be the first freely elected Venezuelan president in history to complete his term. In Brazil, some moderates were elected to congressional and gubernatorial points last fall.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I emphasize the following portions of the statement:

The public pronouncements of Cuban leaders, the daily record of events in Latin America, and reports from our intelligence sources within Communist and other left-extremist elements throughout this hemisphere all agree on one salient conclusion: That Fidel Castro is spurring and supporting the efforts of Communists and other revolutionary elements to overthrow and seize control of the governments in Latin America.

Even before the October missile crisis—and with increasing rancor since then—Cuban leaders have been exhorting revolu-

> tionary movements to violence and terrorism, and supporting their activities.

Again I quote, after skipping some portions of the statement:

> In essence, Castro tells revolutionaries from other Latin American countries: "Come to Cuba; we will pay your way, we will train you in underground organization techniques, in guerrilla warfare, in sabotage and in terrorism. We will see to it that you get back to your homeland for future use."

Here is another portion which I think extremely valuable in trying to analyze what we are facing; and, again, I am quoting from the statement of Mr. McCone, the head of our Central Intelligence Agency, in his official report to the House of Representatives on February 19:

> The know-how is not only imparted to the guerrilla trainees who come to Cuba, but is exported in the form of booklets. There are thousands of copies of the texts on guerrilla warfare by Mao Tse-tung and by "Che" Guevara scattered over all of Latin America. There is also a little pocket booklet, about 2½ by 4 inches, called "150 Questions on Guerrilla Warfare," written by a Spanish civil war veteran, Alberto Bayo. This was apparently printed in Cuba, and turned up first in Peru.
>
> All of these textbooks stress that the guerrilla must be self-sustaining. They not only tell him how to make Molotov cocktails, explosives, and incendiary preparations from materials that he can obtain easily and sometimes even openly at home; they stress that his weapons, his equipment, and supplies should come from the enemy; that is, from the security forces in his homeland.
>
> At least 1,000 to 1,500 persons came to Cuba during 1962, from all the other Latin American countries with the possible exception of Uruguay, to receive ideological indoctrination or guerrilla warfare training or both. More have gone in 1963 despite the limited facilities for reaching Cuba at present.
>
> The largest contingents have come from Venezuela, Peru, Ecuador, Argentina, and Bolivia.
>
> Some of the courses are as short as 4 weeks, designed to let it appear that the trainees had merely attended some conference or celebration and done a little sightseeing.
>
> Other courses last as long as a year, and may include intensive training in such things as sabotage, espionage, or psychological warfare.

Again, part of his evidence in support of his conclusions and his statement:

> Three Cuban nationals were involved in the strike violence at La Oroya, Peru, last December, which culminated in some $4 million worth of damage to the smelter of the American-owned Cerro de Pasco Mining Co.
>
> One of these Cubans has also been directing the armed invasions of big ranches in the Andean highlands by land-hungry Indians. Information of this nature contributed to the decision of the Peruvian junta to crack down on Communists in January.
>
> In Brazil, in fact, the complaint of guerrillas in training camps there was that they had been recruited by a promise of Cuban instructors, but found there were none. This came to light in the Brazilian press when the report of a Cuban intelligence agent, relaying their complaints to Havana, turned up in the wreckage of the Varig airliner which crashed in Peru in November.

I could continue indefinitely to quote from his statement, but all of it will be printed in the RECORD, pursuant to my request.

Mr. President, what is being done by the American Republics, and principally the United States, to thwart this offensive mounted against them by Havana in cahoots with Moscow? Obviously, we are not going to allow a direct conventional attack on any country by Cuba; but, as I already pointed out, no one seriously worries about such an attack. What measures, then, are being taken to defeat the Communists in the subterranean war that is being fought in the streets, in the fields, on university campuses, and elsewhere by small bands of highly dedicated and well-trained Communists?

Admittedly, the United States has a policy. In the first place, according to the President and other administration spokesmen, we are trying to persuade all members of the OAS to adopt strict and uniform measures to sever all diplomatic and commercial contacts with Cuba and to curb and control the movement of Castro-Communist personnel, propaganda, and arms throughout the hemisphere and between each country and Cuba. In addition, we are told, elements of the Armed Forces of the United States are conducting an intensive surveillance of the Caribbean to detect and prevent clandestine movements of arms and persons from Cuba to neighboring countries. Personally, I share the skepticism of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] voiced in his excellent statement in this Chamber on June 13, about the effectiveness of this imposing assignment given to our fleet and air units, especially in light of periodic reports of such clandestine movements that we are pledged to prevent. The difficulties involved in preventing any such movements from an island the size of Cuba can be seen in reverse perspective by the refugees who have conducted attacks on Cuban territory, or even more dramatically by the inability of the East Germans and Russians to prevent escapes from East Berlin.

As the President pointed out in his news conference of March 6, the control of the movement of persons to and from Cuba "is an action which must be taken by each of the countries in Latin America." He said, further:

> This is the kind of thing which each country finally has to do itself, because it is part of the element of sovereignty that the control of movement is within the country of citizenship.

Thus, as the President indicated, the effectiveness of more stringent control measures is predicated upon their implementation and enforcement by all member states of the OAS, and particularly all Latin American States.

Now, Mr. President, what are the prospects for success in this endeavor? Not very encouraging, in my opinion. The President's hopes for the adoption of strengthened internal security measures by all OAS member states appear to have been frustrated. The report of the special OAS committee, from which I have been quoting, notes that "the nature, degree, and effectiveness of the control measures" designed to curb the flow of Communist arms, personnel, and propaganda "vary from country to country." Since the release of this report, over a month ago, a further blow has been dealt to President Kennedy's hopes for mutual cooperation among all OAS member states on this urgent problem.

On July 4, the Council of the OAS, meeting in Washington, D.C., to consider the recommendations made by the special eight-nation OAS Committee in its report, displayed a serious lack of consensus or concert on these recommendations. While 14 members of the OAS Council voted for the recommendations, which is great, 1—Chile—voted against, and 4 abstained. The abstentions consisted of Mexico and Brazil—two of the largest countries in America and sites of considerable Communist activity—Haiti, and ironically, Venezuela, the No. 1 target of the Castro-Communist insurrectionary offensive also abstained.

Why this dissension within the OAS? Some observers attribute it to a distaste for harsh police measures which, it is feared, would abridge civil liberties. I wish I could be charitable. In my opinion, Mr. President, this dissension is a direct reflection of the lack of effective leadership by the United States. Although the President has expressed his hopes for stronger internal security measures by all OAS member states, he has not conveyed any real sense of urgency nor has he put any teeth in his expressions. In fact, Mr. President, despite the Department of State's denials, our Government has apparently told its OAS allies that is has decided to shelve some strong measures it had previously contemplated on the grounds that Castro has put the damper on some of his propaganda and subversive activities in recent months with the alleged result that tensions in the Caribbean have eased.

This is fantastic, Mr. President. The barbudo—the bearded one—looks North and smiles at us, and we heave a great sigh of relief. Hard as it is to believe, Mr. President, this appears to be the case.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. I wonder if we are not going through the same experience in Moscow now. Mr. Khrushchev smiles at us, and we feel that all of our problems are solved. I wonder if we are not being given the same treatment, and that if in order not to take the smile off of Mr. Khrushchev's face we are very careful not to do anything that would upset the bearded one, and if under that situation we are not gradually putting ourselves into a position in which it will be more and more difficult for us to do anything to help our Latin American friends.

Mr. DOMINICK. I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from Utah brought out that point. That is exactly the situation. His point is highly pertinent to the subject. I was so irritated the other day in seeing a picture of our own special ambassador sitting and apparently having a series of good jokes with Mr. Khrushchev in Moscow that I almost decided I would try to rewrite my address and talk about what a complete terrorist Mr. Khrushchev has been during his lifetime of power.

I appreciate the contribution of the Senator from Utah very much. He has described a part of the problem we are facing.

The administration, which desperately appears to look for any sign of Communist friendliness, has fallen for the coexistence line emanating from Havana. In this connection, Mr. President, I call my colleagues' attention to a dispatch appearing in the July 5 edition of the New York Times, entitled "United States Discards Plan on OAS Embargo Against Cuba Trade," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DISCARDS PLAN ON OAS EMBARGO AGAINST CUBA TRADE

(By Henry Raymont)

WASHINGTON, JULY 4.—The Kennedy administration has abandoned plans to ask the Organization of American States to declare an economic embargo against Cuba.

This is the policy at least for the time being while the State Department searches for ways to press for the political isolation of Cuba and for a sharper fight against Communist subversion of the hemisphere.

U.S. officials said 2 months ago that a request for an OAS trade ban on Cuba was "under active consideration" and would be submitted "within the next few weeks." These officials now believe such a ban would serve no useful purpose.

They also believe that no new measures will be taken against non-Communist ships carrying cargoes to Cuba, even though this traffic has increased in recent months.

LATIN OPPOSITION NOTED

According to diplomatic quarters, one reason for the apparent shift in U.S. plans is the growing opposition of some important Latin American countries to Washington's policy in the Organization of American States.

Diplomats from those countries believe that some U.S. requests for action against Cuba were designed primarily for their political and psychological effect and to ward off domestic critics of the Kennedy administration.

That the mood of the Latin American governments for new measures against Cuba is far from unanimous was emphasized yesterday. The OAS Council was divided on a series of recommendations urging member countries to curb travel to the island and to establish closer security ties in the hemisphere.

While 14 countries voted in favor of the recommendations, Brazil, Mexico, Venezuela and Haiti abstained, Chile opposed the proposals on the ground that they threatened to establish "police practices" that would violate civil rights.

One U.S. official said today that demands for action in the economic field at this time could create difficulties within the inter-American alliance far greater than the harm they would inflict on Premier Fidel Castro's government.

TRADE IS NOW MINIMAL

Trade between the Latin-American nations and Cuba is minimal. It is largely reduced to shipments of Chilean garlic and beans in return for sugar. The administration believed, however, that a ban on all trade would have dramatized Latin America's repudiation of the Cuban regime and heightened the island's sense of isolation.

An embargo on arms shipments to Cuba was adopted by the hemisphere foreign ministers' conference at Punta Del Este, Uruguay, in January 1962. The conference also excluded Cuba from the activities of the inter-American system because of her ties to international communism.

Some Latin American diplomats link the decision not to press for a trade embargo to the administration's appraisal of Dr. Castro's recent efforts to reduce tensions in his relations with the United States and a change in the atmosphere of Washington's relations with Moscow.

State Department officials insist, however, that there has been no change in the policy to hasten the overthrow of Dr. Castro by all means short of war. They also concede that his fall is not in sight.

RADIO SOFTENS ITS TONE

U.S. officials who have been analyzing Dr. Castro's offers to normalize relations believe they are motivated by a genuine desire to relieve external pressures on his regime at a time when it must concentrate on solving pressing economic difficulties.

They point out that Havana radio's recent broadcasts to the United States and Latin America have shown less aggressiveness.

Similar observations were made by Latin-American diplomats who recently returned from Cuba. They said that Dr. Castro had personally assured the Governments of Brazil and Mexico that he would abandon his campaign to subvert the Latin American nations.

These assurances, they said, stemmed from Dr. Castro's belief that foreign pressures against him had decreased. The diplomats also said Dr. Castro felt that his government had consolidated itself internally.

Dr. Castro was also reported to have been releasing a growing number of political prisoners in an effort to dispel the impression abroad that the island was governed by police terror.

Diplomatic informants said that an appraisal of the changing situation in Cuba was given to the OAS Council at a secret session June 28 by U. Alexis Johnson, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

According to these informants, Mr. Johnson said that there had been a "definite decrease of tensions" in United States-Cuban relations. He said Cuba no longer constituted a military threat to the hemisphere.

This assessment was felt by some Latin-American officials to differ widely from the report discussed yesterday by the Council. It suggested that Soviet and Cuban attempts at subversion were increasing.

This report was prepared by a special eight-nation committee headed by Ambassador Juan Bautista de Lavalle of Peru. It recommended that the hemisphere nations curb travel to Cuba, increase vigilance over Communist-bloc diplomats and establish closer cooperation among security agencies.

A U.S. official said the discrepancy between the two reports might have been due to the fact that the report discussed yesterday was compiled in January and that "there may have been some new developments since then."

Mr. Johnson was also said to have told members of the Organization of American States of a "marked increase" in shipment to Cuba, mainly involving vessels from Britain, Greece, Lebanon and Norway.

Mr. Johnson was quoted as having said that this increase was "discouraging" but that new action against the shippers would be "ineffectual" because none of the vessels were known to have touched U.S. ports. Under present regulations, a vessel carrying goods to Cuba is barred from loading U.S. Government cargo.

The Maritime Administration, in a report issued today, showed that 37 non-Communist-bloc vessels arrived in Cuba in April, 40 in May and 21 up to June 28. In January, only 12 vessels made the trip.

Mr. DOMINICK. In addition, recently in the July 22 edition of U.S. News & World Report there was published a direct quotation from an article which bears on what the Senator from Utah was saying. The quotation is from an article entitled "Is a U.S. Deal With Russia Near?" On page 28 of the magazine there is the following quotation on Cuba:

> The United States for its part is not going to make strong demands about getting all the Russians out of Cuba. The existence of Castro and the presence of Russians in Cuba are not welcomed by Mr. Kennedy, but are being accepted as facts of life. Cuba in other words, is not likely to upset a deal, provided Khrushchev keeps Russian action in the island within bounds.

I say to the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and to all Senators that that is a typical example of the accommodation with a most gripping and terrible menace our world has ever faced.

Unless we point out the danger clearly in this country and take effective leadership against it, we will slowly but surely be nibbled to death as we continue in this overall war of attrition with the Communists.

Mr. President, it should be self-evident from what I have said that the OAS cannot agree on stronger measures to combat the Castro-Communist offensive. It seems clear to me that it would do so if the United States were willing to show some urgency and back that up with warnings of suspension of American economic and other assistance pending a more favorable response to our wishes. But, Mr. President, this administration apparently is not willing to exercise such leadership. Rather, it appears willing to invoke the dissention within OAS as an excuse for not taking the lead.

It seems clear that, at the very least, considerable time will pass before desirable and necessary control measures can be put into effect by all the non-Communist States in Latin America. Meanwhile, insurrection will continue, and if the past few months offer any guide, it is likely to intensify. But we cannot afford a significant lapse of time. The challenge posed by the intensified Communist campaign of subversion is immediate and urgent.

Where does this leave us now, Mr. President? In the absence of a determined effort to defeat the Communist campaign of subversion, we are falling back on the Alliance for Progress. In fact, we are told, this is the program that ultimately will turn the tide in our favor—provided, I hasten to add, that the Communists throughout Latin America cease their disruptive activities, roll over, and play dead. This contention, that only the economic and social development of Latin America can defeat this campaign, is based on a number of questionable premises. These premises are myths to me, and it is to these myths that I now turn.

Throughout the continuing controvery over U.S. policy with respect to Cuba—most recently, right here on the floor of the Senate—facts have too often been submerged in a flood of myths. And some myths die hard. I would not want to conclude my remarks today without countering one such long-lived myth—and one with special relevance to the question of effective action to thwart the Communist offensive in this hemisphere against free and self-governing nations.

There is nothing mythical about this offensive, as I have already demonstrated. It is underway, no-holds-barred so far as the Communists are concerned. They are grimly determined to bury all free nations in this hemisphere by every possible means. The peril is clear and the danger present.

Nor is there anything mythical about Castro's Cuba—the territorial and ideological base of this massive Communist thrust. I have offered abundant documentation of this fact as well, documentation that can be neither wished nor winked out of existence. To blunt the Communist offensive, there is one utterly indispensable first step: this advance base of world communism must be eliminated. Cuba must once more rejoin the community of free nations.

Let us have no delusions on that score—unpleasant as the facts may be.

But then the question arises: what is the raw material on which this offensive feeds? Why should the Republics of this hemisphere provide such ready targets for the appeals of communism? What are the vulnerabilities open to Communist exploitation? Why, specifically, did Cuba fall prey to the Castro dictatorship?

And here is where the myths begin to take over from hard facts. And here are the premises on which our policy of procrastination is based. As a case in point, I cite the following remarks by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], delivered in this Chamber on June 17, when my senior colleague [Mr. ALLOTT] proposed that a provisional Government of Free Cuba be spurred into formation, to spearhead ultimate Cuban liberation. This is what was said by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH].

I wish to make it very clear that I called the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] before I came to the floor, to tell him I was going to make these remarks. I quote what the Senator from Idaho said:

> I am sure that had it not been for the dissatisfaction of the peons in Cuba, who worked on the great sugar plantations, it would never have been possible for Castro to have achieved the popular support—the grassroots support—that enabled him to overthrow Batista.

Let us examine this flat assertion of "fact" opinion—and identify the myths hidden away in it.

Myth No. 1: That pre-Castro Cuba was a nation of oppressed and impoverished peasants, on the brink of mass discontent and latent revolt. Now, this is a beguiling notion—but it simply is not true. Pre-Castro Cuba was no paradise, no promised land of social and economic democracy, but neither was it a sink of poverty and mass misery. Indeed, it was not even a rural-based country; nearly 60 percent of the population lived in the towns and cities. Its per capita income ranked fourth among all Latin American countries—much higher, for example, than that of postwar Japan and about on a par with postwar Italy. In the words of a leading Cuban Communist—a Communist source, let me stress:

> In reality, Cuba was not one of the countries with the lowest standard of living of the masses in America but, on the contrary, one of those with the highest.

And, as a recognized American authority on this subject, Theodore Draper, has concluded:

> Cuba was one of the most middleclass countries in Latin America.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. BENNETT. The last statement, that Cuba was one of the leading middle-class countries in Latin America, may hold the key to the reason why the Communists chose to attack it, because one of the functions of the Communist revolution is to destroy the middle class. I think this may be a very significant factor in the situation.

Mr. DOMINICK. I agree with the Senator from Utah. There is no doubt that one of the main aims of communism is to knock out all middle-class personnel and the economic system we have built up from the economic bases of this country.

There is another myth hidden away in the statement made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH].

Myth No. 2: That the Castro revolution depended upon an outpouring of grassroots support—and specifically, peasant support. Once again, this simply does not square with the facts. The Cuban revolution, led—or rather perverted—by Castro, was essentially a middle-class revolution, sparked and manned by students, by young professionals, and by artisans and urban workers, and taken over by Communists from within. Quoting again from Theodore Draper:

> The peasantry never had in its hands any of the levers of command of the revolution, before or after the victory. The revolution was made and always controlled by declassed sons and daughters of the middle class.

It was apparent that the people who wished to overthrow the fascist dictator type, Batista, were used as a part of the Communist machinations to destroy themselves.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Did Castro come from the peasant class?

Mr. DOMINICK. He did not.

Mr. BENNETT. Was he a doctor of laws?

Mr. DOMINICK. I think the Senator is correct. He was a doctor of laws.

There is no secret about these facts and, at this late date, no room for real disagreement or delusion. Authoritative documentation is readily at hand. I invite the attention of my colleagues in this connection to the first chapter of Theodore Draper's excellent study, "Castro's Revolution: Myths and Realities," published in 1962 by Frederick Praeger.

But both these myths, misleading as they are and however destructive of sober debate, are relatively minor when compared with myth No. 3; and that is that the appeal of communism is primarily economic, and that its road to power is paved with human misery, poverty, illiteracy, and mass discontent. This is the false idea of "stomach" communism. It is, at best, a half-truth—it may help explain the avowed goals of communism, but never, in no single case, its dynamic origins. We have in our hands the clear record of many years of systematic Communist subversion and militant political warfare. And what is incredible is the need still again to have to reiterate the facts and thus blow down the myth.

But the need is urgent because the myth of "stomach" communism is not only enduring: but it is also influential. And influential at the very highest levels of the executive establishment.

It is, I submit, the major premise underlying the Alliance for Progress—which, together with other aid programs, the administration has so vastly and so dangerously oversold as the panacea for all the ills that now beset the free world, and, in particular, the third world of underdeveloped nations. Such progress of mutual development—assuming they are ever effectively implemented—hold out great long-term hope for basic economic growth and stability. But they must follow tougher and more urgent problems. They must supplement rather than supplant efforts to obtain our immediate goals: not only the removal of the Soviet presence from this hemisphere but also the liberation of Cuba from Communist tyranny.

It is the myth of "stomach" communism that beguiles us into believing that to counteract subversion, humanitarian sympathy will do the job; that wiping out illiteracy is the same as cutting off systematic infiltration by trained cadres of the Communist underground; that to eradicate poverty is to block Communist penetration into every free republic in this hemisphere. It is the myth, in brief, that half-measures can blunt the thrust of world Communist aggression. It is the illusion that massive expenditures can substitute for a militant will to win. It is, I suggest, an invitation to disaster.

And yet, Mr. President, it may easily be that it is this same type of myth disaster that this administration appears to be courting. On July 9, during the colloquy that followed the brilliant speech by my senior colleague [Mr. ALLOTT], I called attention to an Allen-Scott report which alleged that the administration was contemplating a major shift in policy toward Cuba whereby, in return for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Cuba at a later date, the United States would gradually resume diplomatic and commercial relations with the Castro regime. The text of that report is on page 12263 of the July 9 edition of the RECORD.

I commented at the time that we should have a clear, unequivocal answer as to the veracity of this report, and I was joined in that view by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] who is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that article be reprinted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article is ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Colorado Springs (Colo.) Gazette Telegraph, July 1, 1963]

Shift in U.S. Policy on Castro

Washington.—President Kennedy is deliberating a gradual shift in U.S. policy toward Dictator Fidel Castro's Communist regime in Cuba.

For more than a month, the President and his top foreign policy advisers have been discussing a plan under which the United States would resume contact with Castro on both an informal and formal basis.

Under this backstage scheme, New York Attorney James Donovan, who negotiated the $53 million ransom of the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion prisoners, would fly to Havana and Moscow to seek the withdrawal of all Soviet combat forces from Cuba.

In exchange for their removal, the United States would agree to a step-by-step normalization of diplomatic and trade relations with the Red-ruled Castro dictatorship over a 2-year period.

As a first step, the United States would reopen its Embassy in Havana by sending a Chargé d'Affaires there. At present the Swiss Ambassador is handling U.S. affairs.

An exchange of Ambassadors and lifting of the trade embargo against Castro would follow after sufficient time had elapsed to make such a drastic readjustment palatable to the people and Congress.

This far-reaching shift in Cuban relations is part of President Kennedy's policy of seeking accommodations with Russia and its satellite bloc for the avowed purpose of reducing the risk of nuclear war by moderating tensions.

White House insiders say the proposed switch in Cuba policy fits squarely with strategy enunciated recently by the President in a speech that "any plan of action in the Caribbean has to take into account conditions and potential developments between the United States and the U.S.S.R."

THE NEGOTIATOR

The President favors 47-year-old Donovan for this highly explosive diplomatic mission for two reasons: his acceptability to Castro and Khrushchev, and his close ties with key administration officials, notably Attorney General Robert Kennedy.

After Donovan arranged the swap of Soviet Spy Abel for U-2 Pilot Francis Gary Powers, the President wrote him, "The type of negotiations you undertook, where diplomatic channels had been unavailing, is unique, and you conducted it with the greatest skill and courage."

Castro's enthusiasm for Donovan is about on a par with that of the President. In feelers through diplomatic channels to the State Department, the Cuban dictator has indicated he would accept Donovan as negotiator. Words to that effect have been conveyed on three separate occasions—March 8, May 12, and May 19.

A decision on this momentous scheme will not be made until after the President returns from his European trip.

By that time the White House staff hopes to know whether the House Foreign Affairs Committee will undertake an inquiry into Donovan's previous Cuban negotiations. Republican committeemen are vigorously pressing for such an investigation. They have strongly urged it in a joint letter to Representative Thomas Morgan, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, chairman.

CUBAN FLASHES

Richard Goodwin, freewheeling Executive Secretary of the international Peace Corps, is still on the State Department's payroll. The House Appropriations Committee has ascertained that Goodwin is drawing $19,656 as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, although he left that post more than 4 months ago. Meanwhile, Sterling Cotrell, who replaced Goodwin, is being paid by the Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs. The House committee began checking Goodwin's pay as Congress voted down his request for $80,000 to set up the new Peace Corps organization. At a meeting with British officials, Arthur Schlesinger Jr., special Assistant to the President, described U.S. policy on Cuba along these lines: The first objective is to clean up our own backyard in Central and South America by vigorous implementation of the Alliance for Progress. The second objective is to bring isolated Cuba back into the Organization of American States as a chastened, cooperating member. (Nice tricks, if they can be pulled off.)

Intelligence reports that around 100,000 Cubans are in Castro's jails for refusing to accept communism. Also that some 250,000 Cubans have fled, and another 180,000 are awaiting approval and transportation to leave. Senator John Stennis' Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee is preparing a new report on Castro-Communist subversion, sabotage, and guerrilla warfare against Latin American countries. The report, slated for release next month, will warn that Castro has ordered an increase in these operations.

Although Castro has loudly proclaimed fealty and devotion to Russia, a so-called Cuban "scientific delegation," headed by a Capt. Antonio Nunez Jiminez, is en route to Red China, ostensibly for "study and observation" purposes. Beer bottles have become so scarce in Communist Cuba that the output of beer has been seriously affected. Apparently there is no lack of beer, but there aren't enough bottles to hold it. In an effort to overcome this shortage, the "Revolutionary Taxicab Drivers Association" of Santiago has pleged to collect beer bottles free of charge. Presumably the cab drivers will devote their spare time to rounding up empty bottles. Russia, whose agriculture is notoriously in difficulty, is sending around 100 so-called farm "specialists" to help Cuba with its mounting agricultural headaches—a clear-cut instance of the incompetent aiding the inadequate.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I reiterate my call for an answer now. Just what is the role of James Donovan in our sub rosa contacts with the Castro regime? Is there any foundation to the report of the administration's major policy shift? These questions demand and deserve clear, authoritative, and immediate answers.

Cuba will never be liberated by a program of long-term investment in the economic development of Latin America. There has never been any country, once taken over by Communist aggression, which has ever been freed without outside assistance. As a supplementary and supporting measure, yes; but first must come the liberation of that oppressed land from the grip of Communist tyranny. And until the day of Cuban liberation, the Communist offensive in this hemisphere will move forward—implacably and with mounting peril to hemispheric and U.S. security.

Toward the goal of Cuban liberation, the proposal put forward by my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. Allott] is a major contribution. I commend him for his bold initiative and for his tough-minded penetration to the real target. I add my appeal to his: Let us debate this proposal and consider it on its merits. Let us also debate the proposals of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt]. If the administration has a better plan of action, well and good. But in either case, let us get on with the urgent business at hand—to translate the hardened will of the American people into effective action. And to do it before the inter-American defense system becomes the graveyard of free world security.

Let us implement the President's statement that we will do whatever is necessary to prevent the export of Communist aggression. Heaven knows we are not doing it now, and we need to take action. Everyone knows there is only one way to do this—restoration of a free Cuba.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. ALLOTT. I read to the Senator the President's statement:

> It continues to be the policy of the United States that the Castro regime will not be allowed to export its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force. It will be prevented by whatever means may be necessary from taking action against any part of the Western Hemisphere.

Does the Senator interpret that statement as meaning the President believes the present actions of Cuba do not constitute aggressive threats against this country and against this hemisphere?

Mr. DOMINICK. All I can say is that the lack of action of any kind by us would certainly seem to indicate that the President does not think this is export of Communist aggression. How he can come to that conclusion I cannot understand. If he does not mean this, he must mean a shift in policy.

Mr. ALLOTT. My colleague later quoted the President again when he said, in substance, that the armed forces of the hemisphere—and I refer to the quotation used by my colleague—including our own, are made available to insure that arms that are now in Cuba will not be shipped outside Cuba.

Has the Senator any doubt that arms in Cuba, which originated from Czechoslovakia and Russia, are being transported, and that implements of sabotage are now being transported, all over the Latin American part of this whole hemisphere?

Mr. DOMINICK. There is absolutely no doubt in my mind. I would add to what my distinguished colleague has said that not only arms in conventional terms, physical weapons, but arms from the standpoint of Communist indoctrination, and persons trained in guerrilla warfare, people being brought in and shipped back, methods and promoting revolt, are being exported by Castro as rapidly as he can do it.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct. There is one thing most people have a harder time understanding, and that is the means of subversion that the Senator has emphasized, but there can be no question in anybody's mind that hard arms are being exported throughout the hemisphere.

I have another question, or perhaps two. Can the Senator see any practical difference between the net end effect proposed in the statement of Blas Roca and the net end effect of conventional warfare?

The thought in my mind—and I do not know whether it occurs to my colleague—is that, so far as the net end result in this hemisphere is concerned, such a statement would have exactly the same net end result as would conventional warfare. Is there any question about this in the Senator's mind?

Mr. DOMINICK. Not only is the Senator's statement absolutely correct, but I would say that such action has the probability of being more aggressive than conventional warfare, because Castro would be beaten in conventional warfare. As long as he can confine it at that level, he will never be beaten.

Mr. ALLOTT. If he instituted conventional warfare he would immediately arouse the opposition of every country in Latin America, whereas this kind is warfare by attrition, day by day, week by week, and month by month.

I congratulate my distinguished colleague for participating in this continuing debate upon Cuba. So far the administration has seen fit to practically put its head in the sand and ignore the fact of what exists in Cuba.

It seems to me the real contribution of the Senator consists of two parts. The first is calling to the minds of Americans again the hard facts of what we are facing and what exists in Cuba. The second is the diabolical myth of "stomach" communism, which was pointed out so well in the second part of the Senator's speech. He has rendered real service. I hope he will not cease in his efforts to call this subject to the attention of the American people.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank my distinguished colleague.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MORTON. I, too, have been very much impressed by the eloquent argument presented by the junior Senator from Colorado. He has rendered a real service in pointing out the myths that go with the dialogues in connection with Cuba.

It was called to my attention today that the American Maritime Association, through its legislative director, sent a letter to the President on the subject of the rather loose application of our pressures on friendly nations to desist from making their merchant ships available to the Cuban trade. It has summarized it in a press release dated today, Thursday, July 18th. Since it bears on the present discussion, I ask unanimous consent that it may be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> NEW YORK.—The American Maritime Association appealed to President Kennedy today to order new steps to curtail free world shipping to Cuba.
>
> Pointing out that the State Department's efforts to curb allied shipping to Castro have failed, the AMA urged the President to issue new and stronger shipping orders to halt the flow of goods to the Cuban Communists. The association, which represents 40 percent of the American merchant marine, suggested a new order denying U.S. Government-generated aid cargo to all shipowners who use any of their vessels in the Cuban trade regardless of whether they are owned by a parent organization or a subsidiary. The order should also be extended to include the carrying of U.S. aid cargo from foreign ports to other parts of the world, the association said.
>
> The AMA's views were contained in a letter written by AMA Legislative Director Ray R. Murdock and released today by the association. The announcement came on the heels of a Government report that 128 free world ships have traded with Cuba since January 1963 when the United States issued orders denying certain American-financed cargoes to ships that have traded with Cuba.
>
> Mr. Murdock said that since January, free world ships have docked at Cuban ports on an average of one per day, and that only two companies have asked to be removed from the Government blacklist since it was instituted last winter. These facts, he said, demonstrate that the State Department's efforts to curb allied shipping to Cuba "must be termed a miserable failure." They also indicate, he said, "that we have been unable to convince those presently engaged in the Cuba trade to cease operation."
>
> Because of the loopholes in the Government's shipping orders, the AMA said, any foreign steamship company that owns more than one vessel is permitted to continue to trade with Cuba and at the same time to carry U.S. Government-financed cargo on other ships.
>
> "A perfect example of this has recently come to light," the association continued. "A British vessel, the *London Statesman*, has reportedly been chartered to carry Public Law 480 grain from the U.S. gulf to Formosa between July 5–15. This vessel is owned by the London and Overseas Freighters, Ltd., a company which has shown a most flagrant disregard for U.S. policies. This company has chartered 75 percent of its entire shipping capabilities to the Soviet Union, and its vessels make up approximately one-half of the entire British tonnage now engaged in the Cuban trade. London & Overseas Freighters, Ltd., controls the London & Overseas Tankers, Ltd., a firm which has carried more oil to Cuba than any other single company since Castro assumed power. The chartering of the *London Statesman* is just another example of the lack of control exercised by the Department of Agriculture over the chartering practices of foreign trade missions."
>
> The AMA urged President Kennedy to prohibit the owners of ships trading with Cuba from carrying any U.S. Government-financed cargo. It said similar rules should be applied to steamship companies that trade with Communist China, North Vietnam, and North Korea.

Mr. MORTON. Again I commend the Senator for keeping this discussion alive. It is certainly one that should be kept before the Congress and the American people, and it is one of the problems that will face our Nation for many days—not that Cuba is a threat to this Nation; but once Latin America goes, we are indeed threatened.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator. A part of the purpose of my speech today was to make crystal clear that we may have been beguiled by the so-called missile infiltration into Cuba and the so-called missile takeout, and the people may have been led to believe there is no danger. The danger is more real now, through subversion and infiltration, than it was in October. It is certainly not less.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am very glad the distinguished Senator from Colorado has made the point he has just made. I have felt all along that the weaponry, the soldiers, and so forth, in Cuba, do not, in themselves, constitute a military threat to the United States, but communism in Cuba definitely constitutes a threat to the entire hemisphere. I hope the Senator will continue to hammer this point home, because it is quite obvious that the President of the United States does not understand it.

I refer to his press conference of yesterday and to a question and answer in that conference as quoted in the New York Times of this morning. The question was asked:

> Mr. President, do you see any indications that the Castro government is seeking a more relaxed relationship with the United States, and, if so, are we prepared to meet them in that?

The President's answer was:

> No, I've seen these verbal statements but I see no evidence—and, as I say, I don't—I think the United States has indicated very clearly that we do not accept the existence and cannot coexist in the peaceful sense with a Soviet satellite in the Caribbean.

I ask my friend from Colorado if he feels that we are demonstrating in any way that we cannot coexist with communism in this hemisphere, as the President said.

Mr. DOMINICK. I have seen no evidence of any action whatever to show our relationship in trying to get rid of the Communist menace. The only thing that we have done, which we did legitimately and well, was the effort last October in getting rid of the missiles and long-range bombers from Cuba. That was a real positive statement to Mr. Khrushchev to get out. The Russians got out, as far as they have gotten out since, with long-range bombers and missiles, even though we are not sure of the total effect. There has been nothing done to try to develop a position of leadership which would provide us and all the Latin American countries with the ability to put Cuba back on the side of the free nations. This is what we should be doing, in my opinion.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Again I thank the Senator from Colorado for his continuing effort in this field, and the other Senators on this side of the aisle who have joined with him, to point out to the American people the dangers which exist in Cuba. I am sure that if the American people have to depend on their President for true information on Cuba, they will be waiting a long time, especially when the President has said, "I think the United States has indicated very clearly that we do not accept the existence and cannot coexist in the peaceful sense with a Soviet satellite."

The President is not being honest with the American people and with himself when he continues to hide his head in the sand to the obvious threat to our country and to the whole world.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

(During the delivery of Mr. DOMINICK's address, unanimous consent was granted for the inclusion of the following editorial at this point in the RECORD:)

CUBAN PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT

Kentucky's Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, a familiar figure to all Cincinnatians, is one of a group of Senators who has supported a proposal that this country get moving again on the Cuban problem.

Specifically, these men propose that we encourage the Cuban exiles to form a unit which we could recognize as a provisional government for Cuba. It may come as a surprise to many that we still recognize the Castro government—but that's the fact. All we've done is withdraw our diplomatic representation. By recognizing a new provisional government we would finally withdraw all recognition of Castro.

But the most dramatic part of the plan would be to give this new government a headquarters right on Cuban soil—at our mighty Guantanamo naval base. The effect would be similar to our sheltering the Government of Nationalist China on Formosa, behind the might of our fleet. But, in Cuba, the effect could be far more productive of results. It would provide a rallying point for the Cuban underground, a reason for them to keep up efforts which lately have been dwindling due to the discouragement of a do-nothing U.S. policy. It would serve effective notice on the Soviet that the United States is not kidding about its demands that Soviet troops be pulled out, all of them. It would reassert American leadership in inter-American affairs. Finally, it would achieve exactly the objectives of the Bay of Pigs invasion but without firing a shot. That whole invasion, as Senator MORTON has revealed, was planned simply to acquire a beachhead on Cuban soil from which a new government could be recognized. Inevitably, it was felt, the Castro regime would crumble under the gathering strength that such a provisional government would gather.

Whether or not this is the best plan it is at least a plan. And until someone can come along with a better one, we hope that the Guantanamo proposal receives full and serious consideration.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5279) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. JORDAN of Idaho in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 17, 1963, pp. 12764–12766, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, as this bill passed the Senate it provided for appropriations totaling $985,693,400 for the agencies and bureaus of the Department of the Interior, exclusive of the Bureau of Reclamation and power marketing agencies, and the various related agencies, including the U.S. Forest Service.

The conference committee bill provides appropriations totaling $958,456,500 for the programs and activities of these agencies. This total is under the budget estimates of $1,028,509,000 by $70,052,500; over the House bill of $928,625,200 by $29,831,300; and under the Senate bill of $985,693,400 by $27,236,900.

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a tabulation setting out the appropriation for the current year, the budget estimate, the House allowance, the Senate allowance, and the conference allowance for each appropriation in the bill.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Item	Appropriations, 1963 (including Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963)	Budget estimates, 1964	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance	Conference allowance compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE I–DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR								
PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT								
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT								
Management of lands and resources	$44, 410, 200	$46, 286, 000	$43, 292, 500	$44, 652, 500	$44, 152, 500	−$2, 133, 500	+$860, 000	−$500, 000
Construction	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	300, 000	300, 000	300, 000	−700, 000		
Public lands development roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization)		1, 000, 000	750, 000	760, 000	760, 000	−240, 000	+10, 000	
Oregon and California grant lands (indefinite appropriation of receipts)	(7, 175, 000)	(7, 325, 000)	(7, 325, 000)	(7, 325, 000)	(7, 325, 000)			
Range improvements (indefinite appropriation of receipts)	(697, 000)	(967, 000)	(967, 000)	(967, 000)	(967, 000)			
Total, Bureau of Land Management	45, 410, 200	48, 286, 000	44, 342, 500	45, 712, 500	45, 212, 500	−3, 073, 500	+870, 000	−500, 000
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS								
Education and welfare services	82, 508, 400	92, 610, 000	88, 350, 000	90, 381, 500	89, 235, 250	−3, 374, 750	+885, 250	−1, 146, 250
Resources management	35, 590, 000	39, 402, 000	37, 239, 300	38, 147, 900	37, 691, 300	−1, 710, 700	+452, 000	−456, 000
Revolving fund for loans	4, 000, 000	2, 000, 000	2, 000, 000	2, 000, 000	2, 000, 000			
Construction	53, 775, 000	56, 200, 000	55, 500, 000	60, 448, 000	58, 300, 000	+2, 100, 000	+2, 800, 000	−2, 148, 000
Road construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	18, 000, 000	16, 000, 000	15, 000, 000	15, 000, 000	15, 000, 000	−1, 000, 000		
General administrative expenses	4, 190, 950	4, 312, 000	4, 265, 000	4, 265, 000	4, 265, 000	−47, 000		
Menominee educational grants		132, 000	132, 000	132, 000	132, 000			
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs, exclusive of tribal funds	198, 064, 350	210, 656, 000	202, 486, 300	210, 374, 400	206, 623, 550	−4, 032, 450	+4, 137, 250	−3, 750, 850
Tribal funds (not included in totals of this tabulation)	(3, 000, 000)	(3, 000, 000)	(3, 000, 000)	(3, 000, 000)				
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE								
Management and protection	25, 383, 904	28, 816, 000	27, 068, 000	27, 375, 000	27, 124, 000	−1, 692, 000	+56, 000	−251, 000
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities	20, 578, 550	22, 295, 000	21, 375, 000	21, 758, 500	21, 566, 750	−728, 250	+191, 750	−191, 750
Construction	45, 775, 500	42, 942, 000	32, 697, 000	36, 895, 200	32, 697, 000	−10, 245, 000		−4, 198, 200
Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	27, 000, 000	29, 000, 000	28, 000, 000	30, 100, 000	29, 000, 000		+1, 000, 000	−1, 100, 000
General administrative expenses	2, 055, 200	2, 303, 000	2, 120, 000	2, 153, 500	2, 136, 750	−166, 250	+16, 750	−16, 750
Total, National Park Service	120, 793, 154	125, 356, 000	111, 260, 000	118, 282, 200	112, 524, 500	−12, 831, 500	+1, 264, 500	−5, 757, 700
BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION								
Salaries and expenses	1, 201, 096	2, 462, 000	1, 900, 000	1, 900, 000	1, 900, 000	−562, 000		

Item	Appropriations, 1963 (including Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963)	Budget estimates, 1964	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance	Conference allowance compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued								
PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT—Continued								
OFFICE OF TERRITORIES								
Administration of territories	$13,796,500	$13,819,000	$13,000,000	$13,000,000	$13,000,000	−$819,000		
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	13,890,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000			
Total, Office of Territories	27,686,500	28,819,000	28,000,000	28,000,000	28,000,000	−819,000		
Total, Public Land Management	393,155,300	415,579,000	387,988,800	404,269,100	394,260,550	−21,318,450	+$6,271,750	−$10,008,550
MINERAL RESOURCES								
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY								
Surveys, investigations, and research	57,943,000	68,015,000	63,700,000	64,808,500	63,700,000	−4,315,000		−1,108,500
BUREAU OF MINES								
Conservation and development of mineral resources	27,502,450	30,277,000	29,054,000	29,926,500	29,404,000	−873,000	+350,000	−522,500
Health and safety	8,448,000	8,953,000	8,664,000	8,664,000	8,664,000	−289,000		
Construction	425,000	6,692,000				−6,692,000		
General administrative expenses	1,390,950	1,473,000	1,460,000	1,460,000	1,460,000	−13,000		
Development and operation of helium properties:								
Borrowing authorization	(6,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(−7,000,000)		
Annual limitation on contract authorization		(17,500,000)				(−17,500,000)		
Total, Bureau of Mines	37,767,100	47,395,000	39,178,000	40,050,500	39,528,000	−7,867,000	+350,000	−522,500
OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH								
Salaries and expenses	3,450,000	5,000,000	3,200,000	6,575,000	5,075,000	+75,000	+1,875,000	−1,500,000
OFFICE OF MINERALS EXPLORATION								
Salaries and expenses	750,000	900,000	850,000	850,000	850,000	−50,000		
Lead and zinc stabilization program	2,450,000							
Total, Office of Minerals Exploration	3,200,000	900,000	850,000	850,000	850,000	−50,000		
OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS								
Salaries and expenses	557,600	642,000	610,000	621,000	615,500	−26,500	+5,500	−5,500
OFFICE OF MINERALS AND SOLID FUELS								
Salaries and expenses		110,000				−110,000		
Total, Mineral Resources	102,917,700	122,062,000	107,538,000	112,905,000	109,768,500	−12,293,500	+2,230,500	−3,136,500
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE								
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND WILDLIFE								
Salaries and expenses	374,450	386,000	386,000	386,000	386,000			
BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES								
Management and investigations of resources	15,883,400	19,028,000	17,175,000	18,682,500	17,832,900	−1,195,100	+657,900	−849,600
Management and investigations of resources (special foreign currency program)	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000			
Construction	8,473,000	5,753,000	1,800,000	4,458,000	4,450,000	−1,303,000	+2,650,000	−8,000
Construction of fishing vessels	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000			
General administrative expenses	621,850	695,000	640,000	653,000	653,000	−42,000	+13,000	
Administration of Pribilof Islands (indefinite appropriation of receipts)	(2,017,000)	(2,553,000)	(2,468,000)	(2,468,000)	(2,468,000)	(−85,000)		
Limitation on administrative expenses, fisheries loan fund	(258,550)	(270,000)	(270,000)	(270,000)	(270,000)			
Total, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries	26,028,250	26,526,000	20,665,000	24,843,500	23,985,900	−2,540,100	+3,320,900	−857,600
BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE								
Management and investigations of resources	27,729,500	31,484,000	29,879,400	31,685,400	30,589,900	−894,100	+710,500	−1,095,500
Construction	6,922,300	2,860,000	3,678,000	5,898,500	5,243,500	+2,383,500	+1,565,500	−655,000
Migratory bird conservation account	7,000,000	12,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	−2,000,000		
General administrative expenses	1,292,750	1,410,000	1,325,000	1,359,000	1,359,000	−51,000	+34,000	
Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	42,944,550	47,754,000	44,882,400	48,942,900	47,192,400	−561,600	+2,310,000	−1,750,500
Total, Fish and Wildlife Service	69,347,250	74,666,000	65,933,400	74,172,400	71,564,300	−3,101,700	+5,630,900	−2,608,100
OFFICE OF SALINE WATER								
Salaries and expenses	7,600,000	10,500,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	−500,000		
Operation and maintenance	2,000,000	1,850,000	1,850,000	1,850,000	1,850,000			
Total, Office of Saline Water	9,600,000	12,350,000	11,850,000	11,850,000	11,850,000	−500,000		
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR								
Salaries and expenses	3,852,650	4,083,000	4,000,000	4,010,000	4,000,000	−83,000		−10,000
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY								
Salaries and expenses	3,482,050	4,084,000	3,790,000	3,893,400	3,858,400	−225,600	+68,400	−35,000
Total, definite appropriations	582,354,950	632,824,000	581,100,200	611,099,900	595,301,750	−37,522,250	+14,201,550	−15,798,150
Total, indefinite appropriations of receipts	9,889,000	10,845,000	10,760,000	10,760,000	10,760,000	−85,000		
Total, borrowing authorizations	6,000,000	13,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	−7,000,000		
Total, annual contract authority		17,500,000				−17.500,000		
Total, title I, Department of the Interior	598,243,950	674,169,000	597,860,200	627,859.900	612,061,750	−62,10 ,250	+14,201,550	−15,798,150

Item	Appropriations, 1963 (including Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963)	Budget estimates, 1964	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance	Conference allowance compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES								
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE								
FOREST SERVICE								
Forest protection and utilization:								
Forest land management	157, 232, 900	150, 656, 000	143, 609, 000	150, 147, 000	147, 312, 000	−3, 344, 000	+3, 703, 000	−2, 835, 000
Forest research	25, 566, 500	23, 798, 000	23, 948, 000	30, 755, 000	25, 893, 000	+2, 095, 000	+1, 945, 000	−4, 862, 000
State and private forestry cooperation	15, 875, 600	15, 943, 000	15, 943, 000	15, 943, 000	15, 943, 000			
Total, forest protection and utilization	198, 675, 000	190, 397, 000	183, 500, 000	196, 845, 000	189, 148, 000	−1, 249, 000	+5, 648, 000	−7, 697, 000
Forest roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization)	44, 500, 000	66, 400, 000	60, 000, 000	66, 400, 000	63, 200, 000	−3, 200, 000	+3, 200, 000	−3, 200, 000
Access roads	2, 000, 000							
Acquisition of lands for national forest:								
Wasatch National Forest		$20, 000	$20, 000	$250, 000	$250, 000	+$230, 000	+$230, 000	
Superior National Forest	$2, 000, 000							
Special acts (indefinite appropriation of receipts)	(30, 000)	(70, 000)	(70, 000)	(70, 000)	(70, 000)			
Cooperative range improvements (indefinite appropriation of receipts)	(700, 000)	(700, 000)	(700, 000)	(700, 000)	(700, 000)			
Assistance to States for tree planting	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000			
Total, definite appropriations	248, 175, 000	257, 817, 000	244, 520, 000	264, 495, 000	253, 598, 000	−4, 219, 000	+3, 430, 000	−$3, 200, 000
Total, indefinite appropriations	730, 000	770, 000	770, 000	770, 000	770, 000			
Total, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture	248, 905, 000	258, 587, 000	245, 290, 000	265, 265, 000	254, 368, 000	−4, 219, 000	+9, 078, 000	−10, 897, 000
FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW								
Salaries and expenses	70, 000	70, 000	50, 000	70, 000	65, 000	−5, 000	+15, 000	−5, 000
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS								
Salaries and expenses	82, 850	91, 000	91, 000	91, 000	91, 000			
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE								
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE								
Indian health activities	56, 836, 250	58, 985, 000	58, 750, 000	59, 171, 500	58, 960, 750	−24, 250	+210, 750	−210, 750
Construction of Indian health facilities	9, 335, 000	6, 096, 000	5, 000, 000	5, 676, 000	5, 350, 000	−746, 000	+350, 000	−326, 000
Total, Public Health Service	66, 171, 250	65, 081, 000	63, 750, 000	64, 847, 500	64, 310, 750	−770, 250	+560, 750	−536, 750
INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses	296, 650	313, 000	297, 000	297, 000	297, 000	−16, 000		
NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses	675, 000	717, 000	650, 000	650, 000	650, 000	−67, 000		
Land acquisition, National Capital park, parkway, and playground system	100, 000							
Total, National Capital Planning Commission	775, 000	717, 000	650, 000	650, 000	650, 000	−67, 000		
NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY								
Salaries and expenses	3, 000, 000	2, 200, 000	1, 000, 000	1, 0000, 00	1, 000, 000	−1, 200, 000		
Land acquisition and construction	400, 000							
Total, National Capital Transportation Agency	3, 400, 000	2, 200, 000	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	−1, 200, 000		
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION								
Salaries and expenses	11, 060, 550	13, 324, 000	13, 124, 000	13, 124, 000	13, 124, 000	−200, 000		
Remodeling of Civil Service Commission Building		6, 465, 000		5, 465, 000	5, 465, 000	−1, 000, 000	+5, 465, 000	
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park	1, 275, 000	1, 736, 000	1, 275, 000	1, 275, 000	1, 275, 000	−461, 000		
National Air Museum		511, 000		511, 000	511, 000		+511, 000	
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art	2, 113, 850	2, 138, 000	2, 138, 000	2, 138, 000	2, 138, 000			
Total, Smithsonian Institution	14, 449, 400	24, 174, 000	16, 537, 000	22, 513, 000	22, 513, 000	−1, 661, 000	+5, 976, 000	
TRANSITIONAL GRANTS TO ALASKA								
Grants	3, 000, 000	3, 000, 000	3, 000, 000	3, 000, 000	3, 000, 000			
CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION								
Expenses	100, 000	107, 000	100, 000	100, 000	100, 000	−7, 000		
Total, definite appropriations	336, 520, 150	353, 570, 000	329, 995, 000	357, 063, 500	345, 624, 750	−7, 945, 250	+15, 629, 750	−11, 438, 750
Total, indefinite appropriations	730, 000	770, 000	770, 000	770, 000	770, 000			
Total, title II, related agencies	337, 250, 150	354, 340, 000	330, 765, 000	357, 833, 500	346, 394, 750	−7, 945, 250	+15, 629, 750	−11, 438, 750
TITLE III—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION								
Revolving fund	200, 000							
Limitation on administrative expenses, Virgin Islands Corporation	(183, 800)	(186, 000)	(186, 000)	(186, 000)	(186, 000)			
Total, title III, Virgin Islands Corporation	200, 000							
Grand total:								
Definite appropriations	919, 075, 100	986, 394, 000	911, 095, 200	968, 163, 400	940, 926, 500	−45, 467, 500	+29, 831, 300	−27, 236, 900
Indefinite appropriation of receipts	10, 619, 000	11, 615, 000	11, 530, 000	11, 530, 000	11, 530, 000	−85, 000		
Borrowing authorizations	6, 000, 000	13, 000, 000	6, 000, 000	6, 000, 000	6, 000, 000	−7, 000, 000		
Annual contract authority		17, 500, 000				−17, 500, 000		
Total	935, 694, 100	1, 028, 509, 000	928, 625, 200	985, 693, 400	958, 456, 500	−70, 052, 500	+29, 831, 300	−27, 236, 900

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the distinguished chairman of the committee of conference yield, so that I may address a question to him?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that the House conferees insisted, as a condition to getting a conference report, that there be eliminated the item of $500,000, as requested by the Budget, for the acquisition of land in the Everglades National Park, in Florida?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. The House would not agree to it, so we had to yield in order to get a unanimous report.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall not endeavor to hold up the conference report, because I realize the difficulties of handling a bill containing hundreds of details, such as this bill does.

However, I should like the RECORD to show that I believe the State of Florida and its people are not being fairly treated on this item. The State contributed approximately 850,000 acres of land to the project without any Federal participation. Numerous private owners contributed sizable tracts of land. In addition, the State contributed $2 million to acquire various odd lots of land that were left over when the original park was created, and which had not been secured.

Notwithstanding that, and in spite of the fact that several years ago Congress approved an authorization of $2 million for the Federal Government to do something in this field by acquiring lands, we have never been able to make even a start on the program.

I desire the RECORD to show also that it is particularly unfortunate this year that this action has been taken, because another agency of the Federal Government, the Farmers Home Administration, has procured, under foreclosure, a tract of about 5,000 acres adjoining a most colorful and attractive part of the Everglades National Park. The Farmers Home Administration is willing to transfer this tract to the Park Service, provided only that it is reimbursed for the funds which it has invested in the tract, which come to a total of nearly $500,000. It seems to me that when it is suggested that the Federal Government take money out of one pocket and put it into another, to carry out a long-term commitment—a serious commitment—by beginning this land acquisition, it is particularly unfortunate that Congress hesitates to do so.

I hope that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will be helpful in seeing if this wrong cannot be rectified in some way or other.

Mr. HAYDEN. I sincerely hope that that will be possible. The House was adamant, and it was necessary to have a bill. I am sure the Senator understands that situation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do, indeed. I thank the Senator from Arizona for his arduous effort in behalf of the bill. It has been a hard bill, a heavy one to carry. I am glad to vote with him for the approval of the conference report. However, I deeply regret the omission of the item I have mentioned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REQUIREMENTS FOR ARTICLES IMPORTED IN CONTAINERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2513) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Chair indicate what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is House bill 2513.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is ready to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, House bill 2513, known as the marking bill, would close a serious loophole in our marking law as it applies to imported articles. Section 304 of the Tariff Act states:

> Every article imported into the United States, and its immediate container, and the package in which such article is imported, shall be marked, stamped, branded, or labeled, in legible English words, in a conspicuous place, in such manner as to indicate the country of origin of such article, in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

It has been found that, in a number of instances, imported goods are taken out of their original packages which may be properly marked, and placed in other packages which are not properly marked. In some instances the new packages closely resemble packages containing goods made in the United States or seem to imitate packages containing well-known goods produced in some other country.

It is easy to see how a purchaser might be misled by such repackaging. In any event it seems obvious that the intent of the law requiring imported goods to be marked with the country of origin is being evaded.

I shall not discuss the merits or demerits of the marking law. It has been on the books for a long time, and seems to have been tested and approved by the public. As long as the law exists, it should be observed and loopholes should be closed.

There is ample provision in the bill so that hardship and changes in packaging practices of long standing will be avoided. The Secretary of the Treasury is empowered to prevent the application of the law when he finds that compliance would necessitate such substantial changes in customary trade practices as to cause undue hardship and, when the article is repackaged, that the repackaging is otherwise than for the purpose of concealing the origin of the articles.

This would mean that such items as coffee, tea, spices, and similar products which have long been imported and blended, cooked, mixed, or packaged for distribution under labels that have become familiar to domestic consumers, would not be affected. Some meat products made in the United States are known to contain some foreign meats. Not only has the commodity been improved, cooked, and blended; it would be most difficult to tell which item contained meat from other countries. Here again the Secretary of the Treasury would be empowered to provide for exception.

We could not enumerate here all of the possible exceptions. In the future there may be cases upon which the Secretary may need to make a ruling. However, in general, it is anticipated that the more serious violations of the intent of the marking law will cease when and if the bill becomes law.

The bill was reported unanimously by the Ways and Means Committee, and passed the House without opposition. The Finance Committee reported the bill by a substantial majority. I hope we can give it a favorable vote.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I intend to oppose the bill and to move that it be recommitted; and a little later I shall detail to the Senate my reasons for doing so.

However, for the moment I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia whether he is at liberty to tell us the vote in the Finance Committee on the question of reporting the bill.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The vote was 13 to 3.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. President, as soon as the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] has made his statement on this measure, I shall seek recognition.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, House bill 2513, which has been reported favorably by the Committee on Finance, should be passed.

As explained in detail in the report filed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, the bill is intended to close a loophole which is permitting some imported goods to be sold in the United States without disclosure of their foreign origin.

Under our tariff laws, it is intended that the American consumer be advised of the foreign origin of imported goods. Without an accurate indication of the country of origin of such goods, the consumer can be misled into believing that the goods are either of domestic origin, or that they originated in some foreign country other than the actual country of origin. In some cases consumers have a preference for goods of foreign origin, and particularly for goods of a certain class originating in one country, rather than another. Irish linen, French perfumes, and Japanese silks are examples.

There are two major circumstances which result in imported goods reaching the American consumer without marks of origin. First, there are some classes of goods which are oftentimes repackaged by the U.S. importer. These are relatively small articles imported in large quantities for repackaging by the importer and distribution in commerce in this country in smaller packages. When these goods are repackaged, no marking of the foreign origin of the goods is placed on the new package. Various types of metal manufactures are so treated, including screws, nuts, rivets, washers, small handtools, electrical parts, and many other items. These come from such countries of origin as Japan, Germany, England, France, Belgium, and even from countries located behind the Iron Curtain.

Fruits and vegetables from Central and South American countries are also frequently imported in large shipping containers. After they arrive in this country they are repackaged and sold in smaller packages which do not indicate their foreign origin.

The second class of articles to which the bill is directed are containers which are imported in large quantities for use by bottlers or packers of beverages and food. Until recently these containers, such as glass containers, had to have the name of the country of origin marked on the base of the container. In 1960, at the request of an importer of soft-drink bottles made in Japan, the Bureau of Customs ruled that the mark of origin need not be placed on the glass containers themselves, so long as such marking was present on the large shipping containers in which the glass bottles were shipped from Japan to the United States.

Of course, these glass containers are unpacked by the importer and are used as containers for beverages of various kinds. Lacking any marking of origin at all on the bottle, the U.S. consumer would assume that these were of U.S. origin.

Mr. President, there are two basic faults present when foreign goods without any identification of origin move in commerce in the United States. The first fault is that the American consumer is deceived and misled into believing that the article is either made in this country or that it originates in a foreign country where that particular origin would be a matter of prestige. The second fault exists when the consumer, already deceived as to the actual origin of the article, becomes dissatisfied for one reason or another with the article itself, either because it is unserviceable or is not up to his expectations from the point of view of quality, and becomes dissatisfied with such products produced domestically or by the foreign country which the consumer mistakenly believes to be the true origin of the article in question.

Put rather simply, the initial deception results in a consumer's purchasing an article he would not otherwise purchase, and subsequently becoming so dissatisfied with the article that the consumer would not again purchase a similar article originating in the country where the consumer mistakenly believes his purchase was produced. This latter consequence is unfair not only to the consumer but to the domestic producers or the foreign producers who are mistakenly believed by the purchaser to have been the origin of the merchandise in question.

For most classes of goods brought into the United States this type of deception and unfair competition cannot exist because of the necessity for marks of origin. But with a growing number of classes of merchandise this deception and misunderstanding can come into being because of the repackaging exemption or other Customs rulings which deprive the consumer of this basic information.

Mr. President, I cannot imagine on what basis serious objections could be voiced to a bill such as H.R. 2513 which obviously has as its purpose fair play for the American consumer and American and foreign producers whose goods enjoy the good will of the American consumer. Nevertheless, we have come to expect that any legislation remotely connected with foreign trade draws almost automatically a phalanx of opposition from those offices in the executive department of the Government engaged in one aspect or another of foreign affairs—and this bill is no exception.

The State Department is opposed to the bill, and the position of the Commerce Department, while difficult to classify precisely, certainly does not amount to support of the bill. Finally, the Treasury Department has voiced its misgivings about the bill. The objections of these Departments, however, are so stereotyped, routine, and pro forma that I am confident a brief consideration of them will satisfy the Members of this body, as it did the overwhelming majority of the members of the Committee on Finance, that the legislation is meritorious and should be passed.

First, it is suggested by the State Department that the bill would be contrary to the foreign economic policy objectives of the United States. This would occur, according to the Department, because the necessity of marking goods to show foreign origin is asserted to be burdensome, so that a marking requirement would become a clog upon foreign trade.

The answer to this objection is twofold. The foreign economic policy of the United States is to be found in the statutes and international agreements of the United States now in effect dealing with foreign trade. The Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, has through the years imposed, and now imposes, a general requirement that imported goods be marked to show the country of origin. The bill, H.R. 2513, is not, therefore, concerned at this late date with formulating a new policy which catches our foreign trade partners by surprise, but rather in closing a loophole which has developed in our longstanding policy so that some imports do not enter the markets in this country with an unfair advantage over domestic products and other foreign products of the same class by masquerading as one or the other.

Furthermore, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the basic trade agreement defining the trade relations between this country and 49 other nations of the world, specifically recognizes at article IX that marks of origin may be required by all participating countries. In this connection I must point out that paragraph 2 of article IX of GATT acknowledges that due regard must be had "to the necessity of protecting consumers against fraudulent or misleading indications" of origin but requires the countries which are parties to the agreement to enforce their marking requirements so as to reduce difficulties and inconveniences to exporting countries to a minimum. The bill, H.R. 2513, complies with the spirit of article IX by a provision to be found on page 3, lines 5 through 12, which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to exempt articles from the necessity for marking when compliance with the marking requirements would necessitate such substantial changes in customary trade practices as to cause undue hardship, if the repackaging of such an article is not for the purpose of concealing its origin.

In view of these facts, Mr. President, there is no substance to the position of the executive departments that the bill would be contrary to our foreign economic policy.

As a second objection to the bill, the executive department, through the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury concerned with customs matters, advances the thought that it would be difficult for the Bureau of Customs to administer the bill. In explanation of this contention it was suggested that it would be necessary for the Bureau to follow each and every importation after its release from the customs until it had been sold in commerce. The Bureau of Customs does not like to follow goods after they are released from Customs custody.

But this argument is a strained or artificial one which ignores the realities of the situation. There are several laws of long standing in the United States administered by the Customs which require inquiries after imported goods have left Customs custody. Perhaps the best known example is the antidumping law. Theoretically every imported article brought into the United States is subject to investigation under the Antidumping Act. The Secretary of the Treasury is obliged to initiate an investigation, withhold appraisement of similar merchandise, and make certain findings whenever he has reason to believe that the imported goods are being sold in the United States at less than fair value. Under at least one of the definitions in that act, one of the benchmarks which the Secretary is to use in determining whether dumping is taking place is the price at which the imported goods are sold in the United States by the U.S. importer.

It would be possible to urge in connection with the Antidumping Act, as the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury urges in connection with this bill, that the burden of following each and every importation into commerce to ascertain the required information would make for impossibility of administration. But in the case of the Antidumping Act, as in the case of this bill, H.R. 2513, a rational plan of administration would be to act on the basis of complaints. This is one of the principal ways in which articles are identified for investigation under the Antidumping Act. And when the Customs Service determines to initiate an investigation, it is assisted by Treasury agents who are available to the collectors at the various ports to visit the importer's place of business or other business houses which purchase articles from the importer in order to inquire into and ascertain facts pertinent to the law in question.

Furthermore, each and every importation brought into the United States is appropriately identified in a written document called the entry document, to which is attached the commercial invoice and other papers. These are kept on file at the port at which the goods are received. I am advised that it is customary for the customs appraiser or the customs examiner to make notations on the entry document to indicate whether or not compliance has been had with the marking statute. The bill, H.R. 2513, would require the shipping containers in which articles subject to the bill are received to bear words stating that if the contents of the shipping containers are repackaged, the new packages must contain the marking of origin. It is obviously necessary that the presence or absence of these words on the shipping container be ascertained by the customs service before the goods are released from customs custody. Under the bill, goods whose containers are not so marked may be correctly marked while the goods are still in customs custody.

The point of this explanation is that the paperwork on hand at the port can or should indicate on its face whether or not the particular importation, or any part of it, was subject to this bill. Thereafter, a simple procedure of spot checking a reasonable percentage of such importations would enable the customs service through its investigative arm, the Treasury agents, to confirm compliance with the bill. In those instances in which lack of compliance was found to exist, the publication of that fact through appropriate published Treasury decisions would serve to acquaint importers and others engaged in commerce generally of the enforcement of the bill.

The third objection voiced by the executive department is that the bill is not needed because the Federal Trade Commission has the authority to act against those selling imported goods in commerce without marks of origin. This argument is an unusual one in that it impliedly admits the necessity of legal means to prevent the deception of the American consumer which results when foreign goods are sold without an accurate disclosure of origin. The difficulty with depending entirely on the Federal Trade Commission is that that agency gets no notice, as the Bureau of Customs does, of each importation subject to marking requirements. It may only act when it discovers goods in movement in commerce which lack the marks of origin. A moment's reflection should convince the Members of this body, who are familiar with the ever-increasing volume of U.S. imports, that such an approach is equivalent to an attempt to stamp out malaria through the use of fly swatters rather than measures to prevent the breeding of millions of disease-containing mosquitoes in the first place.

There is another compelling answer to the administration's position of "let the FTC do it." When Congress has had occasion in recent years to consider legislation dealing with marking requirements on imports, where primary jurisdiction was given by the legislation to the Federal Trade Commission, it has also imposed a requirement that imported goods be marked to contain the information required by such acts and that the Secretary of the Treasury enforce such marking requirements. An example is the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act passed by the Congress in 1958. That legislation dealt primarily with the necessity for all textile products moving in commerce in the United States to be marked so as to show fiber content and the percentage by weight of each fiber present in the article. That act required imported textile articles to be marked so as to show not only the fiber content, but also the country of origin.

The primary responsibility for administration of that act was placed with the Federal Trade Commission. Nevertheless, the Congress in that act gave the Secretary of the Treasury the responsibility of enforcing all of the marking requirements of the act with respect to imported textiles.

If it were correct to say that the imposition of a marking requirement on imported goods acts as a barrier to imports, we had an excellent opportunity to observe this rule in operation as applied to textile articles. But as all Members of this body are painfully aware, the imports of textile articles have skyrocketed since 1958 notwithstanding the necessity that this ever-growing body of imports be marked, not only as to country of origin, but also to fiber content.

In my opinion, Mr. President, the example of textiles and the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act demolishes the argument advanced by the administration that marking requirements are a burden on imports, that the customs service cannot practicably enforce marking requirements, and that jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission is sufficient to secure compliance with a marking statute.

Finally, Mr. President, it is suggested by officials of this administration that since President Eisenhower vetoed a similar marking bill passed by the Congress in 1960, President Kennedy will, of course, veto this bill if it is passed by the Congress. This argument contains the implication that President Kennedy routinely follows the policies established by President Eisenhower, a suggestion which, while novel and intriguing, has been shown by now to have no foundation in fact.

Secondly, this suggestion implies that the reasons supplied to President Eisenhower for his veto message are beyond challenge. We find in looking at President Eisenhower's veto message of September 7, 1960, of the bill, H.R. 5054, that he relied upon the arguments which I have shown in my remarks today to be without foundation. President Eisenhower was concerned that the marking requirement could be a hindrance to trade. The textile experience which I referred to earlier disproves this possibility.

Second, President Eisenhower referred to the fact that the United States has agreed with other trading nations that "such hindrances" as marking requirements "should be reduced to a minimum." The fact is, Mr. President, that no one seemed to have invited President Eisenhower's attention in 1960 to article IX of GATT in which the United States and virtually all of its trading partners in the world agreed that marks of origin could be required by each member country as a means of protecting consumers against fraudulent or misleading indications. What the United States agreed to reduce to a minimum was not the requirement for marks of origin but, rather, any difficulties and inconveniences which such measures might cause.

The reduction of inconveniences is provided for in the bill now before the Senate by the provision which I referred to earlier which would allow the Secretary of the Treasury to exempt any article where marking would be such a departure from long-established trade practice as to cause undue hardship, and where the omission of marking was not entertained in order to conceal the origin of the product.

Mr. President, I do not believe that President Eisenhower should have vetoed H.R. 5054. It is evident to me that the reasons which were supplied to him for the veto were not well taken. Whatever the merits of his action, our present consideration of this bill, H.R. 2513, should be based upon a fresh appraisal of the need for the legislation and the merit or lack of merit of the arguments advanced against its enactment. The purpose of the legislation is so directly related to fairplay in the U.S. market for American consumers and for domestic and foreign producers that I have no question about its necessity and appropriateness.

The arguments which have been advanced against enactment of the legislation are so shallow and unsubstantial that I have no difficulty in rejecting them out of hand. The opposition of the executive department to the bill is significant not as an indication of the attitude of this particular administration, but of the zeal with which foreign trade personnel in the executive department in any administration oppose any measure which requires a minimum amount of fairplay for our domestic producers. It makes no difference whether such proposals as H.R. 2513 are squarely within the spirit of rights which the executive department has retained for the United States in international agreements, or whether they seem to contravene such rights. The result is always the same: the executive department opposes without regard to the real significance of the measure at hand.

Mr. President, in my judgment, H.R. 2513 is a good bill. It should be enacted. The necessity for this type of legislation has been recognized by previous Congresses.

This legislation imposes no great hardship upon importers nor upon domestic distributors who import in bulk. Many foreign nations have similar packaging requirements. Our own exporters must meet these foreign requirements.

H.R. 2513 was carefully drafted so as to impose no undue hardship where there is no attempt at deception. It recognizes certain practices of long standing and makes exception for those specific cases.

The report on page 2 and 3 explains that:

> The provision authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to except any article where he finds the "compliance * * * would necessitate such substantial changes in customary trade practices as to cause undue hardship," was drafted in this broad manner so that all categories of items might be protected if they meet the test applied by the Secretary. It would be impossible for the Congress to provide by law for the exceptions item by item, so no attempt was made to mention them in the law. It would seem to follow, however, that the cleaning and mixing of spices, for example and subsequent repackaging in the type of packages that have for a long time been recognized by the consumer would not come under the purview of the bill. The same would apply to coffee, tea, chocolate, mixed nuts, olive oil, and a number of other products which have been imported and repackaged over a number of years and without any attempt to deceive the consumer.

There are many other items that could be added to this list. No one would maintain that domestically produced candies, which might contain sugar which comes from Latin America, chocolate from Africa, flavoring extracts and nuts from other countries, would be required to comply with the labeling requirements.

I ought to mention one other product because my own State is vitally interested.

In similar fashion, meats are imported by many packers to be used in manufacturing processes. They are inspected abroad, at the port of entry, and again at the packing or processing plant. There, meats from various countries may be blended with domestic meats, processed and packaged in the form of sausages for instance. The product, whether it be hot dogs or bologna, was made here. This practice is nearly as old as the industry itself. In such case labeling would be both impractical and impossible on the originally imported meats and would be totally misleading, if so labeled, on the finished product, for, in truth the finished product would have been made in these United States of America.

So, Mr. President, to require labeling in the case of meats would clearly be one where "compliance would necessitate such substantial changes in customary trade practices as to cause undue hardship." Such meats should, of course, be exempted.

In view of the action taken by the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and the very substantial vote in the Finance Committee of the Senate, after all the testimony was presented, the Senate should not approve a motion to send the bill back to committee. It ought to approve the bill and send it to the President for his signature.

I yield the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I propose to move to recommit the pending bill to the Committee on Finance, and I should like to ask for the yeas and nays. Inasmuch as many Members of the Senate are present in the Chamber, I now move to recommit the bill, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I believe that the pending bill, which comes to us from the Finance Committee, by a somewhat divided vote should be recommitted. The vote in committee was 11 to 4. The previous figure I was given was apparently in error. However, that is not material to the situation before the Senate at the present time. There was a minority opposed to the bill in the Committee on Finance, which felt that the bill should not be enacted into law. I feel that it should not be enacted. I have some very solid reasons for that feeling.

It represents a very dangerous step on the part of the United States at this time, to warrant fully its being sent back to the Committee on Finance.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has made a very fine speech, as is his wont, in the greatest detail. He has done his homework well. He said, very frankly—and I lead off with this argument—that notwithstanding the fact that no governmental department favors the enactment of the bill, it should nevertheless be passed. The fact is that every governmental department opposes the enactment of the bill.

The Senator from Illinois said that this point was not made very clear by the committee. I ask Members of the Senate to read the very clear statement of the Committee on Finance, at page 4, under "Departmental Reports."

The report states:

> The reports on this bill, submitted by the Departments of Commerce, State, and Treasury, and the Bureau of the Budget are printed in the hearings held by the Committee on Finance on March 21, 1963. These reports were not in favor of enactment of this legislation.

Every governmental department with responsibility in this matter says "no." President Eisenhower vetoed a similar bill in 1960. The proponents of the bill, in effect, ask us to pass the bill on the ground that the governmental departments and President Eisenhower were misled and did not know what they were talking about. They certainly knew what they were talking about. President Eisenhower knew what he was talking about. What he was talking about is as pertinent now as it was then. His reasons for opposing the bill are as pertinent today as they were then.

If we pass a bill like this, we shall give the best possible argument to the European Common Market to tell us precisely where to go and what to do with our desires to have them change their preferences with respect to agriculture. We are telling the European Common Market that foreign trade with us is a one-way street. We do not have to speculate as to exactly what that means. We had a very neat situation not long ago when we raised the tariff on Belgian glass. The European Economic Community immediately turned around and retaliated in exactly and precisely the amount by which we thought we had increased the tariff.

The most scathing indictment of measures of this character is that kind of situation.

The distinguished minority leader said that marking had been required in the textile field, and that imports increased. That is all the more reason why we should not give our friends abroad, who are looking for exactly this kind of argument, the right to say that we are protectionists, that this sort of thing is endemic in our outlook, and that we cannot be relied upon in tariff matters.

Passage of the bill would vex the situation even more.

What does the bill do? The bill imposes totally new duties and responsibilities which do not exist. It imposes a duty and responsibility with respect to repackaging. It would require the policing of jobbers throughout the country to keep track of this situation. The Treasury Department says it is in no position to do that. The bill would pose a new problem for the Treasury Department, requiring the policing of this situation, and requiring a host of additional employees.

It is a most amazing thing to me that many persons who argue for cutting down the Federal bureaucracy and reducing the power of life and death which the Government has over business should see any virtue in a measure which would increase the Federal bureaucracy and give real power of a kind which has not existed before.

The bill also calls for forfeiture, which is a penalty not now imposed.

At the present time where markings are not made upon a particular package in accordance with the requirements of section 304 of the Tariff Act, a 10-percent duty penalty, and a $5,000 fine and 1 year in jail, or both, may be imposed. The bill would impose the additional penalty of forfeiture and seizure of merchandise which is not marked in accordance with the new requirements stated in the bill.

No wonder all the governmental departments have opposed it. No wonder President Eisenhower vetoed a similar bill. If that were not enough, we have yet another significant fact to bear in mind, and that is that the bill, as I understand it will be amended on the floor, would directly violate an agreement with respect to lumber which we have with Canada.

It is true, as the Senator from Illinois has said, that under GATT the question of whether a change in marketing regulations represents a violation of the rules of GATT is somewhat fuzzy.

Let us assume that we can evade the full impact of this measure. The State Department tells us that the agreement with Canada with respect to lumber, which relates to this particular situation, is a legal commitment, which would require renegotiation of our relationships in trade with Canada in order to give them some compensation for the violation that would be involved as to this situation.

This proposal bears very strongly and markedly on the whole posture of the United States with respect to exports. Let us remember what is at stake in our foreign trade situation. In the first place, at stake are the delicate negotiations under the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade. Secondly, special negotiations are taking place with the European Economic Community. In the third place, there is the situation with respect to Canada. As everybody knows, there has been a change in government there recently, which is attributable to Canada's relations with the United States. We would be introducting yet another unsettling relationship into this situation.

What would be accomplished by the bill? What would be accomplished with respect to imports under the bill? The Senator from Illinois said that an unfair advantage exists over domestic items if the imports are not marked. I doubt very much that there is any validity to that argument.

So far as I can tell, people will not be inhibited in their buying in any such respect. However, even if they were, we must balance that situation against what would happen generally in terms of our exports, in terms of our trade, in terms of the administration of the statute, and in terms of retaliation.

In that respect, this bill certainly does not add up.

When I said I would oppose the bill and would move to recommit it, I was met with the argument, "Why worry about it? The President will veto it anyway." First, Mr. President, here is a duty, as much as it is of the proponents of the bill, that we must meet. The bill has been reported to the Senate, and we must deal with it—even though the President may veto it in the end. It is our duty to oppose it. We ought to show the President that favoring of the bill is not the unanimous sentiment in the Senate.

There is serious doubt about it, and there is very serious opposition to it. For that reason, I felt it my duty to press the matter.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have not had an opportunity to read the hearings closely, but I agree with the Senator that we should not do anything that might cause retaliation. We are trying to increase our exports to foreign nations. What is the general practice of England, Germany, France, and other nations to which we ship?

Mr. JAVITS. I have not made a detailed study of the practices of other nations, but in most cases they differ; they are not uniform. Generally speaking, the type of regulation that is applied is the type we have here.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The type we have at the present time?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes. The United States has taken a position in the GATT against vexatious internal regulations which discourage imports. I was coming to that argument in a moment.

It has been pointed out in many international conferences that internal regulations can be put into effect which will materially inhibit imports, even though tariffs are not increased on them, and that imports can be discouraged fully as effectively as if the tariff were increased on them.

To point out one of the really serious problems—and the testimony is in the record made before the committee—consider the case of repackaging goods which are mixed. It is not merely goods which come from abroad which are repackaged. The goods which come from abroad are mixed with domestic goods. Is it not just as unfair to an American manufacturer of goods which are mixed to label all the goods foreign, as not to label them at all?

An American manufacturer, if he thinks people are that much in love with buying products made in the United States—and I believe many people feel that way; I feel that way about some countries in the world. In any case, if an American manufacturer believes there is great virtue in a product being clearly indicated as coming from the United States, and that it is entirely practical to label products "Made in the United States"—many manufacturers see some virtue in that—the important thing is that we weigh the various considerations and issues before us.

There is, on the one hand, a tightening of the marking regulations, which means difficult administrative problems, and a disadvantageous foreign policy basis for the United States at a time like this, including a violation of an agreement we have with a friendly country, Canada.

On the other hand, we have the feeling that people ought to be told in the greatest detail, down to the last line, that a particular product originated abroad. That may influence their buying habits.

Taking these two questions side by side, in view of the fact that we have mentioned them as being decisive in this case, or important with respect to the marking of products, the disadvantages in terms of foreign policy and trade policy, the precedents that have developed against it, and the fact that President Eisenhower vetoed a similar bill, far outweigh the advantages.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator described it as being in violation of a treaty with Canada.

Mr. JAVITS. It is referred to in a letter from one of the Government departments in regard to the bill as I understand it will be amended on the floor. It relates to a limited agreement with Canada and is found on pages 6 and 7 of the record of the hearings with respect to the subject, it being a memorandum by the U.S. Tariff Commission relating to this particular section, and analyzing discussions pro and con. I refer the Senator to the record of the hearing as being an explanation for my statement that it would represent what at least one Government department considers to be a legal commitment. I use the word which the agency used: It is a legal commitment with respect to Canada. I refer the Senator from Tennessee to that part of the hearing record.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. When products from other nations are shipped to any port of entry, of which there are perhaps several hundred in the United States—not merely the big coastal cities—how is it proposed to administer the act in those ports of entry?

Mr. JAVITS. I assume—and this is what the Treasury Department says—that it would require a totally new type of regulatory procedure on the part of the Treasury, and that, pursuant to complaints which may be made in respect to violations in this respect, it would be necessary to send out investigators and agents to proceed to act under the tariff laws, as amended, in order to bring about seizures of particular items or to prosecute, under the law, domestic middlemen who had engaged in repackaging operations which were allegedly in violation of the law.

In addition, an added administrative responsibility would be to conduct hearings and entertain applications for exemptions from the law, for the bill itself provides that where undue hardship can be shown in a situation where the normal practice has been not to mark repackaging, the Treasury Department might grant exemptions. So there would be two additional administrative responsibilities with respect to imports. That is one of the reasons the Department gives for being against the bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. On first impression, the bill appears to be attractive; but our policy is to try to enlarge trade with other nations and try to increase our exports. It seems to me that what is proposed by the bill might lead to retaliation and cause a loss of foreign trade. So I believe there is much force in the Senator's argument that the bill ought to be restudied and considered further by the committee.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his support. It is quite in character with the work which he has done in the international field, of giving leadership in this type of situation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator was discussing the question of an old agreement with Canada in which we exempted

Canada and other nations from marking. There has been a suggestion by some of the departments that this might be a trade concession. But on February 14, 1963, the Tariff Commission said, in no uncertain terms:

> The withdrawal of the country-of-origin requirement cannot be regarded as a trade concession within the meaning of section 301(b) of the Trade Expansion Act.

Mr. JAVITS. I call the attention of the Senator to an aide memoire delivered by the Canadian Embassy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Naturally, we could not expect Canada not to oppose such action. Are we to take the legal interpretation of Canada or the interpretation of the United States Tariff Commission?

Mr. JAVITS. Before we finish the debate, I will try to find quickly the word I used with respect to the legal commitment. It makes crystal clear what we would be violating. I respectfully disagree with the Senator from Washington about the meaning of the aide memoire. That was the very thing—the offense taken by a foreign government to something done by the United States, which we like to think is strictly domestic business—which brought about the very grave strain between the United States and Canada on a previous occasion, and which brought about a change in the government of Canada. Canada should be our best, most friendly, and most constant trade partner.

I cannot agree with the Senator from Washington that we can brush aside a position which Canada may take on a question of this kind; nor do I agree that we put aside the considered judgment of a Department of the U.S. Government as to precisely what such action as is proposed by the bill will mean.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from New York yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think there is a slight error in that aide memoire, because in the aide memoire the Canadian Embassy uses the words "an amendment has been added." It should read "an amendment was proposed."

The amendment was proposed by the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN]. I heard the testimony; I was present when the committee voted; and it rejected that amendment.

So when the statement is made "an amendment has been added", I am sure it should read "an amendment was proposed."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I invite Senators to read the entire aide memoire, which refers generically, in the first paragraph, to the various marking bills which have been introduced in the current Congress, and then goes on to spell out in detail the applicability of this particular measure—namely, House bill 2513. The aide memoire is expressly directed to this particular bill. So I do not think we are left in any doubt as to the position which the Canadian Government intended us to understand it to be taking in regard to legislation of this character.

Many Members of the Senate, including myself, are engaged in doing their utmost, as friendly parliamentarians, with the parliamentarians of other countries to make more liberal, to modernize, and to bring into the best possible posture the trade and commercial relationships of our Nation with their nations. I am chairman of the Economic Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, and for the last 5 years I have been in a position which I think has imposed great responsibilities upon me, but which I think has brought considerable benefit to our country in regard to the matters facilitated and in connection with the explanations given to our parliamentary colleagues abroad and, through them, to their own governments. One of the key matters which has constantly been discussed there is the pressure upon imports attributable to such internal regulations.

I believe in practicing what I preach. Therefore, if we are trying to simplify and to have eliminated in other countries internal regulations of the type which discourages imports and we are doing that, because we want a more liberal policy followed everywhere, and we want to encourage our own exports—then I cannot, for the life of me, see the sense in our proceeding with a measure as vexatious as this one; for if we pass this bill, those abroad could point to the position our Government is taking: The Congress proceeding to fly in the face of the recommendations of all the executive departments and a previous veto by a President of the United States, while at the same time the executive is contending that it seeks to improve and expand exports. If Congress wishes to improve and expand exports, it must treat imports fairly.

Mr. President, this matter does not involve small business. According to the estimates, in 1963 we shall be importing $16,500 million worth of goods, and we shall be exporting $21,500 million worth of goods—or a $5 billion surplus. Together with other Members of the Senate, on July 10, I directed my remarks to the matter of the imbalance between receipts and expenditures flowing from our international transactions resulting in our balance-of-payments deficit, which involves approximately $3 billion a year—a very serious matter. Everyone recognizes that the deficit can be ended only by increasing our exports and thus making our position viable. One of the important tenets embodied in the message sent to us today by the President is to increase our exports.

The President tells us that he is going to do his utmost to see to it that they are increased. Yet on the same day it is proposed that we pass this annoying, vexatious measure, which must be intended—in the eyes of all who deal with imports—to discourage imports. Certainly that could be its only purpose. But then we expect the rest of the world to say, "Hurrah for the U.S. Senate. It is trying to encourage foreign trade, because it realizes how important it is to increase the exports of the United States and thereby to improve its balance-of-payments situation."

Mr. President, I cannot think of a more nonproductive investment than the passage at this time of a bill such as this one.

A peculiar thing about life is that it is always the last straw that breaks the camel's back. In that connection I indict myself. I have sat here and have seen the Senate pass a dozen or more bills of this persnickety, annoying, vexatious type. I do not say that there is anything particularly wicked about many of them; there are just too many of them.

But sometimes when one of this type "comes down the pike," we must seek to stop and consider the situation and take action in accordance with what we preach. Therefore, Congress must be brought face to face with its own conscience. This is a very simple situation, and one very easy to understand. What is the purpose of the bill? Does any Senator really think that it makes any material difference, in terms of consumption, whether an article is made in France or in Germany, or whether the particular article is wood screws or something else? Of course not. As a matter of fact, many purchasers look for new types of commodities because they enjoy new styles, new types of goods something different.

But this bill would discourage exports, by imposing vexatious internal regulations which would discourage them.

Mr. President, imports into our country are not the particular responsibility of any one Member of Congress. But exports are, in effect, a part of my "constituency." New York State exports well in excess of $1 billion worth of manufactured goods each year; and, as a result, thousands upon thousands of persons are employed both in the State of New York and in other States.

My constituents sent me here because they think I have enough brains to look beyond the end of my nose; and I know that by enacting measures of this type we shall be acting contrary to the very policies and principles which have made our country great, and which will make it greater and will enable us to carry on the foreign policy responsibilities we have.

It is for that reason—in short, because I believe this would be the straw that would break the camel's back—that I have decided that this particular bill must be exposed for what it is, and that we, ourselves, must stop long enough to realize what we would be doing by its passage. This is not a question of immorality; no one would, by this measure, be doing anything wrong, or would be getting away with anything. But by the enactment of such a measure we would not be practicing a wise, provident, farseeing policy in connection with U.S. trade. This bill is a clear example of a mistaken measure of that sort; and it is for that reason that I believe the bill should be recommitted to the Finance Committee.

THE INTEREST-RATE INCREASE AND POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last week, when an increase in interest rates was viewed as the most likely means the administration would take to curb the outflow of American dollars, I urged several alternatives which I believe should be tried before interest rates are increased. Obviously, the administration had no intention of trying anything else first. As is usually the case with those in the money-lending business and those in charge of money-lending regulations, raising interest rates is considered a desirable end in itself. Regardless of what party controls the machinery of government, interest rates will be raised for any reason that can be made to sound plausible.

I would have the American people mark it down that the increase in interest rates is one more cost that they must add to the foreign-aid program. I say that because we could have avoided higher interest rates if we had been willing to reduce our outflow of dollars by cutting foreign aid. But, again, no matter what party controls the reins of government, foreign aid is "the sacred cow" that roams where it pleases, roughshod, costing the American people around $4 billion a year, and now costing us an untold amount in higher interest rates.

Mr. President, I wish to say that the interest-rate increase which the Kennedy administration has approved amounts to an additional tax on the American taxpayers. At the same time the administration is talking about reducing taxes. The administration cannot have this one both ways. In my judgment, this is an economic sleight-of-hand performance that is not to the credit of the Kennedy administration; and I deeply regret the economic course of action announced today by the President of the United States.

Frankly, I am not impressed with the recital, in the President's message, of how well things are going in Western Europe. All the President is really telling us is that our financial relationships with Western Europe are not getting worse. The President says we will honor our obligations to carry a fair share of the defense and the development of the free world. But he does not say what Western Europe is going to do in order to carry a fair share.

The time has come for the President to give us a blueprint, a specific agreement, item by item, as to what our NATO allies are willing to do, before the President underwrites an additional tax on the American people by way of an interest rate increase.

The President's message in that respect is more significant in what it does not state than in what it does state. It does not state that our European partners will fill the ranks of NATO so that American boys can come home. It does not state that France will add a single soldier to the NATO line. We all know the dereliction of France in walking out on its obligations in respect to NATO, time and time again flaunting us, with De Gaulle making perfectly clear in a thumb-to-the-nose attitude that he has no intention of filling those ranks with French boys. Rather than raising interest rates, we ought to bring thousands of American boys home out of Europe. That would help our balance-of-payments problems much better than continuing to surrender economically to our NATO allies, which, in my judgment, have welched on us in respect to their clear NATO obligations. Nor does the President's message state when the other wealthier members of NATO are going to help us furnish military aid to the poorer members.

What about Turkey or Greece? I ask Great Britain, France, West Germany, Italy, and the rest of the nations, "When are you going to contribute to the millions of dollars of American economic aid to Greece and Turkey? Are they not important to your defense? If they are, the time has come for you to contribute so that we shall not have to contribute so much, and so that we will not be required to go through the great economic mistake which the President has underwritten today by way of increased interest rates."

The President's message does not state that Britain and France will send troops and financial aid to South Vietnam and relieve us of some of that burden, almost all of which the American taxpayer is now paying. It does not put a number on the defense forces that will be brought home, or tell us what foreign aid programs and missions will be curtailed or eliminated. The President's message contains no specific blueprint in regard to the savings that will be made.

The American taxpayers are crying aloud in asking this administration for such a blueprint before we have imposed upon the American people an indirect tax by way of increased interest rates.

The message tells us that our net outlay for defense abroad—exclusive of foreign aid, of course—has declined from $2.7 billion in 1960 to $1.9 billion in 1962. But the most that is promised by way of future reduction is perhaps $500 million more by 1966. That is not good enough. When any administration tries to correct the situation with an increase in interest rates, it owes it to the American people to show concrete reductions in oversea outlays first.

There is an American expenditure running into hundreds of millions of dollars which is not carried in the foreign aid bill. For that reason this morning in the Foreign Relations Committee a group of us made an official request that the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee prepare a memorandum for us containing every expenditure of every American dollar under every program to which we are now committed abroad. That includes figures on the cost of maintaining the American forces in Europe, the American forces in South Vietnam, and American forces anywhere else in the world, for the foreign aid bill does not contain such figures. Many people, looking at the foreign aid bill, make the mistake of thinking that $4.5 billion is the total cost. It is not. The total is hundreds of millions of dollars beyond $4.5 billion.

Mr. President, as one member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I will insist that the total figure of foreign expenditures that the American taxpayer must pay be made a matter of public information, for it is the business of the public. I desire every voter in our country to know now, so he can make up his mind what his position will be at the ballot booths, and whether he wishes to approve a program of such great extravagant expenditures that characterizes American foreign policy expenditures at the present time.

Mr. President, cutting foreign aid and retrenching our military forces overseas are not the only steps we should have taken before we raised interest rates. We should have restricted foreign borrowings in the United States, and even the outflow of investment capital from the United States.

The President is wrong in singling out capital as the one inviolate, untouchable element in our international dealings. The tap on the wrist he proposes by way of any interest equalization tax on foreign borrowings here in the United States indicates that he does not mean that all capital is inviolate—only the investment Americans wish to make abroad.

I point out to the administration that if we can curb foreign borrowings here, we can curb American investments abroad. We are urging Latin American governments to do exactly that. We do not expect them to raise their domestic interest rates as a means of doing so either, because their domestic interest rates are already astronomical. One of the things we have been urging on Latin American countries in connection with the Alliance for Progress program was to have them take the necessary steps to stop the flight of capital out of Latin America into New York, into Swiss banks, and into investments abroad. We have been saying that they ought to invest in their own economic future. They ought to stop the flight of capital. I happen to take the point of view that what is good enough for Latin America in that respect ought to be good enough for the United States. American companies have some obligations, too, in regard to keeping a healthy economy at home.

In any event, both curbs should have been imposed before interest rates were raised. I do not believe that there is any right to investment abroad which takes precedence over the responsibility of the U.S. Government to insure full employment and a healthy economy at home.

When we talk about the subject of investments abroad, I suggest that we not forget that we are dealing with American jobs at home. I happen to believe that, in view of the extravagant expenditure of the largess of the people of this country under a foreign aid bill, the time has come that the bill should be drastically cut down. We ought to come to grips with some of these economic problems which in my view were evaded in the President's message today. I also desire to say that, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I have been sitting through some of the markup sessions of the committee. The blizzard is on. The snowstorm is upon us. A coverup job is being attempted. But as far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, there is no hurry in the consideration of the foreign aid bill.

To the contrary, I am for considering it step by step, item by item, and rollcall by rollcall in the Foreign Relations Committee. I intend to give my respected colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee an opportunity to go on record time and time again, by one rollcall after another, session after session. That is why I announced earlier today that I shall object to any meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations when the Senate is in session, because I intend to devote my time and attention to the foreign aid bill, and I cannot be in two places at once. The first responsibility I owe to the people of my State is to be on the floor of the Senate. When the Senate is in session I shall be here. When it is not in session I shall be glad to attend meetings of the Committee on Foreign Relations for a slow, steady, thorough, persistent markup of the foreign aid bill.

Moreover, I think it is also regrettable that, while Secretary Dillon called for a tax cut to be coupled with the rise in interest rates, the move on interest rates did not wait for the tax cut.

They have the cart before the horse again. In my judgment the Congress should have taken action on the tax cut first and then given whatever consideration it might merit to the interest rate issue.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I say to my friend from Oregon that, while I agree with much of what he has been saying, frankly I think the action of the President on the interest rate was proper. I would be the first, as the Senator from Oregon knows, to criticize the President when I thought he needed to be criticized. However, when the President needs to be praised he ought to be praised. I believe his action was praiseworthy.

None of us wants to pay more interest. We hope the time will come when we shall not have to do so. But what are we to do, when, as the Secretary of the Treasury pointed out the other day, the short-term interest rate on the New York market is 3¼ percent and it is 4 percent on the London market, and we are losing an estimated $1 billion a year in dollars running out of the United States for investment in short-term obligations overseas? That is a practical problem which must be met. I think the sooner the problem is met the better.

I do not know whether we shall have a tax cut. We may never get one. In the meantime, it seems only proper to try to take some action with respect to interest rates, to ward off continued balance-of-payments deficits.

I say this in all deference to my friend from Oregon, pointing out that I agree with much of what the Senator has had to say. I think the President made a very difficult decision. He went contrary to the longstanding policy of the Democratic Party toward lower interest rates. I think it took courage to face up to the facts, and we had to do something about the problem. I am glad the President did.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in reply to my good friend from Iowa I am sure the President will be delighted with his new found support, which he is receiving from the Senator from Iowa. I find it a matter of deep regret that I cannot support my President in this regard, because I think he is dead wrong; and when I think he is dead wrong the service I owe him is to oppose his wrong position.

There are many steps which could be taken, as the Senator from Oregon pointed out in a speech the other day. Those steps should have been taken first. I think the President should have taken those steps before he made what I think was a serious mistake in economic policy by his message today.

FOREIGN AID AND FOREIGN MILITARY EXPENDITURES NOT EFFECTIVE

It is especially saddening to me to hear the usual stock defenses made of the foreign aid program by administration sources and here in the Senate at a time when the same newspapers that report these stock defenses also report the failures of foreign aid.

We are told again and again that we must send aid abroad and we must keep American troops abroad—although foreign aid is also advanced as enabling nations to defend themselves—to preserve freedom. But in practice it does not even do that.

Can any defender of foreign aid tell me what freedom is being preserved today in South Vietnam? Can any advocate of the roughly half-billion aid program for South Vietnam tell me why it is better to have men and women clubbed in the streets by the minions of our puppet than by the minions of communism?

Do not forget that in addition to our aid to the Diem government, we are also maintaining some 12,000 Americans in uniform in Vietnam to support him, too.

Mr. President, on the basis of the facts about the Diem regime—tyrannical, dictatorial, antidemocratic, completely fascist in type—South Vietnam is not worth the life of a single American boy. I repeat it: In the opinion of the senior Senator from Oregon, the present government of South Vietnam is not worth the life of a single American boy; and so far as I am concerned, I shall not vote a single dollar for further support of South Vietnam.

I point out that we are doing it almost all alone, with a few token gestures here and there from another government or two. More than 95 percent of the bill is being paid by American taxpayers, and what we are supporting, in my judgment, is an atrocious, shocking, tyrannical regime in South Vietnam, the support of which, in my judgment, in history will stand to the discredit of the United States.

That is the story of much of the American foreign aid program. First we send money so we do not have to send men; then we send men and money, both. In the end, the Diem government is going to be kicked out by his own people, and we will be lucky if we do not inherit the entire odium of his infamous regime.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point the story from today's New York Times entitled "Vietnam Orders Rein on Protests."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM ORDERS REIN ON PROTESTS—POLICE BEATING OF BUDDHISTS SAID TO MARK CRACKDOWN—KENNEDY ASKS PEACE

(By David Halberstam)

SAIGON, VIETNAM, July 17.—The police were reliably reported tonight to be under orders to use force to break up Buddhist demonstrations. This report followed a police attack on Buddhist demonstrators, who were clubbed into submission.

About 200 persons—Buddhist priests and nuns and women and children—were arrested. The demonstrators were beaten for their part in the protests.

All Buddhist pagodas were sealed off today with barbed wire. No one was allowed to enter, and no one was allowed to leave. The priests who had been arrested were being interrogated by the police about the leadership of their protest movement. Arrests of leaders, it was reported, might follow.

The police orders to break up demonstrations were given this morning. Some priests tried to jump out of trucks on the way to jail, and some were injured when they jumped out.

Vietnam's Buddhists have been protesting for 10 weeks against what they consider to be restrictive religious policies of the government of Ngo Dinh Diem, a Roman Catholic. On May 8, troops in the city of Hue fired on Buddhists who were demonstrating for the right to fly their religious flag.

There were indications tonight that Buddhist demonstrations would continue and that Buddhists might commit suicide in protest, as a priest and a writer have done so far.

Saigon was extremely tense, and government police precautions were at a maximum.

This was the second day of demonstrations since the Buddhists announced that they would reopen the campaign. An uneasy month of sparring followed the signing of a joint communiqué a month ago by both sides. The communiqué failed to settle the crisis.

Buddhists were arrested today in two major demonstrations. The larger and more violent was in front of the Giac Minh pagoda, and the other was at a Saigon market.

THRONG RUSHES BARRIER

At Gia Minh pagoda, at 8:10 a.m., about 1,000 persons, led by 150 priests, massed to march down the street to the XA Loi pagoda several blocks away. But the police had strung up barbed wire. The Buddhists rushed the barricade, but the police won the struggle.

Then Buddhists sat down in the street. The sitdown continued for more than an hour until secret police started a counterdemonstration. They carried banners charging that the Buddhists were being exploited by Communists. After a few minutes of counterdemonstration a high police official told the Buddhists to disperse. They did not move.

Then uniformed, specially trained riot police drew back the barbed wire, and 100 of them went in after the demonstrators.

The policemen grabbed priests as they knelt and clubbed them. They grabbed seated old women and smashed down with clubs. In one alley, several policemen grabbed an old woman and beat her.

SECRET POLICE JOIN FRAY

The riot policemen were joined by some of the 100 secret policemen at the scene.

The entire attack took less than 15 minutes. It went on as other policemen, with new submachineguns at the ready, stood by. As the struggle was going on, one police official turned to reporters and said, "That's what happens when there is too much liberty."

Several of the monks and women were reported to have been badly injured.

In the other incident, Buddhist leaders sent a messenger to the American Embassy with a letter to Ambassador Frederick E. Nolting, Jr., asking him to intercede. When the messenger, a priest, started to leave the Embassy, the police tried to grab him, but Americans pulled him inside and pushed the police out. The priest spent most of the afternoon in the Embassy while his freedom was negotiated.

American officials who have been disheartened by the religious crisis had no official comment on the incident but appeared very worried.

The United States has supported the Ngo Dinh Diem regime in its fight against Communist penetration from North Vietnam, and Washington fears that the religious issue is alienating the population. Of Vietnam's 16,500,000 persons, only 2 million are Catholics, according to U.S. Government figures; most of the others are Buddhists.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a second prime example of the failure of the American foreign-aid program is also reported in today's paper. It tells of assurances from the Foreign Minister of Pakistan that China will intervene in defense of Pakisitan in the event of trouble between that country and India. I ask unanimous consent to have this story from the New York Times printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAKISTAN EXPECTS CHINA'S AID IF INDIA ATTACKS—FOREIGN MINISTER'S SPEECH IS INTERPRETED TO MEAN THAT TREATY HAS BEEN SET

RAWALPINDI, PAKISTAN, July 17.—Pakistan's Foreign Minister, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, warned today that an attack on Pakistan by India would involve the largest state in Asia. He clearly meant Communist China.

This is the first statement made here that China would assist Pakistan in case of aggression. Parliamentary circles believed Mr. Bhutto's remarks implied an understanding between Rawalpindi and Peking on mutual defense.

Mr. Bhutto would not elaborate on his statement, which was made in the national assembly at the start of a 2-day debate on foreign policy.

He said India was augmenting her military and economic strength not because she wanted to fight China but because she wanted to threaten Pakistan, which Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru and other Indian leaders had often declared to be the prime enemy.

Mr. Bhutto's views differed sharply from the Western Powers' pledges that arms given to India would not be used against Pakistan. He said Pakistan believed that with increased military might, India would speak from a position of strength and that this would preclude any possibility of an honorable and equitable settlement with Pakistan on issues between them. Pakistan and India have long been in disagreement over Kashmir.

Despite Pakistan's representations, Mr. Bhutto said, the Western Powers, mainly the United States and Britain, with which Pakistan has defensive alliances, are giving massive military aid to India. It is imperative, he said, that Pakistan's armed strength also be augmented if a military balance between Pakistan and India is to be maintained.

The Foreign Minister said he thought the Kashmir dispute could be solved if Western Powers made a solution a condition for giving arms aid to India.

The situation arising from the Chinese-Indian border conflict and the dispatching of arms to India, Mr. Bhutto said, has required the people and the Government of Pakistan to reconsider her foreign policy. He said the foreign policy was being reshaped.

He said that Pakistan would like to halt the deterioration in relations between Pakistan and the West but that the initiative would have to come from the West.

He charged that the people of the Indian-held part of Kashmir, themselves not free, were being forced to contribute to India's war fund. He condemned this as tantamount to bringing a threat of war into Indian Kashmir.

Mr. Bhutto commended a recent border accord with China as proof of Pakistan's peaceful intentions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am no longer interested in foreign aid programs that arm nations with whom we have no quarrel against each other. I am not interested in sending aid to India to fight Pakistan or aid to Pakistan to fight India. Since Pakistan, by the admission of her own foreign minister, has no quarrel with Red China but only with India, I do not see any justification whatever for the continuation of our large foreign aid program to Pakistan.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I will yield to the Senator in a moment.

I serve notice today that upon further checking into this foreign minister's statement and a determination of what is the real policy of Pakistan vis-a-vis Red China, if the foreign minister's statement proves to be the case, the senior Senator from Oregon will offer an amendment, first in the Committee on Foreign Relations, and second on the floor of the Senate, to cutoff all aid to Pakistan. The time has come for us to make clear to the world that we do not intend to support a regime which finds a mutual defense treaty with Red China to be in its interest. If that is to be the policy of Pakistan, the sooner we get out of Pakistan the better, in the interest of the American taxpayers and in my judgment in the interest of protection of freedom around the world.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator from Oregon has declared that he is not interested in the war between India and Pakistan. I wonder if he is interested in the war that Nasser is carrying on against Yemen, where he has had 28,000 troops for nearly a year, and which is costing, according to our military experts, $500,000 a day.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is mistaken if he interpreted my remarks as meaning that I am not interested in the war between Pakistan and India. I am interested in the war between Pakistan and India, but I am not interested in promoting that war by giving foreign aid to the parties so they can pursue it. I am very much interested in the Middle East situation. As the Senator knows, I have spoken in the Senate on that subject. I cosponsored—I do not know whether it has been introduced yet—a resolution which was brought to my office this morning with respect to the situation in Yemen.

I am not at all interested in supporting foreign aid to Egypt or to other regimes in that area that are engaged in aggression against their neighbors, and that are oppressive to their own people. But one of the sad things about American foreign policy is that we talk a good game of freedom, but support dictatorship in too many places in the world.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator has answered my question.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I submit today the amendment which I promised the other day I would submit. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment which I propose to offer be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSED MORSE AMENDMENT TO FOREIGN AID BILL, S. 1276

On page 8, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

"SEC. 302. Chapter I of part III is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

" 'SEC. 620. (a) PROHIBITION ON FURNISHING OF ASSISTANCE SUBSEQUENT TO JUNE 30, 1965.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no assistance shall be furnished pursuant to this Act to any country or area (or enterprise therein) subsequent to June 30, 1965 unless—

" '(1) Such country or area has requested such assistance and can show that it is pursuing the following economic, political, and military policies:

" '(A) That it (i) is seriously and continuously engaged in measures of self help, (ii) has taken appropriate steps to assure that its own private capital resources will be utilized within its own country or area, (iii) will encourage the development of the private enterprise sector of its own economy, (iv) has taken adequate steps, where appropriate and necessary, to bring about reforms in such fields as land distribution and taxation to enable its people fairly to share in the products of its development, and that the project or program for which economic aid is requested will contribute to the economic or social development of the country;

" '(B) That it is promoting the maximum amount of individual freedom and is encouraging its people freely to choose their own government;

" '(C) That it seeks to establish and maintain only such military force as may be adequate to prevent the internal overthrow of an elected government or to deter threatened external Communist attack;

" '(2) The furnishing of such assistance is required by an irrevocable commitment made, or contractual obligation incurred, prior to the date of enactment of this section; or

" '(3) In case of any such assistance extended in the form of loans, the interest rate thereon is not less than the average rate payable on obligations of the United States of comparable maturities.

" '(b) The total number of countries or areas receiving assistance under this Act subsequent to June 30, 1965, shall not exceed fifty'."

Mr. MORSE. I ask that the amendment be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONDITIONS SHOULD BE EXACTED FOR FOREIGN AID

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the amendment to the foreign aid bill to which I have referred would curb aid in such circumstances as I have referred to in connection with Pakistan and in the Middle East.

It would probably have the effect of curbing aid to such countries as Indonesia, as well, because it provides that one of the conditions for any kind of U.S. aid would be that the military resources of the recipient are needed to prevent the overthrow of an elected government, or to deter threatened Communist aggression. Such a condition attached to our aid would deny it to any country that is diverting its resources into a military campaign against a non-Communist neighbor.

But my proposal also requires economic conditions to be met. It would require that aid be restricted to countries that can show, in addition to the condition described above, that they are undertaking economic reforms, that private capital and private enterprise are being encouraged, and that the aid requested will contribute to their economic or social development. My amendment requires, further, that the applicant must show that his country is moving in the direction of political freedom, if it does not already have it.

Finally, I am proposing that aid be extended only upon application from another country and that the number of countries receiving aid not exceed 50

Even the administration is in dispute as to how many countries it is really aiding, but it is at least 96. We cannot continue picking up checks around the world by way of an aid program to 96 countries. The time has come for a selective process. My amendment would require it, and would limit aid to not more than 50 nations. But the important thing about my amendment is that it would bring all current aid to an end on June 30, 1965. It would end aid on June 30, 1965. That does not mean we would not have a foreign aid program after that, but I will tell the Senate the kind of foreign aid program we would have. We would have a foreign aid program based upon the application of nations that want it. We would not be cramming and ramming it down their throats, whether they wanted it or not. Under my amendment, they would be required to meet certain conditions that they would be compelled to comply with before they received a single dime of aid. What is wrong with that?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Has the Senator ever listed the various spigots through which foreign aid comes and is ladled out?

Mr. MORSE. I have not listed them, but that would be a good seminar paper for me to assign to the professional staff of the Foreign Relations Committee. I thank the Senator for his suggestion. Dr. Marcy is on the floor. I want him to know that I am going to give him that assignment tomorrow. I think we ought to have that information.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator may not be surprised, but some of us may be surprised by the number of them.

Mr. MORSE. I probably will be surprised by learning that there are more than I thought there were.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska repeat the question he asked the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. GRUENING. I was asking whether the Senator from Oregon, who was making such an eloquent and sound address, was aware of the number of different spigots through which foreign aid was pouring and being ladled out. AID is only one of a dozen or so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In this morning's session, we discussed this item. It was emphasized that the total expenditures as they appear in the foreign aid bill do not reflect the whole gamut of expenditures we are making through various agencies in what is generally termed foreign aid.

Mr. GRUENING. Precisely so.

Mr. MORSE. I have already discussed that subject. I pointed out what we did this morning. I am proud to say the Senator from Ohio joined with me, or I with the Senator from Ohio—at least, it was a mutual desire—in calling for preparation of a memorandum that will give us exactly this information.

As I have said, my amendment would require that a condition of aid would be that the recipient country would have to show that it was not diverting its resources into a military campaign against a non-Communist neighbor.

I have the confidence in my amendment that the jury of America, consisting of American public opinion, will support it once the jury understands it. Let the politicians take note. The American jury will support the principles of the program I am fighting for again this year in connection with foreign aid. If politicians have any doubt about it, wait until they get before the jury.

Let them plead their case in opposition to the Morse amendment, and in support of continuing an outlay in Pakistan. Let them plead their case in support of millions more going into Pakistan when the Foreign Minister is talking about a pact with Red China. Let them plead their case in regard to Yemen. Then see what the verdict will be, because this one cannot be swept under the political rug. Foreign aid has become one of the flaming political issues of our time, and politicians will have to face it. In my judgment, now is the time to meet the desires and objectives of public opinion by seeing to it that the foreign aid bill is drastically curbed.

All these requirements and conditions would go into effect at the close of fiscal 1965, when all except the most irrevocable of our aid commitments would be wiped off the books.

It will be said that this is a drastic amendment. But when American consumers are saddled with higher interest charges in order to compensate for the outflow of dollars caused by our inflated and often empty financial gestures abroad, then it is time for drastic amendments to the foreign aid bill.

That is why I have sent the amendment to the desk for printing and appropriate reference.

I close with a caveat in regard to one argument that we shall hear over and over again in this historic debate. It was used in the Foreign Relations Committee this morning several times, and it is an argument that I want publicly to reject. It is the argument that, because some programs have been authorized, but for which appropriations have not been made, we are stuck with them.

Take that one to the jury, and get the answer of American public opinion. The authorization of a project does not remove the responsibility of Congress to revise the authorization if events subsequent to the authorization justify the revision. At no time in the course of this debate will I accept the argument that, because we made some mistaken judgment in the past in regard to certain authorizations, we are stuck with them. The time has come to say to Pakistan, South Vietnam, to some of our NATO allies, and to many others, for whom we have made certain authorization proposals and commitments, that we are changing them. Under the precious American system of separation of powers and the duty of Congress to check mistaken courses of action, we have the clear duty to modify some of the previous authorizations which have failed to achieve any worthwhile purpose in the countries I have mentioned, and others that I shall mention from time to time as I make my daily speech against the foreign aid bill.

MARKING REQUIREMENTS FOR ARTICLES IMPORTED IN CONTAINERS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H.R. 2513) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes.

Mr. GRUENING. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois, with the understanding that after the business in which he is interested has been disposed of I shall have the floor again.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe the Senate can conclude consideration of the pending bill, H.R. 2513, shortly. A number of Senators who are anxiously watching the clock would like to get away.

Mr. GRUENING. I am happy to yield for that purpose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will take about 3 minutes, and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] will take 5 minutes. Then the Senate can proceed to a yea-and-nay vote. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator make his request in the form of a unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I cannot very well do that except with the forebearance of the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 10 minutes be allowed to conclude the debate on the pending bill, after which the motion to recommit will be made, and that after that vote there may be an intervening quorum call, if necessary.

Mr. MORSE. I object.

Mr. CURTIS. I serve notice that I have some remarks to make. I hope there will be no disposition to adjourn until I have made my remarks.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course not.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a point of order. I have the floor. I have yielded for the specific purpose of having the pending bill disposed of. I cannot yield for any other purpose.

Mr. MORSE. I regretfully object.

Mr. DIRKSEN. To what is the Senator from Oregon objecting?

Mr. MORSE. To the proposed unanimous-consent agreement offered by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then I will have to ask the Senator from Alaska to yield to me.

Mr. MORSE. That is all right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ask the Senator from Alaska to yield to me.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator understands, of course, that I am objecting to his request to limit debate. There is a great deal of discussion going on with regard to the pending bill and certain proposed amendments thereto. Other Senators may wish to make statements. Therefore, I could not agree to limit debate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know of no other amendments, except that our friend from Washington says he has one amendment.

Mr. President, responsive to what the distinguished Senator from New York said on the bill, first of all, this is a marking bill; it is not a tariff bill. It tries to get at the abuses under which commodities come into this country in bulk, and then are repackaged and relabeled, but the country of origin is not recited on the repackaged label. That is unfair to American producers. Certainly it is an imposition on American customers. They are misled. They are deceived. It is an abuse that ought to be stopped. No tariff is involved.

Secondly, every GATT country has authority to do this if it so desires, and they do it. Therefore, it would not be out of line with the other 49 nations which subscribe to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

There are exceptions under existing law. Seventy or eighty of them were recited in the hearings. Those are items that do not lend themselves to marking. The bill contains an exception under which the Secretary of the Treasury can make exceptions for commodities when marking is either not convenient or where it would violate a long-established custom or trade practice.

The Senator from New York spoke about forfeiture, and at the same time he spoke about the difficulty of enforcing the provisions of the bill. Forfeiture is a rather drastic penalty, but it is an easy and effective way of bringing about enforcement of an act of this kind.

Allusion was made to Canada and the aide memoire which appears in full text in the hearings. There is a mistaken word there, because no lumber amendment was adopted. It was offered in committee, but it was defeated by a very substantial vote.

Much is made of the fact that many delicate relationships exist, and we must not offend the sensibilities of other countries. I do not know that they cared about our sensibilities when they increased the import duty on chickens from Arkansas, Delaware, and other areas of our country to a point where they fairly cut off the trade. I do not know that they had any sense of delicacy when they raised the duty on flour and wheat to a point where importation to one of the so-called Common Market countries became virtually prohibitive.

It is about time for us to be a little less sensitive and a little less concerned about delicacy, and to be concerned about the hard verities and realities which face our people today. We have some problems, too.

There are a few jobless in this country. When I say a few, we can put that in quotation marks, because it is still 5.7 percent.

The latest indicator that I saw showed that percentage. I am thinking about those people. I am thinking about the American producers, who are saddled with taxes today and who ought to have an opportunity to obtain some relief. Let us not tend to be so frightfully sensitive with respect to every little feeling and every sense of offense on the part of other countries. I am thinking about a "fair shake" for our own country, our own consumers, and our own producers. That is the issue that is involved in the pending bill.

This is purely a marking bill, with sufficient guidelines, exemptions, exceptions, and adequate permissive authority in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury to take care of all exceptional cases.

As for enforcement, the bill would enforce itself, because on the basis of a complaint it would not take very long before the importers who break down the bulk goods and put them in packages and forget to recite on the labels the country of origin, would be very careful how they labeled those goods. That is all that is involved. The bill was unanimously reported by the Ways and Means Committee and by a vote of 11 to 4 by the Committee on Finance. That is enough to commend it to the Senate. Therefore I hope that the motion to recommit the bill to committee will be voted down.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alaska may yield to me without his losing his right to the floor. I shall take 5 minutes.

Mr. GRUENING. I yield to the Senator for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Illinois, as always, was so persuasive in his arguments that one almost feels uncomfortable when one must marshal facts directly opposite his contention. However, that is the way the facts are.

The bill is designed to restrict imports, in just so many words. The Department of State says so in its report on the bill dated March 20, 1963. It says:

> We believe that the principal effect of this legislation would be to restrict imports.

The Department of Commerce, in its testimony on the bill, at page 14 of the hearing, states:

> The Department of Commerce recommends that H.R. 2513 not be enacted. The Department is not aware that there has been any substantial demonstration of the need for extending marking requirements to the repackage of articles.

I do not see how one could be much clearer than that. Going back to the report of the Department of State, we read:

> The burdens which the bill would impose are unnecessary since procedures now exist that offer relief in justifiable cases.

It then goes on to describe the law which, as we have argued before, has the marking requirement with respect to goods that come into the country, and also the Federal Trade Commission authority to proceed against any endeavor to misrepresent or deceive anybody who might seek to buy the goods.

The Senator from Illinois says that the bill would enforce itself. Again, the facts are distinctly the other way. The report of the Treasury Department dated March 2, 1963, which appears on page 5 of the record of the hearings, reads as follows:

> The effective administration and enforcement of the provisions of this bill by the customs service would be extremely difficult, and, therefore, the Department is opposed to the enactment of the bill. The activity which the bill seeks to control would not take place until after the imported article has been released by the customs service in the normal course of business and all physical control by customs has ceased. The identification of a repackaged article as an imported article, bearing in mind that it would probably have no characteristics to distinguish it from a similar domestic article, would involve an extremely difficult investigative problem in cases where alleged violations were reported to customs.

Upon this limited question, and whether or not it would involve any violation of a legal commitment of the United States, waiting behind the vote on the motion to recommit there is an amendment to be proposed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], which, so far as I know, will very likely be accepted. It would omit from the exceptions green sawed lumber. That is exactly what the State Department was talking about. Incidentally, I have no fault to find with what the Senator from Washington will propose. If there is to be a bill, he is entitled to argue that it should carry out exactly this intention, once the Senate manifests its intention. The State Department says expressly, following upon this limited exemption:

> It has been noted that the Tariff Commission recently held that the withdrawal of the

> country-of-origin marking requirement could not be regarded as a trade agreement concession within the meaning of section 301(b) of the Trade Expansion Act. As noted in the foregoing, however, the U.S. concession to Canada is a legal commitment entered into in 1938 under the authority of the Customs Administrative Act of 1938 and included in a trade agreement under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934. Accordingly the United States is not entitled to withdraw the concession from the trade agreement unilaterally.

The aide memoire of the Canadian Government precisely designates the bill under consideration, H.R. 2513. I invite Senators to read it.

To sum up, this is a measure designed to stop up imports. It is a measure for which there is no real call, according to the advice of the Department of Commerce. It is a measure that would be difficult to administer, which is the reason why the Treasury Department opposed it. It is a measure which would cause complications with Canada, as we know from their aide memoire, because of an amendment to be proposed by the Senator from Washington, which will be offered on the heels of the vote on the motion to recommit.

I close by saying to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen]—I think he knows I mean every word of that—who says he is deeply solicitous about the jobless in the United States and about industries in the United States, that I am, too; but I have $5 billion on the side of my argument as against his argument, because the exports of the United States in 1963 are expected to total $21,500 million, while the imports of the United States, $16,500 million. That is a pretty good margin. I not only want to keep that margin; I want to improve it. By this measure, we shall be loosening the structure which enables us to maintain our foreign trade position in the world.

It is the straw that often breaks the camel's back. In my view, a proposal as clear and evident an item of danger as this one would cause much mischief in the world. I think the Senate would be very wise to reject it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is almost routine for the Treasury, State, and Commerce Departments, when bills of this kind are considered by the Senate, to send some kind of memorandum in opposition. I heard all the evidence in the Committee on Finance. I did not believe it was at all impressive. Yet strangely enough, where our own producers are involved, always the Government agencies have to blow the trumpet of retreat. The other countries are not doing it, because the GATT countries have the authority to require marking, and they do.

Mr. JAVITS. Merely to complete my argument, the United States requires marking, too. The question is whether the marking shall be so vexatious as to interfere with imports; and the finding of the Department is that it would be.

Whatever may be the routine of the great Government departments in reporting adversely upon bills, the fact is that it was not routine with Dwight D. Eisenhower, for in 1960 Dwight D. Eisenhower vetoed a bill exactly like the one now under consideration.

Mr. President, the bill should be recommitted to the Committee on Finance. I hope the Senate will vote accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] to recommit the bill. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COOPER (when his name was called). I have a live pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty]. If the Senator from Vermont were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd]. If the Senator from Connecticut were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] would each vote nay.

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] would each vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 62, as follows:

[No. 115 Leg.]

YEAS—12

Case
Clark
Douglas
Fulbright
Javits
Kefauver
McGovern
McNamara
Metcalf
Neuberger
Pell
Williams, N.J.

NAYS—62

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Goldwater
Gruening
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Lausche
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McIntyre
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—26

Burdick
Church
Cooper
Dodd
Edmondson
Engle
Fong
Gore
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Humphrey
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
Mechem
Moss
Pastore
Pearson
Prouty
Scott
Smathers
Sparkman
Young, N. Dak.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 4, between lines 6 and 7, it is proposed to insert the following new subsection:

> (e) Subdivision (J) of section 304(a)(3) of such Act (19 U.S.C. 1304(a)(3)(J)), is amended to read as follows:
>
> "(J)(1) Such article is of a class or kind with respect to which the Secretary of the Treasury has given notice by publication in the weekly Treasury Decisions within two years after July 1, 1937, that articles of such class or kind were imported in substantial quantities during the five-year period immediately preceding January 1, 1937, and were not required during such period to be marked to indicate their origin: *Provided,* That this subdivision shall not apply after June 1, 1963, to sawed lumber.
>
> "(2) No trade agreement or other international agreement heretofore or hereafter entered into by the United States shall be applied in a manner inconsistent with the requirements of this section."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the amendment would add sawed lumber to the items involved in the bill. In the country from which I come the lumber is called green lumber and it comes direct from the mills. The amendment would include no finished lumber product or any other lumber product. It would include merely sawed lumber which is shipped in bulk by rail or ship to the United States.

The bill contains many items which would require a labeling of the country of origin. I have no objection to that procedure. But I do think that the particular commodity to which I have referred should be included, for many reasons.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois has said that the bill would establish a regulation so that the American people would not be misled. That is all we are suggesting in relation to lumber. Lumber does not necessarily come only from Canada. I do not know why the Senator from New York has made such a point in respect to Canada. Lumber comes in from all over the world. We had better start thinking about that subject, if we are to start to think about our own people in that respect. We will be reasonable on world trade matters.

Russia has now become the major exporter of lumber. It now accounts for 14 percent of the world's total market. Russia's forest resources are double those of any other country in the world. Russia accounts for 19 percent of all of the available timber supply in the world. They are shipping it all over the world. It may be good timber. It may be timber that someone will want to buy, as users sometimes desire to buy Canadian timber. Perhaps a builder might wish to buy American timber or timber from the Philippines or from other places. But we believe that so long as the bill is intended to serve the purpose that its proponents have suggested that it serve, there should be no objection to the particular item to which I have referred.

We have had some trouble with imports of Canadian lumber. The Senator from New York has suggested that Canada is pretty sensitive about many things. If she becomes sensitive over the fact that when she ships lumber into the United States she is merely required to state that it was manufactured in Canada, we had better give up. We shall never be able to get along with anybody as sensitive as that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. How would the Senator from Washington feel if Canada insisted that all textiles and other products which come from the United States be branded so that anti-American boycotts could be organized in Canada?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Almost every country in the world requires that the country of origin be stated on commodities imported. If the Senator refers to Canadian lumber, I remind him that Canada has now taken about 90 percent of our market. We are trying to negotiate with that country. All we are suggesting is that when Canada sends lumber into the United States she mark it. We mark ours.

I know who opposes the proposal. The home builders and the retail lumber dealers oppose it. They do so because they like to have the lumber mixed, so that the person who comes in to buy will not exactly know where the lumber came from. A good contractor can tell the quality and type of lumber when he knows where it has come from. Those to whom I have referred wish to sell maple, oak, fir, and other hard and softwoods willy-nilly. All we suggest is that a marking be required. It is a little thing that does not amount to much, but it would give American industry an opportunity to say, "We have American lumber. Here is Canadian lumber." In some cases builders desire to use Canadian lumber.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Is it not true that American industry is required by law in many States to state the grade of the material, and label it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. There are the most stringent regulations on lumber grades, lumber markings, and lumber sizes.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. In addition, the amount of moisture that is carried in the lumber and many other things about it must be stated. When foreign lumber from any country is purchased, unless it is labeled, the purchaser cannot know where it comes from.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct. The lumber industry in this country must state how long the lumber has been in the kiln. That time is important to determine what is good lumber. We have no objection to manufacturers stating where their products come from.

We have talked about Canada. I believe I know Canada fairly well, for I have lived next to Canadians for a long time. They are a great people. They are great friends. They are among our best customers. I presume the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] would make the point that they are our best customers in his first argument.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is that not true?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is true. That is what I said. The Senator would use that as his first argument. But we are now talking about a market in which our own producers have been selling.

The reason why Canada is our best customer is that Canada buys from us many things she does not manufacture. This is the main reason. If Canada made automobiles, does anyone think for a minute there would not be a big tariff on American automobiles? I suppose there is now.

Canada buys certain things from us because she does not make them. It is much better, I suppose, to buy them in the United States. That is the reason why there is a great trade balance.

We are talking about a special case. This is our market, for the things we produce. If Canada should start sending many things in—and I can think of many things—without a tariff, to take over our market, I think we would all "stop, look, and listen."

We think the bill should include sawed lumber. I suppose Canada does not. I do not know what the objection is. We mark most of our lumber. We are rather proud to mark much of it. We have modern mills. Canada has modern mills, too.

I do not see why there should be objection. We should like to have this competition on the same standard, so that our producers could compete with Canadian producers who send lumber to the United States.

I am in favor of the free trade policy. I have voted for it for many years. Once in a while there is a special case to be considered. At times the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has spoken of special cases, in which there could be some exception to the broad proposal.

We do what we can to expand and to encourage trade with other countries of the world.

Senators talk about being sensitive. I think it is time that we become somewhat sensitive about our own interests.

Canada has no problem in deciding quickly, when there is some export or import over or under balance throughout the world, as to dropping the value of the Canadian dollar. Canada does so overnight. The value is now 92½ cents. That is enough to compete with, for our producers in this particular field.

We have been supplying our market for many years. We compete with Canada in the foreign markets of the world, and we are glad to do so. Those markets are increasing. They will continue to increase. We merely suggest that sawed lumber be included.

Mr. President, I have offered the amendment to the pending bill, H.R. 2513, to require that all lumber imported into our country be marked so as to indicate the country of origin.

My interest and support for this amendment is not academic. Today we find that on an annual basis, imports of softwood lumber from Canada average about 4.5 billion board feet. Projections show that these imports may reach 5 billion board feet by year's end, representing almost 16 percent of our total domestic production. This is a somber fact which must be faced daily in every forest-based community throughout our Nation. It means more U.S. sawmills will be closed down, increasing U.S. unemployment, generally decreasing economic activity in forestry communities, and of course, a continuing profit decline for the lumber industry.

As the senior Senator from a State that has made much economic progress with the help of the American lumber industry, I find these facts most disturbing.

Increasing imports, however, is not the only reason for asking that all imported lumber bear the mark of its country of origin.

Enactment of the pending amendment would assure that any lumber being questioned as to quality, or for any other reason such as quantity and moisture content, could be identified as to its origin. By so requiring, the consumer in the United States would be able to negotiate his just complaint with the supplier responsible.

Lumber is not presently marked to indicate country of origin, and it is impossible for a domestic consumer to seek redress from the foreign manufacturer. In fact, many times when complaints are made as to grade, domestic agencies are blamed for discrepancies in foreign lumber. This occurs because grade stamps presently being used by foreign lumber producers indicate on their stamps that the grading rules under which the foreign lumber was graded were those of domestic grading agencies such as the West Coast Lumbermen's Association or the Western Pine Asociation. In the absence of a mark as to the country of origin, the reference to these local grading agencies is highly confusing, and only too often the U.S. consumer complains to the domestic grading agency when in reality the domestic grading agencies are not responsible, and have in fact no control over the manufacture, grading, or shipping practices of lumber originating in foreign countries.

To provide the fullest measure of protection to the lumber consumer in our country, imported lumber not only should be marked to indicate its country of origin, but also should be positively identified as to grade and species. Only too frequently, instances come to light indicating that weaker imported species—that is, species of a lower fiber strength—are being substituted for a stronger species that rightfully commands values suited for longer spans in construction-type lumber.

Lumber is one of the few industrial items which can be imported into our country without being marked as to its origin. The simple and inexpensive requirement that imported lumber be marked to indicate the country of origin is to me an innocuous means by which we in the Congress could effectively assist the American lumber industry. Enactment of this amendment would be an equitable way to help place our domestic producers on a competitive level with the Canadians, who because of numerous advantages—many of them Government granted—are able to outsell domestic lumber producers in our own markets.

This great industry which has exhausted practically every avenue of relief has now turned to the Congress for assistance, and the Senior Senator from Washington is now proposing to assist it. I stand in strong support of the amendment which is pending before the Senate, and I ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia, who is chairman of the committee having jurisdiction over this legislation, to agree to accept it as an amendment to the pending House-passed bill.

I am aware that the Finance Committee decided that this proposal should not be included in the bill which it reported. They reasoned that the pending amendment might possibly create international friction with a friendly nation.

Mr. President, there apparently has developed within some of the executive agencies of our Government a penchant for crippling every suggestion which we in the Congress propose as an aid to American industry. We are told that we must not do this or do that for American industry and its employees, or we will lose the friendship of other nations of the world. Yet, just within the past few weeks we have seen that our neighbor to the north of our border will take extreme measures to protect its interests when it so desires. Last year, while this Congress was in the process of passing a great Trade Expansion Act, the Government of Canada was invoking surcharges against exports of our country. I do not mention these facts to encourage the Senate to take retaliation; I mention them only to impress upon this body the facts of life.

I do not agree with this type of philosophy expounded by our State Department whereby, in order to retain the friendship of a nation, we are told that we must sacrifice each and every American industry that interferes with their grand design.

Those who oppose this proposal readily admit that it would not deter the Canadians in their pursuit of our markets.

I believe that the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee will confirm that those who are in opposition to this bill appear to be in agreement that it would not place Canadian lumber at an economically competitive disadvantage in our markets. They argue, however, that it would be a "foot in the door" toward the enactment of other legislation of a restrictive nature which the lumber industry supports.

I am a supporter of many of these industry proposals, and I firmly believe that they represent the only means by which the domestic lumber industry can resolve its import problems. But these measures are not now before us for consideration. The amendment pending before us at this moment would simply require the marking of an imported product to indicate its country of origin.

I recognize that there is involved a consideration as to whether the exemption which we have given Canadian lumber from our marking laws is, or is not, a trade concession on the part of our Government. The Department of State advises that it is a concession and the Department of Commerce concurs. Yet, in its report of last February 14, to the President of the United States following its investigation of the softwood lumber industry, the Tariff Commission noted:

> The withdrawal of the country-of-origin requirement cannot be regarded as a trade agreement concession within the meaning of section 301(b) of the Trade Expansion Act.

Whatever the facts may be in this confusing situation, I firmly feel that adoption of this amendment by the Senate would not be unfair to Canada or any other nation, nor would it impose upon the Canadians any undue burden or prevent in any way their access to our markets. It is only an equitable action which we in the Senate should take to place the U.S. lumber industry in a competitive position with the Canadians.

The proposal before the Senate is an effort to protect the U.S. consumer of lumber. It is an effort to help a seriously troubled industry. It is an effort to counteract the many advantages, many of them government granted, which the Canadian lumber producer enjoys over the American lumber producer. Many of these Canadian advantages are made possible by the Government of that country. It is an effort to balance the Canadian advantages so as to give the American lumber industry some much-needed assistance in supplying domestic lumber markets. It is the least we in the Senate can do.

I hope the senior Senator from Virginia will accept this amendment. I urge the Senate to adopt it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Buyers Have Right To Know Lumber Origin," published in the Bellingham Herald of Bellingham, Wash., April 29, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUYERS HAVE RIGHT TO KNOW LUMBER ORIGIN

> Some persons have reservations about the Senate bill which would require imported lumber to be marked with the country of origin, because of the implication of boycott against a friendly nation, Canada.
>
> But Senator MAGNUSON, author of the bill, believes that Russia, also, may pose a threat to the U.S. lumber market unless Congress enacts the measure.
>
> Most of the present market problems are caused by the inroads of Canadian lumber, but Commerce Department statistics indicate that the Soviet Union could move into the situation, too. Russia has become a major exporter and now accounts for 14 percent of the total world's lumber export market. A little appreciated fact is that Russia's forest resources are larger than those of any other country, 19 percent of the world's total. That's more than the combined timber resources of the United States and Canada.
>
> According to MAGNUSON, lumber is an exception to the rule that the country of origin must be marked on major import items.
>
> We do not suggest a boycott of Canadian lumber. A buyer is entitled to give weight to price as well as national interest in such matters. But we think the purchaser of any commodity has the right to know its origin. Certainly lumber produced in the Soviet Union should not be allowed to capture markets in this country under the cloak of anonymity.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] wishes to speak on this subject.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I join with the distinguished senior Senator from Washington in support of the amendment. The junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] has requested that he also be permitted to join as a cosponsor. We wish to support this amendment, to require the marking of sawed lumber with the country of origin.

During this session of Congress one of my prime concerns has been to do something for the depressed lumber industry in my State of Idaho and, indeed, throughout the Nation.

During the hearings on this amendment before the Finance Committee, quite a bit was said about the increase of Canadian imports of softwood lumber into this country. This, of course, is one of the major reasons for the slump in our own domestic lumber industry.

In all honesty, I cannot blame the Canadians for looking out for themselves. I respect the Canadians, for I worked closely with them on the International Joint Commission. I have a very high regard for their Canadian nationalism and the fact that they are people who are looking out for their own country first. As I have pointed out in previous statements here on the Senate floor relative to this situation, the Canadians were forced to turn to other markets for their lumber when England began to import much more of her lumber from such countries as Russia and Finland. The Canadians naturally turned to us, their nearest neighbor, and I feel that, had we been in a similar position, we would have reacted in much the same way.

In 1959, the year when Canadian softwood imports into our country began to cut drastically into the U.S. markets for softwood lumber, the United Kingdom had significantly increased its imports of softwood lumber from Russia and had greatly decreased its imports of the same from Canada.

Perhaps if we do nothing else here today, we can make an earnest request to those who administer the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to prevail upon Great Britain to restore to Canada a greater portion of Great Britain's market for imported softwood lumber. Perhaps it could be pointed out to the British the importance of giving preferential treatment to their allies of the free world—instead of giving what appears to be preferential treatment to Russia.

But one fact remains: The rise in the import of Canadian softwood lumber into this country since 1959 has certainly adversely affected our own domestic industry, and something must be done about the situation. And, if it could be possible, something should be worked out to the benefit of both our country and Canada. But, if a situation cannot be found which would restore our own markets for our own lumber and at the same time not decrease Canada's market, then I suggest we take a page from the Canadian book—look out for our own.

However, Mr. President, the administration opposes this amendment offered today. Adverse reports have been received on this amendment from the Departments of Agriculture, State, Commerce, the Treasury, and the Tariff Commission and Budget. They were all unanimous in opposing this amendment.

This, in my opinion, should in no way deter the Congress from acting favorably on this amendment. There has been much precedent for Congress passing legislation in the past which was opposed by the Executive. This is the way it should be.

I do not have to remind my colleagues that our job here in the Congress is to pass legislation on its merits—not on what we think the administration necessarily wants or will do about it. If we put the Congress in the position of only passing legislation which the administration favors, then we are in effect abrogating the rights of Congress to legislate and giving these powers to the Executive. It is our duty to pass legislation here in the Congress which we feel, in our own minds and conscience, is beneficial to our constituents and the country. It is not our duty to allow the opinion of any administration to predetermine what our action on legislation should be.

Keeping these facts in mind, I respectfully and sincerely urge favorable action on the pending amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, prior to the entrance of the Soviet Union into this type of lumber market the Canadians had ample markets in which to sell their lumber; namely, the United Kingdom, with Commonwealth preference.

Since Great Britain and some of the other Commonwealth countries have been buying more from Russia, the result has been to push down on the United States. Otherwise there would be no problem.

Russia now has 19 percent of the total world supply of timber, on a sustained yield basis, and is exporting, all over the world, 16 percent of all sawed lumber used in world markets today. This poses a serious problem. If they take over the foreign markets, naturally they will push Canada and the United States into the fiercest kind of competition. I think there should be some rules of the game when we enter into such competition. Indeed, we are in it now.

Canada says we might violate some agreement. Let me tell Senators what Canada agreed to the other day. I will demonstrate how insistent they are about getting into this market. A group of timber operators bid on an appraisal for a great number of board feet of lumber in British Columbia. The government threw out the bid because it said it was too high. It said, "You cannot compete with a price that high. Come back and bid lower."

That statement was published in the press. I think we should be aware of what might happen to our own market.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Washington for yielding to me. I commend the Senator for his amendment. I support the amendment. It represents fairness to the consumer. It is another measure to help the consumer know what product he is getting.

Those who work with lumber tell us that the area in which the timber grows has a great deal to do with its adaptability for use in other areas. It depends upon temperature, changes of temperature, rainfall, differences in rainfall, and so forth. Many factors enter into the use of timber, in addition to the species of tree in which it grows.

This is a measure for consumer protection. It represents no embargo. It is no tariff. It is not a slowdown of imports. It will let the ultimate consumer know where the product was produced. I think we should protect the consumer and give him the benefit of this information, at a minimal cost to the producer and to the market.

I commend the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment. It seems to me it has a very laudable objective. Few, if any, can dispute the equity of the proposal involved.

I recall taking the floor and arguing at some length, at the time the Senate passed some remedial legislation to protect the textile industry against imports, when we tried to add an amendment to do something to alleviate the damage resulting to the timber industry from imports, from which it suffered. We were defeated at that time on a rollcall vote in the Senate.

When we are adopting another tactic to try to protect our American industry against unfair and secretive imports from abroad, the question of letting the buyer know whence comes his merchandise—in this instance lumber—makes sense and is in conformity with the concept and operation of the open society of which we are so proud in the United States.

The lumber industry is of considerable size and consequence in the State of South Dakota. It suffers, along with the other lumber industry, from imports.

In an effort to be helpful to the lumber industry, which is in serious difficulty, the subcommitte of the Committee on Appropriations which deals with the Department of the Interior, in the bill which was finally approved this afternoon, allowed for appropriations of sizable sums of money for new research laboratories and new forest laboratories.

The Senate approved a sizable appropriation for the development of additional facilities at Madison in forestry research. Unfortunately, the House took the opposite action. That particular measure was lost in conference. It avails us little to try to produce better and more timber in this country if the timber remains unsold or is to be sold at suicidal prices as a result of competition from abroad.

I rise in support of the amendment. I feel the Senate would be acting wisely in adding lumber to the other products which were originally placed in the measure, as to which it is indicated there is a strong element of support, since the vote to recommit the bill gained only a dozen votes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be brief. I trust the Senate will listen to me as patiently as I did to many other Senators.

This provision bears out precisely what I argued. I have seen proposals which received less than one dozen votes reversed on occasion, and those who voted the other way were glad to see the votes reversed. Very unwise legislation is being proposed, in terms of American foreign trade. It is proposed to do the very thing the State Department warned us against in respect of Canada, and which the Canadian Government has protested, with respect to a species of lumber covered by a trade agreement on lumber from Canada. We are flying in the teeth of that protestation and warning and asking that the lumber be marked.

I wish emphatically to be recorded as voting "nay." I have already made my record. The Senate may do what it thinks wise, but I rise to point out that we are doing precisely what the State Department and other Government agencies warned us against. It may see that at least one voice is raised in protest.

We are flying in the face of a situation which the Canadians have already anticipated and protested against. I think this action is unwise. This is exactly what the State Department warned against in its letter of March 20, when it stated to the committee that there was a legal commitment to the Government of Canada. I regret very much that the Senate, as appears likely from present appearances, is about to put this provision in the bill. The testimony upon this question was explicit. Mr. Blau, of the Commerce Department, stated, as shown on page 22 of the hearings:

> Mr. BLAU. What I did was to call the attention of the committee to the fact that there is an outstanding commitment of the United States not to subject lumber, sawed lumber, and sawed timber, to the marking requirements. The enactment of the amendment would be a violation of this commitment, and would make it necessary for us, under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, either to pay compensation to the affected countries, probably only Canada, or make us subject to some kind of retaliatory action.

So I interpose objection to the amendment; and shall so vote.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD of today, at a point prior to the vote on the Magnuson amendment to H.R. 2513, dealing with the branding or labeling of imported lumber, two telegrams I have received: One from Mr. G. C. Edgett, executive vice president of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association, the other from the Western Pine Association, Yeon Building, Portland, Oreg.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG.,
July 17, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Understand Senators MAGNUSON and JORDAN will offer amendment to H.R. 2513 requiring imported lumber to be marked with country of origin. We urge your support this amendment to assure American lumber buyers knowledgeable choice whether they wish to buy foreign or U.S.-made lumber.

G. C. EDGETT,
Executive Vice President, West Coast Lumbermen's Association.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
July 18, 1963.

U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our members in 12 Western States generally strongly favor Magnuson amendment, H.R. 2513, requiring lumber imports be marked with country of origin. We believe lumber manufacturers in your State will much appreciate your support on this amendment. Since FHA requires stamping anyway, including country origin, would involve no extra cost.

WESTERN PINE ASSOCIATION.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I voted against the motion of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to recommit H.R. 2513 because I felt that the record had been made and that the Senate should proceed to vote the bill up or down. I supported the Magnuson amendment, although I was called to the room of the Committee on Foreign Relations by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] to participate in a conference with representatives of the State Department dealing with the Canadian desk. I am a member of the Subcommittee on Canadian Affairs.

When I went to the conference with the State Department officials, it was my understanding that a yea-and-nay vote would be taken on the Magnuson amendment. While I was at the Foreign Relations Committee meeting, the Magnuson amendment was disposed of by a division vote. I had previously told the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] that I would support his amendment. Had I been on the floor of the Senate, I would have voted in favor of the amendment on the division vote. I had planned to vote for the amendment, as I thought was the plan of the leadership at the time, on a yea-and-nay vote.

The main reason why I decided to support the Magnuson amendment was that I became convinced by representatives of the lumber industry in my State that the adoption of that amendment might have a salutary effect on our Canadian friends in connection with the conversation that was at last planned to be held between representatives of the new Canadian administration and representatives of the United States Government.

About a year ago the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], his able colleague [Mr. JACKSON], my able colleague [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and representatives of our delegations in the House of Representatives met with the President of the United States, from which conference came the so-called White House six-point program in connection with the United States-Canadian lumber controversy. I highly commend the President of the United States for his good-faith attempt to effectuate the points he raised. We have not been successful in connection with most of them; but the recent conference which the President had with the Prime Minister of Canada has, I understand, resulted in an understanding between the two heads of these Governments that there would be continued conversations on this matter; and responsible leaders of the industry in my State seem to feel that adoption of the Magnuson amendment might strengthen the position of the U.S. representatives I resolved to give them the benefit of the doubt; and I saw no reason why the amendment should not be adopted, because if those conversations resulted in an agreement or an understanding which might lead to a modification of this program—provided that, in return, we could get with the Canadian Government some understandings which are sorely needed in connection with the United States-Canadian lumber issue—we could then modify the effectiveness of the Magnuson amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the discussion of the bill the Senate has just passed, and at the end of my own remarks in connection therewith on the timber amendment, which was adopted by the Senate, I may add a newspaper article that comments on the constructive work being done in this general area by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. Although it relates primarily to coal, it does refer to the overall philosophy which the Senate adopted by its vote when it passed the "Buy American" legislation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 12, 1963]

BUY-AMERICAN DIFFERENTIALS INCREASE STILL UNDER STUDY

(By Allen M. Smythe)

A report on the need to increase the differentials in the Buy-American Act allowed U.S. bidders over foreign firms has been withheld by the Budget Bureau because of opposition by other Federal departments. Officials explained it was still "under study."

Disclosure last summer that the Navy had bought some steel from Japan and Germany for new Navy vessels caused an uproar in Congress. Senators SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, and BENNETT, Republican, of Utah, demanded that the Pentagon buy only American steel. Many supported them.

Advocates of greater overseas trade in the State Department, North Atlantic Treaty Organization officials, the Treasury and the Commerce Department do not believe that further restrictions should be placed by the Pentagon on buying foreign steel.

"The Buy-American Act," said one high State official, "grants plenty of authority to Defense Secretary McNamara for security reasons. Any further restrictions would invite serious trade retaliations from Germany and Japan."

President Kennedy asked the Budget Bureau to assemble all facts on the operation of the Buy-American Act. Any changes to be made in the 6 and 12 percent differentials allowed U.S. bidders were to be decided before last October.

Pending possible changes, Mr. McNamara has held up all foreign orders that are over one-half of the low American bid. This does not interfere with the purchase of drugs and medical supplies in Europe that range well below one-half of American wholesale prices.

Senator RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, and former professor of public speaking, is directing his oratory at the White House to help his distressed coal mining State.

He is fearful that any tampering with the Buy-American Act would hurt his efforts to increase coal sales to Germany and Japan. Navy orders for foreign steel range in the hundreds of tons. Germany buys 5 million tons of U.S. coking coal annually. Japan buys 6.4 million tons.

Germany has a quota and a $5 duty over the quota for U.S. coal. Senator RANDOLPH thinks both should be removed and points out that Navy orders for Japanese and German steel are often smelted with West Virginia coal. Four Navy orders that went to the Hyuetten steel mill in the German Ruhr were also rolled on new Pittsburgh steel mill equipment that cost over $1.5 million.

While U.S. coal exports to Canada and Europe have been sluggish, Japan has been increasing her purchases. However, Japan increased her imports from Australia last year reaching 2.6 million tons. Lower transportation costs give Australia a $2 a ton advantage.

Japanese steel mills in 1962 consumed a total of $155 million worth of steel-making raw materials (coal, ore, and scrap) purchased from the United States. Steel scrap accounted for most of this amount. The export price ranged up to $30 per ton.

The PRESIDING OFFICER The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 2513) was passed.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is my understanding that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] has the floor, and that the Senate has been proceeding, by his forbearance, in order to complete action on the bill. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So the Senator from Alaska has the floor.

Will the Senator from Alaska yield to me briefly?

Mr. GRUENING. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois, provided I do not lose the floor.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask the majority leader about the program for the remainder of the day and the week, and what he foresees for early in the next week, if he can tell us.

STATE COMMERCIAL FISHERY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the questions raised by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the minority leader, I move at this time that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 312, Senate bill 627; and that it be laid down and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 627) to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

This Act may be cited as the "Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1963."

SEC. 2. As used in this Act, the term—

"Commercial fisheries" means any organization, individual, or group of organizations or individuals engaged in the harvesting, catching, processing, distribution, or sale of fish, shellfish, or fish products.

"Fiscal year" means the period beginning July 1 and ending June 30.

"Obligated" means the written approval by the Secretary of the Interior of a project submitted by the State agency pursuant to this Act.

"Project" means the program of research and development of the commerical fishery resources, including the construction of facilities by the States for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

"Raw fish" means aquatic plants and animals.

"State" means the several States of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

"State agency" means any department, agency, commission, or official of a State authorized under its laws to regulate commercial fisheries.

SEC. 3. (a) The purpose of this Act is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States through their respective State agencies in carrying out projects designed for the research and development of the commercial fisheries resources of the Nation. Federal funds made available under this Act will be used to supplement, and, to the extent practical, increase the amounts of State funds that would be made available for commercial fisheries research and development in the absence of these Federal funds.

(b)(1) Nothing in this Act prevents any two or more States from acting jointly in carrying out a project.

(2) The Congress consents to any compact or agreement between any two or more States for the purpose of carrying out a project. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this subsection or the consent granted under this subsection is expressly reserved.

SEC. 4. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior for the next fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for the four succeeding fiscal years, $5,000,000 in each year for apportionment to the States to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) In addition to amounts authorized in subsection (a) of this section there is authorized to be appropriated to an interstate cooperative fund for the next fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for the suceeding fiscal year, $500,000 in each such year, and for the next three succeeding fiscal years, $750,000 in each such year, which shall be made available to States in amounts as the Secretary may determine. The Secretary shall give a preference to those States in which he determines there is a commercial fishery failure due to a resource disaster arising from natural causes and in which a new commercial fishery can be developed where none existed previously. Amounts appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 5. (a) Funds appropriated pursuant to section 4(a) shall be apportioned among the States, by the Secretary, on July 1 of each year or as soon as practicable thereafter, on a basis determined by the ratio which the average of the value of raw fish harvested by domestic commercial fishermen and received within the State (regardless where caught) for the three most recent calendar years for which data satisfactory to the Secretary are available plus the average of the value to the manufacturer of manufactured and processed fishery merchandise manufactured within each State for the three most recent calendar years for which data satisfactory to the Secretary are available, bears to the total average value of all raw fish harvested by domestic commercial fishermen and received within the States (regardless where caught) and fishery merchandise manufactured and processed within the States for the three most recent calendar years for which data satisfactory to the Secretary are available. However, no State may receive an apportionment for any fiscal year of less than one-half of 1 per centum of funds or more than 10 per centum of the funds.

(b) So much of any apportionment for any fiscal year which is not obligated during any year remains available for obligation to carry out the purposes of this Act until the close of the succeeding fiscal year, and if unobligated at the end of that year, the sum is returned to the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 6. (a) Any State desiring to avail itself of the benefits of this Act may, through its State agency submit to the Secretary full plans, specifications, and estimates of any project proposed for that State. Items included for engineering, planning, inspection, and unforeseen contingencies in connection with any works to be contructed shall not exceed 10 per centum of the cost of the works, and shall be paid by the State as a part of its contribution to the total cost of the works. If the Secretary approves the plans, specifications, and estimates as being consistent with the purposes of this Act and in accordance with standards to be established by him, he shall notify the State agency. No part of any moneys appropriated pursuant to this Act may be obligated with respect to any project until the plans, specifications, and estimates have been submitted to and approved by the Secretary. The expenditure of funds authorized by this Act shall be applied only to approved projects, and if otherwise applied they shall be replaced by the State before it may participate in any further assistance under this Act.

(b) If the Secretary approves the plans, specifications, and estimates for the project, he shall promptly notify the State agency and immediately set aside so much of the appropriation as represents the Federal share payable under this Act on account of the project, which sum shall not exceed 75 per centum of the total estimated cost of the project.

(c) When the Secretary determines that a project approved by him had been completed, he shall cause to be paid to the proper authority of the State, the Federal share of the project. The Secretary may, if he determines that the project is being conducted in compliance with the approved plans and specifications, make periodic payments on the project, as it progresses, but these payments, together with previous payments, shall not exceed the United States share of the project in conformity with the plans and specifications. The Secretary and each State agency may determine jointly at what time and in what amounts progress payments are made. All payments shall be made to the official or depository, as may be designated by the State agency and authorized under the laws of the State to receive public funds of the State.

SEC. 7. (a) All work, including the furnishing of labor and materials, needed to complete any project approved by the Secretary shall be performed in accordance with applicable Federal and State laws under the direct supervision of the State agency, and in accordance with regulations as the Secretary may prescribe. Title to all property, real and personal, acquired for the purposes of completing any project approved by the Secretary, vests in the State.

(b) All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality, as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5), and shall receive overtime pay in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the Contract Work Hours Standards Act (Public Law 87-581). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133a-15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

(c) If a State disposes of any real or personal property acquired under this Act, the State shall pay into the Treasury of the United States the amount of any proceeds resulting from the property disposal to the extent of and in the same ratio that funds provided by this Act were used in the acquisition of the property. In no case shall the amount paid into the Treasury of the United States under this section exceed the amount of funds provided by this Act for the acquisition of the property involved.

SEC. 8. The Secretary is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he determines necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, either following the pending bill or before consideration of it, it is anticipated that Calendar No. 321, H.R. 4062, a bill to amend the act authorizing the transmission and disposition of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande, will be taken up.

I understand that an amendment has been arrived at which is satisfactory to all concerned.

The leadership would like to have consideration of those two bills completed today. If that is done, it is the intention to have the Senate go over until 12 o'clock noon Monday.

Mr. ALLOTT subsequently said: Mr. President, the majority leader, in stating that he would take up H.R. 4062, said there was an amendment which had been agreed to by all parties. If the amendment is what I understand it to be, we will have no objection, but we have not had an opportunity to see the amendment, although we have been trying to get a copy of it. I wish to serve notice that there may be objection. We would like to see the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from Colorado has brought out that point. No action will be taken until he, along with other interested Senators, gives us his approval. I thought we had clearance.

I serve notice that if this procedure is carried through, the pending business at the conclusion of morning business on Monday next will be Calendar No. 335, Senate bill 646, a bill to prohibit the location of chanceries or other business offices of foreign governments in certain residential areas in the District of Columbia.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader.

SENATOR GRUENING URGES M.D.'S TO HELP PATIENTS SAVE MILLIONS OF DOLLARS BY PRESCRIBING DRUGS BY GENERIC NAME

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to a matter which affects the health and the pocketbook of virtually every one of our citizens.

I refer to the prescription of drugs. Specifically, I would like to suggest that America's physicians should help save their patients millions upon millions of dollars by prescribing drugs, wherever possible, by what is know as their generic name—not in the costlier form—by trade name.

This issue was considered by the Senate last year when it enacted the drug amendments of 1962.

TRIBUTE TO SENATE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE

These amendments were the direct result of 3 years of historic hearings. These hearings were conducted by the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly. I should like to pay tribute to him for his great contribution to the people of this Nation through Public Law 87-781—a law which he fought for both tenaciously and successfully.

I should also like to commend other members of his subcommittee for their interest in this subject, including the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] who has done so much for this Nation's consumers.

THE MEANING OF MY SUGGESTION

I should like to set forth exactly what is meant by these various drug names, and I shall point out the larger significance of this issue.

The fact is that the American people spend over $2 billion a year for prescription drugs. This sum is rising. The proportion of expenditures for, first, prescription drugs, as compared with the outlay for, second, nonprescription drugs and other drugstore sundries has been on the increase for a number of years.

No one knows how large a sum M.D.'s would save for their patients if they prescribed to a greater extent by generic name. But the sum would be very considerable, especially for families in lower and middle income brackets.

ROLE OF REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE

I mention this matter today particularly because it was my pleasure to serve as chairman of the most recent Senate hearing at which this issue came up.

On June 26, it was my privilege to serve as acting chairman at a hearing of a Senate Government Operations Subcommittee which has been studying "Interagency Coordination in Drug Research and Regulation."

Our witnesses represented the American Medical Association.

Many significant matters came up in the course of the hearing; this subject was one of the most important.

Before getting into the details of the June 26 discussion, let me submit a few background observations:

A FEW BACKGROUND POINTS

First. The name by which a drug is ordered can often spell the difference between a relatively high or relatively low cost.

Second. As a general rule, the benefit of a competitive system, in drugs or anywhere else, is that, if it works properly, competition will tend to lower prices.

Third. In the case of drugs, there is often competition between different drug companies' versions of the identical drug; that is, a drug based on the same fundamental chemical formula.

Fourth. A physician can give his patients a "break" by writing out a prescription by "generic," nonproprietary name.

By contrast, if the physician prescribes by a product's "trade" name, that is, its proprietary name, the price will invariably be much higher. The patient will, in effect, be paying a "hidden" cost for the trade name. This hidden cost consists in part of the cost of the company in advertising the trade name, as well as for public relations, and much else.

Fifth. A drug company does have many other important costs. The most significant of these costs, insofar as the advancement of consumer well-being is concerned, is, of course, for research.

Sixth. But there is no reason why consumers should pay needlessly, merely in order to cover hidden costs for a trade name drug, when the same drug is also available under its generic name. The largest of these hidden costs is for what is known as "detailing"; that is, personal conferences between drug company representatives and physicians, designed basically to familiarize M.D.'s with trade name products.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield with pleasure to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, who has done much to save the American people from injury from drugs and from the high cost of drugs.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate very much the remarks of the Senator from Alaska and the credit he has given me in our committee for our effort in connection with this subject. The Senator is making a very important speech. He is pointing out that many hundreds of millions of dollars can be saved and have been saved the American people and the States and the U.S. Government by having drugs prescribed by generic names. It would be possible to save the sick people of Latin America hundreds of millions of dollars also if similar programs could be put into effect in Latin America.

In addition to thanking the Senator for his remarks, I wish to say that a very full discussion of generic names versus drug names is included in the report of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee at page 223 of Report 448, to which reference might be made.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following the remarks of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], a brief statement I made on the subject before the House Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

THREE CATEGORIES OF NAMES—EXAMPLE OF THALIDOMIDE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have discussed the difference between so-called proprietary names and generic names.

Now let us consider the matter of different names.

A drug is often known by many different names.

Let me cite one example—a drug which is now a part of medical history—and tragically so. It will be recalled that the drug which triggered the worldwide tragedy of 6,000 deformed babies last year was known by the "generic" name, thalidomide. It was manufactured, however, under no less than 51 different "trade" names. In the United States, in its experimental form, it was called "Kevadon"; in regular commercial form in Germany, "Contergan"; in the British Commonwealth, "Distaval," and so forth.

Thalidomide also appeared under three chemical names, "3-phthalimido-2, 6-dioxypiperidine; or a-phthalimidoglutarmamide; or N-phthalylglutamic acid-imide."

The difference between these three categories of names—"generic," "trade," and "chemical"—should be understood.

First. The generic or common name is a nonproprietary name; ideally, it serves as an abbreviation of a much longer chemical name.

Second. The trade name is proprietary—it is owned by a particular source or sources. The name itself may simply be a suggestive, easily remembered name. "Miltown" is one such catchy name. It is a mild tranquilizer which has enjoyed considerable popularity, although it may have a habituation or habit-forming effect.

Third. The chemical name is by definition the indication of the actual chemical ingredients. Thus, "Miltown's" chemical name is: "2-methyl-2-*n*-propyl-1, 3-propane-diol dicarbamate."

This long title was abbreviated to come up with the generic name, meprobamate.

The plain fact is that if a physician writes a prescription for "Miltown", a patient will pay one price at the corner drug store; if the prescription reads, "meprobamate," it will be a much lower price at the same drug store. Thus, we see the same drug—same compound—produced by two or more different companies—and sold at different, widely varying prices.

THREE EXAMPLES OF DIFFERENCE IN PRICE

I have selected three specific examples to further illustrate the point of the disparity in price. Literally hundreds of similar examples could be cited.

I have selected three popular drugs—prednisone, the generic name of a drug used for arthritis; reserpine, used to lower blood pressure and as a tranquilizer; and penicillin G, an anti-infective agent.

In each instance, I shall quote the varying prices of two or more drug companies. The first price will be that of a company which sells many generic name products—McKesson-Robbins; the second and third companies sell under their own proprietary, trade names.

I have in my hand three bottles of these drugs. Each contains the generic product.

Here are the comparative prices. The first price is factory cost for the generic product. Thereafter appear costs of the generic product to retailers and the comparative cost of the trade name product to retailers.

Of course, the final cost to consumers may be and often is double the cost which the retailer pays the drug company or wholesaler. The markup at the retail level involves still another set of issues. My point at this time is the vast markup before a product even gets to the retailer, simply because a "hidden cost" is imposed for a trade name product.

1. PREDNISONE 5 MILLIGRAMS

Generic price:	
Factory cost for generic product	$8.99
Generic price to retailers	20.95
Trade price: Merck & Schering price to retailers	170.00

Note the differences: $8.99, $20.95, and $170.

2. RESERPINE 0.25 MILLIGRAMS

Generic price:	
Factory cost for generic product	$0.63
Generic price to retailers	2.75
Trade price:	
CIBA price to retailers: Approximately 15 times as much	39.50
Lilly price to retailers	33.58

3. PENICILLIN G 200,000 UNITS

Generic price:	
Factory cost unavailable.	
Price to retailers for generic product	2.10
Trade price:	
Squibb price to retailers	8.28
Lilly price to retailers	8.50
Merck price to retailers	9.90

VAST POTENTIAL SAVINGS FOR LOW-INCOME AMERICANS

I ask Senators to think of the meaning of these facts to millions of Americans in the lower and middle income brackets. I ask them to recall that millions of elderly Americans, for example, use considerable quantities of drugs for diseases characteristic of advanced years, such as arthritis, cardiovascular diseases, and so forth.

Study after study has shown the heavy proportion of elderly citizens' savings which is consumed by the cost of drug purchases.

DISCUSSION AT JUNE 26 SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING

It was, therefore, very appropriate that, with witnesses from the American Medical Association testifying before us, the issue came up for discussion at the June 26 hearing. The distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], who has served as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, mentioned the disparity in prices between generic and trade name products. Senator RIBICOFF asked, in effect: "Why does not the American Medical Association take the lead in recommending that physicians prescribe by generic name?"

THREE STANDARD-TYPE EXCUSES AGAINST GENERIC PRESCRIPTIONS

Dr. Hugh Hussey, director of the AMA's division of scientific activities, presented an answer of sorts. After much discussion around the subject, he finally turned to one of the standard-type objections, frequently made, namely: that a physician is allegedly "uncertain" of the quality of a generic product, whereas, he might be more certain of the quality of a trade-name product, prepared by a pharmaceutical company with which he is familiar.

In my judgment, this is not a satisfactory answer.

Why? For the simple reason that there is now on the statute books of this Nation Public Law 87-781, known as the Kefauver-Harris Drug Amendments of 1962. This law answers, not just this one, but all three standard-type objections which have been made against the prescription of drugs by generic name.

What are these three typical objections?

First. There has been objection on the ground that "physicians cannot be sure of the quality."

Second. There has been objection on the ground that "physicians did not know the generic name."

The third objection was that the generic name was "too long and too complex to be handled easily."

DRUG LAW'S THREE OUTSTANDING PROVISIONS

Thanks to the pioneering of Senator KEFAUVER, the basis for all three objections has been demolished.

In the first place, the Kefauver-Harris law helps to assure high quality of all drugs. It established broad powers of inspection by the Food and Drug Administration for all manufacturing plants. It required that all plants meet established quality manufacturing controls. Therefore, the faithful administration of this law will assure the purity and related quality of all drugs produced in the United States.

Senator KEFAUVER met the second objection to generic products by providing that in every instance where a trade name appears in drug advertising, drug labeling, drug brochures, or elsewhere, there shall also appear—in type half the size—the generic name. Therefore, any excuse that the generic name is unfamiliar cannot now be accepted.

Finally, we turn to the criticism that it was impossible to handle generic names because they have been too long, too complicated. The law now authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in the interest of simplicity and usefulness, to establish simple, usable names. The Secretary can do so, if he is requested to do so, by the standard formularies, such as the U.S. Pharmacopoeia or the National Formulary. This is assuming that these nonprofit organizations are unable to come to agreement with drug companies on a simple, usable name. In addition, the Secretary can do so on his own initiative, based upon a review of all existing generic names. The law requires that the Secretary make such a review.

This law can, and will, produce lower prices for nonpatented drug products for the Nation.

There are many such nonpatented drug products.

CONSUMERS, M.D.'S NOT FULLY APPRISED

Unfortunately, consumers do not yet realize the powerful asset which the Congress has made available to them—for substantial economic savings.

Even physicians—who understand full well the difference between generic and trade names—have not yet utilized, to the degree that they should, the opportunity to lower drug costs to their patients.

MEDICAL PRESS SHOULD CEASE ITS INDIFFERENCE

Part of the reason is that, unfortunately, these particular provisions of the law have tended to be ignored by much of the medical press. It is not unlikely that the big pharmaceutical companies would like the medical press to continue to do so.

I urge action exactly to the contrary.

I urge that the American Medical Association begin to take leadership in this field. The Journal of the American Medical Association should have a major article on the value of prescribing by generic name, and it should in its pages have repeated reminders of the value of this manner of prescription. Every other medical journal in the land should likewise remind its readers of this opportunity to help save funds for their patients.

The fact is that physicians, in their undergraduate and postgraduate days, are trained by generic name, not by trade name.

Yet, after going into practice they are subjected to such subtle and hidden persuasion in advertising and public relations from the pharmaceutical industry, that M.D.'s develop the habit of writing prescriptions by trade name.

ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND FACTS

A number of additional facts should be borne in mind in connection with this issue.

First, it is no accident or coincidence that generic names have not only been long and unpronounceable in many instances, but that often there are, regrettably, several generic names for the same compound although ideally there should only be one.

Charles O. Wilson, dean of the School of Pharmacy, Oregon State College at Corvallis, cited to the Kefauver subcommittee instance after instance of a multiplicity of difficult, inconsistent generic names for the same compound. Many of the names are invariably what are sometimes called "jawbreakers."

I cite Dr. Wilson's comments in part 21 of the Kefauver hearings. I shall mention the generic names he listed for but one compound:

> Aoetophenolisatin * * *, acetylphenylisatin, diacetoxyphenyloxindol, phenylisatin, bis-acetoxyphenyl-oxindol-Prulet-diacetylhydroxyphenyl-oxindol, diacetyldioxyphenylistan.

Dr. Solomon Garb told the Kefauver subcommittee that drug companies frequently have asserted that it was unreasonable to expect physicians to order by generic name, since the name is usually so unwieldy. To this, Dr. Garb said:

> There is no merit to that argument, since the drug company is usually responsible * * * for the complex generic name * * * [thus], it seems unreasonable to criticize its complexity.

I want to reiterate this point. The fact that a chemical name is long is, by and large, unavoidable. A chemical name should repeat all of the ingredients; there may be many such in any given drug. But a generic name should be a relatively short abbreviation of the chemical ingredients, and it should be easily remembered.

Witness after witness pointed out to the Judiciary Subcommittee that drug companies "seem to" have followed a policy of making generic names as long, as difficult, and as unmanagable as possible.

Fortunately, we can now expect improvement in the situation with respect to generic names, thanks to Public Law 87–781.

The record of the past should not however, be forgotten.

M.D.'S SHOULD BE ALERT AGAINST PURELY COMMERCIAL GOALS

The point I wish to make is that the consumers of this Nation, the doctors, and the Congress must be alert to the fact that drugs are not only matters of health; they are also matters of big business.

Let me make it very clear that I am not questioning the proprietary right of the pharmaceutical industry to its trade name products, and to profits from those products. I believe in the American private enterprise system and in the system of patents.

But the fact remains that private enterprise is flourishing through the sale of generic products—at manufacturing, wholesale, and retail levels.

Major commercial interests have fought against generic-type prescriptions at every turn. They have used, and will continue to use, every device and tactic at their command.

If there is any one finding by the Senate Reorganization Subcommittee today, I would personally say that it is this: the drug industry has worked night and day for its particular interests. But the medical profession has not done so, for its interests and rights. And, quite often, commercial interests and medical interests do not coincide.

Up until the time of the Kefauver effort, there had been almost a vacuum in the national arena on the issue of generic drugs, insofar as the consumer's interest was concerned.

A somewhat similar vacuum has tended to exist around the Food and Drug Administration, insofar as drugs and consumers' rights have been concerned.

The drug industry has constantly pressured the FDA on drug policy; but the medical profession has not; nor have consumers, unfortunately.

This is not the first time that a regulatory agency has found itself completely surrounded, so to speak, by those it was supposed to regulate.

Second. Dr. Harry Dowling, of the University of Illinois, who last Wednesday testified before our subcommittee, had earlier testified before the Kefauver subcommittee that the use of a generic name is "educational as well as regulatory." Ideally, as I have indicated, a generic name is an abbreviation of a longer chemical name.

Therefore, the generic name at least may give an indication as to actual chemical content, whereas a trade name does not. A further reason is that the generic name of analog drugs are usually similar. This helps the physician to classify the drug in its proper group. It enables the physician to be sure that he is selecting the right drug from out of the confusion of literally thousands of drug names.

Third. For years, numerous sources have purchased by generic name, and they appear to be well satisfied with the practice. For example, the Military Medical Supply Agency purchases by generic name. Many of the leading hospitals in the United States purchase by generic name.

VALUE OF ANTITRUST ACTION

Fourth. The Department of Justice must be constantly on the alert to enforce the antitrust laws. One such action on its part will illustrate the value of such effort to consumers.

Here, I refer again to "Miltown." Under an antitrust decree, a drug company, which owned the product—Carter—was forced to sell bulk meprobamate "to all qualified comers" at a price of $20 a pound.

It is this antitrust requirement which has enabled other companies to enter into competition on this particular product.

It is interesting, incidentally, that when Carter sells supplies to other drug companies for marketing of the drug overseas, the bulk price drops to $1.50 per pound.

In our own country, a drug company, selling relatively inexpensive generic versions of Miltown, can make what most observers regard as a more than satisfactory profit. For example, in the United States one generic product sells at a price to druggists of 3.6 cents per pill. But here the trade name "Miltown" is sold by Carter to druggists at 6.3 cents per pill.

Most of the smaller drug enterprises produce generic name products, and a few of the larger companies likewise produce generic products.

CONCLUSION

There is no inconsistency between the sale and the purchase of generic products and the traditional American values which we all respect. Generic names are part of an American tradition of serving the consumer at fair prices.

Today, the average cost of a prescription is around $3.25. Over 700 million prescriptions are dispensed each year.

I respectfully urge American physicians to take advantage of this fine opportunity to serve their patients in this way—write the prescription by generic name, not trade name, wherever possible.

EXHIBIT 1

EXCERPTS FROM TESTIMONY BY SENATOR KEFAUVER ON H.R. 6245 BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 17, 1962, PAGES 64–66

PRESCRIBING BY GENERIC NAMES

A major objective of the bill is to correct conditions which have restricted the use of generic names in the writing of prescriptions. Although the importance of patented drugs has already been indicated, there is a substantial area in which important savings could be achieved through wider use of generic-name prescribing. Examples are provided by a contrast of the prices charged by McKesson & Robbins for generic-name products with the prices of the major drug companies for their trademark versions of the same products. McKesson's price for the nervous-system stimulant, dextro-amphetamine sulfate, is only one-fifteenth that of the most widely selling trade name make of a large company. Both digitoxin, used in heart cases, and isoniazid, used in the treatment of tuberculosis, are sold by McKesson at about half the prices charged by large manufacturers for their trade name products.

Not only individual consumers but Federal, State, and local governments would benefit from the savings available from generic-name prescribing. According to Dr. Alonzo S. Yerby, executive director, Medical Care Service of the New York City Department of Welfare, expenditures on noninstitutional care for recipients of public welfare in the State of New York amounted in 1960 to $16,927,000 of which approximately half was spent on drugs. The New York State Department of Social Welfare in June 1960 issued to the local welfare districts a list of 17 generic-name drugs for which it would not reimburse local welfare districts for prescriptions written by trade name. To obtain some idea of the resultant savings, Dr. Yerby tabulated the number of prescriptions and the quantity of medication prescribed for 11 of these 17 preparations, a few examples of which may be cited here. For reserpine the price actually paid on a generic-name basis was only 11 percent of the price quoted for the trade name product of a large manufacturer, while for rauwolfia it was only 19 percent of the trade name product. Savings of over 50 percent were also obtained for digitoxin, tolazaline, and aluminum-hydroxide gel. According to Dr. Yerby, savings by purchasing on a generic-name basis for these 11 items alone amounted to approximately $60,000 a year.

In addition, a tabulation was made by the New York State Department of Social Welfare of the savings on the 17 products for 1 month in 10 small welfare districts in upstate New York. In Dr. Yerby's words, "The cost of the nonproprietary or generic items that were prescribed according to the requirements of the State was actually $801, as compared to what the cost would have been had these same items been prescribed by trade name, which would have been $2,386."

In view of the existence of such potential savings, why is it that the great majority of physicians write out their prescriptions in terms of trade names? In the first place it is frequently difficult for the physician to use generic names even if he wishes to do so, because the drug companies have coined long. complex, unpronounceable generic names which it is difficult, if not impossible, for physicians to remember and spell. Moreover, on occasion the drug companies have come up with several generic names for the same product or alternatively have designated no generic name whatever. This has been possible because of the absence of any effective control over the designation of generic names. According to Dr. Dowling, who is a member of both the Council on Drugs of the American Medical Association and the United States Pharmacopeia—

"At present the decision on the nonproprietary name of a drug must be reached by agreement by the manufacturer, the American Medical Association, and the United States Pharmacopoeia. It is sometimes impossible to get the producer to agree to a simple name or to a name that is similar to the names of other compounds in the same class. Consequently some of the names in the United States Pharmacopoeia and New and Non-Official Drugs (which is published by the American Medical Association) are tongue twisters, and sometimes, too, drugs of similar chemical structure and with similar actions have entirely different names."

Under S. 1552 the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is empowered to designate in the interests of "usefulness and simplicity" an official name for any drug. Whenever he determines after a review that an official name is "unduly complex or is not useful for any other reason," he shall, after receiving recommendations from the compilers of official compendia, determine the official name, and when the compilers of such compendia request him to do so, he shall determine the official name. These provisions, I might add, are in accord with the recommendations of both the United States Pharmacopoeia and the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

The second reason for the lack of use of generic names in prescribing has been the widespread apprehension among physicians that their patients might receive drugs of inferior quality. Although there is no evidence that drugs of smaller manufacturers are generally inferior to those of large companies, at least to the degree that might constitute any danger to health, the hard fact remains that a great many physicians believe this to be the case. And as long as they hold to this point of view, their patients will never secure the savings which are possible through generic-name prescribing.

In two specific ways S. 1552 seeks to give assurance to the physician that any drug which he prescribes will be of adequate and acceptable quality, regardless of whether sold on a generic or trade name basis or manufactured by a small or large company. Thus the Secretary of HEW is empowered to prescribe the "qualifications required of the manufacturer" and to promulgate regulations which, among other things, are "to provide for adequate inspection" of drug plants. The regulations shall include provisions relating to such matters as plant sanitation, raw materials used, batch records, weighing and measuring controls, cleaning of equipment between batches, etc. The FDA inspectors are explicitly given authority to enter and inspect any drug manufacturing plant.

In this latter connection Mr. George P. Larrick, Commissioner of Food and Drugs, informed the subcommittee that FDA's "authority to inspect manufacturers of drugs was severely restricted when Congress passed the factor inspection amendment of 1953"; as a result, he stated, "many manufacturers, both large and small, now decline to permit our inspectors to inspect significant phases of their drug operations."

As a further means of assuring the physicians as to the quality of drugs and protecting the public health, manufacturers of drugs are required to be registered by the Food and Drug Administration. In order to become registered the company must meet prescribed standards necessary to insure "the continued chemical structure, strength, quality, purity, and efficacy of drugs." As long as his plant meets the prescribed requirements, the registered manufacturer is free to produce any drug. If he is not found to be qualified to produce one or more particular products, the manufacturer can continue to produce and sell others. Once he becomes registered, a manufacturer's registration may be canceled or suspended only after the Secretary of HEW secures an injunction in the district courts.

If the physician is provided with generic names which he can pronounce, spell, and remember, and if he is given reason to have confidence in the quality of all drugs available for sale, there is no reason why the potential savings of generic-name prescribing should not become a reality to the millions of consumers, as well as the thousands of hospitals and governmental organizations, for whom the high price of drugs constitutes a real and continuing financial problem.

AUTHORIZATION OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO MARKET POWER GENERATED AT AMISTEAD DAM ON THE RIO GRANDE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 321, H.R. 4062, to amend the act authorizing the transmission and disposition of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to market power generated at Amistead Dam on the Rio Grande, be removed from the calendar and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the business for today has been concluded, the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is ordered.

LOCATION OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS IN CERTAIN RESIDENTIAL AREAS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 335, S. 646.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 646) to prohibit the location of chanceries or other business offices of foreign governments in certain residential areas in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment on page 2, line 6, after the word "a", to strike out "one-family detached dwelling"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act providing for the zoning of the District of Columbia and the regulation of the location, height, bulk, and uses of buildings and other structures and the uses of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved June 20, 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number in section 6 and by adding at the end of such section the following new subsection:

"(b) After the date of enactment of this subsection, no foreign government shall be permitted to construct, alter, repair, convert, or occupy any building for use as a chancery, chancery annex, or other business office of such foreign government on any land, regardless of the date of acquisition thereof, within a residence district established pursuant to this Act, except on the same basis as in the case of the construction, alteration, repair, conversion, or occupancy of a similar building by a United States citizen or entity. Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit the continued use as a chancery, chancery annex, or other business office of any building lawfully being used for that purpose on the date of enactment of this subsection, or to prohibit the making of ordinary repairs to any such building. This subsection shall not be administered in such a way as to discriminate against any foreign government on the basis of the race, color, or creed of any of its citizens."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], it has been agreed, in accordance with our promise to the Senate, that the so-called chancery bill would now become the pending business and again at the conclusion of the morning business on Monday next, and that the fishery research and development bill, so-called S. 627, will not be taken up again until the chancery bill has been disposed of, which will be on either Monday or Tuesday of next week.

REDISCOUNT RATE INCREASE, THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS, AND THE DOMESTIC ECONOMY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Tuesday the Federal Reserve Board increased the rediscount rate from 3 to 3½ percent. I feel strongly that this action was a very serious economic blunder. The step, designed to stem our adverse flow of capital abroad, was taken with great sincerity and on the basis of the best advice that the Department of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board could get.

INTEREST RATES AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITY

But the consequences of that action on the domestic economy can only be adverse. The Democratic Party platform pledged itself very explicitly not to follow a tight money policy and to keep interest rates down. Certainly it is a serious mistake to raise interest rates at a time when we have nearly 5 million people out of work and when we have a very large part of our factory capacity underutilized.

Our economy is a credit economy. The progress of our economy depends on the willingness of businessmen to borrow to expand their plants and to expand their operations. It also depends upon the decisions of consumers to borrow to buy homes and to buy automobiles.

The action of increasing the rediscount rate will discourage that borrowing in two ways. In the first place, there is no question that it will raise interest rates generally, and thereby make borrowing more expensive. Everyone concedes that point. There is also no question that it will reduce the amount of loanable funds available to borrowers at banks that now have virtually no excess reserves. What the action means is that if such banks desire to loan more money they must go to the Federal Reserve and borrow it. Banks are much less likely to borrow money when the rediscount rate is increased in this country.

I should like to state an example. A bank desires to borrow $10 million on an annual basis. The Federal Reserve, rediscounting the loan, would have charged $300,000 interest before last Tuesday. Now the interest charge is $350,000. As one who has worked in a bank and studied banking carefully, I can tell the Senate that that extra $50,000 will make a great deal of difference to many banks in our country.

INTEREST RATES AND THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

The argument for the Federal Reserve Board's action is that it will discourage the flow of capital abroad. There is no question in my mind that this argument has been very, very feebly supported by the Treasury. In the past, when the same argument was made by the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury before our Joint Economic Committee, I pointed out the only studies in this area were made by Professor Philip Bell of Haverford and Mr. Robert Gemmill of the Federal Reserve Board, both outstanding economists. Both of those studies indicate that interest differentials are not significant causes of capital outflow when compared with other causes.

I should like to quote briefly from a statement by Professor Bell made at our hearings in August 1962. He said:

> We have again tried to see whether there has been any switching of short-term balances over a 5-year period using quarterly data for the most part between the United States and other places in the world on the basis of the changes in interest rates.

Then he continued to explain:

> I find very little interest effect on short-term liabilities.

If Mr. Bell's study is accepted, it means the effect of increasing interest rates to discourage the flow of capital abroad and to encourage the flow of capital into this country is not going to be very effective. Robert Gemmill's study showed exactly the same thing.

NEW STUDIES ON THE INTEREST SENSITIVITY OF CAPITAL MOVEMENTS: THE KENEN STUDY

After a series of challenges over a period of 2 years to Secretary Dillon and Chairman Martin, the Treasury came before our Joint Economic Committee with two studies, one by Professor Peter Kenen of Columbia University. The Kenen study was submitted in support of the Treasury's contention that interest rate differentials are important. I should like to quote what Professor Kenen himself concluded on the basis of his own study. What I am about to read appears on page 5 of the study:

> I am loathe to recommend that the United States raise interest rates to discourage short-term capital movements, even that they be kept at present levels if the domestic situation argues for reduction. My conclusions as to interest sensitivity are not decisive—and even if they were, the costs at home would be excessive.

That is the judgment of the author of the study on which the Treasury is relying.

I might also point out that Mr. Kenen admitted that his study was inadequate. He said:

> A flaw in the computer program gave wrong results for several of the constant terms, introducing a systematic error into the corresponding residuals. This led to bias in the Durbin-Watson coefficient. We were not able to correct the error in time to rerun all the residuals.

What does that mean? It means that, to some extent at least, the equations were wrong. Therefore, there is no way of knowing from Professor Kenen's final equations how much capital might respond to interest rate changes of any given magnitude.

In addition, the staff of the Joint Economic Committee reviewed Professor Kenen's analysis and found that some of the equations expressing his major conclusions are not internally consistent. There are necessarily a number of relationships between a multiple correlation coefficient and the partial correlation coefficients in any multiple correlation equation. The staff was unable to verify the internal consistency of the data presented in several of Professor Kenen's tabulations of statistics.

Furthermore, the review by our staff indicated that, even taking Mr. Kenen's study at face value, only about 15 percent—at most 25 percent—of the capital flow abroad is shown to be sensitive to interest rate differentials. For all of these reasons, the results of the Kenen study are not convincing or conclusive evidence that by raising the rediscount rate by ½ percentage point from 3 percent to 3½ percent, an increase of 17 percent, we will discourage the flow of capital abroad and encourage the flow of capital to this country. That, of course, was the purpose of the action.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE OF NEW YORK STUDY

In fairness, there was one other study which supported the Treasury's position that higher interest rates on short-term obligations would benefit the balance of payments. That was the Federal Reserve study made by Benjamin Cohen, an able economist. That document was also studied by the Joint Economic Committee. The analysis by Mr. Cohen is even less convincing than Mr. Kenen's, because all Mr. Cohen did was to assume that the average amplitude of yearly fluctuations in capital outflows over selected time periods, for whatever reasons, is the amount by which capital exports respond to interest rate changes. His report states:

> In the absence of more precise econometric analysis, we can just assume that the average annual amplitude of fluctuations roughly approximates the amount by which these capital exports might normally vary in a year in response to interest-rate changes.

Mr. Roosa admitted at the hearings—and Mr. Dillon and other economists have conceded that this is true—that the capital flow follows trade much more than it follows interest rates. Furthermore, as Mr. Bell determined in his very careful analysis, speculation can also be more important than interest rate differentials in inducing short-term capital outflows. So the other study, which was the only other empirical analysis which the Treasury cited in support of its decision to go along with the Federal Reserve Board, also seems to be totally inadequate and most unsatisfactory.

The action by the Federal Reserve Board, on the basis of the information which has come before the Joint Economic Committee, will not be very effective in stemming the flow of capital abroad or in encouraging it to come to this country. On the other hand, there is at least some real possibility that the increase in the rediscount rate, with the consequent general increase in interest rates and tightening of credit, is likely to have a deflationary, discouraging, and slowing-down effect on the domestic economy.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD'S POLICY STATEMENT

In all fairness, I must say that I am delighted to see, at long last, that the Federal Reserve Board has gone on record in favor of an expansionary monetary policy under present conditions. The conclusion of its short release announcing the increase in the rediscount rate, on page 2, states:

> These actions * * * do not constitute a change in the system's policy of maintaining monetary conditions conducive to fuller utilization of manpower and other resources in this country.

If this means anything, it means that at a time when there is heavy unemployment, when there is excess plant capacity, the Federal Reserve Board should follow a policy of actively increasing the money supply. That is not inconsistent with raising the rediscount rate. It is not inconsistent with a moderately higher short-term rate.

Mr. President, this will mean following a policy the Federal Reserve Board has not followed, at least not in the past 12 years; that is, a policy of substantial and extensive purchases of long-term obligations, of bonds, in the open market. The money supply should be increased at about the same rate we expect the gross national product to increase, which is about 4 or 5 percent per year.

If the Federal Reserve Board follows the policy of increasing the money supply by buying long-term obligations, it may, in spite of the increase in the rediscount rate, stimulate the economy. Such a policy would tend to reduce long-term rates. The long-term rates, of course, are very important in our economy.

Mr. President, we must closely follow the statistics every week to see what the Federal Reserve Board is doing in actual practice. It is a question of fact. It is a question of action. It is a question of what will happen to the portfolio of the Federal Reserve Board. Rosy statements made by the Federal Reserve Board, assuring Congress that something will be done, are not enough. For the past few months the Board has been following a tighter money policy, under which the growth in the money supply has declined appreciably.

INTEREST RATES OF OTHER COUNTRIES

As to the interest rate problem, I asked Secretary Dillon, when he appeared before our committee, what was to prevent other countries from increasing their short-term interest rates when we increase ours. I pointed out that a number of other countries have every reason to increase their short-term interest rates. By and large, they do not have unemployment problems. By and large, they do not have vacant plant capacity. They have inflationary problems which we do not have. They would be tempted to increase their rates.

Secretary Dillon conceded that, if such countries increased their rates, the effect of our increase in the rediscount rate would be offset, neutralized, and made meaningless.

I asked Secretary Dillon if he could assure us that efforts have been made to reach an understanding with these countries that they would refrain from increasing their interest rates if we raised ours. He said he could.

I wrote Secretary Dillon yesterday and asked him to provide me with some factual documentation of the assurances which he secured. I was dismayed to see in this morning's New York Times the following information:

> In London, the rate on Eurodollars, or deposits of American dollars in banks overseas, moved up a notch by about $\frac{1}{8}$ or $\frac{3}{16}$ percent.

In short, the rate moved up almost half the amount by which our rediscount rate was increased.

> Canadian banks said they would not preclude a rise in time deposit rates later.

The rate is moving up in Canada.

> The Belgian central bank increased its lending rate to 4 percent from 3½ percent.

That paralleled exactly what we did.

It seems that, far from providing assurances that they will not increase their interest rates, other countries are in the process of raising their rates. This is not benefiting the U.S. economy. It is slowing it down. It may benefit the Belgian economy, the British economy, the West German economy, or the Italian economy.

It seems to me that the action taken by the Federal Reserve Board, on the basis of the facts which are available to us tonight, indicates that: First, this action will not be effective in correcting our adverse balance of payments; and, second, it will have a significantly adverse effect on our economy unless the Federal Reserve Board follows a policy of expanding the money supply more rapidly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad the Senator from Wisconsin is making the speech. I wish to associate myself with his observations and conclusions.

Earlier this afternoon I made a speech which was highly critical of the administration's announced policy today that will lead to an increase in interest rates. I say to my friend from Wisconsin that I have one suggestion of a course the administration should have followed first—but better late than never—namely, to drastically cut American expenditures abroad. The best way to cut American expenditures abroad is to cut the foreign aid bill a minimum of 25 percent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon. I shall certainly follow his leadership in this regard. The Senator has been making a series of extremely informative and enlightening speeches on the floor of the Senate, which I have either heard or read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They are excellent speeches.

It is very hard, it seems to me, for anybody to refute the Senator's speeches. I hope that the Senate will follow the leadership of the Senator from Oregon, who is making the case that if we are really to do anything constructive and effective about the adverse balance of payments, we must start with our foreign aid program.

NEW INITIATIVES BY THE ADMINISTRATION

The President made an important announcement today on the balance of payments which I think is constructive and which, in one of its major proposals, follows one member of the Federal Reserve Board, George Mitchell. The President proposed what he called an interest equalization tax, which would be a tax on investments by Americans in foreign securities. This makes sense. It has been a long time coming, but at long last I think we are beginning to make constructive progress.

This was a difficult decision for the President to make, because it breaks new ground. It is not an entirely new concept.

George Mitchell, when he appeared before the Joint Economic Committee earlier this year, suggested it, when we were questioning him as to what might be done. He said:

> We might consider a more direct attack on the capital outflow problem. The United States has the largest and most accessible capital market in the world, and it ought to be kept free of exchange restrictions. It is proper and desirable that capital-poor developing countries should utilize this market to meet a portion of their enormous needs for foreign capital.

I may add that the President of the United States exempted the capital-poor countries from the provisions of his proposal.

I continue the quotation:

> It is not so clear, however, that it is either necessary or desirable for advanced countries, with balance-of-payments surpluses, to have recourse to our capital market on the recent large scale while they restrict and hamper entry of outside borrowers to their own capital markets. If these countries are unwilling to open their capital markets, possibly we should look toward tax measures that might help to remedy this unbalanced position. In general, we need to explore the possibilities of various tax measures that might, consistent with our obligations as an international good neighbor, and with the status of the dollar as a world reserve currency, discourage capital movements that

appear to flow "uphill" to countries that are already capital rich.

OTHER COUNTRIES' POLICIES RESTRICTING CAPITAL MOVEMENTS

In questioning Mr. Mitchell, the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] asked him to document his charge that most Western European countries do exactly what the President is proposing. Mr. Mitchell provided this in a summary which is printed in the Economic Report hearings.

I ask unanimous consent that the summary, beginning a little past the halfway mark on page 401, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS,
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, D.C., February 13, 1963.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your request for documentation of my statement before the committee on February 1, 1963, to the effect that foreign industrial countries restrict access to their capital markets, I am sending you a report prepared in the Department of State entitled, "Government Restrictions on the Outflow of Private Capital Employed by the Principal Capital Exporting Countries" (INR Research Memorandum No. RFX-34, July 20, 1962). This report provides an excellent comprehensive summary both of exchange restrictions on capital outflow and of other kinds of restrictions.

Because this report is rather lengthy, I enclose also a summary prepared by the Board's staff and based on the State Department document.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE W. MITCHELL.

SUMMARY OF RESTRICTIONS ON CAPITAL EXPORTS BY MAJOR EUROPEAN COUNTRIES AND JAPAN

Belgium-Luxembourg

Almost no capital outflows from Belgium-Luxembourg are permitted at official exchange rates, but nearly all such transactions are permitted at the free market rate for foreign currencies, which is usually at premium compared with the official rate. In addition, foreign flotations of stocks and bonds, and trading in existing securities require the approval of the Minister of Finance. Approval may be refused for political reasons, because of the tightness of the capital market, or for any other reason.

France

In France, direct investment abroad by residents requires prior authorization, but such authorization is freely granted. Portfolio investment abroad by residents is also freely permitted for securities listed on stock exchanges; the purchase of unlisted securities is subject to license. Commercial credits to foreigners for less than 5 years are also freely authorized. Other forms of capital outflow are strictly controlled and generally prohibited.

Both foreign and domestic flotations of both stocks and bonds amounting to over $200,000 must be authorized by the French Treasury, and no foreign flotations have been authorized in the postwar period. Loans to foreigners other than commercial credits of 5 years or less are also subject to individual licensing, and generally not allowed. Neither are French residents allowed to make bank deposits abroad.

Germany

The Federal Republic of Germany is the only Western European country that places no restrictions of any kind on capital outflows, but the Government has the authority to restrict capital outflows to safeguard the balance of payments or to protect the German capital market. The flotation of foreign securities has been limited by high interest rates in Germany and a securities issue tax of 2.5 percent and a capital market turnover tax of 1.25 percent.

Italy

Italy restricts capital outflows through the licensing of many types of transactions under the exchange control laws, and also under banking legislation. Direct investment abroad by Italian residents requires prior authorization unless the business being invested in is the same as that of the investor. Portfolio investment abroad by Italian residents is now subject to licensing, with some exceptions, but this regulation is scheduled to be eased in April 1963. The exchange control regulations also presently prevent flotation of stocks and bonds denominated in foreign currencies on the Italian financial markets. In addition, foreign security flotations are subject, along with domestic issues, to control under banking legislation. Authorization to foreign entities to float issues on the Italian exchanges has not been granted since the war except to foreign firms with branches in Italy for use in Italy, and recently to the Inter-American Development Bank.

Italian residents are generally not permitted to make deposits in foreign banks. Loans by Italian banks to foreigners are subject to licensing under exchange control regulations, except commercial credits of under 1 year.

Netherlands

In the Netherlands, capital outflows of every kind are subject to exchange control regulations and to control under banking legislation. In the case of direct investment abroad, however, the required authorization is always granted. Portfolio investment abroad by residents must take place via the free exchange market, which is supplied with funds by foreign purchases of Dutch securities. Foreign bond issues on the Netherlands capital markets are licensed by the Netherlands Bank, and the total amount permitted in any one year limited by the bank. Bank loans to nonresidents of over $2,600 per year require a special license. Deposits by residents in foreign banks are also subject to exchange controls.

Switzerland

Foreign borrowing on the Swiss market is restricted by the requirement that the national bank approve all foreign placements of stocks or bonds and all bank loans to foreigners amounting to more than $2.3 million. Admission of foreign securities to the Swiss stock exchanges must also be authorized by the national bank. The export of capital by Swiss residents is otherwise unrestricted. Residents may freely make direct investments abroad, invest in foreign securities, and make deposits in foreign banks.

United Kingdom

The United Kingdom maintains exchange controls on the outflow of capital to the nonsterling area, and in addition controls the flotation of securities in the United Kingdom by both sterling and nonsterling area borrowers. In the postwar period, only sterling area borrowers with some minor exceptions have had access to the United Kingdom capital market. Direct investment abroad by United Kingdom residents is subject to individual licensing, the liberality of which varies with the balance of payments. Portfolio investment in nonsterling securities is subject to licensing, and the United Kingdom does not normally allot foreign exchange to allow the existing level of holdings to rise. Commercial credits of less than 6 months may be made freely to nonresidents, but longer credits require licensing. Bank accounts may be maintained abroad by resident firms if required for the conduct of business, but such permission is not usually granted to individuals.

Japan

All private investment abroad by Japanese residents must be licensed under the exchange control system. In reviewing foreign investment proposals, the Government inquires as to whether the output will expand or compete with Japanese exports. Portfolio investments by Japanese residents are rarely allowed, and then mainly for the purpose of promoting Japanese exports. The inconvertibility of the yen on capital account has effectively prevented the flotation of foreign security issues in Japan. All private loans and credits to foreigners are also subject to licensing under the exchange control system. Commercial credits of less than 1 year are granted to foreigners, as are longer term credits for the export of capital goods. Otherwise very little lending by Japanese residents to foreigners, either in yen or foreign currency, is permitted. As a rule, no resident (corporation or person) may hold foreign exchange in his own name or deposit money abroad; exceptions are made for export-import firms.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Roughly, it shows that only West Germany, of all the countries in Western Europe, places no restriction on any kind of capital outflow. Most of them do, and their measures are much more restrictive than the President's proposal, which can have a very constructive effect on our balance of payments.

Mr. President, before I leave the subject, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the New York Times, entitled "Money Market Sequel—Banks Raise Key Time-Deposit Rates After Twin Moves by Reserve Board," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

MONEY MARKET SEQUEL—BANKS RAISE KEY TIME-DEPOSIT RATES AFTER TWIN MOVES BY RESERVE BOARD

(By Albert L. Kraus)

New York City money market banks established a rate of 3⅜ percent yesterday on 3- to 6-month negotiable time certificates of deposit and increased by one-eighth point the return to investors on longer maturities.

The action was the most significant sequel to the twin moves by the Federal Reserve Board a day earlier to raise short-term interest rates and to stem a renewed outflow of liquid funds overseas.

In one move, the Board approved a rise to 3½ percent from 3 percent in the lending rate to member banks in 7 of the 12 Federal Reserve districts. In the other move, the Board raised the ceiling on interest rates that member banks may pay to their business depositors on short-term funds.

RELATIVELY NEW INSTRUMENT

Time certificates of deposit, a relatively new money market instrument, have grown rapidly in importance. In the week ended July 10, the most recent figure available, $2,248,100,000 of such deposits was outstanding at nine leading New York City banks. This was an increase of $400,900,000 since the beginning of the year.

Because of the 2½-percent ceiling on 3-month deposits—well below comparable market rates of interest—the banks had written no certificates for maturities shorter than 6 months.

Lifting of the ceiling and establishment of the 3⅜-percent rate in the 3-month maturity is expected to put the banks actively in competition with the Treasury and other short-term borrowers, such as the leading finance companies. The latter sell their commercial paper directly to investors in competition with Treasury bills, bankers' acceptances and other short-term obligations.

CONTINUING OBJECTIVE

The banks, in turn, are expected to channel substantial amounts of short-term funds into long-term loans—mortgages, municipal bonds, and term loans to industry. This should help the Treasury and the Federal Reserve hold down long-term interest rates while propping up short-term rates, one of its continuing objectives so long as the domestic economy remains at less than capacity operation.

Perhaps because of an inflow of new time deposits, the banks were reported to be active buyers of municipal obligations yesterday.

For State-chartered banks, the time-deposit rate increase became possible when the State banking board, at a special meeting, authorized the new ceiling of 4 percent on time deposits and certificates of more than 3 months' maturity.

The New York City banks were watchful to see whether foreign banks would retaliate by increasing their own time-deposit rates. In London, the rate on Eurodollars, or deposits of American dollars in banks overseas, moved up a notch by about one-eighth or three-sixteenths of 1 percent. The new 3-month rate generally is 4⅛ percent.

There was no immediate response in Toronto and Montreal, but spokesmen for the leading Canadian banks said they would not preclude a rise in time deposit rates later. U.S. sources have blamed an outflow of funds to Canada and Britain for a sharp increase in the loss of liquid assets from the United States in the April–June quarter.

BELGIAN RATE RAISED

The Belgian Central Bank increased its lending rate to 4 percent from 3½ percent, but officials took pains to dissociate the move from the change in the U.S. discount rate. They explained that the rate had been dropped earlier in the year and that it was being raised again because of a threat to stability that had developed within the country.

Belgium has not attracted any large volume of short-term funds from the United States.

In Europe generally, the change in the U.S. discount rate had been largely discounted in advance. Japanese officials, however, expressed concern that intensified "dollar defense" measures by the United States might mean some worsening of Japan's trade position.

The Associated Press said Finance Ministry sources feared the U.S. action might result in a cut in American aid to Japan and an accelerated "buy American" policy. The twin moves to raise short-term interest rates by themselves, they said, would have little effect on exports.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I also ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Payment Deficit Seen Worsening" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAYMENT DEFICIT SEEN WORSENING—MAJOR FOREIGN TRADE GROUP FORECASTS 1963 IMBALANCE WILL AMOUNT TO $3 BILLION—PRIOR ESTIMATE RAISED—COUNCIL ATTRIBUTES UPWARD REVISION TO LARGE OUTFLOW OF U.S. CAPITAL ABROAD

(By Brendan M. Jones)

A deficit of $3 billion in the U.S. balance-of-payments this year was forecast yesterday by the National Foreign Trade Council.

The figure is slightly less than the indicated rate for the first half of this year, but it is sharply higher than the $2,200 million deficit for last year.

The balance of payments records all private and public transactions made through foreign currency exchange such as trade, aid, investments, and the like.

The forecast was made by the council's balance-of-payment group, which also made an optimistic estimate indicating a substantial gain in the Nation's exports this year.

UPWARD REVISION

The group consists of some 50 economists and financial officers of leading international corporations.

Its latest estimate on the payments deficit represents an upward revision in the estimate made in January when it forecast a deficit of $2 billion for 1963.

However, it was noted that considering seasonal developments the new estimate implied a considerable improvement in comparison with the rate for the deficit in the first half of the year.

The group observed that in the first half there had been an unexpectedly large outflow of capital from the United States to foreign countries.

MAJOR REASON

This was provisionally reported at $2,400 million, or twice the expected rate, and was considered the major reason for the greater payment imbalance in the first half.

The group predicted that the rate of private capital outflow would fall in the second half. It is estimated the total of private capital outflow for the year at $4,300 million.

In revising its estimate of Government capital outflow to $1,700 million for the year, the group also noted that advance foreign government debt repayment so far announced has been only $200 million. The group originally had estimated such advance repayments for the year at $500 million.

Commercial exports, excluding military aid shipments, are expected to reach a new record of $21,500 million for 1963, the group said. It commented that "exports in the second half of the year would show sustained strength." Last year commercial exports amounted to $20,500 million.

Imports for 1963 were estimated at $16,500 million, a new record, but only moderately higher than the $16,100 million total for 1962.

Dollar expenditures in transactions with foreign countries this year were estimated at $34,500 million, with an additional outflow of $200 million in unrecorded transactions. Dollar receipts are expected to be $31,700 million.

The difference of $3 billion would be the balance-of-payments deficit, as measured by changes in gold and convertible currency holdings by Government monetary authorities, and the increase in liquid liabilities.

The United States has run substantial payments deficits since 1958, when the deficit amounted to $3,400 million. In 1959, the deficit was $3,800 million (excluding a special International Monetary Fund contribution); in 1960, $3,900 million; 1961, $2,500 million, and last year, $2,200 million.

In making its estimates the council group noted that certain unpredictable factors had not figured in calculations. These included effects of various proposals for legislative or governmental actions to alleviate the deficit, including the rise in the discount rate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The article relates that the National Foreign Trade Council estimated there will be a deficit of $3 billion in the U.S. balance of payments this year, which is far greater than it was last year.

I also ask unanimous consent that a chart prepared by the Joint Economic Committee, which brings up to date information on the balance of payment deficits, U.S. gold reserves, foreign countries' gold reserves, claims against our gold, and so forth, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. balance-of-payments deficits, U.S. and foreign countries' gold reserves, U.S. liquid liabilities to foreigners, and official gold and foreign exchange holdings of foreign countries

In millions of dollars]

	U.S. balance of payments	U.S. gold reserves, year end	Foreign countries gold reserves,[1] year end	U.S. liquid liabilities to foreign countries, official and private,[2] year end	Official gold and foreign exchange holdings of foreign countries,[3] year end
1949	+$175	$24,563	$8,990	$6,410	(4)
1950	−3,580	22,820	11,025	8,394	$25,875
1951	−305	22,873	11,185	8,272	25,197
1952	−1,046	23,252	10,870	9,863	26,398
1953	−2,152	22,091	12,495	10,824	29,444
1954	−1,550	21,793	13,405	11,895	31,462
1955	−1,145	21,753	14,060	13,028	32,487
1956	−935	22,058	14,325	14,619	33,827
1957	+520	22,857	14,730	14,906	33,453
1958	−3,529	20,582	17,530	15,642	36,723
1959	−3,743	19,507	18,280	[5] 17,726	37,563
1960	−3,881	17,804	20,260	[5] 18,701	41,921
1961	−2,370	[6] 17,063	22,080	[5] 20,187	44,147
1962	−2,186	[6] 16,156	23,180	[5] 21,046	45,219
1963	[7] −3,224	[6,8] 15,855	[9] 23,390	[5,9] 21,396	(4)

[1] Excludes gold reserves of the U.S.S.R., other Eastern European countries, and China mainland.

[2] Comprises foreign official and private holdings of short-term dollars (principally deposits and U.S. Treasury bills and certificates) and U.S. Government bonds and notes.

[3] Data for the years before 1953 were computed on a different basis than for later years.

[4] Not available.

[5] Data are not adjusted for liquid liabilities to foreigners held in special Treasury account.

[6] In addition to gold, the United States held foreign convertible currencies amounting to $116,000,000 at the end of 1961, $99,000,000 at the end of 1962, and $155,000,000 at the end of May 1963.

[7] First quarter, seasonally adjusted, annual rate.

[8] U.S. gold reserves at the end of May 1963.

[9] End of March 1963.

Compiled by the staff of the Joint Economic Committee from the following sources: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Supplement to Banking and Monetary Statistics, secs. 14 and 15; Federal Reserve Bulletin, various issues; and IMF, International Financial Statistics, various issues.

FRIEDRICH HAILS HONEST, DILIGENT CONGRESSMEN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, too frequently members of the press and the academic community take shots at the Congress. Hardly a day passes that editorials are not written talking about Members of Congress and their laziness, and so forth. I deplore such press reports. It is not fair. In my own experience, Members of Congress are hard working and honest men.

I am delighted that Carl J. Friedrich, a professor at Harvard, who was my adviser on my doctoral dissertation and who is president of the American Political Science Association, wrote a letter to the Washington Star, which appeared in last evening's paper and stated in part as follows:

> Let me then stand up and be counted as one who believes that the large majority of the men serving in the Senate and the House of Representatives are dedicated public servants. It has been my privilege as a lifelong student of politics to be personally acquainted with quite a few of these men. I have no hesitation in saying that I have found them men of intelligence, courage, and integrity, and what is perhaps even more important: very hard working.

Mr. Friedrich goes on to point out he was a consultant with the Herter committee and worked closely with individual Members of Congress.

It is about time we got more than derogatory statements.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAISES CONGRESS

Some weeks ago you published in a news story from Charlotte, N.C., the "jaundiced view of politicians" of the Reverend Norman Vincent Peale. It is regrettable, to say the least, that a man in a responsible position should thus abuse those who serve the Nation in elective public office.

It is, of course, a conventional pastime of the "man in the street" to work off his frustrations by such abuse. But in these times when constitutional democracy in general, and our American Republic in particular, are confronted with the totalitarian challenge to representative government, such reckless misrepresentation of the plain facts ought not to go unanswered.

Let me then stand up and be counted as one who believes that the large majority of the men serving in the Senate and the House of Representatives are dedicated public servants. It has been my privilege as a lifelong student of politics to be personally acquainted with quite a few of these men. I have no hesitation in saying that I have found them men of intelligence, courage, and integrity, and what is perhaps even more important: very hard working.

Knowing the record, I believe that a careful statistical study would show that Members of Congress work longer hours than most Americans, including ministers and college professors. When I had the honor of serving as an expert consultant with the congressional Committee on Foreign Aid (Herter committee) I was deeply impressed with the long hours put in by all the members who went abroad to convince themselves that the Marshall plan proposals made sense. Their epochmaking report became one of the most important documents of the postwar years, and all of Europe owes its remarkable recovery to the labor of these men.

Needless to say, I often have disagreed with one or another of these men. But I have always found them open to fair argument and anxious to discover the best answer. I feel proud of our representatives, and only wish we could bring it about that the representatives of other nations now trying to become constitutional democracies would become equally devoted and public spirited.

CARL J. FRIEDRICH,
President, American Political Science Association.

CONTAMINATION OF ATMOSPHERE BY NUCLEAR TESTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call attention to a fine article by Drew Pearson in the Washington Post of Wednesday, July 17, 1963, in which he pointed out the very serious poisoning of the atmosphere through nuclear testing. This article, it seems to me, corroborates the need for the bill I have introduced, which would give the Public Health Service authority to establish what is the danger level, in a situation which is very confused and conflicting.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Drew Pearson be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 17, 1963]

CHILDREN'S FATE AT STAKE IN TALKS

(By Drew Pearson)

Averell Harriman and the Russian delegates in Moscow won't know it, but several million children will be in the position of looking over their shoulders as they discuss a ban on future nuclear testing.

They are children whose thyroid can be enlarged by the increase of radioactive iodine in the atmosphere and whose bones would be weakened by strontium 90 or who could someday develop leukemia because of the poison which adults in the United States and Russia are unleashing through fallout.

Actually, not too many adult Americans know the entire story of how this poison is accumulating or the steps taken by the atomic officials to hide it.

They probably do not know, for instance, that during the first 4 years of the Eisenhower administration, nuclear testing totaled an average of between 19 and 20 megatons a year, which was considered a lot of radioactive fallout to spread in the atmosphere and was one reason why Adlai Stevenson, campaigning for President in 1956, took a strong though unpopular stand for a ban on testing.

President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon accused him of ignorance and theatrics, but about a year after the election, adopted his proposal. There was no nuclear testing between 1958 and 1961. Then in September of that year the Russians resumed, followed by the United States, with a total of 120 megatons exploded, against 20 megatons annually in the early 1950's. In 1962, this went up to 217 megatons.

AEC WAS WORRIED

Back in 1957, just after Stevenson publicly demanded the end of nuclear testing, the Atomic Energy Commission appeared to agree with him. It said:

"The consequences of further testing over the next several generations at the level of the past 5 years could constitute a hazard to the world's population."

Now that the level has increased from around 20 megatons to 217 megatons, the AEC does not seem so worried. At any rate, the Federal Radiation Council, which the AEC dominates through Executive Director Paul Tompkins, has been extremely skittish about being pinned down on the danger-point for further testing.

Tompkins, a former AEC official and still paid by the AEC, has taken what amounts to a position that danger guidelines for nuclear testing should not be set because they might have to be raised in order to permit more testing.

This is why Senator BOB BARTLETT, the outspoken Democrat from Alaska, bucked his own Democratic administration with this warning:

"I cannot help feeling that the hesitancy in applying the radiation protection guide to fallout is caused by the fear that range III levels may be attained and that countermeasures may, therefore, be called for. Officials responsible for such matters have publicly expressed concern for the application of countermeasures which might have unpleasant economic consequences.

"If the Federal Radiation Council is not prepared to recommend countermeasures when third range danger levels are attained, then why does it not say so and clearly?" asked the Senator from Alaska.

"If the guide does not apply let the Government stop using it. Let it be dropped at once. It is indefensible to continue its use and at the same time refuse to act when the guidelines indicate action."

CURBED TESTIMONY

Apparently the public isn't going to get much chance to testify regarding the Atomic Energy Commission's proposal to turn fissionable materials over to private industry.

Fissionable materials are the deadly, secret materials which go into atomic and hydrogen bombs. After long debate following World War II, Congress decided these should not be given to private industry. But the AEC now proposed otherwise and the Joint Atomic Energy Committee of Congress will hold hearings July 29 on the change.

This is the worst time in the world to hold such hearings. Scientists and concerned citizens who otherwise would testify are away for the summer and many don't even know about the hearings.

However, Senator JOHN PASTORE, of Rhode Island, and Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, both Democrats, have added another hurdle which will limit public testimony. They state:

"All persons desiring to testify or submit statements should submit 12 copies of their prepared statements to the * * * committee not later than July 15."

Finally, the closing date for submitting statements was July 15. And since it is now July 17, it's highly doubtful that many Americans will get a chance to be heard on the all-important question of permitting private industry to have the dangerous fissionable materials which go into the A-bomb and the H-bomb.

NOTE.—The hearings are scheduled just as Averell Harriman is in Moscow, on instructions from President Kennedy to try to keep the atomic "genie in the bottle." Apparently the atomic genie will not be kept in the bottle here at home.

HELP WANTED STATISTICS NEEDED TO BALANCE UNEMPLOYMENT DATA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Arthur Burns, who is a very capable economist, and who was the head of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Eisenhower, points out that the statistics which are made available on unemployment are most inadequate because they do not provide knowledge on job vacancies. Mr. Burns documents his position, and the New York Times gives it very thorough coverage.

As a member of the Statistics Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, I regard this analysis by Mr. Burns as very important, and I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD for the information of the Members of the Senate and others. I am going to call on the staff of the Joint Economic Committee which is assigned to the Statistics Subcommittee to see if we can get better statistics to provide a fairer picture.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTHUR F. BURNS SAYS U.S. DATA ON JOB VACANCIES IS INADEQUATE

Efforts to reduce unemployment are being hampered by a lack of national statistics on actual job vacancies.

That view is expressed by Dr. Arthur F. Burns, president of the National Bureau of Economic Research and former economic adviser to President Eisenhower, in a discussion appearing in the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co.'s latest monthly report on the economy.

Dr. Burns says that comprehensive figures on job openings are a vital missing link in our entire system of economic intelligence. Only by having such figures and then setting them against those for unemployment, according to the Columbia University professor of economics, is it possible to know whether the economy is failing to provide sufficient employment opportunities to permit a job for all who are able, willing, and seeking to work. He terms the lack of such statistics deplorable.

It is necessary to match job availability against joblessness, says the economist, in order to determine the causes of unemployment and the remedy for it.

As for the causes of unemployment, Dr. Burns cites two opposing schools of thought. One consists of the expansionists who attribute unemployment principally to a more or less chronic shortage of aggregate demand. The other comprises the structuralists who give chief importance to the rapid piling up of economic changes, which have been creating more jobs than can be filled in some occupations and communities while substantial unemployment is being created in others.

Much of this debate between the expansionists and the structuralists could be resolved on a factual basis, according to Dr. Burns, if overall national statistics on job vacancies existed, and if there were supporting data on job openings and unemployment in individual occupations and communities. The major policy problem of our generation in the economic sphere is whether aggregate demand at a particular time is deficient and, if so, what action the Government can wisely take.

In urging the development of needed statistics on job vacancies, the head of the National Bureau of Economic Research points out:

"Electronic computers open up exciting possibilities for the future. With their aid, an unemployed worker expressing his need or preference to an officer of an employment exchange might be referred in a matter of hours, if not minutes, to a list of potential employers, outside his community if there are none in his own, who need that type of employee. Employers could be served in a similar way."

Dr. Burns goes on to define "full employment" as meaning "that the number of vacant jobs at prevailing wages is as large as the number unemployed, and that the labor market is so organized that everyone who is able, willing, and seeking to work already has a job or can obtain one after a brief search or after undergoing some training."

OTHER ASPECTS DESCRIBED

Such a concept of full employment, he remarks, would be of assistance to policymakers in many ways. "By focusing on job opportunities as well as on job shortages, on employment as well as unemployment, this concept should help to keep the healthy and the pathological aspects of economic life in perspective."

Dr. Burns called particular attention to several other aspects of unemployment, including:

"A serious need to revamp the insurance system so that more effective aid would be given to unemployed workers in finding new jobs.

"A need to devise ways of administration that would strictly withhold benefits from those who quit their jobs without good cause or who are unwilling to accept suitable work.

"A need to use the insurance system to enlarge the retraining opportunities for workers who can have little hope of finding employment in their own trade."

He adds that "if it is really true that collective bargaining and some of our social legislation are tending to complicate the unemployment problem, it would be well to turn at once to exploring ways of reducing the dangerous side effects."

Dr. Burns' remarks were originally delivered as a lecture at Rice University last spring, but had not been previously published.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND AMERICAN LABOR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there appeared an article in the Washington Daily News by John Herling relating to the American labor movement and civil rights. To the contrary of what has been alleged, American labor has been doing a good job in the fields of civil rights, and, under the circumstances in the South, at great cost to its membership.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Herling be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS AND AMERICAN LABOR

(By John Herling)

Recently, attempts have been made to drive a wedge between President Kennedy and the American trade unions. The sweaty drivers of the wedge, using more muscle than skill, shine with a kind of instant wisdom in labor affairs. Their efforts aim to please those who deplore labor's legislative and political activities as they seek to draw as much labor support as possible away from the Kennedy administration.

This week, the wedge is the civil rights issue. In this area, the American labor movement has in many ways been far in advance of the national community in its opposition to racial discrimination. In some areas, such as the building trades, there has been a long, hard fight for the elimination of the racial bars from apprenticeship and membership in some of the craft unions. The great obstacle here has not been the top leadership of the trade unions, but unhappily, some of the local leadership and some of the rank and file.

In many ways, one of the most dramatic struggles inside the labor movement has been the unremitting efforts of the leadership to persuade, to educate, to cajole, to pressure their local constituency into an understanding of the issues involved and into changing some of their traditional practices. It has been mainly a silent, unpublicized battle.

When the top leadership of the American Federation of Labor—even before the merger with the CIO—came out in flat support of the Supreme Court school decision of 1954, President George Meany was assailed in the days following by a barrage of about 10,000 messages, largely from the South, threatening him and the trade unions with all sorts of dire consequences. But the American labor leadership pushed ahead, not so fast as some in or out of the labor movement would have liked, but they pushed, and pushed hard.

They acted out of conviction, certainly not out of expediency. Obviously, the problems of organization in the South were tough and tricky enough without giving the opposition another stick—the desegregation issue—to beat the unions with. The unions did move, regardless.

In the 9 years since, enormous advances have taken place in the trade unions as in the Nation. The AFL-CIO nationally and through its affiliates, has thrown its full support behind the President's civil rights bill. In fact, without AFL-CIO's backing the civil rights measure does not stand a chance.

The trade unions' position goes beyond the President's civil rights bill. They have given full support to a supplementary bill, calling for the establishment of the Fair Employment Practices Commission. Such a bill, introduced by California's Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT and just voted out of committee, will have its counterpart in a bill introduced by Minnesota Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY. President Kennedy supported the FEPC concept, but it has not been a part of the administration's proposed legislation.

On the rail issue, everybody is unhappy—the administration, the unions and the rail management. The prospect of throwing out tens of thousands of men—former aristocrats of labor—is a moral, not merely a technological, question. The savings in payrolls means waste of human beings and costs to taxpayers. Some formula of accommodation, of adjustment, and of amelioration is desperately sought. Specific legislation may be the only way out, but President Kennedy has made it clear that he is not moving hastily or angrily.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 582) to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

DEFENSE OF THE REPUBLICAN ORGANIZATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, this last weekend an intemperate and, in my opinion, ill-judged, attack was made on the conservatives of the Republican Party. Since the conservatives constitute quite clearly the great majority of the party it seems all the more strange, even suicidal, for a man sometimes thought to have been a Republican leader to turn on the great majority of his party such a destructive attack. The potential damage to the party is incalculable. The effects of the chasm which these attacks are opening in the party will be felt not only on the national level, but right down through the ticket to the local offices. It is no longer possible to remain silent in the face of such self-serving tactics by a man desperately trying to retrieve his declining political fortunes. This brazen attempt to cast a shadow over all conservatives by pinning an extremist label on them is the same tiresome and hypocritical game which for years has been the principal weapon of the northern Democrats. It is false in their hands, and it is equally false in the hands of a Republican.

It is my considered judgment that a man who would take such desperate and destructive measures against his own party in a gamble to gain some temporary, personal advantage has already forfeited any claim to loyalty from any part of the party organization.

I have come to make this statement indeed as a result of many telephone calls, and other communications I have had from party organization people who are filled with anger and dismay at this cynical attack which, if it is continued, everyone knows can only weaken disastrously the whole party. If we of the party allow such desperate opportunism to cloud the chances of all Republicans in 1964, we shall deserve what we get. I call upon the responsible leadership of the party to act with firmness and courage in exposing these destructive tactics for what they are. The party cannot afford to act with tolerance toward ambitious men who would deliberately provoke a deep disunity in the party, in a reckless gamble to achieve some personal gain. The whole ticket from top to bottom must not be brought into jeopardy because a small handful of willful men find this to suit their personal advantage.

Within the last year it has become increasingly clear what would be the major propaganda weapon of the northern Democrats against the Republicans in 1964. And the reason for the choice of this weapon is clear. The weapon is to smear honest and decent conservatism with the label of extremism—to equate a few noisy people on the far right with the broad and decent conservatism which is so widespread today. This is the weapon.

And the reason for the choice of this weapon by the Democrats is the great and growing strength of conservatism in this country today. The liberals are afraid of this great and growing conservatism, and the liberals who have nothing but the leftover ideas of the thirties—the liberals who are intellectually bankrupt—cannot at all depend on the force of their ideas to win public approval. The long history of liberal failures in domestic and, above all, in foreign policy has long ago exhausted the public confidence, so they are driven now to a combination of demagoguery and destructive propaganda.

To smear conservatism is a principal political objective of the northern Democrats as we approach 1964. They are frightened, not of extremism as they pretend, but of a strong and viable conservatism which could revive the great underlying moral strength of this country which they have done so much to undermine.

How are they doing this?

A mysterious organization known as Group Research, Inc., was set up in Washington more than a year ago. Its purpose—to develop dossiers on "rightists." A network of communications has been set up across country, through labor political action specialists, to funnel this concoction of so-called information around the country into every possible locality. More than a year before the 1964 election, this propaganda transmission belt for the Democrat Party is already being advertised in many local union magazines. Republican conservatives are always referred to as "rightists."

The attempt has clearly been to create a broad public impression that the conservative movement is dominated by irrational and dangerous "rightists" who are addicted to violent solutions of political problems.

Bankrupt of ideas, the liberals are turning to clever if rather shoddy propaganda tactics. I will predict now that the liberals will use the "guilt by association" method to discredit conservatives. They will find, as one can find in any group, a few disreputable people and then will smear all conservatives with the sins of these inconsequential few. We are about to behold a "witch-hunt," Democrat-style.

Only a month ago, a calculated demonstration was made by a number of liberal Democrat Congressmen to tie all conservatives together in one disreputable category, for propaganda purposes. They were answered sharply and logically, on the floor of the House of Representatives, by conservatives who had the courage to resist these destructive and irresponsible propaganda tactics.

Now I have been describing in some detail, because it seemed necessary to do so, the propaganda tactics of the Democrats as they strive to turn the rising tide of conservatism. It is clear that the northern Democrats have calculated that their most destructive propaganda weapon will be to tar the whole conservative movement with the brush of extremism.

To achieve this result is the dearest wish of the liberal Democrat strategists. The Democrats know that success in this effort would not only weaken and probably destroy the prospects of any Republican candidate for the presidency, but would indeed reach deep into the party and reap a harvest of lesser offices as the party was weakened down to its very roots by intraparty warfare.

This is the dearest wish of the liberal Democrats.

But it is a shocking fact that their greatest assist has now come from a member of our own party. It is a sad and bitter fact that this so-called Republican leader is helping them to accomplish their precise objective by his current attack on his own party. He is using exactly the tactic which the Democrats themselves have decided would be the most destructive of Republican chances in 1964, right down the line, right down to the local offices.

I find it almost incredible that one who has received such favors from the party and who, it is rumored, looks to this party for even greater favors could fail to see that even his selfish interests would not, in the long run, be served by such destructive tactics.

If such tactics should succeed and a hostile gap be opened inside the Republican Party the nomination would not be worth anything to anyone, in any case. I say it is time to call a halt to reckless and destructive behavior of this kind on the part of anyone who holds a position of responsibility in the party.

Only this week Drew Pearson is reported to have said:

> Word is seeping around that Democratic professional politicians are seriously considering a divide-and-conquer gambit for 1964.

On the question of Republicans I consider Pearson's reliability to be close to zero. When he refers to his friends, the liberal Democrats, perhaps he can sometimes be correct. In this particular instance, indeed he seems to be correct.

If the objective of provoking disunity in the Republican Party is a top project for the Democrats they can rest easy. There is a Republican who seems willing to perform this task for them, and in exact accordance with their specifications.

If this Republican and his little band continue to show a willingness to do the job for them, the Democrats can just sit back and enjoy the spectacle of Republican destruction being undertaken by the Republicans themselves.

As someone who for more than a quarter of a century actively campaigned for all Republican candidates, local, State, and National, I must say I am appalled at this spectacle. During the last quarter century I have taken part and cooperated with block workers, precinct committeemen, county chairmen and State chairmen as well as our national organizations.

I think of these people—block workers and precinct captains—rendering their unselfish services year in and year out, without expectation of any personal reward, and I do not believe they deserve to have their work damaged and made harder by the irresponsible acts of an ambitious man, and a small handful of lieutenants, willing to sacrifice the dedicated work of all these people in order to achieve some personal objectives.

I speak here in defense of the Republican organization which has been outrageously maligned. I am asking for a cessation of the kind of disruptive tactics that can only bring disaster to the organization from top to bottom.

I am asking for a responsible Republicanism, and a rational presentation of issues and national problems.

Neither the Republican Party nor the Nation can afford, at this time, destructive and negative, emotion-laden and name-calling approaches to the great problems we face.

Surely this man has spoken inadvisedly. I cannot believe the wholesale and intemperate attack on the conservatives represents his mature reflection.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point an editorial by the great New York newspaper, the Wall Street Journal, entitled "Politics by Epithet." I draw attention to its judgment that the recent comments directed at the conservative Republicans "is a shoddy way to carry on the public debate."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point numerous other editorials from across the country—coast to coast—expressing views ranging from astonishment to bitter criticism of a Republican leader who could so recklessly attempt to divide and weaken his own party.

I include editorials and columns from the Washington Post, the Washington Star, the Chicago Tribune, the Portland Oregonian, the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, as well as the Wall Street Journal.

I also include a statement by the well-known radio commentator, Ray Henle, made on July 16.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 17, 1963]

Politics by Epithet

We see that the political commentators are interpreting Governor Rockefeller's long political statement this week as a broadside against Senator Goldwater and those who support him for the Republican nomination.

Governor Rockefeller has lent some support for this interpretation, for although in castigating the radical right he mentioned no names, he did remark at a later press conference that he feared Senator Goldwater might be captured by his own followers, whatever that means.

Even so, we are reluctant to believe the Governor meant to make a personal attack on the Senator. If so, the statement doesn't speak very well for the Governor and it isn't going to do his party much good.

Not that there was anything exceptional in the general political sentiments Mr. Rockefeller expressed. In listing his articles of faith he said he was dedicated to freedom, equality of opportunity, the Federal system of government, the free enterprise system, the importance of fiscal integrity, and to our heritage of free speech.

We would hardly expect anyone to quarrel with these sentiments. They are also Senator Goldwater's, and in the Democratic Party they could be embraced equally by Senator Byrd and President Kennedy. In fact, in Governor Rockefeller's stated philosophy there is very little to distinguish his politics from those of the President.

But this was not all the Governor said. He then went on to cry that these principles are in danger from a "highly disciplined minority" who are out to subvert the Republican Party and who are so strong they constitute a present danger to the Republic as well. The implication is that these powerful people do not believe in freedom, equality of opportunity or any of those other things Mr. Rockefeller listed among his articles of faith.

Moreover, the Governor sees them as no trivial conspirators. "They are embarked on a determined and ruthless effort to take over the party, its platform, and its candidates." Already these people—he calls them the "lunatic fringe"—have supposedly subverted the Young Republicans.

Now we have no doubt that the country has its lunatic fringes at both ends of the political spectrum. But the Governor is not just making a commentary; he is making an indictment with words like conspiracy, subversion, and racism.

This is surely a serious indictment, and just as surely calls for a bill of particulars as to what these subversive ideas are, what national leaders are espousing them, and how it happens that this minority is in a position to subvert against its will one of our two great political parties.

No such bill of particulars is forthcoming. Other than showing enthusiasm for Senator Goldwater, what did the Young Republicans advocate that is subversive? Which of Mr. Rockefeller's six articles of faith do these plotters plot against? Who are these oh-so-powerful conspirators? You are left to guess.

Personally we find it difficult to believe that Governor Rockefeller really intended his statement to sound the way it seems to. For unfortunately it sounds too much like one of those demagogic speeches of familiar memory in which the orator cries that "they" are organized to take over the country and subvert our freedoms. In such speeches the "they" are never specified. "They" are simply left to hang over the landscape, brooding, ominous, and frightening.

This is always a shoddy way to carry on the public debate. For what divides this country is not its articles of faith; there is universal dedication to the preservation of our own freedom and heritage. The difference is over how best to preserve them. Those who rally to Senator Goldwater, just as those who rally to Governor Rockefeller, have their reasons and it is no service to the public discussion to conduct it by epithet.

[From the Washington Post, July 17, 1963]

Rockefeller's Bomb

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Three days after Gov. Nelson Rockefeller exploded his bomb on the Republican Party's rightwing, much of the debris can be clearly seen.

The bomb gravely widened the breach between the party's left and right and spelled out the split over Negro equality in plain language.

It demolished the carefully nurtured friendship between Rockefeller and Senator Barry Goldwater (they had been meeting secretly in Washington for breakfast from time to time).

But it seems to have failed to accomplish what many thought to be its major purpose: Pumping new life into the Rockefeller presidential candidacy, which has been in a state of near death since the Governor's marriage 2 months ago.

The widespread suspicion persists, even among Republican moderates and some outright liberals, that the Governor's motives were not entirely selfless and they resent it.

This is, of course, the way of all politics. Nevertheless, politicians note that so long as Rockefeller was far in front for the Republican nomination, he courted Republican unity and displayed his conservative side. Not until Goldwater forged into the lead did Rockefeller blow the whistle on the far right.

It was just 6 months ago that Rockefeller turned thumbs down on a highly confidential request for financial help (the figure mentioned was $50,000) to fight rightwing infiltration of the national Young Republicans. He was shown hard proof that the far right had already locked up about a dozen States in its power grab planned for last month's national convention in San Francisco.

At that time, Rockefeller was still riding high. He was converting conservative party powers to his side. He and Goldwater, the conservative messiah, were meeting for occasional breakfasts at the Governor's Foxhall Road estate here in Washington.

These sessions had one main purpose: To keep the left and right wings from breaking apart. A subsidiary purpose was to steer the party away from any convention decision dictated by Dwight Eisenhower and Richard Nixon.

What followed in rapid succession were Rockefeller's remarriage, Goldwater's boom, and the shocking rightwing power play of the Young Republicans' convention. Panicky eastern Republicans, eyeing the specter of conservative western and southern party domination for the first time, yearned for a leader.

A fortnight ago, Rockefeller told some of his political intimates he could not keep silent any longer. The animosity of the rightwing, he said, had sabotaged his efforts to find an accommodation. He made clear he was going to be the old Rocky—the liberal Rocky. On Sunday he exploded his bomb.

But curiously, he tried to soften the impact on his friend Goldwater. Last Saturday, he sent the Senator a telegram revealing he was about to make a statement dealing with a common cause to all Republicans and expressing the hope that Goldwater would stand with Rockefeller in the interests of party unity. On Monday a copy of the statement—which did not name Goldwater personally but devastated his followers—arrived in Goldwater's office by special delivery.

As might be expected, the advance warning didn't soften the blow.

But what may be really damaging for the Rockefeller cause is the lukewarm response from anti-Goldwater forces. Such moderates as Gov. William Scranton, of Pennsylvania, have been conspicuously silent. A possible reason: The Rockefeller statement appeared to blanket tried-and-true conservative Republicans with the John Birchers and condemn all with equal fervor.

Or, it may just be that Rockefeller is too controversial to lead the Republican left in the party battle from which there is now no turning back.

"Rockefeller had the best of intentions," an anti-Goldwater Republican confided. "But he has now posed the ideological issue in highly personalized terms—himself on one side and Goldwater on the other."

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., July 15, 1963]

Warfare in the GOP

Party schism seems to be the fashion these days. The international Communist movement is breaking up. The Democrats are split wider than ever by the civil rights issue—and now the Republicans.

"Vociferous and well-drilled extremist elements, determined and ruthless effort to take over the party, wholly alien, tactics of ruthless, roughshod intimidation, tactics of totalitarianism, radical right lunatic fringe, disgraceful, subversion, purveyors of hate and distrust."

What have we here? The latest Moscow-Peking blast? Some anti-Fascist fulmination left over from the Hitler era? Not at all. Simply the reaction of New York Governor Rockefeller to the efforts of Barry Goldwater's supporters to take over the GOP.

There is no possibility now that the issue can be bridged—for the next year, at least, there will be open warfare between the Republican liberal and conservative wings. "I for one," says Mr. Rockefeller, "will do everything in my power * * * to counter the influence of these forces and to defeat their purposes."

Well, the Governor's statement has a characteristically hysterical sound to it, which no doubt reflects the very real strength shown by the Goldwater forces in recent days. It is quite possible that, unless someone else moves effectively into the picture, the man from Arizona will sew up the nomination even before he formally declares his candidacy.

We find ourselves in a strangely detached position as between these two adversaries for the Republican leadership—a position shared, it may be, by a good many Republicans. It is silly to say that Senator GOLDWATER would be a "lunatic fringe" candidate. But we would want to know a lot more than anyone now knows about his attitude on basic foreign and domestic issues before taking him seriously for the Presidency. It would be unhealthy for the Republicans, meanwhile, if Senator GOLDWATER were allowed to take over the party by default.

On the other hand, we have never been much impressed with Mr. Rockefeller, so we can hardly hail him as a shining knight needed to slay the rightwing dragon.

Someone else will have to appear, at the right moment, on the Republican stage. It is still our hunch that Pennsylvania's William Scranton will be that man.

[From the Evening Star, July 17, 1963]

FATAL EFFECTS IN ROCKEFELLER BLAST

(By William S. White)

Gov. Nelson Rockefeller's violent attack upon his conservative rival for the Republican Presidential nomination, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, may well have accomplished both the Senator's destruction and his own.

This is the early reading of many practical Republican pros whose interest is more in seeing their party win in 1964 than in the identity of the particular candidate it might choose. And though it is an early reading it is likely to be also the last and correct reading at the Republican National Convention next summer.

For if Governor Rockefeller has not intentionally signaled that the rich Eastern liberal wing for which he speaks will never accept Senator GOLDWATER as the nominee, the effect of his words will make it practically impossible for this wing to do so.

A PARTY CIVIL WAR

The unexampled harshness of the Governors' denunciation of Senator GOLDWATER, by way of a denunciation of the Senator's backers—"subversion, cynical expediency, ruthless, rough-shod intimidation, totalitarianism"—has opened civil war between the party's left and right wings.

Never since the William Howard Taft-Theodore Roosevelt split early in this century had a Republican Presidential possibility made so irreparable an assault upon another so far in advance of convention time.

Governor Rockefeller's bitter and now unrecallable words, indeed, even suggest that his faction might not stop short of an outright bolt or third party movement in 1964 should Senator GOLDWATER yet win the convention's Presidential designation.

This very fact, in turn, also strongly suggests that the nomination will be withheld from the Senator, in spite of the all-but-demonstrable fact that if they were simply voting their wishes, without regard to practicality, the delegates would, in fact, choose him. For Republican Conventions—like Democratic Conventions—are toughly practical affairs. They want to pick a winner, at best. At worst, they want to pick a loser who in his own loss will not leave the party hopelessly broken apart.

Governor Rockefeller, therefore, has created what looks very like a mutually neutralizing stalemate between left and right. If he has not knocked Senator GOLDWATER out—and probably he has—he has almost to a certainty knocked himself out by the undeniable divisiveness of his action.

But left intact, of course, is the great moderate Republican center, which now will come into its own. The prospects of such heretofore second-rankers as Gov. William Scranton of Pennsylvania and Gov. George Romney of Michigan are now far higher than yesterday.

So are those of a man who previously had actually been mentioned more in courtesy than in realism, Senator THRUSTON MORTON of Kentucky. For Senator MORTON, a reasonable moderate and a former national GOP chairman, has a history of effective conciliation and mediation among the various Republican factions.

Draw a circle around these three names—Scranton, Romney, Morton—and the odds are that within it you will have placed the name of the next Republican candidate for President of the United States.

THE WHY OF IT

Finally, the puzzled question among politicians now is:

Why did Rocky do it? The easiest answer is that his own fortunes had sunk so low that he had nowhere to go but up and so was ready to try even the most desperate measures to restore his position. Yet, Senator GOLDWATER is exactly the same Senator GOLDWATER who until very recently was being persistently courted by the Governor as a thoroughly acceptable Republican.

Therefore, the true explanation, in this columnist's opinion, is more subtle. Governor Rockefeller is in almost a fever of frustration that the Republicans in Congress generally, and not merely Senator GOLDWATER, are not going to accept the extreme aspects of the Kennedy civil rights program. The Governor's undoubtedly real private convictions in this matter are passionate and hardline beyond ready belief. He would rather destroy the Republican Party's chances in 1964—including his own—than see it adopt what in simple fact, but never to him, is a moderate civil rights line.

[From the Chicago Tribune]

THE ANVIL CHORUS

Something akin to panic is sweeping the eastern liberal wing of the Republican Party because there is a strong possibility that the party at last will have a conservative candidate for President in 1964. The rapid rise of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER in every national and sectional poll has sent him far ahead as the popular choice.

Meanwhile, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller has gone into a catastrophic skid since his divorce and remarriage. The attempt to inflate the Romney and Scranton balloons has produced no more than a weary suspiration. An effort to achieve a sudden buildup in behalf of such dun-colored horses as Gen. Lucius Clay and Senator THRUSTON MORTON has been greeted with boredom.

So the realization has dawned early that somehow Senator GOLDWATER must be headed off before the race for the nomination becomes a runaway. The suicide corps of the eastern wing of the party, which would always sooner lose with a liberal than give the people a chance to elect a conservative, has set up its battery of popguns and gone into action.

The campaign against GOLDWATER has got underway on the dirtiest possible note. By implication, and frequently by direct allegation, the attempt is being made to portray GOLDWATER's supporters as white supremacists, members of the Birch Society, and crackpots on the lunatic fringe of what is called the radical right.

The sharpshooters do not have the temerity to try to smear GOLDWATER directly. They imply that only such disreputable elements support him. This is an insult to the great body of citizens who admire and respect the Senator and see in him the only chance to provide the voters with an opportunity to express their conservative sentiments.

It has been slyly insinuated that Senator GOLDWATER is willing to write off the urban centers of the North and East and to win the White House by sweeping the Midwest and much of the West and by making heavy inroads in what used to be the Democratic South. According to this theory, GOLDWATER would write off the Negro vote.

The Senator himself says that he has never had any theory of that kind and that Republicans are going after every available vote next year. His opponents are well aware that Senator GOLDWATER, in his years as chairman of the Republican Senate campaign committee, did precisely that. He has spoken in almost every State and major city, tirelessly working for the election of the members of his party, among them some of the men who have the knife out for him now.

The stop-Goldwater movement centers in New York. Rockefeller, the jilted political suitor, has begun braying about well-drilled extremist elements boring within the party. "The radical right lunatic fringe," he cries, is "moving to subvert the Republican Party."

The New York Herald Tribune and its columnists, Joseph Alsop and the team of Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, taped out the line before Rocky got the message. From Denver, where the Republican National Committee recently met, the Messrs. Evans and Novak passed the word, "Top politicians from the vote-rich Eastern States made it clear in private conversation here that GOLDWATER just won't do." The Herald Tribune, with tears in its voice, begs the Senator's supporters to say, "Get thee behind me, Satan."

What has got into these people? They have succumbed to myths of their own creation. Senator GOLDWATER is an able man, a good Republican, and a great patriot, by the description of Mr. Rockefeller's own Republican colleague from New York, Senator KENNETH KEATING. But the anti-Goldwater lunacy raises the question of whether the Republican Party, which has been persuaded to suicide so often by its liberal wing, is going to do it again.

[From the Portland Oregonian, July 16, 1963]

ROCKY EXTREME, TOO

Gov. Nelson Rockefeller's all-out attack on the radical right wing of the Republican Party sharpens the issue confronting primary voters and the GOP National Convention in 1964, whether or not Mr. Rockefeller decides to become a candidate for the presidency.

In his attack on extremists, however, Governor Rockefeller was as extreme as those he accused. It is demagoguery to say that all leaders of the John Birch Society, for example, are in the lunatic fringe. Certainly, many individual members of such organizations as the Birch Society and Americans for Constitutional Action are far from being lunatics. They are, rather, dedicated individuals sincerely seeking a better America.

The extreme right in the conservative movement does not, we believe, represent a majority opinion of Republicans. This party is traditionally and on its record a fundamentally liberal party, not only in the field of civil rights but in its entire philosophy of government. It remains the party of Abraham Lincoln, although some who represent it in Congress may not measure up.

We agree with Governor Rockefeller's appraisal that the voters of America, seeking an alternative to the opportunism of the Democratic Party (or, rather, the Kennedy administration), will not find it in "a party of sectionalism, a party of racism, a party that disclaims responsibility for most of the population before it even starts its campaign for their support."

But this is a strawman. No such party exists. The extreme right has not taken over the Republican Party, any more than the extremists of the South have taken over the Democratic Party. Both parties include voters of many persuasions, with extremists in the minority.

The far-right extremists are more of a problem for Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, assuming he will seek the nomination, than for Governor Rockefeller. Senator GOLDWATER is a conservative, the No. 1 man since the death of Senator Robert A. Taft. He believes in the constitutional rights of the States. But he is not a radical of the right and certainly not a lunatic. The octopus embrace of the extremists would harm, rather than help, his campaign.

To what extent Governor Rockefeller's outburst represents his determination to stop GOLDWATER in the interest of his own candidacy, or to what extent it represents an effort to prevent the capture of the Republican Party by the John Birch-type rightists, is not apparent at this time. The first, of course, could go with the second. But we do not think the radical right will gain control of the party, whether or not BARRY GOLDWATER is its nominee. The bulk of Republican voters have not been shoved by New Deal-Fair Deal-New Frontier liberalism—if that is the word—into a defensive retreat into reaction. On the other hand, we doubt that the middle-road strength of the Republican Party, especially as it continues to support the civil rights principles of Abraham Lincoln, will go all the way with Mr. Rockefeller in his denunciation of rightwing thinkers.

The Republican Party would be in a lower state than it is if a majority of its members were to militantly deny the right of extremists, either liberal or conservative, to advance their views and to seek the election of candidates of their choice.

[From the Oakland Tribune, July 17, 1963]

ROCKY MAKES HIS MOVE

For all practical purposes, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, is now formally a candidate for the Presidency. He has not yet officially declared himself such, but he has loosed a mighty blast at the conservatives within the party who back Senator BARRY GOLDWATER.

The Governor's sudden move to capture the GOP comes at a time when the liberal wing of the party is feeling the effects of a determined conservative drive.

Unfortunately, the Governor's assault upon the supporters of Senator GOLDWATER went way wide of the mark. In fact, the Governor seemed to be jousting windmills. Specifically, he charged that a conservative GOP would be a "party of extremism, a party of sectionalism, a party of racism, a party that disclaims responsibility for most of the population before it even starts its campaign."

One is hard put to associate these charges with the millions of Taft Republicans—now called Goldwater Republicans—who form the backbone of the party across the country. Traditionally, conservative Republicans have stood for decentralized, minimum government; a strong foreign policy directed against Communist aggression; a high degree of personal responsibility and self-sufficiency in lieu of bureaucratic control and welfare-statism; high personal integrity among business and labor leaders in lieu of heavy regulation; maximum personal and economic liberty, and a firm commitment to all constitutional rights.

Millions of conservative Americans would be astonished to find that Governor Rockefeller calls their views extreme, racist, sectional, and designed for only a small segment of the populace. Perhaps the Governor is aiming his attack at the so-called extremists, who stand on the fringe of the political spectrum. But if he is, he is wasting his breath. These few extremists do not control one seat in Congress, nor have they effective political power within any major political party, although perhaps some southern Democrats are influenced by them.

In any case, these people have no influence upon Senator GOLDWATER, nor do they have power among GOLDWATER's principal backers. It would be much more to the point for Governor Rockefeller to direct his attack upon the Democratic Party's record in the field of civil rights, which has been remarkably shabby for decades.

"THREE STAR EXTRA," JULY 16, 1963

(By Ray Henle)

Governor Rockefeller's most recent statement on the condition in the Republican Party, as he sees it, has proved to be a disturbing blast. It goes without saying that countless Republicans of the so-called conservative persuasion will regard the New York Governor's tactics as quite unfair.

The essence of the regret which one finds among many level-headed members of the party is that Governor Rockefeller, by inference if not by precise language, has sought to associate Senator GOLDWATER with rightist extremists, racists and others of the so-called lunatic fringe.

This, many conservative Republicans now are saying, is hitting below the belt.

For the facts as they see them are—Senator GOLDWATER came from a small and not politically important State, yet rose to leadership in his field, by intellectual integrity, not political emotionalism.

He wrote a book, "Conscience of a Conservative," which has lifted the entire discussion of right and left politics to an intellectual level not heretofore attained.

He devoted countless hours of hard work in preparing and delivering speeches to young Americans in their colleges and universities, and was rewarded with a spontaneous, surprising, and wholeheartedly favorable reception because, to these young people, he made sense.

For these and other reasons, Senator GOLDWATER now ranks as the top choice among Republicans for their presidential nomination, if polls are to be believed.

And he has made this record without a single concession to those groups, of which others claim he is, or would be, a captive.

Extremists happily do not control either of our great political parties, and they have been with us in both camps for many, many years. Many will feel that setting them up as bugaboos does little to clarify the true issues which could be decided next year by an intelligent campaign.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will indulge me for a few minutes while I reply to his speech. Knowing the Senator from Nebraska as I do, I feel that he would not have spoken unless he felt deeply and sincerely concerning what he said. That is all the more reason for not letting it go by without a reply.

The distinguished Senator is one Republican, like myself, and it would be so easy to stand aside and say, "Let it go. It is only one man's opinion, the opinion of a distinguished Senator, colleague, and friend. Why argue about it?" But I think that would be a disservice to our party and to the Nation. So I hope the Senator from Nebraska will indulge me while I reply.

In the first place, I am a member of the Republican Party, too. I say, with some pardonable pride, that I received more votes in the last election than any other Republican running for national political office in this country. I won New York by almost 1 million votes. New York is one of the most Republican States in the Nation. It has a Republican majority in both houses of the legislature; it has a Republican Governor; it has two Republican Senators. Governor Rockefeller is the undisputed leader of his party in New York; there can be no question about that. And that is a pretty good record for a Republican who is being charged with trying to wreck his party.

Next—I would hope the Senator from Nebraska would really read and think through very carefully what Governor Rockefeller has said—Governor Rockefeller attacked no Republican. Governor Rockefeller's statement is very different from what we have just heard. The speech we have just heard is a direct personal attack on the Governor of the State of New York. But Governor Rockefeller picked out no Republican to attack as the wrecker of his party. I think that is a very material difference when one is talking about unity and the accommodation of party members to one another's views.

Governor Rockefeller did not attack conservatives. That is a fundamental point. I will not for a moment stand here and hear it said that Governor Rockefeller turned on the great majority of his party. Governor Rockefeller turned on the radical right, and they are not the great majority of his party. The great majority of his party does not believe, with the radical right, that Earl Warren should be impeached; that the income tax should be repealed; that the United States should kick the United Nations out of its headquarters in New York; that we should end foreign aid; and that Eisenhower is a neo-Communist. I strongly maintain that any such statement does a grave disservice to the great majority of the Republican Party.

The Republican Party may be conservative, and it may not. I respect, as much as any other Member of the Senate, including the Senator from Nebraska, the conservatism of Republicans. That is their duty and right, just as it is my duty and right to entertain any view that I maintain. But they are not the radical right whom I believe Governor Rockefeller properly denounced as a danger to our party.

Was Governor Rockefeller the only person in the great expanse of our country who saw this danger coming upon the Republican Party? Not on your life. The distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] stood in the Senate and made two magnificent speeches denouncing the radical right and its infiltration of the Republican Party.

As strong a conservative as any other Member of the Senate on this side of the aisle, Senator MILTON YOUNG of North Dakota, took the same position when he found his party being attacked in his own State by the radical right.

If we need any more evidence, here in the current issue of a national magazine, Look magazine, is an article entitled "The Rampant Right Invades the GOP."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Rampant Right Invades the GOP

(By T. George Harris)

(In the political buildup to 1964, the radicals are on the right. They attack the two-party liberalism of the center. Dozens of new organizations, from the fanatic John Birch Society to the wide-eyed Young Americans for Freedom, cry for Goldwater and try to impose a rightwing orthodoxy upon the Republican Party.)

A fierce new breed of political activist is at work across the land. In public, he calls himself conservative. In private,. he may rightly put on another label: "rightwing." He has lately become the main topic of intense backroom talk among veteran Republican leaders in many States. He is, they know, moving in on the party machinery. His bid for authority is vigorously supported by the money, propaganda, and membership of fast-growing rightwing organizations outside the party.

"It's a real raid," says a ranking member of the GOP central committee in one Rocky Mountain State. "They're grabbing for control of the party." Though a wealthy and conservative businessman, this Republican is one of many who fear to speak of the problem in public. "I don't want to be attacked as a Communist."

Some GOP leaders are delighted, others worried. "I think that in 3 or 4 months you'll see the responsible leadership get in and head them off," says Seattle's R. Mort Frayn, 57, the most experienced leader in the Washington State GOP and Richard Nixon's northwest anchor man in 1960. "This crowd can blow the whole bundle if we're not careful. If we can keep a balance, the party will come out stronger."

The new right shows its greatest strength in the West and South. But in other sections where traditional GOP leadership shows weakness or division, it is moving in to fill the vacuum. The "moderates," as Eisenhower Republicans are now tagged, have to fight or join up, or both. In Illinois, business executive Charles H. Percy, an Eisenhower favorite for years, has been running for Governor. If he can get the GOP nomination, he has an odds-on chance to beat a faltering Democratic incumbent, Gov. Otto Kerner. But Percy is under bitter personal attack inside his party and has to wage his campaign on a single, defensive theme. "Chuck keeps on trying to prove he is a conservative," says one angry critic. "We aren't buying it."

Politicians in the Rocky Mountain States report a strong upsurge in rightist activity, often boosted by piped-in national radio and TV orators. In this thinly populated region, where four Democratic Senators face rough reelection fights in 1964, a few rightwing programs can saturate the electorate. But some GOP leaders do not want this outside help. The propaganda makes it difficult for them to consider nominating nonradicals and hands the Democrats a dandy issue—invasion by monied "foreign interests."

California, with its habit of hyperbole, offers the vanguard example of the radical right at work. Here, the John Birch Society, which trains the far right's toughest militants, is now gaining fast in members and in influence upon a badly splintered GOP. In the past year, the John Birch Society has become, to the astonishment of most politicians, the new force to be reckoned with. Its power centers lie in the ever-spreading suburbs around Los Angeles. Any candidate for GOP nomination to an important office must make peace on Birch terms or take on a battle. Each GOP Congressman knows that if he doesn't show skill in "the care and feeding of the right," as one veteran calls it, he will face "pro-Communist" charges until the next primary—when he will have to run against a massively financed opponent.

It is easier to feed the fires of fear. Representative James Utt, Republican, of California, though not a Birch member, mailed out a newsletter on the U.S. Army's "Exercise Water Moccasin." This Georgia maneuver, he declared, might be "probing the resistance of the American people to an internal takeover, fantastic as that may seem, although the present tendency is to deliver this country into the tender hands of the UN peacekeeping army." By the time rightwing enthusiasts got through expanding the Water Moccasin story, there were 16,000 African troops in Georgia, "with rings in their ears and noses," trained to take over the United States under command of a Russian general at the United Nations.

The most effective new operator in Birch politics is former Republican Congressman John Rousselot, of California. Now 35, he long ago proved his oratorical and organizational skills, and knows the California party from years of work in Richard Nixon's statewide organization. In 1956, he was Nixon-picked for State chief of the Young Republican Federation. He dearly wanted to run for Congress in 1958. Nixon's decision to run another candidate, who lost, turned Rousselot into a bitter critic of the middle-roading organization. In 1960, he overrode Nixon's men, got enough financial backing from somewhere to win both the primary and the general election. He had already been in Congress several months when the press uncovered his membership—and that of his fellow GOP Congressman Edgar "Eck" Hiestand—in the John Birch Society.

Most politicians thought Rousselot's career was ended. The Democratic legislators in Sacramento, then redistricting the State, smelled opportunity. They gerrymandered his 25th Congressional District, boxed him into a new one that was 62 percent Democratic. Also, as Birch Society founder Robert Welch later reported, the old district had 59 Birch chapters; the new one, only 5.

Rousselot, Hiestand, and H. L. (Bill) Richardson, a young Birch member making his first race for Congress, all lost in last fall's general election. The national press reported a Birch rout. But local Republicans noticed that the three Birchers had raised more money than any other congressional candidate in Los Angeles County (Rousselot reported expenditures of $80,556.24) and had benefited from the most ardent core of workers in California politics. Only a massive election-day effort by Democratic pros defeated Rousselot—by just 8,410 votes.

Rousselot became the Birch Society's most useful new weapon. Handsome and blue-eyed, an ardent Christian Scientist, he gave the Birchers a new look of nonsecret activity and respectability. Robert Welch hired him as "district governor" for the Far West. He opened a sleek, modern headquarters in the posh Los Angeles suburb of San Marino, recruited a dozen well-scrubbed, earnest young men as "coordinators" to organize in California. One was Bill Richardson, who works night and day in the suburbs.

In Utah, Reed Benson, son of former Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, started recruiting among the Mormons after he lost a congressional primary there last year. (Birchers turning up in Mormon chapels, like those in Christian Science churches, have inspired quiet, painful struggles in some congregations.) The Birch Society is no longer represented, as a Democrat once quipped, by "little old ladies in tennis shoes." It is led by young politicians with well-developed ambitions for GOP leadership.

The young coordinators are building a base. Mr. Welch, as his followers respectfully address him, claims that his national membership doubled last year. Rousselot adds that in the first 3 months of this year, JBS gained more members, 30 percent more, than all of last year. Reed Benson claims to have tripled Birch enrollment in Utah, where he touts home-reading memberships for people who don't want anybody to spot them at chapter meetings. The actual membership totals remain a closely guarded secret. They sank briefly two years ago, but chapter activity and the heavy schedules of right-wing speakers like Nashville's Tom Anderson, who jets from city to city as the movement's barefoot wit, confirm the Society's claim that it is resurgent. "We grow," one chapter leader told Look, "like a fungus."

Birchers have developed a rowdy style of politics, as other Republicans can testify. Take Jack and Kitty De Stories, of Covina, a suburb in the district where Rousselot ran for reelection last year. Jack, 31, a financial analyst, is an elected officer of the Los Angeles County Republican Central Committee and a director of the statewide GOP businessmen's organization known as the California Republican Assembly (CRA). Kitty works hard at Republican women's activities. One night last summer, the De Stories invited the local CRA chapter, of which Jack was one of the leaders, to hold its annual election meeting in their home. The couple often let GOP groups use their house. Since the club had only 23 members, they expected no more than 15 to show up for a genial session.

That night, a paid Birch organizer rang in a band of noisy strangers and had them made members by the club's pro-Birch vice president. The instant members voted in a new instant president, walked out with the club's records and checkbook. De Stories was left with three big cigarette holes in his carpet and a mischievously unplugged refrigerator. The same roving band—expanded once to 87 when they needed more votes—invaded 2 other CRA clubs.

Such rambunctious tactics fail only when responsible people fight back. CRA's leaders got busy last summer, revoked charters of wayward clubs, fended off an all-out takeover attack by the Birchers.

The fight went the other way in the California Young Republican Federation. This time the Birchers, old hands at Young Republican politics, had the advantage of working behind a non-Birch candidate—young, wealthy, well-spoken Robert Gaston of Los Angeles—for State Young Republican president. "I had known Bob Gaston when I was in Congress," explains Rousselot. "One thing a person learns in the Birch Society is to work where it counts and stick with it." He worked long and hard. In the buildup to the election early this year, Birch organizers in Bakersfield and other cities suddenly packed the Young Republican lists with new members, hung on opponents the dangerous tag of "liberal." Some Birch chapters just constituted themselves as Young Republican clubs. When moderate Young Republican leaders spoke out against the John Birch Society power grab, and documented the charge, an older Bircher darkly asked, in the press, why they should fear "the intrusion and infiltration of constitutional Americanism."

Gaston's Birch-backed campaign carried the Young Republican convention this January. With whoop and holler, the new leadership added California's punch to the "gung-ho" conservatism that dominates Young Republican sessions in many States. Since 1959, the behind-the-scenes Young Republican leaders—successors to those who once rah-rahed for Eisenhower against Robert Taft—have been shifting toward the political style of Arizona's Senator Barry Goldwater. He uses their youth image.

In the older branches of the California GOP, the right wing rise has come as a part of a suburban revolt. "The California Club

Crowd," as the downtown Los Angeles business leaders have been dubbed, found their dominant role in GOP finances challenged in recent years by prospering rebels in the suburbs. The old hands, never exactly raving liberals, backed candidates whom many of the suburbanites considered a bit soft on communism. Example: Richard Nixon, in last year's gubernatorial primary and election. Nixon's friends lost control of the county central committee, had to raise campaign funds by direct contribution. The suburbanites, many of them Birchers, put their money directly into the congressional races. Seeking peace and Birch funds, the downtowners seated Bircher Paul Talbert, Beverly Hills insurance man and member of the John Birch Society national council, on their united Republican fund board.

But there is no peace, and the GOP is now a shambles in the biggest State. Norman Chandler's Los Angeles Times, once the voice of party regularity, has been under attack since it ran an evenhanded series on the Birch Society: "The Times is moving heavily to the left," charges Rousselot. In the absence of clear party leadership, the GOP has come to be represented by any faction that is vocal in its name. That, for the moment, is the right wing. "The Birchers have taken over the GOP image by default," says Aime Michaud, a party stalwart in northern California. Thoughtful big businessmen, now a bit dismayed by the John Birch Society, wait for somebody else to show leadership.

Such quiverish fret about the Birch Society only confirms the deep suspicions of the average dues-paying member. Be he truckdriver or salesman, he is convinced that something's wrong with the big shots who run everything, the GOP included. He knows for sure that he is earnestly fighting communism, so why should any but Communists be scared of him? At his chapter meeting, he throbs with good old foot-stomping patriotism when the phonograph bellows out "The Battle Hymn of the Republic." He gets a lift from the Pledge of Allegiance and comes out strong on the "under God." He feels a healthy tweak of discipline when he stands up to applaud his leaders.

He is a student in the most thorough indoctrination school this side of the Communist Party. "It's a discipline of education," says John Rousselot, "not a discipline of leadership." Mr. Welch's long monthly bulletin to each member does not command; it genially "educates" him, step by step, toward the Welch belief that the whole U.S. Government is in the firm grip of the Communists. The member can come along at his own pace. He does not have to decide whether General Eisenhower is, as Mr. Welch now puts it, "a mere stooge, or * * * a Communist assigned the specific job of being a political front man." The founder's biography of Ike, "The Politician," is now on sale for $8 at chapter meetings and the 60 Birch libraries. But a new prolog explains why Mr. Welch did not make it required doctrine. He could not, he wrote, "lead people too rapidly into a realization of truths that they were unwilling to accept." Outside speakers help lead the faithful deeper into suspicion and anxiety. At Birch Chapter 307 in San Marino, ex-Maj. George Racey Jordan recently warned that under present economic policy, "you're going to be in exactly the same position you were in when they closed the banks in 1933."

The Birch member's local chapter is a seminar, kept small enough for him to take part. At meetings, he finds the society's slick, sneering monthly, "American Opinion," assorted right-wing pamphlets and a dozen true-story books on all the Reds in our midst, put out cheap by "the largest anti-Communist publishing house." The well-read student also learns by doing. He lends a hand at forming Birch fronts, pushes the "Impeach Earl Warren" petitions that Mr. Welch seldom fails to mention. He may go on a Birch "card party" to tag Communist merchandise. (Birchers don't appreciate the businessman who looks down upon the JBS as—in Rousselot's words—"below his dignity.") Or he may infiltrate the PTA and help a fellow member campaign for the school board to straighten out those teachers who—again Rousselot—"have the attitude of being above us * * * a professional sophistication, like an untouchable thing."

It's a program of total, around-the-clock political activity. It gives the member a sense that he's taking a hand in his own destiny, if only by getting even with all those people who look down on him. Yet by the time a Bircher does his duties, he has become not a member of an organization like the GOP, but an organic part of a "body," as Mr. Welch says, like the Communist party. And so, the faithful Bircher works his way up to the big thing that Mr. Welch spells out on pages 110 and 111 of "The Blue Book," the John Birch Society founding document:

"Finally, and probably most important of all these courses of action, we would put our weight into the political scales in this country just as fast and far as we could * * * especially if the Republican Party then stands nationally for any Americanist principles whatsoever, it cannot win unless it has strong help and backing from forces outside * * * such as the Democratic Party has on the other side in Walter Reuther's Committee on Political Education."

The society does not formally contribute to campaigns. But the discipline of education tells members whom to back, and the leaders may hint a bit. In 1962, the Birchers contributed so much to their favorite candidates that they were in danger, Mr. Welch gently warned, of "forgetting us financially." The body's new strength will make it a major money factor in politics between now and November 1964.

Robert Welch has become a serious embarrassment to the host of more sensible men and organizations that make up the diverse elements of the conservative movement. Many knew of his beliefs long before the press uncovered his chief work of art, the Eisenhower book. But they foolishly kept silent. Then they attacked Welch's leadership, not the body he had shaped in his own image. Senator GOLDWATER, whose 1958 senatorial campaign benefited from $2,000 that Welch personally raised, suggested that the Birch founder resign, or that members reconstitute the society under a new leader. "Mr. Welch has revived in many men the spirit of patriotism," wrote William F. Buckley, Jr., in his National Review, "and that same spirit calls now for rejecting, out of a love of truth and country, his false counsels."

The tactic did not work, in part because rightists felt so outnumbered that they could not bear to do in one of their own. Mr. Welch's body refused to cut off its head. Today, his Birch Society dominates the rightwing picture—not just the minds of sensation-seeking reporters—for the simple reason that it is more successful than the other groups. The leading Birchers also hold key spots in most active conservative enterprises. Though they may disagree privately with Mr. Welch's erratic intuitions, their acquiescent membership in his body, which indeed acts as an extension of his thought, taints their more reasonable efforts at political persuasion.

In the years ahead, however, the non-Birchers of the conservative movement, from radicals to reasonables, will have a deeper impact. They have already accomplished, to their own satisfaction, one major goal. "Our chief contribution has been to expose modern Republicanism's intellectual emptiness," say Bill Buckley.

The Republican Party's narrow loss of the 1960 presidential race gave the entire right its strongest stimulus. The country went off Ike tranquilizers, went on Kennedy vigor pills. "We have been freed," says Buckley, "from the burden of Eisenhower." Though he would rather have a Nixon than a Kennedy, others disagree. Says the irrepressible Tom Anderson: "I think we're a lot better off with Kennedy than with Nixon. I think it's better to go to socialism at a hundred miles an hour than to go at fifty. It shocks people more."

The purification of the GOP—washing that Ike out of its hair—thus becomes the right's most important mission and the one to which it dedicates sizzling energy. To Robert Welch, Eisenhower is a traitor to his country. But to the new alliance of very old and very young conservatives now on the move, Ike and his big-business Cabinet are traitors to party ideology. When he appears at the 1964 Republican Convention, the former President may be treated to the hisses and laughs that his name often sets off in rightwing meetings.

The liturgy of the purifiers repeats and repeats the word "Goldwater." If elected President, they agree, the jet-flying Senator would "stop our drift into communism." In his name, often without his nod, a very wide assortment of people, from Birchers to stolid old party pros, demand that the GOP "give the voters a clear choice between Americanism and socialism." Some with delicate antennae fear that Goldwater, now almost convinced he should run, is softening his line to improve his prospects. But, for the most part, the rightwing's champion has avoided the kind of specific statements that would comfort the moderates—and cool the ardents.

The dedicated rightists are, as they often say, "Conservatives first and Republicans second." They are ready to lose almost any election if the loss will help "reform" the GOP to fit their creed. They have devised a satchelful of tools to do the job. Many of them are consciously copied from Democratic liberals—who seem to the concerned conservatives, gifted with a diabolical skill in such matters.

One tool is New York's Conservative Party. Buckley's magazine came up with the idea for a fourth party to anchor the State GOP on the right, as the Liberal Party has anchored the big State's Democrats on the left. A couple of National Review readers spontaneously adopted the suggestion, put two of the magazine's staff on their board and set up political shop. They soon threw a monkey wrench into Rockefeller's machine. Last year, their little-known candidate for Governor cut 142,000 votes out of the majority racked up by Rockefeller, whose liberalism had made him their latest Public Enemy No. 1. They did more than tarnish his victory cup: They delivered a warning to the whole GOP. The Conservative Party is legally locked on the New York ballot through 1966—"up there like Telstar," beams one strategist—and ready for use in protest against any Republican presidential nominee who does not please the right. The GOP cannot ignore it. Only Rockefeller, or a candidate of like liberalism, has a chance to swing New York's big vote against Kennedy. But if the Conservative Party has the will and the way to throw the State to Kennedy, the GOP must find a candidate able to pick up a bundle of new votes in other votes in other States. Who is he? The question comes with a built-in answer: GOLDWATER, whose backers believe that he really could take the solid South and Texas from the restless old Democratic pros.

As conservatives copied one scheme from New York's Liberal Party, so they took another from a group they revile, the Americans for Democratic Action. They built a reverse-ADA and called it ACA, Americans for Constitutional Action. In only 4 years of operation, ACA has built up more political muscle than ADA ever flexed in its heyday. ACA damns what ADA blesses. It opposes the graduated income tax, "bribery of the Sovereign States with 'handouts'" (the Federal-aid programs), costly internationalism (e.g., the purchase of U.N. bonds), and such measures as last year's Trade Act, which allows the President to cut tariffs. Democratic Congressmen once attacked it as a "Birch front."

ACA makes a fundamental assault upon U.S. Government as it has developed since 1932. ACA-ers insist they are not "radicals," even though they fervently demand, in the name of the Founding Fathers, such a revolution in the status quo as to fit Webster's definition of radical: "one who advocates * * * sweeping changes in laws * * * and methods of government with the least delay."

ACA's Washington headquarters lists key votes in the House and Senate, rates each man's ideological purity on a percentage scale. The result: ACA's Cumulative Consistency Index. It operates like the indexes long published by ADA and the AFL–CIO's political arm, COPE. But, naturally, it comes out with opposite figures. Barry Goldwater grades 99 percent perfect on the votes he has cast since 1955, but Kentucky's able Republican Senator John Sherman Cooper has flunked, by ACA's grading system, on all but 25 percent of his votes.

The driving force in ACA is Adm. Ben Moreell, a selfless conservative. He now runs ACA as he formerly ran the "can-do" Seabees of World War II. In the 1962 campaigns, he fielded 18 "professional organizers and campaign specialists" to work quietly for 46 favored candidates. In its wider theater of political operations, ACA provided money and other help to a total of 184 candidates, of whom 135 won (14 of them Democrats). The admiral claims for ACA a "substantial role" in sinking 2 incumbent Senators and 10 liberal Members of the House. His organization has been the most decisive factor in the pattern of Republican change in Congress. While gaining fewer seats than expected, the GOP elected, in its classes of 1961 and 1963, a band of some 25 "gung-ho" young conservatives. This new bloc works as a unit, pretty much the way the liberal caucus once operated on the other side of the aisle.

ACA reaches out through 29 local chapters across the country, but it serves mainly for money raising and lacks the grassroots fervor coveted by the Conservative Movement. In the grassroots business, the Birch Society outgrows everybody else. However, many a less weedy organization has been sprouting among the under-35 set, all the way from California's Orange County to New York's Westchester. In Chicago's Near North Side, the liberal ladies of the Women for Peace March now find themselves outmarched by the North Side Young Conservatives, who ring doorbells for GOP candidates and throw cocktail parties ($1.50 at the door) to raise funds. "We talk politics," explains a happy partygoer, "so the evening isn't wasted."

YAF LEADS THE YOUNG ACTIVISTS

The most active of the new groups is Young Americans for Freedom. YAF was born in 1960 on the Buckley family's Connecticut estate, and Editor Buckley nourishes it through his magazine and some 70 lecture circuit performances a year. YAF now claims a national membership of 20,000. Not all of the members share Buckley's aversion to "fetishistic" views of democracy. But they do share his bent for political activism to overcome the helpless feeling that one vote, out of 68 million, "has about the weight of a grain of sand."

YAF's chief in Indiana is dedicated Richard Allen, 24. Though he has a wife and three children, he suddenly quit his job as an insurance adjuster a year ago to be a full-time crusader. "Some conservatives have to make sacrifices," he said. He set up an office for YAF political action, soon solicited enough money from businessmen to pay his pared-down salary ($95 a week), meet the office rent and hire a secretary. Allen eats little, works 7 days most weeks and lets the grass at home go unmowed, while he "does a little research on socialistic propaganda." He formed 18 new YAF chapters, many of them among ebullient teenagers. One handsome YAF'er at Butler University checks out the political views of pretty girls so that he will not accidentally date a liberal. Courting couples go out gaily on picket lines to counter such menaces as peace marchers, to fight Medicare or to demand a "no" vote in the wheat referendum. Allen's forces now are gathering signatures on their nationwide "Draft Goldwater" petitions. "If they don't nominate Goldwater," Allen believes, "there will be a lot of effort around the country for a third party."

So it goes. ACA, YAF, and dozens of other organizations and publications exert increasing pressure upon a Republican leadership already well to the right of its membership. The militants threaten to impose upon the GOP a hard-right orthodoxy as rigid, though opposite in ideology, as the left-wing line that labor once tried to impose upon the Democratic Party. As the GOP moves right, Kennedy Democrats take over the whole center. Even now, the broad middle area once occupied by Rockefeller style Republicans has come to look narrow. Top rightwing planners, letting the wish father the thought, counted Rockefeller out of the presidential race before his happy marriage. They worry instead about Eisenhower and Nixon throwing weight behind Romney or Scranton.

Whatever it may do to the GOP, the right has already brought the fire of passion—a hotter flame than reason—back into politics. The emotion arises less from the leaders than the led, most of whom come fresh and fervid to any kind of politics or civic action. The typical member is a hard worker who has, in the postwar prosperity, outrun his economic dreams. He is ready to do things, but the civic groups and political parties lack the vitality to come collect his energy. He belongs, with many non-Birchers, to the latest big wave of citizens who have surged into the vast middleclass.

Newcomers have always had to fight, rudely, to prove themselves as good as the stuffed shirts already there. The Populists attacked the whole system—banks, railroads, political parties. In the twenties, Revivalist Billy Sunday's white-shirted believers waved the temperance banner and declared themselves better than all those whiskey-drinking rich people. The labor movement led the power play for the blue collars, and McCarthy gave some ambitious Catholics the chance to claim they were more American than those overeducated pinkos. Now, roaring in, comes the new wave, led by the West's latest battalion of affluent migrants. They attack the biggest thing around, the Federal Government—which bites into their goodly but always tight budgets with taxes, is unable (or is it unwilling?) to get rid of world communism and turns a deaf ear to their cries of danger.

In this superheated situation, even the old-fashioned demagogs see opportunity. Jew-baiter Gerald L. K. Smith has popped up, active again. Smith's monthly, The Cross and the Flag, advises followers to infiltrate Birch chapters in search of members who will add the Jews to their list of Red conspirators. But Smith, the neo-Nazis and other racists get rough treatment from most rightwing leaders. One of Goldwater's attractions is his half Jewish blood, which insures the right against the racist evil and the appearance of evil.

Though they ward off racists, the new right's leaders seem unable to purge themselves of Robert Welch. Nor will they until they can offer something more responsible than phantom Communists and freedom whoops. They have yet to put substance into what they call "the conservative vision." The liberal vision of the future, whatever its utopian defects, inspired men to specific action toward a better society. Now it has grown fat with success and stale in its addiction to Federal pills for all ills. What is the right's alternative? Buckley's deepest book, "Up From Liberalism," attacked the liberal's apparent lack of a philosophy of goals. But his own proposed goals, to enhance individual freedom, offer few specifics for responsible men: "I will not willingly cede more power to anyone, not to the state, not to General Motors, not to the CIO."

This, he admits, is "a no program." In the name of conservatism, it does injustice to the responsible conservatives who work with the whole complex of their institutions—their businesses, their charities and (as little as possible) the different echelons of their government—to better the conditions in which they and their nation live. The no-program also leaves the new affluent with the heart-sinking certainty that the future offers nothing more worthy than a tax reduction. Without vision, the road ahead looms dark and dangerous.

But it is not impassable to any but the soul-sick minority. California's Thomas Kuchel, GOP Senate whip, recently stood up and fought back at the fright mail flooding his office, as it does every office in the Hill. Kuchel's simple courage cleared the air. Back came 13,000 letters. Hundreds were "unsigned epistles sopping with hate and bigotry," but significantly, the whole pile counted out 4-to-1 for Kuchel. Many citizens who had never before written to Washington declared their determination to stand against extremism. They, like other Americans in the years just ahead, will have to fight at home for what they believe and, in the fight, come to know better and care more for what it is. The 1964 campaign, already boiling, promises to be this generation's hottest political test.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, what is the unity we talk about in political parties? Is it a monolithic unity that requires all of us to vote the same way?

I recall very distinctly that in 1960 I introduced in the Senate an amendment to a bill for medical care for the aging, not under social security, which was supported publicly by Vice President Nixon, the respected candidate for the Presidency on the Republican ticket. Twenty-seven Republicans voted for the bill; 5 Republicans voted against it. Those five Republicans—I believe they included the distinguished Senator from Nebraska—were identified with the conservative wing of my party. Does unity mean that I should have said that those five Republicans were attempting to divide our party? Those five Republicans had an absolute right to vote as they did, as their judgment commanded.

When President Eisenhower proposed housing measures, foreign trade measures, and foreign aid measures, and urged Congress to act on them, some conservative Senators on this side of the aisle voted the other way. Was that unity? Was that treason? It was nothing but their duty as they saw it.

If there has been any disunity, it has been introduced by a nefarious effort to infiltrate the Republican Party, one of the two great American parties, with ideas and concepts which are completely un-American and alien to the mainstream of American public life. It is that which Governor Rockefeller denounced.

And this unity business can be overdone. The Democrats seem to have got along very well, and they have had quite a few hassles among themselves. Yet they are sitting here with two-thirds of the Senate, while the Republicans, who have been preaching unity, are sitting here with their numbers diminished from what they were—a majority of the Senate—until we now have a membership of only one-third of the Senate. All this has taken place while the Republican Party allegedly had this conservative tone. That is a price of unity that I do not want to pay, I do not think the country ought to pay, and I do not think the Republican Party ought to pay.

Governor Rockefeller showed great stature by the statement he made. If what the Senator from Nebraska has said is true, that Governor Rockefeller tossed his chances for the presidential nomination to the winds—and I do not agree with that at all—I say more power to him. At least, he has a decent honorable cause to represent against the subversion of his own party by the ideas and by the personalities who would advocate those ideas, ideas which run counter to the whole stream of America. I honor him for it.

A public official has to stand for something. When Governor Rockefeller issued that statement, he stood for something in American public life. I am proud to be associated with him, and I am proud to associate myself with his statement.

I thank the Senator from Nebraska for yielding.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New York is a very lovable individual. It is perhaps fitting that he should defend the Governor of his State. After all, it is a great State. But it is not the most Republican State in the Union. As a matter of fact, the State of Nebraska has a full Republican delegation in the House of Representatives. It has two Republican Senators. It delivered 67½ percent of its popular vote to Mr. Nixon. I do not know where New York was while that was happening.

I might also point out that a great many of the Nebraska Republicans are conservatives. A vast majority of them are taking part in this resurgence of conservatism to free this country of the things which are holding it back. They believe that conservatism will win the election. Whether we are right or wrong on that point, the Senator has a right to debate.

But I rose to condemn, and I do condemn, the intentional destruction of all conservatives by calling them the radical right, implying something sinister, something evil, something anti-American. This attack came from a man who fell from the first place and saw Republican insurgency emerge, so he turned on his party and said that this majority opinion is that of the radical right; it is alien; it is un-American.

And when the distinguished Senator pointed out that the Governor of New York may have tossed aside his chances to be President, I say that by his destructive tactics the Governor is tossing aside any chance for any Republican to be President, because he is playing the game of the Northern Democrats—the game of dividing and destroying—by branding conservatism as "the radical right."

Mr. President, over more than one-quarter of a century I have been the beneficiary of the Republican Party. Unselfish men and women who want nothing but good government have given of their time and talents to organize the party, get out the vote, and stand for the things they wanted. Those people are conservatives. They are a part of the great majority movement in the Republican Party that has surged ahead; and I resent having those people called "the radical right"; and I resent having it implied that there is something sinister about them; and they resent it.

The Republican Party is the conservative party. Without this broad group of conservatives, not a Republican would be elected in any State. It is the basis upon which they first built. That is true in every Northern State; it is true wherever the Republican Party flourishes. It is true in Iowa; it is true in Illinois; it is true in Wisconsin; it is true in Arizona and elsewhere; it is true all over the country. The Republican Party is the conservative party. The people who have made it so are patriotic; they are sincere; they are for each one of our institutions, whether it be the Supreme Court or any other lawful institution.

They have been on the rise. The polls show that. The editorials show it; the whole trend shows it. But because this upsurge of conservatism is disappointing to one man, he assails it and, in his anger and in his frustration, calls it the "radical right"—implying that something is wrong.

Mr. President, it will not bother me. I do not rise for the purpose of defending any Republican officeholder or any Republican aspirant to office. I rise in defense of the Republican Party—the State chairmen, the county chairmen, the precinct captains, and the men and women, without title or description, who make up the mainstay of the Republican Party, and who also, in the majority of cases, are conservatives. They have been maligned.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will my good friend yield to me now?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I must say, in all kindness and good naturedly, that the speech of the Senator from Nebraska reminds me of the old saying in connection with so many of these things—that it all depends on whose ox is being gored.

Mr. CURTIS. I think that is very true. The charge which was made came from someone who is disappointed about certain things.

Mr. MORSE. I wonder whether the Senator from Nebraska will consent if I request that there be printed in the Record the speech delivered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] to the Young Republicans, at San Francisco—so as to let the readers judge for themselves who is smearing whom.

Mr. CURTIS. I have not read the speech; but I object to the request to have it printed in the Record at this time, because I think the Senator from Arizona should be consulted before his remarks on any subject are put into the Record.

I have not mentioned the Senator from Arizona. I am not speaking for him; I have not consulted him.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I take note of the fact that the Senator from Nebraska has objected to my request to have the San Francisco speech of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] printed in the Record. I am willing to let the Record speak for itself.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would feel deeply disheartened if conservatives in the Republican Party identified themselves with the radical right which Governor Rockefeller denounced in his statement. I could think of no greater disservice to the Republican Party than to allow the definition given by the Senator from Nebraska to stick. Mr. President, I do not associate myself with it. I repudiate it.

I do not believe that any Republican conservative can be classed or should be classed with the radical right; and I state that Governor Rockefeller had no such intention and engaged in no such implication. In fact, every word of his statement is exactly to the contrary. In it, when he speaks of Republican conservatism, he speaks of it with the greatest respect. He said:

> They are, in fact, embarked on a determined and ruthless effort to take over the party, its platform, and its candidates, on their own terms—terms that are wholly alien to the sound and honest conservatism that has firmly based the Republican Party in the best of a century's traditions.

Mr. President, I do not believe one can impute to Governor Rockefeller any definition such as the one the Senator from Nebraska endeavors to impute to him; and if that is the basis upon which his speech rests, then I think it collapses like a house of cards.

As for Nebraska and New York, I respect and honor Nebraska; and I respect and honor the Senator from Nebraska, who has been speaking.

Nebraska has 6 electoral votes; perhaps they may not change the fortunes of the candidates in 1964. New York has 45 electoral votes; perhaps they may elect or defeat the President in 1964. But I cast no stone at Nebraska. It is a stronghold of Republican conservatism. God bless Nebraska; it belongs in our party as much as I do.

So when I speak with pride of the success of the Republican cause in New York State, I speak without the remotest disparagement of the stronghold of the Republicans in Nebraska. I speak only to say that the kind of Republican principles we have advocated has received the support of the majority of the people of our State, and has resulted in the election to office of our candidates.

Mr. President, I close as I began: The radical right is not the conservatism or the conservatives of the Republican

Party. The radical right is a group which is seeking to infiltrate and subvert in an attempt to take over the Republican Party with ideas that are alien to American political thought and alien to the views of the two great parties.

I am a progressive in my views, and I am proud of them, and I shall defend them with the last breath I possess. But were I a Republican conservative, I would feel deeply hurt by someone interpreting an attack on the radical right as an attack on conservatives. I am hurt for the tens of thousands of conservative Republicans; they should be offended.

Mr. President, do conservatives believe that Dwight Eisenhower is a neo-Communist? Certainly they do not. Yet that is one of the most sacred tenets of the radical right. If that is the basis of the Senator's speech—and I believe it is—it collapses of its own weight. Governor Rockefeller has cried out against the radical right, and he is to be respected for having done so.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, my beloved friend has scorn for the fact that Nebraska has only six electoral votes. In 1960, we gave all of them to elect a Republican President. The State of New York gave all the electoral votes it had to elect a New Frontier.

As for the Senator's comment on the fact that Nebraska has only six electoral votes, Mr. President, it is shocking that the great exponent and defender of minorities would point that out. We in Nebraska are a minority; we are a small State. The fact remains that the Republican organization—the conservative Republicans—which include the great body of them, the mainstay that holds the party together, and without whom the party could not win any election, were attacked, as I charged in my speech. They were described as the radical right, with connotations unbecoming to any good citizen. The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] himself had printed in the RECORD the statement of the Governor of his State. I ask Senators to keep in mind that it is a statement which was written after the polls—and I do not know how accurate they are—indicated that a conservative candidate was forging ahead, and that the Governor of that great State was falling behind.

What did the Governor say? He said:

> The Republican Party is in real danger of subversion by a radical, well-financed and highly disciplined minority.

Why? Because he had fallen behind. It was an attack on the party. It was an attack on conservatism. It is the line of the opposition party to divide and destroy. It is the weapon not to defeat extreme rightists. They do not amount to anything. The extremists in either party cannot upset our country. But the purpose was to destroy the efficacy of conservatism. Is there any Member of this body so politically naive as to say that if conservatism were on the decline the Republicans would win and the New Frontier would be rejected? Is there anyone so naive as to say that if confidence in conservatism were to be destroyed, it would not help the party of opposition? Therefore, I say that the intemperate and illjudged attack made last weekend was a regrettable one. As I stated in my prepared statement, it could hardly have represented the mature reflection of the man who made it. I hope that he withdraws it.

I yield the floor.

A FAIR TEST FOR KREBIOZEN

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution. It is cosponsored by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senators from New Jersey [Mr. CASE and Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH].

The resolution would authorize and direct the National Institutes of Health to undertake immediately a fair, impartial, and controlled test, under the direction of competent clinical investigators, of the efficacy and safety of Krebiozen and to make to the Congress quarterly reports on the progress of such a test; and it would direct the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and that for the purpose of conducting the test there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000.

When the resolution is passed a fair test of Krebiozen would be undertaken. The Food and Drug Administration would be directed to withhold any action on Krebiozen until such test is completed. Their activities with respect to the drug would cease or be held in limbo until the test was completed. The quarterly reports to the Congress would insure that Congress could make certain that a fair test was held. Meantime, with a fair test going forward and with the activities of the Food and Drug Administration over the drug suspended, the conditions would be created whereby the sponsors of the drug could refile their application and the patients could receive the drug.

I think this is the constructive answer to the controversy about the drug and that it would create the conditions under which the patients could continue to receive the drug which, to them, is a matter of life or death.

Hundreds of patients in the United States are now being treated with the drug Krebiozen and they believe, whether rightly or wrongly, that their lives depend upon the continued use of the drug. I have personally seen as many as a hundred of these patients. I know from their firsthand stories that they are patients who had cancer and whose tumors have either been controlled or reduced under the treatment of the drug. The problem arises in large part because as a result of the persistent efforts of organized medicine, the AMA and the medical bureaucracy, the drug is regarded as controversial. I have always taken the position that it should receive a fair test at the National Cancer Institute.

I am not in any position whatsoever to declare either for or against the drug, but I have felt that it should receive a fair test. I have been struggling toward that end for some years. We merely ask that a fair test be conducted.

That would settle matters once and for all.

On June 7 the sponsors of Krebiozen filed an investigational drug plan with the Food and Drug Administration under the new law. Immediately the Food and Drug Administration began to put out stories that the application would be denied. On June 8, the morning immediately after the filing, they sent inspectors who arrived unannounced at Dr. Durovic's laboratory in Chicago. Previously, the inspectors had apparently filed a favorable report on the inspection of the drug, but they were sent back.

Several incidents occurred which Dr. Durovic claims were in the nature of the most severe kind of harassment. Because of this he filed for an injunction against such tactics and also for the return of a picture apparently taken at this time which the Food and Drug Administration might well have used to try to indicate that capsules were being filled with mineral water rather than with Krebiozen.

These matters are now before the district court in Chicago and I will not comment on them further except to say that there is no question that there has been and continues to be great hostility towards the drug by organized medicine and by many in the Food and Drug Administration. In their brief in the Chicago court, for example, the Food and Drug Administration made insinuations that the number of capsules which were bought and distributed were in excess of the amount of Krebiozen which had been produced, although this matter was gone into and thoroughly aired many years ago by a committee of the Illinois State Legislature.

Last Friday, because of what he believed was continued harassment and a threat to indict him if he did not turn over personal and financial information some 20 years old, Dr. Durovic withdrew the plan for an investigational drug.

Whether he was right in doing this and the extent to which he was harassed by the food and drug inspectors is a matter which will be in part determined by the courts within a few weeks. Personally, I do know that there is no question about the great hostility of many of those in the Food and Drug Administration towards Krebiozen and there is no question in my mind but that they have been waging a propaganda war against the drug at least since June 7, and possibly before that date.

Nevertheless, the patients are caught in the middle. Many of them believe that they will die if they do not get the drug. Others believe that they would regress to the point where their lives would be in danger. Wires have already been sent by numerous qualified medical doctors to the President and to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare urging that the patients continue to receive the drug.

Our resolution, in which I am joined by a number of my distinguished colleagues, would create the conditions under which Krebiozen could receive a fair and scientific test. In addition, it would also create the conditions under which the sponsors of the drug could refile their application so that the patients could receive the drug, without fear of harassment or undue pressures from the Food and Drug Administration while such a test was going forward.

May I say that the answer to the efficacy of Krebiozen is not to be found in the courts, or in the newspapers, or by the Food and Drug Administration inspectors, or indeed by any Senator or Cabinet officer. It is to be found in a scientific and fair test of the drug. That is the answer and that is the way to settle the matter.

While there have been many difficulties, I can say that the National Cancer Institute and the Food and Drug Administration have not been without considerable fault in this matter. They have delayed and delayed and delayed.

Dr. Ivy, the drug's chief sponsor, has submitted the results of the treatment of over 4,000 patients—indeed, close to 5,000—to the National Cancer Institute as evidence that a test is justified and should go forward. The Food and Drug Administration has records on about 500 of the breast cases and twice opened cases. In the past the Cancer Institute has been provided with adequate amounts of Krebiozen in powder form for the chemical analyses which need to be made.

In very recent days Krebiozen in capsule form in large quantities has been given to the Food and Drug Administration, and, in addition to the 10 milligrams of Krebiozen crystals submitted to the National Cancer Institute in the past, an additional 4 milligrams of Krebiozen powder were given to the chief inspector of the Food and Drug Administration last week. This amount is more than adequate for analysis of carbon-hydrogen and nitrogen by the methods of Pregl.

The fact that both the Cancer Institute and the Food and Drug Administration have received large quantities of Krebiozen, both in capsule and powder form, should lay at rest the absurd charge by the medical bureaucracy that it does not exist.

Mr. President, this resolution is being introduced to help save lives of human beings. It is of the utmost importance and the utmost urgency.

The National Cancer Institute should proceed now to test this drug. If a genuine agreement to test can be made and go forward and if, in the interim, the Food and Drug Administration will act in good faith with respect to this drug as this resolution would direct them to do, I believe Drs. Durovic and Ivy would be willing to refile.

I hope very much that the executive branch of the Government will use its energies to the same degree it has used them with respect to the railroad strike and the civil rights demonstrations, to see that the parties in this dispute are brought together, that the patients whose lives are at stake may continue to receive the drug, and that a fair scientific test can be made, which—if it is a fair test—can settle this question once and for all.

In my judgment these investigations should go forward with the utmost speed, for the lives of human beings are at stake.

I am very happy to be joined in the sponsorship of the resolution by the great Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], who has led the fight in the country for an adequate system of testing drugs and whose work has been responsible for keeping off the market a number of toxic drugs.

I think it is significant that the Senator now should join us in the request that this drug be tested.

I point out in addition that no one asserts that this drug is poisonous or toxic in the slightest. It is admittedly nontoxic. The extraordinary thing is that the Food and Drug Administration has in the past authorized the distribution and use of toxic drugs, such as 5-Fluorouracil and a sister drug, and the National Cancer Institute and the Food and Drug Administration have spent $1.7 million to subsidize the drug. Half of the royalties on the drug go to a private chemical company and one-fourth now go to the National Cancer Society.

I find it extraordinary that the double standard which is applied will permit the testing of a toxic drug, which is admittedly toxic—spend money for it—and at the same time resort to the tactics to which they have resorted in the case of Krebiozen.

As I have said, I am very happy that we are joined by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver] who has led the fight for adequate testing. I am also happy that the distinguished present occupant of the chair, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh] is a cosponsor; as are the junior and senior Senators from New Jersey [Mr. Williams and Mr. Case], and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire].

Mr. President, I ask that the text of the joint resolution be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks and that the joint resolution may lie on the desk for a week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the Record and will lie on the desk, as requested.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 101) authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000, introduced by Mr. Douglas (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas hundreds of cancer patients now being treated with the drug Krebiozen believe their lives depend upon the continued use of the drug; and

Whereas Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, chief sponsor of the drug Krebiozen, and former head of the University of Illinois medical schools, is widely known for his work in cancer research as a former director of the American Cancer Society, as the contributor of a dozen or more papers on cancer research to leading medical journals, and as one of the foremost pathologists and medical and cancer research experts in the country today; and

Whereas the National Cancer Institute has investigated and tested thousands of substances for the control of cancer; and

Whereas many of these substances, unlike Krebiozen, have had extreme toxic effects, such as 5-Fluorouracil (5-FU) and 5-Fluorodeoxyuridine (5-FUDR); and

Whereas the nontoxicity of the drug Krebiozen has not been disputed, and such drug has been used on over 4,000 human subjects for periods of up to 12 years, and reports as to its effects have been submitted by about 3,000 physicians; and

Whereas the clinical evidence submitted, with respect to the drug Krebiozen, by Dr. Andrew C. Ivy to the National Cancer Institute indicates that in varying kinds of tumors there has been an actual regression of the tumors in some cases, and relief of pain in many of these cases and in many others; and

Whereas the foregoing facts more than justify a fair test and a determination of the efficacy of the drug Krebiozen: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the National Institutes of Health be authorized and directed to undertake immediately a fair, impartial, and controlled test, under the direction of competent clinical investigators, of the safety and efficacy of Krebiozen and to make to the Congress quarterly reports on the progress of such a test; and that the Food and Drug Administration withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test, and that for the purpose of conducting the test there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a series of articles in the magazine Science by Elinor Langer reviewing this dispute be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the series of articles was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Science magazine]

KREBIOZEN: A DOZEN YEARS AFTER INTRODUCTION, CONTROVERSY OVER CANCER TREATMENT STILL FLARES

(By Elinor Langer)

For 12 years, a drug called Krebiozen, claimed by its proponents to be effective in treating cancer, has had about the same relation to organized medicine that the Holy Rollers have to the Archbishop of Canterbury. In the latest sideshow, 2 weeks ago, frightened cancer victims and their relatives picketed the White House, pleading for continued distribution of the drug on which they think—rightly or wrongly—their lives depend. Earlier extravaganzas have featured a full-scale investigation by the Illinois Legislature and the forced resignation of the president of the University of Illinois, a $300,000 libel suit, and serious tests of both academic freedom and freedom of the press. A continuous attraction has been a series of violent, public attacks on the integrity of science and medicine, both in and out of Government.

The Krebiozen controversy is so complex, and so much of it remains unresolved, that any discussion of it is bound to be incomplete and perhaps even misleading; much of what follows has been disputed at one or another time by one or another of the principals. But it is worth looking at, because when the carnival tents are taken down, at least one question of profound importance to science is left standing. The question, not fully answerable, is whether the procedures that have been developed to protect science against frauds may not also make it difficult for unorthodox, but nonfraudulent, propositions to get a fair hearing—and what category, unorthodox or fraudulent, Krebiozen comes under. At this stage, about the only safe prediction is that when—if ever—the schism is finally healed, Krebiozen will probably tally as many casualties in both science and politics as adherents among the victims of cancer.

Krebiozen's troubles began in March 1951 when Andrew C. Ivy called a semipublic meeting at Chicago's Drake Hotel to present the results of his preliminary experimentation with Krebiozen on 22 human patients with advanced cancer. At that time Ivy was vice president of the University of Illinois in charge of the Chicago Professional Colleges, distinguished professor of physiology, and head of the department of clinical sciences. He had also served as executive director of the National Advisory Cancer Council of the Public Health Service and had represented the Allied governments on the subject of medical ethics at the Nuremburg trials of Nazi physicians accused of war crimes. Ivy had been working with Krebiozen since the summer of 1949 when it was brought to him by Stevan Durovic, a Yugoslav political refugee who was carrying on medical research at a laboratory in Argentina. The laboratory was set up for him there by his brother Marko, who has continued to play a financial role in the Krebiozen story.

If Durovic did discover an anticancer agent in his South American lab, it would be, as the New York Post once said, a little like a high school physics teacher smashing the first atom all alone in his basement, but Ivy was impressed—mainly because Durovic's product squared with a theory he himself had long been interested in. The theory, roughly, is that the body itself contains an anticancer agent that explains the occasional spontaneous disappearance of the disease, and that the agent can be stimulated, extracted from the tissues, and used in treatment. Durovic obtained the substance indirectly, from the blood serum of horses in which it was stimulated by injections of an extract of the fungus Actinomyces bovis. Although the original substance is toxic, the extracted material (which Durovic named Krebiozen from the Greek, meaning "that which regulates growth") presumably is not.

KREBIOZEN'S ORIGINAL SIN

The Chicago meeting was Krebiozen's first disaster. Whatever scientific formalities were left unviolated by the unusual character of the meeting itself (to which not only cancer specialists but medical writers and politicians had been invited) were completely dissipated by a press release, of still unexplained origin, that trumpeted to the world that the battle of medical science to find a cure for cancer was over. Ivy disclaimed any knowledge of the release, and his own report was modest, claiming only that "the substance merits a thorough clinical study." But he did report beneficial results on 20 out of 22 patients, and he was also open to the charge that—due mainly to a certain furtiveness which began then and has continued to characterize Durovic—Ivy was reporting on a substance about which he knew comparatively little, and on which relatively little animal experimentation had been done.

The reasons for the meeting are still obscure. Ivy claims it was intended as an inducement to other researchers to begin working with the drug; the agitation was useful, too, in getting the Durovic brothers' visas extended. Later, in the summer of 1952 they obtained U.S. citizenship through the efforts of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois.

Whatever the reasons, the Krebiozen cat—barely more than an embryo—was out of the bag. The publicity was intense. The University of Illinois, and everyone connected with the drug, were besieged with requests they were unable to fill; a nonprofit institution, the Krebiozen Research Foundation, with Ivy temporarily as its head, was established to begin experimental distribution of the fairly small amount of Krebiozen Durovic had; two drug companies negotiated with Durovic, each offering more than $1 million for Krebiozen rights, and they were rejected; and the medical profession became alarmed.

If Ivy can be accused of haste and poor judgment in reporting his first results, the accusation must fall with equal weight on the medical profession for the speed and style in which it proceeded to discipline one of its most eminent members. Seven months after Ivy's announcement, in October 1951, the Journal of the American Medical Association published a "Status report on Krebiozen," which reviewed the case histories of 100 patients treated with Krebiozen and concluded that 98 of the patients had "failed to show objective improvement" and that the "beneficial effects" reported by Ivy were not confirmed. In an exchange of letters in Science with C. P. Rhodes of New York's Memorial Center for Cancer, Ivy had agreed with criticisms that in his original report "there were no controls reported, the clinical material was not uniform, the results were irregular, [and] the effects were not established as due to the treatment employed," and stated again that he was asking only for further study. Since, in Ivy's estimation, work on Krebiozen had just begun, the finality of the AMA report came as a shocking setback.

THE AMA VERSUS KREBIOZEN

This document, thick with "secret remedy" charges, became a cause célèbre in the Krebiozen controversy; its findings have been bitterly challenged. Of its 100 cases, 24 have been alleged fraudulent in that the conclusions reported contradicted those of the physician actually administering the drug. For several of the remaining cases, Ivy accused the AMA—as it has now so often accused him—of unscientific procedures on the grounds that 58 of the patients were so near death that they received less than four injections, and that none of the patients had been on Krebiozen for very long.

Pressing requests for information doubtless played a role, but the AMA's initial haste in discrediting Krebiozen had several unfortunate results. Although it by no means ended experimentation, it certainly prejudiced the atmosphere to a point where nothing short of a miraculous performance could have redeemed Krebiozen in the suspicious eyes of those to whom the AMA Journal is a rulebook; it made, and has continued to make, it very difficult for Krebiozen supporters to get anything but covert cooperation from the 3,000 or so physicians who have administered the drug; and it gave rise, and many would say credence, to the jungle-thick theories that a financial conspiracy against Krebiozen existed, spearheaded, it was claimed, by the treasurer of the AMA, who hoped somehow to discredit Durovic and exploit the new discovery for himself.

The AMA report appeared on October 27, 1951. On November 12, Ivy was suspended from the Chicago Medical Society on "secret remedy" charges. On November 24, a letter appeared in the Journal of the AMA from the National Research Council's Cancer Therapy and Diagnosis Committee reporting that its review of 63 Krebiozen-treated patients (in several cases there was overlapping with the AMA study) revealed "no evidence of any curative effect."

Opposing the increasingly united scientific front against Krebiozen, was only Ivy's personal distinction and his deep conviction that Krebiozen warranted further study. The medical faculty of the University of Illinois was growing restive about the uproar and Ivy's role in it. With Ivy's approval, the university president, George Stoddard, appointed a "research validation" committee, headed by Warren Cole, head of the university's department of surgery, to review a report Ivy was preparing on 500 Krebiozen-treated cancer patients. The committee was to concentrate on the "scientific validity of the results thus far obtained," not on the "chemical nature of the drug * * * or of its method of manufacture."

Ivy turned over his material in April 1952; the Cole committee report emerged the following September, and like every other exhibit in the Krebiozen controversy it has become a cause célèbre in its own right, each side claiming that the report validates its contentions. It appears from the report's conclusions (the only part released) that the committee was at least a bit uncertain about Krebiozen and was particularly distressed by its ignorance about the substance itself. It ended by recommending further trials in animals and man—but only under carefully controlled conditions, and only if Krebiozen could be reproduced and if enough was available for chemical study.

In a pattern since repeated several times, Ivy agreed to the test, but the Durovics held back. They claimed that no Krebiozen was available and suggested a 6-month delay until more could be produced in Argentina; to them, the university's desire to produce Krebiozen itself, signified its participation in the conspiracy to take Krebiozen away from them.

President Stoddard interpreted the Durovics' reluctance as proof of chicanery and concluded that, except possibly as a "common, harmless, inexpensive ingredient, Krebiozen does not exist." Two months after the appearance of the Cole report, in November 1952, Stoddard proclaimed the "end of the road for Krebiozen insofar as any staff member of the University of Illinois is concerned," and he prohibited further experimentation with it there.

Stoddard was acting in the face of considerable pressure from the Illinois Legislature, which had allied itself with Ivy in the internecine war. Ivy, a Midwesterner and successful money raiser for the university, was a great court favorite; Stoddard, who had tangled with the legislature on several previous occasions—mainly to his credit—was not. For his resistance to the politicians' interference with academia, Stoddard received, in 1954, the Academic Freedom Citation of the American Civil Liberties Union—in some ways a perverse award, since the matter at issue could be interpreted as freedom of scientific research. In the hectic drama, Stoddard was fully supported by the university faculty, though not, it turned out, by the politically elected board of trustees, who forced his resignation the following summer (1953). Ivy had by that time already lost his position as vice president in a rather precipitate reorganization action suggested by Stoddard in November 1952; he retained his other posts until late in 1961, when, on reaching retirement age, he accepted a position with tenure at Chicago's Roosevelt University.

For another year, starting in March 1953, Illinois remained the Krebiozen battlefield as the State legislature conducted intensive hearings that wandered through the mud of various conspiracy theories and exonerated everybody of everything, except President Stoddard, whom it admonished for lack of tact. Krebiozen did not become a national issue until a few years later.

KREBIOZEN: NEARLY A DECADE OF CONTROVERSY SPENT IN PURSUIT OF FAIR, GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED TEST

(By Elinor Langer)

From 1951 to 1954, Krebiozen, as an experimental drug, had been distributed free to physicians requesting it for use on patients with advanced cancer. In April 1954, the drug's producers—at that time the Duga Biological Institute, later Promak Laboratories, both principally owned by Steven Durovic—moved to get commercial status by filing a new drug application with the Food and Drug Administration. Krebiozen's first run-in with the Government not only reflected the ambiguities of its past but presaged the complexities of its future.

The application was denied, partly on the grounds that it was incomplete, but mainly on the argument that Krebiozen was a biological rather than a hormone, and thus subject to the licensing provisions of the Division of Biologic Standards of the Public Health Service rather than to FDA. The importance of the difference is that FDA at the time required only proof of safety, not of efficacy, while the PHS (which has jurisdiction over viruses, serums, toxins, and analogous products) requires both, and that unlike FDA's rulings, PHS rulings cannot be appealed. Krebiozen's sponsors disagreed on scientific grounds with this classification of the drug and have never applied to Biologic Standards. The jurisdictional uncertainties, never resolved, were mainly responsible for the blank check that FDA has given Krebiozen during the intervening years and which its sponsors now claim amounts, in effect, to a sanction.

After the application was rejected, the Krebiozen Research Foundation—the organization responsible for distributing and evaluating the drug—began seeking "donations" from patients receiving it. Estimates vary, but according to Ivy, between one-half and one-third of the approximately 4,200 patients who have received Krebiozen have paid for it. Prices have changed over the years; the current rate is $9.50 per dose. The legality of these procedures is currently under FDA scrutiny, but they do not appear to have been prohibited by the drug laws that were in effect at the time.

From the relatively quiet recesses of the Food and Drug Administration, Krebiozen moved back into the headlines—and onto the editorial pages—not as a scientific but as a civil liberties issue. Learning that his former antagonist at the University of Illinois, George Stoddard, was describing his view of the events there in a book to be called "Krebiozen: The Great Cancer Hoax," Ivy, in the fall of 1954, obtained a temporary prepublication injunction against the publisher, Beacon Press. The injunction was fought through to the Massachusetts Supreme Court and finally dismissed—but not until an ugly question of censorship had further clouded the Krebiozen record. Publication was delayed for a time, the manuscript was apparently revised a good deal, and the offending "hoax" in the title was changed to the more humble "mystery," but the changes were not sufficient to forestall a $350,000 libel suit which Ivy promptly initiated against Stoddard in Chicago. The legal issue predictably became entangled with the scientific evaluation of Krebiozen, and both—though in slightly different senses—are still pending.

Since 1957 the sponsors of Krebiozen have been skirmishing around the fringes of the scientific community, campaigning for a "fair test" for the product which they still believe to have been unfairly boycotted, if not the object of an outright conspiracy. In response to popular pressures that had implications for its own pocketbook, the American Cancer Society in 1958 expressed an interest in sponsoring a test of the drug, but the negotiations quickly collapsed; the main burden, since then, has been carried by the Government's National Cancer Institute (NCI).

Negotiations between the Krebiozen Research Foundation (KRF) and the Cancer Institute have been carried on sporadically since the summer of 1958, most often stemming from popular or political pressures rather than from NCI's scientific initiative. In August 1958, at about the same time that NIH appropriation hearings were going on, Senator Paul Douglas proposed the selection of an arbitration committee to design and conduct a test of Krebiozen. One member of the committee was to be selected by NCI, one by KRF, and a third—a biostatistician to serve as chairman—by the two groups jointly. Despite considerable uneasiness on the part of NCI, discussion was opened. It quickly faltered on two questions: (i) whether Ivy would be a permissible member of the committee, and (ii) whether the material the Krebiozen Research Foundation agreed to submit was to serve as a basis for a test, as Ivy wanted, or as a basis for deciding whether a test was warranted, as the Cancer Institute wanted. To NCI, the insistence that Ivy supervise the planning and conduct of a test seemed incredible, since he was avowedly partisan. NCI interpreted the demand as a delaying tactic, and all the public and political noisemaking as a stalling device to scare off the regulatory agencies and thus make continued distribution possible. To Ivy, on the other hand, exclusion from the committee, and the absence of a commitment from it to perform a test, meant that Krebiozen was once again to be subjected to a secondhand review by researchers who would lack the benefit of his own extensive experimentation. In February 1959 Ivy wired John Heller, the NCI director with whom he had been dealing, "We shall never again give any committee the opportunity of discrediting Krebiozen without first having formulated the criteria which will insure the performance of a valid and fair test. We do not want the opinion of a committee; we want a fair test." The negotiations collapsed.

More promising negotiations were opened in October 1960, following the appearance of a series of articles on Krebiozen in the New York Post. Shortly after his appointment as NCI director, Kenneth Endicott met privately with Ivy and Durovic; it was agreed that they would submit to NCI an analysis of their accumulated data on Krebiozen. According to the NCI version, the data were to be a basis for determining whether a test should be made; according to Ivy, it was to serve as the basis for such a test. This confusion did not become apparent till later, however, and in the interim more pressure was placed on NCI to conduct such a test by the intervention of the Illinois judge to whose lot had fallen the libel suit between Ivy and Stoddard. Although, in the libel charge against Stoddard, lawyers on both sides had agreed that only Ivy's professional conduct, and not the efficacy of Krebiozen, was at issue, Judge Julius Miner felt the case rested on evaluation of the drug, and in April 1961 he wrote to then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff asking for a test. Ribicoff's reply casts doubts on whether HEW's downtown branch knew what its uptown branch was doing, for the Secretary did not mention the likelihood of an NCI test. He did, however, mention that Durovic had filed a second New Drug Application the month before.

Durovic's second attempt to put Krebiozen on a commercial footing increased, rather than reduced, the intricacies of the controversy, and has remained to haunt the disputants. Although the Food and Drug Administration regards the application as having been officially rejected in June 1961, Ivy and Durovic have questioned the legality of the procedure followed and have indicated that for some purposes, at least, they regard the application as having become effective. Litigation would be needed to settle the point definitively, and the case would rest on technicalities, not the substantive adequacy of Durovic's application. So far, the dispute has functioned as a reserve force in the Krebiozen arsenal, and is drawn into battle only when the drug's experimental status appears threatened.

A FAIR TEST FOR KREBIOZEN?

In September 1961, Ivy and Durovic returned to the National Cancer Institute with the fruits of nearly a year's labor over their data—an 820-page draft analysis of their results on 4,000 patients, and a manuscript to be submitted for publication in the NCI Journal. They also brought a small (and disputed) amount of Krebiozen—presumably between 7 and 10 milligrams. But the high hopes genuinely held on both sides that the Krebiozen controversy could at last be resolved were quickly dissipated.

The material submitted by Ivy in order, he thought, to facilitate the design of a clinical test appeared to reviewers at the Cancer Institute shockingly inadequate even to establish whether the drug was fit to be tested on human patients. Within a few months the manuscript submitted to the Journal had been rejected, and further consideration of proposals for a test tabled until more data could be supplied. The old question of whether Krebiozen was being justly treated by the scientific community was back again in full force. What was the cause of the trouble?

If there is reason to doubt that Ivy's data was scientifically inviolable, there is also reason to doubt that it was reviewed by NCI with a very sympathetic eye. Although the Institute's letters to Ivy and Durovic stressed, among other things, the inadequacy of prior toxicity and other studies on animals, the unreliability of the bioassay used (tests on breast cancers), and the uncertainty about Krebiozen's chemical nature, or its reproducibility, high NCI officials, in private conversations, have cast some doubt on the validity of their own objections, and on whether more is being demanded of Krebiozen than of some of the other hundreds of thousands of anticancer substances that the Institute regularly screens and, in many cases, tests on human patients. The human bioassay, for instance, while not regarded as satisfactory, is far from unique in the history of drug experimentation; Krebiozen has generally been conceded to be nontoxic (although this has not been independently established); Krebiozen would not be the first drug (nor the first tested at NCI) to be active on human cancers but not on animal cancers; and finally, an NCI official closely involved with the case stated that enough information had been revealed about the method of extracting and manufacturing Krebiozen for the Institute to produce (and presumably analyze) the substance itself. This would in no way resolve the controversy, since it could always be claimed that the batch produced was not identical to the batches with which Ivy and Durovic claim to have achieved their results; but it is an interesting comment on the validity of the NCI argument that Krebiozen is still too mysterious a substance to justify its use in human patients.

On the other side, however, and despite the fact that Ivy's data were not intended to establish the efficacy of Krebiozen but only to serve as a basis for tests that would do precisely that, it must be said that Ivy's scientific house was not in very good order, and his data did not make the Institute's task any easier. Taken separately, none of the elements of Ivy's report was unprecedented; but the separate unorthodoxies when added up appeared monumental, and left the Institute with the dizzy feeling that Krebiozen could simply not be pinned down in any reliable way. Some sense of the NCI's frustration in dealing with one of its former advisers, a man who officials felt should clearly "know better," can be gleamed from the letter to Ivy from H. B. Andervont, scientific editor of the Cancer Institute's Journal, rejecting his manuscript. After three pages detailing his reasons for regarding the manuscript as inadequate, Andervont closed with a paragraph that is a cross between a plea for scientific integrity and a brief for scientific orthodoxy:

"The manuscript differs from most scientific presentations in several respects. It does not contain an introduction in which the author refers to previous investigators who were interested in stimulating RES (the method of obtaining Krebiozen from horses) to ascertain whether it is involved in the growth of tumors. It does not contain a section on materials and methods for defining clearly the preparation of Krebiozen, the response of patients, the technique for collection and analysis of data procured from physicians, and the criteria used for their evaluation. It does not contain a discussion of results in relation to other kinds of cancer treatment. A conclusion is found on page 80 of a paper consisting of 120 pages."

The misunderstandings—partly petty disagreements over form, partly deep disagreements over substance—all sprang from the initial confusion over whether an NCI test had been absolutely, or only conditionally, promised. The refusal to conduct a test on the basis of the data supplied appeared to Ivy and Durovic as treachery; to the Cancer Institute, the pressure to test on human patients a substance about which it still felt so uncertain threatened its scientific and moral integrity. Both sides, however, though they suspected each other of the worst possible motives, were unwilling to give up the idea of a test altogether, and for different reasons both began to seek the aid of other Government agencies in obtaining some of the data in dispute.

As far as NCI officials were concerned, the inadequacy of the material submitted suggested that Krebiozen's sponsors simply did not have the evidence to support their claims, and they began to press the Food and Drug Administration to determine whether Krebiozen was being "investigated" in a clinical sense at all or merely distributed for commercial purposes. At the same time, in his reply to the Institute's rejection of his data in July 1962 (strategically withheld until NIH appropriation time again, when it appeared simultaneously as a letter to Endicott and as an entry, by Senator Douglas, in the Congressional Record) Ivy explained that some of the material NCI wanted—mainly extensive case histories of patients on Krebiozen—had been impossible to obtain.

Ivy attributed his own inability to collect the records mainly to the inhibitions of physicians in admitting that they had administered a drug that had been frowned on by organized medicine, and in part simply to the financial burdens the task had posed. Although he did not agree that the data was crucial to the proposed NCI test, he did suggest that lack of such data had "impeded our study of the past 12 years," and he, too, suggested that the Government use its power to get the records from hospitals and private physicians.

With requests from both sides on its hands, the Food and Drug Administration could hardly avoid initiating an investigation. After a few more minor skirmishes, an investigation into both the commercial and clinical history of Krebiozen was begun in March 1963. Things were at this stage when the unresolved controversy collided with new drug laws to produce the Krebiozen panic of early June.

Krebiozen: FDA Deadline Brings New, but Not the Final, Episode in Controversy Over Cancer Drug

(By Elinor Langer)

The latest (though probably not the last) chapter in the Krebiozen chronicle grew out of a clash between the old controversy and the new drug laws. The laws, passed in the aftermath of thalidomide last summer, covered several aspects of drug production and marketing. Krebiozen was one of about 2,500 drugs affected by the sections governing distribution of "investigational" drugs for research purposes.

Krebiozen's sponsors, along with sponsors of the other drugs, were required to file with the Food and Drug Administration, by June 7, 1963, a clinical plan detailing the nature of the drug and its method of manufacture, the results of toxicity studies and of past animal and clinical studies, and the identity and qualifications of doctors participating in the research as investigators. Failure to file this information by June 7 rendered further interstate shipment of a drug illegal and consignments liable to seizure by the FDA. The procedure is weighted in favor of the sponsor, however; after filing, he may continue to distribute the drug unless notified that FDA considers his data inadequate. The sponsor may insist on a final conference before FDA is permitted to halt distribution of a drug.

What the actual effect of the new laws will be is not yet certain, since much depends on how they are enforced. But they are far from popular with the drug industry, one of whose representatives spoke recently of volumes of material "reaching several feet above the height of an average man" being sent off to FDA. If the sponsors of Krebiozen look back wistfully to the prethalidomide days when an experimental drug had only to be labeled "experimental," and the FDA notified, for distribution to begin, they will find themselves (for once) in distinguished company.

Although they did not influence the outcome of the FDA-Krebiozen clash, many segments of the drug industry, mentally at least, took Krebiozen out of their files marked "unproved treatments" and put it into a more solemn classification marked "struggle for freedom of research." Many, in short, would not have been sorry to see the FDA back down.

However much FDA officials wished to believe that they were (or, for that matter, probably wished to be) mere passive agents administering a law that fell with blind impartiality on everybody, the case of Krebiozen was bound to be exceptional. For one thing the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, parent organization of both FDA and the National Cancer Institute, had been involved far too long for simplicity to be possible. For another, FDA was already waist deep in its investigation into Krebiozen's clinical and financial past. Although, in theory, the investigation is to facilitate the testing of Krebiozen by the Cancer Institute (stalled about a year ago by the inability of Ivy and Durovic to supply the desired data), in fact it may lead to a less pretty climax. FDA officials have admitted privately that the material they have seen so far has not only opened up some doubts about the legality of past distribution of Krebiozen as an experimental drug but has reinforced what seems to be the innate skepticism of many professionals where Krebiozen's claims of effectiveness are concerned. (The preliminaries have already produced one surprise—and a hint that it will not be easy to close the books on the Krebiozen story: Stevan Durovic, on June 27, named Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Celebrezze, the latter's special assistant for medical affairs, Boisfeuillet Jones, and three FDA officials as defendants in a suit enjoining the Government from harassing him. Depending on FDA's response, this could lead to a long court battle and further complications in the case.)

TWO SMUDGED SLATES

But if it was difficult for FDA officials to approach the June 7 deadline with a clean slate, smudges were visible on the slate of the drug's sponsors as well. Ivy and Durovic approached the deadline with two goals that were beyond the scope of the new regulations—to keep distributing Krebiozen to the 125 or so patients who at present believe their lives depend on continued treatment, and to increase pressure on the Government to sponsor a "fair test." To attain these goals they used a variety of means with which the Government was ill-prepared to cope. Doubting that their application for continued experimentation would be viewed by FDA with an unprejudiced eye, Ivy and Durovic stalled on filing, causing great alarm among the patients, who feared that their supply of Krebiozen would be cut off, and thus bringing a new, highly public, tension into the controversy. A few weeks before, on May 15, some Krebiozen patients and their families, already growing anxious over the nearness of the cut-off date, traveled to Washington to tell their stories to Government officials in an informal substitute for a meeting Ivy had proposed a few months before. Ivy's offer to bring patients and their records to Washington for evaluation by Government physicians had been turned down by HEW on the grounds that patient "testimonials" would "contribute nothing at all toward the solution of the scientific question of Krebiozen's merits." But the patients, mobilized by Mrs. Laine Friedman, a New York woman whose husband is a Krebiozen patient, thought otherwise and appeared anyway. Senator Douglas arranged for them to meet in the Senate Office Building; several Congressmen, or members of their staffs, in addition to HEW officials, were in the audience.

Although to press Ivy and Durovic into filing would have been in the patients' own interest, for the most part they shared the sponsors' view that there was a "conspiracy," and they were sympathetic to the legal reasoning; they hoped the Government could be made more flexible. As was discussed here last week, Ivy and Durovic believed that a New Drug Application they had filed in April 1961 could be activated to keep Krebiozen in distribution; but they also believed that the public pressure would be great enough to forestall FDA's seizing or enjoining distribution of the drug. On its side, the agency flatly disputed the claim of effective new-drug status by Krebiozen, refused to be intimidated by a popular uprising, and is in fact reported to have had its agents in Chicago quite prepared to seize the first shipments of Krebiozen that left Illinois after midnight on June 7. FDA's position was that it could make no advance commitments regarding the application, and that if no application was forthcoming, the law would take its inexorable course.

Ivy and Durovic did not organize the uproar that enveloped Washington on June 5 and 6, but they used it nonetheless. It was partly spontaneous, partly supervised by a skillful conglomeration of public relations firms, a few newspaper and radio commentators, some businessmen, and some private citizens, all dedicated to exposing what they genuinely believe to be the conspiracy against Krebiozen. It consisted of a long picket line in front of the White House, composed of patients and their families and friends, whose placards begged for Presidential intercession to stave off the application of the law and the banning of Krebiozen; of the arrest of Mrs. Friedman, who (by mistake or not) sat down in territory on which White House pickets are forbidden to tread and got her cause in the newspapers as a result; of full-page ads in strategic newspapers, not only in Washington but elsewhere in the country, pointing a finger at "Cancer, Krebiozen and Our National Shame." And since the uproar involved heavy political pressures, most persistently from Senator Douglas, but increasingly from other Senators and Congressmen responding to an outpouring of mail from their constituents, the June 7 deadline, and what FDA would do about it, became a major test of the integrity of the new laws as well as a showdown on Krebiozen. Having played cat and mouse for over a decade, Krebiozen and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare were finally caught in the same trap.

What FDA did was what, legally, it had to do: it waited—waited until, at the very last minute, mounting pressures, a helping hand from an emissary of the White House, and an ad hoc meeting of the disputants persuaded Ivy and Durovic to file an application. But if all the participants felt relief, it was a shortlived and sadly misguided sensation. The old patterns instantly reasserted themselves. In press releases after a private meeting the two sides issued conflicting interpretations of their agreement. Ivy and Durovic tied their decision to file to a supposed assurance that Krebiozen patients would continue to get the drug and that "all efforts would be made to speed an impartial test * * * in the near future." In HEW's view, however, no one had been assured of anything, except that the law would follow its natural course where investigational use of Krebiozen was concerned; this included distribution of the drug while the application was under review. In its press release HEW again stressed its position that the application and the test were entirely unrelated questions. Senator Douglas has already taken a different view and issued a statement which begins, "Now that Dr. Ivy and Dr. Durovic have filed a plan * * * there is no excuse for the National Cancer Institute and the Food and Drug Administration to delay further a fair test of Krebiozen."

As matters now stand, the application has been received and is under review—amid authoritative rumors that its rejection is imminent—and the patients have been receiving the drug. Under the terms of the law, Ivy, and Durovic, if notified that their application is inadequate, may call a conference with FDA to discuss the deficiencies, but it seems doubtful that such a conference would be productive.

If the application is rejected, although several delaying battles might be fought, FDA would be forced by law to attempt to ban further distribution of the drug that Ivy claims has (i) decreased the size of tumors for varying periods in from 20 to 70 percent of 4,200 patients: (ii) reduced or abolished pain for varying periods, depending on the type of tumor, in from 33 to 74 percent of the patients; (iii) lengthened the ambulatory life of previously bedridden patients in 51 percent of the cases; and (iv) prolonged for from 4 to 12 years the lives of 10 percent of the patients whose doctors had expected them to die in 1 year or less. Although these figures have not been verified by any independent authorities, the fact remains that they have been publicly asserted. There will be many people aside from the Krebiozen "true believers" who feel that a drug with claims such as these behind it should under no circumstances be removed from circulation without a definitive test, however difficult it is to obtain the test, and however many unresolved mysteries still remain. If the FDA, either in applying the new laws, or in some other way, attempts to ban further distribution of Krebiozen, a renewal of the uproar is inevitable.

Reenacting the Krebiozen drama, though it may be costly in more ways than one for all the participants, will not be difficult. Many of the actors, onstage since 1951, appear to know their lines by heart.

PAYMENT OF PENSIONS TO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I AND THEIR WIDOWS AND DEPENDENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in behalf of the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], I introduce, by request, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents. I do this at the request of the senior Senator from Indiana, because he is not able to be present today and his junior colleague is in the chair.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement on this subject prepared for delivery by the senior Senator from Indiana, which he would have delivered had he not been detained on official business, may be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thanks the distinguished Senator from Illinois for helping and assisting his colleague, the senior Senator from Indiana.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know the junior Senator from Indiana would have sponsored the bill if he had been in a position to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1918) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents, introduced by Mr. Douglas (for Mr. Hartke), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement of Mr. Hartke, presented by Mr. Douglas, is as follows:

Hartke Asks Aid for World War I Veterans

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents.

An amendment to title 38, United States Code, this bill would authorize a pension of $100 per month for each veteran of World War I who meets certain service and income limitation requirements. It is similar to my bill S. 1260, introduced earlier in the session, but it provides larger pensions for veterans needing constant care, provides pensions for widows of veterans and includes the service and income limitation requirements. If a veteran is helpless or blind, or requires the regular aid or attendance of another person, the rate would be increased by not less than $70 per month. The widow of a World War I veteran would be eligible for a pension of $75 per month if she meets the same conditions and requirements as the veteran himself.

World War I veterans have performed a service to their country every bit as valuable as the veterans of World War II and the Korean war, but they have never received comparable benefits. Most of them are now retired and living on small fixed incomes. With inflation steadily chipping away at these incomes, many are receiving less than the minimum income necessary to maintain a self-respecting standard of living.

On July 1, 1963, a program such as this was estimated to cost $1,885,526,280 per year. This cost will be reduced by at least $36,000 per day for a yearly total of $13,140,000 until 1976, when only 4 percent of World War I veterans will be living.

We have shown how proud and grateful our country is for the services rendered by those who fought in World War II and the Korean war. I see no reason for us to exclude those who risked their lives in World War I. Instead of opening the door to comfortable retirement, the advancing years now open the door to economic distress for these men and their widows. This bill will allow them to enjoy their later years in a truly grateful country.

INTEGRATION IMPACT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a carefully documented article in the Wall Street Journal for Monday, July 15, comes to a conclusion which will be startling to a number of my colleagues, as indeed it was startling to me. The article indicates that desegregated concerns in the South are having their patronage held up; that some hotels and restaurants are doing even better than they did before they served Negro customers. Examples are given from Atlanta and Dallas and a number of other southern cities.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this article may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 15, 1963]

Integration Impact: Desegrated Concerns in South Say Patronage Holds Up in Long Run

(By James C. Tanner)

Atlanta.—Things are swinging these days at the Wit's End, a swank North Side night club which opened its doors last November. Though the Treasury's new expense account rules made things tough at first, the Wit's End is now packing in customers regularly.

In Memphis, the 126-room Downtowner Motel is doing so well its occupancy is even running ahead of last year's booming 95 percent rate. The Downtowner has been filled to capacity much of the time in recent weeks and all signs point to a record year.

The financial fortunes of these Southern establishments are of special interest because both are among those that have begun serving Negroes for the first time. Their experiences, plus those of scores of other businesses from Texas to the Carolinas, point up a significant and perhaps surprising fact: Among those restaurants, hotels, theaters and other places of public accommodation in the South that have begun serving or hiring Negroes, only a few report suffering any lasting economic consequences. A sizable number, in fact, declare that business has been better than ever.

COULDN'T HAVE BEEN SMOOTHER

"We were scared to death—we could just see all our white customers walking out the minute the first Negroes walked in," says Paul Stickney, manager of the Wit's End. "But things couldn't have been any smoother. We know of only one white couple who walked out because we admitted Negroes and they came back within 2 weeks. As far as stirring things up around here, it's been one big zero." The Wit's End is one of only three Atlanta Night clubs serving both whites and Negroes.

All this is not to suggest that desegregation would go smoothly for all Dixie establishments. At Ormond Beach, Fla., near Daytona Beach, motel operator George Thomas is still reeling from the financial punch delivered by boycotting whites when he decided it was the "right thing" to desegregate his 32-unit Star of the South Motel

7 months ago. "My business at first dropped about 50 percent" he reports. But he adds that an influx of Negro guests quickly took up much of the slack, and he expresses confidence that many of his white customers eventually will return.

But most businessmen questioned by the Wall Street Journal report no grave economic dislocations from integration and they leave no doubt that desegregation of commercial facilities has been less painful than expected.

"Things have been going like clockwork—we're surprised and pleased," says Dallas hotelman Henry Rather of last summer's decision by the city's major hotels and motels to integrate. Mr. Rather says a recent check of the city's 35 largest hostelries failed to turn up a single instance of lost business because of desegregation. "There were a few letters and a crank call or two at first, but that's all," comments Mr. Rather.

Broader access to privately owned places of "public convenience," such as hotels, restaurants, amusement facilities and stores, has become a prime goal of Negroes lately. The recent riots in Birmingham, and subsequent disturbances in such cities as Savannah, Ga., Jackson, Miss., Danville, Va., and Tallahassee, Fla., primarily revolved around Negro demands that merchants open their facilities to Negroes—in some cases as customers and in others as employees.

The question has taken on added importance in recent weeks with the appeal to Congress by President Kennedy for Federal power to outlaw racial discrimination in all places of public accommodation. This is unquestionably the most controversial provision of the Kennedy civil rights program and seems likely to become the focal point of the coming congressional battle over civil rights.

NEGROES MAKING MAJOR STRIDES

Southern businessmen generally express strong opposition to this section of the proposed civil rights legislation. But even without such a law, Negroes are making major strides in their push to break down segregation barriers. The Justice Department reports that some desegregation of commercial facilities occurred in 143 cities in Southern and border States in the 4 weeks ended June 18; others are joining the list daily.

Last week, for instance, a biracial committee in strongly segregationist Fort Worth announced that all of the city's public facilities, including hotels, restaurants, theaters, department stores, and athletic contests, would be desegregated in September when the city's schools are scheduled for integration.

If the pattern emerging in other Southern cities holds true, Fort Worth merchants can expect some protests and loss of business when they first begin accepting Negroes. But experience shows that such adverse effects are rarely lasting.

Fred Harvey, president of Harvey's Department Store in Nashville, says that when his store desegregated its lunch counters in 1960 only 13 charge accounts were closed out of 60,000. "The greatest surprise I ever had was the apparent 'so what' attitude of white customers," says Mr. Harvey.

Even were business losses occur, they usually are only temporary. At the 120-room Peachtree Manor Hotel in Atlanta, owner Irving H. Goldstein says his business dropped off 15 percent when the hotel desegregated a year ago. "But now we are only slightly behind a year ago and we can see we are beginning to recapture the business we initially lost," declares Mr. Goldstein.

William F. Davoren, owner of the Brownie Drug Co. in Huntsville, Ala., reports that though his business fell a bit for several weeks after lunch counters were desegregated, he's now picked up all that he lost. Says he: "I could name a dozen people who regarded it as a personal affront when I started serving Negroes, but have come back as if nothing had happened."

MEMORIES ARE SHORT

Even a segregation-minded businessman in Huntsville agrees that white customers frequently have short memories when it comes to the race question. W. T. Hutchens, general manager of three Walgreen stores there, says he held out when most lunch counter operators gave in to sit-in pressures last July. In one shopping center where his competition desegregated, Mr. Hutchens says his business shot up sharply and the store's lunch counter volume registered a 12 percent gain for the year. However, this year business has dropped back to preintegration levels "because a lot of people have forgotten" the defiant role his stores played during the sit-ins, he adds.

Some Southern businessmen who have desegregated say they have picked up extra business as a result of the move.

At Raleigh, N.C., where Gino's Restaurant was desegregated this year, owner Jack Griffiths reports only eight whites have walked out after learning the establishment served Negroes, and he says "we're getting plenty of customers to replace the hardheaded ones."

In Dallas, integration of hotels and restaurants has "opened up an entirely new area of convention prospects," according to Ray Bennison, convention manager of the Chamber of Commerce. "This year we've probably added $8 to $10 million of future bookings because we're integrated," Mr. Bennison says.

CONVENTIONS FOR ATLANTA

Within a day after 14 Atlanta hotels announced on June 13 they would begin accepting Negro guests who come to the city with conventions, the Atlanta Convention Bureau had nailed down three organizations for 1964 and 1965 meetings, a total of 3,000 delegates who otherwise would not have visited Atlanta. Walter Crawford, executive vice president of the Convention Bureau, says the hotels' decision opens up "the remaining 40 percent of the convention market that we estimate we haven't even been able to talk to before."

One frequently expressed fear of Southern white businessmen, that their establishments would be overrun by Negroes if they integrated, apparently is not materializing. "The Negroes want the right to enter your place of business, but they're not so anxious to use the right," says a Nashville banker.

At Knoxville, Tenn., William Tiller, assistant manager of the city's largest hotel, the Andrew Johnson, reports that although the hotel has been integrated more than a month, "we've had only three Negro families and two couples."

SENATORIAL LEGISLATIVE LOGJAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I desire to speak on the subject of the senatorial legislative logjam.

More than 6 months have expired since the Senate convened on January 9 of this year. What has been accomplished?

If we take at face value the Résumé of Congressional Activity as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Daily Digest for the period of January 9 through June 30, we might come to the conclusion that the Senate has done a great deal.

I ask unanimous consent that this résumé may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RÉSUMÉ OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTIVITY

FIRST SESSION OF EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

The first table gives a comprehensive résumé of all legislative business transacted by the House and Senate.

The second table accounts for all nominations submited to the Senate by the President for Senate confirmation.

Data on legislative activity, Jan. 9 through June 30, 1963

	Senate	House	Total
Days in session	85	80	
Time in session (hours and minutes)	452:00	278:28	
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:			
Pages of proceedings	7,084	4,274	11,358
Appendix			4,152
Public bills enacted into law	11	44	55
Private bills enacted into law	2	7	9
Bills in conference		3	
Bills through conference	1	4	
Measures passed, total	341	402	
Senate bills	149	13	
House bills	67	230	
Senate joint resolutions	6	1	
House joint resolutions	7	9	
Senate concurrent resolutions	17	16	
House concurrent resolutions	6	11	
Simple resolutions	89	122	211
Measures reported, total	[1] 371	[1] 450	
Senate bills	168	11	
House bills	42	306	
Senate joint resolutions	6	2	
House joint resolutions	7	13	
Senate concurrent resolutions	19	15	
House concurrent resolutions	5	10	
Simple resolutions	124	93	217
Special reports	20	27	
Conference reports		6	
Reported measures not acted on	20	86	
Measures introduced, total	2,136	8,493	10,629
Bills	1,821	7,350	9,171
Joint resolutions	97	529	626
Concurrent resolutions	51	189	240
Simple resolutions	167	425	592
Quorum calls	31	50	
Yea-and-nay votes	81	41	
Bills vetoed			
Vetoes overridden			

[1] These figures on measures reported include all placed on calendar or acted on by Senate even if there was no accompanying report. A total of 341 reports has been filed in the Senate; a total of 483 has been filed in the House.

Disposition of executive nominations, Jan. 9 through June 30, 1963

Postmaster nominations, totaling 1,175, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	744
Withdrawn	6
Rejected	None
Unconfirmed	425
Army nominations, totaling 8,953, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	8,953
Withdrawn	None
Rejected	None
Unconfirmed	None
Air Force nominations, totaling 15,837, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	15,837
Withdrawn	None
Rejected	None
Unconfirmed	None
Navy nominations, totaling 15,373, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	15,370
Withdrawn	1
Rejected	None
Unconfirmed	2

Disposition of executive nominations, Jan. 9 through June 30, 1963—Continued

Marine Corps nominations, totaling 3,465, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	3,465
Withdrawn	None
Rejected	None
Unconfirmed	None
Civilian nominations other than postmasters, totaling 2,229, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	2,102
Withdrawn	3
Rejected	None
Unconfirmed	124

Summary

Total nominations received	47,032
Total withdrawn	10
Total rejected	None
Total unconfirmed	551
Total confirmed	46,471

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as an example, the Senate has been in session for 452 hours on 85 separate days.

The 100 Senators have succeeded in covering 7,084 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I hesitate to believe the following figure is accurate, but I suppose the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is always accurate, and it says that during the period mentioned only 11 public bills and 2 private bills originating in the Senate were enacted into law.

The Senate passed 341 measures, 371 measures were reported from committee, 2,136 bills were introduced.

There were 31 live quorums, and 81 yea-and-nay votes.

But that is not all, Mr. President. The Senate received 47,032 nominations as to which, under the Constitution, the Senate must give advice and consent. And we have a very high batting average. They were confirmed 46,471 nominations.

One might think that this was quite a record, and it does not include quite a number of Senate investigations which have been going forward at the same time that we have performed these arduous duties. One thinks particularly of the TFX investigation, of the investigation of the Preparedness Subcommittee in which were expressed the views of different members in the executive branch as to the desirability of a test-ban treaty; and I could name a number of others.

Moreover, one could say with accuracy that, so far as the Senate is concerned, we are up to date. There are no major bills on the calendar awaiting action.

I ask unanimous consent that the general orders for today, Thursday, July 18, which set forth, under rule VIII, the matters on the calendar for action, may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the general orders were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

General orders under rule VIII

Order No.	Number and author of bill	Title	Reported by—
12	S. 812; Mr. MCCLELLAN	A bill to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations on certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of Arkansas by the United States of America.	Mar. 1, 1963.—Mr. MCCLELLAN, Committee on Government Operations, with an amendment. (Rept. No. 14.)
136	S. 102; Mr. EASTLAND	A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for additional commissioners of the U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes.	Apr. 23, 1963.—Mr. JOHNSTON, Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments. (Rept. No. 151.)
216	S. 684; Mr. MAGNUSON	A bill to clarify certain provisions of pt. IV of the Interstate Commerce Act and to place transactions involving unification on acquisitions of control of freight forwarders under the provisions of sec. 5 of the act.	June 6, 1963.—Mr. THURMOND, Committee on Commerce, with amendments. (Rept. No. 234.)
224	H.R. 2513	An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of import articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes.	June 13, 1963.—Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Committee on Finance, without amendment. (Rept. No. 243.)
244	S. 979; Messrs. JOHNSTON and HRUSKA	A bill to amend sec. 332 of title 28, United States Code, in order to provide for the inclusion of a district judge or judges on the judicial council of each circuit.	June 19, 1963.—Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment. (Rept. No. 263.) (Individual views filed.)
287	S. 1033; Mr. MAGNUSON and others	A bill to establish a uniform system of time standards and measurements for the United States and to require the observance of such time standards for all purposes.	June 25, 1963.—Mr. MAGNUSON, Committee on Commerce, with amendments. (Rept. No. 312.)
305	H.R. 4214	An act for the relief of the Stella Reorganized Schools R-I, Missouri ($1,500).	June 27, 1963.—Mr. EASTLAND, Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment. (Rept. No. 331.)
312	S. 627; Mr. BARTLETT and others	A bill to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects, and for other purposes.	June 27, 1963.—Mr. BARTLETT, Committee on Commerce, with an amendment. (Rept. No. 338.) (Minority views filed.)
319	S. 5; Mr. YARBOROUGH and others	A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.	July 2, 1963.—Mr. YARBOROUGH, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments. (Rept. No. 345.) (Minority views.)
320	S. 1057; Messrs. EASTLAND and HRUSKA	A bill to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States.	July 10, 1963.—Mr. HRUSKA, Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment. (Rept. No. 346.)
321	H.R. 4062	An act to amend the act authorizing the transmission and disposition of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to market power generated at Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande.	July 10, 1963.—Ordered placed on calendar. Calendar called July 11, 1963.
335	S. 646; Mr. FULBRIGHT	A bill to prohibit the location of chanceries or other business offices of foreign governments in certain residential areas in the District of Columbia.	July 16, 1963.—Mr. MCINTYRE, Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments. (Rept. No. 360.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there were this morning only 12 bills awaiting action. Today the Senate passed one of them. The leadership gave notice that two others will be brought up next week. None of the rest of these bills is ready for action because, for one reason or another—always a good reason—the leadership is not prepared to call them up by motion.

So, as a practical matter, the calendar is up to date, and there is really nothing to bring Senators to the floor. When the Senate adjourns today, it will go over until Monday. The Senate will have a pretty difficult time finding enough floor business to keep it going next week, unless a number of our Republican friends can be induced to continue the Rockefeller-Goldwater battle which entertained a few of us Democrats a few minutes ago. It is indeed a heartening sight to see Republicans quarreling with each other. That has been rather unusual during my period in the Senate, and I would like them to engage more in that new form of activity. It has been great entertainment from the point of view of those of us on this side of the aisle.

However, there is another side to the coin. I have had prepared by my staff a memorandum of the action status of Presidential recommendations in the Senate for the period from January 9 to July 16, 1963. I extend my thanks to the staff of the Democratic policy committee for having assisted me in the groundwork and the factual basis from which this memorandum has been prepared.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the memorandum may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTION STATUS OF PRESIDENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE SENATE, JANUARY 9 TO JULY 16, 1963

I. HOUSEKEEPING LEGISLATION

A. Appropriation bills:

1. Agricultural supplemental, enacted.
2. Supplemental, 1963, enacted.
3. Treasury-Post Office, enacted.
4. Interior, conference.
5. Defense, passed House-Senate hearings.
6. Labor-HEW, passed House-Senate hearings.
7. Legislative, conference.
8. Agriculture, passed House-Senate hearings.

9. Public works, hearings in both Houses.
10. Foreign aid, no action.
11. District, passed House. No action.
12. State-Justice-Commerce, passed House-Senate hearings.
13. Military construction, no action.
14. Independent offices, hearings in both Houses.
15. Military procurement, enacted.

Summary—Total, 15: no Senate action, 3; in Senate hearings, 6 (includes 4 passed House); passed Senate, waiting House approval, none; in conference, 2; enacted, 4.

B. Authorizations, extensions, revisions, etc., of existing programs:

1. AEC authorization, enacted.
2. Airport Act extension, Senate hearings.
3. Foreign aid authorization, Senate hearings.
4. Area redevelopment amendments, passed Senate, awaiting House approval.
5. Export-Import Bank extension, conference.
6. NASA authorization, Senate hearings.
7. Excise tax extension, enacted.
8. Disarmament Agency, passed Senate, awaiting House approval.
9. Hill-Burton Act, extension and expansion, no action.
10. Social security amendments, expansion and revision, no action.
11. Unemployment compensation, no action.
12. Inter-American Development Bank, no action.
13. Farmers Home Administration housing program, no action.
14. Health, community and environmental, creates bureau, no action.
15. Patent fees increase, no action.
16. Public debt increase for 1964, no action.
17. Peace Corps expansion, no action.
18. Public debt increase, enacted.
19. UMT extension, enacted.
20. SEC amendments, Senate hearings.
21. Minimum wage coverage expansion, no action.

Summary—total, 21: No Senate action, 10; in Senate hearings, 4; passed Senate, waiting House approval, 2; in conference, 1; enacted, 4.

Summary of all "housekeeping" legislation—total, 36: No Senate action, 13; in Senate hearings, 10 (includes 4 passed House); passed Senate waiting on House approval, 2; in conference, 3; enacted, 8.

II. MAJOR AND MINOR LEGISLATION

A. Major:

1. Federal aid to education, Senate hearings, H.R. 12 has passed House medical schools.
2. Medical care for the aged, no Senate action, S. 880.
3. Tax cut and tax reform, no Senate action.

Civil rights

4. Extension of Civil Rights Commission, Senate hearings, this included with civil rights group although housekeeping item.
5. Public school desegregation, Senate hearings.
6. Voting rights, Senate hearings.
7. Public accommodations, Senate hearings.
8. Manpower and employment, Senate hearings.

Agriculture

9. Feed grains, enacted.
10. International coffee agreement, enacted.
11. Dairy program, Senate hearings.
12. Cotton program, Senate hearings.
13. Land conservation fund, Senate hearings.

Miscellaneous

14. Wilderness, passed Senate, waiting House action.
15. Foreign Affairs Academy, Senate hearings.
16. National Service Corps, Senate hearings.
17. Transportation policy, Senate hearings.
18. Civil defense, foodstuff stockpile, no action.
19. Mental health, vocational rehabilitation, no action.
20. Urban Affairs Department, no action.
21. Fallout shelter program, no action.
22. Mass transit, passed Senate, waiting House action.
23. Youth Employment Act, passed Senate, waiting House action.
24. Mental health, passed Senate, waiting House action.
25. Housing for the elderly, no action.

Summary of major legislation—total, 25: No Senate action, 7; in Senate hearings, 12; passed Senate, waiting on House approval, 4; in conference, none; enacted, 2.

B. Minor:

1. Equal pay for women, enacted.
2. Outdoor recreation, enacted.
3. Silver policy repeal, enacted.
4. Veterans' family benefits, enacted.
5. Foreign Service buildings, in conference.
6. Water resources research program, passed Senate, waiting House action.
7. Air pollution control, Senate hearings.
8. International air fares, Senate hearings.
9. Military pay, passed the House in Senate hearings.
10. Public defenders, Senate hearings.
11. Shoreline areas, Senate hearings.
12. Water pollution control, Senate hearings.
13. Civil service retirement, no action.
14. Equal time suspension, Senate hearings.
15. Maternal and child health care, no action.
16. Presidential Transition Act, no action.
17. D.C. home rule, no action.
18. FPC gas industry, no action.
19. Food and drug amendments, no action.
20. Food stamp program, no action.
21. Group practice facilities mortgage insurance, no Senate action.
22. Land-use adjustments, no action.
23. National forest roads and trails, Senate hearings.
24. Railroad retirement amendments, no action.
25. River basin planning, no action.
26. Watershed Act, multiple use, Senate hearings.
27. Juvenile delinquency, no action.
28. Political campaign incentive, no action.
29. Three percent salary adjustment for GS 7–15, no action.
30. Narcotics control, no action.
31. REA loan account, no action.
32. Salary reform, no action.
33. Transportation users, no action.
34. User charges, no action.
35. Pacific Northwest power, passed Senate, waiting House approval.
36. Commercial supersonic aircraft, no action.
37. Consolidate management of Dulles National Airport, no action.
38. D.C. Transit System, no action.
39. Immigration amendment, no action.
40. Stockpile disposal, no action.
41. Migratory labor, passed Senate, awaiting House action.

Summary of minor legislation, total, 41: no Senate action, 24; in Senate hearings, 9 (includes 1 passed House); passed Senate waiting on House approval, 3; in conference, 1; enacted, 4.

Summary of major and minor legislation, total, 66: no Senate action, 31; in Senate hearings, 21 (includes 1 passed House); passed Senate waiting on House approval, 7; in conference, 1; enacted, 6.

Summary of all legislation, both "housekeeping" and "nonhousekeeping", total, 102: no Senate action, 44; in Senate hearings, 31 (includes 5 passed House);[1] passed Senate waiting on House approval, 9; in conference, 4; enacted, 14.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a summary of the memorandum discloses some rather startling facts. The President has recommended 102 separate measures to the Senate in various messages which he has sent to Congress since the 9th of January. Of those 102, no Senate action whatever has been taken on 44, 31 more are the subject of Senate hearings. The Senate has passed nine, but the House has not passed any of them. Four bills are in conference, 14 have been enacted into law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator's material show if any of the bills which have been passed are in reasonably identical conformity with what the President recommended?

Mr. CLARK. No; I cannot give that information today, but I can get that material together and make it available to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure it will be helpful, because I am sure that the Senator from Pennsylvania is aware of my suspicion that many of them were watered down, unfortunately, so that, as a result of the coalition that controls the Congress, the President did not get very much of what he asked for out of the measures which were passed.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Oregon is correct.

I make the further comment that, of the 14 bills enacted, it would be difficult to find 1 that could be categorized as a major legislative achievement.

From this summary it is a fair conclusion that well over 70 percent of the President's program has not reached the calendar, and that among measures which have not reached the calendar are some of the most important measures which the President has recommended.

For convenience, I have divided legislation into two categories, one of which I call housekeeping legislation, that is, matters which must be disposed of before we go home, in order to keep the Government in operation, and, secondly, major and minor legislation which the President has recommended, but which it is not absolutely essential to pass at this session.

Most important among the housekeeping legislative matters are the appropriation bills. There are 15 of them. Unless my recollection is incorrect, there is a provision of law that all appropriation bills for the fiscal year in which we are now engaged should have been passed before the end of the previous fiscal year.

Only 4 of the 15 appropriation bills have in fact been enacted, and with respect to 3 others, no action has been taken by the Senate. Those three are District of Columbia appropriation bill, the foreign aid appropriation bill, and the military construction bill.

---

[1] Passed House and in Senate hearings, Agriculture appropriation, Labor HEW appropriation, Defense appropriation, District appropriation, military pay.

Moving to other housekeeping legislation, we find that no action has been taken on the extension and expansion of the Hill-Burton Act. The Senator from Oregon and I can guess why.

No action has been taken with respect to amendments to the Social Security Act, including health insurance for the elderly under social security. The Senator from Oregon and I can guess why.

No action has been taken on the Farmers Home Administration Housing Act, or on the unemployment compensation recommendations of the President, the Inter-American Development Bank, the increase in patent fees, the public debt increase for 1964, the expansion of the Peace Corps, or on the President's recommendations for expanding minimum-wage coverage.

I believe it is not telling secrets out of school to say that in many cases the chairmen of the relevant committees do not intend to take any action on the President's program, because the President's recommendations are not in accord with the views of the Senate establishment. With respect to this housekeeping legislation, it appears that there are a total of 36 bills. The Senate has taken no action on 13. Hearings are pending on 10, including 4 passed by the House. Two have been passed by the Senate and are awaiting House action. Three are in conference. Only eight have been enacted.

Turning to the category of major and minor legislation, we find, upon separating them from the other social security amendments, that there has been no action on S. 880, medical care for the aged. There has been no action on tax cut and tax reform, although I have always contended that if the Committee on Finance had held hearings on the measure during the past 4 months, final legislation would have been expedited by at least 60 days, and the necessity for comprehensive hearings when the bills come from the House would have been eliminated.

There has been no action on civil defense and the foodstuff stockpile; no action on mental health and vocational rehabilitation; no action on the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs; no action on a fallout shelter program; no action on housing for the elderly; no action on civil service retirement; no action on maternal and child health care; no action on the Presidental transition act; no action on District of Columbia home rule, for which the senior Senator from Oregon has fought for so many years, and on which I have had the privilege to join him during my time in the Senate; no action on the FPC gas industry bill; no action on the Food and Drug Act Amendment; no action on the food stamp plan; no Senate action on group practice facilities mortgage insurance; no action on land use adjustments; no action on railroad retirement amendments; no action on river basin planning; no action on extending the juvenile delinquency program.

There has been no action on the long overdue reform of political campaign activities, no action on the 3-percent salary adjustment for civil servants; no action on narcotics control; no action on the REA loan account; no action on civil service salary reform; no action on the Transportation Users Act; no action on the users charges bill; no action on the commercial supersonic aircraft bill; no action on the bill to provide consolidated management for Dulles International Airport; no action on reforming the District of Columbia transit system; no action on the vitally important amendments to the immigration code; no action on stockpile disposal.

I believe it is fair to say that well over 70 percent of the President's recommendations have not reached the calendar.

In addition to the 102 recommendations of the President, there are, of course, a good many measures recommended and bills introduced by individual Senators without administration support, which I feel would be worthy of careful committee and floor consideration. After all, we have not yet reached the point where we are a mere rubber stamp—although we are on the way there—and can act only on Presidential recommendations. Under the Constitution, the legislative power is vested in Congress, not in the President. I hope the day will never come when Congress, by inertia, will yield its power to initiate legislation, whether or not it is recommended by the President.

Therefore I say that at least 75 percent—and this is a modest figure—of the legislation the Senate should consider at this session has not reached the floor, and perhaps as much as 50 percent of such legislation has not yet even reached the stage of having hearings before committee.

Yet here we are on the 18th of July, when we should be on our way home, and when in earlier Congresses we were on our way home, hardly one-quarter of the way through our legislative business, and with the pessimistic prognosis that we will be here at least until Thanksgiving, and perhaps until Christmas.

Moreover, a candid look at the future can engender nothing but gloom. We shall be faced next week with a request for legislation to help terminate a national strike on the railroads. We are not ready for such legislation. It has not been given as much as a half hour's consideration in any committee. I hope that within the next few weeks a limited test ban treaty will be brought back from Moscow by our able Under Secretary of State, Averell Harriman. If that happens, we shall be in for the fight of our lives in trying to support the President by ratifying that treaty.

We are told that the highest priority is for the President's tax bill, and yet the Senate is at least a month, and probably 2 months or 3 months, away from having the bill ready for floor consideration.

Then we come to the civil rights bills. When do we come to them? Who knows? When we do come to them, how long will they take? Nobody knows, but everybody feels it will be a long, long time.

This leads me to a column written by Walter Lippmann appropriately enough, on July 4, the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, in which we announced our intention to be a self-governing people, operating a government in accord with the desires of the governed. Mr. Lippmann took the Congress pretty strongly to task. I am afraid what he said was right. In a very able speech made by the senior Senator from Minnesota on July 9, Mr. Lippmann's column was inserted in the Record and referred to with approval. At the risk of reiteration, I rise to emphasize some of the things that Mr. Lippmann said. I quote:

> Without any filibuster on the floor of the Senate there has been so much delay and obstruction in the committees that after 6 months no important measure has been acted upon, and many of the critical measures, such as tax reduction, are bogged down—it would seem deliberately—in the committees.
>
> What kind of legislative body is it that will not or cannot legislate?

This would be a serious question at any time. But it is a critical question at this time.

Mr. Lippmann continues:

> If then it turns out that the Government is paralyzed and impotent to deal with their grievances—

Referring to the Negroes—

> the prospect is indeed dark and ominous.

He continues:

> But how is wisdom to be made to prevail as against reckless folly? There is only one way. By an unmistakable showing that the Negroes live under a strong Government, one which is not only strong enough to suppress mobs but is also strong enough to redress grievances and raise the standard of public righteousness.
>
> If after the President has proposed legal remedies for an undeniable evil, the Congress of the United States then smothers and obstructs the enactment of laws, on what ground can a rational appeal be made to the Negro people and their leaders?

The answer is that we cannot make that kind of rational appeal; we cannot act, even when a majority of the Senate is ready for action, which every Member of the Senate knows is the case. I continue to read from Mr. Lippmann's article:

> If, therefore, we have a filibuster against civil rights on top of the log jam about everything else, we shall have to say—distressing as it is—that in one of the coordinate branches the capacity to govern has broken down. If this continues, if we linger on in a deadlock in which the President proposes and Congress will not even dispose, there are very difficult days ahead for the Republic. A government must be able to govern. When it cannot govern, a government is sick.
>
> If things go as badly this summer as they threaten to go, and the session drags on into the autumn with little accomplished amidst many angry words, something will have to be done about it. Next to defense and the enlightened conduct of the cold war, the question of highest priority will be how to overcome the paralysis of Congress.

I am egotistical enough to think that I know how to overcome the paralysis of Congress. I have had the effrontery on the floor of the Senate, many times in the past, to suggest how it should be done. These are some of the things we could do right now:

First, we could move to let all committees of the Senate meet while the Senate is in session. This would enable committee work to go forward when the floor business of the Senate bogs down in controversy, as it will not much later than the week after next, or even by the end of next week, when the Senate begins consideration of the rail strike problem, and perhaps thereafter when it considers a number of the other measures which I have mentioned. Pending in the subcommittee on rules of the Committee on Rules and Administration are various versions of a rule to make that possible. I myself have submitted what I think is a good proposal. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] has submitted another. Hearings have been held on those proposals. Why not report them, bring them up on the floor of the Senate for action, and adopt them? Then it could not be said that the entire legislative machinery of Congress would grind to a halt as soon as proposed civil rights legislation reached the floor. I urge the subcommittee on Rules to meet and report such a rules change. I urge the leadership to call it up.

Second, we could save some time by adopting a rule of germaneness relating to business which is pending and which the leadership desires to press to a vote. One has only to read the Congressional Record of this afternoon to see how a bill—a minor one to be sure—was nevertheless, as a matter of annoyance to a good many Senators, held up for several hours while other Senators spoke on nongermane subjects. They had every right to do so; they will continue to do so as long as there is no rule of germaneness.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] has one such proposed change in the rules, and I have another, pending before the subcommittee on rules of the Committee on Rules and Administration. Hearings have been held. Why not report those proposed rules? Why not bring them to the floor for actions? Why not incorporate them into the procedural law of the Senate?

Third, there is still on the calendar Senate Resolution 9, sponsored by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson]. We all recall the bitter fight over that resolution in January. It was not disposed of; it was temporarily shunted aside and left on the calendar. Can anyone believe that the 56 Senators who indicated publicly, by their votes, that they were prepared to support that resolution have waived their right to have rule XXII changed during the pendency of the present session of Congress? I do not believe any constitutional lawyer would so rule. I would hope that before the Senate gets into the civil rights performance and a filibuster, Senate Resolution 9 would be called up again and pressed to a final vote by the Senate itself on the question whether or not the Senate is entitled, by majority vote, to terminate debate under its constitutional right to change its rules by majority vote.

Fourth, I would hope that the Committee on Rules and Administration would promptly act on the many other suggestions pending before it for a reform of the Senate rules. Let us get the Senate back into the business of legislating. Let us remember that far more important than our traditions, our customs, our manners, indeed, our ancient rules, is the national interest which we were elected to guard.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his discussion by way of an inventory of the record of inaction at this session of Congress, for the Record shows that our activity is characterized chiefly by inaction. I believe it is well to take stock of the legislative goods that are still on the shelf and decide that we had better get moving in the disposal of those goods. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania and associate myself with the observations that he has made.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks and express my gratitude for his unfailing courtesy in permitting me, his junior, to make my speech before he rises to make a very important speech which I hope all Senators will read in the Record tomorrow.

I express my condolences to the present occupant of the chair [Mr. Bayh] and to say that I know how he feels, because a few years ago I was there myself.

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, some time ago, in a speech on the floor of the Senate, I discussed some of the problems of the Alliance for Progress program. In commenting on the joint proposals of Lleras Camargo, the former President of Colombia, and Juscelino Kubitschek, the former President of Brazil, Ambassador Moscoso, who is in charge of the Alliance for Progress program for the United States, in conversation with me some time later, discussed my speech on this subject matter, and, at my request, has sent to me an article—from the New York Journal American of July 5, 1963—entitled "It's All in the Family Now," by Charles Bartlett. I think the article should be read in connection with my previous comments on the Alliance for Progress program. I wish to thank Ambassador Moscoso for sending the article to me; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Journal American, July 5, 1963]

Washington Notes: It's All in the Family Now

(By Charles Bartlett)

Washington.—The call for a Latinization of the Alliance for Progress has fallen upon receptive ears in Washington, where officials are weary of bearing the brunt of criticism for an effort that will require the enthusiasm and constructive support of the entire hemisphere to succeed.

To the mass mind, here and in Latin America, the Alliance for Progress is a program proposed by the Kennedy administration and conducted by American officials with American money to save South America from the Communists.

To the men who drafted the Alliance and are struggling now to make it work, it is a summoning of energies and potentials from every possible source to meet the dilemma of 19 nations that have fallen prey to waxing populations, declining prices for the commodities they sell, and rising prices for the products they buy. In the thinking of these men, the United States bears the onus of a rich uncle who has agreed to help some impoverished nephews get started on a course of financial rehabilitation toward which they hold the major and continuing responsibility.

The nephews have been eloquent and verbose in assessing and criticizing the terms their uncle has proposed for them.

But after almost 2 years of wrangling, the nephews seem suddenly to have advanced to a recognition that this is a family project in which their stake is considerably greater than their uncle's. The turn has been marked over recent months by an increasing readiness to refer to "our Alliance" and by the assertion of two prominent South Americans 2 weeks ago that it is time to create a committee of all the nations that would make the Alliance a truly hemispheric instrument.

The two men, Lleras Camargo of Colombia, and Juscelino Kubitschek of Brazil, broached this advocacy through different routes. Mr. Camargo emphasized the mutuality of responsibility and reminded the nephews that their efforts to date have not been impressive and that they have not raised a single voice to encourage the initiative in their behalf. "Very few come forward to explain that the United States has no obligation to undertake a policy of this nature," he said.

Mr. Kubitschek, an aspiring candidate for the Presidency of Brazil in 1965, took the line of opportunistic logic in asserting that uncle had put too many controls and too little money into the rehabilitation project. He wanted more money and less uncle, a freehanded allowance, whose donor would stay as anonymous as possible.

Undoubtedly these are both legitimate reflections of opinion in Latin America, and the Alliance is going to have to cope with the Kubitscheks while it progresses with the Camargos.

The exciting aspect of the Alliance is that it does appear to have caught anchor among the shifting aspirations of transient politicians and that it does now seem, to the most skeptical of those involved in it, to hold positive promise. In the glow of this promise, the apparent readiness of the nephews to assume a greater share of responsibility is most encouraging to the uncle.

THE WEST COAST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Clarence J. Hall, editor and publisher of Cranberries, the national cranberry magazine, in his June 1963 issue wrote an editorial with which, as an Oregon Senator, I find myself in complete agreement except for the fact that far too little of it is devoted to Oregon.

However, I am sure that other west coast Senators will also be pleased to learn of his reaction to our part of the world.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled, "Our Pacific Coast Neighbors," be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR PACIFIC COAST NEIGHBORS

We have just returned from our third "cranberry trip" to the cranberry areas of the west coast. As previously we found our distant colleagues warmhearted, friendly, progressive. This was our first visit, however, to Vancouver, British Columbia, where the "Three Yanks From Carver," Norm Holmes, Fritz Shaw, and Jimmy Thomas have made good in cranberry growing at Lulu Island.

We found many things different in cranberry growing, yet many the same—growers were worrying about frosts, weeds, insects, and how to get top crops.

We learned much and hope to impart some of this information to growers in the other areas, as we believe this becoming better acquainted is one of the better ways of better understanding and cohesion within our industry, which after all is flung from "Shining Sea to Shining Sea," as Dr. Chandler entitled an account of his after a sojourn there.

We of the East have seashore, but they of the West have both seashore and mighty mountains. The Long Beach Peninsula in Washington is a miniature Cape Cod, the longest beach in the world, but the cape has no such towering heights in the background. Washington has been aptly described as having more variety than any other place on earth. Where else than in the Olympic Peninsula, the last U.S. mountain wilderness, between the bogs of Grayland and that at Challam Bay on the Strait of Juan DeFuca can you find glaciers and a lost tropical rain forest side by side? There are the towering forests of Douglas fir, in southern Oregon, the magnificent redwood empire, a few miles south of cranberry bogs at Bandon, Cape Blanco, so named by the Spaniards hundreds of years ago with its most westernmost bog and this being the most western point of the United States except for Capa Alava in Washington, the fantastic rock formations, with sea lions playing and down along Route 101, one of the most spectacular drives in the world, to the thrill of a ride on the cable cars and the Golden Gate of San Francisco.

A visit to the Pacific Northwest is one of the most inspiring of trips to be made.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND ADULT BASIC EDUCATION AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the President of the United States has sent to the Congress a program to strengthen and expand the vocational education programs carried on by the Federal Government in close cooperation with the 50 States and the governments of Puerto Rico and our outlying possessions.

This amendment to S. 580, the National Education Improvement Act of 1963, I propose to introduce in a few minutes. I can assure the Senate that most careful consideration will be given by the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to these proposals, in our markup stage on S. 580.

Because of the widespread interest in vocational education evidenced by testimony taken before the Education Subcommittee during the course of its hearings on S. 580, I believe it might be helpful for Senators to have readily available highlights of the presentation made by the Commissioner of Education. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, Mr. President, that excerpts from the testimony of the Honorable Francis Keppel on June 25, 1963, relating to vocational education and the new proposals of the administration in this area be printed at this point in the RECORD in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE TESTIMONY OF COMMISSIONER KEPPEL, JUNE 25, 1963, ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

In the light of the President's June 19 message on civil rights and job opportunities, I would like to give special attention to the impact of the proposed educational program upon our No. 1 domestic problem—equal rights and equal opportunities for all our citizens. For, as the President pointed out, the enjoyment of civil rights is largely a function of employment opportunities while the availability of employment opportunities is largely a function of educational attainment: "There is little value in a Negro's obtaining the right to be admitted to hotels and restaurants if he has no cash in his pocket and no job." But the exceedingly high rates of Negro unemployment—more than twice that of white workers—cannot be substantially reduced until Negro educational opportunities are massively expanded and Negro manpower skills are drastically upgraded to meet modern technological requirements.

In this context, we are hopeful that the Congress will give special attention to the administration's January 29 proposals and last week's amendments, which propose to (1) modernize and expand the Nation's vocational education programs and (2) launch a Federal-State cooperative venture to eliminate the scourge of adult illiteracy. We ask this not merely in the name of equal rights and equal opportunities for our Negro citizens, but in the name of every taxpayer and citizen who desires to see his country both strong and prosperous. As the President pointed out:

"Although the proportion of Negroes without adequate education and training is far higher than the proportion of whites, none of these problems is restricted to Negroes alone. This Nation is in critical need of a massive upgrading in its education and training effort for all citizens. In an age of rapidly changing technology, that effort is failing millions of our youth."

Nor, in the President's view, is there any question that we can afford the legislation proposed in S. 580 to strengthen American education "at every level from grade school through graduate school": "the loss of 1 year's income due to unemployment is more than the total cost of 12 years of education through high school; and, when welfare and other social costs are added, it is clear that failure to take these steps will cost us far more than their enactment. There is no more profitable investment than education, and no greater waste than ill-trained youth."

Title V–A of S. 580 would redirect, expand, and modernize programs of Federal financial assitance in vocational education so as to assure that vocational training offered by our schools will be both of high quality and realistic in terms of the Nation's projected manpower needs and job opportunities.

As I recently stated in testimony before the House General Subcommittee on Education (the full text of that statement[1] on vocational education has been made available to the committee and for the record):

"under present trends some 30 to 40 percent of the youngsters now in the fifth grade will probably not be graduated from high school unless we undertake vigorous reforms. They will go to work—or vainly look for work—without a high school diploma. They should have the opportunity during their too-brief period of schooling, to acquire at least the rudiments of some skill or trade. This applies also to most of the other 60 percent who, we now estimate, will complete high school only. About half of these boys and girls will go to work or keep house, or both, after graduation. The others will enter college or some post-high school educational institution, but less than half will acquire a college degree. To put it another way, less than 20 percent of today's fifth graders will become college graduates—the physicians, scientists, lawyers, and teachers of tomorrow. A large number of those who do not complete college will join our nonprofessional working population—in business, in the trades, in industry, in the service occupations and on the farms. Their schooling should prepare them to start their working life."

The training to be supported under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (title V–A of S. 580) would be focused upon needs of high school students, persons who have completed or discontinued their formal education and are preparing to enter the labor market, adults now employed but in need of upgrading in their skills or of learning new skills, and young men and women with special educational handicaps. Our proposal also calls for the construction and equipping of urgently required area vocational education school facilities and for increased emphasis on services to improve the quality of vocational education programs, including inservice teacher training, teacher supervision, program evaluation, demonstration, development of instructional materials, and administration.

The new draft proposals submitted to the Congress last week would supplement the vocational education programs proposed earlier in S. 580 in five ways in order to accelerate the rate at which our fellow citizens—and particularly our minority groups in urban and other areas suffering from a high incidence of school dropouts and youth unemployment—may gain marketable job skills and, consequently, full membership in the community of trained manpower needed by our dynamic economy:

(1) Appropriations authorized for fiscal year 1964 are raised from $23 million to $108 million.

(2) Funds earmarked for postsecondary education and construction of area vocational schools are raised from 25 to 40 percent.

(3) The Commissioner of Education is authorized to make grants to States for the establishment of experimental residential vocational schools. For this purpose the sum of $15 million is authorized for fiscal year 1964.

(4) Funds for grants by the Commissioner of Education for special projects to meet the needs of communities with substantial youth unemployment and school dropouts (as well as to meet the needs of youth with academic, socioeconomic or other handicaps to learning) would be increased from 5 to 15 percent of the vocational education appropriations.

(5) A work-study program for high school age students enrolled in full-time vocational education programs is proposed in order to encourage and assist youths who might otherwise drop out of school to continue their education and equip themselves for gainful employment.

These amendments, Mr. Chairman, represent substantial increases in the national investment in vocational education, but they are small in terms of the goals to be achieved and the cost to us all if we do not achieve them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, accompanying the new vocational education proposals of the President's civil rights message are new and expanded financial proposals for adult basic education.

---

[1] See p. 23.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Commissioner Keppel's testimony relating to these modifications of Title VI of S. 580 be printed at this point in the RECORD, in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE TESTIMONY OF COMMISSIONER KEPPEL, JUNE 25, 1963, RELATING TO ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

Exactly the same is true about what can only be termed the national disgrace of adult illiteracy and adult educational deprivation. In the world's wealthiest country it is shameful to have to acknowledge that we have about 23 million Americans aged 18 and older who have completed less than 8 years of schooling, including 8 million adults aged 25 and older with less than a fifth-grade education. These cold and impersonal statistics are only now coming to be appreciated as representing some of the most critical problems faced by our society: Persistent unemployment, dependency on welfare payments, rejection from military service, delinquency and crime, as well as the probability of blighted and arid lives, impoverished by the loss of opportunities to learn and to grow socially and intellectually.

I would greatly appreciate having my recent statement on this problem made a part of my testimony at this point. I believe that the committee will also wish to study the accompanying Department of Health, Education, and Welfare study, "Limited Educational Attainment" which, better than my words at this point, indicates the extent and consequences of this most depressing fact about American educational achievement.

President Kennedy's message on civil rights and job opportunities further relates this problem to my earlier remarks, and I quote him:

"A distressing number of unemployed Negroes are illiterate and unskilled, refugees from farm automation, unable to do simple computations or even to read a help-wanted advertisement. Too many are equipped to work only in those occupations where technology and other changes have reduced the need for manpower—as farm labor or manual labor, in mining or construction. Too many have attended segregated schools that were so lacking in adequate funds and faculty as to be unable to produce qualified job applicants. And too many who have attended nonsegregated schools dropped out for lack of incentive, guidance or progress. The unemployment rate for those adults with less than 5 years of schooling is around 10 percent; it has consistently been double the prevailing rate for high school graduates; and studies of public welfare recipients show a shockingly high proportion of parents with less than a primary school education."

I hope, therefore, that the committee will agree with the President's recommendation that a solution of this problem well deserves the modest level of financial support proposed last week, namely, $20 million, instead of the $5 million originally earmarked in the 1964 budget for the pilot, demonstration and instructional programs authorized in title VI–B of S. 580.

The complete State-by-State breakdown follows:

Number of persons 25 years old and over with less than 5 years of school completed, by color, 1960

[Numbers in thousands]

State	Resident population 25 years old and over [1]								
	Total			White			Nonwhite		
	Total number	Persons with less than 5 years of school completed		Total number	Persons with less than 5 years of school completed		Total number	Persons with less than 5 years of school completed	
		Number	Percent		Number	Percent		Number	Percent
50 States and District of Columbia	99,439	8,302.6	8.3	89,582	5,988.7	6.7	9,857	2,313.9	23.5
Alabama	1,670	273.0	16.3	1,232	115.4	9.4	438	157.6	36.0
Alaska	105	8.6	8.2	86	1.1	1.3	19	7.5	39.5
Arizona	661	66.3	10.0	609	46.7	7.7	52	19.6	37.7
Arkansas	964	148.2	15.4	786	83.6	10.6	178	64.6	36.3
California	8,869	505.0	5.7	8,221	427.3	5.2	648	77.8	12.0
Colorado	941	44.1	4.7	914	41.9	4.6	27	2.2	8.1
Connecticut	1,482	93.4	6.3	1,427	87.1	6.1	55	6.4	11.6
Delaware	246	16.3	6.6	215	9.8	4.6	31	6.5	21.0
Florida	2,845	261.4	9.2	2,427	128.8	5.3	418	132.6	31.7
Georgia	2,015	355.3	17.6	1,511	155.2	10.3	504	200.1	39.7
Hawaii	309	46.4	15.0	96	5.0	5.2	213	41.4	19.4
Idaho	340	11.2	3.3	336	10.5	3.1	4	.7	17.5
Illinois	5,808	365.4	6.3	5,267	290.7	5.5	541	74.6	13.8
Indiana	2,550	123.8	4.9	2,413	105.6	4.4	137	18.2	13.3
Iowa	1,541	46.2	3.0	1,527	44.5	2.9	14	1.7	12.1
Kansas	1,216	44.7	3.7	1,166	38.8	3.3	50	5.8	11.6
Kentucky	1,610	222.5	13.8	1,494	195.0	13.1	116	27.6	23.8
Louisiana	1,639	348.8	21.3	1,175	159.0	13.5	464	189.8	40.9
Maine	534	25.0	4.7	532	24.8	4.7	2	.2	10.0
Maryland	1,693	129.8	7.7	1,436	79.2	5.5	257	50.6	19.7
Massachusetts	3,011	180.1	6.0	2,946	173.8	5.9	65	6.3	9.7
Michigan	4,217	244.3	5.8	3,845	195.6	5.1	372	48.7	13.1
Minnesota	1,845	74.3	4.0	1,825	72.6	4.0	20	1.7	8.5
Mississippi	1,065	200.7	18.8	682	48.7	7.1	383	151.9	39.7
Missouri	2,493	175.8	7.1	2,289	140.8	6.2	204	35.1	17.2
Montana	356	14.6	4.1	347	13.3	3.8	9	1.4	15.6
Nebraska	791	28.6	3.6	773	26.8	3.5	18	1.8	10.0
Nevada	160	6.2	3.9	150	4.4	2.9	10	1.8	18.0
New Hampshire	345	15.1	4.4	344	15.0	4.4	1	.1	10.0
New Jersey	3,600	250.8	7.0	3,327	210.7	6.3	273	40.1	14.7
New Mexico	445	54.0	12.2	417	42.9	10.3	28	11.1	39.6
New York	10,124	785.0	7.8	9,300	687.4	7.4	824	97.6	11.8
North Carolina	2,307	380.1	16.5	1,811	221.5	12.2	496	158.5	32.0
North Dakota	324	19.4	6.0	319	18.7	5.9	5	.7	14.0
Ohio	5,378	292.4	5.4	4,969	233.1	4.7	409	59.2	14.5
Oklahoma	1,300	111.6	8.6	1,196	90.8	7.6	104	20.8	20.0
Oregon	996	33.0	3.3	978	30.7	3.1	18	2.3	12.8
Pennsylvania	6,606	453.2	6.9	6,148	386.8	6.3	458	66.4	14.5
Rhode Island	498	37.0	7.4	489	36.0	7.4	9	1.0	11.1
South Carolina	1,136	230.8	20.3	802	93.1	11.6	334	137.7	41.2
South Dakota	360	14.7	4.1	349	13.6	3.9	11	1.1	10.0
Tennessee	1,912	282.1	14.8	1,626	202.6	12.5	286	79.5	27.8
Texas	5,031	762.2	13.4	4,443	533.5	12.0	588	138.8	23.6
Utah	419	11.7	2.8	412	10.3	2.5	7	1.5	21.4
Vermont	213	8.1	3.8	212	8.0	3.8	(2)	(2)	(2)
Virginia	2,083	273.5	13.1	1,687	156.9	9.3	396	116.6	29.4
Washington	1,577	53.8	3.4	1,528	48.1	3,1	49	5.8	11.8
West Virginia	1,000	109.8	11.0	954	99.0	10.4	46	10.8	23.5
Wisconsin	2,175	115.0	5.3	2,135	110.1	5.2	40	4.9	12.2
Wyoming	174	6.3	3.6	171	6.0	3.5	3	.3	10.0
District of Columbia	461	33.2	7.2	239	8.3	3.5	222	24.8	11.2
American Samoa	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Canal Zone	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Guam	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Puerto Rico	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Virginia Islands	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

[1] Resident population includes institutional population but excludes Armed Forces abroad.

[2] Less than 500.

NOTE.—Items may not add because of rounding.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, U.S. Census of Population: 1960, General, Social and Economic Characteristics, P.C Series.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be printed exhibit 27 from a committee print entitled "National Education Improvement Act of 1963—A Review and an Analysis of the Proposed Legislation," subheaded "Summary of Amendments to Vocational Education Provisions of S. 580 (Title V–A)." This summary also will be helpful to Senators interested in comparing and contrasting the original provisions of the vocational education recommendations contained in the President's June 19 message.

There being no objection, the exhibit was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

EXHIBIT 27: SUMMARY OF AMENDMENT TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROVISIONS OF S. 580 (TITLE V–A)

General comparison with S. 580

The amendment is in the nature of a substitute for "Part A—Vocational Education" of title V of S. 580. It differs from S. 580 in the following major respects:

(a) It continues the George-Barden Act and makes permanent the practical nurse training and area vocational education programs, but makes important amendments to these three laws as well as to the Smith-Hughes Act. S. 580 would replace the first three laws and leave Smith-Hughes virtually intact.

(b) It requires that the new program (like the existing programs) be administered at the State level by State boards of education or of vocational education. S. 580 would permit State administration by a State educational agency headed by a single officer.

(c) It makes the new program permanent (S. 580 limits it to 5 years) and substantially increases the appropriation authorizations.

(d) It puts increased emphasis on broadening vocational education opportunities for youths 15 to 20 years old who have completed or left their formal high school education and need full-time vocational training to equip them for gainful employment, and on the vocational training needs of communities having substantial numbers of such youths who have dropped out of school or are unemployed.

(e) It provides Federal aid for the construction and operation of several experimental, residential, vocational education schools to be located in or near large urban areas having substantial numbers of school dropouts or unemployed youths.

(f) It authorizes Federal grants to States to establish work-study programs for youths aged 15 to 20 who need work assistance to enable them to commence or continue vocational training on a full-time basis.

(g) It provides for an ad hoc Advisory Council to make a comprehensive review of all vocational education laws every 5 years, and also provides for a standing advisory committee.

Appropriation authorizations

The amendment authorizes appropriations of $108 million for fiscal 1964, $153 million for fiscal 1965, $198 million for fiscal 1966, and $243 million for fiscal 1967 and each subsequent year for grants to States for vocational education and construction of area vocational education schools. These amounts are additional to the amounts authorized under existing laws. S. 580 authorizes $73 million for fiscal year 1964 for this purpose, but this sum includes the $50 million already authorized under the George-Barden Act.

Allotments to States

Eighty-five percent of each annual appropriation under the above authorizations would be allotted to the States—50 percent on the basis of their relative populations aged 15 to 19 and their per capita incomes, 20 percent on the basis of their populations aged 20 to 24 and their per capita incomes, and 15 percent on the basis of their populations aged 25 to 65 and their per capita incomes. This is 10 percent less than the 95 percent authorized to be so allotted under S. 580, this 10 percent having been transferred to the Federal project grants discussed immediately below.

Federal project grants

Fifteen percent of each annual appropriation would be reserved for project grants to State boards or local vocational agencies, colleges, universities, and other public or nonprofit private agencies or institutions for experimental or pilot programs designed to meet the special vocational training needs of persons who have educational handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in local vocational education programs, and of communities having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or are unemployed. S. 580 authorizes only 5 percent for such grants and limits them to programs for youths with educational handicaps.

Experimental residential schools

The amendment authorizes $15 million for fiscal 1964 and such sums as Congress determines for the next 4 fiscal years for Federal grants to establish and operate residential schools to provide vocational education to youths of high school age who need full-time study on a residential basis in order to benefit fully from vocational training. In making these grants, the Commissioner will give special consideration to the needs of large urban areas having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of high school or are unemployed, and will seek to attain an equitable geographical distribution of such schools.

Use of State allotments

A State's allotment could be used under an approved State plan for the provision of vocational education (1) to youths attending high school, (2) to youths who have completed or left high school and are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market, (3) to persons (other than those receiving training allowances under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the Area Redevelopment Act, or the Trade Expansion Act of 1962) who have already entered the labor market and who need vocational training or retraining to learn new jobs or advance in present jobs, and (4) to persons who need special attention because of inability to succeed in regular vocational education programs. Federal funds could also be used for the construction of area vocational education school facilities, and for various ancillary services and activities, such as teacher training and supervision, program evaluation, experimental programs, and State administration and leadership (same as S. 580).

For the first 5 years of the program 40 percent, and thereafter 25 percent, of each State's annual allotment must be used for vocational education of high school graduates or dropouts ((2), above) or for construction of area vocational education schools, and 3 percent must be used for ancillary services and activities, unless permitted by the Commissioner to use a smaller percentage for these purposes (same as S. 580, except that S. 580 reserves 25 percent, rather than 40 percent, for each year).

State plans

To qualify for their allotments each State must submit and have approved by the Commissioner a State plan which—

1. Designates the State board (of education, or of vocational education) to administer the program; and if such board does not include persons representative of management and labor and persons representative of college-level vocational training institutions, provides for an advisory committee which includes such persons;
2. Sets forth the State policies for allocating Federal funds within the State among the various uses described above, which policies must give due consideration to the results of periodic evaluations of the State and local programs in the light of current and projected manpower needs and job opportunities, and to the vocational education needs of all groups in all communities in the State; the State policies must also insure against substitution of Federal funds for State and local funds;
3. Provides minimum qualifications for teachers and other personnel;
4. Provides for cooperative arrangements with the State public employment offices under which such offices will supply occupational information to be considered by vocational education agencies in counseling students and in determining the occupations for which persons are to be trained; and under which the vocational education agencies would furnish information regarding the occupational qualifications of persons completing vocational education training and the public employment offices would consider such information in counseling and placing such persons;
5. Sets forth procedures for fiscal and accounting controls;
6. Requires compliance with prevailing wage and hours of work labor standards on construction projects; and
7. Provides for making reports and keeping records needed by the Commissioner.

(Same as S. 580 except for changes in 1, 2, and 4, above.)

State plan approval, administrative hearings, and judicial review

The amended bill contains the usual provisions for opportunity for hearing to State boards in case of disapproval of State plans or finding of nonconformity with approved plans and for judicial review of the Commissioner's decisions in these matters (same as S. 580).

Matching

For fiscal 1964, States need not match Federal funds but must maintain State and local expenditures at least equal to the amounts spent under the various federally aided programs during fiscal 1963; for fiscal 1965 and thereafter, States must match Federal funds on 50–50 basis in each of the "use" categories described above. However, Federal funds used for construction must be matched 50–50 in the first as well as subsequent years (same as S. 580).

Labor standards

Prevailing wages, and overtime, compensation in accordance with the Contract Work Hours Standard Act, must be paid on all construction projects aided under the amended bill (same as S. 580).

Definition of vocational education

Means any vocational or technical training or retraining under public supervision and control (under or contract with the State board or local agency) designed to fit individuals for gainful employment as skilled workers or technicians in recognized occupations, including programs so designed for business and office occupations, and programs so designed which can be aided under existing vocational education acts, but excluding training for employment in occupations generally considered professional or as requiring a baccalaureate or higher degree (same as S. 580 except for the limitation to training for gainful employment, and language making it clear that the term includes instruction related to the occupation for which a person is being trained and instruction necessary for him to benefit from his vocational training).

Advisory committee

The amendment would establish a standing Advisory Committee consisting of the Commissioner of Education and representatives from the Department of Commerce, Agriculture, and Labor, and 12 persons appointed for staggered terms by the Commissioner with the Secretary's approval. The 12 members must include representatives of management and labor, persons familiar with the administration of State and local programs, other experts in vocational education, and representatives of the general public. Not more than 6 of the 12 can be professional educators.

Amendments to Vocational Education Act of 1946 (George-Barden) and Smith-Hughes Act

The amendment would continue these acts but with the following modifications to freely permit interchange of funds between all the existing categories, and to broaden the occupations and groups for whom training can be provided under the principal George-Barden and Smith-Hughes categories. Thus—

1. Any State would be permitted to combine any portion of any of its allotments under existing laws with any other allotments under these laws, as well as with its above-described allotments under the new law.

2. Any State could use funds earmarked for vocational education in agriculture for any occupation involving knowledge and skills in agricultural subjects, such as forestry, soil conservation, landscaping, horticulture, etc., whether or not involving work on the farm or work projects involving practice on a farm.

3. Home economics funds (now limited to training for work in the home) could be used for vocational education in any gainful occupation involving knowledge and skills in home economics subjects, such as home companions for aged and disabled, day care center workers, nursing home assistants, hotel and motel housekeepers, home cleaning services, etc. Beginning with fiscal 1966, at least 25 percent of these funds must be used for training for gainful occupations.

4. Distributive occupation funds (now limited to employed persons) could be used for training of young people who are still in school or who have left school but have not yet become employed (i.e., dropouts).

5. Trade and industry funds (now limited to occupations requiring extensive skill or multiple skills) could be used for vocational education of young people while still in high school to equip them for single-skilled or semiskilled jobs. The amendment would also remove the requirement that one-third of any amounts earmarked for trades and industries be spent only for part-time day or night courses for already-employed workers.

Permanent extension of practical nurse training and area vocational education programs

The amendment would make permanent the practical nurse training program (present expiration date, June 30, 1965) and the area vocational education program (enacted by title VIII of the National Defense Education Act of 1958; present expiration date, June 30, 1964).

Periodic review of vocational education programs and laws

The amendment would require the Secretary to appoint during 1966 an ad hoc Advisory Council consisting of 12 persons with the same representative characteristics described above for the 12 nongovernmental members of the standing Advisory Committee. The Council would make a comprehensive review of the administration of federally aided vocational education programs and make recommendations for improvements in administration as well as for amendments to all vocational education acts. The Council would be authorized to engage in technical assistance and would be furnished secretarial, clerical, and other assistance by the Secretary. The Council would make its report and recommendations not later than January 1, 1968, and cease to exist on that date.

Periodically thereafter, but not less often than once every 5 years, the Secretary would appoint a similar Council with similar responsibilities.

Work-study programs

The amendment adds a new section authorizing $50 million for fiscal 1964 and necessary sums for each of the next 4 years for grants to States to enable local educational agencies (defined to include any public agency or institution providing a vocational education program) to give work assistance to students in full-time attendance in vocational education courses. The purpose of this section is to encourage and enable youths between the ages of 15 and 20—who otherwise would probably drop out of high school or discontinue their education after completing high school and be unable to find jobs—to continue in school in order to take the vocational training they need to equip them for gainful employment. These programs would provide part-time employment, of not more than 15 hours a week, in public schools or other public agencies. Monthly and annual earnings could not exceed $45 and $350, respectively, unless the student attended a school away from home, in which case the limits would be $60 per month and $500 per academic year. Youths would be selected for work assistance on the basis of their need for financial aid and their need for vocational education.

Annual appropriations would be allotted to the States on the basis of their populations aged 15 to 20, inclusive. States having plans approved under the amended bill previously described, would submit supplementary plans to participate in this program.

EXHIBIT 28

Estimated distribution of amounts (fiscal year 1964) for grants to States and work-study program of proposed Vocational Education Act of 1963 (title V–A amendment to S. 580)

	Estimated State amounts		Total
	Grants	Work-study grants	
Aggregate, United States	$91,800,000	$50,000,000	$141,800,000
50 States and the District of Columbia	89,518,466	49,053,879	138,562,345
Alabama	2,369,366	1,031,263	3,400,629
Alaska	105,404	70,807	176,211
Arizona	732,335	374,794	1,107,129
Arkansas	1,288,920	517,545	1,746,465
California	5,878,775	4,118,970	9,997,745
Colorado	845,613	489,265	1,334,878
Connecticut	841,582	625,805	1,467,387
Delaware	137,085	112,980	250,065
Florida	2,602,072	1,264,506	3,866,578
Georgia	2,746,246	1,235,668	3,981,914
Hawaii	355,823	212,374	568,197
Idaho	412,976	201,463	614,439
Illinois	3,866,629	2,544,965	6,411,594
Indiana	2,353,934	1,283,484	3,637,418
Iowa	1,434,152	749,423	2,183,575
Kansas	1,133,255	587,477	1,720,732
Kentucky	2,101,657	938,729	3,040,386
Louisiana	2,150,374	972,073	3,122,447
Maine	572,954	278,451	851,405
Maryland	1,403,004	837,752	2,240,756
Massachusetts	2,124,585	1,346,138	3,470,723
Michigan	3,652,770	2,073,618	5,726,388
Minnesota	1,757,679	926,910	2,684,589
Mississippi	1,757,249	724,056	2,481,305
Missouri	2,088,248	1,144,071	3,232,319
Montana	365,287	187,590	552,877
Nebraska	709,405	373,214	1,082,619
Nevada	$98,770	$72,199	$170,969
New Hampshire	313,634	164,612	478,246
New Jersey	2,209,485	1,455,185	3,664,670
New Mexico	597,786	285,544	883,330
New York	5,733,310	4,059,446	9,792,756
North Carolina	3,355,694	1,522,846	4,878,540
North Dakota	415,333	190,752	606,085
Ohio	4,403,250	2,511,356	6,914,606
Oklahoma	1,410,078	683,182	2,093,260
Oregon	845,302	477,611	1,322,913
Pennsylvania	5,318,556	2,942,077	8,260,633
Rhode Island	434,835	241,584	676,419
South Carolina	1,938,814	847,835	2,786,649
South Dakota	405,990	192,472	598,462
Tennessee	2,489,261	1,102,500	3,591,761
Texas	5,563,187	2,780,839	8,344,026
Utah	548,246	281,910	830,156
Vermont	232,206	116,674	348,880
Virginia	2,522,743	1,227,400	3,750,143
Washington	1,339,655	775,248	2,114,903
West Virginia	1,217,405	568,788	1,786,193
Wisconsin	1,931,393	1,045,196	2,976,589
Wyoming	159,323	90,406	249,729
District of Columbia	246,831	194,826	441,657
American Samoa	18,699	8,029	26,728
Canal Zone	----------	----------	----------
Guam	56,690	21,319	78,009
Puerto Rico	2,178,953	905,846	3,084,799
Virgin Islands	27,192	10,927	38,119

NOTE.—Distribution is based on—

State grants: The product of (1) the Federal allotment percentages, with limits of 25 and 75 percent, and (2) the State population (a) aged 15 to 19, (b), aged 20 to 24, (c) aged 25 to 64, with a minimum State amount of $10,000. An allotment percentage of 75 percent was assigned to Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

Work-study grants: The State population aged 15 to 20.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, the Vocational Education Act amendments to title V–A of S. 580 to which I have alluded, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the proposed amendment in the nature of a substitute be printed at this point in my remarks. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may lie on the desk until the close of business on July 24, 1963, to permit cosponsorship by other interested Senators.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD and will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendments are as follows:

TEXT OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE FOR TITLE V–A OF S. 580

PART A—VOCATIONAL EDUCATION DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 501. It is the purpose of this part to authorize Federal grants to States to assist them to maintain, extend, and improve existing programs of vocational education, to develop new programs of vocational education, and to provide part-time employment for youths who need the earnings from such employment to continue their vocational training on a full-time basis, so that persons of all ages in all communities of the State—those in high school, those who have completed or discontinued their formal education and are preparing to enter the labor market, those who have already entered the labor market but need to upgrade their skills or learn new ones, and those with special educational handicaps—will have ready access to vocational training or retraining which is of high quality, which is realistic in the light of actual or anticipated opportunities for gainful employment, and which is suited to their needs, interests, and ability to benefit from such training.

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 502. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $108,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $153,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $198,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each fiscal year thereafter, $243,000,000, for the purpose of making grants to States as provided in this part.

Allotments to States

SEC. 503. (a) Eighty-five per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 502 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the number of persons in the various age groups needing vocational education and the per capita income in the respective States as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year—

(1) An amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged fifteen to nineteen, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

(2) An amount which bears the same ratio to 20 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged twenty to twenty-four, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

(3) An amount which bears the same ratio to 15 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged twenty-five to sixty-five, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which is less than $10,000 shall be increased to that amount, the total of the increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the allotments to each of the remaining States under such subsection, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than that amount.

(c) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State's plan approved under section 505 shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use under the approved plan of such State for such year and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States not suffering such a reduction. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during such year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

(d)(1) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the per capita income for the State by the per capita income for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands), except that (i) the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than .25 or more than .75, and (ii) the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be .75.

(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner for each fiscal year, between July 1 and September 30 of the preceding fiscal year, except that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, such allotment ratios shall be promulgated as soon as possible after the enactment of this part. Allotment ratios shall be computed on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes for a State and for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) for the three most recent consecutive fiscal years for which satisfactory data is available from the Department of Commerce.

(3) The term "per capita income" for a State or for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) for any fiscal year, means the total personal income for such State, and for all such States, respectively, in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year, divided by the population of such State, and of all such States, respectively, in such fiscal year.

(4) The total population and the population of particular age groups of a State or of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the latest available estimates furnished by the Department of Commerce.

Uses of Federal funds

SEC. 504. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b), a State's allotment under section 503 may be used, in accordance with its approved State plan, for any or all of the following purposes:

(1) Vocational education for persons attending high school;

(2) Vocational education for persons who have completed or left high school and who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market;

(3) Vocational education for persons (other than persons who are receiving training allowances under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–415), the Area Redevelopment Act (Public Law 87–27), or the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–794)) who have already entered the labor market and who need training or retraining to achieve stability or advancement in employment;

(4) Vocational education for persons who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education program;

(5) Construction of area vocational education school facilities;

(6) Ancillary services and activities to assure quality in all vocational education programs, such as inservice teacher training and supervision, program evaluation, special demonstration and experimental programs, development of instructional materials, and State administration and leadership, including periodic evaluation of State and local vocational education programs and services in light of information regarding current and projected manpower needs and job opportunities.

(b) At least 40 per centum of each State's allotment for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1968, and at least 25 per centum of each State's allotment for any subsequent fiscal year shall be used only for the purposes set forth in paragraph (2) or (5), or both, of subsection (a), and at least 3 per centum of each State's allotment may be used only for the purposes set forth in paragraph (6) of subsection (a), except that the Commissioner may, upon request of a State, permit such State to use a smaller percentage of its allotment for any year for the purposes specified above if he determines that such smaller percentage will adequately meet such purposes in such State.

(c) Fifteen per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 502 for each fiscal year shall be used by the Commissioner to make grants to State Boards, or with the approval of the appropriate State Board, to local educational agencies, and to colleges, universities, and other public or nonprofit private agencies or institutions, to pay part of the cost of research, experimental, developmental, or pilot programs developed by such Boards, agencies, or institutions and designed to meet the special vocational education needs of youths, particularly youths in economically depressed communities, who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education programs, and of communities having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or are unemployed.

(d) For the purpose of demonstrating the feasibility and desirability of residential vocational education schools for certain youths of high school age, there are also authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and such sums as the Congress may determine for each of the next four fiscal years, for grants by the Commissioner to State boards and to other public or nonprofit private educational agencies, organizations, or institutions for the construction, equipment, and operation of residential schools to provide vocational education (including room, board, and other necessities) for youths, at least fifteen years of age and less than twenty-one years of age at the time of enrollment, who need full-time study on a residential basis in order to benefit fully from such education. In making such grants, the Commissioner shall give special consideration to the needs of large urban areas having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or are unemployed and shall seek to attain, as nearly as practicable in the light of the purposes of this subsection, an equitable geographical distribution of such schools.

State plans

SEC. 505. (a) A State which desires to receive its allotments of Federal funds under this part shall submit through its State board to the Commissioner a State plan, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which—

(1) designates the State board as the sole agency for administration of the State plan, or for supervision of the administration thereof by local educational agencies; and, if such State board does not include as members persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor in the State, and a person or persons representative of junior colleges, technical institutes, or other institutions of higher education which provide programs of technical or vocational training meeting the definition of vocational education in section 508(1) of this Act, provides for the designation or creation of a State advisory council which shall include such persons, to consult with the State board in carrying out the State plan;

(2) sets forth the policies and procedures to be followed by the State in allocating each such allotment among the various uses set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of section 504(a), and in allocating Federal funds to local educational agencies in the State, which policies and procedures insure that due consideration will be given to the results of periodic evaluations of State and local vocational education programs and services in light of information regarding current and projected manpower needs and job opportunities, and to the relative vocational education needs of all groups in all communities in the State, and that Federal funds made available under this part will be so used as to supplement, and, to the extent practical, increase the amounts of State or local funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for the uses set forth in section 504(a), and in no case supplant such State or local funds;

(3) provides minimum qualifications for teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, directors, and others having responsibilities under the State plan;

(4) provides for entering into cooperative arrangements with the system of public employment offices in the State, approved by the State board and by the State head of such system, looking toward such offices making available to the State board and local educational agencies occupational information regarding reasonable prospects of employment in the community and elsewhere, and toward consideration of such information by such board and agencies in providing vocational guidance and counseling to students and prospective students and in determining the occupations for which persons are to be trained; and looking toward guidance and counseling personnel of the State board and local educational agencies making available to public employment offices information regarding the occupational qualifications of persons leaving or completing vocational education courses or schools, and toward consideration of such information by such offices in the occupational guidance and placement of such persons;

(5) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies) under this part;

(6) provides assurance that the requirements of section 507 will be complied with on all construction projects in the State assisted under this part; and

(7) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this part, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve a State plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a), and shall not finally disapprove a State plan except after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State board designated pursuant to paragraph (1) of such subsection.

(c) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State board administering a State plan approved under subsection (b), finds that—

(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a), or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify such State board that no further payments will be made to the State under this part (or, in his discretion, further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State under this part (or shall limit payments to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

(d) A State board which is dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under subsection (b) or (c) may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record the Commissioner may modify or set aside his action. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the Court, operate as a stay of the Commissioner's action.

Payments to States

SEC. 506. (a) Any amount paid to a State from its allotment under section 503 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, shall be paid on condition that there shall be expended for such year, in accordance with the State plan approved under section 505 or the State plan approved under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts, or both, an amount in State or local funds, or both, which at least equals the amount expended for vocational education during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, under the State plan approved under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts.

(b) Subject to the limitations in section 504(b), the portion of a State's allotment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each succeeding year, allocated under the approved State plan for each of the purposes set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (6) of section 504(a) shall be available for paying one-half of the State's expenditures under such plan for such year for each such purpose.

(c) The portion of a State's allotment for any fiscal year allocated under the approved State plan for the purpose set forth in paragraph (5) of section 504(a) shall be available for paying not to exceed one-half of the cost of construction of each area vocational education school facility project.

(d) Payments of Federal funds allotted to a State under section 503 to States which have State plans approved under section 505 (as adjusted on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made) shall be made by the Commissioner in advance on the basis of such estimates, in such installments, and at such times, as may be reasonably required for expenditures by the State of the funds so allotted.

Labor standards

SEC. 507. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this part shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5), and shall receive overtime compensation in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the Contract Work Hours Standards Act (Public Law 87-581). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

Definitions

SEC. 508. For the purposes of this part—

(1) The term "vocational education" means vocational or technical training or retraining which is given in schools or classes (including field or laboratory work incidental thereto) under public supervision and control or under contract with a State Board or local educational agency, and is conducted as part of a program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment as skilled workers or technicians in recognized occupations (including any program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment in business and office occupations, and any program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment which may be assisted by Federal funds under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts, but excluding any program to fit individuals for employment in occupations which the Commissioner determines, and specifies in regulations, to be generally considered professional or as requiring a baccalaureate or higher degree). Such term includes vocational guidance and counseling in connection with such training, instruction related to the occupation for which the student is being trained or necessary for him to benefit from such training, the inservice training of teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, and directors for such training, travel of students and vocational education personnel, and the acquisition and

maintenance and repair of instructional supplies, teaching aids and equipment, but does not include the construction or initial equipment of buildings or the acquisition or rental of land.

(2) The term "area vocational education school" means a school (A) which admits as regular students, and is principally used for the provision of vocational education to, both persons who have completed high school and persons who have left high school, where such persons are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market, and (B) which is available to all residents of the State or of an area thereof designated and approved by the State board administering a State plan approved under section 505.

(3) The term "school facilities" means classrooms and related facilities (including initial equipment) and interests in land on which such facilities are constructed. Such term shall not include any facility intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

(4) The term "State board" means the State board designated or created pursuant to section 5 of the Smith-Hughes Act (that is the Act approved February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 929, ch. 114; 20 U.S.C. 11–15, 16–28)) to secure to the State the benefits of that Act.

(5) The term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State, or any other public educational institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a vocational education program.

(6) The term "Vocational Education Act of 1946" means titles I, II, and III of the Act of June 18, 1936, as amended (20 U.S.C. 15i–15m, 15o–15q, 15aa–15jj, 15aaa–15ggg).

(7) The term "supplementary vocational education Acts" means section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U.S.C. 30) (relating to vocational education in Puerto Rico), the Act of March 18, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 31–33) (relating to vocational education in the Virgin Islands), and section 9 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (20 U.S.C. 34) (relating to vocational education in Guam).

Advisory Committee on Vocational Education

SEC. 509. (a) There is hereby established in the Office of Education and Advisory Committee on Vocational Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Advisory Committee"), consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be chairman, one representative each of the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, and Labor, and twelve members appointed, for staggered terms and without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Such twelve members shall, to the extent possible, include persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor (in equal numbers), persons familiar with the administration of State and local vocational education programs, other persons with special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to vocational education, and persons representative of the general public, and not more than six of such members shall be professional educators. The Advisory Committee shall meet at the call of the chairman but not less often than twice a year.

(b) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this part, the Vocational Education Act of 1946, and supplementary vocational education Acts, including policies and procedures governing the approval of State plans, under section 505 and the approval of projects under section 504 (c) and (d).

(c) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on the business of the Advisory Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but not exceeding $75 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Amendments to George-Barden and Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Acts

SEC. 510. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in title I, II, or III of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U.S.C. 15i–15m, 15o–15q, 15aa–15jj, 15aaa–15ggg), or in the Smith-Hughes Act (that is, the Act approved February 23, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 929, ch. 114; 20 U.S.C. 11–15, 16–28)), or in supplementary vocational education Acts—

(a) any portion of any amount allotted (or apportioned) to any State for any purpose under such titles, Act, or Acts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, or for any fiscal year thereafter, may be transferred to and combined with one or more of the other allotments (or apportionments) of such State for such fiscal year under such titles, Act, or Acts, or under section 503 of this part and used for the purposes for which, and subject to the conditions under which, such other allotment (or apportionment) may be used, if the State board requests, in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, that such portion be transferred and shows to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that transfer of such portion in the manner requested will promote the purpose of this part;

(b) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for agriculture may be used for vocational education in any occupation involving knowledge and skills in agricultural subjects, whether or not such occupation involves work of the farm or of the farm home, and such education may be provided without directed or supervised practice on a farm;

(c)(1) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for home economics may be used for vocational education to fit individuals for gainful employment in any occupation involving knowledge and skills in home economics subjects;

(2) at least 25 per centum of any amount so allotted (or apportioned) to a State for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1965, may be used only for vocational education to fit persons for gainful employment in occupations involving knowledge and skills in home economics subjects, or transferred to another allotment under subsection (a), or both.

(d) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for distributive occupations may be used for vocational education for any person over fourteen years of age who has entered upon or is preparing to enter upon such an occupation, and such education need not be provided in part-time or evening schools;

(e) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for trade and industrial occupations may be used for preemployment schools and classes organized to fit for gainful employment in such occupations persons over fourteen years of age who are in school, and operated for less than nine months per year and less than thirty hours per week and without the requirement that a minimum of 50 per centum of the time be given to practical work on a useful or productive basis, if such preemployment schools and classes are for single-skilled or semiskilled occupations which do not require training or work of such duration or nature; and less than one-third of any amounts so allotted (or apportioned) need be applied to part-time schools or classes for workers who have entered upon employment.

Extension of practical nurse training and area vocational education programs

SEC. 511. (a)(1) Section 201 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U.S.C. 15aa) is amended by striking out "of the next eight fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "succeeding fiscal year".

(2) Subsection (c) of section 202 of such Act is amended by striking out "of the next seven fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "succeeding fiscal year".

(b) Section 301 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 15aaa) is amended by striking out "of the five succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "succeeding fiscal year".

Periodic review of vocational education programs and laws

SEC. 512. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall, during 1966, appoint an Advisory Council on Vocational Education for the purpose of reviewing the administration of the vocational education programs for which funds are appropriated pursuant to this Act and other vocational education Acts and making recommendations for improvement of such administration, and reviewing the status of and making recommendations with respect to such vocational education programs and the Acts under which funds are so appropriated.

(b) The Council shall be appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws and shall consist of twelve persons who shall, to the extent possible, include persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor (in equal numbers), persons familiar with the administration of State and local vocational education programs, other persons with special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to vocational education, and persons representative of the general public.

(c) The Council is authorized to engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out its functions, and the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the Council such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as it may require to carry out such functions.

(d) The Council shall make a report of its findings and recommendations including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this part and other vocational education Acts) to the Secretary, such report to be submitted not later than January 1, 1968, after which date such Council shall cease to exist. The Secretary shall transmit such report to the President and the Congress.

(e) The Secretary shall also from time to time thereafter (but at intervals of not more than 5 years) appoint an Advisory Council on Vocational Education, with the same functions and constituted in the same manner as prescribed for the Advisory Council in the preceding subsections of this section. Each Council so appointed shall report its findings and recommendations, as prescribed in subsection (d), not later than July 1 of the second year after the year in which it is appointed, after which date such Council shall cease to exist.

(f) Members of the Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $75 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

Work-study programs for vocational education students

SEC. 513. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each of the next four fiscal years such sums as may be necessary, for the purpose of making grants to States as provided in this section.

(b) (1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the sums appropriated under subsection (a) for such year as the population aged fifteen to twenty, inclusive, of the State, in the preceding fiscal year bears to the population aged fifteen to twenty, inclusive, of all the States in such preceding year.

(2) The amount of any State's allotment under paragraph (1) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State's plan approved under subsection (c) shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under paragraph (1) for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum of the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States not suffering such a reduction. Any amount reallotted to a State under this paragraph during such year shall be deemed part of its allotment for such year.

(c) To be eligible to participate in this section, a State must have in effect a plan approved under section 505 and must submit through its State board to the Commissioner a supplement to such plan (hereinafter referred to as a "supplementary plan"), in such detail as the Commissioner determines necessary, which—

(1) designates the State board as the sole agency for administration of the supplementary plan, or for supervision of the administration thereof by local educational agencies;

(2) sets forth the policies and procedures to be followed by the State in approving work-study programs, under which policies and procedures funds paid to the State from its allotment under subsection (b) will be expended solely for the payment of compensation of students employed pursuant to work-study programs which meet the requirements of subsection (d), except that not to exceed 1 per centum of any such allotment may be used to pay the cost of developing the State's supplementary plan and the cost of administering such supplementary plan after its approval under this section;

(3) sets forth principles for determining the priority to be accorded applications from local educational agencies for work-study programs, which principles shall give preference to applications submitted by local educational agencies serving communities having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or who are unemployed, and provides for undertaking such programs, insofar as financial resources available therefor make possible, in the order determined by the application of such principles;

(4) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies) under this section;

(5) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this section, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(d) For the purposes of this section, a work-study program shall—

(1) be administered by the local educational agency and made reasonably available (to the extent of available funds) to all youths in the area served by such agency who are able to meet the requirements of paragraph (2);

(2) provide that employment under such work-study program shall be furnished only to a student who (A) has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student in a vocational education program which meets the standards prescribed by the State board and the local educational agency for vocational education programs assisted under the preceding sections of this part, or in the case of a student already enrolled in such a program, is in good standing and in full-time attendance, (B) is in need of the earnings from such employment to commence or continue his vocational education program, and (C) is at least fifteen years of age and less than twenty-one years of age at the commencement of his employment, and is capable, in the opinion of the appropriate school authorities, of maintaining good standing in his vocational education program while employed under the work-study program;

(3) provide that no student shall be employed under such work-study program for more than fifteen hours in any week in which classes in which he is enrolled are in session, or for compensation which exceeds $45 in any month or $350 in any academic year or its equivalent, unless the student is attending a school which is not within reasonable commuting distance from his home, in which case his compensation may not exceed $60 in any month or $500 in any academic year or its equivalent;

(4) provide that employment under such work-study program shall be for the local educational agency or for some other public agency or institution;

(5) provide that, in each fiscal year during which such program remains in effect, such agency shall expend (from sources other than payments from Federal funds under this section) for the employment of its students (whether or not in employment eligible for assistance under this section) an amount that is not less than its average annual expenditure for work-study programs of a similar character during the three fiscal years preceding the fiscal year in which its work-study program under this section is approved.

(e) Subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 505 (pertaining to the approval of State plans, the withholding of Federal payments in case of nonconformity after approval, and judicial review of the Commissioner's final actions in disapproving a State plan or withholding payments) shall be applicable to the Commissioner's actions with respect to supplementary plans under this section.

(f) From a State's allotment under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the Commissioner shall pay to such State an amount equal to the amount expended for compensation of students employed pursuant to work-study programs under the State's supplementary plan approved under this section, plus an amount, not to exceed 1 per centum of such allotment, expended for the development of the State's supplementary plan and for the administration of such plan after its approval by the Commissioner. From a State's allotment under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, such payment shall equal 75 per centum of the amount so expended. No State shall receive payments under this section for any fiscal year in excess of its allotment under subsection (b) for such fiscal year.

(g) Such payments (adjusted on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made) shall be made by the Commissioner in advance on the basis of such estimates, in such installments, and such times, as may be reasonably required for expenditures by the States of the funds allotted under subsection (b).

(h) Students employed in work-study programs under this section shall not by reason of such employment be deemed employees of the United States, or their service Federal service, for any purpose.

Short title

SEC. 514. This part may be cited as the "Vocational Education Act of 1963."

EXHIBIT 30

Title VI-A and VI-C—Expansion of continuing education

	1964		1965		1966		1967		1968	
	NOA	Expenditures	NOA	Expenditures	NOA	Expenditures	NOA	Expenditures	NOA	Expenditures
General university extension (VI-A)	$9,040	$4,053	$9,040	$13,950	$9,040	$9,020	0	$97	0	0
Public libraries (VI-C)	37,500	9,000	40,000	27,000	40,000	37,000	0	30,000	0	$9,000

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, amendments reflecting the increase in authorization recommended by the President to adult basic education provisions, title VI-B of S. 580; and I ask unanimous consent that these amendments be printed at this point in my remarks. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may lie on the desk until the close of business on July 24, 1963, to permit cosponsorship by other interested Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD and will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendments are as follows:

TEXT OF ADULT BASIC EDUCATION AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI OF S. 580

Page 142, line 16, strike out "$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,000,000".

Page 142, strike out line 17 and insert in lieu thereof "$25,000,000 each for the".

Page 142, line 19, strike out "section" and insert in lieu thereof "part".

Page 149, line 18, strike out "eighteen" and insert in lieu thereof "sixteen".

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in my judgment, the amendments which I have offered are of major importance. Each seeks to provide a method and procedure whereby Americans of all races, colors, and creeds can attain basic skills, without which in our society there can be no economic freedom. Economic freedom, in my view, is the most basic of the American citizen's rights. Education, particularly vocational education, is the key which unlocks the door of access to economic freedom. Without these skills, I very much fear that many of the precious American political rights will remain unexercised.

It is my hope that the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare can meet in initial markup session on S. 580 by not later than the week of July 22.

Senators may be interested to learn that copies of the complete testimony of the Commissioner, covering all titles of S. 580, are available in the committee office, in the form of a committee print, excerpts of which have appeared in my statement.

THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have long supported most strongly the program to create in the District of Columbia, as a national symbol of the aspirations of all of our people, a National Cultural Center.

In the 85th Congress, the testimony presented before me in the joint hearings, which were conducted by the District Committees of both the Senate and the House, convinced me of the need for and the desirability of such a project.

I am, therefore, most pleased at the progress which has been made toward bringing into actuality a National Cultural Center. It will serve as a setting in which can be displayed the performing arts of America.

Mr. President, five centuries before the start of the Christian era, some 2,400 years ago, in the city of Athens a building project, started under the prodding of a legislator and statesman, resulted in the creation of a work of architectural excellence which has been used as a standard of culture and a touchstone of art by every succeeding generation in the civilizations of the West.

The Parthenon, designed by and built under the supervision of Phidias, a master architect, nevertheless owed its realization to the determination of Pericles, the great Athenian statesman and leader, that the genius of Athens should be recognized in a fitting manner. Against much opposition from those who objected to the cost and from those who attacked him on a partisan political basis, and from those who were outraged by the "modernism" of the planned structure, Pericles persevered. The world now counts the Parthenon of Athens as one of the very few major works of human achievement which approach the sublime and which stand as a symbol of the highest aspirations of the human spirit.

Great cathedrals were built during the Middle Ages in France, in Italy, in England, and in Constantinople. These structures were the result of common human endeavor to create a place of beauty in which all men could rejoice. Many of these structures—the great mosque in Kashmir, the Taj Mahal, the Angkor Vat in Cambodia, and the pyramids of the Toltec cultures of Mexico, to name but a few non-European examples—were primarily religious in nature and function.

But they were settings in which took place solemn and colorful ceremonies symbolic of their cultures. In Greece, in Mexico and in Cambodia, the religious functions were also civic functions. The ceremonies were patriotic ceremonies to a very great degree.

When we look to Europe in the days of the Renaissance, we find that magnificent structures were built which reflect the qualities of that age. The greatest artists were called upon to embellish and decorate the palaces of the Medici in Florence, the Papal apartments in the Vatican, the chateau of Fontainbleau for Francis I and in England, the royal residences which Henry VIII acquired.

In our own country, past generations have given us structures which reflected the spirit of each age. Monticello and Mount Vernon typify through their architecture and furnishings the early days of the Republic, as Williamsburg speaks of the colonial period. The White House, itself, has stood as a symbol of our national growth of unity and purpose. The Capitol in its present form speaks of the growing power of our unified country in the past century. It surely in its internal decorations suggests the period of their creation.

For our generation, through the National Cultural Center, we are afforded the opportunity to create a structure which symbolizes the best of the present.

For years we have been talking about the lack of adequate facilities for the performing arts in our Nation's Capital. We have had no national showcase here, either for our own talent, or for distinguished artists from overseas. Now we have a real opportunity to have such facilities.

Other major world capitals are impressive centers of culture. Washington's lag in this respect gives rise to the unfortunate and erroneous impression that the United States is indifferent to the arts. This impression gets back to the 101 countries which maintain diplomatic relations with the United States, through diplomatic personnel and their families who number more than 5,000 at one time and are constantly rotating.

In these critical days, we urgently need to tell the world of the great accomplishments, strengths and values which have developed from our way of life.

Our Nation's Capital belongs to all of our people. Through it, we communicate to the rest of the world. At the moment, the message and image we project from our Capital tend to emphasize the governmental, diplomatic and military strengths we possess. As a service to our people and as a needed sign to other peoples, we must give increased emphasis to the role of the arts in American life. The arts deal with the basic needs of mankind and reflect creative man at his constructive best. While the great national museums and art collections in our Capital do much to evince the richness of the American spirit, we do not have comparable national symbols in the performing arts, which are a major form of human communication—even across language barriers.

Nine million visitors come to the Capital every year. Two million more reside in its environs. Once the National Cultural Center is a reality, many millions more will share in its programs—through tours of its outstanding performers and through television, films and tape recordings of their work.

Also, for the first time, distinguished foreign artists will have a fitting place to perform in the Capital, instead of using makeshift stages with inadequate equipment. Lack of proper facilities in our Capital has created an erroneous and damaging impression that Americans are indifferent to the arts. The center—as a symbol of our national excellence—will correct this misconception.

Certainly such a symbol is wanted by the people of America, for the United States is undergoing the greatest surge of cultural interest in its history. Some 30 million of us play musical instruments, or 1 out of 6 people, often in America's more than 1,200 symphony orchestras. We have some 750 organizations that produce opera, and there are well over 100,000 theatrical groups, ranging from little theater troupes and university clubs to small professional groups. Seventy-three cities in this country already have erected or are in the process of constructing their own cultural centers. These places recognize that their citizens deserve to have the opportunity both to express their own artistic feelings and to see the finest performances of others.

The success of the State Department's cultural exchange programs with other countries has proved that music, theater, song and dance, are a powerful international language that can bring peoples closer together. Yet the cultural exchange program is hampered because we do not have adequate performing halls in which the foreign troupes invited to the country as guests of this Nation may perform and be received by the leaders of our country.

Today in Washington if we decide to attend the theater, we have but one choice, the National Theater whose facilities are far from adequate because of limited stage and seating capacity.

The Congress has taken steps to provide facilities to display these important assets from a national forum, fulfilling a need in our national life.

The National Cultural Center Act (72 Stat. 1698) was passed with bipartisan support by the 85th Congress. This legislation was signed by President Eisenhower and President Kennedy has continued active support for the Center. The Center is a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution and, like the Capitol itself, will belong to all the people, as do the White House, and the Lincoln Memorial. Under this law Congress stipulated that the funds to build the Center would have to come from the American people.

In addition to designating a site for such a Center in the Nation's Capital, the Congress authorized a national fundraising program to obtain the funds for the Center by voluntary contributions from all Americans. The Center as now planned will cost an estimated $30 million.

Both Mrs. Kennedy and Mrs. Eisenhower serve as the honorary chairmen of the National Cultural Center. The board of trustees includes Members of the Congress of both parties, representative individuals from industry and labor, and other distinguished citizens from all over the United States. A large advisory committee has also been appointed by the two Presidents and contains leading representatives of all aspects of American cultural life. All religious groups are represented on this committee, and the 13 most significant national organizations concerned with the performing arts are directly affiliated with both the fund raising campaign and the establishment of the permanent program of the Center. Members on both the board of trustees and the advisory committee reflects the nonpolitical nature of the enterprise.

The President has appointed Roger L. Stevens, well known theatrical producer and businessman, as chairman of the board of trustees, the Center's governing body. There are 30 trustees. A group of 100 distinguished citizens make up the advisory committee on the arts.

The trustees were authorized and directed to plan, create, and then operate a National Cultural Center on a designated site in the Nation's Capital. Section 4 of the act directed the board to:

First, present classical and contemporary music, opera, drama, dance, and poetry from this and other countries;

Second, present lectures and other programs;

Third, develop programs, for children and youth and the elderly—and for other age groups as well—in such arts designed specifically for their participation, education, and recreation; and

Fourth, provide facilities for other civic activities at the cultural center.

The text and structure of the legislation as well as the legislative history in connection with its passage emphasize the desire of the Congress that the National Cultural Center should be a national institution serving the American people through its programs and as a symbol of the importance of the arts as a part of our national environment and heritage. A national forum for the performing arts would take its rightful place in our Capital, where nearly every other important aspect of American life has been honored or symbolized.

The trustees, in fulfillment of their statutory responsibilities, have developed fundraising programs designed to secure the necessary funds to build the Center. These programs are designed to appeal to all Americans.

In directing the trustees to present all forms of the performing arts, Congress intended the Center to be a showcase of the finest talents in America and from abroad. It follows that the trustees would therefore have an almost elemental interest in fostering the arts throughout the country.

The Center, like the Capitol itself, will belong to all the people, as do the Washington Monument, the White House, the Lincoln Memorial, and every other public building in the Capital. The residents of Washington are being asked individually to give a substantial part of the funds needed for the Center and are generally interested in making their contribution, but will have only the same share of ownership as that which will derive to any other city.

The National Center will be unique. It will differ from the Lincoln Center in New York which, while also accommodating distinguished guests, will be primarily the new home of established organizations in New York City, such as the Metropolitan Opera, the New York Philharmonic, the Juilliard School of Music, and a resident repertory theater. The basic role of the National Cultural Center, on the other hand, is intended to be one of providing a showcase for both new and recognized talent from all over the country.

The first phase of the plan will be the construction of three performing halls on the banks of the Potomac: a 2,750-seat symphony hall, a 1,200-seat theater and a 2,500-seat auditorium for opera, ballet, and musical comedy. There will be ample room for future expansion.

Here, our country's most outstanding performers will display their talents. Here, celebrated artists from abroad will find the appropriate setting for their introduction to American audiences. Here, also, the most promising of our young artists will display their talents.

The program now being outlined by a program advisory committee of distinguished people associated with the arts provides for a stage for established artists and for juniors as well, selected through State and regional competitions in all branches of the performing arts. To be presented at the National Cultural Center will give an artist distinctive recognition.

An infinite variety of performances is envisioned, ranging from modern theater, Greek tragedy, symphony, ballet, modern dance, opera, and electronic music, to lectures, poetry readings, jazz concerts, and folksinging. This whole panorama will be visible in the Nation's Capital.

Washington area business and professional people have already responded generously and enthusiastically. But the need is great. This community will obviously benefit far more than any other—yet they are asked for only 25 percent of the cost.

Their share is $7½ million and more than $2 million of this local goal has already been subscribed. It is essential that Washington finish the job. The National Cultural Center will attract many more visitors to this area. Outstanding new residents will arrive for research and development. It will provide a mutual and harmonious interest for business, labor, education, and politics. It will provide a new source of inspiration and opportunity to raise the cultural tone of this community.

Contributions are completely tax deductible. Pledges may be made for payment monthly, quarterly, or annually over a period up to 5 years. The National Cultural Center will build our local economy and attract visitors.

A tradition of Government support for the arts has not developed in this country and is only now coming into limited practice at local and State levels. While Federal subsidy of the arts is increasingly being suggested today, to wait for such a subsidy before establishing the center could easily mean a postponement of many years for the project.

Washington is unlike any other city in the United States. Large segments of its population consist of citizens of the various States. Its main industry is the U.S. Government. Its budget is controlled by the Congress. Much of its area is occupied by Government buildings, parks, memorials, and foreign embassies exempt from the tax rolls. Thus the city lacks a broad tax structure. It has no authority to finance buildings of any kind. Its residents are being asked individually to give a substantial part of the funds needed for the center and are generally interested; obviously they could not supply the whole $30 million that is needed.

HOW WILL THE FUNDS BE RAISED?

In order to raise the $30 million needed to build the center, a number of programs have been put into operation:

First. A vital part of the special gifts campaign will be the solicitation of funds from American business and industry. Under the chairmanship of Ernest R. Breech, former chairman of the Ford Motor Co. and presently director and chairman of Trans World Airlines, a President's Business Committee, has been organized to coordinate the raising of $6 million for the center from business and industry. The committee is a very strong one, and includes leading figures from nearly every segment of American industry.

Second. By the end of 1962, plans were being drawn for a nationwide seat endowment campaign on behalf of the National Cultural Center. This campaign will enable individuals and organizations to play a direct role in founding this new national institution and in equipping its great halls.

The President appointed Edgar Bronfman, president of Joseph Seagram and Sons, Inc., as chairman of the Seat Endowment Committee which will seek personal or organizational endowments of $1,000 per seat.

Already some seat endowments have been made by national organizations and individuals, and the program calls for 6,500 seat endowments totalling $6,500,000.

Third. During 1962, leadership was developed for a major fund-raising program in the Washington metropolitan area. Mrs. Hugh D. Auchincloss was appointed chairman of this campaign which will seek $7,500,000 or about one-quarter of the $30 million National Cultural Center goal.

The initial program of the Washington Committee was sponsorship of the nationwide telecast in eight locations throughout the area. In addition to the main event in the National Guard Armory in Washington, popular priced showings were held in a downtown theater and on all of the area university campuses. Through the excellent cooperation of many interested individuals and organizations and businesses, considerable funds were raised.

Plans for the campaign now in progress reach into every section of the National Capital area. Excellent leadership drawn from every part of community life is being assembled for a special gifts campaign to seek gifts of $1,000 and up and a general solicitation campaign for funds up to $1,000. The special gifts campaign is under the chairmanship of Robert Baker, president of American Security and Trust Co., and the general solicitation campaign is under the chairmanship of Ralph E. Becker, Washington attorney, general counsel and a member of the board of trustees of the National Cultural Center.

We have been very fortunate in having many dedicated community leaders work to raise funds for the center in the metropolitan area. Washington labor and management have spurred on the drive for funds. The Washington Board of Trade is coordinating the efforts of the business group in the area and the local labor unions have been making a major contribution in support of the Center.

A special campaign to solicit voluntary contributions from the 350,000 Federal employees is underway. This campaign is wholeheartedly endorsed by President Kennedy. District of Columbia employees, members of the judicial and legislative branches of the Government are also being asked to give financial support to the center.

For the first time in history 200,000 schoolchildren in the Washington area were allowed to be solicited. This group of children, who will get more than anyone living out of having a National Cultural Center, showed an interest that has set the pattern for the rest of the Nation.

The pupils, teachers, and PTA groups eagerly planned and executed programs which brought in over $15,000, in a short period of 6 weeks. Every child was encouraged to contribute and thereby became a part of the working force for the National Cultural Center. Working through the children was a means of reaching many homes and making fundraising of personal interest to families throughout the metropolitan area.

Fourth. For the first time, recordings for public sale have been made of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Bands. These unique recordings of American marches and patriotic music were released in May and some are already on the best seller list. With the help of the White House, Department of Defense, American Federation of Musicians and RCA Victor, the National Cultural Center will receive the normal recording profits which will be a substantial sum.

The trustees are confident that all of the fundraising programs planned or underway will bring in the funds necessary to enable the trustees to proceed with construction of the National Cultural Center.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there be printed a fact sheet giving further details on the proposal, together with an article by Roger L. Stevens, entitled "American Dream: A National Cultural Center."

There being no objection, the fact sheet and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER—FACT SHEET

WHAT IS THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER?

A proposed national showcase for the performing arts—music, drama, opera, ballet, and poetry—to be located in the National Capital. With no such national center at the present time, we are unable to accord the honor, dignity, and recognition in our Capital due to those who bring us much honor and credit—our performing artists. The Nation's Capital is woefully lacking in proper facilities, both for our own artists and for those from overseas. Congress recognized the need in 1958 when it passed the National Cultural Center Act, and designated the site upon which the center would be built.

WHY IS IT CALLED THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER AND WHY DO WE NEED IT?

Like the Capital itself, it will belong to all of the people of the United States and its programs are being designed to serve all of the people. The performing arts in America are not confined to a single region: they are part of our national life. A forum recognizing and honoring them must be national too. This forum is needed because Americans are turning increasingly to the arts in their leisure time. This is shown by the fact that cultural centers of varying sizes are being planned in 70 cities in 35 States, with roughly 100 other localities contemplating such projects. Hundreds of colleges and universities are rapidly becoming major centers for the performing arts. A National Cultural Center will be the nerve center of all these activities across the country.

WHAT IS THE CENTER'S POTENTIAL AUDIENCE?

Nine million tourists visit the Capital annually. This figure is expected to reach 15 million by 1970. The population of the metropolitan area of the Capital is 2 million now and is projected to be 2.7 million by 1970. Some 800 national organizations have headquarters in the District, visited by hundreds of thousands of members each year. Washington is more and more becoming the crossroads for leaders in all phases of American life. But the center's activities will not be limited merely to those who live in or near Washington, D.C. Through the most up-to-date methods of communication, including radio, television, tape recordings, and educational broadcasting, programs will be brought to every corner of the country. Thus the potential audience is the entire 186 million American people.

WHAT KIND OF PROGRAMS WILL THE CENTER PRESENT?

The center will present national and international festivals, whereby local groups, if their talents merit the honor, will be able to display, upon a national stage, the contribution they make to our cultural heritage. There will be State and regional contests, covering all of the performing arts, to discover new talent, whereby the winners will be brought to the center for a national debut. The center will present serious, popular, and jazz music, opera, plays, dance, poetry readings, folk singing, and lectures covering every facet of the performing arts. Certain programs will be specially designed for children, adolescents, and the elderly.

WHAT WILL THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER LOOK LIKE?

The building design submitted by Architect Edward Durell Stone has been enthusiastically approved by the Board of Trustees and the Commission of Fine Arts. It consists of three halls, under a single roof: a 2,750-seat symphony hall, a 1,200-seat theater, and a 2,500-seat hall for opera, ballet, and musical theater. Also a gardenlike roof area, with retractable roof insuring use in all weather, will be available for band concerts, art exhibits, festivals, children's theater, theater-in-the-round, balls, and restaurants. The entire building will be sheathed in white marble facing, and will be surrounded by a series of delicate steel columns encased in bronze with a gold finish. The site, on the banks of the Potomac River, has been described by Mr. Stone as "one of the most exciting and glorious settings for a public building in the world."

WHAT ROLE WILL THE CENTER PLAY IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS?

Through the use of its excellent stages, and the best technical facilities, we shall be able to play our proper role in the existing international exchange program. At the present time when we invite distinguished performers from another country, we ask for and receive the very best. But we are unable to offer them in return an appropriate setting for their performance in the seat of our Government. By our ability to offer for the first time, the finest means of presentation to the finest artists from overseas, we shall be able to extend the effectiveness of the program. The high quality of performance in each of the arts represented will enable the more than 5,000 foreign diplomats to send home true impressions of the worth of American talent and of the regard we ourselves have for that talent.

WHY DOESN'T THE GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIZE THE CENTER?

While Federal subsidy of the arts is frequently being suggested today, to wait for the resolution of this question of public policy before establishing the Center could easily mean a postponement of many years of this much needed project. Congress, in passing the National Cultural Center Act, authorized a national fundraising drive to build a national center for the performing arts, which is ample proof of the Federal Government's interest in advancing the arts.

WHY DOESN'T WASHINGTON BUILD THE CENTER ITSELF?

While a considerable development of secondary and service industries is taking place in and around the Capital, its main industry is still the U.S. Government. The District of Columbia budget is controlled by Congress. Much of its area is occupied by Government buildings, parks, memorials, and foreign embassies exempt from the tax rolls. Thus the city lacks a broad tax structure. It has no authority to finance buildings of a national nature. Its residents are being asked to provide one-quarter of the building costs of the Center. Obviously they could not, and should not be asked to supply the whole $30 million for a center which will belong to all the people.

IS THE CENTER NONPARTISAN?

Completely. The act establishing the center was signed by President Eisenhower. Both he and President Kennedy and their wives are vigorously supporting the project. Membership on both the board of trustees and the advisory committee reflects the nonpolitical nature of the enterprise.

HOW WILL THE FUNDS BE RAISED?

On a national scale, a variety of programs has been put into effect to raise the $30 million needed. These include a seat endowment program whereby a tax-deductible donation of $1,000 will endow a permanent seat in one of the Center's three halls. For the first time, recordings for public sale have been made of American marches and patriotic music played by the four major U.S. military bands, and normal recording profits will be paid to the Center. The Center will also receive the proceeds from the sale of "Creative America," a magnificent volume tracing the history of creativity in the arts. The Greater Washington area, however, is having its own special fund-raising programs, since it has accepted the challenge of raising $7.5 million, or one-quarter of the total funds needed. These programs, involving more than 5,000 workers, are being carried out in a special gifts campaign, seeking donations of $1,000 and over, and a general campaign enlisting support from the area's schools and universities, business, labor unions, the professions, fraternal orders, etc., to solicit contributions up to $1,000.

WHO ARE THE PEOPLE CHARGED WITH BRINGING THE CENTER TO REALITY?

President Kennedy has asked that the Center become a reality as soon as possible. Mrs. Kennedy and Mrs. Eisenhower are serving as its honorary cochairmen. The President appointed Roger L. Stevens, well-known theatrical producer and businessman, as Chairman of the Board of Trustees, the Center's governing body. The 30 trustees are all eminent figures in industry, the professions, the arts, labor, education, and government. More than 100 distinguished citizens, particularly those associated with the performing arts, make up an advisory committee on the arts, which by law advises on the permanent program of the Center. Thirteen national organizations also have representation on the advisory committee.

The President appointed Mrs. Hugh D. Auchincloss as chairman of the Washington area campaign.

AMERICAN DREAM: A NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER

(By Roger L. Stevens)

(NOTE.—Roger L. Stevens is Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the National Cultural Center. A Detroit real estate man and theaterical producer, Stevens has produced or coproduced over 100 Broadway plays and holds office in a variety of professional theater groups.)

As a nation, Americans always have been among the first to pay tribute to those who do great things. We honor our statesmen, our military heroes, our pioneers in science. If their achievements are of a nature to produce tangible symbols, then we like to bring those symbols to Washington for permanent public display. In this way, we acknowledge that the achievements have brought honor and credit to all America and are a source of great pride to all Americans.

In another field of endeavor, that of the performing arts, we have musicians, actors, dancers, singers and poets who are second to none. They, too, bring our country great honor and credit. But we do not, thus far, possess the means to give them comparable national acknowledgment. We do not have a national forum in which to display their achievements. We have run a grave risk of giving a false impression, to ourselves and to the people of other lands: that we do not regard the performing arts as an integral part of our lives.

Ours is a country in which more people attend concerts in the United States than go to baseball games, both major and minor leagues and including the world series. We possess more than one-half the total number of symphony orchestras in the world, 1,200 out of 2,000. We have 700 opera companies across the Nation, and more than 10,000 theatrical groups. In every State in the Union, local cultural groups are striving to turn what they consider to be worthwhile endeavors into practical contributions to the lives of their communities. Talent is widespread in these cities and regions, in colleges and universities. Yet we have failed to give national recognition and national dignity and national acknowledgment to these efforts and to this talent.

A short while ago, the National Cultural Center's newsletter, "Footlight," sought the views of a famous conductor of a leading symphony orchestra and those of the conductor of a lesser known community orchestra on the importance they each attached to a National Cultural Center. Their opinions were very interesting.

Erich Leinsdorf, conductor and music director of the Boston Symphony Orchestra, had this to say about the significance of the Center: "Why a cultural center? Why not just another fine hall? I'll tell you why. A cultural center is a total enclosure. It should be the temporary home of everyone in the audience. At the end of the working day, you can leave the fumes and noises behind and go into an entirely different atmosphere. I like to think of the Cultural Center as a reservation in the way our national parks are reservations. It represents a concerted effort to protect the nerves and souls of human beings."

Then we talked with Igor Buketoff, conductor and musical director of the Fort Wayne Philharmonic Orchestra, Fort Wayne, Ind., who saw in the National Cultural Center a challenging incentive to community groups such as his own orchestra. "When we play outside of our own hall," Buketoff said, "the facilities are often rudimentary. Symphony orchestras can have no dignity when they perform in wrestling arenas. Ballet and theater groups have no dignity when they perform in discarded vaudeville houses. Once the performing arts have befitting homes in cultural centers, their prestige will soar and it will become the accepted and natural thing to support them. The National Cultural Center will show the way for this evolution of thinking."

These gentlemen were speaking from the world of the symphony orchestra. But it is the same for all the performing arts. Actress Cornelia Otis Skinner has said: "My training with the Comedie Francaise in Paris taught me that a national presentation means prestige. To perform upon one's country's national stage gives this stamp of prestige that cannot be obtained in any other way."

Ballerina Maria Tallchief has drawn attention to the fact that many young dancers today feel the necessity to complete their studies overseas, believing there are inadequate facilities and inadequate recognition in their own country. They feel European training and reputation are all the American public will accept. "This is not entirely true," said Miss Tallchief. "The facilities are here and we have the finest teachers and choreographers. But the recognition is missing. This is why a National Cultural Center is so sorely needed—to lead the country into acceptance of its own artistic greatness."

Composer Richard Rodgers, speaking of acknowledgment for his own branch of the performing arts, said: "The best thing that could happen to the musical theater is that it receive national recognition in a national climate under a national roof."

All reasons why we need a National Cultural Center.

Now what will the Center do when it is built, when its three great halls are lighted and its programs have been put into effect?

It will be not merely an entity of concrete, steel and marble. It will be not just another set of halls, albeit splendid ones with every modern technical facility. Rather it will be a place where ideas are received, where they are created, nurtured, and disseminated; it will be a nerve-center for all the cultural organizations throughout the country.

In drawing up the Center's programs, the Board of Trustees is fully aware of certain basic musts.

The programs must reach, demand, encourage and maintain the highest possible standards of artistic expression. They must adhere to the policy that, in all of its undertakings, the National Cultural Center is a national organization, built by the American people for the American people and for them to share with each other and with the rest of the world.

There will be a program to provide an attainable goal for the hundreds of talented individuals and cultural groups throughout the country who have not yet reached a national performing status. There are symphonies, jazz bands, theatrical, operatic companies, as well as singers, actors, dancers, and poets in every section of the country whose standard of performance is exceedingly high. They may have succeeded in gaining recognition in their own town, region or State, but they may have had no opportunity as yet to be recognized on a national level.

The Center will stage a series of national and international festivals where the criterion for presentation will be quality of performance. This will be the first time this has been done in the Nation's Capital and those groups and individuals meriting the honor will be invited to participate.

In carrying out this program with imagination and vigor, encouragement and impetus will be given to cultural enterprises everywhere; pride in local attainments will be fostered and the financial structure of community groups will be strengthened.

The road to acceptance and success for the gifted unknown is a long and hard one. The ability may be there but not the opportunity.

In order that new talent, representing a hitherto untapped contribution to our national artistic resources, may be sought out, tried and proved, a series of State and regional contests will be held. These contests, again for the first time, will cover the entire range of the performing arts and will be open to every individual of merit everywhere. The winners will be brought to the National Cultural Center for a national debut.

Despite the fact that the Center will be physically located in one city, benefit from its programs will be felt throughout the country. One prime area where this benefit can be expected to have significant impact is that of education.

Through the most up-to-date means of communication, the Center will be able to bring its programs to people throughout the United States, to schools, colleges, and universities and to countries overseas. It can make a significant contribution to the educational curricula of America.

The new media, unheard of a couple of decades ago, includes radio and television, all types of recordings and motion pictures. In addition to the some 3,500 AM and 1,000 FM radio stations, 600 television stations and the 4 major commercial radio networks and 3 major television networks, there also is an educational television video tape network, with 65 associates, reaching almost every principal city in the country. At least 600 educational closed-circuit television systems are in operation across the United States and further distribution of the center's programs could be carried through the National Educational Television and Radio Center and the National Association of Educational Broadcasters.

There will be broadcasts of artistic events, concerts, operas, ballets, recitals, plays, lectures, and seminars, as well as of official receptions and presentations. There will be recordings, both visual and aural, for delayed broadcasting, for circulation as recordings, and for library use. The Center's programs will be able to reach into the schoolhouse and college in New Mexico, in Rhode Island, in Oregon, and Florida. Advanced students of the performing arts, of history, literature, and music will have an added, comprehensive and vivid source of research.

Artistic expression, in all its forms, cuts through language, geographic and, to a significant degree, political barriers. It is the greatest single means of communication among people and nations. It is upon this base that our international cultural exchange program is founded. The National Cultural Center will carry out a program to increase the effectiveness of this existing arrangement.

At the present time, distinguished artists from overseas, invited to appear in the United States, frequently are offered facilities which are inadequate and unsuited to their needs. While they give of their best, they in return are not provided with the best.

It is fitting that the Nation's Capital should play official host to artists from other countries and, in so doing, should offer stages, auditoriums, and technical equipment worthy of the visitors' art.

The Center will extend official invitations to foreign artists and will provide the finest stages for their presentations. These national presentations can be linked to official state visits by chiefs of state and other dignitaries. In this way, the people of the United States, through their National Cultural Center, can demonstrate to the visiting performer and to his nation that we attach the importance it warrants to our participation in all international cultural exchange.

These, then, are some of the things the Center will do when it is built.

What will it look like when it is built? To design the building, the Board of Trustees selected the well-known architect, Edward Durell Stone. Last September, Stone formally presented his model to the Center's honorary cochairmen, Mrs. Kennedy and Mrs. Eisenhower. Both they and, subsequently, the Commission on Fine Arts and the Board itself expressed themselves delighted and excited with his design. The site selected on the east bank of the Potomac River in Washington has been described by Stone as "one of the most exciting and glorious settings for a public building in the world." Situated opposite Theodore Roosevelt Island, a bird sanctuary in the middle of the river and decreed by law to remain in its natural state, the Center will be set in a permanently parklike atmosphere. Its rooftop will command a magnificent view of the city.

The building will include a 1,200-seat theater, a 2,750-seat symphony hall and a 2,500-seat hall for opera, musical comedy, and ballet. A gardenlike roof area, with retractable roof to insure use in all weather, has been designed for band concerts, art exhibits, festivals, theater-in-the-round, balls, and restaurants. The Center itself will rise 100 feet from a terraced plaza and will be 300 feet wide and 630 feet long.

Numerous delicate steel columns encased in bronze with a gold finish will surround the building. A concrete substructure will be topped by a steel superstructure and the entire building will be sheathed with white marble facing. The entrance plaza will include fountains and indigenous flowering trees, including the traditional Washington cherry and magnolia trees. A spectacular nighttime effect will be created by exterior floodlighting and jet fountains rising from the Potomac River on gala occasions.

The architect has designed well. He has drawn up plans for a building in absolute conformity with the ideals and standards of the finished center.

Now, how will it be built? In the National Cultural Center Act, Congress designated those magnificent 13 acres on the banks of the Potomac River as the site of the Center, but stipulated that the funds for the building must come from voluntary contributions. Congress went further. It authorized for the first time, a nationwide fundraising campaign for a cultural enterprise.

We launched the fundraising drive with a closed-circuit, nationwide telecast last November, in which more than 60 local communities from coast-to-coast participated. We have other drives now underway—we believe them to be practical and imaginative—and we are confident we will raise the $30 million necessary to build the Center in the shortest possible time.

The dollars comprising that $30 million will come from people who demand a standard which is constant, by people who will not take their art with a dose of compromise. It will be built by people whose vision is broader than just the path of day-to-day existence, but who realize that that existence requires a substantial artistic ingredient. It will be built by the dollars of people who have enormous pride in their country's artistic achievements and who want to hold those achievements up for the whole country and the rest of the world to see. It will be built by people who give of their best in their own endeavors, demand that a dignity be accorded to those efforts and, by the same token, demand that a similar dignity be accorded to the efforts of others, in other fields of endeavor.

Speaking for labor, AFL–CIO President George Meany said this shortly after accepting President Kennedy's invitation to sit on the Center's Board of Trustees: "This is a project that should arouse the enthusiasm of all of us in the labor movement. We have done much to win for American workers the leisure time to which they are entitled; surely it is highly appropriate for us to join in an undertaking that will help to make those leisure hours more rewarding. In this instance there is the further consideration that an overwhelming majority of the performing artists, to whom this enterprise is so important, are also members of AFL–CIO unions."

For decades now, the entertainment and performing unions have worked for the preservation, betterment and the expansion of the performing arts. Members traditionally have been tireless in their efforts to overcome inadequate conditions and facilities, to provide a respectable livelihood for those who have chosen the arts as their profession.

The National Cultural Center will not carry out the functions of the labor unions, it will complement them. It will increase audiences throughout the Nation and, where this is done, employment consequently will be increased. The Center will elevate national respect for the arts whereby they may be regarded with the same distinction as they themselves have won for the country.

We want people to know about the Center, about the need for it, about its programs and the benefit that it can bring to every citizen of the United States. We want people to think of a national center for the performing arts in terms of America's national stage—a focus in the Nation's Capital which represents and frames some of the foremost interest and activities of our people, those of the drama, dance, music, and poetry.

We want to build our National Cultural Center well and we want to build it right. In order to do this, we need the support of everyone who places a high value upon the cultural attainments of our country and who wants to see them granted the national dignity and recognition they deserve.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have been very pleased to make this speech at this late hour. I am honored to know that it is planned to have the speech reprinted and widely distributed. It is important that our National Cultural Center receive the support it so richly deserves from all the people who will own it, for the National Cultural Center I am talking about will belong to all the people of this country. I say most respectfully, all the people. I am sure that once they understand the need for the Center and once they understand the importance of its symbolism around the world, they will desire to support it.

I see in the Chamber my good friend from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who is a very able associate of mine on the Foreign Relations Committee. I am sure that he will share the view which I now express, that it is not very flattering to the United States as we go about the world to participate in conferences with representatives of other countries, to know that in many places in the world we are looked at somewhat with askance as not being very active devotees of cultural institutions. We go into Italy; and the Italians rightly boast of the great support that they give to operas, orchestras, and the dramatic arts as well as all the other arts. The same statement applies to France, England, the Lowlands, Japan, and almost everywhere else. We are guilty of dereliction in not having given support to the arts through the building up of a national cultural center. Such a center is long overdue.

I am pleased and honored that I was invited to discuss the subject in the speech which I have delivered in the Senate. I am pleased to be informed that it is planned to have the speech reprinted and made use of in an attempt to elicit support at the grass roots level of America, community after community, before women's clubs, artistic groups, and public bodies. I think we ought to proceed without further delay to prove to the world that we are devoted to the arts and to cultural development, and that this National Cultural Center should be supported. Its establishment is long overdue. I yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I commend the senior Senator from Oregon for his fine statement relating to the National Cultural Center. It is a project which is worthy of support—and the generous support—of every American. It relates not only to the cultural well-being of our country, but also the political respect in which this country is held in many areas of the world. I would add that it should relate directly to our own self-respect.

The National Cultural Center belongs in the Nation's Capital. I am sure that every Senator and Representative who has traveled abroad is aware of the truth of the statement of the Senator from Oregon as it relates to the arts and the great cultural centers to be found in the great cities, not only of Europe, but also Asia, Africa, Latin America, and other areas. His statements are so true and obvious that every American ought to be well aware of them.

I join the Senator in extending to the project wholehearted support. I am so pleased that the remarks of the Senator will be brought to the attention of a wide audience in America. I am confident that the response will be generous and enthusiastic.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to thank the Senator. In a few words he has presented much more eloquently than I the major thesis of my speech. I should like to ask his permission right now to have his remarks made a part of the reprint of the discussion of this subject which will be made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will be very honored.

ADMINISTRATION'S PROGRAM FOR IMPROVING OUR BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS POSITION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the President of the United States has presented a balanced and meaningful program for improving our balance-of-payments position while at the same time outlining a policy that will safeguard our domestic expansion. I note also that earlier today the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] commented on the President's message relating to the balance of payments. He noted for the attention of the Senate and the Nation that it was important that the Department of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Treasury give assurances that the program that has been outlined does not in any way—and I quote now from the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]—"violate our longstanding tradition of not opposing direct controls on our international financial transactions."

I join the Senator in that expression. I am hopeful that the assurances that are required will be readily given. I am confident that they will.

I would also add that the suggestion made of a world monetary conference is most meritorious. We live at a time when the requirements for capital are great. No other country is rich enough today to be the world's banker. Therefore it is imperative that we look upon the subject of capitalization as an international responsibility rather than a national responsibility. I claim no expert knowledge in the area of international finance, but I do believe that a degree of commonsense is required and is necessary if we are to have any understanding at all of what is transpiring in the international money markets and the capital markets.

The world is engaged in a great trade program, an expanded trade program. The world is witnessing an increase in the gross national product in every country, with few exceptions. There is an increase in production, which in turn means an increase in the volume of goods and services available for the public; and it means an increase in the volume of credits and dollars, or whatever units of currency may prevail at the moment in any one country, to handle the increased traffic or the increased commerce.

What is the situation? We are attempting to do a giant-sized business in the world with a pygmy-sized monetary system. We are attempting to conduct world commerce—the development of the industrialized nations and the capitalization of the so-called underdeveloped nations—with a monetary structure unrelated to the second half of the 20th century.

I do not believe that the United States should find itself in a position in which it can be, in a very real sense, intimidated or harassed by a group of central banks in foreign countries, which can work their will because of a shortage of gold bullion related to the needs of the marketplace.

It is ludicrous to talk about a nation with a $600 billion gross national product, a high standard of living, and stable value of the dollar being in trouble financially in the world because of a balance-of-payments problem.

The whole subject needs new thinking. It needs what was once termed a "new look." I am hopeful that such a study will be made. The proposals which have been advanced to review the long-term future of the world monetary system should be given the most serious consideration.

I also urge, that we in the Congress support the efforts which have been outlined by the President in his message, and do our part of the job by enacting the proposed interest-equalization tax on foreign borrowings and foreign security issues in our markets.

I wish to comment on another area of congressional responsibility, as a watchdog over interest rates. I understand that my good friend, the able and brilliant Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] had something to say about this subject earlier today. I am sure many other Senators will have more to say about it.

I do not believe any of us can be very happy about an increase in interest rates, even though successfully limited to short-term borrowings.

This Senator stood on this floor when the previous administration was in power and criticized the then Secretary of the Treasury, George Humphrey, for his high-interest-rate policy. I do not think that high-interest-rate policy worked for the good of our country. I do not believe it worked for the good of the farmer, the independent businessman, or the entrepreneur who sought to expand his business and improve his position in the marketplace.

I know that one of the reasons why we have such a large Federal budget today is that we literally doubled the cost of financing the public debt.

I remind my colleagues and the administration that when the interest rate rise took place we were told that this would permit long-term borrowing at more reasonable interest rates. Everybody knows that did not happen.

The Senator from Minnesota, in his capacity as a U.S. Senator and as a friend of this administration, wants to serve notice now. I shall be watching very carefully the end results—even the day-by-day results and effects of any rise in interest rates, as has been suggested and as worked out and announced recently by the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. At this time of the night I do not wish to delay the Senate long, although I find the Senator from Minnesota is discussing a very tempting subject. I rise only to commend the Senator. I remember very well his position on this subject. I am not at all surprised that his position is being restated under this administration. It does not make any difference to the Senator from Minnesota or to the Senator from Oregon whether it is a Republican or Democratic administration, when we think a course is wrong.

It does not really pain me to find myself in disagreement with the President on this subject, because I agree with him on most of his positions.

As I said earlier this afternoon, we can best serve our President, in my judgment, when we disagree, by saying so, as we serve when we fight to put his program across.

I point out also that in our Democratic platform, we took a position in this regard. I know of no reason why we should change that position. If the Democratic Party were meeting in convention assembled next week, I would support the same plank in the platform.

Nevertheless, I say—and I am sure the Senator from Minnesota shares my view—although I may disagree with the President in this regard as to details, I pledge the President anew my support once a policy is established, of trying to effectuate it with the soundest possible legislative controls and checks that are needed.

Much of the harm which might result from this program could be prevented, to permit us to get into a position to lower the interest rates, if we were to carry out certain suggestions that some of us have been making as to how to stop the flight of capital out of the United States. There are many ways to do so.

My position on the foreign aid bill is the major step to take, although there are other things we could do as well. I discussed this question earlier this afternoon, and the record will speak for itself.

I am pleased that the Senator from Minnesota has again demonstrated the same objectivity and courage which have characterized his many years of service in the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his observations.

I am very much concerned about the so-called monetary and fiscal policy of this Government or of any other government, because ultimately this will determine what happens in an economy.

I recognize that President Kennedy made a strong case for stemming the outflow of short-term funds by raising the rediscount rate and, along with it, short-term rates on Government bills and the like. This Senator cannot bring himself to believe that 1-year notes ought to sell at more than 3 percent interest. I cannot bring myself to believe that 91-day notes ought to bear interest at 2 percent or more than 2 percent. This is like printing money and charging interest on it. Therefore, the Senator from Minnesota again must restate his deep concern over these matters.

The President has assured us that an increase in short-term rates—at a time when liquid savings are growing rapidly, and when there are no accompanying restrictions on credit availability nor parallel increases in the interest rate on bank loans, home mortgages, or other long-term obligations—should have little, if any, adverse effect on our economy.

I appreciate the frankness of that statement. I hope it will be fully realized and achieved.

Even more important, from the standpoint of congressional responsibility, the President stated today:

> I have been assured by both Treasury and Federal Reserve officials that they intend to do everything possible through debt management policy and open-market operations to avoid any reduction in domestic credit availability and any upward pressure on long-term interest rates while the economy operates below capacity without inflation. Other agencies of the Federal Government will work to maintain continued ready availability of private mortgage loans at stable interest rates.

Mr. President, this is a commendable statement. I appreciate the fact that the President has told us this and that he has been assured by the Treasury Department and Federal Reserve officials that they will do everything possible to assure the availability of credit at stable interest rates without a rise in those interest rates.

I want the record to be clear that the senior Senator from Minnesota will be one of those, together, I am sure, with members of the Banking and Currency Committee and the Joint Economic Committee, who will be watching with an eagle eye to make sure these commitments are carried out.

I have watched the Federal Reserve Board on other occasions, and sometimes with deep concern. I want to make sure that the Treasury Department does not find itself with a low-grade fever that brings about pressure for a continual rise in interest rates. This is not a sound policy. It is one that can in the future bring tremendously increased burdens on the national economy and the Federal Government.

With almost 6 percent unemployment, with our factories operating at an average of only 85 percent of their capacity, with the pace of expansion as modest as it is today, we would be shirking our responsibility if we did not monitor this situation closely and insist that the Federal Reserve and the Treasury take those agreed steps which will not only protect but promote the expansion of the economy.

I remind the Senate that we have before us a proposal to reduce taxes in order to make available more capital for an expansion of the economy. If interest rates were raised, even though those increases might be upon short-term notes and short-term credits, there could be a conflict of economic philosophy.

I have supported the tax program. I supported it early. Last year I called for a tax reduction. But I submit that a tax reduction which is designed to release capital can be jeopardized if a measure is instituted which tends to freeze capital. I realize that the President's program is designed to prevent the outflow of capital from the United States in order to maintain it and hold it for the purpose of investment within the United States. I want to join with the President in calling upon the Treasury and the Federal Reserve officials to do everything they can, through debt management policies and open market operations, to avoid any reduction in domestic credit availability, and any upward pressure on long term interest rates while the national economy operates below its capacity.

As I understand the workings of the money markets, that means that the Federal Reserve System will have to keep reserves—total reserves, not just free reserves—growing at a satisfactory pace to accommodate the growth in our economy. It means that the Federal Reserve will have to provide reserves by buying securities in the intermediate and long-term market. It means that the Treasury will have to sell bills in the short-term market. Only by this determined combination of efforts—only by a determined twist—maybe we should call it a super twist—can we hope to accomplish the dual objectives of letting short-term rates rise to help our balance of payments and keeping long-term rates low and long-term money easy to help our domestic expansion.

This is a big order. It is one thing to make the statement that this is what is intended to be accomplished, but it is another thing to see that it is accomplished.

My purpose in taking the time of the Senate at this late hour is to make my concern a matter of public record and have it clearly understood that I do not believe we can permit these things to happen and not keep a watchful eye on them to make sure the interest rate policy does not damage the economy.

I am confident the history of the Kennedy recovery to date tells us that what the President has outlined can be done.

Apart from keeping long-term investment and mortgage money plentiful and cheap, we must, of course, get on with the tax cut. The favorable budgetary development for the fiscal year 1963—a sharp $2.6 billion reduction in the deficit—demonstrates once again that an improving economy is the best way to bring our Federal budget into balance. And to get that improvement, to create the 2 to 3 or 4 million additional jobs we need, to put to work the idle men and machines that can give us an added $30 billion of output every year, we must move ahead on the program of tax reduction and revision that is now in the House Ways and Means Committee, and I hope will soon be passed by the House and brought to the Senate for its affirmative action.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, first it must go to the Senate Finance Committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Illinois corrects me; first to the Senate Finance Committee.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 18, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 546) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant easements for the use of lands in the Camp Joseph H. Pendleton Naval Reservation, Calif., for a nuclear electric generating station.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that, under the previous order, the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 36 minutes), under the previous order, the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 22, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 18, 1963:

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Robert J. Stroh, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. John S. McCain, Jr., U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr., U.S. Navy, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of vice admiral under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

IN THE ARMY

The officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3384:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Louis Overton Gravely, Jr., O248412.

Brig. Gen. Robert Clifford Wilson, Jr., O313324.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Stewart Laycock Hall, O349314, Armor.

Col. Norbert John Hennen, O331461, Infantry.

Col. Herbert Toben Johnson, O336101, Infantry.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Ralph Sheldon Phelps, O370892.
Brig. Gen. Richard John Quigley, O400101.
Brig. Gen. Frank Price Williams, O309461.
Brig. Gen. William Jerome Witte, O333473.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Howard Hosom Arbury, O255103, Infantry.

Col. Jasper Newton Baker, O446010, Infantry.

Col. Kenneth William Brewer, O411361, Infantry.

Col. George Delman Eastes, O436928, Artillery.

Col. William Phelps Simmons, Jr., O306376, Infantry.

Col. Burris Olen Smith, O426235, Artillery.

Col. Raymond Ashby Wilkinson, O373466, Artillery.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. John Samuel Anderson, O1283632.

Col. Alfred Carlisle Harrison, O311380, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Erwin Case Hostetler, O336226, Adjutant General's Corps.

Brig. Gen. Chester James Moeglein, O384958.

Col. Robert Louis Stevenson, O343589, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Thomas Roberts White, Jr., O348796, Adjutant General's Corps.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Donald Nicholas Anderson, O375021, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Mayhew Yale Foster, O307029, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. George Morris Gelston, O1177407, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Joseph Thornton Willey, O399386, Adjutant General's Corps.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284, 3306, and 3307:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. William Winston Lapsley, O19727, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Lathrop Throckmorton, O19732, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Dyce Alger, O19848, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ralph Edwards Haines, Jr., O19849, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Vernon Price Mock, O19906, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. William Carl Garrison, O30144, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Chester Victor Clifton, Jr., O20246, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Charles Haneke, O20263, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Paul Sampson, O42926, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Jackson Graham, O20553, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edwin Hess Burba, O31518, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Arthur William Oberbeck, O20569, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Douglass Phillip Quandt, O20605, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Francis Seedlock, O20609, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Alexander Day Surles, Jr., O20622, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Graham Zierdt, O20632, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Vernon Underwood, Jr., O20679, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Albert Ollie Connor, O20699, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Woodrow Wilson Stromberg, O20728, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ferdinand Thomas Unger, O20734, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Benjamin Franklin Taylor, O20779, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Howard Skeldon, O20831, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Joe Stallings Lawrie, O20914, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 18, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Daniel 2: 20: *Blessed be the name of God forever and ever; for wisdom and might are His.*

Almighty God, we earnestly implore Thee that in these times of destiny for our Republic, we may make known to the forces of communism that our Union is one and inseparable.

Grant that we may proclaim to the adversary our conviction that, however we may differ in our philosophy as political parties, we are not a divided nation but that we are all equally determined that nothing will ever be able to undermine our form of government.

May the Members of Congress be men and women who are emulating the example of those patriots and leaders in our national history who served our beloved country with heroic courage and humble fidelity.

Inspire us to dedicate our lives to lofty ambitions, and may we be partners in advancing our Nation's spiritual culture and moral refinement in order that we may truly be a people whose God is the Lord.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On July 11, 1963:

H.R. 1275. An act for the relief of Miss Ann Super;

H.R. 1292. An act for the relief of Carmela Calabrese DiVito;

H.R. 1332. An act for the relief of Mario Rodrigues Fonseca;

H.R. 1736. An act for the relief of Assunta DiLella Codella;

H.R. 3356. An act for the relief of Josephine Maria (Bonaccorso) Botell; and

H.R. 4773. An act for the relief of Leroy Smallenberger, a referee in bankruptcy.

On July 17, 1963:

H.R. 1267. An act for the relief of Lawrence E. Bird; and

H.R. 6681. An act to improve the active duty promotion opportunity of Air Force officers from the grade of major to the grade of lieutenant colonel.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk, and which, together with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., July 17, 1963.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture today considered the work plans transmitted to you by executive communication and referred to this committee and unanimously approved each of such plans. The work plans involved are:

State	Watershed	Executive communication number
Nebraska	Bear-Pierce	895, 88th Cong.
Do	Bellwood	Do.
Arizona	Buckhorn-Mesa	Do.
Oklahoma	Caney Creek	Do.
Florida	Istokpoga Marsh	641, 88th Cong.
Virginia	Johns Creek	940, 88th Cong.
Florida	Jumper Creek	641, 88th Cong.
Oregon	Middle Fork of Hood River.	2423, 87th Cong.
Tennessee	Mulberry Creek	1899, 87th Cong.
Hawaii	Naalahu	898, 88th Cong.
Arkansas	Tupelo Bayou	Do.
West Virginia	Upper Deckers Creek.	940, 88th Cong.
South Dakota	Upper Little Minnesota River.	641, 88th Cong.
Florida	Upper Tampa Bay	1288, 87th Cong.

Sincerely yours,
HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 141)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

Soon after my inauguration, I reported to the Congress on the problems presented to this Nation by 3 successive years, beginning in the late 1950's, of mounting balance-of-payments deficits accompanied by large gold outflows; and I announced a program designed to restore both confidence in the dollar and eventual equilibrium in our international accounts. The challenge posed by those pressures was heightened at that time by the need to halt and reverse the spread of unemployment and revive our faltering economy. Rejecting a choice between two equally unpalatable alternatives—improved employment at home at the cost of a weaker dollar abroad or a stronger dollar at the cost of a weaker economy and Nation—we sought a new course that would simultaneously increase our growth at home, reduce unemployment and strengthen the dollar by eliminating the deficit in our international payments. It is appropriate now—nearly 2½ years later—to look back on the problems faced, to review the progress made and to chart the course ahead.

There is much from which to take heart. Our economy has resumed its growth and unemployment has been reduced. The dollar remains strong, bulwarked by nearly 40 percent of the free world's monetary gold stock as well as by a newly constructed network of bilateral and multilateral financial arrangements. Our gold outflow has been halved. There are signs of longer run improvement in our world competitive position, as our prices and costs hold steady while others are rising. The deficit in our balance of payments has been reduced—from $3.9 billion in 1960 to $2.4 billion in 1961 and $2.2 billion in 1962.

Our basic strength, moreover, is vast, real, and enduring. Our payments deficits, measured in terms of our loss of gold and the increase in our short-term liquid liabilities to foreigners, have consistently been equaled or exceeded by the growth of our long-term, high-yielding foreign assets—assets which have been and will continue to be an increasing source of strength to our balance of payments. Today, Americans hold more than $60 billion of private investments abroad, and dollar loans repayable to the U.S. Government total over $11 billion. At the end of 1962, all of these assets exceeded our liabilities to foreigners by an estimated $27 billion. And they have shown an increasing strength over the years: Our total income from these sources in 1959 was $3 billion; in 1962 it had risen to $4.3 billion; and we expect further substantial increases in the coming years.

These are all signs of progress. But unemployment is still too high; our growth rate is still too low; and it is now clear that, despite the favorable forces at work over the long run, more remains to be done today to eliminate the continuing payments deficit.

A significant portion of our progress so far has been due to special agreements with friendly foreign countries—for debt prepayments, advance payments for military equipment, and U.S. borrowings abroad. While similar arrangements may once again prove capable of covering a substantial amount of the gross deficit in 1963, such special transactions cannot be relied upon for the indefinite future. Moreover, while our commercial trade balance and Government expenditures overseas have shown modest improvement, capital outflows, both short term and long term have increased.

Although there is urgent need for further effort I want to make it clear that, in solving its international payments problem, this Nation will continue to adhere to its historic advocacy of freer trade and capital movements, and that it will continue to honor its obligation to carry a fair share of the defense and development of the free world. At the same time, we shall continue policies designed to reduce unemployment and stimulate growth here at home—for the well-being of all free peoples is inextricably entwined with the progress achieved by our own people. I want to make it equally clear that this Nation will maintain the dollar as good as gold, freely interchangeable with gold at $35 an ounce, the foundation stone of the free world's trade and payments system.

But continued confidence at home and cooperation abroad require further administrative and legislative inroads into the hard core of our continuing payments deficit—augmenting our long-range efforts to improve our economic performance over a period of years in order to achieve both external balance and internal expansion—stepping up our shorter run efforts to reduce our balance-of-payments deficits while the long-range forces are at work—and adding to our stockpile of arrangements designed to finance our deficits during our return to equilibrium in a way that assures the continued smooth functioning of the world's monetary and trade systems.

Before turning to the specific measures required in the latter two categories, I must emphasize once again the necessity of improving this Nation's overall long-range economic performance—including increased investment and modernization for greater productivity and profits, continued cost and price stability and full employment and faster growth. This is the key to improving our international competitiveness, increasing our trade surpluses and reducing our capital outflows.

That is why early enactment of the comprehensive tax reduction and revision program previously submitted is the single most important step that can be taken to achieve balance abroad as well as growth here at home. The increased investment incentives and purchasing power these personal and corporate tax reductions would create—combined with last year's actions giving special credits for new investment and more favorable depreciation treatment—will promote more employment, production, sales and investment, particularly when accompanied by the continued ample availability of credit and reasonable long-term rates of interest. A prosperous, high-investment economy brings with it the rapid gains in productivity and efficiency which are so essential to the improvement of our competitive position abroad.

To gain new markets abroad and retain the gains of new growth and efficiency here at home, we must continue the price-cost stability of recent years, limiting wage and profit increases to their fair share of our improving productivity. That is why we have, for 2 years, been urging business and labor to recognize and use reasonable wage-price guideposts for resolving the issues of collective bargaining. Our success in holding down our price level relative to that of our major competitors is a powerful force working to restore our payments balance over the longer run. This fact should not be obscured by current short-run developments.

While these long-range forces are taking effect, a series of more immediate and specialized efforts are needed to reduce the deficit in our international transactions and defend our gold reserves:

1. EXPORT EXPANSION

Our commercial sales of goods and services to foreign countries in 1962 exceeded our purchases by $4.3 billion, and they are continuing at about the same rate this year. This is our greatest strength, but it is not enough. Our exports of goods have risen only moderately over the past 3 years, and have not kept pace with the rapid rise of imports which has accompanied our domestic expansion. As a result, rather than furnishing increased support for our other transactions, 1962 saw a decline in our commercial trade surplus.

The primary long-term means for correcting this situation is implementation of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The special representative for trade negotiations is preparing to use to the fullest extent the authority given to me by the act, in an across-the-board drive for lower tariffs and against other barriers to trade. This should open new markets and widen existing markets for American exports.

As mentioned above, our whole long-range domestic program—including increased investment, improved productivity and wage-price stability—is designed to better the competitive position of our products both at home and abroad. Continued price stability at home, contrasted with the upward trend in prices abroad, will create an increasingly favorable climate for American exports; and this administration is concentrating on six immediate measures to help American businessmen take advantage of our export potential.

First, the Export-Import Bank has created a wholly new program of export financing which now provides U.S. business with credit facilities equal to any in the world. The major element in this new program is the guarantee of short- and medium-term export credits by the Foreign Credit Insurance Association, composed of more than 70 private insurance companies in conjunction with the Export-Import Bank. I urge the Congress to act promptly to restore the Bank to full operating efficiency by renewing its charter and authorizing adequate financing.

Second, the Departments of State and Commerce have strengthened and expanded efforts overseas to probe for new markets and promote the sale and distribution of American products.

Third, the Department of Commerce has developed a broad program of education and assistance to present any potential American exporters. I have requested a relatively small amount of additional funds to strengthen the Department's efforts to stimulate our exports. These funds, amounting to $6 million, were not approved by the House of Representatives. It is essential, if we are to increase our trade surplus, that they be included in the final appropriation bill. This modest sum would pay for itself many times over in increased exports, lower payments deficits, and protection for our gold reserves.

Fourth, the Department of Agriculture announced last March a new auction program for direct sales of cotton abroad. It is expected that this new technique will insure competitive pricing for our cotton in export markets and will increase exports by as much as $100 million over last year's levels.

Fifth, present ocean freight rates discourage our exports as compared to imports. The freight charges on Atlantic crossings are far higher for eastbound freight than for comparable items bound for our shores. A similar situation prevails on other trade routes. While these substantial differentials may have been acceptable in the immediate postwar period of the dollar shortage when Europe was struggling to get on its feet, their magnitude is clearly unjustified today. Accordingly, I have directed the Secretary of Commerce to take corrective action through the Maritime Administration; and, I am urging the Federal Maritime Commission in its role as an independent regulatory agency to question those specific export rates which appear unduly high. Should legislation prove necessary, it will be sought.

Sixth, in order to give further momentum to the expansion of our export performances, I will convene a White House Conference on Export Expansion on September 17 and 18, to alert American firms, whether or not they are now exporting, to the opportunities and rewards of initiating or expanding export efforts. We shall use this opportunity to emphasize to American businessmen that vigorous action to increase their exports would serve their own private interests as well as the national interest.

2. TOURISM

Another element that requires attention in our commercial transactions is the increase in our unfavorable net tourist balance. With increasing prosperity encouraging American travel abroad, total tourist spending in foreign countries rose another 10 percent last year, to nearly $2½ billion. This was partially offset by increased foreign tourist expenditures in the United States, but the net result was an outflow of $1.4 billion, or two-thirds of last year's overall balance-of-payments deficit. This year the cost is estimated to be still greater. That is why we have had to limit the duty-free exemption for returning tourists to $100 per person. Last year this measure achieved a saving of more than $100 million, and I am gratified that Congress has extended the limitation for another 2 years. We have also sought, through establishment of the U.S. Travel Service, to increase our income from visitors coming to our country. To further that effort, I strongly recommend that Congress approve the full amount of the appropriation requested for the U.S. Travel Service.

In addition, in cooperation with the appropriate government agencies, I am asking the domestic travel and tourism industry to launch a more unified drive to encourage Americans to learn more about their own country and the glory of their heritage. A see-America-now program, to be in full operation by the spring of 1964, will make the most of our magnificent resources and make travel at home a more appealing alternative to travel abroad.

3. FEDERAL EXPENDITURES ABROAD

Federal expenditures abroad go largely for defense and aid. These represent the obligations which flow from our position of world leadership and unrivaled economic strength. With the recovery of other economically advanced nations, particularly our allies in Western Europe, we have made vigorous and increasingly successful efforts to work out with them a better sharing of our common responsibilities. These efforts—combined with rigorous scrutiny of offshore expenditures—have enabled us, in spite of mounting worldwide requirements and costs, to reduce the overall total of our own oversea expenditures while we increase the security of the free world and maintain a high level of assistance to developing countries.

A continual process of modernizing our Armed Forces and increasing efficiency, resulting in heightened defense effectiveness, is reducing the requirements for oversea dollar expenditures. At the same time, by tying our aid more effectively to domestic procurement and cutting civilian expenditures sharply, we should be able to achieve further savings. In fact, by January 1965, these processes should result in a reduction of the rate of our Federal oversea dollar expenditures by approximately $1 billion from that of 1962.

(A) MILITARY EXPENDITURES

The Defense Department has, since the beginning of this administration, been making vigorous efforts to restrain oversea expenditures, without reducing military effectiveness.

Thus, despite the Berlin buildup of 1961 and rising costs overseas, gross expenditures abroad by the Defense Department have been held below 1960 levels. As a result of the desire of our allies to acquire from us modern military equipment, which they need to strengthen free world defenses, at lower cost than they could produce the equipment themselves, substantial offsets to these expenditures have also been achieved, so that our net outlays abroad for defense have declined from $2.7 billion in 1960 to $1.9 billion in 1962.

In line with these continuing efforts, the Secretary of Defense has informed me that the annual rate of expenditures abroad by the Department of Defense will be reduced—by measures to be put into effect before the end of calendar year 1964—by more than $300 million from the 1962 level. At the same time the Department of Defense will continue to seek arrangements with major allied countries to increase their military procurement from the United States so as to reduce the net outflow still further. The Secretary has further assured me that this reduction will be accomplished without any reduction in the effectiveness of our military posture and with no impairment in our ability to meet our commitments to our allies in all parts of the world.

In addition to direct expenditures by the Defense Department our defense expenditures abroad have for many years been increased by the cost of programs for the acquisition of strategic materials from foreign sources. The cost of these programs is now steadily declining since they have largely fulfilled their purpose and are no longer needed. Within 2 years they will be reduced by over $200 million as compared to 1962, ensuring a total reduction in defense dollar expenditures well in excess of $500 million.

(B) AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

During 1960 only about one-third of AID program expenditures were in the form of U.S. goods and services. Last year that proportion had risen to about 50 percent. But during the fiscal year which ended last month, fully 80 percent of AID's commitments were "tied" to the export of U.S. goods and services. The balance was virtually all committed for purchases in the less developed countries rather than in the developed nations where the payments surpluses exist which give rise to our deficit. During fiscal year 1964, for which funds are now being considered by the Congress, AID commitments tied to U.S. exports will rise beyond 80 percent of the total. I have directed the Administrator of AID to continue and intensify this policy so that AID expenditures entering our balance of payments in fiscal year 1965 may be further reduced by about $500 million as compared to fiscal year 1961, from about $1 billion to not over $500 million, the lowest practicable minimum.

(C) OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

The oversea disbursements of all other departments of Government have also been brought under special review and control by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Total Federal expenditures abroad (excluding Defense, AID, Treasury payments on foreign-held debt and Federal pension payments) coming within the scope of this review now amount to approximately $600 million per year. The Director of the Budget has assured me that vigorous screening of expenditures abroad by these other Federal departments and agencies will achieve further substantial balance-of-payments savings. These savings, together with those which may be expected from revisions of programs under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, should amount to some $100 million a year. This includes my request to the Congress to enact legislation permitting freer use of our present holdings of the currencies of a number of other countries.

4. SHORT-TERM CAPITAL FLOWS

By skillful use of the tools of debt management and monetary policy, the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve System have substantially reduced the outflow of short-term capital through a series of carefully managed increases in short-term money rates, while maintaining ample credit availability and keeping both long-term rates and bank loan rates low and, in many cases, declining. Experience in the recovery underway over the past 2½ years provides a solid basis for expecting that a determined effort can succeed in keeping long-term investment and mortgage money plentiful and cheap while boosting short-term interest rates. From February 1961 through July 12, 1963, the rate on newly issued 3-month Treasury bills rose 76 basis points, while the rise in long-term Treasury bond yields was held to only 22 basis points, and the yields on high-grade corporate bonds and mortgages actually declined.

However, the recorded outflows of short-term funds—together with unrecorded net outflows, a large portion of which undoubtedly represent short-term capital movements—still amounted to approximately $1.6 billion in 1962 and have continued on a substantial scale so far this year. A sizable reduction in this drain would do much to strengthen our overall balance of payments. It is for this reason that the Federal Reserve has decided to increase the rediscount rate from 3 to 3½ percent. At the same time, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation have raised the interest-rate ceilings on time deposits payable in 90 days to 1 year, in order to enable our banks to compete more effectively with those abroad and thus attract funds that might otherwise leave the country.

While none of us welcomes higher interest rates at a time when our economy is operating below capacity, an increase in short-term rates—at a time when liquid savings are growing rapidly, and when there are no accompanying restrictions on credit availability nor parallel increases in the interest rates on bank loans, home mortgages, or other long-term obligations—should have little, if any, adverse effect on our economy. The unprecedented flow of liquid savings should largely insulate the longer term markets from the effect of higher short-term rates. I have been assured by both Treasury and Federal Reserve officials that they intend to do everything possible through debt management policy and open-market operations to avoid any reduction in domestic credit availability and any upward pressure on long-term interest rates while the economy operates below capacity without inflation. Other agencies of the Federal Government will work to maintain continued ready availability of private mortgage loans at stable interest rates. Nevertheless, the situation lends increased urgency to the fiscal stimulus that would be provided by the prompt enactment of the substantial tax reductions I have recommended.

5. Long-term capital outflows consisting of direct investment in productive plants abroad appear to have leveled off in recent years, whereas portfolio investments in the form of long-term loans or securities purchases have been rising rapidly. While our long-range program should increase the attractiveness of domestic investment and further reduce the outflow of direct investment, the rising outflow of long-term capital for portfolio investment abroad shows no sign of abating. It is up from $850 million in 1960 to $1.2 billion in 1962, and so far this year is running at an annual rate of well over $1.5 billion.

In view of the continued existence of direct controls and inadequate capital market mechanisms in many foreign countries, and the wide differential between the long-term rates of interest in the larger industrial countries and the United States, there appear to be only three possible solutions to this problem, two of which are unacceptable under present circumstances:

A substantial increase in our whole long-term interest rate structure would throw our economy into reverse, increase unemployment and substantially reduce our import requirements, thereby damaging the economy of every free nation;

The initiation of direct capital controls, which are in use in most countries, is inappropriate to our circumstances. It is contrary to our basic precept of free markets. We cannot take this route.

A third alternative—the one which I recommend—would stem the flood of foreign security sales in our markets and still be fully consistent with both economic growth and free capital movements. I urge the enactment by the Congress of an "interest equalization tax," which would, in effect, increase by approximately 1 percent the interest cost to foreigners of obtaining capital in this country, and thus help equalize interest rate patterns for longer term financing in the United States and abroad. The rate of tax should be graduated from 2.75 percent to 15 percent of the value of debt obligations, according to the remaining maturity of the obligation, and should be 15 percent in the case of equity securities. This tax should remain in effect through 1965 when improvements in both our balance of payments and in the operation of foreign capital markets are expected to permit its abandonment.

Under this alternative, the allocation of savings for investment in securities will continue to be the result of decisions based on market prices. There will be no limitations on the marketing of foreign issues and no governmental screening of borrowers. Reliance will be placed on price alone to effect an overall reduction in the outflow of American funds for stocks, bonds, and long-term loans—both new or outstanding, whether publicly marketed or privately placed.

The tax would not apply to direct investment. It would not apply to securities or loans that mature in less than 3 years. Nor would it apply to the loans of commercial banks. These exemptions will assure that export credit will remain fully available. Furthermore, purchases of the securities of less developed countries or of companies operating primarily in such countries will not be taxed.

Nor will the tax apply to transactions in foreign securities already owned by Americans, or to the purchase of securities by foreigners. Underwriters and dealers would be exempted from the tax on stock or securities resold to foreigners as part of the distribution of a new issue. But all Americans who purchase new or outstanding foreign securities from foreign issuers or owners would be subject to this tax. In order to avoid unfair burdens on transactions which are nearly complete, the tax should not apply to offerings of securities for which active registration statements are now on file with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Purchase commitments which have already been made should also not be affected.

The Secretary of the Treasury is submitting the details of this proposal to the Congress; and I have been assured that the House Ways and Means Committee will be prepared to give high priority to this proposal after action has been taken with respect to the overall program of tax reduction and reform now before it. Since the effectiveness of this tax requires its immediate application, I am asking Congress to make the legislation effective from the date of this message. The Internal Revenue Service will promptly make available all instructions necessary for interim fulfillment of the provisions of this recommendation, pending the enactment of legislation by the Congress.

6. Investment by foreign savers in the securities of U.S. private companies has fallen rapidly to less than $150 million in 1962. The better climate for investment that will flow from enactment of the program for tax reduction and reform now before the Congress will do much to improve this situation but a direct action program is also needed to promote oversea sales of securities of U.S. companies. Such a program should also be designed to increase foreign participation in the financing of new or expanded operations on the part of U.S. companies operating abroad.

To meet these two facets of a single problem, a new and positive program should be directed to the following areas of effort:

(a) The identification and critical appraisal of the legal, administrative and institutional restrictions remaining in the capital markets of other industrial nations of the free world which prevent the purchase of American securities and hamper U.S. companies in financing their operations abroad from non-U.S. sources;

(b) A review of U.S. Government and private activities which adversely affect foreign purchase of the securities of U.S. private companies; and

(c) A broad and intensive effort by the U.S. financial community to market securities of U.S. private companies to foreign investors, and to increase the availability of foreign financing for U.S. business operating abroad.

Such a program will necessarily involve a pooling of the know-how and efforts of the Government and the financial community. I have asked the Treasury Department, in consultation with the State Department, to develop an organization plan and program.

The increased freedom of capital movement and increased participation by foreign citizens and financial institutions in the ownership and financing of American business, toward which these efforts are directed, will serve to strengthen the economic and political ties of the free world as well as its monetary system. Securities of U.S. private firms could be and should be one of our best selling exports. An increasing foreign investment in these securities will encourage a more balanced two-way capital traffic between the United States and other capital markets and minimize the impact of net long-term capital outflows from the United States on our balance of payments.

7. Special Government transactions covered $1.4 billion of our deficit in 1962. These included prepayment of debt by foreign countries, advance payments on military purchases here, and the issuance by the Treasury of medium-term securities to foreign official holders of dollars. Further debt prepayment is expected in 1963—France has just announced a prepayment of $160 million—but it is clear that these are temporary gains which cannot be repeated for very long. Nor is it likely that advance payments on military purchases will again be large, as the pace of deliveries against purchases is now rising.

Therefore, as our continuing balance-of-payments deficit leads to accruals of dollars by foreign central banks, exceeding the size of the dollar balances which they normally carry, it has been particularly helpful that a number of foreign governments and central banks have begun purchasing a new type of nonmarketable medium-term Treasury security, denominated either in dollars or in their own currencies, as a convenient alternative to the purchase of gold. Some $610 million of such securities have been newly issued thus far in 1963.

Further debt prepayments and further sales of these securities during the remainder of this year will reflect the unprecedented degree of cooperation now prevailing in international finance and the growing recognition that correction of payments imbalances is a responsibility of the surplus as well as the deficit countries. In this spirit we shall also continue to press for a fuller and fairer sharing of the burdens of defense and aid and for the reduction or elimination of the trade barriers which impede our exports.

8. Gold sales and increased dollar holdings serve to finance what remains of our deficit after special governmental transactions. In 1962, this deficit amounted to approximately $2.2 billion. It was financed by the sale of $890 million in gold and $17 million of our holdings of foreign exchange as well as by an increase in foreign holdings of dollars and U.S. Government securities amounting to $653 million, and an increase of $626 million in the holdings of dollars by the International Monetary Fund.

The total outflow of gold for the 2 years 1961 and 1962 combined only slightly exceeded the outflow in the single year 1960; and the outflow in 1963 is running at a rate well below last year. Since the rise in short-term interest rates resulting from the recent action of the Federal Reserve will make it considerably more attractive for foreigners to hold their assets in dollars, including short-term U.S. Government securities, prospects are improved that increased foreign holdings of these assets instead of gold will finance a still larger share of our deficit.

9. The International Monetary Fund, however, presents a different situation. Last year the Fund's dollar holdings increased as other countries paid off their debts in dollars and concentrated new borrowings in other convertible currencies to the extent practicable. But the Fund's rules provide that, except in the case of a drawing—that is, a borrowing—it cannot hold more of any currency than was paid in at the time of original subscription (in effect, 75 percent); and the Fund's holdings of dollars have now nearly reached that level.

To meet this situation the United States has requested and the Executive Board of the IMF has approved a $500 million standby arrangement which authorizes us to draw on the Fund from time to time during the coming year. It is our intention to utilize this authority for the purpose of facilitating repayments which are expected to total about $500 million during the course of the next 12 months. When a country desires to repay the Fund, we will draw convertible foreign currencies from the Fund, paying for them with dollars. The country making the repayment will use its own dollars to buy these foreign currencies from us in order to repay the Fund. All transfers will take place at par. Thus the Fund will continue to finance a portion of our deficit by increasing its holdings of dollars and its various debtors will continue to have a simple and costless method by which they can redeem their obligations to the Fund. The alternative under present circumstances, now that they cannot pay off directly in dollars, would have been either to buy gold from the United States with which to repay the Fund, or to purchase other convertible currencies in the market with their dollars at extra cost and inconvenience.

Drawings by the United States under this new arrangement will be repayable in 3 years, with a 2-year extension available if needed. No interest will be payable, but the drawings will be subject to a one-time service charge of one-half of 1 percent.

10. EVOLUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY SYSTEM

During the past 2 years great progress has been made in strengthening the basic fabric of the international monetary system upon which the whole free world depends. Far closer cooperation among the central banks of the leading industrial countries has been achieved. Reciprocal credit arrangements have been established to meet instantly any disruptive disturbance to international payments—arrangements which successfully contained the monetary reprecussions of the Berlin crisis in 1961, the heavy pressure on the Canadian dollar in the spring of 1962, the Cuban crisis last autumn, the reaction that followed the exclusion of the United Kingdom from the Common Market, and a number of less striking events that might, in other years, have set off dangerous rounds of currency speculation. An informal but highly effective operating relationship has grown up among a number of the same countries with respect to the London gold market, ruling out for the future any repetition of the alarming rise in the price of gold which created such uncertainty in October 1960. Finally, 10 of the leading industrial countries have established a $6 billion facility for providing supplemental resources to the International Monetary Fund, which will be available in the event of any threat to the stability of the international monetary system.

The net result has been to provide strong defenses against successful raids on a major currency. Our efforts to strengthen these defenses will continue. While this process is taking place, the United States will continue to study and discuss with other countries measures which might be taken for a further strengthening of the international monetary system over the longer run. The U.S. interest in the continuing evolution of the system inaugurated at the time of Bretton Woods is not a result of our current payments deficit—rather it reflects our concern that adequate provision be made for the growth of international liquidity to finance expanding world trade over the years ahead. Indeed, one of the reasons that new sources of liquidity may well be needed is that, as we close our payments gap, we will cut down our provision of dollars to the rest of the world.

As yet, this Government is not prepared to recommend any specific prescription for long-term improvement of the international monetary system. But we are studying the matter closely; we shall be discussing possible improvements with our friends abroad; and our minds will be open to their initiatives. We share their view that the problem of improving the payments mechanism is one that demands careful joint deliberation. At the same time, we do not pretend that talk of long-range reform of the system is any substitute for the actions that we ourselves must take now.

THE PROMISE OF THE FUTURE

Full implementation of the program of action I have outlined today should lead to substantial improvement in our international payments. The rate of Government expenditures abroad will drop by $900 million over the next 18 months, and the combined effect of the increase in short-term interest rates and the interest equalization tax should equal, and more probably exceed, this figure. Gains of this magnitude—approximately $2 billion—will give us the time our basic long-term program needs to improve our international competitive position, and increase the attraction for investment in the United States.

These two objectives must be the basis of any permanent closing of the payments gap, and this program will achieve them without threatening our growth at home. It will also do so without compromising our adherence to the principles of freer trade and free movements of capital. It will, in fact, help prevent pressures for more restrictive measures. In short, while we must intensify our efforts, we can do so with full confidence in the future.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 18, 1963.*

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the President, despite the lengthy analysis, skirted the basic problems at the heart of the situation. The President seeks to cure the results of Federal control by more Federal regulation and control.

Capitalism, the private enterprise system, thrives on freedom, not Federal intervention. The tax he proposes on the flow of money is no solution.

Why does not the President and his advisers turn instead to fiscal responsibility? The President and his deficit financing advisers have forgotten the reasons for and the need for a federally balanced budget, reduction of debt, and straightforward reduction of taxes including tax rate reduction, instead of the fuzzy tortuous Presidential tax reform recommendations.

If the President really wants to reduce the imbalance of payments why does he not stop giving our money away. While we have the greatest debt in the world we continue to give foreign aid all over the world. Even our increased exports are recognized to be the result largely of our own subsidy. We give foreign nations money and they buy from us. This is artificial growth. Further, that money remaining in foreign hands can be converted into our gold at their discretion. Is it any wonder that foreign nations have built up such dollar reserves, callable in gold? Indeed, in many instances foreign nations have refused to lower their tariffs after agreeing to do so to match our reduction because they have pleaded dollar shortage. Our foreign giveaway and disproportionate support of the U.N. are instances of our inability to live within our means and exercise financial self-discipline.

It is high time the new frontiersmen and other new socialists including our President, Schlesinger, Heller, Galbraith, and others realize the imbalance of payments result from the big spending policies, deficit financing, government in business and the increasing regulation and control of our society by Federal Government, under the liberal-radical democrats.

THE PROBLEM OF OUR OUTFLOWING GOLD RESERVES

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we are vitally concerned with the problem of our outflowing gold reserves. It is no wonder we are losing gold, and our Western European allies are building gold reserves, when we look at the amount of money this Nation is spending on the defense of Western Europe. The facts become startling when U.S. spending for defense in Europe is compared to the share our wealthy European allies are spending.

During the 10-year period 1953–63, U.S. gold reserves have dwindled from $22.1 to $15.9 billion as of March 1963. By comparison, Belgium's gold reserves have risen from $0.8 billion in 1953 to $1.4 billion as of March 1963. France's gold reserves were $0.6 billion in 1953, and have risen to $2.7 billion now. West Germany has come from $0.3 to $3.7 billion in reserves. For Italy the figures are $0.3 to $2.3 billion. Netherlands has risen from $0.7 to $1.6 billion, while the United Kingdom has come from $2 billion in 1955 to $2.6 billion in gold reserves at the end of 1962.

Let us compare the percentage of total government expenditures which these nations spend on defense. The United States spends some 59.1 percent of all Government spending on defense. By comparison, Belgium spends only 12.9 percent, France only 27.7 percent, West Germany 26.6 percent, Italy only 14 percent, Netherlands 19.9 percent, and Great Britain spends some 22 percent on defense.

Mr. Speaker, our military contributions to NATO have continued, our gold reserves have been falling. I am sure the American people agree that our rich European allies should begin to bear more of the cost of their own defense, and I urge that negotiations begin soon in order that this burden will be more equitably shared.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS AND POWER

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Price). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF PUBLIC LAW 78

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry yesterday approved a 1-year extension of Public Law 78, the Mexican labor law. While the enactment of a 1-year program would be heartening to many farmers, ranchmen, Mexican workers, and the general consuming public, authority for more than 1 crop year should be enacted into law. The nonpartisan approach of a 3-year phase out introduced by my colleague, Representative Teague of California, as well as many other Members of the House, including myself, is the more feasible approach and should be enacted speedily into law. The large number of employees of the Department of Labor who are engaged in administering this program want to know what the future holds for them. They are entitled to an answer so that they may know where they will be stationed for another year. The children of these compliance officers ought to be considered as well, as September school opening approaches.

Emil Zubryn, staff correspondent for the Cotton Trade Journal wrote an article entitled, "Failure To Extend Program for Braceros Brings Divergent Reactions in Mexico." This article appeared in the Cotton Trade Journal on June 7, 1963 and is worthy of the attention and consideration of this House.

The article is as follows:

Failure To Extend Program for Braceros Brings Divergent Reactions in Mexico

(By Emil Zubryn)

Mexico City, June 1.—The refusal of the U.S. Congress to renew the bracero agreement beyond the end of this year has brought divergent reactions here.

On the one hand, the Mexican Department of Interior said the action will not seriously affect the Mexican economy or cause serious unemployment. Displaced workers can be absorbed by Mexican industry, a spokesman said.

In any case, according to the Department of State, hiring of braceros has been on the decline since 1961, when the total came to 296,225 workers. Last year this dropped to 198,322 and this year's total may plunge below 150,000.

OPPOSED EXODUS

Francisco Hernandez y Hernandez, formerly head of the National Farmers Federation, said this organization has always opposed the exodus of Mexican farmworkers who he said are needed here. Senator Alberto Medina Munoz, of Nayarit, expressed a similar stand.

Secretary of State Gustavo Diaz Ordaz said that if the bracero movement is stopped it also will create "problems" for the United States.

He said that any extension will only be considered by Mexico if certain basic requisites are met: improved salaries, living conditions, food, transport, medical service, etc.

ADVERSE EFFECTS

Mexico, however, will have some adverse effects if the bracero program is definitely ended. Officials estimate that around $35 million was earned by braceros last year, with an average of around this in the past 3 years.

It could also create employment problems. There is already talk of creating regional labor banks to siphon off excess Mexican farm labor into needed areas, or into industry.

As for the bracero himself, he was stunned by the news and by the loss of an opportunity to work in the United States from 6 weeks to 3 or 4 months.

PROBLEM AGGRAVATED

Many take the attitude that "nobody gives us work here and in rural areas the best lands are for influential well financed farmers, or for the favored few who have political backing."

The problem is aggravated further by the fact that in Mexico firms are hesitant to hire anyone over 35 years of age. Many braceros are in the 40-to-50-year age group.

> Some political leaders view the entire situation with alarm, feel that it could lead to trouble in agricultural communities.
>
> In general, the hope is that American authorities will reconsider and that the bracero agreement will be extended for at least 2 additional years.

THE KENNEDY WALL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have just obtained permission to address the House for 1 hour this afternoon, which I intend to do, on the President's message on balance of payments. In essence we have here a proposal to build the Kennedy wall to keep investment dollars from flowing to a freer economic climate. I suggest the best way to keep dollars or people from fleeing to freer areas is to free up the area which we are concerned about. The way to keep dollars here in the United States and encourage investment dollars to come here is to create the kind of investment climate that will encourage them to come and to stay here. The President has not directed his attention to this critical matter.

RAISES IN EXECUTIVE SALARIES

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, later on this afternoon I have a special order which I am sure will make interesting reading for the Members in tomorrow's RECORD.

Earlier in the year the President requested raises in executive salaries and there was considerable talk about the possibility of Members of Congress even raising their own salaries. I asked the Library of Congress to prepare for me a list of all those public officials, State, local, and Federal, whose salaries equal or exceed the $22,500 currently paid Members of Congress. The report from the Library of Congress was so inadequate and incomplete that we took it upon ourselves to do a much more thorough job in our office, and I believe we have a much more comprehensive report, which I will include in my remarks this afternoon. Included in the report will be a bibliography of the source material although I am sorry that of this date we are still waiting on the reports from 15 of the 50 States contacted. The list of public officials having salaries equal to or in excess of Members of Congress at the local and State level is indeed impressive and will make interesting reading for you all I am sure.

I do want to pay special tribute to Miss Mary Ann Jennings, of Peoria, Ill., a University of Wisconsin political science intern working in my office during the summer for her fine job in getting most of the material together for this report.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF JULY 22

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Monday is District day, and five bills from the Committee on the District of Columbia will be considered. They are:

H.R. 6128, record of stockholders of life insurance companies.

H.R. 6350, dental hygienists licensing examinations.

H.R. 6353, unemployment compensation information for District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare.

S. 489, amending small claims procedures before District of Columbia Court of general sessions.

S. 490, eliminating duplicate District of Columbia motor vehicle lien file.

I have also been advised by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] that he will call up from the Committee on House Administration four bills regarding printing:

H.R. 7043, to provide that certain proceedings of the Veterans of World War I of the United States, Inc., shall be printed as a House document;

House Concurrent Resolution 194, to authorize the printing of 322,500 additional copies of the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag";

House Resolution 428, to authorize the printing of additional copies of the study entitled "The Federal Government and Education"; and

Senate Concurrent Resolution 47, to authorize the printing for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary of additional copies of its hearings on "Effects on Young People of Violence and Crime Portrayed on Television."

On Tuesday, H.R. 7356, to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval and Air Force Academies.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week:

H.R. 7195, Federal-Aid Highway Act amendments of 1963.

H.R. 6518, Clean Air Act.

H.R. 4638, Presidential Transition Act of 1963.

This announcement, of course, is made subject to the general reservation that any further program may be announced later and that conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. I take this time, Mr. Speaker, to advise the House that upon the conclusion of the legislative program for today, if it is concluded today, we will ask unanimous consent to go over until Monday.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS ON CALENDAR WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the President's special message on the balance-of-payments problem. Toward the end of that message you will find this statement:

> As yet, this Government is not prepared to recommend any specific prescription for long-term improvement of the international monetary system. But we are studying the matter closely.

Then we go back to October 31, 1960, when Candidate Kennedy made a speech in Philadelphia, Pa., on the balance-of-payments problem and I recommend it to you for your reading, with much of which I agree.

On page 825 of the report that carries these speeches of Candidate Kennedy, he says this:

> The President himself echoes this alarm. Yet despite these warnings, and the clear trend of the preceding years, we failed to take prompt and vigorous action, and the balance of payments continued to go against us.
>
> What then must we do, what would a new Democratic administration do to reverse the present downward trend in our balance of payments?

And he lists a few.

First. It says, and it is strangely missing from President Kennedy's message today.

Quoting Candidate Kennedy he asks:

> What will a new Democratic administration's policy include?
>
> First, we are pledged to maintain a balanced budget except in times of national emergency or severe recession.

This fact is missing in today's speech. I respectfully suggest that President Kennedy read Candidate Kennedy's speech on balance of payments. I submit that the deficits of the administration contribute greatly to the balance-of-payments problem.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

CODE OF ETHICS

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been 5 years since the Congress approved the concurrent resolution which has become known as the code of ethics for Government employees. Since it was introduced by our distinguished colleague on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable Charles E. Bennett, it has become a standard of conduct for public servants, elected and otherwise, in all three branches of our Government.

So often, however, Mr. Speaker, the public forgets the codes by which men serve, and for this reason, I consider it appropriate for the Members of this body to reemphasize and reaffirm their concurrence in the principles set forth by this resolution. Although the earlier resolution adopted by the Congress covered all Government employees, it was generally believed to apply chiefly to employees of the executive branch of the Government. I want to particularly stress in this new resolution the application of this code of ethics to members of the legislative branch as well.

I therefore am introducing legislation reaffirming that the code of ethics does apply to all Government employees.

CODE OF ETHICS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate our beloved colleague for his insistence upon the maintenance of the highest possible standards in Government and that these principles apply in the Halls of Congress. He sets a good example in this himself.

The "Code of Ethics for Government Service," by its very terms applies to any person in Government service and to Members of the House and Senate. Its legislative history also shows this. It would, however, serve a very useful purpose to pass another resolution to emphasize this, as our colleague has proposed.

Although the code does have some teeth to it, because people can be hired and fired for ethical default and this code is considered in such and other disciplinary matters, it is my opinion that much ethical progress can be achieved in our Government if Congress passes a measure providing for a tribunal of some sort to hear and decide ethical questions and specific cases. I have been sponsoring legislation which would do this, House Joint Resolution 76. I have also introduced House Resolution 322 which provides a grievance committee in the House to handle specific problems which arise here. The public is impatient with Congress for its nonaction in this field and I hope that an increased sensitivity on the part of the Members of Congress may lead to early enactment of more progressive legislation in this field. It is long overdue.

MAKING IN ORDER THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5171, USE OF DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT BY FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Res. 432 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5171) to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 432 provides for consideration of H.R. 5171, a bill to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The provisions of H.R. 5171 stem from a report of the Comptroller General and the continuing concern that a full dollars worth of efficient, responsive Government be obtained for every tax dollar. In a report submitted to Congress on March 6, 1963, the Comptroller General emphasized the need for centralized management as a means of obtaining maximum utilization and economical acquisition of electronic data processing equipment, which is costly but highly useful.

Savings the Comptroller General authoritatively estimates as substantially in excess of $100 million a year can be realized through effective and efficient centralized management of the automatic data processing equipment. H.R. 5171 provides the centralized management that the Comptroller General recommends.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 432.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill comes to us by unanimous vote of the Committee on Government Operations of the House and is for the purpose of authorizing the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies.

Mr. Speaker, this bill actually results in the saving of money, which is rather unusual in this day and age. This rule which passed by unanimous vote of the committee brings the bill before us at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to say that this morning I had the unusual privilege and one which I consider a very high honor, to be permitted to participate in bringing to the floor of this House a rule sponsored by a U.S. Federal judge, my distinguished colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thornberry], who has been named by the President to become a U.S. district judge. His nomination has been confirmed unanimously by action of the U.S. Senate.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thornberry] has served with great distinction and great honor as a member of the Committee on Rules of the House. He is a man we do not like to lose from the Rules Committee of the House. We have found him to be always fair in his judgment. He is a man of great ability and of good nature. We have not always agreed across the table as to what should be done and what action should be taken in the Rules Committee on every matter that has come before it. But any disagreement that has come has been in an agreeable manner.

I am sure I speak for the minority members of the Rules Committee, and I am certain for all minority members of the House itself, when we pay our respects this morning and give honor to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thornberry], who is soon to leave us to become a U.S. district judge. We wish him well and many years of happiness on the bench, where I am sure he will render the same splendid service to his country that he has rendered to the House as a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Roberts].

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio in paying tribute to one of the leaders in the House of Representatives, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thornberry], who is going back to his first love, the field of law. Certainly I would feel that his going back to bar is a gain for that profession and a distinct loss to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to begin my remarks with an expression of deep gratitude to you personally for your splendid cooperation in making possible the project I am about to describe. And, in expressing that appreciation I am confident you will join me in thanking Dr. George W. Calver, the official physician to Congress and Mr. George Stewart, Architect for our Nation's Capitol, for their valuable assistance. Without such generous support the project would not be possible. And, without it, other and less effective means would have to be sought to bring to the attenion of legislators and the public a subject most important to the health of our Nation. My colleagues from Alabama have also given the effort every possible support. So, to all of them, Dr. Calver, Mr. Stewart, and you personally, Mr. Speaker, my sincerest thanks.

These remarks, of course, make it obvious, Mr. Speaker, that you are fully aware of the project of which I speak. And I appreciate this opportunity to inform the other Members of this distinguished body about it and urge them to lend it their fullest support and cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, something new will make a temporary appearance on Capitol Hill next Monday, July 22. And, while it will remain here only a week, I trust it will help write a permanent chapter in the already proud history of the health of our people.

This something new is a mobile unit created to detect emphysema in human beings.

The unit was designed and developed jointly by the Alabama Tuberculosis Association, the public health service and welfare agencies, the Alabama Medical Center, and 31 county TB associations in Alabama.

Of course, as a native Alabamian, and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety I have watched the development of this unit with exceptional interest and its trial use with excusable pride.

However, there are millions of people in this country—indeed, some of them may be in this very room—who are, by now, asking "What in the world is emphysema?" Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask your indulgence and the indulgence of those who do know what emphysema is while I briefly describe it. For, believe me, ignorance about emphysema is not to be considered a sign of stupidity.

The word is almost as strange in today's vocabulary as was tuberculosis 75 years ago. This, in itself, is odd because emphysema was known to our forefathers. Not, however, as it affected them. Rather it was how it affected their chief source of transportation and power—the horse. A common vexation of the day was to apparently be cheated in the purchase of a seemingly healthy animal which proved to be wind broken. Upon the slightest exertion the horse became helpless and useless.

Only in our own time has it been realized that a similar condition is widespread among men. All over the world men in increasing numbers are falling into the most frightening of all disabilities—the inability to breathe. And that is emphysema. But, you may ask, is not there more to it than that? How do you explain it?

Well, "emphysema" is the Greek word for "elasticity." As a disease it may be defined as the enlargement of the whole or a part of the lung due to loss of the lung's inherent stretch—or elasticity. Normally the lungs are very much like elastic balloons inside the hollow cavity of the chest. An individual inhales simply by expanding his chest. The lungs expand to fill up the extra space and thereby draw in air. Breathing out is accomplished by relaxing the muscles of the chest. The air is forced out of the lungs, not by the pressure of the chest wall but by the elastic recoil of every part of the lungs themselves. The patient with emphysema is still able to inhale normally, although perhaps with some effort. However, when he exhales, the air is not forced out as completely as it should be due to the loss of stretch. It must be pushed out by compressing the chest through muscular force. This is difficult and inefficient, as can be demonstrated by trying to squeeze the air out of a plastic bag with a small opening.

Emphysema usually begins in the middle or even early adult years. Its course is relentlessly progressive in the absence of treatment. And, there is no known treatment that will put the stretch back into the lungs once it is lost—any more, for instance, than can stretch be put back into a rubberband. One of the earliest symptoms of the disease is wheezing when exerting any effort. But, here is the insidious part of the ailment. This wheezing is sometimes interpreted as a sign of asthma—or heart trouble—and accepted treatment for either of these conditions meets with no success. As the disease progresses and more lung tissue becomes involved the symptoms become more severe and are brought on by less and less exertion. And, the final stage is the development of respiratory acidosis, right heart failure—and death.

Now, the logical questions at this point of my discussion are: "What is the cause of emphysema?" and "What are the possibilities for treatment?"

As for the cause, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to report that no one really knows. Many possibilities suggest themselves, of course, such as—air pollution, gasoline engine exhausts, smoking, allergies, and others.

With regard to possibilities for treatment I have the optimism to predict, Mr. Speaker, that these are unlimited. For, while treatment at the present time is very primitive by modern standards it is still possible to do much more for emphysema victims than could be done 75 years ago for tuberculosis victims when the campaign against that disease was begun.

These two answers, Mr. Speaker, because of their inconclusive nature, bring me to the main point of this discussion. It is vital to the future health of our Nation that further research be done into the causes, early detection, and treatment of emphysema. This will require the fullest cooperation and support of every citizen. And we, in the Congress, have it within our power to lead the way.

Starting next Monday morning and remaining all week the mobile unit designed to detect emphysema in its early stage will be parked on the House side of the east front of the Capitol. Going through it to determine whether one has emphysema takes only a few minutes of well spent time.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, there will, no doubt, be some who say that a Congressman could not possibly have emphysema since he's so long-winded anyway.

But seriously, Mr. Speaker, I invite you and my colleagues to visit the emphysema mobile unit some time next week—the earlier the better.

The device in itself is a milestone in medical research. From it strides of unknown length can be made, the least of which will be the adding of many fruitful and productive years to the lives of millions who now are not even aware that an insidious killer may slowly be sapping their strength. Even in its early stage emphysema can seriously impair the ability to work and take much of the joy out of living.

So, I urge every Member of Congress to visit the mobile unit next week. To repeat—it will be parked on the House side of the east front of the Capitol. It will require only a few minutes for the actual test and the few minutes each of us spend in it will be well worth our time personally and will set a fine example for everyone to follow in future years. I might add that the reports on the tests will be forwarded to Dr. Calver or whomever you designate to receive them. They will be personal records, not to be made a matter of public record.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 99]

Abernethy
Ashbrook
Belcher
Blatnik
Bolton,
  Frances P.
Bonner
Buckley
Byrnes, Wis.
Celler
Clancy
Clausen,
  Don H.
Clawson, Del
Conte
Daddario
Dague
Davis, Tenn.
Diggs
Donohue
Edmondson
Forrester
Frelinghuysen
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gill
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Hagen, Calif.
Hawkins
Healey
Hemphill
Hoffman
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Keith
Kilburn
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Lesinski
Long, La.
McCulloch
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Miller, N.Y.
Morrison
Moss
Nelsen
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
Pepper
Philbin
Pillion
Pirnie
Powell
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Roybal
St. Onge
Schwengel
Scott
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Smith, Va.
Staebler
Stephens
Taft
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Trimble
Ullman
Wharton
White

The **SPEAKER.** On this rollcall 350 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MAKING IN ORDER THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5171, USE OF DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT BY FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON RESEARCH DATA PROCESSING AND INFORMATION RETRIEVAL CENTER

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Research Data Processing and Information Retrieval Center of the Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Committee on Government Operations for bringing out this measure which covers a very important part of our budget, a part which is going to become increasingly costly. We are talking about an item now that probably runs over $500 million a year. A decade ago probably there was nothing in the budget in this area, or very little. This amount can mushroom under proper and efficient development to where the bill of the Federal Government is $1 billion. If there is any way in which at this relatively early stage of the game we can produce some efficiencies in the method of procuring this automatic data processing equipment, it behooves us to do so. The big areas, of course, of utilization are Defense, Space, and Atomic Energy. Incidentally, the Joint Economic Committee on which I serve became aware of this problem coming in through the area of our concern for economic statistics, which is an important purpose of these data processing machines, but very definitely those agencies compiling these data are minor users in comparison with the other governmental agencies.

The only other point I would like to make on the rule itself, and again expressing my commendation to both of these committees for bringing this matter to the floor of the House is to call attention to a very important aspect: Whether or not we are going to have the money to buy or to lease the additional data processing equipment we need, because we are talking again, I want to point out, in terms of hundreds of millions of dollars. We certainly will have these funds if we will do what is being done in the private sector of our economy. This is something of a harsh thing. These are the kinds of machines that are removing thousands of jobs. The efficiency that one obtains in the private sector from the use of these machines is due to the fact that the payrolls are reduced. I have seen little evidence of any understanding of this point on the part of the executive branch of the Government that the savings have to be reflected in cuts in personnel.

Fortunately I am able to end on a happy note. If we will only look at this business of automation we will realize it creates more jobs than it displaces, but the newly created jobs are frequently 100 or 1,000 miles away from where the jobs that have been made obsolete exist. They are frequently, and in fact usually, in different fields of endeavor and under different jurisdictions of the unions who have carved out in the past their particular areas of jurisdiction. Hence a very difficult human, political, and social problem arises in adjusting in this amazing era of automation. The Federal Government must start dealing in terms of economic efficiencies if we are going to be able to pay for these gains in efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the people handling the bill on the floor a question or two about the discretionary authority. I turn to page 2 of the bill under the proviso that begins on line 17 which reads as follows:

> *Provided,* That the Administrator, in his discretion, may delegate authority to lease, purchase, maintain, or operate individual automatic data processing systems or specific units of equipment when such action is necessary for the economy and efficiency of operations, or when such action is essential to defense or security.

May I ask the gentleman from Texas or the gentleman from New Jersey this question: Who makes this decision as to whether or not an exception is warranted which is essential to defense or security? Who makes that decision under the legislation as reported?

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, may I answer the distinguished gentleman from Michigan who has done such an effective job in military matters in the great Committee on Appropriations? His question is, as I understand, who would make the decision when something is essential to defense or security that some other agency would lease, purchase, buy, or otherwise utilize a given data computer?

Mr. FORD. That is correct.

Mr. BROOKS. Under this legislation it would be the Administrator of the GSA, when sufficient evidence is presented to him that a delegation of authority is justified for security or defense or for efficiency or economy. It is expected that a decision would be forthcoming promptly from the Administrator. In the discussions with the GSA and the Comptroller General there was no question about the simple justification of a large number of scientific and technical data computers that would obviously be for unique defense and security purposes, and which were really beyond the ken of the average computer expert and can justifiably be classified as specialized equipment. This is in keeping with the purpose of this legislation.

Mr. FORD. I can see considerable merit to the overall desire of those who want to achieve greater efficiency and economy in the utilization of this very expensive equipment. On the other hand, there are areas where automatic data processing systems are highly specialized for a specific program and which could not be adapted to broad utilization. Some such equipment is set up for intelligence evaluation, and for a number of other highly classified operations. I should certainly hope that the Administrator of General Services would understand such unique circumstances and would not preempt the utilization of this kind of equipment for various nonrelated jobs.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the expression of hope of the gentleman, but I remind him that the language of the bill, and even the answer of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], are unequivocally that the power and the control and the discretion are vested in the Administrator of GSA. And there is not any explanation that is going to obviate that plain intent and meaning of the law.

Mr. FORD. The only answer I can see, and I have read some of the testimony before the committee, is that the final authority would rest in the Executive Office of the President. In this case I suspect that would be the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Is that understanding correct?

Mr. BROOKS. Of course, the Administrator of FSA is appointed by the President and the Bureau of the Budget works with him on any such decision. I think without question anybody would understand that it would be, as the gentleman has explained, quite essential and obvious that certain of the installations in this country would be used on a part-time basis. This in itself should not indicate that they are not being utilized as fully as circumstances demand.

As the gentleman from Michigan has indicated, certainly nobody would attempt to say that this is a waste of money. It might be totally standby equipment vital to certain agencies.

Mr. FORD. On page 26 of the hearings there appears a statement that the Comptroller General suggests there ought to be a minimum of exemptions passed on by the Administrator. I do not want more exemptions than are necessary, but I do not want to hamstring the Department of Defense, the CIA, or any other agency that is involved with defense or security just because the head of the GSA wants to use an iron fist on this matter. So I hope from the comments of the gentleman from Texas and others some guidelines may be given to the head of the GSA so that he understands the needs and the problems of these most important agencies.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Kluczynski].

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

A RECORD OF GREAT ACCOMPLISHMENT AND LOYALTY

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express to you and to every Member of the House, sentiments which are particularly close to your heart, Mr. Speaker, and are shared by every Member of the House of Representatives.

I refer to and call attention to the fact that on July 18 of this year Eugene T. (Gene) Kinnaly will have completed 45 years of service as secretary and administrative assistant to two distinguished Members of this body, and particularly that he has served as the first assistant and good right hand to our beloved Speaker since 1928, when Speaker McCormack first arrived in Washington, as Congressman representing the 12th Massachusetts District.

Forty-five years of continuous and loyal service to his country, his Congressman, to all Members of this House and the citizens of the 12th Massachusetts District is an outstanding and unique record and contribution of which every man who greatly admires him, rejoice with us in spirit that Gene continues to serve. I am sure he will as long as he is physically able.

Today's testimonial merely marks the passage of time in a long life of great usefullness to his fellow man. We are happy to know it will continue indefinitely.

Those of us who have known Gene Kinnaly intimately, have always been impressed with his loyalty to his chief, the thoroughness and reliability he constantly demonstrates in every task he undertakes, and in striking manner the warm and friendly personality, which he shares with everyone who calls at the Speaker's office.

Every one from the most humble to the most prominent, is immediately struck by his sincerity, his desire to help everyone, and the easy, quiet, and efficient manner in which he accomplishes every responsibility.

Gene Kinnaly probably knows more about how to get things done properly through Federal departments and agencies, has developed through the years probably more friends in these departments than any congressional staff member. He is undoubtedly better and more favorably known to Members of this body than any other person serving in a similar capacity.

I know I am speaking for hundreds of Members and former Members of this House when in their behalf I offer our warmest congratulations for the splendid service Gene has rendered to us all, our most sincere best wishes and hopes that he will continue in his present duties for the Speaker for many years to come, and how pleased we all are to count him as a valued friend.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following gentlemen may extend their remarks in the Record at this point—the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority leader [Mr. Albert], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Martin], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keogh], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Murphy], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Bates].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join the gentleman from Illinois in this word of tribute to a great American, my friend, Eugene Kinnaly. After 45 years on Capitol Hill, there is little about its operations, past or present, or its history, that is unknown to Eugene Kinnaly. He has served as our great Speaker's right-hand man for 35 years, and for 10 years before that he served as assistant to the late Honorable James Gallivan, of Massachusetts. The fund of knowledge he has acquired over more than four decades has made him an indispensable aid to the Speaker and a great servant of the House. Gene has a stupendous acquaintance with everything that has to do with the House of Representatives, ranging from parliamentary procedure to personnel. He is also a fine lawyer and a fine gentleman.

The House of Representatives has undergone some drastic changes during the momentous years Gene has been here. As its duties became heavier, its responsibilities more wide ranging and complex, Gene has continued to learn, to sharpen his talents, and to dispense his skilled services unstintingly to his own Members, to other Members of Congress, and to staff and committee employees.

Forty-five years is only the beginning in the career of a man of Gene's energy and ability.

He is one of the institutions of the House. I hope we may have the benefit of his talents for many years to come.

I wish him health and happiness and many more years of satisfaction in doing the work I know he loves.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with this tribute that is being paid here today to a grand person, Gene Kinnaly. During the many years I have known him, no one could have been more accommodating and helpful to me than he has been. We all realize the importance of good staff work, especially in these days when the Congress is facing increasingly heavy responsibilities to the country.

Certainly Gene Kinnaly has proved his worth to the Speaker and to all of us who have occasion, from time to time, to call on him for information.

His long record of service represents a career of outstanding loyalty and dedication to the Congress. I congratulate him and wish him many more useful and happy years.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join those of my colleagues paying tribute to one of the most remarkable public servants in the history of this Congress, Eugene T. Kinnaly.

Gene completes 45 years of congressional service today, which makes him the dean of the present staff here on Capitol Hill and which must be very close to an alltime record of service to the House of Representatives.

My own administrative assistant, James N. Milne, recently completed 38 years of service with me, a long and wonderful association; but Speaker McCormack's assistant surpasses our record. Gene Kinnaly today completes 35 years with the Speaker, but he preceded the Speaker to Washington with his prior service to Congressman James Gallivan.

I wish for Gene and the Speaker many more years of good health and great service to the Congress and to the people of our country.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I find it gratifying that the Members of this House are taking the time to give this public recognition to one of its most able and likable employees, Eugene T. Kinnaly. I am personally pleased to join with my colleagues in this unusual tribute.

His long service of 35 years with our beloved Speaker, after earlier service with the late Representative James A. Gallivan, of Massachusetts, has brought him to the favorable attention of almost every Member of the House and has gained for him their high respect. His gracious response to every request for assistance is a characteristic of his gentlemanly nature.

It has been my pleasure to have known Gene Kinnaly for many years. I fervently hope that, now having completed 45 years of honorable and effective service, he will choose to remain with us for years to come and that during those years he will have the blessing of good health and everything he desires. I heartily congratulate him today.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I consider it an honor to pay tribute to a devoted public servant and our good friend, Eugene T. Kinnaly. His tireless work in the House of Representatives has continued for 45 years. The citizens of Massachusetts are proud to call him a native son.

Gene Kinnaly has been a part of the Congress of the United States through the administrations of eight Presidents. He has served this House through 20-some Congresses. He arrived here to work as secretary to the late Congressman James A. Gallivan, of Massachusetts, with whom he was associated for 10 years. In the 35 years since then, he has been the confidant and administrative assistant to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable John W. McCormack, our present Speaker of the House.

We are reminded of the remarkable record of Gene Kinnaly in length of service, but we cannot forget the more remarkable part of that record, which embraces the enduring character of his accomplishments. He meets each day, each person, and each task with friendliness, unhurried assurance, and open honesty. Few are endowed with his spirit of helpfulness.

Pressures do not bring a distraught atmosphere to Mr. Kinnaly's being. Many have praised him for his courteous disposition and the retentive memory that works best when under pressure.

His knowledge of the intricate network of government makes him a valued assistant. His diplomacy is exemplary. His calm disposition is a joy.

Gene has always been devoted to his job, but not in a narrow sense which excludes the bigness of the problems to be met. Members of Congress have sought his advice and always carry away a lasting impression of a warm and true friend. He understands the workings of a democracy.

It is with genuine pride that I extend to Eugene Kinnaly my congratulations and wish for him many years of continued success. We are glad to have him in our midst.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there are few occasions, I think, that have given me greater pleasure or more satisfaction than this particular one. Mr. Eugene Kinnaly, the distinguished gentleman to whom I am about to pay tribute, has been with us in this great House for 45 years on this day. For 35 of those years, he has been the able and devoted right hand of the man who is now our Speaker, the honorable and distinguished Representative from Massachusetts, JOHN MCCORMACK.

Gene Kinnaly, as he is so well known to most of us, has served our House and our Speaker for nearly half a century with a devotion and a vitality that have made him a credit to both. I am sure that my colleagues will take it as no slight when I say that I know of few in these chambers who are held in higher esteem by all than Gene Kinnaly.

And so, Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and an honor of the highest order for me to join in the plaudits of my fellow Representatives today and pay tribute to a gentleman who has served this House so well for so long. With our recognition, I want him to know that he has gained the highest regard and respect of the Members of the House, and we all hope he will be with us at least 45 more years.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Capitol Hill, as a secretary, 23 years ago, I knew the employees much better than I know the Members of Congress. These were my first friends and my longest and the memories of them I deeply cherish. It was from the actions of these people that I recognized the truth and significance of that old phase, "the power behind the throne."

There was John Andrews, of Salem, Mass., later to become the Clerk of the House of Representatives. John's desire to serve was too great for the stamina required and more than his body could endure.

There was Ivan Hedin, secretary to our former colleague, Dick Wigglesworth, of Massachusetts, and who was rich in wit and service, and whom we sorely miss around these Halls.

There was Jimmy Milne, until recently secretary to our beloved former Speaker, JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts, and who helped JOE in his long years as Republican leader.

Massachusetts has another son, for years a close friend of the triumvirate from Massachusetts referred to above. I refer, of course, to Gene Kinnaly, for 45 years a secretary on Capitol Hill and for many years assistant to our esteemed Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Gene is a quiet man but ever ready with a gentle smile and kind word. My association with him is something I always will treasure. He is a deeply religious man and ofttimes I note, at noontime, that he and his friend, Jim Guinea of Congressman KLUCZYNSKI's staff, wind their way to St. Peter's Church near the Capitol for a few moments of meditation.

Gene has long been one of the most effective behind-the-scenes worker I have ever known. I am sure that his counsel, experience and judgment have been invaluable to our Speaker in the many trying problems of his office.

He is all of this and more but most important of all to me is that I am privileged to call him my friend.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to join my colleagues in commending the longtime, invaluable aid of our distinguished Speaker, Eugene T. Kinnaly, who is completing 45 years of outstanding and devoted service on Capitol Hill.

Always friendly, helpful, considerate of others, he enjoys the high esteem and affection of Members of the House, his fellow staff members, and all who know him.

In expressing my great pride in the tremendous, memorable record which Gene Kinnaly has accomplished as a congressional secretary and administrative assistant, I take great pleasure in extending to him and his family my heartiest congratulations with my good wishes for many more happy anniversaries and choicest blessings for many more years of success, happiness, and accomplishment.

As secretary to the late, colorful, and highly esteemed Congressman James A. Gallivan, Gene Kinnaly came to Washington as a young man to carve out an enviable career of effective and devoted service to his district, State, and Nation.

Ten years quickly sped by and then began Gene Kinnaly's long, illustrious career as administrative aid to our distinguished and beloved Speaker, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, taking on new and most important tasks and duties through all the vicissitudes and changing currents of national politics and world events.

As aid to the Speaker, he stands at the very top of his great profession, making invaluable contributions to the Congress and to the Nation. Capable, loyal, completely devoted to his job, Gene Kinnaly is a skilled professional who has gained tremendous knowledge of Federal affairs, a sure, competent grasp of affairs in his district and the country, a flair for getting things done easily and quickly that stamp him as one of the most outstanding in his field.

All of us in Congress who have come to know Gene Kinnaly are aware of the great contributions he has made during the many years of his service on Capitol Hill. He has won a legion of friends in and out of public life and enjoys the respect and esteem of his associates, the constituency he serves, a wide range of public officials, employees of the House of every rank and station, and people in all walks of life who have come to know him and who cherish his friendship.

I rejoice with the many friends of this able, zealous, and dedicated worker on this happy occasion and join with very many officials, associates, and people in wishing for Gene Kinnaly all the blessings and graces of good health, success, and happiness that the good Lord may bestow.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is a particular personal pleasure for me to join with my colleagues in this special tribute to Mr. Eugene T. Kinnaly, administrative assistant to our beloved Speaker, who is today beginning his 46th year of congressional service.

"Gene," as he is affectionately known to all of us, personifies the highest tradition and ideal of an exemplary congressional assistant. He is supremely capable, intensely loyal, and devotedly patriotic in his service to the country in his congressional assistant capacity.

Despite the tremendous workload that we know is his responsibility, he always has time to guide the newer and lesser experienced secretaries in the discharge of their particular duties, and he has given counseling words of wisdom to untold Members here whenever called upon.

Gene's superior and developed talents shine through his modest personality, and his kindly nature and disposition are a byword on Capitol Hill.

Here is a man who has dedicated himself to patriotic service for his country for 45 years, and there are few indeed who can match his unique and inspiring record.

We are happy to salute you today, Gene, and join in our most earnest wishes that the good Lord will keep you with us, in continuing good health, for many more years of your fruitful work.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my few words to the many that are being paid in sincere tribute today to Gene Kinnaly on the 45th anniversary of his service to the Congress of the United States.

Gene has an unrivaled record, I believe, as a congressional secretary. Those of us from Massachusetts, of course, are proud that many of his years on the Hill have been spent as the chief aid to our esteemed Speaker of the House.

I know that I speak not only for myself, but for literally hundreds of Members of Congress and staff assistants when I say on this significant occasion "thanks, Gene," for the many times you have given freely of your good counsel and effective talents.

Men of such character and devotion to public service are rare and the Congress, indeed the Nation, is indebted to Eugene Kinnaly.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the wealth that man accumulates is not in the gold that is mined from the earth, but in the gold that is in the friendships engendered by his words of gentleness and sympathetic understanding, his deeds of helpfulness, his spirit of humility and humanness. By this measure Gene Kinnaly is one of the richest men on Capitol Hill.

In the 45 years he has been a part of the life of the House he has made new friends every day and never lost an old one. I join with my colleagues in a salute of admiration, affection, congratulations, and good wishes to Gene Kinnaly.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure and privilege for me to offer my most sincere and heartfelt congratulations to your administrative assistant, Eugene T. Kinnaly, upon the completion of his 45th year of service here in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Gene has long been a very dear friend of mine. A tireless worker and an outstanding administrator, Gene Kinnaly is also a very warm and understanding person whose close friendship and timely advice I deeply value. Knowing him is one of the pleasant experiences you enjoy here in Washington.

I can only hope and fervently pray that God will continue to shower His blessings on Gene and that happiness and good fortune will follow him all the days of his life.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the service of Eugene T. Kinnaly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Hechler].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks] whether the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was consulted as to the advisability of this legislation and whether that agency was asked for its opinion.

Mr. BROOKS. The answer to the gentleman's question would be that they have not been. However, the Comptroller General of the United States who is the chief accounting officer of the Congress investigated this complex problem with reference to all of the Government agencies, including the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. So, while it has not been directly consulted, the ADP utilization problems and practices of that agency were taken into consideration by the Comptroller General of the United States and were reflected in the recommendations contained in his March 6, 1963, report.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. As I understand the question of the gentleman from West Virginia, he asked whether this matter went to the space agency?

Mr. HECHLER. That is correct. I am merely interested in whether the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was given the chance to express its views on the pending legislation.

Mr. JOHANSEN. The witness for the space agency testified before the Census and Statistics Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and he expressed his views in response to a direct question on this matter and was in total opposition to this type of approach.

Mr. HECHLER. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5171) to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5171, with Mr. Ashley in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks] is recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Wallhauser] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this measure which was unanimously approved by the Committee on Government Operations on June 19, 1963, and reported to the House on the same day, has a direct and specific purpose. The enactment of this measure will provide the necessary organization and authority for effective, centralized and coordinated acquisition and utilization of costly automatic data processing equipment on a Government-wide basis.

Mr. Chairman, according to authoritative evaluations of the Comptroller General, the centralized management as provided for in H.R. 5171 will result in sound, accountable and direct savings substantially in excess of $100 million a year. The Comptroller General in his report and in his testimony before the committee states that these savings can be realized through centralized, coordinated management which, in turn, will make possible, first, higher utilization of equipment now on hand and, second, more economical acquisition of equipment in the future.

Mr. Chairman, efficient and economic utilization of this costly equipment requires that it be used on a maximum round-the-clock, three-shift basis. Equipment now used by the Government is utilized only a little more than one shift a day, on an average.

Mr. Chairman, enactment of this bill will almost immediately result in an increase in utilization and, therefore, result almost immediately in substantial savings to the taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5171 will also make it possible to develop an economical Government-wide acquisition program. At this time, today about 85 percent of this equipment is leased. The Comptroller General has indicated in the most recent of a series of audit reports submitted to Congress on March 6, 1963, and in testimony before the committee that there are significant benefits to the Government in the selective purchase of many automatic data processing systems and components.

The Administrator of the General Services Administration would carry out this centralized management program which is comparable in many respects to other property management and centralized procurement responsibilities previously delegated to him by the Congress. Agencies would state their automatic data processing requirements to him and make payments to a revolving fund created under this bill. With the funds so deposited the Administrator would then either purchase or rent necessary equipment to fulfill individual agency needs.

Mr. Chairman, among the amendments adopted by the committee is one which would include automatic along with electronic equipment. Also the program was amended to cover equipment used for and at the expense of the Government in the execution of contracts and other agreements. These amendments were recommended by the Comptroller General.

The committee also added provisions for an annual report to the Bureau of the Budget and to the Congress relating to expenditures from the GSA-administered revolving fund created under this bill.

Mr. Chairman, there is without any doubt, based upon the extended reports made by the Comptroller General, who is the chief accounting officer of this legislative body, that hundreds of millions of dollars can and should be saved if we pass this bill. The Comptroller General stated without equivocation that we could save $148 million in the first 5 years of this program and $100 million each year thereafter. I asked him if this was a sound statement. He said without equivocation, that he thought it was a very conservative estimate of savings that could be achieved through the passage of this legislation.

The March 6, 1963, report of the Comptroller General is the latest comprehensive evaluation of Government automatic data processing utilization submitted to

Congress. It is not the first, however. His recommendations for centralized management of automatic data processing equipment go back to 1958 when he originally made a general recommendation of this kind. Following 2 years of inaction by the executive branch, he reiterated his recommendations in stronger terms in 1960. Following 3 further years during which there was no significant improvement, he restated his recommendations in March of this year. This March 6, 1963, report is one of the strongest and most forceful reports the Comptroller General has ever issued concerning a problem so simply and obviously subject to solution. According to the authoritative figures contained in the Comptroller General's report, and his testimony, the taxpayers of this country are losing approximately $10 million every month a centralized, coordinated program applicable to all Government agencies is delayed in implementation. It is essential that Congress act swiftly and decisively to provide the administrative machinery by which these significant sums can be saved.

Under provisions of H.R. 5171, the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to provide central management of Government automatic data processing equipment. The General Services Administration, which is under the direction of the Administrator, is an operating agency of the executive branch especially created by Congress to perform centralized procurement and property management functions. H.R. 5171, which is an amendment to title I of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, therefore constitutes a logical extension of duties comparable to those which this agency performs.

Under this centralized management program, legislative review and control of Government automatic data processing operations can also be greatly improved. The Comptroller General has predicted an ever increasing rate of growth in the use of this equipment in Government. He has suggested:

> We are discussing here a fixed charge on the Government. This is very much like the fixed charge on the debt. What we are seeing here is growing into what * * * will be a major fixed charge which cannot be reduced and which will probably grow and properly so if we are going to control what goes on in the Government.

Use of automatic data processing systems in Government has increased from 414 in 1959 to 1,169 in 1963, and it is estimated that this figure will increase to 1,600 by the end of 1964. Furthermore, the Comptroller General testified that use of automatic data processing equipment in Government will increase more in geometric rather than arithmetic progression and that he does not expect that utilization will reach a plateau in the near future. At this time, budgetary appropriation requests for hundreds of millions of dollars spent each year by Federal agencies and other users for such equipment are scattered throughout the Federal budget, making it difficult for Congress and the Executive Office of the President to maintain effective budgetary control. Following approval of H.R. 5171, comprehensive information from one source will be available to the Bureau of the Budget, to the substantive committees of Congress, to the Appropriations Committees, and to the Committees on Government Operations, as well as to the Comptroller General. The utilization of this information will assure both the executive and the legislative branches of proper policy and fiscal control over this ever increasing expenditure of taxpayers' funds.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5171, which has been explained to you, in general, by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS]. It seems to me that we have an obligation to the people we represent not only to refuse to appropriate money for projects that we do not consider to be in the public interest but also to attempt to save some money. This bill gives us one grand opportunity to do just that.

The title of the bill really is the key to the whole program, and I would like to read it to you, because it sums up in one sentence the purpose and why we should all support it:

> A bill to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies.

This is not a new proposal. The General Accounting Office has been making studies and recommendations since 1958. On March 6, 1963, it made a very strong recommendation that a centralized purchasing and management agency should be set up. The General Services Administration is exactly this.

Under the act of 1949, on the recommendation of the Hoover Commission and by act of Congress, it was designed to procure and manage real and personal property. It seems to me this falls within that category. We have the statement of the Administrator that no huge staff will be added. He claimed he had sufficient technicians in his own department and could utilize technicians from other agencies now employed by them and, with the help of representatives of private industry, he could come up with the answers required for the various agencies without adding a great deal to the staff. Individual studies would have to be made to determine if it would be financially advantageous to the Government to purchase or to continue to lease if no purchases were made. Even if we continued as we are the utilization of the equipment we now have on a 24-hour basis, or as nearly to that as possible, it would be a big step forward and, as the gentleman from Texas emphasized, studies made on about half of the present equipment indicated a substantial saving of $140 million would be made in the first 5 years of its operation and more than $100 million a year after that.

Most of the equipment used by the agencies is general-purpose equipment, something like a typewriter or adding machine. It should be set up in such a manner that any other agency can come in and utilize the equipment the same as any other recording apparatus.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, this bill has great merit.

I would like to say the Comptroller General in his studies has emphasized the need for it, but up until now no definite program has come out of these recommendations. He regarded them as essential.

If you will read the March 6, 1963, report by him, it would seem quite evident that we should pass this type of legislation.

I would like to close by reading one answer to a question. During the hearings the Comptroller General was asked the following question:

> Mr. Campbell, in light of this, do you feel that these poor utilization conditions, including the question of lease versus purchase, could be improved by having the kind of central coordination that is provided in this bill, H.R. 5171?

Mr. Campbell, the Comptroller General of the General Accounting Office, an arm of the Congress, responded in this way:

> We are convinced of it. We hope that this will be done. This is one of the most serious problems the Government is facing in this area.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this measure will be supported and that this very worthy bill will be passed unanimously. I would hope that the Members give it careful consideration, because, as I said at the outset, we do have an obligation to attempt to save money in the operations of the Government as well as in not appropriating that for which there is no need.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. I would like to rise in support of this bill and to commend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER], and other members of this committee, for bringing this bill to the attention of the House. I think we should be very aware of any efforts that this House can exert to effect substantial savings in the operation of Government. This seems to me to be one of those areas in which we can be most effective. Therefore I rise in support of the bill and commend the committee for the work it has done in this respect.

Mr. Chairman, the bill, H.R. 5171, now before us has my full support. I believe its passage will reflect the interest in this body of maintaining effective and efficient management over the utilization of automatic data processing equipment by the Federal Government. Further, a direct consequence of this improved managerial function will be a substantial saving of taxpayer funds.

This bill vests authority in the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies. The centralized management provided by this bill is authoritatively estimated by the Comptroller General of the United States as realizing a saving substantially in excess of $100 million a year.

Just as private industry has made increasing use of automatic data processing systems in recent years, so has the Federal Government benefited from the advantages these systems possess. Use of automatic data processing systems in Government has increased from 414 in 1959 to 1,169 in 1963. It is estimated that by the end of fiscal year 1964, approximately 1,600 systems will be in use.

The Comptroller General has reported that 85 percent of these systems are leased without comprehensive evaluation as to the benefits to the taxpayers which might be gained through purchase. As no statutory requirement now exists to maintain effective budgetary control over the hundreds of millions of dollars spent each year by Federal agencies and other users for the equipment, legislative review and control of Government automatic data processing operations obviously suffers.

Another problem inherent in the present absence of centralized management is that Government agencies are not fully utilizing automatic data processing equipment at this time. An inventory report of the Bureau of the Budget made in August of 1962 reveals numerous examples of extremely low use of this equipment. Central coordination, as provided by the instant bill, can almost immediately begin to achieve savings by increasing the utilization of automatic data processing equipment the Government now has on hand.

It is noteworthy that the Administrator of General Services has testified the coordinated program provided by H.R. 5171 should not require a large increase in his agency's management staff. Additionally, implementation of this program is expected to result in a lessening of personnel requirements of user agencies.

For the economy and efficiency which would result from this measure, I urge its favorable consideration.

I also commend my colleagues on the Government Operations Committee for the excellence of their work in preparing this bill and reporting it to the House.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNYDER. I was just curious as to the definition of "data processing equipment." What does it constitute?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. It includes more than electronic equipment. It includes equipment other than electronic equipment.

Mr. SNYDER. It does not get into the office electric typewriters, and things of that nature, does it?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. No, sir.

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I am one of those who served on the committee at the time the General Services Administration Act was enacted, which goes back to 1949. I followed with a great deal of interest during the years the progress of this agency. I would like to ask the gentleman if he in his opinion feels that the projected savings that this proposal will make are really genuine or not.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I firmly believe they are genuine, yes.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey has consumed 8 minutes.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill we are considering today offers us an opportunity to gain more effective control over an area of Federal expenditure that is already quite significant and becoming more so every day.

There are nearly 1,200 different automatic data processing systems in use in the Government this year and there will be 1,600 by the end of 1964. The annual cost to the Government of renting and purchasing this equipment runs well into the hundreds of millions of dollars.

Decisions as to the type of equipment to be acquired, the manner of acquisition, the degree of utilization, and the time and nature of disposition are now made, for the most part, by the individual using agencies. There is a minimum of coordination among them.

The Comptroller General of the United States conducted a study of this growing problem, and, as a result, expressed the belief to the committee that substantial savings would be possible if these decisions were made, from the standpoint of the needs of the Government as a whole, by a centralized management agency, rather than by the individual using agencies.

The Comptroller General informed the committee that by purchasing more of this equipment rather than leasing it, for instance, the Government could effect potential savings in excess of $148 million over the next 5 years, with possible savings of $100 million a year after that. He also indicated that additional savings could be made by more effective utilization of this equipment within the Government once it has been acquired.

In other words, there is a pressing need for more effective Government-wide coordination of the acquisition and utilization of this equipment. The committee concurs in the belief that this can best be accomplished by centralized control of these functions, and that is precisely what this bill will accomplish.

There is one aspect of this proposal that will bear careful watching in the future. That is the impact of this bill on the tactical and classified operations of the Defense Establishment. The committee determined, and I think wisely so, that the fewer the exceptions to GSA's authority the better. But the committee does recognize the problem that could arise by removing control of equipment that is an integral part of a vital defense system from the Secretary of Defense and placing it in an outside agency. The bill does not except the Defense Department specifically, but it authorizes the Administrator of GSA to delegate his authority when such action would be essential to defense or security.

I think it is reasonable to assume that any irreconcilable conflict between Defense and GSA over the control of the former's use of automatic data processing equipment would be resolved adequately at higher levels. Nevertheless, I do want to point this potential problem area out to my colleagues as one that will bear careful watching.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of this Subcommittee on Government Activities, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], for his courtesy in extending me this time to speak in opposition to this bill. It is with regret I must take this position, for I have the highest regard for my dear friend from Texas.

I am against H.R. 5171 for the reason that though its intention is the best intention, it is too sweeping and would tend to retard the development of a growing and developing science. That is what computers are. This is not a case of adding machines, or typewriters, but this is a growing science that has not been standardized at all. To place a lid on it in the form of an agency that is not associated, let us say, with the specific duties of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is, in effect, taking the very duties of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and transferring them to the General Services Administration. That is how sweeping, I think, this legislation is.

This bill would authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and control the purchase, lease, maintenance, and use of automatic data processing equipment by or at the expense of the Federal agencies, and to operate or provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise of such equipment. Some of the Members of Congress are very familiar with this legislation and some are not.

Therefore, I shall furnish a little background. We are talking about electronic data processing systems which frequently are referred to as giant brains, robots, monsters, or just plain computers. We are talking as well about conventional punched-card machines. The main emphasis, however, is on the larger gear; that is, on the electronic data processing systems. You may have heard them referred to as Univac's, Ramac's, Edvac's, Maniac's, Lark's, Stretch'es, 7090's, 301's, and a host of other names and numbers assigned by the manufacturers.

The Bureau of the Census was the first Federal Government agency to use one of these systems for a business-type application. That was in 1951. This has grown, however, to where in 1963 there were 1,248 such systems in use in the Federal Government with a total cost annually of $704 million. The range of the rental cost of one of these systems per month is from $1,000 to over $100,000. The purchase price range is from $25,000 to $7 million and up.

At one time all of the systems could be purchased or rented except IBM. Presently and for the past several years IBM systems also can be purchased or rented. The purchase-option method can be used in all cases.

The argument is and has been: Is it more economical to purchase or to rent these electronic data processing systems? This is what the Brooks bill is all about. In an effort to solve the purchase versus rental problem, it would centralize in GSA the control of the procurement and utilization of electronic data processing systems throughout Federal Government.

I am opposed to the bill and would like to take a few minutes to tell you why. I am hopeful that my remarks will adequately describe the shortcomings of the bill and that for these reasons you will join in opposing it. As you know, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee's Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics, of which I am chairman and of which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] was chairman in the 87th Congress, has some jurisdiction in the electronic data processing equipment field in the Federal Government. We have carried out our responsibilities diligently. We have had hearings on this subject for a total of 5 days. Consequently, I believe that we are in a fair position to know what should be done and what should not be done in regard to electronic data processing systems.

At the outset, I should like to point out to you that I do not object to the intention of the bill, but I do object to the basic elements of the bill and its sweeping misassignment of responsibilities. The bill authorizes the General Services Administration, in effect, to run the electronic data processing activities of the Federal Government, a job the General Services Administration cannot do. The bill simply overguns and overkills the electronic data processing problem and could easily make matters worse instead of better. There are problems enough with the experts throughout Government trying to manage electronic data processing, and I cannot see how one service agency could do it.

Let me get down to specifics. H.R. 5171 is intended to take action on the recommendations made in the March 6, 1963, report of the Comptroller General of the United States to the Congress titled "Study of Financial Advantages of Purchasing Over Leasing of Electronic Data Processing Equipment in the Federal Government." The report indicated that the Federal Government potentially could save $148 million over a 5-year period if it were to purchase rather than lease more of its electronic data processing equipment. The report estimated an additional annual savings of $100 million if the machines were used more than 5 years.

The Comptroller General recommended also the means of accomplishing the savings. I quote from the letter to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives which accompanied his report:

> We believe that, to fully realize savings of such magnitude, basic changes in the Government's overall management system will be necessary. Decisions as to the financial advantages of purchasing will have to be made from the standpoint of the Government as a whole, and not primarily from the standpoint of individual using agencies as has been the practice in the past. In addition, more attention needs to be given to obtaining more complete utilization of the equipment acquired. We believe that the only practicable way in which the kind of coordinated management can be practiced to achieve the possible financial savings cited is through the establishment of a small, highly placed central management office in the executive branch of the Government. Accordingly, we are recommending to the President of the United States that he establish such an office in his organization.

I supported the Comptroller General's recommendation in my remarks on the floor of the House on March 18, 1963.

Now, on the other hand, the report of the House Committee on Government Operations—No. 428—states, and I quote:

> H.R. 5171 provides the centralized management that the Comptroller General recommends.

I want to assure you that it does not.

Page 3 of the report goes on to say:

> This authority would be exercised under the overall authority of the Executive Office of the President and the Bureau of the Budget in the exercise of traditional budgetary and policy control.

In my opinion, this is a complete dilution of what the Comptroller General had in mind.

Still, strangely enough, General Campbell favors the Brooks bill, but he seems to consider it as assigning only housekeeping functions to GSA and still wants the policy guidance in an office in the President's organization. This is covered in General Campbell's testimony before our subcommittee. General Campbell, in his enthusiasm to save money, and each of us wants to do that, somehow overlooks the sweeping provisions of the bill which go far beyond housekeeping functions. This is the great danger in this bill. Some seem to think that it provides for a few essential functions, whereas in actuality the bill gives sweeping authority to the GSA.

For my part, based upon the facts, I submit to the Congress that the Comptroller General's recommendation of a central management office in the President's organization and the Brooks bill, which places the authority in GSA, are two different things. Not only are they different per se, but they are different as a matter of practical application.

A central management office in the President's organization would be in a position to carry out the functions that the Comptroller General has in mind. The President's office is the place to make decisions which affect departments and agencies across the Federal Government. I think you will agree with me that it is too inconceivable to think of the Administrator of the General Services Administration telling the Secretary of Defense, the Postmaster General, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and others how they can or cannot operate their departments. Automatic and electronic data processing is a rapidly growing science not presently capable of standardization. Each executive agency has a different problem and develops a different computer for that different problem.

It is quite likely that the proponents of the Brooks bill would tell you that the Administrator of GSA would not attempt to tell General Day, for example, about automating the Post Office Department, but I want to point out to you that such authority for the GSA Administrator is specified in the bill where it gives him the control of the utilization of electronic data processing systems.

Similarly, I am certain that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], in his bill, does not intend that GSA take over the operation of all of the electronic data processing systems in the Federal Government. Still, H.R. 5171 states that the Administrator of GSA is authorized and directed, among other things, and I quote:

> To operate or provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise, of such equipment.

Now, our Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics has held five hearings during the course of the last month on the subject of the use of electronic data processing equipment in the Federal Government. You will recall also the hearings the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] held on the subject in October 1962. After listening to the testimony in these hearings, I can report to you that there is a lot more to the electronic data processing problem than the Brooks bill covers. Mind you, I am not saying that utilization and acquisition of electronic data processing systems are unimportant, but I am saying that the Brooks bill goes about the task in the wrong way and deals with only one of the many problems involved. This is what we have faced in the electronic data processing area time and again. Someone seizes upon a problem here and seizes upon a problem there and never considers the whole picture. The Brooks bill is a case in point. It deals only with the computer hardware. People in the industry are becoming more and more aware that we have been overconcentrating on computer hardware and that we should start paying some attention to the people who make it go. According to figures supplied by the Department of Defense, for example, we spend just as much money for the personal services in computer work as we do for the machinery.

So, when and if we legislate on the electronic data processing problem, we want to consider the human element, the standardization of this equipment, and improved management in general and not just selected areas.

Some of the other subjects that should be included in action taken on electronic data processing are: A study of pricing to find out why certain relationships exist between purchasing and leasing, improved progress in the use of automatic programing languages, attention to assignment of full responsibility for electronic data processing matters in departments and agencies, attention to the level at which the electronic data processing activity is placed in the agency's organizational framework, the establishment of indexes for telling us what we are saving by using electronic data processing, and improvement in general of the reporting and statistics relating to electronic data processing equipment.

In opposing the Brooks bill and in asking you to join me in this opposition, I do not mean to ask you to oppose something with nothing. At the next meeting of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee which is to be held on August 1, as chairman of the Census and Government Statistics Subcommittee, I will have a proposal to present for the committee's approval. I can tell you now that at this point in time we do not see the need for legislation. This does not mean that eventually some legislation will not be required, but at the present time we see the need for a high-level Presidentially appointed group—including Members of Congress, Federal executive agencies, industry, and general public—to place all of these matters under study and to report back to the President and to Congress with their findings. We have already been in touch with representatives of the Budget Bureau concerning this proposal, and I have been informed that Special Projects Funds of the President's Office are available for this study. At our August 1 meeting I plan to present for full committee approval a draft of a letter which our chairman—and I hope—with the support of the full committee will send to President Kennedy. I can asure you that these electronic data processing problems require advice and counsel of unquestioned competence and authority—the very best brains that this country can bring to what is now called the electronic revolution.

Mr. Chairman, I think you will agree with me that it is unreasonable to think of the Administrator of General Services telling the Secretary of Defense, the Postmaster General, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and others how they can or cannot operate their departments. Automatic and electronic data processing is a rapidly growing science, not presently capable of standardization. Each executive agency has a different problem and develops a different computer for that different problem.

I submit that we should have a longer study of this problem before we impose any restrictions or limitations on the development of this wonderful new science.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON] a member of the committee.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] that the purpose of this bill is economy and efficiency and to save the American taxpayers some money. There is no intention in the bill to retard the growth of science in the particular field of data processing equipment.

The Federal Government is not involved to any great extent in the development of data-processing equipment. The more sophisticated equipment that was referred to by the gentleman from Montana could be easily exempted under this bill, as provided on the bottom of page 2. So I do not think the advance of science in this field is going to be hampered in any respect if we enact this legislation. The end result is that we are going to save a large quantity of money. If there is a special instance involved, a particular piece of equipment can be provided for the agency concerned.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield

Mr. STINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Would the gentleman be in favor of the General Services Administration operating the equipment for the Defense Department and the Space Agency?

Mr. STINSON. Did I understand correctly that the gentleman asked if the GSA should operate the equipment?

Mr. GARY. Yes. The bill says so. That is the objection I have to the bill. It says it shall control and operate the equipment. How about operating equipment designed for the Defense Department for specific purposes of defense?

Mr. STINSON. The legislative intent is not to accomplish that purpose but merely to coordinate the operations of the various pieces of equipment that are scattered throughout the Government and to get full utilization of the equipment.

Mr. GARY. If that is made plain in the bill, I would have no objection to it personally, but I would have to oppose it otherwise.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I will say to the gentleman it is not plain in the bill. It cannot be made plain without rewriting the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have requested this time in order to give to the membership of this Committee the benefit of such special knowledge of this question as I have gained by virtue of my activity on the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

A few weeks ago the chairman of my subcommittee, the gentleman from West Virginia, the Honorable KEN HECHLER, referred to me for my attention a certain report to the Congress of the United States by the Comptroller General.

This report had been sent to the chairman of my committee by the Comptroller General by a letter of transmittal dated June 11, 1963, and went to considerable length to point out that in the opinion of the General Accounting Office, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration had, during a period of over 2 years, made overpayments in excess of a million dollars for rentals on automatic data processing equipment.

In fulfillment of the request of my subcommittee chairman to look into this matter, I conferred for the better part of an afternoon with Mr. D. T. Spaulding, president of the Federal Systems Division of the International Business Machines Corp., and another officer of his company, during which time he was kind enough to acquaint me with the nature of the problem and many of the difficulties involved in an accurate determination of the problem of automatic data processing rental charges.

A few days after our conference, I received a letter from Mr. Spaulding stating that although there were no adequate records in existence upon which to make an accurate assessment in the matter, the IBM Corp. had nevertheless agreed to adjust the matter by paying the sum of $1,100,000 to the Government.

My discussion of the problem with Mr. Spaulding very soon led me to the conclusion that the matter was far more complex than it seems when it first meets the eye. In the first place, you heard the word "system" used during the discussion on the floor today in the talk about automatic data processing equipment. "System" is really the word for it. I do not have time to go into this fully, but I want to make a slight stab at drawing a parallel.

Let us say we have the mission of giving photographic coverage to a series of events here in Washington. We order movie cameras, flashbulbs, tripods, all sorts of film, miniature cameras, press cameras, many types of lenses, and accessory equipment of various kinds and description.

If we had a particular mission to fulfill, let us say to photograph a parade, we might decide we needed a movie camera but no floodlights and no flashbulbs, a tripod to hold the camera steady and a telephoto lens. We would put those things together and we would have brought into existence a particular camera system which would appropriately serve our mission of photographing a parade.

Every agency of the Government has its own particular mission to perform. To perform that mission they need not only many different kinds of automatic data processing equipment—they need to put together widely variant automatic data processing systems, composed of various combinations of the components that go to make up such systems.

Examples of such components are computers, memory units, power units, multiplexers, and tape drives, many of which are identical. Also there are card punches and card readers, not to mention such items as consoles and magnetic tape.

I serve on the Committee on Astronautics which has to do with NASA and that is why I have come in contact with this problem. But, NASA has no monopoly in this field and neither does any agency. An IBM official was quite frank to say that his company is constantly encountering new problems with reference to the leasing and selling of this equipment to private industry. It is virgin territory. There is much ground that has not been covered, and such difficulties are no reflection upon anyone. But there is a pressing and urgent need for some agency in Government to develop specialized knowledge in this field, and to bring about economic use of these machines. Great waste is possible and I daresay great waste is going on in every department that uses this automatic data processing equipment. I think this bill will enable one agency to develop a competence that will enable it to decide what system may be necessary to perform a given job. The taxpayers stand to benefit greatly by such an arrangement.

I want to ask the chairman of this subcommittee one question. Is it your view that this bill, as now drawn, would enable the General Accounting Office to ride herd upon the mission of any agency in Government?

Mr. BROOKS. May I say in reply to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, that certainly the General Accounting Office as the accounting arm of this Congress has the authority to investigate any agency of Government.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Let me restate the question. I really did not mean the General Accounting Office, I meant the GSA, the General Services Administration. Is it the opinion of the chairman of this subcommittee that this bill would grant the General Services Administration the power to ride herd on NASA?

Mr. BROOKS. No, not in any way. Actually, to be quite candid about it, the bill would provide the authority to have the General Services Administration act as purchasing agent for the various agencies on the basis of the needs of those agencies and their requirements for these automatic data processing machines, and they would buy the equipment and supply the equipment.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 100]

Abernethy
Ashbrook
Auchincloss
Bass
Belcher
Bonner
Broomfield
Buckley
Byrnes, Wis.
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Conte
Daddario
Dague
Derwinski
Diggs
Donohue
Edmondson
Evins
Farbstein
Foreman
Forrester
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Griffin
Hagen, Calif.
Hansen
Harding
Harsha
Healey
Hemphill
Hoffman
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Kilburn
Knox
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Lesinski
Long, La.
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Miller, N.Y.
Morris
Morrison
Mosher
Moss
Nelsen
O'Brien, Ill.
Philbin
Pillion
Powell
Rains
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Roybal
St. Onge
Schwengel
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Smith, Calif.
Staebler
Stephens
Taft
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Trimble
Utt
Wharton
White

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ASHLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5171) to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 350 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, as ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5171.

It is never my intention to be disrespectful of either the prerogatives or the performance of any other committee.

In this instant matter, however, I must be very blunt.

In terms of both legislative procedure and the content of this bill, we have a situation reminiscent on two counts of the patent medicine salesman at the carnival.

Procedurewise, we have his "hurry, hurry, hurry" tactic.

One single day's hearing was held by the Government Operations Subcommittee on this bill. Two witnesses were heard—the Comptroller General of the United States and the Administrator of General Services Administration. I should point out that the latter was very much a party of interest, since his agency would acquire the enormous power delegated in this bill.

What is even more to the point and even more shocking in this "hurry, hurry, hurry" tactic is that not a single one of the Government agencies nor any representative of private industry who are principal users and suppliers of automatic data processing equipment—including enormously complex and sophisticated automatic data processing systems—was called or heard.

Now the bill comes to the floor of the House under a 1-hour rule.

Furthermore, no real effort was made to correlate the Government Operations Subcommittee action with the very intensive and extensive hearings conducted by the Census and Statistics Subcommittee. While this latter subcommittee has been carrying on hearings and issuing reports on the broad subject of automatic data processing since the 86th Congress, in recent weeks, since the issuance of the Comptroller General's March 6, 1963, report, it has been focusing attention on questions of lease versus purchase and questions of strengthened Government-wide policy for acquisition and utilization of this equipment. This latter series of hearings was completed only Monday of this week, and the report now is in preparation. Yet, for all practical purposes, the Government Operations Subcommittee has acted as if this subcommittee and its labors had never existed. I know as a matter of fact that it has not even seen the transcripts of hearings in which these matters were fully discussed.

I think it goes considerably beyond any question of jurisdiction to suggest that the Census and Statistics Subcommittee may have some information and judgments in this matter worthy of the consideration of this House. I think it is obvious that this consideration cannot possibly be given under the limitation of time and the cavalier treatment of this complex and costly matter involved in these "Hurry, hurry, hurry" tactics.

I said at the outset that this was reminiscent of the carnival medicine man on two counts. I come now to the second point.

There is not the slightest evidence, either in the 1-day hearings or the committee report of the Government Operations Subcommittee, that the nostrum they are peddling will really cure the ailment.

On the contrary, there are good reasons for believing that it will aggravate rather than alleviate the condition.

Let us take a close look at the patent medicine we are being asked to buy on a "hurry, hurry, hurry" basis.

Let me point out first of all the enormous grant of power which this bill delegates to General Services Administration.

> The Administrator is authorized and directed to coordinate and control the purchase, lease, maintenance, and use of automatic data processing equipment by, or at the expense of, Federal agencies, and to operate or provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise, of such equipment.

The committee report comments, apropos of written objections generously incorporated in the committee's printed hearings, from various agencies, but otherwise totally ignored:

> Opposition to H.R. 5171 may center upon a misinterpretation as to the extent of the Administrator's authority.

I see no basis for misinterpretation of the language I read. It is a total grant of authority. Indeed the addition in committee of the words, "or at the expense of" means that GSA authority would extend to automatic data processing equipment in the hands of private contractors doing Government business.

Now let us consider this enormous grant of power in the light of two or three facts:

Under existing laws and regulations GSA already has authority to process Federal supply schedule contracts for lease of ADP equipment. This means it does the routine work necessary to implement equipment requirements of the respective agencies. What has been the GSA record on this score? I read from the June, 1962, report of the Comptroller General:

> In the past, several months have elapsed between the expiration of 1 year's schedule contracts for the rental of electronic automatic data processing equipment and award of the next year's contract. During these months, no contract terms were in effect. When the new contracts were awarded, the terms were made retroactive to the effective date. These time lapses have caused difficulties such as, (1) unnecessary administrative expense for GSA and the agencies using the contracts and (2) problems in the areas of budgeting, purchasing, paying, and maintaining machine utilization records in the agencies using the contracts.

I am informed that such delay cost one important supplier $500,000.

This is the record of GSA in handling the paperwork. I submit that it does not recommend transfer of vastly broader, substantive authority to GSA.

Consider another aspect of the matter. During the 1-day hearing conducted by the Government Operations Subcommittee, Mr. Boutin, the GSA Administrator, was asked by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD] this pertinent question:

> Do you have in GSA at the present time personnel who are capable of analyzing these tremendously difficult machines and these difficult processes and the varying needs of this department or that department?

Mr. Boutin replied:

> We do have substantial in-house capability right now * * * how many additional people would be required, I could not tell you. It would be minimal.

The facts are that Mr. Boutin further testified that GSA now has 481 persons in the agency for its own automatic data processing operations. Let me say right now that this agency which is going to save the Government millions of dollars by purchasing these computers has never purchased one itself. In fact, the 10 computers it has on hand at the present time are all leased. To suggest that the vast functions involved in exercise of the Government-wide control of automatic data processing called for in this bill would involve only a minimal increase in GSA personnel is too preposterous to even argue. Either this bill means nothing, or Mr. Boutin fails to comprehend the responsibility he would acquire, or he was something less than frank with the committee.

One further point. The Comptroller General, in recommending "overall policy guidance and direction" of automatic data processing, proposed that it be directed from the Office of the President.

This led to the following colloquy between Mr. Boutin and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], as follows:

> Mr. BOUTIN. We have a close and everyday liaison with the President and his Office.
>
> Mr. BROOKS. You do not think he would be reluctant to call you and say, "Bernie, we have got to get together on this now." You would be there.
>
> Mr. BOUTIN. It is not unusual to have the telephone ring and have the voice come on and say, "This is the President" and go right into what he has in mind. He is not bashful.

Time does not permit further comment on this exchange.

The heart of this issue goes to the distinction between overall policy guidance—which, I may say, under the proddings of the Census and Statistics Subcommittee, the Comptroller General, and the Bureau of the Budget, is presently being provided and constantly improved—and actual planning, acquisition, and operation of this equipment by a central agency.

Remember we are talking not just about simple punchcard machines. We are talking about complex automatic data processing systems used by the Atomic Energy Commission, by the Department of Defense for defense against nuclear attack, and also by NASA.

With this fact in mind, it seems to me obvious that the views of departments and agencies responsible for scientific and technical use of this equipment are not only highly relevant but absolutely essential. It seems to me that their views need to be explored in depth and not handled in the perfunctory fashion of routine letters introduced into the appendix of the hearings record. Evidently, the Government Operations Subcommittee does not share this view.

The Census Subcommittee does hold this view, however, and I include a few excerpts of testimony which have been given before the subcommittee.

One statement was made on June 24 by Mr. John P. Abbadessa, the Controller of the Atomic Energy Commission:

> Implementation of a program should rest with the agency that has responsibility for the program. In the AEC, a large percentage of our computer work is done in the scientific area. These are very complicated machines and complex applications. We cannot conceive that a central group elsewhere in the Government could discharge this responsibility efficiently.

As to control of contractors by such a central group he added that he felt it would result in administrative costs that could outweigh any economies that would be gained.

On July 15 in response to my questioning on the proposal incorporated in this bill, Mr. John D. Young, the Director of Administration for NASA, voiced his emphatic opposition. He said that he believed the effect would be to diffuse responsibility and accountability. He urged further clarification of guidelines by the Budget Bureau, and continuation of the work that GAO is doing.

And then Mr. Young added this significant comment:

> I think that if tight control were given to the GSA or to the Bureau of the Budget in terms of our use of computers, there is a real question, in fact there would be no question that we could not meet flight schedules at the rate that we are trying to meet flight schedules today.

Here are just a few more comments taken from testimony by department and agency representatives before the Census and Statistics Subcommittee.

Mr. Harold Seidman, Acting Assistant Director, Office of Management and Organization, Bureau of the Budget:

> I would strongly object to any arrangement whereby the control of automatic data processing equipment was put in some agency other than the one responsible for its operations.

Mr. A. T. Bishop, staff director, Data Systems Division, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense:

> We are aware of certain proposals which would greatly centralize control over the acquisition, management, utilization, maintenance and operation of all automatic data processing equipment in the Federal Government. Performance of these responsibilities is a prerequisite to effective control over operating Defense programs. The Department opposes such proposals which would vest these responsibilities in another agency and interfere with vital command relationships.

Mr. O. Glenn Stahl, Director, Bureau of Programs and Standards, Civil Service Commission:

> In view of the very size and complexity of Government operations, I personally would tend to shy away from any heavy emphasis on centralization of such processes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe my record in this House will justify any suspicion that I am hostile to economy or that I favor bureaucratic proliferation, expansionism, or empire building.

We are getting a fast sell on this bill on the alleged grounds that it will prevent waste and improve efficiency of automatic data processing operations.

I think we had better take a second look. I think we need to remember we are dealing with something a little more complex than procurement of paper clips.

Otherwise, we may find to our sorrow that we are compounding instead of curing the evils which concern us all.

There is an old warning about rushing in where angels fear to tread.

I think that warning is appropriate this afternoon. Again, I urge defeat of H.R. 5171.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to say to the gentleman that I agree completely with the position taken by the gentleman. And, is it not a fact that the General Services Administration will have complete control over the operation of these machines and the purchase of these machines, whatever department is involved?

Mr. JOHANSEN. That is precisely what the bill says, and there cannot be anything else under this bill.

Mr. JENSEN. And further than that, the General Services Administration charges 10 percent commission on everything they purchase for any other agency. They then take that money, put it into their own fund and spend it at will without asking Congress. So, to that degree you have back-door spending in this bill.

Mr. JOHANSEN. There is a great deal involved from the financing angle in this bill that needs to see the light of day before we vote on it.

Mr. JENSEN. And, if the gentleman will yield further, to my memory every time in the past any agency asks to reorganize and buy such machinery, they say it will save personnel. However, the record shows that the very next year they ask for more people.

Mr. JOHANSEN. The gentleman is right.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. Will the gentleman tell us how many departments of Government are opposed to the bill? I have found some here, but I am wondering if the gentleman would list them for us.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I can tell the gentleman from Texas from my own knowledge that these include the Department of Defense, the Post Office Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, and NASA, among others. I know about that many.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, and also to commend its author, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas has a nose like a bloodhound for searching out waste and inefficiency in Government. And when he finds waste he expresses himself in a salty way which does not always endear him to the bureaucrats who are more interested in preserving their particular petty empires than they are in rendering service to the taxpayers at the least cost.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] is a member of a subcommittee, the members of which, on both sides of the aisle, are dedicated to the proposition that it is sinful if the taxpayer does not receive a dollar's worth of service for each dollar of tax he pays. You or I might disagree about whether the Federal Government should embark upon a particular new program, but we can all agree that any program which the Government does carry on should be carried out as efficiently as humanly possible. We can all agree to support a savings of dollars which does not reduce any essential Government service. That is the purpose of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is an economy vote. But it does not involve any philosophical concept other than the concept of efficiency in Government. This bill represents a $100-million-a-year savings. As soon as this program becomes fully effective it will mean a savings of $100 million per year.

Mr. Chairman, I have said that I thought it was sinful if the taxpayer does not receive a dollar's worth of Government service for every dollar's worth of tax he pays. If this expensive equipment is not used on a three-shift basis, the taxpayer does not receive 100 cents on his dollar. But what are the facts? Twenty-four percent of this equipment is used only on a two-shift basis. The taxpayer is getting only 67 cents worth of Government out of each dollar of taxes. But even worse than that, 70 percent of this equipment is only used on a one-shift basis, one-third of the time which it should economically be used. Therefore the taxpayer is getting only 33 cents worth of services out of his tax dollar.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a sinful waste of the taxpayer's money, and I believe that H.R. 5171 should be enacted in order to eliminate this sin.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, it was suggested a few moments ago that this was a hurry, hurry, hurry bill. The investigation in regard to electronic data processing equipment in executive agencies was begun back in 1958 and a report was delivered to the Congress in 1960. I carry here to the well of the House with me four reports that we have received on the Government Operations Committee from the General Accounting Office with respect to the use of this equipment by executive agencies for the purposes of effecting savings. I would not be standing here, you can believe me, Mr. Chairman, if I did not firmly believe that this would effect savings of not less than $100 million.

Are we going to concede that private industry can have electronic data processing centers and utilize these machines full time, but the Federal Government is not capable of that action? That is essentially what we are deciding here today. Certainly, the individual agencies do not want to surrender the control they have over this equipment, the spending of the money which goes into automatic data processing equipment and the employees who operate it. But is that efficiency? Efficiency means for us to provide the maximum for the dollar paid by the taxpayers, and the maximum use of this equipment by the fewest number of employees.

GAO made one investigation in the Chicago area with regard to the distribution of VA checks. When they put in the electronic data processing equipment they consolidated six regional offices. Now they have one office instead of six. What else happened? They lost 76 employees. That is too bad. But this example shows how coordinating use of automatic data processing equipment can result in an efficient operation, and that is what we are trying to accomplish here today.

I do not know how long we must study these problems in order to come up with an answer, but it seems to me that 3, 4, or 5 years ought to be enough. We have received reports from the General Accounting Office which we have had an opportunity to study and read. Thereafter, the General Accounting Office recommendations have been put in the form of a bill which we have here today and which we should be able to act on and we should act favorably on this bill.

Another objection has been made to certain language in this bill with regard to delegating authority. That is an essential part of the bill and should remain. If the GSA were not permitted to delegate authority to the Department of Defense with respect to its own specific automatic data processing equipment, we would be shortchanging the Department of Defense. Also, we have provided that GSA may operate such equipment just as all the other agencies can operate it. The GSA may operate such equipment for itself or for other agencies. These are the essential parts of the bill.

Now, these are essentially the objections that have been cited. The committee has considered all of these objections, and we adopted this bill as a full committee. We are now recommending the bill to the Congress for enactment for the purpose of saving not less than $100 million.

We should be interested in that.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. May I ask the gentleman if he is not aware that GSA is already operating some 10 units of its own and this allocation of authority to operate is on a Government-wide basis, not with respect only to GSA?

Mr. McCLORY. This is in a proviso which applies to GSA. There would not be any harm in GSA operating the equipment, if it could do it, for other agencies of the Government.

The Space Agency uses electronic data processing equipment. The use of ADP equipment by all Federal agencies was investigated and reported to the Congress in 1960.

According to that report the Department of Defense had most of these machines or systems. They had 626 out of 1,006. Now that total has gone up to 1,200 systems, as they say. But there is no reason why the Department of Defense cannot keep theirs. That is why the authority is given in the bill to delegate to the Department of Defense and all other agencies to lease, purchase, maintain, and operate automatic data processing equipment. This is essential under a clear interpretation of the bill.

This is a good bill, and it should be passed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does this saving of $100 million presuppose the use of this equipment by the various centers working on a round-the-clock basis?

Mr. McCLORY. On a much fuller basis. That is the recommendation of GAO. If we are not going to accept the recommendation of GAO to effect savings, then we better find some other agency to look to. This amount of $100 million is the figure given us by GAO.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has not come close to answering my question.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI].

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5171.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Operations, House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I am intensely interested in anything that affects the Post Office Department. It appears to me that this bill, giving authority to the Administrator of the General Services Administration over automatic data processing equipment, places authority outside of the Post Office Department to make decisions about and to generally interfere with postal operations. I could not possibly agree with such an arrangement.

I should like to read a letter dated May 9, 1963, to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget from Frederick C. Belen, Acting Postmaster General, in which Mr. Belen comments on H.R. 5171.

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1963.
Hon. KERMIT GORDON,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GORDON: This is in reply to the request of the Assistant Director, Legislative Reference, for the views of this Department with respect to H.R. 5171, "to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies."

The Post Office Department does not favor the establishment of a central control organization for the procurement or management of electronic data processing equipment for all Federal agencies.

The use of electronic data processing equipment is vital to the day-to-day conduct of the Post Office Department business and is considered to be an essential administrative sanction of the Department.

While the bill would permit the Administrator of General Services Administration, in his discretion, to delegate the control of electronic data processing equipment in certain cases, we believe that because an exceptionally high degree of responsiveness to the data processing needs of the Department is required, it is imperative that all phases of administrative management of the equipment, personnel, job schedules, and contact with vendors remain under the direct control of the Postmaster General or his designated representative.

This Department is currently participating in the experimental regional sharing plan for electronic computers sponsored by the Bureau of the Budget. The Department intends to continue in this effort in order to help secure maximum utilization of data processing equipment. However, it is not considered advisable to relinquish authority over the management of this function since data processing services are fundamental responsibilities of the Postmaster General.

This Department would not be opposed to the establishment of an electronic data processing fund provided such fund is available for the purchase of electronic data processing equipment if an economic evaluation of the relative costs of lease against purchase indicates that it is to the best advantages of the Government to purchase equipment and further, that the fund is available to support extraordinary one-time expenses for data processing services which may from time to time occur.

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK C. BELEN,
Acting Postmaster General.

I fully support Mr. Belen's remarks and I daresay this bill would have a similar unfavorable effect on most of the executive departments and independent agencies. Letters of the type of Mr. Belen's from the various departments and agencies bear me out on this.

Mr. Chairman, we would do great damage to the automatic data processing program of the Federal Government by passing this bill. H.R. 5171 certainly should not pass the House.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I have no more requests for time.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned about this bill. As most of you probably know, the Treasury Department has been a leader in the use of electronic data processing equipment. As chairman of the subcommittee that handles the appropriations for the Treasury Department and the Post Office Department, I have been working on the problem of data processing equipment for a long, long time.

By the use of data processing equipment in the Treasury Department we have saved millions of dollars; and I mean literally millions of dollars. Without the use of electronic equipment in the Post Office Department the vastly increased volume of mail could not be handled today. About 2 years ago we gave to the Bureau of the Budget, whose appropriations are also handled by our subcommittee, $50,000 to study the very questions covered by this bill.

Frankly, I am thoroughly in sympathy with the purposes of the bill, but I think it goes too far. I think we need a central agency to coordinate the purchase, lease, and maintenance of this equipment, because as it is now, with each department making its own contracts with the manufacturers, they cannot secure as favorable contracts as a central agency could negotiate.

But this bill says, and I read:

> The Administrator is authorized and directed to coordinate—

That is all right—

> and control—

What?—

> the purchase, lease, maintenance, and use of automatic data processing equipment by, or at the expense of, Federal agencies, and to operate or provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise, of such equipment.

Now, to give the General Services Administration the right to use and operate this equipment in the Department of Defense, in the Atomic Energy Commission, in NASA, in the Treasury Department, in my judgment is absolutely all wrong. What do they know about operating this machinery in the Defense Department? Instead of saving money they would have to have technicians who are familiar with the technical aspects of every department of the Government.

This machinery is scattered all over the United States. We are not dealing with just a few machines here in the city of Washington. They are broadly scattered. Right now the Internal Revenue Service is establishing data processing machinery in their seven regional centers for processing income tax returns. They requested nine but our subcommittee recommended reducing the number to seven, which will save several million dollars. This equipment will be set up in each of those seven regions. Now, is the General Services Administration going to have people in each of those regions to control the operation of that machinery? If so, they will have to employ numerous technicians. If the words "control" and "use" and "operate" are stricken from the bill I will vote for it. I think we need some central agency to coordinate the purchase, leasing, and maintenance. But unless some amendment is adopted to strike out the control, use, and operation by the General Service Administration I shall be compelled to vote against it. I think it is fantastic to talk about giving the General Services Administration control over the use of this machinery in the Department of Defense or in the Central Intelligence Agency, and other sensitive agencies of the Government.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I think my distinguished colleague who just preceded me made an eloquent case for the legislation. There is very little I can add to that case except to say this: that the question of central purchasing and the question of standardization has been a problem which has plagued all levels of the government starting with the municipality, to the Federal Government.

When you get to a budget the size of the one which we must consider here, the problem of central purchasing and standardization is so gigantic as to shake your imagination.

In our Committee on Government Operations we have been dealing with this problem, as have other committees of this body, for a considerable time. I forget the exact number of items used by the Federal Government, but as I recall it is over 3 million. The problem of standardization is so complex that by the time you standardize you have so many new items of inflow into the pipeline that you cannot keep up with the standardization.

In an effort to save money, everyone is in agreement on the desirability and necessity of central purchasing. True, these machines are not of the same category as screwdrivers, yet it has been admitted here that you can within the limit of a single agency make more efficient and more economical use of these machines by proper programing and otherwise. It makes good business sense to adopt these practices within the agency itself. Why is it not good business, good sense, and good logic to do so on a Government-wide basis where applicable, where necessary, and where feasible? That is what we seek to do with this legislation.

Certainly the equipment suppliers would love to have the competition that exists now among all the agencies of Government. Certainly every agency of Government would like to have the best and the newest of equipment, whatever it is, no matter how little they utilize it in space or time. But this is not economic.

I do not mean by that that we ought to eliminate the right of the agency to have its own requirements. The bill specifically provides that they submit their requirements and the purchasing will be done to meet those requirements. But that does not mean that where practicable and possible, if there is a common use or machines can be put to a common use, the General Services Administration should not have the authority at least to try to make this kind of common-use purchase, this kind of common-use leasing, and this kind of common-use management.

No one anticipates that in cases of special military requirements men are going to be taken out of uniform and civilians from the General Services Administration will be sent down to the various stations and posts to operate the machines. That is not the intent of the legislation.

Therefore, I would submit that the theory of central purchasing which the Hoover Commission tried so hard for so many years to get into Government, and that our own committee has fought for so diligently, should be put into effect. Here is a brand new area, expanding like a mushroom, where the bureaus and agencies themselves, the General Accounting Office and others, have recognized that we must do something now before it gets out of hand, before all of these new systems get into the agencies and are fixed to the point where you will never have the opportunity to achieve standardization or common use. The time is now to get some action on this problem. That is all we seek to do.

I have cosponsored this legislation by my bill H.R. 7559 and I urge the passage of it by this House.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, in considering the various proposals contained in H.R. 5171, it is important that we recognize the significance of placing the coordination and control of all Federal electronic data processing equipment under the General Services Administration. In addition we must recognize the far-ranging effects of this bill on the executive agencies and private industry as well as the projected saving indicated by the General Accounting Office.

The General Services Administration has a difficult time controlling and administering its own internal data processing system now. Should we burden it further with the task of coordinating the programs of other agencies? It is beyond estimation at this time how large a staff will be required by GSA to administer the program proposed here. Furthermore, the agencies using the equipment would completely lose their prerogative to select the equipment which will best perform a particular job. This is particularly important when the Nation's security is involved as it is in the defense and space efforts.

This bill will also have a detrimental effect on the competitive spirit which is only now developing in the computer industry. Contrary to the point of view of the Comptroller General in the hearings on this bill, it is not always to the best advantage of the Government to purchase automatic data processing equipment, nor is it always wise to use the equipment 24 hours a day. There are many situations in which it will be to our advantage to reexamine the competitive equipment available and select new computer hardware instead of purchasing existing equipment. The Government must examine the feasibility of purchase in each individual case.

The enactment of this legislation would bring about a huge windfall to the company which presently is the largest supplier of systems. This would discourage competition in the industry and lock that company in for an indefinite period of time.

Finally, the legislation would, I think, discourage technological advancements. The purchase of existing equipment would prevent for some time Federal Government participation in the fruits of the imaginative and productive research now carried on by all companies in the computer field.

I must therefore, Mr. Chairman, oppose this measure. It will not bring about in the long run the savings claimed for it and it may instead set back the cause of progress in this vital contemporary industry.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title I of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended, is hereby amended by adding a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 111. (*a*) The Administrator is authorized and directed to coordinate and control the purchase, lease, maintenance, and use of electronic data processing equipment by Federal agencies, and to operate or provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise, of such equipment. Electronic data processing equipment suitable for efficient and effective use by Federal agencies shall be provided by the Administrator through purchase, lease, transfer of equipment from other Federal agencies, or otherwise and the Administrator is authorized and directed to provide by contract or otherwise for the maintenance and repair of such equipment. In carrying out his responsibilities under this section the Administrator is authorized to transfer electronic data processing equipment between Federal agencies, to require joint utilization of such equipment by two or more Federal agencies, and to establish equipment pools and data processing centers for such joint use when necessary for its most efficient and effective utilization: *Provided,* That the Administrator, in his discretion, may delegate authority to lease, purchase, maintain, or operate (1) general classes of equipment, (2) equipment of special design needed to fulfill some unique requirement or special purpose of a particular Federal agency, and (3) equipment necessary for national defense and security.

"There is hereby authorized to be established on the books of the Treasury, an electronic data processing fund, which shall be available without fiscal year limitation for expenses, including personal services, other costs, and the procurement by lease, purchase, transfer, or otherwise of equipment, maintenance and repair of such equipment by contract or otherwise, necessary for the efficient coordination, operation, utilization of such equipment by and for Federal agencies.

"There are authorized to be appropriated to said fund such sums as may be required which, together with the value, as determined by the Administrator, of supplies and equipment from time to time transferred to the Administrator, less any liabilities assumed, shall constitute the capital of the fund: *Provided,* That said fund shall be credited with (1) advances and reimbursements from available appropriations and funds of any agency (including the General Services Administration), organization, or persons utilizing such equipment and services rendered them, at rates determined by the Administrator to approximate the costs thereof met by the fund (including depreciation of equipment, provision for accrued leave, and where appropriate, for terminal liability charges and for amortization of installation costs, but excluding, in the determination of rates prior to the fiscal year 1966, such direct operating expenses as may be directly appropriated for, which expenses may be charged to the fund and covered by advances or reimbursements from such direct appropriations) and (2) refunds or recoveries resulting from operations of the fund, including the net proceeds of disposal of excess or surplus personal property and receipts from carriers and others for loss of or damage to property: *Provided further,* That following the close of each fiscal year any net income, after making provisions for prior year losses, if any, shall be transferred to the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. BROOKS (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after "Sec. 111." insert "(a)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, so that there may be no misunderstanding about these committee amendments, I should like to explain what they are, and then I intend to ask that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

Other than changing subsection designations and other minor typographical changes, the basic changes made by the committee are these.

We changed the word "electronic" to "automatic" to include punchcard and other nonelectronic equipment as well as electronic data processing components in the coverage.

Second, it is made specifically clear in the bill that reports on the funding, with reference to those matters involving the revolving fund, would go to the Bureau of the Budget and to the Congress and any excess of funds that is not used would be returned to the Treasury.

The other basic change in the legislation which was included at the suggestion of the Comptroller General is that coverage under the bill would include that equipment which the U.S. Government buys and pays for incident to execution of contracts and agreements.

Mr. Chairman, basically that is what the committee amendments do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc and, following that, I would say to the membership I hope to see an amendment offered, possibly by my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Virginia, to remove the word "control" and the word "use" from page 1 of the bill because that has apparently upset many of the people who otherwise are as dedicated as I am to save that $100 million a year and thereby increase the efficiency of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, then is my understanding correct that the amendment relating to the deletion of the word "control" and the word "use" is to come later on?

Mr. BROOKS. I understand that such an amendment will be offered and I would be delighted to discuss the amendment at that time.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to direct a question to the gentleman from Texas in regard to his explanation of these amendments.

Do I understand that the individual agencies will have to justify their request under the terms of these amendments on a yearly basis for new equipment? Let us take, for example, the Social Security Administration where we have had a large outlay each year from the social security trust fund for data processing equipment. I think the gentleman from Texas is familiar with the operation we have in Baltimore and the additions at the Baltimore center for the Social Security Administration. This is equipment that has been worked many, many hours and the Bureau of the Budget in their reports and the Comptroller General has found this to be one of the best Government equipment operations in the country. Presently, the Social Security Administration has to come in and justify on a yearly basis any new additions to this equipment complex. Does the amendment that you ask to be considered en bloc with the other committee amendments provide that the Social Security Administration will have to come in on a yearly basis and justify in their appropriation requests any additions to this computer equipment?

Mr. BROOKS. I want to thank the gentleman for that question because the answer is, of course, "Yes." Under this bill a given agency if they wanted an additional computer capacity would have to get authorization and appropriations through the appropriate committees of the Congress to cover the cost of the additional ADP capacity required during the fiscal year. With an authorization and an appropriation from the Congress the agency would then put in a request to the GSA for the automatic data computing equipment which would give them the required capacity to meet their needs. So the answer to the gentleman's question is, "Yes, every dollar would be approved by the appropriations committee."

I might add with reference to this revolving fund in the General Services Administration, reports would be made to the Committee on Appropriations. Also, any excess of funds resulting from savings from the operation within the agencies would revert back to the Treasury of the United States on an annual basis.

Mr. LAIRD. The GSA cannot tap the revolving fund unless the individual agency has saved the money in their annual appropriation bill; is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct. They would be operating under the Committee on Appropriations as they are now.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BROOKS. I would be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. On the bottom of page 2, the committee amendment in italics, do I understand that this is based on the premise and the presupposition that under this bill the authority to delegate authority will be vested in GSA; is that correct?

Is that the premise of this amendment?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct; on the basis of the justification which is laid out in the succeeding line. Let me see if I can be of some further assistance to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Johansen].

Line 23 goes on to explain that they could eliminate from the performance of this bill, in the discretion of GSA authority, any individual automatic data processing systems or specific units of equipment when such action is necessary for the economy and efficiency of operations, or for the security or defense of this country.

Mr. JOHANSEN. May I ask the gentleman a further question: If it is proposed and if it should be voted by this House—and I will oppose the amendment when it is offered to strike out the words "control" and "use"—how can you then preserve to GSA power and authority which has been delegated?

Mr. BROOKS. We would only be changing slightly the delegation—the authority and power—that is authorized in the bill.

Mr. JOHANSEN. If the gentleman will yield further, what will this power and authority amount to if you are going to eliminate the key words "use" and "control"?

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman understands that we are trying in this legislation—this is the concept of it—to have the different agencies and the Government to work together in an effort to achieve both efficiency and economy. I think this is a mutual purpose that we all feel. I think the agencies do. I give the people in the bureaus that credit, as I hope they give to me. Even without the words "control" and "use" this bill would give this one agency of the Government, the GSA, the responsibility for coordinating and otherwise providing for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by the Federal departments and agencies. It is not a very complex matter to describe. It means that there will be one agency to buy and lease this equipment at the best possible deal in order to see if the equipment can be made available to all agencies to meet their needs on a reasonable and more economic basis.

This is a recommendation that I did not dream up, but is a recommendation of the Comptroller General of the United States. He, as the gentleman from Michigan knows, is a distinguished Republican appointed some years ago as Comptroller General to a 15-year term, and he has worked on this for some years. This has not been a hasty recommendation.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Do I understand that there is now before the committee a unanimous consent request to consider the amendments en bloc?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike the word "electronic" and insert in lieu thereof the word "automatic".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "by" add a comma and the following: "or at the expense of,".

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to direct some questions to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks], the chairman of the subcommittee, as to the meaning and import of the words in this amendment "or at the expense of."

Mr. BROOKS. If the gentleman will yield, it means "or at the expense of the U.S. Government."

Mr. JOHANSEN. Let me be more specific. I want to be very clear as to what I am driving at. Does not this amendment specifically mean that the powers that are granted in this bill to the GSA will be extended to all contractors in private industry operating on Government contracts?

Mr. BROOKS. If the gentleman will yield, I do not believe that would follow, sir.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I think it is very clear, and I think it was brought out in the hearings, that it was for the specific purpose, and I will ask any of the gentlemen of the committee who are here from the Committee on Census and Statistics if it was not the understanding that it was specifically for the purpose of expanding this authority to cover Government contracts?

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Do I understand by the gentleman's line of questioning that he is opposed to the contractors who use this equipment paying for the use of it?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Of course not. My point is I want to know just what the outer reaches of authority that we are granting to GSA are. I want to know how prodigious a job GSA is going to be doing without any addition or at least with a minimum of addition of personnel. It is my clear recollection in reading the committee report that the purpose of this was to include controls of the acquisition and the use and operation of this type of equipment by non-Government agencies operating under Government contracts.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 2, lines 2 and 3, strike out "Electronic data processing equipment suitable for efficient and", and immediately after line 3 insert the following:
>
> "(b) Automatic data processing equipment suitable for efficient and".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 2, line 10, strike the word "electronic" and insert in lieu thereof the word "automatic".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 2, beginning in line 17, strike out "(1)" and what follows thereafter down through page 2, line 21, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "individual automatic data processing systems or specific units of equipment, when such action is necessary for the economy and efficiency of operations, or when such action is essential to defense or security: *Provided further*, That the Administrator, in his discretion, prior to the beginning of fiscal year 1966, may delegate authority to lease, purchase, maintain, or operate automatic data processing equipment to the various Federal agencies to the extent necessary and desirable to allow for the orderly implementation of this utilization program."

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I simply say if we do not grant the kind of total power, czar authority, to the agency that is written into section 111(a), it will not be necessary to start adopting amendments to give part of it back. I directly and particularly emphasize the fact that this amendment does not in any way alter the fact that the discretion rests with the GSA Administrator.

I urge defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 2, line 22, after the quotation mark at the beginning of the line, insert "(c)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 2, line 23, strike "Treasury," and insert in lieu thereof "Treasury".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 2, line 23, strike the word "electronic" and insert in lieu thereof the word "automatic".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 3, line 5, strike the word "agencies." and insert the following: "agencies: *Provided*, That a report of receipts, disbursements, and transfers to miscellaneous receipts, under this authorization shall be made annually in connection with the budget estimates to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and to the Congress."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 3, after the quotation marks at the beginning of line 6, insert "(d)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 3, line 10, strike out "less any liabilities assumed,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 3, line 14, strike out "persons" and insert in lieu thereof "contractor".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 3, lines 18 and 19, strike out "and where appropriate, for terminal liability charges".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 4, line 7, strike out "receipts.'" and insert "receipts."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 4, after line 7 add the following new subsection:
>
> "(e) The proviso accompanying section 201(a) (63 Stat. 383), the provisions of section 602(d) (63 Stat. 401), and any other provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (63 Stat. 377), or of any other provisions of law which are inconsistent with the purposes and provisions of section 111 shall not be applicable."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 3, in line 20, strike the period, insert a comma, and the following: "and the inclusion in appropriation acts of provisions regulating the operation of the automatic data processing fund, or limiting the expenditures therefrom, is hereby authorized".

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would permit limitations in appropriation acts against the use of the funds in the revolving fund. As this bill is now drawn there is a revolving fund set up and the General Services Administration has authority to make purchases whether authorized by the committees or not. It takes the control away from the Congress and they can go ahead. Under the amendment of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], there is a provision that they must report the receipts, disbursements, and transfers to "Miscellaneous receipts." Under this authorization the report shall be made annually in connection with budget estimates to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress. All they have to do is report to the Congress what they spend. If they go ahead and spend beyond what the Congress might think is necessary, there is no limitation. All this amendment I am offering does is permit, in the inclusion of appropriation acts, a provision regulating the operation of the automatic data processing funds. It puts a regulation upon this fund and also permits limiting expenditures so that there can be a limitation if they have gone too far. You see, actually, what this section (c) on page 3 does, and I am sure it was not the intent of the committee to do so, but what it actually does is to give to the General Services Administration the opportunity to go out and buy without any opportunity for the Congress to look it over.

In the subcommittee of which I am a member we have the Weather Bureau coming up before us, and every year we have a question of automatic data processing machines. This would mean they would no longer come to us but the General Services Administration could go out and buy and make a report to us. Then if we did not like it there is not much we could do about it, but if this amendment is adopted it gives the Congress an opportunity to do something about it and to exercise control. I think if we could save $100 million this is fine, but I think this amendment locks the door in a way and keeps within the Congress control of expenditures rather than delegating to the head of the General Services Administration the opportunity of going out and making the expenditures and only reporting to us and giving us an opportunity of saying, "You should not have done it," but that is all. This will give us the opportunity to make a decision and give control to the Congress and I think we should maintain this control.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Let me say to my distinguished and able friend from Ohio, an important member of the Appropriations Committee which has dealt with this matter for many years, that I appreciate the motive behind his amendment. If the gentleman would yield a little further to me, I would just like to explain that there is no intention that any given agency would not have to get clearance from the legislative committee and from the appropriate subcommittee of the distinguished Committee on Appropriations with full authority over any requests. These funds would go then to the General Services Administration's automatic data processing revolving fund. When funds were taken from the revolving fund GSA would justify it. I do not believe there is any conflict between our ultimate aim of seeing that the Congress has a check on what is done. The Appropriations Committee will have one check, and this amendment as I see it would give them another check.

I want to thank the gentleman for what I think would be a constructive contribution to this legislation. It will give Congress a determined and clear check on every dollar that is spent by this agency or any other for automatic data processing equipment, as it should be.

Mr. BOW. I understand the gentleman is accepting the amendment. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BOW. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. FASCELL. Does the language the gentleman offers authorize language in the appropriation act which would not be otherwise authorized?

Mr. BOW. No, I think not; it would have to be authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think anyone can find fault with the objectives of this bill but I believe that the bill was introduced rather hastily, that certain agencies of the Government were not given an opportunity to present their views to the committee as is evidenced by the report, wherein the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Treasury Department, and many others who are the biggest users of these kinds of machines were not given an opportunity to appear before the committee and whose adverse views, including those of the Bureau of the Budget, are expressed in that report.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration does not have here a letter in the report opposing this bill because it did not have an opportunity to get one in. It was only yesterday that I got a letter from Mr. Webb opposing the legislation or opposing the passage of the legislation in its present form.

Many of my colleagues in the House do not need to be reminded that these agencies use scientific computers and more sophisticated machines. They are not bookkeeping machines for payroll or inventory purposes. There is a great deal of difference between them. These machines are sophisticated. They must be under the control of the people who are using them and they cannot be turned over for other purposes successfully.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The same thing is true of the warning system devices, is that not so?

Mr. MILLER of California. That is true; and the Post Office Department and many others. The Weather Bureau has been mentioned here. These are some of the specialized machines that are used. The Department of Defense is in opposition to it for that reason, not that they do not want to see this done, but I think the best thing that could happen to this bill is to have it returned to the committee with instructions to go into the matter more thoroughly and give these important scientific agencies of Government a chance to plead their case before the committee.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I hope that I am alone in this, but I find that I am not. There are quite a few who are not experts in this field and who do not understand all of the ramifications of it. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he and others here who are concerned with the national security feel that this would not be to the best interests of the country; is that correct?

Mr. MILLER of California. That is correct.

Mr. COLMER. If that be true, and the objective gained of trying to save some money, in which all of us are interested—and I am just seeking advice because, as I say, I do not know a great deal about this—why would it not be a good idea to amend this bill to exempt the Department of Defense, as suggested by the gentlemen interested in this subject, such as the distinguished gentleman from California who is now addressing the House? I just throw that out for what it is worth.

Mr. MILLER of California. I think this would be good, but who is going to say what agencies should be exempted from the bill? I can name a dozen. Maybe some of them should not be in; maybe some should be out. We just have not had time to study the matter properly. It is a complicated bill.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I commend the gentleman on the statement he has made and the position he has taken. I ask him again if under the circumstances he does not agree it is a matter of futility to try to rewrite this bill dealing with so complex a matter on the floor of the House? Would not the reasonable, logical solution be to send it back to the committee and have the full and exhaustive exploration the subject deserves?

Mr. MILLER of California. I agree entirely with the gentleman. You cannot write the bill on the floor of the House, and in its present form it is not a good bill.

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration,
Washington, D.C. July 17, 1963.

Hon. George P. Miller,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: This replies to your request for the views of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on the bill, H.R. 5171, "to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies." The bill is on the Union Calendar of the House of Representatives, and this report is directed to the form of the bill in which it appears on that calendar. We understand that it is scheduled for debate tomorrow, July 18, 1963. Due to the urgency of your request, time has not permitted the submission of this report to the Bureau of the Budget for advice as to its relationship to the program of the President.

H.R. 5171 would, through the addition of a new section 111 to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, provide for the assumption by the Administrator of General Services of responsibility for the acquisition, maintenance, and use of most, if not all, automatic data processing equipment required by agencies of the Federal Government for both in-house and contracted automatic data processing activity.

Among the more important aspects of the legislation are provisions under which:

1. The General Services Administration would be made responsible for providing automatic data processing equipment "suitable for efficient and effective use by Federal agencies"; to carry out this responsibility the General Services Administration could not only buy or lease equipment, but could transfer equipment between agencies, require its joint utilization, and establish pools and data processing centers.

2. The General Services Administration could delegate its authority to acquire and utilize "individual automatic data processing systems or specific units" when necessary "for the economy and efficiency of operations" or where "essential to defense or security."

3. The program would be financed by a revolving fund into which agencies using automatic data processing equipment would make advances and reimbursements to pay for services rendered.

4. Provisions of law inconsistent with the purposes of H.R. 5171 would be made inapplicable.

5. Under Section 111(a), the Administrator of the General Services Administration would be authorized and directed to coordinate and control the purchase, lease, maintenance, and use of automatic data processing equipment by, or at the expense of, Federal agencies. The wording of this passage is so broad that not only "in-house" automatic data processing and automatic data processing work contracted out as such, but also apparently any contract or procurement, the performance of which entails any automatic data processing, could be scrutinized by the General Services Administration for "economy and efficiency" of equipment utilization.

6. Section 111(b) would direct that ADP equipment suitable for efficient and effective use by Federal agencies shall be provided by the General Services Administration. It is not clear whether the General Services Administration would merely act as an administrative intermediary in providing all types of ADP equipment requested by an agency or whether the provision would effectively lodge in the General Services Administration the authority to review agency requests for equipment and to approve, modify, or deny them by determining that the equipment requested is, or is not, "suitable for efficient and effective use." If the latter situation should develop, the provision might seriously impede, rather than aid, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in discharging operative responsibilities set forth in the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended. Section 203 of the Space Act requires, for example, that NASA arrange for participation by the scientific community in planning specialized scientific measurements and observations, and authorizes the Administration to enter into those "contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions as may be necessary in the conduct of its work and on such terms as it may deem appropriate." For those projects requiring ADP the statutory grant set forth in the Space Act would be severely circumscribed were the General Services Administration assigned a share in deciding whether the ADP equipment requested for a given project was "suitable for efficient and effective use" or whether the "joint utilization" of the equipment with other Federal agencies was necessary and proper under the circumstances.

As of June 30, 1963, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration had an inventory of 118 general-purpose digital computer systems ranging from 25 very large systems to small "desk" computers available for the direct use of individual scientists and engineers in their daily activities. Only 7 of the 118 computer systems are used full time for administrative applications. The remainder are used on substantive scientific and engineering tasks required by NASA programs. The latter can be classified into five broad areas: (1) theoretical and analytical investigations; (2) engineering studies; (3) similation; (4) space flight operations; and (5) processing scientific and engineering experimental data. Several days ago, Mr. Edmond C. Buckley, Director of NASA's Office of Tracking and Data Acquisition, submitted to the Census and Government Statistics Subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service a statement on the scientific and technical uses of computers in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. It provides a rather complete report on this subject which you might find helpful. I am enclosing a copy for your use.

From the foregoing and the attachment, it appears that the scientific and technical use and management of computers cannot be separated from the responsibility for conducting the national space program. The bill would necessarily have the effect of fragmenting and watering down that responsibility. Accordingly, I see no alternative but to recommend that NASA be exempted from the terms of the bill.

In this connection, reference is made to the exemption in section of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, section 602(d) (40 U.S.C., sec. 474). This section provides that "Nothing in this Act shall impair or affect any authority of * * * (3) any executive agency named in the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, and the head thereof, with respect to the administration of said Act." The National Aeronautics and Space Administration is such an agency. Section 111(e) of H.R. 5171 would make this exemption unavailable since it declares that—

"(e) The proviso accompanying section 201(a) * * * the provisions of section 602(d) and any other provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, or of any other provisions of law which are inconsistent with the purposes and provisions of section 111 shall not be applicable."

Accordingly, we suggest and recommend that section 111(e) of the bill be modified to read:

"(e) Any provision of law inconsistent with the purposes and provisions of section 111 shall not be applicable: *Provided, however,* That section 111 shall have no application for any purpose to the departments and agencies of the Federal Government enumerated in section 2304 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, as amended, 10 U.S.C. 2303."

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. WEBB,
Administrator.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARY

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gary: Page 1, line 7, after "coordinate and" strike out "control the" and insert "provide for the economic and efficient".

Page 1, line 7, after "lease," insert "and".

Page 1, line 8, strike out the comma and the words "and use".

Page 2, line 2, strike out "operate or".

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely takes care of the suggestions I made during my remarks on the bill. It strikes out the control, use, and operation of this equipment by the General Services Administration. With the amendment the section would read:

The Administrator is authorized and directed to coordinate and provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, and maintenance of automatic data processing equipment by, or at the expense of, Federal agencies, and to provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise, of such equipment.

That is the sole purpose of the amendment.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I have talked with the gentleman from Virginia. I think everybody agrees that if there is a coordination program no one is trying to force anyone to do things. We would like to encourage them to save this $100 million instead of building their little empires. But I do not think there is anything devastating about this amendment. I think there might be difficulty in this word "operate." I believe we would be very wise not to try to strike the word "operate" on page 2. If you strike the words "control" and "use" you will give the Administrator authority to coordinate the purchase, lease, and maintenance of automatic data processing equipment by or at the expense of Federal agencies, and to operate or provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise, of such equipment.

I think they sometimes may need to operate this equipment. I think to strike it from the language of the bill would be inappropriate. I would offer a substitute which would only strike the words "control the" and strike the word "use."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman and to the chairman, I do not think striking the word "operate" has much effect except that I am afraid if you give them general authority to operate this machinery that that would mean all of the machinery. I leave in the language of the bill the words "to provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise of such equipment," which I take it would mean to operate their own equipment. I think they ought to have the authority to operate their own equipment and to delegate that to somebody else if they are fit to do so.

Mr. BROOKS. I would say it may well be that that is true. I have not had an opportunity to study this particular language of the amendment at great length so I believe I will not offer the substitute amendment to which I referred. I thank my colleague for his consideration and I appreciate his support on this legislation. We would both like to save some money as my colleague pointed out.

Mr. GARY. I am all for saving the money, and moreover I think it can be saved by coordination of the purchasing, leasing, and maintenance of this equipment. We have already saved a great deal by the action of our committee but I do not want to leave any doubt in anybody's mind that we are giving the GSA the right to use and operate this equipment that is already under control of the various agencies.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I would like to direct a question or two to my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]. Will the gentleman clarify the word that is being striken in his amendment?

Mr. GARY. The word "operate."

Mr. JOHANSEN. That is the word that would be stricken?

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHANSEN. May I ask the gentleman this question: Whether or not we are in danger here of getting into quite a word game and a semantic operation? I wonder if, with the uncertainty as to what the effect might or might not be, of deleting one word or adding another, this is the best way of handling the matter. I ask the gentleman if he does not feel that the committee is a much better area in which to work out these problems and then to come back with something after an exploration of the practicalities of the matter rather than attempting to do this on the floor of the House?

Mr. GARY. Well, of course, the committee could do a more thorough job, but I am particularly anxious to have it absolutely understood, and I think with the explanation of my amendment here on the floor of the House, it will be plain that what we are trying to do by striking out the word "operate" is to insure the fact that the GSA will not attempt to operate the machinery that is under control of the Defense Department or under the control of NASA or of any other agency of Government.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I commend the gentleman for his purpose. But I entertain serious doubts, I will say to the gentleman, as to whether with the retention of the word "control" or the retention of the word "use" that purpose is made clear.

Mr. GARY. They have both been stricken by my amendment. It deletes the word "use" and also the word "control."

Mr. JOHANSEN. Then I will say to the gentleman, while I subscribe to his purpose and commend him for it, I think it is a sorry bit of legislating to come in here with a bill in which the key word is "control" and in which the committee commits itself to building up this kind of power, and then here in the matter of an hour or an hour and one-half of debate it completely backtracks.

And then they ask us to try to doctor up the bill with some namby-pamby euphemisms and kindlier words.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is defeated, not because I disagree with my friend's purpose, but I do not want us to kid ourselves that we are improving this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do so for the purpose of asking someone the question as to where I can find a definition of "Federal agency." This bill is predicated upon "Federal agency." I would like an official definition of the words "Federal agency."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I believe that definition is contained in the basic act. This bill seeks to amend the basic act, and I am sure that that term is defined in that act. If the gentleman will give us a minute or two, I think we can locate the definition of it. Most of them, I am sure, the gentleman from Iowa is familiar with. There are a large number of agencies. We are interested in those, however, who use automatic data processing equipment.

The gentleman could probably in his own mind write down a list of the number of them.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I have some idea of what constitutes a Federal agency, but I do not know whether, for instance, the Department of Defense is legally a Federal agency, or the Department of the Treasury is legally a Federal agency.

Mr. BROOKS. I believe in the Federal Property Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, revised December 1, 1958, on page 4, we have the definition of the words that we use. Section 3 as used in titles 1 through 6 of this act, part B, the term "Federal agency" means any executive agency or any establishment in the legislative or the judicial branches of the Government—except the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Architect of the Capitol, and any activities under his direction.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman, but I would add that the definition just given was apparently written by the committee.

Mr. Chairman I am as much interested in saving money as any Member of the House, but up to this point no one has convinced me that centralization as proposed in this bill will provide any part of the claimed savings. Earlier this afternoon I asked the question as to the basis for the claimed savings and I am still awaiting an answer.

I would point out that in the past 2 years the Government has purchased millions of dollars worth of equipment to provide automation and yet in the same period some 150,000 persons have been added to the Federal payroll.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I, of course, am very reluctant to disagree with my good friend, the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. BROOKS]. But at the appropriate time I expect to offer a motion to recommit this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is probably the best example of poor coordination within the Congress that has been on the floor of the House in a long time. The moment I saw this bill on the calendar I contacted the two agencies with which I have very close relationships, NASA, and the Veterans' Administration. I find that both of them are opposed to the bill. If you read further in the report you find the Post Office Department, the Defense Department, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Aviation Agency, also are opposed to the bill.

Mr. Chairman, we have just completed months of hearings on the NASA authorization. During these hearings we asked representatives of NASA questions about this equipment. This is a question which has a tremendous effect on every agency. We asked whether or not there is not some executive policy on this whole question, and we were told that it was being worked on, but it was not.

Mr. Chairman, I think this legislation is premature. I think it should be given much more consideration among the other committees of Congress and among the other agencies of Government.

Mr. Chairman, I shall offer a motion to recommit the bill at the proper time.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Surely, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BROOKS. It does pain me to have a difference with my old and dear friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. But I would say that I am glad that all of the members of the committee have asked questions of the agencies with which they are so directly concerned, those in particular.

I would say that the Comptroller General, who works for us as Members of Congress, sent in a letter—not an old letter, but I believe it is dated June 11, 1963—a copy of a letter which he sent to the Speaker of this great body, in which he said:

> Our review disclosed that, during fiscal years 1961 and 1962 and part of fiscal year 1963, Goddard Space Flight Center made rental overpayments for automatic data-processing machines because it failed to determine and consolidate operational use time in accordance with provisions of the Federal supply schedule contracts. We estimate that the overpayments amount to about $1.2 million.

Now, I do not say that everyone does not make mistakes. But I think that this bill, in fairness to my colleague——

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I hope the gentleman will not take all of my time.

Mr. BROOKS. I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], in fairness, should be given every opportunity to continue to question these agencies, as I think you have full authority to do, and I think you should exercise it as you do. But this legislation would take no authority away from your great committee or any other congressional committee, and no authority away from the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress. You understand why some of the agencies that would be restricted would sort of be chastised in overpaying $1,231,000, to be exact. You can understand why they are not very enthusiastic about anybody taking a look at their operations.

They did not offer a criticism. My obligation is not to the individual agencies, but, as yours is, I think you will agree, to the people who pay the taxes and expect efficiency from every agency whether we work with them or not.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am glad to say to the gentleman that I requested the General Accounting Office to furnish me the report he made on NASA. I have seen the report. I know the gentleman has it, and I will sooner or later find out why I did not get a copy of it. Our committee was not furnished a copy of it, neither was I furnished a copy. I have seen the gentleman's report and I know it. But why did not the General Accounting Office send us this report? The amount is tremendous and it is going to get bigger and bigger as time goes on, particularly in NASA. The amount there is fantastic. We did ask the question, and we were told that there is a policy being formulated by the Government that would control it.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think a statement has to be made in fairness to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration with regard to the overpayment that was spoken or by the distinguished gentleman from Texas. It is exactly true, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks] has said. The report of the General Accounting Office showed $1.2 million as an overpayment. In fairness now to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, I think the Members should know that the discovery of the overpayment was, as a matter of fact, a discovery made by NASA. NASA learned that they were making some kind of an overpayment and because they learned this fact, they put a kind of counting device, time device, on the computers. Then with the use of these timing devices on the computers NASA learned how much the overpayment was and at what rate this was going. It was the General Accounting Office that revealed the overpayment to the Congress and to the public in general, but it was NASA itself that found the fact of overpayment, indeed that made it possible to find the overpayment. Then they went ahead and negotiated for a refund of the overpayment, and I understand the amount of the refund as agreed upon is $1.1 million.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Was the committee advised by the agency over which it has jurisdiction?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. The committee on which I serve was advised by the General Accounting Office first. I want to give them credit for having first revealed this fact, but it was not because NASA was concealing it. NASA had actually been responsible for finding the overpayment or the effect of it in computing the overpayment. NASA, by the way, appeared before our committee and revealed it as well and gave full credit to GAO and as well to justify their activity and exonerate themselves for having found an error and took credit by correcting the error.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply to correct some of the statements that have been made. I am quite sure they were made in good faith, but, nevertheless, they are in error.

The Comptroller General did write a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics in which he did say that in his opinion there had been an overpayment by NASA to the International Business Machines Corp. and that in his judgment the amount of the overpayment was $1.1 million.

That report was referred to the Subcommittee on Tracking and Data Acquisition, of which my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Hechler], is chairman.

The subcommittee referred that report to me, perhaps for the reason that I had had quite a bit to say in our subcommittee hearings on the question of computers. I was requested to look into the matter and see what I could make of this reported overcharge. I did do that and I spent the better part of an afternoon in conference with officials of the International Business Machines Corp. During that discussion it became apparent, as I have said earlier on the floor today, that the matter was far more complex than the Comptroller General himself had realized. However, it was not disputed by the International Business Machines Corp. that there might very well have been an overpayment. It came to light that the computer system, the automatic data processing system, can be linked up in an extremely wide variety of ways. In some hookups, or in some linkages, you might use three tape drives and one computer and one memory circuit, whereas in another system you might use a different set of components. Each component did not have a separate meter upon it. Furthermore, the machines are energized not only while they are in use, but they are energized while they are being overhauled, and when preventive maintenance was being performed upon them or when they were broken down and being repaired. None of these things have been metered or have been subjected to precise measurements.

Following my conference with the officials of the International Business Machines Corp. an agreement was reached based not upon anybody's measurement, but based simply upon an educated guess as to what the overpayment might have been. The actual refund made by the International Business Machines to NASA was over $1.2 million, although the Comptroller General's estimate was that it was $1.1 million. The whole point of the matter is that it suddenly came to light that a great deal more accuracy was needed in the computation of time. I might add at this point that the International Business Machines Corp. does not meter the time. It was strictly up to NASA to do it. NASA had not done it with the degree of specific accuracy as to each component which would have been necessary to make possible an accurate billing by International Business Machines to NASA.

I am for this bill and I think we need some agency of the Government to develop that degree of specialized knowledge which will enable them to go into any agency of the Government and find out whether a sensible, economical, and thrifty use is being made of automatic data processing equipment. We do not have such an agency at this point.

As to the particular language of the amendment I do not see why we cannot afford to strike the word "operate." We do not want the General Services Administration operating this equipment, but we certainly need an agency and I think the General Services Administration is the best one to do it, to go in and see whether they have the right equipment and whether the right methods are being used to determine how they use the equipment and what type and kind of equipment they ought to have, as well as should the equipment be leased, or whether it ought to be bought outright by the Government.

For the reasons I have stated I urge the membership of this Committee to support this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POOL

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Pool: Page 5, line 4, strike out the quotation marks.

Page 5, immediately after line 4, insert the following:

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, or any other provision of law, no punched card machine shall be purchased or leased under authority of this section by negotiation. Each punched card machine which is purchased or leased under this section shall be so purchased or leased after public advertisement in accordance with subsection (a) of section 303 of this Act, and the award for such purchase or lease shall be made to the lowest responsible bidder notwithstanding any provision of subsection (b) of section 303."

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Jack Brooks, has sponsored this bill and made a speech here earlier, as did my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. Wallhauser]. They pointed out that the main purpose of this bill is to save approximately $100 million a year. I want to help this bill a little bit, so I have offered an amendment to give the contract to the lowest bidder.

First, I want to point out that from the work I have done on this matter, I found that none of these machines is presently bought on a low-bid basis, either by custom or under the terminology of the statutes. Many of the contracts are negotiated. So I offered this amendment in view of the fact that one of the purposes stated in this bill is to save the Government money. Let us save some money by giving the contract to the lowest bidder. This amendment will save the Government a great deal more money by requiring that when punched card machines are purchased or leased, the lowest responsible bidder will get the contract. That is all it does.

Mr. Chairman, I have limited the amendment to punched card machines because upon investigation I found that these are about the only machines on which you can get three or four bidders. The electronic computers are so complex that it would prove virtually impossible to spell out the specifications which would allow enough bidders a chance to offer competitive bids on them. But, on punchcard machines, I have been told that the industry has been developed to the point where it is possible to get a low bid. That is all my amendment does. I think the lowest responsible bidder should get the contract. The same thing is done in many other fields of Government.

There is no reason why we should not do it here, if possible. And it is possible with respect to punched card machines.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POOL. I yield to my friend from South Carolina.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, with whom I have the privilege of serving on the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. We have studied this particular problem for a considerable period of time. I want to associate myself with his amendment and would like to ask him just a question or two to help develop this a little bit further.

Did not the Comptroller General, Mr. Campbell, appear before our committee and discuss this particular matter of competitive bidding as distinguished from negotiated contracts?

Mr. POOL. That is correct.

Mr. WATSON. And did he not at that time say that the Government had lost millions of dollars because of negotiated contracts on automatic data processing machines, instead of going into competitive bid contracts?

Mr. POOL. That is correct. I think he went further than that and said that with respect to punched card machines it would be entirely possible to set up specifications so that the awarding of the contract could be made to the lowest bidder.

Mr. WATSON. Does not the gentleman also recall further that although he did not testify before our committee, the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, recently made a public statement, which we all applaud, that he had saved some $100 million, or perhaps in excess of that, over the past year through competitive bid contracts instead of negotiated contracts? And he cited as one particular example, I believe, of a radio or some electronic device for which originally the Department of Defense had been paying something like $2,000 but which under competitive bidding they got down to about $800?

Mr. POOL. That is right. And this is a very similar situation. When they first came out, the punched card machines were all different and it was difficult for a department to specify what they needed. It was difficult for the industry to bid on specifications that were so general. So they had to negotiate. But we are now in the position where, instead of 3 or 4 companies being in a position to bid maybe 10 or 15 of them could get in a bidding position if we pass an amendment such as this one. It would save the Government thousands of dollars.

Mr. WATSON. Under the gentleman's position, this would not apply to other equipment?

Mr. POOL. No. That is why we limit it specifically to punched card machines, because we can do it in this field.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment basically provides for no negotiated sales in the limited field of punchcards. I believe this is not trying to legislate on purchase practices. I believe there is some merit to the suggestion. I would be delighted and pleased to cooperate with the distinguished Member-at-Large from Texas in pursuance of this, but I feel that it is more arbitrary than we in this Congress would want to establish as a precedent. The statement that you would never buy anything by negotiation has not proved to be good business for the country. As an example, we sometimes do negotiate sales but they ought to be submitted to the Congress for approval. I think this is good policy. Where there is only one supplier or where there is one producer of a given commodity, you might well negotiate a purchase price with that individual, if you bought for the Government or for yourself or for private business. If you bought for the Government on a negotiated contract, I think it would be wise to provide for Congressional approval or renegotiation.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment and hope it will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WATSON) there were—ayes 49, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. ASHLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5171) pursuant to House Resolution 432, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. JOHANSEN moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 5171, to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 96, nays 258, not voting 79, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

YEAS—96

Abele
Ayres
Becker
Beermann
Bell
Bray
Bromwell
Bruce
Burkhalter
Burton
Cameron
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Corbett
Cunningham
Curtin
Derounian
Devine
Dole
Dulski
Edwards
Ellsworth
Everett
Feighan
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gavin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Harvey, Mich.
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Jensen
Johansen
Karth
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kyl
MacGregor
Mahon
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Montoya
Moore
Morris
Morse
Mosher
Norblad
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Pool
Quillen
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Tex.
Saylor
Schadeberg
Secrest
Senner
Short
Sikes
Staggers
Stratton
Teague, Tex.
Tuten
Udall
Utt
Van Pelt
Vinson
Watson
Weaver
Westland
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Winstead

NAYS—258

Abbitt
Addabbo
Albert
Alger
Anderson
Andrews
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton,
Frances P.
Bolton,
Oliver P.
Bow
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Burke
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Carey
Celler
Chenoweth
Clark
Cleveland
Cooley
Corman
Cramer
Curtis
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan
Dwyer
Elliott
Fallon
Fascell
Findley
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Foreman
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Gallagher
Gary
Gathings
Gibbons
Gilbert
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kee
Keith
Keogh
Kilgore

King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Lankford
Lennon
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
Madden
Mailliard
Marsh
Matsunaga
Matthews
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morton
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pilcher
Poff
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Rains
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St Germain
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Stinson
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Tuck
Tupper
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—79

Abernethy
Adair
Ashbrook
Barrett
Belcher
Bennett, Mich.
Bonner
Broomfield
Broyhill, Va.
Buckley
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Conte
Daddario
Dague
Donohue
Edmondson
Evins
Farbstein
Fino
Forrester
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gill
Goodling
Grabowski
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Harsha
Hawkins
Hoffman
Horan
Johnson, Calif.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Kastenmeier
Kelly
Kilburn
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Lesinski
Long, La.
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Miller, N.Y.
Minshall
Morrison
Moss
Nelsen
Nygaard
O'Brien, Ill.
Philbin
Pillion
Purcell
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Roybal
St. Onge
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Slack
Steed
Stephens
Taft
Thompson, La.
Trimble
Wharton
White
Wilson, Bob
Wydler

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Abernethy for, with Mr. Trimble against.

Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Nelsen against.

Mr. Fino for, with Mr. Garmatz against.

Mr. Horan for, with Mr. McIntire against.

Mr. Nygaard for, with Mr. Rooney against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Dague.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Hagen of California with Mr. Wharton.

Mr. Roybal with Mr. Taft.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Pillion.

Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Clancy.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Goodling.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Minshall.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Wydler.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mr. White with Mr. Latta.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Jonas.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Conte.

Mr. Slack with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. McLoskey.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Harsha.

Mr. Forrester with Mr. McMillan.

Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Stephens.

Mr. Steed with Mr. Bonner.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Evins.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Gill.

Mr. FLOOD, Mr. JONES of Missouri, Mr. BATES, and Mr. BARRY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, on July 16, 1963, several members of the Georgia delegation, myself included, were in Georgia to confer with the Governor on a matter of public importance. Accordingly, I am recorded as not voting on rollcall No. 95, taken on a motion to recommit the bill, H.R. 4897, to amend the Wartime Sedition Act. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "nay" on the motion to recommit, and "aye" on final passage of the bill.

PARTICIPATION BY MILITARY PERSONNEL IN CIVIL RIGHTS DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the Defense Department appropriations bill, I made mention of a report released by the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces. I stated that this report indicated a real threat to our military bases as it presupposed that unless an area adjacent to a military base was integrated, the people in the area would be punished by removal of the base. It also called upon military commanders to take the lead in the communities in the desegregation movement. At that time, I stated that such action as contemplated by the report was not considered by military officers when they entered the service of their country and I do not believe that they are qualified either by education or experience to enter into such programs.

I bring this to the attention of the House today, Mr. Speaker, since I read an article in the July 17, 1963 issue of the Washington Post, referring to orders issued at the Military Air Transport Base, Charleston, S.C. One order stated that base personnel were not to take part in civil rights demonstrations. Later, the order was revoked by a second order which stated that under Air Force policy, an airman off-duty could take part in demonstrations as long as he wore civilian clothes and avoided injury that might prevent him from carrying out his duties.

The article further stated that the Secretary of Defense, in the face of protests, sharply restricted such activities last night.

The Secretary said in a memorandum to all Armed Forces:

> It is highly inappropriate and unnecessary for military personnel, with their special obligations of citizenship to participate in these activities. I urge every man and woman in uniform to conduct himself accordingly.

The article further noted that Secretary McNamara did not specifically forbid participation by troops when wearing civilian clothes in off-duty hours.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the order issued by the Secretary of Defense leaves much to be desired. Military personnel are subject to call 24 hours a day. Participation in demonstrations such as have occurred have led to bodily injury. If military personnel is permitted to participate in these demonstrations and become incapacitated, they are not available for the intended purpose of the services. Further, Mr. Speaker, if injury occurs in any demonstration and where there are local ordinances or State laws forbidding such demonstrations, I would like to know how such injury could be found "in line of duty." It would appear that in such case a "not in line of duty" finding would follow and, therefore, the individual would be subject to court-martial proceedings.

In view of the importance of such action that could occur, I have written

Secretary McNamara for an opinion on the matter. The letter follows:

JULY 17, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Pentagon Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In view of your recent memorandum wherein you stated, "It is highly inappropriate and unnecessary for military personnel, with their special obligations of citizenship, to participate in these activities. I urge every man and woman in uniform to conduct himself accordingly."

I would like to propound a question regarding this memorandum, particularly, since you did not specifically forbid participation by troops when wearing civilian clothes in off-duty hours.

It is my understanding that military personnel are subject to call 24 hours a day. If injury occurs to military personnel in off-duty hours, wearing civilian clothes which was the result of demonstrations which are contrary to the laws of the municipality or the State, how could such injury be found "in line of duty?"

It would appear that if such injury did occur to military personnel as a result of these demonstrations, such injuries would necessarily be found "not in line of duty" and they would be, of course, subject to court-martial proceedings.

I would appreciate your comments in this regard at the earliest opportunity.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
KENNETH A. ROBERTS.

LET'S GET WASHINGTON OFF THE GROUND

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, news reports last weekend indicated that President Kennedy spent part of his leisure time on Cape Cod flying kites.

Those who remained behind to swelter in the muggy heat of Washington might wonder why our President must leave town to do his kite flying. What is wrong, they may ask, with the White House lawn?

I have the answer and now, in support of the President, I must reveal it. Kite flying is illegal in the District of Columbia.

Alas, it is true. Congress, in its wisdom as benevolent overseer of the health and morals of our Capital, passed a law in 1892 which provides:

> It shall not be lawful for any person or persons to set up or fly any kite, or set up or fly any * * * balloon or parachute in or upon or over any street, avenue, alley, open space, public enclosure, or square within the limits of the city of Washington, under a penalty of not more than $10 for each and every such offense.

President Kennedy, being a law-abiding citizen, was thus forced to leave our beautiful city in order to educate his children in the artful joys of kite flying.

Yet how many of us, chained to our work in Washington, would not like to give our children the advantages we once enjoyed? Why should Washingtonians, until only recently deprived of the vote and still deprived of the right to govern themselves, be forbidden to take to the open spaces on breezy days to partake in the joy of flying kites? Indeed, had Benjamin Franklin been born in Washington we might all be languishing in darkness of this day.

It is my duty, therefore, not only as a legislator and a father, but as one who believes that the Declaration of Independence is a living document, to do all in my power to throw off the yoke of tyranny. Accordingly, I am today introducing legislation to repeal the kite flying prohibition in Washington.

Lest my bill not be taken seriously, let me point out some practical implications of this oppressive law. The statute, you may note, applies not only to kites, but to balloons as well. What student of political science does not know the value of the trial balloon as an instrument of government? Are we now to label all our Chief Executives—not to mention aspirants to that great office—common criminals when they send aloft the name of a prospective Cabinet appointee? May a member of Congress no longer dip his toe, so to speak, into the pool of public opinion without risking punishment? To pose these questions is to answer them. The law must go!

What about the businessman who instructs his secretary to tell an insurance salesman to "go fly a kite?" Is he now to be punished for soliciting the commission of a crime? With our courts and law enforcement officials under fire for being soft on criminals, what can we expect from strict enforcement of the kite-flying law? The prospects are staggering. If one gets "high as a kite," for example, will he now be subject to criminal punishment as well as the scorn of his wife?

Consider, moreover, the problem of enforcement. To make the law really work should not the helicopter squadron of the Metropolitan Police Force be quadrupled? And how many $10 fines does it take to buy a helicopter? How about the insanity defense? Will we jam St. Elizabeths with psychopathic personalities whose mental aberrations compel them to fly kites?

Finally, what of our children? Innocent and untutored in the ways of adult society, they follow the natural instincts of childhood and aspire to the sky. Are we now to brand with infamy every tot who builds a kite and sails it aloft over Washington's streets, avenues, alleys, open spaces, public enclosures, or squares? The law must go.

Debate will continue I am sure, over juvenile delinquency and over home rule for Washington, but all that is right and good demands that my bill be passed. Surely this is a problem concerning all American citizens. So while Washingtonians must be content to demonstrate, I urge all people of good will beyond the boundaries of our Capital to write their Congressman in support of this legislation.

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, when the Arms Control and Disarmament Act was passed by Congress in 1961, it contained a ceiling on the amount which could be appropriated for the purposes of the act. Since 1961, all but $1.7 million of the $10 million authorized has been appropriated to further the important work of this instrument for national security.

The budget request of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for fiscal 1964 is $15 million, which reflects the demand for its services and the increasing complexity of its work. Of this amount, $11 million has been allotted to research conducted by those outside the Agency, which insures the objectivity of its final recommendations. The remaining $4 million is for research by Agency personnel, for administrative expenses, and for making the product of research and study available at the negotiating table. It is obvious that, if the work of the Agency is to continue, the legislative ceiling on appropriations must be lifted. This is the primary purpose of the bill I am introducing today and to which I lend my wholehearted support.

The eventual control of nuclear weapons, toward which a test ban is a first step, the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons technology, and the reduction of radioactive fallout are national objectives of the highest importance. The United States has striven for these goals in over 70 meetings and conferences with the Soviet Union since the end of World War II. Crucial discussions are even now going on in Moscow, discussions to which our ablest negotiators have been sent. In a laudable effort to break the iron grip of mutual suspicion, President Kennedy has declared a moratorium on atmospheric tests by the United States. It is to be hoped that positive agreement may be reached.

But the pressing need for a treaty must be subordinated to considerations of national security. Every proposal advanced by ourselves or others, every gesture to improve the climate of negotiation must be tested against the standard of adequacy and safety. And it is only with a vast fund of technical information readily available that our negotiators can participate intelligently in these discussions. And, furthermore, it is only with such information that the President and the Congress can determine the proposals which jeopardize our security or promote it. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was created to supply this very need, to consolidate and coordinate our research in this field with the demands of international negotiation in mind. The House recognized this need when it passed the original act creating the Agency by the impressive, bipartisan vote of 290 to 54. I am proud to say that I was one of the original sponsors of that act.

As the Agency continues its work we may discover some useful byproducts developing. For the information which the Agency can provide will furnish both the Congress and the public with the basis on which to draw conclusions about the adequacy of the final agreements. With such information available, the public will be able to separate the question of adequacy of the arrangement from that of the desirability of any arrangement. It is the confusion of these two questions which has put public discussion of a test ban treaty on the level of a numbers game and has forestalled informed debate.

The bill I am introducing would also modify somewhat the security clearance for contractor personnel so as to facilitate the research program by avoiding duplication of effort in making investigations. The proposal would not change the existing standards or procedures for Agency personnel, but would put contractor personnel clearance on a parity with those of other highly sensitive Government agencies. The procedures authorized are common to the Department of Defense and the Central Intelligence Agency. The Congress in 1961 permitted the Atomic Energy Commission to so simplify their procedures.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation as overwhelmingly as they supported the passage of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in 1961.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. **DULSKI**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **DULSKI**. Mr. Speaker, once again in 1963 the city of Buffalo has proclaimed the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week." Appropriate events have been scheduled during the week July 14–21.

Our observation began last Sunday with prayers and religious ceremonies in western New York churches. On the same afternoon, a parade and motorcade proceeded through the streets of downtown Buffalo, gathering in front of our majestic city hall. Here, civic recognition was given to Captive Nations Week in the shadow of the William McKinley Monument.

The Reverend Porter W. Phillips, Erie County Council of Churches secretary, gave an invocation. President Henry J. Osinski of the Central Council of Polish Organizations, acting as toastmaster, introduced Dr. Nestor Procyk, chairman of the citizens committee to observe Captive Nations Week, who gave an address of warm welcome. Dr. Procyk also expressed gratitude to all parade participants, to the mass media for their complete coverage, and to many individuals who had aided in preparing the program.

Mayor Chester Kowal then presented his message and a proclamation:

When our forefathers invisioned the founding of our great Nation they were motivated by great ideals and hoped for a peaceful world in which justice would govern the future of all nations and mankind. Their foresight, sacrifice, hard work, perseverance, and heroism brought forth a nation, which, although young, as history is measured, is second to none in the guarantees of freedom, individual liberty, and the right of family happiness. The labors of the Founding Fathers, their deep philosophy set forth in the documents of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution form a monumental asset in the annals of Western civilization.

Since the founding years, the United States has guarded these inalienable rights for our people and all others. The United States has opened her heart and gates to the teeming masses of the persecuted and unwanted of other lands granting them a chance to a dignified life as guaranteed by the laws of our land. America has always been a stanch defender of human rights, making heavy sacrifices in human life to preserve in other far-off lands those same human rights which are the cornerstone of our great United States. Many of America's sons and daughters have made the supreme sacrifice in distant lands. Those sacrifices were made because we know that a world half free and half slave cannot survive.

Notwithstanding these great sacrifices, the world again is confronted with a mortal challenge. A highly organized tyranny, void of any signs of morals and human dignity, looms threateningly on the horizon. America is leading the family of nations in a total and deadly encounter with this menace. The Soviet Union, this vast prison of nations, is now endangering our very existence.

The desire and fervent aspirations of the peoples in the captive nations for freedom and national independence provides a powerful third force in the war launched by imperial Russia. This third force is bound to our political conviction by an unbreakable bond of ideals—just as it stands as a formidable and unyielding enemy of imperial Russia. We must learn to use this powerful third force for peace, for justice among nations, and for a new world order based upon universal freedom and social righteousness.

The week of July 14 through 21, 1963, is set aside by an act of Congress and by Presidential proclamation as Captive Nations Week. Through this weeklong observance we are reminded of the blessings which we enjoy as a free people and the commitment of our Nation, under God, to advance the frontiers of freedom until tyranny and despotism have vanished from the earth.

As mayor of Buffalo, I welcome this opportunity to advance the cause of peace with justice and I urge and invite all my fellow citizens to join in the activities arranged for this annual observance of Captive Nations Week.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas our Nation was founded and built on the precept of freedom and liberty for its citizens who hailed from all parts of the world and sought on these shores a haven for a free life, free worship, and free speech; and

Whereas our Nation, since its inception, has continuously advocated and supported the natural aspirations of other peoples and nations toward self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas our great Nation has demonstrated time and again its readiness to defend these ideals, bringing countless sacrifices in human life, as well as material values, to defend these inalienable rights; and

Whereas our Nation is facing today its greatest challenge and crisis of history by an opposing ideology based on tyranny and despotism which has no equal in history, Russian Communist imperialism; and

Whereas, after the brutal suppression by Russia of the once free and independent peoples of Albania, Armenia, Bulgaria, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, China, Croatia, Slovenia, Serbia, Poland, Ukraine, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, East Germany, Cossackia, Cuba, Tibet, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Czechoslovakia, Byelorussia, Rumania, Hungary, and others; and

Whereas, since the enactment in 1959 of Public Law 86–90, the American people have fittingly demonstrated to victims of Russian aggression that we, the American people, realize their plight and support the just aspirations of the captive nations to a free and independent life; and

Whereas the alliance of the free world with the captive nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and holds the key to peace, as the captive nations are the Achilles heel of the Russian empire and their restive masses have doubtlessly hampered and prevented many aggressive designs of imperial Russia; and

Whereas it is imperative that we Americans keep the torch of freedom burning in the hearts and minds of the peoples in the captive nations by showing our deep concern to their present plight and their future by strengthening their resolve to win human dignity, freedom, and national independence;

Now, therefore, I, Chester Kowal, mayor of the city of Buffalo, do hereby proclaim the week of July 14 through 21, 1963, as "Captive Nations Week" and urge the people of our city to observe this week as days of rededication to the cause of liberty and the dignity of man with prayers and public ceremonies, demonstrating our moral support for the just aspirations of the peoples of all the captive nations.

Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of giving the afternoon's principal address:

FIFTH OBSERVANCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

My friends, this week Americans across the country will be observing Captive Nations Week. July 14–21 will be the fifth such observance. Since 1959, when the 86th Congress passed the Captive Nations Week resolution, the activities of the annual observance have grown in scope and depth. From the President, the Governors of our States, and the mayors of our cities, proclamations are issued based on the resolution, urging our citizens to devote themselves anew to the emancipation and freedom of all captive nations. Major cities such as New York, Chicago, and Buffalo have made the week an official, citywide observance, and many others are following suit.

While Captive Nations Week has become a firm American institution, it has also been a huge bone in Khrushchev's throat. We cannot ever forget the vehement reaction on the part of the Russian dictator to Congress passage of the resolution in July 1959. For months thereafter Khrushchev denounced Public Law 86–90. Every year Moscow and its puppets decry the observance, and only this past January 23, the New Times, the Soviet Russian weekly, declared: "Is it not high time to discontinue the 'Captive Nations Week' in the United States? That is just as much a dead horse as the 'Hungarian Question.'"

There is nothing that Khrushchev desires more at this time than the complete acquiescence of the United States and the free world to the permanent captivity of the nations of Central Europe, the U.S.S.R., and Asia. Captive Nations Week and all that each observance produces in thought and discussion regarding America's positive role in the cold war is a major impediment to Moscow's goal.

The resolution itself is a permanent portrait—a mirror if you will—of the Soviet Russian colonial empire which Moscow and its puppets seek to conceal from the world at large.

I feel certain the American people will never bow to Moscow's empire. Nor will they buy the currently peddled notion that for a dubious peace we must accommodate Khrushchev and his colonial empire. On the contrary, during this fifth observance of Captive Nations Week, the American people will respond to the theme of the week: "Liberate Cuba—Restore the Faith in All Captive Nations—Win the Cold War." All the captive nations constitute a strategic weapon for us in the cold war. To ignore or to neglect them would mean discarding this basic weapon to the manifest benefit of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism.

We have an obligation to the men and women and children of the captive nations, I believe, that requires steady support and a firm devotion to a tradition that is a permanent part of the American system—a love of freedom.

These peoples will be liberated from the grasp of imperialism. They will regain their status, and we shall play a leading part in it.

We must show patience and courage and determination. We must recognize that no subject, captive peoples held gripped by puppet rulers who are traitors to their own land, must ever be abandoned as hopelessly Communist, hopelessly lost.

Time is on our side. Time is on the side of those who fight for freedom and have the courage to persevere.

Mr. Speaker, the Sunday ceremonies were concluded with benediction by Msgr. Stanley A. Kulpinski.

Other events this week included a civic luncheon on Wednesday, July 17, sponsored by the Kiwanis Club of Buffalo. Also planned is a captive nations festival and pageant under the stars on Sunday, July 21, in Buffalo's Delaware Park. This festival should provide a fitting conclusion to the week's solemn recognition of the captive nations, as well as a reminder of freedom's unfinished battle against Communist tyranny.

IS PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S OPTIMISM ON MOSCOW TEST BAN NEGOTIATIONS WARRANTED?

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has the peculiar ability to be singularly optimistic even when he stands midst the ruins of the failures of his many policies. His attitude toward the present negotiations with the Soviet Union for a test ban agreement is no exception. In his press conference yesterday the President seemed extremely happy with the negotiations and optimistic about the results.

Of course, he did not tell the press nor the American people what is actually being negotiated. He did not say whether or not that an agreement, in fact, has already been reached and the present conference is merely window dressing to soften up Congress and the Nation to accept the final draft. It is just a little suspicious when Communist Dictator Khrushchev does such a sudden aboutface in wanting to reach an agreement with the free world and when he greets with such enthusiasm the arrival of Averell Harriman, the President's negotiator. Are we sure he was only joking when he opened the conference with an invitation to sign first and work out the details later?

I do not want to be unfair to the efforts of President Kennedy, but there is so much evidence of secret deals with the Soviet Union over Cuba and other areas, that the American people just cannot afford to be easy about the Moscow-Harriman meeting and President Kennedy's assurance that all will be well.

My uneasiness is increased by recent statements of Dr. Edward Teller who said:

> It is my conviction that today the Russians are ahead of us in nuclear explosives. I cannot prove this statement, but I will say to you categorically that no one can prove its opposite.

With even the slightest indication that Russia is leading the United States in the development of nuclear explosives, how can anyone in this country be optimistic about a test ban agreement which will bind us because we honor our agreements, but will have no effect upon the activities of the Soviet Union because history proves they do not.

Further, I want to point out several other pertinent statements by Dr. Teller who said he believes that the Russians may be close to developing an anti-missile missile. If they succeed, or if they can make us believe they are about to succeed and we have not developed such a weapon, then we have no defenses.

Dr. Teller says:

> In order to develop missile defenses one needs to test in the atmosphere, but one does not need big tests. No one, in or out of the disarmament agency has claimed that nuclear explosives under 1 kiloton, in the atmosphere, can be detected. With experiments using small explosives missile advances can be conducted. These small explosions, made by the Russians, may seal our doom.

There are two conclusions. We cannot detect their testing and we must continue our testing.

In view of these convictions of one of the world's greatest scientists, how can President Kennedy be optimistic about a test ban agreement? Does he believe the American people are stupid and that they will accept his word as a guarantee for our future security? In view of the long record of broken agreements, betrayals, and the duplicity of every Communist leader since Lenin, including the present jovial Khrushchev, how can President Kennedy dare ask the American people to trust the Russians when the very life of our Nation is at stake?

In addition to the stark reality of the danger of entering into such an agreement with the Soviet Union there is the gnawing suspicion that soon we are going to be asked to make further concessions for a permanently divided Germany, recognition of the Soviet satellite, Cuba, and a nonaggression pact which will allow the Communists to solidify their territorial gains and freeze the activity of any free people to remain free or any people now enslaved by the Communists to regain their freedom. Such suspicion is not confined to a few of us in Congress, or a few knowledgeable people in the United States; it is being frankly discussed by our allies in Europe and is the main reason for the present distrust of the United States in being either willing or ready to defend itself or its allies against the Communists.

Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has shown a remarkable lack of understanding of communism and the threat to world peace of Communist imperialism. Because of this, there is every reason to believe that he and those who are advising him are not capable of protecting the security of the United States through any test ban agreement with the Soviet Union.

Even the Washington Post, a newspaper which certainly cannot be declared unfriendly to President Kennedy, closes its news article this morning on the President's news conference with this frank paragraph:

> If the Soviet Union—with the help of the United States and Britain—can get their names on the dotted line of partial test ban agreement, that would be a political coup in support of the Soviet version of peaceful coexistence and a major blow to Red China.

Mr. President, I ask you to tell the American people if Mr. Harriman is now in Moscow to protect the future security of the American people or the Communist dictatorship of Premier Khrushchev?

CHAMIZAL

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is believed that this evening President Kennedy will release an announcement that part of the United States of America is being turned over to Mexico, the Chamizal area.

The State Department's Chamizal negotiations with Mexico is a matter that has been under consideration by various administrations for many years. The proposed Chamizal settlement which includes the exchange of certain lands of the Chamizal area and of Cordova Island, was initiated by the Kennedy administration over 1½ years ago. Most of the details and commitments involved in this exchange were worked out prior to my taking office as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

The proposed settlement would involve the relocation of the Rio Grande at El Paso, Tex., and an exchange of territory resulting in the net transfer to Mexico of 437 acres of land located in the city of El Paso. The northern half of Cordova Island—193 acres—would be transferred to the United States. State Department officials advised me, "a fair and reasonable market value will be paid to the approximately 3,750 residents and business people for their land and buildings." The value of the property is estimated at $20 million, of which $5 million is for buildings and the remainder for land. The cost of relocating U.S. railroads is estimated at $2 million. The two governments would supposedly share the cost of relocating the river and constructing a new channel, of which $2.5 million would be paid by the United States. There would be a total estimated immediate cost of $25 million to the United States.

In return, a Mexican bank is to reimburse the United States approximately $4.7 million for the improvements on the land. The 193 acres of Cordova Island to be transferred to the United States has an estimated value of $3.2 to $6 million, depending upon the use and method of disposal. Therefore, after deducting the payment for the improvements and the value of the new land acquired, the total overall cost to the United States would be about $18 million.

Personally, I have seriously questioned the advisability of giving this land, which has been in our peaceful possession for over 100 years, to Mexico. According to my interpretation of the law and of past treaties and decisions, this property legally belongs to the United States and giving it away will not enhance the respect of our country in the eyes of the Mexican Government or the people of the world. However, the House of Representatives does not act upon the convention or treaty that could agree to the terms of the Chamizal proposal. This decision would be made by the United States Senate.

Since this decision will not be up to the House of Representatives, I believe that one of my very important responsibilities is to look out for, and protect, the best interests of the people I represent. In the event of an agreement, I will exert every influence of my office to see that my people are treated fairly, receive a justified settlement value for their property and that they are properly reimbursed for the costs and inconveniences to which they will be subjected, including the costs of moving to new locations. You can be assured that I will continue to try, to the best of my ability, to represent the considered opinions and feelings of the folks of west Texas.

MODERATE COST HOUSING NEEDED

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the steadily rising cost of housing a family presents increasing difficulties in supplying middle income housing. A very real gap persists in this segment of the private housing market.

One effective answer to this problem is the relatively recent development of cooperative housing projects. The growing shortage of usable land which is reasonably accessible to centers of employment makes desirable the concentration of more housing in multifamily structures.

Cooperatives combine multifamily dwellings with the added advantage of private individual ownership, and at the same time provide more economical shelter. Lower maintenance and operating costs as well as Federal income tax benefits make it possible that cooperatives are financed under section 213 of the National Housing Act. This results in monthly savings of 20 to 25 percent for middle income families.

The legislation I am introducing today is aimed at strengthening, promoting, and improving the cooperative housing program. Through this legislation more Americans will enjoy benefits under existing laws. The purpose of this bill allows cooperatives the opportunity to reduce their fixed housing costs by putting the Federal Housing Administration insurance fund on a mutual basis. By such reduction the operation of the fund would make cooperatives reap the benefits of far greater stability.

INSURANCE SAVINGS

Furthermore, surpluses which accrue in the cooperative insurance fund would be distributed to participating cooperative mortgagors in accordance with sound actuarial and accounting practices. Any such savings would then be passed on to the occupant members of the cooperatives in the form of lower monthly carrying charges.

The change proposed by this bill is a small one, nevertheless it can have impact on the housing market since even a small reduction in monthly carrying charges can enlarge the market for such housing. Moreover, the prospect of lower costs will further stimulate the development of additional cooperative housing projects.

STRUGGLE AGAINST SLUMS

Cooperatives have proved a valuable addition to the urban housing scene. They are one of the best weapons we have in the struggle against blight and slum conditions. Cooperatives have a particularly vital role in the urban redevelopment movement because of their unique contribution in supplying suitable housing within the financial budget of many city workers.

STABLE NEIGHBORHOODS

Cooperatives also help exert a beneficial stabilizing influence on their respective communities. This is true because cooperative housing occupancy has proved to reduce turnover significantly and has created more permanent and stable neighborhoods. Pride of ownership has been a spur to the growth of cooperatives.

The Federal Housing Administration section 213 program is a success. The amendments I have offered to the cooperative housing program should give impetus to this important program by encouraging it to play an even bigger role in urban housing and redevelopment plans in America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge prompt consideration of this bill.

"WHAT GOES ON?"

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the press in recent weeks has contained periodic reference to the continuing personal correspondence between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev. It is my understanding that more than 40 letters have been exchanged between these two individuals. As many Members of Congress, and interested and concerned Americans, I feel that the President has a responsibility to keep the American people advised of developments in the cold war. Very simply the President owes us some facts.

In this connection it should be recalled that the personal exchanges between President Franklin Roosevelt and Premier Stalin have still not been made public. Events in the world today move rapidly. In a dictatorship such secrecy would be expected. In a democracy, it cannot be accepted.

Mr. Speaker, an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of July 8, 1963, entitled "What Goes On?" follows:

WHAT GOES ON?

Marquis Childs recently wrote that there is a "continuing personal correspondence" between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev.

Is there any other basis on which the apparent softening of Washington's attitude toward Castro Cuba could be explained?

We, like most Americans, are largely in the dark and we would like to know more about what goes on.

Fragments of evidence, all too incomplete, suggest that Washington is impressed with Mr. Castro's latest gestures toward easing tensions. "U.S. officials," reports the New York Times from Washington, "who have been analyzing Mr. Castro's offers to 'normalize' relations believe they are motivated by a genuine desire to relieve external pressures on his regime at a time when it must concentrate on solving pressing economic difficulties.

"Similar observations were made by Latin-American diplomats who recently returned from Cuba. They said that Mr. Castro had personally assured the Governments of Brazil and Mexico that he would abandon his campaign to subvert the Latin-American nations."

"Personally assured."

What goes on?

The OAS Council has just voted a mild resolution to curb travel to Cuba and to tighten inter-American security measures. But this reportedly replaced a stronger resolution. The United States is not now pressing for an economic embargo as it earlier said it would.

Why? Is it because of the supposed easing of Castro's militance? Is there a change of American policy despite the usual denials? Or has Washington been unable to persuade Britain and other European countries to stop trading with Cuba (their trade has been sharply increasing in recent months), and cannot therefore request their Western Hemisphere allies to cut their trade merely to have the Europeans take it over?

Mr. Castro's present mildness could, conceivably be part of an important new gambit of the Soviet bloc which Mr. Kennedy knows

> about because of his letters from Mr. Khrushchev. But it could be tactical, too. Mr. Castro would have ample precedent for smiling while Soviet and western traders replenish his economic larders, only to turn on the Americas with renewed strength and aggression later on.
>
> These are surmises and Mr. Kennedy owes us some facts.

CAPTIVE NATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as I was rereading President Kennedy's recent statements in Europe, I could not help noticing his repeated references to self-determination of peoples.

> The central issue is—

The President said in his address before the Irish Parliament—

> between those who believe in self-determination and those in the East who impose upon others the harsh and repressive Communist system.

The President was visibly moved by what he saw in Berlin. Everyone living in that divided city can be proud of being a Berliner, he told them. Moreover, he urged those who suffer beyond that wall as well as those enduring endless years of oppression not to despair of their future. He offered them the example of the Irish, who had shown constancy, faith, and endurance during the long struggle for independence, finally culminating in success.

While urging the Berliners not to despair, the President saw favorable signs on the horizon. History was running against the Marxist dogma, the Jeffersonian philosophy of freedom was spreading, the winds of change were blowing across the Iron Curtain as well as in the rest of the world.

> It is not too early to think, once again in terms of all Europe.

The President remarked, that is, of a united Europe, where no Iron Curtain splits the German nation in two parts and separates Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Albania from the rest of the European community.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to take strong exception to the Russian Premier and some of our columnists who claim that the President had spoken two different languages at the American University and in Europe. To be sure, at the American University he spoke of the reassessment of our own views on the cold war and of accommodation. However, he also stressed his endeavor to convince Russia that she too could let each nation choose its own future. In elaborating on the same address in Bonn, the President stressed that what he meant was "we cannot accept with equanimity, nor do we propose to, the Communist takeover of countries—we will not accept the subversion or an attack on a free country—for we accept the principle of self-determination.

Hence, what the President meant when he spoke of accommodation did not imply the recognition of the status quo. Nor did it imply accommodation at the expense of other countries. "We will not bargain one nation's interest against another's," the President assured the free and the captive nations alike in his speech in Frankfurt.

Barely returned from his trip to Europe, President Kennedy put his signature on the Captive Nations Week proclamation, in which he said that the cause of human rights and dignity remained a universal aspiration, that justice required the elemental rights, and that this Nation had an abiding commitment to the principles of national self-determination and human freedom. And he concluded the proclamation by urging the American people to pledge renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

In issuing the proclamation on the morrow of the memorable date, on which our own Nation achieved its freedom and independence, the President not only referred to the great principles in which our Nation so strongly believes; he also was moved by the argument, so succinctly expressed in Public Law 86-90, that the captive nations constitute a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace. "We need your freedom to protect ours," the President pointed out in Frankfurt. Needless to say how much better would we be protected if all captive nations enumerated in Public Law 86-90 were free today.

The renewal of our devotion to the just aspirations of all people, made on the heels of President Kennedy's assurances in Europe, that the captive nations will not be abandoned, his urging not to despair, and his belief in the dawn of freedom could but uplift the spirit of the captive nations. What I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, is the endeavor of our Government agencies to undermine his policy, the same policy he has been enunciating since the very beginning of his administration at various places, at various times, on various occasions. Let the facts speak.

It so happens that the issuance of the Presidential Proclamation on Captive Nations Week coincides with the severe curtailment of all exile activities in this country. A heavy axe has fallen across the board. Cuban, Russian, Baltic, and central European exiles have been affected. Their organizations have been left with very low funds. As a result, they had to curtail their information activities. The scholarly Baltic Review and Rivista Baltica have put out their last issues. The monitoring of Soviet broadcasts in the Baltic languages will have to stop soon. The personnel of the various exile committees has been ordered to be cut down to the bone. Their pay has been reduced below the subsistence level. The Baltic Hall in New York, which had for years served as the center for various useful exile programs, had to close its doors.

The curtailment of exile broadcasting activities promises to be just as drastic. It is my understanding that the Baltic exile organizations will have no funds for broadcasts over Radio Madrid and Radio Roma as of September 1. Their appeal to institute broadcasts in the Baltic languages over Radio Free Europe has been disapproved by the State Department. A reply to that effect, addressed to the Joint Baltic American Committee, dated April 22, 1963, and signed by Mr. Richard H. Davis, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, said:

> American efforts in the field of broadcasting to the Baltic States have in the past been purposely concentrated in the Voice of America. The parties concerned have felt that this was the best course, and no new factors have entered into the situation to change this view.

If Mr. Davis' reference to the parties concerned applies to the Free Europe Committee, which operates Radio Free Europe, then he must have failed to check with the parties concerned before replying on their behalf. For Mr. John Richardson, Jr., chairman of the Free Europe Committee, in reply to the Baltic appeal, had assured them on February 19, 1963, that he would give support to the request and endeavor to secure the necessary funds. Mr. Richardson proved consistent in this view. Testifying before a House Foreign Affairs Committee a year ago, on June 12, 1962, he said that the only reason for not including the Baltic countries in the Radio Free Europe program was a financial one.

The State Department's negative attitude toward the expansion of exile information activities doomed the Baltic appeal. After shutting off the Baltic broadcasts over Radio Madrid and Radio Roma, Voice of America will remain the only source of Baltic broadcasts beamed behind the Iron Curtain. Yet we all know that VOA's programs have become so sterile, so dispirited, so empty that even the Russians no longer bother jamming them.

To be sure, the State Department claims that Radio Free Europe is a privately sponsored organization as are other exile organizations and their programs and activities. This view has been stressed in Mr. Davis' reply I just cited as well as in a letter Mr. Frederick Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State, addressed to me on May 20, 1963. However, while disclaiming the Department's official relationship with the exile organizations or its involvement in their financial support, Mr. Dutton admitted that the Department was "very much aware of them, and was following their activities with close interest."

It is, therefore, inconceivable to me that the curtailment of exile activities could have taken place without the State Department's endorsement and/or direction. The fact that the Free Europe Committee no longer speaks of instituting Baltic broadcasts over Radio Free Europe, in contrast to its earlier sympathetic attitude, is a good illustration of the pressure that could have been generated by the Department.

Claiming that the State Department is not involved in financing any of the exile activities, Mr. Dutton admitted that such activities were being reviewed in order to make them more effective in relation to the resources devoted to them. In plain English, this means stretching the meager funds available for such activities. As we have seen, no stretching has helped to avert a drastic curtailment of information services, let alone personal hardships.

Are the exile activities useful? Mr. Dutton gave the answer when he said that the exiles had carried on a number of useful activities over the years and we continue to think that there are fields in which they can do valuable work in the future.

If we are giving aid to the so-called nonalined countries and to the Russian satellites in exchange for their abstention votes in the United Nations or even in disregard of their continuous voting with Moscow, why should we not give comfort to the captive nations, our true friends? Public Law 86-90 not only recognized them as our true friends; it also stressed that it was vital to the national security of the United States that their desire for liberty and independence should be steadfastly kept alive. How can we keep it alive if we deprive their brethren in our country of an opportunity to speak to the captive nations in their own languages and to constantly remind us and the rest of the free world of their plight?

Mr. Speaker, every year the State Department has been bringing its heavy guns up to the Hill in quest of appropriation of hundreds of millions—not thousands—of dollars for the nonalined nations, Russian satellites, and assorted dictatorships. Yet never did the State Department spokesmen request even a modest appropriation to support exile activities which they found useful in the past and promising in the future. In this respect the Department had treated our friends worse than our foresworn enemies of the fence sitters.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that none of the congressional committees have ever looked into the flagrant discrepancy between our assurances and promises to the captive nations and our deeds. I am not surprised, however, for we do not have a committee that would take the plight of the captive nations in its heart. Judging from past experiences, no change in this attitude can be expected as long as we do not have a Special Committee on Captive Nations I and many of my distinguished colleagues have advocated for years.

Only the Special Committee on Captive Nations could ask our Government agencies why they are spending taxpayers' money on studies that praise the Soviet Union for the enslavement of hundreds of millions of people. I am referring to the ill-conceived two-volume study, "Quis Custodiet?" It was completed this last April by the Peace Research Institute under a grant of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

This is a collaborative study, prepared by more than half a dozen researchers. One of them, Mr. Walter Millis, director of the Study of War as an Institution, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Fund for the Republic, had this to say on page A14:

> Whether we admit it to ourselves or not, we benefit enormously from the capability of the Soviet police system to keep law and order over the 200-million-odd Russians and the many additional millions in the satellite states. The breakup of the Russian Communist empire today would doubtless be conducive to freedom, but would be a good deal more catastrophic for the world than was the breakup of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1918.

Mr. Speaker, I expect to read such glorifications of the dreaded Soviet police system in a Communist or pro-Communist tracts; I never expected to find it in a study financed by our Government agencies. When I say "agencies" I mean it.

For the Department of Defense, through its representative, Col. Harold Aarons, also "observed part of the study process"—page 3. To be sure, the statements contained in the "Quis Custodiet?" report proved so controversial that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency hastily pasted a label on the study stating:

> The judgments expressed in the report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Agency or any other department or agency of the U.S. Government.

The hastily pasted-on label means that the Government agencies disagree with Mr. Millis' assertion that there are 200-million-odd Russians over which Soviet police keep law and order. Mr. Millis is not as illiterate as to be ignorant of the fact that the Russian Communist Empire—to use his own terminology—does not contain 200-million-odd Russians. He knows perfectly well that their number is only half as large and that the other half is composed of the Russian-enslaved nations. Nevertheless, he resorts to a deliberate deception of the users of his study and of his contractor.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency-financed report further advocates the preservation of the Russian Communist Empire. The admirer of the Soviet police system, Mr. Millis, bluntly declares on pages A14–A15 that, in a completely policed world, the Hungarian revolution or something similar on a larger scale would be suppressed with all the forces of law and order—that is, including the United States—cooperating in the suppression. As for a completely policed world, with no national armies left and no power possessing nuclear weapons, this is a utopian figment of the imagination of Mr. Millis and his likes.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the captive nations will never learn of the proposals contained in a study that was financed or monitored by two of our Government agencies, or that they will believe it was a fantasy of a group of irresponsible researchers. However, what I would like the future Special Committee on Captive Nations to do is to look behind this and other similar studies, which completely disregard our commitments to the captive nations, our solemn assurances, and our dedication to the same principles that are anchored in our own Declaration of Independence.

My resolution to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations, that was introduced in the 87th Congress, has been gathering dust in the Rules Committee for many, many months without any action being taken. What would be more fitting than to vote favorably on it and then enact it during this Captive Nations Week?

Mr. Speaker, I request your support for House Resolution 14.

A NUCLEAR TEST BAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, this last Monday, July 15, 1963, Gov. W. Averell Harriman began his meetings in Moscow with Premier Khrushchev and Lord Hailsham of England, the purpose—to discuss a nuclear test ban.

Mr. Speaker, the good wishes and prayers of all men of good will accompany Governor Harriman. There is change in the air—and hope, for Governor Harriman journeys to Moscow at a moment in modern history when our relations with the Soviets can be said to be improved.

Governor Harriman's assignment can truly be said to be bipartisan in purpose, for the aims of his mission are in accordance with both the Republican and Democratic platforms as presented to the people of the United States and the world in 1960.

I quote from the Republican Party platform:

> We are similarly ready to negotiate and to institute realistic methods and safeguards for disarmament, and for the suspension of nuclear tests. We advocate an early agreement by all nations to forgo nuclear tests in the atmosphere, and the suspension of other tests as verification techniques permit * * *. We have deep concern about the nuclear arms race. This concern leads us to seek disarmament and nuclear agreements.

And the Democratic Party platform proposes a similar program, as follows:

> There are no simple solutions to the infinitely complex challenges which face us. Mankind's eternal dream, a world of peace, can only be built slowly and patiently.
>
> A primary task is to develop responsible proposals that will help break the deadlock on arms control.
>
> Such proposals should include means for ending nuclear tests under workable safeguards, cutting back nuclear weapons.

In President Kennedy's recent commencement address at American University he not only announced that the United States would refrain from conducting further atmospheric nuclear tests unless other nations conducted them, he also called for a basic reexamination of our attitudes toward our adversaries and toward the pursuit of peace.

Mr. Speaker, as President Kennedy pointed out:

> In the final analysis, our most basic common link is that we all inhabit this planet.

> We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children's future. And we are all mortal.

One of our big problems is that we tend to forget that there are people on the other side. We have only to read the news dispatches from Moscow and Peiping to know that the Communists do not all agree with each other. Splits have occurred in the Communist bloc which could have the most far reaching consequences. The Russians disagree with the Chinese, the Chinese disagree with the Yugoslavs, the Yugoslavs disagree with the Albanians, the Albanians disagree with the Poles, and so on. A struggle for leadership is continuing within Communist parties throughout the world. Internal conflicts wrack the Communist world.

Something else is happening in the Communist world. New generations are rising. The industrialized Communist regimes are undergoing fresh change. As the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles said in 1958:

> There is nothing inevitable about communism except that it, too, is bound to change. The forces that change it are already at work and discernible.

In that same year of 1958, an American industrialist who became a distinguished public servant for the United States and then the United Nations pointed to these changes in the Soviet Union and suggested a new approach for our foreign policy. Paul Hoffman, writing in Look magazine, observed:

> The very success of the Soviet Union in mastering a complex industrial system, its haste in training hundreds of thousands of teachers, scientists, engineers, and administrators, have created a new class of men in Russia, outside and apart from the power bureaucracy—but dominated by it. These men are our potential allies, whether they realize it or not, because they want what we want too—tranquility to pursue their careers and improve their standards of living. Above all, because they are intelligent, they crave dignity: and since dignity comes only with freedom, a conflict of interest must always exist between them and their power bureaucracy. These new men in Russia are growing rapidly in number and prestige. Our problem is to get to them, and, through them, to their masters.

Since then we have seen that the men described by Paul Hoffman have been the ones with whom their counterparts in the West have established the easiest rapport. Soviet and American scientists have met at a series of pugwash conferences and elsewhere, and have discovered that they often see eye-to-eye. But we are not sure that we have been able, in the words of Paul Hoffman, to "get through them, to their masters." We have also witnessed a struggle by another group in Soviet society, the artists and intellectuals, against the power bureaucracy. Here, again, is a group which craves dignity and the freedom to pursue their careers in their own way. They have a tough existence, but is their battle not the battle of all men who want freedom? Is their battle not part of the same struggle, at home and abroad, for elementary human rights?

In his speech at American University, President Kennedy put his finger on this human factor. He said:

> No government or social system is so evil that its people must be considered as lacking in virtue. As Americans, we find communism profoundly repugnant as a negation of personal freedom and dignity. But we can still hail the Russian people for their many achievements—in science and space, in economic and industrial growth, in culture, in acts of courage.

The late Pope John XXIII, in his magnificent encyclical "Peace on Earth," made essentially the same point when he suggested:

> One must never confuse error and the person who errs, not even when there is question of error or inadequate knowledge of truth in the moral or religious field. The person who errs is always and above all a human being and retains in every case his dignity as a human person.

And so, Mr. Speaker, it is with some degree of hope and expectation that we await the outcome of the Moscow discussions. We know that time is running out. In a few short years there may be 15 or 20 nuclear powers. With this in the future we must bend every effort now to build the foundation for a peaceful world where the idealogical differences and disagreements between nations can be resolved not by war but rather under international law and through economic and political competition.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from California for bringing this issue before the House at this significant time. I say significant because news stories from Moscow indicate that we may be on the eve of an historical development. Negotiators from the United States, led by Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman, from the Soviet Union, and from Great Britain, have already begun to draft language for a treaty to end nuclear tests in the air, under water, and in outer space. Although Mr. Harriman's mission was supposed to be largely exploratory, progress is already being made in putting a treaty together.

Some of us have watched the nuclear test ban talks for the past 5 years, hoping that the obstacles could be overcome. During that time four nations have tested nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, a situation which has damaged the health and probably some of the lives of generations now living and as yet unborn. Just recently I have been led by this situation to join Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE in introducing bills which would provide more adequate countermeasures against the pollution of our environment from radioactive fallout. In a real sense we are now paying a high price—in terms of cancer, leukemia, and genetic damage—for participation in the arms race. Some individuals point to the small percentage of our population which might be affected by fallout damage and conclude that the price is not too high. I would remind these individuals, Mr. Speaker, that we are tampering with the lives of people. This is a moral issue of the most agonizing kind.

A nuclear test ban treaty is not an end in itself. It is a beginning—a sensible beginning of the search for ways to settle international disputes without the weapons of modern warfare.

Mr. Speaker, it has been apparent for several years to some of us that this country's security cannot forever be protected by H-bombs and intercontinental ballistic missiles. Other nations will gain these weapons of mass destruction unless we find the means to achieve mutual disarmament. That is why I have repeatedly expressed my concern and joined as an original sponsor of the bill to create the present Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. That is why I am proud to have cosponsored legislation in this session to give the Agency permanent status. I am sure we do not have all the answers to the problem of world security, but I am prepared to say that this Nation can and should spend more time and effort and money to find the answers. If we do not, I see little hope that we will survive the 1970's.

That is why a nuclear test ban treaty would be a hopeful beginning. Such an agreement must provide a base on which further accords in the field of arms control and disarmament can be built, and in which some of the long-smoldering disputes can be resolved. We know that disarmament is not enough—we must also strengthen the United Nations to help contain future conflicts—but disarmament of all countries is one of the main roads to our survival.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the mission to Moscow by Under Secretary of State Harriman has the prayerful support of the vast majority of our citizens. I can testify, on the basis of personal contact with my own constituents, that the issue of a nuclear test ban treaty is one which has generated widespread and continuing interest.

In addition to evidence of this support coming from many sources, I have been pleased to note two statements by religious leaders recently made on behalf of a nuclear test ban agreement. The first is a statement by 45 distinguished American clergymen. The second is the full text of the resolution on nuclear testing approved this month by the General Synod of the United Church of Christ.

The first statement is signed by some of the most eminent church dignitaries in this country, including Edwin T. Dahlberg, former president of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.; Harry Emerson Fosdick; Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr; the Right Reverend James A. Pike; the Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., and Ralph Sockman. When the risks of a test ban are weighed, these religious leaders say, "It is clear that national and world security lie in an inspected agreement to stop atomic testing."

The second statement, by the General Synod of the United Church of Christ, is a model not only of a clear statement of position, but also and especially of a call to members of a religious body to put their beliefs into action. The resolution declares that if a test ban treaty is agreed upon by the negotiating powers, and assuming that such treaty will carry safeguards for the security of the United States and of the free world, the Council for Christian Social Action is authorized and requested, by communications to our churches and by testimony in the U.S. Senate, to work for its favorable consideration by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the full text of these statements so that my colleagues may reflect on their message:

TEXT OF STATEMENT BY RELIGIOUS DIGNITARIES SUPPORTING A NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

It now lies in the power of the United States and the Soviet Union to turn back from the danger of nuclear threats which have haunted the world for so many years.

It is now clear to the United States and the Soviet Union that each has the nuclear power to destroy the other many times over, that accident or calculation can devastate the rest of the world.

It is now clear to both that until nuclear testing is stopped, each will compete with the other in greater potential for death.

We who are citizens of the United States bear a responsibility, not only to ourselves but toward mankind, to do everything possible to stop the increase in nuclear arms and the present drift toward war. We now have the opportunity to act. It may be the last opportunity we have before it becomes forever impossible to stop the arms race.

In the name of humanity we therefore call upon the President of the United States to maintain his belief in the necessity of a test ban treaty, to press his efforts to achieve it, and to trust the good sense and the good will of the American people to support his efforts to the hilt.

President Kennedy has told his country and the world that an effective treaty with the Soviet Union to ban all nuclear tests—in all environments—is not only in the best interests of world peace, but in the best interests of the national security of the United States.

We believe him. Without such a treaty, no man is secure, every man in every country can look to the day when the nuclear threat will come home to him.

There are those who say that to ban the tests will give to the Soviets an advantage so great as to imperil our safety.

This we deny.

We do so because the President, after full consultation with his Committee of Principals, including the Secretaries of State and Defense, the heads of the Central Intelligence Agency, the U.S. Disarmament Agency, the Atomic Energy Commission, and his scientific advisers, has rendered a judgment that our national security is enhanced, not diminished, by a test ban treaty with the Soviet Union. We believe that the President must now be supported in his efforts to negotiate such a treaty.

Other concerns have been expressed that without a large number of inspections on Soviet territory we could not guarantee the agreement. But whether the number of inspections should be seven, as the United States has proposed, or three as the U.S.S.R. insists, is surely a matter to be negotiated by the President's representatives in the assurance that whatever number is agreed upon will not be at the expense of American security.

What then are the risks? On the one side, without a treaty there will be more tests by both countries, more and more dangers to the world's people from radioactive fallout, greater increase in nuclear armaments, greater spread of nuclear weapons to other countries, and thus greater possibility of nuclear war.

On the other side, with a treaty, there is the risk of cheating—not in the atmosphere or outer space, where tests can be detected—but underground where occasionally a small nuclear explosion might be masked as an earthquake disturbance. Even here such risk is minimized by the Soviet agreement to permit obligatory on-site inspections of suspicious events, and the distribution of a small number of sealed seismic detectors on Soviet territory, the number of which will have to be negotiated with the United States.

When these risks are weighed, when the President of the United States has declared both his willingness to negotiate and his assurance of our security, it is clear that national and world security lie in an inspected agreement to stop atomic testing.

As Christians and churchmen we call upon our fellow Americans to understand what is at stake, to clarify for themselves the issues involved, and to support their President in his efforts to call a halt to the testing of the most destructive weapons mankind has ever known. We believe that success in such efforts is the first step to world peace and the control of war.

SIGNATORIES

Stuart Leroy Anderson, president, Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Calif.

Gene E. Bartlett, president, Colgate Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, N.Y.

The Most Reverend Metropolitan Antony Bashir, archbishop of the Syrian Antiochian Orthodox Archdiocese, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Jerald C. Brauer, dean, Divinity School, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Frank H. Caldwell, president, Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.

The Very Reverend John B. Coburn, dean, Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.

Bishop Fred Pierce Corson, Methodist Bishop of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pa.

Robert E. Cushman, dean, Divinity School of Duke University, Durham, N.C.

Edwin T. Dahlberg, former president of National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America, minister in residence, Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa.

Rt. Rev. Horace W. B. Donegan, Protestant Episcopal bishop of New York, New York, N.Y.

Paul H. Eller, president, Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary, Naperville, Ill.

Rev. Carl B. Eschbach, minister, Fairview Evangelical United Brethren Church, Dayton, Ohio.

Edward C. Fendt, president, Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary, Capital University, Columbus, Ohio.

William C. Finch, dean, the Divinity School, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.

Charles W. Forman, acting dean, Divinity School, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Harry Emerson Fosdick, Bronxville, N.Y.

James N. Gettemy, president, the Hartford Seminary Foundation, Hartford, Conn.

The Reverend Theodore Alexander Gill, president, San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo, Calif.

Bishop A. Raymond Grant, chairman, division of human relations and economic affairs, the Methodist Church, Portland, Oreg.

Rev. Dr. Dana McLean Greeley, president, Unitarian Universalist Association, Boston, Mass.

His Eminence Iakavos, archbishop of the Greek archiocese of North and South America.

Rt. Rev. Charles J. Kinsolving III, Protestant Episcopal bishop of New Mexico, Santa Fe, N. Mex.

John H. Kromminga, president, Calvin Theological Seminary, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Bishop John Wesley Lord, Methodist bishop of the Washington area, Washington, D.C.

Samuel H. Miller, dean, Divinity School, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Robert V. Moss, Jr., president, Lancaster Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pa.

Bishop R. H. Mueller, president, board of bishops, the Evangelical United Brethren, Indianapolis, Ind.

Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, New York, N.Y.

Beauford A. Norris, president, Christian Theological Seminary, Indianapolis, Ind.

Rt. Rev. Austin Pardue, D.D., Protestant Episcopal bishop of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Rt. Rev. James A. Pike, J.S.D., S.T.D., Protestant Episcopal bishop of California, San Francisco, Calif.

Bishop Richard C. Raines, bishop of Methodist Church, the Indiana area, Indianapolis, Ind.

Bishop Marshall R. Reed, resident bishop, the Methodist Church, the Michigan area, former presiding bishop, council of bishops, the Methodist Church, Detroit, Mich.

Alvin N. Rogness, president, Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minn.

The Very Reverend Lawrence Rose, dean, the General Theological Seminary, New York, N.Y.

The Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., L.H.D., dean, Washington Cathedral, Washington, D.C.

Rt. Rev. Lauriston L. Scaife, D.D., Protestant Episcopal bishop of the diocese of western New York, Buffalo, N.Y.

Howard Schomer, president, Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

Rt. Rev. Henry Knox Sherrill, retired Protestant Episcopal bishop, former presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal church, and former president of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., Boxford, Mass.

Ralph Sockman, minister emeritus, Christ Church Methodist, New York, N.Y.

Rt. Rev. Anson Phelps Stokes, Jr., Protestant Episcopal bishop of Boston, Boston, Mass.

Bishop Donald Harvey Tippett, Methodist bishop of San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif.

Bishop William J. Walls, secretary board of bishops, African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, Chicago, Ill.

, Bishop Hazen G. Werner, resident bishop, Methodist Church, Ohio area, Columbus, Ohio.

The Very Reverend Richard H. Wilmer, Jr., Ph. D., dean, Berkeley Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.

RESOLUTION ON NUCLEAR TESTING

Whereas the second general synod in its "call to Christian action in society" said: "We therefore call upon our churches and their members to pray and work: * * * for effective international control and reduction of all national armaments, including the testing of nuclear weapons," and

Whereas the third general synod in its pronouncement on "national responsibility and international relations" said: "We welcome the increased attention now being given by both Government and private organizations to plan for the reduction, control, and eventual elimination of national armaments. We also urge the United States to persist in the effort to reach multilateral agreement on the cessation of all kinds of nuclear weapons testing"; and

Whereas the Government of the United States is working toward this goal, as evidenced by repeated Presidential statements, by persistence in negotiations with other nuclear powers, by the announced intention to engage in new discussions in Moscow in July of this year, following the failure of the Geneva Conference to reach agreement, and by the decision to conduct no further tests in the atmosphere so long as other States do not do so; and

Whereas, by providing a first step in the reduction and control of armaments, by eliminating future fallout, and by helping to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, a test ban treaty is in the interests of American security, as well as in the interest of general human well-being: Be it

Resolved, That the fourth general synod of the United Church of Christ, meeting in Denver, Colo., July 4–11, 1963, commend and support the continuous and now renewed effort by our Government to reach agreement by the principal nuclear powers on the permanent cessation of nuclear weapons testing; and be it further

Resolved, That if a test ban treaty is agreed upon by the negotiating powers, and assuming that such treaty will carry safeguards for the security of the United States and of the free world, the Council for Christian Social Action is authorized and requested, by communications to our churches and by testimony in the U.S. Senate, to work for its favorable consideration by the Senate.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from New York for his most excellent remarks.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii.

A NUCLEAR TEST BAN AS A FIRST STEP TOWARD MUTUAL DISARMAMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, today we find ourselves engaged in a never-ending gigantic arms race, firm in our belief that our national security depends in large part upon our ability to keep pace in such a race. Paradoxically, we recognize the necessity for ending this arms race, for it has greatly multiplied international tensions, burdened our political and military institutions, and strained our Nation's economy. We know too that in the long run, our national security cannot be maintained by military means alone.

Yet casting down our weapons cannot in itself offer a satisfactory solution. Unilateral disarmament and isolationistic refusal to support international organizations marked our mistaken retreat from responsibility following World War I. We have learned that disarmament must be multilateral, adequately inspected and appropriately phased. We look to the day when effective disarmament is established and law replaces force through a workable world security system.

A bomb of 10 megatons, available in quantity to both armed camps, has more destructive power than all the weapons exploded by all the participants in World War II. Disarmament, the thorough and lasting protection against the unleashing of such weapons, must therefore be the responsibility of every thinking man. There can be no question of its status as a bipartisan issue. Hans J. Morgenthau has said:

> Disarmament, no less than the armaments race, is the reflection of the power relations among the nations concerned. Disarmament, no less than the armaments race, reacts upon the power relations from which it arose. As the armaments race aggravates the struggle for power through the fear it generates and the burden it imposes, so disarmament contributes to the improvement of the political situation by lessening political tensions and by creating confidence in the purposes of the respective nations.

Mr. Speaker, our participation in the present arms race is justified by our desire to demonstrate to the Soviet Union that no nation can pursue an aggressive policy free from the fear of retaliation. Our desire is to convince the Soviets that if they abandon their expansionist aims, peaceful coexistence awaits them.

A nuclear test ban treaty is necessary as a first step toward an enforceable multilateral disarmament agreement, which is in turn essential to the creation of an atmosphere in which all nations may live secure from the fear of war.

I am sure each of us realizes the difficulties involved in obtaining an acceptable test ban agreement. It is all too easy to allow the need for complex security measures, and the demonstrated intransigence of the Soviet Union, to foster a spirit of defeatism. It is precisely these factors which make American initiative imperative. If it is our desire to guard against the dangers of radioactive fallout, to reduce the crushing economic burden of the arms race, and most importantly, to take the steps necessary to the achievement of effective and mutual disarmament, then the constant effort for a workable test ban treaty must remain as a basic tenet of our Nation's foreign policy. We must not be content to point to the past lack of cooperative response from the Soviet Union to justify a reduced intensity of our own efforts. If we as a nation are sincere in our professed desire for world peace, and we most certainly are, there can be no difficulty so great as to lift from our shoulders the burden of constant effort.

Clearly there are risks involved in any test ban treaty. The risk of secret undetected testing has been widely discussed. The consensus of expert opinion seems to be that while such a risk exists, it is an extremely small one and more importantly, the results of any testing that could avoid detection would not have measurable influence on the military balance of power. The point that is so often overlooked in the consideration of test ban risks is the considerable risk involved in the continuation of unrestricted testing. The generation of cumulative, poisonous fallout, the expansion of nuclear weaponry, the possibility of the Soviet Union gaining nuclear parity—all these must be remembered by those who would consider risk.

It seems strange that those who would never agree to a ban on outer space research, desiring an opportunity to catch up to the Soviet Union, wholeheartedly support the principle of unrestricted testing. The balance of nuclear power is in our favor today, but it was considerably more so 10 years ago. Those who view a test ban treaty as an idealistic compromise and one which contradicts our vital national interests, had best reconsider the alternative effects of unrestricted nuclear testing.

World security cannot rest on disarmament alone. There must be a strengthening of international organizations and a corresponding strengthening of the respect of all nations for these organizations. No number of inspection teams can replace the genuine easing of international tensions. There must be a growth among all nations of a feeling of respect for humanity. We must never lose sight of the fact that a test ban treaty is only a beginning, only an initial step in the treatment of one symptom of international disorder. A test ban treaty cannot end the bitterness of national hatreds, cannot provide a solution to the problems of poverty, disease, and overpopulation. Yet we must never allow the enormity of the tasks before us to becloud the fact that we can advance by taking only a step at a time. Such a treaty would be a historic forward step in the establishment of a world secure in peace and free from fear.

I congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] for calling the attention of Congress to the need for bipartisan support of the administration's effort toward world peace and join him in wishing Under Secretary of State Harriman success and Godspeed in his present mission in Moscow.

Mr. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman. I congratulate my good friend, the gentleman from Hawaii on his creative and thoughtful speech. It is always a rare treat to be in the House when he speaks.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. I yield with pleasure to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN].

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in offering heartfelt support to Governor Harriman in his efforts to negotiate a treaty banning nuclear weapons tests. Mr. Harriman is one of many dedicated Americans who, over the past 17 years, have been called upon by three different Presidents to accept the heavy responsibility of trying to achieve a meaningful agreement with the Russians.

We owe a deep debt of gratitude to these men. Despite the frustration of many past failures—in the face of constantly shifting arguments, and often beset by carping criticism from the home front—they have persisted in negotiations, firmly and fairly.

These men have come from both political parties. Holding widely divergent political and social views, they have been united by a common hope: to achieve a peaceful world, secure against the ravages of weaponry unknown two decades ago.

As a Democrat, I should like to read the roll of some of these men from the opposite party who—with Governor Harriman and other able statesmen of my party—have dispelled any doubt of our ability to deal effectively with Communists.

There is Republican Harold Stassen, the former Governor of Minnesota, who served as our Director of Foreign Operations under President Eisenhower.

There is the former Republican Senator Henry Cabot Lodge. As our Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Lodge presented an American image of aggressive diplomacy and nobility of purpose. He is still carrying on the struggle.

And the list includes such names as James J. Wadsworth, a former Republican Congressman from New York State who led the American delegation to an 87-nation conference on the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency; Frederick M. Eaton, the Republican industrialist-diplomat; John J. McCloy, a Republican banker-industrialist who served as president of the World Bank; William C. Foster, a Republican corporation executive who was Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, and Arthur Hobson Dean, a noted Republican lawyer.

Averell Harriman, a Democrat with a long and distinguished record in public service, carries on a noble quest which has been—and must remain—a wholly bipartisan effort.

I am delighted that support for Mr. Harriman comes from both sides of the aisle in this House, as witnessed by the words of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN]. Mr. Harriman carries our trust to do his his best for us, and for the world, in these critically important negotiations.

Mr. EDWARDS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for his fine words here today.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. I now yield with pleasure to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER].

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the major specters haunting the world's leaders and especially our President is the likelihood that many nations may soon possess nuclear weapons. Most recently at Bonn, President Kennedy said a test ban agreement would help avert the disaster of a spread of nuclear weapons.

At his news conference March 21, speaking of the importance of a test ban agreement, the President said:

> With all the history of war—and the human race's history unfortunately has been a good deal more war than peace—with nuclear weapons distributed all through the world, and available, and the strong reluctance of any people to accept defeat, I see the possibility in the 1970's of the President of the United States having to face a world in which 15 or 20 or 25 nations may have these weapons. I regard that as the greatest possible danger and hazard.

Students of this problem suggest that the countries which have the necessary economic base, industrial capacity, and skilled manpower for at least a primitive nuclear weapons program in the near future include Belgium, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, West Germany, India, Italy, Japan, Sweden, and Switzerland.

We in the Congress cannot escape our own responsibility in the matter. Under our Constitution we have an important role to play in developing and implementing foreign policy.

We must do more than criticize, find fault, and note shortcomings in proposals. We also need to face the same prospect the President faces—to see a world with 10 to 20 nations who once counted little in the balance of power, but who have, through the acquisition of nuclear weapons, become capable of inflicting intolerable damage and injury to any other nation; we must recognize the possibility of inflamed passions, old hatreds and regional quarrels bringing on a world holocaust; and envisage the difficulties facing an American President in a world where nuclear weapons are the great equalizers between large and small powers, and where nuclear blackmail may become commonplace. One of the main purposes of a test-ban treaty is to prevent this potential nightmare from becoming a reality.

Would a test-ban treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union guarantee there will be no more nuclear powers? Obviously not, since there is no way to force nonsigners to comply with the treaty's terms.

Would a test-ban treaty inhibit and deter the proliferation of nuclear weapons? Definitely yes. If the United States and the Soviet Union agree to end nuclear tests it could then be possible to bring economic, technical, diplomatic and psychological pressures to bear on nonnuclear powers. Those groups within each nation opposed to their country's development of nuclear weapons would be immeasurably strengthened. The annual, overwhelming U.N. vote against nuclear testing and the proliferation of nuclear weapons would acquire even more significance. This step might well be followed, as Secretary Rusk and others have suggested, by an agreement by the nuclear powers not to transfer nuclear weapons to nonnuclear powers and by more far-reaching steps toward the development of international institutions under which we could explore disarmament with confidence.

Some argue that because Communist China and France might not be parties to the agreement, we should not enter it. This is a little like saying that because it may not be possible to have just 3 nuclear powers, it is better to have 15 instead of 5. Moreover, it may be that future developments we cannot now foresee will persuade these two countries not to develop their nuclear weapons systems to their full destructive capabilities.

A test-ban treaty is clearly in our own national interest. The fact that it is also in the national interest of the Soviet Union lends substance to the hopes and prayers of millions of people around the world that Governor Harriman will be successful in his current mission to Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from California for providing this opportunity to air the views of many Members of Congress on the important mission in the negotiation being conducted in Moscow. I hope that his work will be well repaid.

Mr. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman. It was indeed a privilege to hear this thoughtful speech given here today by my distinguished colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, why do we test nuclear weapons? To improve our stockpile? And what is that stockpile like now? Mr. Speaker, one expert—Dr. Ralph Lapp—has called it incredible; and incredible is certainly a good word, since Dr. Lapp over a year ago estimated its size at a minimum of 30,000 megatons. Since the bomb that destroyed Hiroshima was only one-fiftieth of a megaton—not one-fifth, Mr. Speaker, but one-fiftieth—that means the United States now has the explosive equivalent of 1,500,000 Hiroshima bombs in its arsenal. Let me repeat that—the United States has one and a half million Hiroshima equivalents in its nuclear arsenal. That sounds a lot more real and understandable to me than megaton estimates—and every time I sit down and think about such a reality I also think it is incredible.

That is quite a stockpile—one and a half million Hiroshima units—so big a stockpile that any sensible person might ask why we need anymore. Now I know that having such a stockpile does not mean we could destroy one and a half million cities the size of Hiroshima even if there were that many cities in the whole world. Some of the bombs are so big that they would have a great deal of explosive power left over around the edges—going to waste, so to speak. Some of the bombs and missiles would miss their target and land in the countryside or on our allies, or even on us. Some would never get fired because communication channels had gone haywire under the pressure of crisis or had failed under attack, or because some local commander had lost control of himself. So the existence of 1,500,000 Hiroshima equivalents in our stockpile does not mean they could all be used in time of war.

Still—assume that one way or another only one-hundredth of the potential gets used. That is 15,000 Hiroshima equivalents. Can we imagine how much war that would be? The word war would have nothing to do with the case—15,000 Hiroshima units is not war, it is a holocaust. And I use the word in its original meaning—everything burns. If anybody has trouble remembering what just one single Hiroshima meant, let him look at two photographs I have seen by courtesy of the Atomic Energy Commission. Both were taken from the air over Hiroshima. The first shows a teeming, bustling city. The second is empty. The river is still there, the hills are still there—in fact they are more apparent—but the city—the people, the streets, the buildings—are just gone.

Imagine 15,000 of that—and that is only one-hundredth of a minimum estimate of our current nuclear stockpile.

Now of course that figure of 15,000 Hiroshimas doesn't mean much unless you compare it with the possible targets. In the Soviet Union, Communist Eastern Europe, and China all put together there are only 370 cities with 100,000 population or more. If you look just at plans for highly invulnerable missile production and emplacement—leave out bombers, leave out vulnerable missiles, leave out so-called tactical nuclear weapons—the United States plans to have 950 Minutemen and 656 Polarises. That's a total of about 1,500 missiles, each of which could destroy a city. Some of them would misfire, some would miss, and some of the Polaris-carrying submarines might be in harbor during a crisis. But if just half the Polarises and all the Minutemen were available and only one-third of them get through, we could still destroy about 400 cities—which is every city in the whole Communist bloc, even including our captive friends in Poland, Hungary, and the rest of Eastern Europe.

That is a lot of death. In fact, it is overkill. I hope the Speaker will forgive me for spelling out this nightmare, because I did so for a reason. I want to point out that we can destroy our enemies more than once—if you can imagine destroying anything or killing anybody more than once—and we can do this even if we never test another nuclear weapon. We can do it out of our present arsenal, even if we never produce another nuclear weapon—let alone test new kinds of weapons.

So much for those who talk as if the United States would be naked and unarmed if we stopped nuclear testing today. Now, what about the more sophisticated arguments against testing? These can be summed up under two headings—which really add up to one so-called strategy; the notion that H-bombs can be aimed solely at H-bombs instead of people, and the notion that nuclear testing might somehow magically produce a defense against nuclear weapons. Together these notions add up to the idea that you can fight a war with H-bombs and get out of it with a whole skin. It is sometimes called the theory of counterforce war, or no-cities war, or limited strategic war.

This theory is absurd. As the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], said on April 11, 1962:

> There have been some estimates and some so-called mathematical computations of the casualties that would result from a nuclear war under various assumptions, including a positive attempt by the adversaries to limit targeting to military installations and facilities. I have no hesitancy in saying, however, that to me these extrapolations, or projections, or hypotheses are exceedingly unrealistic. They presuppose a rational restraint by both sides that I doubt would exist in the awful eventuality of a nuclear attack. This kind of reasoning, if carried to its logical extension, would lead one to believe that an international conflict could be settled under controlled combat or even by a game of some type in which the opponents were in agreement on the rules and abided by them.

And he continued:

> I am afraid that we would be deluding ourselves to base our national policy on an assumption that our potential adversaries would be restrained and rational. In my opinion, if nuclear war begins, it will be a war of extermination.

I am fully able to agree with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the other body on that point. If nuclear war begins, it will be a war of extermination. No counterforce targeting, no anti-ICBM's, can save us then. Since so much has been made of the possibility of an anti-ICBM as a reason to keep on with our nuclear testing, I want to cite what one of our greatest scientists, Hans Bethe, said on this point on January 5, 1962:

> It is not very difficult to design a defensive missile which will come close enough to an ICBM to destroy it by means of an atomic explosion. There is also no problem about providing atomic warheads for antimissiles. But the offense can send decoys along with its missiles which are almost impossible to distinguish from the missiles, and they can send many missiles simultaneously which saturate the radars of the defense. Thus, I think AICBM is virtually hopeless, and the deterrent can remain stable for a long time.

If there is a military answer to and a military defense against H-bombs, Mr. Speaker, it will come from a science as much beyond nuclear technology as nuclear science was beyond TNT technology before 1939—and a scientific advance like that will not come from testing nuclear weapons any more than the first atomic bomb came from testing TNT.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we have a situation in which the present nuclear arsenal of the United States is more than enough to destroy any enemy. We could add to our present arsenal, if we wished to do so, without ever testing another weapon. Why do we need to test? If we can achieve with the Russians an agreement that makes it extremely likely that neither we nor they could test without the other one knowing it, why in Heaven's name—and I say Heaven's name deliberately, and without blasphemy—why in Heaven's name should we want to test?

Mr. Harriman and his delegation are now in Moscow, probing to see if the Russians are serious about concluding a nuclear test ban treaty. If so, perhaps we are at long last about to start down the road toward dismantling the modern warmaking potential in all countries. A nuclear test ban would be an important first step.

I for one, Mr. Speaker, and I know for a fact a heavy majority of my constituents as well, will fully and vigorously support the President in his efforts to bring home the kind of agreement I have mentioned.

Mr. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman from California for the important things he said here today in his most significant speech.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the dissertation on this question of nuclear testing and since I have some strong feelings about it, I had hoped to prepare a statement that I could present myself at this time. However, I do not have it ready at this moment, so I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that while this discussion may aid and abet in strengthening the hand of Mr. Harriman, as he represents our Government on this question of the cessation of nuclear testing, I doubt that it can have a great deal of influence, and I am not sure that I want it to have a great deal of influence, because I am not sure that I know all the factors that are involved at this particular time.

However, I think it may be worth while to say at this time that while this conference may be worth while, and I hope it is successful and will be in the interest of humanity and in the public interest of my country, I think that it may be more urgent to at the same time we consider these days a proposition that would bring about a positive approach to the solution of some of the real problems that are presented in attaining the peace that we want and I believe the peace that people want everywhere. The problem of getting our own people and the people of the world to understand what it is that we the people want most to do on the world arena.

It seems to me that we need to enunciate a statement on this question that is consistent with our own heritage and experience in freedom and liberty in this country. It seems to me that we can learn what to do by reading again the history of our own country and trying to catch something of the spirit that burned in the hearts of these great patriots, these forefathers of ours who we know now had some great and noble ideas, and we now know that they built here a firm foundation. And then we need to do what we can to put that spirit that burned in their hearts, in the hearts and minds of people everywhere who want the freedoms that we have, and to develop in their hearts and minds the same kind of desire that we have here, the same kind of sense of dedication to the basic freedoms, such as freedom from want and fear, freedom of speech, freedom to worship, et cetera, and another great and important freedom, freedom of movement, movement of men and goods—of movement of ideas and ideals.

Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to say is that while we are doing this, we ought also to think about developing a program that has a greater appeal on the foreign front and that more truly represents what we want here not only for ourselves but for the people of the world.

And so while I want to join and applaud this effort, I want to say also that I am not sure that it is going to have a great influence, but I think what has been said here today and what has been put in the Record will be worth reading. I hope the people will read what the gentleman has presented and I hope, when I have more time to go over what is in my mind directly in regard to this question of testing, to make my further views known. I might say that I made a statement two years ago on this question of testing which revealed my position clearly. Perhaps it would be timely for me, and of some value, to put that in the Record at this time. I said this in addressing a meeting of the Farm Women in Iowa in November 1961.

After calling attention to the fact that we had a great stockpile of bombs on hand, at that time—not as much as we have now—and that I felt because of that and because of what I knew about our other defense posture, we had an adequate defense, and that I thought that common sense and decency dictated that our Government then should not be participating in any further testing of the nuclear bomb—and I said then underground or aboveground. I said we should not do this until and unless this can be done without contamination of any kind, pointing out that we had no right as individuals or as nations—when I say "we" I include all humanity, all nations—to contaminate the air that everybody needs to breathe and that nature must have to give us sustenance, any more than we had the right to pollute the waters of our rivers out of which everybody does not have to drink. So I am clearly on the side of no testing and I hope we can bring about some kind of system that will assure the removal of nuclear testing everywhere.

I hope that our leaders can come to some kind of agreement in which we can have confidence and that will head us away from this terrible abyss that I think we are headed for, that could be very disastrous as far as the human family is concerned.

Mr. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. I commend the gentleman for his humane and thoughtful speech here today. I think all of us here in the House of Representatives today are better because of what the gentleman from Iowa said.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Cameron].

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, "history," said President Kennedy in his American University speech of June 10, "teaches us that enmities between nations, as between individuals, do not last forever. However fixed our likes and dislikes may seem, the tide of time and events will often bring surprising changes in the relations between nations and neighbors."

Signs of surprising change are indeed coming to us almost faster than we can assimilate them. And yet, if we are to exploit to free-world advantage the international undercurrents swirling beneath the Communist iceberg, we must continually probe the diplomatic depths and attempt to sail with the tide of history.

Today, in Moscow, Gov. Averell Harriman is probing the depths. He is doing this because the President and all rational Americans are convinced that continued nuclear testing is exceedingly dangerous, and that if it is not stopped this year it is likely to spiral beyond the control of man. A partial test ban agreement hopefully will become an effective tool for inhibiting the spread of nuclear weapons to reckless nations—particularly Red China.

As we rivet our attention on Moscow, where the Soviets are turning their faces to us and their backs on Peiping, it is impossible to paint a rosy picture of tomorrow with a brush dipped in the colors of today. Now is merely a time to hope, to observe, to speculate, to look at our subject from many angles and, at best, pencil in a few lines on the world canvas. It is encouraging to know that Mr. Harriman, a veteran diplomat with a reputation for wariness, wields a perceptive pencil.

The overly optimistic, however, are already talking of a possible summit meeting between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev. In this regard, I think it prudent to recall an observation made by Mr. Rusk before he became Secretary of State. "I conclude," said Mr. Rusk, "that summit diplomacy is to be approached with the wariness with which a prudent physician prescribes a habit-forming drug."

We must remember that when we are dealing with the Soviets, we are dealing with an adversary. And we are dealing with a situation where the consequences of failure are very great, where failure may very well toll the bell for destruction of our planet. In my judgment, we must not rush headlong into a demand for a summit, because when we sit at the summit we sit in the court of last resort.

Equally as immature, and potentially as dangerous, as the view of the overwrought optimist, is the vision of the incorrigible skeptic, the habitual saber-rattler, the Yahoo-myopic who believes that nothing changes but the tide, unaware that the ship of state has weathered the storms of two centuries simply because its captains took advantage of the fact that men and nations, like the tide, are ever changing.

It is unfortunate that many Americans have been hesitant—if not adamantly opposed—to carefully examining the discernible split between Red China and the Soviet Union, as well as changes throughout the entire Communist bloc.

In the July 14 edition of the Washington Post, Stephen Rosenfeld writes:

> Josef Stalin would gasp to see how his tight empire in Eastern Europe has unraveled into a loose skein of partially sovereign states.

He mentions Albania in the Chinese camp, Rumania refusing to attend the recent Communist summit meeting in East Berlin because of dissatisfaction with Soviet economic dictation, and the difficulties encountered by the U.S.S.R. in trying to tuck such diverse countries as Yugoslavia, Cuba, and Mongolia under its ideological wing.

> Openings to the West—through tourism, exchanges, trade, diplomacy—have had a related effect—

Points out Mr. Rosenfeld—

> they ventilate Eastern Europe, sharpen its ideas of the alternatives to the Soviet system, and freshen the forces of change.

These forces of change, I submit, are invisible to those jingoists among us who stand with their feet rooted in the 19th century and their heads buried in the 18th.

These ostriches of obtuse reasoning, I might add, are precisely the same individuals who by rule-of-thumb regard aid to Poland and Yugoslavia as giving dynamite to the enemy, never stopping to realize that dynamite, planted in the proper fissure, can rip huge chunks from mountains of rock, as well as from mountains of ideology.

To illustrate my point, I quote from a statement made by a prominent American statesman in the other body:

> To those who rather naively state that; despite our aid, Poland and Yugoslavia are both still Communist states, I would like to point out that no nation's political orientation was ever transformed overnight. * * * the surprising thing is not their failure to exorcise communism, but, rather, the fact that they have gone so far in asserting their own interests in the face of constant Soviet intimidation.
>
> It can be hoped that as an increasing number of Poles and Yugoslavs taste a certain amount of independence and freedom, they will pay even less attention to these [Soviet] admonitions than they presently do. And to broaden the area of freedom is the prime objective of U.S. aid to both countries.

Contrary to what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are probably thinking, this statement did not originate in the White House. It was made by a Republican Senator—not Kuchel or Javits—but the GOP leader, Mr. Dirksen, who, as we all know, is not a pioneer on this New Frontier.

In this same regard, it was none other than the late John Foster Dulles who said in 1958:

> There is nothing inevitable about communism except that it, too, is bound to change. The forces that change it are already at work and discernible.

Mr. Dulles cited the effects of education—the demand for greater personal security and for more consumer goods, and nationalism in the satellite countries as among the factors which were even then changing the Communist world.

In examining the world scene with a coldness and calmness born of repeated frustration in the frozen wastes of the cold war, what comfort can we take from the increasing strains and tensions within the Communist bloc? Hope must always be tempered with caution. For the Sino-Soviet disagreement is over means—not ends. A rift over how to bury the West is no grounds for uncontrolled rejoicing; it is grounds for calculating appraisal.

The future must be charted with caution because I foresee no spectacular reversal in Communist goals. But I am hopeful that with resolute patience we can exploit to our advantage the frictions and fractures in the Communist bloc. And if all these trends and developments—can persuade the Soviet Union to walk the path of nuclear peace, then let her know that this Nation will join with her. But until that choice is definitely made, and until our two nations can develop a reliable system of international nuclear security, we have no choice but to keep our weapons near.

During the historic confrontation of October 1962 Khrushchev learned that despite Chinese admonitions, President Kennedy was no paper-tiger—that he would step over the brink. And the President learned that Khrushchev would step back from the brink.

Out of the confrontation came one important—and unforgettable fact—American leadership, and the present Soviet leadership, are both committed to averting a nuclear holocaust.

Among the major goals of American foreign policy is to strive tirelessly to end the arms race and reduce the risk of war, to narrow the areas of conflict with the Communist bloc, and continue to spin the infinity of threads that bind peace together; that is, to win peace through perseverance.

I am confident that Governor Harriman will persevere in the finest tradition of American statesmanship. I wish him good luck and a prosperous journey.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA].

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, there is in progress at this time a greatly publicized negotiation session. Its setting is in the capital of the sworn antagonist of our way of life, in Moscow. It is the avowed purpose of this meeting to develop outlines of proposals to restrict and limit nuclear testing. Such steps would, to begin with, hold promise for discontinuance of radioactive contamination in the air and therefore in the food and water of the world. It would also suggest checks on the proliferation of nuclear arms and their potentials. Over, above, and beyond this it well could start our generation along the first pathway to an elimination of nuclear weapons as a threat to peace.

There is a great division in the attitudes of those who watch and wait. There are those who reflect doubt, distrust, and pessimism. These expect at least complete discouragement and at worst some present day example of the Chamberlain experience with Hitler. There is from these sources already the mutterings of "appeasement." They speak in dark terms about a "deal" which will somehow spell disaster for our side and some untold advantage or victory for the Russians.

Others there are who have all too early placed the optimistic tone to the turn of things. These sources are already assuring that the Sino-Russian split spells certain affirmative results for a test ban. Like the words of a popular song of the same name, they have high hopes.

In full deference to the situation, giving due credit to the caliber of our negotiator, Mr. Harriman, one still feels that the difficulties of domestic politics and the limitations of alliance or bloc entanglements dictate that neither the dismal predictions of the detractors nor the great expectations of the Pollyannas is likely to be the outcome. This should not totally discourage us for the task fundamentally involved in this present exchange is far more important than any immediate results.

The purpose the talks are serving is not only the cause of peace—and there is hardly any greater cause—but beyond that the challenging, frustrating quest for a substitute for war. The gauntlet laid down by the atom is simple but awesome—"Man, find a substitute for the use of ultimate force in your disputations—or else." No nation or group of nations is exempt from this ultimatum. It now devolves upon the leadership of the present two great powers to begin the quest. The alternative explicit in the atom's challenge is unacceptable to any people in any part of the world.

Let me make it clear that what is suggested here is not that we dispense with the force we now have, nor do we intimate that such force should not be maintained and improved in the light of existing realities. What we are soberly stating is that there is no answer to the atom's challenge in the nuclear arms race. It courts the deadly alternative. It is clearly not enough. While we may justify our desire to maintain equilibrium in the status quo, we continue to live under the sword of Damocles. Without progress in a more positive and productive direction, the continuing tensions tempt restraints that possess only limited standing powers.

Regardless of our appraisal of Mr. Khrushchev, his honesty or true purpose, in spite of the sad history of some past arguments, we can agree that:

First. Russians, as well as Americans, have an interest in avoiding war.

Second. Russians, as well as Americans, have an interest in limiting the spread of nuclear weapons.

Third. Russians, as well as Americans, have an interest in reducing the burdensome costs of the present arms race.

Fourth. Russians, as well as Americans, have an interest in the health and perfection of their coming generations of children.

Based upon the commonalty of these rather important interests, reasonable minds must agree that there exists impressive motivations for the seeking of affirmative results and progress. Although we can expect the bargainers for the Russians to seek every advantage they can gain in any mutually acceptable line of approach, we have in our corner a rather well prepared Yankee horse trader. He has already shown himself to be richly endowed with most of the gifts requisite for the role he now is playing.

It is my personal feeling that the sentiments expressed by President Kennedy in his American University speech and in his presentations while in Germany place the guidelines for our man in Moscow in classic simplicity and clarity. He in effect has said—we know our friends and we shall keep faith with them. We know our foe and respect him and will keep a vigilant and watchful eye on him. We shall seek peace courageously and continuously by every means commensurate with safety. We recognize that the encompassing, abiding interest of all this earth and all the peoples in it is an honorable peace achieved within the bounds of such safety. We are willing to labor long and with fervent intent for this great and good cause. No carping of poorly informed critics nor the importunings of ambitious politicians should deter or discourage negotiations founded on such principles. Rather we should be asking how we might play a productive part in providing the patience, the perseverance and the prayerful effort this noble work requires.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing support for Mr. Harriman's mission to Moscow. I am particularly proud of the fact that the President has named this distinguished New Yorker, and our former Governor, as his emissary.

Most of us have been concerned and discouraged over the protracted nature of the test ban negotiations, but at long last success seems to be in the offing. Yet many Americans still seriously question whether we can ever reach an agreement with the Russians or trust them to abide by any agreement which might be reached.

I can sympathize with this view, but given the instability of the nuclear age, and the dangers of accidental war, I am willing to gamble on the fact that the Russians have as much to gain from turning down the arms race as we have. We have reached mutually advantageous agreements with the Russians in the past; these negotiations demand that we do so again.

We need to recall and analyze those past negotiations so that we can more easily determine the ingredients which make for success. Such a historical study should also help us develop a more philosophical attitude toward the difficulties involved in negotiating with the Russians. It would also serve to remind us that there have been mutually advantageous agreements which the Russians have kept.

Let me review with you the case histories of two of these instances—the decade of negotiations that preceded the signing of the Austrian Peace Treaty and the year and a half of negotiations that culminated in the Antarctic Treaty.

With regard to the Austrian Treaty, the Soviets were intransigent for many years. There were basic issues in dispute between the West and the Soviet Union; the definition and disposition of German assets in Austria; the question of Yugoslav claims to Austrian reparations and Austrian territory and the withdrawal of occupation troops. Still other issues, real or feigned, which the Soviet Union brought into the negotiations included the alleged resurgence of Nazism in Austria; the alleged remilitarization of Austria; Soviet claims against Austria for relief supplies; the

Trieste question and an insistence that a German peace treaty must be signed before an Austrian treaty could be completed.

But these difficulties were finally overcome and Austria's independence was restored. How were these difficulties overcome? They were overcome in part because the Western Powers never gave up. They kept on pushing. Then too Russia was apparently anxious to neutralize Austria, and Austria offered to refrain from joining any military alliance or permitting any foreign military bases on its territory.

The Antarctica negotiations of June 1958 to December 1959 were a much more harmonious affair and resulted in a very significant treaty which demilitarizes the entire continent. As you will recall, the participants included the United States, the Soviet Union and the 10 other countries who conducted Antarctica programs during the International Geophysical Year. Under the treaty these nations agree that Antarctica shall be used for peaceful purposes only; that there shall be no nuclear explosions or any disposal of radioactive wastes in that continent; that each nation signing the treaty has a right to carry on unilateral inspection of all areas of Antarctica, including all stations and installations in these areas; and that there shall be freedom of scientific investigation and continued scientific cooperation in Antarctica.

At the concluding session of the Conference on Antarctica the Russian delegate spoke of the negotiating sessions as proceeding in "an atmosphere of business-like cooperation and mutual understanding which yielded fruitful results." One of the U.S. representatives said:

> We have concluded basic agreements which will be of benefit to ourselves, and of benefit to all mankind. It is in that spirit that the United States has been proud to associate itself with the other countries represented at this Conference in concluding these broad and far-reaching agreements on Antarctica.

Now, so far as I can gather, none of the participants have changed their minds about the merits of this treaty. Delegates from the signatory governments have met twice since 1959; once in 1961 and again in 1962 to formulate recommendations to further the principles and objectives of the treaty. These sessions were reportedly conducted in the same spirit of international harmony which inspired the signing of the treaty and delegates reached agreement on a number of recommendations relating to cooperation in various aspects of scientific investigation, logistics, communications and the conservation of living resources in the treaty area.

Let us hope for a similar ending to the Harriman mission.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke here today be permitted to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter, and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SPAIN UNDER FRANCO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, as we note the 27th anniversary of the Spanish Civil War, the totalitarian regime of Generalissimo Franco again is proclaiming the imminent liberalization of Spanish life and institutions. We would do well to look closely before concluding that the Franco regime is no longer a police state. Generalissimo Franco's recent interest in image building goes back to the summer of 1962, when a cabinet shakeup brought some younger faces into his government, a relaxation of the tight regulations on censorship was announced, and changes in the custom of summary military trials for political prisoners were promised. This coincided with Great Britain's negotiations to enter the European Common Market. Britain is Spain's best customer abroad. If Britain joined the European Community, economic considerations would impel Spain to seek membership in the Common Market. For Spain to be admitted to the Common Market, Franco had to win the favor of Western European democrats—those same Western European democrats from whom he had sealed off Spain for a quarter of a century.

After General de Gaulle vetoed Britain's application for admission to the Common Market, the pressure was removed, and the process of relaxation in Spain came to halt. The regime announced a return to tight censorship. The promised law modifying the jurisdiction of the military courts was held up. During the 2 months after February 20, 1963, 103 persons were sentenced for political crimes, after being tried under the very procedure which the highly respected International Commission of Jurists had condemned in December 1962, as a flagrant violation of generally accepted legal standards in a study entitled "Spain and the Rule of Law." The 104th person, Julian Grimau, was shot, in part for events that took place 25 years earlier during the Civil War. Grimau was a Communist, and the Soviet Union made the most of his execution for propaganda purposes, but the outraged demonstrations of thousands of Western Europeans were not composed merely of Communists. The French Government temporarily suspended financial negotiations.

The strength of the European reaction is among the reasons why Generalissimo Franco is again trying to disguise the nature of his police state. One hundred and sixty Spanish miners who were deported for the "crime" of striking last August are being permitted to return home. The proposal to modify the jurisdiction of the military courts has been dusted off and approved by the cabinet. The Franco regime has again expressed an interest in European integration, indicating that Spain would like to join NATO.

The fact remains, however, that after 26 years Spain is still a dictatorship. Nothing has happened during the past 3 years to modify the verdict of 339 Basque priests, who in a collective letter to the four Basque bishops on May 30, 1960, expressed their opinion about the social injustice and abuse of government authority. In the words of the Basque priests:

> No genuine parliament, no genuine political or trade union freedom exists in Spain. The single party, the single syndicalist organization and a controlled parliament make up the essential structure of the Spanish state, and all are entirely subject to the Chief of State.

In 1962, 80 Spaniards from Spain joined with 38 exiled fellow-citizens to constitute the Spanish delegation to the European Movement Assembly which met in Munich. The Spanish delegation unanimously supported a resolution, which the Assembly adopted by acclamation, which said that Spanish entrance to the Common Market should be conditional on the creation of authentically democratic institutions in Spain. The recognition by the Franco regime of five elemental civil rights was demanded.

Franco's reaction to this declaration reveals his attitude about civil liberties. All Spaniards were deprived of their freedom of residence for 2 years. About 25 Spanish delegates to the Munich Conference were exiled abroad or to the Canary Islands, including Gil Robles, who would probably be the head of a conservative Christian Democratic Party if Spain were a free country.

Other liberty-loving Spaniards were sent to jail, where they joined a host of fellow political prisoners. One, Demetrio Luis Marcos Pablo, a teacher of commerce in Madrid, had been sentenced to 12 years imprisonment for printing in 1957 that "a bunch of gangsters rule us," and again in 1958 that "Francoism has never been an expression of the people's will," and finally in the same year an "Open Letter to the Youth of Spain." Demetrio Luis' letter ends with this exhortation:

> Spaniards, your duty is to fight everywhere and at all times against Francoism and all that goes with it.

There is nothing unique about the experience of Demetrio Luis Marcos Pablo. The Basque priests observed in their letter of protest that they—and I quote:

> Are continually hearing of men who have been arrested for temporal activities which are not in conformity with the political thinking—along one line only—imposed by the state.
>
> People are imprisoned for expressing in public, or indeed in private, political ideas contrary to those of the government. And since the normal channels for the communication of truth do not exist, what in fact is simply the exercise of a right becomes an offense.
>
> In the 24 years during which the present regime has been in power, men have been imprisoned sine die for months and years, and brought, after a period of time depending on the arbitrary decision of a governor, the director of the public security department, or some minister, before a special court under

> the very serious charge of "rebellion against the state," because they had the courage to believe that those who govern them are neither impeccable nor infallible. Once they have been taken to prison, their families live in a state of perpetual anguish, since they neither know where they are nor when they may be tried.

The basic doctrine and program of the Spanish governing party proclaims that "our state shall be a totalitarian instrument." Like any totalitarian instrument, it seeks to control every aspect of a person's life. Spanish unions, for example, are no more than a part of the state machinery. On November 16, 1960, the Cardinal Primate of Spain pointed out in a letter to the Secretary-General of the Falange, or National Movement, that the syndicates as then organized provided no genuine representation to the working classes. The Basque priests expressed themselves even more clearly in their letter to the four Basque bishops:

> The Spanish syndicate is neither a trade union nor Christian. It is the creation of the state, and it defends the interest of the state * * * Genuine trade unionism, i.e., free trade unionism, springing from the working class and enjoying its confidence, is not only a right of the masses, but still more it is the most effective and suitable means in existence today by which the masses can exercise their responsibilities in social and economic life, responsibilities which involve both rights and duties.

Although strikes in Spain are illegal, the workers of Asturias, a traditionally revolutionary province, left their jobs for 2 months last year, and other workers all over Spain joined in the walkouts. Confronted with the most serious economic challenge it had faced since 1939, the Franco regime was forced to negotiate with representatives of unofficial workers' commissions as well as the local syndicates—a tacit admission that the syndicates do not reflect the desires of the workers. After the men returned to work, leading strikers were brought to trial. Spanish writers and painters were fined exorbitantly for taking part in a silent demonstration in favor of the Asturias strikers.

A large part of the clergy and the Catholic lay brotherhoods were behind the strikes. Before the strikes the majority of Spanish workers earned 33 to 50 pesetas—55 to 83 cents—a day. In the wake of the wage agreement, which the regime negotiated with the illegal strikers, the minimum wage was raised to 60 pesetas—$1 a day. Accion Social Patronal, a Catholic employers' group, estimates that a married worker with two children cannot maintain a civilized standard of living in Madrid on less than 154 pesetas a day, and the cost of living in the northern and eastern cities of Spain is higher than in Madrid. The Bishop of Bilbao has declared in a pastoral epistle that whereas Spain is one of the countries with the lowest popular income in all Europe, it ranks the third highest in the world with regard to unnecessary expenditures. The bishop called the extravagance of the wealthy classes:

> A provocation to those who lack the essential necessities in order to lead a dignified human existence, and they give rise to a pathological condition within the social organism.[1]

When the image builders of the Spanish Government purchase a section of the New York Times to describe the dynamic progress which the country is making under Franco, they do not, of course, mention the grinding poverty which exists.

The reports that Spain has modified its strict censorship provide a good illustration of how the regime talks of relaxing controls without actually doing so. Last summer a new Minister of Information was appointed. He extolled freedom of expression to foreign journalists. However, this same Minister of Information, when addressing Portuguese journalists praised Franco's success in subordinating liberty to order and described freedom of the press as an anarchist utopia.

Editorial writers and reporters are still drilled in official views, and the Government can still dismiss any journalist who displeases it and remove his professional license. All news of political importance must be taken from the official news agency. The Basque priests described the Spanish press as a barrier to the expression of considered judgments on the activities of the political, economic, or social organs of the country. It imposes arbitrary restraints on the right of the free expression of opinion, and debars citizens from any public supervision of the administration of the public services.

Mr. Speaker, reports of relaxation of dictatorial control in Spain should be weighed in the light of the facts which I have related to the House.

I hope all Members of the House will give heed to the 339 Basque priests, who reminded us in their letter:

> Freedom is one of the most sacrosanct and inviolable of rights, which the state is bound to recognize and respect.
>
> We do not hesitate openly to proclaim that the full Christian conception of freedom is necessarily bound up with the inviolability of the human conscience. We affirm that it is not lawful to practice upon the human conscience either by using violence to penetrate its secrets, nor by submitting it to outside pressures working on the mind by methods contrary to all the proceedings of reason; it is not lawful to torture, nor make use of drugs or the procedures of brainwashing, nor subject public opinion to the pressures of a superpropaganda, based on psychological techniques which are an attack on the transcendental dignity of the human person.
>
> We sincerely believe that neither the individual, nor the classes or peoples who make up the Spanish political community, enjoy sufficient freedom.

REWRITING HISTORY A TRICKY TASK

Mr. **SIBAL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, it comes as somewhat of a surprise to learn that the President now feels Cuba was an American victory. Mr. Kennedy says:

> Future historians, looking back at 1962, may well mark this year as the time when the tide of international politics began at last to flow strongly toward the world of diversity and freedom.

He makes this statement in the recently published 1962 volume of the Public Papers of the President of the United States.

In the Soviet Union, history books can be rewritten, and indeed they have been. But not here.

Manipulation of the news may fool the general public temporarily, but news management on a scale to hoodwink future scholars of history would be quite a tricky feat.

President Kennedy has had mixed results in his attempts to rewrite history.

The Associated Press, reporting on the latest volume of the Presidential papers, says the President felt that the Communists appeared to be holding the key to the scientific and technological future after sputnik in 1957.

Apparently this was before we won such notable "victories" as Cuba, Laos, the Congo, and the Berlin Wall.

The President blithely said:

> People in many countries began to accept the notion that communism was mankind's inevitable destiny. Nineteen hundred and sixty-two stopped this process—and nothing was more important in deflating the notion of Communist invincibility than the American response to Soviet provocations in Cuba.

In all fairness and honesty, he should have added: "The American response to Soviet provocations in Cuba was short-lived. Russian troops and arms are still in Cuba."

The President did not follow through in his earlier demand for on-site inspection.

U.S. withdrawal of missile bases from Turkey and Italy during the period when Russian missiles supposedly were being withdrawn from Cuba caused fear throughout the free world that a deal had been made between Mr. Khruschev and Mr. Kennedy.

The notion of Communist invincibility was only momentarily deflated during the Cuban confrontation.

Since then, Mr. Kennedy's lack of followthrough, Mr. Kennedy's clampdown on Cuban exile raiders, and Mr. Kennedy's acceptance of a Communist regime in Cuba have served, I fear, to reinflate the notion of Communist invincibility to its earlier dimensions and beyond.

FOR THE RELIEF OF THE JEFFERSON LOAN CO.

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced for the consideration of the

---

[1] Ecclesia, Feb. 10, 1962.

Subcommittee on Claims of the House Committee on the Judiciary a private bill for the relief of the Jefferson Loan Co., and its corporate successor, the Jefferson Mortgage Co.

This corporation incurred tax liability and paid taxes in the business years ending January 31, 1947, and January 31, 1948, on the amounts reported in profits by certain of the corporation officers. In reality, there were no profits in those years and the profits reported were so reported as part of a plan by the officers involved to accomplish a fraud.

The corporation in question has since thrown out the faithless officers and now seek to have refunded to them the amount of the tax overpayments. Attempts to seek a remedy in the courts have pointed to the necessity of seeking relief through the Congress. The action taken to date in this regard has had the effect of visiting the wrongs of former officers on the present organization. The result of this is, as a matter of policy to reduce the incentive on the part of shareholders and other honest employees to throw out dishonest management. These people should not be punished for their salutory action, but should rather be encouraged to keep a close eye on management.

As a matter of fact this is just one more example among many which points to the need to review our general law which relates to the tax and other treatment of the corporate entity when alert stockholders remove management guilty of criminal action and replace it with law-abiding people.

TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the tax on toll telephone service and telegraph service to and from points outside the United States where paid for in the United States. Under existing law such services are subject to the 10-percent excise tax. However, if the service is paid for outside the United States, the tax is avoided.

Many people feel that the entire excise tax on telegraph and telephone service imposed during the Korean conflict as a temporary measure should be repealed. In fact, I voted against its extension on the floor of this House several weeks ago. However, all attempts to repeal the excise tax have been defeated in that it has been extended on an annual basis for some 10 years beyond its original expiration date.

The tax on service to and from points outside the United States, however, is a different matter. These taxes can be avoided, and are being avoided, by the simple expedient of having the calls paid for outside the United States. As a result we have a tax that is easily avoided. There is no practical or feasible way to tighten this loophole. Therefore, in fairness to all, such a tax should be repealed. No tax which can so easily be avoided, is in fact being avoided in a widespread manner, and is incapable of proper enforcement, should be allowed to stand on the books.

A PROPOSED PERMANENT HOUSE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have long felt there is too much redtape for proper consideration of the needs of the Nation's small businesses. The legislation that I have joined my colleagues in proposing would create a permanent House Committee on Small Business, giving it full legislative authority. In the past, since the House Small Business Committee has been only a study committee, it has resulted in unnecessary delays and duplication of functions. This repetitious process is not fair to the 4½ million small businessmen in America.

In addition to having legislative authority relative to existing small business acts, this committee would be authorized to conduct studies and investigations of the problems of all types of small businesses that now exist or may exist in the future. In this connection, one of the areas where the Committee on Small Business would operate is determining whether Government agencies adequately serve and give due consideration to the problems of small business. It has also become evident that in a good many instances there is an overlapping of programs which often leads to confusion and difficulty for small businesses in dealing with the many respective Government agencies and departments.

I respectfully request that the consideration of the Congress be directed toward legislation which would seek to remedy this present situation.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep personal conviction that I join my colleagues in commemoration of the fifth anniversary of Captive Nations Week. The need for remembering the captive nations of the world, the necessity for strengthening the faith and hope of these oppressed peoples is immediate and real.

More than 100 million people live in captive nations. Many of these people have given their lives in protest against their captivity. The uprisings in East Berlin in 1953 and in Poland and Hungary in 1956 amply attest to the desire for freedom from the yoke of tyranny.

Communism threatens us today as it did in the 1950's. We must prevent the passage of time from diminishing this yearning for freedom. Mere selfish interest dictates that in the fight between East and West the material resources, the manpower, and the spirit of these ancient nations must be on our side. As long as the people of these countries are in captivity, we cannot be free. And as long as they are slaves to communism, our professions of faith in and devotion to democracy and freedom are empty.

But more than for the sake of self-interest, it is in a humanitarian spirit that we of the United States speak out today. We who live in freedom must remember the captive peoples. Our commitment to freedom compels us to dedicate ourselves to the cause of freedom wherever freedom is denied.

SUPREME COURT PRAYER DECISION

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the Supreme Court's decision barring the reading of the Bible and the saying of the Lord's Prayer in public schools. The Kentucky Legislature, in second extraordinary session, on June 26, 1963, adopted a resolution in this regard which I believe to be worthy of the attention of all Members of this House. This resolution reads as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 10

Whereas the Supreme Court decisions barring the reading of the Bible and saying the Lord's Prayer in public schools has gone beyond the intent of the Federal Constitution, and is in disregard of the laws of 37 States of the Union, including the sovereign State of Kentucky; and

Whereas the decision of the highest Court of the land infers that the mere recognition of Almighty God, is in itself, a violation of religious liberty and the reading of the Holy Word is in violation of the law of the land; and

Whereas many millions of Americans join in the opinion of dissent to the High Court's opinion; and

Whereas the majority of the Supreme Court, Earl Warren always included, is soft on communism and hard on religion;

Whereas the reading of the Bible does not establish a church and the recognition of Almighty God by an employee of a State does not tend to unite church and state and therefore is not at variance with the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution; and

Whereas State legislatures and the U.S. Congress say prayers to the Great Master but school personnel are not permitted to call on His name; and

Whereas it is now feared by many of His Elect that all religious aspects of governmental procedures will be banished and the following may soon come to pass:

1. Coins, bearing the inscription, "In God We Trust," will be called in by U.S. Treasury and will no longer be legal tender in the United States of America;

2. All public documents containing any word, phrase, or reference to God, and all such documents on file in all counties, States, and the United States shall be pulled and the word "God" obliterated, marked out or otherwise destroyed;

3. No instrument which must be recorded shall mention the name of the Lord, no testamentary document will be effective which refers to the name of the Most High and no deed of conveyance will be valid which refers to His Holy name;

4. In the year of our Lord will no longer be referred to and B.C. and A.D. will no longer be used in the calculation of time;

5. Inscriptions on public shrines and monuments shall be removed if reference is made to the Diety. This includes the tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington National Cemetery and all tombstones in all Government cemeteries;

6. No longer will chaplains serve in the Army of the United States or religious service be permitted where U.S. soldiers are stationed; and

Whereas certain decisions of the Supreme Court are alien to and inimical to the well-being and spiritual growth of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, That the house go on record opposed to the decisions of the Supreme Court relating to Bible reading and recitation of the Lord's Prayer in public schools in the cases of *School District of Abington Township* v. *Schempp, et al.*, and *Murray, et al.* v. *Curlett, et al.*

SALARY INCREASES FOR MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there has been a considerable amount of talk relative to the President's request for salary increases for members of the executive branch. To implement the President's request, he has appointed the Randall committee to study Federal salaries in three particular areas—statutory salary systems, military salary systems, and executive salary systems. This committee has submitted its report to the President; however, the report has not been released, and we do not have at this point the President's updated recommendations to the Congress in legislative form.

The very fact that a considerable amount of discussion has already ensued about the possibility of increases for our own Members prompted me to ask the Library of Congress some time ago to compile a list of Federal, State, and local governmental employees receiving salaries of $22,500 or more in order that we might have some basis for comparison. I was very disappointed in what meager information was available from the Library on this subject, and so I set about to gather my own information.

Today I am glad to bring to the attention of the House the fruits of this labor, and I am sure it will make interesting reading.

I might say that this report covers salaries only and does not take into account additional earnings from special expense accounts, living expenses, and fringe benefits which in many cases amounts to several thousand dollars of additional income.

I shall include a bibliography with this report so that all might know of our source material. Included in this material are replies from 35 of the 50 secretaries of state. Because there are 15 States which have not yet responded to our inquiry and because several salary increases are pending for various officials in the several States, this report will be in need of revision and updating from time to time. But to the best of my knowledge, this report is the most comprehensive that has yet been assembled for those salaries of governmental employees at all levels of government which match or exceed what Members of Congress are being paid today.

Mr. Speaker, by way of review it might be well to begin with a very simple résumé of the history of legislative salaries since the year 1789 which is as follows:

REVIEW OF LEGISLATION ESTABLISHING CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

In 1789: $6 for every day in attendance, plus an allowance of $6 for every 20 miles given at the beginning and the end of every session by the most usual road from the Congressman's place of residence to the seat of Congress.

In 1818: $8 for every day in attendance, plus the same travel expenditure as above.

In 1856: $3,000 per year.

In 1866: $5,000 per year, plus 20 cents per mile for travel going to and returning from the seat of the Government.

In 1873: $7,500 per year in lieu of all pay and allowance except actual individual traveling expenses going to and returning from the seat of the Government.

In 1874: The act of 1873 is hereby repealed; pay and mileage revert to the rates fixed by the act of 1866 above.

In 1907: $7,500 per year; no change in travel allowance.

In 1925: $10,000 per year; no change in travel allowance.

In 1946: $12,500 per year, plus $2,500 expense allowance and no change in travel allowance.

In 1955: $22,500 per year; no change in travel allowance.

For the sake of simplicity, we have outlined the report in the following way:

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES EARNING $22,500 OR MORE PER YEAR

- I. Federal employees:
  - A. Executive.
  - B. Judicial.
  - C. Legislative.
- II. State employees:
  - A. Executive.
    - 1. Governors.
    - 2. Other administrators.
    - 3. Superintendents of public instruction.
    - 4. Public university presidents, officers, and department heads.
  - B. Judicial.
- III. County employees:
  - A. Executive.
    - 1. County administrators and other officials.
    - 2. County (or intermediate) superintendents of school districts.
  - B. Judicial.
- IV. City employees:
  - A. Executive.
    - 1. Mayors and city managers.
    - 2. Other administrators.
    - 3. Public corporations positions.
    - 4. Superintendents of school districts.
  - B. Judicial.
- Bibliography.

Government employees earning $22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)

Federal employees:	
Executive:	
The President	$100,000
Vice President	35,000
Administrative Assistants to the President (2)	22,500
Director, Bureau of the Budget	22,500
Director, Office of Emergency Planning	25,000
Director, Office of Science and Technology	22,500
Administrator, Agency for International Development	22,506
Foreign Service:	
Chiefs of missions:	
Class 1 (19)	27,500
Class 2 (28)	25,000
Class 3 (36)	22,500
Chiefs of aid missions: Class 1 (4)	22,500
Secretary of Agriculture	25,000
Secretary of Commerce	25,000
Secretary of Defense	25,000
Deputy Secretary of Defense	22,500
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare	25,000
Secretary of Interior	25,000
Attorney General	25,000
Secretary of Labor	25,000
Postmaster General	25,000
Secretary of State	25,000
President's special representative—Department of State	25,000
Under Secretary of State	22,506
Under Secretary for Political Affairs (U.N.)	22,506
U.S. representative to the United Nations	27,518
Deputy U.S. representative to the United Nations	25,002
Deputy U.S. representative to the U.N. Security Council	25,002
U.S. representative Council of Organization of American States	25,002
U.S. representative to the U.N. Economic and Social Council	22,506
U.S. representative to the U.N. Trusteeship Council	22,506
U.S. representative, International Atomic Energy Agency	22,506
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission	22,500
Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency	22,500
Administrator, National Aeronautical and Space Administration	22,500
Comptroller General	22,500
Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	22,506
Members, Mississippi River Commission (3)	22,500
Trade negotiations, special representative	27,500
Staff director, Commission on Civil Rights	22,500

Government employees earning $22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)—Con.

Federal employees—Continued	
Judicial:	
Chief Justice	$35,000
Associate Justices (8)	35,000
Chief judge, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals	25,500
Judges (4), Court of Customs and Patent Appeals	25,500
Chief judge, Customs Court	22,500
Judges (8), Customs Court	22,500
Chief judge, Court of Claims	25,500
Judges (4), Court of Claims	25,500
Circuit judges (78), courts of appeals	25,500
District judge, district court	23,000
District judges (306)	22,500
Senior judges (86)	23,844
Judge, Court of Military Appeals (3)	25,500
Judges, Tax Court of the United States (16)	22,500
Territorial Courts (Canal Zone, Guam, Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico)	22,500
District Court of the District of Columbia:	
Chief judge	23,000
Judges (14)	22,500
Retired judges (2)	22,500
Legislative:	
Speaker of the House	35,000
Members of Congress:	
Senators (100)	22,500
Representatives (435, plus 1 Resident Commissioner, Puerto Rico)	22,500
State employees:	
Executive:	
Governors:	
Alabama	25,000
Alaska	25,000
Arizona	22,500
California	44,100
Florida	22,500
Hawaii	27,500
Illinois	30,000
Iowa	22,500
Michigan	27,500
Mississippi	25,000
Missouri	25,000
New Jersey	35,000
New York	50,000
North Carolina	25,000
Ohio	25,000
Oklahoma	25,000
Pennsylvania	35,000
Rhode Island	25,000
Texas	25,000
Virginia	25,000
Washington	22,500
Other administrators:	
Alabama: State hospital superintendent	25,000
California:	
Director of finance	30,319
Coordinating Council of higher education, director	28,248
Attorney general	27,300
Resources agency administrator	25,000
Health and welfare agency administrator	25,000
Highway transportation agency administrator	25,000
Youth and adult correction agency administrator	25,000
Mental hygiene director	24,805
State compensation insurance fund manager	22,575
Florida:	
Inter-American Trade: Exposition director	50,000
Citrus commission general manager	25,000
Georgia: Controller	26,145
State employees—Continued	
Executive—Continued	
Other administrators—Continued	
Illinois:	
Mental health director	$27,500
Public aid director	25,500
Chief highway engineer	22,500
Iowa: Mental health director	25,000
Kansas:	
Institutional management director	25,000
Mental health director	27,000
Maryland:	
Roads commission chairman	25,000
Chief health officer	22,500
Mental health director	22,500
Massachusetts: Commissioner of education	25,000
Michigan:	
Child psychiatric institute director	23,386
Crippled children commission director	24,576
Highway managing director	22,655
Medical superintendent (13)	24,576
Mental health clinic director	28,042
Mental health director	24,000
Mental health psychiatrist	23,386
Mental retardation program director	28,042
Psychiatric administrator (3)	25,724
Public health commissioner	22,500
Public health laboratory scientist	24,576
Public health medical services director	24,576
Personnel director	22,655
Mississippi: Tax collector	25,000
Missouri: Mental health director	25,000
New Mexico: Revenue structure committee chairman	25,000
New York:	
Executive assistant to Governor	27,500
Attorney general	27,500
First assistant attorney general	22,655
Alcoholic Beverage Control commission chairman	25,200
Office of atomic development, director	27,300
Director of the budget	28,875
Deputy director of the budget	24,675
Chief budget examiner (unit No. 1)	23,159
Chief budget examiner (capital planning and construction unit)	23,610
Chief budget examiner (research and fiscal policy unit)	22,560
Civil defense director	25,200
General services commissioner	27,300
General services deputy commissioner	22,575
Commissioner and chairman of the commission for human rights	25,200
Commissioner-vice chairman of the commission for human rights	23,100
Commissioner of the office for local government	25,200
State employees—Continued	
Executive—Continued	
Other administrators—Continued	
New York—Continued	
Chief of staff to the Governor, commanding general of the New York National Guard	$25,200
Board of parole chairman	25,200
State police superintendent	25,200
Office of transportation director	25,200
Veterans' affairs director	23,100
Agriculture and markets commissioner	28,875
Comptroller	35,000
First deputy comptroller	25,200
Deputy comptroller (division of administration)	22,700
Deputy comptroller (division of audits and accounts)	22,700
Deputy comptroller (division of municipal affairs)	22,700
Superintendent of the banking department	28,875
First deputy superintendent of banks	22,844
President of the civil service commission	28,875
Department of commerce commissioner	28,875
First deputy commissioner of commerce	22,784
Conservation commissioner	28,875
Department of correction commissioner	28,875
Education commissioner	28,875
Deputy commissioner of education	25,395
Associate commissioner of education (research)	23,295
Associate commissioner of education (elementary, secondary, and adult education)	23,295
Associate commissioner of education (high and professional education)	23,295
Associate commissioner of education (cultural education and special services)	23,295
Industrial commissioner	25,200
Labor relations board chairman	23,100
Workmen's compensation board chairman	25,200
Solicitor general	25,880
Department of mental hygiene commissioner	28,875
Motor vehicles commissioner	28,875
Public service commission chairman	28,875
Public service commission commissioner (5)	25,200
Public service commission counsel	25,200
First assistant counsel, office of the counsel (Albany), public service commission	22,560
Department of public works superintendent	25,200
Administrative deputy (public works)	21,946
Superintendent of operation and maintenance, department of public works	22,599
Commissioner of social welfare	28,875

Government employees earning $22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)—Con.

State employees—Continued	
Executive—Continued	
Other administrators—Continued	
New York—Continued	
Secretary of State	$28,875
Harness racing commission chairman	23,625
Taxation and finance commissioner, and president of the tax commission	28,875
Tax commissioners (2)	23,100
North Dakota: Hospital superintendent	25,000
Ohio:	
Superintendent of education	25,000
Mental health director	23,500
Highways director	22,500
Oklahoma: Mental health director	24,000
Oregon: Chancellor of education	25,000
Pennsylvania:	
Auditor	22,500
Mental health commissioner	25,000
Lieutenant Governor	22,500
Treasurer	22,500
Internal affairs secretary	22,500
Joint State government commission director	23,000
South Dakota: Superintendent of state hospital for mentally ill	23,600
Texas: State banking official	22,500
Washington: Mental health superintendent	25,000
Superintendent of public instruction:	
California	22,500
Maryland	22,500
Massachusetts	25,000
New Jersey	24,500
New York	28,875
Ohio	25,000
Public university presidents, officers, and department heads:	
Alabama:	
University of Alabama, president	27,500
Auburn University, president	24,000
Arizona: University of Arizona, president	22,500
California:	
Coordinating council for higher education, director	28,248
University of California:	
General administration:	
President	38,000
Vice president, finance	26,000
Vice president, government relations	26,000
Vice president, treasurer, and land agent	29,000
University dean, academic planning	22,700
Berkeley campus: Chancellor	30,000
Davis campus:	
Chancellor	24,000
Dean of college of agriculture	23,300
Dean of college of veterinary medicine	23,176
Irvine campus: Chancellor	23,000
Los Angeles campus:	
Chancellor	30,000
Dean of college of letters and science	31,072
Dean of school of medicine	23,920
Academic dean of graduate division	23,132

Government employees earning $22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)—Con.

State employees—Continued	
Executive—Continued	
Public unversity—Con.	
California—Continued	
University of Calif.—Con.	
San Diego campus: Chancellor	$25,000
Santa Cruz: Chancellor	23,000
Hastings College of Law: Dean	26,189
Trustees of the California State colleges	32,000
Colorado:	
University of Colorado:	
President	27,500
Vice president	23,000
Provost	22,500
Dean of medical school	26,500
Colorado State University:	
President	24,000
Connecticut: University of Connecticut, president	25,000
Florida:	
University of Florida, College of Medicine:	
Head, department of psychology	25,000
Head, department of radiology	25,000
Head, department of surgery	25,000
Georgia:	
Medical College of Georgia, president	28,000
University of Georgia, president	25,000
Georgia Institute of Technology, president	25,000
Hawaii: University of Hawaii, president	32,800
Illinois:	
Eastern State Teacher's College, president	25,500
Normal State Teacher's College, president	25,500
Northern State Teacher's College, president	25,500
Western State Teacher's College, president	25,500
Southern Illinois University:	
President	36,000
Vice president	24,000
Vice president	24,000
University of Illinois:	
President	36,000
Vice president	22,500
Vice president	24,500
Vice president	26,500
Vice president	28,500
Assistant to president	22,500
Professors at Chicago and Champaign campuses (14)	22,500–27,500
Deans (11)	22,500–26,000
Director	23,000
Director	25,500
Indiana:	
Indiana University, president	30,000
Purdue University, president	30,000
Iowa:	
Iowa State University, president	26,000
State University of Iowa:	
President	26,000
Head of university hospital	30,000
Kansas:	
University of Kansas:	
Chancellor	26,000
Chairman, pathology department	25,000
Chairman, radiology department	25,000

Government employees earning $22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)—Con.

State employees—Continued	
Executive—Continued	
Public unversity—Con.	
Kansas—Continued	
University of Kansas—Con.	
Chairman, psychiatry department	$25,000
Chairman, surgery department	25,000
Chairman, obstetrics department	25,000
Chairman, internal medicine department	25,000
Kansas State University, president	26,000
Louisiana: Louisiana State University, president	25,000
Maryland: University of Maryland, president	25,000
Minnesota:	
University of Minnesota:	
President	31,500
Vice president, business	25,750
Vice president, academic	25,750
Nebraska: University of Nebraska, chancellor	27,500
New York:	
State University of New York:	
President	28,875
Dean, upstate medical college	26,000
Buffalo College of Education	25,000
City College of New York, president	30,000
City College presidents (4)	30,000
North Carolina: Consolidated University, president	22,500
Ohio:	
Ohio State University:	
President	36,000
Vice president, business and finance	26,976
Vice president, instruction	26,976
Dean, medical school	26,952
Bowling Green State, president	30,000
Kent State University, president	25,000
Miami University, president	25,000
Ohio University, president	25,000
Oklahoma:	
University of Oklahoma, president	22,500
Oklahoma State University, president	22,500
Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University, president	36,000
Tennessee:	
University of Tennessee:	
President	25,000
Vice president, medical unit	25,000
Utah: University of Utah, president	25,000
Washington: University of Washington, president	30,000
West Virginia: University of West Virginia, president	30,000
Judicial:	
Alaska:	
Supreme court:	
Chief justice	23,500
Associates (2)	22,500
California:	
Supreme court:	
Chief justice	29,400
Associates (6)	27,300
District court of appeals:	
Presiding justices (10)	25,200
Associates (20)	25,200
Administrative director of courts	25,200

Government employees earning $22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)—Con.

State employees—Continued	
Judicial—Continued	
Connecticut:	
Supreme Court of Errors:	
Chief Justice	$22,500
Delaware:	
Supreme court: Chief justice	22,500
Georgia:	
Supreme court: Chief justice	22,500
Court of appeals: Chief justice	22,500
Hawaii:	
Supreme court: Chief justice	22,500
Illinois:	
Supreme court: Justices (7)	30,000
Circuit court: Justices (20)	29,000
Superior court: Justices (53)	29,000
Appellate court: Justices (24)	25,000
Louisiana:	
Supreme court:	
Chief justice	25,000
Associates (6)	22,500
Maryland:	
Court of Appeals:	
Chief Justice	25,500
Associates (7)	25,000
Massachusetts:	
Supreme court: Chief justice	23,000
Michigan:	
Supreme court: Justices (8)	25,500
Minnesota:	
Supreme court:	
Chief justice	23,500
Associates	22,500
Missouri:	
Supreme court: Justices (7)	22,500
New Jersey:	
Supreme court: Chief justice	27,000
Associates (6)	26,000
New York:	
Court of appeals:	
Chief judge	39,000
Associates (6)	36,500
Appellate divisions, supreme court:	
1st and 2d departments:	
Presiding justice	39,000
Associates (13)	37,500
3d and 4th departments:	
Presiding justice	33,000
Associates (13)	32,500
General trial court:	
Supreme court:	
Justices (80)	34,500
Justices (20)	26,000
Court of special sessions:	
Chief justice	26,000
Justices (23)	25,000
Surrogate's court:	
New York City justices (5)	34,500
Richmond justice	33,000
Elsewhere:	
Presiding justice	26,000
Justices (22)	25,000
Domestic relations court:	
Presiding justice	30,000
Justices (34)	25,000
State administrator, Judicial Conference	31,075
North Carolina:	
Supreme court: chief justice	22,500
Pennsylvania:	
Supreme court:	
Chief justice	33,000
Associates (6)	32,500

Government employees earning $22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)—Con.

State employees—Continued	
Judicial—Continued	
Pennsylvania—Continued	
Intermediate appellate court:	
Superior court:	
President judge	$31,000
Associates (6)	30,500
General trial courts:	
Court of Common Pleas:	
Judges (5)	27,500
Judges (96)	25,000
Judges (12)	22,500
Orphans courts: Judges (24)	25,000
County employees:	
Executive:	
County administrators and other officials:	
California:	
Alameda County: county administrator	25,500
Los Angeles County:	
County administrator	29,700
County counsel	28,464
District attorney	26,500
Superintendent of charities	28,464
Assessor	27,500
Sheriff	27,500
Chief engineer	26,604
Other positions (9)	25,176
San Diego County: County administrator	25,020
San Francisco County: County administrator	25,200
San Mateo County: County administrator	25,128
Florida:	
Dade County: Medical examiner	25,000
Illinois:	
Cook County:	
District attorney	25,000
Superintendent of highways	27,960
Director of public aid	24,600
Michigan:	
Wayne County:	
General superintendent of hospital	24,845
Medical examiner	24,845
County (or intermediate) superintendents of school districts:	
Florida: Dade County	25,000
Georgia: DeKalb County	24,000
Louisiana: Orleans Parish	23,000
Maryland: Montgomery County (Rockville)	23,000
Judicial:	
Illinois:	
Cook County:	
County court judge	29,000
Probate judge	29,000
Circuit court judge (76)	29,500
Associate circuit court judge (58)	28,500
Michigan:	
Wayne County:	
Circuit court judge (18)	25,501
Probate court judge (5)	22,500
Recorders court judge (9)	24,500
Pennsylvania:	
Allegheny County:	
County court, president judge	23,000
County court, associates	22,500
Dauphin County: Commonwealth court	27,500
Philadelphia County:	
County court, president judge	23,000
County court, associates	22,500

Government employees earning $22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)—Con.

City employees:	
Executive:	
Mayors and city managers:	
Arizona: Phoenix	$25,500
California:	
Anaheim	26,796
Burbank	26,721
Downey	22,800
Fresno	26,064
Glendale	25,800
Long Beach	26,000
Los Angeles	25,000
Oakland	26,250
Norwalk	23,004
Palto Alto	26,200
Pasadena	29,662
Richmond	23,160
Riverside	23,100
Sacramento	27,600
San Diego	28,956
San Francisco	32,790
San Jose	28,728
San Leandro	24,900
San Mateo	24,360
Santa Ana	22,800
Santa Monica	23,000
Connecticut: Hartford	22,551
Florida:	
Miami	25,000
Miami Beach	25,425
St. Petersburg	24,000
Illinois: Chicago	35,000
Iowa: Des Moines	24,000
Kansas: Wichita	24,300
Louisiana: New Orleans	25,000
Maryland: Baltimore	25,000
Michigan: Detroit	25,000
Missouri:	
Kansas City	27,000
St. Louis	25,000
New Jersey: Newark	25,000
New York:	
New York City	50,000
New Rochelle	23,000
Rochester	23,310
Yonkers	22,875
Ohio:	
Cincinnati	30,000
Cleveland	25,000
Dayton	26,643
Toledo	25,000
Pennsylvania: Philadelphia	30,000
Texas:	
Dallas	27,610
Houston	25,000
San Antonio	22,600
Virginia:	
Newport News	25,000
Norfolk	30,000
Richmond	23,160
Washington:	
Spokane	24,000
Tacoma	22,800
Wisconsin: Milwaukee	24,000
Other administrators:	
California:	
Long Beach: City attorney	23,400
Los Angeles:	
General manager, water and power	40,560
General manager, airports	35,000
Assistant general manager, water and power	33,768
City schools business manager	32,565
Chief assistant city attorney	31,140
Chief electrical engineer, water and power	31,140
Auditor-controller, water and power	31,140

Government employees earning $22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)—Con.

City employees—Continued	
Executive—Continued	
Other administrators—Continued	
California—Continued	
Los Angeles—Continued	
Chief engineer, water works, water and power	$31, 140
General manager, harbor department	30, 312
City schools controller	29, 185
Assistant chief electrical engineer, water and power	26, 568
Assistant chief engineer (2)	26, 568
City schools deputy controller	26, 165
Operation and maintenance, water and power	25, 524
Design and construction, water and power	25, 524
City schools deputy business manager	25, 143
Chief administrative officer	25, 050
San Diego:	
Assistant city manager	25, 020
City attorney	25, 020
San Francisco:	
Controller	30, 528
Chief administrative officer	28, 812
Public utilities	26, 444
Assessor	25, 215
District attorney	25, 215
City attorney	25, 215
Health officer	23, 700
Illinois:	
Chicago:	
Administrative officer	25, 000
Budget director	24, 000
Chairman and commissioner, urban renewal	30, 000
Deputy commissioner, urban renewal	26, 500
Chief engineer	24, 708
City comptroller	24, 000
Commissioner of buildings	24, 000
Commissioner of health	25, 000
Commissioner of planning	24, 000
Commissioner of public works	25, 000
Corporation counsel	30, 000
Fire commissioner	30, 000
Medical director, municipal TB sanitorium	23, 532
Purchasing agent	22, 500
Superintendent of police	30, 000
Massachusetts:	
Boston:	
Development administrator	30, 000
General manager, transit authority	40, 000
Business manager, transit authority	25, 000
Michigan:	
Detroit: Health commissioner	24, 331
Missouri:	
Kansas City:	
Hospital director	25, 000
Radiologist	25, 500
Pathologist	25, 500
St. Louis:	
Metropolitan sewer district:	
Executive director	25, 000
General counsel	25, 000
New Jersey:	
Newark: Director of hospitals	25, 000

Government employees earning $22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)—Con.

City employees—Continued	
Executive—Continued	
Other administrators—Continued	
New Mexico:	
Albuquerque: City attorney	$24, 444
New York:	
New York City:	
Controller	40, 000
Borough presidents (5)	35, 000
City council president	35, 000
Chairman, housing authority	35, 000
Chairman, transit authority	35, 000
District attorney (4)	34, 500
Executive deputy superintendent of schools	32, 500
Deputy mayor	30, 000
City administrator	30, 000
Deputy superintendents	27, 500
Commissioner of traffic	27, 500
Members, transit authority (2)	27, 500
General manager, transit authority	27, 500
Executive secretary to mayor	25, 000
Assistant to the mayor	25, 000
Corporation counsel	25, 000
First deputy controller	25, 000
Budget bureau director	25, 000
Commissioner of hospitals	25, 000
Hospital directors of service (10)	25, 000
Fire commissioner	25, 000
Police commissioner	25, 000
Commissioner of public works	25, 000
Commissioner of sanitation	25, 000
Commissioner of parks	25, 000
General counsel, transit authority	25, 000
Chairman of housing and redevelopment	25, 000
Director of personnel	25, 000
Pennsylvania:	
Philadelphia:	
Managing director	26, 500
Director of finance	26, 500
City solicitor	26, 500
City representative	26, 500
Executive director, general hospital	25, 000
Street commissioner	24, 000
Water commissioner and city engineer	24, 000
Texas:	
Dallas: City attorney	22, 700
Public corporations positions:	
California:	
East Bay Municipal Utility District:	
General manager	33, 600
Attorney	27, 600
Louisiana: Director, port of New Orleans	40, 000
New York:	
Port of New York Authority:	
Executive director	60, 000
Deputy executive director	45, 000
General counsel	45, 000
Chief engineer	45, 000
Director, finance	40, 000
Director, marine terminals	40, 000
Director, port development	40, 000
Director, aviation	40, 000
Director, administration	35, 000
Director, public relations	35, 000

Government employees earning $22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)—Con.

City employees—Continued	
Executive—Continued	
Public corporations positions—Con.	
New York—Continued	
Port Authority—Continued	
Director, personnel	$33, 300
Director, tunnels and bridges	33, 300
General attorney	33, 000
First deputy director, aviation	33, 000
General solicitor	33, 000
Controller	31, 350
Director, terminals	31, 000
Director, world trade	30, 000
Deputy director, port development	29, 500
Deputy chief engineer	29, 000
Deputy director, marine terminals	28, 400
Engineer of construction	28, 000
Deputy director, transportation policy	27, 500
Chief architect	27, 500
Deputy director, aviation	27, 000
Deputy director, real estate	27, 000
Assistant chief engineer, design	26, 000
Deputy director, operations service	25, 558
Chief, port commerce	25, 558
Engineer, research and development	25, 536
Deputy director, tunnels and bridges	25, 000
Triboro Bridge and Tunnel Authority:	
General manager	45, 000
Assistant general manager	37, 500
Counsel	32, 000
Assistant civil engineer	26, 000
Pennsylvania: Delaware River Basin Commission: Executive director	25, 000
South Carolina: South Carolina Public Service Authority: General manager	25, 000
Texas: Lower Colorado River Authority: General manager	25, 000
Superintendents of school districts:	
Arizona:	
Phoenix Union High School District	24, 000
Tucson	25, 675
California:	
Concord (Mount Diablo USD)	24. 000
Covina	24, 000
Fremont Union High School (Sunnyvale)	23, 200
Fresno	25, 110
Fullerton Union High School	23, 000
Glendale	25, 000
Hayward Union High School	23, 535
Inglewood	23, 500
Montebello Unified	23, 500
Long Beach	26, 000
Los Angeles:	
Superintendent of district	35, 000
Associate superintendent	29, 767
Assistant superintendent	26, 674
Norwalk-La Mirada	24, 000
Oakland	26, 250
Palo Alto	23, 000
Pasadena	26, 000
Richmond	22, 726

Government employees earning $22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)—Con.

City—Continued	
Superintendents—Continued	
California—Continued	
Riverside	$22,500
Sacramento	23,750
San Bernardino	24,425
San Diego:	
Superintendent	28,392
Associate superintendent	24,528
San Francisco	31,000
Sequoia Union High School (Redwood City)	23,000
Torrance	23,000
Whittier Union High School	24,000
Colorado: Denver	29,000
Connecticut: New Haven area (Greenwich)	23,500
Illinois:	
Chicago:	
Superintendent	48,500
Associate superintendent	27,600
Highland Park H.S. No. 108	24,000
New Trier Township High School District (Winnetka	27,500
Niles Township High School District No. 219 (Skokie)	23,500
Lyons Township High School District (La Grange)	25,500
Oak Park-River Forest High School District (Oak Park)	24,500
Winnetka EDS	22,500
Indiana: Gary	24,000
Iowa: Davenport	24,500
Kansas:	
Wichita	22,500
Shawnee Mission Rural High School District No. 6	23,500
Maryland: Baltimore	25,000
Massachusetts: Boston	25,000
Michigan:	
Detroit	33,000
Flint	27,500
Grosse Pointe	23,500
Minnesota:	
Minneapolis	28,000
St. Paul	22,500
Missouri:	
Ladue	26,500
Kansas City	24,000
St. Louis	25,000
University City	22,500
Nebraska: Omaha	27,000
New Jersey: Newark	24,000
New Mexico: Albuquerque	22,500
New York:	
Buffalo	24,000
East Meadow	24,000
East Rockaway	23,000
Farmingdale	23,000
Garden City	25,500
Great Neck	29,000
Hewlett	23,240
Huntington—Union Free School District No. 3	24,000
Kenmore District, Tonawanda	23,065
Mount Vernon	23,760
New York City:	
Superintendent	37,500
Associate superintendent	27,500
Assistant superintendent	23,645
Director	23,645
New Rochelle	24,000
Oyster Bay School District No. 2 (Syosset)	25,000
Plainview	23,000
City—Continued	
Superintendents—Continued	
New York—Continued	
Port Washington	$22,500
Rochester	24,500
Roslyn	25,000
Scarsdale	26,500
Schenectady	22,550
White Plains	24,500
Yonkers	23,145
Ohio:	
Akron	25,000
Cincinnati	30,000
Cleveland	25,000
Columbus	25,000
Dayton	22,625
Oregon:	
Portland	23,400
Pennsylvania:	
Abington Township High School	24,000
Lower Merion School District (Ardmore)	22,500
Philadelphia	27,500
Pittsburgh	30,000
Texas:	
Dallas	33,000
Fort Worth	24,000
Houston	27,500
San Antonio	25,000
Spring Branch ISD (Houston)	22,500
Virginia: Richmond	23,160
Washington: Seattle	24,000
Wisconsin: Milwaukee	29,000
Judicial:	
Illinois:	
Chicago:	
Municipal court:	
Chief judge	25,000
Associates (12)	22,500
Michigan:	
Detroit:	
Recorder's court traffic judge	24,500
Court of common pleas judges	25,000

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Federation of Teachers. Superintendents' Salaries, 1962.

Fennell, Margaret. Positions Requiring Appointment by the President, revised December 1962.

International City Manager's Association. Municipal Yearbook, 1962.

National Association of Counties. Salaries of Selected County Officials (Counties of Approximately 1 Million Population), October 1962.

National Association of County Officials. County Administrator Salaries, October 1962.

National Education Association. Salary Schedule Maximums for Administrators, 1962–63, School Systems Having 600 or More Pupils, February 1963.

National Education Association. Salary Schedule Maximums for School Administrators, 1961–62, Urban Districts 100,000 and Over in Population, 1961.

Public Personnel Association. Executive Compensation in Public Service (California), April 1960.

U.S. Civil Service Commission. Pay Rates of $25,000 or More in State and Local Government, March 1963.

U.S. Civil Service Commission. Salary Rates or Salary Limitations Fixed by Congress for Individual Positions in the Executive Branch, December 1962.

California State Budget, fiscal 1963.

Illinois Budget, fiscal 1962 and 1963.

Information from the secretaries of state of all 50 States in response to a request of July 2, 1963.

Journal of the American Judicature Society. "State and Federal Judicial Salary Summaries," vol. 45, No. 10, March 1962, 241–263.

New York State Budget, fiscal 1964.

The Book of the States, 1962–63.

"Study Report of Special Committee on Elected Officials' Salaries (City of Milwaukee)," 1960.

U.S. Civil Service Commission. The Federal Top Salary Network, revised April 1963.

AMERICAN HEART MONTH—HEART AND BLOOD VESSEL DISEASES

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, this Nation's No. 1 health enemy is the heart and blood vessel diseases, a broad complex of diseases and disorders including heart attack and stroke, rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease, inborn heart defects, high blood pressure and other complications of hardening of the arteries, varicose veins, congestive heart failure, endocarditis, peripheral vascular disease, heart disease caused by diphtheria, thyroid, kidney, and other organic disorders, and many other heart and circulatory conditions.

These diseases account for approximately 950,000 deaths in the United States in a year. This is more than the total number of deaths from all other causes combined.

Additionally, considerably more than 10 million living Americans are afflicted in varying degrees by one or another of these disorders. Men and women, young and old, employers and employees—all are subject to these diseases. They play no favorites.

Medical science is making a militant attack on this great health problem and encouraging progress is being made through research underwritten by public contributions to the Heart Fund and by Government support through the Heart Institute. Such research in recent years has developed vital new knowledge to improve diagnostic techniques so that heart disease victims can be discovered more rapidly and be given earlier treatment that has also been vastly advanced in the past generation.

Thus, it is now possible for most heart attack victims to recover from first attacks, three out of four who do so being able to return to their jobs; new treatment and new methods of rehabilitation now can reduce or prevent invalidism from stroke; rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease, major childhood menaces, can be made preventable diseases; most cases of high blood pressure now can be controlled, reducing damage and threat of damage to the heart, brain, and kidneys; and, of historic value, many defects of the heart itself and its great vessels, hopeless only a few years ago, now are correctable through dramatic advances in surgery.

By themselves, however, research advances are mere academic victories. It is necessary to communicate them to the physicians of the Nation and to the public so that they can be properly applied to lengthening and saving the lives of victims of these diseases. Thus, the job of communication is imperative. This job is also twofold. First, the truths about the dangers of the heart diseases, and the great complexity of this problem, must be brought to the people, misinformation disspelled, and hope and encouragement created. Secondly, all of us must be made aware of the facts that these diseases now can be controlled better than ever before, that risks can be reduced, that preventive steps can be undertaken, and that early discovery and early treatment can spell the difference between a full, useful, productive life on the one hand and protracted illness and unnecessarily early death on the other.

One of the truly valuable results of the campaign the American Heart Association carries on nationally each February is the furtherance of this important communication need. The Heart Association campaign focuses a public-informational spotlight on the heart disease problem through a concerted effort to win the support of all media—newspaper, magazine, and broadcasting—during this period. And, additionally, it attracts to its ranks more than 1½ million volunteers throughout the month to carry the heart story into the homes of our citizens everywhere by distributing authoritative brochures and pamphlets.

Because Feburary has become so important in the crusade that science is conducting against these treacherous diseases, every effort should be made to highlight its importance in the eyes of all Americans. It is for this reason that I am proposing to this body for its approval a request that the President of the United States be authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation designating February as American Heart Month, inviting the Governors of the States and territories to issue proclamations for like purposes, and urging the people of the Nation to give heed to the nationwide problem of the heart and blood vessel diseases and to support all essential programs required to solve it.

FARM LABOR PROBLEM

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, lately we have heard proponents of Public Law 78 issue some claims for that so-called humanitarian solution to our farm labor problem.

To our argument that the influx of foreign labor decreases domestic wages by increasing the supply of labor, they say, "But the Labor Department allows no braceros to work in the U.S. for less than the minimum adverse-effect wage set by the Department."

True enough, the Labor Department does set an adverse-effect wage so that supposedly the domestic wage is not depressed. But let us look at this situation more closely.

Prior to 1962 there was no attempt to prohibit the bracero program from adversely affecting domestic wages. The simple fact is that domestic migrants' wages were then lower than what they would have been without Public Law 78. That conclusion is simple supply-and-demand analysis, supplemented by the fact that braceros can live much more cheaply than can domestic migrants.

Farm wages were thus depressed before any concrete and practical adverse-effect provision was put into practice. In March, 1962, therefore, when the Labor Department set the minimum wage for braceros, it was taking an average wage for an occupation already depressed by a cheap foreign labor supply.

This is the built-in adverse effect of any bracero program. It remains whether the Labor Department requires growers to hire all domestics seeking work at that wage or not. It remains whether the Labor Department now sets an adverse-effect wage or not.

I invite those who claim that sufficient domestic laborers can never be procured for stoop labor to examine the successful program established by communities in Washington and Oregon to supply all growers with seasonal domestic labor. This takes concerted efforts by communities. It requires a higher wage and better living conditions. But the fact remains that it has worked.

A BEAUTIFUL LIFE IS A GREAT BLESSING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that I rise to pay tribute to one of the finest human beings I have ever been privileged to know—the late William K. Dorfman of Forest Hills, N.Y. If ever an American's life and works were worthy of recognition in this House, his merit this honor.

Hence, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to talk about Bill Dorfman, my dear friend whose untimely passing occurred last March 12. Few persons leave behind them such a record of dedicated service to humanity. Although he earned a worldwide reputation for his work in behalf of the Zionist Organization of America, the everyday kindnesses and deeds of humanity which he habitually demonstrated, will never be forgotten. Personally, I can say that my life has been greatly enriched in having known Bill Dorfman and sharing a deep and beautiful friendship with him. Countless others, I am sure, feel the same way.

To Bill Dorfman's lovely wife, Rose, and his fine family, I extend my sincere sympathy. Mrs. Dorfman was a constant inspiration to her husband, as she dedicated herself to the causes in which he so avowedly believed. She is former president of the Queens region of the Hadassah, the women's Zionist organization, and has gained a national reputation for her work in this group and in other good causes.

Mr. Dorfman was a native of new York City and at an early age became associated with the aspirations of the homeless Jewish people to rebuild their ancestral homeland. To the Zionist movement he gave his constant support and because of his outstanding contributions many honors came his way. But he never forgot the little deeds that make for lasting friendship. He was never too busy to assist in solving the problems of his friends and neighbors. He was a man of tender compassion.

An essay by Max Nordau entitled "On Life and Death" has been translated from the Hebrew by Max Chaitman and appeared in the 29th Annual Convention Manual of the Long Island Zionist Region in June of this year. This essay is so poignant and reflects much of what I feel about my dear friend, Bill Dorfman, that I want to bring you a part of it:

> At the foot of a gigantic mountain whose head was constantly covered with snow there lay a tranquil valley. Near the valley there flowed a lively stream. And the stream washed the roots of a very old oak tree. The face of the tree was reflected in the water. In the shade of the oak tree grew a variety of flowers and on the top of the tree nested an old and wise owl.
>
> On a hot summer's day the flowers stopped blooming, their petals withered and complaints were heard among the flowers concerning their fate. "How unfortunate we flowers are and how bitter is our fate. * * * Only for a short while do we enjoy the singing of the birds. * * * A thousand times more fortunate is this oak tree whose rustling branches make us all tremble with their mighty sound. * * * She still lives and who knows how many more thousands of years she will live and enjoy the pleasantness of the spring."
>
> The little flower who spoke became silent and a strong wind passed through the branches of the old oak tree and the tree chastised the flower who spoke. "As you understand, thus you speak. The truth is that my life is longer than yours, but you are greatly in error when you envy me. * * * Your life is devoid of sorrow and every moment of your life is a joy. You know only the joys of the spring and the pleasantness of the early summer. The sorrow of the winter is not known to you. You have no enemies. * * * But I, from early youth, had to carry on a war with a host of enemies that sought to destroy me. * * * If you desire to envy the fate of someone who will truly live forever, then choose to envy the fate of this great mountain that is above us, and not my fate."
>
> Deep silence fell for a brief moment. Then there was a great uproar on the mountain. The mountain began to speak: "Oh you mighty tree, I see that years have not given you any wisdom. You are not wiser than this little blue flower. There is nothing on earth that is eternal. The earth itself is not eternal. * * * I do not think much, and I dream empty dreams. My time passes without purpose. I hardly notice what happens around me. Everything to me is empty and void. Oh, how I wish to be like you, or even to be like the little flowers that grow

nearby. All of you see life for a while. I see nothing."

At that moment the wise owl that lived on the treetop and was listening to all this screamed and in a loud voice asked the mountain, the oak tree, and the little flower to look at the waters of the stream. Upon the face of the water there appeared a host of tiny creatures. They were day flies that had just been hatched. They spread their frail wings and drank from the soft sweet breeze and they washed their tiny bodies in the warm sunshine. Then they began to dance—individually, in twos, or in groups. They were not concerned about things that were before them, nor about things that were to come after them. That moment was a moment of abundance for them. They were lost in their ecstasy until the day turned and disappeared. They folded their wings and began to descend upon the face of the stream. The joyful thoughts of that wonderful day began to fade little by little. Everything around them began to disintegrate, and they began to sleep a sweet sleep, satisfied like children who played and got tired. But they were not sleeping, for they were dead. When their dead bodies covered the surface of the stream, the wise owl said this to the mountain, the oak tree, and the flower: "A short life or a long life, that does not add or detract. A beautiful life is a great blessing."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. Don H. Clausen (at the request of Mr. Arends), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. Mathias (at the request of Mr. Halleck), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Ryan of New York for 10 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Bow, for 30 minutes, on Monday next.

Mr. Curtis, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. Rumsfeld, for 1 hour on Tuesday next.

Mr. Curtis (at the request of Mr. Sibal), for 1 hour, on Monday, July 22.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Sibal), for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Dorn in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey.

Mr. St. Onge.

Mr. Miller of California to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole and to include a letter received from Mr. Webb.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Sibal) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Sibal.

Mr. McLoskey.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Brown of California) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Dent.

Mr. Carey in two instances.

Mr. Flood.

Mr. Roush.

Mr. Daniels.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2998. An act to amend titles 10, 14, and 38, United States Code, with respect to the award of certain medals and the Medal of Honor Roll.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 582. An act to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3845. An act to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766); and

H.R. 2998. An act to amend titles 10, 14, and 38, United States Code, with respect to the award of certain medals and the Medal of Honor Roll.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 22, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1049. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, relative to the message of the President of today, July 18, and his recommendation of the imposition of a special excise tax, called an interest equalization tax; and submitting certain information and detailed explanation of the interest equalization tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1050. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the construction of a U.S. Embassy office building and an adjacent ambassadorial residence at Rabat, Morocco; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1051. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 1(c) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 382); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1052. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to relieve the Veterans' Administration from paying interest on the amount of capital funds transferred in fiscal year 1962 from the direct loan revolving fund to the loan guarantee revolving fund"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1053. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 31, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on St. Michaels, Talbot County, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BUCKLEY: Committee on Public Works. S. 254. An act to provide for the acquisition of certain property in square 758 in the District of Columbia, as an addition to the grounds of the U.S. Supreme Court Building; without amendment (Rept. No. 560). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 489. An act to amend the act of March 5, 1938, establishing a small claims and conciliation branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 561). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 490. An act to amend the act of July 2, 1940, as amended, relating to the recording of liens on motor vehicles and trailers registered in the District of Columbia, so as to eliminate the requirement that an alphabetical file on such liens be maintained; without amendment (Rept. No. 562). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 6353. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 563). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 6128. A bill to amend section 15 of the Life Insurance Act to permit any stock life insurance company in the District of Columbia to maintain its record of stockholders at its principal place of business in the District of Columbia or at the office of its designated stock transfer agent in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 564). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 6350. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto", approved June 6, 1892, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 565). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 7643. A bill to repeal section 4 of the act of July 29, 1892, relating to the prohibition against flying kites, balloons, or parachutes in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 7644. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 7645. A bill to designate the Perry Dam and Reservoir, Delaware River, Kans., as the Ozawkie Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 7646. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit ministers who were formerly entitled to railroad retirement annuities, but whose entitlement was subsequently invalidated, to elect to use their social security credits to reestablish their right to such annuities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 7647. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to place the Federal Housing Administration cooperative housing mortgage insurance program on a mutual basis; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 7648. A bill to amend section 661 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide that the punishment for larceny of livestock shall be the same as the punishment for larceny of property of a value exceeding $100; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 7649. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to permit funds appropriated under title III of that act to be used for the acquisition of equipment for use in teaching the English language to students whose primary language is not English; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 7650. A bill to amend the joint resolution of September 15, 1960, with respect to the use of certain park roads, highways, and vehicular facilities by those carriers of passengers by motor vehicles which are certificated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 7651. A bill to provide authority to protect heads of foreign states and other officials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 7652. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the tax on toll telephone service and telegraph service to or from points outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 7653. A bill to designate the Perry Dam and Reservoir, Delaware River, Kans., as the Ozawkie Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 7654. A bill to designate the new lock on the St. Marys River at Sault Sainte Marie, Mich., as the John A. Blatnik lock; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 7655. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of May 13, 1954, commonly referred to as the St. Lawrence Seaway Act, to provide that the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation shall not engage in certain activities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 7656. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 7657. A bill to amend the criminal laws of the United States to prohibit any person from crossing State lines for the purpose of violating the laws of any State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 7658. A bill to provide for the allocation of a certain percentage of the proceeds from lands in the national park system, situated in Teton County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming for use by it in compensating Teton County; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 7659. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 7660. A bill to amend section 5899 of title 10, United States Code, to provide permanent authority under which Naval Reserve officers in the grade of captain shall be eligible for consideration for promotion when their running mates are eligible for consideration for promotion; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 7661. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches, work measurement programs, or other performance standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 7662. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide appeal rights to employees of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 7663. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 7664. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 7665. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize additional relocation payments to displaced individuals and families in hardship cases, and to include in such payments to displaced business concerns a reasonable allowance for losses of good will and profit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 7666. A bill to prohibit the designation of any place as off limits to members of the Armed Forces solely because it is segregated; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7667. A bill to authorize the offering of prayers in schools on military reservations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 7668. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday, to be known as "Columbus Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND (by request):

H.R. 7669. A bill to remove restrictions upon the free entrance to the United States of citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 7670. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to require that motion pictures photographed outside the United States, and any advertisements thereof, shall set forth the country of origin; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 7671. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.R. 7672. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to require that advertisements of motion pictures photographed outside the United States set forth the country of origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.J. Res. 562. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of February in each year as "American Heart Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.J. Res. 563. Joint resolution authorizing the continued shipment of the drug Krebiozen in interstate commerce in order to insure the continued availability of such drug for the treatment of patients now being treated with such drug and for terminal cancer patients; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.J. Res. 564. Joint resolution authorizing the continued shipment of the drug Krebiozen in interstate commerce in order to insure the continued availability of such drug for the treatment of patients now being treated with such drug and for terminal cancer patients; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARING:

H. Con. Res. 198. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress on the need for a healthy domestic gold mining industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. Con. Res. 199. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress on the need for a healthy domestic gold mining industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. Con. Res. 200. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress on the need for a healthy domestic gold mining industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. Con. Res. 201. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress on the need for a healthy domestic gold mining industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H. Con. Res. 202. Concurrent resolution providing for a congressional code of ethics; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. Res. 445. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H. Res. 446. Resolution creating a standing Committee on Small Business in the House of Representatives, and to grant it full authority in legislative matters; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the high and frequently excessive charges made for housing occupied by public assistance recipients, particularly in the metropolitan areas, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expressing appreciation of the people of Guam to the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, for sponsoring the bill H.R. 7028; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 7673. A bill for the relief of Georgios V. Banakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 7674. A bill for the relief of Victor Lu Hsung Yen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 7675. A bill for the relief of Jefferson Loan Co., Inc., and Jefferson Mortgage Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 7676. A bill for the relief of Miss Amalia Salvaterra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 7677. A bill for the relief of Inger J. Ladegaard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7678. A bill for the relief of Dr. Nathaniel Y. Cualoping, and his wife, Dr. Lourdes Cualoping; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7679. A bill for the relief of Isaac Fuad Roubein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 7680. A bill for the relief of Mieszyalaw Rutyna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.R. 7681. A bill for the relief of Patricia A. Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Passamaquoddy Project To Harness the Tides

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 1 I warned that the plans of Secretary of Interior, Stewart Udall, for connecting all Western Federal power lines into one gigantic "grid of grief" constituted a "Kilowatt Kremlin" for the United States. Now I see where he has recommended the expenditure of $800 million of the taxpayers' money on the Passamaquoddy project in Maine to harness the tides.

This project would only be in use for some 800 hours per year, which constitutes a cost of some $1 million per hour. If this project was feasible, it would be another matter. Yet countless recommendations, the last in 1961, have declared the project unfeasible. Canada has refused to participate in the entire project—but Udall has brought them in through the backdoor by saying that we will build it and they will have to buy the power generated from the operation.

It would seem that politics has entered into what should be dispassionate consideration of projects on their own merit. Since a Democratic Senator is up for reelection in Maine next year, the taxpayers must pay for a nearly $1 billion boondoggle because of Secretary Udall's zealous activity to ride roughshod over private interests and spread Government control through both power plays and land grabs.

This power project has been suggested by Mr. Udall along with Federal landgrabs ranging from the Sleeping Bear Dunes in Michigan to Assateague Island in Maryland which would dispossess thousands of private businessmen, landowners and homeowners with little or no justification. The only justification for such projects has been Mr. Udall's statements that we must think big and act big. To me all this means is that Americans must pay big—for projects using the people's money to build a political empire and to compete with private power companies and our free enterprise system. One thing Secretary Udall did not learn in Russia was to let "sleeping bears" lie.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the fifth annual observance of Captive Nations Week, and I am happy to join my distinguished colleagues in commemorating this significant event.

Seven years have passed since the dramatic upheavals in Eastern Europe during 1956 focused public attention on the plight of the 100 million people behind the Iron Curtain. For us in the free world the events of 1956 proved to be an extremely painful experience, for we had to stand by helpless as the freedom fighters of Poznan, Budapest and elsewhere struggled against great odds to throw off the yoke of a hated oppressor—the Soviet Union. We could do nothing to prevent the Red Army from brutally suppressing these revolts. Nor could we encourage more widespread anti-Soviet revolutions in the captive nations knowing that bloody reprisals would be forthcoming. We were caught in a dilemma: We wanted to help the captive peoples in their struggle for independence and liberty, yet we were unable to give effective assistance for fear of triggering world war III.

Today we still face this dilemma, although it is not posed in such stark terms as during the uprising of 1956. Developments in the Communist satellites since then have brought us to realize that the eventual liberation of these captive peoples will probably result from evolution instead of revolution. It must be our task to further this process by constantly voicing our concern for their fate and by encouraging greater autonomy from the Kremlin. Above all, we must maintain our steadfast dedication to the goal expressed in President Kennedy's Captive Nations Week proclamation—the fulfillment of "the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty."

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the history of tyranny holds no greater story of oppression, for size, extent and cruelty, than that of the peoples we designate as captive nations. No colonial power or combination of powers has ever touched the scale of enslavement like that by which the harsh hand of colonial communism directly grasps the lives of nearly half the world and threatens the peace and welfare of the other half.

The brutal Communist suppression of human rights is the central political and moral fact in the world today. It is this fact which underlies all the basic tensions suffered by the world and pervades and hobbles all international efforts to seek peace. It is my conviction that peace will be impossible until this dark influence is overcome and once-free peoples can breath free air again, in charge of their own distinies. At this time in history, we should be wary of Soviet ventures into friendliness with us. We know they are driven by fear of the divisions in their own camp. We ought to proceed with caution lest we be entrapped by the cordiality of the Russian bear; and lest we find we have bartered away the cause of the captive nations and gravely compromised our own.

It is well that we observe Captive Nations Week as a reminder that is both sorrowful and chilling. We, in this House of free institutions, should make every effort to keep this event high in the minds of our negotiators who are at this moment, in the midst of Captive Nations Week, engaged in cordial meetings with the Soviets in Moscow itself. The ever-growing list of captive nations should serve to show what the friendly Soviets really have in mind for us. Each of these names is associated with a great national history and with the eternal battle for human freedom: Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, the Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba.

This is a tragic catalog, Mr. Speaker. Let us never forget what it means.

National Service Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of this body to the statement made yesterday by the President at his news conference regarding the proposed National Service Corps. The question asked has been raised on this floor, as well as the floor of the other body, by some opposed to legislation designed to implement this service corps. It was that critics of the plan charge the corps would duplicate the work already being done by existing agencies. We should all pay attention to the President's answer.

He first compared this criticism to the kind of criticism leveled at the oversea Peace Corps while legislation to create it was being considered. And he pointed to the great success that wonderful group of dedicated Americans has made. The President pointed out that much of the poverty here at home is geographically isolated; it is not seen by many people, and hence disregarded. As an example he referred to our institutions for mentally retarded children, all of which could use corpsmen volunteers badly. He mentioned the pitiful state of our Indian reservations, and the urban slum with its plethora of dropouts. He reminded us that these, our poor, have little or no voice to make themselves and their pleas heard.

And, Mr. Speaker, he spoke of our people's propensity for helping their brothers:

> I think these young men and women would be proud to give a year of their lives to the service of their country. They are willing to go abroad. I think they would be more willing to stay home. Their example, I think, can be a catalyst. We have millions of people who work in the various agencies. I think they do a wonderful job. We want to supplement their work. Most of those who work in the field say more can be done. * * * What we want to do is to make it possible for people in this country to give a year of their lives without compensation, but with enough to live on to serve in these various areas where people do not enjoy the prosperity which so much of our country experience live. I think those opposed to it are wrong. I think the program is a good idea.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the national service program bill now before this body is the embodiment of another phrase of the President's:

> We shall be judged more by what we do at home than what we preach abroad.

Washington, D.C., International Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSSIONAL RECORD, a statement which I have prepared on the Washington, D.C., International Race, the "Jewel of the International Crown," for "Horse of the World" honors, held on Veterans' Day at the Laurel, Md., racetrack.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., INTERNATIONAL RACE A GLOBAL "PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE" SPORTS EVENT

On November 11, Veterans' Day in the United States, the unique Washington, D.C., International Race will be presented to the sporting people of the world for the 12th time. As each year becomes history, global interest shows a decided increase, not only among the peoples of the world who breed, own and race thoroughbreds, but also by racing's millions who thoroughly enjoy keen competition everywhere. Perhaps Vice President Lyndon Johnson best expressed the thought in a congratulatory telegram to Laurel president John D. Schapiro, in which he said: "You may well be proud of this people-to-people sports event for its role in furthering understanding among nations of the world. Best wishes for success in the years to come."

From its beginning 11 years ago, the Washington, D.C., International held at Laurel Md., has captured the imagination of racegoers from the four corners of the globe. It has blended together a sound sporting idea with modern air travel to form an international spectacle ranking with the best worldwide contests. From Dublin to Rome, from Melbourne to Malta, from New York to Los Angeles, the International is a topic of conversation among sporting people.

The Washington, D.C., International was conceived by John D. Schapiro, president of Laurel Race Course, with the idea in mind that the best horses of each country, meeting on the turf (which is the natural footing for thoroughbreds), and at the classic distance of a mile and a half, should have the opportunity to compete for the world championship, as in other sports. This event is an invitational affair, with both foreign and American contenders handpicked by an international committee. The entrants must be winners of important races and possess outstanding records.

It is significant to note that Laurel Race Course was host to the first International Jockey Club Seminar, held in 1957 in Washington, D.C. Heads of jockey clubs from all over the world attended and were received at the White House by President Eisenhower.

No greater tribute could be given the Washington, D.C., International on the occasion of its 10th anniversary than the congratulatory messages received by Mr. Schapiro from ambassadors of the 15 countries who had then been represented in this classic race. I quote a few:

Herve Alphand, the Ambassador of France: "I have always been keenly interested in the Washington, D.C., International. And that is not only because French horses won in 1953 and 1956 and because I am hoping for a new French success. Whoever wins, it is always a great and fascinating event in which I am happy to see French participation."

Sir David Ormsby Gore, the Ambassador of Great Britain: "We are proud to have been represented by Britain's leading thoroughbreds in Laurel's great International race; and pleased, of course, to have carried off the first victory in 1952. Recognition of the caliber of this classic can be seen, I believe, in the fact that both Her Majesty the Queen and Sir Winston Churchill have sent their horses to compete. Congratulations on an event that follows the 'Olympic' pattern of sports competition among nations."

Anatoly Dobrynin, the Ambassador of U.S.S.R.: "There are so many things which the peoples of the world have in common; and one of them is the love of good sport. For this reason, the Washington, D.C., International plays a part in strengthening the bonds of friendship and cooperation among nations. We of the Soviet Union are most proud to have had our thoroughbreds participate in the past four runnings of this great classic."

The 11th running of the Washington, D.C., International marked the first appearance of a Japanese thoroughbred in the race. However, hands-across-the-sea between Japan and Laurel Race Course are not limited to the international race alone, for each year during Laurel's spring meeting, a Mikimoto pearl-encrusted horseshoe trophy is presented to the winner of the Laurel "Cherry Blossom Purse."

In addition to enlarging the roster of international participating nations with Japan, the 11th running was also notable for the spectacular victory of the French champion Match II, who won over a stellar international field, including Kelso, the U.S. horse of the year, and Carry Back, who had been this country's 3-year-old of the year in 1961. Sports Illustrated magazine had this to say about the race: "Match's victory now gives foreign horses an edge of 6 to 5 in the international and earns for Match the title of 'Horse of the World.'"

Another international facet at Laurel Race Course was the commissioning last year by Laurel President John D. Schapiro of a mural by Argentine Artist Vincente Forte. This mural was unveiled by Argentine Ambassador Roberts Alemann, and is now on display in the clubhouse at Laurel. Entitled "The Finish," it captures the color and excitement of the international race. Mr. Forte is recognized as one of South America's foremost contemporary artists. A Forte painting was recently presented by the Argentine Government to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, in a White House ceremony.

Still further indication of the regard with which the Washington, D.C., International is held throughout the world are the honors bestowed upon Laurel executives. In 1956, France presented Laurel president John D.

Schapiro with the Merite d'Acricole, one of the few occasions it has gone to someone outside France. In 1962, Joseph T. Cascarella, executive vice president of Laurel, was invited by the U.S.S.R. Ministry of Agriculture to tour Russia's thoroughbred racing and breeding facilities. He was the first American racing executive honored by such an invitation.

It is interesting to note that this race is now attracting visitors from abroad as part of the "Visit U.S.A." program sponsored by the U.S. Travel Agency, a division of the Department of Commerce. Tours have already been arranged for groups from England and Canada; and plans are being completed with other groups on the European continent.

We in Maryland are proud of the global popularity of this great thoroughbred classic. Racing in the U.S.A. crowns its best 3-year-old thoroughbreds through the Triple Crown. Now, the world crowns its best horse via the International Crown, comprised by the King George IV and Queen Elizabeth Stakes at Ascot, England; the Prix de L'Arc de Triomphe at Longchamp, France, and the final jewel, the Washington, D.C., International at Laurel. Yes, this race is Maryland's own, being staged by Marylanders on Maryland soil. It carries the name of Maryland all over the world, something no other sporting event in the State does, because racing, unlike other American sports, is known far and wide. And the Washington, D.C., International, by its very name, is of prime importance to the vast amount of people all over the globe who have a strong affinity for the sport of horse racing.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—Congressional Record, volume 107, part 3, pages 3518–3544, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Record:

Citizens' Action Committee,
Nassau-Suffolk Counties, N.Y.,
June 12, 1963.

Hon. Daniel J. Flood,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Flood: The executive board of the Citizens' Action Committee voted unanimously in favor of House Resolution 14. It is to be hoped that speedy action will be taken upon it and that it will be passed in the House of Representatives.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter sent to Representative Howard Smith urging his favorable consideration of House Resolution 14.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely,
Mrs. Joseph Moosbrugger,
Chairman.

P.S.—We would appreciate having our letters inserted into the Congressional Record.

Citizens' Action Committee,
Nassau-Suffolk Counties, N.Y.,
June 12, 1963.

Hon. Howard Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: We of the Citizens' Action Committee deplore the sad plight of the captive nations. They have seemingly been abandoned to the tyrannical rule of their Communist masters. The bloody regime of Hungary is now being cleansed and absolved and readied for recognition by the United States. How shameful.

Representative Daniel Flood has introduced House Resolution 14 calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations. This committee is long overdue and vitally needed. It would study and prepare concrete recommendations for an effective U.S. policy toward these forgotten countries behind the Iron Curtain. We urge you to submit House Resolution 14 to a vote by your committee and to give it your favorable consideration so that it may be released to the floor of the House and voted upon.

It is imperative that we do all in our power to help these poor, neglected people who are enslaved under the Communist yoke.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Joseph Moosbrugger,
Chairman.

May 31, 1963.

Re House Resolutions 14 and 15, to establish Captive Nations Committee.

Congressman Daniel J. Flood,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Flood: Your diligent efforts in advocating the establishment of a Committee on Captive Nations are not unnoticed by the people of the United States. We are proud and honored that you realize the need for such a committee and have made a concrete effort in this direction by introducing the above bill. Do not be discouraged by the present status of the bill. We are certain that others will follow your able leadership.

Sincerely yours,
Garobed Danielian.

June 4, 1963.

Re passage of House Resolutions 14 and 15, Captive Nations Committee establishment.

Congressman Daniel J. Flood,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Flood: As a first generation American of Armenian ancestry, I am writing to you to let you know how much I am in favor of the above bill submitted by you sometime in 1960.

Although it is very encouraging to know that some measure of relief is planned by men in your position to bring to view the grasping and tyrannical hand of the Soviet Union with regard to certain nations such as Armenia, it is very discouraging to have this bill bottled up by the Rules Committee. At this time, I am also writing to the Rules Committee urging the release of this bill to the House floor.

I know you will continue to maintain your stand on behalf of the passage of this bill.

Very truly yours,
Miss Rose Mooralian.

Congressman Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
House of Representatives Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Congressman: Congressman Flood submitted House Resolution 14 to the House Rules Committee. As to date this resolution is still in the committee on a shelf. Would you please give your support and put this resolution on the floor for debate as it would help all the captive nations under the Communist domain to gain their freedom.

Being of Armenian descent we know what our parents are going through living under such regime.

Please give this matter a consideration as it means a lot to people who have relatives living in the captive nations.

Sincerely yours,
Jud W. Joffouciv.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1963.

Mrs. Marie Podoorska,
Secretary,
Mr. Walter Tustaniqsky,
Chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Detroit, Mich.

Dear Friends: Thank you for your letter urging my support of House Resolution 14—to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

At the present time this bill is pending before the House Committee on Rules with no action scheduled.

Let me assure you this measure has my support and I will continue to do all I can to see that it is enacted.

Sincerely yours,
Martha W. Griffiths,
Member of Congress.

Text of Address by Congressman John Brademas, Captive Nations Week Dinner, July 17, 1963, National Press Club, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include in the Record a speech by our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, JOHN BRADEMAS, which was delivered at the Captive Nations Week dinner, July 17, 1963, here in Washington.

Indiana was pointed out by the Assembly of Captive Nations by an award because of its activities in behalf of the people of the captive nations of the world. The remarks by our colleague were delivered as he accepted the award on behalf of the State of Indiana:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS, CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK DINNER, JULY 17, 1963, NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C.

It is a great pleasure for me to accept this award on behalf of Gov. Matthew Welsh and the people of Indiana.

The citizens of my State are proud that, because of the actions of our delegation in Congress, of our Governor and State legislature, of the press and many community organizations, Indiana has been chosen to receive this honor from the Assembly of Captive European Nations.

I must say, however, that support for the oppressed peoples of the world seems to me less a cause for special commendation than a natural duty of all freedom-loving men and women.

I want to salute the Assembly of Captive European Nations for its continuing and dedicated leadership in dramatizing the plight of the millions throughout the world, in Eastern Europe and elsewhere, who live their lives under the tyranny of Communist rule.

I have the honor to represent in Congress many thousands of persons whose origins are in the nations now captive in Eastern Europe. Indeed, only last fall I had an opportunity to visit two of these countries, Poland and Czechoslovakia.

In the grey mist of the ancient city of Prague, I saw the grim and deadening effect of Stalinism. Even the street lights of Prague were dim and flickering as if to reflect the despair of a people without freedom.

In Warsaw and Krakow and Czestochowa, I felt, in conversations with writers and teachers and students, the intense desire of the Polish people to speak their minds without fear of the informer or the knock on the door.

Happily, that desire is permitted to burn more brightly in Poland than elsewhere in Eastern Europe, but even now the Gomulka government is, with the dampening hand of conformity, seeking to snuff out the dangerous fires of free thought.

I have seen as well in Moscow and Leningrad and Kiev the trappings of the modern Communist state and observed what it does to narrow and confine and distort the lives of human beings.

And I have seen, as many of you have seen, and as President Kennedy saw last month, the wall of shame that divides the great city of Berlin.

As President Kennedy told that vast outpouring of peoples: "There are many people in the world who really don't understand, or say they don't, what is the great issue between the free world and the Communist world. Let them come to Berlin."

It is with some feeling therefore that I would venture one proposition to you tonight. It is this—that the case of the captive nations must never be conceived as a problem apart from the mainstream of free world policy.

GLOBAL STRUGGLE

For we are engaged in a global struggle involving the fundamentals of our faith as a free people, and the fate of the tens of millions of peoples now living under Communist dictatorships is a crucial factor in that struggle.

Therefore, even as Averell Harriman, a tried and tested and tough expert in dealing with the Soviets, talks with them in Moscow about the prospects of a nuclear test ban, we must maintain our commitment to a powerful military defense and to a foreign policy that will seize every opportunity to press for freedom for the peoples now living under Communist dictatorship.

Let us be soberly aware of the threat of nuclear destruction. To fail in this awareness would be the height of irresponsibility. Yet let us be equally aware that the task of achieving freedom for all peoples is no less significant or compelling.

We must then never agree with the Communist World that the situation in Eastern Europe is to be forever frozen. Our policy toward the captive nations must not be based on an acceptance of the status quo.

Our commitment is now and must continue to be aimed at the ultimate and complete freedom of the peoples caged behind the Iron Curtain.

Yet no man has an easy prescription for resolving the extraordinary and complex problems we face in seeking to expand the horizons of freedom. I believe, however, that in Eastern Europe, one of the most critical areas in the struggle for freedom, there are conditions of change which are hopeful.

For as President Kennedy said last month in his great speech at the Free University of Berlin. "The people of Eastern Europe, even after 18 years of oppression, are not immune to change. The truth never dies, the desire for liberty can never be fully suppressed."

What are some of these signs of change to which the President referred?

First, we are now witnessing the deepening and savage warfare between Moscow and Peking for authority over the Communist world. To suggest that this bitter division is mere shadow play would be to ignore the obvious. Of course, to suggest that the Sino-Soviet split solves all our problems would be foolish.

Second, there are many signs of troubles within the captive nations.

Gomulka has postponed the Polish Party Congress for a year or more for fear it might bring the struggles between warring factions in that country to an uncontrollable boil.

The Rumanian regime continues to resist the Moscow-conceived plans for the Soviet economic orbit.

Clearly readable distress signals are coming out of Czechoslovakia, the longest holdout against even slight deviations from Stalinist rigidity.

FALTERING COMMUNIST ECONOMY

Third, we are witnessing the increasing contrast between a faltering Communist economic system in Eastern Europe and a growing, vigorous economy in Western Europe. We may be legitimately concerned about the step-by-step advance of the new European economic community and about American relations with it. But we surely cannot view free Europe alongside totalitarian Europe without concluding that the future belongs to the free.

And finally, our hope can reside as firmly as ever in that most constant force for freedom, the peoples of Eastern Europe and their spirit of resistance to Communist oppression—a spirit of courage and quiet determination so well known that I need not dwell on it here.

Clearly, the Communist ship in Eastern Europe is floating on a sea of troubles.

We should therefore lose no opportunity for imaginatively exploiting these troubles to press the Communists for a greater degree of freedom for the peoples of the captive nations wherever and whenever there is a prudent and reasonable expectation that our efforts to do so can be effective.

EISENHOWER AND KENNEDY

For example, there is increasing talk of opening lines of trade between West and East. Provided that such lines of trade are managed on the free world side with careful selectivity and a clear sense of political purpose, they can be—as both Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy have recognized—valuable weapons with which to weaken Soviet influence in East Europe.

Trade agreements aimed at those faltering areas of the Eastern European economies where Soviet master planning has failed could be a means of undermining the systems of rigid economic control by which the Communist regimes try to fortify their grip on the peoples' lives.

I need hardly add that, unmanaged or left to Soviet initiative, a rise in East-West trade could have an opposite and damaging effect.

Should we not therefore consider meeting with our Western European partners to devise a concerted system of control that will transform this question of trade into a weapon for freedom?

I offer this thought only as one example of the range of possibilities which merit serious consideration if we are to carry the struggle for freedom into the captive nations. In doing so, I reiterate that in no way does this suggestion mean nor do I mean that our policy toward captive nations should be based on an acceptance of the status quo.

PEIPING-MOSCOW SPLIT

Let me add one other observation which is perhaps appropriate at a time when the Peiping-Moscow split is on one side of the front page and the nuclear test ban talks are on the other.

There are those in this country and elsewhere in the West who seem to agree with, indeed, enthusiastically, to accept the thesis of the Peiping Communists that war—which of course would be a nuclear war—between East and West is either inevitable or essential or both. I disagree with this view. For we would be making mockery of the cause of human freedom if we were not to exercise all our energies and resources toward achieving the kind of world in which men can be both alive and free.

I am confident, as I know you are or you would not be here, that out of mankind's long, dark night of tyranny there will finally shine the light of freedom—for the peoples of the captive nations and for all men everywhere.

It is our responsibility, yours and mine, to strive to shorten the dark night and make the bright morning come soon.

So I say to you, as President Kennedy said to the people of West Berlin, "There is work to be done and there are obligations to be met—obligations to truth, justice, and liberty."

Hon. John S. Monagan Addresses Assembly of Captive European Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, on July 17 the Assembly of Captive European Nations honored our distinguished colleague from Connecticut, Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN, at the annual banquet commemorating the observance of Captive Nations Week. Mr. MONAGAN was presented a plaque and a combination of the flags of the captive European nations, together with a citation in sincere gratitude for his steadfast furtherance of the freedom aspirations of the captive nations.

We are well aware of Congressman MONAGAN's effective efforts and accomplishments in chairing the hearings on the captive European nations held by the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I was privileged to hear his comments at the awards dinner and I wish at this time to call them to the attention of my colleagues. I include at this point the statement of Congressman MONAGAN which he eloquently presented at the dinner in his honor.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN S. MONAGAN, PRESENTED WEDNESDAY EVENING, JULY 17, AT CAPTIVE NATIONS DINNER OF THE ASSEMBLY OF CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS, NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply honored to receive this award from the Assembly of Captive European Nations, and I assure you that this plaque and combination of the flags of the captive European nations will be a treasured possession and symbol.

I am particularly honored to be linked in these exercises with the distinguished Senator from New York, Senator KEATING, and the distinguished Senator from my own State, my dear friend, Senator DODD. I am also honored that my colleague and friend from Indiana, Representative Brademas, shares in today's program, as well as the distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond, and the equally distinguished commentator, Edgar A. Mowrer.

It is a particular honor to be invited to join, also, the long list of outstanding Americans who over the years have lent their support to the movement to give aid and encouragement to the people of the captured countries of Eastern Europe.

It is vitally important that the activity of your committee and of the various friends of the captive nations be continued because the need for this support is as great today as it ever has been. This task is complicated by the fact that we are passing through a period of thaw in which conditions in some of the captive nations have been materially improved. In addition, the Western World is striving manfully to find some basis upon which there might be agreement between the East and the West to outlaw thermonuclear war and to eliminate some of the sources of friction that have hitherto existed. The uninformed and those with short memories might be inclined to be unduly optimistic about the future and, therefore, to be disposed to gloss over the still remaining difficulties of the present.

It is here, precisely, that the Committee on the Captive Nations performs its function. It can and does call attention to the fact that in spite of the thaw, conditions in all of the captive nations are as far from those in the free world as day from night. There are still political prisoners. Religion is harassed. Cardinal Mindzenty and Archbishop Beran are still virtual prisoners. Intellectual and cultural activities are kept under control. The elections are not free. Trade discrimination is practiced on a broad scale to the detriment of the captive countries. Armed Communist troops, in the tens of thousands, are still stationed in Hungary. The threat of armed Russian intervention is always present.

As human beings, we must continue to sympathize with the fate of these hapless people who are strongly oriented to the West, and whose love of freedom is no less than our own.

All of us, I am sure, were heartened by the strong and stirring statements about the people behind the Iron Curtain which President Kennedy made recently in Berlin and in Dublin. He spoke of the impossibility of doing business with the Communists as demonstrated in Berlin, and he encouraged the continuation of resistance by the captive nations along the lines of the conduct of the Irish during their long struggle against English rule.

Let us hope that the acts of our Government representatives, contrary to the unfortunate decision on the Hungarian question at the United Nations, will, in the future, reflect these challenging words of the President, rather than a gradual lessening of our strict emphasis on the rights of self-determination and individual freedom.

I have been privileged to act as chairman in the House of Representatives of a committee which spent many hours of study of the problems of the people of the captive nations and which filed in the House a report which received widespread publicity and which was fortunate enough to receive the praise of this organization.

It was our conclusion that support of the captive nations should not flag nor lessen. We felt that a lessening of freedom anywhere meant a lessening of freedom everywhere. We concluded that tyranny and oppression and the deprival of private liberties should be proclaimed to the world and we felt that the United States should champion the cause of the oppressed people and on every occasion should work for their liberation.

In accepting this honor tonight, which represents a recognition of the efforts of others, as well as my own, I pledge my continuing support of the people of the captive nations in the hope that one day our efforts may contribute to bringing about the time when these people, in their own homelands, will enjoy the same privileges which are ours today.

Taxes: Exempt and Otherwise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the tax cut issue is high on the agenda at this time for congressional action. Some notes of interest have a top priority in the arguments for and against.

The problem, as I see it, is not one of lack of jobs and income producing opportunities but rather one of bad distribution. We seem to be getting into a situation in less than 200 years that it took European countries centuries to achieve.

We are gradually putting all our wealth into the hands of a few families who in turn are now actively seeking full political as well as complete economic control over the whole U.S. economy. In fact, there is a growing suspicion that their aims go further and the full control of world economy between top U.S. inherited wealth and prestige is lining up their counterparts in other countries under the slogans and doubletalk of "world peace," "brotherhood," "humanitarianism," "free trade," "aid to the underprivileged," and so forth.

Now understand this clearly, I believe all of us—good or bad, low or high—are interested in these aims, all of us in the main want to be good, friendly, and helpful to those in need.

However, some of us do these things and promote our aims from a viewpoint of Christian principles while others doubletalk, doublecross, and alibi.

The world's welfare revolves on an economic axis and until we can get all peoples to realize that work of some kind must be performed by all of us in order to serve the common good, these aims will only serve to make paupers out of some and princes out of others.

For instance, here in the United States we have 1 percent of all U.S. adults owning 28 percent of all the personal wealth in the Nation. This same 1 percent of our adults actually represent only about one-half of 1 percent of our total population and yet they hold 76 percent of all corporation stocks and 100 percent of all State and local tax exempt bonds.

This means that all the billions of dollars of local and State personal income producing obligations are scot free of all taxes. For instance, a person having $50,000 income earned would pay about $23,000 in income taxes but by buying tax exempts he pays nothing. The same person putting his money into savings and investments that are taxable would pay $12,500 taxes.

You can see why the 1 percent of heads of families in the United States own all the tax-exempt bonds while the workingmen and lower income bracket earners of $10,000 or less pay taxes on 90 percent of their earnings at the highest rate of taxation.

In fact, although the law calls for a 91 percent tax on a million dollar income, the average paid is only 28 percent because of loopholes, exemptions, and so forth.

In 1960, out of the entire national income, after taxes, 20 percent of the richest people got 44 percent while 80 percent or the rest of all the people got 56 percent.

It is not a socialist plan or even a radical plan to have all citizens pay their share of taxes. When we have gimmicks the only thing that happens is that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

Only 2 percent of total U.S. income was received by 7 million families while 3½ million families received 23 percent of total income. These facts are sobering to those amongst us who are worried about chronic unemployment and the situation as outlined by Leon Keyserling, chief economic adviser under Truman, whose studies show 40 percent of all Americans living in poverty and deprivation.

It is true that this poverty group is hidden because it is scattered over our 50 States but it is there, and here, even if we cannot see it. According to Keyserling and a report made recently to the President by a special group studying our economy, we may have more underprivileged than some nations we are pouring aid into.

Another false, double talk propaganda line, by the well-heeled lobby for the privileged taxpayers is that if greater tax breaks are given to high, upper-bracket incomes it will stimulate investments and in turn create more employment.

How silly can we get, all of us—those who promote such tripe and those of us who believe it?

How can any sound argument be made for such a silly economic fallacy when we now have over 17 percent of our production capacity idle and millions unemployed? The answer is not production at this stage, but rather income and consumption.

Automation can be a blessing but when it is used to cut out labor, produce surplus, and increase the top profit brackets and incomes, it is a curse on the body politic.

It causes more unemployment, higher taxes on the poor people, lessens consumption, for as one economist said:

> I've never seen an automat get its shirt cleaned, get a shave, have a lawyer, see a doctor, or sit down to eat the produce of our farms.

We have reached a crossroad in our economy and a decision must be made. Either we put people to work producing goods and services, create purchasing power in the hands of the masses or we develop into a two-class society, those who are lucky enough to inherit wealth and prestige and the rest of us who will live in a restricted income economy like the millions of peasants all over the world in those nations where the inheritor of wealth and prestige have lived in luxury while the main body of the populace lived in hand-to-mouth existence.

My parents and millions more ran away from the closed societies of the old countries and if this generation of their offspring allows this to happen here in the greatest land of opportunity ever created by man, then their hopes for peace, friendship and brotherly consideration amongst the peoples of all nations will be as dead as the proverbial dodo bird.

Even in the so-called broad based taxes such as excise, sales and use taxes, the little fellow carries the load.

Those amongst us in the lower brackets spent 92 to 94 cents of our income on goods and services while those in the upper brackets spent less than 25 cents out of a dollar.

This means that a 5-percent sales tax is about 4½-percent effective on the lower income group while it is only about a 1½-percent tax upon the high incomes.

The truth of the matter is that instead of spreading our income in a fashion that would insure the greatest possible market basket distribution we are gradually but surely wiping out the leveling in our society provided by the middle income earner, a phenomena peculiar to the U.S. economy and most responsible for our economic, civic, and political growth.

Every year sees less and less workers climbing out of the ditch, becoming self-employed and employers in their own right. The day of the self-made man and unlimited horizons appears to have been trampled underfoot by the inheritors of exorbitant tax-exempt wealth.

No single business can be saved if one of our large monopolistic-type industries, chain stores or fabricators wants to take it over. Antitrust antimonopoly laws become useless in our domestic economy because of the internationalization of our large corporations, producers, importers, exporters, and processors who must, of a necessity, if they seek survival in world markets, become part of the foreign cartels and combines, syndicates and state-controlled production and distribution systems.

Recently we witnessed the takeover of U.S. foreign-based investments in many countries. Some, like in Cuba, were taken over without compensation, others in Brazil were supposed to be paid for while many are just being taxed out of U.S. control.

The latest country to show its economic fangs to the profiteering U.S. companies who have subsidiaries in foreign countries for many reasons not the least of which is cheap labor, foreign tax concessions and a haven away from U.S. income taxes, is our neighbor, Canada.

I quote from the U.S. News, June 24, 1963:

> Tax penalties are to be applied to U.S. corporations that operate subsidiaries in Canada. Canada's new budget calls definitely for a "Canada first" policy in industry.
>
> Here are the highlights:
>
> A "takeover tax" of 30 percent is to apply to future sales of Canadian stocks and assets to foreigners. This amounts to a hefty sales tax on transactions that transfer control from Canadians to United States and other outside firms. Tax is effective immediately for companies listed on Canadian stock exchange.
>
> A tax cut is offered to companies that are 25 percent owned by Canadians. Withholding tax on dividends to nonresidents in these firms drops from 15 to 10 persons, immediately.
>
> A tax boost is scheduled on dividends paid by companies that are less than 25 percent owned by Canadians. Rate goes from 15 to 20 percent on January 1, 1965.
>
> A 15-percent withholding tax is levied on management fees paid by Canadian firms to nonresidents.
>
> Accelerated depreciation rates will be available only to companies with a minimum of 25 percent Canadian ownership. This runs to 50 percent on new machinery and equipment.
>
> Tax refunds from the 20-percent levy will be made if, by January 1967, the foreign-controlled firms become 25 percent Canadian-owned.

To add insult to injury the Canadians are going to drive U.S. investors out of control of companies in Canada while at the same time they will coax U.S. investors to buy bonds and debt issues of Canadian companies where these investments are purely investment paper without voting rights.

Another quote from U.S. News:

> The budget also contains a device to attract U.S. purchases of bonds and other debt issues of Canadian companies. Tax-exempt organizations in the United States such as pension trusts and foundations, will be given tax-free privileges in Canada.
>
> Major aim of Canada's new liberal Government is to reduce U.S. influence in Canada's industrial operations. Nonresidents, most of them from the United States, are said to control 57 percent of Canada's manufacturing, 61 percent of mining and smelting, 75 percent of oil and gas.
>
> Some large U.S. companies are to be affected by Canada's new tax laws. Examples: Ford Motor Co. of Canada; General Motors of Canada; Canadian International Paper, a subsidiary of International Paper, Canadian General Electric, DuPont of Canada, Coca-Cola, Ltd. All of these Canadian companies are more than 75 percent owned by U.S. firms.
>
> Canada wants U.S. capital in the future to be in the form of bonds and debt issues, rather than common stocks.

This program is not new nor is it an isolated case of foreign objection to U.S. control. It is a common occurrence and will become even more the rule as days go by and these foreign countries have their industries in production with the U.S. market handed to them by our idiotic trade deals.

Again, I quote from the U.S. News:

> American investments in Europe's Common Market are to get a critical study by the Market's executive commission.
>
> Finance ministers of the six Common Market countries agreed on June 11 that the study should be made. It is to be an industry-by-industry inquiry.
>
> France, which has been critical of growing U.S. investments in Europe, initiated the study. The French Government criticized the recent acquisition of Simca, the French automobile manufacturer, by Chrysler. France also has expressed concern over growing American investments in food processing and in the oil industry.
>
> One French fear is that expanding American investments in France may interfere with that country's economic planning.

As you can see, the whole world is commercially minded when it comes to trade. Every nation must look out for its peoples, its institutions, first, and still give to all others whatever does not deny its peoples of their rights, their opportunities and, above all, their means of earning a livelihood.

Most of us realize the need for employment, but few of us have the answers or perhaps the position of power to put our proposals into action.

Time alone will tell whether we can continue to have unemployment, increased automation, surplus, subsidies, and free trade all at the same time without breaking our banks or our collective economic needs.

Nationwide Observance of Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which provides that October 12 of each year be recognized as a legal holiday for the whole Nation, to be known as Columbus Day.

In proposing that we observe October 12 as a national holiday I am not suggesting the establishment of merely another occasion or excuse to celebrate. I believe that Columbus Day should be observed as a day of rededication of the American people to strive for the kind of a world envisioned by Columbus, a world of peace and justice. It should be a day on which the life of the great discoverer and his achievements in the face of dire circumstances should be related to young and old as an inspiration and a source of confidence in the destiny of our own Nation. It should also be a day of prayer for world peace and justice so that mankind may enter the new world of tomorrow.

Columbus Day is already being observed as a State holiday in 37 States throughout the Nation. They are: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. It is also observed in the District of Columbia. Several States, notably Indiana, North Dakota, and Ohio, call it Discovery Day; in Arkansas, Iowa, and Wisconsin it is known as Landing Day.

The 13 States which do not observe Columbus Day are: Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho, Maine, Mississippi, New Mexico, North Carolina Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia, and Wyoming. Thus the overwhelming majority of the States—in fact, nearly three-fourths of them—observe the discovery of America. Under the circumstances, I believe the time has come for us to make this a national holiday and to pay nationwide tribute to Christopher Columbus.

Nearly five centuries have passed since Columbus made his historic discovery and inaugurated a new era in human affairs. From that day on civilization has made great strides forward on the road to freedom and human achievement. Since the time of Columbus the world has experienced periods of war and peace, upheavals, and revolutions, events that shook the world to its very foundations, tremendous scientific progress, the liberation of many nations and the oppression of others.

We, in our day, still ponder the future of mankind just as was done nearly five centuries ago in the days of Columbus. Mankind is still searching for new horizons and still cherishing new hopes for a better tomorrow. As we look at the unrest and tension of the world of our day, the question comes to mind: Is this the kind of a world envisioned by Columbus? We know of the many difficulties he encountered during his great journeys of discovery. We know that these journeys would never have succeeded were it not for his indomitable spirit, his steadfast faith in divine guidance to help him pursue his chosen course. We know that he wanted to prove that the world is round and that trade routes could be established with Asia.

Columbus was known as the great dreamer in his day. Surely, he must have been dreaming much beyond the globular shape of the world and the possibility of trade routes to India. Undoubtedly, he was also dreaming of a world at peace, of a happy mankind, of justice, and human dignity for all. He was a man who possessed the same kind of vision and faith which sustained the early settlers of our country, which inspired the Founding Fathers of our Nation.

This is the kind of vision and faith which are so desperately needed in the world today. Despite all the progress we have made since the days of Columbus, we still have a long way to go before we can attain genuine peace, justice, and human dignity for all. We have not only the problems of today to consider, but we must also think of the world of tomorrow in which our children are destined to live and we must be prepared to meet the problems and the unknown dangers of the future.

In the perspective of history, we think of Columbus as a dedicated man who inspired countless generations, and will continue to inspire other generations to come, as long as America remains the symbol of liberty and the moral leader of the free world. The observance of Columbus Day as a national holiday, as a day of rededication and prayer, would serve as a reminder and an inspiration to the American people and to the whole free world. It would be a reminder of the difficulties he encountered and how he met them with great fortitude and determination. It would be an inspiration of his great faith and his achievements which exemplify the American spirit for greater achievements, the discovery of new horizons, and the successful solution of the problems of our times.

Mr. Speaker, may I also add that the observance of Columbus Day as a national holiday would be a well-deserved recognition to the great Italian-American community in this country for the wonderful contributions it has made to our Nation throughout its history, particularly in the fields of art, science, education, religion, politics, and many others. We, in Connecticut, are particularly proud of the invaluable role which Americans of Italian descent have played in the growth and development of our State. They are highly esteemed and are regarded everywhere as an industrious and patriotic group.

"Federal Aid to Education—Present State of the Question," by Hon. James J. Delaney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the RECORD a clear, concise statement by a distinguished colleague, Hon. JAMES J. DELANEY, on "Federal Aid to Education"—a subject with which he is fully acquainted. Congressman DELANEY's knowledge and sound reasoning produced the "GI Bill for Junior" which I and seven other Members have cosponsored. This legislation presents a constructive approach to the problem of Federal aid to education.

Mr. DELANEY's article was printed in the annual education issue of the Brooklyn Tablet on May 16, 1963, and states cogent and irrefutable reasons for his position.

I am sure all Members who read this statement will agree that we have at hand an equitable solution to meet the pressing need in the educational field.

The statement follows:

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—PRESENT STATE OF THE QUESTION, BY HON. JAMES J. DELANEY, REPRESENTATIVE, NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

In July of 1961, I voted, in the Rules Committee, against a Federal aid to education bill which had been prepared by the NEA on two grounds:

1. The bill made no provision for some 7 million American children attending independent schools, thereby discriminating against them in violation of the equal protection clause of the Constitution.

2. This bill was part of a plan by NEA to set up a monolithic educational system controlled by the Federal Government and based on the atheistic concept of man. At that time I called the attention of the American public to a brochure inspired by the NEA entitled "A Federal Education Agency for the Future" which fully supported my charge.

At that time I stated: "I shall not vote for legislative discrimination." I also stated "diversity is the quintessence of democracy. Uniformity is the hallmark of totalitarianism". On these principles I still stand.

Early in 1962 in the 87th Congress I introduced a bill based on the freedom of choice and parental rights principles. This bill has been reintroduced in the 88th Congress by me and bears number H.R. 320. Identical bills have also been introduced by Congressmen CAREY and HALPERN, of New York, and HAWKINS, of California, and are now before the House Committee on Education and Labor. My bill recognizes the natural, civil, and constitutional right of parents to choose the education of their children. This basic right of parents has been held to be a constitutional right by the U.S. Supreme Court in the cases of *Society of Sisters* v. *Pierce,* 263 U.S. 510 and *Meyer* v. *Nebraska,* 262 U.S. 390. The universal declaration of human rights proclaimed by the United Nations also includes this right in subdivision 3 of article 26: "Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children." It is interesting to note that the most recent encyclical of Pope John XXIII also proclaimed the principles of freedom of choice and the prior rights of parents to direct the education of their children. Pope John said:

"By the natural law every human being has the right to respect for his person. To his good reputation. The right to freedom in searching for truth and in expressing and communicating this opinion, and in pursuit of art, within the limits laid down by the moral order and the common good. And he has the right to be informed truthfully about public events.

"The natural law also gives man the right to share in the benefits of culture, and therefore the right to a basic education and to technical and professional training in keeping with the stage of educational development in the country to which he belongs. Every effort should be made to insure that persons be enabled, on the basis of merit, to go on to higher studies, so that, as far as possible, they may occupy posts and take on responsibilities in human society in accordance with their natural gifts and the skills they have acquired."

Pope John also said:

"Parents, however, have a prior right in the support and education of their children."

My bill is modeled on the GI bill of rights, whose provisions are generally well known to the American public. I stated at the time when I first introduced this bill "the bill merely follows the approach of the GI bill of rights and the page boys bill, both of which have worked successfully and without criticism. It is the commonsense solution to this problem."

Two years ago there was a lack of clear understanding on the question of the constitutionality of aid to students attending nonpublic schools insofar as the public consensus was concerned. The public dialog, which has occurred within the past 2 years has dissipated the fog of doubt which existed. During that time the public has learned that the Federal Government, even before the adoption of the Constitution, in the Northwest Ordinance, made provisions for aid to all educational institutions including theological seminaries. Since the Northwest Ordinance the Federal Government has made grants of land to all of the land-grant colleges, which included church-related colleges and even theological seminaries. Immediately after the Civil War, the Federal Government set up Howard University in Washington, D.C., and has supported it from that day to this. Howard University maintains a theological seminary although under the Federal law, which has been on the statute books for three quarters of a century, no portion of the moneys granted by the Congress goes to support the theological seminary.

It is interesting to note that the State of New York, at the same time that the Northwest Ordinance was enacted, also set up a similar plan known as the Gospel Lots or Gospel Funds which provided that in the distribution of public lands in upstate New York that a certain portion be set aside for the Gospel and school. These Gospel Lots and Gospel Funds are still perpetuated in the education law of the State of New York and many upstate communities are still receiving benefits from them.

It is also interesting to note that in New York, St. Peter's Roman Catholic School on Barclay Street received aid from the State of New York in 1806, and further that Governor Seward in 1840, in his annual message to the legislature, recommended State aid to church-related schools.

At the present time there are a large number of educational programs on the college level, where the Federal Government makes grants, either direct to the institution, or to students attending private and church-related colleges. In addition, the Federal Government maintains a military educational program, known as the ROTC in which all church-related colleges are eligible to participate. It is interesting to note that the ROTC program also extends to secondary, or high schools. The GI bill of rights is probably the best known Federal aid to education program. This treats all persons alike and there is no discrimination or attempt to control the educational system. It is not generally known but the GI bill of rights is also applicable to GI's attending either primary or secondary schools of their choice. Throughout the country many GI's attended primary and secondary schools of their choice and their tuition was paid for by the Government under the GI bill of rights. Under the various junior ROTC programs all secondary schools, whether church related or not may participate and receive benefits from the Federal Government. The page boys bill, which provides that the Federal Government shall pay the tuition for the education of page boys of the Supreme Court and the Congress also applies to primary, secondary, and college education.

It is not necessary to be a constitutional lawyer to realize that the church-related schools were here first and that the Federal Government, from its inception, has, down to, and including the present time, made provisions for students attending independent or church-related schools. In fact, in the present bill before the Congress, H.R. 3000, the provisions thereof which deal with higher education are not discriminatory and make fair and equal provision for all students and all educational institutions. In H.R. 3000, it is section IV which fails to follow the principles of the other provisions of the bill and undertakes, on the secondary and primary level, to make provisions only for State managed schools and makes no provision for independent schools privately managed.

The Aid to Medical Schools Act, which passed the House of Representatives within the past few weeks, also makes equal provisions for church-related medical schools.

In the last 2 years innumerable constitutional authorities and law review articles, throughout the country, have pointed out clearly that there is no constitutional bar on the Federal level for giving aid to all children attending all schools. The "constitutional issue" is similar to the constitutional issue raised in many circles before 1960 as to the eligibility of a Catholic to be President of the United States. Such a constitutional question may sound strange today but only 3 years ago it was seriously debated.

There is no better way of guaranteeing freedom and democracy in education than by allowing each child, or his parent, to choose his school. This is the educational policy of practically all of the countries of the free world excepting our own. Of course in totalitarian countries there is only one system of education and that is controlled by the State as a monopoly. Some of our secularists would like to have a similar system in the United States. They do not realize that secular education is limited education. Although we have compulsory education in the United States, the requirements of the compulsory education laws are satisfied by students attending independent schools privately managed. In other words, the independent schools serve the same public function as the State managed schools. All of these schools meet the educational standards set up by the compulsory education laws of our States. They are part of the American educational system. However, the independent schools are not limited and usually add other subjects to their curriculum. It might be significant to note that during the First World War, when synthetic rubber was the Nation's greatest need, that synthetic rubber was not developed in a secular, or public university, but rather was developed in Notre Dame University.

There are some who object to students attending independent schools receiving any public aid because they contend that the curriculum in these schools is permeated with a theology. A careful examination of the Declaration of Independence will also reveal that the Declaration of Independence is in substance, a small summary of theology. Does this mean that the Declaration of Independence cannot be read or taught in schools which receive public aid?

At the present time the largest single item in every State budget and in the budget of every local community in the United States is the provision for education. Large as these provisions are they are bound to progressively increase in the near future. This is due to three factors. One, increased costs of all items that go into education. Two, the large increase in population which started in 1942 and three, the need for more education for more children in order to meet the threat of world communism.

At the present time it costs, in the State of New York, approximately $600 per student, per annum, for elementary education and $800 per student, per annum, for secondary education. Roughly speaking the cost of education in the State of New York is distributed between the local community and the State. The State's share is reflected in income taxes and the local share is imposed upon real estate, which includes homes. My bill, which would give $20 per student to every student, including those attending independent and private schools, would be a great incentive for more independent and private schools and would to that extent relieve the taxpayers of a tremendous financial burden. It is sound public policy to encourage private and independent groups, including religious groups, to support schools which meet the requirements of the compulsory education law and which save a considerable portion of the cost of educating American children.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the fifth annual observance of Captive Nations Week. At this time we solemnly renew our pledge to keep alive the ideals of freedom and independence which persist among those peoples crushed by the weight of the Iron Curtain.

Since the beginning of the Second World War, communism has made marked advances throughout the world. Yet Communist expansionism is not a phenomenon confined to the past two decades. Ever since 1917, international Communist leadership has pursued an unscrupulous policy of aggrandizement. The first Soviet Commissar of Nationalities was Joseph V. Stalin, and under his direction such newly independent states as Armenia and Georgia were, by treachery and by force, incorporated into the Soviet empire.

And so it has continued for more than 40 years. The events of succeeding decades have been but further embroidery upon this web of aggression, aggression supposedly justified by "the inevitable march of history." Since 1940, over 100 million people in Eastern Europe have been sucked into the Communist vortex. In not one instance has a Communist regime been established through the free and willing consent of a democratic majority. The techniques have been numerous: Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania—outright invasion; Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Rumania—political subversion; Albania—guerrilla warfare; Bulgaria and Hungary—occupation by so-called Russian liberation armies. Such were the methods by which apocryphal people's governments have been established. Surely the inevitable course of history has something better to offer than this record.

Through the vigorous policies of President Truman and his successors, we have checked the brutal swing of the Red sickle in Europe. But now the Communist tide flows to the south and to the east. In China there has arisen a monster which even its creators cannot control. Yet we must not interpret this growing split within the Communist camp as an ebbing of the tide. Whether it be the nuclear tactics of a Mao or the subversive tactics of a Khrushchev, the ultimate aim is still the same: to spread the shadow of darkness over the face of the earth.

Mr. Speaker, as we have demonstrated in the past 15 years, our Nation is irrevocably committed to stemming the wave of Sino-Soviet expansionism. But this is not sufficient—nor can it be, as long as 22 nations are bowed beneath the Communist yoke. The desire for freedom among these captive peoples remains great, as evidenced by the courageous uprising in Poland and Hungary in 1956, or the continuing exodus from East Germany, in spite of nearly insurmountable obstacles. It is to their liberation that we must further commit ourselves.

For almost 200 years, the United States has led the struggle for freedom and self-determination. The Declaration of Independence, the Monroe Doctrine, the Truman Doctrine—such documents attest to our continuing resolve to sustain the ideals of democracy. By observing Captive Nations Week, we reaffirm to the world that we still hold forth the beacon of liberty to all those who desire it. And until that day comes when those who draw the yoke of tyranny shall be free, let this week serve as a proclamation, that we do not forget.

Senator Russell Speaks for the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, in his superb statement on June 12 was not speaking for the South alone. Senator RUSSELL was speaking for the American way of life, our free enterprise system, our Constitution, and the foundation stones upon which our civilization and this Republic are built.

Mr. Speaker, we are at the crossroads in our destiny as a Nation. We have been making fantastic progress and now we either move straight ahead with a continuation of this progress with dignity and equality for all of our people or we plunge down a side road of violence, retrogression, and socialism. We either move forward under the Constitution and the written law or we turn the clock backward to anarchy, chaos, and stark naked centralized power.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the entire Nation Senator RUSSELL's statement as carried in the U.S. News & World Report of June 24.

THE SOUTH STATES ITS CASE

(Statement by Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, June 12, 1963)

(NOTE.—A key spokesman for the South—Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia—now states the South's case against civil-rights proposals. In a major policy statement issued after a conference of 18 Southern Senators, Senator RUSSELL said rights proposed for Negroes by President Kennedy would conflict with rights of other Americans and take the United States toward socialism. He promised to oppose administration plans with every means and resource.)

The President's speech on June 11 appealed eloquently to the emotions but completely disregarded reason, human experience and true equality under the Constitution.

The fact that every citizen has the same right to own and operate a swimming pool or dining hall constitutes equality. The use of Federal power to force the owner of a dining hall or swimming pool to unwillingly accept those of a different race as guests creates a new and special right for Negroes in derogation of the property rights of all of our people to own and control the fruits of their labor and ingenuity.

The outstanding distinction between a government of free men and a socialistic or communistic state is the fact that free men can own and control property, whereas statism denies property rights.

"From each according to his ability and to each according to his need" may have greater emotional appeal than "work hard to acquire property and the law will protect you in its enjoyment." However, Marxism has not worked and can never work because it does not take human nature into account. To rebut the emotional appeal, we have the hard, undeniable fact that in our free-enterprise system we have plenty, whereas the Marxists—though they have never been able to apply literally their avowed creed—all suffer from scarcity and privation.

Our American system has always rejected the idea that one group of citizens may deprive another of legal rights in property by process of agitation, demonstration, intimidation, law defiance and civil disobedience.

I do not believe that the American people will be easily frightened into discarding our system for adventures into socialism that have been discredited wherever tried.

The highest office of the land should symbolize respect for law, whether it be legally enacted ordinances of the meanest hamlet in the land or the written word of our national charter—the Constitution.

I was, therefore, shocked to hear the President justify, if not encourage, the present wave of mass demonstrations, accompanied by the practices of sitting or lying in public streets and blocking traffic; forming human walls before the doors of legal businesses and assaulting with deadly weapons officers of the law whose only offense was undertaking to maintain order and protect private property.

The South has its shortcomings as well as other areas. But a calculated campaign waged by the metropolitan press, television, and radio has magnified the unfortunate occurrences in the South while crimes of violence in other areas have been minimized. This has generated bitterness and hatred against the white people of the Southern States almost amounting to a national disease. It is also encouraging a condition bordering on anarchy in many communities. These terrible conditions are sure to further deteriorate with increasing disorder unless the President of the United States desists from using threats of mass violence to rush his social-equality legislation through the Congress.

No American citizen has the right to select the laws he will obey and those he will disobey.

The President of the United States has a higher call to leadership than to use threats of mass violence and disregard of reasonable local laws as a means of securing action in the courts and Congress, however desirable he may regard it to be.

The Congress of the United States, by an enactment of March 1, 1875, declared that all persons were entitled "to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of inns, public conveyances on land or water, theaters, and other places of public amusement. * * *" The Supreme Court of the United States on October 15, 1883, declared this Federal restriction upon the use and control of private property to be unconstitutional. In accordance with the contentions of those who would use Federal power to mix the races socially, this has been the "law of the land" from that date and still applies today.

The President and the Attorney General now say that they will predicate this new thrust for race mixing on the already tortured commerce clause of the Constitution. If the commerce clause will sustain an act to compel the white owner of a dining hall to accept a Negro against his wishes, it can be used to sustain the validity of legislation that will compel his admittance into the living room or bedroom of any citizen.

I believe in equality before the law for every American. In equal measure, I reject the idea that Federal power may be invoked to compel the mingling of the races in social activities to achieve the nebulous aim of social equality.

Every Negro citizen possesses every legal right that is possessed by any white citizen, but there is nothing in either the Constitution or Judaeo-Christian principles or common sense and reason which would compel one citizen to share his rights with one of another race at the same place and at the same time. Such compulsion would amount to a complete denial of the inalienable rights of the individual to choose or select his associates.

I hope that the American people will not be swept further down the road to socialism by the present unprecedented wave of propaganda. To me, the President's legislative proposals are clearly destructive of the American system and the constitutional rights of American citizens. I shall oppose them with every means and resource at my command. I do not believe a majority of the Congress will be frightened by thinly veiled threats of violence.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. Price.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

The Speaker's Room,
July 22, 1963.

I hereby designate the Honorable Melvin Price to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

John W. McCormack,
Speaker.

The Reverend Vairl C. Winter, Grass Lick Baptist Church, Kenna, W. Va., offered the following prayer:

Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God.—Romans 13: 1.

May we pray:

Supreme Architect of the Universe: Maker and ruler of all people, history and experience have given us so many evidences of Thy guidance to nations and to individuals that we should not doubt Thy power or Thy willingness to direct us. Give us faith to be led by Thee.

Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure manners. Defend our liberties, preserve our unity. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion. Fashion us into one happy people whose God is the Lord. Endue with the spirit of wisdom those whom we entrust in Thy name with authority, temper our self-confidence with thankfulness, and in the day of trouble, suffer not our trust in Thee to fail.

We would thank Thee for our beloved colleague who has served among us and now who lives in Thy clearer presence.

In His name, who gave His all to us, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 18, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on July 19, 1963, the President approved and signed a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4946. An act to amend the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1959, to provide for reimbursement of transportation expenses for Members of the House of Representatives; and

H.J. Res. 405. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 513. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week beginning July 28, 1963, as Veterinary Medicine Week.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2513. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5279) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order today under clause 8, rule XXIV, pertaining to District of Columbia business, shall be in order on tomorrow, Tuesday, July 23.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS TRANSFERRED TO TUESDAY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any special orders obtained for today shall be transferred to tomorrow and that they be called before any special orders scheduled for Tuesday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RECESS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A further message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

RAILROAD RULES DISPUTE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 142)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

This Nation stands on the brink of a nationwide rail strike that would, in very short order, create widespread economic chaos and distress. After more than 3½ years of constant but fruitless attempts to achieve a peaceful settlement between the parties through every private and public means available, this dispute has reached the point where only prompt and effective congressional action can assure that serious injury to the public will be prevented.

BACKGROUND OF THE CASE

This dispute is between virtually all of the Nation's major railroads and the five railroad operating brotherhoods—the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, the Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and the Switchmen's Union of North America. It involves—in addition to the more traditional issues of wage structure and fringe benefits—new and complex issues relating to changes proposed by the carriers and the brotherhoods in work rules affecting the manning of certain railroad operations and the assignments of particular crafts. The background and history of this case, the issues in dispute and the respective positions of the parties have been clearly and concisely set forth in a July 19, 1963, report unanimously signed by six tripartite members of a special subcommittee of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy. That report, including the appendixes, is included as an appendix to this message, and should be carefully read by all who seek the facts on this case.

Without attempting to summarize either the findings of that report or the excellent work of the other panels mentioned below, the following points are worth noting:

After the carriers on November 2, 1959, had served notice of proposed rules changes on the brotherhoods, and the brotherhoods had served notice of other proposed rule changes on September 7, 1960, and no agreement was forthcoming, both parties agreed on October 17, 1960, to submit the entire subject to a special Presidential study commission of 15 members, composed of an equal number of public, railroad, and brotherhood representatives. Following 13 months of extensive hearings and deliberations, 15,500 pages of oral testimony and more than 300 exhibits, this Presidential Railroad Commission, under the chairmanship of Judge Simon H. Rifkind, recommended specific rules changes and employee protection provisions in a comprehensive 342-page report.

Following a Supreme Court determination that there was no legal barrier to the carriers' initiating such changes, with appropriate bargaining and recourse to the Railway Labor Act procedures, and following the continued inability of the parties to negotiate an agreement, the National Mediation Board recommended to the parties that the case be submitted to binding arbitration.

As disagreement continued and a nationwide strike threatened an Emergency Board established pursuant to section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, under the chairmanship of Judge Samuel I. Rosenman, following its own unsuccessful efforts to mediate the dispute, made a series of recommendations designed to serve as the basis for constructive collective bargaining.

After further discussions and an extension at my request of the status quo period, the Secretary of Labor on July 5, 1963, recommended solutions for the two most controversial issues along with procedures to dispose of the rest.

On July 9, 1963, I recommended to the parties that all issues be submitted for final settlement to Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Arthur Goldberg, whose judicious temperament, expert competence, and many successes as a mediator uniquely deserved the confidence of both parties. This recommendation, and each of the preceding four sets of recommendations, were accepted by the carriers; but the brotherhoods rejected them in whole or in part.

On July 10, at my request, the parties agreed to maintain the status quo until July 29 to permit time, first, for the Labor-Management Subcommittee to examine and report the issues, and, second, for the Congress to consider this entire matter. It was my hope—and remains such—that the parties would recognize the importance of settling this dispute without resort either to legislation or to a crippling national strike. However, too little progress has been made in the past 11 days to release me from my July 10 commitment to transmit to the Congress on this date a review of the case and my recommendations for its disposition.

We face this prospect: In the absence either of an agreement, postponement, or reversal of position on the part of the parties, or of enactment of some contrary measure on the part of the Congress, July 29 will almost certainly witness the start of a general rail strike. The carriers on that date can be expected to initiate work rules changes along the lines of those approved by the various panels. And the brotherhoods thereupon can be expected to strike 94 percent of the Nation's rail mileage.

THE EFFECTS OF A PROLONGED NATIONWIDE RAIL STRIKE

In the event a strike occurs it will bring widespread and growing distress.

Many industries which rely primarily on rail shipment—including coal and other mining which is dependent on rails leading directly to the mine, steel mills that ship by rail, certain chemical plants which load liquids directly into tank cars, and synthetic fiber mills dependent on chemicals which for safety reasons can be carried only in rail tank cars—all of these and others would be forced to close down almost immediately. There would not be enough refrigerated truck capacity to transport all of the west coast fruit and vegetable crop. A substantial portion of these and other perishable products would rot. Food shortages would begin to appear in New York City and other major population centers. Mail services would be disrupted. The delay, cost, and confusion resulting from diverting traffic to other carriers would be extremely costly; and considerable rail traffic would be wholly incapable of diversions.

The national defense and security would be seriously harmed. More than 400,000 commuters would be hard hit.

As more and more industries exhausted their stockpiles of materials and components—including those engaged in the production of automobiles, metal products, lumber, paper, glass, and others—the idling of men and machines would spread like an epidemic. Construction projects dependent on heavy materials—exports and waterway shipping dependent on rail connections—community water supplies dependent on chlorine which also moves only by rail—slaughterhouses and stockyards, iron ore, rubber and machinery, magazine publishers and transformer manufacturers—all would be hard hit by a strike. The August grain harvest would present a particularly acute problem.

The Council of Economic Advisers estimates that by the 30th day of a general rail strike, some 6 million nonrailroad workers would have been laid off in addition to the 200,000 members of the striking brotherhoods and 500,000 other railroad employees—that unemployment would reach the 15-percent mark for the first time since 1940—and that the decline in our rate of GNP would be nearly four times as great as the decline which occurred in this Nation's worst postwar recession.

At the same time, shortages and bottlenecks would increase prices—not only for fruits and vegetables but for many industrial materials and finished products as well—thus impairing our efforts to improve our competitive posture in foreign and domestic markets and to safeguard our balance of payments and gold reserves. And even if the strike were ended by private or congressional action on the 30th day, at least another month would be required before the economy would be back on its present expansion track. Indeed, a prolonged strike could well break the back of the present expansion and topple the economy into recession before the tax reductions and other measures now before the Congress for reinforcing the expansion have had a chance to take hold.

THE LEGISLATIVE SETTING

In short, the cost to the national interest of an extended nationwide rail strike is clearly intolerable. No responsible government could accept the present situation with complacency. Because in the past both sides have recognized the serious consequences involved, there have been only two brief national rail strikes in this century. The likelihood of a strike next week thus means that we are confronted with an extraordinary situation, both in terms of the impact of the strike on our economy and in terms of the issues involved. These issues, unlike those of typical wage disputes, are ones with very little collective bargaining play left in them. The work-rules aspects of the present dispute are regarded as do-or-die matters by both parties—and the history of industrial relations shows that when employers and employees consider the issue to be this vital, they can both stand a strike much longer than the country can stand it. Therefore the parties being unable or unwilling to reach agreement or accept arbitration, and the executive branch having exhausted all statutory and other tools available, the responsibility now lies with the legislative branch.

The Congress has expressly refused to give the Executive authority to seize the railroads in time of peace and has expressly excluded railway labor from the national emergency provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. The Supreme Court has stated that the Congress is the appropriate forum for considering remedies against strikes designed to prevent the railroads from reducing employment for economic reasons. (*Telegraphers* v. *Chicago & N.W.R. Co.*, 362 U.S. 330, 342.) When adopting the Railway Labor Act in 1926, moreover, it was contemplated that special congressional action might be required "to protect the public interest in adequate and uninterrupted transportation. If (the bill) does not so work so as to avoid any impairment of the public interest, Congress will be unembarrassed in adopting any means it sees fit to protect the public interest." (Report of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, S. Rept. No. 222, 69th Cong., 1st sess., 1926.)

In 1916, the Congress set a precedent that is of interest today. As the result of a dispute over hours and wages, the railroad brotherhoods had isssued a call for a nationwide rail strike; and President Wilson held a conference with the parties. When he proposed arbitration, the carriers agreed and the brotherhoods refused. When he proposed the 8-hour standard of work and wages, the brotherhoods agreed and the carriers refused. Confronted with the prospects of an early strike, the President then asked Congress to enact the 8-hour standard as an interim law pending a further report to the Congress by a special Presidential Commission. He pointed out that he had "no resources at law for compulsory arbitration, to save the commercial disaster, the property injury and the personal suffering of all if the strike was not prevented." The Interstate Commerce Commission, he stated, would protect the carriers through its rate powers against any undue cost increases resulting from this change. Congress acted promptly and effectively; and the Supreme Court (*Wilson* v. *New*, 243 U.S. 332, 333, 342, 1917), emphasizing the fact that the nature of the railroad industry required both employers and employees to defer to regulation in the public interest, held that Congress had the power to impose a settlement binding on both parties "for a reasonable time, in order that the calamity may be averted and that opportunity may be afforded the contending parties to agree upon and substitute a standard of their own."

With all of these legal, economic, and other facts in mind, this administration has given careful consideration to the kind of legislation Congress might usefully enact to meet the needs of the present situation.

Ineffective measures which would not halt an injurious nationwide rail strike have been rejected as inconsistent with the public interest.

Punitive antilabor measures which would destroy railway labor's rights to collective bargaining and reasonable job security have been rejected as harmful to the Nation and insensitive to the very real issues posed by the proposed work rule changes.

Seizure of the railroads has been rejected as unjustified in the circumstances of this case, as creating complex legal and financial problems for the Government, and as merely postponing the day of reckoning on more efficient work rules and their acceptance by the brotherhoods.

Compulsory arbitration of this dispute by a special or congressional panel has been rejected as inconsistent with the principle that solutions reached through free collective bargaining should always be permitted and preferred.

Indefinite extension of the status quo for one or both parties has been rejected as an evasion of a serious public, as well as labor-management, issue that must be squarely faced.

Our objective instead was to find a solution which—

(1) is sufficiently familiar to the Congress, in terms of the procedures and principles involved, to facilitate its prompt enactment;

(2) encourages the parties to achieve their own solutions through collective bargaining;

(3) confronts the parties, on issues where voluntary agreement is not possible, with methods and standards of solution which are comparable to those both sides have previously experienced and found acceptable;

(4) recognizes both the public interest in promoting railroad efficiency and preventing a disastrous strike and the public's concern for those adversely affected by a settlement; and

(5) provides for an interim remedy while awaiting the results of further bargaining by the parties.

RECOMMENDED LEGISLATION

As noted above, the railroad 8-hour law of 1916 provides a precedent for congressional intervention of this type; and the Interstate Commerce Act provides a pattern to which both Congress and the parties are accustomed. Recognizing that both railroad mergers and their effect on railroad employment are deeply affected with the public interest, section 5 of that act wisely supplements the results of private decisionmaking and collective bargaining in this area with the quasi-judicial regulatory powers of the independent Interstate Commerce Commission. Proposed mergers must be passed upon by the Commission after due regard to their effect on public service and safety, the rights of employees and other considerations. In its order of approval the Commission includes specific terms and conditions to protect the job security of the employees involved. The carriers and brotherhoods remain free to supersede these employee security provisions with their own collective bargaining agreement. The value which railroad and other unions attribute to this section was reflected in their urging that comparable provisions be included in this year's mass transportation bill; and there are such provisions in this bill as it passed the Senate and as it was reported in the House.

There is no reason why these principles and procedures, if they are applicable to the employment security problems raised by railroad mergers and mass transit modernization, are not equally applicable to the employment security problems raised by railroad modernization and mechanization. An expert body should pass on these proposed rule changes in the light of public service and safety; and it should also make provision to prevent the employees from bearing the full cost of technical or economic progress, so long as priority is given to agreements privately reached by the parties themselves.

I recommend, therefore, that—for a 2-year period during which both the parties and the public can better inform themselves on this problem and alternative approaches—interim work rules changes proposed by either party to which both parties cannot agree should be submitted for approval, disapproval or modification to the Interstate Commerce Commission in accordance with the procedures and provisions of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act, the Commission being directed to use to advantage the work of the two previous panels which received evidence on these matters. At its discretion, the Commission may also appoint a special advisory panel to assist it in the discharge of its functions. The Commission shall judge the effect of each proposed rule on the adequacy and safety of transportation service to the public and on the interests of both parties; and it shall, with the advice of the Secretary of Labor, require fair and equitable arrangements to protect the interests of the affected employees, giving proper weight to the protection provisions of section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act and those recommended by the Presidential Commission and Emergency Board reports. Emerging from the recommendations of these boards was the principle that, while many jobs would not be filled following the death, retirement or voluntary transfer of the present occupants, every present employee with a significant attachment to the railroad industry would retain the right to his present employment or to comparable railroad employment at comparable pay. Provisions would also be made for rehiring priority, relocation expenses, displacement allowances, education and retraining grants, supplemental severance and retirement benefits and other features. In short, no one would be thrown out in the street; and, while the railroads gradually modernized their operations, there would be little, if any, loss to individual employees.

Unlike compulsory arbitration, this method would preserve and prefer collective bargaining and give precedence to its solutions. But any strike or lockout designed to impose a rules change which has not been approved by the Commission or the parties, or to oppose one which has been approved, would be subject to the remedies of section 5(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

This procedure is most appropriate to the disposition of those rule changes involving the manning of train or engine crews—the "automation" issues, in a sense. It would build on the progress made to date in defining and refining those issues through the various panel studies and subsequent bargaining efforts.

While the disposal of those issues should be sufficient to remove the barriers to a peaceful solution of all other issues by collective bargaining between the parties, many of them are closely interrelated to the work rules changes—and I recommend that the same joint resolution of the Congress provide that either party may submit such issues to the Commission to be settled by procedures deemed appropriate by the Commission.

I stress the fact that, unlike compulsory arbitration, these procedures would provide only interim changes and only for those situations and for such length of time as the parties are unable to agree by collective bargaining. This was also true of the 1916 act. Experience with both the interim rules and these temporary procedures should enable the parties to consider in 2 years, under considerably less pressure, whatever more comprehensive and final solution is needed, if any.

This recommendation contemplates that the Nation as a whole, which shares in the benefits, would also bear part of the burden imposed by advancing railroad technology. To the extent that provision for retraining and other payments may be available to an employee under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 or other Federal statutes, the carrier will be relieved of this obligation. As Congress recognized in the readjustment provisions of the Trade Expansion Act and selective service laws, the Government has some obligation to assist those adversely affected by governmental decisions which are required in the national interest; and there is little logic in protecting the economy by methods which also lead to increased unemployment and more distressed areas. The unfairness of placing the entire burden of readjustment costs upon either the carriers or the workers is an additional reason why legislation is particularly appropriate in this case.

The combination of elements stressed in this bill—permitting progress for the carriers and assuring job security and readjustment assistance for the workers—was also stressed by both the Presidential Railroad Commission and the Emergency Board established in this case. Referring to the provisions of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act and their successful application to other areas, the Presidential Commission states:

> An adequate program to realize the benefits of advancing technology in the public interest, therefore, must include both reasonable opportunity for management to achieve change, and for workers to enjoy reasonable protection against the harsh effects of too sudden change. Progress plus protection must be our choice * * * in the case of technological improvement * * * as in the case of mergers.

The Emergency Board stated:

> We are mindful also of the necessity for progress in the railroad industry, for efficiency in order to meet the challenge of competing industries. We have sought by our recommendations to increase these prospects of the carriers, and at the same time to preserve not only strong unions for the employees, but for the individual worker a continued life of usefulness to himself and his family, and to society itself. The railroads, and society as a whole have benefited by these changes; and they should both share generously in the burdens which have been cast upon the workers by the dislocations. These burdens, in addition to dollar payments, involve education or retraining for new jobs at the expense of the carriers, supplemented by public funds now or hereafter committed to general retraining of displaced manpower.

AUTOMATION

This brings me to the broader issue to which this message is addressed. The dispute which confronts us today has many special features—including the unusual public-interest nature of the industry, the disastrous impact of a prolonged strike and the particular circumstances of this case. It would be wholly inappropriate to make general and permanent changes in our labor relations statutes on this basis.

It would be particularly unwise to enact a general and permanent compulsory arbitration law, which I have always opposed. The Congress contemplated, in enacting the Railway Labor Act as well as the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, that special actions by the Congress may be required as a final recourse in any individual dispute; but the automatic assurance of compulsory arbitration would encourage one or both parties to neglect their bargaining responsibilities. The measure I am recommending today, in contrast with compulsory arbitration, gives encouragement and preference to solutions reached by collective bargaining, and provides only for interim decisions. It recognizes, moreover, that disputed rules changes and their effects on employment are appropriately matters for regulation by an independent agency which has specialized knowledge of the railroad industry and possesses procedures for handling these matters.

I would be remiss in my duty, however, if I failed to note that this dispute over railroad work rules is part of a much broader national problem. Unemployment, whether created by so-called automation, by a shift of industry to new areas, or by an overall shortage of market demand, is a major social burden.

During the past 6 years the level of unemployment has remained far too high. Men have been without jobs and factories have been without orders, primarily because the overall level of market demand has fallen short of the Nation's productive capacity. But when job opportunities are already scarce, those whom technological progress or industrial change displaced are more likely than ever to join the ranks of the unemployed than to find a new job. General unemployment is thus a double burden; as it penalizes those without jobs, it also creates fear and resentment against the very kind of modernization and change upon which our economic progress must in the long run depend. This is why I have placed such heavy emphasis upon the prompt enactment of my tax proposals, designed to stimulate market demand and return the economy to full employment.

To be sure, even with full employment, economic change will still bring problems in the wake of progress. Problems will remain for workers who are displaced by advances in technology, obsolescence of their skills or their industries, inadequacy of their education or training, or geographical shifts in economic activity. These problems are not new; they are the price of progress in any dynamic society. More particularly, the phenomenon that we call automation is not new; technological innovation and change have been the mainspring of economic growth in this country for more than a century. Nor is there yet convincing evidence that the overall pace of such change has accelerated recently.

But seen through the magnifying lens of our general unemployment problem of the past 6 years, the difficulties faced by those who are technologically and structurally displaced from work have captured unprecedented attention; and this is as it should be. Our awareness has been mounting that it is unfair to ask particular workers—or in some instances, even particular employers—to bear the full social costs that attend such progress.

This problem is particularly but not exclusively acute in the railroad industry. Forty percent fewer employees than were employed at the beginning of this decade now handle substantially the same volume of rail traffic. The rapid replacement of steam locomotives by diesel engines for 97 percent of all freight tonnage has confronted many firemen, who have spent much of their career in this work, with the unpleasant prospect of human obsolescence. The introduction of self-propelled vehicles for railroad maintenance, repair, and construction work—the use of longer, heavier, faster, and more efficiently filled trains—and the initiation of centralized traffic control, electronic inspection equipment, telephone and radio communications, and automatic switching and braking equipment have all decreased the need for railroad employment. The Presidential Commission was established in part, it said, because of the need "to close the gap between technology and work."

That Commission recognized, however, that "revolutionary changes even for the better carry a high price in disruption (that) might exceed the value of the improvements."

Yet we cannot stop progress in technology or arrest economic change in transportation or any other industry—nor would we want to. For technological change has increased man's knowledge, income, convenience, leisure and comfort. It has reinforced this Nation's leadership in scientific, economic, educational, and military endeavors. It has saved lives as well as money, and enriched society as well as business. Our task as a nation, to use the phrase of the Commission report, is simply to make sure that this public blessing is not a private curse. We cannot pretend that these changes will not occur, that some displacement will not result or that we are incapable of adapting our legislative tools to meet this problem.

While last year's Manpower Development and Training Act recognized the Federal Government's responsibility to help retrain and readjust workers who have been displaced by industrial change, as do this year's vocational education proposals, their scope is too limited to provide the full answer to a problem of this magnitude. The problems of manpower displacement, of which automation is only one cause, should not be settled primarily by the use of private economic power and pressure, or discussed only on the picket lines. They cut across many departments of government, all types of occupations, all standards of income, all sections of the country. Their solution is of importance to the entire Nation which now enjoys all the benefits of economic progress but, except when it is part of the employee group affected, now bears very little of its burdens.

For these reasons, it is my intention to appoint a Presidential Commission on Automation, composed of the ablest men in public and private life, and charged with the responsibility of—

(1) identifying and describing the major types of worker displacement, both technological and economic, which are likely to occur during the next 10 years, and the social and economic effects of these developments on our economy, our manpower, our communities, our families, and our social structure and human values; and

(2) recommending, in addition to those actions which are the responsibility of State and local government and private management and labor, specific administrative and legislative steps to be taken by the Federal Government in

meeting its responsibility to share the costs and alleviate the losses of automation job displacement, in such a way as to assure both the continued advance of our technology and the continued well-being of our people.

This Commission should undertake the most comprehensive review of this complex and many-sided subject ever ventured, and report no later than the close of next year. Its report must pioneer in the social, political and economic aspects of automation to the same extent that our science and industry have pioneered in its physical aspects. For the pending railroad dispute is likely the first of many, and a comprehensive long-range policy will be needed. I have no doubt, let me add, that such a policy will embody the basic elements of the measure recommended today—encouraging the advance of technology while protecting the security of the workers, encouraging private bargaining while protecting the public interest.

Thus the prompt enactment of this measure by the Congress will help launch a new national effort to meet the growing challenge of worker displacement by technological and economic change. Both the proposed bill and the new Commission are actions that will benefit both labor and management—but above all, they will benefit the public interest, and that is our primary test.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 22, 1963*.

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT ON WEATHER MODIFICATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 143)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read by the Clerk and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress the fourth annual report on weather modification (for fiscal year 1962) as submitted by the Director of the National Science Foundation.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 22, 1963*.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5279. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 513. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week beginning July 28, 1963, as Veterinary Medicine Week.

THE LATE HONORABLE HJALMAR C. NYGAARD

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, at this time I desire to offer a resolution, but before offering it I would like to say that, of course, it is with genuine sorrow that we have learned of the passing of one of our colleagues, the Honorable HJALMAR NYGAARD, of North Dakota. I suggest that in the very near future, at an appropriate time and after consultation with the Speaker, we shall arrange for those of us who desire to do so, and I certainly shall be among that number, to speak of the life and character and public service of our departed colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 449), as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable HJALMAR C. NYGAARD, a Representative from the State of North Dakota.

Resolved, That a committee of nineteen Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. SHORT, Mr. HALLECK, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. BERRY, Mr. MCINTIRE, Mr. AVERY, Mr. SISK, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. LANGEN, Mr. RIVERS of Alaska, Mr. BEERMANN, Mr. DOLE, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska, Mr. REIFEL, and Mr. DUNCAN.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect, the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

Mr. ALGER.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 23, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1054. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480 agreements concluded during June 1963, pursuant to Public Law 85-128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1055. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics) relative to the Department of the Navy proposing to transfer a 56-foot landing craft *LCM 6*, hull No. 124528 (without engines), to the Pamlico County Health Department, county of Pamlico, N.C., pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 7308; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1056. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the May 1963 report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10 (d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1057. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1058. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to accept gifts and bequests for the purposes of the Department of Commerce"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1059. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report on the feasibility and desirability of developing a national parkway extending from the Blue Ridge Parkway near Beech Gap, N.C., southwest into Georgia, pursuant to Public Law 87-135; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1060. A letter from the Chairman, Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission, transmitting the 15th Annual Report of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission for the year 1962, pursuant to Public Law 232, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1061. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of July 8, 1940, relating to the transportation of the remains, families, and effects of Federal employees dying abroad, so as to restore the benefits of such act to employees dying in Alaska and Hawaii, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1062. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions which this Service has approved according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 3669. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 566). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. S. 130. An act to change the name of Fort Randall Reservoir in the State of South Dakota to Lake Francis Case; without amendment (Rept. No. 567). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. S. 131. An act to change the name of the Big Bend Reservoir in the State of South Dakota to Lake Sharpe; without amendment (Rept. No. 568). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. S. 850. An act to change the name of the Bruces Eddy Dam and Reservoir in the State of Idaho to the Dworshak Dam and Reservoir; without amendment (Rept. No. 569). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 405. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment in certain cases because of race, religion, color, national origin, ancestry, or age; with amendment (Rept. No. 570). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 7682. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 7683. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the determination of the maximum amount which may be allowed a taxpayer as a medical expense deduction to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 7684. A bill to provide that the United States shall hold certain land in trust for the members of the Alamo Band of Puertocito Navajo Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 7685. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 7686. A bill to amend Public Law 409, 74th Congress, to authorize the appropriations necessary to carry out authorized improvements in the project for the Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 7687. A bill to prohibit transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 7688. A bill to amend the National Firearms Act to eliminate the Federal occupational and transfer taxes on certain firearms which are chiefly collectors' items; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATTHEWS (by request):

H.R. 7689. A bill to regulate in the District of Columbia rates for all forms of casualty insurance, including fidelity, surety and guarantee bonds, and for certain forms of fire, marine and inland marine insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 7690. A bill to provide for more effective utilization of certain Federal grants by encouraging better coordinated local review of State and local applications for such grants; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.J. Res. 565. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Con. Res. 203. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the study entitled "The Federal Government and Education"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H. Res. 447. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives in favor of direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab States in the search for peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 448. Resolution concerning collective defense agreements with Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the enactment of appropriate Federal legislation to incorporate the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., as a national organization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting enactment of legislation granting a pension to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 7691. A bill for the relief of Krystyna Horoszko Powell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 7692. A bill for the relief of Martin Gerald Freedman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 7693. A bill for the relief of Dr. Polieno A. Cespon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 7694. A bill for the relief of Marie Katemopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 7695. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret C. Kebbon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 7696. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Lentini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

206. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Margaret A. Hughes, Rutland, Mass., requesting the adoption of legislation to achieve an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the recitation of the Lord's Prayer and Bible readings in our schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

207. Also petition of Sir John McLeay, Speaker House of Representatives, Parliament House, Canberra, Australia, relative to a resolution adopted by the Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia on May 23, 1963, relating to the necessity for worldwide disarmament, and the importance of bringing about successful agreements on international inspection; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

* * *

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 22, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers: At another week's beginning, from the tumult of an angry, agitated world, we seek the sanctuary of Thy overshadowing presence, not that we may escape from the world, but that we may turn with confident spirits and quiet minds to the perplexing maze of its tangled problems.

In these challenging days, when so many hopes are being dashed to the ground, so many once radiant dreams dimmed, help us to rest our minds in Thee and in the strength of the everlasting verities and values which nothing can shake.

As we play our part in this age on ages telling, make us large hearted in helping and cautious in criticizing. Keep us from unkind words and from unkind silences, yet sure and strong in the faith that is in us, whenever and wherever we are called to take our stand. Join us to the seers and prophets of the past who have gone ahead of the lagging crowd to climb the beckoning hilltops of humanity's highest hopes.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BIBLE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 18, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 19, 1963, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 535. An act to extend the principles of equitable adjudication to sales under the Alaska Public Sale Act;

S. 581. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend for 2 additional years the provisions permitting the lease of tobacco acreage allotments;

S. 969. An act to provide medical care for certain Coast and Geodetic Survey retired ships' officers and crew members and their dependents, and for other purposes; and

S. 1031. An act to repeal the Inland Waterways Corporation Act.

REPORT ON WEATHER MODIFICATION, FISCAL YEAR 1962—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress the Fourth Annual Report on Weather Modification (for fiscal year 1962) as submitted by the Director of the National Science Foundation.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 22, 1963.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 5171) to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 5171) to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on July 19, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 582) to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. BIBLE, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. BIBLE, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 32

Joint resolution relative to ratifying the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States

Whereas the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States was proposed to the legislatures of the States of the United States by the 39th Congress on the 13th day of June 1866; and

Whereas on the 21st day of July 1868 the Congress adopted and transmitted to the Department of State of the United States, a concurrent resolution declaring that the requisite number of three-fourths of the States of the Union had ratified the said 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States and that the said 14th amendment was thereby declared to be a part of the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of California has not heretofore ratified said amendment; and

Whereas the said 14th amendment has long been a vital part of the Constitution of the United States and should be ratified by the State of California to show the concurrence of this great State with the principles therein enunciated; and

Whereas the said 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides as follows:

"SECTION 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

"SEC. 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

"SEC. 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

"SEC. 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emanicipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

"SEC. 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, a majority of all the members elected to each house of said legislature voting in favor thereof, That the said 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States be and the same is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of California; and be it further.

Resolved, That certified copies of the foregoing preamble and resolution be forwarded by the Governor of the State of California to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

RALPH M. BROWN,
Speaker of the Assembly.
HUGH M. BURNS,
President of the Senate pro tempore.
FRANK M. JORDAN,
Secretary of State.
By CHAS J. HAGERTY,
Assistant Secretary of State.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "STAFFING PROCEDURES AND PROBLEMS IN THE SOVIET UNION"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 174); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations three thousand additional copies of the committee print entitled "Staffing Procedures and Problems in the Soviet Union," issued by that committee during the 88th Congress, 1st session.

EXTENSION OF MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 372)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I report favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 1703) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the minority views of Senators PROXMIRE, MCCARTHY, NEUBERGER, and MCGOVERN, members of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Montana.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1920. A bill to authorize and direct the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress building in square 732 in the District of Columbia, to provide that such building shall be designated the "President James Madison Memorial Library," and to provide that additional facilities for the Library of Congress shall be built in squares 637 and 691 in the District of Columbia in order to render unnecessary the construction (at a cost of $39 million) of a special memorial to President James Madison, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Douglas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1921. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Golden Spike National Monument in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BAYH:

S. 1922. A bill for the relief of George Sgouritsas; and

S. 1923. A bill for the relief of Fotios G. Milonas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

S. 1924. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bennedict P. Mariano, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 1925. A bill to prohibit featherbedding in enterprises subject to the Railway Labor Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Goldwater when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. Dirksen):

S.J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Commerce.

RESOLUTIONS

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "STAFFING PROCEDURES AND PROBLEMS IN THE SOVIET UNION"

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 174) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print entitled "Staffing Procedures and Problems in the Soviet Union," which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jackson, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.)

DEATH OF HON. HJALMAR C. NYGAARD OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. Young of North Dakota) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 175) relative to the death of Hon. Hjalmar C. Nygaard, late a Representative from the State of North Dakota, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Dirksen, which appears under a separate heading.)

PRESERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITOL HILL AND THE WEST MALL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] and myself, a bill providing for the rational and frugal development of Capitol Hill and the West Mall. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Congressional Record and that it be held at the desk for 1 week for additional sponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

The bill (S. 1920) to authorize and direct the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress building in square 732 in the District of Columbia, to provide that such building shall be designated the "President James Madison Memorial Library," and to provide that additional facilities for the Library of Congress shall be built in squares 637 and 691 in the District of Columbia in order to render unnecessary the construction (at a cost of $39 million) of a special memorial to President James Madison, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Douglas, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the House Office Building Commission and the Senate Office Building Commission, jointly, is authorized and directed to construct in square 732 in the District of Columbia the third Library of Congress building, the design of which shall be in harmony with the prevailing architecture of the Federal buildings on Capitol Hill. Such third Library of Congress building shall be known as the "President James Madison Memorial Library".

Sec. 2. In addition to the underground garages to be constructed in squares 637 and 691 in the District of Columbia by the Architect of the Capitol, he shall construct above ground facilities to accommodate the portions of the collections of the Library of Congress which cannot be accommodated in the building authorized by the first section of this Act and in the present facilities of the Library of Congress.

Sec. 3. The plans for the buildings and facilities authorized by the first two sections of this Act shall be prepared by the Architect of the Capitol under the direction of the House and Senate Office Building Commissions and the Librarian of Congress. In the development of the design for the third Library of Congress building the Architect of the Capitol shall, with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts and the American Institute of Architects, obtain the services as consultants of distinguished architects of the United States and if, upon receiving advice from such architects, he deems a national competition for such design to be appropriate, he shall hold such a national competition and specify the conditions thereof.

Sec. 4. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the National Capital Planning Commission shall, after seeking the advice of the House and Senate Committees on Public Works, the House and Senate Office Building Commissions, the National Park Service, the Commission of Fine Arts, and groups representing residents and businessmen of the Capitol Hill area, prepare a plan which can be carried out within a period of ten years for the beautification, restoration, and rehabilitation of the entire west Mall area, and the residential and business areas of Capitol Hill. Such plan shall assure the preservation of the Union Station building (one of the major achievements of the McMillan Park Commission headed by Senator James McMillan, chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, and authorized by a Senate resolution adopted on March 8, 1901). The plan provided by this subsection shall include methods and techniques for organizing and sustaining joint governmental and citizen action through tax incentives, rehabilitation, restoration, spot clearance, and strict enforcement of the housing code, and other means for encouraging and assisting rehabilitation and restoration work by private citizens and homeowners and the elimination and prevention of blight by them in the residential and business areas of Capitol Hill which show signs of deterioration but which are not yet so blighted as to warrant extensive redevelopment producers.

(b) The National Capital Planning Commission shall, in addition, after seeking the advice of the House and Senate Committees on Public Works, the House and Senate Office Building Commissions, and the Secretary of the Interior, prepare a plan for honoring distinguished Americans by naming Federal buildings, and buildings of the District of Columbia government, after them. Such plan must be provided if the concept of open space and dignity which contribute so much to the beauty of the Nation's Capital is to be preserved in the face of constant pressures to use land (owned by the United States or which must be acquired from churches or private property owners) in the Nation's Capital for memorials.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this bill is identical with a bill introduced in the House of Representatives on July 5 by Representative William B. Widnall, of New Jersey, H.R. 7391. Congressman Widnall deserves great commendation for introducing this constructive proposal, and I am pleased to be able to join in introducing this companion measure with the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio who has long argued for an approach to this matter which would be reasonable and not wasteful of the taxpayers' money. On June 19 of this year, in my testimony before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Legislative Banch Appropriations, I stated my concern about the wasteful and irrational development of the Capitol Hill area which Congress has either been unable or unwilling to correct. While I have suggested that a fundamental step in the right direction would be to require that the Architect of the Capitol be qualified architect—and Senate bill 1800 proposes such action—in the absence of such a correction, the present bill does propose the outlines of an acceptable solution.

The core of this proposal is that the proposed second annex of the Library of Congress be designated the President James Madison Memorial Library and that it be constructed on square 732, the large vacant land area south of Independence Avenue SE., and directly across that street from the main Library of Congress building. On the basis of the previous proposals made for both a separate memorial to Madison and a separate library annex, this combination of the two will save at least $39 million. And when consideration is also given to the cost of the properties east of the present Library Annex, which the Librarian has proposed would be used for a separate second library annex, at least an additional $2 million is involved, in fact, in my judgment, even more than $2 million would be required. The bill we are introducing today also would provide that in addition to the underground garages to be constructed in squares 637 and 691, south of the Rayburn Building, there would also be constructed above ground library facilities to supplement any deficiencies of space in the Memorial Library. The leeway permitted by this provision will allow the Memorial Library to be so constructed that it will in fact be of memorial design without limiting the provision for the needs of the Library. But, of course, steps must be taken immediately by the House Office Building Commission to require that the design and construction of the understructure of the parking garages be capable of supporting the proposed above ground library facilities. I am informed that the House Office Building Commission is to meet this week. I hope they will consider this question.

The adoption of this solution of the combined memorial and library is desirable, in my opinion, not only because of its economy, but also because it will provide fair treatment for the private and institutional property owners of the Capitol Hill area. Under present conditions and plans, property owners many blocks from the Capitol have good reason to wonder whether it is worthwhile to protect their property from deterioration. The present bill would require an expert plan to be prepared for the beautification, restoration, and rehabilitation of the residential and business areas of Capitol Hill and of the entire West Mall area. This plan would be drawn up by the National Capital Planning Commission with the advice of the House and Senate Committees on Public Works, the House and Senate Office Building Commission, the National Park Service, the Commission of Fine Arts, and groups representing residents and businessmen of the Capitol Hill area. An important provision of the plan would be the preservation of the Union Station building. The plan would also provide methods and techniques for organizing and sustaining joint governmental and citizen action to encourage and assist the rehabilitation and restoration of private residential and business properties.

Another, and badly needed, proposal made by this bill is that appropriate officials prepare a plan for honoring distinguished Americans by naming Federal buildings after them. This would be a needed element of sanity which would help to alleviate the problem of an excessive number of monuments and statues as well as making the designation of Federal buildings give greater historical depth than the mere designation of a number.

I hasten to add that, while this bill necessarily places administrative responsibility in the Architect of the Capitol, it also explicitly provides that the Architect must consult with qualified architects and others.

DESEGREGATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators Clark, Randolph, and Javits, I send to the desk, for reference to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, an amendment to S. 772, relating to desegregation of public schools, which is presently pending in that committee.

This amendment would substitute the text of title III of the administration's omnibus civil rights bill, which deals with desegregation of public schools, for the present provisions of S. 772.

My purpose in offering this amendment is to bring before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ultimately before its Subcommittee on Education, the administration's proposals for public school desegregation.

The Education Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, will soon hold hearings on various school desegregation bills.

I think that it is most important that the administration's proposals also be before the subcommittee so that they, too, can be considered in the forthcoming hearings.

I would like to make it plain that by offering this amendment, I do not mean to express a preference for the administration approach over the approach embodied in S. 772, sponsored principally by Senator Clark, or S. 1209, sponsored principally by Senator Kuchel. Both are somewhat stronger bills. They incorporate a requirement for filing plans of desegregation which has great merit.

But I am also of the view—and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania concurs—that it would be a great mistake for the Education Subcommittee to proceed to hearings on the proposals before it without also having before it for consideration the administration's bill. This amendment remedies that situation.

I ask unanimous consent to have the substitute amendment lie at the desk for the remainder of the week in the event that other Senators wish to cosponsor it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the Record.

The amendments are as follows:

Amendment No. 133

On page 1, beginning with line 5, strike out all through line 25 on page 9, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"DEFINITIONS

"Sec. 2. As used in this Act—

"(a) 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education.

"(b) 'Desegregation' means the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, color, religion, or national origin.

"(c) 'Public school' means any elementary or secondary educational institution, and 'public college' means any institution of higher education or any technical or vocational school above the secondary school level, operated by a State, subdivision of a State, or governmental agency within a State, or operated wholly or predominantly from or through the use of governmental funds or property, or funds or property derived from a governmental source.

"(d) 'School board' means any agency or agencies which administer a system of one or more public schools and any other agency which is responsible for the assignment of students to or within such system.

"ASSISTANCE TO FACILITATE DESEGREGATION

"Sec. 3. The Commissioner shall conduct investigations and make a report to the President and the Congress, within two years of the enactment of this Act, upon the extent to which equal educational opportunities are denied to individuals by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin in public educational institutions at all levels in the United States, its territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

"Sec. 4. (a) The Commissioner is authorized, upon the application of any school board, State, municipality, school district, or other governmental unit, to render technical assistance in the preparation, adoption, and implementation of plans for the desegregation of public schools or other plans designed to deal with problems arising from racial imbalance in public school systems. Such technical assistance may, among other activities, include making available to such agencies information regarding effective methods of coping with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation or racial imbalance, and making available to such agencies personnel of the Office of Education or other persons specially equipped to advise and assist them in coping with such problems.

"(b) The Commissioner is authorized to arrange, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education for the operation of short-term or regular session institutes for special training designed to improve the ability of teachers, supervisors, counselors, and other elementary or secondary school personnel to deal effectively with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation or measures to adjust racial imbalance in public school systems. Individuals who attend such an institute may be paid stipends for the period of their attendance at such institute in amounts specified by the Commissioner in regulations, including allowances for dependents and including allowances for travel to attend such institute.

"Sec. 5. (a) A school board which has failed to achieve desegregation in all public schools within its jurisdiction, or a school board which is confronted with problems arising from racial imbalance in the public schools within its jurisdiction, may apply to the Commissioner, either directly or through another governmental unit, for a grant or loan, as hereinafter provided, for the purpose of aiding such school board in carrying out desegregation or in dealing with problems of racial imbalance.

"(b) The Commissioner may make a grant under this section, upon application therefor, for—

"(1) the cost of giving to teachers and other school personnel inservice training in dealing with problems incident to desegregation or racial imbalance in public schools; and

"(2) the cost of employing specialists in problems incident to desegregation or racial imbalance and of providing other assistance to develop understanding of these problems by parents, schoolchildren, and the general public.

"(c) Each application made for a grant under this section shall provide such detailed information and be in such form as the Commissioner may require. Each grant under this section shall be made in such amounts and on such terms and conditions as the Commissioner shall prescribe, which may include a condition that the applicant expend certain of its own funds in specified amounts for the purpose for which the grant is made. In determining whether to make a grant, and in fixing the amount thereof and the terms and conditions on which it will be made, the Commissioner shall take into consideration the amount available for grants under this section and the other applications which are pending before him; the financial condition of the applicant and the other resources available to it; the nature, extent, and gravity of its problems incident to desegregation or racial imbalance, and such other factors as he finds relevant.

"(d) The Commissioner may make a loan under this section, upon application, to any school board or to any local government within the jurisdiction of which any school board operates if the Commissioner finds that—

"(1) part or all of the funds which would otherwise be available to any such school board, either directly or through the local government within whose jurisdiction it operates, have been withheld or withdrawn by State or local governmental action because of the actual or prospective desegregation, in whole or in part, of one or more schools under the jurisdiction of such school board;

"(2) such school board has authority to receive and expend, or such local government has authority to receive and make available for the use of such board, the proceeds of such loan; and

"(3) the proceeds of such loan will be used for the same purposes for which the funds withheld or withdrawn would otherwise have been used.

"(e) Each application made for a loan under this section shall provide such detailed information and be in such form as the Commissioner may require. Any loan under this section shall be made upon such terms and conditions as the Commissioner shall prescribe.

"(f) The Commissioner may suspend or terminate assistance under this section to any school board which, in his judgment, is failing to comply in good faith with the terms and conditions upon which the assistance was extended.

"Sec. 6. Payments pursuant to a grant or contract under this Act may be made (after necessary adjustments on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments, and on such conditions, as the Commissioner may determine.

"Sec. 7. The Commissioner shall prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of sections 2 through 6 of this Act.

"SUITS BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

"Sec. 8. (a) Whenever the Attorney General receives a complaint—

"(1) signed by a parent or group of parents to the effect that his or their minor children, as members of a class of persons similarly situated, are being deprived of the equal protection of the laws by reason of the failure of a school board to achieve desegregation, or

"(2) signed by an individual, or his parent, to the effect that he has been denied admission to or not permitted to continue in attendance at a public college by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin, and the Attorney General certifies that in his judgment the signer or signers of such complaint are unable to initiate and maintain appropriate legal proceedings for relief and that the institution of an action will materially further the orderly progress of desegregation in public education, the Attorney General is authorized to institute for or in the name of the United States a civil action in a district court of the United States against such parties and for such relief as may be appropriate, and such court shall have and shall exercise jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this section. The Attorney General may implead as defendants such additional parties as are or become necessary to the grant of effective relief hereunder.

"(b) A person or persons shall be deemed unable to initiate and maintain appropriate legal proceedings within the meaning of subsection (a) of this section when such person or persons are unable, either directly or through other interested persons or organizations, to bear the expense of the litigation or to obtain effective legal representation; or when there is reason to believe that the institution of such litigation would jeopardize the employment or economic standing of, or might result in injury or economic damage to, such person or persons, their families, or their property.

"(c) Whenever an action has been commenced in any court of the United States seeking relief from the denial of equal protection of the laws by reason of the failure of a school board to achieve desegregation, or of a public college to admit or permit the continued attendance of an individual, the Attorney General for or in the name of the United States may intervene in such action if he certifies that, in his judgment, the plaintiffs are unable to maintain the action for any of the reasons set forth in subsection (b) of this section, and that such intervention will materially further the orderly progress of desegregation in public education. In such an action the United States shall be entitled to the same relief as if it had instituted the action under subsection (a) of this section.

"(d) The term 'parent' as used in this section includes other legal representatives.

"Sec. 9. Nothing in section 8 shall be construed to deny, impair, or otherwise affect any right or authority of the Attorney General or of the United States under existing law to institute or intervene in any action or proceeding.

"Sec. 10. In any action or proceeding under section 8 the United States shall be liable for costs the same as a private person.

"Sec. 11. Nothing in this Act shall affect adversely the right of any person to sue for or obtain relief in any court against discrimination in public education.

"Sec. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide assistance to facilitate desegregation in public education and to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education."

"DEVELOPMENT LOANS" SO-CALLED ARE BOTH LOANS AND GRANTS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators Simpson, Ervin, Moss, Cannon, Dominick, Morse, Yarborough, Bible, and Smathers, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to S. 1276, authorizing funds for the foreign assistance program for fiscal year 1964, to establish a minimum interest charge for loans made under the development loan program.

The change in the Development Loan Fund program made by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to require the repayment of the principal and interest on the loans granted in dollars rather than in local currencies or in dollars, as was formerly the case, was hailed as a great step forward in our foreign assistance program.

In some respects it was an advance. Loans theretofore made which were repayable as to principal and interest in the currencies of the borrowing countries were loans in name only. The local currencies received in repayment could only be utilized within the borrowing country and did the U.S. taxpayer little good.

Therefore, requiring both principal and interest on development loans to be repaid in dollars was a distinct improvement.

However, because of the terms on which many of these "loans" are made, the term "loan" is still a misnomer.

Since the Development Loan Fund program was transferred to the Agency for International Development in 1961, loans in the amount of $1,075 million have been approved. Of this amount, up to December 31, 1962, $628.2 million in loans—well over half the loans—were made on terms providing for repayment in 40 years at three-fourths of 1 percent.

The United States is not on a pay as you go basis. In order to make these loans for the economic development of foreign countries we have had to borrow the money. Four percent per annum interest is a conservative figure for the cost of the money we must borrow. Figuring even more conservatively, let us assume a figure of 3¾ percent interest at the cost to the United States of the money borrowed to enable it to make these loans.

Not figuring interest on interest or grace periods granted during which no repayment on principal is required—usually the first 10 years—it will cost the U.S. taxpayer in actual expenditures for interest payments on the amount borrowed to make these loans at least $377 million to loan $628.2 million.

As an example, consider the $17 million loan to Egypt for grain storage facilities. The loan, of course, was necessitated by the need for grain storage facilities to store the Public Law 480 grain "sold" to Egypt for Egyptian currency. Under the terms of the development loan, the $17 million loaned to Egypt was repayable in dollars in 40 years at an interest rate of three-fourths of 1 percent per annum, with no amortization of principal due for more than 10 years. Therefore, by the year 2002—when this loan is supposed to be paid up—even if the loan is paid in full as to principal and interest it will have cost the U.S. taxpayers more than $12.5 million to make the $17 million loan to Egypt, or a grant to Egypt of almost 80 percent of the face value of the loan. When interest on the amount borrowed to meet the interest payments on the amount borrowed to make the initial loan is added it is found that there is a hidden grant of about $1 for every $1 loaned.

It is time to stop fooling the American people. These so-called development loans are not loans—they are combination loans and grants—with the grant portion coming close to equaling the amount of the loan. They constitute a shocking giveaway.

The amendment which I am introducing on behalf of myself and some of my colleagues would require that the interest charged on development loans be no less than the interest which must be paid on the amount borrowed by the United States. Only in this way can we really be accurate when we call these loans.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this amendment be printed in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 2, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 102. Section 201(b) of title I of chapter 2 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (Public Law 87-195), as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Loans shall bear interest at a rate of not less than the rate arrived at by adding one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum to the rate which the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be equal to the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the date the application for the loan is approved and by adjusting the result so obtained to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum;' ".

Renumber the remaining sections appropriately.

NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS TO STRENGTHEN COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JAVITS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1321) to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR RIBICOFF AT BREAKFAST MEETING OF SENATORS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, recently, at a meeting of Senators on Wednesday morning, at what is called the breakfast group, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] was the leader, and spoke in a very timely and very fine way with respect to both the Old Testament and the New Testament. I requested him to have his words reduced to writing, for I think they are of unusual value and should have wider publication. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"All things therefore whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also unto them: for this is the law and the prophets." I am reading from Matthew, chapter 7, verse 12. The words are, of course, those of the Golden Rule. Most people think of them as central to the message of Christianity.

Let me read now from Leviticus, chapter 19, verse 18: "Thou shalt not take vengeance, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people; but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself: I am Jehovah." The central message of the New Testament then, was central to the Old Testament as well. The New Testament is grounded in the Old. Jesus was so truly a son of the prophets that His words often illustrated their attitude.

The thesis which Senator STENNIS has suggested for me this morning—that the Old Testament is a book of love as well as a book of law—that Judaism is deeply concerned with high spiritual values as well as judicial ones—is one which is not difficult to prove. It is one which now intrigues modern biblical scholars. For it was the Hebrew prophet Hosea who declared, the first man in the world to declare it, that love and not fear was the force that could draw men away from evil to good. Not power but love was the distinguishing characteristic of Hosea's God, as he saw Him, 2,700 years ago.

Too often modern laymen and clergymen describe the Old Testament as merely a book of rigid law and merciless judgment. Too easily, they present the God of Judaism as the God of wrath, the Lord of vengeance, the King of jealousy.

This has come about because the Old Testament is, of course, a chronicle of law. But it is a fountainhead of narrative and poetry, of history and philosophy as well. The God of the Old Testament was a suffering God. When love meets no return, the result is suffering, and the greater the love the greater the suffering. As the scholar Edith Hamilton points out, there can be no greater suffering than to love purely and perfectly one who is bent upon evil and self-destruction. That was what God endured at the hands of men. He loved them, and they turned from Him to pursue what must end in their ruin. He could not save them, for He was love, and so He could not compel them. Nor could they ever have been saved by compulsion. Only their own love could save them.

The whole concept of Judaism—of the Old Testament religion—was built on love. The main evidence for this is found in the second chapter of the Bible, the Book of Exodus. The Exodus experience wherein God reveals Himself and leads the Israelites from Egypt to make them His people is the formative event in the life of Israel. The Israelites' belief in God's love brought them into being as a people; from that time on they felt they were a chosen people, chosen to communicate God's love to the world.

"I will mention the lovingkindness of the Lord according to all that the Lord hath bestowed upon us," cried Isaiah. "For He said, surely they are my people * * * in all their affliction He was afflicted; in His love and in His pity He redeemed them."

According to Exodus, God instructed Moses to say to Pharaoh, "Thus says the Lord, Israel is my first-born son, and I say to you, 'Let my son go that he may serve me.' " And later, God gave His people most concrete proof of His love: the law, the Ten Commandments. He gave men a specific way to remain in covenant with Him.

Were these the acts of wrath or vengeance? Certainly not. If God did not love man, why would He choose to speak to him? If God did not have compassion for His people, why would He lead them out of Egypt to their own promised land of milk and honey? If God did not realize that the men He loved could not exist without justice, without a sense of responsibility, why did He give them the Ten Commandments?

The confusion in later attitudes toward the Old Testament on the part of some people came about because men disobeyed the law, and as a result they suffered, and were punished. More and more they came to look at the law as something which brought about suffering, and so was devoid of love. But closer study shows that Judaism was—and is—the living out of a life of love.

Interestingly enough, in more modern history, our own Founding Fathers saw this clearly. They considered their own experience quite similar to that of the Israelites of old. In their writings—in their paintings and drawings—they came back time and time again to the Exodus experience: once more, in effect, God's love for man is revealed as He leads His people to the promised land.

In the British Parliament at that time, requests were repeatedly made for the enactment of "Mosaic legislation." And the influences of Puritan England were carried across the sea to become an important part of American democracy. In the Preamble of the Pilgrim Code, adopted in 1636 by the Plymouth Colony, this influence of the Old Testament is spelled out:

"It was the great privilege of Israel of Old and so was acknowledged by them * * * that God gave them right judgements and true laws. They are for the main so exemplary, being grounded on principles of moral equity as that all Christians especially ought always to have an eye thereunto in the framing of politic constitutions. We can safely say both for ourselves and for them that we have had an eye principally unto the aforesaid platform in the framing of this small body of laws."

The Colonists did not simply copy the laws of the Old Testament. They understood and incorporated the spirit in which those laws were given. God's outrage at the wickedness among men impressed them. So they tried to frame laws to protect and encourage individual responsibility—the same individual responsibility which God wished to stimulate in the Israelites of the Old Testament, because of the love He bore them.

Let us look back a little, then, at the form this love took. We have seen that Moses repeated God's instructions to Pharoah: "Let my son go that he may serve me." Was this the love of a master for his servant? Or was it the special love a father holds for his son—punishing him only when he must be punished for his own sake? The question is interesting in view of the fact that many people think that the notion of the fatherhood of God stemmed only from the New Testament.

The answer becomes clear in Hosea, chapter 11, verse 1. God speaks: "When Israel was a child, I loved him, and out of Egypt I called my son." God's love for Israel was a special, compassionate love a parent holds for his son. Hosea saw God looking at mankind as a mother at a stumbling child learning to walk, or as a man at his tired, hungry ox after the long day's ploughing, or as an anguished father at a wayward son. To Hosea God said:

"When Israel was a child, then I loved him.
And I called him out of Egypt to be my son.
The more I called, the farther they went from me.
Yet I taught them to walk, holding them on mine arms.
But they knew not that I healed them (when they fell and hurt themselves)
I drew them with a man's cords, with bonds of love,
And I was to them as they who lift up the yoke upon the neck,
And gently would I give them to eat.
Yet my people are bent to turn from me,
And though they are called to the Most High
None can lift them."

And the passage continues,

"How am I to let thee go, O Israel?
How am I to give thee up?
My compassions are kindled.

For I am God and not man,
I will not come in anger.
I will heal their backsliding.
I will love them freely.
I will be as dew unto Israel;
From me shall thy fruit come."

These words reached the high water mark of the Hebrew conception of God. This is a conception of a God as one whom modern psychiatrists might call an ideal parent. He is kind, but firm. He does not destroy simply for the sake of destroying. He does not play carelessly with the lives of men as a child plays with tin soldiers. He loves man, but His love is responsible. He cannot afford to be sentimental or mawkish—He cares too much. If men do evil, God cannot overlook it. If men act injustly, God must act, and punish them.

Certainly the God of the Old Testament metes out punishment—sometimes it is harsh punishment—and this, I think is what gives the Book its reputation for harsh justice. But this punishment, as the poet Francis Thompson puts it, is simply "the shadow of (God's) hand outstretched caressingly." It is the punishment of a God who loved man enough to speak with him, lead him out of bondage, and treat him as His son, created in His own image. It is the punishment of a God who realizes that the people He loves cannot exist without justice—that individual men and women must behave responsibly or the family of man will disintegrate.

So, when men violate the laws which God has cared enough to give them, He is understandably outraged. When men err, God must judge, and then punish. But this punishment is only the other side of the coin—on the one side love, on the other punishment. Always, always behind this punishment is the love of a father who wishes only the best for his son.

Let us say you are a father, and your 6-year-old son runs out into the busy traffic without your permission and without your help. Somehow, miraculously, he escapes, and excited, you may want to hug and kiss him. But you can't. You care too much. You are afraid for him—afraid of what may happen to him if he does not learn to obey the rules. So you must punish him.

Your son may not understand at the time—as many people in the Old Testament did not understand and as many people who read or talk about it do not understand. But some day he may grow up to understand, as did great men like Hosea, that love, mercy, and pity have nothing to do with glorious might. Power is not divine—thought Hosea—in fact nothing is divine except the perfect goodness of perfect love.

Interestingly enough, the Hebrew grammar of the Old Testament shows that God the Father, though He is divine, is not a distant or feared parent. In Hebrew, as in French, different forms of the second person pronoun are used in different personal relationships. The second person plural is spoken to those whom one does not know well or to those who demand formal respect, the second person singular in talking with one who is loved as a parent, wife, or close friend. The second person singular is a pronoun of affection and warmth. Throughout the Old Testament, God is addressed in the second person singular.

If we consider the full stretch of irresponsible acts in the Old Testament we come to see that God extended His love to miraculous extremes. He did have compassion, He did mete out His justice with great mercy. This is seen clearly in the classic story of the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah. God hears of the shamefulness and evil of these two cities. Yet He does not recoil and react with instinctive wrath. "I will go down," He says "and see whether they have done altogether according to the outcry which has come to me; and if not, I will know."

God then enters into a Socratic-like dialog with Abraham concerning the fate of these two evil cities. He concludes that He will be satisfied if He finds 10 righteous men in these cities. And if He does find these 10 men, He will then not merely save them but will save the entire city. Certainly, this is judgment based in love and bound with mercy.

Again, it is often said that the God of the Old Testament is that of the Israelites alone, that His compassion extends only to the people of Israel. The story of Jonah shows that this is simply not the case.

God instructs Jonah to go to the city of Nineveh and tell the people there that because they have done great evil their city will be overthrown in 40 days. The people of Nineveh are not Israelites—they are not Hebrews—but they believed the words of Jonah and immediately began a great period of repentance.

God is moved by this. "When God saw what they did, how they turned from their evil way, God repented of the evil which He had said He would do to them; and He did not do it."

But this act of compassion annoyed Jonah. And he prayed to the Lord and said, "I pray Thee, Lord, is not that what I said when I was yet in my country? That is why I made haste to flee * * *. Therefore, now, O Lord, take my life from me, I beseech Thee, for it is better for me to die than to live." And the Lord said, "Do you do well to be angry?"

Could there be a more vivid demonstration that the God of the Old Testament is God of love who has compassion for all beings whether they be Hebrew or not, whether they be human or not? God's love for the creatures of His earth is deep and all-encompassing. It is the foundation of all of His actions.

That God wishes men to emulate Him and make love the basis of their actions too should also be clear. This is seen as the Lord decided to consult Abraham about the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah. "Shall I hide from Abraham what I am about to do? * * * No, for I have chosen him, that he may charge his children and household after him to keep the way of the Lord by doing righteousness and justice; so that the Lord may bring to Abraham what He has promised him."

The story is also told of a young man who came to visit Rabbi Hillel who lived in about 90 B.C. and asked the rabbi to teach him the whole of the Old Testament while he stood on one foot. The great rabbi responded: "Whatsoever is hateful unto Thee, do it not unto Thy neighbor. This the whole of the Old Testament, the rest is but commentary."

In the person of Jesus, in the actions He took and the words He spoke, this Golden Rule assumed new clarity and meaning. But those who claim that love and other higher spiritual values did not appear at all until the arrival of the New Testament are simply wrong. I hope that my words today have demonstrated—if anything—that those who refer to Western civilization as a combined Judeo-Christian heritage know well of what they speak.

KENNEDY TAX PROGRAM

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement supporting the tax program of the Kennedy administration. The statement has been signed by more than 400 prominent American economists, and I believe it should be studied very carefully. I hope it will crystallize public opinion.

As one who had a share in drafting the petition of 1,046 American economists, in 1930, protesting against the Hawley-Smoot-Grundy tariff, I feel particularly interested in this petition, for the predictions which we made about the evil effects of the tariff in 1930, were unfortunately, borne out in practice.

I hope the Nation will take to heart the very excellent points made in this statement and petition.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TAX PROGRAM OF THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

As professional economists, we welcome the administration's clear recognition of the role which Federal fiscal policy can and should play in maintaining and expanding the level of economic activity. While some of us disagree with one or another specific feature of the tax program now before the Congress, we all, without exception, subscribe to the following propositions:

1. There is now a substantial deficiency of aggregate demand in the American economy, with the result that the level of unemployment is significantly higher than it need be—and, in our opinion, higher than it should be.

2. While there are significant "structural" problems which make it difficult to find jobs for the more disadvantaged of the unemployed, the first need is to achieve a higher overall level of economic activity. If this is done, efforts to retrain and relocate displaced workers will be more effective.

3. We subscribe to the belief, as recently expressed by Walter Heller, that an "increase in aggregate demand is most appropriately brought about in a predominantly private-enterprise economy such as ours by means of monetary or fiscal measures."

4. It is generally agreed that, in the present situation, monetary policy by itself cannot bring about the necessary expansion of economic activity—in part, because of the restraint imposed by the present balance-of-payments situation. Hence the primary reliance must be on fiscal policy.

5. While we welcome the improvement in economic conditions which has occurred in the last few months, we believe that "natural forces" alone will not eliminate excess unemployment this year or even next year.

6. It therefore follows that, in the months ahead, substantial use should be made of fiscal policy as a means of stimulating aggregate demand and raising the level of employment. This can be done by reducing tax revenues, by increasing Government expenditures, or by some combination of the two.

7. We believe that the increase in the Federal deficit proposed by the administration is not too large, given the objective being sought. We are confident that both the short-run and long-run effects of the tax reduction will be beneficial. Indeed, insofar as there is a difference of opinion among us, it is that some of us believe that a larger tax cut should have been proposed.

8. On the whole, we believe that the administration's program, as originally submitted to the Congress, represents a reasonable compromise. It provides tax reductions for both individuals and corporations. It should provide a significant stimulus to consumer's spending, and it should have a beneficial effect on private investment. Virtually all of us believe that substantial tax reform is badly needed, but we also believe that arguments as to the details and timing of tax reform should not delay the prompt approval of a substantial across-the-board reduction in Federal income tax rates.

9. We should like to assure the American people that a Federal deficit of the magnitude proposed, given the extent to which capital and labor are not now being fully

utilized, carries no danger of accelerated inflation. Nor does such a deficit in any manner or degree threaten the solvency of the Federal Government. This country's outstanding record of economic growth during the last century and a half or more has been associated with increases in debt representing mobilization of the people's savings by business and government. It should be noted, also, that the size of the deficit will automatically decline as rising incomes generate increased tax revenues at the lower rates.

10. We should also like to affirm—and we do so with complete confidence—that there is nothing to fear from the present size of the Federal debt. Nor is there anything to fear from the moderate increase in the debt that will result from the deficits envisaged in the next few years. Indeed, measured as a fraction of the gross national product, the Federal debt today is much smaller relatively than it was 15 years ago. And interest payments on the debt absorb a significantly smaller fraction of the national income than they did at the end of World War II.

In the realm of economic policy—as in all social and political action—there are as many versions of what is "best" as there are people who are likely to be affected by any proposed line of action. To insist on a "perfect" tax program is to insure that nothing will be done. The administration's program is a significant step in the right direction.

We subscribe to the propositions included in the statement on the tax program of the Kennedy administration. Each of us signs as an individual economist and not as a representative of an institution.

Amherst College: Ralph E. Beres, Arnold Collery, Irwin Kleinberg, Heinz Kohler, Willard L. Thorp, Colston E. Warne, James R. Wilson.

Bowdoin College: Albert Abrahamson, Paul G. Darling, Giulio Pontecorvo, William D. Shipman, James A. Storer.

Brandeis University: Richard I. Weckstein, P. J. D. Wiles.

Brookings Institution: Barbara R. Berman, Edward F. Denison, Gary Fromm, Bert G. Hickman, Joseph A. Pechman, Merton J. Peck, Alice M. Rivlin, Walter S. Salant.

California, University of, Berkeley: Joseph S. Bain, George T. Break, Eugene W. Burgess, Norman R. Collins, J. M. Culbertson, Malcolm M. Davisson, Kenneth B. Farrel, Hugh Folk, V. Fuller, Theodore J. Goering, R. A. Gordon, E. T. Grether, Gregory Grossman, Saul H. Hymans, Sydney Hoos, Van D. Kennedy, Ivan M. Lee, John M. Letiche, Choh Ming Li, Sherman J. Maisil, Julius Margolis, Hyman P. Minsky, David Olbe, Andreas G. Papandreou, Ray Radner, Earl R. Ralph, David A. Revzan, Henry Rosovsky, Arthur M. Ross, Bernard Saffran, Tibor Scitovsky, Lloyd Ulman, Dow Votaw, Frank A. Waring, Sidney G. Winter, Jr.

California, University of, Davis: Oscar R. Burt, Frank C. Child, Bruce Glassburner, Warren S. Gramm, Curtis C. Harris, Jr., Trimble R. Hedges, Gordon A. King, Martin P. Oettinger, J. Herbert Snyder, Stephen H. Sosnick, J. M. Tinley.

California, University of, Santa Barbara: Mortimer Andrew, J. F. Halterman, Jerry F. Karer, William J. Kennedy, Walter J. Mead.

California, University of, Los Angeles: H. Robert Bartell, Jr., E. F. Brighen, C. J. Huizinga, R. J. Jessen, Erwin L. Kelly, Jr., Buruhan T. Campbell, H. Lawrence Miller, Jr., Harold P. Moody, Frank E. Norton, George E. S. Murphy, J. Fred Weston, Robert M. Williams.

Carnegie Institute of Technology: G. L. Bach.

Chicago, University of: B. M. Fleisher, Harry G. Johnson, Dale W. Jorgenson, Arnold Harberger, Marshall D. Ketchum, Lloyd A. Metzler, Merton H. Miller, Albert Rees, T. W. Schultz.

Columbia University: Harold Barger, Arthur R. Burns, Alexander Erlich, Carter Goodrich, Albert O. Hirschman, Robert Lekachman, David E. Novack, Julius Rubin.

Connecticut, University of: David G. Edens, Dorothy C. Goodwin, James C. Loughlin, Morris Singer, William P. Snavely, Paul N. Taylor, Philip E. Taylor, H. John Thorkelson, Paul Weiner, Imanuel Wexler.

Cornell University: William D. Carmichael, Douglas F. Dowd, John A. Henning, George H. Hildebrand, Alfred E. Kahn, Chandler Morse, George J. Staeler.

Dartmouth College: William A. Carter, M. O. Clement, James F. Cusick, Clyde E. Dankert, Thomas J. Finn, Jr., Herbert Goertz, Martin L. Lindahl, Kenneth J. Rothwell, Martin Segal, Ian A. Stewart.

Duke University: William Porfohe.

Harvard University: Abram Bergson, Richard E. Caves, Robert Dorfman, John T. Dunlop, James Duesenberry, Otto Eskstein, Alexander Gerschenkron, Seymour Harris, R. B. Heflebower, Richard O. Mallon, Edward S. Mason, Rhod J. Ohyme, Gustave F. Papanel, T. Schelling, Wolfgang F. Stolper.

Illinois, University of: V. Lewis Bassie, Ruth A. Birdzell, John D. Bowman, Sanford Cohen, Milton Derbe, John F. Due, Robert Ferber, Marvin Frankel, Donald W. Paden.

Indiana, University of: Robert W. Campbell, Troy J. Conley, Irvin Grossack, Taubman A. Miller, Henry M. Oliver, Lloyd D. Orr, Ross M. Robertson, Nicolas Spulber, Ted Witney, E. R. Wicker.

Iowa, University of: Raymond R. Beruke, Eugene A. Brady, Harold W. Dewey, Hirschel Harper, Earl O. Heady, Bob R. Holden, Sydney James, Lee Kolmer, Francis A. Kutish, Stanley S. Long, Dudley G. Luckett, Charles Meyer, John W. Rowe, Jr., J. T. Scott, Erik Thorbreke, Karl A. Totz, John F. Truemont, Don Winkelmann.

Johns Hopkins University: Z. Adel, G. Heberton Evans, Jr., James K. Kindahl, Kelvin J. Lancaster, Edwin S. Mills, R. T. Sparrow.

Maryland, University of: John H. Cumberland, Dudley Dillard, Norton T. Dodge, Lyle E. Gramley, Robert E. L. Knight, Philip C. Packard, Melville J. Ulmer, Paul Wonnacott.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Albert Ando, Francis Bator, E. Cary Brown, Paul H. Cootner, Rischard S. Eckaus, Everett E. Hagen, Daniel M. Holland, Edwin Kuh, Louis Lefeber, Max F. Millikan, Paul A. Samuelson, Robert M. Solow, Charles P. Kindleberger.

Michigan State University: Abba P. Lerner.

Minnesota, University of: John Buttick, E. Coen, Edward Foster, Lowell Gallany, Ralph H. Hofmeister, Leonid Hurwicz, A. O. Krueger, Jim Schwinden, Harlan M. Smith, John G. Trumbull.

New York University: Clifford D. Clark, Lawrence S. Ritter, Arnold W. Sarnet, Harvey H. Sezal.

North Carolina, University of: Paul N. Guthrie, Leopold B. Koriebroski, David T. Lapkin, Henry A. Latane, R. S. Winslow, Marice Whee.

Pennsylvania, University of: Irving B. Kravis, Wilfred Malrubaum, Robert Summers, C. R. Whittlesey, Willis J. Winn.

Pennsylvania State University: Edward Budd, William M. Hench, Philip A. Klein, Will E. Mason, Arthur H. Reede, Randall S. Stout, Robert J. Trusk.

Pittsburgh, University of: Benjamin Chuntz, A. T. Eapen, R. D. Entenberg, Alan E. Fechter, Shinkyung Kim, Charles L. Levin, Daniel McFadden, William C. Pendleton, Robert J. A. Pratt, Merrill J. Roberts, Edward Sussia, C. Edward Weber.

Princeton University: William Baumol, Arthur Benavie, William G. Bowen, Ansley J. Coale, Warren W. Eason, F. Aldrich Finegan, Peggy Heim, Edward J. Kane, Klaus Knorr, Richard A. Lester, David McFarland, R. A. Musgrave, Gardner Patterson, Richard E. Quandt, Frederic C. Shorter, John Williamson, Burton A. Weisbrod, Lester V. Chandler.

Rice University: S. N. Afriat, John H. Auten, Dwight S. Brothers, Edgar O. Edwards, Hans Jurgen Jelesch, Gaston V. Remlinger.

Rochester, University of: Marcus Alexis, William E. Dunkman, Robert R. France, Myron J. Gordon, Ronald W. Jones, Lionel McKenzie, Rudolph G. Penner, Richard T. Rostoff, Edward Zabel.

Southern Methodist University: Leo T. Bakomy, Paul T. Hornan, Attiat A. Farag, Richard B. Johnson, W. J. Lovejoy, Daniel J. Ott, J. H. Pratt.

Stanford University: Kenneth Arrow, Richard Attrych, Paul David, Emile Despres, John G. Gurley, Bernard F. Haley, Paul Hartman, James Howell, Theodore J. Kreps, Alan S. Manne, Ronald McKinnon, Mel Reder, Louie Tarshis, Dale Yoder.

Tufts University: V. E. Andric, John Cornwall, Franklyn D. Holzman.

Utah, University of: Sigmund Krauthauser.

Vanderbilt University: Rudolph C. Blitz, John A. Brittain, Reynold E. Carlson, Reulias Fels, E. J. Eberling, Leo J. Raskind, Ewing P. Shabor, George W. Stocking, Fred U. Wertfield, Jeffrey G. Williamson, James S. Worley.

Virginia, University of: George R. Hall, Almarin Phillips, James R. Schlesinger, Rutledge Vining.

Washington, University of: Henry T. Buechel, J. A. Crutchfield, Barney Dowdle, J. P. Gillingham, William S. Hopkins, W. D. Morris, Vernon A. Mund, Judith Thornton, Charles M. Tribout, D. A. Worcester, Jr.

Wesleyan University: Clyde Olin Fisher, Burton C. Hallowell, Lawrence C. Jones, Stanley Lebergott, Melvin Lurie, Gerald M. Meler, Richard A. Miller, Edward J. Neli, Vladimir L. Stoikov.

Williams College: Henry J. Bruton, Paul G. Clark, Robinson G. Hollister, Jr., Joseph A. Kershaw, Robert Miki, Frederick S. O'Brien, William G. Rhoads, Norman Schneider, John Sheehan.

Wisconsin, University of: Benjamin Bridges, Jr., Martin H. Daid, James S. Earley, Arthur S. Goldberger, Edward Greenbey, Farsham Hall, Kathleen Haygood, Edward B. Jakubauskas, David B. Johnson, John Korbel, Roger F. Miller, Guy H. Orcutt, Robert Ozanne, Gerald G. Somers, James Stern, G. E. Swingay, William Russell, Hans O. Schmitt, Ernest W. Stromsdorfer, Leonard W. Weiss.

Yale University: John Arena, Bela Balassu, Sylvester E. Berki, Ronald G. Bodkin, William Brandio, William T. Bruns, Jr., Duncan R. Campbell, Mariam Chamberlain, Neil W. Chamberlain, John Davis, F. Trenery Dolbear, Jr., Eeme Draudabej, Stanley Engerman, John Fei, James W. Frieda, Reginald H. Green, Joseph Grunewald, Donald A. Hester, John W. Hoofer, Shane J. Hunt, Zoran Horfert, Lawrence B. Krause, Michael C. Lowell, Peter Mieszkowski, Harry A. Miskimin, Arthur M. Oken, Hugh D. Patrick, Richard C. Porter, Raymond Powell, Gustave Ranis, Lloyd C. Reynolds, Leonard Schifrin, Peter Schran, Adolph Strumthel, James Tobin, Harold W. Watts, Menuhin Yaari.

THE VOICE OF AMERICA OF USIA SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE HEARD THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, one of the most important policy changes by the rulers of the Kremlin since Premier Khrushchev backed down over Cuba was the sudden Soviet reversal of policy toward the Voice of

America. The Voice is now penetrating the Iron Curtain loud and clear.

Not since 1948, when it started this operation, had the Soviet Union stopped its costly jamming operations. There was a partial relaxation during Khrushchev's trip to the United States in 1959, but it lasted but a day or two. It is very significant that only 8 days after President Kennedy's speech at American University, pledging cooperation with the Russians in leading the world out of the vicious and dangerous cycle of the cold war, this costly Soviet policy to prevent our Voice of America from being heard within Soviet borders was ended.

Senators will remember that our President said at that time:

> World peace, like community peace, does not require that each man love his neighbor—it requires only that they live together with mutual tolerance, submitting their disputes to a just and peaceful settlement.

Mr. President, under the direction of Edward R. Murrow, a truly dedicated public servant, the U.S. Information Agency has become one of the tremendously important governmental agencies in our cold war effort. He has inspired it with a new sense of purpose and direction in its task of convincing people the world over that our policies are in harmony with their legitimate aspirations for freedom, progress, and peace.

Few men in public life bring to their official positions the fine experience, background, industry, understanding, and imagination that Ed Murrow has brought to the post of Director of the U.S. Information Agency. Under his leadership, our citizens are receiving full value for our expenditures.

This Agency gives significant support to our policy abroad. Through the Voice of America, magazines, books, pamphlets, libraries, educational motion pictures, and television films the USIA is gradually suceeding in setting forth a true picture of our Nation and its goals. Without this effort, the Soviet Union would have a considerable propaganda advantage.

Mr. President, it is reported that the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives may refuse to appropriate funds for important and worthwhile television projects which Director Murrow feels will be of great value to our Nation in placing the story of our Nation's achievements and unselfish purposes before the people of the world. I hope that the committee will reconsider its position on this matter. While I believe that there are numerous instances in which some independent agencies and departmental budgetary requests can be reduced without impairing the efficiency of governmental programs, I believe that to do so here would be a case of being "penny wise and pound foolish."

In the Washington Post of July 20, 1963, Drew Pearson, one of the outstanding political reporters of the Nation, discussed this important matter in his column entitled, "House Blocks Murrow on Funds."

Mr. President, I commend this column to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 20, 1963]

HOUSE BLOCKS MURROW ON FUNDS

(By Drew Pearson)

Edward R. Murrow, whom the public used to hear or see nightly on radio and television, has been out of the public view for about 2 years. Reason: He took a cut from around $250,000 a year to around $20,000 a year to run the very important but thankless job of informing the world about U.S. operations through the Voice of America and the U.S. Information Agency.

The other day Murrow took his first vacation. He went up to his farm in Pawling, N.Y., to operate a bulldozer.

"There is nothing that gives you such a false sense of power," he confided before he left, "as running a bulldozer."

In Washington, Murrow does not have any false sense of power. Despite the power and glamour of his old television career, Murrow knows that today he is completely powerless before the appropriations committees of Congress. And this year he has run athwart the powerful pruners of the House, headed by No. 1 pruner, likeable JOHN ROONEY of Brooklyn.

When Murrow asked for $3 million extra to tell the story of U.S. achievements to the world on television, he was made to feel about as powerless as an old stump in front of his own bulldozer.

It happens that a score or more of new countries in Africa and Asia, plus some older countries in Latin America, have built new TV stations and suddenly find themselves with no programs. They are desperate for films to fill the vacuum. Murrow wants to feed their hungry program managers with the filmed story of U.S. accomplishment.

"We have a great story to tell," Murrow told the Congressmen. "We got criticized all over the world for Little Rock. Now we need to tell the story of success at Little Rock, and at Clinton, Tenn., and various other places. Either we go forward with the story of the greatest race progress in history or we let other countries tell the adverse, unfair story against us."

Last year over 500 USIA programs were shown over TV stations in 61 countries, and this could probably be doubled. However, the House Appropriations Committee so far has said no.

CONGRESSIONAL STAFF OPERATIONS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in view of the increasing interest in the broad question of congressional reorganization, majority-minority staffing of committees, and other related aspects of this important subject, I would like to call attention to an outstanding book by Prof. Kenneth Kofmehl, of Purdue University, entitled "Professional Staffs of Congress."

Professor Kofmehl's book provides a remarkably clear insight into various aspects of staff work here in the Congress, both in Senate and House committees and in the offices of Senators and Representatives. It is based on exhaustive research, interviews, and close personal observation of the author, a member of the political science faculty at Purdue.

Members of the Congress, as well as Capitol Hill staff personnel, will benefit from reading Professor Kofmehl's scholarly and penetrating study of our important congressional staff operations.

Mr. President, as part of my remarks I ask unanimous consent to include, at this point in the body of the RECORD, three reviews of Professor Kofmehl's book—one from the 1963 Kansas Law Review, one from the Washington Star of April 21, 1963, and an article by Richard L. Strout commenting on the book from the January 18, 1963, issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the reviews were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas Law Review, 1963]

BOOK REVIEW OF "PROFESSIONAL STAFFS OF CONGRESS," BY KENNETH KOFMEHL, WEST LAFAYETTE, IND., PURDUE UNIVERSITY STUDIES, 1962

(By James E. Titus)

Seventy-eight years ago Woodrow Wilson wrote his famous "Congressional Government" without setting foot inside the District of Columbia or darkening the door of a single congressional office to inquire about the inner workings of that complex institution. Professor Kofmehl's new book, "Professional Staffs of Congress," shows how political science research has changed. Based upon interview data from approximately 180 congressional employees and held to a concise period of time—"the three Congresses from the start of the 80th on January 3, 1947 * * * through the expiration of the 82d, 6 years later"—this is a rigorous, well-written book that examines the establishment, organization, and operation of the professional staffs authorized by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The book is divided into five parts. Part 1 is a general survey of committee operational procedure, and part 5 presents the author's conclusions and a brief review of committee staffing practices since 1953. Part 3 deals with the Senate office staffs (also authorized by the 1946 legislation) and part 4 presents data on the Office of the Legislative Council, a staff service available to Congress in roughly its present form since 1924. Part 2 contains the major portion of Kofmehl's study, an analysis of congressional committees' staffs.

Congress exists as a living reflection of diverse interests in a nation that abounds in sectional, political, economic, social, and personal differences. This resulted, not surprisingly, in a proliferation of committee staffing patterns and organizational titles when the reorganization legislation was implemented in the 80th Congress. Kofmehl lists 49 different titles, ranging from the mundane "staff assistant" to the more imposing "director of studies and investigations." The way in which staffs were organized revealed a similar diffusion. But far from reflecting the disorganization of Congress, it marks the institution's unique organization.

Administrative efficiency is not a major congressional goal, and as Kofmehl notes so accurately "* * * the ability, personality, energy, and experience of the chairman affect the way in which a committee is run far more than formal procedures." The relationships that develop in a congressional committee are highly personal without the formal structure and lines of authority that channelize human relationships in big organizations. Congress, of course, is a big organization with 535 Members of more or less equal standing and several thousand employees. Yet contrary to principles of formal organization, each House of Congress is divided and then subdivided into almost completely autonomous units for purposes of getting its work done. Committee staff members work for these divisions and subdivisions rather than for the Congress, thus their spirit and loyalty hinge about the work they do for members of the committee, and the personal relationships thus established. Kofmehl speaks out in at least two places in the book against the development of any greater congressional bureaucracy.

The intimate association between staff and committee members creates a great reliance upon the staff in most committees. "Occasionally," notes Kofmehl, "even a very able chairman of a major Senate committee walks into a meeting and asks the staff what is on the agenda." With such acceptance of staff work, and the feeling of confidence committees have in their staffs, it is obvious that these men and women are a new influence in the Congress.

Educational qualifications of staff members range from high school diplomas to the highest advanced degrees. Eight staff members held doctor of philosophy degrees, and one individual was a doctor of jurisprudence. The great majority have bachelor's degrees with quite a number of master's degrees and law degrees. In many respects, training in the law according to Kofmehl's appraisal, is the most valuable background for a professional staffer. This is his view:

"A legal education is advantageous for a committee aid. Most importantly, it inculcates him with a propensity to adopt a client-counsel attitude. It equips him to be a generalist. It is helpful in preparing bill analyses, briefs, opinions, and other legal memorandums. It is almost a prerequisite to acquiring skill in the art of bill drafting. It facilitates learning parliamentary procedure with its analogous paraphernalia of precedents, rulings, and maneuvers. It is very useful in handling casework and other kinds of legislative oversight duties involving technical points of law. Being of the same profession and knowing the vocabulary and mindset of legal practitioners is an asset in dealing with the large number of congressional liaison officials from the executive agencies and from organized interest groups that are lawyers. A number of committee aids—including several graduate economists—expressed a feeling of inadequacy because of a lack of legal training," (pp. 85–86).

Regardless of a person's education or experience, there are what Kofmehl calls essential attributes that a committee aid must possess. Briefly, he must be above all a generalist, adapting easily and quickly to the changing emphasis in committee work; he must possess flexibility, a facility to express himself well in both the written and spoken word, and a personality and temperament that adjusts to changes in committee personnel and periods of intense work with little relaxation.

Staff members of the committees participate in every phase of committee work dealing with legislation. The staffs are frequently the key personnel in setting up legislative hearings, preparing questions for committee members to ask, briefing members before the hearing, questioning and selecting witnesses prior to the hearing. Bill drafting, preparing reports to accompany bills from the committee to the House or Senate floor, assisting committee members during floor action and participating in the detailed work of House-Senate conference committees are other areas of staff work. Committee staffs also play a role when the standing committees exercise the function of legislative oversight of administration.

Several interesting innovations, such as the development of a round-table procedure by Senator Joseph O'Mahoney for committee hearings on highly complex or controversial economic and social problems, as well as heretofore unexplored problems, such as creating a greater congressional bureaucracy or giving standing committees added responsibility for legislative oversight of administration, enliven Kofmehl's treatment of Congress as a complex institution. Students of government, Members of the Congress, and others with a need for a special understanding of how the U.S. House and Senate get their work done, will find this an interesting and rewarding book.

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 21, 1963]

STAFFING THE BOARDS OF INQUIRY

(Book review of "Professional Staffs of Congress," by Kenneth Kofmehl, Purdue University Studies)

(By Robert K. Walsh)

Republicans currently claim a democratic right to minority representation on professional staffs of House committees. Democrats sometimes demanded the same in years of Republican congressional control.

One of the most timely and revealing features of this book is the treatment of the disputed question of assigning a certain percentage of committee staff aids specifically if not exclusively to minority Members of the House or Senate.

The answer given by Professor Kofmehl, an authority on political science and governmental procedures, will not satisfy everyone, especially party members who happen to be in the minority at the time. But it shows that at least there are two sides to the question and that the problems involved are far from simple of solution.

Professor Kofmehl believes there is ample evidence and well-rooted political principle against earmarking a part of a committee staff for the minority. He warns that a general practice of that kind would threaten the integrity of committee staffs. He fears it would lead to partisan counterattacks and periodic upheavals.

He contends that it would thwart the 1946 Legislative Reorganization Act's attempt to assure genuine professional staffs to assist—but not substitute for or meddle with—elected officials and congressional prerogatives.

If ever a book was desirable reading for public servants and those they serve it is this one analyzing the nature and functioning of House and Senate committee staffs particularly since 1946.

It gives due attention to the special difficulties of staffing the diffuse, diverse, and changeable internal power structure of Congress. It traces the growing need for capable, nonpartisan and highly skilled professional aids to help members with constantly broadening challenges and burdens.

The book admittedly is not the last word on the subject. It calls for concentration and some background knowledge by the reader. But as a comprehensive and objective work covering a comparatively little known but vastly important field it deserves immediate consideration as well as due deliberation by all concerned with making Congress more effective.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 18, 1963]

COMMITTEE STAFFS

(By Richard L. Strout)

Anybody who has lived long in Washington knows that some of the ablest men in the city are professional assistants on congressional committees. Their party affiliation is often not known or is nonexistent. If a Republican asks for their assistance they give it, just as they would to a Democrat.

Connecticut's former Senator Prescott Bush, Republican, once declared that the Joint Economic Committee might well be abolished save for testimony of outside witnesses and the valuable additions to economic knowledge contributed by the committee's able staff.

One of the goals of the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946 was to promote professional standing among committee assistants. It has been gratifying to see this movement grow, though its success has varied widely as among committees.

Recently a conflicting movement has begun, however, in conjunction with special committees making bitterly partisan investigations in the 83d and 86th Congresses. The frustrated minority demanded the right to name special committee aids, with access to documents and witnesses, to protect their interest. Democrats, for example, demanded a minority counsel under the McCarthy subcommittee.

From 1957 on in the Senate, at the instance of Senator CARL CURTIS, Republican, of Nebraska, nearly all resolutions setting up specially authorized staffs carried a provision allowing the minority one staff member. There was some questioning of this, but in general the Curtis amendment has prevailed since, under these circumstances.

Recently there has been a movement to apply and expand this to House committees, also. Last week House Republicans vainly demanded a 60 to 40 representation on the rules committee staff. Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, is one of the sponsors of the drive for specially designated minority representation on congressional staffs. Advocates of the change have charged that the Democratic majority has 285 professional advisers and experts on the 23 House committees, while the Republicans have only 21.

Before this argument is accepted in toto, Purdue Prof. Kenneth Kofmehl's new book, "Professional Staffs of Congress," should be studied. He denounces the drive to pick committee staffs by party, rather than by competence, and calls it a threat to the integrity of committee staffs.

It is a fallacy, Dr. Kofmehl asserts, to say that the Democrats have 285 staff members on the committees noted above or to imply that everybody not identified as a minority member was a Democratic employee. For example, three of the eight members of the House Agriculture Committee staff, including the two professionals, were hired by Representative Clifford Hope, Republican, of Kansas.

This argument does not deny that congressional committees vary widely from one another, and that partisanship often appears, particularly in specially appointed, temporary probes. But to guarantee a specially protected, frankly avowed partisan staff representation on all regular committees shocks Professor Kofmehl.

A possible analogy is the gradual rise of the merit system in appointing postmasters over the country. Admittedly the process is not complete, but should the country therefore frankly accept partisanship, and guarantee a certain number of postmasters to a minority party in each State?

Dr. Kofmehl leaves no doubt of how he feels and how some of the present professionals feel about it. One group, he says, blamed their failure to get a pay boost on congressional resentment over incompetent political hacks on some committees. They declared publicly, he reports, that key staff members should be nonpolitical professionals who had the respect and confidence of Democrats and Republicans alike.

ANALYSIS OF CURRENT STATUS OF VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, Representative ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, recently delivered an address at the 1963 State convention of the department of Kansas Veterans of Foreign Wars at Hays, Kans., on July 15, 1963.

Representative **Ellsworth** directs great effort, intelligence and a sound judgment toward legislation dealing with veterans' affairs. The speech I have heretofore mentioned is a thorough analysis of the current status of veterans legislation now before Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that Representative **Ellsworth**'s speech as heretofore noted, be printed in the **Record**.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the **Record**, as follows:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE ELLSWORTH, OF KANSAS

Thank you very much. To say I am glad to be here with you this morning would be the understatement of the year. It is always good to be with a group of Veterans of Foreign Wars members, not only because of the fellowship that is born of a shared experience but also because of the fact that I know I am talking to Americans in the very best sense of the word.

I am highly flattered at the honor you have paid me by inviting me here to speak to you. It is an even greater honor knowing that I am the guest of my own department of Kansas.

From all indications it appears that you are having a successful convention. This comes as no surprise because we of Alford-Clark Post No. 852 in Lawrence know that anything that Bud Hess ramrods, is bound to be successful.

I want to speak to you this morning about veterans' affairs. I can't speak on this subject, however, without first saying a few words about the VFW. The two, veterans' affairs and Veterans of Foreign Wars just seem to go together. I have always had a tremendous amount of respect and admiration for this organization. Your programs are programs that good Americans can understand and support. Your nationwide rehabilitation program, having as its theme, "We honor the dead by helping the living," has earned a splendid reputation for the VFW with a corps of expert service officers quietly and efficiently pursuing their daily tasks. I am proud to note that this program is directed by a fellow Kansan, Norman Jones.

The organization's recognition of the fact that our national security is dependent upon maximum military strength is most encouraging to Members of Congress.

Your vigorous programs of positive Americanism in action command the attention of our citizenry. The voice of democracy program with its scholarship awards to young Americans encourages the leaders of tomorrow to analyze this precious heritage called freedom. This program points up the vitality of the VFW and its never-ending drive to maintain and perpetuate the great freedoms which were won and preserved on the world's battlefields. Your successful campaign to have May 1 designated as Loyalty Day and your opposition to the elimination of the Committee on Un-American Activities all are evidence of the VFW's positive Americanism.

These are the things that make me proud to be one of you. Then on April 2 of this year, my pride in the organization reached new heights as Commander in Chief Byron Gentry accompanied by his extremely capable legislative director, Frank Stover, appeared before our committee to present the highlights of the Veterans of Foreign Wars legislative program. I wish that every person in this room could have heard Commander Gentry's presentation and the accolades it drew from all of my colleagues on the committee.

* * * * *

These are the things that make your voice a powerful one—a respected one—in Washington and throughout the Nation. I repeat—I am proud to be one of you.

Now, let's look for a few minutes at the other half of this partnership in veterans' affairs—the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the House of Representatives.

To give you some idea of the scope of our work on veterans' legislation, you would be interested to know that in the 87th Congress, 592 bills and resolutions were referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the House of Representatives. Testimony taken in hearings conducted in 45 open sessions consisted of 3,055 printed pages. The committee reported favorably 52 bills or resolutions and 39 of these were enacted into law. Time won't permit me to talk about these now but you should know that the most important piece of veterans' legislation enacted in the 87th Congress was the bill granting increases in monthly rates of compensation for service-connected disability with individual increases ranging from 5.3 to 20.8 percent for the seriously disabled.

Already in this 1st session of the 88th Congress more than 300 bills have been introduced and referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The committee has reported 13 of these and the House of Representatives has passed 11. Six of these have passed the Senate and are now law.

Undoubtedly the most important bill enacted into law during the current session of Congress relates to the payment of dependency and indemnity compensation for dependent parents and children. Back in 1957, the Congress tied the payment of death benefits for widows to military pay. In other words, widows of service-connected deceased veterans received a basic pay of $112 plus 12 percent of the military pay of their deceased husband at the time of separation or death. The military pay bill which recently passed the House of Representatives and is now pending in the Senate thus provides an automatic increase to these widows. Benefits for other survivors of the service-connected dead, however, were not geared to military pay. As a result, parents and children were not affected by the military pay bill. To correct this the Congress enacted Public Law 88–21, approved on May 15 of this year. This bill increases generally by 10 percent the monthly rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to eligible parents and children of veterans dying of service-connected causes.

As I mentioned widows will receive a nominal increase when the military pay bill becomes law. I do not believe this increase is adequate and I am hopeful that the Congress will increase the basic rate of $112 monthly to $120. This amount, together with the nominal increase provided under the military pay bill, will provide the widows of service-connected dead with a substantial increase in monthly payments.

Two additional bills in which you will undoubtedly be interested have just been enacted into law. The first, Public Law 88–20 will provide a separate statutory award of $47 monthly for veterans having the service-incurred disability of deafness of both ears. The other, Public Law 88–22 authorizes the same statutory award for veterans who have lost the ability to speak.

Another bill which has passed the House of Representatives and is now pending in the Senate relates to national service life insurance. As you well know, many veterans have failed to convert the term insurance they purchased at the time they first went into service. The premium rate of this insurance increases every 5 years so that when a veteran reaches advanced years the cost of the insurance becomes prohibitive. To solve this problem the House of Representatives passed H.R. 220 which provides a new plan of modified life insurance. The premium remains at the same level throughout the life of the insured but the face value of the policy will be automatically reduced by 50 percent on the insured's 65th birthday. Policyholders can retain the additional insurance lost at age 65 by paying the premium for ordinary life insurance at that age. This type of insurance is not mandatory. The veteran may decide to keep his term insurance and pay the increasing premiums throughout his lifetime. This is his privilege. We in the Congress, however, believe that this legislation will to a great extent protect the term policyholder from paying exorbitant premiums when he reaches his golden years.

The Senate Finance Committee, in reporting this bill last Wednesday, amended it by adding provisions authorizing the Veterans' Administration to sell national service life insurance for a period of 1 year. If it passes the Senate in this form, it will be returned to the House for action on the Senate amendment. Because of the controversial nature of the amendment, the bill will undoubtedly have tough sledding in the weeks ahead. These are but a few of the actions that have been taken in the Congress thus far this year in your behalf.

Our greatest efforts are being devoted to solving the problem of the aging veteran. As the World War I veteran reaches age 65 or 70, we find a greater need than ever before for hospital facilities. The Veterans' Administration hospital system is well equipped to care for the veteran who requires active hospitalization for an acute condition. They are also well equipped to care for the veteran who is not sick or who is not seriously ill but can take care of himself. The domiciliary program in the Veterans' Administration, of course, cares for this type of veteran. There are no facilities, however, to take care of the aged veteran with a chronic illness who requires long-term nursing care as opposed to active medical care. A Special Subcommittee on Intermediate Care in the Veterans' Affairs Committee is presently conducting hearings on this very subject. I am a member of this subcommittee and we were privileged to receive VFW testimony on this subject just last week. We are hopeful that our efforts, with your help, will result in the inauguration of a new program of nursing type care for aging veterans.

Another matter affecting the welfare of the aging veteran is the non-service-connected pension program. More than 100 bills, all designed to either liberalize the existing pension program or create a new pension program, are pending before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Each of the major veterans organizations is supporting a different bill. The present administration has declared its violent opposition to any and all pension legislation. In this atmosphere, it becomes the formidable task of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to determine what kind of legislation most equitably meets the needs of the aging veteran; provides adequate pension for those who are seriously disabled, and those who have the greatest financial need; and has a reasonable chance of passing both the House and Senate and being approved by the President.

I am not going to attempt to analyze these bills with you today. I am confident that the Congress to a man recognizes the need for some action in the field of pensions. I am equally confident that those bills that would expend the greatest portion of the pension dollar on adding new pensioners with substantial incomes to the rolls, while providing little or no increase for the low-income pensioner, have little popular appeal with my colleagues in the Congress.

Both Chairman **Teague** and the ranking Republican on our committee, Mr. **Ayres**, have introduced identical bills to liberalize the existing pension law. These are H.R. 2916 and H.R. 3164. Both were introduced at the request of the VFW and are identified as

VFW bills. As a relatively junior member of this committee, I would be presumptuous, indeed, to predict success for these VFW proposals. I can safely observe, however, that these bills contain the kind of provisions that seem to have the greatest popular appeal in the Congress.

In discussing veterans' legislation, it is important to remember that our system of veterans' programs has been developing for many years. Surely, one of the most important bills considered by the Congress is one which is seldom mentioned. I am speaking of the annual appropriation bill. We have the most extensive veterans' program of any nation on earth. The budget for fiscal year 1963, which ends on June 30 of this year, totals nearly $5¼ billion. Most of this is spent for direct veteran benefits. One billion dollars is expended to operate the medical and hospital program. Three billion, eight hundred and sixty-seven million dollars is paid directly to veterans, widows, and children for compensation or pension. One hundred and sixty-six million dollars is paid for readjustment benefits. Most of this is for the education and training allowance for the few remaining veterans and war orphans who are taking education and training. We spend about $75 million each year for construction, maintenance, and modernization of the Veterans' Administration hospital system.

The American public takes a generous attitude toward its veterans. The public is contributing 7 cents out of each taxpayer's dollar for veterans benefits and has shown a willingness to support the extensive hospital and medical program, compensation payments to the disabled and survivors of service-connected dead, and pensions for those veterans who, because of very low income, age, and disability, are in need.

The philosophy that has dominated the thinking of the Congress for many years is that as the war years fade in the distance and there is less public interest in veterans programs, it is essential that the various veteran programs be reasonable and enjoy the support of the public. There is not sufficient money to do all of the things that everyone wants to do. Therefore, it has been necessary to proceed with an order of priority. There is general agreement that the hospital and medical program must come first. Compensation for the service-connected disabled and survivors of service-connected dead must received a high priority, since it seems unquestionable that the Government's first obligation is to this group. Non-service-connected pension programs should be made available to aging veterans and widows and those seriously disabled, even though from a non-service-connected cause, but these programs must be kept in bounds and in proper relation to the service-connected programs. If they are not, the entire structure of veterans benefits will be placed in jeopardy.

It appears to me that veterans organizations in this year of our Lord 1963 are standing at a crossroads.

The first road leads to the continuation of a sound program of veterans benefits—adequate compensation for the service-connected disabled and survivors of our war dead; hospitalization for the service connected; pensions for needy and disable non-service-connected veterans. Down the other road lies the destruction of this great benefits program. I am supremely confident that our great organization, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, will exercise the kind of responsibility that will lead us down the first road.

Thank you and God bless you.

ECONOMICS AND OUR PUBLIC POLICY OF FULL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the subject of unemployment is particularly important today because for some time the level of unemployment has been more than 5 percent, and because, to deal with this problem, the President's advisers have proposed a tax cut of more than $10 billion, primarily to stimulate aggregate demand in the economy, even in the face of a budget deficit, in order to get the economy moving again.

The Morgan Guaranty Survey for July 1963 contains an article, "Economics and Our Public Policy of Full Employment," by Dr. Arthur F. Burns, John Bates Clark professor of economics at Columbia University and president of the National Bureau of Economic Research, that was delivered as a lecture at Rice University on April 18, 1963. It is a wise and balanced discussion of the vital issue of formulating a public policy for full employment that I recommend to every Member of the Senate who is concerned about some of the paradoxes and dilemmas that have emerged in the current discussion of employment. Dr. Burns points out that in a free society a certain amount of unemployment is inevitable even though that society might have resolved the problem of the business cycle. Dr. Burns also points out some of the pitfalls in making a specific percentage of unemployment, such as 4 percent, an official policy of the Government. Dr. Burns advances an interpretation of full employment which is marked by its evidence of saneness and deep understanding not only of the technical economic considerations involved in employment policy but also a keen appreciation for some of the economic consequences of our cherished values of freedom of enterprise and freedom of choice in seeking job opportunities. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, the text of Dr. Burns' article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMICS AND OUR PUBLIC POLICY OF FULL EMPLOYMENT

(Following is the text of a lecture delivered by Dr. Arthur F. Burns, John Bates Clark professor of economics at Columbia University and president of the National Bureau of Economic Research, on April 18, 1963, as one in the semicentennial lecture series of Rice University. It is reproduced here with the concurrent permission of Rice University and the University of Chicago Press, publisher of the forthcoming book, "The Nation's Economic Objectives: Roots and Problems of Achievement," edited by Prof. Edgar O. Edwards, in which Dr. Burns' lecture will appear. Copyright 1963 by the William Marsh Rice University.)

During the 19th century, full employment was just a dream of a small band of reformers. Today it is a firmly established objective of public policy through the greater part of the world, including our own country. The Employment Act, which was passed by the Congress in 1946, states plainly that it is the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to create and maintain "conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work."[1] This moral commitment to full employment has been reaffirmed time and again by successive Presidents and successive Congresses. There can be no doubt that it expresses faithfully the prevailing sentiment of the American people. What we debate nowadays is the scale, the timing, and the precise character of employment policies, not the need to strive for full employment or to use the powers of Government to move the Nation toward this goal.

The pursuit of full employment has naturally served to enhance the role of economists in the formation of public policy.[2] Government officials charged with the responsibility of administering the Employment Act need to know how economic trends have been developing. They need to form judgments about the demand for labor and its supply in the months or years ahead. They need to shape or readjust policies to relieve existing unemployment. They need to devise ways of minimizing unemployment in the future. In view of the frailty of much of economic knowledge, the economist cannot often speak with the impersonal authority of science on these vital matters. His power to predict the future is as yet very limited. As with other men, his economic judgments are influenced by ethical intuitions and philosophical attitudes. These limitations of economics and of economists must be understood. It is well, however, not to underestimate the power of economics to define and disentangle the issues with which policymakers are concerned. If economists cannot be implicitly trusted to lead the Nation to the goal of full employment, they can at least clarify the nature of the goal and the obstacles that may be encountered by taking this or that route to it.

I intend to take advantage of the quiet setting of this university by discussing some issues surrounding the goal of full employment. I do so in the belief that a clearer notion of what full employment means may help our Nation to deal with its unemployment—a problem which President Kennedy has recently characterized as "our number one economic problem."[3]

I

The causes of unemployment are complex and many. We usually associate it with business recessions or a lagging rate of economic growth, and we are apt nowadays to attribute both the one and the other to a deficiency of aggregate demand. However, even if the business cycle vanished, a troublesome volume of unemployment would remain.

In the first place, seasonal variations of economic activity will continue. At certain seasons of the year, a considerable number of workers will still be laid off or lose their jobs in the construction industry, in the garment trades, in the automobile industry, in vacation resorts, and in many other places and activities.[4]

In the second place, the fortunes of individual firms, industries, and communities will still vary enormously. The economic impact on working people will therefore be uneven. Here and there, men and women will become unemployed as new technology renders their skills obsolete, or as factories move to new locations, as old mines become exhausted, as construction projects reach completion, or as both old and new businesses shut down or reduce their operations because they are unable to compete successfully against their rivals. Inevitably, some interval often elapses before those who have lost jobs can find employment once again.

---

[1] This Act, except for recent minor amendments, is conveniently reproduced in Economic Report of the President, January 1954, appendix B.

[2] See "An Economist in Government" by the present writer, Columbia University Forum, winter 1957.

[3] Manpower Report of the President, March 1963, p. 11.

[4] It is perhaps worth noting that the seasonal corrections of monthly figures of unemployment, as practiced by statisticians, merely redistribute the unemployment that occurs within a year. They do not serve to reduce the annual level of the figures. Nor should they do so; this function belongs to economic policy, not to statistical contrivance.

In the third place, the disappearance of the business cycle will not of itself eradicate certain differences among people that count in our labor markets. In all probability, the rate of unemployment will therefore remain higher among young persons than for the labor force at large, for Negroes than for native whites, for women than for men, for older workers than for those in the prime of life, for those with little schooling than for educated persons, for the physically handicapped than for those free from disability, and for lethargic people than for those who proceed with energy and initiative. Needless to add, the rate of unemployment will also be higher for men and women who harbor somewhat romantic notions about their worth than for those who adjust readily to market conditions.

The significance of these familiar observations should be clear. What they mean is that a risk of unemployment is present for the individual even in times of prosperity, that whether times are good or bad the risk is uneven for different parts of the working population, that this risk increases materially during business recessions, and that it may remain uncomfortably large when economic recovery proceeds slowly. These are reasons enough for public policy to concern itself with unemployment. But if the goal of full employment is to be of constructive aid in diminishing unemployment, it must be framed with an eye to actual characteristics of people and the conditions under which they live and work.

II

In popular discussions, the goal of full employment is sometimes described in phrases that are so sweeping as to suggest that it would be well if every man, woman, and child worked 24 hours every day. Of course, no one wants or means that. Everyone recognizes the infirmities of childhood and old age, that human endurance has its limits, that much of leisure is sanctioned by custom or religion, and that a free society leaves it up to an individual to decide whether to work or not. When we speak precisely, we do not therefore identify the unemployed with the jobless. Instead, we consider as unemployed only those among the jobless who are able, willing, and seeking to work. If all persons of this category actually succeeded in finding jobs, employment would surely be at a maximum while unemployment would disappear.

This seems to be the objective of public leaders when they assert, as men often do in a mood of exuberance, that the elimination of unemployment is a basic goal of our society. For example, the Council of Economic Advisers recently declared that "ideally, all persons able, willing, and seeking to work should be continuously employed."[5] Statements such as this convey a noble sentiment, but they can hardly be taken literally. I doubt if anyone who has seriously thought about the matter really believes that the complete elimination of unemployment would be ideal or even good for our type of society, in contrast to one that is rigidly governed by custom or authority.

We can put what I say to a test by a little reflection. Let us provisionally agree that full employment means a condition of zero unemployment. This, let us say, is the goal toward which public policy should be directed. Let us suppose, next, that the rate of governmental spending is sharply increased in the interest of stimulating the economy, and that a large and well-sustained upsurge of private spending follows. Employment in most lines of activity will therefore rise progressively, unemployment will diminish, and the economy will move toward the established goal. As the process of expansion gathers momentum, young men and women embarking on their careers will find it easier to obtain suitable work, members of minority groups and many of the physically handicapped will discover that they and their services are wanted, and not a few women who took jobs because their husbands were temporarily out of work will resume their normal family responsibilities. Hence, there will be ample cause for satisfaction in the improved performance of our economy.

Prosperity, however, has a habit of creating problems of its own. When the demand for all sorts of commodities and services steadily increases and unemployment decreases, costs of production and prices do not stand still. In the early stages of expansion, increases of output can commonly be achieved without significant addition to overhead costs. As output keeps growing, this source of economy diminishes and eventually vanishes. Technological and managerial advances continue, of course, to be made at a thousand points. Their favorable influence on costs is offset, however, as older equipment is again put to use, as the quality of newly hired labor declines, as hours of work lengthen and overtime rates are paid, as fatigue grips both managers and their employees, as workers become more restless and independent, and as deliveries of needed materials or equipment become less dependable.

These developments would in time raise costs of production even if wage rates remained constant. That, however, will not happen. With aggregate demand continuing to expand, labor shortages will appear first in this trade or community, then in another, and so keep multiplying. Wages will therefore rise on a wide front, and they would do so even if trade unions were few and weak. Prices will likewise rise under the pressure of expanding demand, sometimes advancing before and sometimes after wages have risen.

Not all of us, of course, will be troubled by the higher prices that now have to be paid for consumer goods. Indeed, most of us may point with pride to the power of our economic system to provide employment for more and more people who are less fortunate than we, but who also want to live decently, raise families, and give their children a good start in life. Many of us will have a more personal cause for rejoicing—either because our incomes have risen faster than the cost of living or because the market value of our holdings of common stocks or real estate has soared. There will be some among us, however, whose savings have been accumulated chiefly in the form of bank deposits, savings bonds, or life insurance. There will be others, too, whose salaries or wages have failed to keep in step with the rise in the cost of living. There will be still others whose livelihood depends on a pension, annuity, or some other type of fixed income. These groups will not be indifferent to the rise of prices. Nor will economists, public officials, and others who ponder the future as they watch speculation spreading, economic injustices multiplying, the balance of payments deteriorating, and—perhaps also—the world's confidence in the dollar declining.

The advance of costs and prices will therefore arouse some skepticism about the ideal of full employment that we postulated. Symptoms of shortage, besides that of soaring prices, will add their mite to this changing mood.[6] In view of the scarcity of labor, more and more of us will find that we must deal with a salesgirl whose understanding is faulty, or that we must get along with a janitor who seems never to be around, or that we must defer to the plumber who arrives a week after we had discovered a leaky pipe, or that we must learn to wait patiently for the new sofa that was promised for the wedding anniversary we celebrated 3 months earlier. So great is the variety of human nature and of personal circumstance that, notwithstanding the persisting advance of prices and the mounting of personal inconvenience, there will still be some among us who continue to espouse with fervor the goal of zero unemployment. But there will now be others, and their number is likely to swell as the expansion of aggregate demand becomes more intense, who will not only question the practical wisdom of their earlier ideal but will actually complain that the economy is suffering from over-full employment.

Once this stage has been reached, the simple concept of full employment with which we started will have lost its usefulness for public policy. True, all or most of us may still believe sincerely in full employment, but this will now mean different things to us, reflecting our individual values, attitudes, and circumstances. Compassion for the unemployed will weigh heavily in the scales, but other values will also count—among them a concern about the cost of living, industrial efficiency, the rate of economic growth, the scope of governmental authority, the level of taxes, the balance of payments, the prestige of our country abroad, to say nothing of such earthly matters as personal convenience in riding trains or shopping. This diversity of values is, of course, the condition in which we find ourselves in actual life, and it is one reason why economists, among others, differ in the advice they give to lawmakers.

III

If my analysis has run close to the track of human sentiment, it follows that zero unemployment, apart from being unattainable,[7] would not really be a desirable condition for our society. But if that much is true, we should recognize that not all unemployment is evil, and that some unemployment actually serves a useful function from the viewpoint of the individual or that of society. Although this proposition may appear strange to some of you, let us consider the case for it.

To begin with, some of the unemployment experienced by young men and women when they look for their first regular job is linked to our national tradition of freedom. Having a job is obviously important to them, and there are times when any job is better than none. Ordinarily, however, some picking and choosing helps young people to decide what they would like to do and how they can make the most of their capabilities. This, of course, results in a certain amount of unemployment. The only conceivable way of avoiding it would be to have young people take the very first job that came along. Such a rule of conduct would hardly recommend itself to them or, for that matter, to older men and women when they decide to reenter the labor force.

---

[5] Economic Report of the President, January 1962, p. 44.

[6] Cf. Bertil Ohlin, The Problem of Employment Stabilization (1949), ch. 1.

[7] Popular impressions to the contrary, some unemployment has persisted even in the U.S.S.R. See Warren W. Eason, "Labor Force Materials for the Study of Unemployment in the Soviet Union" and the discussion of this paper, published in The Measurement and Behavior of Unemployment, a report of the National Bureau of Economic Research, 1957; also, I. Kaplan, "A Questionnaire Study of the Causes of Labor Turnover in the Industry of the Economic Councils," Problems of Economics (IASP translations from original Soviet sources), December 1961, pp. 42–47.

Unemployment arises voluntarily also among those who already have jobs. Independent businessmen sometimes discontinue one business before they establish another. Employees frequently leave their jobs before they have found new work. Some workers quit because they become dissatisfied with the rate of pay, or because they see no opportunity or insufficient opportunity for advancement, or because they do not like their work or their working conditions or the neighborhood where they live. Others leave because they think that their talents can be put to better use elsewhere, or because they wish to try out different jobs or live in different places before settling down, or because they are moved to sudden anger by a foreman's or colleague's injury to their feelings, or because they decide to seek or to follow husbands, wives, or sweethearts. Migration from job to job occurs at all stages of life, but it is especially common among young folk who have both more opportunity and better reason for experimenting. To the extent that unemployment arises from the striving of men and women to escape the limitations of one environment and to seek out the opportunities of another, we may justly regard it as useful both to the individual and to society.

But if the exercise of freedom by new job seekers or by established employees creates some unemployment, so also does the exercise of freedom by employers. Individual employees are undoubtedly injured in the process. This fact warrants steady search for constructive ways of easing personal adjustments, but it should not blind us to the advantages that accrue to society from the exercise of freedom. In every group enterprise—whether it be a business firm, a Government bureau, or a university—a certain degree of discipline is essential if the efforts of the group are to prosper. Individuals who are incompetent, undependable, or dishonest must be subject to the risk of dismissal, or else order and efficiency will suffer. Moreover, we could not have an efficient economy if employers who closed down their shops were required to support in idleness the men who previously worked for them, or if those who remained in business but needed fewer workers—whether because of dwindling markets or of technological changes—still had to retain their earlier work force on the payroll.

Industrial efficiency depends not only on the maintenance of certain standards of job performance and on the ability of every enterprise to dispense with labor that is no longer needed. Industrial efficiency depends also on the ability of an enterprise to maintain smooth operations and to meet unforeseen contingencies. We have already seen how the normal activities of consumption are impeded when unemployment tends to vanish. But if inability to locate a plumber, or laborer, or space part may cause trouble or inconvenience to households, it will also impede the efficiency of business firms. Just as stocks of raw materials help to insure the continuity of production, so does the existence of a certain number of people seeking work help to insure the continuity and efficiency of production and thereby also contributes to the stability of total employment itself.[8]

The upshot of these remarks is simply that some unemployment is necessary or desirable from the viewpoint of a society that values freedom, equity, and efficiency. More specifically, we must have some unemployment if new entrants into the labor force are to be free to choose among jobs, if employed individuals are to be free to change jobs, if employers are to be free to replace unsatisfactory workers or to dispense with those whose services they no longer require, if business firms are to be able to carry on their productive operations with reasonable continuity and efficiency, and if the purchasing power of the dollar is to maintain some semblance of stability.

IV

These broad but basic considerations may be stressed differently by individual economists. All economists recognize, however, that if the concept of full employment is to serve public policy constructively, it must at least allow for seasonal variations in economic activity and for the familiar frictions of the labor market. Since the adoption of the Employment Act, economists have also been under pressure to add precision to the concept of full employment. This has proved to be difficult and sometimes a very disconcerting task.[9]

An obvicus starting point of the quest for precision is the act's specification of the goal of maximum employment. Some students have reasoned that since the act takes maximum employment as the objective of public policy, it is desirable—even if not strictly necessary—to express this magnitude numerically. Others have gone further and argued that unless the objective of full employment is expressed by a definite number, policymakers will not know the magnitude of the gap in activity that needs to be filled and therefore will be unable to devise satisfactory public policies. In line with this thinking, the Council of Economic Advisers declared in its report of March 1961 that an unemployment rate of 4 percent is a reasonable target for full utilization of resources.[10] In this pronouncement the Council merely used a figure which had gradually become something of a convention in economic circles during the postwar period. The Council, however, took the novel step of making this figure official.

The use of a 4-percent unemployment rate as a criterion of full employment in our country can be rationalized in different ways. One possible justification is that when unemployment has been at that level or lower, it does not appear to have been much of a political problem. This argument will hardly satisfy those who believe that the American people need to apply a more exacting standard to the performance of their economy. Another possible justification is that the average unemployment rate during peak years of the business cycle works out for the period since 1900 to a figure that is close to 4 percent.[11] This historical generalization is surely not irrelevant to a practical judgment concerning full employment, but it too will not satisfy those whose hearts are set on a different numerical goal. After all, there is nothing sacred about an average, especially when it varies with the precise period covered and with the treatment accorded to extreme cases, such as the war peak in 1918 or the depressed peak in 1937. Those who deem a 4-percent unemployment rate too high can always point to historical instances when the rate was lower, while those who deem 4 percent too low can point to inflationary conditions in years when the rate was at that level or even higher.

Of course, criticism of the 4 percent figure along these lines is not directed against the desirability of numerical targets as such. But if what I said previously about the subtle role of human attitudes and values is valid, any unemployment rate that identifies full employment in the minds of people at one time may fail to do so at another time, for example, if prices begin rising swiftly. On this view, the presence or absence of full employment must be judged with reference to the entire complex of conditions that bear on a nation's economic health.

Still another criticism is that it really makes little difference whether the unemployment target is, say, 3 or 5 percent. The point here is that the two figures are very close, that they imply an employment target of either 97 or 95 percent, and that the economy will be doing about as well at one level of activity as at the other. This way of thinking must appear strange, if not irresponsible, to those who see and judge the economic world in terms of its unemployment. To them it makes a great deal of difference where the unemployment target is set. According to their lights, if unemployment happens to be 5 percent, then the distance from full employment will be twice as large with a target of 3 percent as with one of 4 percent. One who believes that compelling human or economic factors favor 3 percent can therefore urge with a show of plausibility that whatever increase of governmental spending is being proposed to move the economy to the 4 percent goal is merely half of what is required.

In view of the rich diversity of such judgments, it is not surprising that a storm of criticism from both the left and the right followed the Council's announcement that a 4-percent rate of unemployment is a reasonable goal for full utilization of the Nation's resources. The Council responded by explaining that the figure is simply "an interim goal, a way-station."[12] Needless to say, this modification will also not satisfy everyone, although the nebulous part of the new official goal is perhaps its strongest feature. The crucial weakness of the Council's 4 percent figure is not that it is arbitrary. On the contrary, this figure is sufficiently grounded in experience to be useful on many occasions. The difficulty is rather that any numerical goal of full employment, once it has been made official, can be easily misinterpreted and become an obstacle to rational economic policy in a changing world.[13] For instance, if several hundred thousand teenagers or women suddenly entered the labor force and sought temporary, part-time jobs, unemployment could jump from 4 to 5 percent but that would have little economic significance and require no change in public policy. On the other hand, even an unemployment rate of 3 percent could be dangerous to a nation if it rose to that level in the course of a new recession. The threat at such a time would not be the unemployment that exists, but rather the cumulating force of recession that could in time carry unemployment to 6 or 8 percent or even higher.

V

There is no need to dwell further on the point that full employment cannot be wisely identified with a fixed numerical target. This conclusion, however, will not make life easier for the makers of Federal economic policy. True, it may help them avoid some costly mistakes, but they also need positive assistance in interpreting their duties under the Employment Act.

As far as I know, there are only two passages in the act that give any promise of eventually bringing some precision to its employment objective. One is the specification of the goal of "maximum employment" which, as we have just seen, easily leads to unhappy arithmetical debates. But the act also specifies, as I noted at the beginning of this lecture, that the Federal Government has the responsibility of promoting conditions that will afford "useful employment opportunities * * * for those able, willing, and seeking to work."[14] This passage does not invite absolute numerical targets of employment or of the unemployment rate. It will not suit those who seek the illusory comfort of precise targets. It nevertheless provides, in my judgment, a more useful handle for a public policy of full employment.

---

[8] The need of continuity could, of course, be met in part by hoarding labor, but only at the cost of efficiency and of the fluidity required for growth. See also section V, below, in this connection.

[9] See E. G. Nourse, "Defining Our Employment Goal Under the 1946 Act," Review of Economics and Statistics, May 1956.

[10] Hearings on January 1961 Economic Report of the President (by Joint Economic Committee, 87th Cong., 1st sess.), p. 326.

[11] Based on official data and Stanley Lebergott, "Annual Estimates of Unemployment in the United States, 1900–50," published in the National Bureau report cited in note 7, pp. 215–16.

[12] See Economic Report of the President, January 1963, p. 42; also Report for January 1962, pp. 44–48.

[13] Cf. my comments in Hearings on January 1955 Economic Report of the President (by Joint Committee on the Economic Report, 84th Cong., 1st sess.), pp. 43–45.

The central thought of this pasage of the Employment Act is simply that ample employment opportunities are of great social or public importance. Let us now pursue this thought in the light of our earlier conclusion that some unemployment is socially desirable. That conclusion rested on a tacit assumption which very much needs to be made explicit; namely, that unfilled jobs exist. Clearly, new entrants into the labor force will be unable to exercise their freedom to choose among jobs if there are no jobs to be filled. Nor will those at work be able to exercise their freedom to change jobs if there are no vacancies. Nor, speaking more generally, will those who are seeking jobs, whatever the cause of their searching, be able to get work unless jobs are being created or vacated. It follows that job opportunities—or, more narrowly, vacant jobs—are absolutely vital. It further follows that if the number of job vacancies equaled the number unemployed, there would then be sufficient employment opportunities to permit, in principle, a job for all who are able, willing, and seeking to work.

This line of reasoning leads at once to a basic criterion of full employment; namely, equality between the number of jobs seeking men and the number of men seeking jobs. Of course, these quantities need to be considered in terms of the marketplace. If the prevailing wage in a given trade happened to be approximately $20 a day, it would make little sense to treat a man who holds out for $30 as being unemployed. It would likewise be pointless to treat an employer who is willing to pay only $10 as having a real vacancy. In other words, we need to think of the relation between unemployment and job vacancies in terms of actual market conditions. Furthermore, we need to recognize that it makes a good deal of difference to the general welfare, and therefore also to public policy, whether equality between the number of unemployed and the number of job vacancies comes to rest at a figure of 3 million or 13 million. Taking all these considerations together, full employment may be said to mean that the number of vacant jobs at prevailing wages is as large as the number unemployed, and that the labor market is so organized that everyone who is able, willing, and seeking to work already has a job or can obtain one after a brief search or after undergoing some training.[15]

Let us now see how helpful this interpretation of full employment can be in formulating public policy. First of all, the criterion of equality between the number of unemployed and the number of vacant jobs poses squarely what in the economic sphere is perhaps the major policy problem of our generation, namely, whether aggregate demand at a particular time is deficient and, if so, what action the Government can wisely take. Many of us have become accustomed to attribute every drop in general economic activity—more recently also every sign of sluggishness in the rate of economic growth—to a deficiency of aggregate demand, and we are therefore apt to urge the Government to compensate for any deficiency that we believe exists. This way of thinking is often sound, practically useful, and socially beneficial. It rests, however, on an excessively simple view of the economic process. There can surely be difficulties on the supply side as well as on the demand side, for example, when a protracted strike in a major industry or a concentration of geographical shifts of businesses brings economic trouble, including unemployment. In diagnosing the state of the economy, it is critically important therefore to check the number unemployed against the number of job vacancies before concluding that aggregate demand has become deficient or to what degree this has happened.

Let me be more specific. I think that informed citizens will generally agree that our economy has suffered in recent years from excessive unemployment. There is less agreement, however, about the causes of the unemployment or the proper remedy for it. According to one school of thought, I shall call it the expansionist school, the principal cause is a more or less chronic shortage of aggregate demand. According to another school of thought, to which I shall refer as the structural school, the principal cause is found in the rapid piling up of economic changes, which have been creating more jobs than can be filled in some occupations and communities while substantial unemployment is being created in others.

Each school has presented impressive evidence to support its position, but neither the one nor the other has been able to demonstrate conclusively that its diagnosis is the right one. Thus the expansionist school stresses the recent failure of business investment in fixed capital to match earlier economic performance, the reduced rate of growth of total production since 1957, and the higher rate of unemployment since then. These facts may be granted; but they still leave open the vital question whether the number unemployed has been larger or smaller than the job vacancies. Unless this question is resolved, there is bound to be at least some lingering doubt about the characteristic remedy of the expansionist school—namely, easy credit, larger Federal expenditures, lower tax rates, or some combination of these policies for increasing aggregate demand.

The structural school, in its turn, stresses the existence of extensive shortages of scientists, teachers, engineers, doctors, nurses, typists, stenographers, automobile and TV mechanics, tailors, domestic servants, and some other types of labor. In view of these shortages, it denounces the fiscal remedies proposed by the expansionists as being circuitous and needlessly costly. A far more effective way of dealing with unemployment, according to the structuralists, is to focus policy on better organization of the labor market—for example, by disseminating fuller and more timely reports on occupational trends, by bringing together pertinent data on every unemployed individual and every vacant job in a pool of information coordinated by employment exchanges,[16] by improving the existing system of vocational training and guidance, and by extending as soon as experience justifies it the retraining programs that have been established under recent legislation. All this and even more may be granted by the expansionists without budging from their position. They can properly insist that the mere existence of shortages in various occupations or communities by no means discredits their thesis that, taking the Nation as a whole, unemployment substantially exceeds the unfilled jobs.[17]

These recent discussions have served to illustrate once again that inadequate knowledge of the causes of economic difficulty is by no means a bar to strong opinions on the part of economists, as of others. This is unavoidable when a problem like unemployment, about which men feel deeply, becomes a subject of public concern. It is not so much the exaggeration by this or that school that I find deplorable, as the complete absence of national statistics on job vacancies. The Employment Act has now been on the statute books nearly 20 years. It has come to serve as a sort of "constitution" for economic policymaking.[18] Its authority is constantly invoked by both public officials and private citizens. Its emphasis on ample employment opportunities is widely applauded. In its name all sorts of governmental programs are debated or undertaken to expand aggregate demand. Yet our Nation has thus far failed to take the trouble of equipping itself with the facts needed to determine whether, when, or to what degree aggregate demand is deficient. If overall national statistics on job vacancies existed, and if they were supported by data on job openings and unemployment in individual occupations and communities, much of the debate between the expansionists and structuralists could be resolved on a factual basis.[19] Controversy about public policy would doubtless continue for reasons to which I have already alluded, but it would proceed along more constructive channels, concentrating on future prospects and needs of the economy—a subject on which men are bound to hold different opinions.

---

[14] See note 1.

[15] Stated more formally, equality between the number of vacant jobs and the number unemployed is a necessary but not a sufficient condition of full employment. The two other conditions are, first, that the equality hold at prevailing wages, second, that the labor market is so organized that practically all of the unemployed could obtain a job after a brief search or after obtaining some special training. Cf. W. H. Beveridge, Full Employment in a Free Society (1945), pp. 18–20, 124–31.

Equality of job openings and job seekers, at prevailing wages, could emerge at a high level of unemployment. In that event, the obstacle to full employment would not be the level of aggregate demand, but rather that the unemployed lack the highly intricate skills that are wanted, or that they choose not to practice them, or that they are located in the wrong places, or that they lack information about available jobs, or that legal wage minima are out of line with conditions in some markets. Even this statement is incomplete, for it assumes that adjustments must be on the side of supply, whereas some could in fact be made by those demanding specific types of labor.

The present concept of the goal of full employment would require for its full implementation detailed statistics on the structure (occupational, geographic, sex, age, etc.) as well as on the overall level of both job vacancies and unemployment. However, even if we had nothing more than national totals, we would still be able to judge whether or not existing unemployment was due to a deficiency of aggregate demand. In deciding this issue, both job vacancies and unemployment would need to be expressed in seasonally-adjusted form.

[16] Electronic computers open up exciting possibilities for the future. With their aid, an unemployed worker expressing his need or preference to an officer of an employment exchange might be referred in a matter of hours, if not minutes, to a list of potential employers (outside his community if there are none in his own) who need that type of employee. Employers could be served in a similar way. If all this seems remote, the main reason is that our Federal-State Employment Service has failed to flourish.

[17] My own speculations on this issue, if of any interest in this connection, are expressed, among other places, in the preface to Thomas B. Curtis' "87 Million Jobs" (1962), and in a statement at "Hearings on January 1963 Economic Report of the President" (by Joint Economic Committee, 88th Cong., 1st sess.).

[18] See A. F. Burns, "Some Reflections on the Employment Act," Political Science Quarterly, December 1962.

VI

The concept of full employment that I have sketched may be helpful to policymakers also in other ways. By focusing on job opportunities as well as on job shortages, on employment as well as on unemployment, this concept should help to keep the healthy and the pathological aspects of economic life in perspective. Moreover, it should help to make students of public policy more alert to structural problems of our economy. As I have already noted, even if the business cycle vanished, unemployment would remain troublesome. Even if there were never any shortage of aggregate demand, the mutual adjustments of supply and demand for labor would often proceed slowly. Hence, whatever one may think of the merits of the controversy between the structuralists and the expansionists, there can be no doubt that unemployment would be very substantially reduced through better organization and functioning of the labor market.

This aspect of the unemployment problem has not received the attention it deserves on the part of economists. For example, economists frequently urge extension of the coverage of unemployment insurance and liberalization of benefits on the ground that such reforms would make the unemployment insurance system a more powerful stabilizer of personal incomes and of consumer buying. This argument, which I think is valid, does not justify the tendency to neglect the supply side or the interaction of supply and demand. There is a serious need to revamp the insurance system so that more effective aid would be given to unemployed workers in finding new jobs. There is a need to devise ways of administration that would strictly withhold benefits from those who quit their jobs without good cause or who are unwilling to accept suitable work. There is a need to use the insurance system to enlarge the retraining opportunities for workers who can have little hope of finding employment in their own trade. It should also be possible to modify the insurance system so as to give employers a greater financial incentive to stabilize output. Structural reforms along these lines would promote better adjustment of the supply of labor to the prevailing demand. They would serve to prevent unemployment as well as relieve it. Indeed, it is doubtful if the advantages sought from extended or liberalized insurance benefits will be realized unless they are accompanied by extensive structural reforms.[20]

Another problem that deserves the attention of economists is that while many workers have recently been unemployed or have had to be content with part-time jobs, many others have been working overtime or holding down extra jobs. For manufacturing, accurate data exist on overtime and they disclose a disturbing development. In 1956, a year of booming business, overtime accounted for 3 hours of the average workweek. In 1962, when business activity was sluggish, overtime was equally abundant, although the number of manufacturing workers had in the meantime fallen by 8 percent. One possible explanation of this increasing tendency to keep people on overtime is the steady growth of fringe benefits, the cost of which to a business firm tends to vary with the number of men employed rather than with the number of man-hours worked. Another possibility is that employers are gradually learning that disputes about work rules are fewer when they resort to overtime than when they add to their work force and therefore need to rearrange some of the jobs. These and other hypotheses require the most careful study by economists. For if it is really true that collective bargaining and some of our social legislation are tending to complicate the unemployment problem, it would be well to turn at once to exploring ways of reducing the dangerous side effects.

The very high unemployment rate among young people in recent years is still another problem that cannot be understood in its entirety in terms of the theory of deficient aggregate demand. More recognition needs to be given to what the increasing emphasis of our society on academic training and college education is doing to the minds of young people. The dignity of honest labor, whether skilled or unskilled, is no longer stressed by parents or teachers as it once was. Not all youngsters, however, are capable of climbing high on the competitive educational ladder. Some lack the interest, or the intelligence, or the emotional stability to do so. When they are told on all sides that life holds out little for a person who lacks a good education, it is not surprising that many young men and women, who could have become good workers at some trade, drop out of school and join the ranks of casual labor. Whatever the answer to this distressing problem may be, we can be quite sure that the mere expansion of aggregate demand will not solve it.

The main reason more attention has not been devoted to this and other peculiarities of labor markets is the preoccupation of economists with the problem of demand. The belief has developed and is now widely held that, whatever the cause or causes of unemployment may be, a sufficient increase of aggregate demand will in time work an effective cure. On an abstract plane this theory seems quite valid, as I in fact have shown by analyzing what would happen for a time if the Government constantly kept injecting new money into the income stream. But I also concluded that demonstration by stressing the revulsion of feeling that would eventually be stirred by any such experiment.[21] There are limits to the amount of inflation, and the inefficiency and inconvenience associated with it, that our country will tolerate. Indeed, these limits are more severe in actual life than in my illustration. The practical significance of this is that the discontent aroused by a large inflationary experiment would be likely to lead to its discontinuance before enough of a dent had been made in structural unemployment.[22] Not only that, but massive political resistance could develop to any early repetition of the experiment even on the modest scale that might be needed to deal with that part of unemployment which, in the event of a recession, is really due to an insufficiency of aggregate demand.

I am well aware of the need for further research on the problem of business cycles and on the more general problem of maintaining aggregate demand at satisfactory levels. I surely hope that such research will go forward at this university and elsewhere. I particularly hope that economists will seek better understanding of the subtle forces that shape the confidence that businessmen, investors, and consumers have in their own and the Nation's future. But I also feel that far more of the best thought of economists needs to be devoted to the several structural aspects of unemployment that I singled out for attention, as well as to related problems, such as the influence of the minimum wage and current ways of administering welfare programs on the supply of labor, the influence of prejudice on the job opportunities of older men and minority groups, the effectiveness of both old and new training and retraining programs, the feasibility of reducing seasonal fluctuations in employment, and so on. If I am also right in thinking that comprehensive statistics on job vacancies are a vital missing link in our entire system of economic intelligence, there is plenty of useful work ahead for economists.[23]

It is by patient extension of the still small area of knowledge and understanding that economics has made its principal contribution to public policy in the past. That is also the way in which new usefulness to our public policy of full employment will be found in the future.

TEST BAN DISCUSSION

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, it is evident from the press reports emanating from Moscow that some sort of test ban accord is about to be ratified by the United States, Britain, and Russia. This agreement presumably would seek to end certain nuclear detonations for as long a time as all parties obey the spirit and the letter of such an accord.

No American who is cognizant of the awesome destructive potential of a nuclear war or of the effects of sustained nuclear radiation upon human life could fail to applaud American motives in seeking such a treaty, Mr. President; however, there are dangers that cannot go unnoticed.

The Senate can be expected to give full debate to each and every provision, ramification, and connotation of the accord for never will there be a treaty of such importance that could be broken with such ease.

We must not let the hope for an agreement, desirable as it might be, place the United States in the jaws of an international trap that is baited with the Sino-Soviet dispute.

The coincidence of the Communist unity conference and the test ban discussion at the same time and place is too patent to be ignored. Is this great battle between the Communist giants a genuine schism induced by ideology and lust for power, or is it a ruse contrived to make us drop our guard?

There are indications that the test ban agreement may be contingent on a declaration of nonaggression—something that would not need Senate ratification. If there is a nonaggression factor of any type connected with a test ban accord—be it a formal provision or a handshake—I would urge this legislative body to reject completely any treaty derived from the Moscow talks.

---

[19] There is some reason to hope that the report of the Gordon committee will be more successful than an earlier effort by the Council of Economic Advisers in getting a national system of job vacancy statistics organized. See President's Committee to Appraise Employment and Unemployment Statistics, "Measuring Employment and Unemployment" (September 1962), pp. 25, 199–202, and appendix B.

[20] Cf. the writer's comments in the Proceedings of the 14th Annual Meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association, December 1961, pp. 198–200.

[21] See section II of this paper.

[22] Given the number of vacant jobs and the number of unemployed for the entire Nation, the smaller of the two figures (or either one if they are equal) may be taken as a rough indication of the size of the structural problem.

[23] The new annual report on manpower (see note 3) should foster a more balanced approach to the problem of unemployment. This report is required by the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

Why such haste to declare nonaggression and who will benefit from such a declaration? The Soviet Union knows that the West will not initiate an attack—preemptive war has never been a tenet of our defense dictum—and we should know by now the utter worthlessness of agreements with the powers described so accurately by our own FBI chief as the "Masters of Deceit." An endless list of promises and agreements abrogated by communism since World War II should lay to rest any vapid reference to the honor and statesmanship of communism.

Again, in the reports from Moscow comes the hackneyed term "relaxing tensions." It is time the United States announced to Chairman Khrushchev that the only "relaxing of tensions" recognized by the West will be unrefutable evidence that communism has abandoned its insidious desire for world conquest and is freeing the captive nations under its heel. The Moscow conference would be a most propitious time for such an announcement.

Despite the differences that may exist within the Communist family, Khrushchev and Mao are still motivated by the words of Marx and Lenin. In short, they are still Communists. Red China would certainly not be bound by an American, British, Russian accord. Why then would any satellite, even Cuba, be bound by the Moscow treaty? The treaty could be broken by a violation of either party acting within its territorial boundaries, but what is to prevent the Communists from moving their tests outside of Russia proper to escape the treaty provision? In regard to violating this treaty, Mr. President, the United States is being put in the position wherein the Soviets can at their initiative break the treaty and gain a maximum propaganda victory in so doing by unleashing a propaganda harangue against the West accusing it of the perfidy the Russians themselves are committing.

The United States has retreated before the on-again, off-again advance of communism since the disastrous World War II conferences which handed Stalin the territory and peoples he could not conquer. We have been continuously outmaneuvered. We have been forced to fight with our backs to the wall and accept an unpalatable stalemate—a sterile cease-fire in Korea. We are presently expending millions of dollars and hundreds of American lives in southeast Asia, and we have allowed a permanent Communist satellite to grow and to fester in the Caribbean. We have suffered these humiliating and strategically disastrous defeats because we have failed to act in accordance with the plain simple truth—that communism is our enemy. It seeks to destroy us. It will use any device, and chicanery or perfidy to "bury us." Its oath is meaningless, and its leaders are not able to negotiate for the common good in concert with the peoples of a free society.

As one who has seen his skepticism of Communist peace overtures justified time and again, I look now toward Moscow with the deepest trepidation. Has the United States again been outmaneuvered by the shadowboxing within the Communist family? The security and freedom of all the world will hinge on the answer to that question if this body is called upon to debate a test ban treaty with the masters of communism.

A SOLUTION TO THE ARAB REFUGEE PROBLEM MUST RESPECT THE RIGHTS OF ISRAEL AND HER INTEGRITY AS A NATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, early in June the Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, of which I have the honor to serve as chairman, issued its annual report on world refugee problems. Included were specific recommendations on the Cuban and Chinese refugee problems, on U.S. immigration policy toward unsettled refugees, and on a global approach to the problem of refugees from communism. Additional comments were made on other refugee situations. A section on the Arab refugee problem reviewed briefly the current situation, stated the urgent need for continuing responsible efforts to seek out a solution to the problem, and acknowledged the diplomatic mission for this purpose by Dr. Joseph E. Johnson, president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and until earlier this year a special representative of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine of which our Government is a member.

To avoid misunderstanding, Mr. President, I want to make it abundantly clear that it was not my or our intention to endorse Dr. Johnson's report to the Conciliation Commission on the results of his mission, or to support his proposals for a solution to the Arab refugee problem. In short, the subcommittee did not put its stamp of approval on the Johnson plan.

Mr. President, as all of us know well, the future peace and stability of the Middle East require a solution to the Arab refugee problem. Isolated treatment of the problem is not, however, the answer. It is illusory to assume that a solution can be manufactured and simply imposed upon the situation. The refugee problem can be solved only in the context of a general peace settlement between Israel and her Arab neighbors—a settlement which necessarily must recognize the rights of Israel and guarantee her integrity as a nation.

A pertinent article on the subcommittee's recent report appeared in the July 12 issue of the Jewish News published at Detroit, Mich. The article contains the text of a letter I sent recently to Mr. Philip Slomovitz, the paper's perceptive editor and publisher, on the subcommittee's report. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article be made a part of my remarks at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Jewish News, July 13, 1963]

Senator Hart Denies His Report Accepted Johnson Proposals—Emphasizes That Any Settlement "Must Guarantee Israel's Integrity"

U.S. Senator Philip A. Hart, in statements to the Jewish News and the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, declared this week that it was not his intention to endorse the report of Dr. Joseph E. Johnson as a solution to the Arab refugee problem.

Senator Hart's statement was made after the appearance of the editorial in last week's Jewish News and a JTA story, both of which revealed that the Johnson report, never previously published, was included in the Michigan Senator's report as the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees.

In his explanatory statement, after it was indicated by the Jewish News that the Johnson report was rejected by both Israel and the Arabs and that it was considered a negative and damaging plan for the attempted solution to the Arab-Israel problem, Senator Hart stated:

"Any solution must be part of an agreement bringing permanent peace to the Middle East. The parties involved must themselves bring about this agreement. The settlement must recognize the integrity of Israel as a nation and, above all, our country must fulfill its commitment to see that Israel's independence is not violated."

Senator Hart, in a supplementary statement addressed to the editor of the Jewish News, emphasizes anew that any settlement in the Middle East "must guarantee Israel's integrity as a nation." The complete text of his statement reads:

"Thank you very much for forwarding your editorial of July 5 referring to the report of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees.

"Your comments, as always, were incisive and thought provoking. You have also brought to my attention the possibility that my position on our policy toward Israel may be misunderstood. This letter is written to reaffirm my stand taken many times publicly and privately.

"Certainly it was not my intention even by implication to accept the report of Dr. Joseph E. Johnson as a solution to the Arab refugee problem. The reference in the subcommittee report was part of a review of all activities concerning world refugee problems.

"We are in agreement that a realistic, practical solution must be found. Isolated treatment of the refugee problem is not the answer. Lasting peace between Israel and its neighbors can be accomplished only by settlement of all grievances.

"Permanent peace in the Middle East is an essential goal of our policy. Only the parties involved can make this a reality.

"Any settlement must guarantee Israel's integrity as a nation. This country is obligated to fulfill its commitment to see that Israel's independence is not violated. To this end, as you know, I have cosponsored with Senator Humphrey and others a resolution seeking positive administrative action resulting in a withdrawal of nuclear arms from the area.

"Support of the democratic people of Israel is essential in our struggle to free the oppressed. The fires of hope in others will soon die should we default in our promise to the Israelis."

CIVIL RIGHTS—A MORAL ISSUE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, all those who believe that the civil rights issue, in the final analysis, is a moral issue should be heartened to see the religious leaders and organizations of America moving into the forefront of the struggle for equal rights and equal opportunity.

Almost daily we read of national, State and local religious groups not only making eloquent pronouncements but actually laying the groundwork for direct involvement; we see religious leaders in every section of the country physically moving to the frontlines of this struggle.

I am happy to say that the religious communities of Michigan are no exception, and I ask unanimous consent that a resolution passed unanimously by the board of directors of the Metropolitan Detroit Council of Churches be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution passed unanimously by the board of directors of the Metropolitan Detroit Council of Churches, Wednesday, June 12, 1963.

The board of directors of the Metropolitan Detroit Council of Churches endorses the National Council of Churches' recent call to its constituent churches to implement at once their official statements calling for an end to racial discrimination. The churches have made many pronouncements but have lagged in the implementation of them.

The time is here for unequivocal, bold, and resolute action. Further delay would be fraught with grave consequences for society and for the church itself. We would urge the local churches of the member denominations in the Metropolitan Detroit Council of Churches to become personally involved in efforts to end discrimination.

We call for the establishment of fair practices in employment, education, housing, and public accommodations.

We approve peaceful demonstrations expressing concern for full freedom and justice and commend the leaders who have been able to prevent violence, under prevailing tensions.

We commend the action of many denominations in their recent National, State, and local judicatories calling for aggressive moves in facing this critical challenge. We welcome the leadership of the National Council of Churches (in behalf of the denominations) in coordinating these denominational programs and stand ready to carry out our responsibility here in Metropolitan Detroit. We are aware that such a stand may require courage and sacrifice.

We stand ready to share with the Metropolitan Detroit conference on religion and race in its program in this field, desiring to join hands with adherents of all faiths in forwarding this compelling cause.

We recommend, therefore, that a special committee be appointed, including representatives of the various interests of the council and that this committee immediately draw up a plan for council action to be presented at the council's executive committee meeting in July.

CREATION OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT COMMISSION, SOUTH BEND AND MISHAWAKA, IND.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I am happy to announce a precedent-setting move by leaders of labor and management designed to promote the welfare and progress of the South Bend-Mishawaka area of Indiana. These foresighted leaders, after several informal meetings, have set up a commission to study ways in which labor and management can cooperate in the advancement of their community.

Much progress has been made in labor-management relations in this area, but an undeserved image of economic trouble has remained. Part of the commission's job will be to help publicize the present peaceful and progressive climate.

I wish this project well and believe that it may become a model for other organizations for the progress and welfare of other communities. So that this admirable new idea may be spread far and wide, I ask unanimous consent that the news release outlining the purposes and organization of the labor-management commission for the South Bend-Mishawaka area be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The leadership of organized labor and industrial management of South Bend and Mishawaka today united for the first time to work jointly toward "correcting an undeserving and unfavorable economic image of the community" and to provide an official agency to "foster continued area business growth through better labor-management relations."

The precedent-setting announcement was made jointly by Mayors Frank J. Bruggner and Joseph M. Canfield in a special news conference in Mayor Bruggner's offices in the South Bend city hall.

Present at the news conference were members of a special 11-member labor-management commission, appointed by the mayors to achieve the area business climate objectives. The commission, designated as a permanent organization to enhance the area's economic growth, represents organized labor, business, and industrial management, the Federal and State government.

George A. Hupp, former South Bend labor leader and industrial management representative, and now a member of the South Bend staff of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, was announced as chairman of the labor-management commission.

Chester E. Ralston, of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, and T. Forrest Hanna, former South Bend union leader, now on the mediation staff of the Indiana Department of Labor, will be vice chairmen.

Eli D. Miller, assistant executive vice president of the Chamber of Commerce of South Bend-Mishawaka, Inc., was appointed commission secretary.

Other members of the commission announced by Mayors Bruggner and Canfield are:

Stanley J. Ladd, president of the St. Joseph County AFL–CIO Council, which represents 90 union locals and a membership numbering about 35,000.

Norman C. Murrin, president of Local No. 364, Teamsters' Union, with a membership of 4,900.

Roy B. Root, president of the Building Trades Council of St. Joseph County, representing 19 locals and a membership of about 4,000.

C. M. MacMillan, vice president of industrial relations of the Studebaker Corp.

Louis A. Tiedge, director of industrial relations of the four South Bend-Mishawaka divisions of the Bendix Corp.

John A. Toth, general manager of the Bantam Bearings Division of the Torrington Co.

Kenneth M. Burch, executive vice president of the Chamber of Commerce of South Bend-Mishawaka.

Mayors Bruggner and Canfield said the commission was created at the invitation of both labor and management leaders of the area who have met informally in recent weeks to review area business problems, and to explore mutual areas of cooperation. The 11-man commission, the mayors explained, is charged with the responsibility of mobilizing the strength, prestige, and know-how of labor and management, and to pull together toward one common objective—the economic development of the South Bend-Mishawaka area.

Mayors Bruggner and Canfield said both business and labor has shown serious concern over the development and continued nurturing of an economic image for South Bend and Mishawaka which has placed unnecessary, unwanted, and undeserving roadblocks in the path of progress in our communities.

Despite these roadblocks, our two communities have registered marked gains in labor-management relations, particularly during the past 5 years. This progress, resulting from serious and effective approaches to community problems by both labor and business management, has contributed immeasurably to the establishment of a present-day business climate in our communities which have given both labor and management new confidence in our future, the mayors stressed.

The mayors noted that despite these outstanding gains in area labor-management relations in recent years, a past image, not deserved today, paints an undesirable economic picture for South Bend-Mishawaka nationwide. This image also has contributed to a downgrading of our communities among their own citizens, they said.

Specifically, the labor-management commission will "explore areas of mutual community interest in which labor and management can jointly cooperate, and which will have total community impact."

The commission's immediate task was described as one of "documenting labor-management progress in the area" and publicizing this progress and a more favorable business climate resulting from it. The publicity will be disseminated nationwide through the use of all available internal and external communications media, the mayors announced.

Mayors Bruggner and Canfield stated further that the commission also would serve as an official influence agency to assure the least amount of economic loss and community prestige damage in times of labor-management dispute. Intervention in such matters would come only with the approval of the parties involved.

Other commission objectives are "down the road," the mayors noted, and will involve study and programs which could contribute important developments in labor-management relations. Such programs would involve becoming more vocal in "tooting the area labor-management horn," selling the area's civic assets, promoting the community as a desirable locale for new business and industry, promoting existing industry expansion and growth, and exploring joint action in municipal, State, and Federal improvements, in the best interest of the majority of our taxpayers and the citizenry, Mayors Bruggner and Canfield said.

The two municipal chief executives called on citizens of the area and all other organizations to offer full support and cooperation to the commission.

KREBIOZEN

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I am privileged to join in cosponsoring the joint resolution calling for continued interstate shipment of the drug Krebiozen until a fair test has been performed by the National Cancer Institute.

The history of Krebiozen is replete with controversy. Despite substantial evidence to support the value of a test of the drug by the National Cancer Institute, Krebiozen has been tried in the court of the press release, with continual charges and countercharges between the drug's developers and the Federal Drug Administration. The controversy raged while over 5,000 patients were under Krebiozen treatment with beneficial results in 20 to 70 percent of the cases, depending on the type of cancer. Certainly, I am in no position to pass upon the value of the drug, but it is imperative that the National Cancer Institute proceed immediately to test this promising drug for its adequacy as a cure for one of the most devastating diseases known to man.

Now that the drug is threatened with removal from interstate commerce, the controversy has reached even more serious proportions. We need only to read the anguished letters of patients now using Krebiozen to realize that the people, along with their physicians, firmly believe that withdrawal of the drug will result in death. I do not know whether or not Krebiozen is keeping them alive, but I, for one, do not want to take a chance. They must be allowed to use Krebiozen until the National Cancer Institute has established, for once and for all, the value of the drug in fighting cancer.

HAVE WE FORGOTTEN KOREA?

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the 25th of June has passed almost unnoticed by the majority of the American people and by the American press; but it has not passed unnoticed by the families of 27,704 U.S. soldiers who were killed or by the 72,596 who were wounded in fighting the Communist aggressors to maintain the freedom of the Republic of Korea. For it was on June 25, 1950—13 years ago—that the Communist world initiated its first and so far only overt attack against a free-world nation since the bloodbath of the Second World War had terminated only about 5 years previously.

Three years and 1 month later, on the 27th of July 1953, an armistice was signed between the Communists and United Nations representatives at the small Korean town of Kaesong. The Communist onslaught had been halted, and their forces driven back. A defeat of major proportions had been inflicted on them, but one which policy prevented pursuing to its logical conclusion, the complete annihilation of the enemy's military power. The armistice that was signed brought a strange halt to a strange war.

But an armistice—even a 10-year old one—does not constitute peace, and the more than 26 million South Koreans are painfully aware of this; their nation is an armed camp with almost 600,000 men in the armed forces, the second largest military force in the free world. The United States has spent about $2.1 billion since 1945 in the support of these Korean armed forces, plus an additional $3.3 billion in economic aid—a most impressive investment to say the least, but greatly outweighed in relative sacrifice by efforts of the brave Korean people in their own behalf.

Will the 27th of July also pass as a date generally unrecognized by the American people and press?

The 55,000-odd U.S. troops now stationed in Korea, separated from their families and loved ones, will certainly not let this date pass unnoticed. They, together with the Republic of Korea forces and small military units representing Turkey and Thailand, comprise the United Nations Command, with an American general as its Commander-in-Chief, which today is an effective deterrent to renewed Communist aggression.

These troops all know why they are in Korea. They are there to protect the Republic of Korea and the free world from Communist aggression. Their presence makes a reality of American promises to free nations throughout the world that we stand behind them in their efforts to maintain their freedom and to thwart Communist aggression.

The dividing line in Korea between the Communist North and the free South is a 4,000 meter wide demilitarized zone that runs across the Peninsula near the 38th parallel. South of this zone stands American troops, facing their Communist opposites to the north. These American troops are not working a 35- or 40-hour week and they get no extra pay for the long hours and weekends they spend on duty. Many are living in the field under conditions far from comfortable. All are separated from their families and their homes. In the past some have given their lives in the performance of their duties during this armistice period, and at this moment two Army captains are being illegally detained by the Communists. Yet in spite of these conditions, these American troops are willingly and cheerfully performing their duties in order that we at home and the peoples of all other free nations may enjoy the benefits of our freedom and our way of life.

I for one do not intend to let this 27th of July pass without notice. And I wish to publicly express my appreciation for what my fellow Americans serving with the Armed Forces in Korea are doing for me.

SUCKERED BY THE FEUD

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on Tuesday, July 16, 1963, there appeared on the editorial page of the Oakland Tribune, Oakland, Calif., a most significant editorial about the possible political chicanery which could be taking place through the possibility of a propaganda feud between Russia and Communist China. This editorial sets forth the thesis that this feud could be a sucker play between the two Communist powers in an effort to gain more concessions from this country and the free world.

The editorial is excellent and hoists the warning flag for all of us to observe. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Record at this point and commend it to all my colleagues for their edification.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SUCKERED BY THE FEUD

The Kennedy administration's reaction to the alleged Sino-Soviet split has been slightly schizophrenic.

According to the testimony of an Assistant Secretary of State, a major reason why the administration ended the blockade against Cuba so quickly last fall was because it feared and believed that the rivalry between the Soviets and Red Chinese would cause the Soviets to assert their Red bloc leadership by going to war to save Cuba.

But now the administration is arguing the exact opposite. The new line from Washington is that the feud between the Red Chinese and the Soviets is so hot that it may force the allegedly more moderate Russians to seek some sort of rapprochement with the West. Therefore, according to this reasoning, the time is ripe for accommodating the Russians, promoting a test ban treaty even on essentially Soviet terms, and so forth.

What it boils down to is that the New Frontier wanted to appease the Soviets last October because it feared the Sino-Soviet rivalry would drive them to war, and now the New Frontier wants to appease the Soviets because it hopes the Sino-Soviet rivalry might drive the Soviets into moderate, peaceful coexistence with the West.

Obviously, you can't have it both ways. This kind of lunacy among the mighty intellects on the New Frontier is a clear cut indication the administration just plain wants to appease communism, regardless of the excuse.

The very fact that administration liberals are so eager to cite the alleged feud as the reason for accommodating the Soviets should be enough to make smart students of world affairs highly suspicious of the validity of the "feud" itself. It is obvious that the noisy quarrel has been responsible for a real softening of the Western position in the cold war, and therefore its very success is evidence that it is a well-conceived, deliberate instrument of Red-bloc foreign policy.

We are not suggesting that no real differences exist between the two Red powers; what we are suggesting is that the Reds have discovered that the louder they bicker, the more they frighten the New Frontier into making major cold war retreats.

If the feud were truly dangerous to the Red bloc, there would be an immediate effort to smother it in silence and keep it from Western ears. But quite the opposite has been the case. The two Red powers have been trumpeting their charges at each other at the highest possible decibel level, and making sure that Western observers are present at each melee. The Red dictatorships could cut off the noise instantly, but significantly, they have not chosen to do so.

If the feud were genuine, there would be a substantial weakening of the Soviet bloc, caused by lack of cooperation. But far from weakening the Red bloc, the feud is obviously producing major cold war advances.

The great tragedy is that so many Americans, both in government and out, have made their assessments of the quarrel without taking into account the disciplined, dictatorial nature of communism. It is not the Soviet and Chinese people who are making all the racket; it is a handful of skilled Communist Party members. There is no freedom of information behind the Iron Curtain, and the bickering could not occur without the express approval of the Red dictators.

Once again, liberalism's intellectual failure to grasp the totalitarian and cunning nature of communism is endangering the free world. It is urgently important for the

Kennedy administration to climb down from its ivory tower and realize that it is being bamboozled at every turn.

THE INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE: FRIEND OF THE OPPRESSED

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of America's outstanding private organizations devoted to aiding refugees from world tyranny, the International Rescue Committee, is celebrating its 30th birthday this year. This fine group, which has aided oppressed peoples find homes in our land, deserves special congratulations this year for its dedicated and effective service to humanity.

An excellent editorial in the Rochester (N.Y.) Times-Union of June 24 points up the outstanding activities of the IRC and emphasizes properly the mutual benefits to be derived from opening our doors to refugees from abroad. As this editorial notes, those who escape from tyranny tend to become our most dedicated citizens and champions of freedom. That is a fact which should be borne in mind as we in Congress struggle to remove inequities and shortcomings in the immigration laws.

Mr. President, I am pleased to join the International Rescue Committee's many friends and admirers in saluting the organization for its years of tireless service and express the hope that it will continue undaunted in its splendid endeavors.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Rochester Times-Union to which I have referred be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

These People Found Refuge From Tyranny

Einstein, Fermi, Teller, Szilard, and Bethe—these are the names of famous scientists who have moved among us. They are also the names of men who escaped tyranny to live in freedom. There have been many like them in the past, and there will be many more in the future. It's appropriate at the moment that we should remember this.

For this is the 30th year of existence of the International Rescue Committee, America's major nonsectarian voluntary agency aiding refugees from all forms of political persecution.

IRC was first formed in response to the rise of nazism and fascism. After World War II, with Eastern Europe encircled, began the largest migrations of refugees in our lifetime.

By 1963, more than 10 million men, women and children had penetrated the Communist barriers to reach the free world. They came from Berlin, East Germany, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Czechoslovakia, North Vietnam, North Korea, China and Cuba.

If the refugee is indebted to us, so are we to him. For as IRC reminds us, "his loyalty and commitment to freedom are immediate and personal. By the very nature of his escape, he has exhibited courage, energy and resourcefulness."

CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am very pleased to have joined with the distinguished minority leader in cosponsoring S. 1914, a bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America.

The Catholic War Veterans was founded in 1935 by the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward J. Higgins. The purpose of the organization, in its own words, was and has always been "to promote zeal and devotion for God, country, and home regardless of race, creed, or color."

This organization has throughout its lifetime been in the forefront of our Nation's struggle against totalitarianism in all its forms. It has always supported the rights, freedom, and dignity of the individual.

The Catholic War Veterans is recognized by the U.S. Veterans Administration in the handling of cases before it, and has received praise and commendation from every President of our Nation who has held office since it was founded almost three decades ago.

Through its distribution of materials and literature exposing the evils of both communism and fascism this organization has led the fight to keep America free and independent. It has ceaselessly worked to maintain the high moral standards of our citizens through not only the promotion of necessary and worthwhile activities, but just as important through the exposure and elimination of disloyalty in all its forms. In the words of the constitution of this fine organization, these ends are to be reached "through a more vivid understanding of the Constitution of the United States of America and through active participation in the promotion of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

Through service to our Nation and service to the individual, the Catholic War Veterans consistently work to insure America's future. I hope that at this time, on the 28th anniversary of the founding of the Catholic War Veterans, we will honor this worthy organization through Federal incorporation.

Those who have fought for their freedom have a sharpened sense of what it means to defend something they hold dear. This is why the Catholic War Veterans is an important organization: because its members know that freedom is not something you lock up in a vault—not something you can forget about once it is won. It is through organizations such as the Catholic War Veterans that service to our Nation and its heritage can best be carried on.

CIVIL RIGHTS—EDITORIAL

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as the Senate approaches consideration of the civil rights proposals, much is being written in regard to the situation confronting our Nation.

Recently Clyde Reed, Jr., editor of the Parsons Sun, and the son of a former distinguished Member of this body, Clyde Reed, Sr., wrote an editorial that I think is most timely in this situation.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be made a part of these remarks, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the editorial was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Grave Hour

The moment is at hand for President Kennedy to assert leadership in the growing racial troubles of this Nation, employing the full power and prestige of his office. The fuse is short; an explosion impends.

The President must act firmly and decisively. He must lay aside personal political considerations and move in the best interests of all of the people and of the welfare of the country itself.

A breakdown of law and order will not advance opportunity for those now denied it, but rather retard the whole process.

Deliberate flouting of the law, by lay citizens or by men of the cloth, will only inflame passions already at the boiling point.

Vacillation in official station is proving a rocky and dangerous road to equality, a poor substitute for the resolution now required.

Let's face it. Both parties have been guilty of exploiting minority votes in the big cities for political purposes. Promises made with cynical intent were largely designed to be forgotten after election day.

The Kennedy administration may prove to be the more culpable chiefly because it happened to be in office at a critical point, but it cannot escape censure for playing the old political game of both sides against the middle with more than normal vigor.

Developments have passed the stage of picking partisan winners or losers. Higher stakes are involved.

Before this summer of discontent turns into a summer of disaster, the President should go to the country and:

1. Call for a 60-day truce on all demonstrations to ease the strain placed on human emotions by recent events in a season when irritability is always at its highest under the most ideal conditions.

2. Pledge that the Federal Government will deal equally with all those who intentionally violate the law, and urge States and cities to do likewise.

3. Give stress to realities by urging that the greatest gains will come through courts of law and other orderly channels, as indeed they have in the past, and whatever the personal political hazards involved, remove the cruel promise of overnight miracles.

These steps would constitute bitter medicine for some, to be sure. But better such dosages now than serious malady later, for what has been accomplished in the strife and turmoil of recent weeks? Nothing of a positive nature; only bitterness and disunity and the shuddering prospect of far more to come.

The President is the one person to whom the Nation looks to leadership in times of trial. His is the one voice which can command utmost respect. He is able to speak with authority and power if he chooses to do so.

This is a grave hour and those who would disregard the signs of calamity are either foolish or naive. The country need not or must not abandon its goals of equality and opportunity, upon which it is agreed in principle.

It should seek a better perspective, impossible in the heat of controversy, in order that the details can be further refined without the ugliness of name calling, the high price of division, and the tragedy of bloodshed.

This is no time for partisan gambles. It is a time for statesmanship of the highest order, and nothing less.

SPEECH BY TEODORO MOSCOSO TO CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN ARMIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Honorable Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, made an excellent speech on July 19, 1963, before the 1963 conference of the American Armies at Fort Amador, Panama, C.Z. It deserves consideration by my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that this fine address be set forth in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE TEODORO MOSCOSO, U.S. COORDINATOR OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS, BEFORE THE 1963 CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN ARMIES, FORT AMADOR, PANAMA, C.Z., JULY 19, 1963

I

I am grateful for this opportunity to talk to you about the Alliance for Progress, for you are important partners in this noble effort to achieve a better life for all Americans. And make no mistake. The Alliance for Progress is a partnership whose success depends on the best efforts of all its partners: The governments and citizens of Latin American countries and the Government and citizens of the United States.

In the last week of October two events of major significance for Latin America coincided: The United States took its decisive stand in the Cuban crisis; and in Mexico City 20 hemisphere republics, including this country, undertook the first detailed and critical review of their joint program for economic and social development—the Alliance for Progress.

Today, in the perspective of the months since, we find that President Kennedy's determined stand on Cuba helped forge a new unity among the hemisphere republics, and that the danger which the Cuban crisis so dramatically highlighted has greatly heightened the sense of urgency in Latin America about getting on with the work of the Alliance. The President himself, in a message to the Alliance conference in Mexico, noted the vital connection between the two events when he said: "Your meeting is a vital reminder that the central task of this generation of Americans is not merely the avoidance of conflict. It is the construction of a new community of American nations in which all our citizens can live not only free from fear but full of hope. * * * Just as the unyielding determination of today is essential if we are to realize the future promise of the Alliance for Progress—the future success of the Alliance for Progress will be the final vindication of the resolute course we are taking today."

What is this Alliance, why was it created, how is it faring, and what are its chances of success?

The objective of the Alliance for Progress is to meet the rising demands of 200 million Latin Americans through a peaceful revolution. The specific goals are: to raise per capita income in Latin America 2½ percent a year for each of the next 10 years; to reform and modernize agriculture; to build new industries and thus diversify the economies of Latin American countries which now rely on one or a few export commodities for their foreign exchange income; to eliminate violent ups and downs in the commodity trade through regulatory agreements such as the one recently worked out by the world's major producers and consumers of coffee; to bring about one common market through Latin American economic integration; to revamp tax structures and administrative procedures to assure larger government incomes and a fairer distribution of the tax burden; to improve the investment climate and provide new incentives for badly needed private capital—both domestic and foreign.

While pursuing these economic goals, schools and health facilities must be built, and other socially urgent needs met. Social and economic development must go hand in hand, for economic progress is unlikely to be substantial or lasting without social justice.

Last, and most important, all this is to be done within the framework of freedom and democracy.

The Alliance—this joint endeavor of 20 nations—has begun to build. One hundred forty thousand homes have gone up to give decent shelter to families who have been clinging to life in squalid slums. Thousands of land-hungry farmers are being resettled on soil of their own. Large school building and teacher training programs are underway in all parts of Latin America to curb and eventually wipe out illiteracy. And we are helping to build or expand pure water systems, roads, ports and factories—from Mexico to Uruguay, from northeast Brazil to southern Chile.

Unlike the Marshall plan, this is not merely a program to reconstruct a war-ravaged economy; this is an effort to rebuild a society; not merely to repair roads but to build them from scratch through steaming jungles and over icy mountains; not to install new equipment in factories smashed by bombs but to build factories where there were none before and on top of that, train the men to run them.

All this takes time—the commodity in shortest supply and one that cannot be replaced. We cannot afford to waste it by thinking about whether we shall succeed. We use it in order to succeed. But above all, success requires that Latin America assume main responsibility for this undertaking. The Alliance is not a U.S. aid program. It is a vast cooperative effort based on Latin American concepts and dependent on the effective coupling of Latin American self-help with outside assistance. We cannot and do not propose to do the job for our neighbors. We shall do it with them. That is the way the charter of the Alliance directs it.

II

Within the Alliance, the military has a vital role to play, and it is this role that I want to talk about this morning. The military's role is implicit in many of the words of the Declaration of Punta del Este. The declaration, signed by 20 American nations in August of 1961, is the conceptual foundation of the Alliance. Its words are as valid today as they were 2 years ago.

The very first goal of the Declaration of Punta del Este reads as follows:

"To improve and strengthen democratic institutions through application of the principle of self-determination by the people."

The declaration goes on to say:

"This Alliance is established on the basic principle that free men working through the institution of representative democracy can best satisfy man's aspirations, including those for work, home and land, health and schools. No system can guarantee true progress unless it affirms the dignity of the individual which is the foundation of our civilization."

History demonstrates that the military institution can be a powerful force for—or against—democracy. To the extent that the military is responsive to the opinions and aspirations of the people; to the extent that the military achieves true professionalism; to the extent that the military resists and opposes those elements dedicated to the destruction of democracy; to this extent, the military is an important and perhaps crucial force for real and lasting democracy. To the extent that it fails to do these things it is an equally important force against democracy.

Without the support of the military, the words "To improve and strengthen democratic institutions through application of the principle of self-determination by the people" are likely to become words without meaning.

III

The Declaration of Punta del Este also contains the following goal:

"To stimulate private enterprise in order to encourage the development of Latin American countries at a rate which will help them to provide jobs for their growing populations, to eliminate unemployment, and to take their place among the modern industrialized nations of the world."

You may be wondering what this has to do with the military. It has a lot to do with the military.

As any competent economist will tell you, economic growth is largely a function of the rate of investment. It is investment which makes the new jobs and products which are responsible for a higher standard of living. The rate of investment is dependent upon the investment climate, and one of the most important elements in this climate is law and order.

It is apparent to all of us that there are alien forces at work within this hemisphere, forces dedicated to the destruction of democratic institutions, forces to whom individual dignity means nothing. To gain their ends, these forces are more than willing to use a variety of illegal tactics ranging from minor acts of subversion and violence to full-scale guerrilla warfare. If their efforts to disrupt law and order are not thwarted, they will discourage investors both at home and abroad from risking their capital on new ventures. Foreign capital inflow will drop to a trickle; domestic capital will leave the country in search for investment opportunities that involve less risk. The country's economy will stagnate.

The connection between security and development is therefore a very important one. At its worst, a breakdown of security can result in the domination of a country by a totalitarian minority. But even if the threat is one of isolated instances of violence which do not threaten the foundations of the country, the threat is nonetheless a serious one in terms of the development goals of Punta del Este.

At a time when so-called wars of national liberation are the basic tool of a new kind of imperialism, an imperialism that threatens all of us, Latin American military forces must recognize the urgency of this threat, the focus of which is inside national borders, not outside. They must be prepared to defeat this new threat with tactics that very few military textbooks prescribe. They must recognize that the threat feeds on poverty, ignorance, and injustice. They must maintain law and order not merely in the name of anticommunism, or on behalf of a sterile status quo, but in order to permit their people to develop economic growth and social justice in the framework of a free society.

IV

This brings us back to the Declaration of Punta del Este. The second goal reads as follows:

"To accelerate economic and social development, thus rapidly bringing about a substantial and steady increase in the average income in order to narrow the gap between the standard of living in Latin American countries and that enjoyed in the industrialized countries."

This general development goal is amplified by others:

"To wipe out illiteracy; to extend, as quickly as possible, the benefits of primary education to all Latin Americans; and to provide broader facilities, on a vast scale, for secondary and technical training and for higher education."

And—

"To press forward with programs of health and sanitation in order to prevent sickness, combat contagious disease, and strengthen our human potential."

Those among you who have been concerned with the expanding civic action programs of Latin American military forces will recognize at once the important role you can and do play in the achievement of these goals. To me, civic action is a key element of the Alliance for Progress, and it is a tribute to the vision and dedication of the Latin American military that the skills, equipment, organization, and leadership of the military are being applied to basic economic and social problems.

I was in Bolivia several months ago, and what I saw the armed forces doing to improve their country and the life of their people was most impressive. Roads are being built and repaired; virgin areas are being colonized; maps of the country are being prepared; rural schools are being built; small communities are being supplied with pure water; medical services are being provided to people in remote areas. And all this—and more—is being accomplished through the resources, energy, and dedication of the Bolivian armed forces.

I know that the armed forces of all Latin American countries are engaged in this type of activity. Through civic action you are demonstrating your commitment to the principles of Punta del Este, and we heartily applaud you.

V

There is one more statement in the Declaration of Punta del Este which has important implications for the Latin American military. I quote:

"For their part, the countries of Latin America agree to devote a steadily increasing share of their own resources to economic and social development."

Fulfillment of this commitment requires unprecedented discipline on the part of the governments and peoples of Latin America. We would be deceiving ourselves if we thought that the objectives of Punta del Este could be achieved without considerable sacrifice. Austerity now can mean abundance later. If we do not face up to our responsibilities now, there may be no "later."

At the present time, military expenditures in Latin America approximate $1½ billion annually. This is more than the U.S. Government made available for the Alliance last year. I know that much of the military spending is for such high priority missions as internal security and civic action. Yet I feel that money may be being spent for lower priority purposes, and expenditures for such purposes may result in the nonavailability of resources needed for high-priority economic and social development tasks.

A million dollars will buy a lot of things. You may be able to get 40 tanks or a hundred howitzers with it. You may even be able to buy one new jet fighter. But this same million dollars can do many other things.

It can buy a daily glass of milk for 50,000 children for 1 year.

It can build 500 rural schools.

It can make graduate engineers out of 130 secondary school graduates.

With this million dollars in hand, you will probably be able to obtain an additional million dollars from an external lending agency. With the $2 million you may be able to build 100 kilometers of fair-weather road, or build an electric power plant with an output capacity of 10,000 kilowatts, or provide supervised agricultural credit to permit 4,000 small farmers to improve their farms.

I recognize that you are not responsible for the distribution of your governments' resources among the competing requirements of the various ministries. I only ask that in developing your requirements you keep in mind the nonmilitary needs of your country, many of which are critical. If we fail to respond to the legitimate aspirations of the people for a better way of life, no amount of arms can assure us of freedom and security.

VI

There is one special title in the Charter of Punta del Este which deserves special mention: Latin American economic integration.

It seems to me that you, the military of the Latin American republics, must be among the first to realize that your countries will achieve their full potential and constitute a source of real and constructive power in the modern world only when you do what Western Europe has done: build a common market. In Central America, this movement has made mighty strides. In the rest of Latin America, it is progressing somewhat more slowly and along different paths. But the movement is on. The Charter calls for economic integration precisely because it seeks to convert the Latin American countries from a group of raw material exporters at the mercy of a fickle world market, into a well-knit economic system diversified and strong enough to influence the world economy rather than merely be influenced by it. In this direction lies strength and a role in world events to which the Latin American countries are entitled but which under the old system of economic isolationism they have sought in vain.

VII

In the context of the Latin American situation today, true military professionalism means, among other things, the recognition by the military of the real needs and demands of the people. It means making the all-important distinction between popularly-rooted forces whose aim is the development of a truly democratic society and those who would undermine and subvert society on behalf of foreign interests. Patriotism is not merely the unmasking of destructive conspiracies; it is also the strengthening of the forces of progress and modernization against those who are insensitive to the demands of millions for a new and better life.

Increasingly, I have found the military in our countries redirecting their thinking and their activities toward these modern objectives.

The trend clearly is away from "personalismo," from coups and revolutions which bring a mere change of faces without any change in policy, away from the suppression of legitimate opposition elements; away from callous disregard for the real problems of the majority of the people. With few exceptions, the military in Latin America today are showing a greatly increased sense of political, economic, and social responsibility, including their prime duty of supporting constitutional civil government. They show growing awareness of the economic and social problems which are at the heart of security problems that are the normal concern of the military.

The military are learning—in Latin America, in other parts of the world as well as in my own country—that unless they concern themselves constructively and along with other responsible elements with the root causes of the problems that plague their peoples, they will be doing the work of Sysiphus. They will be rolling that stone up the mountain and finally will find the mountain so steep and the stone so heavy as to strain their ability even to keep it from rolling back.

Your recognition of these facts of developmental life in the 20th century is one of the most encouraging and hopeful elements in our common quest. Against this background, it is readily evident that you have a vitally important role to play in the Alliance for Progress.

By your commitment to the principles of democracy, your struggle against subversion and violence, your civic action programs which contribute so importantly to economic and social development, and your restraint in placing drains on national resources, you can be a decisive factor in the success of an undertaking which must succeed if freedom is to flourish in this hemisphere.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF CATTARAUGUS COUNTY, LITTLE VALLEY, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Cattaraugus County, Little Valley, N.Y.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution is as follows:

MEMORIALIZING FEDERAL LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING PROSECUTION FOR FRAUDULENT CHECKS

Whereas, in the course of conducting business, business people frequently are called upon to honor personal checks amounting to less than $100; and

Whereas certain unscrupulous individuals have exploited this practice, particularly where fraudulent checks are issued and passed in jurisdictions other than the State where the makers of these checks reside or conduct business, they knowing full well that the crime cannot be prosecuted where they live or conduct business and that the crime does not subject them to extradition, with the result that every year untold thousands of dollars are stolen from various business people in the United States who are not afforded any form of legal relief: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Cattaraugus County Board of Supervisors does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation making the issuance of fraudulent checks a Federal offense, punishable in any Federal court where either the crime is committed or the check passer resides or conducts business; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the board be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to President Kennedy, to the Attorney General of the United States, to J. Edgar Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to Senators Javits and Keating, and to Congressman Goodell, urging the introduction and enactment of legislation accordingly.

Adopted July 10, 1963.

MIDDLE EAST POLICY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, U.S. policy in the Middle East will be coming under more and more critical attention as the present climate of tension and crisis deepens in that region. The continued fighting in Yemen accompanied by Egyptian bombing of Saudi Arabian villages in Soviet-built planes, the bullet-punctuated political upheavals in Syria between the Ba'athist government and supporters of President Nasser of Egypt, the unstable siutation in Jordan which is being rocked by President Nasser's propaganda agitation and subversive activity, the fears in Israel aroused by President Nasser's hostile threats and the missile program allegedly being developed in Egypt by former Nazi scientists—all these developments which can be traced to the policies of President Nasser, endanger the objectives of peace and stability in the Middle East sought by the United States. I have urged our Government to suspend or withhold foreign aid to the U.A.R. if President Nasser continues his aggressive and warlike activities in violation of the express aims and objectives of the Foreign Assistance Act.

U.S. policy in the Middle East proposes to give a so-called "evenhanded" treatment to the U.A.R. and to Israel, which leads us into a position where we treat friends and foes of peace alike. This is an untenable and ill-advised posture for our Nation, and it is time we abandoned it.

An informed analysis of U.S. policy in the Middle East which seeks as objectively as possible to present all considerations has been written by Claire Sterling, a correspondent with considerable experience and background in this region. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record with my remarks the article entitled, "The Never-Ended War of the Middle East," which appeared in the Reporter magazine, July 18, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE NEVER-ENDED WAR OF THE MIDDLE EAST

(By Claire Sterling)

In the nearly 7 years since the Israelis fought their hundred-hour preventive war in the Sinai Desert, they have lived in peace with their Arab neighbors. While the two sides are still not on speaking terms, each has been careful to avoid provoking the other—the Arabs because they could not now win another war, the Israelis because they have had no reason to fight one. The circumstances, however, appear to be changing.

There is every likelihood that another war would already have broken out if King Hussein of Jordan had failed to quell the riotous Nasserite mobs in his capital in April. Throughout the crisis, Israeli troops were massed on the Jordanian border, ready to invade should Hussein fall. Once again, as in 1956, the Israelis feel endangered by new political and military developments in the Arab world and are prepared, when and if they judge the danger intolerable, to act accordingly.

A Western visitor to Cairo doesn't readily see why the Israelis should be so worried. The atmosphere is nothing like that back in 1956, when the first huge arms shipments were flooding in from Russia, and Nasser, unsure of himself and his power, was under great pressure to use them. The inexperienced young colonel of those days is a lot more relaxed now. With a considerable reputation for statesmanship abroad and not a shadow of opposition at home, he need no longer feel driven to prove his mettle by marching on Tel Aviv. Notwithstanding his solemn pledges to the Arabs, his closest associates say—privately, for Western ears only—that he has no intention whatever of doing so.

"Nasser has long since given up any thought of Israel's military annihilation," one of them told me. "The problem will solve itself some day, when we Arabs are strong enough to seal off the Israelis economically and diplomatically. Meanwhile, force is out. In the first place, Nasser doesn't like bloodshed. But even if he did, he wouldn't be fool enough to risk everything in a war that could only end with foreign intervention and occupation."

One might question Nasser's distaste for bloodshed, considering that he has had 28,000 Egyptian troops fighting in Yemen—against fellow Arabs. But he would unquestionably be risking a great deal by attacking Israel, now or for many years to come.

ILYUSHINS AND REALITIES

Theoretically, the Egyptian ruler should have no trouble winning such a war. His Soviet-stocked arsenal at this point is roughly twice the size of Israel's and boasts nearly all the deadliest weapons of modern warfare except nuclear bombs. Among them are about a thousand tanks, including several hundred T–54s, which travel faster and farther on less fuel than any produced in the West; self-propelled artillery with a range 50 percent longer than the best made in Britain; a fleet of 11 submarines; and an air force that has lately acquired supersonic MIG-21's and TU-16 medium jet bombers to add to a large supply of MIG–15's, MIG–17's, and MIG–19's and the lighter Ilyushin-28 bomber. The MIG–21 can reach any part of Israel from any Arab airport in 5 minutes; the Ilyushin-28 can carry up to 4,400 pounds of explosive; and the TU–16, a high-altitude, long-range bomber comparable to the American B-47, carries a bomb payload of nearly 20,000 pounds. Since Nassar is known to have at least 60 Ilyushin–28's and 40 TU–16's, presumably he could drop more than a million pounds of explosive on Tel Aviv in a single bomber run.

Nevertheless, he has already learned from his experience in the Sinai Desert that quantitative military superiority is not enough. Most experts agree that Israel cannot be defeated on the battlefield—with conventional weapons, at any rate—unless it is invaded by all the bordering Arab states simultaneously and faced with troops who can match the Israelis in technical skill and adaptability. Nasser could not turn out troops of that kind for another 10 or 15 years, if then; and it may be just as long before the Arab states are sufficiently united to mount a concerted attack.

Despite their grand proclamation of a new United Arab Republic on April 17 the Syrians, Iraquis, and Egyptians have already lapsed into violent disagreement. The Ba'ath socialists in Syria and Iraq, desperately in need of popular support after their respective revolutions last winter, had seized upon the issue most likely to muster it—Arab unity—and pressed the federation plan on Nasser. But the Ba'athists had been waiting a long time for their first taste of power in the Middle East and they did not intend to lose it in a merger that was bound to end up (as the 1958–61 union with Syria had) under Nasser's personal domination. Having duly paid homage to the principle of unity, therefore, they promptly took steps to block it in practice. Barely a fortnight after returning to Damascus and Baghdad from the federation conference in Cairo, they arrested all the pro-Nasser army officers they could lay hand on. This is hardly a promising start for the second United Arab Republic, if it ever gets started at all.

MUCH QUID, LITTLE QUO

Assuming that Nasser were so unrealistic as to invade Israel under these conditions, he would at once face the possibility of American intervention on the Israelis' side—for that is a solemn U.S. commitment in the event of such an attack—and of the Russians thereupon coming to his own rescue. The risk then would be not only to his independence but also to his exceptionally privileged and profitable position. From the time the U.N. and the United States turned his military defeat in the Sinai into diplomatic triumph at Suez, Nasser's influence throughout the Middle East has made him immensely attractive to both the Russians and the Americans. In addition to at least $500 million worth of armaments and all the foreign currency needed for the Aswan High Dam, the Russians have given him another $500 million in development credits. The United States has matched that sum and is now furnishing half the wheat and a third of all the food consumed in Egypt. Both benefactors have said that no strings were attached to this aid, and Nasser has taken them at their word. Few nationalist leaders have extracted so much from the two major powers and given so little in return.

Unlike Fidel Castro—"an inept man, and a coward," in the estimation of one of Nasser's aides—the Egyptian ruler has refused to accept even an implied political commitment to Khrushchev. He has supported the Soviet diplomatic position when it happened to coincide with his own interests. But at the Belgrade neutralists' conference in September, 1961, he spoke out sharply against Soviet resumption of nuclear testing; his delegation was openly in league with the Chinese against the Russians at the Afro-Asian conference in Moshi, Tanganyika, last February; and he has not even deigned to let his local Communists out of jail. Indeed, he has been a ruthless opponent of the Communists in Egypt and throughout the Middle East.

Characteristically, Nasser has treated the Americans no better. At the same Belgrade Conference, he led the field in sponsoring an extremist anti-American resolution; in Moshi, he and the Chinese jointly wrote a resolution defining the U.N. as a tool of American imperialism; and despite urgent pleas from the State Department, he has not hesitated to drop napalm bombs on scores of villages in Saudi Arabia—whose good will is vital to our oil interests—or to welcome the aid of a thousand Soviet "technicians" (pilots and military experts) for the present war in Yemen against the royalists and their Saudi allies.

Nasser's ability to get away with all this has depended mostly on a mutual conviction in Washington and Moscow that a cutoff in aid from either capital would simply increase the flow from the other. But in part, too, it has depended on his unusually skillful use of triple-speak, using one reassuring language for private conversations with the Russians (including a recent 15-hour talk with Khrushchev's son-in-law, Alexei Adzhubei), another for the Arabs, and a third for the Americans, with whom he never fails (again in private) to profess his friendly inclinations toward the West.

While never quite knowing what to make of this performance, American diplomats have tried to make the best of it. They had not expected to buy Nasser's friendship, still less his loyalty, when they decided in 1958 to restore the aid that had stopped during the Suez crisis. The decision was made because we could not refuse indefinitely to have normal relations with the man who not only headed the one stable Arab regime in the Middle East but who already dominated the Arab scene and might some day control it. The State Department realized that our aid would inevitably strengthen Nasser in Egypt and the Arab countries, and it tried at first to minimize this result. Officially, that is still what we are trying to do, following a policy described by an embassy spokesman in Cairo as nonalinement toward all the Middle Eastern Arab States. Actually, however, our policymakers have gradually come to feel that the prospect of strengthening Nasser isn't necessarily threatening and might even be beneficial. The assumption is that Nasser is our best guarantee against the extension of Soviet influence in the area, that he is the most likely of all Arab leaders to handle the Israeli problem with restraint, and that his kind of Arab nationalism, with its stress on economic and social revolution, is much more likely than the old-fashioned dynastic and/or reactionary kind to win out in the end, bringing peace and stability to the disordered Middle East. Consequently, the State Department has not tried to use whatever modest influence it has to prevent Nasser from spending money for political projects in Syria and Iraq, where he might be a stronger anti-Communist bulwark than the feeble Ba'athists; or in Jordan, where our support for Hussein at the time of the Nasserite riots was offered only belatedly; or even in Yemen, where we have put little pressure on Nasser to keep his bargain with the United Nations. (Though he has long since agreed to a U.N. proposal for a gradual withdrawal of both Egyptian and Saudi Arabian troops from Yemen, Nasser has simply been withdrawing a few thousand men in the daylight hours and replacing them by fresh troops at night.) Nor, beyond setting some technical limits, have we ventured to tell Nasser how he ought to spend his money at home.

KNOW-HOW ON THE NILE

On the whole, he has not done badly in his efforts to renovate Egypt. The high dam at Aswan is far advanced and ahead of schedule, with 20,000 employees working around the clock. Industry is developing fairly rapidly, and is well on the way to covering national needs for sewing machines, refrigerators, TV sets, fertilizer, and assembled trucks and automobiles. The nationalized Suez Canal is doing well and its former owners have by now even been paid off in full. The growth rate has been running at a creditable 5 percent a year, and while the fellaheen are still miserably poor, the per capita income has been rising steadily.

That is certainly a better record than most players in the positive-neutralist game can claim. But it could be much better still were it not for Nasser's other interests. Though Egypt is constantly in need of emergency foreign aid to cover its deficits, Nasser has been spending $250,000 a day, or a total so far of more than $60 million, on the war in Yemen. And large amounts are being spent on propaganda abroad—teachers, political agent, and a shortwave radio network more effective than the Voice of America's. By far the biggest sums, however, said to total more than half a billion dollars annually, are going into Nasser's secret arms factories at Helwan and Heliopolis.

Despite tight security regulations, a good deal is known about what goes on in these factories—not just because of Israel's recent sensational disclosures but also through more detailed reporting in several responsible European publications, including the reliable Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung. None of these reports confirm the Israeli charge that Nasser is trying to build an atomic bomb—though a former German artillery officer now in Israel's employ recently told a Swiss court that he had bought a million dollars' worth of fissionable materials for Nasser last year. They do, however, confirm the following:

There have been German and other foreign scientists and technicians working in Egypt (as in Israel and many other countries) since about 1950. Their number has been increasing steadily since 1956, when Nasser, irked by Russia's inability to send spare parts for the MIG-15, decided to build his own jet planes. At present there are about five hundred of these experts, all but a dozen of whom are working in Military Factories 36 and 135 to develop two kinds of aircraft: the HA-200 jet trainer and the HA-300, a supersonic pursuit plane whose performance, on paper, is better than the French Mirage III's. The plane bodies are being made under a license sold to Egypt by Professor Willy Messerschmitt, and the mach 2 engine is being designed by Ferdinand Brandner, an Austrian engineer who had worked first at the Junker aircraft plant in Germany, then as a prisoner of war in Russia, where one of his engine designs was used for the famous TU-114.

So far, about 12 of the HA-200's have been assembled, entirely from imported parts. The first prototype to be shown publicly was actually flown in readymade from Spain (which also has a Messerschmitt license). Repainted with Arab markers, it made a dramatic appearance in last July's Independence Day parade as "the first Arab plane." The wildly cheering crowds had no notion that the pilot, as well as the plane, was Spanish.

There is nothing wrong with Nasser's idea of building his own planes, except that 12 similar planes purchased abroad would have cost him about $12 million, whereas these, still in the experimental stage, have already cost him $250 million. What causes concern is another and costlier Nasser project: the development of an Arab guided missile.

Contrary to Egyptian claims, Nasser did not wait to start his missile program until the Israelis goaded him into it. While Israel's first weather rocket was fired in the spring of 1961, Nasser's program began in 1960, when he hired Prof. Eugen Saenger, head of the Stuttgart Research Institute of Jet Propulsion Physics. Under pressure from the West German Government (which was under pressure from Israel), Saenger later withdrew. He has been replaced by Wolfgang Pilz, a rocket-propulsion specialist who worked at Peenemünde, home of the German V-2, and Paul Goercke, an expert in guidance mechanisms who is also a veteran of Peenemünde. Although the former head of Peenemünde, Wernher von Braun, claims that neither Pilz nor Goercke is a topflight scientist, both were decorated in France for their decisive contribution to development of the Veronique rocket. (Their merit has also been recognized by the Israel secret service, Shin-Bet, whose agents have threatened Goercke's life and nearly succeeded in assassinating Pilz.) With a team of 10 assistants, they were able to produce 2 experimental missiles for Nasser in barely a year.

Foreign correspondents invited to see these missiles fired last July found it hard to take them seriously. The range was effective enough, since one of the two, named El-Kahir, could travel 560 kilometers to a point "just south of Beirut," as Nasser put it (Israel lies just south of Beirut). But both had a 72-hour countdown, and, since the reporters were not permitted to see where they landed, they were unable to make any evaluation of their guidance system.

So long as the money rolls in and foreign scientists abound, however, Nasser's chances of eventually perfecting his missiles are excellent. He would then have a sophisticated offensive weapon against which the Israelis would presumably have no defensive shield, and whose performance would depend upon a relatively small technical staff that could be hired. Clearly, this would change the whole concept of military strategy for both sides, not to speak of what it would do to our diplomatic calculations.

One cannot help wondering why Nasser is diverting such tremendous sums from his country's development to build a weapon he manifestly does not need for his country's defense. The most charitable explanation is that he wants to impress the Arabs. The danger, however, is that he will overimpress them. The fact that he has displayed such a weapon, imperfect as it is, has already sent a thrill of admiration, pride, and excitement through the Arab world. What would the Arabs expect him to do when the weapon becomes operational, enabling him—or so they believe—to strike at Tel Aviv with impunity? Would the United States, which has done nothing to prevent its construction, be in a position to take resolute action against its use? Would Nasser himself then have second thoughts about Israel's military annihilation?

DEFENDING A BEACHHEAD

The Israelis do not believe that any second thoughts would be necessary. Living among the Arabs, they understand—though they do little to alleviate—the Arabs' frustration and bitterness, their rankling sense of injustice and incurable hostility toward this interloper state. Few Israelis doubt for a moment that Nasser would attack them whenever he had a reasonable chance of victory, and the country's defense planning is based on this supposition.

Planning Israel's defense has always been extraordinarily difficult. There are 2,350,000 people in the country now, living on a narrow littoral only 250 miles long; three-quarters of them are concentrated in Tel Aviv and the outlying suburbs, only 8 miles from the Jordanian border; and except for the Mediterranean on the west, the country is surrounded by Arab states with 61 times as much territory, 20 times as many people, and at least 3 times as much modern armament. (Syria and Iraq have Russian equipment, too.)

To survive as a tiny island in a hostile Arab world, the Israelis have relied partly on their powerful friends abroad and on the eternal quarrels among their Arab neighbors, but above all on a superbly educated and trained army, a lightning system for mobilizing all able-bodied men and women, and an arsenal which, if not as amply stocked as Nasser's, is sufficient to convince the Arabs that an attack wouldn't pay. Their chief suppliers have been France and, more recently, West Germany, which, according to Deputy Defense Minister Shimon Peres, is now giving Israel almost as much military help as the French do. Until lately, the Israelis had gotten very little armament from the United States. But the arrival of Khrushchev's MIG-21's and TU-16's in Cairo created such a conspicuous defense gap that Washington has agreed to fill it by supplying Israel with the ground-to-air Hawk missile.

The Hawk, however, would not be a defense against Nasser's ground-to-ground missile, nor do the Israelis have any military deterrent of that kind. They could certainly develop one if necessary; their scientific competence has been proved by the successful firing of the weather rocket Shavit II and the construction of an atomic reactor. But so sophisticated a weapon would add greatly to Israel's already immense defense burden. The Israelis, Peres told me, are not "hysterical" about Nasser's missile. Admittedly, it would reduce Israel's biggest single military advantage—the superiority in discipline, skill, education, and morale of the individual Israeli soldier. "But even in a sophisticated weapons system, the human factor, the ability to improvise, still counts," he said. "The problem is not that the missile makes us nervous but that it makes the Egyptians confident, which increases the danger of war. We are not worried so much about the outcome of such a war—we can hurt them at least as much as they can hurt us, and we have more to defend—as by the human cost of it. By the time help comes, if it comes, the cost could be frightful."

OVER JORDAN

It is because of this increased potential, both in the danger of war and the human cost of it, that the Israel Army mobilized on Hussein's border last April, with its eyes on the River Jordan's west bank. The Arabs have always charged that Israel had designs on the west bank, so as to get more living space. With its 7,000 square kilometers of land, they say, the west bank would expand the Israelis' cramped quarters by a third, making it possible for them to keep their otherwise impossible commitment to take in all the Jews of the diaspora.

This reasoning might have been valid 15 years ago when Israel came into being, but it isn't any longer. The 50,000 Jews who have been coming in each year are being absorbed with growing ease. The Israelis now are able to feed more than 3 million people, roughly what their population should be in 1973. Now that they have food surpluses, they no longer care so much about reclaiming the Negev, and still less about acquiring another tract of desert next door. Where the famous Jordan River pipeline had been designed originally for irrigation in the Negev, its main purpose now will be to serve the cities and factories. Israel is solving its space problem by building upward instead of outward, and the agriculture that used to be its lifeline is giving way to industry.

What interests the Israelis about the west bank is that it probes deeply into their territory in two elongated curves, the more northern of which is within walking distance of Tel Aviv. I drove the 8 miles from this closest Jordanian border point to the heart of Israel's biggest city, through traffic, in 15 minutes. So far, the military danger here has been slight, since the Jordanian Army has only antiquated British equipment and Hussein has never cared to tangle with his more powerful neighbor. But there are 800,000 Palestinian Arab refugees encamped on the west bank who would like nothing better. These are the most expendable of all Arabs because they are homeless, and they believe they have the best claim to wage a "just" war.

"If Jordan were in Nasser's orbit," said an Israel Army spokesman, "he would be spared the need to send his troops across the long Sinai, past the U.N. police force patrolling its frontier since 1956, so as to strike at Israel. He could simply concentrate his tanks, artillery, and planes in Jordan, and arm the Palestinian refugees for an invasion in which the loss of lives would not much matter. Geography would make it physically impossible for the United States to intervene, at least in time to prevent appalling bloodshed, and political considerations—remember, these would be Palestinian invaders—wouldn't make intervention so simple, either."

Even if Nasser did not attack, the spokesman went on, the possibility that he might would keep Israel in an unbearable state of tension. All that has been gained in these 7 years of peace, and all that might be gained in another 7, would be put in jeopardy. Industry and trade are rapidly expanding and personal income has already reached an average of $1,500 a year. If the growth rate continues and private investors (non-Jewish as well as Jewish) are not frightened away, the Israelis should be able to export $1 billion worth of consumer and capital goods by 1972, twice their present level.

Reasoning in this way, the Israelis have said from the start that a pro-Nasser regime in Amman would be a casus belli, and their truculent stance at the border during the Nasserite riots in the Jordanian capital last April left little doubt that they meant business. Accordingly, Nasser did not press his Jordanian insurrection to a successful conclusion: for the present (especially with 28,000 of his troops in Yemen), he is not ready for a clash with Israel in Jordan or anywhere else. The Israelis believe, however, that he will consider himself ready when his missiles are ready, perhaps even before then if favorable diplomatic conditions prevail.

WHERE WE COME IN

There is a good deal of hard thought in Washington at the moment as to how or whether Nasser might or should be kept out of Jordan. The question was simpler in the days when the State Department did not mind being identified with old-fashioned kings. Since it does mind now—indeed, since the United States has become a sponsor of "progressive change" here and elsewhere—it cannot very well take Hussein's side against Arab nationalists who want an economic and social revolution, nor can it make an arbitrary distinction between those revolutionaries who don't like Nasser and those who do. While the Americans might hope, therefore, that Nasser will tactfully stay out of Jordan for the sake of peace, they have not yet found any tactful way to tell him that he must. On the other hand, there seems to be no doubt in Washington as to what the United States should do if Nasser does take over Jordan, and Israel thereupon invades the west bank. The Kennedy administration is formally pledged in that event to intervene actively and directly—with or without the U.N.—to drive the Israelis back.

Anxious to avoid that eventuality, the Americans have tried hard during and since the recent Jordan crisis to dissuade Israel from taking precipitate action. The danger point, they have argued, would not be reached when and if a pro-Nasser regime was installed in Amman, but when and if Nasser started to move his planes and tanks into Jordan and arm the Palestinian Arabs—a hypothetical date still comfortably remote. The Israelis have not ignored this counsel, because they can't afford to. Their state could scarcely have come into being and certainly could not have survived for these 15 years without American support, both diplomatic and financial.

Financially, American aid is less important than it used to be. Where West Germany has been sending $200 million a year for private and public reparations, the United States is sending just under $100 million, nine-tenths of it in the form of private contributions. But in terms of security, America's diplomatic support has been indispensable. However invaluable the military help furnished by France and West Germany, it is the United States that has been sole keeper of the peace in the Middle East since Suez—or, more precisely, the sole guarantor of all existing frontiers in the area, both Arab and Israeli.

As formulated recently by President Kennedy, the American position sounds reassuring: "The United States supports social and economic and political progress in the Middle East. We support the security of both Israel and her neighbors. We seek to limit the Near East arms race which obviously takes resources from an area already poor, and puts them into an increasing race which does not really bring any great security. We strongly oppose the use of force or the threat of force * * * and we also seek to limit the spread of communism in the Middle East. * * * In the event of aggression or preparation for aggression, whether direct or indirect, we would support appropriate measures in the United Nations, adopt other courses of action on our own to prevent or to put a stop to such aggression."

Since not all these objectives are compatible, obviously much will depend on where the State Department puts the most emphasis. While the Israelis do not think the declaration particularly relevant to the specific problem of Jordan and the general one of Nasser, they are divided as to how far the State Department can be trusted. In fact, there is sharp disagreement among men like former Premier Ben-Gurion and his successor, Levi Eshkol, ex-Commander in Chief Moshe Dayan, and Shimon Peres over whether Israel can afford to rely on U.S. protection in the difficult days ahead, and whether or when, under what conditions, it should fight.

In weighing the matter, the Israelis must consider their relations not just with the United States but also with the U.N. and especially with the new African states, whose numerical strength in the organization is steadily increasing. In the past few years, Israel's quiet program of technical assistance has spread throughout the continent. There are 300 Israeli experts working now in Ghana, the Ivory Coast, Tanganyika, Guinea, Mali, Upper Volta, and a dozen other places, helping to reorganize armies and water systems, train nurses and social workers, and set up technical schools and shipping lines. The program has won such warm friendship in Africa that Nasser was not even able to introduce, let alone pass, an anti-Israel resolution at the recent African summit meeting in Addis Ababa. Considering the tireless Arab effort to isolate Israel economically and diplomatically, the Israelis can hardly afford to lose these new African friends, either.

With all this in the balance, the Israelis face a dramatic dilemma. They cannot remain passive if the balance of power in the Middle East swings too far in their disfavor. And if necessary, they are willing to defy the whole world again, as they did in 1956, by fighting another preventive war. Before doing so, however, their Parliament has appealed to the United States, Russia, and the U.N. for total and controlled disarmament in the Middle East. This resolution of the Knesset was a cry of alarm. For a war in the Middle East could not be local, and if it were to be fought with the sophisticated weapons now in preparation—with or without atomic warheads—it would be a microcosm of, and perhaps the prelude to, a third world war.

U.S. EXPORT EXPANSION EFFORT INEFFECTIVE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate an excellent critique of the administration's export expansion program which appeared in this morning's Wall Street Journal.

The article is critical of the effectiveness of the administration's present efforts on grounds that it lacks aim and direction and that it has failed to devise an effective incentive to our exporters. I believe the administration should respond on both counts.

On May 27, I introduced a bill, S. 1614, calling for the creation of a National Advisory Council on Export Policy which would go a long way to remedy the lack of aim and direction in the Government's export drive. The bill has bipartisan cosponsorship of leading Members of the Senate, among them Senators CASE, COOPER, ENGLE, HUMPHREY, KEATING, LONG of Missouri, MORSE, MOSS, SCOTT, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I have been assured by the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, whose committee has jurisdiction over this bill, that he will hold hearings on the bill at an early date.

On July 10 during the course of a debate on our balance-of-payments situation, I proposed that a system of tax credits be established specifically as an incentive to our exporters. I want to urge the administration to give this proposal urgent and immediate consideration. I believe that the question of whether such a tax incentive would be a violation of GATT rules should be resolved within GATT. It makes no sense that waiver by certain European countries of taxes on exports should be considered legal, while at the same time it is contended that waiver of U.S. income taxes on exports should be treated as an export subsidy and therefore in violation of GATT rules.

I am glad to note that the administration is now considering asking GATT to modify their stand on this question and that the Commerce Department is continuing to campaign within the administration for the enactment of tax credit on export legislation. Such legislation should have strong congressional support.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Lee Silberman, entitled "Administration Drive To Spur Foreign Sales Show Meager Results," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of July 22, 1963, be printed in the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPORT TROUBLES—ADMINISTRATION DRIVE TO SPUR FOREIGN SALES SHOWS MEAGER RESULTS—HEAD OF CAMPAIGN QUITS HIS POST; EXPORT-IMPORT BANK DEATH ADDS TO PROBLEMS—NO 1963 RISE IN TRADE SURPLUS?

(By Lee Silberman)

WASHINGTON.—When President Kennedy last week gave Congress his plans to stem the outflow of dollars and gold from the United States headlines dwelt on his proposal to tax American purchases of foreign securities. Few noted his comment that the surplus of U.S. exports over imports "is not enough" to do the job.

But these words help explain why Mr. Kennedy feels the United States must now place its first peacetime restrictions on capital movements. Earlier his administration had talked up an export-boosting drive as a painless step to end the dollar drain. Even before the President spoke, however, evidence was accumulating that this drive was getting nowhere fast, and stronger medicine might be needed.

The Commerce Department, for instance, figures that in the first 5 months of 1963 it drew 18,500 businessmen to clinics at which Government and business speakers try to induce companies to enter export markets by describing foreign sales methods and opportunities. But it concedes only 500 of those attending actually were prompted to make their first shipments abroad. A top aid calculates these new exporters for the full year will chalk up only $75 million sales abroad—or less than 0.4 percent of the total U.S. merchandise exports expected this year.

SLOW EXPORT GROWTH

Partly as a result, U.S. nonmilitary exports in 1963's first 5 months hit an annual rate of only $21.4 billion. That was only 2 percent above the annual rate of the like 1962 period, though the administration has been predicting a 10-percent gain for the year.

Imports meanwhile rose 3 percent in the January–May period, to an annual rate of $16.6 billion, and are expected to rise further now as U.S. prosperity creates a bigger market for foreign goods. So President Kennedy last week conceded the all-important surpus of exports over imports this year is unlikey to exceed last year's $4.3 billion; some other authorities expect a decline.

With the export surplus showing little growth, the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit has been growing again, largely because of an outflow of U.S. private capital, particularly for long-term investment abroad. At last report in the first quarter the balance-of-payments deficit hit an annual rate of $3.3 billion, up from the 1962 full-year figure of $2.2 billion and approaching the record $3.9 billion of 1960. The deficit is believed to have risen further in the second quarter, though figures aren't available yet.

A payments deficit occurs when the total of U.S. private and Government spending, lending, investing and giving abroad exceeds total income from foreign transactions. It's dangerous because foreign nations can use the dollars they thus accumulate to buy gold from the shrinking U.S. gold stock, most of which is needed by law to back the value of U.S. currency.

HEAD OF DRIVE QUITS

Future prospects for the administration's export promotion drive are even more cloudy. For one thing, the drive has now lost its head mar Last year Mr. Kennedy with some fanfare appointed Draper Daniels, a well-known Chicago advertising man, to the new Commerce Department post of national export expansion coordinator. A few days ago, however, Mr. Daniels quietly left his job.

The White House has not yet acknowledged Mr. Daniels' departure, nor said if it will name a successor. A Commerce Department official says Mr. Daniels left with "no bad feelings." But in his last weeks in office Mr. Daniels had let it be known that he had doubts about the aims and direction of the export drive.

Mr. Daniels' doubts are shared by a growing number of influential critics, including Allan Sproul, former president of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, and a committee of the American Bankers Association. Generally, these critics concede export promotion is necessary, and they don't contend the Administration has mishandled the drive—though some believe too much emphasis has put on pep talks to would-be exporters when more basic steps are needed.

EXPORT LIMITS SEEN

But the critics imply the administration has been rather naive to put so much faith in export expansion as a way of stopping the dollar drain. If export could somehow be expanded enough "to clean up deficits of the present magnitude," says one trade specialist, "other countries almost surely would clamp on even more trade restrictions than already exist," thus cutting exports again.

And few authorities think exports can be expanded that much to begin with. Mr. Sproul, for one, believes exports face so many obstacles that the most vigorous promotion will be needed simply to maintain Uncle Sam's present foreign-trade position.

The obstacles to the export push are varied, and some may be temporary. An annoying one right now is that the Government's Export-Import Bank technically has been out of existence since June 30 because House and Senate committees can't agree on how it should be financed. The Bank underwrites credit to finance foreign sales by U.S. business, and some major U.S. manufacturers say foreign orders are beginning to pile up because of the lack of this credit machinery; undoubtedly some business is being lost, too.

Another obstacle, at least according to President Kennedy, is that Congress has refused to appropriate $6 million the administration had requested to expand the Commerce Department's export-promoting clinics and other activities. In his balance-of-payment message last week he urged the appropriation be restored.

But the biggest obstacles have little to do with these congressional controversies. They involve economic conditions in prime oversea markets for U.S. goods and the troubles encountered by U.S. exports of farm products such as cotton.

In recent years economic conditions, and so demand for goods, have not been uniformly strong in all major foreign markets at one time, but have tended to pulsate unevenly. Last year, for example, economic growth in the European Common Market boosted U.S. exports there. But exports to Canada—the biggest U.S. customer—were held down by temporary tariff increases imposed by the Dominion to help that country weather a currency crisis, and exports to Japan fell because that nation imposed restraints to correct a balance-of-payments problem of its own.

This year finances have improved in both countries and their purchases of U.S. goods are rising—but now the boom in Europe is slowing and U.S. exports to the Common Market are expected to slow, too. Higher external tariffs imposed by the Common Market July 1 are bound to restrict them further.

COTTON EXPORTS DROP

Agricultural exports currently account for about 25 percent of all U.S. exports. So any decline in sales of U.S. crops abroad requires a huge increase in manufactured-goods exports to offset it. Last year, even though total U.S. exports rose to a record $20.9 billion, a $347 million drop in cotton sales abroad took away much of the gain from a $444 million rise in machinery exports.

In addition to these troubles with merchandise exports, the administration is confronted with a seeming decline in the export of U.S. production processes and technological knowhow. In the past many U.S. firms have licensed foreign manufacturers to use their patents and technological expertise; income from these licenses is not counted as export income but also helps cut into the balance-of-payments deficit.

Booz, Allen & Hamilton, a management consulting firm, makes periodic surveys of foreign business activities of some 1,300 U.S. companies. In the second half of 1962, its latest survey shows, only 22 percent of those activities involved licensing, down from 29 percent the year before.

John L. Church, vice president of Booz, Allen & Hamilton, believes this decline stems from a realization by U.S. companies that long-range opportunities for foreign business expansion are lacking in a licensing arrangement. After the license expires, nothing is left. On the other hand, companies that go abroad through joint ventures or by building their own plants are building for the future.

WESTINGHOUSE FOREIGN-PLANT PLANS

The building of U.S. plants abroad cuts into U.S. goods exports, too; in some cases sales made by foreign plants almost completely supplant the sales a company used to make by shipping goods from the U.S. Plant-building abroad is expanding, too. Westinghouse Electric Co., which long tapped foreign markets chiefly through exports and licensing arrangements, now plans to set up a string of plants in Western Europe to make such things as washing machines and refrigerators.

The Kennedy administration is unhappy about such direct investments abroad for reasons apart from their effect on exports. It grumbles that the money sent out of the United States to build foreign plants adds directly and importantly to the balance-of-payments deficit. Last year the administration secured from Congress a tax law that among other things tightened tax treatment of earnings from some U.S.-controlled business operations abroad.

This hasn't stopped the foreign plant building trend. In fact, the outflow of dollars directly invested abroad by U.S. business in the first quarter of 1963 came to about $550 million, one of the largest totals on record. Businessmen contend these investments in the long run will help ease the balance-of-payments problem because foreign plants and other holdings return income to the United States. Even last year, they point out, income returned to the United States from private investments abroad, at $3.8 billion, vastly exceeded the $1.5 billion sent out of the United States to make new direct foreign investments.

At any rate, the administration, while not yet conceding its export-boosting drive is in trouble, has moved well beyond it to vigorous action on other fronts to cut the balance-of-payments deficit. Besides asking for a tax on American purchases of foreign stocks and bonds, President Kennedy last week told Congress the administration has worked out a complex arrangement designed to encourage foreign nations to put some of their surplus dollar holdings into the International Monetary Fund, rather than using them to buy U.S. gold, and promised a $900 million a year cut in the Government's spending abroad.

On the other hand, the President also stressed further measures aimed at boosting exports. For instance, he announced an investigation of ocean freight rates, which, he said, are "far higher for eastbound freight than for comparable items headed for our shores."

This is a new tack in the administration's export-boosting drive. To date, the drive's chief elements have been the attempt to induce more companies to enter the export market, and development of a new credit insurance program for exporters.

To induce more businessmen to export, the Commerce Department has persuaded bankers and businessmen versed in foreign trade to serve without pay on 33 "regional export expansion councils." The councils operate out of Commerce Department field offices, and furnish speakers and programs on export procedures at such occasions as chamber of commerce meetings.

Council speakers typically describe various services the Department offers to exporters. They point out, for instance, that for $50 a would-be exporter can order a "trade contact survey" from a U.S. Foreign Service officer abroad, who will track down prospective agents, distributors, or licensees in a specific country. They might mention, too, that the Department will arrange to send a U.S. company's promotional literature along with members of one of its trade missions going to a distant point, such as the one slated to visit Malaysia and Hong Kong from October 5 through November 6.

The export credit insurance program has two main facets: Export-Import Bank guarantees of loans by commercial banks to foreign purchasers of U.S. goods, and the sale to exporters of credit insurance policies at relatively low premiums. The policies are issued by the Bank in collaboration with the Federal Credit Insurance Association, a specially formed group of marine and casualty insurance companies. They protect an exporter against both commercial risks (such as failure of a foreign customer to pay his bill) and political risks (such as devaluation of a foreign currency).

BIG SAVINGS CITED

Many firms interested in foreign sales have found these programs helpful. Old Town Corp., a Brooklyn maker of office supplies, says Commerce Department services have saved it "many thousands of dollars" in lining up licensees in seven countries. Indeed Marshall Mazer, a vice president, says the company has not yet had to send one executive traveling abroad to set up these operations.

Exporters have been happy to avail themselves of the credit insurance program, too. The Export-Import Bank last year issued $346 million in export credit guarantees and helped underwrite $482 million in credit insurance. Recent moves by the Bank to cut redtape in these programs are understood to have pushed up its volume of new business so far in 1963, too; Alfred H. Von Klemperer, a vice president of New York's Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., says his bank has experienced "a considerable increase in the number and size of foreign transactions" it finances under Export-Import Bank guarantees. Though "Ex-Im" hasn't been able to approve new commitments since it technically died June 30, its staff is still busy processing applications while awaiting new legislation renewing its charter.

Federal trade promoters sometimes complain, however, that in addition to their other problems they don't always get cooperation from other branches of the Government. Shortly before leaving his job as export expansion coordinator, Draper Daniels charged that the State Department has not sufficiently insisted that U.S. ambassadors give U.S. trade efforts their fullest support, and also that businessmen too often are selected for trade missions on the basis of political considerations rather than merit.

OTHER STEPS ADVOCATED

Some Commerce Department officials further believe the Justice Department should abandon its opposition to permitting U.S. companies to form special export combines to fight foreign competitors for oversea sales. They contend this would be legal under the almost-forgotten Webb-Pomerene Act of 1918—an interpretation now being pressed by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., recently appointed Under Secretary of Commerce. President Kennedy soon may have to decide this controversy between Justice and Commerce.

Another step that the Commerce Department has long advocated is legislation to give exporters and shippers a credit against Federal income taxes on their foreign sales. This might allow U.S. companies to sell goods more cheaply abroad than at home—a practice already followed by many European exporters who don't collect on their foreign sales the sales taxes that are imposed when they sell goods at home.

The problem with any push for a U.S. tax credit for exporters is that it would violate the rules of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, an international body to which the United States belongs. The administration has been thinking about asking GATT to modify its stand on income tax credits for exporters, but so far as is known has not yet reached a decision.

ATTACK ON CONSTITUTION BY SILENT AMENDMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues who have so far spoken out on the floor against the three constitutional amendments proposed by the Council of State Governments at their December 1962 meeting. It was their proposal that the State legislatures be given power to amend the Constitution; that a court of the Union be established, so that State supreme court justices could reverse decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States; and that the Supreme Court's reapportionment decision be reversed. It is apparent that these proposals, if adopted, would vitally undermine the Federal system of checks and balances built into the Constitution by the Founding Fathers. Virtually unnoticed, a number of State legislatures have adopted these proposals, despite their extremist character. Fortunately, however, the bar in various States is beginning to alert the public and members of State legislatures to the danger involved in such proposals. The Association of the Bar of the City of New York has just issued a report on the proposals, stating that they would "revolutionize our form of government and turn the clock back to the Articles of Confederation of 1777—which proved to be a failure and which were replaced 10 years later by the Federal Constitution." I ask unanimous consent that the report of the association's executive committee be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Report[1] on Three Amendments to the U.S. Constitution Proposed by the Council of State Governments

INTRODUCTION

The Council of State Governments, meeting in Chicago in December 1962, approved three resolutions[2] for action by State legislatures petitioning Congress to call a convention[3] to propose three amendments to the U.S. Constitution, which may be summarized as follows:

1. To provide that if two-thirds of the State legislatures approve identical texts of a proposed constitutional amendment, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives must so certify and such amendment shall be deemed to have been proposed without further action by Congress and when ratified by legislatures of three-fourths of the States shall become a part of the Constitution.

2. To provide for the establishment of a Court of the Union, composed of the chief justices of the highest courts of each of the States which would have authority to reverse the U.S. Supreme Court in matters relating to the rights reserved by the Constitution to the States or to the people.

3. To provide that no provision of the Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature and that the judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit or any controversy relating to apportionment of representation in a State legislature.

Considering the far-reaching character of the proposed amendments, they have made remarkably successful, but until recently unnoticed, progress in State legislatures since they were proposed by the council last December.

---

[1] This report was prepared by the executive committee in consultation with the association's committee on Federal legislation. The executive committee wishes to express its appreciation to the chairman and the members of that committee for their valuable assistance.

[2] The full texts of the three proposals are annexed hereto as appendixes A, B, and C, and reasons for their adoption advanced by the Council may be found in "Amending the Constitution to Strengthen the States in the Federal System," 36 State Government 10 (1963).

[3] The proposal for a constitutional convention is an innovation since this alternative of amending the Constitution has never been used. Article V relating to amendments reads so far as it is pertinent here:

"The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress."

The proponents of the amendments argue that Congress would be required to call a convention if legislatures of two-thirds of the States adopt and file with Congress identical resolutions containing the text of the proposed amendments, petitioning Congress to arrange a convention to "propose" them. The soundness of that conclusion has been challenged. Black, "The Proposed Amendment of Article V: A Threatened Disaster," 72 Yale L.J. 957 (April 1963). While the committee shares Professor Black's views, the risks attendant upon the possibility that Congress might under such circumstances feel constrained to call a convention for the limited purpose of proposing these particular amendments are so great that the committee believes that the organized bar should take all possible steps to convince Congress, the public, and State legislatures of the unwiseness of these proposals so that the stage at which Congress would face the difficult and unprecedented problem of deciding whether it would be required to call a convention will never be reached.

Based on the information available: [4]

Eleven States; i.e., Arkansas, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming have passed the first resolution proposing the amendment giving the States power to amend the Constitution, and it has been passed by one house of the State legislatures in eight other States; namely, Colorado, Indiana, Iowa, Mississippi, New Jersey (but later rescinded), New Mexico, Oregon, and Wisconsin.

Four States; i.e., Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, and Wyoming have passed the second resolution proposing the Court of the Union amendment, and it has been passed by one house of the State legislatures in six other States; namely, Mississippi, New Jersey (but later rescinded), New Mexico, South Carolina, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

Fourteen States; i.e., Arkansas, Idaho, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska (but vetoed by the Governor), Nevada, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah,[5] Washington, and Wyoming, have passed the third resolution proposing the apportionment amendment and it has been passed by one house of the State legislatures in six other States; namely, Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Mississippi, New Jersey (but later rescinded), and Oregon.

Advanced by their sponsors purportedly in support of the principle of States' rights and to correct what they believe to be a presently existing grave imbalance in the division of the powers of Government between the Nation and the States,[6] the proposals are in fact accurately described by Prof. Charles L. Black, Jr., of Yale Law School, as "radical in the extreme."[7] In an analysis of the three proposals, Professor Black has stated: [8]

"They aim not at the preservation but at the subversion of that balance in Federal-State relations which has, in the words of the (Council of State Governments) report, enabled us to escape 'the evils of despotism and totalitarianism.' * * * They constitute, collectively, one more attempt, so late in the day, at converting the United States into a confederation. * * * The wisdom of peace and the sacrifices of war alike warn against starting down that ruinous road."

Taken collectively, the three proposals would result in (1) placing the power to amend the National Constitution in the control of State legislatures, (2) placing the final construction of the Constitution in the hands of judges whose offices are created and whose salaries are paid by State legislatures, and (3) exempting State legislatures from any effective policing by the U.S. Supreme Court or Congress of their representative character.

Each of the proposed amendments is analyzed below and the views of the committee with regard thereto are stated.

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CHANGE THE AMENDING PROCESS [9]

Set forth below is article V of the Constitution showing the changes which would be effected if the Council of State Governments' proposal were adopted (new matter which would be added by such amendment being italicized and present matter which would be deleted by such amendment being shown in brackets): [10]

"ARTICLE V.—AMENDMENTS

"The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, [shall propose Amendments to this Constitution,] or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, *shall propose Amendments to this Constitution,* [shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments,] which [, in either Case,] shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States. *Whenever applications from the Legislatures of two-thirds of the total number of States of the United States shall contain identical texts of an amendment to be proposed, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall so certify, and the amendment as contained in the application shall be deemed to have been proposed, without further action by Congress.* [, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no] *No* State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate."

The effect of this proposed amendment would be to

1. Abolish the present alternative method of proposing amendments, whereby, upon application of legislatures of two-thirds of the States, Congress shall call a convention for that purpose.

2. Abolish the present alternative method for ratification by conventions in three-fourths of the States (instead of by State legislatures in such number of States) if Congress so decides, of amendments which have been proposed either by Congress (by two-thirds of both Houses or by a convention called by Congress for the purpose.

3. Substitute a procedure whereby the Constitution may be amended by (a) filing with Congress applications from legislatures of two-thirds of the States which contain identical texts of a proposed amendment, (b) certification of such filing (a purely ministerial act) by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, and (c) ratification of such amendment by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

Under present article V an amendment to the Constitution cannot be proposed except after national deliberation and presumably the achievement of something like a national consensus either in Congress by a two-thirds vote of both Houses (including the House of Representatives where at least the voting power is roughly proportional to population), or by a national convention (upon proper application of two-thirds of the States) called and constituted by Congress. The council's proposal, on the other hand, would bring about a "change in the distribution of ultimate power,"[11] giving to the States, acting through their legislatures, power not only to propose, but also to ratify, amendments to the National Constitution.

State legislatures, by the very nature of their purpose and function, have relatively small acquaintance with problems viewed from a national perspective. They have little or no experience in dealing with problems in such perspective. Moreover, even given the best of intent on the part of any State legislature, there would be great difficulty in acquainting the members with the attitudes, views, and needs of sections of the country other than their own. Whereas a congressional committee can obtain views from many areas of the country at a single hearing, the States would require 50 hearings. In addition, the greater publicity which is given to Washington activities provides a greater likelihood that proposed amendments will be given the full consideration which they deserve and not slipped through the legislative mill without publicity.

While the Constitution describes a federation of States united as a Federal Nation, the proposed amendment moves in the direction of a confederacy.[12] By completely bypassing all national organs (except for the ministerial roles assigned to the President of the Senate and the Speaker), the proposed amendment seeks to give the individual States the final voice on questions of national importance. The political theory expressed by the proposed amendment is similar to that behind the Articles of Confederation, a philosophy rejected by the authors of the Constitution. It also partakes of the doctrines of Calhoun and other States rights advocates, which were rejected by the War Between the States.

The amendment appears in an even more dangerous light when one takes into consideration the fact that many State legislatures are grossly unrepresentative of the people within the States—a condition which the third proposal of the National Council of State Governments would perpetuate.[13] To commit the process of amending the Federal Constitution to the control of the State legislatures would result in permitting constitutional amendments to be adopted which had support from only a minority of national citizenry. Professor Black has pointed out[14] that 38 least populous States, whose legislatures might under proposed article V repeal the full faith and credit clause, contain about 40 percent of the country's population. He further states: [15]

"In the best table accessible (compiled by the National Municipal League, New York Times, Mar. 28, 1962, p. 22, col. 3) relevant data are given for 34 of the 38 least populous States of the Union. On the average, it takes 38 percent of the people in one of these States to form the constituencies of enough State senators or representatives to pass a measure through the more accurately representative house of the State legislature. Taking this figure as good enough for present purposes, if the proposed article V were in force, the income tax could be abolished, by repeal of the 16th amendment, if about 15 percent of the American people were represented by legislators who desired that result."

Professor Black explains that this figure is arrived at by taking 38 percent (the percentage of people in the relevant States necessary, on the average, to control the legislature) of 40 percent (the percentage of the American people residing in the 38 least populous States).

THE COURT OF THE UNION AMENDMENT [16]

This amendment would provide that upon demand of the legislatures of five States, made within 2 years after the rendition of a judgment by the Supreme Court "relating to rights reserved by the Constitution to the States or to the people," such judgment shall be reviewed by a court to be known as the "Court of the Union," composed of the chief justices of the highest courts of the 50 States. The issue before the court would be whether "the power or jurisdiction sought to be exercised on the part of the United States" (apparently as reflected in the judgment of the Supreme Court under review) was a power granted to the United States under the Constitution. A majority of the Court of the Union (that is, State chief justices representing 26 of the States) would have the authority to reverse the Supreme Court decision. The proposed amendment further provides that decisions of the Court of the Union upon matters within its jurisdiction would be final, could not be overruled by any court and could be changed only by a constitutional amendment.

---

[4] New York Times, Apr. 14 and 15, 1963, and May 2 and 15, 1963; release of Council of State Governments, May 3, 1963.

[5] The Utah resolution was adopted in somewhat different language than that proposed by the Council of State Governments.

[6] National Legislative Conference Committee on Federal-State Relations, report to the general assembly of the States, Dec. 6, 1962, statement of principles (obtainable from the northeastern regional office of the Council of State Governments, 1201 Bar Building, 36 W. 44th St., New York, N.Y.).

[7] New York Times, Apr. 14, 1963.

[8] Ibid.

[9] See app. A.

[10] Capitalization and style of present art. V are retained.

[11] Black, supra, note 2, at 957.

[12] A "confederacy" is a "body formed * * * by States * * * united by a league"; it is a "looser union than a federation." Webster's Third New International Dictionary. For example, in the Article of Confederation of 1777, art. III provided that the "States hereby severally enter into a firm league of friendship with each other * * *" and art. II stated, "Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom and independence, and every power, jurisdiction and right, which is not by this confederation expressly delegated to the United States, in Congress assembled."

[13] See discussion at p. 30, infra.

[14] Black, supra, note 2, at 959–960.

[15] Id. at 960.

[16] See app. B.

On its face the proposal purports to establish a court with fairly limited jurisdiction with power to decide only a single issue, but the Court of the Union's jurisdiction would inevitably be broad and sweeping. In giving the court jurisdiction to review "any judgment of the Supreme Court relating to the rights reserved to the States or to the people" the proposal would in effect allow the court to review practically any Supreme Court decision interpreting the Federal Constitution. In a government of granted powers any case involving a constitutional question necessarily determines whether rights have been reserved. Moreover, it is to be expected that the Court of the Union would be the final judge of its own jurisdiction, for an inferior court could hardly determine the jurisdiction of a superior court.

The proposal, therefore, would transfer the ultimate judicial power in this country from a court whose members are responsible to a nation to one whose members are avowedly responsible only to individual States. As such we believe it objectionable in its attempt to reverse the trend of history and to change principles on which the country has been founded and developed.

Apart from the undesirability of such a transfer of ultimate judicial power, the proposal is objectionable, because it would place the judicial power in a body that could not be expected to be independent. The Court of the Union will consist of the chief justices of each of the States, and there is no restriction on the manner in which the chief justices are to be selected. Many States elect their chief justices, in some cases for relatively short terms. Thus, the members of the court would not have a guarantee of life tenure that would permit them to be immune to the whims and tyranny of transient majorities within their States. Under these conditions, it cannot be hoped that they would act on the controversial issues that inevitably would be before them in a judicial rather than a legislative manner.

In addition, the authors of the proposal have ignored the practicalities of constitutional litigation in several substantial respects:

1. Procedure of the Court. The size of the Court and the dual functions of its members raise serious doubts concerning the ability of the Court to function like an ordinary judicial tribunal. The Court of the Union would be too large to consider issues in the ordinary judicial manner of collective deliberation. The requirement of a majority of 26 for affirmative action renders written opinions on decisions unlikely. Moreover, each member of the Court of the Union would have a full-time job as chief justice of his State, but the issues to be considered by the Court of the Union should doubtless receive extensive consideration. Either the administration of State justice must suffer, or the constitutional issues must receive less than due consideration.

2. Representation. Although the drafters clearly consider the real parties in interest to be the States and the Federal Government, there is no indication of how governmental interests are to be represented. Important constitutional questions may arise in private litigation, and an amicus appearance may not be adequate in all cases, when the decision is to have the finality planned for the Court of the Union. But intervention of right would make the lawsuit unwieldly if many exercised the right.

3. Burden to litigants. The possibility of Court of the Union review would mean that Supreme Court decisions on constitutional questions could not become final for a minimum of 2 years after delivery. This additional time and the opportunity for a losing litigant to canvass various State legislatures will add considerably to the already heavy expenditure of time and money needed for constitutional litigation. Moreover, even if the litigants wish to terminate the litigation, they cannot do so, for the States may always act on their own initiative.

4. Constitutional paralysis. The Council of State Governments objects to the present finality of Supreme Court decisions. But the Supreme Court can overrule its own decisions, and Congress can frequently change the effect of decisions by legislation (e.g., cases involving Federal preemption). The Court of the Union's decisions, however, "shall be final and shall not thereafter be overruled by any court and may be changed only by an amendment of this Constitution." This suggests that the Court of the Union cannot reconsider its own decisions in the light of changed circumstances and imposes a greater finality than now attaches to decisions of the Supreme Court. Such finality would stifle constitutional growth.

In brief, the committee's basic objections to this proposal are that (1) it would commit the interpretation of the Federal Constitution (with its characteristic of national law) into the hands of a court which would be representative not of the national judiciary but of the judiciary of the individual States, and (2) the chief justices representing 26 of the least populous States would have the power, in the final analysis, to decide what the Constitution means. Taken together with the other two proposed amendments, this proposal would take the United States further down the back road from nation to confederacy.

THE APPORTIONMENT AMENDMENT [17]

With the avowed purpose of overruling the Supreme Court's decision in *Baker* v. *Carr*,[18] this proposal would amend the Constitution to provide that no provision of the Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature and would further provide that the judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit in law or equity or to any controversy relating to apportionment of representation in a State legislature.

Regardless of one's views on the merits of the Supreme Court's decision in *Baker* v. *Carr* (as to which the committee in this report takes no position), the committee opposes the "apportionment" amendment because in principle it is opposed to diminishing Federal constitutional guarantees under the "equal protection clause" of the 14th amendment, and also because it believes that to embark upon a policy of introducing exceptions to the "equal protection clause" is dangerous and may lead eventually to whittling away that vital constitutional guarantee.

Moreover, the proposal goes beyond the 14th amendment's equal protection clause. It provides that "no provision of the Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature." This apparently would provide sanction for States to use " 'apportionment' as a guise for rank racial discrimination, in contravention of at least the purpose and spirit of the 15th amendment." [19]

The proposal is also open to the objection that it would thwart the constitutional provision (art. IV, sec. 4) by which the United States guarantees "to every State in this Union a republican form of government," since the proposed amendment would deprive the Federal judiciary and Congress of authority to implement that guarantee, no matter how gross might be the malapportionment in any particular State, and since experience has shown that correction of malapportionment abuses is unlikely to be made by the State legislatures themselves.

The effect of the adoption of this proposed amendment would be not only to remove from the jurisdiction of U.S. courts matters relating to apportionment of representation in State legislatures, but it would also deprive State courts of jurisdiction of such matters on Federal constitutional grounds.

Beyond doubt, adoption of this proposal would entrench more deeply existing abuses and make it unlikely that such abuses would ever be corrected.

Finally, if adopted, this proposal would constitute the first diminution in American history of any Federal constitutional guarantee of liberty, justice, or equality. Together with the other two proposals in the Council of State Government's package, it would work a profound, and in the view of the committee, a damaging change in the government of our country and in Federal-State relationships.

CONCLUSION

Advanced by their sponsors in the name of "conservatism" and the tradition of States' rights, the full impact of these three proposals, when viewed in the light of our constitutional history, is radical in the extreme. It is not overstating to say that should these amendments to the Constitution be adopted it would revolutionize our form of government and turn the clock back to the Articles of Confederation of 1777—which proved to be a failure and which were replaced 10 years later by the Federal Constitution.

RECOMMENDATION

The executive committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York believes that it is the duty of the organized bar to speak out publicly and emphatically against the adoption of these ill-conceived amendments and to take steps to educate the public as to their real significance. Accordingly, the executive committee recommends to citizens, to State legislatures, and to Congress, that the three amendments proposed by the Council of State Governments (as set forth in appendixes A, B, and C to this report) be rejected.

Respectfully submitted.

---

[17] See app. C.

[18] 369 U.S. 186 (1962), where the Court held that Federal district courts have jurisdiction of suits by qualified voters for members of a State legislature to redress alleged deprivation of such voters' Federal constitutional rights arising from malapportionment of seats in the legislature, on the ground that such voters are thereby denied the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment.

[19] Amendment XV provides that the right of U.S. citizens "to vote shall not be denied or abridged * * * by any State on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude" and empowers Congress to adopt enforcing legislation. See Anthony Lewis, "Justice Aide Says 'States' Rights' Amendments Would Cost Negroes the Vote," New York Times, May 2, 1963.

The executive committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York: Arthur H. Christy; Merrell E. Clark, Jr.; Mark N. Donohue; William Everdell; Henry Harfield; Mendes Hershman, chairman; Seymour M. Klein; George S. Leisure, Jr.; Charles Looker; E. Nobles Lowe; Russell D. Niles; Sheldon Oliensis; Charles F. Preusse; Ross Reid; Andrew Y. Rogers; Whitney North Seymour, Jr.

Ex officio members: Herbert Brownell, president of the association; George P. Kramer, secretary; Melbourne Bergerman, treasurer.

Former presidents of the association: Dudley B. Bonsal,[20] Allen T. Klots, Louis M. Loeb, Orison S. Marden, Whitney North Seymour, Harrison Tweed, Bethuel M. Webster.

JUNE 4, 1963.

APPENDIX A

A [joint] resolution [1] memorializing Congress to call a Convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to article V thereof

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That this legislature respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a Convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Article V of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or, on the application of the Legislatures of two-thirds of the several states, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several states. Whenever applications from the Legislatures of two-thirds of the total number of states of the United States shall contain identical texts of an amendment to be proposed, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall so certify, and the amendment as contained in the application shall be deemed to have been proposed, without further action by Congress. No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

"SEC. 2. This Article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several states within seven years from the date of its submission."; be it further

Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a Convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

APPENDIX B

A [joint] resolution [1] memorializing Congress to call a Convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That this legislature respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a Convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Upon demand of the legislatures of five states, no two of which shall share any common boundary, made within two years after the rendition of any judgment of the Supreme Court relating to the rights reserved to the states or to the people by this Constitution, such judgment shall be reviewed by a Court composed of the chief justices of the highest courts of the several states to be known as the Court of the Union. The sole issue before the Court of the Union shall be whether the power or jurisdiction sought to be exercised on the part of the United States is a power granted to it under this Constitution.

"SEC. 2. Three-fourths of the justices of the Court of Union shall constitute a quorum, but it shall require concurrence of a majority of the entire Court to reverse a decision of the Supreme Court. In event of incapacity of the chief justice of the highest court of any State to sit upon the Court of the Union, his place shall be filled by another justice of such state court selected by affirmative vote of a majority of its membership.

"SEC. 3. On the first Monday of the third calendar month following the ratification of this amendment, the chief justices of the highest courts of the several states shall convene at the National Capital, at which time the Court of the Union shall be organized and shall adopt rules governing its procedure.

"SEC. 4. Decisions of the Court of the Union upon matters within its jurisdiction shall be final and shall not thereafter be overruled by any court and may be changed only by an amendment of this Constitution.

"SEC. 5. The Congress shall make provision for the housing of the Court of the Union and the expenses of its operation.

"SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission."; be it further

Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a Convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

APPENDIX C

A [joint] resolution [1] memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), that this Legislature respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a Convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. No provision of this Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any state in the apportionment of representation in its legislature.

"SEC. 2. The judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit in law or equity, or to any controversy relating to apportionment of representation in a state legislature.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission."; be it further

Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a Convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to join the Senator from New York in his remarks. It seems to me that these amendments—which, in various forms, and as submitted at various times, I have read—would do much to undermine our system of government. So I cannot believe that the amendments would ever be passed.

If I correctly understand the remarks of the Senator from New York, let me say that the conference of Governors has within the last few hours taken a position against them. Is not that correct?

Mr. JAVITS. Entirely so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a former Governor, and having attended six of the Governors' conferences, I know the value of the consideration given at them; and I am happy to join the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to the Senator from Massachusetts, especially because he has one of the most distinguished minds in this Chamber and he also is considered a very constructive proponent of the conservative point of view. This only emphasizes what persons such as myself have constantly emphasized; namely, that when it comes to constitutional practices and guarantees, there are no liberals or conservatives; there are only those who move forward in the tradition of American public life and those who do not do so. So I am especially grateful to the Senator from Massachusetts for his contributions on this subject.

I ask unanimous consent also to print in the RECORD with these remarks the article entitled "To Form a Much Less Perfect Union," which appeared in the New York Times magazine on July 14, by Dr. Henry Steele Commager, professor of history and American studies at Amherst College, and one of the great American historians of our time.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO FORM A MUCH LESS PERFECT UNION

(That, says a historian, is the aim of today's States rights movement, a philosophy concerned less with guaranteeing freedom than inducing anarchy.)

(By Henry Steele Commager)

Not for more than a century has the doctrine of States rights been so defiantly proclaimed as now; not since Appomattox has it found such widespread support.

---

[20] Judge Bonsal did not participate in the preparation or consideration of the report.

[1] This resolution should be in whatever technical form the State employs for a single resolution of both houses of the legislature which does not require the Governor to approve or veto.

We can dismiss as irrelevant the demagoguery of a Governor Wallace or a Governor Barnett. But we cannot dismiss so easily the formal endorsement by as many as a dozen States of constitutional amendments which embody a States rights philosophy and assert no confidence in the Constitution and the Government of the United States. Revolutionary as these proposed amendments are, they have received curiously little public attention. Indeed, it is safe to say that the average American is wholly unaware of them or of the changes they would bring about in the American constitutional system.

The first of these proposed amendments is a clumsy effort to repeal the Supreme Court decision, in *Baker* v. *Carr*, that Federal courts may take a hand in reapportioning seats in State legislatures; it would deny them any jurisdiction in this area. The second, and most pernicious, would allow State legislatures to bypass the Congress entirely in the amendment process by permitting amendments to the Federal Constitution solely through State action. The third would create a super Supreme Court to be composed of the chief justices of the 50 States, with power to overrule decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in all cases involving State-Federal relations. So far, the first of these amendments has been approved by 12 States, the second by 11, the third by 4.

There is perhaps little likelihood that the gestures toward constitutional anarchy will command the support of three-fourths of the States, or that they will be endorsed by the Congress. Yet we should not forget that the Bricker amendment—designed to paralyze presidential conduct of foreign relations—failed of passage in the Senate by but one vote, and that the 22d amendment limiting Presidents to two terms—an amendment which President Eisenhower himself called an example of retroactive vindictiveness—slipped through the Congress and the State legislatures almost without notice.

What we are witnessing in these amendments—and in the defiance of the Supreme Court by State Governors, in the assault on the constitutional powers of the President to conduct foreign affairs, in the ground swell of revolt against what is vaguely called Federal centralization—is not merely a recrudescence of States rights. It is an expression of something deeper—of a philosophy of antigovernment and of no-government. Whereas the Constitution was designed to form a more perfect Union, this is an effort to form a much less perfect Union. It is a philosophy, in fact if not in concept, of constitutional anarchy.

For one thing which is clear is that the proponents of these amendments are not genuinely concerned with the powers of the States. They are concerned with nonpowers in the Nation. They do not want to see State governments invigorated, carrying through broad legislative programs; they want to see the National Government frustrated, incompetent to carry through legislative programs. The ambition which animates them is not to strengthen the States, but to paralyze the Nation.

Does anyone for a moment suppose that if the apportionment amendment should by some quirk become law, the States would then proceed to reapportion legislative seats on a fair basis? They have had 50 years in which to deal with the problem and have failed to do so; some States have actually defied their own constitutional mandates requiring decennial reapportionment.

Does anyone really suppose that if the amendment permitting the States to bypass the Congress in the amending process became law, the States would proceed to set their domestic houses in order—to end the scandal of racial discrimination themselves, to reform antiquated tax structures, to deal vigorously with the problems of conservation and of public lands, to take care of the needs of public education and public health through a series of constitutional amendments? Clearly, the new authority would be used not to carry through programs of public welfare but to repeal existing programs of public welfare.

Does anyone for a moment suppose that if the fantastic proposal for a super-Supreme Court were to materialize, that court would rule impartially between the claims of State and Nation? That amendment would enable 26 chief justices representing (and representing unfairly) States with one-sixth the population of the United States, to rewrite constitutional law. In all likelihood, such a court would strip the Supreme Court of that crucial function of harmonizing the Federal system which is quintessential to the survival of the Nation. As Justice Holmes said half a century ago: "I do not think the United States would come to an end if we lost our power to declare an act of Congress void. I do think the Union would be imperiled if we could not make the declaration as to the laws of the several States. For one in my place sees how often a local policy prevails with those who are not trained to national views."

Make no mistake about it. These amendments, and the forces behind them, are inspired by deep-seated hostility to the National Government. They are designed to weaken the whole constitutional structure—not only the positive power of Government under the Constitution, but rights guaranteed to persons under the Constitution. They look ultimately to paralyzing the effective operation of the Constitution, which means, of course, paralyzing the Nation itself.

There is nothing new about this. Thomas Jefferson invoked the principle of States rights on behalf of freedom, but he was almost the last statesman who did so. For well over a century now, this pernicious doctrine has been invoked for two major purposes, and almost exclusively for those purposes: to weaken government and to endanger freedom.

The most notorious, and historically the most decisive, use of the doctrine of States rights was, of course, to protect the institution of Negro slavery. States rights were invoked, too, to delay expansion into the West, to defeat the regulation of trusts and railroads, to frustrate prohibition of child labor, to hold up the grant of suffrage to women, and to oppose social security, the conservation of natural resources, the creation of hydroelectric power for national purposes, the encouragement of public education and the protection of equality.

It is worth adding—it is something southerners might note—that the doctrine of States rights was used, too, to disrupt and eventually to destroy the Confederacy itself.

No political doctrine in American history has been more consistently invoked on behalf of privilege; none has had a more egregious record of error and calamity.

What is the explanation of this record, and of the attitude which it reflects?

It is not, I think, to be found in any deep or passionate attachment to the States. There was some of that earlier, and we are still reminded of it on ceremonial occasions. But there is no persuasive evidence that what animated a John Adams, a Jefferson, even a Calhoun, is still a vital force.

The modern champions of States rights have none of that loyalty to the community which impelled a Jefferson to build the University of Virginia and cherish its integrity; which persuaded a Franklin to lavish his rich talents on his adopted city of Philadelphia; which convinced earlier generations of Bostonians that they had built a Zion upon a hill, and later generations that their city was the hub of the solar system ("You couldn't pry that out of a Boston man," said Oliver Wendell Holmes, "if you had the tire of all creation straightened out for a crowbar"). They have not even that generous vanity which compels Texans and Californians to vie with each other in building universities and museums and foundations, and in preserving the natural resources and beauty of their States.

No, the States rights champion of our time displays no real pride in his State, no sense of its past, no feeling for its traditions, no respect for its dignity, no pride in its future. What has he done, what does he do, to preserve its natural resources, to cherish its institutions of learning, to protect its good name? What interest does he show in the richest possession of any State—the welfare of its men and women and children? The mobs invading the university campus at Oxford, the Negro children huddled behind wire fences in Birmingham and police dogs in the streets—these are the stigmata of States rights today.

What shall we say of the other side of the shield; that fear of nationalism, that suspicion of the Federal Government, which motivates not only the three proposed amendments to the Constitution but the whole crusade against the political effectiveness of the National Government?

What an extraordinary spectacle it is, this fear of the United States by its own citizens. The generation of the Founding Fathers worried and bickered over the potential hostility between large States and small, and wrote safeguards against the exploitation of small States into the Constitution. We can see now that these fears were unreal and absurd. But they were neither as unreal nor as absurd as the fear that grips large segments of our population today—the fear of the National Government itself.

What an extraordinary spectacle it is. One might imagine, to hear some of our contemporary nihilists talk, that we were not one people but many, not Americans but Virginians and Mississippians; one might suppose that Jefferson Davis was right when he wrote, long after the Civil War, that "no such political community or corporate unit as one people of the United States existed, has ever been organized, or yet exists, and that no political action by the people of the United States in the aggregate has ever taken place, or ever can take place, under the Constitution." One might suppose that we had not existed as a Nation for 175 years. One might conclude that the attempt at Federal union, so hopefully inaugurated in 1787 and so widely copied throughout the globe, and proved a failure, and that we were now called upon to go back to 1787, reject the Constitution, and cleave to the old Articles of Confederation.

Is there any foundation for the misgivings that animate the champions of States rights; is there any justification for their fears?

Has the National Government proved dangerous to the liberties of Americans, or to the rights of the States?

Certainly it would be asking a great deal to ask Negroes to believe that the National Government has been the enemy of freedom, and the States the guardians of freedom. It would be asking a great deal to ask labor to subscribe to the doctrine that it should look to the States, not to the Nation, for the preservation of its rights.

Opponents of national centralization never cease to deplore the invasion of the rights of private citizens by the National Government, and Governor Wallace played variations on that weary theme in his proclamation. It is fair to ask: What rights have they lost? Freedom of religion, of speech, of the press, of assembly, of petition, of association? Due process of law, the right to a jury trial, immunity from unreasonable search and seizure, from cruel and unusual punishment, from self-incrimination?

To ask these questions is to answer them. As far as the Federal Government is concerned (and it is very much concerned) these rights are still unimpaired—or impaired only where considerations of national security have appeared to require qualification. For the past 30 years or so the Federal courts have been engaged not in restricting but in enlarging the scope and meaning of these rights. The same, alas, cannot be said for the States. Who can deny that in the overwhelming majority of instances impairment of the rights and liberties of men has come from the States—and in large measure from precisely those States whose spokesmen are the most vigorous proponents of States rights. If ever it can be said that advocates do not come into court with clean hands, it can be said of those who today lament the destruction of liberties of the States by the National Government.

Who, knowing our history, can doubt for a moment that the real source of danger to the freedoms of Americans has been the States themselves? There are some exceptions, to be sure—the episode of the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798, for example, the repressive legislation of the First World War, the manifestations of McCarthyism in the fifties.

But anyone familiar with the history of freedom in the United States knows that it is the States that interfere most frequently with academic freedom, the States that set up censorship of press and stage and films, the States that threaten freedom of association, the States whose un-American activities committees have chalked up the most shameful records, the States that have most frequently flouted the due process of law and denied equal protection of the laws, and challenged or denied religious freedom. The vast majority of civil-liberties cases in the Supreme Court come up from the States, and involve local ordinances or State laws.

Do those who now invoke States rights do so because they want higher standards of freedom, or because they fear the Supreme Court is too active on behalf of freedom?

Has the national Government threatened those institutions on whose prosperity our society depends for its social and moral health? Has it threatened the independence of the church? The Federal Government started off with complete separation of church and state; it was in the States that discrimination on the basis of religion lingered on. When Madison proposed that the prohibitions of the first amendment be applied to the States, his proposal was defeated.

Has the National Government threatened the integrity of arts and letters and science? On the contrary. Since the early years of the 19th century, the National Government has maintained such institutions as the Library of Congress, the U.S. Geological Survey, the National Observatory, the Smithsonian Institution, and, more recently, the National Archives and the National Gallery of Art. Have these institutions been free? Certainly they have been more free than many State universities. Congress has never interfered with the Library of Congress, for example, as the legislatures of Ohio and Colorado are even now interfering with their State universities.

It is precisely because the National Government is so generous to arts and sciences that the proponents of States rights fear it, for they do not really believe in freedom, nor in those institutions that preserve and prosper freedom: Universities, libraries, scientific institutes. All of these foster the open mind and the cosmopolitan spirit. How alien these are to the philosophy of States rights can be observed in the South of 1860—or of 1960.

Has the National Government threatened the general welfare, or failed to promote it? On the contrary. That whole body of welfare legislation whose woof is interwoven with the warp of private enterprise to make the fabric of our life today finds its authority and support largely in the National Government: Social security, public health, conservation and, now, education, and civil rights.

It is precisely because the Federal Government does promote the general welfare that proponents of States rights fear it. They proclaim that these enterprises should not be performed by the National Government, but by the States. But they are not truly concerned with the general welfare, but only with that of members of their own faction. And they have failed egregiously to promote the welfare of even these—to provide schools and housing, for example. All too often, the States have wasted their resources of water and forest and soil, or handed them over to predatory private interests. Ever since the days of Theodore Roosevelt it has been the United States which has stepped in to protect these resources.

Has the National Government failed to form a more perfect union, to provide for the general defense, to insure domestic tranquility? Quite the contrary. There has never been a serious threat to the Union from the National Government, or to the domestic tranquillity. There has never been an adventurer, a soldier of fortune, a dictator, or a tyrant in the Executive chair.

The only threats to the Union have come from the States. States rights imperiled the Union in 1803 when New England States flirted at secession because Congress had bought Louisiana. States rights threatened the disruption of the Union during the War of 1812, when States refused to permit their militias to serve outside State territories. States rights threatened the integrity of the Union in the 1820's when Georgia nullified Federal treaties and Supreme Court decisions protecting the Cherokee Indians, and in the 1830's when South Carolina nullified tariff laws and enforcement laws. States rights actually broke up the Union in 1861, and precipitated the most tragic war in which the American people have ever been engaged. We cannot say that the doctrine of States rights threatens the Union today, but clearly it disturbs domestic transquility by defying the constitutional mandate of equality and justice.

And what of the States? Have they, in fact, lost any of the rights or powers they originally possessed? They have lost the right to secede. That, at least, was settled by Appomattox. They have lost the right to deprive persons of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or deny the equal protection of the laws; they have lost the right to deprive any person of suffrage on account of race or color. These rights they did indeed forfeit, and it was Appomattox which settled them all.

It would be a mistake to imply that the current revival of States rights had been entirely insincere or misguided. Bigness is dangerous; the welfare State can dry up initiative; power does tend to corrupt, and there is much to be said for fragmentation of political authority; eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

But a States rights philosophy that has its origin in fear of Government itself, and is rooted in a deep distrust of majority rule and of the democratic processes, forfeits its claim to respect. A States rights philosophy which is never inspired by generosity, never excited by a passion for freedom or for justice, never exalted by magnanimity, but takes refuge in narrowness and selfishness and vindictiveness, exhausts its claim to tolerance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

LOCATION OF CHANCERIES OR OFFICES OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS IN CERTAIN RESIDENTIAL AREAS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 646) to prohibit the location of chanceries or other business offices of foreign governments in certain residential areas in the District of Columbia.

THE 14TH AMENDMENT AND PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in a July 11 Senate floor speech, I presented my general objections to the enactment of S. 1731, the omnibus civil rights bill presented by the administration to the Congress. At that time, I stated:

> I seriously doubt that the groups and individuals who have been called upon by the administration to endorse its far-reaching proposals received a full explanation of the fundamental and basic constitutional issues which are involved and the threat which this bill poses to individual rights, liberties, and freedom. I do not believe that fully informed Americans would sponsor or support resolutions which endorse the surrender of principles and concepts which are so inseparable from our cherished system of government.

I wish to enlarge on that statement and more clearly and more fully set forth the implications of this bill and the radical departure from established constitutional principles it would represent. Today I shall confine myself largely to the legal principles involved. This bill proposes a novel and dangerous legal philosophy. Many of its provisions are so clearly unconstitutional that I cannot conceive their being enacted by this Congress.

Title II is the so-called public accommodations section of S. 1731. A similar section appears in S. 1732. My remarks today will be limited primarily to consideration of the authority of Congress to enact these sections under the powers granted by the 14th amendment to the Constitution.

I believe it is agreed by all that Congress is a body with limited legislative powers. Any bill that it passes must be bottomed upon a constitutional grant of power. Otherwise on its face the bill would be invalid.

These provisions attempt to impose Federal authority directly and primarily on the individual citizens of the United States. Section 202 of S. 1731 provides simply that—

> All persons shall be entitled, without discrimination or segregation on account of race, color, religion, or national origin, to the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations of the following public establishments.

The following provisions then enumerate the facilities involved and circumstances under which it is attempted to secure these accommodations.

Those services include hotels, motels, restaurants, theaters, and related service groups.

It is clear from a mere perusal of this section that an attempt is here made to create separate and independent Federal rights and actions, and it is likewise unmistakably clear that no such authority or power is granted to the Congress by the 14th amendment. Section 1 of the 14th amendment states:

> All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 5 of the amendment provides:

> The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

The key word in that amendment is State. The civil rights bills, especially in respect to public accommodations, are bottomed on the 14th amendment and the authority that the proponents hope to squeeze from its contents.

The provisions of section 1 have uniformly been held to mean that the prohibitions therein set forth are restrictions on the actions of the several States only and do not operate in any manner to inhibit the actions of individuals acting alone.

An illustration of that point would be an individual who operates a restaurant.

Yet it cannot be disputed that the provisions of the bill now under consideration purport to regulate and restrict purely private acts of individuals. It has been held by the Supreme Court, of course, that any action on the part of a State or any of its political subdivisions, whether such action be by its legislative, executive or judicial branch, shall be sufficient to make the amendment operative in a given situation. But S. 1732 and title II of S. 1731 do not pretend to require any action on the part of any State agency.

Further, the Supreme Court has uniformly held since the adoption of this amendment that its provisions are self-executing, and that the authority conferred on the Congress by section 5 to enforce the enumerated rights is corrective only. That is, Congress can only enact legislation to prevent the States from violating the provisions of the amendment or to abrogate prohibited State action, but the Congress cannot, on the basis of the amendment, act directly and primarily on the people and thereby create any new rights. It must restrict itself to preventing the States from encroaching on the rights of its citizens.

These questions have been looked upon as political and moral issues. We live under a government that protects the rights of everyone. Before the Congress can pass a law, the bill must be bottomed on a constitutional grant of authority.

Having stated these constitutional principles as to the meaning of the 14th amendment and the powers conferred thereby on Congress, let me now briefly review the decisions of the Supreme Court and other court decisions interpreting the amendment. The authorities presented here, while far from being exhaustive, clearly present the status of the law today.

The U.S. Supreme Court first interpreted the meaning of the 14th amendment in *The Butchers' Benevolent Association of New Orleans* v. *The Crescent City Live-Stock Landing and Slaughter-House Company,* 16 Wall. 36, 83 U.S. 36, 21 L. Ed. 394 (1873). This decision, popularly known as the Slaughter-House cases, dealt primarily with the meaning of the citizenship clause and the privileges and immunities clause, and it is not now necessary to set forth the facts giving rise to the case. The Court did, however, discuss the meaning of the equal protection of the laws clause, and with reference to both the 13th and 14th amendments, laid the basis for later pronouncements when it stated:

> In the light of the history of these amendments, and the pervading purpose of them, which we have already discussed, it is not difficult to give a meaning to this clause.
>
> The existence of laws in the States where the newly emancipated Negroes resided, which discriminated with gross injustice and hardship against them as a class, was the evil to be remedied by this clause, and by it such laws are forbidden. (83 U.S. 36.)

Only a few years after the adoption of the 14th amendment, we thus find the Supreme Court stating that it was the existence of State laws—and that cannot be repeated with too much emphasis: it was the existence of State laws—which the amendment was designed to prohibit.

Greater clarity was given to the meaning of the due process and equal protection clauses when the Court rendered its decision in *United States* v. *Cruikshank,* 92 U.S. 542, 23 L. Ed. 587 (1875), wherein certain defendants were indicted in Federal court on 32 separate counts. The indictment was brought under the Enforcement Act of 1870 and charged the defendants with banding together and conspiring to injure, oppress, threaten, and intimidate two U.S. citizens of African descent with the intent thereby to hinder and prevent them in the free exercise and enjoyment of rights and privileges alleged to be granted and secured to them by the Constitution and laws of the United States. The indictment charged, in part, that the defendants had sought to hinder and prevent the plaintiffs in exercising their right to peaceably assemble, to keep and bear arms, to vote, and further to deprive them of their lives and liberty without due process of law and to deprive them of the equal protection of the laws. In a rather lengthy discussion of the respective powers and the relationship of the Federal and State Governments, the Court found the indictment to be faulty in each and every count but stated, however, that even had it been sufficient, this action could not be maintained because:

> The 14th amendment prohibits a State from depriving any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; but this adds nothing to the rights of one citizen as against another. It simply furnished an additional guaranty against any encroachment by the States upon the fundamental rights which belong to every citizen as a member of society (92 U.S. 542, 554).

And, likewise:

> The 14th amendment prohibits a State from denying to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws; but this provision does not, any more than the one which precedes it, and which we have just considered, add anything to the rights which one citizen has under the Constitution against another. The equality of the rights of citizens is a principle of republicanism. Every republican government is in duty bound to protect all its citizens in the enjoyment of this principle, if within its power. That duty was originally assumed by the States; and it still remains there. The only obligation resting upon the United States is to see that the States do not deny the right. This the amendment guarantees, but no more. The power of the national government is limited to the enforcement of this guaranty (92 U.S. 542, 554).

The next major decision of the Supreme Court, and possibly the most well-known, involved five separate cases which collectively are cited as the *Civil Rights* cases, 109 U.S. 3, 3 S. Ct. 18, 27 L. Ed. 835 (1883). Each of these cases arose under the Civil Rights Act of 1875—chapter 114, sections 1 and 2, 18 Stat. 335—section 1 of which provided:

> That all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of inns, public conveyances on land or water, theatres, and other places of public amusement; subject only to the conditions and limitations established by law, and applicable alike to citizens of every race and color, regardless of any previous condition of servitude.

It will be readily noted that the provisions of this act were very similar to those now proposed in S. 1731 and S. 1732. The language is almost identical. Let us see what the Supreme Court said about that act. The Constitution has not been changed one iota since that time.

Section 2 of the Civil Rights Act of 1875 provided that any person guilty of violating section 1 by denying to any person the full and equal enjoyment of such accommodations would be liable to the person aggrieved in the amount of $500 for each offense, and further provided that such action would constitute a misdemeanor with appropriate penalties.

The Court rendered a collective opinion in these cases, two of which involved indictments for denying Negroes accommodation and privileges of a hotel, two of which involved indictments for denying to Negroes the full enjoyment of theater accommodations, and one of which involved an indictment for denying to a Negro the full and equal use of a railroad car. All of said indictments were brought under the aforementioned Civil Rights Act of 1875.

The Court declared this act unconstitutional, holding that Congress had no authority by virtue of the 14th amendment to enact said legislation. In reaching this conclusion, the Court said:

> It is State action of a particular character that is prohibited. Individual invasion of individual rights is not the subject matter of the amendment. It has a deeper and broader scope. It nullifies and makes void all State legislation, and State action of every kind, which impairs the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, or which injures them in life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or which denies to any of them the equal protection of the laws (109 U.S. 3, 11).

The Court further held that, to enforce the provisions of the amendment, section 5 thereof gives the Congress authority to enact corrective legislation only; that is, to adopt appropriate legislation for correcting the effects of such prohibited State laws and State acts. The Court clearly stated:

> This is the legislative power conferred upon Congress, and this is the whole of it. It does not invest Congress with power to legislate upon subjects which are within the domain of State legislation; but to provide modes of relief against State legislation, or State action, of the kind referred to (109 U.S. 3, 11).

In its full discussion of the meaning of the equal protection clause and the power of Congress to enforce the rights secured thereby, the Court further stated:

> In this connection it is proper to state that civil rights, such as are guaranteed by the Constitution against State aggression, cannot be impaired by the wrongful acts of individuals, unsupported by State authority in the shape of laws, customs, or judicial or executive proceedings. The wrongful act of an individual, unsupported by any such authority, is simply a private wrong, or a crime of that individual; an invasion of the rights of the injured party, it is true, whether they affect his person, his property, or his reputation; but if not sanctioned in some way by the State, or not done under State authority, his rights remain in full force, and may presumably be vindicated by resort to the laws of the State for redress. An individual cannot deprive a man of his right to vote, to hold property, to buy and sell, to sue in the courts, or to be a witness or a juror; he may, by force or fraud, interfere with the enjoyment of the right in a particular case; he may commit an assault against the person, or commit murder, or use ruffian violence at the polls, or slander the good name of a fellow citizen; but, unless protected in these wrongful acts by some shield of State law or State authority, he cannot destroy or injure the right; he will only render himself amenable to satisfaction or punishment; and amenable therefor to the laws of the State where the wrongful acts are committed (109 U.S. 3, 17).

This decision of the Supreme Court rendered in 1883 thus clearly and forcefully announces, first, that the prohibitions of the 14th amendment apply solely to denials by the several States of the rights guaranteed thereby, and second, that section 5 of the amendment does not grant unto Congress the authority to enact direct and primarily legislation to enforce its provisions, but only grants authority to enact corrective legislation to prohibit the States from denying the rights set forth in section 1. Wrongful acts of individuals, unsupported by State law or some State action through its officers or agents, are not prohibited by the amendment and the Congress has no authority to enact legislation designed to prevent such purely private acts.

The decision of the Supreme Court in the civil rights cases has been followed and reaffirmed without exception to the present time.

Mr. President, I stand on that statement. The decision of 1883 has been followed and reaffirmed without exception down to the present time. In the very recent case of *Williams* v. *Howard Johnsons Restaurant*, 268 F. 2d 845 (U.S.C.A., Fourth, 1959), for example, the plaintiff brought a class action against the defendant, alleging that he had wrongfully been refused service in the defendant restaurant solely because of his race. He sought a declaratory judgment that his exclusion on racial grounds amounted to discrimination against a person moving in interstate commerce as well as being a violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1875. He conceded that no statute of the State of Virginia, where the restaurant was located, requires the exclusion of Negroes from public restaurants, but he cited other statutes of the State requiring segregation of the races in facilities furnished by carriers, and he emphasized the long-established local custom of excluding Negroes from public restaurants and contends that acquiescence of the State in these practices amounts to discriminatory State action.

The court stated:

> The essence of the argument is that the State licenses restaurants to serve the public and thereby is burdened with the positive duty to prohibit unjust discrimination in the use and enjoyment of the facilities.

On motion of defendant the suit was dismissed in the district court, and the court of appeals affirmed, holding that the dismissal was in accord with the decisions of the Supreme Court and other Federal courts.

The court cited as authority the holding of the Supreme Court in the civil rights cases of 1883, and further held that the licensing of the defendant restaurant to operate did not constitute such State action as is required to make the provisions of the 14th amendment applicable. The court stated in this regard:

> This argument fails to observe the important distinction between activities that are required by the State and those which are carried out by voluntary choice and without compulsion by the people of the State in accordance with their own desires and social practices. Unless these actions are performed in obedience to some positive provision of State law they do not furnish a basis for the pending complaint. The license laws of Virginia do not fill the void (268 F. 2d, 845, 847).

The court then cited the applicable section of the Virginia Code which makes it unlawful for any person to operate a restaurant in the State without an unrevoked permit from the Commissioner, who is the chief executive officer of the State board of health. Speaking of this statute, the court said:

> The statute is obviously designed to protect the health of the community but it does not authorize State officials to control the management of the business or to dictate what persons shall be served (268 F. 2d 845, 848).

The Supreme Court has, of course, in several cases found that certain acts of individuals were either supported by some State action or the acts of the individuals or organization constituted State action by the very nature of the act. For example, in *March* v. *Alabama*, 326 U.S. 501, 66 S. Ct. 276, 90 L. Ed. 265 (1946), the Court held that the ownership and operation of a small "companytown" by the Gulf Shipbuilding Corp. amounted to a "public function." A member of the Jehovah's Witnesses was refused the right to distribute literature on a sidewalk of the town and was subsequently arrested and convicted under a State statute making it a crime to enter and remain on the premises of another after having been warned not to do so. The Court held that the private ownership of property in such a case could not justify restricting the fundamental liberties of its townpeople, but the decision was primarily directed at the act of the State in enforcing through its courts the restriction established by the property owner.

In *Smith* v. *Allwright*, 321 U.S. 649, 64 S. Ct. 757, 88 L. Ed. 987 (1944), the Court held that Negroes could not be excluded by the Democratic Party from participation in its primaries when the primary election constituted an integral part of the general election. The Court found that the primary elections in Texas were conducted by the party under the statutory authority of the State and said:

> We think the statutory system for the selection of party nominees for inclusion on the general election ballot makes the party which is required to follow these legislative directions an agency of the State insofar as it determines the participants in a primary election. The party takes its character as a State agency from the duties imposed upon it by State statutes (321 U.S. 649, 663).

The Supreme Court has also held that the enforcement of discriminatory acts through the judicial machinery of a State also constitutes "State action" and therefore is subject to the provisions of the 14th amendment. For example, in *Shelley* v. *Kraemer*, 334 U.S. 1, 68 S. Ct. 836, 92 L. Ed. 1161 (1948), the Court held that a racial restrictive covenant established by a private property owner cannot be enforced in the courts of a State. However, the Court clearly recognized the rule established in the civil rights cases when it said:

> Since the decision of this Court in the *Civil Rights cases*, 109 U. S. 3 (1883), the principle has become firmly embedded in our constitutional law that the action inhibited by the first section of the 14th amendment is only such action as may fairly be said to be that of the States. That amendment erects no shield against merely private conduct, however discriminatory or wrongful.
>
> We conclude, therefore, that the restrictive agreement standing alone cannot be regarded as violative of any rights guaranteed to petitioners by the 14th amendment. So long

> as the purposes of those agreements are effectuated by voluntary adherence to their terms, it would appear clear that there has been no action by the State and the provisions of the amendment have not been violated (334 U.S. 2, 13).

In other cases the Court has held that the granting of a license in the nature of a franchise, such as those granted to public utilities and common carriers, constitutes the recipient an agency of the State to the extent that the utility or carrier is subject to the provisions of the equal protection of the laws clause. It is clear beyond doubt, however, that there is a significant distinction between this type of license and that required, for example, for the operation of a restaurant, a barber shop, or other place of public accommodation. A very clear and lucid explanation of this distinction is found in the recent case of *Boman et al.* v. *Birmingham Transit Company,* 280 F. 2d 531 (U.S.C.A., Fifth, 1960). It was there held that a city transit company could not require separation of the races on its buses, but the Court stated:

> Because of the peculiar function performed by this transit company as a public utility, and its relation to the city and State of Alabama through its holding of a special franchise to operate on the public streets of Birmingham, we conclude that so long as such an ordinance was in force, the acts of the bus company in requiring racially segregated seating were State acts and were thus violative of appellants' constitutional rights (280 F. 2d 531, 534).

The ordinance referred to provided that carriers of passengers for hire could formulate such rules and regulations for the seating of passengers on public conveyances as are reasonably necessary to assure the speedy, safe, orderly, convenient, and peaceful handling of its passengers.

The court also stated:

> It is, of course, fundamental that the justification for the grant by a State to a private corporation of a right or franchise to perform such a public utility service as furnishing transportation, gas, electricity, or the like, on the public streets of the city, is that the grantee is about the public's business. It is doing something the State deems useful for the public necessity or convenience. This is what differentiates the public utility which holds what may be called a special franchise from an ordinary business corporation which in common with all others is granted the privilege of operating in corporate form but does not have that special franchise of using State property for private gain to perform a public function (280 F. 2d 531, 535).

In conclusion, the court specifically stated:

> Moreover, we fully recognize what has been known by all to be the law since the Supreme Court decided the Slaughter-House cases * * * that "the action inhibited by the first section of the 14th amendment is only such action as may fairly be said to be that of the States * * *" (280 F. 2d 531-535).

The most recent decisions of the Supreme Court involving this question were rendered on May 20, 1963, just 60 days ago, in what has popularly become known as the sit-in cases. In *Peterson* v. *City of Greenville,* 373 U.S. 244 (1963), petitioners, who were all members of the Negro race, attempted to sit in the white section of a lunch counter in the S. H. Kress & Co. store in Greenville, S.C. They were refused service, were subsequently arrested by city police officers, and convicted for violating the trespass statute of the State. On appeal to the Supreme Court, these convictions were set aside, but the Court specifically cited and recognized the ordinance of the city of Greenville which required the separation of restaurant facilities for white and Negro customers. The Court stated in this regard:

> It cannot be denied that here the city of Greenville, an agency of the State, has provided by its ordinance that the decision as to whether a restaurant facility is to be operated on a desegregated basis is to be reserved to it. When the State has commanded a particular result and thereby "to a significant extent" has "become involved" in it, and, in fact, has removed that decision from the sphere of private choice (373 U.S. 244, 247, 248).

In so ruling, the Court cited with approval the following statement from its decision in *Burton* v. *Wilmington Parking Authority,* 365 U.S. 715, 81 S. Ct. 856, 6 L. Ed. 2d 45 (1961):

> Private conduct abridging individual rights does no violence to the equal protection clause unless to some significant extent the State in any of its manifestations has found to have become involved in it (365 U.S. 715, 722).

In the case of *Lombard et al.* v. *State of Louisiana,* 373 U.S. 267 (1963), a similar set of facts existed except that there was no State law or city ordinance requiring segregation in restaurants. There the Court found the required State action in public announcements of the superintendent of police and the mayor of the city of New Orleans. Four days before petitioners' arrest, for example, the mayor stated publicly:

> I have today directed the superintendent of police that no additional sit-in demonstrations * * * will be permitted * * * regardless of the avowed purpose or intent of the participants.

The Court further stated that there was evidence which tended to indicate that the actions of the particular store officials involved was coerced by the city, and held that these facts constituted State action, stating:

> A State, or a city, may act as authoritatively through its executive as through its legislative body. See *Ex Parte Virginia,* 100 U.S. 339. As we interpret the New Orleans city officials' statements, they here determined that the city would not permit Negroes to seek desegregated service in restaurants. Consequently, the city must be treated exactly as if it had an ordinance prohibiting such conduct (373 U.S. 267, 273).

The existence in every State of the Union of a specific State statute requiring discrimination of the most flagrant nature based on race, creed, or color, could not provide the constitutional authority for Congress to enact these measures to regulate the conduct of individuals and their private acts.

Now, Mr. President, I have briefly discussed a number of decisions involving the application of the provision of section 1 and section 5 of the 14th amendment. As stated at the beginning of my remarks, I have not cited each and every decision of the Federal courts on the points under consideration, but those here mentioned do accurately reflect the status of the case law today under the holdings of the Federal courts. Some of those which I have discussed reached the conclusion that only individual acts were involved; in others the court found the presence of a State law or some other State action in support of or sanctioning individual discriminatory acts. My purpose in presenting cases reaching both conclusions is to point out as emphatically as possible that in every single case in which this question has ever been considered, the Supreme Court, as well as the lower Federal courts, have repeatedly held that section 1 of the 14th amendment is a prohibition against State action only. This is the original holding of the Slaughter-House cases, as affirmed and made more clear in the Civil Rights cases. No principle of law could be more clear than this. There is no other principle of constitutional law to which the Supreme Court has more uniformly and consistently adhered than this one. What authority is there to the contrary? There is absolutely none.

Thus, we have a definite and clear constitutional interpretation which has continued, unbroken and unaltered, and repeatedly affirmed by the Court from 1873 until 1963—a period of 90 years. The first major decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1873 and 1883, came soon after the adoption of the 14th amendment. The membership of the Court in 1883, as well as in 1873, were of the same generation which adopted the amendment. The members of the Court personally knew the history and the purposes of the amendment.

The Civil Rights cases decision of 1883 declaring invalid an act of Congress similar to the proposal of 1963 was not challenged by the Congress or by the people of the Nation. No proposed constitutional amendment to offset the decision was seriously considered.

I point out with emphasis that here was a Court which was composed of a membership that was of the generation that adopted the 14th amendment, the same generation that had passed the law of 1875. The Court knew the purposes, the argument, and the political and moral, as well as the legal side, in and out. Nevertheless, they declared and firmly set forth the extent of the powers and the amount of authority under the 14th amendment. Then they cut down a law which had been enacted by Congress, and said Congress had no such authority. Every Court from then until now, as recently as 60 days ago, has affirmed, reaffirmed, and followed consistently that basic principle, without any kind of exception.

Moreover, as heretofore pointed out, the 1883 decision has been expressly affirmed and followed by the Court for these 900 years, including the recent case, Williams against Howard Johnson's Restaurant, decided by the U.S. Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit, in 1959.

Still, in this wave of hysteria and as a part of this colossal grab for naked power by the Attorney General, in these bills, we are asked by the President and the Attorney General to ignore this long line of Court decisions on a constitutional principle and pass this law in defiance of the plain wording of the Constitution and the Court decisions. Congress is now asked to reverse the Supreme Court on a constitutional question with a statute. Then, in order to uphold the legislation, the Court will be asked to reverse itself with a decision upholding the more modern law.

In short, the Congress has no power whatsoever to overrule the Court on a constitutional question by the passage of mere legislation. The Congress has no power to overrule the Court on a constitutional question by the passage of a simple bill. The only way the Supreme Court can be overruled on a constitutional question is by the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution. Of course, this must be done in the manner set forth in the Constitution itself.

In order to amend the Constitution, each House must by a two-thirds vote propose such amendment, and this must be followed by the ratification of the proposed amendment by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States; or the proposed amendment must originate with the States and be approved by three-fourths of them.

I have not heard a single advocate of these bills proposing such an amendment.

If the people of the Nation want to amend the Constitution on this point, they can do so. But, as the Constitution is writen, every citizen regardless of race or color, has the constitutional right to earn and save money and, with it, to buy property. Every citizen has the right to use his own property in keeping with his desires and wishes, subject only with regard for public health, public safety, and related matters. This right is fundamental, and cannot be destroyed or impaired under the guise of the Federal Government enforcing the alleged or real civil rights of another individual. This fundamental right applies to every citizen, including, of course, the owners of restaurants, hotels, motels, theaters, and other business activities included in these bills.

This proposed legislation therefore would destroy far more rights than it could ever possibly protect.

Even limiting the legislation to those who would come within the limits of the bill would not be the end of the tragedy. There would be a collapse and a breaking down, not only on that subject, but on all subjects of basic constitutional limitations upon the legislative branch and the executive branch of the Government—limitations which protect all the people. It is a question of authority. Congress does not have the authority under the wording of the amendment or under any of the interpretations.

After all possible points are fully weighed, this basic hard fact remains: The Federal Government is totally without jurisdiction insofar as the 14th amendment is concerned in all the matters covered by title II of S. 1731 and S. 1732, the so-called public accommodations provisions.

Insofar as the 14th amendment is concerned, the Congress is totally lacking in authority to pass the "public accommodations" provisions of these proposals.

At a later time I shall address myself to the commerce clause and other provisions of these bills.

Everyone had better be skeptical when a great mass of far-reaching proposed legislation is bottomed on two different provisions of the Constitution of the United States, and real doubt is engendered by the mere putting it on two bases. However, we do not have to stop with inference. We can go to the Attorney General's testimony. He is the one who has written the proposed legislation, or at least it was written under his direction. He is the man who would be given this power. I read from his prepared statement given before the Commerce Committee on July 1, 1963:

> In addition to the commerce clause, we rely on the power of Congress under the 14th amendment to prohibit the denial of equal protection of the laws to any person. The 14th amendment also provides that Congress may enforce this provision by appropriate legislation.

Mr. President, I challenge the Attorney General to make such statement or reach such a conclusion if he has read the plain, unmistakable and unbroken decisions of the Supreme Court interpreting the 14th amendment.

I quote further from the statement of the Attorney General:

> We recognize that in 1883 the Supreme Court held in the *Civil Rights* Cases (109 U.S. 3), Congress did not have power under the 14th amendment to prohibit discrimination in privately owned places of public accommodation, and that Congress' power under that amendment is only over discrimination accomplished by the action of a State.

The Attorney General of the United States, in a formal statement, agrees with the interpretation of that amendment and the Supreme Court decision of 1883, which has been affirmed as recently as 1963.

He agrees with that interpretation. He says it is a correct one. I quote him further:

> But in 80 years, much of the force of that decision has disappeared. State regulation of private business has increased. State relationships with business have become more varied and complex, and views of what action may be attributed to the State have changed.

There is a bold, brazen attempt to amend the Constitution of the United States, to reverse it, to make it say and do something it does not say in language, and by a contrary interpretation, in order to have the power, the springboard, for a legislative enactment that has heretofore been condemned by the Supreme Court, merely on the flimsy statement and argument that times have changed and there has been more regulation of business by the States. The Attorney General does not cite any opinions or give anything in proof of his bare, bald statement, a statement unsupported by logic, and certainly unsupported by any legal reasoning. I quote him further:

> There are a number of recent cases in which the Federal courts have held that private decisions to discriminate may be attributed to the State for purposes of the 14th amendment.

I have already reviewed those kinds of cases. They are beside the point. The Supreme Court took them up and refused to change its own decision or to use new situations, circumstances, or facts in any way, except in keeping with the original decision by the Supreme Court in 1883. The Attorney General said:

> Consequently, if the Supreme Court were now asked to pass upon the constitutionality of a public accommodations law based on the 14th amendment, it might well uphold the law.

The Attorney General did not even say, in the statement I have just quoted, that he believed the Court would reverse itself after all these years and after the repeated affirmances, as recently as just a few years ago. He said the Supreme Court "might," if called upon to pass upon such a statute, uphold a new statute now. I quote him further:

> However, the 1883 decision has not been overruled and remains the law of the land.

That is the very argument I have made. Further quoting the Attorney General:

> It is for this reason that we rely primarily on the commerce clause.

I have posed this question for every Senator. I said in my previous speech that I was certain every Senator wanted to do what he believed was his duty. He wants to uphold the Constitution of the United States, rather than to violate it and trample on it. Senators do not want to use any authority that is not granted to them by the terms of the Constitution. But here we have an argument made by the Attorney General to the effect that a public accommodations bill can be bottomed on the 14th amendment. In the face of this flimsy argument, which has no substance, the Attorney General himself comes before the committee and says:

> It is for this reason that we rely primarily on the commerce clause.

Congress is asked to write off the 14th amendment. That is like a man coming before a jury and pleading self-defense by one set of witnesses, but proving accidental discharge of a weapon by another set of witnesses. He cannot stand on both grounds.

The Attorney General begins by trying to stand on both provisions of the Constitution. That is a fatal admission in substance by the Attorney General himself, when he says, in effect, "We rely primarily on the commerce clause." How can any Senator say, in view of what the law is, and of what even the Attorney General says it is, that such a proposed law can be bottomed on the 14th amendment? I quote the Attorney General further:

> Some Congressmen, who seek objectives similar to those of the bill, would place sole reliance on the 14th amendment.

I do not know who they are.

> There are others who strongly oppose any reliance on the 14th amendment.

I quote this statement because it shows how desperate the Attorney General was for some kind of authority which he could present to the committee, when the clear point at issue was, Where is the law under the 14th amendment that gives Congress the authority to pass such bills?

I quote the Attorney General further:

> We recognize that there is some merit in both positions.

He had just said, in a sentence or a paragraph earlier, in effect, that there is precious little in the 14th amendment, because he said:

> It is for this reason that we rely primarily on the commerce clause.

I quote him further:

> However, we feel it is absolutely clear that Congress has the power to end discrimination in places of public accommodations under the provisions of the commerce clause.

I shall not recite the commerce clause. I shall continue to quote the Attorney General. I continue to quote the Attorney General because, in fairness to him, his statement should be placed in the RECORD.

> Should it ultimately be decided that Congress can regulate these businesses under the 14th amendment, the fact that the bill describes them in terms of their impact on interstate commerce would not diminish Congress' power.

There is a bold, brazen statement by the Attorney General of the United States, and others, admitting doubt about each of these provisions; admitting that there is little if any, authority to stand on the 14th amendment. Here is a bold statement to the effect, "We will run the bills through the Halls of Congress on both wheels, on both grounds; and then, if either of them is upheld by the Court, we will still be in business." That shows the inherent weakness, the lack of firmness, the lack of faith as a basis for the enactment of the bills.

I have also a statement by the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who asked some questions at that time, showing that he had his doubts. I mention this to show that there is concern in the committee. I did not want to omit anything that might be a defense. The quotations I have given from the testimony of the Attorney General were taken from the reporter's notes; they are not available now in printed form. However, I am certain that they are accurately quoted because they have been taken directly from the reporter's notes.

In discussing earlier certain rights of individuals in connection with my point that Congress has no authority to pass such a law under the 14th amendment, the Senator from Mississippi intended to cite section 1983 of title 42, with reference to certain civil actions, that are based on civil law statutes of many years past, passed in 1871, which give persons certain civil rights on a person-to-person basis. I quote that section now:

> Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress.

That section does not have any application to the subject being discussed; but I desired to point out that it exists, that it has not been overlooked, and that it fills out the picture of the pertinent law, so as to put the whole subject in a different category.

Later I shall submit, for the consideration of the Senate, articles on the commerce clause, as well as other articles on these bills.

I am certain—and I believe that the great majority of the Senate will reach this conclusion—that authority does not exist in either of these constitutional provisions as a proper basis for the enactment of the proposed laws, and that they will fall by the wayside, for the very reason that 80 or 90 years ago the Supreme Court held that such a law was invalid; and since that time no such congressional statute has been permitted by the courts to stand.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Mississippi knows the great respect I have for him and for his learning as a lawyer and a judge. Later, I shall speak on the application of the 14th amendment to the issue of public accommodations. However, I thought that at this time I would intervene briefly, because, together with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and other Senators, I have introduced a bill which rests upon the 14th amendment.

Is it not correct that in the 1883 decision of the Supreme Court there was a specific finding by the Court that it did not pass upon the issue as to whether there was an equal right of access for all citizens to the public accommodations named in the act of 1875? That issue was not determined by the Court, was it?

Mr. STENNIS. I recall language somewhat to that effect in that decision. But the Court moved on.

I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky; I have a high regard for his opinion.

Mr. COOPER. And the Senator from Mississippi knows my respect for him.

Later I shall elaborate upon this point. It is that the Court specifically said that it was not ruling on the question of whether there was equal access for all citizens to the public accommodations named in the statute of 1875.

Mr. STENNIS. As I recall, the Court said, in substance, that it was not necessary to decide on that involved point, because by all standards it was beyond the constitutional authority of the Congress to pass such an act. So it was struck down.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Mississippi is correct in saying that the Court held it was not necessary; but the Court did specifically state that it was not passing on the question of whether there was such a right.

Is it not also correct that what the Court actually passed upon was the language incorporated in the 1875 act; and in its findings, the Court said that nothing in the language of the 1875 act specified in any way State involvement?

Mr. STENNIS. Neither the language nor the facts showed it; but since then the Court has passed on many matters in which a State was involved; and in the absence of any law the Court has upheld the power of the 14th amendment, as the Senator from Kentucky knows.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the Senator from Mississippi will agree that the 1875 act incorporated no language or statement which indicated State involvement.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not also correct that in considering any statutes which may be enacted by Congress, the issue for the Court would be whether the language of such an act and the findings upon which it was based showed an involvement by a State—or, more precisely, as the Supreme Court has said in its recent decisions such a manifestation of State activity or authority as to bring it within the scope of the 14th amendment?

Mr. STENNIS. That is what the Court has consistently held; it has recognized at all times that under this amendment, Congress has no authority to pass such a law, and has stated that the Court would, of its own accord, correct a State action or State manifestation.

Mr. COOPER. I respectfully disagree, because Congress has passed various acts under its powers under the 14th amendment.

I merely state the point, which I shall make in more detail later, that if Congress passed an act which showed on its face the involvement of a State's authority and if that was also shown by the facts, the Court could pass upon the specific act, and distinguish its decision and the 1883 decision, rather than be called upon to reverse the 1883 decision. I do not think this point has been made in the congressional debates or in the general debate in the country.

Mr. STENNIS. I believe the situation would be that the facts of any case tried or heard would have to show a State involvement or a State pattern or manifestation of some kind. If so, the Court could take action in the absence of such a statute.

However, State involvement cannot be shown merely by the language used in a preamble or in a congressional finding of facts. Congress has no mission of finding facts, anyway. These are declaratory statements in the introduction of the bill—discussions of the experience all over the Nation, and so forth. Such things have no place in the bill.

Mr. COOPER. I agree wholly with the Senator from Mississippi that a bill which contains only a preamble, and does not have an operative section, would present no issue for the Supreme Court. I have taken the position, that the administration bill does not rely at all on the 14th amendment, as is asserted, because there is only a finding in the preamble, but nothing in the operative section.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. The cases passed on thus far by the Supreme Court have dealt with legislation by a State or ordinances of a State subdivision or orders of a State offered acting officially under color of law—positive State action.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. There have been some other cases. I recall one in which a franchise had been given to a private bus company—in Alabama, I believe.

Mr. STENNIS. A public utility.

Mr. COOPER. In that case the court held that discrimination could not be practiced, because the State had given a franchise.

Mr. STENNIS. I cited that case in my argument.

Mr. COOPER. I thought so.

I point out that this holding marked a step from the original holding that State legislation or ordinances—were necessary to bring discriminatory acts under the 14th amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. With all deference to the Senator from Kentucky, the courts have uniformly held that if there is any State action, legislative, judicial, or executive, the 14th amendment applies of its own vigor and effect. That was expressly held by the Court. But the Court also held that a mere licensing, even on an interstate highway, was not sufficient to bring the action before it.

Mr. and Mrs. Murphy do not have a franchise; they have only a permit to operate their business.

Mr. COOPER. The point I make is that if Congress should enact a law which, in its language and upon the facts, showed sufficient State involvement, there would be an issue which could be brought before the U.S. Supreme Court; and the Court would not be called upon to reverse its 1883 decision, but could distinguish between its 1883 decision and its decision on a different set of facts.

I know the Senator from Mississippi is an able lawyer and judge, and I believe he knows that distinction can properly be drawn by a court.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator. I appreciate his comments. I hope to hear his speech when he makes it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consideration of executive business, to consider the nomination on the Executive Calendar under "New Reports."

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Prouty in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles R. Ferguson to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review for the term expiring July 15, 1966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RICHARD R. CONLEY—RECOMMITTAL OF NOMINATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of Richard R. Conley, to be postmaster at Rome City, Ind., which is presently on the Executive Calendar, be recommitted to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONVENTION ON POLITICAL RIGHTS OF WOMEN—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there was transmitted to the Senate today a Convention on the Political Rights of Women, Executive J, 88th Congress, 1st session, which was signed at New York on March 31, 1953, in behalf of certain governments, but not the Government of the United States of America. I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the Convention, and that the Convention, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the message from the President be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to accession, I transmit herewith the Convention on the Political Rights of Women, which was signed at New York on March 31, 1953, in behalf of certain governments, but not the Government of the United States of America.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State with respect to the Convention.

In the event that the Senate advises and consents to accession to the Convention, it is recommended that it indicate that such accession is subject to the understanding that in Article III the phrase "public office" does not include military service and the phrase "public function" is co-terminous with "public office."

John F. Kennedy.

The White House, *July 22, 1963*.

CONVENTION RELATING TO ABOLITION OF FORCED LABOR—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President of the United States also transmitted to the Senate today a convention concerning the abolition of forced labor, Convention No. 105, being Executive K, 88th Congress, 1st session, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its 40th session, Geneva, June 25, 1957. I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the Convention, that the Convention, together with the President's message be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Convention concerning the abolition of forced labor (Convention No. 105), adopted by the International Labor Conference at its 40th session, Geneva, June 25, 1957.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State concerning the Convention, together with the copy enclosed therewith of a letter from the Secretary of Labor.

John F. Kennedy.

The White House, *July 22, 1963*.

SUPPLEMENTARY CONVENTION ON ABOLITION OF SLAVERY, THE SLAVE TRADE, AND INSTITUTIONS AND PRACTICES SIMILAR TO SLAVERY—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President of the United States further transmitted to the Senate today the Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery, being Executive L, 88th Congress, 1st session, which was signed at Geneva on September 7, 1956, in behalf of certain governments, but not the Government of the United States of America. I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the supplementary Convention, that the Convention, together with the President's message be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to accession, I transmit herewith the Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery, which was signed at Geneva on September 7, 1956, in behalf of certain governments, but not the Government of the United States of America.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State with respect to the Convention.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 22, 1963.*

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LOCATION OF CHANCERIES OR OFFICES OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS IN CERTAIN RESIDENTIAL AREAS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 646) to prohibit the location of chanceries or other business offices of foreign governments in certain residential areas in the District of Columbia.

STATE COMMERCIAL FISHERY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending bill, S. 646, be laid aside temporarily and that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 312, Senate bill 627, and that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 627) to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my intention at this time, with the concurrence of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], to lay aside temporarily the pending business and ask the Senate to consider certain items on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Order No. 336. Before I do so, I ask unanimous consent that at the appropriate point in the consideration of the measures I may be allowed to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the reports and other pertinent legislative material.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first order of business on the calendar.

PORTION OF BENTON HARBOR CANAL, MICH., TO BE A NONNAVIGABLE STREAM

The bill (H.R. 4646) to declare a portion of the Benton Harbor Canal, Benton Harbor, Mich., a nonnavigable stream was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 361), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Benton Harbor Canal is an artificial water spur from the confluence of the Paw Paw and St. Joseph Rivers easterly into the center of the downtown area of Benton Harbor, permitting the loading of fruit on ships bound for Chicago.

The ship canal was commenced in 1860 by private capital, and completed in 1870 with funds provided by the town of Benton Harbor. It extended about three-fourths mile eastward of the Paw Paw River, with a turning basin at the easterly end, and was declared a public waterway by the State legislature in 1879.

The act of June 14, 1880, authorized the United States to take over the project for maintenance and improvement, the channel to be 15 feet deep and 100 feet wide. The River and Harbor Act of August 30, 1935, authorized an increase in project depth to 18 feet over a width of 80 feet, from the junction of the Paw Paw River to Ninth Street. No maintenance work has been performed on the canal since 1948, and the Corps of Engineers has no current request for its maintenance. This section of the canal is now used as a dumping ground and the water is badly polluted.

About 1,000 feet of the reach of the canal east of Ninth Street, including the turning basin, was not recommended for improvement and was declared a nonnavigable water of the United States and abandoned, by the act of June 2, 1937 (50 Stat. 243). This abandoned channel has been completely filled and is used for street and parking purposes.

H.R. 4646 would authorize the abandonment of an additional reach of the canal extending about 1,968 feet westward from the west line of Ninth Street. The remaining section of the canal, approximately 1,600 feet to the confluence with the St. Joseph River, would continue to be available for navigation.

The city of Benton Harbor proposes to fill the abandoned section of the canal, and extend the streets and water and sewer lines across the canal, and use the area for surface transportation, public parking, and in connection with proposed urban renewal projects. It would make accessible an area of about 120 acres for industrial expansion, and permit extension of sanitary sewer service to the industrial area north of the canal, comprising about 300 acres on which are presently located 10 industries employing approximately 2,500 persons.

The canal section to be abandoned is not suitable for any marine use, other than small noncommercial craft of shallow draft. The city has acquired the land fronting on St. Joseph River, which is more suitable for development for port use.

AMENDMENT TO NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER ACT

The bill (S. 1652) to amend the National Cultural Center Act to extend the termination date contained therein, and to enlarge the Board of Trustees was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 2 of the National Cultural Center Act (72 Stat. 1698) is amended in its last clause by striking out the word "fifteen" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "thirty".

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 2 of the National Cultural Center Act (72 Stat. 1698) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The general trustees shall be appointed by the President of the United States and each such trustee shall hold office as a member of the Board for a term of ten years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, (2) the terms of any members appointed prior to the date of enactment of the National Cultural Center Amendments Act of 1963 shall expire as designated by the President at the time of appointment, and (3) the terms of the first fifteen members appointed to the Board pursuant to the amendments made by the National Cultural Center Amendments Act of 1963 shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, three on September 1, 1964, three on September 1, 1966, three on September 1, 1968, three on September 1, 1970, and three on September 1, 1972."

SEC. 3. Subsection (a) of section 6 of the National Cultural Center Act (72 Stat. 1699) is amended in its second sentence by deleting the word "eight" and substituting in lieu thereof "twelve".

SEC. 4. Subsection (a) of section 7 of the National Cultural Center Act (72 Stat. 1700) is amended by deleting the word "five" and substituting in lieu thereof the word "eight".

SEC. 5. This Act may be cited as the "National Cultural Center Amendments Act of 1963".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 362), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

Public Law 874, 85th Congress, authorized the establishment in the Smithsonian Institution of a Board of Trustees of the National Cultural Center, composed of 15 specified Federal officials, members ex officio, and 15 general trustees appointed by the President, to cause to be constructed for the Institution, with funds raised by voluntary contributions, a building to be designated as the National Cultural Center on a site in the District of Columbia bounded by Rock Creek Parkway, New Hampshire Avenue, the proposed Inner Loop Freeway, and the approaches to the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge.

The Board would maintain and administer the National Cultural Center and site thereof, present programs of the performing arts, lectures, and other programs, and provide facilities for other civic activities. There would also be established an Advisory Committee on the Arts, designated by the President, to advise and consult with the Board and make recommendations regarding cultural activities to be carried on in the Center. The lands for the National Cultural Center and related activities would be acquired by the National Capital Planning Commission, with plans and specifications for the building approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

The act provides that it will expire if, within 5 years after the date of its approval, in the opinion of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, sufficient funds to construct the National Cultural Center have not been received by the trustees. Any funds and property (real and personal) received by the trustees during this period, and income therefrom, in event of the termination of the offices of such trustees, shall vest in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and shall be used by the Board to carry out the purposes of Public Law 357, approved March 28, 1958, which provides for the transfer of the Civil Service Commission Building in the District of Columbia to the Smithsonian Institution to house certain art collections, and for the acquisition of works of art to be housed in such building, except that such funds or property may be vested in an organization designated by the donor at the time of making the donation, if a contribution to such organization is tax deductible under the internal revenue laws.

S. 1652 would increase the number of general trustees appointed by the President from 15 to 30, to hold office as a member of the Board for a term of 10 years. The terms of any members appointed prior to the date of enactment of these amendments would expire as designated by the President at the time of appointment; and the terms of the first 15 members appointed under the terms of these amendments would expire at staggered intervals, 3 on each of the dates September 1, 1964, 1966, 1968, 1970, and 1972. The bill would also increase the membership of the Board constituting a quorum required for the transaction of business from 8 to 12 corresponding with the enlargement of the Board of Trustees. The increase in number of general trustees would give the Board wider geographic representation, and permit appointment of additional Board members who are interested in the objectives of the cultural program, interested in the prospective activities, and in the establishment of adequate facilities for the Center.

The authorized period for the trustees to solicit funds for the construction of the National Cultural Center expires on September 2, 1963. S. 1652 extends the period for 3 years in order to give the trustees additional time in which to complete the fundraising campaign. It is understood that the Board of Trustees has received in excess of $3 million of the necessary funds to date. In addition, the Ford Foundation has made a conditional pledge of $5 million. President Kennedy recently designated the period from June 16 through June 30, 1963, for a special Federal fundraising campaign in behalf of the National Cultural Center in the National Capital area.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

The committee is of the opinion that enlargement of the Board of Trustees of the National Cultural Center is highly desirable, to provide broader representation of the arts, and permit a broader geographical representation on the Board, to adequately cope with the wide range of cultural interests and art forms involved. It has also become apparent that additional time will be required to reach the $30 million voluntary contributions necessary for construction of facilities for the National Cultural Center. The committee therefore recommends enactment of S. 1652.

ESTIMATED COST

Enactment of S. 1652 will involve no additional Federal funds.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 6016) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

RICE ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The bill (S. 1604) to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to the transfer of producer rice acreage allotments was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (f) of section 353 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as added by Public Law 87-412, is amended in paragraph (3), clause (i) thereof, by adding immediately following the word "acquire" the language ", except for land," and by striking out the language ", and any land owned by the transferor to which any of the transferred rice history acreage may be ascribed".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 364—explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1604) to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to the transfer of producer rice acreage allotments, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

This bill would permit a rice producer permanently withdrawing from rice production to transfer his history for allotment purposes, without transferring his land as required by existing law. It applies only in areas where allotments are made on the basis of producer history; and the producer would still be required to transfer his rice producing equipment, other than land.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 403) to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed was announced as next in order.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask that the joint resolution be passed over and placed at the foot of the calendar.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

AMENDMENT TO ACT CREATING BOARD FOR THE CONDEMNATION OF INSANITARY BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 994) to amend the act, entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (d) of section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved May 1, 1906 (34 Stat. 157; title 5, ch. 6, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), as amended, is amended by striking "same manner as general taxes are collected in the District of Columbia", and inserting in lieu thereof "manner provided in section 7 of this Act".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 7 of said Act, as amended, is amended (1) by striking "in the same manner as general taxes are collected in the District of Columbia", and inserting in lieu thereof "as provided in this section"; and (2) by inserting immediately before the period at the end of said section the following: ": *Provided further*, That the taxes authorized to be levied and collected under this Act may be paid without interest within sixty days from the date such tax was levied. Interest of one-half of 1 per centum for each month or part thereof shall be charged on all unpaid amounts from the expiration of sixty days from the date such tax was levied. Any such tax may be paid in three equal installments with interest thereon. If any such tax or part thereof shall remain unpaid after the expiration of two years from the date such tax was levied, the property against which said tax was levied may be sold for such tax or unpaid portion thereof with interest and penalties thereon at the next ensuing annual tax sale in the same manner and under the same conditions as property sold for delinquent general real estate taxes, if said tax with interest and penalties thereon shall not have been paid in full prior to said sale".

(b) Any tax levied pursuant to such Act approved May 1, 1906, as amended by the Act approved August 28, 1954, which was levied after the effective date of such Act of August 28, 1954, and prior to the effective date of this section, shall, for the purpose of computing interest thereon, be deemed to have been levied as of the effective date of this section.

SEC. 3. Section 10 of such Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. (a) Any notice required by this Act to be served shall be deemed to have been served when served by any of the following methods: (a) when forwarded to the last known address of the owner as recorded in the real estate assessment records of the District of Columbia by registered or certified mail, with return receipt, and such receipt shall constitute prima facie evidence of service upon such owner if such receipt is signed either by the owner or by a person of suitable age and discretion located at such address: *Provided*, That valid service upon the owner shall be deemed effected if such notice shall be refused by the owner and not delivered for that reason; or (b) when delivered to the person to be notified; or (c) when left at the usual residence or place of business of the person to be notified with a person of suitable age and discretion then resident or employed therein; or (d) if no such residence or place of business can be found in the District of Columbia by reasonable search, then if left with any person of suitable age and discretion employed at the office of any agent of the person to be notified, which agent has any authority or duty with reference to the land or tenement to which said notice relates; or (e) if any such notice forwarded by registered or certified mail be returned for reasons other than refusal, or if personal service of any such notice, as hereinbefore provided, cannot be effected, then if published on three consecutive days in a daily newspaper published in the District of Columbia; or (f) if by reason of an outstanding unrecorded transfer of title the name of the owner in fact cannot be ascertained beyond a reasonable doubt, then if served on the owner of record in a manner hereinbefore provided. Any notice to a corporation shall, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed to have been served on such corporation if served on the president, secretary, treasurer, general manager, or any principal officer of such corporation in the manner hereinbefore provided for the service of notices on natural persons holding property in their own right; and notices to a foreign corporation shall, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed to have been served if served personally on any agent of such corporation, or if left with any person of suitable age and discretion residing at the usual residence or employed at the usual place of business of such agent in the District of Columbia.

"(b) In case such notice is served by any method other than personal service, notice shall also be sent to the owner by ordinary mail."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 366), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 994) to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended, after full consideration, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of this bill is to amend the act of May 1, 1960, as amended by the act of August 28, 1954 (Public Law 681, 83d Cong.), so as to correct what has proved to be certain administrative deficiencies in the act. The proposed amendments would bring the provisions of the act relating to assessment and collection of taxes into conformity with the provisions for assessment and collection of taxes applicable to special assessments levied for public improvements under the act of July 25, 1935 (sec. 47-1103(b), District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition).

Existing law provides for the repair or the demolition by the District of Columbia of buildings condemned under such law, in the event the owner fails to comply with orders of the Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings to repair or demolish such buildings. Present law further provides that the costs incurred by the District government in repairing or demolishing any such buildings be assessed as a tax against the property and collected in the same manner as general taxes are collected, the tax assessment being enforced by the sale of the property at an annual tax sale. However, there is no provision for a specific time when the assessment shall be paid, nor does it provide for interest on delinquent payments.

The bill would amend the act of May 1, 1906, as amended, so as to provide that the assessment may be paid without interest within 60 days after the assessment is levied. Interest at the rate of one-half of 1 percent a month or portion of a month would be charged after such 60-day period. The tax would be payable in three equal installments, with interest. If the tax is not paid in full within 2 years after the assessment is levied, the property would be subject to sale at the next ensuing tax sale. The bill also provides that any tax levied after August 28, 1954, shall be deemed to have been levied on the effective date of the bill for the purpose of determining dates of payment and computing interest thereon.

Another deficiency in the existing law is the specified number of methods of giving notice to the owner of the property affected of the proposed action to be taken by the Board. Any notice required by this act to be served shall be deemed to have been served if delivered to the person to be notified or if left at the usual residence or place of business of the person to be notified, with a person of suitable age and discretion, or if no such residence or place of business can be found in the District by reasonable search, if left with any person of suitable age and discretion employed therein at the office of any agent of the person to be notified. If no such office can be found in the District by reasonable search, notice shall be forwarded by registered mail to the last known address of the person to be notified; or if no address be known or can by reasonable diligence be ascertained, or if any notice forwarded by registered mail is returned by the post office authorities, then it shall be published on 3 consecutive days in a daily newspaper published in the District of Columbia. These several methods must be followed in chronological order.

The bill amends this section of the act so that any order of precedence is eliminated and permits the use of the respective methods of service of notice without the necessity of first exhausting any other method of accomplishing service. The bill provides that in case such notice is served by any method other than personal service, notice shall also be sent to the owner by ordinary mail.

A substantially similar bill (S. 745) was passed by the Senate in the 86th Congress on April 10, 1959, and again in the 87th Congress (S. 563).

The bill was requested by and has the approval of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. The committee was informed that enactment of this measure would incur no additional cost to the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT TO ACT TO PROVIDE FOR COMPULSORY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND FOR TAKING OF SCHOOL CENSUS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 999) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of article II of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 807; sec. 31-208, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), is amended (1) by striking therefrom "all children between the ages of three and eighteen years permanently or temporarily residing in the District of Columbia, and annually thereafter or as frequently" and inserting in lieu thereof "all children under the age of eighteen years permanently or temporarily residing in the District of Columbia as frequently;" and (2) by inserting immediately after "the school attended by him," the following: "whether such school is public or private."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 367), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 999) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925, after full consideration, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of this bill is to amend existing laws as to assure an accurate school census, and to provide a greater source of data for anticipatory planning purposes with respect to zoning and school construction in the District of Columbia. The bill would specifically accomplish the following:

(1) Provide that all children below the age of 18 years be listed in the taking of the school census, instead of the present requirement that only those between the ages of 3 and 18 years be listed. The committee was informed that this provision is desirable and would be very helpful to the Board of Education in making projections of future enrollments. It would also be of assistance in anticipatory planning with respect to zoning and school construction, with the ultimate result benefiting the District financially;

(2) Provide that in addition to the name of the school attended by the child as required by the census, there be a designation as to whether such school is public or private; and

(3) Provide that the census be made as frequently as the Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Education find it necessary and desirable to do so, instead of annually, as now required. This provision was recommended to the committee on the basis of a more economical use of funds than is possible under existing law.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia favor enactment of the bill. They informed the committee that enactment of the measure could result in a financial saving to the District, and that in any event, passage would involve no additional expense.

The Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety held public hearings on the bill on March 26, 1963. No one appeared in opposition.

An identical bill, S. 560, passed the Senate during the 87th Congress.

AMENDMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOL FOOD SERVICES ACT

The bill (S. 1078) to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last sentence of section 5 of the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act (65 Stat. 369; sec. 31-1404, D.C. Code, 1961 edition) is amended by striking the comma following "motor trucks" and inserting in lieu thereof a period, and by striking the remainder of such last sentence.

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 6 of such Act, as amended (sec. 31-1405, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended to read as follows: "Appropriations are hereby authorized for all necessary expenses of the Office of Central Management, Department of Food Services, in the public schools of the District of Columbia, including the payment of compensation for personal services and Government contributions to related insurance costs; for the acquisition, maintenance, and replacement of equipment used or acquired for use in the conduct of the Department of Food Services in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and for reimbursement of the District of Columbia public school food services fund for lunches served in accordance with section 9 of the National School Lunch Act (60 Stat. 233; title 42, sec. 1758, U.S.C., 1952 edition), to children without cost to such children or at reduced cost."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 368), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1078) to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act, after full consideration, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purposes of the bill are (1) to authorize appropriations of public funds to pay salaries and related costs of operating the Office of Central Management of the Food Services Department in the public schools and (2) to provide for appropriation of public money to pay for lunches furnished to all needy elementary and secondary public school children.

Under existing law (65 Stat. 369) the expenses, salaries, and related costs of conducting the Office of Central Management of the Department of Food Services of the public schools in the District of Columbia are paid from the Food Services Fund. This fund is a revolving account into which all revenues from the operation of food services in the public schools are placed. These receipts are used for the "purchase of foods, supplies, and all other services and expenditures of whatever nature which are necessary for the conduct of the Department of Food Services, including personal services, the operation and maintenance of motortrucks, *and the expenses of conducting the Office of Central Management.*"

In reporting on the bill, the Board of Commissioners made the following statement concerning the need for striking the above italicized language from the existing law:

Experience has shown that these costs cannot continue to be borne by the school lunch program (salaries and related insurance costs of employees of the Office of Central Management) without this assistance. The Superintendent of Schools reports that conferences with officials of the Department of Agriculture and with food services directors of other cities and States tend to the conclusion that such costs should not be borne by the students any more than the other costs of administering the school system. The Superintendent points out that the staff of the Office of Central Management of the Food Services Department serves in a dual capacity of State and city administration for three Federal programs; namely, the national school lunch program, the special milk program, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture donated-commodity program for District of Columbia schools and institutions. The Superintendent further notes that comparable functions in the States are administered by State officials of education, and administrative staff salaries are paid from State appropriated funds, whereas the District of Columbia school lunch program is forced to bear this expense.

In the District of Columbia public schools elementary needy lunch program, authorized by Public Law 86–104, all students certified as needy by the school principal, whether or not their families are receiving public assistance, have their lunches paid for from public funds. In the secondary school program there is a distinction made between lunches served to needy pupils whose families receive public assistance and lunches served to needy pupils whose families do not receive public assistance.

Public Law 85–901, enacted by the 85th Congress, provides authorization for reimbursement to be made to the secondary schools only in cases where free lunches are served to children of families who are recipients of public assistance granted by the government of the District of Columbia.

During the school year, September 1962 to June 1963, 142,994 lunches were served without charge to needy children in the secondary schools. Of this number, 51,236 were reimbursed for from public funds in accordance with Public Law 85–901. Reimbursement is made at whatever the current student price is at a given time and for this year that price was 30 cents. The cost of the remaining 91,758 free lunches served was absorbed in the overall operation of the Department of Food Services. In other words sufficient "profit" was made on the lunches sold to nonneedy students in the elementary and secondary schools to defray the cost of furnishing free or reduced-cost lunches to the needy students whose families did not receive public assistance.

If the Food Services Fund is reimbursed with public funds for all needy lunches served in the secondary schools, the Food Services Department will be able to improve the quality of the meals furnished, particularly with respect to the variety of food. It will also make it possible for the Department of Food Services to pay its cafeteria workers a better wage. These workers are currently receiving $1.25 an hour.

The cost of the central office operation for the fiscal year 1963 is estimated to be approximately $72,700 for the salaries and related insurance costs for the Director and two Assistant Directors and for eight other employees and the cost of providing free lunches to needy secondary school pupils whose parents do not receive public assistance payments from the District will be $30,000, making the total estimated annual cost of the bill $102,700.

Upon enactment of this legislation, the committee urges and is most hopeful that the Office of Central Management of the Food Services Department takes the necessary steps to improve the quality of the school lunches.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia recommend enactment of S. 1078. An identical bill, S. 3314, passed the Senate in the 87th Congress.

AMENDMENT TO ACT RELATING TO REGISTERED NURSES WITH RESPECT TO MINIMUM AGE LIMITATION FOR REGISTRATION

The bill (H.R. 1933) to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia", as amended, with respect to the minimum age limitation for registration was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 369), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 1933) to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," as amended, with respect to the minimum age limitation for registration, after full consideration, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommmend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of this bill is to amend existing law so as to lower from 21 to 19 years the age requirement for registration as a nurse by the Nurses' Examining Board of the District of Columbia.

The present law states that no nurse shall be registered in the District of Columbia who has not attained the age of 21 years. The committee is informed that an increasing number of students are graduating from nursing schools before they reach 21 years of age, and these students who do not meet the District's age requirement take an examination in another State and practice nursing temporarily and/or permanently in these other jurisdictions. Further information furnished the committee indicates that 20 States presently have no minimum age requirement for registration of nurses, and the age requirements in the other States, with the exception of North Dakota and the District of Columbia, range from 18 to 20 years.

The Graduate Nurses' Association, the Capital City School of Nursing, the Lucy Webb Hayes School of Nursing, and the Washington Hospital Center School of Nursing all urged passage of this legislation.

The Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety held public hearings on the bill on March 26, 1963. No one appeared in opposition.

The District of Columbia Commissioners requested introduction of this measure and recommend its enactment.

Passage of this bill will not involve additional expense to the District of Columbia government.

AMENDMENT TO ACT REGULATING PREVENTION AND CONTROL OF COMMUNICABLE DISEASES SO AS TO PROVIDE FOR TREATMENT OF MINORS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 2485) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment on page 2, line 21, after the word "section", to insert "The Director of Public Health or his authorized agent shall exercise reasonable diligence in ascertaining the whereabouts of a parent, or of a person standing in loco parentis to such minor, and if such whereabouts are ascertained shall as soon as practical notify such parent or loco parentis that such minor is affected with a venereal disease, or is a carrier of a venereal disease, and whether he has received or refused such treatment."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 370), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 2485) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable disease," approved August 11, 1939, as amended, after full consideration, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendment is as follows: Page 2, line 23, immediately after the period insert the following sentence:

"The Director of Public Health or his authorized agent shall exercise reasonable diligence in ascertaining the whereabouts of a parent, or of a person standing in loco parentis to such minor, and if such whereabouts are ascertained shall as soon as practical notify such parent or loco parentis that such minor is affected with a venereal disease, or is a carrier of a venereal disease, and whether he has received or refused such treatment."

The purpose of this bill, as amended, is to amend existing law so as to authorize the Department of Public Health of the District of Columbia to treat minors for venereal disease upon their own consent, when they present themselves voluntarily to the Department's health centers, rather than having to obtain such permission from their parents or guardians. However, the committee amended the measure to provide that the Director of Public Health, or his authorized agent, shall exercise reasonable diligence in ascertaining the whereabout of a parent, or of a person standing in loco parentis to such minor, and if such whereabouts are ascertained shall as soon as practical notify such parent or loco parentis that such minor is affected with a venereal disease, or is a carrier of a venereal disease, and whether or not he has received or refused such treatment.

At present, minors for whom parental consent for treatment of gonorrhea cannot be obtained are given only oral antibiotics, which are relatively safe to administer but are not the drugs of choice, since effective treatment is assured only by injections, and also because oral medication is impractical in patients who are irresponsible or careless. In the case of syphilis, there is no prophylactic agent other than penicillin, and hence minors who have been exposed to this disease receive no treatment whatever without parental consent. According to testimony presented in a public hearing on March 26, 1963, approximately 10,000 persons per year are reported to the District of Columbia Department of Public Health as having venereal disease and approximately 3,000 of these are minors.

The seriousness of this situation is graphically illustrated by the following statistics which were reported to this committee by the Bureau of Disease Control of the District of Columbia Public Health Department:

TABLE 1.—*Venereal disease cases reported by all sources by age: District of Columbia, calendar year 1962, all races*

Age	Total cases	Syphilis				Gonorrhea	Other venereal disease
		Total	Primary and secondary	Early latent	Other		
Total	10, 573	2, 162	723	383	1, 056	8, 219	192
Under 15 years	80	14	4	--------	10	66	--------
15 to 19 years	1, 639	156	106	38	12	1, 456	27
20 to 24 years	3, 442	322	210	81	31	3, 059	61
25 to 29 years	1, 855	281	165	70	46	1, 548	26
30 to 34 years	1, 093	222	100	76	46	850	21
35 to 39 years	747	172	58	37	77	555	20
40 to 44 years	519	171	34	26	111	334	14
45 to 49 years	310	147	18	15	114	154	9
50 to 54 years	202	126	11	12	103	67	9
55 to 59 years	162	126	6	4	116	33	3
60 to 64 years	131	112	2	9	101	19	--------
65 years and over	185	175	1	3	171	9	1
Not stated	208	138	8	12	118	60	1

TABLE 2.—*Venereal disease cases and case rates by stage and disease; District of Columbia, calendar years 1953–62, all races*

Venereal disease	Number of cases									
	1962	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956	1955	1954	1953
Total, venereal disease	10, 573	11, 119	13, 234	13, 181	12, 201	10, 226	13, 176	12, 335	15, 514	16, 698
Syphilis, total	2, 162	2, 037	2, 569	2, 015	2, 019	1, 519	2, 193	2, 101	3, 382	4, 189
Primary and secondary	723	627	518	323	181	141	60	44	60	78
Early latent	383	336	456	344	368	226	323	305	526	828
Late and late latent	1, 006	1, 043	1, 553	1, 315	1, 428	1, 116	1, 773	1, 700	2, 722	3, 186
Congenital	48	30	42	33	42	36	37	52	74	97
Not stated	2	1	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Gonorrhea	8, 219	8, 652	10, 262	10, 926	10, 077	8, 651	10, 889	10, 090	10, 938	12, 084
Other veneral disease	192	430	403	240	105	56	94	144	1, 194	425

Venereal disease	Rate per 100,000 population									
	1962	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956	1955	1954	1953
Total, venereal disease	1, 350. 5	1, 420. 2	1, 711. 1	1, 698. 8	1, 546. 8	1, 298. 4	1, 691. 0	1, 556. 5	1, 942. 2	2, 047. 6
Syphilis, total	276. 2	260. 2	332. 2	259. 7	256. 0	192. 9	281. 4	265. 1	423. 4	513. 7
Primary and secondary	92. 3	80. 1	67. 0	41. 6	22. 9	17. 9	7. 7	5. 6	7. 5	9. 6
Early latent	48. 9	42. 9	59. 0	44. 3	46. 7	28. 7	41. 5	38. 5	65. 8	101. 5
Late and late latent	128. 5	133. 2	200. 8	169. 5	181. 0	141. 7	227. 5	214. 5	340. 8	390. 7
Congenital	6. 1	3. 8	5. 4	4. 3	5. 3	4. 6	4. 7	6. 6	9. 3	11. 9
Not stated	. 3	. 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gonorrhea	1, 049. 8	1, 105. 1	1, 326. 9	1, 408. 2	1, 277. 5	1, 098. 4	1, 397. 5	1, 273. 2	1, 369. 3	1, 481. 8
Other veneral disease	24. 5	54. 9	52. 1	30. 9	13. 3	7. 1	12. 1	18. 2	149. 5	52. 1

NOTE.—Rates based on estimated midyear population: 1962 rates based on 1961 estimated population.

TABLE 3.—*Venereal disease case rates for cases reported by all sources by age: District of Columbia, calendar year 1962, all races*

Age	Total cases	Syphilis				Gonorrhea	Other venereal disease
		Total	Primary and secondary	Early latent	Other		
Total	1, 350. 5	276. 2	92. 3	48. 9	134. 9	1, 049. 8	24. 5
Under 15 years	38. 5	6. 7	1. 9	0	4. 8	31. 7	0
15 to 19 years	3, 121. 9	297. 1	201. 9	72. 4	22. 9	2, 773. 3	51. 4
20 to 24 years	5, 560. 6	520. 2	339. 3	130. 9	50. 1	4, 941. 8	98. 5
25 to 29 years	3, 486. 8	528. 2	310. 2	131. 6	86. 5	2, 909. 8	48. 9
30 to 34 years	2, 081. 9	422. 9	190. 5	144. 8	87. 6	1, 619. 0	40. 0
35 to 39 years	1, 385. 9	319. 1	107. 6	68. 6	142. 9	1, 029. 7	37. 1
40 to 44 years	971. 9	320. 2	63. 7	48. 7	207. 9	625. 5	26. 2
45 to 49 years	587. 1	278. 4	34. 1	28. 4	215. 9	291. 7	17. 0
50 to 54 years	413. 9	258. 2	22. 5	24. 6	211. 1	137. 3	18. 4
55 to 59 years	395. 1	307. 3	14. 6	9. 8	282. 9	80. 5	7. 3
60 to 64 years	384. 2	328. 4	5. 9	26. 4	296. 2	55. 7	0
65 years and over	261. 3	247. 2	1. 4	4. 2	241. 5	12. 7	1. 4
Not stated	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

NOTE.—Rates per 100,000 estimated midyear population, 1961.

EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE 1963 TOBACCO ALLOTMENT LEASES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 340, House Joint Resolution 403.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 403) to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 365), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> This joint resolution extends the time to file leases of 1963 tobacco acreage allotments with the county committee until 20 days after the enactment of this joint resolution. It would be applicable only to leases agreed upon prior to the normal planting time, or June 15, 1963, whichever is earlier. It would thus afford relief to those farmers who met all conditions of the law regarding allotment leases, except the procedural requirement that the leases be filed with the county committee prior to the normal planting time in the county. Allotment leasing has been permitted only for the 1962 and 1963 crops, and mistakes and misunderstandings have consequently occurred both years. Public Law 87-530 added subsection (g) to the law to provide relief last year similar to that provided by House Joint Resolution 403 for 1963.
>
> S. 581, passed by Congress but not yet approved by the President, would extend leasing authority, with minor amendments, for an additional 2 years.
>
> The tobacco markets open about July 25, so prompt passage of this measure is urgent in order that the tobacco farmers affected by it may market their tobacco without penalty.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that brings to an end the call of the items on the calendar to which there is no objection, for the time being.

TRANSMISSION AND DISPOSITION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY GENERATED AT FALCON DAM ON THE RIO GRANDE RIVER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I know that Calendar No. 321, the bill (H.R. 4062) is still listed on the calendar. It is my understanding that the Senate granted unanimous consent to refer that measure to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Is my understanding correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

STATE COMMERCIAL FISHERY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 627) to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is Senate bill 627.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair. For the information of Senators, I should make an explanation. On Thursday last it was stated by the leadership that the pending business at the conclusion of the morning hour today would be the bill S. 646, the so-called chancery bill. Because of situations which have come to light since that time, it has been decided that the bill will not be taken up today, but will be the pending order at the conclusion of the morning business on Monday next.

THE X–15 PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Nowadays we hear a great deal about the exploits of some of our famed scientists, technicians, and others who are working in the field of science, especially in the atmosphere. There is one group about which we hear all too little, but whose contributions to the development of the atmosphere have been many, striking, daring, and have been carried on for a number of years. I refer, first, to the intrepid pioneers who work in what is known as the X–15 project.

On Friday a U.S. research airplane—the X–15—flew to a height of nearly 67 miles and set a world record for winged aircraft.

The flight was the 90th in an 11-year-old program which has set many marks, not just for speed and altitude, but for its contributions to aeronautical research and as an example of teamwork among agencies of Government and private industry.

The X–15 program is conducted cooperatively by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the U.S. Air Force, the U.S. Navy, and by the North American Aviation Co., the builder of the airplane.

When the stubby-winged rocket plane reached its new altitude record last Friday it was piloted by a civilian, Mr. Joseph A. Walker, chief test pilot for NASA. But Walker took the record away from another X–15 test pilot, Maj. Robert White of the Air Force.

Last summer, in the White House rose garden, President Kennedy presented the Robert J. Collier Trophy to four of the X–15 test pilots in recognition of what was described as "the greatest achievement in aeronautics or astronautics in America with respect to improving the performance efficiency or safety of air and space vehicles." The men accepting the Collier Trophy were Mr. Walker, Major White, Cmdr. Forrest S. Petersen of the Navy, and Mr. A. Scott Crossfield, a test pilot for North American Aviation.

Other men who have flown the X–15 include NASA test pilots John B. McKay and Neil Armstrong and Air Force Maj. Robert Rushworth. Earlier this month Major Rushworth deliberately crippled his X–15 by shutting off all electronic stability controls while traveling at more than five times the speed of sound. The purpose of the simulated breakdown was to test the natural stability of the aircraft and to see if the pilot could fly manually. Major Rushworth proved it could be done.

Mr. Walker, the new holder of the aircraft altitude record of 350,000 feet, also holds the world's aircraft speed record based on an X–15 flight last year. He is 42 years old, comes from Washington, Pa., and has been a test pilot for 18 years. He is married and has four children.

Joe Walker called last Friday's flight the smoothest of the 24 he has made in the X–15. At a news conference after landing, Mr. Walker, with a space-age flair for description, said the sky at 67 miles up was "like a black velvet photographer's curtain." He added that he was able to look below him and distinguish parts of Mexico, the Los Angeles Basin, California's Imperial Valley, and the U.S. cities of Las Vegas, Nev.; Monterey, Calif.; and Winslow, Ariz. During his record climb, Mr. Walker traveled about 315 ground miles. His speed reached about 3,866 miles an hour, but not fast enough to break his own record.

From the time his needle-nosed rocket plane was dropped from under the wing of a B–52 at an altitude of over 40,000 feet until he touched his steel skids down on the clay of Rogers Dry Lake, Walker had been airborne for only about 10 minutes. The powered portion of his flight, when the big rocket engine kicked the X–15 into a 67-mile-high arc, lasted 85 seconds. At that, the engine burned two seconds longer than had been programed and a surprised Walker later credited those short 2 seconds of extra thrust for the fact that he landed with a new altitude record. "I thought my altimeter was whacky," he said when he landed.

During his flight, Mr. Walker had reached the fringes of space. Out of the earth's atmosphere, he briefly had experienced weightlessness. He had controlled his craft with reaction jets similar in principle to those used to control the Mercury spacecraft. His pattern for reentry into the earth's atmosphere was like that of a spacecraft and even the X–15's color—dull black—was dictated by the necessity to reduce the searing heat of reentry. Even so, the temperature climbed so high during Mr. Walker's plunge back into the atmosphere that the paint on his aircraft glowed red. Mr. Walker, as a civilian, is not eligible to earn the military astronaut's wings although this was the third time he had passed the qualifying 50-mile mark.

But astronaut or no, there can be no question that Mr. Walker and all the members of the X–15 team are pioneers of the space age. The solid contributions of the X–15 program have been many and valuable. They include information on aerodynamic heating, the behavior of the boundary layer, the effect of noise levels on aircraft structures, measurement of friction drag on aircraft skin, new control systems, new piloting techniques, new landing gear designs and new ways of measuring landing gear loads, better instrument displays, and many other improvements to "performance, efficiency, or safety of air and space vehicles." In addition, during the current series of tests, the X–15 is being used to carry scientific experiments into space. One of these experiments will use a camera which may give us the first meaningful photographs of stars taken from outside the earth's atmosphere. Speed and altitude records may be the incidental contributions of the remarkable X–15 program. More significant in the long run is the information and experience it has provided and continues to provide about this strange new sea of space upon which man has embarked.

These men are heroes in the stricter connotation of that word. They carry out their duties and their obligations with dignity and integrity. It is a personal pleasure for me at this time to take the floor of the Senate and to give what personal recognition I can to this outstanding group of teammates who have performed so well and, in effect, so silently in behalf of the country as a whole. They have earned the thanks and appreciation of the Nation and we in the Senate salute and commend them.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point various statements relative to the work being performed by this team, as well as certain newspaper articles concerning the latest advance of the X-15 into space.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the statements and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, FLIGHT RESEARCH CENTER, EDWARDS, CALIF.

X-15 flight log

Number	Date	Flight No.	Pilot	Mach	Miles per hour	Maximum altitude (feet, mean sea level)	Remarks
1	Aug. 8, 1959	1-1-5	Crossfield	0.79	522	37,550	Planned glide flight.
2	Sept. 17, 1959	2-1-3	do.	2.11	1,393	52,341	1st powered flight.
3	Oct. 17, 1959	2-2-6	do.	2.15	1,419	61,781	
4	Nov. 5, 1959	2-3-9	do.	1.00	660	45,462	Engine fire; fuselage structural failure on landing.
5	Jan. 23, 1960	1-2-7	do.	2.53	1,669	66,844	
6	Feb. 11, 1960	2-4-11	do.	2.22	1,466	88,116	
7	Feb. 17, 1960	2-5-12	do.	1.57	1,036	42,640	
8	Mar. 17, 1960	2-6-13	do.	2.15	1,419	52,640	
9	Mar. 25, 1960	1-3-8	Walker	2.00	1,320	48,630	1st Government flight.
10	Mar. 29, 1960	2-7-15	Crossfield	1.96	1,293	49,982	
11	Mar. 8, 1960	2-8-16	do.	2.03	1,340	51,356	
12	Apr. 13, 1960	1-4-9	White	1.94	1,255	48.000	
13	Apr. 19, 1960	1-5-10	Walker	2.56	1,689	59,496	
14	May 6, 1960	1-6-11	White	2.20	1.542	60,938	
15	May 12, 1960	1-7-12	Walker	3.19	2,111	77,882	
16	May 19, 1960	1-8-13	White	2.31	1,590	108,997	
17	May 26, 1960	2-9-18	Crossfield	2.20	1,452	51,282	
18	June 4, 1960	1-9-17	Walker	3.31	2,196	78,112	
19	Aug. 12, 1960	1-10-19	White	2.52	1,772	136,500	
20	Aug. 19, 1960	1-11-21	Walker	3.13	1,986	75,982	
21	Sept. 10, 1960	1-12-23	White	3.23	2,182	79,864	
22	Sept. 23, 1960	1-13-25	Petersen	1.68	1,108	53,043	
23	Oct. 20, 1960	1-14-27	do.	1.94	1,280	53,800	
24	Oct. 28, 1960	1-15-28	McKay	2.02	1,333	50,700	
25	Nov. 4, 1960	1-16-29	Rushworth	1.95	1,282	48,900	
26	Nov. 15, 1960	2-10-21	Crossfield	2.97	1,960	81,200	1st flight with XLR-9 design engine.
27	Nov. 17, 1960	1-17-30	Rushworth	1.90	1,254	54,750	
28	Nov. 22, 1960	2-11-22	Crossfield	2.51	1,656	61,900	1st restart with XLR-99 design engine.
29	Nov. 30, 1960	1-18-31	Armstrong	1.75	1,155	48,840	
30	Dec. 6, 1960	2-12-23	Crossfield	2.85	1,881	53,374	
31	Dec. 9, 1960	1-19-32	Armstrong	1.80	1,188	50,095	1st hot-nose flight.
32	Feb. 1, 1961	1-20-35	McKay	1.88	1,242	49,780	
33	Feb. 7, 1961	1-21-36	White	3.50	2,275	78,150	Last LR-11 flight.
34	Mar. 7, 1961	2-13-26	do.	4.43	2,905	77,450	1st Government XLR-99 flight.
35	Mar. 30, 1961	2-14-28	Walker	3.95	2,760	169,600	
36	Apr. 21, 1961	2-15-29	White	4.62	3,074	105,000	
37	May 25, 1961	2-16-31	Walker	4.90	3,300	107,500	
38	June 23, 1961	2-17-33	White	5.27	3,603	107,700	
39	Aug. 10, 1961	1-22-37	Petersen	4.11	2,735	78,200	
40	Sept. 12, 1961	2-18-34	Walker	5.25	3,614	114,300	
41	Sept. 28, 1961	2-19-35	Petersen	5.30	3,600	100,800	
42	Oct. 4, 1961	1-23-39	Rushworth	4.30	2,830	78,000	Flight made with lower ventral off.
43	Oct. 11, 1961	2-20-36	White	5.21	3,647	217,000	Outer panel of left windshield cracked.
44	Oct. 11, 1961	1-24-40	Walker	5.74	3,900	108,600	
45	Nov. 19, 1961	2-21-37	White	6.04	4,093	101,600	Design speed achieved.
46	Dec. 20, 1961	3-1-2	Armstrong	3.76	2,502	81,000	1st flight for X-15 No. 3.
47	Jan. 10, 1962	1-25-44	Petersen	.97	645	44,750	Emergency landing on Mud Lake after engine failed to light.
48	Jan. 17, 1962	3-2-3	Armstrong	5.51	3,765	133,500	
49	Apr. 5, 1962	3-3-7	do.	4.06	2,830	179,000	
50	Apr. 19, 1962	1-26-46	Walker	5.69	3,866	154,000	
51	Apr. 20, 1962	3-4-8	Armstrong	5.31	3,789	207,500	
52	Apr. 30, 1962	1-27-48	Walker	4.94	3,489	246,700	Design altitude flight.
53	May 8, 1962	2-22-40	Rushworth	4.34	3,524	70,400	
54	May 23, 1962	1-28-49	do.	5.03	3,450	100,400	
55	June 1, 1962	2-23-43	White	5.42	3,675	132,600	
56	June 7, 1962	1-29-50	Walker	5.39	3,672	103,600	
57	June 12, 1962	3-5-9	White	5.02	3,517	184,600	
58	June 21, 1962	3-6-10	do.	5.08	3,641	246,700	
59	June 27, 1962	1-30-51	Walker	5.92	4,104	123,700	Speed record.
60	June 29, 1962	2-24-44	McKay	4.95	3,280	83,200	
61	July 16, 1962	1-31-52	Walker	5.37	3,674	107,000	
62	July 17, 1962	3-7-12	White	5.45	3,784	314,750	FAI world altitude record.
63	July 18, 1962	2-25-45	McKay	5.18	3,474	82,500	
64	July 26, 1962	1-32-53	Armstrong	5.74	3,989	98,900	
65	Aug. 2, 1962	3-8-16	Walker	5.07	3,438	144,500	
66	Aug. 8, 1962	2-26-46	Rushworth	4.40	2,943	90,877	
67	Aug. 14, 1962	3-9-18	Walker	5.25	3,747	193,600	
68	Aug. 20, 1962	2-27-47	Rushworth	5.24	3,534	88,900	
69	Aug. 29, 1962	2-28-48	do.	5.12	3,447	97,200	
70	Sept. 28, 1962	2-29-50	McKay	4.22	2,765	68,200	This and all following flights without lower ventral.
71	Oct. 4, 1962	3-10-19	Rushworth	5.17	3,493	121,200	
72	Oct. 9, 1962	2-30-51	McKay	5.46	3,716	130,200	
73	Oct. 23, 1962	3-11-20	Rushworth	5.47	3,764	134,500	
74	Nov. 9, 1962	2-31-52	McKay	1.49	1,019	53,950	
75	Dec. 14, 1962	3-12-22	White	5.65	3,742	141,400	
76	Dec. 20, 1962	3-13-23	Walker	5.6	3,886	157,000	
77	Jan. 17, 1963	3-14-24	do.	5.0	3,716	270,000	
78	Apr. 11, 1963	1-33-54	Rushworth	4.24	2,795	73,000	
79	Apr. 18, 1963	3-15-25	Walker	5.54	3,682	92,000	
80	Apr. 25, 1963	1-34-54	McKay	5.44	3,545	106,000	
81	May 2, 1963	3-16-26	Walker	4.86	3,511	130,000	
82	May 14, 1963	3-17-28	Rushworth	5.17	3,443	95,000	
83	May 15, 1963	1-35-56	McKay	5.55	3,886	123,000	
84	May 29, 1963	3-18-29	Walker	5.57	3,750	92,000	
85	June 18, 1963	3-19-30	Rushworth	4.79	3,477	132,000	
86	June 25, 1963	1-36-57	Walker	5.44	3,784	112,000	
87	June 27, 1963	3-20-31	Rushworth	4.73	3,545	286,000	
88	July 9, 1963	1-37-59	Walker	----------	3,580	223,000	
89	July 18, 1963	1-38-	Rushworth	----------	3,818	103,000	
90	July 19, 1963	3-21-	Walker	----------	3,866	350,000	

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 20, 1963]

X–15 Pilot Says Record Flight Was "Just My Job"

Edwards Air Force Base, Calif., July 20.—Veteran X–15 pilot Joe Walker says that becoming the world's highest flying airplane pilot was "just my job"

He said he isn't "bothered in the least about not qualifying as a winged astronaut.

"Records are all in a day's work," drawled the greying 41-year-old father of four, who already was the world's fastest flying pilot when he set a new altitude mark of 67 miles (350,000 feet) yesterday.

He regards flying as a business and shuns the glamor.

Yesterday's flight surpassed the previous world altitude mark of 59.6 miles (314,750 feet) set last year by another X–15 pilot, Air Force Maj. Bob White.

Pilot Walker overshot his scheduled height of 60 miles, which also would have been a record, apparently because of too much push from the X–15's 57,000-pound thrust engine.

He said he did not know he had gone so high until after his flight was over.

"I saw the altimeter needle pointing to 350,000 feet, but I figured it was just whacky and didn't pay any attention to it."

At the top of his high-reaching flight, Walker said, "it sure is dark up here."

He later compared the dark void of space to a "black velvet photographer's curtain."

Where U.S. Is No. 1

Edwards Air Force Base, Calif.—In another spectacular demonstration of U.S. rocket-plane supremacy, the X–15 soared to a record altitude of about 67 miles on July 19.

The climb broke the X-15's own world mark for aircraft altitude by more than 7 miles. No plane built by Russia or any other country has come close.

Joseph Walker, National Aeronautics and Space Administration test pilot, attained a speed of 3,866 miles an hour during the 11-minute flight—in which he went far higher than expected.

X–15 Vaults 67 Miles, Snaps Altitude Record on 3,886 Miles per Hour Flight

Edwards Air Force Base, Calif., July 19.—Space pilot Joseph M. Walker shot to an unexpectedly high X–15 altitude of nearly 67 miles Friday—presumably towing a small balloon—then landed with these comments: "I thought my altimeter had gone wacky.

"It sure is dark up there, like a black velvet photographer's curtain.

"It was the smoothest flight I've ever had.

"I could see farther than I could see.

"It's all in a day's work."

Walker, who flies for the National Aeronautics and Space Agency, was supposed to soar to but 315,000 feet (about 60 miles), barely surpassing the old X–15 record of 314,750 set a year ago by Air Force Maj. Joseph M. White.

Instead, the rocket plane soared feet higher, to 350,000 feet, or nearly 67 miles. Why?

Walker attributed it to the fact the engine burned 85 seconds instead of the programed 83, giving it a harder kick as it zoomed skyward.

HITS TOP SPEED

Plunging back from the almost airless realm of near space into the thicker earth's atmosphere, Walker hit a top speed of 3,886 miles an hour, no threat to his X–15 speed mark of 4,104 miles per hour.

To determine air density, the X–15, was to eject a 30-inch-diameter balloon at 250,000 feet and trail it at the end of a 100-foot fishline as it arched over the desert. Experts assume this happened, but will have to check data to be sure. Walker's view of it was blocked.

STEALS OWN THUNDER

By soaring to 350,000 feet, Walker stole his own thunder in a way. The flight had been described as a warmup for a 350,000-footer later in the summer.

The 350,000-foot altitude is regarded by some as the probable safe maximum for X–15's as they are presently constructed. The engine has power to shoot them far higher, probably 100 miles or more. The problem is heating due to air friction as they return to earth.

One of the three X–15's is due to be equipped with new heat shielding for flights to 400,000 feet or more.

ANNOUNCE ALTITUDE

The flight was the X–15's longest, 315 miles, from Smith Ranch, Nev., where it was dropped from a B–52. The previous high was 240 miles. On his way in, to gain extra distance, Walker pulled back on his stick at 80,000 feet and bounced back to 90,000. This gave him more altitude for the final glide to a landing.

Although radio monitors announced his 350,000 feet while he was still aloft, Walker said he wasn't aware he had set a new record until he landed. "I thought my altimeter had gone wacky."

SAW MORE AREA

About that "I could see farther than I could see" remark:

What he meant was that he could have seen farther than he actually did, if weather conditions had been better.

"I saw more territory than I ever had before, and had more time to look around, but it seems like every time I go up there's a fog bank somewhere."

As a civilian, Walker does not qualify for astronaut wings, as military pilots do after flights 50 miles or more high.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, believing that credit should be given where credit it due, and in the hope that these men who have performed such wonderful feats and who have learned so much from the X–15 will understand that their work is appreciated, I join the Senator from Montana in paying tribute to these men, of whom the whole Nation should be justly proud.

Mr. President, it might be well to give a little history of the events which have led up to the remarkable exploits of the men who pilot the X–15.

In May 1952 the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, which later formed the nucleus of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, directed its laboratories to begin studies of manned, hypersonic flight at high altitudes.

In May 1954, NACA established performance requirements for a research craft to assist in these studies.

In July 1954, representatives of NACA, the U.S. Air Force, and the Navy, agreed on a joint research airplane program.

In 1955 North American Aviation, Inc., was awarded a contract to build three X–15 airplanes.

The first X–15 aircraft was completed by the contractor in 1958.

A. Scott Crossfield of North American Aviation made the test flights for the contractor. In 1960 this airplane was delivered to the Air Force and turned over to NASA to begin its research flight program.

The first Government flight was completed on March 25, 1960, with Joseph A. Walker as test pilot. This is the same Joseph A. Walker who, a few days ago, established an altitude record of approximately 67 miles.

I have given a very sketchy background of how the X–15 came into being. Only those who have participated in the program can know the troubles and obstacles encountered. I am sure they were very numerous.

The performance of the X–15 has justified the confidence placed in it, and of its history every American should be proud. Through experimenting with this plane man is learning to fly from earth into space.

As the Senator from Montana has indicated, there were six pilots originally assigned to the X–15 project.

Capt. Ivan C. Kincheloe, Jr., of the Air Force, was killed in a crash of an F–104 in 1958.

Comdr. Forrest Petersen, who was assigned by the U.S. Navy to X–15 duty, was reassigned to command a fighter squadron in 1962.

But of the original six pilots, there are four remaining; Joseph A. Walker, Neil A. Armstrong, and John B. McKay, all of NASA; and Maj. Robert M. White of the U.S. Air Force.

Without benefit of a publicity buildup, without hope for unusual pecuniary reward, and without other things which could have been theirs, these men recognized the job which needed to be done, and they are doing it well.

The debt which the Nations owes to the pilots of the X–15 and to their collaborators on the ground can never be paid in cash or glory. It will be paid in terms of the satisfaction which each will receive from the knowledge of the part he is playing in freeing man from the "surly bonds of earth" and making space travel both possible and practicable.

ANCHOR LIGHTS AND FOG SIGNALS IN SPECIAL ANCHORAGE AREAS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, before the Senate proceeds to the consideration of Senate bill 627, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1036.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1036) to amend the inland and western rivers rules concerning anchor lights and fog signals required in special anchorage areas, and for other purposes, which were, on page 2, line 17, strike out "or" and insert "of"; and on page 5, line 16, after "vessel" insert "of".

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments, which are of a technical and clarifying nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alaska.

The motion was agreed to.

STATE COMMERCIAL FISHERY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 627) to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in connection with S. 627, I offer an amendment, send it to the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment, offered by the Senator from Alaska, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 9, in the committee amendment, lines 11 and 12, strike out "and in which a new commercial fishery can be developed where none existed previously" and insert in lieu thereof "or a new commercial fishery can be developed."

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to clarify the preference that is given to the States which qualify for the amounts authorized under section 4(b). A State can qualify if the Secretary determines that either one of the two conditions described exist in the State. The first condition is that there is a commercial fishery failure due to a resource disaster arising from natural causes. During the hearings, testimony was given which pointed out the severe problem that some States face in their development of a commercial fishery due to recent resource disasters that have arisen from natural rather than manmade causes.

The second condition is directed at promoting the development of a relatively new or inactive commercial fishery. Testimony during the hearings pointed out that in many areas there was much work that should be accomplished to help new or recent commercial fisheries. Specifically, the committee was concerned with the problem of the inland States and the commercial development of such fishery products as the Buffalo fish and yellow perch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alaska to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill (S. 627) is to promote commercial fishery research and development projects. It has been cosponsored by 30 Senators, representing all sections of the United States, and representing, of course, both parties. It is strongly supported by all concerned Government agencies and departments, including the Department of the Interior, and, more specifically, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. It has the endorsement of numerous Governors, State agencies, interstate fishery commissions, and industry and labor.

The clear need for this legislation was demonstrated during extensive hearings that were held on the measure by the Senate Commerce Committee. It is widely known that our commercial fishery industry has deteriorated sharply within the past years. The total catch of fish and shellfish in the United States has remained markedly stable for 20 years. Our catch reached nearly 5 billion pounds in 1936. In 1961, despite the greatly increased population, it was 5.15 billion pounds.

On the other hand, the world catch in 1961 was approximately double what it was in 1938 and 1948, just before and just after World War II.

During the past 10 years the United States has dropped from second to fifth place in the total world catch. We now trail Japan, Peru, China, and Russia.

During this period of domestic stagnation foreign imports have increased dramatically and, in my opinion, regrettably. In 1940, U.S. fishery imports totaled approximately one-half billion pounds, valued at about $40 million. This increased to more than 1 billion pounds, valued at more than $200 million in 1950.

Last year foreign imports reached 4½ billion pounds, valued at more than $475 million.

In 1958, for the first time the value of our fishery imports exceeded domestic production.

During the past 4 years the value of imports has continued to increase, showing a rise of approximately 30 percent, while domestic production has remained stable.

Last year, while imported fishery products were valued at $475 million—almost half a billion dollars—U.S. domestic production amounted to only $380 million.

It is interesting enough to note that more and more domestically caught fish are being used for purposes other than human consumption.

To suggest that the United States, in the area of fisheries, faces no crisis, no critical problem, no urgency, is to ignore facts and to ignore the appraisal of what is really a dying fishing industry.

I conducted the hearings on this bill. Naturally, I was for it at the outset, because I introduced the bill. But, after listening to witnesses from all over the country, from so many different States, who traveled great distances, at considerable expense to themselves, to come before the committee, to tell the committee of the urgency of the problem, I became all the more convinced that, for many reasons, it is essential for this country to move forward affirmatively, and that the Government should cooperate to a much greater degree than it has done in the past, in assisting an important industry, one which used to be more important than it now is, but one which could become much more important if we so willed it.

I know of few measures that would be more helpful than the coordinated program of Federal-State cooperation suggested in S. 627.

This proposal follows in general the same practice that has worked so well in other fields. It has worked well under the Pitman-Robertson Act. It has worked well under the Dingell-Johnson Act. It can work well here.

We have been asked, and we will be asked many times, I suspect, before the afternoon is over, "Why should we do this? Why should we pass this new bill, which, admittedly, would cost money, when the Federal Government is already engaged in so much research?" We will doubtless be told that enough is being done.

In advance of any such contention, let me say that this is far more than a simple research bill. It is true that the Federal Government, through appropriations made by Congress, is now engaged in a rather considerable and altogether worthwhile program of research. There is the big difference between what is now being done by the Federal Government and what is proposed to be done under the provisions of the bill. This measure, as will be noted in the language, is intended "to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects."

It is true that research is contemplated. It is proposed by all who have considered the bill that research be undertaken. But I want to emphasize the developmental aspects of S. 627. This means that research already accomplished, or to be accomplished, can be moved from the research area, and that something can be done now to put that research into effect.

What can be done? For example, in my own State of Alaska, many streams could be productive with respect to fish if they could only be cleared of logs, rocks, and other impediments. But this clearing has not taken place because insufficient money is available. The money could be used for that purpose under the allocations proposed to be made under the bill. Fish hatcheries could be built by whatever States desired to do so.

Predatory control has been suggested by many of the Federal research activities. However, predatory control has not been established in many States because no money was available for that purpose.

In terms of total appropriations, this program can be said to be rather modest. It calls for a total authorization, over a 5-year period, of $28,250,000. It proposes an authorization for each of the first 2 years of $5,500,000, and, an authorization for each of the last 3 years of the program of $5,750,000.

I am convinced that this is one of the proposals for the restoration of U.S. fisheries that can accomplish great good. I do not look upon the bill as being tailored altogether, or even principally, to benefit the coastal States, because by the mechanism established within the framework of the bill adequate opportunity would be given to the inland States to augment their commercial fisheries; or, if they have none, to establish such fisheries.

I see in the Chamber the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA]. The committee, in its consideration of the bill, went to some length to meet the needs of the Great Lakes States. The proposals made by the senior Senator and by the junior Senator from Michigan were accepted by the committee.

In the first place, it was provided that two or more States may enter into a compact and do that which needs to be done on a cooperative or unit basis, specifically in respect to the discretionary fund amounting to $500,000 for each of the first 2 years, and $750,000 for each of the last 3 years of the program. The discretionary fund would be administered by the Secretary of the Interior.

Special emphasis is given to the situation which has arisen in the Great Lakes States because of the depredations of the lamprey eel, which has practically eliminated trout and other fishery resources. The Secretary is directed by the language of the bill to give preference to States in which he determines there is commercial fishery failure due to a resource disaster arising from natural causes. Quite obviously, those words are tailored to meet such situations as those found in the Great Lakes area.

Mr. McNAMARA. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Alaska yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Madam President, I wish to express appreciation, for myself and my colleague from Michigan, for the Senator's kind reference to us in his statement. I should like to ask a question with regard to the table on page 5 of the report. The indication is that an allocation of funds is made to various areas. It indicates that Michigan would be allocated approximately $26,000. Is this an additional sum, or is it something that we have been receiving in the past? What is the situation with respect to that point?

Mr. BARTLETT. That is brand new. That is what is proposed to be done under a rather complex formula in the bill, which was arrived at after much study and work by fishery experts from all over the country.

The money would be a brandnew sum. This kind of program is not now in existence. The formula provides that any State may get a minimum of $25,000. The distribution is to be made on the basis of 75 percent Federal participation and 25 percent State participation. The $25,000 appropriation would be in addition to the allocation from the discretionary fund, because there would be available for 1 year, $500,000. For the 2d year, there would be $500,000 available. That would be available to Michigan; and any State could apply for funds from that amount of money, in addition to the normal allocation proposed to be made available under the formula.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator for his brief explanation. I believe it helps to clarify our position considerably.

Mr. HART. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. I should like early in the debate to congratulate the Senator from Alaska for his leadership in the development of the bill that is now before us.

S. 627, in authorizing Federal grants-in-aid to the States for research and development of the commercial fisheries resources of the Nation to the extent of 75 percent of the cost, seemed to me a sound way to assist a very sick industry and I was glad to cosponsor the legislation.

As originally drafted, however, S. 627 would have distributed the $5 million, authorized annually for 5 years by the bill, entirely on the basis of a formula which penalized those areas whose dollar value of catch has been low in recent years because of acts of God. The trout of the Great Lakes, for example, have been so hard hit by the lamprey eel that the value of the catch and the number of fishermen have declined drastically in recent years. The figures on the decline in fishermen are as follows:

Year	Great Lakes area	Lake Superior area	State of Michigan
1940	3,647	828	1,525
1950	3,193	762	1,245
1954	2,938	655	1,126
1955	2,322	536	901
1956	2,163	507	878
1957	2,076	498	821
1958	2,060	445	886
1959	1,901	451	892
1960	1,823	409	842

Our situation on the Great Lakes was ably described at the Senate hearing by Dr. Peter I. Tack, chairman of the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, Michigan State University. His testimony appears on page 112 of the hearings, and I quote a part of it:

> The Great Lakes commercial fishery is in a state of collapse as a result of the depredations of the sea lamprey. The decline of the lake trout and the whitefish has had far-reaching economic consequences.
>
> The marketing structure has nearly collapsed, for want of sufficient volume of fresh fishes of high value to sustain it. The gear used for catching these fishes has become useless, thus a significant part of the capital has been destroyed.
>
> The collapse of the trout and whitefish began in the midforties and has progressed to the present low.
>
> As a consequence, many commercial fishermen have been forced out of the business and many more are in distress.
>
> It is remarkable that the total catch of fish from the Great Lakes has remained relatively constant at around 120 million pounds per year, for the U.S. sector. This is approximately 1.1 pounds per acre. The distress arises out of the need to shift from catching fishes of very high value to catching fish of very low value.
>
> The low value fishes have been used as animal food, and very little product development has taken place. The industry has been unable to do this type of work because it is made up of widely distributed individual operators without resources for supporting the kind of research needed. These circumstances account for the fact that the Great Lakes commercial fishery is technologically about 30 years behind the coastal areas.
>
> If the commercial fishery is to be maintained on the base of the lower priced fishes, several steps must be taken to upgrade the products derived from these underutilized species. These steps are as follows:
>
> A. Increase efficiency of catching gear and methods.
>
> B. Intensive studies on produce development in order to make marketable products from these fishes.
>
> C. Development of new marketing channels adequate to handle the volume of fishes which are available as human food items.

Not only Dr. Tack but also Mr. Wayne Wachter, president of the Michigan Fish Producers Association, Mr. Francis L. Thill, of the Lake Superior Association of Fish Producers, and Mr. Abram P. Snyder, of the Upper Peninsula Committee on Area Problems testified in support of S. 627 but suggested amendment to permit a fair share of the funds to be allocated to those areas most in need of assistance.

I am pleased to report that the Senator from Alaska and the committee accepted our suggestion—which incorporated also the opportunity for research and development aid for our manmade waters of the West—and we now have a bill which those of us in the Great Lakes area can support enthusiastically.

Madam President, on April 24, in remarks in this Chamber, I presented a full and factual story of the decline of fishing in the Great Lakes. I will not repeat at this time what I said then. But I want to reiterate: What is needed to reclaim this industry is precisely what this bill offers, namely, research and development. Research into possible byproducts from different kinds of fish; research into shelflife, market demand, market potential, types of processing—all these are needed. And we need development of improved methods of handling, of means of maintaining quality from catching to the purchaser, and pilot plants for processing and holding.

With these kinds of aid, I am confident our fishermen will know how to help themselves. I hope the Senate will vote favorably.

I again congratulate the Senator from Alaska. He sat patiently through hearings which, in my judgment, have improved materially the bill that has finally been presented to us. It is a bill which I hope the Senate will enact. It is my conviction that with the passage of time we will realize that it is a function that the Federal Government quite properly can perform, and that it may effectively help develop an industry and increase a resource of the whole Nation. States with a coastline, and those that believe they do not have a coastline now, will find this legislation to be to their great good. When that time arrives, I am sure the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] will be accorded the tribute that we in these limited circumstances seek to pay him today.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Senator for his statement. I am not so much concerned with tributes as I am with having more fish.

The question has been raised as to what the word "preference" means, as it appears in line 9, page 9, of the bill. After this question was put to the committee, a consultation was had with the Department of the Interior. As a result, I am authorized to say that the Department of the Interior will interpret that word as indicating an obligation on the part of the Secretary of the Interior to allocate funds to the areas described later in that paragraph.

Mr. HART. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. HART. It was this feature which concerned the Great Lakes basin interests particularly. Under the original base suggested in the formula we would have been handicapped. I believe the committee has responded to this concern constructively in the language that we have discussed.

Mr. BARTLETT. I assure the Senator from Michigan that the word "preference" was intended to be meaningful, and will be meaningful according to the Department of the Interior.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask the Senator if at this time he has only a question to ask? I have promised my colleague from Alaska to yield to him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. Under the language of the bill, according to page 5 of the report, 26 States of the Union have so little by way of commercial fishing industry that each of the 26 States would qualify under the minimum provisions of the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. BARTLETT. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So 26 States would each receive $25,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I observe that the State of Idaho has 0.01 percent of the national fishing industry. It will receive $25,000 to do research work and to increase the commercial fishing industry.

Nevada, which has very little by way of waters and fish, will receive $25,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. Nevada will not receive $25,000 unless it desires $25,000, and unless the projects submitted to the Department of the Interior are approved by that Department.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then it will also have to post about one-third or one-fourth?

Mr. BARTLETT. Twenty-five percent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So Nevada would receive $25,000 from the Federal Government and would contribute about $6,000 of its own funds to do research?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; research and development.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And development. Does it not appear that the $31,000 that most States will have for this purpose will not be sufficient to attack what is supposed to be a problem of determining how to raise fish in ponds, reservoirs, and other places, and that the net result would be a waste?

Mr. BARTLETT. I think not. On the contrary, I think the net result would be most productive and helpful.

I should like to answer the Senator from Ohio by citing a statement by Dr. G. Robert Lunz, director of the Division of Commercial Fisheries, South Carolina Resources Department, Charleston, who came before the committee and made a most persuasive statement in behalf of the bill. He concluded his testimony by saying that while it is true that South Carolina would receive very little of the money, nevertheless, as one interested in the fisheries, he believed it was good and useful legislation, and ought to be passed.

I remind the Senator from Ohio that no State would get $25,000 a year from the Federal Government as a matter of right. In the first place, as I have already related, a State would have to put up 25 percent. In the next place, a State would have to convince the Department of the Interior that one or more worthwhile projects are under consideration and will be developed, if the allocations are approved.

When the bill was originally introduced, five States were entirely omitted. On the first morning of the hearings before the Committee on Commerce, some time ago, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] submitted that that was not fair; that perhaps there was an opportunity in those States now, or would be in the future, to develop a worthwhile commercial fishery, and that they ought to have an opportunity to receive allocations under the proposed legislation. The more I studied that proposal, the more I came to agree with the Senator from Vermont. Who can tell if that which obtains today will necessarily be the case on a figurative day after tomorrow?

I believe protective devices are written into the bill, and that overall a fine opportunity is afforded for the enhancement of our commercial fisheries, plus the general development of fisheries of different kinds, including processing and retailing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the record of the testimony taken show, except for the States of Louisiana and Alabama, about which I have already spoken, how much the States are spending individually to conduct research?

Mr. BARTLETT. I believe the answer to that question is in the negative. I would not apply what I am about to say to the coastal States, some of which spend great sums of money, but I believe it will be discovered that some of the inland States spend no money on the development of commercial fisheries, but spend varying sums, some of them quite considerable, under another Federal-State cooperative program, this one for the sport fisheries, under the Dingell-Johnson Act.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In reading the record, I found that the witness who testified about Alabama stated that the State legislature had provided $10,000 as an assignment for research, but has not been able to provide more because only two counties border on the ocean, and all the other legislators are against the expenditure of money for that purpose. If Alabama is unwilling to do anything for itself, why should the Federal Government step in and spend a large sum?

Mr. BARTLETT. The Federal Government will not step in unless a worthwhile program is submitted. For example, if Alabama persisted in refusing to appropriate money for research and development of commercial fisheries, the Federal Government would not contribute funds to Alabama for that purpose. There is no intention, I assure the Senator, to force Federal money upon any State. What is proposed is merely an extension of the type of program that has worked well over many years. It is a cooperative program. It is not intended to require Alabama or Ohio or Alaska to spend money. The bill merely provides that if there are good projects, projects which the Secretary of the Interior determines might establish a new commercial fishery, or help one that already exists, there may be assistance under the provisions of S. 627.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the bill is passed, Alaska will receive $500,000, provided it contributes $125,000?

Mr. BARTLETT. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. California will receive $500,000, provided it puts up $125,000?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Florida will receive $239,000, provided it puts up one-fourth of that amount; and Massachusetts, which is ably represented in the Chamber by our good friend, its distinguished senior Senator [Mr. SALTONSTALL], will receive $450,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. It should be said in connection with the last statement by the Senator from Ohio that probably no State is more in need of this money than is Massachusetts. Fishing has been an important industry in Massachusetts for some time. Now the people of Massachusetts who engage in the commercial fishing industry are under a tremendous handicap. Only the other day, the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]—and the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] was present—exhibited some colored motion pictures of fishing at the Grand Banks, showing the fishermen of Russia, Japan, Germany, Denmark, and other nations, with whom the fishermen of Massachusetts must compete, with older vessels and less modern gear. I think that is a fine illustration of how money could be expended under the program to revive, in part, the Massachusetts fishing industry. I do not claim that it would provide everything that is needed; on the contrary. But I say it would be a good start.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The States I named—Alaska, California, Massachusetts, and Florida—would receive $1,700,000, while 26 States would receive $650,000. Why cannot Alaska, with its huge fishing industry and its large income, and California, Florida, and Massachusetts, with their large incomes from the fishing industry, provide their own funds for research?

Mr. BARTLETT. Let me state two reasons. Let us refer again to California. The California people themselves are hurt by a certain situation, concerning which I do not need to go into detail at this time. It involves the tuna fishery and the tuna fishermen. In April, the price was cut $20 a ton. A few weeks later it was cut another $20 a ton. A third cut—of $10 a ton—later was made—slashing from the income of these fishermen a substantial percentage of the amount which theretofore they had been receiving. Their fishing industry has been badly hurt.

As for Alaska, the other day my colleague [Mr. GRUENING] and I received some very dismal news. It had been estimated that 15 million red salmon would return to Bristol Bay streams from the Pacific Ocean, where they had lived for 4 to 5 years, and that from those 15 million, there would be a good escapement and a fair—even if not large—take of the fish by the fishermen there. This was the greatest red salmon fishery in the world. But what happened? It turned out to be the greatest disaster in the history of Alaska fishing: Instead of 15 million fish returning, only 6 million returned.

Similar experiences in California and in Alaska—and especially in Alaska are most significant to the overall economy.

If by the passage of a law of this sort we can gain more information about the life habits of the red salmon which are born in the Bristol Bay streams, and go out to sea, and if we can find out what happens to them, and can make other spawning areas available, if necessary—and that could be done under the terms of this bill—we shall have been spending wisely and prudently the money of the U.S. taxpayers.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Alaska yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of course, I do not wish to interfere with the statements being made by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is quite all right.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But let me say that the Senator from Ohio, for whom I have great respect, forgets that the Federal Government has taken action which has had a very great effect on the fishing industry—and, in particular, in three ways, I believe, insofar as the effect on Massachusetts is concerned. First of all, there is the provision of law that our fishing ships must be built in the United States; under that law, they cannot be built abroad.

Second, at the present time the Russian fishing fleet is operating close to our coasts. This point has been mentioned by other Senators. For example, when I was on a small boat last summer I tried to reach my Washington office by the marine telephone. I made the connection, but had to stop talking because the Russians were talking between themselves and their fishing fleet, close to our coast. I cite that to demonstrate what the Russians are doing today along our shores.

Furthermore, today the control by the Federal Government is such that imports now account for more than 50 percent of all fish products consumed in the United States. For example, 86 percent of the Canadian catch of fish is sold in our country, thus increasing the competition with our fishing industry.

A few weeks ago one of our fishing vessels which was 72 years old went down; but, as I have stated, under the law it is not permissible to construct outside this country vessels intended for use in the American fishing industry. In addition, we are faced with the tariff.

So if we can take steps to provide some relief for our fishing industry—which, as has been stated, has always been an important industry for Massachusetts—that will be helpful, of course.

As the Senator has said, the Federal Government is responsible for some of the difficulties of the fishing industry; therefore, we are asking it to help at the present time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On that point, my view is that a proposal to spend money to cultivate fish on the desert lands of Nevada does not sound good to me, nor does it sound good to try to grow fish in places where nature has demonstrated that that cannot be done. So it seems to me that this proposal would amount to sending to 26 of the States $25,000 each, in order to procure their votes, so as to make possible liberal grants to the several States I have heretofore mentioned.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In reply, let me say that if the Nevada Legislature and the Nevada executive branch do not feel there is any merit to this proposal, they will not put up the $25,000; instead, they will spend that money in other ways or for other assistance. It seems to me we must credit them with commonsense, too.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Furthermore, $500,000 a year would be made available to the States, in accordance with the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, provided the States have submitted acceptable plans.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; $500,000, for an aggregate of $1 million; and in each of the last 3 years, $750,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. But only under the guidelines set forth in the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is to say, the Secretary of the Interior could, by complying with the guidelines, determine where the money would be sent.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would not that give the Secretary of the Interior power which he should not have—to allow him to decide what States would receive the money and what States would not receive it?

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not think so, because—for one reason, although I do not suggest this would necessarily be controlling—between the time when Congress meets and the time when Congress ends its sessions, and before the time when the new session convenes and the time when action is taken—for sometimes the reconvening of Congress and action by Congress do not occur simultaneously—a great disaster could have happened in connection with a particular fishery. So I believe we should have enough faith in a Cabinet officer to be willing to say to him, "Here is $500,000; we tell you how it must be spent, and we leave to you the allocation of the money under the circumstances and conditions set forth in the bill."

Mr. LAUSCHE. In view of the political currents now running, I would prefer to declare in the law what shall be done or what shall not be done, instead of placing such authority even in a member of the President's Cabinet, to be used in accordance with his whims and caprices.

Mr. BARTLETT. I shall conclude briefly, because I know that certain Senators, including the Senator from New Hampshire, who is in charge of the bill for Senators on the other side of the aisle, have appointments, and I do not wish to delay them.

This discretionary provision was not included in the original text of the bill. It was added principally because representatives of Oklahoma, including the distinguished senior Senator, and representatives of the Great Lakes States, including the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], made what they thought was a good case for the establishment, in these circumstances, of such a discretionary fund.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield again to me?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say to the Senator from Alaska that I am glad to support this bill. I believe it is a good one for every State, and particularly in order to improve research, which today is necessary for our fisheries. The fishermen of Massachusetts must compete with the Russians, who have ships very much superior to our own. We must compete with the low tariff and the great quantity of fish that is coming in from Canada today. We must compete with old, outmoded equipment. If the Federal Government desires to be of assistance to business, we must remember that $1,400 million of our gross national product comes from fish. We wish to make it possible for our people to compete with the other countries of the world, particularly Russia, Canada, Nova Scotia, and Iceland, and to give the people of our country who are engaged in that industry an opportunity to receive the benefits of research in order to obtain the best possible equipment and to know where the most fish are located.

I hope that the bill will be passed by the Senate today. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his contribution.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague from Alaska.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I desire to raise a point of order. I shall not interpose an objection or ask for the regular order, for I am perfectly delighted to have the distinguished Senator from Alaska yield to his colleague. But there should be a limit to the practice sometimes engaged in of a Senator obtaining the floor and then farming it out for remarks and speeches. If that practice continues after the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] has concluded, I shall have to ask for the regular order.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it will not, I assure my friend from New Hampshire.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I merely wish to respond to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and also the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], who, I understand, is also opposed to the measure. I point out two basic facts which can be elaborated upon more fully in the debate later.

First, I point out the great contrast between the amount of assistance our Government has given to those who produce food from the land and the virtual nothing the Government has done on behalf of those who produce food from the sea.

That is a very important fact. Our fisheries are in a bad way. They are facing an entirely new menace—the menace of Russian fishing, Japanese fishing, and the aggression in fisheries of other countries whose ships come close to our shores.

Finally, there is the important point that we are spending vast sums of money for the benefit of other countries' fisheries. I address this statement particularly to my friend from Ohio, who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. We spend millions of dollars to help rehabilitate the fisheries of 25 foreign countries, which pay nothing in the way of taxes. Some of their fisheries actually compete with ours. Look at the list. It includes Nationalist China, Cambodia, Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam, Korea, Laos, Ethiopia, India, Liberia, Pakistan, Turkey, Somalia, Ghana, the Ivory Coast, Nigeria, and Iceland. The people of Iceland were fishing before Leif Ericsson came to America. Also on the list are Spain, Chile, Peru, and British Guiana, which is still a British colony. How can we go back to our constituents and say, "We are not going to help you rehabilitate your depleted fisheries, but it is all right for us to give aid to 25 foreign countries for the purpose of enabling those countries to rehabilitate their fisheries?" I do not see how any Member of this body could justify such an attitude.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We have no difference of opinion concerning the need for research. But I suggest that the Federal Government, with its bankrupt treasury, being in distress, ought to be spared that responsibility. The responsibility ought to be assumed by Alaska, California, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Florida, and other States which receive a great income from the fishing industry. The Federal Government ought not to be saddled with that expense.

I fear that there is emerging now the idea of a subsidy for the fish farmer in the manner in which we have subsidized the land farmer. If such a subsidy is in the making, I begin to tremble about what the future will be. And it is in the making, because 2 years ago we appropriated $750,000 a year to help the fishermen of the United States buy new ships. At that time I said, "That is the beginning." It was the nose of the camel under the tent.

There is now pending a bill to give $7,500,000 a year for the building of new ships. Shipbuilding would be subsidized by the Federal Government. We are now adopting a program to put the fish farmer in the same category in which in the past we have placed the land and food farmer.

Mr. GRUENING. I have never yet heard of any program to subsidize fishermen for fish that they do not catch. We subsidize farmers for crops they do not grow. Of course, if such a program were to be developed for the fisheries a great drain on our finances would result. Such a measure is not proposed, though we are doing it for farmers. It is merely proposed to help a sorely depleted fishing industry which is beset with the most vicious competition it has ever had in its history, and needs the kind of support proposed. Our individual fishermen cannot build the kind of vessels which the Russian Government builds for its fishermen. They are taking our fish, and our fishermen are being ruined. They cannot exist under those circumstances.

Let us consider the case of the Alaska fishermen. Until Alaska gained statehood a few years ago, the Federal Government had absolute control of the fisheries. The Federal Government maintained that control over the repeated protests of every territorial legislature and the pleas of our voteless delegates in Congress, and despite the efforts of Alaskans and legislature that pleaded with the Federal Government to turn that resource over to the management of the Territory, which Alaskans felt that it could operate the fisheries much better, we saw our fishing industry go down from a production of 8½ million cases in the 1930's to the lowest point in 60 years in the last year of Federal control, 1959. Now with its own efforts the State is trying to rebuild those fisheries.

The Federal Government is responsible for the depletion of the Alaskan fisheries. It is absolutely responsible. The Federal Government refused to abolish the fish trap. We know what happened through the use of those devices, and that is only one aspect of the problem.

The Federal Government has a responsibility to atone for its past mismanagement. I know that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] wishes to leave. I shall not take more time now. But I wish he would consider the question in relation to the contrast that exists in respect to our treatment of those who produce food from the land and what we have never done with respect to those who produce food from the sea.

I notice the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], who is opposed to the bill, is present in the Chamber. I wonder if it has not occurred to him that some of his people on Lake Champlain, which borders Vermont on its western border, would appreciate an opportunity to develop some fisheries on that great body of water.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, while there is a sufficient number of Senators present in the Chamber, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Commerce. On that motion, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire to recommit the bill to the Committee on Commerce. The yeas and nays have been requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I desire that, as a signer of the minority views, and as the maker of the motion to recommit the bill, that my purpose be clearly and distinctly understood.

There were three bills before the Committee on Commerce designed to aid the fishing industry.

In the opinion of the Senator from New Hampshire—which I believe is shared by others—one of the bills is meritorious, and would be truly effective in aiding the fishing industry. That particular bill which is not before the Senate now would provide tangible aid to our fishermen who daily compete with modern, heavily subsidized commercial fishing fleets from Norway, Great Britain, Japan, and Russia. Passage of that bill, S. 1006, is needed, for it is pointed at the need.

In the opinion of the Senator from New Hampshire, while undoubtedly the other two "fishing" bills have merit—and this includes the bill now before the Senate—they are not designed and streamlined to do the job which should be done for the industry.

It is the further firm opinion of the Senator from New Hampshire that passage of the bill before the Senate today, if the bill should be passed, would make it less likely that the bill which has the greatest merit will be passed later.

I regret that the committee saw fit to send this bill to the Senate first. I am not even suggesting this is a motive, but it is a curious thing that this bill would spread money all over this country, to every State in the Union, to inland as well as seaboard States. To use fishing terms, not only is that bait dangled before the eyes of Senators—that their States can get certain amounts—but also, in addition, there is a discretionary fund of half a million dollars a year for the first 2 years of the life of the law, if the bill should become a law, and $750,000 a year for the last 3 years, to be allocated among the States. To be sure, as my distinguished friend from Alaska has said, it would be allocated "with certain guidelines," but it is curious that so many Senators from so many States fondly believe their States will get some of those additional funds.

Mr. President, I have made the motion to recommit. I would be glad, instead of moving to recommit—and I had intended to so move—to move to substitute S. 1006, which I happen to believe strikes at the heart of the problem, for the pending bill. I would gladly support that bill, because I think it is a bill to provide essential money, to be well spent for the fishing industry, even though we do have a heavy financial burden.

However, since the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee, the distinguished and able Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], is ill and in his home State, I did not feel it would be fair and courteous treatment of him, or of my colleagues on the committee, to come to the Senate and move to substitute another bill, which is before our committee, with respect to which our committee has not voted or completed consideration.

I have moved to recommit the bill because I should like to have an opportunity, in the committee, to attempt to see that the committee reports the bill which would do the job first, and let the "fluff" and the "frosting" come after.

Mr. President, I wish to read into the RECORD—it is very brief and will require only a minute—the "Minority Views" signed by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], and myself about this bill:

> The bill, if enacted, would inaugurate a new Federal program of grants to the States for research and development of commercial fishing resources and activities. It would authorize grants totaling $28,250,000 over 5 years, and cost an additional $400,000 a year to administer.
>
> In our view, enactment of this new spending program cannot be justified in the face of a budget deficit that looms at the $12 billion mark. The bill meets no top priority need, no critical problem. It runs directly counter to the President's declaration in his budget message that "we shall continue, and indeed intensify, our efforts to include in our fiscal program only those expenditures which meet strict criteria of fulfilling important national needs."
>
> New research programs like this may be desirable, but they are hardly necessary when the country is confronted with a record peacetime deficit and an urgent need to reduce taxes. Furthermore, a long-range, slow-acting research program in 50 States and 4 territories will be of negligible benefit to those American commercial fishermen who are hard pressed by tough competition from Russian, Japanese, and other heavily subsidized foreign fleets. State-sponsored research projects in inland areas especially will be a futile gesture, as far as their needs are concerned. We also note that the Department of the Interior already spends more than $20 million a year on commercial fisheries research under present programs.
>
> In allocating research grants to 50 States and 4 territories, the bill ignores the great difficulty which State and Federal agencies have in getting qualified research people in this field. It glosses over the fact that many State fishery agencies are devoted exclusively to sports fishing activities, are financed by sportsmen's fees, and could not match the Federal grants under this bill. In short, it spreads Federal dollars around to all States regardless of the need, regardless of their interest in the problem, and in complete disregard of their role in the Nation's commercial fishing industry. The State matching requirement under the bill is fixed at only 25 percent, apparently in recognition of a limited State interest, but past experience in many fields clearly indicates that such a low percentage of State participation may lead to projects of questionable necessity and to minimal State supervision.
>
> In addition, the funds are allocated to the States partly in relation to the size of the fish canning and processing industry in the State, despite the fact that many processing plants use imported fish almost exclusively, and despite the fact that the processing industry has suffered no decline. Instead, the value of its production last year was the highest in history.
>
> For all these reasons, the bill should be defeated.

Mr. President, the pending bill is only one element of what has been described as a "total long-range program for the improvement of our domestic commercial fishing industry." The other elements of this total program are still pending before the Senate Commerce Committee, but the Senate ought to be aware of those bills, and ought to know, before acting on this measure, that this is only the beginning.

One of the other bills for improvement of the commercial fishing industry is S. 744, which provides for the construction of two large, factory-type fishing trawlers.

These trawlers would have ramps at the back of the ships so that fishing nets could be hauled directly into the body of the ship, instead of being lifted over the sides as is done in most American ships. These trawlers, furthermore, would have facilities on board for the processing and preservation of fish.

The construction of two fishing trawlers, under S. 744 would cost the taxpayers more than $15 million, and would, in my opinion, create far more problems than they would solve. Serious questions as to who would operate these Government-built, Government-owned ships will plague the entire fishing industry. For instance, we still do not know how these Government-built ships will operate in competition with other unsubsidized American fishermen, without driving them right on to the beach with empty nets.

Passage of the pending bill, S. 627, will add new impetus to the backers of S. 744 and lead the Senate an additional step toward enactment of another $15 million boondoggle.

The final element of this commercial fishing program is a bill, S. 1006, which would provide Government financial assistance to enable our commercial fishermen to secure the new, modern boats and equipment they need to compete with the foreign fishing fleets which are crowding the waters off our shores.

I am interested in the fishing industry. My State has a short coastline, but it is a seacoast State and it has a fishing industry, and I would not stand on the floor and be indifferent to it. But this bill is the one I think that has real, practical use.

The United States, during the last few years, has slipped from second place among the fish-producing nations of the world to fifth place, the lowest relative position for this country in many generations. Our share of the world fish catch has been nearly halved since 1946, from 13 to 7 percent.

One of the primary reasons for the continuing deterioration of the industry is the high cost of construction of replacement vessels. Generally, a vessel built abroad, where construction costs are half of what they are in this country, cannot be used by American fishermen. The industry must have its vessels built in domestic shipyards, and this requirement constitutes a subsidy, for national defense purposes, for American shipyards which ought, in my opinion, to be paid for by the Government and the taxpayers and not by the hard-pressed American fishing industry.

The bill, S. 1006, would authorize the Government to pay half the cost of building modern commercial fishing vessels in American shipyards, at a cost which could not exceed $12.5 million a year, to last until 1972.

Here then is a measure which would provide real help to the American fishing fleet. Here is a measure which would make a direct and real contribution to our national well-being, and to our national economy. Officials of the Department of the Interior calculate that increased earnings and the increased taxes produced by vessels built with the subsidy as contemplated by the bill, S. 1006, would repay the subsidy costs within 2 years.

Furthermore, S. 1006 would provide tangible aid to our fishermen who daily compete with modern, heavily subsidized commercial fishing fleets from Norway, Great Britain, Japan, and Russia. These American fishermen are right on the firing line, at least in an economic sense, as they compete with as many as 360 Russian fishing vessels off our coasts. As Senator BARTLETT of Alaska pointed out recently, there may be more Russians on these fishing vessels off our coasts than there are in Cuba, and the economic threat they pose is just as real and just as dangerous.

In my view, enactment of S. 1006 would be an effective step toward the rehabilitation of the American commercial fishing industry, but its passage—and I want to emphasize this—will be jeopardized by the enactment of S. 627.

The national debt has zoomed to an all-time high, and next month we are going to be asked to increase the debt limit again. The deficit for the current year is crowding the peacetime record. Congress is straining to enact an effective, meaningful tax cut to stimulate our economy. We simply cannot do it if we persist in approving new spending programs without any regard for their fiscal soundness, or their necessity.

Passage of the pending bill, S. 627, means simply, in my opinion, spending money unwisely—money which could be put to really effective use in behalf of the fishing industry through a program such as is contained in S. 1006.

The pending bill should be recommitted to the Committee on Commerce, so that when the Senate considers it, it will consider the whole field and select the bill that will best do the job, for the fishing industry of Alaska, the fishing industry of Hawaii, the fishing industry of Massachusetts, my neighboring State, the fishing industry of New Hampshire, and the fish and shrimp industry of the southern coast. It is highly essential that the industry be competitive and the bill S. 1006 would help in that regard.

Under the pending bill, my State of New Hampshire would be entitled to a minimum of $25,000, but there are 12 inland States that would also be entitled to $25,000—Wyoming, Utah, Nevada, Iowa, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Arizona, Montana, and Kansas. That amounts to a total of $300,000. I am not referring for the moment to some of the larger amounts that will go to other States.

Does anyone think that in the interest of the people and the taxpayers and the fishing industry of my State of New Hampshire, in order to get a paltry $25,000, I would obligate them to pay that part of the $300,000 for a dozen States—and I speak with due regard and respect for those fine States—in the inland part of this country, whose commercial fishing industry, in the parlance of some of my own New Hampshire friends back home, "you could put in your eye"?

Additionally, with regard to my own State of New Hampshire, I doubt seriously that our commercial fishing industry will benefit materially from the award of $25,000 for research purposes. In my judgment, New Hampshire would prefer to participate in a program of real and substantial merit rather than one of such doubtful return to the fishing industry of my State.

I doubt if it is understood generally that this bill refers only to commercial fishing. A State may have a fish and game commission that collects money from fees from sportsmen and is used to promote fishing for sportsmen and recreation in a State. It may not even have an agency to collect this $25,000, to be used if it can produce the 25 percent, used, in some mysterious way, to promote commercial fishing. Under the terms of the bill, it is amazing what lengths have been gone to in an attempt to try to find and qualify commercial fishing in some of the States.

People who collect minnows and advertise them for sale as bait to be used by fishermen on the inland lakes would be benefited under the provisions applying to commercial fishing. Perhaps it is commercial fishing. However, at a time when this country needs every dollar it can get, proposed legislation that would dissipate money merely in order that every State can get its share, and then create an extra discretionary fund so that it becomes a grab bag which is dangled out in the hope that every State will believe it can get a little more than its share, without in any sense reproaching or questioning the deep sincerity and motives of my friends who represent States in which commercial fishing is a vital industry, in my opinion, is pretty low grade legislation.

It is the same old story. There will always be people who, if it can be pointed out to them that their State is going to get a little money, no matter how small, will favor a bill.

That is using the shotgun method, the blunderbuss method, the birdshot method, in order to scatter money by the Federal Government—money which is rather scarce and on which we are paying interest.

I return to where I started. If I could do it and if it were good legislation, and if it be proper to do so, and if it would be treating my committee and its chairman properly, I would move to substitute S. 1006, because in my opinion that is a fishing bill. That bill would help the fishermen of Alaska, Hawaii, Maine, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire, and all along the coast, to provide themselves with equipment and vessels that are competitive.

I believe it strikes at the heart of the problem. I do not begrudge them that help. The other two bills are merely frosting. That is the reason why I hope the pending bill will be recommitted, not to defeat the fishing program, but to aid in the passage of a good, sound commercial fishing program that will help where help is needed and where the money can be used effectively.

I note that two Senators are on their feet. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I commend the able senior Senator from New Hampshire for making a forceful and logical statement with respect to this whole subject. I cannot emphasize too strongly that if the bill is not recommitted and if it become law, it is almost certain to make it impossible to give consideration to S. 1006, which would be of real value and help to the American fishing industry.

I commend the Senator very highly for the manner in which he has brought this difficulty to light. I hope that a majority of Senators, who are sincerely interested in the fishing industry, will see fit to vote for his motion to recommit. I am grateful to my friend from New Hampshire for his efforts.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his contribution. I now yield to the Senator from Ohio, my colleague on the Commerce Committee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for showing me this courtesy. He has already pointed out that he and I and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] filed minority views with respect to the merits of the pending bill. I do not see the Senator from Nevada in the Chamber, but in committee he argued rather energetically that he could not go back to the people of Nevada and say, "I have voted for a bill entailing a cost of $27,500,000, a part of which money would come to Nevada to induce us to cultivate the fish industry on the deserts and the arid land of Nevada." That thought dominated the discussions in the Commerce Committee.

The subjects discussed by the Senators from Alaska deal with international fisheries, but the bill was drafted to give 50 States a pittance of help for the purpose of providing generous help to California, Alaska, Louisiana, Florida, and a few other States. The bill should not be passed. It comes within the category of setting up new subsidies, subsidizing the fish industry. The American public is not conscious of how, on the floor of the House and on the floor of the Senate, new programs of subsidization are being urged, in spite of the fact that our deficits are growing larger each year.

I do not blame the Senators from Alaska for wanting the $500,000, but I do not concur with the proposal, in order to get their $500,000, to throw the bait of $25,000 to each State, believing that that would cause 26 States to subscribe to the program. It is an insult to Nevada. It is an insult to Wyoming. It is said to them, "We will give you $25,000, but vote for this program under which we will get $500,000."

I am against the passage of the pending bill because, first, I believe the Federal Government should not enter this field of subsidization in this manner. Officials of the State of Oklahoma testified about a program which they contemplate. They testified that in 3 years they would need $700,000 to explore means and methods of cultivating the fish industry in the impounded waters of Oklahoma. That means farm ponds and newly created lakes. That is where the experiment would be carried on.

I suggest that that ought to be done by Oklahoma; it ought to be done by Ohio, Alabama, and the other States, individually, on their own. But if it is desired to have the Federal Government finance such a program, the whole attack upon the problem can be concentrated through centralized research by the Federal Government, to determine what can be grown in farm ponds and reservoirs, and not by having the research scattered over 50 States.

Nevada will expend, if it puts up $6,250, $31,500. Twenty-five other States will be in that category. If 26 States put up $25,000 apiece, that would mean $650,000. Better results would be achieved by having one centralized research center spend $650,000 than by having Colorado, Wyoming, Nevada, and the other States conduct their research separately.

I am aware that the bill provides for the right to form consortiums; but they would not do the job.

My second point is that the States could conduct this research on their own. Ohio could do it by itself. Testimony was given by Mr. Caffey, representing five States on the gulf coast—Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas—that they desire to have the bill passed. The Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] then asked Mr. Caffey if the five States were in unison in their expressed judgment. Mr. Caffey replied that Texas felt that this work ought not to be done by the Federal Government, but ought to be done by the individual States, and that Texas could do it on its own.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that one point?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. When I asked that particular question, I was certain that the answer would be as the Senator has related it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There is another interesting phase: That it is the view that this program must be adopted; that the States want it. I read the testimony last night until my eyes got tired and I finally fell asleep. But there is in the bill this statement of Mr. Caffey:

> Senator, we have a special problem in Alabama, in that we have only two counties that border on the gulf. Those two counties are the ones that are directly interested. And we have difficulty—I am from one of those counties—we have difficulty in getting sufficient funds from the others, through cooperation of the other 65 counties, to carry out a research program.

What does that mean? It means that Alabama does not want to do the job. The 2 counties bordering on the ocean favor the program; the other 65 counties are against it. If the problem is so vital, are we not justified in assuming that especially the States that have a huge income from the fishing industry would be able to do the job? Yet they declare that they will not do it. All of them, however, say that it is a great program; that if the Federal Government will give them the money, they will conduct it. That fact is really laughable.

It requires great courage and much stamina to turn away from the largess and say, "Federal Government, watch your Treasury; watch your red imbalances; quit depreciating the dollar; quit loading up the debt; quit driving us into bankruptcy." That is exactly what is happening. The States which are in the best position, because of their large fishing industry, would get the biggest amounts, while the States having the least industry will get the smallest amount. The rich would grow richer, and the poor would grow poorer, under the philosophy embodied in the bill.

This is a new subsidy program. On the question of subsidies, the course for a Senator to follow is quite simple: The Federal Government will give you the money. Take it. The Federal Government will give it to you whether the money is in its Treasury or not.

I say to Senators who come from States where it is fairly obvious that the program is imprudent that if someone will go into their States and tell their votes of this largess, which in all probability would cost the taxpayers more than they would receive, I predict, on the basis of my political experience, that they will be defeated at the polls.

The distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] stated that he did not dare to support the bill; he did not dare to go back and tell the people of his State, "I shall vote to spend $27,500,000 for fishery research, which will also mean that the Federal Government will enter Nevada and make a study."

I urge Senators to spare the Federal Treasury this responsibility. Let us set a precedent which will bring to an end the constant political demagoguery of making gifts for the purpose of winning votes. The time is at hand when we had better begin to think about the security of our country, and less about the insurance of being reelected.

Practically every week we learn of a new subsidy program, a new assumption of functions by the Federal Government, functions that historically have been carried on by local and State governments, but which result in a bigger and bigger centralized government.

Witnesses came from States which expect to receive the largest sums of this largess. The witnesses represented the merchant marine unions. No witnesses were called from the interior States. There is not a word of opposition anywhere in the hearings to the proposals made. The testimony nowhere shows what the States are spending to do this work. The record contains only the sum of $450,000 spent by Louisiana for some overall study, and $10,000 being spent by Alabama.

I say to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] that if for no other purpose, the bill ought to be recommitted in order to place in the RECORD information as to what the States are spending and what they are doing for themselves. The amount involved in the bill is not large; but if the bill is passed, it will merely indicate the continuing trend of Federal subsidies; that is all it will mean. The passage of the bill would forebode a constant worsening of our position; it would forebode that in the end the Government would rob the thrifty, decent individual of whatever holdings he was able to accumulate to sustain himself through life.

I thank the Senator from New Hampshire. I yield the floor.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am about ready to yield the floor.

First, I commend the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

I conclude my remarks with approximately three sentences of observations:

First, I wish to make sure that the Senate understands, and the RECORD shows, that the bill now under consideration—Senate bill 627—means the expenditure of approximately $30 million, of which, according to the most careful computation I can make, between one-fourth and one-third would go into regions where—to use the most charitable term I can select—it would be ineffective; and the local or State contribution would be only 25 percent, which would be an open invitation to squander money.

Senate bill 744 would cost $15 million, to build two trawlers. That would be more or less a pilot operation, and there would be a mad scramble to see who, among all those in the fishing industry, would get the use of the trawlers.

Senate bill 1006 would provide not to exceed $12,500,000 a year, for 8 years. I want it clearly understood that I would support this bill, although not necessarily in that amount, because that would be $100 million, whereas I think $50 million or $60 million would be all we could afford. But the money would be used to enable actual fishermen off our coasts to provide themselves, at as reasonable a price as that paid by their competitors from rival countries, to equip themselves with the best modern equipment. That would help Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Alaska; it would be effective.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for a question?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true that the act providing the fishing vessels subsidy expired in June, so that at the present time there is no subsidy for the construction in this country of new fishing vessels?

Mr. COTTON. Yes; but I am talking about a bill, to be reported from committee, to create a new subsidy and to continue with the carrying out of this purpose.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes. However, I point out that the other act has expired.

Mr. COTTON. That is correct—which makes the enactment of this measure all the more imperative. My point is that of the three bills, this one is the most imperative.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Can the Senator from New Hampshire point out any part of the hearings which shows what comprises $12,000 of commercial fishing in the State of Arizona? I could not find it; and I am not aware that Arizona has such a program.

Mr. COTTON. As has already been pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], who is a member of the committee, the hearings do not disclose that. At the hearings, some most mysterious figures—procured from somewhere, I suppose—as to the situation in the inland States were presented. I have pointed that out in the course of my remarks, which the Senator from Arizona may not have heard. I said that even the catching of minnows and their sale as bait to be used by sportsmen are being considered a fishing industry. Some of the most amazing things were used in an attempt to justify the spreading of these funds among the inland States, such as Arizona, although it would seem only commonsense to conclude that there is only a very small commercial fishing industry there.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I was wondering about that. I suppose bait and minnows would be a part of it. Would it also include so-called sportsmen's fishing pools, where for a sum of money one can catch raised trout?

Mr. COTTON. I am advised by one of the committee counsel that that would be included—situations in which fish in a pool are actually sold; for a certain sum of money, sportsmen are actually allowed to catch the fish.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for the information, for I am learning something about my State that I did not know; I did not know that Arizona was engaged in the commercial fishing business. There is not much water in Arizona, and very little would be available to be used by sportsmen.

Mr. COTTON. In that connection, I wonder whether Arizona has any sort of commercial fishing authority. New Hampshire has a fish and game commission which deals with fishing for sportsmen, but I doubt that it is authorized to raise money and accept money from the Federal Government for commercial fishing. What is the situation in Arizona?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Arizona has a fish and game department which is especially interested—although I have never heard that it had a commercial phase—in sportsmen—for example, in providing for the planting of trout and the maintenance of bass; and the few catfish in the Colorado River go merrily on their way.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. President, in closing my remarks I reiterate the hope—which is not a minor one—that even in the midst of the discussion of civil rights matters, the Senate will practice a little discrimination and a little segregation by trying, in connection with the consideration of all three of these bills, to pick out the one which would be the most effective in providing assistance where it is most needed.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I now yield to the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], who is a cosponsor of Senate bill 627.

Mr. McINTYRE. I thank my distinguished colleague from Alaska.

Mr. President, I rise in support of Senate bill 627. I do so after hearing the very able arguments of my senior colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], whose opinions I value highly, but in this particular case I must beg to differ. Although my home State of New Hampshire has a small seacoast, our 1961 employment in commercial fisheries was 345 persons, which is a noticeable contribution to the economy of our seacoast region, and the State possesses in-shore clam and oyster beds, as well as areas for lobster fishing. Our historic port of Portsmouth has a small fishing fleet.

In recent months, however, considerable interest has been shown in expanding our groundfish and shellfish industries, as well as building docking and processing facilities. Such activities could offer a fine way to expand employment in a way of life richly overlaid with American traditions. But before private businessmen can be assured of an adequate return on investment in this ancient and honorable industry, we must know more—much more—about our marine resources.

Our New England groundfish industry has developed specialties in particular types of fish, the most important being haddock, ocean perch, and cod. This specialization means that declines in the abundance of one species drive ships out of operation, each time leaving the industry with a smaller base from which to recover. The Canadian industry, with which New England fishermen compete, is closer to the most productive grounds, extremely well organized, and virtually unaffected by wage pressures.

No New England State—and I believe this to be important—exists in isolation from its neighbors. While the amount of research to be performed in New Hampshire under this bill is small, our State will benefit from discoveries made by investigators in Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and elsewhere. I have received testimonials as to the importance of work being done off our shore by the Sandy Hook Marine Laboratory, which is located in New Jersey, but which sends mapping teams throughout the western North Atlantic. It is for this reason that the New Hampshire State Fish and Game Department, the New Hampshire Port Authority, and the New Hampshire State Marine Fisheries Association have all indicated their support for the bill. Its passage will help us to conserve the resources that we have now, and will provide solid information to investors who would be willing to support future development.

Mr. President, I was shocked to discover that this country is the world's largest importer of fish and fish products in the world. Not only can we regain our lost position in commercial fisheries, but according to the National Academy we could multiply the annual world catch of fish by at least five without resorting to radically new methods of taking fish. Their report also stated that "some of the things the Russians are doing give us cause for worry as to whether we are not being out-distanced in this field." The world-wide deployment of Russian trawlers, backed by the world's most active research program in commercial fisheries and oceanography, gives us genuine cause for concern. I wonder if the opponents of this bill realize that our individual fleet operators cannot perform research on the scale that is needed. That would be as foolish as expecting our farmers to perform research on an individual basis. There is a strong Federal Government interest in fisheries research which this bill helps to answer. Research will not be a panacea. We must revitalize our industry, meet strong foreign competition, and take steps to protect disappearing fisheries resources.

These problems are most informatively described in a 1961 study by the Fish and Wildlife Service entitled "The Groundfish Industries of New England and Canada." This study has convinced me that our New England fisheries, including those of New Hampshire, cannot expand without much more certain knowledge about the future security of investments in fishing vessels, which ultimately depends upon knowledge about the fish themselves. In this connection I have been looking at the recent Marine Resources Report of the National Academy of Sciences. This report speaks of our pitiful efforts to plumb the secrets of the sea and our vast ignorance of its important resources. Too much research is now concentrated on short-term crisis situations, and not enough on broadly based, comprehensive studies of marine communities. The National Academy recommends studies of fish behavior to lead to radically new and more efficient means of catching them. Factors controlling the survival of fish in their environment must be understood. We must do much more systematic mapping of the resources of the sea and methods of converting unproductive areas of the sea to yield a return in commercial fish.

My own State of New Hampshire possesses beds of seed oysters which are shipped all along the Atlantic coast, as well as clam beds and inshore lobster fishing grounds. The recent report of the Federal Council for Science and Technology on water resources research pointed out that "polluting substances are reaching these waters in increasing amounts" and "oceanographic research is becoming more important as the place of marine waters in the water cycle and water-resources picture becomes clearer." The National Academy has called strongly for research on estuaries and inshore areas to safeguard these resources of oysters, clams, and lobsters.

Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to point to other bills now pending before the Congress which would help New Hampshire and the Nation fulfill our potential in commercial fisheries. One of these is S. 744, which I am proud to cosponsor with Senators MAGNUSON and other Senators. This bill would provide for the construction of two experimental stern-ramp trawlers—the most efficient vessels for offshore fishing. The other bill, S. 1006, which my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] has referred to, is one that I have been delighted to join in offering with Senators MAGNUSON, BARTLETT, ENGLE, KENNEDY, and SALTONSTALL.

I have been somewhat impressed by the argument of my distinguished colleague with reference to that subject. I should like to ask the Senator from Alaska whether, as my senior colleague has seemed to indicate, there is any danger that the passage of the bill S. 627 would jeopardize the passage of the bill S. 1006 and the bill S. 744?

Mr. BARTLETT. I certainly would hope not. The two bills to which the Senator has referred have not yet been considered by the Committee on Commerce. I think the measures represent a three-pronged attack on the total problem, and that all of the bills ought to pass. The aggregate cost of the bill S. 1006 is estimated to be $112,500,000. Personally I do not believe that amount is too much for a job which needs to be done. At the same time, I realize that the bill will receive heavy opposition. I do not relate the two. To answer the Senator precisely, I do not think that the passage of the bill now before the Senate would endanger the other bill.

Mr. McINTYRE. It seems to me that the three bills taken together represent a broad frontal attack on the entire problem. That is why I was somewhat concerned over what my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire said.

Mr. BARTLETT. I cannot see how any Senator who is for the construction subsidy bill would turn against it merely because the bill now before the Senate had passed.

Mr. McINTYRE. I thank the Senator.

In conclusion, I believe these two bills, and S. 627 which we are considering today, represent a constructive approach to our fisheries problems on a broad front. S. 627 is not a hasty, unnecessary gimmick, but part of a well-considered solution to the Nation's commercial fisheries needs now moving through the Congress. I commend the senior Senator from Alaska and the senior Senator from Washington for their leadership in developing our national potential in commercial fisheries. All those in New Hampshire who have taken an interest in fisheries resources are grateful to them for the progress this Nation is now making in these important fields.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] to recommit the bill.

Mr. GRUENING and **Mr. JAVITS** addressed the Chair.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague from Alaska.

U.S. FISHERIES NEED ATTENTION AND SUPPORT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I rise to urge the Senate to pass S. 627, a bill to promote State commercial fishery research and development.

If the United States is to regain its position of leadership among the fishing nations of the world, the speedy enactment of this bill is essential.

The fact is that our fisheries need help desperately. If we contemplate the tremendous amount of Federal assistance that has been given through the years to those who produce food from the land, and contrast the solicitude, the generosity, and the great financial aid that has been given to our farmers with the virtually nothing that has been done for those who produce food from the sea, the need for this legislation becomes very apparent.

It is a modest bill. It will help the States that have commercial fisheries, and the majority of the States have, to catch up for the past neglect and to enable us to draw abreast of other nations which we formerly led as a fishing nation but which now have surpassed us and left us in fifth place, behind Japan, Peru, Communist China, and the Soviet Union.

Now, there are many reasons why this legislation is desirable. Much of our fishing equipment is obsolete, and in many cases the fishermen are not able themselves to provide the very modern type of equipment which the Russians and Japanese have.

It should also be pointed out that during the past decade we have spent millions of Federal taxpayers' dollars to assist the rehabilitation of fisheries in 18 foreign countries. We have poured out money to help China, Taiwan, Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam, Ethiopia, India, Liberia, Pakistan, Turkey, Peru, Korea, Laos, Iceland, Yugoslavia, El Salvador, Cambodia, and even British Guiana, still a colony of Great Britain.

I shall go into this aid for foreign fisheries in greater detail shortly. But the fact is that we have poured our money to help them build up and in some cases these foreign fisheries we have helped build up with our dollars compete damagingly with our own fisheries.

I personally am not at all in accord with that policy, but we must face the fact that it has been done and it continues to be done, and that is all the more reason why we should begin to do something for our own.

I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to one important difference between what we have done abroad to build up foreign fisheries and what we seek to do through this modest bill in rehabilitating our fisheries at home. When we gave money to rehabilitate the fishery resources of foreign nations we gave them outright grants. These were gifts of U.S. dollars to build up foreign fisheries. They were not even loans.

But here in S. 627—a really modest approach to the major task of rehabilitating our own fisheries resources—we require matching funds of up to 25 percent to be put up by the States receiving the funds. In the case of Alaska, because of the truly incredible mismanagement of the territory's fishing resources by the Federal Government, a strong case can be made out for not requiring the State of Alaska to put up any matching funds. But this is not done. Alaska will be treated like all the other States of the Union and will be required to match the Federal grants up to 25 percent.

Now, in the case of Alaska, we have a special situation.

We know that through the years of Federal control, while Alaska was a territory, the fishery resource was managed, mismanaged, I would say, by the Federal Government over the increasing protests of Alaskans, unceasing protests of our succession of very able voteless delegates, which my distinguished colleague, Senator BARTLETT, was the last, and prior to him, Anthony Dimond, prior to him Dan Sutherland.

They all protested against the fact that uniquely in the case of Alaska, the control and management of this great resource had been denied to the Territory of Alaska, and had been vested in the Federal Government.

First it was the Treasury Department, then for a time the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries of the Department of Commerce, and after 1940, the Fish and Wildlife Service had control of Alaska's fisheries resources.

During those years, over the unceasing protests of Alaskans, of our delegates in Congress, the biannual memorials of our legislatures, which pleaded for the abolition of fishtraps, a very destructive device which has now finally been abolished, because the State abolished it, we saw our fishery resources go down, down, down, from highs of 8½ million cases in the thirties, to a million and a half cases in the last years of Federal control.

In the last year of Federal control, our salmon pack dropped to the lowest point in 60 years and that can be ascribed only to the fact of inadequate, insufficient, incompetent Federal management, and the unwillingness to heed the pleas of Alaskans, who were familiar with this problem, who knew the fishtraps were destructive, who knew there was overfishing by the then absentee fishing interests which came to Alaska during the summer, took out as much as they possibly could, overriding the occasional efforts of the Fish and Wildlife Service to check this.

The fact of the matter was instead of managing the absentee resource exploiters, they were the ones that managed the Federal agency. They dominated it. And although during those forties, when our fishery declined atrociously, the agency was headed by a well-known, nationally reputed conservationist. These nationally known reputed conservationists were conservationists in theory, but not in practice, because they allowed this resource to go down, down, down, year after year, over the unceasing protests of Alaska.

And now it devolves upon the State of Alaska to take this sorrily depleted fishery and rebuild it. And I would say it has made an excellent beginning, because since we have had statehood, the first year of State control being 1960, the resource has more than doubled from the low of approximately 1½ million cases in the last year of Federal control, to 3½ million cases.

And I am confident that with the able management, which the State has installed, free from absentee control and domination which existed during our territorial years, we look forward to progress. We look forward to a slow rebuilding of this once great resource, once the greatest national resource, and this bill will greatly aid that.

I think we face a real challenge here. We must not allow totalitarian nations to get ahead of us in fisheries.

This is a worldwide contest. As I pointed out, if we can help 18 foreign nations to rebuild their fisheries, the least we can do is do as much as this bill attempts to do, in a modest way for our own.

Let us examine in greater detail the aid we have given abroad to rehabilitate the fisheries of other nations:

Grants made under the aid program to foreign countries for development and rehabilitation of fisheries, fiscal years 1955–62

China	$848,000
Cambodia	159,000
Indonesia	907,198
Philippines	82,000
Thailand	147,000
Vietnam	1,908,500
Korea	5,351,000
Laos	13,450
Ethiopia	43,200
India	1,128,620
Liberia	167,280
Pakistan	1,355,670
Turkey	18,500
Tunisia	147,000
Somali	337,000
Ghana (fiscal year 1962)	66,000
Ivory Coast (fiscal year 1962)	200,000
Nigeria (fiscal year 1962)	195,000
Iceland	14,600
Spain	2,000
Yugoslavia	100,000
South America:	
Chile (fiscal year 1962)	26,000
El Salvador	23,055
Peru	151,971
British Guiana	8,000
Total	13,399,544

Marine research in South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand, $960,000.

Examples of specific grants made for development of fisheries in foreign countries under the AID program, fiscal years 1955–62

China:	
Ocean fisheries improvement, fiscal year 1955	$204,000
Fishing fleet rehabilitation, fiscal year 1956	5,000
Fish propagation, fiscal year 1956	5,000
Fishing fleet rehabilitation program, fiscal year 1957	17,000
Fisheries, fiscal year 1957	13,000
Tuna long liners, fiscal year 1957	530,000
Fisheries development:	
Fiscal year 1958	11,000
Fiscal year 1959	13,000
Fiscal year 1960	26,000
Fiscal year 1961	21,000
	848,000
Cambodia:	
Fisheries conservation:	
Fiscal year 1958	35,000
Fiscal year 1959	41,000
Fiscal year 1960	31,000
Fiscal year 1961	24,000
Fiscal year 1962	28,000
	159,000

Examples of specific grants made for development of fisheries in foreign countries under the AID program, fiscal years 1955–62—Con.

Indonesia:	
Expansion and modernization of marine fisheries, fiscal year 1955	$224,700
Expansion of inland fisheries, fiscal year 1955	51,000
Expansion and modernization of marine and inland fisheries:	
Fiscal year 1956	150,498
Fiscal year 1957	149,000
Fiscal year 1958	68,000
Fiscal year 1959	84,000
Fiscal year 1960	77,000
Fiscal year 1961	70,000
Fiscal year 1962	33,000
	907,198
Korea:	
Fishing boat construction, fiscal year 1956	1,000,000
Fisheries development:	
Fiscal year 1957	2,314,000
Fiscal year 1958	160,000
Fiscal year 1959	475,000
Fisheries development (typhoon rehabilitation):	
Fiscal year 1960	409,000
Fiscal year 1961	131,000
	5,351,000
India:	
Project for modernization and expansion of marine and inland fisheries and exploratory fishing:	
Fiscal year 1955	278,100
Fiscal year 1956	437,520
Fiscal year 1957	93,000
Fiscal year 1958	134,000
Fiscal year 1959	106,000
Fiscal year 1960	40,000
Fiscal year 1961	40,000
Total	1,128,620
Vietnam:	
Development of inland fisheries, fiscal year 1955	3,000
Development of marine fisheries, fiscal year 1955	95,000
Development of inland fisheries, fiscal year 1956	13,500
Development of marine fisheries, fiscal year 1956	46,000
Development of inland fisheries, fiscal year 1957	7,000
Development of marine fisheries, fiscal year 1957	160,000
General fisheries development, fiscal year 1958	192,000
Fisheries development:	
Fiscal year 1959	898,000
Fiscal year 1960	409,000
Total	1,823,500
Fisheries resources, fiscal year 1962	85,000
Total	1,908,500
Pakistan:	
Karachi Fish Harbor, fiscal year 1955	364,000
Fisheries development:	
West Pakistan, fiscal year 1956	371,375
East Pakistan, fiscal year 1956	129,295
West Pakistan, fiscal year 1957	45,000
East Pakistan, fiscal year 1957	46,000
West Pakistan, fiscal year 1958	116,000
East Pakistan, fiscal year 1958	56,000
Pakistan—Continued	
Fisheries development—Con.	
West Pakistan, fiscal year 1959	$91,000
East Pakistan, fiscal year 1959	32,000
Fiscal year 1960	74,000
Fiscal year 1961	15,000
Fiscal year 1962	16,000
Total	1,355,670
Somali:	
Fisheries:	
Fiscal year 1958	121,000
Fiscal year 1959	18,000
Fisheries improvement:	
Fiscal year 1960	61,000
Fiscal year 1961	30,000
Fiscal year 1962	107,000
Total	337,000

In conclusion, Mr. President, there are two basic facts we must bear in mind and that is that through the years our Federal Government has given tremendous aid to those who produce food from the land. Our farm program running into billions of dollars has helped the farmers and produced great surpluses, almost too much.

But there has been no corresponding solicitude for those who produce food from the sea. And this bill is a beginning to try to do that.

Then there is the fact that we are helping and continuing to help 18 foreign countries rebuild their fisheries, in many cases these fisheries now compete with ours. I think we should at least pay equal attention to our own.

Actually our expenditures to aid foreign fisheries by the end of fiscal 1962 amounted to $13,399,544. It may be assumed that by the end of fiscal 1964 the amount will exceed $15 million. When you subtract the 25 percent which the States will be obligated to contribute under S. 627 it will be seen that the amounts S. 627 proposes to spend on our own fisheries and what we are granting abroad are not far apart.

I repeat: Let us do as much for our own.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in the Senate in support of this measure. I shall vote against the motion to recommit. I am a cosponsor of the bill.

I think this represents an example of the Lincolnian aphorism that when the people cannot do something for themselves it is appropriate for the government to do it.

The fisheries industry includes a very heavy proportion of small business. The bill is designed to keep the industry abreast of world development in fisheries. The United States has fallen from the second to the fifth place in this regard.

This is not a question of national pride, as the report so properly states, but rather a question of properly exploiting the resources of nature which are available to all of the world in common and available to us in terms of our domestic economy.

This represents a measure of assistance which would materially facilitate private enterprise, and without which private enterprise is slipping back in world competition.

For those reasons, and because of its essential purpose—a purpose which I regard as highly opposite to the functions of government—I joined in cosponsorship of the bill, and I trust the bill will be passed.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I am delighted to hear what the Senator from New York has said.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the senior Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the junior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Considering the points made in the debate this afternoon, am I correct in my conclusion that one of the purposes of the legislation is to help to assist interested interior States develop their fisheries?

Mr. BARTLETT. That is one of the purposes. It is said by some that this is an inconsequential matter, and of no importance, but those who so state disregard the experience of Communist China, which has developed inland fisheries to the point that now Communist China is ranked the third fish-producing nation in the world.

Mr. KENNEDY. That has been the result of development of lakes, reservoirs, and manmade ponds; is that correct?

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. Has the testimony in the hearings pointed out the fact that this type of development seems to be a real possibility in many of the interior States of this country?

Mr. BARTLETT. Not only is it a real possibility, but also in some cases it is a surety.

Again I emphasize the fact—for such it is—that no State need participate in this program if it does not desire to do so.

Mr. KENNEDY. Has it been the interest of those who have cosponsored the proposed legislation, and is it the purpose of the proposed legislation, as the Senator from Alaska understands it, that the information which is derived as experiments are perfected by many States will be information and research which will be available for use by all others of the 50 States?

Mr. BARTLETT. That is correct. Knowledge gained will be shared across the Nation.

I wish to add the feeling which becomes stronger and stronger within me, that this is an action program. It does not contemplate more and more and more research, which could continue over a long period of time, from which no useful developments would flow.

The States, armed with knowledge—which some States already possess—could put that knowledge to work immediately after the bill became a law and an appropriation was made available.

Mr. KENNEDY. Therefore, experiments and research which had reached development in one State would be provided for the benefit of others of the 50 States; is that correct?

Mr. BARTLETT. I think the Senator from Massachusetts has made a very important point. The experience gained and the knowledge accumulated would not be localized. It would be sent abroad over the land. I think that is an important aspect of this whole program.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I appreciate the answers given by the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] to recommit the bill. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "nay," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] is absent on official business to attend the funeral of Hon Hjalmar Nygaard.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

In this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 52, as follows:

[No. 116 Leg.]

YEAS—21

Aiken
Bennett
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Miller
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Russell
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NAYS—52

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Church
Clark
Douglas
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Hartke
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—27

Allott
Brewster
Burdick
Cannon
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Engle
Gore
Hart
Hayden
Holland
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
Mechem
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Pell
Robertson
Simpson
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. Cotton's motion to recommit was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 627) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, This Act may be cited as the "Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1963".

Sec. 2. As used in this Act, the term—

"Commercial fisheries" means any organization, individual, or group of organizations or individuals engaged in the harvesting, catching, processing, distribution, or sale of fish, shellfish, or fish products.

"Fiscal year" means the period beginning July 1 and ending June 30.

"Obligated" means the written approval by the Secretary of the Interior of a project submitted by the State agency pursuant to this Act.

"Project" means the program of research and development of the commercial fishery resources, including the construction of facilities by the States for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

"Raw fish" means aquatic plants and animals.

"State" means the several States of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

"State agency" means any department, agency, commission, or official of a State authorized under its laws to regulate commercial fisheries.

Sec. 3. (a) The purpose of this Act is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States through their respective State agencies in carrying out projects designed for the research and development of the commercial fisheries resources of the Nation. Federal funds made available under this Act will be used to supplement, and, to the extent practical, increase the amounts of State funds that would be made available for commercial fisheries research and development in the absence of these Federal funds.

(b)(1) Nothing in this Act prevents any two or more States from acting jointly in carrying out a project.

(2) The Congress consents to any compact or agreement between any two or more States for the purpose of carrying out a project. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this subsection or the consent granted under this subsection is expressly reserved.

Sec. 4. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior for the next fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for the four succeeding fiscal years, $5,000,000 in each year for apportionment to the States to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) In addition to amounts authorized in subsection (a) of this section there is authorized to be appropriated to an interstate cooperative fund for the next fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for the succeeding fiscal year, $500,000 in each such year, and for the next three succeeding fiscal years, $750,000 in each such year, which shall be made available to States in amounts as the Secretary may determine. The Secretary shall give a preference to those States in which he determines there is a commercial fishery failure due to a resource disaster arising from natural causes or a new commercial fishery can be developed. Amounts appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until expended.

Sec. 5. (a) Funds appropriated pursuant to section 4(a) shall be apportioned among the States, by the Secretary, on July 1 of each year or as soon as practicable thereafter, on a basis determined by the ratio which the average of the value of raw fish harvested by domestic commercial fishermen and received within the State (regardless where caught) for the three most recent calendar years for which data satisfactory to the Secretary are available plus the average of the value to the manufacturer of manufactured and processed fishery merchandise manufactured within each State for the three most recent calendar years for which data satisfactory to the Secretary are available, bears to the total average value of all raw fish harvested by domestic commercial fishermen and received within the States (regardless where caught) and fishery merchandise manufactured and processed within the States for the three most recent calendar years for which data satisfactory to the Secretary are available. However, no State may receive an apportionment for any fiscal year of less than one-half of 1 per centum of funds or more than 10 per centum of the funds.

(b) So much of any apportionment for any fiscal year which is not obligated during any year remains available for obligation to carry out the purposes of this Act until the close of the succeeding fiscal year, and if unobligated at the end of that year, the sum is returned to the Treasury of the United States.

Sec. 6. (a) Any State desiring to avail itself of the benefits of this Act may, through its State agency, submit to the Secretary full plans, specifications, and estimates of any project proposed for that State. Items included for engineering, planning, inspection, and unforeseen contingencies in connection with any works to be constructed shall not exceed 10 per centum of the cost of the works, and shall be paid by the State as a part of its contribution to the total cost of the works. If the Secretary approves the plans, specifications, and estimates as being consistent with the purposes of this Act and in accordance with standards to be established by him, he shall notify the State agency. No part of any moneys appropriated pursuant to this Act may be obligated with respect to any project until the plans, specifications, and estimates have been submitted to and approved by the Secretary. The expenditure of funds authorized by this Act shall be applied only to approved projects, and if otherwise applied they shall be replaced by the State before it may participate in any further assistance under this Act.

(b) If the Secretary approves the plans, specifications, and estimates for the project, he shall promptly notify the State agency and immediately set aside so much of the appropriation as represents the Federal share payable under this Act on account of the project, which sum shall not exceed 75 per centum of the total estimated cost of the project.

(c) When the Secretary determines that a project approved by him had been completed, he shall cause to be paid to the proper authority of the State, the Federal share of the project. The Secretary may, if he determines that the project is being conducted in compliance with the approved plans and specifications, make periodic payments on the project as it progresses, but these payments, together with previous payments, shall not exceed the United States share of the project in conformity with the plans and specifications. The Secretary and each State agency may determine jointly at what time and in what amounts progress payments are made. All payments shall be made to the official or depository, as may be designated by the State agency and authorized under the laws of the State to receive public funds of the State.

Sec. 7. (a) All work, including the furnishing of labor and materials, needed to complete any project approved by the Secretary shall be performed in accordance with applicable Federal and State laws under the direct supervision of the State agency, and in accordance with regulations as the Secretary may prescribe. Title to all property, real and personal, acquired for the purposes of completing any project approved by the Secretary, vests in the State.

(b) All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality, as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a–5), and shall receive overtime pay in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the Contract Work Hours Standards Act (Public Law 87–581). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133a–15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

(c) If a State disposes of any real or personal property acquired under this Act, the State shall pay into the Treasury of the United States the amount of any proceeds resulting from the property disposal to the extent of and in the same ratio that funds provided by this Act were used in the acquisition of the property. In no case shall the amount paid into the Treasury of the United States under this section exceed the amount of funds provided by this Act for the acquisition of the property involved.

Sec. 8. The Secretary is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he determines necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BARTLETT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in connection with the bill which has just been passed by the Senate, I wish merely to say what has already been reported to the Senate by the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], that the chairman of the Commerce Committee, Senator Warren Magnuson, one of the sponsors of the bill, and one of the great leaders in the fight to bring back American fisheries, would have been present, of course, had it not been for the fact that when he went home to Seattle the other day, he was stricken with a virus infection and has a very high fever. He has been unable to return to Washington.

In June, the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, meeting in Tucson, Ariz., endorsed the bill just passed. I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record at this point the text of the resolution which that organization adopted.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution 12

Resolution supporting assistance to research on commercial fish species

Whereas the United States national position in world fisheries has been rapidly declining as a result of greatly expanded fishery operations by other nations; and

Whereas the commercial fisheries of the United States now and in the future will be essential in supplying food to expanding populations; and

Whereas the fisheries industry in many sections of the United States is in a depressed condition; and

Whereas the rapid acceleration of research and development of fish stocks is essential to the reversal of this trend; and

Whereas the various States in the United States are unable to finance the necessary research and development; and

Whereas Senate bill S. 627 recognizes the need and responsibility of the Federal Government to assist in the development of strong national commercial fisheries, and it also recognizes the States' role in these fisheries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, That its full support be given to the early enactment of Senate bill S. 627 [Bartlett] as that fishery research and development may be vigorously pursued.

Mr. BARTLETT. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point an address entitled "What Is the U.S. Position in the World's Fisheries," delivered by Wilbert McLeod Chapman, of the Van Camp Foundation, at Galveston, Tex., in November of last year, before the Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute.

There being no objection, the text of the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

What Is the U.S. Position in the World's Fisheries

(Wilbert McLeod Chapman, Van Camp Foundation)

Your executive secretary has suggested that I speak to you on the subject of "What Is the U.S. Position in the World's Fisheries." That story is quickly told. It is bad and getting steadily worse both absolutely and relatively to the rest of the world. I should like to comment on that and make some suggestions as to how the trend might be changed.

The total catch of fish and shellfish in the United States, as recorded by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, has remained remarkably stable for a very long while. It exceeded 4 billion pounds in 1934, and reached very nearly 5 billion pounds in 1936. It has moved between those two limits with very few exceptions for the past 25 years. In the first war year, 1942, it dropped to 3.9 billion pounds, but quickly recovered above the 4 billion mark the following year. In 1956 it was 5.3 billion pounds, in 1959, 5.1 billion pounds, and in 1961 it was 5.15 billion pounds. In 1936, however, it was 4.82 billion pounds, in 1941, it was 4.83 billion pounds, in 1950 it was 4.90 billion pounds, and in 1960 it was 4.94 billion pounds. Substantially speaking the total catch of fish and shellfish in the United States has remained stable for 25 years (Fisheries of the United States 1961 CFS No. 2900, Apr. 1962).

This has not been the case with other countries of the world. According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (Yearbook of Fishery Statistics, 1960) the world catch of fish and shellfish in 1960 (83.2 billion pounds) was approximately double what it was in 1938 and 1948, just before and after World War II. Furthermore it was up by 6 percent over the record of the previous year (1959: 78.5 billion pounds) and a third more than it had been in 1955 (62.4 billion pounds). While the statistics will not be available for some time yet it is obvious from trade information and preliminary reports that the total catch of fish and shellfish in the world has continued this rapid increase during 1961 and 1962. For instance, Peru alone, which is listed by FAO as having a catch of 7.8 billion pounds in 1960, will exceed 12 billion pounds of fish catch in 1962, and may reach 13 billion pounds.

The incidence of fish catch is far from even among the countries of the world. Out of the more than 100 independent countries in the world the top 10 fishing countries caught 69.4 percent of the total world fish production in 1960, and the 5 leading fishing countries of the world produced 54.7 percent of the catch.

It seems likely that this disproportion will be even greater in 1962 as three of the five leading fishing countries in 1960 (Japan, U.S.S.R., and Peru) have continued the rapid expansion of their fisheries in the past 2 years and there has been no startling increase of fish yield among the remaining countries.

Communist China is listed as the second fishing country in the world by FAO in the 1960 yearbook, with a catch of 11.1 billion pounds (1959 data). All economic statistics from Communist China are suspect, and this one is perhaps to be doubted more than most. That there has been a substantial increase in the fresh water fish production in Communist China in recent years seems to be likely. This would stem primarily from the increase in cultivated or pond reared fish and not from natural waters, although there apparently has been an increase in production from fresh-water lakes as well.

What increase in production there has been from sea fisheries is not known beyond what the Communist Chinese say. It can be stated, however, that in distinction from the other principal fishing countries, fishing vessels of Communist China are not seen elsewhere in the world oceans except in such places as Hong Kong, Macao, Taiwan, etc., where they have escaped with refugees and stay. Even the Taiwan Chinese who stood 24th in the 1960 list of fishing countries have fishing vessels that are seen in the tropical Pacific, the Indian, and the Atlantic Oceans. I personally do not think that the Communist Chinese caught as much fish in 1959 as they said they did, or that they are a factor of any great importance in the world ocean fisheries. Since I really have little evidence for my opinions I shall say no more about them.

The situation of the other three principal fishing countries, Japan, Peru, and U.S.S.R., is different. There progress in sea fisheries in recent years has been astounding, verifiable, and is continuing. Furthermore, to a substantial extent, these enormous increases in yield can be attributed to causes.

The dominance of Japan in world fish production has been quite consistent during this century. It shrunk during the latter part of the Pacific war as fleets were destroyed and areas available for activity were continuously circumscribed by American military action. Directly after the war the industry rebuilt itself swiftly. By 1950 production exceeded that of prewar years and since 1955, in particular, the geographic expansion of the Japanese fishery has been as phenomenal as has been its increase in production.

Japanese fishermen now fish in practically all the world oceans where it is practical to fish commercially, and in those areas where they are not so active they have well laid plans to become so. Their tuna fishermen fish wherever tuna occur in the Pacific, Indian, and Atlantic Oceans. Their whalers are dominant in the Antarctic. Their oversea trawlers are increasing their activity sharply throughout the North Pacific, off east Africa, off west Africa, and are beginning just now in the North Atlantic. Japanese fish along the equator around the world. They fish up to the pack ice in the Antarctic and Bering Sea, and will soon be doing so in the North Atlantic. They fish most places in between where a commercial fisherman can make a living, and in many places where those of no other nation can.

The vigor, persistence, and ability of the Japanese fishermen and industry is notorious, and without these characteristics of its men, that nation's fisheries could not have expanded as they have. But the activities of the Japanese Government cannot be divorced from any phase of the Japanese fish business. It is a matter of national policy that the Japanese fisheries expand as an important element of the national economy, as a provider of critically needed animal protein food at home and foreign exchange from abroad, as an employer of Japanese citizens, and as an instrument of foreign policy on the high seas and abroad. The role of the fishing industry as an element of the national military posture has not been evident since the war, as it was so powerfully in the 1930's and during the war, but I venture that somewhere in Dai Nippon some body of men dealing with national policy has this aspect under constant view.

The general policy of Japan in respect of its fishery can be expressed under three compatible headings: to maximize the production of fish by Japanese; to maximize the accumulation of capital in and by the Japanese fishing industry; and to maximize the employment of Japanese by the fishing industry. The Japanese Government is well equipped to carry out this policy and it does so with vigor, and high adaptability. In the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry there is a large and vigorous Fishery Agency. In the Ministry of International Trade and Industry there is an important fishery section; in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs oversea fishery matters get prime attention. Official committees from these three ministries have Japanese fishery problems under constant review. Committees combining Government and industry elements exist for overall policy and for keeping particular problems under constant review. There is freedom for an individual or a company to make a million or to go broke, but if a considerable segment of an industry stands in economic danger credit facilities are available from a variety of Government sources to tide over the emergency, and flexibility of tactical policy is available to correct quickly, or mitigate, the cause of the trouble.

As a matter of fact an outsider is struck by the fact that from Prime Minister to the lowest fisherman the Japanese Government and fishing industry is a remarkably flexible and resilient machine designed and equipped to carry out the above noted three pronged national policy. While competitiveness amongst its elements is as vigorous and throat cutting as in the U.S. fish business, or even more so, unlike here it is not only permissible for elements of the fishing industry to combine on ventures of all sorts but if excess competitiveness gives evidence of slowing down the growth of a segment of industry, the Government has no hesitancy whatever to step in and force collusion and cooperation in the most intimate and critical details of a firm's or individual's business.

It would be easy to remark contrasts between the United States and Japanese systems, such as the elaborate fishery educational system, the research vessels that roam the world to put fishermen on fish, the solid support of its fishermen and fish marketers abroad, the integration of industry, science, technology, foreign and domestic policies to constantly improve the industry's economic situation vis-a-vis the rest of the world, etc. The sum and substance of the matter is that Japan is the dominant factor in the world fish business, has been for a long while, has enormous strength in variety and depth, and although Peru in its first mad dash may overreach Japan in a year or 2 temporarily, and Russia also is evidencing remarkable power in the development of high sea fisheries, I venture the opinion that 10 years from now Japan will be the top fish producer in the world as it was 10 years ago, 20 years ago, and 20 years before that.

It has been known for a very long time that the near shore ocean of Peru was remarkably productive. I remember my freshman instructor at the College of Fisheries dwelling upon the subject 35 years ago. Prior to World War II Peru's fisheries were scarcely beyond a subsistence level. By 1948 they were producing 36,000 metric tons a year only. By 1955 production had increased to 213,000 metric tons. By 1960 they had increased productivity to 3,551,000 metric tons. In 1962 the production of one species of fish alone in Peru, anchovy, will exceed 6 million metric tons and may reach 6,500,000. The industry at this moment is expanding at an enormous rate. It is obvious that the total production of fish in Peru in 1962 will exceed that produced by the leading fish country of the world (Japan) in 1960. Such a remarkable expansion of a nation's fishery, or a fishery for one species by many nations, is without reasonably close parallel in the history of the world.

While the primary productivity of the seas immediately offshore Peru is remarkably high the recent phenomenal development of fish production there has not been entirely due to geographic chance. The Government of Peru has also played a vital role in this development. An industrial development of this sort cannot in an industrially underdeveloped country take place so spectacularly without foreign know-how, capital, and a stable and favorable economic and governmental climate. The Government of Peru during the decade of the 1950's and so far into this decade has provided that climate and that encouragement to both foreign and domestic entrepreneurs.

While the role of the Japanese Navy in the prewar development of the Japanese fishery is well known and the role of the Russian Navy in the present rapid development of the Russian fishery is suggested, the important role of the Peruvian Navy in the development of the Peruvian fishery is not so generally recognized. It can be stated without elaboration that the role of top Peruvian naval officers in creating the favorable governmental climate, in managing the fishery at sea, in furthering the attraction of foreign know-how to Peru, in securing the establishment of solid ocean research programs in the area, and in providing the legal apparatus by which these things could be done, has been of critical importance to these developments.

It may be noted that when conflict of interest over use of this resource arose in Peru the Peruvian Government resolved that conflict in favor of a broadly based commercial fishing industry; when world market conditions threatened the industry's economy in 1960–61, the Peruvian Government proceeded internally and internationally to provide the governmental machinery to resolve the problem; when the rapid expansion of production gave rise to worries about stability of the stock of fish the Peruvian Government obtained international scientific assistance adequate to inform it as to what should be done to safeguard the resource.

As soon as it became solid governmental policy in Peru for the commercial fishery to expand that policy was implemented and the fishery grew. It grew from practically nothing, hauling itself up by its bootstraps In the absence of shipyards it built a thousand modern purse seiners in vacant lots and backyards. In the absence of processing machinery it imported old plants until it could afford to buy the best. In the absence of trained masters and crewmen for its vessels it brought down Indians out of the Andes who had never seen the ocean, and trained them. It improvised, it gambled, it cut corners, and it has grown with amazing speed and sturdiness. It is presently growing more rapidly than the fishing industry of any other country of the world.

It is not easy for Russia to go out upon the sea. In the Pacific nearly all its ports are closed by ice for considerable periods of the year, as is its northern coastline. Its Baltic ports are a long distance from the productive waters of the North Sea and North Atlantic. Its Black Sea ports are removed by the distance of the fish-poor Mediterranean from good fishing grounds.

Russia has been known for centuries as the epitome of a landpower with little seagoing ability. Yet in the past 5 or 6 years Russia has become the third or fourth fishing power of the world (depending on where you put Communist China) and leads the United States, which as late as 1955 was the second fishing country in the world, by a substantial margin. Furthermore the expansion of the Russian high seas' fishery appears to be just nicely getting underway while that of the United States is still standing still, or retrogressing.

I will leave it to intelligence officers and political commentators to iterate the military significance of Russia's expanding high seas fishing ventures. As a fishery expert who gets around the world some, I can only say that what I have read about it, what I have seen of it, and what my colleagues in other countries tell me about it persuades me that the Russian fishery expansion has been ably planned and is being skillfully carried out simply as a fishery venture.

It is always easy for us in the United States to say of Socialist ventures that there is no possibility for us to compete because we have to watch costs and they do not. A recent paper by S. C. Mikhailov (OKeanologiia 2(3): 385-392, 1962) entitled "On the Comparative Efficiency of Production of Some Products of the Land and the Sea," begins as follows:

"For a Socialist society with its planned economic system and scientific analysis of production, it is far from being a matter of indifference at what cost in labor and materials expended one or another product is obtained." (translated from the Russian by W. G. Van Campen, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries Laboratory, Honolulu.)

Professor Mikhailov continues to examine the costs in labor and capital (both invested and working) involved in the production of meat (beef and pork) on the Russian state farms and the production of fish (including whales) by Russian vessels. He sums this up in his table 2 were he shows that to produce 100,000 tons of meat requires the capital investment of 2 to 2.5 billions of rubles whereas to get the same yield of fish requires a capital investment of only 1.5 to 1.7 billions of rubles; he estimates that it would require production costs of 600 millions of rubles to produce this much meat and only 200 millions of rubles to produce that weight of fish; and finally concludes that to produce this much meat on the state farms would require 5.4 millions of man-days whereas that weight of fish could be produced by a labor expenditure of only 1.35 millions of man-days.

No matter what one thinks of the efficiency of Soviet agriculture, or high seas fisheries for that matter, such a set of figures would lead an American capitalist to put his money on fish production as quickly as it would a Soviet bureaucrat. At any rate it is not at all safe to assume that the Russian high sea fishery venture has any other motivation than that Russia requires animal protein for the diet of its human population, it will require greatly additional volumes of this as its economic standards continue to improve, and its planners are convinced that this can be had from the sea more cheaply than from the land. That large, long-range fishing vessels are useful militarily is only a plus factor that our Navy is wealthy enough to ignore in our case.

At any rate I assume that the Russian fishing effort is solidly based on nutritional need and economic justification, and that it is going to be with us for a long time.

In any event the expansion of the Russian fishing effort is an enormous undertaking. The educational system has been geared to produce the required personnel; the scientific apparatus has been geared to provide scientific assistance on a scale we do not contemplate in our fisheries and that our fishermen are neither trained nor habituated to use; while Russian shipyards and those of other Soviet countries turn out a great variety of fine modern vessels, many of which in size and seaworthiness completely overshadow our best and biggest, great fleets of fine big vessels have been purchased from British, German, and Danish yards. It has recently been reported (Minato Shimbun, Oct. 26, 1962) that Russia has offered to buy $100 million worth of fish processing and carrier vessels from Japan.

The upshot of all of this is that FAO reports the following production of fish by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in thousands of metric tons, for recent years:

1948	1, 485
1952	1, 888
1953	1, 983
1954	2, 258
1955	2, 500
1956	2, 620
1957	2, 530
1958	2, 620
1959	2, 760
1960	3, 050

A doubling of fish production in 10 years time is not as spectacular as Peru's achievement, but Russia has had to do it the hard way. Its planners have said what they were going to do, their statisticians have later said what they have done, and this has matched up pretty well. Unlike the contentions of the Communist Chinese, no alert person involved in the sea fisheries of the northeast Atlantic, the northwest Atlantic, west Africa, south Africa, Antarctica, northeast Pacific, or Bering Sea questions that the Russian fleets are out in force catching fish in those areas with magnificent, big, new vessels of which we are all jealous. The Russian planners say they are just getting a good start. As long as the production of beef and pork in the Soviet Union remains so inefficient it can be guessed that they are correct.

Having examined all of this activity in other countries one may look coldly at whether it is in the interest of the United States to join the parade of high seas fishing expansion and if so how this might be accomplished.

It is a matter of considerable congratulations amongst the sellers of fish in the United States if the per capita consumption of fish goes up two or three-tenths of a percent, and of heart-rending pessimism if it goes down as much. The fact is that when the per capita consumption of fish in the United States is plotted on a scale suitable to illustrate the per capita consumption of meat and poultry in the United States not the slightest wiggle is seen in the fish line from 1930 to the present day. Since 1935 the per capita consumption of meat and poultry in the United States has risen from about 120 pounds per annum to about 178 pounds. During this period of time the per capita consumption of fish did not reach 11 pounds per annum.

Furthermore the proportion of the domestic catch used for human consumption has been declining rather steadily since 1920 as the portion of the catch used for making industrial products increased. The absolute amount of the catch used for human consumption reached its peak in 1950 and has been declining rather steadily since then. The amount of the catch used for industrial use has trended up steadily since 1920, reaching a peak in 1959, which was not much greater than in 1961. In 2 out of the past 3 years more of the catch has been used for industrial products than for human food.

Additionally, since 1950 while the catch of fish for human food by U.S. fishermen has steadily declined (from 3,307 million pounds in 1950 to 2,479 million pounds in 1961) the import of edible fishery products has risen steadily (from 640 million pounds in 1950 to 1,067 million pounds in 1960). During the same period of time the export of edible fish from the United States has halved (from 122 million pounds in 1950 to 61 million pounds in 1960).

From these statistics the following harsh conclusions can be reasonably drawn:

1. The elasticity of meat and poultry production in the United States is such that fish for food is a matter of taste and price, not need, and that the use of fish is declining sharply and steadily relative to that for meat and poultry in the United States.

2. The trend in the United States is to use fish for industrial purposes not as human food.

3. Of the amount of fish used for human food in the United States the trend is toward the use of imported products, and

4. While imports of food fish have steadily increased the export of edible fish has just as steadily decreased (during a period when the use of fish in the world totally has aproximately doubled).

There have been two notable exceptions to this trend. The per capita consumption of tuna has a little more than trebled since 1940 and nearly doubled since 1950. Also the per capita consumption of shrimp has a little more than doubled since 1940 and has increased by nearly 50 percent since 1950. It does not follow from this that the increase in use of tuna and shrimp has been from U.S. production. The percentage of U.S. tuna pack made from the domestic production declined from 73 percent in 1950 to 43 percent in 1960. The percentage of the shrimp supply from domestic production declined from 76 percent in 1951 to 43 percent in 1961.

The strong suspicion in my mind, for which a considerable amount of data are available but for which there is not space here to develop, is that most of these trends adverse to the U.S. fishing industry are the result of price competition. In the product amongst these with which I am most familiar it is not difficult to demonstrate that when the average price per can of all the tuna sold in the U.S. increases by a few tenths of a cent consumption levels off or declines and that when the price moves down again by a few tenths of a cent per can consumption continues its long term increase. It is also easy to demonstrate that every time the domestic fleet ties up to maintain its tuna price some other fishermen in the world (mostly Japanese) build additional tuna vessels to fill the space left in the market.

There is one other unfavorable factor to take into consideration in this gloomy picture. I have mentioned the putative effect of Naval interest on the progress of the thriving fishing industries of Japan, Peru and Russia. Substantially speaking this factor does not exist in the United States. Occasionally an officer of high or low estate in the U.S. Navy takes a mild interest in the progress and fortunes of the U.S. fishing industry and optimists among us conclude that the Navy is about to become interested in us. This moment of budding passion always vanishes without issue when the officer is returned to duty at sea.

Furthermore, as a practical matter, this is unlikely to change. The number of vessels over 5 gross tons in size obtaining documents as fishing craft each year has declined steadily from a peak of 1,300 in 1947 to 432 in 1960. The total number of these in the fishery was 12,018 in 1960 having a total gross tonnage of 402,312. But of these 11,491 were less than 100 gross tons in size and could not be conceived to have much application to the problems with which the U.S. Navy may be called upon to contend. Another 356 of these were between 100 and 199 gross tons in size; another 83 were between 200 and 299 gross tons; 54 were between 300 and 399 tons; and only 34 were 400 gross tons or larger in size. With the size of budgets that the U.S. Navy has had in recent years it would rather get vessels of the larger size noted above out of its mothball fleet to save the expense of maintaining them, and build new when it needs. For the smaller sizes it has no use. At least this would appear to be a reasonable accounting for the Navy's attitude toward the U.S. fishing fleet.

What, then, is to be done by the U.S. fishing industry to get back into the swing of things in competition on the high seas? Whatever is to be done it seems plain that it will require to be done by the U.S. fishing industry itself, and through its trade associations. It may be noted that the situation of the industry's trade associations has deteriorated steadily during the past 10 years chiefly through lack of financial support from the industry. Certainly it is not going to be easy to correct these adverse trends and one man can give no more than a few ideas calculated to stimulate further thought by others. Some that occur to me follow:

1. Highly industrialized nations prosper when they put science and technology to work to lessen the cost per unit of a product, or improve its quality, or increase the value per unit price to the consumer. This works best in the resource field where there is large scale, highly efficient harvesting of resources. In our field this would look toward the use of larger vessels using more efficient gear to harvest greater quantities of resource at lower labor use per ton. This seems to be working reasonably well in the purse seine fishery for menhaden and for tropical tuna. One cannot believe that ingenuity in developing such large scale efficient harvesting methods has been exhausted.

By and large, however, the U.S. fishing industry is suspicious, or at best contemptuous, of science and technology and their practitioners.

2. One of the more difficult problems in many fisheries is the desperate desire of the fishermen not to maximize his earnings per day, per month, or per year but instead to maximize the price per pound or the price that he receives per ton of his product. In the competitive society in which we live stopping fishing to raise the unit price of raw material simply is no longer practical. In the fishery field this leads inevitably to the increase of imports with consequent loss of market and earnings to the fisherman. Where this does not happen the increase in price of end product results in consumers switching to other meat or poultry products.

3. In many of our fisheries the quite bonafide attempts to conserve one or more species of fish from overutilization has accidentally led to the economic crippling of the commercial fishery of a whole area. For instance regulation of salmon take by limiting the size of purse seiners in Alaska has made it almost impossible to develop larger, more efficient vessels for use in other fisheries of that region. The individual fisherman must depend so much on his seasonal earnings from salmon that he has to be able to fish for them. He cannot afford two boats so he builds an Alaska size purse seiner. This limits him from getting out on the high seas of the Gulf of Alaska, in the weather normal to that area. Examples of the same sort could be enumerated ad nauseum where conservation by increasing the inefficiency of the gear has eliminated the commercal fisherman. In fact in some quarters it has become a conservation fetish simply to rule out efficient gear in order to make it uneconomical for fishermen to work.

Some way requires to be found out of this blind channel. In the Pacific Northwest this is now being forced by the incursion of large, efficient Russian and Japanese vessels working on unexploited resources beyond the territorial sovereignty of the United States. Northwest habits and practices will change or the Russian and Japanese vessels will have the fish. Not dissimilar situations are developing off New England in the herring and other fisheries.

4. In many areas the competition between using resources for commercial fisheries or reserving the resources for recreational or esthetic purposes is an important factor in hampering the development of a commercial fishery. For instance, the largest apparent fishery resource off California, anchovy, goes substantially unused from this cause.

In some instances the commercial fishery requires to be abandoned completely because the sport fishery can use the maximum sustainable productivity, but this does not seem to be a frequent situation, nor to involve many fish stocks capable of supporting substantial commercial fisheries.

In other cases an ignorance of the natural conditions causes inefficient utilization. A good example of what biological research can contribute to the solution of such a problem is provided by the controversy between kelp-cutters and kelp-bass sports fishermen off California. Competent scientific inquiry produced the unexpected information that in the most controversial area where the kelp was being cut and harvested regularly the production of kelp-bass was consistently greater than where it was being left unharvested. (University of California, Institute of Marine Resources, annual report for the year 1961-62).

This sort of problem is the most vexing one plaguing the near shore fisheries of the United States. In a lifetime of dealing with such controversies I have never seen one solved other than by one of two methods: Legislating the commercial fishery out of existence, or producing impartial scientific information with which the controversy can be settled.

5. There is a general reluctance in even the largest fisheries to provide the necessary economic data to a competent university economist, or to hire for private confidential purposes an economist, to study the economics of a total fishery. Yet it is obvious to those engaged in the fisheries that the economics of commercial fisheries are exceedingly complex and not well understood by those most intimately acquainted with the fishery.

The method of regulating the halibut fishery in the Gulf of Alaska might be felt by the casual observer not to be much connected with the economics of the albacore fishery off Baja California, but it is. Similarly there are economic relationships between the latter fishery and the yield of skipjack off southern Japan, although the species do not directly compete on the market at any point.

One cannot help but believe that competent economic analysis could provide much of benefit to the American fisheries.

6. A primary sort of controversy in the world's fishery is that between the small, local, inefficient coastal vessel and the large, highly efficient vessel from a distant port. Up until recently this has not been much of a problem to U.S. fishermen, but it is becoming so in the Northeast Pacific and the Northwest Atlantic, and this will increase.

At least one of the things that require to be done in this matter is the negotiation of a treaty laying down rules of the road for fishermen on the high seas so that interference between different sorts of gear will be kept to a minimum.

A great many things of this sort can be suggested but the key factor is that the cost of fish must come down in the United States to compete with the imports and with meat and poultry. If the price structure does not come down the fishery will.

The difficult part of this is that while the price of raw material must decrease the earnings of fishermen and boatowners must go up at the same time. The first is necessary so that boatowners can compete in the labor market for top, skilled hands; the second must happen so that competition in the capital market will provide the top fisherman with a modern, efficient, boat in which to exercise his talents and skills.

This twin necessity is the true challenge we face.

If these things cannot be accomplished then the U.S. commercial fishery will continue to stultify or retrogress; to the extent that they can be done, it will forge ahead with those of the other principal fishing countries.

As with every other part of a free economy, and in the last analysis (as Professor Mikhailov has said) in a Socialist society, the capital and labor cost of a fish product must be competitive with those of products that can be substituted for it or the fishery must perish.

Whatever contributes to lowering the cost per ton of fish without lowering the earnings of fisherman or boat will cause the U.S. fishery to grow; whatever contributes to increasing the earnings of fishermen or boat without increasing the cost per ton of producing the fish will have the same effect. If the price of fish does not come down the fishery will not grow; if the earnings of fishermen and boat do not increase it will not grow either.

Whatever stands in the way of these movements must disappear or the commercial fishing industry will. Whether this challenge can be met without solid Government support, urging and assistance as in Japan, Peru, and Russia is moot.

THE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—INCREASE IN FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN MEETING COSTS OF MAINTAINING THE NATION'S CAPITAL CITY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, while many Members of the Senate are in the Chamber, I should like to ask about the schedule of the Senate for the remainder of the day and also for tomorrow and, in so far as the majority leader can determine it, for the remainder of the week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the question raised by my distinguished colleague, the minority leader, it is the intention of the leadership to move next to the consideration of Calendar No. 346, H.R. 6177. I ask unanimous consent that it be made the pending business at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6177) to amend section 2(a) of article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 relating to the annual payment to the District of Columbia by the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That title I of this Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Payment Authorization Act".

TITLE I—FEDERAL PAYMENT

SEC. 101. In recognition of the unique character of the District of Columbia as the Nation's Capital City, regular annual payments are hereby authorized to be appropriated from revenues of the United States to cover the proper Federal share of the expenses of the government of the District, and such annual payments, when appropriated, shall be paid into the general fund of the District. The annual payment authorization shall consist of an amount computed by the Commissioners, as of the beginning of the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the request for payment is being made, equal to the sum of—

(A) the amount of the real property taxes lost to the District, based upon the assessed value and rate of tax then in force, as a result of the exemption from real property taxation of the following properties:

(i) real property in the District owned and used by the United States for the purposes of providing Federal governmental services or performing Federal governmental functions, but excluding parklands, museums, art galleries, memorials, statuary, and shrines, and also excluding, to the extent to which it may be so used, property owned by the United States and used to provide a service or perform a function which would otherwise be provided or performed by the District, such as, by way of example and without limitation, public streets and alleys and public water supply facilities;

(ii) real property in the District exempt from taxation by special Act of Congress or exempt from taxation pursuant to subsection (k) of section 1 of the Act approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1089), as amended (sec. 47–801a(k), D.C. Code, 1961 edition), and not eligible for exemption from taxation under any other subsection of said section 1 of the Act approved December 24, 1942;

(B) the amount of personal property taxes lost to the District based upon the assessed value and rate of tax then in force, as a consequence of the exemption from personal property taxation of tangible personal property located in the District and which is owned by the United States, exclusive of objects of art, museum pieces, statuary, and libraries. Tangible personal property located in the District owned by the United States may be estimated by one or more methods developed by the Commissioners;

(C) the amount obtained by multiplying the actual collections in the second preceding fiscal year of corporation and unincorporated business franchise taxes and taxes on insurance premiums and on gross earnings of financial institutions and guaranty companies by a fraction the numerator of which shall be the total number of Federal Government employees whose places of employment are in the District as estimated by the United States Civil Service Commission and the denominator of which shall be the total number of other employees whose places of employment are in the District, as estimated by the United States Employment Service for the District, but excluding employees of the government of the District, employees in nonprofit activities, and domestics in private households, also as estimated by such Service.

SEC. 102. (a) The Commissioner shall, in consultation with the Administrator of General Services, annually compute the amount of the Federal payment authorized to be appropriated under this title and the amount of such authorization so computed shall be submitted to the Congress along with any request for appropriation of such payment.

(b) For the first fiscal year in which this Act is effective, the amount of the annual payment authorized to be appropriated under this title may be computed by the Commissioners on the basis of preliminary estimates: *Provided*, That such amount shall be subject to later adjustment in accordance with the provisions of this title.

SEC. 103. Article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947, as amended (61 Stat. 361; sec. 47–2501a and 47–2501b, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), and title I of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1085; sec. 47–134, D.C. Code, 1961 edition) are hereby repealed with respect to fiscal year 1964 and subsequent fiscal years.

TITLE II—AUTHORIZATION FOR LOANS FROM THE UNITED STATES TREASURY

SEC. 201. Subsection (b) of the first section of the Act approved June 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 183; sec. 9–220(b), D.C. Code, 1961 edition), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) To assist in financing the cost of constructing facilities required for activities financed by the general fund of the District, the Commissioners are hereby authorized to borrow from the United States Treasury and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to lend to the Commissioners such sums as may hereafter be appropriated. No loan made pursuant to this subsection shall cause the aggregate indebtedness of the District payable from the general fund to exceed 6 per centum of the average of the aggregate assessed values (as of the first day of July of the ten most recent fiscal years for which such assessed values are available) of (1) the taxable real and tangible personal property located in the District, and (2) the real and tangible personal property referred to in paragraphs (A) and (B) of section 101 of the District of Columbia Payment Authorization Act, the values of which shall be computed in accordance with the applicable provisions of such Act. Any appropriation for a loan under this subsection in any fiscal year must first be specifically requested of the Congress in the budget submitted for the District. Such loans when advanced shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the general fund of the District."

SEC. 202. Subsection (f) of the first section of such Act approved June 6, 1958, is hereby repealed.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. DEFINITIONS.—As used in this Act, the word "Commissioners" means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or their designated agent, and the word "District" means the District of Columbia, either as a territorial area, or as the government and municipal corporation of that name.

SEC. 302. EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall take effect with respect to fiscal years beginning on and after July 1, 1963.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as announced previously—and I am afraid that I may have been misunderstood, or I may have used the word "Monday" instead of "Wednesday"—at the conclusion of the morning hour on Wednesday, the Senate will turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 335, S. 646, to prohibit the location of chanceries or other business offices of foreign governments in certain residential areas in the District of Columbia.

That bill will be taken up at the conclusion of the morning hour on Wednesday next.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the further information of Senators, it is quite possible that Calendar No. 338, H.R. 6016, authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and for other purposes, will be brought up later this week.

THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE DEBT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the July 22, 1963, research report of the American Institute for Economic Research contains an illuminating article on the public and private debt in the United States, with supporting statistical data. It notes that net public and private debt in the United States increased nearly 8 percent last year to more than $1 trillion. It also underscores a warning which I feel should be heeded. I quote:

> The continued increase of all major categories of debt in the United States has increased the vulnerability of the economy. Debt that is not burdensome under current economic conditions soon could become so in the event of a recession, with serious compounding effects, as the experience of the early 1930's amply demonstrated.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Public and Private Debt in the United States," be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE DEBT IN THE UNITED STATES

Net public and private debt in the United States increased nearly 8 percent last year to more than $1 trillion.[1] This rate of increase compares with 4 percent in 1960, 6 percent in 1961, and an average annual rate of a little less than 6 percent during the past decade. Trends of recent years continued with the greatest rates of increase occurring in State and local debt and in noncorporate (individual) debt.

The 3-percent increase in the debt of the Federal Government was the same as that of the previous year. Net Federal debt of $256 billion excluded about $50 billion of

---

[1] This article is based on data compiled by the Department of Commerce and reported in the Survey of Current Business for May 1963.

All figures for private debt exclude (1) deposit liabilities of banks and the amount of bank notes in circulation; (2) the value of outstanding policies and annuities of life insurance carriers; (3) short-term debt of individuals and unincorporated nonfinancial business firms. Moreover, the figures used are net; that is for example, Federal Government net debt is that owed to all other sectors of the economy except the Federal Government proper and its corporations and agencies.

Government debt held by Government agencies.

State and local government debt increased 13 percent last year, compared with 8 percent in each of the 2 preceding years. This rate of increase was exceeded only by that of nonfarm individual mortgages, which increased 14 percent. During this period noncorporate mortgage debt increased in about the same proportion.

Despite the rapid rate at which public debt, especially that of State and local governments, has increased during the past three decades, the total of private debt is still about twice that of public debt. Total private debt, reported at $688 billion at the end of 1962, was divided roughly equally between corporate and noncorporate debt. Corporate debt, which has increased at a considerably lower rate than noncorporate debt during the past decade, increased nearly 8 percent last year, compared with a little more than 10 percent for noncorporate debt. During 1962 corporations increased slightly the proportion of their long-term debt and thereby continued a trend of the past decade. At the end of 1962, however, corporate short-term debt was still nearly 15 percent more than corporate long-term debt.

Private noncorporate farm and nonfarm debt both increased at about the same rate during 1962.

Individuals increased their mortgage debt on 1-4 family house mortgages by 10 percent, their other mortgage debt by 14 percent, their consumer debt by 10 percent, and their other debt by nearly 9 percent. The rates of increase were greater than those of 1961 for each category except other debt. Consumer short-term debt not only reached a record level but was greater in relation to disposable personal income than in any previous year. This relationship is among those included in table 2, "Selected debt income ratios."

Some broad generalizations concerning the relationship of debt to income may be drawn from table 2. For example, (1) total debt is larger now in relation to national income than it was in 1929; (2) although the Federal debt has decreased somewhat in relation to national income, State and local government debt has increased in relation to national income since 1929; and (3) nonfarm noncorporate mortgage debt has increased to 55 percent of total disposable personal income.

The continued increase of all major categories of debt in the United States has increased the vulnerability of the economy. Debt that is not burdensome under current economic conditions soon could become so in the event of a recession, with serious compounding effects, as the experience of the early 1930's amply demonstrated.

TABLE 1.—*Net public and private debt in the United States, end of calendar year*

[Dollar amounts in billions]

Classification	1952	1961	1962	Percent increase	
				1952–62	1961–62
Total public and private	$555.2	$944.1	$1,017.3	83.2	7.8
Public	248.7	313.1	329.7	32.6	5.3
Private	306.5	631.0	687.6	124.3	9.0
Public:					
Federal	222.9	248.1	255.9	14.8	3.1
State and local	25.8	65.0	73.7	185.7	13.4
Private:					
Corporate	171.0	321.5	346.0	102.3	7.6
Noncorporate	135.5	309.5	341.7	152.2	10.4
Corporate:					
Long term	73.3	149.1	161.2	119.9	8.1
Short term	97.7	172.4	184.8	89.2	7.2
Noncorporate:					
Farm	15.2	27.8	30.5	100.7	9.7
Nonfarm	120.3	281.7	311.2	158.7	10.5
Nonfarm:					
1 to 4 family house mortgages	$55.6	$145.4	$159.9	189.6	10.0
Other mortgages	19.6	44.7	51.0	160.2	14.1
Consumer	27.4	57.7	63.5	131.8	10.1
All other	17.7	33.9	36.8	107.9	8.6

TABLE 2.—*Selected debt-income ratios*

	1929	1952	1961	1962
Total net debt to national income	2.17	1.90	2.21	2.23
National debt to national income	.19	.76	.58	.56
State and local debt to national income	.15	.09	.15	.16
Consumer short-term debt to disposable personal income	.08	.11	.16	.17
Nonfarm noncorporate mortgage debt to disposable personal income	.38	.32	.52	.55

SELF HELP, INC.—A NEW KIND OF FOREIGN AID

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, beginning on page 36 of the August issue of the Catholic Digest is an article by Mr. Maurice Murray entitled "New Kind of Foreign Aid." The article is about Self Help, Inc., an Iowa organization founded by Vern L. Schield, Waverly, Iowa, industrialist and civic leader.

Self Help is dedicated to providing the means and incentive for peoples in underdeveloped countries to help themselves to a higher standard of living. The novelty of its approach is to make capitalists out of these people by providing them with the means of production—especially agricultural production—on a low-cost, long-term, pay-as-you-go basis. Thousands of items of used farm machinery are donated to Self Help, Inc., completely reconditioned, and shipped to all parts of the world in response to specific requests. The opportunity for this program to grow is limited only by the donations Self Help receives from benefactors who desire to further its objectives. The Rockefeller Bros. Fund is one of several such benefactors which has seen fit to lend assistance so that it can expand its operations.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW KIND OF FOREIGN AID—SELF HELP, INC., TURNS MEN AWAY FROM COMMUNISM BY MAKING CAPITALISTS OF THEM

(By Maurice Murray)

Iowa is where the tall corn grows. Some tall ideas take root there, too. Self Help, Inc., at Waverly in Bremer County, is one of them.

Self Help is an entirely new kind of foreign-aid program. It has nothing to do with the government, although many government officials, both State and Federal, give it enthusiastic approval.

Self Help means just what the name says. Its aim is to help our have-not neighbors overseas to help themselves. It is a nonprofit, people-to-people organization. The basic purpose is not to fight communism—or to fight anything or anybody except hunger—but it may well prove one of the most powerful weapons against communism that we Americans have yet developed. It hurts communism by helping people; it strengthens capitalism by making more capitalists.

Until recently, the story of Self Help was largely the story of one man, Vern L. Schield of Waverly. He doesn't want it that way. His plans call for the participation of as many people as he can get interested in the idea. Within the last year his one-man show has been turned into a firmly established organization with an executive director and a board of public-spirited citizens.

Mr. Schield was born and reared on a farm in western Iowa. From boyhood, he exhibited the interests that were to rule his life: farming, all things mechanical, and people. He built with his own hands the first Bantam crane out of a 1932 International truck frame, an old Ford engine, and various parts scrounged from junkyards. The crane, which on its truck chassis could move freely almost anywhere, proved so useful to roadbuilders that Mr. Schield found the backing to establish the Schield Bantam Co. of Waverly, of which he is now president and board chairman.

After the Second World War, Mr. Schield's business often took him abroad, and he was appalled by what he saw. In many of the young nations just emerging from the yoke of colonialism he saw land as rich as that of his native Iowa lying fallow while the people went hungry.

"I'm an inquisitive sort of fellow," he says. "I like to know what other folks are doing, and why, and how they're getting along. It just happens that I like people; and if I get to understand them, and if they get to know me, perhaps between us we can learn better how to get along in this world. It's that wanting to know that has taken me to 69 foreign countries to get acquainted."

Self Help sees hunger, not politics, as the basis for world tensions. "A stomach gets empty every day regardless of its address" is one of the slogans of the organization. In America nearly everyone gets enough to eat, and some of us get much too much. Yet in the world as a whole, after thousands of years of civilization, at least half the population go to sleep hungry every night. What's the answer?

"Some of the most productive soils and climates of the world," says Mr. Schield, "produce almost nothing. Even densely populated areas, with their manpower, good soils, excellent rainfall, and plenty of sunshine, grow almost no food. That's because all work is done by hand and crops are poorly tended. Those people need power equipment."

He began collecting used farm machinery from all parts of Iowa. Obsolete by American standards, the equipment was nevertheless good enough to be rebuilt. Shipped overseas, it could mean the difference between starvation and plenty for the ones who received it. And so the idea for Self Help was born.

But that posed another problem. How to decide who was to get such help, and how? Self Help began working with Catholic and Protestant foreign missions. Here was a readymade peace corps, established years before two World Wars had focused American attention on the plight of our less fortunate brethren. The missioners were on the ground and knew the people and their language; they would see to it that the rebuilt machinery went to those who needed it and could use it. Self Help was not founded to strengthen the hands of landlords grown rich under a colonial system, but to help the emerging peoples of the world preserve their new freedom.

Beginnings were small; a tractor to Brazil, a windmill to Indonesia, a feed grinder to India. But results were astonishing, and the plan grew of its own momentum. American farmers for the most part were only too glad to part with items that had been lying around their yards unused. Some of them they sold at a low price, others they donated.

Self Help collected the material, rebuilt it like new, and shipped it to the missions requesting it for sums ranging from one-third to one-fifth its real worth. From the beginning, the organization has been very firm on three points.

1. All machinery is sold; nothing but good will is given away. "Give a man a tractor, or even so much as a hammer, and he won't take care of it," says Mr. Schield. "But if he pays for it—no matter how little—then he has a stake in it." (American fathers who nightly round up their offsprings' bikes and trikes can readily appreciate this point.) Besides, the Self Help philosophy is to turn people away from communism by making capitalists out of them.

2. The machinery is rebuilt to last. "The equipment is so thoroughly overhauled it is really just like new," says Mr. J. W. Baccarini, executive director of Self Help. "There is no point in shipping a lot of junk overseas; that would only add to the problem. In some instances, all major parts are entirely replaced. And not a piece of machinery leaves the United States without a complete set of instructions. The instruction books are printed in several languages." The missioners see to it that the recipients have plenty of practice in using the particular item before it is actually turned over to them. Self Help aims at combining idealism with engineering realism.

3. Nothing is shipped unless there is a specific request for it. Here again, realism is the guiding principle. Self Help is not dedicated to pressing unwanted or unneeded aid on foreign countries. "The man on the spot knows what he can use much better than we possibly could here in Waverly," says Mr. Baccarini. Most requests come through foreign missions of all faiths and, increasingly, through U.S. embassies and consulates.

Since the Second World War, the U.S. Government has poured billions of dollars into foreign aid, and Self Help has no quarrel with that. "We all know that there were great defects in some parts of the aid program, as there would be in any such gigantic undertaking," says Mr. Schield. "But I definitely am for foreign aid. We need the Peace Corps. We need to send doctors and medical supplies and public health experts. But there's not much point in sending penicillin to people whose fundamental trouble is that they are starving. Wonder drugs are not the answer to malnutrition. In some teeming refugee cities like Hong Kong, perhaps a handout is the only thing—at least temporarily. But in those many areas of the world where there is opportunity for people to help themselves, that is what we should help them to do.

"Too often, U.S. aid went only to enrich the rich at the expense of the poor. Machinery obtained through handouts was ruined by lack of care. Or aid went to the wrong people at the wrong time for the wrong reason. For international understanding we need a true people-to-people form of assistance."

But where do the oversea farmers get the money to pay for Self Help equipment? How do you sell things to people who have no money? The time-honored American "buy now—pay later" principle is stretched to its utmost limit. Self Help terms are no cash down, and first payment after the harvest. Payments go into a revolving fund that pays for more machinery to send to the next place. Though up to now, Mr. Schield and the Self Help board of directors have been footing most of the bills, the plan can eventually become self-sustaining, if others will get into the act.

Most of the newly liberated farms overseas are very small by American standards. The average in India, for instance, is 4.2 acres. So small equipment works the best. Self Help has developed a special compact tractor which looks more than anything like a child's toy. At least, that's the impression until you see it in action. Though it has only 10.2 horsepower, it will do the work of three draft animals. Developed exclusively for Self Help, it is not for sale in the United States, but oversea farmers can get it new for $675, about what Americans paid for a model A Ford back in the good old days.

In the last year, nearly a quarter of a million dollars worth of equipment was shipped to some 23 nations. Where corn yields had been 9 to 12 bushels an acre, they are now 60 bushels an acre. A small grinder does in 20 minutes what it once took a native woman 2 weeks to accomplish. And where a number of native women farmed small, garden-sized plots, a cooperative field of several acres is now farmed by native men, efficiently, with power tools. One such farm in South America is now grossing $40,000 a year, thanks to Self Help equipment.

Besides farming machinery, Self Help now rebuilds and ships other equipment that makes for the better life: washing machines, sewing machines, typewriters. American farmers have been quick to respond to appeals from the organization whenever they saw the need. A recent request for old windmills (outdated in the United States now, but extremely useful in countries lacking electric power) brought 170 of them in a few days.

So much equipment keeps coming in that the job of reconditioning it has outgrown the facilities of the rebuilding shop at Waverly. Now, Future Farmers of America chapters in Minnesota and Iowa are lending a hand by doing much of the collecting and rebuilding right in their own vocational school shops.

Machinery shipments so far sent abroad have included tractors, plows, scrapers, cultivators, incubators, silage cutters, cement block makers, feed grinders, cream separators, windmills, rock crushers, and farm wagons. They have gone to such places as India, Egypt, Burma, Nigeria, East and West Africa, British Honduras, West Pakistan, Java, Brazil, Ecuador, Bolivia, Mexico, Guatemala, Chile, and Colombia, to name only a representative list. In May, Self Help shipped its 31st carload. The equipment went to some five overseas nations.

Today, Self Help has plenty of good quality machinery on hand, and bright prospects of getting more as facilities expand. The pressing problem, of course, is money. It takes cash and lots of it to build the kind of operation that will make Self Help self-sustaining. Support is expected shortly from all parts of the United States.

Congressman Donald M. Fraser, of Minnesota, for example, says, "Here is a wonderful way of encouraging an improved agriculture in other countries, and in such a sensible way, too." U.S. Senator Jack Miller, of Iowa, says, "I am deeply and favorably impressed with the Self Help program." And the editor of International Management magazine has written of it as "a kind of enlightened foreign aid that the world very much needs." Other encouragement has been received from Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, and from Laurance S. Rockefeller, of the Rockefeller Foundation, which contributed $5,000 to the organization.

Congressman Fred Schwengel, of Iowa, called attention to Self Help in an address before the House. He spoke of it as "a type of foreign aid program which should be encouraged because it is based on the American principle of helping people to help themselves. It is a unique, practical plan for making dependable farm and industrial machinery available to emerging areas of the world at prices the people can afford to pay." He also inserted a full description of Self Help's activities in the Congressional Record.

Other heartening words come from those who have benefited immediately from Self Help. "We are now using the wagon almost daily to transport sugarcane to the local sugar mill," writes Robert W. Nave, of the Lodhipur Institute, Shahjahanpur, U.P., India. "In this wagon the oxen are able to pull more than 5,600 pounds as compared with about 1,600 pounds they could pull before. The hammermill also works wonderfully. We are amazed at how fast it grinds. Now that we have it, we are thinking of going into the chicken business, as there is great need for that here and great opportunity if one can prepare his own feed."

And Delmer Yoder, of the agricultural service project of Kupang, Timor, Indonesia, writes, "It is amazing how the fame of our windmill has spread so far and wide. Almost every day someone stops to see it. Many people want to buy our other mill, but I am going to try to place it in some needy village that has dug a good well."

"As of this week, I have graduated from a bicycle to an Oliver tractor. Everything has arrived in excellent shape, thanks to the careful crating and the sheet of masonite on top of the incubator crates. Our entire outlook on life has changed. You can see what a little bit of equipment does." That from H. Drewer Johns, of the Hyderabad Conference on Rural Development, Vikarabad, A.P., India.

In the Self Help offices there is a blownup snapshot taken a few years ago in Cuba, before Castro. It shows a pair of oxen pulling a crude wooden single-bladed plow in the country that is "only 90 miles away." Beneath it is another snapshot of the Self Help bantam tractor going through its paces. "I wonder," observes Mr. Schield, "what might have been if we had had Self Help operating in Cuba about 25 years ago."

Charles Lamb, the English essayist, was not the first, nor the last, to ponder the problem of poor relations. He called them "impertinent correspondencies."

Many Americans came to this country as poor immigrants, and found plenty. Now, with half the world starving, the thoughtful among them ponder most deeply this persistent problem of poor relations. Self Help offers all men of good will—whether Catholic, Protestant, or Jew—an opportunity to work together on a matter on which all can agree: the necessity of helping others in need, whatever their address.

By such means Americans can show that they look upon their have-not kin overseas not as "impertinent correspondencies," but as their brothers in the fatherhood of God.

THE SETTLEMENT OF THE CHAMIZAL ISSUE, A GREAT KENNEDY ACHIEVEMENT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the administrations of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy and of President Adolfo Lopez Mateos, of Mexico, are to be warmly congratulated on the pending and announced settlement of the nearly century-old Chamizal dispute.

The Chamizal is an area of some 600 acres which, owing to a change in the course of the river—known in the United States as the Rio Grande and in Mexico as the Rio Bravo del Norte—found itself north of that stream's flow and presumably de facto moved from Mexico to U.S. territory and sovereignty. In the intervening years it was deemed by Texans and North Americans to be a part of their city of El Paso, Tex., and by Mexicans to be a part of their city formerly called El Paso del Norte and later renamed Ciudad Juarez.

The issue wrought by these conflicting views was raised repeatedly by Mexicans in the 19th century as were other land alternations brought about by changes in the river's course.

Bearing upon this issue was the language in a number of treaties and conventions between the United States and Mexico. First, there was the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo of 1948 between the United States of America and the United States of Mexico which concluded the war between them.

That treaty fixed the boundary between the two nations. It established that as beginning three leagues from land opposite the mouth of the river's deepest branch and then up the middle of that river following the deepest channel, where there was more than one, to the point where it strikes the southern boundary of New Mexico—and the specifications in the treaty beyond that do not concern us here because the river ceases to be the boundary at El Paso and Ciudad Juarez. The Gadsden Treaty of 1853 reconfirmed that part of the boundary.

The river, however, was not keeping within bounds, and in 1882 a boundary convention was adopted to provide for the reestablishment of the monuments or markers which had been displaced or dislodged by unruly waters.

Two years later, in 1884, another boundary convention provided means for settling channel changes as they might affect the earlier established boundary. However, article one of that convention provided:

> The dividing line shall forever be that described in the aforesaid treaty (of Guadalupe-Hidalgo) and follow the center of the normal channel of the rivers named, notwithstanding any alterations in the banks or in the courses of those rivers, provided that such alterations be effected by natural causes through the slow and gradual erosion and deposit of alluvium and not the abandonment of an existing river bed and the opening of a new one.

In 1889 there was another convention establishing the present international boundary commission, and two more conventions, in 1895 and 1900, extended its life, the latter of these, indefinitely.

In 1905 a convention settled the ownership of some 58 bancos or sandbars which the river's vagaries had detached from the shore by deciding that they should go the country from whose shore they had been detached.

None of these conventions touched the larger issue of Chamizal. But in 1896 one Pedro Ignacio Garcia presented evidence to the two boundary commissioners that he had inherited some land in the Chamizal from his grandfather, Don Lorenzo del Barrio, who had acquired it by purchase, and that his grandfather had occupied it peaceably, as had his son, and that it had been occupied by Garcia himself until in 1873, "in consequence of the abrupt and sudden change of the current of the Rivo Bravo," his land was left on the other side of the river in El Paso, Tex. He declared that since that change had taken place he had not dared occupy his land "fearful that some personal injury might befall from the part of a few North Americans, who supposing this land to belong to the United States of North America, pretended to come into possession of the same." Garcia added that he did not know which of the two governments, the United States or Mexico, he should recognize for the payment of taxes.

Garcia made a good point in raising the tax question. But his claim was not the only concomitant of this unprecedented and unique situation. The Commissioners—Col. Anson Mills, representing the United States, and F. Javier Osornio, representing Mexico—could not agree and felt that the issue involving so much personally owned property was beyond their capacity to adjudicate. But Commissioner Mills had written the Secretary of State, Richard Olney, that he was fearful that writs of ejectment might be demanded by American citizens who had occupied this area and that if the Mexicans should resist there might be bloodshed.

It may be cited, parenthetically, Mr. President, that this area lay west of the Pecos, where it was once believed and alleged that there was not much of any law, and in that day the border—as those who have followed the "westerns" have gathered—was a turbulent area where violence was often the rule. If the episode has not been portrayed in any westerns, it should make a TV or movie thriller—especially now that there is a happy ending—an idea I pass on for what it may be worth without claim to discovery or copyright.

In a letter to the Secretary of State of August 4, 1896, Commissioner Mills raised what would be the crucial question in the Chamizal case, namely, whether the Chamizal severance had taken place by gradual erosion and deposit of alluvium, which would bring it under the provisions of article 1 of the Convention of 1884, in which case it would stay with the United States, or whether the river had rapidly changed its course in which case it would go to Mexico. The Mexican Commissioner was contending that the latter was the case. The American Commissioner disagreed.

A lengthy correspondence between the Governments ensued. On December 4, 1897, Commissioner Mills, now a brigadier general, retired, wrote John Sherman, Secretary of State in President McKinley's Cabinet, suggesting that a third Commissioner, not a citizen of either the United States or Mexico be appointed to act as arbiter on issues on which the two Commissioners could not agree, adding that this was perhaps the most important case submitted for the Commission's consideration and "presented great provocation to the citizens of both countries for violence and disorder, where so many small tracts of land are claimed by citizens of both nations."

The Mexican Government, when this suggestion was made known to it, properly pointed out, through its Secretary of Foreign Relations, Ignacio Mariscal, that the existing boundary convention made no provision for a third member, and would, in any event, have no power to settle this issue, and proposed that it be approached with a new treaty to ascertain the pros and cons of the Chamizal issue and decide it. He said that the President of Mexico would, through his Department, so propose, and that the chief of one of the several nations be asked to serve as arbiter—mentioning the Presidents of the Republics of Chile, Colombia, or Ecuador or the King of Belgium.

Secretary Sherman replied, through U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, Powell Clayton, that "while accepting the proposition in principle," Mexico's counterproposal gave "the matter an extension which was not at all contemplated in the original proposition of this Government," and that he was "not prepared to recognize the necessity for so elaborate a proceeding at this time. The question at issue is not so much one of international right, or disputed interpretation of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, as it is the application to the matter of the ordinary rules and precedents of law with respect to changes in a fluctuating river boundary. The question being essentially judicial, and not involving the element of friendly compromise, which is so often apparent in the settlement of international disputes by a neutral arbitrator, I am still of the opinion that it can find a just and satisfactory solution without resorting to a new treaty, or appealing to the kindly offices of a third state, and that the simplest and most practical way to determine it is to enlarge the commission by the appointment of an American or Mexican jurist upon whom the two governments may be able to agree. In this manner, the existing convention will be sufficient for the determination of the question."

Ambassador Powell Clayton transmitted the text of this letter to Secretary Mariscal and followed it up with a personal interview. He then wrote to Secretary Sherman:

> I confess that I was at a loss to answer his objections as to the lack of authority for the appointment of a third commissioner, article 2 of the treaty of March 1, 1889 having provided for the number of commissioners and having made no provision for the adding thereto.

What Ambassador Clayton was saying diplomatically to his boss, the Secretary of State, was that the Secretary was wrong and Mariscal was right. He could probably do this safely. A brigadier general in the Union Army, Clayton had been Governor of Arkansas, later was elected and reelected U.S. Senator, and to the end of his life was virtually the Republican boss of his State.

In any event, Mariscal renewed his proposal for a new convention but the McKinley administration and the succeeding Theodore Roosevelt administration took no further steps in the matter.

Meanwhile, various incidents, such as the ejection by the El Paso authorities of Mexican citizens from what they considered their homes in El Chamizal and resulting official protests brought home the need of some action by the United States.

Renewing the effort to secure it, Mexico's Ambassador to the United States, Enrique C. Creel, wrote to Secretary of State Elihu Root on July 19, 1907, again requesting a new treaty or convention and proposing that it provide that a Canadian jurist be made a third member of the International Boundary Commission, saying:

> My Government believes that the universally recognized respectability of the Government of Canada and its preeminent impartiality toward the Mexican and American Governments are a sure pledge of the justice that will guide the acts of the Commission it may appoint and constitute the fullest guarantee for the high contracting parties.

The administration of President William Howard Taft acceded to the long repeated Mexican pleas for a new treaty—and with a Canadian jurist as a third member—which was worked out in correspondence between Mexico's Ambassador Francisco León de la Barra and Secretary of State Philander Chase Knox.

The new convention between the United States and Mexico to deal with the Chamizal case provided that the existing International Boundary Commission be enlarged by the addition of a Canadian jurist, Eugene Lafleur. The two pertinent articles provided:

> ARTICLE III
>
> The Commission shall decide solely and exclusively as to whether the international title to the Chamizal tract is in the United States of America or Mexico. The decision of the Commission, whether rendered unanimously or by majority vote of the Commissioners shall be final and conclusive upon both Governments and without appeal. The decision shall be in writing and shall state the reasons upon which it is based. It shall be rendered within 30 days after the close of the hearings.
>
> ARTICLE VIII
>
> If the arbitral award provided for by this convention shall be favorable to Mexico, it shall be executed within the term of two years, which cannot be extended and which shall be counted from the date on which the award is rendered.

The Commission, on June 15, 1911, awarded the greater portion of El Chamizal to Mexico, Canadian Commissioner Lafleur and Mexican Commissioner F. B. Puga affirming, and U.S. Commissioner Anson Mills dissenting.

Based on the evidence which comprises several volumes of testimony, documents, records, and so forth, the Commission's opinion was "that the accretions which occurred in the Chamizal tract up to the time of the great flood in 1864 should be awarded to the United States of America, and that inasmuch as the changes which occurred in that year did not constitute slow and gradual erosion within the meaning of the Convention of 1884, the balance of the tract should be awarded to Mexico."

And so the conclusive paragraph of the award reads as follows:

> Wherefore the presiding Commissioner and the Mexican Commissioner, constituting a majority of said Commission, hereby award and declare that the international title to the portion of the Chamizal tract lying between the middle of the bed of the Rio Grande, as surveyed by Emory and Salazar in 1852, and the middle of the bed of the said river as it existed before the flood of 1864, is in the United States of America and the international title to the balance of said Chamizal tract is in the United States of Mexico.

Unfortunately—for the good name of the United States—the provisions of the treaty were not carried out. The treaty provided that the award of the Commission would "be final and conclusive upon both Governments and without appeal" and that it should "be executed within the term of 2 years."

It was not done. For the first and only time in our history the United States failed to abide by an arbitral award. Why?

The political pressure from Texas was too strong. All the more gratifying, therefore, that it was a Texan, the able U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, Thomas Clifton Mann, of Laredo, Tex., who was given the opportunity and charged with the responsibility of carrying the complex negotiations to the present point of pending settlement. He is carrying out his assignment with skill and dispatch.

A careful reading of the voluminous material which makes up the Chamizal case leads to the conclusion that based on equity Mexico had a good case from the beginning. After the Commission's painstaking sifting of the evidence, and its award based thereon, there should have been prompt compliance by the United States with the award. The United States regrettably cannot wholly erase a 50-year failure to fulfill its obligation but President Kennedy has now wiped this escutcheon clean and vindicated the good name and good faith of the United States.

There may be some individual hardships among those whom the carrying out of the award will affect. Had the United States acted as it should have on or before June 15, 1913, the damage and the dislocation as well as the cost to Uncle Sam would have been much less. There is now an obligation on our Government to deal generously and equitably with all affected. Whatever the costs, they are negligible when measured against the value of salvaging our Nation's honor. Moreover, there is a priceless spiritual dividend in demonstrating to the people of Mexico that the United States is determined to be a good neighbor.

So again, congratulations to President Kennedy and to all the people of our two adjacent Republics.

I ask unanimous consent that three articles from the New York Times reporting on the Chamizal agreement, one under a Washington dateline by Henry Raymont, and two from El Paso and Ciudad Juarez by Jack Langguth, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

UNITED STATES AND MEXICO AGREE ON BORDER—WASHINGTON GIVES UP CLAIM TO EL CHAMIZAL AREA

(By Henry Raymont)

WASHINGTON, July 18.—The United States and Mexico announced today a final agreement for the settlement of the longstanding dispute over the El Chamizal, a border zone between El Paso, Tex., and Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua.

The agreement was a major step in the Kennedy administration's efforts to end a troubled episode in relations with the neighbor Republic.

President Kennedy said solution of the 50-year-old dispute would make a "significant contribution" to relations between the two countries and to the development of the twin cities of El Paso and Ciudad Juarez.

The accord, which came after nearly 6 months of intensive, complicated negotiations, was announced simultaneously by the White House in Washington and by President Adolfo Lopez Mateos in Mexico City.

The terms of the agreement will be written into a convention in the next 2 months, officials said. The pact will then go to the Senates of the two countries, probably in October, for ratification.

The document stipulates several shifts of territory, for a net transfer to Mexico of 437 acres of land. The Rio Grande, which can alternate from a trickle to a torrent depending on seasonal rainfall, will be diverted northward to mark a new boundary between El Paso and Ciudad Juarez.

To purchase buildings and lands belonging to U.S. citizens in the area awarded to Mexico, the U.S. Government is expected to spend about $28 million. It must also relocate to other parts of El Paso about 3,500 persons who will lose their homes.

The Texas city, on the other hand, will take over a bulge of 193 acres, about one-third of what was known as Cordova Island. The area, mainly barren land, was a major traffic bottleneck.

KENNEDY PLEDGE FULFILLED

The drafting of the agreement fulfills a pledge Mr. Kennedy made during his visit to Mexico in June last year.

In a private meeting with President Lopez Mateos, he is reported to have acknowledged that the United States had been wrong in refusing to accept the decision of a 1911 arbitration commission that awarded the El Chamizal area to Mexico. Mr. Kennedy is said to have promised he would make "every effort" to correct that error.

U.S. officials attached great significance to two other features of the settlement.

First, it erased the only known case in which the United States had failed to comply with an international arbitration award. Mexico, like all Latin American states, has always been a strong supporter of arbitration.

Second, it removed a major source of irritation in United States-Mexico relations. The El Chamizal issue had long been used by Communists and ultra-nationalists in Mexico and throughout Latin America in accusing the United States of "colonialism" and of defaulting on its international obligations.

The dispute dates back to 1864 when the Rio Grande, which marks the border between Chihuahua and Texas, changed its course. The El Chamizal area, which had been on the river's southern bank, was left on the northern Texas side by the change.

[From the New York Times]

INHABITANTS SHOW DISTRESS

(By Jack Langguth)

EL PASO, July 17.—The people of El Chamizal, whose property will be deeded to Mexico under the agreement announced today, were distressed to find themselves suddenly south of the border.

While the 3,500 U.S. citizens directly affected by the agreement were reluctantly making plans to move, however, El Paso's civic leaders expressed satisfaction that a troublesome breach between the two nations was at last being closed.

The U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, Thomas C. Mann, a former Laredo, Tex., attorney, is credited with having shepherded the proposed settlement past opposition from property owners in El Chamizal and political conservatives in southwest Texas.

"John Birch Society members and others opposed the agreement as some kind of threat to our sovereignty, but just about everybody else was behind Tom Mann from the beginning," one leader said.

Proponents of the pact said about 85 percent of El Chamizal's homeowners were pleased with the transfer. But conversation with men and women through the area showed attitudes ranging from resignation to bitterness.

"This is something between the two countries. We can't do anything about it," Mrs. Marciano Carrasco said. She is the mother of four children, and her husband works at a nearby mine and smelter supply company, which will remain within the U.S. boundary.

"We were happy here, and we don't like to be uprooted. We were going to pay off our house next year. Now we'll have to start all over again," Mrs. Carrasco said.

Residential neighborhoods cover about one-third of the 630 acres that will be turned over to Mexico if both countries' legislatures approve the settlement. The city of El Paso will receive 193 acres of vacant land on Cordova Island.

NEIGHBORHOODS ARE VARIED

El Chamizal is divided into four different sections, each with its own character and color. Along the existing border, near Santa Fe Avenue, the district is a welter of taxi stands, tam shops and weather-beaten houses.

Six blocks east, the residential neighborhoods, become more colorful and better kept. Painted orange, green, yellow, or pink two-bedroom houses look out on tended lawns bounded by low fences.

The corner stores in this area are clean but sparsely stocked, with a few dozen canned goods barely covering a wall shelf. At some, such as Los Alamos grocery store, the clerks speak only Spanish.

Farther east is an industrial area with warehouses and manufacturing companies standing on sandy plots near the railroad tracks. In the vicinity of Cordova Island, where the United States will receive its 193 vacant acres, cotton is sometimes grown.

There are also bare stretches of sand along the Rio Grande where patches of weed thrive in the 107° heat. El Chamizal was named for a desert weed, like tumbleweed, which grows in thickets over the entire region.

Homeowners in the residential sections estimate that the average El Chamizal house and lot last sold for about $3,500. With replacement costs likely to be far higher in other neighborhoods, however, some residents are pricing their property higher.

Peter Ramos, who built his own spacious and well-maintained house 8 years ago, worries that the Federal Government will pay him its assessed valuation, or about 35 percent of its market value. "We'll move," he said. "They wouldn't let us stay if we wanted to. But we're all concerned. We don't know what is to come."

U.S. officials of the International Boundary and Water Commission, who will handle the relocation, insist that displaced families have nothing to fear. "There is no question, of course, that they will retain their American citizenship and that they will be paid fairly for their property," one Federal spokesman said.

MEXICANS HAIL AGREEMENT

MEXICO CITY, July 18.—Mexican Government circles today described the El Chamizal settlement as a diplomatic victory for their country.

The newspaper Excelsior carried the headline, "Mexico obtains the greatest diplomatic triumph of its history."

The agreement was the lead story in all newspapers. The Government newspaper El Nacional's headline was "An Old Desire of Mexico Becomes Reality Today."

[From the New York Times, July 21, 1963]

TRADE GAINS SEEN BY CIUDAD JUÁREZ—EL CHAMIZAL TRANSFER ADDS SPUR TO BORDER PROJECT

(By Jack Langguth)

CIUDAD JUÁREZ, MEXICO, July 17.—Officials of this border city, which grew this week by 437 acres with the transfer of the border zone of El Chamizal, expect it will give new impetus to an ambitious building program.

The United States has long been reluctant to invest in construction or improvements on the northern side of the Rio Grande because of the Chamizal dispute. To the south, however, Mexico has proceeded with a $14 million border beautification project.

A museum of arts and history was opened here last Sunday, the first of a proposed number of cultural and commercial buildings financed by the Mexican Government.

Sixteen hundred visitors from both sides of the border attended the opening ceremonies. Many were more curious about the building than the exhibition of photographs of Mexican industry on display.

Some Mexicans describe the museum's circular design, conceived by Pedro Ramirez Vazquez, as resembling an oven or an Indian hut. Most agreed, however, that the finished building, capped with a fiberglass dome and set off by Italian marble and a shallow moat, was an impressive addition to the city.

A new, four-lane bridge linking Cordova Island with Ciudad Juárez was also recently completed. The formal name for the 178-yard-long span is Friendship Bridge, but Mexicans refer to it as simply "the new bridge."

The largest structure on the 250-acre border site will be a $360,000 convention center now under construction. When it is completed in October, the city plans to bid for conventions from the United States.

"Conventions will have to be joint enterprises with El Paso," said Manuel de la Torre, an official of the Programa Nacional Fronterizo. "Even with the 150-room hotel we're building, we couldn't house any large group."

Mr. de la Torre, a graduate of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in Troy, N.Y., said he would attempt to bring the college's midwinter reunion, often held in Havana in the past, here.

The largest Mexican city along the border with the United States, Ciudad Juárez had a population of 309,337 in 1960. The population of El Paso County that year was 314,070.

The frontier program also includes improvements in eight other northern border cities—Ensenada, Tijuana, Mexicali, Nogales, Piedras Negras, Nuevo Laredo, Reynosa, and Matamoros.

About $4 million has been spent so far in Ciudad Juárez in the expectation that private capital will be attracted to the new commercial center and that downtown merchants will be persuaded to improve their shops.

The project, headed by a former mayor of Ciudad Juárez, Antonio J. Bermudez, was chiefly designed to make the entire 1,600-mile border between Mexico and the United States a more attractive showcase for Mexican products.

In El Paso, the tradition of shopping in Mexico is already firmly established. Many housewives make a weekly trip to Ciudad Juárez buying meat at about one-half the price at home and stocking up on sugar and fresh vegetables at substantial savings.

The Mexican Government estimated before the development program began that the city was selling about $113,500,000 in goods annually to visitors from the United States, most of them from El Paso. The figure represents 19 percent of the total income of El Paso residents.

So many Texans cross the border to save about 10 cents a gallon on gasoline that the Texas Legislature, in its most recent session discussed putting a tax on the contents of car fuel tanks believed filled with Mexican gas.

UNNECESSARY EXPENDITURES IN CONNECTION WITH EMBASSIES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, almost daily the Comptroller General submits to the Congress reports calling our attention to unnecessary expenditures on the part of some agency of the U.S. Government. A careful reading of these reports would give any American citizen an interesting insight as to the inefficiency which develops when a bureaucracy is overfinanced.

Under date of July 17, 1963, the Comptroller General called to our attention another glaring example of unnecessary expenditures. In this instance the State Department built an embassy in Morocco which apparently it never needed because now, 2 years since its completion, it is still unoccupied and they are proposing to change it to an office building.

Not only did the State Department build an embassy which it did not need, but apparently even after they did build it, it was not suitable for living quarters.

Some observations that have been made by Embassy personnel about the residence are that: First, the main entrance to the building and the main staircase to the living quarters are on opposite sides of the building, making it necessary to cross a central patio, take a circuitous route through the representational rooms, or use a servants' staircase in order to reach the family quarters; second, it is necessary to go through the library or cross an open patio to reach the state reception room, making formal reception of guests by the Ambassador quite awkward; third, the kitchen is separated from the state dining room by the family dining room and a narrow serving alcove which could become congested during a large dinner party; and, fourth, the main entrance to the residency faces a large paved area although the Embassy desired that it face a driveway.

In 1958 the State Department had decided to build an Embassy office building and an adjacent ambassadorial residence at Rabat, Morocco. Construction of these buildings was begun in July 1958 and was completed in July 1961.

Prior to this, in 1956, the Government had already purchased a residence for the use of the Ambassador at a cost of $161,392.

On July 14, 1958, contracts were awarded to the Compagnie Industrielle de Travaux of Casablanca, Morocco, for the construction of these two buildings at a cost of $877,954.

Under the original construction contract the cost was to be $877,954; however, subsequently 56 different change orders were issued, resulting in increasing the cost by $90,425. The contractor was paid $45,000 on January 8, 1963, for damages as the result of construction delays resulting from the Government's indecision as to what it wanted. A $42,000 claim is still pending.

The architect was paid an additional $10,678 to design some of the changes.

The first change was made after the building had been little more than 40 percent completed and they discovered that the windows were too high. The occupants of the building could not see out.

Another change was when they found that the plans called for the use of glazed transoms at the top of every dividing wall, which left no privacy whatever in the living quarters.

Many of these defects were called to the attention of the Department in separate letters written by the Ambassador and the Deputy Chief of Mission. Both strongly recommended that the entire project be abandoned and the residence converted to office space since it was not needed as a residence. The recommendations were ignored and after approving 56 changes, each one adding to the cost, the building was finally completed in July 1961.

The ambassadorial residence has not been occupied during the 2 years since its completion, and the apparent reason for its nonuse is that the residence in Rabat currently in use—which had been purchased in 1956—is considered far more suitable and comfortable than the new structure.

As evidence of what a monstrosity this building really is I quote from the construction supervisor's completion report:

> The suitability of the design of this building will be argued for a long time to come. This is especially so of the residence. This portion of the project is, unfortunately, unsuitable for comfortable living and inadequate for proper entertainment. The official reception area is too removed from the area where the host has to receive his guests. If the Ambassador decides to receive his guests at the main door they will have to be led to the main salon, which is reached either through the center patio or through a corridor leading to the library room. The Ambassador will not be able to be with his guests or even be seen by his guests until all of them have arrived. Should a large group attend a reception, there are no suitable areas to accommodate an overflow crowd unless they all tramp through the formal dining room to reach the main patio area between the two buildings.
>
> The design of the undulating roof and ceiling of the upper portion of the building has made the installation of drapes and curtains a nightmarish project. The use of glazed transoms at the top of every dividing wall has made privacy, in the living quarters, a worrisome matter. The design of the Ambassador's bath and toilet room is reminiscent of a New York tenement house with a small toilet room at the end of the hallway. The design of the radiator units is of a type that is generally found in a factory or school building. In the formal reception room the units project 14 inches into the room making the hanging and drawing of drapes and curtains a cumbersome operation. The doors in the main reception room also occupy a lot of free space as they all swing inward. The use of sliding doors would have enhanced the room considerably and added to the unencumbered flow of persons during receptions. The location of the main staircase at the opposite side of the building from the main entrance makes it necessary for the occupants to traverse three rooms and go through five doors to get to the upper floor when reentering their residence.

The Embassy is now considering converting this monstrosity into office space. Just how much this conversion will cost the taxpayers is as yet undetermined. Nor does it appear that much study has been given as to whether or not they need the additional office space. Perhaps under typical bureaucratic procedure these questions will be determined after this conversion has been completed.

PROHIBITION OF FEATHERBEDDING IN RAILROAD AND AIR TRANSPORT INDUSTRIES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the threat of a nationwide railroad strike, with all of its crippling effects on our Nation's economy, is now upon us. The seemingly endless succession of collective bargaining talks, factfinding boards, court cases, and public discussions dealing with the work rules or featherbedding problem has gotten us virtually nowhere. The parties to this dispute, the railroads and the rail unions, are still unable or unwilling to come to an agreement.

Within a few days, now, a settlement must be reached or else the railroads will cease operation, and the United States will face a domestic crisis of immense proportions. In short, then, the moment of truth is at hand.

Mr. President, we are all familiar with the lengthy series of events which has brought us to the current collective bargaining impasse. The dispute involves the work rules and pay structure of some 200,000 employees of 195 railroads and terminal and switching companies. The issues were formally raised in 1959 and have been under various forms of negotiation and study ever since. Ad hoc Presidential commissions, emergency boards, and the parties themselves have met for countless hours in attempts to resolve the dispute. Nevertheless, the featherbedding issue is as alive today as it was 4 years ago, when the railroads first announced their intention to do away with thousands of jobs which they consider unnecessary.

A number of alternatives have been suggested as possible means of resolving this dispute. The first alternative is that of allowing the railroads and the unions to reach an agreement in their own way and in their own time. Since this method would undoubtedly involve a strike which would severely damage our economy, it has been dismissed as impractical and worse by many observers.

We have also heard a great deal of talk about imposing some sort of compulsory solution upon the carriers and the unions. The suggested uses of compulsion have included both arbitration and seizure. In addition, it has been suggested that the railroad workers be deprived of their right to strike.

Finally, the idea of a so-called one-shot intervention by Congress to settle this dispute has been widely discussed. Those who follow this line of thinking hope that Congress can impose a settlement upon the parties in a manner which will set no precedents nor affect labor-management relations in any other segment of our economy.

The one-shot concept involves a good deal of wishful thinking. It is obvious, Mr. President, that an imposed settlement of the rail dispute will set a precedent for other industries and for other collective bargaining problems. Once the Congress steps in and settles one dispute of this sort, other management and union leaders will bargain less earnestly because they will hope for or fear an imposed settlement which will relieve them of the responsibility of solving their own problems.

It is interesting to note that a congressional enactment to prevent a rail strike and to resolve the issues facing railroad management and labor would involve the President in a procedure substantially the same as that outlined in the national emergencies section of the Taft-Hartley Act and conspicuously absent from the Railway Labor Act. The Taft-Hartley procedure calls for the President to make a legislative proposal to Congress if the injunctive period has passed and the dispute remains unresolved. It is precisely these emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act that President Kennedy and other supporters of the administration have so severely criticized. They have called them inadequate and unworkable. Nevertheless, we see congressional intervention on a one-shot basis being heralded as a possible New Frontier masterstroke. Perhaps the President, whose talk often surpasses the quality of his actions, has again changed his mind when faced with the reality of a national crisis.

In this connection, it appears significant to me that much of the public discussion of this problem as well as the administration's efforts to avoid a strike have skirted the central issue, that of featherbedding. Most of the talk and the suggested proposals to keep the railroads running have been concerned with the effects rather than the causes of the threatened shutdown. The settlements and the legislative proposals which have been discussed have also been significant in that they have sought, by one means or another, to postpone the inevitable day when it must be decided whether or not the jobs the railroads consider unnecessary are to be eliminated. It seems, Mr. President, that a studied attempt is being made to avoid rather than come to grips with the labor problems besetting America's railroads.

Ignoring the "guts" of the matter is not the way to solve a problem. In this case, the "guts of the matter" is the featherbedding question. This is the question which the Congress should tackle, and I believe that the bill I am introducing will do so in an effective manner.

However, before describing the antifeatherbedding legislation which I consider necessary to solve the rail dispute in an equitable way, I would like to discuss the dangers inherent in the compulsory arbitration proposals which are being so glibly bandied about.

Certainly, free and voluntary collective bargaining is the surest guarantee of the preservation of a genuinely democratic society based primarily on an economic system of free enterprise. An indispensable element of free collective bargaining is the right of employees, acting in concert, to withhold their labor in an effort to induce employers to grant them the condtions of employment that they seek. This right to strike, subject to certain necessary limitations in the public interest, constitutes a basic civil liberty. The fact that strikes sometimes inflict economic hardships on the public, constitutes the price a free society must pay for the effective retention of that freedom.

This philosophy of free, collective bargaining, which I have enunciated many times, is still this country's best hope. Unfortunately, it has not been permitted to function fully in the railroad industry. Mr. President, the Nation's railroads and the rail unions have been subjected to a continuous series of governmental interventions and attempted interventions. In addition to the various boards and mediators which have tried to tell the parties how to settle their problems, we have seen the President of the United States offer the services of Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg as a special mediator. Aside from the obvious fact that this dispute has been mediated to death, Justice Goldberg's career of service to the labor movement opened his suggested appointment to a serious charge of impropriety.

Another indication of the desperate lengths to which this administration is willing to go in order to delay a final adjudication of the substantive issues, is the fact that compulsory arbitration is even being discussed as a possible method of preventing a strike. For, as all Senators are well aware, President Kennedy has consistently held to the view that compulsory arbitration has no place in our system of collective bargaining.

The President's categorical opposition to the doctrine of imposed settlements of labor-management problems was stated succinctly during one of the televised debates of the 1960 campaign. On October 13, 1960, the then Senator John F. Kennedy put it this way:

> I have never suggested that compulsory arbitration was a solution for national emergency disputes.

On another occasion during the campaign of 1960, Mr. Kennedy stated the case against depriving labor of its only effective weapon, the right to strike. His position, one in which I wholeheartedly concur, was as follows:

> We have to pay a price for freedom, and, therefore, I have never supported compulsory arbitration in the great basic disputes, nor did Senator Taft in the 1947 National Labor-Management Act. * * *
>
> Finally, let me say that strikes are painful, but I am sure if you think of the complete alternative, which would be compulsory arbitration by the Government, I am sure that no one would really feel that that is a very happy solution.

I suggest, Mr. President, that although I stand with Senator Taft, President Kennedy, and the others who have opposed compulsory arbitration, that there is an alternative solution to the dispute now before us. The alternative, as I have previously implied, is contained in my bill.

The proposed legislation which I am introducing will prohibit all types of featherbedding in the railroad and air transport industries. Mr. President, as the featherbedding problem is the basis of the railroad crisis now facing the Nation, it follows that the problem must be resolved before the crisis can be ended.

My bill would resolve the problem by applying the principle of the national policy against featherbedding of America's railroads. The national policy of opposition to featherbedding practices is enunciated in both the National Labor Relations Act and the Lea Act. Section 8(b)(6) of the National Labor Relations Act or, as it is better known as, the Taft-Hartley Act, is designed to prohibit make work practices. The Lea Act applies the strong American principles of opposition to featherbedding to the communications industry.

These prohibitions against featherbedding are incorporated into laws affecting all industries except those governed by the Railway Labor Act; namely, the railroads and the airlines. My bill, therefore, will simply bring the Railway Labor Act into line with the established national policy in this respect.

This gap in the Nation's labor relations law has been the specific cause of the collective bargaining stalemate in the railroad industry. There can be no doubt that it is in the public interest that this gap in the law be filled at once.

I propose to eliminate the immunity, under the law, which the railroad unions currently enjoy with regard to featherbedding practices. My bill will remove this special privilege by applying the general language by which the Lea Act meets the featherbedding problems of the broadcasting industry, to the Nation's railways.

It is interesting to note that the Lea Act, which I have referred to, was passed in 1946 by a Democratic Congress and signed into law by a well-known Democratic President. Surely, the present Congress and the current occupant of the White House cannot dispute the validity of the principle which their predecessors laid down.

My bill to amend the Railway Labor Act will forbid the requirement of payments for work not reasonably needed, or for work not performed at all, or for employing more employees than are reasonably needed to perform required work. An employer in the industries covered by the Railway Labor Act will be permitted to bring a civil suit for damages or appropriate injunctions in a Federal court against labor unions which seek to compel him to follow these and other featherbedding practices.

Mr. President, the key word in the legislation that I am proposing is that old legal standby, the word "reasonable." The standard of "reasonableness" is found everywhere in the law. It is one of the most widely recognized concepts in our legal system.

When, for example, the phrase "the number of employees reasonably needed by such carrier to perform actual services" is used in the bill, it means that it will be up to the courts to decide, in the event of a dispute, as to what constitutes the number of workers required. The courts will make this decision, based upon all of the relevant factors and circumstances, just as they do in hundreds of lawsuits each day.

I want to emphasize, Mr. President, that the provisions of my bill do not leave the question of alleged featherbedding up to the employer. The employer must present his contention that featherbedding practices are being urged upon him to a Federal court; and then, as I have previously described, the court alone will make the determination.

If any of my colleagues have doubts regarding the validity or the practical application of antifeatherbedding laws, I suggest that they consider the words of Justice Hugo Black, in the case of the United States against Petrillo. This decision of the U.S. Supreme Court held the validity of the Lea Act, the provisions of which are similar to those contained in my bill.

The pertinent portion of Justice Black's majority opinion, which upheld the right of Congress to have the courts decide when featherbedding practices are being carried on, is as follows:

> We could not sustain this provision of the act if we agreed with the contention that persons of ordinary intelligence would be unable to know when their compulsive actions would force a person against his will to hire employees he did not need. *Connally* v. *General Construction Co.*, 269 U.S. 385, 391; *Lanzetta* v. *New Jersey*, 306 U.S. 451. But we do not agree. Of course, as respondent points out, there are many factors that might be considered in determining how many employees are needed on a job. But the same thing may be said about most questions which must be submitted to a factfinding tribunal in order to enforce statutes. Certainly, an employer's statements as to the number of employees needed is not conclusive as to that question. It, like the alleged willfulness of a defendant, must be decided in the light of all the evidence.
>
> Clearer and more precise language might have been framed by Congress to express what is meant by "number of employees needed." But none occurs to us, nor has any better language been suggested, effectively to carry out what appears to have been the congressional purpose. The argument really seems to be that it is impossible for a jury or court ever to determine how many employees a business needs, and that, therefore, no statutory language could meet the problem Congress had in mind. If this argument should be accepted, the result would be that no legislature could make it

> an offense for a person to compel another to hire employees, no matter how unnecessary they were, and however desirable a legislature might consider suppression of the practice to be.
>
> The Constitution presents no such insuperable obstacle to legislation. We think that the language Congress used provides an adequate warning as to what conduct falls under its ban, and marks boundaries sufficiently distinct for judges and juries fairly to administer the law in accordance with the will of Congress. That there may be marginal cases in which it is difficult to determine the side of the line on which a particular fact situation falls is no sufficient reason to hold the language too ambiguous to define a criminal offense. *Robinson* v. *United States*, 324 U.S. 282, 285–286. It would strain the requirement for certainty in criminal law standards too near the breaking point to say that it was impossible judicially to determine whether a person knew when he was wilfully attempting to compel another to hire unneeded employees. See *Screws* v. *United States*, 325 U.S. 91; *United States* v. *Ragen*, 314 U.S. 513, 522, 524, 525. The Constitution has erected procedural safeguards to protect against conviction for crime except for violation of laws which have clearly defined conduct thereafter to be punished; but the Constitution does not require impossible standards. The language here challenged conveys sufficiently definite warning as to the proscribed conduct when measured by common understanding and practices. The Constitution requires no more.

Mr. President, we all hope that the present railroad dispute will be settled without the serious inconvenience of a nationwide strike. Nevertheless, whether or not the differences between the railroad management and the unions can be worked out before the deadline on this particular occasion is irrelevant to the need for the legislation I am proposing. The necessity for a law to eliminate featherbedding on America's railroads can stand on its own, crisis or no.

The Congress should not be placed in the position of legislating under the pressure of a fast approaching disaster. The President has been grossly negligent in his handling of the railroad dispute; he had a responsibility to the Congress which his party controls, and to the people of the United States, to propose the necessary legislation prior to a few days before a crippling walkout is to begin. Although the administration has failed to meet its responsibilities, the responsibility of the Congress remains.

I ask that Congress meet its responsibility by enacting legislation which can be justified under any conditions. Panic proposals, which violate the principles of a free society, have no place before the House and the Senate. I urge the Congress to legislate in accordance with the best in its traditions. I urge the adoption of my proposal.

Mr. President, since preparing these remarks, I attended a briefing at the White House, this morning, at which the President outlined the proposals he will send to us some time this afternoon. I must say they are different from what I expected when I prepared these remarks. But on sober reflection after leaving the White House—and my mind remains open on this subject, I remain to be convinced—the proposals he will make, namley, to refer this dispute to the Interstate Commerce Commission on a one-shot basis, constitute, in my view, compulsory arbitration. If the Interstate Commerce Commission were given continuing authority in this field, as a part of its duties, that might make a difference; but as of now I am very fearful that to allow a bureau of the Government to settle a strike could well establish a precedent which would come back to haunt us, because if the Interstate Commerce Commission could, by its mandate, correct a strike situation in the railroads, it follows that the Federal Communications Commission could do likewise with communications, and the Federal Power Commission could do likewise with power; and we might then extend our thinking to include allowing the Department of Commerce or the Department of Labor to act in connection with the solution of strikes.

What I think most Members of the Senate and most Members of the House of Representatives are fearful of is an approach to this problem which would spell out compulsory arbitration. Compulsory arbitration has no place in labor-management relations, Mr. President. It has no place in free collective bargaining. If adopted for even a one-shot basis, I am very fearful that the end of free collective bargaining would probably be closer to us than any of us dares think about.

Mr. President, I have prepared an analysis of my bill, and I ask unanimous consent for permission to have it and the text of the bill appear at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and analysis will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1925) to prohibit featherbedding in enterprises subject to the Railway Labor Act, introduced by Mr. Goldwater, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Railway Labor Act (44 Stat. 577, 45 U.S.C. sections 151–164 and 181–188), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph, as follows:

"Twelfth. (a) It shall be unlawful for the purposes of this section only, for employees in concert, or for any labor organization or representative of employees or their officers or agents, to engage in conduct which has an object or effect, requiring a carrier—

"(A) to employ or agree to employ any person or persons in excess of the number of employees reasonably needed by such carrier to perform actual services; or

"(B) to pay or give or agree to pay or give any money or other thing of value in lieu of employing, or on account of a failure to employ any person or persons in connection with the conduct of the business of a carrier, in excess of the number of employees reasonably needed by such carrier to perform actual services; or

"(C) to pay or agree to pay more than once for services performed; or

"(D) to pay or give or agree to pay or give any money or other thing of value for services which are reasonably needed by a carrier in connection with the conduct of the business of such carrier but which are not performed or not to be performed; or

"(E) to pay or give or agree to pay or give any money or other thing of value for services not reasonably needed in connection with the conduct of the business of a carrier; or

"(F) to pay or agree to pay any tax or exaction for the privilege of, or on account of, producing, preparing, manufacturing, selling, renting, operating, using or maintaining any article, machine, equipment, or materials or rendering any service; or to accede to or impose any restriction upon the production, preparation, manufacture, sale, purchase, rental, operation, use, maintenance of the same, or upon the rendering of any service, if such restriction has an object thereof, preventing or limiting the use or utilization of such article, machine, equipment, materials, or service.

"(b) Whoever shall be injured in his business or property by reason of any violation of subsection (a) of this paragraph may bring a civil action in a district court of the United States for such remedy or relief (including damages and injunctions) as may be appropriate. Whenever a judgment for damages is granted against a labor organization, collection of such judgment shall be limited to the assets owned or controlled by such labor organization, and such judgment shall not be enforceable against any individual member. Any such action against a labor organization or representative shall be brought in the district court of the United States for the district where the alleged violation occurred, or where the principal office of such labor organization or representative is located.

"(c) The district courts of the United States and the United States courts of the Territories and Possessions shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, and subject to the provisions of section 17 (relating to notice to opposite party) of the Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U.S.C., title 28, sec. 381), to restrain violations of this paragraph, without regard to the provisions of sections 6 and 20 of such Act of October 15, 1914, as amended (U.S.C. title 15, sec. 17, and title 29, sec. 52), and the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," approved March 23, 1932 (U.S.C., title 29, secs. 101–115)."

The analysis presented by Mr. Goldwater is as follows:

Analysis of Goldwater Bill To Prohibit Featherbedding in the Railroad and Air-Transport Industries

The bill is designed to extend the existing Federal statutory prohibition against featherbedding to the only industries whose activities affect interstate commerce which are not presently subject to such a prohibiton. The bill therefore takes the form of an amendment to the Railway Labor Act and is therefore applicable to featherbedding practices in the railroad and air-transport industries only.

Section 2 of the Railway Labor Act contains 11 paragraphs setting forth, among other things, the duties and obligations of carriers by rail and air in their collective bargaining relationships with their employees, and with the labor organizations which represent their employees for the purposes of collective bargaining. It also sets forth the rights of employees with respect to their labor union activities.

This bill would add a 12th paragraph to section 2 making it unlawful for labor unions or employees acting concertedly, to engage in any conduct which had the object, in whole or in part, or would have an effect of requiring a carrier by rail or air to do any of the following:

1. Employ or agree to employ more employees than are reasonably needed to perform actual services.
2. Pay or give, or agree to pay or give, money or anything of value, in order to escape being required to employ more employees than are reasonably needed to perform actual services.
3. Pay or agree to pay more than once for needed services actually performed.
4. Pay or agree to pay for services which are reasonably needed but which are not actually performed or which it is agreed are not to be performed.
5. Pay or agree to pay for services which are not reasonably needed in the conduct of the carrier's business.
6. Pay or agree to pay any tax or exaction in order to be permitted to produce or manufacture any article or render any service.
7. Agree to impose a restriction on the production or manufacture of any article or the rendering of any service, if the purpose of the restriction is to prevent or limit the use of such article or the rendering of such service.

By way of remedy, the bill permits anyone whose business or property is injured by any of these forbidden featherbedding practices to bring a civil suit in a Federal district court for appropriate relief, including damages and injunctions, with the limitation that any judgment for damages is collectible only from the union or representative and not from any individual union member. The suit must be brought in the district where the alleged violation occurred or where the union or representative has its principal office.

The limitations on the granting of injunctions by Federal courts in labor disputes are specifically made inapplicable to suits instituted under the provisions of the proposed legislation. (These inapplicable limitations are contained in sections 6 and 20 of the Clayton Act, and in the provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act.) However, in any proceeding in which injunctive relief is sought, the provisions (relating to notice to the opposite party) which are to be found in section 17 of the Clayton Act are specifically made applicable.

The basic functions of the court in a suit brought under the provisions of this bill are threefold:

1. To determine if the facts are substantially as alleged by the complainant.
2. To determine if these facts constitute a violation of the bill's prohibitions, with the court deciding whether the demands of the union or the position of the employer better meets the standard of "reasonableness" in those provisions where such a standard is specifically provided.
3. To determine, where a violation has been found, the appropriate relief or remedy in accordance with established principles of law and equity.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, at this time I see in the Chamber two distinguished members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the majority leader. I wonder whether they can shed any light on the committee reference of the President's bill. Will it be referred to the Committee on Commerce or to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I shall have to speak without having either the President's message or the bill before the Senate at this time. But in view of the fact that it appears that the ICC will play a major part in the consideration of any measure sent to the Congress by the Executive, it is my belief and hope that the measure would be referred to the Committee on Commerce, and I would hope that the Senator from Arizona would give his support in that connection.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, as of the present moment I would be opposed to such a move. The Reorganization Act specifically spells out that all matters covering the Railway Labor Act shall be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Inasmuch as that committee has custody, so to speak, of that act, it would be proper to refer the bill to that committee, which is not already burdened down with a very serious and responsible series of hearings such as the Committee on Commerce is burdened with at the present time in connection with measures relating to civil rights. The possibility is very high that should the bill be referred to the committee that I feel would be incorrect under the Reorganization Act I shall raise a question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator would be perfectly within his rights in making such a motion or opposing such a motion. However, I would point out that, to the best of my knowledge—and I see that there are other members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare present in the Chamber—that committee has held no hearings or given consideration of any kind to measures having to do with the Railway Labor Act as such. The Committee on Commerce has had many hearings and considered much legislation affecting the Railway Labor Act as it is affected by the ICC. I would point out that if the ICC is to be given the increased responsibility, it would appear to me to be most reasonable to expect that proposed legislation of the nature of that which we are discussing, in which the ICC would play such a very important part, would be referred to the committee which has legislative jurisdiction over the ICC.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it is true that we have not held any hearings in that field in a good many years, but I believe a check will disclose that in the past all legislation pertaining to the Railway Labor Act has been referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I can understand the reasoning of the majority leader in his desire to see the bill go to the Committee on Commerce, because the ICC comes under the jurisdiction of that committee. But I suggest that the Committee on Commerce, with all due respect to the committee, has not dealt with labor matters. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is constantly in that field, and it is greatly concerned about such questions. I am not speaking for my colleagues who are present in the Chamber because I do not know how they feel about the question, although I am sure that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is opposed to compulsory arbitration as much as I am.

What I am fearful of is that allowing a bill such as the one proposed to go to a committee that has had no practical experience in the field might result in hasty decisions that would come back to haunt our committee. They might be decisions which probably could be avoided if the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were given jurisdiction in that field.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. To the best of my knowledge, what the Executive is sending to the Congress is not a measure in the form of an amendment or amendments to the Railway Labor Act. Therefore, it appears to me more reasonable to assume, on the basis of what sketchy information we have had at our disposal—subject to change, of course—that in view of the fact that there are no amendments being offered to the Railway Labor Act, the committee which has the legislative ability and jurisdiction over the ICC should be the one to which the proposed legislation should be referred.

However, I am speaking off the top of my hat. I am trying to respond to questions raised by my distinguished colleague. All I can do is to state the best information that is available to me.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I understand the position of the majority leader. Frankly, the junior Senator from Arizona is in the same position, because he has not seen the President's message or the bill. It is possible that if the bill does not refer to the Railway Labor Act in any way, the majority leader is correct. I shall therefore wait until we see the language of the proposal so both of us can know what we are talking about.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

AEROSPACE AND ASTROSPACE CONCEPTS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on July 19, it was my pleasure to appear before the Air Force Historical Foundation at Maxwell Air Force Base, in Montgomery, Ala. I am a member of the board of that foundation. They invited me to lead the discussion at the meeting this year. My subject was "Aerospace and Astrospace Concepts." I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made before the Air Force Historical Foundation be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AEROSPACE AND ASTROSPACE CONCEPTS

(NOTE.—Text of an address by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, before the Air Force Historical Foundation, July 19, 1963, 7:30 p.m., Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala.)

Aerospace and astrospace concepts. That's the name of the game. I'm supposed to talk about it today. You are supposed to play it, professionally, day in and day out. I don't envy you, frankly. The rules of the game are far from clear. And yet, the stakes involved are frighteningly clear. The stakes are simply the survival of the Nation, perhaps of freedom everywhere. It's something we can't afford to lose. It's something we don't have to lose. But it is surely something we can lose if we do not look and look hard at what we need to win.

I have been and certainly will continue to be criticized for using terms like win and lose. Some people suggest that I can't really mean what I say; that no one can win or lose in such an age as this; that there is really nothing to win or lose for. I think there is. And unless there is, I suggest that any consideration of space policies, beyond simple scientific curiosity, is meaningless. In fact, your jobs would be meaningless. I don't think that they are. I pray that you never think that they are.

The win-lose phase of the conflict in which we find ourselves stems simply and directly from the fact that there is a conflict. It comes by definition. What we, the free world, want is pitted directly against what they, the Communist world, want. Freedom versus slavery. The same sort of conflict has been going on throughout history. And there are winners and losers. They have not been marked, however, only by the superiority of their ideas—for slavery often has won. They have been marked by the superiority of their weapons and the real vigor of their wills.

What about a midcourse? I can think of no examples where a compromise between freedom and slavery has endured.

Peace in such a conflict is possible only when one side or the other decides to change—the freemen to accept slavery, or the slaveowners to share freedom. Such a change does not require war. It requires simply a decision. But such decisions usually are made under the heavy pressure of weapons and will. No such issue I can think of has been decided simply by debate or negotiation. Such issues are decided by confrontations of power against power, will against will.

Thus, the essence of national power is involved in concepts of the use of space, any concepts, that is, that go beyond the abstract. With our major weapons systems already using near space in their transits, the notion cannot be avoided that the fuller use of space represents today a major area in which the physical power of nations will be determined.

The determination will not be on the basis of propaganda, regardless of how seemingly potent that force may seem. The determination will be on the basis of major breakthroughs in which one side or the other in this confrontation of will, skill, and power achieves a weapons capacity in space which will give it the same order of advantage that the United States once enjoyed with its monopoly of nuclear weapons.

The side that achieves this advantage will have the full option to keep the peace or break it for its own purposes. More, it will have the way to force its will on its adversary without war.

We can judge the current situation by the past. When the news was flashed from Kitty Hawk that man was airborne, there were two broadly possible concepts of flight that could be followed.

The first would be that the airplane was, at the least, just a gadget, a sort of supertoy, or, at best, a vaguely promising means of transportation. The second, which took painful years to get across, was that the airplane was the future key to national power. You will recall, also, that the first breakthrough in this power-centered concept of aviation was not in terms of a weapons platform or delivery vehicle but as an observation vehicle. It took a court martial to fully awaken us to the peril and the promise of the airplane as an instrument of national power.

It is possible that if the military concept of the airplane had advanced more rapidly than it did, and in this Nation, that a clear superiority in the air would have permitted the United States to keep the peace and suppress aggression without the devastation of world war. Let me put it this way, given an absolute weapons superiority it is possible for a nation fully to implement its policies—be they for peace or war—on its own terms.

Today we stand on the edge of space in much the same way we stood on the sands of Kill Devil Hill. All of the potential is there, all of the promise, all of the peril.

We have been at such a point before, with a fateful choice of weapons and a fateful course of history both in the balance. We have seen that balance teeter precariously and then swing hopefully toward us only by the barest margin. We have been lucky. It's a run of luck that cannot be trusted endlessly to repeat itself despite blunders of policy and blinders on policymakers.

There was the hydrogen bomb as a recent and crucial example. Who needed it? Weren't conventional nuclear weapons sufficient? Didn't we have a commanding lead in the field? We heard all of those arguments in the highest quarters of decision. We also heard that moving into this new field would imperil hopes for disarmament, that it would add a new dimension to the arms race, that it would merely provoke the enemy. Had we failed to develop the hydrogen bomb, however, we would now be at the thermonuclear mercy of the Soviets.

Development of the Polaris system hung for perilous months on the same sort of arguments. It took extraordinary effort by extraordinary men to build the system that is so important to the defense of the free world today. We thought we didn't need it at the time. Where would we be without it today? We have thought before that talk of such advanced weapons systems was foolish or dangerous or both. We know that failure to talk of them and to build them would have been worse than foolish and fatally dangerous.

But, once again, we are at the same point and once again we can expect to hear that we needn't worry. That those who do are alarmists.

By choice of official policy, so far, we are choosing to relegate the military function of space to a secondary position. We have delayed and debated to the point where it must be said that the United States today has no fully defined and effective military space program at all.

We have a flotsam and jetsam program of floating theories, scattered projects, and foundering followthrough. We have, in fact, policy declarations stating that we will not orbit weapons of mass destruction in space unless forced to do so by the hostile action of others. In short we say that we will not utilize the military potential of space until such time as it may be too late.

If the other fellow orbits weapons of mass destruction, then we'll think about doing the same. But if the other fellow already has his weapons in orbit—can we? Or would we already have lost the race in space?

Just what is this race in space? By our actions we are clearly saying that it's a race for the moon. We are moonstruck. And, to be sure, the moon is most romantic. It's had sex appeal for centuries. But, while our eyes are fixed upon it, we could lose the earth or be buried in it.

To deny the importance of a military space program today is to put oneself squarely in the tradition of those men who denied the potential of bombing aircraft and who persecuted Billy Mitchell for his defense of it.

We now know that there never was a missile gap. But we have the solemn words of our own policies today that we have been walking flatfooted into a full-fledged and possibly fatal space gap. Whether we beat the Russians to the moon is not the measure of that gap. Whether we explore the military uses of space and exploit them is the measure of that gap or the closing of it.

We are now 6 full fiscal years into the space age. We have launched satellites by the dozen. We have achieved magnificent feats in space exploration. We have opened magic doors of space communications.

We have not authorized a single military space weapons system.

We have reviewed the Dyna-Soar project and re-reviewed it and then re-reviewed the review. But we don't have it settled yet—and even Dyna-Soar is just a probe toward a military space program. It is not such a program by itself.

The Manned Orbital Development System—the space station project—appears to be a logical key to much that we need to know about possible military missions in space. And what have we done about it? There are several minor projects bearing upon it for which we have appropriated less money than we are asked to spend to buy new helicopters for the White House this year alone.

What do we have instead of a military space program? We have only the self-satisfied pronouncements that the admittedly and markedly wonderful achievements of our civilian space program will provide virtually all we need to know for military planning.

We have, for instance, the assurance of a high official of the Department of Defense (Rubel) that "projects under NASA supervision will prove equally applicable to systems and devices in space, whether these are used for military or nonmilitary purposes."

That statement might be called a concept. Surely it is the concept that has apparently made many Americans feel quite secure that we are engaged in an effort that will protect our military interest in space. And, I would be the first to admit, there is some justification for the statement. Just as the airplane was first developed as an observation craft, the space program is certainly developing fabulous capabilities for surveillance. But, again as with aircraft, observation is a far cry from a full military program. If we stop there, we stop dead, literally.

Let me suggest, now, some reasons why we cannot rest on our peaceful laurels in space development. Our main civilian effort is directed toward lunar orbit rendezvous techniques. Our main known need for a military program, however, involves terrestrial orbit techniques.

It is the defense of our part of this planet, not the moon, that should first concern us.

Military supporting equipment, in space, must involve extremely fast reaction times—launching, tracking, reentry, maintenance, and so forth. Our civilian program does not emphasize this. It doesn't need to.

The manned systems being developed in the civilian program, as I have mentioned, are aimed at the moon, they are on a single-mission track. A military program would require a multimission track.

The civilian program demands very little maneuvering in space, or changes of orbital planes and trajectories. A military program, of course, would demand great flexibility of maneuver to accomplish its missions and to survive.

The space vehicles of the civilian program do not have to consider or incorporate defensive capabilities. A military program, of course, would have to.

However, our top policy statements keep insisting that the game is going well. That we are preparing to meet "any level of aggression with appropriate level of force." The very idea is either self-deluded or deliberately deluding.

The terrible fact is that we cannot today claim the capability of meeting any level of aggression—if the level of aggression is in the space levels up to 24 hours from the surface of the earth we can make no such claim.

To meet such levels of aggression we would have to be planning now to cope with space vehicles capable of carrying offensive weapons, weapons aimed at us, and with unmanned but armed satellites, as well as with missiles and air breathing systems.

To handle the job, in rough outline even, we would need a force in space with such capabilities as:

1. Continuous information acquisition, reconnaissance-surveillance.
2. Decisionmaking, command, and control.
3. Defensive capability, maneuverability, and armament.
4. Attack capability, interception, inspection, and kill.
5. Retaliatory capability, deorbiting weapons, and so forth.

I say that is only a rough outline with deep awareness of the fact that we have so far, so tragically failed to implement the space program needed by our military, that we don't even know enough about space to spell out fully our requirements. We know the outline, but we are doing nothing to fill it in. We know the challenge but we aren't preparing to meet it. We are not even preparing the tools for the job.

It is the same old intolerable stretch-out, the same old yo-yo concept that dangled such programs as the B-17, the B-36, the B-52, the RS-70 back and forth over the edge of decision and pit of indecision. We hear that the space challenge is receiving more serious attention by planners in the Department of Defense. The attention, if true, will be some 3 to 4 years late at best. It will require more than respectful attention. It will require a major reorientation. The future of the Dyna-Soar program should provide a valuable indication of what the chances really are. It would provide at least the basis to begin searching out the elements of a military mission in space—if it ever gets off the ground.

It will also require, if we are to seriously shift our efforts and strive for a military capability in space, a serious rethinking of the implications of certain key political decisions. For instance, in the U.S. paper submitted to the 10 Nation Committee on Disarmament there was the proposition that "the placing into orbit or stationing in outer space of vehicles carrying weapons of mass destruction shall be prohibited." We seem to be living up to that proposition at our peril at this moment.

This is a matter every bit as sensitive as a nuclear test ban arrangement. Have we really thought it through? Or are we just coasting along the familiar road of complacency on which the Soviet is expected to travel in the same fashion as we do but without real assurances?

We must face it squarely, the challenge of military missions in space in part and parcel of our attitudes toward disarmament and, of course, to the Soviet attitudes toward it.

All we have to do is let our military space efforts slide as we have been doing and we will have unilaterally disarmed ourselves in space by the simple expedient of never building the weapons in the first place.

Meantime, what is the Soviet attitude? The appointment of Marshal Biryuzov as Chief of the General Staff provides a useful indication. He formerly was Commander of Soviet rocket forces. They now have a space-oriented man running their military show. On the political side, of course, Khrushchev already has warned the world that the cargoes of his sputniks might be changed to weapons of mass destruction if the West persists in annoying him.

Their space program, to get right to the heart of it, is believed to be fully under military control. Worry about an arms race in space is largely academic. The Soviets have begun it.

When the first Russian successes in space were recorded, the propaganda emphasis was on peaceful research. That has changed. Articles published in their military journal, Red Star, have shifted to frank discussions of space weapons. The articles speak of Russia's reluctant decision to engage in space weapons development in order to protect itself against the aggressive West. There is truly grim irony in the proposition. They talk of weapons in space to defend against a West which has not even launched such a weapons program.

Soviet concentration on manned satellites and maneuverability in the near space environment clearly points to military goals and away from abstract scientific curiosity or straightline preoccupation with a lunar landing.

Again, since last year, open-source Soviet publications are more and more spotted with materials related to space weapons development. Their new master-work on Strategy, edited by Marshal Sokolovsky, puts it this way: "The studying of questions of the use of outer space and of space vehicles for the purposes of strengthening the defenses of the socialist countries is considered essential in Soviet military strategy. It would be a mistake to allow the imperialist camp to achieve any superiority in this field."

Finally, of course, Marshal Biryuzov, now Chief of the General Staff, has publicly boasted that rockets can be launched from satellites, as he put it, "at any desirable time and at any point of the satellites' trajectory, on command from earth." A primitive concept, maybe. But at least a concept.

We can assume that he was merely boasting and let it go. At the moment we seem to be doing just that. And, because I am firmly convinced that they are not supermen, I might even share the suspicion. But I do not share the reaction that shrugs it off.

I would ask serious consideration not only of whether he is speaking the truth, but whether he is speaking sense. I say he is. Space weapons are the real new frontier of defense—not the moon.

Others obviously think he was talking sense too. Last year, before the House Committee on Appropriations, Defense Department testimony indicated that the Russians can be technically operational with a weapon in orbit. Later, the committee was reported to have heard Air Force testimony that an armed vehicle could be placed in orbit without our even knowing of its nuclear capabilities.

Russia has lived for 18 years under the overwhelming power of our nuclear superiority. They have been unable to reverse that situation. What actions we have successfully taken to contain their aggression all have been taken under the shield of that superiority.

The situation easily could be reversed in space. We could find ourselves by default of effort, faced by an equally effective counterthreat of military superiority in space.

Our concepts of how to handle this contingency are negative so far. We think of space weapons in terms of older weapons, as something we'll develop if or when we need them. We demand that any talk of military space programs be neatly integrated into the computer complex of our conventional programs. The danger is in not recognizing that we need to get out in space itself and experiment with totally new concepts and systems before we will even know the full potential.

We cannot sit here on earth, in or out of an ivory tower and glibly program the theories of a military space capability any more than we could truly develop the role of bombing aircraft until General Mitchell racked up his bombs, took off, and headed for the target to test his theories.

We do not need opinions at this juncture. We need to know. And we will only find out in space itself.

On the basis of opinion alone, we find such obstacles as that of cost. Space weapons, true space weapons, are viewed as prohibitively expensive compared to semispace weapons such as the ICBM. First, of course, we have such opinions without any true testing of just what sort of space weapons we might be talking about. But we cannot, even at the outset, simply compare the cost of ICBM's and space vehicles. We must take into consideration such factors as the costs involved if ICBM's are attacked. Their launching complexes, of course, are on earth—and this is a fairly crowded earth. Attack an ICBM and you necessarily inflict a costly blow on some section of the earth. Dispersal of a weapons force in space, even if costly, would force the enemy to attack it first, actually saving and preserving earth targets.

Adequate weapons in space might be a bold step toward forever abolishing war on earth. The weapons of war could be used to wage war on war itself.

Development of a military space force, to look at it another way, also gives a powerful motive to preclude surprise attacks by enemy ICBM's. The space force would have to be attacked first or the enemy would risk its immediate retaliatory strikes. This, it would seem to me, is the sort of factor that must be weighed right along with the cost factors, a factor that could change the entire present posture in which we have to react only to a blow against our homeland.

We talk of a building block approach to military space requirements, blocks that we are supposed to pick up from the pads and programs of our general space effort. But how can we build any sort of structure without a blueprint? How do we use the building blocks without a true concept? How do we assure our military safety in space without finding a full definition of what the military mission is or can be? I don't think we can.

There is the final argument, of course, of international law. If we started an arms race in space, it is said, we would pose a peril to international law and order. If those who hold to this concept can tell me just how we are to prevent the Soviet from doing this, I would rest easier. But they cannot tell us. They can hope and pray but they cannot tell. And, if there are to be weapons in space—ever—I pray that they carry the insignia of the free world.

More, as I said earlier, the Soviet itself has already claimed to have started the arms race in space. The question is not starting it now. The question is winning it—to keep the peace, to keep our freedom, even to save our lives.

If they win such a race, freedom's light suddenly will be put under a terrifying shadow—a far greater shadow than would be cast by a Soviet flag on the distant moon, with its relatively slow predictable orbit.

We have not used our weapons superiority so far to shield any substantial rollback of the Communist camp. Would the Communists be as considerate? What a fantastic gamble to count on it.

But would a Soviet space force be such a shadow on freedom? Wouldn't we still have enough conventional weaponry—which is just what ICBM's and thermonuclear bombs have become—to destroy an aggressor? Even if the answer remains "Yes," a question remains: Would we use them in the event of a political threat backed by weapons poised in space? We might find ourselves in the same position which confronts us in fighting brush fire wars. We won't initiate even political counterattacks over Berlin, Quemoy, or even Cuba. Would we over an armed space threat? Could we?

Part of the answer might be in the position in which a space breakthrough would place the Soviet. In their doctrine of war, which is quite well spelled out and which, in fact, forms the basis for their present emphasis on peaceful coexistence, war against the United States is an unrealistic proposition—today. The conditions which would be necessary to make it feasible, and thus free their political ambitions of any inhibitions whatsoever, are roughly these:

First, there would have to be a significant superiority of their attack force in comparison with our retaliatory force. They have no such superiority—today.

Second, the ability to surprise us on many fronts such as striking unexpected targets, outmaneuvering our warning systems, using more weapons than contemplated in our defense plans, and striking more rapidly than anticipated. Such a capability is not apparent today.

Third, the use of new weapons against which no defense has been raised.

Fourth, striking from a posture in which the aggressor bases can be protected from counterattack or counterattacking weapons destroyed.

Should the Soviet outrace us, not to the moon, but into near space with a military force, they would have the potential of satisfying every one of those demands.

And it is on that very front, I insist, that we have been huddling behind a Maginot Line of ill-conceived or defaulted programs.

Unless we mount a major military effort in space, or unless we can be assured that the Soviet cannot, our lives are committed to nothing more than hopesmanship. The Soviet may well be committing its efforts to spacemanship. And that could kill us.

I would like to elaborate on this proposition now by using words which must be familiar to you, but which must be made familiar to all Americans. In the Air University Quarterly Review, the Deputy Chief of Staff, Foreign Technology, of the Air Force Systems Command, addressed himself to the questions I have been discussing today. This is a fairly long quote that I want to read because it contains serious statements which I find shocking—shocking in the sense that they have not broken through into national debate, shocking in that responsible officials in Washington have done little or nothing to come to grips with the problem, shocking in that this Nation can complacently pursue its love affair with the moon while standing knee deep in the greatest potential disaster freemen ever have faced.

I quote:

"Assume for example, that one nation over a period of time builds in great secrecy and then suddenly launches an overwhelming force of spacecraft that have significant offensive bombing and interception capability. Assume that elements of this space-alert force are overflying the second nation at all times—in fact, they are patrolling its skies.

"Under these postulated conditions, the second country's strategic retaliatory power is to a significant degree preempted. The initiation of nuclear war in response to such a patrol force would seem unlikely. Yet the political-psychological impact of such a space-borne force on the leadership and populace of the second nation would probably cause fundamental accommodation of its national objective to those of the first nation.

"Is this what Gromyko had in mind by his remark on December 23, 1960? 'The time has come when it is possible to cut short the attempts by the aggressors to start world war * * *.'

"Whatever the answer to this question may be, no elaboration of the gravity of the potential threat of the Soviets developing a capability to restrict our freedom in space is needed. It is clear that the Soviets must not be permitted to win a military technological superiority in space.

"The conflict must be won by the United States, not for cold war advantages, not for national prestige purposes, but for vital national survival.

"In winning this race our goal is not to dominate any nation or to dominate space. Our goal should probably be to attain the capability to prevent any hostile force from dominating space. To put it in positive terms, our goal should be to insure the peaceful use of space.

"It appears that the Soviet leaders are embarked upon a technological strategy of outflanking us in aerospace. It appears they are embarking upon a major campaign to develop a military space capability which would in fact constitute a strategic aerospace envelopment. Thus, in old infantry langauge, the Soviets are conducting a vigorous holding attack in the aerodynamic and missile technological battle areas while executing a strategic aerospace envelopment in the space systems technological battle area.

"The United States has operated for years on the assumption that we enjoy military technological superiority. New Soviet developments in basic and applied research * * * give us serious cause to ask if this assumption is valid today."

End of quotation. But not, I hope, end of discussion. I know that we have among our defense planners today the most assured group of young men in recent history. They must be challenged, for the Nation's sake, however, to speak plainly and frankly about this one.

It should not take another Billy Mitchell or a dozen Billy Mitchells and a dozen court-martials to break the silence on this one. There exists today, obviously, a fundamental disagreement on the military role of space.

The fact that we have such an article as the one from which I quoted is a symptom. The fact that we have Soviet statements on the subject is a symptom. And all of the glib talk of building block theories and civilian program spin-off and international law and disarmament will not and must not prevent discussion of this disagreement. Maybe those who want us left defenseless in space will win the argument. But let's at least have the discussion.

The subject of this talk this afternoon, aerospace and astrospace concepts, happens to be the subject also of what should be a major probing of the American concept and conscience itself.

Computers and ledger sheets alone cannot answer the question. Men, in an uninhibited confrontation, must answer it.

I am told that Nikita Khrushchev keeps on his desk a piece of metal scarred by a laser beam. The possible application of laser beams to space weapons is an obvious area of speculation. Perhaps the Russians are doing far more than just speculate. We are not.

Unless we do, and unless we move along the entire orbit of military space considerations, the Premier of the Soviet Union might someday replace his little desk trinket with a more impressive memento—a scarred piece of some shard gingerly extracted from the rubble or the ruin of the United States. But if our will is equal to the challenge of space today that will never happen. If we are truly to keep the peace, preserve and extend freedom, we must assure that freedom takes its light into space.

The stars are no longer neutral. Freedom's light and life are at stake on the sweeping terraces of space.

LOCATION OF CHANCERIES OR OFFICES OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS IN CERTAIN RESIDENTIAL AREAS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 646) to prohibit the location of chanceries or other business offices of foreign governments in certain residential areas in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now turn to my daily discussion of foreign aid. Today I shall take up a discussion of the Somali Republic and what I consider to be an unwarranted extension of aid to Somali.

An interesting event is occurring in the Foreign Relations Committee, which has jurisdiction over the bill, and a committee of which I am privileged to be a member. I do not criticize voting by proxy. Such voting is within the rules of the committee. I only desire that the RECORD show that the senior Senator from Oregon was beaten twice last Friday on rollcall votes in the Foreign Relations Committee when I moved for substantial reductions in items in the bill.

I was beaten by a vote of 8 to 8, with 7 proxies used against me.

At the beginning of the session this morning, I was pleased that a few of my brethren returned to the committee. We did not reach any votes this morning. But at the meeting this morning, I gave notice that I shall ask for a series of reconsideration of actions already taken by the committee, which is also within my parliamentary right.

I also served notice, which the chairman in his usual gracious manner made clear was within my parliamentary right, that I had no intention of accepting the explanation and argument that the expenditure has already been authorized.

The fact that the Congress has authorized money for foreign aid creates no situation of finality. As I explained this morning in the Committee on Foreign Relations, we must take a look at 1963 and the conditions prevailing in 1963, not at the situation which existed at the time authorizations were passed.

So I said, "in order to keep my record before this committee perfectly clear for subsequent action on the floor of the U.S. Senate, I want the committee to know that I shall offer, before we send the bill to the Senate, a long series of amendments calling for changes in authorizations already passed by the Congress."

As a result of huge authorizations made in the past, we have sent large amounts of aid to Pakistan. I read the surprising alibi for Pakistan in the Washington Post editorial this morning. It was an obvious attempt to pass the buck to the Congress.

We made a mistake in authorizing such large sums that aid could be handed out broadcast to Pakistan. The time has come to change the authorization.

So in the committee—and on the floor of the Senate subsequently—if the present foreign policy of Pakistan continues—I shall propose the elimination of every dollar of authorized funds for Pakistan. The senior Senator from Oregon will not make, for his descendants to read, a record of voting for a single dollar for a country engaging in international blackmail. That is exactly what Pakistan is engaging in against the United States today. It is about time for Pakistan's hand to be called, for I do not intend to vote for a single dollar for a country which proposes to enter into treaties with Red China, nor do I intend to vote for a single dollar for any country which enlists the aid of Communist China in fighting its political war with India.

I shall give Senators an opportunity to stand up and be counted, vote by vote, on that amendment.

The senior Senator from Oregon has no hesitancy in saying, as I shall say from the platforms of America, "If you have representatives in the Senate or House who vote for that kind of support, keep them at home when you get the next opportunity to vote on them in the voting booths of America."

This is an issue as to whether we shall defend the greatest weapon we have, the economy of this country. I want every Member of Congress to have an opportunity to determine whether he wishes to vote to sustain international blackmail against the United States. What Pakistan is saying to us, in effect, is, "You maintain this huge, inexcusable give-away program to Pakistan under a foreign aid program, and reduce your program for India, or we are going to fly into the arms of Red China." My answer is, "Get into that embrace as fast as you can, and the sooner the better, if that is the principle on which you propose to act in respect to foreign aid."

That is also my answer to the Washington Post editorial of this morning.

In my judgment, Members of Congress will get a similar answer from an overwhelming majority of American taxpayers. Whether this Congress and this administration know it or not, I am satisfied that across the land, rising with increasing momentum, are demands for a cutback in the foreign aid program.

So I propose to fight this issue out, amendment by amendment. I shall do it if I am all alone, but I shall not be all alone in the Congress, as I am not all alone in the committee. If I were all alone, I would still make the record against the foreign aid bill, for it cannot be justified in the national interests of the Republic.

Eventually, both in the committee and in the Senate, I shall offer my amendment to bring to a complete end the entire foreign aid program as now constituted by the end of fiscal year 1965.

That would not mean the end of a foreign aid program for the United States, but it would mean that at the end of fiscal year 1965 we would start all over, tabula rasa.

We shall clean the slate. Then we will listen to applicants. We will stop running around the world, offering foreign aid. We will stop running around the world trying to cram aid down the throats of various governments. We will say to them, "Come on in, if you have a set of proposals or list of projects which you think are meritorious, which are economically sound, which will help raise the standard of living of the masses of your people, which will benefit the productive power of your economy, which will strengthen democratic government. We will listen favorably and will make you loans, and in some instances grants, on the basis of conditions which will protect the American taxpayer and best serve the long-term interests of your country."

That is the kind of foreign aid program we need. That is the kind of foreign aid program I shall support. I have supported foreign aid for 17 years in the Senate. Last year I left the program when appropriations for it were provided, because, after a 5-year attempt to reform the program, I had become convinced that no longer could many features of the program be justified.

I shall welcome an opportunity to return to supporting foreign aid, but it will have to be a foreign aid program which comes at least somewhere near to measuring up to the criteria I have been advancing in this series of speeches on the present foreign aid bill.

FOREIGN AID IN AFRICA

Today I have selected Somali. I have already referred in past speeches, to Pakistan, Korea, Taiwan, Turkey, and the NATO countries; but there are many more. The interesting thing is that almost everywhere the foreign aid bill is pricked, there oozes out unjustifiability in connection with much of the aid program that is involved.

Mr. President, today I want to give another concrete example which serves to shed some light on the blunders we perpetuate each year under the name of foreign aid. I am going to talk about the Somali Republic. But I can assure my colleagues that this is not an isolated instance of the mistakes we have made on the African continent and elsewhere; it is merely a symptom of a larger disease. I do not entertain any animus whatsoever against this particular country or any other African land in the same category. Indeed, I believe I will be doing the Somali Republic a service by exposing some of the illusions which we have persuaded the Somalis to entertain. One further disclaimer: Since most of the Somali peoples predominantly come from white stock, let no one support or condemn my remarks on some fancied ground of racial prejudice.

Now, just a few words of background. Prior to 1960 the territory which is now designated the Somali Republic was composed of two parts: the Italian-administered U.N. trust territory of Somalia—formerly Italian Somaliland—and the protectorate known as British Somaliland. These two areas were joined together and made a single independent country in 1960. Unfortunately, the new nation is a barren land virtually without economic resources.

Surely, most rational Americans would have considered it in the best interests of our country and of the new republic if the Somalis had been encouraged to rely primarily upon Italy and the United Kingdom for necessary assistance in developing their country. In fact, both European nations are giving aid to the Somali Republic at the present time. But what else has happened? What has happened is that the United States has been providing more assistance to the Somali Republic than either the United Kingdom or Italy has.

How did this happen? Why is it in the American interest to get heavily involved in a program of largely grant aid to one of the most infertile and poverty-stricken regions of the world? Why were we not content to let our European friends shoulder the moral and humanitarian burden of giving the basic essentials of help to the Somalis? Why were we not content with an entirely secondary role of providing the small amounts of educational and technical assistance which we might logically make available to a land where none of the prerequisites for substantial development exists?

Mr. President, the answer to these questions is almost solely political in nature. It seems that our State Department officials saw evidence of Communist interest in the Somali Republic, decided that this was a strategic area, and, in almost spasmodic reaction, whipped up a supposedly impressive aid program which was expected to retrieve this barren land from the menace of communism. At least, the numbers of U.S. personnel were impressive—as Somali moved toward full sovereignty, a 40-man aid mission appeared in the Somali capital.

WHY A BIG AID PROGRAM IN SOMALI?

Let us examine this political judgment very briefly. In the first place, I cannot for the life of me determine what is so "strategic" about the territory now encompassed by the Somali Republic. A British colonial administrator of Disraeli's time would undoubtedly consider the area's position near the entrance to the Red Sea as significant in terms of the old British lifeline. But this assumption is rather peculiar, even in 19th century terms, when it is noted that French Somaliland and British Aden in fact face each other across the relatively narrow Red Sea entry. Moreover, I am very happy to be able to say that the United States has no military installations on this semi-desert territory. So what is the strategic significance of the Somali Republic? I submit it has none.

Perhaps the word "strategic" is only used in connection with the fear that the Soviet bloc might have gained a foothold in East Africa if the United States had not outpaced its British and Italian friends in providing assistance. I suggest this definition holds no water, either.

Western economic assistance did not keep the Somali Republic from accepting the Soviet bloc offer in 1961 of about $63 million worth of credits and grants—a program which is in the process of fulfillment.

Ironic, is it not? The fact is that the Somali Republic turned to Red Russia, anyway, to the tune of $63 million. So if the State Department's objective was to keep Red Russia out of Somaliland, it failed. That is one of the sad chapters in the history of our foreign aid program. We hear the alibi. We hear the rationalization. I hear it over and over again in the Foreign Relations Committee. We will hear it again in the debates that will take place when the foreign aid bill reaches the floor of the Senate. It will be said that we must do it to keep the Soviet bloc out. We have not kept them out. Foreign aid has been a failure from many standpoints, including that one, too.

We even find India dealing with Red Russia. It is proposed that we should pour millions more—and I am for helping India in a reasonable amount, but certainly not for $1 billion for a steel mill—into India so that India will not negotiate further with Red Russia. Well, I have studied and watched developments in India for some time, and I am perfectly willing to take judicial notice that it will not stop India from turning to the Soviet bloc for more aid.

So far as $1 billion for a steel mill in India is concerned, I am shocked. There are steel mills there already that are not working at anywhere near full capacity. There are many reasons why they are not doing so. Among the reasons is the fact that they could not obtain the necessary skilled personnel to operate them. I wonder where they propose to get the personnel to operate the $1 billion steel mill being asked for.

My objection to this proposal in its present form is not to its Government sponsorship. We know there are good reasons for Government sponsorship of certain enterprises even in a society dedicated to free enterprise.

But from what I have heard to date about it, the economic case for this mill has not been made. There is the lack of trained personnel to operate it which I have mentioned.

Nor are the raw materials there. In my judgment, at the present time India needs this steel mill about as much as I need the Washington Monument on my Oregon farm; and I can assure Senators that that would be quite uneconomic. I can also assure them that, upon analysis, the $1 billion steel mill proposed for India is also uneconomic. Yet it is being suggested that we reach down into the pockets of the American taxpayers to the tune of another $1 billion. Not with my vote.

So I return to my thesis of Somaliland. If the objective was to keep Red Russia out, the State Department failed. Russia is in there, to the tune of $60 million worth of credits and grants.

Secondly, the absence of any U.S. aid program whatsoever would have not left the field entirely to the Soviets, for the western Europeans and international agencies have been operating in the area.

Thirdly, I suspect the U.S. fear of communism in 1960 was not so much directed at the Soviet bloc as toward some sort of guilt by association thesis. The major external influence in Somalia then and now derives from the United Arab Republic and not from the Soviet bloc. Presumably we were afraid that Egypt's acceptance of Communist aid would somehow transmit political strings from the bloc to Somalia. Finally, we seemingly discounted entirely the fiercely independent character of the Somalis themselves, which strongly militates against undue political influence being exerted by any outside power.

I would be very much interested in any excuse on the part of the State Department which would seek to support the argument that what we are doing for Egypt keeps Egypt out of the Communist bloc. The argument was made a few weeks ago that we ought to support Nasser in making use of German scientists for building up the nuclear power of Egypt, because if we do not do so he will turn to Russian scientists.

I do not know what that means to others, but to me it means one thing. It is another example of international blackmail against the United States. I would like to see my Government stop surrendering to international blackmail. I would like to see my Government start telling the international blackmailers, "Go into the arms of Russia. You are not going to get consideration from us on the basis of any such shoddy argument."

We have sent large quantities of aid to the United Arab Republic on the theory that if we do not, she will seek it from Russia. But apparently we also sent relatively large sums to Somali to keep her from seeking closer ties with the United Arab Republic. It is this elaborate and highly theoretical basis for so much of our spending that is breaking the backs of our taxpayers and for which we are getting few favorable results.

PRESENT PROGRAM IN SOMALI

Now, what about the actual nature of our aid program? As indicated above, I have no quarrel with the idea of making modest amounts of educational and technical assistance available to the Somalis—quite the contrary. But look at the amount of aid provided in fiscal year 1962: a total of about $15 million, with $11.5 million of it grant money.

That aid program represents about 30 percent of the figure roughly estimated to be the country's gross national product for the previous year. That does not sound very modest to me.

It is true that we have since scaled down the amount of grant aid. But we have turned with development loans to support a project which, even if successful, is unlikely to be of much benefit to the country within the next decade or more. Here I am talking about our decision to devote about $7½ million to the construction of a port at Chisimaio on the southern Somali coast. The justification for this project is couched in terms so conditional that it is very difficult to have any confidence that there will actually be many concrete benefits even in the distant future.

The reason for building this port is to provide an outlet for exports in the one moderately promising agricultural area of the country. However, the problem is not only that the crops do not now exist—the land has not even been rendered fertile as yet. But we and the Somalis are not the only ones to see this mirage, it appears that the West Germans are giving serious thought to construction of a road leading from the port to this nonexistent agricultural oasis.

It has occurred to me that this is what the AID Agency calls a high impact project. It does, indeed, have an impact upon me—though one which is not likely to enthuse the AID administrators.

POLITICAL EFFECTS OF AID

Now let us turn to the political effects of our program, which we have seen has been allegedly justified on political grounds

That argument also falls of its own fallacious weight. The salient political fact in the area known as the Horn of Africa is that the Somalis have long been embroiled in bitter disputes with their Ethiopian neighbors and are now feuding with Kenya next door by claiming jurisdiction over a considerable portion of the latter's territory.

I have no intention of trying to consider—much less of trying to rule on—the merits of the various quarrels in which the Somalis are presently engaged, but I do know that we cannot overlook their effects. To the degree that we assist the Somali Republic we seem deeply to offend that country's neighbors. What we have in capsule form is a repetition of the Pakistan-India dispute, and the Arab-Israeli dispute, in both of which we appear to generate ill will no matter what course we adopt. And these are not the only such balancing acts that we engage in around the world.

So far as I can make out, the main reaction to our aid which we find on the part of the Somali Government is resentment over the supposedly larger amount of assistance that we provide to Ethiopia, a part of a program which has gone on for about a decade and a half. Were it not for my great fear of irritating the Ethiopians, I would stress the fact that, on a per capita basis, they receive considerably less aid from the United States than do the Somalis. Yet, rightly or wrongly, we do have an identifiable strategic interest in Ethiopia.

Mr. President, this is a classic example of the kind of foolishness we have engaged in over the past years, and from which the present administration finds it so difficult to disentangle itself. I do not deny that some progress has been made over the last 2 years in reducing certain of our more fatuous commitments. But the executive branch has shown itself unable to undertake the drastic remedies which are urgently required. I submit that the Congress has both the opportunity and the duty to perform the task from which the executive branch recoils.

Therefore, in due course of time I shall offer in committee and, if necessary, on the floor of the Senate, an amendment which would reduce aid to Somali to technical assistance and grant programs which can be classified under our moral obligations in regard to humanitarian purposes and projects.

THE THREATENED RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall await with great interest the message of the President of the United States on the railroad controversy, and shall read with great interest and care the specific suggestions that I understand he will make for legislative action.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The message is now on the news ticker. It has not been presented in the Chamber, but it is on the news ticker. I thought the Senator should know that.

Mr. MORSE. I shall await with great interest the message. I will make my statement very quickly. I shall probably have a lengthy statement to make later.

On the basis of the briefing in which I participated, and which was referred to by another Senator on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, I wish merely to say that as I listened to the briefing I saw no connection between the proposal of the President and compulsory arbitration.

I wish to make it clear that my understanding is that the proposal would keep open the door of collective bargaining and mediation for the parties. It provides for consideration, under its regulatory powers, of changes in working rules based upon evidence submitted to the Interstate Commerce Commission, but for a limited period of time; even in the absence of collective bargaining modifications of the findings of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the rulings would be tentative and not final, and would exist for the life of the period covered by the President's message.

That is not compulsory arbitration. It is far from it.

I do not care which way we turn in an attempted solution of this problem. We shall encounter difficulties in any event. No one will be completely happy.

However, I salute the President of the United States in these preliminary remarks, prior to my even reading his message. I salute him because I do not know how anyone could be more reasonable, patient, understanding, and helpful than the President has been in his sincere and patriotic endeavor to lead the parties to this dispute to an amicable settlement, short of economic action.

The American people should be proud that they have had the caliber of statesmanship that the President of the United States has, over the months, extended to the parties to this dispute. I served with the President when he was a Member of the Senate and a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. There is no question that the President has always sought to avoid any distortion of the precious rights of free collective bargaining in this country by way of legislative proposals.

But the time has come to point out to the parties that when a procedure is made available, such as I understand the President is offering to the country, the parties cannot justify the horrendous economic loss from a strike. I think it can be substantiated that a strike of 30 days' duration would result in a minimum loss to the country of $1 billion. Such an economic loss flowing from a strike would be unthinkable and would redound to the everlasting discredit of those responsible for such a loss. What is needed is time for Congress to consider legislation, far more comprehensive than any stopgap legislation to settle an individual labor dispute.

A week ago last Thursday I urged Congress to face a great legislative responsibility which events have imposed upon us and which Congress cannot shuffle off, that of automation. We have entered an era of progress through rapidly advancing technology. We can no more turn back the hands of that progressive movement than we can turn back time. Although we could physically turn back the hands of a clock, we could not change the passage of time by so doing.

The problem calls for more than stopgap emergency action. Congress has had delivered to it on its doorstep for 2 or 3 years the problem of automation. We have no right to expect industry to pick up the cost completely. We have no right to expect labor to assume the cost completely. You and I, Mr. President, and 180 million Americans like us, as taxpayers, have a responsibility to assume our share of the cost and losses. So I renew the request which I made on April 30 in a joint letter to four Cabinet officers, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Agriculture. I said that those departments, particularly, have a great interest in what is happening to our country through automation. They should give favorable attention to the appointment of a national automation council, authorized and directed by the President to undertake a thorough factfinding study, and recommend whatever legislation is necessary to have the Government assume its share of the cost of, and the loss from, automation upon the working force and upon industry in America.

I well know the complexity of that assignment. The railroad case has served a purpose in focusing attention on this question as perhaps no other event in our country in recent times has focused attention on it. I believe we ought always to try to extract from a very bad situation any good that might be in it; and there is this much good in the railroad controversy. I sincerely hope that Congress will proceed in the days immediately ahead to pass whatever legislation is necessary along the lines of the President's recommendations this afternoon; but then proceed to work with the greater task, which is the task of passing some progressive legislation which falls into the same area of significance as the great progressive legislation of the period from 1900 to 1915, when Congress dealt with the 8-hour day legislation, minimum wages, workmen's compensation, safety regulations, and eventually unemployment insurance and social security.

We now have a challenge to meet the same kind of responsibility that Senators before us lived up to in that period of time, when they wrote indelibly on the pages of history of the United States such great names as Bob LaFollette, Norris, Hiram Johnson, Burton K. Wheeler, Couzens, Dill, McNary, and many others. They lived up to their responsibility of meeting a great labor crisis of that period. I believe we shall have to do it by the passage of legislation on the general subject and in the general field to which I have just alluded.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Like the Senator from Oregon, I, too, have had the benefit of a briefing on this subject. The Senator has emphasized the emergency nature of the dispute. The estimates which I have made—and I think they are fairly accurate—indicate that this dispute could cost as much as a 5-percent reduction in the gross national product of the United States, if it should continue for even a modest period of time. This is a totally unacceptable burden.

Like the Senator from Oregon—that is the reason I asked him to yield, and I am grateful to him for having done so—I have expressed myself as being against compulsory arbitration. Some will endeavor to define what the President has suggested as being compulsory arbitration. At first impression—and that is all we have—I do not believe it incurs many of the objections which have been made to compulsory arbitration. I do not believe the labor unions will like the proposal particularly, and I regret that very much. It gives Congress an added responsibility to afford a fair opportunity, to be heard, within the limits of the emergency, to all interested parties. But what the President is trying to do, as we can see it so far, is to provide a forum in which there may be an approval of mediation efforts and agreements, and only to use that forum for adjudication when there is no possibility whatever of getting the parties together on any of the elements of solution.

Also, the Interstate Commerce Commission is a quasi-judicial body, having many built-in safeguards against arbitrary action, and a history and tradition of successful regulation of the railroad industry.

All of that, I believe, distinguishes this situation, at first impression, from the classic compulsory arbitration, in which an arbitrator is appointed who has the power to make a binding determination.

I had not thought of the ICC approach. Others perhaps had, but I had not. To me, it seems at the moment to be a way out.

I join with the Senator from Oregon in emphasizing the urgency of dealing with the total automation problem. The President in this very message recommends the appointment of a commission for that purpose.

Finally, the Nation faces a national emergency of a grievous character. It is necessary in the national interest to find a one-shot means to determine the issue.

At first impression this would seem to be a feasible means. Normally, I favor seizure in cases of this character; but in this case that would be impractical, because then the United States would be in exactly the position in which the railroads find themselves now. They, too, would have to find some way out of the dilemma with their workers, and probably would go, too, to the Interstate Commerce Commission; and then we would be right back where we began.

In concluding, Mr. President, I should like to say that this illustrates how bereft the Congress is of remedies which have been thought through and adjudicated by us as a legislative forum charged with dealing with such emergencies. This is one of the reasons why I voted against the Taft-Hartley bill and why I have been urging the Senator from

Oregon and other Senators to face this problem, not "in time of war," but "in time of peace." Its solution is urgent, and I hope the result of this experience will be that we shall have on the statute books legislation which will enable the President to move in and deal with a situation of this kind, rather than to have the Congress faced with a rush situation such as the one with which we have been faced during the last 10 days, and culminating in the one this morning. This is a grave defect in our procedural system.

Considering the circumstances, I believe—on first impression—the President has done about as well as could be expected by recommending that this authority be given the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from New York, and I am grateful to him for his remarks.

I have also listened with great interest to the remarks of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], who favors settling this dispute and other disputes by what I would call a rather blanket amendment to the Railway Labor Act of 1926, taking, in broad outline, the form of the Lea bill of 1946. I would be as much opposed to that approach as to compulsory arbitration.

I would have railway labor know that the adoption of that proposal—and it would be a precedent for moving into many other types of labor disputes—would result in placing railway labor in this country under a system of government by injunction; I thought that years ago we had put behind us that era in industrial relations, because under such an approach, a variety of legal remedies would be sought, including, for example, a suit for civil damages and a decision by the courts, followed by use of the injunctive process, in case there was any tendency at all not to go along with the court decision.

As a lawyer who has great respect for the courts, I wish to say that the courts are not generally constituted as the most suitable forum for the determination of the kind of complex economic problems which are involved in the human relationships in labor controversies; and we need the kind of specialty approach which exists in the field of collective bargaining and mediation, to keep disputes such as this one out of the courts. Otherwise, we will find imposed again, as a yoke on the neck of free labor in this country, what developed into the system of labor government by injunction which a few decades ago finally led to the enactment of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. That system led free men in this country to take a militant course of action in which they made perfectly clear that they would use all the power of militancy at their disposal to protect their freedom.

So I believe it would be a great mistake to follow the suggestion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

Mr. BIBLE obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield, if it is understood that in doing so he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. BIBLE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana, the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to commend both the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for the remarks they have made this afternoon. Both of them, together with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] and other Senators on both sides of the aisle, have been extremely interested in the matter of railroad legislation; and Members on both sides of the aisle have contributed mightily, by their advice and their counsel, to the endeavor to bring about a solution of the difficulty which today confronts not only the rail carriers and the rail unions, but in effect, as has been brought out so well by the Senator from Oregon, also confronts the rest of the economy as a whole.

I would hope that the resolution, which shortly may be presented to this body, will be given quick consideration by the appropriate committee—which I believe is the Commerce Committee—so that the necessary action by this Congress can be taken as quickly as possible.

No one could have been more patient, more understanding, or more tolerant than the President of the United States has been in this matter; and I wish publicly to give him great credit for the extreme patience which, in my opinion, he has shown. He has bent over backward; he has carried the ball a long time, now—as did his predecessor. Now the ball has been thrown to this body; and it is up to us to assume our responsibility. I hope—and am certain—that this institution, known as the Senate, will do so, and will do so in good time.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

Mr. MORSE. While the majority leader is still on the floor, let me say that I assume that the message just now delivered to the Senate—although I do not know this to be a fact—is the President's railroad message.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that it is a message from the President of the United States, with an accompanying resolution.

Mr. MORSE. Although I am open to persuasion, it would require considerable argument to persuade me contrary to the view I now express, namely, that I think this matter is so important to the people of the United States that the message should be read from the desk to the Senate, and, through the Senate, to the country, and that this matter deserves that formality because of the great respect which I think is owed to the President of the United States for the statesmanship which I am sure will be set forth in the message.

I ask whether the majority leader knows of any reason why the message should not be read from the desk to the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. None at all. I think it is very important that that be done. I think the Senator from Oregon has made a sound suggestion, and I would hope the Senate would agree to it. I make only this exception: In view of the fact that the Senator from Nevada has so graciously yielded to me, I would hope that the bill he has been discussing could first be passed; and then I would ask that the clerk be instructed to read to the Senate the message from the President of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Very well.

INCREASE OF FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN MEETING COSTS OF MAINTAINING THE NATION'S CAPITAL CITY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6177) to amend section 2(a) of article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 relating to the annual payment to the District of Columbia by the United States.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair). The Senator from Nevada will state it.

Mr. BIBLE. What is the pending business, and what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill now before the Senate is House bill 6177. The pending question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I understand that the amendment which has been agreed to is the one from the House, and that the bill as thus amended is now to be considered as original text, for the purpose of amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment has been agreed to, and is not now open to amendment. The committee amendment is in the nature of a complete substitute.

Mr. BIBLE. That is correct; I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to make a brief statement: This legislation will provide one of the greatest, yet flexibly sound, contributions to the Federal-District fiscal relationships in the last half century in meeting the many problems unique in this federally controlled and congressionally governed city. Under this bill, Congress will be providing a device for improving this city, not only on the surface, but, also in depth, and at the same time will retain full power to alter what it can and should do under this legislation.

Mr. President, H.R. 6177, as amended, provides for increased Federal participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and would authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs.

The annual congressional task of dealing with the District of Columbia government's increasingly difficult fiscal problems this year presents a more challenging approach than in some previous years. The bill before the Senate today affords what this Committee believes is a real hope for Congress to help the District's taxpaying citizens get the Nation's Capital City on a sound, businesslike and fiscally-responsible basis.

In brief, title I of the bill provides authority for a regular annual payment to the District of Columbia, by means of a flexible formula which the committee believes will more fairly represent the Federal Government's fiscal responsibility to the government of the District, in lieu of a lump sum Federal payment as is presently authorized.

Title II would authorize the District of Columbia to increase the limit of borrowing authority from the U.S. Treasury in order to finance needed capital construction projects, tying the maximum general fund debt limit to an assessed valuation of real and personal property percentage.

Under existing law, the District's authorized Federal payment is $32 million and the total of $30 million was appropriated for fiscal year 1963, such figure representing less than 12 percent of the District's annual budget this year.

Without additional financing, the District government is confronted with an unprecedented general fund deficit if present services are to be maintained and if critically needed school classrooms on all levels are to be provided. Under the proposed formula, it is estimated that payment to the District in fiscal 1964 would amount to $53 million and under the formula factors could conceivably go to $67 million within 5 years if Federal construction and Federal employment levels continue on the uptrend here.

The question may be asked as to why District expenditures are on the uptrend. One major cause rests with the Congress itself since the 87th Congress approved legislation increasing by $13.2 million the annual cost of the District government. Such authorizing legislation was principally in the area of pay increases, comparable to all Federal employees, for District firemen, policemen, teachers and others. For instance, Washington today has improved fire protection since the firemen's workweek was reduced by Congress last year with a yearly added expense of $1.2 million. Likewise, unless work construction which has been or will be completed, is to stand idle, the District must incur in 1964 new costs of $1.2 million in staffing and maintaining it.

Washington, D.C., as a city actually must perform dual roles for it is the seat of our Federal Government.

Secondly, Washington is a great American city, with all the problems and increasing municipal expenses common to New York City, New Orleans, Los Angeles, Chicago, and others. The influx of a record population into the Washington metropolitan area and the accompanying social upheavals that flow from this urbanization, especially at the central city, are dramatic evidence of increasingly serious situations which make themselves tragically felt too often.

As chairman of the Senate District of Columbia Committee and as an Appropriations Committee member as well, I have advocated a Federal payment formula concept since 1960. It is my belief that this method will ease the difficult task for both the legislative and the appropriations committees in determining an adequate Federal payment by this city's largest industry, the Federal Government, when the imponderables of District tax revenue forecasts, borrowing authority totals, and capital improvement requirements come into play.

The present lump-sum authorization has no direct relationship to local taxes or requirements and does not reflect the proper share of the District's financial needs which the Federal Government should furnish. President Kennedy, in sending to the Congress this proposed legislation, said that the formula method "more accurately measures the Federal responsibility to the Capital of the Nation."

One question frequently heard is whether such enactment would establish a precedent for payments in lieu of taxes in other jurisdictions in which the Federal Government owns property. Obviously, the Federal Government established this city as the seat of its government and therefore has unique responsibilities for the financial well-being of the Nation's Capital. For more than 75 years Congress has recognized that responsibility by appropriating a share of the funds needed for the operation of the government of the District. Congress has fully understood that, because Washington is the Federal city and the seat of the National Government, its development and growth have been unusually affected by Federal Government operations.

Hence, the issue is not in any sense whether the Federal Government should contribute to the expense of government in the District, but only what measure can best be used to determine its fair share of the District's financial needs.

A formula approach based on the valuation of tax-exempt property of the Federal Government located in the District of Columbia, tax-exempt property of foreign governments, and others exempted by special acts of Congress, is not a new idea. The House Appropriations Committee, in the 86th Congress, used local tax-exempt properties in computing its recommendations on the Federal payment authorization for the 1960 fiscal year, and this bill might well be classed as an extension of the House Appropriations Committee's logic.

Further, history also provides authority for a Federal payment percentage approach. From 1879 through 1920, the Federal payment to the District of Columbia was a flat 50 percent of the general fund appropriation. In other words, of each dollar appropriated to operate and maintain the District, the local taxpayer paid 50 cents with the remaining 50 cents being paid by the Federal Government.

In 1921 the Congress discontinued its 50-percent formula. Since that time, the percentage of costs borne by the Federal Government has fluctuated from a high of 39.5 percent on general fund appropriations in 1924, to a low of 8.5 percent in 1954. Since 1956, the Federal payment has been slightly over 12 percent. The $30 million Federal payment voted to the District by Congress last year is approximately 12 percent of the general fund estimate of a $254 million appropriation for the 1963 fiscal year to operate the District government.

It must be remembered that, under this formula, Congress can, at any time by legislative action, alter it should it appear excessive or inadequate. Likewise, this bill provides only for a Federal payment authorization and the subsequent appropriation must be determined through the regular appropriation processes.

It is the committee's judgment that the formula approach treats the Federal Government as an industry. Consequently, the Federal payment would fluctuate in the same manner as do taxes payable by a business. Such a method for determining the share of the Federal Government's payment to the general fund for the expenses of the District would make a flexible payment that can be determined with a reasonable degree of accuracy and provides a more equitable basis than the existing authorization for a fixed payment.

Under the borrowing authority provision of this bill, the District of Columbia government would be authorized to compute its debt limit against the existing valuation of real and personal property. This method would replace the existing practice of a lump-sum authorization. The tie-in of the debt limit with assessed value of real and personal property reflects the prevailing method for limiting debt in practically every city and State around the country. Actually, the 6-percent debt limitation, as provided by this bill, is conservative by comparison with prevailing practices in other jurisdictions.

Under existing law the loan authority for the District of Columbia is set at $75 million but has been fully obligated since authorized in 1958. Actually, approximately $18 to $20 million is obligated each year by the Congress in approving the District's annual appropriation. Since the $75 million authorized loan authority is now fully obligated, it is mandatory that additional loan authority be provided if necessary capital construction is to proceed.

Under this bill, it is estimated that the debt limit for the District would vary from an estimated $229 million in fiscal 1964 to an estimated $279 million by fiscal 1969.

Mr. President, the House bill which our committee considered, provided a flat $45 million Federal payment authorization and an additional $75 million borrowing authority authorization. It is the committee's view that the bill, as amended, and before this body will deal more effectively with the District's problems. Money alone is not the all-purpose remedy for the District's ailment, but we cannot cure those ailments without it.

Mr. President, the bill was examined very carefully, first at a joint hearing, then in executive session of the subcommittee, and then in the full committee. I recommend passage of the committee substitute for the bill (H.R. 6177).

I now yield to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the ranking member of the committee on the minority side.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, to avoid repetition and taking the time of the Senate, I concur in the statement made by the chairman of the committee. The proposed legislation is long overdue. This Federal payment formula and increased borrowing authorization will provide Federal assistance long overdue. I am looking forward to the day when the Congress will pay its equal share of the expenses of operating the Nation's Capital and I believe this legislation can provide that share.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to join the distinguished chairman of the Senate District of Columbia Committee in urging adoption of this legislation.

The soundness of the Federal payment formula concept and the borrowing authority percentage of valuation has an equity in it that cannot fail to be recognized.

At our hearings on this bill, almost unanimous approval was voiced to its provisions. It must be remembered that the amount of the Federal payment authorization to the District is adjusted annually as relevant conditions in the District change.

In essence, the Federal payment formula provides an excellent guideline for the regular appropriation process by the Congress. Actually, the formula approach treats the Federal Government as an industry since, certainly, the Federal Government is this city's greatest industry. Consequently, the Federal payment would fluctuate as do taxes paid by business. Such a method for determining the share of the Federal Government's payment to the general fund for the District government's expenses would make a flexible payment which can be determined with a reasonable degree of accuracy and provide a more equitable basis than the existing authorization for a fixed payment. Actually, the formula stems from a recognition that regardless of the employment or benefits that business may generate in an area, business also pays such taxes as real property, personal property, and income from franchises. Actually, the Federal Government would be authorized to make a payment approximately that which an industry or business of comparable size would pay in taxes. If the rate of taxation on real or personal property or on business franchises were increased or decreased, the Federal payment would be increased or decreased. The contention that an in-lieu-of-tax payment would be precedent-setting, cannot stand, in my judgment. Actually, the Federal Government has made such a payment annually since the District of Columbia government came in to being. A mere formula concept certainly does not alter that fact.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate may adopt this measure in its entirety because the problems of this third fastest growing metropolitan area in the Nation will not decrease in the immediate years ahead unless we in the Congress assist.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield.

Mr. BIBLE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who is a very valuable member of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MORSE. I commend the committee chairman, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], for the able leadership which he has given to our committee, and through our committee to the Senate, in devising what I shall call an adjustment program. As the Senator himself would be the first to say, we would that the amount authorized could be much higher. The District of Columbia deserves a higher payment. But the proposal is a great improvement over the past. It represents wonderful progress. I desire the RECORD to show that in my opinion the progress never could have been made this year had it not been for the wonderful leadership of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]. I commend him.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I appreciate those compliments. I have merely been a laborer in the vineyard attempting to do the best I could in a very difficult situation. I hope that the formula will be ultimately enacted into law. It is the correct answer to the troublesome Federal Government and District government fiscal relationships. If the formula is enacted, those problems will be partly solved in future years.

I point out that, after all, the Appropriations Committee must appropriate money, but the bill would provide the guidelines for their appropriation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I rise to speak not only because I am in sympathy with the purposes of the pending measure, but also because of great personal admiration for the distinguished chairman of the committee. One question that has bothered me from time to time, so far as the finances of the District of Columbia are concerned, is that the District of Columbia is a circumscribed metropolitan area in which are employed a large number of workers. Many, if not most, of those workers live outside the District of Columbia, but in reality they pay very little toward the upkeep of the District. Thereby an unfair burden is placed on the District. That problem ought to be viewed, and consideration should be given to it at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. BIBLE. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from Montana. The suggestion has been made before. The committee has attempted to make a study of this particular problem. So far we have not been able to come forth with what I would consider to be a successful solution.

Mr. President, I ask for the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 6177) was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs."

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LOCATION OF CHANCERIES OR OFFICES OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS IN CERTAIN RESIDENTIAL AREAS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 646) to prohibit the location of chanceries or other business offices of foreign governments in certain residential areas of the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENTS TO THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATION PROVISIONS OF CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, three amendments to the public accommodation provisions of S. 1731, the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1963, and S. 1732, the public accommodations bill, and ask that they be printed and appropriately referred.

S. 1732, which is pending before the Commerce Committee, is identical to title II of S. 1731, which is pending before the Committee on the Judiciary. I am submitting the amendments to both bills in order that they may be considered by both committees.

Mr. President, I have a few words of explanation of the amendments.

The first amendment would add a new section to the bill squarely based on the 14th amendment to the Constitution. This section would outlaw any racial discrimination under color of law and would strike down in one swoop the myriad of State and local ordinances compelling or fostering segregation at places of public accommodation.

The second amendment would make it clear that the listing of specific types of public establishments in the bill is not intended to preclude its applicability to other similar establishments not specifically listed. Experience under State public accommodation laws suggests the desirability of this change. The courts have tended to construe narrowly the coverage of these State laws, one case holding, for example, that "restaurants and lunchrooms" were not included under a statute prohibiting discrimination at any "inn, hotel, or boarding house, or any place of entertainment or amusement for which a license is required by the municipal authorities," even though a State license was required for the operation of restaurants and lunchrooms. As a result of such decisions, the State laws have necessitated frequent amendment and the list of covered establishments has grown larger and longer. We can avoid this process of amendment by litigation by clarifying the intent of the law at its inception.

The third amendment would include discriminatory advertising among the prohibitions listed in the present bills. Such a provision is contained in the New York civil rights law and has been upheld by our highest court as necessary "to forbid the accomplishment of the discrimination barred by the statute, not only by direct exclusion but also by the indirect means specified"—*Woolcott* v. *Shubert*, 217 N.Y. 212 (1916). The States of Colorado, Illinois, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Washington, and Wisconsin have similar statutes banning discriminatory advertising as well as discriminatory selection of patrons. Ironically, but significantly in terms of the justification for such a provision, Virginia, which does not have a State equal accommodations law, is one of the States that bans advertisements that express any religious discrimination. Such an amendment obviously would help prevent evasion of the obligations established under the law.

I believe that these amendments would do much to strengthen and clarify the provisions of the public accommodations proposal. They have been discussed with officials of the Department of Justice, and I am hopeful that they will be endorsed by the Attorney General in his testimony before the Committee on the Judiciary, which resumes on Wednesday of this week.

A number of Members of both bodies prefer the equal protection approach under the 14th amendment to the interstate commerce approach advanced by the administration. But there really is no reason for these bills to founder on a difference in approach among those who strongly favor its objectives. The commerce clause conceivably could reach some cases which the equal protection requirement would not cover, and it is evident that the equal protection clause could reach other cases excluded by the bill's commerce provisions. The best way to assure the broadest coverage of the bill under these circumstances is to rely on both standards, and this is exactly what my principal amendment would accomplish. Under this dual approach, there is no doubt that the bills would be given the widest application consistent with the Constitution.

The findings already in the bills amply justify this dual approach. They include a recitation that the discriminatory practices against which the bill is directed are "in all cases encouraged, fostered, or tolerated in some degree by the governmental authorities of the State in which they occur, which license or protect the businesses involved by means of laws and ordinances and the activities of their executive and judicial officers." They also include a declaration that these practices "can be best removed by invoking the power of Congress under the 14th amendment and the commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States."

For some reason, however, these findings are not reflected in the substantive provisions of the proposed legislation, which are couched entirely in terms of the commerce clause. This is most unfortunate, in my judgment, since it would appear to condone a continuation of segregationist practices in public establishments which do not meet the commerce formula, even though these practices are compelled by State law. Certainly, no one can contend that there is any justification for segregation under the coercion of State and local laws, and it is these situations to which my amendment would have particular application.

Many of those who have protested against the public accommodations provisions as an infringement on private property rights are unaware of the extent to which segregation is forced upon the owners of such establishments by State and local laws. The city of Greenville, S.C., ordinance referred to in the Supreme Court's opinion in the recent sit-in case, for example, makes it unlawful for "any person owning, managing, or controlling any hotel, restaurant, cafe, eating house, boarding house or similar establishment to furnish meals to white persons and colored persons in the same room, or at the same table, or at the same counter"—except where separate facilities are furnished.

Separate facilities, the ordinance solemnly recites, must include "separate eating utensils and separate dishes for the serving of food, all of which shall be distinctly marked by some appropriate color scheme or otherwise"; a "distance of at least 35 feet between the area where white and colored persons are served"; and separate facilities "for the cleaning of eating utensils and dishes furnished the two races."

There are similar laws in many cities and States. The city code of Birmingham, Ala., forbids any restaurant to serve whites and Negroes in the same room unless they are "separated by a solid partition extending from the floor upward to a distance of seven feet or higher, and unless a separate entrance from the street is provided for each compartment."

The city code of Durham, N.C., requires separate rooms for Negroes and whites in any public eating place which serves both races—"the partition between such rooms shall be constructed of wood, plaster or brick or like material, and shall reach from floor to the ceiling"—and violations are punishable by fines of $10 and each day represents a new violation.

A State law in Oklahoma requires the telephone company to provide separate telephone booths for each race at the request of a particular locality.

A State law in Arkansas requires that racetracks must provide segregated seating.

In Louisiana and South Carolina, State statutes expressly require separate entrances and seating at circuses.

In Texas, State law forbids boxing or wrestling contacts between whites and Negroes and violations are punishable by fines ranging up to $200.

In Georgia, there is a State statute requiring segregated billiard rooms.

In Louisiana, this requirement is extended to circuses and tent exhibitions, and even separate ticket offices and entrances for white and colored races are prescribed.

In Mississippi, a State statute requires public officials to prohibit integration of the white and Negro races in public facilities or accommodations.

In Oklahoma, a State statute requires separate telephone booths for white and colored patrons.

In Virginia, a State statute makes it a crime for operators or sponsors of public halls, theaters, opera houses, motion pictures, or any place of public entertainment or public assemblage to fail to separate the races.

We should not have to measure such State laws against an interstate commerce standard in order to determine their repugnance to the Constitution. Even in the absence of any statute, it is doubtful that any of these laws could withstand a court challenge. My amendment would eliminate any possible doubt on this issue, however, and provide an effective legal remedy for all such situations.

All of us interested in this problem are aware of the leadership provided on this subject by our colleagues the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], in proposing a public accommodations bill based on the equal protection clause before the administration's bill was submitted to us. Their testimony before the Commerce Committee and the Judiciary Committee on this subject has been very illuminating, and I personally have no doubt as to the soundness of this approach.

I believe we would do well to reflect the pioneering work they have done on this subject—which has received the support of a substantial number of Senators on both sides of the aisle—in any bill Congress finally approves to deal with this problem.

Whether or not the approach of the 14th amendment is preferable to the approach of the commerce clause, we can, by adopting such an amendment as I submit, join the two together in such a way that we shall have the benefit of both approaches to the problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my proposed amendments to S. 1731 and S. 1732 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments to S. 1731 were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 139

On page 15, line 18, immediately after "(a)" insert the following: "directly or indirectly publish, circulate, issue, display, post, or mail any notice, advertisement, or written or printed communication, to the effect that any of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any public establishment to which the provisions of section 202 apply shall be refused, withheld from, or denied to any person on account of race, color, religion, or national origin, or (b)".

Redesignate "(b)", "(c)", "(d)" and "(e)" in section 203 as "(c)", "(d)", "(e)" and "(f)", respectively.

Amendment No. 140

On page 15, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following new subsection:

"(c) The enumeration of any public establishment listed in clause (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a) shall not be construed to exclude the application of such subsection to any other public establishment not listed in such clause which is similar to such enumerated establishment."

Amendment No. 141

On page 16, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following new section:

"DISCRIMINATION UNDER COLOR OF LAW PROHIBITED

"Sec. 204. No person acting under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage shall in the operation of any public establishment, including but not limited to, any hotel, motel or other public place engaged in furnishing lodging to transients, guests or any motion picture house, theater, sports arena, stadium, exhibition hall, or other public place of amusement or entertainment, or any retail shop, department store, market, drugstore, gasoline station, or other public place which keeps goods for sale, or any restaurant, lunchroom, lunch counter, soda fountain, or other public place engaged in selling food for consumption on the premises, or any other establishment where goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations are held out to the public for sale, use, rent or hire, shall directly or indirectly publish, circulate, issue, display, post or mail any notice, advertisement, or written or printed communication to the effect that any of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations of such public establishment shall be refused, withheld from, or denied to any person on account of race, color, religion, or national origin, or withhold, deny, or attempt to withhold or deny, or deprive or attempt to deprive, or interfere or attempt to interfere, or intimidate, threaten or coerce any person with a purpose of interfering with, or punish or attempt to punish any person, or incite or aid or abet any person, to segregate or otherwise discriminate against customers on account of their race, color, religion or national origin."

Redesignate sections 204 and 205 as sections 205 and 206 respectively.

On page 16, line 8, insert after the comma (,) the words "or section 204".

On page 17, line 7, insert after the number "20B", the words "or section 204".

On page 17, line 14, insert after the number "203", the words "or section 204".

The amendments to S. 1732 were referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

Amendment No. 134

On page 7, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following new section:

"DISCRIMINATION UNDER COLOR OF LAW PROHIBITED

"Sec. 5. No person acting under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage shall in the operation of any public establishment, including but not limited to, any hotel, motel or other public place engaged in furnishing lodging to transients, guests or any motion picture house, theater, sports arena, stadium, exhibition hall, or other public place of amusement or entertainment, or any retail shop, department store, market, drugstore, gasoline station, or other public place which keeps goods for sale, or any restaurant, lunchroom, lunch counter, soda fountain, or other public place engaged in selling food for consumption on the premises, or any other establishment where goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations are held out to the public for sale, use, rent or hire, shall directly or indirectly publish, circulate, issue, display, post or mail any notice, advertisement, or written or printed communication to the effect that any of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations of such public establishment shall be refused, withheld from, or denied to any person on account of race, color, religion, or national origin, or withhold, deny, or attempt to withhold or deny, or deprive or attempt to deprive, or interfere or attempt to intefere, or intimidate, threaten or coerce any person with a purpose of interfering with, or punish or attempt to punish any person, or incite or aid or abet any person, to segregate or otherwise discriminate against customers on account of their race, color, religion or national origin."

Redesignate sections 5 and 6 as sections 6 and 7 respectively.

On page 7, line 21, insert after the comma (,) the words "or section 5".

On page 8, line 20, insert after the number "4", the words "or section 5".

On page 9, line 12, insert after the number "4", the words "or section 5".

Amendment No. 135

On page 7, line 7, immediately after "(a)", insert the following: "directly or indirectly publish, circulate, issue, display, post, or mail any notice, advertisement, or written or printed communication, to the effect that any of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any public establishment to which the provisions of section 3 apply shall be refused, withheld from, or denied to any person on account of race, color, religion, or national origin, or (b)".

Redesignate "(b)", "(c)", "(d)" and "(e)" in section 4 as "(c)", "(d)", "(e)" and "(f)", respectively.

Amendment No. 136

On page 7, line 7, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following new subsection:

"(c) The enumeration of any public establishment listed in clause (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a) shall not be construed to exclude the application of such subsection to any other public establishment not listed in such clause which is similar to such enumerated establishment."

MONETARY EXPANSION FAR SOUNDER SOLUTION THAN DEFICITS TO ECONOMIC STAGNATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there is a strong difference of opinion among many economists as to whether the economy can best be stimulated by deliberate, calculated, planned deficits or by following a monetary policy of expanding the supply of money.

It is perfectly obvious to anyone, of course, that if the money supply is increased or if a deficit is incurred it will tend to be expansionary and inflationary if there is a shortage of labor and plant facilities are being used at near capacity. It is also apparent that the economy can be expanded by these means if there is substantial unemployment and if there is a slack in the use of productive facilities.

Mr. President, recently a very interesting study was made by a number of economists, and brought together in a fine paper for the Journal of Political Economy by an outstanding and unusual banker, Beryl Sprinkel. Mr. Sprinkel is vice president of the Harris Trust & Savings Bank of Chicago.

Mr. Sprinkel refers to a recent study by Michael E. Levy of the Division of Economic Research, National Industrial Conference Board, which shows that for various Western countries—in fact, for all countries for which there is comparative data—there is no correlation between economic expansion and the size of deficits. A country, merely by reducing taxes and increasing spending, will not achieve economic expansion, on the basis of the experience of the decade 1950 to 1960 in the industrial countries for which statistics are available.

This was a competent study by a responsible economist. Perhaps it is the only one of this kind using this data that has been made.

This economist has found that there is no correlation between budget deficits and growth. In some countries there has been an increase in gross national product which has corresponded with the increase in deficits. There has been a stimulation of the economy by what we might achieve by cutting taxes and increasing spending in certain cases. In other countries it has been shown that there has been a negative correlation.

On the other hand, there are startling statistics with respect to what happens when the money supply is increased. It has been found there is an almost precise correlation between the increase in the money supply and the increase in the real gross national product. The study confirms this, and confirms it most impressively.

It shows the money supply in Japan, between 1955 and 1960 increased by 13.7 percent. In Italy it increased by 10.5 percent. In Germany it increased by 10.2 percent. In France it increased by 9.9 percent. In Canada it increased by 3.4 percent. In the United Kingdom it increased by 2.1 percent. In the United States it increased by 0.9 percent.

The gross national product correlated remarkably with the money supply. The increase for Japan was 11.2 percent. For France the increase was 10.8 percent; Germany, 9.2 percent; Italy, 7.6 percent; Canada, 5.8 percent; the United Kingdom, 5.7 percent; the United States, 4.9 percent.

The degree of increase in the national gross product and the degree of stimulation of the economy correspond very closely.

So, Mr. Sprinkel concludes, studies support the argument of the need for the monetary change.

He points out also that it is one kind of economic stimulation we can achieve without requiring the painful process of executive recommendation and congressional action.

He points out that the principal function of a central bank is to control the quantity of bank reserves and the quantity of money. He refers to a recent study by Milton Friedman and Anna

Schwarts as presenting very strong evidence that the causal sequence in the United States confirms this argument.

There is just one more aspect of this study which I think is most startling. Mr. Sprinkel points out the correspondence between the monetary supply increase and the increase in industrial production is 1 for 1 in Japan, Italy, Germany, France, Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Let me very quickly run down the list. Between 1956 and 1961 Japan had an increase in the money supply of 14.1 percent; in industrial production, 20.4 percent. For Italy, the increase in the money supply was 12 percent and in industrial production 10.1 percent. In Germany it was 11.6 percent and 7.6 percent, respectively. In France it was 10.9 percent and 7.6 percent. In Canada, 6 percent and 3.1 percent. In the United Kingdom it was 2.2 percent and 2.5 percent.

The United States had the smallest increase in the money supply and the smallest increase in industrial production.

Furthermore, this production study shows another fact that may help allay fears. There is no correlation between the increase in money supply and the cost of living.

Japan had the biggest increase in money supply and a relatively moderate increase in the cost of living. France had the largest increase in the cost of living and about an average increase in the money supply.

There is one other point I want to stress, and that is that the increase in the money supply should not be confused with an increase in interest rates. The fact is that in Japan there was a substantial increase in interest rates that corresponded with the increase in money supply.

The fact is that the central bank, or, in the case of the United States, the Federal Reserve Board, could act as a very important stimulant of our economy by increasing the money supply, and particularly at a time like the present when there is heavy unemployment and a real slack in our Government.

The conclusions of Mr. Sprinkel are particularly significant:

> Those concerned with inducing more rapid spending increases in the U.S. economy should concentrate attention on stimulating monetary growth rather than increasing the size of the Government deficit. So long as monetary growth is severely restricted due either to fear of inflation, gold losses, or other reasons, there will probably be no rapid increases in spending.

This is exactly the inhibitory force of the Federal Reserve Board's action in increasing rediscount rates from 3 to 3½ percent. Unless there is a compensating action of increasing the money supply, this is going to have a significantly adverse effect.

Continuing with the conclusions:

> Since there exists substantial economic slack in both labor and capital resources in the U.S. economy, more rapid monetary expansion would initially result primarily in higher real economic growth.

Of course, this is what we all want.

Continuing with the conclusions:

> Although several European monetary authorities have argued that the United States should follow a restrictive monetary policy in order to solve the U.S. balance-of-payments problem, it is clear from the monetary growth trends abroad that such policies have not been followed there.
>
> If the maintenance of full employment of labor and capital resources with relatively stable prices proves to be inconsistent with equilibrium in the balance of payments, serious thought should be given to amending the international institutional framework that creates the contradiction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this fine and relatively brief study by Mr. Beryl Sprinkel be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELATIVE ECONOMIC GROWTH RATES AND FISCAL-MONETARY POLICIES

(By Beryl W. Sprinkel,[1] Harris Trust & Savings Bank, Chicago)

I. ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS

In an effort to evolve policies for stimulating lagging U.S. economic growth, considerable attention has been devoted to examining why the U.S. economy has grown less in recent years than has that of other highly industrialized countries. It is a well-accepted principle in economics that a country's growth rate depends both on the pace of increases in capacity to produce and on whether it is raising or lowering the proportion of its capacity actually in use. Potential for economic growth is determined by the expansion in capacity but, particularly in the shorter run, changes in the degree of utilization of resources may be a very important determinant of actual growth. Potential for economic growth is controlled by changes in supply factors such as the size and quality of the labor force, average hours of work, the stock of capital, the state of technology, and the efficiency with which resources are combined. The degree of utilization of resources is determined primarily by the volume of total demand, that is, whether or not demand is large enough to utilize available resources at existing prices. There also appears to be interplay between demand-and-supply forces since a high state of demand may tend, under some conditions, to create incentives to further expand capacity for production. Some analysts have properly cited the more favorable tax structure applied to savings and investments in many countries abroad as an explanation for the higher rates of growth in productive capacity. Also the possibility for many countries to embark on postwar economic expansion by incorporating technology already applied elsewhere made possible a rapid growth in capacity. Yet these advantages would not have led to higher actual economic growth unless total spending had been sufficient to utilize available resources. Since total demands have been insufficient to utilize all resources at prevailing prices in the U.S. economy during the past 5 years, attention has turned to analysis of comparative fiscal policies as measured by the relative size of budget deficits.

This paper will briefly review the evidence relating to the deficit spending hypothesis, an implication of the income-expenditure theory, and present data and arguments supporting an alternative monetary-spending hypothesis. Due perhaps to the difficulty of achieving comparability in budget data between nations, little published research on this subject exists. An unpublished, but widely circulated, study by Andrew Gantt compared the "consolidated cash budget" for the Central Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and West Germany over the past several years and concluded that the European countries experienced more frequent cumulative budget deficits than did the United States.[2] A recent study by Michael E. Levy, Division of Economic Research, National Industrial Conference Board, makes a comparison of general government activities (central, state, and local) on a national-income-accounts basis for all Western countries for which currently available statistics are approximately comparable.[3] Data are provided for six European countries, Canada, and the United States. The data indicate that "Canada, France, and the United Kingdom have had at least as many, or more, and larger cumulative deficits during the 1950's than the United States—whether measured in relation to total government expenditure or as a percentage of national product. In contrast, Austria, the Netherlands, Norway, and Portugal have run significant cumulative surpluses and have had few, if any, budget deficits."[4] Hence the wide variation in budget practices made possible a test of the deficit-spending hypothesis.

The Levy study correlated the real growth rates of six European countries, Canada, and the United States, for the years 1950–60 with their cumulative budget surpluses or deficits, measured as a percentage of gross national product. The resulting scatter "does not indicate any systematic relationship between budget deficits and growth. Rapid economic growth well in excess of that of the United States was associated with significant surpluses in the case of Austria, the Netherlands, and Portugal, and with substantial cumulative deficits in the case of France. Similarly, much lower rates of economic growth coincided with cumulative budget surpluses for Norway and with cumulative budget deficits for the United Kingdom and the United States."[5] Levy also correlated the cumulative budget surpluses or deficits with the rate of inflation during 1950–60 and observed no significant relationship. He concluded that "the limited, and admittedly crude, empirical evidence presented here does not support current pronouncements and prescriptions that larger deficits—or lower-saving budget structures—as such, will almost automatically result in accelerated economic growth over the years."[6]

One of the conceptual difficulties that complicate the testing of the deficit-spending hypothesis is the fact that, even if a deficit tends to stimulate spending, it is also true that depressed economic activity which reduces revenues will tend to create a deficit. In other words, causation may run in both directions: from the deficit to spending and from spending to a deficit. It is clear, for example, that in recent years United States budget deficits have been larger than would have been the case had the economy operated at full-employment levels of output even though it is not clear that the existing deficits raised total demands.

---

[1] The views expressed are those of the author and not necessarily the official views of the Harris Trust & Savings Bank.

[2] The findings of the Gantt study were summarized in an address by Robert C. Turner, assistant director, Bureau of the Budget, before the Midwest Economic Association, Omaha, Nebr., Apr. 12, 1962. After summarizing the Gantt study, Mr. Turner stated, "It may not be an unrelated accident that unemployment is very low in Western European countries and that their growth rate is much greater than our own."

[3] "Cycles, Growth, and Discretionary Budget Policy" Business Record (National Industrial Conference Board, Inc., July 1962).

[4] Ibid, p. 11.

[5] Ibid., p. 12.

[6] Ibid.

An alternative hypothesis that purports to explain spending increases is based upon the quantity theory of money. The quantity theory hypothesis implies that there should exist a close correlation between the rates of increase in the money supply in various countries and the corresponding increases in total spending. This hypothesis could be consistent with the deficit explanation if in fact variations in monetary growth resulted only from differences in deficits financed by new money. However, if either the varying sized deficits were not financed with new money or monetary growth rates differed because of variations in the rate of monetary expansion in the private sector of the economy, the two hypotheses do not have identical implications.

Studies of monetary expansion within the United States support the argument that monetary changes are closely correlated with spending changes.[7] Although some contend that spending changes bring forth changes in the money supply, rather than primarily vice versa, that contention is inconsistent with recognition that the principal function of a central bank is to control the quantity of bank reserves and the quantity of money. Furthermore, a recent study by Milton Friedman and Anna Schwartz presents very strong evidence that the causal sequence in the United States runs primarily in the opposite directions.[8] If monetary changes do in fact cause spending changes, then it should be possible to explain varying rates of spending increases abroad by reference to varying monetary growth rates, regardless of tax structures and deficits.

II. MONETARY GROWTH AND RELATED ECONOMIC VARIABLES

Readily available information published by the International Monetary Fund does in fact support the hypothesis that money has placed a causal role.[9] Comparison of the rank order of rates of monetary expansion in the seven most advanced industrial and largely free market countries from 1955 to 1960 with the rank order of rate of increase of gross national product shows high rank correlation between the two[10] (table 1). Only the order of France and Italy was transposed in the GNP series as compared to the rank order of countries by monetary growth. In view of the inevitable variation in quality of data and the possibility that definitions of data may vary somewhat between countries, the rank correlation is surprisingly high.[11]

TABLE 1.—*Compound annual rates of increase 1955–60* [1]

	Percent
Money supply:	
Japan	13.7
Italy	10.5
Germany	10.2
France	9.9
Canada	3.4
United Kingdom	2.1
United States	.9
Gross national product:	
Japan	11.3
France	10.8
Germany	9.2
Italy	7.6
Canada	5.8
United Kingdom	5.7
United States	4.9

[1] Moderate shifts in the base dates of both series did not substantially affect the high rank correlation.

Rapid spending increases will lead to rapid increases in either real output or prices, depending on the state of available resources. If full employment of resources exists and there is little opportunity for increasing production, spending increases will bring primarily inflation. If, on the other hand, economic slack exists and opportunities for increasing productivity and the employment of factors of production are substantial, spending increases will bring forth primarily output increases.

The rank order of monetary expansion and industrial production increase for the same countries from 1956 to 1961 is identical, thereby suggesting that there were substantial potential resources to meet spending pressures resulting from monetary growth with increased physical output in the industrial sectors of the economies. Since supply conditions were unusually favorable in recent years, it is unlikely that foreign nations can continue the rates of industrial growth achieved in the past 5 years. Nor does recent growth in U.S. capacity for production suggest a potential growth in production similar to that achieved by the top four countries listed in table 2.

TABLE 2.—*Monetary expansion, industrial production, inflation, and interest rates*

[In percent]

Country	Compound annual rates of increase			Average rates of interest, 1957–61
	Money supply, 1956–61	Industrial production, 1956–61	Cost of living, 1956–61	
Japan	+14.1	[1] +20.4	+3.5	(Bank loan rate) 8.18.
Italy	+12.0	+10.1	+1.9	(Government bond yield) 5.76.
Germany	+11.6	+7.6	+2.2	(Mortgage bond yield) 6.4.
France	+10.9	+7.6	+6.5	(Government bond yield) 5.42.
Canada	+6.0	+3.1	+1.9	(Government bond yield 4.65.
United Kingdom	+2.2	+2.5	+2.7	(Government bond yield) 5.29.
United States	+1.2	+2.4	+1.9	(Government bond yield) 3.78.

[1] Manufacturing production (industrial production is not reported).

The countries with the more rapid rates of monetary growth also tended to have the most inflation, but the rank correlation is not strong, as indicated in table 2.

It is frequently assumed that rapid monetary growth will lead to low interest rates. Yet if monetary growth does in fact stimulate total spending, it is conceivable that the consequent higher rate of spending will generate a strong demand for money and therefore result in higher rather than lower interest rates. Observation of the rank correlation in table 2 suggests that countries that tend to have high rates of monetary growth also have high, rather than low, interest rates. Unfortunately, the rate series readily available for the various countries are not identical. Also it must be recognized that many factors affect the level of interest rates besides the rate of economic growth. For example, varying rates of inflation could account for some of the observed difference in interest rates. Nonetheless, interest-rate data in table 2 strongly suggest that high rates of monetary growth will not necessarily lead to low interest rates, even when inflationary pressures are relatively mild, as was the case in most of the countries considered. Thus, interest rates appear to be primarily a result of economic activity rather than a cause.

III. CONCLUSION

The above data and point of view are not conclusive but are highly suggestive and deserve further investigation. Before embarking upon either a vast Government expenditure program or substantial planned deficits resulting from massive tax reductions for the purpose of spurring demands, it would appear appropriate to investigate further the possibility of stimulating gross national product through greater monetary expansion. The data suggest that greater monetary growth is more likely to stimulate total spending than is a larger Federal deficit. Nonetheless, incentive-oriented tax reductions and reforms could play an important role in stimulating capacity to produce. Stimulation of demand by monetary change is much easier to achieve since monetary growth can be determined by Federal Reserve Board action rather than administration and congressional action. An implication of the money-spending hypothesis is that a large Federal deficit financed out of savings is likely to have only a nominal stimulating effect upon total spending whereas sizable monetary growth, financing either the public or the private sector of the economy, would yield an increase in total demand. The above evidence supports the argument that insofar as inadequate total demand is the critical factor limiting economic growth, the money supply rather than the Government deficit is the relevant policy variable which should be adjusted.

To summarize, the above evidence appears to support the following conclusions with respect to the U.S. economy:

1. Those concerned with inducing more rapid spending increases in the U.S. economy should concentrate attention on stimulating monetary growth rather than increasing the size of the Government deficit.

---

[7] See Clark Warburton, "The Misplaced Emphasis in Contemporary Business Fluctuations Theory," Journal of Business, XIX (1946), pp. 199–220; Milton Friedman and David Meiselman, "The Relative Stability of Monetary Velocity and the Investment Multiplier in the United States, 1897–1958" (to be published by the Commission on Money and Credit); and Beryl W. Sprinkel, "Effects of Monetary Change and Some Implications for Monetary Policy," State of the Economy and Policies for Full Employment, Hearings before the Joint Economic Committee (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, Aug. 7–10, 13–17, 20, 21, and 22, 1962), pp. 433–438.

[8] "Money and Business Cycles," Conference on Monetary Economics (sponsored by Universities-National Bureau Committee for Economic Research, Apr. 13 and 15, 1962). (Study published as a supplement to the February 1963 Review of Economics and Statistics.)

[9] International Monetary Fund, International Financial Statistics, August 1962.

[10] Complete GNP data for 1961 were unfortunately not available, hence the use of the 5-year period 1955–60. Current rather than real GNP was used in all cases since a measure of change in total spending was desired. Similar computations were made for several smaller countries; the resulting rank correlation was somewhat lower than for the above seven major countries.

[11] In the January 1960 issue of International Financial Statistics, p. v, money is defined as "currency and deposit money held by the domestic non-Government sector." Currency consists of notes and coin in current use. Deposit money means deposits unrestrictedly exchangeable on demand into currency at par and without penalty. Year-end data for the money supply were used since the average quantity in circulation during the year was not available.

So long as monetary growth is severely restricted due either to fear of inflation, gold losses, or other reasons, there will probably be no rapid increases in spending.

2. Since there exists substantial economic slack in both labor and capital resources in the U.S. economy, more rapid monetary expansion would initially result primarily in higher real economic growth. Continued rapid monetary growth after relatively full employment of labor and capital resources is attained would result in serious inflation. Hence, monetary growth should be more limited once that point is reached.

3. Increased monetary growth in the United States would probably lead to higher interest rates on average after increased spending was generated. In the very short run, before increased spending and higher demand for funds developed, an increased money supply would undoubtedly depress interest rates. The Friedman-Meiselman study indicates that the correlation between money and income is highest with a one-quarter lag of income change behind monetary change. Hence increased spending would probably shortly follow increased monetary growth. An easier monetary policy in terms of greater monetary expansion would probably ultimately result in tighter money in the sense of a higher average level of interest rates.

4. Higher internal economic growth induced by a larger money supply would probably discourage both long- and short-term capital flows abroad and hence tend to reduce the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit. Increased profit opportunities and higher short-term interest rates at home would probably ultimately result from a higher monetary growth rate. However, higher internal economic growth would also tend to increase imports. Recent monetary policies that attempted to support short-term interest rates by severely limiting growth in banking reserves and the money supply resulted in insufficient demand to employ available resources. Although several European monetary authorities have argued that the United States should follow a restrictive monetary policy in order to solve the U.S. balance-of-payments problem, it is clear from the monetary growth trends abroad that such policies have not been followed there. It is true that high interest rates are frequently a symptom of a healthy and rapidly growing economy, but it is not true that high interest rates, forced by a restrictive monetary policy, will lead to economic health.

If the maintenance of full employment of labor and capital resources with relatively stable prices proves to be inconsistent with equilibrium in the balance of payments, serious thought should be given to amending the international institutional framework that creates the contradiction. It has long been recognized that fixed exchange rates between countries with varying rates of growth and inflation lead to an unstable system. The above evidence supports the view that recent monetary policies have sacrificed substantial income and employment without solving the balance-of-payments deficit.

TAX CUT WILL NOT STIMULATE UNLESS MONEY SUPPLY IS EXPANDED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on another subject related to this one, Mr. Sprinkel also made a speech at the Sixth Annual Economic Conference of the National Industrial Conference Board on May 16, 1963, in New York, under the title "Financing a 'Constructive Deficit,'" in which he pointed out it is imperative, if we have a tax cut which increases the deficit, that it should be financed by increasing the money supply; that we have a rate of money supply increase of between 3 and 5 percent; that in the last few years there has been a constant correlation between the rate of economic activity and the increase in money supply, which has been corroborated by many careful, thoughtful, and responsible economists.

So it does little good for the President to recommend a tax cut, or the Congress to enact it, if the Federal Reserve Board does not increase the money supply at a time when we need stimulation of the economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a short summary of the statement by Dr. Beryl Sprinkel be printed in the Record at this point; and I thank the Senator from Oregon for permitting me to speak before he makes a very important speech.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Financing a "Constructive Deficit"

(By Dr. Beryl W. Sprinkel, vice president and economist, Harris Trust & Savings Bank, presented at the Sixth Annual Economic Conference of the National Industrial Conference Board, New York City, May 16, 1963)

SUMMARY

The fundamental question with respect to financing a deficit is "Should it be financed by savings, by new money, or by some combination of the two?" With respect to this issue two subsidiary questions arise: (1) Is it merely the size of the Federal deficit which is most important with respect to its stimulating effect or does the method of financing make a difference? (2) Is total private spending on goods and services principally a function of monetary change and is this change dependent or independent of the size of the prevailing Federal deficit?

Despite alltime highs in economic activity, many argue the economy has not performed satisfactorily in recent years because of the persistence of excessive economic slack representing unemployed labor and capital. Although U.S. capacity for growth has continued to rise, actual production has not kept pace with capacity. Potential for economic growth is determined by changes in real supply factors such as the size and quality of the labor force, average hours of work, the stock of capital, the state of technology and the efficiency with which resources are combined. On the other hand, the degree of utilization of these resources is determined principally by the volume of total demand. Since 1957, persistent economic slack suggests that there has been insufficient demand to utilize all our resources. Therefore, the tax cut and the resulting deficit is touted as a means for providing longrun incentives which will expand productive capacity and also provide a stimulant to overall total demands. If the method of financing has a bearing on how stimulative a tax cut will be, present economic patterns dictate financing in a way that will stimulate growth in total demands to enable the economy to move toward full employment of labor and capital resources.

The evidence supporting the argument that deficits are stimulating and surpluses are restraining, irrespective of the method of finance, is hard to come by. Yet, the arguments tend to be accepted as gospel. It is frequently argued that adverse budget swings during economic recoveries have thwarted full economic recovery. Yet, our tax system has been essentially unchanged in the past three economic recoveries and the first recovery was excellent whereas the latter two were unsatisfactory. Furthermore, the budget swing as a percentage of GNP growth was the largest during the most satisfactory recovery and least during the present expansion. Correlation between the budget position and the accompanying GNP change amounts to +0.39 according to a recent study by George Terborgh of the Machinery and Allied Products Institute. This data is contrary to the general argument that deficits encourage expansions and surpluses exert restraint since deficits are associated with weak GNP performance and surpluses with strong trends in GNP. Even when the budget position is correlated with economic trends 6 months later, the correlation shows no statistical significance. Turning to international comparisons, Michael Levy of the National Industrial Conference Board investigated budget-economic growth data for six European countries, Canada and the United States for years 1950–60. He concluded that the correlation "does not indicate any systematic relationship between budget deficits and growth. Rapid economic growth well in excess of that of the United States was associated with significant surpluses in the case of Austria, The Netherlands, and Portugal, and with substantial cumulative deficits in the case of France. Similarly, much lower rates of economic growth coincide with cumulative budget deficits for the United Kingdom and the United States." He also concluded that "limited and admittedly crude, empirical evidence presented does not support current pronouncements and prescriptions that larger deficits, as such, will almost automatically result in accelerated economic growth over the years."

In summary we must conclude that economic evidence for both the United States and foreign countries does not support the thesis that large deficits per se will stimulate economic activity and large surpluses will act as a depressant. There are two possible reasons why this should be the case: (1) The budget impact may be submerged by other factors, and (2) Federal budgets may not have the impact that is widely claimed. My own view is that if the stimulative effect of a deficit were substantial, irrespective of the method of finance, the empirical support would be stronger than is actually the case. Therefore, I am inclined to search elsewhere for the basic determinant of total private demands.

The quantity theory of money argues there is a close positive correlation between changes in money and changes in the amount of money spent by the private sector on goods and services. A recent study by Milton Friedman and David Meiselman found a 0.985 correlation between annual volumes of money and spending, and they concluded money was the major factor affecting total spending. A study by Friedman and Schwartz demonstrated that the stock of money displays systematic cyclical behavior with reduced monetary growth preceding recessions and higher monetary growth preceding recoveries. In a recent article by the author published in the April issue of the "Journal of Political Economy," it was demonstrated that a comparison between monetary growth for the seven most advanced industrial and largely free market countries and spending growth in recent years shows high rank correlation. Those countries enjoying the highest rate of monetary growth had the largest increase in gross national product and also the highest interest rates. Increased economic activity initiated by monetary growth apparently promoted high demands for funds which resulted in higher rates of interest despite the easier monetary policy. There was very little relation between monetary growth and inflation for the time span examined even though over longer periods the relation is closer. In summary the evidence appears overwhelming that monetary growth has a direct impact on private spending. The monetary hypothesis would be consistent with the deficit explanation only if in fact monetary growth variations resulted only from differing rates of new money financed deficits. However, if either the varying sized deficits were not financed with newly created money or if monetary growth rates differed because of variations in monetary expansion in the private sector of the economy, the two hypotheses would not have identical implications.

The data strongly suggest that a tax cut and resulting deficit will provide only nominal stimulus to total spending unless it is partly financed by new money. Furthermore, the data suggest that adequate monetary stimulus, similar to that existing since September of last year, would provide adequate economic stimulus to total demands even without a tax cut. Therefore, the main justification for a current tax cut resulting in a sizable deficit must be because of resulting beneficial incentive effects which will increase the capacity of the economy to produce. The recent rate of monetary expansion has been the largest we have enjoyed for many years even though the pace has slowed since January. In view of the persistent long-term relation between monetary and total private demand, I am prepared to argue that the recent substantial monetary stimulus is one of the principal reasons why the economy now appears to be getting its second wind for a renewed economic expansion. New money financing of the large deficits projected for the next 2 years should be sufficient to permit a growth rate in the money supply in excess of the approximate 1 percent average for the past 6 years but probably no more than the present 5-percent rate of monetary growth. Such an expansion in the money supply would not raise a serious inflation threat at the present time due primarily to existence of substantial excess capacity. Once the economy approaches full employment of resources, excessive monetary growth would clearly be an inflationary force.

If by constructive deficit we mean a deficit that will provide economic incentives which will increase both our capacity for production and provide a stimulus to total private demands, then the method of financing becomes a critical question. I conclude that the prospective deficit should be financed both from new money and savings and that the degree of new money financing should be sufficient to permit an annual growth rate in the money supply of from 3 to 5 percent under present economic circumstances.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE RAILROAD RULES DISPUTE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 142)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have just been informed that the message of the President of the United States on the railroad situation is in process of being read in the House, and that its reading there is nearly completed. In view of that fact, and other matters, I would hope that the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon would reconsider his previous suggestion.

Mr. MORSE. That is exactly what I was about to do. The majority leader notified me that the message was being read in the House and that its reading is about completed, which gives to it the national attention that I sought to give it. I have also been advised that many of our colleagues in the Senate were advised earlier by the leadership that after the yea-and-nay vote this afternoon there would not be any further business which would require a rollcall in the Senate. I believe they are entitled to the courteous consideration of their reliance upon the information they received. Many of them had other things to do and are not within the precincts of the Senate at the present time. I am not ever interested in an empty gesture.

The fact that the message has been read in the House and that it will be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and I believe the Senator from Montana has already asked that it be published, as I recall, and if he has not, I will ask that it be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—I withdraw my request to have it read.

I have read the message. I am delighted with it. I believe it is one of the papers of President Kennedy that will go down in the history of his Presidency as marking the high caliber of his statesmanship.

The message deals not only with the present emergency and provides a procedure for resolving the emergency without compulsion upon the parties, and keeps the full bloom of the floor of economic freedom in our country in respect to these disputes, but it also places—and rightly so—upon the Interstate Commerce Commission, the appropriate regulatory body, the jurisdiction which I think falls legitimately to the Interstate Commerce Commission in a dispute such as this. There is much more to this message from the standpoint of its historic significance than merely the specific recommendation of the President in respect to the pending railroad dispute.

We see the President again exercising a farsighted vision of statesmanship in connection with a problem which some of us have been talking about publicly for quite some months. In this message the President takes the initiative of suggesting that the Government has the responsibility in connection with helping to resolve the economic hardships and disjointures which are suffered both by management and labor in the whole field of automation, and proposes a facing up to it by the Federal Government, through the appointment of an appropriate commission to give study to it and to make recommendations which some of us have been urging for quite some time.

I am deeply moved by this magnificent demonstration of great farsightedness and keen statesmanship on the part of the President of the United States. I pledge to him anew my complete support in his gallant efforts not only to solve this railroad dispute without in the slightest degree tarnishing the great vessel of economic freedom in this country, but also in his proposal of tackling on a Federal-national basis the complex problems of automation.

I believe that out of this farsighted statesmanship of the President of the United States will come a legislative program in the months ahead which those who follow us decades hence in the Senate will be able to refer to the legislative program of this era as I referred to the legislative program of the Congress of the era of 1900 to 1920.

I am not going to renew my request for a reading of the message, but I ask unanimous consent that the message be printed at this point in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

This Nation stands on the brink of a nationwide rail strike that would, in very short order, create widespread economic chaos and distress. After more than 3½ years of constant but fruitless attempts to achieve a peaceful settlement between the parties through every private and public means available, this dispute has reached the point where only prompt and effective congressional action can assure that serious injury to the public will be prevented.

BACKGROUND OF THE CASE

This dispute is between virtually all of the Nation's major railroads and the five railroad operating brotherhoods—the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, the Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and the Switchmen's Union of North America. It involves—in addition to the more traditional issues of wage structure and fringe benefits—new and complex issues relating to changes proposed by the carriers and the brotherhoods in work rules affecting the manning of certain railroad operations and the assignments of particular crafts. The background and history of this case, the issues in dispute and the respective positions of the parties have been clearly and concisely set forth in a July 19, 1963, report unanimously signed by six tripartite members of a Special Subcommittee of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy. That report, including the appendixes, is included as an appendix to this message, and should be carefully read by all who seek the facts on this case.

Without attempting to summarize either the findings of that report or the excellent work of the other panels mentioned below, the following points are worth noting:

After the carriers on November 2, 1959, had served notice of proposed rules changes on the brotherhoods, and the brotherhoods had served notice of other proposed rules changes on September 7, 1960, and no agreement was forthcoming, both parties agreed on October 17, 1960, to submit the entire subject to a special Presidential study commission of 15 members, composed of an equal number of public, railroad, and brotherhood representatives. Following 13 months of extensive hearings and deliberations, 15,500 pages of oral testimony, and more than 300 exhibits, this Presidential Railroad Commission, under the chairmanship of Judge Simon H. Rifkind, recommended specific rules changes and employee protection provisions in a comprehensive 342-page report.

Following a Supreme Court determination that there was no legal barrier to the carriers' initiating such changes, with appropriate bargaining and recourse to the Railway Labor Act procedures, and following the continued inability of the parties to negotiate an agreement, the National Mediation Board recommended to the parties that the case be submitted to binding arbitration.

As disagreement continued and a nationwide strike threatened, an Emergency Board established pursuant to section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, under the chairmanship of Judge Samuel I. Rosenman, following its own unsuccessful efforts to mediate the dispute, made a series of recommendations designed to serve as the basis for constructive collective bargaining.

After further discussions and an extension at my request of the status quo period, the Secretary of Labor on July 5, 1963, recommended solutions for the two most controversial issues along with procedures to dispose of the rest.

On July 9, 1963, I recommended to the parties that all issues be submitted for final settlement to Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Arthur Goldberg, whose judicious temperament, expert competence, and many successes as a mediator uniquely deserved the confidence of both parties. This recommendation, and each of the preceding four sets of recommendations, were accepted by the carriers; but the brotherhoods rejected them in whole or in part.

On July 10, at my request, the parties agreed to maintain the status quo until July 29 to permit time, first, for the Labor-Management Subcommittee to examine and report the issues, and, second, for the Congress to consider this entire matter. It was my hope—and remains such—that the parties would recognize the importance of settling this dispute without resort either to legislation or to a crippling national strike. However, too little progress has been made in the past 11 days to release me from my July 10 commitment to transmit to the Congress on this date a review of the case and my recommendations for its disposition.

We face this prospect: In the absence either of an agreement, postponement or reversal of position on the part of the parties, or of enactment of some contrary measure on the part of the Congress, July 29 will almost certainly witness the start of a general rail strike. The carriers on that date can be expected to initiate work rules changes along the lines of those approved by the various panels. And the brotherhoods thereupon can be expected to strike 94 percent of the Nation's rail mileage.

THE EFFECTS OF A PROLONGED NATIONWIDE RAIL STRIKE

In the event a strike occurs it will bring widespread and growing distress.

Many industries which rely primarily on rail shipment—including coal and other mining which is dependent on rails leading directly to the mine, steel mills that ship by rail, certain chemical plants which load liquids directly into tank cars, and synthetic fiber mills dependent on chemicals which for safety reasons can be carried only in rail tank cars—all of these and others would be forced to close down almost immediately. There would not be enough refrigerated truck capacity to transport all of the west coast fruit and vegetable crop. A substantial portion of these and other perishable products would rot. Food shortages would begin to appear in New York City and other major population centers. Mail services would be disrupted. The delay, cost and confusion resulting from diverting traffic to other carriers would be extremely costly; and considerable rail traffic would be wholly incapable of diversion.

The national defense and security would be seriously harmed. More than 400,000 commuters would be hard hit.

As more and more industries exhausted their stockpiles of materials and components—including those engaged in the production of automobiles, metal products, lumber, paper, glass and others—the idling of men and machines would spread like an epidemic. Construction projects dependent on heavy materials—exports and waterway shipping dependent on rail connections—community water supplies dependent on chlorine which also moves only by rail—slaughterhouses and stockyards, iron ore, rubber and machinery, magazine publishers and transformer manufacturers—all would be hard hit by a strike. The August grain harvest would present a particular acute problem.

The Council of Economic Advisers estimates that by the thirtieth day of a general rail strike, some 6 million nonrailroad workers would have been laid off in addition to the 200,000 members of the striking brotherhoods and 500,000 other railroad employees—that unemployment would reach the 15-percent mark for the first time since 1940—and that the decline in our rate of gross national product would be nearly four times as great as the decline which occurred in this Nation's worst postwar recession.

At the same time, shortages and bottlenecks would increase prices—not only for fruits and vegetables but for many industrial materials and finished products as well—thus impairing our efforts to improve our competitive posture in foreign and domestic markets and to safeguard our balance of payments and gold reserves. And even if the strike were ended by private or congressional action on the thirtieth day, at least another month would be required before the economy would be back on its present expansion track. Indeed, a prolonged strike could well break the back of the present expansion and topple the economy into recession before the tax reductions and other measures now before the Congress for reinforcing the expansion have had a chance to take hold.

THE LEGISLATIVE SETTING

In short, the cost to the national interest of an extended nationwide rail strike is clearly intolerable. No responsible government could accept the present situation with complacency. Because in the past both sides have recognized the serious consequences involved, there have been only two brief national rail strikes in this century. The likelihood of a strike next week thus means that we are confronted with an extraordinary situation, both in terms of the impact of the strike on our economy and in terms of the issues involved. These issues, unlike those of typical wage disputes, are ones with very little collective-bargaining play left in them. The work-rules aspects of the present dispute are regarded as do-or-die matters by both parties—and the history of industrial relations shows that when employers and employees consider the issue to be this vital, they can both stand a strike much longer than the country can stand it. Therefore the parties being unable or unwilling to reach agreement or accept arbitration, and the executive branch having exhausted all statutory and other tools available, the responsibility now lies with the legislative branch.

The Congress has expressly refused to give the Executive authority to seize the railroads in time of peace and has expressly excluded railway labor from the national emergency provisions of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947. The Supreme Court has stated that the Congress is the appropriate forum for considering remedies against strikes designed to prevent the railroads from reducing employment for economic reasons. (*Telegraphers* v. *Chicago & NWR Co.*, 362 U.S. 330, 342.) When adopting the Railway Labor Act in 1926, moreover, it was contemplated that special congressional action might be required "to protect the public interest in adequate and uninterrupted transportation. If the bill does not so work so as to avoid any impairment of the public interest Congress will be unembarrassed in adopting any means it sees fit to protect the public interest." (Report of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, S. Rept. 222, 69th Cong., 1st sess., 1926.)

In 1916, the Congress set a precedent that is of interest today. As the result of a dispute over hours and wages, the railroad brotherhoods had issued a call for a nationwide rail strike; and President Wilson held a conference with the parties. When he proposed arbitration, the carriers agreed and the brotherhoods refused. When he proposed the 8-hour standard of work and wages, the brotherhoods agreed and the carriers refused. Confronted with the prospects of an early strike, the President then asked Congress to enact the 8-hour standard as an interim law pending a further report to the Congress by a special Presidential Commission. He pointed out that he had "no resources at law for compulsory arbitration, to save the commercial disaster, the property injury and the personal suffering of all if the strike was not prevented." The Interstate Commerce Commission, he stated, would protect the carriers through its rate powers against any undue cost increases resulting from this change. Congress acted promptly and effectively; and the Supreme Court (*Wilson* v. *New*, 243 U.S. 332, 333, 342, 1917), emphasizing the fact that the nature of the railroad industry required both employers and employees to defer to regulation in the public interest, held that Congress had the power to impose a settlement binding on both parties "for a reasonable time, in order that the calamity may be averted and that opportunity may be afforded the contending parties to agree upon and substitute a standard of their own."

With all of these legal, economic, and other facts in mind, this administration has given careful consideration to the kind of legislation Congress might usefully enact to meet the needs of the present situation.

Ineffective measures which would not halt an injurious nationwide rail strike have been rejected as inconsistent with the public interest.

Punitive antilabor measures which would destroy railway labor's rights to collective bargaining and reasonable job security have been rejected as harmful to the Nation and insensitive to the very real issues posed by the proposed work rule changes.

Seizure of the railroads has been rejected as unjustified in the circumstances of this case, as creating complex legal and financial problems for the Government, and as merely postponing the day of reckoning on more efficient work rules and their acceptance by the brotherhoods.

Compulsory arbitration of this dispute by a special or congressional panel has been rejected as inconsistent with the principle that solutions reached through free collective bargaining should always be permitted and preferred.

Indefinite extension of the status quo for one or both parties has been rejected as an evasion of a serious public, as well as labor-management, issue that must be squarely faced.

Our objective instead was to find a solution which—

(1) is sufficiently familiar to the Congress, in terms of the procedures and principles involved, to facilitate its prompt enactment;

(2) encourages the parties to achieve their own solutions through collective bargaining;

(3) confronts the parties, on issues where voluntary agreement is not possible, with methods and standards of solution which are comparable to those both sides have previously experienced and found acceptable;

(4) recognizes both the public interest in promoting railroad efficiency and preventing a disastrous strike and the public's concern for those adversely affected by a settlement; and

(5) provides for an interim remedy while awaiting the results of further bargaining by the parties.

RECOMMENDED LEGISLATION

As noted above, the railroad 8-hour law of 1916 provides a precedent for congressional intervention of this type; and the Interstate Commerce Act provides a pattern to which both Congress and the parties are accustomed. Recognizing that both railroad mergers and their effect on railroad employment are deeply affected with the public interest, section 5 of that act wisely supplements the results of private decision making and collective bargaining in this area with the quasi-judicial regulatory powers of the independent Interstate Commerce Commission. Proposed mergers must be passed upon by the Commission after due regard to their effect on public service and safety, the rights of employees, and other considerations. In its order of approval the Commission includes specific terms and conditions to protect the job security of the employees involved. The carriers and brotherhoods remain free to supersede these employee security provisions with their own collective bargaining agreement. The value which railroad and other unions attribute to this section was reflected in their urging that comparable provisions be included in this year's mass transportation bill; and there are such provisions in this bill as it passed the Senate and as it was reported in the House.

There is no reason why these principles and procedures, if they are applicable to the employment security problems raised by railroad mergers and mass transit modernization, are not equally applicable to the employment security problems raised by railroad modernization and mechanization. An expert body should pass on these proposed rule changes in the light of public service and safety; and it should also make provision to prevent the employees from bearing the full cost of technical or economic progress, so long as priority is given to agreements privately reached by the parties themselves.

I recommend, therefore, that—for a 2-year period during which both the parties and the public can better inform themselves on this problem and alternative approaches—interim work rules changes proposed by either party to which both parties cannot agree should be submitted for approval, disapproval, or modification to the Interstate Commerce Commission in accordance with the procedures and provisions of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act, the Commission being directed to use to advantage the work of the two previous panels which received evidence on these matters. At its discretion, the Commission may also appoint a Special Advisory Panel to assist it in the discharge of its functions. The Commission shall judge the effect of each proposed rule on the adequacy and safety of transportation service to the public and on the interests of both parties; and it shall, with the advice of the Secretary of Labor, require fair and equitable arrangements to protect the interests of the affected employees, giving proper weight to the protection provisions of section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act and those recommended by the Presidential Commission and Emergency Board reports. Emerging from the recommendations of these boards was the principle that, while many jobs would not be filled following the death, retirement, or voluntary transfer of the present occupants, every present employee with a significant attachment to the railroad industry would retain the right to his present employment or to comparable railroad employment at comparable pay. Provisions would also be made for rehiring priority, relocation expenses, displacement allowances, education and retraining grants, supplemental severance and retirement benefits, and other features. In short, no one would be thrown out in the street; and, while the railroads gradually modernized their operations, there would be little, if any, loss to individual employees.

Unlike compulsory arbitration, this method would preserve and prefer collective bargaining and give precedence to its solutions. But any strike or lockout designed to impose a rules change which has not been approved by the Commission or the parties, or to oppose one which has been approved, would be subject to the remedies of section 5(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

This procedure is most appropriate to the disposition of those rule changes involving the manning of train or engine crews—the "automation" issues, in a sense. It would build on the progress made to date in defining and refining those issues through the various panel studies and subsequent bargaining efforts.

While the disposal of those issues should be sufficient to remove the barriers to a peaceful solution of all other issues by collective bargaining between the parties, many of them are closely interrelated to the work rules changes—and I recommend that the same joint resolution of the Congress provide that either party may submit such issues to the Commission to be settled by procedures deemed appropriate by the Commission.

I stress the fact that, unlike compulsory arbitration, these procedures would provide only interim changes and only for those situations and for such length of time as the parties are unable to agree by collective bargaining. This was also true of the 1916 act. Experience with both the interim rules and these temporary procedures should enable the parties to consider in 2 years, under considerably less pressure, whatever more comprehensive and final solution is needed, if any.

This recommendation contemplates that the Nation as a whole, which shares in the benefits, would also bear part of the burden imposed by advancing railroad technology. To the extent that provision for retraining and other payments may be available to an employee under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 or other Federal statutes, the carrier will be relieved of this obligation. As Congress recognized in the readjustment provisions of the Trade Expansion Act and selective service laws, the Government has some obligation to assist those adversely affected by governmental decisions which are required in the national interest; and there is little logic in protecting the economy by methods which also lead to increased unemployment and more distressed areas. The unfairness of placing the entire burden of readjustment costs upon either the carriers or the workers is an additional reason why legislation is particularly appropriate in this case.

The combination of elements stressed in this bill—permitting progress for the carriers and assuring job security and readjustment assistance for the workers—was also stressed by both the Presidential Railroad Commission and the Emergency Board established in this case. Referring to the provisions of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act and their successful application to other areas, the Presidential Commission states:

> An adequate program to realize the benefits of advancing technology in the public interest, therefore, must include both reasonable opportunity for management to achieve change, and for workers to enjoy reasonable protection against the harsh effects of too sudden change. Progress plus protection must be our choice * * * in the case of technological improvement * * * as in the case of mergers.

The Emergency Board stated:

> We are mindful also of the necessity for progress in the railroad industry, for efficiency in order to meet the challenge of competing industries. We have sought by our recommendations to increase these prospects of the carriers, and at the same time to preserve not only strong unions for the employees, but for the individual worker a continued life of usefulness to himself and his family, and to society itself. The railroads, and society as a whole, have benefited by these changes; and they should both share generously in the burdens which have been cast upon the workers by the dislocations. These burdens, in addition to dollar payments, involve education or retraining for new jobs at the expense of the carriers, supplemented by public funds now or hereafter committed to general retraining of displaced manpower.

AUTOMATION

This brings me to the broader issue to which this message is addressed. The dispute which confronts us today has many special features—including the unusual public-interest nature of the industry, the disastrous impact of a prolonged strike, and the particular circumstances of this case. It would be wholly inappropriate to make general and permanent changes in our labor relations statutes on this basis.

It would be particularly unwise to enact a general and permanent compulsory arbitration law, which I have always opposed. The Congress contemplated, in enacting the Railway Labor Act as well as the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, that special actions by the Congress may be required as a final recourse in any individual dispute; but the automatic assurance of compulsory arbitration would encourage one or both parties to neglect their bargaining responsibilities. The measure I am recommending today, in contrast with compulsory arbitration, gives encouragement and preference to solutions reached by collective bargaining, and provides only for interim decisions. It recognizes, moreover, that disputed rules changes and their effects on employment are appropriately matters for regulation by an independent agency which has specialized knowledge of the railroad industry and possesses procedures for handling these matters.

I would be remiss in my duty, however, if I failed to note that this dispute over railroad work rules is part of a much broader national problem. Unemployment, whether created by so-called "automation," by the shift of industry to new areas, or by an overall shortage of market demand, is a major social burden.

During the past 6 years the level of unemployment has remained far too high. Men have been without jobs and factories have been without orders, primarily because the overall level of market demand has fallen short of the Nation's productive capacity. But when job opportunities are already scarce, those whom technological progress or industrial change displace are more likely than ever to join the ranks of the unemployed than to find a new job. General unemployment is thus a double burden; as it penalizes those without jobs, it also creates fear and resentment against the very kind of modernization and change upon which our economic progress must in the long run depend. This is why I have placed such heavy emphasis upon the prompt enactment of my tax proposals, designed to stimulate market demand and return the economy to full employment.

To be sure, even with full employment, economic change will still bring problems in the wake of progress. Problems will remain for workers who are displaced by advances in technology, obsolescence of their skills or their industries, inadequacy of their education or training, or geographical shifts in economic activity. These problems are not new; they are the price of progress in any dynamic society. More particularly, the phenomenon that we call "automation" is not new; technical innovation and change have been the mainspring of economic growth in this country for more than a century. Nor is there yet convincing evidence that the overall pace of such change has accelerated recently.

But seen through the magnifying lens of our general unemployment problem of the past 6 years, the difficulties faced by those who are technologically and structurally displaced from work have captured unprecedented attention; and this is as it should be. Our awareness has been mounting that it is unfair to ask particular workers—or in some instances, even particular employers—to bear the full social costs that attend such progress.

This problem is particularly but not exclusively acute in the railroad industry. Forty percent fewer employees than were employed at the beginning of this decade now handle substantially the same volume of rail traffic. The rapid replacement of steam locomotives by diesel engines for 97 percent of all freight tonnage has confronted many firemen, who have spent much of their careers in this work, with the unpleasant prospect of "human obsolescence." The introduction of self-propelled vehicles for railroad maintenance, repair, and construction work—the use of longer, heavier, faster, and more efficiently filled trains—and the initiation of centralized traffic control, electronic inspection equipment, telephonic and radio communications, and automatic switching and braking equipment have all decreased the need for railroad employment. "The Presidential Commission was established in part," it said, "because of the need to close the gap between technology and work."

That Commission recognized, however, that "revolutionary changes even for the better carry a high price in disruption that might exceed the value of the improvements."

Yet we cannot stop progress in technology or arrest economic change in transportation or any other industry—nor would we want to. For technological change has increased man's knowledge, income, convenience, leisure, and comfort. It has reinforced this Nation's leadership in scientific, economic, educational, and military endeavors. It has saved lives as well as money, and enriched society as well as business. Our task as a nation, to use the phrase of the Commission report, is simply to make sure that this public blessing is not a private curse. We cannot pretend that these changes will not occur, that some displacement will not result or that we are incapable of adapting our legislative tools to meet this problem.

While last year's Manpower Development and Training Act recognized the Federal Government's responsibility to help retrain and readjust workers who have been displaced by industrial change, as do this year's vocational education proposals, their scope is too limited to provide the full answer to a problem of this magnitude. The problems of manpower displacement, of which automation is only one cause, should not be settled primarily by the use of private economic power and pressure, or discussed only on the picket lines. They cut across many departments of Government, all types of occupations, all standards of income, all sections of the country. Their solution is of importance to the entire Nation which now enjoys all the benefits of economic progress but, except when it is part of the employee group affected, now bears very little of its burdens.

For these reasons, it is my intention to appoint a Presidential Commission on Automation, composed of the ablest men in public and private life, and charged with the responsibility of—

(1) identifying and describing the major types of worker displacement, both technological and economic, which are likely to occur during the next 10 years, and the social and economic effects of these developments on our economy, our manpower, our communities, our families, and our social structure and human values; and

(2) recommending, in addition to those actions which are the responsibility of State and local government and private management and labor, specific administrative and legislative steps to be taken by the Federal Government in meeting its responsibility to share the costs and alleviate the losses of auto-

mation job-displacement, in such a way as to assure both the continued advance of our technology and the continued well-being of our people.

This Commission should undertake the most comprehensive review of this complex and many-sided subject ever ventured, and report no later than the close of next year. Its report must pioneer in the social, political, and economic aspects of automation to the same extent that our science and industry have pioneered in its physical aspects. For the pending railroad dispute is likely the first of many, and a comprehensive long-range policy will be needed. I have no doubt, let me add, that such a policy will embody the basic elements of the measure recommended today—encouraging the advance of technology while protecting the security of the workers, encouraging private bargaining while protecting the public interest.

Thus the prompt enactment of this measure by the Congress will help launch a new national effort to meet the growing challenge of worker displacement by technological and economic change. Both the proposed bill and the new Commission are actions that will benefit both labor and management—but above all, they will benefit the public interest, and that is our primary test.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 22, 1963*.

EMPHYSEMA—WHEN THE BREATH OF LIFE FALTERS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, to those of our colleagues who smoke like chimneys and to those who have had the ill fortune to live most of their lives in urban areas where clusters of great chimneys smoke, I commend an invitation issued this week by two congressional leaders devoted to the cause of public health: the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and his House colleague, Representative KENNETH A. ROBERTS. They have invited each Member of Congress to take advantage of the facilities of the new mobile unit developed by the 31 Alabama Tuberculosis Associations and the Medical College of Alabama, to detect the lung disease—emphysema.

Emphysema is not yet a household word. But this disease, the maker of breathless cripples, has emerged during the past 2 or 3 years from relative obscurity to be identified as a major public health scourge.

There are as yet no comprehensive statistics on the incidence of emphysema. It is not one of the diseases for which we have a reliable index. However, the State of California has recorded a 300-percent increase in the incidence of emphysema in an 8-year period. There is no reason to believe that this increase is restricted to California.

Speaking in Portland recently, Dr. Irving Kass, coordinator for medical education at the National Jewish Hospital in Denver, said:

> In the older age group we know now that almost one-half of the people who come to post mortem examination have some emphysema.

Also, Dr. Edward Ernest Rockey, the noted chest surgeon, estimates that 10 million Americans suffer from emphysema.

Emphysema is characterized by the blockage of the air passages in the lungs and the consequent ballooning and loss of elasticity in the air-sacs of the lungs. Its effect upon the lives of its victims is graphically cataloged in a public affairs pamphlet by Jules Saltman:

> Whether he exercises or not, the victim pants for air, awake or sleeping, working or resting. He may cough continuously. His life becomes a moment-by-moment struggle to take in life-giving oxygen and expel carbon dioxide.
>
> As he steadily loses headway in the fight, the individual may have to give up work completely. Then almost all activity may stop. Next, he will need medical help to breathe—lung-clearing drugs or oxygen for a few minutes at certain times every day; then perhaps more oxygen for longer periods.
>
> In the end, the breath of life may fail altogether. This may happen of itself, but usually it will be in the course of an acute infection—bronchitis, pneumonia, or a severe cold. It may be brought on by such an external event as a heavy pollution-laden fog. Such episodes of acute air pollution have in the past brought death to lung cripples in London, England, in Donora, Pa., and elsewhere.
>
> Very often it is neither the lungs nor the laboring muscles of the chest and neck that weary of their hopeless task and give up. It is the heart. The human heart is a mighty pump, when its own muscles, along with those of the body, are starved for oxygen.

Mr. Saltman also examines the evidence as to the causes of emphysema, singling out above all the rest, air pollution and smoking.

Mr. President, I have introduced in the Senate a comprehensive air pollution control bill, and Representatives ROBERTS has introduced in the House a similar bill which has now been reported by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and is awaiting floor action. We are indeed hopeful that the the Roberts-Neuberger "Clear Air Act" will become law this year and that we may then begin to see an end to environmental pollution of our lungs, and thus brake the spiralling rise in lung-diseases such as lung-cancer and emphysema.

It is clear however, that even a massive assault upon urban air pollution will be ineffectual unless we are likewise capable of mounting a comparable public health program to discourage the individual air pollution of cigarette smoking.

Again let me commend Senator HILL and Representative ROBERTS for making the mobile emphysema detection unit available to us. I intend to take advantage of this facility. I earnestly hope that all Members of Congress will do likewise.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a portion of Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 326 on the subject of emphysema.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT CAUSES EMPHYSEMA?

> Like today's greatest killer, heart disease, the growing curse of emphysema may be a byproduct of our prosperity. Our industries are expanding in every part of the country, and we own and operate more and more cars and trucks—adding constantly to the pollution of the air we breathe. We also smoke an ever-swelling mountain of tobacco.
>
> Moreover, we have escaped triumphantly from many killing diseases of the past. More people now live to advanced ages, giving our hearts the time to wear out; and our lungs, too. Emphysema is a result, as far as we know, not of any particular germ or accident, but of the accumulated effect of all the lung ailments we have managed to live through, as well as the vast volume of bad air we have breathed.
>
> We do not know exactly what causes the damage to air sacs and bronchioles that adds up to emphysema, but we have plenty of suspicions. It seems logical that the many infections that can attack the lungs—colds, pneumonia, influenza, and particularly the severe, unrelenting, year-in and year-out onslaughts of chronic bronchitis, bronchial asthma, tuberculosis and others—may cause permanent damage of this sort.
>
> Infections, themselves temporary, that attack the walls of the smallest bronchi may inflame and swell the wall tissues and block the passages, starting the process of trapped air that does permanent damage. The same effect may come from the scarring caused by chronic infections and diseases such as TB, silicosis and sarcoidosis,
>
> Since age is apparently a factor in the development of emphysema, we must suppose that there are changes that take place with time. A stiffening of all the tissues, perhaps, and a loss of muscle elasticity add to the trouble themselves as well as inviting or permitting the destructive effects of other causes, such as infections. With age, too, the body's ability to repair damage may decrease. Such changes may be related to the hormones, the powerful substances that are the products of the master glands of the body; time as well as many ills may affect the glands.
>
> It is probable, many experts think, that an inborn tendency to damage may help determine who gets emphysema and who doesn't. Some doctors have noticed that it runs in families.
>
> Most patients with emphysema, while they cannot remember any point—or even the year—when their shortness of breath began, can usually recite a long history of repeated winter colds and coughs. These ailments then merged into a permanent condition, chronic bronchitis. And emphysema was the final step.
>
> Yet sometimes the fully developed condition is preceded by no more than "simple common cold," according to Dr. Maurice S. Segal of Tufts Medical School, Boston. Occasionally a man in his forties who is of the "driving" type and smokes a great deal develops a rapidly progressive dry emphysema with no previous signs of trouble.

WHAT ABOUT POLLUTED AIR?

> When we breathe polluted air we are taking foreign bodies into the lungs. It seems hardly to be questioned that such invaders will cause trouble.
>
> We have no direct evidence that the type of damage called emphysema is specifically caused by any of the numerous pollutants that may be in the air. Yet it is a fact that one of the diseases known to be caused by polluted air invariably has emphysema as one of its final conditions. This is silicosis, suffered by miners and others working without protection in rock dust.
>
> Scientists have studied the lungs after death by fixing them with a bath of chemical fumes and then cutting them into thin slices. Even in supposedly healthy lungs, streaks of black carbon have been found in the lung tissues. Generally the typical holes and tissue stretching of emphysema are found nearby (even though emphysema may not have been detected while the patient lived).

Carbon itself is not harmful to lung tissue, but it has a great affinity for other chemicals, absorbing them readily. At least one lung specialist believes that the acids and other corrosive materials carried into the lungs by carbon dust may eat away enough tissue to start the process of the breaking down of the air sac walls.

Not all air pollutants are acid or corrosive in nature, however. It may be argued that few people, even in the smokiest cities, come in contact with enough airborne corrosives to eat away appreciable amounts of lung tissue. But there are other mechanisms by which air impurities may work:

They may interfere with the normal protective and cleansing devices of the lung tissue, making it more susceptible to attack by bacteria and viruses. Or they may constrict the bronchioles, or inflame them, or increase mucus production or in other ways cause the bronchioles to become obstructed, to lose muscle tone, and to deteriorate. Or certain impurities may cause an allergic reaction in the tissues, with swelling and mucus formation within the lungs much like the reactions in the nose caused by hay fever.

In industries where dusts abound, such as mining, it is hardly surprising that emphysema also abounds. But actually, with regard to this growing problem, industrial injury "must be assigned a relatively minor and contributory role," says Dr. Roger S. Mitchell of the University of Colorado School of Medicine.

Much more significant, according to Dr. Mitchell and many of his colleagues among chest specialists, is the bad air we all breathe, whether we are factory workers or office workers, especially if we live in cities. Dr. Mitchell recently presented to a scientific gathering the results of two Denver studies indicating the great frequency of emphysema in individuals living in urban centers but not exposed to industrial or mining dusts in their occupations.

One of the studies, of 172 bank employees, showed significant symptoms of early emphysema in 24 percent. Similar symptoms were found in 11 percent of 194 medical students.

Many statistics have been gathered showing a relationship between the kind of air we breathe—city or country—and the amount of lung disease of all kinds, including emphysema, that we suffer. In England, a map showing the location of deaths from chronic bronchitis (which, in English terminology, includes what we call emphysema) looks much like a target, with its black center in the heart of industrial Lancashire and the shading growing lighter as it spreads outward through the commercially busy Midlands and the mining communities of Wales to the rural areas of the north and south.

The only area outside of the Midlands and its neighboring counties similarly shaded is a spot in the south representing London. A detailed map of the metropolis and its suburbs shows the same target formation again, with the bull's-eye in the ancient "city."

WHAT ABOUT SMOKING?

Like other kinds of impurities in the air we breathe, tobacco smoke has never actually been proved to be a direct cause of emphysema. But, like other air pollution, it is hard to disregard smoking, particularly of cigarettes, as a factor.

In some studies, more than 9 out of every 10 patients with emphysema admitted that they were heavy smokers (using more than a pack of cigarettes a day). In a study in South Wales of men with lung disease, it was found that a great proportion were miners rather than nonminers. But even greater was the proportion of those who were smokers rather than nonsmokers.

On the other hand, some heavy smokers do not get emphysema and some patients who do have never smoked in their lives. But doctors who point to these facts concede that smoking is certainly a factor, even if only one of many, in the cause of the disease. Says Dr. Wright, "Smoking may play a role as an aggravant and in this way accelerate the time at which emphysema becomes manifest."

All physicians in this field agree that if anything is done to prevent and control emphysema, cutting down on smoking or eliminating it altogether should certainly be a first step. A smoker suffering from the breathlessness of emphysema almost always gets some relief if he gives up smoking.

VISIT BY MEMBERS OF THE SENATE TO BERLIN AND SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, together with other Senators, I had the privilege last fall of visiting Berlin and southeast Asia at the request of President Kennedy. I ask unanimous consent that the text of a letter from the President dated October 16, 1962, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 16, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MIKE: As you know, the administration keeps our foreign relations under continuous review in an effort to insure the highest degree of effectiveness of our foreign policies and the efficiency of expenditures related to their administration. While we have a constant flow of information through executive branch channels, it is useful to have a review of these matters through congressional eyes from time to time.

Might I prevail upon you, therefore, to undertake to visit selected areas of major significance to U.S. policy, prior to the next Congress. I had in mind, particularly, Berlin and Vietnam and other nations in the southeast Asian region. It would be most helpful if you were to travel in the company of several Members of the Senate from both parties and provide me with such observations on these situations and our policies and overseas administration as you and your colleagues would care to make.

I know that it has been a taxing session for you and other Members of the Senate. Nevertheless, if you see your way clear to comply with this request, please feel free to proceed at your leisure during the coming weeks. I should be happy to have the Departments of State and Defense assist in every appropriate way in facilitating a Senate study of this kind.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as a consequence of this journey, I made a written, confidential report to the President and another to the Secretary of State, both of which were generally concurred in by the other members of the group. An oral report of a confidential nature was also given to Mr. Shriver on the status of the Peace Corps in the countries visited. In addition, two public reports of the group as a whole, one entitled "Berlin in a Changing Europe" and a second entitled "Vietnam and Southeast Asia" were submitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations and published by that committee.

As a followup, the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and I requested the Department of State to keep us informed of developments bearing upon the observations and findings as contained in the two published reports and we have had most courteous and helpful response to our continuing interest.

I should also like to note that at my request the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] visited Samoa. He has now reported to me on his findings in that American territory. I made this request because it seemed to me that Mr. INOUYE was singularly equipped by his profound understanding of the history and development of Hawaii and by his great empathy for the island people of the South Pacific to give us a fresh insight into the situation in Samoa. His excellent report is now available and should be of great help in the design of territorial policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that "American Samoa Report for 1961–63" as prepared by Senator DANIEL K. INOUYE be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
July 12, 1963.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Majority Leader,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: As a great friend of American Samoa, I know you share with me my interest in that American community some 2,300 miles south of Hawaii.

You will recall that I made my first visit to American Samoa on December 11, 1962.

Although my stay was necessarily short, I was able to see much of the main island of Tutuila and to talk freely with several hundred residents. On frequent occasions I have had long talks with Gov. H. Rex Lee of American Samoa and have been in communication with members of the Samoan Legislature and officials of the administration in American Samoa.

I was deeply impressed with the tremendous rate of progress made since decisions were made in Washington to improve conditions in American Samoa.

I am therefore, honored to present to you my report on American Samoa for 1961–63.

Respectfully,

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
U.S. Senator.

AMERICAN SAMOA REPORT FOR 1961–63

(By Senator DANIEL K. INOUYE)

PREFACE

American Samoa is rapidly becoming a showplace in the South Pacific. Here at last we are beginning to show what the United States can do in an underdeveloped area.

It was only 2 years ago that a valuable report prepared by former Senator Oren E. Long of Hawaii and Senator ERNEST GRUENING of Alaska revealed the extent of long neglect of these islands by one administration after another in Washington.

That report prompted fast action by the Department of the Interior and firm support in the form of a greatly enlarged budget by the Congress.

In the past 18 months a crash program directed by the very able Gov. H. Rex Lee has been in effect. Nearly impossible program schedules have been met and surpassed. The Samoan people have not only enthusiastically participated in the program but, spurred by our new interest in their islands, have launched some other improvement programs without any Federal support.

The program will not only make American Samoa a better place for natives of American Samoa, but will naturally attract many more tourists from the United States and other countries.

The real concern now is whether the fruits of this mass rehabilitation program can be preserved for the Samoan people. This is the aim of the present economic development program planned by Governor Lee and his administration.

Should the Samoan people be exploited by outside business interests or by a few long term island residents who have long enjoyed complete economic domination of the islands, U.S. prestige in the South Pacific, despite our best intentions, could suffer a serious setback.

We must now let the Samoans, using the tools and facilities we have given them, develop the islands in their own best interests.

This will take time, patience, understanding and more assistance.

In the long run, however, we will drive home the true message of our democracy to the many diverse peoples of the Pacific and bury the myth of colonialism forever.

REPORT ON AMERICAN SAMOA—1961–63

H. Rex Lee, a career employee in the Department of the Interior, was appointed Governor of American Samoa in May 1961, by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall. The new Governor had wide experience in territorial administration and in dealing with underdeveloped areas and minority groups.

Three weeks after his inauguration, Governor Lee returned to Washington with a $26 million 3-year rehabilitation program for Samoa, the first phase of which was immediately adopted by the administration and sent to Congress as a $5 million deficiency appropriation. Several weeks later the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee issued the Long-Gruening report, which pointed out in detail how utterly the United States had failed to consider the economic and social needs of American Samoa since its cession to the United States in 1900. During the same month the Reader's Digest published an indictment of the United States neglect of Samoa with an article in the July issue, entitled "Samoa—America's Shame in the Pacific." Several months later the National Broadcasting Co. did a short television report on Samoa that followed the same theme, even though the new Governor's rehabilitation program was well underway at the time of the actual showing. Both the Reader's Digest article and the NBC show invoked thousands of letters of protest over the treatment of Somoa.

The following is a brief summary of the major problems and developments in American Samoa since the new administration took over the latter part of May 1961.

Education

Samoa did not have a public school system until the 1920's and it has never had an adequate system. While the majority of Samoans have spent several years in school, few can use the English language fluently and very few have been educated beyond the high school level. In 1961 the new administration found the following school system:

Elementary schools: Approximately 50 elementary schools staffed by Samoan teachers who had the equivalent of a fifth to sixth grade education. In the use of the English language, many were as low as the second grade level. Most of the classrooms were in native houses with little, if any, equipment.

Intermediate schools: There were five junior high schools with essentially the same conditions found in the grade schools, except that one school had one stateside-certified teacher.

High school: One high school, established in 1946, was large enough to take only one-third of the students graduated from junior high school. Students were accepted on the basis of grades and competitive examinations.

A large backlog of students clamored for a high school education but could not receive it. While the teachers were stateside-certified, their salary was only $3,800 per year with no security or pension system. There were a few good teachers but the general quality was poor because of working conditions and salary.

The following steps were taken to improve the situation:

Elementary schools: Twenty new consolidated schools are now being built to replace the 50 village schools. The Samoan teachers are being retained to supervise the classrooms under a system of educational television, now being built and scheduled for completion in early 1964. With this system a few outstanding teachers from the United States will teach directly over television and the Samoan teachers will monitor, maintain order, and feed back questions and suggestions to the studio. In this manner the Samoan teachers, as well as the students, will be upgraded in their level of education. This is a bold new experiment which will use educational television more extensively than it has ever been used before. The only alternative to this system would be to release most of the Samoan teachers and bring in large numbers of stateside personnel at much greater cost and with accompanying social readjustment problems.

Intermediate schools: The same improvement program as that for the elementary schools.

High school: Three new high school buildings and a large auditorium were completed by midsummer 1962 with approximately 40 new high school teachers recruited for classroom instruction. By September 1962, for the first time in the history of American Samoa, there was a school seat for every high-school-age student on the islands. As the television system becomes operational some of the stateside teachers will be replaced by Samoan teachers and there will be a greater dependence on direct television teaching. The television system has been designed so that adjoining Western Samoa, which is now an independent state with 116,000 inhabitants, can tune in on the system and enjoy its advantages. Their educational problems are similar to American Samoa's and if they use the system, it will save them a great deal of money and give them a good educational system. The kingdom of Tonga is also exploring the possibility of setting up relay pickup stations to tune in on the system.

The immediate problem is to find enough workers and technical assistants to complete the schools and television system in time for full operation by the end of this coming school year. Salaries for the stateside teachers were increased from $3,800 to an average of $6,100. But because of late recruiting, budget timing of raises, and inadequate screening procedures, some of the recent recruits were either poor quality teachers or unable to adjust to island living. Four teaching couples were released and a few more are still dissatisfied or inadequate. By the next school year the Government plans to complete an agreement with certain school districts in Honolulu and on the West Coast for the loan of outstanding teachers for a 2-year duty in American Samoa. Once the educational television system is put into use its six channels will be used after school hours for adult education. Programs will deal with sanitation, agricultural science, preventative medicine, self-government. A limited amount of amusement programs will be offered to assist in the teaching of English.

The Governor is optimistic that once the system becomes operational, Samoa will have a school system that will compare favorably with the better stateside school districts.

Health

Until 1961 a fair health program was carried out in American Samoa. Contract physicians from the United States mainland worked for the Governemnt and treated everyone at little or no cost. The 200-bed hospital, a temporary structure built during the war years, provided a hospital for the entire population. While most ailments were handled reasonably well, little was done on health problems requiring specialized treatment.

During the last 18 months many outstanding surgeons and other specialists from Hawaii and the mainland have been brought to American Samoa at Government expense and have donated their time performing many thousands of dollars worth of free operations and other treatments. Arrangements have also been made to take many special cases to Hawaii for treatment. Recently, following a plea from the Governor, the University of California at Los Angeles agreed to provide doctors to supervise a program for the eradication of filariasis, which causes the dreaded elephantiasis. Lederle Laboratories will provide the necessary drugs without charge.

The fiscal year 1964 budget, which is now before Congress, contains construction funds for a new 200-bed hospital and additional medical personnel. This will give American Samoa an excellent health service which can be used as a treatment center by many other islanders in the general vicinity. This budget also contains money to build a sewer system in the Pago Pago bay area, now highly polluted by raw sewage dumped directly into the bay. Funds for construction material and supervisory help sufficient to provide local sanitation systems in all of the villages in American Samoa are also included. Manual labor will be provided by the villages. The Governor is encouraging various medical groups to conduct research in tropical diseases in American Samoa with the idea of providing leadership for other South Pacific islands by showing them what health and sanitation measures are effective.

Matai system

Much has been written and said about the matai system. When the present Governor was appointed, many people in the United States and Hawaii and a great number of Samoans, expressed the hope that something would be done about replacing the system.

Samoa's basic economic and political unit is the extended family, composed of related kin tracing their origins bilaterally back through the generations of mythological ancestors. Within their extended group, which is administered by a matai or chief, a collective family economy prevails. The matai is responsible for control of family lands and property and represents the family in the political affairs of village, county, and district councils. He is responsible for the welfare of the family and is trustee of family lands and property. This has been modified through the years to a point where personal property is no longer administered by the matai, and some property is individually owned except that disposition to other than Samoans is restricted.

After a short period in American Samoa, the Governor decided that it would be folly to attempt to abolish the matai system or, for that matter, to change it radically. After almost 2 years in Samoa, he still feels that any attempt to force the Samoans into a different political and social system might well produce utter chaos.

In some respects, the system is as democratic as some of our local political systems and every day it is changing and becoming more democratic and more adaptable to new methods and ideas. It is an extremely flexible system which the Governor believes can be used as the instrument to develop a truly modern form of democratic government. The inequities that have existed in the system are gradually disappearing under a new code of laws now being formulated by the legislature, with the assistance of the Governor and his staff. Within the system it will be necessary to define more clearly the individual land rights that are now claimed but this is only a routine matter of surveying and recording.

With the establishment of the outstanding educational television system any inequities that exist in the matai system should disappear as a result of gradual evolution and education.

The Governor is emphatic in his belief that one cannot suddenly force upon any people a new system of government or culture, but rather that the people have to make the changes themselves over a period of time as they seek the advantages of such changes. This process is now taking place in American Samoa.

Citizenship

American Samoans are proud of their ties with the United States. They are very loyal to the United States and any suggestion that they might someday prefer independence or unite with Western Samoa, which is now an independent state, is very distasteful to them.

For the past 2 or 3 years they have discussed the possibility of becoming American citizens, instead of continuing in their present status as nationals. The legislature has petitioned within the last year that U.S. citizenship be considered. During the month of December 1962, the chairman of the House Insular Affairs Committee, Congressman WAYNE N. ASPINALL, and his Chief Counsel, Mr. T. Richard Witmer, spent 2 weeks in American Samoa in company with the Governor to discuss and consider the possibility of citizenship for the American Samoans.

The legislature, representatives of the local government, and the hereditary chiefs, all seem to be in agreement that they would like citizenship, provided that some formula could be found under which they would be able to retain their land base. They are fearful lest their change of status will make their lands salable to outsiders who may come to Samoa and acquire all of their lands as outsiders did in Hawaii years ago. They are presently groping for a formula which will provide citizenship and yet permit them to retain the land controls that they consider most necessary. The Governor and the administration are sympathetic to the need for retaining land controls. As recent experience indicates, because of the lack of education most Samoans would rapidly lose their land and would eventually be relegated to poverty in the area.

Many people have suggested a reunion of the two Samoas. Many Western Samoans would like this but American Samoans are completely opposed and consider such a proposal an insult to their Americanism. At the time of Western Samoa's independence, the Soviets tried to exploit the division of the two Samoas by hinting that all that was needed now was for Samoa (Western Samoa) to get back the rest of her territory (American Samoa). Because of the friendly and close relationship that the present Governor has with Western Samoa's Chiefs of State and Prime Minister, there appears to be no danger that this could become an issue. We must encourage this very friendly and helpful relationship to continue.

Economic Development in American Samoa

At the time the administration took over American Samoa there was only one industry, the Van Camp Tuna Co., Inc. This corporation purchased fish from Japanese fishing companies, and the cannery employed approximately 300 Samoans, mostly women, to process the fish. The remainder of the population was on an agricultural subsistence economy or worked for the territorial government. Opportunities for young people were virtually nonexistent. This, in addition to the failure to get into high school, caused a substantial majority of the young people to migrate to Hawaii or west coast cities on graduation from junior high school.

With the present large scale rehabilitation of the islands, American Samoa has become a more attractive place to live.

In the last 8 months, the Governor has concluded negotiations with three new industries which will provide a combined total exceeding the number of private jobs which previously existed on the island. These three consist of:

A new processing plant that will process fresh coconuts from the American Samoan island, Western Samoa, and the Kingdom of Tonga.

Star-Kist Samoa, Inc., an additional tuna packing company, similar to the one that is in operation.

The American Can Co. which will manufacture tin cans for the tuna industry and provide, the Governor hopes, a source of containers for tropical fruit and vegetable canners.

The most promising field for commercial development, however, is the tourist industry. Shortly after the Governor was inaugurated and after discussion with the Samoan leaders, it was agreed that American Samoa should embark on a tourist industry development program. The Governor spent his first year trying to encourage private hotel developers to move into the area. While several entered into negotiations, none were willing to complete the negotiations on terms that the Governor considered were reasonable to the Samoan people.

In June of last year, the Governor proposed to the Samoan people that they organize a Samoan Development Corporation through which they could build and own their own hotels. In this way they could reserve all of the small related enterprises that go along with hotel development for their own people, such as fishing boat operations, barber shops, gift and curio shops, laundry and pressing shops, U-drive operations, duty-free shops, etc.

The corporation has been formed and over $250,000 in cash has been pledged in the form of stock certificates at $10 per share. The stock ownership is limited to Samoans with at least 50 percent Samoan blood. Virtually all subscribers consist of the average wage earner and in many instances, stock has been purchased through their meager savings. There are over 1,000 owners of this stock. The Samoan leaders have pledged that their people will supply the labor and whatever materials and land are required for the hotel construction. The cost will be financed through stock certificates.

A Polynesian style 100-room cottage type hotel is in the design stage and a prototype of the first cottage is under construction by Samoan carpenters.

Shortly after the Samoan Development Corporation was launched, several west coast firms became interested in American Samoa and offered to build a large hotel in American Samoa. The Governor refused their request and advised them that the Samoans wished to reserve this field of development for themselves, but with the understanding that if in the future the Samoans were unable to complete their financial arrangements, outside development would be considered.

With the inauguration of jet service through American Samoa, demands from outsiders to build hotels increased greatly. There were literally hundreds of requests from people wanting to take advantage of the new opportunities offered as a result of the vast rehabilitation program carried out by this administration. The Governor is holding most of these requests in reserve to first determine whether it is possible to start the Samoans in these businesses through the Samoan Development Corporation. The Governor and the Samoan people feel very strongly that there is no particular advantage in overrunning the islands with small businesses owned by nonresidents if the Samoans are simply going to be relegated to jobs as busboys and waitresses.

The great mass of the Samoan people are strongly behind the Governor in this program but there is some opposition. Most of it comes from the business community which has organized a chamber of commerce that is quite critical of the Governor's administration.

The chamber of commerce newsletter charged recently that the administration in America Samoa is guilty of racial discrimination by sponsoring the American Samoan Development Corporation which may engage in various businesses, including the construction of one or more tourist hotels.

A person may not purchase or own shares in the corporation unless he has at least 50 percent Samoan blood.

Governor Lee, however, is anxious to avoid a repetition of the history of Hawaii where immigrants eventually gained title to most of the valuable land in the islands. I share his belief that we must take every step we can, within the limits of the law, to protect the Samoan people at this time.

Virtually the entire Samoan community, including the legislature, has backed the Governor, however.

Tax policy

Down through the decades, Samoa has had a very archaic, inadequate, and discriminatory tax policy. While a little less than half a million dollars has been raised by taxes and duties, the vast majority has been raised by a high import duty on food, clothing, and other essential items imported into the islands. There has been a 2-percent gross business tax, which was simply passed on to the customer as a sales tax. As a result, the cost of living has been high and has hit those persons who could least afford to pay. No income tax or other personal tax of any consequence was levied, except a $10 poll or head tax. The equivalent of the United States income tax, which was imposed on Guam and also the Virgin Islands, did not apply to American Samoa. The Governor had tax experts from the Treasury Department study the problem and after receiving their report, he called, in January 1962, a special session of the legislature and proposed that it do away with the gross business tax, the import duties on food and other items of necessity, and in place of these taxes substitute the U.S. income tax as a Samoan income tax. After 13 days of heated debate the Samoan Legislature passed the Governor's tax program by a vote of 14 to 1 in the senate and 12 to 5 in the house. The tax measure was bitterly opposed by the merchants, who had been essentially tax free and some of whom were in the $50,000-or-more income bracket down through the years.

The fact that the Samoan people were willing to tax themselves rather than have the U.S. Congress levy a tax, as it had done in Guam and the Virgin Islands, indicates the spirit of cooperation that they have in working with the administration.

Public works and utilities

When Governor Lee obtained the first big appropriation to start the rehabilitation program and to get the islands into a decent condition before the 1962 South Pacific Conference, less than a year away, he was immediately faced with the problem of obtaining additional technical presonnel to carry out the large-scale public works program.

Neither the Director of Airport Construction nor the Director of Public Works was a trained engineer. As a matter of fact, there was not a trained engineer on the islands.

Rather than attempt to recruit a large permanent technical staff for the rehabilitation program, the Governor relied heavily on borrowing experts from various Government agencies, in the field of construction; he went to the Navy and made an arrangement with the 14th Naval District in Honolulu whereby the Navy was to supply him with the technical personnel needed to carry out the construction program. The Navy cooperated enthusiastically by sending top-flight personnel to assist. Since this time, the Navy has continued to provide such service and has given the Governor much assistance over and above that which could normally be expected under a reimbursable agreement.

This is quite a change over the past decade. When the Navy turned over administration of the islands to the Department of the Interior in 1951, there was a very sharp break in relationship. The Navy pulled out completely and had virtually nothing to do with the islands until 1½ years ago. Since that time there has been a very close working relationship. They have had many ships visit the area and have rendered a great variety of assistance. The goal of the present administration is to assist all U.S. agencies that might have needs in this part of the world by making adequate facilities available to them in Samoa. Last year the Samoan Government gave support to the Atomic Energy Commission, Pacific Missile Range, and numerous other groups that need to cover the South Pacific area.

Roads: In mid-1961 when the administration took over there was only one-half a mile of paved road on the island. Most of the roads were primitive and discouraged tourists or any type of development. A modern two-lane asphalt road has been programed from one end of the main island to the other and at the present time is nearing completion. Branch roads to the inland areas are being built. By the end of next year Samoa will have a good basic road system.

Airport: In 1956 the Government of American Samoa started building a jet strip and by mid-1961 this was approximately 40 percent complete. The strip was completed by mid-1962 and the first jet landed during the Fifth South Pacific Conference bringing Secretary Udall and the Washington delegation to that important Conference. In December, Pan American inaugurated through jet service from Honolulu to Sydney using Pago Pago International as the halfway stop. In recent months MATS has been using the field in the Deep Freeze operation runs and eventually the strip should provide a very important base for all U.S. South Pacific air operations. The Samoan Government is trying to interest commercial airlines to use this as a stop and it hopes to develop Pago Pago International Airport as the crossroads of the Pacific. A modern new airport terminal is now under construction and should be completed by the end of the year.

Power: The island of Tutuila has had a very archaic power system, which frequently broke down and discouraged any type of industrial development. By mid-1962 the powerplant had been replaced by a modern diesel-electric plant and power service is being extended to most of the villages in American Samoa, whereas formerly only the Pago Pago Bay area had electricity. Because of the new industrial plants and the proposed hotel development the level of power capacity of the new generating plant is being tripled within the present calendar year.

Water: While Samoa has a high rainfall average (200 inches per year) there has been insufficient water to serve new industry. Water resources have been surveyed and additional reservoir and pipelines are provided for in the present budget.

Communications: The communications system has been completely outmoded, with its rundown World War II surplus equipment. Recently this equipment has been upgraded by the addition of surplus equipment from the mainland and the present budget contains funds for a modern communications system. Presently the Government of American Samoa is in the final stage of negotiations with A.T. & T. of San Francisco to operate a direct telephone system to the Pago Pago Bay area.

Harbor improvements: While the Pago Pago Harbor is one of the finest in the South Pacific, very little has been done to improve the harbor since World War II days. Much needed dock repair has been made in the last 6 months and the present budget contains funds for a new dock, which is necessary for all of the new commercial development.

APPENDIX

PHYSICAL FACTS (FROM S. DOC. NO. 38, 87TH CONG.)

Samoa is a group of 14 volcanic tropical islands below the Equator some 1,600 miles east and north of New Zealand, and 2,200 miles southwest of Hawaii. The six islands of this archipelago east of longitude 171 degrees west, together with Swains Island, constitute Eastern or American Samoa and are under the sovereignty of the United States. The islands west of the meridian are Western Samoa, and are now independent.

The total area of American Samoa is but 76 square miles, and most of that is mountainous. Thus, in land area, Eastern Samoa is about the size of the District of Columbia. Its population, as of April 1, 1960, was 20,051. The Eastern Samoans are American nationals, as distinct from U.S. citizens. Natural resources, other than the excellent harbor of Pago Pago, the scenic beauty of a tropical South Sea isle, and an equable tropic climate, are meager. There are no known mineral deposits; the amount of arable land is extremely limited. Because of inadequate and undeveloped storage facilities, water is sometimes in such short supply as to require use limitation, although rainfall approximates 200 inches a year.

Western Samoa has a land area of 1,133 square miles, and a population of more than 100,000. The amount of arable land is substantial. The capital of Eastern Samoa, Pago Pago, and that of Western Samoa, Apia, are about 77 miles apart.

Ethnically, the population of both Samoas is Polynesian, with little mixture of other strains. They are a bronze-skinned, large-bodied, hearty people, possessed of true dignity, yet friendly and hospitable. Their language is considered the oldest Polynesian tongue in existence, and is closely related to the Maori of New Zealand and the Hawaiian.

HISTORY

Relationship between Samoa and the United States goes back to 1838, when the American Navy lieutenant, Charles Wilkes, made a survey of the islands. In 1872 an agreement was concluded with the Samoan chiefs of Tutuila, which gave the United States exclusive rights to the harbor of Pago Pago, one of the finest in the South Seas. For many years, Pago Pago was a highly strategic coaling station for the U.S. Navy in the South Pacific. It was the locale of Somerset Maugham's celebrated play "Rain."

At the same time, however, Britain and Germany were obtaining commercial concessions in the Samoan Islands and the rights and privileges asserted by the three nations there became the subject of misunderstandings and controversies. In 1899, the three nations resolved their differences by treaty under which the signatories recognized the claims of the United States to the islands east of the 171st meridian, while Germany's claims were recognized in the islands west of the meridian.

In 1900 and in 1904, the Samoan chiefs voluntarily ceded the islands of Eastern Samoa to the United States. Nearly three decades elapsed before Congress took cognizance of this cession. In February 1929, the 70th Congress adopted a resolution accepting the islands as of the time they were ceded. Of special interest is the section of this public law which states:

"(c) Until Congress shall provide for the government of such islands, all civil, judicial, and military powers shall be vested in such person or persons and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct; and the President shall have power to remove said officers and fill the vacancies so occasioned. (Act of February 20, 1920, 455 Stat. 1253.)"

More than another three decades have elapsed since this law was written, but Congress has as yet made no provision for the government of Eastern Samoa, other than to appropriate Federal funds for disbursement to the island government by the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Interior.

SOCIAL SYSTEM AND LAND TENURE

No understanding of the particular needs of American Samoa is possible without knowledge of the unique social and land tenure system which is a basic part of Samoan life. The entire social structure is based on an intricate, far-reaching system of traditional family relationships, often referred to as the "matai" system. Strictly speaking, matais are family chieftains of varying degrees of power and prestige.

Almost all the land throughout American Samoa is owned, communally, by these family units. It can neither be bought nor sold, foreclosed upon, nor made subject to legal process for collection of debts. A few tracts, limited in size and number, are owned by eleemosynary institutions originated by foreigners but, by and large, from the very beginning the doctrine has been and is, "Samoan lands for the Samoans."

This policy has been founded on the concept that the basis for the integrity of Samoan life rests in the ownership and control of their lands by the Samoans themselves. The plight of the native Hawaiians, who in large measure lost their lands to outsiders, has been cited as a clear-cut example of the social undesirability of a contrary policy.

However, the matai system is far more than a means of communal landholding. It is a social pattern extending into virtually every phase of Samoan life, controlling the economic as well as the social relationships of the Samoans. For example, we were informed that, theoretically at least, the girl who works in the privately operated fish cannery for the excellent, relatively, wage of 75 cents an hour, must bring her pay envelope home and turn it over intact to the matai or chief to use for the benefit of the whole family, whether its other members work or not.

Apropos to the matai system as we found it in 1960, the observations in 1931 of the first Senate group to visit the Samoan Islands officially are significant. This was the American Samoan Commission, appointed by President Hoover pursuant to subsection (d) of Public Resolution 89, the 70th Congress, to "recommend to Congress such legislation concerning the islands of eastern Samoa as they shall deem necessary or proper." The Commission consisted of Senators Hiram Bingham and Joseph T. Robinson, Representatives Carroll L. Beedy and Guinn Williams, and three eastern Samoan chiefs, Tufele, Mauga, and Magalei.

The Commission's report, set forth in Senate Report No. 195, 72d Congress, to accompany S. 417, a bill to provide a government for American Samoa, states with respect to the matai system:

"The Samoan social organization was the chieftain system. Each family group elected or selected its own head. His title was that of "matai" and he ruled the family so long as he furnished it efficient leadership. When he became inefficient he was deposed. He held the power of life and death over the group. The semblance of the office remains, although shorn of this arbitrary power: Today the family group discusses matters led by the matai. No votes are taken.

Conclusions are reached after much deliberation and when once arrived at the matai speaks for the family group. Originally, the family lands were worked by the family and practically everything was owned in common, as it were, used and consumed by those who required it. There was under this system no incentive of effort on the part of the individual. Thrift brought no reward. However, 30 years of contact with American civilization have weakened this communal organization. The idea of personal property owned by the individual has infiltrated deeply. There are complaints from those who are not matais that the leadership of old is lacking and that it is not practical now to depose a matai. The schools have hastened the new ideas. The children are oriented away from the old culture. The thinkers among the chiefs wish the best for their children, but admit that the changes have come and that sooner or later much of the old order will go. They look at these changes regretfully, but turn with hope and confidence to the possibilities of the future."

It is to be noted that this 1931 report to the Senate of the 72d Congress uses the past tense in describing the matai system. Your subcommittee in 1962 did not find this hierarchy of family chieftains nearly as much a thing of the past as the report of 30 years ago indicates; rather the system is still in the process of dynamic transition.

The vitality of the matai system is recognized in the official policy statement regarding American Samoa issued by the Secretary of the Interior in 1956. This document asserts "Protection of Samoans against the loss of their family lands is an important policy not only as regards the economy, but also as it may affect the Samoan matai system. It is the policy to maintain this protection." The policy statement continues:

"General advancement—It is the policy to respect the Samoans' desire to protect the matai system and to consult fully with the Samoans, through their legally constituted representatives, on any question which may affect the preservation or destruction of the system. It is also the policy to encourage the acceptance of such nonindigenous social concepts as would be beneficial and to provide such social regulations and services as may be necessary in the light of local conditions and dictated by precepts of common humanity and governmental responsibility."

The "traditional leadership" is a vital force in Samoan life today. It must be, and should be, taken into consideration in any action taken by the Federal Government affecting Eastern Samoa.

There are, to be sure, countervailing influences. The election by secret ballot and universal suffrage of members of the house of representatives of the legislature from among Samoans in all strata of the social order, in contrast to the senate, which is composed of persons elected by the county councils from local chiefs who have been chosen in the traditional way, is inevitably bringing about a shift in political power. Another such influence is the greater ease of travel, with more and more Samoans coming in contact with the outside world, as is the developing wage economy spurred by the establishment of the fishpacking company.

As to land tenure, it is significant that the constitution of American Samoa contains the following provision in article I, section 3:

"It shall be the policy of the Government of American Samoa to protect persons of Samoan ancestry against alienation of their lands and the destruction of the Samoan way of life and language, contrary to their best interests. Such legislation as may be necessary may be enacted to protect the lands, customs, culture, and traditional Samoan family organization of persons of Samoan ancestry, and to encourage business enterprises by such persons. No change in the law respecting the alienation or transfer of land or any interest therein, shall be effective unless the same be approved by two successive legislatures by a two-thirds vote of the entire membership of each house and by the Governor."

GOVERNMENT

After 61 years under the American flag, the legal basis for Government in American Samoa is still executive fiat from Washington.

Western Samoa, in sharp contrast, attained full and complete independence on January 1, 1962.

As stated, by the 1899 treaty—to which, of course, the Samoans were not a party—Germany assumed sovereignty over the Samoan Islands west of the 171st meridian. New Zealand occupied them, bloodlessly, as a war measure in 1914, and took a League of Nations mandate over them in 1921. This mandate became a U.N. trusteeship after World War II, and Western Samoa, in 1962, became a nation.

Some 77 miles to the east, the voluntary cession of the seven Samoan Islands by the chiefs thereof in 1900 and 1904 was accepted de facto by the executive branch of the U.S. Government and administrative responsibility assigned by President McKinley to the Navy Department.

The Navy's administration was characterized by almost complete reliance on the traditional matai system. That is, the United States governed through the hierarchy of chieftainships.

But at the same time the Navy maintained a relatively effective public health service, kept law and order, dispensed justice, and inaugurated a system of free, compulsory education. In some ways our social services appear to have been superior to or at least more effective than those of either Germany or New Zealand in Western Samoa.

In 1951, President Truman transferred administrative responsibility from the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of the Interior after extensive consultation among the Secretaries of State, Navy, War, and Interior. In 1960 a constitutional convention of American Samoans drafted, and the people approved, the first constitution in Samoan history. It was signed by Gov. Peter Tali Coleman, a native-born Samoan appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, and by the Secretary himself.

As nearly as can be determined this document for the most part is a product of the Samoans themselves, and it appears to have their acceptance and support. By its own terms the constitution of American Samoa provides that 5 years from the effective date of the constitution the Governor shall appoint a constitutional committee to prepare amendments or a revised draft "in view of changing conditions."

However closely the constitution and the civil government it creates are in conformity with the wishes and present political capabilities of the Samoan people as a whole, the fact remains that all executive, judicial, and legislative power is concentrated in the Secretary of the Interior through the President. Legally, the American Samoa constitution is but an administrative order, subject to the will of the Executive in Washington.

The Secretary of the Interior appoints the Governor, without the benefit of the advice and consent of the Senate: he appoints the chief justice of the high court; the powers of the legislature are dependent upon his grant of legislative authority.

However, just as the Members of the Senate should be informed of and consider these facts, we also should know and acknowledge that on the whole the administration of Eastern Samoa by the United States, both under the Navy and under Interior, has been markedly fair, and has enabled the Samoans to preserve their own traditions and way of life, while at the same time bringing to them social services in the way of education and public health, which, inadequate as they are by American standards, are many ways superior to those of their larger, richer neighbors.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the publication of this report, the sixth and final one, Mr. President, concludes the work which the special Senate group began last fall. I shall, at this point, submit to the Rules Committee, in accordance with present procedures, a report of counterpart expenditure of the group. There were no dollar expenditures of public funds in connection with this mission.

Before concluding, I should like once again to thank the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], and our former colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Smith, for their outstanding and diligent contribution to the work of the group. They, together with the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], formed a distinguished, capable, and hard working group. They were, and are, an asset to the Nation and to the Senate and I commend them and thank them for a job well done.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

H.R. 5279. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 513. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week beginning July 28, 1963, as Veterinary Medicine Week.

The message communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Hjalmer C. Nygaard, late a Representative from the State of North Dakota, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE HJALMAR C. NYGAARD, OF NORTH DAKOTA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 449

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable HJALMAR C. NYGAARD, a Representative from the State of North Dakota.

Resolved, That a committee of 19 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant of Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in connection with the death of the late Representative HJALMAR C. NYGAARD, of North Dakota, I submit the following resolution:

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the anouncement of the death of Honorable HJALMAR C. NYGAARD, late a Representative from the State of North Dakota.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

THE RAILROAD RULES DISPUTE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and myself, I send to the desk a joint resolution and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 102) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees, was read the first time by its title, and the second time, at length, as follows:

Whereas the labor dispute between the carriers represented by the Eastern, Western, and Southeastern Carriers' Conference Committees and certain of their employees represented by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and the Switchmen's Union of North America, labor organizations, threatens essential transportation services of the Nation; and

Whereas it is essential to the national interest, including the national health and defense, that transportation services of these carriers be maintained; and

Whereas all the procedures for resolving such dispute provided for in the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted and have not resulted in settlement of the dispute; and

Whereas the Congress finds that emergency measures are essential to secure the continuity of transportation services by such carriers; and

Whereas it is desirable to achieve the above objectives in a manner which preserves and prefers solutions reached through collective bargaining, and preserves the carriers' right to initiate work rules changes under procedures to which they are accustomed and assures reasonable conditions of employee security: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That changes in work rules involving the manning of train or engine crews and the protection of the interests of employees affected thereby, which changes come within the area of those proposed by a carrier in the notices of November 2, 1959, or by a labor organization in the notices of September 7, 1960, shall become effective upon application to and approval or modification by the Interstate Commerce Commission in accordance with the procedures and provisions of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act, such rules to be operative only as interim rules and until the current controversy regarding such rules is resolved by the parties through continued collective bargaining; and no provision in this Joint Resolution shall be construed as limiting the right and responsibility of the carriers and organizations to reach agreement regarding such rules.

SEC. 2. An application filed under section 1 shall be given priority over all other matters pending before the Commission, and shall be acted upon within 120 days after it is filed or as soon thereafter as is practicable. The Commission may consider as evidence before it the evidence introduced before the Presidential Railroad Commission, created by Executive Order No. 10891, of November 1, 1960, and before Emergency Board 154, created by Executive Order No. 11101, of April 3, 1963, and shall not be required to receive evidence cumulative thereto. The Commission may establish a Special Advisory Panel to assist in the discharge of the functions conferred upon it by this joint resolution.

SEC. 3. In acting upon an application filed pursuant to section 1, the Commission shall give due consideration to the effect of the proposed rule upon adequate and safe transportation service to the public and upon the interests of the carrier and the employees affected, giving due consideration to the recommendations of the Presidential Railroad Commission and Emergency Board 154, and to the narrowing of the areas of disagreement which has been accomplished in bargaining and mediation following the Emergency Board report. As a condition of its approval of any interim rule involving, directly or indirectly, the reduction of existing manning requirements or practices, the Commission shall require a fair and equitable arrangement to protect the interests of the railroad employees affected as provided in Section 5 (2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act, and with due consideration to the recommendations of the Presidential Railroad Commission and Emergency Board 154 relating to the retention of job rights by senior employees, relocation expenses and earnings protection to less senior employees transferred to other jobs by the employing carrier, preferential hiring rights, displacement allowances, supplemental severance allowances, and retraining allowances. To the extent that provision for such payments and retraining may be available to an employee under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 or other Federal statutes, the carrier will be relieved of this obligation.

SEC. 4. The Commission shall act upon any application filed with it under section 1 of this joint resolution by way of approval, modified approval, or disapproval; and upon such approval or modified approval an interim rule consistent therewith shall be put into effect and shall remain operative until the parties reach agreement regarding the matter involved or, if no agreement is reached, for two years following the date the interim rule goes into effect.

SEC. 5. No change in rules coming within the scope of the notices referred to in section 1 of this joint resolution may be made except by agreement or by the procedures prescribed herein, and any strike or lockout to accomplish, prevent or interfere with such change shall be subject to the procedures of section 5(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

SEC. 6. The parties shall proceed immediately to bargain collectively, with the assistance of the National Mediation Board, concerning any unresolved issues regarding any proposals which were included in the notices of November 2, 1959, or September 7, 1960, but which do not involve the manning of train or engine crews and the protection of the interests of employees affected thereby. If agreement has not been reached within 60 days following the effective date of this joint resolution, any party may submit its proposal to the Interstate Commerce Commission for disposition by such special procedures, not confined to those set out specifically in this joint resolution, as the Commission, after consultation with the parties, deems appropriate. Due consideration shall be given in any such procedure to the recommendations of the Presidential Railroad Commission and Emergency Board 154 and to the narrowing of the areas of disagreement which has been accomplished in bargaining and mediation. The provisions of section 5 of this joint resolution shall be applicable to matters covered by such proposals.

SEC. 7. The provisions of the Act of March 23, 1932, entitled "An Act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," shall not be applicable to an action under sections 5 or 6. In any such action, service of the complaint and summons shall be made on the parties to the controversy by delivery thereof to an officer or to any other agent of said parties authorized by appointment or by law to receive service of process. The delivery of the summons and complaint may be made by certified mail. The orders, writs, and process of a district court issued in any such action shall run, be served, and be returnable anywhere in the United States.

SEC. 8. This joint resolution shall expire two years from the date it becomes effective: *Provided,* That the jurisdiction of a district court of the United States under sections 5 and 6 shall continue for so long as any interim rule under section 4 continues to be operative. Prior to such expiration, the President shall report on its operation to the Congress and make such further recommendations, if any, as he deems appropriate, including his recommendation as to whether this joint resolution should be extended. In addition, the Interstate Commerce Commission may, from time to time, submit interim reports to the President on its actions pursuant to this resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message and joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have been reading the rules. I appreciate the desires which are involved and the fact that a bill or joint resolution cannot be referred to a committee unless that committee desires very much to take jurisdiction. At the same time, in all fairness it should be pointed out that this is a joint resolution which involves, in accordance with the wording of the rule, the mediation and arbitration of labor disputes. That point is very clear and specific. It seems to me that the joint resolution would certainly involve mediation and arbitration of labor disputes. The Committee on Commerce is entitled to deal with regulations of interstate railroads, buses, trucks, pipe lines, and interstate and foreign commerce generally.

That seems a rather far cry from the specific suggestion. I was consulted on the question and I shall not object, but I should like to have the Record clear on one point. As I said when I started, it seems to me that the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare would be absolutely uncomplicated and clear. Conceivably the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce could be invoked. But I understand very clearly that we cannot make someone do something. Therefore, although the joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Commerce, I—for one Senator—would like to spread these facts upon the Record so that if a contingency should arise which indicates that the labor dispute aspect of the question preponderated very strongly over the question of the regulation of interstate and foreign commerce or the regulation of the interstate railroads, the door would not be absolutely shut because no one said anything about it and let the matter be referred.

I am willing to see the joint resolution referred to the Committee on Commerce, as such action seems to be the prevailing view of the leadership as well as the prevailing view of the subcommittee chairman and the committee chairman, provided there is some caveat spread on the Record that the question shall be dealt with and handled as a labor dispute, and at least we will have someone who said something about it so that if it does not work well, we might, as we sometimes have, be required to change our signals.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana that the message and joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Commerce? The Chair hears none. The President's message and Senate Joint Resolution 102 are referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with regard to the observations of the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], I wish to associate myself with the point that he last made. If in the handling of the proposed legislation it develops that there should also be consideration of the labor aspects by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—and I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore]—I have no doubt that the Senator from Rhode Island, who I understand at the present time, in the absence of the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], who is ill, is the acting chairman of the committee, would have no hesitancy in having a joint conference with the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in respect to any of the labor aspects. But the President has circumscribed his proposal in such a manner that it pertains primarily to the Interstate Commerce Commission. We should note the expanding of the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, or at least the calling upon the Interstate Commerce Commission to take on this added burden.

Senators will note that the President in his message has proposed that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall have authority to appoint a special panel to be of assistance to it in handling the work that will be involved. In view of that fact, may I say to my friend from New York, we can look to the Committee on Commerce to cooperate with us, as they always do, on any of the labor aspects of the question. But I think it quite appropriate under those circumstances that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Commerce, although, as the Senator from New York has pointed out, the rule book itself makes perfectly clear that questions involving railway labor shall go to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

It is common to note that something is not a precedent, or may not cause people to consider it a precedent, but I think I would speak for a unanimous Committee on Labor and Public Welfare if I put into the Record the observation that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is not in any way waiving jurisdiction over a labor subject matter. The committee in this instance is recognizing that there is a joint problem, that the interstate commerce regulation at the present time predominates, that the message itself pertains specifically to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and that jurisdiction over the Commission falls to the Commerce Committee.

Therefore, I support the reference to the Commerce Committee.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Edmondson in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I listened very attentively to what the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] said. He had every reason to say what he did. His remarks were very well advised.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who is an authority on labor matters, for the offer of his assistance. Surely this is important legislation, and it will require the hearts, the minds, and consciences of every single Member of this body.

As acting chairman of the committee, I do not relish this added burden. I perhaps would hope that some other committee with concurrent jurisdiction might assume this responsibility at this time. Our committee is now involved in protracted hearings on the question of civil rights. It will be another week and a half before the hearings are completed. Then we must go through the process of consultation in executive session, with the drafting of reports and the drafting of legislation to report to the Senate.

But I assure the Members of the Senate that, inasmuch as this responsibility falls upon us now, we shall meet it with industry, impartiality, fairness, and expedition.

We realize that the inherent rights of people are involved at this time. We realize the urgency given to this whole problem by the President of the United States this afternoon, through the eloquent message he has sent to the Congress.

Because I am conscious of the urgency of the matter, I now announce to the Senate and to all parties concerned that hearings on this question will be started at 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. The reason why I suggest that time is that all of our days from now until next Wednesday are taken up with morning hearings on civil rights matters. The calendar has already been planned. Witnesses have already been informed. Invitations have already been accepted. We must continue with our work on civil rights in the mornings, and we shall try our best to expedite the hearings by beginning them tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock.

I urge upon our distinguished majority leader that whenever he can afford to do so within the next 2 weeks he recess the Senate from time to time so that we will not run up against an objection to the committee meeting and have to obtain unanimous consent to hold hearings in the afternoon. If it becomes necessary, we shall hold hearings in the evenings, because we understand that the rights of these people are involved and they want their rights resolved, and resolved, not only with impartiality, but also expeditiously.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island has demonstrated clearly the soundness of the reference of the joint resolution to the Commerce Committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to my distinguished leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, so far as the leadership of this body is concerned, we shall do our best to comply with the request of the distinguished acting chairman of the Committee on Commerce. However, I would call to his mind the fact that the press seems to take an unusual delight in pointing out that this Congress does nothing. I would hope that the press would understand when we do nothing on this floor we always hope the committees are in operation and functioning, as they have been. I compliment the committees for the fine work they have done throughout the session this year.

I would express the hope also that those who raise objections to unanimous consent requests that a committee or committees meet while the Senate is in session would consider the seriousness of the situation confronting the country today and, not only in this respect but also in all other aspects, would adopt a more cooperative attitude, to the end that committees may meet while the Senate is in session and accomplish things which must be done in the best interests and welfare of the Nation.

Mr. PASTORE. If I may buttress the eloquent statement by my distinguished leader, anyone who is in doubt about the functioning of the Senate is invited to come to the hearings at 9:15 a.m., tomorrow, when the committee will conduct hearings on civil rights, and at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, when we shall begin hearings on this joint resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for weeks there has been in the contemplation of the country, of the President, and the executive branch, and certainly of Members of Congress, the possibility of a railroad strike, which would have a devastating effect upon the economy, upon the gross national product, and generally speaking upon the morale of the country.

We convened this morning, at the request of the President, at the White House and heard from him the approach which is set out in his message and in the joint resolution which came with it.

Everybody has been speculating about what kind of philosophic approach should be taken. There are those who were wondering whether it would eventuate in seizure of the railroads, which, of course, is not a solution to the problem. There was a question of possible compulsory arbitration, which never sets well with a body in a free government, because compulsion and freedom are antithetical, to say the least.

So there was speculation and exploration and search for some kind of approach.

This morning the President indicated to the joint leadership that he thought that perhaps the Interstate Commerce Commission might be the appropriate vehicle to bring about an ultimate solution of the problems and items that were involved in the dispute between the carriers and the brotherhoods. Though it is only a coincidence, something of the same thought came into my mind after days of reflection, and I presented a memorandum at the White House meeting this morning embracing the same general approach; namely, the employment of an agency of Government which has been in business for more than 75 years and has broad authority. Among other things, the Commission has been dealing with nearly every facet of transportation, and particularly the rail problem, for a long period of time.

It occurred to me, as it must have occurred to others, that the Interstate Commerce Act could be implemented so as to give the Commission jurisdiction and to make possible, first, an interim solution of the problems created by the work rules controversy, and then a final solution.

The joint resolution would endure for a period of 2 years, if enacted, but I think in connection with it I should say, for myself and for other Senators on my side of the aisle, that we must naturally reserve the right to offer amendments if we think we can improve the joint resolution and insure expeditious action so that at long last this dispute can be resolved.

There are some items to which I need not allude at the moment. Expedition, for one thing, is of transcendent importance. This will have high priority if the joint resolution is enacted into law, so far as the procedure of the Interstate Commerce Commission is concerned.

It might be an improvement of the resolution if we were a little more specific as to the sole jurisdiction of the Commission, for one thing.

Secondly, the minimum distance which traincrews might travel is an item of transcendent importance so far as the carriers are concerned.

There is still the item of new employees to be considered. Under any bargaining arrangement, it is compulsory for certain employees to be hired, even though they are not needed for the operation of rail equipment.

I allude to some of those to fortify my own feeling that the resolution is subject to amendment. Every Senator should feel free to offer whatever amendments he thinks are necessary in order to improve the joint resolution and to expedite action in order to dispose of this very vexing and troublesome problem.

So I am glad to join my friend the distinguished majority leader, because a beginning must be made. The President has indicated very clearly that, after the 29th, he would ask for no further suspension of the work rules. So the Congress has before it the job of initiating something within a 7-day period, unless there comes a respite by common understanding, or we can gain some borrowed time the more clearly to examine the equities that are involved.

I shall content myself with that much of a statement at this time, as the joint resolution goes to the Commerce Committee for further consideration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I announce to the Senate that, together with the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], I shall introduce at the next session of the Senate, on Wednesday, a joint resolution to appoint a Commission on Automation, which is one of the recommendations contained in the President's message on the railway labor dispute. The President said, "It is my intention to appoint a Presidential Commission on Automation."

I feel—and I have consulted very briefly with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], but enough to get his view—that, as we have expressed ourselves before, this is one of the most critical problems before the Nation, which has directly brought us to this situation in the railway labor dispute. I feel that we should have congressional action upon this subject at least in parallel with such a drastic step as we propose to take in the railway labor situation.

It may very well be that we shall attach the idea of a commission to whatever measure is finally enacted with respect to the railway labor dispute, or we may let it proceed on its own. But, at any rate, I feel the obligation is that of the Congress, as well as the President. So, together with the distinguished Senator from Oregon, I shall introduce, on Wednesday, appropriate legislation to implement this recommendation of the President for a Commission on Automation, thus fulfilling what I consider to be a very critical aspect of what has brought us almost planlessly to the present very serious labor dispute.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate—and I understand there is not—as a further mark of respect to the late Representative Hjalmar C. Nygaard, I move that the Senate adjourn, under the previous order, until noon next Wednesday.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and, at 6 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m., under the previous order, the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, July 24, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 22, 1963:

U.S. District Judge

Charles H. Tenney, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York, vice Alexander Bicks, deceased.

Federal Power Commission

David Statler Black, of Washington, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1968, vice Howard Morgan.

National Labor Relations Board

Howard Jenkins, Jr., of Colorado, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years expiring August 27, 1968, vice Philip Ray Rodgers.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 22, 1963:

Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review

Charles R. Ferguson, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review for the term expiring July 15, 1966.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my newsletter of July 20, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, FIFTH DISTRICT, TEXAS, JULY 20, 1963

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

The Presidential message on balance, that is, imbalance, of payments once again shows the President's misunderstanding of the problem and solution to the problem. Because of Government programs and controls our Nation yearly must pay others more than they pay us. Further, others can collect by demanding our gold for their dollars while we hold foreign I.O.U.'s. While our foreign assets (according to the President) exceed our debts by $27 billion we are, because of our Government's policies, in danger of losing all our gold and devaluing the dollar. So the stage is set for our economic collapse. Because of our Government's fiscal policies, the world can demand $24 billion in gold and we have less than $4 billion with which to pay off, before dipping into the approximately $12 billion of gold which backs up and gives our dollar its value. All our gold now equals only $15.6 billion. So what does the President do? He imposes more financial straitjacketing. He seeks to cure the results of Federal controls and dictates by more Federal regulation and control, a 15-percent tax called "interest equalization tax" on the purchase by Americans of new or outstanding foreign securities—a tax on the free flow of money, a wall to prevent the financial activities we have always encouraged in the past.

The President, despite the lengthy analysis, skirted the basic problems at the heart of the situation. Capitalism, the private enterprise system, thrives on freedom, not Federal intervention. The tax he proposes on the flow of money is no solution. Why doesn't the President and his advisers turn instead to fiscal responsibility? The President and his deficit financing advisers have forgotten the reasons for and the need for a federally balanced budget, reduction of debt, and straightforward reduction of taxes including tax rate reduction, instead of the fuzzy tortuous Presidential tax reform recommendations. If the President really wants to reduce the imbalance of payments why does he not stop giving our money away. While we have the greatest debt in the world we continue to continue to give foreign aid all over the world. Even our increased exports are recognized to be the result largely of our own subsidy. We give foreign nations money and they buy from us. This is artificial growth. Further, that money remaining in foreign hands can be converted into our gold at their discretion. Is it any wonder that foreign nations have built up such dollar reserves, callable in gold? Indeed, in many instances foreign nations have refused to lower their tariffs after agreeing to do so to match our reduction because they have pleaded dollar shortage. Our foreign giveaway and disproportionate support of the U.N. are instances of our inability to live within our means and exercise financial self-discipline. It is high time the New Frontiersmen and other new Socialists including our President, Schlesinger, Heller, Galbraith, and others realize the imbalance of payments result from the big spending policies, deficit financing, Government in business and the increasing regulation and control of our society by Federal Government, under the liberal-radical Democrats.

Besides foreign aid gifts of our money, as an example of the liberal Democrats failing to see the answer, look at their political charges in the past of the need for low interest rates and criticism of increasing interest rates. Democrats demand low interest rates; as a result United States capital flows abroad to get higher rates. If the interest rates were higher at home the money would stay here. So instead of recognizing the need for raising the interest rates, the President seeks to prevent the outflow by taxing the money sent overseas.

DANGER IN TEST BAN NEGOTIATIONS

Most important development this week was the beginning of talks on a nuclear test ban agreement with the Soviet Union. The danger is that the people of the United States could lose World War III without ever knowing that it had begun. Besides the cruel facts of history showing that the Soviet Union never honors its agreements, and that they ruthlessly broke the last test ban moratorium when it suited their purpose, my concern over the present negotiations is even greater because of a talk by Dr. Edward Teller. Recognized as one of the world's greatest scientists, Dr. Teller's warnings should make us consider the implications of entering into agreements with the Russians on test bans. Here are some thoughts he gives us to ponder. "It is my conviction that today the Russians are ahead of us in nuclear weapons. I cannot prove this statement, but I will say to you categorically that no one can prove its opposite." With even the slightest indication that Russia is leading the United States in the development of nuclear explosives, how can anyone in this country be optimistic about a test ban agreement which will bind us because we honor our agreements but will have no effect upon the activities of the Soviet Union because history proves they do not.

Dr. Teller also points out that he believes the Russians may be close to developing an anti-missile missile. If they succeed, or if they can make us believe they are about to succeed and we have not developed such a weapon, then we have no defenses. Dr. Teller says: "In order to develop missile defenses one needs to test in the atmosphere, but one does not need big tests. No one, in or out of the disarmament agency has claimed that nuclear explosives under 1 kiloton, in the atmosphere can be detected. With experiments using small explosives, missile advances can be conducted. These small explosions made by the Russians, may seal our doom."

There are two conclusions here that should be apparent to even the most naive and certainly should be clear to the President, (1) we cannot detect their testing and, (2) we must continue our testing.

IN THE HOUSE THIS WEEK

Comic relief came in the guise of "boiled peanuts" and any laughter relieves tension on the floor. Yet if laughter seemed hollow it was because of the realization that this plea to remove boiled peanut acreage from Government control leaves other peanut and additional crop growers still under Federal Government dictation.

Grief came in the sudden death of Hjalmar Nygaard (a relative newcomer and younger Member in his second term) of a heart attack during debate on the ADP bill, and reminds us of our tensions. I was privileged to visit Hjalmar in his district and to know him. Once again the flags at half mast were an unwelcome sight at morning going to work.

Automatic Data Processing equipment (ADP) comprises the electronic brain computing machines now widely used by many agencies of the Government. In an effort to streamline Government, increase efficiency, and eliminate cost at an estimated savings of $100 million yearly, a bill (H.R. 5171) was presented to place the coordination of their joint use under the GSA (General Services Administration). Eight Government agencies disapproved, yet the Comptroller General recommended this program. Even though generally not well understood, the bill passed. (ALGER for.) Charges embodying economy and false economy were exchanged. I believe this effort to be sound and can succeed without transgression on each agency's jurisdiction and peculiar needs.

A Bill To Close U.S. Seaports to Foreign-Flag Vessels Engaged in Commerce With Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would in effect close U.S. seaports to foreign-flag vessels of nations which allow their ships to be used in commerce with Cuba.

This legislation would prohibit any article from being transported in interstate or foreign commerce by such vessels, and would also prohibit the shipment of any article which has been transported by any such vessels.

The continuing ship traffic of vessels flying the flags of our allies to and from Cuba has been steady since the communization of Cuba. Although the United States has tried to discourage this traffic, these efforts have not resulted in ending the assistance which our allies provide Communist Cuba through use of their ocean shipping capacity.

Cuba being an island makes water transportation the most economical means of supply for that nation. To end allied shipping to Cuba would put a serious kink in the Moscow-to-Havana pipeline.

I am hopeful that the Congress will realize the urgency of this situation, and enact this legislation as rapidly as possible.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 23, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalms 73: 28: *It is good for me to draw near unto God; I have put my trust in Him.*

Almighty God, by whose mercies we are spared and by whose power we are sustained, as we go forth into the hours of a new day, may we be thankful for the many opportunities we have of enriching and enlarging our lives and that of our fellow men.

Grant that we may not lose our enthusiasm for life, but may our minds and hearts daily be stirred and inspired with those noble aspirations and ambitions which will enable us to gain the victory over every selfish and sordid impulse.

May we never give up the struggle to attain unto greater nobility of character or allow ourselves to break faith and fealty with our deeper convictions, however difficult we may find it to be to live up to the level of our best moments.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a resolution, as follows:

S. RES. 175

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Honorable Hjalmar C. Nygaard, late a Representative from the State of North Dakota.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the late Representative, the Senate do now adjourn until Wednesday next.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1933. An act to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," as amended, with respect to the minimum age limitation for registration;

H.R. 4646. An act to declare a portion of the Benton Harbor Canal, Benton Harbor, Mich., a nonnavigable stream; and

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2485. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, as amended; and

H.R. 6177. An act to amend section 2(a) of article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 relating to the annual payment to the District of Columbia by the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 627. An act to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects, and for other purposes;

S. 994. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended;

S. 999. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925;

S. 1078. An act to amend the District of Columbia Public School Services Act;

S. 1604. An act to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended, relating to the transfer of producer rice acreage allotments; and

S. 1652. An act to amend the National Cultural Center Act to extend the termination date therein, and to enlarge the Board of Trustees.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1036. An act to amend the inland and western rivers rules concerning anchor lights and fog signals required in special anchorage areas, and for other purposes.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN H. FOLGER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a keen sense of sorrow and with deep regret that I inform the House of the passing of a former distinguished Member of this body, Hon. John Hamlin Folger.

Mr. Folger, the son of Thomas Wilson Folger and Ada Dillard Folger, was born in Rockford, Surry County, N.C., on December 18, 1880, and passed away on last Friday morning, July 19. He is survived by his widow, Maude Douglas Folger, of Mount Airy; one son, Henry Folger; two daughters, Mrs. Nell Folger Glenn and Miss Frances Folger; two sisters, Mrs. R. C. Llewellyn and Mrs. R. E. Ashby; two brothers, W. P. Folger and Hugh Folger; his eldest son, Fred F. Folger, having predeceased him.

Mr. Folger attended public and high school in Dobson, N.C., and Yadkinville Institute, in Yadkin County, where he was awarded a scholarship to Guilford College. He later read law in his father's office and studied law at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He was admitted to the bar in 1901, practiced law in Greensboro for a short time and then returned to Surry County where he opened an office in Dobson and later in Mount Airy.

Mr. Folger served as mayor of Mount Airy from 1908 through 1912, was a member of the North Carolina House of Representatives in 1927 and 1928, and served as a member of the State senate in 1931 and 1932. He was a delegate to the Democratic State conventions of 1924 through 1940 and delegate to the Democratic National Conventions of 1932 and 1944. He was elected to the 77th Congress in a special election to fill the vacancy resulting from the death of his brother, Alonzo Dillard Folger, and was reelected to the 78th, 79th, and 80th Congresses, serving from June 14, 1941, to January 3, 1949, when he returned to the practice of law in which he continued until his retirement in 1959.

While serving in the North Carolina General Assembly, Mr. Folger was the leader in the move for 9-month school terms and later served as a member of the State school commission. Throughout his adult life, up to the time of his retirement, he was an active and outstanding political leader in North Carolina. He was widely known as a Bible scholar and for many years taught the men's Bible class in the Mount Airy Methodist Church. He was a great orator and was eagerly sought as a speaker for religious, civic, and political events. He had a wide general law practice and was one of the most able trial lawyers in North Carolina.

It was my cherished privilege and good fortune to know Mr. Folger well all of my adult life and to be associated with him from time to time politically, professionally, and as a friend. I knew his character and quality. He was in all respects a man of high rank but if he could here speak for himself I know quite well that he would in effect say:

"The rank is but the guinea's stamp,
"The man's the gowd for a' that."

He was by nature a quiet and deliberate man, of fine mettle, and always a courageous and effective warrior in the many worthy causes he entered. He was a busy lawyer but at the same time was an active citizen. By choice or circumstance, perhaps both, he was always in the thick of the battle, diligently devoting himself to the causes he felt were worthy. He never hung along the battle's edge wishing for "a blade of keener steel." His weapons, blue blades all, were high Christian character, honesty, loyalty, and unfaltering faith in the eternal goodness of God. His life was a sermon of inspiration to all who knew him; he lived as though he knew and cared that his life and example might lend some argument to his neighbors' creed. The plain garments of unassuming simplicity which he wore never completely concealed the robes of purple beneath.

Again and again, the passing of those whom we have admired and loved so much impresses upon us a sense of the values we daily gain from the lives and examples of friends yet with us. And thus, even by their passing, our departing friends press upon us a final bequest in the form of a more delicate understanding of human worth.

My district and State has lost one of its finest and most valuable citizens and I have lost a great and good friend. I join the wide circle of loving and admiring friends of Mr. Folger in extending to Mrs. Folger and all the family assurances of sincere sympathy in this sad loss.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] in the beautiful words of tribute which he has paid to a great, kind, genteel man, a former distinguished Member of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of knowing and serving with John Folger. He was a dedicated Member of Congress. He was in every sense of the word a Christian gentleman. He was a man with progressive, forward-looking ideas. He made an enormous contribution as a Member of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from North Carolina in extending to his family and friends my deepest and sincerest personal sympathy.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my distinguished colleague, the able gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], in the tribute which he has so eloquently paid to a distinguished former Member of this body from North Carolina, whose passing he has just announced, the Honorable John Hamlin Folger, of Mount Airy, N.C.

I also want to express my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Folger and all the members of the Folger family.

I never had the pleasure of personally knowing former Congressman John Folger, but long before I came here I was well acquainted with his distinguished record of public service to his home community, the State of North Carolina, and our Nation. Mr. Folger came from a long line of outstanding and dedicated people. In fact, he was elected as a Democrat to the 77th Congress in a special election to fill the vacancy caused by the death of his distinguished brother, then Congressman Alonzo D. Folger. He was reelected to the 78th, 79th, and 80th Congresses and served with distinction in this great body from June 14, 1941, to January 3, 1949. Choosing not to be a candidate for renomination in 1948, he resumed the practice of his legal profession in Mount Airy, N.C., until his retirement in 1959.

As mayor of his hometown of Mount Airy, 1908 to 1912, as a member of the North Carolina House of Representatives in 1927 and 1928, as a member of the North Carolina Senate in 1931 and 1932, and as an active participant in the affairs of the Democratic Party of both the State of North Carolina and the Nation, Mr. Folger reflected credit not only upon himself, his family, and the people he had the privilege of serving, but upon our State and Nation.

Even until this day, whenever the name Folger is mentioned in North Carolina, we think of action, service, and dedication to some worthwhile cause.

Though saddened by the passing of this outstanding son of North Carolina, I am happy to pay my personal tribute to him for his long record of civic and public service to his community, State, and Nation.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I have learned of the passing of my distinguished former colleague, John Folger, whom I had the privilege to know well during 6 years service in this body.

John Folger was a gifted forceful speaker, possessing all the charm, insights, and manners of expression which characterized the great orators who have stood in this well down through the years. John Folger never hesitated to enter a political fray where he believed his convictions were at issue. He was a man of high principles and with a strong determination to exercise those principles in carrying out his duties as a Member of this body. He was a grand man with all the grand manners that won him a lasting place in the memories of the many friends he enjoyed during his years in Congress.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] in taking note of the passing of John Hamlin Folger, a great American.

During the service of our departed friend in the House of Representatives for three terms, he distinguished himself as a representative of the people. Prior to coming to Congress, John Folger had served as mayor of his home city, as a member of the North Carolina General Assembly, and in numerous other positions of honor and trust. In each position he served with ability and diligence.

Our departed friend was endowed with those human characteristics which qualify one for leadership. He exercised those qualifications in such a manner as to bring wide acclaim to himself and great benefit to the people of our Nation.

I join with my dear friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman RALPH SCOTT, in expressing my sentiments of deepest sympathy to the members of the distinguished Folger family in this tremendous loss they are experiencing.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Dorn and I learned with sadness of the passing of my distinguished and able colleague of the old 80th Congress. John H. Folger was a warm and devoted personal friend. John Folger was a quiet, unassuming, and dedicated public servant. He spent a long life in public service having been mayor of Mount Airy and having served in both houses of the North Carolina General Assembly. He was a loyal Democrat and was often a delegate to the State and National conventions. John Folger spent 58 years in the practice of law, and those whom he assisted, often without remuneration, are legion.

John Folger was progressive. He believed in the uplifting of the standards of living and the opportunities of those engaged in the industrial, mechanical, and agricultural arts. He was loyal to the principles and ideals of the Southland. John Folger will always be remembered as an able, patriotic Congressman and a great American.

He and Mrs. Dorn graduated from the great University of North Carolina. She joins me in my deepest sympathy to his family and friends.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned of the passing on July 19, of the Honorable John Hamlin Folger, formerly a Representative in the U.S. Congress from the Fifth District of North Carolina, a seat now being so ably and effectively filled by our distinguished colleague and my longtime warm personal friend, the Honorable RALPH J. SCOTT.

Former Congressman Folger who was a native of Surry County, N.C., was living at Mount Airy in Surry County at the time of his passing. Mr. Folger was elected to the House of Representatives to succeed his brother, the Honorable Alonzo Dillard (Lon) Folger, whose death occurred on April 30, 1941, as a result of an automobile accident in Mount Airy. His service in the Congress extended from June 14, 1941 to January 3, 1949. He was not a candidate for renomination in 1948 and thus voluntarily retired from these halls.

I was closely associated on many occasions with the late Honorable Fred Folger, a son and law partner of the Congressman, and thus I had the privilege and the opportunity of becoming acquainted also with the former Congressman. The Folger law firm enjoyed the highest professional reputation for integrity and ability. Their reputation in this respect could not be surpassed. These gentlemen were among the leading lawyers in that section of North Carolina and it was in this capacity that I became associated with the Folgers and came to admire them for their uprightness, their honor and their high standards of personal and professional conduct.

The Fifth District of North Carolina and the Fifth District of Virginia, which I have the honor to represent, are contiguous for a distance of approximately 150 miles up and down the North Carolina-Virginia line. In this way, I have felt quite close to all who have served in Congress from that district in recent years and have had the opportunity of observing at first hand the high caliber of these Representatives and the fine and effective work which they did.

The people of North Carolina with whom I have talked believed in John Folger and always referred to him as a dedicated public servant, who was interested not only in his political party, but who was interested in the welfare of the country. His reputation extended far beyond the confines of the Fifth Congressional District of North Carolina. He was well and favorably known in many of the counties of the district which I have the honor to represent. He believed in the true principles of the

Democratic Party. He was schooled in the highest traditions of our Government and of our country, and stood willing at all times to do whatever was necessary to promote good government in his State and in his Nation. We have too few such men left.

John H. Folger will be greatly missed by a host of friends and admirers. I know that his work will be appreciated for many years to come, and his memory will be cherished not only by his widow and children and grandchildren, but by many hundreds and thousands of others who knew and understood and appreciated his true manly worth and great nobility of character.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish at this time to join with my colleague, Representative Ralph Scott, of the Fifth District of North Carolina, in paying tribute to a former colleague, the late John Hamlin Folger.

During John Folger's tenure in Congress it was my pleasure to serve with him on the House Banking and Currency Committee. It was also my pleasure to have served with his late brother, Alonzo Dillard Folger.

John Folger was elected to the 77th Congress in a special election to fill the vacancy caused by the untimely death of his brother. He was reelected to the 78th, 79th, and 80th Congresses, serving from June 14, 1941, to January 3, 1949.

He was a man of sincerity, a distinguished public servant, and one who commanded the respect of all who came in contact with him. He was endowed with those characteristics which qualify one for leadership. He had an understanding of all men, whether they worked on the land, in their overalls, in the factories, or in their blue serges in the countinghouses. And at all times he was ready to listen to their problems with a sympathetic heart.

He has gone to his reward. But he leaves behind to his loved ones and to his friends an inspiration that will be part of our lives for as long as we shall live.

I extend to the family my heartfelt sympathy.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE HJALMAR C. NYGAARD

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that after consulting with the minority leader and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Short], time will be set aside tomorrow preceding the legislative business during which Members may pay tribute to our late colleague from North Dakota, Mr. Nygaard.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

BARRINGTON, ILL., CENTENNIAL

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it is with particular honor and distinction that my colleague, Donald Rumsfeld, of Illinois, 13th Congressional District, and I, who represent Illinois, 12th Congressional District, call to the attention of the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives the centennial of Barrington, Ill.

The village of Barrington, which was incorporated on November 18, 1863, and received a special charter from the Illinois General Assembly on February 16, 1865, has designated August 22 through 25, 1963, as its centennial days.

Many of my colleagues have inquired how it happens that the gentlemen from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld and Mr. McClory] are sharing in this recognition to Barrington, and we have been proud to explain that the village of Barrington is situated in both of our congressional districts. We have noted proudly in the special act of incorporation the references to Barrington Township in Cook County and Cuba Township in Lake County wherein the incorporated area of the village of Barrington has been situated during this century of its proud history.

We recognize too that the strength of America and its promise of the future lies in the home, the church, the school, and the community. As a thriving and representative community of citizens, Barrington ranks among the best. And as an environment in which home, church, and school flourish, Barrington is a leader.

We salute the Barrington village government, the many civic and fraternal organizations which have contributed to the success of Barrington's centennial days, and the citizens whose welfare we serve jointly in the Congress of the United States.

ADDITIONAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTION FOR THE PHYSICALLY OR MENTALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which will provide an additional income tax exemption in the case where a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent is physically or mentally handicapped. In my opinion, this bill has been needed for some time. There is no doubt that a person who has the misfortune to be handicapped or to have a handicapped person in his family bears a greater financial burden than other taxpayers. Such persons and families have many extra expenses which cannot be deducted under present law. Furthermore, many such persons fail to take deductions to which they are entitled, due to the complexity of the income tax law and their failure to understand it completely. This bill would be a means of easing the financial strain borne by the handicapped and their families.

My bill would provide an extra exemption claim for a taxpayer if he, his spouse, or one of the persons whom he claims as a dependent is physically or mentally handicapped to a degree sufficiently severe to require the use of special devices or apparatus, or to require special care or attendance at a special school, or if his handicap is permanent or of such nature as to require extensive treatment over a period of years. At present, the income tax law allows an extra exemption to a taxpayer or spouse who is blind, or over 65 years of age. It appears to me that all handicaps deserve equal income tax status with the blind. Inasmuch as there is a bill under consideration to reduce the income tax burden this year, I believe it is an appropriate time to call attention to the plight of the handicapped and the need for tax relief for this group. Certainly most people would agree that the handicapped is one of the groups that should receive special tax consideration. I hope, therefore, that my colleagues will get behind this bill and give it the support it deserves.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit today and during the balance of the week during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 7043) to amend the act of March 2, 1931, to provide that certain proceedings of the Veterans of World War I of the

United States, Inc., shall be printed as a House document, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays]?

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, may I ask the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays] if he will advise the House how the Committee on Printing voted upon these several resolutions we are now bringing up and as to the vote also in the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Printing considered this resolution and it passed unanimously. This also passed the full committee unanimously.

This particular bill makes the Veterans of World War I, which has a charter from the Congress, eligible to have the proceedings of its convention printed the same as we have already extended this privilege to the GAR, the United Spanish War Veterans, the VFW, American Legion, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, and Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. SCHENCK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that is the standard procedure, to extend this courtesy to this veterans organization?

Mr. HAYS. We have extended it to all the others, and this just puts the Veterans of World War I in the same category.

Mr. DERWINSKI. There is no implication that we might subscribe to the program of that particular organization?

Mr. HAYS. Oh, no. This is merely for having the proceedings printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act of March 2, 1931, as amended (44 U.S.C. 275b), is amended to read as follows:

"That hereafter the proceedings of the national encampments of the Grand Army of the Republic, the United Spanish War Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the American Legion, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Incorporated, and the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, respectively, shall be printed annually, with accompanying illustrations, as separate House documents of the session of the Congress to which they may be submitted."

Sec. 2. The last sentence of section 16 of Public Law 85-530 (36 U.S.C. 776) is repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE DOCUMENT 225, "PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 194, authorizing the printing of additional copies of the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed three hundred and twenty-two thousand five hundred additional copies of House Document Numbered 225, Eighty-fourth Congress, first session, entitled "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag", of which two hundred and nineteen thousand five hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and one hundred and three thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF STUDY ENTITLED "THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND EDUCATION"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 428, authorizing the printing of additional copies of the study entitled "The Federal Government and Education," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 428

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor two thousand five hundred additional copies of the study entitled "The Federal Government and Education" prepared by that committee during the current session.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 2, strike out "two thousand five hundred" and insert "three thousand".

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I will be glad to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I wanted, if I may, to ask the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays] if he will further explain the fact that the printing provided for under House Resolution 428 provides only for a limited number of copies of the study entitled "The Federal Government and Education" and which is in an amount sufficient for the use only by the Committee on Education and Labor. However, there is a great demand for this named publication by Members of the House generally to answer inquiries from superintendents of schools and boards of education. Therefore, additional copies are anticipated to be included later in a House concurrent resolution. Is that not true?

Mr. HAYS. I would say to the gentleman that is true.

Mr. Speaker, after the passage of this resolution I will ask permission to submit a statement which will clarify some of these points.

This will explain to the committee chairman how they can use another procedure which would be helpful to them in situations of this kind, but I do not want to burden the House at this moment with a lot of debate.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. KYL. It is my hope that the gentleman from Ohio will include a rather complete statement concerning the use of committee prints.

Mr. HAYS. I have a statement prepared which I will hand in as an extension of my remarks.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with this resolution (H. Res. 428) entitled "Federal Government and Education," I wish to call the attention of the issuing committee and all committees of the House that I see no need for extensive printing and distribution of so-called committee prints. The terminology "committee print" is supposed to mean just what it says, and is designed for the general information of the issuing committee.

If this particular compendium is in heavy demand, may I suggest that the Committee on Education and Labor vote to release it as a House report or a House document. It will then get automatic distribution through the House and Senate document rooms, plus the important distribution throughout the Federal depository library system. In short it would receive regulated public distribution as against proprietary release by a subcommittee as the case may be. If the contents are worth extra demands, the law provides for sales copies to be made available at the Superintendent of Documents at very reasonable costs. This would more than accommodate organizations that send in for bulk copies—and generally do not mind the nominal charge when their request is referred to the Superintendent of Documents.

I simply cite this information as it was one of the important phases of publication distribution disclosed during the years I was working out the successful conclusion of the act authorizing general expansion of the Federal depository library system.

I am anxious that this thinking be noted by all committee chairmen, as wider application of the original rule is going to be effected before the situation worsens.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN HEARINGS ON EFFECTS OF TELEVISION PORTRAYAL OF CRIME ON YOUNG PEOPLE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent

Resolution 47 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary three thousand additional copies of the hearings of its Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency entitled "Effects on Young People of Violence and Crime Portrayed on Television," part 10, dated June 8, 9, 13, 15, 16, and 19; July 27 and 28, 1961; January 24 and May 11 and 14, 1962.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIENS ON MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAILERS

The SPEAKER. This is District Day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMillan] chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Huddleston] to call up several bills from his subcommittee. Also I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama have permission to submit for the Record an explanation of each bill that is considered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 490) to amend the act of July 2, 1940, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if all these bills out of the House Committee on the District of Columbia were reported out by unanimous vote or unanimous agreement?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, all four bills that I shall bring up today came out of the House District Committee by unanimous vote.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes", approved July 2, 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 736, 738; sec. 40–706, D.C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by striking from the sixth sentence "each of two cards" and "cards" and inserting in lieu thereof respectively "a card" and "card", and by striking from the eighth sentence "each of the said cards" and inserting in lieu thereof "the said card".

Sec. 2. Section 7 of such Act approved July 2, 1940 (sec. 40–707, D.C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by striking "cards" wherever such word appears in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "a card", and by striking "each of said cards" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "said card".

Sec. 3. Section 8 of such Act approved July 2, 1940 (sec. 40–708, D.C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by striking from the second sentence "each of the cards" and inserting in lieu thereof "the card", and by striking from the third sentence "each of the cards" and inserting in lieu thereof "the said card".

Sec. 4. Section 11 of such Act approved July 2, 1940 (sec. 40–711, D.C. Code 1951 edition), is amended by striking from the first sentence "each of the cards" and inserting in lieu thereof "the card", and by striking from the last sentence "cards" and inserting in lieu thereof "card".

Sec. 5. Section 13 of such Act approved July 2, 1940 (sec. 40–713, D.C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by striking "files wherein he shall file one set of the cards hereinbefore described alphabetically under the name of owner and the other", and inserting in lieu thereof "a file wherein he shall file a set of cards hereinbefore described".

Sec. 6. Alphabetical files established and maintained in accordance with the requirements of section 13 of such Act approved July 2, 1940, may, with the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, be destroyed.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 490) to amend the act of July 2, 1940, as amended, relating to the recording of liens on motor vehicles and trailers registered in the District of Columbia, so as to eliminate the requirement that an alphabetical file on such liens be maintained, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of the bill, as stated in the committee report—Report No. 562—is to amend the act of July 2, 1940, which requires the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers registered in the District of Columbia. Provision is made in such act for the maintenance by the Recorder of Deeds of two card files, one an alphabetical file, the other a file by trade name and engine number of motor vehicles and trade name and serial number of trailers. The alphabetical file maintained by the Recorder of Deeds is in addition to an alphabetical file carrying identical information maintained in the Department of Motor Vehicles.

In view of the fact that the District of Columbia now is maintaining two alphabetical files, alongside of one another in the Office of Recorder of Deeds, relating to liens on motor vehicles and trailers, the committee believes it would be desirable both from the standpoint of conserving space and of saving the services of personnel if one of the two alphabetical files could be eliminated. Accordingly, enactment of this bill is recommended by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, as it will amend the act of July 2, 1940, and thereby allow the Recorder of Deeds to dispense with the maintenance of an alphabetical file.

H.R. 6348, which is identical to this bill, was approved by our Subcommittee No. 5 after a public hearing held on June 25, 1963, at which no opposition to the measure was expressed.

Enactment of S. 490, substituted for H.R. 6348, will result in a saving to the District of Columbia both in terms of space utilization and in terms of personal services.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on each of the District bills that will be brought up under consideration today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, last May 15, I introduced a bill identical to this, H.R. 6348, to accomplish a saving of time, expense, and space in one area of the District of Columbia government.

At present, the District of Columbia Recorder of Deeds is required by law to maintain two card files with respect to liens on motor vehicles and trailers—one alphabetical and the other by trade name and engine number of the motor vehicle, or trade name and serial number in the case of trailers. At the same time, the District of Columbia Department of Motor Vehicles maintains an alphabetical file of such liens identical in nature to the one kept by the Recorder of Deeds.

All parties involved—the Recorder of Deeds, the Director of the Department of Motor Vehicles, and the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners—agree that the two alphabetical files described above are a needless duplication of service, and that one should be eliminated in the interest of saving badly needed space and of more efficient utilization of employees' time.

Accordingly, this bill would accomplish this saving by eliminating the requirement of an alphabetical file of motor vehicle liens in the office of the Recorder of Deeds. I am pleased to be a sponsor of this legislation.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECORDS OF STOCKHOLDERS OF STOCK LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 6128) to amend section 15 of the Life Insurance Act to permit any stock life insurance company in the District of Columbia to maintain its record of stockholders at its principal place of business in the District of Columbia or at the office of its designated stock transfer agent in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 15 of the Life Insurance Act (D.C. Code, sec. 35–515) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 15. Capital-Stock Record.—It shall be the duty of the directors of every domestic stock company to cause a record to be kept by the treasurer or secretary of the company or by the stock transfer agent of the company containing the names of all persons, alphabetically arranged, who are or shall within six years have been stockholders of such company, and showing their place of residence, the number of shares of capital stock held by them, respectively, the time when they became owners of such shares, and the amount of capital stock actually paid in.

"Such record shall, during the usual business hours of the day, on every business day, be open for inspection by policyholders, stockholders, and creditors of the company, and their personal representatives at the office or principal place of business of such company in the place where its business operations shall be located or at the office of the stock transfer agent located in the District of Columbia, and any policyholder, stockholder, creditor, or representative shall have a right to make extracts from such record.

"Such record shall be presumptive evidence of the facts therein stated in favor of the plaintiff in any suit or proceeding against such company or against any one or more stockholders.

"Every officer, stock transfer agent, or any other agent of any company who shall neglect to make any proper entry in such record, or shall refuse or neglect to exhibit the same, or allow the same to be inspected and extracts to be taken therefrom, as herein provided, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and the company shall pay to the party injured a penalty of $50 for any such neglect or refusal, and all damages resulting therefrom.

"Every company that shall neglect to have such record kept open for inspection, as herein provided, shall forfeit to the District the sum of $50 for every day it shall so neglect, to be sued for and recovered by the Superintendent, the Corporation Counsel representing him, in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia."

With the following committee amendments:

1. Page 2, line 10, strike out the word "and".

2. Page 2, line 10, insert a comma immediately after the word "company".

3. Page 2, line 11, strike out the word "their" and insert in lieu thereof "the".

4. Page 2, line 11, immediately after "representatives", insert "of such policyholders, stockholders, and creditors".

5. Page 2, line 13, immediately after "located", insert "in the District of Columbia".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under present law, as stated in the committee report—Report No. 564—stock life insurance companies in the District of Columbia are required to maintain a current and complete record of all their stockholders at their respective principal places of business in the District. However, some of these stock life insurance companies maintain appointed stock transfer agents, who themselves keep full records of listed stockholders. Thus, in these cases the result is a needless and expensive duplication.

H.R. 6128 would eliminate this required duplication by permitting the current listing of stockholders to be maintained either by the company itself at its principal place of business, or by its stock transfer agent.

There are presently 12 stock life insurance companies in the District of Columbia. At a public hearing conducted on June 25, 1963, the counsel and assistant secretary of one of these, the United Services Life Insurance Co., informed this committee that his company currently has 1 million shares of stock outstanding, and approximately 2,000 stockholders. In 1959, this company appointed a local bank as its stock transfer agent because of increased trading activity in its stock, and hence this large volume of recordkeeping has been duplicated since that time. This same problem confronts several of the other local stock life insurance companies at this time, and others face the prospect of being similarly affected as they increase in size.

This present restriction on stock life insurance companies is similar in pattern to an old requirement in District of Columbia law which at one time was applicable to all business corporations in the District. In 1954, however, the business corporations statutes in the District of Columbia were modernized and patterned after the model corporation code approved by the American Bar Association. As a result of these amendments, the new Business Corporations Act now permits a District of Columbia corporation to maintain a record of its stockholders either at its principal place of business or at the office of its stock transfer agent. However, this 1954 act does not apply to life insurance companies in the District, and hence H.R. 6128 seeks to remedy this inequity and alleviate the needless duplication of recordkeeping now imposed upon the District of Columbia stock life insurance companies.

Moreover, this committee takes the view that this legislation not only will serve as a convenience to the insurance companies but also will result in economic savings which ultimately should benefit the public.

At public hearing on June 25, 1963, the Superintendent of Insurance for the District of Columbia expressed approval of this bill, and also the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners have advised this committee that they have no objection to its enactment.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this bill would permit stock life insurance companies in the District of Columbia which have designated stock transfer agents to keep a current listing of their stockholders either at their principal place of business in the District or at the office of their stock transfer agent. Present law requires that this record be maintained in the insurance company's local main office, regardless of the fact that the nature of a stock transfer agent's services necessitates his keeping a complete and current record of the company's stockholders at all times. The reason for the legal requirement that such a record be maintained in the District is to assure proper access to stockholders' names on the part of policyholders, stockholders, and creditors of the life insurance company. However, the duplication of this list which results in some cases under present law serves no useful purpose.

At one time, this same requirement applied to all business corporations in the District of Columbia. In 1954, however, the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act was revised and modernized, and since that time District of Columbia corporations have been permitted to maintain their record of stockholders either at their respective principal places of business or at the offices of their stock transfer agents. However, the 1954 act does not extend this permission to stock life insurance companies.

It is my opinion that this present situation is discriminatory and unfair to the 12 stock life insurance companies now doing business in the District of Columbia, and I am pleased to support this legislation which will afford them equitable treatment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRACTICE OF DENTISTRY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 6350) to amend the act entitled "An act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto," approved June 6, 1892, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 24 of the Act entitled "An Act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto", approved June 6, 1892 (27 Stat. 42), as amended (sec. 2–324, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), is amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: "The Board of Dental Examiners may, in its discretion, waive the theoretical examination and issue a license to any applicant who holds a certificate from the National Board of Dental Examiners: *Provided,* That such applicant shall pass a practical examination given by the Board of Dental Examiners: *Provided further,* That in exercising its discretion to waive theoretical examinations the Board of Dental Examiners shall satisfy itself that the examination given by the National Board of Dental Examiners was as comprehensive as that required in the District of Columbia."

SEC. 2. The foregoing amendment of said Act of June 6, 1892, as amended, shall not be considered as affecting the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824), and the performance of any function vested by said plan in the Board of Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners shall continue to be subject to delegation by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan. Any function vested by this amendatory Act in any agency established pursuant to such plan shall be deemed to be vested in said Board of Commissioners and shall be subject to delegation in accordance with said plan.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, as stated in the committee report—Report No. 565—is to authorize the District of Columbia Board of Dental Examiners to waive any theoretical examination of an applicant for a license as a dental hygienist if he holds a certificate from the National Board of Dental Examiners.

At present, an applicant for a license as a dental hygienist in the District of Columbia is required to pass both a practical and a theoretical examination. In many cases, however, the applicant has successfully passed the theoretical examination given by the National Board of Dental Examiners, whose examinations are acknowledged by the District of Columbia Board of Dental Examiners to be at least as comprehensive and as exhaustive as their own. For this reason, the District of Columbia Board feels that this requirement for theoretical examination on the part of those applicants who have qualified in the national examination is a needless duplication and an unnecessary expense to the District of Columbia. Also, such a requirement imposes a definite hardship upon the older applicants who may have been out of school for some years and yet are completely qualified from a professional standpoint. For this reason, the District of Columbia Board of Dental Examiners has requested this legislation, through the District of Columbia Commissioners, which will authorize them to waive the theoretical examination for licensure as dental hygienists in the case of applicants who hold certificates from the National Board of Dental Examiners, providing such applicants can successfully pass the practical examination administered by the District of Columbia Board.

As a matter of fact, the law presently permits the local Board to waive the theoretical examination in the case of applicants for licensure to practice dentistry in the District when such applicants hold certificates from the National Board of Dental Examiners. Hence, H.R. 6350 seeks merely to extend this same authority to the local Board in the case of dental hygienists.

This bill will provide a safeguard against the possibility that in some cases the national board's theoretical examination may not have been as comprehensive and exhaustive as that conducted by the District Board in that the District of Columbia Board will have complete freedom in interpreting the national board grades and in supplementing the national board examination with any other examination which they may deem necessary to assure compliance with District standards.

The committee has been informed that the following States now recognize the dental hygienists' theoretical examination administered by the National Board of Dental Examiners: Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia.

No opposition to this bill was expressed at a public hearing held June 25, 1963.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, an applicant for a license to practice as a dental hygienist in the District of Columbia is presently required to pass both a theoretical examination and a practical examination. Many such applicants, however, have already passed a theoretical examination administered by the National Board of Dental Examiners, as the final step in their academic training for their profession. I have been advised that the District of Columbia Board of Dental Examiners consider the National Board's theoretical examination to be as comprehensive and as difficult as their own, for which reason they regard the present requirement of duplication of the theoretical examination as unnecessary and a needless expense to the District. For this reason, they requested this legislation, which would permit the Board to waive the theoretical examination of those applicants for licensure as dental hygienists who have been certified by the National Board of Dental Examiners. It is important to note, however, that H.R. 6350, which I introduced for this purpose, reserves to the Board the right to withhold this waiver and to require an applicant to qualify on their own theoretical examination whenever they deem this expedient for the best interests of the District of Columbia.

At present, the Board has this same authority with respect to applicants for dentists' licenses. Hence, I feel it logical and appropriate to extend the same privilege to the Board in the case of dental hygienists.

The National Board's theoretical examination for dental hygienists is recognized in this manner in 35 States, and I am pleased to sponsor this bill which would add the District of Columbia to this list.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 6353) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the third sentence of subsection (f) of section 13 of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act approved August 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 946), as amended (sec. 46–313(f), D.C. Code, 1961 edition), is amended by inserting ", or the Department of Public Welfare of the government of the District of Columbia" immediately after "public employment offices".

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as stated in the committee report—Report No. 563—presently authorizes the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board to disclose information pertaining to an individual's status in regard to unemployment compensation only to first, a State or Federal agency which administers an unemployment compensation law or a system of public employment offices; or, second, the U.S. Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Thus, the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board is not permitted to advise the District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare as to whether an applicant for public assistance is receiving or is eligible to receive unemployment compensation. This bill, which was requested by the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, would extend this authority to the Unemployment Compensation Board.

At present, the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board is required to furnish an applicant for public assistance with a letter stating that he is or is not eligible to receive unemployment compensation. Obviously, the applicant may then submit this letter to the Welfare Department or withhold it, whichever he may deem expedient in connection with his application for public assistance. At best, this present system is cumbersome and time consuming; at worst, it facilitates fraudulent concealment of important information.

Eligibility for public assistance in the District of Columbia is based partially upon "need," which is defined as that part of a person's subsistence requirements which he is unable to meet by available income or other sources of funds. Thus, in order to decide properly any applicant's eligibility for public assistance and to avoid overpayments, the Department of Welfare must have knowledge of all income being received by the applicant from all sources. Also, eligibility for general public assistance in the District requires that a person be unemployable, and in this respect an applicant's representations to the Unemployment Compensation Board may in some cases be very helpful to the Welfare Department in the proper administration of the public assistance laws.

This committee is informed that in the past 4 years an average of 3,579 applications per year have been filed in the area of general public assistance in the District of Columbia, and the present average monthly caseload is 709.

At a public hearing held on June 25, 1963, support for this proposed legislation was expressed by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and by the Chief of Public Assistance Division of the Department of Public Welfare. No opposition was expressed.

In view of the above-cited facts, this committee feels that the authority which would be granted by this bill, as it may help insure against duplication and misuse of public funds, should be granted without delay.

A letter from the Board president follows:

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICES,
April 16, 1963.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit herewith a draft bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended.

Subsection (f) of section 13 of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended, presently provides that the District Unemployment Compensation Board may disclose information obtained from any employing unit or individual pursuant to the administration of such act "to any agency of this or any other State, or any Federal agency, charged with the administration of an unemployment compensation law or the maintenance of a system of public employment offices, or the Bureau of Internal Revenue of the U.S. Department of the Treasury * * *."

Existing law does not, however, authorize the District Unemployment Compensation Board to furnish to the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia information as to whether an applicant for public assistance is receiving or is entitled to receive unemployment compensation.

The Federal Social Security Act, as amended, and District of Columbia laws and regulations require that all public assistance payments to individuals and families be based on "need" in addition to other requirements. For purposes of public assistance, "need" is defined as that part of a person's or a family group's subsistence requirements which cannot be met by available income or other resources. The Federal Social Security Act requires that the State agency (Department of Public Welfare) "shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources" of the recipient or any member of his family included in the assistance payment. Accordingly, in order to properly establish eligibility for public assistance, and to avoid overpayments, it is necessary for the Department of Public Welfare to know the amount of income from all sources received by the applicant or recipient. Further, in order to be eligible to receive general public assistance in the District of Columbia, a person must be unemployable, while to receive unemployment compensation a person must be employable. In certain situations a person may be found by the Department of Public Welfare, on the basis of medical information, to be unemployable and consequently he may be granted general public assistance. The same individual may have qualified for unemployment compensation benefits and may present himself to the Unemployment Compensation Board as employable and available for and, therefore, at the same time draw unemployment compensation.

Under the existing programs of public assistance there exists a need for a direct, efficient method of exchanging information between the District Unemployment Compensation Board and the Department of Public Welfare. Moreover, if the program of aid to unemployed parents, as proposed in the fiscal year 1964 budget request is adopted, or if at some future date the Federal program of aid to dependent children of unemployed parents is adopted, the need for exchange of information will become even more imperative. During the past 4 fiscal years the number of applications for general public assistance received was an annual average of 3,579. The estimated monthly average general public assistance caseload for fiscal year 1963 is 709. The present method of obtaining information through the individuals applying for public assistance is slow, expensive, and unreliable, and an automatic clearance of active case files of one agency against those of the other would further insure that there be no duplication and misuse of public funds.

In order to furnish the Department of Public Welfare with information as to whether applicants for public assistance may be receiving or may be entitled to receive unemployment compensation, it is necessary at the present time for the District Unemployment Compensation Board to give an applicant for public assistance a letter stating that he is or is not entitled to receive unemployment compensation. This letter then may be given to the Department of Public Welfare by the applicant for public assistance. In this manner, without violating the provisions of section 13(f) of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, the District Unemployment Compensation Board is able to comply to a certain extent with the requests of the Department of Public Welfare for information concerning the status of an applicant for public assistance, insofar as his entitlement to unemployment compensation is concerned. However, this procedure is cumbersome and time consuming, and accordingly the Commissioners strongly recommend that section 13(f) of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act be amended as set forth in the attached draft bill so as to authorize the District Unemployment Compensation Board to furnish the desired information directly to the Department of Public Welfare. Such an amendment will facilitate coordination of the functions performed by both the District Unemployment Compensation Board and the Department of Public Welfare, and, the Commissioners have reason to believe, will serve to prevent persons receiving public assistance from also receiving unemployment compensation.

The Commissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this legislation to the Congress.

Yours very sincerely,

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners,
District of Columbia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I introduced this bill for the purpose of extending to the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board permission to advise the District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare as to the status of applicants for public assistance with respect to their eligibility for unemployment compensation.

It is essential for the Welfare Department to obtain complete information as to all sources of income available to applicants for public assistance, and also as to the applicants ability to work, in order to determine their eligibility and to avoid overpayment of benefits. At present, however, the Unemployment Compensation Board is permitted to disclose such information only to a Government agency administering an unemployment compensation program or public employment offices, or to the U.S. Bureau of Internal Revenue. In the case of applicants for District of Columbia public assistance, the Board must furnish the applicant a letter declaring his status of eligibilty with respect to unemployment compensation. Obviously, this system cannot be as reliable or as effective as direct information to the Department of Public Welfare.

The average caseload in general public assistance in the District of Columbia is now in excess of 700 applications per month, and benefit costs exceed $54,000 per month. In view of these facts, and the recent disclosure of a large percentage of the recipients of such payments being actually unqualified, I feel strongly that it is incumbent upon the Congress to provide the District of Columbia Welfare Department with every possible means of assuring proper and efficient operation of this program. This bill will contribute materially to this end.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY].

SMALL CLAIMS AND CONCILIATION BRANCH, MUNICIPAL COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 489) to amend the act of March 5, 1938, establishing a small claims and conciliation branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will this require the appointment of another municipal judge?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. No. This will avoid the issuance of a number of orders in many cases which appear before this court.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (g) of section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act establishing a small claims and conciliation branch in the municipal court of the District of Columbia for improving the administration of justice in small cases and providing assistance to needy litigants, and for other purposes", approved March 5, 1938, as amended (52 Stat. 105; D.C. Code, 1961 edition, sec. 11–805(g)), is amended by inserting after the word "action" a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That where in any case controlled by any other statute a greater or lesser time for hearing is specified by such other statute, such other specified period of time shall be controlling".

SEC. 2. The second sentence of subsection (g) of section 5 of such Act is amended by striking "herein" and inserting in lieu thereof "therein".

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, as stated in the committee report—Report No. 561—is to correct an inconsistency between two provisions of law relating to actions in the Small Claims and Conciliation Branch of the court now designated the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions—formerly the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia.

Subsection (g) of section 5 of the act creating the Small Claims and Conciliation Branch in the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia—act of March

5, 1938, as amended, 52 Stat. 105—which relates to time for hearing of small claims, provides:

> (g) The clerk shall furnish the plaintiff with the memorandum of the day and hour set for the hearing, which time shall be not less than five nor more than fifteen days from the date of the filing of the action. All actions filed in this branch shall be returnable herein.

However, section 7 of the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 123), provides in part as follows:

> Section 7. SERVICE OF PROCESS ON NONRESIDENT.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The court in which the action is pending may order such continuances as may be necessary to afford the defendant a reasonable opportunity to defend the action, and no judgment by default in any such action shall be granted until at least twenty days shall have elapsed after service upon the defendant, as hereinabove provided, of a copy of the process and notice of service of said process upon the Commissioners.

The District of Columbia has occasion to file a relatively large number of cases against nonresident motorists in the small claims branch of the municipal court, and in these cases, in view of the conflicting provisions of law quoted above, the question has arisen as to which statutory period of time is applicable.

Presently, the clerk of the Small Claims Branch sets as return day for all actions the 14th day from the date on which suit is filed, in accordance with the statute governing the operations of the Small Claims Branch. However, in motor vehicle operation cases involving nonresident defendants, it is frequently necessary for the plaintiff to secure a continuance on the return date to comply with the longer time limitation of the Safety Responsibility Act. Thus, the plaintiff's attorney and the court's clerical staff are burdened with the work of providing two, and sometimes three, trial dates in the same case.

S. 489 seeks to reconcile the inconsistent provisions of these two statutes by the simple expedient of amending the act establishing the Small Claims and Conciliation Branch of the Municipal Court, to provide that the 15-day maximum period between the date of filing of an action and the date of hearing shall not apply in any case controlled by another statute specifying a greater or lesser period of time.

A bill identical to this, H.R. 12417, passed the House late in the 2d session of the 87th Congress, but was not acted on in the Senate. The same bill was again introduced in the House this year, as H.R. 2696, and was approved by this committee on March 7, 1963. However, the reporting thereof was withheld pending final action on H.R. 3537—now Public Law 88-60, approved July 8, 1963—which changed the municipal court to the court of general sessions. The reported legislation changes the procedures in such court.

At a public hearing held on August 10, 1962, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia expressed their approval of this bill. The committee was informed also that the board of judges of what is now the court of general sessions had voted unanimously in favor of enactment of the measure. No opposition to the bill was expressed.

The following letter, addressed to Hon. JOHN DOWDY, chairman of our Subcommittee No. 4, from Mr. Charles P. Henry, Jr., chief deputy clerk of the Small Claims and Conciliation Branch of the Court of General Sessions, known at that time as the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, under date of August 14, 1962, presents the views of the court on this proposed legislation:

> THE MUNICIPAL COURT FOR
> THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
> *Washington, DC., August 14, 1962.*
>
> Hon. JOHN DOWDY,
> *House District Committee,*
> *House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SIR: For the purpose of clarification of my phone conversation on August 13, 1962, and for your information may I refer to title 40, section 423(a) of the District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition, which refers to service of process on nonresidents.
>
> "The court in which the action is pending may order such continuances as may be necessary to afford the defendant a reasonable opportunity to defend the action, and no judgment by default in any such action shall be granted until at least 20 days shall have elapsed after service upon the defendant, as herein above provided," etc.
>
> The present period of time in which a case may be heard in this court is 5 to 15 days from date of filing, this being for the purpose of eliminating and preventing any backlog of pending cases before the court.
>
> I am not in favor of an amendment in entirety of this time period but only and specifically in nonresident automobile damage cases for a longer original return date which would eliminate the need and necessity for numerous continuances which only take up valuable time of plaintiffs, plaintiff's attorney, as well as court personnel.
>
> Present procedure of a nonresident case filed in this court is as follows:
>
> (1) Case is filed with original return date of 2 weeks.
>
> (2) Marshal serves copy on Director of Motor Vehicles and Traffic; time requirement (2 to 3 days).
>
> (3) Plaintiff, after verification of service on Director of Motor Vehicles and Traffic, mails a copy of the statement of claim to the defendant at his home address outside of the District of Columbia by registered mail with return receipt requested.
>
> (4) On the original return date, plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney must appear with return receipt showing date of delivery of claim on the defendant.
>
> (5) In all instances when the defendant fails to appear, the case must be continued for a period of 20 days from the date of delivery of notice to the defendant.
>
> (6) Plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney must again appear in court on the extended return date to request a judgment against the defendant.
>
> Inasmuch as the steps of procedure in such actions are now more numerous and involved, favorable consideration of this bill would, in my opinion, be of great benefit to all concerned.
>
> Respectfully yours,
> CHARLES P. HENRY, Jr.,
> *Chief Deputy Clerk, Small Claims and Conciliation Branch.*

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to eliminate the present duplication of services in the Small Claims and Conciliation Branch of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions with respect to nonresident defendants in automobile damage cases. This situation is a result of a present conflict between two controlling statutes.

The act which created the Small Claims and Conciliation Branch in the present District of Columbia Court of General Sessions establishes a period of not less than 5 days nor more than 15 days between the date of filing and the date of hearing, in all small claims cases. However, the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act provides that in automobile damage cases involving nonresidents, as much as 20 days may elapse between service upon the defendant and the granting of a judgment by default against him.

Presently, because of this conflict of laws, the court sets as return day for all actions the 14th day from the date on which suit is filed; and then in automobile damage cases where the defendant is a nonresident and does not appear within this 2-week period, the case is continued for a period of 20 days from the date of actual delivery of notice to the defendant. The result is that the plaintiff's attorney and the clerk's clerical staff are burdened with the work of providing two, and sometimes three, trial dates in the same case.

This bill would resolve this and any other conflict of a similar nature, by amending the act establishing the small claims and conciliation branch to provide that in any case coming under this act but controlled also by any other statute specifying a different time between notice and hearing, such other specified period shall be controlling. The effect of this will be that the court will serve notice on nonresident defendants in automobile damage cases specifying a 20-day period for hearing, rather than the costly and time-consuming series of notices now made necessary by this conflict of laws.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOMINATION OF CANDIDATES FOR THE SERVICE ACADEMIES

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 442 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7356) to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill

for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George] and I now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 442 provides for the consideration of H.R. 7356, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

At the present time, 4,417 midshipmen are authorized for attendance at the Naval Academy whereas only 2,529 are authorized for attendance at the Military and Air Force Academies.

Under existing law, the U.S. Military and Air Force Academies each graduate about 550 cadets annually. With the enactment of this legislation, these academies could ultimately expect to graduate about 930 cadets annually.

The purpose of the bill is to increase the authorized cadet strength of the U.S. Military Academy and the Air Force Academy from the present strength of 2,529 to the strength presently authorized by the U.S. Naval Academy of 4,417; to revise the appointment provisions of the law applicable to the U.S. Naval Academy as well as to the Military and Air Force Academies so as to increase the number of authorized cadets and midshipmen from congressional sources from the present level of 61 percent to approximately 75 percent; to make uniform the statutory provisions relating to the appointments of cadets and midshipmen to the Military, Air Force, and Naval Academies.

One of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, according to the report and an important reason for increasing the admission of Academy graduates to the Army and Air Force officer structure is to improve the retention rate which will result, as we read, through the provisions of the bill. I know many of us have often wondered about the admission standards of the various academies. I know I, for one, a couple of years ago, had a young fellow who graduated from high school. He was not in the top quarter of his class. But on going into the service and after being in the service for a year, he decided he wanted to go to Military Academy. He, during his year in the Army, had grown from adolescence to manhood. He went to prep school and became an excellent student. He took his examinations before the college boards and got around 600 in English and a perfect score in mathematics, an 800 mark. Yet, he was unable to get the appointment that I gave him to one of the service academies because he had not been in the first quarter of his graduating class in high school. He had graduated from high school 2 years previously. The interesting fact about the high school he went to is that it was an honor school. Had he gone to an ordinary high school, no doubt he would have been one of the leaders in the class. But, because of the fact he was not in the first quarter of his graduating class in the high school, he was not admitted to this service academy. But the other two service academies would accept him.

Now, to me, that is a ridiculous situation. I am happy to see in the report on this bill on page 7 it states:

> In view of these circumstances, the committee recommends that the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower review this problem—

That is the problem of admission standards—

> with a view toward making as uniform as practicable admission standards for all the service academies.

I, for one, really think that should be put into effect and the committee says as an alternative, it may be necessary for the Congress to establish these uniform standards by law.

I think this is excellent legislation. At the present time we have a principal and three alternates to the Air Force, a principal and three alternates to the U.S. Military Academy, and a principal and five alternates to the Naval Academy. This would make the law uniform and we will have a principal and five alternates to all academies.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert] and the committee for what I think is an excellent job that they have done on this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 442 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 7356, a bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code relating to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, this bill came from the Armed Services Committee unanimously, even though that may not be a surprise. It is an excellent bill in every respect. It is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'Neill] has pointed out, it does something that has always seemed important to those of us who have had close relations with the various academies; namely, that it put them all on an even basis. For some reason which I have never quite been able to fathom the Naval Academy always had far more candidates and was able to accept far more than either of the other two academies. This will bring the Military Academy at West Point and the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs, Colo., up to the same level. It is, as I said before, long overdue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, from time to time each of the services has varied by regulation the number of alternates who will be named by congressional sources. These alternates are extremely important because the academies very often pick up several of them after they have appointed the principal.

Mr. Speaker, the Army now permits a principal, plus three alternates. The Navy permits one principal, plus five alternates. The Air Force permits a principal, plus five alternates. If this bill is enacted they will all be the same. It is the hope that they, in time, that is, probably within the next 4 to 5 years, will be able to graduate, roughly, 1,000 officers from each academy.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that both former President Eisenhower and, I believe on good authority, President Kennedy have favored such legislation. When President Eisenhower was Commander in Chief and made a study of these academies he favored—and in fact I have heard him say that the Military Academy should graduate roughly 1,000 candidates per year. Even so, the idea that all officers or the majority of officers are graduates of these academies is utterly false and even if this legislation goes into effect the officers in the Military Establishment will still constitute a minority as far as graduates from these academies are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, the bill will also represent a great relief to us as Members of Congress to be able to appoint more of these young men who want to go and who should go and who are capable, and not to have them discriminated against at some of the academies.

As has been said before, when the standards are all the same we will not have the kind of conflict and the kind of treatment that my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'Neill], has just described.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one differentiation as far as I know, and that is that the Naval Academy will continue to have a stricter line as far as eyesight is concerned. In other words, the physical examinations will not be entirely identical.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly favor this legislation and I am sure that the House, in its wisdom, will probably pass it, as the committee has unanimously reported it.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Barry].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentlewoman from New York for bringing to our attention this bill. I also wish to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'Neill] for his comments, and to commend the committee for having unanimously adopted it.

Certainly most every Member of Congress has gone through the pains of selecting highly qualified candidates for admission to the service academies. The passage of this bill would set the stage for some young men of great ability, who have been deprived of admission, to seek and obtain admission thereby benefiting not only themselves but most especially our great country.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George] represents the congressional district in which the Military Academy at West Point is located. I am fortunate to have the privilege of representing the adjacent congressional district overlooking the Hudson River. From a part of my district one can stand and see West Point on the other side. I think the gentlewoman would agree with me that it is a necessary effort to expand our colleges, to keep up with this rising trend of teenagers who are seething with all of the energy and ability that they have accumulated in their earlier years and are ready to use it. I am sure the gentlewoman would also agree with me: The facilities at West Point and at the Air Force Academy need to be expanded so that they can take on their share of the increased responsibilities of our college-level institutions.

We must be prepared to nearly double the number of college students in 1975 over 1960. I know this is a difficult thing for all of us to encompass, but, nevertheless, it is crystal clear that the quality of boy at West Point and the Air Academy and Annapolis in the form of their graduates has redounded to the credit of the United States. Whether that boy remains in the military service, whether he goes into industry, or whatever his occupation may be, I certainly wish to add my voice of approval to this particular piece of legislation and to the future security of our country.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. May I say I join him in hoping that the Military Academy, with which we are both so familiar, will be able to add greatly to its already remarkable contribution to the welfare of our country and the peace of the world.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7356) to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7356 with Mr. HECHLER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] have given you a brief outline of the basic concept of this legislation and its general effect on the future of the two military academies.

I want to point out and emphasize exactly what the bill does and particularly those provisions which are of particular interest to the Members of this body.

This bill in effect not only enlarges the authorized cadet strength of the Air Academy and the Military Academy to the strength of the Naval Academy but broadens and tightens the control on the appointment system authorized for Members of Congress. There has been a tendency which we all have recognized for many years to take away from Members of the Congress the right of appointment to military academies. This settles that issue for once and for all.

At the present time the Members of the Congress have the right of appointment of five midshipmen numerically at the Naval Academy, four at the Military Academy, and four at the Air Academy.

Under this legislation every Member of the Congress will have the privilege of naming five candidates or nominees to each of the three academies.

In addition to the principal nomination, each Member will have the privilege of naming five alternates. This brings into uniformity and consonance the same appointment privileges to the three academies.

Now most important and most significant is the new priority system setup in the bill, and the creation of a new category as reflected in the appointive powers of the Members of Congress. The first and highest priority for appointment of cadets and midshipmen are congressional appointments; the Presidential appointment and sons of Medal of Honor winners. These nominating sources must first be satisfied. The first appointments to the academy must be from people in these categories who are qualified. Then there is created a new category of 600 individuals, 150 a year, or 600 over a period of 4 years, which will constitute another source from which qualified congressional alternates may be admitted to the academy. In this new category group of 150 or 600 over 4 years, all the congressional qualified alternates will be put into competition one with the other and the entire 150 of this new category shall come from congressional appointees.

In the next category are appointments from enlisted personnel of the Regular military service and the Reserve group. After this group is satisfied then there is still another opportunity for a qualified congressional alternate to be appointed. The remaining qualified alternates from the congressional sources are then put into competition with qualified candidates from all sources. At this point the Secretary of the military department will utilize this pool to bring the academy up to strength and fill remaining vacancies, but 75 percent of these qualified alternates selected from the last category must come from congressional sources. This is the real impact of the bill.

In addition the report recommends that the academies immediately take steps to bring into consonance and uniformity their admission standards. We have a strange situation at the present time of one young man being denied admission to one academy and being admitted to another academy, and upon graduation going into the very service to which he had been originally denied admission. This situation requires correction and if appropriate action is not taken by the Defense Department, Congress will be forced to prescribe uniform standards of admission by law.

Another important feature of the legislation is the fact that appointments from the congressional alternate source is strictly on a competitive basis after initial qualification. The qualified alternate who stands at the top goes in, succeeded by his own successive alternates.

As to the strength which this brings into the picture, the authorized strength of all three academies is brought to the strength of the Naval Academy which it has enjoyed over many, many years of 4,417 as compared to 2,500-plus in the two other military academies. However, you must keep in mind and it must be brought to your attention that the 4,417 strength authorized at the Naval Academy is not exercised. About 4,000 people are in the Academy and full strength has never been authorized or utilized. This, simply stated, is what the bill does.

The purpose of the legislation is threefold:

First. It will increase the authorized cadet strength of the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy from the present strength of 2,529 to the strength presently authorized the U.S. Naval Academy of 4,417.

Second. It will revise the appointment provisions of the law applicable to the U.S. Naval Academy as well as the Military and Air Force Academies, so as to increase the number of authorized cadets and midshipmen from congressional sources from the present level of 61 percent to approximately 75 percent.

Third. It will make uniform the statutory provisions relating to the appointment of cadets and midshipmen to the Military, Air Force, and Naval Academies.

BACKGROUND

At the present time, 4,417 midshipmen are authorized for attendance at the Naval Academy whereas only 2,529 are authorized at the Military and Air Force Academies.

Under existing law, the U.S. Military and Air Force Academies each graduate about 550 cadets annually.

With enactment of the proposed legislation, these academies could ultimately expect to graduate about 930 cadets annually.

It is generally recognized that academy graduates, because of their unique background, exert an important beneficial influence upon the officer corps of each of the respective military departments.

Unfortunately, the present production of approximately 550 graduates annually from the Military and Air Force Academies is not adequate to insure a substantial proportion of Academy graduates in the future Regular officer corps of these military departments. Hence, both the Chief of Staff of the Army as well as the Chief of Staff of the Air Force urgently recommend an increase in the number of graduates authorized for the Military and Air Force Academies.

At the present time, Academy graduates constitute only 3 percent of the total officer force or 8.4 percent of the Regular officer force of the Air Force. In the case of the Department of the Army, Academy graduates constitute only 7.3 percent of the total officer strength or 22 percent of the Regular officer strength.

On the other hand, approximately 32 percent of the Regular officer strength of the Navy is made up of Academy graduates.

Present Military and Air Force Academy production of approximately 550 graduates annually will constitute only 18 percent of the Air Force and 26 percent of the Army officer input when the authorized Regular force of 69,425 and 49,500, respectively, is obtained.

This proportion of Academy graduates in the Regular officer strength is obviously insufficient. The 930 cadets which could be graduated annually upon full implementation of this legislative proposal would constitute 31 percent of the Air Force and 50 percent of the Army input into the Regular officer structure.

Accomplishment of this goal would be consistent with the recommendations of many boards and study groups which have urged that the Regular officer strength of the individual military departments be made up of 50 percent academy graduates and the balance from other sources.

Another important reason for increasing the input of academy graduates into the Army and Air Force officer structure is the improved retention rate which will result.

For example, the Air Force has advised the Committee on Armed Services that its overall retention rate of academy graduates in the Air Force is 87.2 percent compared to a 27-percent retention rate for ROTC graduates.

An increased retention rate for officer personnel has a double advantage in that it will not only result in substantial savings in training costs but will also provide and insure a higher experience level throughout the officer corps. The advantages of both these considerations are evident and require no elaboration.

It is important to note that the proposed legislation does not authorize any increase in the facilities at either the Air Force or Military Academy. Obviously, it will be necessary to provide additional facilities if the full authorized strength of the Military and Air Force Academies is to be attained. However, authorization for such facilities will necessarily be the subject of separate legislation. In the meantime, upon enactment of this legislation, both the Military and Air Force Academies will be permitted to make maximum use of existing facilities.

The Committee on Armed Services has been advised that both the Department of the Air Force and the Department of the Army will probably increase their cadet strengths by approximately 150 to 200 the first year without any increase in existing facilities. Moreover, this initial increase in cadet enrollment will not require additional appropriations.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The bill as originally acted upon by a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services was H.R. 6611. H.R. 6611 simply proposed to provide the Army and Air Force Academies with the same authorization for cadet strengths that is presently enjoyed by the Naval Academy.

The Committee on Armed Services concurred in the desirability of providing this increased cadet strength for the Military and Air Force Academies but was of the opinion that certain of the provisions of existing law relating to authorized strength at the Naval Academy required revision.

As a consequence, the Committee on Armed Services made a number of substantive changes to H.R. 6611 and, therefore, introduced a clean bill, H.R. 7356. In addition to providing the Military and Air Force Academies with the same authorized strength now provided the Naval Academy, H.R. 7356 will make the following substantive changes to existing law:

First. The bill would establish a new appointment category for qualified congressional alternates who do not receive a principal appointment.

Under existing law, qualified congressional alternates who do not receive a principal appointment are not given consideration for possible appointment to fill existing vacancies at the academies until after the services have exhausted all other competitive sources of appointment prescribed by law.

As a consequence, relatively few qualified congressional alternates receive appointment to the academies.

The committee has, therefore, proposed the establishment of a new category of competitive appointment restricted to qualified congressional alternates. This category would provide for appointment of 150 alternates per year with a 4-year cumulative total of 600.

Second. The bill will provide a system of priorities in the use of authorized sources of academy nominees and appointees.

The committee would change existing provisions of law relating to the Navy, and would make them also applicable to the Army and Air Force by establishing priorities in the use of nominating and appointing sources for the Academies.

These priorities would be in the following order:

First, all congressional appointments under the "authorized strength" portion of the law would be filled. This means that qualified nominees of Representatives and Senators would be appointed to bring the total "authorized strength" from this source to 2,675. In addition, nominees from other sources in the "authorized strength" section could be appointed in the number necessary to bring midshipmen and cadets from these sources to a total of 58.

Second, appointments would be made from the Presidential source. The authority for these appointments is in the annual appointment portion of the law, and amounts to 75 cadets or midshipmen each year. On a cumulative basis, the number of cadets or midshipmen that could be in the Academy from this source at any one time would be 300, less attrition.

Third, appointments would be made from the new additional congressional source—that is, qualified alternates of Representatives and Senators. The authority for these appointments is likewise in the annual appointment portion of the law, and amounts to 150 candidates each year. On a cumulative basis, the number of cadets or midshipmen that could be in the Academy from this source at any one time would be 600, less attrition.

The fourth, and last, priority would be appointments from nominees of the Secretary from the Regular and Reserve enlisted forces, ROTC, and graduates of honor schools. A total of 170 midshipmen or cadets yearly may be appointed from these sources. On a cumulative basis, the number of midshipmen or cadets that could be in the Academy from these sources at any one time would be 680, less attrition.

Third. The bill includes a provision for a uniform number of authorized congressional alternates.

From time to time, each of the services have varied by regulation the number of alternates who would be named by congressional sources.

The Army now permits a principal plus three alternates.

The Navy, principal plus five alternates.

The Air Force, principal plus five alternates.

Inasmuch as this opportunity for possible appointment of congressional alternates will be enhanced under the legislation—new category of 600 congressional alternates—and since it is desirable that the highest caliber candidates be made available—the bill prescribes that a congressional source may name a principal and 5 alternates for each vacancy.

Fourth. The bill would amend the existing authority of the Secretary to make additional appointments to bring the academies up to strength by providing that at least 75 percent of such appointments rather than 66 percent must come from congressional sources.

The law presently provides the Secretary with authority to make such additional appointments as may be necessary to bring the academies up to authorized strength on opening day.

Presently, two-thirds of these appointments must come from congressional sources.

The bill would increase this to 75 percent to conform to the general increase in input from congressional sources allocated to authorized congressional sources.

Fifth. The bill includes a provision which would govern the gradual increase in cadet strength at the Military and Air Force Academies.

The present authorized strength of the Military and Air Force Academies is 2,505 cadets. Under this authorized strength, each Member of Congress is authorized four principal appointments.

Under the proposed new strength, each Member of Congress would be authorized five principal appointments.

However, since the initial increase in cadet strength will be less than 535 the first year—the number which would be required to give each Member of Congress another principal appointment—there will be required an equitable distribution of the additional appointments that will be possible during the buildup period.

The bill, therefore, provides that all additional appointments made to the Military and Air Force Academies which would result in a cadet strength in excess of 2,505—the present strength—must come from congressional sources.

The committee was also assured by representatives of the service departments that these additional appointments would be made from qualified congressional alternates in order of merit.

As a Member of Congress received one of these additional appointments, he would not be eligible for an additional appointment until after every other congressional source had received a fifth appointment.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ACTION

In summary, the bill as reported by the Committee on Armed Services and recommended for enactment, will provide a uniform cadet/midshipman strength for all the service academies. However, by virtue of the committee changes previously mentioned, the Congress will reaffirm its insistence that the major procurement of candidates for the service academies will be from congressional sources.

Under the proposed committee changes, the possibility of a congressional alternate being appointed to one of the service academies will be greatly enhanced. Today, if a qualified congressional alternate does not succeed to a principal appointment, he only receives consideration for appointment after all other competitive sources of the Secretary of the military department have been exhausted.

Under the committee change, he will now be given a second opportunity for selection in the new congressional alternate category recommended by the committee.

Also, if he fails of selection in this category, he will then have a third opportunity to be considered for appointment by the Secretary when the Secretary utilizes his established authority to bring the academies up to strength. In this instance, at least 75 percent of these additional appointments made by the Secretary will, under the bill, be required to come from congressional sources.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will not require any additional appropriations to the Department of Defense. The committee has been advised that both the Military and Air Force Academies would increase cadet strength by approximately 150 to 200 cadets in the first year. This increase could be accomplished without the construction of any new facilities or any additional appropriations.

New facilities, however, would be required to accommodate any substantial increase in cadet strength above the initial input.

The Army has advised that the construction of new facilities to accommodate the maximum authorized strength would require an estimated $66 million of new construction.

The Air Force advised that new facilities requirements would amount to approximately $36 million.

CONCLUSION

The Department of the Air Force, on behalf of the Department of Defense, has advised the Committee on Armed Services that it strongly supports enactment of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my summary and explanation of the bill. I believe it to be an excellent bill which merits the approval and support of every Member of this body.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues in rising in support of this legislation.

As the ranking minority member on the subcommittee which drafted this legislation, I feel particularly qualified to vouch for its merits.

The Members of the House have been given a very excellent and detailed explanation of the bill. However, I feel that certain features of this bill require special emphasis and, therefore, I will take the next few minutes to review these important elements of the bill.

As Mr. Hébert has previously explained, this bill, when completely implemented, will result in an increase in principal appointments made by Members of Congress from the present level of four to a level of five. However, since the initial input of cadets into the Military and Air Force Academies will be less than 535 and, therefore, will not permit another principal appointment for each Member of Congress, there will be a period of buildup in academy strength which must be carefully supervised.

Therefore, the bill provides that during the interim or buildup period and until each Member of Congress is given his increased quota of five principal appointments, all appointments that will result in exceeding present actual or authorized strength will necessarily come from congressional sources.

The bill requires a monitoring of this procedure by requiring the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force to consult with the Committees on Armed Services of the House and Senate during implementation of this procedure.

The second distinctive and important feature of this bill that merits congressional attention relates to the new category of 150 congressional qualified alternates who may be appointed to each of the academies annually. That is 150 for each of the 4 years.

This group of appointees from congressional sources will, under the bill, be given a priority above other appointment sources available to the Secretary. Thus, the Secretary will be required to exhaust this new congressional qualified alternate category before he utilizes his other competitive sources of procurement.

The net result of these actions is to reassert the desire of the Congress that our cadets and midshipmen at the Military, Air Force, and Naval Academies will largely come from congressional sources.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to point out that this legislation as originally recommended to the committee from the Department of Defense did not give this additional group of appointments to the Congress. It went back to the old Naval Academy plan whereby these extra numbers were selected by the Academic Board of the Academy. Now this will increase the number of congressional appointees, roughly, from, I believe, 61 to 75 percent. Under the bill we are returning to the method of appointment which will be principally congressional, and from which the Navy had gotten away in yearly appointments. In fact, all three of the Academies will be under exactly the same type of appointments and the numbers will be the same.

Mr. Chairman, I think this legislation is long overdue and I heartily recommend its enactment.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I congratulate the committee very much on the bill and I intend to support it. It would seem to me that we ought to know exactly what we are doing. The committee, very properly in the report, has shown the cost of this change. It is estimated that this will cost us about $146 million over a period of 10 years. Am I correct in that?

Mr. BRAY. As I recall, that is approximately correct.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. The figure is not $146 million over 10 years, it is closer to $106 million over 10 years, provided that the Congress authorizes the new construction. The control is entirely in the Congress. The actual figures would be some $60 million at the Military Academy and $36 million at the Air Academy, but this is not an authorization bill at all in that connection. We must have separate legislation, and it must come before the Committee on Armed Services and before the House before any construction can be begun.

Mr. BRAY. That is correct.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman from Louisiana is quite right, with the one exception, I believe. The report shows a total to the Military Academy of $110 million, $44 million of which is for modernization and $66 million for expansion. Then there is a matter of $36 million for the Air Force Academy. So if my figures are right, that brings it to $146 million when you take into consideration the modernization.

Mr. HÉBERT. No; you are adding two figures back again. Even without this legislation the Military Academy will make a request over a period of years, and it has been doing so for several years in the past, for rehabilitation of its buildings, in the amount of some $46 million. Regardless of whether or not this legislation is passed, the Military Academy in the next several years is going to come to the Congress to ask permission to rehabilitate the buildings, which are of ancient vintage and need rehabilitation. We must remove that $46 million from the total of $146 million, which includes the amounts, if and when Congress adds them, to enlarge the Academy to take care of the full authorized strength. You do this in annual increments.

At the Air Force Academy the figure of $36 million applies only to new construction, which could only be granted by Congress in an authorization for the Air Force Academy.

As a typical example, at the present time the Air Force could take in 200 new cadets, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bray] pointed out, in this phase-in, with the physical facilities it has now. The Military Academy could take in 150 under the same circumstances. As the years go on the Academies must come back to the Congress and get authorizations for new construction for the continued phasing in and the required expansion of the property at the institutions.

Mr. BOW. I agree again with the explanation of the gentleman from Louisiana. The report shows it very clearly. The purpose of raising this question is simply to let us know and have it right on the record. I am going to support this bill, as I said. I think it is a good bill. But when we have bills of this kind, I think it is well to have some understanding about the possible cost we may be faced with in the future.

I understand there is no authorization in this bill for any funds. That would come later through the great Committee on Armed Services of the House, of which the gentleman is a member. After a complete hearing, then it would be reported to the House and then come before the Appropriations Committee. This bill carries no authorization for construction, but there is the estimate of the possibility of $66 million in new construction for the Army and $36 million in new construction for the Air Force, over a period of 10 years.

Mr. BRAY. That is correct. I am happy the gentleman brought that matter up, because in the building of the Air Force Academy a very unfortunate thing occurred. The amount ran far more than the estimate. I think the Congress should keep a very tight rein on these authorizations and appropriations, because what did happen there is very unconscionable. I intend for my part to see that that does not happen again.

Mr. BOW. I am delighted the committee does bring out these facts in connection with this bill, although this is not an authorization bill. I hope the other committees in the future will give us in their reports estimates about what these things will cost in the future, and give us an opportunity to examine them.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HÉBERT. I thank the gentleman for his support of this legislation and for his concise explanation of what the facts are, and I would again indicate that the committee did bring this to the attention of the Congress in the report and the only time money will be authorized is if the facts justify it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to discuss one important aspect of this bill which relates directly to another bill that was before the House in the last session, H.R. 7913 of the 87th Congress, and which also provided for certain additional cadets at two of our service academies. Members may perhaps recall that H.R. 7913 became the subject of some controversy, and eventually failed of passage, largely because of the whole problem of athletic professionalism in our service academies.

I am sure that many Members of the House have been concerned, as I have, about these recurring reports of athletic professionalism in our service academies, of attracting people into the service academies not because of any great motivation on their part for the services but simply because they happened to have some particular kind of athletic ability that this or that particular service academy happened to be in need of at the moment. And all too frequently, Mr. Chairman, individuals appointed to the academy in this fashion have left the services just as rapidly as they could after graduation in order to take up a full-time career in professional athletics.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, this is very wrong and should not be permitted. The taxpayers of the United States should not be asked to pay for the college education of individuals purely for the sake of training them in a career of professional athletics. Whatever might be the argument in favor of athletic professionalism in our civilian universities—and I for one do not find them very persuasive—it certainly has no proper place in our military academies. Yet, Mr. Chairman, the situation has become so serious in recent years that we actually have the spectacle of service academy coaches wandering through the corridors of the House Office Buildings soliciting academy appointments from Members of Congress without any regard whatsoever for the congressional district in which the particular individual appointed may reside. Indeed, in some cases I know of we have even had these coaches or athletic representatives trafficking personally themselves in congressional appointments to the academies and have had them, in effect, promising these congressional appointments to individuals solely because of their athletic ability.

Why only last year, Mr. Chairman, in the Congressional Record, volume 108, part 10, page 13171, I placed a sworn affidavit describing the details of a situation of this kind which came to my attention in my own congressional district, where a West Point basketball coach had actually promised a resident of my congressional district an appointment to the Military Academy and then had himself obtained that appointment for the lad from another district in another State, and all without my ever having been aware of the fact that the boy in question was an applicant for the Academy. When at the last moment the promised appointment fell through, the boy was left holding the bag and at that moment his parents appealed in desperation to me, their own Congressman.

I think this kind of thing is very wrong in our academies. Members will recall that this rampant athletic professionalism was discussed not only in this House last year but also in the other body by the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long]. Senator Long also spoke out against such activities in the U.S. Military Academy. And I dare say similar things have happened in some of our other service academies as well.

The bill we had before us in the last Congress, H.R. 7193, was intended to increase the number of appointments in the Military Academy and in the Air Force Academy. It was drawn up, Mr. Chairman, to allow the so-called academic boards of these two academies to make additional appointments of their own selection to fill in advance an anticipated annual attrition in their entering classes. The able Senator from Louisiana pointed out in the other body that although these so-called academic board appointments constituted regularly only about 10 percent of the total number of cadets appointed to these academies, they nevertheless over the years have also regularly constituted something like 75 percent of the varsity athletes in these same academies. And so the Senator pointed out that obviously the assignment of additional appointments to the academic boards as H.R. 7913 would have done, would have had the practical effect of just letting the academies pick more of the athletes they wanted regardless of the legal requirements of congressional district residence, and without regard for the obligation to select all qualified candidates on the basis of their overall ability.

The Senator from Louisiana did succeed in getting several amendments added to H.R. 7913 in the other body. Chiefly, there were two of these amendments. One was an amendment which required that if the academies did select these new appointees from qualified alternates designated by Members of Congress, then they had to give first preference to the selection of first alternates rather than jumping down the line to the boy with the particular athletic ability they wanted. This of course has been the practice in the past. They get some obliging Member to be good enough to put this or that lad on as third or 4th or 5th or even 11th alternate on his own list, just so he was anywhere at all within the ball park, and then the academic board could reach down and pick him up. That amendment helped to block that little gimmick.

The second amendment added to H.R. 7913 in the other body was a provision to the effect that the names and addresses and the name of the congressional appointer for each of these newly appointed individuals be published annually by each Academy.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. **HÉBERT**. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. **STRATTON**. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this bill (H.R. 7913) came back over to this body on August 14 last year. I objected to its immediate consideration in this body because I felt very strongly, as I commented at the time, that we needed to discuss this whole subject of athletic professionalism more fully, and I also felt that we needed not only the protection that had been written into the legislation as it left the other body, but also some more evidence in the higher echelons of the Defense Department that somebody over there understood the problem and perhaps really cared about doing something about it.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to say that I am supporting H.R. 7356 today, a bill which also provides for additional cadet strength, because, after having had an opportunity to study it carefully, I have concluded that it does represent a more significant step in the direction of eliminating the kind of rampant and improper methods of cadet recruitment that I had objected to so strenuously last year. It does this in several ways, Mr. Chairman. First, as the able gentleman from Louisiana has already pointed out, H.R. 7356 provides that henceforth a larger percentage of those appointed to the Academies shall be congressional designates and a lesser percentage shall be selected by the various academic boards. Secondly, it provides that those thus selected shall be selected on the basis of merit, and as a result of competition, with their merit based on more than athletic ability alone. And finally, H.R. 7356 spells out once again, for all three of the Academies, the very clear legal requirement that no individual shall be appointed who is not himself a resident of the district represented by the particular Member of Congress appointing him. And may I add, Mr. Chairman, that I believe the services have just as much responsibility in seeing that this requirement of law is adhered to as do the Members themselves. Together these three provisions of H.R. 7356 should help to put an end to Academy athletic coaches roaming up and down the corridors of the House Office Building looking for a Member, let us say, from the Far West, to give an Academy appointment to a lad who lives in the East, or looking for a Member from the East to appoint someone living in the West.

Mr. Chairman, we were all shocked and disturbed a few years ago over the athletic cribbing scandal at West Point. Is it really any wonder we have cheating if the officials of those same academies themselves encourage young boys to falsify their addresses to gain their original entrance to the Academy? How can such procedures help but contribute to the breakdown in the code of honor we saw at West Point a few years ago?

Mr. Chairman, these three requirements which have been placed in H.R. 7356 are all big steps in the right direction. In fact I believe they will go further toward eliminating athletic professionalism in our academies than anything that might have been done by H.R. 7913, even with the amendments added in the other body. And, while it might perhaps be helpful to have a further provision that the name of the congressional sponsors and the actual residence of each academy appointee be published annually by each service academy, as H.R. 7913 would have done, if the provisions of H.R. 7356 are faithfully carried out, there may not be any need for that further kind of amendment.

So, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to increase the service academies, if we are going to run into the expenditure of additional sums of money, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] mentioned a moment ago, at least let us make sure today that the taxpayers of America are not being asked to spend this money just to train professional athletes. I am all for athletics; I even am in favor of having good professional athletics. But I do not think that athletic professionalism has any place in any university and I particularly do not think that tax money spent for developing the naval and military and air force leaders of the future ought to be diverted, even in the slightest percentage, to subsidizing professional athletics in those service academies.

With that understanding, Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] for his bill and to say that his legislation, if passed here with this clarification of congressional intent, should indeed serve to put an end to disturbing practices of the past that have no proper place in any American service academy.

The **CHAIRMAN**. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 403 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 4342 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4342. Cadets: appointment; numbers, territorial distribution

"(a) The authorized strength of the Corps of Cadets of the Academy is as follows:

"(1) 40 cadets selected in order of merit as established by competitive examinations from the sons of members of the armed forces who were killed in action or died of wounds or injuries received or diseases contracted in, or preexisting injury or disease aggravated by, active service—

"(A) during World War I or World War II as defined by laws providing service-connected compensation or pension benefits for veterans of those wars and their dependents; or

"(B) after June 26, 1950, and before February 1, 1955.

The determination of the Veterans' Administration as to service connection of the cause of death is binding upon the Secretary of the Army.

"(2) Five cadets nominated at large by the Vice President.

"(3) Ten cadets from each State, five of whom are nominated by each Senator from that State.

"(4) Five cadets from each congressional district, nominated by the Representative from the district.

"(5) Five cadets from the District of Columbia, nominated by the Commissioners of that District.

"(6) Five cadets from each Territory, nominated by the Delegate in Congress from that Territory.

"(7) Six cadets from Puerto Rico, five of whom are nominated by the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico and one who is a native of Puerto Rico nominated by the Governor of Puerto Rico.

"(8) One cadet nominated by the Governor of the Panama Canal from the sons of civilians residing in the Canal Zone or the sons of civilian personnel of the United States Government, or the Panama Canal Company, residing in the Republic of Panama.

"(9) One cadet from American Samoa, Guam, or the Virgin Islands nominated by the Secretary of the Army upon recommendations of their respective Governors.

Each Senator, Representative, and Delegate in Congress is entitled to nominate a principal candidate and five alternates for each vacancy that is available to him under this section.

"(b) In addition, there may be appointed each year at the Academy cadets as follows:

"(1) 75 selected by the President from the sons of members of regular components of the armed forces.

"(2) 85 nominated by the Secretary of the Army from enlisted members of the Regular Army.

"(3) 85 nominated by the Secretary of the Army from enlisted members of the Army Reserve.

"(4) 20 nominated by the Secretary of the Army under regulations prescribed by him, from the honor graduates of schools designated as honor schools by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and from members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

"(5) 150 selected from qualified alternates nominated by the persons named in clauses (3) and (4) of subsection (a).

"(c) The President may also appoint as cadets at the Academy sons of persons who have been awarded the Medal of Honor for acts performed while in the armed forces.

"(d) All cadets are appointed by the President. An appointment is conditional until the cadet is admitted.

"(e) If the annual quota of cadets under subsection (b) (1), (2), (3) is not filled, the Secretary may fill the vacancies by nominating for appointment other candidates from any of these sources who were found best qualified on examination for admission and not otherwise nominated.

"(f) Each candidate for admission nominated under clauses (3)–(7) and (9) of subsection (a) must be domiciled in the State or Territory, or in the congressional district, from which he is nominated, or in the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Somoa, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, if nominated from one of those places.

"(g) The Secretary of the Army may limit the number of cadets appointed under this section to the number that can be adequately accommodated at the Academy, as determined by the Secretary after consulting with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, subject to the following:

"(1) He may not limit by more than one the number of cadets that could otherwise be appointed by each nominating authority under subsection (a) (3) or (4).

"(2) If he limits the number of appointments under subsection (a) (3) or (4), any appointment that will cause the total number of cadets at the Acedamy, chargeable to the nominating authorities named in subsections (a) and (b), to be more than 2,505 must be made under subsection (a) (3) or (4).

"(3) If he limits the number of appointments under subsection (b)(5), and the total number of cadets upon admission of a new class at the Academy will be more than 3,737, no appointments may be made under subsection (b)(2)–(4) or section 4343 of this title."

(2) The second sentence of section 4343 is amended—

(A) By striking out "two-thirds" and inserting in place thereof "three-fourths".

(B) By striking out "clauses (1)–(6) of section 4342(a), and clause (2) of section 4342(e)," and inserting in place thereof "clauses (2)–(8) of section 4342(a)".

Sec. 2. Section 6954 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following flush sentence:

"Each Senator, Representative, and Delegate in Congress is entitled to nominate a principal candidate and five alternates for each vacancy that is available to him under this section."

(2) Subsection (b) is amended by striking out "160" in clauses (2) and (3) and inserting "85" in place thereof, and by inserting the following new clause after clause (4):

"(5) 150 selected from qualified alternates nominated by persons named in clauses (3) and (4) of subsection (a)."

(3) The following new subsection is added at the end:

"(d) The Secretary of the Navy may limit the number of midshipmen appointed under subsection (b)(5). When he does so, if the total number of midshipmen, upon admission of a new class at the Academy, will be more than 3,737, no appointments may be made under subsection (b)(2)–(4) or secton 6956 of this title."

Sec. 3. Section 6956 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) By striking out "one or more alternates" in subsection (a) and inserting in place thereof "five alternates".

(2) By striking out "two-thirds" in the second sentence of subsection (e) and inserting in place thereof "three-fourths".

Sec. 4. Chapter 903 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 9342 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 9342. Cadets: appointment; numbers, territorial distribution

"(a) The authorized strength of Air Force Cadets of the Academy is as follows:

"(1) 40 cadets selected in order of merit as established by competitive examination from the sons of members of the armed forces who were killed in action or died of wounds or injuries received or diseases contracted in, or preexisting injury or disease aggravated by, active service—

"(A) during World War I or World War II as defined by laws providing service-connected compensation or pension benefits for veterans of those wars and their dependents; or

"(B) after June 26, 1950, and before February 1, 1955.

The determination of the Veterans' Administration as to service connection of the cause of death is binding upon the Secretary of the Air Force.

"(2) Five cadets nominated at large by the Vice President.

"(3) Ten cadets from each State, five of whom are nominated by each Senator from that State.

"(4) Five cadets from each congressional district, nominated by the Representatives from the district.

"(5) Five cadets from the District of Columbia, nominated by the Commissioners of that District.

"(6) Five cadets from each Territory, nominated by the Delegate in Congress from that Territory.

"(7) Six cadets from Puerto Rico, five of whom are nominated by the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico and one who is a native of Puerto Rico nominated by the Governor of Puerto Rico.

"(8) One cadet nominated by the Governor of the Panama Canal from the sons of civilians residing in the Canal Zone or the sons of civilian personnel of the United States Government, or the Panama Canal Company, residing in the Republic of Panama.

"(9) One cadet from American Samoa, Guam, or the Virgin Islands nominated by the Secretary of the Air Force upon recommendations of their respective Governors.

Each Senator, Representative, and Delegate in Congress is entitled to nominate a principal candidate and five alternates for each vacancy that is available to him under this section.

"(b) In addition, there may be appointed each year at the Academy cadets as follows:

"(1) 75 selected by the President from the sons of members of regular components of the armed forces.

"(2) 85 nominated by the Secretary of the Air Force from enlisted members of the Regular Air Force.

"(3) 85 nominated by the Secretary of the Air Force from enlisted members of the Air Force Reserve.

"(4) 20 nominated by the Secretary of the Air Force, under regulations prescribed by him, from the honor graduates of schools designated as honor schools by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and from members of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

"(5) 150 selected from qualified alternates nominated by the persons named in clauses (3) and (4) of subsection (a).

"(c) The President may also appoint as cadets at the Academy sons of persons who have been awarded the Medal of Honor for acts performed while in the armed forces.

"(d) All cadets are appointed by the President. An appointment is conditional until the cadet is admitted.

"(e) If the annual quota of cadets under subsection (b) (1), (2), or (3) is not filled, the Secretary may fill the vacancies by nominating for appointment other candidates from any of these sources who were found best qualified on examination for admission and not otherwise nominated.

"(f) Each candidate for admission nominated under clauses (3)–(7) and (9) of subsection (a) must be domiciled in the State or Territory, or in the congressional district, from which he is nominated, or in the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, if nominated from one of those places.

"(g) The Secretary of the Air Force may limit the number of cadets appointed under this section to the number that can be adequately accommodated at the Academy, as determined by the Secretary after consulting with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, subject to the following:

"(1) He may not limit by more than one the number of cadets that could otherwise be appointed by each nominating authority under subsection (a) (3) or (4).

"(2) If he limits the number of appointments under subsection (a) (3) or (4), any appointment that will cause the total number of cadets at the Academy, chargeable to the nominating authorities named in subsections (a) and (b), to be more than 2,505 must be made under subsection (a) (3) or (4).

"(3) If he limits the number of appointments under subsection (b) (5), and the total number of cadets upon admission of a new class at the Academy will be more than 3,737, no appointments may be made under subsection (b) (2)–(4) or section 9343 of this title."

(2) The second sentence of section 9343 is amended:

(A) By striking out "two-thirds" and inserting in place thereof "three-fourths".

(B) By striking out "clauses (1)–(6) of section 9342(a), and clause (2) of section 9342(e)," and inserting in place thereof "clauses (2)–(8) of section 9342(a)".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HÉBERT

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. Hébert: Page 3, line 13, page 6, line 13, and page 9, line 10, after the word "Congress" the following additional language: ", including the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico,".

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, the intent of this amendment is to include the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico. The amendment is purely technical and makes no substantive change in the bill. The amendment is designed to make clear that the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico also is entitled to nominate a principal and five alternates for each vacancy available to him.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAIRD

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Laird: Page 11, after line 25, insert:

"Sec. 5 (a) Paragraph (2) of section 4348, paragraph (2) of section 6959, and paragraph (2) of section 9348 of title 10 of the United States Code are each amended by striking out 'three' and inserting in lieu thereof 'five'.

"(b) The fourth sentence of section 182 of title 14 of the United States Code is amended by striking out 'four' and inserting in lieu thereof 'five'.

"(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply only with respect to cadets and midshipmen appointed to the service academies after the date of enactment of this Act, and shall not affect the obligated period of service of any cadet or midshipman appointed to one of the service academies on or before the date of enactment of this Act."

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is simply to extend the period of obligated service from 3 years to 5 years. At the present time each cadet at the service academies obligates himself to 3 years of service. By regulation, however, this has been extended to a 4-year period. The statutory obligation as far as the Coast Guard Academy is concerned is presently 4 years. This amendment would make the Coast Guard Academy, the Air Force Academy, and the Naval Academy, as well as the U.S. Military Academy at West Point the same by extending the obligation to 5 years for all cadets appointed after enactment of the bill.

Last year I offered the same amendment to a bill that was considered by the House. The amendment was adopted by the House of Representatives and became a part of the bill that got caught in a controversy and did not finally receive passage in the last session of the Congress.

Mr. HÉBERT. I want to congratulate the gentleman on offering the amendment, and I wholeheartedly support it. The committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Would this apply to the ones who are now nominated to the 1964 academy?

Mr. LAIRD. This applies to those appointed after the enactment of this particular piece of legislation. That is the only manner in which we can change the obligated service.

Mr. WINSTEAD. In other words, if the nomination is made now for 1964 it would not apply to those particular individuals, but as to ones made later, after this is enacted into law it would apply to that individual even in the 1964 class?

Mr. LAIRD. That is correct. It would not apply to those already in the service schools now or appointed before the bill becomes law.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. On the minority side of the committee we agreed to that amendment. I think it is a long-needed amendment to this legislation.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. I would just like to clarify the question asked by the gentleman from Mississippi. Members of the House who have made appointments for the class of 1964 now, or before the enactment of this act, are not subject to this provision. I understood, and I agreed to the amendment and I voted for it last year. I do not make my appointments until October and this law goes into effect prior to October which would mean my appointees, while not appointed subsequent to the enactment in 1964, would be affected by this. It seems to me if we are to be fair with such an amendment we should not make an act so effective that only part of a class of 1964 will be affected and another part will not be affected. Could we not clarify that?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. This is what the amendment says:

> The amendments made by this section shall apply only with respect to cadets and midshipmen appointed to the service academies after the date of enactment of this Act.

That is just as plain as it can be. It does not make a particle of difference. If you appoint him now, and this law is not on the statute books, it does not apply to him. However, if you appoint him after the enactment of this act it does apply.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to state this amendment does not apply to nominations. This amendment applies to appointments. The appointments all come at one time in any 1 year to the service academies. The appointments are on a fixed date basis for all schools. You are talking about nominations and this amendment refers to appointments. It does not have any retroactive provision in it as far as appointments are concerned.

Mr. BECKER. Then do I understand this to be the case: This amendment will apply to all cadets after the class of 1964, if enacted by the Congress?

Mr. LAIRD. If enacted before the time of the appointments, but it will not if it is enacted after the appointment date. The appointment date at the various academies is different, but it applies if the act is passed prior to the appointment. If that is the case then it will apply. After the appointment date it will not apply. It has no retroactive provision.

Mr. BECKER. What does the gentleman consider an appointment date?

Mr. LAIRD. Selection by an academy and notification of the appointment that comes from the academies to the individual nominees nominated by Members of Congress or any other nominating authority.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I shall support this amendment, although I am not exactly happy that the period of obligated service is limited to 5 years. I believe, and I am sure there are other Members who agree, it ought to be 7 or 8 years of obligated service. Let me point out to you again this year that Air Force ROTC students at the universities and colleges, paying for their own education, or their parents paying the bills, are obligated, if they take flight training, to a 5-year service contract.

I say again that this amendment imposes only a 5-year contract with a taxpayer-paid education for service academy cadets. The Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate ought to give serious thought and attention to the extension of their period of obligated service to 7 or 8 years rather than 5 years. If these young men are going into the service academies for the purpose of becoming career officers, then the period of obligated service ought to be commensurate with the $40,000 educations which are provided. The taxpayers have every right to expect them to give a fair return for the investment which has been made in preparing them for the military profession.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to rise in support of H.R. 7356.

The bill, as reported by the Committee on Armed Services, will establish a uniform authorized strength for all the service academies.

At the present time, there are a total of 4,417 midshipmen authorized for attendance at the Naval Academy. On the other hand, only 2,529 cadets are authorized at the Military and Air Force Academies.

Under the terms of this legislation, the authorized strength at each of these academies would be established at 4,417.

Now, what does this change mean to a Member of Congress?

At the present time, each Member of Congress is authorized four principal appointments at the Military Academy, four principal appointments at the Air Force Academy, and five principal appointments at the Naval Academy.

Thus, a Member of Congress may now have a maximum total of 13 principal appointees in attendance at one time at the various service academies.

Under the terms of the proposed legislation, the principal appointments authorized a Member of Congress will be increased to 5 at each of the service academies, for a total of 15 principal appointments.

Thus, when this legislation is fully utilized and implemented, each Member of Congress will be authorized to have in attendance at one time at the service academies a maximum of 15 principal appointees.

This represents an increase of two principal appointments for each Member of Congress.

In addition to the foregoing increase in principal appointments, each Member of Congress will have an increased opportunity to obtain appointment of his qualified alternates to each of the service academies.

There is contained in this bill a provision which would establish a new appointment source for individuals desiring to enter the service academies.

This provision provides that all qualified congressional alternates, who do not succeed to a principal appointment, be placed in a pool from which will be selected an additional 150 appointees to each of the service academies.

Thus, a Member, in addition to his principal appointments will each year after enactment of this bill, enter all his qualified alternates into competition with other qualified congressional alternates for appointment to one of the 150 annual vacancies at each of the service academies.

This new appointment source to be established by this legislation, is particularly meritorious since it will provide qualified congressional alternates with a new and genuine opportunity to obtain an appointment despite the fact that they may not have been selected as the Congressman's principal nominee.

These changes to existing law will reaffirm the insistence of the Congress that the bulk of appointees to our service academies must come from congressional sources.

Under existing law, only 61 percent of appointees to the Naval Academy must come from congressional sources. Under the changes in existing law proposed by this legislation, approximately 75 percent of these appointees must come from congressional sources.

Now, the objective of the Congress in reasserting itself as the basic source of appointment to the Service Academies, is not for the purpose of developing another avenue of political patronage but rather to insure that the future generals and admirals of our Nation who guide our military destinies, will, in fact, be representative of the heart and soul of America.

The development of this system of procurement for a substantial portion of our career officer personnel insures against the possibility that our Armed Forces might otherwise become parochial in their social, economic, or political philosophy.

It prevents the possibility that one section of the country or one strata of our society would eventually control and mold the shape of our military thinking.

In short, it insures the all-American character of our career officer personnel.

This is a good bill which deserves your support. Mr. HÉBERT and all the members of his subcommittee who worked so diligently in preparing this splendid legislation deserve the thanks of the Congress.

I hope that when reference is made to this legislation in the future, it will be referred to as the "Hébert bill" in honor of its distinguished author.

Before closing, I would like briefly to review existing appointment sources.

Appointments under the law today to the three academies are from the following sources:

CONGRESSIONAL APPOINTMENTS

Under existing law, each Member of Congress is authorized to make the following principal appointments to the service academies:

Four to the Military and Air Force Academies, respectively, and five to the U.S. Naval Academy.

PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

The President appoints in three general categories:

First. He appoints 40 cadets/midshipmen annually to each of the academies from among sons of dead veterans.

Second. He appoints 75 midshipmen annually to the Naval Academy and approximately 22 each year to the Air Force and Military Academy.

Third. He is also entitled to appoint the sons of Medal of Honor winners. This latter category has no limitation.

VICE PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

In the case of the Vice President, he may appoint three to the Air Force and Military Academy, and five to the Naval Academy.

DISTRICT COMMISSIONERS

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to appoint a total of three each to the Air Force and Military Academy and a total of five to the Naval Academy.

OTHER OFFICIALS

The Governors of Guam, Samoa, and the Virgin Islands are authorized to have in attendance at each of the Air Force, Military, and Naval Academies, one cadet/midshipman.

The Governor of Panama is authorized to have two cadets at the Military and Air Force Academies, and one midshipman at the Naval Academy.

The law specifically authorizes a maximum of 24 foreign students in attendance at the Military, Air Force, and Naval Academies. These foreign students are limited to the Philippine Islands and the American Republics, and are appointed by the cognizant authority of those states.

SECRETARIES OF THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

The Secretary of each of the military departments is authorized to make additional appointments each year as follows:

The Secretaries of the Army and Air Force are authorized approximately 22 annual appointments from the enlisted Regulars and another 22 from the enlisted Reserves, a total of 44.

In the case of the Secretary of the Navy, he is presently authorized to appoint a maximum of 160 a year from the enlisted ranks of the Regular service and 160 a year from the enlisted ranks of the Reserve service.

The Secretaries of the departments are also authorized to appoint additional cadets/midshipmen from honor schools.

In the case of the Army and Air Force, this amounts to approximately 10 per year. In the case of the Secretary of the Navy, this amounts to 20 per year.

SUMMARY

The total of these nominations in the case of the Air Force and Military Academy presently amount to a total authorized strength of 2,529.

In the case of the Naval Academy, these authorizations amount to 4,417.

ADDITIONAL APPOINTMENT AUTHORITY

In addition to the foregoing authorizations, the Secretaries of the individual military departments are given general authority to bring the academies up to strength on opening day each year. These appointments are to be made from available qualified alternates.

The law prescribes that when this authority is utilized, not less than two-thirds of these additional appointments must come from congressional sources.

CONCLUSION

The only change in the proposed bill in source of appointments is with reference to enlisted personnel of the Regular and Reserve services.

In the case of the Navy, it is presently authorized an annual appointment authority of approximately 160 per year. The committee was advised that the Navy has failed to fully utilize this appointment authority since it has averaged approximately 114 appointments each year in each of these two categories.

Consequently, the committee reduced this authorization to an annual figure of 85 appointments, and transferred the 75 appointments saved from each of these categories—a total of 150—to a new category called the qualified congressional alternate category.

The remaining sources as established by law for the academies will remain unchanged.

Mr. Chairman, I publicly want to thank and compliment the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] and his subcommittee for bringing in this logical, well thought out bill. It is a step that should have been taken many, many years ago and I am happy that the Committee on Armed Services, after most careful study and analysis of the Department's proposal, wrote this bill themselves. It is the proper way to make these appointments and it gives the Congress the major portion of the appointments, which is nothing but right and proper, because in that manner you get a complete cross-section of appointees from all over the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I want this bill to be referred to and to be known as the Hébert bill, because he is the author of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HECHLER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7356) to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies, pursuant to House Resolution 442, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS OF ANY CITIZEN ON ACCOUNT OF RACE OR COLOR

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a new civil rights bill. I know that a number of bills in this area have previously been introduced in this session of Congress, and I would not add to their number unless I believed a new bill would be a contribution to the present congressional efforts in this field.

My bill is a comprehensive one. After an exhaustive study of all the bills introduced this year and in previous years and an analysis of cases and legal opinion, I have put together a bill that I believe combines the best features of previous bills of both parties. In addition, the bill contains new material that will add significantly to the effectiveness and strength of the legislation.

It is hoped that passage of this bill will make unnecessary periodic and piecemeal consideration by Congress of remedial legislation in the field of civil rights.

A title-by-title analysis, together with a summary source reference, is reprinted below as a guide to the provisions of the bill.

TITLE I

The protection provided by the administration bill against discriminatory application of voting tests is here incorporated and strengthened. Its guarantees are broadened to cover all elections, Federal or State, rather than the former only. To insure the caliber of voting referees, their selection is to be made by the chief judge of a circuit rather than by the district-judge-dominated judicial conference, the impartiality of which in matters of race relations is often questionable. A 60-day time limit is prescribed for decisions on registration applications, in place of the administration's requirement that applications be "determined expeditiously"—which because of its imprecision, could be abused by unsympathetic judges.

Further, while particular discriminatory practices are curtailed, a general prohibition is also included against the use of any voting test or device which deprives a racial class of equal voting rights. The administration bill, by limiting itself to the regulation of existing abuses, would prompt southern legislatures to invent fresh and unregulated discriminatory practices; for example, the good moral character test. These budding methods of suffrage limitation are herein nipped; if any test, as applied, operates unequally upon a racial class, its use is forbidden.

Section 102, derived from a Republican bill, orders the Bureau of the Census to conduct an immediate State-by-State analysis of limitations upon voting rights. With these determinations, Congress could have the data with which to enforce the second section of the 14th amendment if it so desires.

TITLE II

The public accommodations title of the Kastenmeier bill follows closely the administration's bill. The title is broadened, however, to reach those businesses which are licensed by the State or which discriminate under the State's compulsion or sanction—section 202(a)(4). Thus the 14th amendment, as well as the commerce clause, is brought to bear on the problem. At the same time, Mrs. Murphy's boardinghouse is exempted from coverage by a new provision excluding any owner-occupied private home in which not more than five rooms are rented out to the public as lodging.

TITLE III

Under the provisions of title III the Attorney General is authorized to go to court in three situations.

First. He may sue for injunctive relief if any person or group of persons is being denied equal protection of the laws and if the victim or victims are unable to sue on their own initiative—this inability may take the form of insufficient finances or likelihood of economic reprisals. The initiative may be the Attorney General's own; he is not obliged to wait for a complaint.

Second. He may intervene in any private school segregation action. Unlike the President's bill, at section 307(a)(c), his right to intervene is not limited to those cases where the party who commenced the private action is unable to continue it.

Third. The Attorney General may seek an injunction in another class of cases carefully defined in the amended section 125(a). Essentially, these are situations where a party, unable himself to sue, is harassed under color of a State statute or custom because he has protested against unconstitutional racial segregation or other denials of equal protection.

Title III is appropriate for this title, for it lodges in the Attorney General much of the standing to sue which was recommended in the 1957 title III that ran aground in the Senate.

TITLE IV

Like the administration bill, the Kastenmeier bill provides grants and technical assistance to States to aid them in achieving school desegregation. The Commissioner of Education will have discretion over the purse strings. The list of purposes for which grants are authorized is enlarged so as to include the cost of employing additional schoolteachers, the cost of employing specialists to further orderly, peaceful desegregation, and other costs related to integration.

The Kastenmeier bill also requires every school board to submit a comprehensive desegregation program. This program must promise first-step compliance by next September 1964, and must contain a detailed timetable for the desegregation of the entire school district. The Attorney General may sue to compel the school board to prepare its plan. Once submitted, the plan becomes a local law in the school district, and the Attorney General may sue to secure its diligent implementation.

TITLE V

This title essentially duplicates the President's title IV, establishing a community relations service. This service would be called upon to mediate and improve communications between the Negro and white leaders of a troubled community.

TITLE VI

The Kastenmeier bill adopts the broadened powers of the Civil Rights Commission as contained in the administration bill, and in addition gives the Civil Rights Commission permanent status.

TITLE VII

Under this title a Commission on Equal Opportunity is established. This Commission is designed to be more than an FEPC; it is an independent agency operating in those economic areas where unfair discriminatory practices commonly occur. The title catalogs examples of unfair practices. Included are aspects of job discrimination both by an employer in hiring or firing and by labor unions. It is also an unfair practice to discriminate in making loans, mortgages, or insurance policies. Real estate brokers may not discriminate, and publicly assisted housing must be rented out without regard to color. Public accommodations must be open to all races—reinforcing title II; and economic sanctions must not be visited upon one exercising his right to vote—supplementing title I.

The concerns of the Commission thus spread over much of the national economy. The administration bill, by way of contrast, merely gives a statutory base to the present President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, and that Committee has authority only over Government contracts and Federal personnel.

The Commission, under the Kastenmeier bill, is delegated ample powers of enforcement. A three-stage process is envisioned: Commission investigation as to whether the alleged unfair practice has been committed; conciliation by the Commission to end the practice; a cease-and-desist order issued by the Commission if conciliation fails. Either party would then have recourse to the court of appeals: the Commission for judicial enforcement of its order, the aggrieved party for judicial review.

TITLE VIII

The antilynching provisions of this title protect persons and their property from mob violence done on account of the victim's race or color, or done in the unlawful exercise of the power of punishment. No such title is present in the administration bill.

A lynching occurs within the meaning of this title when two or more persons act together to do violence to a person, or his property, first, because of his race or color; or, second, as vigilante action. The Federal Government has jurisdiction under the act when State authorities knowingly fail to use all possible means to prevent a lynching.

The bill punishes members of the lynch mob as well as local officials who knowingly fail to prevent the lynching. The local government is made liable to the victim or his next of kin for injuries suffered by the victim or for damage to his property.

The title also punishes lynching under the Lindbergh kidnap law if the victim is carried across State lines.

The section on official violence specifies what acts constitute unlawful police brutality and makes the local governmental subdivision liable for unlawful violence committed by members of its police force.

Such a section is necessary in order to revitalize section 242 of title 18, United States Code, which punishes deprivation of rights by local authorities. The Supreme Court in the Screws case found it necessary to restrict the application of the section greatly in order to avoid declaring it unconstitutionally vague. This proposed amendment, by specifying the offenses, gives the section a broad, effective, and precise meaning.

The political subdivision which employs officers who use coercive and brutal techniques in their police work can be sued under this title by the victim or his next of kin. The advantage of suing the local government is twofold: First, the local government can pay a judgment, whereas the police officer, who has little or no money, cannot pay; and, second, if the Government knows it is liable for police brutality, it will take administrative steps to eliminate such practices among its employees.

TITLE IX

The removal provisions of 28 U.S.C. 1443 are broadened, so that it is easier to remove a case from a State court to a U.S. district court, whenever it appears that strict impartiality is not possible in the State court. Moreover, if removal is refused by the Federal court, there is a right to appeal such refusal to a higher Federal court.

In addition, the usual legal and nonlegal disabilities that follow arrest and criminal record are removed, as far as Federal law and practice are concerned, in the case of arrest or prosecution because of participation in peaceful demonstrations, sit-ins, or other civil rights activities.

TITLE X

The principle expressed in title X is that the Federal Government should not subsidize discrimination. Thus no funds are to be provided under any circumstances for a program which discriminates in making available its services or facilities. The administration bill stops short, stating only that the Executive has authority to withhold funds if he so chooses; this probably declares existing law, and thus is unnecessary as well as insufficient.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include eight editorials from the Wausau Daily Record-Herald on our foreign policy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Wausau Daily Record-Herald in my district recently published a series of eight thoughtful and thought-provoking editorials on the foreign policy of the United States. In the first editorial, a question was raised about the propriety of newspapers and individual citizens speaking out on this crucial and often controversial subject. I agree with the conclusion of the editors that "all of us have an obligation to speak out in such a way that we may help our Nation carry out its role of free world leader."

In this country, Mr. Speaker, all great issues are or should be ultimately resolved through the conduct of a dialog between the policymakers, on the one hand, and the people. The people normally function in this interplay through their elected representatives and through the news media.

It is a function of the press of this country in its editorial pages to comment responsibly on the great issues that confront the United States. The Wausau Daily Record-Herald, in my opinion, has contributed significantly to the continuing dialog on the foreign policy of this country.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorials which appeared in the Wausau Daily Record-Herald entitled "Our Foreign Policy"—1 through 8—in the RECORD at this point.

The editorials referred to follow:

[From Wausau Daily Record-Herald, June 3, 1963]

Our Foreign Policy—I

Today as we begin a brief series of editorials on U.S. foreign policy, much of our comment to be based upon a talk given April 20 before the American Society of Newspaper Editors by former Vice President Richard M. Nixon. We do so because Mr. Nixon, in a nonpartisan manner, expresses our feeling about foreign policy and foreign aid better than we have seen it expressed at any time in a single brief statement.

Mr. Nixon acknowledges in his opening remarks that he could have a field day in a partisan-type attack, but that he was speaking as an individual citizen without regard to the effect on any individual or party. Since he had 16 years as candidate, party leader and administration official, he has the background to make a useful contribution.

Today we answer two preliminary questions: Should Mr. Nixon, the Record-Herald and you, the citizen, speak out on foreign policy? Should the administration place great stress on prestige polls conducted abroad?

President Kennedy answered the first very well on September 20, 1960, when he said: "Some people say it is wrong to say we could be stronger. It is dangerous to say we could be more secure. But in times such as this I say it is wrong and dangerous for any American to keep silent about our future if he is not satisfied with what is being done to preserve that future."

We feel certain that President Kennedy feels the same way that Candidate Kennedy did in 1960.

With regard to the second question concerning foreign polls, we agree 100 percent with Mr. Nixon when he says: "We should always have a concern for the sensitivities and opinions of our friends in other nations: But, as the strongest nation in the world, it is our responsibility to lead, not follow, the forces of freedom. Our policies should never be compromised to the level that only the weak and timid may approve."

Thus, with regard to foreign policy, all of us have an obligation to speak out in such a way that we may help our Nation carry out its role of free world leader.

[From the Wausau Daily Record-Herald, June 4, 1963]

Our Foreign Policy—II

Can the administration be accused of trying to appease Russia? Of course not, because the word connotes intent and the fact that decisions were made to resume atomic tests, to defend Vietnam, and to impose the Cuban blockade, all indicate no intent to appease.

Likewise, the President's speeches on Laos, Cuba, and Berlin deserve applause, but while the words are not subject to question, the deeds with regard to these crisis points must be.

We agree with former Vice President Richard Nixon when he said on April 20 that, as a result of our deeds, the Atlantic Alliance is in disarray, Cuba is western Russia and the rest of Latin America is in deadly peril.

"It is dangerous nonsense to attempt to gloss over these problems by pointing out that there are also troubles in the Soviet camp."

All evidence indicates Russia and Red China are having their differences, but with Mr. Nixon "we cannot take too much comfort in the fact that what they are debating about is not how to beat each other but how to beat us."

Thus, while communism has its troubles, it is on the move, stressing offense, not defense. And how is the Kennedy administration meeting this threat? With a policy of containment, a defensive posture, expressed in the President's words of January 25: "The West has the power to hold back the expansion of communism until the time it loses its force and momentum."

Thus, our policy is a defensive, waiting game, in which we expect the Communists to run out of gas. Here we must disagree with the policy of the administration.

Freedom is a positive thing and we must adopt a strategy of victory for freedom to meet the strategy of victory for communism. This sort of talk isn't fashionable these days in some quarters, of course. Because of nuclear weapons we are supposed to quake in our boots and forget about an offensive for freedom, but can we afford to?

We believe, with Mr. Nixon, that there is a responsible strategy which will avoid both war and surrender. A good offense can be the best defense. Let's put freedom on the march.

[From the Wausau Daily Record-Herald, June 5, 1963]

Our Foreign Policy—III

As indicated Tuesday, what the U.S.A. needs is a victory of strategy, based on responsible policies which will avoid both war and surrender.

With former Vice President Richard Nixon we believe that an offensive for victory requires positive action in three critical areas, the first of which is the reassembling and strengthening of the Atlantic Alliance.

We have at present a crisis of confidence. It serves no good purpose to rehash whether this is due to our new emphasis on conventional weapons, cancellation of Skybolt, opposition to France's nuclear force, withdrawal of Jupiter bases in Italy and Turkey, indecision at Berlin, or nuclear test ban negotiations.

To restore confidence, the United States must take the lead in expanding NATO from a pure military alliance to a political confederation, with the primary objective of developing a unified and total defense strategy for both the United States and our European allies.

"An American pledge to respond to a European formula for nuclear cooperation within a unified Europe and within the NATO framework could lead at least to an enduring solution of our greatest problems involving our alliance friends," says Mr. Nixon.

While this is true, it will be difficult to accomplish, as all of us share a fear involved in sharing of nuclear weapons. But the choice is between risk of nuclear sharing with our allies or nuclear destruction from our enemies, between nuclear unity in the West or nuclear anarchy.

The hour of decision nears and the issue grows more critical. The free world must present a unified front in a positive program aimed at some day freeing all mankind from the scourge of totalitarianism. A confederation of free nations is the essential step in the strategy for victory over the dictatorship of communism. The NATO concept must be expanded.

[From the Wausau Daily Record-Herald, June 6, 1963]

Our Foreign Policy—IV

A second element essential to a U.S. victory of strategy is a change in foreign aid aimed at more effective assistance for the struggling free nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America threatened by Communist subversion.

Like most Americans, we agree that our foreign aid program has been both necessary and beneficial. Like many Americans, we also believe that there has been shocking waste. But even regardless of the waste, the time has come for a full reappraisal of the program.

In the first place, there is a definite need for easing the load on the U.S. taxpayer. The recent recommendations of the Clay Committee represent the minimum that the administration and Congress should do to eliminate waste and to bring the program in line with present foreign policy needs. However, with Mr. Nixon we believe that the program must not be abolished or emasculated to the extent that the President loses an essential tool for the job of world peace.

In three areas, however, the program should be substantially altered.

First, we must promptly suspend all aid to nations not committed to the side of freedom. If we do not, we are doing irreparable harm to our own good cause.

Second, economic assistance should only be used to actually strengthen the economy and political stability of the nation given aid. Under no circumstances can we justify aid which is to be used for socializing or nationalizing a basic industry, such as a government steel mill in India. India has the right to operate a government mill, but no U.S. administration has the right to ask the U.S. taxpayer to finance such an experiment.

Third, reappraisal is needed in the field of population control. This issue has been out in open debate for 3 years now, ever since the Draper committee report, and only recently the National Academy of Sciences proposed that the United States take the lead. The point is that the billions of dollars we spend in foreign aid are not improving the lot of the people in underdeveloped countries, simply because population growth outruns growth in economy. Religious traditions must be considered, of course.

This is how foreign aid should be altered.

[From the Wausau Daily Record-Herald, June 7, 1963]

Our Foreign Policy—V

A third and very important major element of America's victory strategy must be the development of a program to extend freedom.

The need for this element is well illustrated by what has happened in Cuba in the past few years. Without second-guessing the Bay of Pigs disaster, Americans should look at the Cuban venture objectively and attempt to see how it fits into the Communists' strategy for world conquest and attempts to calculate how American policy should be geared to deal with that strategy.

Did Khrushchev spend a billion dollars in Cuba just to take over an island nation with its 5 million people? Of course not. The Cuban venture was a prelude to moving into Venezuela, Brazil or other more important targets. If we do not accept this fact, we are not facing up to the Russian grand strategy of world domination.

Now then, what object lesson can the rest of Latin America learn by observing Cuba? From Cuba they learn (a) that communism will supply total aid for its satellite friends and (b) that freedom-loving exiles who hope to retake their native lands are placed on a leash and given little support by the United States.

Or as former Vice President Nixon states it: "The moral is clear: Go Communist and get aid; fight for freedom and go it alone."

The only answer is to no longer postpone making a decision to do what is necessary to force the removal of the Soviet beachhead. We cannot tolerate a subversive base 90 miles from our shore.

There are risks involved in such a decision, of course. But those risks will only grow with each passing month.

Says Mr. Nixon: "I am convinced that the risks of inaction are far greater than the risks of action."

We agree.

[From the Wausau Daily Record-Herald, June 8, 1963]

Our Foreign Policy—VI

A second rationalization which the administration uses for our do-nothing policy about Cuba is that we should not act now because time is on our side and the tide is turning our way.

Those who take this position point to economic chaos in Red China, a power struggle in the Communist world, an economic boom in West Europe, the superiority of U.S. missiles, etc. From this they quickly assume that the Communists are satisfied with the status quo and are willing to meet us halfway to maintain it. If we push too hard, we will weaken Khrushchev in his struggle with hard-line Communists, these people reason.

Comments former Vice President Richard Nixon: "The result of this strategy in Cuba has been that after seizing the offensive in the struggle with world communism last October, we then proceeded to pull defeat out of the jaws of victory."

The Cuban example illustrates our basic misunderstanding of communism. Yes, Communists are concerned about their split, but it has not altered in the least their No. 1 objective—world conquest. Therefore, any U.S. policy aimed at stabilizing the status quo is doomed to failure.

"For the Communist, the status quo is just a launching pad for their next conquest," comments Mr. Nixon.

He adds: "To put it bluntly, Mr. Khrushchev will not treat us gently because we treat him gently, but only when and because he respects our power to deal firmly with him. I believe that a continued policy of going easy on Khrushchev in Cuba rather than convincing him that he should go easy on us elsewhere is likely to have exactly the opposite effect. We must never attempt to judge his motives by our own standards."

This is today's point. We cannot be satisfied with the status quo because we must recognize the fact that the Communists are not. The only solution is a strategy of victory for freedom.

[From the Wausau Daily Record-Herald, June 10, 1963]

Our Foreign Policy—VII

What the United States needs now is a Monroe Doctrine based not solely on the traditional concepts of conquest, but also on the modern methods of indirect, internal, and subversive action.

Former Vice President Nixon suggests these two points:

"1. When any free nation in the Western Hemisphere is internally threatened by forces under the control of international communism or any other foreign power, the policy of the U.S. Government should be to openly support the forces of freedom; and

"2. When any force is organized for the purpose of overthrowing a foreign-controlled government in this hemisphere, it should be the policy of the U.S. Government to openly support the forces of freedom inside and outside of that country."

Actually, President Kennedy has endorsed such concepts in principle, but he has shown reluctance to implement them on the grounds that they might increase the risk of war.

The important point here is that by announcing and enforcing this freedom doctrine for the Americas, as Mr. Nixon calls it, we will reduce the chance of Khrushchev's miscalculating our will to resist. This is the way to prevent another serious crisis similar to the one of last October.

What difference does it make today whether Cuba was taken by a Soviet invasion or through Castro, a tool of the Communist Party? That island country is sealed just as tightly behind the Iron Curtain today as a result of the Castro revolution as it would have been if Russian soldiers and tanks had been used to accomplish the same goal.

With Mr. Nixon we believe that the time has come for America to frankly recognize the problem of Communist takeover by revolution and to deal with it openly and directly. A freedom doctrine for the Americas is essential today.

[From the Wausau Daily Record-Herald, June 11, 1963]

Our Foreign Policy—VIII

A final factor, perhaps the most important of all, is needed in our foreign policy approach. The one word which best summarizes this need is "spirit."

As a result of 14 years of contacts with representatives of the Communist movement, former Vice President Richard Nixon is convinced that communism's big sales appeal is not its military power, its economic productivity, or its materialistic philosophy, but rather the "spirit of those who become infected with the Marxist virus."

"Call it drive, dedication, will to win, anything you like," says Mr. Nixon, "Communist leaders have a conviction that they should win and that they will win. No risks, no defeats seem to discourage or weaken that will and it is this spirit that they pound into their people."

Mr. Nixon tells of seeing hundreds of Soviet billboards with the slogan, "Work for the victory of communism." People in other countries are naturally attracted to such a message because they want to be on the winning side. Simply through conviction and repetition the Communists convince them that theirs is the winning side.

Would it be wrong for us to emulate this spirit? Of course not. "This vital dynamic drive has been characteristic of all great revolutionary movements, including our own," says Mr. Nixon.

We are not devoid of this spirit, of course. But too many Americans seem to think that we are running out of steam, that our goal should be to hold our own, to not take risks, to welcome neutralism in other countries.

Dr. Charles Malik expressed it well in one sentence: "Those who keep insisting that their civilization is not for export—only their industrial products—are digging the grave of their civilization and way of life."

Our leaders must encourage our people to be inspired by this great challenge. We have the opportunity to make all the world's men free. What a glorious and exciting goal to seek.

PURCHASE OF ATTITUDE INDICATORS FOR MILITARY AIRCRAFT

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the Army has canceled another proposed sole-source—noncompetitive—purchase of attitude indicators for military aircraft as a result of my inquiry. This time an additional $55,000 has been saved, but that is not the big story.

The big news is that the Army is currently having the whole matter of procurement of items such as the attitude indicators intensively reviewed in order to avert unnecessary procurement of these and other equipments by the Government.

The latest attitude indicator is called the ID-1000/ASN. You might remember the ID-999/ASN attitude indicator, which was also a planned sole-source buy and was canceled. In that procurement the Government was saved $338,000 by the cancellation, and my inquiries uncovered over 12,000 of the almost obsolete equipment on hand. That procurement is still being investigated.

Shortly after the ID-999 attitude indicator investigation, the Army Electronics Materiel Command issued another invitation for bid, this one for 69 of what is known as the ID-1000/ASN attitude indicator. The Army planned to spend at least $50,000, or $724 each, for the items and said it did not have any plans or drawings to allow competitive bidding.

This procurement document was issued May 25, 1963. Three days later I asked the Army to supply me with copies of past contracts and the determination and findings which justified the single-source purchase. As in the past, I wanted to see just how much of the unavailable material was, indeed, available.

On June 8 the entire procurement was canceled, just as the ID-999/ASN procurement was canceled. In a letter to me dated July 17, 1963, Maj. Gen. Stuart Hoff, commanding officer of the U.S. Army Electronics Command, gave this reason for the cancellation, and I quote from the letter:

> Your inquiry into a previous solicitation dealing with the attitude indicator ID-999 concentrated our attention on a group of items, including the ID-1000, which had been incorrectly identified as new logistics responsibilities of the Electronic Command. These and other items are being intensively reviewed to fix their logistic responsibility and thereby avert unnecessary procurement by the Government.

Major General Hoff concludes:

> Mindful of this goal and guided by your inquiries, all procurement actions on both the ID-999 and the ID-1000 have been canceled.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have assisted the Army in uncovering this logistic boo-boo and hope the savings from the disclosures I have made may multiply many times. While congratulating General Hoff on his frank admission of an error in his command, I can only shake my head and wonder how many billions must go down the sewer each year because of such bureaucratic inefficiency.

A BILL TO BRING JUSTICE TO "RETREADS"

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill to confer jurisdiction on U.S. district courts to hear and render judgment on certain claims. This is a bill the enactment of which into law would take a long overdue step toward the correction of an injustice still suffered by a deserving though relatively small group of retired members of our uniformed services. If enacted into law it would not, of itself, erase the inequity, but it would open a door, now closed, to the restoration of justice to this group. It is unfortunately too late to extend this benefit to all of those who were affected. Many of them have, due to the passage of time and the toll of age, gone on to a higher reward.

The legislation would compensate officers for the differences between the retired pay provided under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and that actually received by them since retirement under the provisions of the Retirement Equalization Act of 1948. The Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 provided for retirement pay of 75 percent of rank and period of service for officers who served in World War I. Officers of the regular service have been receiving retirement pay on that basis since the passage of the act. Comparable retired officers of the Reserve components receive compensation based on length and type of service but in a lesser amount.

The group to which I refer constitutes that cadre of officers of the Second World War who served in World War I, who retained in Reserve status their competence and availability during the long 23-year period between wars, and who proved ready, willing, and able to provide urgently needed military leadership when their country again called them to active duty in World War II. They are the group called, among themselves, "Retreads." They helped provide the limited reserve of trained leadership available to us when that great struggle began. In the long period of neglect of our fighting forces between those wars the Regular Army officer corps was down to less than 14,000 in number. A major effort of our Government was to bring back into service as many as possible of the World War I men. Their experience was urgently needed.

The 77th Congress, seeking to strengthen the mounting war effort, sought also to bring back to active duty that trained pool of World War I experience. By June of 1942, when the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 was enacted into law, about 122,000 Reserve officers were on active duty. In the bill which became law on June 16, 1942, the Congress sought to make more nearly adequate the long neglected area of military pay, and to erase discriminatory distinctions between the Regular and Reserve components of the services. It is to this latter objective that I direct your attention.

In the 1942 Act, mileage allowances, subsistence, pay, and all other areas of pay and allowances were thoughtfully screened, and Regulars and Reserves painstakingly equated in pay, benefits and privileges. Among the provisions so equated, paragraph 4 of section 15 of the act, the only portion of the act still in effect, reads as follows:

> The retired pay of any officer of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, hereafter retired under any provision of law, shall, unless such officer is entitled to retired pay of a higher grade, be 75 per centum of his active duty pay at the time of his retirement.

Originally proposed by the Navy to apply to its Regular and Reserve retirees under the two 1938 naval retirement acts, it was deliberately expanded by the conference, and by the Congress, to apply to "any officer of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act." Those services were the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service. It would seem virtually impossible to misunderstand or misconstrue the meaning of the provision or the intent of Congress. Nonetheless, it has been misconstrued by the Court of Claims, not once but three times, by introducing before the word "officer" the extraneous word "Regular." In other words, the Court has by judicial fiat, amended a law of Congress.

If the terminology used, that of "any officer of any of the services," refers only to Regulars, as the decisions contend, then the whole 1942 Pay Readjustment Act becomes invalid, for it used the same terminology in providing for the pay and allowances of all the services. As pointed out by the sponsor of the act and the conference committee members, it is a long stretch of the imagination to assume that Congress, in using such a term, was referring to some 14,000 Regulars, and purposely excluding from the pay, allowances and other provisions of the act the more than 122,000 Reserve component officers then on active duty. The proposition is preposterous.

It is my purpose in submitting this bill to open the door to a review of these clearly erroneous decisions. To assert, as those decisions do, that in a year of intensifying war effort the Congress would deliberately discriminate against Reserve component officers who constituted the vast majority of its military leadership, is a reflection on the patriotism and good sense of the 77th Congress, and an insult to the intelligence of this 88th Congress.

Obviously, the inequity produced by this series of decisions calls for correction. My bill is designed to take the first step in such correction. I propose that the Congress will simply provide a legal forum in the district courts where members of this deserving and rapidly dwindling group of our Nation's defenders in two World Wars may have their claims heard, determined and a judgment rendered. I propose that this be done in courts in their own areas, near their homes, thus avoiding the costs, the delays, and the crowded condition of the

Court of Claims, a condition of which the chief judge of that court has himself but recently complained to the Judiciary Committee of this House.

A careful survey shows there appears to be about 3,500 surviving officers who meet the terms of the 1942 act and of existing retirement laws. Their ages average a little over 70 years. Many of these men gave up a school or college career to fight in the First World War. They maintained an active interest in the armed services in that long dry spell between wars. They gave up careers, businesses, professions, and some never regained them when the shooting was over, in order to serve again in World War II.

While cost has no part in a matter of justice, it is obvious that the small number of these survivors, their advanced ages, and the passage of time, have reduced the eligibles to a very small number. Moreover, the proposed legislation will not automatically provide any benefits, but will merely give those so minded, and especially those most in need, a forum in which to present their cases. Of one thing I am certain—this Congress is the last occasion upon which we will have the opportunity to render to many of these men the justice long overdue them.

TO BECOME AMERICAN

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, through the press and radio-television media we read and hear a great deal about becoming Americans, being good Americans, not being "ugly" Americans, and upholding American traditions and ideals. Of course, we all want to be loyal Americans and in becoming such we manifest our intentions and desires in various ways. Sometimes we become so involved in our individual ways of proving that we are good Americans that we become skeptical and unsympathetic to those who may follow different paths in showing their loyalty and devotion.

In the July 8, 1963, issue of the San Juan (P.R.) Star, Miss Ursula Von Eckardt, a news columnist, comments on encouraging citizens to demonstrate their loyalties through flag waving as being a ritual that may enhance a sense of belonging and promote an image, but it may be less significant to the character of the United States of America than similar rituals in nations with a different history. Miss Von Eckardt contends there is more to becoming an American than flag waving. She writes:

> To become an American is to join the debate. It is to be involved, to have an opinion, to join a cause, and to wage a campaign. It is to insist on being an individual, on living by consent and by commitment.

Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of our colleagues Miss Von Eckardt's thought-provoking column which I urge each to consult when preparing his next patriotic address.

The column follows:

To Become American

(By Ursula von Eckardt)

Well-meant exhortations have appeared in the "Letters" column of the Star encouraging citizens to demonstrate their Americanism by celebrating Independence Day and by literally waving the flag. Such rituals may enhance a sense of belonging and promote an image, but they are less significant to the character of the United States than similar rituals in nations with a different history.

One of the most difficult yet gratifying aspects of sharing an American identity is the realization that this identification demands participation in a process rather than the profession of a fixed dogma or a display of fixed mores.

It has been said that one can be a Hindu, or a Mohammedan, or a Jew, but one can only become a Christian. In the same sense, one cannot be, one can only become an American.

Everyone, of the 1st or of the 15th generation on this continent or island, brought a heritage with him, a heritage he has had to be willing to modify, but has never been asked to abandon.

The American identity is hyphenated: one is a Swedish-American, an Italian-American, a Spanish-American, or a German-American. All are equally American, yet each has been entrusted to bring something with him, the gift of his past, as a contribution to building a new and common future.

I am baffled when I hear others oppose the terms "American" and "Puerto Rican." To deny one's own heritage in the name of America is to deny the validity of the great experiment itself, the experiment of building a nation of refugees.

All those who came freely, sought refuge from hunger, from persecution, or from a sterile and stratified society. Some who sought freedom found new forms of oppression. Many who prospered neglected to grant others the benefits and liberties they demanded for themselves.

America, as Dr. Morales Carrion explained so clearly, is the constant flux, the constant becoming in which yesterday's oppressed become tomorrow's liberated.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Gov. George Wallace, Senator Aiken's mythical Mrs. Murphy—whose right to discriminate in her private judgment is as American as the right of her neighbor not to be discriminated against unjustly—are all equally able to cite laws, documents, principles, and traditions, each to defend his own position.

But in the process which is American democracy (and who dares say that this has been tame and timid without occasional upheaval and violence? The tree of liberty, said Thomas Jefferson, does not grow unless it is watered regularly by the blood of patriots) the great debate never stops: each day sees new quarrels and new compromises.

"As long as the reason of man continues fallible, and he is at liberty to exercise it, different opinions will be formed," said James Madison. These differences of opinion, nourished by a vast variety of self-interests, clash against each other continuously. When factions are dead, when laws and attitudes become final and irrevocable, then the flame of liberty is extinguished and America itself is dead.

To become an American is to join the debate. It is to be involved, to have an opinion, to join a cause, and to wage a campaign. It is to insist on being an individual, on living by consent and by commitment.

"Despair," said James Baldwin, "is man's greatest sin." Perhaps. It is surely the one and only anti-American sentiment.

Despair is always a resistance to change; a desperate clinging even to an unhappy past; a rejection of the commitment to a self-determining future. Despair is refusal to experiment, the demand for the tried and true. Despair is to see the traditions, customs, and laws of the American past as a welcome straitjacket and a blessed source of labels.

To become an American is to will to create the future, and therefore to take responsibility for it and to trust in it; to be free to let go of the past.

LOGAN (W. VA.) HIGH SCHOOL CLASS PROPOSES DIPLOMATIC ACADEMY

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, the members of the 1963 summer class in American history at Logan High School in Logan, W. Va., have written to me a well-reasoned letter with a proposal which I believe deserves the consideration of Congress.

Under unanimous consent, I include the text of the letter in the Record:

Dear Congressman: We have a proposal and without wasting any more of your time, here it is.

We propose that the Federal Government build a college comparable to West Point of the Naval or Air Force Academies for the special training of our diplomatic corps. A young man or young women who desires to make a career out of being a diplomat would spend 4 years at the school and graduate with a bachelor of arts degree in foreign relations or international law or global economics. Then for postgraduate work, the student would specialize in the language and customs of some special country. This would lead finally to a master's degree in Japan or Russia, or some other foreign country. Even Ambassadors and other high-ranking diplomats who are political appointees would be required to spend 6 months to a year in special study of the country to which they have been appointed before finally leaving for a tour of duty. A speaking knowledge of the language of the country to which they have been appointed should be required of all diplomats to all posts both great and small. This could be learned at this special school.

We are an American history class and our study under the direction of our teacher, Mr. Charles Harris, has led us to believe that our diplomats are often poorly and haphazardly prepared for their work. We believe that the Peace Corps has demonstrated how important it is to send abroad men and women who are interested in the language and customs of the countries they help. Also we believe that Russia has often outmaneuvered us in other countries because their diplomats were better prepared for the job than ours were.

We believe no less than a first class diplomatic college could properly train our future representatives.

Our class feels very strongly about this situation, and we hope to get your interest and support in what we consider a vital problem.

Yours truly,

James L. Steele, Jo Ann Ferguson, James I. Carnes, James M. Dress, Helen Callaham, Billy L. Walsh, Brenda Darby, Roger G. Mullins, Jeanne Miller, Wallace Thompson, Nadine Cline, Charles E. Adams, Larry Scalf, Brad Johnson, Chi Chi Cox, Joseph A. Coppola, Mary Coleman, Harvey H. Brodersen, Wilburn C. Hoskins, Charles Edward Cook, Frederick John Bryant, William E. Perry, Dean Douglas, John D. Hall, Ronnie McNealy, Paul W. Fortune, Freda McCoy, Darlene Miller, Ronald Cross, Phyllis C. Huff, James Preston Maynard, members of the 1963 summer class in American history at Logan High School, Logan, W. Va.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF ADMINISTRATION'S IMMIGRATION BILL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the administration's immigration bill, and since there will be widespread interest in its provisions, it is my opinion that it will prove most helpful to the Members to have in the RECORD at this point a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD that analysis at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF ADMINISTRATION'S IMMIGRATION BILL

Section 1 abolishes gradually the national origins system by reducing present immigration quotas by one-fifth of their present number each year for 5 years. As numbers are released from national origins quotas, they are added to the quota reserve pool. In the first year, 20 percent (roughly 32,800 quota numbers) are released to the pool; in the second year, the pool will have 40 percent of present quotas (or 65,600 numbers); until, in the fifth year, all numbers are allocated through the pool. To provide some immediate relief to minimum quota areas, the present minimum quota of 100 is raised to 200, but is then reduced in the same manner as other quotas.

Section 2 establishes the quota reserve pool under which all numbers will be allocated by the fifth year. In each of the 5 years constituting the period of transition, the pool will consist of (1) the numbers released from national origins quotas each year, and (2) numbers assigned to the present quotas but unused during the previous year because insufficient demand for them existed in the assigned quota area.

These quota numbers will be issued in the order specified in amended section 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. That is, first call on the first 50 percent is given to persons whose admission, by virtue of their exceptional skill, training, or education, would be especially advantageous to the United States; first call on the next 30 percent, plus any part of the first 50 percent not issued to the skilled specialists, is given to unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens, not eligible for nonquota status because they are over 21 years of age; first call on the remaining 20 percent, plus any part of the first 80 percent not taken by the first two classes, is given to spouses and children of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence; and any portion remaining is issued to other applicants, with percentage preferences to other relatives of U.S. citizens and resident aliens, and then to certain classes of workers. Within each class, visas are issued in the order in which applied for: first come, first served, throughout the world.

To prevent disproportionate benefits to the nationals of any single country, a maximum of 10 percent of the total authorized quota is set on number of immigrants from any quota area. However, this limitation is not applied if to do so would result in reducing any quota at a more rapid rate than that provided by section 1. Ultimately, after 5 years, the limitation applies to all.

Exceptions to the principle of allocating visas on the basis of time of registration within preference classes are provided to deal with specific problems. Thus, the bill allows the President, after consultation with the Immigration Board (established by sec. 16), to reserve up to 50 percent of the total quota for allocation to qualified immigrants who could obtain visas under the present system but not under the new bill and whose admission would further the national security interest in maintaining close ties with their countries. The President is also given authority to grant visas to such immigrants without regard to the 10-percent limit on the number of immigrants from any country.

The President may also disregard priority of registration within preference classes for the benefit of refugees.

Finally, it is provided that if the President reserves, against contingencies, any numbers during the year, but does not then find them needed for the named purposes, they are to be issued as if not reserved. Similarly, the 10-percent limitation on the number of visas to be issued to any quota area is removed where other persons would not be foreclosed from entry by its removal.

Section 3 amends section 201(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which presently limits the number of visas issued in any single month to 10 percent of the total issued each year. The amendment allows the issuance each month of the 10 percent authorized for that month plus any visas authorized but not issued in previous months.

Section 4 amends section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the so-called Asia-Pacific triangle provisions, which require persons of Asian stock to be attributed to quota areas not by their place of birth, but according to their racial ancestry.

Another amendment to section 202 raises the minimum allotment to colonial subquotas of dependent countries, thus preserving their present equality with independent minimum-quota areas.

Section 5 repeals section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which prevents the issuance of visas in lieu of those issued but not actually used, or later found to be improperly issued.

Substituted for section 207 is a specific command that nonquota immigrants shall not preempt visas which would otherwise be issued to quota immigrants.

Section 6 amends section 101(a)(27)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which grants nonquota status to spouses and children of U.S. citizens, to extend nonquota status to parents of U.S. citizens as well.

Section 7 amends section 101(a)(27)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to extend nonquota status to all natives of independent Western Hemisphere countries.

Section 8 amends section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which establishes preferences for immigrants with special skills and relatives of U.S. citizens and resident aliens.

Subsection (a) relaxes the test for the first preference accorded to persons of high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability. Under present law, such persons are granted preferred status only if their services are needed urgently in the United States. The amendment allows their admission if their services would be especially advantageous to the United States.

Subsection (b) eliminates the second preference for parents of American citizens, now accorded nonquota status by section 6.

Subsection (c) grants a fourth preference, up to 50 percent of numbers not issued to the first three preferences, to parents of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence. It also grants a subsidiary preference to qualified quota immigrants capable of filling particular labor shortages in the United States. Under present law, if an immigrant does not meet the standards of the skilled specialist category, he is not preferred to any other immigrant even though he may answer a definite need in the United States which the other immigrant does not. The amendment allows to persons filling such a definite need a preference of 50 percent of visas remaining after all family preferences have been satisfied or exhausted.

Section 9 amends section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which establishes the procedure for determining eligibility for preferred status under section 203.

Paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) provide for the filing of petitions, on behalf of the workers granted preference by section 8, by the persons who will employ them to fill the special needs. Paragraph (1) provides for approval of these petitions by the Attorney General, and paragraph (2) requires that he consult with the Immigration Board and interested departments of Government before granting preference to these workers with lesser skills.

Paragraph (4) allows the Attorney General to grant preferred status to highly skilled immigrants upon affidavit of the immigrant, supported by such other documentary evidence as the Attorney General shall prescribe. The Attorney General is directed to ascertain from the Immigration Board (which consults with the Secretary of Labor and studies such problems with specific reference to immigrants) that employment opportunities exist in the immigrant's special field.

Section 10 amends section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, providing for petitions to establish the right to preferred status as a relative of a U.S. citizen or lawfully resident alien, to conform to the substantive changes made by section 8.

Section 11 amends the fair share refugee law (Public Law 86–648). Presently, that law allows the entry only of refugees within the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. The provision relating to the United Nations mandate is stricken out.

In addition, subsection (b) repeals the fair-share law's special provision for 500 difficult to resettle refugees; these have all been settled and the authority is now unnecessary.

Section 12 amends the definition of refugee applicable in the administration of Public Law 86–648 to allow the admission of refugees from north Africa generally, and Algeria particularly, who are unable to return to their countries because of their race, religion, or political opinions.

Section 13 grants discretionary authority to the Secretary of State to specify the time and manner of payment of the fees for visa applications and issuances set by section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Section 281 is further amended to equalize the visa fees paid by all immigrants; at present, nonquota or preference applicants must pay $10 more than persons not entitled to priority.

Section 14 would allow the Secretary of State to terminate the registrations of immigrants who had previously declined a visa.

Section 15 amends subsections (a) (4) and (g) of section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to allow the entry of certain mentally afflicted persons.

The amendment gives the Attorney General discretionary authority to admit such persons who are the spouses, children, or parents of citizens, resident aliens, or holders of immigrant visas. The Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, would prescribe the controls and conditions on entry, such as the giving of a bond to insure continued family support, as would be appropriate in each case.

The exclusion of epileptics is removed entirely.

Section 16 establishes the Immigration Board. The Board is composed of seven members. Two are appointed by the Speaker of the House, two by the President of the Senate, and three, including the Chairman, by the President. Members not otherwise in Government service are paid on a per diem basis for actual time spent in the work of the Board.

The Board's duties are to study, and consult with, appropriate Government departments on all facets of immigration policy; to recommend to the President whether to reserve quota numbers in the national interest under section 2; and to recommend to the Attorney General criteria for admission under the occupational preferences of section 8.

Section 17 grants consular officers discretionary authority to require bonds insuring that certain nonimmigrants will depart voluntarily from the United States when required.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE ABRAHAM J. MULTER

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, on June 13, 1963, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer], was honored by the award of a degree of doctor of laws by Yeshiva University at its 32d annual commencement exercises.

His presentation to the president of the university, Dr. Samuel Belkin, was enhanced by the beautiful tribute paid to him by Dr. Joseph Lookstein.

I commend it to the attention of our colleagues. It reads as follows:

Mr. President, Thomas Jefferson once extolled the study of the law in these words: "It qualifies a man to be useful to himself, to his neighbors, and to the public."

Congressman Abraham J. Multer exemplifies admirably this Jeffersonian doctrine. The law can be a profession. It may be, to borrow a Talmudic metaphor, "a spade to dig with." It can become a ladder leading toward the gratification of personal ambitions.

Such unworthy attitudes justify the observation of Lord Halifax that "if the laws could speak for themselves, they would complain of lawyers in the first place." No such complaint can be registered against the eminent Congressman from Brooklyn who is now completing his ninth term as an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives. For him, the law was an instrument of service, a vehicle for personal fulfillment, and a medium for the achievement of public welfare.

His record from his earliest youth will amply support this appraisal of the man and his work. He obtained his general and legal education the hard way—working by day and studying at night. After admission to the bar he labored, as all must, to establish a rewarding career.

But there was always time for the individual in need of guidance and the community in search of leadership. These qualities won him wide esteem in county, country, and even in Israel, the ancestral homeland of the Jewish people.

In the House of Representatives he was an articulate spokesman for every form of liberal legislation. Civil liberties found in him a fearless champion. The homeless and the driven knew him as a friend who sponsored immigration laws consistent with the traditional hospitality of America. The bigot and reactionary knew him as a foe. The liberal and progressive cherished him as a colleague.

Mr. President, an ancient Greek once observed that: "The good have no need of an advocate." Not so in these days of perplexity and confusion. It is the good and the righteous that need good and righteous advocates. Such a one is before you.

I have the honor, sir, to present Congressman Abraham J. Multer, for the degree of doctor of laws, honoris causa.

A FEATHERBED SOLUTION

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on the impending railroad strike is the subject of the lead editorial in the New York Times of July 23, 1963. The President is accused of lack of courage to face up to the real problem, the continuation of featherbedding. The President refuses to take action, and knuckled under to union demands, the article points out. As a result the financial burden will be passed on to the people and business in higher rates for transportation and in higher taxes to pay for all the Federal aids to the workers.

The editorial follows:

A Featherbed Solution

The author of "Profiles in Courage" has run away from a tough decision to embrace a politically easy one.

Once again the White House has knuckled under to the unions' intransigence on the railroads. The President's announcement that he will seek legislation referring the 4-year-old dispute over featherbedding to the Interstate Commerce Commission would postpone indefinitely—and perhaps forever—the elimination of unneeded train jobs that push the carriers a half-billion dollars closer to bankruptcy every year. He leaves Congress the alternative of doing nothing and thereby accepting the inevitability of a nationwide strike.

The ICC has no special competence in this field. Its members cannot be expected to appraise the incredibly complex issues of work rules and manning practices with anything like the expertness of the able Presidential Commission that submitted its recommendations for squeezing out manpower waste nearly 18 months ago. President Kennedy made that report an exercise in futility by walking away from it on the very day it was presented. He knew the unions would reject it.

Since then the railroads have said "yes" and the brotherhoods have said "no" both to the peace plan put forward by a Presidential emergency board under the Railway Labor Act and to the supplementary settlement formula suggested by Secretary of Labor Wirtz. Now, faced with the choice between a national rail strike and the necessity for forcing a showdown through legislation, President Kennedy retreats into another time-wasting study under circumstances which give the unions every encouragement for continuing to veto the economies essential both for the railroads and for the job security of those workers whose jobs are genuinely needed.

The employers are confronted with the prospect of a 2-year wait before they can hope to reap any of the savings permitted by technological change, with no real reason for belief that the same political considerations that dictated the President's decision will not again frustrate any basic change in their archaic work rules. Mr. Kennedy even hints that the cost can be lifted from their pocketbooks by the usual expedient of passing it to the public in higher rates. The parallel announcement by Mr. Kennedy that he will appoint a Presidential commission on the general problems of automation could not be more ill-timed. The precedent he is setting in the railroads is bound to undermine public confidence in the new body even before it begins work.

The inescapable lesson of the entire experience is that Congress must give priority attention to a reappraisal of all our legal safeguards against emergency strikes and the abuse of union power. Waiting for the crisis always leads to political evasions that may prove as damaging in their end effects as the strikes they were designed to avert. President Kennedy has taken the easy way out, and a way that can only do harm to the country, the railroads and, in the long run, to labor as well.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, we see the President failing to solve a problem; more than this, refusing even to face up to reality. The President's message cannot stand scrutiny by any test of logic. Neither management nor labor will approve this. Nor will the people as they weigh the pros and cons. Perhaps this statement will be the catalyst to awaken the people to the stark reality of today's incompetency in the White House.

EXECUTIVE VIOLATES FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1963

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, some significant data has come to my attention which should be the cause of deep concern to every Member of Congress. The executive branch apparently is in violation of two restrictions contained in Public Law 87-872, the Foreign Aid Appropriations Act of 1963.

Several countries that received aid from the United States in fiscal year 1963 have in turn carried on trade with Communist Cuba. As a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House, I became very interested in the facts surrounding this apparent violation of the Foreign Aid Appropriations Act. After investigation, some highly interesting facts emerged:

In calendar year 1962, 27 countries whose trade with Cuba amounted to over $2 million received economic and/or military aid from the United States.

In the first half of fiscal year 1963 AID expenditures to these countries totaled $245.9 million.

Through March 9, 1963, military expenditures to these countries amounted to $231.7 million.

At the conclusion of my remarks, I will insert a table which breaks down in the latest available figures the amount of aid each one of these countries has received from the United States in fiscal year 1963.

Mr. Speaker, in every one of these 27 cases U.S. aid has been granted. The available facts indicate that the extension of such aid is a direct violation of certain restrictions contained in Public Law 87-872.

The fact that the executive branch of the Government is aware of the restrictions imposed by Public Law 87-872 was made abundantly clear as long ago as January 12, 1963. Both the United Press and the Associated Press on that date issued stories indicating that the State Department had warned countries whose ships go to Cuba that they risk losing American aid. I quote from the AP story:

> A State Department press officer, Joseph W. Reap, disclosed yesterday that the warnings have been conveyed in line with the new foreign aid law. Congress attached a proviso, as the spokesman put it, that "aid shall be cut off to countries whose ships carry goods to Cuba."

At the conclusion of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will include the AP and UP articles in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, the AP story goes on to declare:

> State Department authorities made plain they hope to carry out the law by persuading aid-receiving nations to divert their vessels from Cuban ports, rather than imposing the no-aid penalty.

The facts indicate that 27 of these countries were not so persuaded. Yet, U.S. aid continues to be supplied. I find it difficult to reconcile this with the language of the law as passed by the Congress in the last session of the Congress.

There are two restriction that apply to trade with Cuba. One such restriction flatly bans any U.S. aid to a "country which permits any ships under its registry to carry to Cuba petroleum" and certain other goods of a military or strategic character.

In the first 6 months of 1963, tankers from the United Kingdom, Greece, Italy, and Norway have traveled to Cuba. The provisions of the law are clear in this case. The Executive is given no discretionary authority. Under the law, U.S. aid must be denied to those countries.

Has it been denied?

As of March 9, 1963, the United Kingdom received $6.2 million in U.S. military aid.

As of December 31, 1962, Greece received $7.5 million in economic aid and $89.5 million in military aid through March 9, 1963.

As of March 9, 1963, Italy received $87,000 and Norway $41.2 million in U.S. military aid.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the executive branch chose to ignore that particular provision of the law. Apparently, the Executive's commitment to enforce the law of the land is not an across-the-board commitment; it appears to be selective.

That phrase "law of the land" has seen a lot of usage in recent years. In most discussions, however, it is used to decribe the outcome of Supreme Court decisions. What is usually forgotten, or at least ignored, is that the laws passed by Congress and signed by the President become in every case the law of the land.

The Constitution is clear on this point. It states:

> This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof * * * shall be the supreme law of the land.

Article I of the Constitution declares:

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, there is no discretionary power here. The Constitution does not vest in the President the authority to review laws passed by the Congress and decide which provisions are worthy of enforcement, which not. It does not give the executive branch of this Government a working item veto so that each law can be bent to his own idea of what is in the best interests of this country. This is a government of laws, not a government of men.

For Congress to permit any individual to exercise a discretionary authority when such discretion is not provided by law means that Congress is abandoning its prerogatives. There was a time when a Representative or a Senator was first a Member of Congress and second, a member of his party. His first loyalty was to the institution of Congress; then came his commitments to partisan considerations.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this Congress—Republican or Democrat, liberal or conservative—should be on his feet denouncing the President's refusal to implement this particular provision of Public Law 87-872. The President has demonstrated his eagerness to apply the so-called law of the land as it is defined by the Supreme Court. Each Member of Congress should remind the President that equal vigor should be applied to the implementation of the law of the land as it is enacted by the Congress. After all, there is some controversy in the land as to whether Supreme Court decisions become the law of the land or the law only of a particular case. There is no controversy, however, over the status of laws passed by the Congress and signed by the President. They are the law of the land.

In the second restriction that applies to trade with Cuba, economic aid is denied to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry items of economic assistance to Cuba unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest and reports such determination to the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives.

This provision, Mr. Speaker, does contain a certain discretionary authority. But if the executive branch decides to exercise that discretion, the law again is very clear on the procedures to be followed. Certain committees of both Houses of the Congress must be informed by the President of his decision.

The evidence indicates that the executive branch has seen fit to violate this provision of the law as well. An inquiry was made of the staffs of the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives. This inquiry disclosed that the President had not submitted the required certification.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress should demand that the executive branch explain its failure to comply with the provisions of Public Law 87-872. Whether an individual Member of Congress supported or opposed a particular bill, once that bill has been passed by a majority and signed into law by the President, every Member of Congress should support the enforcement of the provisions of that law. To do otherwise is to renounce the duty and responsibility of the office to which he was elected.

Executive encroachment on the prerogatives of Congress should be the subject of deep concern to every Member of Congress. In effect, it represents a frontal assault not only on the institution of Congress itself but on the effectiveness of the laws passed by the Congress as well. Every Member should be that jealous of his prerogatives that he will not tolerate such a bald-faced refusal by the Executive to administer the laws of the land.

Mr. Speaker, I have addressed a letter to the Comptroller General of the United States, dated July 18, 1963, in which his attention is called to the facts set forth in this statement and requesting him to initiate an investigation of the executive branch's administration of this law.

The letter follows:

JULY 18, 1963.

Hon. JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States,
General Accounting Office,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CAMPBELL: Public Law 87-872, which is the Foreign Aid Appropriations Act of 1963, contains among others the following two provisions:

"SEC. 107. (a) No assistance shall be furnished to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry to Cuba, so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, any arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic energy materials, or any articles, materials, or supplies, such as petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, contained on the list maintained by the Administrator pursuant to title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended.

"(b) No economic assistance shall be furnished to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry items of economic assistance to Cuba so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interests and reports such determination to the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives. Reports made pursuant to this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register within seven days of submission to the committees and shall contain a statement by the President of the reasons for such determination."

It has come to my attention that the executive branch of the Government apparently has violated both of these provisions in a number of instances. Section 107(a) of Public Law 87-872 provides that no U.S. aid shall be extended to any country whose ships provide petroleum and/or other strategic or military goods to Cuba. My information is that tankers from the United Kingdom, Italy, Norway, and Greece have traveled to Cuba in the first six months of 1963. According to the "Operations Report," AID and the hearings before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, April–June 1963, these countries continue to receive assistance from the United States. This appears to be in violation of section 107(a) of Public Law 87-872.

Section 107(b) of Public Law 87-872 prohibits U.S. aid to countries whose ships furnish economic aid to Cuba. There is, however, a certain discretionary authority afforded the Executive. But, if this discretion is exercised, the law is explicit in its requirement that the President inform the appropriate committees of the Congress.

Inquiries made of the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives disclosed that the President has not made the required certification.

Certain newspaper accounts dated January 12, 1963, disclose that the State Department warned those countries concerned that U.S. aid would be withdrawn if their trade with Cuba did not cease. I enclose for your information copies of two of the cited newspaper articles. Also enclosed is a list of 27 countries whose trade with Cuba exceeded $2 million in calendar year 1962, which countries continue to receive aid from the United States. The amount of U.S. aid extended to each of these 27 countries is included in the table.

It is requested that your office investigate the facts concerning this information in order to ascertain whether the provisions of Public Law 87-872 cited above have in fact been violated by the executive branch.

With best wishes and kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the materials to which I have referred follow:

Aid to countries whose trade with Cuba amounted to over $2,000,000 in calendar year 1962

Country	AID commitments, fiscal year 1963 through Dec. 3, 1962	AID expenditures, fiscal year 1963 through Dec. 31, 1962	Military aid, fiscal year 1963 through Mar. 9, 1963
Japan		$171,000	
United Kingdom [1]			$6,200,000
Morocco	$315,000	22,000,000	
United Arab Republic	41,000,000	4,400,000	
Canada			
Netherlands			7,900,000
West Germany		38,000	260,000
Spain		5,700,000	15,600,000
Chile	1,000,000	36,700,000	
India	39,800,000	146,800,000	60,000,000
Tunisia	774,000	5,600,000	
Sweden			
France			4,000,000
Denmark			18,800,000
Switzerland			
Finland			
Yugoslavia	90,000	14,700,000	
Belgium			4,700,000
Luxembourg			50,000
British Guiana	307,000	221,000	
Syria	110,000	314,000	5,000
Uruguay	1,000,000	647,000	
Norway [1]			41,200,000
Poland		304,000	
Italy [1]			37,400,000
Lebanon	90,000	820,000	87,000
Greece [1]		7,500,000	89,500,000
Total	34,400,000	245,900,000	231,700,000

[1] Denotes tankers as well.

NOTE.—David Bell informed the House Foreign Affairs Committee that as of June 30, 1963, there would be an estimated unexpended balance in the AID pipeline to Poland of $2,400,000 and to Yugoslavia of $18,600,000. The grants are almost entirely for technical assistance—related top projects now underway and being paid out as the project is completed.

Sources: AID commitments and expenditures from Operations Report, AID, date as of Dec. 31, 1962. Military aid figures from hearings before House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, April–June 1963.

UNITED STATES REVEALS CUBA TRADE CRACKDOWN—COUNTRIES WARNED AID WILL HALT UNLESS SHIPPING IS STOPPED

(By Donald May)

WASHINGTON, January 11.—A number of free world nations have been warned they face the loss of U.S. aid if their ships continue to trade with Cuba the State Department said Friday.

A spokesman said the crackdown would be required under a provision of the foreign aid bill passed by Congress last session.

He declined to list the countries warned but said the notifications had been served over the last 2 months.

REPORT TO SENATORS

Secretary of State Dean Rusk was questioned about the Cuban shipping situation when he briefed the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee at a closed-door session Friday morning.

Committee Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, reported that Rusk seemed encouraged by the response of many nations to U.S. efforts to discourage shipping to the Fidel Castro regime. Rusk observed however, that some of the vessels engaged in the Cuban trade were under long-term charters and not under firm control of their governments.

At the briefing, Rusk also made these points on Cuba:

The United States is determined to protect the Western Hemisphere from any overt or subversive invasion by Castro forces. He declined to go into detail.

The administration is confident that all Soviet offensive weapons such as missiles and bombers have been withdrawn from Cuba despite contrary reports from some Castro refugees.

The United States has made no commitment against a Cuban invasion. The prospect of such a pledge went down the drain when no on-the-spot inspection of missile sites in Cuba was allowed by Castro. Rusk observed that had the pledge been made it would have applied only to the immediate situation and would not have disrupted U.S. treaty obligations in Latin America.

CUBAN TRADE PERILS AID, UNITED STATES WARNS NATIONS

The United States is cautioning countries whose ships go to Cuba that they risk losing American aid.

A State Department press officer, Joseph W. Reap, disclosed yesterday that the warnings have been conveyed in line with the new foreign aid law. Congress attached a proviso, as the spokesman put it, that "aid shall be cut off to countries whose ships carry goods to Cuba."

State Department authorities made plain they hope to carry out the law by persuading aid-receiving nations to divert their vessels from Cuban ports rather than imposing the no-aid penalty. They said imposing such a heavy penalty could damage the violating country unduly and impair free world security.

Mr. Reap declined to name the countries with which the United States has been negotiating to end the Cuba shipping.

Most non-Communist nations plus Poland and Yugoslavia get U.S. aid. A number like Great Britain, Norway, and Greece, have large maritime fleets. Some maritime nations including Panama, Liberia, West Germany, and Italy, bar their vessels from Cuban ports.

State Department authorities said increasing cooperation has been forthcoming from other non-Communist countries and that Cuba's trade patterns shows a dwindling number of non-Communist ships.

The Congress-imposed restriction is apart from a series of shipping regulations which President Kennedy has said he will issue as part of his drive to isolate the Red regime of Fidel Castro. Informants said they now expect these long-delayed regulations will be issued next week.

A NICE ROUND BILLION DOLLARS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, not long ago a newspaper in my congressional district published an editorial entitled "A Billion Is a Nice Round Sum." It had to do with Secretary of Defense McNamara's cost-reduction program during the past fiscal year. The newspaper said that for a man of McNamara's precision with figures, he used a well-rounded sum of $1 billion because it made a good headline.

As for me, Mr. Speaker, I am all for more headlines like that, especially if they are true. Furthermore, I think the taxpayers of the country should and would applaud any such rare instances of cutting government costs and perhaps especially if the figure was not quite so round. Instead I would reduce the amount of any such saving so each citizen could apply the figure to himself. I gave an example of what this means on the floor of the House of Representatives not long ago; I showed that $1 billion represents an average $21.66 for each of the 46.3 million families in the United States.

Of course, this $21.66 saving is not going to mean much to one of the 4.8 million who unfortunately are jobless today. The unemployed have other and more serious personal worries than the cost of government. Perhaps, too, the 398 persons who we are told enjoy incomes of $1 million a year or more are not too concerned about $21.66. But, Mr. Speaker, there are 28,887,841 taxpayers who have reason to be concerned. This is the number of persons who paid Federal income taxes whose incomes are $6,000 a year or less. When it is shown that the President's budget request of $98.8 billion averages $2,133.90 for each family, or $177.82 a month, it certainly means something to a person whose income before taxes is $500 a month or less.

In 1960 there were 48.1 million individual taxable returns filed with the Internal Revenue and these taxpayers must have a deep personal interest in the way their money is spent. Certainly the cost of government and the cost of each proposed new program that would be added to the cost of government is of interest to them. Why not? They must pay their share too.

For example, of the 48.1 million individuals who have filed taxable returns—this excludes corporation returns—30.8 million are joint returns and represent a husband and wife. Therefore, that would make 63.5 million persons who pay personal income taxes. The average individual tax paid by these 63.5 million persons would be $621.48 each, so it is not difficult to describe Government expenditures in a way it strikes home to the individual taxpayer. It relates to each one's own paycheck or pension.

I have in mind, for example, that last April the Congress approved a supplemental appropriation bill. In theory a supplemental appropriation, of course, is making up any shortages in the amounts allowed by Congress in the previous year for the current year's operations. So the amount of that supplemental bill is not included in this year's budget request.

In April the Senate added $450 million to the House supplemental. This was for an increase in the accelerated public works program. When this $450 million boondoggle, as I consider it, was added to the House bill its total was $1,438 million.

At the time the bill passed Congress the news media of the country informed the people that this $1.4 billion was appropriated. Yet, I doubt if many Members of Congress received protests or even comments one way or the other on the amount of the bill. It was just a nice round sum.

Mr. Speaker, this $1.4 billion in that supplemental appropriation bill averaged $31.07 for each family in America or if averaged on the basis of each individual taxpayer, including the 28,887,841 taxpayers with incomes under $6,000 a year, it represents a cost of $29.91 each.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, one of our colleagues, a member of the Rules Committee, called for action by the House one way or the other on the Kennedy proposal for new programs which are simmering on the fire but not fully cooked apparently or ready for serving.

In this connection, there are three New Frontier programs that I can think of pending. These are, first, the omnibus Federal aid to education bill; second, the 3-year $500 million urban mass transportation bill; and, third, the youth employment and training program.

The first year cost of these three proposals represents a total average cost to each family of $30.54. Moreover, if the $455 million area redevelopment program passes which the Senate tacked on to another bill, although previously rejected by the House, an additional $9.83 per family will be added to this year's cost of government.

The cost of foreign aid and for the space program I intend to discuss at a later date.

Meanwhile, I will conclude by simply repeating what I said to the Members of the House last week that $1 billion, when written, does not mean much. Stated differently, however, the billions and even millions Congress spends can mean something very clearly.

As I said last week each family's share in the Federal debt on the basis of total debt of $309 billion would be $6,674. I said also that the $10 billion annual interest on that national debt amounts to $215 per year per family and should not be allowed to increase through more deficit spending. Finally, let me conclude that each Member of Congress has an important responsibility, it seems to me, to explain how government spending relates to their constituents personally.

UNEMPLOYMENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to open my remarks today by reading a letter. It begins:

> MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing to you about a serious problem. You see, I am unemployed and have four children and a wife to support. The children are 14, 16, 17, and 18 years of age. I am only 36 years old and cannot get a job. They say I am not qualified, sir. I am not illiterate. I can read and write and also work. The only thing I didn't do was finish school. I have tried to get work everywhere. It's a rotten shame a man, only 36 years old, can't support his family decently.
>
> I have a 96-acre farm in Tuscarawas County. Cannot borrow money to farm it right. Now I have to sell my tractor for some money to eat on.
>
> What I would like to know is why the Government is spending all this money on the retraining program. Who is benefiting from it? As big as Stark County is, only 15 men got the program. I was not 1 of the 15. Why only a handful of men? There are hundreds of men like me. What are we supposed to do? Slowly watch our families starve to death?
>
> They say this is a land of wealth. It sure isn't in my house.
>
> My daughter graduated from high school and can't get even a part-time job. She is going to Mercy Hospital to become a nurse. That is, she has been accepted, but I can't borrow the money. She is a good student, won a $200 scholarship, but if I don't get the rest it won't help her.
>
> What is happening to this Government. Why aren't the poor class being helped more.
>
> I think it's a disgrace to say a man is illiterate just because he is poor.
>
> If I could get the retraining I would be willing to move anywhere in the State. But I must do something to feed my family.
>
> Would you please help me to get the retraining program or a job? Anywhere just so it's a living, a decent living. As I said before, I would be willing to move anywhere in the State.
>
> Thank you kindly.

This is only one of many moving letters that have come to me from men who are out of work, who want to work, and who cannot find work.

AMERICAN MEN WANT HONEST WORK

I have heard people talk about the unemployed who are content to relax on unemployment compensation, and I suppose there are a few of these who add to the statistics on the unemployed.

But I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of American men who are out of work today would like nothing better than to have a job that would provide, as my constituent says, a decent living on which to raise a growing family. Despite all of the talk about how a paternalistic government has sapped the initiative of the American people, the average American man is still independent, ambitious, energetic, and honest. He wants a job. He wants to work. And the 2 or 3 million who are in this category of hard-core unemployed today are growing more and more bitter that they cannot seem to carve out an opportunity to make a living and take a place in society as an independent, self-sufficient, hard-working citizen.

This kind of unemployment is the most distressing and potentially the most dangerous domestic problem of these United States.

Unless something is done to find honorable and worthwhile employment for most of the men and women who are without work, and for the 3 million who will be added to our labor force each year for the next several years, the effects upon our economy and our way of life will be serious indeed.

THE PRESIDENT'S PLEDGE

The President's many references to this subject indicate that he is well aware of the problem.

In one of his campaign speeches at Scranton, October 28, 1960, he said:

> If anyone can tell me a more desperate fate for an American than wanting to work and unable to find it, having children and a family to support—and this morning I talked to three steelworkers who have been out of work since April. How do you meet the weekly budget? What do you do, go down and get surplus food, which amounts to 5 cents a day per person? What do you do about your children? What do you do about the mortgage on your house? After unemployment compensation runs out, then what do you do? You move away or you work in another State or your wife goes to work.

On the same theme, Mr. Kennedy told an audience in Ohio that one of the two great problems facing the next President was industrial employment, and he said:

> There are in this country now nearly 4½ million people out of work. There are 3 million people who are working part time, and yet we had a recession in 1954, a reces-

> sion in 1958; now, 2 years later we have a slowdown. We are using today only 50 percent of the capacity of our steel. The Soviet Union last week came close to outproducing us, even though they have only one-half of our capacity. The reason, of course, is that we can produce more than we can consume. We can produce more in our factories and more on the farms than we can consume at at a decent price. Therefore, our steel mills work 50 percent, 100,000 steelworkers are out of work, it affects coal, chemicals, paper, everything. It affects Detroit. How can the next administration so provide an atmosphere for our economy where our country begins to move ahead, where our people work, where our facilities are used, particularly at a time when machines are taking the jobs of men?

And at Oakland, Calif., Mr. Kennedy said:

> We also intend to make sure that every able-bodied American has a job to look for by adopting programs to aid depressed areas, increase our economic growth, and add the new industries and the new jobs which a growing population demands.

Unfortunately, the problems Mr. Kennedy describes are still with us, although there was some improvement in the steel industry this spring.

I recall that Mr. Kennedy established a goal and made a pledge to the American people when he spoke in Canton, Ohio, my hometown, on September 27, 1960. He said:

> We are going to have to find 25,000 jobs a week for the next 10 years if we are going to find jobs for your children who are coming into the labor market—25,000 jobs a week, 52 weeks a year for 10 years, if we are going to maintain full employment in the United States, and it is going to be a matter that is going to be of concern to us all, Canton, Ohio, and the United States. We want to make sure that any American who seeks a job, who honestly wants to work will have a chance to work. That is our objective.

Mr. Kennedy established an ambitious goal, and it is a goal that our free enterprise system must meet. Unfortunately, we are still far from it, and I submit that the Congress must act and by its action implement the pledge of the President to the American people.

LONG-RANGE PLANS NECESSARY

I am growing more and more concerned by the emphasis placed upon stopgap programs and Federal subsidies, and by the lack of any overall concerted attack upon the long-range problem. Moreover, I am concerned by what seems to me to be a grave lack of coordination between the various efforts that have been made to view the long-range problem.

For these reasons, I am introducing today a resolution calling for the establishment of a Select Committee on the Problems of Employment to be composed of Members of the House from the major committees concerned in these problems. The select committee will be charged with the responsibility for making a full and complete study with a view to recommending comprehensive plans for achieving maximum employment in our free enterprise system.

This is no partisan problem, and it should not be treated as one. All men and women of good will in both political parties share a desire to find the solution, and I hope that this resolution will win prompt endorsement from my colleagues of every political persuasion.

We need to know what deficiencies of Government or business policy have created the present unemployment problems.

We need to know what positive and constructive changes in Government policy, in the business world, in education and commerce can provide the broad expansion of enterprise that will be required to provide full employment for the growing labor force.

Mr. Speaker, it is a common error to think of the 4.8 million who are unemployed today in terms of the 20 million who were unemployed during the depression of the 1930's. The two situations are not parallel.

NATURE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

In 1930 a worldwide depression threw millions of people out of work, and the situation continued with little improvement until World War II began. There was nothing selective about the problem of unemployment in the thirties. It brought hardship on everyone, in every nation of the world.

Today's problem is selective. In the first place, there is no worldwide economic distress. The defeated nations of World War II are operating at high capacity with full employment, and some of them must import workers from other nations. Even in the United States, we are not in a business recession. The rate of business activity fluctuates from year to year, but the rate of unemployment remains at a high level affecting certain groups of people in our land.

Samuel Lubell has written a series of articles, which appeared in my hometown newspaper, the Canton Repository, in which he discusses in plain terms the nature of the unemployment problem of the sixties.

He points out, for example, that there are several hundred thousand young men, some of them approaching 30, who have never had a steady job. Perhaps my constituent is one of these. They are willing and anxious to work and have some training, but there appears to be no real place for them in the economy of the sixties. Consider what this means in terms of lost opportunities to own a home, start a family, take an adult's place in the American society. This is one part of the unemployment picture and it is a real tragedy.

There are others who trained for a specific job and who may have built up years of seniority in a plant, only to become unemployed when changing markets or technology eliminate the industry for which they are working or the job for which they are trained. We recognize this problem. It is a part of the current crisis in the rail industry.

There are, of course, the unemployed of all ages in areas which are acutely depressed such as the coal fields in certain parts of West Virginia, Ohio, Illinois, and Tennessee. The unemployables who lack education or training are found everywhere in the United States and they are of both sexes and of all ages.

A youth conservation corps or an area redevelopment program is not going to solve the problems of these unemployed Americans. At best, such programs can provide only a short-term opportunity to earn some money after which, in the absence of a constructive solution to the Nation's problems, the men concerned will reenter the ranks of the unemployed. With regard to the youth corps, for example, the Secretary of Labor has testified that the men who go through this program will return with no new skills.

Mr. Lubell points out also that current statistics about unemployment are an unreliable index to the extent of the problem.

We are appalled to find that 4.8 million Americans are still unemployed according to the July 1 report of the Department of Labor but, as I indicated earlier and as Lubell agrees, this numerical expression of the problem is not the whole story. Many of the 4.8 million are people who are between jobs, men and women taking advantage of unemployment compensation to rest a few weeks, youngsters, housewives, and retirees seeking part-time work and many who would like to work or are willing to work but suffer no acute hardship by reason of being unemployed.

This does not lessen the seriousness of the problem for those I have mentioned who are numbered among the hard-core unemployed and those who inevitably must join this group unless constructive action is had soon.

SCOPE OF STUDY

The select committee I propose would include two members of each of the Committees on Appropriations, Banking and Currency, Education and Labor, and Ways and Means. The committee will be charged with responsibility for a full and complete study of the problem of unemployment in the United States with a view to recommending a comprehensive plan for the achievement of maximum employment in the private enterprise system. This study shall include, but shall not be limited to—

First. Chronic unemployment among persons aged 45 and over.

Second. The role of women in the labor force.

Third. Unemployment of young people, including the problems of school dropouts and the effect of compulsory military service.

Fourth. Apprenticeship and on-job training in industry.

Fifth. Federal, State, and nongovernmental agencies for placement of the unemployed.

Sixth. Vocational education in high schools.

Seventh. Industry programs for upgrading skills.

Eighth. The effects of automation.

Ninth. The effects of foreign competition.

Tenth. The effect of Federal taxation on industrial expansion.

A similar committee of Republican members only was proposed 2 years ago as a means of developing information for our party on these subjects. This proposal was contained in the excellent report called "Employment in the Dynamic American Economy" which included statements and studies by a number of our colleagues and papers prepared by distinguished academic and professional experts. I commend these reports to your attention. They appeared in the Records of July 20, 25, 26, and 27, and August 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, and 10, 1961.

It is my thought that a similar but much broader bipartisan study is urgently needed at this time. I hope that the Select Committee on the Problems of Employment may be established without delay and that its studies may produce programs that will solve the problems of unemployed men who need jobs, including my constituent, whose letter I read to you today.

U.S.S.R. NATIONALITIES IN DANGER OF EXTINCTION

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman continues the negotiations in Moscow which are supposedly limited to a discussion of a nuclear test ban.

However, public statements have also been made of the possibility of a nonaggression pact between the NATO Alliance and the Soviet Warsaw Pact nations which, if developed, would mean complete acceptance by the United States of Communist control of previously free peoples in Eastern Europe.

In effect, we would be placing our stamp of approval on the Iron Curtain and would be crushing the hopes and aspirations of the captive peoples of the Soviet colonial empire for a return to legitimate governments of their own choosing.

We have had many reports from the Soviet Union in the past years indicating the continuing nationalistic resistance that the captive peoples are waging against Soviet imperialism. We have also been informed authoritatively of the persecution which the Soviet Government carries on against the unwilling captives of communism.

At this point I wish to insert into the Record as part of my remarks the following editorial which appeared in the Hairenik Weekly of July 18, a publication of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, entitled "U.S.S.R. Nationalities in Danger of Extinction":

U.S.S.R. Nationalities in Danger of Extinction

That the Armenians are in the forefront in the current drive for the creation of a congressional Committee for Captive Nations is not merely an instinctive action nor a flippant gesture to keep up with the Joneses.

The Armenians have good reason to be concerned about the fate of the nation, perhaps a little more than any other nationality group of kindred fate, because they are small in numbers, and weak in might, and because they have been buffeted by fate far more than any other nation and they are desperately trying to prevent national extinction.

There are things going on inside the Iron Curtain these days. There are things going on in Soviet Armenia of which the world should be informed. The very life of the Armenian Nation is being threatened with a peril which is far more deadly than the famine, the epidemic and the massacre.

It is the peril of national dissolution. It is blatant Russification.

One after another, the bastions of national identity are being demolished. Religion, the foundation of the Armenian people which enabled them to survive 2,000 years has been eradicated in Armenia and has been replaced by atheism.

Nationalism, patriotism, have been ruthlessly suppressed and replaced by international communism.

Our language has been hideously disfigured with the rushing influx of Russian words, an atrocious hodgepodge of bilingualism. One needs a new Armenian dictionary these days to decipher the foreign words.

Culture is denounced as formalistic and the artists of Armenia are closely watched lest they deviate, the result being that artistic growth is stifled.

And now, as the capstone of this false structure, comes the so-called fraternal union of the Caucasian S.S.R. Communist Parties—Armenia, Georgia, and Azerbaijan—which have been merged into the transcaucasian bureau, doing away with native party leadership.

The pattern is being implemented in other parts of the Soviet Union—Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Kazakistan, Ukraine, etc.

And this liquidation of the nationalities is being done in the name of "the brotherhood of the nation," in the name of the "common land" and the "common fatherland" which, in reality, is destined to become "common Russia" with Russian language, culture, and ideology.

This is the beginning of the end—the disintegration of the nationalities of the Soviet Union.

As regards Armenia, with the relaxation of the former repressions, of late there had been indications of a national awakening.

Voices were being heard in Armenia, voices which no one dared raise in the days of the infamous Stalin.

The poet Hovhanness Shiraz sings of the nostalgia of the "old home on the other side of the border." The academician, Karapetyan, writes a stringing rebuttal to a Polish Communist writer who apologized for the Turk and the Soviet by contending that "The confiscation of Armenian historic territories by Turkey, Georgia, and Azerbaijan was a historic necessity in the interests of world communism."

And now the Soviet cudgel is descending heavily on Shiraz and Karapetyan and others, as "chauvinists" and "imperialistic reactionaries."

The Communist Party in Armenia is alarmed and puts the blame on the Armenian Revolutionary Federation.

There is every indication that a reversal to the Stalin era is in the offing in Armenia. There will be persecutions and purges. The revival of the national spirit will be ruthlessly suppressed.

With religion gone, language gone, and now the territorial demarcations gone, Armenia is in danger of complete dissolution.

The Christian West failed Armenia in the days of Abdul Hamid.

Will history repeat itself? Will the free West stand by passively and watch with indifference as Armenia is being crucified the second time?

Although this editorial directs attention to the abuse being suffered by the Armenian minority in the Soviet Union, the practices of the Soviet Government are consistently applied to the other nationality groups under Soviet control. By destroying the identities of the captive nations the Soviet Union hopes to perpetuate its control over their lands and reduce the resistance that they are continually demonstrating.

Having recently commemorated Captive Nations Week, it is well for us to ponder the sinister implications of conditions within the Soviet Union as related to the foreign policy goals of the Communists. We should be forewarned and concerned with the dangerous trap that is being laid for us in Moscow.

SOMBER REMINDER: IRON CURTAIN STILL THERE

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, largely forgotten are millions of people still behind the Iron Curtain under Soviet domination. Since 1959 the U.S. Congress has set aside a week of the year as Captive Nations Week, during which the President makes a proclamation calling for the liberation of peoples under Communist bondage.

The President did so this year although, curiously, at a time when an accommodated agreement on atmospheric nuclear testing seemed imminent. Perhaps the proclamation was less than enthusiastic for fear it would irritate the Communists and foul the negotiations. If so, the somber tone of Captive Nations Week became even more somber.

During Captive Nations Week last week, we were reminded that all of Eastern Europe is under Soviet domination 18 years after World War II, as is most of Asia.

Lands which for years provided the United States with the riches of immigration now are under Communist rule. They were given the Communist yoke at the conference table where the wily and artful Communists outsmarted U.S. negotiators.

Despite talk that parts of the Communist world are independent of Russia, Communists argue only over the best means of destroying the free nations.

Within the Communist bloc is little evidence of freedom, a break in foreign policy with Soviet Union, or any change in the ideology of planned victory over capitalism. Under communism everywhere the individual person is but an ant-like slave in a mass society.

Yet there are strong indications that the policy of peaceful coexistence is now the policy of the U.S. Government. While no one wants war, the easiest way to get into war is to encourage the enemy to think we are soft and will make accommodations and concessions.

After Captive Nations Week it is especially appropriate to think through this question:

Have we resigned ourselves to accept Communist rule for these nations?

If the answer is "No," and I hope it is, an equally important question remains: What can we do to aid the people who have lost their freedom?

First, we can all stand for a firm policy against communism, opposing agreements and treaties which would legalize Communist rule in Eastern Europe, Cuba, and the Far East.

Second, we can aid refugee organizations and national groups in their efforts to present their case for freedom and regain their homelands if opportunity comes. Tragically, we missed such an opportunity to do so in Cuba when we let Cubans die on the beaches of the Bay of Pigs without our promised air strikes.

Third, we can step up efforts in the United Nations to get neutral nations to condemn the real imperialism, the real colonialism in the world—the Soviet Communist empire.

If the United Nations is to be useful, it must be a center where tragic problems like this can be brought to light and discussed.

Fourth, we can stop aiding Communist governments. We can cut off the trade concessions, free steel mills, and free food. We can withhold aid for the day when the oppressed people overthrow their masters.

The United States won its independence from Britain with strong help from nations across the seas. One of these was Poland.

Let us not forget Poland and the other captive nations in their own hour of misery—but let our aid be to the open hand of freedom, not to the mailed fist of dictatorship.

PITFALLS OF THE MOSCOW PARTIAL TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, we will be hearing much about the alleged advantages of the partial test ban treaty negotiated in Moscow. There will be much said about the risks claimed to be reduced or eliminated by the arrangement. There will be little or nothing said by the administration about the risks it increases or creates. Unless these latter are understood thoroughly, assessed, and then balanced against the former, it is impossible to say whether the Moscow arrangement is in the national interest of the United States, whether it is detrimental to these interests, or whether the entire affair is no more than a meaningless exercise in futility.

That such risks do, in fact, exist, we can be sure. Unless Mr. Khrushchev is a madman, and he is not, he sees advantages for the Soviet Union and communism in the partial treaty. He sees them as substantial advantages, worthy of his time and effort. By no stretch of the imagination can such advantages to him be assumed to be, in any substantial part, advantages which also accrue to us. There must, therefore, in substantial part, be disadvantages to us.

Another reason for a hard look at risks inherent in the partial test ban treaty is to dispel the general feeling of euphoria it might create. People will tend to regard it as evidencing an easy solvability of East-West relationships. Pressures will mount for concessions all along the line to achieve a detente with communism. First, a nonaggression declaration, next a summit conference, then concessions here, there, and at many points which, when taken together, will add up not to solution of East-West relations, but to the tragic shift of strategic superiority to Communist hands. Misconceptions already prevalent concerning the Sino-Soviet dispute amply illustrate the pitfalls of miscalculating Communist intentions. Wishful thinkers view it as a fundamental split in Communist ranks. Realistically, it concerns in no way whether the West shall be buried. Only in dispute are the subsidiary questions of: when? and how?

MILITARY CONSEQUENCES OF THE PARTIAL TEST BAN TREATY

First. U.S. progress in high yield, 30- to 100-megaton weapons will be paralyzed at a time when the Soviets already have achieved these capabilities. The United States gives up entirely its opportunity to cope with the Soviet's massive program of hardening its offensive intercontinental missile bases.

The consequent inability to mete out destruction to Soviet weaponry will decrease the credibility of our deterrent force in direct ratio to increases in Soviet hardening. It is equivalent to cutting back our SAC air squadrons, ICBM bases, and Polaris submarine patrols.

Sufficient Soviet base hardening will progressively leave us threatening only empty launching pads or invulnerable hardened sites. This cannot be expected to deter the Soviets from initiating nuclear war. Our only alternative under these conditions would be to target Soviet cities, which hardly squares with the administration's no city deterrent-targeting doctrine.

Second. U.S. progress in antimissile defense will be either greatly slowed down or paralyzed completely at a time when, according to Khrushchev, the Soviets have solved the problem of antimissile defense. It is to be noted that Soviet claims in the nuclear field have generally been accurate. Their claim relative to having achieved the H-bomb is a notable example. When made, many in the United States scoffed. Nonetheless, it turned out to be quite accurate. The massive construction program now going on at Leningrad's missile defense sites lends credence to the estimate that the Soviets have what they claim regarding ICBM defense and are installing it.

Antimissile defense capability in the hands of the Soviet Union is another way of saying our deterrent against Soviet attack has weakened. It, too, is the equivalent of cutting back our SAC air squadrons, ICBM bases, and Polaris fleet. If the warheads carried by these delivery systems are to be intercepted by Soviet defenses with any degree of efficiency, then they will not loom large as deterrents to Soviet button pushers.

Conversely, the absence of U.S. antimissile capability permits a Soviet first-strike, surprise attack to get through, destroy our deterrent forces before they are put in operation, and thus further reduce U.S. power to deter. Destroyed weapons cannot impose damage upon the Soviet Union greater than can be accepted in return for accomplishment of the Communist objective of world domination. This situation cannot be remedied except by improvement of U.S. antimissile capabilities. This cannot be done well, it cannot be done readily, perhaps it cannot be done at all without atmospheric testing.

Third. The partial test ban treaty introduces the completely new hazard and risk to America of surprise abrogation. This is the situation where, under the cover of the partial treaty, Soviet nuclear weapons scientists would be put to work intensely in weapons laboratories behind the secrecy of the Iron Curtain, all test preparations would be made in strictest secrecy, then the Soviet Government suddenly would announce itself no longer bound by the treaty and promptly initiate an extensive test series.

During this period, which might last for years, U.S. laboratory work would deteriorate in quantity and quality and our capabilities for atmospheric testing also would deteriorate. The net effect would be a quantum jump in Soviet nuclear capabilities which might well gain them decisive nuclear superiority. Under such conditions, the West could expect at the worst a nuclear Pearl Harbor and at best a surrender or die ultimatum.

Fourth. As an alternate to surprise abrogation the Kremlin might simply direct its nuclear laboratories to concentrate exclusively on areas of nuclear development concerned with highly efficient tactical nuclear weapons. This could include the neutron bomb. This type of development can be done conveniently underground. It could be done by the Soviets safely under partial test ban conditions because they are assured that we are not making other nuclear developments with which they must compete.

In any event, we do know that the Soviet Union spends 3½ times the amount spent by the United States on basic military research. This indicates an aim at developing full spectrum military superiority in approximately a decade. This fits well either with the surprise abrogation timetable or with the tactical-neutron development timetable.

Unless one is to be wholly and totally naive, one cannot with any assurance anticipate that Soviet weapons funds released by the partial test ban will be reallocated to consumer goods production. This "refrigerator" argument simply fails to square with any past action ever taken by Communist leaders. Put another way, we can be absolutely certain that whatever financial advantages the Soviet Unions finds in the partial test ban treaty will be utilized to perfect its arsenals, not better its standard of living.

Fifth. If all, or any substantial portion of the foregoing disadvantages occur and result in debilitation of the American deterrent, it is axiomatic that Communist leaders will intensify their efforts in the cold war areas of conflict between East and West. It could even lead to easier decisions by Communist leaders to engage in limited conventional warfare. This is simply because today, the fearful capacity of the American deterrent cautions Communist leaders against risking lesser types of conflict which might escalate into a nuclear exchange. Any reduction in the relative fearfulness of that deterrent makes it easier for them to be more adventurous in choosing actions which might escalate. Conversely, it places us in a weaker position to control such actions. The threat of nuclear response, heretofore a handy lid to place on them, becomes progressively smaller, less credible, and less effective.

POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE PARTIAL TEST BAN TREATY

First. Heretofore the U.S. policy of nondissemination of nuclear weapons; that is, the policy against proliferation of weapons to numerous countries, has been a matter of discretion. The partial test ban treaty will commit us indefinitely to the policy. We will not be able to change it without abrogating or at least violating the treaty.

(a) With respect to our NATO allies, this comes at a time when the U.S. policy is seriously weakening the alliance. If the partial treaty results in weakening our deterrent capabilities, as outlined above, Europeans will become less and less inclined to follow our lead. The estrangement will deepen. European defenses will weaken and the dissolution of NATO could well follow. This, for years, has been one of Premier Khrushchev's priority objectives.

(b) With respect to the situation in the Far East, our options in meeting the threat of emerging nuclear capabilities on the part of the Red Chinese will be seriously restricted. It will be impossible to work closely with Japan in creating a nuclear deterrent. The full burden of deterrence will fall on the United States, at the very time its overall deterrent capabilities are seriously weakened because of the treaty.

Second. Any adverse effect on the American deterrent consequent to the treaty is certain to accelerate, rather than decelerate efforts of other countries to obtain their own independent national deterrents. Even if we choose to weaken ourselves, they may not. Proliferation will occur under other countries' terms, not under terms which the United States might impose to make the consequences of proliferation less risky.

It is readily apparent that the partial test treaty raises almost as many difficulties, problems, and risks to U.S. security as a comprehensive treaty. The chief difference is that the U.S.S.R. can conduct underground tests without violating the pact. We still will be unable to determine accurately what underground testing programs they will be carrying on.

JUSTICE ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG RECEIVES DOCTOR OF LAWS DEGREE AT YESHIVA UNIVERSITY.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on June 13, 1963, the Yeshiva University honored the distinguished Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, Arthur J. Goldberg, when it conferred upon him the degree of doctor of laws for a career in public service which was crowned by his appointment to the Supreme Court last year.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following presentation of Rabbi Joseph Lookstein and Justice Goldberg's address on the occasion of Yeshiva's 32d annual commencement:

PRESENTATION OF THE HONORABLE ARTHUR GOLDBERG

(By Rabbi Joseph Lookstein)

Mr. President, when our eminent guest was Secretary of Labor he was frequently referred to as the Davy Crockett of the New Frontier. He was fond of that appellation because it intimated courage, daring, and vision.

The raccoon hat and the buckskin tunic have since been exchanged for the dignified judicial robe. But the qualities of courage, daring, and vision still remain the proud possessions of the learned, dynamic, and sagacious Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, the Honorable Arthur Joseph Goldberg.

He is the son of a Russian-Jewish immigrant, the youngest of 11 children. Orphaned of his pious father at the tender age of 8, he learned early in life the pain of adversity and the pangs of hardship. He speaks of himself as an "academic moonlighter," attending Crane Junior College in the morning and De Paul University at night and working in between.

His humble beginnings and admirable perseverance call to mind another youth—the tall, gaunt, and saintly fellow-Illinoisan whose name is holy legend in American history.

It is out of such struggle that character is distilled and noble ambitions inspired. The passion for freedom, justice, and equality is nurtured, often enough, not in palaces and mansions, but in log cabins and in immigrant huts. In such environments, social prophets are made and our distinguished guest is one of them.

Renown has not affected him; prominence did not obscure his essential humanity. Amidst public acclaim he can still hear the cry of the aggrieved and anguished. 'Neath the black robe beats, even more strongly than before, a warm, compassionate and understanding heart.

It is gratifying to realize that this commanding national figure proudly identifies himself with the fortunes of his people and with the traditions of his faith. Many a Cabinet member and Supreme Court Justice who were guests at the Seder service at his home will attest to that.

Mr. President, in his latest opinion written but days ago, our guest defines the phrase "with all deliberate speed" as it applies to the vexing problem of desegregation. For him, it means that the pernicious evil of race discrimination should be removed from our midst forthwith and without delay.

In keeping with the Jewish principle of "measure for measure," it is appropriate sir, that we confer upon Arthur Joseph Goldberg "with all deliberate speed" the degree of doctor of laws, honoris causa.

ADDRESS BY ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, U.S. SUPREME COURT, YESHIVA UNIVERSITY, JUNE 13, 1963

Mr. President, distinguished rabbis and teachers, this is a redundancy, distinguished guests, graduates, their families and friends. This weekend, and during the last week all over America, commencements were being held.

I would like to tell you in all candor that this commencement has the first claim on my heart. I must tell you that it does not. It has the second claim as my son is graduating on Sunday and obviously that commencement has the first claim on me.

Every commencement speaker has difficulty in defending his role. If Lincoln's great address had any statement most applicable to commencement speeches it was the phrase that a commencement speech is little noted and long remembered. In fact the principal purpose of a commencement speech is kind of to tide over between processional and recessional. It reminded me very vividly of an experience I had just the other day of the same type or I should say of a related type.

I knew when I assumed the high office of the Justice of the Supreme Court, that I was charged with many responsibilities—grave ones indeed—and I was vested under our constitutional system to have extraordinary powers which have challenged the thinking and sometimes raised the doubts of political scientists here and all over the world. The power to declare acts of Congress unconstitutional, the powers to set aside the actions of the Chief Executive of the Nation, the powers to set aside acts of States as unconstitutional.

I must confess that as a lawyer I know that I had those responsibilities and powers and was gravely conscious of this but I did not know that a Jusice of the Supreme Court was vested by the laws of the District of Columbia with the powers to perform marriages, and I discovered this just not so long ago. (Joke about Army soldier who wants to get married on a weekend without proper license. GI asks Justice for a few words to tide couple over.) I shall in this address make a few remarks to tide the graduates over between coming in and coming out.

I am deeply honored to receive this degree from Yeshiva University, greatly respected as it is for its outstanding scholarship and for its uncompromising devotion to intellectual pursuits in the great Jewish tradition.

As an outstanding rabbinical school and a higher institution of learning, Yeshiva University continues to demonstrate that fidelity to Judaism is lawful devotion to the moral heritage upon which our country was founded, and which informs all civilization.

I have discovered in my career that the role of the public official, executive, or judicial, and the role of the scholar, the educated person, are not widely separated, as some believe.

For both executive and judge must depend upon the illumination of the religious sage, the philosopher, the historian, the scholar, to light the way. If we seek as we must seek to lift the poor and deprived and suppressed to better conditions and wider opportunities, if we pursue equal justice for all extending to all the equal protection of the law it is because the prophets, the speculative thinkers, the contemplative men throughout recorded times have inquired into the higher reasons for society, for government and, indeed, life itself. I believe that the ivory tower is a complete fiction. There is no possibility today for noninvolvement in a world in which the salvation of the human race is at stake, nor can there for the average citizen be disengagement from the responsibilities the free man accepts as a part of his birthright. It is freedom itself that imposes this burden upon those who cherish their freedom.

It is commonplace to say that we live in troubled times. Though we have lived in troubled times ever since I sat in your place in 1929, and in 1930, and in 1931, when we were on the eve of terrible events which challenged the very existence of our civilization.

We are in perilous times today and while judges, sworn to, and performing their duties of interpreting the law, can issue decisions which express the conviction that our society by our Constitution is an open society and while Presidents can speak to the Nation and propose legislation to that end and while legislators can deal with the laws that can give strength, vitality, and force to that concept, ultimately these precepts which are the basis for our society will prevail and depend upon you. It will depend upon graduates here and the average man and woman here in the United States. This does not mean that judges cannot educate, that presidents cannot enforce the law and inspire the people and legislators cannot legislate.

This does mean that the sum total of our achievements for the type of society upon which our hopes exist will depend upon the people of the United States, and their dedication to the basic principles of equality and to use our Biblical term from which these principles derive of justice and righteousness and indeed the great challenge of the present hour in America is the response of the people to their commitments to citizenship in our country. Moral commitments if you will, far more than law can or should enforce. But the fact that they are moral commitments does not mean that they do not profoundly effect the course of ways and the future of our country.

The pursuit of education in my opinion has a double and related function. It must, of course, inform the mind, sharpen it; that is one of the purposes. It must also fuel the belly of the student. Unless an education makes you passionately devoted to what is going to be in life, to the great issues of today and tomorrow, and commits you to the obligations that you have toward those issues, the education that you get is a complete failure.

I believe that scholarship, that higher education, have a higher purpose than intellectual satisfaction and stimulation that comes from pursuing the engrossing story of man's culture and meaning; that higher meaning is not only to illuminate the present but to inspire it.

This is one of the things that makes this university appealing to me, and that is that it is founded upon the principle which the Jewish heritage strongly emphasizes: that a man must turn inward and set the true value on our days and works, define the purposes for which we spend the years God has granted to us and ask whether freedom and individual liberty prosper in our cause.

We have been much concerned, as we have had to be throughout all of the time that the graduates of this institution can remember, with foreign affairs. Because if we are not successful abroad, then the survival of freedom is endangered. Again I would like to say to you that I wish that there is as much interest, dedication and devotion to domestic matters as well. We cannot be successful abroad unless we are successful at home.

The measure of our success at home is what we do to make the fruits of our life available to the poor, to the underprivileged, to the prejudiced against, to the discriminated against.

The measure of our success at home is likewise the quality of our institutions. It is to be found in respect for law and obedience to it, by governor and governed alike, in the resolute and enlightened leadership of our executive, in the fully representative character of our legislatures; in the impartiality and integrity of our judiciary and in the moral and ethical standards of our citizens.

The burden of achieving the great heritage of freedom and all that it connotes, derived from Moses, and incorporated into our Constitution belongs, therefore, to all of us. There is no disengagement from the responsibility that every citizen bears to understand our goals and help contribute to their achievement.

You who graduate from this great institution have a special responsibility. I would hope that your education has not only improved the mind but opened the heart as well. Intellectual understanding and human compassion are sorely needed in the complex modern world. Perhaps the best hope of all in the future is that man's curious and inquiring mind will make its progress by the light of an open and warm heart.

This is a new doctrine, this is not a new frontier for life from a man who is now nonpolitical. This is the eternal teaching of the Torah. The prophet Amos demanded hate evil, and love God and establish justice. Of course, it is an often commented fact that righteousness is the Hebrew word for charity.

The burden of achieving the great heritage of freedom and all that it connotes, derived from Moses, and incorporated into our Constitution belongs, therefore, to all of us. There is no disengagement from the responsibility that every citizen bears to understand our goals and help contribute to their achievement.

You who graduate from this great institution have a special responsibility. You have been schooled to understand the moral basis, the ethical structure upon which democratic government depends. And I would hope, I do not advise, I do not think our generation is capable of advising, that I would hope that your education has not only improved the mind but that it has opened the heart as well. Intellectual understanding and human compassion are sorely needed in the complex modern world. Perhaps the best hope of all in the future is that man's curious and inquiring mind will make its progress by the light of an open and warm heart.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 30 minutes, tomorrow, July 24.

Mr. LLOYD, for 2 minutes, for Wednesday, July 24.

Mr. WEAVER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 2 hours, on July 29.

Mr. MARSH, for 2 hours, on Monday, July 29, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. SCHADEBERG and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOW) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. TALCOTT.

Mr. WALLHAUSER.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. SNYDER.

Mr. DEROUNIAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HARRIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RAINS.

Mr. HEALEY.

Mr. HANNA in two instances.

Mr. UDALL.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. ULLMAN (at the request of Mr. HARRIS) and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $630.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 627. An act to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 994. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to create a board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 999. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1078. An act to amend the District of Columbia Public School Services Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1652. An act to amend the National Cultural Center Act to extend the termination date therein, and to enlarge the Board of Trustees; to the Committee on Public Works.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 24, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1063. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1064. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Navy (Installations and Logistics), transmitting information relative to the intention of the Department of the Navy to give certain surplus obsolete material to the city of Roanoke, State of Virginia, pursuant to section 7545 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1065. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the activities of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems during the period July 1 to December 31, 1962, pursuant to the Bretton Woods Agreements Act (H. Doc. No. 144); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

1066. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the procurement of aluminum caps and cans without adequate pricing data, by the E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc., from the Aluminum Co. of America under an Atomic Energy Commission cost-type contract; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1067. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 7043. A bill to amend the act of March 2, 1931, to provide that certain proceedings of the Veterans of World War I of the United States, Inc., shall be printed as a House document, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 571). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 194. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag"; without amendment (Rept. No. 572). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 428. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the study entitled "The Federal Government and Education"; with amendment (Rept. No. 573). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 47. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of certain hearings on effect of television portrayal of crime on young people; without amendment (Rept. No. 574). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 7697. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 7698. A bill to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 7699. A bill to provide that Flag Day shall be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 7700. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H.R. 7701. A bill to designate the Curwensville Dam on the West Branch of the Susquehanna River at Curwensville, Pa., as the James E. Van Zandt Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 7702. A bill to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to provide injunctive and other relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize suits by the Attorney General to secure civil rights, to provide for the desegregation of public schools, including first-step compliance by 1964, to establish a Community Relations Service, to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency, to establish a Commission on Equal Opportunity, to protect citizens against lynching and official violence, to protect activities conducted under the authority of constitutional rights, to prohibit discrimination in federally assisted programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H.R. 7703. A bill to authorize the acceptance of donations of land and the construction, administration, and maintenance of an extension of the Blue Ridge Parkway in the States of North Carolina and Georgia by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 7704. A bill to authorize the acceptance of donations of land and the construction, administration, and maintenance of an extension of the Blue Ridge Parkway in the States of North Carolina and Georgia by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 7705. A bill to amend the act of July 4, 1955, as amended, relating to the construction of irrigation distribution systems; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 7706. A bill to amend the St. Lawrence Seaway Act to provide that the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation shall not engage in publicity or promotional activities such as free or paid advertising; solicitation of cargoes; publication of ocean, rail, port or motor carrier rate or service comparisons; or other activities that are actually or potentially disruptive to the flow of waterborne trade among ports in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 7707. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that benefits payable under such act on the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935 shall not be considered as income in determining eligibility of individuals for benefits from the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 7708. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place horse and mule shoes, together with adjustable calks for such shoes and certain tools, on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 7709. A bill to amend the act of May 21, 1928, relating to standards of containers for fruits and vegetables, to permit the use of additional standard containers; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 7710. A bill to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 7711. A bill to confer jurisdiction on U.S. district courts to hear and render judgment on certain claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 7712. A bill to make available to all retired Government employees and retired military personnel free passes to national parks and monuments under the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 566. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.J. Res. 567. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.J. Res. 568. Joint resolution exempting the Bistate Development Agency, its affiliates and the transportation rendered by either, whether by motor or rail, within the bistate development district from the applicability of the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and the rules, regulations, and orders promulgated thereunder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. Con. Res. 204. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to a program for paying the national debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H. Con. Res. 205. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress on the need for a healthy domestic gold mining industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOW:

H. Res. 450. Resolution to create a Select Committee on Problems of Employment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Res. 451. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives declaring the policy of the United States relative to the intervention of the international communistic movement in the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STAEBLER:

H. Res. 452. Resolution creating a standing Committee on Small Business in the House of Representatives, and to grant it full authority in certain legislative matters; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. DADDARIO: Memorial of the Connecticut General Assembly memorializing the Congress to include deputy sheriffs of Connecticut and other States under social security benefit program as self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to submitting certain material relating to Senate bill 1495 and House bill 6225, known as the Guam Rehabilitation legislation, and calling for an appropriation of $56 million in the form of a loan, to be used for reconstruction and rehabilitation of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 7713. A bill for the relief of Miss Mamie H. Winstead; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 7714. A bill for the relief of Manuel Lee Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 7715. A bill for the relief of John Soderman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 7716. A bill for the relief of Francesco Bongiovanni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 7717. A bill for the relief of Joao Constancio De Gouveia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. Con. Res. 206. Concurrent resolution expressing the appreciation of the American people for the pioneering activities of Dr. Ross Gunn and Dr. Philip Abelson in the development of nuclear power for naval vessels; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Government Lotteries of Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, and Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House the government-run lotteries in more of the European countries. Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, and Rumania are among the 77 foreign nations which utilize government lotteries to raise revenue.

Hungary, in 1962, took in over $73 million in gross receipts. After payment of prizes, the net income to the Government was almost $40 million. The Government devotes a considerable part of the lottery income to housing construction and for development of sports, including construction of sports installations.

Iceland has lotteries which are of a private nature. The resultant income to the Government is derived from duties levied if the prize is an imported one and taxes on the prizes won. One lottery is conducted under the auspices of the University of Iceland. Last year, total gross receipts amounted to over $950,000. The other lottery which was initiated in 1953 provides for the distribution of material rewards such as cars, houses, furnishings, and so forth, to individual ticket holders. The profits from this lottery have been used exclusively for the purchase and maintenance of a domicile for elderly indigent seamen.

Italy operates several lotteries and thus realizes very important revenues. The four Government-operated national lotteries last year took in $4,409,000. The net profit of $2⅓ million was distributed for hospitals, orphanages, educational institutions and various charities. The big lottery took in over $75 million and after payment of prizes, almost $41 million went to the Italian treasury.

Luxembourg is our smallest NATO partner. In 1962, the total gross annual receipts amounted to almost $1½ million. The total annual net income came to almost $400,000 which was used for charitable and welfare programs and for the benefit of numerous medical organizations.

Rumania, although a Communist country, knows the benefits of government-run lotteries. Lottery information from this country is neither published nor made available to foreign officials except that prizes also include automobiles and household appliances.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, gambling in this country is a $50-billion-a-year industry which is the financial mainstay of organized crime.

Why can we not establish a national lottery in the United States and divert these many billions of dollars into the coffers of the Government where they may work for the public good? Why must we remain blind to the fact that gambling is part of human nature?

A national lottery in this country can easily pump into our own Treasury over $10 billion a year in additional income which can be used to cut our high taxes and reduce our gigantic national debt.

Tribute to Congressman Hjalmar Nygaard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join the Members of the House in paying tribute to Hjalmar Nygaard, one of our most respected, able, and beloved colleagues.

Hjalmar Nygaard had established himself as one of the soundest and most dedicated Members of the House. His devotion to our Nation's principles, his interest and support of sound legislative acts was recognized by all of us who associated with him.

He came to Congress with a great record as a State legislator in his home State of North Dakota, and in the period he served in Washington he became recognized as a sound, progressive dedicated legislator—an example for all to follow.

Hjalmar Nygaard served his home communities, his State, and his country with devotion and effectiveness, and left an imprint upon those who were associated with him that will be lasting.

His early training and vocation as a teacher was apparent in the thorough and scholarly fashion in which he analyzed and faced the problems of his constituents, and the spirit of his early vocation was always evident in the concern he showed for individuals, and his willingness to help all of us by passing on to us the knowledge he had obtained in a long and varied career.

I extend my deep sympathy to Mrs. Nygaard and her family, realizing the great loss and sorrow that is theirs. However, the inspiration Hjalmar provided throughout his life remains with us. We are all better because of our friendship and association with him. We share with his family and the people of North Dakota the loss of a conscientious and dedicated public servant.

Survival of a Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, we have in the Second Congressional District of Kentucky one of the most remarkable families in the Commonwealth.

The head of this family, Samuel Rosenblatt, was born in Rumania in 1861. Recognizing the absence of opportunity and freedom which was the situation in his country then as now, upon reaching manhood, young Samuel migrated to the United States, leaving behind his wife and children until he could become established in the new land. For his own protection and that of his family, the name Rosenblatt was assumed in place of Braun. After initial stops at Baltimore and Oklahoma, the family traveled to Hancock County, Ky., having been told that it was "God's country."

After one or two business ventures outside of Hawesville, the county seat, Mr. Rosenblatt returned to that community where today, the building which he purchased and the business which he established, stand as a continuing memorial to this man of vision, courage, and tremendous energy. The original store dealt in clothing and groceries and later developed an extensive tobacco business. Through the years Sam Rosenblatt, as he was known and loved, proved his devotion and loyalty to his adopted home and when he died in May 1927, he left a lasting heritage built on faith in and love for his fellow man.

With the change of times the Rosenblatt store now specializes in clothing for the entire family and through the years, this firm has not only furnished its customers quality merchandise but it has provided quality in the truest definition of business ethics. It is now a third generation business carried on by son, Leo, and grandson, Nathan. In a few short years Nathan's son, Samuel, II, will doubtlessly take his place in this business which has stood firm through depression and prosperity and, on more than one occasion, serious floods. Starting with its founder, the Rosenblatt store is today one of the few small businesses which has survived the onslaught of time and changing conditions by virtue of having been established and continued by men of tireless energy, unquestioned integrity and determination, dedicated to the betterment of their community.

In recent years a floodwall was built to protect this community and now a new bridge is to be erected across the Ohio River at Hawesville, Ky., and Cannelton, Ind. In addition, a new lock and dam is under construction by the U.S. Corps of Engineers at Hawesville and Cannelton. These accomplishments, together with the anticipated new industry which will locate in Hancock County in the future, will bring better times to the citizens in that area and will justify the faith and belief that Leo Rosenblatt, his father and all of his family have had in Hawesville and Hancock County.

Mr. Speaker, as you well know, there are not many small merchants left and those who have diligently struggled for survival against countless odds and accepted the good with the bad and are now an integral part of their community, are to be commended. I, therefore, want to salute Leo Rosenblatt, his son, Nathan, and all the members of their families for their never-ending display of good citizenship, courage, and loyalty to their community.

Mr. Speaker, in Hawesville, Ky., we have an outstanding weekly newspaper, the Hancock Clarion. On July 18, 1963, this newspaper also paid tribute to this remarkable family.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the observance of Captive Nations Week, we should concern ourselves with the tragic plight of these subjugated peoples. We must also ask ourselves how we can help them. One billion people in 23 countries suffer under Communist tyranny. They have been deprived of the most fundamental rights of man, including the right of self-determination; but they have not lost hope.

Their spirit of passive resistance represents a crumbling keystone in the Communist arch. We have seen growing nationalism in Poland and open revolt in Hungary and East Berlin. The unreliability of captive armies tempers Soviet urges of aggression. The free spirit of captive peoples must not be taken for granted. Unless the West encourages captive peoples, they will lapse into despair and resignation. We must show them that America adheres to the principle of self-determination and does not consider a free Europe an illusion.

A solemn reiteration of American concern during this week revives the hope of oppressed peoples. But just as religion deserves more than 1 hour a week, captive nations demand more than 1 week a year. Therefore, I call for a Committee on Captive Nations. This year, many Members of this body, including myself, introduced resolutions to create such a committee which would make studies and inquiries concerning conditions in captive nations. The committee would give particular attention to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over nations and to peaceful means of assisting them in their present aspirations to regain national and individual freedoms. The facts of Communist domination should be promulgated at this important and respected level if we wish to explode the myths about the Soviet economy and Soviet unity.

Unfortunately, these resolutions have not been reported and so I again urge a solid expression of support for the proposal. By so doing, we will demonstrate our belief in the power of freemen to prevail and overcome the forces of totalitarianism.

Boy Scout World Jamboree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Boy Scouts World Jamboree will take place August 1 through 11. Over 12,000 Boy Scouts and leaders from 76 free nations will gather on the historic plain of Marathon, Greece, for the 11th World Jamboree—the free world's largest nonpolitical youth event.

The American contingent is made up of 629 Boy Scouts and on July 19 it was my pleasure to greet those fine young men who are the delegates from Nassau County, N.Y. They are: Richard D. Barr, Eagle Scout, of 14 Locust Lane, Glen Head, N.Y.; William M. Dunn, Life Scout, of 27 Red Maple Drive North, Wantagh, N.H.; George Frooke, Eagle Scout, of 21 Central Drive, Plandome, N.Y.; Arthur W. Gruhn, 1st class Scout, of 480 Windsor Place, Oceanside, N.Y.; William K. Norton, Life Scout, of 66 Andrew Road, Manhasset, N.Y.; and Ralph L. Searles, Eagle Scout, of 76 Park Avenue, Port Washington, N.Y.

The American contingent has been organized into 16 troops. A 17th American troop from the transatlantic council, Boy Scouts of America, which makes scouting possible for American military and other families stationed in European and Mediterranean areas, will join the contingent at Marathon.

In keeping with scouting self-reliance, the cost of the trip for each delegate—$990—was earned by the Scouts themselves through a great variety of after-school and summer jobs. Some local scholarships helped but only partially. In scouting a young man learns to pay his own way and stand on his own feet.

It is refreshing and reinvigorating to observe the activities of this wonderful organization of Boy Scouts and its world jamboree comes at a most significant time.

President Kennedy's Immigration Proposals Will Eliminate Harsh National Origins Quota System and Take Humane Approach for Selection of Immigrants—Benefits Relatives of American Citizens in Portugal, Italy, and Greece With Aim Toward Reuniting Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased that legislation was filed today by our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from New York, Congressman CELLER, to implement President Kennedy's sweeping new immigration proposals outlined in his message of today.

Ever since coming to Congress in January 1953, I have sponsored similar legislation to liberalize the national origins quota system which has worked inhumane hardships on the relatives of American citizens who remained behind in the Mediterranean-southern European countries, particularly in Portugal, Italy, and Greece. Under our present law, these quotas are based on the number of Americans who migrated from the old country and had gained citizenship before the 1920 census. Naturally, this worked a hardship on the Portuguese, Italians, and Greeks, because they were in the latter waves of migration to this country just before and after World War II. This system did not adversely affect the peoples from northern European countries.

President Kennedy's proposed changes in the law will eliminate the national origins quota system by 20 percent per year over a 5-year period, and thereafter will place all quota numbers in one pool. Therefore, unused quota numbers from northern European countries will benefit the split families of American citizens who remained behind in these—the split families of American citizens who have been forced by our present restrictive immigration law to remain behind in southern European countries.

Also, President Kennedy's proposals include the elimination of preference quota for the mothers and fathers of American citizens. This phase of the Kennedy proposal can mean the almost immediate migration of some 3,500 southern European parents to these shores to be reunited with their loved ones who are now American citizens, subject, of course, to enactment of these proposals by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, some quick calculations and analysis of this Kennedy immigration proposal would indicate that as many as 100,000 more people can be admitted to the United States annually over and above the present quotas based solely on national origin. This, I think, is the humane approach to select immigrants for the United States, based on the need for uniting families or the compelling need for seeking new opportunities in America, rather than the distasteful national-origin basis which has been a cornerstone of our immigration laws for 40 years. I hope that early hearings will be held on President Kennedy's proposals with a view toward enacting the new immigration changes this year.

Let Actions Speak More Loudly Than Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, so many false statements are made in an effort to defeat the bracero program that it is difficult to find time to refute them all. Some are so patently false that one would ordinarily assume they would not be believed by anyone. But apparently, sometimes a false statement is so often repeated that it becomes believed by some who do not analyze the facts or the statement.

One such false statement is that farm jobs are so few and far between that there are hundreds of thousands of unemployed farmworkers in the United States. The fact is that there is none. Any farmworker—or nonfarmworker, also please note—who wants to work in the row-crop vegetable industry—average wage about a $1.40 per hour—can work today in California. Such jobs are going begging right now.

Whenever there is a bracero in the United States, there is a job for a domestic in the United States—in fact and by law.

The employment of a single bracero in my district has the same effect as hoisting a green flag to the top of the employment office. The employment of the first bracero is advertised widely by the State department of employment, the department of labor, by employment agencies, and among farmworkers and industrial workers. Each year with the first bracero, swarms of derelicts, alcoholics, and unemployed from the big cities of San Francisco, Oakland, Stockton, and Sacramento are brought or sent to the Salinas Valley. If they can present themselves and stand during a brief interview, they are referred or taken to a field and the grower is required to hire him and pay him promptly no matter how many hours he stays in the field. He may do no constructive work; in fact, he may—and often does—damage the crops; but nevertheless the bracero law requires that he must be paid immediately when he wants to quit.

Preposterous? I once thought so. But ask any farm placement worker or anyone who has actually been in the fields. It is true. Our laws protect the worker well. The point is, anybody can get a job in agriculture during harvest seasons. He can work for 1 hour or 6 months, whatever he prefers. If he prefers to work 1 hour—and some do—he will earn at least $1 and on the average about $1.40. This, of course, brings the average days a farmworker works per year down considerably. It also lowers the average yearly income of the farmworker considerably.

Anybody can find a row-crop vegetable harvesting job during the summer at a wage higher than he can earn in any other industry. Anyone who thinks he can disprove this statement may do so simply by producing a single, unemployed, able-bodied man or woman, with sight, above 18 years of age in the Salinas Valley. If opponents of Public Law 78 cannot produce such an unemployed person, I think they should no longer shout so loudly. Actions should speak more loudly and more persuasively than naked words in congressional hearings or records.

Constitutional Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to report the people of the Third District of Kentucky overwhelmingly support constitutional government and would rather solve problems with local individual initiative instead of looking to the Federal Government as a cure-all.

I thank the people of Louisville and Jefferson County for their cooperation in helping me to be a better Representative in Congress by giving me their opinion and views on some of the major issues we face.

Mr. Speaker, based on over 16,000 replies, the results of my questionnaire follow:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Should a Federal old-age medical care program be instituted with social security taxes?	31.0	62.3	6.7
2. Do you believe the Federal budget should be kept in balance during peacetime years?	82.5	7.3	10.2
3. Do you favor the admission of Red China into the United Nations?	11.4	81.6	7.0
4. Do you have confidence in President Kennedy's ability to handle our foreign policy?	44.1	39.1	16.8
5. Do you approve of the policy of selling military equipment to Communist-controlled countries?	3.0	91.8	5.2
6. Should the Committee on Un-American Activities be abolished?	11.5	71.1	17.4
7. Do you support President Kennedy's proposal for a Domestic Peace Corps?	39.3	48.7	12.0
8. Do you favor an income tax cut which would result in a bigger national debt—that is, without a reduction in spending?	13.8	80.4	6.3
9. Do you favor President Kennedy's proposal for Federal aid to the transportation industry?	17.4	59.0	23.6
10. Do you think that labor unions should be subject to the antitrust laws to the same extent as industry?	83.8	8.6	7.6

Public Law 78

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, among the arguments we have heard in defense of Public Law 78 is that it has solved the wetback problem; that is, it has cut down on the number of illegal entrants into this country from Mexico. In other words, we have managed to solve the wetback problem by legalizing the wetback.

We are told that termination of Public Law 78 would mean a return of the wetback problem. I submit that this is more of a threat than an argument. According to this logic, any significant reduction in the number of braceros would mean a corresponding increase in the number of wetbacks. During the past few years the number of braceros has been reduced sharply—in 1962 the number of braceros was less than half of the 1956 total. Yet there has been no great increase in the number of illegal entrants into this country. Why not? Because the United States has improved its enforcement of the immigration laws. I submit that we could eliminate the whole bracero program and still not have a great wetback problem. All we would need to do is see that the law is enforced.

Duty Free Measurement Instruments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, as you know, H.R. 2874 is presently on the Union Calendar awaiting action by the House. This bill would remove electronic microscopes from the present duty free status. We commend this bill to the

House for its early consideration and passage.

The beneficiaries of the duty free status are France, England, and Germany. At least two of these are within that group of common market countries which have within the last few days taken action seriously impairing the export of the United States as competitive products in their lands. Although we would not like to see a trade battle in which duty barriers became increasingly high, and, therefore, all world trade seriously damaged, on the other hand, where there are competent manufacturers of products within the United States who are put at a competitive disadvantage by products from countries who at the same time refuse fair competition to our exports, we are forced to take a rather tough position in order to protect our domestic producers.

As to the particular bill, H.R. 2874, may we state for the RECORD that Beckman Instruments, Inc., which is in the 34th Congressional District which I am proud to represent, is one of a number of California companies producing instruments fully as competent and of competitive quality to those imported presently duty free. The Research programs and employee levels of the Beckman Co. and others in this business are seriously threatened by a situation in which we find that the import of foreign competitive instruments are not only free, but come from countries who levy import duties on U.S. instruments, and in many cases flatly refuse import licenses on any basis.

Mr. Speaker our instrument industries are essential to our national defense and our future advancement in space research. Our laws, therefore, as a matter of national concern, should assure their development and well being should not be threatened by an unfair competition from countries who refuse to take a fair free trade position with the United States.

Detailed Explanation of the Interest Equalization Tax Proposal of the Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting in the RECORD, for the information of the Members of Congress and the interested public, a detailed explanation of the interest equalization tax proposal of the administration along with other supporting information on this proposal. I would like to point out that the detailed explanation is dated July 18 and since that time there have been three Treasury releases relating to the original proposal which I am also including. These three releases contain certain modifications in the original proposal which are self-explanatory.

As you know, this tax is being proposed so as to help alleviate our continuing very serious balance-of-payments problem. It is a part of a coordinated series of actions on the part of the administration to correct our balance-of-payments deficit. Although I am personally opposed to the increase in the discount rate by the Federal Reserve System, I am in complete accord with the equalization tax proposal and other parts of this coordinated program.

DETAILED EXPLANATION OF THE INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX

1. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE TAX

The proposed interest equalization tax is a special excise tax to be imposed through the end of 1965 on the acquisition of foreign stock, securities, or obligations, other than those specifically exempted. The tax is payable by all U.S. persons, including organizations exempt from Federal income tax. It is based on the actual value of the interest acquired; in the case of debt securities or obligations, the rate of tax will vary with the period remaining until maturity. The tax applies to portfolio purchases of foreign securities, whether representing new or already outstanding issues, and whether the acquisition is effected in the United States or abroad. It does not apply, however, to purchases of securities presently held by Americans.

The tax will not generally be applicable to direct investments by U.S. persons in overseas subsidiaries or affiliates, nor will it apply to any indebtedness payable upon demand or maturing in less than 3 years. Moreover, loans made by commercial banks in the ordinary course of their banking business will be exempted. The tax will not be applied to purchases of securities issued by international organizations of which the United States is a member, governments of countries considered to be less developed, and corporations whose principal activities are centered in less developed countries.

The tax is not a stamp tax. A U.S. person who acquires any foreign stock or debt obligation will be required to file a return and pay the tax at the time of filing. The first of such returns will be due at the end of the first full calendar month following the end of the calendar quarter in which implementing legislation is enacted and will cover all prior acquisitions subject to its provisions. Returns thereafter will be due at the end of the calendar month following each calendar quarter in which a U.S. person makes any acquisition subject to the legislation.

The tax is applicable to acquisitions occurring after the date of the President's message in which it was proposed. Since an acquisition is deemed to occur when the purchaser first becomes unconditionally obligated to buy, the tax does not apply to purchase commitments made on the open market on or before the date of the President's message, or to other purchases which the buyer on that date was unconditionally obligated to make. Substantial evidence will be required, however, to demonstrate the existence of such an obligation. The tax is also inapplicable to acquisitions made within 60 days after the date of the President's message if the foreign stock or debt obligation acquired was covered by a registration statement filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission within 90 days prior to the date of the President's message.

This tax will not be deductible for Federal income-tax purposes, but will be included in the adjusted basis of the foreign stock or debt obligation acquired.

2. RATE AND COMPUTATION OF TAX

The tax is based upon the actual value of the interest acquired, actual value being determined under principles established by the Treasury regulations pertaining to the documentary stamp tax on original issues of stock. Under these rules, the price agreed upon by parties dealing at arm's length in a transaction subject to no special conditions constitutes actual value. (See Treasury Regulation § 47.4301-1(b)(2)(ii).)

In the case of stock or other equity interests, the rate of tax is 15 percent. In the case of debt obligations, the rate of tax is a percentage varying in accordance with the period remaining before maturity, as follows:

Maturity and tax rate

	Percent
At least 3, but less than 3½ years	2.75
At least 3½, but less than 4½ years	3.55
At least 4½, but less than 5½ years	4.35
At least 5½, but less than 6½ years	5.10
At least 6½, but less than 7½ years	5.80
At least 7½, but less than 8½ years	6.50
At least 8½, but less than 9½ years	7.10
At least 9½, but less than 10½ years	7.70
At least 10½, but less than 11½ years	8.30
At least 11½, but less than 13½ years	9.10
At least 13½, but less than 16½ years	10.30
At least 16½, but less than 18½ years	11.85
At least 18½, but less than 21½ years	12.25
At least 21½, but less than 23½ years	13.05
At least 23½, but less than 26½ years	13.75
At least 26½, but less than 28½ years	14.35
At least 28½ years or more	15.00

In determining the rate of tax applicable to the acquisition of an obligation, the actual period of time beginning with the date of acquisition and ending at maturity is taken into account. The maturity of an obligation is deemed to be the latest date on which, under its terms, the amount payable to the holder of such obligation may remain outstanding. Thus, for example, the 13.75 percent rate applies if payment is not absolutely required in less than 23½ years. Where an obligation is renewable without affirmative action manifesting consent on the part of the holder, the period to maturity is considered to include any renewal period. Any extension of the term of an existing obligation through affirmative action on the part of the holder will be regarded as the acquisition of a new debt obligation with a remaining period to maturity equal to the remaining life of the old obligation plus the extension period.

The computation of the tax may be illustrated by the following examples:

Example 1

On June 1, 1964, A, a U.S. citizen, purchases from B, a nonresident alien, 20 year bonds of X, a foreign government, having an actual value of $20,000. The bonds mature on December 31, 1974, and therefore have a remaining period to maturity of 10 years and 7 months. Assuming that the transaction is not exempt, A would incur a tax of 8.30 percent of the actual value of the bonds or $1,660.

Example 2

The facts are the same as in example (1) except that, under the terms of the bonds, the obligation is automatically renewable for an additional period of 10 years if the holder does not demand payment within 30 days following the elapse of the initial term. The period to maturity is deemed to include the renewal period of 10 years. Accordingly, assuming that the transaction is not exempt, A would incur a tax of 12.25 percent of the actual value of the bonds or $2,500.

Example 3

In 1962, C, a domestic corporation, acquires from Y, a foreign corporation, 5-year promissory notes of Y with a face value of $17,500. In 1965, C surrenders the notes to Y in exchange for new 30-year bonds of Y. The new bonds have an actual value of $18,000. The period to maturity is deemed to include the entire period to maturity of the new bonds, or 30 years. Accordingly, assuming that the transaction is not exempt, C will incur a tax of 15 percent of the actual value of the new bonds or $2,700.

Example 4

In January of 1964, D, a U.S. citizen, acquiries from Z, a foreign corporation, on original issue, its 15-year bonds, having an actual value of $10,000. Under the terms of the indenture securing the issue bonds, a sinking fund is to be accumulated by Z and used at the end of each year to retire bonds to be selected by lot. The bonds are considered to have a maturity of 15 years. Accordingly, assuming that the transaction is not exempt, D would incur a tax of 10.30 percent of the actual value of the bonds or $1,030.

3. PERSONS SUBJECT TO THE TAX

Every U.S. citizen, every resident individual or partnership, and every domestic corporation, estate or trust is subject to the tax. These terms have the meaning already assigned to them by the Internal Revenue Code; such persons are generally referred to as U.S. persons. Determination of liability for the tax is made as of the time of acquisition, and later changes in status have no effect. As set forth in paragraph 7, however, foreign stock or debt obligations cannot be acquired free of tax from a person who has not been a U.S. person throughout his entire period of ownership of such interest or continuously since the date of the President's message.

These rules may be illustrated by the following examples:

Example 1

In 1964, A, a U.S. trust, all the beneficiaries of which are nonresident aliens, acquires stock in N, a foreign corporation. Assuming that the transaction is not exempt, A is subject to tax.

Example 2

On June 1, 1964, B, a citizen and resident of foreign country X, acquires bonds of foreign corporation O. On July 1, 1964, B becomes a resident of the United States and on July 15, 1964, acquires additional bonds of O. The June 1, 1964, acquisition of bonds by B is not subject to tax, and no tax is payable by B upon becoming a U.S. resident. However, assuming that the transaction is not exempt, the July 15, 1964, acquisition is subject to tax.

4. INTERESTS THE ACQUISITION OF WHICH IS SUBJECT TO TAX

The tax applies to the acquisition of any stock, security or other debt obligation of any international organization, foreign government (including any agency or political subdivision thereof), foreign corporation, partnership, estate or trust, or a nonresident alien individual, unless acquisition of the stock or obligation is covered by an exemption described in paragraph 5 or such transaction is an excluded acquisition described in paragraph 7. The status of the shareholders of a foreign corporation, members of a foreign partnership or beneficiaries of a foreign estate or trust is irrelevant for this purpose. The tax applies to the acquisition of any stock or obligation, whether or not negotiable and whether or not represented by a certificate or other writing, including any shares representing beneficial interest in an organization which would be taxable as a corporation under the provisions of section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code if subject to U.S. tax. Limited partnership interests would be treated as stock.

Acquisition of a depository receipt or other evidence of interest in any of the foregoing is treated as an acquisition of the underlying asset. Options, warrants and rights to acquire foreign stock or obligations are subject to tax unless received in a distribution which is not considered a taxable acquisition, as described in paragraph 6.

5. INTERESTS THE ACQUISITION OF WHICH ARE EXEMPT FROM TAX

Exemptions from the tax are provided for acquisitions of interests which do not fall within the area of long-term capital outflows to which the tax is designed to apply. These exemptions relate to the type of interest acquired.

Short-term indebtedness: The tax does not apply to the acquisition of any indebtedness payable upon demand or within 3 years of the date of acquisition. Thus, acquisition of a long-term obligation may qualify under this exemption if the obligation is due or overdue (and therefore payable upon demand) when acquired or payable within 3 years thereafter. The rules for fixing the period to maturity in order to determine the applicable tax rate, set forth in paragraph 2, also apply in determining whether an obligation is payable within 3 years. Accordingly, where an obligation is automatically renewable without affirmative action on the part of the holder, it is not considered an exempted short-term indebtedness unless the entire unexpired term, including any renewal periods, totals less than 3 years.

Commercial bank loans: Also exempted from the tax are acquisitions representing loans made for commercial purposes by banks in the ordinary course of their banking business. This exemption applies even if the maturity of the loan exceeds the minimum 3-year period. It is irrelevant whether the loan is evidenced by a note or other evidence of indebtedness. The exemption does not extend, however, to investment banks, trust companies or others not regularly engaged in a commercial banking business. Where a person is engaged both in the commercial banking business and in other businesses or activities, only those transactions related solely to the commercial banking business are exempt.

Required reserves of insurance companies: An acquisition of foreign stock or debt obligations is exempt from the tax if made by a corporation in the normal course of an insurance business conducted in one or more foreign countries (and not with the intent to sell such interests or offer them for sale to any U.S. person), to the extent that the interests acquired are, or would have been, required to be held in connection with such business by application to such business of foreign laws which were in force on the date of the President's message. Thus, a company insuring risks in a foreign country which requires the holding of reserves relating to such risks in local securities or obligations would be permitted to acquire free of tax the holdings necessary to meet such requirement with respect to its business. The exemption extends, however, only to the extent that the foreign country does not, after the date of the President's message, enact more stringent reserve or holding requirements. The test is not the amount of holdings on the date of the President's message; if, by applying the foreign law in effect on such date, increased local holdings are, or would have been, required (for example, to reflect higher levels of insurance in force), acquisitions necessary to achieve the needed increase are exempted. If, however, the increased holdings are required by changes in the applicable foreign law, acquisitions designed to meet the changed requirement are not exempt from the tax.

Direct investment: The tax does not apply to the acquisition of a direct investment in a foreign subsidiary or affiliate. Under this exemption, any acquisition of the stock or debt obligations of a foreign corporation is free of the tax if the U.S. person immediately following the acquisition owns at least 10 percent of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock entitled to vote. The 10 percent test is applied without regard to the attribution rules prescribed by various provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. The exemption for direct investment applies to purchases of stock or obligations of the foreign corporation from third parties as well as loans and capital contributions made directly to it.

An acquisition qualifying as a direct investment is denied the exemption, however, if the foreign corporation is formed or availed of by the U.S. person for the purpose of acquiring any stock or obligation which could be subject to tax if acquired directly, unless the foreign corporation makes such acquisition: (a) in the normal course of a commercial banking, securities underwriting or brokerage business conducted in one or more foreign countries; or (b) in the normal course of an insurance business conducted in one or more foreign countries, to the extent that the interests acquired are, or would have been required to be held in connection with such business by application to such business of foreign laws which were in force on the date of the President's message. This rule is designed to prevent avoidance of the proposed tax by indirect acquisitions through foreign affiliates, while leaving free of tax investment in affiliates which acquire securities interests in the normal course of their active business activities.

An acquisition otherwise qualifying as a direct investment loses its exemption as such if made with the intent of selling or offering for sale to any U.S. person any stock or obligation acquired. This rule will prevent avoidance of the tax through a combination of the direct investment exemption and the exclusion from the tax of later acquisitions by other U.S. persons purchasing from the direct investor.

The principles set forth in this section may be illustrated by the following examples:

Example 1

On January 13, 1964, A, a U.S. citizen, acquires 100 shares of the only class of stock of foreign corporation N, which immediately thereafter has a total of 1,000 shares outstanding. N acquires no stock nor any obligations having a maturity of 3 years or more. A's acquisition of the 100 shares of N stock is exempt from tax as the acquisition of a direct investment.

Example 2

The facts are the same as in example (1), except that later in 1964, A lends N $100,000, taking a 5-year promissory note in return. A's acquisition of the indebtedness of N is exempt from tax as the acquisition of a direct investment.

Example 3

The facts are the same as in example (1), except that later in 1964 A purchases from R, a nonresident alien, an additional 50 shares of the stock of N. A's acquisition of the 50 shares is exempt from tax as the acquisition of a direct investment.

Example 4

The facts are the same as in example (1), except that N is a foreign personal holding company, engaged solely in investing and trading in stock and obligations of foreign persons. Since N is availed of by A for the purpose of acquiring interests which would be subject to tax if acquired directly by A, A's acquisition of the 100 shares of N stock is not exempt as the acquisition of a direct investment.

Example 5

The facts are the same as in example (1), except that N acquires 100 percent of the voting stock of foreign corporation O, which acquires no stock or obligations of foreign persons. A's acquisition of the 100 shares of N stock is exempt from tax as the acquisition of a direct investment, since the interest acquired by N in O would, if acquired directly by A, be exempt from tax as the acquisition of a direct investment.

International organizations: The tax is also inapplicable to acquisitions of obligations of international organizations of which the United States is a member. This exemption does not extend to purchases of obligations of foreign persons, even though these obligations are acquired from an international organization of which the United States is a member.

Less developed countries: The tax is not applicable to the acquisition of obligations issued or guaranteed by the government of a less developed country or an agency or subdivision of such a government. Nor is it applicable to stock or obligations of a corporation which, during its last annual accounting period prior to the acquisition, meets the definition of a "less developed country corporation" in section 955(c) of the Internal Revenue Code by reason of conducting an active business in countries designated as less developed for purposes of this tax. This includes companies which meet the standards of section 955(c)(2) by reason of their deriving income from aircraft or vessels registered under the laws of a designated country. The exemption would also be available for new issues of stock or obligations of a corporation which establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary or his delegate that it has met these tests for a period of 60 days prior to the issuance of such stock or obligations and that it may reasonably be expected to continue to meet such tests for such period as the Secretary or his delegate may deem appropriate.

The countries to be considered less developed countries for the purposes of this exemption will be designated in an Executive order to be issued by the President. For the interim period prior to the issuance of an order under the new legislation, all countries designated as less developed by Executive Order No. 11071, dated December 27, 1962, will be considered to be less developed for purposes of this tax. This includes all countries, and oversea territories and possessions of countries (other than countries within the Sino-Soviet bloc) except the following: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany (Federal Republic), Hong Kong, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of South Africa, San Marino, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and United Kingdom.

The designation of a country as a less developed country could be terminated by a further Executive order after 30 days' notice to the Congress. Any termination will not affect the treatment of acquisitions occurring prior to the issuance of the terminating Executive order.

6. TAXABLE ACQUISITIONS

In general, any acquisition of stock or debt obligations of a foreign issuer or obligor will be subject to tax unless specifically exempted. It is irrelevant whether, for Federal income tax purposes, the transaction in which such interest is acquired would be characterized as a sale or exchange, a contribution to capital, a loan, or otherwise. The fact that the acquisition occurs as part of a transaction which is tax free for Federal income tax purposes does not mean that it is exempt from this tax. A contribution to the capital of a foreign corporation will be considered an acquisition of a stock interest in such corporation, whether or not any new shares or certificates are issued. A contribution of foreign stock or obligations to the capital of a domestic corporation constitutes a taxable acquisition by such corporation. The pledge or mortgage of stock or obligations as security for a debt will not be considered an acquisition by the pledgee or mortgagee, but any subsequent foreclosure, collection or purchase will constitute a taxable acquisition.

When a U.S. person acquires an option, warrant or right to acquire foreign stock or obligations, the acquisition is limited to the option, warrant or right itself; and tax is computed on the actual value of that interest alone, at the rate applicable to the stock or obligations which may be acquired on exercise. A later exercise is considered a separately taxable acquisition; and the tax is then computed on the actual value of the interest then acquired, less the value of the option, warrant or right previously taxed. Conversion of an obligation into stock of the same issuer will be considered an acquisition subject to tax, but the amount will be reduced by the amount of tax appropriate to the acquisition of the obligation.

The distribution as a dividend of stock or obligations, or rights to acquire the same, will not be considered an acquisition. This is true whether or not such distribution is tax free for Federal income tax purposes. In addition, the tax will not be payable upon the receipt by a domestic corporation of stock or obligations in a foreign corporation, or its distribution of such stock or obligations to its shareholders, pursuant to a reorganization described in section 368(a) of the Code. These rules will permit the continued acquisition of foreign securities in cases where no outflow of capital from the United States is involved.

Gifts, legacies, bequests and similar donative transfers will not be treated as taxable acquisitions.

The fact that the acquiring person is an underwriter, dealer or other person engaged in the distribution of securities will not exempt him from tax. Thus, if an underwriter makes a firm purchase of securities the acquisition of which is subject to tax, this constitutes a taxable acquisition, even though the acquisition constitutes part of an underwriting distribution which contemplates the resale of the securities by the underwriter. (An exclusion in the case of resales to foreigners is set forth in paragraph 7. Subsequent acquisitions by Americans in the distribution process would not bear the tax under the rules relating to nontaxability of acquisitions from other American persons, described in paragraph 7. Exclusion of brokers and agents' transactions is also described in paragraph 7.)

If any security is acquired on behalf of a U.S. person by a nominee, the U.S. person is liable for the tax. Any acquisition by a U.S. person will be deemed to be for his own account and not as a nominee unless the person furnishes adequate proof that the acquisition was for the account of another person, whether a U.S. person or a foreigner.

To prevent avoidance of the tax through interposition of foreign entities, the transfer of cash or other property by a U.S. person to a foreign trust or partnership will be considered the acquisition of a taxable interest, unless it is first established to the satisfaction of the Secretary or his delegate that the foreign trust or partnership will not acquire stock, securities or obligations, the direct acquisition of which by the U.S. person would give rise to the tax.

The rules set forth in this section may be illustrated by the following examples:

Example 1

In 1964, A, a U.S. citizen, purchases for $1,000 warrants entitling him to purchase at any time within 2 years 100 shares of the common stock of M, a foreign corporation, at a total price of $10,000. Assuming that the transaction is not exempt, the acquisition of the warrants by A is subject to tax based upon the actual value of the warrants ($1,000 if A was dealing at arm's length and no special conditions affected the transaction).

Example 2

The facts are the same as in example (1), except that later in 1964, A exercises the warrants. The shares acquired on exercise have an actual value at that time of $12,000. Assuming that the transaction is not exempt, the acquisition of shares of M stock by A is subject to tax based upon the actual value of the shares at the time of their acquisition ($12,000), less the actual value of the warrants at the time of their acquisition ($1,000) or $11,000.

Example 3

B, a domestic corporation, receives as a dividend distribution from foreign corporation N rights to acquire the stock of foreign corporation O. B's acquisition of these rights is not a taxable acquisition.

Example 4

C, a U.S. citizen, is a stockholder in domestic corporation P. Pursuant to agreement, foreign corporation R acquires all of the stock of P in return for voting stock of R, in a transaction which qualifies as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code. P distributes the voting stock of R to C in exchange for his stock in P. Prior to the reorganization, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue issues a ruling under section 367 of the Internal Revenue Code that the exchange pursuant to the reorganization was not in pursuance of a plan having as one of its principal purposes the avoidance of Federal income taxes. Neither the acquisition by P nor the acquisition by C of the voting stock of R is considered a taxable acquisition.

Date of acquisition: An acquisition is deemed to occur when a U.S. person first becomes unconditionally obligated to acquire the stock or debt obligation involved. In the normal open market purchase, this occurs on the trade date, that is, the date when the order to purchase is executed. It is irrelevant when legal title passes to the acquiring person, when certificates or other evidence of interest are delivered, or when any payment or other performance by the purchaser occurs. If the obligation of the U.S. person to acquire the interest is subject to conditions precedent which are more than mere nominal conditions, the acquisition will not be deemed to occur until those conditions have been satisfied. For example, if the obligation of a U.S. lender to purchase promissory notes of a foreign corporation is subject to the purchaser's receipt on the closing date of an opinion of counsel that the notes are duly issued and binding obligations of the issuer, the acquisition will not be deemed to occur until that opinion has been delivered.

7. NONTAXABLE ACQUISITIONS

An acquisition will not be subject to tax if it constitutes merely a broker's or agent's transaction, if the acquisition is from another U.S. person, or if it is made by an underwriter or dealer for resale to foreigners as part of an underwriting distribution.

Brokers' and nominees' transactions: The tax would not apply to the acquisition by a broker or his nominee of foreign stock or securities solely for the purpose of enabling the broker to sell or accept delivery of the stock or securities on behalf of his customer. A transfer into the name of a selling agent, such as a bank, would generally be subject to tax, although no liability would be incurred if a certificate or other evidence of interest is merely delivered to an agent who acquires no legal title or other interest in the underlying stock or security. An underwriter acting only on a "best efforts" basis therefore will not bear the tax. Several technical exemptions will be made in the case of transfers of legal title without change in beneficial ownership. These rules generally follow those applied under the stock and securities transfer taxes.

Acquisition from another U.S. person: An acquisition of stock or debt obligations by a U.S. person from another person who has been a U.S. person during the entire period of his ownership of the stock or debt obligations (or continuously since the date of the President's message) will not be subject to tax. In determining whether he is exempted from tax by this rule, the purchaser will be entitled to rely upon a certificate supplied to him, attesting to the prior U.S. ownership. This certificate is to be executed either by the former owner or by the nominee of the former owner. The signature must be guaranteed by a bank or member of the National Association of Securities Dealers. Where the certificate is executed by a nominee, it will not be necessary to reveal the name of the actual owner to the purchaser; but the nominee will be required to maintain adequate records to identify the U.S. person for whose account the securities were held and to establish such owner's U.S. citizenship, residence or incorporation during his period of ownership. While it is anticipated that the certificate in the great majority of cases will be delivered to the purchaser at the time of delivery of the related security, it could be delivered within any reasonable period of time thereafter. Temporary forms of certificates which the Treasury Department will accept on an interim basis will be made available promptly by the Internal Revenue Service.

The effect of this rule will be to exempt from the tax stock and debt obligations which are held by U.S. persons on the date of the President's message, and to assure that only one acquisition tax will be paid on such interests thereafter acquired, so long as continuous U.S. ownership is maintained. A person who has not maintained his status as a U.S. person during the entire period of his ownership of a security (or continuously since July 18, 1963) would be unable to execute the certificate referred to above; this rule is intended to prevent abuse of the U.S. exemption through changes in residence status or place of incorporation.

Brokers, dealers and their nominees will be permitted under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate to utilize simplified certificate procedures where a large volume of transactions executed through other brokers or dealers are involved.

Anyone executing a false certificate will be liable for the tax that would otherwise have been collected from the purchaser upon the acquisition and to criminal and civil penalties. The purchaser, however, will still be absolved of any tax liability unless he has actual knowledge of fraud committed in the execution of the certificate.

Underwriters or dealers reselling to foreigners: Any U.S. underwriter or dealer who resells foreign stock or securities to foreigners, as part of the distribution of a new issue offered to the public, will be exempted from tax otherwise payable upon his acquisition of the stock or securities. Any person claiming this exemption will be required to report his acquisition, specify the manner in which such stock or securities were distributed, and attach to his appropriate return certificates of American ownership covering such stock or securities, executed by the underwriter or any dealer participating in the distribution and selling the interests to any person other than a U.S. person. Thus, for example, an underwriter, as part of an underwriting, may sell stock to a U.S. dealer who buys them for his own account. The underwriter is tentatively subject to the acquisition tax and may properly execute and deliver to the dealer a certificate of American ownership covering such stock. If the dealer does not in turn deliver a certificate of American ownership when he resells the stock, he may execute such a certificate with respect to the stock and return it to the underwriter. The underwriter may then claim exemption by filing the proper return and attaching the dealer's certificate. The dealer remains exempt from tax by virtue of the certificate of American ownership received from the underwriter.

In general, any resale by an underwriter or dealer will be subject to this rule if made within the period of time provided in the underwriting agreement for the distribution of the underwritten issue.

Payment of tax must, however, be made by the underwriter or dealer upon filing of the return covering the period during which his acquisition occurred if the conditions for exemption have not then been fulfilled; and sales will not be considered to be part of the distribution of the issue unless it can be clearly established that the stock or securities sold are part of the seller's allotment or participation.

8. EFFECTIVE DATE

As previously indicated the tax will be applicable to acquisitions occurring after the date of the President's message, an acquisition being deemed to take place when a binding commitment is made to acquire the interest involved. The tax will not be imposed, however, on acquisitions of stock or securities covered by a registration statement (or, in the case of an open-end investment company, a posteffective amendment) filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on, or within 90 days prior to, the date of the President's message where such acquisitions occur within 60 days after the date of the President's message. This rule relates only to the number of shares or face amount of indebtedness set forth in the registration as of the date of the President's message; if the number of shares or face amount of indebtedness covered by the registration statement is increased by amendments filed after that date, none of such interests may be acquired free of tax. Other amendments to the registration statement will not affect the taxability of acquisitions.

This provision is designed to avoid hardship to foreign issuers with public offerings of securities in an advanced stage of preparation. The rules providing cutoff dates are designed to prevent abuse of the exception, either through reactivation of old filings of registration statements subsequently "put on the shelf" or in cases where a long-term exemption might otherwise be achieved under a registration statement contemplating a continuing public offering over a substantial period of time (as might be the case, for example, under a registration of shares offered by a foreign investment company).

9. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Returns and payment of tax: Every U.S. person making an acquisition of foreign stock or debt obligations which is subject to tax will be required to report that transaction by filing a return. In addition, a return will be required with respect to transactions which do not bear the tax because of prior American ownership or because of the exemption for interests resold by underwriters or dealers to foreigners. Returns will not be required with respect to interests the acquisition of which is exempt as described in paragraph 5 or with respect to brokers' or similar transactions described in paragraph 7.

The first of such returns will be required to be filed on or before the last day of the first full calendar month following the end of the calendar quarter in which implementing legislation is enacted and will cover all transactions subject to the legislation occurring on or before the last day of such calendar quarter. Thereafter, returns will be required to be filed on or before the last day of the calendar month following the end of the calendar quarter in which an acquisition is made. All acquisitions for the covered quarter may be reported in the same return. Payment of any tax due on transactions reported in the return must accompany it. If the person filing the return has received any Certificate of American Ownership and claims exemption from tax on a transaction by reason of the prior American ownership shown in such certificate, the certificate must accompany the return. As described in paragraph 7, a certificate must also be submitted when an underwriter or dealer claims exemption by reason of resale to a foreigner.

Administrative provisions: Provision will be made for the application of the civil and criminal penalties for the failure to file returns, filing of fraudulent returns, the willful failure to file a return or to pay tax, etc., which are provided in the case of other Federal taxes. Interest on underpayment or nonpayment of the tax will also be collectible. The period of limitations for assessing the tax or for filing a claim for refund of taxes paid will be comparable to that provided in the case of Federal income taxes.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., July 20, 1963.

July 19 remains the effective date of the interest equalization tax, recommended by President Kennedy, on purchases of all foreign securities outside of the United States, the Treasury said today.

Following the President's message on July 18, the Treasury announced a delay to August 16 as the date from which purchases of outstanding foreign securities would be subject to the rules of the proposed tax, if those purchases were effected on U.S. national securities exchange registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The delay does not apply to transactions carried out on foreign securities exchanges nor to transactions in the United States or elsewhere which are not carried out through U.S. registered securities exchanges. The recommended effective date of the proposed tax on such transactions, and for taxable newly issued foreign securities purchased by American investors, remains July 19.

The Treasury and representatives of the exchanges are currently developing the detailed procedures involved in applying the rules of the proposed tax to transactions on these U.S. exchanges.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., July 21, 1963.

JOINT CANADIAN-UNITED STATES STATEMENT

Representatives of Canada and the United States met in Washington during the weekend to appraise the impact on the Canadian financial markets of the proposed U.S. "interest equalization tax."

The two Governments recognize the need for effective action to improve the balance-of-payments positions of both countries and both are equally determined that such action shall not impair the intimate economic relationships between the two countries, nor impede the growth essential for both economies.

For many years the capital markets of the two countries have been closely interconnected, and U.S. exports of capital to Canada have financed a substantial portion of the Canadian current account deficit with the United States. This need continues. A portion of these flows must be supplied through the sale of new issues of Canadian securities in American markets. United States officials had considered that ample flows for these needs would continue under the proposed "interest equalization tax." However, Canadian representatives stated that this would require a very substantial rise in the entire Canadian interest rate structure. It was recognized by both governments that such a development would be undesirable in the present economic circumstances.

In the light of this situation U.S. officials agreed that the draft legislation to be submitted to the Congress would include a provision authorizing a procedure under which the President could modify the application of the tax by the establishment from time to time of exemptions, which he could make either unlimited or limited in amount. The President would thus have the flexibility to permit tax-free purchases of new issues needed to maintain the unimpeded flow of trade and payments between the two countries, and to take care of exceptional situations that might arise in the case of other countries. U.S. officials made clear that this did not modify their proposals regarding the taxation of transactions in outstanding securities; over the past year such transactions between Canada and the United States have not been a major factor.

The Canadian authorities stated that it would not be the desire or intention of Canada to increase her foreign exchange reserves through the proceeds of borrowings in the United States, and it is the hope and expectation of both Governments that by maintaining close consultation it will prove possible in practice to have an unlimited exemption for Canada without adverse effects on the United States.

It was agreed that active consultations would continue to strengthen the close economic relations between the two countries and at the same time facilitate measures for making the maximum practicable contribution to economic expansion and the strength and stability of both currencies.

The conversations which were conducted in the U.S. Treasury on Saturday and Sunday included for Canada, Ambassador Charles S. A. Ritchie; Louis Rasminsky, Governor of the Bank of Canada; A. F. W. Plumptre, Assistant Deputy Minister of Finance; and A. E. Ritchie, Assistant Under Secretary of State for External Affairs; for the United States, Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury; George Ball, Under Secretary of State; Robert V. Roosa, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs; and Stanley Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C., July 18, 1963.

The Treasury Department announced today that purchasers of foreign securities traded on a national securities exchange registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission would not be subject to the interest equalization tax proposed by the President in his message to the Congress today on purchases made on such exchanges prior to and including August 16, 1963.

Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C., July 19, 1963.

Information on Proposed Interest Equalization Tax

BACKGROUND

The President today announced a series of coordinated actions to reinforce the administration's program to correct the U.S. balance-of-payments deficits, including a request for an interest equalization tax, to be effective July 19, 1963. This special temporary excise tax would remain in effect through 1965. The Federal Reserve System has also announced an increase of one-half percent in the discount rate and a rise in the ceiling interest rate permitted to be paid by banks on time deposits.

The move by the Federal Reserve System should, without constricting credit generally, increase short-term interest rates in the United States relative to those abroad and thus help to dampen the outflow of short-term funds from the United States. During 1962, that outflow amounted to $0.5 billion on recorded account; and unrecorded transactions showed a further loss of $1.0 billion, the bulk of which is believed to represent short-term capital. The short-term capital outflow has continued in substantial volume so far this year.

A parallel reinforcing measure, upon which congressional action has been requested, involves a special interest equalization tax applicable to certain portfolio transactions that entail longer term capital movements from the United States. The pressure of the heavy flow of domestic private savings into the U.S. capital market, combined with our highly developed and efficient market facilities, have been reflected in a level of long-term borrowing costs in this country far below those prevailing in most industrialized countries abroad. These domestic savings are consequently also overflowing abroad in large volume. It is not expected that longer term borrowing costs in this country will change appreciably following the change in the discount rate and related short-term market rates, given this ample supply of domestic savings.

At the same time, however, the long-term rates appropriate to domestic needs invite a volume of securities sales in the United States by foreigners that places heavy strains on our balance of payments. In 1962 $1.1 billion of new foreign long-term securities were sold to U.S. interests; and sales of new foreign securities in the U.S. market are running at a substantially higher rate this year. Purchases of outstanding foreign bonds and equities by U.S. interests have also been large and have substantially increased in 1963.

The administration for some time has pointed out that a portion of these foreign needs for capital now met from U.S. sources might more appropriately be satisfied in the borrower's own market or by countries with balance of payments surpluses. The imposition of the proposed tax will encourage this process by tending to equalize costs of longer-term financing in the United States and in markets abroad, reducing the incentive to raise capital in the United States simply to take advantage of a possible interest cost saving. The tax, to be applied to purchases by U.S. interests of foreign securities sold by foreigners, would introduce a differential of approximately 1 percent between capital costs of domestic and foreign borrowers seeking funds in the U.S. market.

The tax will thus complement the action of the Federal Reserve System designed to influence short-term rates, without impeding access to the American market by foreigners unable to find longer-term funds available on reasonable terms elsewhere nor preventing purchase of foreign securities by American interests. Allocation of funds for investment in foreign securities and the determination of securities to be offered in the U.S. market would continue to be the result of market prices and decisions. Accordingly, the interest equalization tax serves domestic and international needs in a way that supports the essential freedom of our trading and financial markets, and fulfills our special responsibilities at the center of the financial system of the free world. By relying on the uniform and nondiscriminatory application of an excise tax, this method of influencing aggregate American purchases of foreign securities assures that selection among issues will be freely made on the basis of the same considerations that would prevail if the entire structure of long-term interest rates were raised by 1 percent.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE TAX

The interest equalization tax would be a special temporary excise tax, to remain in effect through 1965, imposed on the acquisition of stock, securities or other obligations of foreign issuers or depositary receipts or other evidence of interest in, or rights to acquire, such interests. The tax would be payable by all U.S. citizens, residents, and corporations, including organizations exempt from Federal income taxes. The tax would apply to portfolio purchases of stock or debt securities issued by foreign corporations, governments, or other persons, whether such securities represented new or already outstanding issues and whether the acquisition was effected in the United States or abroad. It would not apply, however, to purchases of interests presently held by Americans.

The tax would not be applicable to direct investments by U.S. persons in oversea subsidiaries or affiliates, nor would it apply to acquisition of any indebtedness payable upon demand or maturing in less than 3 years. Moreover, loans made by commercial banks in the ordinary course of their banking business would be exempted. The tax would not be applied to purchases of securities issued by international organizations of which the United States is a member, governments of countries considered to be less developed, and corporations whose principal activities are centered in less developed countries. An underwriter or dealer would be exempted from the tax on acquisitions of stock or obligations resold to foreigners as part of the underwriting of a new issue.

The tax would be applied to acquisitions occurring after the date of the President's message. It would not apply to purchase commitments made on the open market on or before that date or to other purchases which the buyer on that date was unconditionally obligated to make. Exemption from the tax would also be provided for purchases made within 60 days after the date of the President's message if the security purchased were covered by a registration statement filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission within 90 days prior to the date of the President's message.

RATE OF TAX

The tax, which would be based on the value of the security acquired, would be imposed at the rate of 15 percent in the case of stock. In the case of debt securities, the rate of tax would be geared to the remaining period to maturity, ranging from 2.75 percent to 15 percent, as follows:

Maturity and tax rate

	Percent
At least 3 years, but less than 3½ years	2.75
At least 3½ years, but less than 4½ years	3.55
At least 4½ years, but less than 5½ years	4.35
At least 5½ years, but less than 6½ years	5.10
At least 6½ years, but less than 7½ years	5.80
At least 7½ years, but less than 8½ years	6.50
At least 8½ years, but less than 9½ years	7.10
At least 9½ years, but less than 10½ years	7.70
At least 10½ years, but less than 11½ years	8.30
At least 11½ years, but less than 13½ years	9.10
At least 13½ years, but less than 16½ years	10.30
At least 16½ years, but less than 18½ years	11.35
At least 18½ years, but less than 21½ years	12.25
At least 21½ years, but less than 23½ years	13.05
At least 23½ years, but less than 26½ years	13.75
At least 26½ years, but less than 28½ years	14.35
At least 28½ years or more	15.00

The tax would not be deductible for Federal income tax purposes but would be included as an item of cost in the tax basis for the stock or obligation acquired.

LIABILITY FOR THE TAX

The U.S. person making a taxable acquisition would be liable for the tax, which would be collected through the filing of returns. The first of such returns would be due at the end of the first full calendar month following the end of the calendar quarter in which legislation imposing the tax is enacted and would cover all prior acquisitions subject to the legislation. Returns would thereafter be due at the end of the calendar month following each calendar quarter in which a U.S. person made any acquisition. This would not be a stamp tax; no obligation to compute or collect the tax would be imposed on the issuer or seller, or any underwriter, dealer, broker, or transfer or deposit agent (except with respect to his own purchases).

EXCLUSION OF SECURITIES PREVIOUSLY HELD BY AMERICANS

An acquisition from another U.S. person would not be subject to tax. To permit tracing of securities covered by this exclusion, a U.S. transferor would execute a certificate attesting that he was a U.S. citizen, resident or corporation during the period of his ownership of the security. A nominee would be permitted to attest that the security had been held for the account of a U.S. person if such nominee kept adequate records to identify the actual owner of the securities and such owner's U.S. citizenship, residence or incorporation. The signature on any certificate would be required to be guaranteed by a bank or member of the National Association of Securities Dealers. In determining his liability for the tax, a purchaser would be entitled to rely on any such certificate. While the certificate might be delivered along with the security in most cases, it could be delivered within a reasonable time thereafter.

There are attached temporary forms of certificates, together with instructions and sample filled-in forms, which the Treasury Department will accept in fulfillment of these requirements pending enactment of the legislation by the Congress and issuance of regulations and forms thereunder. These interim forms will be made available promptly by the Internal Revenue Service, and facsimile reproductions conforming to the requirements of Revenue Procedure 61-31, 1960-2 Cum. Bull. 1003, will be accepted.

EXPLANATION OF EXEMPTIONS

As indicated above, no acquisition would be subject to the tax if the obligation acquired is payable upon demand or within 3 years of its acquisition. Most trade financing transactions will fall within this exception. In addition, the exemption of loans made by commercial banks in the ordinary course of their banking business will permit tax-free trade financing on a longer term basis.

Direct investments in oversea subsidiaries and affiliates would be exempted from the tax. A direct investor would be defined as one who owns at least 10 percent of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock of a foreign corporation entitled to vote. If a U.S. person qualified as a direct investor, his acquisition of both stock and debt securities of the foreign corporation would be exempted. This exemption would be denied, however, if the foreign corporation were formed or availed of by a U.S. person for the purpose of acquiring securities which would be subject to tax if acquired directly, unless the foreign corporation acquired the securities in the normal course of a commercial banking, securities underwriting, or brokerage business conducted in one or more foreign countries. Insurance companies would be exempted from tax on the acquisition of foreign securities in the normal course of a foreign insurance business carried on either directly or through subsidiaries, to the extent that the securities acquired are, or would have been, required to be held in connection with such business by application to such business of foreign laws which were in force on the date of the President's message.

Purchases of securities issued by any international organization of which the United States is a member would not bear the tax. This would exempt purchases by Americans of the obligations of such organizations as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Inter-American Development Bank.

The exemption for acquisition of securities issued by governments of less-developed countries would include purchases of securities issued by any corporation with the guarantee of such a government, as well as securities of political subdivisions.

The exemption for purchases of securities issued by corporations operating in less-developed countries would apply to any corporation which for its last annual accounting period prior to the acquisition by the U.S. person had conformed to the definition of a "less-developed country corporation" in section 955(c) of the Internal Revenue Code, by reason of conducting an active business in one or more countries designated as less developed for purposes of this tax. The exemption would also be made available for the securities of any foreign corporation which established to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that it had met these standards for a period of at least 60 days prior to issuance of its securities and might reasonably be expected to continue to meet them for such period as the Secretary or his delegate may deem appropriate to carry out the intent of this exemption.

The countries which would be considered less developed for this purpose would be designated in an Executive order to be issued by the President. For the interim period prior to the issuance of this Executive order, all countries designated by Executive Order No. 11071 dated December 27, 1962, as less developed countries for purposes of the Revenue Act of 1962, would be considered less developed countries. This includes all countries, and oversea territories and possessions of countries (other than countries within the Sino-Soviet bloc), except the following: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany (Federal Republic), Hong Kong, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of South Africa, San Marino, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and United Kingdom.

The designation of a country could be terminated by further Executive order, but such termination would not affect acquisitions of securities occurring prior to issuance of the Executive order.

FORM 3625
(July 1963)
U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

CERTIFICATE OF AMERICAN OWNERSHIP
INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX
(See instructions on reverse)

Name of transferor	Address of transferor	Social security number or employers identification number if any

The foregoing hereby certifies that he was the actual owner of

Number of shares or face amount of security	Certificate number if any	Name of issuer or obligor	Class of stock or description of security

From: Date of acquisition or July 18, 1963, whichever is later | To: Date of transfer

And that during all of this time he was a U.S.—
☐Citizen ☐Resident ☐Corporation ☐Trust or ☐Estate

Signature (if corporation, partnership, trust or estate, give title) | Date

Signature guarantee (see instructions) | Date

INSTRUCTIONS

NOTE.—The term "foreign securities" as used herein means stock, securities, or other obligations of foreign issuers or obligors or depositary receipts or other evidence of interest in, or rights to acquire, such interests.)

Purpose: The Congress is considering proposed legislation which would impose a tax on purchases and certain other acquisitions of foreign securities by U.S. citizens, residents, and other U.S. persons, including tax-exempt organizations.

The proposed tax, which would be effective July 19, 1963, does not apply to the purchase or other acquisition of securities from U.S. citizens, residents or other persons who had such a domestic status either during the entire period of their ownership or continuously since July 18, 1963.

This certificate is designed to provide information needed to determine whether the purchase or other acquisition of the foreign securities qualifies for exemption from the tax.

Who may execute certificate: This form may not be executed by anyone other than a transferor of foreign securities who was a U.S. citizen, resident, or other U.S. person throughout the period of his ownership or continuously since July 18, 1963.

Who must secure the certificate: This form or an acceptable substitute (see below) properly completed must be secured by the purchaser of the foreign securities from the seller if he wishes to claim exemption from the tax on the transaction and has not secured a certificate from the nominee of the seller.

When to file: The certificate should be retained until the Congress acts upon the proposed legislation. At that time further instructions will be issued by the Treasury Department.

Signature guarantee: The signature guarantee must be executed by a bank or a member of the National Association of Securities Dealers.

Substitute forms: Substitutes for the form will be accepted provided they contain all the information required by the form and are certified in the same manner.

Nominee: This form may not be executed by a nominee. Certifications to acquire exemption from the tax on the transfer of foreign securities held by nominees are to be made on form 3626.

[Example]

Form 3625
(July 1963)
U.S TREASURY DEPARTMENT
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

CERTIFICATE OF AMERICAN OWNERSHIP
INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX
(See instructions on reverse)

Name of transferor Ajax Securities Corp.	Address of transferor 39 North Broadway, New York, N.Y.	Social security number or employers identification number, if any 64-1816829

The foregoing hereby certifies that he was the actual owner of:

Number of shares or face amount of security	Certificate number if any	Name of issuer or obligor	Class of stock or description of security
$100,000	72-135-72-234	Foreign Widgets, Inc.	5½ percent 1st maturity bonds of 1972.

From: Date of acquisition or July 18, 1963, whichever is later
July 18, 1963
To: Date of transfer
July 30, 1963

And that during all of this time he was a U.S.—
☐ Citizen ☐ Resident ☐ Corporation ☐ Trust or ☐ Estate

Signature (If corporation, partnership, trust or estate, give title)
Ajax Securities Corp. by John Drinker, President
Date
Aug. 5, 1963

Signature guarantee (see instructions)
Dealer & Co. by L. R. Dealer, Secretary
Date
Aug. 5, 1963

Form 3626
(July 1963)
U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

CERTIFICATE OF AMERICAN OWNERSHIP BY NOMINEE
INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX
(See instructions on reverse)

Name of nominee	Address of nominee	Social security number or employers identification number if any

The foregoing hereby certifies that (1) he is a registered nominee under sec. 4351(a) of the Internal Revenue Code and (2) that, on the date of transfer indicated below, he held, as nominee for the actual owner, the following securities:

Number of shares or face amount of security	Certificate number, if any	Name of issuer or obligor	Class of stock or description of security

And (3) that the person for whom he was acting as nominee actually owned these securities:

From: Date of acquisition or July 18, 1963, whichever is later
To: Date of transfer

And (4) that during all of this time such person was a U.S.—
☐ Citizen ☐ Resident ☐ Corporation ☐ Trust or ☐ Estate

Signature (If corporation, partnership, trust, or estate, give title)
Date

Signature guarantee (see instructions)
Date

INSTRUCTIONS

(NOTE.—The term "foreign securities" as used herein means stock, securities or other obligations of foreign issuers or obligors or depositary receipts or other evidence of interest in, or rights to acquire, such interests.)

Purpose: The Congress is considering proposed legislation which would impose a tax on purchases and certain other acquisitions of foreign securities by U.S. citizens, residents, and other U.S. persons, including tax exempt organizations.

The proposed tax which would be effective July 19, 1963, does not apply to the purchase or other acquisition of securities from U.S. citizens, residents or other persons who had such a domestic status either during the entire period of their ownership or continuously since July 18, 1963.

This certificate is designed to provide information needed to determine whether the purchase or other acquisition of the foreign securities qualifies for exemption from the tax.

Who May Execute Certificate: This form may not be executed by anyone other than a registered nominee acting for a seller of foreign securities who was a U.S. citizen, resident or other U.S. person throughout the period of his ownership or continuously since July 18, 1963. While a nominee executing this form need not identify the actual owner, he should maintain sufficient records to support the statements certified herein.

Who Must Secure the Certificate: This form or an acceptable substitute (see below) properly completed must be secured by the purchaser of the foreign securities if he wishes to claim exemption from the tax on the transaction and has not secured a certificate from the seller.

When to File: The certificate should be retained until the Congress acts upon the proposed legislation. At that time further instructions will be issued by the Treasury Department.

Signature Guarantee: The signature guarantee must be executed by a bank or a member of the National Association of Securities Dealers.

Substitute Forms: Substitutes for the form will be accepted provided they contain all the information required by the form.

Actual Owners: This form may not be executed by the actual owner of the foreign securities being transferred. Certification by the actual owner should be made on form 3625.

[Example]

Form 3626
(July 1963)
U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

CERTIFICATE OF AMERICAN OWNERSHIP BY NOMINEE
INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX
(See instructions on reverse)

Name of nominee Member, Inc.	Address of nominee 222 South Wall St., Chicago, Ill.	Social security number, or Employers identification number if any 64-2334232

The foregoing hereby certifies that (1) he is a registered nominee under sec. 4351(a) of the Internal Revenue Code and (2) that, on the date of transfer indicated below, he held, as nominee for the actual owner, the following securities:

Number of shares or face amount of security	Certificate number, if any	Name of issuer or obligor	Class of stock or description of security
300	LZ-23-456	Widgets, Inc.	Common stock

And (3) that the person for whom he was acting as nominee actually owned these securities:

From: Date of acquisition or July 18, 1963, whichever is later
July 30, 1963
To: Date of transfer
Aug. 30, 1963

And (4) that during all of this time such person was a U.S.—
☐ Citizen ☐ Resident ☐ Corporation ☐ Trust or ☐ Estate

Signature (If corporation, partnership, trust, or estate, give title)
Member, Inc., by Ralph Miller, Vice President
Date
Sept. 4, 1963

Signature guarantee (See instructions)
National Bank of New York, by Henry Roe, Vice President
Date
Sept. 4, 1963

Tender, Loving Index

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have been pleased to observe the manner in which my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona, the Honorable George F. Senner, Jr., has gone about his job of representing the people of the new Third District of Arizona since he first came to Washington last January. I have particularly noted the fact that he studies issues and votes on the basis of his own judgment and convictions. The gentleman from Arizona, Congressman Senner, is obviously nobody's rubberstamp.

However, this is not the impression given readers of that eminent journal of ultraconservative bias, the Dan Smoot Report. In a recent issue that publication rated the voting records of the Members of Congress, and it seems, the gentleman from Arizona, Congressman Senner, did not rank too high. In fact, he received a rating of zero. Noting this fact, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Senner] wrote a report for his constituents which I think deserves the attention of all who find their names occasionally on Mr. Smoot's tender, loving index. The report follows:

> I recently learned that I flunked a test administered by that illustrious gentleman, Dan Smoot.
>
> For those of you who may not know him, Mr. Smoot is a Texan who publishes a weekly magazine called the Dan Smoot Report, and conducts a weekly news analysis broadcast on radio and television. He is a self-styled guardian of the Constitution, although there is some question as to which constitution Mr. Smoot is guarding.
>
> In his May 27 report, Mr. Smoot listed recorded rollcall votes on several pieces of legislation with this explanation: "Rollcall tabulations in this report are unique in that we try to select only those votes which reflect a stand for or against constitutional principles." To clarify matters, Mr. Smoot carefully defines a liberal as one who votes against what he considers to be constitutional principles. By implication, therefore, a Smoot conservative is one who votes for Smoot's constitutional principles.
>
> It appears that out of 535 Congressmen there are only 58 who voted for Mr. Smoot's constitution every time. The rest were either on his side just part of the time or else opposed his ideas every single time as I did—along with 148 other Congressmen.
>
> The real significance of Dan Smoot and his report is that he represents a certain type of fuzzy thinking that unfortunately exists in America today. For this reason, I believe a useful purpose can be served by examining some of the issues selected by Mr. Smoot to test the patriotism of those men and women elected to Congress by the people of America.
>
> SILVER LEGISLATION (H.R. 5389)
>
> Basically, this bill withdraws silver backing of paper currency. According to Smoot, "This bill to demonetize silver certificates would create a greater drain on our gold reserve, and speed arrival of the day when foreigners may decide to wreck our entire economy by foreclosing on the gold in our monetary reserve." Anyone voting for the bill was a liberal and an anticonstitutionalist, which therefore included 258 Representatives and 68 Senators.
>
> What the Texas wizard either deliberately failed to mention or simply did not know was that the free world cannot supply enough silver for our coin mintage needs. Therefore, unless this legislation had passed it would soon have become necessary to purchase silver from Iron Curtain countries. Apparently, therefore, Mr. Smoot must believe that the Constitution—his Constitution—requires this country to give aid and comfort to the Communists by purchasing their silver with our gold for this monetary silver certificate.
>
> Incidentally, in voting for this bill, I found myself on the same side of the fence as such noted "liberals" as John Rhodes, Senator Karl Mundt, Senator Harry Byrd, Senator Bourke Hickenlooper, Congressman Joel Broyhill, Congressman Craig Hosmer, and Senator John Tower.
>
> RULES COMMITTEE (H. RES. 5)
>
> Permanent enlargement of the House Rules Committee by two members. According to Mr. Smoot, "The sole purpose was to give totalitarian liberals a majority, thus handicapping conservative opposition to administration proposals."
>
> Assuming his reasoning to be accurate, which it wasn't, then Mr. Smoot has labeled all 145 members of the Republican conference as "totalitarian liberals" since that group voted unanimously to enlarge the committee by two members, providing the composition was 9 Democrats and 6 Republicans.
>
> Furthermore, Smoot's frightening assumption that one small group should determine what legislation the body of elected Representatives will or will not be permitted to consider, in my opinion refutes his stated belief in American constitutional principles.

Interest Rates and Balance of Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Dillon and the Treasury Department, in their recent presentations to Congress and their recent actions on interest rates, gave a classic example of the man who jumps astraddle a single horse and rides off in two different directions. No one has more vigorously pumped for the President's proposed tax reduction reforms measure; no authority has pleaded more effectively for the need for energizing and enlivening our economy. No person's predictions portraying the persistent specter of recession has been more persuasive than has Mr. Dillon's. Yet, this same Secretary, this same Department, has in the last few days taken steps to tighten credit. Such a move has characteristically and promptly put the brakes on the domestic economy. When used as a counteroffensive for inflation it has been a reasonable and effective tool. Now it appears that the tool has a double cutting edge. The administration is intrigued with its potential as a possible deterrent to the outflow of short-term investment capital. Moving up interest rates on short-term investments at home, it is reasoned, will induce the outflow to stay in the United States. Aside from the fact that available information gives less than comforting assurance that such results will follow, the contradictions implicit in this move vis-a-vis the tax reduction are potentially apparent.

We cannot accept the quieting assurance of Mr. Roosa that the 0.5-percent increase in the Federal Reserve System discount rate will not affect the "whole interest rate structure." Such an observation is about as accurate as saying water will not run downhill.

Increase in the discount rate represents an additional cost of doing business for the banks. Who do you suppose is going to pay this cost? Why, the banks' customers naturally, the borrowers. And, who are these borrowers? Consumers, other financial leaders, and commercial credit sources, of course. The ultimate payer of this cost will be John Q. Public, the consumer, regardless of what avenue of financing be pursued. For those sources not tied directly to the banks for a portion of their funding the usual competitive factors of the marketplace will assure their advance. We feel that a present accurate prediction can be made that the Department's encouragement to the Federal Reserve bank to increase discount rates to the bankers of the United States, will very shortly reflect an observable increase in the "whole short-term interest rate structure," within the domestic economy. Such an increase will represent an additional curb on an already seriously hampered economic growth situation.

The real "cat out of the bag" exposure of the inconsistency in the Treasury position is illuminated by the candid quotation contained in the Wall Street Journal story of July 10 of this year. Quoting the Secretary, the Journal states:

> The possibility of this kind of interest rate action having little effect on the economy is hinged on the tax bill.

Now we take this to mean that the Secretary here could be admitting the validity of Chairman Martin's position that the "heaviest cloud over the economy at present is the balance-of-payment problem." It would appear that the administration is now willing to gamble off a portion of the tax increase effect for economic expansion in another skirmish in the battle for a better balance-of-payment position. However, we may lose sight of the fact that by prearranging a portion of the tax cut benefits by this indirect earmarking of a portion of the tax cut money for the lending segment of the economy, in effect, there is a preempting of the decision of Congress as to what "mix" of benefits in the tax reform would best serve the national interests.

No informed person should be unmindful of the perplexing complexities and the built-in frustrations that our present fiscal position in international affairs holds. Nor should we be unmindful of the paradoxes posed by the superimposition of our domestic economic challenges. However, we respectfully submit that the program set forth in the President's recent message contains a proliferation of temporary plugs for a continuing perforated dike which stands between the United States and the outflow of its gold.

We must acknowledge the ingenuity and inventiveness of the staff of both the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board in manipulating the inhouse materials to jerry-build a defense against the continued outflow of capital funds. To the administration's credit they fully recognize this fact as reflected in the final paragraphs of the President's message of July 17, 1963.

Obviously, the limited expansion of the world's gold reserve and the unlimited future expansion of the world's economy and trade poses the real and fundamental problem. The pressures of competition for the existing gold supply will not cease because of the temporary measures currently being taken. The ingenuity and sophistications of the capital control centers are far too resourceful. The growing demand for the means to support the productivity and industrialization of the nations of the world will stimulate that resourcefulness. It can be predicted now that we are only at the beginning of a jerry-built structure answering to the new threats just around the corner, unless some more flexible, fluid, and effective international monetary structure, with real velocity propensity, is provided. We have the boys with their fingers in the leaks at the old dike but what we should like to know is that the architects and engineers are working at the real solution to be found only in the new structure.

Former President Perez Jimenez

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, only a few more days remain before Secretary of State Rusk must hand down his decision whether or not former President Perez Jimenez is to be extradited back to Venezuela, to be delivered into the hands of the Betancourt leftist government. Despite the unctuous protestations that he will be given a fair trial, you and I know that, if he is sent back, he goes to almost certain death at the hands of his political enemies.

I would like to think that the administration has an open mind on this extremely controversial case. When we are dealing with an ex-President, it has always been the custom of our Government to assume that his alleged offenses, while in office, were political, and hence not extraditable under our extradition treaties. In the whole history of our Nation, we have never yet delivered a Latin American ex-President, who came to us asking political asylum, into the hands of his political enemies for liquidation. Why this is now proposed in the case of former President Perez Jimenez is one of the occult mysteries of the New Frontier. Can it be that the turning over of Perez Jimenez was the price which crypto-Communist President Romulo Betancourt demanded of President Kennedy at their closed-door meeting last November?

That the mind of the administration has already been made up was indicated by an interview with Attorney General Robert Kennedy, published in El Diario—New York—a few weeks ago. In this interview, Attorney General Kennedy is reported by El Diario to have said:

> We will be able to deliver him (Perez Jimenez) to the Venezuelan authorities in a very short time.

At the time the Attorney General made this statement, the extradition case was still in the courts.

The fact is, there has been something smelly about this Perez Jimenez case from the beginning. Perhaps the most unwholesome thing about the case is the fact that, from the outset, Attorney General Kennedy has permitted the law firm of Covington & Burling, the senior member of which is the President's adviser, Dean Acheson, to prosecute the case in the Federal courts. Could it be that the spectacle of the law firm of the President's intimate, Mr. Acheson, acting as Betancourt's counsel in the case, has heavily weighted the scales against former President Perez Jimenez?

The Attorney General's report on the administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1962 indicates that, for 1961, Covington & Burling received from the Betancourt government the amount of $180,843.87. At this rate, if receipts for 1962 and 1963 were available, the total would mount to a formidable figure.

Fortunately, there is a vast public in the United States which does not believe that U.S. foreign policy must be tailored to please political chameleons like Romulo Betancourt. A different view on the extradition of Perez Jimenez was voiced by the Miami News, May 14, 1963:

> A decision by the U.S. Supreme Court yesterday brings the day closer when the Secretary of State must decide whether or not to ship the former dictator, Marcos Perez Jimenez, back to Venezuela.
>
> It is our opinion that there is more at stake in this case than the future welfare of one man. At issue is whether the United States, having granted a man political asylum, is now ready to withdraw this asylum. If our country does this, it would seem to be a precedent-setting reversal of policy.
>
> The time to decide whether or not the United States is going to extend its hospitality and protection to repudiated dictators like Perez Jimenez is when they first ask permission to enter the country, not when their political opponents ask for their return. This is something the State and Justice Departments should keep in mind when the situation arises again, as it very well might.

Another voice which might well be heeded by Secretary Rusk is the voice of Judge Robert Morris, president of the Defenders of American Liberties and former general counsel for the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security. Certainly, if any living American sees through the doubletalk and the masquerades of hard-bitten Communists who pretend to be liberals, it is Judge Morris. He says:

> MAY 21, 1963.
>
> Re Gen. Marcos Perez Jimenez.
>
> Hon. DEAN RUSK,
> *Department of State,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SIR: I write this for the Defenders of American Liberties on behalf of the right of asylum and its bearing on the status of former head of state for Venezuela, Gen. Marcos Perez Jimenez.
>
> In 1948 the current President of Venezuela, Romulo Betancourt, was overthrown by a group led by General Jimenez. In 1954, General Jimenez was in turn overthrown by President Betancourt. Each of the two has been highly praised by U.S. Presidents while in office. President Kennedy has recently praised President Betancourt in very lavish terms on the occasion of his visit to the United States.
>
> In 1954, General Jimenez was—according to reports—awarded the highest rank of Commander in Chief of the Legion of Merit by the United States for his "sound investment policies." He was also praised by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.
>
> The right of asylum is a very precious asset in these troubled times when Communists and other despots overthrow governments with violence and terror. It is a right that should be preserved by our example and by practice. If it should fall into desuetude as a result of our noninvocation in such cases as General Jimenez', some of the heads of state, now our allies, may well be the losers in the years ahead.
>
> Distinctions such as that between right and left, which unfortunately characterizes the difference between General Jimenez and President Betancourt pale into insignificance by the solemnity of the right of asylum itself which should be preserved.
>
> General Jimenez has been, until his recent apprehension, residing in Miami Beach with his wife and four daughters. He recently said: "It is my hope and desire that the U.S. Government will continue to allow me to live peacefully and quietly here with my family, as I have done the last 3 years, in order that my daughters may continue their American education, and that my wife and I may be part of this community."
>
> It is hoped that the United States will honor the tradition of asylum in this case and keep alive this important ingredient of international law.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> ROBERT MORRIS.

Mr. Speaker, there is more to this Perez Jimenez extradition case than the mere legalistic fulfillment of our extradition treaty. Venezuela under the weak administration of Romulo Betancourt, stands today upon the very crater edge of communism. Betancourt, despite all the aid which he has been given by the State Department, had made no serious effort to wipe out the Communists who are ready to take over Venezuela. When Prof. Philip Taylor, of Johns Hopkins University, visited Caracas on May 14, 1963, at the invitation of the American Embassy, to participate in a seminar, he was so shocked by the half-heartedness of Betancourt's handling of the Communists that he issued a public statement urging Betancourt to arrest Gustavo Machado and Eduardo Machado, the two official leaders of the Venezuelan Communist Party. What happened? Professor Taylor, by order of Betancourt's Minister of Internal Affairs, was expelled from the country. And so invertebrate is the State Department and the Caracas Embassy in its dealings with Betancourt that, to date, no official protest has been made against this outrage against an American scholar.

To send the former President Perez Jimenez in chains into this explosive situation would be the greatest contribution which the United States could make to Venezuelan communism. It would be a public sign that the United States was not following a sincere anti-Communist policy in Venezuela. It would be a weak admission of American neutrality in the struggle between the Communists and the anti-Communists in Venezuela.

I am making no judgment as to his past activities. The fact is that what he has done or has not done is beside the point in the issue at stake. Like him or not, former President Perez Jimenez is today the symbol of anti-communism in Venezuela. He is the only public figure who has strength enough to be a rallying point for the scattered Venezuelan anti-Communists. Because this is true, he is hated and feared by the leftist groups which now rule Venezuela. Is the United States now to be a party to the liquidating of this symbol? I cannot believe that even the State Department can stoop to such a decision. The United States must honor its commitment made to Perez Jimenez when he was granted political asylum.

Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I support President Kennedy's request to Congress for effective civil rights legislation. I admire the firmness of his determination to carry out his commitments to remove barriers to equality and justice which some of our American citizens still face today, a hundred years after the issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation.

My bill, H.R. 7224, contains the President's proposals, Mr. Speaker, and with permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert my testimony before the House Judiciary Committee on July 17, 1963:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN JAMES C. HEALEY, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to present to you and members of your distinguished committee my views on H.R. 7152, your omnibus civil rights bill and my own bill, H.R. 7224, containing the President's civil rights proposals. As you know, my bill, H.R. 7224, is identical to your bill, Mr. Chairman. I am here to testify in favor of these proposals and to urge approval by your committee.

As you know, I was one of the sponsors of the anti-poll-tax legislation passed in the 87th Congress, which when approved by three-fourths of the State legislatures, will become the 24th amendment to the Constitution.

You also have before your committee my bill, H.R. 2095, to eliminate unreasonable literacy requirements for voting; and my bill, H.R. 6639, to extend the Civil Rights Commission and to broaden the scope of its duties. These proposals are both incorporated in our omnibus civil rights bill.

Mr. Chairman, 100 years ago Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation assuring freedom and equality to all Americans. One hundred years later, some of our people are still deprived of these rights. Across our Nation we are seeing evidence of impatience of some of our American citizens who are victims of discrimination. And the rest of the world watches while we preach to them about freedom.

There should be no partisan politics here; we must support our President. Congress must enact legislation to lay the guidelines for solutions to the various phases of this problem. Failure to do so will weaken the fabric of this Nation at a time when it needs its full strength.

It is my hope that 1963 will go down in annals of memory as the year in which the U.S. legislative conscience came to grips with that perennial splotch on American morality—racial discrimination—and took the lead in providing substance to the promise of emancipation made a 100 years ago.

Under the aegis of the commerce clause and the 14th and 15th amendments to our Constitution, the U.S. Congress must transform its concern over a troubled and anguished situation into positive remedial action.

What is desperately needed is legislation providing effective, not piecemeal, legal tools, with which our citizens who are victims of discrimination will be able to prosecute against the daily abuses that are heaped upon them.

The erupting civil rights crisis has injected a sense of urgency into this session of Congress and our adjournment date should not be set until action is taken on this problem. Congressional inertia in this area of our national life would be tragic. As our President has put it so adroitly:

"In short, the result of continued Federal legislative inaction will be continued, if not increased, racial strife, causing the leadership on both sides to pass from the hands of responsible and reasonable men to purveyors of hate and violence, endangering domestic tranquility, retarding our Nation's economic and social progress, and weakening the respect with which the rest of the world regards us."

The President's proposals, which we have presented in our bills, Mr. Chairman, are the most sweeping of any President on civil rights since the Emancipation. His program incorporated in our omnibus bill, is an admirable attempt to remove the barriers which some of our citizens have faced the past 100 years—barriers which will stand in the way of enjoyment of full citizenship, to which every American is entitled, and which is guaranteed in his birthright.

There are those who regard the President's proposals as too much, too soon, as too ambitious an undertaking, especially in terms of success. I think not. They offer the Congress a set of solutions that should be acceptable to all men and women of good will. They are not designed because of mere economic, social, or diplomatic considerations. They were designed out of the knowledge that to insure the blessings of liberty to all is the primary prerequisite in a democracy, in a government, of and by, and for the people.

Our basic commitments as a nation and a people, our conscience, our sense of decency and human dignity, demand that we try to eliminate discrimination due to race, color, religion. To eliminate it is (1) not to practice it, and (2) not to tolerate it on the part of others. If we are successful in eliminating discrimination in our great country, other countries will look to us for having given substance to the dream of freedom and equality. If we do not, then we have lost our dignity and leadership both at home and abroad.

Our civil rights bill demands urgent and effective action by Congress to assure justice and equality for all of our citizens. The struggle is not that of the Negro alone. No American should be denied his basic rights to work, eat, vote, to learn, and to live where he chooses. A century after the Emancipation Proclamation, no American should have to demonstrate for his right to admission to a dining room, a school, or a theater.

Legislative relief is needed in the areas of voting, education, employment, and public accommodations. It has been in these spheres of activities that the American Negro's struggle for full equality has been a frustrating one.

Legislation cannot change a person's prejudices. If color discrimination were to disappear overnight, the Negro's low economic status would still handicap him. But legislation can work to eliminate conditions that handicap the Negro. And this is where we have a responsibility in the U.S. Congress.

Limitation of the exercise of that right to vote according to race serves no other purpose than to put into doubt the rendition of justice to the Negro citizen and the protection of his rights. A government not electorally responsible to one segment of our national citizenry seriously jeopardizes the very essence of our representative democracy and the political life of the Nation as a whole.

Under the provisions of our civil rights bill, Mr. Chairman, voting protection in Federal elections would be strengthened by providing for the apportionment of temporary voting referees, and by speeding up voting suits. For States having the literacy test, a presumption of qualification to vote would be created by "the completion of the sixth grade by any applicant." The constitutionality of such a provision is beyond reproach; Congress has within its purview of constitutional powers the power to regulate the manner of holding Federal elections.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the elimination of unreasonable literacy requirements for voting, I would like to quote from my testimony before your committee in the 87th Congress: "It is a known fact that unreasonable literacy tests have been used unjustly to deny the right to vote. Education is a reliable gage of literacy, but how much education? At what point should the standard be set? My bill establishes the minimum line at the completion of the sixth grade in schools * * * this a reasonable demarcation point, and I believe the most effective device is the one in my bill. It consists of establishing an objective standard by which an individual's literacy may be judged. This eliminates the intrusion of bias or prejudice * * * it requires the determination of fact, rather than a judgment or an interpretation."

Title I under our omnibus civil rights proposal would further require that if a literacy test is used as a qualification for voting in Federal elections, it shall be written and the applicant shall be furnished, upon request, with a certified copy of the test and the answers he has given.

The Civil Rights Act of 1957 provided for the Attorney General's power to bring civil action in the Federal courts where there are reasonable grounds to believe discrimination was being practiced at the polls. A 1963 Civil Rights Act should enlarge upon this and empower the Attorney General to initiate civil proceedings when asked to do so by a complainant financially unable to sue to "further the orderly progress of desegregation in public education." This provision would go a long way in ridding the path of progress of mala fide desegregation. It would be more in keeping with the proposition articulated by the highest tribunal of the land, that integration via the "all deliberate speed" formula doesn't mean that it should take forever. President Kennedy observed in his TV-radio talk to the Nation: "Too many Negro children entering segregated grade schools at the time the Supreme Court handed down its decision 9 years ago will enter segregated high schools this fall having suffered a loss which can never be restored."

A second look at some of the language in the 1954 decision of *Brown* v. *Board of Education* serves as a reminder of the urgent need for this particular provision. The Supreme Court said that attendant with segregation as practiced in public schools there runs the pernicious likelihood of saturating the Negro child psychology with a "feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone." Constituting a denial of equality of opportunity to learn, the maintenance of segregated schoolhouses was held to be a violation of the guarantee of the "equal protection of the laws" in the 14th amendment.

Title II of our bill proscribes discrimination in public establishments such as hotels and motels engaged in furnishing lodging for guests traveling interstate; movie theaters and other public places of entertainment which present forms of amusement which move in interstate commerce traffic; and restaurants and stores that extend food services, facilities and the like, the substantial portion of which has moved in interstate commerce, for sale or hire to a substantial degree of interstate travelers. Arbitrary practices guided by racist considerations in this area create nothing but unjust hardships and inconveniences for the Negro citizen. He is forced to stay at hotels of inferior quality, and travel great distances to obtain any kind of satisfactory accommodations or food service. He is limited in his complete enjoyment of the free flow of commerce. I feel that when a private owner appeals to the public for patronage, he has no right to draw the color line.

Discrimination in the field of public accommodations should find no quarter of sympathy or tolerance in our National Legislature. As it contributes to an artificial restriction of interstate commerce, it can best be removed by congressional action invoked under the commerce clause. In addition, legislative action can be justified by the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment: As these particular vehicles of private enterprise are licensed by the appropriate State authorities to engage in their particular activity, discriminatory practices found therein take on the character of State action and therefore fall within the limits of the 14th amendment.

Today Americans travel widely; millions travel each year, from place to place, State to State, and are often subjected to discrimination. Organizations—fraternal and professional—holding conventions face racial embarrassment. In our increasingly urbanized society, brought closer together by modern communications and transportation, Federal economic and social legislation—unthinkable possibly in the 18th century—has become essential today. These provide a legal basis in the clause of the Constitution giving Congress power "to regulate commerce, among the several States."

Critics of the public accommodations section level the charge that legislation of this kind would amount to an unconstitutional hindrance to property rights. The soundness of this argument is tenuous to say the least, for when was the right to property considered to be absolute? President Kennedy answered his critics by saying that: "The argument that such measures constitute an unconstitutional interference with property rights has consistently been rejected by the courts in upholding laws on zoning, collective bargaining, minimum wages, smoke control, and countless other measures designed to make certain that the use of private property is consistent with the public interest * * * indeed, there is an age-old saying that 'property has its duties as well as its rights'; no property owner who holds those premises for the purpose of serving at a profit the American public at large, can claim any inherent right to exclude a part of that public on grounds of race or color."

The commerce clause, in the light of today's social and economic structure, demands a uniform national "rules of access to public accommodations."

Mr. Chairman, a further provision of the bill—title IV—provides for the establishment of a Community Relations Service, the duties of which would be to work with regional, State and local bi-racial committees to alleviate racial tension. The value of such a service cannot be emphasized enough. Lacking the power of subpena, it would advise and assist local officials in improving the communication and cooperation between the races. By so doing, the Service would go a long way in helping to preclude recurrences of racial crises.

I have already mentioned the Civil Rights Commission; title V will extend and broaden its powers. With regard to title VI, our Federal Government provides financial assistance or backing for many programs and activities administered by local and State governments, and by private enterprises. As a Member of the U.S. Congress, it is my privilege and responsibility to vote on these proposals and I feel the activities and benefits of such programs should be available to eligible recipients without regard to race or color. This should also apply to the employment practices of the organizations involved, public or private. Title VII authorizes the President to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, to prevent discrimination against employees or applicants for employment because of race, color or religion or national origin, by Government contractors and subcontractors, and by contractors and subcontractors participating in programs or activities in which direct or indirect financial assistance is provided by the Federal Government.

Unemployment falls with special cruelty on minority groups, and creates an atmosphere of resentment and unrest; the results are delinquency, vandalism, disease, slums, and the high cost of providing public welfare and of combating crime. I support the President's requests for more vocational education and training for our illiterate and unskilled. It is programs such as the manpower development and training program which assist in reducing unemployment.

Mr. Chairman, our President has spoken out; he has followed through on his promises and commitments. He has called on us here in Congress to enact sound and effective legislation to provide justice and equality for all Americans. We have never been faced with such a challenge in terms of moral integrity. We should not hesitate, but act swiftly, to take the battle for civil rights out of the streets, and enact legislation which will eliminate the necessity for segments of our citizenry to march in groups to demand equality.

The primary reason racial discrimination in America must be ended is not because of a clause in our Constitution, or as we sometimes hear, because of Communist challenge, but because racial prejudice and discrimination are fundamentally wrong. Our Judeo-Christian heritage, our sense of how man should treat his brother, our democratic ethics—our basic commitments as a nation and a people—should make us want to eliminate a practice not compatible with the great ideals to which our democratic society is dedicated.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for letting me appear before your committee. I urge prompt and favorable action by the Judiciary Committee, and pledge my support when the civil rights bill comes to the floor of the House of Representatives.

One Nation Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, on July 4, in my hometown of Gadsden, Ala., was held an outstanding celebration on the birthday of our Nation. It was a patriotic and religious service sponsored by the Episcopal Church of the Holy Comforter.

The program was under the direction of one of our most outstanding ministers, the Reverend John T. Speaks, the rector of the Church of the Holy Comforter of Gadsden.

On this occasion, I had the honor and privilege of presenting my highly esteemed colleague from Alabama, the Honorable ARMISTEAD SELDEN, as the featured speaker.

Congressman SELDEN's address on the subject, "One Nation Under God," is a gem and I think should be read by every Member of the Congress, the executive and the judicial, as well as all liberty loving citizens of our country:

ONE NATION UNDER GOD

Today we commemorate the birth of the spirit of our Nation. The key to understanding the greatness of America lies in our celebration of July 4—rather than October 19—as our national holiday.

For on July 4, 1776—187 years ago today—a spiritual force came to life with the adoption of the Declaration of Independence by the Continental Congress. Consider the fact that what occurred that day did nothing to alter the material balance of power between the colonies and the King. As a result of the adoption of the Declaration, the Colonies did not in fact become independent of the King—only in spirit.

It took 5 long and arduous years of struggle and sacrifice for Americans to win their independence in fact. On October 19, 1781, Lord Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown—and only then was the Nation born. Yet we commemorate, as our national holiday, not the military victory at Yorktown—but the spiritual victory at Philadelphia.

It would be well for us and for all Americans to reflect today, on this 187th anniversary of the Declaration, on the reasons why July 4, and not October 19, is our national holiday. There is more to this question than simple historic accident, as a reading of the Declaration itself will reveal.

The Declaration begins with the acknowledgment that mankind's inalienable rights are determined by "the laws of nature and of nature's God"—that they are rights endowed by our Creator. The Declaration ends with an appeal to the Supreme Judge of the world and "with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence."

Thus was the "Spirit of '76"—the spiritual force that has since altered world history—firmly based on a belief in the transcendent Spirit of a Divine Creator. Our observance of July 4 as the American national holiday acknowledges this spiritual heritage.

Today Americans everywhere pay homage to the victory at Philadelphia. Yet there are those among us who seem to have forgotten—and would have future generations of Americans forget—the spiritual origin and meaning of this holiday.

American independence—our right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—was finally sustained at Yorktown. But the cannon at Yorktown did not give Americans their independence—any more than the rockets of today give us our way of life. Our freedom and our system are the gifts—the endowment—of nature's God, and our preservation of these gifts, from Yorktown to the present, stems from our "firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence."

Without this reliance, there would have been no military victory at Yorktown in 1781. For what sustained our revolutionary fathers was not firepower, of which they had little compared to their adversaries—but faith. And although today, 187 years later, American firepower is second to none in the world, only our faith can truly preserve our freedom and our system for future generations of Americans.

Today, then, we mark the birth of an ideal, the products of a generation which had faith—faith in God and in the God-given rights of man. Those who believe that the benefits of this ideal—Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness—can exist for Americans without this faith do not truly understand the spirit of '76. Their materialistic ideology, left unchecked, could achieve what tyrants from George the Third to Nikita Khrushchev have failed to do—destroy our freedom and our system.

This is the same materialistic philosophy that holds love of country, like faith in God, to be an outmoded sentiment. The materialist who cannot recognize America's spiritual tradition ultimately spurns the concept of patriotism itself. For American patriotism—our love of country—is forever linked to the concept of divine providence. The spirit of America could not have come to life without this faith. It cannot survive without it.

In 1776, Americans were short on firepower but long on faith and love of country. Their cause prevailed, despite overwhelming odds. Today, July 4, 1963, the same cause is threatened by the most massive, formidable tyranny in world history. Compared to the aggressive 20th-century threat of Communist tyranny, the 18th-century tyranny of George the Third was petty. In potential firepower, however, we face our Communist enemy on terms which our forefathers would have envied. America is physically strong—the mightiest Nation in the world. If we lose then, the judgment of history must be that while our cause was right—and our firepower great—our faith was not up to the challenge of the time.

Without faith it is said, the people are blind. And if our faith is not up to the challenge of the times, our vision of the dangers confronting us becomes blurred. The ultimate evil of communism is its materialistic ideology. But if America itself falls victim to materialistic ideology, how are we to come to grips with this evil?

It is one thing to separate state from church. It is another to attempt to separate state from God. Our form of government is founded on separation of state from church. But we separate state from God to our peril and to the peril of our country.

One hundred and eighty-seven years after the spiritual triumph of Philadelphia, we Americans face a godless enemy—but an enemy, nevertheless, dedicated in its purpose.

That purpose is simply stated. It is to bury us—to bury the United States as a country—to bury the American system as a way of life—to bury Americans as a free and independent people—and to bury the God-given spirit of '76, replacing it throughout the world with the materialistic spirit of Marxist-Leninism.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I am especially aware of the dangers of the Communist effort to bury freedom in our neighboring Latin American countries.

Khrushchev knows that if he succeeds in stifling the spirit of liberty among our Latin neighbors, then the United States—the bastion of the Western Hemisphere and the free world—becomes more vulnerable.

In the time of the American Revolution, Paul Revere rode the countryside to warn patriots that the forces of tyranny were on the march—"The Redcoats are coming."

Today the enemies of American liberty do not come to battle in bright red coats, to the roll of drums. Communist techniques are undercover and subversive—and it is more difficult to arouse our people to their dangers. The aggressors of 1776 with their red coats and muskets were repelled by alert and courageous Americans. The subversive Communist aggressors of the 1960's can only be repelled by firm action taken by an alert and courageous American leadership.

The framers of the Declaration of Independence knew that freemen cannot do business with tyrants. So long as tyranny has power to challenge the rights of freemen, peaceful coexistence—whether it be with a George III or a Nikita Khrushchev—is a false illusion.

In 1776, the tyranny of the Crown could not be bought off or repelled by wishful thinking. Nor can the Red tyranny of 1963. And, like Patrick Henry, we must also recognize that although there are those who cry "Peace, peace—there is no peace," there can be no true peace for Americans until, like their forebears, they face up to the tyranny of the times.

Americans of 1963 must also be alert to the devisive forces within our own country which seek to destroy our institutions by resort to mob and community disorder. The street demonstrations which have spread throughout the country recently—and have taken place in our State and in your community—threaten to lead Americans into a different form of tyranny—to the odious tyranny of the mob.

In standing guard against the tyranny of totalitarian communism we must take care not to fall victim to mob tyranny. Mobocracy is the enemy of all Americans—regardless of race, religion or creed. And those Americans who advocate or encourage mob action to attain their narrow political ends are undermining the foundations of our Republic.

Nor can there be any doubt that these demonstrations—by dividing the American people and diverting our national energies at this critical time—serve the ultimate purpose of our Communist enemies.

In 1776, the ideals at stake between the Colonies and the King were universal—but the field of combat was limited. Today both the stakes and the arena are universal. Had the Colonies lost their struggle against the King, there still might have been hope that their ideal of human freedom would survive—to rise again another year. But if we spiritual inheritors of the Declaration of Independence were to submit to the Communist tyrant which threatens us today—then, indeed, a Dark Age—the darkest age in human history—would descend upon mankind.

We, therefore, are the champions of freedom not only for our own cause—but for the cause of all freemen. And if we fail—if our faith weakens and our reliance in divine providence falters—we will have been guilty of the greatest moral irresponsibility in history.

"If we study the history of Rome and Carthage," said our fellow American, Winston Churchill, who today stands as the symbol of the bond between modern-day England and America, "we can understand what happened and why. It is not difficult to form an intelligent view about the three Punic Wars; but if a mortal catastrophe should overtake the British nation and the British Empire, historians a thousand years hence will still be baffled by the mystery of our affairs."

"They will never understand," Churchill warned his countrymen in 1938, "how it was that a victorious nation, with everything in hand, suffered themselves to be brought low and to cast away all they had gained by measureless sacrifice and absolute victories—gone with the wind."

When these words were spoken a quarter-century ago, the British Empire stood at the pinnacle of power and prestige throughout the world. The words proved prophetic for Churchill's Britain in 1938. Their meaning can still be prophetic for Churchill's America in 1963.

"Now is the time," declared Churchill, "at last to rouse the Nation. Perhaps it is the last time it can be roused with a chance of preventing war, or with a chance of coming through to victory should our efforts to prevent war fail. We should lay aside every hindrance and endeavor by uniting the whole force and spirit of our people to raise again a great * * * nation standing up before all the world, for such a nation, rising in its ancient vigor, can even at this hour save civilization."

It is ironic, but yet fitting, to paraphrase the words of a man who, like Jefferson, is both a great Englishman and a great American—the only person since colonial days to share these two national titles—in summing up the 1963 challenge and opportunity facing us, the heirs of Jefferson and the Spirit of '76.

Now indeed is the time to rouse the Nation, to lay aside every hindrance, and by uniting the whole force and spirit of our people to rise again in the vigor of the men at Philadelphia and at Yorktown. For such a nation, and only such a nation, can at this hour save civilization.

SENATE

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose mercy never faileth, in these epochal days we would be the servants of Thy will.

With the gaze of the Nation and the world fixed upon this Chamber of governance, we would solemnly reaffirm, in this dedicated moment, the reverent declaration of those who long ago with intrepid courage and with radiant hope stepped upon the shores of this new land—"In the name of God, amen."

We thank Thee for the things that unite us: the passion for freedom; the hatred of tyranny; the steadfast belief that in Thy providence a purged America has come to the kingdom for such a time as this; for the vision splendid of a redeemed earth when gnawing hunger and blighting superstition, and needless pain and misery, will be but haunting memories. We thank Thee for the things that unite us.

For the triumph of the global crusade now raging, whose victory will mean that men everywhere will live in freedom, we would here set up our banners with the prayer that our imperfect service may express something of Thee before life's little day ebbs out and the night comes down and our work is done.

We ask it in the name of Him who is the way, the truth, and the light. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 22, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 22, 1963, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1745) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 489. An act to amend the act of March 5, 1938, establishing a small claims and conciliation branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia; and

S. 490. An act to amend the act of July 2, 1940, as amended, relating to the recording of liens on motor vehicles and trailers registered in the District of Columbia, so as to eliminate the requirement that an alphabetical file on such liens be maintained.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 47) to print additional copies of certain hearings on effects of television portrayal of crime on young people.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 6128. An act to amend section 15 of the Life Insurance Act to permit any stock life insurance company in the District of Columbia to maintain its record of stockholders at its principal place of business in the District of Columbia or at the office of its designated stock transfer agent in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6350. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto," approved June 6, 1892, as amended;

H.R. 6353. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended;

H.R. 7043. An act to amend the act of March 2, 1931, to provide that certain proceedings of the Veterans of World War I of the United States, Inc., shall be printed as a House document, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7356. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 194) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag," in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 6128. An act to amend section 15 of the Life Insurance Act to permit any stock life insurance company in the District of Columbia to maintain its record of stockholders at its principal place of business in the District of Columbia or at the office of its designated stock transfer agent in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6350. An act to amend the act entitled "An Act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto," approved June 6, 1892, as amended;

H.R. 6353. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia;

H.R. 7043. An act to amend the act of March 2, 1931, to provide that certain proceedings of the Veterans of World War I of the United States, Inc., shall be printed as a House document, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration; and

H.R. 7356. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 194) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag" was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed three hundred and twenty-two thousand five hundred additional copies of House Document Numbered 225, Eighty-fourth Congress, first session, entitled "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag", of which two hundred and nineteen thousand five hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and one hundred and three thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on July 22, 1963, the Vice President had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 5279. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interor and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 513. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week beginning July 28, 1963, as Veterinary Medicine Week.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Amendment of Immigration and Nationality Act

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Construction at U.S. Naval Ammunition and Net Depot, Seal Beach, Calif., and Santa Susana Air Force Plant, at Chatsworth, Calif.

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction at the U.S. Naval Ammunition and Net Depot, Seal Beach, Calif., and Santa Susana Air Force Plant No. 57 at Chatsworth, Calif.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Report on Title I Agreements Under Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954

A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, for the month of June 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Proposed Transfer of Landing Craft to Pamlico County Health Department, North Carolina

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed transfer of a 56-foot landing craft to the Pamlico County Health Department, county of Pamlico, State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Proposed Donation of Certain Surplus Obsolete Material to City of Roanoke, Va.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed donation of certain surplus obsolete material to the city of Roanoke, Va.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Procurement From Small and Other Business Firms

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on procurement from small and other business firms, for the month of May 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Acceptance of Gifts and Bequests by Department of Commerce

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to accept gifts and bequests for the purposes of the Department of Commerce (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Joint Resolution Relating to Membership of the United States in the South Pacific Commission

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report of National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, for the period July 1–December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report on Review of Construction of Embassy Office Building and Ambassador's Residence, Rabat, Morocco

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of construction of Embassy office building and Ambassador's residence, Rabat, Morocco, Office of Foreign Buildings, Department of State, dated July 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Procurements of Aluminum Caps and Cans Without Adequate Pricing Data

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on procurements of aluminum caps and cans without adequate pricing data by the E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc. from the Aluminum Co. of America, under an Atomic Energy Commission contract, dated July 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on North Carolina-Georgia Extension of Blue Ridge Parkway

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the feasibility and desirability of developing a national parkway extending from the Blue Ridge Parkway near Beech Gap, N.C., southwest into Georgia, dated June 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Petitions To Classify Status of Certain Aliens First Preference

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, petitions to classify the status of certain aliens first preference (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Amendment of Act Relating to Transportation of Remains, Families, and Effects of Certain Federal Employees Dying Abroad

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of July 8, 1940, relating to the transportation of the remains, families, and effects of Federal employees dying abroad, so as to restore the benefits of such act to employees dying in Alaska and Hawaii, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Disposition of Executive Papers

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. Johnston and Mr. Carlson members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Commerce:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 33

"Joint resolution to memorialize the Congress of the United States to restore local airline service to Ohio cities as such service existed during December 1962

"Whereas the members of the 105th General Assembly of Ohio are fully cognizant that local service certificated airlines operating in the United States of America now receive a subsidy, the formula concerning which is administered by the Civil Aeronautics Board; and

"Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Board has recently developed a new formula for the allocation of subsidy among the local service airlines; and

"Whereas Lake Central Airlines has rendered valuable and economical services both to the major terminal cities as well as to many smaller cities in the State of Ohio; and

"Whereas it is believed that the new subsidy formula will adversely affect Lake Central Airlines and will result in a substantial decrease in local airline service to our Ohio cities; and

"Whereas Lake Central Airlines now has pending applications Nos. 14232 and 14233 before the Civil Aeronautics Board seeking authority to reduce service at the following cities and further has been required to reduce service to the cities of Dayton, Findlay, Lima, Portsmouth, Toledo, and Youngstown in order to accommodate this subsidy reduction, all to the detriment of these growing communities: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the 105th General Assembly of the State of Ohio by adopting this resolution hereby registers a formal protest to the proposed subsidy formula of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which will result in a decrease of local carrier air service to the cities of Ohio which are now enjoying such service; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the public convenience and necessity will be best served by restoration of local airline service to the Ohio cities as such service existed during December 1962; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the clerk of the senate transmit a duly authenticated copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from Ohio in the Congress of the United States.

"Roger Cloud,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
"John Brow,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Adopted June 25, 1963.

"Attest:

"Thos. E. Bateman,
"*Clerk.*"

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Vermont; to the Committee on Finance:

"JOINT RESOLUTION RELATING TO PENSION FOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS

"Whereas the national policy of the United States concerning veterans of the United States has been to grant assistance to them in their declining years by a pension in consideration of their military services in defense of our country; and

"Whereas there has been no general pension granted to veterans of World War I by the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate and house of representatives*, That the General Assembly of the State of Vermont hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting a pension to veterans of World War I comparable to grants to veterans of American wars prior to World War I; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent forthwith by the secretary of state of Vermont to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officers of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from the State of Vermont.

"Approved June 27, 1963."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 1521

"Resolution memorializing Congress respectfully requesting the enactment of appropriate Federal legislation to incorporate the Italian American War Veterans of the United States Inc. as a national organization

"*Resolved*, That the Members of the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby respectfully requested to enact such legislation to incorporate the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., as a national organization; and further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state be and he is thereby requested to transmit to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution in the hope that each will use every endeavor to have favorable action taken by Congress upon this special matter."

RESOLUTIONS OF MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL COURT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and myself, I present a certified copy of a resolution entitled "Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact Legislation Consenting to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact," passed by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on July 17, 1963.

I ask that this resolution be appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Northeastern water and related land resources compact provides a means for coordinated planning of resource development in New England with consequent benefit to the people of the region; and

Whereas the compact has been entered into and enacted into law by the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island and requires only approval by the Congress to become effective: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact pending legislation consenting to the Northeastern water and related land resources compact; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from the Commonwealth.

Adopted by the Senate July 15, 1963.

THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
Clerk.

Adopted by the House of Representatives, in concurrence, July 17, 1963.

WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
Clerk.

Attest:

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 2221. An act to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif. (Rept. No. 373);

H.R. 2675. An act to extend for 3 years the period during which certain tanning extracts, and extracts of hemlock or eucalyptus suitable for use for tanning, may be imported free of duty (Rept. No. 374);

H.R. 3272. An act to provide for the free entry of an orthicon image assembly for the use of the Medical College of Georgia, Augusta, Ga. (Rept. No. 375);

H.R. 3674. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that polished sheets and plates of iron or steel shall be subject to the same duty as unpolished sheets and plates (Rept. No. 376);

H.R. 5712. An act to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid (Rept. No. 377); and

H.R. 6011. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle or Tampico fiber (Rept. No. 378).

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment:

S. 1642. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, to extend disclosure requirements to the issuers of additional publicly traded securities, to provide for improved qualification and disciplinary procedures for registered brokers and dealers, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 379).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Two hundred and thirty-seven postmaster nominations.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LAUSCHE (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 1926. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to make more specific the purpose for which loans may be made under sections 2 and 4 of such act, and to modify the provisions relating to interest rates on loans made under such act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. LAUSCHE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1927. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to authorize for teachers in private nonprofit schools certain benefits under the provisions of titles II, V, and VI of such act provided for teachers in public schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 1928. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to sell a part of the former Cheli Air Force Station to Chanslor-Western Oil & Development Co., by negotiation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART:

S. 1929. A bill for the relief of Vladimir Petrovich; and

S. 1930. A bill for the relief of Resan Tokad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1931. A bill to provide that the United States shall hold certain land in trust for the members of the Alamo Band of Puertocito Navajo Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HART (for himself, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. KEATING):

S. 1932. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 1933. A bill to authorize the Department of the Army to make equitable contribution to the costs incurred by the village of Goodfellow Terrace, Mo., in providing municipal services with respect to real property of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1934. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 requiring certain adjustments of apportionments depending upon the amount of funds available in the highway trust fund; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. HILL, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 1935. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PELL (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 1936. A bill authorizing the State of Rhode Island or its instrumentality to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge across Mount Hope Bay subject to the terms and conditions of the act approved March 23, 1906; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CASE, Mr. HART, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. NELSON, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. GRUENING, and Mrs. NEUBERGER):

S. 1937. A bill to promote equal employment opportunity by securing equal treatment in the various incidents of employment, to establish an Equal Employment Opportunity Administration in the Department of Labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S.J. Res. 103. Joint resolution to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the work of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri (for himself, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S.J. Res. 104. Joint resolution exempting the Bi-State Development Agency, its affiliates and the transportation rendered by either, whether by motor or rail, within the Bi-State Development District from the applicability of the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and the rules, regulations, and orders promulgated thereunder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Missouri when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION—STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 176) to create a Standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs and for the Veterans' Administration, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Dirksen, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senior Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to make more specific the purpose for which loans may be made under sections 2 and 4 of such act and to modify the provisions relating to interest rates on loans made under such act. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1926) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to make more specific the purpose for which loans may be made under sections 2 and 4 of such act, and to modify the provisions relating to interest rates on loans made under such act, introduced by Mr. Lausche (for himself and Mr. Bennett), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the next to the last sentence of section 4 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 904), is amended by striking out "and shall bear interest at the rate of 2 per centum per annum; interest rates on the unmatured and unpaid balance of any loans made pursuant to this section prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be adjusted to 2 per centum per annum, and the maturity date of any such loans may be readjusted to occur at a date not beyond thirty-five years from the date of such loan:" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average rate of interest payable by the United States of America on its marketable obligations, having maturities of ten or more years, issued during the last preceding fiscal year in which any such obligations were issued and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of one per centum:".

(b) Section 4 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "No loan shall be made under authority of this section or section 2 of this Act after June 30, 1965, except for the sole purpose of furnishing electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service and who are not in a rural area being served by a central station; and the Administrator shall, with respect to any loan made under authority of this section or section 2 of this Act after June 30, 1965, impose such terms and conditions as may be necessary to insure that the proceeds of such loan are not used, directly or indirectly, for any purpose other than to furnish electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service and who are not in a rural area served by a central station."

Sec. 2. The last sentence of section 5 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 905), is amended by striking out "and shall be at a rate of interest of 2 per centum per annum; interest rates on the unmatured and unpaid balance of any loans made pursuant to this section prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be adjusted to 2 per centum per annum", and inserting in lieu thereof "and shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average rate of interest payable by the United States of America on its marketable obligations, having maturities of ten or more years, issued during the last preceding fiscal year in which any such obligations were issued and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of one per centum".

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act relating to interest rates shall be effective with respect to all loans made on and after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the bill would require the Rural Electrification Administration to finance its future operations in the open market at the current rate of interest except in cases when it may be called upon to furnish electric power and light to rural areas to which central power service is not available. Secondly, the bill would require that loans made by the Rural Electrification Administration bear interest at a rate equal to the average rate of interest payable by the United States of America on its marketable obligations, having maturities of 10 years or more, issued during the last preceding fiscal year in which any such obligations were issued and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent.

Mr. President, amendments to the Rural Electrification Act of this nature are long overdue. The Rural Electrification Administration was originally established by Executive Order No. 7037, signed by President Roosevelt, May 11, 1935.

Seventy-five thousand dollars was authorized to be allocated from emergency relief appropriations—RFC—to carry out the general program of relief of unemployment. On May 20, 1936, Congress enacted the Rural Electrification Act providing for a limited, 10-year program of rural electrification. This act established the REA as an independent lending agency and loan funds were authorized to be secured from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944, approved September 21, 1944, established a flat rate of 2 percent on unmatured, unpaid balances of REA borrowers. At that time, the Treasury Department was paying an average interest rate of 2.3 percent on its marketable issues of 10 years or more.

Obviously, the reason for the differential in the interest rate charged REA borrowers as compared to the rate the Treasury was paying was to lend more encouragement for the establishment of new REA units and the building of additional lines to serve the rural population. This obviously was successful for, according to the tabulation to which I shall refer later, 1944 marked the beginning of a very substantial increase in REA units and line construction.

I believe that the Rural Electrification Administration has been an outstanding asset and a program which has brought much comfort, lightened the burdens, and stimulated the economy of our Nation's rural areas. The purpose for which the Rural Electrification Administration was created has largely been fulfilled.

Its continued operations under the same terms and provisions provided in the present law permit the REA to go far beyond the original intent of the Congress and its activities now are in direct conflict to our basic free enterprise system.

Mr. President, the sharp rise in REA loan authorizations over the level proposed by a previous administration for 1962 has occurred in the face of these facts: First, 98 percent of all farms already have electric service; second, four of every five new customers being added to the REA system are nonfarm power users; and third, more than half of the total power sales of the systems are now being made to nonfarm users. The expansion of the REA electrification program, despite these factors which should indicate a diminishing program, is due to an aggressive effort on the part of rural electric cooperatives in several areas to create their own sources of power to replace existing sources.

During the first 18 years of the REA's existence through fiscal 1954, about $2.3 billion in loans were granted for distribution systems to carry power directly to rural customers. Over the same period a total of $550 million was granted for generation and transmission—G. & T.—purposes. This was 18.8 percent of all electrification loans granted. During the 6 fiscal years 1955–60 G. & T. loans totaled $463 million, or 35.7 percent of all electrification loans. This was an average of $77 million a year for G. & T. purposes.

In fiscal 1961 G. & T. loans rose to $152 million, or 55.3 percent of total loans. The sharp increase in amount and proportion of G. & T. loans in 1961 was accounted for by approval on June 15, 1961, of a $60 million G. & T. loan which was the largest single REA loan ever granted. Loans for G. & T. purposes in 1962 amounted to $155 million, or 59.4 percent of total loans. The estimate for the current year is $250 million which would be about 62 percent of all loans. Of the $425 million authorization request for 1964, about $290 million would be available for G. & T. purposes. This would be 68 percent of the total authorization.

Thus, in the 4-year period 1961–64 the funds loaned and budgeted for G. & T. purposes total $847 million. This 4-year total is more than four-fifths of the $1,013 million total which was granted in G. & T. loans over the 24 years of REA's existence prior to 1961.

If the true economic cost of power financed by G. & T. loans were taken into account in justifying the loans, there would be few instances when such loans could be justified on the basis of cost. The economic cost of power sold by investor-owned utilities includes the cost of interest, operating expenses, depreciation, and taxes. The true economic cost of power sold by the G. & T. cooperatives includes these same elements of cost although the cooperative itself does not bear all the costs. By having to pay only 2 percent interest to the U.S. Treasury on money which costs the Treasury 4 percent, the cooperative shifts one-half of the true interest cost to taxpayers generally.

Also, by being exempt from the Federal income tax and a sizable portion of State and local taxes, the cooperative shifts to taxpayers generally the burden of taxes it forgoes.

Mr. President, the Rural Electrification Administration has been non-self-sustaining financially and subsidized by the general taxpayer for a period far too long. After exhaustive studies the second Hoover Commission made the following report and recommendation to the Congress in 1954:

> It is our belief that the time has arrived for the reorganization of the Rural Electrification Administration into a self-supporting institution securing its own finance from private sources in a manner similar to that of other agencies. Moreover, the operations of Rural Electrification should be made subject to the Government Corporation Control Act in order to secure the advantages of more efficient organization under that act.

Unfortunately, that recommendation was ignored and the REA has gone ahead in ways that were never intended, and certainly never conceived of, when it was given its first instruction to bring electricity to the rural areas of our country. Some of its operations seem ludicrous—as the financing of a ski lodge with lift and artificial snow in Illinois. Some border on the scandalous—as the investment of 2 percent money in private companies where it makes profits for local electric cooperatives on which no taxes are paid.

Some reflect bad and wasteful lack of judgment—as the erection of a $104,000 building in a desert town where it stands mostly idle and useless. There are countless examples of carelessness, ineptness and just plain silliness; I highly recommend an impartial study of the whole situation.

A beginning of sanity in the Rural Electrification Administration's operations can be made by the adoption of my bill, for I am convinced that much of today's waste arises from the fact that easy 2 percent money is available in practically unlimited quantites—and that no one is watching to see what is done with it.

Mr. President, to illustrate that the REA has accomplished the mission for which it was created, I submit statistics supplied to me by the Rural Electrification Administration itself. Of the 3,818,200 farms in the United States, 3,726,850—or 97.6 percent—had central station electric service as of July 1, 1962. Of these electrified farms, approximately 54 percent are served by REA-financed electric systems. The remainder are served by other suppliers, principally commercial power companies. Therefore, REA has accomplished its intended mission to fill up that gap which could not profitably be served by private power companies. In 1935, when REA was created, 743,954 farms in the United States had central station electric service. This was only 10.9 percent of all farms in the Nation which then totaled 6,812,350.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a table revealing the number of loans and amounts thereof for the years 1935 to 1962, inclusive. This table clearly reveals the recent expansion of this program.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Loans made by the Rural Electrification Administration, fiscal years 1935–62

Fiscal year	Electric loans	
	Number	Amount
1935-36		$17,929,017
1937		50,347,265
1938		31,559,719
1939		141,899,413
1940		44,880,216
1941		101,710,165
1942		91,282,300
1943		8,225,380
1944		34,002,078
1945		26,343,238
1946		290,913,868
1947		256,389,000
1948		319,110,000
1949		449,317,700
1950	651	376,199,000
1951	472	221,815,500
1952	295	165,758,731
1953	345	164,972,662
1954	325	167,104,100
1955	349	167,530,430
1956	344	189,804,800
1957	404	300,461,514
1958	337	241,636,869
1959	250	177,292,100
1960	276	220,108,000
1961	255	274,507,218
1962	242	261,374,500

LOAN FUNDS OUTSTANDING

As of Jan. 1, 1963, the following amounts in REA loan funds were outstanding:

Electric loans	$2,899,785,266
Telephone loans	700,564,240

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the statistics show clearly that the Rural Electrification Administration has very substantially fulfilled its intended mission and, therefore, further expansion or encroachment into new fields contrary to the original intent of the Congress should be brought to an end immediately. This bill would not halt expansion to serve strictly rural areas in the future.

PEGGED REA—TWO-PERCENT INTEREST RATE

Mr. President, I now want to refer to the pegged 2-percent interest rate charged on REA loans since 1945. This practice has caused an unjustified expense to the taxpayers in the sum of more than one quarter of a billion dollars. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table compiled by the U.S. Treasury Department showing interest rate charged by REA, computed annual interest rate paid by U.S. Treasury on securities outstanding, variance between interest rate charged by REA and paid by U.S. Treasury, average REA loans outstanding, and excess of interest cost to U.S. Treasury over interest rate charged by REA, all for the years 1936 to 1962, inclusive.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The table below shows the estimated variances between the interest rate charged by REA and the rate paid by the U.S. Treasury on outstanding securities:

Year ended June 30	Interest rate charged by REA	Computed annual interest rate paid by U.S. Treasury on securities outstanding	Variance between interest rate charged by REA and paid by U.S. Treasury	Average REA [1] loans outstanding	Excess of interest cost to U.S. Treasury over interest rate charged by REA
				Thousands	
1936	3.00	2.56	(0.44)	$412	($1,813)
1937	2.77	2.58	(.19)	6,344	(12,054)
1938	2.88	2.59	(.29)	35,954	(104,267)
1939	2.73	2.60	(.13)	90,974	(118,266)
1940	2.69	2.58	(.11)	170,771	(187,848)
1941	2.46	2.52	.06	254,539	152,723
1942	2.48	2.29	(.19)	315,722	(599,872)
1943	2.57	1.98	(.59)	343,245	(2,025,145)
1944	[2] 2.67	1.93	(.74)	346,239	(2,562,169)
1945	2.00	1.94	(.06)	362,603	(217,562)
1946	2.00	2.00		415,289	
1947	2.00	2.11	.11	541,621	595,783
1948	2.00	2.18	.18	742,256	1,366,061
1949	2.00	2.24	.24	866,633	2,079,919
1950	2.00	2.20	.20	1,148,165	2,296,330
1951	2.00	2.27	.27	1,403,926	3,790,600
1952	2.00	2.33	.33	1,629,020	5,375,766
1953	2.00	2.44	.44	1,832,024	8,060,906
1954	2.00	2.34	.34	2,011,927	6,840,552
1955	2.00	2.35	.35	2,148,828	7,520,898
1956	2.00	2.58	.58	2,274,876	13,194,281
1957	2.00	2.73	.73	2,431,114	17,747,132
1958	2.00	2.64	.64	2,623,500	16,790,400
1959	2.00	2.87	.87	2,825,500	24,581,850
1960	2.00	3.30	1.30	3,039,000	39,507,000
1961	2.00	3.07	1.07	3,243,500	34,705,450
1962	2.00	3.24	1.24	3,407,850	42,257,340
July 1, 1962, to Nov. 30, 1962	2.00	3.29	1.29	3,568,707	[3] 19,181,818
Total					240,215,813

[1] 1936 through 1948, mean value of principal balances outstanding at July 1 and June 30 each fiscal year on electric loans by REA. 1949 through 1962, mean value of loans by U.S. Treasury Department to REA. July 1, 1962, to Nov. 30, 1962, balance of U.S. Treasury loans outstanding to REA on June 30, 1962, plus ½ of REA loans granted in the interim.

[2] REA charged 2.49 percent on new loans during the period, July 1 to Sept. 20, 1944.

[3] Based on a 5-month period.

NOTE.—All figures shown in parentheses are negative amounts.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point and as a part of my remarks a table also compiled by the U.S. Treasury Department showing average interest rates on marketable issues in each fiscal year with maturities of 10 years or more for the years 1935 to 1960, inclusive.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Average interest rate on marketable issues in each fiscal year with maturities of 10 years or more

Fiscal year	Average interest rate	Average rate rounded to nearest ⅛ of 1 percent
1935	2.97	3
1936	2.76	2¾
1937	2.59	2⅝
1938	2.67	2⅝
1939	2.64	2⅝
1940	2.16	2⅛
1941	2.36	2⅜
1942	2.39	2⅜
1943	2.50	2½
1944	2.30	2¼
1945	2.28	2¼
1946	2.44	2⅜
1947	(1)	
1948	(1)	
1949	(1)	
1950	(1)	
1951	(1)	
1952	(1)	
1953	3.25	3¼
1954	3.25	3¼
1955	3.00	3
1956	3.00	3
1957	(1)	
1958	3.56	3⅝
1959	4.04	4
1960	4.25	4¼

[1] No issues of 10 years or over.

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Office of Debt Analysis, Jan. 18, 1963.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, our country, a world leader and the richest and most progressive in the world, was able to attain this position largely because its economy was based on the philosophy of free enterprise. I will admit that there have been occasions when it was necessary for the Federal Government to underwrite and foster certain programs that could not be performed by private enterprise. The Rural Electrification Administration was such a program. It is only sensible, however, and in the best interests of our economy and the perpetuation of the free enterprise system that once these Federal Government-fostered programs have fulfilled their mission, they should be curtailed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may lie on the desk for 3 days in order that other interested Senators may join as cosponsors should they so desire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECONVEYANCE AT FAIR MARKET VALUE OF 50 ACRES AT CHELI AIR FORCE DEPOT, BELL, CALIF.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into direct negotiation with the Chanslor Western Oil & Development Co. for the sale at full fair market value of approximately 50 acres of land located at the Cheli Air Force Station in Bell, Calif., which has been declared surplus to the needs of the Government.

Mr. President, the Cheli Air Force Depot consists of 388 acres which were originally donated to the Government by the predecessor corporation of Chanslor-Western, then known as the Chanslor-Canfield Midway Oil Co., a subsidiary of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. This subsidiary has had a splendid record of industrial development in the Los Angeles area. During the Second World War, when the Government was in need of land on which to erect an Air Corps supply depot, the Army Air Corps approached Chanslor-Canfield and, early in 1943, an original parcel of 211 acres was conveyed to the U.S. Government for the consideration of $1. A second parcel of 177 acres of adjacent land was deeded to the Government on July 10, 1944, in order to meet the urgent need to expand this depot. Again the consideration was $1.

At the time of the transfer, Chanslor-Canfield asked the Division Engineer of the War Department who was handling the conveyance for return of the property at the same consideration of $1 when it was no longer necessary for the needs of the Government. The War Department informed Chanslor-Canfield that they had no statutory authority by which the Government could relinquish the land acquired by such a donation. Statutory authority was also lacking for the disposal of any improvements which the Government might make on the property.

Congress, in passing the Surplus Property Act of 1944, recognized the equity of permitting the donor to reacquire property when it was no longer needed by the Government. Unfortunately, this law expired on December 13, 1949. At that time there were no indications that the Government would declare the depot as surplus and unneeded for defense purposes.

The first indication that such land would be declared surplus came in 1960. Thus, on March 30, 1961, I introduced S. 1497 which would authorize reconveyance to the former owner of that portion of the property which was declared surplus to the needs of the United States in accordance with existing policy. A hearing was held on this bill by a Special Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations consisting of Senators MUSKIE and JAVITS. This hearing was held on August 22, 1961.

At that hearing I presented various resolutions from many groups in the area who agreed with me that, if this land were to become surplus to the needs of the Government, the reconveyance of the land to Chanslor Western Oil & Development Co. was in the public interest since it would be used as a site for additional industrial development and, thus, provide needed employment opportunities then estimated at between 7,500 and 10,000 new jobs for the residents of Bell and the many surrounding communities. In addition, there would be great added tax benefits to the local taxing districts in whose jurisdictions the property lay as well as to the city of Bell. Organizations which agreed with this position included the following:

Los Angeles County Division of the League of California Cities.

City Council of Bell.

City Council of Downey.

City Council of Huntington Park.

City Council of Lynwood.

City Council of Maywood.

City Council of Montebello.

City Council of Pico Rivera.

City Council of South Gate.

City Council of Vernon.

Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, AFL–CIO.

Los Angeles Building & Construction Trades Council.

Maywood Lodge No. 979 of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen.

Local 243 of the Switchmen's Union of North America.

Chrysler Local 230 of the UAW, AFL–CIO.

Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

Greater East Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

Industrial Council of the City of Commerce.

Bell Chamber of Commerce.

Downey Chamber of Commerce.

Huntington Park Chamber of Commerce.

Maywood Chamber of Commerce.

Montebello Chamber of Commerce.

Vernon Chamber of Commerce.

Bell-Cudahy Democratic Club.

Uptown Huntington Park Democratic Club.

East Los Angeles Merchants Association.

Los Angeles County Council of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

John Henry Carroll Post No. 2325 of the VFW.

Wm. Chas. Orr, Jr., Bell Post 120 of the American Legion.

Los Angeles Times.

Los Angeles Mirror.

Los Angeles Herald Express.

At that time the Montebello Unified School District sought part—approximately 78 acres—of this property on which to construct a junior college and had filed an application in accordance with existing procedures with the General Services Administration. By resolution approved last week by the board of education of the Montebello Unified School District, this application has been withdrawn effective July 19, 1963. Mr. President, a telegram pertaining to this action of the board is as follows:

> The following resolution passed by the board of education, Montebello Unified School District last night:
>
> "Now, therefore, be it
>
> "*Resolved*, That the Montebello Unified School District withdraw its pending application for a Federal grant of land at the Cheli Air Force Station, Bell, Calif., effective date of withdrawal July 19, 1963."
>
> Signed "John C. Whinnery, superintendent of schools, secretary to the board."

Recently the General Services Administration has announced that only approximately 50 acres of the 388 acres will be released for disposal since the GSA has decided to utilize the improved portion of this surplus depot as a regional supply center for southern California. Thus, the legislation which I have today introduced pertains to the 50 acres which were originally donated by the Santa Fe subsidiary and which lies east of Eastern Avenue in the city of Bell. This land has never been utilized by the Government and is unimproved. The proposed legislation which I have introduced would provide that the land would be sold at its current fair market value as determined by the Administrator of General Services. If within 90 days after the Administrator's determination of the fair market value an acceptable offer is not received from Chanslor-Western and a sale is not consummated in an appropriate manner, then the Administrator would dispose of the land in accordance with the existing provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

Mr. President, I ask consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in my remarks, and that it lie on the desk until the close of business next Monday, for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from California.

The bill (S. 1928) to authorize the Administrator of General Services to sell a part of the former Cheli Air Force Station to Chanslor-Western Oil & Development Co. by negotiation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is authorized, without regard to the provisions of section 203(e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, 63 Stat. 377, as amended, to negotiate a sale to Chanslor-Western Oil & Development Company of the approximately fifty acres of land in the former Cheli Air Force Station which lie to the east of Eastern Avenue in the city of Bell, County of Los Angeles, State of California, and were included in the report of excess real property of March 24, 1960, as amended, to the Administrator of General Services, to the extent that said land is determined by the Administrator of General Services to be surplus property. Such sale of land is to be made at its current fair market value as determined by the Administrator of General Services.

SEC. 2. If, within ninety days following the receipt of a notice from the Administrator of General Services of the fair market value of said land and of the terms and conditions that would be acceptable for such a sale, Chanslor-Western Oil & Development Company does not submit an acceptable offer to purchase in accordance with the terms and conditions specified by the Administrator of General Services or fails to propose satisfactory arrangements for consummating the purchase, the Administrator of General Services may dispose of said land in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, 63 Stat. 377, as amended.

A BILL CARRYING OUT THE LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS IN PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S IMMIGRATION MESSAGE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, today the President of the United States forwarded to the Congress an historic message relating to basic revision of this Nation's immigration laws.

The President continues his public leadership in seeking an immigration policy which reflects the American belief in the individual worth of each man. As a Member of the House, as a Senator, and as President, President Kennedy has worked continually and effectively toward these goals.

Since President Wilson's eloquent veto of the 1921 law proposing a racially restrictive immigration law, most of the succeeding Presidents of these United States have called upon the Congress to take corrective action. Studies have been made, and limited proposals for legislation have been sent to the Congress.

President Kennedy's message and the accompanying proposed legislation represent the first time in these many years that a specific bill abolishing the national origins quota system has been proposed to the Congress by the President.

It is fitting that this proposal should come at a time when the Nation and the Congress are deeply committed to a full review of our practices and laws affecting our fellow citizens of different races.

No provision of national law has been more repugnant to peoples of many nations throughout the world than one based on the infamous concept of judging a man's worth for immigration to our Nation on the basis of his place of birth or the racial ancestry of his parents. This meanness of spirit in our law is alien and apart from the great traditions of this Nation. As a people we are morally committed to seek a national policy which will make real the simple truth of the words of St. Paul that "God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth."

Earlier this year, I was joined by 36 of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in introducing and sponsoring Senate bill 747. For a number of years this bill, also designed to find a formula for removing from our laws the principle of the national origins immigration concept, has been the basis for increasing public support for legislative action. Through conferences in key metropolitan centers across the country, by resolution of national, religious, fraternal, nationality, veterans, labor, and other broad community groups, the concept and principles contained in Senate bill 747 are widely supported and endorsed.

Earlier this session, hearings on Senate bill 747 were announced by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, but they were postponed as we awaited the proposals from the President. I am hopeful that hearings on all of the bills proposing revisions of the national origins quota provisions can now be rescheduled in the near future.

To those in Congress and those outside it who have supported and worked in support of Senate bill 747, I would say that the provisions of that bill and of the bill which I shall introduce today to carry out the recommendations of the President seek the same fundamental objectives. Many of the provisions of Senate bill 747 and of the bill being introduced today are identical. These bills represent two alternate ways of removing the national origins quota system. I shall actively support the fullest congressional consideration of both proposals.

The legislative task ahead will not be an easy one. To insure the fullest success in achievement of the goals common to all who work on immigration reform, we must have before the Congress the most creative and very best proposals. The President's proposal today moves us many strides toward reaching our goals, and its approach represents the most advanced proposal on this subject placed before the Congress by any Chief Executive. It will also have my support, and I hope all who previously joined with me in sponsoring Senate bill 747 will support it. With these two sound bills before the Congress, we move to the stage where the decision now belongs to the Congress. Let us get on with this job.

Highlights of the President's bill are recounted in his message and in the section-by-section analysis which I shall ask to have printed, be included with the text of the bill, at the end of my remarks. A few comments on the provisions of this proposal are in order.

First, and most important, it recognizes the essential foreign-policy demands of a sound immigration policy. With flexibility in refugee policy, removal of the Asia-Pacific triangle restrictions, increased basic quotas for many new nations, and inclusion of the new nations in the Western Hemisphere within the nonquota areas, this bill is, in its most essential aspects, a major foreign-policy statement.

Equally important, this proposal recognizes that each immigrant, as a individual, has a special worth because of his potential contribution to the total manpower of our Nation, and that this potential should be judged on that individual contribution.

The President knows, from his many years of experience in working to ease the burdens caused by geographic separation of families, that reunification of families must remain at the top of our priority objectives in immigration reform. One of the major provisions of this new bill is the nonquota provision for parents of American citizens and the new preference for parents of American resident aliens.

Today, President Kennedy has called on Congress for action, specific action. It is with a sense of privilege that I introduce the bill to carry out his recommendations.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of the bill and a section-by-section analysis be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

I also ask that the bill be held at the desk until the end of business on Tuesday, July 30, to enable other Senators to join in its sponsorship.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

The bill (S. 1932) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HART (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred

to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 201(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175, 8 U.S.C. 1151(a)) be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 201. (a) The annual quota of any quota area shall be the same quota heretofore determined under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952: *Provided,* That the minimum quota for any quota area shall be two hundred: *Provided further,* That beginning with the first fiscal year commencing after the enactment of this Act and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years the annual quota of every quota area shall be reduced by twenty per centum of its present number for each such fiscal year. The quota numbers so deducted from quotas of quota areas shall be added to the quota reserve established by subsection (f) of this section and shall be available for distribution in accordance with the provisions thereof."

Sec. 2. Section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175, 8 U.S.C. 1151) is amended by adding the following additional subsection:

"(f) Quota numbers made available at the commencement of any fiscal year as a result of the reduction of the annual quota of any quota areas pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, together with quota numbers not issued or otherwise used during the previous fiscal year, shall then be made available (1) during the five fiscal years following the passage of this Act, to quota immigrants, if otherwise admissible under the provisions of this Act, who are unable to obtain prompt issuance of visas due to oversubscription of their quotas or subquotas as determined by the Secretary of State, and (2), thereafter, to quota immigrants if otherwise admissible under the provisions of this Act. These quota numbers shall be allocated within the percentage limitations and in the order of priority specified in section 203 without regard to the quota to which the alien is chargeable: *Provided, however,* That the combined number of quota numbers issued to any quota area in any year, under the provisions of this subsection and subsection (a) of this section, shall not exceed ten per centum of the total quota numbers authorized for that year: *Provided further,* That in no case shall this limitation operate to reduce any quota in any of the five fiscal years following the enactment of this Act by more than the twenty per centum specified in subsection (a) of this section: *And provided further,* That the President may, after consultation with the Immigration Board, reserve—

"(1) Not to exceed fifty per centum of such numbers for allocation to quota immigrants, if otherwise admissible under the provisions of this Act, whose admission is determined by him to be required (A) to avoid undue hardship, resulting from the reduction of annual quotas pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, which is not otherwise avoided under the provisions of this subsection, and (B) in the national security interest of the United States: *Provided,* That the limitation on immigration from any single country in any year shall not apply to visas issued under this clause; and

"(2) Not to exceed twenty per centum of such numbers for allocation to quota immigrants, if otherwise admissible under the provisions of this Act, whose admission will further the traditional policy of the United States of offering asylum and refuge to persons oppressed or persecuted, or threatened with oppression or persecution, because of their race, color, religion, national origin, adherence to democratic beliefs, or their opposition to totalitarianism or dictatorship, and to persons uprooted by natural calamity or military operations who are unable to return to their usual place of abode. After consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of State shall establish by regulation the requirements for qualification within this class, with reference to current world conditions.

In no case shall the authority to reserve such numbers, or the limitation on the combined number of quota numbers to be issued to any quota area in any year, operate so as to require that authorized quota numbers be unused."

Sec. 3. Section 201(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 176, 8 U.S.C. 1151(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"There shall be issued to quota immigrants chargeable to any quota (1) no more immigrant visas in any fiscal year than the quota for such year, and (2) in any calendar month of any fiscal year, no more immigrant visas than ten per centum of the quota for such year in addition to that portion of the quota authorized for issuance but not issued during any preceding calendar month or months of the same fiscal year; except that during the last two months of any fiscal year immigrant visas may be issued without regard to the 10 per centum limitation contained herein."

Sec. 4. (a) Section 202(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 176, 8 U.S.C. 1152(a)) is amended by deleting paragraph (5) thereof.

(b) Section 202(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 177, 8 U.S.C. 1152 (b)) is repealed.

(c) Section 202(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 177, 8 U.S.C. 1152 (c)) is redesignated section 202(b) and is amended to read as follows:

"Any immigrant born in a colony or other component or dependent area of a governing county for which no separate or specific quota has been established, unless a nonquota immigrant as provided in section 101(a)(27) of this Act, shall be chargeable to the quota of the governing country, except that no more persons born in any such colony or other component or dependent area overseas from the governing country shall be chargeable to the quota of its governing country in any one year than a number which bears the same relation to the quota of its governing country as the number two hundred bears to the quota of the governing country prior to the enactment of this Act."

(d) Section 202(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178, 8 U.S.C. 1152(d)) is redesignated section 202(c).

(e) Section 202(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178), as amended (75 Stat. 654), (8 U.S.C. 1152(e)) is redesignated section 202(d) and is further amended by substituting "section 202(b)" for "section 202(c)(1)" after the words "issued under".

Sec. 5. Section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 181, 8 U.S.C. 1157) is repealed, and the following inserted in its place:

"A quota immigrant visa shall not be issued to any alien who is eligible for a nonquota immigrant visa."

Sec. 6. Paragraph (27)(A) of section 101 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 169, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) An immigrant who is the child, spouse, or parent of a citizen of the United States."

Sec. 7. Paragraph (27)(C) of section 101 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 169, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)(C) is amended to read as follows:

"(C) An immigrant who was born in any independent foreign country of North, Central, or South America, or in any independent island country adjacent thereto, or in the Canal Zone, and the spouse and children of any such immigrant, if accompanying or following to join him:".

Sec. 8. (a) Section 203(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178, 8 U.S.C. 1153(a)(1)) is amended by deleting the words "determined by the Attorney General to be needed urgently in," and substituting the words "especially advantageous to."

(b) Section 203(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178), as amended (73 Stat. 644, 8 U.S.C. 1153(a)(2)), is amended by deleting the words "parents of citizens of the United States, such citizens being at least twenty-one years of age or who are the".

(c) Section 203(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178), as amended (73 Stat. 644, 8 U.S.C. 1153(a)(4)) is amended by—

(1) inserting after the words "married daughters of citizens of the United States" a comma, followed by the words "or parents of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence," and

(2) adding at the end thereof the following: "Qualified quota immigrants capable of performing specified functions for which a shortage of employable and willing persons exists in the United States shall be entitled to a preference not to exceed 50 per centum of the immigrant visas remaining available for issuance under this paragraph after the preference to the named relatives of United States citizens and resident aliens is satisfied or exhausted."

Sec. 9. Section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 179, 8 U.S.C. 1154) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsections (a) and (c) are amended by deleting the words "or section 203(a)(1)(A)" and substituting, in each instance, a comma, followed by the words "section 203 (a)(1)(A) or the last clause of section 203 (a)(4)."

(2) Subsection (b) is amended (A) by deleting the words "section 203(a)(1)(A)" and substituting the words "the last clause of section 203(a)(4)" and (B) by inserting, after the words "required by the Attorney General" the words "after consultation with the Immigration Board."

(3) Subsection (d) is redesignated (e) and is amended by deleting the words "or section 203(a)(1)(A)," and substituting a comma, followed by the words "section 203 (a)(1)(A) or the last clause of section 203 (a)(4)."

(4) The following new subsection is inserted after subsection (c):

"(d) Any immigrant claiming in his application to be entitled to an immigrant visa under section 203(a)(1)(A) of the Act shall file a petition with the Attorney General. The petition shall be in such form as the Attorney General may by regulations prescribe and shall contain such additional information and be supported by such documentary evidence as may be required by the Attorney General. The petition shall be made under oath administered by any individual having authority to administer oaths, if executed in the United States, but, if executed outside the United States, administered by a consular officer."

Sec. 10. The first sentence of section 205 (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 180), as amended (73 Stat. 644), (8 U.S.C. 1155(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Any citizen of the United States claiming that any immigrant is his spouse, child, or parent, and that such immigrant is entitled to a nonquota immigrant status under section 101(a)(27)(A) of this Act, or any citizen of the United States claiming that any immigrant is his unmarried son or unmarried daughter and that such immigrant is entitled to a quota immigrant status under section 203(a)(2) of this Act, or any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence claiming that any immigrant is his spouse or his unmarried son or unmarried daughter and that such immigrant is entitled to a quota immigrant status under section 203(a)(3) of this Act, or any citizen of the United States claiming that any immigrant is his brother or sister or his married son or his married daughter and that such immigrant is entitled to a preference under section 203(a)(4) of this Act, or any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence claiming that any immigrant is his parent and that such immigrant is entitled to a preference under section 203(a)(4) of this Act, may file a petition with the Attorney General."

Sec. 11. (a) Section 1 of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504), is amended by inserting the word "and" after the words "communist-occupied," by inserting a period after the word "made," and by deleting the third clause of said section and the word "and" immediately preceding it.

(b) Section 2 of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504), as amended (76 Stat. 124), is amended by deleting (1) the letter "(a)" immediately following the words "Sec. 2", and (2) subsection (b) thereof.

Sec. 12. Section 15(c)(2) of the Act of September 11, 1957 (71 Stat. 644) is amended by deleting the word "Libya" and inserting the word "Morocco" in its place.

Sec. 13. Section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 230, 8 U.S.C. 1351) is amended as follows:

(1) Immediately after "Sec. 281," insert "(a)".

(2) Paragraph (2) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) For the issuance of each immigrant visa, $20; except that such fee shall be $10 in the case of any alien who is the beneficiary of a petition required under sections 204(b) or 205(b)."

(3) The following is inserted after paragraph (7), and is designated subsection (b):

"The time and manner of payment of the fees specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) of this section, including but not limited to partial deposit or prepayment at the time of registration, or postponement for an appropriate period, shall be prescribed by the Secretary of State."

(4) The paragraph beginning with the words "The fees * * *" is designated subsection (c).

Sec. 14. Section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 179, 8 U.S.C. 1153(c)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The Secretary of State, in his discretion, may terminate the registration on a quota waiting list of any alien who fails to evidence his continued intention to apply for a visa in such manner as may be by regulation prescribed."

Sec. 15. (a) Paragraph (4) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182, 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(4)) is amended by deleting the word "epilepsy" and the commas before and after it.

(b) Section 212(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (75 Stat. 654, 8 U.S.C. 1182(g)) is amended to read as follows:

"Any alien who is excludable from the United States under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), or (4) of subsection (a) of this section, and any alien afflicted with tuberculosis in any form, who (A) is the spouse or the unmarried son or daughter, or the minor unmarried lawfully adopted child, of a United States citizen, or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or of an alien who has been issued an immigrant visa, or (B) has a son or daughter who is a United States citizen, or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or an alien who has been issued an immigrant visa, shall, if otherwise admissible, be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence in accordance with such terms, conditions, and controls, if any, including the giving of a bond, as the Attorney General, in his discretion after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, may by regulations prescribe."

Sec. 16. (a) There is hereby established the Immigration Board (hereafter referred to as the "Board"). The Board shall consist of seven members, of whom three members, including a chairman of the Board, shall be appointed by the President, two members by the President of the Senate, and two members by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The members of the Board shall be selected by virtue of their high personal integrity, their capabilities, and their experience in and expert knowledge of immigration laws and international migration problems. A vacancy in the membership of the Board shall be filled in the same manner as the original designation and appointment.

(b) The duties of the Board shall be—

(1) to promulgate, after consultation with the Attorney General, such regulations as are necessary to insure its efficient functioning under the provisions of this Act;

(2) to make a continuous study of such conditions within and without the United States, which, in the opinion of the Board, might have any bearing on the immigration policy of the United States;

(3) to consider, and after consultation with the Secretary of State, to recommend to the President, such allocation of quota immigrant visas, under section 201(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as will best fulfill the purposes of that section;

(4) to consider, and after consultation with the secretaries of Labor, State, and Defense, to recommend to the Attorney General such criteria for admission of immigrants under section 203(a)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, and the last clause of section 203(a)(4), as amended, as will further the policy of the United States to secure the immigration of persons of high skill, education, or training, or who are capable of performing specified functions for which a shortage of employable, willing persons exists in the United States;

(5) to study such other aspects of the Immigration and Nationality Act as the President shall assign to the Board for study, and make recommendations with respect thereto;

(6) to conduct such investigations and to hold such public and executive hearings in such places within and without the United States and at such times as the Board deems necessary.

(c) All Federal agencies shall cooperate fully with the Board to the end that it may effectively carry out its duties.

(d) Each member of the Board who is not otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall receive the sum of $75 for each day spent in the work of the Board, shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses, when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended.

(e) Each member of the Board who is otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for such other service, but while engaged in the work of the Board shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses, when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended.

(f) There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

Sec. 17. Section 221(g) of the Immigration and Nationailty Act (66 Stat. 192, 8 U.S.C. 1201(g)) is amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and by substituting the following:

"*Provided further,* That a visa may be issued to an alien defined in section 101(a) (15) (B) or (F), if such alien is otherwise entitled to receive a visa, upon receipt of a notice by the consular officer from the Attorney General of the giving of a bond with sufficient surety in such sum and containing such conditions as the consular officer shall prescribe, to insure that at the expiration of the time for which such alien has been admitted by the Attorney General, as provided in section 214(a), or upon failure to maintain the status under which he was admitted, or to maintain any status subsequently acquired under section 248 of the Act, such alien will depart from the United States."

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. Hart is as follows:

Section-by-Section Analysis

Section 1 amends section 201(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, under which quotas for each country are determined. It abolishes the national origins system by reducing present quotas by one-fifth of their present number each year for 5 years. As numbers are released from national origins quotas, they are added to the quota reserve established in section 2. Thus in the first year, 20 percent (roughly 32,800) are released to the pool; in the second year, the pool has 40 percent of present quotas (or 65,600); until the fifth year, all numbers are allocated through the pool. To provide some immediate relief to minimum quota areas, the minimum quota is raised to 200, but is then reduced in the same manner as other quotas.

Section 2 establishes the quota reserve pool under which all numbers will be allocated by the fifth year. In each of the 5 years constituting the period of transition, the pool will consist of (1) the numbers released from national origins quotas each year, and (2) numbers assigned to the old quotas but unused the previous year because insufficient demand for them existed in the assigned quota area.

These numbers are issued in the order specified in amended section 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. That is, first call on the first 50 percent is given to persons whose admission, by virtue of their exceptional skill, training, or education, would be especially advantageous to the United States; first call on the next 30 percent, plus any part of the first 50 percent not issued to the skilled specialists, is given to unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens, not eligible for nonquota status because they are over 21 years of age; first call on the remaining 20 percent, plus any part of the first 80 percent not taken by the first two classes, is given to spouses and children of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence; and any portion remaining is issued to other applicants, with percentage preferences to other relations of U.S. citizens and resident aliens, and then to certain classes of workers. Section 203 further provides that within each class, visas are issued in the order in which applied for—first come, first served. These preferences provisions, which under present law determine only relative priority between nationals of the same country, will now determine priority between nationals of different countries throughout the world.

To prevent disproportionate benefits to the nationals of any single country, a maximum of 10 percent of the total authorized quota is set on immigration attributable to any quota area. However, this limitation is not applied if to do so would result in reducing any quota at a more rapid rate than that provided by section 1. Ultimately, of course, the limitation applies to all.

Exceptions to the principle of allocating visas on the basis of time of registration within preference classes are provided to deal with specific problems. Since some countries' quotas are now current, their nationals have no old registrations on file. To apply the principle rigidly would result, after 4 or 5 years, in curtailing immigration from these countries almost entirely. Such a result would be undesirable not only because it frustrates the aim of the bill that immigration from all countries should continue, but also because many of the countries so affected are our closest allies. At a time when the national security rests in large part on a continual strengthening of our ties with these countries, it would be anomalous indeed to restrict opportunities for their nationals here. Therefore, the bill allows the President, after consultation with the Immigration Board (established by sec. 16), to reserve up to 50 percent of the reserve pool for allocation to qualified immigrants (1) who could obtain visas under the present system but not under the new bill, whose admission (2) would further the national security interest in maintaining close ties with their countries. He is also given authority to grant visas to such immigrants without regard to the 10-percent limit on the number of immigrants from any country.

The President may also disregard priority of registration within preference classes for the benefit of refugees. Many refugees, almost by definition, are uprooted suddenly. They have had no thought of immigration before being forced to leave their usual homes by natural calamity or political upheaval; or they may be fleeing from persecution or dictatorship, in which case previous registration would have been dangerous. He may consider these and other factors in deciding whether to admit any applicant as a refugee or require him to await his turn under the regular procedure.

Finally, it is provided that if the President reserves, against contingencies, any numbers during the year, but does not then find them needed for the named purposes, they are to be issued as if not reserved. Similarly, the 10-percent limitation on the number of visas to be issued to any quota area is removed where other persons would not be foreclosed from entry by its removal.

Section 3 amends section 201(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which presently limits the number of visas issued in any single month to 10 percent of the total issued each year. This limit is needed to insure that persons entitled to preference by virtue of skills or family ties will not be foreclosed from that preference by a rush of earlier applications which exhaust the annual quota. To insure that all numbers are nevertheless issued, present law provides that numbers not issued during the first 10 months may be issued during the last 2 months of the fiscal year, without limitation up to the total annual quota for the quota area. Often, if close to the full 10 percent is not issued in each of the first months, undesirable administrative problems result in the last two. The amendment allows the issuance each month of the 10 percent authorized for that month plus any visas authorized but not issued in previous months. It thus allows more even spacing of visa issuance during the year.

Section 4 amends section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the so-called Asia-Pacific triangle provisions, which require persons of Asian stock to be attributed to quota areas not by their place of birth, but according to their racial ancestry. By the end of 5 years, this provision would be superfluous in any case, since national origin will no longer limit the admission of qualified immigrants. But the formula is so specially discriminatory that it should be removed immediately, and not operate even in part during the 5-year transition period.

Subsection (c) raises the minimum allotment to subquotas of dependent countries, thus preserving their present equality with independent minimum-quota areas. The dependent countries' allotments are taken from the mother countries' quotas. To prevent the dependent countries from preempting the mother countries' quotas disproportionately, it is provided that the dependent countries' shares of the quotas will decrease as the governing countries' quotas are reduced.

Subsection (e) conforms the present section 202(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to the change in designation prescribed in subsection (c).

Section 5 repeals section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which prevents the issuance of visas in lieu of those issued but not actually used, or later found to be improperly issued. Thus in Germany alone, under present law, over 7,000 visas are taken by persons entitled to nonquota status, and 2,000 more visas are issued to persons who do not apply for actual admission. All these visas are lost. Such a result is inconsistent with the new bill, which seeks full use of authorized quota numbers.

Substituted for section 207 is a specific command that nonquota immigrants shall not preempt visas which would otherwise be issued to quota immigrants.

Section 6 amends section 101(a)(27)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which grants nonquota status to spouses and children of U.S. citizens, to extend nonquota status to parents of U.S. citizens as well.

Section 7 amends section 101(a)(27)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to extend nonquota status to all natives of independent Western Hemisphere countries. Under present law, such status is granted to natives of all independent North, Central, and South American countries, and of all Caribbean island countries independent when the Immigration and Nationality Act was enacted in 1952. The amendment extends the status to countries gaining their independence since then.

Section 8 amends section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which establishes preferences for immigrants with special skills and relatives of U.S. citizens and resident aliens.

Subsection (a) relaxes the test for the first preference accorded to persons of high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability. Under present law, such persons are granted preferred status only if their services are "needed urgently" in the United States. The amendment allows their admission if their services would be "especially advantageous" to the United States.

Subsection (b) eliminates the second preference for parents of American citizens, now accorded nonquota status by section 6.

Subsection (c) grants a fourth preference, up to 50 percent of numbers not issued to the first three preferences, to parents of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence. It also grants a subsidiary preference to qualified quota immigrants capable of filling particular labor shortages in the United States. Under present law, if an immigrant does not meet the rigorous standards of the skilled specialist category, he is not preferred to any other immigrant even though he may answer a definite need in the United States which the other immigrant does not. The amendment allows to persons filling such a definite need a preference of 50 percent of visas remaining after all family preferences have been satisfied or exhausted.

Section 9 amends section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which establishes the procedure for determining eligibility for preferred status under section 203.

Paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) provide for the filing of petitions, on behalf of the workers granted preference by section 8, by the persons who will employ them to fill the special needs. Paragraph (1) provides for approval of these petitions by the Attorney General, and paragraph (2) requires that he consult with the Immigration Board and interested departments of government before granting preference to these workers with lesser skills.

Paragraph (2) also exempts skilled specialists from the present petition procedure, to conform to the new procedure established in paragraph (4). Under present law, persons with high education, technical training, experience or ability, may qualify for preferred status only when a petition requesting their services is filed by a U.S. employer. This requirement unduly restricts our ability to attract the educated, trained people whose services would significantly enhance our economy, national life, and general welfare. Thousands of such people have no way of contacting employers in the United States in order to get the necessary job. Even if they knew whom to contact, few jobs important enough to attract such highly skilled people are offered without personal interviews. And only a few very large enterprises and institutions have representatives abroad with possible authority to hire. Thus many highly skilled applicants cannot obtain the jobs presently required for preference; they cannot be hired abroad, because hiring is done domestically; and they cannot be hired domestically until they enter.

Moreover, the requirement of prearranged employment, as to these persons, is unnecessary. Such a requirement may serve two ends. First, it may help to insure that the immigrant, granted preference for a defined purpose, will fulfill that purpose; if we need engineers, he should work as one. Highly skilled specialists, however, will always work at their speciality, provided that employment is open. The only check needed, therefore, is that the Attorney General ascertain from the Board (which has consulted the Secretary of Labor and studied such problems with specific reference to immigrants) that job openings exist in the immigrants' special field. The second end the present petition procedure may serve is confirmation of the applicant's own evidence of his training, education, or skills; presumably he would not be employed unless qualified. But such confirmation is superfluous if proper controls are enforced when the visa is applied for. And since we allow immigrants to enter without U.S. citizens vouching for their loyalty—a far more important matter—there seems no reason to require their capability to be thus additionally supported.

Paragraph (4), therefore, allows the Attorney General to grant preferred status to highly skilled immigrants upon affidavit of the immigrants, supported by such other documentary evidence as he shall prescribe.

Section 10 amends section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, providing for petitions to establish the right to preferred status as a relative of a U.S. citizen or lawfully resident alien, to conform to the substantive changes made by section 8.

Section 11 amends the "fair share" refugee law to remove a provision which has hampered its operation. Presently, that law allows the entry only of refugees within the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. The provision relating to the United Nations mandate is striken out, so that our refugee law is no longer subject to outside control. In addition, subsection (b) repeals the "fair share" law's special provision for 500 "difficult to resettle refugees"; these have all been settled and the authority is now unnecessary.

Section 12 amends the Refugee Relief Act to allow the admission of refugees from North Africa generally, and Algeria particularly, who are unable to return to their countries because of their race, religion, or political opinions. The act now admits such refugees from "any country within the general area of the Middle East," which is defined as the area between Libya on the west, Turkey on the north, Pakistan on the east, and Saudi Arabia and Ethiopia on the south. The amendment substitutes Morocco for Libya as the western border of this area.

Section 13 grants discretionary authority to the Secretary of State to specify the time and manner of payment of the fees for visa applications and issuances set by section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The discretion granted will allow him to control two undesirable situations.

(1) Many people in countries with oversubscribed quotas register their names on visa waiting lists even though they have no present intention of immigrating; they regard the registration as insurance against a possible future move. These registrations make planning difficult and encumber administration. The amendment would allow the Secretary of State to require a registrant to deposit part of the $5 visa fee at the time of registration. While not unduly burdensome on those who wish to come here, such a rule might discourage the most frivolous registrations.

(2) Otherwise admissible immigrants, particularly refugees, are often unable to pay the $20 visa fee. Rather than bar them from entry, the Secretary is given authority to allow postponement of payment until they have earned the money here.

Section 281 is further amended to equalize the visa fees paid by all immigrants; at present, nonquota or preference applicants must pay $10 more than persons not entitled to priority.

Section 14, like section 13, addresses the problem of insurance registrations. Many people who applied for visas years ago and have been offered visas repeatedly, have turned them down each year. They wish only to preserve their priority against some future event. This addition to section 302 (c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act would allow the Secretary to terminate the registrations of those who had previously declined a visa. Like section 13, it also is important in connection with a projected reregistration of all applicants in certain oversubscribed quota areas, in which we have no way of knowing whether registrants have died, emigrated elsewhere, or changed their minds; the Secretary could terminate the registration of all persons who fail to reregister as required. The provision is not made mandatory to avoid embarrassing or endangering registrants in totalitarian countries, who have no desire to approach an embassy before visas are actually available for them.

Section 15 amends subsections (a) (4) and (g) of section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to allow the entry of certain mentally afflicted persons. Under present law, no visas may be issued to aliens who are feebleminded or insane, or have had one or more attacks of insanity, or who are afflicted with a psychopathic personality, epilepsy, or a mental defect. This provision has an unfortunate effect on families seeking admission though one member, often a child, is retarded or feebleminded. Such families are forced to choose between leaving the child behind, or staying with it; in either case, the child is condemned to facilities for treatment which are often inadequate. The person afflicted may not enter even if the family is willing and able to care for him, nor even if he is one of the 85 percent of mentally afflicted persons who can be substantially helped by proper treatment.

The amendment gives the Attorney General discretionary authority to admit such persons who are the spouses, children or parents of citizens, resident aliens, or holders of immigrant visas. The Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, would prescribe the controls and conditions on entry, such as the giving of a bond to insure continued family support, as would be appropriate in each case.

The bars to epileptics are removed entirely, since this affliction is now under the control of modern medicine. Those few epileptics whose illness prevents normal functioning will be excludable under the provision barring persons likely to become public charges.

Section 16 establishes the Immigration Board. The Board is composed of seven members. Two are appointed by the Speaker of the House, two by the President of the Senate, and three, including the Chairman, by the President. Members not otherwise in Government service are paid on a per diem basis for actual time spent in the work of the Board.

The Board's duties are to study, and consult with, appropriate Government departments on all facets of immigration policy; to recommend to the President whether to reserve quota numbers in the national interest under section 2; and to recommend to the Attorney General criteria for admission under the occupational preferences of section 8.

Section 17 grants consular officers discretionary authority to require bonds insuring that certain nonimmigrants will depart voluntarily from the United States when required. At present, some students and visitors are denied visas because there is doubt whether they are bona fide nonimmigrants. The amendment, by providing an additional safeguard against a later refusal to depart, would allow the issuance of visas in many borderline cases in which visas are now refused.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Michigan for his leadership in the field of immigration. Heretofore, he and I have joined in the introduction of other bills dealing with immigration problems. One of them—Senate bill 747, which now is before us—has had the approval of a large number of organizations; and we have been doing our best to have some action taken in this field.

I am very pleased that the executive branch has now made these proposals and am sympathetic to the approach in this bill. The fact that the Chief Executive has now supported efforts at immigration reform is very important and I shall certainly exert every possible effort to have such legislation enacted at this session.

Mr. President, I am very happy to join the Senator from Michigan in the introduction of this bill, and hope that there will be prompt hearings on this important subject.

Mr. HART. Of course I am grateful to the Senator from New York. He did not say—but I shall—that Senate bill 747 is known as the Hart-Keating bill. I hope either that bill or another one containing the best features of both will become the law of the land.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE HIGHWAY REVENUE ACT OF 1956

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 to eliminate delay in the building of the Interstate Highway System.

As originally planned, the Highway Trust Fund was established so as to bring about a balance between receipts and expenditures over the entire life of the interstate highway program. Authors of the act realized that during construction of the system, there would be years during which the authorized expenditures would exceed revenues. Therefore, they provided that during these years, amounts could be borrowed from the general fund of the Treasury so that the program could be kept on schedule.

The Senate, however, added a provision to the bill, section 209(g), the so-called Byrd amendment, which was "to give assurance that no deficit will developed in the highway trust fund." According to this provision, whenever the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the fund balance is insufficient to meet expenditures required by the highway authorization act, he is to notify the Secretary of Commerce who then is required to reduce the amounts available for apportionment to the States so that no deficiency will occur. As a result of this amendment, we now have a year-by-year balance of revenues and expenditures rather than the originally anticipated revenue-expenditure balance over the life of the program. This produces a seesaw arrangement, with the States and the Federal Government jockeying for financial convergence.

My bill, by repealing section 209(g), will restore the original intent of the act, and will eliminate the financial seesaw effect now achieved. The program will be, as before, self-financing.

All of us who have driven over the twin-ribbon interstate highways are aware of the added speed and convenience they provide. But, more important, these highways are safer. It is estimated that when the program is completed, an estimated 4,000 lives a year will be saved and approximately 150,000 injuries will be prevented. This, it seems to me, is reason enough to take the steps necessary to assure completion of the program on schedule or, if possible ahead of schedule. Therefore, I hope my colleagues in the Senate will give this measure their careful and symathetic consideration.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1934) to repeal the provisions of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 requiring certain adjustments of apportionments depending upon the amount of funds available in the Highway Trust Fund; introduced by Mr.

HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

MAKING SECTION 3 OF THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT A PART OF THE CLAYTON ACT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act.

The need for this proposed legislation has been apparent to supporters and defenders of small business since January 20, 1958. On that date, by a 5-to-4 split decision, the Supreme Court decided the companion cases of Safeway Stores against Vance (355 U.S. 389) and Nashville Milk Company against Carnation Co. (355 U.S. 373). These decisions held that an action by a private party for injunctive relief and treble damages under sections 4 and 16 of the Clayton Act did not lie for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act. The Court reached this result by concluding that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act was not an "antitrust law," as such laws are defined in section 1 of the Clayton Act.

On January 23, 1958, just 3 days after the Safeway and Carnation decisions, I introduced a bill, S. 3079, 85th Congress, to cure this defect in the antitrust laws revealed by the opinion of the Court's majority. S. 3079 attempted to reach and solve the problem by simply amending the definition of "antitrust laws" in section 1 of the Clayton Act expressly to include the Robinson-Patman Act. That bill has subsequently been introduced and reintroduced by a number of Members of both Houses of Congress. Enactment of S. 3079 was recommended by a unanimous Senate Small Business Committee in Senate Report 1855, 85th Congress, 2d session, 1958, at page 12. My original bill also won the support of the Justice Department in the Eisenhower administration, in principle, although certain technical deficiencies were noted. It is my understanding that the Justice Department under the present administration also approves of the general principle that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act should be made an "antitrust law" by express legislation. The bill I introduce today seeks again to achieve this goal, but by a different and, I believe, technically better method.

The method employed by my new bill is to repeal section 3 of the Robinson Patman Act and reenact it as section 3A of the Clayton Act. Since the Clayton Act is an antitrust law, this device will entitle all of those having an interest in or damaged by violation of the section to all of the civil remedies available for the enforcement of other sections of the Clayton and Sherman Acts, notably to private treble-damage actions and suits for injunctive relief.

Section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act (15 U.S.C. 13a) prohibits three separate and distinct types of price discrimination: First, discrimination against competitors of a purchaser; second, discrimination between parts of the country for the purpose of destroying local competition or a local competitor; and third, any unreasonably low pricing aimed at destroying competition or eliminating competitors. Precisely similar prohibitions are not found elsewhere in the laws designed to preserve our free competitive enterprise system; hence the importance of giving this section the status of an antitrust law.

The reason for the new approach taken by this bill—that is, repealing section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act and immediately reenacting it as a section of the Clayton Act—is perhaps best explained by quoting a paragraph from the comments of the Department of Justice on my original bill, S. 3079 of the 85th Congress. Then Deputy Attorney General Leonard E. Walsh, in a report to the Senate Judiciary Committee, wrote, in part, as follows:

> It is noted that in its present form the bill does not make section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act in terms a specific amendment to the Clayton Act, and thereby leaves undefined the words "person" and "Commerce" used in that section. Absent definitions such as those in section 1 of the Clayton Act, for example, it might be held that "person" includes only natural persons, not organizations, a result which Congress obviously did not intend. Moreover, unless section 3 is made clearly amendatory to the Clayton Act, the Government may be unable to use injunctive proceedings under section 15 of that Act (15 U.S.C. 25) against section 3 violations, for the injunction proceedings are limited to those directed to restraining "violations of this Act," the Clayton Act. It would appear that these defects could be remedied by amendment of the legislation to state expressly that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act is made an amendment of the Clayton Act.
>
> The letter from Deputy Attorney General Walsh concludes:
>
> Subject to the above suggested amendment, the Department of Justice favors the enactment of the measure. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Mr. President, section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act is potentially one of the strongest weapons available to small businessmen in their struggle for survival. The section has never attained its full potential, however, because it is a criminal statute and therefore outside the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission, and because, under the Safeway and Carnation decisions, it has not been available to private antitrust litigants. The section has been given a new importance by the recent decision of the Supreme Court in U.S. against National Dairy Corp. (372 U.S. 29), which has affirmed its constitutionality. I therefore earnestly hope that this Congress will enact the bill I am introducing today in order to remove the last obstacle to the full development of the utility of this section, by giving it the status of a section of the Clayton Act.

I am very pleased to announce that the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly [Mr. KEFAUVER] is cosponsoring this legislation, as are the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. I am pleased, also, to announce that invitations extended to members of the Senate Small Business Committee to join me in sponsoring this legislation have thus far been accepted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. Because not all members of the committee have as yet had an opportunity to consider this legislation and respond to my invitation, I ask unanimous consent that it lie on the table for 1 week. During that week, I shall, of course, be delighted to have any other interested Member of this body, whether or not a member of the Small Business Committee, add his name as a cosponsor of this bill.

I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk and be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

The bill (S. 1935) to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to amend section 2 of the Act entitled 'An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes', approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U.S.C., title 15, sec. 13), and for other purposes", approved June 19, 1936 (49 Stat. 1528, 15 U.S.C. 13a) is repealed.

SEC. 2. (a) The Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914, as amended (38 Stat. 730 et seq.; 15 U.S.C. 12 et seq.), commonly known as the Clayton Act, is amended by inserting therein, immediately after section 3 thereof, the following new section:

"SEC. 3A. It shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, to be a party to, or assist in, any transaction of sale, or contract to sell, which discriminates to his knowledge against competitors of the purchaser, in that, any discount, rebate, allowance, or advertising service charge is granted to the purchaser over and above any discount, rebate, allowance, or advertising service charge available at the time of such transaction to said competitors in respect of a sale of goods of like grade, quality, and quantity; to sell, or contract to sell, goods in any part of the United States at prices lower than those exacted by said person elsewhere in the United States for the purpose of destroying competition, or eliminating a competitor in such part of the United States; or, to sell, or contract to sell, goods at unreasonably low prices for the purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competitor.

"Any person violating any of the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both."

(b) Sections 11 and 16 of that Act, as amended (15 U.S.C. 21, 26), are amended by striking out the words "sections 2, 3, 7, and 8" wherever they appear therein, and inserting in lieu thereof in each instance the words "sections 2, 3, 3A, 7, and 8".

Sec. 3. Nothing herein contained shall affect any pending prosecutions, or judgments or orders of any court issued and in effect or pending on appeal, based on section 3 of the Act of June 19, 1936, prior to the effective date of the repeal thereof by section 1 of this Act.

EXEMPTION OF BI-STATE DEVELOPMENT AGENCY (MISSOURI-ILLINOIS) FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the Bi-State Development Agency of the Missouri-Illinois Metropolitan District is a bi-State agency of the States of Missouri and Illinois, created in 1949 by a compact between those States and consented to by Congress in 1950—Public Law 743, approved August 31, 1950. This compact was amended and supplemented in 1953, 1958, and 1959, and in each instance the amendment was consented to by Congress. The Bi-State Agency is administered by a board of 10 commissioners, 5 of whom are appointed by the Governor of Missouri and 5 by the Governor of Illinois, with the concurrence of the respective State senate.

The Bi-State Agency was created for the purpose of owning and operating various public facilities within the Missouri-Illinois Metropolitan District which includes the cities of St. Louis and East St. Louis and the counties of St. Louis, St. Charles, and Jefferson, Mo., and the counties of Madison, St. Clair, and Monroe, Ill. It has been empowered to acquire, own, and operate public passenger transportation facilities within the described metropolitan district.

Pursuant to this power the Bi-State Agency acquired the properties of 15 transit companies operating in the St. Louis metropolitan area and is now operating a unified public transit system pursuant to temporary operating authority obtained from the Interstate Commerce Commission. Approximately 95 percent of the revenues of the Bi-State Agency are realized from the transportation of passengers in intrastate commerce rendered primarily in the city and county of St. Louis, and the remaining 5 percent of its revenues are realized from transportation of passengers in interstate commerce which is subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The Bi-State Agency has undertaken the operation of a unified public transit system in order to provide a continuous and a more efficient and economic mass transportation service to the St. Louis metropolitan area. Heretofore, the service rendered by 15 transit companies, operating buses and streetcars has been attended by duplicating routes, closed-door restrictions, and other uneconomic practices which increased the total cost of the service and contributed to a decline in passenger revenue. By consolidating the operations into a unified transit system the Bi-State Agency expects to decrease the cost of providing mass transportation, to modernize facilities, to establish a reasonable, nondiscriminatory, zoned fare structure and to provide an efficient, attractive transportation service to the St. Louis metropolitan area.

The Bi-State Agency believes that the attainment of these goals will require its complete and undivided attention. Freedom from regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission would permit it to commit all of its resources to these ends. Such freedom would also give the Bi-State Agency needed flexibility readily to inaugurate changes to cope with the difficult problems which it faces. Therefore, the Bi-State Agency has requested that its transit operation be exempted from the Interstate Commerce Act. For this reason, I am introducing today on behalf of other Senators and myself a joint resolution to free the Bi-State Agency from the delays, burdens, and restrictions of Federal regulation and to permit it to concentrate on solutions to the problems encountered in rendering a mass transportation service to a large metropolitan area.

As a nonprofit public agency, the aims of the Bi-State Agency are essentially identical with those of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is therefore in the public interest, especially in view of the local nature of the transportation service being rendered by the agency, to permit it to operate a mass transit system in the St. Louis metropolitan area unfettered by regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. President, I introduce on behalf of myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], and the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to exempt the Bi-State Development Agency, its affiliates and the transportation rendered by either, whether by motor or rail, within the Bi-State Development District from the applicability of the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and the rules, regulations, and orders promulgated thereunder.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 104) exempting the Bi-State Development Agency, its affiliates and the transportation rendered by either, whether by motor or rail, within the Bi-State Development District from the applicability of the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and the rules, regulations, and orders promulgated thereunder, introduced by Mr. Long of Missouri (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION ON AUTOMATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, while the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] is in the Chamber, I announce, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], that it is our intention, either later today or tomorrow, to introduce a joint resolution to authorize the appointment of a Presidential Commission on Automation. We are advising with the administration. Before introducing the joint resolution, we wish to have the advice of the White House, the Department of Labor, and the Bureau of the Budget.

It may be that we shall desire to have some changes made in the joint resolution; but it conveys the idea of having the Congress join the President in the development and creation of such a commission—a fundamental idea which we desire to present to the Congress. We hope to receive the comments of the Department of Labor and of the President's office on the provisions of this measure. Inasmuch as the President would appoint the Commission, the provisions of the joint resolution should be satisfactory to him. For myself and other Senators who will join me in the introduction of the joint resolution, I wish to state that we believe we certainly should do our utmost to conform in every way to the President's desires.

We believe it highly desirable to present to Congress the proposal incorporated in the President's message, in order to bring to the attention of the President and of Congress the concept that the Commission should be representative of the entire Government, including the legislative arm.

In his message to the Congress on the railroad strike problem Monday, the President stated that the automation issue, which is particularly acute in that case, is in reality a much broader one which affects the entire economy of the Nation. To reflect this, he proposed to appoint a Presidential commission composed of both private citizens and Government officials. The commission would be charged with the responsibility of identifying and describing worker displacement likely to occur within the next 10 years, and the social and economic effects of these developments on our entire social structure; and of making recommendations to the Federal Government, to all levels of State and local government, and to management and labor outlining steps to be taken so that individual workers are not harmed while the Nation reaps the benefits, to which it is entitled, of increasing automation. The joint resolution which we propose to introduce would join the Congress with the President in creating a commission along these lines.

Such a body, drawing upon the combined expertise of all sectors of economy and Government, has been recommended by Senator Morse and has long been a recommendation of mine. The latest in a series of bills along these lines is S. 1302, introduced on April 10 by myself and Senator COOPER, to create a National Productivity Council, which in its main outlines is much like the commission recommended by the President. Similarly, Senator MORSE in dealing with U.S. labor problems had long urged that a Presidential commission be established to deal with the problem of automation.

The resolution of the automation problem will have a decisive effect upon the many other deep economic problems plaguing our Nation, including our wholly unacceptable rate of endemic unemployment, widespread underutilization and obsolescence of production facilities, and aggravated labor-management differences. The joint resolution emphasizes the variety of means which must be explored in order to prevent hardship on the individual worker due to the impact of automation. These include: retraining, relocation, early retirement, preference in rehiring and employment services, and interim compensation during unemployment induced by automation.

These techniques are primarily the responsibility of industry, but they may of necessity also become the responsibility of Government. They must be shaped by the basic fact that automation is sought by industry in order to increase productivity and profit and that, when effective, increases national productivity and wealth.

The most important aspect of the proposal is that it would create a mechanism designed to meet the problem of automation as it will affect the economy in the future, not merely at the moment or for the purposes of solving one crisis. In terms of Federal law we have been caught unprepared in the railroad crisis, both as to how to keep the railroads moving and how to deal with automation. We must not be caught unprepared again on an issue which will clearly be increasingly more critical in every aspect of the American economy.

We must have an overall national policy to deal with it in the various sectors of the economy, guidelines for business and Government to follow, and to implement in detail through business, government, trade associations, and trade unions. Such a policy would be a contribution to justice for the worker and to the country and would increase our Nation's effectiveness.

We have a deadline on the President's emergency bill. We should also place a time limit on this aspect of the program and get to it promptly.

There have been many difficulties in the railroad situation within the past 5 or 10 years. Great adjustments by labor will be required—and also, in my opinion, some support by the Government—in order to prevent automation from becoming a hardship on labor—which certainly no one wants. Automation will involve problems of labor-management relations similar to those in the railroad situation, as well as problems of retraining, relocation, early retirement, and interim compensation during periods of unemployment induced by automation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I consider it an honor to join the Senator from New York as a cosponsor of the joint resolution, which is for the purpose of implementing the President's recommendation on automation.

As the Senator from New York has indicated, a copy of the joint resolution has been sent to the executive branch, from which we expect to receive the advice of the Department of Labor, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Presidential assistants at the White House. Therefore, we may not introduce the joint resolution today. However, we believe it very important that the announcement with respect to the joint resolution be made this afternoon—for several reasons, one of which is to give the President a manifestation of assurance that this entire problem will be approached on a bipartisan basis, for, after all, it is a national problem; and, second, we believe it important that the parties to the railroad dispute—both the carriers and the brotherhoods—take cognizance of the fact that we realize that the dispute between them involves in no small degree the problem of automation, and that there is a public responsibility in connection with it.

There is no reason why the employers and the workers should assume all the costs and all the losses incident to automation, inasmuch as it merely represents technological progress. It cannot be stemmed or turned back. It benefits every citizen. The entire economy benefits from automation.

The question is, to what degree should all the taxpayers of the Nation pay for the costs and losses incident to automation? Who knows? But, Mr. President, I do not think it can properly be questioned that a part of the costs should be paid by the American public as a whole.

Therefore, the joint resolution will propose the creation of a Presidential Commission on Automation to undertake a detailed study of all facets of the automation program and to report periodically to Congress, and also to include recommendations for legislation.

As members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and I have been interested in the question for quite some time. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, I had the question called particularly to my attention this year when witness after witness testified with regard to the effect of automation on school dropouts. We must face the problem of thousands and thousands of young people who are dropping out of school, and who are unemployed because they are simply not trained for any of the skilled jobs for which they must be trained these days in order to be employed.

On April 30 I sent a joint letter to Secretaries Freeman, Hodges, Wirtz, and Celebrezze, suggesting that the Secretaries give consideration to a suggestion that they recommend to the President of the United States the appointment of a National Commission on Automation. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Identical letters sent to Secretaries Freeman, Hodges and Wirtz)

APRIL 30, 1963.

The Honorable ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: At the opening session on April 29, 1963, of the hearings before my Education Subcommittee on S. 580, the administration's comprehensive education bill, I announced that I was writing to you and to your Cabinet colleagues, Secretaries Freeman, Hodges, and Wirtz, voicing my concern over the problems which the phenomenon of automation is week by week creating in these United States.

The rapidity with which automated change is affecting adversely both our blue and our white collar labor forces poses serious problems which should be met.

These problems are of particular concern to those of us currently engaged in reviewing the President's recommendations concerning the quality and the kind of training to be given our school-age population. However, in my judgment, they are problems the nature of which transcends this one area. They are problems, the magnitude of which should make them of paramount concern to your department and those other Federal Departments of Cabinet level I have specified.

I am, therefore, suggesting to you and to each of your colleagues that you consider carefully, and I hope favorably, recommending to the President of the United States that he establish a broad-gage Council on Automation composed of such members both within and without the Government as he may deem desirable, which shall be charged with the responsibility of reporting to him such steps as should be taken by the Government of the United States to identify and describe what has taken place in the field of automation, what is currently occurring in this area, and what is likely to occur within the next decade, together with specific proposals designed to meet and ameliorate these adverse effects upon the men and women who make up our working force.

Since this problem cuts across departmental lines, it seems to me only appropriate that your recommendations, based upon the advice of your technicians and staff specialists, should be a joint Cabinet recommendation to the President.

Cordially,

WAYNE MORSE,
Chairman, Education Subcommittee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am sure—and I cannot conceive of any other attitude being adopted—that the administration will be highly pleased with the manifestation this afternoon of congressional support of the concept of a National Commission on Automation. I am always proud to be associated with the Senator from New York in any of the great issues that involve the national interest.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to my colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I am informed by the Parliamentarian that the joint resolution, when offered, will be referred to the Committee on Labor and

Public Welfare. Therefore the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will be able to play its proper role both in relation to the railroad dispute and the general problem facing the country. The fact that the Senator from Oregon has joined with me in the effort is most auspicious because of the Senator's knowledge of the subject of labor in the country and his outstanding prestigeful position on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROPOSED STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I notice, on examining bills introduced at this session and also in other sessions, that a great many bills have been introduced to provide for a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs. It occurs to me, on the basis of representations that have been made and also statements that have been made by me, that perhaps a resolution, cosponsored from both sides of the aisle, might be beneficial. I submit a resolution for that purpose, modifying the rule, and including with it certain resolutions and articles, including memorandums, from the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other organizations, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent that the resolution be held at the desk for cosponsorship for a period of 10 days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution, together with the other matters referred to, will be printed in the RECORD, and the resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

The resolution (S. Res. 176) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended by—

(1) striking out subparagraphs 10 through 13 in paragraph (h) of section (1);

(2) striking out subparagraphs 16 through 19 in paragraph (1) section (1); and

(3) inserting in section (1) after paragraph (p) the following new paragraph:

"(q) Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of nine Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"(1) Veterans' measures, generally.

"(2) Pensions of all the wars of the United States, general and special.

"(3) Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

"(4) Compensation of veterans.

"(5) Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"(6) Veterans' hospitals, medical care and treatment of veterans.

"(7) Soldiers' and sailors', civil relief.

"(8) Readjustment of servicemen to civil life."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out "and Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences" and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences; and Committee on Veterans' Affairs".

SEC. 3. Section 6(a) of rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to the designation of ex officio members of the Committee on Appropriations), is amended by adding at the end of the tabulation contained therein the following new item:

"Committee on Veterans' Affairs—For the Veterans' Administration."

SEC. 4. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall as promptly as feasible after its appointment and organization confer with the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for the purpose of determining what disposition should be made of proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters theretofore referred to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the Eighty-eighth Congress which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The matters presented by Mr. DIRKSEN are as follows:

RESOLUTION BY ADMIRAL BENSON POST NO. 83 OF THE CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas the United States has been involved in many wars, veterans of which are living who took part in the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, and Korean conflict; and

Whereas many of our brothers are now seeing conflict in such faraway countries as Cuba, Laos, Korea, Indochina, Vietnam, and Nationalist China; and

Whereas it is the intent of the Congress of the United States to protect and secure the rights and privileges of all active soldiers and veterans; and

Whereas all the major veteran organizations support congressional consideration of veterans' legislation; and

Whereas Public Law 601 has been amended since it was created in 1946, in that a new committee was created in 1963 called the Committee on Aeronautics and Space Sciences; and

Whereas veteran legislation has been under the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Finance and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, notwithstanding the fact that both of these committees are already heavily overburdened with responsibility, and because of their heavy responsibility many pieces of deserving veteran legislation are lost for lack of consideration by these fine committees; and

Whereas the United States has millions of veterans, and the people of this great country have shown on many occasions their great interest in their welfare: Be it

Resolved, That Public Law 601 be further amended in this Congress to create a standing Committee on Veterans Affairs in the Senate and eliminate the division of jurisdiction presently existing over all veteran affairs in this august body.

MICHAEL J. HOWLETT,
Commander.
FRANCIS X. POYNTON,
Member.

[From VFW magazine, November 1962]

WHY A STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE FOR VETERANS AFFAIRS?

(By Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN)

There is need for a standing committee of the Senate to deal solely with Veterans Affairs. Veterans problems and their solutions must be handled with greater speed and efficiency. I advocate creation of such a veterans committee.

In 1945 I served on a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives which was created for the purpose of reorganizing the legislative branch of government, including the streamlining of committees. The joint committee consisted of six Senators and six Representatives. It labored for 2 years and the fruit of this labor was the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, under which standing committees of the House were reduced from 48 to 19 and in the Senate from 33 to 15. It was a considerable task but at long last the reorganization plan was accomplished, the new duties and jurisdictions were allotted, and the committee organization and staffing perfected.

The members of the joint committee soon realized that government is a dynamic and not a static thing. Many factors lead to this conclusion. Our population is rising by leaps and bounds, new functions for government are authorized by the Congress, new fields of activity are invaded, new discoveries—like that of nuclear power—command new activities by government and new agencies are created to deal with such functions. The result is a substantial addition to the workload of all committees.

Matters relating to veterans in this setup are presently divided between the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Finance. In a general way, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has jurisdiction over those matters relating to veterans hospitals, medical care, and treatment. The Committee on Finance deals with veterans measures generally, including pensions for all wars, life insurance issued by the Government for service in the Armed Forces, compensation of veterans, and all matters in the economic categories.

Now let me point out that in the 1st session of the present 87th Congress there was, insofar as I can determine, 322 bills and resolutions introduced in the Senate and House of Representatives and 99 bills and resolutions in the 2d session up to July 13, 1962. This makes a total of 421 veterans measures. I am quite certain that additional measures have been introduced since that time.

These proposals deal with a vast variety of matters affecting veterans, such as awards, disability benefits, burial allowances, hospitalization, housing loans, soldiers' homes compensation, unemployment, war orphans, and a great many others.

Consider the impact of these measures on a completely overburdened Finance Committee, which has been under exceedingly heavy pressure in the preparation of such other important matters as tax revision, trade expansion, social security, medicare, and many other matters over which this committee has jurisdiction. These proposals have kept the Finance Committee in almost continuous session since the beginning of the year, taking an incredible amount of testimony and preparation and submitting measures to the Senate for consideration. It must be obvious that it left far too little time for veterans' matters, certainly not the amount of time that veterans' affairs properly require. Moreover, when the Finance Committee staff is engaged in work on general legislation like trade expansion and tax revision, it allows little time for proper and adequate staff work in connection with those measures in which veterans are most interested.

Much the same case can be made for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which deals with vocational rehabilitation and the education of veterans as well as hospitals, medical care, treatment, etc. In addition to this the Labor Committee has general jurisdiction of the GI bill of rights, all health, education, and welfare matters such as education, National Institutes of Health, Hill-Burton hospital legislation, Federal Council of Arts, including Federal grants, if any, and the railroad retirement and labor matters including labor legislation, labor-management relations, pension and welfare disclosure matters, manpower retraining, longshoreman compensation and District of Columbia workman's compensation.

The sheer volume of work occasioned by problems relating to veterans dictates that a new standing committee, adequately staffed, should be added to the roster of Senate standing committees if our responsibility to the veterans is to be fully and adequately discharged.

It must be evident to anyone who has watched the growth and added responsibilities of Government that the volume of legislation dealing with veterans is not receding. Certainly the Congress has a solemn responsibility to do full and adequate justice to those who in peacetime and in war have assumed their responsibilities for the defense and security of our country.

I believe the record fully supports the need for a standing committee of the Senate on Veterans' Affairs.

STATEMENT BY EDWARD F. MCGINNIS, NATIONAL LEGISLATION COMMISSION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION WITH REFERENCE TO CREATION OF A VETERANS' COMMITTEE IN THE U.S. SENATE

I conclude my discussion of this subject, the last paragraph of this paper, with a one, two, three, recommendation by a well-known and very knowledgeable former Congressman:

1. Know your Congressman.
2. Know your subject.
3. Know the procedure to follow.

My special subject today is No. 2, "Know Your Subject." Anyone talking to, or writing to, a House Member, or a Senator, should know what he is talking about.

Of the sackful of mail hauled into a Congressman's office every morning, only about 1 letter in 25 will be from a constituent who really knows his subject. The Congressman has, at best, only 3 or 4 staff members to answer about 300 letters a day. They can't tarry trying to explain in detail what the facts are because tomorrow will bring in another 300 letters. So, the misinformed letterwriter receives a vague but pleasant stock reply that pleases no one, including the Congressman.

So, here's the background of our drive to get a Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee established: For something like 38 years, and 18 Congresses; from about 1922 to date, the veterans of this country have been trying to get the Congress of the United States to establish, as one of its standing committees, in both Houses, a Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Due largely to the efforts of the late Congressman Royall C. Johnson of South Dakota, a dedicated Legionnaire, General John Thomas Taylor, Watson Miller, and Tom Miller, in February 1924, a World War Veterans' Committee was created in the House with Johnson as chairman. This came about primarily as the result of action taken in the San Francisco National Legion Convention in 1923 calling for the establishment in each House of Congress of a veterans' committee so as to simplify legislative procedures.

However, little progress was made in the Senate until 1945, when the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress was created pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 18, introduced by Senator (then Representative) MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, during the 1st session of the 79th Congress. The joint committee, chairmaned by Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, was charged, among other things, with the responsibility of making a full and complete study of the organization of Congress and recommending improvements in its organization and operation with a view toward strengthening it, simplifying its operation, improving its relationships with other branches of the U.S. Government, and enabling it to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution.

The joint committee was faced with a tremendous task. This was to be the first comprehensive study of legislative procedure since 1921. The committee devoted more than a year of study, hearings, and deliberations in an effort to fulfill the charge placed upon it by the Congress of the United States.

The committee during that year held 39 public hearings and four executive sessions between March 13 and June 29, 1945. The testimony of 102 witnesses was taken, 45 of whom were Members of Congress. In addition, 37 Members and many private citizens submitted written statements. The American Legion was among those who strongly supported this proposal. The joint committee submitted its report to the Congress on March 4, 1946.

On May 13, 1946, Senator La Follette introduced S. 2177, which was reported to the Senate May 31, 1946. After exhaustive debate, it was passed by the Senate on June 10, and by the House on July 25. It was signed by the President August 2, 1946, becoming Public Law 601.

This law streamlined and modernized the complicated and antiquated procedures of the Congress, and reduced the number of standing committees from 33 to 15 in the Senate, and from 48 to 19 in the House. (Recently another committee has been added in each House.) Public Law 601 provided for a Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the House, but directed that jurisdiction over veterans' benefits and service in the Senate be divided between the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, notwithstanding the fact that both of these committees were already heavily burdened with the responsibility of considering many other subject matters. To be exact, the Finance Committee has 13 subject matters, only 4 of which pertain to veterans and the Labor and Public Welfare Committee has 19 separate subjects, only 4 of which pertain directly to veterans' affairs.

Now what happened?

As a matter of fact, when Senator La Follette introduced S. 2177 on May 13, 1946, it contained a provision amending rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and made provision for the creation of a 16th committee, which was to be called the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, having identical jurisdiction with that of the Veterans' Affairs Committee in the House.

During the intense debate which followed the introduction of S. 2177, Senator La Follette, in response to objections on the floor, that the two-committee assignment rule (each Senator at that time was limited to service on two major committees) would deprive the new committee of the long experience with veterans' affairs possessed by members of the Finance Committee which had jurisdiction of such affairs since World War I, struck the provision for a veterans' committee from the bill. More likely than not this was a compromise measure designed to placate some of the more severe critics of the bill; at the time, however, Senator La Follette observed that a Veterans' Affairs Committee would have to be set up "in the near future in order to relieve the Finance Committee of a tremendous burden."

Efforts directed toward the creation of a Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs did not cease with the end of the 79th Congress. One of the responsibilities of the then Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the Senate and House was to "evaluate the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government." In the exercise of this responsibility, the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments held hearings during June of 1951 on the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. It had been 5 years since the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; Congress had had 4 years' experience with the workings of the law; it was therefore considered timely to undertake a fresh review of the operation of the so-called La Follette-Monroney Act in terms of its own objectives. It was felt that consideration should be given in the light of this experience, as to whether or not the act needed amendment and strengthening.

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, under the chairmanship of Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, held hearings June 6 to 27, 1951, 14 in all.

One of the principal recommendations which culminated as the result of these hearings in 1951, was to "create a standing Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs." This recommendation was embodied in Senate Resolution 148, introduced by former Senator Homer E. Ferguson on May 29, 1951, in behalf of himself and 35 other Senators, calling for an amendment to the Senate rules to create a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs. When Senator Ferguson testified before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, in the Senate on June 6, 1951, he referred to Resolution 148, which had the strong support and backing of all the major veteran organizations, and then gave the following testimony, which is quoted in part:

"When I introduced the present resolution last week, I sought to stress the broad scope of veterans' affairs as we have already assumed responsibility for them, the accumulation rather than any decrease in their scope as a result of present military activities and national security plans, and the need for specialized congressional attention to these matters both in the interest of the veteran and the public at large.

"Rather than detail the arguments for this proposal, I would like to bring into the open what is probably the principal objection held by some Members of the Senate. They contend that such a standing committee as we propose would perhaps become a captive committee, readily subject to pressures from highly organized special interests of veterans' groups.

"Granting the sincerity and good purposes of these objectors, and I know their purposes are well intended, I feel first that that attitude is an unwarranted reflection upon the organized veterans groups as I have observed them. Of course, they hold special interests. But what organized group does not and is there anything necessarily wrong or sinister in special interests? I think not. I believe the veterans want and deserve a specialized and expert group in Congress to whom they may take their problems for fair appraisal. I believe they will return good faith for good faith. I feel the public interest as well as the extensive interest of veterans will be best served, in the long run, by such an arrangement.

"Furthermore, I see in the nature of the objection an unwarranted reflection upon the Members who would serve on such a committee. It is argued that Members are shielded from exposure to veterans' interests by burying veterans' matters within the jurisdiction of two other committees with other major interests. I do not think any Member of the Senate needs the protection of such subterfuge."

Despite the time, effort, and money expended by the committee and the personal pleas of Senator Ferguson and the late Senator James E. Murray, only one major recommendation came out of the committee, and was enacted into law, and that was changing the title of the committee from Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department to the Committee on Government Operations.

The campaign was not abandoned. Led by such champions as Senators Morse, Dworshak, and Ferguson, renewed efforts were made in 1953 and 1956. At least 8 or 10 Senate resolutions were introduced between 1953 and 1960, by the three Senators just mentioned and by Senators Potter, Neuberger, Humphrey, Jackson, Magnuson, Cannon, and Keating. But those Senators who had opposed the change since 1956 still prevailed.

During the 1st session of the 86th Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, Senator Hennings, of Missouri, appointed Senators CANNON and KEATING as a subcommittee to consider Senate Resolutions 10, 12, 19, and 80, all providing for a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs. This subcommittee held hearings on June 9 and 10, 1959. Almost all of the testimony, both oral and written, favored the creation of a veterans' committee.

Senator WAYNE MORSE provided a table of statistics and the staff of the Committee on Rules of the Senate made an independent study of the history of both House and Senate bills relative to veterans. The various statistics submitted, contained minor discrepancies which the staff was unable to entirely reconcile, but it was able to construct a composite history from the several sources, which indicates that during the 80th, 81st, 82d, 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses, the Committee on Finance did report favorably to the Senate 93 House bills and 17 Senate bills relating to veterans; and that 63 House bills and 55 Senate bills died in the Senate Finance Committee. A total of 110 favorable; and 118 died in committee.

Veterans' legislation fared better in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the same period—45 House bills and 9 Senate bills were reported favorably, and 4 House bills and 60 Senate bills died in committee. I repeat what I said a moment ago, that because of lack of certain statistics, not readily available, this report is not complete, but is accurate to the extent that complete figures were presented to the subcommittee pertaining to the 84th and 85th Congresses.

The subcommittee report states that more than 40 Senators, by their cosponsorships of one or more of the resolutions before the committee, have expressed their desire that the Senate create a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs and that more than 49 Senators have expressed their support of this proposal.

Since this subcommittee report was filed, 25 new Senators have entered that body, in 1960 and 1962. A number of these new Senators have announced their support of this proposal.

The subcommittee report calls attention to a very important point. I quote:

"The creation of a new standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs would in your subcommittee's opinion not be in derogation of the spirit of the 1946 Reorganization Act. The bill which resulted in that act, as reported to the Senate, provided for the establishment of a Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The bill was amended on the Senate floor to delete reference to a Committee on Veterans' Affairs and to divide jurisdiction over veterans' legislation between the two committees now handling such legislation.

"Senator Robert La Follette, Jr., who was in charge of the bill in the Senate, reluctantly agreed to the change in order to speed consideration and passage of the bill, but noted that a new committee would soon have to be created because the burden of veterans' legislation would be too much for the Committee on Finance with its manifold other exacting tasks concerning the revenue.

"It has been suggested that to create a new standing committee would, by setting a precedent for additional committees, open the floodgates toward the establishment of multitudinous committees, and in the end leave the Senate under a handicap. In the first place the precedent for the creation of additional committees was made last year with the creation of the new Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. Secondly, the Senate should not hold to a rigid rule about creation of committees but be guided by what is most advantageous in the conduct of Senate business. Last year it created a new committee without any hestitation because it saw the wisdom in so doing. We suggest that the wise course again is for it to create this much needed committee on veterans' affairs.

"As the Senate is now constituted, with a very large number of subcommittees, Senators are working under virtually the same handicaps as they were prior to the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act. The creation of another standing committee will not place any undue burden on the Senate. In addition, with all veterans' legislative problems centered in one committee devoted solely to that subject matter, Senators in their daily handling of all types of veterans' problems would be greatly aided.

"Your subcommittee cannot accept the argument that the Finance Committee charged with revenue prolems should, therefore, have jurisdiction over the authorization of veterans' benefits. On the basis of this reasoning, the Senate could be reduced almost to one committee. There is no more logic behind this reasoning than there would be to a proposal to give the Finance Committee jurisdiction over all fund authorization affecting the Armed Services, Department of Agriculture, and the Post Office Department.

"Finally, your subcommittee urges the creation of a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs because with over 22 million veterans in the Nation and the vast expenditures involved in present veterans' benefit programs, the subject matter is of great national importance and warrants the special attention of a standing committee adequately equipped with full-time staff specialists and experts.

"For the reasons outlined above, your subcommittee respectfully recommends that the Committee on Rules and Administration report to the Senate favorably the committee resolution set forth above.

"Your subcommittee included in the proposed committee resolution a provision (sec. 3) authorizing three members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to sit as ex officio members of the Committee on Appropriations when the annual appropriations bill making appropriations for the Veterans' Administration is being considered by the latter committee. This is in keeping with the policy now in force concerning committees with jurisdiction similar in kind to that proposed for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs."

I believe it is obvious to any observer of the actions and procedures of the Senate that our first job is to work for consideration and an early hearing by the Rules Committee of the several resolutions already introduced by a number of Senators.

This should be the first order of business for our legislative commission, our national commander, all of our department officers, and legislative committees of the 56 departments.

First things first. The leadership of the Senate, and the chairman of the Senate Rules Committee should be pressed for early action. This must be the first order of business for us, because our entire legislative program, our efforts in behalf of the disabled, national defense, all of our long list of must legislation, may wind up where so many other bills finished during the past years—dead—for lack of action by the Finance Committee or the Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

The Veterans' Committee of the House does not always act favorably on Legion proposals. In fact, sometimes it acts unfavorably. But, that House Veterans' Affairs Committee rarely allows legislation to die without action; its membership is composed of men and women who are dedicated to give consideration to the problems of those who have served their country in its Armed Forces.

In closing my part of this discussion, may I sum up by suggesting a few practical, hard, steps that can be taken. I shall quote one of the best authorities that can be found—a man who served in the Congress for many years:

1. Know your Congressman.
2. Know your subject.
3. Know the procedure to follow.

APPENDIX

Under the present circumstances, the American Legion, and other veterans' organizations find it extremely difficult to appear before and present arguments to the Senate Committee on Finance for the simple reason that that committee does not have time to hold such hearings. Veterans' legislation coming over from the House is shunted aside in the hope that they can get around to it at a later date. But that later date has a way of never coming around.

One of the soundest reasons for requesting help for the creation of a Senate Veterans' Committee is that this would mean a full-time informed staff to handle veterans' problems in the Senate. The presence of a capable informed staff would provide Members of the Senate with a place to go when they receive requests for information and assistance from their constituents regarding veterans' problems.

Under present conditions, most veterans' legislation is originated in the House because the Senate committees simply do not have the time and the staff to study and develop veterans' legislation.

ANALOGY

Latest statistics (1959) indicate there are 3,710,503 farmers in the United States. The same authority states there are presently something over 22 million veterans of our last three wars still living.

Veterans' benefits appropriations in the last Congress total approximately $5,500 million. Appropriations for the Agriculture Department total approximately $5,700 million. This in itself seems to provide an excellent reason why there should be a veterans' committee in the U.S. Senate as well as a Committee on Agriculture.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D.C., June 28, 1963.

HON. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN,
U.S. Senate, The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DIRKSEN: Knowing your interest in the desire of the veterans of this country to have established in the U.S. Senate a Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and your interest in general of the problems facing the veterans, I feel that you would be interested in knowing that there was held today a meeting to discuss establishment of such a committee in the Senate of the United States.

Attending this meeting were the personal representatives of the national commanders of six of the leading veterans' organizations of the United States. They were: Mr. Garry J. Bowman, AMVETS; Mr. James W. Hafey, Catholic War Veterans; Mr. William J. Flaherty, Disabled American Veterans; Mr. Francis W. Stover and Mr. John D. Fagan, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Mr. Michael Dwyer, Veterans of World War I; Mr. Edward F. McGinnis and Mr. Clarence H. Olson, the American Legion; and Mr. Leroy P. Chittenden, the National Tribune.

This group reviewed the history of efforts to establish a veterans' committee in the U.S. Senate which began in 1924, at which time a World War I Veterans' Committee was created in the House of Representatives. Little progress was made to establish such a committee in the Senate until 1946 at which time the La Follette-Monroney bill was introduced, S. 2177, and after exhaustive debate passed the Senate and became Public Law 601. That original bill provided for amendment of rule XXV of the Senate and made provision for the creation of a Committee on Veterans' Affairs, having identical jurisdiction with that of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House. During the debate on the floor that provision was struck from the bill, and at the time Senator La Follette observed that a Veterans' Affairs Committee would have to be set up "in the near future in order to relieve the Finance Committee of a tremendous burden."

Since that time a number of hearings have been held and a rather extensive record exists indicating the efforts made by many Senators to accomplish this purpose. Attached you will find a chronological history of these legislative activities.

Under the present circumstances, the American Legion, and other veterans' organizations find it extremely difficult to appear before and present arguments to the Senate Committee on Finance for the simple reason that that committee does not have time to hold such hearings. Veterans' legislation coming over from the House is frequently set aside in the hope that they can get around to it at a later date. But that later date, in many instances, has a way of never coming around.

One of the soundest reasons for requesting help for the creation of a Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee is that this would mean a full-time informed staff to handle veterans' problems in the Senate. The presence of a capable informed staff would provide Members of the Senate with a place to go when they receive requests for information and assistance from their constituents regarding veterans' problems.

Under present conditions, most veterans' legislation is originated in the House, because the Senate committees simply do not have the time and the staff to study and develop veterans' legislation.

Recent statistics (1959) indicate there are 3,710,503 farmers in the United States. The same authority states there are something over 22 million veterans of our last three wars still living. Veterans' benefits appropriations in the last Congress total approximately $5,500 million. Appropriations for the Agriculture Department total approximately $5,700 million. This in itself seems to provide an excellent reason why there should be a Veterans' Affairs Committee in the U.S. Senate, as well as a Committee on Agriculture.

Out of this meeting held today came a determination to have all veterans' organizations highlight this matter at their national conventions to be held later this summer. One thing is certain, all veterans' organizations (which means a substantial segment of the 22 million veterans) are united in this effort to try to convince the Members of the U.S. Senate that there should be a separate Senate committee to consider the many veterans' problems that come before the Senate.

I am authorized to say to you that we are deeply grateful for your support in this project, and we earnestly solicit your continued good efforts toward this goal.

Respectfully yours,

Edward F. McGinnis,
National Legislative Commission.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROSECUTION OF PROJECTS IN CERTAIN RIVER BASIN PLANS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. Mansfield) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 6016) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INCORPORATION OF CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS—ADDITIONAL TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON DESK FOR ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on July 18, I introduced the bill (S. 1914) to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, and asked that the bill be held at the desk through July 23. I now modify that request, and ask to have the bill kept at the desk for cosponsors through July 25.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Vietnam.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

Statement made by him on July 18, 1963, relating to the President's balance-of-payments message.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF SENATOR MAGNUSON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, William S. White, who for many years has studied and written about the Senate, has a shrewd and kindly profile of our esteemed colleague, Senator Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington, in his syndicated column which appeared on Friday, July 19, in the Washington Star and other newspapers.

"The Hayload Falls on 'Maggie'" is the perceptive heading chosen for this column, in which the Pulitzer Prize-winning newsman reports on Senator Magnuson's responsibilities as chairman of the committee considering the most emotion-packed bill before the Congress in many years and also as chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee.

That Senator Magnuson affably accepts these responsibilities—which in some sections of our country may appear incongruous—and will pursue both objectives with equal energy, is strongly implied by Mr. White when he states:

> This columnist, who is not innocent of skepticism toward the motives of politicians, has no doubt that Senator Magnuson, of Washington, is truly for the civil rights package, public accommodations and all. Equally, there is no question that Senator Magnuson is no less devoted to his mission of helping return his hard-pressed Western Democratic colleagues.

Mr. White might have made the same observation about Senator Magnuson's dedication to electing Democrats to the Senate from every section of the country.

Nor has our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Washington, ever shirked his legislative duties, however arduous, as we who have followed his service on Capitol Hill for more than a quarter of a century will agree.

The Senate Committee on Commerce, over which he presides as chairman, does not always have to resolve such dramatic issues as nondiscrimination in public accommodations; but it is always busy with such important and complex problems as communications, interstate and foreign commerce, fisheries, and transportation.

Mr. White in his column speaks of Senator Magnuson's "solid, uncomplaining, Scandinavian-American shoulders," on which the burdens of civil rights legislation and the election of Democratic Senators have been placed.

To these and to the normal pressing workload of the Committee on Commerce has now been added the administration's bill designed to prevent a railroad transportation crisis of such magnitude as this country has not before experienced.

It is not my place to predict at this time what action the committee will take on the proposed legislation—action which may depend on the attitude of railroad management and the railroad brotherhoods while the bill is before the committee.

But I do know that Chairman Magnuson, as will the other members of the committee, will without protest or complaint, welcome this new burden, this new responsibility, and that they will discharge their responsibility with honor and integrity. Another load of hay has fallen on Maggie's shoulder.

I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper article "The Hayload Falls on 'Maggie,'" written by Mr. William S. White and published in the Washington Star, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Hayload Falls on "Maggie"

(By William S. White)

As they say around the Senate these days, the whole load of hay in this session of Congress has fallen on "Maggie."

"Maggie" is the Capitol's affectionate nickname for Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Democrat, of Washington. The load of hay that now burdens his solid, uncomplaining, Scandinavian-American shoulders represents twin responsibilities which are at war with each other. The discharge of one is anything but helpful to the discharge of the other.

On the one hand, as chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee his job is to forward the most controversial part of the Kennedy administration's omnibus civil rights package. This is the proposal to force integration of private business by Federal law under pain of Federal punishment.

On the other hand, as chairman of Democratic senatorial campaign committee, it is Senator MAGNUSON's urgent duty to help reelect all Democratic Senators who must run again next year.

The first task is difficult in the extreme. For, notwithstanding the probability that he will be able to bring the integration bill from his Commerce Committee—though doubtless in a much modified state—its chance of approval by the Senate itself is dim, indeed.

A Senate majority, if allowed to proceed without unduly violent intimidation from the Negro leaders and the small band of Democratic and Republican civil rights extremists allied with them, is likely in the end to vindicate such actual Negro rights as the free vote and unrestricted use of publicly supported facilities like schools and transportation. But it is most unlikely in any event to accept the proposition that the refusal of a private business or lodging home to serve all comers, however unethical this refusal may be, is actually to be made a Federal offense. The concern here, of course, is for the maintenance of the centuries-long rights of private property.

It is at this point, in any event, that great complications arise under the second of Senator MAGNUSON's hats, the hat he wears as chairman of the Democratic senatorial campaign committee. For the mere existence of the civil rights issue in its inflamed condition—and especially that part of the issue specifically involved in the public accommodations section now before his Commerce Committee—will undoubtedly injure most of the Democratic Senators who must run for reelection next year.

This is most poignantly true, as it happens, of precisely the one group of such Senators—seven from the West—who happen to be most vulnerable of all to Republican challenge in 1964. No competent political observer denies that the West—which was generally hostile to the Kennedy-Johnson ticket in 1960 and which in all the country outside the South has since shown the sharpest rise in conservative sentiment—is the most dangerous senatorial territory from the Democratic point of view.

To pass any sort of substantial civil rights legislation in the Senate will require application of the gag rule to shut off a southern filibuster. This needs a two-thirds majority. The westerners will be pressured endlessly to vote for the gag. If they do not so vote, they will be branded, quite unfairly but also quite inevitably, as "anticivil rights." If they do so vote, they will break an old tradition among western Senators—outside giant California—against supporting the gag at any time. It is a tradition based upon the demonstrated fact that the West, itself, knows it often needs the right to filibuster, as the ultimate protector of all minority interests and of all the ill-populated States.

This columnist, who is not innocent of skepticism toward the motives of politicians, has no doubt that Senator MAGNUSON, of Washington, is truly for the civil rights package, public accommodations and all. Equally, there is no question that Senator MAGNUSON is no less devoted to his mission of helping return his hard-pressed western Democratic colleagues.

All this explains why it is that when his fellow Senators say that the whole load of hay has fallen on "MAGGIE," they utter but the painful and total truth.

THE RAILROAD RULES DISPUTE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, bearing upon the danger of a railroad strike, we have a great test of the sense of responsibility of American labor and of American management.

A number of us who are deeply concerned with this matter have been concerned about whether Congress can act in time to head off a strike. It is obvious that if the deadline is next Monday midnight, Congress cannot act in time, even with the best of good will and the best desire to move forward.

The President is in no position to ask the railroad managements to defer further the application of the work rules, but Congress is. So I believe very much that the railroads should respond to the request made of them by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and, as I understand, a similar request made by the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the other body. Nonetheless, we must deal with realities. Therefore, I hope that sometime today the leadership will introduce a joint resolution—by the leadership, I mean the chairman of the committee, the majority leader, and the minority leader—requesting the railroads—and I shall read the wording of the joint resolution which I have drafted:

> To defer the effective date of the new work rules from July 29, 1963, to August 30, 1963, in order to afford to the Congress the opportunity to act upon the President's recommendations and to provide by law a means to settle definitively the work rules dispute and avert the crisis which a railroad strike would involve for the Nation.

We now have endorsement of that position by Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO.

If this is not done in the ways I have described, by the Congress or by the leadership, I shall hope to join with the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in introducing such a joint resolution before the end of the day. I hope very much it will not be necessary; or, if it is necessary, I hope they will do it; but I hope that it will not be necessary, by virtue of agreement by the railroad managements.

I repeat that I hope, first of all, that the railroads will agree; and, second, that if they do not agree, that the leadership will take the suggested action. But I suggest that certainly Congress should have an opportunity to express itself.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the feelings of the distinguished Senator from New York. I call his attention to a fact he already knows—namely, that both the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and I have received letters from Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO. I have discussed the matter with the distinguished minority leader, and also with my Democratic colleagues in the Congress, as the minority leader has done with his Republican counterparts in the other body; and it is not our intention to introduce a joint resolution at this time.

We would like to see how things develop. We have not given up as to the possibility of the introduction of such a joint resolution; but for the time being we would like to see the trend of events; and on the basis of the letter sent to both leaders by the president of the AFL-CIO, we would like to have the trust and the confidence of Members on both sides.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I believe the time available to me has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we may run over a minute or two, but I believe it would be well to have a continuity of discussion on this subject at this time. It is an important matter. What I have to say will take only 3 or 4 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New York may have an additional 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I intend to object to committees meeting.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No Senator has yet made such a request.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I object now to the committees meeting.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No Senator has yet asked.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I want to enter an objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No Senator that I know of is asking that a committee meet this afternoon.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I shall have to object to a committee meeting. I object to all committee meetings.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I join with the majority leader. I am sure the Senator from New York will not differ with the principle I wish to discuss for a moment. If there is no voluntary agreement to postpone for 30 days putting into effect the working rules, the Congress has a clear obligation to adopt a resolution calling upon the parties to postpone. If we cannot get an understanding with them, then, of course, we must take other courses of action.

My intuition tells me that both sides in the dispute are as appreciative of their public responsibility as we in the Congress are of ours. I can quote no one. But I had a conference yesterday and again this morning with representatives of the parties. There is certainly no desire on their part, in my judgment, to precipitate a strike on the 29th if Congress is proceeding to the consideration of necessary legislation proper in the field.

In my judgment, within the next few hours the prospects are very good that the carriers will voluntarily, without need for any congressional action—and I think that is desirable if possible—announce that they intend to postpone putting into effect the working rules until Congress has had ample time to act in the premises.

It is pretty well known—the statement has appeared on the ticker—that Representative HARRIS made that request of the carriers at the beginning of the House hearing this morning. The spokesman for the carriers, Mr. Loomis, said that although he was not then in a position to commit the carriers, he would take the request back to the carriers and announce a decision later.

Mr. President, I take a second or two to commend highly the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] for the magnificent way in which he has started hearings. At the hearing yesterday afternoon, the acting chairman of the Senate committee made the same suggestion as that made by Representative Harris. So the carriers are aware of the suggestion of at least the chairmen of the two committees. My conversation this morning leads me to believe that if I were a betting man, which I am not, I would give heavy odds that the carriers will agree to the request that has been made of them by the chairmen of the two committees, voluntarily to postpone putting the working rules into effect until the Congress has had time to act.

But we in the Congress must face our responsibilities on this question. We cannot justify any dilatory tactics, or dilly-dallying. We must proceed with dispatch. The chairmen of the two committees have made clear that they intend to bring to the floors of the two Houses at the earliest possible moment proposed legislation on the subject for due debate and final action.

The carriers are entitled to exercise their legal right to effectuate work rule changes. On the other hand, they have a very clear public duty to postpone putting those rules into effect within the next 30 days so that the Congress may take wise action, and not hasty action. Furthermore, I never give up hope on this matter. Such a postponement would provide the parties with an opportunity to settle their dispute by collective bargaining, which is the soundest way in which to settle it during the next 30 days.

Mr. JOHNSTON rose.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, with the indulgence of the Senator from South Carolina, I should like to speak for 1 minute.

MEETING OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I wish to object to the meeting of committees. I understand that at the present time some committees are meeting. I want it understood that I object to any committees meeting while the Senate is in session.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. In response to the statements of the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], I should like to say that I am grateful to the majority leader for allowing us time for a consecutive discussion of the subject. I have always done my utmost to cooperate with the leadership. I shall do so on the present occasion. Sometimes some of us must stimulate a line of thought. The only point I should like to add is that it is our duty not only to try to enact legislation which will settle the controversy, but also to terminate a possible strike. I believe action can be taken in two ways. First, through a resolution such as the one I have submitted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas railroad management has announced that new work rules will become effective on July 29, 1963; and

Whereas railroad labor has announced its intention to call a nationwide strike if the proposed work rules are made effective; and

Whereas the President has made it clear that such a strike would have drastic and far-reaching effects upon the economy of the Nation; and

Whereas the President has proposed to the Congress legislation to deal with the work rules dispute which is presently pending before the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the railroads should defer the effective date of the new work rules from July 29, 1963, to August 30, 1963, in order to afford to the Congress the opportunity to act upon the President's recommendations and to provide by law a means to settle definitely the work rules dispute and avert the crisis which a railroad strike would involve for the Nation.

Mr. JAVITS. Second, the Senate should enact section 5 of the measure which the President sent us, which is a satisfactory provision in and of itself in respect to any possible strike. It contains power of legal enforcement.

I agree with the Senator from Oregon that there must be no dilatory action. Thirty days is about the right time. We must act within that period of time. I shall cooperate closely with the leadership and, in the final analysis, I shall endeavor to discharge my responsibility, if responsibility is not otherwise discharged. Of course, I shall cooperate fully.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish it clearly understood that it is not anticipated that it would require 30 days for proposed legislation to be reported from the committees. It is the hope of the combined leadership that proposed legislation will be reported as expeditiously as possible. I am happy to note the dispatch with which the committees are serving. On the Senate side the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] has already undertaken hearings. He is prepared to resume hearings at 4 o'clock this afternoon and, if need be, at 7 o'clock this evening.

Mr. JAVITS. If it is a question of keeping the Senate in session in order to act seasonably, by resolution or otherwise, we ought to do so in order that we may complete action by the midnight deadline. That is the whole purpose I desire to serve. If I have done so, I am grateful.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator always serves a useful purpose.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, yesterday I was in attendance at the hearings of the Committee on Commerce. The evidence shows that thus far five public agencies have made recommendations of ways and means to settle the dispute. Each of the five recommendations was accepted by the railroads.

Each of the five was accepted by the unions on condition. The conditions attached disclose that there was no acceptance of any of the five recommendations that were made.

The principal recommendations were made by the President's Commission, which was made up of 15 members appointed in 1960 by President Eisenhower. Five of the members represented labor, five represented the railroads, and five represented the public. The committee was known as the Rifkind Committee. That committee made recommendations which would solve the problem. The railroads accepted the recommendations. The union rejected the recommendations.

The point I make is that, based upon the attitude of the railroads in connection with the five recommendations, I feel certain that the request made by the members of the Committee on Commerce and the request contained in the resolution of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] that there be a deferment of the institution of the work orders will be abided by.

I am certain that, based upon past conduct, we can expect that the future conduct of the railroads will be to "delay the institution of the rules." I feel as certain as I stand here that that will happen. If that happens, we shall be able to proceed in a more orderly way in our hearings, in determining what should or should not be done.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I join the Senator from Ohio in urging upon the carriers their continued good will and cooperation in reference to withholding the application of the new work rules.

The most important thing is to insure the continuation of the processes of collective bargaining, even as the Congress itself works its will on proposed legislation. I join with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], and other Senators in asking—and humbly requesting—the carriers that they do in this instance as they have done in the past, and extend the period of time so that collective bargaining may continue, so that Congress may carry out its work and that there may be no work stoppage. I have the feeling that this will be accomplished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio may proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GRANTING OF "THE MOST FAVORED NATION CLAUSE" TO THE YUGOSLAV COMMUNIST GOVERNMENT

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it appears that we are heading in the direction of recognizing Yugoslavia as a most favored nation, and thus granting to it export privileges into the United States under this benign appellation which is to be applied to that country. If that should be done, in my judgment we would be making a serious mistake.

In 1962 Yugoslavia improved its balance of payments, which was at a catastrophic level in 1961. In 1961 its foreign indebtedness reached $1 billion.

The main reason for this state of affairs was the Communist preoccupation with high rates of growth and hence high investment, without the Communist government paying much attention to where it was heading fiscally. The proof shows that the Communist government of Yugoslavia has been subsidizing operations, and most notably its industry of building ships to sail on the high seas and other waters. The Communist government has been subsidizing the building of such ships to the extent of 50 percent, in an effort to capture world markets. While indulging in this program its internal situation economically has grown constantly worse, and because of that worsened condition Yugoslavia considers it imperative that it find markets in the world.

In response to its appeal, we are in the process of saying, "Yugoslavia, with your Communist government, you are entitled to be labeled as 'most favored.'"

I cannot go along with that program.

I point out that several days ago Mr. Noyes of the Washington Evening Star had published a series of articles—and other newspapers have published similar articles—emphasizing that we are selling more to Yugoslavia than we are buying from Yugoslavia. Yesterday in the Foreign Relations Committee a special check was made on the subject for the year 1962. The check showed that we exported to Yugoslavia $154 million worth of goods, and that Yugoslavia exported to the United States $47 million worth. It would appear that our sales were $107 million more than our purchases, but nowhere was it revealed that $116 million of the exports were embraced in the selling of food for soft currencies.

My only purpose in making the statement is that this subject will require much more attention before we grant to Yugoslavia the status of a "most favored nation."

The granting of "the most favored nation clause" or the withdrawal of it can change little as long as the Yugoslav Communist Government does not put its own house in order. Should the clause be granted, the Government will feel less compelled than ever to reform the Yugoslav economy on a sound basis. What is worse, other small countries will have the impression that the United States approves of the confused Yugoslav economic policy and will continue taking it as a model.

The Yugoslav Communists do their best, anyway, to persuade small countries to do precisely that, i.e., to copy Communist development methods. During the fifth plenary session of the CC of the Communist League of Yugoslavia, in May 1963, Mijalko Todorovic said:

> The wide and in the future even wider economic cooperation of Socialist Yugoslavia with the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa, and Southern America is, firstly and foremostly, an expression of our active coexistence and of our internationalism in practice. By cooperating with these countries, we contribute to the economic emancipation of the only just liberated, still underdeveloped countries, we help the development of the working class and intelligentsia in these countries and we contribute to the strengthening of progressive forces and tendencies in these regions.

At the same meeting, Milentije Popovic came out for supporting those movements in underdeveloped countries which are against multiparty systems and parliamentary democracy.

Among other things, the Yugoslav Communists build their trade and propaganda with underdeveloped countries on commercial credits, $330 million, which they have extended only during the past 5 years. Of course, such loans would be impossible if Yugoslavia were not herself on the receiving side of large sums from the West. Thus the West is indirectly financing Communist propaganda. As long as money and credits will be forthcoming, there is hardly any danger that Yugoslavia will reduce its business connections with the West, because she needs subsidies to support her shaky Communist economy and to make Communist propaganda of her own.

SUPPORT OF QUALITY STABILIZATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent address by my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], and a column appearing in Sunday's New York Times that testify to the wisdom of prompt and affirmative action by Congress on the quality stabilization bill, S. 774.

Recently I have encountered several statements and editorials opposing this legislation. I am one who stoutly supports a free exchange of views on matters so vital to the growth and expansion of free enterprise. I welcome honest differences of opinion if they are based on a complete and thorough understanding of the matter at issue. Unfortunately certain critical statements in regard to S. 774 have not reflected such an understanding.

Let me suggest that those persons who sincerely doubt the wisdom of the quality stabilization bill read the address, "Property Rights, Competition, and the Law," delivered by my distinguished colleague from Minnesota before the National Retail Hardware Association. This is a comprehensive, illuminating, and hard-hitting analysis of the quality stabilization bill. It contains a point-by-point refutation of the standard arguments that have been voiced in opposition to the legislation. For my money, it sets the record straight with the forthrightness and candor we associate with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy]. I commend these remarks to every Senator.

Also on Sunday, the New York Times carried an excellent and perceptive analysis of the legislation by Herbert Koshetz entitled "The Merchant's View: Small-Business Men Again Turn Toward Legislation Against Unfair Competition." I hope that those sophisticated devotees of price cutting and discounting, who prefer to describe such ruinous marketing practices as "healthy, free competition," will study this column after reading the Senator's remarks.

Let me quote the conclusion of Mr. Koshetz' column, a conclusion that the apologists for discounters and price cutters would do well to ponder carefully:

> Those who cut prices on branded items do not do so from purely altruistic reasons. Admittedly, they are seeking to create store traffic, and know that the consumer who came to buy the cut-price item will stay to buy others that are sold at regular profits. * * * It stands to reason, therefore, that if he sells one-tenth of his goods at severely cut prices, then some part of the other nine-tenths must be marked above his average to meet his earnings requirements. The consumer buying that portion of his goods may not be getting anything resembling a bargain.

I congratulate Mr. Koshetz and the New York Times for this penetrating and nonbiased analysis of the true objectives of the quality stabilization bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague's address before the National Retail Hardware Association and the column, "The Merchant's View," from the New York Times of July 21, 1963, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PROPERTY RIGHTS, COMPETITION, AND THE LAW

(Excerpts from address of Senator Eugene J. McCarthy to the National Retail Hardware Association, July 16, 1963)

As a cosponsor in the Senate of the quality stabilization bill, I want to express my personal appreciation that your National Retail Hardware Association was the first national trade association to endorse this vital measure.

I believe this bill will be enacted by this Congress.

It is making real progress. It has now cleared the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee with that committee's recommendation that it "do pass."

A special subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee has held some hearings but because of the civil rights measure these hearings have not been completed.

The problem with which this proposed legislation deals is an important one; and in the complex of laws and procedures designed to maintain some degree of justice in the field of distribution, the quality stabilization bill would fill a real need.

One of the best reasons for the Quality Stabilization Act, in my judgment, is the protection it does provide the small independent retailer. The independent retailers are one of the largest groups of individual owner-operators in the economy, and their well-being is important to our economic system and our social structure.

Quality stabilization will not give advantage to the retailer over the consumer. It will not give the retailer a subsidy. It will not underwrite inefficiency, nor will it decrease the necessity of normal adjustment.

The proposed Quality Stabilization Act is permissive. Under its terms the Government does not impose a price—and it does not establish a Government policing system.

In a relatively simple economy, producers and buyers know one another, and often the maker and seller are the same person. As production becomes more specialized and on a large scale, the distance between the manufacturer and the ultimate consumer is greatly increased. Yet the relationship is not broken. Brand names and trademarks have economic value, and the goodwill related to them is property.

The Supreme Court of the United States has said in a unanimous decision that ownership of this goodwill for the brand name remains the property of the brand name owner when he puts that brand name into the channels of distribution. The ownership of the physical product to which the brand name is attached becomes the property of the reseller.

But the brand name—sometimes valued in the millions of dollars—remains the property of the manufacturer. This bill simply enables the brand name owner to control in limited ways how his property will be used and how it will not be abused.

The manufacturer who makes quality products and guarantees satisfaction assumes a responsibility to the consumer—and the established manufacturer is concerned with his product and its reputation even after his legal responsibility is over.

Under these circumstances it is proper to give consideration to the rights of the manufacturer, and to clarify, when the issue becomes blurred, the extent of his right to regulate such details of public presentation and sale of his product as are demonstrated to be directly related to the quality of his product.

The quality stabilization bill does this.

It was intended, and it is, a relatively simple issue. The opponents of this measure are obscuring the issue; and in doing so they are making your job, and my job as a cosponsor, that much more difficult.

Here are examples of misrepresentations by the opponents of the quality stabilization bill, along with the answers to these charges.

The charge: Products under quality stabilization will not be subject to the forces of competition.

The Answer: A product under the quality stabilization law must be in "free and open competition" with goods usable for the same general purpose. Any product placed under quality stabilization will compete in price and quality (a) with other quality stabilized products, (b) with brand name products not quality stabilized, (c) with unbranded products, and (d) with private brand products of the retailer.

The Charge: Quality stabilization is a price-fixing act for manufacturers.

The Answer: The reason this allegation crops up is because the opponents of quality stabilization shut their eyes to a simple but fundamental distinction. To permit one manufacturer of a brand name competitive product, a mattress, for example, to control the use of his trademark, is far different than to permit all mattress manufacturers to get together and fix prices. The former is permitted under quality stabilization. The latter is not permitted under quality stabilization. The former promotes competition. The latter destroys competition.

The Charge: Quality stabilization will result in higher prices to the consumer and will cost him "savings" of billions of dollars.

The Answer: Although deep discounting does give the impression of savings in buying well-known brands, these savings are necessarily nullified by a higher markup on other less-known products. This is true because every store has to realize a certain minimum gross margin on total sales. Therefore, it is a gross misconception to add up the savings on specific items and project these on a nationwide basis as to the basis for claims that quality stabilization will result in higher prices to the consumer and cost him "savings" of billions of dollars.

More than one-third of the total volume of trademarked goods sold today are controlled in price all the way from manufacturer to the consumer. These are the brands of large distributors such as chain stores, mail order houses, and cooperative buying organizations. The forces of competition have kept the prices of these brands in line. The same will be true for the prices of products placed under quality stabilization.

The quality stabilization law will extend to a national brand name manufacturer distributing through independent resellers an analogous right to control the use of its brand name as Sears, Roebuck, for example, now possesses for its Kenmore line distributed through its own outlets.

The Charge: Quality stabilization is a crutch for the inefficient retailer and greedy manufacturer.

The Answer: The price of a quality stabilized product, like all retail prices, will be based on costs, competition, and average efficiency. The price will be on the basis of the national average cost of doing business, plus a moderate profit to the retailer. Although the overall costs of doing business may vary somewhat between retailers, the difference between stores in the same field of distribution is not substantial.

By way of analogy, the cost of doing business of individual units of a chain store system do differ, yet there is standard pricing throughout the chain. The chain reasons that the differences are so insubstantial that greater economics of distribution, and lower prices to the consumer, can be achieved through standard prices reflecting the average efficiency of all units. The same will be true for the quality stabilization manufacturer and the units of his field of distribution.

Any manufacturer using the Quality Stabilization Act will be doing so at his own peril. If his prices are too high to protect any inefficient retailer, he prices himself out of the market. If his prices are too low, only a few retailers will handle his product.

The Charge: Quality stabilization is compulsory legislation.

The Answer: Quality stabilization is completely voluntary—for the manufacturer, for the reseller, and for the consumer. No one can force the manufacturer to elect to use the quality stabilization law. No one can force the reseller to handle the quality stabilized product. No one can force the consumer to buy the quality stabilized product.

The Charge: Quality stabilization will put the discounter out of business.

The Answer: There's no reason that the discount house cannot handle trademarked products under the quality stabilization bill—so long as it respects the conditions announced by the trademark owner regarding the use of his trademark. No one can force the discount house to sell or not sell products that are quality stabilized. If it doesn't like the way any trademark owner does business, there surely will be an overwhelming number of substitute products available that will carry no quality stabilization restrictions.

The Charge: Quality stabilization will lead to monopolies.

The Answer: Quality stabilization is antimonopoly because it gives the small businessman a chance to survive. It enables him to compete on a realistic, fair, and equitable basis with giants. Today the giants are swallowing up the small businessman.

The truth of the marketplace is that price wars destroy competition, destroy availability of the product to the consumer, and if unchecked will lead to exactly the conclusion that the House Commerce Committee announced in its favorable report on this quality stabilization bill last year. That committee said:

"We are faced squarely with the proposition that unless the small businessman is afforded the opportunity of making a profit by enabling him to compete pricewise on nationally advertised, branded merchandise, we shall find ourselves faced in a few years with the biggest concentration of retailing in the hands of a few giant corporations that this country has ever seen. And if we permit this trend to continue, the economy of this country will suffer."

The Charge: All products from soup to nuts, from aspirins to zippers, will be placed under quality stabilization.

The Answer: Only trademarked products in free and open competition may be placed under quality stabilization. Those are the technical requirements. But the dynamics of the marketplace impose other practical requirements. The product must possess consumer appeal and be sold broadly through retail outlets that compete one with the other. It must be a product that lends itself to price cutting, to baiting and switching, because of its good name for high quality. It must be a product with no substantial trade-in problem. It must be a product sufficiently stable and free from deterioration to permit its maintaining a substantially uniform value. It must not be a staple sold through supermarket grocery outlets, such as coffee or other canned foods. It must not be a perishable or a highly stylized product, or seasonal merchandise.

In light of these practical marketing considerations, no one knows for sure how many products will be placed under quality stabilization. The best answer seems to be to refer to the experience under fair-trade legislation. In the heyday of fair trade, the world's largest department store, Macy's, admitted in its advertisements that less than 10 percent of the 400,000 items sold had either a price restriction or a price suggestion by the manufacturer as to its resale prices.

Therefore, as to 90 percent of its items, a store can give them away to the consumer. As to the remaining 10 percent of its items, it can remove the trademark and also give them away to the consumer. This will not be prohibited under quality stabilization so long as the store does not use the goodwill of the brand name manufacturer.

The Charge: Quality stabilization will increase the cost of Government.

The Answer: Not one penny will be added to the Federal budget by the enactment of the quality stabilization law. Under quality stabilization there is no Government control nor no Government agency enforcing the act.

The Charge: Quality stabilization will lead to a higher rate of small business failures.

The Answer: To support the above proposition, opponents of the quality stabilization bill have used a sample of about one-half of 1 percent (only 15,782 firms out of approximately 2,600,000 stretched across the whole country) to draw a completely unsupportable conclusion that resale price maintenance laws do not help small business.

They show no causal relationship between failure rates and the status of resale price maintenance laws in the various States. They give no weight to the number of businesses that disappeared without going through bankruptcy.

They ignore the varying socioeconomic factors that influence business failures and evade their responsibility to tell Congress that these factors are not the same in each of our country's States. They ignore the amount and type of commercial activity in each State, the nature of the State's economy, the population growth of the State, the number of new businesses established in the State, the rate of failure of such new businesses.

The opponents of the quality stabilization bill have compared failure rates between fair trade States and non-fair-trade States to show that quality stabilization will lead to a higher rate of small business failures.

Ignoring all of the socioeconomic factors that must be given weight to draw a valid conclusion, the opponents with a straight face compare, for example, business failures in agricultural Nebraska with commercial New York to prove that enactment of the quality stabilization bill would hurt small business in New York. Their proof: The failure rate in 1962 in the fair trade State of New York was 116 per 10,000 firms compared with the 13 failure rate per 10,000 firms in the free trade State of Nebraska.

The truth is that there are no statistics available to either prove or disprove whether quality stabilization, or resale price maintenance laws, or fair trade, help or hurt small business. What is available and significant is expert testimony from business themselves who say that quality stabilization definitely helps small business.

The Charge: Quality stabilization will encourage manufacturers to engage in price-fixing conspiracies.

The Answer: If they do, they violate the Sherman Antitrust Act. And under comparable legislation, namely fair trade, years of investigation by a hostile Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission have failed to produce even one suit charging that a manufacturer conspired with another manufacturer to fix prices on fair-traded products.

The Charge: Quality stabilization puts the American consumer in a pricing straitjacket.

The Answer: The consumer says "yes" or "no" to all prices, quality stabilized or not. If she does not like the quality-stabilized price, she buys a competitive product. Under quality stabilization the price must be right for the consumer or else the manufacturer will lose his market.

The Charge: Quality stabilization will prevent the retailer from doing what he wants with his own property.

The Answer: Everyone agrees that under the Quality Stabilization Act the retailer can remove the brand name of a product and sell the retailer's property, the physical commodity, at any price he pleases, provided he does not use the manufacturer's property—the goodwill in the brand name. When the retailer buys the brand name product, he only gets ownership of the physical commodity. He does not get property rights to the brand name's goodwill. The fact that the retailer rarely removes the brand name confirms (1) the tremendous selling force of the brand name and (2) that goodwill in a brand name represents valuable property.

The Charge: Quality stabilization will hurt the small retailer because the giant store will use its private brands to take away the small retailer's customers.

The Answer: Today there is no profit for either the small retailer or the giant in most national brands. The small retailer does not have the resources to develop his own private brand product. The giant does. His private brand products are priced the same in all of his stores, and the giant makes a reasonable profit on their sale.

Since the small store does not have this alternative of private brands, he must have quality stabilization. This law will enable him to use national brands to compete on a moderate profit basis with the giant store's private brands.

Those who use the private brand argument as a basis for opposing quality stabilization are in effect saying: "Don't throw the drowning man a life preserver. A bulldozer might run over him when he gets to shore."

The Charge: President Kennedy will veto the quality stabilization bill even if it is passed by Congress.

The Answer: The fact is that the President has indicated in no way his position.

There is no logical basis to give weight to the testimony of the Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission as reflecting President Kennedy's position regarding the quality stabilization bill. A repeat of the traditional opposition of the Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission was expected and is of no unusual significance. For example, both of these Government agencies strongly opposed the McGuire fair trade bill in 1952. Yet President Truman signed that bill into law.

There is nothing sacred about the opinion of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission. Theories of Government agencies do not always square with the facts of the marketplace.

You may be sure that President Kennedy is quite aware that leaders of both parties in Congress are strongly supporting the quality stabilization bill as a practical workable tool to help small business.

The Charge: The quality stabilization bill is being sneaked quietly through Congress by lobbyists.

The Answer: The quality stabilization bill is winning on its merits—after long and thorough and exhaustive study not only by this Congress but by preceding Congresses as well.

For example, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee recently went on record recommending that Congress "do pass" this bill. It took its action only after 6 days of hearings had been completed; only after receiving testimony and statements from more than 125 persons and organizations; only after studying a 459-page transcript of the hearings; and only after 4 days of executive sessions on this 1 bill by its 33-man committee.

Witnesses both for and against the bill represented every phase of interest: the consumer, the Government, distribution. Typical of those testifying were representatives of the Department of Justice, Federal Trade Commission, AFL–CIO, National Small Business Association, National Council of Senior Citizens, National Farmers Union, American Farm Bureau Federation, National Consumers League, American Bar Association, etc.

Similar study is being given the bill on the Senate side.

The Charge: Quality stabilization is an outdated way of doing business that stands in the way of lower prices to the consumer.

The Answer: Quality stabilization means more and better—not just cheaper and cheaper—goods and services for the consumer. Quality stabilization keeps open the honest and forward-looking approach to merchandising.

No one has yet developed a magic way to produce low prices—despite sensational claims advanced by some deceptive merchants. The way the American consumer gets long run low prices for quality products is through mass production and mass distribution, and not through bargain-basement merchandising.

The bargain-basement fraternity uses the device of parasitic and deceptive leader merchandising to create the illusion that it sells for lower prices than its competitiors. This type of merchandising is parasitic in that it feeds on someone else's property; namely, the good will of the manufacturer in the brand name that is used as the leader. This type of merchandising is a deceptive short cut to more business because it falsely creates the image that all other products are as low priced as the leader. The facts are otherwise, or else the store would go broke.

Most ethical American retailers have adopted the policy of one price to every customer because it is an honest way to do business. Quality stabilization, in consistency with this policy, helps the consumer—

1. By increasing production and sales, which decreases and lowers prices.
2. By encouraging ease of selection and eliminating the fear of being cheated by higher prices than the neighbor pays.
3. By honesty in pricing, because prices under quality stabilization must be realistic or else they will fail.
4. By making the product available in many outlets, thus adding convenience to shopping.
5. By enabling a manufacturer to build up to a standard of quality rather than down to a price.
6. By arresting the growth of retail monopolies which crush competitors, crush the manufacturer, and crush the consumer.
7. By preserving an opportunity for the small ethical retailer—the backbone of his community and of the free enterprise system—to sell and serve his customers.
8. By intensifying competition among manufacturers to excel.
9. By protecting the consumer from exploitation inherent in loss-leader selling.
10. By bolstering the American economy and strengthening the ability of the American quality manufacturer to compete in the world market.

We in the United States have never accepted that man should be viewed solely as an economic unit. When we have manifested proper concern for increasing our standard of living or increasing the productivity of our economy, it has generally been with the purpose of not only improving the material welfare of our citizens but also of improving their intellectual and spiritual growth, of strengthening the democratic base of our society, and of providing greater opportunity for citizens to perfect themselves as persons and to rear their families in greater dignity.

For these reasons, I am for the enactment of the quality stabilization bill.

[From the New York Times, July 21, 1963]

THE MERCHANT'S VIEW—SMALL BUSINESSMEN AGAIN TURN TOWARD LEGISLATION AGAINST UNFAIR COMPETITION

(By Herbert Koshetz)

Many independent merchants, cognizant of the growing merger trend among chain, variety, and department stores, are wondering if the antitrust laws are affording them protection against unfair competition. Their concern over their ability to stay in business has led them to back such measures as the so-called quality stabilization bill.

Essentially, this bill represents an effort to put into law—on a national scale—the right of a manufacturer to dictate the resale price of his product if he feels that in price-cutting actions, his brand name is being abused.

The bill has cleared the House Commerce Committee with a recommendation for its passage. Hearings have begun in the Senate and there is a definite feeling that it has an excellent chance of being enacted into law unless it meets with a Presidential veto. That possibility exists because of protests voiced by governmental agencies such as the Federal Trade Commission, and by consumer groups.

OPPONENTS COMPARE

Opponents of the bill compare it to fair trade legislation that presently is not vigorously enforced, although it exists in some form in 41 States.

The term "price fixing," when used to designate collusion between sellers, is generally considered anathema to American business. The concept of competition is generally recognized as a vitalizing factor in industry. The opponents of fair trade are prone to compare the setting of a minimum price with price fixing at its worst. They say that if a retailer, through more efficient methods, can offer lower prices, they should be allowed to do so in any way they wish and without any hindrance. Discount merchants, of course, concur with this view.

Yet, it appears that there must be some check on indiscriminate price cutting if the small merchant is to survive. The question is asked whether there should be any effort to help the small distributor to survive. Would not the consumer be better served if all retail distribution was confined to large outlets only?

Students of marketing know that the basis of distribution in the United States still is in the hands of the small and medium-size retailer. The corner drug store, the neighborhood stationer, dry-goods store, butcher, baker, variety store and others, still move the greatest majority of goods into the hands of consumers.

One of the great miracles of American merchandising is availability. Thousands of items are almost immediately available in small and large communities on the shelves of merchants who have shown a willingness to invest in these goods so that they are quickly and easily obtained. Certainly a great part of retail volume consists of sales resulting from ready availability. If it were destroyed, it would follow that a very large portion of productive capacity would not be needed, and that the cost of distribution would rise considerably.

Fair trade faltered in its performance because of inability to obtain enforcement in all sections of the country. In the 1930's, many States had passed fair trade laws that prohibited the resale of products at prices below those stipulated by the vendor. In 1937, the Miller-Tydings amendment to the Sherman Act imparted Federal authority to the State fair trade laws.

This act specifically exempted contracts and agreements prescribing minimum prices on branded items from the prohibitions of the Sherman Act. It was upset, however, in 1952, by the Supreme Court. That body ruled that the Miller-Tydings amendment was limited to voluntary fair trade practices permitted by State law, and those who had not signed agreements with the seller were exempt.

Within a few months of the Supreme Court decision, the McGuire Act was passed to remedy the defects of the Miller-Tydings legislation. It amended the Federal Trade Commission Act by stipulating that nothing contained in that act or in any of the antitrust laws could render unlawful agreements prescribing minimum or stipulated prices. Moreover it specified that nonsigners were subject to price agreements.

Opponents of fair trade thereupon concentrated their attacks in State courts in an attempt to get the individual State laws declared unconstitutional or watered down through decisions declaring nonsigner agreements invalid. As a result, only 24 States enforce nonsigner agreements, while 17 have outlawed them, but still recognize signed agreements.

STORE TRAFFIC AN AIM

Those who cut prices on branded items do not do so from purely altruistic reasons. Admittedly, they are seeking to create store traffic, and know that the consumer who came to buy the cut-price item will stay to buy others that are sold at regular profits.

A retailer knows that his store will need a certain gross profit to be successful. If he is a discounter he will be counting on 25 percent of the cost price, or 33 percent of the selling price to pull him through. This means that he must get an average of these percentages on all his merchandise.

It stands to reason, therefore, that if he sells one-tenth of his goods at severely cut prices, then some part of the other nine-tenths must be marked above his average to meet his earnings requirements. The consumer buying that portion of his goods may not be getting anything resembling a bargain.

PASSAMAQUODDY TIDAL POWER PROJECT

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, as a Republican, I deeply regret that some have so quickly accused the latest Passamaquoddy tidal power project of being a political boondoggle with the crass political purpose of giving advantage to Democrats. I regret it because Quoddy is no more a Democratic project than it is a Republican project.

To the contrary, as far as living officials are concerned, there is more Republican support for Quoddy than Democratic support in the Maine congressional delegation and the Governor of Maine. To the contrary, as far as living officials are concerned, Republican support and action in behalf of Quoddy precedes that of Democratic sponsorship of Quoddy.

For example, Republican CLIFFORD MCINTIRE's active sponsorship of Quoddy precedes that of Democrat EDMUND MUSKIE by several years—for Representative MCINTIRE introduced and obtained hearings by the House Foreign Affairs Committee on Quoddy legislation back in 1953—the hearings being held on July 14, 1953, more than 10 years ago.

Thus, Republican MCINTIRE, presently a member of the House Republican policy committee, was exhibiting effective support of Quoddy long before Democrat MUSKIE was—2 years before Democrat MUSKIE became Governor of Maine and 6 years before he entered Congress. In fact, this was 2 years before Democratic Secretary of the Interior Stuart Udall first came to Congress.

And I do not find anything in the records to show that President Kennedy as a Member of the House or as a Member of the Senate ever declared his support of Quoddy prior to the 1960 presidential campaign.

With Republicans having sponsored Quoddy long before Democrats Muskie, Udall, and Kennedy ever publicly expressed their own sponsorship of Quoddy, I rise in the defense of Democrats Muskie, Udall, and Kennedy and say that it is unfair to accuse them of politics on Quoddy at this time.

Unless and until they should make it an issue in the 1964 campaign by attempting to claim credit for it to the exclusion of the Republican sponsors, it is unfair to accuse them of attempting to exploit Quoddy politically. And it serves no useful purpose to charge partisan politics and impair the bipartisan support for Quoddy. Why not let the project have an opportunity to be judged on its merits instead of alleged politics?

Not only does the Quoddy project have bipartisan support from both Democrats and Republicans, but it also has very interesting support, according to an authoritative reporter, as between liberals and conservatives in the Democratic Party—both liberal Democrats like Senator MUSKIE and conservative Democrats like Senator HARRY F. BYRD of Virginia.

Mr. Floyd T. Nute, in his State house report appearing in the Westbrook, Maine, American newspaper of July 3, 1963, reported the extremely good news that "due to some clever political footwork by ED MUSKIE, Senator HARRY BYRD of Virginia will even vote for the project."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for another half minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. Nute is widely recognized in Maine as a most astute, accurate, and objective reporter on Democratic Party matters. His credentials for authoritativeness and availability to inside Democratic information are extremely impressive—and particularly in this instance—in the fact that he was the press secretary to Gov. EDMUND S. MUSKIE.

Thus, when Mr. Nute reveals that "due to some clever political footwork by ED MUSKIE, Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, will even vote for the project," it is very good news to Quoddy supporters. For everyone knows how Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD has been the champion "watchdog" in the Senate against waste—and particularly in his chairmanship of the committee guarding against nonessential expenditures by the Federal Government.

Everyone knows that Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD would not support a political boondoggle, so how can anyone really accept the charge that Quoddy is a political boondoggle when Senator BYRD is reported to be going to vote for it by the former press secretary to Senator MUSKIE.

Surely this should lay to rest the allegations of political boondoggle made against Quoddy.

Mr. President, because of its pertinence in the matter, I ask unanimous consent that the column of Mr. Nute be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Westbrook American, July 3, 1963]

STATE HOUSE REPORT—EXCITING ELECTION PREDICTED

(By Floyd T. Nute)

AUGUSTA.—While everyone is enjoying a glorious Maine summer, we are going to throw a few coals on the fire and predict that the 1964 elections are going to be the most exciting that this country and this State have had in the last 100 years.

On the national scene, the most obvious piece of political reality has been either skipped over or ignored. President Kennedy is going to do what Teddy Roosevelt tried to do. He has split his party and will run on a liberal ticket—the South be damned.

This is a hard thing for a good politician to do and Kennedy is a good politician, but the incongruous alliance which Franklin Roosevelt created back in the 1930's has finally blown sky high.

We are going to make a prediction right now. Kennedy is going to take Maine in 1964. It makes no difference whether the Republicans put up GOLDWATER or Rockefeller. We were wrong on this before, but not this time.

And here on the State level, Senator ED MUSKIE is going to run on a huge, public power platform and the citizens are going to have to decide whether they want to remain a provincial, colorful State that is an economic disaster area or whether they want a major base for industry.

The Quoddy report, to be released by U.S. Interior Secretary Udall this week, will give the green light to public power for the Northeast.

This has been kicked around so long, that almost everyone here in Maine has adopted a ho-hum attitude, but the ho-hummers will soon have to make up their minds.

The Udall report will not only recommend a Quoddy-St. John River public power project, but there are understood signs in Congress that several hundred million dollars will be forthcoming. Due to some clever political footwork by ED MUSKIE, Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, will even vote for the project.

But nothing can come to fruition without the support of Maine citizens. They will have to really think about this and decide whether they want to go on in the present economic state.

It is a shame that everyone cannot go abroad and see what public power has accomplished, but there is the TVA in the central southern United States: there is the power project in northern Quebec, and there is the power project on the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Where there is cheap power in large amounts, industry comes.

We say this as a fiat. The Maine Central Power Co. and the Bangor Hydro-Electric Co. will not agree on this basic principal, but we will also make another prediction.

None of the Maine private utility companies will oppose the Quoddy-St. John project when it is announced. We will tell why in another installment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I listened with interest to the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] concerning the problem she discussed in connection with the building of a great water project in Maine. I wish to associate myself with her remarks.

(At this point Mr. MANSFIELD assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS QUESTION

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, this morning, at a Commerce Committee hearing, I suggested a new approach to the public accommodations question.

I have felt from the beginning that discrimination in public accommodations is the taint of slavery the 13th amendment was designed to abolish.

I believe, also, that the citizenship clause and the enforcement clause in the 14th amendment give Congress the right and the power to declare and define the incidence of citizenship.

Therefore, I shall endeavor to have the Congress approve a public accommodations bill which relies on the 13th amendment and the citizenship clause of the 14th amendment as well as the commerce clause and equal protection clause which are mentioned in the administration bill.

Dean Erwin Griswold, dean of Harvard Law School and a member of the Commission on Civil Rights, indicated that he was "impressed by this approach" and the more he thought about it the more he realized that there were court cases which would indicate the potentialities of this proposal.

Dean Griswold agreed that my proposal would not be hampered by the State action requirement that affects the due process and equal protection clauses of the 14th amendment.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF VERMONT LEGISLATURE ON FHA LOANS ON RESORT HOMES AND PENSION FOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to present two resolutions of the senate and house of representatives of the Vermont State Legislature. I have a great sense of pride when introducing resolutions from my State because I know they are the product of great research and abiding sincerity and ably reflect the views of the citizens of Vermont.

The first resolution relates to pensions and World War veterans and urges that Congress enact legislation granting a pension to veterans of World War I. I want to associate myself with the feeling that Congress should indeed look into this problem.

Secondly, I want to present a resolution urging a relaxation of restrictions on Federal Housing Administration loans for vacation homes. I have communicated with the FHA and understand that their present policy with regard to FHA insured mortgage loans requires that there be a substantial demand for homes to be occupied the year around.

Vermont is one of America's great recreational areas and offers recreational facilities for all seasons. Visitors to my State constantly stop in my office to express to me the beauties of Vermont in spring, summer, fall, and winter. I am constantly made cognizant of its year-round permanent appeal.

I, therefore, wish to associate myself with this resolution and urge the Federal Housing Administration to give close attention to this resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION RELATING TO FHA LOANS ON RESORT HOMES

Whereas the economy of the State of Vermont is greatly dependent upon recreation and the allied industry which involves the establishment of vacation homes by nonresidents; and

Whereas the ever increasing cost of labor and materials has imposed great financial burdens on those wishing to erect such vacation homes; and

Whereas the present system of financing such vacation homes is not conducive to stimulating the establishment of the vacation home industry; and

Whereas with favorable financing the vacation home industry could add several millions of dollars to our gross national product, and

Whereas the stimulation of this industry would reduce unemployment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the General Assembly of the State of Vermont favors the proposed easing up of restrictions on FHA loans for vacation homes; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to Hon. George D. Aiken, Hon. Winston L. Prouty, and Hon. Robert T. Stafford, as well as to Hon. Philip A. Brownstein, Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration.

JOINT RESOLUTION RELATING TO PENSION FOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS

Whereas the national policy of the United States concerning veterans of the United States has been to grant assistance to them in their declining years by a pension in consideration of their military services in defense of our country; and

Whereas there has been no general pension granted to veterans of World War I by the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the General Assembly of the State of Vermont hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting a pension to veterans of World War I comparable to grants to veterans of American wars prior to World War I; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent forthwith by the secretary of state of Vermont to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officers of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from the State of Vermont.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND CIVIL RIGHTS ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on Memorial Day this year the Vice President of the United States, at Gettysburg, made what I thought at the time was one of the truly great speeches of this generation on the subject of human rights and civil rights. Last night, at the Governors' conference in Florida, he made an equally great speech, in my judgment, and I rise to compliment him, for he lifted the issue, as it ought to be lifted and kept, high above the level of partisan politics; and he very properly pointed out to the Governors, Democrats and Republicans alike, that this is not a partisan issue, but a national issue. I think he again distinguished himself in his speech at the Governors' conference.

I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

Without objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, MIAMI BEACH, FLA., JULY 23, 1963

One hundred seventy-six years ago, our Constitution anticipated our many differences of section, State, and philosophy. That Constitution was ordained and established in the faith that those many differences would be overcome in a single will to unite—to unite as Americans, knowing no North, no South, no East, no West; favoring no creed, despising no color, and holding against no individual any condition of his birth or ancestry.

In that same faith, I come to speak tonight—not of those differences among us which will eventually pass, but of that higher unity which will inevitably prevail.

I know it is not the fashion at present in some quarters to speak hopefully or confidently of the future. Despair, despondency, and defeatism have their disciples among us. But I cannot accept the proposition that hope is wishful or innocent. It is defeatism that is naive. For this generation of Americans, at this moment in our national history, optimism is the only true realism.

In the world and at home, we are beset with old, difficult, and continuing problems. Old perils remain. Old challenges still confront us. The fact of this year of 1963 is that—both abroad and at home—new breezes have begun to blow and we are sailing now with a favoring wind.

In the world, this year of 1963 is developing as a year of unusual portent and significance. For the first time since the beginning of the cold war, there are omens of change in the climate between East and West.

New forces are at work behind the Iron Curtain.

Profound changes are developing in relations among members of the Communist bloc.

New attitudes toward dealings with the West are being manifested by the principal nation of the Communist bloc.

On the basis of present evidence, no man can responsibly imply that the millennium is at hand in relations between East and West or in the success of freedom's cause. But no responsible man will insist that we keep the door closed against the opportunities which seem to be opening. It is a tragic perversion of American leadership—and a betrayal of American character—to ask the people to greet with suspicion any talk of peace and to greet with applause all talk of war.

We sit honorably at the negotiating tables today instead of standing anxiously at the nuclear brink not because we have accommodated the adversaries of our system, but because we have refused to accommodate them—in Greece and Turkey, in Iran and Italy, in Western Europe and West Berlin, South Korea and South Vietnam.

Communism's designs have been repulsed in the Middle East, rejected in Africa, repelled in southeast Asia and forced into retreat from Latin America. Of the six guerrilla wars launched by communism, five have ended in defeat of Communist forces and in the sixth, American support is turning the tide in Vietnam.

Communism's one desperate effort last October to escape the ring of containment by establishing missile bases in this hemisphere ended in a historic retreat—a retreat which history may mark as the vital turning point of the entire cold war.

Furthermore, let it not be forgotten that since the start of the cold war, more than 50 new nations have come into being—and not one has chosen communism. But many have adopted as their own, the concepts and forms and even the language of our own constitutional system.

In the world of today, we must recognize that the winds and the waves are with us. This is the time for us to steer straight and true toward the horizons we have for so long hoped to reach.

But we should also recognize that favoring winds are rising at home. Our record in space is a prime example. We started late. We moved too slowly at first. But the record shows now that where the Soviet Union has successfully launched 43 payloads into orbit, the United States has launched 144. Our ratio of successes to failures in launchings prior to 1961 was only 1 to 1—but it has now reached the ratio of 5 to 1.

The Soviet continues its lead in the ability to launch heavier weights into space. But we are pulling far ahead in developing practical uses of space with weather, communication, and navigation satellites.

We are not racing for prestige in space. We are engaged in a deadly serious race for peace—and for control of our own destiny. This is a race freemen must win.

As we act to grow stronger in space, we are also acting to grow stronger on earth. Since January 1961, we have increased our nuclear warheads in the strategic alert forces by 100 percent; our ship construction and conversion to modernize the fleet by 100 percent; our special forces trained to deal with threats of guerrilla warfare by 200 percent; our airlift capability by 60 percent; our number of combat-ready Army divisions by 45 percent; and our number of tactical air squadrons by 30 percent.

We have increased the muscle of our defenses while trimming away the fat. During the fiscal year of 1963, savings of more than $1 billion were realized in the Defense Department through improvements in operating efficiency. As these improvements continue to take effect, we can look forward to savings by 1967 of nearly $4 billion a year.

Achievements such as these are coming on impressively. But in our domestic economy, too, the favoring winds are blowing briskly.

Since January 1961 our gross national product has risen from $500 billion to $580 billion, up 16 percent. Personal income has risen from $400 billion to a record annual rate last month of $462 billion, up 15 percent.

Corporation profits are up from $39 billion to $53 billion—a gain of 36 percent.

Employment has for the first time in the history of the Nation passed 70 million jobs.

Average weekly wages for factory workers have for the first time in the history of the Nation passed $100.

Farm income last year was up more than $1 billion over 1960—a gain of 11 percent.

This economic expansion has come with consumer prices holding comparatively stable while wholesale prices and industrial prices have actually declined. Moreover, as a consequence of this expansion, the flow of revenue to the Treasury has increased so that the cash deficit for the last fiscal year is only half as large as estimated 6 months ago.

What does this mean for us? I believe the answer is self-evident. Now, while the favoring winds are with us, we should be doing those difficult things which responsibility demands that we do to perfect our system.

That list is long. Many of the items upon it are old: education, unemployment, medicare for the aged, retraining of displaced workers, redevelopment of depressed regions, renewal of blighted cities, revitalizing the family farms, conserving our forest and soil, developing our water resources, curing the problems of mass transit, overcoming the congestion of our city streets.

America is not a nation with its work all done. America is a nation in which much of the most vital work has not yet begun. The demands of the future press down upon us.

Every day, our population over 65 increases by 1,000.

Every day, our population of 16-year-olds increases by 3,000.

Every day, our school-age population grows by nearly 5,000.

Every day, our need for new jobs increases by more than 7,000.

If we are to meet the human needs and the humane obligations of our future, we must move today—while the winds are favoring us—to stimulate our economy, reduce our excessive tax rate, that in some cases is practically confiscatory, overcome the drain on our balance of payments, and restore our national fiscal house to order.

But we remember at all times that governments are not instituted among freemen merely to make budgets and balance them or levy taxes and collect them.

If we are to meet the tests of our future, our foremost challenge is to face and dispose of the problem of human rights which has burdened and compromised our society for 100 years—the problem of the inequality of our Negro citizens.

In saying this, I could not be more aware than I am of the many views of the question represented by this audience—or, in turn, by the people each of you represents.

To some, the issue is "human rights." To others, it is "property rights." Some say, "Negro rights." Others say, "white rights." Some say, "States rights." Others say, "moral rights." The descriptions vary. Slogans are many.

But let us strip away the slogans, the descriptions, the cliches and labels. What is it that we must do? We must attack the "wrongs" in our society—not the "rights."

Whatever the legalisms or traditions, it is wrong that tax-paying, arms-bearing, vote-casting Americans should be unable to find a bed for the night or meals for their children along the highways of our free and decent society. Whatever the reasons, it is wrong that Americans who fight alongside other Americans in war should not be able to work alongside the same Americans, wash up alongside them, eat alongside them, win promotions alongside them, or send their children to sit in schools alongside children of other Americans.

I know of no valid right in our system which is jeopardized or compromised or weakened by correcting the wrongs which we know exist among us. On the other hand, I would suggest that the human rights and property rights of all of us will be strengthened and protected by ending the corrosion of these wrongs.

When I first entered the Senate, Arizona's Senator CARL HAYDEN told me there were two kinds of public officials: show horses and workhorses, talkers and doers.

This question will be answered by the workhorses and by the doers, by those who remove the beam from their own eye before concerning themselves with the mote—or the beam—in the eye of others.

This is not a regional problem, but a national problem.

Men who were denied the right to work last week on a Harlem hospital being built with public funds can understand the plight of their brother in a Birmingham cafe. Discrimination is not confined to the smaller community of Danville, but infects Metropolitan Philadelphia as well. The problem is in Brooklyn and Baltimore, in Charleston and Chicago, in San Antonio and Santa Fe.

In the room in the White House where Jane Adams hung out her wash, the President has talked with labor leaders and businessmen; with Governors and mayors; with editors and women leaders; with educators and Negro leaders. No President in my 30 years of life in Washington has met with so many Governors as has President Kennedy in his search for a solution to the civil rights problem.

Among the people, there is a will to resolve this issue—not prolong it. It is especially noteworthy that throughout the Nation—especially in some of the most difficult States and cities—newspapermen from editors to deskmen are showing the highest order of responsibility and constructiveness.

Americans such as these are doing the workhorse jobs. They are getting results quietly but effectively. Two hundred of the five hundred largest cities in the Southern and Border States—nearly half of them—have taken affirmative action on local public accommodations problems. Right in Miami outstanding progress has been made in a short time by the efforts of ministers and medical society members and department store owners and county commissioners and union leaders.

The trust of public leaders will not be kept by exploiting the issue for partisan ends or discouraging its resolution for personal advantage.

American politics must not be less responsible than the electorate it serves. There can be no Democratic or Republican answer, no White House answer or statehouse answer, no 1964 answer or 1968 answer—but only a responsible American answer achieved by all of us, at all levels, working together all of the time for and with the people.

Let us recognize this one thing: While the Negro has long been the object of studied neglect, many of the conditions he protests today are blind to color. If the Negro is now the first victim, he will not be the last if we fail to cure the ills within our society—of underemployment, undereducation, underdevelopment of our potential, underuse of our productive capacity.

We are moving now with a favoring wind behind us in the world and at home. If we are to resolve these problems within our society, we must act now before those winds fall or change to blow against us.

In response to the challenge before our Nation now, some say "now"; others say "never." But the clear response of the American majority is "together"—together, for there is no other way.

Mr. HART subsequently said: Mr. President, when the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] addressed the Senate and obtained consent to have printed in the Record the speech the Vice President made yesterday at the Governors' conference in Miami, I did not have—unfortunately—an opportunity to speak immediately following his remarks. At this time, I wish to express my pleasure because of the fact that the Senator from Oregon brought to our attention and—through insertion in the Record of the Vice President's speech—to the attention of the people of the Nation that most eloquent expression by the Vice President of aspiration and conviction.

Several weeks ago, when the Vice President spoke at Gettysburg, many of us felt that his speech was as eloquent as any which we could recall having heard. None of us felt it likely that the Vice President could follow it—certainly not so soon as this—with an equally persuasive documentation of the case for civil rights. However, I think the speech delivered yesterday by the Vice President at Miami rang the same bell which he rang at Gettysburg—a bell which I believe is alerting the Nation to the need for Congress to respond constructively to the President's admonitions in regard to civil rights legislation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Michigan in his commendation of the Vice President for his magnificent leadership in the area of civil rights and civil liberties.

REDUCTIONS MADE IN COMMITTEE IN THE FOREIGN AID BILL

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I am gratified by the action of the Foreign Relations Committee yesterday in accepting an amendment, moved by me, to cut from the foreign aid program all further grant assistance, military and economic, to countries capable of sustaining their defense burden and economic growth.

For me personally, this is the culmination of a 4-year effort to put an end to handouts to the prosperous countries of Western Europe, and to Japan, which totaled, in fiscal year 1962, nearly $400 million. During this time, I have said repeatedly that the American people cannot be expected to support the aid programs unless they can see that an end is in sight. In fiscal 1962, the list of recipient countries totaled 107. As a result of this amendment, regular reductions in this list should begin by the end of the coming fiscal year.

Mr. President, I wish at this time to extend my special thanks to the Senators who helped prepare the way for yesterday's committee action by cosponsoring or pledging support to my amendment.

I know that each of them shares my satisfaction that a hard job is at last completed.

THE ATLANTIC FUTURE: EUROPE'S CHOICE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, it was my privilege to be invited, together with Senators Eugene McCarthy, of Minnesota, and Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania, to participate in the summer seminar of the political club of the Evangelical Academy at Tutzing, Bavaria, conducted under the sponsorship of the Lutheran Church. The political club was established after World War II for the purpose of fostering informed citizen interest and involvement in the processes of free government in West Germany.

This year marked the club's 10th anniversary meeting. Among those participating were Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and Dr. Willy Brandt, mayor of West Berlin.

I am advised that my address, delivered on July 16, 1963, will be published in Europa-Archiv, the German journal on foreign affairs. Inasmuch as I spoke to the question, "The Atlantic Future: Europe's Choice," which is a matter of prime concern to the Congress, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks may be published at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Atlantic Future: Europe's Choice

(Address delivered by U.S. Senator Frank Church, on July 16, 1963, before the Political Club of the Evangelical Academy at Tutzing, Bavaria, Germany)

You have honored me with your invitation to speak at this 10th anniversary meeting of the political club at Tutzing Academy, and I should like to reciprocate by giving you a frank statement of my views concerning the future of the treaty which has linked us so closely together. In doing so, I must emphasize that I speak solely in my capacity as an individual citizen. Although I am a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, nothing that I say today should be construed as an expression of the official viewpoint of my Government. I am here to state my personal opinions, nothing more.

We meet at a time of change and crisis in the Atlantic Community, and in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization which has been its sword and shield.

Everyone agrees, on both sides of the Atlantic, as to the fact that a crisis exists. Yet there is a paradox in this, for it is the very success of NATO in accomplishing its original objectives which has led to the present impasse.

NATO was originally established to prevent Western Europe, the heartland of our common civilization, from falling under Russian rule. From the beginning, NATO's shield included large numbers of American troops, whose presence in Europe was proof of the American commitment to invoke her nuclear power, as NATO's sword, in the event of a Communist attack. American arms of both conventional and nuclear character were required to make NATO work, that is, to keep the Russians at bay while the countries of Western Europe, battered and broken in the aftermath of the war, could regain their health and strength.

I do not believe that either the Senate of the United States, which ratified the treaty, or the American people, regarded our entry into NATO as an arrangement for stationing American forces permanently in Europe. Firemen are welcomed into a household threatened by fire, but they are not expected to remain inside indefinitely as residents. So it ought not to be surprising—in view of the remarkable recovery in Western Europe which has since occurred—that some Europeans should begin to ask, "How much longer are the Americans to stay here?" or that some Americans should begin to inquire, "How much longer will we be welcome?"

We have come to the end of the era for which NATO was first created. The circumstances have changed. We must remold our alliance to fit present conditions, or the crisis within it will deepen. NATO cannot remain static and stay relevant; it must be transformed or abandoned; it will adapt to the new era as a useful instrument to serve the objectives we hold in common, or it will come apart from the stress of mounting internal pressures. So we must clearly identify those changes in circumstances which have rendered NATO, as originally conceived, obsolete.

To begin with, there has been a change in the relative strength, and hence in the credibility, of the American nuclear deterrent. This change has taken place in three phases. In the first phase, only the United States possessed massive strike capability with nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union could oppose us with conventional land power alone. Our deterrent was believable, and therefore effective, so long as the Soviets in fact understood that it would be used to prevent, or to punish intolerably, a march by them on the West. In the second phase, the Soviets, too, possessed weapons of mass destruction. But the ones which could reach and damage the American Continent were few in number, and vulnerable to neutralization by the enormously superior and diversified nuclear weapons system which we had by then developed. While the risks to the United States had been greatly increased, there was room to suppose that we could, if necessary, obliterate Soviet power without suffering mortal damage in return. Now in the third, and present phase, this assumption can no longer be made. Each side possesses weapons, sufficient in number, in diversification, in concealment, or in invulnerability, to insure that it could withstand a first strike by its adversary and thereafter inflict nearly total destruction upon him.

The consequence of this third phase is that Europeans must ask themselves, for the first time, if it is really believable that the American Nation would suffer immolation in their defense. And the question is not whether we, the Americans, believe that we would do this, or whether you, the Europeans, believe we would do it. For it is evident that a deterrent has failed if it has to be used, and it follows from this that it is only the adversary's belief about the conditions under which it would be used, not our belief, or yours, or even the objective fact itself, which is ultimately determinative.

I know of no way to remove, absolutely, the doubts which some Europeans have raised about the answer to this question. The cornerstone of American policy has been, and remains, that the defense of the West is indivisible. Our President has recently reaffirmed, here in Germany, that our forces will remain so long as they are wanted and needed; that we will put our cities to the hazard in defense of yours. He spoke, as I am sure you sensed, with absolute sincerity and conviction, and with the support of the American people. Still, the proposition itself is without precedent in human history. It cannot be tested or proved in advance. While it may be convincing to the Soviets, it evidently is no longer convincing to all Europeans, for, if it were, there would be no need to pursue, in France, the effort now in progress to create, at great difficulty and expense, a separate national nuclear capability.

This brings me to the second fundamental change in circumstances which accounts for the crisis in NATO. It is that Europe now has, for the first time, the capacity to create for itself an alternative to reliance upon American power. I make a distinction here between nuclear capability of modest dimensions, useful chiefly as a means of augmenting the prestige or bargaining power of its possessor—perhaps having the potential of invoking, under some conditions, the use of American power—and a genuine nuclear deterrent, capable of massive or controlled response in a variety of strategic situations. It is the latter which free Europe now has the population, the economic base, the technological resources, and the developing political institutions to create and command, if it chooses. In most of these categories, Western Europe now surpasses the Soviet Union itself. If Europe determines that the effort is necessary or desirable, it can, in due course, equip itself to match the Soviet Union, bomb for bomb, rocket for rocket. It would then, of course, be free from the necessity for dependence upon a nuclear deterrent provided and controlled by the United States.

The present drift in free Europe points toward the eventual development of separate national nuclear systems, even though this course represents the most unstable, costly, and inefficient method for achieving nuclear self-sufficiency. Perhaps this is inevitable, as long as Western Europe remains a loose association of wholly sovereign states. The possession of nuclear weapons cannot be separated from the sovereign power to command them, for they represent, in today's world, the instrument of life or death, for the country which has them, for its adversaries and, quite probably, for its allies.

What I have thus far said carries the implication that there is an inherent incompatibility, in this new state of affairs, between sovereignty, if sovereignty necessarily involves possession and control of nuclear weapons, and alliance. I think this is the case, and that this single concept summarizes and explains the reasons for the crisis in NATO.

The continued expansion in Europe of nuclear capability under national control will expose the United States to intolerable risks, so long as our troops are here, and our commitment to regard any attack upon our European allies as an attack upon ourselves is outstanding. Every additional finger upon the nuclear trigger means, in these circumstances, one more person, other than the President of the United States, with power to decide what Americans will die for. While the risks involved in sharing this fateful power with a single independent European state, or with a suitable command structure representing all of Europe, might be acceptable, it is too much to ask that we share it with every European country stocking a nuclear arsenal of its own, each with its own sense of destiny and order of priorities.

In short, the present drift toward proliferation in the control of nuclear weapons, unless it is checked, will eventually force the United States to withdraw from Europe. Time is running out on the NATO alliance. No amount of exhortation will save it.

What then, of the future? How are we to reconcile the conflicting positions on control of nuclear weapons which now plague the alliance? I think we must begin by recognizing that no device or technical arrangement designed to gloss over the differences, without really changing anything, will suffice. As strongly as De Gaulle feels that France must have its own deterrent, we feel just as strongly that we must retain control over the risks to which we are exposed, so long as American forces are committed in Europe, and we supply the nuclear means for meeting or preventing an attack against it. It is possible to share the master plan for programing and targeting, but the core decisions about the use of American nuclear weapons must be made by Americans.

I think there are, however, alternative solutions to the problem. The first is for Europe—not France, or Germany, or even Great Britain, but Europe—to undertake a unified effort to arm itself with a genuine nuclear deterrent capability. To do this would require a genuinely integrated program, not merely because of the expense, but chiefly because it would be necessary to create a unified command structure with the sovereign power to invoke the use of its nuclear weapons in the defense of Western Europe. It seems to me that it would be in the interest of the United States to encourage and assist Europeans to make this effort. We could then withdraw our forces from the continent in an orderly fashion, leaving Europe with its own defense, and both Europe and America could thus minimize the risks inherent in the proliferation of separate national defenses.

This course need not involve, as might first be supposed, a return to isolationism on the part of the United States. On the contrary, the creation of a European entity capable of producing and commanding a unified European nuclear deterrent could contribute to the realization of a stronger partnership, spanning the Atlantic, for the defense and development of our common civilization. I say it could contribute, because partnership is illusory if one partner is in a position to dominate the others. Just as there can be no authentic European entity under the hegemony of France, so there can be no equal partnership across the Atlantic until Europe has achieved cohesion to match and balance the unified power of the United States. In addition to this crucial advantage, there would be others, incidental to the assumption by Europe of full responsibility for its own defense. The American adverse balance of payments problem would then lend itself to ready solution. It is entirely possible, also, that the vexing problems resulting from the artificial division of Europe between East and West, which do not seem amenable to negotiations between Washington and the Kremlin, could be approached from new perspectives by Europeans negotiating with Europeans.

If the problem of a sovereign, integrated European Nuclear Defense Command proves to be insuperable, and this further step toward a more perfect union among the countries of Western Europe is not taken, there is the other alternative. Let Europe forgo nuclear armament, and continue, so long as the cold war makes it necessary, to rely upon the United States to furnish the nuclear deterrent against a Soviet attack upon the continent.

From our national point of view, this alternative is to be preferred, but I think, if we Americans are to be Europe's nuclear sentinels, stationed here for indefinite duty, then we have a right to ask for fairer arrangements and a clearer understanding.

Let it be understood that we are here as your invited guests, not as intruders; that our presence in Europe is no longer a rescue mission, extended by the strong to the weak, but simply a division of responsibility, as between rich equals, for the mutual advantage of each. If we furnish our nuclear deterrent for the defense of Europe, as well as our physical presence to make this deterrent convincing to the Soviets, then Europe must make their exchange, including at least:

1. No further diffusion of nuclear arms, for this will involve intolerable risks, both to us and to Europe itself. If we are to have the responsibility for holding at bay the weapons of mass destruction which might otherwise be used to smash or blackmail Europeans, we must ask that you rely on us to honor that trust in our common interest, come what may.

2. Equitable financial and economic arrangements to assist us in solving our adverse balance-of-payments problem. In this connection, it is notable that our military disbursements abroad contribute five times as much to the drain on our dollar resources as do all of our foreign aid programs. There is no good reason why the force levels of American troops quartered in Europe should not be reduced, and the difference made up by an added commitment of European troops to the NATO Command. It is essential, too, that European trade barriers against American agricultural and industrial products, be reduced or removed as speedily as possible. Finally, we have a right to ask that Europe assume an increased share of the cost of aiding the underdeveloped countries of the world, in those needy regions of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, where the struggle with communism is yet to be won.

There are heavy burdens and responsibilities, for Europeans as well as for Americans, whichever alternative is chosen. And the choice, after all, is Europe's. Either would seem acceptable to the United States. What is not acceptable is a continuation of present trends, which point, I am sorry to say, toward the disintegration of the Atlantic Alliance, leaving a vacuum of policy and power, with diminished security for us all. Happily, the successes we have enjoyed, during the past 20 years, in meeting and solving together a series of formidable problems, augers well for our ability to find, in the years ahead, ways to achieve a constructive transition from NATO to genuine partnership in a developing Atlantic Community.

TRIBUTE TO THE MORMON PIONEERS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in this, Idaho's centennial year, the people of my State pause to join their sister State of Utah in paying tribute to the Mormon pioneers on the 116th anniversary of their arrival at the valley of the Great Salt Lake.

It was on July 24, 1847, that Brigham Young led his little band of Mormons into the Salt Lake Valley and declared, "This is the place." Behind them the Mormons left a past filled with persecution. This had culminated in the murder of their founder and prophet, Joseph Smith, in 1844. It was to escape such persecution and intolerance, to establish a home where they could practice their religion freely and raise their children to worship God as they believed, that the Mormons came west.

In a relatively short period of time, the Mormons had turned the desert into a blooming, fertile farmland. Patient hard work, skillful use of irrigation methods, and endurance born of deep religious faith, enabled the members of the Church of the Latter-day Saints to turn the desert into a home.

An important feature of the Mormon government was religious tolerance. Any man, Mormon or gentile, was free to worship as he pleased. Thus these pioneers, accustomed to being persecuted for their religious beliefs, established a territory wherein every man was to be free of religious persecution.

But persecution of the Mormons did not cease with the establishment of the colony at Salt Lake. In 1848, gold was discovered in California. The Mormons themselves did not catch the gold fever, preferring to remain on their own lands, tilling and irrigating their farms. But swarms of men on their way to the California gold fields passed through Utah, harassing the Mormon settlers. Then, in 1857, the U.S. Government began a shameful chapter in its history when it sent Johnston's Army to Utah to punish the Mormons. This persecution continued throughout the latter half of the 19th century. But in spite of persecution, hardship, and drought, the Mormons maintained their hard-won homeland and began to expand beyond the borders of Utah.

In 1855, Mormon settlers under Thomas B. Smith pushed northward and founded Fort Lemhi, the first major attempt at settlement in my own State of Idaho. In 1860, Mormons established Idaho's first permanent settlement at Franklin, and the second, at Weston, in 1862. Thus, even before the waves of gold seekers poured into Idaho, Mormon pioneers had established settlements in the territory.

Idaho at this time was part of Washington Territory. After the discovery of gold in the Clearwater region by Capt. Elias Davidson Pierce in 1860, men flocked to the Idaho goldfields from California, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington territory. Soon after this, gold was discovered in the Boise Basin, in the Salmon River country, and in the Owyhee and Bannock districts. The territory was rapidly populated and it soon became difficult to govern from the territorial capital at Olympia. It became clear to many that a new territory would have to be created which would include the goldfields east of the Cascades. And so, in 1863, the move for creation of the new territory reached full swing.

During the final days of the "lame duck" session of the 37th Congress, the territory of Idaho was created. Senator Henry Wilson, of Massachusetts, led the fight for passage of the organic act and caused the territory to be given the name "Idaho," which, freely translated, meant "the gem of the mountains." On March 3, 1863, both Houses of Congress passed the bill creating Idaho Territory. President Lincoln signed it into law, and Idaho had passed a milestone on her way to statehood.

It is significant that Idaho was peopled largely from the West—by miners from the goldfields of California, by farmers from Oregon and Washington, and by the Mormon settlers from Utah. In sharp contrast to the rugged and often lawless mining camps, the Mormon settlements in Idaho were stable and peaceful communities which exerted a beneficial influence on the life of the new territory. Law and order, stable government, and permanent agricultural settlements were the legacies of the early Mormons in Idaho.

Today, 100 years after Idaho became a territory and 73 years after she became a State, the Mormons continue to exert a powerful and beneficial influence in Idaho and throughout the Nation. Many of Idaho's leaders in government, in business, and in community affairs are members of the Latter-day Saints Church. Nor is this characteristic only of Mormons in Idaho or Utah, for members of the Latter-day Saints faith all over the United States exercise similar influence in affairs of business and State.

Here in the U.S. Senate, three of our colleagues are members of the Church of Latter-day Saints. Members of the Latter-day Saints faith hold seats in the House of Representatives. Others are serving or have served as Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Interior, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Treasurer of the United States, and U.S. Commissioner of Education.

Mormons have also distinguished themselves in the arts, in the field of entertainment, and in the world of sports, as well as in many other facets of American life.

The Mormon church is almost unique among Christian bodies in that it maintains a nonpaid clergy, deriving its church officials from among its members. As the Bible urges all Christians to do, Mormons tithe, giving 10 percent of their income before taxes to the church. Mormons are equally active in missionary work, with many young men and women of the Latter-day Saints giving up 2 years for voluntary missionary work both in America and in other lands. The Latter-day Saints Church maintains a youth organization known as the Mutual Improvement Association. This offers Mormon young people a combination social organization and personal improvement group, teaching them to speak well, to deal with people, and to lead better lives.

Thus, 100 years after the founding of the Territory of Idaho, the people of Idaho pay tribute to the contributions of the Mormons to our State and to our Nation. One hundred and sixteen years ago, Brigham Young and his hardy little band of Mormon pioneers arrived at the Great Salt Lake. Little could those men and women have then known the influence they would wield, or the benefits they would bring, to the mountainous land to the north—to the State of Idaho.

RACE RELATIONS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the June 10 issue of the New Leader contains an article on the President's role in the crisis of race relations, entitled, "A Chance for Greatness," by Karl E. Meyer, of the Washington Post.

At the end of this article, Mr. Meyer says that "great business now beckons to President Kennedy." Earlier in the article, the point is made that "technology is not what differentiates America from the Soviet Union." Mr. Meyer adds:

> Indeed, the United States has fallen into a Soviet trap by letting ideological competition focus on gadgetry, and the Negro has given his country a chance to get out of the trap. The question that the racial revolt, North and South, poses is whether the majority of Americans can rededicate themselves to some purpose more ennobling than supremacy in supermarkets, superhighways, and superbombs.

I share this conviction, Mr. President, and I ask that the article to which I have referred be printed in full at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Chance for Greatness

(By Karl E. Meyer)

Washington.—In a speech that was widely quoted in the Capital last week, Secretary of State Rusk spoke of the "deep injury" that racial injustice was inflicting on America's world standing. "Our voice is muted," he said, "our friends are embarrassed, and our enemies gleeful because we have not really put our hands fully and effectively to this problem at every level of our national life." Because of this, Rusk continued, American diplomats must conduct foreign policy as if they were in a foot race with one leg in a cast.

Yet as one reflects on the meaning of today's Negro revolt, it is possible to argue quite the reverse proposition. In the process of freeing himself, the American Negro may shake his own society out of the complacent torpor—indeed, the sleeping sickness—that is the pervasive national malady. If he can reawaken the dormant radical tradition in American life, the Negro could give a greater lift to national prestige than any conceivable feat in outer space. There are signs that a miracle of this magnitude might occur.

Not since the economic collapse of the 1930's has any domestic crisis so shaken the country. No longer the invisible man, the Negro has chased Cuba and Laos off the front page and forced his countrymen to confront an evil within remedial range. Magazines are thrusting deeper; not long ago, the New Yorker published James Baldwin's cry of despair—an essay on being black that has become the manifesto of a minority—and last month Life creditably ran a report by a Negro journalist on the Black Muslims that was free from the usual cliches.

It is difficult, too, to overstate the effect of television. The coaxial cable has made the country a single community and virtually every evening the news programs carry film footage that makes comment superfluous. An example was a report the other day on a sit-in demonstration in a Mississippi department store in which Negroes were dragged from a lunch counter and were stamped upon or had catsup squirted on their heads. This is a passion play with a hundred million witnesses—for once, one is grateful for television.

The word passion can be used in a double sense. No quality has been more absent from national politics, and in Washington one can feel the tingling of a long-sleeping limb. A fortnight ago, Attorney General Robert Kennedy had his now-famous encounter in a New York apartment with a group of Negroes rounded up by James Baldwin. The President's brother was shocked by the depth of passion. "He didn't get the point," Baldwin said afterward. "He was naive. He doesn't know pain. He just doesn't know."

The Kennedys are learning. The President is moving with a tide that may take him in directions hitherto uncongenial to his temper. This is the kind of problem that does not yield simply to adroit managerialism—and yet the White House has grounds for gratification. It has been the standing complaint that a lack of urgency in national opinion has tied the President's hands. There is now no lack of urgency; President Kennedy has come to a Finland Station in which the momentum of events can be influenced by his own leadership.

One path ahead, clearly, is legislative. Civil rights measures which a few months ago were considered unobtainable are now given chance of passage in Congress. The administration is belatedly presenting proposals that would broaden Federal authority in dealing with demonstrations against segregation in stores, theaters, hotels, and restaurants. This would finally ease the unfair burden placed on the courts, which, by virtue of political paralysis, have been forced to preside over a piecemeal social revolution and take the full brunt of the segregationist attack.

But a change of laws can only work if there is a change of heart, and here President Kennedy meets the more exacting test. He must be able to articulate the Negro cause in a way that makes change seem not only necessary but also wholly just. Thus far, he has dealt circumspectly with the race question, stressing the need for law and order and for community responsibility. Yet without being preachy, the President must surely use the pulpit of his office for a series of addresses modeled in the tradition of Lincoln (and not, for a change, of Churchill).

If Kennedy succeeds, his Presidency may prove more memorable than anyone dared to hope. One has the impression that a country sated with material wealth is ready for an appeal to the radical ideas of equality charted in the Declaration of Independence and sustained in a Civil War. A response to this appeal could be more decisive in foreign affairs than any grisly weapon the Pentagon could concoct. "In the final analysis," President Kennedy wisely observed before his election, "our foreign policy, our relations with other countries, will be most affected by what we do here in the United States. It was Franklin Roosevelt's compassionate actions here at home that built his great reputation abroad. What we are speaks much louder than what we say."

Hence one can argue that the Negro revolt in America is as much a national opportunity as a handicap. It opens a field for the compassionate action of a Roosevelt. A confirming statement comes from an unexpected source, Premier Sékou Touré, an African nationalist who is nobody's puppet. Asked in Ethiopia about the Birmingham riots, Premier Touré replied: "We cannot say that the American people are racists—racism exists everywhere, even in Guinea. We know that in the United States a fight is being organized by the government of President Kennedy. We approve without reserve of this policy by President Kennedy."

No American astronaut could elicit the same tribute; technology is not what differentiates America from the Soviet Union. Indeed, the United States has fallen into a Soviet trap by letting ideological competition focus on gadgetry—and the Negro has given his country a chance to get out of the trap. The question that the racial revolt, North and South, poses is whether the majority of Americans can rededicate themselves to some purpose more ennobling than supremacy in supermarkets, superhighways, and superbombs.

"We talk about ourselves these days," Walter Lippmann wrote a few years ago, "as if we were a completed society, one which has achieved its purposes and has no further great business to transact." Great business now beckons to President Kennedy, and Dean Rusk may yet bless the cast on his leg.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES GROSSLY UNEQUAL IN OUR COUNTRY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, for more than a century the pride of America has been its fine system of public school education. It was founded on the premise that education is the heart of a democratic society and is the birthright of every American. Through the years, we have willingly supported our public schools in the belief that it is in them that we develop our most precious natural resource, our children. Although our system of public education has worked well, I maintain we could do better—much better. Indeed, it must be the very best if our society is to meet the grim challenges of the years ahead.

The sheer pressure of population growth has brought about a critical need for rapid expansion of educational facilities and rapid increase in educational personnel. Today there are 70 million young Americans under the age of 20. Seven years from now there will be 86 million. This year, alone, there are 1 million more 16-year-olds than last year.

Because of this population pressure, our educational needs, now and in the years to come, are staggering. Since 1950 enrollment in our schools and colleges has increased by over 50 percent, and it is expected that by 1970 college enrollment will double and secondary school enrollment will increase by 50 percent.

One and a half million new classrooms will be needed for elementary and secondary schools in this decade. Yet, last fall we had a shortage of 121,000 classrooms, and if current construction rates continue we will make up only half of what is needed. Moreover last year, 1½ million of our children were studying in overcrowded classrooms, and 2 million others were studying in substandard conditions of health and safety. These figures represent but a small illustration of our very immediate educational needs.

Recognizing the enormousness of the problem, we must also recognize that this is not only a local problem, but a national one as well. Education is a serious national problem. If education is inadequate in one area, ability is undermined in all areas. Today, we are allowing a situation to exist in which educational opportunity is unequal. The quality of education a child receives can often be measured in terms of the dollars and cents devoted to his schooling. I am startled by the disparity between the expenditures per pupil by the States. For example, during the current school year, New York State spent $645 per pupil in public elementary and secondary schools. My own State of Ohio spent $422 per pupil. At the same time, the expenditure per pupil in Arkansas was only $279 and in Mississippi, $230. I state these wide differences in expenditures regretfully.

State and municipal taxes in most States already are committed to the hilt. Dropping the solution of this massive problem in their laps will mean that we are willing to sentence our school system permanently to the near-starvation diet which now stunts its growth and development.

Fine young scholars in a number of States—to mention Arkansas and Mississippi as being only two of a number—are discriminated against, through no fault of their own. A student who possibly could become a great nuclear physicist who would serve our Nation magnificently may thereby be deprived of that opportunity, due to inadequate training.

We only need use our eyes. A visit to the school buildings of almost any city will reveal the crowded conditions under which millions of children receive their basic education. In Cleveland, Ohio, in other communities in my State of Ohio, and in States throughout the Nation, those in charge of the schools have had with increasing frequency to resort to the use of half-day sessions, instead of permitting pupils to attend the full-day sessions they need for an adequate education.

Mr. President, we owe our children the best possible education. The form and content of this education, we all agree, must remain for educators and local and State school boards themselves to determine. There is, and will be, no attempt by the Federal Government to interfere with this traditional concept of education in our Republic. I flatly reject the charges of opponents of Federal aid that Government assistance will bring Government control.

The Government's sole responsibility—in the absence of State and local ability to meet fully the pressing need—is to help to construct adequate classroom space and to train and attract enough qualified teachers.

I assert that those who mournfully predict that Federal aid to education connotes Federal control are completely wrong. The evidence is against them. Federal assistance programs, from the time of legislation for the land-grant colleges to the GI bill of rights, have brought no hint or suggestions of Government domination of schools.

Those who cry of a "Federal takeover" are wasting their tears and our time. Our total national expenditure for education is about $30 billion. The Federal Government contributes only 4 percent of this. Administration officials have recently proposed that we increase the Federal contribution toward education to a rather modest extent which might bring Federal Government contributions to 6 percent or 8 percent of the total instead of 4 percent.

While some of us are splitting straws over whether an educational crisis exists and whether a suitable solution can be found, the problem grows.

We have an obligation to provide the finest possible education for all the school children of this country. They cannot be given the finest possible education in antiquated, overcrowded school buildings, with classes conducted by teachers who have received inadequate training, and who are there on an emergency or temporary basis.

We must begin now to correct the deficiencies in our public school system. They will not disappear if we ignore them. They will only grow more acute. The time has come when the only interest which must be satisfied is the interest of our children—the interest of those whose future is dependent upon education.

I fervently hope that before this Congress adjourns we shall have enacted into law an adequate aid-to-education bill. The strength, power, and supremacy of our Nation a few years hence will in large part depend upon how well we provide education for the schoolboys and schoolgirls of our time.

THE PRESIDENT'S HISTORIC IMMIGRATION MESSAGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, speaking as one Senator who has been deeply involved for many years in the struggle to revise our immigration and naturalization statutes, I cannot express too forcefully my enthusiasm for the courageous and far-seeing immigration message sent to Congress yesterday by President Kennedy.

I recall that when the President was still a Member of the Senate, he joined with the Senator from Minnesota in introducing immigration legislation with objectives quite similar to the bill sent to Congress yesterday. The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] has assumed command of efforts in Congress to enact these new recommendations. He is the author of proposed legislation (S. 747), with which I have long been associated, and that I am proud to cosponsor in the 88th Congress, legislation to put the quota system on a rational and just basis.

Although Congress faces many urgent matters of national importance at this session and the next, I fervently hope we can nevertheless push ahead with the long-postponed, long-overdue task of bringing our immigration laws up to the civilized standard which the world has reason to expect of the United States. The present system is cruel, unworkable, discriminatory, and illogical.

As a nation composed almost entirely of immigrants, and as a nation that has profited and prospered immeasurably from the many nationalities who have come to our shores, we can ill afford to continue for much longer the immigration policies that have critically hindered an infusion of new citizens into the lifeblood of this Nation.

I urge prompt consideration by the appropriate congressional committees of the President's bill and related immigration legislation so that the 88th Congress will not adjourn sine die until affirmative and constructive action has been secured by both Houses.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in this morning's Washington Post and an article published in the New York Times dealing with the President's immigration message be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 24, 1963]

Immigration: A Sea Breeze

President Kennedy has proposed to Congress the best immigration law within living memory to bear a White House endorsement. He would remove altogether the ignoble national origins quota based on the composition of the country in 1920—a system that he rightly says in his letter to the Speaker of the House "is without basis in either logic or reason. It neither satisfies a national need nor accomplishes an international purpose."

The new law that Mr. Kennedy seeks would squarely meet national needs and accomplish considerable international purpose. Over a 5-year period, national origin quotas would be eliminated and the quota numbers assigned to a new pool. Priorities for admission would be given first to immigrants with skills needed in our economy, second to persons related to individuals already here and finally on a first-come, first-served basis—with a safety proviso that no one country receive more than 10 percent of the quota numbers authorized in a single year.

Two other touchy problems are intelligently dealt with. Present law embodies an objectionable formula that provides that any person with at least one parent born in nonwhite Asia be admitted in terms of the country quota of his ancestors—regardless of where the applicant himself was born. This provision would be expunged. Secondly, Jamaica, Trinidad, and Tobago would be given the same nonquota status as other independent countries in the Western Hemisphere, a change which accords with a long tradition.

The administrative structure of the law would be flexible. Its provisions could be modified if the President accepts the recommendations of a seven-man immigration board with four members appointed by Congress and the rest by the President. In terms of overall numbers, the proposed bill would entail a modest increase over last year's immigration total of 283,763 persons—with the one uncertain factor being the number of West Indians who might enter the United States.

The bill does not take up the harsh deportation and exclusion features of the McCarran-Walter Act, but there is no reason why Congress should not reappraise these clauses—and indeed, Chairman Celler of House Judiciary has already indicated he intends to do just this. Ironclad political exclusion policies which involve a cumbersome waiver procedure have been a continuing source of embarrassment to a country hostile to walls. In addition, Congress might well consider, as we have suggested previously, the insertion of general language in the preamble stating the larger goal of creating a free world community in which people can move as freely as trade and capital. The bill represents a long stride in this direction, and strong and informed pressure should be brought on Congress to pass a measure that is sensible, liberal, and overdue.

[From the New York Times, July 24, 1963]

President Urges Repeal of Quotas for Immigration—He Asks Congress To Admit Aliens Without Regard to Country of Their Origin—Bar to Asians Opposed—New System Would Allot Highest Priority to Those With Useful Talents

(By Tom Wicker)

Washington, July 23.—President Kennedy asked Congress today to abolish the quota system of immigration within 5 years.

The quotas, in effect since 1924 and based upon the census of 1920, would be reduced by 20 percent in each of the 5 years, until they disappeared. With them would go the much-criticized system by which the United States has sharply limited immigration from southern Europe and Asia.

The country most affected would be Italy. Government officials estimated today that Italian immigration would rise from the present annual quota of 5,500 to an average of more than 16,000 in each of the 5 years that would follow enactment of Mr. Kennedy's proposals.

TERMS OF KENNEDY BILL

The President's bill would provide for an eventual annual immigration total from all countries of about 165,000 persons. They would be admitted generally without regard to country of origin but by no means at random.

In addition to this major goal, Mr. Kennedy proposed the abolition of racial-origin restrictions against persons of Asian descent. His bill would also end the requirement that persons seeking immigration on grounds of their special skills or talents first obtain employment in this country.

It would permit the immigration, in addition to the established annual quota and without numerical restriction, of parents of American citizens, and of residents of Western Hemisphere nations that have gained independence since 1952—Jamaica, Trinidad, and Tobago.

CITES COMPELLING NEED

Congressional approval of these changes, most of them controversial, is not believed likely this year and promises to be difficult at any time in the House of Representatives.

However, Mr. Kennedy, the author in 1958 of a little-known book called "A Nation of Immigrants," said that there was a "compelling need" for an immigration law "that serves the national interest and reflects in every detail the principles of equality and human dignity to which our Nation subscribes."

The President sent his draft bill and an accompanying letter to Speaker of the House John W. McCormack and Vice President Johnson.

The system he proposed as a replacement for national quotas would give first priority to persons of useful skills and attainments—those, as Mr. Kennedy said, "with the greatest ability to add to the national welfare." Engineers, doctors, teachers, and scientists would probably be high in this category.

Second priority would go to persons whose immigration would reunite a family—to the unmarried, adult daughter, for instance, of parents already living in the United States.

A Government officer estimated that under these priorities relatives of persons already in the United States would provide more than half the annual total immigration.

ONE RESTRICTION PROPOSED

After these priorities, admission would be governed by the date of application, still without regard to country of origin.

The only national restriction would be that no country could provide in any one year more than 10 percent of the total annual immigration.

Thus, the present inflexible assignment of quotas would be eliminated. Under the quota system, 68,000 immigration places went unfilled in 1962 of a potential total of 157,000.

This was because many countries, notably Ireland and the United Kingdom, did not fulfill their large quotas. But the unused places could not be transferred to countries like Italy with small quotas and huge backlogs of would-be immigrants.

It is estimated here that 300,000 persons have registered for emigration to the United States in Italy since World War II, in addition to those who have been admitted.

Following are the details of the system by which Mr. Kennedy proposed to eliminate the restrictive national quotas that created this backlog, and similar ones in other countries:

First, 20 percent of each national quota would be placed in each of the 5 years into a quota reserve pool, to be distributed on the basis of the proposed new system.

Thus, in the first year, about 32,800 quota numbers—20 percent of the annual quota total of 156,700 from all countries—would go into the reserve pool. In the second year, the same number, plus a further 20 percent, a total of 65,600, would go into the pool.

In addition, unused quota numbers for a given year would be assigned to the reserve pool in the following year. That is, a country with a remaining quota of, say, 4,000, of which only 3,000 places were filled, would have 1,000 additional of its quota numbers assigned to the pool the next year.

OVERALL ANNUAL QUOTA

After 5 years, the reserve pool would have absorbed the national quotas entirely. Together with some relatively minor additions, this would create a new annual immigration quota, from all countries, of 165,000 persons.

The increases would result from a provision doubling the present minimum quota of 100 persons. This would add 7,000 to 8,000 persons to the annual total.

Neither during the 5 years of the transition period, nor after the national quotas had been eliminated, could natives of any single country take more than 10 percent of the total annual immigration.

Thus, the Italians, as an example, would be limited at most to about 16,500 immigrants annually. For a number of years, officials expect that Italian immigration would average that number.

In the 5-year period, the President would be authorized to set aside up to 50 percent of the reserve pool. He could use this authority to adjust cases of hardship arising under the new system, and to obtain the admission of a representative number of persons from closely allied countries.

In pursuit of these purposes, the President would have the power to set aside the 10 percent limitation. For instance, if the present large immigration from Britain (20,000 persons a year) were sharply curtailed by a combination of the annual 20 percent reductions in its quota and the assignment to the reserve pool of its unused quota numbers, the President could authorize additional immigration from Britain.

The President would continue to have this discretionary authority over up to 50 percent of the annual immigration even after the 5-year transition. Officials said it would become less important after the quota system had been abolished.

In making such allocations, and for other purposes, Mr. Kennedy would have the advice and assistance of a new seven-man immigration board.

Again using Italy as an example, the following situation might arise:

In, say, the second year of the transition period, Italy would have a quota of 3,300 (its original quota of 5,500, minus 40 percent). In addition, Italy would be eligible to send a maximum of about 13,200 more persons to the United States from the quota reserve pool, making up the permissible 10 percent share of the total of 165,000.

In practice, Italy's share of the reserve pool would be governed by the priorities established in the law, and by the President's use of his authority to reserve 50 percent of the pool.

Two other countries vitally affected would be Greece and Poland. The latter, with a quota of 6,488 annually under present law, has a backlog of 60,000 applicants. Under the new law, Polish immigration might hit an average of 12,000 a year, officials said.

Greece, which has a quota of only 308 a year, has a probable backlog of 100,000 persons seeking immigration here. Under the proposed law, her migration to the United States also would rise to 12,000 a year.

All these figures are inexact, because so are the backlog figures. There is no way to tell, officials said today, how many on the Greek or Italian or other lists are now dead, have emigrated to some other country, or have changed their minds about leaving their native lands.

The proposed bill would cope with this situation, and with so-called insurance registrations. The latter are registrations for future entrance into the United States by persons who want to establish a priority but who at the time of registration do not intend to come here.

The new bill would empower the Secretary of State, at his discretion, to order new registrations, in effect purging the old lists. It would also require part of the visa fee to be paid at the time of registration.

The Secretary could also terminate the registration of any person who had become eligible for immigration but who had turned down a visa. At present, such persons remain on the list.

Other major provisions of the draft bill are as follows:

Racial origin restrictions on persons of Asian descent would be repealed. These restrictions now provide that if half an immigrant's ancestors come from an Asian or Pacific island nation, he cannot be considered under the quota of the country of his birth, but only under the quota of the nation of his ancestry.

A person of Japanese descent born in Brazil, which is accorded unlimited immigration to the United States, would thus have to be considered under the Japanese annual quota of 185.

Refugee admittance would be liberalized. The President would be authorized, if the circumstances warranted, to disregard the date of application for immigration and speed up the admittance of a person regarded as a refugee. In addition, the regular refugee quota would be broadened to permit admittance of refugees in addition to those under the mandate of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees, and from Algeria.

In addition to easing admittance requirements for persons of high skills, a special preference would be established for other persons who could help fill specific labor shortages. Special preference would also be extended to the parents of alien residents.

Provisions of present law barring admittance of most persons with mental afflictions would also be eased. Such persons, who are the spouses, children or parents of a citizen or alien resident could be admitted by direction of the Attorney General. Restrictions on epileptics would be abolished.

Administration sources said today that they expect the bill to be introduced in the Senate by Senator Philip A. Hart, Democrat, of Michigan. It was hoped, they said, that perhaps half the Senate would join in sponsoring it and that passage could be obtained in that body during the 88th Congress.

In the House, the bill will be introduced by Representative Emanuel Celler, Democrat, of Brooklyn, who is chairman of the Judiciary Committee. Its prospects are considered dim for the time being, owing to a lack of established leadership on immigration affairs in that body.

LET US ALSO NOTE CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRESS IN AMERICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Congress and the Nation have been deluged and inundated in recent weeks with reports of racial violence and discord that has broken out in all sections of the United States.

I think it is unfortunate that all too often too little notice is given to the definite progress in civil rights that is also being made. Many grave problems remain and unfortunately will take many years to resolve. But other differences are being constructively met, solutions are being developed, and the cause of human rights is going forward. I believe it is just as important to report the hopeful and encouraging news as it is to spread the problems on the pages of the Record.

Today I should like to note the tentative settlement of racial discord in Cambridge, Md., that was reached yesterday.

I feel certain that the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], is every bit as grateful and thankful for this agreement as is every other Member of this body. I comend him for his most helpful suggestions in achieving this result. The agreement is a victory not for either side; it is a victory for all the citizens of Cambridge. Let me add, not being a citizen of Maryland, but a citizen of Minnesota and the United States of America, that it was a victory, too, for all Americans.

The Attorney General deserves the praise and commendation of every American for the most constructive role he played in reaching this accord. Similarly, the Cambridge Nonviolent Action Committee, under the leadership of Mrs. Gloria H. Richardson, the mayor of Cambridge, the Honorable Calvin W. Mowbray, and others who participated in this initial agreement are to be congratulated. I echo the sentiments expressed at the conclusion of the meeting yesterday at the Department of Justice, namely, that the agreement "was not a victory for either side—it is a victory for all the citizens of Cambridge." And let me add—for all Americans.

I also note the heartening progress being made in Birmingham toward greater freedom for all persons and tranquility for the entire community. A report published in yesterday's New York Times was indeed encouraging in this regard. Likewise I also note the progress that is being made in New York to open the construction trades to qualified workmen without regard to race, color, or national origin.

None of these reports represents final or total solutions. But each one should be duly recognized for the hopeful note it injects in the evolving civil rights picture in this country.

I intend periodically to bring other reports of good news to the attention of the Senate, because I want the American people to know of the progress that has been made, as well as of the problems we face. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that three articles commenting on these developments in Cambridge, Md., Birmingham, Ala., and New York City, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 24, 1963]

Pact Is Reached for Racial Peace in Cambridge, Md.—5-Point Accord Is Signed by Negroes and City Officials — Mayor Pledges Aid

(By Ben A. Franklin)

Washington, July 23.—The explosive civil rights struggle in Cambridge, Md., was tentatively settled here today after 72 hours of intensive Federal intervention.

Under the terms of a five-point agreement signed this morning in the office of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, Negro desegregation demonstrations will cease immediately "for an indefinite period."

(In Charleston, S.C., 62 merchants agreed to integrate their stores, in the hope that this would end demonstrations there, the Associated Press reported.)

"Now we have an agreement on paper," Mr. Kennedy said. "Whether it will be implemented, whether it will mean something for that city, its citizens and the country, is going to depend on the effort, good judgment, the confidence, the faith of the Negroes and whites alike.

"Now it is up to the people that are here around this table," he continued. "It is also up to the individual citizens of that city."

In halting demonstrations, Negro leaders reversed the position they had taken in earlier attempts to reach a settlement.

A key to the accord was their acceptance of a possible referendum on city legislation desegregating public accommodations.

WOULD DESEGREGATE SCHOOLS

Other points in the agreement call for:

Rapid desegregation of the Cambridge public schools, now totally segregated.

The construction of a low-rent public housing project for Negroes.

The employment of a Negro in the Cambridge office of the Maryland Department of Employment Security.

The appointment of a Human Relations Commission.

The agreement noted that the city had adopted a charter amendment desegregating public accommodations and said "it is hoped" that it would become effective August 20.

The city council voted the amendment 3 weeks ago after it had refused to pass a desegregation ordinance, which would not have been subject to a referendum.

If 780 registered voters—20 percent of the voting list—petition for a vote, the referendum must be held. The deadline for the petition is August 9.

However, Mayor Calvin W. Mowbray pledged his government today to blocking the petition.

It was the possibility of a repetition of violence in Cambridge in spite of modified martial law there, it was reported, that caused the Negroes to change their position.

Mr. Kennedy was instrumental in achieving the crucial concession during an 8-hour conference yesterday.

Gov. J. Millard Tawes initially ordered the National Guard into Cambridge on June 14. Four days after the troops withdrew on July 8 he had to order them back because violence again erupted.

More than 900 troops are now there. Their commander, Brig. Gen. George M. Gelston, said today he would reduce the force, but the rest would remain until peace was assured.

Federal efforts to bring both sides together intensified over the weekend. Negro leaders accepted an invitation from Burke Marshall, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the civil rights division, to meet in Washington yesterday. General Gelston, Attorney General Thomas B. Finan of Maryland, his deputy, Robert C. Murphy, and Edmund C. Mester, an aid of Governor Tawes were also invited.

Cambridge officials were absent from the session, which lasted until midnight. They were represented by Mr. Finan.

Their absence was taken as an indication that the focus of the Justice Department's efforts was on the Negro leaders' refusal to accept the settlement package.

Attorney General Kennedy, Mayor Mowbray and the leaders of the Cambridge Nonviolent Action Committee, which had conducted the 19-month Negro campaign, stressed that the agreement was "not a victory for either side—it is a victory for all the citizens of Cambridge."

Seated at Mr. Kennedy's right in his office was Mrs. Gloria H. Richardson, chairman of the Negro group. She said:

"We are very pleased with the agreement. We look forward to moving to a new era in which we can work together on community relations instead of just Negro and white relations."

Cambridge is the seat of Dorchester County. The county's State Senator and four-man delegation to the lower house of the Maryland General Assembly voted last March to exempt it from the State public accommodations law.

The measure is now in effect in 12 Maryland counties covering about 90 percent of the State's population.

Dorchester County's exemption is widely believed to have touched off the wave of Negro demonstrations that began in April.

[From the New York Times, July 24, 1963]

The Text of the Cambridge, Md., Accordance

Whereas the Negro citizens of the city of Cambridge have organized for the purpose of eliminating racial segregation and discrimination in all public institutions and privately owned business establishments catering to the general public in the city of Cambridge; and have as their further purpose and objective the securing of equal employment opportunities and better housing facilities for all of the Negro citizens of Cambridge and;

Whereas the Negro citizens of Cambridge have petitioned city officials of Cambridge toward the accomplishment of these ends; and

Whereas the resolution of these problems has occasioned racial unrest in the city of Cambridge for a period of approximately 19 months; and

Whereas the situation became such as required, on June 14, 1963, the ordering of the Maryland National Guard to Cambridge to maintain peace and order in that community; and

Whereas despite the presence of the National Guard, incidents have occurred which have aggravated and heightened tensions brought on by the attempted resolution of such racial problems; and

Whereas since the proclamation of the Governor sending the National Guard to the city of Cambridge, there have been numerous meetings between representatives of the Negro citizens and representatives of the city of Cambridge and State of Maryland, at which time the various grievances aforesaid were discussed and proposals tendered by the Negro citizens were considered, all of which were predicated upon a desire of those representing the Negro community to achieve equal rights and opportunities; and

Whereas further progress can best be obtained in an atmosphere of calm and serenity; and

Whereas various negotiations, including those held today, July 22, 1963, under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Justice, have produced material and tangible accomplishments to the satisfaction of the just and equitable goals of the Negro citizens of Cambridge, some of which are as follows:

1. The mayor and city council of Cambridge have appointed a biracial committee, designated as the Human Relations Commission of the city of Cambridge, on which commission four Negro citizens have been named as members.

2. A Negro citizen has been retained, effective August 1, 1963, as an interviewer with the Department of Employment Security of the State of Maryland in the Cambridge office.

3. The mayor and commissioners of Cambridge have adopted a charter amendment which provides for desegregation of places of public accommodation. Though said charter amendment may be subject to a referendum, as provided by law, it is the hope of all those signing this agreement that such a referendum vote will not be necessary and that said amendment will become effective on August 20, 1963. The parties hereto express the belief that it is in the best interest of the entire city of Cambridge that the charter amendment not be petitioned to referendum.

4. Firm assurances were received today that desegregation of the first four grades in the Dorchester County school system will be accomplished by the opening of the school year, September, 1963, and that applications for admission to any grade in any school within the Dorchester County school system are now ready to be received and processed without regard to race, creed, or color.

5. The mayor and commissioners of the city of Cambridge, acting by and through its duly constituted housing authority, will cause the necessary applications to be filed with the Federal Housing Administration in order to obtain a low rent public housing project which will materially benefit the Negro community. Absolute conformation of such action has been received today from the mayor and commissioners of Cambridge, and, at a meeting between Negro representatives of the city of Cambridge, held in the city of Washington, with Dr. Robert C. Weaver, Federal Housing Administrator, Dr. Weaver gave assurances that such application would be expeditiously processed.

In recognition of the above, and in order to achieve continued cooperation in a climate most conducive to successful implementation of the purposes set forth in this agreement, the representatives of the Negro citizens of the city of Cambridge hereby agree that there will be no form of protests or demonstrations for an indefinite period hereafter.

The parties hereto whose signatures are affixed below realize that although there are no legal sanctions attached to this agreement yet it is considered as imposing a moral obligation upon them to abide by and fully support the spirit and intention of this agreement.

Mrs. Gloria Richardson, chairman, Nonviolent Action Committee, Cambridge, Md.

Phillip Savage, area secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

John Lewis, chairman, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

Stanley Branche, field secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Reginald Robinson, field secretary, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

Clarence Logan, chairman, Civil Interest Group.

Calvin W. Mowbray, mayor city of Cambridge, Md.

Arthur Parker, president, Commissioners of Cambridge, Md.

C. Awdry Thompson, city attorney, city of Cambridge, Md.

Thomas B. Finan, attorney general, State of Maryland.

Edmund C. Mestor, executive assistant to the Governor, State of Maryland.

Witnessed this 23d day of July, 1963:

Robert F. Kennedy, Attorney General, United States of America.

Burke Marshall, Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice.

[From the New York Times, July 22, 1963]

Birmingham Now: A City With Renewed Hope—Racial Gains, Made Quietly, Erase Bitterness of Riots—Restraint Sets Tone

(By Foster Hailey)

Birmingham, Ala., July 20.—A few days ago a group of Negroes from north Birmingham went to city hall, took the elevator to the third floor and entered the council chamber where Mayor Albert Boutwell and the new city council were in session.

The group said it had come to protest what it considered the unjustified shooting by a policeman of a Negro youth.

Chief Inspector W. J. Haley of the Birmingham police was called to the chamber. He said he was familiar with the matter. The youth had been intercepted in a stolen car. When halted, he had jumped from the car carrying a gun and tried to escape. Mr. Haley thought the policeman was justified in firing a disabling shot. Mayor Boutwell and the council agreed.

The explanation probably did not satisfy the group of protestors (the boy was retarded mentally, they said, and probably did not realize what he was doing). But their complaint at least had been heard and an official report given to them.

In many American cities such a protest, and its resolution, would be considered routine. In Birmingham it was the subject of editorial comment. The comment was favorable.

The occurrence is a symptom of the change of climate in the city of Birmingham over the last 2 months. This is now a city of hope—hope for its Negro population of 140,000 as well as for the 200,000 white persons who also call Birmingham home.

"We're just as anxious as the white people to have this a peaceful and prosperous city," said one Negro leader. "We live here too."

The millenium has not yet arrived in Birmingham. In city hall and in the county buildings there are still white and colored signs over the drinking fountains and on the doors of the rest rooms.

The schools are still segregated, although they are under Federal court order to do something about that in September.

A colored man still cannot go to the restaurant of his choice and get a cup of coffee or a serving of Gulf Coast shrimp, or register in a white hotel, or do a lot of other things he would like to do as an American citizen.

But he can go out and play a round of golf on the city course of his choice. When his wife goes to a store to buy a dress, she does not have to go out in the alley to try it on; she can go into a fitting room that perhaps was vacated by a white customer only moments before. Both can go over to any water fountain in a downtown store and get a drink. He can even use the paper cups that are provided. That is what most, if not all, the white persons do. He can take any seat he wants in a bus.

The most significant symbol of change came last Tuesday night when almost 200 of Birmingham's leading citizens, white and Negro, pushed their way through protesting members of the Ku Klux Klan and White Citizens Councils at city hall to register as members of Mayor Boutwell's biracial Committee on Community Affairs of the city of Birmingham.

For the first time in the history of the city, responsible leaders of the white community were standing up to be counted on the issue of racial justice.

Only 3 of the 250 invitations to serve on the committee have been declined.

For its part, the Negro community is showing firm control of its more militant young members. Some of them have formed a "self enforcement committee" that restrains any attempts by individuals to speed up the process of integration by unauthorized sit-ins at segregated restaurants or hotels. The energies of others have been channeled away from street demonstrations.

REGISTRATION DRIVE GAINS

One group has been working to stimulate voter registration among Negroes, and with reportedly remarkable results. Since the end of the demonstrations on May 8, more than 2,000 Negroes are said to have registered in Jefferson County (Birmingham and its suburbs). That raises the total of Negro voters in the county to between 13,000 and 14,000.

Resentment against the use of police dogs and fire hoses during a series of demonstrations in May also seems to be dying away. Some tires on police cars were slashed in May, and one night a crowd of more than 1,000 Negroes tried to block fire engines responding to a fire alarm. (Three Negro children burned to death.) But there have been no such incidents for some time, police officials say.

The Negroes still complain that there have been no arrests in the bombings of the A. G. Gaston motel and the home of one of the integration leaders on the night of May 11. The bombings touched off the most serious rioting of the period. Both city and Federal authorities say the investigation is continuing and will be pressed until the culprits are found.

ABUSIVE TELEPHONE CALLS

There still is considerable white racial sentiment in the community. Anyone identified with any attempt to promote better race relations is subject to anonymous and often obscene abuse by letter and by telephone. Sometimes rocks are thrown at their houses at night. But that group of diehards is thought to be a small minority.

There are some white leaders who say that everything gained so far could have been accomplished without the street demonstrations that focused unfavorable world attention on Birmingham 2 months ago. Most Negro leaders believe the pace would not have been so steady nor as much progress made had the open protest not been made.

[From the New York Times, July 22, 1963]

Unionist Softens Stand on Negroes—Construction Chief Accepts Idea of an Outside Review on Apprenticeships Here

(By Emanuel Perlmutter)

The head of the city's construction unions retreated yesterday from the strong stand he took last week against a plan for providing more openings for Negro and Puerto Rican apprentices in the building trades.

Peter J. Brennan, president of the New York Building and Construction Trades Council, said he still believed that job trainees should be chosen by organized labor and not by "outsiders."

However, he said he had no objection to having an appropriate outside person or Government agency review cases in which applicants for union apprenticeship contended that they had not received fair consideration.

COMPROMISE PROVIDED

The statement represented a compromise from the flat rejection by Mr. Brennan of some of the recommendations by Mayor Wagner's "action panel" on ways to open the construction unions to more Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

Mr. Brennan had turned down the panel's suggestion that ministers and teachers, instead of only union members, be accepted as sponsors for applicants and that a Government agency test the qualifications of journeymen.

Yesterday's more moderate position was put forth by the head of the building trades' 122-union council on a taped interview over "Let's Find Out," a WCBS radio program.

Mr. Brennan said he would ask the council tomorrow to let him join a special union panel composed of Negroes and white persons to screen and interview applicants for apprenticeship. He added:

"Now, I also will ask that if any of these young men feel that the committee is not giving them a fair chance to become an apprentice we would then ask somebody outside to review this, still maintaining that we have the right to run our own business."

Mr. Brennan defended the city's construction unions, which have 250,000 members. He charged that they had been singled out as targets for accusations of discrimination while other trades that were more guilty of the abuses had not been criticized.

The building unions have been repeatedly criticized by the Joint Committee for Equal Employment Opportunity, which represents the major civil rights organizations in the city.

The joint committee criticized both Mayor Wagner and Governor Rockefeller yesterday for "their categorical refusal to take any meaningful action to put an end to discrimination in and by building trades unions in New York City."

It charged that the Mayor and the Governor had abdicated from "both their legal and moral responsibility" to enforce the antidiscrimination laws by refusing to halt construction on public-financed projects until the unions had adopted full integration.

The committee termed the report of the mayor's action panel "extremely weak." It called Mr. Rockefeller's proposal for a program of educational conferences and investigations of the job bias problem an "interminable exercise in futility."

The group, which has sponsored demonstrations against the construction unions, said more and larger demonstrations were being planned.

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, our distinguished Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, the Honorable John Bartlow Martin, recently addressed the 13th annual convention of the Chamber of Commerce of the Americas, which was held in Santo Domingo. This address is an eloquent declaration of faith in the goals and in the methods of the Alliance for Progress, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

Ambassador Martin's approach to the Alliance is at once optimistic and practical, as illustrated by the following statement:

> Too much progress cannot be expected too fast. The Alianza is not a receipe for instant utopia. In this slow hard business of nation building, we would all be better off if we stopped thinking in terms of target dates, deadlines, and final victory, for although on the first Wednesday after the second Monday in November every 4 years in the United States we know who won the election, only our children's historians, perhaps not us at all, may know whether the Alianza won. (Though we may know if it loses.)

It is indeed heartening to know that our country is represented in the emerging nations by men of Ambassador Martin's sagacity. At a time when the Senate is about to consider the appropriation for the Alliance, this speech should be read by all who desire to inform themselves on the Alliance. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in its entirety at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech of Ambassador John Bartlow Martin, Chamber of Commerce of the Americas, 13th Annual Convention, Hotel Embajador, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to meet with distinguished business leaders of our hemisphere—and by choosing to hold your 13th annual meeting in Santo Domingo, the cradle of the hemisphere and its newest birthplace of democracy, you honor with your presence and with your confidence the brave Dominican people and their elected and dedicated president, Juan Bosch.

Your deliberations will reach far beyond this lovely island. They have the capacity to help shape the future. For yours is an absolutely crucial role in hemispheric development, not only your capital but your technical knowledge and above all your flexibility, your confidence, and your constructive leadership of the revolutionary change which is the condition of our life today.

Change is everywhere. The splendored jets which brought you here glided into Aeropeurto Punta Caucedo over the heads of ragged women on burros, carrying charcoal to market; and what concerns that woman is not the European Common Market but the market on Avenida Mella, and the pennies she can take home to her children tonight. Change, wrenching change; contrast and contradiction; campesinos plowing the earth with forked sticks while the hydrogen bomb ticks away, one man orbiting the earth while below him millions starve—this is the world we live in, this is the basic fact of our life.

Whatever we do, whatever anyone does, the plain truth is that Latin America is having, and will continue to have, a revolution. Whether it will be peaceful and maintain liberty, or will be bloody and destroy freedom, is to a considerable extent in your hands.

I would not presume to lecture this audience on such technical though vitally important questions as those you have discussed this week—capital formation and capital flight, systems of housing finance, investment guarantees, and so on.

Rather, I should like, if I may, to set our discussions in a somewhat larger frame of reference.

For we must not forget that in all our deliberations, in all our common efforts, our common purpose is to make a revolution. And the questions we must confront are these: Is social revolution compatible with a business system of free enterprise? Is it compatible with peace, with democracy, with individual freedom? And are we up to the task—can we summon the wisdom, the courage, the patience, and above all the confidence we need—confidence in ourselves, confidence in the ordinary people?

Our opponents answer no.

And we would do well to heed them. A leading theoretician of the extreme left in Latin America has told us plainly what he thinks. Speaking directly to the United States, he said that we have had four centuries of uninterrupted development, of industrial revolution and liberal democracy within a capitalistic structure, while, he says, Latin America has had four centuries of continuous underdevelopment, misery, and stagnation, within a feudal structure derived from old Spain, with its tyranny, great estates, denial of rights to the masses, and barriers raised against modern ideas. Our theoretician contends that the only solution for Latin America today is to destroy its feudal structure once and for all. He tells us the Alliance for Progress is a sham and that its only real structural reform, agrarian reform, is doomed by the Latin American oligarchy. Agrarian reform, he argues, "can only be brought about by revolution, with a gun in hand." And our theoretician continues—and I quote him directly—

"Revolution? Yes, because, as Mexico and Cuba have shown only revolution can destroy feudalism—not aspirin and good wishes.

"Revolution? Yes, because as Cuba and Mexico have shown, only armed revolution can destroy forever the armies which guard the old order.

"Revolution? Yes, because, as Mexico and Cuba have shown, only a revolution can bring about the structural changes necessary to modernize our countries, put stagnating natural resources to work, recoup ill-spent and estranged resources, carry through agrarian reform, create an internal market, diversify production, promote popular education and industrialization.

"Revolution. You cry out and put your hands to your heads, weeping to see the violence and the spilling of blood. Yes, because unfortunately, it has never been possible to convince the ruling classes of a feudal country that their hour has come. Blood? Yes, historical delay is paid for in blood. Remember Jefferson. From Spartacus to Fidel Castro, through Protestant, English, French, United States, Mexican, and Russian revolutions, revolutions have been violent. Revolutions are not made by Mickey Mouse. They are made by hungry, courageous, angry, desperate men."

Now, it is manifestly absurd to equate the Mexican revolution, which was indigenous and has remained so, with the Cuban revolution, which is the creature of a foreign colonial power; it is also absurd to pretend that tragic Cuba proves that violent revolution promotes economic growth.

But I think our theoretician raises a serious question which deserves an answer when he asserts that revolution can be made only with rifles and not with reason; only by bullets, never by bankers; only with blood, never with brains.

I assert, and I deeply believe he is wrong.

I refuse to believe that the human race has learned nothing since Spartacus, that history is an iron vise, and that reason, good will, education, and a passionate devotion to freedom cannot loosen that viselike grip on mankind.

History is not a straitjacket. The human race does learn. Change is the one certitude. The dismal factories of 19th century England on which Karl Marx founded his historical postulates resemble in no way the institutions of modern capitalism in the 1960's. And our doctrinaire theoretician is as wrong in his interpretation of history today as Karl Marx was wrong when he predicted that communism was unlikely in Russia in the near future but historically inevitable in England and Germany.

The experience of my country demonstrates that a profound social and economic revolution can indeed be made by peaceful means and without destroying individual freedom. We had one. It began in the 1930's, and it is continuing yet. I belong to the generation of Americans who grew up in the great depression—like some of you, I daresay. I not only remember the long lines of unemployed at factory gates—I stood in them, every day at daybreak all one icy winter. I cannot only recite the history of the New Deal and its great leader—I also remember that one of its reforms saved my parents' home from the mortgage holder, that one of its emergency programs put my father to work, and that I received my own first increase in pay, from $9 a week to $14.50 a week, because of the minimum-wage law. And I have not only read Franklin Roosevelt's speeches but I heard his voice coming over the old-fashioned radio in our home: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

If ever a great free nation might have gone under to authoritarian revolution; if ever free men were tempted to barter freedom for bread, it was in the United States in the 1930's. But instead, unrestrained finance capitalism was thoroughly and peaceably reformed. And we erected a new structure which preserved the free enterprise system but created mechanisms for protecting the people—and business itself—against excess. Stock market regulation, social security, Federal housing, bank deposit insurance, legislation guaranteeing minimum wages and maximum hours and the right to collective bargaining, agricultural credit and extension systems, rigorous income and inheritance tax reform, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the other grand river valley developments that made deserts bloom and destroyed private power monopolies—these measures were at the time viewed with alarm; yet today they are accepted as ordinary and necessary safeguards to make a free society work.

Nor is this all. Since World War II, instead of the predicted postwar bust, we have enjoyed a postwar boom. And its most striking aspect is this: Far from fulfilling Marx's gloomy prophecy that the rich always get richer and the poor poorer, under the umbrella of the new society forged in the 1930's, the poor have moved upward, the middle class has broadened enormously, and prosperity has reached so many that we can afford to become concerned not about the quantity of what we have but about its quality—the quality of the education of our children, of the medical care of our parents, of the growth patterns of our new suburban metropolis.

I am not contending all our problems are solved. Far, very far, from it. No American conscience can lie easy while any American citizen is denied his rights because of the color of skin. But I am particularly proud to stand before you today as the representative of an American President who last week told my countrymen with unmistakable clarity: "The time has come for this Nation to fulfill its promises." And fulfill them we will, and with all the world watching.

Now, no doubt our theoretician would say that our recent social and economic revolution merely proves his case: We could do it peaceably precisely because we never bore the burden of feudalism.

But is this also true of Western Europe, of Italy, of France, of West Germany? Is it also true of Japan? In those countries, since World War II, under private enterprise nurtured by built-in government safeguards, led by farsighted statesmen both in government and in private business, and assisted by the United States, other revolutions have been wrought; other feudal classes have been broken; other masses have been lifted; other peoples have been set free; and all by peaceful means.

Indeed, the most dynamic revolution afoot on earth today is not Communist imperialism but the dramatic surge of abundance and the dramatic rise of the middle class under private enterprise capitalism. This is the force which is making the advance to the future. And Soviet colonialism, with its enslavement of peoples in so-called people's democracies, with its collapsing agriculture and its consumer starvation, is marching rapidly backward to the darkness of the past.

I would agree with our theoretician that it is difficult to reconcile the 19th century history of private enterprise with today's irresistible force of social progress. I think we all recognize that in the past some of us, North Americans and Latin Americans alike, in one Latin American country or another, while committing ourselves in principle to social change, have said, "But, of course, we mustn't rock the boat here."

But I think we recognize now that no rational confidence in an unchanged society is possible in today's world. Confidence today requires the expectation of change and progress, of social betterment, of dramatic, sometimes explosive and confused, sometimes even frightening and dangerous change.

I remind you that the heart of the free enterprise we cherish is risktaking. Call it venture capital, call it risk capital, call it by any name, its heart is risk.

We have not feared change and risk in the past. This is why we have progressed. We cannot fear it now if we intend to survive.

But there is more. Every one of us here, traveling through the lovely but impoverished countryside of Latin America, contemplating not only its beauties but its misery—every one of us who has left his office and walked through the barrios where the displaced camposinos dwell in squalor without job or decent home, where a single barrio contains 1,000 unchecked cases of raging cholera and where nine human beings, a man and wife and seven children, exist in a 6-by-6 thatched hut with a dirt floor and a single bed—every one of us here today has seen such sights in these nations, sights that make us ashamed to be a human being. These men are our brothers; these children are our future leaders. This is how they are passing their formative years. I have seen them, you have seen them, we all have seen them. And I say to you that the revolution to which we are dedicated is not necessary because we must defeat the Communists. It is necessary because it is morally right; because these people deserve a better life; because they belong to the family of man. It is, quite simply, necessary if we really believe with the Psalmist that the Creator is mindful of man, that He "hast made him a little lower than the angels."

What, then, must we do?

Our chosen instrument in this part of the world is the Alliance for Progress.

It would be superfluous, not to say presumptuous, for me to discuss the Alianza at length with you gentlemen. I shall content myself with four observations.

First, it cannot be said too often that the Alianza is widely misunderstood as a U.S. giveaway program and that, as Assistant Secretary Edwin Martin has said, the United States is "strictly a junior partner" in the Alianza.

Second, I agree with Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY that delays are still much too long and businessmen "quite rightly do not care to wait 18 months" to find out whether a project qualifies for an investment guarantee; and that in the lending process in general, "the unconscionably long delays must be eliminated."

Third, at the same time, too much progress cannot be expected too fast. The Alianza is not a recipe for instant utopia. In this slow hard business of nation-building, we would all be better off if we stopped thinking in terms of target dates, deadlines, and final victory, for although on the first Wednesday after the second Monday in November every 4 years in the United States we know who won the election, only our children's historians, perhaps not us at all, may know whether the Alianza has won. (Though we may know if it loses.)

Fourth, we have learned from the experience of the Alianza's first 21 months that Latin America is not postwar Western Europe, and the Alianza is not the Marshall plan, for the conditions are different. True, we need highways, powerplants, factories, ports, all the tools of economic development. But what we need just as badly is human development. I am not speaking now in the general terms of social justice. I am speaking of education, especially vocational education—specifically, of management and administrative skills, both in government and in private business, and of skilled labor. It may well be that not only capital but an equally valuable contribution which foreign private enterprise can make at this stage is the skills and habits of trained and expert work—on-the-job training, intramural schools, sometimes shared, as Mr. Morrison suggested, with outsiders. And it may well be that government's most valuable contribution can be made in education—primary and secondary education, adult education, and vocational training, particularly in public administration and agriculture, using not only traditional methods but audiovisual techniques, radio, and television. As Adlai Stevenson has said, "People are the one common denominator of progress. No improvement is possible with unimproved people. Advance is inevitable when people are liberated and educated."

I should like to discuss one final matter briefly.

I do not know but I can guess that underlying all your deliberations this week has been a sometimes spoken, sometimes unspoken, but always vital question: The question of confidence.

The statesmen of the Inter-American Social and Economic Council, who framed the Charter of Punta del Este, agreed that if the Alliance is to work, governments alone cannot do everything; fully 80 percent of the needed capital investment must come from the private sector. The question is: Will it come? Does private capital possess enough confidence to invest?

The returns are not all in yet, but the short-term results suggest that the issue is in doubt. Senator HUMPHREY wrote that in the first year of the Alianza, "Too many wealthy Latin Americans are still refusing to make large new investments. U.S. firms are reluctant to make large new investments." David Rockefeller has said that in the first year total investment came "hearteningly close to the target," but too much came from governments, too little from the private sector, and he added, with, I thought, considerable grace, that many Latin American capitalists "sought safer havens for their money abroad."

Almost daily we hear that a "climate of confidence" must be created. What creates confidence? And what undermines it?

The answers will vary from country to country in this hemisphere of differences. But I think we might agree on half a dozen factors of importance:

Capital, the traditionally timid million dollars, desires political stability. It dislikes upheaval and confusion, which interfere with business as usual.

Capital desires monetary stability. As Mr. Rockefeller has said, governments "cannot put local capital to work effectively in an inflation-ridden economy where the price level soars sixfold as it did between 1953 and 1961 in Brazil, 10-fold as in Chile, or 26-fold as in Bolivia."

Capital applauds fiscal responsibility—a balanced budget, an efficient public administration, a sensibly managed public debt, realistic exchange rates instead of debilitating exchange controls, a free market unhampered by artificial monopolies.

Capital wants a government strong enough not only to insist on tax and land reform but on labor responsibility; and labor wants a government strong enough to guarantee its right to true collective bargaining.

Capital wants honesty in government, a government with a reputation as impeccable as that of Caesar's wife.

Capital wants a good market and a high rate of economic growth—but I would point out that it is mainly capital itself which must create growth and markets. Today in Latin America millions of people dwell not only in misery but entirely outside the money economy itself; and as the Alianza improves their lot, they will become your customers, your new and untapped market. What is good for the people and their standard of living is good for business. The rising tide lifts all the boats.

And yet, when all this has been said, I think it leaves unsaid the one thing which frightens capital, both foreign and domestic, more than anything else in Latin America today. It is something seldom talked about in public, though ceaselessly in private. It is the almost nameless dread that this country or that will "go Castro," "become another Cuba." And to this question I should like to address myself.

Let me begin by saying that everyone recognizes that Communist Cuba exists and that it is a clear and present danger to the peace, democracy, and freedom of the hemisphere; that its treacherous leader betrayed the legitimate aspirations of the revolution made by the Cuban people and handed their country and themselves over bodily to a foreign colonialism; that today Castro's Cuba is the first Soviet beachhead in the New World; that from it Castro seeks to export violence and subversion throughout the hemisphere; and that, in the succinct words of the Punta del Este conference, Castro's Cuba is "incompatible" with the principles of the Inter-American system.

We know that, as Senator HUMPHREY has said, Castro is no military threat to the United States, except as an extension of Soviet military power. But we also know that he is a real threat to the other American Republics—that he is training guerrillas and exporting them, sending out propaganda if not weapons; that he is seeking to infiltrate other Latin American nations and governments on every level, especially the military, the labor movement, youth groups, and certain key government ministries; and that in addition he seeks a mass following in the yearnings of the restless and long-neglected masses of barrio and campo.

But let us for a moment look beyond Cuba. Let us look beyond that tragic country to the new bastion of democracy here in the Dominican Republic, and to the great nations to the north of this island, and to the great nations to the south and west.

And let us remember these nations would confront pressing, even explosive, social and economic problems if Castro were removed tomorrow, indeed, if he had never existed. As Senator HUMPHREY has said, "We must keep in mind that Cuba, however important, is only a part of the total problem. * * * If the Alliance for Progress is to succeed in meeting the staggering problems of poverty, illiteracy, maldistribution of wealth, and economic stagnation in vast areas of Latin America, we must administer and support the Alliance with the same sense of urgency that presently motivates our thinking about Cuba."

I would suggest to you that it is not only Castro's arms and his guerrillas, his subversive agents and propaganda experts, which threaten our governments and endanger our progress.

I would suggest that it is, also, the fear we feel about him.

For Castro possesses the dangerous potential of strengthening the extreme right in Latin America. Men of property and of goodwill, fearing the spread of the Castro disease to their own countries, may become deflected from their forward march to progress; may be tempted to seek refuge from the storm in a rightist storm cellar instead of moving confidently ahead toward progressive reform.

Men afraid of Castro may hesitate to invest in the future of the Alianza and of their own countries. For the Alianza demands a wrenching readjustment of national wealth and power, and thus tends to encourage the very political and social unrest they might not fear without Castro but do fear with him—for who knows, they ask, whether they can trust the politics of hope when the politicians preaching hope may turn out to be Fidel's agents?

In brief, we are in danger not only of being subverted or attacked by Castro but also of being mesmerized and paralyzed by fear of him.

Why else, but for fear, would we allow the leftist extremists in some cases to take over the nationalist reform movements which are perhaps the most powerful force at large in the hemisphere today? Close to Russian's borders, as in Hungary and Rumania, nationalism is on our side; but not always in Latin America. Yet it should be. For Soviet colonialism never permits national identity—it destroys it. But we encourage it—as President Kennedy has said, "Diversity and independence, far from being opposed to the American conception of world order, represent the very essence of our vision of the future."

Why else, but for fear, would we invent the bogeyman of the red superman—in the face of the evidence of the wreckage of Cuba's economy, the Soviet diplomatic disaster in Guinea, and the shipment of Soviet snowplows to Burma?

Why else, but for fear, would we dissipate our energies looking under the bed for Communists when we should be looking to modern technology for the techniques of social betterment—or to the stars for inspiration?

Why else, but for fear, would responsible men sometimes mistrust and doubt the governments of the leaders of the democratic left in Latin America? For they are in fact, as anyone knows, the governments constitutionally elected by the people themselves, and responsive to the legitimate aspirations of the people. And they do in fact, as anyone knows, represent the hopes of freedom in our hemisphere today.

No, it is really asking too much to ask a developing nation to go through the industrial revolution, the revolution against colonialism, emergence from feudalism, the great depression, and McCarthyism in a single year, or even a single decade.

We must not slide back into an unfortunate past, when patriotic but misguided men made us afraid of shadows; when journalists well-intentioned but incompletely informed distorted our perception of reality; when friends of freedom were deceived into fostering the schemes of adventurers. We must take care today that our assessment of the Castro menace is not beclouded by unreasoning fear. We must be vigilant but sensible.

Let us never close our eyes to the very real danger of Castro Communist subversion. But let us not permit that danger to blind us to our might or deflect us from our goal, to tie our hands or paralyze our will or mesmerize our minds.

Let us remember that, as Victor Hugo said, "No army can destroy the force of an idea whose hour has come." Our idea is a better way of life, and peace and freedom, for our peoples and our children. And its hour has come.

Gentlemen talk of confidence today; but I would remind you, as visitors to this Republic, of what really destroys confidence. It is Trujillo, and all he stood for. The knock on the door at 4 a.m., the unsuspected police informer next door or in one's own family, friends who disappear into prisons whence none return, the jackboot, the slave labor camp, wire taps, spies, surveillance, the murder factory, all the odious trappings of the police state, and above all fear itself—this is what destroys confidence. Look back in this Republic 2 years, or 30 years. Who could even be confident he would be alive tomorrow? Look back 2 years or 30, and ask what happened to people's confidence in each other, even in themselves. Trujillo destroyed it. He destroyed it by the fear he spawned. Look across the seas today to tragic Hungary and Rumania and East Germany and ask what is happening to confidence. The Soviets are destroying it. Their weapon is fear.

Confidence is not merely what bankers demand. Confidence is what blesses family life. Confidence is what makes good neighbors. Confidence makes friendship possible. Confidence is what enables men to live together. Confidence is the glue that binds civilized society together.

And fear is what corrodes and finally destroys it. Fear of Trujillo. Fear of the Kremlin. Fear of Castro.

Fear is our enemy, the irrational intangible fear that unnerves and corrodes and destroys.

Why should we be afraid? We come from great nations. We know what needs doing and how to do it. We know that social betterment and economic progress—a better life for the ordinary man—is not merely the bar to Castro but the only acceptable road to national independence and individual human dignity. We know that to be independent, a people must be free. And to be free they must be educated. And to afford education they must have bread. We know that change is long overdue in this part of our world and that it is inevitable, and if the developing nations assume unfamiliar configurations, we should welcome them nonetheless, not force them into a procrustean bed. We know that change is the only certitude of life. We know that risk and danger are the lot of our generation. We know that now for the first time we possess the technological knowledge to destroy the earth—or abolish poverty from its face. And what we do today will shape this choice. We know that this is the terror and the glory of being alive today. We know our decisions will decide our children's fate, even their survival. We know the human spirit can soar. We know its only chains are fear. And we can hear the echo of the past, in an hour of different peril and a moment of great decision, the echo of the voice of Franklin Roosevelt: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

And on that note, which struck home because it bespoke the yearnings of millions and the greatness of one, but which prevailed because it spoke the truth, I choose to leave you, confident of your confidence in yourselves and your future. Let us put fear aside. And let us get on with our great work.

Thank you.

SENATOR ERVIN'S VIEWS ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, all who have served in this body with the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] know that he is one of the ablest constitutional lawyers in public life today. Even in the extreme hysteria that has been generated in this country in the effort to whip a misnamed civil rights bill through Congress before the American people have an opportunity to read and understand the "fine print," Senator Ervin is measuring up to the highest traditions of this body by patiently, carefully, and judiciously analyzing the extreme and unconstitutional grants of power which the administration is seeking at the hands of this Congress.

The country is fortunate indeed that Senator Ervin is a member of the committee conducting the hearings on this bill. Despite the one-sided reporting often manifest in discussion of this issue, a few able columnists and commentators, without regard to their personal views on the problems involved, are fairly reporting many aspects of this matter to their readers.

Such a column is that written by Mr. Max Freedman and published in the Washington Evening Star of Monday, July 22, 1963, entitled "Ervin Views Worthy of Hearing."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the body of the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 22, 1963]

Ervin Views Worthy of Hearing—Senator Held One of Wiser Spokesmen for Southerners on Rights Issues

(By Max Freedman)

In fairness, the considered case of the South against civil rights legislation should be judged not by the extreme statements of Governor Barnett of Mississippi and Governor Wallace of Alabama but by the comments of its more thoughtful and responsible spokesmen.

We may not agree with the southern case even when it is stated in its most persuasive form. But at least we owe the South the primary courtesy of recognizing that generous and honorable southerners can have honest doubts about the proposed legislation. We merely widen the gulf between the races and between North and South if we assume that every opponent of a civil rights bill is the embodiment of cruel prejudice and nothing else.

Among the wiser southern spokesmen in the Senate, few have a stronger position than Senator Ervin of North Carolina. He had a distinguished career in the South as a lawyer and judge before he became a Senator. Even now he is more at home with constitutional principles than with political prejudices. He is respected by the Members of both parties and by most students of the Senate. His presentation of the southern case to the Senate Judiciary Committee deserves the attention even of those who disagree most profoundly with his values and his objectives.

Senator Ervin believes the Federal Government is seeking an unconstitutional grant of power from Congress in the public accommodations section of its civil rights bill. As he sees it, existing laws permit any white Southerner to use his own property as he thinks fit. The owner of this property can select his own customers. He can choose to serve only white customers or only Negroes or he can be agreeable to doing business with both races. The decision is his to make.

A local or State authority in the South has no right to give orders on this point to the business merely because it issues a license. The license is imposed as a tax, not as a certificate to make the business an agency of the State. Senator Ervin argued that the Federal Government cannot cite any valid or controlling precedents, either under cases affecting the 14th amendment or the commerce clause, to justify the exercise of this new power now.

He thought the law had been correctly stated in a recent case by Justice Harlan of the Supreme Court. Justice Harlan said on May 20, 1963, that "the ultimate substantive question is whether there has been State action of a particular character, whether the character of the State's involvement in an arbitrary discrimination is such that it should be held responsible for the discrimination." Senator Ervin took this formulation of the law to mean that the 14th amendment only applies if the State itself is responsible for the discrimination; and the commerce clause does not apply at all unless it can be tortured into an altogether new meaning. Either way the power of the Federal Government to interfere with a State or a private business, to end racial discrimination, is sharply limited.

Then Senator Ervin criticized as totally unfair and unjust the provision in the administration's bill under which a person can be allowed a reasonable fee for his lawyer if he wins a private action to vindicate his right to equal treatment in a place of public accommodation. But what happens if he loses the case? The bill says nothing about the owner of the business who has successfully defended himself againt the charge of discrimination. Senator Ervin thinks the owner, in these circumstances, has an unanswerable right to the payment of his lawyer's fee. Any other decision means that the Department of Justice is trying to establish equality of rights through unequal law.

He also regretted various provisions in the bill which allowed the Federal Government to take action to end racial imbalance in a school. This power could be exercised even if it meant that white or Negro children had to be transported considerable distances to a new school. Although there are numerous references in the legislation to racially imbalanced schools, the term is never precisely defined. The definition is left to the "uncontrolled imagination" of the Federal Commissioner of Education.

Another point made by Senator Ervin concerned the relationship of civil rights legislation to a house built with a loan from the Veterans' Administration or the Federal Housing Administration. He thought there was a clear danger, in the North as in the South, that the owner might have trouble selling the house to a person of his own choice if the terms of the sale offended the Federal Government's notions of racial justice. He saw the same risk of interference in hospitals benefiting from the Hill-Burton Act or other Federal funds. There might be ugly questions about the composition of the medical staffs in these hospitals, or the assignment of patients to various wards.

Senator Ervin described Attorney General Kennedy as the "principal political officer of the administration." He warned against the discretionary power which would be given to the Attorney General in this bill. The risk was present, he declared, that this power would be used with political motives rather than to serve disinterested justice or to advance the pure cause of racial justice.

THE RIGHT OF ASSEMBLY AND PETITION

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, whenever so-called civil rights measures come before Congress, we always encounter the difficulty of delineating exactly where one man's rights end and another man's begin. We now have a new issue before the country, namely, when the unquestioned constitutional right of assembly and petition for the redress of grievances becomes a violation of the law of the community where such an assemblage is held.

I would be the last to challenge the right of assembly or petition; but I also remember that Justice Holmes said that, while the right of free speech exists in this country, no person has the right to shout "fire" in a crowded theater.

Some of the so-called peaceful assemblages are certainly in that category.

I have read an interesting editorial entitled "When 'Justice' Challenges 'Order,'" which was published in the Norfolk Ledger-Star, and reprinted in the Charleston, S.C., News and Courier of July 21, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, July 21, 1963]

When "Justice" Challenges "Order"

To hear Dr. Martin Luther King tell it, on his visit to Suffolk the other day, the preservation of order isn't of much consequence when it comes to a matter of justice.

This view came out when he criticized "the so-called moderates, who are more devoted to order than to justice."

In a sense, Dr. King performed a useful service in those few words. For he brought into unusually sharp focus a collision of values which forms the most explosive ingredient in the current swirl of racial troubles.

This relationship between order and justice, of course, is an old, old question. Since tribal times, order has been an essential element of any kind of social structure. And while tyrants have again and again used the instruments of order to perpetuate injustice, the maintenance of order has been just as essential to the preservation of hard-won individual rights and to everything that has lifted people out of ignorance and misery.

Even the freest of peoples, and certainly the American nation represents one of the farthest advances to date, have found it imperative, in the words of the preamble to our own Constitution, to "insure domestic tranquility."

For the founders, though they had joined in rebellion themselves against a government, faced the reality that the new government must protect itself against rebellion. The laws and the force necessary to that end were among their first creations.

Similarly, safeguards against civil disturbance and violations of the law must exist at all levels of authority if what we have here is to survive.

The theory that violence, or threats of violence, or situations inviting violence, may be used in behalf of justice, is one that can be condoned only in the extremes of governmental repression and in the absence of democratic channels for working remedies.

Because our system of agreed law is simply the best we have been able to work out so far, there are almost bound to be injustices in some degree. Some can be corrected faster or more completely than others. Further, there are human inequalities which governments can do only so much to correct anyway.

We would have only anarchy if all such victims of injustice considered themselves automatically freed of obligations to obey the law and possessed of the right to act violently against the rest of society.

When someone applies the label "justice" to something, as Dr. King does, this does not thereby render anything he does to that end either right or tolerable, not if we have anything in this country that is worth keeping.

For the "order" Dr. King sees as less than precious today may be indispensable tomorrow to preserve some of the very things he and his people are striving for.

THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Peace Corps has been an unusual innovation in our foreign relations. It is one measure that has met with general approval throughout the country.

I received in my mail—and I feel certain other Senators have received a copy of the same communication—a letter written by three young Americans who are teaching in the area of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. They state in their letter that all the information that has heretofore been released to the American people has been released by those who direct the Peace Corps. I believe that is generally true. I do not know of any committee that has been sent into the field in an attempt actually to examine the work of the agency in various parts of the world; but I found the letter from Addis Ababa to be quite interesting. The three members of the Peace Corps who wrote to me have given their impressions of the Corps, in which they are serving at this time. I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Peace Corps,
Post Office Box 1096, Addis Ababa,
Ethiopia, July 4, 1963.

The Honorable Richard B. Russell,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Russell: We are presently Peace Corps volunteers serving in Ethiopia as secondary schoolteachers. After completing 1 year of service, we have decided that there are some things which ought to be brought to the attention of the general public at home concerning Peace Corps activities.

We believe that members of the Peace Corps currently serving overseas should be given the opportunity to express some of their opinions. We further believe that a story about the opinions of Peace Corps volunteers by an independent reporter would be a service to the country.

The Peace Corps is supposedly one of the most successful new programs of the present administration. It is an infant Government agency which desires to expand its operations and increase its budget. Before Congress votes on new appropriations for the Peace Corps, we feel that the general public and Congressmen are entitled to more information about its activities. Are the objectives of the Peace Corps worthwhile? According to the Peace Corps Act of September 22, 1961, the purpose of the Peace Corps is:

"To promote world peace and friendship through a Peace Corps, which shall make available to interested countries and areas men and women of the United States qualified for service abroad and willing to serve, under conditions of hardship if necessary, to help the peoples of such countries and areas in meeting their needs for trained manpower, and to help promote a better understanding of the American people on the part of the peoples served and a better understanding of other peoples on the part of the American people."

Few people will deny that these are worthy objectives. The next question that should be asked is, "Based on present information, are these objectives being achieved?" Also, "Could these objectives be achieved by some method superior to those at present employed by the Peace Corps?" We believe that these questions could rightly be the subject of some independent study. We also believe that the general public is entitled to this information, because it is the public that must pay for Peace Corps operations.

At present information concerning the Peace Corps comes almost exclusively from Government sources. This is because few groups independent of the Government have made studies of the Peace Corps, and also because few Peace Corps volunteers have completed their service overseas and returned to tell of their experiences. We believe that the information presently available through Government sources is inadequate. The Government may not be deliberately trying to manage Peace Corps publicity; however, we believe that since the Peace Corps staff is apparently already convinced of the Peace Corps' success, they tend to be biased in the information that they release to the general public. The presentation of such a one-sided view does not give the public an objective view of Peace Corps merits, and does not give them the opportunity to judge accurately whether they want to pay for an expanded Peace Corps. Biased Peace Corps publicity is not only detrimental to the general public but is also detrimental to prospective Peace Corps volunteers. Misrepresentation before and during training sometimes requires extensive readjustment by the volunteer after arriving in the field. There is some disillusionment and disappointment sometimes resulting in the resignation of volunteers from the Peace Corps.

A story about Peace Corps volunteers by an independent reporter would offer an opportunity for volunteers now in the field to express their individual hopes, opinions, and criticisms of the Peace Corps. These opinions, we believe would show a wide divergence of views on a great many subjects. If nothing else, they would dissipate the myth of the Peace Corps volunteer stereotype that current publicity seems to present to the public. We would like to offer, as a few examples, some of our opinions based on 1 year of experience.

Though we were told that we would suffer physical hardships, and though we expected them when we came, it is our opinion that very few volunteers in Ethiopia have experienced physical hardship. Publicity at home appears to emphasize the hardships that are endured by a minority and ignores the fact that most volunteers live in comparative comfort. Peace Corps publicity also states that volunteers live at a level comparable to a national who is serving in the same occupation as the Peace Corps volunteer. In reference to the Ethiopia project this publicity is completely false. Volunteers do not live on as high a level as State Department officials or Peace Corps administrators, but they also do not live on as low a level as Ethiopian nationals who teach secondary school.

It appears to us that there is confusion in Peace Corps administration. We received misinformation regarding Peace Corps policy while we were in training. Now it is seemingly impossible for us to ascertain our rights and obligations in the Peace Corps. Peace Corps administrators do not know the policies and do not provide us with written copies of Peace Corps policy. One begins to question the basis upon which administrators arrive at decisions. The Peace Corps administration also encourages the concept that all Peace Corps equipment is Government-owned and consequently may be used by any volunteer. We believe that this leads to the denial of responsibility by everyone and results in the misuse of Government equipment. All these things are not conducive to high morale in volunteers. It is our opinion that a study should be made to ascertain whether the purposes of the Peace Corps could not be better achieved through Government subsidization of private organizations rather than through direct Government action.

In conclusion, we believe that—because the success and proposed expansion of the Peace Corps is an important issue at this time; because most of the information about the Peace Corps is obtained exclusively from Government sources which are perhaps biased; because this bias tends to describe all Peace Corps volunteers as stereotyped, selfless, dedicated, idealistic people, ignoring the fact that there are widely divergent types of people in the Peace Corps; and because we feel that Peace Corps volunteers should be able to express their individual opinions of the work they are doing to the public at home—a magazine or newspaper story independently reporting the successes and failures of Peace Corps volunteers in the field would be a service to the country.

Sincerely yours,

Raymond T. Donaldson.
Thelma Bingham.
Phillip W. Bingham.

SLEEPING BEAR DUNES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, over the July 4 weekend the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Senate Interior Committee visited Michigan's Sleeping Bear Dunes and held a 3-hour public hearing on S. 792, the Hart-McNamara bill to establish a national lakeshore in that area.

The opposition turned out in large numbers and reiterated its blanket opposition to the proposal; and others in the area explained why they favored it.

On July 8 the Detroit News commented on the situation in a well-balanced editorial. In comment, I would point out that our Sleeping Bear Dunes bill goes to new lengths in lakeshore legislative history to assure continued private ownership of homes and expanded functions of a lakeshore advisory committee on which local citizens would be represented. It provides for permanent private ownership of the homes within the area, in perpetuity, and it establishes a permanent advisory committee with which the Secretary of the Interior is directed to consult—particularly with respect to park development and rights of property owners, both residential and commercial.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Detroit News editorial be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Detroit News, July 8, 1963]

Dunes Park Furor

Opposition to Senator Hart's proposal for a 77,000-acre park in the Sleeping Bear Dunes area of Michigan is as understandable as the enthusiasm of others to see it accomplished.

The opposition is grounded in the fear that control over the holdings and homes of local residents and owners will pass to a not too responsive Washington agency, the Department of the Interior. This feeling of a loss of independence and local decision-making power undoubtedly is a deeper issue than the size of the area to be embraced and the prospect of a tourist invasion.

Proponents of the park rightfully argue it is a last opportunity to preserve for posterity a peculiarly distinctive part of Michigan's dwindling national beauty and share it with all. Here is the familiar standoff that occurs always when what is good for the many for years to come is weighed against what pleases local residents in their lifetimes.

Certainly local opposition to the project was amply and convincingly demonstrated at the Frankfort hearing by a U.S. Senate committee on July 4. The setting of the hearing guaranteed that. Held in the area of potential park users, say in Detroit or Chicago, the results and sentiments expressed might have been directly opposite.

To resolve these differences should be the goal of park proponents. That can be accomplished, it would seem, only by giving local residents some guarantee their voices will be heard to a sufficient degree in the administration of the park if it is created.

SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a detailed survey of current anti-Semitic activities through the world has been published by the American Jewish Committee's Institute of Human Relations. It is a clear and comprehensive analysis of discrimination against a minority group struggling for religious freedom. It is not surprising that the Soviet Union is one of the greatest offenders.

Anti-Semitism inside the Soviet world is an old story. Moscow turns it on or off whenever it suits Soviet purposes. Inside Russia itself, Jews are, in effect second-class citizens. They are consistently discriminated against, and often are used as scapegoats. In the Soviet Union, where the state stands for atheism, Jews are considered a separate national group. No recognition is given to religion. Anti-Semitic discrimination seriously impairs their nationality rights—despite Soviet claims.

We in the United States properly view these developments with revulsion and anger. To express our strong feelings, our Government should bring this problem to the attention of the world, and should seek some means of its solution or alleviation. Certainly our Government should not hesitate to publicize and document the religious persecution which continues throughout the Soviet Communist empire.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, following my remarks, the article published by the American Jewish Committee's Institute of Human Relations, which specifically deals with anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Soviet Union

In November 1962, the only synagogue in Lvov, the capital of the Western Ukraine, was closed. It had served a community of about 30,000. The closing was the culmination of an intensive yearlong campaign by the Communist party paper, Lvovskaya Pravda, which charged the synagogue with being "a shelter for idlers, speculators, parasites and moneygrubbers." In the spring of 1962, several members of the board had been arrested, convicted and imprisoned for "profiteering and hooliganism."

The identification of the synagogue with economic malpractices was purposeful, indeed symbolic. Jews have been the prime targets of a drive against "economic crimes"; of the 58 trials for such offenses held in 36 cities from the start of the campaign until March 1963, more than half have involved Jews.

ECONOMIC CRIMES

Beginning in May 1961, the Soviet Union enacted decrees extending the death penalty to economic offenses like pilfering public or state property, counterfeiting, currency speculation and bribery. Most observers interpreted this drastic move as an attempt to wipe out the nearly universal graft and corruption in Soviet industry and agriculture. Such practices are an inevitable response to the realities of the Soviet economy: shortages of raw and manufactured goods, unrealistic production goals, a complex bureaucracy and a low standard of living. As experts on the Soviet Union have pointed out, bribery to obtain needed supplies and graft to cut through redtape are often necessary if the economy is to function under these conditions. In a wider sense, the economic offenses express a desire to eke out, by whatever means, some measure of "private" security in a tightly controlled, Spartan economy.

The death penalty is being publicized to frighten those involved in economic malpractices, and to scare off others who may be tempted by the financial rewards. During the 2-year period from May 1961 to April 1963, 141 persons were reportedly sentenced to death for economic offenses. Cases of this sort are covered more extensively in the Soviet press than others; the Government wants as many people as possible to learn that death by shooting is the ultimate penalty for economic crimes.

The barbaric severity of the punishment has shocked the outside world—witness a recent petition initiated by Henry Steele Commager, Lewis Gannett, William Ernest Hocking, Martin Luther King, Linus Pauling and Norman Thomas, and signed by 223 other prominent American scholars and clergymen. The document urged the Soviet Union to repeal the decrees on the ground that "the conscience of mankind rebels against excessive and inhumane punishment, of which capital punishment for economic crimes is a lamentable example."

JEWS AS SCAPEGOATS

No less disquieting is the fact that nearly 60 percent of those put to death for economic offenses have been Jews. The International Commission of Jurists has pointed out that the application of the death sentences shows "racial overtones," and that the number of Jewish-sounding names in the lists of the condemned is strikingly large. Observers of Soviet affairs believe that this is not accidental—that Jews, being a vulnerable minority, are made scapegoats for the bureaucrats in charge of the vast production and distribution machinery and forced to bear the brunt of public discontent with shortages or inferior quality of goods. In addition, Jews are singled out for object lessons showing how severely the state regards economic crimes.

The Soviet press emphasizes the Jewishness of the defendants in various ways. Repetition of obviously Jewish-sounding family names like Kaplan, Shapiro, Rabinovitch, Goldman, Zuckerman is most common. When the surname alone is not clearly Jewish, the first name and patronymic may be given in full instead of being abbreviated as is the normal practice; thus A. L. Kraisman appears as Abraham Lazarevitch Kraisman, and M. I. Maly as Mikhail Isaakovitch Maly.

In mass trials involving dozens of people, Jewish names appear more frequently than others. For example, of 47 defendants in a trial in Frunze, the capital of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic, more than half were Jews or related to Jews—though Jews constitute less than 1 percent of the population in the Kirghiz Republic. Nine named individuals "and others" were reported to have received death sentences; four of the nine bore Jewish names.[1] Analysts of the press reports believe the defendants' names were presented in a manner intended to stress the high proportion of Jews.

In another trial, at Dnepropetrovsk in the Ukraine, 24 defendants were accused of manipulating the price of apples. Though the majority were non-Jews, only the Jews were singled out for death sentences.[2]

Jewish defendants are depicted in the crudest anti-Semitic stereotypes as manipulators of gullible non-Jewish victims. Yet in reality most of the Jews executed for economic offenses occupied relatively minor posts, whereas non-Jews, who received light sentences, often held responsible positions. For example, at a trial in Leningrad, on charges of diverting goods from official trade channels, a Jew named Kraisman was sentenced to death, though he was only an agent employed by the several trade organizations involved; the top officials, factory directors and managers received short prison terms.[3]

In some cases the press and the prosecution stressed the Jewishness of the defendants by referring to their religious observances. Apropos of Mordekh Kakiashvili, who was shot for currency speculation in Tiflis, Georgia, the local paper wrote: "Even the religious books of the Torah have been used" to hide foreign currency. Later, the paper reported that the defendant had refused to sign a statement of his testimony on a Saturday because of his religious convictions, and that "speculation went on in full swing in the Lord's temple. While praying, they emptied each other's pockets."[4]

In Vilna, four Jews were sentenced to death for currency speculation, among them the first woman convicted in a case of this nature. Here the press and the prosecution involved the synagogue and the rabbi in the proceedings. The national trade-union daily, distributed throughout the Soviet Union, claimed that the defendants had gone to the local rabbi to settle their financial disputes, and concluded with an unmistakably anti-Semitic note: "These people stood apart from our life. They were not interested in how the Soviet people live."[5] The case was also used for an attack on religion in general. According to one report, witnesses testified about the complicity of "representatives of the clergy of different religions," specifically local Catholic priests, as well as the local synagogue.[6]

In singling out Jews for economic offenses, publicly identifying them as Jewish through emphasis on their affiliation with the synagogue (the only Jewish institution remaining in the Soviet Union), punishing them more harshly than non-Jews in more responsible positions, and shooting a disproportionate number of them, the Soviet Government practices Stalinist policies even while condemning them.

Soviet leaders consistently deny that the Government's policy toward economic offenders is in any sense anti-Semitic. Thus, Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev wrote to Bertrand Russell in February 1963:

"It is for the sake of justice that our people have to punish those who want to live at the expense of others, to rob our society. The attempts of reactionary propaganda to ascribe to our State pursuance and encouragement of the policy of anti-Semitism are not a new phenomenon."

Similar denials have accompanied the closing of synagogues, the arrest of congregation leaders, and the ousting of congregation officials. But there can be little doubt that such acts are intended as attacks on the remnants of Jewish community structure.

THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST THE SYNAGOGUE

Though all religions are subject to restrictions and hostility in the Soviet Union, Judaism is singled out for special disabilities which add up to a program of planned attrition.

Jewish congregations, unlike others, are isolated; they may not form national or regional associations by which they might help one another and maintain spiritual unity. Religious leaders are not permitted to leave the country for visits with Jewish officials or institutions elsewhere, while members of other faiths have visited coreligionists, attended conferences, gone on pilgrimages, and even studied abroad.

For nearly 40 years, Jewish congregations have been forbidden to manufacture urgently needed religious articles such as prayer shawls and phylacteries, whereas other religious bodies have been authorized to acquire new vestments, ikons, and the like. And Jews have not been free to print religious calendars, except that during the last 2 years a few synagogues received permission, late in the Jewish calendar year, to produce small quantities for their own use.

While the Russian Orthodox Church, the Roman Catholic Church, the Moslems, and other creeds have been provided with facilities for training reasonable numbers of clergymen, there were no provisions for rabbinical training until recently, and there are hardly any now. In 1957, a rabbinic academy was opened in Moscow, but was never permitted to function properly. Its building needs were not met, and its enrollment, always limited to 20, has been whittled down to 3 or 4 through bureaucratic maneuvering.

Finally, a harsh discriminatory restriction is implicit in the Government's long-standing ban on the Hebrew language. Whereas most of the religions represented in the Soviet Union conduct their rituals in the congregants' languages, Judaism requires some knowledge of Hebrew for an understanding of services and prayer books; but none has been taught since 1917. During the same period, no Hebrew Bible and only one token edition (3,000 copies) of the Prayer Book have been printed. Therefore, most Jews who still attend synagogue cannot actively participate in the service. No comparable restrictions are imposed on the Moslems, who use Arabic as a special language for religious purposes; an Arab Koran was issued in 1958.

THE BAN ON MATZOH

In 1962, the Government discontinued its previous practice of providing flour, labor and facilities for baking matzoh, the unleavened bread used during the Passover season. Householders were advised to prepare a supply at home (a method few could follow, because of technical and ritual difficulties), but at the same time the press featured semiofficial attacks on private baking.

Since then, individuals who sell home-baked matzoh have been imprisoned for conducting private businesses, violating health regulations, "illegal commercial activities" or "price speculation."

The ban on matzoh production climaxed a policy of harassment dating back to 1957. Beginning in that year, the amounts produced by state bakeries were progressively curtailed. Synagogues were accused of making huge profits from the "illegal production" and sale of matzoh; in 1960, the officers of the Riga congregation were charged 115,000 rubles in taxes on their alleged private profits, and elsewhere synagogue officials were forced to resign their positions.

Like other restrictions on Jewish religious practices, the campaign against matzoh apparently is intended to separate Soviet Jews from their historical traditions. The press has virulently attacked the ancient feast of Passover, which commemorates the liberation of the Hebrews from slavery in Egypt and their emergence as a religious people. Such traditions, it is alleged, are chauvinistic; they "give rise to nationalist feelings, and poison the minds of Jews by diverting their thoughts to 'the land of their fathers' (while killing) love for the Soviet motherland.[7]

---

[1] Sovietskaya Kirghizia, Frunze, June 25, 27, 1962; July 22, 1962; Izvestia, Moscow, July 22, 1962.

[2] Pravda Ukrainy, Kiev, Apr. 4, 1962; Trud, Moscow, Mar. 21, 1962.

[3] Sovietskaya Rossia, Moscow, Jan. 27, Mar. 1, Aug. 26, Nov. 16, 1961.

[4] Zaria Vostoka, Tiflis, Nov. 26, 30, 1961.

[5] Trud, Moscow, Jan. 16, 1962.

[6] Sovietskaya Litva, Vilna, Feb. 3, 1962.

[7] Sovietskaya Moldavia, Kishinev, July 23, 1959.

JEWISH CULTURE CURTAILED

Unlike other minority groups in the Soviet Union, Jews are not free to carry on a cultural life in their own language. Official quarters insist that Russian Jews are culturally assimilated and not interested in Yiddish—despite the fact that in the 1959 census 20 percent of them did name it as their mother tongue.

In 1948, all of the country's Yiddish journals and publishing houses, cultural and literary research institutes, theaters and dramatic schools were abruptly closed, as was the large Yiddish school system. Since then, such cultural activities have been permitted to resume only on a severely limited scale. The Minister of Culture, Ekaterina Furtseva, has indicated that any Government moves in this field are merely gestures addressed to the Soviet Union's friends abroad.

Until the late 1950's, Yiddish song recitals and literary readings by old artists remained virtually the only cultural expressions permitted. The response was great; though not of a high standard, the performances attracted a total audience of 3 million in 1957 alone. Today a handful of Yiddish theatrical and musical groups, all amateur, are active; they are in great demand in the major cities, but their schedules are sharply limited, and their achievements do not begin to compare with those of the Soviet Yiddish theater in the days of its professional glory.

Beginning in 1959, half a dozen Yiddish books, all by authors long dead, were reissued, but only in small editions (10,000 to 30,000), which were soon sold out. In 1961, after years of insistent pressure from abroad, the Government permitted publication of a Yiddish magazine, Sovietish Heimland.

Reference works and textbooks published in recent years treat Jews and their cultural achievement as virtually nonexistent. For example, a recent edition of the "Great Soviet Encyclopedia" devotes only 2 pages to Jews, as against 116 in an earlier edition.

DISCRIMINATION IN PUBLIC LIFE AND EDUCATION

Since World War II Jews have been eliminated from the Soviet Union's political leadership to a striking degree. As far as is known, there are none in the upper echelons of the Communist Party or the Government, with the sole exception of V. E. Dimchitz, first deputy chairman of the planning office. Before the war, 4.1 percent of the deputies to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. were Jewish; by 1958, the figure had dropped to 0.25 percent. Jews are underrepresented in the supreme Soviets of most constituent republics, especially those three—Russia, Byelorussia and the Ukraine—where most of them live.

Careers of Jews, especially at the local level and that of the constituent republics, are markedly limited by discrimination. For the higher executive positions the rule seems to be "last hired, first fired." Jews have virtually disappeared from sensitive areas like the diplomatic service and the armed forces. Elsewhere, for example in cultural and scientific pursuits, especially able Jewish individuals may still be found in the middle ranks; but the Jewish share of employment in higher education, science and political life has not kept up with the nation's expanding opportunities.

VOICES OF PROTEST

As the Soviet Government's anti-Semitic policies have become increasingly plain, much indignation has stirred in the outside world. To name but one protest among many: in December 1962, a telegram to Premier Khrushchev, drafted by the American Jewish Committee and signed by American religious leaders of all faiths, scored discriminatory acts against Jewish religious and cultural institutions.

Inside the Soviet Union, too, certain intellectuals have been shocked to realize that anti-Semitism is once more being actively fostered. A protest, unusually explicit by Soviet standards, was voiced during 1961 by one of the country's most popular poets, Yevgeny Yevtushenko, in a poem entitled "Babi Yar."

Babi Yar is a ravine, just outside Kiev, where the Nazis murdered about 100,000 Ukrainian Jews in 1941. No monument marks this tragic place; the Government has remained coldly indifferent to all requests for one and, indeed, has generally remained silent about the holocaust of European Jewry under Hitler. In his poem, Yevtushenko, though not a Jew, identifies himself with suffering Jews from the days of Egyptian bondage to those of Hitler, and ringingly indicts those who would carry on the evil tradition of persecution in present-day Russia. He points up the existence of a historic Jewish people, which Soviet doctrine denies.

"Babi Yar" appeared in a journal published by the Soviet Writers Union and created a sensation.[8] A few days after its publication, the journal of the Writers Union of the Russian Federated Republic printed several attacks on Yevtushenko, in which his depiction of anti-Semitism in Russia was rejected.[9] In the ensuing conflict between "liberal" and party-line writers, anti-Semitism became an issue; the liberals deplored it, while the adherents of the party line denied it existed.

On December 18, 1962, the "Thirteenth Symphony" by Dmitri Shostakovich, Russia's best-known composer, had its premiere in Moscow. The symphony contains a choral section, set to word from "Babi Yar." The day before the first performance, Khrushchev and other top members of the Soviet Government met privately with several hundred prominent intellectuals and writers; at this meeting, complaints were made that the verses would be used by "enemies of the Soviet Union" to support charges of anti-Semitism. Yevtushenko subsequently changed the text for the second performance of the symphony, in February 1963, adding Russians and Ukrainians to the Jews who lie in Babi Yar and omitting a slogan ascribed to anti-Semites ("Thrash and kikes and save Russia"). The music was not altered.

AN INEXTRICABLE VISE

The best and most recent survey of the condition of Russian Jews is "The Status of the Jews in the Soviet Union" by Moshe Decter.[10] The article concludes:

"In sum, Soviet policy places the Jews in an inextricable vise. They are allowed neither to assimilate, nor live a full Jewish life, nor to emigrate (as many would wish) to Israel or any other place where they might live freely as Jews. The policy stems, in turn, from doctrinal contradictions abetted by traditional anti-Jewish sentiments. On the one hand, the authorities want the Jews to assimilate; on the other hand, they irrationally fear the full penetration of Soviet life which assimilation implies. So the Jews are formally recognized as a nationality, as a religious group, as equal citizens—but are at the same time deprived of their national and religious rights as a group, and of full equality as individuals."

"Soviet policy as a whole, then amounts to spiritual strangulation—the deprivation of Soviet Jewry's natural right to know the Jewish past and to participate in the Jewish present. And without a past and a present, the future is precarious indeed."

---

[8] Literaturnaya Gazeta, Sept. 16, 1961.

[9] Literatura i Zhizn, Sept. 21, 1961.

[10] Foreign Affairs, January 1963.

FOREIGN STUDENTS AT CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, student exchange programs between the United States and foreign countries can play a very worthwhile role in international relations. If foreign students have an opportunity to get a true picture of our country, then we hope they will always retain a better understanding of the workings of the U.S. Government and of our goals as a nation. Since many of the students will be the leaders of their nations in years to come, it should be a vital part of U.S. efforts to promote student exchange programs. The program along these lines offered by Cornell University is an example of a highly successful effort to introduce foreign students to American life. I was very glad to be able to meet these students in Washington and to learn of the important work through this program by Cornell University. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks the text of this article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN STUDENTS GIVEN CLOSEUP VIEW OF U.S. PEOPLE AND GOVERNMENT

WASHINGTON.—For the more than 60,000 foreign students now in the United States, living abroad is both a pleasure and a challenge.

The pleasure is derived largely from their favorable impression of Americans, whom they have come to know as friendly, generous and sincere people. The challenge is the basic one of adjustment to a different way of life.

Some 150 countries are now represented at 1,800 U.S. colleges and universities. Their languages, traditions and mores cover a wide range, and sometimes the leap from a comparatively quiet world to the bustle of an American metropolis is not only confusing but painful for a student. Even at a small-town college he is confronted by strange and bewildering customs.

Fortunately, the young visitors do not face their problems alone. Those who are involved in the rapidly expanding student-exchange movement—and this includes not only universities but private organizations, foundations, and the U.S. Government—are eager to facilitate the foreign student's adjustment to American life.

Special orientation courses are given at the start of the school year, and most colleges have foreign student advisers whose task it is to give advice as needed on everything from religion to money, and who often act as a bridge between the students and the townspeople.

All this helps create an atmosphere of mutual understanding. As one young man from Malaya remarked after 9 months of contact with Americans, "I may not agree with everything you do, but at least I think I understand why you do it."

In the course of their stay in the United States, the students have an opportunity to participate in American life not only at school but also in their communities. For 9 years the 294 people of Burns, Kans., have invited groups of foreign students from the University of Kansas to share their Thanksgiving Day and experience life in a typical small town in the Midwest. Other communities periodically invite foreign students to spend weekends with local families who are always delighted to meet people from other lands.

One of the major schools playing host to foreign students is Cornell University, located in upper New York State. Its 17 colleges, which offer specialized education in everything from agriculture to hotel management in addition to the traditional liberal arts course, attract young people from every part of the world. At present its foreign student population numbers more than 850 persons representing 85 foreign countries.

Cornell, like other institutions of its kind, makes a special effort to give these young people as broad and true a picture of life in the United States as possible. A recent weekend spent by a group of foreign students was typical of the programs arranged for them.

Among the 40 were young people from the Middle East, Europe, Canada, the Far East, Africa, and Latin America—22 countries in all. Included in the group were couples from Japan, Ireland, Australia, Chile, and Turkey, as well as four nuns from Canada.

The students came down by bus from Cornell to Washington in the manner of ordinary tourists, but during their long weekend in the capital they saw and heard much more than the casual visitor. Thanks to the cooperation of many individuals and Government departments, they obtained new insight into the political system under which Americans live.

Even before their arrival the visitors from abroad were made to feel welcome, for many more homes had been offered than there were students. As a result, some families which were unable to give the students overnight hospitality entertained them at dinner. In each case, the hosts were Cornell alumni, working in cooperation with the International Student Office at Cornell.

The students, many of whom are expected to assume positions of responsibility on their return home, were given an opportunity to talk with some of the men who are engaged in decisionmaking in the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

At a luncheon in the old Senate Office Building, Senator Kenneth Keating of New York told the students that, while intolerance exists among some groups in the United States, "they represent only a minority, and a minority that is steadily getting smaller." Senator Edmund S. Muskie of Maine, describing himself as the son of an immigrant from "Russian-occupied Poland," said that everyone in America is a member of a minority. "We have majority rule in this country, in a democratic ideal," he said, "but because we also belong to minorities, we are careful to protect the rights and interests of minorities."

During the weekend the group visited the Department of State, where Daniel W. Montenegro, Director of the Office of Public Services, described the structure of the Department and how American foreign policy is carried out. Later he freely answered questions made by the students.

At the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Arnold W. Frutkin, Director of International Programs, discussed its operations, explaining that this program involves cooperation with other countries, and that it is an agency for exchange of information with others. He pointed out that, in a number of instances, the United States has worked hand in hand with other countries in making space probes.

Subsequently the students were conducted on a special tour of the White House, visited the National Gallery of Art, the Supreme Court Building, the Lincoln Memorial, the Smithsonian Institution, and the Jefferson Memorial.

It was a busy weekend for the students and obviously a rewarding one, for they later summed up the program as "typical American friendliness."

AUTHORITY TO WITHHOLD FEDERAL FUNDS BECAUSE OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, some weeks ago, together with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], I directed to the several executive agencies inquiries in order to determine whether they felt they were administering any Federal-funds program which in any region of the Nation discriminated because of racial or religious reasons.

Since then, I have had printed in the Congressional Record the responses which have come to me from the various agencies.

Today I submit, and ask to have printed in full in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks, the response, dated July 23, from the Department of Labor. The letter is very short, but is most informative.

As this record accumulates, I believe we shall find increasing reason to support the title of the administration's omnibus civil-rights bill which will make very clear that the use of Federal funds in a way which subsidizes discrimination is neither intended nor desired by Congress; and certainly the present President and his successors should take action to prevent it.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Department of Labor,
Office of the Under Secretary,
Washington, D.C., July 23, 1963.

Hon. Philip A. Hart,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Hart: This is in further response to your letter of April 29, 1963, requesting information about the authority of the Department of Labor to withhold Federal funds from programs in which racial discrimination occurs. Secretary Wirtz has asked me to respond to your inquiry.

It is the position of the Department of Labor that we have sufficient legal authority to condition grants of Federal funds upon assurance that the funds will be administered in a nondiscriminatory manner. It is on this legal ground that the Department has initiated administrative actions to end segregated facilities and services in State employment security offices; to end discrimination in apprenticeship programs registered with the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training of the Department of Labor and to condition approval of Manpower Development and Training Act projects on the requirement that selection and referral to such projects shall be performed in a nondiscriminatory manner. In view of this authority, therefore, the Department does not feel it needs the enactment of specific new legislation.

As you know, however, the legal position of the Department of Labor may not be identical to that of other Departments of Government. In his recent message to Congress on civil rights and job opportunities, President Kennedy stated:

"Many statutes providing Federal financial assistance, however, define with such precision both the Administrator's role and the conditions upon which specified amounts shall be given to designated recipients that the amount of administrative discretion remaining—which might be used to withhold funds if discrimination were not ended—is at best questionable."

The President, therefore, called for enactment of "a single comprehensive provision making it clear that the Federal Government is not required, under any statute, to furnish any kind of financial assistance—by way of grant, loan, contract, guarantee, insurance, or otherwise—to any program or activity in which racial discrimination occurs." The Department of Labor supports enactment of legislation that would authorize administrators to withhold Federal funds, where they do not already have such authority, from programs in which racial discrimination occurs.

With best wishes and kindest personal regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,
John F. Henning,
Under Secretary of Labor.

SUPPORT OF TOBACCO CURBS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, several weeks ago I counseled the leaders of the tobacco industry that this Nation would not tolerate a token response to the fundamental challenge now facing the industry in the form of the medical indictment of smoking.

Now, each day brings new evidence of expanding public pressures for root reform of cigarette marketing practices. Monday's New York Times alone contained three distinct major articles dealing with the approaching crisis in cigarette merchandising.

From Berkeley, Calif., the Times reported that the State Public Health Department was calling for remedial legislation to curb cigarette sales, including increased cigarette taxes, limitations upon vending machine sales, and restrictions upon the free distribution of cigarettes on airplanes and at universities.

From Buffalo, N.Y., the Times reviewed the vigorous and imaginative "war on cigarette smoking" conducted by Dr. George E. Moore, director of the Roswell Park Memorial Institute—a war symbolized by the cartoon propped up outside Dr. Moore's office entitled "The Big Flip-Top Box for the Smoker"—a coffin.

Finally, there was the always admirable and informative advertising column of Peter Bart, which has been filled for many months with graphic accounts of the advertising industry's vain efforts to wish away the clinical evidence against smoking by brave pronouncements and declarations of high-sounding principles. Yesterday, Mr. Bart reported on a byproduct of the proven hazards of smoking: the proliferation of "smoking deterrents"—antismoking pills, chewing gum, and so forth and their advertising schemes. Mr. Bart reports, not surprisingly, that various advertising media, sensitive to the interests of the major cigarette advertisers, are extremely reluctant to accept "smoking deterrent" advertising which suggests that smoking is in any way hazardous.

These articles appear in a single issue of the Times. They are indicative of the type of story which abounds in the Times and other responsible newspapers and magazines throughout the country.

On Monday I also received a clipping from the Portland Oregonian of an eight-column article reporting the views of the justly famed cancer surgeon, Dr. Alton

Ochsner, who flatly predicts that a million teenagers living today will die from lung-cancer before they are 70 years old unless the Nation's smoking habits are radically altered. And, from the Oregon Labor Press, a review of the strong evidence against cigarettes by Dr. William Sawyer.

I ask unanimous consent that the three New York Times' articles and the excerpts from articles in the Portland Oregonian and the Oregon Labor Press be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 22, 1963]

CURB ON CIGARETTES URGED IN CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY, CALIF., July 21.—Legislative action, no later than 1965 to reduce cigarette smoking has been proposed to the State board of public health here.

The proposal was part of a program offered this week. Dr. Lester Breslow, chief of the Division of Preventive Medical Services of the Public Health Department.

Presenting a 56-page report reviewing studies on "cigarette smoking and health," he asserted:

"The evidence now indicates that cigarette smoking has such a profoundly harmful effect on health that it should be abandoned. While the task ahead seems enormous, it is unavoidable."

The legislative action might include an increased tax on cigarettes, Dr. Breslow said, or possibly "greater restrictions on vending machines."

He also suggested restricting the free distribution of cigarettes on airplanes and at universities.

[From the New York Times, July 22, 1963]

SCIENTIST PRESSES FIGHT ON SMOKING

BUFFALO, N.Y.—Proposed outside the office of the director of the Roswell Park Memorial Institute was a large cartoon with the caption:

"The Big Flip-Top Box for the Smoker."

It was a coffin.

That sums up the general feeling at the institute, which is one of the Nation's chief cancer research centers.

About 1,000 teenagers had seen the cartoon a few days previously at a public health meeting. It was one more phase of the institute's war on cigarette smoking.

If you ask for a match at Roswell, you may get a book of them. The message on the cover is: "Danger, Smoke Less. Measure Your Smoke for Safety."

Roswell scientists think it is safer to smoke only the first inch or so of a cigarette. The theory is that the rest acts as a filter.

INSURANCE RISK GREATER

Recently the institute published a 14-page booklet, "Health Hazards of Smoking." Among the items: Heavy smokers who are 35 years old have chances of dying before 65 that are almost twice as great as those of a nonsmoker, the booklet said. Two life insurance companies, it added, are offering nonsmokers lower premiums.

The cigarette-vending machines have been removed from the lobbies and corridors at Roswell.

Within a year, the institute hopes to open a clinic for people who want to stop smoking. It may be the first of its kind in the United States.

The man behind this intensive but low-budget campaign is Dr. George E. Moore, Roswell's 43-year-old director. Dr. Moore has never smoked but has worked 14 years on the relation of tobacco to some of the more than 100 basic kinds of cancer.

His conclusion: Cigarettes are a cause of lung cancer. Dr. Moore views the annual American lung cancer death rate of more than 40,000 as an epidemic.

Explaining his feelings about his work, Dr. Moore says:

"It's hard not to be thought a missionary about this subject. If you could operate on lung cancer and become a famous surgeon, the number of people you would save would be relatively small—probably less than 5 out of 100 if you saw a lot of people. On the other hand prevention would be infinitely more important. We are attacking by this rather difficult route."

HABIT DISCUSSED

He believes most people are convinced that cigarettes cause lung cancer.

But if so, why do they smoke?

"I think," Dr. Moore said, "they feel that there is a hopeful doubt remaining. They would like to feel that there still is a controversy among knowledgeable physicians and scientists about the matter—which there is not, in my opinion."

Dr. Moore does not agree with contentions that there is not enough evidence to support the theory that cigarettes are a cause of lung cancer.

"We don't think there needs to be further studies in humans as far as the clinical proof," he says. "Over 98 percent of our patients with lung cancer are heavy smokers and the disease is extremely rare in nonsmokers. And this is proof enough as far as we're concerned.

"Furthermore, this is not just a correlation. You can derive an increasing incidence of deaths from lung cancer as you have an increasing frequency of smoking."

[From the New York Times, July 22, 1963]

ADVERTISING: DRUGS AND THE SMOKING HABIT

(By Peter Bart)

The cigarette industry's decision to impose certain voluntary restrictions on its advertising, apparently has encouraged producers of "smoking deterrents" to step up their promotional efforts.

Makers of these deterrent products, however, complain that their campaigns are inhibited by the reluctance of certain advertising media to accept their ads.

Smoking deterrents are drugs that are designed to help smokers shake the habit. Some leading brands contain chemicals whose effects on the nervous system are roughly similar to that of nicotine.

The number of deterrent products is proliferating. Hudson Vitamin Products, Inc., a national mail-order company, is about to start an extensive campaign on behalf of a new product called Smokurb. Hudson says its product contains two ingredients that simulate cigarette effects and also, as a chewing gum, provides the oral gratification inherent in cigarette smoking.

Eli Schonberger, president of Pace Advertising Agency, Inc., Hudson's agency, says his campaign for Smokurb has been rejected by some magazines and radio stations. "We didn't create this campaign to get into a fight with anyone," he said, "but some media just stall and put us off in the hope that we'll go away." Ads for Smokurb will nonetheless appear in several New York newspapers and radio spots also will be used.

"Let Hudson help you stop smoking," says the headline on one Hudson ad. Copy steers clear of what Mr. Schoenberger calls emotional words. Says he: "One newspaper even asked us not to say that smokers crave cigarettes on the ground that crave was an emotional word."

Another new deterrent, called Nikoban, also is widening its advertising. Nikoban, produced by the M. R. Thompson division of the J. B. Williams Co., Inc., has been the subject of an extensive direct-mail advertising campaign aimed at physicians. Ads also have been run in medical publications.

The most widely advertised deterrent probably is Bantron, which is made by the Campana division of Purex Corp. Bantron ads generally use testimonials by such figures as Sam Snead, the golfer; Otto Graham, a former professional football player, and Mickey Mantle.

Though Bantron ads have run in Life and Time, some magazines like Look and Sports Afield have turned them down. The Saturday Evening Post started accepting Bantron ads recently.

Media generally are vague on their reasons for rejecting ads for smoking deterrents. One major magazine turns down the ads on the ground that products for relief of addiction are unacceptable. One implicit reason for reluctance to accept ads for deterrents presumably stems from the fear of offending major cigarette advertisers.

Cigarette producers recently have sought to allay public criticism by announcing voluntary restrictions on their advertising. The companies said they would stop the practice of giving millions of free cigerettes to college students, would not sponsor TV shows aimed mainly at young people and would avoid use of youthful looking models in their ads.

Though the cigarette companies may cut back their campus activities, one cigarette producer says is will vastly step up its college ads. The company is Notob Products, Inc., producer of Sentry, a vegetable fiber cigarette. "Since Sentry contains no tobacco and, therefore, no nicotine, we plan to advertise in all major campus publications," says Gerald M. Schaflander, president of Notob.

[From The Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., July 18, 1963]

FAMED SURGEON CITES GRIM STATISTICS OF CANCER DEATHS CAUSED BY CIGARETTE SMOKING

A million teenagers living today will die of lung cancer before they are 70 years old, unless something is done about it.

The ugly statistic was sounded loudly here Wednesday by a famed surgeon, Dr. Alton Ochsner, emeritus professor of surgery at Tulane University. He will address the Northwest Cancer Conference opening at the Sheraton Hotel, Thursday.

Dr. Ochsner also scored doctors, Catholic priests, parents and teachers for failing to accept their responsibilities about cigarette smoking. To the statement on how many teenagers will die, he added five more slowly emphasized words:

"From a disease which is preventable."

"If we said fallout would kill that many," said the New Orleans surgeon, flown across two States to save Ben Hogan's life in 1949, "you can be sure that something would be done about it—and done right now.

"Lung cancer," he explained, "is a disease which 30 years ago was almost nonexistent. It is now the most frequent of all cancers. Up until 1955, cancer of the uterus and cancer of the breast exceeded it.

STUDIES CITED

"Next year, in this country, there will be more people die of cancer of the lung—a preventable disease—than from automobile accidents," he said.

Of the evidence against cigarettes, Dr. Ochsner has no doubt.

Dr. Ochsner cited a series of studies on people and cigarette smoking, first started by the American Cancer Society, of which he was once president, and since then supported by some half dozen similar and careful studies in this country, in Canada, and Great Britain.

In them the smoking and medical histories of almost 2 million people have been followed. The American Cancer Society study shows this, he said:

"The overall death rate from all causes is 105 percent higher among cigarette smokers than nonsmokers.

"The death rate from heart disease is 15 percent higher."

The death rate from lung cancer is 800 percent higher.

Now look at some new findings, recently released by the director of public health for Massachusetts, said Dr. Ochsner, concerned about the teenagers:

The individual who began smoking after he was 20 years old has a death rate from lung cancer of 14 per 100,000 population.

Those who began between 15 and 20 years of age have a death rate of 40 per 100,000 population.

RATES COMPARED

Those who began between 10 and 15 years, have a death rate of 80 per 100,000 population.

It probably means two things, said Dr. Ochsner, "the person who began smoking early has already damaged his lungs 10 years worth, and the earlier he begins, the more susceptible he is to lung cancer."

Dr. Ochsner said that the highest incidence of lung cancer in the world is on the Isle of Jersey, where more cigarettes are consumed per person than anywhere in the world, where there is no tax on cigarettes and where more children smoke.

He said 40 percent of all cancer cases on that island are lung cancer, and pointed out that 77 percent of children there between 13 and 15 years of age smoke cigarettes.

Insurance companies put higher premiums on obese persons who have a 1.42 times greater death rate from cardiovascular problems than those who are not fat, said Dr. Ochsner. But he wagged his head in disbelief at what he termed their complete disregard of the eight times greater death rate from lung cancer among cigarette smokers—"to say nothing about heart disease and emphysema (cigarette smokers have much greater rates of death here than nonsmokers)."

"Here you are," he said, in scornful tone, "condoning a form of self-destruction. This is a form of suicide just as sure as putting a bullet in one's head. But that is quick, cheap and relatively painless.

"Lung cancer is prolonged, damn expensive—and painful. All one has to do," he said sadly, "is watch one person die with cancer of the lung or of emphysema.

"It would be too bad to lose $12 million a day in Federal cigarette taxes," said Dr. Ochsner, "but, think of the unnecessary illness and death."

He believes America, as Great Britain, should curb cigarette advertising of "manliness, strength and virility" and particularly advertising which can reach young people.

[From the Oregon Labor Press, Portland, Oreg., July 19, 1963]

DR. SAWYER SAYS: LUNG CANCER A MAJOR KILLER

(By Dr. William A. Sawyer)

I was asked recently by a good friend who smokes too many cigarettes just what is the low-down on the dangers of tobacco smoking. He apparently thought I might have something special to tell him that I haven't told many others. There are no secrets about recent evidence of the dangers of cigarette smoking.

As forcefully as I knew how, I told him something like this, and I repeat it here because I want everyone interested in the effects of cigarette smoking to understand the true facts.

First, there is abundant evidence that cigarette smoking plays a significant part in causation of lung cancer, bronchitis, and coronary heart disease.

There are about 40,000 deaths a year from lung cancer. Research authorities say that 30,000 to 36,000 of these deaths can be blamed on cigarette smoking. This is more deaths than occurred in the U.S. Armed Forces in 3 years of fighting in Korea, and about equals the deaths from auto accidents in a year.

During the past 45 years, lung cancer has changed from an infrequent to a major cause of death. Men and women in late middle age up to 65 are most seriously affected, when family and work responsibilities are at their highest. While deaths from lung cancer have been increasing, deaths from some forms of cancer have been declining.

Deaths from heart disease, too, are much higher among cigarette smokers than among nonsmokers. Smoking is an important cause of thrombo-angiitis obliterans, a disease in which blood flow is interfered with, chiefly in the vessels of the legs. Chronic bronchitis, with its cigarette cough, is unquestionably related to too much smoking. There is definite evidence that a cigarette smoker's length of life is less than that of a nonsmoker.

Recent investigations have revealed that the risk of dying in the prime of life is almost twice as great for heavy cigarette smokers as for nonsmokers.

Of American men 35 years of age, 41 percent of the heavy smokers may expect to die before age 65, compared to 23 percent of nonsmokers.

Among American men 50 to 70, the death rate for all causes is 123 percent higher for heavy smokers than for nonsmokers. For moderate smokers it is 34 percent higher.

With all these facts, doctors and Public Health officials have taken little positive action so far as trying to curb cigarette smoking. I believe the U.S. Public Health Service is contemplating some education of the public, in view of their awareness of the harm to the Nation's health. In England, the medical profession and public health officials seem much more stirred up about all this.

While the American public seems somewhat aware that lung cancer may follow excessive cigarette smoking, the individual smoker does not relate these hazards to himself. He thinks it can't happen to him. Well, it can. It has happened to some of my friends.

Most thinking people will agree that moderation at least is desirable as regards the use of cigarettes. Sometimes it is easier to stop altogether.

THE BILLBOARD BLIGHT

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, today the House of Representatives is considering the Federal-Aid Highway Act Amendments of 1963, which include a 2-year extension of the Federal billboard control regulations, during which States may elect to participate in this program. The program expired on July 1, 1963.

Eighteen Senators have joined with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and me in sponsoring S. 1676, to extend the time during which States might enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Commerce to control advertising adjacent to the system of interstate and defense highways. States which enter into such an agreement receive a bonus of an additional one-half of 1 percent of the Federal share of the cost of the highway. Just recently the first bonus payment was made to the State of Kentucky.

Since the enactment of the billboard control provision in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958, 20 States have entered this program. These States are Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Nebraska, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Ohio, Vermont, New Hampshire, New Jersey, and Rhode Island.

Mr. President, I again urge the Senate Public Works Committee, to which our bill has been referred, to give prompt and favorable consideration to extending the billboard control provisions.

Mr. President, on July 15 a highly effective editorial was published by the Waukegan (Ill.) News-Sun entitled, "The Billboard Blight." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BILLBOARD BLIGHT

The opportunity for a motorist and his family to enjoy unobstructed scenery on our new interstate highways may become a thing of the past unless Congress acts quickly. If it does not, the driver may be confronted with miles upon miles of billboard advertisements, garishly lauding the virtues of everything from aspirin to zithers.

In 1958, a far-sighted Congress authorized control of outdoor advertising within designated limits of the routes of the Interstate System. States which agree to ban all except "informational" signs within 660 feet of rights-of-way were to receive incentive payments of an extra one-half of 1 percent of the cost of interstate projects within their boundaries.

Congress extended the law for another 2 years in 1961 over opposition of the billboard and motel lobbies. The law expired June 30, although both the House and Senate have extension bills in the hopper.

On June 25, the House Public Works Committee reported out the Federal Aid Highway Amendments of 1963 which include a 2-year extension of the billboard bonus. Senators JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Republican, of Kentucky, and MAURINE NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, have also introduced bills in the Senate calling for an extension of the law.

President Kennedy recognized the necessity for such a law when he urged in 1961 that the billboard control section be extended for 4 years and that a State's bonus be increased from one-half of 1 percent to 1 percent. He hinted darkly that a "variety of pressures" had prevented States from taking advantage of the 1958 provision.

The President stated his position in unusually strong language: "The Interstate Highway System was intended, among other purposes, to enable more Americans to more easily see more of their country. The system was not intended to provide a large and unreimbursed measure of benefits to the billboard industry, whose structures tend to detract from both the beauty and the safety of the routes they line.

"Their messages are not, as so often claimed, primarily for the convenience of the motorist whose view they block. Some two-thirds of such advertising is for national products."

But while it is imperative that Congress keeps the bonus arrangement in effect, it will be largely wasted effort unless the States get tough with their own billboard requirements to qualify themselves for the bonuses. So far only 19 States have taken advantage of the incentive plan and Illinois is not among them. Only Wisconsin and Ohio from the Great Lakes area have qualified.

Illinois is on the outside looking in because the State senate highway committee 2 years ago succumbed to the blandishments of the billboard lobby. The cost to the State at the time was estimated at $4 million in lost Federal aid. Another attempt was made this year. Senate bill 795 was introduced April 23 and promptly referred to committee. The death knell was sounded June 18 when action was tabled.

In Kentucky, the billboard industry has lost the first round in its battle to void a law banning billboards within 660 feet of interstate highways. The ruling is still pending before an appellate court.

The plaintiffs complained that the act violated their constitutional privileges. The judge ruled, however, that the property rights the plaintiffs claimed would have had no value had the State not built the interstate roads. He added:

"It seems to me, therefore, that the act does not affect the taking of property to a public use, but rather the restraint of a private use by the owner which is deemed by the general assembly injurious to the safety and well-being of the public."

While billboard advertising has its place in society, when it constitutes a hinderance or hazard to the public, there is just cause for its regulation.

We hope Congress will move quickly to extend the expired law, and that the Illinois Legislature will take the necessary steps when it meets in 1965 to qualify the State under the incentive plan.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am indeed pleased that the American Society of Landscape Architects has gone on record in support of S. 1676. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point a letter from the executive director, Mr. Lynn M. F. Harriss, dated July 19, which expresses concern over the aggressive tactics of the outdoor advertising interests.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS,
Washington, D.C., July 19, 1963.

HON. MAURINE BROWN NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: From previous correspondence you know how strongly this society opposes unrestricted outdoor advertising, especially within view of public highways.

You can readily appreciate our concern when, at the Trustees meeting last month in Pittsburgh, a report was presented by Trustee Dewald of Cleveland, Ohio, describing the aggressive tactics of the outdoor advertising interests in connection with current legislation.

Accordingly, they have instructed me to communicate with you and with Senator COOPER, expressing their complete support of S. 1676, providing for the extension of the control incentives of the Highway Act until 1965. Do let us know if there is any way we can be of service.

Very sincerely yours,
LYNN M. F. HARRISS,
Executive Director.

SMOKING AS A MAJOR CAUSE OF DISEASE

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, we need not look very far afield to find a nation responding vigorously and appropriately to the evidence indicting smoking as a major cause of disease.

The excellent weekly journal of health news, Health Bulletin, for last week contains a brief but graphic account of the activities of Canada's young and energetic new Minister of Health, Miss Judy LaMarsh.

In the 2 months since she took office with the Liberal government of Lester Pearson—

Health Bulletin writes—

> Miss LaMarsh has taken action on a series of health problems which are merely subjects of conversation in the United States. One of her first acts was to plan a curb on cigarette advertising beamed at young people. Even though Pall Mall, Ltd., advised her that it would ban all TV commercials appearing before 9 in the evening, Miss LaMarsh went a step further and said she would have her department prepare movies for her own antismoking commercials to tell young people about the dangers of smoking.

Nor has cigarette advertising been the sole object of Miss LaMarsh's vigor. The use of coal tar dyes in canned cherries, synthetic food additives in bread—a questionable practice with which I was very much concerned while in the Oregon State Legislature—and in juices, milk, prepared cereals, and margarine have all come under her critical scrutiny.

The drug consumer, too often the object of gross exploitation by the drug industry, has also aroused Miss LaMarsh's active concern. She has requested a sweeping inquiry into the sale of drugs, as well as into food contamination from pesticide residues.

Perhaps symbolic of Miss LaMarsh's devotion to the cause of public health can be found in her recent decision to quit smoking, though formerly a heavy smoker. Health Bulletin quotes Prime Minister Pearson as commenting, "It will be the best thing you have ever done."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Energetic Guardian of Canada's Health," from the July 13, 1963, edition of Health Bulletin be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENERGETIC GUARDIAN OF CANADA'S HEALTH

An element of surprise, youth, and uncertain dynamite has been added to Canada's Ministry of Health since Miss Judy LaMarsh became chief of that office 2 months ago. The sole woman Cabinet member and—at 38—the youngest, her activities to date portend a thorough housecleaning in her department.

In the 2 months since she took office with the liberal government of Lester Pearson, Miss LaMarsh has taken action on a series of health problems which are merely subjects of conversation in the United States. One of her first acts was to plan a curb on cigarette advertising beamed at young people. Even though Pall Mall, Ltd., advised her that it would ban all TV commercials appearing before 9 in the evening, Miss LaMarsh went a step further and said she would have her department prepare movies for her own antismoking commercials to tell young people about the dangers of smoking.

Miss LaMarsh has also refused to allow cherry canners to use coal-tar dyes and has criticized the use of synthetic food additives in bread, juices, milk, prepared cereals, and margarine. Last week she made an opening pass at the food and drug industry with a request for a sweeping inquiry into the sale of drugs and for an investigation of the possible hazards of food contamination by pesticides and other noxious substances. If Parliament OK's the drug investigation it will probably revive last year's proposal that drug patents be abolished as the only way to keep prices down.

Experienced as a practicing lawyer and former member of the House of Commons, Miss LaMarsh has a reputation as a hard-hitting debater who can take the medicine she prescribes for others. Formerly a heavy smoker, she reported for work one recent Monday morning with word that she had quit the habit. Her Cabinet colleagues ribbed her, but Prime Minister Lester Pearson said: "It will be the best thing you've ever done."

UTAH PIONEER DAY ANNIVERSARY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, today marks the 116th anniversary of one of the most significant events in the history of the West, the arrival of the first group of Mormon pioneers in the Salt Lake Valley.

On that memorable July 24 in 1847, Brigham Young, the leader of that gallant band of pioneers, looked across from the eastern fringe of the Salt Lake Valley and said: "It is enough, this is the right place; drive on."

Now, 116 years later, celebrations and events throughout Utah are underway commemorating and proving again and again that this really was the right place.

Since that historic entry into Salt Lake Valley, life has changed incredibly. Among the pioneers, every man had to be his own butcher, baker, candlestickmaker, carpenter, blacksmith, tailor, doctor, and so on—so that each, working with one another, could carve an existence from the barren earth. I think it is significant that they started right out, planting potatoes that very afternoon.

Those pioneers who pressed beyond the frontiers of the Nation were literally risking their lives; and, in this case, ironically enough, those pioneers left the boundaries of the then United States in order to find religious freedom.

It is a moving experience to review the history of the Mormon exodus from Nauvoo, Ill., to the Salt Lake Valley—especially if one has driven across the country and has some idea of the distances and the diversity of terrain one crosses.

The time and distance factors are more or less simple to comprehend. But there is really no way to visualize the conditions as they were then or to comprehend the suffering, the hardships and privations they underwent, or to sense the indomitable courage they manifested when adversity was the darkest.

They traveled only 20 miles a day. Today that represents 2 minutes in a jet. To those men, women, and children it meant thousands of weary footsteps. To be sure, they rested at night; but they also realized that the next day would mean another 20 miles and many thousands more steps.

Intense drama was theirs as they made their perilous trek, struggling for survival against the elements, Indians, and sickness. But those pioneers arrived and survived. They remained, and they prospered.

To mark that date in history, the "Days of Forty-seven Celebration" was begun in Utah. Today in the streets of most of the cities and towns, banners are hanging; parades are being held; rodeos are luring crowds; and young children are eating cotton candy.

For today in Utah is Pioneer Day; it also is a day we should keep fresh our appreciation of one of the finest chapters in the record of this great Nation.

Of this great epic, H. H. Bancroft, who wrote "History of Utah," said:

> There is no parallel in the world's history to this migration from Nauvoo. The exodus from Egypt was from a heathen land, a land of idolaters, to a fertile region designed by the Lord for His chosen people, the land of Canaan. The Pilgrim Fathers, in fleeing to America, came from a bigoted and despotic people—a people making few pretensions to civil or religious liberty. It was from these same people who had fled from Old World persecutions * * * that others of their descendants and associates, who claimed the right to differ from them in opinion and practice, were now fleeing.

Surely, there is no parallel to this story. What a priceless heritage, what a magnificent legacy is ours.

GHANA—THE FIRST SOVIET SATELLITE IN AFRICA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on July 15 the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security released the testimony of Dr. Kofi Busia, the distinguished Ghanaian opposition leader in exile. The testimony was supported by a total of 108 documents. Commenting on the evidence submitted to the subcommittee, I said that—

> The testimony and documentation presented * * * strongly suggest that Kwame Nkrumah's Ghana has become the first Soviet satellite in Africa.

A New York Times editorial in the Times of July 16, characterized my statement as "unjust to Ghana," "harmful to the position of the United States in Africa," and "irresponsible."

I felt that the New York Times editorial was inaccurate and unfair in several major respects. By way of replying to this editorial, I wrote a detailed letter to the editor. Among other things, I reminded the New York Times that, although they had similarly rejected earlier statements that Fidel Castro and Cheddi Jagan were Communists, my position in both these instances had been borne out by events. The letter in its original form was some 1,700 words long. The New York Times consented to print the letter if it were reduced to approximately 800 words in length. This morning, the abbreviated version of my letter to the editor appeared on the Times editorial page.

Mr. President, I hope that my recent exchange with the New York Times will be of interest to the Members of the Senate and I ask unanimous consent to insert into the Record the text of the New York Times editorial of July 16 and the unabridged text of my reply to the Times, which was printed in an abbreviated form in the Times of this morning's date.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Text of New York Times Editorial, July 16, 1963

The statement by Senator Dodd, of Connecticut, that Ghana is probably "the first Soviet satellite in Africa" is almost as harmful to the position of the United States in Africa as it is unjust to Ghana. The irresponsibility of the statement is obvious from the fact that even Senator Dodd only claims to have talked to one man, who is a respected Ghanaian opposition leader in exile, Dr. Kofi Busia.

Conclusive evidence of President Kwame Nkrumah's communism, according to Senator Dodd's way of thinking seems to be that Mr. Nkrumah made a trip behind the Iron Curtain. Even Dr. Busia, for all his hostility, did not testify that Ghana in his opinion is a Soviet satellite. He argued that it is Communist oriented.

The evidence is mixed, even contradictory. The aid being given by the U.S. and British Governments and the World Bank was arranged after careful inquiries. A new Ghanaian investment law to encourage foreign private investments has just been adopted. The American Peace Corps has had a successful program.

Ghana's foreign policies do often coincide with the Soviet position; but that is a very long way from saying that Ghana—or any other African state—is a satellite. Guinea was stereotyped in the same way by many Americans until a year or two ago, when the essential African determination to be nobody's satellite became clear there—and Guinea was much nearer to being a Soviet satellite than Ghana has ever been.

None of this means that the Nkrumah government is pro-Western or democratic. Nothing could be less democratic than the autocratic, authoritarian, one-party system of Ghana, with Kwame Nkrumah as the tribal chieftain of his nation. Moreover, no one can question the fact that Mr. Nkrumah is a fanatical anticolonialist, anti-imperialist African leader with, doubtless, imperial ambitions of his own in west Africa. Besides which, he is a variation of a Marxist since he has introduced what he himself calls a policy of African socialism.

Senator Dodd seems to believe all this makes Ghana a Soviet satellite. Such wild statements are, in fact, calculated to drive any African leader toward Moscow. It is hard for foreigners to realize that people like Senator Dodd, fortunately, do not speak for the United States, or the U.S. Government or, in his case, even for the U.S. Senate.

Unabridged Text of Reply of Senator Thomas J. Dodd to the New York Times

July 18, 1963.

To the Editor of the New York Times:

In the interest of fairness, I wish to ask permission to reply to your editorial of July 16 in which you took me to task for the statement I made in connection with the testimony of the Ghanaian opposition leader, Dr. Kofi Busia.

In my statement I said that the evidence and documentation presented to the subcommittee "strongly suggest that Kwame Nkrumah's Ghana has become the first Soviet satellite in Africa." This statement, in the opinion of your editorial, was "unjust to Ghana" and "harmful to the position of the United States in Africa."

"The irresponsibility of the statement," said your editorial, "is obvious from the fact that even Senator Dodd claims to have talked to only one man, a respected Ghanaian opposition leader in exile, Dr. Kofi Busia." My first comment is that I did not "talk" to Dr. Busia; I took his sworn testimony. (Dr. Busia, incidentally, is a man of unchallengeable integrity who belongs in the very front ranks of the academic world. He is a graduate of Oxford University, a recipient of Fulbright and Carnegie awards, and has been a visiting professor at universities in Holland, Mexico, and the United States.) But what your editorial failed to mention altogether is that this testimony was supported by 108 documents which convey the views and opinions of many other prominent Ghanaians, as well as numerous independent observers.

In combination, these documents and the testimony taken set forth the views of (1) Ghana's opposition leader in exile, Dr. Kofi Busia, (2) Joe Appiah and R. R. Ampousah, erstwhile members of Ghana's Parliament who were jailed for their opposition to Nkrumah, (3) the Ghana Student's Association of the Americas, (4) K. A. Gbedeman, Nkrumah's former finance minister, (5) Alex Hammah, a Ghanaian who "by virtue of his profession became intimate with the concealed Communist machinery which is being forcefully used to impose on Ghana a Communist regime," (6) 11 British newspapers, (7) the International Commission of Jurists, and (8) the International Press Institute of Zurich. But most compelling of all are the documents written by Nkrumah himself or by propagandists serving under his command.

How your editorialist could have failed to mention the existence of this documentation to your readers, I fail to understand. The only assumption that makes sense is that he did not examine the evidence before writing his editorial.

I share the belief of the New York Times that grave harm can be done by reckless or exaggerated charges against foreign governments or their leaders. There are, I am afraid, irresponsible conservatives who gratuitously denounce as Communist the Betancourt Government in Venezuela and any other mildly Socialist or reform government. Conversely, there are irresponsible liberals who are prepared to condemn as Facist any anti-Communist government which is not a lily-white democracy. Fascist and Communist have very precise meanings, and they should not be employed loosely or carelessly.

I believe that my own record will show that I have not made any indiscriminate charges of communism against heads of foreign governments. Kassem, Nasser, Sukarno, Ben Bella and other modern statesmen have sometimes carried their collaboration with the Communists to the danger point—but they are not Communists and I have never so described them. I have made this charge heretofore against two heads of government whose political identity at the time seemed to mystify many people, as Nkrumah's does today. These two men were Fidel Castro and Cheddi Jagan. In both cases my evaluations, while they did not enjoy the immediate acceptance of the State Department or the New York Times, were borne out by events.

On July 14, 1959, Maj. Pedro Diaz Lanz, former chief of Castro's Air Force, told the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security that Castro was trying to convert Cuba into a "tool of Russia." (The subcommittee at that time already had substantial evidence on hand from other sources that Castro was himself a Communist and that his movement was Communist-dominated.) Twenty-four hours later, Herbert L. Matthews of the New York Times filed a dispatch from Havana from which I quote:

"This is not a Communist revolution in any sense of the word and there are no Communists in positions of control. * * * The accusations of Maj. Pedro Diaz Lanz before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee yesterday are rejected by virtually all Cubans. * * * The only power worth considering in Cuba today is in the hands of Premier Castro, who is not only not Communist but decidedly anti-Communist."

Regrettably, there were many people, both in Government and out, who continued to "give Castro the benefit of the doubt," some for another year, some for almost 2 years.

On July 17, 1961, in a speech on the floor of the Senate, I warned that the election of Dr. Cheddi Jagan in British Guiana might give us another Communist-dominated government in the Americas. There was no doubt in my mind as there was no doubt in the mind of the British Royal Commission which had investigated Jagan's activities, that Jagan was a Communist. But the official position at the time was that we should give Jagan a chance. On August 23, the New York Times commented editorially:

"Dr. Jagan has been labeled by some high American officials and some Senators as a Communist, or the equivalent of one. If this were to prove the official U.S. Government attitude, Dr. Jagan and his government would certainly be in the communistic camp alongside of Cuba very soon. If British Guiana is handled by the United States with some understanding, sophistication, and sympathy, there is every reason to hope it will become a desirable member of the inter-American system."

I rest my case with the statement that I do not think there is anyone in the U.S. Government or anyone in the New York Times who today has any doubts that both Fidel Castro and Cheddi Jagan are confirmed Communists. About Castro, nothing more need be said. In the case of Jagan, it is sufficient to note that, in greeting the arrival of a Cuban oil tanker at the height of the recent general strike, Prime Minister Jagan pledged to emulate the example of Castro and to convert British Guiana into the first socialist country on the South American Continent.

While we must be fastidious in gathering our evidence and in making our determinations, I believe that it is important to know who is a Communist and who is not a Communist—because if we are not able to make this central distinction, we can have no foreign policy worthy of the name. It is also important to face up to the fact that Communists frequently do not announce themselves as Communists and that party membership cards are more often than not impossible to produce as evidence.

In attempting to decide who is a Communist and who is not a Communist, I believe we must be guided by certain elementary rules of commonsense. Basically, it is a matter of examining the entire pattern of a man's actions and activities. If this pattern conforms to the known Communist pattern at every point—if a man consistently supports the Communist line on every issue of foreign policy; if he welcomes known Communist and Soviet agents into his entourage; if he apes Radio Moscow in assailing Western imperialism but has no criticism for Soviet imperialism; if he espouses the philosophy of "Marxism-Leninism" while denying that he is a Communist Party member; if his actions, once in power, follow the familiar Communist pattern of establishing totalitarian controls by means of the notorious "salami" technique—if, in all these respects, a man adheres to the master pattern of Communist behavior, then we have no alternative but to draw the conclusion that he is, in fact, a Communist.

Your editorial misleadingly stated that the only evidence I adduced to prove my case against Nkrumah was that he had made a trip behind the Iron Curtain. Let me present a few of the facts that led me to my evaluation of Kwame Nkrumah's Ghana.

Prime Minister Nkrumah has himself written that he long ago decided that the philosophy of Marx and Lenin was capable of solving his problems.

Nkrumah since he came to power has replaced the moderates in his entourage with known pro-Communists and extremists. (Among the American and British Communists invited to serve under him were the British traitor, Alan Nunn May, and Cedric Belfrage, a former member of Elizabeth Bentley's espionage underground.) He has consistently supported the Soviet Union and Cuba in the U.N.

In 1962, the Kremlin awarded Nkrumah the Lenin Peace Prize, which caused his own newspaper to acclaim him as the "Lenin of Africa."

Ghana under Nkrumah is the focal point for the subversion of Africa as Cuba is the focal point for the subversion of the Americas. It is widely believed in Africa, for example, that the assassination of Prime Minister Olympo of Togo was master minded from Ghana.

Like Castro's Cuba, it carries on a propaganda campaign that would tax the resources of a major country. It trains natives of other countries in the arts of infiltration, sabotage, terror, and guerrilla warfare. It exports arms by clandestine means to the opposition terrorist groups in other countries which it has fostered and today supports.

I note at this point that the Times did not dispute my statement of facts; indeed, your editorial bore out my statements in many respects. The issue, essentially, is what interpretation to place on these unchallenged facts.

I believe that, to those who have made a careful study of Communist history, the pattern of Kwame Nkrumah is as clear as the patterns established by Fidel Castro and Cheddi Jagan in their early days.

If we conceal the facts about Nkrumah and his regime, or fail to face up to the meaning of these facts, we are, in effect, helping him to maintain his dictatorship and acting against the best interests of the Ghanaian people. There is reason for believing that the Nkrumah regime is detested by the great majority of its people, by its immediate neighbors, and by many of the other African states. The publication of the facts, I am convinced will be welcomed by all Ghanaians who are fighting for their freedom and by the many African states that are endeavoring to resist the inroads of Nkrumah's subversion.

THOMAS J. DODD.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT C. RHONE, JR.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, it was with a great deal of pleasure that I learned of the results of a vacancy appointment to the Colorado House of Representatives. That vacancy was filled by a Democratic executive committee which appointed Robert C. Rhone, Jr., an attorney, to fill the unexpired term.

Mr. Rhone's election by the committee is doubly satisfying to me. In the first place, this young man is the son of a good friend of mine, "Buck" Rhone, of Cheyenne, Wyo. And secondly, Mr. Rhone is a Negro and his selection signifies another reduction in the barriers that have separated Americans of different races and backgrounds.

Mr. President, an article describing Mr. Rhone's election appeared in the July 10 edition of the Denver Post. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RHONE BESTS EIGHT RIVALS—DEMOCRATS PUT NEGRO IN HOUSE SEAT

It took three ballots, but Robert C. Rhone, Jr., a Negro attorney, won a vacancy appointment to the Colorado House of Representatives Tuesday night.

Rhone, 34, of 2820 Ash Street, bested eight opponents in what amounted to a battle of proxies at a city Democratic executive committee meeting. He will replace Elmer Johnson, Democrat, Denver, who resigned July 1 to become city budget director under Mayor Tom Currigan.

Rhone is Democratic captain in northeast Denver's district 16. He was a candidate for the legislature last year, but ran 19th in a 17-seat race.

LED FROM START

The attorney took the lead on the first ballot and held it all the way as candidates with lesser support dropped—or were pushed—out. With 79 party captains, vice captains, or other officers represented at the executive committee meeting in the Petroleum Club Building, either in person or by proxy, a 40-vote total was needed to win. Rhone's votes on successive ballots, were 34, 38, and 41.

His nearest competitors on the final ballot were Wayne Knox, Denver Young Democrats president and a former State representative, and Ernest Capillupo, owner of Ernie's Supper Club. Knox had 19 votes and Capillupo, who was backed by the party's north Denver contingent, had 17.

Other contenders, none of whom were ever really in it, were Dave Slawson, Phil Lowery, Mrs. Nell Williams, Tony Lovato, Dominic Coloroso, and Roger Cisneros.

Hubert Safran, unsuccessful candidate for the city council in southwest Denver, had been listed as a candidate, but withdrew before balloting began. Only those who had received a party designation and ran in a prior general election should be considered, he said.

The party organizational meeting opened with a motion by Abe Weiner, captain in west Denver's District 7, that all candidates who did not themselves have an executive committee vote be excluded from the meeting. Rudolph Gonzales, captain in district 3, amended the motion to exclude all nonmembers, including reporters.

Gonzales' bar-the-door proposal was shouted down. Weiner's motion was declared lost by Chairman Robert S. Appel after a close voice vote.

In all, 20 proxies were voted at the meeting—and the bulk of them seemed to be in the hands of Rhone or his supporters. One nonmember proxy holder was former Gov. Steve McNichols. McNichols, now Democratic national committeeman, held the vote of Mrs. Lea Robinson, captain in district 26.

Rhone, by his victory, became the only Negro in Colorado's 65-member State House of Representatives. He will serve until the next election when, under the new legislative districting law, he will have to defeat Representative Andrew Kelley, Democrat, Denver, in a party primary to become the Democrats' general election candidate.

COURTNEY JOHNSON

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, recently I had as my guests in Washington two young people from Wyoming—the winners of the Gale McGee Senate Internship Contest. I have already reported to this body on the many wonderful impressions these young people gained during their stay here. However, one of these young people, Courtney Johnson, of Cheyenne, has written to the Wyoming press of his impressions of his trip here.

Mr. President, Courtney's letter was reprinted in several Wyoming newspapers including the Sheridan Press. The editor of that paper added an incisive comment of his own, and I ask unanimous consent that his editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SENSED THE ACHIEVEMENTS

(Courtney Johnson, of Cheyenne, was one of Wyoming's high school students who received the opportunity to spend a week in Washington, D.C., under a Senate internship contest sponsored by U.S. Senator GALE McGEE. Following are portions of a letter he wrote expressing impressions and feelings.)

"To the People of Wyoming:

"I think it would have been impossible for me to write about Washington immediately after returning. Such a trip leaves a myriad of impressions—impressions which must be carefully classified in one's thoughts. For this reason, I have postponed this letter as long as I dared; I have carefully selected certain primary ideas to share with you.

"As I walked into the Lincoln Memorial, I was confronted by the statue of the Great Emancipator. I stood and thought of the man whose face bore a record of the struggle which tested 'whether that nation or any nation so conceived and dedicated (could) long endure,' a man who truly lived 'with malice toward none, with charity for all.' At the Jefferson Memorial, I thought back still further and remembered those 'certain inalienable rights' for which our forefathers pledged '(their) lives, (their) fortunes, and (their) sacred honor.'

"In the White House I sensed the achievements of not only one great man, but many of our country's outstanding leaders. I was reminded of those leaders by the furniture, china, silverware which I saw, but most significantly by the intangible feeling of their presence.

"This abstract feeling of great men and great deeds was acutely experienced in the Senate Chambers. But, as Senator McGEE informed me, little actual work takes place on the Senate floor. The real scrutinization of a bill goes on behind the scenes, in Senate committee meetings.

"And in the Supreme Court Building I looked with reverent awe at the nine empty chairs which seat nine exceptional men who have given their lives to the law and who now sit at the head of a system which guarantees to all of us 'equal justice under law.'

"To understand and to appreciate America is a lifelong task. But as one of the winners of the birth of the McGee Senate internship contest, I feel I have received an aid toward achieving this goal. In the best living workshop for democracy that the world has ever known, our history and our Government which I had studied suddenly came alive and took on all the deep meaning which textbooks and even teachers cannot engender."

Comment: And then we question whether our young people appreciate their heritage of freedom and the men who made it and are making it. At least this young man does, and with a more passionate idealism that most of us old folks can muster.

THE YOUNG PEOPLE OF POWELL, WYO.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on several occasions I have talked to this body about the enterprising spirit of the young people of Powell, Wyo., who converted the national craze for 50-mile hikes into a demonstration of the generosity of the American public.

The fact that these young people were able to start a campaign that resulted in the collection of more than 3,000 pounds of clothing for the people of Taraco, Peru, is an indication of their enthusiasm and effectiveness.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Powell Tribune describing the end result of this drive and a letter to me from Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OVER 3,000 POUNDS—TARACO CLOTHING BUNDLE LEAVES SAN FRANCISCO

Over 3,000 pounds of clothes and shoes left San Francisco Tuesday aboard the SS *Santa Juana* headed south for Peru and Walter Vande Veegaete in the mountain village of Taraco.

The ocean voyage is the final leg of a journey that started in Powell February 17 when nearly 60 students from Northwest Community College and Powell High School participated in a 50-mile President's physical fitness march to publicize a clothing drive they were holding.

The march was a success. Waiting in Cody for the marchers was nearly a ton of clothing. The same amount was raised by Powell people. For the next week clothing kept coming in from throughout the Powell Flat until the NWCC administration building lobby was nearly full.

Then came a period of frustration. How was the clothing to be shipped to Peru? By commercial carrier it would cost several hundred dollars. Then the Seventh Day Adventist Church in Powell came to the rescue. They told the group they would haul it to Peru if the clothing could be shipped to Watsonville, Calif.

BigWig Canning Co. of Cowley said they didn't mind hauling the clothes to Watsonville. Then came a real snag: the clothes had to be in Cowley to be shipped to Watsonville. Here the college group had arranged for shipping the clothes halfway around the world, but they couldn't find transportation to a neighboring town of Cowley.

L. L. Smith Trucking, of Powell, heard about the predicament and volunteered their services.

It is not known when the clothes will arrive in Taraco.

PEACE CORPS,
Washington, D.C., July 12, 1963.

Hon. GALE McGEE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR McGEE: I was delighted to learn that the clothing collected by the people of Wyoming is on its way to Peru and will be distributed by Walter Vande Veegaete, one of our many Peace Corps volunteers from Wyoming.

It has been said that the American people are unconcerned with the rest of the world. Nothing could be further from the truth, and some very generous Wyomingites have proved it.

You can be sure that the people of Taraco, Peru, will no longer believe that Walter Vande Veegaete and other Peace Corps volunteers are unique exceptions. The successful clothing drive in Wyoming proves that helping people help themselves is part of the American tradition which has made this country the greatest in the world.

This is one more example of the people of Wyoming coming forth to help their country in the cause of peace.

Sincerely,

ROBERT SARGENT SHRIVER, Jr.,
Director.

U.S. POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the U.S. policy in the Middle East is of concern to all of us but few Members of this body have demonstrated as deep an interest and concern as has my distinguished colleague, Senator KEATING, from New York.

Dedicated to the independence of Israel, Senator KEATING has repeatedly supported policies to achieve this end. He has urged that we "leave no stone unturned to oppose Soviet moves and to demonstrate that the United States will not permit Arab encirclement of Israel or Arab aggression against the Israelis."

My able collegue's keen awareness of the current Middle East situation and his outstanding contributions toward a peaceful resolution of Middle Eastern tensions and the independence of Israel have been well described in a recent news article. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD following my remarks the text of this article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM JERUSALEM TO NEW YORK

(By Trude B. Feldman)

I first met Senator KENNETH KEATING, Republican, of New York, in Jerusalem, near the Hadassah Hospital when he planted a tree in the Keating Forest—the first of the U.S. Freedom Forests. At that time, he told me of his gratefulness to the American friends who gave funds to the forest "enabling me to symbolically live in Israel."

And during that brief visit he quipped: "As Senator from New York, I represent more Jews than Prime Minister David Ben Gurion."

Upon my return to New York, I've noted the reality of his quip about representing Jews. I've witnessed his numerous appearances as keynote speaker at Jewish functions and listened to his eloquent and heart-rending talks in behalf of Israel and Jewish causes.

KEATING is not only the foremost authority on Communist Cuba in Congress; but, this week, he spelled out strategy for a bipartisan coalition (in Congress) that could produce the margin of votes needed in any showdown on civil rights legislation. Speaking to 300 of New York's leading attorneys at an Anti-Defamation League dinner, KEATING lauded President Kennedy for speaking "eloquently about the urgent civil rights tasks that confront America" and urged that he "now do everything within the area of his power and responsibility to make certain that his plea for action is heeded."

PUTTING PRESSURE

Nonetheless, the dynamic Senator has been putting pressure on the Kennedy administration to adopt a more aggressive policy in behalf of Israel, who is threatened by the Arab States. I asked the Senator what policy changes should be instituted by the Administration toward Israel now and in the future. He said he has been very concerned over the military designs of Egypt and her partners in the Middle East.

"Unless the United States of America takes the initiative to smooth the troubled waters of that region, an outbreak of hostilities with incalculable consequences for the whole world is highly possible," he stated.

The Senator gave a five-point program dealing with the situation:

1. We should restate explicity, firmly and unequivocally our dedication to the State of Israel.

2. We should increase pressure and diplomatic efforts to have the imported German

scientists withdrawn from Egypt before they have done irreparable harm.

3. We should make clear that, if need be, we will supply Israel for her to defend herself against the enemies who surround her.

4. We should use every means at our disposal to bring the Arab States and Israel together for direct negotiations to promote a pilot arms control agreement. I have often made this specific proposal to the State Department, with little response from that quarter.

5. Nasser and his comrades have their aggressive designs. It is ironic that year after year the United States of America has continued to send generous assistance to Egypt, for example, and that aid has helped free Egyptian funds for Nasser's aid if they continue to pursue expansionist ambitions.

GREATEST MENACE

Senator KEATING also spoke this week at Kutcher's Country Club before the Free Sons of Israel, the oldest Jewish fraternal organization in the United States of America (115 years old). He charged that the latest Soviet moves to hamstring the United Nations represent the greatest menace to Israel. And he emphasized that the United States must leave no stone unturned to oppose these Soviet moves, to preserve the peacekeeping functions of the United Nations independent of the Soviet veto in the Security Council and to defend the world institution from its foes.

"We can also take other steps," KEATING pointed out, "steps that will convince both Arabs and Israelis that the United States has a vital interest in the Middle East and that we will not permit Arab encirclement of Israel or Arab aggression against the Israelis."

When Senator KEATING attended the 34th annual convention of the National Federation of Jewish Men's Clubs at the Concord Hotel, he was duly impressed when rabbis and delegates recited the prayer over bread (hamotzie) at the commencement of the dinner and the benediction (benching) at the conclusion of the meal. KEATING made it a point to ask me the ritualistic and historical meaning of these religious ceremonies.

When asked about the roots of his predilection for things Jewish, KEATING said his admiration for the Jewish people stems from his adherence to the democratic credo and the historic religious and spiritual contributions of Judaism and Israel to civilization.

KEATING's white hair, good looks, and neat appearance stamp him as the typically ideal Senator depicted in the movies and on the television screen. His genuine motives come to the fore very markedly whenever he speaks and acts in behalf of all worthy undertakings.

Senator KEATING recently celebrated his birthday at an American Jewish committee dinner where public congratulations were extended him by Adlai E. Stevenson.

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS FROM SWEDEN

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, recently it was my good fortune to be a guest at a luncheon for several members of the Swedish Parliament and their wives. These distinguished visitors from Sweden are on the last leg of a month-long tour of the United States and, along with my colleagues, Senators NELSON, DOUGLAS, McGOVERN, and McCARTHY, I was particularly interested in their perceptive impressions of the United States. I can sum up their comments by saying that they were mightily impressed with the dynamism, the diversity and the good will that they found among the American people.

I had a special interest in meeting with this group from Sweden. My grandmother came to this country from Sweden as a young girl over 100 years ago. She secured a job in Chicago as a housemaid where she met a young Danish immigrant and together they migrated via Iowa to North Dakota where they were among our State's earliest settlers.

Americans of Swedish descent, Mr. President, have made many great contributions to our political, cultural, and intellectual life in America—contributions so lengthy that were I to list them it would fill many pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list of those present at the luncheon and also a story from the Washington Post which describes the splendid labor-management climate in Sweden.

There being no objection, the list and story were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTICIPANT LIST OF THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC GROUP VISITING THE UNITED STATES, JUNE 23 TO JULY 19, 1963

1. Miss Rosa Andersson, Member of Parliament for the county of Södermanland, deputy member of the standing committee on laws.

2. Miss Ruth Andersson, Member of Parliament for the county of Älvsborg, deputy member of the standing committee on laws and of the standing committee on miscellaneous affairs.

3. Mr. Gunnar Berg, Member of Parliament for the county of Blekinge, member of the standing committee on agriculture.

4. Mrs. Marie-Louise Berg.

5. Mr. Karl Damstrom, Member of Parliament for the county of Kopparberg (Dalecarlia), member of the standing committee on the constitution.

6. Mrs. Iris Ekroth, Member of Parliament for the county of Jönköping, deputy member of the standing committee on laws and of the standing committee on miscellaneous affairs.

7. Mr. Uno Hedstrom, Member of Parliament for the county of Västerbotten, member of the standing committee on miscellaneous affairs, and deputy member of the standing committee on agriculture.

8. Mrs. Mary Holmqvist, Member of Parliament for the county of Malmöhus, deputy member of the standing committee of ways and means.

9. Mr. Erik Johansson, Member of Parliament for the county of Kristianstad, deputy member of the standing committee on agriculture.

10. Mr. Tage Johansson, Member of Parliament for the county of Jönköping (Smaland), deputy member of the standing committee of ways and means and of the committee on miscellaneous affairs.

11. Mr. Rolf Jüring, journalist in the staff of the cooperative insurance company, Folksam.

12. Mrs. Göta Jüring.

13. Mr. Ake Larsson, Member of Parliament for the county of Örebro, member of the standing committee on banking and deputy member of the standing committee on laws.

14. Mr. Essen Lindahl, Member of Parliament for the county of Stockholm, deputy member of the standing committee on the constitution and of the standing committee on banking.

15. Mrs. Brita Lindahl.

16. Mr. John Lundberg, Member of Parliament for the county of Uppsala, member of the standing committee on laws.

17. Mrs. Karin Lundberg.

18. Mrs. Thyra Lüfqvist, Member of Parliament for the county of Blekinge, member of the standing committee on laws.

19. Mr. Nils Magnusson, Member of Parliament for the county of Gothenburg, deputy member of the standing committee on laws and of the standing committee on agriculture.

20. Mr. Eric Mossberger, Member of Parliament for the county of Halland, member of the standing committee on agriculture.

21. Mr. Arne Müller, secretary to the Social-Democratic Parliament Group.

22. Mrs. Maja Nilsson, Member of Parliament for the county of Kopparberg, deputy member of the standing committee on laws and on agriculture.

23. Mr. Emil Nässtrum, Member of Parliament for the county of Västernorrland, deputy chairman of the standing committee of supply.

24. Mrs. Dagny Nässtrum.

25. Mr. Olof Nässtrum.

26. Miss Gunnel Olsson, Member of Parliament for the county of Stockholm, deputy member of the standing committee of supply.

27. Mr. Güran Petterson, Member of Parliament for the county of Örebro, member of the standing committee of supply.

28. Mrs. Rosa Svensson, Member of Parliament for the county of Vastmanland, deputy member of the standing committee on laws.

29. Mr. Erik Södersten, labor specialist at the U.S. Embassy, Stockholm.

30. Mr. Fridolf Wirmark, Member of Parliament for the county of Örebro, deputy member of the committee of ways and means and of the standing committee on laws.

SWEDEN, IT SEEMS, HAS NO LABOR PROBLEMS

(By Frank C. Porter)

On invitation, a tripartite panel of Swedish economic experts testified on Capitol Hill yesterday and left the legislators scratching their heads.

Unemployment?

In Sweden it has held between 1 and 2 percent over the past 20 years, Labor Under Secretary Ernest Michanek told the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower.

Automation?

Swedish labor embraces it wholeheartedly, said Arne Geijer, president of the Confederation of Swedish Trade Unions (LO).

A managed economy?

Sweden's Socialist government interferes very little with private enterprise, which controls more than 90 percent of the nation's industry, explained Bertil Kugelberg, managing director of the Swedish Employers Confederation (SAF).

School dropouts?

"I never heard of any problem of that kind," Michanek replied.

The subcommittee, and members of the House Select Labor Subcommittee who joined it for the occasion, also heard that about 50 percent of Swedes go to college, against 25 percent here, that there has been no major strike for more than a decade despite the absence of compulsory arbitration, and that private employment agencies have been banned for the last 20 years.

The latter point took the American legislators by surprise. They have lately been caught in a crossfire between the U.S. Employment Service and private agencies, which accuse USES of attempting to build a "manpower monopoly." What is the Swedish attitude, the members wished to know.

"We feel job placement should be free, without cost," Michanek said. "It should not be handled on a profit basis."

Michanek, Geijer, and Kugelberg are becoming a familiar team in Washington, having traveled here several times to brief Americans on the Swedish system.

They dwelt at length yesterday on how Sweden has achieved full employment, a high production rate, comparatively stable prices and labor peace through a unique partnership among business, labor, and Government.

Chairman Joseph S. Clark, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, hailed this common effort as "the most successful policy of dealing with manpower problems of any country in the world."

He also noted that the methods so well suited to a small, homogeneous nation like Sweden might not be adaptable to such a large, heterogeneous country as the United States.

But there was common recognition among subcommittee members that if the exact Swedish methodology could not be introduced here, the spirit behind it could be.

Looking at Geijer and Kugelberg, Senator Jennings Randolph, Democrat, of West Virginia, observed that the comradeship shown by Swedish labor and management sitting together is "very wholesome. Perhaps we should do more of it in this country."

And after Kugelberg praised the Swedish labor unions, Representative Elmer J. Holland, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, who still holds a card in the United Steel Workers, remarked:

"I have never heard any American manufacturer talk like that."

The Swedish officials explained how their national employment service includes labor and business representatives and circulates countrywide job vacancy lists through its 25 regional councils. An ambitious retraining program seeks a simultaneous enrollment of 1 percent of the work force, and labor mobility is promoted through a liberal system of relocation allowances. The impact of layoffs is cushioned by industry agreement to notify the employment service as far in advance as possible.

DEDICATION OF OOLOGAH DAM AND RESERVOIR PROJECT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, July 20 was a great day for Oklahoma. The Chief of Engineers, Lt. Gen. W. K. Wilson, Jr., joined a great crowd of Oklahomans in the dedication of the Oologah Dam and Reservoir project. This is the first major control structure to be dedicated in the comprehensive Arkansas Basin development project, which, when completed in 1970, will provide a 9-foot navigation channel from Catoosa, Okla., to the Mississippi River.

The remarks of the Chief of Engineers were timely, concise, and constructive. I believe they will be of interest to many, both in Oklahoma and elsewhere, who did not have the privilege of attending the dedication.

We were proud to have General Wilson in our State and congratulate him and his dedicated staff of officers and civilian employees who are doing so much to build a better America.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the remarks of General Wilson.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by Lt. Gen. W. K. Wilson, Jr., Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, at the Dedication of Oologah Dam, Tulsa, Okla., July 20, 1963

I am pleased to be here this morning to share this historic moment with you. This is an important day in the development of the Arkansas Basin. It is the first of many such days; other dedications will take place, one after another, as successive units of the Arkansas Basin development program are completed.

Oologah Dam is a major project that will contribute several kinds of benefits—benefits which reach outward in widening circles. It is an important project in its own right, fully capable of justifying its cost as an individual project. Beyond that, it is a major element in an integrated program for the Arkansas Basin. Finally, it contributes to a nationwide effort to keep the water-resource availabilities of the United States abreast of its growing needs.

The United States today is engaged in a great effort to meet its anticipated water-resource needs. This effort was greatly stimulated by the work of the Senate Select Water Resources Committee headed by the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, who was also one of the fathers of the Arkansas Basin program. The Kerr committee helped show how greatly and how swiftly national water needs are increasing, and how closely the Nation's prosperity depends on adequate water-resource development; and it made recommendations which form part of the basis of present national water-resource policy.

As a result, the Nation 2 years ago began an effort aimed at doubling its national reservoir capacity by 1980, and expanding other water-resource developments in proportion. The Corps of Engineers estimates its own share of this task at about $28 billion. To approach this huge task in an orderly and efficient way, we propose to plan development programs on an integrated river-basin basis—much as was done here in the Arkansas Basin.

Let us see how Oologah fits into Senator Kerr's first love: the development of the Arkansas.

We propose at first to store about 50,000-acre-feet of water in Oologah Reservoir. I am told that this should provide a good fishing lake. We have already provided four public use areas and will provide two more in the future.

Water from this pool is available, under contracts already signed, to provide up to 47 million gallons of water per day to the cities of Tulsa and Collinsville, Claremore, Inc., and the Public Service Co. of Oklahoma for municipal or industrial water supply whenever they may need it.

For some years to come, however, the bulk of the space behind this dam will remain empty, because its main function for that time will be to contain floods. This valley experienced 69 floods in the 33 years up to 1955, when construction of the project was actually begun. During the 1940's it experienced eight major floods within 9 years. Therefore, flood control is a major and valuable benefit from this project.

About 1970, the navigation system is expected to reach Catoosa. At that time Oologah Dam will begin performing additional functions—functions that will serve the entire Arkansas Basin. In particular, it will begin contributing water to help maintain navigation depths in the waterway. In order to perform this service, the reservoir will have to contain more water than it does now, and the releases of water will have to be controlled. These purposes will be accomplished by the provision of some movable tainter gates at the spillway 2 miles east of here. Installation of the gates will permit raising the elevation of the conservation pool about 30 feet.

The Arkansas navigation system consists mainly of 18 locks and dams. Besides these, the comprehensive basin program consists of a series of reservoirs, powerplants, bank-stabilization works, and channel improvements. These elements will work together to form one of the best-integrated river-basin systems in the United States.

As a unit of this system, Oologah will contribute flood-control benefits not only to the Verdigris Valley, but throughout the downstream reaches of the Arkansas Valley. By helping regulate the amount of water in the Arkansas, it will not only aid navigation but also provide downstream water-supply, water-quality, and related benefits. Provision has been made for project modification to add hydroelectric power generating capacity at a later date, if found economically justified.

Since Oologah Dam was started, the tempo of progress on the entire program has been stepped up. Keystone and Eufaula Dams will be ready for full flood-control operation next year. The Dardanelle Lock and Dam project, between Fort Smith and Little Rock, is nearly half finished. Structural work on the first two navigation units above the jurisdiction with the Mississippi will begin this year. The appropriation bill now before Congress also includes funds for beginning Short Mountain Lock and Dam in Oklahoma, which may be renamed the Robert S. Kerr Lock and Dam before work starts.

So we see that Oologah Dam is in the van of a basin-wide development, with all parts proceeding on schedule.

The Federal investment in this plan will reach a third of a billion dollars by the end of this month. Three times that amount is yet to be spent by the Government before we complete the project. For the next 7 years, therefore, considerable volumes of Federal construction money will be pouring into the Arkansas Basin.

The Arkansas Basin faces many adjustments. The currently heavy expenditures of Federal construction funds will be followed by a drop-off as projects are completed. The basin also must adjust to thousands of people seeking water recreation, problems of seasonal employment, and even perhaps traffic and policing.

Finally, will come industrialization as commerce begins moving on the waterways, and factories move in.

Such transformations are never completely smooth, but with the leadership this region has shown, I have no doubt that it may look forward confidently to a prosperous, indeed a truly glorious, future.

THE LATE AMBASSADOR FROM NORWAY, WILHELM MORGENSTIERNE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the former Norwegian Ambassador, the Honorable Wilhelm Morgenstierne, passed away on July 15 here in Washington. I trust it is not too late to say a few words in eulogy about a dear friend.

Ambassador Wilhelm Thorleif Munthe Morgenstierne was born in Oslo, Norway, November 4, 1887. He grew up there and attended the University of Norway where he took his bachelor of arts degree in 1909. In addition, he attended Oxford University, and Luther College in Decorah, Iowa. He received his doctor of laws degree from the latter in 1935.

He was attaché to the Norwegian legation, Washington, 1910; he was secretary consulate at Antwerp, 1913; and he toured the United States, 1915 and 1925, giving a series of lectures. In 1915, he was the Norwegian vice commissioner to San Francisco, and 1921–29, he was chief of division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in Oslo. After World War I, he served as Norwegian delegate to the International Labor Conference in Washington, 1919, and later to the same conference in Geneva. In 1929–34 he was consul general in New York City. He was elected to Parliament, and served in that post from 1934 to 1942. He became an Ambassador to the United States in 1942, and was honored with the title "dean of the diplomatic corps" in 1948.

Following the World War II, he was appointed delegate to the United Nations Conference in San Francisco, 1945. He was appointed Chairman of Commission III of the Security Council in 1945; in 1946, he was Chairman of the delegation at the Atlantic City session of the U.N. Relief and Rehabilitation Administration; in the same year—1946—he was a delegate to the second part of the first session of the General Assembly of the U.N., and delegate of the second session in 1947.

Additionally, he has been decorated for the services which he so graciously gave for his country. He received the Grand Cross Order of St. Olav; H.M. King Haakon's Medal of Merit—gold; Saint Olav's Medal; King Haakon's Jubilee Medal—all decorations from Norway. However, he won the acclaim of the world for his selfless devotion to the cause of world peace, and other nations rewarded him as well. From Denmark came the Cross of Dannebrog. Portugal awarded him the Comdr. Order of Christ, and Italy, the Comdrs. Order of the Crown. Siam—Thailand—awarded him the Distinguished Order of White Elephant.

He belonged to the Metropolitan Club in Washington, and the Minneapolis Club in Minneapolis, Minn. He is author of the book "Et Større Norge" which was published in 1932.

The beloved dean of the diplomatic corps was a man of whom we can all be very proud. His life was dedicated to the cause of lasting friendship between nations. What finer way to spend one's lifetime.

We are all sorry to learn of his passing. He will live on in our hearts. In trying times like these we need good leaders, good men like Wilhelm Morgenstierne to represent the nations of the world. Yes, he will live on in our hearts as a great Ambassador and a champion of peace.

THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, much has been said recently concerning the National Cultural Center. I cosponsored a bill which passed the Senate last Monday. I am hopeful that a companion bill will be approved by the House shortly so that the nationwide fund-raising campaign so well begun under the Center's Chairman, Roger Stevens, may continue for an additional 3 years. Last week my distinguished colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] made a very fine speech in behalf of the National Cultural Center.

During the summer months, the Berkshire Hills of western Massachusetts become the Nation's cultural center. The Berkshires offer jazz and folk music concerts in Lenox, a chamber music festival on South Mountain, several fine summer theaters, the Jacob's Pillow dance festival at Lee, and the world-renowned Tanglewood festival.

Saturday night, July 27, the Tanglewood festival will present the American premiere of Benjamin Britten's "War Requiem." The "Requiem" was commissioned for the consecration of the new Cathedral of St. Michael in Coventry, England. The old cathedral had been destroyed during the last war. Eric Leinsdorf will lead the Boston Symphony Orchestra, soloists and chorus in what promises to be one of the more important musical events in Tanglewood's history.

I ask unanimous consent that a review of Britten's "Requiem" which appeared in the London Times and an editorial which appeared in last Sunday's Boston Globe be included as part of my remarks.

I hope that those of my colleagues who are interested in culture or those who wish to escape Washington for a weekend of music in the quiet cool of the Berkshire Hills will be able to attend this great musical event.

For those who are not fortunate enough to attend the concert, it will be taped and presented on TV in the Washington area on Sunday, August 4.

There being no objection, the review and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM THE HEART TO THE HEART

(Benjamin Britten's "War Requiem" will have its first performance in America by the Boston Symphony Orchestra at the Berkshire Festival in Tanglewood, on Saturday evening, July 27. Erich Leinsdorf will conduct this great work, which requires a full orchestra and chorus with soprano solo, a boys' choir, a chamber orchestra of twelve individual players, a tenor and a baritone soloist. The larger groups perform the sections of the traditional mass for the dead, in Latin, the tenor and baritone answer with verses, sung in English, from the poems of Wilfred Owen, who was killed in the First World War a week before the Armistice. This motto from Wilfred Owen is on the title page of the score:

> "My subject is war, and the pity of war.
> The poetry is in the pity.
> All a poet can do is to warn."

(The mass is dedicated by Britten to four friends who fell in the last war. It was performed last spring at the consecration of the rebuilt Cathedral of St. Michael in Coventry, which was destroyed in the war. The mass was repeated in London and in West Berlin.

(The mass is reported from each source as not only a poignant antiwar document, but as one of the most deeply moving musical works of our century. The review of the Coventry performance by the critic of the London Sunday Times (June 3, 1962) is here quoted.)

(By Desmond Shawe-Taylor)

Nothing about Benjamin Britten is more striking than his freedom from inhibition. Outwardly reserved, he has preserved intact an inner creative world in which he has the sure habit of heartfelt spontaneity and simplicity. Though twice as clever as the most advanced of his contemporaries or juniors—perhaps just because he is twice as clever—he has remained untempted by paper complexities and imperceptible schematic jigsaws. The highly personal and recognizable language he has forged for himself over the years is made up, for all its subtlety, of traditional procedures and devices: of instantly communicative melody, harmonies whose point and pull can be felt at once notwithstanding their strangeness, and an emotional commitment that is rare and unmistakable—going from the heart to the heart, in Beethoven's words.

All these qualities at their highest point, deployed on a scale far larger than is usual for him outside opera, are to be found in the "War Requiem" which was first performed in Coventry Cathedral on Wednesday. It does not break new ground, but it sums up and crowns the many achievements of the past 10 years. It is surely a masterpiece of our time.

A characteristic audacity relates the grand and timeless spiritual theme to the dull, brutal horrors that stare us daily in the face. Britten has interspersed the Latin text of the mass for the dead, set for soprano soloist, boys' and mixed choirs and very large orchestra, with nine of Wilfred Owen's harsh and truthful antiwar poems, set for solo tenor and baritone with a small instrumental chamber group.

It was audacious to do this because the tone of the poems, which is at some points antireligious and anticlerical, might easily have been felt to jar with the ritual element, and because of the many acute problems of transition that arise between the two levels of language and feeling. That there should be no jar except the one profound intended shock inherent in the conception is a measure of Britten's taste and skill and of the strength of his inspiration. The work is, beyond all questions, an artistic unity.

The means by which this unity is achieved will repay close attention because of the extreme ingenuity and beauty of the points of reference and transition; but the great outlines are wonderfully clear even at a first hearing. Throughout the work, the tritone or augmented fourth (in this case, C to F sharp) constantly recurs, sometimes as a symbol of sorrow, and sometimes seeming to suggest the blind forces of hostility against which the Requiem enters so passionate and moving a plea. At first the bells clash out the warring interval, and their jangle is not silenced until the last page. By then we have heard on three separate occasions an unaccompanied choral cadence resolve the hurtful discord into the deep peace of F major.

Within this general scheme, musical ideas of the greatest abundance bring to startling life the juxtaposed poems and sections of the mass. The bells of the opening lead into the tenor's angry question, "What passing-bells for these who die as cattle?", the fanfares of the "Dies irae" (the more terrible because scattered and punctuated with sudden silences) soften towards the baritone's "Bugles sang, saddening the evening air"; the stuttering male-voice "Confutatis maledictis" is silenced by the baritone's tremendous curse "on seeing a piece of our artillery brought into action"; the traditionally shaped but new-minted "Lacrymosa," with the solo soprano soaring above detached chords for the choir, is mingled with the tenor's barely whispered "Move him into the sun"—tears made manifest here and now, on earth.

Still stranger and more moving confrontations are to come. In the traditionally fugal "Quam olim Abrahae" the buoyant 6/8 theme is vaguely familiar; and the familiarity is explained when the two male soloists, quoting almost exactly from Britten's Canticle on the same subject adapt theme and treatment to suit Owen's bitter perversion of the story, in which the old man will not listen to God's command—"but slew his son, and half the seed of Europe, one by one."

After a concise and masterly blend of the "Agnus Dei" with Owen's "At a Calvary," and a shattering choral and orchestral climax in the "Libera me," we reach the emotional resolution of the work as the huge chord of G minor fades into the ghostly dream of Owen's "profound dull tunnel," wherein a soldier meets the enemy he had killed yesterday, and the two with no bitterness left, but only faint thoughts of "wells sunk too deep for war, even the sweetest wells that ever were," murmur perpetually to each other "Let us sleep now," while, far above, the boys begin their consoling "In paradisum."

The beauty and humanity of the singing of Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau and Peter Pears in this episode and throughout the work were above praise, and I have never heard Heather Harper's soprano sound so pure and so radiant. The whole performance, with Meredith Davies conducting the Festival Choir and City of Birmingham Orchestra, and with the composer in charge of the Melos Ensemble during the chamber sections, was worthy of the music, even though much fine detail was inevitably blurred by the cathedral's acoustics; and the music itself was gloriously worthy of the occasion that had called it into being.

BRITTEN'S "WAR REQUIEM"

First, the plain facts. Their further meaning will take longer to appear, decades perhaps.

Next Saturday evening at 8 in the Shed at Tanglewood, Benjamin Britten's "War Requiem" will have its first performance in America, by the Boston Symphony Orchestra, with soprano, tenor, and baritone soloists, mixed chorus, boys' choir, and chamber orchestra. The words are a combination of the traditional Mass for the Dead in Latin, with verses sung in English from the poems of Wilfred Owen who was killed in the First World War 1 week before the Armistice. On the musical score stands this motto from his verses:

"My subject is war, and the pity of war.
The poetry is in the pity.
All a poet can do is warn."

This "Requiem" was commissioned for the consecration of the restored St. Michael's Cathedral at Coventry, May 30, 1963. The cathedral was wrecked by German bombers in the Second World War. As tenor and baritone soloists, two sometime enemy soldiers, were Peter Pears, an Englishman, and Dietrich Fischer-Diskau; the eminent German singer. This work is dedicated by the composer, a Christian pacifist, to four friends who were killed in the Second World War. It is now superbly recorded, "OSA 1255 London A 4255."

The popular poet of the First World War was Rupert Brooke, who also lost his life. He said what people at first wanted to be told, an ideal image of radiant youth sacrificing itself for its country. Owen's poems had longer to wait. They are not about what soldiers gloriously did but what they were unforgivably made to do to others and to suffer themselves. Moriturus te saluto (I who am about to die, salute you); this poet did not accept what he called The Old Lie—Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori, Horace's It is sweet and fitting to die for one's country. That was, writes William Mann, somewhat confidently, the attitude toward war of every reasonable man in every century before our own. But now comes a wartime poet to say, of a shattered crucifix:

"One ever hangs where shelled roads part.
In this war, He too lost a limb.
But His disciples hide apart;
And now the Soldiers bear with Him.
Near Golgotha strolls many a priest,
And in their faces there is pride,
The scribes on all the people shove
And bawl allegiance to the state."

To convey any notion of this music's grandeur, words are painfully pallid. All the sounds, including the new strange ones, of a modern orchestra are called upon, and with such passionate sincerity that they are accepted without question. With Britten, even as with the true originators in any of the art-forms, innovation takes its departure from the traditional frameworks; he builds anew on what has gone before. After Bach's Mass in B-Minor or Beethoven's Missa Solemnis, what is left for a composer to do with the Sanctus? Listen to Britten's, and learn.

Heard resounding from end to end under the vaulting of a cathedral, choir answering choir, the boys' voices singing consolatory Latin, comes as from a distance, now together, again in antiphony, as if "from the other side." But, says the poet, a humanist, there is no other side. These men are dead and dead to stay, their creative ideas have perished with them, and our world will slide along dully content with lacking them. Abraham, warned not to sacrifice Isaac, refuses to sacrifice the Ram of Pride, and instead slays his son:

"And half the seed of Europe, one by one."

No listener can yet judge this work; this work tests the listener. Berlioz, in his "Damnation of Faust," depicted an imaginary hell; this English poet and composer depicts a man-made hell on earth, and over the anguished cries of the "Libera me" mushrooms the H-bomb. Matthew Arnold's touching sonnet to an east London preacher ends,

"Thou mak'st the heaven thou hop'st indeed
thy home."

Our 20th century paraphrase is—

"Thou mak'st on earth indeed the hell thou
fear'st."

And yet, and yet. * * * Here at last in music, the one art form in which our epoch surpasses, or surpassed, all others, and through which our men of genius most truly speak, or spoke, here at last sounds forth the moral revolt against man's most monstrous of crimes. It had been wondered whether the greatness of music had spent itself. Lacking 1 year and a few days (August 4, 1914–63) there are those who have waited half a century for this voice to speak. And here it is.

Music, thou art thyself again:

"Thy world's great age begins anew,
Thy golden years return."

And our blood-boltered human race, shall we, too, finally pull out of our tailspin?

UNCLE DUDLEY.

REQUIRED PRAYER AND BIBLE READING IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the recent Supreme Court decision concerning Bible reading and prayer in public schools, as its predecessor the New York regents' prayer case, has been misconstrued and misunderstood in many quarters. These decisions which go to the very heart of the first amendment's protection of religious freedom have been condemned as entrenching atheism and secularism in our public schools. However, this is not the case. These decisions uphold the concept of separation of church and state. They make it clear that the state has no power to establish religion. The Word and Way recently published an editorial concerning these decisions. Because I believe it would be helpful in promoting a better understanding of these decisions, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial by H. H. McGinty be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COURT'S DECISION REASSURING

(By H. H. McGinty)

In a momentous decision handed down Monday, June 17, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the required reading of the Bible and recitation of the Lord's Prayer in public schools are unconstitutional, because they violate the prohibitions of the first amendment.

In an 8-to-1 decision the Court said that government has no business invading the religious life of the people. It said that the home, the church, and the individual heart and mind are an inviolable citadel of religion. "We have come to recognize through bitter experience," the Court said, "that it is not within the power of government to invade that citadel, whether its purpose or effect be to aid or oppose, to advance or retard. In the relationship between man and religion, the state is firmly committed to a position of neutrality."

Only Justice Potter Stewart dissented. He said that the cases before the Court had not presented enough evidence for a decision and that the issues were so complicated that he would have remanded them back to the lower courts.

In reaching its decision the Court went out of its way to say that its action is not hostile to religion and that it was not ruling out teaching about religion in public schools. It emphasized that the Constitution demands neutrality in matters of religion and that its action does not constitute an establishment of a religion of secularism.

As in the celebrated decision in the New York regents' prayer case, handed down on June 25, last year, the Court's main objection was directed at the State-required factors. In the New York case the Court objected to a State-composed prayer, the recitation of which was required daily in all New York public schools.

Supporters of the bill who argued before the Court contended that the reading of the Scriptures and the reciting of the Lord's Prayer are effective means of teaching morality.

Opponents of the law argued that religion is a personal matter between the individual and his God, if any, and that the State has no business invading that sacred area.

Now all concerned are having their say about the decision. There are the usual cries that this ruling further entrenches atheism and secularism in the public schools. One metropolitan paper carried a feature editorial with the title, "Outlawing God From Schools." The editorial expressed the thought that "the Creator" and "Divine Providence" of the Declaration of Independence—the "author of liberty" of "America"—the "one nation under God" of the Gettysburg Address have been woven into the warp and woof of American life.

Generally, Catholic comments have followed this line. On the other hand, evangelicals have been divided in their opinions.

Certainly those who know something about what history reveals concerning the state-dominated church are gratified at this ruling of the Court. They believe that this further guarantees individual freedom in worship.

If the State has the authority to require the reading of 10 verses of Scripture and the recitation of the Lord's Prayer in the public schools, then it has authority to add other requirements. Conceivably, this might be extended to the point that the State would dominate completely the religious life of the people.

Almost without exception Baptists who have expressed themselves publicly commend the decision. With a long history of a stanch defense of the principle of separation of church and state, they are reassured by this latest pronouncement of the Supreme Court.

This ruling does not remove every vestige of our religious heritage from public life. It does not eliminate the Bibles from the court rooms. It does not deny chaplains for our Armed Forces; it does not take Thanksgiving away from the calendar.

If a pupil or a teacher desires to pray, there is nothing in this decision that would prevent him from doing so. There is nothing there that prevents the pupils from even agreeing to pray together, but they must not be ordered to pray.

It does not mean that "The Star Spangled Banner" will have to be rewritten or that "In God We Trust" will have to disappear from our money. Congress still opens each day with a prayer and the blessings of God are still besought for the Supreme Court. This is as it should be.

The study of the Bible was not thrown out of the schools by the Court's decision. In fact, the court said, "It might be well said that one's education is not complete without a study of comparative religion and the history of religion and its relationship to the advancement of civilization. It certainly may be said that the Bible is worthy of study for its literary and historical qualities. Nothing we have said here indicates that such study of the Bible or religion, when presented objectively as a part of a secular program of education, may not be effective consistent with the first amendment."

The court then further said, "It is no part of the business of government to compose official prayers for any group of American people to recite as a part of a religious program carried on by government." It applied this same principle to the required reading of the Scriptures and recitation of the Lord's Prayer.

In the long run the court decision has the effect of renewing emphasis on the homes and the churches in the religious upbringing of our children. There may have been some who have regarded the Bible or prayer in the schools as a replacement for old-fashioned spiritual training by parents. Now the responsibility of the church and home cannot be shrugged off so easily.

The Court by this action may have helped to emphasize this responsibility, but it definitely did not cast a thunderbolt at the church or at religion. The United States remains a nation under God. We hope that it will ever be thus.

NUCLEAR SURVIVAL POSSIBLE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, while we all hope that nuclear war does not come to us, neither can we, like ostriches, put our heads into the sand and do nothing.

In this connection, I find myself in support of the job Stuart L. Pittman, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Defense, is doing. It is not a popular job, but he is handling it with intelligence, tenacity, and imagination.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the July 15, 1963, Newport Daily News, of my own home city of Newport, R.I.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NUCLEAR SURVIVAL POSSIBLE

Refuting the general impression that a thermonuclear attack would create a wasteland of the United States, the Nation's chief civil defense officer told Congress that nuclear war would not foreclose economic recovery, or permanently contaminate agriculture, or disable rail and road transportation if the Nation supports an adequate shelter program.

Stuart L. Pittman, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Defense, declared that the greatest hurdle to survival is the apathy of the American people. They do not want to hear, let alone act, on how to prevent destruction from the thermonuclear attack. It would impose obligations to act in ways which are inconvenient and sometimes costly.

Refuting testimony on the ravages of nuclear war, Pittman conceded that an attack would severely damage our national economy, but would not create insurmountable barriers to eventual economic recovery. Most of the key sectors of the economy would continue to function, at levels adequate for recuperation. Except for perhaps 5 percent of the land in the area of the holocaust, the countryside would look normal, though partially contaminated by radiation.

Available information, Pittman said, does not support the speculation that radiation damage to domestic and wild animals and insects would upset the ecological balance of nature. He ruled out a wasteland as a result.

Food and water, the necessities for survival, would be quickly available to support survivors for at least 5 or 6 weeks in the form of food stocked in shelters, canned food in homes and restaurants, and supplies in local food distributing channels. After that, sufficient transport and stockpiles would survive to provide backup for at least a year.

The effects on agriculture appear to be limited to the first year after the attack. Medical supplies and medical manpower could be the most serious factor contributing to a relatively high death rate from disease, but preparation and organization could solve that, too.

As the last major witness before the House Armed Services Subcommittee, Pittman appealed for congressional support of the nationwide shelter program at a cost of $175 million. He made a superb case for civil defense preparedness that should win congressional approval, despite public apathy. It is little enough to do for insurance against thermonuclear attack in time to avert most of the horrors. Rejection or watering down this program would be an irreparable error, should nuclear attack come.

THE INTERNATIONAL HOUSE IN PROVIDENCE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, recently a group of Rhode Islanders received a charter for a nonprofit organization called International House of Rhode Island. The purpose of this organization is to promote friendship and understanding between the 400 foreign students studying in Rhode Island schools and universities and the community at large. Its objective is to raise a sufficient amount of funds to either build or purchase a building that can then be used as a meeting place for both foreign students and Rhode Islanders—something akin to the community centers which used to abound in New England years ago.

I consider this effort a truly warmhearted response on the part of private citizens to the plea of foreign students in their community for a "simple place where we can get together and meet Americans; where we could go so that we do not have to sit in our rooms most of the time." And these citizens of Rhode Island are responding in a manner which commends itself to us all.

International understanding is a goal which I am sure we all desire. It is a very elusive goal, and the problem is often how to approach it. In the instance of the International House, we have a group of private citizens who have taken the initiative personally because they feel it is their duty as American citizens and as citizens of Rhode Island to provide a facility in their community where foreign students can informally meet with Americans. It may be a modest effort, but I can think of no better way to secure this goal of international understanding, for as the charter group of International House states in its motto, "The only bond strong enough to span oceans is the clasp of hands in friendship."

I wish the International House group the very best of luck in this endeavor, and in closing would like to particularly commend Mr. Gilbert Mason, the pro tempore chairman of this organization, and Mrs. Morton Blender, who is heading the building committee.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS DEFICIT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the balance of payments deficit is of such serious import that, unless corrective action is taken immediately, financial chaos will result. This result will rock not only the financial structure of the United States and the free world, but will also imperil the free world's battle against Communist aggression.

The administration just recently asked the Congress to levy up to a 15-percent tax on those who purchase foreign securities. While this proposal appears to be an effort in the right direction, I believe that it falls far short of drastic steps which must, of necessity, be taken to insure the financial stability of not only the United States but of the free world, as well.

Many foreign countries today place currency restrictions on the export of capital investment as well as on the amount of tourist dollars spent outside their respective countries.

Some of these countries include Austria, Denmark, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, United Kingdom, and others. The United States, on the other hand, has no such restrictions either with respect to the outflow of capital investment or on the amount of tourist dollars taken out of the United States.

Official figures of the Department of Commerce disclose that during the calendar year 1961, the United States exported a total of $4.2 billion in capital investment.

For the year 1962, this figure was $3.3 billion and for the first 6 months of this year, it is estimated the total of capital investment exported abroad to be somewhere in the neighborhood of $2 billion.

In the area of tourism, we had a net loss in 1961 of approximately $847 million; in 1962, $984 million. Both of these figures were exclusive of transportation payment. This is a considerable travel dollar deficit, adding to the gravity of the overall problem.

Just recently, news reports reflected that one U.S. company exported $17 million in U.S. capital investment. About 2 years ago, another well known concern exported some $300 million in capital investment.

Certainly the time has come when a definitive limitation must be placed on the export of U.S. capital abroad, including a limitation on the amount of tourist dollars that may be spent abroad by U.S. citizens and others.

We have given, since World War II, through the generosity and humanitarian instinct of our people, billions of dollars in foreign aid to strengthen the economies of countries abroad. Its primary objective was to strengthen the economies of these countries in order to assist them in maintaining human dignity.

Some foreign aid is essential when intelligently and sensibly expended for the purpose of combating Communist aggression.

However, foreign countries have, in addition to receiving foreign aid, lured our dollars along other lines much too long.

We have been, and continue to be, patsied too long in permitting these governments to expect that this is but a one-way street.

It is not only in our best interest but in the best interest of the countries of the free world, that the United States remain on the gold standard.

If demands by foreign countries should be exercised in presenting their dollar credits for payment in gold, it is clearly evident that a world financial crisis would result—either we would be forced off the gold standard, or the dollar would, of necessity, have to be devaluated. Either course would weaken the free world's position in its thus far successful effort to contain the Communist threat. I believe that our foreign brethren understand this language and the situation only too well and, for this reason, have thus far not exercised their privilege.

I urge that the administration, in an effort to cope with this very grave problem, adequately and effectively, give serious consideration toward placing mandatory restrictions and mandatory limitations on the export of U.S. capital abroad, as well as placing a limitation on the amount of dollars American tourists and others may take out of this country.

Such action should be taken without further delay because it is clearly evident that a U.S. liquid and favorable balance-of-payment position is imperative to the survival of the free world.

STATUS OF RESERVE OFFICERS WHO ARE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it has been more than 2 months since I asked that the Judiciary Committee look into the question of possible incompatibility between serving in the Reserves and in the Congress at the same time. My resolution, Senate Resolution 142, is designed to produce a complete and impartial inquiry into this entire question.

Unfortunately, Senate Resolution 142 has not yet been acted upon and the inquiry has not taken place. Nevertheless, I have continued to look into the entire matter on my own behalf. My research has turned up a variety of significant statutes and historical facts which bear upon the incompatibiltiy question. In the interest of making all of the pertinent information available for the consideration of my colleagues, I have discussed this matter on the floor of the Senate and inserted historical and legal documents in the Record on several occasions.

I feel very strongly, Mr. President, that the law is on the side of the congressional reservists. My opinion in this regard has been supported by my research; nevertheless, I have made information available to the Senate and to the public which bears upon all sides of the issue. My only purpose is to dig out the facts and then let the chips fall where they may.

Mr. President, I have recently come across a 1930 statute which is the basis of section 30R.(d) of title V of the United States Code. This is the provision in the code which specifically permits employees and officials of the U.S. Government to serve in the Reserves. This provision in the present code reads as follows:

> (d) Status of Reserves and National Guardsmen when not on active duty, or when on active duty for training.
>
> When he is not on active duty, or when he is on active duty for training, a Reserve is not considered to be an officer or employee of the United States or a person holding an office of trust or profit or discharging any official function under, or in connection with, the United States because of his appointment, oath, or status, or any duties or functions performed or pay or allowances received in that capacity. (Aug. 10, 1956, ch. 1041, sec. 29, 70A Stat. 632; Sept. 2, 1958, Public Law 85–861, sec. 13, 72 Stat. 1557).

The language of the act of July 1, 1930 (46 Stat. 841), has been included in the present law almost verbatim. The 1930 statute that I refer to reads as follows:

> Reserve officers while not on active duty shall not, by reason solely of their appointments, oaths, commissions or status as Reserve officers, or any duties or functions performed or pay or allowances received as Reserve officers, be held or deemed to be officers or employees of the United States, or persons holding any office of trust or profit or discharging any official function under or in connection with any department of the Government of the United States.

The legislative history of the 1930 law contains two explanatory statements by Senator James Couzens, of Michigan, which relate directly to the constitutional question of whether Congressmen and Senators may serve in the Reserves. The statements, from the Congressional Record of June 27, 1930, are as follows:

> Mr. Couzens. Mr. President, the bill involves quite an intricate question, affecting Reserve officers who may hold office in the Government in addition to the office which they hold in the military service. There is a constitutional inhibition against an officer in the military service holding two offices. There are officers in the Reserve Corps who are Members of the Senate and who are also Members of the House of Representatives, as there are Reserve officers holding other governmental positions.
>
> In consultation with the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs the other day—and I am sorry he is not now present—he went into the matter very thoroughly with me, because of inquiries I was receiving from the Reserve officers. I do not believe that I misquote the Senator from Pennsylvania when I say that he doubts whether this proposed legislation will remedy the situation. However, it is an attempt to do so by amending the law so as to provide that Reserve officers shall not be considered as officers referred to in the Constitution. In order to relieve the officers who are in the Reserve Corps and who are holding other governmental offices, from possible liability under the Constitution, it was thought that the passage of this bill was necessary.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Mr. Couzens. The bill has passed the House of Representatives, of course, and the Committee on Military Affairs of both Houses report it with a view of remedying present conditions. The Reserve officers, of course, are volunteers; they are only to be called in case of emergency; and it does not seem to me to be just that officers holding positions in the Reserve Corps for military purposes should be excluded from holding any Federal office.

Thus, Mr. President, the legislative history of the statute which has resulted in the language of title V, section 30R. (d), indicates that the law was intended to permit Members of Congress to serve in the Reserves free from constitutional inhibitions. I should point out, in addition, that this statute, as amended, has not been held to violate the Constitution by our courts. The presumption, as all of my colleagues know, is that any law passed by the Congress is constitutional unless and until the courts rule otherwise.

Mr. President, in addition to the excerpts from the legislative history of the act of July 1, 1930, which I previously discussed, I wish to insert the complete legislative history of the law into the Record. I have included the House and Senate debate as well as the House report on the bill. I have omitted the Senate report because it is identical to that submitted by the House Military Affairs Committee. In addition, Mr. President, I wish to include a memo prepared by Mr. Hugh P. Price, legislative attorney in the American Law Division of the Library of Congress. Mr. Price's memo follows the rather circuitous path of the language of the act of July 1, 1930, into the present United States Code.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the material I have referred to appear at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[71st Cong., 2d sess., House of Representatives, Rept. No. 1884]

Amend Section 37 of the National Defense Act

(June 12, 1930, referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed; Mr. Stafford, from the Committee on Military Affairs, submitted the following report (to accompany H.R. 3592):)

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 3592) to further amend section 37 of the national defense act of June 4, 1920, as amended by section 2 of the act of September 22, 1922, so as to more clearly define the status of reserve officers not on active duty or on active duty for training only, introduced by Mr. James, having considered the same, report thereon with the recommendation that it do pass with the following amendments:

Line 5, add an "s" to the word "section"; strike out "356" and insert in lieu thereof "351, 352, 353, 356, and 360".

Line 8, page 1, and line 1, page 2, strike out the phrase "or while on active duty for instruction or training only".

Section 37 of the national defense act as amended, with this proposed amendment shown in italics, reads as follows:

"Sec. 37. Officers' Reserve Corps: For the purpose of providing a reserve of officers available for military service when needed there shall be organized an Officers' Reserve Corps consisting of general officers of sections corresponding to the various branches of the Regular Army, and of such additional sections as the President may direct. The grades in each section and the number in each grade shall be as the President may prescribe. Reserve officers shall be appointed and commissioned by the President alone, except general officers, who shall be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Appointment in every case shall be for a period of five years, but an appointment in force at the outbreak of war or made in time of war shall continue in force until six months after its termination. Any reserve officer may be discharged at any time in the discretion of the President. A reserve officer appointed during the existence of a state of war shall be entitled to discharge within six months after its termination if he makes application therefor. In time of peace a reserve officer must at the time of his appointment be a citizen of the United States or of the Philippine Islands, between the ages of twenty-one and sixty years. Any person who has been an officer of the Army at any time between April 6, 1917, and June 30, 1919, or an officer of the Regular Army at any time may be appointed as a reserve officer in the highest grade which he held in the Army or any lower grade. Any person commissioned in the National Guard and recognized as a National Guard officer by the Secretary of War may, upon his own application, be appointed as a reserve officer in the grade held by him in the National Guard. No other person shall in time of peace be originally appointed as a reserve officer of Infantry, Cavalry, Field Artillery, Coast Artillery, or Air Service in a grade above that of second lieutenant. In time of peace appointments in the Infantry, Cavalry, Field Artillery, Coast Artillery, and Air Service shall be limited to former officers of the Army, officers of the National Guard recognized as such by the Secretary of War, graduates of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, as provided in section 47b hereof, warrant officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, National Guard, and Enlisted Reserve Corps, and persons who served in the Army at some time between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918. Promotions and transfers shall be made under such rules as may be prescribed by the President, and shall be based on so far as practicable upon recommendations made in the established chain of command. So far as practicable reserve officers shall be assigned to units in the locality of their places of residence. Nothing in this act shall operate to deprive a reserve officer of the reserve commission he now holds. Any reserve officer may hold a commission in the National Guard without thereby vacating his reserve commission. *Reserve officers while not on active duty shall not, by reason solely of their appointments, oaths, commissions, or status as reserve officers, or any duties or functions performed or pay or allowances received as reserve officers, be held or deemed to be officers or employees of the United States, or persons holding any office of trust or profit or discharging any official function under or in connection with any department of the Government of the United States.*"

This comprises section 2 of the act of September 22, 1922, in its entirety as referred to in paragraph (a), page 2 of the Secretary of War's letter. The act is amended by adding a new sentence.

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as embodied in H.R. 3592, is to remedy a condition occasioned by a ruling of the Attorney General that prevents reserve officers, who are attorneys at law, from practicing before the Treasury Department or from performing any other work that the law forbids officers of the Government to undertake.

The Attorney General has recently handed down an opinion, which supports the contention of the Treasury Department, that reserve officers are "officers of the Government" under the penal statutes of the United States. Unless remedial legislation is enacted it is feared that there will be many resignations from the Officers' Reserve Corps because of this restrictive construction. The bill has the approval of the War Department, other than that it recommends the elimination of the clause in line 8, page 1, and line 1, page 2, as follows: "or while on active duty for instruction and training only." This amendment the committee adopted for the reasons as given by the War Department, as follows:

"The bill, H.R. 3592, defines the status of reserve officers so broadly that the well established and desirable relation of these officers to our military law would be disturbed in time of peace. Thus reserve officers might be held ineligible to sit on military courts or boards in time of peace and the legality of the orders issued by reserve officers on active duty for training purposes might be successfully questioned."

The War Department also suggested the striking out of the word "office" in line 6, page 2, and substituting the word "place," but the committee believed that the clause "office of trust" has a more general acceptation in legal terminology than "place of trust."

A further amendment is suggested by the War Department, which the committee adopts, to add certain sections of the statutes, which this legislation also affects. This provides for striking out section 356, in line 5, page 1, and inserting in lieu thereof sections 351, 352, 353, 356, and 360. The reason for this is as given by the War Department, as follows:

"The reference to section 356, title 10, United States Code in lines 5 and 6, page 1, of H.R. 3592, is believed to be incomplete as the citation therein given evidently refers to section 2 of the act of September 22, 1922, in its entirety."

The committee recommends the passage of the bill with the two committee amendments for the reasons stated.

The report of the War Department explaining the legislation is as follows:

July 30, 1929.

Hon. W. Frank James,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. James: I am pleased to comply with your request of June 21, 1929, for a report on H.R. 3592, a bill to further amend section 37 of the National Defense Act of June 4, 1920, as amended by section 2 of the act of September 22, 1922, so as to more clearly define the status of reserve officers not on active duty or on active duty for training only.

The applicable provisions of existing law upon this subject appear in sections 37 and 38 of the National Defense Act of June 4, 1920, as amended, which establish the Officers' Reserve Corps and provide that all persons appointed therein shall be commissioned in the Army of the United States.

The proposed legislation, H.R. 3592, meets deficiencies in existing law which does not clearly define the civil status of Reserve officers who are not on active duty or who are on active duty in time of peace. Reserve officers who are members of the bar are therefore in some doubt as to their status in litigation in which the Government may be involved. Many other Reserve officers who are interested in the civil affairs of their own States are similarly in doubt as to their status under State constitutions many of which deny State offices to citizens who are officials of the Federal Government.

The War Department favors the enactment of legislation which will meet the deficiencies just described. While H.R. 3592, as drafted, would accomplish this end, careful study in the War Department seems to show that textual amendment as follows may be desirable:

"A BILL TO FURTHER AMEND SECTION 37 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT OF JUNE 4, 1920, AS AMENDED BY SECTION 2 OF THE ACT OF SEPTEMBER 22, 1922, SO AS TO MORE CLEARLY DEFINE THE STATUS OF RESERVE OFFICERS NOT ON ACTIVE DUTY OR ON ACTIVE DUTY FOR TRAINING ONLY

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 37 of the National Defense Act of June 4, 1920, as amended by section 2 of the act of September 22, 1922 (Forty-second Statutes, page 1033; [section] *sections 351, 352, 353, 356 and 360,* title 10, United States Code), be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto another sentence as follows: 'Reserve officers while not on active duty, [or while on active duty for instruction or training only,] shall not, by reason solely of their appointments, oaths, commissions, or status as reserve officers, or any duties or functions performed or pay or allowances received as reserve officers, be held or deemed to be officers or employees of the United States, or persons holding any [office] *place* of trust or profit or discharging any official function under or in connection with any department of the Government of the United States.'"

The reasons leading the War Department to suggest these changes are given below:

(a) The reference to section 356, title 10, United States Code in lines 5 and 6, page 1 of H.R. 3592, is believed to be incomplete as the citation therein given evidently refers to section 2 of the act of September 22, 1922, in its entirety.

(b) The bill H.R. 3592 defines the status of Reserve officers so broadly that the well-established and desirable relation of these officers to our military law would be disturbed in time of peace. Thus Reserve officers might be held ineligible to sit on military courts or boards in time of peace and the legality of the orders issued by Reserve officers on active duty for training purposes might be successfully questioned.

It is believed that the amendments herein given would overcome the difficulties just mentioned while insuring the intent of the proposed legislation. The War Department therefore favors the enactment of the amended draft.

The proposed legislation will be without cost to the Government.

If any additional information from the War Department is desired, I shall be pleased to furnish it. Should hearings be held upon the proposed legislation, suitable witnesses will be designated to appear.

Sincerely yours,

James W. Good,
Secretary of War.

[From the Congressional Record, House, June 24, 1930]

Status of Reserve Officers

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H.R. 3592) to further amend section 37 of the National Defense Act of June 4, 1920, as amended by section 2 of the act of September 22, 1922, so as to more clearly define the status of Reserve officers not on active duty or on active duty for training only.

The title of the bill was read.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman give some reasons for the passage of this bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. From my acquaintance with the situation, hundreds or even thousands of Reserve officers may withdraw from commission as Reserve officers in case this legislation is not passed, so as to permit them, if they happen to be practicing attorneys, to practice before the departments.

I feel obliged to have this bill brought out at the earliest possible moment. I may say to my friend from Mississippi that this bill was introduced away back, a year ago, at the request of the War Department, when the former incumbent was Secretary of War. It was called up in the early part of the year, but no action was taken on it because of a certain minor objection.

Mr. COLLINS. I do not believe in the idea of making civil authorities subservient to the military.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. This only applies to officers in the Reserve and removes this disqualification that now exists and prevents them from practicing before the departments.

Mr. COLLINS. It goes further than that.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No. I do not think it does.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the Reserve officers' law the Reserve officer is understood to be an officer of the Government. Then there is a law which forbids officers of the Government practicing before the departments. There are many Reserve officers that are attorneys at law. Why should Reserve officers in an active state be deprived of the privilege of practicing before the departments? It is their bread and butter. If you do not give them relief, it will result in the withdrawal of, perhaps, 111,000 Reserve officers who are now in the Reserve Officers' Corps of the U.S. Army.

Mr. COLLINS. Some of them ought to be dropped. The War Department recognizes this fact and have divided them into active and nonactive officers instead of dropping them as they should do. They are placed in a nonactive status. A large number of these officers could not and would not be used in case of war, and certainly these are useless and there is no justification for keeping them on the rolls as Reserve officers. About 40 percent of the Reserve officers are in the noncombat units. There are too many of this class.

Mr. CRAMPTON. I do not think that is the way to get rid of them.

Mr. COLLINS. The departments are honeycombed with Reserve officers. They are even in the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. CRAMPTON. This is a bill which was introduced by my colleague from Michigan [Mr. JAMES], who is ill and unable to be here. I have had some contact with him as it relates to the Reserve officers of my State, who, at the present time, under a recent construction of the law, are prevented from handling cases before the departments. They are lawyers. This bill is to prevent doing that very thing.

Mr. COLLINS. No. This bill reads:

"Reserve officers while not on active duty shall not, by reason solely of their appointments, oaths, commissions, or status as Reserve officers, or any duties or functions performed or pay or allowances received as Reserve officers, be held or deemed to be officers or employees of the United States, or persons holding any office of trust or profit or discharging any official function under or in connection with any department of the Government of the United States."

Which is far beyond what the gentleman contends.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If the gentleman can cite any one instance other than the example given by the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Michigan——

Mr. COLLINS. I want the bill to go over so that I can study it more carefully and find out if there is any good excuse for its enactment.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Here is a letter from the Attorney General to Senator BROOKHART with reference to a lawyer in his State, and it refers to this qualification referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin. It would bar those men who happened to be lawyers on the Reserve list from practicing before the department. It was never intended to do that.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I yield.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The gentleman always tries to be fair. Does it seem fair to the gentleman that a proportion of the 100,000 officers who happen to be lawyers and who are rendering this patriotic service to the Government without compensation should be handicapped in this way? Is there any public reason why they should be?

Mr. COLLINS. I think there are many reasons why the bill should not be passed.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But this bill has nothing to do with that.

Mr. STAFFORD. The phraseology of this bill could not be construed in the manner in which the gentleman from Mississippi has construed it.

Mr. SPEAKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I yield.

Mr. SPEAKS. Let us take the cases of thousands of men throughout the United States as they are affected by existing law. Being of military age and liable for service in time of emergency they accept commissions in the Reserve Corps, undergo training, and through a systematic course of study and practice prepare themselves to properly perform their duties when called upon for national defense purposes. They comprise businessmen, professional men, experts, and skilled workmen in various lines. But under the law as it now stands they are barred from transacting business with any governmental department and thus deprived of a right accorded all other citizens other than members of the regular service establishments. The law was never intended to operate in this manner, and the bill under consideration is intended to correct the discrimination against reserve officers. I hope the gentleman from Mississippi will withdraw his objection and permit the bill to be passed at this time.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I hope the gentleman will not object. The gentleman knows I will go a long way with him in stopping some of these military bills.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 37 of the National Defense Act of June 4, 1920, as amended by section 2 of the act of September 22, 1922 (42 Stat. 1033; sec. 356, title 10, U.S.C.), be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto another sentence as follows: 'Reserve officers while not on active duty, or while on active duty for instruction or training only, shall not, by reason solely of their appointments, oaths, commissions, or status as reserve officers, or any duties or functions performed or pay or allowances received as reserve officers, be held or deemed to be officers or employees of the United States, or persons holding any office of trust or profit or discharging any official function under or in connection with any department of the Government of the United States.' "

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Section 356" and insert "Sections 351, 352, 353, 356, and 360."

Page 2, line 2, after the word "duty," strike out the comma and the words "while on active duty for instruction or training only."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senate, June 27, 1930]

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. COUZENS. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I think it is eminently advisable that some legislation may be enacted so that the reserve officers will not fall under the inhibitions to which officers in the Regular Army in active service are subjected, but I suggest to the Senator from Michigan, to make a sweeping change in the bill to the effect that all laws applicable to officers in the military service of the United States shall not be deemed applicable to reserve officers would be of questionable propriety. It seems to me we ought to have some information as to the particular legislation that would be affected by the passage of this bill.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, the bill involves quite an intricate question, affecting reserve officers who may hold office in the Government in addition to the office which they hold in the military service. There is a constitutional inhibition against an officer in the military service holding two offices. There are officers in the Reserve Corps who are Members of the Senate and who are also Members of the House of Representatives, as there are reserve officers holding other governmental positions.

In consultation with the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs the other day—and I am sorry he is not now present—he went into the matter very thoroughly with me, because of inquiries I was receiving from the reserve officers. I do not believe that I misquote the Senator from Pennsylvania when I say that he doubts whether this proposed legislation will remedy the situation. However, it is an attempt to do so by amending the law so as to provide that reserve officers shall not be considered as officers referred to in the Constitution. In order to relief the officers who are in the Reserve Corps and who are holding other governmental offices, from possible liability under the Constitution, it was thought that the passage of this bill was necessary.

* * * * *

Mr. COUZENS. The bill has passed the House of Representatives, of course, and the Committees on Military Affairs of both Houses report it with a view to remedying present conditions. The reserve officers, of course, are volunteers; they are only to be called in case of emergency; and it does not seem to me to be just that officers holding positions in the Reserve Corps for military purposes should be excluded from holding any Federal office.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is quite true, and I fully agree with the Senator with respect to that; yet I am afraid that the language as contained in the bill, if agreed to, would be too sweeping.

Mr. COUZENS. If the Senator objects to the consideration of the bill, of course, it cannot be considered.

Mr. Walsh of Montana. I think the bill had better go over until we can obtain further information in regard to it.

The Vice President. Being objected to, the bill will go over.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT

Mr. Reed. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 1138, House bill 3592.

The Vice President. The Senator from Pennsylvania moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a bill, the title of which will be stated by the Secretary.

The Chief Clerk. A bill (H.R. 3592) to further amend section 37 of the National Defense Act of June 4, 1920, as amended by section 2 of the act of September 22, 1922, so as to more clearly define the status of reserve officers not on active duty or on active duty for training only.

The Vice President. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McNary. Mr. President, just a moment.

The Vice President. The motion is not debatable.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs without amendment.

Mr. McNary. Mr. President, of course I have no objection to taking up the bill. It is quite proper to do so. Does the Record show the name of the Senator who objected upon the reading of the calendar?

Mr. Reed. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. McNary. Who was it?

Mr. Reed. The objection was made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. Walsh], who has subsequently withdrawn his objection.

Mr. McNary. I asked simply because I thought I would send for that Senator if he is not on the floor.

Mr. Reed. The Senator from Montana objected when the bill was first reached on the calendar, asking for an explanation. I was necessarily absent and was not here to make the explanation. Since then he and I have gone over the report on the bill, and the Senator stated in open Senate just before he left the Chamber that he had no further objection.

In a word, this bill meets a decision of the Attorney General to the effect that a reserve officer not on active duty is nevertheless a person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States, and therefore is ineligible, if he is a lawyer, to appear in an argument before the Treasury Department or to argue a tax case. Of course, nobody ever dreamed that a reserve officer should be crippled from pursuing his ordinary peacetime vocation when he was not on active duty; and if the decision were insisted on and applied in parallel cases, it would force the retirement from the Reserve Corps of a large number of valuable, useful officers. Therefore the committee was unanimous in reporting the bill.

The Vice President. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 37 of the National Defense Act of June 4, 1920, as amended by section 2 of the act of September 22, 1922 (42 Stat., 1033; secs. 351, 352, 353, 356, and 360, title 10, U.S.C.), be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto another sentence as follows: 'Reserve officers while not on active duty shall not, by reason solely of their appointments, oaths, commissions, or status as reserve officers, or any duties or functions performed or pay or allowances received as reserve officers, be held or deemed to be officers or employees of the United States, or persons holding any office of trust or profit or discharging any official function under or in connection with any department of the Government of the United States.' "

The Library of Congress,
Legislative Reference Service,
Washington, D.C., July 17, 1963.

To: Hon. Barry Goldwater.
(Attn: Mr. Denison.)
From: American Law Division.
Subject: Reserve officers.

The question presented is whether 5 U.S.C. § 30r(d) is based on the act of July 1, 1930 (ch. 784, 46 Stat. 841), as amended.

The act of July 1, 1930, supra, reads as follows:

"*Be it enacted* * * *, That section 37 of the National Defense Act of June 4, 1920, as amended by section 2 of the act of September 22, 1922 (42d Stat., p. 1033; secs. 351, 352, 353, 356, and 360, title 10, United States Code), be and the same is hereby amended by adding thereto another sentence as follows: "Reserve officers while not on active duty shall not, by reason solely of their appointments, oaths, commissions, or status as Reserve officers, or any duties or functions performed or pay or allowances received as Reserve officers, be held or deemed to be officers or employees of the United States, or persons holding any office of trust or profit or discharging any official function under or in connection with any department of the Government of the United States."

The above reference to section 37 of the National Defense Act of June 4, 1920, is in error insofar as it relates to section 37. The reference should be to section 32 of the National Defense Act of June 4, 1920. Said section 32 amends section 37 of the National Defense Act of 1916. Said act of July 1, 1930, supra, then in reality, amends the National Defense Act of 1916 (act of June 3, 1916, ch. 134, 39 Stat. 166) by adding to section 37 thereof the sentence set forth above.

The act of June 15, 1933 (ch. 87, 48 Stat. 1953), effected numerous amendments to the National Defense Act of 1916, including section 37. The pertinent provision was changed to read as follows:

"Members of the Officers' Reserve Corps, while not on active duty, shall not, by reason solely of their appointments, oaths, commissions, or status as such, or any duties or functions performed or pay or allowances received as such, be held or deemed to be officers or employees of the United States, or persons holding any office of trust or profit or discharging any official function under or in connection with any department of the Government of the United States."

The act of July 1, 1930, supra, was codified as 10 U.S.C. § 372. As stated, it was an amendment of section 37 of the National Defense Act of 1916.

Section 37 of the National Defense Act of 1916 was repealed by the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (act of July 9, 1952, ch. 608, 66 Stat. 481). The repeal is found on page 505, under section 803.

Section 246 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, supra, under chapter 5 deals with Civil Employment. Section 246 reads as follows:

"When not on active duty, members of the reserve components shall not be held or considered to be officers or employees of the United States, or persons holding any office of profit or trust or discharging any official function under or in connection with any department or agency of the United States, solely by reason of their appointments, oaths, commissions, or status as such, or any duties or functions performed or pay and allowances received as such."

Section 246, supra, was codified as 50 U.S.C. § 981.

Under the act of August 10, 1956, ch. 1041, 70A Stat. 1, which codified titles 10 and 32 of the United States Code, the subject of Reserves and National Guardsmen who are Federal employees are dealt with under section 29 (71A Stat. 632) which section has been codified as 5 U.S.C. § 30r. Subsection (d) thereof reads as follows:

"(d) When he is not on active duty, or when he is on active duty for training, a Reserve is not considered to be an officer or employee of the United States or a person holding an office of trust or profit or discharging any official function under, or in connection with, the United States because of his appointment, oath, or status, or any duties or functions performed or pay or allowances received in that capacity."

The notes to section 29(d) as set forth on page 741 of Senate Report No. 2484 (84th Cong.), which report deals with this legislation, cites 50 U.S.C. § 981 as authority for section 29(d). The comment on subsection (d) is this:

"In clause (d), the words 'or when he is on active duty for training' are inserted for clarity. The word 'Government' is substituted for the words 'any department or agency.' The word 'because' is substituted for the words 'solely by reason.' The words 'in that capacity' are substituted for the words 'as such' after the word 'received'. The words 'held or', 'commissions', and 'as such', after the word 'status', are omitted as a surplusage.

"This section is not enacted as a part of title 32 since it is of limited applicability."

In answer to the question of whether 5 U.S.C. § 30r(d) is based on the act of July 1, 1930, as has been pointed out, section 30r(d) is based on 50 U.S.C. § 981 which was a codification of section 246 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952. That section appears to have taken the place of the act of July 1, 1930, which was a part of section 37 of the National Defense Act of 1916, and was repealed by the said Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952.

Hugh P. Price,
Legislative Attorney.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no pending business before the Senate.

LOCATION OF CHANCERIES OR OFFICES OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS IN CERTAIN RESIDENTIAL AREAS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 335, Senate bill 646, and that the bill be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 646) to prohibit the location of chanceries or other business offices of foreign governments in certain residential areas in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment.

Mr. HRUSKA obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, has the bill (S. 646) been laid before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as the sponsor of S. 646 I wish to say a few words in support of the bill.

First, I am appreciative of the work of the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], who is present in the Chamber. He conducted the hearings. I am appreciative also of the work of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], who has contributed to the consideration of the subject. I do not wish to occupy very much time.

I introduced the bill because I am concerned about the encroachment of business establishments in residential areas in the District of Columbia. I do not object to embassies locating in residential areas because they are essentially residences, but chanceries, which are actually office buildings, should not be permitted to locate in residential neighborhoods. I might add that I certainly would not support the U.S. Government in any case where it sought to locate a chancery in a residential district abroad.

There is no justification in my opinion for having a double standard on zoning—one that applies to foreign governments and one that applies to American citizens. Foreign governments wishing to locate chanceries or other business offices in Washington should be subject to the same building and zoning regulations that apply to American commercial or business establishments. As long as American concerns are precluded from locating their business offices in residential areas in the District, foreign governments should be governed by the same rules. For example, if the Girl Scouts cannot establish a business office in a residential area a foreign government should not be authorized to do so either.

The present situation regarding location of chanceries is unsatisfactory to everyone concerned and it is obvious that congressional action is the only way that a measure of stability and certainty can be obtained. By passing this bill the Congress will have drawn the guidelines so that every foreign government will know where it stands. I cannot see how anyone can object to a proposal that merely puts foreign governments on a par with U.S. citizens and corporations for zoning purposes.

I commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire, and the members of his subcommittee for their efforts in trying to create order out of the chaotic situation we now have relating to location of chanceries in the District. Theirs was a thankless task, but they did a job that has been needed for many years.

The condition is in no way attributable to action of the committee. The problem was allowed to grow up during the 1950's in particular, without much attention, and during a period in which the number of countries sending ambassadors to our country virtually doubled.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I commend the Senator for his statement, in which I join wholeheartedly. Two years ago I joined in sponsoring a bill for the purpose stated. This year I filed a statement with relation to it.

A chancery is essentially a business office. To permit a business office, whether it be that of a foreign government or an office building of one of our own citizens, to come into a residential district would change completely the character of that district. As one who many years ago in Massachusetts worked very hard to enact a law on a similar subject, I know that the essence of a zoning law is to maintain and stabilize the district in which there are residences because by doing so such laws help to insure that the area will be a good one in which to bring up a family free from the excessive traffic and inconveniences which may result when the character of the area is changed by permitting businesses to operate in the midst of such areas.

Essentially the bill would place a chancellery, which is the business office of a foreign government, in the same status as a business office of an American citizen. It would permit the American citizen and the residence of the Ambassador to be in a residential district. I commend the District of Columbia Committee, under the leadership of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] for making that point clear. I commend and join the Senator from Arkansas in making the effort to stabilize the residential districts of Washington, D.C.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, before making an explanatory statement with respect to the bill I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Does the Senator from Nebraska yield and, if so, to whom?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to say to my colleagues that there is no more able Member of the Senate than the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], who is about to address himself to a matter of supreme importance to the people of the United States. That concerns the continuing Communist cancer in this hemisphere.

I think all Senators will be extremely interested in reading or hearing what the Senator has to say. I rise on this occasion because I think Senators ought to be invited to come into the Chamber to listen to our colleague the Senator from Nebraska. Under those circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield for that purpose?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor thereby, I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANTI-CASTRO FORCES WITHIN OCCUPIED CUBA: THE LEADERLESS RESISTANCE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, recently the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] made a major contribution both in focusing the firm purpose of the American people and then formulating effective national policy consistent with the popular will. With the vigorous support of many other Senators he has moved with courage and imagination to fill an urgent need in the forum of public debate and decision.

His proposal for Cuban liberation is simple and clear cut. It goes straight to the heart of this Nation's obligation, and its solemn pledge, to assist in the restoration of a free Cuba. Not eventually, but now. And not a so-called Titoist Cuba—in the image of that Communist regime's so-called independence of Moscow—but a Cuba that can once more fulfill its national destiny within the free world community.

He has proposed that we offer the use of our Guantanamo Naval Base as the seat of government for a provisional free Cuban regime—organized by the Cuban patriots themselves, established on their own soil, a rallying point for ultimate liberation from the Castro-Communist tyranny. To this proposal, my colleague, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] has added the idea of a Pacific blockade, a complete quarantine, to seal off this Communist satellite from all external trade and traffic, except medicines and other emergency supplies for the Cuban people. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] has called for a tough crackdown on all free world commerce with the Castro-Communist—by reminding the President of his statutory obligation to suspend all U.S. assistance to those nations still dealing with Castro or, if he has not done so, to tell the Congress his specific reasons why.

The junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] has also joined in this mounting demand for action: he has directly and devastatingly challenged the administration's contention that Cuba no longer poses a clear and acute menace to free world security. Point-by-point and case-by-case, he has spelled out the grim details of a Cuban-based massive subversion campaign, aimed at every free government in the Americas.

These proposals, these calls for effective action, are no mere debater's points. Their purpose is not partisan; they are offered not as panaceas but, rather, as spurs to debate and deliberation. The immediate goal is effective action. And the ultimate goal: the liberation of Cuba from Communist oppression.

The challenge contained in all these bold proposals is addressed, equally, to the disunited forces of free Cuba and to the timid officials of our own Government. Now, let us face facts: the disarray among anti-Castro Cubans has been shameful. It has reflected credit on no one—neither the Cuban patriots themselves nor those administration spokesmen whose endless vacillation and empty bombast have simply compounded the disarray. But the Allott proposal meets these facts head-on.

To the Cubans, it is a challenge to put aside their differences and to rally behind the goal of national liberation.

To the officials of this administration, it is a challenge to put aside their counsels of delay and despair and to make good their own pledges that Cuba must once more be free.

This proposal is a clear call to have done with endless but futile eloquence. In the broadest sense, it is a challenge to the whole Organization of American States community to get on with the vital task of ridding this hemisphere, once and for all, of the festering sore represented by the Soviet presence in Cuba and by a foreign-supported tyranny imposed on the Cuban people.

We have it on the word of the President himself—repeated as recently as July 17—that this Nation cannot continue, indefinitely, to coexist with a Communist satellite almost within sight of our own shores. On this overriding premise, then, "let us get moving." And here, in the form of the Allott proposal, is one way to begin.

It is a proposal, in its essence, aimed at making effective use of all those resources—of power, of fervor, and of patriotic purpose—that have been so shamefully wasted up to now in the sheer futility of our Cuba policy. Within the general framework of that proposal, it is my purpose today to center attention on one such wasted resource: the anti-Castro and anti-Communist ferment within occupied Cuba itself. I want to speak of what might be called the leaderless resistance to a foreign-bred, foreign-supported, and foreign-dominated tyranny.

Here we have, for the first time, a practical proposal for providing the necessary leadership to this resistance. Here is a way to capitalize on the overwhelming desire among Cubans for a rebirth of freedom and for an opportunity to pursue their own national destiny.

This undercurrent of resistance is explosive in its potential. And the existence, on Cuban soil, of a free Cuban provisional government might well provide the spark to light the fuse of ultimate and eventual liberation.

I repeat that this potential is explosive. We must be fully conscious, in our discussions and in raising the hopes of the Cuban people for freedom, that we are indeed playing with fire. We are dealing in human lives. We must never forget our awful responsibility—not to raise these hopes too high too fast, nor to cause this resistance to surface only at the suicidal risk of reprisals by Castro's police. Let us, therefore, exercise great care and sober judgment in our deliberations. We must be fully prepared—morally and militarily—to back up any outbreaks or initiatives that we may help stimulate. Our hearts and voices and strong right arms must become one entity. This is a lesson that I would especially urge upon the spokesmen of this administration with their seemingly limitless powers of soaring eloquence—but whose powers of effective action seem to be frozen tight.

Let us, then, be prudent and painstaking. But let us not shrink from our clear obligations. Let us not continue to fritter away this matchless opportunity to hasten the collapse of Castro's vicious and unnatural tyranny. The resistance exists. It exists in the hearts of the Cuban people—and, more tangibly, in the Cuban hills. It is utterly dedicated to the overthrow of Castro-communism. It needs focus and direction—it must have leadership. And it must be spurred by the realistic hope that the march toward liberation has finally begun.

A unified all-party provisional government is the indispensable first step. Next must come a pledge of U.S. support—neither greater nor less than we are prepared to supply—made plain by the offer of a territorial base at Guantanamo. At this juncture, internal Cuban resistance can take on its true and vital significance.

Resistance is an easy word to throw around. It stirs the imagination. But let me say again that active resistance involves grave risk of life and the threat of terrible reprisals—and we must temper our discussion always with this sober awareness. We must never spur the people of Cuba to forms of action that we are not prepared to back up. But, equally, we must not forever lag behind them in our commitment to the cause of freedom.

We have already lived through an experience which is directly relevant to our present dilemma. We should, by now, have learned the lesson of the most deadly gap of all—the gap between words and deeds. This terrible lesson was played out, in October and November of 1956, in the streets of Budapest. I think it is just to say that the Hungarian freedom fighters were, equally, the victims of brutal Soviet suppression and of their own shattered hopes about their own ideas of the commitments they thought this Nation was prepared to fulfill. On the basis of such thoughts and their own interpretation of the facts, their hopes were falsely raised. But at the moment of cruel choice, they stood alone. And alone they shed their blood in the name of freedom.

I think, too, that I can speak of this lesson with a special intensity. My own racial stock affords me a particular understanding and depth of feeling for the plight of all captives of Communist tyranny—in Czechoslovakia, in Hungary, in Poland, Yugoslavia, and all other captive nations throughout Eastern and Central Europe. I have talked with many Hungarian patriots. I have heard their stirring message at first hand by reason of my membership on the Internal Security Subcommittee. During the months of November and December 1956, as well as the ensuing months in 1957, a series of hearings was held at which many witnesses, some of them having come to this country from the embattled streets of Budapest, described their experiences. It was heart rending to listen to their accounts of what actually happened and the terrible crime against humanity which the Communist overlords perpetrated.

And today, while considering the case of Cuba, we would do well to apply the lessons of occupied Europe to the needs of occupied Cuba.

So long as a single armed Soviet trooper remains in Cuba—whether we delude ourselves with the fiction that they are "technicians" or face squarely the fact of a full-scale Soviet occupation—so long as this Soviet presence remains, the threat of a Cuban Hungary is real and acute. The President has been unequivocal in his warning—we will not tolerate such a repetition of past history. There must be no second Hungary in this hemisphere.

If this warning is to mean anything, it must mean that we will not tolerate the suppression of any act of internal Cuban resistance by Soviet troops.

But if this is indeed the sense of the President's declaration, then I submit that he owes us answers to at least these two questions: first, what positive action has he undertaken to bring to an immediate end this blatant Soviet occupation of Cuba—and nothing short of this, I repeat, can possibly guarantee the prevention of a Cuban Hungary. And second, is the President aware of the mass of evidence, mounting day by day, that just such direct Soviet suppression of the internal anti-Castro resistance is already taking place?

What of the report, to cite one example, that on March 26 of this year, in the area of the Nicaro mines, a pitched battle with Soviet guards cost the resistance 4 dead and 12 captured—all of them summarily tried and executed, with a Soviet officer among their judges?

What of the repeated reports—wherever pockets of Cuban guerrillas hold out—that every skirmish involves not just Castro's Soviet-armed militia, but also the direct intervention of uniformed Russians?

And what of this quotation—published by Free Cuba News on June 22—from a Cuban police commander:

> If there is a popular uprising here, we will employ the same tactics used in 1956 in Hungary. The only way to secure ourselves is through the use of absolute power.

Dare we speak of the threat of a Cuban Hungary? Rather, it may be necessary to face its reality—grim and present.

Evasion will not do. The American people, and their responsible representatives in the Congress, must have answers—clear and prompt. I call again on the President for authoritative information.

In this context and with full awareness of the stakes involved, what then do we mean by resistance? We do not mean open insurrection in the streets of Havana. That would represent only the last extreme step and could only succeed in tandem with massive external pressure, with force of arms. And that, I am sure, is not what the Senator from Colorado contemplated in his liberation proposal. Such a step, such a final commitment, could only be taken by the provisional government itself. And it could only be taken in close collaboration with the United States and the entire OAS community. It is a step we all pray will never have to be taken—not if other measures succeed.

Effective and purposeful internal resistance may mean, on the other hand, a great variety of acts, limited enough in particular, but massive in its totality: acts of passive resistance, industrial slowdowns, and deliberate low productivity in factories and farms; acts of vandalism and destruction of irreplaceable spare parts and machinery; acts especially of agricultural sabotage, in the cane fields and the sugar mills; wreckage of communications lines, roads, and rails; and the systematic spread of both information and misinformation—of rumors intended to disorganize the Castro regime and of truth which will undercut its pretensions and give the lie to its propaganda.

All this would constitute the resistance of a whole people. It would be massive proof of their distrust and disaffection, their hatred of a Communist puppet government which maintains itself only by virtue of Soviet arms. We have Castro's own testimony, added to that of his economic czar, of the tremendous cumulative impact of all such forms of economic sabotage.

Such concerted action may not, in and of itself, bring Castro to his knees. But it cannot fail to shake the very foundations of his Soviet-sponsored tyranny. And it may set the price of continued Soviet support so high—in terms of risks and resources and extended supply lines—that Moscow may think a second time, may even reappraise its long-term commitments. The lessons of last October—when we confronted Soviet power with bold and unswerving purpose—these lessons should not be lost on our own timid policymakers.

Internal resistance also means, of course, guerrilla and partisan forces—actively engaged in harassment and sabotage, and the nucleus on Cuban soil of the forces of ultimate liberation. Free Cubans throughout the hemisphere must maintain intimate liaison with this internal resistance. There must be close coordination of plans and action programs. There must be airdrops and covert landings of supplies and equipment.

There must be, most of all, a sense of common purpose and of unity throughout the free Cuban community. All this can only be provided by a unified provisional government—best of all, most inspiring of all, a provisional government established on Cuban soil. And that is the special genius of the Allott proposal for Cuban liberation.

A free Cuban government at Guantanamo would, I repeat and reemphasize, be the indispensable first step toward ultimate liberation. So, too, is the Colorado Senator's proposal a first step in yet another sense: a first step toward sober debate and then effective action by this Government. With every passing day, the Cuban base of world Communist imperialism becomes more hardened, more destructive of Cuba's social and economic fabric, tougher to dislodge. The Soviet presence remains—and grows. The entire hemisphere is under incessant attack, by the implacable agents of Communist subversion.

With every passing day, therefore, the menace grows. There is no more time to lose. Delay can only compound the deterioration of free world security. The time for decisive action is now.

And yet, Mr. President, although the urgency of the Cuban problem has been demonstrated beyond doubt, the administration apparently is not terribly concerned about Cuba. This complacent attitude, it seems to me, accounts for the administration's silence on the Allott proposal. The administration evidently prefers to put the damper on discussion of the Cuban situation. But, Mr. President, silence will not solve the problem. This problem and the set of circumstances which prevail in that unhappy island will not fade and disappear. The challenges posed by it will remain.

Mr. President, I feel that the Allott proposal deserves serious consideration by the administration. For this reason, I have dispatched a letter to the Secretary of State today, requesting his personal expression of the administration's official opinion of the Allott proposal. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 24, 1963.

The Honorable DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On June 17, on the floor of the Senate, Senator GORDON ALLOTT, of Colorado, made an important statement in which he offered a proposal designed to bring about the liberation of Cuba from Communist rule. A copy of the Senator's statement is attached.

Senator ALLOTT urged all freedom-loving Cubans to bury personal rivalries and political differences and to unite behind the goal of liberating their homeland by forming a provisional all-party government. The sole function of this provisional government would be to channel and direct the efforts of the Cuban people to free themselves from the Communist yoke. As a spur to unity among the Cubans, the United States, under the Allott proposal, would pledge to them that upon the formation of a provisional all-party government, it would permit that government to establish its seat on Cuban territory at the U.S. Naval Station at Guantánamo Bay. As I understand the Senator's proposal, the effort to free Cuba from Communist rule will and should be carried out by the Cuban people primarily. But first there must be inspiration and direction to that effort, which can best be generated by the creation of a provisional government.

As you know, Senator ALLOTT served this country ably and faithfully last year as a U.S. delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations. He made his proposal soberly, with the hope that it would be debated on its merits in like fashion. Thus far, however, it has been greeted with virtual silence in the executive branch. To my knowledge, there has been no official statement of opinion on this proposal by the administration save only an informal reaction by the Department of State's press officer in response to reporters' questions on June 21.

In my opinion, Mr. Secretary, the Cuban situation is the most urgent problem in American foreign policy, and any serious proposals for coping with it merit serious consideration by the responsible officials of the executive branch. I invite your personal attention, therefore, to the Allott proposal, with the request that you give me your opinion of its merits.

Sincerely yours,

ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
U.S. Senator, Nebraska.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for his constructive remarks on the Cuban situation. More and more, as we proceed, we see an inclination on the part of the administration to continue the policy which it has followed for the past 2 years, of walking away from the Cuban question rather than meeting it. To date, no one in the administration has attempted to discuss the proposal I made, and on which I frankly asked for discussion and debate on the matter on the Senate floor. The only response has been the one by the senior Senator from Oregon. I believe that his response was more than adequately covered by a subsequent statement which I made.

I have in my hand—if the distinguished Senator will permit me to read it—a United Press dispatch, which reads as follows:

> HAVANA.—The Castro government today expropriated the U.S. Embassy building and grounds in a move believed unprecedented in diplomatic history.
>
> The action was taken in reprisal for the freezing of Cuban Government accounts in U.S. banks, according to the expropriation decree.
>
> The decree was signed by Prime Minister Fidel Castro, President Osvaldo Dorticos, and Treasury Minister Luis Alvarez.
>
> The Embassy has housed the Swiss Mission for American Affairs, beneath the Swiss flag, since the United States broke relations with Cuba on January 4, 1961.
>
> The nationalization decree even specified that all the Embassy's "equipment and furniture have been assumed by the state."

The decree said "it is the duty of the revolutionary government of Cuba, in the maintenance of national dignity and sovereign rights of our people, to respond to the aggressions" of the United States.

The latest aggression was the bank freeze, the decree said.

The building on the Malecon Seawall Drive was modeled after the United Nations Secretariat Building in New York.

In view of the fact that one of the main contentions of the administration, or of its spokesmen from whom we have heard, is that we must maintain our diplomatic relations with Cuba, does the Senator see how we can possibly be worsening our relations in any way by encouraging the Cubans in exile to establish a provisional government, when the Castro government itself has now seized our administration building?

Mr. HRUSKA. On the contrary, it would be my judgment that our position would be improved. A long time ago, the Castro regime cut off any practical diplomatic contact with the United States. This country has had to deal through the Swiss in Cuba. Now the Castro government has committed the unprecedented diplomatic affront of taking over the official residence of the U.S. Government in Havana. We may as well complete the story and have a provisional government installed at Guantanamo, pursuant to the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], give recognition to it, and at the same time discontinue the nominal connection with Castro's government.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator may recall the statement of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that most of the people in America do not realize that the United States has not severed diplomatic relations with Cuba, but has only withdrawn our representative. I believe that if most Americans knew this, they would rise up in their wrath. But since we have not severed diplomatic relations with Cuba, what does the Senator from Nebraska think of the position in which this leaves us, when the Castro government has taken our embassy buildings in Cuba?

Mr. HRUSKA. The latest action of Castro's does not place the United States at a very high point of prestige in the world; and we are told that prestige is very important. It has not placed us in a very high position of prestige in the eyes of the family of nations.

Mr. ALLOTT. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska has performed a real service in drawing a parallel with Hungary. I am sure he has had the experience, as I have had, of meeting and speaking with hundreds of exiles who have come from numerous Eastern European countries, including Hungary. We have had to give as our excuse for not acting in the Hungarian crisis that we had no way in which to act. That there was no practical, feasible way, militarily or otherwise, to support Hungary.

But such a reason cannot be advanced at this time for our not supporting the Cubans in exile in their attempt to take back their government, so that they can hold elections under their constitution, because it is not necessary to overfly antagonistic, hostile countries in order to help Cuba.

Mr. HRUSKA. There is no question about that; the Senator from Colorado has analyzed the situation accurately.

Mr. ALLOTT. Keeping in mind the attitude of millions of people throughout the world who are either now under the heel of communism or have escaped from Communist rule—and many hundreds of thousands are in this country who have escaped from the heel of communism—does the Senator from Nebraska see any way in which we can justify our action and still be considered the leader of the free world, when the present administration seemingly does not have the will to start the machinery which would help the exiled Cubans to return to their own country?

Mr. HRUSKA. In answer to the Senator's question as to whether there is any way in which such inaction can be justified, I say that an attempt is being made to justify it. The administration and its apologists argue that any such course of action as that suggested by the Senator from Colorado would involve risk. There is no question about it. There would be a risk. There would be a grave risk. But the alternative must always be considered. The question is not whether a risk would be taken, but whether the risk of action would be greater than the alternative, which is a continuation of the present intolerable situation.

Mr. ALLOTT. A continuation of the subversion, sabotage, and disguised insurrection which is taking place in Cuba and throughout Latin America today, and which my colleague, the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] described so well the other day.

Mr. HRUSKA. He described in dramatic detail the incidents of violence, guerrilla warfare, and subversion, and indicated that it is not only in the Castro pattern, but is conducted on a sustained basis, and that its force and effect are constantly growing, rather than diminishing.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have in my hand an article published in a recent issue of Newsweek, commenting on the requests of those of us who have been asking the administration to pay heed to this situation and come forth with their own plan, or even to tell us if the administration has a policy. The article indicates that we seem to be baffled by the indifference that is shown to the question, implying that the people are not interested.

I say to members of the other party and to the administration that if they think the people of the United States do not believe that Cuba is our primary foreign policy problem, they are badly out of step with the people of the United States. Everywhere I go I have found that this is the first question I am asked.

I can understand why the administration would be very glad to walk away from the problem of Cuba policy and to have the people talk about other things. I do not blame the administration, considering the failures they have experienced with respect to Cuba. It is understandable why the administration would hope that the American people will forget about the failures, and make every effort to help them forget. I wish particularly to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for his remarks and especially for the parallel he has drawn between Cuba and Hungary, and his statement as to why we cannot again permit another Hungary to occur with respect to the people of Cuba.

Mr. HRUSKA. The mail received by my office does not indicate that the people of America—at least that part of America I represent—are minimizing this problem. Nor was it minimized, as we all know, in the report of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee which considered the subject not long ago. The sum and substance of that report was that Cuba should have the No. 1 priority among our foreign relations problems, notwithstanding the many other serious and grave problems which this country faces in the international field.

Mr. ALLOTT. No matter what those of us on this side of the aisle could say, we could not make any stronger statement than that report, which seeks to impel the Government into a positive course of action with respect to Cuba. Does not the Senator agree with that?

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes; there is no question about it. The report was made after a well-considered review of the testimony and evidence which was accumulated under the leadership of the conscientious, hardworking Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. He and his committee rendered a commendable service to the country.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I commend my distinguished colleague from Nebraska for presenting so forcefully his thoughts on this subject. Something has been said about the risk involved. Can the Senator think of any greater risk to the entire Western Hemisphere, any greater risk to the United States, than to continue to do nothing, and thus ignore the Communist threat in the Western Hemisphere? Is there any greater risk than that?

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct in ascribing to the situation the importance that he does. There is no greater risk than that. Let me cite a simple analogy.

Not so many years ago we found the same type of Soviet Operation Nibble at work in Europe. There were subversive efforts, economic pressures, even, of direct military pressures, here and there, along the borders of the various countries. There was only one answer to Operation Nibble: It was the creation, for that particular type of situation and those circumstances, of NATO—the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. NATO was designed for the purpose of preventing the biting off, chunk by chunk, of the territory, political integrity, and liberties of the people of Western Europe, to the point where complete domination would be reached.

We have the same type of operation in this hemisphere; and there is no greater menace than the one now facing us by reason of the illegal and revolutionary tactics being practiced in Latin American countries by Castro Communists and the Russian Communists based in Cuba.

Mr. CURTIS. After all, if a building is on fire, although it can be said there is risk in having a fireman climb a ladder or in having a fire truck run through the streets, yet such risk is minimal when compared with the risk of letting the fire spread generally. We are faced with a similar situation as regards Cuba.

In connection with my colleague's valuable remarks, I should like to state that I hold in my hand a speech delivered by a very distinguished former Member of this body, Hon. William F. Knowland, of California, who formerly served as majority leader and also as minority leader of the Senate. I wish to read several sentences from the speech:

> Ninety miles from our shores there is a Soviet base in Cuba. We have had a vacillating policy relative to Castro. We have at one time or another encouraged him, tried to ignore him, entertained him, encouraged but failed to support an invasion against him, paid him ransom and tribute of millions of dollars in cash and supplies to release the Bay of Pigs prisoners; subverted our own judicial and legal processes by releasing Cuban criminals and gunmen in exchange for Americans held in Cuban prisons. In dealing with the Soviet base in Cuba we marched up the hill last October and since then have marched most of the way down again.

Mr. President, if my colleague will yield further, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following his speech and the colloquy in connection with it, the speech delivered by Senator Knowland at the National Sheriffs' Association convention at Portland, Oreg., on July 15.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, NATIONAL SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION, PORTLAND, OREG., MULTONOMAH HOTEL, 11 A.M., MONDAY, JULY 15, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the National Sheriffs' Association, last November I received your invitation to speak at this Portland convention. A great deal has happened, at home and abroad, since that time.

Like most small boys I considered sheriffs and locomotive engineers to be the tops in future occupational possibilities.

The change from steam locomotives to diesels modified my views of one and the substitution of prowl cars for horses lessened my enthusiasm for the other.

After 6 years in the legislature of my State of California and over 13 years in the Senate of the United States, 6 of which were as majority or minority leader I developed a deap-seated conviction that the real strength of our Nation is in local government of which your people are an integral part.

The men who founded this Republic were very wise. They knew the history of the world up to their time. They knew that where people had lost their freedom it was because of the concentration of power in the hands of a single individual in a nation's capital.

As a result the Constitutional Convention which met in Philadelphia in 1787 determined to guard future generations of Americans from tyrannical government. They did it by:

(1) Making ours a Government of laws and not of men.

(2) Providing that government was the servant and not the master of the people.

(3) Dividing power in the Federal Government between three coequal branches as checks and balances one against the other.

(4) By choice, making the Federal Government one of limited and specified powers and reserving all other powers to the States or to the people thereof.

They were still not satisfied that they had completely achieved their objective so in 1789 there were proposed and by 1791 the requisite number of States had ratified our first 10 amendments which we know as the "Bill of Rights" guaranteeing certain rights to the people which neither the Federal, State, nor local governments can take away from them.

Since that time we have amended our Constitution 23 times. To be sure this is, as it should be, a long and a difficult process.

We must never quietly permit the Constitution to be short circuited because some "whiz kid" decides that in this age of space travel and automation the American Constitution is antiquated or too cumbersome.

Neither executive fiat, judicial legislating or congressional resoluting should change the basic frame of structure of our Government or the guaranteed constitutional rights of our people.

Civil rights are far more broad than racial rights alone.

These include the right to walk our streets day or night without danger to life, limb, or property; the right to own, manage, and dispose of property; the right to associate with friends of one's own choice; the right to have gainful employment and to stay or leave the job based upon one's own choice and judgment. These are also civil rights entitled to the protection of Federal, State, and local authorities.

Whenever a mob can deny these rights regardless of the composition of these who would take over the streets from their use by peaceful citizens and from the duly constituted civil authorities we have a breakdown of constitutional government.

It is too bad that those who have led the fight for one segment of civil rights have not equally stressed civil obligations and civil responsibilities.

Every American citizen has the right to register and vote according to the qualifications for voting established by each of our 50 States and to do this without having discriminating standards applied to the individual applicant or voter because of race, creed, sex, or color.

Every American citizen has a right to patronize or withhold his purchasing power according to the choice he and his family make in the marketplaces of the Nation.

By his political action and economic participation an opportunity is given to every citizen to have his say in influencing events now and over the future years.

But he has no right to ride roughshod over the constitutional rights of the rest of our citizens. No pressure group minority can impose by unconstitutional means its views upon the majority of our people without their consent. Changes can only be made through the constitutional process of amendment.

The American people are a just people, they are a patient people, they are an understanding people, and they are a law abiding people.

But if pushed too far (as King George III, Kaiser Wilhelm, Hitler, and Tojo learned to their sorrow) they are capable of taking the necessary political or military steps to remove the dangers to their constitutional form of government. The ballot box can and will serve the majority as well as the minority.

The citizen who preaches civil obligations and responsibilities along with civil rights must practice what he preaches.

He cannot, as in the movie "High Noon," leave the problem of the bad men and gunmen to the lone law enforcement official. The attitude, too often prevalent among our people, "This is your problem, not mine" is not in keeping with American tradition.

Too often our newspapers, radio and television carry reports where the offender against the law has the moral if not the physical support of citizens as against the law officer carrying out his duty. The very least the officer has a right to expect is in the words of the early frontiersman "if you can't help me at least don't help the bear."

In this the press has a part of the responsibility. So do the sheriffs and police officers. The overwhelming number of law enforcement officers are dedicated men of integrity and courage. A few, a small percentage, from time to time betray their trust but so do a few bankers, political officials, newspapermen or civic leaders. The rest should not have the tar brush of "guilt by association" applied in an indiscriminate way.

The first amendment to the Constitution reads as follows: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

This constitutional guarantee of a free press was for the protection of the people not just for the protection of newspapermen.

I do not say to you that there are no arbitrary or unreasonable men in the fourth estate but I do say that the overwhelming majority of them are trying to discharge their obligation to keep the public informed about the news of the day—local, area, State, national, and international. They are working against deadlines where their mechanical problems make 5 or 15 minutes vital in making an edition. Returning a city editor's or a reporter's call 2 hours or an hour after receiving it can mean the public is not as informed as it should be.

Sometimes public officials on the national, State, and local level forget that they are public servants and that public business is the public's business. They classify as secret or confidential that which is not necessary to so classify by any legitimate security standards.

As one who has been both a public official and a newspaperman may I suggest that you invite your city editor, editor, and publisher down to your office to get a better understanding of your problems and that you in turn (if you have not already done so) visit your newspaper plant to learn more about the problems of publishing a metropolitan, suburban, or rural newspaper. I have found in life that, for the most part, the better we know a person the less difficult it is to deal with him. There are, of course, exceptions to the rule, but not many.

We have discussed some domestic problems. Now let us turn to the foreign field. Experience has taught you as law men that you cannot appease the criminal or the gangster. As in foreign affairs the road to appeasement is not the road to peace but in fact is only surrender on the installment plan.

In order to gain our independence the founders of our Republic pledged to each other "Our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."

Ninety miles from our shores there is a Soviet base in Cuba.

We have had a vacillating policy relative to Castro.

We have at one time or another encouraged him, tried to ignore him, entertained him, encouraged but failed to support an invasion against him, paid him ransom and tribute of millions of dollars in cash and supplies to release the Bay of Pigs prisoners; subverted our own judicial and legal processes by releasing Cuban criminals and gunmen in exchange for Americans held in Cuban prisons.

In dealing with the Soviet base in Cuba we marched up the hill last October and since then have marched most of the way down again.

Last October the strong stand of the President which had the support of a united Congress, widespread public approval, the wholehearted support of our Latin American states and the backing of our NATO allies has been frittered away.

Khrushchev was not prepared for a showdown 90 miles from our bases and 5,000 miles from his. He may be in the future when his Cuban base is augmented by others.

Despite the Monroe Doctrine and a current expression from the American Congress that foreign bases and missiles in the Western Hemisphere would be contrary to our vital national interests the Soviet Union challenged us in our own backyard.

During the October exchange of letters between President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev the latter has suggested we get our missiles out of Turkey and Italy in exchange for his getting Soviet missiles out of Cuba. Our Government denies any "deal." But without advance consultation and agreement with our allied Italian and Turkish Governments we have taken our missiles out of those two countries.

Was it historic coincidence or was it a "deal" with Khrushchev? I don't know. Members of Congress of both parties have told me they don't know either.

During the Korean war the obstructionists to the winning of that war as advocated by General Douglas MacArthur said that our further involvement (bombing the Chinese Communist bases across the Yalu) would be fighting the wrong war, in the wrong place at the wrong time.

As a U.S. Senator I did not agree with that defeatist policy then and as a private citizen I do not agree with it now after 13 years of reflection upon those events.

American forces were required to fight with restrictions never before placed on our fighting men. They had to leave in the privileged sanctuary of north of the Yalu the bases from which Chinese Communist forces were attempting to decimate our divisions and shoot down our air power.

At that time (in 1950–52) we were in exclusive possession of the atomic weapon and an effective means of delivery.

We accepted what at best may be considered a stalemate because we wouldn't pursue the enemy to his lair or even to use a tight blockade to prevent petroleum products including aviation gasoline from getting to the enemy while we were suffering 160,000 casualties in Korea.

This didn't make sense to me then and it doesn't now. It was too high a price to pay for the good will of the neutralist states.

Mr. Nehru's neutralist views regarding Chinese Communists have changed some since the overrunning of Tibet and the invasion of India.

Mine, regarding Communists are the same as they were before, during and since the Korean war.

Even if one agrees that because of distance the Yalu bases where in the wrong place at the wrong time to meet the challenge to human freedom can anyone say that Cuba is the wrong place and October of 1962 was the wrong time?

Or have we become so much a captive of the "peace at any price" and "better red than dead" philosophy that we are prepared to surrender bit by bit and piece by piece at the constant "nibbling tactics" of the Soviet Union.

From that high point of last October where President Kennedy appeared to be functioning in the President Theodore Roosevelt tradition we have been brushing Castro's beard with a feather duster.

Last October we demanded the removal of the missiles and on the ground inspection to see that this was carried out.

Though history is replete with examples that the word of the Soviet Union is not worth the paper upon which it is given we backed down from our "on the ground" inspection requirement and took the word (without boarding their ships to inspect) of the Soviet Union that the canvas covered objects on deck were indeed all the missiles going back to the Soviet Union from Cuba. How naive can we be?

We did not insist on the immediate withdrawal from Cuba of all Soviet Armed Forces though these as well as the missiles were both there contrary to the Monroe Doctrine and the Rio Pact.

An Assistant Secretary of National Defense, Arthur Sylvester, has enunciated the doctrine of the "right to lie" to the American people. He has not to this date been repudiated by either Secretary of Defense McNamara or by the President of the United States.

This is no "refusing to comment" or "declining to give out a release" on an inquiry by the press. The "right to lie" is deliberately misleading the American people.

The administration has not escaped the penalty of such a policy. Millions of Americans no longer know when they are being lied to and when they are being told the truth. I sincerely regret this is so, for if there is ever a need for a people to have confidence in the statements of the Government it is when we face the menace of international communism.

The only way confidence will be restored is for Assistant Secretary Sylvester to be removed from his job of "managing the news" of the Defense establishment and for his "right to lie" doctrine to be repudiated by both President Kennedy and Secretary McNamara. Anything less will insult the intelligence and continue to shake the confidence of the American people.

Senator Ken Keating of New York has more accurate information on Cuban missile bases than the administration weeks in advance of October 22. At least the Defense Department was denying their existence until the President's speech to the country. Why? The Cubans knew the missiles were there for they had imported them. The Soviet Government knew they were there for they had supplied them.

Only the American people were deceived and they were the ones at whom they were aimed.

On Sunday, October 21, 1962, the newspapers reported that a Defense Department spokesman denied the cancellation of the trip of President Kennedy, Secretaries Rusk and McNamara had anything to do with the Cuban or Sino-Indian crisis.

Monday afternoon, October 22, 1962, the President discussed for the first time the proof of Soviet missile bases in Cuba.

Weeks earlier Members of the Senate and the House had pointed out that Soviet missile bases were in Cuba.

On September 17, 1962, at the Los Angeles Rotary Club, I said: "The buildup of a missile base in Cuba—90 miles from our shores—is a clear violation of the Monroe Doctrine."

In April of this year President Kennedy in his press conference said that about 4,000 Soviet troops had been withdrawn from Cuba.

This still left from 12,000 to 13,000 Soviet troops in Cuba even if the 4,000 were a net withdrawal.

Senator Keating states that approximately 3,000 to 4,000 have been sent to Cuba while the others were being withdrawn. These facts have also been released by a report released May 9 by the Senate Preparedness Committee.

I believe Senator Keating and the Senate committee under Senator Stennis have done a great service in giving the American people the whole picture on Cuban troop movements rather than just half the picture.

This administration after its less than halfhearted aid to the free Cubans at the time of the Bay of Pigs disaster when only air cover could have assured success of the venture has now withdrawn support from the Cuban exiles. Not only are they forbidden to use U.S. territory as a point of departure which is at least understandable from a point of view of international law but we go farther and along with the British intercept them when they depart from other countries and are on international waters.

It seems to me we are applying naval sanctions upon the wrong people.

Thirteen years ago we gave the Communists a sanctuary across the Yalu. Now we give both Cuban and Soviet Communists a sanctuary 90 miles from our shores.

This is not a partisan question. Not long ago I spent several days in Washington. Democratic as well as Republican Members of the House and Senate are deeply troubled over Cuban policy or lack of one.

The answer one gets from the whiz kids whose advice finds its way to the President is: "Would you have this country invade Cuba and risk the danger of all-out war?"

They try to slam the door on congressional and public discussion while at the same time spoon feeding the public only what they want the public to know.

On this they will not be successful. A great debate is now underway at every crossroads, village, and town in America. It will spread until we will have an American policy that is sound and defensible.

Let me tell you what it will not be before I give you my views on what it should be.

(1) It will not pay extortion or permit the payment of ransom to any nation, Communist or otherwise.

(2) It will not torpedo the Monroe Doctrine as a basic cornerstone of American policy.

(3) It will not be founded upon lies, half truths or news blackouts in order to make it swallowable by the American people.

Recognizing that there are risks involved in any policy we follow other than complete surrender or appeasement which is a form of surrender on the installment plan I would be prepared to take whatever risks are involved for my country, for my family, and for myself.

Our general worldwide guideline to our State Department and to our Foreign Service should be:

The U.S. Government and the American people are dedicated to human freedom. What advances it we will support and what undermines or destroys it we will oppose.

In support of this general directive the Government of the United States will examine the facts and then take whatever steps our national interests require.

We shall neither feel required to telegraph our punches in advance nor will we establish privileged sanctuaries of operations for communism while communism is engaged in a worldwide conspiracy to destroy human freedom.

Now to the specific Cuban cancer.

(1) The President should proclaim that the Monroe Doctrine has been reestablished as a keystone of American policy in the Western Hemisphere.

(2) The President should address another private letter to Mr. Khrushchev stating that the continuation of Soviet forces in Cuba is in clear violation of the Monroe Doctrine and that in the interest of our mutual desire to maintain the peace of the world they should be withdrawn.

(3) If a completely satisfactory reply is not received by the President he should ask to speak to a joint session of the House and Senate. At this session he should ask the Congress for a joint resolution in support of the President to secure the removal of

every Soviet soldier from Cuba. He should request legislation permitting the immediate recruitment, equipment and training of "Freedom Volunteers Corps." I believe many more Americans would make their contributions to such a corps than contributed to the blackmail ransom tax-free donations of last year.

If Khrushchev should be cooperative the President could offer to furnish sufficient U.S. transports and cargo vessels to return all troops and their equipment to the Soviet Union. If Khrushchev is not cooperative it should include:

(1) Joint action by all the Western Hemisphere countries (or as many as will cooperate) notifying the Soviet Union that if all such troops and their equipment is not out of Cuba by a stated date that all Soviet embassies will be closed and diplomatic relations will be suspended with the Soviet Union until such troops are withdrawn.

(2) The placing of U.S. air, naval and ground forces on an alert basis at least equal to that which existed in October of 1962.

(3) If the Soviet forces are not withdrawn by the date set pursuant to paragraph (1) a joint blockade (both sea and air) to cut off all shipments to Cuba except for food and medical supplies.

(4) If the Soviet forces are not fully withdrawn the U.S. should encourage the creation of a freedom volunteer corps (air and ground). This would be open to free Cubans, Hungarian freedom fighters, members of U.S. reserve units who could volunteer without losing their retirement or other rights, veterans of Polish, Czechoslovakian World War II forces, volunteers from trained units of free Chinese and free Korean forces, and any other experienced fighters who are prepared to strike a blow for freedom. The plane cover would be flown by experienced combat fliers like Chennault's Flying Tiger volunteers in China.

Since these would be volunteers and since the use of Chinese Communist volunteers at the time of the Korean war were not looked upon by the United Nations as being a casus belli by the Chinese Communist regime, we have ample precedent and quotable quotes for any who might feel called upon to object at the Security Council of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Such volunteers would be adequately equipped with air, ground, and naval forces to make decisive landings and/or feints simultaneously along the Cuban coasts.

Its international banner could be the torch of freedom that is held aloft from the Statue of Liberty and has been an inspiration to men and women who love freedom everywhere.

(5) Notice would be served that following the removal of Castro and the Soviet forces that a trusteeship would be established under the Organization of American States until free elections could be held by the Cuban people.

(6) U.S. ground, naval, or air forces would not be used unless the Soviet Union attempts to reinforce its garrison or commit a hostile act against the United States or its allies.

This I would call the progressive squeeze policy to offset the Communist nibbling process.

Of course risks are involved. But if the signers of the Declaration of Independence had not taken risks, we would not be here now. Risks have been taken throughout our history to gain, preserve, and protect our way of life.

The risk of doing nothing is, in my judgment, far greater to our ultimate survival.

To international communism the time is rapidly approaching, if indeed it has not already long since passed for the free world to say, "You have gone far enough." And for Americans to say, "Indeed you have gone too far when you have established your bases in Cuba 90 miles from our shores."

If we have no confidence in ourselves, no real devotion to our way of life, no determination to "pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor" to maintain the freedom others provided, how can we hope to hand a free society to our children and grandchildren?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank my colleague, Mr. President. I am very grateful to him for the colloquy we have had this afternoon; and in that connection I also thank the Senator from Colorado.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY PARLIAMENTARIANS FROM ETHIOPIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senate is privileged today to have in the Chamber as guests of the Senate three distinguished and honorable members of the Parliament of the country of Ethiopia. I consider it a high privilege and honor to introduce these distinguished members of the Ethiopian Senate and Chamber of Deputies to the U.S. Senate.

I am sure that all of us have warm spots in our hearts for the brave people of this gallant country. We remember its days of difficulties. We rejoice in the fact that the people of Ethiopia and their honored Emperor and distinguished representatives in government have made a remarkable recovery and are good and steadfast friends of freedom and of the United States of America.

Today some of our colleagues in the Senate joined with me in a luncheon in the committee room of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I now present to the Senate his Highness Dejazmatch Assrate Kassa, President of the Senate of Ethiopia; His Excellency Lij Araya Abebe, a member of the Ethiopian Senate; and Honorable Ato Tadele Yigezu, a member of the Chamber of Deputies of Ethiopia.

I ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming them.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I remember, with great fascination and interest, the time long ago when the distinguished Emperor of Ethiopia was the guest of this country. As I recall, we welcomed him at one of the joint meetings of the two Houses of Congress. He created great interest in the United States, and gained the support and sympathy of the people of our country. Our people have followed with great interest the destiny and fortunes of Ethiopia as she has been blazing the trail for equality and freedom and leadership of a great continent.

We join with the distinguished acting majority leader [Mr. Humphrey] in extending the hand of fellowship and welcome. We are delighted to have you as guests of the Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, as these representatives of the Ethiopian nation travel through our country I am sure they will be received with warm hearts and welcome hands everywhere they go. Our people have not forgotten the heroic and gallant position taken by the Ethiopians 25 years ago. Their land was invaded. Their country was one of the first to fall. They suffered immeasurably through persecution, destruction of property, and destruction of human beings.

When the hours were long, when our people were looking around the world for friends, the Ethiopians were at our side. That memory is still with us. It is with our people.

I am glad to welcome you to the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in order that our colleagues in the Senate may know more about our honored guests, I ask unanimous consent that biographical material relating to these distinguished gentlemen may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Biographical Information on Highness Dejazmatch Assrate Kassa of Ethiopia, a Participant in the Foreign Leader Program of the Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Name, Assrate Kassa.

Present address, the Office of the President of the Senate, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Personal data: Birth, Fiche, Shoa Province, 1914; citizenship, Ethiopian; knowledge of English, excellent; other languages, Amharic; marital status, married, 7 children; religion, Coptic Church.

Present position, President, Senate of Ethiopia.

Past positions, colonel Ethiopian military service; Governor General of Provinces Welega, Arussi, Shoa, and Beghimdir; Vice President, Senate of Ethiopia.

Academic background, educated in England, secondary school, Bath; 3 years theology, Wales Bible School, Swansea.

Travels, Europe and Africa.

Hobbies and other interests, photography and farming, studying ancient Ethiopic manuscripts.

Biographical Information on His Excellency Lij Araya Abebe of Ethiopia, a Participant in the Foreign Leader Program of the Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Name, Araya Abebe.

Present address, the Office of the Senate, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Personal data: Birth, Sidamo Province, 1909; citizenship, Ethiopian; knowledge of English, excellent; other languages, Amharic; marital status, married, one child; religion, Coptic Church.

Present position, member, Ethiopian Senate.

Past positions: Officer, Ethiopian Army; President, Ethiopian World Foundation; Director, General Customs; Minister, Posts and Telegraphs; Minister, Public Works; Ambassador to Greece.

Academic background, studied in Ethiopia and India.

Travels: United States, England, Greece, Germany, India, China, Japan, and Brazil.

Hobbies and other interests, agricultural projects, gardening.

Biographical Information on the Honorable Ato Tadele Yigezu of Ethiopia, a Participant in the Foreign Leader Program of the Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Name, Tadele Yigezu.

Present address, c/o Chamber of Deputies Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Personal data: Birth, Shashemare, 1931; citizenship, Ethiopian; knowledge of English, good; other languages, Amharic; marital status, married, one child; religion, Coptic Church.

Present position, member, Chamber of Deputies representing Haykoch, Butogera.

Past positions, school teacher, Director Shashemane.

Academic background, secondary education, Haile Selassie First Day School.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, our friends from Ethiopia will visit many areas of our Nation and will go back to their homes with a better understanding of the United States. Those of us who have been privileged to be with them this afternoon have a much finer understanding of the great qualities of the people of Ethiopia and their country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On behalf of the Senate, the Chair extends a cordial welcome to our distinguished guests.

LOCATION OF CHANCERIES OR OFFICES OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS IN CERTAIN RESIDENTIAL AREAS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 646) to prohibit the location of chanceries or other business offices of foreign governments in certain residential areas in the District of Columbia.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, S. 646, a bill prohibiting location of chanceries of foreign governments in residential areas of the District of Columbia, was introduced by Senator FULBRIGHT, the distinguished chairman of Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

The purpose of S. 646 is to preserve a suitable environment for family life in residential areas of the District of Columbia by preventing the further encroachment of business establishments in these areas of the city.

S. 646, as amended, provides that no foreign government shall be permitted—with the exception of making ordinary maintenance repairs—to construct, alter, repair, convert, or occupy any building for use as a chancery, chancery annex or other business office on any land, regardless of the date of its acquisition, within any residential district in the District of Columbia. The bill is not intended to have a retroactive effect and, accordingly, it will not prohibit a foreign government from continuing to use any chancery which that government has lawfully used as a chancery prior to the date of the bill's enactment. Nor will the bill affect the location of embassies which, because of their truly residential nature, will continue to be eligible for sites in any appropriate residential area or district of the city.

The committee recognizes that certain property owners may possess nonconforming uses in connection with their land. It is not the intention of the committee in enacting this bill, to modify in any way existing vested rights in property being used by foreign governments as chanceries at the time of the enactment of the bill.

The committee, on May 3, 1963, held public hearings on the bill. During the hearing, witnesses representing the State Department, the District of Columbia government, and various business, civic, and neighborhood organizations testified. The majority of such witnesses recognized the urgent need for more stringent regulation of chanceries or business offices of foreign governments in the District of Columbia. Moreover, representatives for the State Department, and the District of Columbia government were unanimous in concluding that efforts in the past of administrative regulation of zoning for chanceries in the District had not been successful from the standpoint of the foreign governments, the State Department, the District government or the residents of the District of Columbia.

Pursuant to considering all the views presented at the May 3 public hearing, the committee concluded that the legislative policy, intended by the bill, could best be achieved by prohibiting future construction, enlargement, alteration, or occupancy of chanceries in all residential neighborhoods.

As introduced, the bill would have prohibited location and enlargement of chanceries in only one type of residential district, namely, an area where one-family detached dwellings may be located. It was the opinion of the committee that such a provision would unfairly discriminate against residents of the more populous residential districts where row housing, apartments, and other high density living accommodations are permitted. Since the principal objection to chanceries in residential areas is that they are commercial establishments which generate parking inadequacies and traffic congestion and adversely affect living conditions, the committee did not feel that it could logically prohibit their inclusion in the least dense residential districts and at the same time permit them in the areas of greatest density. Therefore, the committee unanimously approved an amendment to the bill which prohibits the location of these commercial establishments in any residential district. This, in effect, places a foreign government in the same status as a U.S. citizen or business entity with respect to the location of its business activities within the District of Columbia.

The committee is aware that although chanceries are business establishments, there is a unique character to their business activities. To help meet the future needs of foreign governments for appropriate sites for chanceries, the Committee has urged the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, and the National Capital Planning Commission to cooperate with the Department of State to explore the feasibility of establishing a specialized diplomatic enclave for chanceries in some appropriate area of the District of Columbia. Such an enclave would not only solve the chancery problem in the District of Columbia, but equally important, could become a civic asset to the Capital City of the United States and beneficial to foreign governments in their business activities.

Mr. President, the bill as amended is uniform and nondiscriminatory in every respect and is designed to bring order out of an increasingly difficult situation and should for the reasons stated be approved by the Senate.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a question?

Mr. McINTYRE. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the intent of the committee that any property which, as of the present date, is not being used for a chancery will be permitted to be used by a foreign government for a chancery?

Mr. McINTYRE. The intent of the bill and the committee is that up until the time of the enactment of the bill there will be no retroactive effect in relation to what may now be the situation. The bill looks forward to a date of enactment and, as of that time, as is stated in the first clause of the bill, the bill would prohibit the construction or alteration of chanceries in residential areas. However, the committee has been intent upon preserving any existing vested legal rights.

Mr. CURTIS. I agree. But how about legal rights established between today and the time the bill might be signed into law? What is the position of the committee on that question?

Mr. McINTYRE. The committee's position is clear. Any legal rights that are now vested or may be vested before the bill became law would be preserved.

Mr. CURTIS. Even though they do not now exist?

Mr. McINTYRE. Even though they do not now exist. If the Senator has reference to any particular set of facts, perhaps I shall be able to answer the question more fully.

Mr. CURTIS. I call to the Senator's attention the language of the bill appearing on page 2 beginning in the middle of line 10. Prior thereto the language on page 2 is clear. The language provides that hereafter foreign governments shall not have the right to proceed to build and use buildings under certain conditions. Then in line 10 the following language appears:

> Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit the continued use as a chancery, chancery annex, or other business office of any building lawfully being used for that purpose on the date of enactment of this subsection, or to prohibit the making of ordinary repairs to any such building.

The way that provision is drawn any foreign government could move into any kind of building, including a residence, a contractor's shack, or anything which was permanently attached to the land, install some typewriters and other office equipment, and start to do business as a chancery after the bill was passed. If the foreign government should establish its chancery before the bill became law, it would be saved by the provisions of the bill.

That provision is an invitation to defeat the intent and purpose of the bill. It invites uncertainty. I would hope that the committee itself would correct the language. If it does not do so, in due course I shall offer an amendment. My amendment would strike out on page 2, line 13, "the date of the enactment of this subsection" and insert "January 31, 1963," because that was the date on which the bill was introduced. I would accept the date July 24, 1963. As the language is written there is a hiatus, and some foreign government could defeat the purpose of the bill.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I should like to address myself to the question of my distinguished colleague. On page 2 of the bill, beginning with the terminology after "the date of the enactment of this subsection," there appears the prohibitory clause which looks to the future insofar as chanceries and chancery annexes are concerned.

The clause which the Senator has pointed out is nothing more or less than a saving clause. It is not the intent of the committee—and I am sure it is not the intent of the Senator from Nebraska—that a law should be enacted which would affect the legal position of chanceries that are now in operation.

Mr. CURTIS. If the Senator will amend the language so that today's date appears at the point I indicated, I shall settle for that provision. But the Senator desires to make the date at a future time.

Mr. McINTYRE. We wish to make it the date upon which the bill would be enacted.

Mr. CURTIS. Such language would give the governments affected several months in which to act. Most proposed legislation is started in the first session of the Congress and ends the next year. Often that happens.

As the language now appears, if a foreign government could establish some rights between now and the time the President signs the bill, it would be saved by that provision of the bill.

Mr. McINTYRE. Any foreign government that would take it upon itself, in the present state of affairs, to act in that way while the bill is pending would be ill advised. If that government had gone ahead and expended the funds and then the bill should become law, the foreign government's position would certainly be prejudiced. For example, assuming a hypothetical case, it is my understanding of the bill that an application pending before the Board of Zoning Adjustment of the District of Columbia might be granted by the Board of Zoning Adjustment.

An appeal might be taken from the permission granted, by interested citizens. During the time the hypothetical case was pending, if the bill became law before the chancery in question secured a permit for construction, as distinguished from zoning permission, it is very likely that no building inspector or licensing director of the District of Columbia would issue a permit.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not think we should leave the situation in that hazy state. Furthermore, building permits of this type are not the type a particular inspector or administrative officer in the District of Columbia can rule upon. He is subject to diplomatic pressures and arguments of all kinds. He must yield to so-called higher authority. If we were dealing with American citizens, I think that would be true.

The distinguished Senator stated that it is the desire not to make anything retroactive. I agree with that. That is a two-way street. If we pledge that we will not take something away from somebody who has something now, we also should say we will not permit anybody to acquire any additional rights while this proposal is going through the legislative process.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, in response to certain questions raised by the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator seems to be trying to indicate that unless a specific date is put into the bill there will be a situation in which various foreign governments or people will be running around trying to acquire some sort of vested interest in something, pending the enactment of the bill. This overlooks the true situation, which is that any person seeking to establish a chancery on any property which falls within the purview of the zoning regulations must, in the ordinary course, go to the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment and make his application and provide the facts which would enable him to obtain a special exception.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McINTYRE. I am happy to yield to my colleague on the committee, the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL].

Mr. BEALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the citizens of the District of Columbia are entitled to the relief which this bill would grant to them. They are entitled to have their homes and neighborhoods protected from the deteriorating effects of encroachment by commercial establishments—whether these commercial establishments be business offices of a foreign government or private business offices.

The foreign governments in our Nation's Capital are here at our invitation. As our friends they are entitled to be treated with fairness. Fairness in this situation is to have the same status as a U.S. citizen or business entity with respect to the location of their business activities within the District of Columbia. That is what this bill gives them.

The hearings held before our Committee demonstrated clearly that the District Government, the Department of State and many responsible civic organizations all agree that the increasing number of chanceries in residential areas in the District of Columbia has had an adverse effect on residence property. The State Department in a letter to the Committee reporting on the bill as originally introduced stated.

> The chancery situation in Washington has for a long time been confused and unsatisfactory for all parties concerned. The Department of State would welcome an equitable and reasonable law prohibiting the future construction of chanceries in designated residential areas of the District of Columbia.

This bill is "equitable and reasonable" because it applies in a completely nondiscriminatory way to all nations and to all types of residence districts. It is "equitable and reasonable" because it preserves existing vested property rights in property being used by foreign governments as chanceries.

During the course of consideration of this bill by the committee the distinguished Senator from Oregon who always finds time to bring his invaluable legal and legislative skills to bear on District problems, made what I think is a most valuable suggestion. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] suggested that the future needs of foreign governments for chancery sites could be met by the establishment of a diplomatic enclave for chanceries in an appropriately zoned area of the District of Columbia. The committee was very much in favor of this suggestion and the report on the bill reflects this by urging the appropriate District authorities and the State Department to explore this matter as a long-range solution to the problem.

Mr. President, last week the Senate passed legislation permitting urban renewal in commercial areas in the District of Columbia. The bill before us today has a bearing on the urban renewal bill in that we are suggesting that new locations be sought for chanceries. This is consistent with the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon that a Diplomatic Enclave be established in the District.

In closing, Mr. President I would like to commend the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE] for the excellent way in which he has guided this bill through the committee so that it now does uniform justice to the citizens of the District of Columbia and to foreign governments who will in the future seek chancery sites in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. McINTYRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. McINTYRE. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I expect to offer an amendment. I seek recognition in my own right.

Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a point of order. Has the Senator from New Hampshire surrendered the floor?

Mr. McINTYRE. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor. He has yielded to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Nebraska appreciates very much the yielding by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. I prefer, however, to be recognized in my own right, for the purpose of offering my own amendment. Has any time limitation been entered into? Is the Senate operating under controlled time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no controlled time in effect.

Mr. CURTIS. Then I ask to be recognized on my amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator that his amendment is out of order at the present time. The committee amendment has not been acted on.

The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "one family detached dwelling".

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a point of order. Who has the floor?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, if I may have unanimous consent, I will yield for disposition of the committee amendment. I will then proceed to offer my amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to raise a question with my friend. I wish to propound a question to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire with respect to the purport of the bill as it would be amended, and in that connection I wish to make a little legislative history before listening to what my able friend from Nebraska has to offer.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yield for that purpose, without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, referring to page 25 of the hearings, I recall that I wrote a letter to the committee on behalf of a California constituent. I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of my letter appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 10, 1963.

Re S. 646, 88th Congress,
Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: As you already know, since March 1961 I have been and am the owner of the premises known as No. 2127, which is family occupied, and No. 2129 LeRoy Place NW., in the Kalorama area of the District of Columbia. Since August 1, 1962, No. 2129 has been and is leased to and used by the Jamaican Government as a chancery. Such premises have been used for chancery purposes for all practical purposes since its construction in about 1908. The cost involved to convert this four-story edifice from a chancery to a residence would be prohibitive. Further, it is extremely doubtful that, if converted, a purchaser could be found at a price commensurate with the cost of conversion.

Although the particular area in which my property is situated is not zoned for chancery use, my attorneys advise that such use was permitted pursuant to the zoning regulations of the District of Columbia which allow a nonconforming use, lawfully existing on the effective date of the zoning regulations, to continue. A recent decision of the Board of Zoning Adjustment of the District of Columbia, however, apparently alters this result. The facts giving rise to that decision were that the subject property was used as a chancery of the Government of Morocco from September 1956 through November 1962. In December 1962, the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic leased this property for use by its chancery. In holding that a public hearing was required to determine whether such property could be leased as a chancery to the Syrian Arab Republic (or any other government, for that matter), and that a certificate of occupancy was not issuable as a matter of right for that purpose, the Board stated:

"With this as background, we must agree fully with appellant council that we are not here considering a nonconforming use as is envisioned by the Zoning Act and regulations. We believe, and so hold, that a chancery in a residence district, regardless of when it is or was established, or by what authority or board, is a nontransferable privilege and is not a right which runs with the land as does the usual nonconforming use authorized by the Zoning Act. The substitution of the chancery of one country for that of another is therefore subject to the review contemplated by paragraph 3101.410 of the regulations." *The Sheridan Kalorama Neighborhood Council, appellant,* v. *The Zoning Administrator, District of Columbia, appellee,* Appeal No. 7149, decided March 27, 1963.

It is clear from the penultimate sentence of S. 646, 88th Congress, that the continued use as a chancery of any building lawfully being used for that purpose as of the effective date of the proposed legislation would be allowed. I am advised by counsel, however, that, if S. 646 is enacted in its present form, doubt would exist by virtue of the first sentence on page 2 of the bill and the above cited decision of the Board of Zoning Adjustment whether, if the Jamaican Government vacated the premises known as No. 2129 LeRoy Place NW., I could lawfully sell or lease such premises to another government for use as a chancery. In order to clarify any ambiguity as to this issue, my counsel has suggested that the following be added on line 13 of page 2 of S. 646 between the comma following the word "subsection" and the word "or": "or prohibit such use after any sale or lease of any such building,"

My counsel further advise me that as a result of the above-cited decision of the Board of Zoning Adjustment, a building used as a chancery on May 12, 1958 (the effective date of the Zoning Regulations of the District of Columbia), which use has continued to the present time, might not be construed as "lawfully being used for that purpose" within the meaning of the penultimate sentence of S. 646. It is suggested, therefore, that the following sentence be inserted immediately after the period on line 15 of page 2 of S. 646.

"The use as a chancery, chancery annex, or other business office of any building on May 12, 1958, which use has continued to the date of enactment of this subsection, shall be considered lawful for the purpose of this subsection."

Thanking you for your kind attention and assistance in this matter, I am.

Respectfully,

RALPH V. DEVOTO,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I indicated that certain property has been owned by one of my constituents in California and has been occupied and used by the Jamaican Government as a chancery for a long period of time. With that background and understanding as to the intention of the committee in reporting the bill, I wish to phrase a question on legislative intent, and ask my able friend, the Senator in charge of the bill, for an answer.

Suppose that one government had occupied a building for chancery purposes prior to May 12, 1958, the effective date of the zoning regulations. Under the legislation, could such property then be sold or leased or hypothecated to another foreign government for continued use as a chancery? Will the Senator give us an answer to the question as a part of the history of legislative intent?

Mr. McINTYRE. I appreciate the interest of the Senator from California in the bill. I can understand his concern for his constituent, and particularly the situation of the law with reference to the question. What the Senator is really asking is whether the bill, S. 646, treats such chanceries as the Senator referred to as nonconforming uses. I wondered whether the bill extended such recognition to them and considered adding an amendment to that effect. I am not sure that this would be necessary, because the bill itself reads, on lines 10 and 11 of page 2, that:

> Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit the continued use as a chancery, chancery annex, or other business office of any building lawfully being used for that purpose on the date of enactment of this subsection or to prohibit the making of ordinary repairs to any such building.

And the courts of the District of Columbia have held that very similar language about continued use in section 7 of the District of Columbia Zoning Act means that property which has nonconforming use status may be transferred. The zoning act gives very explicit recognition to the right to continue lawful uses in effect at the effective date of any zoning regulation in the District. This bill does not in any way alter section 7 of the 1938 act, and I believe the protection of that section was meant to extend to all properties covered by the zoning regulations.

My colleagues on the subcommittee are averse to adding any express protections about the transferability of properties used for chancery purposes before the effective date of the zoning regulations. After all, the basic intention of the bill is to protect residential areas of the District of Columbia, and they would like to go as far toward that objective as we can without interfering with vested rights.

They believe that if, by any chance, the chanceries of foreign governments need not be regarded as nonconforming uses, this bill should not extend positive protection to them. There is a decision of the Board of Zoning Adjustment to that effect, reprinted at pages 103–104 of the hearings, the Sheridan-Kalorama case.

But I find little cause to doubt that the bill conforms to the policy laid down by Congress in 1938, that all property which subsequently fell or came under the zoning regulations could continue to be used. One factor which influenced my decision not to seek an amendment to the bill was a memorandum prepared by the Department of Justice and concurred in by the Department of State which covers just this point. The memorandum states, in part, that "the right to continue a nonconforming use, once established and not abandoned, is a vested right. Eitnier against Kreitz Corp., 172 A. 2d 320 (Pa., 1961)." The memorandum further states that "the law on this subject indicates that property owned by alien friends—and I interpret that as friendly foreign nations—"is protected to the same extent as property owned by American citizens. Yick

Wo against Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356, 369 (1886)."

I ask unanimous consent that the letter of the Department of State be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 12, 1963.

The Honorable THOMAS J. MCINTYRE,
Chairman of the Senate District Subcommittee on Commerce, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The following reply has been prepared in response to your request that certain legal questions be answered for the Subcommittee on Commerce of the Senate District of Columbia Committee relating to S. 646, which would prohibit the establishment of foreign chanceries from certain residential zones in the District of Columbia. Your first question is as follows:

"1. How does the Department feel, from a legal standpoint, about transferring a variance from zoning regulations obtained by a foreign government or a private person for a certain building located in a residential area? Our answer is to address itself exclusively to variances granted by the Board of Zoning Adjustment after 1958 and not to those granted before 1958 since the latter are regarded as nonconforming uses. Recently the Board of Zoning Adjustment ruled that it was illegal for the Zoning Administrator to grant a permit of occupancy to the Syrian Government in order for that Government to occupy a building previously used by the Moroccans as a chancery and for which the Moroccans had obtained a variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment. It is felt by the committee that perhaps the ruling of the Board of Zoning Adjustment deprives the previous owner of his constitutional rights since it might cause the lowering of the value of the property."

The Department of Justice has furnished the following reply:

"In your question you refer to a recent ruling of the Board of Zoning Adjustment in which it was held that the Syrian Arab Republic may not, as a matter of right, occupy a building formerly occupied as a chancery by the Government of Morocco. You state that the Government of Morocco had obtained a variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment, and this is the basis of your inquiry whether such a variance may be transferred. It appears, however, that the use of the building by the Moroccan Government was not pursuant to a grant of variance. A check with the District of Columbia Zoning Commission has revealed that Morocco's use of the building antedated the adoption of the zoning regulations now in effect, and consequently no variance from those regulations was ever needed.

"Thus the matter considered by the Board of Zoning Adjustment was not whether a variance could be transferred, but rather whether the use of the building by the Moroccan Government as a chancery was a nonconforming use which could be continued by another government. Those opposing the continuation of the nonconforming use argued that a chancery use of property is a personal nontransferable privilege based on comity between nations, and when located in a residential district must be construed strictly, since it is tantamount to a tolerated or condoned zoning abuse. The Board's decision was that although 'the usual nonconforming use authorized by the Zoning Act' is a right which runs with land, a nonconforming use by a foreign government is a nontransferable privilege.

"The degree to which land within the District of Columbia, including land owned by foreign governments and aliens, may be regulated in its ownership and use is a matter entirely within the discretion of the Congress which, subject to constitutional limitations, exercises over the District exclusive jurisdiction in all cases whatsoever. Constitution, article 1, section 8, clause 17. By the act of June 20, 1938, as amended, section 5-413 et seq., District of Columbia Code, Congress delegated to the District of Columbia Zoning Commission, and to the Board of Zoning Adjustment, certain powers to regulate land uses within the District. It would thus appear that questions as to the extent to which this power was delegated, and the propriety, in specific cases, of the exercise of this power, are matters primarily for the consideration of the Congress and the government of the District of Columbia.

"Nevertheless, we would point out the anomalous nature of the Board's decision, for while the Board concludes that 'the usual nonconforming use authorized by the Zoning Act' runs with the land, it further concludes that this is not so when the land is used by a foreign government. The Board's views on the usual nonconforming use appear correct. Further, a cursory review of the law on this subject indicates that property owned by alien friends is protected to the same extent as property owned by American citizens, *Yick Wo* v. *Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356, 369 (1886), and presumably property owned by foreign governments is entitled at least to the same protection as property owned by foreign individuals. Since the right to continue a nonconforming use once established and not abandoned, is a vested right, *Eitnier* v. *Krietz Corp.*, 172 A. 2d 320 (Pa. 1961), it appears that the Board's decision might constitute a taking in violation of the fifth amendment.

The Department is fully in accord with the position of the Department of Justice that a foreign government is entitled to the same protection in respect of a nonconforming use as is a foreign national or a U.S. citizen.

Your second question is as follows:

"2. How does the Department regard a hypothetical case in which Government 'X' has occupied de facto a building for use as a chancery without having obtained a variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment? To what extent does sovereign immunity protect that government from being forced to vacate the premises by local authorities, Federal authorities, and any law passed by Congress."

It is the Department of State's opinion that the protection adhering to the foreign government in such instances is characterized as diplomatic, rather than sovereign immunity. To the extent authorized by the real property laws of the District of Columbia, action could be taken against the realty to enforce a proper decision of the Board of Zoning Adjustment. However, placing a cloud upon the title is far different than regaining possession of the premises qua-chancery, or regulating the use of such diplomatic premises.

Under generally accepted tenets of international law, the premises of an embassy or chancery are inviolable. Further, the foreign ambassador or other diplomatic occupant is immune from service of process and the jurisdiction of the courts in such matters. Hence, either an action for eviction or other remedial action of an in personam nature could not successfully be prosecuted.

Finally, taking the Syrian Chancery matter again as an example, remedial action could lie against the private American citizen lessor but not, as indicated above, against the diplomatic tenant. The lessor similarly has no recourse against the diplomatic tenant to enforce any decision lying against him.

If I can be of further assistance to your subcommittee in this matter, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, Congress went very far toward express recognition of rights of continued use in the Zoning Act of 1938. This bill does not go as far, but I doubt that it needs to. The original policy of section 7 of the Zoning Act of 1938 continues unimpaired. I would indicate, as my personal opinion, that chanceries established prior to the May 12, 1958 zoning regulation may "continue to be used" by any other foreign government acquiring such premises or buildings by purchase, lease, or otherwise.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my able friend from New Hampshire for his excellent statement, based on his thorough examination of the problem involved in the question which I have raised. I agree with his reasoning, and I agree also with the statement he has made with respect to the intention of the legislation with respect to this particular case. I also thank my able friend from Nebraska for permitting this legislative history, bearing as it does on the intent of the legislation, to be spread on the RECORD before action is taken on the committee amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask that my amendment be read.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me briefly before the Senate considers the pending amendment?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I should like to address two or three questions to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. McINTYRE. I shall be happy to have the Senator do so.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Is the question before the Senate on agreeing to the committee amendment which strikes out on page 2, line 6, the phrase "one family detached dwelling"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the pending question.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to address some questions to my friend from New Hampshire. In the testimony at page 3 of the hearings, Assistant Secretary of State Frederick G. Dutton advocated a proposed alternative. He suggested that "a survey should be made to determine in advance which parts of the above designated districts can still be regarded as suitable for the construction, purchase, or lease of chancery facilities. The results of this survey could then be incorporated into a revised set of zoning regulations, with the understanding that new areas could be declared unsuitable for chancery use as changing conditions warranted."

The bill, as originally introduced, referred only to one-family detached residence districts. Apparently it is the purpose of the committee that these words be stricken so that the bill would apply to all residential districts. Some of these border more closely on commercial uses than they do on one family detached dwelling residence districts. I wonder if the Senator could explain why the committee did not give more consideration to

the proposal of Assistant Secretary of State Dutton, which strikes me as a constructive way of approaching this subject.

Mr. McINTYRE. The Secretary in his letter indicated a preference for retaining this prohibition only with respect to R–1 A and B areas. The committee felt, after full consideration, that we should aim to prevent the establishment of the commercial aspect of these chanceries in all residential areas. The residential aspect, of course, involves traffic congestion, parking problems, and esthetic deterioration. The committee's feeling was that if it was perfectly all right to place a restriction on the single-family or detached dwelling areas, which are, after all, areas of low density, why should we then say, in the case of the high-rise apartment areas, which are also residential in character, with a higher density, that they must put up with this situation? I believe that was the main reason.

Mr. KEATING. Has it been the practice of chanceries to seek to locate in higher density areas? I thought they preferred the lower density areas

Mr. McINTYRE. The Senator is probably correct in his statement. Chanceries and embassies are looking for prestige areas. No doubt they prefer the R–1 districts to the R–2 and 3 and 4 districts. At the same time, the record shows that there are chanceries in the R–3 and R–4 areas.

Mr. KEATING. As I understand it, the bill does not affect embassies.

Mr. McINTYRE. The Senator is correct. They may go anywhere.

Mr. KEATING. Would an embassy with a chancery attached be affected by the bill?

Mr. McINTYRE. A chancery annex would be affected in the same manner that a chancery alone would be.

Mr. KEATING. Except for those that are now already so located. The newer nations require a great deal of money to establish a chancery. Some of the newer nations do not have the money. Was that point the subject of discussion in the committee, or was it discussed in the hearings—namely, whether there is any danger that the newer nations might feel that this proposal is in some way directed at them?

Mr. McINTYRE. I believe the answer to that question is that the committee felt we had to come to some conclusion. We considered the fact that there are four independent nations which are not yet represented in Washington. They are Algeria, Burundi, Uganda, and Tanganyika.

I read from the committee report:

> Kenya, Zanzibar, the Rhodesias, and Gambia are slated for indepedence. Dahomey has not been successful in finding a chancery, and some 10 nations are contemplating new chanceries.

I felt, first of all, that the bill was not discriminatory in any way insofar as chanceries are concerned. With respect to such countries we did not intend any discrimination. We felt we had to counterbalance the fact that the people resident in the District of Columbia are being inconvenienced continually by the Board of Zoning Adjustment through the granting of special exceptions for the construction of chanceries in residential areas. We had to balance the equities. I believe we have done the best we could. There is no intention in any way to discriminate against these young countries as they come to Washington.

Mr. McINTYRE. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. One thing that has concerned me about the bill—and I wish my friend from New Hampshire would give me his frank opinion—is that at this time many of the newer nations seek to establish chanceries in Washington, but particularly African and Asian nations and, in some instances, Latin American nations. My question is whether they might have a feeling that the bill was directed at them rather than at the larger and richer countries, which can afford to locate their chancery in business sections.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure that that is not the intention of the committee, and specifically, not the intention of the Senator from New Hampshire. The bill does not in any way apply to embassies. They are free to locate anywhere. The location of chanceries is different. I am informed that some of the smaller countries do not have the funds with which to buy property in a commercially zoned area, or to rent in high-priced areas in a commercial zone.

I have one other question to ask of the Senator along the same line. The bill seems to prohibit the construction of additions to already established chanceries after the enactment date.

How is it intended that nations will provide for their necessary additional space, if they find they need more space? Does it mean that they will have to sell that property and move into a commercial zone?

Mr. McINTYRE. I am not certain that I understand the Senator's question. The bill would not affect the operation of any chancery or chancery annex that was in existence on the date of the enactment of the law. There appear to be various classifications of chanceries. We do not want to go into that subject too deeply, unless we have to do so. First, there is the kind that was referred to in my discussion with the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. That is a nonconforming use or type, with which I have some familiarity.

There is another group of chanceries that have come into being, upon being granted a special exception by the Board of Zoning Adjustment, since March 1958. Those chanceries can continue in operation.

The question raised by the Senator from California was whether the use could be transferred to another country. In the case of a group of chanceries which had been granted special exceptions, would their rights fall by the wayside when they were abandoned, or when the use of the buildings for chancery operations was given up?

Mr. KEATING. My question was really directed toward something else. At the top of page 2 of the bill, we read:

> After the date of enactment of this subsection, no foreign government shall be permitted to construct * * *.

That is perfectly clear. Then the language reads:

> Alter, repair, convert, or occupy any building for use as a chancery * * *.

And so forth.

Suppose a chancery finds it needs additional space to take care of additional duties? I realize that under the latter provision of the bill, if a roof leaked, the roof could be repaired without any question. But that would not involve an alteration or a major repair. My question is, What would such a foreign government now located in one of the residential districts do? Would it have to move out and give up the building?

Mr. McINTYRE. If the classification were a nonconforming use, the nonconforming use standard, as we understand, looks forward to an eventual closing off or dropping off of the particular use that is nonconforming.

Chanceries in existence would be allowed to maintain their property and keep it in repair; but any enlargements or attempts to build annexes—and we can think of chancery annexes as additional buildings—would run afoul of the zoning law by virtue of being extensions of nonconforming uses.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his frank answer. It seems to me to raise serious problems for some of the presently legally located chanceries, which, as I view his answer, would be required to give up their locations and move into commercial zones and purchase new property for a chancery, if they needed more room than they now have.

The bill troubles me greatly. I know the committee has given it careful consideration. I understand it was unanimously reported by the committee. Nevertheless, I have strong reservations about it. I am afraid that it will not enhance our position with some of the newer nations. I fear they will view the action, whether rightly or wrongly, as an effort to make it more difficult to open a chancery in Washington.

In the course of the hearings, did the Senator's committee receive any evidence as to the procedure that is followed in other countries? I am informed—perhaps erroneously—that in other nations, our Government can establish a chancery anywhere it wishes; that foreign countries do not have restrictions upon the locations of chanceries. I may be in error. Can the Senator enlighten me? The reason for my question is the fear that, if we enact the proposed legislation, it might result in some restrictions being imposed by other countries with regard to the location of U.S. chanceries in those countries.

Mr. McINTYRE. The committee looked into the restrictions on the locations of U.S. chanceries in other nations of the world. That information appears on pages 31 through 33 of the hearing record. One of our intentions in being nondiscriminatory and in keeping the effective date as of the date of the enactment of the law was so as not to discriminate in any way with respect to any pending chancery situations that were in process in the District of Columbia.

Mr. KEATING. Would they not be covered by the bill? In other words, if chanceries have not actually been established, would they not be covered by the proposed legislation?

Mr. McINTYRE. That raises a legal point as to what will be the status of any particular petition that may exist on the part of Kuwait or the U.S.S.R. for example, when the law becomes effective. The best legal opinion we could get indicates that if the petitions had not been perfected—by that I mean if appeals not been decided and the country had not been issued appropriate building permits—the passage of the law would void any such opportunity.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, if they merely had an application pending before the Zoning Board at this time, they would be covered by the legislation?

Mr. McINTYRE. If the law were passed?

Mr. KEATING. Passed and signed.

Mr. McINTYRE. What was the stage of the application?

Mr. KEATING. If they had passed the Zoning Board and were ready to ask for a permit, is it the Senator's view that they would not be covered?

Mr. McINTYRE. If they had building permits, and the bill was still pending, the construction would commence. But if they did not have a permit and the law were passed, the best legal opinion we could procure is that when they asked for such permit, the building inspector or the licensing officer of the District of Columbia would be without authority to grant it to them.

To get back to the original question, we have found that foreign countries, in general, are quite generous with us in affording us the opportunity to locate our chanceries.

Mr. KEATING. That had been my understanding. Does the bill have the approval of the State Department?

Mr. McINTYRE. Let me check that further.

Mr. KEATING. I would appreciate it if the Senator would do so.

Mr. McINTYRE. At pages 3 and 4 of the record, the Department of State indicated the existing difficulty with respect to chanceries and the applications before the Board of Zoning Adjustment. They approved the purpose of the bill, but they did not give us complete approval of the manner in which the bill has been drafted. There were other methods that the Department would have preferred.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his frank statement. My informal opinion was that the Department of State did not favor enactment of the bill in its present form; but I may be mistaken about that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Inouye in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I may respond partially—not that the Senator from New Hampshire has not already responded—the Department did object to the all-inclusiveness of the provision used. It proposed the use of the term "detached single dwelling." But the committee, in its wisdom—and perhaps it is correct; certainly I agree in principle—adopted the all-inclusive provision, so as to make it comply with the same rights a citizen would have; and I think it a good principle.

Of course we can imagine cases involving a "gray" area—for example, a case in which a very small country, represented by a very small staff, wished to have certain basement rooms converted to business use. There are such cases—for example, in Japan, where the size of a business office in a residential area is strictly limited; and there are similar situations.

However, I think the bill will have a good result. The State Department favors such a bill, although not this particular one.

Mr. KEATING. Before the Senator intervened, I was referring to the testimony of Assistant Secretary of State Dutton. It seems to me that the approach he recommended was somewhat sounder than the proposed legislation now before us. However, the Senator from New Hampshire responded to that comment, and I appreciate his response to all of my questions.

Mr. McINTYRE. I should like the Senator to know that the other method, proposed by the State Department, fell on rather barren ground, so far as the committee was concerned, because—as indicated by members of the committee who have been in Washington longer than I have—there has been ample time to deal with this problem in the District of Columbia. It is our feeling that this is the fair way to deal with it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, at this time I ask for action on the committee amendment, provided it is understood that I shall not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask that my amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bible in the chair). The amendment of the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 2, in line 13, it is proposed to strike out "the date of enactment of this subsection" and to insert in lieu thereof "January 31, 1963."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that in doing so, I shall not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 117 Leg.]

Allott
Anderson
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Byrd, Va.
Clark
Cotton
Curtis
Fulbright
Hart
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Mansfield
McIntyre
Monroney
Morse
Nelson
Neuberger
Pell
Saltonstall
Smathers
Sparkman
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent on official business.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] is absent on official business to attend the funeral of Hon. Hjalmar Nygaard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. Aiken, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Church, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Engle, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Fong, Mr. Goldwater, Mr. Gore, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McClellan, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. McNamara, Mr. Mechem, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Miller, Mr. Morton, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Russell, Mr. Scott, Mr. Simpson, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Symington, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Tower, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, and Mr. Young of Ohio, entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I ask, for the benefit of the Senate, how long the Senator intends to speak?

Mr. CURTIS. I hope to finish in 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well. It is my intention to move to table the amendment. I think the Senator is entitled to make his statement. As he recognizes, since he yielded to me I could have made the motion to table.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, if my amendment is to be tabled without debate, it is entirely possible that I may wish to offer another amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is perfectly all right. This question has already been debated.

Mr. CURTIS. On the Senate floor?

Mr. MANSFIELD. On the Senate floor this afternoon. I was present and heard the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from New Hampshire debate on this subject.

Mr. CURTIS. I offered an amendment. I have yielded to various Senators, to accommodate them, and have not yet said anything on my amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct, but the amendment has been debated at least by the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. CURTIS. I have not debated it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has mentioned it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it is a privilege to speak before an audience with open minds, anxious and willing that the course of this Republic be charted according to the best available information and that the rights and prerogatives of all of our citizens and that the arguments and suggestions of all of our Members be given equal and just consideration. I am overwhelmed by that opportunity today.

This amendment may be tabled. The issue is quite clear. The objectives of the bill are fine. They are in the best interests of this country. The objectives of the measure would prevent hardship. They would prevent discrimination between countries in the application of the provisions of the law. They would establish a rule of law for the location of chanceries.

I commend the committee for the language it has put into the report. In reference to the hearings, the committee states:

> The committee concluded that (1) chanceries are business establishments; (2) their inclusion in residential neighborhoods creates traffic congestion, parking problems, and esthetic deterioration; (3) there is a need for a definite legislative policy with respect to the location of chanceries which will not discriminate against any foreign government nor against the residents of any particular area in the city;

Mr. President, that is noble language. I wish I could offer an amendment, to be voted on its merits, to achieve this objective.

> (4) such a policy can best be achieved by prohibiting future construction, enlargement, alteration, or occupancy of chanceries in all residential neighborhoods.

The report goes on to cite that since 1957, or thereabouts, the procedure which has been followed is that the chanceries have been prohibited, but the Board of Zoning Adjustment can grant exceptions, and the decisions of the Board of Zoning Adjustment are not subject to review by the Commissioners.

I ask Senators to refer to page 2 of S. 646, lines 1 to 10, where it is stated very fairly and firmly:

> After the date of enactment of this subsection, no foreign government shall be permitted to construct, alter, repair, convert, or occupy any building for use as a chancery, chancery annex, or other business office of such foreign government on any land, regardless of the date of acquisition thereof, within a residence district.

But there is a saving clause to protect those nations which already have chanceries in residence districts. That saving language begins in the middle of line 10. I invite attention to it:

> Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit the continued use as a chancery, chancery annex, or other business office of any building lawfully being used for that purpose on the date of enactment of this subsection, or to prohibit the making of ordinary repairs to any such building.

What does that language mean? If it should take a month to enact the bill, all a foreign country would have to do would be to get in before the month expired. The usual practice, when bills are considered in one House, is to have consideration completed in the other. Then a conference is held. Then the bill is sent to the President for signature. It may become law in the next session.

All one has to do to make ineffective the desire to render fair treatment to everyone is, between now and the time the bill is signed into law, to move into the premises and start using it as a chancery.

Unless my amendment is agreed to, it is possible for that result to be accomplished.

Usually delays are encountered in the enactment of a bill into law, when the schedule is heavy in both Houses. During that time, all that would be needed would be some State Department pressure on the Board of Zoning Adjustment, to hurry up and grant a request to build a chancery in a residence section. They could get started. They could occupy the building. The bill later would go into effect, but they could remain there. They could remodel and repair the building. They would be there all the time.

So, instead of this measure treating all sections of the city alike, it does not. It carries a loophole so that, if they want to come in between now and the time the bill is enacted, they can come in. Instead of treating all countries alike, it means the loophole can be used by the powerful, the influential, those who can intimidate us; and there are some countries in the world, and I can think of at least one, that make some Americans quiver every time they make demands. That country likes us to quiver. But all that country, or any other country, has to do is to take advantage of the time that will be required in order to enact the proposal into law, and it gets all the advantages of the saving clause relating to a foreign government that has a chancery in a residential district or has used it for years. This provision is not an accident. It was put in the bill as an intended loophole, so that the bill will not treat all countries alike. It is a loophole in the bill, so that all areas of the Nation's Capital will not be treated alike.

What is the answer? Instead of protecting those that happen to be "in" on the date of enactment of this bill, I use the date the bill was introduced, January 31, 1963. There is precedent for such procedure. Many times Congress has enacted tax legislation that has become effective either on the date the President has sent a message to Congress or on the date the bill was introduced in the other body. It is generally accepted that that is notice of the intention of Congress to so proceed.

The amendment is a simple one. The Congress is going to embark on a procedure of prohibiting foreign chanceries in residential areas and treat everybody alike. It would plug the loophole so that the powerful and influential could not come in and proceed to establish a chancery before the bill was enacted.

If this loophole prevails, we do not know what it will be used for. We do not know whether the State Department will select some little country that is struggling along, that wants a chancery and wants a durable place to have it, and say to it, "If you will hurry up or if you will vote right with us in the United Nations, we will tell the Board of Zoning Adjustment to grant your request immediately. Move in and you have the benefit of the saving clause." The reason the motion will be made to table the amendment is to keep that loophole open.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I found very interesting the argument of the Senator from Nebraska. He says there is one country which makes us quiver. As an American, I do not know of any country that makes me quiver or makes our country quiver.

The Senator has also said that the bill is not an accident. He is correct: the bill is not an accident. It was considered in the previous Congress. It has been and is being considered in this Congress. It was reported to the Senate unanimously by the District of Columbia Committee, as a result of the good, reasonable, deliberate consideration by the members of both parties who serve on that committee.

If the Senator wishes to go back to the date of introduction—and it is unusual, despite the precedent he cites in tax measures—to make this measure effective, there are a number of countries which would be, in effect, deprived of the opportunity to build chanceries, based on applications which have been approved by the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment, and not forced on that Board by the Department of State, as follows: Three independent nations are not yet represented in

Washington; namely, Burundi, Uganda, and Tanganyika. In addition, Kenya, the Rhodesias, and Gambia are slated for independence. Dahomey has not been successful in finding a chancery, and approximately 10 nations are contemplating new chanceries. They are Congo-Brazzaville, Congo-Léopoldville, Nigeria, Sudan, U.S.S.R., Kuwait, Spain, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, and Australia.

If Senators will read the report and study the bill, they will find that it was unanimously reported, is meritorious, and is not being forced on us by the State Department, but is the result of well deliberated considerations and debates on the part of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CURTIS. Let me say to the distinguished majority leader that if the Senator from Nebraska stated that this bill was no accident, but was deliberately planned he misspoke. What I intended to say was that this loophole is not an accident. It was not put in the bill because it was a difficult question to deal with and to find the right language. I say that there is a loophole to allow a particular country to escape from the application of the bill; and it is well known in this body that that is true.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator yield again?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That loophole, so-called, is something I cannot see through. It reads as follows:

> Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit the continued use as a chancery, chancery annex, or other business office of any building lawfully being used for that purpose on the date of enactment of this subsection, or to prohibit the making of ordinary repairs to any such building. This subsection shall not be administered in such a way as to discriminate against any foreign government on the basis of race, color, or creed of any of its citizens.

I see no loopholes there. It appears to me that it gives an opportunity to all who have chanceries, or who will have them on the date of the enactment of the measure, to continue to occupy and to repair such chanceries. It appears to me it does not discriminate against any foreign government on the basis of race, color, or creed. It sounds like good American doctrine.

Mr. CURTIS. The key words are "on the date of enactment." When will the bill be enacted? If anybody can tell me, I should like to know when Congress is to adjourn this year. I wish someone would tell me whether Congress is to take a Thanksgiving recess; also when the appropriation bills are to be enacted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be no Thanksgiving recess. So far as the day of adjournment is concerned, that is something for the Congress as a whole to decide. I do not know when the bill will be enacted.

Mr. CURTIS. The loophole exists in some undefined way—some time in the future. When they have decided they have come in under the loophole, they can line up the bill and send it to the President.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. In just a moment.

The purpose of the language is not to disturb anybody who is already established with a chancery in a residential section. It pretends to take care of those already there, so they do not have to move. But the provision is so written that any country can come in between now and the time the President signs the bill, and establish a chancery in a residential area; and that language protects them.

My amendment would strike out the key words "on the date of enactment of this subsection," and insert the words "January 31, 1963."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator have any objection to Spain, Sweden and Australia being considered on that basis?

Mr. CURTIS. No; I have no objection to any particular country, but I want them all treated alike. I want to follow a rule of law. If we are to enact legislation which provides that residential areas shall not be used for chanceries, I do not want anyone to be invested with authority to reward or punish or offend any country, regardless of which one it is. This is a bad precedent.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield briefly.

Mr. MILLER. I invite the Senator's attention to the following language in the committee report:

> In 1957, at the request of the District of Columbia Government, 21 foreign countries indicated their intention to construct or enlarge chanceries on 27 separate properties. Work has been completed on four of these and is in progress on one other.

Can the Senator tell us which one is in progress? Which country has a chancery which is in process of being constructed?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not know.

Mr. MILLER. Does the Senator mind my asking the Senator from New Hampshire, who is in charge of the bill?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. McINTYRE. To what page of the committee report did the Senator refer?

Mr. MILLER. I was referring to the middle of page 2 of the committee report. Which country is it which has a chancery that is now in process of being constructed?

Mr. McINTYRE. The chancery referred to is the chancery of West Germany.

Mr. MILLER. In the report it is stated that construction is in progress on only one other chancery.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McINTYRE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It happens that in the neighborhood in which I live there is one chancery in process of being constructed. That is the chancery of the Federal Republic of West Germany.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator. My question is this: If the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska is adopted, will the Republic of West Germany be able to occupy its chancery?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not know the state of the construction, or whether a part of the chancery has been occupied. However, following that line of reasoning, if the bill is passed by the Senate today and passed by the House tomorrow and signed by the President, without an amendment we would have the same situation. However, that is an entirely different problem. I suggest that my amendment would take care of it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McINTYRE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. This is no problem, because to the best of my knowledge this chancery has been under construction since before the date of the introduction of the now pending measure. Therefore it would not be affected.

Mr. MILLER. If that is so, as I read the bill, the chancery would not be included, because the bill provides:

> Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit the continued use as a chancery.

If this chancery is only in the process of being constructed, it is not being used as a chancery.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator knows that that would not be the case. We would not want to show such a discourtesy to another country. I point out that how these countries are treated may determine how other countries will treat our representatives who are accredited to those countries. So far as the chancery of the West German Republic is concerned, that chancery would not be, in my opinion, considered in the sense that the Senator states, so far as the legislation before us is concerned.

Mr. MILLER. I want to have the Republic of West Germany accorded all the courtesies possible.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would like to see the same courtesies extended to Spain, Sweden, and Australia.

Mr. MILLER. The specific language in the bill reads:

> Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit the continued use as a chancery.

It is not being used as a chancery if it is in process of construction.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course, it may not be used physically, but it is considered to be physically a chancery. A permit has been granted, and notice has been given. I suppose that preparations have been made to move furniture and other articles from the old chancery to the new one. It is a matter of courtesy, I am sure; and I know that the Senator from Iowa recognizes that fact.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator made reference to an application having been filed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Does he consider the mere filing of an application which has been approved by the Board of Zoning Adjustment to be in the same category as a chancery that is actually in being, or in process of construction?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Although I am not a member of the committee, it is my understanding that if an application has been filed and approved, and it has been done prior to the date of the enactment of the bill before us, the answer is yes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. CURTIS. This is something new. Where is there any language in the bill which suggests that if an application has been filed and approved, and no property has been purchased, and no building constructed, and the premises are not being used, the provisions of the bill would apply?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator twists this matter out of all proportion. If an application is filed and approved, it would be assumed that the applicant country has acquired an interest in the property which the United States fully intends to protect.

Mr. McINTYRE. The majority leader is absolutely correct. The bill would honor any application that was made.

Mr. CURTIS. That was made?

Mr. MANSFIELD. And approved.

Mr. McINTYRE. Made and approved.

Mr. CURTIS. Approved by whom?

Mr. MANSFIELD. By the Board of Zoning Adjustment.

Mr. McINTYRE. By the Board of Zoning Adjustment and by the Department of Licenses and Inspections. The bill has been carefully drawn so as not to affect any vested legal right. The Senator from Iowa, a brother attorney, knows that we do not intend either to add to or subtract from any vested right of any foreign nation which is in process of having a building under construction. If the chancery of West Germany is well under construction, there is no doubt that it will have the right to occupy it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The subsection also states:

> This subsection shall not be administered in such a way as to discriminate against any foreign government on the basis of race, color, or creed, of any of its citizens.

Mr. MILLER. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McINTYRE. I do not know whether I have the right to yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The picture becomes quite clear. The bill was introduced in the previous Congress. The committee held hearings on it on the very day that it was intended to report the bill. How does it happen that on that very day within 24 hours the Board of Zoning Adjustment granted an exception to a country to build a chancery in a residential area? The bill is designed to protect that exemption and to give it, in effect, a grandfather clause.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. It receives the same protection as a country which has a chancery and has moved into it and used it for a year or two. No one is being fooled. The purpose of this loophole is to take care of that situation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Unfortunately I am not a lawyer, and I cannot follow the Senator's reasoning. However, I assume that the Senator is not referring to the application of Spain, is he?

Mr. CURTIS. No; I am not.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Australia?

Mr. CURTIS. No; I am not. If the Senator wishes to know what country I am referring to, he should read the letter that is being circulated about the Chamber. It is a letter from the State Department arguing against my amendment. If he will look at the letter he will learn the country to which I am referring.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have not seen such a letter; nor would I be influenced by such a letter. I am being influenced by the fact that, by unanimous vote, both Republican and Democratic Senators on the Committee on the District of Columbia voted to report the bill to the Senate and gave it their full approval. I am very much interested in seeing to it that foreign countries whose representatives come here are given full consideration regardless of the race, color, or creed of its citizens. I am also very much interested in the welfare of Spain, Australia, and Sweden.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I share the Senator's high opinion of these countries. I have nothing against the people of any land. But I believe that equality before the law is a noteworthy American principle, even though it is sometimes disregarded.

Mr. President, I think the issue is quite clear. I believe Senators understand what they will be voting upon. I hope the majority leader will accept the amendment. I hope that it will not be tabled.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] to table the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] is absent on official business to attend the funeral of Hon. Hjalmar Nygaard.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I knew how the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] planned to vote, I would be glad to give him a live pair. I do not know how he expected to vote, so I call for the regular order.

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 23, as follows:

[No. 118 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Clark
Eastland
Ellender
Engle
Hart
Hartke
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—23

Allott
Bennett
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Ervin
Fong
Goldwater
Gore
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Mechem
Miller
Mundt
Russell
Scott
Simpson
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—18

Carlson
Case
Cooper
Dominick
Douglas
Edmondson
Fulbright
Gruening
Hayden
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
Moss
Prouty
Ribicoff
Stennis
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2513) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Mills, Mr. King of California, Mr. O'Brien of Illinois, Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin, and Mr. Baker were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, while a good many Senators are in the Chamber, I should like to ask the majority leader about the prospects of a session tomorrow and what the calendar of work may be.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the distinguished minority leader would give me a little time, I could answer more accurately; but, as of now, I would say that at the conclusion of action on the pending business, it is the intention of the leadership—and we have previously discussed this question, I say to Senators—to lay before the Senate Calendar No. 338, House bill 6016, authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and for other purposes. Whether the Senate will be in session tomorrow has not yet been determined; it would depend, I assume, on the possibility of events which may occur later today.

I shall be very happy to work most closely, as always, with the distinguished minority leader, to arrive at a judgment, and inform the Senate a little later in the afternoon as to the plans of the leadership.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in view of the discussion on the Senate floor at the opening of the session, I think the majority leader will be within the bounds of propriety—and I believe he should feel entirely free to do so—if he acquaints the membership with the problem which arose in connection with the possibility that a certain joint resolution might be introduced today. I would encourage him to give the Senate a little information on that matter, because it pertains to the railroad legislation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, earlier today the distinguished minority leader and I had a discussion about a joint resolution proposed to be introduced today. We decided that in view of possible developments, we should wait at least until tomorrow; and it was my latest impression—although I stand subject to correction—that that was where we left our discussion at that time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Earlier today there was discussion, particularly on the part of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], to the effect that he, together with other Senators, was prepared to introduce such a joint resolution today, if necessary, because of the deadline involved in the railroad legislation. Therefore, time is a factor; and I know it was the hope of the majority leader that the Senate could adjourn from today until at least Friday, and then over the weekend.

There is some information that I believe the committee might elicit this afternoon which would give the question a slightly different turn and determine whether or not the Senate should meet tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senate meets tomorrow, the area river basin bill will be the business of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. At least, the bill will be laid before the Senate.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASIN PLANS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Did I understand correctly the Senator to say that H.R. 6016 would be made as the pending business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. The calendar is so clean that at the moment it is the only bill which can be laid before the Senate.

Mr. MUNDT. In fairness to the majority leader, I think I should point out that the bill (H.R. 6016) contains one highly controversial feature which will require a considerable amount of time to discuss on the floor of the Senate unless it is modified. Here is one Senator who is going to employ every parliamentary procedure available to defeat this bill if its injustices are not amended out.

I call to the attention of Senators, both Democrats and Republicans, who represent any of the nine States in the Missouri River Basin that the final provision of the bill would have the effect of deauthorizing every project which was authorized under the Pick-Sloan plan, and which has been previously authorized by any other measure. Such a provision would be wholly unwise and totally unfair legislation. Senators from all the States in the Missouri River Basin should want to know exactly what is involved in the bill before they vote. As one Senator from a State in the Missouri River Basin, I expect to spend a considerable amount of time describing the totally unfair procedure, unless happily in the meantime an agreement can be reached with the committee which would eliminate the necessity of such discussion. I am preparing an amendment to knock out the objectionable provision and unless it is adopted I assure the Senate it is in for a very lengthy discussion—perhaps a "Southern style deliberation"—before H.R. 6016 can be acted upon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota makes a point of real significance when he says that the bill will be discussed at length. A number of Senators will wish to be heard on the last proviso.

Mr. MUNDT. Meanwhile I call to the attention of Senators representing States in the Missouri River Basin the language beginning on page 9, line 11, and ending on page 9, line 16. I do not know how that language crept into the bill, but it is there, and it ought to be eliminated before the remainder of the bill is accepted. It comprises a direct attack against the economic development of the nine Missouri River Basin States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have a happier solution. That would be to eliminate the bill tomorrow and be done with it. The bill represents a potential spending which would run into billions of dollars before we were through. I have not totaled the entire estimated amount for all the projects proposed, but some of them run up to $250 million or more. It would be a great idea to offer a motion to recommit the bill. It would break my heart to do so because my distinguished counterpart, the very distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], not for himself but for his State, has a project in the bill. Oddly enough, I have been called by the distinguished Governor of his State. I have been importuned, supplicated and entreated to oppose the Knowles Dam Project. So what does a hapless minority leader do in order to let everyone down gently? My remarks include, of course, Trotter Shoals, a project which would cost approximately $78 million. A motion to recommit would be a wonderful and expeditious way to dispose of this controversial measure by sending it back to the committee with the imprint "Requiescat in pace," meaning, "May it rest in peace."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have never accused the Senator from Illinois of bad judgment nor do I intend to now. On every occasion I have given the distinguished minority leader the benefit of the doubt just as he has done so to me. He has always been most fair and I have respect and affection for him. But in respect to the case about which he has spoken, the newspapers in Montana have reported, not that the Governor of Montana called the Senator from Illinois and asked for information and material, but rather that the Senator from Illinois called the Governor. The newspapers report that the Senator from Illinois would oppose the project, which is his right, and that he desired all the information he could get so that he could be in a better position to carry out the request, the order, or whatever it might be called, which had been made.

I feel fairly certain that my distinguished colleague, the minority leader, would not wish to see the entire bill recommitted. I would like to see the subject given careful and close consideration and a vote taken on the merits of the legislation and that I am sure will be done.

One of the questions which merits close and serious consideration is the point raised by my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from South Dakota

[Mr. MUNDT] as it affects the Missouri River basin. That question is entirely apart from the proposed Knowles Dam. The Missouri River basin is important to Montana. It covers two-thirds of our State. Knowles is in the Columbia River Basin in the western part of the State. That project also is important. So the Senator can see that the legislation relates as far as Montana is concerned, not merely to one particular project, but projects in two river basins—the two greatest river basins in the country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I did not call the Governor of Montana. But what has been said shows what happens when one campaigns in the great State of Montana, including the cities of Billings, Miles City, and Helena. I have campaigned in that State from one end to the other. I have come to know a great many of the people out there. I came to know the Governor. So he is always free to call me.

I would never wish to see the coup de grace administered to a measure until there had been full discussion. Then, Mr. President, if I succeeded, I would weep. But I would hope that I would succeed, because weeping endureth for a night, but joy cometh in the morning.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Only as a last resort would I feel compelled to join the Senator from Illinois in an effort to recommit the entire bill. I assume that the committee has done good and diligent work in determining which projects to authorize. However, if we were to adopt the policy which the Senator from Illinois has presented, it might be a good plan to deauthorize all projects which have been authorized, because of their multimillion-dollar potential. That would be one course of action, which, of course, I would resist.

But it would at least have the merit of being fair and objective. If we are to perform that kind of act of decapitation on our natural resources potential, I shall resist as hard as I can having the ax fall only on the nine States of the Missouri River Basin. If we are to deauthorize projects, I see no reason why we should pick out the Missouri River Basin and say, "We are going to start with your projects and fight this conflict only with Missouri River blood." I think we should look at the development programs with complete objectivity from the standpoint of the national interest. Surely a bill which selects nine States and in effect states, "For your States all projects are hereinafter deauthorized," is one which should give every Senator from that area cause not only to give the question careful scrutiny, but to do something on the floor of the Senate to see that that kind of injustice is not perpetrated on the nine States individually and the whole area collectively.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, my interest is far more universal than that of my friend from South Dakota. I am not merely interested in serving the States in the Missouri River Basin. I wish to serve all the States of the Union. What bothers me is the atomic hole that we continue to blow into the budget of this country when we are now up to $100 billion in our cash budget already. All we have to do is to look at the total for all of the projects, and then add to that total what will be required in future years. Senators will observe that we would add a ghastly commitment to the authorizations in the budget of the country. That point is of paramount interest, because I have felt that we ought to take some time to consider the budget of the country, the deficit of payments, and all the make-shift proposals that come day after day in order to keep this country solvent and moving in the proper direction.

THE RAILROAD RULES DISPUTE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, while Senators are in the Chamber, I think they should realize what was discussed earlier today. The threat of a railroad strike continues. It continues as of midnight on Monday, unless something is done about it or unless the railroads decide to pull down their notice that they will put into effect the work rules, which is in effect a strike notice. I do not say that they are right or wrong in this situation at all. That would be most unfair.

We face a serious deadline. As I suggested earlier in the day, we can request a delay, on the part of the Congress, by concurrent resolution. We can state that we would appreciate it very much if the railroads would relieve the Congress of that particular deadline by allowing a reasonable period—say a maximum of 30 days—or we may have to act affirmatively to head off a strike, which we can do by passing section 5 of the bill which the President sent to the Congress, standing alone, which would impose a standstill.

I do not think we should assume for a minute that this is a light matter. Notwithstanding the President's message, notwithstanding the introduction of the joint resolution, and notwithstanding the reference of the joint resolution to committee, we face a railroad strike next Monday at midnight. We shall have to do something about it, unless we are taken off that difficult situation by action by the railroads themselves. I say, with all humility—though I think it is a pretty general opinion—that we should not be driven to act by Monday night.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have noted a press dispatch on the Associated Press ticker, which indicates that the railroads have deferred for 30 days the placing in effect of the amended rules. I interpreted that to mean an allowance of an additional 30 days to the Congress. I may be mistaken, but I noted a dispatch to that effect on the ticker. The Senator may be interested sufficiently to look at it.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I do not believe that statement is accurate. I am sure it is correct, so far as the senior Senator from Florida stated it, but a moment ago I was talking with one of the representatives of the carriers, making the same point that the Senator from New York is now making—what a terrible thing it would be for the country if the parties went forward with their plans—and I was informed the carriers are to have a meeting tomorrow morning at 8 o'clock in order to determine exactly what they will do.

It was rather specifically stated by this man, at that particular time, that they have some doubt as to whether they will be able to accede to the wishes expressed by the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the other body and the able Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], that they defer for 30 days the imposition of their work rules.

Mr. JAVITS. I have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the form of a resolution which could be utilized—I would hope by the majority leader and minority leader—to effect that request on the part of the Congress. It bears upon the need to stay close to the scene of action at this moment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, all I can say is——

Mr. GORE. A point of order, Mr. President. Senators are not in their seats, and other Senators cannot hear the proceedings.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a point of order. I insist that Senators speak from their seats.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield for the point of order?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there is no such rule of order, but I am glad to return to my seat.

The dispatch on the Associated Press ticker may or may not be as far reaching as I interpret it to be; but as I interpreted it, it stated there would be a 30-day delay in the enforcement of new work rules by the railroads. I hope that that is correct. I judge, from what my distinguished colleague [Mr. SMATHERS] has said, that there is at least a serious question as to whether that has been done. At any rate, the dispatch on the ticker must speak for itself.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask Senators to bear with me so that the pending bill may be read the third time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may we finish this colloquy? Will the Senator yield to me for 30 seconds?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Earlier today I said that I would submit the resolution before the Senate concluded its business today. I will not do so. I will, of course, cooperate with the leadership.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is what I would expect the Senator to do.

LOCATION OF CHANCERIES OR OFFICES OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS IN CERTAIN RESIDENTIAL AREAS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 646) to prohibit the location of chanceries or other business offices of foreign governments in certain residential areas in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 646) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader what will be the business tomorrow, if any? Will the Senate meet tomorrow? Has that question been decided?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It has not been decided definitely. As of now, the prospect is that the Senate will meet tomorrow. I can only state that much definitely. The distinguished minority leader and I will get together later today to see what can be done. If there is a meeting tomorrow, it will be for the purpose of carrying out a certain procedure.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In other words, Senators cannot be sure what will be the pending business, if the Senate does meet?

Mr. MANSFIELD. We know what the business will be. It will be H.R. 6016, the so-called river basins bill. But no action will be taken on that bill tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think now is the time to spend a minute or two discussing the problem before this body, because we might as well face it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator will do so, I should like to defer that until the pending bill is passed.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Iowa briefly, and then I will yield to the Senator from Oregon for a longer time.

LOCATION OF CHANCERIES OR OFFICES OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS IN CERTAIN RESIDENTIAL AREAS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 646) to prohibit the location of chanceries or other business offices of foreign governments in certain residential areas in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I do not propose to offer an amendment to the pending bill. I regret that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] was tabled. It is not that I necessarily agree with the amendment, but I think the Senator from Nebraska performed a service in bringing to the attention of the Senate a defect in the bill.

After the colloquy, I find that the language of the bill does not quite state what it was supposed to state. The bill before the Senate reads:

> Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit the continued use as a chancery, chancery annex, or other business office of any building lawfully being used for that purpose on the date of enactment of this subsection.

As a result of the colloquy, I find that actually the intention of the sponsors of the bill is that the bill should read:

> Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit the continued use as a chancery, lawfully being used for that purpose, or being constructed for that purpose, or for which an application for that purpose has been approved by the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment.

If that is indeed the intention of the bill, I think the least the committee could do would be to have language such as that written specifically into the bill.

I shall not offer an amendment on that subject. I leave it up to the Senator in charge of consideration of the bill to do what he wishes in that regard. I suggest that if the Senator who has charge of consideration of the bill really hopes to see the bill enacted he should get it in better shape as to language than it is now, because if he does not do so I doubt very much that the bill will be accepted on the other side of the Capitol. It will have to be sent back with language changes.

I have nothing further to say in that regard. I do not think that the mere fact that a committee reports a bill unanimously means that the bill is in perfect shape. The colloquy we have heard this afternoon indicates that it is a very poor job of drafting and is not in the tradition of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I disagree with what the Senator said about the bill being a poor job of drafting, and raising questions about the ability of the committee which handled this legislation.

We all know that serving on the Committee on the District of Columbia in this body is not the most desirable assignment for any Senator. Senators who serve on that committee do a good job in looking after the interests of the metropolitan area, which, in terms of votes and being returned to office, mean nothing whatever to them.

I am especially proud of any unanimous vote in that particular committee, because I know what it means to serve on that committee.

The Senator from Iowa has performed a service by his remarks, because they will be a part of the RECORD. They will be taken to conference. They will be studied by Members on the other side of the Capitol. I think the end result will be far more beneficial than would have been the case had the Senator remained silent.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Montana.

As a former member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I recognize the truth of what the Senator from Montana said about service on the District of Columbia Committee.

I repeat what I said the other day on this floor in connection with consideration of another bill. If Senators do not have it within themselves to pay attention to legislation affecting the District of Columbia, to whom can the people of the District of Columbia look? I think it behooves every one of us to try to do the best possible job of legislating. When we detect a defect in a bill, it behooves the Senator in charge of consideration of the bill and the committee itself to recognize the fact that we are trying to help to do the best job possible.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. McINTYRE. I thank the distinguished legal authority from Iowa. The point he has made is well taken. We will be happy to try to settle that question in conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida.

THE RAILROAD RULES DISPUTE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a few minutes ago, in a colloquy with the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], I commented that I had noted on the ticker tape of the Associated Press a dispatch indicating that the railroads had delayed or agreed to delay posting new work rules for 30 days.

I have that dispatch. I do not vouch for its authenticity, because I have no other means of knowing whether it is authentic or not, but I should like to include it in the RECORD. It reads as follows:

> NEW YORK.—The Columbia Broadcasting System reported today that the Nation's railroads have decided to delay posting new work rules for 30 days, thus averting a threatened strike Tuesday.
>
> On the CBS radio network, News Correspondent Robert Pierpoint said White House sources had disclosed that the railroads had agreed to hold the new rules in abeyance for another month.
>
> Previously the railroads had said the revised work rules would go into effect at a minute after midnight next Tuesday. Five rail unions have threatened to walk out once the rules are applied.

That ends the dispatch. I wished to place it in the RECORD to illuminate the statement I made some time ago.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that one member of the committee wishes to be heard on the pending bill before passage. Unfortunately, he has been called out of the Chamber on a matter of importance and will not return for a minute or so.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I can take the minute or so, if the Senator will yield to me in order to introduce a bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield for that purpose.

(Mr. SPARKMAN introduced a bill to amend the Clayton Act, the statement on which appears elsewhere in the Record.)

LOCATION OF CHANCERIES OR OFFICES OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS IN CERTAIN RESIDENTIAL AREAS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 646) to prohibit the location of chanceries or other business offices of foreign governments in certain residential areas in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, since this bill is to be passed on a voice vote, I feel constrained to state, in a few words, my reason for opposing it. I note that the bill was unanimously reported by the committee. I note that Senators who managed the bill on the floor have correctly stated that the objective of the bill is only to regularize our municipal life by prohibiting the establishment of new chanceries in residential districts, and, that it has nothing whatever to do with anything that could bear upon discriminatory practices. But inasmuch as the bill would change regulations that have heretofore obtained, and inasmuch as numbers of chanceries have been established in certain residential areas, pursuant to these regulations, the practical effect of the bill will be to exclude new countries which are seeking chanceries, most of which happen to be African countries. It is for this reason, I understand, that the State Department does not support the bill.

I know of the great sensitivity of these new African countries, and the importance in Washington of conducting our affairs in such a way as not to give the impression, however erroneously founded, that we are engaging in practices that have the effect of discriminating against Negro countries. I personally feel that the bill is not in our best national interest, and that the municipal advantages to be served by the bill do not balance the losses that may be suffered by reason of the interpretation that I fear will be given to it. So weighing the national interest against that of the municipality, I wish to be recorded against the bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator may have the floor in his own right.

Mr. KEATING. I wish only to say that I agree with the distinguished Senator, for the very reasons which he has stated. While I realize that there is no intention on the part of members of the committee or others to discriminate, I feel that the passage of the bill at this very time may be construed, unfortunately, by some of the smaller countries as discriminatory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 646) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act providing for the zoning of the District of Columbia and the regulation of the location, height, bulk, and uses of buildings and other structures and the uses of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved June 20, 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number in section 6 and by adding at the end of such section the following new subsection:

"(b) After the date of enactment of this subsection, no foreign government shall be permitted to construct, alter, repair, convert, or occupy any building for use as a chancery, chancery annex, or other business office of such foreign government on any land, regardless of the date of acquisition thereof, within a residence district established pursuant to this Act, except on the same basis as in the case of the construction, alteration, repair, conversion, or occupancy of a similar building by a United States citizen or entity. Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit the continued use as a chancery, chancery annex, or other business office of any building lawfully being used for that purpose on the date of enactment of this subsection, or to prohibit the making of ordinary repairs to any such building. This subsection shall not be administered in such a way as to discriminate against any foreign government on the basis of the race, color, or creed of any of its citizens."

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the title will be appropriately amended.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to prohibit the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in any residential area in the District of Columbia."

COMMENDATION OF SENATOR McINTYRE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I commend and congratulate the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], who twice within the space of a week has been responsible for passing in this body controversial bills reported from the District of Columbia Committee. He has rendered an excellent service, and has comported himself with dignity, understanding, and tolerance. I am indeed happy to say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] that he has rendered a great service, and has done it in the best tradition of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to join the distinguished majority leader in congratulating the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] for his very able handling of the chancery bill. I am delighted with the passage of the bill. I am sure any differences that will develop in the House can be adjusted in conference. For the first time we now have a uniform policy in the District of Columbia that is of a nondiscriminatory nature and will be fair to all countries concerned.

The very heart of the bill, so far as its uniform policy is concerned, is due to the leadership of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall], in what became known, in our discussion of the bill, as the Beall amendment, which provided for a uniform rule equally applicable to all.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASIN PLANS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 338, House bill 6016.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by the title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 6016) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments.

THE RAILROAD RULES DISPUTE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the majority leader, I wish to discuss briefly the very serious responsibility that confronts it in connection with the railroad labor dispute. The Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] has placed in the Record an Associated Press dispatch which justifies the conclusion that the carriers have postponed for 30 days the application of the work rules.

Since he put it in the Record I have been in consultation with both the White House and the Department of Labor, and neither the White House nor the Department of Labor has received official notice of any such character from the carriers. We are hoping that within the next few minutes we can have official word from the carriers themselves, because they have been asked to supply it.

This may be my last opportunity to discuss this subject before the Senate adjourns today. Therefore I wish most respectfully to make certain suggestions to the majority leader and the minority leader; namely, that they plan, if necessary, to have the Senate meet tomorrow and lay aside all business for further consideration, if it becomes necessary, of the resolution calling upon the carriers to postpone for a 30-day period the application of their work rules. I do not believe it will be necessary, for I have such confidence in the carriers that I am satisfied that they will realize that, although this is a costly request from their standpoint, they nevertheless have a public trust and a public obligation to oblige Congress in regard to this matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I assure the distinguished Senator from Oregon that so far as the leadership is concerned, the Senate will meet tomorrow, if nothing develops, and will be prepared to go ahead with the plan that has been discussed today.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE RAILROAD RULES DISPUTE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in fairness to the carriers, it must be noted for the RECORD that the carriers have cooperated with every agency of Government, with all the boards and commissions of this Government which, since 1949, have been appointed to give consideration to the difficult and vexing dispute which has arisen between the carriers and the brotherhoods. They agreed to go along with the Rifkind Commission report; they agreed to go along with the report of the Rosenman Commission; they agreed to go along with what became known as the Wirtz recommendation—the proposal which was made by the Secretary of Labor; they indicated their willingness to go along with the President's recent proposal for the settlement of the dispute; and they agreed to go along with the recommendation of the President that Mr. Justice Goldberg be appointed to arbitrate the dispute on a voluntary basis.

Therefore, when I speak about the problem which now confronts the carriers, I speak out of a great feeling of appreciation and respect for what has been their procedural fairness. I speak out of great appreciation for the position the carriers have taken procedurally. I emphasize "procedurally," because I am in no position to pass a valid judgment on the substantive issues involved in the dispute. Procedurally, the carriers have cooperated with the Government at every step of the way whenever the Government has asked for cooperation on the part of the carriers.

A message has just reached me from the carriers. Apparently the ticker story is in error. The railroads have made no statement which would cancel putting the work rules into effect next Tuesday.

Therefore I now make this plea to the carriers: I can well understand their dissatisfaction with further delay. However, it will be less costly to them in the long run, because I do not need to tell the carriers what even a short strike will cost them. Moreover, there are considerations that rise above our own individual, selfish economic interests; namely, the good of our country, and the public interest.

I have made this plea to the brotherhoods in the past weeks, as I have pleaded with them not to make the mistaken judgment of attempting to settle on the picket lines a set of issues which are not susceptible of being settled on the picket lines, unless they want to defend going back to jungle law in economic disputes. We ought to settle this dispute by the application of rules of reason, by taking the economic evidence involved in connection with this substantive issue and in connection with the jobs that are involved in the dispute. A good many substantive work rules are involved.

If there ever was a case, in my work in the field of labor relations, that calls for settlement, first around the collective bargaining table, then around the mediation table, and then around the voluntary arbitration table, this is it.

These offers have been made to the brotherhoods, and they have adamantly refused them each time.

What has the President done? He sent to Congress a proposed joint resolution. Interestingly enough much of the heart of the proposed bill goes back to the Washington agreement. The Washington agreement went on the statute books because of the active support and urging of the railroad brotherhoods of this Nation. The President is asking that a large part of the Washington agreement and the procedures thereunder be used in the determination of the present case.

Earlier this year various labor groups asked me to submit an amendment to the mass transit bill. I offered that amendment, because in my judgment they were right on the merits. The brotherhoods were among those who urged the senior Senator from Oregon to offer that amendment to the mass transit bill. There was quite a debate on the floor of the Senate, as the Presiding Officer will remember. There was anything but unanimity on it. The final vote showed that we never did get uniformity, but that we adopted the Morse amendment by a substantial majority vote.

I say most respectfully to the brotherhoods that if that procedure was good enough with respect to the mass transit bill, it is good enough now in respect to the work rule issue.

Let us remember that under the Washington agreement the Interstate Commerce Commission has jurisdiction over matters of job security in connection with railroad mergers. I did not hear the brotherhoods crying about compulsory arbitration when they were urging the Washington agreement procedure for rail mergers and mass transit problems.

We cannot have government by law unless the law is enforced. I suppose it can be said that when the law is enforced compulsion is being used. It is a pretty lame argument the brotherhoods are making by trying to label a procedure that keeps swinging the doors of collective bargaining and mediation opportunity on their part for a 2-year period. This is only an interim procedure which is recommended by the President of the United States. The doors of arbitration and mediation would be kept swinging for 2 years. Any agreement reached by collective bargaining and mediation, or by a voluntary arbitration proposal, within 2 years would set aside any ruling of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I say to the brotherhoods that the time has come when the American people have a right to expect from their Congress that the public interest be protected in this railroad dispute. The statistical facts laid down by the President of the United States in his magnificent message cannot be answered by the brotherhoods. The brotherhoods cannot deny the fact that 1 month's strike would cost the economy of this country a billion dollars.

Do not talk to me about rights. I yield to no one in defense of the right to strike. But the right to strike must be exercised in the light of the rights of others. When we are dealing with a case which by its very substantive nature ought to be settled not on the picket line, by the use of the jungle law, and the use of economic force, but by means of minds applying reason to the facts, I say to my friends in the brotherhoods: "You are making a great mistake in judgment. You are doing not only the house of railroad labor, but the house of free labor in the United States, a great injustice, particularly when you take into account another part of the President's masterful, statesmanlike proposal for the settlement of this dispute."

The President recognizes, and he has told the American people so in this great message that the time has come when Congress must grapple with the problem of automation in this country. The President recognizes, as I am sure an overwhelming majority of the representatives of the people in Congress recognize, that all the costs of automation should not be borne by industry, and not all the losses of automation should be borne by free labor.

Mr. President, you and I and all the rest of the American people have a stake in automation, because we are the beneficiaries of it. We cannot turn back the clock. Progress must continue. We cannot justify further make-work rules. We cannot justify further economic waste merely to keep men on jobs, because such a program is uneconomic. It is not in the public interest, and it is not in the long-time best interest of American workers.

In 1938 I wrote the first decision against a make-work program in the maritime industry along the west coast. I did it under a voluntary arbitration agreement. It resulted in ending the economic waste of making work in that industry, and the whole working force of the industry soon became the beneficiary. It is interesting to observe that when economic waste is eliminated from an industry that is involved in make-work programs, called by some persons by the ugly name "featherbedding," it costs workers jobs in their totality. But when make-work procedures are eliminated, efficiency and production are increased; more jobs are produced in a short period of time.

I do not know the substantive facts with respect to the desirable modification of the work rules in the railroad industry, as they affect jobs; that is a matter of proof. But the President has provided a procedure which would make it possible for the parties to present their proof; and also, in keeping with our system of government by law, he has provided for a decision by a body which Congress created years ago to regulate the railroad industry.

Early next week, when I discuss this subject further, I shall read to the Senate excerpt after excerpt from the debates in the Senate and House of Representatives when the Interstate Commerce Commission was created. Statement after statement by the proponents of the bill which established the Interstate Commerce Commission said, in effect, that there is a responsibility to use the Commission's procedures in order to prevent unnecessary strikes. In my judgment, one of the reasons why there have been fewer railroad strikes since 1910, I suppose, than I have digits on one of my hands, is that we have been dealing with a group of workers who are not exceeded by any other group of workers in the Nation from the standpoint of their sense of public responsibility.

I refuse to believe that such clear-headed judgment will not return to the leadership of the brotherhoods before it is too late. I refuse to believe that the leaders of the brotherhoods propose to throw this country into a stalemate economic blockade rather than have a decision on the substantive issues involved in the dispute, a decision that would be reached in accordance with our legal procedures of enforcement, without which there cannot be a government by law. These are critical hours for both parties to the dispute.

The President has announced that a Commission on Automation will be created, and some of us propose to support the President by giving congressional sanction to it by making it a Commission created by Congress as well as by the President. It will have the responsibility within the next 2 years of proposing to Congress and placing upon Congress the necessity for passing such legislation as will provide that economic justice is done to workers who are victimized by unstoppable automation.

It is not unusual for me to find both sides angry at me in a major labor dispute. If ever I was convinced of the soundness of my procedural position in any labor dispute, I am convinced of its soundness in this dispute.

So I plead with the chiefs of the railroad brotherhoods: "Take a look at your holecard. In my judgment, you will find it to be a deuce, not an ace, if you bring about a strike that would cost the people of the country a billion dollars or more a month, that would put more than 6 million fellow workers out of work, that would have an adverse effect on the balance-of-payments situation, that would disrupt the Nation's economy. It would not serve any worker in the country well."

I need not tell the railroad brotherhoods that as the strike proceeds, they will soon discover that those in Congress who they thought would stand behind them in that kind of economic warfare will receive messages clear and loud from back home: "We elected you to serve the public first." Members of Congress should heed that prediction now, because that is what will happen.

In closing, I say to the carriers that I hope that when the Committee on Commerce meets tonight at 7 o'clock, and the acting chairman, the able Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], asks the carriers, as I understand he will ask them, if they are willing to postpone for a month the posting of their work rules, the answer of the carriers will be that they will accede to the desire of the two chairmen. The same question has already been asked of them by the chairman of the House committee this morning, and the leadership of both Houses of Congress have already made clear to the carriers that that is the desire of the leadership. I cannot speak for the Congress; but I can express my view as to what undoubtedly would be the attitude and opinion of Members of Congress if the carriers were to do that and if on that question there were to be a yea-and-nay vote among Members of Congress.

Of course, the carriers have the same right the brotherhoods have to resort to economic warfare—which, in essence, it would be; in essence, the carriers would be following the economic struggle route, rather than the route whereby good judgment and reason prevail. A very serious situation in Congress could be avoided if tonight in the committee the representatives of the carriers would give an affirmative answer to the respectful request of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] that they postpone for 30 days the posting of the working rules, until Congress can take action, following calm deliberation.

But assuming for the moment that their decision is otherwise, then, I repeat—and the majority leader has indicated very clearly, and so has the minority leader, I understand, that he shares the same point of view—when we meet tomorrow, the joint resolution providing for a 30-day postponement will be offered. I do not think it will take very long to pass it, and then send it to the House of Representatives; but that would be a most unfortunate mistake in judgment on the part of the carriers, for I believe it would tarnish the record of cooperation they have made in this case. It is one which they cannot justify tarnishing, from the standpoint of the best interests of their stockholders, and also of the American people generally, for, after all, their industry is vested with a public interest. I respectfully remind them that, after all, each one of us owns a small part of the railroads of the Nation, even though we may not own a single share of their stock, for in a very real sense over the years the railroads have been the recipients of the largess of the Treasury of the United States in a variety of ways—and they should be. But, after all, the various subsidy programs of which they have been the beneficiaries over the years raise—in my judgment—some obligations of public responsibility, which I am sure they appreciate and understand.

Mr. President, I know the representatives of the carriers, as I know the representatives of the brotherhoods; and I know them to be outstanding industrial statesmen. In 1941, I lived with them for about 6 weeks, along with the chiefs of the brotherhoods, when we settled an exceedingly difficult railroad dispute; and I formed great admiration for the leadership of the carriers. Many of them are still leaders of the carriers. I want them to know that in the remarks I have just made I intended no reflection, but intended only to state to them what I know to be the realities of the situation which confronts them.

So, Mr. President, as a friend, I plead with them to accept the suggestion which will be made to them—namely, voluntarily to lay aside their plan to post their new working rules on Tuesday morning—thus precipitating a strike, for they know that would be a certainty—and also to follow the course of action I have suggested, so the elected representatives of our free people in the Congress of the United States can handle deliberately, calmly, and with wisdom, this railway legislation request of the President.

Last of all, let me say to the carriers that this proposal is not one for dilatory tactics or delay. If I ever become convinced that Congress was not going to act within the 1-month period, I will be the first to suggest that we withdraw our request for continuation of the postponement, for the carriers are also entitled to fair treatment from the Congress. In my judgment, if the carriers oblige in this matter, Congress must make railway legislation its primary, major piece of business until a final decision, one way or the other, is reached by Congress.

I would that I had not felt it necessary to make the speech I have just made, for if I had not made it, probably I would have more friends among both the brotherhoods and the carriers. But if I had not made it, I would not have been a true friend to either the brotherhoods or the carriers. Time will prove that I have rendered them a service by my plea that the brotherhoods reconsider their adamant opposition to the magnificent proposal that the President has made, and that the carriers recognize that if they decide not to follow this advice, they will have made a mistake which will tarnish the record they have made of splendid cooperation with their government in trying to resolve this difference short of economic action.

I yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the

following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 1933. An act to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," as amended, with respect to the minimum age limitation for registration;

H.R. 4646. An act to declare a portion of the Benton Harbor Canal, Benton Harbor, Mich., a nonnavigable stream; and

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY AND WITHDRAWAL FROM SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on June 27, the Washington Post and other newspapers published an advertisement entitled "We, Too, Protest." This advertisement was an attack on the Government of President Ngo Dinh Diem, of South Vietnam, and upon the effort of the United States to assist South Vietnam to resist Communist efforts to take over the country by military means. On July 2, I pointed out on the Senate floor that the advertisement was false and either distorted or ignored the facts. I further pointed out that no evidence whatsoever had been produced to support the flimsy charges listed in this advertisement over the names of Protestant, Jewish, or Buddist clergymen.

Yesterday I received a letter from Mr. Harold F. Erickson, an American citizen now living in Saigon, Vietnam, where he is engaged as a writer on a private research contract in South Vietnam. Mr. Erickson enclosed an open letter to the signers of the June 27 advertisement. In the letter he refutes conclusively every charge made, and points out the tragic results of propaganda pieces such as this, signed by clergymen.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter to me from Mr. Harold F. Erickson, dated July 17, and the open letter addressed to Dr. Donald S. Harrington, of the Ministers' Vietnam Committee, dated July 15, 1963, be printed in the Congressional Record following my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Saigon, Vietnam,
July 17, 1963.

Hon. Strom Thurmond,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Thurmond: I was gratified to read in the July 11 Times of Vietnam an extract of your speech to the Senate on the subject of the Ministers' Vietnam Committee. I think this misguided group should (1) publish a formal retraction of its newspaper advertisement entitled "We, Too, Protest," and (2) be disbanded.

The enclosed letter on the subject of the shocking and ill-advised advertisement might be of interest to you. I have sent copies of it to the President, to Ambassador-designate Lodge, to Senators Mansfield and Engle, to the 11 prominent ministers who signed the advertisement, and to the editors of 7 major newspapers in the United States.

Sincerely yours,
Harold F. Erickson.

Open Letter to Ministers' Vietnam Committee

Saigon, Vietnam,
July 15, 1963.

Rev. Dr. Donald S. Harrington,
Secretary, Ministers' Vietnam Committee,
New York, N. Y.

Dear Dr. Harrington: I was shocked and dismayed by your full-page advertisement headed "We, Too, Protest" in the New York Times international edition of June 28, 1963.

I have been in Vietnam for 4 months working as a technical writer on a private research institute contract with a U.S. Army unit whose function is to observe, interpret, and report on military operations in Vietnam. Since the military and political aspects of the counterinsurgency war being fought here cannot be separated, I find that I deal with as much information of a political nature as I do that of a military nature.

The sources of the information I receive are in Saigon, in the strategic hamlets, and in the countryside where the war is being fought. They are military and civilian; Vietnamese and American; Catholic, Protestant, and Buddhist. I have been with the operating forces in the field, have visited the residents of the strategic hamlets, and have interviewed many informed people in Saigon. For the most part, these sources are reliable. They are, at least, on the scene.

I came to Vietnam with no preconceived ideas of the military, political, moral, or religious issues involved here, and I have been careful to maintain my objectivity, as this is a prerequisite of my job and a duty to the institute of which I am a member.

I can only conclude, on the basis of the information I have been privileged to obtain, that your advertisement shows an appalling lack of factual evidence, an incredible naivete, and an irresponsible disregard of the consequences of lending the names of eminent Protestant and Buddhist ministers and Jewish rabbis to this spurious and ill-advised cause.

I can honestly, and with the authority based on factual evidence, state that all four enumerated points in your protest are gross misrepresentations, tantamount to unjust and inflammatory propaganda that can benefit only the cause of communism.

Your first protest: "Our country's military aid to those who denied him (the Buddhist monk who set himself on fire) religious freedom" indicates a simple unawareness of the facts of the case. The self-immolation of the Venerable Thich Quang Duc did indeed take place, and photographs of the burning monk had an electrifying effect on world opinion. But the motives behind the act are obscure. The tragedy was heightened by the fact that the sacrifice was needless. There is not now, nor has there ever been, any denial of religious freedom to Buddhists in Vietnam.

The first demand by the General Association of Buddhists (the organization that staged the recent Saigon demonstrations) was that the Buddhists be permitted to fly their own flag. In the first place, there is no recognized flag of Buddhism, as such; the flag in question is that of the General Association of Buddhists, an organization that by no means represents Buddhism in general or Vietnamese Buddhism in particular. Since 1957 there has been a Government order with respect to the precedence of the national flag over all other flags (similar to the traditional, formal treatment of the American flag). This order was first invoked against Catholics in Vietnam. At the dedication of a new Catholic church in Hué early this year, papal flags were flown. They were ordered to be hauled down and replaced by national flags. The Catholics acquiesced.

Another of the General Association of Buddhists' demands was freedom of worship. There has, in fact, been no suppression of Buddhist services or observances, private or public. It is also interesting to note that one-fourth of all the existing Buddhist pagodas in Vietnam have been built since the Diem government came to power; another fourth have been rehabilitated during this time; and the Diem government has granted 9 million piasters ($125,000) for these projects. The President himself donated 600,000 piasters ($8,300) toward construction of the Xa Loi Pagoda in Saigon (the very pagoda to which the charred body of the Venerable Thich Quang Duc was taken). This is indeed a strange way to deny religious freedom.

Religious freedom also presumably implies the absence of discrimination in political and military appointments. A footnote to your advertisement, taken from a New York Times editorial of June 17, 1963, states that most high government officials and military officers are Catholics. Another error in fact. The majority of high government officials, including the Vice President and Secretary of State, are Buddhist, not Catholics; of the 19 generals in the Vietnamese Army, only 3 are Catholics.

Your second protest: "The immoral spraying of parts of South Vietnam with crop-destroying chemicals and the herding of many of its people into concentration camps called strategic hamlets" shows a callous disregard for the true significance of these projects. The crop-destroying chemicals are used for two purposes: (1) Selective destruction of crops in areas known to be occupied only by Vietcong guerrillas; and (2) of greater importance, as a means of clearing dense vegetation from either side of arterial roads in Vietnam in order to cut down the opportunities for Vietcong guerrillas to hide and ambush highway traffic. I'm sure you are aware of the high incidence and brutality of these ambushes. Innocent civilians (including Protestant missionaries, Catholic priests and nuns, and schoolchildren) as well as military personnel in convoys have been killed on the roads leading to and from Saigon. Thanks to the crop-destroying chemicals, these same roads are now relatively safe. It is indeed unfortunate that such a measure must be taken, but without any doubt it has saved hundreds of lives, and at the expense of a band of vegetation 100 yards or so deep on either side of some roads. (Our own freeway projects do infinitely more damage to the landscape, crops, and roadside businesses.)

As for the strategic hamlets, your statement that they are "concentration camps" is absurd. The strategic hamlet program is a truly inspiring patriotic effort on the part of all who are involved in their construction, and they may well be the deciding factor in this very real war against communism. For the first time, the people of rural Vietnam have some security against the Vietcong terrorists who, before the strategic hamlets came into being, roamed the countryside at will, living off the defenseless farmers. The hamlets deny the Vietcong access to one of its primary sources of food supply.

Apparently it must be pointed out that the strategic hamlets are built and fortified by the people who live in them; no one is forced to move into these villages; and the inhabitants are free to come and go as they please. Typically, the farmers who live in the hamlets tend their fields or rice paddies outside the hamlets in the daytime, and retire at night to the hamlets, with their harvested crops, for security.

Other benefits accrue: Because of the community life to which some of these agrarian people have, for the first time, been exposed, a real grassroots democracy is being formed. The residents of the hamlets are electing their own officials and making their own laws. Public welfare projects are being given a practical focus formerly impossible for the scattered rural population. With American material aid and technical assistance, wells are being dug, bridges built, and dispensaries and schools constructed. These are concentration camps?

Your third protest: "The loss of American lives and billions of dollars to bolster a regime universally regarded as unjust, undemocratic, and unstable" is fatuous. What, precisely, does the term "universally regarded" mean? Obviously, there is opposition in Vietnam to the Diem government. But my experience and observations have been that this opposition is by no means universal here, where it matters most. And what of the attitude of my own Government? If opposition to the Government of Vietnam were truly universal, it seems illogical that the representative government of the United States would bolster it. And certainly your committee would be the first to admit that the Diem government is at least tolerated by the Catholic Church, the most numerous of Christian denominations.

Then we should examine the words "unjust," "undemocratic," and "unstable."

Most certainly we could find examples of gross injustice in the Diem government—or any other government, or any other human institution, for that matter. We can also find examples of justice and wisdom and a dozen other virtues. It is useless to debate the point here.

As for undemocratic, the Government of Vietnam is quite definitely not a democratic form of government as we know it, but it does not pretend to be. It is known as "personalism"—a term little known or understood by Americans. A personalistic government is to the right of center politically and to the left of center economically. It might well be the most effective and most desirable form of government for this new nation at this particular stage of its development. In any event, personalism is compatible with the basic tenents of democracy, of Christianity, of Buddhism, and of Judaism. It is not compatible, however, with atheistic communism.

"Unstable?" The Diem government has been in power for 9 years—since Vietnam was divided by the Geneva accords in 1954. There is no sign, in Vietnam at least, that the government is on the verge of collapse. Describing a government as unstable, when it has been in power the equivalent of more than two of our own presidential terms, seems irrational. It might be of interest to point out here that early this year (February) the Diem government proclaimed a national policy of open arms (chieu hoi) to induce defections from the ranks of the Vietcong. In less than 5 months more than 7,300 people have returned from the Communist fold. Defections in the opposite direction during the same period have been negligible. Quite an accomplishment for a tottering government.

Your fourth protest: "The fiction that this is fighting for freedom" is morally reprehensible. If the fight against communism—and therefore for freedom is going on any place in the world today, that place is Vietnam.

Mr. Roger Hilsman, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, has said "Vietnam is the testing ground for Communist guerrilla strategy. Vietnam's twilight war may rank as one of the decisive battles of world history. An effective counter against these guerrilla tactics could be quite decisive to Western strategy in southeast Asia and eventually Africa and Latin America."

It is apparent to those of us living in Vietnam that the American troops who are risking their lives in support of this counterinsurgency war realize, quite literally, that they are "fighting for freedom."

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD F. ERICKSON.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD ACTIONS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on May 13, 1963, a representation election was held at the direction of the National Labor Relations Board in the Utica-Herbrand Tool Division of Kelsey-Hayes plant in Orangeburg, S.C. The union which was seeking recognition was the International Association of Machinists. The union was rejected by a vote of 245 to 171.

On July 8, the regional director for region 11 of the NLRB recommended that this election be set aside.

The fourth and fifth objections to the validity of the election, which incidentally were both sustained by the regional director, are as follows:

> 4. Allowing and encouraging, influential people in the community to conduct a reign of terror immediately preceding the election. Specifically, the "interested citizens of Orangeburg" threatened, coerced, and intimidated the employees through newspaper ads, housecalls, handbills, and radio programs.
>
> 5. Allowing, and encouraging, the editor of the local newspaper to make statements and write editorials that prevented a free vote by creating confusion, and fear of reprisals among employees.

The people of Orangeburg, S.C., are most indignant at the findings and recommendations of the regional director, and justifiably so. The regional director concluded—

> In evaluating the evidence in its entirety, the undersigned is of the opinion that the barrage of propaganda issued by the employer and others in the community, including the newspaper editorials and radio broadcasts, generated an atmosphere of fear of economic loss and complete futility in selecting the union as the bargaining representative, thus destroying the laboratory conditions deemed necessary in the conduct of Board elections and prevented the expression of a free choice by the employees.

Mr. President, no election in this country is or should be held under laboratory conditions. The public, itself, has legitimate interest in representation in elections which take place in this community.

One of the charges made was that the employer allowed the editor of the local newspaper to make statements and write editorials concerning the issues in the election. Mr. President, surely the employees of the NLRB should know by now that the press of this country is still free to editorialize on whatever subject it sees fit, and such expressions cannot be prevented in order to bring about what the regional director of the NLRB calls laboratory conditions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the "Report On Objections" in the case of the Utica-Herbrand Tool Division of Kelsey-Hayes Co., employer, and International Association of Machinists, AFL–CIO, petitioner in case No. 11–RC–1780 be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UTICA-HERBRAND TOOL DIVISION OF KELSEY-HAYES CO., EMPLOYER, AND INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS, AFL–CIO, PETITIONER, CASE NO. 11–RC–1780

(Before the National Labor Relations Board, 11th Region)

REPORT ON OBJECTIONS

Pursuant to a Decision and Direction of Election,[1] issued by the undersigned Regional Director of the Eleventh Region on April 18,[2] a secret ballot election was held under the supervision and direction of the undersigned on May 13, with the following results:

Approximate number of eligible voters	460
Void ballots	0
Votes cast for petitioner	171
Votes cast against participating labor organization	245
Valid votes counted	416
Challenged ballots	2
Valid votes counted plus challenged ballots	418

The challenged ballots were not sufficient in number to be determinative.

Copies of the tally of ballots were duly served on the authorized representatives of the employer and the petitioner.

Timely objections to conduct affecting the results of the election were filed by the petitioner on May 20. A copy of the objections was duly served on the employer.

The objections allege as follows:

1. Refusing to allow union representatives access to the plant at the time designated by the NLRB to examine the list of eligible voters.
2. Delaying the start of the election by posting large bulletins near the voting area making it necessary to remove them before the election could be started.
3. Allowing supervisors to make election speeches to massed assemblies within the plant during the 24-hour period immediately preceding the election.
4. Allowing, and encouraging, influential people in the community to conduct a reign of terror immediately preceding the election. Specifically, the interested citizens of Orangeburg threatened, coerced, and intimidated the employees through newspaper ads, house calls, handbills, and radio programs.
5. Allowing, and encouraging, the editor of the local newspaper to make statements and write editorials that prevented a free vote by creating confusion, and fear of reprisals among employees.
6. Making statements immediately prior to the election that were designed to intimidate the employees by indicating that the company would not grant increased benefits short of a strike by the Union.

For these reasons, and for other reasons, the Union requests the Regional Director to set aside the election held on May 13 and to conduct a new election under conditions that will allow the employees a free choice.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 102.69 of the Board's rules and regulations, series 8, as amended, an investigation of the issues raised by the objections has been conducted under the direction and supervision of the undersigned, who, having afforded the parties full opportunity to submit and present evidence bearing on the issues, and having carefully considered the results of the investigation, makes the following recommendations: [3]

---

[1] The unit found to be appropriate is, "All production and maintenance employees, including plant clerical employees, employed at the Employer's Orangeburg, South Carolina plant, but excluding office clerical employees, professional employees, foremen, leaders, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act."

[2] All dates are 1963.

1. The investigation disclosed that the preelection arrangements made by the Board agent included the inspection of the eligibility list by representatives of the petitioner at 9 a.m. on May 11. However, due to a misunderstanding by the employer's attorney as to the time the list was to be made available the petitioner's representatives were denied admission to the plant at the scheduled hour. Other arrangements were made very soon thereafter and the petitioner's representatives were able to check the list before the election.

While the misunderstanding was unfortunate the petitioner did have an adequate opportunity to check the eligibility list before the election. Accordingly, the undersigned finds that this objection raises no substantial and material issues and recommends that it be overruled.

2. The Board agent reports that the polls opened at 6:55 a.m.[4] because of a number of factors: It was necessary to assemble and instruct the observers; the Board agent answered questions posed by the representatives of the parties concerning the mechanics of the election; at the Board agent's request the employer removed several signs which were posted near the voting area. No evidence was presented, nor was any adduced during the investigation, which would indicate that anyone was deprived of the right to vote because of the short delay in opening the polls.

The undersigned finds that this objection raises no substantial or material issues and recommends that it be overruled.

3. No evidence was presented to substantiate this objection. Accordingly, the undersigned finds that objection 3 raises no material or substantial issues and recommends that it be overruled.

4., 5., and 6. The petitioner contends that because of the massive and coercive antiunion campaign, including speeches, editorials, radio broadcasts, newspaper advertisements, leaflet distribution and visits to the homes of the employees, the laboratory atmosphere which the Board seeks for its elections was destroyed.

Orangeburg, S.C., where the plant is located, is the county seat of Orangeburg County. The city has a population of 13,852, the county 68,559. The city of Orangeburg has one newspaper, the Times and Democrat,[5] with a daily circulation of 8,299 and 9,236 on Sunday. The city has three radio stations—WTND, WDIX, and WORG.[6]

As noted previously, the petition was filed on March 13. A hearing was held on April 5 and a decision and direction of election issued on April 18. By April 23, the election arrangements were completed and a letter confirming the details was sent to the parties. At various times on April 24 and 25, Plant Manager Derry delivered a speech[7] to assembled groups of employees.

One employee witness states that during the afternoon of April 30 Dr. Henry F. Frierson, a doctor who the witness and his family used from time to time, stopped by his house. Dr. Frierson asked the witness to come out to his car where they could talk in private. The witness complied. Dr. Frierson stated that he knew that the witness was interested in forming a union at the employer's plant, that interested citizens did not want a union in Orangeburg, and that he was visiting employees to get them to vote against the union. The doctor talked about unions about an hour. Before leaving, Dr. Frierson tried to extract a promise from the witness that he would vote against the union.

Another employee witness states that on April 21 two Orangeburg policemen stopped by his house and asked him to get in their car. They talked about working conditions at the plant. They then discussed the merits of unionization and the possibility of the plant moving out of the area.

Copies of the notice of election were mailed to the parties on May 1. On May 3, the employer mailed a letter[8] to the homes of its employees. An advertisement,[9] occupying one-quarter of a page and inserted by the interested citizens of Orangeburg County,[10] appeared in the May 7 edition of the Times. This advertisement, in the form of a handbill, was widely distributed throughout the city of Orangeburg during the 3 or 4 days immediately preceding the day of the election. An interested citizens' advertisement appeared each day after that up to and including May 12.[11] Also on May 8, a letter,[12] on the letterhead of and signed by C. Walker Limehouse, an attorney and a former member of the South Carolina Legislature, was sent to a number of plant employees.

Beginning on May 9 and continuing up to and including May 13 a series of spot announcements,[13] sponsored and paid for by the interested citizens, were broadcast over the three local radio stations. These announcements over WORG were as follows: On May 9 there were 9 announcements, beginning at 6:21 a.m. and ending at 5:11 p.m.; on May 10 there were 10 announcements, beginning at 6:17 a.m. and ending at 5:40 p.m.; on May 11 there were 10 announcements, beginning at 6:20 a.m. and ending at 5:40 p.m.; on May 12 there were 11 announcements, beginning at 8:20 a.m. and ending at 6:50 p.m., and on May 13 there were 4 announcements, beginning at 6:25 a.m. and ending at 6:50 p.m. On WDIX the announcements were as follows: On May 9 there were 9 announcements, beginning at 5:59 a.m. and ending at 11:07 p.m.; on May 10 there were 10 announcements, beginning at 5:59 a.m. and ending at 11:06 p.m.; on May 11 there were 10 announcements, beginning at 5:59 a.m. and ending at 11:04 p.m.; on May 12 there were 11 announcements, beginning at 7:11 a.m. and ending at 11:04 p.m., and on May 13 there were 4 announcements, beginning at 6:04 a.m. and ending at 12:30 p.m.

On May 9, the employer sent a letter[14] to the homes of its employees. On the same day Plant Manager Derry made a speech[15] to assembled groups of employees. The editorial, attached hereto as appendix P, appeared in the May 10 edition of the Times.

A witness states that during the evening of May 10 Mr. Fair, the mayor of Orangeburg, visited him at his home. Another employee was at the witness' home at the time. Mayor Fair told the employees that he hoped they would vote the right way, that other industries were thinking of locating in Orangeburg but would not if the union was voted in, that other employees were being visited, and that the union would hurt the business people in town. Mayor Fair admits visiting several of the employees.

During the evening of May 11 and on subsequent broadcasts on May 12, WDIX carried the story of John David Brown, a farmer, as a newscast. The Farmer Brown newscast is attached hereto as appendix Q. On May 12, the Times carried two quarter-page advertisements, one signed by the Orangeburg County delegation to the South Carolina Legislature,[16] the second signed by Mayor Fair.[17] Appendixes R and S appeared on the same page as appendix H, thus making a full-page advertisement. On the same day, the Times carried an editorial on its first page which is attached hereto as appendix T. The editorial stated that the employer could discharge employees who struck to support union demands. During the week immediately prior to the election, the booklet, "Dear Mom * * *" attached hereto as appendix U, was available to anyone who wanted a copy at all the banks in Orangeburg.

An election serves its purpose only if it affords an opportunity for the employees to register a free and untrammeled choice of a bargaining representative. While it is true that much of the conduct described above was not attributable to the employer, nonetheless, if the character of such other conduct coupled with the employer's actions, is so aggravated as to create a general atmosphere of fear of economic reprisals, a free expression of choice of a bargaining representative is impossible.

In Plant Manager Derry's speech to employees on April 24 and 25 (appendix A), he stated, inter alia:

"Orangeburg is a fine town and has a great future ahead of it, provided it is not subjected to the destructive influences which have ruined industry in the East, West, and North and cause them to move into the South. No company in its right mind is going to leave a section of the country when it has been subjected to the ridiculous and destructive influences brought about by these unions and move into another area to face the some thing. * * * Many of these distressed areas are a result of moving out in wholesale quantities of industries. Having ruined one section of the country, the unions now want to ruin this section."

Substantially the same remarks were made in the employer's letter to employees, dated May 3 (app. B). Similar remarks were made over the radio through spot announcements sponsored by the interested citizens beginning on May 9 through the day of election

---

[3] Only incidents which occurred between March 13, the date of filing of the petition, and May 13, the date of the election, are reported herein (*Ideal Electric and Manufacturing Co.*, 134 NLRB 1275).

[4] The scheduled voting hours were 6:45 a.m. to 10:30 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. to 7 p.m.

[5] Hereinafter referred to as the Times.

[6] Statistics from Editors Publisher Market Guide, 1963.

[7] The text of the speech is attached hereto as appendix A.

[8] Attached hereto as appendix B.

[9] The text of the advertisement is attached hereto as appendix C.

[10] Hereinafter referred to as the interested citizens. This committee was composed of a number of prominent citizens in the community; the presidents of the three Orangeburg banks were cochairman.

[11] Each advertisement, except for the one on May 12 which was a half page, occupied one-quarter of a page and appeared in the Times. The text of the May 8 advertisement is attached hereto as appendix D, the May 9 advertisement as appendix E, the May 10 advertisement as appendix F, the May 11 advertisement as appendix G, and the May 12 advertisement as appendix H.

[12] Attached hereto as appendix I.

[13] The texts of the announcements over WORG and WDIX are attached hereto as appendixes J to M, inclusive. The texts of the announcements made over WTND and the times of these announcements were not made available. It is assumed that the same material was broadcast over this station.

[14] The text of the letter is attached hereto as appendix N.

[15] The text of the speech is attached hereto as appendix O.

[16] The text is attached hereto as appendix R.

[17] The text is attached hereto as appendix S.

(apps. J through M). Spot announcements over the radio also stated the union drove the company out of Utica, N.Y., implying the same could happen at the Orangeburg plant (apps. K, L, and M).

In his announcement in the Times of May 12, Mayor Fair stated that two other companies were planning on locating in the area but were awaiting the outcome of the election to be held the following day. It is clear from the text, he conveyed the message that these companies would not locate there if the union were voted in (app. S). The same theme was voiced in an editorial appearing in the Times on May 10 and in an ad placed on May 12 by the interested citizens (apps. P and H, respectively).

In the opinion of the undersigned, these statements tended to instill in the minds of the employees the fear that selection of the union would cause Orangeburg to become a distressed area, would cause the employer to move and would deprive employees of job opportunities with other companies who would not then locate in the area.[18]

Apart from that described above, another type of propaganda was disseminated. In the employer's letter to its employees, dated May 3 (app. B), it stated:

"This union has made many rash promises as to what it intends to get for you. Let's not be misled. This company under the law has no obligation to grant a single concession to this union. The only way that this union can get any concessions from this company is by a strike.[19] Should this union strike this company because of wages, hours, or working conditions, this company has a right under the law to replace permanently each and every worker who goes out on strike, with no obligation to take any of them back. In that event not only do you fail to get what the union promised you, but you have lost your job as well. I am sure that the union has not told you this. Has the union told you about a Henderson, N.C., strike where hundreds of families were left homeless and destitute? The union then called off the strike and told the employees that they would have to fend for themselves."

This same theme was expressed in a condensed version in the ad placed by interested citizens in the May 7 edition of the Times (app. C). In an editorial appearing in the Times on May (app. T) the day preceding the election the following appeared:

"It (the union) cannot make good the promise, Utica's management can refuse union demands, and probably will. The union's only weapon is to call a strike. In that event, under South Carolina's laws, the management would be entirely within its right to fire such employees who do not report for work as expected. And commonsense would lead one to believe that such discharged personnel would find it impossible to return to Utica and would find it difficult to obtain industrial employment anywhere else."

In the opinion of the undersigned, the statements by the employer, coupled with those by the outside elements, tended to convey to the employees the futility of selecting the union as their bargaining agent. Thus, the theme expressed was that the only way the employees could get a bargaining contract was through a strike and concurrently hovering over the employees was the danger of replacement. The editorial appearing on May 12 on the eve of the election actually spoke of discharge in event of strike and perils of obtaining reemployment with the company or any other employer. Added to the forecast of eventual strike was the distribution of the "Dear Mom" booklet which appears to be a printed version of the movie, "Why Women Must Weep."[20]

In evaluating the evidence in its entirety, the undersigned is of the opinion that the barrage of propaganda issued by the employer and others in the community, including the newspaper editorials and radio broadcasts, generated an atmosphere of fear of economic loss and complete futility in selecting the union as the bargaining representative, thus destroying the laboratory conditions deemed necessary in the conduct of Board elections and prevented the expression of a free choice by the employees.

RECOMMENDATION

The undersigned recommends that the election conducted herein on May 13 be set aside.

CONCLUSIONS

Having recommended that the May 13 election be set aside, the undersigned further recommends that the Board issue a decision and direction of second election, directing that the case be remanded to the undersigned to conduct a new election at such time as he deems that circumstances permit the employees' free choice of a bargaining representative.

Dated at Winston-Salem, N.C., July 8, 1963.

REED JOHNSTON,
Regional Director.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, this recommendation and report by the regional director of the 11th region of the NLRB merits the severest criticism. The Times and Democrat of Orangeburg, S.C., the very newspaper attacked in the recommendation, has itself provided the very type of criticism which the report deserves, and it would be far more fitting that the Times and Democrat of Orangeburg, S.C., be permitted to speak for itself on this matter, something it is very capable of doing. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Recommendation To Set Aside Utica Election Made to NLRB" appearing on page 1 of the Times and Democrat of July 13, 1963, and an editorial entitled "We Affirm Our Stand" from the same edition; and an editorial from the July 14 issue of the Times and Democrat entitled "Laboratory Conditions—For What?" be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Orangeburg (S.C.) Times and Democrat, July 13, 1963]

RECOMMENDATION TO SET ASIDE UTICA ELECTION MADE TO NLRB—REIGN OF TERROR IN CITY BEFORE PLANT VOTE CLAIMED

(By Frank K. Myers)

A recommendation to the Washington, D.C., office of the National Labor Relations Board that an employee election May 13 at the Utica-Herbrand Tool Division plant near Orangeburg be set aside has been forwarded by the NLRB's regional office in Winston-Salem, N.C., The Times & Democrat learned Friday.

The recommendation, signed by Reed Johnston, director of region 11 of the NLRB, cites a "reign of terror" against employees at the plant who, in a secret ballot, refused to accept the International Association of Machinists, AFL–CIO, as their bargaining agent by a vote of 245 to 171.

John N. Sheridan, representing the IAM in Orangeburg, told the newspaper that "considering the number of recommendations approved in such matters in the past as against the number turned down, the former would outweigh the latter."

"At some time, it may be soon or it may be a year from now," he said, "there will be another election at the plant. In the meantime, we will await the national board's action.

"in order for us to have an election in which an employee would have a free choice, it would be necessary for some of the town people to restrain themselves. I am just sitting on it at the present time. It is in the hands of our attorneys in Washington."

Attempts to reach Utica executives for comment were unavailing Friday, the top officers being out of town.

Observers said, however, that the Utica management will have three courses they may follow. One is to petition for an immediate election should the recommendation be approved. Another is to await NLRB action and abide by any date set for a second election. And the third would be to fight the matter to a conclusion through civil court action.

Sheridan, however, inferred that the IAM will be consulted before an election date is set, calling attention to Johnston's conclusions in his "report on objections" in which he recommended that "the board issue a decision and direction of second election, directing that the case be remanded to the undersigned to conduct a new election at such time as he deems that circumstances permit the employees free choice."

Basis of the recommendation for a second election is on three "timely" objections filed by the IAM on May 20. Three other objections were thrown out by Johnston on the basis of reports from NLRB investigators who visited the city to make a study.

The three objections on which the recommendation was made follow:

(1) Allowing, and encouraging, influential people in the community (by Utica management) to conduct a reign of terror immediately preceding the election. Specifically, the "Interested Citizens of Orangeburg" threatened, coerced, and intimidated the employees through newspaper ads, house calls, handbills, and radio programs.

(2) Allowing, and encouraging, the local newspaper (on the part of Utica management) to make statements and write editorials that prevented a free vote by creating confusion, and fear of reprisals among employees.

(3) Making statements (by Utica management) immediately prior to the election that were designed to intimidate the employed by indicating that the company would not grant increased benefits short of a strike by the union.

Thrown out by the NLRB regional office as just complaints were the following:

(1) That Utica management refused to allow union representatives access to the plant at the time designated by the NLRB to examine the list of eligible voters.

(2) That Utica management delayed the start of the election by posting large bulletins near the voting area making it necessary to remove them before the election could be started.

(3) That Utica management allowed supervisors to make election speeches to massed assemblies within the plant during the 24-hour period immediately preceding the election.

The "Report on Objections" said that the IAM contends that "because of the massive and coercive antiunion campaign, including speeches, editorials, radio broadcasts, newspaper advertisements, leaflet distribution and visits to the homes of employees, the laboratory atmosphere which the board seeks for its elections was destroyed."

It specifically notes a call to the home of a Utica employee by an Orangeburg physician in which an attempt was made to extract a promise that the employee would vote against the union, and a visit by two Orangeburg policemen to the home of another employee during which working conditions at the plant, the merits of unionization and the possibility of the plant moving out of the area were discussed.

---

[18] See *The Falmouth Company,* 114 NLRB 896; *James Lees and Sons Company,* 130 NLRB 290.

[19] In Derry's earlier speech to employees (app. A), the words "persuasion or" preceded "a strike."

[20] *See Plochman and Harrison-Cherry Lane Foods, Inc.,* 140 NLRB No. 11.

The "Report on Objections" was also accompanied by texts of newspaper editorials, advertisements, texts of letters sent employees by Utica management and speeches made to them by management representatives at the plant and a schedule of radio spot announcements, including the script of a short talk made by John David Brown, a farmer, as a newscast.

It also noted a visit by Orangeburg's Mayor S. Clyde Fair to an employee's home, at which another employee was present, during which he said that he "hoped they would vote the right way." It quoted the mayor as saying that he admitted visiting several of the employees.

Johnston, in his report, also came to the conclusion that "an election serves its purpose only if it affords an opportunity for the employees to register a free and untrammeled choice of a bargaining representative.

"While it is true that much of the conduct described above (in the report) was not attributable to the employer, nonetheless, if the character of such other conduct coupled with the employer's actions, is so aggravated as to create a general atmosphere of fear of economic reprisals, a free expression of choice of a bargaining representative is impossible."

The NLRB official also said of letters to the employees, statements in the Times and Democrat by Mayor Fair, editorials in the newspaper and spot announcements over radio that "in the opinion of the undersigned, these statements tended to instill in the minds of employees the fear that selection of the union would cause Orangeburg to become a distressed area, would cause the employer to move and would deprive employees of job opportunities with other companies who would not then locate in the area."

In evaluating the evidence in its entirety, Johnston wrote that he "is of the opinion that the barrage of propaganda issued by the employer and others in the community, including the newspaper editorials and radio broadcasts, generated a fear of economic loss and complete futility in selecting the union as a bargaining representative, thus destroying the laboratory conditions deemed necessary in the conduct of board elections and prevented a free choice by the employee."

[From the Orangeburg (S.C.) Times and Democrat, July 13, 1963]

WE AFFIRM OUR STAND

In a recommendation that an election at the Utica-Herbrand Tool Division's plant in which the International Association of Machinists (AFL–CIO), was rejected 245 to 171, as a bargaining agent be set aside, Reed Johnston, director of region 11 of the National Labor Relations Board, has attacked freedom of speech and the press and is insulting the intelligence of the Utica voters.

Johnston bases his recommendation on three objections made by the union, discarding three others as of having little effect on the balloting.

Two of those objections begin with the words: "Allowing and encouraging." In one case, Utica management is charged with "allowing and encouraging" influential people in the community to conduct a reign of terror immediately preceding the election. In the other, management is accused of "allowing and encouraging" the Times and Democrat to make statements and write editorials that prevented a free vote by creating confusion and fear of reprisals among employees.

The "reign of terror" was conducted, according to union charges in Johnston's report, by "interested citizens of Orangeburg" who "threatened, coerced, and intimidated the employees through newspaper ads, house calls, handbills, and radio."

The Times and Democrat believes that the "interested citizens of Orangeburg" have the God-given and constitutionally supported right at any time to express their opinions vocally, by the written word in print, or over the air.

The Times and Democrat, further, believes that the "interested citizens of Orangeburg," whether in newspaper ads, radio announcements, handbills, or by word of mouth expressed their convictions for the best interest of Orangeburg, Orangeburg County, the citizens—and the employees at Utica.

The Times and Democrat believes that in presenting news stories regarding the labor negotiations at Utica in its news columns did so truthfully, fearlessly, and objectively.

As to its editorial utterances, the Times and Democrat arrived at its own conclusions in expressing the editorial thought of the newspaper. It categorically denies that at any time conferences were held either with union or management representatives and affirms that its editorial opinions were expressed only after conferences within the newspaper management and staff.

The Times and Democrat believes that in its editorial stand it protected the interests of Orangeburg, Orangeburg County, its readers—and the employees at Utica.

John N. Sheridan, IAM representative in Orangeburg, said Friday that before a second election is held, should the NLRB so order, "some of the townspeople" must "restrain themselves."

We cannot speak for the "interested citizens of Orangeburg," but Sheridan and his cohorts can be assured that the "two-bit newspaper" he has often referred to will stand firm in its right to print any story it deems newsworthy, and to voice any editorial opinion it believes in the best interest of this area.

It also reaffirms the stand taken in previous editorials that the International Association of Machinists is not wanted in this community, that it is not needed in this community, that its presence at Utica would not be in the best interests of its employees, and that if voted in, it would be a stumbling block in the economic—and social—progress of Orangeburg County.

Finally, the Times and Democrat's voice will not be stifled by any labor union or its leaders, nor by such Federal bureaucracy in Washington as the National Labor Relations Board, an agency formed by Congress to maintain peace between management and labor—not to stir up dissension.

[From the Orangeburg (S.C.) Times and Democrat, July 14, 1963]

LABORATORY CONDITIONS—FOR WHAT?

What are the laboratory conditions Reed Johnston, director of region 11 of the National Labor Relations Board demands before employees at the Utica-Herbrand tool division's plant near Orangeburg can express a free choice in determining whether the International Association of Machinists, AFL–CIO, should represent them as a bargaining agent?

Normally, one would think that laboratory conditions mean pure, wholesome, and sterile conditions, without dirt or any foreign matter. Perhaps that is what Johnston had in mind when he made his report on objections (by the union) in which he recommended to the NLRB in Washington that the May 13 election at the Utica plant be set aside and another election set.

Apparently Johnston, as a thoroughly unbiased, fair, and impartial referee, believes that the citizens of Orangeburg, and the area, the newspapers, the radio stations, and others should ignore the fact that union representatives (foreign) seek to unionize an industry which has already left one locality because of labor pressures.

Apparently Johnston believes that the citizens of Orangeburg should lie supine to be run over when labor puts its machine into motion; that labor agitators should visit the homes of Utica employees and hold out false promises they cannot fulfill while interested citizens of Orangeburg shut their mouths and hold their peace.

Apparently Johnston believes that the Times and Democrat, as a newspaper, should express no editorial opinions, should not present the truth so that its readers might be informed, should not do everything in its power to keep out of the Orangeburg area an organization that Utica employees, by their vote, have already shown is not needed.

We have only a copy of Reed Johnston's "Report on Objections" as a basis for our belief that what the NLRB wants, what the union wants, are "laboratory conditions" that means that everyone else should shut up and that all, primarily the employees at Utica, should listen to the mighty voice of labor.

In that report, Johnston cites only the union's side. He tells of the advertisements by interested citizens of Orangeburg, editorials in the Times and Democrat, spot announcements over the city's radio stations, handbills, a newscast by a farmer he identified as John David Brown, but who, in reality, is John David Bates. Because of that, he supports the union's charge that a reign of terror existed in Orangeburg just prior to the Utica election. How stupid can he get? Lt. Morrison Whetstone of the Orangeburg Police Department, speaking in the absence of Chief C. Harold Hall, knows nothing of a reign of terror. A reign of terror was also news to Sheriff R. F. (Bob) Dukes who, when questioned, said that everything was so quiet and orderly at Utica the day of the election that he did not even believe it necessary to send a deputy as an observer.

What Reed Johnston has failed to include in his report is the fact that union organizers freely visited Utica employees in their homes to "sell" their union to them. He did not tell of the many parties given at which the union attempted to win over Utica employees. He did not send along with his report and copies of letters sent by the union to Utica employees nor copies of talks made to them at the high and handsome parties.

The Times and Democrat hopes that there will never be laboratory conditions in Orangeburg suitable to the union and the NLRB. Their laboratory conditions infer sterile conditions—but sterile only so far as the people of Orangeburg are concerned. From our viewpoint, the germs of unionism would soon destroy that. But the NLRB's regional official can't see that. He is thoroughly unbiased, fair, and impartial—to labor.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the recommendation to set aside the representation election for the Utica plant in Orangeburg is by no means the only example of the arbitrary actions of the NLRB which are happening with almost monotonous frequency, particularly in the Southern States. Another such occurrence was a recommendation by the trial examiner of the NLRB that a representation election at the Daniel Construction Co. of Greenville, S.C., held in November 1961, be set aside. I ask unanimous consent that a report of this recommendation entitled "NLRB Finds

Daniel Influenced Voting," which appears in the July 20 edition of the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C., be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Greenville News, July 20, 1963]

Orders Rejection of Union Be Nullified—NLRB Finds Daniel Influenced Voting

A National Labor Relations Board trial examiner has ruled Daniel Construction Co. of Greenville guilty of unfair labor practices and recommended that the results of a November 1961 union election—won by the company—be set aside.

This was confirmed last night by Buck Mickel, executive vice president and general manager.

Charles E. Daniel, a former U.S. Senator and chairman of the huge construction company, which has offices in the Carolinas, Virginia, Alabama, Georgia, and Florida, was out of town and could not be reached for comment.

"We are appalled at the prejudice of the NLRB but of course, we did not expect better treatment," Mr. Mickel commented and added that the company attorneys have been instructed to take whatever steps are necessary to begin fighting the decision in the courts.

In November 1961, Daniel gave the union, the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipefitting Industry of the United States and Canada, AFL–CIO, a walloping defeat in a southeasternwide election at all Daniel construction sites.

MAINTAINED VOTE

In the election, 520 Daniel mechanical employees voted against representation by the union and 174 voted for the union. The union and the company challenged a total of 641 ballots. In subsequent checking of these ballots Daniel maintained its overwhelming vote.

The union filed charges of unfair labor practices by Daniel following the election and these included: (1) that Daniel officials tended to influence workers by threats of loss of work and hinted promises of benefits if they voted against the union; (2) that company foremen were advised to poll workers and determine their views and union sympathies and to question them about the union; (3) that supervisors made threats and promises to the workers.

Hearings on the charges were held in Kingsport, Tenn., April 22–24, and in Greenville May 7–10.

George J. Bott was the NLRB trial examiner who reviewed the election and his report has now been turned over to the full board.

Mr. Bott notes that the case be remanded to the director of the 11th region to conduct a new election such time as he deems the circumstances "permit the free choice of a bargaining representative."

"We, of course, expected this after we saw the highly prejudiced NLRB officer who was sent down here," Mr. Mickel said last night concerning the new finding. "It was obvious he had been conditioned to rule against us. We were given a biased hearing as far as he was concerned."

INTEND TO FIGHT

"We fully intend to fight this in the courts and our attorneys have been so instructed. We have notified our men of this abominable ruling. We are not going to take this lying down and we fully intend to fight for our rights," Mr. Mickel said.

He added that in his opinion the ruling is simply an effort on the part of the NLRB "to save face for the union" which smarted under the lopsided defeat.

"Even in the election, which was so obviously stacked in favor of the union, our mechanical workers handed the union a tremendous slap in the face," the company official noted.

"During the election our people were under terrific pressure by the union but they stood up to the test and cast their ballots as free-thinking and hardworking men. We are gratified that these fine people who work for us showed that courage. Our responsibility to them is quite clear. We shall fight to have their rejection of the union recorded fully and completely and thus bring an end to this harassment by the union and by the NLRB."

For the election, the NLRB ruled that any person who had been employed by Daniel for as little as 45 days within the 2 years prior to the 1961 election, was eligible to vote.

The Daniel firm has 20 days in which to file exception to the decision of Mr. Bott. If the firm does so, as it has been indicated it will do, the entire NLRB will consider the matter. If the company fails to file, the recommended order will be adopted automatically. The decision can also be appealed in Federal court.

The examiner's order also instructed the company not to interfere with union organizing activities and to post notices for 60 days at all job sites that it is complying with the NLRB order.

In his report, Examiner Bott upheld the union and ordered the Daniel firm to refrain from: questioning employees on their union views, instructing supervisors to do so, threatening reprisals for union activities, promising benefits for voting against the union, or otherwise interfering with the free choice of employees.

Mr. THURMOND. The public is becoming increasingly incensed at the fact that every time a union loses a representation election, it is set aside by the National Labor Relations Board. There is strong evidence that the Board is attempting to curb the right of free speech. Resentment at the conduct of the NLRB is reflected in an ably written and well documented editorial in the Spartanburg Herald on July 19, entitled "Zany NLRB Excesses Need To Be Braked." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Herald, July 19, 1963]

Zany NLRB Excesses Need To Be Braked

South Carolina is not the exclusive target of union-organizing pressure of the National Labor Relations Board, though it sometimes seems to be so.

Representative Phil Landrum, of Georgia, made an important speech before Congress on the activities of the NLRB. He is coauthor of the Landrum-Griffin legislation which limits big labor abuses.

The Congressman declared that the Federal agency is tinkering with the right of free speech. His charge is well placed.

Landrum cited two cases to prove his point. In one, the Board threw out an election which the union lost on the basis of a letter the company management wrote to employees. The letter simply pointed out to employees that their wages and other benefits were already better than those of unionized workers in the same area.

In the other situation, the firm told workers that jobs would be eliminated if union demands forced it to turn to new methods of production. It added that insistence on high demands would mean that "we would have no choice but to resist. In turn, they (union) would have no choice but to either agree or force you out on strike."

This was straight talk. There was no suggestion that anything said was either illegal or untrue. Workers need to know, and they have the right to know, the facts about unionization pro and con.

The NLRB is bent on seeing that they get only the union propaganda. Representative Landrum said, "The restrictions imposed by the Board as to what employees may hear from their employers are in sharp contrast with the wide latitude accorded union officials."

Workers are denied access to facts necessary to an informed and intelligent decision, he added.

Since he spoke, this oppression of free expression has been extended. An NLRB regional director has endorsed a union argument that an election in an Orangeburg plant ought to be nullified (the union lost).

This time, the NLRB man said it was bad for "influential citizens" and the newspaper to express their views on the issue.

The bill of particulars against the NLRB in South Carolina is startling. Just over the past couple of years, these examples have occurred:

(1) A Ware Shoals apparel plant was ordered to move back to Pennsylvania, or else pay moving expenses for all workers who wished to move to Ware Shoals. The NLRB admitted that the firm could not operate profitably in the northern State because of union demands.

(2) When Daniel Construction Co. had an election, the board ruled that any person who had worked for the company within the previous 3 years could vote. Many of these absentee voters were in distant States, union members with other firms. The union lost that one, anyway.

(3) More recently in a Spartanburg case, the Board rejected a petition signed by more than 90 percent of P. Garvan Co. employees asking for an election to decertify their union.

The Orangeburg deal takes the prize, however.

Something has got to be done to put a brake on the zany excesses of a Board which is meant to be the protector of individual rights, and not their oppressor.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is beginning to appear that the labor reform bill, known as the Landrum-Griffin Act, passed by the Congress only a short while ago, was not sufficient. If the trend of NLRB decisions continues, Congress will surely have to enter once more into the field and enact a National Labor Relations Board reform bill. If Congress finds, of course, that the National Labor Relations Board is beyond reformation, perhaps it would be better to abolish it altogether.

THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to promote equal employment opportunity by securing equal treatment in the various incidents of employment and to establish an Equal Employment Opportunity Administration in the Department of Labor.

This bill is introduced on behalf of myself and the following distinguished Senators: Senators CLARK, CASE, HART, DOUGLAS, RANDOLPH, NELSON, RIBICOFF, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, LONG of Missouri, GRUENING, and NEUBERGER.

Earlier today I presented the substance of the bill, including the text of the bill, in testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Manpower of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. In my testimony, I described the provisions of the bill, and I was given an opportunity by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the subcommittee members to answer inquiries and questions relating to the purpose and intent of the measure.

Mr. President, the Nation remains gripped by the historic effort to remove racial segregation and discrimination from all segments of this Nation's life and to open the door of freedom and opportunity to every American whatever his race, color, or creed. We have received President Kennedy's courageous civil rights program. Each of the proposals contained in the President's omnibus bill is absolutely essential and I intend to devote every ounce of strength and determination I possess to achieving their passage by the Senate.

The civil rights crisis has also provided fresh evidence, if more was needed, of the bitter frustration and hopelessness that exists among minority groups in our society, principally Negroes, over continuing job discrimination and inequality. Long after the "white only" and "colored only" signs have been taken down, and other superficial symbols of racial discrimination and intolerance have disappeared, the basic facts of job discrimination and inequality will still exist unless a nationwide program of equal employment opportunity is initiated to remove such barriers. Until we achieve equality of opportunity in such fundamental activities of life as voting, earning a living, buying a home, and going to school, we cannot claim to have made the promises of American democracy a living reality. Just as we have begun to attack discrimination in voting and education, we cannot now delay the equally vital and difficult task of achieving equality in the realm of job and employment opportunities.

Why the urgency of this task? Let me state the facts as boldly and as bluntly as possible: the Negro American is the principal victim of a vastly complex system of self-perpetuating practices, traditions, and processes that has denied him true parity in the national job market. He has consistently and effectively been kept from participating fully in the job opportunities developed by the American free enterprise system.

PRESIDENT'S MANPOWER REPORT

The "Manpower Report of the President" transmitted to Congress in March 1963, forcefully demonstrated the plight of nonwhite workers in the job market that operates today and will operate tomorrow unless remedial action is undertaken soon. Since World War II this Nation has experienced a second industrial revolution, a revolution so far-reaching in its impact that the very nature of the basic employment patterns in the United States have been changed permanently. By 1956, for example, more people were in service occupations than in goods-producing jobs for the first time in our history. Last year the number of persons producing goods had declined even further to only 42 percent. As a result of this trend there are today almost 10 million more white collar workers than there were 15 years ago. But there are also 600,000 fewer production jobs. Today, there are only 5 million farmers engaged in producing food and fiber for 185 million Americans; just 15 years ago the number exceeded 8 million. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing these changes in the distribution of employment be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Employment in industry divisions, 1947–62

Industry division	Employment (in thousands)			Average annual employment change			
				1947–57		1957–62	
	1947	1957	1962 [1]	Number (in thousands)	Percent	Number (in thousands)	Percent
Total agricultural employment [2]	8,256	6,222	5,190	−203	−2.8	−206	−3.6
Total nonfarm industries (wage and salary employment only) [3]	43,881	52,904	55,325	902	1.9	484	0.9
Manufacturing	15,545	17,174	16,750	163	1.0	−85	−.5
Durable goods	8,385	9,856	9,443	147	1.6	−83	−.8
Nondurable goods	7,159	7,319	7,308	16	.2	−2	(4)
Mining	955	828	647	−13	−1.4	−36	−4.8
Contract construction	1,982	2,923	2,696	94	4.0	−45	−1.6
Transportation and public utilities	4,166	4,241	3,925	8	.2	−63	−1.5
Trade	8,955	10,886	11,571	193	2.0	137	1.2
Finance, insurance, and real estate	1,754	2,477	2,793	72	3.5	63	2.4
Services and miscellaneous	5,050	6,749	7,757	170	3.0	202	2.8
Government	5,474	7,626	9,185	215	3.4	312	3.8
Federal	1,892	2,217	2,341	33	1.6	25	1.1
State and local	3,582	5,409	6,844	183	4.2	287	4.8

[1] Preliminary.

[2] Based on the monthly labor force survey of households.

[3] Based on employers' payroll data.

[4] Less than 0.05 percent.

NOTE.—Individual items may not add to totals because of rounding.

Source: Manpower Report of the President, March 1963.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, while these dynamic changes were occurring within the past 15 years—while our total work force was increasing by 10 million—our population was growing at an even more rapid rate. While the work force increased by 17 percent, the available work force expanded by 21 percent. Consequently, the unemployment rate slowly but persistently advanced until today there are 5 million unemployed compared to little more than 2.5 million in 1947. Failure to maintain an adequate rate of economic growth has been another major factor contributing to rising unemployment.

The impact of these vast changes on race relations must not be underestimated. Internal changes in the nature of the job market—stimulated by the technological revolution—and steadily increasing unemployment has had far more disastrous consequences for the minority of nonwhite citizens than the white majority. The simple truth is that the Negro worker in relation to his white counterpart has been either falling behind or barely staying even as a result of these developments. For instance, the Negro has fared badly in obtaining his share of the 10 million new white-collar jobs that have been created. Apart from Government jobs, Negroes continue to be either largely excluded due to overt discrimination or are inadequately trained and prepared for such white-collar occupations. In sales, for example, 1 in every 16 white workers is employed as a salesman as compared to 1 in every 64 Negroes. By 1970, jobs in sales will have increased by another million. There is little evidence to suggest that the percentage of Negroes employed as salesmen will increase significantly. While 1 in every 3 employed white women are clericals, only 1 in every 9 Negro women are so employed. Clerical jobs are projected to increase by 3 million by 1970.

Although production jobs were declining by 600,000 during the past 15 years, the number of nonproduction workers was increasing by almost 2 million. And once again Negro workers were falling behind, not gaining. One in every eight white workers is a professional-technical worker as compared to 1 in every 20 Negro workers. One in every seven whites works as a manager as compared to 1 in every 40 Negroes. Jobs in these categories are projected to increase by another 3 million in the next 7 years. Production jobs which provided such impressive economic gains for Negro workers during and after World War II unfortunately have turned out to be the very jobs which have been declining during the past decade. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing percentage distribution of employed persons be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Employed persons, by occupational group and color, 1948 and 1962

[Percent distribution]

Major occupational group	White		Nonwhite	
	1948	1962	1948	1962
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
White-collar workers	39.1	47.3	9.0	16.7
Professional and technical	7.2	12.6	2.4	5.3
Managers, officials, and proprietors	11.6	11.9	2.3	2.6
Clerical workers	13.6	15.8	3.3	7.2
Sales workers	6.7	7.0	1.1	1.6
Blue-collar workers	40.5	35.4	39.7	39.5
Craftsmen and foremen	14.6	13.6	5.3	6.0
Operatives	21.0	17.5	20.1	19.9
Nonfarm laborers	4.9	4.3	14.3	13.6
Service workers	7.9	10.6	30.3	32.8
Private household	1.5	2.1	15.6	14.7
All other	6.4	8.5	14.7	18.1
Farmworkers	12.4	6.8	21.0	11.0
Farmers	7.8	4.0	8.5	2.7
Laborers	4.6	2.8	12.5	8.3

Source: Manpower Report of the President, March 1963.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the consequences of this growing disparity between the employment opportunities of white and Negro workers may be seen in its most negative light in the unemployment figures contained in the manpower report. In 1962 the rate of unemployment for white workers averaged 4.9 percent; for nonwhite it averaged 11 percent. In every major category—color, age, sex, and occupational groups—the unemployment rate for nonwhite exceeded that for white workers; sometimes it was three times as great. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing comparative unemployment rates by color, age, sex, and major occupational groups for 1962 be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Unemployment rates, by color, age, sex, and by selected major occupational group, 1962

Characteristics	1962	
	White	Nonwhite
AGE AND SEX		
Total	4.9	11.0
Male	4.6	11.0
14 to 19 years	12.3	20.7
20 to 24 years	8.0	14.6
25 years and over	3.6	9.4
Female	5.5	11.1
14 to 19 years	11.5	28.2
20 to 24 years	7.7	18.2
25 years and over	4.3	4.8
SELECTED MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL GROUP		
Clerical workers	3.8	7.1
Craftsmen and foremen	4.8	9.7
Operatives	6.9	12.0
Nonfarm laborers	11.0	15.8
Private household workers	3.1	7.1
Service workers, except private household	5.3	10.8

Source: Manpower Report of the President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have attempted to demonstrate with these figures the dimensions of the challenge that confronts us in terms of making equal employment opportunity a living reality in the national job market. It clearly is not such a reality today.

FEDERAL AND STATE EFFORTS

We must also evaluate the present state of affairs in light of Federal and State action to eliminate job discrimination and inequality. In 1941 President Franklin Roosevelt issued Executive Order No. 8802 banning employment discrimination in war contracts and defense programs; subsequently a Fair Employment Practice Committee was established to implement this policy. New York enacted the first State FEPC law in 1947. As of July 1962, 20 States had enacted enforcible fair employment practices laws covering 60 percent of the U.S. population and 40 percent of the Negro population. Two additional States, Indiana and Iowa, have fair employment practice laws without enforcible provisions.

President Kennedy's Executive Order No. 10925 issued on March 6, 1961, established the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity with broad authority and responsibility to eliminate discrimination in Federal employment and Government-connected work. The order has been recently broadened to include all employment activities supported by Federal grants-in-aid as well as contracts. Under the leadership of the distinguished and able Vice President of the United States—LYNDON B. JOHNSON—the President's Committee has done a thorough and comprehensive job in meeting the challenge of eliminating discrimination and promoting equal employment opportunity. The President has now requested full statutory authority for the Committee in his omnibus civil rights bill. Whatever the fate of this bill or other fair employment practice legislation, I believe it essential to move ahead in establishing the President's Committee by congressional action. This Senator has always maintained that in such areas of critical national importance you should make whatever progress you can whenever you can. A statutory commission as opposed to a President's Committee is a definite forward step in the overall goal of guaranteeing equal employment opportunity in all sectors of the American economy.

A NATIONAL PROBLEM

Nevertheless I believe the facts fully substantiate the position that a comprehensive program to provide equal employment opportunity—particularly in the nongovernmental areas of employment—must be enacted by Congress. The challenge is clearly national in scope. It is not confined to one region of the country. It is not limited to any particular industries or occupations. The total American economy is involved and only the Federal Government possesses the resources and the authority—as contained in the commerce clause of the U.S. Constitution—article I, section 8—that are required to achieve meaningful results. It is this Senator's opinion that we must begin to consider a program of Federal fair employment practices geared to an economy vastly different from the one existing in the late 1940's when the initial State fair employment practice commissions were created.

We must begin to think in terms of establishing a Federal program that will operate simultaneously in two fronts. First, we must be able to insure equal employment opportunity in an economic system where certain types of jobs are suddenly disappearing and other totally new categories of jobs are being created. This is an immensely complex and challenging task in itself. We must be prepared to think in terms of all incidents of employment, hiring, transfer, recruitment, training, promotion, and apprenticeship. In other words, the employment process must be viewed in its totality. We must understand that every aspect of the process has a definite relationship to the existence of equal employment opportunity.

Second, we must continue to fight all forms of job discriminations and restrictions based on race, color, religion, and national origin. Unfortunately in all sections of the country and in almost all occupations, overt racial discrimination is still a standard practice. We have made definite progress and the rate of progress is accelerating. But much remains to be done and we can scarcely afford to postpone our responsibilities much longer.

AUTHORITY TO INITIATE ACTION

According to the traditional approach, emphasis has been placed upon the adjudication of complaints filed by aggrieved individuals. Conciliation between the two parties—employer and applicant, employer and employee, or union and apprentice candidate—has been the primary basis of action. Experience has suggested that the complaint-centered approach is not sufficiently productive in itself and in many instances administrators of State fair employment practice commissions and Federal agencies have increasingly tried to deal with discrimination on an industry or pattern-centered basis.

Few complaints are filed largely because of fear or ignorance. Many complaints that come to official notice are lacking sufficient merit or have been filed too late to reach a satisfactory solution. Those with merit often require formal adjudication to resolve. The number of complaints acted upon by all 22 States and by 10 Federal committees over the past 20 years has not averaged 100 per month. Over the same period, the number of hearings or appeals actually held by all of the State fair employment practice commissions or Federal committees has not averaged 12 per year. Moreover, the process of identifying problems, analyzing specific employment practices or personnel procedures, working out adjustments, is not—in my opinion—a process that is effectively administered or controlled by an independent multimember hearing board. For these reasons, the legislation I introduce today provides for a single administrator with authority to initiate surveys, studies, and investigations and to issue appropriate remedial orders as well as the more traditional authority of responding to individual complaints of discrimination.

BROADER SCOPE OF RESPONSIBILITY

What will be the scope of the administrator's duties? It has become increasingly evident that many of the problems associated with lack of employment opportunities result from existing practices in the process of public and private employment, practices not directly related to overt discrimination. For example, there are recruiting systems which never locate qualified Negro technicians and typists because Negroes normally do not attend the trade and technical schools on the recruiter's schedule. Whether or not stenography courses are offered in vocational high schools where Negro students are concentrated, whether or not trainees for new jobs are selected only from departments where Negroes have never worked, whether or not promotions are based upon job experience in assignments which Negroes have never held—each of these examples illustrates how broad employment and personnel systems have direct impact upon equal employment opportunities. In short, willful discrimination is often commingled with many impersonal institutional processes which nevertheless determine the availability of jobs for nonwhite employees.

Therefore, this legislation departs from the traditional concept of enforcing nondiscrimination in employment and seeks to establish the broader and more comprehensive obligation of promoting equal employment opportunities. Thus the administrator is charged with the responsibility to see that no person subject to the act denies equality of treatment in employment and all incidents of employment including not only hiring, promotion, transfer and seniority, but also the related areas of recruitment, recruitment advertising, apprenticeship and training opportunities, membership in employee and labor organizations, and equality of access to the various facilities and services of employment agencies. The administrator has the authority to initiate appropriate investigations to insure that persons subject to the act provide full employment opportunity. Whenever he has reason to believe that equality of employment opportunity does not exist, he has the further responsibility to determine whether or not this actually is the case and, if it is, to issue appropriate remedial orders. The administrator is empowered to act on his own initiative and reach findings without lengthy administrative proceedings. However, as explained later, full opportunity is provided for administrative appeal and judicial review.

LOCATED IN THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

As I have already indicated, the problem of equal job opportunity is clearly a national problem and a Federal responsibility. Therefore, it is appropriate and desirable that an Equal Employment Opportunity Administration should be located within the Department of Labor. The existing administrative machinery and professional expertise in the Department will be available in achieving the comprehensive objectives of the legislation. The criterion of equal employment opportunity can be coordinated and correlated with the other national employment policies and decisions that come within the purview of the Department.

For instance, the resources of the Federal-State employment services must be brought to bear in the administration of the act. Additional areas of departmental responsibility that relate to equal employment opportunity include the activities of the new Manpower Administration, the new manpower training programs, the regional efforts designed to stimulate additional youth job opportunities, the technical and analytical expertise of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the inspection skills of the wage-and-hour staff, and the operation of the Farm Labor Services.

In short, the experience of the States and the experience of the Federal Government teaches us that authority for comprehensive, direct, speedy, and flexible administrative action is needed with due and proper provision for appeal and judicial review. My bill creates an independent Equal Employment Opportunity Board to provide for such appeals of orders issued by the Administrator or in the cases where the Administrator fails to uphold the complaint of the allegedly aggrieved individual. This Board would operate in the fashion of an administrative court, concerned solely with reviewing and enforcing decisions of the Administrator, somewhat as the Tax Court reviews and enforces the judgments of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The Board would have no policy or operating responsibilities. Provision has been made for the Board to appoint hearing examiners and to delegate to such examiners the authority to issue decisions in the name of the Board. Finally, decisions of the Board can be taken to the appropriate Federal circuit courts for final enforcement.

However, if past experience of State fair employment practice commissions is relevant, the authority of the Administrator to initiate action to correct employment practices that deny equal job opportunities will prove to be a sufficient remedy in most cases. Skillful persuasion and conciliation, backed up by the knowledge that sanctions exist if needed, should achieve a satisfactory resolution of the situation in most instances. In any event, it is clearly not the intention of this legislation simply to transfer the duties of the traditional fair employment practice commission to the Equal Employment Opportunity Board. The burden of implementing the policies of the act will lie entirely with the Administrator and the Equal Employment Opportunity Administration in the Department of Labor.

COMPREHENSIVE COVERAGE

The legislation is comprehensive in coverage. Persons subject to the provisions of the act include any employer engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce, or any Government contractor, Federal agency, labor organization and employment agency. The bill does not contain categories of exemptions, such as private employers not doing business with the Government or employers of a certain size or engaged in certain types of activity. Often such exemptions have tended to create invidious and competitive comparisons with those industries and persons covered. The failure to include labor unions, employment agencies, or training programs closely associated with employment has created uncertainties as to responsibility and actual coverage.

Finally, a word about the objectives of the Senator from Minnesota in proposing this legislation. I do this primarily as a means of bringing these relatively new concepts to the attention of the Congress in an appropriate and workable fashion. It is not my intention to displace or hinder existing fair-employment-practice legislation, most of which I have been proud to cosponsor.

This morning I testified before the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on the general principles contained in this legislation. As I indicated to the distinguished and able chairman of that subcommittee, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], it is my hope that the concepts contained in this bill will be considered and discussed in the course of the fair-employment-practice hearings. But, of course, I leave to the able chairman and other members of the subcommittee the decision as to whether any of these proposals should be incorporated in whatever legislation is reported by the subcommittee. I am confident that this legislation will receive the usual fair and comprehensive examination by the subcommittee in the course of its hearings on this critical issue.

President Kennedy specifically urged the Congress in his recent civil rights message to enact fair employment practices legislation. I hope we are sufficiently aware of the nature of the civil rights crisis to heed the President's wise counsel. There is an urgent need to guarantee every American the opportunity to hold a job when he possesses the requisite training and experience. He also has the right to expect an equal opportunity to acquire training and experience that will qualify him for personally and economically satisfying work. No one seeks charity for any group or segment in our society. We only seek an equal opportunity for each person to live and work as a participating member of society, meeting his personal and social responsibilities and obligations, and functioning as a contributing member of our democratic system.

We ask nothing more than this and we can accept nothing less. True equality of employment opportunity is essential to the realization of this goal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the bill's principal provisions and the full text of the bill, together with an editorial entitled "Job Equality," be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill summary, and editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1937) to promote equal employment opportunity by securing

equal treatment in the various incidents of employment, to establish an Equal Employment Opportunity Administration in the Department of Labor, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Equal Employment Opportunity Act".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that discrimination in employment against qualified persons because of their race, color, religion, or national origin has been practiced and continues to be practiced in the United States in a manner which restricts the fair and equal opportunity of such persons to earn their livelihood commensurate with their talent and ability. The Congress also finds that this inequality of employment opportunity forces such persons into substandard conditions of living, foments industrial strife and domestic unrest, deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities, and adversely affects the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States. Accordingly, it is in the national interest that equality of employment opportunity be secured in commerce and in activities affecting commerce.

The Congress further finds that because of the accumulated impact of prior discrimination and related disadvantages in employment, education, housing, and other areas, a nationwide effort is required to secure equal employment opportunity by the affirmative and conscious efforts of government, employers, unions, and others. Efforts to equalize disparities in employment opportunity should include all of the incidents and conditions of employment opportunity, including not only hiring, promotion, transfer, and seniority, but also recruitment and recruitment advertising, apprenticeship and other job training programs, access to all employment facilities and services, participation in employee organizations, and other incidents of employment opportunity necessary to the achievement of equality as an existing reality in the operation of the national job market.

The Congress further finds that due to the scope, size, and complexity of the national job market it is desirable and appropriate to establish an Equal Employment Opportunity Administration in the Department of Labor so that the administrative resources and professional expertise of the Department may be used in implementing the policies of this Act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in the Act—

(a) The term "person" includes one or more individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, receivers, and any organized group of persons.

(b) The term "State" means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the possessions of the United States, and (except as used in subsection (c) of this section) any political subdivision of any of the foregoing.

(c) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication between two or more States; between any State and any place outside thereof; between points in the same State but through any point outside thereof; or within the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United States.

(d) The term "affecting commerce" means in commerce, or burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce.

(e) The term "person subject to this Act" means any employer, government contractor, Federal agency, labor organization, and employment agency.

(f) The term "employer" means any person who—

(1) is engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce, or is acting, directly or indirectly, in the interest of a person so engaged, and

(2) has one or more individuals in his employ, or has had one or more individuals in his employ while so engaged or acting.

(g) The term "government contractor" means—

(1) any person who is carrying out a contract entered into by him with the United States or with any Federal agency.

(2) any person who is carrying out a subcontract for the execution of any part of a contract described in paragraph (1) or of any part of a subcontract described in this paragraph, and

(3) any person who is furnishing services, supplies, or materials, or constructing or repairing any property, under any program part or all of the funds for which are granted by the United States.

(h) The term "Federal agency" means any department, agency, or instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government of the United States, and any independent agency or instrumentality of the Government of the United States.

(i) The term "labor organization" means any organization which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of collective bargaining or of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, terms or conditions of employment, or for other mutual aid or protection in connection with employment.

(j) The term "employment agency" means any State employment agency financed or operated in whole or in part from public funds, and any private employment agency engaged in commerce or supplying workers for an employer.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 4. (a) No person subject to this Act shall refuse or deny equal employment opportunity to any individual because of race, color, religion, or national origin. Such refusal or denial shall include any act or practice which, because of an individual's race, color, religion, or national origin, results or tends to result in material disadvantage or impediment to any individual in obtaining employment or the incidents of employment for which he is otherwise qualified.

(b) Equal employment opportunity shall include all the compensations, terms, conditions, and privileges of employment including but not restricted to: hiring, promotion, transfer, and seniority; recruitment advertising and methods of recruitment; referrals for employment; apprenticeship training and other educational opportunity for or in employment; equality of access to facilities and services provided in employment; and equality of participation and membership in employee organizations and labor organizations.

(c) The Equal Employment Opportunity Administrator shall from time to time promulgate regulations and requirements reasonable and necessary to implement the policies of this Act. Such regulations and requirements may include provisions for affirmative action to be taken by persons subject to this Act in compliance with the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) to promote equal employment opportunity which has been denied to any individual because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby established within the Department of Labor an Equal Employment Opportunity Administration which shall be headed by an Equal Employment Opportunity Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator"). The Administrator shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate provided by law for Assistant Secretaries of Labor.

(b) The Administrator shall carry out the duties and functions imposed on him under this Act under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of Labor. In carrying out such duties and functions, the Administrator shall, to the extent feasible, utilize the existing bureaus, divisions, and facilities of the Department of Labor.

(c) The Administrator is authorized, subject to the civil service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1949, to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as may be necessary to enable him to carry out his duties and functions under this Act. Attorneys appointed under this section may appear for and represent the Administrator in any litigation.

(d) The Administrator is authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary to provide protection within Federal agencies to insure equal employment opportunities for Federal employees in accordance with the provisions of section 4 and the regulations and requirements promulgated thereunder.

(e) The Administrator is authorized to gather data regarding the practices of any person subject to this Act and to enter and inspect such places and such records (and make transcriptions thereof), question such employees, and investigate such facts, conditions, practices, or matters as is necessary to determine whether any person subject to this Act is violating or has violated the provisions of section 4 or the regulations or requirements promulgated thereunder, or as may aid in the enforcement of this Act.

(f) With the consent and cooperation of State agencies engaged in furthering equal employment opportunity, the Administrator is authorized, in carrying out his duties and functions under this Act, to utilize the services of such State agencies and their employees and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, may reimburse such State agencies and their employees for services rendered in assisting the Administrator to carry out his duties and functions under this Act.

(g) In carrying out his duties and functions under this Act, the Administrator is authorized to secure the assistance and support of all Federal agencies.

ENFORCEMENT BY ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 6. (a) It shall be the duty and function of the Administrator to require all persons subject to this Act to comply with the provisions of section 4. In order to prevent violations of section 4 or the regulations or requirements promulgated thereunder, or whenever the Administrator has cause to believe that any persons subject to this Act are violating or have violated such provisions, regulations, or requirements, the Administrator shall initiate appropriate investigation thereof and shall take appropriate measures to correct such violations, including the issuance of orders pursuant to subsection (c).

(b) The Administrator may receive written complaints by any individual or individuals aggrieved that such a violation is occurring or has occurred, but no complaint shall be a prerequisite to his investigating any such violation which may come to his attention by any appropriate means, including inspections regularly made under his authority to assure general compliance with the provisions of section 4 and the regulations and requirements promulgated thereunder.

(c) If as a result of an investigation conducted under this section the Administrator determines that any person subject to this Act is violating or has violated the provisions of section 4 or the regulations and requirements promulgated thereunder, he shall attempt through persuasion and conciliation to bring such person into compliance with such provisions. If such attempts are not successful in bringing such person into compliance, he shall issue appropriate remedial orders, including cease and desist orders, orders of back pay to individuals injured by the violation, and orders disqualifying such person from award of contracts and privileges by the United States or any Federal agency. In the case of an investigation initiated pursuant to a written complaint, if the Administrator determines that there is and has been no violation of section 4 or the regulations and requirements promulgated thereunder, he shall issue an order to that effect.

(d) Any person subject to this Act against whom an order is issued under subsection (c), and any individual who submits a written complaint to the Administrator with respect to which the Administrator issues an order finding no violation of section 4 or the regulations and requirements promulgated thereunder, shall be entitled to appeal such order, within 30 days from notice of issuance thereof, to the Equal Employment Opportunity Board.

(e) If no appeal is taken to the Equal Employment Opportunity Board from an order issued under subsection (c) against a person subject to this Act within the time prescribed by subsection (d), and if the person against whom such order is issued fails or refuses to comply with such order, the Administrator may apply to the Board for enforcement of such order.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY BOARD

SEC. 7. (a) There is hereby established, as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government, an Equal Employment Opportunity Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"). The Board shall be composed of five members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of the members first appointed shall be appointed for a term of one year, one for a term of two years, one for a term of three years, one for a term of four years, and one for a term of five years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of five years each, except that any individual appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he succeeds. Any member of the Board may be removed by the President for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

(b) The President shall designate one of the members to serve as Chairman of the Board.

(c) Three members of the Board shall constitute a quorum. A vacancy on the Board shall not impair to the right of the remaining members to exercise all of the powers of the Board.

(d) The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(e) Each member of the Board, other than the chairman, shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per year. The chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,500 per year. Each member shall be eligible for reappointment and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(f) The Board shall appoint such attorneys, hearing examiners, and other employees as it may from time to time find necessary for the proper performance of its functions. The Board may establish or utilize such regional, local, or other agencies, and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services, as may from time to time be needed.

(g) All of the expenses of the Board, including all necessary traveling and subsistence expenses outside the District of Columbia incurred by the members or employees of the Board under its orders, shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Board or by any employee it designates for that purpose.

(h) The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise any or all of its powers at any other place.

(i) The Board shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind, in the manner prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out its duties and functions under this Act.

(j) The Board shall at the close of each fiscal year make a report in writing to the Congress and to the President stating in detail the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, the names, salaries, and duties of all employees of the Board, and an account of all moneys it has disbursed.

DETERMINATION OF CASES BY THE BOARD

SEC. 8. (a) It shall be the duty and function of the Board to hear and determine appeals taken pursuant to section 6(d) from orders of the Administrator issued under section 6(c), and to hear and determine applications made pursuant to section 6(e) for enforcement of such orders. The Board shall have the power to issue orders affirming, affirming in part, modifying, or reversing orders of the Administrator issued under section 6(c).

(b) The Board shall hear each case de novo. Each party in any case shall have the right to present evidence and to examine and cross examine witnesses. All testimony shall be taken under oath. Any member of the Board, or any hearing examiner designated by it under subsection (e) acting for the Board, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to any case before the Board. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required, from any place in the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession, at any designated place of hearing.

(c) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person under this section, any district court within the jurisdiction of which the proceeding is being carried on or within the jurisdiction of which the person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Administrator shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring him to appear before the Board, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony relating to the proceeding.

(d) The Board is authorized to designate a division of the Board, a member of the Board, or a hearing examiner appointed by it under section 7(f) to hear and determine any case before the Board, including cases remanded for the taking of additional evidence under section 9(f). Whenever any such designation is made, the Board shall retain a discretionary right to review the action of the designated division, member, or hearing examiner, upon its own initiative or upon petition of any party in such case, within such time and in such manner as the Board shall prescribe by rules or regulations. The vote of a majority of the members of the Board less one member thereof shall be sufficient to bring any such case before the Board for review. If the Board declines to review any such case, or if no review is sought within the time prescribed by the rules or regulations of the Board, then the action of the division of the Board, the member of the Board, or the hearing examiner shall, for all purposes, be considered to be the action of the Board.

(e) Any member of the Board, or any hearing examiner or other employee designated by the Board for such purposes, may administer oaths.

(f) Orders and other process and papers of the Board may be served either personally or by registered mail or by telegraph or by leaving a copy thereof at the principal office or place of business of the person required to be served. The verified return by the individual so serving the same setting forth the manner of such service shall be proof of the same, and the return post office receipt or telegraph receipt therefor when registered and mailed or telegraphed as aforesaid shall be proof of service of the same. Witnesses summoned before the Board shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and the persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

(g) All process of any court to which application is made under this section may be served in the judicial district wherein the defendant or other person required to be served resides or may be found.

(h) The several departments and agencies of the Government, when directed by the President, shall furnish the Board, upon its request, all records, papers, and information in their possession relating to any matter before the Board.

JUDICIAL REVIEW AND ENFORCEMENT OF ORDERS OF THE BOARD

SEC. 9. (a) The Administrator or any person subject to this Act who is aggrieved by an order of the Board issued under section 8 may obtain a review of such order in the United States court of appeals for the judicial circuit in which the violation of section 4 or the regulations and requirement promulgated thereunder was alleged to have occurred, or in which such person resides or transacts business, or in the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the Board be modified or set aside. If such petition is not filed by the Administrator, a copy thereof shall forthwith be served upon him. The Administrator shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding before the Board, including the testimony and other evidence upon which the order of the Board was entered and the findings and order of the Board.

(b) The Administrator shall have power to petition the United States court of appeals for the judicial circuit in which the violation of section 4 or the regulations and requirements promulgated thereunder occurred, or in which the respondent resides or transacts business, for the enforcement of an order of the Board issued under section 8 and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order. The Administrator shall certify and file in the court to which petition is made a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding before the Board, including the testimony and other evidence upon which the order of the Board was entered and the findings and order of the Board.

(c) Upon the filing of a petition under subsection (a) or (b), the court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act. The court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon the respondent and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper and to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Board.

(d) No objection that has not been urged before the Board shall be considered by the court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances.

(e) The findings of the Board with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive.

(f) If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Board, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Board and to be made a part of the transcript.

(g) The Board may modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed, and it shall file such modified or new findings, which findings with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive, and its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order.

(h) The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

(i) The commencement of proceedings under this section shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Board's order.

TEMPORARY ENFORCEMENT OF ADMINISTRATOR'S ORDERS PENDING DECISIONS BY THE BOARD

Sec. 10. In any case in which an order of the Administrator against a person subject to this Act is appealed to the Board under section 8, or in which application for enforcement of an order of the Administrator is made under such section, the Administrator may apply to any district court for the district in which the violation of section 4 or the regulations and requirements promulgated thereunder was alleged to have occurred, or in which the person subject to this Act against whom such order was issued resides or transacts business, for a restraining order, temporary injunction, or other temporary relief for the enforcement of such order pending the decision of the Board. The district court to which such application is made shall have jurisdiction, in conformity with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, to grant such restraining order, temporary injunction, or other temporary relief as it deems just and proper to prevent irreparable injury to rights protected by this Act.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS

Sec. 11. (a) When granting appropriate temporary relief or a restraining order under sections 9 and 10, or when making and entering a decree or order enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part an order of the Board under section 9, the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes", approved March 23, 1932 (29 U.S.C. 101–115).

(b) Petitions filed under section 9, and applications filed under sections 8(c) and 10, shall be heard expeditiously.

VETERANS' PREFERENCE LAWS

Sec. 12. Nothing contined in this Act shall be construed to repeal or modify any law of the United States or of any State creating special rights or preference for veterans.

EFFECT ON STATE LAWS

Sec. 13. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to exempt or relieve any person from any liability, duty, penalty, or punishment provided by any present or future laws of any State, other than any such law which purports to require or permit the doing of any act which is a violation of section 4 of this Act or of the regulations and requirements promulgated thereunder.

SEPARABILITY

Sec. 14. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 15. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 16. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), this Act shall take effect on the date of its enactment.

(b) The provisions of sections 4 (and the regulations and requirements promulgated thereunder by the Administrator), 6, 8, 9, and 10 shall take effect six months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) The President shall, as soon as feasible after the enactment of this Act, convene one or more conferences for the purpose of enabling the leaders of groups whose members will be affected by this Act to become familiar with the rights afforded and obligations imposed by its provisions, and for the purpose of making plans which will result in the fair and effective administration of this Act when all of its provisions become effective. The President shall invite the participation in such conference or conferences of (1) the members of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, (2) the members of the Commission on Civil Rights, (3) representatives of State agencies engaged in furthering equal employment opportunity, (4) representatives of private agencies engaged in furthering equal employment opportunity, and (5) representatives of employers, Government contractors, Federal agencies, labor organizations, and employment agencies which are subject to this Act.

The summary and editorial presented by Mr. Humphrey are as follows:

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY ACT PROPOSED BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS

1. Standard of equal employment opportunity: The legislation seeks to establish equal employment opportunity as the principal standard to be enforced as distinct from the more traditional and less comprehensive standard of fair employment practices. No person subject to the act may refuse or deny equal employment opportunity to another individual because of race, color, religion, or national origin. Equality of employment is meant to include actual parity of access to employment in all its incidents. In including as elements of equal employment opportunity the vital incidents of employment such as advertising, recruitment, training, and promotion, the legislation goes beyond former FEP proposals. It has been found that certain employers who claim they have not rejected a Negro or other minority worker from employment have, in fact, carried on personnel practices and procedures which nevertheless have prevented Negroes even from applying for certain positions or have created other barriers and impediments to equal employment opportunity.

Persons subject to the act would be in violation not only if they overtly discriminated against Negro job applicants but also if their employment practices in collateral areas of employment opportunity denied equality of treatment to persons due to race, color, religion, or national origin.

This broader standard stems from the fact that the combination of vast technological advances in industry and agriculture and consistently rising unemployment among minority groups creates an employment situation significantly different from the one which existed when the initial FEP proposals were formulated in the late 1940's.

2. Administrator with authority to initiate: The legislation empowers a single administrator to promulgate regulations, initiate investigations, make findings, and issue orders in implementing the policies of this act. Total reliance on a hit-or-miss complaints procedure has been a significant weakness in State FEPC programs and this bill seeks to rectify this situation. The administrator also has authority to receive written complaints from allegedly aggrieved parties but such complaints are not a prerequisite for affirmative action by the administrator.

3. Equal Employment Opportunity Administration in Department of Labor: In order to sustain an equal employment opportunity program of national scope and impact, an Equal Employment Opportunity Administration is located within the Department of Labor. Headed by an administrator, this administration is empowered to use the existing Administrative resources and professional expertise of the Department in implementing the policies of the act. The administrator is further authorized to take such action as may be necessary to provide protection within Federal agencies to insure equal employment opportunities for Federal employees.

4. Equal Employment Opportunity Board: An independent Equal Employment Opportunity Board is created to hear appeals from decisions of the administrator and from individuals whose complaints have not been upheld by the administrator. The administrator is also authorized to apply to the Board for enforcement of orders not appealed within the 30-day limit and not complied with. The Board would function as an administrative court in a manner somewhat analogous to the operations of the Tax Court in internal revenue matters. The Board would have no policy or operating responsibilities similar to the ones traditionally lodged with FEP commissions. The Board is authorized to appoint hearing examiners who may be delegated the authority to render decisions in the name of the Board.

5. Judicial review: Decisions of the Board can be taken for review by the aggrieved party to the appropriate Federal circuit court of appeals. Similarly the administrator can apply to the circuit court for enforcement of an order by the Board that has not been complied with. Provision is also made for the administrator to apply to any Federal district court for an interim enforcement order of a decision pending on appeal before the Board.

6. Coverage: The legislation is comprehensive in its coverage. Persons subject to the act include any employer engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce, any government contractor, Federal agency, labor organization, and any employment agency financed or operated in whole or in part from public funds and any private employment agency engaged in commerce or supplying workers for an employer. Categories of exemption such as private employers not doing business with the Federal Government, employers of a certain size, or employers engaged in certain kinds of business have tended to create invidious and competitive comparisons with those industries

> and companies including in former FEP bills. This legislation contains none of these exemptions or exclusions. Since the process of employment is clearly national in scope and impact, the legislation uses the commerce clause of the U.S. Constitution (art. I, sec. 8) as its justification for the participation of the Federal Government in guaranteeing equal employment opportunity.
>
> JOB EQUALITY
>
> "There is little value in a Negro's obtaining the right to be admitted to hotels and restaurants," said President Kennedy in his civil rights message, "if he has no cash in his pocket and no job." Here is a piece of simple, homespun commonsense; and we hope the whole of the administration will keep it clearly in mind as it presses the fight on Capitol Hill for a public accommodations law. They are equally important; and they are intimately interrelated.
>
> It is disquieting, therefore, to hear reports that there is no great steam behind the measure just approved by the House Labor Committee to create a five-member Equal Employment Opportunities Board empowered to eliminate racially discriminatory practices in hiring and firing among all business enterprises affecting interstate commerce. This is a thoroughly practicable proposal. And it is indispensable to the attainment of real racial equality.
>
> Fair employment practices commissions of various sorts are working successfully in a number of States. A national FEPC operated with great effectiveness—and with very little friction—during the war. It is just as possible and just as reasonable to forbid racial discrimination in job opportunities as to forbid it in businesses offering services to the general public. Enforcement must, of course, be preceded and accompanied by tactful and skilled efforts at persuasion. But it also must be backed by the ultimate sanction of legal compulsion. Nothing is more fundamental to the idea that all men are created equal than an equal chance for all men to make the most of their abilities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, since hearings on FEP legislation have already begun before the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I ask unanimous consent for the bill to remain at the desk for only 1 additional day in order for other Senators to become cosponsors if they so desire. However, I will be pleased to ask subsequently for unanimous consent to add names of additional Senators and to have their names included on later printings.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

BAN ON NUCLEAR TESTS IN THE ATMOSPHERE, IN OUTER SPACE, AND UNDER WATER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we are on the threshold of a truly historic development in international relations. Our negotiators in Moscow, headed by the distinguished citizen and public servant, Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman, are very close to reaching agreement with representatives of the Soviet Union and Great Britain to prohibit nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space, and under water.

This is a limited agreement to prohibit nuclear tests in these three environments. It will be an agreement, if it can be reached, which will have far-reaching consequences.

It is a proposal which I believe to be in our national interest. Later I shall discuss this in more detail.

It is a proposal which can assist in preventing the further spread of nuclear weapons into the hands of nations and individuals who are unreliable or less reliable. Such dispersal could only add tension to the world.

It is a proposal which safeguards vital American interests. I say this after having been privileged to see the draft treaty, as it was the privilege of each member of the Committee on Foreign Relations to do, and, I understand, of each member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Secretary of State spoke to us yesterday, and today he spoke to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The Secretary of State fully discussed with us the provisions of the draft treaty.

If the draft treaty is agreed upon by the negotiators, it will be initialed in Moscow. At that time our negotiators will return to the United States to discuss the proposals with the Members of the Senate and the executive branch.

I mention this because the initialing of the proposed agreement will not be binding. It will be merely preliminary. In order for any agreement to be binding, it must first have the signature of the President of the United States or of the Secretary of State or of an officer appointed by the President of the United States with the authority to commit this Government. Of course, to be fully binding and to become a part of the supreme law of this land and to have merit in international tribunals, it must be ratified by the U.S. Senate.

Since one does not wish to speak about specifics at this juncture, suffice it to say that the proposed treaty provides an escape clause for the United States which will protect our national interest and our national security, in case of violation or evasion of the requirements of the treaty.

Let it be crystal clear that our Government, under the proposed treaty, will maintain in a constant state of alert and readiness our testing facilities, so that in case there is a violation, we can readily test, if we need to, for our own national security. Also, since the treaty will not include underground tests, it will permit the United States, if it wishes to do so, or if it finds it necessary, to conduct experimentation of nuclear technology, both weapons and for peaceful purposes, underground. It so happens that the United States is best equipped to undertake underground testing either for weaponry or for peaceful purposes.

So I judge this proposed treaty to be sound, safe, and in our national interests. Obviously it is in the interests of humanity.

I have a clipping from the daily press to which I wish to invite the attention of the Senate. It is from this morning's Washington Post, and relates to a significant study in Canada of the effect of radioactive rainfall due to atomic explosions, testing in the atmosphere. This rainfall has caused deformity and malformation of children. At least, this is the report of reliable medical and scientific sources in Canada.

We have an obligation to ourselves and to future generations to prevent any such disaster. Above all, we have an obligation to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons in a world filled with unrest and tension. I regret to say that in many other lands the leaders are less than reliable and responsible.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate the article which appeared this morning in the Washington Post, entitled "Where We Stand," by Joseph Alsop.

Mr. Alsop has not been a continuous proponent of a nuclear test ban treaty. Mr. Alsop is a keen student of national security. He cannot be looked upon as a pacifist. He cannot be looked upon as an appeaser. He cannot be called "one who is soft on the Russians." If anything, he has been called, many times, "tough-minded," and he has been spoken of as one who has advocated the strongest possible military defense of this Nation. In the past, Mr. Alsop has been highly critical of what he considered to be weaknesses in our defense policy.

The article, which came to my attention as I read the morning press, impressed me with the importance of the proposed treaty and the importance of the negotiations which are now under way.

I wish to read a few paragraphs. Mr. Alsop speaks of the balance sheet of military power as between ourselves and the Soviet Union, and particularly the balance sheet as between ourselves and the Soviet Union in terms of nuclear power. He states:

> The U.S. missiles are smaller, more dependable and much more accurate—advantages considered greatly to outweigh their smaller warheads. And in this range of destructive power, the Soviets have not tested any warheads as efficient as ours—which means that they will not find it easy to go forward, as we have gone, from liquid-fueled to solid-fueled rockets.
>
> Such, then, are the main features of the balance sheet. Even if we were to test an improved American warhead comparable to the Soviet 30-megaton type, we would not have any rockets capable of delivering it unless we made that retrograde step of returning to a liquid-fueled delivery system.
>
> Meanwhile, as noted, the Soviets have somewhat handicapped themselves for the forward step to a solid-fueled rocket delivery system. In practical terms, therefore, it is hard to see why the United States will lose by the ban.

I digress from the article to say he means the nuclear test ban.

I continue to quote:

> And this is all the more true since the omission of underground tests will keep the Atomic Energy Commission's weapons development laboratories in being and at work. A complete ban, which would all but annihilate the laboratories, would be a very different proposition.

The whole substance and weight of this article is in support of the nuclear test ban treaty. I pray—and I say this in all reverence—that we may be successful in these negotiations, because this could be the beginning of a brighter day among nations. The clouds that have covered the earth in the years since

World War II may be lifted a bit, and a ray of light and hope may come through.

Many people wonder why the Soviet Union seems to be more agreeable to a nuclear test ban agreement or treaty. I cannot fully understand the motives of the Soviets or why they do what they do, but I think there are one or two facts which are quite obvious.

First of all, the Soviets are having to decide whether they are to continue the arms race and sacrifice economic growth, or whether they should reduce the arms race in order to have more economic growth. The Soviet economic system finds it difficult to support both an arms race and adequate economic expansion.

It has been my view for years that, if we are to have an arms race, we ought to have one big enough so that the Soviet must make a choice President Kennedy's defense policy and national security policy, without being emotional, belligerent, bellicose, or strident, has served to build up the strength of American military power—surely and consistently—with the cooperation of Congress. I believe the Soviet Union has now had to make the choice—the choice was either armaments and sacrifice their 5-year, 7-year, or 20-year plan, or reduce armaments and east tensions in order to go forward with her economic program. This is a sensible policy on our part. I think it has paid off.

Secondly, I think the change in relations between the Soviet Union and the United States started on that day in October 1962 when the President informed the Soviet Union we would not tolerate Soviet missiles in this hemisphere, and when the President of the United States, again without being belligerent, without being emotional, without being bellicose, but by being firm and resolute, informed Premier Khrushchev that those missiles must go or the consequence would be war, and that we were prepared to take that step. There was some rethinking in the Kremlin.

To the eternal credit of President Kennedy, he did not rub salt into the wounds of Soviet pride. He did not listen to the cries that came from this body and elsewhere that we do more things in Cuba and that we do more things that would humiliate the Soviets. But the President of the United States did what was necessary to be done in terms of our commitments to the free world and our national security. Premier Khrushchev understood that, and he has responded as a man who understands power and the use and application of power. Our President understands power and the use and application of power, with restraint and responsibility.

In the months since last October there have been many exchanges of letters between the two heads of state, President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev. Some of them have been made public; others have not. The President has acted as a statesman, not as a demagog. The President has acted as a world leader, and not as a precinct politician. And because he has acted as a statesman and as a world leader, and because he has acted firmly and with resolution, without being belligerent or bellicose, it appears he may be reaping a part of the harvest of sensible, constructive, affirmative, responsible foreign policy.

Nikita Khrushchev is faced with the problems of Communist China and the ideological struggle going on in the Communist world. Nikita Khrushchev says that the way to expand communism is by way of peaceful coexistence, and he defends his policy against Communist attack from China.

I note for the record—and I shall comment on them later—that the radio broadcasts from Peiping, and the newspaper articles from the controlled press in Communist China, view the proposed nuclear test ban treaty as appeasement by Russia, charging that Nikita Khrushchev has yielded to what the Chinese Communists call the imperialists of the West. But I have the feeling that Mr. Khrushchev may very well have boxed the Chinese Communists into a corner, from which they cannot find a way out. What is that corner? It is that the people of the world want peace, not war. It is that those who speak and work for peace will have the following of the masses of the people.

I think Mr. Khrushchev does not want to argue with the Chinese Communists the issues of Marxism and Leninism and communism. It is a fact that he has deviated somewhat from the traditional line of Marxism and Leninism. But, be that as it may—and I do not claim to be an expert on Marxism and Leninism—Nikita Khrushchev will do better for himself and his country by being an advocate of restraint and peace, limiting nuclear tests and prohibiting nuclear tests, than will the leaders of Chinese communism in advocating war, aggression, and more tests.

I happen to believe the Russian Communists have been willing to make this concession on the nuclear issue because of the greater political rewards that it will give to them, not the military rewards.

So let us hope that, whatever those reasons may be, the test ban agreement can be consummated. If it is, I say that the American people will want the Senate of the United States, after careful examination and hearing, to ratify it.

Let it be clearly understood that no treaty will be brought to the Senate that would sacrifice our national security. Consultations are taking place hourly with Members of the Senate who hold responsible and key positions. Before any treaty reaches any Senator, it will be gone over carefully by the Senate. In other words, as the late Arthur Vandenberg said, "We will be present at the takeoff, not merely at the crash landings." We will be a part of the consultations and advisory process. Then when the treaty comes here for our action, I cannot believe the U.S. Senate will reject it.

Once before we rejected a treaty, the Versailles Treaty, and the League of Nations, and we paid a horrible price. I think we have learned our lesson, and I think we will accept that treaty and ratify it, if the treaty contains provisions that the Foreign Relations Committee thinks should be included.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I referred, written by Mr. Alsop, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WHERE WE STAND

(By Joseph Alsop)

The most obvious effect of the agreement on a nuclear test ban is to freeze the existing American and Soviet nuclear weapons systems except in the limited areas where progress can be made by underground testing.

We are undoubtedly due to hear much heated argument about the advantages and risks of this nuclear version of the old children's game called still pond, no more moving. Hence it may be in order to offer a cool assessment of the present stage of United States and Soviet nuclear weapons development.

In the current stage of the grim nuclear art, it must be noted, the test of success is not mere destructiveness. The main test is, rather, what some of the scientists call the weight-to-bang ratio.

In other words, if you can pack more kilotonnage or megatonnage of destructive power into a given weight of bomb than your rival has managed to do, you are in the lead. The weight-to-bang ratio is so important, in turn, because light bomb weights make for simpler delivery systems; and the delivery systems nowadays count far more than bomb stocks in all calculations of the balance of nuclear striking power.

When this test of the weight-to-bang ratio is applied to United States and Soviet nuclear weapons development, what emerges is quite wonderfully banal. We are ahead of the Soviets in the kind of weapons we want and have tried extra hard to develop. And the Soviets are ahead of us in the kind of weapons they want and have emphasized in their development program.

Nothing could be less unexpected. Yet the cry is already being raised in some quarters that the nuclear test ban has been agreed to when "the Soviets are ahead." In hard-nosed Soviet circles, meanwhile, one may be pretty sure that there is grumbling about a test ban being agreed to when "the United States is ahead." In both cases, the question to ask is, "Ahead, how and where?"

To be more specific, the Soviets are ahead, in terms of the weight-to-bang ratio, in the development of weapons of very high megatonnage. They have tested a 100-megaton bomb; but its estimated weight of hundreds of thousands of pounds, though fairly low for its destructive power, still forbids the use of this bomb in combination with a rocket-delivery system.

More important, the Soviets have also tested a 30-megaton bomb, whose weight is thought to be low enough to make it deliverable by their very large, powerful but cumbersome intercontinental ballistic missiles. Warheads of this pattern may well be used for some, at least, of the second generation Soviet ICBM's (comparable to our late-model Titans), which are now beginning to be deployed in Russia.

The American military theorists, in contrast, have consistently held that 10 megatons was about the limit of the really useful explosive power of a nuclear weapon. Hence the U.S. nuclear weapons program has emphasized warheads and bombs of powers up to 10 megatons, and in this range the United States has the lead.

The weight-to-bang ratio of the American weapons is particularly good, as might be expected, in the warheads designed for use with Polaris and Minuteman missiles. The numbers of Polaris and Minuteman missiles in the American program considerably exceed

> the numbers of second-generation ICBM's being deployed by the Soviets.
>
> The U.S. missiles are smaller, more dependable and much more accurate—advantages considered greatly to outweigh their smaller warheads. And in this range of destructive power, the Soviets have not tested any warheads as efficient as ours—which means that they will not find it easy to go forward, as we have gone, from liquid- to solid-fueled rockets.
>
> Such, then, are the main features of the balance sheet. Even if we were to test an improved American warhead comparable to the Soviet 30-megaton type, we would not have any rockets capable of delivering it unless we made the retrograde step of returning to a liquid-fueled delivery system.
>
> Meanwhile, as noted, the Soviets have somewhat handicapped themselves for the forward step to a solid-fueled rocket delivery system. In practical terms, therefore, it is hard to see why the United States will lose by the ban.
>
> And this is all the more true since the omission of underground tests will keep the Atomic Energy Commission's weapons development laboratories in being and at work. A complete ban, which would all but annihilate the laboratories, would be a very different proposition.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I say to my good friend from Minnesota that I associate myself with him in the remarks he made in regard to the probability of a test ban treaty going into effect. I said yesterday, following the briefing by our great Secretary of State—and historians will record that he was one of the greatest in our history—that if we are successful in negotiating with Russia and Great Britain a test ban treaty which comes even close to the kind of proposal the Secretary of State told us was under present discussion, it would be a great day for mankind. We will either negotiate in the not too distant future an end to this insane nuclear armaments race, or we will have to assume our share of the responsibility for the destruction of most of mankind.

I am one who thinks that these are solemn days in which we live when we take a look at our responsibilities. Therefore I share the view of the Senator from Minnesota that such a treaty should be negotiated and ratified; and I am confident if the American people and the Congress understand it, if it is presented to us, it will be ratified.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to read into the RECORD a statement which was released today by the distinguished Representative from California, CHET HOLIFIELD, following discussions at a meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, at which the Secretary of State and the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Mr. Foster, appeared. Mr. HOLIFIELD states more succinctly and concisely and eloquently what I believe to be the merits of the proposed treaty than anything I have read or heard. He says:

> The prevention of thermonuclear war is the paramount task of our time. Thermonuclear war would destroy not only the political structures of leading nations, but their populations and physical assets.
>
> The responsibility of the national leaders of nuclear nations is to achieve genuine arrangements and agreements which will give their peoples the right of survival.
>
> Through diplomatic negotiation, based on the grim realization that there can be no victor in a world nuclear struggle, we seem to be approaching an international agreement containing reasonable terms for the prohibition of nuclear tests in space, water, and air.
>
> In my opinion, we can well afford to take this step. We can accept the minimal risks involved, when compared to the increasing danger of an unrestricted nuclear arms race. We need time to achieve further reduction of international tensions so we can negotiate bona fide agreements and arrangements for the attainment of world peace.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this states the case very clearly; namely, that, although there may be some risks, they are much less than if we continue with no agreement. It points out that this could well open vistas and portals to future opportunities to reduce tensions and to take additional steps down the path of a just and enduring peace.

We need to remember that peace, as President Kennedy has said, is a process. It takes time. It takes building blocks to achieve it. The possibility of reaching agreement on a limited test ban treaty would provide a most important stone in that edifice of world peace.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my speech today on foreign aid will be very brief. I am talking about a very vital issue. I am honored that my friend from Minnesota is present, because a part of it involves a subject matter in which he has taken a very active interest for years. I wonder if my friend from Minnesota is even aware of the course of action the Foreign Relations Committee, of which he is a member, took the other day in regard to this issue.

(At this point Mr. HUMPHREY took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. MORSE. My friend from Minnesota was not present at the meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee, and for a very good rason. He is the whip of the Democratic Party in this body, which means that he is assistant majority leader, and a very able one, and was engaged in very important official work of the Senate, where he was participating in a conference at a very high level which made it impossible for him to be at the meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee. In his absence and in the absence of a considerable number of other members of the committee, an amendment to the foreign aid bill was adopted in the Foreign Relations Committee, and in adopting it a large number of proxies were used.

Let the record be clear that the Senator from Minnesota did not leave his proxy; at least, he did not leave it in the hands of those who used their proxies to adopt this very unfortunate amendment. The Senator from Minnesota could not have been aware that the amendment was going to be offered at that time, because I cannot imagine, if he were aware of it, that he would not have left his proxy with me for me to use to help defeat the amendment. It would not have been enough, but it would have closed the gap, because we needed very few votes to close that gap.

The amendment was to delete the statement of policy in the foreign aid bill. About the best thing in the foreign aid bill was the statement of policy. It is too bad that the foreign aid bill is so constructed that it cannot possibly implement this grand statement of policy that was deleted. That is not the reason for its deletion. If it had been deleted on that basis, there would be some sense in the course of action. It was not deleted for that reason. It was deleted for another reason, and it is a very serious reason.

There are serious implications in the deletion. The country needs to be notified as to what the Foreign Relations Committee has done. I wish to say to the country: "You still have time to make clear to those on the Foreign Relations Committee, who made this great mistake, in my judgment, that you want it changed."

The Foreign Relations Committee will be given an opportunity to change that decision, because I shall move that it reconsider its action. If I lose in committee, I shall move an amendment on the floor of the Senate which will change this action of the Foreign Relations Committee in the matter of policy.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the statement of policy of the foreign aid bill which was in the bill as it came to Congress from the administration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> SEC. 102.[1] STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the sense of the Congress that peace depends on wider recognition of the dignity and interdependence of men, and survival of free institutions in the United States can best be assured in a worldwide atmosphere of freedom.
>
> To this end, the United States has in the past provided assistance to help strengthen the forces of freedom by aiding peoples of less developed friendly countries of the world to develop their resources and improve their living standards, to realize their aspirations for justice, education, dignity, and respect as individual human beings, and to establish responsible governments.
>
> The Congress declares it to be a primary necessity, opportunity, and responsibility of the United States, and consistent with its traditions and ideals, to renew the spirit which lay behind these past efforts, and to help make a historic demonstration that economic growth and political democracy can go hand in hand to the end that an enlarged community of free, stable, and self-reliant countries can reduce world tensions and insecurity.
>
> It is the policy of the United States to strengthen friendly foreign countries by encouraging the development of their free economic institutions and productive capabilities, and by minimizing or eliminating barriers to the flow of private investment capital.
>
> In addition, the Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States to support the principles of increased economic cooperation and trade among countries, freedom of the press, information, and religion, freedom of navigation in international waterways, and recognition of the right of all

---

[1] 22 U.S.C. 2151.

NOTE.—The Foreign Assistance Act will be referred to as the FA Act and "this act." The Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1963, will be referred to as the FA Appropriation Act, 1963.

private persons to travel and pursue their lawful activities without discrimination as to race or religion. The Congress further declares that any distinction made by foreign nations between American citizens because of race, color, or religion in the granting of, or the exercise of, personal or other rights available to American citizens is repugnant to our principles.[2] In the administration of all parts of this Act these principles shall be supported in such a way in our relations with countries friendly to the United States which are in controversy with each other as to promote an adjudication of the issues involved by means of international law procedures available to the parties.[3]

Accordingly, the Congress hereby affirms it to be the policy of the United States to make assistance available, upon request, under this part in scope and on a basis of long-range continuity essential to the creation of an environment in which the energies of the peoples of the world can be devoted to constructive purposes, free of pressure and erosion by the adversaries of freedom. It is the sense of the Congress that assistance under this part should be complemented by the furnishing under any other Act of surplus agricultural commodities and by disposal of excess property under this and other Acts.

Also, the Congress reaffirms its conviction that the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered so long as international communism continues to attempt to bring under Communist domination peoples now free and independent and to keep under domination peoples once free but now subject to such domination. It is, therefore, the policy of the United States to continue to make available to other free countries and peoples, upon request, assistance of such nature and in such amounts as the United States deems advisable and as may be effectively used by free countries and peoples to help them maintain their freedom. Assistance shall be based upon sound plans and programs; be directed toward the social as well as economic aspects of economic development; be responsive to the efforts of the recipient countries to mobilize their own resources and help themselves; be cognizant of the external and internal pressures which hamper their growth; and should emphasize long-range development assistance as the primary instrument of such growth.

It is the sense of Congress that in the administration of these funds great attention and consideration should be given to those countries which share the view of the United States on the world crisis and which do not, as a result of United States assistance, divert their own economic resources to military propaganda efforts, supported by the Soviet Union or Communist China, and directed against the United States or against other countries receiving aid under this Act.[4]

The Congress further declares that in the administration of programs of assistance under this Act the highest practicable emphasis should be given to: programs providing for loans or loan guarantees for use by institutions and organizations in making repayable low-interest rate loans to individuals in friendly foreign countries for the purchase of small farms, the purchase of homes, the establishment, equipment and strengthening of small independent business concerns, purchase of tool or equipment needed by individuals for carrying on an occupation or a trade or financing the opportunity for individuals to obtain practical education in vocational and occupational skills, and to those programs of technical assistance and development which will assist in carrying out and in preparing a favorable environment for such programs. While recognizing that special requirements, differing development needs and political conditions in various assisted countries will affect the priority of such programs and of each country's relative ability to implement them, it is further the sense of Congress that each such assisted country should be encouraged to give adequate recognition to such needs of the people in the preparation of national development programs.[5]

The Congress reaffirms its belief in the importance of regional organizations of free peoples for mutual assistance, such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization,[6] the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the European Economic Community, the Organization of American States,[7] the Colombo Plan, the South East Asia Treaty Organization,[8] the Central Treaty Organization,[9] and others, and expresses its hope that such organizations may be strengthened and broadened, and their programs of self-help and mutual cooperation may be made more effective in the protection of the independence and security of free people, and in the development of their economic and social well-being, and the safeguarding of their basic rights and liberties.

Finally, the Congress urges that all other countries able to contribute join in a common undertaking to meet the goals stated in this part. It is the sense of Congress that, where feasible, the U.S. Government invite friendly nations to join in missions to consult with countries which are recipients of assistance under this part on the possibilities for joint action to assure the effective development of plans for the economic development of such recipient countries and the effective use of assistance provided them; and that the President may request the assistance of international financial institutions in bringing about the establishment of such missions.[10]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I will not take the time, because of the lateness of the hour, to read this magnificent statement of objectives. Would that we had a foreign aid bill that carried out this magnificent statement. I will do my best to make the bill do so. Next week I shall discuss the matter of the shocking waste of the foreign aid bill in connection with equipment that we have sent abroad under both the military aid and economic aid programs. Do Senators know who my witness will be?

I shall figuratively put on the stand in the Senate the Comptroller General of the United States.

The Comptroller General of the United States, one of our most dedicated public officials, is really an officer or an agent of Congress. Congress created his office and charged it with the responsibility of serving as a watchdog over the executive branch of the Government with respect to the expenditure of Federal funds. Nobody has been talking about the Comptroller General's findings; but every member of the Committee on Foreign Relations knows what he has been finding. We have been getting envelopes with the reports of the Comptroller General marked "Top Secret." In some instances we have to sign a receipt, the contents are so top secret. But report after report from the Comptroller General shows the shocking waste of the equipment that we have for years been shipping abroad, paid for by American taxpayers. Yet those countries which are asking for more and more equipment cannot use and do not use the equipment we have already sent them. That will be the subject of a part of my speech next week. Tonight I shall talk about the policy statement.

I may say, in response to a message that has been handed to me, that I shall be finished before 6 o'clock.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. If I am not interrupted, I shall be through before 6 o'clock.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So that there may be no misunderstanding, what the Senator from Oregon is referring to is a meeting to be held by the Committee on Commerce at 6 o'clock to consider proposed railroad legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Just focus attention on the clock. I shall conclude in 6 minutes, if I am left alone.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall do so.

Mr. MORSE. It may take 6 minutes to devastate the Committee on Foreign Relations on the mistake it made the other day in eliminating the statement of policy from the foreign aid bill. What was included in that elimination is very interesting. Many times we have had a historic battle on the floor of the Senate, starting in 1955, with respect to the Lehman-Morse resolution; then, in 1959, on the Morse-Javits amendment to the foreign aid bill; then, in 1960, 1961, and 1962, standing firm in support of the language we have written into the law, language now removed by the Committee on Foreign Relations in the action it has taken, which puts this Government on record as against aid to any country that discriminates against American citizens because of religious faith.

Mr. President, every Member of this body knows about the debate to which I allude. I say to the proponents of the amendment: "If you want to raise that fight again, we are ready to take you on, because you cannot justify this retreat in respect to American idealism." I am one Senator who will say to those groups in America that stand for tolerance, that believe in religious freedom, that we must protect our ideals and principles in regard to religious freedom and nondiscrimination because of religious faith. We must say to the Senate, and if necessary to the House of Representatives, that we want those guarantees rewritten into the foreign aid bill.

I will remember that fight. I was told in 1955 that we could not pass the Lehman-Morse resolution. Presiding over the Senate at the present moment, and sitting in the majority leader's chair, are two Senators who performed yeoman service in support of the Lehman-Morse resolution: the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from

---

[2] This sentence was added by sec. 101(a) of the FA Act of 1962.

[3] See also sec. 106 of the FA Appropriation Act, 1963, p. 80.

[4] This paragraph was added by sec. 101(b) of the FAAct of 1962.

[5] This paragraph was added by Sec. 101(b) of the FAAct of 1962.

[6] For text of the North Atlantic Treaty, see p. 600.

[7] TIAS Doc. No. 2361.

[8] TIAS Doc. No. 3170.

[9] For U.S. Agreements with CENTO countries, see TIAS Doc. Nos. 4189 (Iran), 4190 (Pakistan), and 4191 (Turkey).

[10] This sentence was added by sec. 101(c) of the FAAct of 1962.

Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. In 1959, the same two Senators stood with the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], in support of an amendment to the foreign aid bill that wrote those guarantees into the statement of policy of the foreign aid bill of that year.

It will be remembered that in the battles of 1960 and 1961, the same kind of drive was made to have us retreat. There were dictators in the world to whom we were giving millions of dollars of foreign aid, but who would not let Jewish boys serving in the Armed Forces, and wearing the uniform of the U.S. Government, enter their lands. I said in 1955, 1959, 1960, 1961, and 1962, and I repeat on the floor of the Senate, "Bring all our forces home, if we cannot send Jewish boys, serving that flag behind the chair of the Presiding Officer, and as loyal as any Gentile." That is what is behind this fight. Let us get it out in the open.

This is an ugly issue. In my judgment, the Committee on Foreign Relations should retrace its steps. The magnificent statement of policy by President Kennedy, which continues the inclusion of this pledge of America idealism, of religious freedom, and of nondiscrimination, must, in my judgment, be reestablished in the bill.

I hope enough has been said. I respectfully serve notice that we will wage this fight, unless the majority of the Committee on Foreign Relations will retrace its steps and put the policy statement back into the bill. If they fail to do so, and if we lose in committee, we will fight it out on the floor of the Senate.

But tonight I alert the defenders of tolerance in America to take note of what is happening in connection with the foreign aid bill and to make clear their wishes to Congress.

Mr. President, it is now 3 minutes before 6 o'clock. I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, in accordance with the previous order, until tomorrow, Thursday, July 25, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, July 24, 1963:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Vietnam.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

John E. Horne, of Alabama, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the term expiring June 30, 1967.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Eugene P. Foley, of Minnesota, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration, vice John E. Horne.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

1. For appointment:

To be senior surgeon

Maria Sarrigiannis

To be senior assistant surgeons

Crittenden E. Brookes
Samuel Dubin
Jan A. Fawcett
Richard L. Gross
Eric J. Hanson
Harvey J. Karten
Kenneth G. Kassebaum
David C. Kay
Elliot I. Morrison
David J. Muller
Edward M. Pattison
Monroe Pray, Jr.
John A. Schremly
Thorbjorg Sigurdson
Leon R. Wanerman

The following named officers for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. John W. White, 1087A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert H. Curtin, 1643A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Abe J. Beck, 5831A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William S. Steele, 1229A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Bertram C. Harrison, 1425A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Henry C. Huglin, 1436A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph T. Kingsley, Jr., 1702A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Thomas P. Corwin, AO328499R, Air Force Reserve.

Col. James H. Isbell, 1463A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Stebbins W. Griffith, 3944A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William L. Mitchell, Jr., 4063A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Luther H. Richmond, 4133A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert W. Paulson, 3871A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William T. Daly, 3947A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert H. McCutcheon, 4150A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William J. Meng, 4510A, Regular Air Force.

Col. George S. Boylan, Jr., 4836A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Oris B. Johnson, 5052A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Howard J. Withycombe, 4000A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William C. Bacon, 4828A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Fred J. Higgins, 20019A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Ernest C. Hardin, Jr., 8211A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Royal B. Allison, 8451A, Regular Air Force.

Col. James T. Stewart, 8692A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Andrew S. Low, Jr., 8890A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Russell E. Dougherty, 9985A, Regular Air Force.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 24, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Luke 4: 4: *Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God.*

O Thou source of every good and needed blessing, we penitently confess that we are frequently tempted to yield to the fallacy that living becomes worth while when we possess an abundance of this world's goods.

We are continually ignoring the warning of the Master that "man does not live by bread alone" and that life measures up to its real value not by accumulating quantities of material things but by achieving lofty qualities of spirit.

Grant that we may pursue and accept life on the higher terms of a faith that conquers all anxiety and by a trust in Thee that meets life's hard experiences with courage and hope.

Show us how we may master the fine art of living by gaining for ourselves Thy divine attributes of love and holiness and by reaching out toward others in service and sacrifice.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

IN MEMORIAM—THE LATE HONORABLE HJALMAR NYGAARD, OF NORTH DAKOTA

The **SPEAKER.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, as most Members of the House know, my colleague from North Dakota, HJALMAR NYGAARD, suffered a fatal heart attack here in the Capitol Building on last Thursday afternoon.

To say that I was shocked and saddened is hardly an adequate expression of my emotions at losing HJALMAR as an experienced and able partner in this assignment of representing the people of North Dakota here in the National Congress. I say this is hardly an adequate expression because HJALMAR, in addition to being my colleague in Congress, was my close friend. We had served together during my one term in the North Dakota House of Representatives, and since we have been together here in Congress, our acquaintance had developed into a personal friendship. The good Lord just does not create finer people than HJALMAR—and I am sure those of you here who got to know him and had occasion to work with him, share and understand my feelings.

My sorrow also extends to Mrs. Nygaard, "Tommy" to those who know her well, because I learned to know of the deep affection that existed between these two wonderful people. I know my loss of a close personal friend is almost nothing compared to Tommy's loss of her lifelong partner and beloved husband.

HJALMAR was born on a farm near Sharon, N. Dak., in 1906, and spent practically his entire life in his native State. He received his college education at Mayville Teachers College and the University of North Dakota, and as a young man taught school for several years. In his hometown of Sharon, N. Dak., he operated a grocery store, served as mayor of the town, and as a member of the school board. Perhaps this was when HJALMAR first became interested in politics because we find him doing more than his share of public service during the rest of his life.

He was one of those who took an active and positive interest in public affairs for the good of his town, his church, his State, and our great Nation. When he moved to Enderlin, N. Dak., in 1944, where he went into the hardware business with his brother-in-law, Carl Bjerke, his ability and dedicated sound thinking was soon recognized because it was from this community that he was sent to the North Dakota House of Representatives in 1948. Here he served continuously for six terms, through 1959. His honesty, integrity, leadership, and ability, was again recognized in the halls of our State legislature because he served as majority leader in the 1955 and 1957 sessions and was speaker of the house in 1959. It was only natural that his Republican colleagues in North Dakota should choose him as their candidate for Congress in 1960, and he was elected to Congress in the November 8, 1960, general election—and again in 1962.

In addition to his interest in politics, HJALMAR was a member of Kiwanis and served on the board of directors of the North Dakota Lutheran Welfare Society. One of his most intense interests was the welfare of unfortunate children and he actively supported the Fargo, N. Dak., Lutheran Welfare Department, the Jamestown, N. Dak., Crippled Children's School, and the Shriner's Crippled Children's Home.

HJALMAR was a Mason and belonged to the Lutheran church. Those of us who attended his funeral service in Enderlin on Monday witnessed the love and esteem in which he was held as people from all walks of life and all over North Dakota, gathered to pay their respects to their humble and unassuming friend. This was a demonstration of the highest honor that could be accorded a fellow citizen, a neighbor, and a friend. The simple, but beautiful church service in the small town church, conducted by three pastors who had known HJALMAR and served as pastor in churches he attended, was in keeping with the calm dignity which personified the man we knew and loved as HJALMAR NYGAARD.

I know that sympathy is perhaps small comfort in time of such a loss, but my wife Edith and I hope and pray that Tommy will find her loss easier to bear through the knowledge of the high regard in which her husband of 30 years was held by all who knew him.

We want to extend our sympathy to Hjalmar's father, Carl Nygaard, and Hjalmar's sisters and brothers—and to Hjalmar and Tommy's daughter, Eileen and her husband, John Larson, and their two children John and Mary.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it is always a sad occasion for all of us when the time comes to pay our last respects to the memory of a colleague who is no longer with us.

Usually there is some small consolation in the fact that death has come only after a long period of service for this young Representative. But there is no such consolation as we speak here now of the life and achievements of HJALMAR NYGAARD, for he left us after less than two terms of service in the House. Not only was his passing untimely but his death was so sudden that it came as a great shock to all of us who knew and admired him. One moment he was with us, here on this floor, and the next he was gone.

But it is not for us to question the wisdom of a Divine Providence in mourning the death of our friend.

It was my privilege to know HJALMAR NYGAARD before his election to the House of Representatives in 1960. I met him while campaigning for our party in North Dakota and was impressed with the high regard and affection in which he was held by the citizens of his State. The fact that he was elected to Congress in an at-large race 3 years ago, and reelected last year, is proof of this fact.

During his brief but effective service in Congress, HJALMAR has probably developed as much respect and affection among his colleagues as any man ever has in such a short length of time.

He was a quiet, gentle, unassuming, friendly, dependable, and able man who will be missed by all who had the privilege of knowing and working with him.

In their bereavement I offer my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Nygaard and her fine daughter and to all of HJALMAR's family and friends.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and untimely death of our late friend has deeply shocked every Member of this House. In a relatively short period of time, our late colleague won unanimous recognition in this body through his ability and his character. He served his country and the Congress with distinction and devotion as was expected of a man who had been elected to serve in this body following his service in the highest position in his own State legislature, as speaker of the North Dakota State Legislature.

I join my friend, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT], in this word of humble tribute. Mr. NYGAARD won not only the respect and affection of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle, he made a place for himself in our esteem by his fine work. He endeared himself to all of us by his friendly, cooperative manner.

I extend my deep sympathy to his widow, his daughter, his grandchildren and to all his loved ones.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, one of the privileges of membership of this House is that of developing intimate acquaintance with some of our Nation's most dedicated and patriotic servants. This intangible but nonetheless real benefit of serving in Congress is not, in fact cannot be, fully understood by those who have not served our Nation here. It is a privilege that must be experienced firsthand in order to be fully appreciated and today as I come to the well of this House with the burden of a personal sorrow caused by the death of a colleague and dear friend, I am perhaps more aware of this privilege than at any time during the past 2½ years.

I do not presume to be able with words to express any deep or profound thoughts about the man in whose memory we as a House meet today. His appearance on the political scene involving our Nation's life is but as a moment compared to her years of rich history. In a very real sense he has but made an entry upon the stage of history—rapidly passing across the stage, and making his exit. But, in the historic drama unfolding before the eyes of a weary world, that brief and fleeting appearance has significance far out of proportion to the measure of time. Just as in a great work of art, some actor who plays a minor part becomes the most remembered character of a play because he has projected himself into the part to such an extent that those who view the play cannot separate the character from the man, HJALMAR NYGAARD, in rapidly proceeding across the stage of our national history has left an indelible imprint upon our time, for he did not—indeed he could not—appear what he was not. He presented himself as he was: First, a man of deep and abiding conviction; second, of more than average ability; third, of sincerity born of a faith in his fellow men and in God; and fourth, of trustworthiness and complete honesty growing out of his simple heartfelt concern over the problems that beset the free people of our world.

HJALMAR NYGAARD does not need me or any Member of Congress to speak in his behalf. He has ably spoken in his own behalf with his life. No mere words of mine could either add to nor detract from the high esteem in which he was held by those who knew him intimately. No words of ours can change the circumstances of this hour nor would it be our desire to do so if we could, for God in His infinite love has called one of His own unto Himself. We who remain miss the presence of one whose life did not belong to us but was merely loaned to us for a time.

While we are sorrowful because of his death we have grateful hearts because we have been privileged to have had our lives touched by the all too brief presence of one who is no longer with us in body.

Several hours before HJALMAR NYGAARD laid aside the mantle of flesh I was privileged to have had a brief chat with him in the cloakroom about some of the problems with which our Nation and this House are faced in our day. At the close of our conversation I reminded him that there were some things in this life worth living for and some worth dying for. I said:

> HJALMAR, you and I have passed the period in life in which the mere fact of living is so precious that we are willing to look askance at wrongs—social, political, and otherwise—merely to have a few more years of comfort

and satisfaction. We have, if God would so bless us, at best but 40 years; more probably 20 years of life; and who knows it may be just a few hours.

Then we had a quorum call and I left him. Returning to my office after the completion of the business of the day I thought of HJALMAR and the conversation we had had in which he made it clear that he intended to continue as he had in the past to pursue the goal of freedom for all men regardless of personal cost. It was shortly thereafter that my colleague had been relieved of his burdens and concerns and had proceeded on that journey that we must all someday take alone to meet face to face with our Maker.

We have bid our farewell to a dear colleague but we would be naive indeed if we did not recognize that for those of us who knew him as a trusted friend and counselor; as a companion in our daily walk with reality; there is now a void which in our moments of sober reflection will be filled with sorrow over his absence. Yet sorrow is not all ill; it is the means by which we learn some of life's deepest secrets and profound truths.

Robert Browning Hamilton wrote these words of wisdom which I pass on to you. I urge you to take this time to consider them ere the rush of activities and demands upon our time blot out the lessons to be learned.

> I walked a mile with Pleasure;
> She chattered all the way,
> But left me none the wiser
> For all she had to say.
>
> I walked a mile with Sorrow
> And ne'er a word said she;
> But, O, the things I learned from her
> When Sorrow walked with me.

Today we who meet in memory of a departed colleague have our thoughts on death. We talk about the one who died. We mourn his absence. We will not admit it to anyone—not even to ourselves—but deep in our conscience is the thought that but for the grace of God these minutes might have been set aside for us. We feel we are too young to die. Surely HJALMER NYGAARD was too young to die. We know that if the experience of untimely death could come to him, it could come to us, for death is no respecter of persons. So, perhaps, this laying aside of the mantle of flesh—we in our frailty and our finiteness because our human minds cannot comprehend what life really is and cannot deal with it aside from the body—brings us to a realization that death—or what we call death—is not necessarily an evil to be shunned nor is it a tragic experience of life whether it come early in life or late in life or as in the experience of our colleague, in our middle years. Yet death in reality is life in its fullest and we who feel we are indispensable might well know that try as we might we cannot evade the consequences of our actions even though our eyelids close in silent sleep. George Washington Bethune reminds us in his verses:

> It is not death to die,
> To leave this weary road
> And, midst the brotherhood on high,
> To be at home with God.
>
> It is not death to close
> The eye long dimmed with tears,
> And wake in glorious repose,
> To spend eternal years.
>
> It is not death to fling
> Aside this sinful dust,
> And rise on strong, exulting wing
> To live among the just.
>
> Jesus, thou Prince of Life
> Thy chosen cannot die:
> Like Thee, they conquer in the strife,
> To reign with Thee on high.

I offer to Mrs. Nygaard and her daughter my hand of Christian fellowship and love. My prayer is that God will reach down with his hand of love and uphold and strengthen her as she bears the burden of sorrow in her bereavement. While no words of mine could comfort her soul, tortured by this sudden separation, I assure her that HJALMER has won our deepest gratitude for allowing us to be his friend. He has won a place of lasting respect in our hearts because he in his own way had learned the key to life that gave meaning to it for him and for those who knew him.

These brief lines of Henry Van Dyke apply to our friend and colleague. They speak to us the true measure of the man:

> Four things a man must learn to do
> If he would make his record true;
> To think without confusion clearly;
> To love his fellow man sincerely;
> To act from honest motives purely;
> To trust in God and Heaven securely.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for us to understand why one so fine and so young, so good and noble, should suddenly be taken from us. In the short time HJALMAR NYGAARD has been here in Congress he has enriched the lives of all of us. He has left his mark not only upon legislation but upon the minds and hearts of those of us who have been privileged to serve with him.

Prior to coming to Congress he served in the State Legislature of North Dakota for many years. The fact that he became speaker of the North Dakota House of Representatives bespeaks his legislative ability and his leadership qualities. He was destined to be one of the leaders of the Congress.

There was nothing ostentatious or superficial about HJALMAR. He was a man of quiet simplicity. I enjoyed just sitting and talking with him. I am honored to have known and called him friend.

There comes to mind a few lines from Robert Burns which are truly applicable to HJALMAR:

> For thus the royal mandate ran
> When first the human race began
> The social, friendly, honest man,
> Whate'er he be
> 'Tis he fulfills great nature's plan,
> And none but he.

With the passing of HJALMAR I have lost a very fine friend—one of the finest one could have. I extend my sincerest sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I rise here today to pay tribute to our departed colleague, the late HJALMAR NYGAARD, Representative from the State of North Dakota.

Although Congressman NYGAARD's service in the Congress was brief—he was with us only 2½ years—his service was distinguished. He was an able legislator, quiet but effective. He was dedicated to the interests of his people of North Dakota and was genuinely concerned about the problems of all people in this Nation of ours. He was a kindly man, ever ready to assist his colleagues in their own problems.

It was my privilege to serve with Congressman NYGAARD on the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and also on the Indian Affairs Subcommittee, of which I am chairman. I had the opportunity to know him well and I knew him to be a man faithful to his responsibilities. He was diligent in his attendance both in committee and in the daily sessions of the House of Representatives. His service on the Committee was very valuable. North Dakota and the Nation have lost a noble citizen and great public servant.

To Mrs. Nygaard and her family, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn of the sudden passing of my very good friend, Congressman HJALMAR NYGAARD. Both coming from the vast Midwest area of this great country, we had very much in common. Our personal relations were also most pleasant, and it has been a real pleasure and a privilege for me to have been associated with him throughout his service in the Congress.

HJALMAR NYGAARD was a quiet and kindly man who was greatly admired and respected by all of his colleagues in the House of Representatives. He was a fine legislator and ever attentive to his Congressional duties. Best of all, he was a Christian gentleman who served well his day and generation.

We in the House of Representatives have lost a real friend and able Representative. The State of North Dakota has lost a great public servant. We all regret his untimely passing.

Mrs. Hoeven joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Nygaard and all members of the family.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I cannot be silent and merely listen to the eulogies for HJALMAR NYGAARD. I am speaking as a new Member of Congress. He was not a friend of long duration although I certainly counted Congressman NYGAARD as my good friend. I respected him as a colleague, I admired him as a person. He was a kind, gentle man—always ready to give the benefit of his counsel when requested but never forcing his opinions.

I worked with him on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He was quiet but when he spoke he contributed by his deep insight into the problems at hand. I feel that I, particularly, can understand Mrs. Nygaard's feelings at this time and I wish to extend to her and her family my deep, heartfelt sympathy. I hope that these meager words which are uttered here today will emphasize to them the genuine loss each of us feels.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, life's moments of sadness and remorse are not easily recorded. I have never been more aware of this fact than I am today in joining my colleagues in expressing my deepest feelings of regret and lonely melancholy in the untimely passing of a very dear friend, a most respected colleague and noble citizen, Congressman HJALMAR NYGAARD.

A normal lifetime offers few opportunities to share and profit from an altogether too short acquaintance with a person whose depth and strength of character was of such proportion that it defies description. I shall always cherish and benefit from having been exposed to his vibrant and faithful friendship, his dedicated and productive statesmanship, and his colorful and catching Christian character.

HJALMAR NYGAARD responded to and fulfilled with commendable achievement the roles of husband, father, civic and social leader, and public servant. To this I can attest as a recipient of his gracious hospitality at his home, his probing and reflecting wisdom in committee, his reliable and understanding deliberations throughout the Halls and on the floor of Congress. His success in so many endeavors can be attributed to a gentle, convincing persuasiveness that was worthy of marvel, an uncanny ability and talent to project the significance of every objective into the future, a judgment that was tempered by experience and studious research that produced decisions with a ruggedness that would stand the trials of time.

All of his attributes were further flavored with a sense of fairness that was considerate of every segment of our society, with equal regard for future members.

One cannot possibly reflect on HJALMAR NYGAARD's estate without also being aware of a very humane, confident responsiveness that could only be supplied by an understanding, loving and contributing wife. "Tommy," as she is known to friends, was always ready with a beaming admiration, a trusting word, an encouraging prod, and an unquestioning faith, each appropriated with understanding ingenuity. To her, their daughter, and the host of personal friends, these words must seem hollow and inadequate, for they reflect praise, but provide no hint that justice prevailed in HJALMAR's untimely calling. But this is not for us to either contemplate or explain, but rather to accept with divine faith and recollection of his rich life of contribution to our welfare and memory. For his community, State, Nation and, yes, the world, bear both the seeds and the fruit of his efforts that will provide a nourishing strength and benefit to the cause of mankind in government and Christian endeavor for years to come.

Mrs. Langen joins me and his colleagues here in the House in extending our fondest hope that this knowledge may bring some solace and comfort to those who mourn him. My life has been enriched, this Congress has been dignified, the liberty and freedom of man has been enhanced by HJALMAR NYGAARD. May his memory be as lastingly blessed.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for this opportunity to join in a well-earned and well-deserved tribute to a most distinguished colleague. It was my privilege to serve on the distinguished House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with our departed colleague, for several years. During that time I came to appreciate the fact that he was a man of many gifts. One gift that he had that was particularly impressive to me and one that I always admired in him very much was his ability to engage in partisan controversy and yet to retain, even in the most heated type of controversy, a sweetness and a friendliness in his approach to his colleagues and to those who disagreed with him that made it impossible not to love him and to respect him. This is a quality which I particularly admired and respected in our departed colleague.

Certainly in this and in many other ways it was an enriching experience to serve with him and work with him in this great forum.

My wife joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Nygaard and to the Nygaard family.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma. I now yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL].

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, amongst our many friends in the Congress, HJALMAR and Mrs. Nygaard were closest to Mrs. Reifel and me. In the nature of things each of us forms attachments that brings him near to only a few people. For us, HJALMAR and his lovely and thoughtful wife Tommy were amongst these few. We four came to Washington at the same time; we occupied offices in the Old House Office Building; we had living quarters in the same apartment house; the four of us frequently took weekend trips; we visited as neighbors back in our adjoining districts. They shared with us the happiness of Tommy's birthday and their 30th wedding anniversary just a few days ago at dinner at the Army Navy Country Club where HJALMAR was a member.

HJALMAR was a regular attendant at the Thursday morning Congressional Prayer Breakfast. It was on that day last week that he was called to his reward. Tommy watched him as he left home to be present.

Here was a man with whom a visit was always a restful and reassuring experience—what more could one ask of a friend?

His place in the life of our family, while empty of his physical presence, shall always be filled to overflowing with pleasant memories of our delightful hours happily shared over these past 2½ years.

He was a friend to those he knew—he thought ill of none. He was always ready to befriend a stranger.

When God calls, we who remain behind must try to understand His good works, close ranks and continue to fashion a better world for our fellow man as did our departed colleague in his allotted time.

To Tommy, Eileen, their daughter, Hjalmar's dad, Carl, and the entire family, Mrs. Reifel and I extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, measured against the service of many, HJALMAR NYGAARD passed rather hurriedly through the congressional firmament. Yet he left his mark etched deeply on the record of this body and in the memory and affection of his colleagues. The product of a small Midwestern community, he rose through dedicated and unselfish public service to the Congress of the United States in a classic example of the American tradition.

Monday, his neighbors and friends from North Dakota gathered to pay an impressive final tribute to HJALMAR NYGAARD. I was privileged to share in that tribute. Today I am pleased to join the Members of the House in saying HJALMAR NYGAARD, as he observes us from the point of vantage we all hope someday to achieve, "Well done."

And I want further to say to his wife and family how fortunate they have been, as has the Congress, to have had HJALMAR in their midst even for so brief a period.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, the flag atop the Nation's Capitol has flown at half-mast. Old Glory has lost a friend. Our own spirits, too, are at a lower level this day, because we have lost a friend. HJALMAR NYGAARD is gone. When he left, he took something from each of us. And he left with us, something of himself.

It was my pleasure to share many personal experiences with this friendly, moral man. I knew him best as a Congressman. Many times it occurred to me that Congressman NYGAARD had a singular attribute which all true representatives of a State should have. There was never any question that he belonged to the State of North Dakota.

He reflected the broad vista of the great prairie. He had substance, even as the most hardy of pioneers who built the sod shanty and broke the land. His was the tolerance of that virgin territory which opened its doors to men of all nationalities. His usual voice was that of the prairie summer breeze that whispers through the blue stem and the buffalo grass. Yet, when man's liberty was questioned, he could thunder like the line storm which sweeps from the Badlands to the Red River. He could tie together the story of the past with vision of the future. He was North Dakota. But provincial, he was not.

The memory of HJALMAR NYGAARD will remain an inspiration. We are better because he was here.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, when I attended the HJALMAR NYGAARD funeral service in North Dakota on Monday with 20 of our colleagues I did so in memory of fondness for a friend as well as high and great respect for a distinguished colleague in this Congress.

I join in the very fine thoughts that have been spoken here about HJALMAR NYGAARD. I certainly subscribe to them because, having been privileged to be a member of the same committee with him, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I got to know his sterling quality and the effectiveness of his work and to recognize the scope of his interest and the dedication with which he served. My deepest sympathy goes to Mrs. Nygaard and the others of his family, and I extend my wishes for their happiness in the years ahead with the inspiration of HJALMAR's memory.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it is always a sad occasion for all of us when the time comes to pay our last respects to a colleague and friend who is no longer with us. The untimely death of HJALMAR C. NYGAARD, of North Dakota, is a shock to his many friends here in the Congress, and I join my colleagues in paying tribute to his memory.

HJALMAR C. NYGAARD was one of the stalwart members of the 87th Club. A man of high principles, integrity, and complete honesty, he was one in whom his colleagues had the greatest confidence. HJALMAR always did his homework and was quick to grasp the essentials of a problem and to suggest a workable solution. His insistenec that all legislation should be considered in the light of America first was one of the cardinal principles to which he always adhered. He always stood steadfast in this regard and refused to sacrifice his principles for expediency.

As a fellow member of the 87th Club, I came to know HJALMAR early in January of 1961. He was a quiet, modest fellow who easily made friends. I first knew him as a fellow legislator whom I held in the highest regard and, later, on a social basis with his charming and friendly wife, Tommy. He was always a gentleman under all circumstances.

His background as a small businessman in North Dakota showed up in his practical approach to problems. His 12 years in the North Dakota House of Representatives, including 4 years as majority leader and 2 years as speaker, were evident in his approach to legislative problems. He had a thorough background in both the field of business and government. This solid, down-to-earth approach will be missed. He worked with sincere dedication for the welfare of his district, his State, and his Nation. We can ill afford to lose men of his caliber. He well deserved the admiration and respect of those of us who knew him and who worked with him.

Personally, I have lost a friend—one on whom I could count at all times. Acquaintances are many but friends are few and precious. To his lovely wife, Tommy, and daughter, I offer sincere condolences. You have both enriched the lives of those who have been privileged to know you.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN].

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, in memory of our beloved colleague, whose untimely death last week was such a shock to all of us, I would like to read an editorial from the Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Herald:

> Death of U.S. Representative HJALMAR NYGAARD in the National Capitol last Thursday was a great loss not alone to his many friends but to this State at large, for in his public life he had won respect and wide acclaim.
>
> His sudden and untimely death at 57 was a shock to the State he had served so well in several capacities, always devoting his full energy to the faithful discharge of the duties entrusted to him. There are those in public life—all too many, alas—whose first concern is the headlines they will achieve or the public applause they can evoke in the performance of even the routine tasks of public office.
>
> This was never Mr. NYGAARD's concern; he was never a headline hunter. To have sought fulsome acclaim for discharging his duties to the best of his ability would have been a compromise with the high standards that had always fixed his course in public life.
>
> Mr. NYGAARD was devoted to the principles of the Republican Party, through which he saw the greatest opportunity of service to his State and Nation, but above that he was first a loyal and devoted citizen of his State and country.
>
> North Dakota—and every State and community—can ill afford to lose citizens of Mr. NYGAARD's caliber, whether in public or private life. Naming a worthy successor will be no small task.

Could one say more?

And I might add, his colleagues of both sides of the aisle can ill afford to lose a man of such unquestioned integrity and veracity; a quiet man but a man with all of the determination and resourcefulness of his Norse forefathers who have added so much to the strength and character of his State and our country.

To his family, my deep friendship and sympathy.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the real measure of any man can be gaged most accurately by the attitude of those in his home community, his church, his friends, neighbors, and associates—those who have known him best through the years. By this test, or any other, HJALMAR NYGAARD was an outstanding man.

In visiting with his friends and neighbors in Enderlin, N. Dak., Monday, July 22, one quickly noted the profound respect and admiration felt for our friend, and theirs, was real, genuine, and deep rooted. The words spoken by Rev. C. A. Tollefson and Rev. O. H. Schaible were based on long and enduring friendships with a man who had humbly served his church, his community, State, and Nation. Too often those in national politics become so involved in efforts to meet unending demands we forget real virtues are not based on political successes, but are developed and strengthened among our hometown friends and associates, not necessarily in Washington, D.C.

To those of us in the Republican 87th Club, HJALMAR was a true friend. He reflected daily the knowledge, temperament, character, and objective attitude so many of us yearn for. He believed in sound Government and voted accordingly. HJALMAR had faith that the concept of individual responsibility was best for his devoted wife, Clara; his daughter, Eileen; his lovely grandchildren, John and Mary; his father, Carl; his brothers and sisters; other relatives and all those he was privileged to represent in the First District of North Dakota. He represented a solid-thinking constituency who, by their vote, recognized his complete devotion and adherence to fundamental American principles. His strength and dedication will be missed by all who knew him on Capitol Hill, by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and deeply by Republican 87th Club members who were privileged to work actively with him. His death is our first and, while he can never be replaced, we now pledge ourselves to uphold with honor and dignity, through our action and conduct, our love and respect for our departed friend and colleague.

We shall miss him, but to have known HJALMAR at all, has enriched the lives of all of us. Our sincere sympathy goes out to his devoted and loyal companion, Clara; his daughter, Eileen; and a host of relatives and friends.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying our respects to our departed colleague from North Dakota, HJALMAR NYGAARD.

Mr. Speaker, I was greatly shocked and saddened when I heard of his untimely passing last week. I saw him on the floor of the House that afternoon just a short time before he became ill. It was hard to believe that he had been taken from us so suddenly, and without warning.

Mr. Speaker, I have never seen a more perfect gentleman than HJALMAR NYGAARD. He had such a gentle and gracious personality that he made lasting friends of everyone he met. It was a great privilege for me to serve with him on the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. We had many visits in connection with legislation pending before the committee and on many national issues. This gave me an opportunity to get better acquainted with him and to appreciate more fully his many sterling qualities. I shall always cherish happy memories of these interesting and pleasant visits with HJALMAR NYGAARD.

Our beloved colleague was a most capable legislator. We need more men like HJALMAR NYGAARD in public life. His passing is an irreparable loss, not only to his district, but to the State of North Dakota and the entire Nation. He was taken just at a time when he was needed the most.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Chenoweth joins me in extending our deep personal sympathy to Mrs. Nygaard and the other members of the family.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I now recognize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a melancholy occasion indeed that brings us together on the floor of this Chamber to honor the memory of a departed colleague. There is a particular poignancy for those of us who were banded together in the 87th Club, an organization of the 41 Republican Members of the House of Representatives who were first elected to serve in the 87th Congress. For HJALMAR NYGAARD is the first of that number to depart this life. Perhaps because we shared together some of the common experiences and at times what seemed like frustrations of newly elected Members of Congress I came to know HJALMAR well, and as I came to know him I also came to cherish him as a friend and to respect him for the constancy of his convictions. Faithful in his attendance at the sessions of this House, few were the days during our sessions when we did not exchange not only greetings, but more often than not enter into a discussion of the issues before the Congress.

HJALMAR was, I suppose, what you might call a plain man. He was not given to extravagant oratory nor did he consciously seek the white light of publicity for every action that he took. Yet he made an impact on his colleagues and was an effective Representative of his State. Members of Congress, I believe, because of their training and experience have more than an average ability to detect the insincere man—the self-seeker—the political opportunist whose sole concern is to aline himself with the winning faction.

Our departed colleague, and my friend, HJALMAR NYGAARD, was none of these. He was a quiet man, yet there was no difficulty in ascertaining where he stood on a particular issue. He was a gentle and a kindly man. Yet he was able to radiate the strength of his convictions. He was respected by his colleagues who saw in him an example of the kind of dedicated public servant who does credit to our representative form of government.

HJALMAR NYGAARD came to the Congress of the United States with a distinguished background of public service. He had served as the mayor of Sharon, N. Dak., and as a member of the school board. In 1948 he was elected to the North Dakota State House of Representatives where he rose to speaker and served until his election to the 87th Congress on November 8, 1960.

As an educator, local official, State official, and businessman, HJALMAR NYGAARD had the breadth and diversity of training and practical experience that prepared him admirably for his role as a U.S. Representative. He understood the problems of the people whom he was called upon to represent. He will be missed on the Interior Committee where he served faithfully and well. I shall miss him as a friend, but all of us will remember him with both pride and affection.

My wife joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Nygaard and also to their daughter, Mrs. John Larson. We hope and pray that they will be comforted in their sorrow by the knowledge that he will be remembered as a man of genuine character and stature by those of us who serve in this body.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, the loss of Mr. NYGAARD to the Congress, to the great State of North Dakota, and to the Nation has been recognized here and throughout the country in most realistic terms. It is with deep sorrow that I reaffirm this grim but realistic fact.

Mr. Speaker, may I add this. The Members of Congress who came to Washington in January for the first time had no greater friend and counselor than HJALMAR NYGAARD. His time was never too precious for him to stop and lend a helping hand to freshmen. I, personally, have profited by his counsel and assistance many times. Truly the new Members of the 88th Congress will miss a loyal friend.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, all of us were shocked by the untimely passing of our friend and colleague, HJALMAR NYGAARD. One might paraphrase a Scriptural passage saying, "his sun went down while it was yet day." There are times when we anticipate the death of a friend who may have lived his allotted years. In this case it appeared to have come in the prime of life.

The House has lost a sincere, friendly, capable Member who was not an extremist but a moderate who was not given to spontaneous statements. He chose rather to think things through in a calm, cool, deliberate manner.

We can only trust more men will follow in the mold and character of HJALMAR.

I join his host of friends in expressing sincere sympathy to Mrs. Nygaard and his daughter, Mrs. Larson.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in this sad hour to pay tribute to a personal friend and dedicated public servant.

HJALMAR NYGAARD and I came to the U.S. House of Representatives at the same time. Our associations here have been close. I have a personal knowledge of his great ability, of his sincerity and dedication to the best interests of his district, State, and Nation. He was a stanch defender of our free enterprise system and our American processes of government.

His outstanding record of public service includes distinguished membership over a period of 12 years in the North Dakota House of Representatives where he served in many capacities including that of speaker. His contribution in the Congress and to his State and Nation have been significant and commendable.

He was a friendly, happy, and courteous man, always with a kind word for and in behalf of his associates. We have lost an invaluable colleague; we have lost a great and good friend and our prayerful sympathy goes out to his wife and family in this hour of darkness and sorrow.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my esteemed colleagues in paying tribute to the late gentleman from North Dakota, the Honorable HJALMAR NYGAARD.

Early after my arrival here in the Congress, I met HJALMAR on a number of occasions. I am frank to admit that our parallel Scandinavian background and our party affiliation had much to do with the establishment of an early acquaintance. However, in this particular instance there were an extraordinary number of areas where we enjoyed a community of interest. During our prayer breakfast each Thursday morning I got to know him as an outstanding Christian citizen. During our many meetings where we conducted verbal exchanges on pending legislation he willingly provided me with a frank and articulate point of view, thereby guiding me immeasurably during my breaking in period in the House of Representatives. For this I shall be forever grateful.

In addition to the above and most important, HJALMAR impressed me as being one of the fairest and most considerate men I have ever been privileged to know. I shall always remember his conduct among our colleagues and I have every intent to pattern my own course of action after his. Suffice it is to say, my life is richer for having known him.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, some phrases are overworked, used without proper discrimination. One is the phrase which so often appears in obituaries, "He was admired, respected, and liked by all who knew him."

It is proper to use this phrase today because HJALMAR NYGAARD was truly admired, respected, and liked by all who knew him in the House of Representatives.

I was enriched by my own short but close association with him, and I know my experience was shared by many, many others.

His stability, abiding good sense, and high character will continue to inspire us in memory, just as before this parting.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Schweiker].

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Short].

I found my friend and colleague from North Dakota, Hjalmar Nygaard, to be one of the most dedicated and most sincere public servants I have ever met. It was a pleasure to know him in the 87th Club and in our weekly prayer breakfast meetings. He was most cordial, most tolerant, and most respectful of the opinions of others. Yet, he had the ability to stand up strongly for the principles in which he believed, to advocate these beliefs, and to work hard for these principles. Our country profited much from his earnest devotion and his hard work.

He was most fortunate in having such a charming and lovely wife who worked so well with him as an able companion and a loving wife, who was so well liked by all.

My wife and I extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Nygaard and her family over her tragic loss.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bruce].

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, one of the strong men of the Congress has been taken from us. We in the 87th Club, of course, knew Hjalmar Nygaard better than most perhaps. His quiet strength, his deep conviction, his holding to spiritual values made Hjalmar Nygaard the kind of man that we all not only like, but loved and respected. I suppose we could all sum it up with perhaps just one phrase. We are better men for having known him; the Nation is better for the service that he has given. We shall miss him, but his memory will be with us forever.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Brotzman].

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleagues the deep sense of loss that has been engendered by the loss of our good friend and dedicated public servant, Hjalmar Nygaard.

Mr. Nygaard was a remarkably fine man. His record of service to his State and his Nation sets a worthy example for all of us to follow. He leaves a remarkable heritage for the annals of North Dakota.

I am reminded of the great lines:

> Lives of great men all remind us
> We can make our lives sublime,
> And, departing, leave behind us
> Footprints on the sands of time.

Hjalmar Nygaard has left his footprints on the State of North Dakota and on the United States. His State and his Nation are better places for his having lived, and we are better men and women for having known him.

I extend my deep sympathy to his family.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Libonati].

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, our genial colleague from North Dakota, Hjalmar Nygaard, spent most of his legislative career either in committee or in the House of Representatives.

And so it was at his death here in the Capitol, while leaving his work on the floor of the House to seek medical attention.

His political career prepared him well for his important duties as a Congressman, having served as mayor of Sharon, N. Dak., and from 1948 to 1959, as a member of the House of Representatives of North Dakota, selected as majority leader of his party 1955–57, and elected speaker in 1959.

He exerted a powerful influence in the Congress among many Members who represented rural areas and, also, among the membership of the several farm organizations throughout the Nation.

His background as a teacher and businessman contributed much to his proficiencies as an analyst of educational and business programs presented to the Congress for consideration. He was industrious in perfecting any task presented to him, both in committee and on the floor. He was one of the last Members to leave the floor at the end of a legislative day and served in the capacity of acting minority leader of his party, frequently.

Congressman Nygaard was a conscientious, determined, and sincere party member whose loyalty to the principles of party action won for him the recognition of all of his colleagues as a factor in their deliberations. There was no question as to where he stood on the controversial issues of the day. His loss to his party is a serious one. Very few men in this life would sacrifice their personal ambitions, by not serving local interests, in order to support those national issues differing from his local party determination.

He enjoyed the friendship of many Congressmen on both sides of the aisle. His valued abilities, asserted in a quiet, gentle way, were reflected in his work in committee and on the floor.

He loved his family and often spoke of them in the endearing terms of a good husband and father.

We, of the Illinois delegation, held Hjalmar in high regard and admired him for his contributions to the legislative life of the Congress. His many attributes of character will live long in our memories. We extend our heartfelt condolences to his dear wife, Clara, and darling daughter, Mrs. Eileen Larson, and to his dear grandchildren, John and Mary, in their bereavement.

The citizens of the State of North Dakota and of the Nation have lost a distinguished public servant and statesman.

It is in times of misfortune that our sympathies seek the solace and comfort of prayer and our prayers are with his family.

I dedicate these few lines to his memory:

A Good Servant

> The veil of life has fallen from his face.
> Its webbed vibrant skein has also disappeared.
> A life no longer here by God's grace,
> Seeks the solace of saintly space—endeared
> To him, who keeps the record straight,
> For those on earth who kept the faith.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Berry].

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Short] and the many friends that Hjalmar Nygaard had in this body in paying tribute to that great American, a loyal husband and father, at his untimely death.

While we lived almost as neighbors for many years, he in southern North Dakota and I in northern South Dakota, I had not known Hjalmar Nygaard until he came to Congress. But since that time, because of the fact that our interests in that part of the Nation were very similar and because of the fact that both of us served on the important Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, we came to know and work closely together. The more I became acquainted with him the more I respected him, his judgment, and his ability.

Hjalmar was a quiet, gentle, and unassuming man, but in spite of these qualities he was a powerful man, powerful because he was a great student and a man of unquestionable ability. He spoke only when he had something to add to the solution of the problem under consideration, and when he spoke he spoke as a man who had thought the problem through.

As has been pointed out several times in these comments today, he was a student of government and a student of economics. I was impressed with the comments of one of the ministers who took part in the very beautiful funeral services at Enderlin, N. Dak., Monday. He told about how he had been a neighbor of the Nygaard family. He told how night after night when he turned off his light to go to bed he would glance out his window and there he would see a light still burning in the Nygaard home, and he knew the light indicated that Hjalmar was still reading and studying.

As I listened I could not help but think that the light in the Nygaard window did not go out in the death of Hjalmar. That light will shine and continue to cast its rays not only in his hometown of Enderlin but across his State of North Dakota and across the Nation. That light will glow in the hearts of his many, many friends and, of course, in the hearts of his widow and his family.

Mrs. Berry and I join the wide circle of his friends in extending our deep sympathy to his widow, to their daughter, and to their family on the occasion of their great loss.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. Harding].

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I want to join those Members of the House who are taking this opportunity to pay tribute to the life of our departed colleague, HJALMAR NYGAARD. HJALMAR's life was an example that we could all well follow. I would have been very proud to have pointed out HJALMAR NYGAARD to my son as a man whose life he might well emulate as he lived his own.

I am not as concerned today about the threat to this Nation from Soviet communism or from the rumored subversion from within as much as I am with the decline and possible destruction of those moral principles that have built stable families, stable communities, and States and the greatest Nation in the history of the world. As long as we have enough men in public life who live according to the teachings of Jesus Christ, who devote their lives to serving their fellow man; men of high ideals who are not lured astray by the temptations of publicity, material wealth, or the pursuit of riotous living, we will retain the freedom that we enjoy as Americans. HJALMAR NYGAARD was this type of individual. He was a man of high principle and honorable character. He was a worthy leader in the truest sense of the word.

I cannot help but think of the saying that many of us have often read, "I would rather see a sermon than hear it." Those of us who have served in the House of Representatives for the past 2½ years with the honorable gentleman from North Dakota, HJALMAR NYGAARD, can honestly say we have seen a sermon in the life and actions of this great man.

His wife and family and the fine people he so ably represented can take real comfort and pride in the fine example he has set for his fellow man.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WHALLEY].

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of deep personal sadness that I join my distinguished colleagues in mourning the passing of a good friend and a great American, the Honorable HJALMAR NYGAARD. I was deeply impressed with the ability, conscientiousness, and sincerity of Mr. NYGAARD. He had a most pleasant personality and a strong character. He was kind and friendly.

His district, the House of Representatives, and the Nation have suffered a loss in his passing. It is with a feeling of profound sorrow and regret that I pay this last tribute to HJALMAR NYGAARD, who will be missed by all who knew him. I wish to join with his host of friends in extending my deep sympathy to his widow and to his family.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

Mr. ASHBROOK. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the very sincere and eloquent tributes already delivered on this floor are the best indication of the character of the man whom we are honoring today. As a close personal friend, however, I do want to add something, although I certainly cannot add to the beautiful oratory we have already heard.

I was very close to our departed brother. We came to the Congress at the same time. We had philosophical convictions that closely paralleled each other. Only the Wednesday before his untimely death, we had an opportunity in my office, to discuss legislative matters. At that time I again recognized the depth of his convictions and the great contribution he was making in serving in this body and in bringing to this body the beliefs, principles, and high moral convictions that he had.

My memory goes back to something that someone else said and I think that is quite often the best way to say the appropriate thing. I was not a Member of this Congress at that time, but I had the opportunity to be present when Mr. Sandburg made his wonderful and eloquent address before this body on behalf of Abraham Lincoln. He said something at that time that has stuck in my mind, and I am quite frank to admit that it does not apply to many people. He said the most distinctive thing about Abraham Lincoln was his quality of "goodness." Millions of words have been written, many descriptive phrases have been penned, but when all is said and done, there was one thing about Lincoln that was distinctive and that was his quality of goodness. I believe we are talking today about a man who was good and whom we can describe in the same words of Sandburg, as a man of whom you would say, "Here was goodness."

Something else that Sandburg said about Lincoln was that the martyred President was a man who possessed qualities that were both velvet and steel at the same time. The velvet, of course, applied to the softness, the mellowness and the humility of the man. The steel, of course, applied, as Sandburg, put it, to the convictions that he had on certain basic principles and the way that he fought for what he believed to be right.

I believe that HJALMAR NYGAARD was a true heir of the spirit and tradition of Lincoln. He was one of the few men that you can say had that quality of goodness. He had the quality of velvet and steel that made Lincoln stand out among all men.

We will all miss HJALMAR, especially those of us who came to Congress at the same time—the 87 Club.

I want to add my message of sympathy to the family and to tell them that all of us miss this friend and we hope that the memory of the words we have spoken here today will in some measure give them relief from the sorrow which they must now be suffering.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEERMANN].

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, today we pause and pay tribute to the memory of our departed colleague and friend, the able and outstanding public servant of the sovereign State of North Dakota, whom I was privileged to know so well, HJALMAR C. NYGAARD.

With HJALMAR's election to the 87th Congress the conservative element of Congress gained one of its most eloquent exponents, and his integrity of character and depth of understanding were exceeded only by his perception, honesty, and sincerity toward his State and country.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation and his beloved State mourn this dedicated legislator who was laid to rest at Enderlin, N. Dak. I know the God-fearing people of his State will miss his vigorous contributions to good government, since he served his constituents so well.

HJALMAR was a man who personified the beliefs and ambitions of his people. I sensed that at his funeral as I listened to them discuss his life, listened to them extend their sympathies to his family and listened to them pay tribute to his memory in sermon and song. I concluded that if ever a man had the complete confidence and love of his people, then HJALMAR was that man.

I believe I know the reasons for the love and affection expressed at his last rites, since I was closely acquainted with his personal and political life in the Nation's Capital. Here it was we met as freshman Congressmen and here it was he won our admiration and respect.

HJALMAR's concern for the Nation is probably best expressed in a speech he made on this floor when he said:

> If freedom is to survive, the free nations of the world must remain strong economically and spiritually; * * * a determined and dedicated free government will survive.

To conclude this all-too-brief testament to our colleague's memory, I want to add that our beloved United States will continue to survive and it will continue to be served by other dedicated and responsible legislators. However, none that has served in the past nor none who may come to serve in the future will do so with more concern for our heritage than exhibited by HJALMAR NYGAARD from North Dakota.

Mrs. Beermann joins me in expressing our sincerest condolences to his wife, Tommie, to their daughter, and to the members of his immediate family.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR].

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, much has been properly said here today about HJALMAR NYGAARD's humility, charity, kindliness, and his outstanding record of distinguished legislative service. But, in addition, HJALMAR had a fine sense of humor and was possessed of balanced good judgment. Just as he always saw the best in every man, so too could he find the lighter side of difficult situations and complex issues.

Mr. Speaker, as one who was privileged to come to the Congress with HJALMAR in January 1961, I have many times seen evidence of his excellent judgment. It was usually his custom in the course of any discussion with his colleagues to wait until each had had his say, to listen carefully to the arguments or points advanced by each of his friends, and then at the conclusion of the remarks of others to make a few brief comments of his own. Many times he left me with the feeling, "Why, how simple. Obviously HJALMAR has the proper answer and has outlined the best approach."

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. MacGregor joins me in extending to Tommie Nygaard, to their daughter, Mrs. Larson, to HJALMAR'S father, Carl, and to his brothers and sisters, our warmest thoughts and our most sincere sympathy in this very difficult time for all of the Nygaards.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the Nation and the State of North Dakota have suffered a severe loss at the passing of HJALMAR NYGAARD. I was fortunate in having had the opportunity to work with him when we both came in as Members of the 87th Congress. I can assure you I benefited tremendously by this association. He was always the essence of kindness and consideration to all the other Members, and he was one of the most able Members of the 87th Congress.

My wife and I express our deep sorrow at the passing of HJALMAR NYGAARD, and we extend condolences to family.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved over the passing of our beloved colleague, the Honorable HJALMAR NYGAARD.

HJALMAR was one of the most likable men I have ever known. Honorable in all his associations with his fellow man, he carried on his duties here in Congress in a quiet, gentlemanly, efficient manner.

My heart goes out to Mrs. Nygaard and family. May the same God who called their loved one to his Heavenly home give them strength to bear the great loss they have suffered. God rest his soul.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, it came as a great shock to all of us when we heard of the death of HJALMAR NYGAARD. We lost a neighbor, a colleague, and a great American. HJALMAR was a quiet, sincere, and dedicated man. He proceeded to do his duty as he saw it and his conduct was based on a deep-seated Christian philosophy.

We will miss this true gentleman and we extend to his loved ones our sympathy at this time of bereavement.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with other Members of the House in expressing my sorrow over the untimely passing of my good friend HJALMAR NYGAARD.

I first learned to know HJALMAR when he and I served on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during the 87th Congress. I found him to be a very clear thinker and dedicated to the welfare of our country and to his State of North Dakota. He took a keen interest in all of the bills which came before the committee and with his experience in legislative matters he was of great help in straightening out many difficult problems. He was liked and respected by all Members of the House and was looked upon as one of those individuals who could always be counted on in time of need.

I enjoyed my association with HJALMAR and I will miss greatly my visits with him on the floor of the House and the discussions we had concerning important legislative matters.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his family on their loss but they can always be proud of HJALMAR, the record that he made during his lifetime and the respect and admiration everyone had for him.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a saddened heart that I join with my colleagues of the House in paying tribute and honor to the memory of HJALMAR NYGAARD. His passing is a great personal loss for he was an understanding and able Member of this Congress and of the committee which I have the honor to chairman. Our hearts are saddened by the loss of his noble and gentle personality and spirit.

His love for people, together with a wide experience in the business and political activities in his community and State, had prepared him for the difficult duties which presented themselves when he came to Congress. He made the transition from the State legislature to the National Legislature more easily than most, and while doing so he gained the respect and affection of those with whom he was to spend so short a time.

During his membership in this body HJALMAR NYGAARD served diligently and effectively on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. His industry, ability, and cooperation were acknowledged by all. But perhaps I, as his chairman, am best able to testify to his dedication to duty as a committee member. He made a very constructive contribution to committee deliberations.

He came to Congress with a consuming desire to help secure a greatly needed water resource project for his State—the Garrison irrigation project. He gave unstintingly of his talents in preparing the way for the authorization of the project. He had the confidence of his chairman, and I am sure that I had his confidence, too. When this great project is finally built, it can then truly be said that he was, and shall continue to be, a part of it. All too often a real public servant is not permitted to view the finished handiwork of his efforts. Such was his fate. But his legion of friends shall remember.

HJALMAR NYGAARD will be sorely missed by all of us, but he will hold a special place in the memory of those of us with whom he served.

That his soul may find eternal repose, and his family, God's comfort and consolation, is the prayer of all of us.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, when HJALMAR NYGAARD came to Congress more than 3 years ago, I had the opportunity of getting to know him well and later the pleasure of counting him as one of my warm friends. His untimely death at the age of 57 halted a career which carried him from the flat plains of his native State of North Dakota to the higher plateaus of the Nation's Capitol. But his route was marked with that vital ingredient of greatness—humility—which has characterized every man of stature who has served in the Congress of the United States.

Born on a farm near Sharon, N. Dak., not too far from where he was laid to rest on Monday of this week, HJALMAR NYGAARD attended public schools in the area, later taught in those same rural schools. He was elected mayor of Sharon, later moved to Enderlin and went into the hardware business. He then ran for the State legislature, where he served for 10 years with distinction before his election to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1960.

As a battler for his constituents, HJALMAR led the fight—as yet unfinished—for the Garrison diversion project which would provide irrigation facilities for some of the arid farmland of his State. He fought for better wheat legislation for his farmers and for other measures aimed at helping his district.

Mr. Speaker, someone once said that "death only closes a man's reputation and determines it as good or bad." HJALMAR NYGAARD's untimely death has closed a great reputation and ended a brilliant career. I am sure that all his colleagues in the Congress will agree it was even more than good. It was great. We will miss him very much.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join my distinguished colleagues in the tribute which has been so eloquently and deservingly paid to our colleague, HJALMAR C. NYGAARD. Truly, his sudden and shocking passing is a distinct loss, not only to the State of North Dakota, but to our Nation. There was nothing flamboyant about HJALMAR—not in character, not in his appearance, not in his personality. He was a dedicated, sincere, hard-working public servant, and a tremendous credit to this body, to his State, and Nation—a model for all of us to follow.

It was my privilege to enter Congress, the 87th, with HJALMAR. On this mutual ground alone, I was given the opportunity of becoming well acquainted with this outstanding legislator. Of all his wonderful traits, he was, above all, a real Christian gentleman.

HJALMAR will be sorely missed. His length of service in Congress was brief, but his service and contributions will be long remembered. My heartfelt sympathy goes out to the family of this distinguished Member in this time of deep bereavement.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, we all were saddened by the sudden death last week of our friend and colleague, HJALMAR C. NYGAARD.

Mr. NYGAARD had served in this body only since 1961. For most of us our acquaintance with him is thus of short duration. We do not have long years of memories on which to draw.

Yet, I believe there are few indeed who have won such sincere respect and deep friendship in such a relatively short time among us. Mr. NYGAARD was soon marked as a man of strong conviction, a man who had given very earnest thought to the problems we face as a nation and was not hesitant about forming conclusions as to what we should do to meet these problems.

We all quickly learned of his pleasant disposition which made him so well liked among his colleagues.

These things that we learned only in recent years were well known I am sure, in his home State of North Dakota. There he had served more than a decade in the State legislature, and his preeminence in that body was noted by his election as majority floor leader in 1955 and as speaker in 1959.

Our loss, too, is great, but we know that so long as America produces leaders such as HJALMAR NYGAARD we will continue to be a land of greatness. Our deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my bereaved colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of the late HJALMAR NYGAARD, of North Dakota.

His passing was a great shock to me, as it was to the State of North Dakota, the party which he loved so well, and the Nation which was fortunate to have his services.

Although he spent a relatively short time in the Congress, he will long be remembered as one of the most dedicated and able servants who ever served in this Congress.

Born on a family farm, he was well aware of the great strength of this land, and he contributed to that strength in numerous ways.

A former teacher and mayor, he knew well the many facets of our American community life, and exemplified the highest traditions of that life.

He was an outstanding member of the North Dakota Legislature and served his State as both majority leader and speaker.

The U.S. Congress was certainly fortunate in obtaining his services, and he came to this highest legislative tribunal in the land with a firm desire to serve his district, State, and Nation.

As a member of the Republican Party, he made a great impression upon all of us with his faith in the two-party system, and his belief that the Republican Party contained those fundamental beliefs which gave him sustenance and strength.

His passing will take from the Congress one of its most genuine men.

I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to extend my deepest sympathies to his family in North Dakota.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed shocked last Thursday when I learned of the passing of our good friend and colleague, HJALMAR C. NYGAARD.

He was a very humble, kind, and considerate man; highly respected and admired by all who knew him and worked with him.

HJALMAR was a good citizen, and an honest, conscientious legislator who very ably looked after the welfare of his district and State.

So today it is with a feeling of deep sadness that we who were privileged to serve with him in the House record his untimely passing. He will be keenly missed by his many friends.

I extend my deepest and most sincere sympathy to his family.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I, too, was saddened to learn of the passing of our colleague and my friend, HJALMAR C. NYGAARD.

While I was only privileged to know HJALMAR for a short time, we came to this great legislative body for the 87th Congress, it did not take long to realize he was a most dedicated public servant with an astounding insight to the ramifications and intricacies of legislation.

His service as a representative, majority leader, and as speaker of the North Dakota Legislature obviously prepared him well for the tasks as Representative to Congress.

Frequently at our 87th Club meetings, HJALMAR would give us the benefit of his experience and understanding. At these gatherings, it was obvious to all that here was a man possessed with great depth and understanding of the problems facing the Nation. He was a most able legislator, and he will be missed by all. He was an honorable, able, dedicated man admired by all who shared the privilege of associating with him. His loss is our loss, and to his widow and daughter go my most profound sympathies.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, HJALMAR NYGAARD was one of the finest Members of Congress it has been my privilege to know; I will miss him very much. As the Congressman from his State of North Dakota, he combined the finest qualities of a Representative devoted to the welfare of his State and Nation as well. This rare quality he possessed with such modesty that probably too few were actually aware of it. So long as our great legislative body consists of men of his caliber, we need have no fear for our survival and progress. Our sincere sympathy is extended to his widow and the family.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I join with all Members of the House of Representatives in expressing our feeling of loss in connection with the sudden passing of our friend and colleague, HJALMAR NYGAARD.

HJALMAR NYGAARD will be missed. He will be missed personally by us who were his friends, and he will be missed because of his sound views and because he always voted his conscience and for what he believed was the best interest of our country. He was a great public servant.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no one who better demonstrated the truth of the old adage that still water runs deep. HJALMAR invariably conversed in a quiet, intelligent and gentlemanly fashion, but never raised his voice or was in any way garrulous or garish. Instead of the fire of contention or anger, his eyes carried a warm glow of human understanding, and to my mind, his views, as I indicated, were invariably sound and well thought out. So, as I said, his loss is a real loss to the Nation as well as to his friends.

I sat next to HJALMAR at lunch and conversed with him on the day he was taken. He was obviously tired, but looked healthy and well. I am sure he felt no pain or indication of an impending heart attack, and this was only a few hours before he was stricken.

We can all take satisfaction that any suffering was very short, and I guess we can hope for as much for each other and ourselves. So, while he was only 57 years of age and could have continued to render great and useful service for many, many years to come, at least there is comfort in the way he went. Certainly, too, it was a case of a good man dying young, in accordance with the old maxim.

Mr. Speaker, as one who respected and admired a colleague and a fellow Republican, I feel real sorrow at the loss of a fine American and friend.

My wife joins me in this expression of a deep sense of loss and in extending our heartfelt sympathy to his widow, Mrs. Nygaard.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of Congress at the 88th session, I found the late HJALMAR C. NYGAARD to be among the most friendly and considerate of my colleagues. Although he was soft spoken and gentle mannered, Mr. NYGAARD was a man of firm convictions.

HJALMAR NYGAARD was alert to the magnitude of the great problems facing our Nation. He faced up to these problems with a keen knowledge and understanding of the human and economic values involved as well as the capacity of the Congress to act with intelligence and decisiveness.

HJALMAR NYGAARD possessed those qualifications of leadership and statesmanship from which our Nation has become great and after which we earnestly seek.

HJALMAR NYGAARD was always helpful to me and the other Members serving their first term at this session. From my observation, I would judge that no Member of Congress was held in greater affection or respect than the late HJALMAR NYGAARD.

As the Members of Congress join today in expressing their sadness on the occasion of his passing, may we also communicate to his beloved wife and family our sincere, though inadequate, compassion.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it seems the hardest words to find are those that adequately express the loss one feels at the death of a close friend. HJALMAR NYGAARD and his wife were among the first friends we made in establishing our new life in Washington in the 87th Congress.

I was privileged to be with HJALMAR and his "Tommie," when he died. I know that everything that could be done, was done to stay an all consuming vascular accident. We are not privileged on this earth to know why some men are taken from us while they still have so much to give of themselves. We must draw on deep and abiding faith that some day we will perceive God's great plan. HJALMAR was an outstanding Member of Congress. He was sincere and dedicated in his service, devoted to his family, to his staff, and to those he was privileged to represent. Our first offices joined.

He understood the obligations that go with serving in this House, and he never took lightly his responsibility for exercising all the judgment at his command on every issue that came before us. He will be missed by all of us. To his wife and family, Mrs. Hall and I extend our heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues of the House in expressing my deep sympathy on the untimely passing of HJALMAR C. NYGAARD, the distinguished Congressman from the State of North Dakota.

As many of us know, Congressman NYGAARD was elected to Congress in 1960, and joined this distinguished Body at the same time I was privileged to do so. Due to the fact that we served here as freshman legislators together, I developed a warm affection for this great man and fine public servant. I remember his activities very well in the Republican 87th Congress Club, and the sage advice he gave other Members concerning the welfare of our Nation and the quality of legislation which was being considered by Congress.

During this association with him, I learned that his period of service to the people of his native State preceded by some time his service here in Congress. In 1948 he was first elected to the North Dakota House of Representatives, and it is my understanding that he was majority floor leader there in 1955 and again in 1957, and was honored with the highest role and position to which his fellow members could elevate him when he became speaker of that body in 1959.

I think Hjalmar C. Nygaard exemplified the type of life all Americans should attempt to lead. He worked diligently, giving his time and efforts to one task—to make this country and our system of Government work just a little better.

I was amazed to learn that for 25 years he served as a volunteer fireman. He also served his church, and civic groups and fraternal organizations in his native State.

I am proud to say that he was my friend and close associate here in Congress.

My heartfelt sympathies go to Mrs. Nygaard and to their daughter, Mrs. John D. Larson. I know that this distinguished public servant will be sorely missed by this Congress and by all who considered him their friend.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to pay my sincere respects to the memory of Hjalmar Nygaard and to extend my most sincere sympathies to his widow, his daughter, the two grandchildren, and the rest of the Nygaard family.

One of the great privileges of service in the House of Representatives is to meet and know men like Hjalmar Nygaard. A quiet man, of the Norwegian blood that has added so greatly to the steady and sustained growth and glory of our Nation. Hjalmar was diligent in the pursuit of his duties to his State, and by constant attention to his committee and congressional service, he contributed a searching and a steadying influence on the affairs of the Nation. To me it is tragic that such a man should be taken from us by such an untimely death. Still we can gain some sad surcease of sorrow from his record of positive labor in the common good of all of us.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed a great shock to learn of the untimely death of the Representative from North Dakota, the Honorable Hjalmar C. Nygaard.

Throughout his life, as an educator, as State representative, as Member of Congress, and in innumerable other ways, he served the people of North Dakota and of his country with courage and wisdom. As a Member of this body, he has gained the respect and admiration of his colleagues for his deep convictions and outstanding dedication.

He was a hard working man. It seems fitting that when death came, it should find him in the midst of his chosen work in the Capital of his country. We will miss his good counsel, the strength of his character, and the warmth of his friendship.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Wallhauser joins me in extending deepest sympathy to his widow and family.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, as we grow older, we become more aware of a class of persons among us who combine rare value to the group with self-effacing reserve. The death of such a person, be it swift or otherwise, always comes as a shock because of the enormous gap it leaves. Instinctively and unwittingly we rely upon them for the good and the sure while we puzzle out the antics of others or try to use the working tools ourselves. Then suddenly and quietly they are gone and we are uncommonly saddened and a sense of loss and loneliness hovers for a long time.

This was Hjalmar Nygaard. In northern Iowa we are familiar with the northern names, like Hjalmar, and with the virtues such names represent. This House could not be the cross-section of our people that it is without Members like Hjalmar Nygaard, and it is a tribute to the draftsmen of the Constitution and the people of North Dakota that he came here. In him there was none of the false, none of the egotist, everything of the good and faithful public servant. In an age of instability he was stable. He understood freedom, never deserted it, and knew that for it to survive it had to be protected in small matters. He was of the American West. He understood farming. He understood small business. He understood the primary relationships of families and small communities. I am inclined to believe that Hjalmar Nygaard as we knew him could have served this House and our people from the time it was founded. His values, his knowledge, his experience, were fundamental.

Hjalmar Nygaard was one who came to the House in 1961, a Republican, and hence a member of the 87th Club. He is the first to die, which makes his death memorable to us so situated in service, raising unexpected questions of who will be next and who will be last; like the medieval memento mori, his passing has reminded us of our own. But it is not his death that is to be remembered, it is the record of his life.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our colleague and beloved friend Hjalmar Nygaard, of North Dakota, removes from our company one of the finest men it has been my privilege to know.

He was a distinguished citizen who gained prominence through his service to his community, State, and Nation. Quiet in manner, he was firm of conviction, and he was respected by all who knew him. He was a devoted Christian who practiced his faith in everyday living.

Hjalmar was a family man, blessed with a wonderful partner in the person of Mrs. Nygaard. He also drew great pleasure from his daughter and her family.

Mrs. McIntire and I shall always treasure the privilege we had in being neighbors to the Nygaards here in Washington. Close association with this couple gave us the opportunity to appreciate their many fine qualities and their devotion to each other.

All of us are grateful that a man like Hjalmar came into our midst, for he was dedicated to his fellow man and he was a person of Christian conduct.

Mrs. McIntire joins me in an expression of love and sympathy to Tommy, his widow, and members of the family.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my deep sorrow in the untimely death of our distinguished colleague, Hjalmar Nygaard. I feel particularly moved because he was one of the finest gentlemen I have known and because we were so closely associated, having come to Congress at the same time.

I was privileged to enjoy his friendship, and I have had great respect for the ability, fairness, and sense of cooperation which he demonstrated abundantly in his work here in the House of Representatives. In the difficult days which lie ahead, we in the Congress shall miss the contributions which Hjalmar Nygaard might have made.

Mrs. King joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to his beloved family. Their sorrow is lightened only because it is shared by so many.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked and saddened when I learned of the untimely death of our distinguished colleague and good friend, Hjalmar Nygaard.

Here was a relatively young man, apparently in the best of health, who had already established himself as an outstanding Member of Congress. In a few short years he had made a splendid record. If spared, he would have added to this record as the years passed by. The House of Representatives, the State of North Dakota, and the entire Nation have suffered a great loss.

It will be a difficult task indeed for his constituents to replace Hjalmar Nygaard with a man of similar stature and ability—a man of many talents, a faithful public servant, a fine human being and a splendid friend.

I wish to join in extending our sincere sympathy to the members of the family.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the Members of the House in tribute to the late Hjalmar Nygaard, whose untimely passing has shocked the Nation. Certainly he was one of our most respected, devoted, and beloved colleagues and he will be sorely missed, not only from the standpoint of his great contribution to the many matters of concern to the Congress of the United States but his warmth and friendship as well.

Hjalmar Nygaard won the respect and admiration of his colleagues and the people he represented by virtue of his soundness of mind and his adherence to principles. His service and his dedication to duty has been recognized as outstanding and our Nation has lost a valued and progressive legislator.

Hjalmar Nygaard was a great American, who responded to public service, not only here in the Congress but to his community and State as well.

I join with you in extending my deep sympathy to his beloved wife and his family. And to them I can only add that my life and the Congress as a whole has been enriched by virtue of our association with him. We share with them and the people of the great State of North Dakota the loss of a devoted American, and one who has established an inspirational record which will serve as an influence and guide for others to follow.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, we miss HJALMAR. Unfortunately, too often we fail to appreciate our colleagues sufficiently or we take each for granted. I wanted to discuss some matters with HJALMAR. I waited too long.

It was my privilege to be in HJALMAR's district for a Lincoln Birthday celebration. It was a pleasure to visit him in his district, among his constituents. I saw first hand how liked he was.

This Congress was better for his presence, brief though his stay. His memory helps. I'm sure he would want us to do our best in our work legislatively as a memorial to him.

I join with my colleagues in sympathy for his loved ones and his constituents. I am personally strengthened by his friendship and memory and shall try to carry on some of his convictions in our work here.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine sorrow and deepest regret that I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to our late distinguished Member, HJALMAR NYGAARD, of North Dakota.

Those of us who were fortunate enough to serve on a committee with Mr. NYGAARD and who had the opportunity of knowing him as a person, as well as a Member of Congress, indeed feel that his passing was a tremendous loss, not only to his family but to his State and Nation as well. He was a hard-working Member, devoted to the interests of his State and its welfare, devoted to the finest traditions of America. Above all, he was an honorable, just, and fair man—a man whom I was always proud to call a friend.

My deepest sympathy to his widow and family, his community, and his State.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, we have all been deeply saddened by the untimely passing of our colleague, HJALMAR NYGAARD, of North Dakota. He and I came to the House together in the 87th Congress. In the all too brief time I had the privilege of knowing him, I had nothing but respect for his devotion to the House and to the public interest.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing to the family of HJALMAR NYGAARD my deepest sympathy during this time of their bereavement.

Although I never had the privilege of serving with him on a committee, I did associate with him on the House floor and the Halls of Congress. I shall long remember his friendly and conciliatory attitude to other Members of Congress.

Unfortunately, Congressman NYGAARD was privileged to serve for only a short period of time, but the impression he left will be felt for years. It is a most unhappy occurrence to lose a man of his age who had the capacity and great desire to serve his country.

I hope that the One who guides the destiny of us all will provide strength for his family in these trying hours.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked, as I know our many colleagues were shocked, when I learned of the sudden and untimely death of HJALMAR C. NYGAARD. His passing was a loss to all of us in the House, as well as to the District, State, and Nation he represented so ably and served so well. HJALMAR NYGAARD took his responsibilities as an elected official seriously and he worked diligently to carry out his duties.

Words are difficult to come by at a time like this. Depth of feelings is hard to express. Perhaps this is because a man is more than just the sum total of his life's work and his characteristics. This was certainly true of HJALMAR NYGAARD. I do know that I will always value and cherish his memory. There were facets to his character. He was highly capable and he approached his job here in the Congress as one of opportunity and duty and service instead of some just due he deserved. He was a man of subtle humor, kindness, consideration, thoughtfulness, and understanding. He was a wonderful Christian.

I will miss HJALMAR NYGAARD as I know all of his many friends will miss him. We have lost a dear friend and the sudden news of the loss increases the sadness and the sense of the depth of loss. But I am thankful for his memory and I extend my sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I remember well that HJALMAR NYGAARD was the first new Member of the 87th Congress whom I happened to meet after arriving here in Washington, when I also was a new Member. I had a very special feeling for Congressman NYGAARD, perhaps for that reason. I remember well the lively, pleasant twinkle in his eyes as he spelled his first name and said, "Just forget that H."

It always seemed to me he was a salt-of-the earth type of man, and definitely a product of the great American Midwest at its best.

He was a quiet, unassuming man. But when he talked, it was worth while listening, because his ideas were good, his thinking was sound, he was forceful and well informed in his beliefs.

HJALMAR was a teacher and a scholar, and every inch a courteous gentleman.

He was not only successful and respected in his private business life, he was most useful and effective in his community leadership and as an elected public servant with a very long and distinguished record of accomplishment at the local, State, and National levels of government.

I was not privileged to serve on the Interior Committee with HJALMAR NYGAARD, but I know well his reputation for hard, conscientious, productive service on that committee.

I was privileged frequently to ask his personal advice and opinion on legislative matters, and I greatly valued always what he had to say. In a quiet forceful manner he knew what he was talking about.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it came as a very great personal shock to me when I learned of Congressman NYGAARD's sudden death last Thursday. It is a very great tragic loss, not only to the members of his own family, but for his constituents, our Republican Party and for all Members of this 88th Congress.

All of us are the better for having had the honor of associating with him. All of us will miss him greatly.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, HJALMAR NYGAARD was an earnest, experienced legislator, completely faithful to his convictions. I am privileged to have had the opportunity to know him and to be associated with him in the Congress.

Although firm in the application of principle to the conduct of public affairs, HJALMAR was a kindly man and his friends were many as evidenced here this afternoon. His untimely death is a genuine loss to North Dakota and the Nation.

Mrs. Gross joins me in extending sympathy to Mrs. Nygaard and their daughter.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, my association with our distinguished departed colleague, the late gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NYGAARD], was relatively brief, but the sense of loss is nonetheless great.

It was my privilege to serve with Mr. NYGAARD on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and I held him in the highest esteem. He gave careful attention to each matter coming before the committee. He took his work seriously. He was earnest in advancing his views, but respected the views of his colleagues.

This courteous and friendly man represented his district conscientiously and well. His passing is a great loss to North Dakota, and to his many friends in this House.

My deep sympathy goes out to Mrs. Nygaard, their daughter and grandchildren.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, sorrowfully I join with my colleagues in noting the death of our distinguished colleague and friend, HJALMAR NYGAARD, of North Dakota.

HJALMAR was a quiet man, within the depths of that quiet calmness that marked him outwardly, lay an abundance of understanding of the nature of this life and of his fellow men who so tenuously hold onto it. In those depths also lay a remarkable dedication to the only real things that, for all of us, make life worth living—love of God and country, and service to both; respect for one's neighbor and his right to differ from you; the true joy in useful work, particularly of the kind that would advance the principles in which a man like HJALMAR so deeply believed; the worth of a friendship, freely given and returned, and, of course, the priceless gift of love of home and family.

There are all too few men of this caliber willing to dedicate themselves to the service of their country; but, when they determine to do so, all of us are so much the better therefor, and so very much the lesser when we lose them.

It is in this fashion that I shall remember my friend, Hjalmar Nygaard, and cherish that memory for the balance of my own appointed days, as I now extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and family in this hour of their loss.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to the memory of our able and distinguished colleague, Hjalmar Nygaard, and in expressing my deepest sympathy to his widow and family.

We were not privileged to have Hjalmar Nygaard in this body for long, but in the comparatively few years he was among us, his depth of character, his sincerity, and his deep devotion to liberty made an indelible impression on all who came to know him.

He was a devoted public servant, always keeping the best interests of the land he loved uppermost, and this House can ill afford the loss of men like him at a time when grave problems press upon us from all sides. It was an honor and a privilege to work with him and to count him a friend, and I feel a deep sense of personal loss at his sudden passing.

Mrs. Byrnes joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Nygaard and all of Hjalmar's devoted family in their hour of trial and sorrow.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, no one could meet Hjalmar Nygaard and come away unimpressed. I was privileged to know and work with this noble man.

He had a quiet, modest, courteous manner that brought dignity and reason to every proceeding in which he participated. While we occasionally disagreed, I never knew a man who could do so with more consideration and kindness.

His family, his beloved State of North Dakota, and his country, all have great reason to be proud of and thankful for the good life of this fine man.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, we are all sorrowful at the sad and sudden passing of a colleague whom we liked and respected, Hjalmar Nygaard. None of us who knew and worked with him have anything but admiration for the kind of life he led and the kind of service which he gave to his country and to his district. Hjalmar was a man of kindness, integrity, and ability, and the Congress will suffer from his loss. I am grateful for the opportunity to have known him—I regret only that this privilege was for such a short period of time.

My deepest sympathy goes to Hjalmar's family; I share, as we all do, in the sadness and loss which has come to them.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on the life and accomplishments of our late colleague, Hjalmar Nygaard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. Miller of California). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

AMENDING TARIFF ACT OF 1930 TO REQUIRE CERTAIN NEW PACKAGES OF IMPORTED ARTICLES TO BE MARKED TO INDICATE COUNTRY OF ORIGIN

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2513) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. Mills, King of California, O'Brien of Illinois, Byrnes of Wisconsin, and Baker.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Science and Astronautics may have until Friday midnight to file a report on the bill H.R. 7500.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LOS ANGELES-SAN GABRIEL RIVER BASIN

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 7638) to authorize additional appropriations for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan in the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. McFall]?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, may I say this bill has been approved unanimously on our side and meets with the approval of the leadership on this side of the aisle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $6,400,000 for the continuation of construction of the comprehensive plan for the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin approved in the act of August 18, 1941, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE RAILROAD SITUATION

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have written today to the representatives of the railroad industry asking them to delay their institution of work rules next Tuesday until action is taken on legislation now pending in Congress.

Precipitate action on a matter so grave is hardly conducive to the proper consideration of the proposals presented to Congress.

We are tampering with the American institution of collective bargaining. This means of resolving labor disputes should not be dealt with lightly nor in a hostile or emotional atmosphere.

I am not passing judgment on the reason for, or the value of, the intended legislation when I express my opinion that Congress should be permitted to work its will on this matter, which affects the entire Nation, without having to work under the pressure of unreasonable deadlines or under the pressure of a nationwide strike which will arouse emotions and passions to the detriment of reason.

EXPROPRIATION OF U.S. EMBASSY BY CASTRO

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I read today that the Castro government has expropriated the U.S. Embassy building, and grounds, and furniture, and the Embassy home in a move believed unprecedented in diplomatic history. While we are negotiating a nuclear test ban with Russia supposedly in good faith, Khrushchev's puppet regime in Cuba is expropriating U.S. Embassy property valued at about $2 million.

This further open, notorious, and purposeful slap in the face of our Government by Khrushchev's puppet government in Cuba, particularly at this time, casts a serious doubt on the good faith of Khrushchev in the Moscow negotiations today. I think it is time that the administration took steps to bring an end to these indignities by this Communist satellite that is subverting this hemisphere and dealing serious body blows to our prestige throughout the world. It is time we take action, particularly in the face of this latest slap in the face, to institute a meaningful economic and political quarantine of Cuba, insisting that all free nations stop doing business with Castro and use Federal aid to accomplish this; withholding Alliance for Progress funds to any Latin American nation doing business with or continuing to recognize Castro's Communist government and denying the use of U.S.

harbors to any country permitting ships under its flags or registries to trade with Cuba, and requesting the OAS backing for such a program. It is about time such action was taken.

THE RAILROAD WORK-RULES DISPUTE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, today, with several other Members, I have introduced a bill to provide a means for settling the railroad work-rules dispute, for preventing such disputes, and to require aid to employees displaced by work-rule changes. The measure would adopt the approach used previously and with success to eliminate musician featherbedding in connection with the radio broadcasting industry. It would also specifically adopt the generous recommendations of the President's Emergency Board which reported in May with regard to recommendations to assist employees affected by change in work rules.

Such legislation has become necessary because the President's message to the Congress, and the joint resolution introduced pursuant to that message, amounts to nothing more than compulsory arbitration and passing the buck until after the 1964 election. The adoption of the administration's resolution seems sure to weaken rather than strengthen the collective bargaining processes in the transportation and, perhaps, as a precedent, in all industries. It is important that Congress deliberate with care and then enact clear and fair procedures for dealing with labor disputes in the transportation industry or any other industry affecting our national interest. The President's expectation that the Congress, should, within a week, attempt to come up with a solution for a problem that the administration has failed to solve in a period of 9 months, is ridiculous. Under circumstances, it should be up to the President to work out some arrangement for delaying the possible disastrous effects of a rail strike on our economy while Congress is given a reasonable period to study and propose its solutions.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1963

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 441 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7195) to amend various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal-aid highway systems. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous qustion shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 441 provides for consideration of H.R. 7195, a bill to amend various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal aid highway systems. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

H.R. 7195 amends various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal aid highway systems. These amendments include a minor change in the formula of the apportionment of urban funds; a new date for the submission of Interstate System cost estimates to the Congress; elimination of the 1975 interstate "design date" restriction, substituting therefor a requirement that the interstate design be based on 20-year traffic projections; and an extension from June 30, 1963, until June 30, 1965, of the period during which a State may enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Commerce relating to advertising along the Interstate System.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 441.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Colmer] in requesting the House to adopt this rule which makes in order the consideration of the bill H.R. 7195, which is a bill to amend various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal aid highway systems.

Primarily this bill is designed to bring up to date in the next 2 or 3 years the various provisions of the Federal Highway Act. The bill was reported out of the House Committee on Public Works unanimously. The rule was reported out of the Committee on Rules unanimously. I know of no opposition to the measure itself or to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Albert). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7195) to amend various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal aid highway systems.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7195 with Mr. Ullman in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7195 makes certain amendments to title 23 of the United States Code, which are necessary to provide for more effective operation of the Federal aid highway program.

H.R. 7195 was reported unanimously by the Committee on Public Works after full and complete hearings. There are four sections to H.R. 7195, and these sections provide as follows:

Section 2 of the bill amends paragraph (3) of section 104(b) of title 23, United States Code, by eliminating a special provision applicable to the two States of Vermont and Connecticut, in the apportionment of urban highway funds. This change was recommended by the Federal Bureau of Public Roads and the General Accounting Office. Under the present law, which has been in existence since the Federal Highway Act of 1944, Connecticut and Vermont towns are considered municipalities regardless of their incorporated status for the apportionment of Federal-aid urban funds. The census conditions which originally supported this position no longer exist. Consequently, Connecticut and Vermont are receiving special treatment by having the population of these towns counted twice for apportionment of both secondary funds and urban funds. Connecticut and Vermont have received more in the apportionment of urban funds than they would have received if they were treated in the same manner as all other States. This section will provide for uniform treatment of all States in the apportionment of Federal-aid urban highway funds.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. I would like to clear up this problem of Connecticut. It has caused considerable question to some of us. If we did not have this special treatment of Connecticut and Vermont heretofore, it is not correct to say, is it, that they would be treated as the other States, but rather that they would be treated in a detrimental fashion as compared to other States. Because of that fact, in the past they were given that special treatment. Is that not correct?

Mr. FALLON. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GIAIMO. As I understand it, there was a problem because of the nature of the political subdivisions in the New England States, particularly Vermont and Connecticut, whereby the towns and the unincorporated areas did not reflect the same position as other parts of the country and by that fact had to be given this special treatment which resulted in additional funds being paid to them. I would like to ask the gentleman, if we remove this special provision will they be treated equally with the other States or will they then have a reverse inequity, so to speak, and revert to an inferior status, although perhaps not as bad as they would have before the change in the means of computation.

Mr. FALLON. It will be uniform treatment because many other States are in the same position as Connecticut and Vermont were in the days when they were given this special treatment. There is no penalty attached in this legislation. It just brings them into a uniform position with all the rest of the States in the Union.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. The gentleman has referred to the position of the General Accounting Office. I notice that in their report they say:

> In view of the changed Bureau of the Census definition of the urban population, which appears to place the States of Connecticut and Vermont on an equal basis with all other States, we recommend that the Congress consider amending section 104 (b)(3) of title 23, United States Code.

I would like to ask some questions with reference to that. The General Accounting Office does not say there is a definite equality but it says it appears to have adjusted the difference. Although there have been, apparently, in the past, population figures which appear to place Connecticut in a more favorable position, it seems to me at the moment that if we take the present figures into consideration that those figures are worked out so that there now is an inequity.

As I understand the figures that you will use to determine the urban funds, with over 2,350,937 people in Connecticut you will take into consideration 185,000 people less than the total population of a State which is considered completely urban. Now have you taken into consideration the method now used to determine the population in Connecticut which eliminates these 185,000 people?

Mr. FALLON. I might say to the gentleman, the same conditions exist in many States today that exist in Connecticut and Vermont, so that you are being treated the same as every other State in the Union. You are getting preferential treatment up until the present day. But in the 1960 census for the purpose of apportionment of funds, we are using the new 1960 census formula. No one who appeared before the committee from any government agency thought that these two States were being treated unfairly, but they thought they would be treated the same and in a uniform manner the same as every other State in the Union. I can, of course, appreciate the gentleman's concern because it does reduce the amount of apportionment to these two States.

Mr. DADDARIO. If the gentleman will yield further, I have had a discussion with the Census Bureau on just this question and as a result, because they recognized the peculiar governmental setup in New England, they have issued a supplementary report to explain the importance of the minor civil divisions and the greater governmental significance that exists in New England above other States.

If we take the Bureau of Public Roads figures which are used in Connecticut we can determine that although the town of Plainfield has 8,884 people, a portion of 2,760 people is not considered in the formula through which aid is apportioned. This number is that which is included in the borough of Moosup which is part of Plainfield. This is only one example of many instances where communities of over 5,000 people are affected.

Mr. FALLON. If my colleague will permit me to say so, they do not eliminate those figures at all because you do not get a double count in this connection; you only are counted once as a figure for the apportionment of funds.

Mr. DADDARIO. I would like to answer the gentleman in that regard if he will yield further.

Mr. FALLON. I will be glad to yield some time to the gentleman, if I may be permitted to complete my statement at this time.

Mr. DADDARIO. I would appreciate that as I do have some further questions.

Mr. FALLON. I thank my colleague.

Mr. DADDARIO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, section 3 of the bill amends paragraph (5) of subsection (b) of section 104 of title 23, United States Code, to provide for a change in dates for the submission to the Congress by the Secretary of Commerce of cost estimates for completing the Interstate System. It further provides a change in the formula of apportionment of Interstate funds authorized for fiscal years 1967 through 1971, so that such apportionment will be based on the estimate of the actual Federal share rather than the total cost of completing the system.

Under existing law three more cost estimates must be prepared by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with the State highway departments for submission to the Congress. This section requires the submission of three more cost estimates, the same as the present law, but changes the dates of their submission to the Congress. The 1966 cost estimate is advanced 1 year to 1965 and is to be used as a basis for apportionment of funds for fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969. The 1968 estimate will be used to apportion fiscal year 1970 funds and the 1969 estimate will be used for the fiscal year 1971 apportionment.

These changes are necessary because if the present date of January 1966 is retained in the law, then the Secretary of Commerce will be unable to certify to the States the sums they will receive for the fiscal year 1967. This certification must be made available on or before January 1 of calendar year 1966. Under present law the estimate upon which the 1967 apportionment must be certified will not have been approved by the Congress at the time the law requires such apportionment to be made. For this reason, the date of the next estimate must be advanced to 1965 so that Congress may act upon this estimate and the Secretary of Commerce may prepare the information and advise the States of the funds they will receive.

Further in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961 funds were authorized for the Interstate System for the fiscal years 1970 and 1971. There is no provision in law at the present time for apportionment of these funds to the States. Thus the new dates in this section take care of the changes made in law by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961 provided additional funds for the Interstate System and took full recognition of the increase in estimated cost of the system.

The other change made by this section—a change in the method of apportionment for fiscal years 1967 through 1971 to one based on the Federal share of the cost of constructing the Interstate System insures that the apportionment during this period will more correctly match the ratio of disbursement which varies in States containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands.

Section 4 of the bill amends subsection (b) of section 109 of title 23, United States Code, by eliminating the 1975 interstate "design date" as set forth in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 and substituting therefor the requirement that the standards to be applied to each actual construction provision be adequate to enable such project to accommodate the types and volumes of traffic anticipated for such project for the 20-year period commencing on the date of approval by the Secretary of the plans, specifications, and estimates for actual construction of the project.

The general practice in the highway industry is to design major highways for traffic for 20 years in the future. This change will give the State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads the needed flexibility in planning for future construction of sections of the Interstate System.

Section 5 of the bill simply extends under existing law for a period of 2 more years the time under which a State may qualify for one-half of 1 percent bonus by controlling advertising on the Interstate System in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Bureau of Public Roads and the Secretary of Commerce.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961 extended the time for 2 years. This bill once again extends this time.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this bill may be properly described as not controversial. Its objective is to try to iron out certain existing inequities and problems in the highway program that have come to the attention of the Congress, partially through the General Accounting Office and also through the Bureau of Public Roads and the Department of Commerce. It does not provide for the expenditure of additional funds.

It also has as its purpose making certain that the program will be completed by the year 1972, which is the target date written into the act back a few years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be well to take a minute to bring the Congress up to date as to what has been accomplished in the program and how the program has progressed.

The Federal-aid program is progressing on schedule, as authorized by the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 and subsequent enactments, including the Federal Aid Highway Acts of 1959, 1960, 1961, and 1962.

To give you an idea as to size, the program is expected to total $3.8 billion during the fiscal year 1963 and to continue at about this level for the next several years.

As to the financing of the program, the highway trust fund is in sound condition to support a program of this size. For instance, receipts have totaled $16,613 million through April 30, 1963, while expenditures totaled $15,932 million, a balance credit of $681 million.

Over 12,220 miles of the 41,000-mile Interstate System have been improved and opened to traffic. This is in addition to the 2,368 miles of toll facilities incorporated into the system.

The established goal is the improvement and opening for traffic of half of the Interstate System by the end of the calendar year 1964, which is approximately the midpoint of the trust fund period, and the full improvement of the total 41,000-mile system by the end of the trust fund period in 1972.

In addition to the Interstate System, this program includes the A-B-C system. Over 152,000 miles of construction projects have been completed since July 1956, at a total cost of over $10 billion, of which about $5 billion were Federal funds. Projects are underway or authorized at a total cost of over $3.5 billion, including $1.8 billion of Federal funds for over 22,000 miles of A-B-C construction.

This gives a clear picture as to the financial integrity of the program; also as to its construction, and its completion target will be met.

The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has discussed in his usual capable fashion the merits and the purpose of specific sections. I am not going to belabor them except to clarify one or two of the matters discussed.

Discussion took place with regard to Connecticut and Vermont. Basically this puts Connecticut and Vermont on the same basis for the apportionment of funds as are all other States.

Some discussion took place with regard to why in apportioning funds the population that is used is less than the total population of the State. All the States, of course, under this bill would be treated on the same basis in determining what their population figures should be. The reason is that there is a gap between the top rural population figure of 2,500 to qualify for Federal-aid secondary funds and the minimum 5,000 figure used to quality for urban funds. So in every State, in determining the apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds, the total population used in all probability will be less than the total population of the State, but all States are treated on the same basis and all States get the same fair apportionment treatment on the basis of formulas set out in the legislation. That is, all areas of less than 2,500 are considered qualified for rural and secondary funds and all urban population areas in excess of 5,000 qualify for urban funds.

Of course, I assume the result is that any State that has a large or substantial number of urban areas then gets treatment based on that number of urban areas compared to States that have fewer such areas.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. The gentleman just stated that all States are treated equally and the difference in the overall population figure may relate to the fact that some towns under 5,000 are not to be included, but I have before me a photostat of the Census Bureau's table 8, which is the population of all incorporated places and urban towns and unincorporated places of 1,000 or more. That gets us back to the point where we are eliminating places in Connecticut and Vermont where there is an inequity because some towns of over 5,000 people are not being totally included in the formula through which the apportionment of funds is determined. The town of Cheshire which has a population of 13,383 people has 4,072 people deleted in the formula the Bureau of Public Roads uses. Cromwell with 6,780 people is reduced by 2,889 people. Killingly with 11,298 people has 4,642 of its people left out. New Milford with 8,318 people is reduced by 3,023. I could list a long series of Connecticut towns which shows this same pattern of activity.

It seems to me in the desire to equalize this situation that the peculiar municipality setup in Connecticut has not been taken into consideration, and as a result an inequity is now being worked here in the deletions made by the Bureau of Public Roads in Connecticut and perhaps Vermont.

Mr. CRAMER. As I understand the Census approach on the 5,000 population figure it operates regardless of how you define the area. Any area that has a population, be it an incorporated or unincorporated area, or a township, or whatever you define it as, with a population in excess of 5,000, is included as an area of urban population for the purpose of apportionments under this legislation. That is the reason for the amendment and that is the reason for the change. It is my understanding any such area that has a population in excess of 5,000, regardless of whether it is incorporated, unincorporated, or otherwise, will be included, and that was the basic problem relating to Connecticut and Vermont prior to that time, in that they defined their incorporated and other areas in a manner different from other sections of the country.

Mr. DADDARIO. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAMER. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. DADDARIO. I think the gentleman's explanation satisfies me as to how we arrive at a figure which is more than the total population in Connecticut. Certainly there should be no question about this being adjusted, but it does not answer the problem involving a determination of a final figure which is less, when we take into consideration the communities I have already read to you. I believe that this is an area which must and should be explored because the peculiar setup of communities in Connecticut has not allowed the Census Bureau to put Connecticut on a proper and even basis for the determination of population figures with other States, and that has not been taken into consideration, in my opinion, in this determination.

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman the objective of the committee, as I understand it and as I understood the testimony, was to provide the same type of treatment for any area in the United States that had a population in excess of 5,000 regardless of how that area was defined, including Connecticut. So if any area in Connecticut has a population in excess of 5,000 it was my understanding that it was the intention that that be considered an urban area for apportionment purposes. If that is not in fact the case I would be delighted, and I am sure the committee would be, to take the matter up with the Bureau of the Census to take care of these apportionments to make sure fair and equal determinations result, but I am sure the bill accomplishes that.

Mr. DADDARIO. The only difficulty with that is that when this bill will be passed it will be some period of time before we can get an adjustment. The fact remains that some communities in Connecticut which have a population of over 5,000 people are not considered urban for apportionment purposes. It is a result of this that the figures upon which Connecticut's returns are to be determined come to 185,000 people less than should be included.

As a result there will be a loss to the State of Connecticut, which will be an inequity worked upon the taxpayers of Connecticut.

Mr. CRAMER. With reference to his conclusion as to why there is a lesser population than the total population of the State of Connecticut in determining the number of people in Connecticut as compared to other States in the country, for the purpose of apportionment, I explained the reason why it was less than the total population. Likely it is less in most other States. As to the 5,000 population figure with regard to urban apportionment, I can assure the gentleman it was the intention of the committee, and this I think will stand in interpreting the intention, that all areas with a population in excess of 5,000 should be entitled to urban funds. I ask the chairman of the subcommittee if that is not correct.

Mr. FALLON. That is correct, as I understand it.

Mr. CRAMER. That should satisfy the gentleman. If he can convince the Bureau that there are areas in excess of 5,000 then in fact those areas are entitled to urban extension apportionment.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further observation?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman further, because I understand his interest in the matter.

Mr. DADDARIO. I think the difficulty here is that the Census Bureau and the Public Works people are operating to achieve different ends. The figures which are being used by the Bureau of Public Roads, depending upon the Census figures, are therefore erroneous and the matter of adjusting them would be a very difficult one because the end objectives are not the same. I am not satisfied that the question has been answered and I am of the firm opinion that there has been an inequity worked, that there are communities in Connecticut of over 5,000 are not completely included for apportionment purposes because of the structure of the municipalities. One example has already been cited where Moosup is separated from Griswold by the Bureau of Public Roads for apportionment purposes, and there are numerous cases of a similar nature.

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman that it was our intention to include them and it would be our intention that they should be entitled to urban extension funds.

I would suggest that the gentleman take it up with the Bureau of Public Roads, and certainly in light of this colloquy that has taken place today the intention of Congress is clear concerning the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the balance of the proposed legislation involves certain cost estimates which I assume the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] will discuss in detail, in view of the fact that he offered certain amendments with regard thereto in the committee. It has been of concern to a number of us for some time, that the standards set up in the 1956 act were 1975 traffic needs for design purposes. That concern results from the fact that the more time that passes, the smaller the period of time between the construction date and the 1975 design date. For instance, in 1963, you now have a period of some 12 years involved. When we started the program we had 19 years advance design period. As of now it is down to some 12 years. In 1970 it will be 5 years of advance design.

It is obviously essential, particularly in view of the testimony, that the usual standard used by the Bureau and by the States in determining the usability of highways is for an advance period of 20 years, and the committee acted accordingly in writing in the 20-year period for design purposes in the future from the date of construction. That satisfies the problem of adequate design standards in the future for the Interstate System which, of course, is essential. If the taxpayers are going to put out this money they should be entitled to a highway that is at least usable for a period of 20 years.

The last section deals with the question of outdoor advertising and the extension of the present legislation which expires on June 30, 1963. It merely extends it to July 1 of 1965.

I do not believe it is really controversial. It has been supported by the agencies that testified, and I believe it is worthy of the support of the House.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROBISON. My friend said at the outset of his remarks that the bill is intended to correct certain inequities among other things. I wonder if the gentleman would not agree with me that one problem that I have considered to be an existing inequity that has not been touched upon by the bill is the reimbursement to the States of money spent for toll roads that become part of the Interstate System. I wonder if the gentleman would not agree with me that the hearings we held in our Subcommittee on Roads both yesterday and today indicate, at least to me, that there is good reason beyond the equitable principle involved for our committee and the Congress to give serious consideration to the problems raised by the incursion of sections of toll roads into the Interstate System.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is discussing a subject which has been for a number of years discussed before our committee and on which some action by Congress has been taken. The gentleman has constantly shown an interest in it. I can understand it, because the State of New York has a number of miles on the Interstate System to which they are not entitled to Federal reimbursement because they were constructed toll roads. The gentleman has said many times they should be entitled to reimbursement at some time in the future, and the sooner the better I am sure the gentleman would say.

Mr. ROBISON. Correct.

Mr. CRAMER. The second question is about the new toll roads, the toll traps, as I call them, which have been permitted to come into existence since the 1956 act, contrary, in my opinion, to the basic policy of the highway program, as a result of which the taxpayers are putting up 90 percent of the funds. Any kind of toll traps put into the system would have to be with the approval of the Bureau after the 1956 act, following the principle of the free highway.

I have introduced H.R. 3934, which would give the highway departments and the Department of Commerce some say-so, and give Congress the right to review not only that situation but also the situation where you have parallel free roads paralleling the Interstate System and so jeopardize it.

I have also introduced House Resolution 464, which would permit a study starting now of not only toll road problems but all problems for continuing the highway program for a 10-year period after 1972.

Mr. ROBISON. Would not the gentleman also feel that the resolution which he is sponsoring and which I happen to endorse and feel is urgently necessary should provide that such a study should be a continuing problem as to the question of reimbursement to the States?

Mr. CRAMER. There is a specific provision in paragraph (5) of that legislation that does provide for review of all toll road problems, including reimbursement, and injection of toll traps into the Interstate System, a study now as it relates to the 1972 period.

Mr. ROBISON. I would certainly hope this study would be authorized first by our committee and then by Congress and get underway, because we are fast approaching the target date of 1972. Some of these decisions that should have been made a long time ago I think should be made without further delay.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. I hope our committee will this year take action on this program, because it takes 5 or 6 years to firm up a program.

Action should be taken and the basic policy decisions made at least 5 or 6 years before the 1972 period, which means 1967 or 1968. To accomplish this by 1967 or 1968, we should get at the studies now. I agree with the gentleman wholeheartedly. I hope our committee and the Congress will vote such a resolution this year.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. I should like to say I agree with the gentleman from Florida wholeheartedly with respect to his conclusion that the admission of toll facilities into the Interstate Highway System is contrary to the intent of Congress in enacting this legislation. Surely, it comes as something of a shock to the motoring public who have been told that their road-user taxes were paying for the construction of this "pay as we go" highway system, to get onto a stretch of that system that is so designated and then to learn that in addition to their highway taxes, they are expected to pay a toll to ride on that Interstate System. I agree with the gentleman from Florida and commend him for his interest in this problem. I hope that something can be achieved by way of a uniform policy in this regard.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRAMER. I am delighted to yield to my colleague.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Would the gentleman please enlighten me as to what appeal procedure or what authority the Secretary of Commerce has regarding the alinement of a road? For example, in the city of Newark, N.J., the State of New Jersey has made a State alinement which will take it through the city of Newark and through a heavily populated area where several thousand people will have to be moved. Apparently, the Department of Commerce relies entirely on the alinement by the State. Does the bill or does the Federal Highway Act give the Secretary of Commerce any overriding authority?

Mr. CRAMER. What city did the gentleman say was involved here?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. The city of Newark, N.J.

Mr. CRAMER. The basic policy of the act is and has been ever since the highway program was initiated that the administrative function belongs to the States subject to limited review by the Federal Government. A highway location is one of basic and primary importance and is one for State and local decisions, and I think rightly so, if you believe in State and local rights at all. The local community together with the State, as the act provides, holds public hearings and makes a decision that is submitted to the Bureau of Public Works for approval. There is no question, however, but what the Bureau of Public Roads has denied approval on occasion largely on the basis that there are alternative route locations that do not work greater hardships and would cost less to the Federal Government. On these grounds the Bureau of Public Roads has on occasion, in accordance with authority under the act, refused to accept the highway location recommended by the State and local community because it either works too great hardship or costs too much money. But I will say it has to be a pretty serious hardship before, in my own experience, the Bureau would overrule the State and local agency.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. In this case, of course, the local community is bitterly opposed to the alinement made by the State. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] has consumed 24 minutes.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I might say that this bill, as has been said before, was adopted by the committee unanimously and it is recommended by the State highway officials, the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to take this opportunity as a member of the subcommittee to express the appreciation of all of us on the subcommittee to the able gentleman from Maryland for the leadership that he has given to this program and for the outstanding quality of his work as chairman of this subcommittee and in getting together a group of needed amendments and lining up united committee support for them. I think the entire country and our road program particularly owe a debt of gratitude to the able gentleman from Maryland. It has been a great privilege, Mr. Chairman, to work with the gentleman on this subcommittee.

Mr. FALLON. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my previous remarks which were made in the Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I have noted that the language of the proposed bill revises the existing formula under which aid will be apportioned for extension of the Federal aid primary and Federal aid secondary systems within urban areas. It does so by specifically eliminating a special provision applicable to Vermont and Connecticut in the apportionment of urban highway funds.

This provision was placed in the law by the Congress with due thought and consideration when it enacted the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944. It was prompted by the unusual meaning of the term "town" in the New England States, where it signifies a minor civil division which is of greater governmental significance than in most of the other States.

In coping with this question, the Bureau of Public Roads and the Committee on Public Works have entered an area in which the Bureau of the Census has been involved for many years. In June 1961, following a conference regarding the 1960 census of population, the Bureau issued a special supplementary report on the population of towns and other minor civil divisions in the New England States which specifically explained this greater governmental significance. It noted that in Connecticut, the minor civil divisions account for the entire area of the State and their total population is the same as that of the entire State. In Connecticut, there are 169 minor civil divisions, all of which are designated as towns; the 22 cities and 12 boroughs in the State are either coextensive with a town or consist of part of a town and are, therefore, not shown separately in this report.

Let me say parenthetically that this same census report notes that in Vermont there are 8 cities, 238 towns, 3 townships, 4 gores, and 1 grant.

When the census report was published, table 8, the population of all incorporated places and urban towns, and of incorporated places of 1,000 or more, was commonly believed to be the standard list of Connecticut population. However, it was noted that some small communities of 36 people and 800 people were included, but other communities with more than 50,000 people were not mentioned in this listing. It was necessary to cross-check with another table to represent this situation accurately.

A town in Connecticut is a distinct governmental body and not a collection of villages as the census tabulation implies. Our State is part of the metropolitan complex growing between Maine and Virginia. The proposal to do away with the existing category would work an injustice on towns developing with a density of population which gives them urban characteristics, even though they are under 5,000 people.

Connecticut has taken the lead in highway planning designed around population growth and trends of economic development. In 1961, working with the Bureau of Public Roads and with private foundations the State highway department completed a traffic study report in the Hartford area which projected the needs for construction of roads in the coming decade. It analyzed present and future travel and capacity needs of the Greater Hartford area. It involved more comprehensive methods and more advanced techniques than the generally accepted practice. It emphasized once again the rapid urban growth which is taking place in Connecticut.

The committee's proposal which follows the pattern of the Bureau of Public Roads, would determine urban funds for only 2,350,937 people or some 185,000 people less than the population of this highly urban State.

I would point out respectfully that a grave injustice has already been done in the enactment of Federal aid for Connecticut highways. Congress has yet to take any action to reimburse the State taxpayers who bore the burden of providing new and modern roads for this national highway system. Connecticut had grown more rapidly than other New England States and could not afford to wait on outside help to build its roads. When the Federal Aid Highway Act became law, the Federal Government accepted these routes for use in its system. I have always contended that simple justice and fair play require that Washington recognize its obligation to this State, and others as well.

I can understand that the bookkeeping mind would red line a Federal grant to meet highway construction needs in a highly urbanized state where the figures do not show the human factors and the substantial growth requiring this special treatment. The Census Bureau has recognized through its special supplement the need for detailed reports on Connecticut population to explain more fully the Connecticut needs. Yet the language of H.R. 7195 by referring only to the latest available Federal census, provides for consideration of a comparable table like table 8 which is in harmony with the other States but not with the facts or traditions of New England life.

I would urge, therefore, that this provision be stricken from the bill and that the existing law remain in effect. This law provides for more adequate aid to a bridge State in an urban complex which has truer urban characteristics than the available census statistics can reflect. Federal aid funds are distributed to the States with the congressional intent that they help develop highway systems of the most appropriate nature. This apportionment must be aware of the type of development in the northeastern part of the Nation. Under the proposed language, there would be a substantial group of Connecticut's population which would not be counted either as rural or urban in the computation of Federal aid apportionments. The proposed bill would thrust this area even farther behind in its major effort to build adequate roads for a growing economy.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to devote my comments to section 3 of this bill which provides for the procedure for reapportionment of funds between the States from now to the end of the prescribed period of the Federal interstate highway development program.

Mr. Chairman, under section 3 there will be three remaining cost estimates required of the States on the basis of the needs formula which was adopted by the

Committee on Public Works some years ago and which was approved by the House of Representatives and the Senate. Under this needs formula the Interstate Highway System fund allocation is made on the basis of estimates received from each State as to the amount of funds which will be required to be used by that State to complete its share of the Federal Interstate Highway System.

Mr. Chairman, under section 3 there will be three more cost estimates submitted, one on January 2, 1965, upon which the allocations will be made for fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969. Then there will be a cost estimate made on January 2, 1968, which will be used as the basis of the allocation of funds for fiscal year 1970. Then there will be the last cost estimate made on January 2, 1969, for which funds will be allocated for fiscal year 1971. Upon the basis of those cost estimates the program is intended by Congress to be completed in 1972.

There was an amendment offered to this section and adopted by the Public Works Committee. I was the author of the amendment, which provides for the three remaining periods, particularly the last 2 years of the program, so that we could make sure that all States are caught up so as to bring this program to a successful conclusion at the same time. If this is to be done it is extremely important that all States catch up and work on schedule to bring this to completion.

Mr. Chairman, I want again to point out to the members of the committee that there is no more serious problem right now in completing this system than the situation which exists in the District of Columbia and in the adjoining States of Maryland and Virginia. The situation in the adjoining States of Virginia and Maryland is not their fault, but is the fault of the District of Columbia. There are coordinated interstate highway routes coming into the District of Columbia from both Maryland and Virginia.

The estimates upon which funds have been allocated to both of those States and the District of Columbia have been based upon the estimates made by those two States and the District to complete their interstate Federal highway routes by 1972. But because of the difficulty which has now occurred in the District of Columbia, because there has been, in effect, a suspension order placed against the completion of certain portions of the Federal interstate highway routes, particularly the Three Sisters Bridge, the Potomac River Freeway, and the upper leg of the inner loop, the District of Columbia is being allocated funds at the present time but is being barred from using them. This is because of a recommendation of the National Capital Transportation Agency that apparently temporarily has won the support of the White House, which has issued a suspension order for the construction of these three particular projects. Because of this delay the State of Virginia has been held up since it does not know what to plan for in the way of connecting routes. It originally thought it was to plan for the connection at the Three Sisters Bridge and it has made those plans for that purpose. But now it cannot go forward because it does not know whether it will be approved.

The State of Maryland has the same problem because it does not know what to count upon in the way of the interconnecting routes in the District of Columbia.

So, we have at the present time a most serious problem in the Nation's Capital as to whether this important segment of the Federal interstate highway program is going to be brought to completion at the time when the Federal Interstate Highway System should be completed.

Mr. Chairman, it was clearly the intent of the Congress that the entire system be completed as a unit simultaneously in 1972.

I do not think it can be stressed too much that those who have been responsible for this delay in the District of Columbia should remove the obstacle to this delay, should retract the suspense order, and should issue a go-ahead order so that this program can be brought to completion on time, so that the States of Virginia and Maryland will not be penalized, and so that the 2 million people in the Washington metropolitan area who have been paying a 4 cents per gallon gasoline tax can get their fair return by having their share of the roads completed so that they can use them to drive their cars on, rather than having their funds going into a trust fund, and then being frozen there by some "suspend" order barring construction in the District of Columbia of the interstate highway routes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN].

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Public Works and the Roads Subcommittee of that committee, I rise to speak on H.R. 7195. This bill amends various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to Federal aid highways, but I wish to direct my remarks to one particular section.

Section 4 of the bill, pertaining to standards for construction of the Interstate System, would amend existing law in keeping, I believe, with the original intention of Congress. The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, which launched the current Federal aid highway construction program, provided that the geometric and construction standards for the Interstate System be adequate to accommodate the types and volumes of traffic anticipated for the year 1975. This provision, at the time it was enacted, gave recognition to the established practice of designing and constructing major highways adequate for 20 years in the future.

However, this is 1963. Interstate highways now being constructed to meet 1975 traffic requirements provide for a future period of 12 years, and traffic needs for shorter and shorter periods will be provided as the present construction program progresses toward scheduled completion in 1972.

As I said, I think it was the original intention of Congress that interstate highway projects be adequate to accommodate traffic for at least 20 years after construction. This is a desirable objective to assure maximum benefits to the public from the investment we are making in the Interstate System.

Section 4 of the bill, which includes language that I had the privilege of offering as an amendment in committee and which was accepted and incorporated in the bill as reported out, would require that the geometric and construction standards, as applied to each actual construction project on the Interstate System, shall be adequate to accommodate traffic anticipated for the 20-year period commencing on the date the Secretary of Commerce approves the plans, specifications, and estimates for such project.

This is a good provision and should be enacted into law.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN].

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for allowing me this time to express myself about one of the sections of the public highway law, that is directed to public hearings. There was supposed to have been submitted an amendment on the floor but it was determined it would not go through today and would prove more advisable if it were proposed to the committee in regular course.

There is nothing in the law which suggests any time for notice prior to a date set for a public hearing. It is thought that at least 30 days notice should be given before a public hearing is had. Before there is any determination made at the end of the public hearing and before the completion of any preliminary or final plans on any project, further hearings should be held and sufficient time be given so that all the people may have notice of the proposed change, if there is to be one, in connection with a public highway.

Further, there is nothing in the law that requires the consideration of economic effects upon families who live in an area for which a public road is proposed. Also, there is no consideration in the law insofar as the effect on small business in an area is concerned. It appears to me these things should be considered before any road is determined upon in order that the residents of the particular area affected shall have an opportunity to speak their piece. I trust in due time the committee will give consideration to this proposal which will be submitted in the form of an amendment, which I believe will be very salutary.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads of the House Committee on Public Works for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Wallhauser], and I planned to offer an amendment this afternoon to section 128 of title 23 of the underlying act relating to the problem of public hearings.

Mr. Chairman, the problem is this: Hearings in many areas and communities, not in all, but in some, have been a sham. They have not been hearings in the proper sense. At the same time, by pretending to be hearings, they delude the public. There is nothing in the act as it exists that indicates when public hearings are to be held. In my own area a substantial amount of taxpayers' money—Federal funds—were committed and spent before there were public hearings in connection with a particular highway project. In fact, when public hearings on this project were held, sentiment ran so strongly against it that the city of New York decided not to go forward with the plan. But there seems to be no way by which the taxpayers' money already spent could be recouped. It was a tragic situation and a monument to bad administrative procedures.

Second, although there is a reference in section 128 to the "economic effects" on a community, there is nothing mandatory about an economic report being filed with the Department of Commerce. We think a report should be filed.

Third, there is no definition of what is meant by "economic effects." We think the highway act should be amended in order to define the terms. It should include, specifically, relocation studies and the effects on families and small businesses in the area.

Fourth, and the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. Baring] is particularly interested in this aspect, our proposal would formalize the hearing procedure. The proposed amendment would key it in with the Administrative Procedures Act.

In conclusion I would like to say that we plan to introduce legislation on this subject and we very much hope when the bill is introduced that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Fallon] will hold hearings on it and obtain reports from the Executive so that we may consider this matter in due course.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I certainly strongly support the statement of both gentlemen from New York. I believe before the State makes an alinement the economic impact on the communities should be carefully considered and the loss of ratables to the community, and the uprooting of citizens and many other factors, should be taken into consideration and prior notice of hearings should be given to citizens. The evidence should be gone into in more than a cut and dried fashion and all facets of the situation should be studied and reported. I strongly support the legislation we propose to introduce and hope that other Members of the House will support it.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman that this is an important change in the basic law and I suggest to him rather than offering an amendment here today where we could not get a full and complete hearing, that if they would introduce the bill, as soon as the reports come back from the various departments we will be glad to give them a hearing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Stafford] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, it is with regret I note from the language of H.R. 7195, page 1, section 2(B) that this legislation will eliminate Vermont from eligibility for about $73,000 per annum of Federal funds for urban highway construction in future years. Vermont does not seek special treatment, but proposals have been made that this act be additionally amended to provide:

> No State shall receive less than one-fourth of 1 per centum of each year's apportionment for urban highways.

I shall not now offer such amendment on the floor because its general impact has not been fully explored—it has not been subject to hearings nor committee consideration. However, if H.R. 7195 passes in form as recommended by the Committee on Public Works, I shall offer legislation incorporating the phrase I have just described and shall hope for its favorable consideration before fiscal 1965.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Amendments Act of 1963".

Sec. 2. Paragraph (3) of section 104(b) of title 23, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(3) For extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary systems within urban areas:

"In the ratio which the population in municipalities and other urban places of five thousand or more in each State bears to the total population in municipalities and other urban places of five thousand or more in all the States as shown by the latest available Federal census."

Sec. 3. (a) So much of paragraph (5) of subsection (b) of section 104 of title 23, United States Code, as precedes the third sentence thereof is amended to read as follows:

"(5) For the Interstate System for the fiscal years 1960 through 1971:

"For the fiscal years 1960 through 1966, in the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in such State, as determined and approved in the manner provided in this paragraph, bears to the sum of the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in all of the States. For the fiscal years 1967 through 1971, in the ratio which the Federal share of the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in such State, as determined and approved in the manner provided in this paragraph, bears to the sum of the estimated cost of the Federal share of completing the Interstate System in all of the States. Each apportionment herein authorized for the fiscal years 1960 through 1971, inclusive, shall be made on a date as far in advance of the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized as practicable but in no case more than eighteen months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized."

(b) The eighth and ninth sentences of paragraph (5) of subsection (b) of section 104 of title 23, United States Code, are amended to read as follows: "The Secretary shall make a revised estimate of the cost of completing the then designated Interstate System, after taking into account all previous apportionments made under this section, in the same manner as stated above, and transmit the same to the Senate and the House of Representatives within ten days subsequent to January 2, 1965. Upon the approval of such estimate by the Congress, the Secretary shall use the Federal share of such approved estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1967; June 30, 1968; and June 30, 1969. The Secretary shall make a revised estimate of the cost of completing the then designated Interstate System after taking into account all previous apportionments made under this section, in the same manner as stated above, and transmit the same to the Senate and the House of Representatives within ten days subsequent to January 2, 1968. Upon the approval by the Congress, the Secretary shall use the Federal share of such approved estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970. The Secretary shall make a final revised estimate of the cost of completing the then designated Interstate System after taking into account all previous apportionments made under this section, in the same manner as stated above, and transmit the same to the Senate and the House of Representatives within ten days subsequent to January 2, 1969. Upon the approval by the Congress, the Secretary shall use the Federal share of such approved estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971."

Sec. 4. Subsection (b) of section 109 of title 23, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) The geometric and construction standards to be adopted for the Interstate System shall be those approved by the Secretary in cooperation with the State highway departments. Such standards, as applied to each actual construction project, shall be adequate to enable such project to accommodate the types and volumes of traffic anticipated for such project for the twenty-year period commencing on the date of approval by the Secretary, under section 106 of this title, of the plans, specifications, and estimates for actual construction of such project. The right-of-way width of the Interstate System shall be adequate to permit construction of projects on the Interstate System to such standards. The Secretary shall apply such standards uniformly throughout all the States."

Sec. 5. Subsection (c) of section 131 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out "1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "1965".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments? If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. Ullman, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that

Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7195) to amend various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal-aid highway systems pursuant to House Resolution 441, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS ACT OF 1926

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 453, Rept. No. 576), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report on the bill, H.R. 5207, to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes, and all points of order against the conference report are hereby waived.

TRANSFER OF EXECUTIVE POWER IN CONNECTION WITH EXPIRATION OF TERM OF OFFICE OF A PRESIDENT AND THE INAUGURATION OF A NEW PRESIDENT

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 454, Rept. No. 577), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4638) to promote the orderly transfer of the executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CLEAN AIR ACT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 440 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6518) to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH]; and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As the reading of the resolution shows, it provides for an open rule with 1 hour of debate on H.R. 6518, which is entitled the "Clean Air Act," and which would replace the Air Pollution Control Act of 1955.

To my knowledge there is no opposition to the rule, and I therefore reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 440 provides an open rule of 1 hour general debate for the consideration of H.R. 6518, a bill entitled "Clean Air Act." The purpose of this measure is to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution.

Air pollution is a serious national problem. I am certain that any Member who has been in Los Angeles at any time when smog was present realizes the seriousness of the situation. I understand that there are many other cities throughout the United States that are faced with this problem. The pollutants come from many sources—from furnaces which heat homes, offices, and public buildings; from burning of domestic and industrial waste; from motor vehicle exhaust; from industrial processes which release chemical vapors; and from combustion of fuels for the generation of power.

Great progress has been made, but the problem is far from settled. I do not know the actual figure, but I am certain that the city and county of Los Angeles and the State of California, as well as private enterprise, have spent millions of dollars in attempting to eliminate smog from the area.

This measure will authorize a total of $90 million to be used to try and help solve the problem. Of this, $5 million is for fiscal year 1964, $20 million for fiscal year 1965, $30 million for fiscal year 1966 and $35 million for fiscal year 1967. In other words, a total of $90 million over the next 4 years. The money will primarily be used for research, investigation and training by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, particularly the Public Health Service.

According to the testimony before the Rules Committee and the report, H.R. 6518 requires the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish a national research and development program for prevention and control of air pollution, and for that purpose to conduct research, render technical service, and conduct investigations and research if requested to do so by appropriate air pollution control agencies, or if he deems the problems of air pollution of national significance; and, in addition, to conduct studies relating to motor vehicle exhausts and to the effect of the discharge of such exhausts on human health and the determination of standards of safety for such discharge. For these purposes the Secretary is authorized to collect and make available information on the subject, to cooperate with all interested public and private agencies and institutions, to make grants for research, training, and demonstrations; to introduce controls, to provide training for personnel, to establish research fellowships, to collect and disseminate basic data on chemical, physical, and biological air quality and other information; to develop effective practical processes, methods, and prototype devices for the prevention or control of air pollution; and to establish criteria of air pollution.

The bill also sets up a procedure whereby under certain circumstances, the Federal Government can proceed to secure abatement of serious situations and violations.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that this measure will extend the Federal jurisdiction into another field which possibly is a more local than Federal problem. By the same token, I believe that the taxpayers in these areas where air pollution exists are willing to do anything they can to help clean up the air. It is occasionally stated that if the city officials can place the responsibility on county officials, they will do so. It probably follows that county officials may feel the same way about the State, and the State may feel the same way about the Federal Government. I would certainly hope that in the passage of this legislation, city, county, and State officials will not come to the conclusion that the Federal Government has taken over this field and that they thus will have no responsibility in the future. It seems to me that this is a problem that requires the attention and best efforts of all of these groups working closely together. I would also hope that this money is not used to duplicate research which has been heretofore conducted by local communities or States, as well as any universities. I would hope that all results of research by the various organizations will be readily gathered together and disseminated to the communities that it may benefit and, in turn, the Federal research program will continue from that point.

I would further hope that the subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee having jurisdiction over this matter will devote their close attention to the developments under this program in order to determine that the $90 million is spent wisely.

I support the bill, Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule and urge its adoption. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6518) to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 6518, with Mr. Ullman in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Under the rule, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Roberts] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Schenck] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Roberts].

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to recommend to the favorable consideration of this distinguished body the bill, H.R. 6518, which is designed to assist in the prevention and control of one of the Nation's most serious health and economic problems—that of pollution of our air, which, without exaggeration, has become a national disgrace.

Air pollution problems have existed in varying degrees of intensity for many years in most of the Nation's metropolitan centers.

The swift growth of our technological society has produced a high level of material benefits for the people but has also generated a high level of actual and potential problems caused by contamination of our environment.

These contaminating elements come from many sources—from furnaces which heat homes, offices, and public buildings; from motor vehicle exhaust; from burning of domestic and industrial waste; from industrial processes which release chemical vapors; and from combustion of fuels for the generation of power.

Air pollution imposes a heavy burden on our economy, causing extensive damage through its effects on animals and plant life, corrosion and soiling of materials and structures, depreciation of property values, interference with air and surface transport, and losses of unburned fuels. It has been estimated that economic damage from air polluting amounts to as much as $11 billion each year in the United States; $500 million of this figure represents agricultural losses alone. Air pollution thus costs an estimated $65 per capita annually in economic losses alone.

The adverse effects on human health caused by air pollution are of even greater concern, although obviously health is too precious to be measurable in terms of dollars.

Research conducted over the past few years has produced overwhelming evidence linking air pollution to the aggravation of heart conditions and to increases in acute and chronic respiratory diseases. Specific diseases associated in one degree or another with air pollution are lung cancer, emphysema, chronic bronchitis, and asthma. And the irritation caused our eyes, noses, and general sensibilities by the blight of air pollution in most of our urban areas is a vexatious problem with which many of us are all too familiar.

It is not difficult to understand the nature of this threat when one realizes that only a small part of the vast supply of our air resources is available for use in any single location. In general, the sources of air pollution are concentrated where people are concentrated. Over one-half of our population now lives on less than 10 percent of the land area of the country, and there is every indication that by 1970 two-thirds of our population at that time will live in the same limited land area.

The anticipated growth and concentration of our population and industry in these land areas will inevitably result in increasingly serious health and economic consequences, unless appropriate action is taken now.

Within recent years considerable progress has been made at the Federal, State, and community levels, but the problem will continue to demand an expansion of research and control efforts for many years in the future.

The need for such an expanded effort has become apparent to me after careful study of the problem in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The problem of air pollution has been under consideration by the committee for many years. In 1955 the committee reported favorably on the basic legislation establishing the present Federal air pollution research and technical assistance program.

In 1956 the Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety of the committee made a study of noxious, toxic, and harmful motor vehicle exhaust fumes in connection with a comprehensive investigation of highway traffic safety. Testimony was taken and research activities of the industry were studied on visits to manufacturing plants.

Hearings have been held by the Health and Safety Subcommittee in 1958, 1959, 1960, and 1962 on various bills concerned with extension of the Federal air pollution program and on the progress being made in air pollution control, particularly with regard to motor vehicle exhausts.

In 1959 the committee reported favorably on legislation to extend the Federal air pollution program—Public Law 86-365—and in 1960, a favorable committee report was made on a bill requiring increased emphasis on research into the motor vehicle exhaust problem and a report to Congress on the results of such investigations—Public Law 86-493.

Last year, the committee reported favorably on legislation to extend the Federal program for an additional period of 2 years and to enact into permanent law the substance of Public Law 86-493 requiring the Surgeon General specifically to conduct studies on motor vehicle exhaust as it affects human health through the pollution of air—Public Law 87-761.

Thus, over the years the air pollution problem has been carefully studied. During these years significant progress has been made, through research, in understanding the nature of the problem and the methods for its control. But, in comparison with the magnitude of the problem, far too little has been done at all levels of government, to actually apply the knowledge we now possess to control the existing problem and to prevent its aggravation in the future.

Mr. Chairman, although organized programs to deal with problems of air pollution are of comparatively recent origin, I should like to summarize briefly what has been done, or at least begun, at the Federal, State, and local levels.

FEDERAL PROGRAM

Since its establishment in 1955, the air pollution program of the Public Health Service has conducted and supported research, provided training, rendered technical assistance upon request, and disseminated information on air pollution to official and other organizations and the general public. Main emphasis has been placed on research, which has developed vital information on the health and economic effects of air pollution. This information has been made widely available for use by all levels of government, industry, and the public. New and valuable information on levels of air pollution throughout the Nation has been made available through the cooperative local, State, and Federal national air sampling network which now operates in every State, in 213 urban and 37 nonurban sampling sites. A continuous air monitoring program now provides what is virtually a minute-by-minute appraisal of the levels of gaseous pollutants in eight major cities.

A 2-year study on air exhaust and health has been completed under the authority of Public Law 86-493, enacted in 1960. The report to Congress, "Motor Vehicles, Air Pollution, and Health," makes clear that automobile emissions produce effects on human health and other biological systems. It points out that it is possible that none of our present approaches will, in the long run, provide adequate solutions to the problem. Entirely different concepts may be needed, such as the modification of basic engine design or employment of types of engines not now commonly in use.

Progress has also been made in assessing the quantities of individual pollutants present in the atmosphere. One example is the studies published on comparative levels of benzpyrene in cities throughout the country.

The Service has also accelerated its work on the investigations of techniques and basic design considerations, not only as they relate to the pollutants produced by automobiles, but for other pollutants, such as the oxides of sulfur, for which adequate means of control are not now available.

Technical assistance activities have been expanded. Thirteen cooperative statewide surveys have been completed, as well as 10 major local surveys and dozens of investigations of special air pollution problems.

Finally, the training programs of the Service have made a major contribution to the development of the technical manpower required for Federal, State, and local programs. Up to the present, training at the sanitary engineering center in Cincinnati and the field include courses in 18 different subject areas. Research and training grants to universities and other organizations have increased from 31 in 1958 to 85 at the present time.

STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS

Because of their many variations in scope and emphasis, it is not possible to generalize about State and local programs. They include research, equipment development, surveys, and pollution abatement activities. The primary emphasis is on control activities—the application of present scientific knowledge and techniques to reduce or control the emission of pollutants into the atmosphere. However, the widespread application of control techniques is dependent in large measure on the availability of competently staffed and supported State and local air pollution control agencies. Unfortunately, our present structure of such agencies is far from adequate for dealing with the needs of the Nation for air-pollution control.

With respect to our urban population, approximately 90 percent or 100 million persons live in localities having air pollution problems. It is estimated that all 232 communities in this country with a population greater than 50,000 have air pollution problems and approximately 40 percent of the communities in the 2,500 to 50,000 population range have problems. In total, about 6,000 communities in the United States have air pollution problems of varying degrees for which action programs should be initiated or strengthened as soon as practicable.

Today there are only 106 local control programs on record which have full-time staffs. These programs serve 342 local political jurisdictions, which comprise about 45 percent of the national urban population. Only 28 of these control programs have 5 or more full-time employees. There is an additional number of local programs with part-time staffs. The median annual expenditure is about 10 cents per capita, an amount highly inadequate to do the job which is necessary to attain effective control.

On the State level, during the past decade, there has been some improvement in the status of State air pollution legislation and the development of comprehensive programs dealing with problems in this area. Thus, about 15 States now have enactments which authorize the conduct of specific programs, whereas no State had such authorization as of 1950.

These relatively new State programs are quite varied with respect to the types of activities included. Of the 15 States having specifically identifiable air pollution programs, 12 have regulatory control authority at the State level, but only 4 of these exercise this authority statewide. All 15 of these States provide some technical assistance to local jurisdictions; 8 provide for encouragement of interlocal programs, and 4 have set up statewide air sampling and monitoring networks; 5 of these 15 States have engaged in varying degrees in training of personnel, nuisance abatement, laboratory assistance, research, pollutant emission studies, and dissemination of information. In general, those States with specific air pollution programs carry on activities in one or more of the following categories: First, surveillance of problems; second, technical assistance to local agencies; and, third, legal regulatory control at the State level.

Because the air respects no arbitrary boundaries and flows freely from community to community and State to State, the problem of interstate air pollution is a very real one. There are some 38 million Americans living in metropolitan areas that reach across State boundaries, and all these people live and work in polluted air. Yet there is in this country only one air pollution control agency that is interstate in its activities, and it has barely begun.

In recent years several committees composed of highly qualified persons have studied the problems of air pollution in the United States, at the request of the President, the Congress, and the Surgeon General. All of these groups have emphasized the essentiality of preserving the quality of our air resources and the need for more research and technically trained manpower, and greater application of our available technology in preventing air pollution.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 6518 would replace the existing Air Pollution Control Act, as amended, with a new version. The legislation would strengthen and make more explicit the authority of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to its activities in air pollution research, training of needed manpower, and demonstrations. In addition, two new programs are authorized; namely, one, a 4-year program of Federal grants to State, regional, and local air pollution control agencies to assist in the establishment and improvement of air pollution prevention and control programs in the States and local communities; and two, a program of limited Federal assistance and participation, under certain circumstances, in actions directed toward abatement of particular air pollution problems.

ENFORCEMENT

The provisions of H.R. 6518 relating to abatement of air pollution are an important adjunct to the expanded local and State control activity which the bill seeks to encourage.

This portion of the bill is again an expression and a logical outgrowth of the concept that control is best secured through the efforts of local and State agencies. The plan for abatement action is predicated on the belief that the proper role of the Federal Government in these matters is as collector and disseminator of information, to assist the States and local governments on request, and—when control efforts by the States have not been successful in resolving an interstate problem, to exercise a limited abatement authority.

Mr. Chairman, the abatement procedures outlined in the bill and discussed in the accompanying Report No. 508 have been developed in considerable detail. I would like to summarize them briefly here.

The abatement procedures recognize that States and communities are faced with two classes of air pollution problems—first, those in which both the sources of pollution and the persons whose health or property are endangered by it are found in one State—interstate pollution; and, second, those in which property or health damage result from air pollution originating in another State or States—interstate pollution. In both such cases, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized, when officially requested to do so, to conduct conferences of the interested parties and to make recommendations intended to secure abatement of the pollution problem in question. The Secretary would furthermore be authorized to convene such conferences on his own initiative when an air pollution problem which he has reason to believe that air pollution arising in one State is endangering the health or welfare of persons in another State.

Following the conference, the Secretary must allow 6 months for any remedial action which he recommends to be taken. Thereafter, if appropriate remedial action for abatement of the problem has not been taken, he may call a public hearing of the interested parties and receive from the hearing board its recommendations to secure abatement of the pollution problem. The Secretary may then convey the hearing board's recommendations to the interested parties, specifying a reasonable period of time—not less than 6 months—for them to be carried out.

If, at the end of the period specified by the Secretary, measures to secure abatement have not been carried out, he may then transmit his recommendations, together with a transcript of the hearing to appropriate governmental officials. At this point, again, the bill makes a clear distinction between abatement of interstate and intrastate air pollution. In instances of intrastate air pollution, the Secretary shall present his findings to the Governor and the attorney general of the State, and may, at their request, provide technical and other assistance in judicial proceedings to secure abatement. When the pollution problem in question is of an interstate nature, the Secretary may turn over his recommendations and findings to the Attorney General and request him to bring suit to secure abatement on behalf of the United States. He shall not, however, make such a request until he has received certification from the

Governor of each offended State that such Governor has made a good faith effort to enter into a compact or agreement with the State in which the pollution originates, and has met with no success.

Mr. Chairman, this plan for abatement of air pollution places the primary responsibility for control at the State and local levels of government and invokes the power of the Federal courts only when every reasonable effort to control an interstate problem at the State level has been shown to be unproductive and the health or welfare of American citizens is being needlessly jeopardized.

I believe we can all agree that the principal effect of this provision of H.R. 6518 will be to encourage communities and States to accept fully their responsibility for the control of air pollution, which, as I have said, is consistent with the broad objectives of the bill and with the intent of the Congress.

Interstate air pollution is a uniquely complex and demanding problem. With the growth of urban population, more and more metropolitan areas are reaching across State boundaries. So indeed are the air pollution problems that urban life creates, for as we have learned in committee hearings, the air pollution byproducts of our technological society are carried on the wind across the hundreds of miles, heedless of the political boundaries that crisscross the land.

Yet despite this growing problem, the resources of the States and their communities can be made equal to it, if the Federal Government helps to provide the climate for constructive and meaningful growth of the air pollution control effort throughout the Nation.

Today, Mr. Chairman, there is only one interstate air pollution agency in the United States, and it is without adequate authority to effectively abate air pollution. Yet, in 1960 some 38 million people lived in 24 metropolitan areas that extend into two or more States. The Nation has every right to look to the Federal Government for aid and guidance in finding a remedy to this situation. H.R. 6518 though it can offer no panacea, would, if enacted, be the first real step toward a solution.

GRANTS FOR SUPPORT OF AIR POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS

The legislation before the House explicity states that primary responsibility for the prevention and control of air pollution at its source rests with State and local governments, a reaffirmation of a policy which the Congress has consistently set for the Federal air pollution program. Mr. Chairman, the provision of H.R. 6518 authorizing the use of Federal funds to partially support State and local air pollution control programs is not only consistent with the expressed intent of Congress, it is essential if that intent is to be fully realized.

If the Nation were effectively controlling its growing air pollution problem, H.R. 6518 would be superfluous. The facts, unfortunately, point to the contrary. Mr. Chairman, only 24 of our 50 States spend more than $5,000 a year to control air pollution. In all, the States are spending less than $4 million a year to meet the rising threat of air pollution, and more than half of that sum is being spent in California alone. Local control agencies are spending considerably more, about $8.5 million annually; but half of the Nation's metropolitan centers and some 6,000 smaller communities are inadequately served by control programs, despite the fact that they all suffer moderate or serious air pollution problems.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to expend not more than $5 million annually, plus any unexpended portion of the funds for this purpose appropriated for the previous fiscal year, in the form of grants to State and local air pollution control agencies to assist them in establishing and maintaining control programs. The objective of these grants is to provide impetus to the establishment and improvement of regulatory air pollution programs in the States and local communities. Members of the House will agree, I feel sure, that this is indeed a modest sum when compared with the billions of dollars worth of damage to goods, property, and agriculture inflicted each year by polluted air. Yet these funds, allocated as the bill prescribes on the basis of a formula which takes into account population, per capita income, and the extent of the air pollution problem within each State, would enable and encourage many communities to undertake effective control programs where they are now either inadequate or totally lacking.

There are, of course, serious-minded persons who deplore, as I do, the thought that the Federal Government might assume the full burden and cost of air pollution control throughout the country. This is neither the responsibility of National Government, nor is it the intent of the legislation before the House. The bill, in its entirety, would rather assist the several States in meeting their responsibility for the prevention and control of air pollution. It would mark the beginning, Mr. Chairman, of a concerted effort to deal wisely and effectively with a problem, which, though it is primarily local in nature, is nonetheless a national disgrace and a serious economic and health problem.

The time for prudent Federal leadership and support is upon us. The Congress should delay no longer in helping initiate and strengthen effective air pollution control programs where they are most sorely needed—in the cities and States of the Nation troubled by polluted air.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, every individual person in the Nation must breathe in order to remain alive, and there is no choice but to breathe the air with which we are surrounded. Therefore, this bill H.R. 6518 is vitally important to every person in this Nation in a very personal way.

Our colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS], chairman of our subcommittee, is to be most sincerely commended for all the work he has done in this field of air pollution and better health.

The United States enjoys, more than any other nation on earth, a level of prosperity and a standard of health that are a monumental tribute to our industrial and technological progress and to our representative form of government. It is incongruous, in the face of these accomplishments, that we are failing to adequately meet the problem of air pollution, one of the challenges thrust upon us by modern civilization. A nation that can provide employment for 70 million people, that can achieve miracles of lengthened lifespan and reduced infant mortality, that can provide its citizens more educational opportunities, more of the trappings of personal comfort, indeed more of the tangible and intangible elements of a prosperous life—such a nation must certainly find ways to correct the steadily worsening environmental insults of air pollution to which its people, its proud cities, even its agricultural areas are subjected.

From the economic viewpoint alone, it is reliably estimated that the loss per capita in damage to crops and vegetation, paint, chrome plate, rubber, and other material goods is costing $65 per capita per year and this does not take into account the damage to the health of our people and animals which cannot be measured in dollars alone. This per capita economic loss will continue and even at an increased cost unless prompt and effective steps are taken to meet these problems. Yet we are currently spending only about 10 cents per capita to meet these problems and thus the wisest thing to do is to step up our efforts to reduce the rate of economic loss and protect the good health of everyone. No area in our Nation is free from these dangers and losses. Appropriate and proper efforts now will produce lasting benefits to every area of the Nation and each of our citizens.

It has been my great privilege to have had a direct part in activities relating to the problem of air pollution for several years and in so doing I believe I have come to really appreciate the urgent seriousness of this property loss and the bad effects on human life. A good step in the right direction is embodied in H.R. 6518, introduced by my able colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS], which I urge the House to approve overwhelmingly. This bill will make it possible for the cities and States of the country to fully assume their own proper responsibility for the control of air pollution, by intelligent and limited use of the instrumentality of the Federal Government to aid them in this endeavor. Herein lies the key to an expanded national program to deal with a proliferating, national problem: cooperation among government at all levels, with the primary responsibility as it should for direct control authority left to the States and local governments.

Mr. Chairman, I had the pleasure of participating last December in the National Conference on Air Pollution, called by Surg. Gen. Luther L. Terry. Many differing views were expressed at that meeting on specific details of the air pollution problem, but I cannot emphasize too much the really remarkable unanimity of opinion that much more needs to be done nationally to bring the problem of air pollution under control. Spokesmen from industry, from science, from public health, from air pollution control activities and from all levels of government were virtually of one voice in calling for a substantial increase in the national effort to bring about better control of this problem. And the public response to the conference, manifested only in part by the impressive coverage given it by the press, radio, and television, provides yet another index of the growing public acknowledgment that much more needs to be done now to halt the contamination of our air resources. Thus, I think we here in the Congress have a unique opportunity on the one hand to truly represent the will of the American people and on the other to provide the leadership that is a traditionally essential element of the legislative process.

The bill now before the House, H.R. 6518, may be looked upon as having three major elements. First, it reiterates the well established sentiment of the Congress that air pollution, a byproduct of industrial, technological, and population growth and concentration, demands abatement action, which is primarily the responsibility of the communities and States. In a second element, the bill authorizes a substantial expansion of existing Federal activities in the field of air pollution; namely, research, technical assistance, training, and dissemination of information. Finally the bill gives the Federal Government, for the first time, the authority to assist States and communities directly in the establishment and maintenance of control programs by providing limited financial assistance, if the need is shown, and by participating under certain circumstances in activities directed toward abatement of particular air pollution problems.

In its totality, the bill introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] is focused on the one great stumbling block that has thus far frustrated efforts to deal conclusively with the problem of air pollution—the inability or unwillingness of many States and an alarming number of cities and towns to conduct the kind of air pollution control programs they so urgently need. Virtually every provision of the bill is clearly aimed at aiding, primarily through making technical information available, the establishment and improvement of local and State control programs, and hence, at removing the serious obstacle of inadequate action. There is no intention, as far as I am concerned, to relieve local communities and States of their own responsibilities to provide for and administer a clean-air program.

The bill does this, I think, in two closely related ways. The Federal Government through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, can provide very limited initial financial impetus when proven necessary to initiate, or where needed, strengthen control programs in the States and cities of the Nation. As the bill provides, the Federal Government can serve only in the capacity, as a starter, to help the local programs get their feet on the ground through modest financial help and technical information. I am sure that once effective programs are undertaken and their worth and benefit to the community or State is demonstrated, as it will be, the citizen-taxpayers served by such programs will be glad to assume the full responsibility for their continuing support, and the modest investment made by the Federal Government will be far outstripped by appropriated local funds. Once the people realize the gains in personal health and comfort and in economic returns that will accompany effective air pollution control, I submit they will never again allow the needless and careless destruction of their air resource that we are witnessing today.

The bill will authorize what we must certainly call a modest investment in Federal grant support of local and State control programs—a total expenditure in any fiscal year not to exceed $5 million. These funds would be allocated to the States on an equitable formula basis of established need, designed to take into account the State's own financial capacity and its air pollution problem. Obviously, this sum could never serve to underwrite the entire national cost of air pollution control, and the bill envisions nothing of this kind. This money would serve only as a stimulus, and as tangible evidence of the willingness of the Federal Government to aid the States in launching and maintaining their own effective control programs.

Another major feature of the bill, one which is intimately tied to the grants program, is the authorized Federal participation in abatement activities. On this point, too, the bill places full responsibility for control with State and local governments, but it does more than that. It attempts to create a climate, now sorely absent, in which States can pursue abatement measures with the assistance of the Federal Government as a repository of authoritative technical information and counsel. In only one type of air pollution situation would the Federal Government be authorized to intervene directly to secure air pollution abatement through the Federal courts. This would only occur when all efforts at the State level have failed to resolve an air pollution problem involving two or more States. We have every reason to believe that application of this authority would truly be the exception to the rule.

This leads to a point which I believe needs to be emphasized. In attempting as it does to encourage and foster increased local and State air pollution control activity, the bill recognizes the need for the creation of both interstate and intrastate agreements to deal with air pollution problems, as they so often occur, on a multijurisdictional basis. Experience has demonstrated that single political entities, whether they be cities, counties, or entire States, often cannot adequately deal with the air pollution problems confronting them because another political jurisdiction, entirely independent of the first in many cases, is directly involved. Where these problems are confined within one State, the course of action is clear—a statewide or regional control agency must be established and empowered by the States to deal with the problem. But when two or more States are involved, the situation becomes administratively more complex and demands the adoption of agreements or compacts among the States. The bill, H.R. 6518, would give the consent of the Congress to the creation of such compacts or agreements so that interstate problems could be resolved at the State level. Only when no such compact or agreement exists and when efforts to secure one prove fruitless would the Federal courts be asked to intervene on behalf of the people of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, my experience in the field of air pollution, particularly in the perplexing area of automotive exhaust gas air pollution, has firmly persuaded me that every segment of our society, governmental and nongovernmental, has an important role to play in the struggle to preserve our diminishing supply of fresh, healthful, clean air. Last year, the Surgeon General, in response to legislation which I was privileged to introduce 2 years earlier, submitted a lengthy report to the Congress on the biological and health effects of motor vehicle air pollutants. The report concluded in essence that this specific air pollution problem is beyond question a potentially critical health threat and that it will surely worsen unless effective measures are taken to correct it. As we all know, the automotive industry has continued to spend huge sums in research on the matter of the harmful effects of automotive exhaust gases and has taken an important step by equipping all new cars beginning with the 1964 models with a crankcase "blowby" device that will reduce by about one-third the amount of harmful unburned hydrocarbons released into the air by each car. I understand that the industry is and has been working, furthermore, on the development of other devices and techniques that will help to correct the far more serious problem of pollutants released through the exhaust system itself. But this effort alone will not solve the automotive pollution problem unless and until the cities and States of the Nation are equipped to administer and insist upon a program of strict control to assure that motor vehicle pollution control devices and procedures are uniformly adopted and enforced. To my knowledge, only one State, California, has seen and acted upon the wisdom of this course, despite the fact that every city in the land with more than 50,000 residents either has now or soon will have a motor vehicle pollution problem to be dealt with.

In other areas, what I have just said is even more true, because the problem of control need not wait for the development of reliable and economical equipment and techniques. Air pollution authorities agree that many means are already at hand to bring under effective control many of the major sources of air pollution, such as fuel use, industrial operations, refuse disposal, and others. This information all too often is lying unused because the cities and States of the country, or certainly most of them, are either not equipped or are not yet willing to assume responsibility to bring it into application in the interests of their citizens.

I will conclude, Mr. Chairman, by respectfully asking that the House take this opportunity to strike a blow at the national disgrace of air pollution. The people of the United States are ready and able to meet the threat of air pollution. Our responsibility is to help them in every way appropriate to the Federal system of government. I urge my colleagues here in the House to overwhelmingly approve the clean air bill, H.R. 6518, and thus make an important start in providing all our people with urgently needed clean air in which to live.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHENCK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I seek the advice of the gentleman. I am very well aware of the seriousness of the problem of air pollution as well as the problem of water pollution. I would like to get the opinion of the gentleman as what a Member such as myself can do or should do if that Member has taken the position, as I have in the past, that water pollution problems, serious as they are, are primarily a matter to be handled at the local level. How is this air pollution proposal to be distinguished in principle from that relating to water?

Mr. SCHENCK. If I may reply to my good colleague from California, I will say that this legislation attempts to put under one umbrella all the various types of air pollution programs, participation, the matter of research, and the matter of grant in aid where a proven need exists, but those grants are not in excess of $5 million a year. It also makes it possible for the local communities to receive technological information and know-how from the research department of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which is extremely important.

It provides, also, that there can be organized State compacts if the Congress will approve State compacts the same as they do with respect to water pollution. It also provides that we encourage and urge the local communities and States to do the job for themselves, applying only to the Federal Government when there is no other resource available.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 4 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill and I wish to heartily commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the able gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS], for his hard work and dedication to this legislation. He has shown a continued determination to protect the lives and welfare of millions of Americans.

I believe H.R. 6518 will do just that. And I am privileged to have worked closely with the gentleman in this, and in the previous Congress on legislation in this field, my companion bill in this session being H.R. 4750.

Although I am not a member of the subcommittee, I have had continued interest in this problem and have found the chairman extremely helpful and fully cooperative in seeking the answers to the ever-growing chaotic air pollution situation. I also want to express my appreciation to the officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare who have been so cooperative with me and my staff in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, this is a most important problem and tragically, for too long a time, it has lacked the necessary tools to be effectively attacked. We can no longer be apathetic about this dangerous scourge which has caused such immeasurable damage to the health, property, and welfare of countless Americans.

We certainly do not shrug off as insignificant the pollution of air with radioactive materials from nuclear explosions. We may question contentions about the kind and extent of damage such pollution causes, but this uncertainty whets our determination to probe the dangers in order to decide more intelligently what do about them. In contrast, our response to air pollution which is a byproduct of urban, industrial living has been somewhat lethargic. For this reason, passage of H.R. 6518 will be both a sign and means of our overcoming apathy.

Perhaps our slowness to act in this area stems from the rarity of spectacular damage caused by nonradioactive pollutants. The Donora disaster of 1948, when 20 persons died because of a concentrated, 3-day smog is an exception. If the effects of nonradioactive pollutants are less dramatic than those caused by radioactive substances, nevertheless they are equally invidious. For nonradioactive pollutants—nitrogen and sulfur oxides, hydrocarbons, and solid particles—threaten our pocketbooks, our aesthetic satisfaction, and, above all, our health.

The estimates of the economic cost of air pollution are staggering. They range from $7.5 to $11 billion annually. Just imagine that, Mr. Chairman. This figure takes into account the damage to crops as well as the increased work absenteeism in areas where air pollution reaches high levels. Compare the billion dollar annual figure with the $90 million appropriations for a 5-year period envisioned by the clean air bill under consideration. Who can label this expenditure wasteful spending?

The aesthetic debits of air pollution are obvious to anyone familiar with the grayness of city buildings, the haze that greets the traveler flying to a large metropolis and, to single out a trivial but telling example, the sooty pall typical of snow in an urban environment.

It is possible that some persons might acquiesce in the economic and aesthetic costs of polluted air, an attitude I find hard to comprehend. But, how many of us can accept calmly danger to our health? Recent studies conducted by the U.S. Public Health Service postulate a close connection between the lung ailments, particularly chronic bronchitis, emphysema and lung cancer, and the prevalence of polluted air. Laboratory experiments with animals and humans tend to support the conclusions drawn from statistical surveys.

By the experts' own admission, evidence on the relation between air pollution and disease is far from conclusive. This incompleteness alone is a powerful argument for supporting H.R. 6518 which makes possible increased research into all aspects of air pollution, the dangers it poses as well as the remedies for them. However inadequate, the data already gathered persuades me that action to reduce and, if possible, to eliminate air pollution, is also imperative. To argue that it is necessary to wait until we have more information before acting often masks a determination to do nothing at all. In most instances, we act on probabilities and, as I interpret the facts the probability is for additional economic, esthetic, and health losses as long as the projected increase in urbanization, automobile travel, and industrialization goes on unaccompanied by anti-air-pollution programs. H.R. 6518 takes into account the need for applying what we know about air pollution and its remedies by empowering the Federal Government to take legal action against those responsible for polluting the air.

Admitting the need for more extensive and intensive air pollution programs, why should the Federal Government get into the picture? Why not leave the responsibility to the States and local communities?

In the first place, air circulates freely, observing no State or municipal boundaries. The citizens of one State affected by pollutants discharged into the air in another State need some means to protect their interest in clean air. This bill makes the Federal Government their protector by allowing the U.S. Attorney General to bring suit against air pollution violators in the offending State after less compulsory paths to compliance have failed.

Second, local and State governments in general have failed to do adequate jobs in the past. Substantial progress has, of course, been made in in some communities in the last few years. I can point to New York and the superb job being done by Commissioner Arthur J. Benline of the New York City Department of Air Pollution Control. But there is just so much States and cities can do on their own. According to the U.S. Public Health Service, only 342 local political units including about 45 percent of the population in areas which have problems, have air pollution control programs with full-time staffs. A scattering of other communities have programs with part-time staffs.

Finally, the coordinating role of the Federal Government under this bill inevitably reduces wasteful duplication, especially in research. Many communities, geographically widely separated, have similar problems. With the Federal Government acting as liaison, they could more easily arrange a division instead of a duplication of labor. This would save considerable sums of money as well as make possible maximum use of available resources. H.R. 6518 further aids local and State cooperation by authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to channel reports to local agencies about developments in the air pollution field.

Mr. Chairman, as a Representative from New York City, whose industry, automobile traffic and population density create an ever-growing air pollution problem, I naturally have an immediate and personal interest in seeing H.R. 6518 passed. But, I do not speak only on behalf of either the urban dweller nor the 50-odd small farmowners and numerous home gardners within New York City's limits. I know that I speak too, for countless others wherever they live, who have an interest in maximizing the economic, esthetic and physical well-being of all citizens. I trust this view is shared by the overwhelming majority in the House and that it is reflected in a resounding vote in favor of this bill.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BURKHALTER].

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Chairman, In America today we are faced with many problems; however, I feel that air pollution or, as some call it smog will be our No. 1 problem in the very near future if we do not do something to alleviate its spread now at the Federal level with proper legislation during this session. Regardless of what this contaminator of our life giving air is called it is a daily detriment, a serious daily detriment, to the health and welfare of each and every community in our Nation.

Initially certain scientists and air pollution experts and some health authorities tried to say that this problem was confined to parts of California and a few other large metropolitan areas, however, it is now more or less a generally accepted fact that the problem has become a national one, especially in any locality of over 50,000 inhabitants.

Physicians and leading health authorities have long held that air pollution is certainly a contributing factor, and perhaps one of the major causes, of lung cancer, heart ailments, asthma, tuberculosis, and other respiratory ailments. Only this week were members of this House and the Senate asked to participate in a mass survey technique to detect a common chronic disease of the lungs, emphysema. Smoking and air pollution are the chief contributing factors of emphysema, yet no one knows how to prevent this disease, although it may be slowed down by modern medicine if the condition is detected in its early stages. Each and every year new types of respiratory diseases are finding their ways into our daily existence because of the pollutants thrown into the air by our industrial economy.

The general public is still skeptical about what is really causing smog, or air pollution. Most experts still insist that motor vehicles, contribute in excess of 60 percent of all the pollutants and irritants which are discharged into the atmosphere. The other factors which constitute the remaining 40 percent are spread out in much smaller percentages. In California the following were found to be sources of air pollution: Petroleum refineries, steel mills, chemical plants, rubber processing and finishing establishments, foundries, electroplating plants, steam plants, open dumps, the private back yard incinerator and even the municipally owned incinerators and a host of unlisted and unnamed industrial processing plants. Air pollution is also contributed to by each little community restaurant, each open burning of leaves—in Los Angeles one of the first bans carried out was against the back yard incinerator because of the solid pollutants which were carried into the air each day, afterwards, the public incinerators were banned for the same reason, contamination of the air with solid pollutants.

Unfortunately the first conclusion a person was apt to reach was—if you do not see smoke or dust, no air pollution was occurring. However, due to the intensive research and public educational programs presented today concerning the many reasons for the pollution of the air the public has become well aware that it is for the most part the unseen vapors and chemicals which react one with the other to cause one's eyes to water and burn and to cause terrific pains and discomfort in breathing to some individuals.

It has been pointed out that local, city, county, and even State laws are not the answer. For example, in California some of the industries that contribute a great deal to the Los Angeles basin smog are located in neighboring counties. Also, local laws are not effective in combating smog created by motor vehicle exhaust because today there are thousands of individuals who commute to and from their daily occupations or businesses who may travel well over 50 miles a day, and these people may cross and recross many local, county, and even State boundaries during the day. This movement naturally applies to the tourist as well as the commuter. With this kind of boundary criss-crossing it is easy to see that local ordinances which attempt to control air pollution are meaningless. Why? Because the moving, fleeting pollutants are transported by moving vehicles across local and State lines, as well as being carried by the changing wind and weather patterns out and beyond the local boundaries of their origin.

In face of ordinary facts such as these it is imperative for any control which is to be really effective to originate at the Federal level. Before ordinances or laws were passed at the local level, nothing was being done to curtail the daily scourge of this problem. In Los Angeles County, notwithstanding our phenomenal growth from 3,900,000 people and 9,800 industries in 1948 to 6,500,000 people and 16,000 industries as of 1960, because of the smog research and ordinances passed since 1947 the volume of contamination entering the air from stationary sources is less than half what it was 15 years ago, and about 6,000 tons a day less than it would have been had not our local control measures been taken in the interval. Even in London, England, which passed its "clean air act of 1956" the average concentration of smoke over the city has been reduced by roughly 40 percent.

It is estimated that air pollution is costing our Nation $11 billion a year. Dollars represent only replaceable goods, but what of the loss of a single life to this manmade air poisoner? This is not just a scare threat, unfortunately the record shows that smog can kill and has. How many remember the headlines of 1952 that let the world know that over 4,000 deaths occurred in London from a killer—smog—and as late as 1962, 400 Londoners lost their lives to another killing smog blanket. The residents of Donora, Pa., were lucky and escaped with their lives, but 5,900 inhabitants out of 13,900 were made deathly sick by polluted air. These are all facts not fantasies. It would indeed be a grave mistake to infer that all the damage that smog creates is to the physical body of man. It is estimated that in California damage to crops from smog alone is approximately $8 million to field and vegetable crops, according to Dr. John Middelton, chairman, department of plant pathology, citrus experimental station, University of California, Riverside. It is obvious Federal legislation is long past due in combating the foul mixtures that are polluting our lifegiving air hourly.

The automobile exhaust is one of the worst offenders. I have introduced legislation, H.R. 3765, which will set up certain standards that must be maintained for the elimination of this source of contamination. However, the other 40 percent creating air pollution are from a variety of sources, and each, no matter how small, must be treated and acted upon accordingly. The control of the pollutants from small and large industrial establishments is a factor which can be a financial drain on companies which are paying interest and principal on original loans, and will be for the next 15 to 20 years. A large portion of these new industrial plants have been started in the last 15 to 18 years, and a high percentage of the owners are veterans who received their initial loan from the Small Business Administration.

In talking with many of these individual owners, I have found that although they are encumbered with present financial obligations they would be more than willing to seek further loans which would enable them to install air-pollution control devices on any and all processes they employ which are at present contaminating the atmosphere, if such loans could be made available from Government agencies at a low interest rate.

I do not believe it is the desire of any of us advocating the rigid enforcement of controls of air pollution to harass or close down any of our industrial, commercial, or any firms which are contributing to the economic well-being of our country. However, this is a two-way street and the public health is of the first importance. Due to this dual involvement, and to the ready cooperation of many of the firms to install devices to control the emission of pollutants from their establishments, I believe that those of us in the legislative branch of the Federal Government are obligated to make low interest loans available to this group because of the very vital contribution to the welfare and health of the Nation this control of air pollution would be. Quoting from S. Smith Griswold, air pollution control officer for the Los Angeles air pollution control district, in this regard he has said:

> Three separate factors suggest this need for a Federal program:
>
> 1. Los Angeles County and other urban areas cannot cope independently with the many technical and scientific factors associated with effective control efforts. To secure answers to the many questions confronting State and local agencies, there must be an effective division of effort between the several levels of government. Without that kind of cooperative approach, the solution to the air pollution problem will be dangerously slow.
>
> 2. Much positive and constructive data and information regarding air pollution and its control already has been developed by local agencies, particularly in Los Angeles County where a very comprehensive program is being administered. This existing information should be correlated and made available to all control agencies through central coordination at the Federal level. There is little need to duplicate research or engineering development projects already completed or well on their way to completion, if the information can be retrieved readily through a central agency. Available time and money should be used to expand the knowledge of air pollution and its effect on environmental health wherever necessary.
>
> 3. Federal financial assistance through grants-in-aid or contract research projects should be made available to local agencies conducting work of national interest. Most local governmental budgets are already strained to the breaking point and they should not now be required to spend local tax funds on projects that are of benefit to the entire Nation.
>
> The aggressive program at the Federal level which could result from the enactment of H.R. 6518 would provide sorely needed support to State and local air pollution control programs. It would concentrate the great mass of technical data and information and provide for the uniform national effort which the Surgeon General of the United States has said is vitally necessary for the protection of the health and welfare of the citizens of this Nation.

Many, many reasons and facts have been stated from both sides of the House that point out the increasing dangers from continued inactivity of Congress to act in controlling air pollution. I, therefore, urge that all of my colleagues weigh the responsibilities involved in the interest of public health and urge that Mr. ROBERT'S bill, H.R. 6518, be supported and passed by this august body unanimously.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for his interest and his contribution and support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation and also to commend the chairman of this subcommittee and the other members of the committee, including the ranking minority member, for the fine work they have done over the years on this program.

Actually this problem of air pollution is increasing daily. We are seeing it right here in the Nation's Capital. In fact, it is to be found in all cities with a population of 50,000 or more. From a survey that has been made it is stated that 40 percent of all communities of 2,500 to 50,000 have air pollution problems. Of course, this is going to increase as our population increases, as the use of automobiles increases, as we industrialize, as we urbanize.

This legislation is simply founded upon the idea that some research done now will pay off not only in lessening the damage of some $11 billion that comes about yearly, but also in the saving of lives.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is offered in an effort to combat a national problem which threatens to become worse in very short order unless corrective action is taken. Polluted air, a byproduct of industrialization and urban growth, threatens the health of every American, as well as the food he eats and the materials he uses.

Air pollution is a health hazard. To consider one aspect, it can turn mass murderer. In 1952, the city of London, England, suffered under heavy fog laden with a thick variety of polluted material. In those two weeks, more Londoners were killed than had died in the cholera epidemics of the 19th century. That infamous fog took from 3,000 to 4,000 lives.

In 1948 a deadly fog in Donora, Pa., resulted in 20 deaths and many, many of illnesses.

But these incidents happened some years ago. Yes, but the average American recognizes the problem we have under discussion here today when you mention to him the irritation which accompanies a warm, still day in any urban or semi-urban area where automobile exhaust fumes, chemical waste, industrial vapors lay in the atmosphere to hinder sight and breathing. And any farmer can recognize the damage which can occur to crops planted near heavily traveled highways.

The problem of contaminated atmosphere has become common knowledge for every American, and concern for this problem is seen in local, State, and Federal activities.

The problem is getting worse despite corrective action even now underway to control it. The U.S. Public Health Service estimates that by 1970, two-thirds of the American people will be breathing the air which covers less than 10 percent of this Nation's total land area—strong testimony to illustrate our trend toward even greater population density. As a corollary, let us compare the amount of toxic substances in circulation. In 1947 U.S. production of synthetic organic chemicals was about 18 billion pounds. In 1958 we were producing more than 40 billion pounds. The waste products of this production are still being thrown into the air we breathe.

We have ample evidence to link polluted air to all sorts of diseases. Respiratory diseases naturally fall to mind first—emphysema, asthma, lung cancer, tuberculosis, and many other maladies with cardiorespiratory effects are accelerated if not caused directly by dirt in the air.

Laboratory tests show that polluted air becomes more a threat when exposed to sunlight. In some cases, chemicals which pose no danger can suddenly become dangerous when irradiated by the sun's rays, and many chemicals once irradiated become even more potent than when originally emitted. For example, exhaust fumes have been found to be highly toxic; $11 billion damage yearly is reported from air pollution and vegetation damage alone from polluted air is estimated to run as high as $500 million annually, indirectly affecting damage to our health as well as our economy.

Thus we can see the very great need for extending our efforts in the field of air pollution.

The committee emphasizes that the primary responsibilities and rights are the States and local governments in controlling air pollution.

H.R. 6518 does extend our efforts in this field, and does so in a way which gives closer congressional scrutiny, spells out the legislative authority much more clearly than has ever been done in any Federal air pollution program before, and will result in greater efficiency and returns per dollar spent as well.

At present, the U.S. Public Health Service has been conducting air pollution studies and work under broad, general authority as contained in sections 301, 311, and 314(c) of the Public Health Service Act. This legislative authority allowed great leeway for PHS activities, and the only real control which Congress had over these activities lay in the appropriations which were allowed to the Public Health Service.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has agreed with the findings of the Health and Safety Subcommittee that any future air pollution efforts must be scaled down to a compact package which allows close congressional supervision, specific authority, a definite set of goals to be accomplished, and a time limit on this new authority.

For these reasons, the committee has redefined the law with specific recommendations, required that any departure from this authority be checked by coming before the Congress for authorizations as well as appropriations, and cut the entire program to basically a 3-year program instead of the 5-year program originally proposed.

One of the main amendments which the committee adopted reduced the program to 3 years, and reduced the amount of the authorization as well. The House has this year already approved some $13 million for Public Health Service activity to be carried out under existing law. Because H.R. 6518 would enhance air pollution programs to include, for the first time, abatement of the problem as well as research into its causes, an authorization for $5 million is contained in this legislation to carry out this new authority for fiscal year 1964. However, Public Health Service suggested $154,937 for fiscal years 1965 through 1968 to implement this authority. However, the committee, by imposing ceilings of $20 million for fiscal year 1965, $30 million for fiscal year 1966, and $35 million for fiscal year 1967, has reducd the program to a 3-year authorization, and cut some $70 million as well.

There are other amendments which the committee has adopted in an effort to better regulate this program. Adoption of these amendments by the Congress is needed in order that air pollution programs, existing as well as the one proposed, can be better administered and made more effective.

The first such amendment places a restriction on the funds to be made available for grants for air pollution control programs. The amendment specifies a ceiling of $5 million for these grants, and states that such funds must come from the general appropriations for operation of the entire air pollution effort.

The second amendment is designed to discourage excessive spending in these grants made to States for air pollution control. The bill prior to this amendment would have directed that grants for this purpose be made in the amount of two-thirds of the cost of these programs. This amendment removes this fixed formula, and allows grants of smaller amounts to be made, with the effect being greater flexibility of administration, wider distribution of funds, and a reduction in the overall cost of the program as well.

The next two amendments follow through to conform with the grant formula alteration just described. These amendments allow regional air pollution agencies to receive grants in the same manner for which grants to the States are proposed, and provides that regional grants be figured pro rata as part of the share allotted to each State. The same effects of flexibility, wider distribution of funds, and reduction in cost are desired with regard to these amendments.

At the request of the Department of the Interior, the committee amended this legislation to allow the Department of the Interior to sit on the hearing board proposed. The Department of the Interior, with its concern in the field of coal mining, one cause of polluted air, was felt to be of value in such cases.

Mr. Chairman, as you can see, this legislation would provide action needed in the recognized problem of air pollution, and does so by providing efficient methods for that action through better regulation and control by the Congress. For these reasons I urge the enactment of H.R. 6518 as unanimously reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I wish to commend the gentleman from Florida for his able and strenuous efforts in getting this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague, a member of the committee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nelsen].

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make some comments relative to this legislation, also to ask some questions of the chairman of the subcommittee in order to make a complete clarification for the record as to what this bill does.

Originally when this bill came before our subcommittee I think some of us envisioned the possibility that this might be a very far-reaching measure moving much along the lines of the Water Pollution Act. Some of the original enforcement provisions in the bill, in my judgment, were ill-advised, and I think the committee did a very thorough job in modifying the bill in all respects. I personally do not want the Federal Government to move in and start paying for air pollution control in every little town in the country. I think there is an area of research and technical assistance that should be available to communities. I think there is an interstate problem, where there may be problems among several States, where there may be justification for the Federal Government's taking a hand in the problem.

May I ask this question: It is my understanding that many of the things that are being done under this bill in the way of research, technical assistance, and grants have previously been done under acts that presently are on the books. Is that not right?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. That is true; under the Public Health Service Act and the existing Air Pollution Control Act. The gentleman was in attendance at all the hearings. He helped write the legislation. At all times we were aware of his concern that we not replace local or State effort. We figure about $5 million a year for the new grant program. We do not want this to go into every little town. I do not think the wide open spaces and the little towns are bothered with this problem. It is primarily a problem of the cities with 50,000 population and above.

Mr. NELSEN. I certainly want technical assistance, advice, and planning made available, but to go in there to install physical facilities is another thing. I think the bill as written now will prevent that.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I think the gentleman knows from reading the bill that this is under the control of the local authorities. The Federal Government cannot go in without the concurrence of the Governors of the States and at the request of the Governors of the States.

Mr. NELSEN. That is right.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I think we tried very hard to avoid some mistakes that have been made in other Federal programs. The general purpose of the bill is to encourage cooperative effort on the part of the local jurisdictions, the States, and the Federal Government.

Mr. NELSEN. In other words, any request to the Federal Government does come through the Governor of the State, and the municipalities of the State must bring their requests to the Governor, who in turn brings the matter to the Federal agency.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. That is true.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. As I read the bill, you do provide under (A) on page 10, under (B) on page 11, that requests originate from State or local authority, but under (C) on page 12, that the Secretary can move on his own volition without any request from any State or municipality.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. That is merely for the purpose of holding a conference.

Mr. CURTIS. No; I beg to differ. This is the provision for bringing about the enforcement. You can start in any one of three ways.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Would the gentleman read the language to which he refers?

Mr. McCLORY. If the gentleman will yield, I think I can point out the language.

Mr. CURTIS. The language I am referring to, if the gentleman will yield, is on line 9. It reads:

> The Secretary shall also call such a conference whenever, on the basis of reports, surveys, or studies, he has reason to believe that any pollution—

He starts on his own initiative and this just as section A and section B can culminate in the action taken against the State. It goes through quite a long bit of procedure, but it does result in that action.

Mr. NELSEN. Does the chairman wish to respond to the observation just made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis]?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. This is with reference to an interstate situation. However, before the machinery of abatement begins to operate, the Governor of the affected State must certify that he has made a bona fide effort to enter into an agreement to secure abatement but has been unable to obtain such an agreement. So there again you go right back to the Governor who finally has to open the door to any Federal enforcement in the interstate situation.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. I note on page 4 of the committee report you outline the appropriations authorized under this particular legislation and it sets forth the maximum authorization out of the Appropriations Committee. I would like to find out whether any additional personnel will be required in order to carry out the provisions of this proposed legislation.

Mr. NELSEN. It is my understanding that it will not.

Mr. LAIRD. It is the understanding of the gentleman from Minnesota, a member of the committee, that no additional personnel will be required?

Mr. NELSEN. It is my understanding that that is correct.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I would not like the gentleman to be led into error. The breakdown on the personnel, I think, calls for 10 additional people to carry out existing programs. I will give the gentlemen the number and the breakdown. It increases from 407 to 417. That is the actual number of new people who would be required.

Mr. LAIRD. It goes from 400 to 417, in other words, an increase of 17?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. An increase of 10 for fiscal 1964, to carry out programs under existing authorizations.

Mr. LAIRD. What is the projection over the lifetime of this particular program as far as personnel is concerned?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I can also give the gentleman a detailed breakdown for the new grant, and abatement programs and can supply it for the RECORD. I can assure the gentleman the figures I have given are substantially correct.

Mr. LAIRD. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would supply that information for the RECORD at this point.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I will supply the information for the RECORD.

Air pollution estimates, fiscal year 1964

[In thousands]

	(Positions)	1963	(Positions)	House allowance, 1964
Grants		$3,342		$4,851
1. Research		2,892		3,851
2. Training		450		1,000
Operations	(407)	7,720	(417)	8,103
1. Research	(336)	6,740	(339)	7,039
A. Analysis, identification, measurement and control	(158)	3,680	(161)	3,876
B. Determination of effects:				
(1) Medical and biological studies	(100)	1,905	(100)	1,963
(2) Community and other field studies	(78)	1,155	(78)	1,200
2. Technical assistance	(47)	681	(47)	708
3. Training	(24)	299	(31)	356
Total		[1] 11,062		12,954

[1] Excludes $7,000 transfer to GSA; actual appropriation was $11,069,000.

NOTE.—The appropriated amounts for fiscal year 1963 and the estimates for fiscal year 1964 are based on the legislative authority contained in the act of July 14, 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857-1857F), and secs, 301 and 311 of the Public Health Service Act, Public Law 410, 78th C ong. 58 S tat. 683, as amended.

Program: Air pollution—Estimate of additional cost, 1964–67, H.R. 6518

	1964	1965	1966	1967
Appropriation requirements:				
Grants to air-pollution control agencies	$5,000,000	$5,000,000	$5,000,000	$5,000,000
Grant review and approval and related technical assistance	200,000	250,000	300,000	300,000
Investigations of intrastate and interstate air-pollution problems	170,000	250,000	500,000	500,000
Hearings, conferences, enforcement	80,000	150,000	250,000	400,000
Development of air-pollution standards	50,000	125,000	350,000	700,000
Device development	100,000	225,000	600,000	1,000,000
Total	(51) 5,600,000	(78) 6,000,000	(109) 7,000,000	(136) 7,900,000
Expenditures:				
Grants to air-pollution control agencies	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Grant review and approval and related technical assistance	190,000	240,000	290,000	290,000
Investigations of intrastate and interstate air-pollution problems	160,000	240,000	490,000	490,000
Hearings, conferences, enforcement	70,000	150,000	250,000	400,000
Development of air-pollution standards	40,000	115,000	320,000	670,000
Device development	90,000	215,000	590,000	950,000
Total	5,550,000	5,960,000	6,940,000	7,800,000
Man-year employment	38	68	97	124

NOTE.—The above projected additional costs relate only to new substantive authorization under the proposed legislation. Costs of implementation of additional activity under existing authorizations are not included.

Mr. NELSEN. It was brought out in the testimony that the increase would be quite immaterial.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I share the concern that has been expressed by other Members about this matter inasmuch as it is essentially a local and State concern. First, let us be very clear about this. I think all of us are concerned about air pollution, and this is simply a question of how do we best go about correcting it. In St. Louis, Mo., this was solved pretty well at the beginning back in 1934, and we spent a lot of money and a lot of effort on this. We have a problem now with East St. Louis on the Illinois side and we are moving ahead quite well through an understanding and through bi-State agency and other methods. I am very disturbed about these new Federal programs that are mushrooming—granted that to some degree this is a consolidation of programs that have already been started. But here is something that is mushrooming, and in a period of 3 or 4 years will cost $90 million and where in my judgment very few guidelines are being set out.

To pick up the point I was bringing out as to whether or not there could be action taken on the part of the Secretary at the Federal level without the request or consent of a State in which a pollution has occurred: I agree that if it were solely within a State, the Federal Government, constitutionally, could not go in. But I am thinking about the power to move into a State which is an alleged violator, and this can be started under section C as contained on page 12, by the Secretary, and it culminates on page 15 in this language:

> The Secretary may request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution, except that he shall not make such a request in any case where no interstate agreement or compact relating to air pollution is in existence until after he has received a certification from the Governor of each State—

In other words, except if the Governor involved, not of the State where the alleged violation occurred, but the aggrieved Governor, and where there is no interstate agreement, says he has made a good-faith effort to enter into an agreement and he has been unable to do so. Other than that, the Federal Government can move right ahead.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, I certainly will yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. On page 8 of the report the gentleman's question is answered just as clearly as can be. That answer will be found at about the 10th or 11th line from the bottom of page 8 of the report, which I would like to read to the gentleman:

> In the case of interstate air pollution, the Secretary may request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement. He shall not make such a request until he receives a certification from the Governor of each State wherein the health and welfare of individuals are being endangered by air pollution——

Mr. CURTIS. Where is that in the statute or in the proposed bill?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. If the gentleman will yield further, it is in section 5. The trouble with the gentleman is that he is reading out of context. He is not reading the first part of the section.

Mr. CURTIS. Well, give me the context. That is what I am asking for. Where does it say this? Where in the context is this?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. If the gentleman will yield further, and if the gentleman will look at page 16, line 3, there is the following: "Until after he has received a certification from the Governor of each State."

I do not know how you could make it any clearer, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Well, all right, then, I will try and make it a little clearer and read the last part of that:

> Wherein the health and welfare is being endangered—

And, here is what it requires, if the gentleman wants to read his own bill:

> that such Governor has made a good-faith effort to enter into an agreement or a compact with the State wherein such discharge or discharges originate in order to secure abatement of such pollution, and has not been able to secure such an agreement or such a contract—

This does not say anything about he shall not make such a request until he receives the certification from the Governor of each State. Where there is a violation.

Well, Mr. Chairman, this is exactly it. It does not limit the Attorney General from bringing suit at the request of the Secretary, if the State Governor has made such a good-faith attempt to get an agreement with the violating State. You actually set up the machinery whereby the Federal Government can move into a State without the State's request or permission.

I am not necessarily objecting to this, but I am pointing out that it does grant this authority and it does not require the permission or, rather, the request of the State or municipality involved.

The language, as the gentleman has said, is quite clear. He misled me a bit, I think unintentionally, when he stopped reading from the committee report. This is exactly what is on page 16, and has nothing to do with the certification from each Governor, except as far as this compact is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield to me some additional time?

Mr. SCHENCK. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. CURTIS. Oh, heavens. You gentlemen have plenty of time. Yield some additional time to me other than 1 minute.

Mr. SCHENCK. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri such time as he desires.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman from Alabama yield to me about 3 or 4 minutes, together with the 1 minute which I already have?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I would be delighted to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 4 additional minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. I might say that this is a strange procedure when we have a bill on the floor of the House to which apparently little attention has been paid, and when someone comes down to the well of the House to try to dig into it, we have this difficulty of assigning time in order that we can have proper debate.

Now, what I am concerned about here is another aspect. We are getting into a lot of these research programs at the Federal level, which disturbs me very much. On page 5 the Secretary is provided authority "to collect and make available through publication and other appropriate means the results of and other information."

In other words, this is published. This is what could be propaganda and not information if not done carefully. Then it says, "include appropriate recommendations in connection therewith."

This could easily be read to include proposed legislation before the Congress. Indeed, that is what we are finding out is happening in connection with many different Federal research programs.

The Federal agencies whose job it is to collect and gather information have then been going ahead and propagandizing the people of this country to get behind specific legislation.

That is exactly what has been going on for several years now in regard to a very difficult issue before the Congress, health care for the aged. This activity in my judgment, has been a violation of present law which forbids our Federal agencies to lobby. This is lobbying with Federal funds.

Then the language on page 5, as I read it, would actually give permission to the Secretary in this instance to lobby in regard to some particular legislation he might think is appropriate in this connection.

Now I want to go to page 6 and refer to research and development grants. We have had something similar to this up for consideration in the Committee on Ways and Means in connection with a very difficult problem of retarded children. Again we get into these research and training projects, these various grants to private agencies, training of personnel. Then we have section 5, research fellowships, which indicate the Federal Government is going into the business of direct research. We find that these research moneys are being spent in some of our institutions of learning around the country and other matters are tied in with the people receiving it. These people then come out for the various Federal programs that the people in the executive departments have dreamed up.

We found out, for example, in health care for the aged that a doctors committee of some 40 doctors—and it is their right, of course, to support the President's approach to health care for the aged—that 30 of these 40 doctors are heavy recipients of Federal grants in research. The medical schools have reached a point where a dean dare not speak out on an issue because of the tie-in of these Federal research grants. We are having this happening all over the country. Some of our universities are heavily dependent upon these Federal Research grants and it is becoming apparent there are tie-ins of these grants with the Federal propaganda going on, in my opinion, for ill-conceived Federal programs. At least, they should not be using these grants for the purpose of obtaining support for Federal programs even if they were well conceived.

What limitations are there in this bill to be sure that the kind of research contracted for is needed? Who establishes the criteria?

The bill provides for research fellowships in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. They must be going into other research. Are we going to develop another National Institutes of Health?

Finally I want to say this about dollars. We have reached the point in these research programs of the Federal Government where it is not dollars holding us back, it is lack of trained personnel—scientists and research people. Some people have computed that about seven-eighths of our scientists and research people today are being directed by the Federal bureaucracy. This concentration in the Government sector is drying up basic research that must go on in the private sector of our economy if we are to continue to advance.

I think this bill should be recommitted: The more I think about it the more I realize that attention has not been paid to some of these serious aspects I have tried to point up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

The gentleman from Alabama has 10 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I might say that our subcommittee has been going over the NIH grants week after week. I think I could give the gentleman some very good answers. I do not think it is called for in the debate on this bill because I think we have these funds well under control and we know where they are being spent.

I might say that 30 percent of this program is being spent in the operation of the Taft Sanitary Engineering Center at Cincinnati. This is a growing problem.

We spoke of emphysema here. This disease ranks next to cardiovascular disease now because of its rate of death and disability. We are paying out this year over $60 million in social security payments on emphysema alone. I could say to the gentleman if we were still a rural nation we would not have this problem. I do not know how you are going to keep people from moving into the cities. They keep moving in in ever-increasing numbers but we do not pump any more air in for them to breathe.

We have had a food and drug law for over a half a century, and yet breathing is more essential than food, if such a comparison could be made.

I think this committee, having been in this program for 8 years and having studied it very carefully, and having watched the authorization, and we will continue to do that, is offering a program which ought to have the support of the House.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I want to say to the gentleman, and I realize his concern, that many questions he has asked, the committee has asked. We have tried in this bill to bring these programs under an umbrella and bring some control to them because the subcommittee shared some of the feeling of the gentleman. Of course, under the present law the Department can come to the Congress under the general provisions of law with no ceilings. We are now coming in and trying to tighten up this program.

I might also say to the gentleman from the requests we have seen that the Department was going to make, we have cut them about in half.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I, too, want to commend the gentleman for the position he has taken. There are some limitations in this bill and I am aware of that. What I was trying to find out, I might say from our side, was how much have you been able to gather together the various programs and put them under one umbrella? I think you are on the right track. I am really worried about this because I have the situation in my own committee where we have a similar problem that we have not been able to grapple with, and that is one reason why I expressed this concern.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I appreciate the concern of the gentleman because I share it and I offer this amendment to provide, when we pass this legislation, that no similar programs can be carried on anywhere in the Government under similar legislation. So we tie it all in and we can go to this one law and know that all of our air pollution control programs are right here.

Mr. CURTIS. I am frank to say to the gentleman I am about to embark on a little study of my own to see what can be done in respect to all of these research grants so that what I regard as an abuse, as I tried to describe it, cannot go on. It is not peculiar to what we have here in this bill but it is something general and applies to all of this Federal research.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. May I say I commend the gentleman for his interest in this. This subcommittee and our committee have already embarked on this program and would welcome the support of the gentleman in all its recommendations.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. McCLORY. Is there any reason why Dr. Wiesner, who is in charge of the Officer of Science and Technology and in charge of the scientific group at the White House, endeavoring to coordinate research activities, was not invited to appear and testify before the committee?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. They did not testify on this as I recall it.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHENCK. May I suggest to my friend from Illinois that Dr. Wiesner, who heads up the Office of Science and Technology and the White House scientific group, is an electrical engineer. He did appear before our committee on another subject.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I might say that that organization spends no funds in this field. We have other agencies which have the responsibility for carrying on the program. This is not a new program. I am sure the gentleman knows that, because the Congress has already appropriated this year—that is, it has already passed through this House a bill for almost $13 million for this program. I am sure the gentleman knows that.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add with regard to the subject of water pollution that Dr. Wiesner did appear before our Committee on Government Operations.

Dr. Wiesner testified in part, with regard to the duplication of research and the effort that is being made, quite unsuccessfully so far, I might say, to coordinate the numerous multimillion-dollar research programs being carried on by various Federal departments and agencies. It would seem important that before we authorize additional expensive research programs we should make sure that we are getting the maximum results, or at least some substantial results from all of this diversified research effort.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The committee has gone into this. This is the purpose of the legislation, to tie this all in and to give Congress greater control over these programs.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, as I envision this program it is one which converts an existing research program of limited Federal authority and function to a greatly expanded program of control and abatement on the part of the Federal Government. It follows the pattern of the Water Pollution Control Act which is referred to several times in the report and will give greatly expanded authority to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in this area. We talk about the conference which is to be called in connection with abatement procedures. Any members who have had experience with conferences called by the Public Health Service with regard to water pollution know that it results in a very unsatisfactory situation so far as the States and local municipalities are concerned. We have had numerous complaints before our committee investigating water pollution about the conferences that have been called by the Public Health Service. These are provided for in this act and also, although they look like innocent things, just little meetings, and although provision is made for giving notice the result is that the Public Health Service moves in with a conference which is the first step in an abatement proceeding.

Mr. Chairman, as I interpret this bill, it not only authorizes the Governor to initiate these proceedings, but it authorizes a municipality within a State to initiate these proceedings if the air pollution originates in another State. That is the way I interpret the bill, as I read it on page 10, where it says:

> Whenever requested by the Governor * * * or * * * the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall—

That is mandatory.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, evidently he did not read lines 18 and 19, in parenthesis, which says:

> (with the concurrence of the Governor and the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated)—

Mr. McCLORY. If I understand it, this requires the Governor to concur where the alleged pollution originates in another State. That is correct. It will provide in these instances for the Public Health Service to move in and initiate these proceedings under those circumstances. And I can tell you from the experience that we have had before our committee that these may result in very disagreeable situations in your area.

Now, with regard to the greatly increased Federal expenditures which this bill authorizes, I call your attention to page 4 of this report. As pointed out there, this bill provides for two new programs. These two new authorizations will cost the taxpayers $90 million of money which we know we do not have.

These are programs which can be better conducted and financed locally by the States and municipalities which have better understanding of the problems and more resources to conduct these programs. They know what the problems are and how to solve them.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to concur emphatically with the statement of my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS], in support of this very important legislation. The need for the additional authority contained in this bill is, in my opinion, not open to question.

For many years the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has carefully studied the air pollution problem and the committee can take real pride in its legislative record which I am happy to say has received strong bipartisan support over the years.

In 1955 the committee reported favorably on the bill which formed the basis for the Federal air pollution research and technical assistance programs. In the ensuing years the committee has followed the progress made in this area very carefully.

My colleagues, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK], have, as most of us know, made very significant contributions. Therefore, it seems only fitting that I take this opportunity to compliment these gentlemen and the other members of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety on doing such a fine job with respect to this legislation.

The committee is aware of the criticism that there has been duplication and overlapping of programs administered by the Public Health Service, particularly with respect to appropriations authorizations which support these programs.

The committee has specifically provided that no appropriations or authorizations shall be made under certain sections of the Public Health Service Act for any fiscal year for any purpose for which appropriations may be made under authority of this legislation.

The committee report discusses this question in detail.

The purpose of this provision is to insure that this legislation will become the basic authority for appropriations by the Federal Government for all air pollution programs, in order that the legislative committees of Congress may have, to an extent which they presently do not have, a fuller understanding and control of the true costs to the Federal Government of these air pollution programs.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6518, known as the Clean Air Act. This legislation is designed to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution.

In 1955 the 84th Congress recognized the need for a program of research and technical assistance to obtain and to devise and develop methods for control and abatement of air pollution, for it had become a serious national problem. Our progress in developing material benefits for our people also developed certain gaseous fumes which was contaminating the air we breathe. This contamination not only became an irritant to the membranes of our breathing faculties but it proved to be a health hazard to many with allergic conditions.

Congress made a study of the problem that existed and then enacted Public Law 159, 84th Congress, which provided the Secretary of Health, Education, and Labor the necessary authority and funds to carry a program of research in order to develop methods for control and abatement of air pollution.

Since being alerted to the dangers that did exist, Congress has continued to further its investigation of this problem and Public Law 86–493, approved June 8, 1960, directed the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to conduct a thorough study of motor vehicle exhaust as it affects human health through the pollution of air.

This year the Subcommittee on Public Health and Study conducted further studies into this problem. The results of the hearings are now before us as H.R. 6518. Through the enactment of this legislation we replace Public Law 159 of the 84th Congress with a new act that strengthens and broadens the Air Pollution Control Act. We also provide Federal grants to State, regional, and local air pollution control agencies and establish a program of limited Federal assistance and participation, under certain circumstances, in actions directed toward abatement of particular air pollution problems.

Our Nation is growing at a rapid pace, both in population and technological advancements. There is a need for more homes, offices, and public buildings, which will need furnaces to heat them.

The burning of fuel in these furnaces will add certain gases to the air. Coupled with the exhaust fumes generated from the ever-growing number of motor vehicles, vapors from chemicals used in industry, and from combustion of fuels to generate power we increase the danger of pollution of our air.

If we are to be assured that we will breathe clean air and not a silent lethal weapon which could destroy our health, then we must continue to research and develop controls to insure the public health.

The legislation before us is a step further in the progress we are making to resolve this health problem. It deserves the support of this body and I wholeheartedly endorse its passage.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The **CHAIRMAN.** There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of July 14, 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857–1857g), is hereby amended to read as follows:

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I will have to object to that request at this moment. There may be Members who would like to have a little time. The only way we can really assure ourselves of that is to have the bill read.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Objection is heard. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

"FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

"SEC. 1. (a) The Congress finds—

"(1) that the predominant part of the Nation's population is located in its rapidly expanding metropolitan and other urban areas, which generally cross the boundary lines of local jurisdictions and often extend into two or more States;

"(2) that the growth in the amount and complexity of air pollution brought about by urbanization, industrial development, and the increasing use of motor vehicles, has resulted in mounting dangers to the public health and welfare, injury to agricultural crops and livestock, damage to and the deterioration of property, and hazards to air and ground transportation;

"(3) that the prevention and control of air pollution at its source is the primary responsibility of States and local governments; and

"(4) that Federal financial assistance and leadership is essential for the development of cooperative Federal, State, regional, and local programs to prevent and control air pollution.

"(b) The purposes of this Act are—

"(1) to protect the Nation's air resources so as to promote the public health and welfare and the productive capacity of its population;

"(2) to initiate and accelerate a national research and development program to achieve the prevention and control of air pollution;

"(3) to provide technical and financial assistance to State and local governments in connection with the development and execution of their air pollution prevention and control programs; and

"(4) to encourage and assist the development and operation of regional air pollution control programs.

"COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES AND UNIFORM LAWS

"SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary shall encourage cooperative activities by the States and local governments for the prevention and control of air pollution; encourage the enactment of improved and, so far as practicable in the light of varying conditions and needs, uniform State and local laws relating to the prevention and control of air pollution; and encourage the making of agreements and compacts between States for the prevention and control of air pollution.

"(b) The Secretary shall cooperate with and encourage cooperative activities by all Federal departments and agencies having functions relating to the prevention and control of air pollution, so as to assure the utilization in the Federal air pollution control program of all appropriate and available facilities and resources within the Federal Government.

"(c) The consent of the Congress is hereby given to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law or treaty of the United States, for (1) cooperative effort and mutual assistance for the prevention and control of air pollution and the enforcement of their respective laws relating thereto, and (2) the establishment of such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making effective such agreements or compacts. No such agreement or compact shall be binding or obligatory upon any State a party thereto unless and until it has been approved by Congress.

"RESEARCH, INVESTIGATIONS, TRAINING, AND OTHER ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall establish a national research and development program for the prevention and control of air pollution and as part of such program shall—

"(1) conduct, and promote the coordination and acceleration of, research, investigations, experiments, training, demonstrations, surveys, and studies relating to the causes, effects, extent, prevention, and control of air pollution; and

"(2) encourage, cooperate with, and render technical services and provide financial assistance to air pollution control agencies and other appropriate public or private agences, institutions, and organizations, and individuals in the conduct of such activities; and

"(3) conduct investigations and research and make surveys concerning any specific problem of air pollution confronting any air pollution control agency with a view to recommending a solution of such problem, if he is requested to do so by such agency or if, in his judgment, such problem may affect or be of concern to communities in various parts of the Nation or may affect any community or communities in a State other than that in which the source of the matter causing or contributing to the pollution is located.

"(4) in view of the nationwide significance of the problems of air pollution from motor vehicles, conduct studies of the amounts and kinds of substances discharged from the exhausts of motor vehicles and of the effects of the discharge of such substances, including the amounts and kinds of such substances which, from the standpoint of human health, it is safe for motor vehicles to discharge into the atmosphere.

"(b) In carrying out the provisions of the preceding subsection the Secretary is authorized to—

"(1) collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, the results of and other information, including appropriate recommendations by him in connection therewith, pertaining to such research and other activities;

"(2) cooperate with other Federal departments and agencies, with air pollution control agencies, with other public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and with any industries involved, in the preparation and conduct of such research and other activities;

"(3) make grants to air pollution control agencies, to other public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and to individuals, for research, training projects, and demonstrations;

"(4) contract with public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and with individuals, without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5);

"(5) provide training for, and make training grants to, personnel of air pollution control agencies and other persons with suitable qualifications;

"(6) establish and maintain research fellowships, in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and at public or nonprofit private educational institutions or research organizations;

"(7) collect and disseminate, in cooperation with other Federal departments and agencies, and with other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations having related responsibilities, basic data on chemical, physical, and biological air quality and other information pertaining to air pollution and the prevention and control thereof;

"(8) develop effective and practical processes, methods, and prototype devices for the prevention or control of air pollution; and

"(9) recommend to air pollution control agencies and to other appropriate organizations, after such research as he determines to be necessary, such criteria of air quality as in his judgment may be necessary to protect the public health and welfare.

"GRANTS FOR SUPPORT OF AIR POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS

"SEC. 4. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, for grants to air pollution control agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining programs for the prevention and control of air pollution. Sums so appropriated shall remain available for making grants as provided in this section during the fiscal year for which appropriated and the succeeding fiscal year.

"(b) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year the Secretary shall from time to time make allotments to the several States, in accordance with regulations, on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the extent of the air pollution problem, and (3) the financial need of the respective States. For purposes of this section, population shall be determined on the basis of the latest figures furnished by the Department of Commerce, and per capita income for each State and for the United States shall be determined on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

"(c) From each State's allotment under paragraph (b) for any fiscal year, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to air pollution control agencies in such State in an amount equal to two-thirds of the cost of establishing and maintaining programs for the prevention and control of air pollution: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to make grants to air pollution control agencies described in section 9(b) (2) or (4) in an amount equal to three-fourths of the cost of establishing and maintaining regional air pollution control programs which meet criteria established in regulations by the Secretary as necessary for the effective control of air pollution in the area: *And provided further*, That in the case of grants to an interstate air pollution control agency (as defined in this Act) the grant shall be made from the allotments of the several States which are members of such agency on such basis as the Secretary finds reasonable and equitable. As used in this subsection, the term "regional air pollution control program" means a program for the prevention and control of air pollution in an area that includes the areas of two or more municipalities, whether in the same State or different States.

"(d) Such grants shall be made, in accordance with regulations, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(e) Sums allotted to a State under subsection (b) of this section which have not been obligated by the end of the fiscal year for which they were allotted because of a lack of approvable applications shall be reallotted by the Secretary, on such basis as he determines to be reasonable and equitable and in accordance with regulations promulgated by him, to States from which approvable applications have been made but which have not been approved for grants because of a lack of funds in the allotment of such State. Any sum made available to a State by reallotment under the preceding sentence shall be in addition to any funds otherwise allotted to such State under this Act and shall be available for grants to air pollution control agencies in such State.

"ABATEMENT OF AIR POLLUTION

"SEC. 5. (a) The pollution of the air in any State or States which endangers the health or welfare of any persons, shall be subject to abatement as provided in this section.

"(b) Consistent with the policy declaration of this Act, municipal, State, and interstate action to abate air pollution shall be encouraged and shall not be displaced by Federal enforcement action except as otherwise provided by or pursuant to a court order under subsection (f)(1).

"(c)(1)(A) Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State air pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the Governor and the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to air pollution which is alleged to endanger the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, give formal notification thereof to the air pollution control agency of the municipality where such discharge or discharges originate, to the air pollution control agency of the State in which such municipality is located, and to the interstate air pollution control agency, if any, in whose jurisdictional area such municipality is located, and shall call promptly a conference of such agency or agencies and of the air pollution control agencies of the municipalities which may be adversely affected by such pollution, and the air pollution control agency, if any, of each State, or for each area, in which any such municipality is located.

"(B) Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State air pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the Governor and the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to alleged air pollution which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate and if a municipality affected by such air pollution, or the municipality in which such pollution originates, has either made or concurred in such request, give formal notification thereof to the State air pollution control agency, to the air pollution control agencies of the municipality where such discharge or discharges originate and of the municipality or municipalities alleged to be adversely affected thereby, and to any interstate air pollution control agency, whose jurisdictional area includes any such municipality and shall promptly call a conference of such agency or agencies, unless, in the judgment of the Secretary, the effect of such pollution is not of such significance as to warrant exercise of Federal jurisdiction under this section.

"(C) The Secretary shall also call such a conference whenever, on the basis of reports, surveys, or studies, he has reason to believe that any pollution referred to in subsection (a) is endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges originate is occurring.

"(2) The agencies called to attend such conference may bring such persons as they desire to the conference. Not less than three weeks' prior notice of the conference date shall be given to such agencies.

"(3) Following this conference, the Secretary shall prepare and forward to all air pollution control agencies attending the conference a summary of conference discussions including (A) occurrence of air pollution subject to abatement under this Act; (B) adequacy of measures taken toward abatement of the pollution; and (C) nature of delays, if any, being encountered in abating the pollution.

"(d) If the Secretary believes, upon the conclusion of the conference or thereafter, that effective progress toward abatement of such pollution is not being made and that the health or welfare of any persons is being endangered, he shall recommend to the appropriate State or municipal air pollution control agency (or to both such agencies) that it take necessary remedial action. The Secretary shall allow at least six months from the date he makes such recommendations for the taking of such recommended action.

"(e)(1) If, at the conclusion of the period so allowed, such remedial action or other action which in the judgment of the Secretary is reasonably calculated to secure abatement of such pollution has not been taken, the Secretary shall call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originated, before a hearing board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary. Each State in which any discharge causing or contributing to such pollution originates and each State claiming to be adversely affected by such pollution shall be given an opportunity to select one member of such hearing board and at least one member shall be a representative of the Department of Commerce, and not less than a majority of such hearing board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At least three weeks' prior notice of such hearing shall be given to the State, interstate, and municipal air pollution control agencies called to attend such hearing and to the alleged polluter or polluters.

"(2) On the basis of evidence presented at such hearing, the hearing board shall make findings as to whether pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and whether effective progress toward abatement thereof is being made. If the hearing board finds such pollution is occurring and effective progress toward abatement thereof is not being made it shall make recommendations to the Secretary concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and suitable to secure abatement of such pollution.

"(3) The Secretary shall send such findings and recommendations to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution; to air pollution control agencies of the State or States and of the municipality or municipalities where such discharge or discharges originate; and to any interstate air pollution control agency whose jurisdictional area includes any such municipality, together with a notice specifying a reasonable time (not less than six months) to secure abatement of such pollution.

"(f) If such action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in the notice following the public hearing is not taken, the Secretary in the case of air pollution which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, shall send to the Governor and the attorney general of such State the findings and recommendations of the hearing board and his notice, together with a transcript of the hearing and his finding that action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution has not been taken, and at the request of such Governor or attorney general he shall provide such technical and other assistance as in his judgment is necessary to assist the State in judicial proceedings to secure abatement of the pollution under State or local law.

"(g) In the case of air pollution which is endangering the health and welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, if action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in the notice given in accordance with subsection (e)(3) of this section is not taken, the Secretary may request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution, except that he shall not make such a request in any case where no interstate agreement or compact relating to air pollution is in existence until after he has received a certification from the Governor of each State wherein the health and welfare of persons is being endangered (other than the State in which the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originate), that such Governor has made a good faith effort to enter into an agreement or a compact with the State wherein such discharge or discharges originate in order to secure abatement of such pollution and has not been able to secure such an agreement or such a compact. The court shall receive in evidence in any such suit a transcript of the proceedings before the hearing board in such case and a copy of such board's recommendations and shall receive such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper. The court, giving due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved, shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing such judgment, as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

"(h) Members of any hearing board appointed pursuant to subsection (e) who are not regular full-time officers or employees of the United States shall, while participating in the hearing conducted by such board or otherwise engaged on the work of such board, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(i) In his summary of any conference pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall include references to any discharges allegedly contributing to pollution from any Federal property. Notice of any hearing pursuant to this section involving any pollution alleged to be affected by any such discharges shall also be given to the Federal agency having jurisdiction over the property involved and the findings and recommendations of the hearing board conducting such hearing shall also include references to any such discharges which are contributing to the pollution found by such hearing board.

"REQUIREMENT OF REPORTS

"SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary is authorized to require any person whose activities result in the emission of air pollutants causing or contributing to air pollution which has been the subject of a conference under section 5 to file with him, in such form as he may prescribe, a report, furnishing to the Secretary such information as may reasonably be required as to the character, kind, and quantity of pollutants discharged and the use of devices or other means to prevent or reduce the emission of pollutants by the person filing such reports. Such report shall be made under oath or otherwise, as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall be filed with the Secretary within such reasonable period as the Secretary may prescribe, unless additional time be granted by the Secretary. All information in such report shall be considered confidential for the purposes of section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code.

"(b) If any person required to file any report under this section shall fail to do so within the time fixed by the Secretary for filing the same, and such failure shall continue for thirty days after notice of such default, such person shall forfeit to the United States the sum of $100 for each and every day of the continuance of such failure, which forfeiture shall be payable into the Treasury of the United States, and shall be recoverable in a civil suit in the name of the United States brought in the district where such person has his principal office or in any district in which he does business: *Provided*, That the Secretary may upon application therefor remit or mitigate any forfeiture provided for under this subsection and he shall have authority to determine the facts upon all such applications.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the various United States attorneys, under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, to prosecute for the recovery of such forfeitures.

"COOPERATION BY FEDERAL AGENCIES TO CONTROL AIR POLLUTION FROM FEDERAL FACILITIES

"SEC. 7. It is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress that any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall, to the extent practicable and consistent with the interests of the United States and within any available appropriations, cooperate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and with any air pollution control agency in preventing and controlling the pollution of the air in any area insofar as the discharge of any matter from or by such building, installation, or other property may cause or contribute to pollution of the air in such area.

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary is authorized to prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out his functions under this Act. The Secretary may delegate to any officer or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such of his powers and duties under this Act, except the making of regulations, as he may deem necessary or expedient.

"(b) Upon the request of an air pollution control agency, personnel of the Public Health Service may be detailed to such agency for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act. The provisions of section 214(d) of the Public Health Service Act shall be applicable with respect to any personnel so detailed to the same extent as if such personnel had been detailed under section 214(b) of that Act.

"(c) Payments under grants made under this Act may be made in installments, and in advance or by way or reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 9. When used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) The term 'air pollution control agency' means any of the following:

"(1) A single State agency designated by the Governor of that State as the official State air pollution control agency for purposes of this Act;

"(2) An agency established by two or more States and having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the prevention and control of air pollution;

"(3) A city, county, or other local government health authority, or, in the case of any city, county, or other local government in which there is an agency other than the health authority charged with responsibility for enforcing ordinances or laws relating to the prevention and control of air pollution, such other agency; or

"(4) An agency of two or more municipalities located in the same State or in different States and having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the prevention and control of air pollution.

"(c) The term "interstate air pollution control agency' means—

"(1) an air pollution control agency established by two or more States, or

"(2) an air pollution control agency of two or more municipalities located in different States.

"(d) The term 'State' means a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

"(e) The term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, State, municipality, and political subdivision of a State.

"(f) The term 'municipality' means a city, town, borough, county, parish, district, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law.

"OTHER AUTHORITY NOT AFFECTED

"SEC. 10. This Act shall not be construed as superseding or limiting the authorities and responsibilities, under any other provision of the law, of the Secretary or any other Federal officer, department, or agency.

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 11. If any provision of this Act, or the application of any provision of this Act to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, and the remainder of this Act, shall not be affected thereby.

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 12. This Act may be cited as the 'Clean Air Act'."

SEC. 2. The title of such Act of July 14, 1955, is amended to read: "An Act to provide for air pollution prevention and control activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes".

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, strike out lines 8 through 17, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 4. (a) In any fiscal year, not to exceed $5,000,000 of the amounts authorized to be appropriated by section 12 of this Act for such fiscal year shall be available to make grants to air pollution control agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining programs for the prevention and control of air pollution. Sums available for making grants as provided in this section shall remain available for such purpose during the fiscal year for which appropriated and the succeeding fiscal year."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply changes the language which we first had in the bill. As previously written, this would be an appropriation here, and we are striking that out.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], I am disturbed by some of the provisions of this bill. Let us see if I get this straight. The Governor or Attorney General of a State may request that the Federal arm of the Government be used in the event of pollution in a State. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. May the Governor and Attorney General move into a municipality where the mayor and the city council, or whatever form of city government there may be, are opposed to the Federal power of the Government being used?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. It is my understanding that the bill provides that the municipality must request either the State air pollution control agency or the Governor for assistance.

Mr. GROSS. So this would only be in the event that the municipality asked the State control agency for assistance; is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. And in no other event?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, the Governor, or the attorney general, or the State——

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. No, not "or"—the Governor is in control of any State action. Or a State air pollution control agency which might be set up by the Governor.

Mr. GROSS. On page 15 the language reads as follows, and I am excerpting, of course. Beginning on line 12, "and at the request of such Governor or attorney general."

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. No, that is for technical assistance. He shall provide such technical and other assistance as, in his judgment, is necessary to assist the State in judicial proceedings to secure abatement of pollution under State or local law.

Mr. GROSS. There is dual responsibility and power in some ramifications of this bill then?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Of course, there is dual responsibility in the interstate situation because you have more than one jurisdiction involved. But in every local situation, the Governor is the boss in this situation and that is the way we wrote the bill.

Mr. GROSS. With respect to the State control agency that is created by this bill—is there an agency created in every State?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Not necessarily. We have about 15 States so far that have set up air pollution control agencies.

That is a matter still for the State, the Governor and the State legislatures as to how they want to handle the problem.

Mr. GROSS. Is there Federal financing of these State agencies?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. In the case of technical assistance—yes. But not as to personnel. But it so happens in this particular field, the testimony shows that there is very little in the way of technical assistance outside of the Air Pollution Division of the Public Health Service. There just are not people trained for this work and we simply do not have them except in the Federal agency.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman, on page 5 of this bill you have certainly created a bonanza for contract organizations, management firms and firms in the nature of think-factories. You certainly open the door to a vast expenditure for that purpose. I share the concern of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] again on that subject, too.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. This has been in the law for the past 8 years, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa. This has been in the law ever since the 1955 act and I fail to see any bonanza that will result from this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, one of the differences is that you are kicking this spending up to $25 million next year, then, as I recall, $30 million the following year and then $35 million more the year after that so there will be $90 million authorized by this bill and that is a lot of money, believe me.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Actually, the estimates show that more and more people will be moving into these affected areas and that the local jurisdictions now are spending as much money as the Federal Government and have been for many, many years.

Mr. GROSS. That is another thing. Pittsburgh seemed to be able to clean up and St. Louis seemed to be able to clean up without the help of the Federal Government or at least without substantial help.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I will say, if I may, that we had the mayor of Pittsburgh before our committee and I certainly commended him for the splendid job that they have done, but he said there is still a growing problem in his city.

This bill was supported by practically all of the people involved. It has the support of the Conference of Mayors, the American Municipal Association, the National Association of County Officials. One of the strongest statements that was made in this whole picture was made by the American Medical Association. We had very little opposition to this bill in the hearings.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to get into the RECORD at this point the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] when he spoke to the National Conference on Air Pollution only last December. At that time the gentleman from Alabama said this:

> Let me say, I do not think the Federal Government has any business telling the people of say Birmingham or Los Angeles how to proceed to meet their air pollution problems. This was made clear in the 1955 act. Even if Washington attempted to exercise such authority, we would have a hard time writing and enforcing regulations at long range.
>
> The effort would be not only difficult but expensive, and without the cooperation of local citizens very little could be accomplished.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. If the gentleman will yield, there are two ways I would answer that. In the first place I would say that a wise man changes his mind and a fool never does.

Mr. GROSS. I was in hopes that the gentleman from Alabama would say that he has not changed his mind.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I do not necessarily say that I have, because I think States rights are protected in this bill. I think the local situation is separated from the interstate situation. That was exactly what I had in mind when I talked to them.

Mr. GROSS. I was in hopes that the gentleman would say that that was his feeling here today, that the Federal arm of the government would not intervene.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I would say this to the gentleman: I think this is both a State and a Federal problem. I do not think air stays in one State all the time. It frequently moves, as the gentleman knows. It moves across State lines.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. In furtherance of the very fine question the gentleman from Iowa has raised——

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I cannot hear the gentleman's question.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I would like to raise this question: First of all, in our own State of Indiana, for example, the attorney general is an elective office, as well as that of the Governor. Now, with this dual responsibility in this instance, suppose the attorney general of the State should embark upon this program without the approval or consent of the Governor? Then whose authority is it to proceed?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. If the gentleman will yield, I would say to the distinguished gentleman what I have said all during this debate, that the Governor is the key man under both the interstate and intrastate situations. Of course, we know that the attorney general assists him in the insitution of legal proceedings. The attorney general has no power of his own to do anything about air pollution. He could not initiate a suit at all without the concurrence of the Governor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, in furtherance of that request, if the gentleman from Iowa will yield further, I would also like to make this question a pertinent one:

Suppose, for example, we have a situation as we do have in Indiana where steel mills are adjacent to a large metropolitan area which are located in my State adjacent to the city of Chicago, and suppose, for example, there is an air pollution problem connected with this industry. Would the State of Illinois, of which Chicago is a municipality, have a right to move in and take action in the State of Indiana because the wind happened to be blowing this polluted air over into Illinois from Indiana?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I am sorry. Does the gentleman have a question?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I have propounded it for 2 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I am sorry. I am sorry. You know, when you are trying to handle a bill, sometimes you have to talk to a lot of people. I am sorry if I was out of the gentleman's range. If the gentleman will turn over this way I shall be glad to accommodate the gentleman.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes so I can repropound my question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the question I propounded had to do with the bounds of jurisdiction. I posed it in this form:

Assuming that a steel mill and other industrial projects in the Lake County area, which is adjacent to Chicago, in Indiana, should create an air pollution situation which would involve the city of Chicago, which is in the State of Illinois, and that a move was made on the part of Illinois with regard to this situation, would the jurisdiction in this instance as to the source of the pollution control extend over into Indiana?

In other words, would the jurisdiction of Illinois extend into Indiana in this instance?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. If the gentleman will yield, I would say this: To the extent that we provided in the bill for an agreement between States which are affected. We had in mind exactly this situation. The same thing is true of St. Louis and Kansas City.

You have one jurisdiction or both jurisdictions affected. One wants to do something about the problem and the other does not. We felt first of all we should try to get them to agree on their own and work out some type of compact. Should the Governor fail to get some relief in that manner, then he should have the right to come to the Secretary. Then the Secretary would hold a conference and allow 6 months for these agencies to come in and try to remedy the situation. Failing that, a hearing and another 6 months in which to give them a chance to do something about that. Failing that, they should have a right to local abatement.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have sent an amendment to the desk for consideration, and I should like to inform the distinguished gentleman from Alabama so that he will know what my amendment does. I should like to read it. On page 22, section 12, under appropriations, line 18, you have the words "not to exceed $5,000,000." Then in section (b):

> There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act not to exceed $20,000,000 for the fiscal year 1965, $30,000,000 for the fiscal year 1966, and $35,000,000 for the fiscal year 1967.

My amendment that I shall offer simply adds the words in front of the figures $30,000,000 and $35,000,000 "not to exceed" so that the language will be uniform throughout. I want the gentleman to know what my amendment is. I think it is rather technical, but I do believe it would be best for the legislation if we added those words in each instance. Where it is in there for one instance and not in the others, it might be presumed they could go over the amount.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. We have tried to cover that, but the gentleman's amendment does it better.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I do so to pick up a point of interrogation of the gentleman from Indiana in regard to this hypothetical situation he posed in respect to Illinois and Indiana. The colloquy clearly brings out now what I originally said that without the consent or request of the Governor of Indiana suits eventually can be brought by the Attorney General of the United States against the parties involved in the State of Indiana.

On page 15, section (g), it is stated:

> In the case of air pollution which is endangering the health and welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, if action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in the notice given in accordance with subsection (e)(3) of this section is not taken, the Secretary may request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution.

The exception only applies if the Governor of Illinois in this instance will file a certification that he has not been able to get an agreement.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The gentleman is right in the meaning of the language. Here is the situation as explained by the subcommittee chairman. Where in one State you are polluting another State, the Governors shall make an effort to get together. That is the first step.

Mr. CURTIS. I think it is clear now. This would not have to originate with the Governor or a local group.

I pointed out that under (c) this could originate with the Secretary.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Not within a State.

Mr. CURTIS. No.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. But only in an interstate situation would that exist.

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct.

I have one other question. This contemplates $90 million over a period of several years. The statement has been made that this is sort of collecting together what has already been going on. How much money is being spent or was in the budget for these same items? At what rate were we spending money?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Right now, for programs now in existence, the House has already approved for this fiscal year $12,954,000.

Mr. CURTIS. So we are cutting back to $5 million for next year. Is that right?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Five million dollars is additional authorization for fiscal year 1964, but we are also pulling in together all of the programs.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. So we are tying down all air pollution control programs in this bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Let me get it straight. Here is what I want to be sure I understood.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. There is an additional $5 million for 1964, in other words.

Mr. CURTIS. But in effect you would have your $13 million, as you said, and $5 million. That $18 million item would become in the next fiscal year a $20-million item. Is that right?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. So it is up about $2 million.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. It is up $2 million. In other words, what the Department wanted was much beyond that. In fact, over this period of years, in what they were asking the Congress, we have cut this authorization almost in half.

Mr. CURTIS. I have one other question. How much direct research in this area is being conducted now by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare? Do you have any idea of that?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. We can furnish those figures. I do not have them directly in front of me at the moment.

Mr. CURTIS. They are doing some. Is that right?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I think it is about $5 million for intramural research as I recall it.

Mr. CURTIS. About $5 million?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. That would be in addition to this other sum, would it not, or am I in error? Would that be in addition to the previous sums the gentleman gave me, or is it included?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. No, that is included in them.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the local character of this legislation and the reason why it should remain primarily a local and State responsibility, it seems to me, is brought out both in the report and in the testimony. For instance, in the report it is brought out that approximately $2 million is now spent by the States, of which more than half is spent by one State, namely, the State of California. That indicates that with respect to air pollution the State of California has recognized its responsibility, and has been able to retain control of the study, solution, and abatement of air pollution.

In the testimony presented here on behalf of Mayor Daley of the city of Chicago, by Mr. James V. Fitzpatrick, I notice on page 91 he states that the city of Chicago handled this problem as a city and municipal problem, appropriating $600,000 a year. They have 69 employees who handle the local problem of air pollution control in the city of Chicago.

The testimony on behalf of Mayor Daley also brought out the fact that the State legislature established the Northeastern Illinois Air Pollution Control Commission. I happened to have been a member of the Illinois General Assembly at the time that legislation was enacted and supported the bill which created that commission. Although the States and municipalities have endeavored themselves to take care of their own air pollution problems, the effect of this large grant of Federal funds will be to supplant authority of the States and municipalities without relieving them of any substantial financial responsibility. The action the States have already taken demonstrates that that is where this legislation and where this responsibility belongs.

I wish to address one question with respect to the subject of enforcement because on page 15 it states with respect to judicial enforcement of the abatement proceedings that the Federal Government can be called upon by the governor or the Attorney General to provide technical and other assistance. I want to know whether the Federal Government under this authority can provide such assistance as Federal marshals to abate an air pollution condition in a State?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I think the gentleman knows my sentiments on the use of Federal marshals.

Mr. McCLORY. It seems to me that when a condition is to be abated it means that the condition is to get rid of it and when it is necessary to get rid of it by judicial enforcement, as included here in H.R. 6518 it means that at some point it may be necessary to call upon Federal marshals to do it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman obviously is against the program, he does not want any part of it; that is clear to see. But I do think the gentleman realizes that any time you go into court you have whatever facilities the court has for enforcing an order. I am sure anyone would acknowledge that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLORY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The agents of the court are the Federal marshals. Of course, they are going to be into this thing before they get through.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. If it is justified and the court so rules.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a few questions. No. 1: He made the remark awhile ago about emphysema being second only to heart disease as the cause of death in the United States. I just wonder, for my personal edification, if the gentleman could document that statement.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I will say to the gentleman that Dr. Branscomb who developed this excellent device told me in conversation—I am not a doctor, I am not a medical expert—told me that and I just pass it on from his conversation.

Mr. HALL. Doctor who?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Dr. Branscomb, who is at the University of Alabama Medical Center. He developed this test for emphysema and tells me that it is beginning to rank in that order. I do not have any documentation concerning it, but I know it is beginning to be a very serious problem.

Mr. HALL. I think the gentleman is correct; it is a very serious problem and it is certainly a very distressing one. But I am sure the gentleman would not want to mislead the House that it is second only to heart disease in the cause of death or even second of the respiratory ailments, because it simply is not. Let me say to the distinguished subcommittee chairman that I am one who, as a physician, has done much chest surgery and I am in favor of doing what we can to avoid interstate contamination of the air, as well as water pollution, and everything else, but I am not quite sure that this is the way to get at it and I do not want that misstatement to go on the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, if I may move on to my second question, I wonder if the gentleman could tell me where in the hearings we will find the statement that he made a while ago; I believe the gentleman said, if I quote him correctly, that the American Medical Association was one of the principal testators in favor of this bill.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I do not think that I said it was in the hearings, but I was quoting from Dr. Blasingame, the AMA executive vice president who made this statement at the National Conference on Air Pollution. I would like to give that quotation.

Mr. HALL. That is Dr. F. J. L. Blasingame, executive vice president of the AMA.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Dr. Blasingame, who was the AMA vice president at that time, said:

> It can and should be controlled * * * enough has been said—let's clear the air.

That was his statement.

Mr. HALL. Well, I think we are all for that. But he did not say that before the distinguished gentleman's subcommittee.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I do not know where he said it, but he said it.

Mr. HALL. Has the gentleman's subcommittee had any hearings on the testimony concerning the clearing of the air in confined spaces of public usage, for example airplanes in flight, of contaminants, such as cigarette smoke or other vented gases from any source?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I do not know if I understand the gentleman's question. If he will repeat it, I will be glad to try to answer it.

Mr. HALL. I think it is generally recognized in the profession and among those interested in air pollution that one of the most common contaminants of the air that we all must breathe is that which comes from our fellow men in the form of smoking, for example.

I just wondered if the committee had taken into consideration whether or not there should be some limitation on the prerogative of polluting the air by the one that sits next to you in a confined space.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I would hate to take the responsibility for stopping cigarette smoking. I do not know that the AMA even takes a position on that. I think a doctor in New Orleans says it would cause cancer, but it has not been documented so far as I know, and I would not want to say that this bill attempts to stop cigarette smoking.

Mr. HALL. I would not, either. I do not read that in any one spot in the bill. But I think it is important for us to consider that the pollution of the atmosphere in confined spaces where the public is confined in one area, is just as important as it is in another. I would forecast to the gentleman that the time will come when at least 25 percent of lung cancer will be proved as coming from nicotine, and coal tars or contaminants inhaled while breathing.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the committee amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 8, line 22, strike out "equal to" and insert "not to exceed".

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, too. This is simple wordage put in by the committee saying "not to exceed," of course in conformity with the gentleman from Ohio, who has stated that he wanted that restated, although it was the intention of the committee to see that these would not exceed certain amounts.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Is this the same amendment which I had offered?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. No, this is not the same amendment. This provides that the grants cannot exceed two-thirds, where it had said "equal to two-thirds." This says "not to exceed two-thirds," which means that the grant can be less than that, which is what the committee desires, if possible.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the committee amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 24, strike out "pollution:" and insert "pollution."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 24, strike out *"Provided"* and all following thereafter down to the words "That in the" on page 9, line 6, and insert "In the".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 23, immediately after the comma insert, "and one member shall be a representative of the Department of the Interior,"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 24, strike out "This Act" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, this Act".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 4, insert the following:

"(b) No appropriation shall be authorized or made under sections 301, 311, or 314(c) of the Public Health Service Act for any fiscal year after the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for any purpose for which appropriations may be made under authority of this Act."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is simply to bring all of the authority that is now in general law under this one act, as we discussed during the debate, and put all of the antipollution work in this one act where we can go to it and put our finger on it and know what is being done.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the committee amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 15, insert the following:

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 12. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 4 of this Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, not to exceed $5,000,000.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act not to exceed $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow to the committee amendment: Page 22, line 21, after "1965" insert "not to exceed" and in line 22, after the word "and" insert "not to exceed".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, the minority side will accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I can see that this bill, while I know that air pollution is a very, very real problem, does place a tremendous responsibility on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Health, Education, and Welfare. I have followed quite closely the problems we have had around Los Angeles. All kinds of schemes come up to end pollution, the counterparts of these ideas of rainmakers that spring up overnight everywhere. A lot of sorting out is going to have to be done by some of our colleagues who serve on the Committee on Appropriations. I am happy to have this limitation placed here because I still believe in local responsibility in a lot of these fields. I can see where basic research is probably a Federal responsibility with some aid, perhaps, in research that may be conducted locally. But when it comes to the physical facilities, the building of research-born pollution dispensers and that sort of thing, I dislike tremendously, with our national debt up where it is, and the President sending up a special message regarding the situation affecting the dollar and all that sort of thing, I dislike tremendously programs where the ground rules for grants are so open as in this measure. I think we are in a fiscal dilemma right now. I think we ought to protect the expenditure of Federal funds as much as possible without going overboard and getting on an unsound basis with reference to programs such as this.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I agree with the gentleman and I think his remarks are certainly pertinent. What the committee is trying to do in placing the limitation here is to make sure that the Congress gets two looks at it so that we can try to effect whatever savings may be possible. In the first instance in the legislative committee we will check the program more closely than ever before and then the Committee on Appropriations, perhaps, can cut out even more as it comes before that committee each year in justification of the requests made.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 23, line 2, strike out "12" and insert "13".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAFT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TAFT: Page 19, line 19, after the word "such" insert the word "procedural".

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, the only purpose of this amendment that I am offering is to clarify the power of the Secretary of HEW to issue regulations under this act. The power that is given to him in section 8(a) of the act on page 19, in lines 18 through 20, is unlimited power. As I see it, under the procedure of the Administrative Procedures Act, the Secretary could go ahead and issue regulations which would then have the force of law controlling anything to do with this program and, I believe, controlling the State programs or at least putting conditions on the State programs which might be cooperating with it. I wonder if this was the intention? I do not think it should be the intention. I think, perhaps, if we are referring only to procedural regulations within his own Department, this would be proper, but I see no reason why he should have general regulatory powers under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAFT. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I think the gentleman has stated what was in the minds of the members of the committee in writing this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I see no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PUCINSKI

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PUCINSKI: On page 2, line 4, after "vehicles" insert "and jet aircraft".

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this additional language is to establish the fact that in those communities lying in close proximity to a large airport where jet operations are in existence, serious problems have been created in recent years because of the heavy exhaust—kerosene exhaust—which is dumped into large areas from large jet aircraft on departure.

I happen to represent a district which lies just east of O'Hare Field, and on certain days the sky is just thick with exhaust from the aircraft.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS], whether the language in the bill now is sufficiently broad to permit under subparagraph 2 on page 2, line 19, "to initiate and accelerate a national research and development program to achieve the prevention and control of air pollution"—I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if the language in the present bill, without this additional language which I have proposed identifying jet aircraft, is sufficiently broad to permit both local committees in concert with the government to conduct studies to see what effect this heavy residue of jet exhaust has on communities.

If the chairman of the subcommittee feels that the language in the bill is now sufficiently broad to permit this kind of study affecting jet aircraft, then of course, Mr. Chairman, I shall not persist in this amendment.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would say to the gentleman that I share his concern. Our committee has been concerned with this problem both from a noise standpoint and from the standpoint of its contribution to smog conditions, particularly in the atmosphere. I would say that the language of the bill is sufficiently broad to cover this situation. I would hope the gentleman would not press for his amendment.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Then, Mr. Chairman, in view of the excellent explanation on the part of the gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of the subcommittee, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment. It is my hope that this very important legislation will assist my community toward developing an adequate air pollution program to safeguard the people in my district against any possible ill effects from this heavy jet exhaust dumped over my district during jet departures from O'Hare Field.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to be sure that the airports serving Palm Beach, Fla., and Hyannis Port, Mass., are taken care of insofar as this particular pollution is concerned.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I share the gentleman's concern.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I had the opportunity of appearing before the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama who is handling this bill, on this matter, and I would like to point out to the members of the committee that for 20 years I have been trying to advise this House as to how to escape much of this problem. My predecessors from my district for 100 years were trying to do the same thing.

Mr. Chairman, had we been burning anthracite coal, which is hard and smokeless and clean and clear in the United States, as we have been trying to tell you, much of this smog and industrial waste all over the country would not have developed. But you persisted and insisted in shrinking our markets. You are now reaping the whirlwind.

Mr. Chairman, it is always a very human pleasure to come here and tell you "I told you so."

Mr. Chairman, the advent of liquid and gaseous fuels has produced a series of problems—even bituminous coal. Now, of course, there is only one kind of coal, and that is anthracite. There is a bitumite which by grace and custom is so classified as coal. But, actually, it is not so, I am advised.

Now, Mother Nature, a cantankerous old gal, has not followed our advice either. So from the crevasses in our coal-fields there is a sulfur and gaseous mine fire seepage, I am very sorry to report, and I hope this does not appear in the newspapers since we are trying to invite industry and attract industry to the sadly depressed hard coal areas of our State. We have a serious problem in the hard coal valleys where mines have been abandoned and where there are underground fires producing this deadly seepage of gas, damaging property and endangering health.

We also have the so-called culm banks that by spontaneous combustion have become ignited and are a costly and deadly menace to the health, safety, and welfare of the American people.

So I repeat for the purpose of emphasis my support of this highly commendable bill.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this year I appeared before the Public Health and Safety Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to testify on my bill, H.R. 5024, to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution.

I had with me on that occasion State Representative Stanley Meholchick, of Ashley, Pa., in my congressional district, who also testified in support of my bill.

I am gratified that the House is taking up this national problem today because I am particularly concerned with two specific problems in my congressional district. One is a burning culm bank at Ashley and the other an underground mine fire at Laurel Run, near Wilkes-Barre, both emitting noxious fumes endangering public health as well as causing a deterioration of private property. These two conditions I would like to see corrected just as soon as humanly possible.

As we all know, air pollution is a very serious national problem and becoming increasingly more severe with each passing day. The Nation's rapid and continuing progress in industrial and technological development has made possible a high level of material benefits for the people of this country, it is true, but it has also generated and caused a high level of existing and potential problems of contamination of our larger cities, in particular. Air pollution will increase greatly unless appropriate action is taken by the Congress owing to further industrial growth and the concentration of population in our urban areas.

There seems to be a tendency to place the cause of air pollution to the increasing number of motor vehicles on our roads and highways. This is only one of a series of sources with which we should be concerned in combating the menace of air pollution. We must turn our attention, as well, to the pollutants from heating units for our homes, offices, and public buildings; from burning of domestic and industrial waste; from industrial processes which release chemical vapors into the air, and from combustion of fuels for the generation of power.

If major adverse effects on the public health and welfare are to be prevented, continuing research and control programs will be required and necessary. We know that the Federal Government as well as many State and local governments have spent and continue to spend large sums to study and control pollution. Industry, likewise, has spent many millions on research and abatement. Great progress has been made but, unfortunately, the problem is far from solved.

In the interest of public health and safety of the people residing in my section of Pennsylvania, I requested that a complete underground survey be made of the anthracite coal mines by the U.S. Army Engineers, the U.S. Bureau of Mines, and the U.S. Geological Survey in order to determine the steps necessary in combating serious subsidence problems. This survey is now underway with a Federal appropriation of $500,000.

Also in the public interest, I requested that a comprehensive survey be made by the Army Engineers of the entire Susquehanna River Basin through the three-State area of New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, with one of the objectives being the elimination, if possible, of the river's pollution problems and the implementation of a clean streams program for economic development and recreation.

This survey is now underway with an appropriation of $3 million that began last year and has 5 more years to go.

I point up these two programs because they each characterize Federal action in the interest of public health and safety over a wide area. They are, of course, each very important but no less important than what we do about cleaning up the air we breathe and the environments in which we must live and work.

I am confident that with the adoption of this measure today a great stride forward will have been made in combating this national menace to the public health and safety.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in furtherance of the colloquy which I had with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] earlier, I am constrained to offer a motion to recommit this bill. I am reluctant to do that, but I feel very definitely that the ultimate effect of this bill will be to extend the jurisdiction of one State into that of another, which I certainly disagree with very vigorously.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT] having resumed the chair, Mr. ULLMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6518) to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution, pursuant to House Resolution 440, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. HARVEY of Indiana moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6518 to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARVEY of Indiana) there were ayes 29, noes 41.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 273, nays 102, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 102]

YEAS—273

Abbitt
Addabbo
Albert
Andrews
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Baldwin
Barry
Bates
Beckworth
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton,
Frances P.
Bolton,
Oliver P.
Bonner
Brademas
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Celler
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Colmer
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Delaney
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gary
Gavin
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Holifield
Horton
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kornegay
Laird
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McMillan
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien. N Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson. Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts. Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers. Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Sheppard
Shipley
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staebler
Staggers
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson. Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Wydler
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—102

Abele
Adair
Alger
Anderson
Ashbrook
Baring
Battin
Beermann
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bow
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brown, Ohio
Bruce
Burton
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen,
Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Dulski
Ellsworth
Findley
Fisher
Ford
Foreman
Gathings
Glenn
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Hall
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kunkel
Kyl
Langen
Latta
Lloyd
McClory
McLoskey
Martin, Nebr.
May
Meader
Morton
Mosher
Norblad
Pelly
Pillion
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. George
Schadeberg
Short
Shriver
Skubitz
Snyder
Stafford
Stinson
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Tollefson
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Westland
Wharton
Winstead

NOT VOTING—57

Abernethy
Arends
Ashley
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Barrett
Bass
Becker
Belcher
Blatnik
Buckley
Carey
Dawson
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Diggs
Fallon
Flynt
Fogarty
Forrester
Frelinghuysen
Garmatz
Grabowski
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Hawkins
Hébert
Herlong
Holland
Kee
Kilburn
Kluczynski
Long, La.
McCulloch
Madden
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Morse
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Brien, Ill.
Purcell
Rains
Scott
Shelley
Siler
Steed
Trimble
Watson
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wyman

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Wyman against.

Mr. Morse for, with Mr. McCulloch against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Siler.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Avery.

Mr. Holland with Mr. Baker.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Derounian.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Murphy with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Flynt.

Mr. Denton with Mr. Becker.

Mr. Rains with Mrs. Kee.

Mr. Multer with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Herlong.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Purcell.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Forrester.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Ashley.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON and Messrs. LIBONATI, CONTE, AUCHINCLOSS, and FOUNTAIN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. POOL, CHAMBERLAIN, and SKUBITZ changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed, H.R. 6518.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

SUMMARY OF NET BUDGET RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES (THE ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET) IN FISCAL YEAR 1963 WITH COMPARISONS

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include tabulations.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with leave granted I include, for the information of Members and others a tabulation of net budget receipts and expenditures in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963, with pertinent comparisons.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

Budget revenues were officially estimated by the President last January at $85,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963—a projected increase of $4,091,000,000 above actual revenues in the previous fiscal year of 1962. The Treasury statement just released discloses actual budget revenues of $86,357,000,000 in fiscal 1963—$4,948,000,000 above fiscal 1962 and $857,000,000 more than last January's estimate, but $6,643,000,000 short of the original fiscal 1963 budget forecast.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Budget expenditures were officially projected in the President's budget last January at $94,311,000,000 for fiscal year 1963—an increase of $6,524,000,000 over actual budget expenditures for fiscal year 1962, of which $1,901,000,000 is for national defense and $4,623,000,000 is for other than national defense.

The Treasury statement discloses that net budget expenditures in fiscal 1963 aggregated $92,590,000,000—$4,803,000,000 more than the preceding year but $1,721,000,000 less than the budget projections of last January, and only $53,000,000 more than the original fiscal 1963 budget forecast. National defense spending in fiscal 1963 exceeded that of fiscal 1962 by $1,640,000,000. Nondefense spending in 1963 exceeded 1962 by $3,163,000,000.

And in total, fiscal 1963 budget spending compares with certain earlier years as follows:

[In millions]

	Budget spending, fiscal 1963, over—	
	1961	1954
National defense	+$5,249	+$5,757
Other than national defense	+5,826	+19,296
Total	+11,075	+25,053

BUDGET DEFICIT

The January official budget estimate of the deficit for all of fiscal year 1963 was $8,811,000,000, or $2,433,000,000 larger than the actual deficit for all of fiscal 1962. A later but unofficial administration revision, according to the report from the Committee on Ways and Means on the debt limit bill, indicated the fiscal 1963 deficit would approximate $8,407,000,000. According to the Treasury, the deficit for fiscal 1963 was actually $6,233,000,000—slightly less than the actual deficit during fiscal year 1962, but in sharp contrast to the original 1963 budget forecast of a $463,000,000 surplus.

Fiscal 1963 represents the 27th year of budget deficits in the last 33 years.

In summary, the plight of the Treasury from fiscal 1963 administrative budget operations is $6,696,000,000 worse than the original 1963 budget reflection but not quite as bad—$2,578,000,000 less—as estimated in the revised 1963 budget last January. The latter situation arose from three factors. Revenues exceeded the January forecast by $857,000,000; receipts from sales of assets from the Government's portfolio were about $800,000,000 higher; and expenditures failed by about $900,000,000 to increase as much as had been estimated.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

The official January budget projection was that the public debt at the end of fiscal 1963 would be $303,494,000,000, or several billions above the level at the start of the fiscal year primarily because of the expected budget deficit. The change in the debt does not always correspond to the budget deficit, or surplus; changes in the amount of the general Treasury cash balance on hand have a bearing.

The actual direct debt on June 30, 1963, was $305,859,000,000; including the guaranteed debt, the total was $306,466,000,000. But on that date the general Treasury cash balance was $12,116,000,000, somewhat higher than usual—higher by some $1.7 billion than a year earlier.

A supporting table follows:

Net budget receipts and expenditures (the traditional administrative budget), fiscal year 1963, with comparisons

[In millions of dollars]

Item	Fiscal 1954	Fiscal 1961	Fiscal 1962	Fiscal 1963			Fiscal 1963 actual compared to—			
				Original budget	Revised budget	Actual	1954	1961	1962	Original 1963 budget
1. Budget receipts (net)	$64,420	$77,659	$81,409	$93,000	$85,500	$86,357	+$21,937	+$8,698	+$4,948	−$6,643
2. Budget expenditures (net):										
(a) National defense, per official budget classification	46,986	47,494	51,103	52,690	53,004	52,743	+5,757	+5,249	+1,640	+53
(b) Other than national defense	20,551	34,021	36,684	39,847	41,307	39,847	+19,296	+5,826	+3,163	
Total expenditures	67,537	81,515	87,787	92,537	94,311	92,590	+25,053	+11,075	+4,803	+53
3. Net deficit (−) or surplus (+) line 1 minus line 2	−3,117	−3,856	−6,378	+463	−8,811	−6,233	−3,116	−2,377	+145	−6,696
4. The Federal public debt—										
(a) At end of fiscal year (in billions)	271.3	289.2	298.6	294.9	303.5	[1]306.5	+35.2	+17.3	+7.9	+11.6
(b) Per capita (in dollars)	1,670	1,575	1,600			1,619	−51	+44	+19	
(c) For a family of 4 (in dollars)	6,680	6,300	6,400			6,476	−204	+176	+76	

[1] General fund cash balance at June 30, 1963, was $12,100,000,000, as compared to only $6,800,000,000 projected for that date in the original 1963 budget. This unusually large amount held on that date affects to some extent the comparisons shown.

Source: Budget document and Treasury statements.

THE CURRENT RAILROAD DISPUTE

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, former President Harry Truman may have been a controversial figure in American life, but few will deny that he earned his reputation for facing responsibilities squarely. It is well known that he displayed a small sign in his White House office which read: "The buck stops here."

Instead of meeting head-on the issues involved in the current railroad dispute, President Kennedy has come up with a clever, almost ingenious, "Tinker to Evers to Chance" proposal which calls upon the Congress to shift the responsibility to still another Government agency, the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The President's proposed solution would require maintenance of the status quo, and continuation of current featherbedding practices, for a period of up to 2 years until such time as the Interstate Commerce Commission might see fit to issue an order approving work rule changes.

Mr. Speaker, aside from the loopholes and technical defects which show up in the President's hastily drafted resolution, it is at best a stopgap, one-shot approach which does not squarely face up to the problems in the current rail dispute, nor does it contain any long-range solution for, or approach to, the basic problems of national industrywide strikes.

In an effort to be constructive as well as critical, I am introducing today two legislative proposals. One is a bill to define and prohibit featherbedding practices in the railroad industry in much the same manner as such practices are outlawed in the broadcasting industry under the Lea—anti-Petrillo—Act. It should be noted that the Taft-Hartley Act, which applies to most industries affecting commerce but does not apply to the railroad industry, contains a provision, section 8(b)(6), designed to prohibit featherbedding. So, the proposal I make here today is not new or novel except in the railroad industry.

I wish to emphasize that the bill I am introducing would give the force and effect of law to those recommendations of the Presidential Emergency Board 154 which are designed to assist employees affected by changes in work rules.

Mr. Speaker, when and if the current railroad dispute is finally resolved in one way or another, the Nation will still be left without guidance and without any improvement in the procedure to deal generally with national industrywide strikes.

It is necessary to recall that except for his railroad strike message this week, President Kennedy has submitted no legislative proposals or recommendations to Congress during his administration which would deal with national industrywide strikes.

It is even more regrettable that the committees of this Congress, which are controlled by the President's party, have avoided any serious study of this broad problem. However, some reason, if not justification, for the failure of Congress in this area can be found in the unfortunate fact that the legislative jurisdiction in this field is now dispersed and scattered among a number of committees

For example, in the House, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries recently conducted hearings on compulsory arbitration in the maritime industry. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has jurisdiction over the Railroad Labor Act which applies to the airlines as well as the railroads. The Committee on the Judiciary deals with monopoly or antitrust aspects of labor-management relations. And the Committee on Education and Labor has jurisdiction to deal with most of the other aspects of labor-management relations.

It is readily apparent that the vehicle needed to seriously cope with this broad problem does not now exist in the organization of the Congress.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution calling for creation of a blue-ribbon bipartisan Joint Senate-House Committee on Industrywide Bargaining. This committee would consist of 16 members, 8 from each House, with membership equally divided between the parties. The committee would be authorized to study and investigate problems related to collective bargaining and strikes and lockouts which affect an entire industry, or a substantial portion thereof.

It would be my hope that such a committee could operate in an atmosphere as free as possible from political pressures, that it could make an intensive and scholarly study, and that it would come up with legislative recommendations meriting the support of Congress and the Nation.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, my proposal to create such a joint committee is not a solution for the current crisis in the railroad industry. However, the current situation should emphatically underscore the need to begin now to find or devise improved procedures so that other such crises can be avoided or minimized in the future.

Pursuant to permission granted, the bill and the joint resolution to which reference has been made are reprinted below:

H.R. 7731

A bill to provide means for settling the current dispute between the railroads and their employees over work rules, to prevent such disputes from arising in the future by prohibiting featherbedding practices in the railroad industry, and to provide various forms of assistance for employees displaced by changes in work rules, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the recommendations of Emergency Board 154, created on April 3, 1963, by the President under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, insofar as such recommendations deal with actions to be taken by the carriers with respect to employees displaced by changes in work rules, shall be put into effect by the carriers forthwith and carried out by the carriers. The duties imposed upon the carriers hereunder may be enforced by a suit in equity in an appropriate district court of the United States, or in any other court having jurisdiction.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the Railway Labor Act is amended by inserting after paragraph "Seventh" a new paragraph reading as follows:

"Eighth. The term 'featherbedding practice' means an act or practice, through coercion or express or implied threat of coercion, of requiring, or attempting to require, a carrier—

"(1) to employ or agree to employ, in connection with the conduct of its business as a carrier, any person or persons in excess of the number needed by such carrier to perform carrier services; or

"(2) to pay or give or agree to pay or give any money or other thing of value in lieu of giving, or on account of failure to give, employment to any person or persons in connection with the conduct of its business as a carrier, in excess of the number of employees needed by such carrier to perform carrier services; or

"(3) to pay or agree to pay more than once for services performed in connection with the conduct of its business as a carrier; or

"(4) to pay or give or agree to pay or give any money or other thing of value for services, in connection with the conduct of its business as a carrier, which are not to be performed; or

"(5) to pay or agree to pay any exaction for the privilege of, or on account of, producing, preparing, manufacturing, selling, buying, renting, operating, using, or maintaining any article, machine, equipment, or materials; or to accede to or impose any restriction upon the production, preparation, manufacture, sale, purchase, rental, operation, use, or maintenance of the same, if such restriction is for the purpose of preventing or limiting the use of such article, machine, equipment, or materials, but such term does not include any act or practice reasonably required in the interest of safety or in the interest of preventing undue work burdens on other employees."

(b) Section 2 of the Railway Labor Act is amended by inserting after paragraph "Eleventh (d)" a new paragraph reading as follows:

"Twelfth. Featherbedding practices are hereby declared unlawful. The mandate of this paragraph may be enforced in the same manner as mandates of other paragraphs of this section."

H.J. RES. 569

Joint resolution to create a joint congressional committee to study and report on problems relating to industrywide collective bargaining and industrywide strikes and lockouts

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be known as the "Joint Committee on Industrywide Bargaining" (hereinafter referred to as the joint committee) to be composed of eight Members of the Senate to be designated by the President pro tempore of the Senate and eight Members of the House of Representatives to be designated by the Speaker. The members of the joint committee appointed from the Senate shall include four members of the majority party and four members of the minority party; and they shall be designated from among the members of the Committees on Labor and Public Welfare, Commerce and the Judiciary. The members of the joint committee appointed from the House of Representatives shall include four members of the majority party and four members of the minority party; and they shall be designated from among the members of Committees on Education and Labor, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Judiciary and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SEC. 2. The joint committee acting as a whole or by subcommittee shall be authorized to study and investigate the entire field of industrywide and regional collective bargaining procedures and practices between employers and labor organizations, and combinations or groups thereof, and problems relating thereto, including but not limited to—

(1) The ways and means by which the collective bargaining process might be improved, altered, revised, or supplemented so as to avoid or minimize strikes and lockouts which affect an entire industry or region, or a substantial part thereof;

(2) The concentration of economic and other power under the control of business organizations and labor organizations, and groups thereof, and such practices or policies, if any, which tend to concentrate or monopolize power affecting the collective bargaining process, and the relationship of such factors to strikes and lockouts affecting an entire industry or region, or a substantial portion thereof;

(3) The effectiveness and usefulness of various forms of mediation, conciliation, arbitration, and other possible procedures and methods for aiding or supplementing the collective bargaining process;

(4) The administration, operation, and possible need for revision of existing Federal laws which in any way concern collective bargaining, strikes, or lockouts affecting an entire industry or region, or substantial portion thereof;

(5) Such other problems and subjects which relate in any way to collective bargaining, strikes, or lockouts as the joint committee deems appropriate.

SEC. 3. A vacancy in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the powers of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 4. The members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House of Representatives, by bill or otherwise, the results of the joint committee's studies and investigations, together with their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

SEC. 5. In carrying out its duties, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings or investigations, to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The joint committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary; provided however, that no bill, measure or recommendation shall be reported from the joint committee unless a majority of the committee assent. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the joint committee or by any member designated by him or by the joint committee, and may be served by such person or persons as may be designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the joint committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. The provisions of sections 192 and 194 of title 2, United States Code, shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section. The cost of stenographic service to report public hearings shall not be in excess of the amounts prescribed by law for reporting the hearings of standing committees of the Senate. The cost of stenographic service to report executive hearings shall be fixed at an equitable rate by the joint committee. Members of the joint committee, and its employees and consultants, while traveling on official business for the joint committee, may receive either the per diem allowance authorized to be paid to Members of Congress or its employees, or their actual and necessary expenses provided an itemized statement of such expenses is attached to the voucher.

SEC. 6. The joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and taff employees as it deems necessary and advisable. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

SEC. 7. The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the joint committee or by any member of the joint committee duly authorized by the chairman.

PUBLIC SERVANTS MUST SET EXAMPLE

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, time and time again, Members of this body have taken the floor in debate to speak out against wasteful and extravagant expenditures of taxpayers' money. Those economy-minded Representatives have met with some very limited successes, but they also have suffered too many failures. Consistently, this administration calls for, and gets, more and more Federal programs, bigger and bigger Federal spending, greater and greater Federal deficits.

Our country is watching those in high places for a guide to its own behavior—whether it be with personal morals, public opinions, or the manner in which to handle a household budget. In short—and whether we like it or not—we in Government help set the standards for this counrty. If we meet our responsibilities, we can look forward to similar action by others. If we set an example by frugal and wise spending, we can rightfully expect the citizenry to be wise managers of their own purses.

Pointing up the need for public servants to sacrifice and abstain from certain luxuries in order to set the pace for greater individual responsibility, Mr. Henry J. Taylor wrote a splendid column which was currently carried in the Chattanooga News Free Press. Believing my colleagues in Congress and officers of the administration can profit from close study of Mr. Taylor's thoughts, I commend the following to your attention:

MIGHT AS WELL FACE THE FACT: HE'S A SPENDTHRIFT PRESIDENT

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The biggest single tip President Kennedy gave worried Western statesmen abroad stayed out of our headlines entirely.

The underground alarm has spread out of the Adenauer meeting in Bonn and a gratuitous statement by Mr. Kennedy to the West German press.

He informed the Chancellor that the United States is preparing another new plan asking Europe's aid in our payments-deficit problem and gold crisis.

The first dismay arose from an apparent failure to realize, or at least to recognize, that were it not for the aid already given by Europe's central banks the New Frontier performance would already have forced the United States off the gold standard.

Mr. Kennedy stated in Bonn: "If the monetary problems are not solved they are going to master us." He is a good deal more right than when he stated in a campaign speech in October 1960, "Our balance of payments will be strong and we can cease to worry about the outflow of gold."

Our gold crisis is as much a problem of confidence as a problem in payments. So long as Mr. Kennedy insists on the overspending he calls "planned deficits," our creditors abroad know that, if he does not reverse this, no matter what he or anyone else says, that policy is heading us smack toward the devaluation of the dollar. In fact, just Chancellor Adenauer and President De Gaulle could pull the plug on the New Frontier tomorrow morning.

AN OLD STORY

Solvency is more a matter of attitude than income. If a man, woman, or enterprise's attitude toward money and debt is unsound or irresponsible it makes no difference how much income is received. They never have enough—and never will. Many a debt-ridden husband has learned this from a spend-spend wife the hard way.

Last year the administration collected $102,466,252,087 in taxes. Of this amount $65,377,533,010 came from citizens. And of that figure, $48,891,395,741 was withheld, and never even seen by the earners who worked for the colossal sum. In addition, corporations collected $21,846,608,441 for Washington.

Yet no matter what the taxpayers' sacrifices are or what the total tax take, the red ink grows and splashes and deepens. This is a fact that concerns Europe's central banks as it would any other creditor.

Apparently Mr. Kennedy has an absolute blind spot about money. Where it comes from, how you must save to have any for your security and your family's safety, how people must do without many things to meet their taxes—all these hard lessons are completely outside his lifetime experience. This is no reflection; merely a fact.

WORSENS CONTINUALLY

As one result, the President neither counts costs carefully and clearly nor shows a noticeable grief for those who have to foot the bills. Otherwise he would not say, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country," and then sanction the most lavish administration in the history of the United States—which becomes more lush and lavish all the time.

The President could set an entirely different example. For one thing, brought to mind by his recent European trip, he would be unwilling to order personal (taxpayers') jets that are the most expensive per seat in the history of aviation. The latest one in the White House stable, which flew Mr. Kennedy on this trip, cost alone as much as 300 Rolls-Royce limousines. That's mighty high-cost riding. And we pay every penny.

Never has the "Let them eat cake" atmosphere of Versailles been so blatant, expensive and uncalled for. These and other "tut-tut-to-the-cost" kind of baubles are bad symbols of a bad example in the public service. For the attitude in a government toward the taxpayers' money starts at the top and percolates down. It certainly does not start at the bottom and percolate up. A marvelous roar of approval would back our President at the first sign of sacrifice in Washington, beginning at the top.

TFX CONTRACT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the testimony of Navy Secretary Fred Korth presents a shocking picture of factors that went into the decision on the multibillion-dollar TFX warplane contract. Initially the contract would have called for expenditure of more than $6.5 billion, but additional planes have been added costing $1.4 billion which will now bring the total program to more than $8 billion.

Keep in mind that Korth, Defense Secretary Robert Strange McNamara, and other political Secretaries overruled the unanimous recommendations of the high-level Pentagon Source Selection Board to give the contract to General Dynamics, a firm operating in Korth's hometown of Fort Worth, Tex.

Keep in mind that the civilian and military experts of the Pentagon had taken part in a lengthy evaluation that resulted in the unanimous recommendation for the Boeing company on the basis of a superior performance and a much lower price. The initial estimates were that the price would be $100 million to $415 million lower than General Dynamics. However, on the initial research and development contract alone, Boeing bid 22 percent less than General Dynamics, or $132 million less. Chairman McClellan has used a figure of $1 billion as being much more likely as the difference between Boeing and General Dynamics on the total TFX contract.

With those facts in mind, examine what Korth's most recent testimony discloses:

First. He was president of the Continental Bank of Fort Worth, and approved a loan of several hundred thousand dollars to the General Dynamics Corp. That loan was part of the money used to bail General Dynamics out of serious financial trouble resulting from a record loss of $425 million.

Second. When Korth became Secretary of Navy he retained his stock in his Fort Worth bank, which had a large amount of money tied up in the future of General Dynamics. Korth says the lending authority of the bank was $600,000.

Third. It was indicated that a part of that loan is still owed by General Dynamics to Korth's bank in Fort Worth, Tex.

This new evidence, piled on top of Korth's strong advocacy of General Dynamics, indicates a pattern of activity that compares with the RFC scandals, the activity of T. Lamar Caudle of the Truman era, or the Talbot case and Dixon-Yates case of the Eisenhower administration.

Fred Korth should have recognized that he could not be objective, even if there was no conflict of interest law in existence. Korth should have disqualified himself from handling the contract, for it was a clear conflict of interest. Instead, we now see the evidence of Korth's 16 conferences and 5 telephone calls from General Dynamics officials he characterizes as "longtime friends."

Korth admits that these men who called on him were not impersonal acquaintances. He said they were longtime friends from Fort Worth and oldtime pals from his days in Washington under the Truman administration. Incidentally, he testifies that there were only two visits from Boeing officials in 1962, and that only one of these visits dealt with TFX.

It would appear that Korth and Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell Gilpatric brought not only their experience from the Truman administration, but also some of the loose ethical standards that characterized the era of "influence peddling" and government by "crony."

However, TFX is not a 5-percenter scandal. TFX is a 22-percenter scandal, for that is how much tax money is being wasted on the research and development contract alone.

This is a real Texas-size scandal.

This is a real Texas-size raid on the U.S. Defense budget.

If President Kennedy and Defense Secretary McNamara have any ethical sensitivity they should fire Korth immediately. It is possible that they did not know all the facts on the transactions between Korth's bank and General Dynamics until the admissions before the McClellan subcommittee. However, from this point on there can be no excuses.

Korth should be fired. There is no place for his TFX ethics in Government, and this is particularly true when it involves a contract that could result in expenditure of $6.5 billion to more than $8 billion.

This TFX case makes Teapot Dome, the Truman tax scandals, and the Billie Sol Estes affair look like peanuts. The President and the Attorney General should take steps to launch a Federal grand jury investigation of this shameful affair to study the possibility of violations of the criminal laws on conflict of interest. I would suggest that they pay particular attention to the Supreme Court decision in the Dixon-Yates case reported in January 1961.

From the McClellan committee is emerging a picture that flatly contradicts the Kennedy administration's claim that Defense Secretary McNamara's actions are saving billions of dollars. McNamara tells us he will save the taxpayers $1 billion on his decision to let the contract to General Dynamics. He gives no details, but only his vague opinion.

By contrast, there is testimony that McNamara is paying $132 million more to General Dynamics on the research and development contract than the Boeing bid. Apply this $132 million figure—about 22 percent on the research and development contract—to the entire TFX contract and you will see strong indications that McNamara will waste more than $1 billion by giving the contract to the high bidder against the advice of experts on cost and performance. Remember, McNamara had no cost studies. He had rough judgments from his head.

PURCHASE OF FOREIGN AIRCRAFT BY U.S. AIRLINES DESERVES CENSURE

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in our concern over the U.S. critical and chronic balance-of-payments deficit, we have noted that the administration has laid great stress on the importance and urgency of exploring and developing export opportunities. Certainly it is highly desirable that American industry make every effort to develop an expanded foreign market for its goods as one contribution toward a more favorable balance-of-payments situation for the United States.

But it seems to me that the administration also ought to take a good look at the other side of the coin and provide some leadership in discouragement of foreign imports which adversely affect American industry and contribute to our unfavorable balance-of-payments problem.

As a significant instance of this, we note the recent announcement of American Airlines that it has purchased 15 shorthaul turbo jet transports—BAC 111—at a total cost of $40 million, from British Aircraft Corp., and has taken an option on an additional 15 aircraft of the same type. Previously, Braniff Airways had purchased 12 of these same aircraft from the British firm at a cost of $35 million and Mohawk Airlines 4 of them for $10 million.

These orders were placed at a time when an American aircraft manufacturer was well along with construction of a counterpart, superior plane, the DC-9. But the U.S. airlines involved make no secret of the fact that they have chosen the British plane over the DC-9 because an earlier delivery date was promised. And, what is more, officials of the British firm say they are encouraged by these purchases to believe that other U.S. shorthaul trunklines which have been considering both the BAC 111 and the DC–9 will purchase the foreign plane.

SERIOUS DEFENSE IMPLICATIONS

If this trend toward purchase of commercial transports abroad is not reversed, foreign expenditures by U.S. airlines could reach billions of dollars. Furthermore, to yield the world commercial aircraft market to government-subsidized foreign manufacturers would be to injure this country's defense through reduction of the domestic manufacturers' airframe producing capabilities. In addition, it goes without saying that such sizable foreign purchases as these contribute not only to the imbalance of payments situation and the gold outflow but also to unemployment and reduced Federal income tax revenues.

Where would our airlines be today if it were not for the American aircraft manufacturing industry? How far would air travel have progressed in the United States today if the carriers had had to depend on foreign producers for planes? Our aircraft producers have always been the world's trail blazers in research and development leading to availability of the world's best air transports to the airlines of this country. Aside from the harm they are doing to the Nation's monetary stability through these foreign acquisitions, these airlines are to be roundly condemned for biting the hand that has fed them through all the years of their fruitful operations.

The administration recently has announced several approaches to a more favorable balance-of-payments situation. These include an increase in short-term interest rates, a new tax on sales of foreign long-term bonds in the United States, and a $500 million standby loan arrangement with the International Monetary Fund. In addition, the administration plans to reduce Federal purchases abroad through continuation of the policy of encouraging our allies to make military purchases in this country and by reducing our acquisition of strategic materials abroad.

Of what avail will such measures be, however, if such private concerns as our domestic airlines abandon American manufacturers and take their business abroad? Such purchases as those I have mentioned involve no small sums of dollars which are going overseas and thus will go a long way toward offsetting any gains which may be achieved through new administration policies in the effort to equalize the balance of payments and halt the gold outflow.

AIRLINES SUPPORT ESSENTIAL

In that connection, it should be noted that some 400 U.S.-built planes of the type we are discussing can be sold throughout the world during the next 8 to 10 years, provided that the domestic planning and construction programs are supported by the airlines of the United States. But, without that initial support, these programs will bog down for lack of American customers. Assuming that support, however, let it be noted that the sale of 133 of these planes abroad would increase the U.S. gold reserve nearly $700 million.

But if domestic airlines purchase from abroad 267 of these planes, the initial purchase price and subsequent spares orders would result in an outflow of $959 million. And if a U.S. manufacturer were not in the market, the gold balance would be affected adversely by more than $1.7 billion.

On the other hand, it is significant that the favorable gold flow created by sale abroad of just one of these U.S.-built planes would completely offset the estimated loss to the United States brought about by European Common Market effects on our chemical industry.

It also should be noted that, unless the trend toward foreign aircraft purchases is reversed, the orders placed to date will lead to purchases of monumental proportions. The total fleet requirements of American Airlines alone for planes of this type will increase to 40 or 50 aircraft. On that basis, expenditures abroad for engine replacement parts alone will be equal to the initial $40 million purchase price of the 15 aircraft.

The consequences of a curtailment or discontinuance of U.S. manufacture of this type of plane would be most serious. This will readily be seen from the fact that airlines would spend more than $2 billion for the 400 planes contemplated for production, and for the required operating spares. This production would provide 73,000 jobs for an 8 year period. These workers would pay personal incomes taxes estimated at $188 million and the corporate income tax would be some $106 million, making a total tax revenue of about $294 million. Production of these 400 planes would create contracts for the purchase of raw materials, parts and major subassemblies with large and small businesses in 28 different States.

In California alone, the production program would require an average of 19,000 workers in the aircraft and parts industry. An additional 22,700 jobs throughout the State would be sustained in supporting services. The total new employment of 41,700 is equivalent to 10 percent of the State's unemployed.

ACTION BY PRESIDENT IMPERATIVE

The threat to the Nation's economy and to the very existence of the American aircraft manufacturing industry which is inherent in the purchase of foreign planes by our air carriers must be readily apparent. Clearly, it is a situation which calls for the President to exercise the great powers and prestige of his office. If he can use these to urge American industry to seek expanding foreign markets for its goods, in the interests of improving the balance-of-payments situation, he can also use them to discourage imports which not only worsen the balance-of-payments problem but also do great harm to the Nation's eocnomy.

If the President can use his powers and prestige to force the steel industry into a price rise retreat, he can use them to persuade the Nation's airlines to order American, not foreign, airliners. He should take whatever measures are at his disposal to accomplish this, especially since it appears that the foreign purchasers are motivated solely by interairline competition to "get into the air first" with the particular type of airliner which is involved in this situation.

Mr. Speaker, the Long Beach Chamber of Commerce and the mayor of the city of Long Beach, the Honorable Edwin W. Wade, have sent the President a communication which outlines in detail the harmful effects of these foreign aircraft purchases. It is my earnest hope that the President will give this matter his careful attention and take the positive action this situation deserves.

REPRESENTATIVES SCHWENGEL, CURTIS, AND OTHERS HAVE DONE FINE JOB IN POINTING OUT LACK OF MINORITY STAFFING

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Representative FRED SCHWENGEL's Committee on Minority Staffing has done an able job in pointing out an unfair practice in congressional representation. House committees are staffed overwhelmingly by Democrats who outnumber minority staff representatives 10 to 1 despite a less than 2 to 1 Democrat-Republican ratio in actual voter-elected congressional representation.

This situation deserves careful attention and prompt action. Representative TOM CURTIS has done excellent work in making this minority staff shortage known across the country. I think all Representatives, whether Democrat or Republican, should give fair and serious study to this need for actual two-party government in Congress.

Appreciation should go to Representatives SCHWENGEL and CURTIS, and all those such as Fred Sontag who have helped them for so long.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat, which is known for being one of the Nation's most informative and outspoken newspapers of quality, published the following editorial on July 8 which I certainly recommend for all to read:

SHORT STRAW FOR CONGRESS AND GOP

The American system of governmental checks and balances presumes a Congress able to understand and review the activities of the executive branch.

In recent years, the massive growth of Federal power at the executive level has rapidly outstripped the ability of Congress—and the staffs now at congressional disposal—to adequately carry out this function.

As one long-time Congressman put it, "We can't review (the executive) adequately; we can't check it adequately; we just don't know what it is doing."

But, if the executive branch is outstripping the ability of the legislative to review, the majority in Congress, the Democrats, seem to be hastening the process by denying a just portion of committee staff members to the Republican Congressmen.

Representative FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, contends that the breakdown between majority-minority staff members on committees is an overall ratio of 10 to 1.

This cripples the minority party and gravely hinders its ability to act as the "loyal opposition." It is as unjust and damaging to our form of government as the increasing inability of Congress to review, explore, and report independently on the executive.

The congressional Democrats have a responsibility to grant their Republican colleagues a more proportionate number of committee staffers. Congress as a unit has an obligation to the American people which is not discharged if, through their own fault, they lack the manpower to keep the proper check on the executive branch.

STAFFING REFORM

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the Republican committee on increased minority staffing is gaining momentum in its drive for much needed congressional reform. An increasing number of thoughtful people are becoming convinced that the demands of democratic government within the framework of a strong two-party system rest squarely on the proposition that fair and adequate committee staffing, responsible to the minority party, is a must.

Under the leadership of the gentleman from Iowa, Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, the committee on increased minority staffing is making visible progress. It is not my purpose today to recite the great amount of work that is being done by the gentleman from Iowa, Congressman SCHWENGEL, and his committee. Nor is it my purpose to recite the larger number of political scientists and political commentators who are actively supporting the objectives of the committee.

It has occurred to me, however, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues will be interested in a thoughtful editorial which appeared in the Cedar Rapids Gazette on July 3, 1963. This editorial is not only a fine tribute to the gentleman from Iowa, Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, it is also a perceptive summary of this important struggle which the Republican committee on increased minority staffing is waging on behalf of good government and a strong, constructive two-party system.

Mr. Speaker, I predict that the bemused and somewhat condescending manner with which the opening struggles for fair play staffing reform were met by many here on the floor of the House last January, shall soon change. There is nothing so powerful as the truth. The battle for good government and the battle against monolithic centralization is a continuing battle. I am proud to call the attention of my colleagues to a great champion of this cause, the gentleman from Iowa, Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, and to the heart-warming and encouraging editorial which follows:

SCHWENGEL PLUGS AWAY

Citizens genuinely interested in the preservation of a strong two-party system one day will be eternally grateful to Representative FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa's First District, if he is successful in increasing minority representation on congressional committee staffs.

It is an effort which doesn't attract a great deal of attention because there is no glamor connected with it. But it is something that sorely needs to be done. It has been known among Congressmen for many years that the Republican minority has been understaffed on committees. In some instances the Democratic majority has 10 times the number of staffers that the Republicans have—far out of proportion to the membership of the two parties in Congress itself.

Representative SCHWENGEL decided a year or so ago to see what could be done about it. He didn't get a great deal of encouragement from Republican leaders—who had almost given up hope—and, of course, none at all from the Democrats. Nevertheless, he was given the chairmanship of a special Republican conference committee to look into the matter.

The committee has been taking a hard look ever since and it has rallied a good deal more support from Republican leaders, who now think something must be done about it, as well as among Republican Congressmen generally.

Political scientists throughout the Nation are quite agreed that lack of staff is one way to keep the minority weak and to eventually downgrade two-party government. The loyal opposition must have its proportionate share of staffers to help do the study and research which is so necessary in formulating opinions.

The rule should provide for a proportionate division of staff positions no matter which party is in the minority. Such a rule would afford the people the greatest protection.

REMEMBER THE LONG HISTORY OF SOVIET VIOLATIONS OF TREATIES AND AGREEMENTS

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, before we become too elated over the glowing stories of the success of the administration in getting a nuclear test ban with the Soviet Union, let us ask ourselves a couple of questions.

What secret agreements have been reached with Khrushchev to get him to sign the test ban agreement? Recent past history reminds us too clearly that President Kennedy sees nothing wrong in making deals with Khrushchev secretly while he prepares the American public for their acceptance. We are told the President and Mr. Khrushchev have exchanged numerous letters.

What guarantee is there that this agreement will be any more sacred to the Communists than the treaties and agreements which have been arrogantly violated, including Germany, Korea, Laos, Cuba, Vietnam, subversive activities, and the last resumption by Russia of nuclear testing?

Will the President tell the American people of one single agreement which was kept by Russia? So why a new one?

Has Khrushchev and the Soviet Union abandoned their announced objective to rule the world and to reach this goal by any means possible which includes lying, betrayal, subversion and, as a last resort, war?

Mr. Speaker, I hope our people will not be carried away by the well organized propaganda of the Kennedy machine and its managed news, and that no hasty approval is given this agreement so that we are not led into a Communist trap to sap our strength and give the Soviets time to increase their military strength at our expense.

ANOTHER MISREPRESENTATION OF THE PLIGHT OF THE MIGRANT

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, many accurate but deplorable accusations can be made concerning the deplorable status of the migrant worker and especially concerning the pathetic, tragic effects upon the innocent children who are, necessarily or unnecessarily, dragged from one place of employment to another. The best that can be said for a migrant, nomadic life—whether in rodeo, military, Congress, agriculture, baseball, sales, et cetera—is that it is cruel, undesirable, un-American. Those who wish to foist it on others, by legislation or otherwise, should be sentenced to sharing, if only for one season, the existence, heartache, and tribulations of a domestic migrant farm family.

But what is wrong with a 14-year-old boy, during the summer, working in the fields, even if he starts work at about 4:30 a.m., especially when he earns $6 or more per day. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 2, 1963, page 12135. The incident must have been in Texas, because he would earn twice that much in California. If more high school kids worked instead of loafed during the summer, they, their families, and their communities would be much the better for it. There are many jobs in agriculture during the summer. Unlike factory, inside or heavy work, agricultural jobs seldom harm a healthy child.

No proponent of Public Law 78, to my knowledge, has ever advocated that the small children of migrant families should work in the fields for money or education. I personally believe there is a good deal of education in any kind of honest work, however. Most proponents of Public Law 78 advocate and urge, with a humane sensitivity, that families with small children stay in a permanent place and maintain a stable home life—unless they prefer to migrate or live like nomads.

I find the opponents of Public Law 78 trying to enlarge, glamorize, and promote the cruel and tragic life of the nomad. I wish they would analyze more thoroughly the pathetic plight they are perpetrating on poor people.

The reason a migrant child cannot be educated is not because he works but because he moves. His education is interrupted and disrupted—in one school and another, often one grade and another, with different texts, different teachers, different classmates, different counselors.

Parents who move their children from place to place, school to school, miss and deny their children other stabilizing factors such as church, teams, youth groups, regular work, hobbies, a home. Well, if there is anything good that can be made of a migrant life, I would like to hear. I will share it with the nomads.

Furthermore, every migrant child who matriculates in a new school interrupts and disrupts that school. Everything he does affects the permanent students, almost invariably adversely. Even those with no imagination and little understanding of our educational system can appreciate this deplorable condition—and the detrimental consequences to the permanent school. It would be better in most communities to have separate schools for the permanent and migrant student but this would be unconscionably expensive for the small schools and such a scheme would be criticized as discriminatory.

The best way to eliminate the deplorable, cruel conditions of migrant life is—like eliminating the cruelties of war—to eliminate the cause or source—the migrant family way of life—or war.

There is little we can do to improve substantially the conditions of war or the migrant family life.

It seems to me outrageous to hold out false hopes for the migrant way of life and to dupe families who are already in a deprived condition, economically, educationally, mechanically, emotionally, socially.

The answers are to be found, not in the promotion, but, in the elimination of the necessity of the migrant family way of existence.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

ELLIS ISLAND AND "THE PUBLIC INTEREST"

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today, for appropriate reference, a bill to secure effective use of Ellis Island. This historic piece of Federal property—once of great use, now of no use—has been since 1954 merely a drain of $100,000 a year to the American taxpayer.

The first public use of Ellis Island was in defending the port of New York. The second was in admitting 20 million immigrants to this country through that port.

Ellis Island was ceded by the State of New York to the U.S. Government in 1808, and until 1861 remained a harbor defense installation of the Army known as Fort Gibson. Further quasimilitary uses continued until its formal opening in 1892 as an immigration station. The new activity was matched by extensive operations on the island: The construction of 35 buildings at a cost of nearly $6½ million; the increase in area of the original island by earthen fill and bulkhead construction from its original 3 acres, residually New York property, to 27½ acres. The 24 differential acres puzzle the task of redesignating this property to private use because these were never New York property, but, as subaqueous territory, pertained to the jurisdiction of New Jersey. A private Ellis Island would create a knotty problem in interstate jurisdiction.

New immigration policies terminated the old function of the island. On October 15, 1954, the Department of Justice declared this property to be "in excess of the needs of the United States"—that is, useless. Since this date, the story of efforts to dispose of the island or find use for it is one of dilatoriness and confusion, set in a framework of considerable annual expenditure on maintenance to merely negative effect.

Between October 1954 and March 1955 the availability of the property had been brought to the attention of all Federal agencies with no suggestion in reply for continued Federal use. To September 1956 the island was kept available to proposals for transfer of the property to State and local government agencies, or to qualified nonprofit institutions for various specific public uses pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and related laws. No application was received from an eligible applicant.

Then the property was advertised for private sale by sealed bids. Great public outcry opposed this announcement. For more than a year the Nation was again canvassed for acceptable proposals for public use of the island, again without success.

After February 1958 offers to sell the island have been met by high bids of $201,000 in 1958, $675,000 in 1959, and $1,025,000 in January 1960. These offers, including the last, have been rejected as not being commensurate with the value of the property.

Present proposals for use of Ellis Island are dominated by a $2,100,000 cash offer for the island to build a self-contained city designed by Frank Lloyd Wright. Other smaller scale offers envisage the island as a resort; as a historic reconstruction of downtown Manhattan as the Nation's first Capital, of the nature of Williamburg, Va., as a Biblical study center, as a living museum of immigration.

In fact specific proposals for the use of this island are legion, ranging from the practicable to the bizarre. But in the meantime the only use of the island which actually obtains is the negative use of nothing, with the requirement of maintenance.

The present bill advocates no specific use. The bill does not commit the island to public use, though it is admittedly designed to preserve active public use if one can be found. What this bill does is to react to the tale of confusion which has been the story of this formerly busy island since 1954, positively, not by making an isolated and particular scheme, but by creating a seven-member Commission, which will in itself cost the taxpayer very little, and will conceive of a function for the island commensurate with its traditions.

The bill will establish a seven-member Commission, three to be appointed by the President, to include the nominees, if any, of the Governors of New York and New Jersey at their option; two members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and two by the President of the Senate. The Commission shall study and report on possible uses for Ellis Island, submitting their report to Congress not later than December 31, 1964. The bill would bar the General Services Administration from disposing of the island until July 1, 1965, in order to give the Congress 6 months to act on the recommendations of the Commission.

Neither the ponderous attention of this Congress nor the coils of Federal procedure will be brought to bear on this 27-acre matter, but a small Commission, which will speedily find a solution to the problem of this island, or free the Administrator of General Services to act on it, and in any event end 9 years' vacillation.

I am offering this proposal today to break the stalemate over the future of Ellis Island; a stalemate which, if allowed to continue, could culminate with Ellis Island as a honky-tonk or worse. In the past I have affirmed the belief that Ellis Island should be used for educational purposes. This is still my belief. I would assert, however, that the establishment of a commission is necessary at this time to end the drift which persists on this question. The Muskie subcommittee has made a brave attempt to resolve the problems pertaining to the disposition of the island. But it now appears that the efforts of the subcommittee have failed. Therefore, if we fail to act with dispatch, the General Services Administration will be confronted with no alternative but to sell the island to the highest bidder irrespective of whether the transaction will benefit the public interest. If this should come to pass in my judgment it would be an unhappy final chapter in the noble history of Ellis Island.

I, therefore, urge that the Congress act promptly and favorably on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, an informative article by Warren Weaver, Jr., which appeared in this morning's New York Times, July 23, 1963, describes the present plight of the island and emphasizes the need for immediate congressional action. The text of the article follows:

Housing Foreseen for Ellis Island—Private Developers Held Likely To Buy Island for Apartment Projects—Alternatives Scarce—Congress Has Little Hope That Public Use Will Be Found for Island

(By Warren Weaver, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, July 22.—Hope that Ellis Island may be preserved for some kind of public use has been virtually abandoned by Congress.

Barring some totally unforeseen development, the historic immigration center in

New York Harbor will be sold to private real estate interests for development as a high-rise residential community before the end of the year.

Less than a year ago, New York State was prepared to accept the island as a gift from the Federal Government. But now the State maintains that the island should be devoted to "an appropriate Federal use."

New Jersey, which has kept clear of any proposals for its acquisition of the island, has not even answered an invitation from the Senate Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee to attend a last-ditch conference of would-be public developers.

DEVELOPMENT TOO COSTLY

The development of the island for any purpose, would be a multi-million-dollar proposition, and neither New York nor New Jersey has enough money for such prospects at this time.

Most serious of all, the Senate subcommittee has received no evidence that the sponsors of various nonprofit projects designed for Ellis Island have been able to arrive at any joint plan that would be financially sound.

Two New York Republicans have made last-minute proposals, designed to postpone if not actually prohibit public sale of the island to the highest bidder.

Senator Kenneth B. Keating proposed that Congress require the approval of Governor Rockefeller and of Gov. Richard J. Hughes of New Jersey for any sale of the surplus property.

LINDSAY PROPOSES STUDY

Representative John V. Lindsay, of Manhattan, was preparing today to introduce a bill that would set up a seven-member Federal commission to study the disposal of Ellis Island. The group would report its findings to Congress by December 31, 1964.

Under the Lindsay bill, the General Services Administration would be barred from selling the island until July 1, 1965.

A month ago, the Senate subcommittee drafted a proposed bill that would authorize New York and New Jersey to decide between them which State would have jurisdiction over the island.

Lawyers with the General Services Administration have concluded that only the original three acres of the island are in New York while 24.5 acres of later fill belong to New Jersey. The issue would have to be resolved for purposes of taxation, criminal jurisdiction and so on.

But Governor Rockefeller maintained in a recent letter to Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Democrat, of Maine, and chairman of the subcommittee that Ellis Island would fall entirely under New York jurisdiction after the Federal Government withdraws. Thus he opposes the bill because he sees no need for it.

ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY IN DEALING WITH COMMUNISM

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Snyder] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress, I believe that the problems facing our Nation today are so critical as to require every responsible Member of this House and of the other body to declare himself publicly and specifically on those vital issues of domestic and foreign policy which so deeply involve our national welfare, our prosperity—indeed our very survival as a free people—in a world increasingly lost to Communist tyranny through bloody violence, or without a struggle to the superstate of creeping socialism.

I must call attention also to the robot record of many in both Houses of unvarying support for the present administration's liberal socialistic "no-win" policy of dealing with the Communists—through compromise, concession, appeasement—even to the point of squandering billions of dollars of American tax money to feed and support the very Communist governments that are openly committed to destroy us—and I place myself on record as totally and unalterably opposed to this blind folly.

I should like us to examine policies pursued in programing American foreign aid commitments elsewhere—particularly those to the so-called underdeveloped countries. In this area, it quickly becomes patently obvious that the facts will not sustain generosity regarding motives. By no stretch of the imagination can innocence explain the studied partiality and favoritism shown socialistic programs and centralized State planning by American bureaucrats dispensing foreign aid in ever-increasing amounts from one end of the earth to the other.

Today we see the President of the United States endorsing a proposed United States loan to the Government of India to build a Government-owned steel plant at Bokaro. This project would be the largest single U.S. aid project ever undertaken. It calls for an initial U.S. loan of $512 million and a later one of $379 million—the total cost to India and the United States would be $1.5 billion.

The overriding issue is whether the United States, as a matter of policy, should put money into Government-owned businesses that compete with private enterprise. The issue, purely and simply, is whether or not the bureaucrats of the administration should finance socialism in other countries.

So many of these other countries are impatient, poor, and inexperienced and there the American bureaucrat, armed with his own people's tax money is in a position to exercise enormous influence in forming the institutions, attitudes, and process of the host countries. This he does by virtue of his broad discretionary power in selecting among projects and in preferring one local faction over another.

We have seen in the past the United States suspend all foreign aid to the pro-American premier of Laos in order to compel him to capitulate to the Communist coalition government which later repays us by allowing the Communists in neighboring North Vietnam to use Lao territory to attack us in South Vietnam. Likewise we stopped all foreign aid to Peru when the anti-Castro, anti-Communist military seized power to prevent a leftwing government from gaining power. In this case, the military junta proved so effective and so popular we had to backtrack in embarrassment as one after another neighbor state hastened to recognize the new order. On the other hand, leftist Brazil where for years the United States has underwritten spendthrift Government programs, staved off bankruptcy by advancing one unpaid U.S. loan after another—leftist Brazil reacted to Adlai Stevenson's goodwill tour and the New Frontier's $20 billion Alliance for Progress in Latin America by shouting down our timid attempts to unify the Association of American States against Castro's Communist beachhead in Cuba, by reestablishing Brazilian relationships with the Soviet Union and other Communist nations and finally by confiscating Americans' private investments in Brazilian telephone utilities. And what was the response of the United States to this defiance of its peoples' rights and peremptory challenge to its own leadership in this vital area? American foreign aid to Brazil was quickly and dramatically increased lest they go Communist, and Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, stubbornly rejected every suggestion in the Senate, by Lausche, Capehart, and others, that there be written into our foreign aid bill provisions to protect American private investors against the confiscation of their property by governments receiving American foreign aid funds. His rationalization for this was that it "might make it appear that our foreign aid programs are substantially motivated by a desire to protect U.S. foreign investments, and that they are in effect tools of U.S. capital." He also said that such provisions "could retard some of the economic and social reforms we seek in connection with our foreign aid programs, particularly in Latin America; civil land reform may well require expropriation of existing estates, some of which may be owned by U.S. nationals."

Congress did not accept this theory which was advocated by Rusk and his liberal Socialist colleagues, those who blush with shame at the idea that foreign aid might be linked with the natural desire of our Government to protect the legitimate interest of the very American taxpayers who make this foreign aid money available.

On the other hand, the administration does not shrink from voluntarily suggesting that the law should permit the bureaucrats to use American tax money in a premeditated plan to finance foreign aid projects deliberately designed to destroy the property interests of the very American people whose taxes pay their salaries as well as subsidize over a hundred different countries throughout the world, at a cost of $100 billion—one-third of the entire national debt since World War II.

It is my belief that this liberal point of view dangerously undercuts one of the most vital interests of the United States. I say the State Department appointees as agents of the U.S. Government might reasonably be expected to protect American rights and promote such cherished institutions of our free society as private enterprise—not use our own money to liquidate our interests, destroy these rights and promote the alien institutions of socialism. I suggest that it is proper for foreign aid to stand as collateral for compensation of American private investments confiscated by governments receiving American aid. Wherever they are in foreign countries, let us never forget American investors are there with the permission and invitation of these governments and people who were all too eager to attract outside capital to develop their idle resources. Now I say that it is not only just to both parties that these agreements be honored, but most particularly, it is in the long-range interests of the underdeveloped countries themselves that their governments avoid driving away new capital through irresponsible policies of confiscating what is already there—and most certainly, if it really is the welfare of these people and not just the promotion of socialism per se, that our liberal agents in the State Department are interested in, it is their responsibility to use every measure calculated to encourage private capital to flow into these underdeveloped areas.

After World War II, the American people were called upon to launch a brave new adventure in internationalism—a program of American peacetime foreign aid to the war-ravaged countries of the world—a program that began modestly, which we were assured was a temporary measure to rebuild physical destruction suffered and to provide relief to suffering people. Today, after spending $100 billion, the American people are told some things very different. American foreign aid has become a permanent and global obligation and should be viewed as a privilege. Moreover, we have new purposes, we now undertake the limitless task of industrializing, modernizing and reforming the underdeveloped regions and people of the earth—and what we have been giving, we are told, is but a pittance that must be enlarged in scale and projected in time. For Latin America alone, President Kennedy has designed a 10-year program of $20 billion, and for foreign aid for the last fiscal year, he requested $4.9 billion. This figure was more than even the predominately liberal 87th Congress could stomach—so they rebelled and slashed $1 billion from this request. But even so, note, the remaining $3.9 billion is substantially more than the $3.2 billion that the State Department was able to give away the previous year when, despite all efforts, they ended up with an unspent surplus of $700 million. Dave Bell indicated on "Meet the Press" that nearly $300 million of this is unobligated.

For the current fiscal year, the administration requested $4.9 billion. This request was subsequently scaled down to $4.5 billion, but still represents an increase over what the aid people were unable to spend during fiscal 1962.

I want to make my position on foreign aid most clearly understood. I am not, I repeat, I am not opposed to foreign aid as such. I am most emphatically an opponent of foreign aid as presently conceived and employed by the liberal socialistic bureaucrats who use it as a tool and instrument to foster elaborate state planning and public ownership—the essentials of socialism instead of private enterprise and freedom of individual choice—the essentials of our own society.

Academically, the liberals seek to justify their socialistic foreign aid policies by insisting that the underdeveloped nations of the mid-20th century are so poor that the normal process of capital accumulation; private investment and trade, which have promoted economic growth through history, no longer function. MIT Prof. P. A. Samuelson, made their point when he said:

> Production is so low that they can spare nothing for capital formation, by which their standard of living could be raised ("Textbook Economics").

Gunnar Myrdal proposes a "world welfare democracy"—American Scholar, volume 26, spring 1957, pages 139–154—and says:

> Apparently nobody in the advanced countries sees any way out of the difficulties which are mounting in the underdeveloped countries than the socialistic ones.

But in developing their favorite theme—namely, that the peoples of the underdeveloped countries are caught up in an "unbreakable and vicious circle of poverty" which defies all hope of progress and improvement—except by means of foreign aid, through which the governments of the advanced countries, acting through the governments of the so-called depressed countries, promote more and more nationalized planning, control and ownership, these liberal intellectuals and bureaucrats choose to consider only such evidence as seems to suit their own bias favor of socialism, and blatently ignore the whole body of hard facts that make a most favorable case for private enterprise. For example: to begin with, if, as Professor Samuelson argues, these people are so poor they can spare nothing to invest in private capital development, how can they spare any more, by way of taxes, for their governments to use for these same purposes as public capital development? Indeed, far less so, I would say, since the excessive overhead cost of government—there, as here—invariably make the provisions of goods and services through government more costly than their production privately.

Secondly, if the people of these underdeveloped lands cannot supply the capital for their own development, and if it must be done by foreign aid from the advanced countries, why should we not logically expect our bureaucrats who administer this aid to seek to minimize rather than encourage national planning and socialistic statism in the areas they deal with? Why should they not place major emphasis on promoting economic systems based on limited government—the system that served their own society so well—and created the abundance they now disburse so freely? Why should they not insist, as a condition of granting aid that the recipient nations establish conditions respecting contracts and property such as would induce and permit private investors to relieve government of the prime responsibility for economic development—with enormous advantage to the people of both countries?

Thirdly, if the people of underdeveloped lands are too poor to accumulate capital on their own, this in itself imposes no insurmountable barrier to progress and in no sense distinguishes them, in the mid-20th century, from America, or the people of any other highly developed country at an earlier date in their history. All once were poor and underdeveloped—and the international flow of private capital under circumstances of mutual regard for contract and security of property supplied the local market for developmental funds. There is no economic aspect or peculiar poverty of the underdeveloped countries that renders invalid for them the same tried and proven methods that produced progress and affluence among the advanced societies of our modern world. The problem is, Mr. Speaker, that so many of their planners and manipulators—as well as our own—have become inoculated with the Marxist virus of active hostility toward our capitalistic system of private enterprise—and they seek to disguise their enthusiastic bias in favor of socialism as a logical necessity born of peculiar circumstances. I say that the facts bear out no such conclusion. The problem is that so many of our planners—and theirs—continue to emphasize, not what private enterprise can do, but what government ought to do. In such an atmosphere the American system of private enterprise never has a chance abroad.

Our Government is charged with the encouragement of free enterprise and private participation by virtue of section 601 of our foreign aid legislation and certain progress was made during the 87th Congress toward making our foreign aid dollars stand as collateral for the expropriation of American property in foreign countries.

Along these lines and in furtherance of the comments which I have made today, I have today introduced here in the House an amendment which would require that all U.S. foreign aid funds be spent for American goods and services, if available. This measure should substantially improve our present unfavorable balance of trade, reduce the drain on our gold reserves and put a stop to the criminal negligence of our present policy which allows U.S. aid funds to be spent in a rival market, including those of the Communist world itself.

I have also introduced legislation today which would require that 50 percent of all foreign aid funds be specifically earmarked to promote investment in the private enterprise system of the recipient countries—a system of loans to private individuals and groups as distinguished from Government-owned plants; that is, socialism.

If we want American leadership to prevail in these areas, we had better see to it that our agents quit peddling the Marxist patent medicine of socialism and honestly clarify in the minds of these people the true image of the American free society.

CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Hon. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, of Illinois, has been most active in behalf of the people of captive nations, and is an outstanding and consistent spokesman for their right to self-determination.

Mr. DERWINSKI was the principal speaker at the St. Louis Captive Nations Week rally on Saturday, July 13, 1963. Among his profound statements is included a request that the U.N. make an inquiry into Red military control of Eastern Europe. The following editorial, "Get With It, Mr. DERWINSKI," in the July 22, 1963, issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat is not only interesting but of value to every Member of this House.

GET WITH IT, MR. DERWINSKI

U.S. Representative EDWARD J. DERWINSKI has suggested that Congress and the United Nations take up the issue of colonialism in earnest. Before delighted liberals scramble for the attic to get out the old anticolonialist placards, they should know the Illinois Republican has in mind a review of Soviet colonialism in Eastern Europe.

Mr. DERWINSKI asks that the U.N. make an inquiry into Red military control of Eastern Europe; he asks that Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America expand their programs in this area; he asks for creation of a congressional committee to look into the issue of these captive states.

This committee would hear testimony of refugees to determine the extent of the loss of their human rights. Mr. DERWINSKI also proposes a vigorous propaganda offensive against the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

Great Scott, we weren't sure there were any like him left.

U Thant says we must recognize changes for the good in the Soviet bloc. Just because Khrushchev sends in Stalin tanks to retain his Stalin-built empire does not mean he is even faintly like the evil old Stalin.

The administration has told us to get modern. Don't emphasize those sticky points of disagreement such as military subjugation of free nations or denial of human rights—get with it and emphasize things we agree on like Van Cliburn, and the Bolshoi Ballet, and an uninspected moratorium on atmospheric testing.

Why go and irritate the Soviets by letting them know there is a little matter of 100 million Eastern Europeans under their boot?

How are we ever going to get any "constructive, meaningful accords" with Soviet leaders if every time they try to seize a Cuba, a Laos, a Venezuela, a Vietnam, we "inflame the atmosphere" with some nasty protest?

REVISION OF THE IMMIGRATION LAWS

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the administration's new proposals to revise the immigration laws. A revision of our immigration policy is long overdue. I believe that President Kennedy's proposals represent a giant step forward in the creation of a sensible and humane immigration policy.

From the beginning of our history our country was looked upon by the oppressed throughout the world as a haven of freedom—as a land where all men could develop their potentialities in a free democratic society. However, after World War I, fear, hysteria, and anxiety gripped our land, and a wave of xenophobia swept over the country. As a result a highly restrictive immigration policy based on the 1920 census was instituted. That policy is still with us today and is discriminatory and unrealistic. As long as racial and national origin discrimination remains enshrined in the immigration laws, those laws constitute an affront to our democratic principles.

The legislation I have introduced today will go a long way toward the creation of an immigration policy which is consonant with our traditions and beliefs.

Under this bill the results of the 1920 census will no longer shape our immigration policy. The bill abolishes the invidious national origin quota system over a 5-year period. It also deals intelligently with the backlog of applications built up over the years in a number of our consulates abroad by providing for the administration of those on the waiting list during the transitional period and by weeding out those who are not serious applicants and who have registered only so that, if they should ever wish to come to the United States, they could do so without waiting.

The bill will serve the national interest by permitting the admission on a preferential basis of those whose skills would be advantageous to the economy, without the necessity of first persuading an individual employer to hire a particular employee sight unseen.

The bill will simplify the administration of the immigration laws in many areas.

The bill will end discrimination against the newer nations in the Western Hemisphere whose citizens are now bound by minimum quotas, whereas the citizens of other nations in the same geographic area are entitled to nonquota admission.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation proposed will not solve all problems in the immigration area. However, its passage will be a significant step in the right direction. I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation and hope that it will receive approval in the very near future.

ANOTHER BELT ON THE CHIN

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning's newspaper carried an account of a bitter condemnation of the United States by the Soviet Ambassador to the United Nations. The Russian representative charged that the United States had been laggard in the struggle to end colonialism in Africa. He charged that NATO powers were "teaching Portugal's forces how to fight the Africans." He said that the United States was an accomplice and abettor of alleged Portuguese atrocities in Africa.

According to the newspaper article, most of Ambassador Fedorenko's speech was devoted to an attack on members of NATO, "particularly the United States."

This speech points up the strange double standard of the United Nations in the field of colonialism and it also emphasizes the contradictory nature of the policy of the United States.

At the present time, our officials are walking on tiptoe on the question of Soviet colonialism in Eastern Europe. Nothing must be said to disturb the Soviets who are alleged to be sponsoring a "thaw" in some of the captive countries. Attacks on scandalous abuses in the fields of civil rights and personal liberties must be held back lest we offend Mr. Khrushchev and cause him, once again, to tighten the screws.

At the same time, in the United Nations we have permitted the gradual elimination of the Hungarian question as a matter of importance while giving Portugal, our ally, a healthy belt on the chin with our position on the resolution on African colonialism.

I refer to these matters to emphasize that the U.S. policy does not accomplish its objective. Our reticence on the subject of European colonialism is not meant to condone this policy, I am sure, but is apparently made in the belief that it will bring about on the part of the Russians, reciprocation and tolerance of our difficulties and liberalization of restrictions.

From the instances which I have cited, this result has obviously not been achieved, for the Russians smite us hip and thigh whenever the opportunity presents. Since the position of our Portuguese ally in Africa is a delicate one and presents us with a conflict between our desire for security and our traditional support of self-determination, this is an area of great sensitivity and one which confronts us with possible embarrassment.

Regardless of the thaw, however and regardless of the currently smiling Russian faces in Moscow, the Soviet Ambassador wades in and hits us about the head as many times as he can. Should we not criticize the Russians for abetting white colonialism in Europe as they criticize us for abetting colonialism of the blacks in Africa?

"HOW PERMANENT IS TEMPORARY?"

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker in thinking about the bracero program, I often begin to wonder, "How permanent is temporary?"

I wonder because the bracero program has always been called a temporary one by many advocates. Yet, to read the arguments for the bracero program, it is easy to see that "temporary" really means "permanent." We are told that there will not be any tomatoes next year unless the bracero program is extended. Now would there be any sugar beets, or any more of almost anything?

Quite frankly, we need to admit to ourselves that only a very small percentage of farmers in this country use braceros—less than 2 percent. But these 1½ percent tell me that the whole farm economy is going to explode unless they can have some temporary help.

My feeling is that if 98 percent or so of U.S. farmers can get along without bracero labor, so can the rest.

Let us be honest with ourselves. The "temporary" bracero program has gone on long enough.

PANAMA CANAL: POLICY MUST BE REAFFIRMED

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years, Members of the Congress, engaged in the defense of U.S. rights, power, and authority over the Canal Zone territory and the Panama Canal, have sought in vain among the mass news media for a competent treatment of some phase of the crucial isthmian question. What until recently had appeared unlikely has now occurred in a Western newspaper.

In a series of seven articles in the June 16–22, 1963, issues of the Arizona Republic, of Phoenix, Ariz., Edwin McDowell, of its editorial department, deals extensively with recent isthmian history of United States-Panama relations affecting the Panama Canal and the question of sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

In contrast to many reporters who visit the Canal Zone without preparation, view the Panama Canal from a car window during a train ride across the isthmus, listen to unverified stories from a few isthmian gossips, and return promptly to the United States to write a news story in haste, Mr. McDowell obviously studied his subject before going to Panama, found out what to seek, and verified information supplied him. The results of his efforts, with the principal features of which I concur, are not only refreshing to read, but also a credit to the newspaper which gave him the opportunity. There are, however, some statements and observations of minor character to which valid objections could be made should need arise and certain conclusions with which I do not agree.

The series ends with the telling assertion:

> The entire world is watching and waiting to see what the next U.S. move will be.

Mr. Speaker, in commenting on this statement, I would emphasize that the next move of our country is obvious: The clarification and reaffirmation by the Congress of U.S. interoceanic canal policy by prompt adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 105, introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The indicated series follows:

[From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Arizona Republic, June 16, 1963]

TROUBLE BREWS IN PANAMA—SOVEREIGNTY OVER CANAL ZONE IS OMINOUS ISSUE

(By Edwin McDowell)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In the always volatile Caribbean area, now menaced by an increasingly lively traffic of subsersives to and from Castro's Cuba, the story of what has been happening in the crucially important Panama Canal Zone has often been pushed into the background in recent months.

(For some time now, United States-Panama relations have been heading on a collision course over the issue of the Panama Canal. To discover just what is at stake in Panama, and what the future holds for the United States, the Republic sent Editorial Writer Edwin McDowell to the Central American Republic for a first-hand look.)

PANAMA CITY, PANAMA.—It may not be apparent to casual visitors to Panama, those who merely stop over briefly in this hot, humid nation linking North and South America, but trouble is definitely brewing.

Beneath the surface in this steaming jungle republic, tension is building up that is certain to have worldwide repercussions.

And the issue remains that which long has complicated United States-Panama relations: Which nation is sovereign in the Canal Zone, that strip of land running 40 miles across the breadth of Panama 5 miles on either side of the Panama Canal?

Except for a noisy anti-U.S. demonstration last October by Panamanian students, who were egged on by nationalists and Communists, there have been no outward signs of deep-rooted anti-U.S. sentiment—certainly nothing comparable to the screaming howling mob which 4 years ago surged into the Canal Zone intending to hoist the Panamanian flag.

But outward signs present an incomplete picture. For the Spanish-language newspapers here constantly and brutally lash the Canal Zone and the United States. And, not surprisingly, Panamanian politicians have made the United States the principal target of their election campaigns, each one trying to outdo the other in denouncing Uncle Sam.

That's why tension, on both sides, is mounting.

And it is likely to rise even higher sometime after Wednesday when an important legal issue is expected to be acted on in U.S. District Court in the Canal Zone.

The issue is a lawsuit brought by a U.S. citizen of the zone against Army Maj. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., Governor of the Canal Zone.

The question which must be decided is whether the Governor acted lawfully last October when he ordered the Panamanian flag to be flown alongside the U.S. flag in selected sites in the zone, a reservation over which the United States, under terms of a treaty signed 60 years ago, has exercised complete and exclusive sovereignty.

Gerald Doyle, who brought the suit, and who has the backing of virtually all the nearly 4,000 U.S. employees of the Canal Zone, maintains that the procedure was illegal and that it was carried out without due process of law, to the detriment of U.S. citizens.

Doyle's lawyers claim that the Governor, upon reading that an agreement had been reached between President Kennedy and Panama President Roberto F. Chiari for the joint display of the United States-Panamanian flags in the Canal Zone, directed his executive assistant to formulate a plan making it possible to carry out the agreement.

Yet under U.S.-flag law, Doyle's attorneys contend, a foreign flag cannot be displayed in U.S. territory in a position of equal or superior prominence to that of the U.S. flag, hence the joint display of flags in the Canal Zone is illegal.

Fleming's lawyers argue that the Governor acted under Presidential authority.

Recently, in moving for dismissal of the suit, they filed a State Department brief contesting Doyle's suit, attached to which was a certified copy of a White House press release, signed by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, announcing the displaying of Panama's flag in the zone.

If the court dismisses the suit, it will end the controversy in the local court.

If it finds for Doyle, the suit will come to trial at a later date. But instead of settling the present Canal Zone controversy, a decision in Doyle's favor will most likely exacerbate tensions, especially in view of the coming Panamanian presidential elections.

"Unless Panama wins that lawsuit, I shudder to think what might happen. But I'm willing to bet that there will be anti-U.S. riots as bad as those in 1959."

So spoke Luis Noli, a Panamanian educated in U.S. schools in the Canal Zone. His words cannot be dismissed lightly. For Noli, Associated Press correspondent in Panama, is generally acknowledged to be a knowledgeable, objective observer.

And he recognizes, as does every other serious observer in Panama, that the Doyle lawsuit involves far more than the surface issue of whether the Panamanian flag will fly in the Canal Zone.

It involves, basically, the entire question of U.S. policy toward the Panama Canal, that U.S.-built engineering miracle which links the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, that vital trade artery which speeds the world's economic pulse by obviating a 7,000-mile trip around Cape Horn.

For in fact the Panamanian flag has been flying alongside the U.S. ensign in at least one spot in the Canal Zone ever since President Eisenhower, on September 17, 1960, directed that it be raised as visual evidence of Panama's titular sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

This directive was issued even though just 7 months earlier the House of Representatives voted 381 to 12 that any variation in the traditional interpretation of the three United States-Panama treaties, with reference to matters of territorial sovereignty, be made solely pursuant to treaty—a vote clearly aimed at preventing the raising of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone.

Furthermore, the House also unanimously passed an appropriations bill denying the use of any funds in that bill for erecting a flagpole or any other contrivance for the flying of a flag in an attempt to undermine U.S. sovereignty.

This was done because the House felt sure that the Senate, bowing to State Department pressure, would be reluctant to pass a bill reaffirming U.S. sovereignty in the Canal Zone. Predictably, the bill was bottled up in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The question at issue now is the future of the canal and the Canal Zone.

Many U.S. residents of the Canal Zone, as well as Representatives DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, BOB CASEY, Democrat, of Texas, and WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, fear that the United States is acting unwisely in bowing to increased Panamanian demands.

"The State Department is determined to hand the canal over to Panama, lock, stock and barrel," the wife of a Canal Zone engineer recently told me. "They're so scared of the United States being called colonialists or exploiters in the United Nations that they're prepared to surrender what is rightfully ours."

Both the State Department and Joseph S. Farland, U.S. Ambassador to Panama, deny any such intention. Farland, in an interview at the U.S. Embassy here, said the decision allowing Panama to fly its flag in the Canal Zone does not involve the surrender of any U.S. sovereignty. "It merely removes an irritant which impedes United States-Panama relations," he commented.

Critics here and in the Canal Zone counter by saying that each U.S. concession serves only to whet the appetites of Panamanian nationalists and politicians.

They point to the fact that although there have been two major revisions of the original United States-Panama treaty (about which more will be said tomorrow), Panama continues to demand more.

They point to testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on January 15, 1960, in which George H. Roderick, Assistant Secretary of the Army, was asked if we allowed the Panamanian flag to be flown in the Canal Zone today would we be confronted with another demand tomorrow.

Roderick replied: "I would say that history confirms your suggestion."

Furthermore, these critics of U.S. policy toward Panama feel that a recent editorial in the London Times, which charged that the United States "apparently lacks a firm policy in its dealings with Panama over the Canal Zone," vindicates their position.

A "firmer policy, defining in more precise terms exactly what the United States is prepared to grant * * * would command more respect * * * than a continuing series of concessions granted only in response to growing Panamanian clamor," the Times said.

[From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Arizona Republic, June 17, 1963]

Tension in Panama Influenced by Past

(By Edwin McDowell)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Here is the second article in a firsthand report on the growing tension in relations between the United States and Panama. The crux of the problem is Panama's effort to chip away at U.S. sovereignty in the crucially important Canal Zone. Today's installment is a carefully researched and reported account of the fascinating events leading up to the present situation.)

PANAMA CITY, PANAMA.—It is all but impossible to understand the present controversy over the Panama Canal without first knowing something of the fascinating background of this sparsely populated Republic connecting North and South America at Costa Rica and Colombia.

Colonized by Spain under King Ferdinand, Panama underwent a series of invasions and conquests until 1821, when it voluntarily joined Colombia (until 1863 known as New Granada).

But even that relationship proved to be as unstable as a Hollywood marriage, and from 1850 until 1902 there were 53 major uprisings in Panama.

Balboa, Columbus, Cortez, even Goethe and Henry Clay, long had envisioned a waterway connecting the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean.

But it wasn't until the Spanish-American War in 1898, when the warship *Oregon* had to sail around South America to join the U.S. fleet at Santiago, that the need for such a waterway was brought to the attention of the U.S. public.

The following year President McKinley appointed an Isthmian Canal Commission, which examined prospective sites and, like earlier investigating committees, reported in favor of a waterway through Nicaragua.

Meanwhile the second French group which tried to build a canal across this wild, mountainous land finally decided to give up, and was understandably eager to unload its investment on the first group foolish enough to make it an offer.

Toward that end, it hired a New York lobbyist and lawyer, William Cromwell, to sell Congress on the advantages of selecting Panama for a waterway.

Cromwell immediately began an anti-Nicaraguan propaganda campaign in the United States. His cause was aided immeasurably when President Theodore Roosevelt was mistakenly persuaded that a sea-level canal could be constructed through Panama (whereas locks would be a certainty through Nicaragua), and when the French company contributed $60,000 to the Republican campaign fund, via political boss Marc Hanna.

Shortly afterward the Canal Commission made a supplementary report advocating the Panama route. And the Spooner bill subsequently authorized President Roosevelt to acquire rights and property of the French canal company for $40 million.

But Colombia, which still owned the Isthmus of Panama, objected, partly because it hoped to collect $10 million from France, and partly because it was incensed by President Roosevelt's thinly veiled warning that it ratify the Hay-Herran pact.

Colombia's refusal pleased lawyer Cromwell, who hoped to share in the $10 million. And he decided a revolution would be required to free Panama from Colombia.

Even before the Hay-Herran Treaty had been submitted to the Colombian Government, a Cromwell-inspired story appeared in the New York World giving details about the forthcoming revolution in Panama, even mentioning the exact date it would occur.

After Colombia rejected the treaty, Cromwell, together with Philippe Buneau-Varilla, French engineer and principal in the second French canal company, chose five employees of the Panama railroad company to incite the revolution.

Colombia dispatched a gunboat to Colon, intending to quell the revolution. But President Roosevelt conveniently remembered that an 1846 treaty with Colombia bound the United States to "protect the right-of-way or transit across the Isthmus of Panama."

Whereupon, declaring that his purpose was to keep the isthmus open in the event of civil war, Roosevelt dispatched the cruiser *Nashville*, armed with marines, "to prevent the landing of any armed force with hostile intent."

This display of U.S. force, together with $100,000 in bribes, convinced Colombian officials to abandon their claim to Panama.

Thus on November 3, 1903, exactly as the New York World story had predicted, the new Republic declared its independence.

Three days later the United States accorded the new nation diplomatic recognition. And on November 18, it signed a treaty with Panama outlining terms for constructing the canal.

The following year the constitution (which had been written in America) went into effect and the country was launched on its independent existence.

Looking back on the Panama revolution years later, Teddy Roosevelt boasted in his autobiography, "I took Panama without consulting the Cabinet."

(Bothered by a guilty conscience, the United States in 1922 agreed to pay Colombia $25 million, ostensibly in settlement of claims for use of Colombian property. In return, Colombia recognized the title to the canal and railroad "is now vested entirely and absolutely in the United States of America." And it also recognized Panama as an independent nation.)

In subsequent years, Theodore Roosevelt's "big stick" policy toward Latin America gave way to the "good-neighbor" policy of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Under terms of the 1936-39 Hull-Alfaro Treaty, the United States renounced its right to maintain public order here outside the Canal Zone, surrendered its right of eminent domain for acquiring property needed for canal purposes, and raised the annual annuity to Panama from $250,000 to $430,000.

(Unfortunately, the United States also relinquished its right to erect defense bases outside the Canal Zone. And less than 2 months after the treaty, with the outbreak of World War II, the United States paid more than $1 million for the right to build defenses on land it had previously owned, with the stipulation that all defense installations would become the property of Panama 1 year after the war.)

The Eisenhower-Remon Treaty of 1955 continued the good-neighbor policy by granting similar concessions.

In addition to raising the annual annuity to $1.9 million, the United States promised to build a $20 million bridge across the Canal and promised to give Panama more than $25 million worth of real estate, including the Panama Railroad Company's yards and terminals.

Congress rejected the plan to give away the railroad, because of U.S. treaty obligations with Colombia to operate the railroad. But it sanctioned giving the railroads' yards and terminal stations for the 15-year use of the Rio Hato Air Base, a base the United States built during World War II and gave to Panama in 1948.

Four years later, in 1959, President Eisenhower signed the order allowing the Panamanian flag to fly in the Canal Zone as evidence of Panama's titular sovereignty.

And it is that decision, since expanded by President Kennedy, which is at the center of today's fears that U.S. policy toward the Panama Canal is wavering and conciliatory.

[From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Arizona Republic, June 18, 1963]

Reds Want Canal "Internationalized"

(By Edwin McDowell)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—United States-Panama relations are complicated in part by Communist strategy designed to remove the Panama Canal from U.S. control. Unsuccessful thus far, the Reds nevertheless refuse to abandon their designs on the canal.)

PANAMA CITY, PANAMA.—On October 10, 1962, Russia's Anatoly Movchan stood before the U.N. General Assembly Legal Committee and scored the United States for its alleged mistreatment of Panama.

The United States-Panama treaty, the Soviet delegate charged, is unequal and an example of the type of agreement imposed by colonialists on less-developed nations.

Russian charges of Western colonialism and imperialism have a familiar hollow ring. More often than not, they are ignored by Western statesmen.

But it would be a serious mistake to ignore Soviet concern over United States-Panama relations. And few knowledgeable officials here intend to ignore that concern. For there is ample evidence that the Communists are more than casually interested in the Panama Canal.

As early as the Bolshevik revolution, one of the professed goals of communism was someday to internationalize the canal.

In 1946, after Russia charged that U.S. defense bases around the world were visible evidences of aggression, Alger Hiss—at that time head of the State Department's Office of Political Affairs—submitted to the U.N. a list of United States "occupied territories."

His list, not accidentally, included the Panama Canal Zone.

Hiss' action was supported by Secretary of State Dean Acheson. But Spruille Braden, Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America, objected to the designation. Later he was to write:

"I was infuriated by the stupidity—which I then thought it was—of putting the Panama Canal Zone in the category of "occupied territories." But I did not realize its full significance as a play into Russian hands until after Hiss' other activities were exposed."

In 1956, the Soviet commander of the Polish armed forces told Polish Communist leaders that, "The Panama Canal has considerable advantages for the Soviet Union."

And during the International Communist Party Congress in Moscow in 1960, the Reds once again emphasized the importance of Latin American disorders in wresting the canal from the United States.

One of the more vocal advocates of Panama control of the canal is Panama Assemblywoman Thelma King, who calls herself a nationalist but who is considered by U.S. officials here and in the Canal Zone, and by Panamanians themselves, as an outright Communist.

Assemblywoman King, described by Representative Daniel J. Flood as "Castro's No. 1 representative in Panama," continues to beat the war drums, urging her countrymen to throw off the yoke of "Yankee domination" and assert their claim to the canal.

In a recent interview for NBC, Mrs. King admitted her ideological affection for Castro. And she said she believes that a "very violent revolution," in which it will be necessary to execute counter-revolutionaries, is needed in Panama.

No one I spoke with—educator, worker, politician, or businessman—expects Panama to follow Thelma King's advice.

But U.S. citizens in the Canal Zone were astonished by a recent incident which seemed to confirm fears of many of them that the United States is hoping the canal will fall without looking as though it had been pushed.

That incident was a State Department invitation to the canal for Abdel Hamid Abubakr, Secretary General of the Suez Canal Authority.

Before a joint luncheon of engineers, accountants, and employees of the comptroller's office, the United Arab Republic spokesman enthusiastically described how Egypt seized the Suez Canal during a 55-hour period in 1956. The day following his speech, one of this city's leading English-language newspapers displayed a front page picture of the United Arab Republic spokesman handing the flag of the expropriated Suez Canal to Robert Fleming, Governor of the Canal Zone.

Understandably, this performance shocked and amazed those U.S. citizens who remembered that at the time of the Suez crisis, a Panamanian delegation visited Cairo and went on record stating that "the Suez Canal belongs to Egypt and the Panama Canal belongs to Panama."

Shortly after Abubakr departed, another United Arab Republic delegate arrived in the Canal Zone, again as a guest of the State Department. This time, however, the appearance was kept out of the papers.

Both of these appearances were handled from Washington. U.S. Embassy officials here, who were as upset over the inexplicable invitations as were residents of the Canal Zone, did not know about them until after the United Arab Republic spokesmen arrived.

When they finally did learn, they protested vigorously. But a great deal of damage already had been done.

Suez and the United Arab Republic have more to do with Panama than might otherwise be thought. Shortly after Nasser seized the Suez Canal, the United States joined with Russia in demanding that the canal be internationalized by the U.N.

This move delighted the Communists, for they argued that if Suez should be internationalized, Panama should also be.

(Although the U.S. position in siding with Russia weakened America's position vis-a-vis Panama, there is a critical distinction to be made: The Suez Canal was built by a private company on territory leased under contract from Egypt, providing reversionary right to the Egyptian Government. The Panama Canal was built by the U.S. Government in a zone in which the United States was empowered to govern in perpetuity as if it were sovereign.)

The Communist strategy is to wrest the Panama Canal from the United States, either by demanding in the U.N. that the canal be internationalized, or by using their agents in Latin America to demand that the canal be handed over to Panama.

In other words, the Communists do not care who gets the Big Ditch immediately, just so long as it is taken from the United States. After that, they believe, they will obtain total control of the canal.

The Communists, of course, are not alone in demanding that the Panama Canal be internationalized.

In the past, such a course has been advocated by Senators Mansfield and Aiken, Representative James Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Adlai Stevenson, Milton Eisenhower, British Labor Party Leaders Atlee and Gaitskell, and by a Northwestern University study group.

Panama, however, rejects any such solution. "We do not favor internationalization," President Roberto F. Chiari of Panama emphatically told this reporter recently. Yet even if the United States were unwise enough to abandon the canal, it automatically would revert to full Panamanian jurisdiction.

[From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Arizona Republic, June 19, 1963]

ASSIGNMENT TO PANAMA—GOVERNOR, ENVOY CAUGHT IN MUDDLED U.S. POLICY

(By Edwin McDowell)

PANAMA CITY, PANAMA.—Appearing on a nationwide radio program, 2 weeks ago, Representative Daniel J. Flood, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, a student of Panamanian affairs, demanded the resignation of Maj. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Governor of the Canal Zone.

As President Kennedy noted at a recent press conference, Congressmen are always advising Presidents to get rid of appointed officials with whom they disagree.

In this case, however, Congressman Flood is a northern Democrat. And politicians rarely demand the resignation of officials chosen by the head of their party—in this case, by the President of the United States.

But Flood was annoyed by remarks attributed to Governor Fleming and by what he considers the erosion of U.S. sovereignty in the Canal Zone.

Perhaps better than any other congressman, Daniel Flood understands the economic, political, and psychological value of the Panama Canal to the United States.

And certainly more than any other congressman, Representative Flood has called attention to continual turmoil and potential danger in the isthmus.

* * * * *

It's true that Fleming, a graduate of both the Military Academy and MIT, arrogantly told newsmen that in the military "you could bust" a man like General Doyle, the Canal Zone resident who is suing Fleming in an effort to prevent the flying of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone.

It is also true that Fleming's personal liberal ideology caused him to denounce those who pay "blind adherence to a treaty signed 60 years ago," a "strictly legalistic interpretation" of the treaty's provisions and conservatism, which he said "should have no part in either our guide for the present or our approach for the future."

But Fleming is not a pie-in-the-sky radical waiting for the opportunity to hand the canal over to Panama.

In fact, one U.S. official in the Canal Zone, who strongly and rather colorfully criticized State Department policy in Panama, told of a meeting at which Panamanian officials demanded not only the use of their stamps in the zone (a demand already agreed to by the State Department) but the takeover of the entire zone postal system.

At that, Fleming is said to have resorted to his most expressive military vocabulary to tell the Panamanian officials the United States would never agree to such a proposal.

Furthermore, after the decision last October to fly the Panamanian flag alongside the United States flag in the Canal Zone, the flagstaff was mysteriously removed from outside Fleming's Balboa Heights residence, the Balboa police station, the civil affairs building, the Navy supply building and the Balboa fire station.

No one admits it publicly, but the suspicion here is strong that Fleming decided he would rather not fly any flag than have to fly the Panamanian flag alongside the United States standard everywhere throughout the Canal Zone.

And that, it goes without saying, is hardly the attitude of a wild-eyed internationalist bent on undermining the U.S. position.

* * * * *

Farland, a West Virginian who spent 2 years with the FBI after graduating from law school, demonstrated his character the very day he arrived in Panama, after having served as U.S. Ambassador to the Dominican Republic.

He arrived 9 months after the riots of November 3, 1959, the 56th anniversary of Panama's independence.

On that day a mob of Panamanians, led by hotheaded students, surged into the Canal Zone hoping to erect the Panamanian flag. After they were repulsed by U.S. police and soldiers armed with tear gas and bayonets, the demonstrators raced across town, smashed the front of the U.S. Information Agency office, destroyed the U.S. flag in front of the American Embassy, and hoisted their own flag.

Tension was so high for months afterward that the U.S. flag was not even raised in front of the Embassy "lest it provoke hostile demonstrations."

That is, until Ambassador Farland arrived in Panama. His first order was that the U.S. flag be raised. And it has flown ever since.

* * * * *

Since then he has traveled the length and breadth of this nation, over steep mountains and through steaming jungles, visiting slums, schools and orphanages, and generally spreading good will.

Even Gerald Doyle, whose lawsuit has angered Governor Fleming and has stirred all of Panama, speaks highly of Ambassador Farland.

"I think he is acting unwisely as far as some of his policies go," Doyle said. "But there is no question that he probably has won a number of friends for the United States here in Panama."

The fact is that both Fleming and Farland are caught in the middle of U.S. policy toward Panama which is at best ambiguous, at worst hopelessly confused.

Each is trying to carry out that policy as best he can without provoking either Panamanian extremists or Canal Zone residents who, not without reason, often feel they are being immolated on the altar of accommodation.

[From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Arizona Republic, June 20, 1963]

PANAMANIANS DEMAND CANAL ZONE SOVEREIGNTY

(By Edwin McDowell)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Panamanian politicians and newspapers ceaselessly rail against the treaty which established the canal. The following interview with President Chiari tells what Panama hopes for and expects from the United States. Fifth in a series.)

PANAMA CITY, PANAMA.—"Panama does not want control over the canal. But we do want a new treaty. We haven't received satisfactory economic compensation."

So said Roberto F. Chiari, President of Panama, in an interview in the Palace of Herons.

The United States, President Chiari said, does not own the Canal Zone; it merely leases it from Panama. And its lease gives it the right to construct, defend, and maintain a canal.

But the President, a taciturn, blunt man, made no effort to disguise his country's unhappiness with the present treaty. In fact, he stated categorically that a new treaty, according increased benefits to Panama, is necessary.

The $1.9 million annual annuity is simply not enough, Panamanian officials contend.

They point to the money the United States has given Communist Poland ($522.6 million from July 1, 1945 to June 30, 1962) and Yugoslavia ($2.3 billion) compared with what it has given Panama ($100 million) during that same period.

And they point to other demands they feel should be met by the United States. Chief among them is that the United States recognize Panama's sovereignty over the Canal Zone. This, President Chiari said, would provide unequivocally for the flying of the Panamanian flag in the zone. And it would mean that both nations, not just the United States, would make decisions affecting the canal.

Other demands mentioned by President Chiari include:

Mixed courts in the Canal Zone; use of Panamanian postage in the zone; greater opportunities for Panamanian products in the zone; dock and port facilities at U.S. expense; establishment of Spanish as an official language of the Canal Zone, along with English; and that the U.S. Government withhold Panama taxes of Panamanian citizens who work in the Canal Zone.

A cynical Canal Zone resident told me that all Panamanian demands can be satisfied by just two words: "more money."

But that is an oversimplification which ignores the Panamanian national temperament.

For the local newspapers and politicians have made the canal their principal whipping boy, just as unimaginative U.S. candidates regularly lash out at unnamed "special interests."

And with a presidential election just around the corner, in May 1964, the campaign against Uncle Sam is certain to increase in tempo and invective throughout this nation.

President Chiari is not alone in his belief that Panama has complete sovereignty over the Canal Zone; Panama's U.N. delegate makes the same claim.

And just 2 months ago Panama Foreign Minister Galileo Solis warned that President Chiari is planning to take "radical action" unless a joint United States-Panama commission, meeting weekly since last June at the instigation of Presidents Kennedy and Chiari, arrived at agreeable solutions.

Asked what form this "radical action" would take, President Chiari denied knowing what Foreign Minister Solis had in mind. But he insisted that "reform is long overdue" and "Panamanians are becoming impatient."

Impatient or not, most Panamanians I talked with, except those professional anti-Yankee demagogues, readily admit the extent of the U.S. contribution to their economy.

In 1962 for example, total Canal Zone payments to Panama amounted to $85.2 million, or $18.4 million more than the entire Panamanian national budget for that year.

Furthermore, because of U.S. sanitation methods throughout the Republic, this is the one Central American nation where it is possible to drink or eat anything without having to worry about contracting severe intestinal disorders.

Panamanians have the highest annual per capita income of any Central American people (almost $300), and have a higher life expectancy than any other Latin people, again, thanks to the presence of the United States.

Human nature being what it is, however, it is always more popular to find fault with a person or a nation for real or alleged abuses, rather than honor them for whatever benefits they may have bestowed.

This accounts for the continuing agitation against Uncle Sam sparked by politicians, nationalists, and a tightly disciplined handful of Communists concentrated here in Panama City.

Last September, Foreign Minister Solis made what the New York Times described as "a bitter and unexpected attack" on the United States-Panama treaty, calling it "humiliating, injurious, unjust, and inequitable."

On October 5, the Panama National Assembly adopted a resolution recommending that a new $20 million U.S. bridge across the canal in nearby Balboa be designated the "Bridge of the Americas." And it suggested that Panamanian officials refuse to accept correspondence referring to the structure by any other name.

During the October 12 dedication of the mile-long bridge (named for former Representative Maurice Thatcher, of Kentucky, who headed the Canal Zone's civil administration during the canal's construction years), student demonstrators disrupted the ceremonies by displaying pro-Castro, and anti-U.S. signs and banners, by chanting anti-U.S. slogans, and by proclaiming Panamanian sovereignty over the canal.

To their credit, most Panamanians in attendance were embarrassed by and unsympathetic toward the demonstrators. But the outburst was effective in disrupting Under Secretary of State George Ball's dedication speech and in preventing the guest of honor, Maurice Thatcher, from making previously announced comments.

Finally, when members of the Latin American Subcommittee of the U.S. House Foreign Affairs Committee were guests of the National Assembly here late last year, they were confronted with a lengthy list of demands, including the demand that Panama exercise sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

Several House Members later said they were tempted to walk out. And Representative ARMISTEAD SELDEN, Jr., Democrat, of Alabama, chairman of the group, said he considered the address unusual for a welcoming speech.

Panama's claim of sovereignty over the canal runs head on into the fact that since the time John Hay signed the treaty with Panama establishing the canal, the United States has considered itself completely and solely sovereign in the Canal Zone. "Titular sovereignty," William Howard Taft scoffed, was only a "barren scepter" with a "poetic and sentimental" appeal to the Latin mind.

Secretary of State Hughes in 1923 said the United States "would never recede from the position it had taken from the note of Secretary Hay in 1904."

And Philippe Bunau-Varilla, who on behalf of Panama signed the treaty which he coauthored with a U.S. lawyer who was later appointed counsel to the Panama Legation in Washington, wrote in his book in 1913 that, "I decided to grant a concession of sovereignty en bloc.'

But it would be all but impossible today to get any Panamanian in any position of influence to admit that total sovereignty over the Canal Zone resides in the United States, especially when the newspapers, in unholy alliance with politicians and rabble rousers, keep up an endless campaign of distortion and misrepresentation designed to set Panama against the United States.

[From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Arizona Republic, June 21, 1963]

WHY THE "UGLY AMERICAN" IMAGE?

(By Edwin McDowell)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Causes of friction between Panama and the United States and between the U.S. State Department and U.S. citizens of the Canal Zone, are explained in the following article. Sixth of seven parts.)

BALBOA, CANAL ZONE, PANAMA.—I had been warned against the man sitting across the table from me in the Tivoli Hotel.

The manager of a U.S. bank in Panama City, a U.S. citizen who has spent 11 years in Latin America, told me that Gerald A. Doyle epitomized all that was wrong with the United States.

"Doyle represents the reactionary, chauvinistic approach to U.S. problems," the bank manager said. "It's guys like him, who are always trying to keep the foreigner in his place, who are responsible for the 'ugly American' concept most foreigners have of us."

As I listened to Doyle explain his reasons for suing the Governor of the Canal Zone in an effort to stop him from flying the Panamanian flag alongside the United States flag in the zone, he sounded not at all like the ogre described by the banker.

"I brought this lawsuit myself," Doyle, chief architect in the Canal Zone, explained. "But when it became apparent that lawyers' fees would be more than I could handle, a group of my coworkers set up the 'Gerald A. Doyle Flag Fund.' We've raised something like $8,000, and we're in good shape financially."

Why had Doyle, who holds a master's degree from Harvard and who teaches math at the Canal Zone College, decided to sue the Governor?

"Things had just gone too far," he explained. "I've been here 15 years, and during that time I've watched one after another of our country's rights being given away to satisfy Panamanian demands.

"But nothing the United States has done has quieted those demands. Each concession has only created increased demands. First (President Dwight) Eisenhower allowed Panama to fly its flag at one location in the zone; now Kennedy has decided Panama can fly its flag wherever the U.S. flag is flown in the zone. And even that has not begun to satisfy the Panamanians, who ultimately want control of the Canal Zone."

Doyle, who says he was a stanch Kennedy supporter in 1960, is not alone in his disillusionment.

A longtime U.S. resident of Panama City, who confessed to being a very liberal Democrat, explained, "The United States has been spongy on the canal issue; we're losing the canal by nibbling process. I'm sure the State Department intends to draw a line somewhere, and tell the Panamanians they can't go beyond it. But unless these concessions are stopped immediately, I'm afraid the State

Department is going to find it will be too late to draw that line."

Contrary to the warning I had been given, Doyle is not xenophobic. He admits he is proud of being an American, "just as Bostonians are proud who think the world centers around Cambridge Square, or New Yorkers who think it centers around Times Square."

Some of his ideas, however, are far more broadminded than any I had heard from even U.S. businessmen living outside the Canal Zone, who with few exceptions dislike the zonians and, as a consequence, side with Panama.

* * * * *

A principal reason U.S. citizens working in Panama dislike their fellow Americans in the Canal Zone is because the zonians live in a socialized state—a genuine "womb to tomb" existence—from which all others are excluded.

Doyle concedes that theirs is a socialized state. But, like other zonians I talked with (who, I am told, represent the minority viewpoint), he thinks the socialistic features of the Canal Zone should be eliminated and that free enterprise be given free reign.

"It's incongruous to fight socialism abroad and foster it in the Canal Zone," he said. But think of the advantage of having an enclave of North Americanism to export from Central America, to counter the spread of communism from Cuba and British Guiana.

"Think of the advantage to the United States if we were to establish a University of the Americas in the Canal Zone, which all qualified Panamanian students could attend. It would be of infinitely more value than any number of Peace Corps or any number of Alliances for Progress."

Like most zonians, Doyle believes the U.S. citizen in the Canal Zone has been made a whipping boy of not only the Panamanians, but of the State Department and of U.S. citizens who live outside the zone.

It has been suggested that the reason those Americans dislike the zonians is because they are denied the subsidized benefits the Canal Zone residents enjoy.

Doyle, however, believes it is because they are adversely influenced by Panamanian newspapers, which continually berate the United States, especially the zonian.

And he, like other Canal Zone residents I spoke with, denies the oft-repeated charge that the zonians generally remain aloof.

Most of his coworkers, Doyle said, have learned Spanish and do their best to establish friendly relationships with Panamanians.

Where they fail, more often than not, it is because of a wide economic gulf, not because of any ethnic or linguistic differences.

[From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Arizona Republic, June 22, 1963]

U.S. Canal "Line" Needed—State Department Stalling for Time

(By Edwin McDowell)

(Editor's Note.—In this seventh and final article, our reporter presents his conclusions from an on-the-spot investigation of the situation in the Panama Canal Zone. They add up to a U.S. formula for preventing further trouble over the Panama Canal.)

Panama City, Panama.—The essence of Greek tragedy, Yale Classicist Richmond Lattimore once wrote, is not that it is between good and evil, but that it is between good and good.

That perhaps is an imprecise analogy to apply to United States-Panamanian differences over the Canal Zone.

Yet there is no question but what both sides have cause for legitimate complaint.

In the past the United States often acted foolishly and disdainfully in its dealings with Panama. But, a Panamanian newsman assured me, Uncle Sam has since bent over backwards—"too damn far backwards," is the way a U.S. citizen here phrased it—in an effort to expiate its past sins.

Nevertheless, there remains much the United States can do.

For one thing, the $1.9 million annual annuity paid to Panama could be and probably deserves to be raised substantially.

The Spanish language should perhaps be compulsory in Canal Zone schools.

Canal Zone tests for positions which do not require mastery of the English language could be printed in Spanish.

* * * * *

None of these concessions, however, is likely to quiet Panamanian demands for more—more of everything its politicians think it can wangle from Uncle Sam.

After Hanson Baldwin, New York Times military analyst, did a brilliant series on Panama, the Times (reversing its previous position) last year correctly noted that "a case can be made—indeed a House committee has made it—that the repeated concessions made by the United States have increased tension, not quieted it."

Furthermore, the Times properly pointed out the military, economic, political, and psychological importance of the Canal to the United States, not just in Latin America but throughout the world.

It is true that the United States is studying the possibility of building a sea level canal, possibly across Nicaragua, through northern Colombia, even across the Tehuantepec Isthmus in Mexico.

But chances are that a new sea level canal suggested 2 years ago by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will be built in the Darien Province of eastern Panama, where engineers can dig the canal with nuclear explosives.

Speaking at a science symposium last week, Dr. Gerald W. Johnson, assistant to the Secretary of Defense, said a new canal can be dug with nuclear explosives at one-seventh the cost of conventional methods.

Dr. Johnson, formerly of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, said that a 1,000-foot-wide sea level canal could be blasted across the isthmus for $750 million. The cost of a 600-foot-wide canal using normal construction procedures would be more than $5 billion, he estimated.

Furthermore, he said atom-blasting a canal would probably require only one-half the time of conventional construction.

If and when Congress decides on a new canal, the current controversy over the Panama Canal will become meaningless.

For a new canal will require a new treaty, and it is unlikely that the United States will agree to a treaty whose language would ever leave room for doubt (as Panama claims the original treaty leaves room for doubt) or whose terms were opposed to U.S. interests.

Until such time, however, the present canal remains a vital defense lifeline in the type of limited warfare military experts predict for the future.

For even while giant U.S. aircraft carriers are too wide for the 110-foot-wide locks, Polaris submarines and other missile-carrying vessels can transit the canal with ease.

During the October blockade of Cuba, 26 U.S. warships went through the canal in a 12-hour period, underscoring the passageway's importance not only to the United States but to the entire free world.

It is impossible to know just how far the State Department plans to go in acceding to Panamanian demands.

Except for a hint that at least someone in the State Department probably envisions turning the entire canal over to Panama (as evidenced by a State Department invitation to the canal to a United Arab Republic delegate, who described how Egypt seized control of the Suez Canal), the most likely explanation seems to be that the State Department is stalling for time.

Because a new canal soon will be necessary, the State Department apparently feels that by giving in gradually to Panamanian demands it will satisfy Panama without really jeopardizing U.S. interests. After all, the thinking seems to be, what will it matter giving Panama sovereignty over a canal that soon will be outdated?

If that is the State Department's thinking, it is uniformly opposed by U.S. citizens in the Canal Zone and by others who feel that by acceding to unwarranted demands in Panama, the United States establishes a bad precedent elsewhere—in nations where it is impossible to arrive at a successful denouement by making one concession after another and then blithely pulling up stakes and moving elsewhere.

Furthermore, it greatly annoys Canal Zone residents who feel they are unwitting pawns in a cynical game.

What, then, should be done?

Perhaps the most important move the United States could make would be for President Kennedy, with the backing of both Houses of Congress, to state categorically just where the United States intends to draw the line.

Once U.S. citizens in the Canal Zone were assured that the United States does not plan to desert them, once they were assured that the United States is determined to retain control of the canal, it would give them an enormous psychological lift.

And once Panama realizes that there is a limit beyond which the United States cannot be pushed, it should go a long way toward quieting the strident Panamanian nationalists.

In any event, the United States must not even consider abandoning the Panama Canal until such time as a new canal becomes operative—even, as Hanson Baldwin suggested, if the defense of the canal must be guaranteed by force.

For the Panama Canal, no less than Berlin or Formosa, is considered a barometer for measuring U.S. resolution—for measuring our determination to stand fast, or to pursue a policy solely because it is right and just, regardless of who may disagree.

The entire world is watching and waiting to see what the next U.S. move will be.

EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION: A LEGACY OF THE UTAH PIONEERS

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, 116 years ago today, July 24, 1847, a unique and significant milestone in American history was reached when the Mormon colonizer and church president, Brigham Young, leading a first company of 148 persons, including 3 women and 2 children, traveling with 72 prairie schooners drawn by mules, horses, and oxen, entered the Salt Lake Valley in what was then Mexican territory, to colonize a desert. A desert characterized by the Rocky Mountain trapper of the era, Jim Bridger, as "a lot of salt flats and a dead sea," and concerning which he offered to give "$1,000 for the first corn ripened in the open air there."

In the year following, in 1848, the United States acquired title to the territory from Mexico.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

About 2,000 colonizers arrived in Utah that first year, 1847. Nearly 3,000 more were to follow in 1848, drawn in search of religious freedom and tranquillity "to make the desert blossom as a rose."

Less than 2 years after arrival, the colonizers petitioned for statehood as the State of Deseret, a scriptural term meaning "honeybee," but statehood was not that soon to be granted. However, on September 9, 1850, a law passed by the Congress creating the Territory of Utah, so named after the tribe of Ute Indians native to the area, was signed by President Millard Fillmore. It was not until January 4, 1896, that Utah was admitted as the 45th State of the Union.

In pausing today to take renewed inspiration from the example of faith and courage of the Utah pioneers and their contributions to the strength of this Nation, I can think of nothing more characteristic of their example and of the State which they created, or more timely in our present search for progress as a Congress and as a people, than to cite the dedication to education which has made Utah one of the lighthouses in the cause of education in America.

"The glory of God is intelligence," is a fundamental Mormon precept and scripture.

"Parents, I want you to teach your children not only to read but to love to read," said Brigham Young to the colonizers.

This dedication to education and to educational excellence in Utah has indeed been so intense that its ferment attracts interest approaching astonishment today when the Nation's press has carried the surprising news that superiority in educational opportunity is not enough in Utah. There must be even more to satisfy the ferment.

In the first fall after the arrival of that first company of colonizers on July 24, 1847, Utah's first schoolteacher, Mary Jane Dilworth, was teaching school in an old military tent shaped like an Indian wigwam. The students' seats were logs and the teacher's desk was a campstool. That same fall, Julian Moses established a school for older boys and girls in the original Old Fort, and the classes were held throughout the winter. By 1854 there were 226 schools in Utah territory, with 13,000 students and more than 300 teachers. Textbooks were a problem, but in 1850 it was announced that wagons had arrived "with 2 tons of schoolbooks." Every class was opened with a prayer, and one of the main texts with which to learn reading was the Bible.

Less than 4 years after that first company arrived in Salt Lake Valley, the legislative assembly passed a law providing for schools throughout the State. A school tax was soon passed, but in the meantime the schools were financed by individual tuition payable, as in some other frontier territories, in wheat, potatoes, flour, building rock, lumber, or any products that the teacher was able to use. In 1874 the legislature made territorial appropriations of lump sums to be apportioned on a school-age per capita basis among the various districts, and in 1878 inaugurated a territorial tax for a permanent school fund.

The Utah Legislature passed a compulsory attendance law as early as 1852 which applied to adopted Indian children as well.

The second law passed by the territorial legislature established the University of Deseret, now the University of Utah. This was in February 1850, less than 3 years after the Saints had descended upon the desert. It is our claim that the University of Deseret has the distinction of being the first institution of higher learning established west of the Mississippi River. Before money was available to pay for the construction of classrooms, the pioneers set to work to build 135 rods of wall and hauled enough stone to build nearly a mile more.

The ferment in education in Utah has continued unabated, these 116 years.

Because of its exceptional educational desire, Utah carries an unusually large school finance budget. It is some years first, some years second, in percent of personal income devoted to schools. It is one of the few States which requires school attendance through high school, or to age 18, and I for one am proud of that fact because it comes face to face with the school dropout problem, so injurious to society. Many claim that we do not give sufficient incentive to students with highest intellectual capacity. I believe it is of the greatest importance that we do not discard human beings with lesser intellectual capacity. They are deserving too and they are part of our society, and they must not be discouraged by exclusive emphasis upon the exceedingly gifted.

According to the National Education Association, Utah stands highest among all the States today in percentage of Selective Service registrants passing the mental tests. It stands the highest in the Nation in percentage of population over 25 with more than 8 years schooling. It stands highest in the Nation in percentage of population over 25 with at least 4 years of high school. It is highest in the Nation in median school years completed by persons 25 and older, and is highest in percentage of population having more than 5 years education. It is second in percentage of residents having 4 years of college. At the same time, it stands only 30th in per capita personal income.

Utah stands first in the United States in its expenditures for public education in comparison with its other expenditures, which means that Utah spends more of its revenue for education than any other State, and in this connection, I should point out that Utah has virtually all the taxes imposed by any State except a gambling tax. We have a State income tax, a high sales tax, a local and State property tax, special taxes on tobacco, beer, gasoline, oleomargarine, and so forth. We have a corporate franchise tax, a severance tax, and the State itself is the monopoly retailer of liquor on which more than $4 million annually is received on markup, plus revenue from liquor taxes and liquor license permit fees.

Utah is second in the Nation in percent of total State expenditure devoted to higher education, despite a heavy enrollment in private church-supported colleges and university. Utah is also first in the Nation in the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher learning within its boundaries, as a percentage of the State's population.

While achieving these high goals, Utah carries the second highest percentage among the States of total population of school age.

The New York Times, in its issue of Sunday, July 21, has the following to say in an editorial entitled, "States and Nation":

> But there are many * * * men of competence who worry about the centralization of authority in Washington—the ever-expanding range of both Federal services and intrusions, and the drainage of power from the States.
>
> The only effective antidote to this transfer of responsibility lies in a more affirmative demonstration that the States are zealous guardians of the rights and dignity of their citizens.

I believe that today's Utah, as in the case of pioneer Utah, subscribes to this proposition.

In a positive desire and active intent to pay its teachers a salary commensurate with their contributions to our society, the 1963 session of the Utah Legislature raised the State sales tax to 3½ percent. This is in addition to a one-half cent local option sales tax for local government. There is no exception in Utah's sales tax for food and drugs. The tax on cigarettes was raised an additional 4 cents per pack to 8 cents and the statewide property tax is subject to increase for the benefit of the school fund. These were the State tax increases of a single legislature. Utah, which has made systematic advances in teacher salaries in every legislature of recent years although not wholly satisfying the continuing education ferment, has now begun an intensive further study of teacher salaries by a committee appointed by the Governor and to which organized education has given support.

The Utah Legislative Council sponsored a State-financed 6-year research study of merit pay for the Utah public schools, a State project probably without parallel among the States, in one effort to investigate the possibility of making better use of the present school dollar. The school districts of the State have been consolidated so that there is an efficient 40-district system in the State's 29 counties and continuing studies may result in even greater efficiencies, thus reducing further the cost per pupil and here again obtaining greater mileage from the education dollar. The most efficient use of the school dollar is an objective of Utah educational finance and much of the fat has been removed from the average cost per pupil.

The uniform school fund of the State, established in 1947, guarantees to every Utah school district, a certain basic educational program. Each year the percentage of the State's contribution to the overall expense of the 40 school districts has increased until today the State's share is over 50 percent of the total expenditure made by the local districts.

State government of Utah has affirmatively accepted responsibility in financing not only the salaries and operations of the district schools, but in financing classroom construction as well. Since 1951 nearly $30 million has been appropriated by the State to the local school districts in greatest need to build additional classrooms for a mushrooming population—this in a State with only 1 million population.

Mr. Speaker, the ferment in education to be observed in Utah today, is but a continuance of the restless desire for excellence and still more excellence in education which the Mormon pioneers of 1847 demanded. This excellence stands today and will continue in ascendancy as a living memorial to the Saints who walked and rode across the mountains with the prairie schooners and stayed to make their homes and build their schools when their leader looked down upon the desert valley of the Great Salt Lake 116 years ago today and said, "This is the place. Drive on."

REPRESENTATIVE W. E. BROCK

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time today to join with a host of my colleagues in paying tribute to our outstanding friend, the gentleman from Tennessee, Bill Brock, who has received one of the most distinguished awards his party can bestow upon him. During the recent Young Republican National Convention in San Francisco, the gentleman from Tennessee, Congressman Brock, was voted the "Outstanding Young Republican of the Year." He was presented with a fine trophy at the convention awards ceremonies.

I might add that this award could not be given to a more deserving nor a more exemplary man than our colleague from Tennessee who has brought great credit to his district, his State and his political party. He is certainly one of the bright young men on the Republican horizon and already is a speaker of excellence and great demand. I know that his dedication to the duties of his congressional office makes it impossible for him to accept one small fraction of the speaking engagement requests he receives. The fine people of his district can gain a sense of satisfaction in knowing that they sent a man to Congress whose good name has spread throughout the Nation and whose talents have brought him a following which extends far beyond his own district or his native State of Tennessee. People everywhere are counting on great things from Bill Brock and I might add that I personally believe he is one of those who will come into future leadership position in this party and this Nation.

I had the pleasure to travel on a Paul Revere panel last April with Bill Brock and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Michel]. Bill has a warmth and humor that is infectious. More than that, however, he has a deep and abiding political philosophy which, in his articulate expression, presents a message that gives great hope to citizens who have long since tired of the panacea of big government and the dependent state. Bill Brock has a steadfast belief in the free enterprise system, in the worth of the individual and the necessity of a limited Federal Government. He has consistently supported constitutional principles and economy in Government.

I had the honor to serve as chairman of the Young Republican National Federation for the years 1957 to 1959. I came to know Bill Brock well and I watched his campaign with great interest. The fact that he stood for principles of constitutional government, economy and a strong foreign policy and forcefully presented the issues to his constituency made him a strong contender. However, in an overwhelmingly Democratic district which had not sent a Republican to Congress in 42 years, this was not enough. Bill Brock did one thing that politicians only talk about and very few ever succeed in doing. He was supported by a volunteer force which created political history in Chattanooga and the rest of his district. Through his own strength of character and personality and his dynamic energy on the one hand and his fearless presentation of the issues on the other, he was elected to the 88th Congress. He has already written a record which he can proudly take to his constituents in 1964. Representative Brock represents the new look in the South and we all hope that he is joined by more Republicans of his caliber when the 89th Congress convenes in 1965.

Because I have been identified with Young Republican activity for more than 15 years, the award which my good friend Bill Brock received is particularly meaningful to me. However, it is in a larger sense a tribute to the steadfast principles of this fine young man and the political history which he has written in his own State. I consider it an honor to count as one of my close friends the recipient of this award and I stop at this point not because there is little more I could say but because so many of our colleagues want to join in this tribute to a great guy and an outstanding Young Republican.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I yield to our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding to me in connection with the matter the gentleman is now discussing. I would simply like to say that this time a great many fine Republicans were elected to the House of Representatives, for which we were all very happy. We were likewise happy a couple of years ago when again a group of great young folks came in to help us out in what I feel is a real endeavor to do something for the welfare of the country.

As far as Bill Brock is concerned, I would certainly put him right up on top of the list of young men here who has proven himself and is proving himself and giving a good account of himself. I predict for him a brilliant, rewarding, and a great career here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank our distinguished minority leader.

Mr. Speaker, I yield at this time to a colleague of the gentleman from Tennessee, a colleague who also came to the 88th Congress and a distinguished gentleman in his own right who will speak for the other two Republican Members from Tennessee.

Mr. QUILLEN. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that our colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Baker] may insert his remarks in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure and privilege to join in this spontaneous tribute to my colleague and friend, the gentleman from the Third District of Tennessee, Mr. William E. (Bill) Brock. Bill Brock richly deserves the honor bestowed upon him by his fellow Young Republicans at their recent national convention held in San Francisco, Calif. I can think of no one better qualified to be Outstanding Young Republican of the Year, 1961–63.

Bill has served with distinction as the Young Republican national committeeman representing the State of Tennessee and as chairman of the National Teenage Republican—TAR—Committee. These are most worthy contributions to the growth of the Young Republican movement in this country.

Last November the citizenry of the Third Tennessee District, Republicans, Democrats, and independents alike, elected this capable young Republican to the Congress of the United States. Bill has the distinction of being the first Republican to represent the Third District in over 40 years.

Although he has served in this body and on the Banking and Currency Committee for only a short time, my colleague has demonstrated marked ability. He is, and will continue to be, an outstanding Member. I wish him much success and happiness in this and future Congresses.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I join others in paying tribute to an outstanding American today.

To my colleague and very good friend, William Emerson Brock III, better known as Bill, I offer my congratulations on being named "Young Republican of the Year."

This honor is well deserved, and the Young Republicans of our country, in convention assembled in San Francisco recently, could not have made a better choice.

Bill Brock is a fellow Tennessean and a neighbor. He represents the Third District, and I represent the First. He is highly respected and loved by the people of his district, and he has brought great credit to his State and his country.

He is one of the youngest Members of this great body and is the first Republican to represent his district for over 41 years. The campaign he conducted for Congress was a shining example of his high character and good will toward his fellowman. The people proudly carried his political banner because they believed in his convictions and his devotion to his country.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

His victory was a miracle to some, but not to Bill Brock or his friends and supporters. He entered the race to win, and this determination brought him victory and is with him in all of his undertakings here in the Congress, as it has been in his everyday life.

Bill Brock has been active in civic, church, and community affairs in his area for many years. He became active in the Young Republican Club of Hamilton County at a very early age and has served in various offices of the Republican Party in that county. He was the Young Republican national federation national committeeman for Tennessee in 1961 and 1962 and served as chairman of the national teen committee in 1961 and 1962.

Bill has a wonderful family with a lovely wife and two fine boys.

Again, congratulations to my colleague and very good friend, and best wishes in all your endeavors.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank Representative Quillen and Representative Baker for their contributions.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the very distinguished and wonderful lady from Illinois [Mrs. Reid].

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleague in recognizing the honor which has been bestowed upon Congressman William Brock. As a member of the 88 Club with Bill and after observing the contribution he has already made to the Congress I know this is a well-deserved honor.

I have enjoyed my association with Bill thus far—I appreciate his wisdom and his quiet humor and I am looking forward to working with him in the future.

Congratulations, Bill Brock.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Taft].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have this occasion to join in the recognition of the honor that has been done to our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Brock].

Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure of serving with him on the Committee on Banking and Currency during this session. I can assure all of the Members of the House who are not members of that committee that he has been an outstanding member of the committee and has done a real job there. His practical experience as a businessman, particularly, has become very evident. He has attended the committee meetings diligently and he has asked very penetrating questions of the various witnesses on the important economic issues coming before that committee.

Mr. Speaker, based upon his work there and the pleasant associations that his colleagues have had with him in the first-year group of Congressmen, as well as our contacts with him here on the floor of the House, I know he is going to grow and continue to be an outstanding leader and become one of the most important Members of this body.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bruce].

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our friend from Tennessee, Bill Brock.

Mr. Speaker, we are all extremely proud of Bill. Those of us who came in at the beginning of the 87th Congress on the Republican side of the aisle watched with great interest the campaigns waged in the succeeding election, and the one that we watched with more than passing interest was the campaign of Bill Brock down in Tennessee, because everybody said that it could not be done.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is most significant that having watched it very closely with some mutual friends in the news media and elsewhere that Bill won not by out-promising the opposition, not by promising something for nothing, but by standing on basic constitutional principles, by taking a forthright stand, without compromise, and then when he gets here standing by it.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the organization that has given him this honor for its exceedingly fine judgment. I say that Bill Brock is a symbol of what is now happening across the country. I think all of us who have been out, as most of us have been, on the speaking trail occasionally, have become very much aware of the increased presence of young people that are in the audiences, that are coming out and asking what they can do, and who are volunteering to work.

Mr. Speaker, in no small measure the willingness of men like Bill Brock and the rest of the group that came in this year, as well as in the 87th Congress, and the senior Members on this side recognize that the true liberal stands for the individual and the responsibility of the individual.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the organization for its selection of Bill Brock, and I commend Bill Brock for his fine record and for his fine character.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his excellent remarks.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Weaver].

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I take this opportunity to pay tribute to a friend and colleague, William E. Brock III, on the recent honor which was bestowed upon him by the Young Republicans at their recent national convention—"Outstanding Young Republican of the Year."

A tireless worker for his party and the principles for which it stands, Bill Brock with his boundless energies and qualities of leadership has certainly earned this coveted honor.

His vote-getting qualities and ability for hard work are reflected in his amazing victory last fall which saw the election of a Republican Congressman for the first time in 42 years in Tennessee's Third Congressional District.

In his home community Bill has compiled an outstanding record of leadership in community affairs, serving on numerous committees and commissions aimed at the betterment of the community where he lives. He served as education chairman of the junior chamber of commerce, chairman of the public affairs committee of the chamber of commerce, a member of the citizens committee for better schools, the good government league, and the golden gateway—urban renewal—citizens committee. I cite only a few of his public service activities of the past. Dedication to civic betterment is an outstanding characteristic and quality of Bill Brock. His comprehensive background in community service ideally equips him to be a Member of Congress.

The Congress should be proud to have Bill Brock as one of its Members. In the short time he has held office, the freshman Congressman has won the respect and admiration of his fellow freshmen legislators.

Because of his many qualities Bill Brock is marked for greater responsibilities and recognition by his party and Congress. I wish to congratulate him on the honor he received and to say that it is a pleasure and honor to serve with him in the House of Representatives. May he serve many years in Congress.

I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Beermann].

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to one of our newest members of Congress, the Honorable William Emerson Brock III, of the sovereign State of Tennessee, who was recently named "Young Republican of the Year" by the San Francisco Convention of Young Republicans. I heartily concur in the honor accorded my capable young friend and wish him many occasions of similar recognition, a wish that I know will be fulfilled when I assess Mr. Brock's abilities and virtues.

To enlarge upon my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that my acquaintance with our Tennessee Third District Congressman has been all too brief. But despite that, every day that I watch him on the House of Representatives floor convinces me that we conservatives have gained a zealous exponent of our philosophy. That is important I believe, because without articulate leaders like Bill Brock, leaders who can enunciate the cause of conservatism at length and in detail, we cannot win converts to our standard, nor ever hope to achieve the commonsense Government each of us envisions.

My wife and I made a little trip down to Charlottesville, Va., to see the home of Thomas Jefferson—Monticello. We checked into the hotel and lo and behold here are Bill Brock and Senator Dominick expounding the cause of young Republicanism. I congratulate him for taking this extra time and working so hard in this cause.

In addition to his devotion to the cause of conservatism, our new friend has also demonstrated that he has the practical facility of fitting his political philosophy to the legislation he helps fashion and conceive. I do not think some of our more liberal colleagues will ever forget or forgive Mr. Brock for his suggestion that a Congressman's salary should be lowered by the same percentage national spending exceeds the budget; nor will they soon recover from his absolute refusal to compromise his best judgment on the area redevelopment legislation, although it was pointed out his State stood to get a Federal handout if he did. Both actions clearly indicate Bill Brock's first concern is for the taxpayer, the latter highlighting the fact that robbing Peter to pay Paul is not a way of professing statecraft. In short, Mr. Speaker, our freshman Congressman Brock has proven himself to be a man of principle, character, and integrity, a man who shuns the role of a political bagman who would nod his head at every Federal pie-cutting, then run home with his State's share.

To conclude, I would like to congratulate Congressman Brock's home constituency on the quality of its discernment in sending him to represent it. And I am sure that in the light of the great conservative awakening in the Nation, it will continue to exercise the same good judgment.

Mr. ASHMORE. I thank the gentleman and I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding to me in order that I might add, as a member of the 87th Club, congratulations to Bill Brock of the 88th Club, as the elected "Young Republican of the Year." Having been so elected by his peers from the great State from which he comes—and from which my ancestors came before they settled in the Ozarks in southwestern Missouri. I think it is particularly appropriate that this man with the big "sweet tooth" be recognized by his colleagues here today. I was privileged to operate on Bill Brock—finger smashed—the first day he came to the 88th Congress and gave him some relief in areas other than that "sweet tooth." Since that time I have traveled and spoken in his district with the Tennessee Medical Association and other groups, and I can say he is justly and truly typical of the Young Republican of the Year, Mr. Speaker, in three particular respects.

First of all, he believes in the principle on which this representative Republic was founded under our Constitution; namely, the dilution of power rather than that of concentration of power, to wit, he was general chairman for the drive for handicapped children in his home community, and he enlisted 17,000 people to give modestly, thus broadening the base and diffusing power.

He also believes in the "Do-It-Yourself" philosophy, Mr. Speaker.

If the gentleman from Ohio will yield further, I say that, because he is one of Chattanooga's 25 young leaders who joined together to form a corporation with a capital investment of over $2 million for the purpose of developing their own hometown and helping themselves.

Then, again, if I might cite a third instance, he has been an integral part of the Chattanooga literacy movement to teach adults to read and write, thus foreshadowing and portending action that has subsequently come on the part of the Federal Government to again transcend State barriers and to do that for the States which they were already doing for themselves, in direct violation of the 10th amendment.

Congratulations for all that you do so well, because your actions speak louder than words can tell, Bill Brock.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman and I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld].

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my colleagues in honoring the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Brock]. As a new Member of Congress myself, and having worked as a staff assistant on the Hill prior to running for Congress, I have observed there is one ingredient that every Congressman has, who is truly respected and who over a period of years gains the respect of other Members whereby they are able to play a major part in the determination of policy, and that ingredient is the desire to work hard and do the necessary homework.

Since coming to Congress many of us have observed in Bill Brock this willingness to do his homework. Every time he takes the floor the Members listen, and listen carefully, because they know when he speaks he is thoughtful and has an excellent understanding and background in the subject to which he is addressing himself.

Very obviously his future is bright and I am delighted to participate in this commendation.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Schadeberg].

Mr. SCHADEBERG. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great personal satisfaction that I am about to congratulate my colleague, Bill Brock, on the honor that has come to him as a recipient of the Young Republican Man of the Year award bestowed upon him by the gathering of the Young Republicans at their national convention in San Francisco.

I want to add my best wishes to those of my colleagues that Bill will have a long and successful service and I know it will be also a fruitful service as a Member of this House. He has already made it clear to us that he is indeed a young man who commands the respect of all of us, and that means all of us on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Kansas, the president of the 87th Republican Club [Mr. Dole].

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity of becoming well acquainted with Bill Brock, and certainly want to add my congratulations. I do so not just because Bill is an outstanding Republican, although this is important, but primarily because of his outstanding accomplishments in business, politics, and community activities. Recently the Chattanooga News Free Press stated it well. Their editorial said this, in part:

> In congratulating Bill Brock, we hail him not so much in a partisan way as we do for his firm and sound stand for the basic principles of Americanism in general at this time when our Nation's very foundations in law, in self-reliance, in free enterprise are being shaken, when efforts are being made to impose a deeper socialization and a more inescapable dictation by Government upon the affairs of individuals.

Mr. Speaker, this comment sums up the basic reason Bill Brock has been successful. It is not a partisan matter when we deal with the future of our country and the fate of future generations. On this basis Republicans, Democrats, and independents, and above all, the taxpayers of his district paid tribute to Bill Brock by sending him to Congress. He is to be congratulated for being selected the "Outstanding Young Republican of the Year."

I congratulate you, Bill, for this and for voting your convictions.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Foreman].

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend Bill Brock, not just for being a good Republican Member of Congress, but also because he is a sound, conservative business leader and an outstanding young American.

I joined him in speaking appearances around the country. He is an articulate spokesman and supporter for capitalism and free enterprise and our American way of life. He is doing a tremendous job in helping us preserve those things that made this country great. I am pleased to join my colleagues in this body in commemorating this fine, aggressive, articulate young man. We need more men like Bill Brock. The world today is looking for men who are not for sale; men who are honest, sound from center to circumference, true to the heart's core; men with consciences as steady as the needle to the pole; men who will stand for the right if the heavens totter and the earth reels; men who can tell the truth and look the world right in the eye; men who neither brag nor run; men who neither lag nor flinch; men who can have courage without shouting it; men in whom the courage of everlasting life runs still, deep, and strong; men who know their message and tell it; men who know their place and fill it; men who know their business and attend to it; men who will not lie, shirk, or dodge; men who are not too lazy to work, nor too proud to be poor; men who are willing to eat what they have earned and wear what they have paid for; men who are not ashamed to say "No" with emphasis and who are not ashamed to say, "I cannot afford it."

Bill Brock is this kind of a man. We need more men like Bill Brock.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Lloyd].

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, it is with very genuine respect that I join my colleagues today to compliment William E. "Bill" Brock on the rare and well-merited recognition which he has received from the national convention of Young Republicans, which we who have worked closely with him recognize as wholly deserved. I compliment also the Young Republicans of America for giving this official recognition award to one who brings credit to those with whom he associates.

I know Bill Brock not only as a fellow member of the 88th Club, but perhaps more knowledgeably as his associate on the House Banking and Currency Committee.

I am impressed with the clarity of his logic as he contributes so effectively to the more strategic work of that committee. In his interrogation of witnesses, his questions are incisive, consistent, and are presented without any waste of words, and perhaps most impressively with a quiet confidence. This is very obviously a confidence born of knowledge gained through a fine intellect and of the courage of strong conviction which can only be truly gained through hard, honest, and original thought. His mind is clear, strong, and consistent. He is never vague.

It is said that a prophet is not without honor save in his own country. I am pleased that this is not true in the case of Bill Brock, whose townsmen in Chattanooga share the high esteem in which he is held by those of us who are in a position to watch him while he works. The following editorial is from the Chattanooga Times:

> TRIBUTE TO MR. BROCK
>
> The election of William E. Brock III last November as a Republican Representative from a congressional district which had been Democratic for 40 years was enough to bring the young Chattanoogan to the attention of national party leaders.
>
> But once in Congress, it has been Bill Brock's pleasing personality, his considerable energy, and his articulate espousal of those principles in which he believes which have heightened his standing as a freshman Member of the House. He has become a sought-after speaker for GOP meetings the country over.
>
> It was on the basis of this record that the Young Republican National Convention chose Mr. Brock as the outstanding young Republican of the year, and, as a corollary, designated the Hamilton County Young Republican Club as the outstanding organization of the country. Its activity was a major factor in the election of Mr. Brock to Congress and Dr. Arthur Vieth to the county council.
>
> Representative Brock's fellow Chattanoogans, whether or not they hold with his views politically, do share in a feeling of pride at this national recognition. Congratulations are in order for him and for the Young Republican Club here to which he has contributed much in interest and leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I subscribe to that fully.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Snyder].

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join my colleagues today who are commending the gentleman from Tennessee for the recognition he has gotten from the Young Republicans of this great country. I also would like to commend the Young Republicans for selecting Bill to receive this award.

As I sat here listening to many of my colleagues and Bill's colleagues point out the accomplishments that Bill has made during his short life, and point out how he has dedicated himself to so many civic affairs for the benefit of his community, I cannot help but recognize the fact that he here today in the Congress by his voting record is again helping to preserve these things that he has worked for so long thus far, for these very civic affairs that Bill has been engaged in throughout the years would not mean anything at all if we lose the society that we live in, be it our church or the different civic groups that have been mentioned here today. Bill here in the Congress is lending so much encouragement to those of us who do believe in constitutional government and who do want to preserve a free society for our children and our children's children.

James Russell Lowell was asked one time how long our Republic would endure. He said our Republic would endure so long as the people kept to the ideas of the Founding Fathers. Of course, the ideas of the Founding Fathers were that we had the God-given right to determine our own destiny. Bill Brock holds to that belief.

It has been a privilege for me in the short time I have been here in the Congress to know Bill Brock. It is refreshing to know a gentleman who adheres to his principles and votes for the benefit of the country rather than expediently.

Congratulations, Bill. May you be here many years.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClory].

Mr. McCLORY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, nothing provided me with greater pride when I was first seated as a Member of Congress than to find myself associated with new Members of the caliber and quality of Bill Brock. Bill has distinguished himself in his legislative work where he has carried forward the guiding principles of Republicanism which he enunciated during his successful campaign. He has represented our 88th Club on many occasions on the Republican policy committee. In addition, he has served as an active member of a special study committee to help make the Republican conference a more effective instrumentality of the minority party in this and succeeding Congresses.

He is not passive in his ideals and principles but is very articulate in affirming them whenever the appropriate occasion arises. I found him to be conscientious in all his work. A young man of his capacity and success is a great incentive to other young men and women to identify themselves with a political party and to aspire to public office. This, I think, is an important ideal and an important goal for the young men and young women of our Nation in order that it may endure.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Don H. Clausen].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be able to join with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] and our other colleagues in congratulating Bill Brock on his outstanding achievement. This achievement has certainly brought new hope to many of the younger Republicans throughout the United States and I think will provide much in the way of motivation for them. Shortly after my arrival here, when the gentleman from Tennessee, Bill Brock, and other colleagues came to the airport to meet me, I had the opportunity to visit with Bill Brock and his lovely wife, Muffett. We visit socially and in this way have had a grand opportunity of getting to know each other extremely well.

Bill Brock is a very successful businessman in his own right in his home community. I learned that he ran for this particular office primarily because he was concerned about what was happening in the country. As I understand it, he became involved in politics because of his interest and concern in local matters. This interest carried forward in the field of national and international issues. As any good citizen, Bill Brock was interested in knowing the qualifications of candidates. He joined with others in evaluating candidates. He found very few potential candidates who held those convictions which would adequately represent the people in that area who could and would make the effort required to win an election of this magnitude.

The one concern I have, possibly more strongly than any of you here in the House, is that which pertains to local government. I have had many years of experience in local government. I consider local government to be one of the most important units in our governmental structure.

I found after talking to Bill Brock that he, as a young fellow, had an extraordinary understanding of the problems of local government. So, in our conversations we expounded our views relative to the tax structure at all levels of government and how it is destroying our Nation.

We discussed the need to strengthen the organizational structure of all levels—if the Nation was to retain our Republic form of government.

I would simply summarize in this way. I think we in the House of Representatives owe Bill Brock a great debt of gratitude for his service here, for his recent accomplishment and for providing that goal and objective to many of our younger Republicans looking to the Members of this body for leadership. I think many of the young Democrats should accept his success story as a challenge. This would result in a strengthening of our traditional two-party system.

Truly Bill Brock is a credit to our party and I am very happy to be able to associate myself in this testimonial to him.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, as I bring this special order to a close, I want to add also that there are several of the Members who for various reasons are not able to be present and to make comments in person. I received a note, for example, from our distinguished friend, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Wyman], who unfortunately was called to his native State, because of the death of this father-in-law. He left remarks which he would like to extend in the Record, and I ask unanimous consent that those remarks along with the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Broyhill], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Brotzman], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Stinson] may be extended in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my other colleagues on this occasion in paying tribute to one of our outstanding freshmen Congressmen, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Brock]. Those of us who know Bill and have worked with him for the past 7 months have learned to appreciate both his brilliance and his dedication to the responsibilities of his position.

I was most pleased to learn of his selection as "Outstanding Young Republican of the Year" at the recent national Young Republican Convention in San Francisco. This was a well deserved honor and was received with the humility and sincerity that characterizes Bill Brock. I consider it an honor to sit with him in the House of Representatives and to call him a friend. The Congress needs young men of his caliber and I wish him a long tenure of office.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to join with my colleagues here today in honoring Bill Brock on his receiving the outstanding Young Republican of the Year Award at the Young Republican Convention recently in San Francisco. It is a well-deserved tribute to a fine and dedicated young American.

My association with Bill Brock dates back for more than a year when we were both considering leaving our businesses and entering public life. Our contacts continued through the campaign last year and were renewed when we arrived in Washington to add to the ranks of southern Republicans in the Congress.

My respect for the insight, integrity, and energy of Bill Brock has grown with each passing month. His articulation and his willingness to fight for principles of responsible conservatism are outstanding and impressive attributes of this man. He came to Congress not to settle down into a comfortable political rut, but to alert the Nation to trends which weaken the fabric of a free America and to work tirelessly for the programs in which he believes so strongly.

The Third District of Tennessee is most ably represented here by its new Congressman. In fact, we in the South regard Bill Brock as a fine example of the kind of Republican leadership our area can produce and we are proud of him. I sincerely believe that the entire country will share that pride as it comes to know him better.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the hot, muggy heat of Washington is a long way from the cool breeze-swept top of Lookout Mountain, Tenn. But as someone once said, "the longer the step the bigger the man."

Bill Brock has taken some giant strides on his way up; and the climb has just started. His ability and determination will carry him to the top.

Bill's home on Lookout Mountain housed one of the most distinguished old families in the Chattanooga area. His grandfather was a U.S. Senator and the lessons Bill learned at home have never been forgotten. Whether in college at Washington and Lee, in the Navy, or excelling in the business world, the record Bill Brock has left behind is an admirable one.

Not long ago the national young Republicans paid Bill their highest tribute in selecting him as Young Man of the Year. Here is a gentleman who represents the tradition and honor exemplified in this award. Bill is an aggressive and energetic legislator who daily typifies the effort and ability we recognize in forceful leadership. As a responsible young Conservative, Bill Brock vividly projects the image of a new rising generation which will lead America into the future.

Whether you recognize him personally as a good friend as I do, or as a hard working and likable colleague, we all know that William E. "Bill" Brock, the third, will go a long way and contribute much to the cause of good government.

In his behalf, therefore, I would like to take this opportunity to join in paying tribute to Bill and wish him and his charming wife godspeed in the future.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook]. In the short time that I have known Bill Brock, I have been singularly impressed with his capabilities, integrity, and depth of his judgment. It is easy to understand why Bill Brock was selected the Outstanding Young Republican of the Year by the Young Republican Convention. I value Bill Brock both as a friend and as a colleague and I hope that our association will be one of long standing.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to close with a statement which our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Tennessee, Bill Brock, made in his June 1963 newsletter.

Bill said the following and I quote:

> To me, this loss of confidence in the American citizen and in his ability to run his own affairs is the most dangerous trend in the United States today. Our system is not perfect, yet it has worked for over 200 years. It has continually improved and has succeeded as no other form of government ever has, in promoting individual responsibility, personal initiative, and freedom.
>
> We will keep our way of life just as long as we earn it, through individual, personal participation in community, State, and national affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is a very good statement from a freshman Representative. I believe it is one of the reasons why he was so honored as the outstanding Young Republican of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to add my great personal satisfaction which I have received as a result of this honor which has been extended to him.

Mr. Speaker, I think the fact that almost two dozen Members of Congress would take the time in a busy day to speak out on this fine man is a very good indication of the high esteem in which he is held by this body.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I am a little bit overwhelmed. I do not know how to close this up. However, I would like to simply say that a person, in my opinion, is known by the company he keeps.

Mr. Speaker, the type of people who have spoken on the floor today in these remarks make me more grateful than I can say. I am proud to be a colleague of them. I look forward to working with them for the common beliefs in this country and in our children.

I thank you very much.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CAPTIVE NATIONS AND THE MOSCOW-PEIPING DISPUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article and an address.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the growing signs of political discontent and national conflicts within the vast Russian Empire serve to demonstrate the importance of Captive Nations Week, observed last week throughout the United States.

The dialog now being carried on between Moscow and Peiping occupies a great deal of news space in the United States. That dialog suggests a basic difference which some interpreters of the news relate as an "ideological break" between the Russians and the Red Chinese. Little or no attention has been given to the published demands of the Red Chinese that they be treated as equals in all respects by the Russians. The spokesmen for Peiping claim that the theories of Marxism-Leninism provide no license for the superior and privileged position the Russian Communists have held in controlling the Eurasian empire and the world Communist conspiracy. Consequently, the Red Chinese are demanding an equal status and an equal voice in running the affairs of the Communist international. This is the basic issue, the fundamental dispute, hidden behind the mirage of public charges and counter charges in the Moscow-Peiping dialog.

Cutting through the layers of dialectical argumentation and the camouflage of intent which accompanies the maneuvers of all trained Communists—whether they be of Chinese, Russian, Cuban, Polish, German, Albanian, Yugoslav, or other national origin—the issue of nationalism looms as the unsolved and unsolvable problem of communism. Since the death of Lenin in 1923, the Russian Communists have been possessed with this problem. Lenin, as is known, condemned Russian chauvinism, that is, the superior race theories of the Muscovites, and predicted on his deathbed that the small number of Sovietized workers would be overwhelmed by that historic character of Russian life. He was aware that his reign of less than 5 years was far too short a period to overcome basic beliefs, values, and national character developed during five hundred years of history.

Stalin, who followed Lenin as supreme ruler, adopted a twofold approach to the problem of nationalism within the reconstructed empire of the czars. On the one hand he used organized brute force and the tactics of perpetual purge in an effort to wipe out the popular demand for national independence in such occupied countries as Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia, and Turkestan. Millions of national patriots died the death of martyrs at the hands of Stalin during his long and bloody reign.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am happy to yield to the very able and distinguished colleague from the great State of Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is now almost 6 o'clock. I have remained here to listen to the gentleman from Ohio, because of my regard for him as one of the soundest thinkers in this body and one who is recognized both in this country and abroad as an authority on the problems of the captive nations and the means of restoring to them the sacred right of self-determination of their own lives and destinies.

Mr. Speaker, there is no one in our country who is a more stanch and a more informed friend of the people of the captive nations than the gentleman now in the well. There is no one in our country who is better informed not only of the history of events but informed as to the aspirations and the thinking of the leaders and the people of these captive nations.

I am particularly interested in hearing what the gentleman has to say now, because it seems to me that we are approaching a very interesting period.

So I would be very much interested in hearing the thought of the gentleman from Ohio how serious is the problem of the captive nations so far as the Russians are concerned in their dispute with Red China.

Mr. FEIGHAN. The best answer I can give to that is to remind you of what happened in East Germany in 1953, in Poznan, Poland, in 1956, and the Hungarian freedom revolution of 1956. During those times the captive peoples rose up against their Russian occupier in a demonstration of their contempt for their Communist chains.

In each instance it will be recalled that the popular slogan of the freedom fighters was "Ruskies go home."

If all the captive European nations from the Baltic Sea to the Caspian Sea were to rise up in common revolt against Moscow, which I am convinced would happen in the event of war in the Far East between Moscow and Peiping, the Russians would be overwhelmed and a blood bath of unprecedented proportions would follow.

I have often referred to this as the prospect of spontaneous total political revolution in which over 200 million captive non-Russians would rise up against the 90 million Russians who are their oppressors.

This is the real problem confronting Khrushchev as he looks toward Peiping. He knows this is his real problem and he seeks to eliminate it by duping the free West into helping his prevent freedom revolutions throughout the European part of the Russian empire. That would be the effect, for all practical purposes, of a nonaggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. And that is why I suggest now is the time for the United States to propose use of its good offices to force Khrushchev into meaningful nonaggression pacts with the peoples of the captive nations.

On the other hand, Stalin produced one significant Communist theoretical work during this reign of 30 years. Even more significant, he called it the Lenin-Stalin solution to the national question. That theoretical work provided a Communist justification for the Stalin purges aimed at killing the national spirit in the captive nations and set forth the techniques for Russian takeover of nations yet to be conquered by Moscow.

Stalin's solution to the problem of nationalism was not outlawed in the so-called de-Stalinization program launched by Khrushchev in 1956. All Khrushchev called for in fact was a halt to the murder of Communists by Communists. This easing of the terror programs conducted by Stalin against brother Communists led to confusion in the ranks of communism and misinterpretation in the non-Communist world. In particular the peoples of the European captive nations took the so-called liberalization program seriously and this in turn produced the Poznan revolt and the Hungarian freedom revolution. But Khrushchev quickly ended the myth of liberalization by launching a blood bath in Hungary and tightening the chains on the rest of his European captive empire.

Time and the relentless pressures of nationalism have brought new problems for Khrushchev. The 7 years since the Hungarian freedom revolution have seen Red China become more aggressive in the Far East and more assertive within the ranks of the Communist international. There are some indications the Red Chinese are interested in recovering those vast lands between Lake Baikal and the Pacific Ocean which once belonged to the Manchu dynasty but which the Russian czars acquired by conquest during the past century. This seems a logical interest because those lands now are either uninhabited or sparsely populated and could provide a livelihood for some 70 to 80 million people. The Chinese people need land for their expanding population. Perpetual famine has been a real problem in China and recovery of those lands to the north could provide some solution or alleviation if they were brought under cultivation. Moreover, Chinese interest in regaining that lost territory to the north would lessen the current Chinese pressure on southeast Asia where the rice breadbasket now attracts their attention. While it is true this would create serious problems for imperial Russia, requiring her to shift her exclusive attention to her Far East territories, this should not raise concern in the ranks of freemen. Contrarywise, this development should be viewed as a rare opportunity to help the Russians to save themselves from both tyranny and disaster.

Khrushchev has suggested a nonaggression pact between NATO and the so-called Warsaw Pact. It is becoming more and more obvious that Khrushchev needs the help of the free world to shore up the European part of his empire. At this point it is too early to judge whether the pressures of nationalism within the captive European nations or the prospect of Chinese action to regain their lost territories is the primary reason behind Russian pressure for a nonaggression pact with NATO. It is altogether possible that a combination of these pressures motivate Russian behavior at this time. In any case a nonaggression pact between NATO and Moscow will not serve the cause of human freedom any more than it could advance the cause of peace. Moscow would be the sole beneficiary of such a pact.

It is no exaggeration to observe that Khrushchev's nonaggression pact, if entered into by NATO, would serve notice on the hundreds of millions of non-Russian people who inhabit the captive nations from the Baltic Sea to the Caspian Sea, that the free West has put its official stamp of consent on their national and personal state of slavery. Such action would formalize the status quo, freeze the borders of the Russian Communist empire, desert the proven allies of freedom and provide the Russians with a propaganda weapon that would bring down the enmity of one-third of the human family against the United States. Those are the major objectives behind the Russian proposal for a nonaggression pact.

If it is true that Imperial Russia is being forced to seek an accommodation with the West as a result of Chinese pressure in the East, as some observers claim, this presents a unique opportunity for the exercise of political leadership by the United States. Khrushchev knows that he cannot deal effectively with the Red Chinese unless his European flank, that is, the captive nations, is safe and secure. This is an elementary rule of geopolitics. That rule is compounded by the pressures generated by the national independence movements within the multinational empire of Moscow. Khrushchev knows that if he is forced to use his imperial power in the Far East he will not have the power to hold his European captive nations.

Peiping is also aware of this fact of life and this accounts for their efforts to woo such captive nations as Albania and Rumania. It also explains the demand of the Red Chinese for the status of equals in the Communist International. Some of the Communist regimes imposed by Moscow upon the captive nations of Europe would like that status for their own preservation but they lack the power to demand it. But Red China is able to make that demand and in so doing stirs the pot of nationalism in the European part of the Russian empire. The superior and privileged position of the Russians in the conspiracy of communism is wearing thin and may be reaching the breaking point. It would, therefore, be a tragedy many times greater than all those which occurred during and following World War II if the United States were to fall into the well baited Russian trap set up by the proposal for a nonaggression pact.

But there is a way to help Khrushchev out of his difficulties if in fact he is in serious trouble with the Red Chinese. We can do that by offering our good offices to negotiate peaceful pacts of mutual understanding between the non-Russian peoples of the captive European nations and Moscow. No such understanding exists at present. The Moscow regimes imposed upon them have not been able to speak for the captive peoples and worse, those regimes have aggravated the historic anti-Russian feelings among the captive peoples. Nor can the Russians negotiate directly with the peoples of the captive nations because of the profound and deep rooted distrust they have for the Russians. Need for the good offices of the United States is more than justified under these circumstances. This negotiation would involve free and open plebiscites under international supervisions in all those nations to determine the popular will of the peoples directly involved. The choices offered the people in each of the non-Russian captive nations would be identical and would include the following:

First. Remain as a Soviet Republic or so-called Socialist state with no change in relationships with Moscow.

Second. Become independent nations with governments of their own free choice but retain their membership in the Warsaw Pact.

Third. Become independent nations with governments of their own free choice, disbanding the present relationships with Moscow but entering into nonaggression pacts with Moscow, the integrity of which would be backed by the United States.

Whatever the outcome of these plebiscites might be, the Russians as a people and as a nation would not be the losers. The Russians would end up with the guarantees they need to meet the Chinese challenge in the Far East. They might end up with a group of independent nations which would be willing to help them with their Far East problems in an alliance based upon the political principle of equality among independent equals. The worst they would end up with would be meaningful nonaggression pacts with a series of independent nations, permitting them to concentrate on such threats as may develop in the Far East. A nonaggression pact between NATO and Moscow would not be binding on the peoples of the captive nations. Khrushchev's real problem is not NATO but the non-Russian peoples in the captive nations. Their aspirations for freedom and national independence threaten Moscow as it faces the expansion efforts of Red China.

The latest rumors about a return to the tactics of summitry as a means of ending the cold war may or may not be accurate. Certainly Khrushchev wants it. If the United States reenters the arena of summitry, this departure from present policy should be singularly motivated by a sincere desire to relieve the Russians of their overriding fear of the peoples in the captive nations as Moscow faces the challenge of Red China in the Far East. We should approach that task in a businesslike manner, with proposals to use our good offices to negotiate peaceful pacts of mutual understanding between Moscow and the peoples of the captive nations. We could assure the Russians that if our efforts were successful both NATO and the Warsaw Pact could be disbanded as there would be no further need for these military alliances. Under these conditions the free West should provide a guarantee of nonintervention in the Moscow-Peiping dispute. Such an approach to the many problems confronting Moscow corresponds with the realities of the global changes which have taken place since the death of Stalin.

Failing a settlement of this type, the Russians will be frozen into the closing ring of nationalism, unable to extricate themselves from a hopeless situation. If Red China puts more pressure on in the Far East, the pressures of nationalism are bound to increase in the European part of the empire. If Red China instigates war in an effort to regain her lost territories now held by Moscow, the European captive nations will seize upon the conditions war provides to throw off their Russian chains and regain their national independence. Moreover, if the Red Chinese are determined to regain their lost territories, the only way Moscow can stop them is by threatening the use of atomic weapons. Even then it is doubtful such threats would deter the Red Chinese because they have made their contempt for fear of nuclear war well known to all who will listen. These considerations may not be disregarded in any effort to analyze the reasons why Moscow is so intent on a nonaggression pact with NATO.

The important role now being played by the people of the captive, non-Russian nations of Europe in preventing further Russian armed aggression must be turned into the role of peacemaker. We can do that by extending our good offices as negotiator between those captive peoples and Moscow. I am confident a solution can be found in which a series of nonaggression pacts between the captive European nations and Moscow would be exchanged for the peaceful attainment of their national independence. This will require a full show of good will by Khrushchev and a serious desire to engage in peaceful coexistence with Russia's neighbors. This is a small price for Moscow to pay in light of the growing storm of nationalism throughout their Eurasian empire. It is small reparation for the peoples of the captive nations in light of the price they have paid to deter Russian Communist aggression against still free Europe.

An astute political observer and national columnist, Roscoe Drummond, has presented a down to earth analysis of what lies behind Khrushchev's effort to make a nonaggression pact the price tag for a test ban treaty. He sees such a pact as nothing more than a brick to be added to the shaky foundations of the Russian empire. I insert in the RECORD at this point his column which appeared in the Washington Post on July 16:

REDS UP THE PRICE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

There are good reasons why the United States and Britain intend to reject Premier Khrushchev's idea that we should pay the Soviets an extra diplomatic price for signing a nuclear test ban.

You will recall that in his East Berlin speech Mr. Khrushchev said that simultaneous with a test ban agreement there should be a nonaggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw countries; that is, with the Soviet Union and the eastern European satellites.

Two of the reasons why Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman and Britain's Lord Hailsham are in Moscow with instructions not to let anything be tied to the test-ban talks are these:

1. A treaty ending nuclear testing in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, is either desirable in itself or it isn't desirable. Such a treaty either serves the national interests of both sides or it isn't going to come into being. We are not asking the Soviets to pay some additional price to sign, and we are not going to accept a side deal to get them to sign.

2. This is no way to negotiate prudently or successfully with the Communists. For at least 8 years now the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations have been discussing disarmament and a test ban with the Soviets in London and Geneva, in Moscow and in New York. Now, at the last moment of negotiation, after each side has publicly committed itself to the same kind of test ban (everything except underground), the Soviets propose a new item for the agenda and want to up the price. The price: A nonaggression pact, not among the signatories of the test ban but between NATO and Eastern Europe.

There is no reason to criticize Mr. Khrushchev for trying. The Soviets could use a NATO-Warsaw nonaggression pact to very good advantage right now. Both the non-Communist peoples and the Communist regimes in the Eastern European satellites are showing themselves extremely restless under Soviet rule. Albania is pro-Red China. Rumania is protesting its economic chains. The Communist Parties in Czechoslovakia and Poland are having internal troubles.

The United States by unanimous resolution of Congress and by the declarations of every President since F.D.R. is committed to the objective of seeing political freedom and national self-determination restored to the peoples of eastern Europe. Under the Yalta agreements the Soviet Union once pledged to support freely elected governments in eastern Europe.

We could sign a nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union—if Moscow wanted it. But why should the United States or Britain, France or Germany put their names to any treaty which suggests in any way that the Kremlin's subjugated, Moscow-run European satellites are independent nations? Why should we add one brick to the uneasy foundation of these facade-regimes?

Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to appear as a guest on the "Manion Forum" on June 16 to discuss the issue of captive nations in the context of American foreign policy. My remarks on that occasion were directed at exposing and eliminating the Russian beachhead on American foreign policy so that we could begin to look at the realities of foreign policy possibilities in this era of change with a clear and objective eye. While it will take a great effort to free American foreign policy from the influence of Russian pleaders entrenched in the Department of State, we can accomplish that task if there is an ounce of commonsense left in American democracy.

I insert, at this point of the RECORD, my remarks on captive nations carried by the Manion Forum:

TO WIN THE COLD WAR WE MUST ENCOURAGE LIBERATION OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

(Discussion on the "Manion Forum" broadcast by HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Member of Congress From Ohio)

DEAN MANION. Another big appropriation for foreign aid is now on its way through Congress. Following their annual custom, its advocates are solemnly stressing our moral obligation to help the unfortunate, poverty stricken nations of the free world. But what about the unfortunate captive nations in the slave world? Do our moral obligations stop at the Iron Curtain?

For instance, how can our hearts bleed so profusely for the people of South Vietnam without provoking some pain of conscience for the enslaved people of North Vietnam? And while we are giving millions of dollars to the South Koreans, do we ever give as much as a thought to the much more unfortunate North Koreans?

Our foreign aiders point with pride to what we have done to advance the freedom and prosperity of nations in Western Europe but they ignore the fact that at the very same time we have worked to destroy the freedom of all of the nations in Eastern Europe.

Is anybody in our Government concerned about the hundreds of millions of formerly free people whom official U.S. policies are sealing into the slavery of communism?

Some morally conscious Congressmen have long been concerned about these unfortunate people, and one of these distinguished Representatives is here with me now. The Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, of Ohio, has fought valiantly to bring the plight of these helpless captives to the attention of the American people and to fulfill our moral obligation to them by appropriate legislation.

Congressman FEIGHAN, your untiring leadership in this moral and patriotic cause is most heartening. Welcome back to the Manion Forum.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Thank you, Dean Manion. It is a pleasure to take part in your forum. I appreciate this opportunity to raise a few questions about U.S. policy toward the captive nations which I trust will cast some light on current U.S. policy toward the aggressive actions of imperial Russia.

In speaking about the captive nations I refer to more than a score of once free and independent nations now under the dictatorial control of Fascist Russia, through the imperial mechanism of communism. Congress identified those nations in Public Law 86–90, which established the third week of July each year as Captive Nations Week.

Congress also made a finding in that law determining that the aspirations for freedom and national independence held by the people in those captive, non-Russian nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of our best hopes for a just and lasting peace. The deterrent to war concept expressed in that public law is based upon the belief that imperial Russia will not dare to launch an all-out shooting war so long as the human hopes for freedom and national independence burn brightly in the captive nations.

War would provide the conditions under which the people of the captive, non-Russian nations could turn in open revolt against their imperial Russian oppressors. That is precisely what happened when the Germans invaded the Soviet Union in 1941, making it possible for the German armies to reach the gates of Moscow, Leningrad, and Stalingrad within a matter of months and with marginal opposition.

Two million non-Russian soldiers in the Red army surrendered to the Germans, begged for the opportunity to take up common arms against imperial Russia. All they asked in return was that their captive homelands be granted freedom and independence at the end of the war. Hitler turned them down on both counts and thereby hangs the true story of German defeat on the eastern front.

It is obvious, therefore, that our national interests and the cause of peace are best served by nurturing the hopes for freedom and national independence among the peoples of the captive nations. The Russian nation, comprised of about 90 million loyal subjects, is sitting on a volatile human powder keg of several hundred million captive non-Russian peoples with European attachments.

That human powder keg will explode in the face of imperial Russia in the event of war. The Russian leaders are aware of this reality. It serves as a powerful brake on their imperial ambitions.

That is why Congress called upon the President to proclaim Captive Nations Week during the third week of July—as a means of demonstrating publicly our Nation's support for the aspirations held by the people of the Captive Nations, and to emphasize our association with their struggle for freedom and national independence.

Imperial Russia is, however, instigating and supporting so-called wars of liberation against countries of the free world. The present armed conflicts in Laos and Vietnam are examples of that warfare. Closer to home we have the example of Cuba which Castro liberated into communism.

Russian occupied Cuba is now serving as a base of operations for future wars of liberation into communism. Those wars are being directed at the Republics of Central and South America where well-trained Russian agents, prototypes of Fidel Castro, are attempting to seize control of the social revolutions underway in those areas. This is what imperial Russia means by peaceful competition with the free world.

There is nothing peaceful about this competition, and the real irony is, this so-called competition is restricted to the territory of the free world. Imperial Russia assumes the right to instigate, and support localized wars of liberation in the free world without bringing on the threat of a thermonuclear holocaust.

Yet, the mere mention of encouraging the spirit of freedom and national independence behind the Iron Curtain, not to mention the prospects of liberating the captive nations into freedom, brings forth an angry chorus of protests predicting a nuclear holocaust is sure to result. Such false voices of protest and prediction on the American scene are becoming as articulate and vehement as those in the Kremlin.

This double standard, with two sets of rules, laid down by Khrushchev for the deadly game of peaceful competition is more dangerous to our security than the entire Red army. The multinational character of the Red army makes it vulnerable to mass disloyalty by the non-Russian soldiers indentured into it. Khrushchev's double standard of conduct for localized wars of liberation makes us vulnerable to piecemeal dismemberment of the free world community.

It is timely, therefore, to question whether our approach to the worldwide challenge of imperial Russian communism is based upon, confidence in the power of human freedom, or fear of a nuclear holocaust.

Time and time again President Kennedy has expressed publicly his confidence in the ultimate triumph of human freedom. He has challenged the Russians to debate in full on the evils of colonialism.

He has reaffirmed our Nation's historic commitment to the right of all peoples to self-determination and to governments of their own free choice. And he has called for free plebiscites in all quarters of the globe so that all people and nations who are not free masters of their destiny may thus attain their natural rights.

OUR ACTIONS DON'T AGREE WITH POLICY PRONOUNCEMENTS

Recognizing the revolutionary character of the era in which we live and true to the political ideals of our revolutionary heritage, President Kennedy has put us on record as opposed to all forms of colonialism and imperialism.

But the policies and practices of our Department of State with regard to the modern day Russian Empire run contrary to the policy pronouncements of President Kennedy.

Members of both political parties in the Congress have been calling for establishment of a Select Committee on Captive Nations as a means of strengthening the cause of freedom behind the Russian Iron Curtain. The Department of State has expressed official opposition to such a committee on the grounds it would disturb delicate negotiations now underway with imperial Russia.

And worse, Secretary of State Dean Rusk has gone on public record in defense of Russian imperialism. He maintains the once independent nations of Ukraine, Georgia, and Armenia, among others identified as captive nations in Public Law 86–90, are historic parts of the Russian Empire. He further maintains that to advocate freedom and national independence for those captive nations would lead to the dismemberment of the Russian Empire, a result which he opposes.

Secretary Rusk is not entirely to blame for this denial of the policies enunciated by President Kennedy. He is not generally regarded as an authority on Russian colonialism or the supporting tactics of imperial communism and is largely dependent upon an entrenched bureaucracy of Russian experts in the Department for guidance and decision.

Those Russian experts hold the dubious distinction of misguiding no less than four national administrations. They continue along their erroneous and losing ways despite the change in administrations and the all too obvious need to unleash the dynamics of our political and moral ideals to avoid war and to win the peace with justice.

That same group of Russian experts in the State Department holds that the Russians are mellowing, that given time they will evolve out of tyranny into freedom, that their aggressive plans for world conquest are nothing more than expressions of immaturity, that meanwhile we must tolerate Russion ruthless exploitation of other nations, and above all, we must not allow the worldwide movement toward freedom to interfere with what they regard as a Russion historical process.

These theories ignore the fact that Russia is the historic seat of despotism, that imperial Russia has engaged in wars of conquest for centuries, that the Iron Curtain was erected to repel all currents of change from the outside world and that it is a crime against the Russian empire to entertain or admire Western thinking.

It is worth noting here that Lenin in a deathbed statement admitted that the Bolsheviks had failed in their efforts to subdue what he called "the incursions of that hundred percent Russian, the great Russian, the chauvinist, in reality the scoundrel and despoiler which the typical Russian bureaucrat is."

Lenin also made this deathbed prophecy: "There can be no doubt that the insignificant percentage of Soviet and Sovietized workers will drown in the great Russian sea of chauvinist riffraff like a fly in milk."

Lenin, himself a great Russian, knew that the Russian character could not be changed by Communist theories, that communism had already failed in its utopian claims. The 40 years since his death have proved Lenin's prophecy to be correct.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE MUST REPUDIATE APPEASERS IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Today we are faced with the threat of old-fashioned Russian imperialism dressed up in the propaganda of Communist theory. When any nation falls victim to Communist agents, Russian despotism moves in to take over. We have adequate proof of that Russian technique on our own doorstep—in Cuba.

The great issue before the American people today can be stated very simply. Will the policy pronouncements of President Kennedy be put into practice, or will the entrenched bureaucracy of Russian experts in the State Department defeat those policies by their countermeasures which I have described?

This great issue can be resolved by two actions. The first action is Presidential endorsement of a congressional Committee on Captive Nations.

The second action is public repudiation by Secretary Rusk of his letter to the House Rules Committee denying the right of national independence for Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, and other captive nations identified in Public Law 86–90.

Anything short of these meaningful actions lays our Nation open to the charge of massive discrimination against once free and independent nations, and invites serious doubts about our leadership in the cause of freedom and national independence for all nations.

DEAN MANION. Thank you, Congressman MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, of Ohio.

My friends, you have just been given the size and scope of a scandal that is preventing our victory in the cold war. Send this startling speech to Secretary Rusk and demand an explanation. In the meantime, tell your Congressman to join Congressman FEIGHAN in his effort to establish a congressional Captive Nations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I suggest now is the time for the United States to propose the use of its good offices to force Khrushchev into meaningful nonaggression pacts with the peoples of the captive nations.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from Ohio. He is speaking on a subject of interest to every American, and I think to all of the people throughout the world, and to have an expression of opinion from the gentleman from Ohio, who is so well informed on every angle of this question, has been very helpful. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am most appreciative of the kind sentiments expressed by my very distinguished colleague.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I will be very happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRUCE. I would also like to express my appreciation of the statement made by the gentleman from Ohio. I believe you have made a correct analysis and I wish to express my appreciation of your taking the time to make the recommendations you just made. It is something that many of us felt very strongly about for some time. I hope the recommendations the gentleman made are now followed up with the appropriate actions in the appropriate places to bring them to fruition. I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the gentleman very much.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX—"CONTINUED ADHERENCE TO FREE TRADE AND CAPITAL MOVEMENTS"?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in his message to Congress last Thursday on the subject of balance of payments President Kennedy stated:

> I want to make it clear that in solving its international payments problem this Nation will continue to adhere to its historic advocacy of freer trade and capital movements.

In the same message the President proceeded to propose a 15-percent "interest equalization tax" on American investments in foreign securities, which would have precisely the opposite result. The President's proposal represents a complete reversal of the position expressed by Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon in appearances before congressional committees earlier this year. He and other administration spokesmen have stated that controls on the flow of capital would continue to be rejected as an instrument to reduce our balance of payments deficit. Although the new tax cannot be called a direct control on the outflow of private capital, it is designed to act as a tariff. It is a step in the direction of direct control and is a departure from the principle of an international free flow of capital.

What is even more disturbing is the lack of candor with which the administration has presented its program. While paying lip service to the sound principle of international free flow of capital, it has proceeded to undercut this principle by its actual proposal.

It is, in effect, an artificial wall to the free flow of private capital which, if enacted, would distort private investment decisions and strike at the very roots of confidence. In the long run I believe its effects would be damaging both to our domestic economy and our foreign economic policy.

It is extremely unfortunate that the President should propose to restrict the flow of private capital at a time when the United States has been so conspicuously successful in its efforts to have foreign countries remove such restrictions.

In addition there is a likelihood that foreign investment in the United States which the President says he is trying to attract will be somewhat discouraged by the fear that further restrictions may be imposed on the use of the dollar. Furthermore, it seems to me that the tax proposal is clearly inconsistent with the administration's announced objective of selling more U.S. securities abroad. The creation of an artificial wall to foreign flotations in this country can serve only to negate any beneficial effects which might flow from the administration's efforts in this area.

Historically, partial restrictions on the free flow of capital as well as goods have been notoriously unsuccessful. Ways to circumvent such partial restrictions can always be found. In the case of this particular tax the administration found it necessary to include a tremendous number of loopholes and within 48 hours after the tax had been proposed an additional one was added. To be specific, Canada applied for and received an exemption from the tax for new issues of Canadian securities. In order to meet the possibility of such requests from other countries the administration has made its usual request for discretionary executive authority to exempt other foreign securities from the burden of the tax as it sees fit. We are now faced with a request to enact a tax which will be thoroughly discriminatory in its application and which will have no basic underlying principle save that of the momentary whims of the executive branch. Thus, I submit that by the time we have finished granting exemptions to this tax we will have merely succeeded in adding another complication to our already hopelessly confused tax structure while making little substantial progress toward the ultimate solution of our balance-of-payments problem. If the administration seriously attempts to stem the outflow of private capital by this method I believe it is inevitable that the administration will have to resort to an increasingly stringent and more complex set of controls which can only end with complete Government control over foreign exchange.

Another possible effect of this so-called interest equalization tax may also be to reduce the amount of our foreign exports. One, of course, cannot estimate how closely foreign purchases in this country are tied to foreign borrowings. However, a number of financial experts have noted that several countries which are principal borrowers in this country are also among our greatest export markets. Even the Department of Commerce has admitted that the passage of this tax may well produce a "small but significant" decline in our foreign exports.

I would also suggest that even though the administration presents this tax as a temporary one, lasting only until 1965, the likelihood is that it will be with us far longer than that. The history of "temporary" taxes such as the Korean excise taxes and our difficulty in repealing them should serve as support for this view.

Mr. Speaker, instead of erecting barriers to provide capital movements and adopting other palliatives to anesthetize the symptoms of our balance-of-payments deficit the administration should come to grips with the basic cause of the outflow of U.S. funds, an unfavorable investment climate in this country arising from a weakness in business confidence, based on a continuing profit squeeze, chronic Federal budget deficits, and a slow but steady erosion of the value of the dollar, and a failure to adopt wage and price policies that will sufficiently improve our international ability to compete. Confidence and the healthier business climate which accompanies it will not be restored until the administration imposes discipline upon itself in the conduct of its fiscal affairs and of our domestic economy. In my speech last week on the balance-of-payments problem I made eight recommendations which I will now summarize again for a program of action in this regard:

First, that the United States not continue to gear its interest rate primarily to domestic requirements but use it to create a more attractive investment climate for private capital in this country.

The major remedy recently taken to improve our balance-of-payments deficit by the increase in discount rate to 3½ percent—is a step in the right direction. Taken by itself it will prove inadequate to solve the balance-of-payments problem and I believe that the administration's contention that the short-term interest rate can be raised without affecting the long-term interest rate will ultimately prove to be false. For as short-term borrowing becomes increasingly attractive relative to long-term borrowing, competitive conditions will demand a compensatory rise in the long-term rate. In spite of domestic political and economic considerations I believe our balance-of-payments position is such that such a rise will prove to be necessary and should not be thwarted by the administration. It is high time that we stop playing politics with the interest rate and permit it to be used as an effective instrument in solving our balance-of-payments problem.

Second. That the United States review not only our foreign economic and military aid but also our military operations abroad which substantially contribute to the balance-of-payments deficit.

Third. That the administration initiate vigorous efforts to equalize competitive conditions between U.S. exporters and those of other industrial nations.

Fourth. That we as a nation do more to impress upon all sectors of our economy the need to hold down wages and prices, to maintain our competitive position in world trade.

Fifth. That Federal fiscal policy be conducted in an anti-inflationary manner in order to maintain the line against price increases.

Sixth. That the Federal Government continue its policies such as the continuous review of depreciation schedules to increase the productivity of American industry.

Seventh. That the United States while continuing its policy of selling gold to official monetary institutions at $35 an ounce remove its guarantee to buy gold at $35 an ounce or at any other predetermined price.

Eighth. That the United States look forward to the time when U.S. balance-of-payments deficits are eliminated and initiate immediate discussions within the International Monetary Fund on fundamental changes in its structure which should be made to provide sufficient international liquidity to meet the growing needs of world trade.

In the President's balance-of-payments program there is much which is sound and necessary but the keystone of any successful attack on the payments deficit is putting our Federal house in order and that, this administration has regretfully chosen to ignore.

Yesterday I wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, C. Douglas Dillon, raising some question about the efficacy of the proposed tax in view of the considerations I have already cited. I stated that a brief examination of the administration's proposal has led me to the impression that the gains to be realized from the enactment of the interest equalization tax are likely to be so small as not to justify the heavy costs—both certain and potential—which it would involve.

In fact I might just say that it is entirely possible that the administration will shortly conclude that the rate of this tax is so low as to be relatively ineffective in stemming the balance-of-payments deficit. If this proves to be so the administration will soon be back here to seek a rate increase, having succeeded in getting the erroneous basic principle adopted.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert my letter to Secretary Dillon in the RECORD.

The New York Times in the issues of July 19 and 24 and the Wall Street Journal in an editorial on July 22 have also expressed similar reservations about the President's proposal and I wish to insert them in the RECORD:

JULY 23, 1963.

HON. C. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary, U.S. Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing in regard to the administration's plan to reduce the balance-of-payments deficit by stemming foreign security sales in the United States through an interest equalization tax. It is claimed that such a tax would, in effect, increase by approximately 1 percent the interest cost to foreigners of obtaining capital in this country and would thus help equalize interest rate patterns for longer term financing in the United States and abroad.

The significant nature of this proposal was demonstrated by the unsettling reaction which its announcement caused in major financial centers around the world. Because of the serious effects that it might have on domestic and international money markets and because it is a clear departure from U.S. policy of maintaining freedom of capital movements, the benefits to be derived from such a program must be carefully weighed against the costs. It seems clear that the costs of such a program, particularly when employed by a key currency country, would be so onerous as not to justify the meager balance-of-payments savings which might be expected to result from it.

In his July 18 balance-of-payments message to the Congress, the President said that the balance-of-payments savings which would result from an interest equalization tax combined with the increase in short-term interest rates should over the next 18 months equal or probably exceed $900 million. As you pointed out in your testimony before the Joint Economic Committee on July 8, a reasonable increase in short-term interest rates would be likely to improve our annual balance of payments by $500 million or more. Over an 18-month period, therefore, we might expect an improvement arising from the increase in the discount rate of about $750 million. It would follow that the balance-of-payments savings over 18 months which the administration believes would flow from the foreign security tax program would be in the area of $150 million—or $100 million on an annual basis. I would appreciate knowing if my understanding is correct.

Furthermore, I presume that this estimate was arrived at prior to the exemption of new Canadian issues, which the administration reportedly has granted. Since new Canadian issues for the past 3 years have comprised an average of 33 percent of American purchases of all new issues of foreign securities plus all transactions in outstanding foreign securities, it appears that exempting them would very largely wipe out the balance-of-payments savings which the administration has estimated. What is the administration's estimate of the total balance-of-payments savings which would be realized by the program on an annual basis if Canadian new issues are totally exempted?

If new Canadian issues and issues of the less developed countries are exempted, as is apparently planned, my estimates indicate that the total amount which might be affected by the tax would have been only $189 million in 1960, $478 million in 1961, $379 million in 1962, and $131 million in the first quarter of 1963. Admittedly, one cannot predict the size of future outflows of this nature solely on the basis of past experience. It does appear to me, however, that the magnitudes covered by the tax would be so small as not to warrant taking such a potentially harmful and unsettling step.

Aside from the fact that the balance-of-payments savings which might be realized would be relatively insignificant compared to the size of the overall deficit, there is a possibility that there will be offsets to such savings. First, some exports of U.S. capital goods which are financed from foreign borrowings in the U.S. market probably would be reduced. Second, there is a likelihood that some foreign investment in the United States, which the President seeks to attract, would be discouraged by the fear that further restrictions might be imposed on the use of the dollar. Has the Treasury Department made any estimate of the size of these possible offsets to balance-of-payments savings arising from the proposed tax?

In addition, the tax proposal is inconsistent with the administration's objective, which was clearly spelled out in the President's message, of selling more U.S. securities abroad. The erection of an artificial wall to foreign flotations in this country can only serve to negate any beneficial effects which might flow from the administration's efforts to sell more U.S. securities overseas. Has the Treasury estimated the size of this possible offset?

Furthermore, there is considerable doubt about whether a 1-percent increase in long-term-interest rates would discourage much foreign borrowing in the U.S. market. For example, an article by Prof. Peter B. Kenen in the June 1963 issue of Lloyd's Bank Review points out that the costs to the borrower of floating new issues is considerably higher in other financial centers than in the United States. Even after a 1-percent increase in effective interest rates, the U.S. market would still remain considerably more attractive than nearly every other major financial center. Furthermore, as you yourself have often pointed out, there are numerous important influences other than interest rates which attract borrowers to the New York market and which would remain largely unaffected by the tax.

If my conclusions are correct, the tax plan at the rates proposed is likely to have no appreciable effect on the balance of payments. If the tax were to be passed by Congress, however, I fear that once its ineffectiveness became apparent the administration would insist that the approach was right but that the rates were not high enough and needed to be increased.

I do not wish to leave you with the impression that my comment on the effectiveness of the proposals implies any agreement with the principle behind it. Instead of erecting barriers to private capital movements, the administration should grapple with the basic cause of the outflow of funds. This outflow results from an unfavorable investment climate in this country arising from a weakness in business confidence based upon the continuing profits squeeze, chronic Federal budget deficits, and the slow but steadily erosion of the value of the dollar. Confidence and the healthier investment climate which accompanies it will not be restored until the administration imposes discipline upon itself in the conduct of its fiscal affairs.

In sum, Mr. Secretary, aside from rejecting the principle underlying the administration's proposal, I have the distinct impression that the gains which might be realized from it are likely to be so small as not to justify the heavy costs involved. Because of my deep concern over our payments problem and my desire to seek solutions consistent with the U.S. role as world banker, I should appreciate hearing any comments you may have on my understanding of this proposal.

With very best wishes,
Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

[From the New York Times, July 24, 1963]

RAISING NEW BARRIERS

The modifications that the administration has been making in its hasty and ill-advised proposal to tax American purchases of foreign securities will lessen much of the plan's potential effect on the balance of payments. They also expose the weakness in the international monetary network that has been built up over the past decade.

In effect, the administration is now proposing to set up a two-price system for long-term capital. This is inconsistent with the position of the United States as the world's banker and with the long-standing objective of lowering barriers to trade and capital movements. Instead, it suggests that we are regressing toward direct controls over capital, which led to the breakdown of international finance a generation ago.

President Kennedy is seeking to avert the obvious dangers by requesting discretionary authority to exempt from taxation some foreign issues. This concession came after discussions with the Canadian Government which, ironically, had made an attempt to penalize American investors in Canadian securities. Canada represents the biggest single source of the drain of long-term capital for stocks and bonds; exempting its securities would thus limit the amount that could be saved.

The fact is that this latest attempt to cope with the serious problem posed by the chronic deficit in our balance of payments tends to solidify barriers, not erase them. It cannot eliminate the deficit, but could lead to a return to the financial nightmare of the 1930's, when each power resorted to unilateral "beggar thy neighbor" policies that effectively disrupted trade and brought economic stagnation.

Mr. Kennedy's proposal does have the merit of demonstrating that the United States has the determination and the means to defend the dollar. But that has always been the case. Despite the persistence of the payments deficit, we are still the greatest economic power in the free world. The problem has been to reduce the deficit without impairing the progress that has been made in international economic and financial cooperation.

We do need to accelerate reduction of the deficit. But we should also be exploring new approaches to improve the international monetary system and to insure that the free world will never again go to the brink of financial bankruptcy. The proposed tax with its two-price system for capital and its controls over borrowers does not represent a constructive step in this direction.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 22, 1963]

DRAMATIZING THE DOLLAR'S DISTRESS

"I want to make it clear that, in solving its international payments problem, this Nation will continue to adhere to its historic advocacy of freer trade and capital movements."

That's what President Kennedy said last week. Then he proceeded to propose a 15 percent tax on investments in foreign securities. Whatever else may be said about it, this is a restriction on free capital movements.

And whatever the President may have intended, this and other proposals surely spotlight the depths of the dollar's troubles. They also leave the impression that the administration really does not understand why America, in 12 of the past 13 years, has been able to balance its international income and outgo only by dipping into the gold that backs up our dollar.

A major factor—if not the major factor—in this chronic payments deficit is the Government's own huge spending abroad. A lot of this spending goes for foreign aid, and there's growing agreement that much of this aid is misdirected and unavailing. Yet the President proposes no real cutback in aid outlays; he merely would force foreigners to spend somewhat more of their aid dollars in the United States. Whatever modest help this may be to our balance of payments, it hardly squares with our "historic advocacy of freer trade."

Most of the rest of the Government's overseas outlay is military spending, and Mr. Kennedy does say that this spending will be trimmed a bit over the next couple of years. But it seems certain the reduction could materialize sooner and go a good deal deeper if our allies would assume their fair share of the burden of the West's defenses. And it should be obvious by now that they will do so only when Uncle Sam stops picking up their part of the tab.

Still another reason for the payments deficit has been the persistent policy of keeping money plentiful and cheap, both in recession and recovery. The idea is that when business is bad easy money will turn things around, and when business is good easy money will make it get even better. It didn't work out that way in the depression thirties, and in the past couple of years it hasn't produced the rate of growth the administration is seeking.

What it has done has been to encourage both Americans and foreigners to invest relatively more abroad, where higher interest rates are available. The Government seems well aware of this, and yet it still shrinks from strong countermoves, still clings to easy money as an economic stimulant.

It's true that the Federal Reserve raised the discount rate last week, indicating that short-term interest rates may head slightly higher. The proposed investment tax also would force foreigners to offer higher long-term rates if they want to borrow in the American market. But the President, in arguing for the tax, emphasized that there's to be no such interest rate rise for domestic borrowers. In other words, we're going to try the treacherous trick of tightening money for foreigners while we have even more easy money at home.

However much misunderstanding there may be about all of this in Washington, foreigners understand these things all too well.

They can see, for instance, that the investment tax may well be self-defeating. For U.S. investments in foreign securities produce a return flow of income, a flow that has been rising sharply. Last year it came to $800 million, not far from the $1.1 billion that Americans invested in new foreign securities. In the long run the income almost surely would surpass new investment.

Foreigners, furthermore, recognize flags of distress when they see them; they've flown them for their own currencies often enough. Like a bank that's in trouble, the United States proposes to limit withdrawals. In such circumstances, what will a German, an Englishman or anyone else think about the safety of investments he has made here? Or about the wisdom of investing any more funds in the United States? And will his confidence be inflated by the knowledge that America, for the very first time, plans to borrow from the International Monetary Fund?

Even so, these moves might accomplish something if the Government would accompany them with steps toward fiscal and monetary responsibility. Specifically, by making more meaningful cuts in its own spending and by abandoning its easy notions about easy money. But time will run out if the Government instead relies mainly on gimmicks that dramatize the dollar's distress.

[From the New York Times, July 19, 1963]

Dollar Problem, Not Crisis

President Kennedy's message on the balance of payments makes it plain that there is no impending dollar crisis. There is, however, a dollar problem. The measures already taken to reduce the deficit and relieve the pressure on the Nation's gold stock have not worked so effectively or so speedily as had been hoped. The deficit is still uncomfortably large, which means that foreign governments are accumulating new supplies of dollars that can be exchanged for gold.

For the most part, Mr. Kennedy's new proposals for bolstering the dollar strengthen steps already in operation. He hopes that Government economies will cut as much as $900 million from the deficit. He expects the Federal Reserve's action in raising the discount rate, which increased the attractiveness of short-term dollar obligations to both American and foreign investors, will stem another large portion of the outflow.

The object of the proposal to impose taxes on foreign securities sold to American investors is to reduce the attractiveness of foreign bonds and stocks, which are responsible for a further sizable outflow of dollars. Mr. Kennedy claims that taxing foreign obligations is not a barrier to the free flow of capital; but while it is not to be equated with direct controls, which many foreign governments still maintain, it does amount to an indirect restriction. In foreign circles, it may well be regarded as the harbinger of exchange controls.

Under this proposal the American investor, not the foreign borrower, would be subjected to discrimination. Foreign borrowers have been flocking to the United States not because capital is cheaper but because it is freely available. Presumably they will continue to do so until their own countries develop their own capital markets and eliminate barriers on capital movements.

As for the administration's request for $500 million in a standby loan from the International Monetary Fund, there is no doubt that this will help ease the drain on the gold stock. By drawing funds now, the United States may be able to make much larger borrowings without exciting fears of a crisis.

These measures will not erase the deficit. Nor will they lead to a long-term improvement in the international monetary system. The new program merely provides more time to deal with the deficit.

As the leading financial power in the free world, the administration has demonstrated that the dollar will be defended. This is the time to begin exploring new efforts to stimulate the free movement of capital through an international monetary system. This cannot be done by setting up barriers to investment.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Missouri for his remarks and to associate myself with them in connection with this balance-of-payments and gold-flow problem. This country owes a great debt to Tom Curtis. It shall be repaid perhaps some day in the bright tomorrow when commonsense and practical experience return as guiding principles for the fiscal policies of this Nation. This gold-flow matter is one which I have interested myself in for a long time. I shall first refer to previous remarks of my own in the Record, with the permission of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on February 21 of this year I called to the attention of the House that one of the chief objections to the administration's conduct of foreign affairs was their method of conducting foreign affairs. I cited as examples the fact that if they had done their preliminary homework it would have avoided some of the unsettling uproar connected with matters such as the Skybolt missile and the Canadian defense problem.

Here again we have a situation where apparently there has been a complete lack of advance planning with our allies. No homework. The administration has had to reverse itself very drastically in connection with the impact of this proposed tax on foreign investments as it affects Canada.

Canada again and so soon.

On March 7 I called the attention of the House to the fact that the balance-of-payments problem was becoming so serious that we were offering the sale of U.S. bonds to France. In connection with this I pointed out the inflationary potential and the fact that the balance-of-payments problem was becoming very serious. I suggested that a balanced budget might be a solution.

On March 13 I again called the attention of the House to the problem of balance of payments and gold flow by means of an excellent editorial in the Wall Street Journal which scored this administration's lack of understanding of the problem and their "peddling efforts to stanch the flow."

On March 21, this problem of how strong the dollar actually is was called to the attention of the House when I inserted in the Record a strong statement by Senator Dirksen that this entire question of the weakening of the dollar, the dollar flow and the gold flow, was a reflection of the very inflationary budgetary policies of this administration, with particular reference to the deficit of $12 billion, the planned and recommended deficit of $12 billion. I praised the Senator for linking the balance-of-payments problem to the planned deficit and warned of how important to America the problem was becoming.

On the 4th day of April I called to the attention of this House the perceptive and portentous words of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis]. There seems to be a great deal of misunderstanding in connection with all this talk about the weakening of the dollar, and sometimes it leaves people cold. I want to remind such people of the words of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis], which I quoted in the Record then and I quote for the Record now. This is what he said—

> I remind all of you of what Lenin and other Communist leaders have said that they are not going to defeat America on the battlefield. We will get America to spend itself to death.
>
> And, indeed, if they succeed we will then go down the same trail of oblivion as so many other nations in history have gone. We will not go out in a blaze of glory but in a whimper.

When President Kennedy finally delivered his message on the gold flow and balance-of-payment problem to the House last week I responded with a release the same day which is pertinent to my remarks today. I accused the President of almost inconceivable inconsistency in his special message to the Congress on the gold-flow crisis, pointing out that early in his message, just as the gentleman from Missouri has pointed out in his remarks today, President Kennedy promised that this Nation will continue to adhere to its historic advocacy of freer trade and capital movement.

I then went on to point out, as the gentleman from Missouri has done today, that in stark contrast to this pledge the President asked Congress to impose a punitive tax on foreign investments. Such a tax would create a virtual wall. Just as the Berlin wall signifies to the world that a communistic society cannot compete with a free society, this Kennedy tax law would be an admission to the world of the dollar's weakness—a signal to the world of the sad state to which our ruinous financial policies are leading us. But this plan cannot succeed. You cannot stop the flow toward freedom—be it with people or dollars.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] has already read into the Record certain editorials, but I ask unanimous consent to add at this time three editorials to which I shall refer very briefly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. The first editorial is one appearing in the Wall Street Journal of July 23, in which they referred to the fact that there was no advance cooperation with the Canadian Government, resulting in the fact the administration had to reverse themselves immediately on this tax as far as Canada is concerned. We can only ask what country will be next. We can only deplore that so serious a problem has waited so long for a solution. We must deplore that once again at long last under the mounting pressure of crisis, recommendations are finally made—but again they are last-minute, halfcocked, ill conceived, hipshooting solutions that fail to get to the heart of the matter.

The editorial follows:

Going Off Halfcocked

When somebody in the administration, a week or so ago, came up with the bright suggestion for a special tax on Americans who buy foreign securities, it apparently looked like a nice, simple idea.

After all, we do have a balance-of-payments problem, due to the fact that too many dollars are going abroad. And after all, one part of the problem is the fact that some Americans buy foreign securities.

True, the dollar loss from the purchase of foreign securities is tiny compared to the Government's huge foreign spending (which we are constantly reminded is an "investment") or compared to the withdrawal of foreign funds frightened from this country. Also, investment abroad brings returns here.

Still, wouldn't it be helpful to reduce what foreign security buying there is?

And what better way to do it than with a little tax on such transactions? It's a much more moderate measure than a gold embargo, or devaluation, or direct prohibitions on the transfer of funds abroad, all of which had been broached in council. An "interest equalization tax" (nice phrase, that) would not have the same violent effects as these other measures, and it would be fairly simple to administer.

Well, that's the way it seemed when the idea was adopted, sold to the President and hurriedly presented to Congress. But since then, things have been happening.

One of the first things that happened, last Thursday afternoon, was a query from knowledgeable people in the New York securities markets. How, pray, were the stock exchanges going to open any of their foreign securities, many of which have been traded in this country for years, come Friday morning?

Nobody had thought of that. And apparently nobody in Washington had thought either of the possible effects on the stock exchanges of a situation in which these foreign securities, a number of them really blue chip stocks, were paralyzed. There was a very real risk that the demoralization would spread to the rest of the market.

So there was much rushing around, and by nightfall Thursday the Treasury had issued an emergency amendment to the President's emergency proposal. There'd be a 30-day "grace period" for securities on listed exchanges.

This, of course, immediately created an anomaly—discriminatory treatment for all the other issues not listed on the big exchanges—and confounded confusion. And the confusion was quickly felt abroad.

In London, in Amsterdam, in Toronto, in Tokyo—in all the complicated and interrelated machinery of the international financial market system—there were immediate repercussions. The Tokyo market plummeted in the sharpest drop it has experienced since World War II. In Canada the repercussions were felt all the way to the highest government offices.

Nobody had thought of that either. Treasury officials concede that they were surprised by the severity of the reaction among our Canadian neighbors; surprised, but in a mood to dismiss it. As late as Friday afternoon they had no intention of changing anything.

By the weekend, however, they changed their minds again. This simple and trivial little tax had brought to Washington the governor of the Bank of Canada, the deputy minister of finance and the Canadian under secretary of state. From this hurried meeting came another amendment to the proposal—the foreign securities purchase tax won't apply to "new" Canadian issues.

Immediately, another quirk in the crazy quilt. If you buy an existing foreign security from an American, no tax. Buy it for a foreigner, a 15 percent tax. Buy a "new" Canadian security from an American or a Canadian, no tax. Buy a new issue from some other country, pay the tax. Or, anyway, that's the way it was up to a moment ago. Probably be different tomorrow.

The irony of all this is that all these shocks to the world security markets, all this confusion, all these political blows delivered to our friends, will at the most have but a small effect on the balance of payments. Even on the basis of very crude guesses, the security purchase tax will affect only $150 million out of a deficit running at more than $3 billion a year.

This alone makes it a very reckless proposal. But what is truly staggering about it is the plain evidence of the record that it was put forward without any real awareness of its possible complications and repercussions.

The world's money markets, where in the final analysis the fate of the U.S. dollar will be decided, are delicate and complex. They are no place for men to go charging about halfcocked.

Mr. CURTIS. I might say on that point that in my letter to the Secretary of the Treasury I point out that a bulk of the impediment of this tax would have been against Canada. Therefore, the effect of the tax being eliminated as against Canada will be to cut the benefit of that action such as it may be to one-third.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I thank the gentleman for pointing out those figures. I do think it is important. Here we have the second major incident within half a year where our relations with Canada, which is not very far away, have been muddied and strained by not taking the time and trouble to lift up a telephone and call the Canadians and tell them in advance what we plan to do, and why, and to thus eliminate this sort of ridiculous and morale devastating situation.

Mr. CURTIS. Another way to say this is that the administration should do its homework but is not on various matters of both national and international importance.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I concur wholeheartedly with the gentleman in that statement.

Lest somebody accuse me of citing papers that might be considered just unfriendly to this administration, I also insert an editorial from the Washington Post of today. I have never heard anybody accuse the Washington Post of being unfriendly to this administration. This editorial chides the President's proposed tax for being impractical and pleads plaintively for more advance consultation and cooperation with Canada.

[From the Washington Post, July 24, 1963]

COOPERATION WITH CANADA

How close economic relations between Canada and the United States have become was brought home once more by the drastic reaction of Canadian markets to the President's proposed tax on capital exports. Canada has been the principal foreign borrower in the New York capital market. The tax on purchases of foreign securities, in the view of Canadians, would have pared Canadian borrowing far more than the U.S. Government expected. If the Canadians were right in their appraisal, the tax would have pushed up borrowing costs and perhaps reduced employment in Canada by a substantial margin. It might have compelled Canada to take restrictive action on imports or to modify the exchange rate of the Canadian dollar. In consultations held over the weekend, the proposal was altered to permit the President to exempt Canadian borrowing if he wishes to do so.

This turn of events parallels the fate of a similar tax proposal offered in the Canadian budget a few weeks ago. Finance Minister Gordon wanted a tax that would restrict purchases of Canadian companies by American interests. Such purchases represent another, although less important, part of the flow of American capital to Canada. Economic realities forced Mr. Gordon to beat a retreat. Now the U.S. Treasury has had to withdraw as far as Canadian new issues are concerned.

What this change in policy, including the unpopular demand for Presidential power over taxes, will do to the prospects for congressional passage remains to be seen. It demonstrates clearly, however, that it has become impractical for either country to pursue tax legislation of this sort without consultation. Canada did receive advance warning of the American proposal, but only of the brief kind that spares the recipient the surprise of learning the matter from the newspapers. There was not enough time to consult and change the proposal before it was made public. Precisely this advance consultation is increasingly necessary between the two countries. It is not easy for governments to share confidences when information bearing on the securities market is involved or where everything might be spoiled by a leak. But enough confidence will have to be developed to permit this kind of sharing. The two countries have already agreed to go on consulting on the tax matter. They should make every effort to broaden their consultations.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Finally, Mr. Speaker, in support of my position, at this point in the RECORD I will insert an editorial from the New York Times. Again the New York Times is not considered exactly as an antiadministration paper. They characterize this action which the gentleman from Missouri and I and many others are criticizing today as a "hasty and ill-advised proposal."

The sharply critical editorial referred to is as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 24, 1963]

RAISING NEW BARRIERS

The modifications that the administration has been making in its hasty and ill-advised proposal to tax American purchases of foreign securities will lessen much of the plan's potential effect on the balance of payments. They also expose the weakness in the international monetary network that has been built up over the past decade.

In effect, the administration is now proposing to set up a two-price system for long-term capital. This is inconsistent with the position of the United States as the world's banker and with the long-standing objective of lowering barriers to trade and capital movements. Instead, it suggests that we are regressing toward direct controls over capital, which led to the breakdown of international finance a generation ago.

President Kennedy is seeking to avert the obvious dangers by requesting discretionary authority to exempt from taxation some foreign issues. This concession came after discussions wtih the Canadian Government which, ironically, had made an attempt to penalize American investors in Canadian securities. Canada represents the biggest single source of the drain of long-term capital for stocks and bonds; exempting its securities would thus limit the amount that could be saved.

The fact is that this latest attempt to cope with the serious problem posed by the chronic deficit in our balance of payments tends to solidify barriers, not erase them. It cannot eliminate the deficit, but could lead to a return to the financial nightmare of the 1930's, when each power resorted to unilateral "beggar thy neighbor" policies that effectively disrupted trade and brought economic stagnation.

Mr. Kennedy's proposal does have the merit of demonstrating that the United States has the determination and the means to defend the dollar. But that has always been the case. Despite the persistence of the payments deficit, we are still the greatest economic power in the free world. The problem has been to reduce the deficit without impairing the progress that has been made in international economic and financial cooperation.

We do need to accelerate reduction of the deficit. But we should also be exploring new approaches to improve the international monetary system and to insure that the free world will never again go to the brink of financial bankruptcy. The proposed tax with its two-price system for capital and its controls over borrowers does not represent a constructive step in this direction.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from New Hampshire who has been a thoughtful student in this crucial area for the work that he has been conscientiously performing for the past months to call this serious matter of gold flow and balance of payments to the attention of our colleagues as well as to the attention of the people of our country. I welcome his help and his support in this very crucial matter.

THE CHAOTIC BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. I rise to discuss a matter of serious importance—one which affects not only the American people, but also the economy of the entire free world. I refer to the timely and chaotic balance-of-payments situation.

We must realize that the international payments system of the free world is no longer envisaged as an automatic mechanism which absolves all members of conscious cooperation. Ever since Bretton Woods, the keynote has been international monetary cooperation. This cooperation is not yet perfected, but the trend since Bretton Woods has been encouraging. The work in creating an international currency, which the International Monetary Fund was not powerful enough to undertake, was taken on by the United States, which became the dominant key currency country and the leader in the free world's return to convertibility after the war.

The integration of the economic policies of the members of the international payments system is not as close as it ought to be if convertibility at stable rates of exchange is to be achieved; and the arrangement, as it now exists, puts too heavy a burden on the key currency country without extending to it the benefit of exchange rate adjustments. Nevertheless, the system as it is, constitutes a great improvement over the gold exchange standard of the 1920's.

The key currency is used by other countries as a unit of account in international transactions, a means to balance international payments, and a reserve of international liquidity. The choice of the dollar as the international unit of account of the free world was the result of the commanding position of the United States after World War II.

The members of the key currency system can acquire key currency balances by two methods; they can either borrow these reserves from the key currency country or they can develop an international payments surplus to earn key currency balances. When they use a payments surplus to acquire reserves, as has been the case in the past few years, they implicitly extend credit to the key currency country which then can enjoy imports for which it does not have to pay in terms of exports. The key currency system can work only if the key currency country is willing to lend when it is in a balance-of-payments surplus, or if it develops a deficit in its balance of trade which helps members finance sufficient reserve holdings via their export surpluses.

Thus, we come to the end result that it is a perfectly natural state of affairs for a key currency country to be in a balance-of-payments deficit position. If the key currency country is not willing to provide sufficient international reserves in this fashion, it will create a dollar shortage. On the other hand, the key currency must not be in excessive supply in consequence of a serious and protracted international payments deficit because the member countries might doubt the ability of the key country to maintain both the internal and external value of its currency unit—this leads to the conversion of dollars into gold.

The United States, then, is caught between Scylla and Charybdis. If we reduce our balance-of-payments deficit by too much, we will reduce the world liquidity on which international trade depends. Yet, the United States cannot long remain in its current position, and any efforts it makes will both affect individual foreign economies and international liquidity.

The time has come, then, for the United States to think beyond the mere symptoms of the key currency dilemma and act in a fashion that is consistent with the role it plays in world monetary affairs. We must take a new look at the international payments situation and the role which the United States, as the predominant key currency country, is to play in it. It should be obvious that the calling of an International Economic Conference, as stated in the resolution I have introduced, is the only way the United states can review the long-term adequacy of international credit and adopt needed changes in existing financial institutions.

When the United States takes such action as the "Interest equalization tax" to solve its present uncomfortable position, it ought to discuss these measures with foreign governments in order to insure their success. Naturally, we should know whether the European countries will follow our rise in the short-term interest rate and whether they will place a counter tax of their own on long-term capital outflows. We must be cognizant of the effect our policies have on other economies and give them enough advance notice and help when the need is demonstrated.

It is apparent that at the present time our balance-of-payments deficit is too large and is more than adequate to supply liquidity to the free world. This is demonstrated by the fact that European countries have been exchanging their dollars for gold; this indicates that they feel they have sufficient dollar holdings to finance their international trade. For this reason we must reduce our payment deficit which has reached such critical proportions that broader measures than those proposed by the President last week are essential to cope with the problem before American's gold supply is hopelessly depleted. The proposals made by the President, in themselves, are not the answer to the problem. In attempting to cure some of the ills, namely the deficit, I feel the medicine may develop new ailments, namely insufficient international liquidity. The President's message does recognize the dramatic impact of the problem, but I feel that his proposals tackle the problem on too much of a short-term basis rather than the long-range approach that is necessary to be meaningful.

A few specific areas that the President might study in regard to reducing our present deficit to a reasonable level is in the field of expenditures by the U.S. citizens on foreign services. Much has been said about our importation of hard foreign goods, but too often the importation of services is neglected. The United States has experienced a large outflow in the field of insurance premiums and in payments for foreign merchant marine services.

In the field of insurance, the U.S. citizens have been paying out, net, an annual sum of about $150 million for foreign coverage. Over a 5-year period, this would amount to a net outflow of three-fourths of a billion dollars. Certainly measures should be taken to stop this huge outflow by encouraging domestic companies to write the policies.

In the field of merchant marine shipping, I was startled to learn that less than 10 percent of our foreign waterborne imports and exports are carried on American bottoms. Much of the revenue to U.S. shippers was due to the U.S. Government policy of requiring at least 50 percent of the U.S. Government generated exports to be carried on American ships.

These areas need immediate consideration by the President to relieve our present short-term situation; but, more important, the long-range problems of the key currency country must not be forgotten. The President's recommendations are steps in the right direction, but what really is needed is a broader domestic program and concerted international cooperation in order to effectively correct the basic policy which cause such payments deficits. We must grapple with the basic cause of the outflow of U.S. funds and take forceful steps to correct the situation and develop long-range plans to prevent its recurrence. Only then will we succeed in improving world confidence in the dollar and prevent a drain on our gold reserves.

Mr. Speaker, to fulfill the observations and objectives I have outlined today, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the resolution I have introduced. It is similar to the one aimed at calling for drastic action to resolve the payments crisis introduced by our distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] and identical with the concurrent resolution sponsored in the other body by the able and distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits]. The difference between my resolution and Mr. Curtis' resolution, House Joint Resolution 192, is that the former, like its Senate counterpart, calls for an International Economic Conference, the desirability of which I emphasized today.

In view of the seriousness of the long-term problem, I urge that these resolutions receive early and favorable action by both bodies of the Congress.

AMENDMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1945

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, an extremely significant debate took place in the Senate on July 16, 1963, when Senator MILLER of Iowa, and Senator LAUSCHE of Ohio, tried to prevent the destruction of structurally sound buildings in the District of Columbia.

Senator LAUSCHE declared that:

> Reports have repeatedly come to me to the effect that in urban renewal programs buildings of economic use and value have been bought and torn down, driving the occupants out. My question is: Is there, in the proposal made for the amendment of this act language that would curb the powers of those who seek to condemn, and confine their condemnation to properties that are not of economic use and ought to be destroyed? In many places good buildings have been torn down solely to promote the program.

Senator LAUSCHE added:

> I pose the question because I know of one Ohio city in which the General Accounting Office found that many buildings of usable quality were to be torn down.

The Comptroller General of the United States recently reported that only 24, or about 20 percent, of the buildings marked for destruction in Cleveland's Erieview urban-renewal project were substandard because of building deficiencies which could not be corrected by normal maintenance. Yet the Federal Urban Renewal Administration's approval of the Cleveland project was based on building inspection reports, submitted by Cleveland to the Housing and Home Finance Agency's Chicago regional office, which classified 84, or about 71 percent, of the 118 existing buildings in the project area as substandard because of what the city considered to be serious building deficiencies.

The Comptroller General said in transmitting his Cleveland audit to the Congress that:

> The cited deficiencies of the other 60 buildings were minor in nature and could be corrected through normal maintenance; these buildings, therefore, did not seem to be "substandard requiring clearance," pursuant to the Urban Renewal Administration's eligibility standards for clearance. Inasmuch as (1) a relatively small percentage of the buildings were structurally substandard, (2) demolition is generally the most expensive form of urban renewal treatment, and (3) the intent of the urban renewal legislation is to encourage alternative forms of urban renewal treatment, such as rehabilitation and spot clearance, we believe that, before approval, the Urban Renewal Administration should have fully investigated the situation to determine whether the extent of demolition proposed by the city was warranted.

The distinguished junior Senator from Iowa, Mr. MILLER, in offering an amendment to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, pointed out that the Senate committee report on S. 628:

> Quotes the chairman of RLA as stating that the achievement of urban renewal objectives does not always permit the retention of sound buildings, even though their use may be permitted by the urban renewal plan.

There is ample evidence to show that the bill, S. 628, does not merely make it possible to conduct nonresidential urban renewal in the city of Washington as its proponents maintain. Rather, the evidence shows that it would open the door wide, and permit the very same kind of destruction in the Nation's Capital which the Comptroller General complained of in Cleveland.

Senator MILLER of Iowa was right in making the fight he did on S. 628, for that bill would eliminate the present definition of slum, blight, and substandard in the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, and replace the present definitions in this act—which have proved tremendously elastic and open to flexible interpretations which have permitted the destruction of $2 million worth of structurally sound commercial structures in the southwest urban renewal project in the District of Columbia. It would replace these definitions with new definitions which would allow the District of Columbia Land Agency to declare any dwelling or commercial structure anywhere in the Nation's Capital to be a slum, blighted, and substandard, and thus greatly aggravate the destruction of structurally sound residential and commercial buildings.

Under the new definitions proposed in S. 628, the Redevelopment Land Agency could claim that any dwelling or commercial structure would "impose severe public economic or social liabilities, or impair, arrest, or prevent the sound growth, development, or redevelopment of the District of Columbia." This bill provides no standards upon which such judgments are to be made, and it gives unlimited discretion to the Redevelopment Land Agency of the District of Columbia to determine, without any required criteria, as to whether a home or commercial structure is substandard, slum, or blighted.

We have always assumed that we in America lived under a Government of laws, not men. Here under the Federal Government's urban renewal programs, the situation is reversed, and those unfortunate enough to live or do business within the boundaries of an urban renewal project are subjected to the whims of nonelected public officials who operate without let or hindrance and who build empires of their own fancy with tax moneys.

A study of the testimony presented before Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the District of Columbia clearly indicates that such power should not be given to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency. The testimony shows that in both the Columbia Plaza project, and the Adams-Morgan project, staff members of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency have gone to extreme lengths to define structurally sound dwellings and business structures as slums, blighted, or substandard.

In fact, 141 businesses will be displaced from the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project area, without any study having been made as to whether these 141 commercial structures are structurally sound, or structurally unsound.

It is important to note that the junior Senator from Iowa, Mr. MILLER, asked regarding the bill, S. 628: "Who is to determine what 'severe' is?" "Who is to say what 'sound' growth is?" and he pointed out that "It is what some nonelected public official determines in his own mind is sound."

In behalf of his amendment, Senator MILLER said:

> If there were a guideline, such as I would establish, the aggrieved property owner, who did not think his property should be condemned, could go into court. Then what would happen, under the terms of my amendment? The Redevelopment Land Agency would have to show that the building was substandard. In that connection, the Agency would have to show that the building could not be economically improved or modified to meet the requirements, which it had reasonably established, for integration into the plan; or, if the building could be economically modified, the Agency would have to show that the owner refused to do so.

Senator MILLER then went on to say:

> I do not think that is a very big burden of proof to put on an administrator who wishes to be fair.
>
> I wish to point out that in our zeal for improvements for the public good we should never forget that Government exists primarily for the individual, and individual rights should be protected.

And he called the attention of his colleagues to an editorial in the Washington, D.C., Post for July 17, 1962, which said with regard to the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project:

> Adams-Morgan will show us whether urban renewal can be used to preserve the healthy diversity that is, on a small scale, the reflection of the city itself.
>
> Adams-Morgan must succeed. It must be steered away from one dangerous error toward which it appears to be drifting. The easy way to improve a community is to eject the land uses, and the people, offensive to the majority's sense of esthetics.

If the proponents of S. 628 are sincere in their statement that they only want to make possible nonresidential urban renewal in the District of Columbia they should be willing to make their sincerity evident by supporting an amendment which will do only that, and not so broaden the powers of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency that it will be legal to demolish in the Nation's Capital the kind of structurally sound commercial buildings which were marked for destruction in Cleveland's Erieview project.

Senator MILLER offered an amendment which was quite reasonable, in the view of reasonable men.

Another amendment which would make possible nonresidential commercial urban renewal in the District of Columbia, without making possible the demolition of structurally sound structures, has been suggested, and it reads as follows:

> SEC. 3. Section 3 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency Act is amended by striking out "an area" in subsection (j) which defines "project area" and inserting in lieu thereof "a slum area" or "blighted area," and make the following addition:
>
> "(r) 'Slum area' or 'blighted area' is a residential or nonresidential area in which the conditions obtaining in connection with the existence of any dwelling, or dwellings, or housing accommodations for human beings, or structures used for commercial or industrial purposes predominate which, by reason of structural unsoundness, obsolescence, or a combination of these factors is, in the opinion of the Commissioners detrimental to the safety, health, morals, and welfare of the inhabitants of the District of Columbia."

Recently I introduced a bill, H.R. 7520, to transfer to the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia certain powers and duties relating to urban renewal.

This bill incorporates the reorganization order proposed by the District of Columbia government's administrative and urban renewal staff, which was given general approval by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and sent to the Bureau of the Budget.

President Kennedy has proposed in his bills for home rule in the District of Columbia to centralize urban renewal authority in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Such centralization would avoid duplication, and waste, and prevent the wasteful destruction of good buildings. This would surely be the end result of any plan which would end the present dispersal of urban renewal authority.

I think I should also point out that H.R. 8697, sponsored by the late and distinguished gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Rabaut, which passed the House 10 to 1 on June 27, 1960, also provided for centralization of urban renewal powers in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The amendments to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency Act of 1945 in my bill, H.R. 7520, would go far to correct the present unfair, unjust, wasteful, and discriminatory practices which have been the outstanding features of all of the urban renewal programs in the District of Columbia, and they would prevent the perpetration here of the kind of destruction which was proposed in Cleveland's Erieview urban renewal project.

LAND DIVERSION PROGRAMS HELP MEAT PRODUCERS—WE SHOULD GRAZE MORE OF OUR CULTIVATED LAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, too many people assume the feed grains program only helps to stabilize farm income of feed grain producers when in fact it is also a program for livestock and poultry producers. Some feeder cattle producers have objected to letting cooperators take a lower diversion payment in return for the right to graze diverted acreage. Some poultry producers also objected to the enactment of the program at the same time they were complaining about the price problem resulting from common market actions and excess production. More producers would cooperate if they could graze the diverted areas. Some would divert twice as many acres for the same payment if they could graze the diverted acres and in so doing would contribute even more toward stabilization of livestock and poultry producers income. In view of this, a study of diverting feed grain acres to grazing and its effect upon the beef cattle industry should be valuable and worthy of attention.

J. Carroll Bottum, a well-known and respected Purdue University agricultural economist, in an article in the current issue of the Farm Policy Forum, published by Iowa State University, states:

> The feed-grain program has reacted to the economic advantage of the beef cattle industry.

In considering the implications of taking land out of crop production and allowing grazing on this land, he says:

> Studies show that an acre of cropland shifted to grass and used by beef cattle produces about one-third as many calories of food as when it is in a grain crop and fed to concentrate-consuming livestock. Thus production can be reduced two-thirds as much by shifting cropland to grass as by idling the land.

In discussing the effects of the feed-grains program on beef cattle prices he explained:

> Feed grains make up a higher proportion of the feed inputs for hogs and poultry than for beef cattle. Therefore, when the price of feed grains rises, costs of hogs and poultry producers increase relatively more than those of cattle producers. Thus, the feed price rise checks the expansion of these enterprises more and leaves less pounds of pork and poultry to compete with beef. Cross-elasticity of demand studies indicate that a pound of other red meat and poultry has 40 to 50 percent as much affect on the price of beef as another pound of beef. Therefore, a decrease in the supply of these competing meats increases the demand for beef.
>
> Producers of feeder cattle have often looked with economic concern upon programs that raised the price of corn. It is true that for any one year a rise in corn prices may weaken the demand for feeders. Nevertheless, over the longer period, higher priced corn gives cattle producers an economic advantage over hog producers. For example, if the price of corn could be cut in half, hog producers would get a larger share of the total meat market than now.

He goes on to say:

> The beef industry does not need to fear a shift into pasture of a part of the land retired from crops. Every acre shifted from grain production to pasture will decrease the supply of competing meats sufficiently to more than offset the increased beef supply. Roughly every time cropland is shifted to grass and is used by beef cattle, the supply of competing meats is reduced by 3 pounds for every 1 pound increase in beef. In terms of the cross elasticity of demand and the effect of the total smaller supply of meat, this means a higher price for beef.
>
> For example, an acre of good Corn Belt land which will produce 80 bushels of corn per acre, will supply the feed for 900 pounds of live hog production. Figuring 75-percent dressing percentage this will make 675 pounds of pork and lard. If this same acre is placed in pasture with equally good management, it will produce 300 pounds of live cattle. Figuring a 60-percent dressing percentage, this will make 180 pounds of beef. Thus, the food product per acre with beef is less than one-third as much as with hogs. For the United States, the production of calories with grass and beef is about one-third as much as with grain and hogs or poultry, the grain consuming livestock.

I think it is apparent that Government programs and particularly the feed grains program and wheat program of 1963 resulted in reduction in the amount of land in harvested crops.

If this diverted land is used for grazing purposes, less beef will be produced on that land than if the land had remained in other crops.

The 1961–63 feed grains and wheat programs have obviously economically benefited the cattle industry as well as the hog and poultry industries.

Surely it is apparent that any program that shifts grain acreage to grazing does not hurt the beef industry and that the opposition of certain beef cattle spokesmen is to the effect that " I am not satisfied with the help it would offer—I want more."

If more of the intensely cultivated land were shifted to grass, we could produce the livestock needed without so many totally idled acres, livestock and poultry producers would not be hurt and there would be a reduced cost of production. This would assure a more efficient allocation of national resources. For the benefit of producers, consumers, and taxpayers, this is the direction we should move.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WYMAN (at the request of Mr. CLEVELAND), for balance of this week, on account of death in his family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CURTIS, for 45 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin), for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. KYL (at the request of Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa (at the request of Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RYAN of New York (at the request of Mr. ROGERS of Florida), for 20 minutes on Thursday, July 25, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. EDMONDSON and to include extraneous material.

Mr. Philbin in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Morse.

Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Ashbrook.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Roberts of Alabama) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Burke.

Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Corman.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of Representatives the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1933. An act to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," as amended, with respect to the minimum age limitation for registration;

H.R. 4646. An act to declare a portion of the Benton Harbor Canal, Benton Harbor, Mich., a nonnavigable stream; and

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on July 23, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5279. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 513. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week beginning July 28, 1963, as Veterinary Medicine Week.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 25, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1068. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to consolidate and simplify laws relating to easements and permits upon certain federally owned lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1069. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, relative to the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of the Government at the end of the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1963 (June 30, 1963), pursuant to section 8031(c), title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1070. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act, as amended, with regard to filing designation of beneficiary"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 7638. A bill to authorize additional appropriations for prosecution of the comprehensive plan in the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin; without amendment (Rept. No. 575). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 453. Resolution for consideration of, and waiving points of order against, the conference report on the bill, H.R. 5207, to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926; without amendment (Rept. No. 576). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 454. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 4638, a bill to promote the orderly transfer of the executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President; without amendment (Rept. No. 577). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 7718. A bill to provide means for settling the current dispute between the railroads and their employees over work rules, and for preventing such disputes from arising in the future, and to require various forms of aid for employees displaced by changes in work rules, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 7719. A bill to amend sections 404 and 406 of title 37, United States Code, relating to travel and transportation allowances of certain members of the uniformed services who are retired, discharged, or released from active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 7720. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to facilitate the entry and mailing as second-class mail of publications of churches and church organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.R. 7721. A bill to authorize additional appropriations for prosecution of the comprehensive plan in the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 7722. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is physically or mentally handicapped; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7723. A bill to provide that appropriate ceremonies shall be conducted in connection with the raising and lowering of the flag of the United States at the Tombs of the Unknown Soldiers, Arlington National Cemetery, Va., and at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 7724. A bill to incorporate the Little League Baseball, Inc., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.R. 7725. A bill to direct the Administrator of General Services to convey to Kenton County, Ky., all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain real property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 7726. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 7727. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to provide financial assistance to municipalities and others for the separation of combined sewers, to authorize the issuance of regulations to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate or navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7728. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special U.S. postage stamp in commemoration of the crusade against cancer; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 7729. A bill to prohibit transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GILL:

H.R. 7730. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 7731. A bill to provide means for settling the current dispute between the railroads and their employees over work rules, to prevent such disputes from arising in the future by prohibiting featherbedding practices in the railroad industry, and to provide various forms of assistance for employees displaced by changes in work rules, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7732. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 7733. A bill to amend section 5 of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act to provide a definition of the term "age" as used in the labeling and advertising of whisky, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 7734. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 7735. A bill to amend the act of May 21, 1928, relating to standards of containers for fruits and vegetables, to permit the use of additional standard containers; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 7736. A bill to authorize and direct the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress building in square 732 in the District of Columbia, to provide that such building shall be designated the "President James Madison Memorial Library", and to provide that additional facilities for the Library of Congress shall be built in squares 637 and 691 in the District of Columbia in order to render unnecessary the construction (at a cost of $39 million) of a special memorial to President James Madison, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7737. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide benefits thereunder for certain foster children and others with respect to whom an insured individual stands in loco parentis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 7738. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 7739. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 7740. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 7741. A bill to amend section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 7742. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 7743. A bill to limit the purposes for which funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may be used; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 7744. A bill to establish a Commission on the Disposition of Ellis Island; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 7745. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.R. 7746. A bill to amend section 601 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to require active encouragement and development of free enterprise by the Agency for International Development; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 7747. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to require that articles or commodities acquired with foreign assistance shall be products of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 7748. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide for the earmarking of funds to promote free enterprise; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.R. 7749. A bill to provide means for settling the current dispute between the railroads and their employees over work rules, and for preventing such disputes from arising in the future, and to require various forms of aid for employees affected by changes in work rules, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 7750. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain additional losses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7751. A bill to extend certain construction authority to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in order to provide adequate veterans' hospital facilities in Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 7752. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to require that motion pictures photographed outside the United States, and any advertisements thereof, shall set forth the country of origin; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.J. Res. 569. Joint resolution to create a joint congressional committee to study and report on problems relating to industrywide collective bargaining and industrywide strikes and lockouts; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 570. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.J. Res. 571. Joint resolution to increase the amount available for elderly housing loans, farm housing loans, urban planning grants, and advances for planned public works, and to extend the mortgage insurance programs under sections 809 and 810 of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.J. Res. 572. Joint resolution to provide for a study of needed Federal-aid highway programs for 10 years following the termination of the present interstate and defense highway program by requiring the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive investigation and study of highway traffic and needs forecast for the year 1992, and the changes determined necessary in the Federal-aid highway systems as a result thereof, and to report to Congress the results of such study and his recommendations for a 10-year highway program commencing July 1, 1971; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.J. Res. 573. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.J. Res. 574. Joint resolution authorizing the continued shipment of the drug Krebiozen in interstate commerce in order to insure the continued availability of such drug for the treatment of patients now being treated with such drug and for terminal cancer patients; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Con. Res. 207. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that achievement of balance-of-payments equilibrium is essential and that the United States should take the initiative in calling for an international monetary conference; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 208. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the continued operation by the parties to the present labor dispute involving the railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. Res. 455. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate expenditures for research programs conducted by or sponsored by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 456. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate expenditures for research programs conducted by or sponsored by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. Res. 457. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate expenditures for research programs conducted by or sponsored by the departments and agenices of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. Res. 458. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate expenditures for research programs conducted by or sponsored by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. MONAGAN: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, memorializing Congress concerning social security benefits for deputy sheriffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation consenting to the northeastern water and related land resources compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 7753. A bill for the relief of Francesca Sparaccine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKER:

H.R. 7754. A bill for the relief of Hanna Wiernicka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 7755. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Bruschi, his wife, Maria M. Carrera Bruschi, and their son, Giovanni Bruschi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H.R. 7756. A bill to authorize the Administration of General Services to sell a part of the former Cheli Air Force Station to Chanslor-Western Oil & Development Co. by negotiation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Goverment Operations.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 7757. A bill for the relief of Jesse I. Ellington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 7758. A bill for the relief of John (Ioannis) Antonopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 7759. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Kerenyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 7760. A bill for the relief of Cleopatra Trentowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7761. A bill for the relief of Zroubavel Beth Yacob; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 7762. A bill for the relief of Peter Czaban; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 7763. A bill for the relief of Bienvenido V. Ticsay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 7764. A bill for the relief of Sumie Sukai Romanesk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL (by request):

H.R. 7765. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Angelina Cardellina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Supreme Court Decision on the Issue of Prayer in Our Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, the recent Supreme Court decision on the issue of prayers in schools, has caused many interested citizens to write to their Congressmen in protest. Under unanimous consent, I would like to insert the following comments from two of my constituents, Laura Roberts of Sebastopol and Pastor Linden W. Heath of the Christian Missionary Church of Santa Rosa. The first was sent to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] and referred to my office, and Pastor Heath sent me a copy of a recent radio broadcast that he initiated. I feel that this letter and broadcast is typical of the scores of letters that I have received on this issue and reflects the understanding and concern many of my constituents have on this subject. I would also like to include my personal opinions on the religious issue, which include principles that reflect my views.

SEBASTOPOL, CALIF.,
June 25, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CHAMBERLAIN: It is not with the desire to impose upon a friend, but, that I'm not certain to whom I should express my views, knowing you for one, takes his responsibilities of office and responsibilities of citizenship most seriously, I have taken the liberty of writing regarding a subject of great concern.

I feel there is a latent strength and health in this country—our country. One which comes forth to allow us to be just a little proud of ourselves. During time of emergency or war there are so many instances of sacrifice, loyalty, and service beyond the call of duty, that most are lost to history. During peace, we do become citizens who enjoy the benefits of the situation, but allow us to hear of a real need, and the response is often more than was requested.

If there is benefit to personal loss or tragedy, it is to know the kindness, sympathy, and support of friends and neighbors, for Americans are generous, and kind, and good, and the very substance of this goodness is a belief in God.

As our shores have embraced the humble and the proud, the rich and the poor, the ignorant and the wise, from whatever part of the earth they have come and granted them the blessings of democracy, so has our country embraced the right of every man to believe in his own God, worship in his own fashion, but I conceive no written law which would deny nor defy Him. Surely, not against the common good?

This is only one small voice of one citizen, but there are so many of us shocked, hurt, and a little disillusioned, that the law we respect should speak against the greatest loyalty one should have.

That our Constitution could be interpreted to remove the worship of God is too revolutionary a thought, but where do we go from here?

Our allegiance, as we pledge it, is to "one nation under God." Our coin of exchange states "In God do we trust." As does our national anthem, and a popular song which speaks the thoughts of so many, and carried us through dark days and victory, "God Bless America."

We, as a Nation, feel the blessings of our God, and we pray for His blessing upon every new President, Congress, and invoke His blessing before personal and national undertakings of importance. How dare we write Him out now? The education of every child is an important dedication of future thought in our world.

Having sincere faith in your ability and concern to do that which is right, I implore you to use your voice to say that which should be said, and your strength of position to do that which should be done, to correct this situation which does not represent a God-fearing nation.

Most sincerely,

LAURA ROBERTS.

LIVING WATERS BROADCAST, JUNE 23, 1963

Our Nation suffered another tragic blow this past week, a blow far worse than the Communists inflicted when they took over Cuba, for this blow was at the foundation of our strength. It struck at the very spiritual forces upon which our Nation was built. Those forces instilled in the hearts and minds of our youth have been the guiding and energizing truths that have made our country one of the greatest in all of the history of mankind.

Who struck this blow? The Supreme Court of the United States, when they ruled this past week that it was unconstitutional for any public school to read a portion of the Bible, or to utter a prayer. What a mockery against a holy God in heaven. What total blindness to the true meaning of freedom; for to deny the majority the exercise of their rights because of the very, very small minority, is to distort the total meaning of liberty and freedom. Every Christian should stand for minority rights, but only a fool and a despot would stand for minority rule.

Here in California this Supreme Court ruling may not affect our educational institutions so much, for long ago God's word and any recognition of God in prayer has been ruled out of public schools in our State. Here and there sincere, dedicated Christian teachers have dared to share such portions of Holy Scripture as the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and even to offer a prayer in class. I know of one kindergarten teacher who, at lunchtime, would lead her little ones in a simple prayer of thanks to God. Then one day a mother came in and read the riot act to the teacher and to the principal, and from that time on there has been no simple expression of thanks in that kindergarten class just before the children eat. So, California has led the way in moral cowardice, before a very small minority, to rule out any mention of God and His word to our children in school.

However, this has not been the case in nearly 40 of the other 50 States in the Union. For they have, since the days of our forefathers, shared the wonderful influence in the minds of growing children, of the utterance of a prayer, and the simple reading of a brief portion of Holy Scripture. No, such an act doesn't make saints out of children, but it did help to instill these great virtues of reverence, respect, love, faith, and a consciousness of the human being's responsibility to a holy God in heaven.

But now, in one brief moment, our Supreme Court has declared unconstitutional these privileges that our forefathers fought and bled and died for. I agree wholeheartedly with Dr. Billy Graham, who stated that he was "shocked" at the ruling, and added, "Prayers and Bible reading have been a part of American public school life since the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock. Now a Supreme Court in 1963 says our fathers were all wrong all those years. In my opinion, it is the Supreme Court that is all wrong."

I agree with Billy Graham 100 percent.

The tragedy is that so many professing Christians have succumbed to the propaganda brainwashing that has been going on for years, that our law of separation of church and state means separation of God from our society, except for the confines of the home and the church building. This, of course, is the Communist's policy, freedom for religion as long as it does not penetrate society outside the walls of the home and the church.

So the Christians of America will allow this Supreme Court decision to go by with very little objection, aside from perhaps a fleeting thought that "it does seem a shame." But we will go on our merry way, while the foundations of a God-fearing nation are destroyed by our leaders; until one day we will awake to discover that we can no longer call upon God to deliver us. Instead of enjoying His mercy, we must face His judgment.

I believe in religious liberty, and hold that this God-given right is exercised at its best when there is separation between church and state.

I believe in civil government as divinely ordained to protect men in the enjoyment of their natural rights, and to rule in civil things; and that in this realm it is entitled to the respectful and willing obedience of all.

I believe in the individual's natural and inalienable right to freedom of conscience: to worship or not to worship; to profess, to practice, and to promulgate his religious beliefs, or to change them according to his conscience or opinions, holding that these are the essence of religious liberty; but that in the exercise of this right, he should respect the equivalent right of others.

I believe that all legislation and other governmental acts which unite church and state are subversive of human rights, potentially persecuting in character, and opposed to the best interests of church and state; and therefore, that it is not within the province of human government to enact such legislation or perform such acts.

I believe it is our duty to use every lawful add honorable means to prevent the enactment of legislation which tends to unite church and state, and to oppose every movement toward such union, that all may enjoy the inestimable blessings of religious liberty.

I believe that these liberties are embraced in the golden rule, which teaches that a man should do to others as he would have others do to him.

Don H. Clausen,
Member of Congress.

Tribute to Danny Kaye in Recognition of His Contributions to International Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, Danny Kaye, one of America's foremost all-round entertainers, accomplished a most extraordinary personal, good will mission to the Soviet Union. I wish to bring to the notice of my colleagues the meritorious service performed by Mr. Kaye, which reflected great good will in the Soviet Union for the peoples of the United States. I invite my colleagues to join with me in paying tribute to Mr. Kaye, who has achieved international stature not only as a show business star, but as a humanitarian, whose heart, mind, and formidable talents are dedicated to the children of the world.

Mr. Kaye went to Moscow under the combined aegis of the U.S. Information Agency and the entertainment industry, as a guest of honor at the Third International Film Festival in Moscow.

Although he participated in the film festival, Mr. Kaye's primary concern was to meet the Soviet people, and particularly to visit with the Russian children—children in schools, children in hospitals and children in various rural establishments and training centers.

In the 10 days Danny Kaye spent in the Soviet Union, he charmed his way into the hearts of untold millions of Russians, but particularly into the hearts of the Russian children.

In the cultural exchange pattern in recent years between the United States and the Soviet Union, there are many who believe the Soviet Union has come off to greater advantage. This because the Soviets have been able to send to the United States such outstanding cultural attractions as the Bolshoi Ballet, the Leningrad Kirov Ballet, the Moiseyev Dancers, and many great musical artists, including David Oistrach, among others.

The United States has sent over to Russia many outstanding American cultural groups and individual artists, but it is apparent that we have a long way to go to make up for the impact that Soviet culture has made with the American public in relationship to the impact that American culture has made upon the Soviet peoples.

The State Department has found that personal impact can be most influential. Official Soviet Government organizations, as well as the Soviet Red Cross Alliance and Red Crescent Societies knew of the commendable work Danny Kaye has done over the years for UNICEF, relative to the welfare and happiness of children throughout the world.

Danny Kaye was warmly greeted upon his arrival in Moscow by Prof. George Miterev, president of the Soviet Red Cross Alliance and Red Crescent Societies. The welcoming event was covered by the international press, as well as the full Russian press—and it was considered a major breakthrough for American-Soviet relationships.

Danny Kaye was officially invited to visit various Soviet Government-operated clinics, hospitals, and camps for children—the first individual from any Western country to ever receive such an invitation. Danny Kaye's visits to these various children's centers were covered by both the Soviet press and American press. Under ordinary circumstances the American press would never have been allowed to cover such developments.

Wherever Danny Kaye went he found children ready to play for him, sing for him, and dance for him. And everywhere Danny Kaye went, he immediately went on stage, and he, in turn, played, danced and joked and clowned with the children.

From the press coverage of this extraordinary good will mission one major fact evolved—the Russian children showed great love for Danny Kaye.

Veteran newsmen on the Russian scene personally report that the Danny Kaye mission was one of the most exciting and thrilling experiences they had ever encountered. This was not because Danny Kaye was able to capture the interest and love of the Soviet children—it was more than that. Danny Kaye has done this all over the world for many years and in 24 different foreign countries. There was a much more important implication.

I wish to point out to my colleagues, that the important thing in this Danny Kaye one-man mission was the fact that he was reaching out to thousands of Russian children who had never met an American before. Children who had been taught that everything that stems from communism is good and everything that stems from capitalism, including capitalistic countries, is bad.

Suddenly, this lanky, funloving, talented man shows up in their midst—and he is not evil at all. In fact, he is a "nice guy." He plays with them, he sings with them, and he dances with them. These children are going to tell other children and they are going to tell their parents, and their parents are going to tell other parents that a fine American visited them and brought them great happiness.

In addition, Danny Kaye was the star attraction of the "Saturday Night News Show," on Moscow TV, which, in addition, telecast film clips of his visit to the various Soviet children's establishments. It is estimated that over 100 million people saw this telecast.

It has been evaluated that Danny Kaye in that 1 hour did much to promote good will between the American people and the Soviet people. It is apparent that if peace is to come to the world, it will be on a "people to people" basis.

An interesting, but characteristic, aspect of this entire mission, is the fact that Danny Kaye personally paid all the expenses connected with his trip to Russia.

The lives of Americans throughout our land, as well as the lives of people throughout the corners of the world have been enriched by the artistry and genius of Danny Kaye. Particularly, this is true of the children of the world. As an American, he has brought great credit to his country—the United States of America.

It is, therefore, fitting and proper for us as fellow Americans to pay tribute to Danny Kaye and commend him for his great humanitarian and patriotic endeavors. His accomplishments have been great—the position he holds in the hearts and minds of his fellow man everywhere is just as great.

Railroad Jobs Are Threatened by the Loss of Braceros

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURT L. TALCOTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, last week representatives of the railroad unions called at my office to present organized labor's version of the strike situation.

One reminded me that a few days earlier 260 railroad cars of fresh produce were shipped from my district in 1 day. This is not unusual. As many as 400 railroad cars have been shipped from Salinas in 1 day. This equals five long trains of fresh vegetables.

This is more produce than most Members of Congress have seen. These trains go at least to Chicago—many to Philadelphia, New York, Washington. Many thousands of railroad workers from Salinas to New York derive their whole livelihood from the row crop vegetable industry of the Salinas Valley of California.

This union representative was grateful for the bracero. Without the bracero many railroad workers and suppliers will lose their jobs.

A few years ago when the fresh produce was refrigerated by crushed ice on its long trip to eastern markets, more ice was manufactured in Salinas, population about 22,000, than in New York City. This will give an idea of the size and variety of industries which are allied to, or dependent upon, agriculture, which is dependent upon the bracero for supplemental labor. Now much of the produce is refrigerated by vacuum or dry cooling. This is another large industry employing many highly skilled and paid workers whose jobs are dependent upon the harvest of the crops.

The supplemental fieldworker—presently the bracero—makes it possible for many highly paid workers in other industries, from Salinas to New York, to enjoy good livelihoods. Ask these people if they would cancel the bracero program.

The President's Balance-of-Payments Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I made on July 18, 1963, in regard to the President's balance-of-payments message.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, DEMOCRAT, OF VIRGINIA, IN REGARD TO THE PRESIDENT'S BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS MESSAGE

The continuing deficit in our accounts with foreign countries which causes the continuing loss of our gold is the most serious problem currently confronting the United States.

Administration proposals contained in the President's baalnce-of-payments message today do not provide for either a balance or a surplus in these accounts. The message predicts a deficit of at least $1 billion as late as 1965.

We spent abroad $2.4 billion more than we collected from foreign countries in calendar year 1961. The deficit was $2.2 billion last year; and it is running at a rate of $3 billion or more in the current year ending in December.

The President in his message expects some reduction in calendar year 1964, and estimates there will be a $1 billion deficit in 1965. Even this estimate is based on too many contingencies to make it certain.

This reduction in the deficit is contingent upon reduction in U.S. military expenditures abroad, reduction in sale of foreign securities in the United States, reduction in U.S. investments abroad, and continuing excess of exports over imports. The administration continues to avoid substantial reduction in foreign aid.

There is no assurance that foreigners will not retaliate against today's administration proposals which would raise the short-term interest rates, and tax sales of foreign securities in the United States; and it is likely that raising the discount rate will result in higher interest rates generally.

The fact remains that so long as these deficits in our foreign accounts continue, our gold supply is vulnerable to withdrawals by foreign governments and banks. They have already taken 66 percent of our free gold. More than $8 billion in gold has gone out of the country in 13 years; $4 billion since 1959. Less than $4 billion not needed to back the dollar remains, and withdrawals are still being made.

A situation in which dollar-gold convertibility could not be offered would rock the free world. It is tragic that effective steps to correct this balance-of-payments deficit have not been taken before. Previous efforts affecting military dependents abroad and duty-free tourist purchases abroad have not been effective. I believe stronger steps than those now proposed will have to be taken.

The emphasis in the President's message today was on curbs in the capital area. But American dollars are still going out of the country in tremendous foreign aid, military, and tourist expenditures abroad. These are in addition to private investment overseas, foreign loans in the United States, and U.S. loans abroad.

Stern and positive measures must be immediately taken to balance our foreign payments and avoid continuing deficits. Constructive action has been too long deferred.

Henry C. Lynch: Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on December 13, 1962, it was my great privilege to attend and participate in the very impressive and moving memorial exercises at the Rindge Technical School, Cambridge, Mass., in honor of an old and valued friend of mine, the late Henry C. Lynch.

At the exercises, a beautiful memorial photograph of Mr. Lynch, for many years head of the foreign language department and faculty manager of athletics at Rindge, was presented to the school at a largely attended student assembly.

The photograph, a gift of Rindge alumni and other friends of Mr. Lynch, now hangs in the school trophy room, in which he took such great pride.

Present for the ceremony were Dr. Albert Lynch, a son, Richard Partridge, of the Lynch family, Headmaster Robert R. Sweeney, Headmaster Emeritus John W. Wood, Hon. Raymond Fitzgerald, outstanding educator and lawyer, N. V. "Swede" Nelson, the well-known sports figure and afterdinner speaker, the beloved Charles Linehan, former teacher and famous coach, and a host of other very prominent friends and distinguished figures of public service, business, professional and educational life.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the text of my speech at the Henry C. Lynch memorial ceremony:

My dear friends, I am very grateful to my good and great friend, our beloved Charlie Linehan, your distinguished headmaster and others who have given me the great privilege and honor to be with you on this very moving occasion.

To visit your renowned secondary school, one of the finest of its kind in the land, would ordinarily stir some very happy memories for me. But today, I come on a mission of commemoration and love that is mingled with sadness and yet with great pride. For I know that when we are honoring a man like our beloved and lamented Henry Lynch, we are honoring one who for so many years served this beautiful community as a gifted teacher, counsellor, adviser and able, dedicated lawyer with every ounce of his being and every pulse of his great heart.

Henry Lynch was a few years ahead of me at college when I came down here to Cambridge from Clinton High School, friendless and alone, as a neophyte to what was for me the strange and rather bewildering collegiate world of the time. But with typical kindness he immediately took me to his heart and his home and the hospitality of his wonderful family and was my dear friend until he passed to his eternal reward.

Henry had many warm, admiring friends throughout his long, useful life, because he was deeply interested in people and their concerns, and could not do too much to emphasize his high concept of what loyal friendship really means.

He had a superb background and was sprung from a fine family, a family of doers and achievers, civil, business, and professional leaders, all of whom were deeply public-spirited, interested in making something out of themselves and contributing something of real worth to their community and country.

Henry Lynch was endowed with great natural gifts, a keen alert mind that made him an outstanding student at Harvard, and later enabled him to achieve magnificent success as a teacher, a leader, and a lawyer, molding and guiding the minds of young people in creative, aspiring channels, wisely counselling his fellow citizens, and serving his proud city and his country with the Army overseas in World War I, and throughout his long, constructive civilian career.

Henry Lynch had deep, rugged convictions and high principles and always clung tenaciously to them. He wore no man's collar, and rigidly followed his own way of life which was the way of high character, rectitude, lofty aims, perseverance, and a fine sense of justice and desire to help others.

Greatly devoted to his family, he was extremely proud of the great progress he saw them make and the marked success he lived to see them achieve. It is most appropriate that his brilliant, young son, who is achieving such great success in the medical profession, should be with us today.

It is hardly necessary for me here today, in the presence of his dear friends, too numerous to mention, his loving family and colleagues, and the fine student body of this great school, to dwell more upon the fine life and inspiring, wonderful achievements and the many good works of Henry Lynch because you of Cambridge know them so well and appreciate them so much. This community owes him a great debt.

We will ever continue to be inspired by the fine example Henry Lynch set for us, his complete devotion to so many young people, whom he helped in innumerable ways to find their place in life, his special, outstanding service to sports and athletics, his unselfish dedication to his work, his generosity of impulse, and his surpassing loyalty to his friends, his school, and so many good causes.

I commend our esteemed, beloved friend, Mr. Charles Linehan, great friend and leader that he is, your able distinguished headmaster, Robert R. Sweeney and his able staff, the Key Club and all those who helped to arrange for the presentation of this beautiful, characteristic likeness of Henry.

For many years to come, this lovely portrait will remain in these cherished halls to remind all who pass here of the memorable virtues and unstinted contributions of Henry Lynch.

May the remembrance of his noble qualities, friendship, and peerless service long continue to bring us light, inspiration, and firm resolve to emulate the things he so stanchly stood for, and the many things he did to make Cambridge and our great country a better place in which to live.

So long as this famous school, and our great Nation can produce able, distinguished, and dedicated leaders and teachers and patriotic, God-fearing, liberty-loving, red-blooded Americans like Henry Lynch, we need have no fear of the future. For ambitious, well-trained young people like you, always looking upward with spirit and hope, and pressing forward with vigor, courage and determination, faithfully following the lessons and the lofty example he gave, will continue to keep our great Nation strong, peaceful, and free.

May our dear friend, Henry Lynch, find rest and peace in his heavenly home.

I insert as part of my remarks a copy of the able and most appropriate speech made on the occasion of the Henry C. Lynch memorial exercises, by Mr. William H. Mahoney, distinguished teacher and leader of Rindge Technical School:

HENRY LYNCH—IN RETROSPECT. "THE TRUMPET'S SILVER VOICE IS STILLED," THE WARDER SILENT ON THE HILL."

Henry Carty Lynch, great humorist, master teacher, kind and wise moralist, has gone to his reward, and nevermore shall we at Rindge bask in his ready smile and be regaled by his inimitable anecdotes which already have become a part of the Rindge legend.

Henry always loved the limelight of life's stage and no man loved more the sunshine of full recognition.

If you were merely an acquaintance you could not help noticing that he was a lover of life, but if you were an intimate friend, as I was privileged to be, you always felt in your heart a warmth, a joy from being in his company. Of subtle intelligence and open nature, of deep erudition and vast conversational powers, he brought rich gifts indeed to his teaching.

Certain it is that thousands of Rindge students will always recall with affection and gratitude the clarity and orderliness of his teaching which, brightened by bland humor and tingling wit, made his classes rich and memorable experiences.

The whole expanse of education was his familiar park of pleasance. Yet he was not a scholarly recluse. With all his intellectual gifts he was as much a companion of all the leading figures in the athletic world as of Chardinal and Blackstone. And on an evening in the square, that he loved, he liked to discuss the contemporary scene with such firm and fast friends as "Jack" Lyons, "Bill" Cleary, "Bill" Cunningham, and if I may boast, myself. These were golden moments for Henry.

Henry's social sympathies were no less strong than his fondness for learning and he was the most fascinating of comrades.

His extraordinary knowledge, whether of literature, law, or athletics and his gleaming wit and glittering repartee, in which his knowledge was fused, glowed throughout his conversation, completely captivating all of us.

Education was his pursuit but athletics were his passion. He had an unfailing interest in all sports but track was his delight and the two "Toms" who revered him, "Tom" Duffy and "Tom" Hynes, shared his enthusiasm.

Henry was an intensely loyal Harvard man. The Harvard legend, the Harvard language, the character and the achievement of Harvard men were all his delight and constant topic of conversation. Woe betide the luckless wight who spoke disparagingly of Harvard "brains" or memorial hall which always evoked for him nostalgic memories.

Henry was a preeminently fair and objective person, but on the subject of his alma mater, it was always "Harvard right or wrong, but Harvard, my love."

Even at the most serious and critical moments when he was so ill, if there was a gleam of humor anywhere he saw it and used it to help himself over rough places. He could still joke in the dark hours and, what is more uncommon, greatly enjoyed being the target of a good jest.

To the end, Henry remained unfailingly attractive because he was always perfectly natural and his own wonderful self.

His like we have not met before nor shall we see again.

Requiescat in pace.

The Customs Service on Its 175th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Customs, one of the first Federal Government agencies to be created, will celebrate its 175th anniversary on August 1, 1964. President George Washington established the customs service when he signed the Fifth Act of the First Congress on July 31, 1789. This was an act "to regulate the collection of the duties imposed by law on the tonnage of ships or vessels, and on goods, wares, and merchandises imported into the United States." The 1789 act created 59 Customs Districts in 11 States. Two States, North Carolina and Rhode Island, had not as yet ratified the Constitution, but subsequent, seven districts were created in these States in 1790.

Prior to the creation of the customs service and the enactment of the first Tariff Act, almost every State had its own tariff laws and collector of customs. Some States even imposed duties against neighboring States. Chicken peddlers from New Jersey had to take their fowl to the New York customhouse to have them valued and to pay duty before selling them in New York City.

Government finances, furthermore, were in a perilous condition. The States were often slow in honoring, or ignored altogether, requisitions for funds from the Continental Government which did not have the power to levy taxes directly.

The Tariff Act had been proposed by James Madison as a temporary expedient intended to provide operating revenues. As finally passed, it included a levy on such items, as candles, rum, iron, and steel, carriages, sugar, cocoa, and coffee. The act caused rejoicing throughout the young Republic and the newspapers referred to it as the second Declaration of Independence.

After the passage of the Tariff Act, quick implementation was needed as it was to go into effect almost immediately. Thus the customs service antedated even the Treasury Department by a month. The Treasury Department was created September 2, 1789. One of the duties of the Secretary of the Treasury was to superintend the collection of the revenue and the customs service automatically became a part of the Treasury Department.

In its first year, the customs service collected approximately $2 million. This sum loomed large in the total Government income of about $2½ million. In fact, up to 1910 customs receipts provide the principal means whereby the Government maintained the Army, the Navy, the civil service, paid the interest on the national debt, and performed all other services. Today, of course, the income tax and other internal revenue taxes provide the greater part of the receipts of the Federal Government, but even today customs collections contribute a substantial sum. During calendar year 1962, $1,729,706,696, was collected and turned over to the Treasury.

Through the years, by determined effort, Customs has kept down its operating costs. During the first 10 years of its existence, the cost of collecting the revenue amounted to 4½ cents on each dollar; today it is 4⅕ cents for each dollar collected. Its budget for fiscal 1962, for example, was approximately $63 million and it collected over $1,624 million in duties and taxes in the same period.

In addition to collecting revenue, customs has been given other duties relating to seaports. The Navigation Act of 1789 was the first of the navigation laws governing the registry and clearing of vessels and regulation of coastal trade. Customs was given the responsibility for local administration of the law. Today customs still is concerned with the entrance and clearance of vessels, documentation of vessels, and the measurement of tonnage—which is used in assessing port fees and tolls.

For many years customs officers were the only local Federal officials and they had many extra functions assigned to them. Collectors of customs often acted as lighthouse superintendents and they also were designated as pension agents directed to pay military pensions. The creation of the Marine Hospital Service in 1798 required collectors to gather hospital dues of 20 cents a month for every employed seaman from vessels arriving from foreign ports. Collectors were actually in charge of the hospitals for over 70 years.

The prevention of smuggling has always been a major concern of the Bureau of Customs. It is the responsibility of customs to apprehend the vicious narcotics smuggler as well as the casual traveler who is trying to evade the payment of duty. Both professional and casual smugglers are noted for their ingenuity. Diamonds, watch parts, and narcotics are hidden in clothing, suitcases, and hidden compartments in automobiles. In an earlier, more ornate, time, lace was another item often smuggled. An article about the New York Customs House published in 1884 tells of a gentleman who was caught with a quanity of point lace concealed in the crown of his hat.

The continuing war which customs has fought with professional smugglers throughout its long history has not been without hazard. Customs lives were lost in the early 19th century fighting Laffite, the pirate. Laffite was brazenly auctioning off slaves and goods obtained as booty. In this century, 42 customs officers have been killed in the line of duty by violators of customs laws or by accident while on duty.

Today the Bureau of Customs must cope with an increasing amount of foreign trade and travel. In fiscal year 1962 there was an estimated $16 billion worth of merchandise importations, and 160 million people and 46 million vehicles crossed our borders. This flow of goods and persons must be checked not only for violations of the tariff laws but for violations of health, agriculture, and immigration laws. Customs, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, must guard against the noxious plant, the insect pest, the disease carrier, the unlawful immigrant.

A big job has been assigned to our customs service in guarding our farflung borders. Judging from its past history, however, its future duties will be carried out with efficiency and dedication.

It is interesting to note that concurrently with the celebration of the 175th anniversary of the establishment of the customs service, the National Customs Service Association will mark its 40th anniversary in 1964.

The National Customs Service Association is an independent organization comprised of employees of the customs service at all levels. It is the only organization that has been accorded nationwide formal recognition by both the Treasury Department and the Bureau of Customs as representative of employees of the customs service.

One of the high points of next year's 175th anniversary celebrations will be the 21st Biennial Convention of the National Customs Service Association, which will be held in Montreal, Canada, August 2 through 8, 1964. Many persons of prominence in civic and governmental life of both Canada and the United States are expected to attend. The convention should provide a fitting climax to the many anniversary celebrations.

The U.S. customs service is an agency of Government that is noted for its efficiency and dedication to duty. The slogan, "175 years of service to the American people,' is most appropriate, as is the motto of the National Customs Service Association, "Integrity, Loyalty, Efficiency."

Eugene (Gene) Kinnaly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I was impressed and delighted with the testimonials to Eugene (Gene) Kinnaly on the floor of the House on July 18. No man has shown more devotion to this body, to his chief, Speaker McCORMACK, or to his country.

As a Member from Massachusetts I have had personal experience with Gene's ability and fine judgment. He is a credit to his State. I cannot match the eloquence of my colleagues who paid tribute to Gene last week, but I cannot let the occasion of his 45 years of continuous service to our Speaker pass without giving him my sincere good wishes and congratulations. I hope that we will all have the benefit of his counsel for many years to come.

Speech of Hon. M. G. (Gene) Snyder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague, Hon. M. G. "GENE" SNYDER, delivered a principal address at the Kentucky American Legion Convention held in Louisville, Ky. I was struck by the logic of the fine message to these patriotic Americans and I would like to bring it to the attention of the House so that they might receive the benefit of its fine message.

The speech follows:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN M. G. (GENE) SNYDER TO STATE CONVENTION OF AMERICAN LEGION AT LOUISVILLE, KY.

Hello, my friends, it is good to get home today and I'm pleased to be asked to speak to you for about 20 minutes this noon. I'm particularly pleased because it all occurs as a result of what happened here last November. I stand as a living example of what surprises came out of Kentucky ballot boxes. Why in Washington they say we have more surprises in our ballot boxes than you find in a lady's purse. That's a lot of surprises—a bandit snatched a woman's purse on Pennsylvania Avenue the other day. He got $2.50 and a hernia.

But I must say this: Can you imagine a community like this sending to Congress a "square"—a fellow who would go to Washington asking nothing for nothing. Oh, it's not easy in that "puzzle palace on the Potomac" to stand up for basic fundamental constitutional principles. Why a certain fellow running for the U.S. Senate was quoted in the local press as saying that a fellow with that philosophy would be laughed right out of Congress. But, you know, I don't mind being a square—that's another of the good old words that has gone the way of love and patriotism. Some political theorists do laugh out loud at those words. It used to be that you could pay a man no higher compliment than to call him a square shooter—and a square deal was the best. But today's "square" is apparently a fellow who gets his kicks from trying to do a good job. A "square" is a goon who gets so wrapped up in his job he has to be reminded to go home. A "square" is a guy who doesn't stop at the bar every night to get "juiced up." He prefers to go home—to his own dinner table, to his own bed. He's a guy who isn't "hep" to cutting corners and "goofing off." He believes in God—and says so, in public—the Supreme Court notwithstanding. Today's "square" still gets a funny feeling when the flag goes by. He believes that he should live within his income—and that the Government should too. He doesn't believe in vacationing today and paying later. A square believes in saving a few dollars for a rainy day rather than counting on using yours. A square is a fellow who still believes in the Bible—and in prayer. He still has that old-fashioned notion that taxes are for the purpose of raising revenue rather than for the purpose of redistributing the wealth. A "square" believes it is more important to play the game fairly than it is to win. Thank Heaven there are a lot of "squares" left today—and a lot of them are in this audience. But to some we are "mossbacks," "reactionaries," "extremists," and "obstructionists" along the New Frontier.

Why we even believe that experience is a good teacher and we believe that we can manage our own affairs and spend our own money better than the Government can do it for us.

It is because of this thinking that I am so concerned about the future of this—the greatest country on earth. The framers of our Constitution thought we could handle our own affairs—but we have been constantly granting to big government more and more authority. The Government is a lousy businessman. The Government is an incompetent manager. Americans are good businessmen and excellent managers. Where we get the idea that Government can do it better baffles me. All evidence is to the contrary.

Today's political theorists say that something called "the public sector" is destitute and another something they call "the private sector" is filthy rich. "Public sector" means government—"private sector" means individual persons. A high Government official says, "The choice our Government must make is a choice between the public interest and private comfort." Another Government planner says, "We have not provided the 'public sector' enough money to keep up with the 'private sector.' People are spending their money on pleasures and gadgets and automobiles that they do not need." In other words, the Government must take from the people the money they are unwisely spending—or saving—and spend it for them—wisely.

Let me say here that this theory is not necessarily a political party position. Both parties have their share of those who adhere to such philosophy. Now, the Federal Government wants to spend your money for you because your sense of values is warped.

Here are a few examples of how the Federal Government spends your money wisely for you:

(a) 1,000 23-inch TV sets costing over $400,000 for an oversea area without electricity.

(b) $80,700 to study dolphin talk—to try to communicate between these fish and humans.

(c) $1¼ million to study the affectional relationship of an infant monkey for its mother.

(d) Foreign aid funds are spent to build superhighways where there are few, if any, automobiles.

(e) $3,100,000 spent to build a millionaire Emperor a luxury yacht—with air-conditioning and gold wallpaper.

(f) $1,996 for a study of alcohol used in a changing Navaho community.

(g) $26,565 for studies of silent thinking.

(h) $8,205 for a study of the social role of aging wild ungulate.

(i) $9,775 for a study of stereotactic atlas of the beagle brain.

(j) $11,500 to study blood groups genetics of Southampton Island Eskimos.

(k) $14,030 for a study of oral health of Icelandic peoples.

(l) $20,092 for studies of disease in a giant snail.

(m) $15,998 to study the role of behavior of frontal monkeys.

(n) $13,816 for a study of the establishment and maintenance of a monkey colony.

(o) $100,215 for a suicidal referral demonstration.

(p) $18,000 for a study of appointment breaking in a pediatric clinic.

(q) $61,985 for initiation and support of a colony of baboons.

There are hundreds and even thousands, of expenditures like these that have been going on for the past 15 or 20 years that make "squares" like me stand in amazement.

Senator HARRY BYRD, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, says the combined debt of all Federal Government agencies and instrumentalities is $1,242 billion—$6,642 for each man, woman, and child—or $27,500 for every family of four. Is the public sector that has incurred that much debt underprivileged? The consumer debt in the private sector is only $56 billion or $2,995 per capita—or $11,908 per family of four. The Federal Government's income has increased by about 20 times since I was born—the private sector's income only about 4 times. Whatever is or isn't wrong with public services, it cannot be said they have been deprived of money.

The big difference is that businesses operating in the private sector have two important incentives—(1) they must compete and (2) they must make a profit. Take away these necessities and you have a listless organism.

The Government need not make a profit and it need not compete.

Let's revive the system which made us the unquestioned powerhouse of this planet in less than 200 years. Government doing for the people that which must be done and which they can't possibly do for themselves—and leaving them otherwise alone. Government is a good servant—but a bad master. You know you can kill your children with kindness. I would love to give my 2½-year-old son all the candy he wants, but I don't—for surely he would get diabetes. He would be momentarily happy but permanently dependent.

Dr. Walter Judd once said that he could do his daughter's homework for her better than she could do it herself—but he does not—not because he does not love her—but rather because he does love her.

We can kill our own country with kindness. Today we hear so much about the Negro's plight. Chicago has less than 10 percent Negro population yet 60 percent of the relief rolls are Negroes. One Representative has said that increased relief is worsening the Negroes' condition—not improving it. Relief has done more to keep the Negro in an inferior position than all other factors combined. It has caused the birth of children—compounding the problem. The philosophy behind public relief is that it helps people who need help and permits them to live in a dignified manner, thereby facilitating a return to independence. But the philosophy is false because it fails to take human nature into account. Without the necessity to work and without the incentive to work—many people won't work—it's that simple.

Kentucky distributed over $69½ million in public aid in 1962. The aid for dependent children program now runs over $2 million per month in Kentucky and it is estimated generally about one-third of the recipients are illegitimate.

Are we destroying the people we are trying to help? Available evidence indicates we are. Killing them with kindness. The shadow of big Government is lengthening over all aspects of American life. Is not the same result likely in other areas? I mean when the farmer is paid for not farming, are we not encouraging idleness, indigence, apathy, decay? When any American who gets sick can count on the Government to pay, what inducement is there for him to work and save for the rainy day? And why should shipbuilders and airline operators try for efficiency and improvement if they can always fall back on a Federal subsidy? Washington's deepening intrusion in our daily lives is nobody's fault but our own. We keep asking Government to take over and do for us things which traditionally we've been doing for ourselves. We make a lot of fancy Fourth of July speeches but we still vote for Santa Claus. We seem to forget that Government to perform increasing services has to get bigger and bigger and bigger and bigger—and we, spoon fed, overtaxed, overweight, get weaker and weaker.

On the wall of the Ox Bow Inn near Brandenburg, Ky., we find these words, "New England was a depressed area too—but the people took all they had—an ax, a plow, two hands, courage, and self-respect—moved out of their depressed area and founded the great West. When it is let alone—when the Government keeps its wasteful hands off—the profit motive leads men to outdo themselves, create their own frontier, grow, and prosper, but when Government decides it is its function to 'take care of' the people, it kills ambition, progress, self-respect, and that kills the Nation."

Patrick Henry said, "Give me liberty or give me death." Many Americans today just say "Give me, give me, give me."

This great country is going into the direction of having so many of its people become dependent upon it. Listen, the average age of the world's great civilizations is 200 years. These nations progressed through this sequence:

From bondage to spiritual faith.
From spiritual faith to great courage.
From courage to liberty.
From liberty to abundance.
From abundance to selfishness.
From selfishness to complacency.
From complacency to apathy.
From apathy to dependency.
From dependency back again into bondage.

In 13 years our United States will be 200 years old. This cycle is not inevitable—but it depends upon you.

James Russell Lowell as Minister to England was asked how long our Republic would endure. His answer was—it will endure as long as the people keep the ideas of the men who founded it. What were these ideas? The Founding Fathers—that little band of men, the like of which this country has never known since—they created a government based on the theory that you and I have the God-given right and ability to determine our own destiny. It was the first revolution in all history that did not exchange one set of ideas for another.

This brave little group of men—they shaped a government, they bound it with a constitution, and they intended that this government was to be a watchdog over man's freedom, not a cow to be milked. There were no fringe benefits at Valley Forge. The West was won without an area redevelopment program—and if I might quote just a little bit more of Patrick Henry's famous statement—he said: "Is life so dear and peace so sweet as to be purchased with the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God. I know not what course others may take but as for me, give me liberty or give me death." If we are unwilling to dedicate our lives, our efforts, our sacred honor—to preserving this great country of ours, this system which has been so good to us—then we must one day, perhaps have the unpleasant task of sitting down and telling our children—and our children's children, what it once was like in America when men were free.

You men—you fought for your country. You fought for the system. Surely people like you will not see it taken away or see it extracted from us without some effort, some real effort, to preserve this way of life.

You say, "I've done my part." And surely you have. Now you say, "It's time to let somebody else make this effort" you are talking about—fight here domestically for these principles and ideas that we "squares" believe in. Let George do it. Well, my friends, if you take the attitude that you should let George do it—then it won't be done, for you are George. You say, I'm busy. You say, I have got my American Legion work to attend to—I've got my church work to take care of. I belong to the Optimist or the Rotary. I handle the Boy Scouts—and believe you me, every one of these things is really good. Nothing could be much better than any of these enterprises that you are working so hard to try to perfect and make better. But it is also true that none of these—not the American Legion—not the Boy Scouts—or your church—or these civic clubs—will amount to a hill of beans if you lose the society you live in.

Provide Full Annuity Benefits to Employees After 30 Years' Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in connection with my bill, H.R. 327. I am hopeful that the Congress will pass this greatly needed legislation during this session.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. JACOB H. GILBERT OF NEW YORK

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, your committee has under consideration my bill, H.R. 327, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize the retirement of employees after 30 years of service without reduction in annuity, as well as numerous other bills on this subject of retirement.

This legislation has wide support. You have heard testimony by representatives of the National Association of Letter Carriers, the National Rural Letter Carriers Association, the National Postal Union, the United Federation of Postal Clerks, and others, who have shown the need for, and the fairness of, this proposed legislation.

By the time a person has worked for the Federal Government for 30 years, he has given the best years of his life to his job, and 30 years is a long time. It seems only fair that when he has completed 30 years of service, he should be permitted to retire regardless of age, without any reduction in annuity because of earlier retirement. Our conscientious and faithful postal workers and classified Federal employees are entitled to this consideration and assistance. They deserve a few years of leisure in which to travel, to pursue hobbies, to enjoy life, while their health is still good and they have the energy to carry out their retirement plans.

Many persons have written me, stating that they are in poor health and suffering, but they cannot afford to retire at the reduced annuity they would have to accept because they have not reached the age of 60. Most persons between the ages of 55 and 60, suffer some deterioration in their general health; many have severe ailments. Yet, they have to struggle to work day after day, looking forward to reaching the age of 60, when they can afford retirement.

We must admit that the Federal Government has never been overly generous regarding salaries. The vast majority of Federal employees receive pay in the lower brackets of income. Considering the high living costs and high taxes they have to meet, they find it impossible to save very much money, and when they have dependents, they can barely make ends meet. These people need every cent of their retirement benefits.

There is at present a high rate of unemployment in our country. In New York City alone, there are many thousands of unemployed persons who have passed U.S. civil service examinations and are on the registers, waiting to be called for appointment. If civil service employees were given the opportunity to retire, as provided in my bill, the vacancies created would be filled by the young people who desperately need work and who should be given the opportunity to start their Federal careers.

I am hopeful that your committee will take favorable action on the legislation before you. Our Federal employees highly merit this assistance.

The Congressional Reservist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, there has been some publicity in recent weeks about the question of whether or not a Member of Congress should continue to serve as a member of the Reserve Forces of the United States, following election to this body.

On this point, I read with keen interest the remarks of our distinguished and beloved colleague, the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia, in the House of Representatives on July 10, 1963.

Congressman VINSON, who is chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services and certainly as well informed as any Member of Congress about the needs of our Armed Forces, has significantly endorsed the resolution of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States commending members of the Congress who serve in the Reserve Forces.

As a member of the Naval Reserve, active in the service in World War II and prior to election to this body in 1952, I appreciate very much the view of Congressman VINSON that "significant service is being rendered today by Members of Congress who also maintained their posts and also their efficiency in the Reserve Forces."

My personal views on the subject are very much along the same lines stated by another distinguished colleague, the Honorable CLARK W. THOMPSON of Texas, as expressed in a newsletter to his constituents on June 6, 1963. The text of Congressman THOMPSON's very fine letter follows:

COMMENTS FROM WASHINGTON BY CONGRESSMAN CLARK W. THOMPSON

DEAR NEIGHBORS: For a great many years, I have believed that the Nation should maintain a strong and thoroughly prepared Armed Forces Reserve. This would constitute the trained militia recommended by Presidents from Washington on down. They have foreseen the fact that without such a Ready Reserve the only safe alternative was the maintenance of a tremendous standing Army.

After World War I, the soundness of this doctrine seemed very clear to me. I practiced it as I preached it; and it may be remembered by my hometown neighbors that it was the 15th Battalion, Marine Corps Reserve, which I had the honor to command, which was the first civilian component called to the colors in 1940.

Going back a little in history, in 1933, as a Reserve officer, I was attending a contact camp at Fort Crockett one weekend. A group of fellow Reserve officers got their heads together and decided that I should be a candidate for Congress in the next election which was then close to 2 years off. I had never dreamed of such a thing but since they seemed to be deadly serious, I did give the subject some little private thought. Exactly 1 week later, the incumbent Congressman, the late Clay Stone Briggs, suddenly died. Had the Reserve officers not made the suggestion to me, I would have never dreamed of becoming a candidate. At that time, the country was being bombarded by the pacifists who wanted to practically disband our Armed Forces.

I came to Congress as a proponent of a strong national defense, and I associated myself with an effort to increase the size of our Army from the pitiful figure of about 117,000 up to the minimum recommended by the then Chief of Staff, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. I introduced appropriate legislation; and in 1934, saw the move gain sufficient momentum so that in 1935 it became a law.

My knowledge of the needs of national defense came largely through my membership in the Reserve. It is well known, and has frequently been remembered during my political life since World War II, that I served as a Reserve through that war and that I retired as colonel when it ended after close to 30 years service.

I have always had an idea that my service as a member of the Armed Forces had something to do with my election to Congress in 1947. There is no question that it did in 1933.

In the present Congress there are approximately 175 members of the Armed Forces Reserves. A few weeks ago, someone raised the question that a conflict of interest confronts a Member of Congress who was also a Reserve. In other words, it was implied that we might have a selfish interest in the legislation upon which we were voting. This seems to me to be a very farfetched theory. Certainly, I have cast some votes which were more intelligent because of my intimate knowledge of the workings of the Armed Forces. That, I believe, is one reason why you hired me.

So far as any Reserve officer in my knowledge personally profiting by the legislation on which he voted, I can only say that I have never known it to happen.

If by some stretch of the imagination it was held that a Reserve officer could not properly be a Member of Congress, it would logically follow that a veteran is also taboo. Where it goes from there, Heaven only knows. Maybe next someone will suggest that a taxpayer shouldn't be a Member of Congress because of his interest in legislation pertaining to taxes. Anyhow, I am proud of my service on active duty and in the Reserve of the Armed Forces of my country. I commend to every young man careful consideration of a similar service.

Sincerely yours,

CLARK W. THOMPSON.

It is reassuring to know that the view of Congressman VINSON and Congressman THOMPSON, as well as that expressed by the Reserve Officers Association, has strong support at home by newspapers with a consistent record of supporting a strong national defense for the United States.

A very fine recent example along that line in the editorial which appeared in the Tulsa Daily World on Thursday, July 4, 1963.

The text of the Tulsa World editorial follows:

RESERVISTS IN CONGRESS?

One of the minor league questions being discussed nowadays is whether Reserve officers of the military services ought to be allowed to serve in Congress. Or, putting it in reverse, whether Congressmen should be allowed to keep their Reserve commissions.

We say it is minor league because it is not shaking the Nation like civil rights or any of the other really first-rate issues. But it's a fair question, nevertheless.

We believe all Members of Congress ought to be Congressmen first and whatever else they are, second. In other words, they must look at every proposition primarily as Members of the House or Senate, rather than as farmers, businessmen, Oklahomans, New Yorkers, Baptists, Presbyterians or Reservists.

But almost every segment of our population has members in Congress. Why not the Military Reserve? Certainly these men should have the advantage of authentic information and sound judgment in defense, security, and other military affairs.

They ought to be big enough to lay aside their interservice rivalries in the national interest. And they should always remember that in Congress they are civilian officials, not military. But we see no reason to deprive either Congress or the services of their talents and experience.

Eugene T. Kinnaly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, July 18, the U.S. House of Representatives paid tribute to the record of great accomplishment and loyalty of Eugene T. Kinnaly. At that time, I was in executive session of the House Ways and Means Committee; however, I would like to take this occasion to join with my colleagues in praising this outstanding public servant.

Gene Kinnaly first came to the U.S. Congress and served for 10 years under the late beloved Congressman James Gallivan. Today, 45 years later, he is completing 35 years of service under our distinguished Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK. Gene has been an outstanding example to all administrative assistants and secretaries on Capitol Hill. I am particularly grateful for the many times he has given advice and counsel to my office staff. He is a walking encyclopedia on Government agencies and an extraordinary authority on how to get things done.

Gene Kinnaly is loved and admired by all those who know him. He is the epitome of efficiency and competence and his record of service here in the U.S. House of Representatives is one which is honored by all and equaled by none.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to pay tribute to Eugene T. Kinnaly and I sincerely hope that he will enjoy many long years of beneficial service and continued good health.

Dedication of New Quarters of Southbridge, Mass., Post No. 29, Franco-American War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an account from the Southbridge Evening News on the dedication of the new quarters of Southbridge, Mass., Post No. 29, Franco-American War Veterans, Inc.

This outstanding event was held on Sunday, May 26, 1963, and it was my great privilege and honor to attend the inspiring dedicatory exercises which also marked the 1st anniversary of the post. Under unanimous consent, I include my remarks in the RECORD.

The material follows:

[From the Southbridge (Mass.) Evening News, May 27, 1963]

FRANCO VETS DEDICATE QUARTERS; PHILBIN HEADS LIST OF DIGNITARIES

Several hundred persons, including town, State, and national leaders along with delegations of various veterans and patriotic organizations, were present yesterday at ceremonies marking the first anniversary of Southbridge Post 29, Franco-American War Veterans, Inc., and for the formal dedication of its new headquarters at 61 Chestnut Street.

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, cut the ceremonial ribbon with Senator Paul H. Benoit, Selectman S. Anthony Capera; Post 29 Comdr. Paul R. LaRochelle; National FAWV Comdr. Alfred O. Pinault, of Providence, R.I., and other dignitaries assembled with him at the front entrance of the building.

Dedicatory rites highlighted a weekend of first-anniversary events that included an open house, a military ball, veterans' memorial services, and a chicken barbecue.

FULFILLMENT OF DREAMS

Delivering the principal address, PHILBIN hailed the occasion as "the fulfillment of the dreams of an outstanding group of veterans that has rendered truly distinguished service to the community, State, and Nation."

Praising Franco-Americans, he stated that "they have bravely fought in every war, and have faithfully and brilliantly sustained the cause of freedom, justice, and good government."

The organization which today numbers approximately 360 war veterans of French descent dedicated the program to two members who died last year, Dorila Cournoyer of 80 Worcester Street, and Adelard Dauphinais, 199 Charlton Street. The American flag that Commander LaRochelle presented for Cournoyer's funeral was returned by Mrs. Cournoyer, his widow, to fly at half mast as Emile Gendron and then Robert Lamothe sounded taps. The colors were raised by Commander Pinault and Post 29 Junior Vice Comdr. Laurent E. McDonald.

150 COUPLES DANCE

The military ball was notable for an enthusiastic turnout of 150 couples, who danced to the music of the Don Tremblay Orchestra of Southbridge.

Yesterday at 8:45 a.m. the various veterans and patriotic organizations assembled in front of Town Hall and then proceeded together to Notre Dame Church for the Veterans Memorial Services, a High Mass. The celebrant was Rev. Armand Morrisette, O.M.I., of Lowell, FAWV national chaplain.

The Fife, Drum, and Bugle Corps of Nipmuck Tribe 131, Order of Red Men, played march music for the parade to and from the church.

Senator Benoit served as master of ceremonies at the dedication, and the welcome address was delivered by Caprera, who is chairman of the Board of Selectmen. Commander LaRochelle offered a brief talk in which his officers, members and others were thanked for their support over the past year.

Volunteering their time and skills to the project, Post 29 members have extensively remodeled the former Town Infirmary, installed furnishings and opened rooms for the use of several groups such as the Gold Star Mothers and the World War I Veterans.

"We owe much gratitude to those of you who supported us verbally at the town meeting enabling us to obtain this building." Commander LaRochelle said, "We will never forget your support. We hope to work in the best interest of all veterans and their families and to serve the community whenever and wherever we can."

In the main building of Post 29 headquarters there is a meeting room, 32 by 17 feet, completely remodeled with wood paneling; and the gold star room, 16 by 17 feet, home of Southbridge Chapter 27 of the Gold Star Mothers. The motif is patriotic with gold stars and eagles, natural oak paneling, and a marble fireplace.

A cocktail lounge, some 15 by 20 feet in size with Victorian period furnishings, a crystal chandelier and marble top tables, is also on the first floor.

The front hall of the main building has an open staircase of hand-carved oak, now completely restored. The Victorian style is predominant here as in the cocktail lounge. The front hall leads to the main club room, which is modern in design, with two-tone wood paneling. Some 40 by 25 feet in size, the room permits a bar 19 feet long and recreation facilities that include a pool table. A kitchen 11 by 20 feet in size adjoins the main clubroom.

On the second floor there is a ladies powder room; another meeting hall, 32 by 17 feet, and other rooms, including the administrative offices and facilities for the firing squad and honor guard.

The military ball took place in the auditorium, or what was the "barn," outside of the main building. Some 42 by 62 feet in size, it has been restored to give the hall an attractive rustic appearance, and the veterans have installed a hardwood floor.

The auditorium is the setting for dances, installations, banquets and other functions.

AMONG DIGNITARIES

Among the dignitaries at the dedication were Army National Guard Capt. Alfred F. Guenette, Jr., of Chicopee Falls, attending as Governor Endicott's personal representative; Fire Chief Alva Gregoire; Police Chief Ovide A. Desrosiers; Louis N. Provencal of Lawrence, State commander of the Massachusetts FAWV; Roland J. LaBrie of Riverside, R.I., Rhode Island State FAWV commander; LaBrie's wife Emma, who is president of the Rhode Island FAWV Auxiliary; and State Polish-American Veterans Comdr. Albert Gryncewicz of Southbridge.

Attending were officers and members representing FAWV posts in Fall River, New Bedford, Lawrence, Haverhill, Lowell, Leominster, Worcester, Newton, and Lynn in Massachusetts and Woonsocket, Central Falls, and Providence in Rhode Island. (FAWV representatives from Connecticut were at the military ball.)

Organizations represented at dedicatory services included Southbridge Post 66, Italian-American War Veterans, Inc., with Comdr. Anthony DiPietro; Southbridge Barracks 1747, World War I Veterans with Comdr. Omer Genereux; Southbridge Post 31, American Legion with Comdr. Alfred Papineau; Leonide J. Lemire Post 6055, VFW, with Comdr. Gerard Archambeault and incoming commander Wilfred H. Forcier.

Also, Southbridge Chapter 101, Disabled American Veterans, Inc., with Comdr. John F. Jesky; Polish-American Veterans, Inc., of Southbridge with Comdr. Frank Smolen; Southbridge Chapter 27, American Gold Star Mothers, with President Mrs. Gertrude Gendron; Sturbridge Chapter 38, DAV, with Comdr. Roger Cloutier; and United War Mothers, Inc., with President Mrs. Parmelia Gaumond. Representatives of the Legion, VFW, Barracks 1747, PAV, and DAV auxiliaries were on hand. The Daughters of the Union Veterans and the Cercle Canadien sent members. Highway Superintendent Joseph Benoit was present.

The program yesterday included coffee and donuts following the dedication; then a chicken barbecue open to the public. Close to 300 persons attended. The Intertown Square Dance Club entertained.

OFFICERS

The complete list of Post 29 officers is Paul R. LaRochelle, commander; Albert J. Langevin, senior vice commander; Laurent E. McDonald, junior vice commander; Richard H. Genereux, quartermaster; H. Albani (Ben) Bousquet, adjutant; J. Archie Champagne, chaplain; Robert Girouard, historian; William Paquin, Ernest A. Peloquin, and Donald Sarrasin, trustees; and Emery Gendron, officer of the day.

REMARKS IN PART OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN, DEDICATION NEW FRANCO-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS HEADQUARTERS, SOUTHBRIDGE, MASS., MAY 26, 1963

Franco-Americans may well be proud of their contributions to the country.

They have bravely fought in every war; they have faithfully and brilliantly sustained the cause of freedom, justice, and good government in times of peace.

They have been inspiring constructive leaders in Southbridge and throughout the Nation, always in the first rank of our fellow citizens devoted to the security, progress, and advancement of our great democracy.

Ever mindful of their obligations as citizens, Franco-Americans have resolutely stood and worked for the spiritual ideals and the enlightened political principles that are so largely responsible for the greatness of our American Government and the richness of our national life. Their loyalty and devotion may well serve as an example and inspiration to all who believe in our country and what it stands for.

(Referring to the growing evidence that the tides of world opinion were now running strongly on the side of the free world.)

Not even the boisterous jingoism of embattled Soviet leaders can conceal the sense of frustration that is permeating the Communist conspiracy throughout the world.

The overwhelming military and economic strength of this Nation and the free world will continue to be the real effective deterrent to aggression and violence, said Philbin. The threat of nuclear destruction is receding before the tremendous moral and physical power of the free world and our determined efforts to implement a lasting peace, based on justice, truth, and the rights of man.

As we grow in faith, good works, and strength, as we are bound to do, let us continue to make clear to the whole world our wholehearted support of every worthy movement and every practical instrumentality to promote amity, good will, justice, and peace among the nations.

Let us prayerfully resolve here today, as we have done so many times before, that as we strive for peace, we will never give up our American heritage, we will never appease those who seek to dominate us, and if necessary we will continue to defend our country and our freedoms, whatever the cost, with our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 25, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 35: 4: *Say to them that are of a fearful heart, be strong, fear not.*

O Thou God, our Father, whose blessings and benediction are the supreme needs of all mankind, grant that in our deliberations and decisions we may have Thy divine counsel and companionship.

Inspire us with a faith and a faithfulness that never wavers and a courage that never falters when we endeavor to carry out the high and holy mission with which we have been entrusted.

Show us how we may authenticate the glory and grandeur of the ideals and principles of democracy by incarnating them in our daily personal life and in all human relationships.

May each to the extent of his ability and all with equal fidelity seek to hasten the dawning of that blessed day when righteousness and peace shall be established everywhere.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 646. An act to prohibit the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in any residential area in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the U.S. Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 64–1.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 25, 1963.

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I respectfully submit herewith my resignation from the standing Committees of the House of Representatives on Post Office and Civil Service and Veterans' Affairs.

Sincerely,

DON EDWARDS,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file its report on S. 1007.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]?

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 459) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Banking and Currency: Compton I. White, Idaho.

Committee on House Administration: Lucien N. Nedzi, Michigan.

Committee on the Judiciary: Don Edwards, California.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Charles H. Wilson, California.

Committee on Un-American Activities: George F. Senner, Jr., Arizona.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT EXTENSION

Mr. PATMAN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 3872) to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes.

EXPROPRIATION BY CUBA OF UNITED STATES EMBASSY IN HAVANA

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I hope you all realize what Cuba did yesterday in Havana. It notified Switzerland, the country that is taking care of our affairs in Cuba, that they were expropriating our Embassy and all of its contents.

This is something which, according to all I talked with, has never been done before. It should not be left without action. It is the hope, I am sure, of all of us that the Government will be very firm in refusing to accept this piracy. I believe there is a very strong note going to the Swiss with whom we have been in telephonic communication in Berne. I think it is something about which all of us on both sides of the aisle should do a good bit of thinking. Where do we really stand as a nation?

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK AND NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week and next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the minority leader, H.R. 4638 will be considered this afternoon. The disposition of that bill will finish the lgeislative program for the week. When that bill is disposed of it will be my purpose to ask to go over until Monday.

As to the program for next week, there is no legislative business for Monday.

On Tuesday there will be a conference report on H.R. 3872, Export-Import Bank Act Extension.

On Wednesday we will take up House Resolution 453, consideration of and waiving points of order against the conference report on H.R. 5207, Foreign Service Buildings, Philippine War Damage Claims.

For the edification of the House I might state that Members have advised me that there will be plans to ask for rollcalls on at least one, if not both of these conference reports.

On Thursday and the balance of the week, H.R. 7500, authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

This announcement, of course, is made with the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and that any further program may be announced later.

LAW BOOKS, U.S.A.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as a pioneer sponsor of the classics of democracy program that in its 10 years of operation has carried into the nooks and corners of the world, in paperback editions translated into many languages, the classics that inspired our own forefathers, I commend the Federal Bar Association and the World Peace Through Law Committee of the American Bar Association for their sponsorship of a contributing program, supported by private contributions from the members of the bar associations, and aimed at placing in the hands of lawyers in many foreign lands a selected number of paperback books dealing with the philosophy and spirit of the American law concept.

This program, inaugurated by the Federal Bar Association during the presidency of our distinguished colleague from Maryland, Mr. Lankford, is well outlined in purpose and scope in an article in the July 1963 edition of the Federal Bar News by Richard N. Flint and Scott Hodes. Mr. Hodes is the able son of the Honorable Barnet Hodes, former corporation counsel of the city of Chicago and presently heading with Col. Jacob Arvey one of the largest law firms in Chicago. It was Barnet Hodes who arranged and masterminded the largest political rally every staged in an American presidential campaign. This was in the final week of the campaign of 1948 and from the gigantic demonstration in Chicago, Harry Truman rode the crest of the wave to victory. The Chicago rally was definitely the turning point in the 1948 campaign.

From the experience of 10 years with the classics of democracy program, I can speak with knowledge and some authority of the need and the field of usefulness of the Law Books, U.S.A. program. Before the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan], and I appeared before the advisory board of USIA, composed of some of the country's outstanding editors and publishers, and obtained the Board's endorsement of paperbacks, printed in many languages and dialects and distributed at grassroots, the classics of our democracy were available in foreign lands only in expensive English editions on the shelves of libraries that few ever visited. Meanwhile Soviet paperbacks were everywhere. Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson has credited the classics of democracy program, inexpensive translations reaching people at grassroots, with turning the tide in the battle for the hearts and minds of people.

I might explain for the benefit of the newer Members of the House that the classics of democracy program had its birth at a now historic luncheon of a distinguished group of Chicagoans that I was privileged to attend. Participating in the luncheon discussion were: Dr. Jerome Kerwin, chairman of the Charles P. Walgren Foundation, University of Chicago; Dr. Harold Fey, executive editor, Christian Century; A. T. Burch, then associate editor, and Van Allen Bradley, literary editor of the Chicago Daily News; Emery T. Filbey, vice president emeritus, University of Chicago; Thomas B. Stauffer, a member of the faculty of Wilson Junior College with State Department background, the host at the luncheon; John McGinnis, president, Pennsylvania Lodge 225, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks; and Dr. Richard P. McKeon, professor of philosophy, University of Chicago, State Department visitor to the universities of India and other countries, a recognized authority in his field, as were the others in their respective fields.

This distinguished group formed itself into a permanent committee that for a decade has been a driving force in what has proved probably the most effective program for reaching the hearts and minds of men in the history of our country. It is based upon something so simple that the wonder is why it was overlooked so long. That was the realization that the classics of democracy that inspired our forefathers in their search for more perfect structures of popular government would prove equally inspiring, if made available in native languages and at grass-roots, to the men and women in the newly independent nations of the world who are searching, as did our forefathers, for the most perfect governmental expression of the popular will.

When the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Feighan, and I first proposed the classics of democracy program to the Congress there was only one translation of the Federalist. That was in Spanish and it was out of print. Today it is available in many languages in inexpensive editions and is one of the most widely read books in the world. I am reliably informed that at all-African conferences practically every delegate has had a translated copy of the Federalist in his valise library. The Italian, German, and Arabic translations ran into several editions, and were widely heralded by the press.

So it has been with the other classics of democracy, once they were taken from their entombment on the seldom-visited shelves of large but widely separated libraries, translated into native languages, printed in paperbacks, put within the reach of people everywhere.

There is room and need for Law Books, U.S.A., which is in a specialized field. It can prove a formidable factor in the fight for the hearts and minds of people. That is the fight that is important. It is the fight that will be decisive. And especially in these new nations, now in their founding years, their power and influence in the ascendancy, it is important that the lawyers should know and have the very feel of the American concept of law. To this end, Law Books, U.S.A. should contribute. It is not a Federal project. It is not subject to the charge of propaganda. It can be the vehicle for the lawyers of the United States to speak to the lawyers of other lands, lawyers to lawyers, all joined in the common interest of making this world of ours a world of justice, equity and peace under law.

Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the article in the July Federal Bar News by Richard N. Flint and Scott Hodes, as follows:

The Young Lawyer Speaks

(By Richard N. Flint, and Scott Hodes)

FBA ANNOUNCES LAW BOOKS, U.S.A.

An itinerant book salesman in native dress walked into the Lagos, Nigeria, office of a large American book distributor and purchashed a variety of paperback volumes dealing with the nature of the American legal system. The transaction consummated, he carefully packed the volumes in a canvas satchel, flung it over his bare shoulders, and embarked on a barefooted sales expedition which would carry him in succeding days to the outlying districts of his country. In these remote areas, local civil administrators and attorneys would examine each paperback in the satchel longingly and carefully before making his selection. His choice finally made, he would pay the equivalent of a week's wages for one or two of the volumes.

This incident, which actually happened less than 2 months previous to this writing, typifies the thirst for knowledge regarding

American jurisprudence and the interest in the American legal system which is currently being exhibited by the emerging nations throughout the world. Reports from the United States Information Agency, the Department of State, and from Peace Corps volunteers reveal a great demand for American books of all kinds.

But the United States is not the only country which has noted this great thirst for books: The Communists presently export books in dozens of different languages to some 68 non-Communist countries. Last year this Communist effort accounted for the distribution of an estimated 40 million volumes, and not surprisingly, Communist literature is being supplied abroad at a price far below the combined costs of publishing, shipping, and distributing. Clearly, if the growing international demand for American books is not satisfied at a price within the range of foreign readers, the Communists will fill the void by providing books which best serve their own purposes.

Books, U.S.A.

In an effort to meet this demand for American books, the U.S. Information Agency, in its various programs, will distribute or assist in the distribution abroad of some 6 million volumes this year. One such program which is entitled "Books, U.S.A." permits the American public, the publishing industry, and USIA to join in a nonprofit campaign to ship overseas large numbers of English language paperbacks. The costs involved are being met by donations from great numbers of individual Americans, particularly those who understand the importance of books in the international arena of political, social, and economic competition. Interestingly enough, when USIA first released the "Books, U.S.A." blueprint to its oversea posts, an immediate response was received from the USIA mission in Djakarta, together with a personal check from each American staff member. In the words of the Djakarta staff, "(it) is difficult for us to imagine a number adequate to reach the saturation point of effective and useful distribution of the packets."

Lawbooks, USA

More important to us as lawyers, Americans abroad also report a profound interest in American jurisprudence, particularly among the emerging nations. Many of these nations are former British colonies, and the local leaders have been educated in English schools and are familiar with a common law system. Also, in these new nations, lawyers and law students constitute probably the greatest single source of political and intellectual leadership. A great proportion of the educated population has studied law, and these lawyers serve as the statesmen, politicans, civil servants, and administrators in the developing countries.

Thus, to meet this great need for books concerning the American legal system, the Federal Bar Association has joined with the World Peace Through Law Committee of the American Bar Association and the USIA in sponsoring a program of "Lawbooks, U.S.A." Under this program, interested Americans, particularly lawyers, will be encouraged to contribute the sum of $8.

For each $8 contributed, a packet of basic paperback books concerning the nature of our legal system will be sent to selected lawyers, jurists, teachers, and law students abroad. The donor's name will be enclosed with the packet of lawbooks, and the recipient will be encouraged to correspond directly with the American donor. Oceana Publications, Inc., has undertaken to coordinate the program on a nonprofit basis and will publicize it throughout the legal profession in the United States, although the books making up the packet have been selected from the lists of several publishers.

The seven paperback books in the packet have been selected by lawyers, law students, and law teachers in this country. Technical legal treatises have been bypassed since the intent is to select books dealing with the philosophy and spirit of our legal system. Although substitute titles may be necessary if the supply of a particular book is temporarily exhausted, a typical packet will contain the following: "Spirit of Liberty" by Learned Hand; "The Nature of the Judicial Process" by Benjamin Cardozo; "Talks on American Law" by Harold Berman; "Brandies Reader" by Erwin Pollack; "Equal Justice Under Law" by Carroll Moreland; "American Constitution Reader" by Robert McKay; and "American Jurisprudence Reader" by Thomas Cowan.

Final selection of recipients will be made by USIA, but lists of prospective recipients will be furnished by the FBA, ABA, American attorneys serving with the Peace Corps and by Judge Advocate Detachments in the emerging nations. The individual American donor may leave the choice entirely with USIA, or he may indicate a particular country within which he wishes his packet distributed.

The program has received the enthusiastic support of the executive committee of the FBA and deserves the support of the entire association. Lawyers taking part may rest assured that they have contributed to, in the words of Edward R. Murrow, "keeping the human spirit unshackled and the desire for freedom alive."

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION ACT OF 1963

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 454 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4638) to promote the orderly transfer of the executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 103]

Abernethy
Arends
Ashbrook
Auchincloss
Avery
Baring
Belcher
Buckley
Carey
Cederberg
Conte
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Diggs
Ellsworth
Fogarty
Forrester
Grabowski
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Healey
Hébert
Holifield
Kee
Kilburn
Long, La.
McCulloch
McDade
McIntire
Madden
Martin, Mass.
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Minshall
Morrison
Morse
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
Pepper
Pike
Powell
Price
Purcell
Rains
Reid, N.Y.
St. George
Saylor
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Trimble
Watson
Westland
Williams
Wyman

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 379 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

STATUS OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, for general information I include as a part of my remarks a down-to-date report, similar to earlier ones, on the status of the appropriation bills of the session.

The House has processed 10 appropriation bills—2 for fiscal 1963 and 8 for fiscal 1964—accounting for about $73,673,000,000 of the President's budget requests. A total of $3,402,000,000 has been cut by the House from the requests.

Four bills have been sent down to the President. They were reduced $356,298,000 below the corresponding budget requests.

Four regular 1964 bills, plus the usual closing supplemental, remain to be reported. They prospectively involve requests of roughly $26,000,000,000, not counting whatever may be proposed for the closing supplemental. They are the military construction bill, the independent offices bill which includes the space agency, the public works bill and the foreign aid bill. All four hinge on annual authorization bills not yet enacted.

The tabulation follows.

The appropriation bills, 88th Cong. 1st sess., as of July 25, 1963

[Does not include back-door appropriations or permanent appropriations under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

Bill No.	Title	House							
		Budget estimates to House	Date reported	Amount as reported	Amount reported compared with budget estimates	Date passed	Amount as passed	House action compared with—	
								Budget estimates	Amount reported
	1963 SUPPLEMENTALS								
H.J. Res. 284	Supplemental, Agriculture	[1] $508, 172, 000	Feb. 26	$508, 172, 000		Feb. 27	$508, 172, 000		
H.R. 5517	Supplemental	1, 641, 507, 106	Apr. 5	988, 756, 506	–$652, 750, 600	Apr. 10	1, 438, 691, 506	–$202, 815, 600	+$449, 935, 000
	Public works acceleration	(500, 000, 000)		( )	(–500, 000, 000)		(450, 000, 000)	(–50, 000, 000)	(+450, 000, 000)
	All other	(1, 141, 507, 106)		(988, 756, 506)	(–152, 750, 600)		(988, 691, 506)	(–152, 815, 600)	(–65, 000)
	Total, 1963 supplementals	2, 149, 679, 106		1, 496, 928, 506	–652, 750, 600		1, 946, 863, 506	–202, 815, 600	+449, 935, 000
	1964 APPROPRIATIONS								
H.R. 5279	Interior	998, 009, 000	Mar. 28	929, 690, 200	–68, 318, 800	Apr. 2	922, 625, 200	–75, 383, 800	–7, 065, 000
	Loan authorization	(13, 000, 000)		(6, 000, 000)	(–7, 000, 000)		(6, 000, 000)	(–7, 000, 000)	
	Contract authority	(17, 500, 000)			(–17, 500, 000)			(–17, 500, 000)	
H.R. 5366	Treasury-Post Office	6, 146, 842, 000	Apr. 1	5, 997, 026, 000	–149, 816, 000	Apr. 4	5, 997, 026, 000	–149, 816, 000	
H.R. 5888	Labor-HEW	5, 759, 489, 000	Apr. 25	5, 449, 988, 000	–309, 501, 000	Apr. 30	5, 449, 981, 000	–309, 508, 000	–7, 000
H.R. 6754	Agriculture	6, 368, 755, 000	June 3	5, 979, 457, 000	–389, 298, 000	June 6	5, 979, 457, 000	–389, 298, 000	
	Loan authorizations	(855, 000, 000)		(855, 000, 000)			(855, 000, 000)		
H.R. 6868	Legislative	[2] 148, 580, 245	June 6	[2] 140, 038, 919	–8, 541, 326	June 11	[2] 140, 038, 919	–8, 541, 326	
H.R. 7063	State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary	2, 159, 891, 900	June 14	1, 851, 269, 900	–308, 622, 000	June 18	1, 851, 269, 900	–308, 622, 000	
H.R. 7179	Defense	49, 014, 237, 000	June 21	47, 092, 209, 000	–1, 922, 028, 000	June 26	47, 082, 009, 000	–1, 932, 228, 000	–10, 200, 000
H.R. 7431	District of Columbia	(289, 581, 800)	July 8	(284, 286, 800)	(–5, 295, 000)	July 11	(284, 286, 800)	(–5, 295, 000)	
	Federal payment	34, 868, 000		32, 868, 000	–2, 000, 000		32, 868, 000	–2, 000, 000	
	Loan authorizations	(8, 000, 000)		(8, 000, 000)			(8, 000, 000)		
	Total, 1964 appropriations	70, 630, 672, 145		67, 472, 547, 019	–3, 158, 125, 126		67, 455, 275, 019	–3, 175, 397, 126	–17, 272, 000
	Total, all appropriations	72, 780, 351, 251		68, 969, 475, 525	–3, 810, 875, 726		69, 402, 138, 525	–3, 378, 212, 726	+432, 663, 000
	Total, loan authorizations	(876, 000, 000)		(869, 000, 000)	(–7, 000, 000)		(869, 000, 000)	(–7, 000, 000)	
	Total, contract authority	(17, 500, 000)			(–17, 500, 000)			(–17, 500, 000)	

[1] Shifted from budget for 1964, which was reduced accordingly.

[2] Excludes Senate items.

The appropriation bills, 88th Cong. 1st sess., as of July 25, 1963—Continued

[Does not include back-door appropriations or permanent appropriations under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

Bill No.	Title	Senate							Final action			Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates to date
		Budget estimates to Senate	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	Senate action compared with—		Date approved	Amount as approved	Public Law No.	
							Budget estimates	House action				
	1963 SUPPLEMENTALS											
H.J. Res. 284	Supplemental, Agriculture	$508,172,000	Feb. 28	508,172,000	Mar. 4	$508,172,000			Mar. 6	$508,172,000	88-1	
H.R. 5517	Supplemental	1,652,300,456	Apr. 24	1,486,096,841	May 1	1,488,683,841	−$163,616,615	+$49,992,335	May 17	1,467,430,491	88-25	−$184,869,965
	Public works acceleration	(500,000,000)		(450,000,000)		(450,000,000)	(−50,000,000)			(450,000,000)		(−50,000,000)
	All other	(1,152,300,456)		(1,036,096,841)		(1,038,683,841)	(−113,616,615)	(+49,992,335)		(1,017,430,491)		(−134,869,965)
	Total, 1963 supplementals	2,160,472,456		1,994,268,841		1,996,855,841	−163,616,615	+49,992,335		1,975,602,491		−184,869,965
	1964 APPROPRIATIONS											
H.R. 5279	Interior	998,009,000	May 22	979,093,400	May 28	979,693,400	−18,315,600	−57,068,200		952,456,500		−45,552,500
	Loan authorization	(13,000,000)		(6,000,000)		(6,000,000)	(−7,000,000)			(6,000,000)		(−7,000,000)
	Contract authority	(17,500,000)					(−17,500,000)					(−17,500,000
H.R. 5366	Treasury-Post Office	6,146,842,000	May 3	6,074,216,250	May 8	6,069,466,250	−77,375,750	+72,440,250	June 13	6,045,466,000	88-39	−101,376,000
H.R. 5888	Labor-HEW											
H.R. 6754	Agriculture											
	Loan authorizations											
H.R. 6868	Legislative	182,218,450	June 25	168,273,069	June 26	168,273,069	−13,945,381	+28,234,150				
H.R. 7063	State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary											
H.R. 7179	Defense											
H.R. 7431	District of Columbia											
	Federal payment											
	Loan authorizations											
	Total, 1964 appropriations	7,327,069,450		7,221,582,719		7,217,432,719	−109,636,731	+157,742,600		6,997,922,500		−146,928,500
	Total, all appropriations	9,487,541,906		9,215,851,560		9,214,288,560	−273,253,346	+207,734,935		8,973,524,991		−331,798,465
	Total, loan authorizations	(13,000,000)		(6,000,000)		(6,000,000)	(−7,000,000)			(6,000,000)		(−7,000,000)
	Total, contract authority	(17,500,000)					(−17,500,000)					(−17,500,000)

[1] Shifted from budget for 1964, which was reduced accordingly.

NOTE.—Totals reflect amounts approved and comparisons at latest stage of congressional action on each bill.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate on July 29 and 31, and August 1 and 2.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have been told by some that this is one of the most important bills that will come before this session of Congress. I am, of course, referring to the bill before us this afternoon to spend $1,300,000 in connection with the transition of one President to private life and the indoctrination of a new President.

Does not the gentleman want to be here to take care of the Presidents, present, and future? It is a very important bill, or at least so I am told.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION ACT OF 1963

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I know of no controversy at all on this rule and I reserve the balance of my time insofar as the rule is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and ask unanimous consent that he may speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

"DEAL MADE IN HOUSE ON COTTON, AREAS AID"

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert a newspaper article at the conclusion of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was rather shocked this morning to read an article in the newspaper to the effect that a deal was being made in the House on the cotton and the area redevelopment bills. It is quite a lengthy article, but I am going to read the first two paragraphs:

> A North-South political trade finally moved the long-stalled cotton bill out of the House Rules Committee yesterday.
>
> The committee voted to let the cotton bill go to the House floor after southern Democrats—

And I am one of them—

> Agreed to support depressed areas legislation that they helped to defeat last month.

I just wonder what we are coming to around here. Primarily I want to absolve the Rules Committee from any participation in any such outrageous trade if it took place.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I read the article to which the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules has made reference. The article, if it purports to cover anything that the leadership has said or done, is entirely false. No such deal has been made and certainly the leadership has been no party to any such deal.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am delighted to hear that. What I wanted to say is that the Rules Committee is certainly no party to any such deal. So far as the Rules Committee is concerned this bill was reported in the regular way. If there was any such trading going on here the Rules Committee did not know anything about it. Certainly it was never mentioned or considered in any way, shape or form by the Committee on Rules. And I can assure you that I know the members of that committee so well that I do not believe the rule could have gotten out under any such kind of conditions if they had known about it.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to get the statement from the majority leader. I am glad to know that he is not a party to this arrangement. As a matter of fact, I had heard about it before the Rules Committee acted and I could not believe it. I was assured on authority that I thought was ample that there was no relationship between the two bills. But I did notice in this article a very strange sort of quirk; that is, that the cotton bill will not be called up until after the area redevelopment bill is first acted upon. That is a very unusual thing because I do not know whether the area redevelopment bill will ever come up. The area redevelopment bill is still in committee. I am sure everybody here remembers that the area redevelopment bill was here once this year and was defeated on a rollcall vote by this House. It is very unusual that we should have voted on a bill once in this House and defeated it on a rollcall vote, after due deliberation and debate, and then have it come back here again in the same session, almost within the same month, and that we would be asked to pass upon it again.

This is a quid pro quo deal. Trading one bill for another.

Just how is it going to be arranged that the quid must come before the quo? How is it going to be arranged that the cotton bill shall not be voted upon until after the quid pro quo votes have been delivered on the area redevelopment bill? Maybe somebody can inform me about that. You know, it so happens that the Rules Committee has a little something to do about when these bills come to the floor. I want to assure you that if there is any such deal going on or has gone on, I am going to use what little finagling and delaying, and so forth, that I can bring to pass on this situation to see that that does not happen.

Mr. Speaker, I resent this article.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I resent this article because it puts every Member of the House on the spot. Some Members may want to change their vote one way or the other, on account of changed conditions or changed provisions of the bill. But he will be subject to criticism, he will be subject to charges, any Member that changes his vote. It has placed every Member of this House—and some Members may have good reason to change their votes—I do not know what they might be; it seems to me we thrashed this thing out once—however every Member is under suspicion from now on until this matter is disposed of, and I hope it will be disposed of quickly.

They say that the southern boys did this, the southern Members. You know, we southern boys are pretty good old horse traders. I was raised to be a pretty good horse trader myself. When I have a horse trade I want to get equivalent value. Here this accuses our southern boys of being so softheaded that we are going to trade off a thing that we are not for, in the appropriation of the taxpayer's money and our taxpayers' money, of $450 million, and what are we going to get in return? They are going to trade us an old, broken-down, windbroken, and spavined horse for $250 million in a cotton deal. Is that what we are going to do around here if we are going to make a trade?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I always yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I am certain the gentleman is one of the best horse traders in the country. I think he is trying to make a trade now. I think he is trying to use an article which has no foundation so far as I know to make it impossible for Members for good reason to vote for either of these bills.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I appreciate the compliment of my good friend. I know one coming from him is more valuable than one coming from most everybody else. I admit I am a pretty good horse trader. I admit I am opposed to the area redevelopment bill. I further admit I am going to do anything I can to help defeat it. If that is horse trading, then I am a horse trader.

I am going to say one other thing. There was another newspaper article that I saw this morning which was published yesterday morning in a newspaper from another State. It mentioned the name of one of my colleagues in this House to whom I am very much devoted, but it told a story that ought to be corrected.

Gentlemen, I hope that this House has not dropped down to the point where we sit around here trading off our taxpayers' money just to pass a bill.

Mr. Speaker, the article to which I referred earlier is as follows:

DEAL MADE IN HOUSE ON COTTON, AREAS AID

(By Julius Duscha)

A North-South political trade finally moved the long-stalled cotton bill out of the House Rules Committee yesterday.

The committee voted to let the cotton bill go to the House floor after southern Democrats agreed to support depressed areas legislation that they helped to defeat last month.

Northern Democrats and Republicans who had been opposed to the cotton bill have in turn agreed to support it in exchange for southern backing of the depressed areas program.

All of this logrolling probably will push the depressed areas bill through the House, but it is still doubtful whether the House will approve the cotton legislation.

SECOND CHANCE

Under present plans the House will be given a second chance to pass the depressed areas bill before Democratic leaders ask for a vote on the cotton legislation.

On June 12 the House defeated by a vote of 209 to 204 a bill that would have provided $455 million in additional funds for the Area Redevelopment Administration.

Established 2 years ago as one of the first major innovations of the Kennedy administration, the ARA lends money to depressed areas to help them attract industry.

The program was defeated in the House following charges that it had been badly administered and that projects had been awarded on a political basis. The charges were denied by the supporters of the program.

APPROVED BY SENATE

The Senate approved the additional funds for the program by a vote of 65 to 30 on June 26. Since then the White House and Democratic House leaders have been trying to find a way to resurrect the bill in the House.

The cotton bill seemed to be the best vehicle because the 20 southern Democrats who supported the depressed areas program when it was enacted in 1961 and then opposed it in June included several influential members who desperately want a cotton bill.

Among them are Chairman HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, of the House Agriculture Committee, and Representative THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Democrat, of Mississippi, a senior committee member.

Next Monday the House Banking Committee is scheduled to take up the depressed areas program again. The committee is expected to approve a slightly modified version of the legislation as it was passed by the Senate.

The cotton bill, which has been the subject of controversy for more than 6 months, would make it possible for domestic textile mills to buy American cotton at the same price it is marketed abroad.

AN 8½-CENT SUBSIDY

Now U.S. cotton sells for 24½ cents a pound in foreign markets and for 32½ cents in the United States because of an 8½-cent subsidy paid to exporters. Without the subsidy American cotton could not compete with lower price cotton produced in other countries.

The proposed legislation would subsidize domestic as well as foreign sales of cotton.

The legislation has run into opposition from Congressmen who question the wisdom of piling another subsidy on top of the subsidies already paid cotton farmers through the 32½-cent-a-pound Government price guarantee.

Also complicating the outlook for the legislation is a proposal in it allowing cotton farmers to increase their production if they are willing to market the additional cotton at the lower world market prices.

This proposal, which was put into the bill at the insistence of efficient Western producers, would provide for greater cotton production when there already is a large surplus of American cotton.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, crisis is piling upon crisis, one of our more astute political writers, the versatile and brilliant William S. White, suggested the other day. While we are in the midst of a second racial revolution, not unlike the 1860's, we are faced with a grave economic problem involving the railroads and a threatened nationwide strike, which would create chaos throughout the country.

With these two major problems hanging over our heads like the sword of Damocles, we should not forget another great issue, which involves not only our generation, but our children's and their children's. I speak of the threatened degradation of the ethical and moral responsibilities which have been the guiding principles for our Nation since its beginning.

There are apparent and obvious examples of this possible deterioration of community responsibility standards.

First, I refer to an announcement by the Federal Bureau of Investigation last week, reporting that crime in general, ranging from thefts to murder, was up 6 percent in 1962 over 1961. Every category of major crime, with the exception of murder, showed a substantial increase. The FBI report said that crime had increased four times faster than population in the past 5 years. A portion of the report—based on surveys from local police departments, that should disturb every decent and law-abiding adult in the Nation—was concerned with the increase in crime among those only 18 years of age.

In this category, arrests were up a staggering 9 percent. In fact, more than half the arrests made in communities of over 2,500 for burglaries, thefts, and auto thefts were of persons under 18.

Second, for a period of years the Supreme Court has handed down decisions which are spelling the destruction of our ethical and moral standards in the United States. The Supreme Court has created ambiguities when they did not exist and its decisions have had in many cases little justification as enunciation of existing law. The Court has not looked at the legislative intent of our basic laws, for example, in its interpretation of the 14th amendment and integration of schools. The Court has made it easier to be a Communist without apprehension; and habitual criminals escape laws which Congress has enacted, because of decisions distorting our Bills of Rights.

The recent prayer and Bible decisions by the Supreme Court should have been decided on the legal principle, de minimis non curat lex, that is, that the law does not cure small or trifling matters. The complaint of the parties involved, it seems to me, was insignificant. There seemed to be no substantial injury to those who brought suit in both the prayer and Bible cases.

However, I am certain the general public suffers from these decisions. The major responsibilities for moral and ethical teaching now are placed on the home and the church. There now is substantial training in social behavior taught in the home. But, in our modern society, in many cases, both parents work, and there are split families, which leaves a definite vacuum in moral training. This is something we must be cognizant of today and in the future. Woodrow Wilson said it with clarity: "Our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually."

Mr. Speaker, I feel it is vitally necessary to provide legislation for Federal assistance for the establishment of proper ethical and social behavior standards. I have introduced today a bill which sets forth these ideas. This bill should not be objectionable to the atheist or the agnostic. As a practical matter, I believe lectures could be prepared and taught at appropriate levels in our schools. In connection with this, texts could be written with the objective of crime prevention. Take, for example, the field of stealing and its various ramifications. The statutes designed to prevent theft rest on basic moral and ethical standards, and instruction in these statutes and the principles underlying them would have very substantial influences for improved social behavior.

We cannot escape the fact that what we believe in is directly tied to what we do in life. Rousseau described the role those of us in Congress should aspire to: "Those who treat politics and morality apart will never understand the one or the other." Louis W. Cabot of the Cabot Corp., in Boston, said recently, "to maintain public confidence, business must pursue higher standards of ethical conduct more vigorously than ever."

Whatever we do, whatever our children grow up to be, should be based on proper lessons of moral and ethical behavior.

This bill I have introduced provides Federal assistance in a field which needs our urgent attention today. Some of the present crisis is the responsibility of the national level of government; and any solutions that may be found will definitely benefit the Nation as a whole, as well as the States and their subdivisions.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM], and ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, last week when a great Georgian, a distinguished American, reached the milestone of passing the record for continuous service in this House established by any other previous Member, his own colleagues from Georgia were unavoidably absent attending a conference in Georgia called by the Governor of Georgia dealing with matters affecting all of us, at which, after discussion with the distinguished gentleman from Georgia and others, it was decided that our presence in Georgia was required. Since we were not here to join in the splendid and deserved tributes to the near incredible record established by our dear friend, CARL VINSON, I wonder if the House would indulge me one moment, the opportunity to say publicly something not about the record of Mr. VINSON but about the man, CARL VINSON, as I have come to know him in the 11 years that it has been my privilege to serve here.

When I came to the Congress in 1953, I had never met Mr. VINSON. I must confess that as I prepared to go to his office to meet him I experienced a sort of nervous elation similar to the way I felt when my father carried me to meet another great Georgian, Ty Cobb, when I was a very young boy. But despite that nervousness and apprehension on meeting a man who already, at that time 10 years ago, had established a record for greatness in America—all nervousness disappeared instantly when, as I entered his office, he arose and greeted me with a warmth and a welcome usually reserved for only warm, personal and intimate friends. From that moment to this day, I have found CARL VINSON's friendship not only delightful and valuable, but I have learned through this association with him that he has many magnificent qualities not given to all people in public life and one of those qualities is this. I believe he as much as any man alive has the courage to do things which he thinks are best for democracy regardless of what it may mean in the light of a present political situation. I am glad I have had the privilege of knowing him these 10 years. I confess I have developed a near parental affection for the friendship he has allowed me to enjoy with him.

I congratulate the people of Georgia for providing our colleague, CARL VINSON, the opportunity to serve his Nation and the world for half a century during a period of unparalleled progress in world history. I join them, as I know all of you join us, in hoping that the years in the future will be marked by the continued success and service of this great Georgian and distinguished American. I am happy to have this opportunity to express publicly my admiration for his record and my esteem and affection for the man.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCK].

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the impending strike against the public. I believe in collective bargaining.

I recognize the fact that the right to strike is the principle weapon of labor unions. The worker should not be deprived of his most valuable weapon, but I do not now and never have regarded the right to strike as absolute. There should and must be some limitations if we are to preserve public safety and promote our national defense.

No man, no set of men have a right to weld themselves together in such fashion as to bring suffering upon the innocent public. It has come down to us through hundreds of years of civilization that public safety is the paramont function of law. No man has a right to strike against the public security.

These nationwide strikes in essential public utilities such as the threatened railroad strike, are contrary to the public interest and ought not to be tolerated. Persons employed in public utility companies are quasi-public officials. They should recognize at the inception of their employment that the responsibility in an emergency to stay at their post of duty until suitable relief can be obtained is a compelling one. Their employment to a large extent may be likened to the employment of city fire and police departments, for a strike such as these railroad unions are about to inaugurate on a nationwide scale could be even more disastrous than the strike of the police or fire department in a single city.

Professional doctors and nurses in both our public and private health services recognize these responsibilities. Irrespective of whatever working conditions may arise at their hospitals or places of employment, we have never heard of them uniting to strike. If doctors and nurses formed a union amongst themselves and went on strike, ignoring the suffering and dying patients in hospitals, as well as those outside, we know that the wrath of the public would speedily correct such a situation.

We recognize in this country that every man has the right to self-defense. But however strong the provocation, we also recognize that no man has the right to hurl a missile at his antagonist if that missile endangers the safety of an innocent bystander. In such a situation as the proposed railroad strike, the United States of America may lie prostrate and be powerless to defend itself against its enemies, foreign and domestic. Likewise, our economy may be upset to such an extent as to accuse men, women, and children to suffer.

The unbridled right to strike is the shibboleth of the labor unions. It is a false and spurious doctrine to claim that such a right cannot be restrained. We must repudiate such preachments. We must prevent these power-drunk union tyrants and modern-day Samsons, blinded with their fury and wrath, from pulling down the two pillars of the temple, thus destroying the people and themselves alike.

The problems of the country and of the world today arise largely because we have too many men in high public office whose concern for the public good is subordinated to their desire for reelection to public office, and thus for political purposes they cater to this or that organized group.

The "Profiles in Courage" about which we have read so much should be proliferated and projected down to meet the present-day problems, such as the menacing railroad situation that confronts us today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, following precedent, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York and ask unanimous consent that he may proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

DISCHARGE PETITION ON LEGISLATION TO PERMIT PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND PUBLIC PLACES

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am very well aware that every Member of the House knows that I have placed a petition at the desk to bring before the House a constitutional amendment that would permit prayer in all public schools and in all public places. That petition has been at the desk now for the past 2 weeks. The signatures are moving up gradually.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that in the not too far distant future we will secure enough signatures to bring that matter before the House. However, I know because of questions that have been asked of me, that there are 47 Members who have introduced resolutions providing for a constitutional amendment such as mine and that the wording of these constitutional amendments is in many different forms.

Mr. Speaker, I announced last week that I was going to ask for a meeting of the 47 Members and sit down and discuss the method of writing one particular amendment that could be agreed upon by these 47 Members so that an amendment can then come before the House under an open rule as provided in my discharge petition, which will meet the approval of these 47 Members, and substitute it for House Joint Resolution 9.

After the meeting of these Members, six Members were appointed and asked to serve on the committee, with legislative counsel.

This is a bipartisan committee made up of the following Democrats and Republicans: Mr. BARING of Nevada, a Democrat, Mr. LATTA of Ohio, a Republican, Mr. KORNEGAY of North Carolina, a Democrat, Mr. CRAMER of Florida, a Republican, Mr. FUQUA of Florida, a Democrat, and myself from New York, a Republican.

I hope that, given a couple of weeks time, we may come up with a satisfactory amendment which we can all support.

May I also say to the Members of the House and those who have been reluctant to sign discharge petitions, that if we can agree, I would ask every Member, to please, at the very earliest possible moment, sign this petition so that this matter may come before the House.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from New York for his efforts on behalf of the bill he has introduced and in which many of us are deeply interested.

I would like to inform the Members of the House that this is one of the most important matters which we ought to be considering this year. It is of great importance to this country's welfare because it goes to the very root of our freedoms and the very structure of our political system. We are a nation that is built upon a foundation of faith in God, we are a nation that has grown strong because of our faith in God, we are a nation has has liberties beyond those enjoyed by other countries because of our faith in God and because we believe God has created us in His image and has endowed us with these rights.

We surely will be weakened in proportion to the discouragement of that faith if we do not allow that faith to be strengthened.

Mr. BECKER. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. I am heartened by the fact a Member of the other body has informed me he is going to take like steps to bring this matter before the other body and get it on its way.

This is not a matter of signing a discharge petition or disliking to sign a discharge petition on a piece of legislation that can come before the House at any time. A constitutional amendment must be passed by the Congress, then forwarded to the 50 States and ratified by three-quarters of the States. This takes time. We have little time to spare.

I stated the other day that other cases are appearing in the courts. I have here a copy of an article dated June 20 announcing that the American Civil Liberties Union was taking up a case in the California courts now to eliminate "under God" from the pledge of allegiance to the flag. This was put in there by an act of Congress of 1954.

Above the Speaker's rostrum appears "In God We Trust," put there by our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [JOHN MCCORMACK].

This is another case that will come before the courts, to take this off our coins and currency and other places.

I include as part of my remarks the following article previously referred to:

[From the New York Times]

FACTS ABOUT AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES SUIT

LOS ANGELES, June 20.—The American Civil Liberties Union filed suit in superior court (June 19) to eliminate "under God" from the pledge of allegiance to the flag, as recited in the Los Angeles school system.

The suit asserted that the phrase, added to the pledge by Congress in 1954, violated the constitutional guarantee of freedom of religion.

The action was prepared by the ACLU regional office on behalf of a history teacher in the Los Angeles schools (George Washington High School).

The Los Angeles Board of Education was named as defendant.

The teacher said:

"It's a matter of conscience with me. I think the phrase is out of place there. I am not an atheist and I am not an agnostic."

The teacher said he had permitted his classes to recite the pledge while he stepped out into the hall. This, he said, might subject him to dismissal and he sponsored the suit to protect his rights.

Mr. Speaker, I say we should act now to amend the Constitution so that we do not permit Almighty God to be taken out of our American society that made this country great.

Under the regimes in Russia and under Hitler in Germany it was stated: "Give me the youth of the nation, let me control them, and I will control the nation."

They did just that. They got the youth of those countries to eliminate God from their minds and the Communists continue to do that, so that they create a godless society. We should not permit that in this country.

Sign the petition, bring it before the House, let it be debated, and let it go before the people.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I say to the gentleman and to the Members of the House that I shall support any proper resolution of the type the gentleman has in mind that will provide for the submission of a constitutional amendment to the various States for ratification so we may have a Constitution that cannot be misinterpreted by any court as to our belief in Almighty God.

Mr. BECKER. I thank the gentleman and appreciate his support.

Mr. Speaker, last year, and again this year, the Governors' conference supported prayer in public schools and I have no doubt that should we submit this constitutional amendment to the various State legislatures, it will be approved.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if the House will bear with me I would like to speak for just a moment or two on the bill, and the rule which makes in order the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4638.

The adoption of this resolution and rule would provide that H.R. 4638 would be subject to 1 hour of general debate under an open rule which would permit the offering and consideration of any and all amendments and, of course, would permit the House to work its will on this very important legislation.

The bill itself is designed for the purpose of promoting the orderly transfer of Executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of the President and the inauguration of a new President. It also applies to the office of the Vice President. Another provision of the bill, by the way, would authorize the preparation, transfer, and employment of needed help and assistants for a period of some 6 months after a President went out of office, in order to rearrange his records and papers, and transport them wherever he might desire them to be placed, or to turn them over to the proper agency of the Government for preservation and future use.

The enactment of this type of legislation has been requested by a bipartisan commission of very distinguished Americans named by the President, by the Bureau of the Budget, by both the Democratic and Republican National Committees, and endorsed and recommended, as I understand it, by the President and every living ex-President. While the request for the enactment of this legislation, based on the recommendation of this bipartisan commission, was submitted to President Kennedy, he is the only man in America who cannot possibly benefit from it. That is because this money, or this appropriation, that is to be authorized to meet the expenses of a proper transition from one administration to another applies only when a new administration comes into office, that is, when a new President takes over from a sitting President. Should President Kennedy be reelected—and I have my personal views on that which I will not express here—but should President Kennedy be reelected and this bill be law, he would not benefit and would not receive any aid or any benefit under the provisions of this act.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I will come to you in a moment because I like to discuss this legislation with the very learned gentleman from Iowa, but I will discuss it on my time and on my basis, I might add.

This bill does provide for $1,300,000 as a top-level amount that can be spent for the transition from one administration to another and also for preparing, shipping, and delivering certain records during a 6-month period after a President and Vice President go out of office; that is, to take care of their various effects such as records, and so forth and so on.

This $1,300,000 contained in the bill is a limitation on the total amount that can be expended. You will note the amount is a committee amendment. The Bureau of the Budget and others suggested the amount be $1,500,000. It was upon my motion that the amount was reduced to $1,300,000. I had the idea, by the way, I might say to the gentleman from Iowa, that perhaps we could get by with $1,200,000, but thoughtful as I am always of his welfare and of his position here on the floor of the House, I agreed to the $1,300,000 so as to permit the gentleman from Iowa to follow his usual procedure of putting in an amendment to reduce the amount by $100,000 so he may maintain the great record he has made in this House for always voting for economy and for saving tax money. I personally would be glad to accept that amendment if the gentleman will offer it at the proper time.

I know there will be some discussion of this bill and as far as I am concerned you can amend it in any way you please, because I am not a candidate for President, and I will not benefit from it. No President will talk to me about any job he may have to offer, or anything of that sort. But I do know from experience, as a member of the Republican National Committee and as one who has been close to several Republican administrations back in the dear dead days when we had Republicans in the White House, that when you elect a new President there are a great many expenses involved in changing over from one administration to another.

I remember how we went around, usually at the end of a presidential campaign, with tincup in hand, whether it was the Republican or the Democratic National Committee that waged the winning, a victorious campaign, the committee generally was broke when the election was over. As most of the Members know, who are practical in politics, that is the case. I do remember something about the difficulty that the Republican National Committees had in the past in getting enough money together to help meet the expenses of a President-elect, so that he might organize his new administration in time to take over. The same is also true as far as the Democratic Party is concerned, because both political party committees—that is, the Democratic and Republican National Committees—have made that very clear in discussions with some of us.

This bill does provide—and I want to discuss this because somebody will bring it up—this bill does provide that the General Services Administration shall furnish the help and the equipment and the finances, up to this fixed amount, as may be needed for this transition period, after the General Services Administrator determines in his own judgment, as the director of this fund, that there has been a President elected. Of course, that does not mean that he has to wait until the electoral college meets, or until we canvass the votes here just a few days before the inaugural; but instead, as the bill is written, when it becomes apparent; and he may not act until it becomes apparent that a President has been elected.

Well, in 1960 we had one of the closest presidential elections in all history and yet it became apparent soon after the election that Mr. Kennedy had been elected. I was not too happy about it, I might add, that he had defeated Mr. Nixon for President. But Mr. Nixon admitted it, conceded it, the Republican leadership admitted it and conceded it, and there was no reason why the transition period should not have started, as it would have if this bill had been in effect. And, as a matter of fact, it did start then soon after the election, just as soon as it became apparent that Mr. Kennedy had been elected.

So I think this is a particularly safe section. I do not believe, regardless who might be in charge at the General Services Administration, that any man would dare to say that somebody else was elected President other than the man who all the American people knew had been elected. There would be a necktie party here in Washington. You know it and I know it, if any man occupying that post were to attempt any funny business in connection with that. And anybody who tries to argue anything about this particular section of the bill will be doing nothing but dragging a red herring across the trail to mislead you in order to get you to complain about this bill.

I am told there are other sections of this bill that one or two Members have complained about. On page 7 there is a provision that not more than 20 percent of the total expenditures under this act for any President-elect or Vice-President-elect may be made upon the basis of a certificate by the Administrator or the assistant designated by him pursuant to this section, and that such expenditures are confidential, and that they accord with the provisions of subsections (a), (b), and (d) of this section.

Somebody may say, "What are you trying to do? Hide what you spend? What are you going to do? Shade a little bit? cheat a little bit?"

Do you mean to tell me a President-elect, a man who has been elected President of the the United States, is going to cheat on this expense account? I do not believe it. I do not care who he may be. Of course, I hope he is a Republican, but whether he is a Republican or a Democrat, when this change comes between administrations I do not believe that the man the American people elect as President would try to cheat.

Why is this confidential setup provided? I will tell you why, from a practical, political angle. If you stop and think for a minute you will all agree with me. It is because the President, and those who counsel with him, will want to talk to a great many people in organizing his administration. He may want to send for a man. Well, I can imagine they can go a lot further and do a lot worse, if we elect a Republican President, that they may want to send for my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, and have him come to Washington and discuss with him whether or not he would accept a position as Secretary of State, or as Secretary of the Treasury. The President-elect might say, "I want to pay your expenses as provided under this bill," because I know that you—the gentleman from Iowa—are an honest man. I do not know what your financial situation may be. It may be helpful to you to have your expenses paid. But would the President of the United States, or would the gentleman from Iowa, either one, want it carried in the newspapers that he had received $318 in carfare to come to Washington to talk about the job that was offered to him or that he had turned down? What would be the embarrassment to him, and to the President-elect?

The President might go even further than that. He might if he was a smart Republican that had been elected, send for me first and say, "Brown, tell me, what do you think about this man from Iowa? Do you think he would make a good Secretary of the Treasury, or should I name him Secretary of State to take care of our foreign affairs? What is your judgment?"

He might not be satisfied with having my judgment alone, so he might send for others. He might ask other Members of Congress to come see him about this matter.

Of course, that is why this paragraph is there. You do not want to advertise to the world that you have asked any man to come in for consultation. Why, bless your heart, the President-elect might even send for some Democrat like the floor leader of this House and say, "You are on the opposite side but you are a good American, and you want this administration to be successful. What do you think about this man? Should I name him to my Cabinet?"

You may be suprised as to some of the investigations that are made by Presidents-elect—and I happen to know about some of them—or by those they designate, going into the past records of men they are considering, and women, too, for appointment to public positions. Perhaps if they had done a little better checking over in Great Britain before they had made certain appointments there might be a different situation in that country today.

That is all this amendment does. If somebody is going to cry out, "You cannot trust the President-elect," why, that is all it does. It gives the President-elect, or whomever he designates, the ability and the authority, and the opportunity, to use this money without telling everybody in the world to whom he has talked, or whom he has sent out to investigate somebody, or to find out what conditions are.

I think this is one of the wisest provisions in the bill, yet a few criticize it. I think they ought to compliment the committee for having it in the bill. This is in my opinion a bill that is long overdue. It has been supported by all living ex-Presidents and the present President. It has been recommended by a distinguished bipartisan commission set up to study this question.

It has been recommended by both political party committees. Its adoption is urged by the Bureau of the Budget and by every agency of the Government that I know of. I do not know why, except just for the fun of it, perhaps, that anyone should be taking pot shots at this bill. It should be enacted unanimously and I hope it is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio has consumed 15½ minuutes.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5(a) of Public Law 307, 73d Congress, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 25, 1963.*

PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION ACT OF 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4638) to promote the orderly transfer of the executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4638, with Mr. GIAIMO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I suggested to the Member who is managing this bill on the floor, the gentleman from Florida, that sometimes when you are ahead you ought to quit, and after the very articulate presentation by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], I think we might do well if we had a vote right now. But, being a former trial lawyer, sometimes I cross-examine a little too far and I am wondering if I might not be doing that now. But there is just one point the gentleman did not mention which I think I might add which is really, so far as I am concerned, a motivating force for the consideration of this bill.

Surely it is important that we have an orderly transition of government. I think everyone agrees with that. I think everyone agrees that the President-elect should have the facilities and the staff made available so that he can participate in the orderly transition of government. But I think there is an overriding and equally important consideration that should be stated on the floor of the House. When President Eisenhower came in during the interim period I think the Republican National Committee spent something in excess of $200,000 for staff help and office equipment during the transitional period. Mr. Chairman, during 1960, the Democratic National Committee is reported to have spent about $360,000 for the transitional period. However, it was testified to before the subcommittee on which I have the honor and distinction of serving, and which subcommittee reported this bill to the floor of the House, that the total cost to individuals concerned came closer to $700,000 or $800,000 for the transitional period.

Mr. Chairman, the question raises itself: Who provides the money other than the national committees for these expenses during this period?

The answer is that private individuals and private groups and others who are legally permitted to make these expenditures have put up the money. It seems to me that the day is coming when government is going to have to underwrite some of these costs, because the question answers itself: If someone is going to come forward and help pay what we now recognize is a cost of government, which is actually what it is, during the transitional period, that person may feel inclined to think that he is entitled to special consideration from the government.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should enunciate a policy here and now that people should not be permitted to expect special consideration because what they did was to help pay the cost of government.

Mr. Chairman, there is a considerable difference between someone participating in campaign expenses, because a person of their party seeks high public office and a person who helps pay a quasi-governmental expense. We have come to recognize the fact, that the orderly transition of government is a public function and, actually, the public should pay the cost.

Mr. Chairman, we should here and now say by the passing of this bill—which really is the first legal document in this field—that from now on the government will assume its responsibility and shall pay the cost for the orderly transition of government. If we do this, Mr. Chairman, we can prevent any special group or any special interests from anxiously coming forward to help pay government expense.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that this is the most significant reason, and I think a singular and important reason why this bill should be enacted.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I think that were it not for the fact that we are enjoying the luxury this afternoon of a somewhat leisurely legislative pace, as we have indeed for some weeks past, I too would hesitate to engage in any further discussion of this particular measure. But I think since we do have the time we might as well use a little of it to answer any questions which might still reside in the minds of those who possibly wonder whether or not we are, in fact, by the passage of this bill instituting just another new Government program which has in fact little foundation, and for which there is little necessity.

Mr. Chairman, I think it has been pointed out already that the genesis for this particular legislation goes back to the report of the President's Commission on Campaign Costs, and that that was a bipartisan group. As I recall it, among the members were former Members of this body and also one present Member of Congress. This particular Commission in May of last year submitted a number of different resolutions or recommendations on this general subject of campaign costs and how they ought to be financed.

Mr. Chairman, recommendation No. 8 is specifically addressed to this question of financing the transition between administrations. I shall quote at this point from the language of recommendation No. 8:

> We endorse proposals to institutionalize the transition from one administration to another when the party in power changes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it was emphasized at the hearings that were held on this bill that since the amendment to the Constitution was enacted that accelerated the date for the inauguration of a President to January 20, we have had two new administrations come into power.

Both of the Presidents involved, President Kennedy and President Eisenhower, enjoyed the cooperation of the man who had held the office prior to them. However, this transition is important enough, and this was pointed out by the preceding speaker, the gentleman from New York, that it should be formalized; it should be institutionalized into law. I think, therefore, there is valid reason for us to consider this kind of a bill, this kind of a statute, to provide, as this bill very simply does, that the Administrator of the General Services Administration shall make available services and certain facilities in the way of staff and personnel to the incoming President and to the incoming Vice President.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. As I understand this bill, it would provide over a million dollars to help get a President into office. I am wondering if there is any way the money might be used to get a President out of office.

Mr. ANDERSON. I can assure the gentleman that much as we might want to be able to answer that question in the affirmative, the answer is "No." This is simply a bill that provides for expenses of the President-elect and Vice-President-elect under certain circumstances.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SNYDER. I am wondering, if it is going to cost the taxpayers $1.3 million to change Presidents, it might not be a deterrent to them to change Presidents if it is going to cost that amount of money.

Mr. ANDERSON. It might be an added inducement for those who think that this authorization of $1.3 million is too much. I am tempted to say, that considering the shape the country is in and the shape it is going to be in by November 1964, that this is a modest sum indeed to turn the country around and install a new administration.

Mr. SNYDER. I would hate to vote for this legislation and then hear the President announce a slogan: "Vote for me and save $1.3 million."

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman has submitted a suggestion, but, in my opinion, infinitely more than $1.3 million will be saved by utilizing the provisions of this bill.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. Is it not a fact that there is already legislation on the books providing the outgoing President expenses for a period of 6 months?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true. I am glad the gentleman brought that up. Section 4 of this bill would also provide certain services to be provided by the GSA to the outgoing President and Vice President. The law at the present time makes no provision for a Vice President. It was felt this was warranted.

I want to answer one possible question before concluding these remarks. One concern that the committee had during the hearings was that this bill should not be used as an excuse for any county chairman or any officeseeker to come down to Washington for a brief vacation and have his travel expenses paid pursuant to the provisions of this bill.

I want to call attention to page 4 of the report where this question is discussed and where we specifically say:

> It is the committee's intention that the funds made available to the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect shall not be used to pay the transportation and other costs of officeseekers and others who visit them on their own initiative.

When we provide for the payment of travel expenses, we mean for people here in Washington at the request of the President and who are on official business, for consultation or for some other legitimate purposes. I think this should allay the fears of any person who might have some doubt about this particular feature.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. In my opinion, it is long overdue and is much needed. When the bill was under consideration by the Committee on Government Operations, I took the liberty of sending a copy of this legislation to former Attorney General Herbert Brownell. He wrote me back as follows:

> I was interested in reading the copy of H.R. 4638, "Presidential Transition Act of 1963," which you sent me with your letter of April 22. I was down in South America which accounts for my delay in answering.
>
> I read the bill with some care and think that it is well drawn and should be enacted. My experience during the months immediately following the election of 1952 convinced me that a law of this type would be in the public interest.

Mr. ANDERSON. I certainly thank the gentleman from New York for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me merely add again that this bill was reported unanimously out of the subcommittee and reported unanimously out of the full Committee on Government Operations. It is a bipartisan measure and I think it deserves the fullest measure of support of every Member of this body.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has consumed 8 minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation which seeks to improve the transfer of Executive power in the instance of a change of administration in our Federal Government.

Under the bill, certain services and facilities are provided to the President-elect and Vice President-elect from the time of their election until their inauguration, and provides that these services and facilities shall be paid for from public funds.

This is the most important part of the bill because it does recognize that in these days of big government, the expenses of preparation for office by an administration are so great that the country cannot reasonably expect that they will any longer be borne by individuals or even by a party organization. They are an integral part of the presidential administration and should be borne by the public.

It is the public assumption of this burden which this legislation authorizes and I shall vote for this bill because I believe that its purpose is proper.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I had several questions to ask my friend from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. He declined to yield. He apparently became so imbued with extolling my virtues as an advocate of economy and my virtues as a prospective appointee of some president—I do not know which one—that perhaps he lost sight of the fact that he had agreed to yield to me so that I might ask him a few questions. Now he is conspicuous by his absence. It appears I will have to direct the questions I have to someone else.

First of all I think I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee the question of who this bill is designed to help in the immediate future.

Mr. FASCELL. I do not know the gentleman's name but it would be whoever is President-elect in the next changeover administration, if any.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think there will be a change in the next election?

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield so I may respond, if I could look into my glass or somebody else's glass and name the gentleman, in answer to that question, I think I should resign.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is preparing for a transition period and evidently, considering all the haste in order to get this bill through, there is going to be a change in 1964. Would that be possible, in the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. FASCELL. Anything is possible, I assume. But I would say that there is hardly any rush on this matter. I think out of an abundance of caution, however, and good judgment and good business, we may look ahead to the time when there might be a change of administration; although, frankly, I do not think it will be the next time.

Mr. GROSS. Then let me put the question this way: I do not seem to be able to get a very responsive answer from the gentleman as to the future that this bill is designed to take care of. If there is no change in 1964 then there is no immediate need for this bill, is there?

Mr. FASCELL. The bill is inoperative if the present administration succeeds itself, by the terms of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman think it would be the part of wisdom to wait for another 2 or 3 years, anyway, and see what transpires before authorizing an appropriation of $1,300,000?

Mr. FASCELL. No, sir; the gentleman does not, because that is what we have been doing up until now. And while the situation is as it is, it is a good time to prepare for the future. That is the reason the bill is being brought up at this time, not in an election year and not when there is any particular political heat with respect to any change in administration.

Mr. GROSS. But if the line of succession should follow as some people think it may, this legislation would not be necessary for a period of perhaps 8 years; is that correct?

Mr. FASCELL. On the other hand, it could be effective immediately.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman means in 1964. I am glad to get the suggestion that there is a strong possibility it may become effective in 1964.

Mr. FASCELL. I do not know that I said there was a strong possibility. I said that it could become effective immediately, but that it was well for the bill to be brought up not in an election year.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Ohio said that this legislation would not affect the present President. Does the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. FASCELL. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Then what about the provision in the bill that gives him an office staff for 6 months after he leaves office?

Mr. FASCELL. He would be an outgoing President then.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but he would benefit, then, under the bill, would he not?

Mr. FASCELL. We have already taken care of that by a prior congressional act. All we do with this bill is extend the services available.

Mr. GROSS. Why is that provision in the bill if it is already taken care of?

Mr. FASCELL. I think the gentleman who preceded the gentleman from Iowa answered that question; also because of the Vice President's not being included in the original law, as I recall it. I am trying to give the citation of the Public Law about which the gentleman is talking.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question. Does the gentleman see on the political horizon some man who will be a candidate for President or Vice President who has to worry about where his next hamburger sandwich is coming from?

Mr. FASCELL. I should hope we have not reached the point in this country where only very rich people would aspire to hold legislative or executive office.

Mr. GROSS. This is not exactly a question of aspiration. The question is, Does the gentleman see any front runner on the political scene that has to be worried about the matter of taking care of himself in the interim from November until the next January 20?

Mr. FASCELL. I am not ready to announce, but my 7-year-old son aspires to the office and I would like to think that some day the costs of the transition would be paid by the Government, as they ought to be, and he would not be required to go around and see his friends and cronies in order to take care of those costs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask about this business of the General Service Administrator designating the President and the Vice President. Does the gentleman think this is a good precedent to set, that the General Services Administrator pick the President and Vice President after an election?

Mr. FASCELL. Of course, the law does not give the Administrator that authority. He does not pick them. He does, in carrying out the administrative functions under this act, make selection of the apparent winner. But this is not a question, I might add to the gentleman from Iowa, because in Public Law 87-829, from which the language in the pending legislation was taken, we have used that language in providing for the protection of the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect in the event of harm or injury, and so forth. The Secret Service and the Secretary of the Treasury have had absolutely no difficulty in determining who the President-elect or the Vice-President-elect might be, so far as carrying out the administrative duties under that law is concerned. Therefore, I do not see why the General Services Administrator should have any difficulty under the pending legislation.

Mr. GROSS. We apparently have a situation growing up in certain States of the Union whereby there may be independent electors. Does not the gentleman think that those designated as President and Vice President by the present Administrator of General Services would be given psychological and other advantages by designating them as President and Vice President?

Mr. FASCELL. I do not think so, because if they were unable at the time to determine the successful candidates, this act would not be operative. Therefore, in a close contest, the Administrator simply would not make the decision.

Mr. GROSS. But that provision of the law makes no exception, does it? It says that the Administrator shall do thus and so.

Mr. FASCELL. Only if he can determine the apparent successful candidate.

Mr. GROSS. It says he shall make the determination, does it not? Let me read from the bill:

> The terms "President-elect" and "Vice-President-elect" as used in this act shall mean such persons as are the apparent successful candidates for the office of President and Vice President, respectively, as ascertained by the Administrator.

There is not much question about that language; is there?

Mr. FASCELL. There is nothing in the act that requires the Administrator to make a decision which in his own judgment he could not make. If he could not determine the apparent successful candidate, he would not authorize the expenditure of funds to anyone; and he should not.

Mr. GROSS. Well, it could be whoever he thought was the apparent winner; is not that correct?

Mr. FASCELL. It could be—yes.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. of course, that is all the authority he needs—whoever he thinks is the apparent winner—that is all—without waiting for the college of electors to meet and cast the official ballots as provided for in the Constitution.

Mr. FASCELL. I would suggest to the gentleman this kind of discretion has been placed in many public officials. The Secretary of the Treasury under the previous law is one of those who has been given specific authority with the exact language we are talking about in the pending legislation. He has not had any problem in protecting the life of the Vice President and President-elect. I do not see any great big problem in the Administrator of the General Services Administration being unduly involved in the matter of determining who is the apparent winner in order to perform the ministerial functions under this act. In the whole history of the country, we have had only three close elections and I do not think there is any great problem. The gentleman previously pointed out in the last election we had one that was as close as we would want to have an election and nobody had any trouble in deciding who was the apparent winner.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question which intrigues me in connection with the political aspects of this thing. The last sentence of the report on page 12 reads:

> Enactment of these proposals—

Says President John F. Kennedy—

> will go a long way to improve the political climate.

What political climate is being improved by this legislation?

Mr. FASCELL. I think that has already been referred to by speakers who have preceded me. I think the political climate can be very, very much improved by not having the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect of these United States calling on his friends and others who might be interested to pay the costs of him assuming office in this, the greatest country in the world. It just does not seem proper and necessary to have them going around begging for money to pay for the cost of what ought to be legitimate costs of Government, and that is what I think he means by improving the political climate.

Mr. GROSS. I say again, I do not see anyone on the horizon of presidential candidates who needs this legislation and $1,300,000 it would dig out of the taxpayers. I know of not a single potential presidential candidate in 1964 who is going to worry about where his next sandwich is coming from. I do not think any of them will have to go around town with a tin cup in hand to get the money to sustain himself in the interim between the day of election and the inauguration. I do see some taxpayers who are getting tired of being fleeced for purposes of this kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, it is my belief that the genius of this country and the greatness of this political system are based upon the fact that we have an orderly transition of government. I was here as a freshman Congressman on that cold but brilliant day in 1960 when the present President was sworn into office. I could not help but contrast in my own mind the situation here with what happens in most parts of the world when there is a change of power in government. There was no blood in the streets. There were no hoodlums. There was a holiday spirit. It was, indeed, a festival of freedom. The outgoing President, Mr. Eisenhower, was there. The defeated candidate, Mr. Nixon, was there. The people had spoken and we were demonstrating to the world that we do have a government by consent of the governed.

But there is one flaw in this almost perfect system to which we are addressing ourselves today: It is what to do in the brief period between election and inauguration day. Because once a man is President-elect, he is not the Democratic President-elect; he is not the Republican President-elect; he is the President-elect of the people of the United States of America. In that interim time he is called upon probably to make more fateful decisions than he will have to make after he is, indeed, sworn into office. For that reason it is up to us to see that he has the tools and the implements. The gentleman from Iowa wants to know whom this bill benefits. I believe it benefits the people of America. It makes a good system perfect. For that reason I would certainly urge the support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. I wish the gentleman in charge of handling the bill at this time would give to the members of the committee a little explanation of when under the terms of this bill a person becomes the President or Vice-President-elect.

I notice that these funds can be used immediately after the general election in November. But how would this situation work, for instance, if the President or, at least, before the determination of the votes in the electoral college, suppose that some person was, say, three or four votes shy? How would this Administrator determine who was in a position to expend these funds?

The reason I ask this is because in my humble opinion a person does not become the President or President-elect until after the Congress has had an opportunity to examine the ballots cast in the electoral college. Only at that point when that determination has been made by the House of Representatives does a man become the President-elect.

Mr. FASCELL. I would say to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Haley], that the gentleman is absolutely right in a technical sense with respect to the determination of the election of the President and the Vice President.

The pending legislation does not seek to do anything about it or change it in any way, and we are not directly concerned with the question of election, nomination, or the inauguration, for that matter. But we do provide under this pending legislation, as we have provided in previous congressional actions, the right of the Administrator to determine that funds shall be spent for certain services, supplies, and other things for the benefit of the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect.

The language in this bill defines those terms for the purposes of this act.

On page 6, paragraph (c), is the following language:

> (c) The terms "President-elect" and "Vice-President-elect" as used in this Act shall mean such persons as are the apparent successful candidates for the office of President and Vice President, respectively, as ascertained by the Administrator following the general elections held to determine the electors of President and Vice President in accordance with title 3, United States Code, sections 1 and 2.

This act and the Administrator could in no way, in any way, affect the election of the successful candidate. The only decision the Administrator can make is who the successful candidate—apparent successful candidate—for the purposes of this particular act in order to make the services provided by this act available to them. And, if there is any doubt in his mind and if he cannot or does not designate the apparently successful candidate, then the act is inoperative. He cannot do anything. There will be no services provided and no money expended.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FASCELL. Certainly.

Mr. HALEY. Do I understand the law to be that an elector in the electoral college—that actually there is no way to force him to vote for the man or even the party of which he has held himself out to the people as being in favor of?

The only time that you can thoroughly determine that is when the tabulation of the electoral college is made by the House of Representatives. So when this administrator determines who seemingly is the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect, he has no assurance that the people elected to the electoral college will vote in accordance with the public stand which they took. That is the thing which worries me. I want my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell], to understand that I am not opposing this legislation. But this language does disturb me.

Mr. FASCELL. I can appreciate my distinguished colleague's feelings on it, and all I can say is I agree with him about the possibilities that he has outlined with respect to the electoral college. I think it is an archaic system, and I will tell the gentleman right now that I will join the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Haley] in any reasonable modification by either representational proportion or by direct public vote, to eliminate the possibility that the gentleman very properly has described.

The present electoral system is a problem and I think we ought to meet its modification head on in this Congress and I hope we will. All I can say to the gentleman is that his analysis is absolutely correct. However, in a previous law we have used the same kind of authority, the same kind of language and we have had no problem. In the whole history of the United States there have only been three close such situations. It is an unlikely proposition, but if it were to happen, if the administrator had any question in his mind, he simply would not make any designation in order to make the services available as provided by the act. If as an intelligent human being and he has a doubt, he would not act until a decision has been made in the electoral college or in the Congress.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. I am in favor of the principle of this bill, but there is one thing that puzzles me. In 1952 it cost $250,000, in 1960 it cost $360,000. Yet this bill authorizes $1.3 million. It seems to me that around $600,000 or $650,000 ought to be absolutely stricken from the bill.

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman has raised an interesting question, but the figures to which he refers, the small figures of several hundred thousand dollars, were the expenses taken care of by the national committees.

Mr. KUNKEL. The figures were $250,000 and $360,000.

Mr. FASCELL. The two figures to which the gentleman refers are the expenses which were testified to and discussed on the floor here as having been paid by the respective political national committees. They did not include all the other expenses which were not paid by those committees. They did not include the personal costs and the other expenses. The best estimate we could get from the Bureau of the Budget was about the amount of the authorization figure that we have in this bill.

Mr. KUNKEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4638 has been reported unanimously to the House by the Committee on Government Operations. It was introduced by me to carry out a recommendation made to the Congress by President Kennedy on May 29, 1962, submitted along with certain other proposals dealing with the financing of Presidential election campaigns. These proposals, including that contained in this bill, resulted from a study and report prepared by the President's Commission on Campaign Costs. The Commission was made up of distinguished members of both parties—see list on page 9 of committee report.

In essence, the purpose of this bill is to promote the orderly transfer of Executive power when there is a change of administration in our Federal Government by providing certain services and facilities such as office space, compensation for staff personnel and experts, travel expenses, telephone, telegraph, postage and printing to Presidents-elect and Vice-Presidents-elect during the period of time from their election to their inauguration. These services and facilities are to be paid from public funds. It also authorizes that services and facilities for outgoing Presidents and Vice Presidents be provided for 6 months after the expiration of their terms of office in order that they may wind up their affairs.

It was estimated by the Commission that during the transition period between the election of President Eisenhower and his inauguration expenses generated by his preparations to take office resulted in more than $200,000 and were borne by a special Republican committee. In a similar period prior to President Kennedy's inauguration costs generated by his preparations to take office totaled at least $360,000 which were borne by the Democratic National Committee. These were not by any means the total costs during these two periods because many expenses were paid out of the pockets of the Presidents-elect and their associates. The President's Commission and the Committee on Government Operations agree that these expenses are a legitimate part of the operation of our Federal Government and should be appropriated for like other Government expenses.

I need not remind my colleagues of the House of the complexity of our governmental processes and the immense knowledge that must be quickly acquired by a new President and his close associates on their accession to power and the tremendously important decisions that must be made. It is true that in the past the transfer of office from one administration to the other has been accomplished without serious difficulty. But this need not always be so and it is the better part of wisdom for us to provide for this transfer for all time to come in an orderly and systematic manner.

The bill also provides for an orderly exit of Presidents and Vice Presidents and makes provisions—at the expense of the Government—for them to wind up their affairs. Heretofore, this has been done on a rather haphazard basis with some expense to the individuals involved. Certainly, the dignity of the offices held, along with the vast accumulation of personal papers and effects, require this additional service. You recall, of course, that several years ago the Congress enacted legislation giving a permanent salary, staff, and office space to former Presidents—act of August 25, 1958. This will not be affected by our bill, except that the services and facilities provided under existing legislation would be postponed for 6 months under the operation of H.R. 4638.

The committee added to the bill a limitation on expenditures of $1,300,000 for all of the purposes of the bill in any one fiscal year. This seems a reasonable figure considering both incoming and outgoing Presidents and Vice Presidents and was based on the best estimates available to us. Of course, the specific figure to be appropriated in any year must be fully justified before the Appropriations Committee.

During our hearings, a question was raised about the possible construction of the language of the bill to enable travel expenses to be paid to visit the President-elect and Vice-President-elect by those who may be seeking a job or an office on their own initiative. To make certain that these expenses would not be paid the committee report on the bill contains this clear statement:

> It is the committee's intention that the funds made available to the President-elect and Vice President-elect shall not be used to pay the transportation costs of officeseekers and others who visit them on their own initiative.

This, of course, would not prevent the President-elect from inviting persons to Washington for interview or consultation and paying their transportation costs.

This bill does provide for a modest increase in Government expenses that heretofore have been paid out of the pockets of private individuals or from the treasuries of political parties. I believe we have reached a point today, however, where we can easily recognize that the potential good to be achieved together with the potential dangers that would be avoided certainly outweigh this additional expense.

H.R. 4638 has been approved and endorsed by the Republican National Committee and the Democratic National Committee. I understand that the President's Commission consulted our three former Presidents and they have likewise endorsed the general proposal contained in the bill.

I hope that the House will overwhelmingly vote to enact this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Presidential Transition Act of 1963."

PURPOSE OF THIS ACT

SEC. 2. The Congress declares it to be the purpose of this Act to promote the orderly transfer of the executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President. The national interest requires that such transitions in the office of President be accomplished so as to assure continuity in the faithful execution of the laws and in the conduct of the affairs of the Federal Government, both domestic and foreign. Any disruption occasioned by the transfer of the executive power could produce results detrimental to the safety and well-being of the United States and its people. Accordingly, it is the intent of the Congress that appropriate actions be authorized and taken to avoid or minimize any disruption. In addition to the specific provisions contained in this Act directed toward that purpose, it is the intent of the Congress that all officers of the Government so conduct the affairs of the Government for which they exercise responsibility and authority as (1) to be mindful of problems occasioned by transitions in the office of President, (2) to take appropriate lawful steps to avoid or minimize disruptions that might be occasioned by the transfer of the executive power, and (3) otherwise to promote orderly transitions in the office of President.

SERVICES AND FACILITIES AUTHORIZED TO BE PROVIDED TO PRESIDENTS-ELECT AND VICE-PRESIDENTS-ELECT

SEC. 3. (a) The Administrator of General Services, referred to hereafter in this Act as "the Administrator," is authorized to provide, upon request, to each President-elect and each Vice-President-elect, for use in connection with his preparations for the assumption of official duties as President or Vice President necessary services and facilities, including—

(1) Suitable office space appropriately equipped with furniture, furnishings, office machines and equipment, and office supplies, as determined by the Administrator, after consultation with the President-elect, the Vice-President-elect, or their designee provided for in subsection (e) of this section, at such place or places within the United States as the President-elect or Vice-President-elect shall designate;

(2) Payment of the compensation of members of office staffs designated by the President-elect or Vice-President-elect at rates determined by them not to exceed the rate provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for grade GS-18: *Provided,* That any employee of any agency of any branch of the Government may be detailed to such staffs on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis with the consent of the head of the agency; and while so detailed such employee shall be responsible only to the President-elect or Vice-President-elect for the performance of his duties: *Provided further,* That any employee so detailed shall continue to receive the compensation provided pursuant to law for his regular employment, and shall retain the rights and privileges of such employment without interruption. Notwithstanding any other law, persons receiving compensation as members of office staffs under this subsection, other than those detailed from agencies, shall not be held or considered to be employees of the Federal Government;

(3) Payment of expenses for the procurement of services of experts or consultants or organizations thereof for the President-elect or Vice-President-elect, as authorized for the head of any department by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals;

(4) Payment of travel expenses and subsistence allowances for members of office staffs or other assistants, including experts or consultants, designated by the President-elect or Vice-President-elect, as authorized for persons employed intermittently or for persons serving without compensation by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b-2), as may be appropriate;

(5) Communications services found necessary by the President-elect or Vice-President-elect;

(6) Payment of expenses for necessary printing and binding, notwithstanding any provision of law codified in title 44, United States Code, or any regulation promulgated thereunder;

(7) Reimbursement to the postal revenues in amounts equivalent to the postage that would otherwise be payable on mail matter referred to in subsection (d) of this section.

(b) The Administrator shall expend no funds for the provision of services and facilities under this Act in connection with any obligations incurred by the President-elect or Vice-President-elect before the day following the date of the general elections held to determine the electors of President and Vice President in accordance with title 3, United States Code, sections 1 and 2, or after the inauguration of the President-elect as President and the inauguration of the Vice-President-elect as Vice President.

(c) The terms "President-elect" and "Vice-President-elect" as used in this Act shall mean such persons as are the apparent successful candidates for the office of President and Vice President, respectively, as ascertained by the Administrator following the general elections held to determine the electors of President and Vice President in accordance with title 3, United States Code, sections 1 and 2.

(d) Each President-elect shall be entitled to conveyance within the United States and its territories and possessions free of postage of all mail matter sent by him in connection with his preparations for the assumption of official duties as President, and such mail matter shall be transmitted as penalty mail as provided in title 39, United States Code, section 4152. Each Vice-President-elect shall be entitled to conveyance within the United States and its territories and possessions free of postage of all mail matter sent by him under his written autograph signature in connection with his preparations for the assumption of official duties as Vice President.

(e) Each President-elect and Vice-President-elect may designate to the Administrator an assistant authorized to make on his behalf such designations or findings of necessity as may be required in connection with the services and facilities to be provided under this Act. Not more than 20 per centum of the total expenditures under this Act for any President-elect or Vice-President-elect may be made upon the basis of a certificate by him or the assistant designated by him pursuant to this section that such expenditures are confidential and that they accord with the provisions of subsections (a), (b), and (d) of this section.

(f) In the case where the President-elect is the incumbent President or in the case where the Vice-President-elect is the incumbent Vice President, there shall be no expenditures of funds for the provision of services and facilities to such incumbent under this Act, and any funds appropriated for such purposes shall be returned to the general funds of the Treasury.

SERVICES AND FACILITIES AUTHORIZED TO BE PROVIDED TO FORMER PRESIDENTS AND FORMER VICE PRESIDENTS

SEC. 4. The Administrator is authorized to provide, upon request, to each former President and each former Vice President, for a period not to exceed six months from the date of the expiration of his term of office as President or Vice President, for use in connection with winding up the affairs of his office, necessary services and facilities of the same general character as authorized by this Act to be provided to Presidents-elect and Vice-Presidents-elect and as authorized by the Act of August 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838; 3 U.S.C. 102, note), and such services and facilities shall be in addition to those authorized by the latter Act.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator such funds as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this Act. The President shall include in the budget transmitted to the Congress, for each fiscal year in which his regular term of office will expire, a proposed appropriation for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 5, after "Government" insert "except for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959;".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 17, strike out lines 17 to 24, inclusive, and insert the following:

"(4) Payment of travel expenses and subsistence allowances, including rental of Government or hired motor vehicles, found necessary by the President-elect or Vice-President-elect, as authorized for persons employed intermittently or for persons serving without compensation by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b-2), as may be appropriate;".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a few more questions. Can the gentleman from Florida tell me, if he will, please, how many $100-a-day consultants it is expected will be employed to take care of the incoming President and Vice President in 1964?

Mr. FASCELL. I may say to the gentleman from Iowa whatever the President can substantiate in his budget request and whatever he can get out of the Committee on Appropriations and whatever may be necessary or required within the limitation of the authorization under this act.

Mr. GROSS. It is wide open insofar as this bill is concerned and insofar as the committee is concerned; that is, the Committee on Government Operations?

Mr. FASCELL. No, I would not say it is wide open at all. We do have a limit on the authorization and we do follow the normal appropriation procedure.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman tell me how many Cadillacs will be hired or leased to take care of the incoming President and Vice President?

Mr. FASCELL. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa I would hope we would not need any more.

Mr. GROSS. Any more?

Mr. FASCELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Those we provide today are all in use?

Mr. FASCELL. That is what I mean.

Mr. GROSS. Then it will take some additional limosines, will it not?

Mr. FASCELL. Maybe we can get by with Fords.

Mr. GROSS. With regard to this business of the 20 percent that can be spent from the $1,300,000 without accounting to anyone—or am I correct in saying that this can be spent without any accounting whatever?

Mr. FASCELL. It has to be on a Presidential certificate, yes.

Mr. GROSS. But it is of an unaccountable nature; that is, they make no accounting to anyone for it?

Mr. FASCELL. That is true. It is a provision we have had since time immemorial in appropriation acts with respect to Presidential requests.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Now, this 20 percent, none of that will go to the outgoing President in 1964, will it?

Mr. FASCELL. No.

Mr. GROSS. The 20 percent will be spent by both the President and the Vice President?

Mr. FASCELL. It will be spent, not more than 20 percent of the total expenditures, for the President-elect and Vice-President-elect.

Mr. GROSS. Is that 20 percent each, or 20 percent for both?

Mr. FASCELL. It is the total applying to both.

Mr. GROSS. The total of 20 percent applies to both. Then each can spend 10 percent on his own accounting, if he so wishes?

Mr. FASCELL. Whatever arrangements are made, within the limitation. We have felt that a limitation was necessary and that is the reason why we wrote it into the act. However, I might say to the gentleman in the appropriation process, if it is felt that some other accounting procedure or limitation is necessary, that can be done.

Mr. GROSS. In addition to the automobiles, does the gentleman think there will be any helicopters or jet 707's provided for the incoming President and Vice President in 1964?

Mr. FASCELL. Not by this act, I might say to the gentleman from Iowa; I assume that if the incumbent President will extend the hospitality of his own conveniences, as he probably will, it would be helpful to the President-elect.

Mr. GROSS. I notice the gentleman was speaking of the incumbent President. Perhaps I do not read enough, or something, but I notice in the report it states that in 1952 President Truman sent some kind of a message to President Eisenhower. I was not aware that Truman and Eisenhower were exchanging messages shortly after the election in 1952, but apparently according to your report they did exchange at least one message. So the gentleman thinks the most amicable relations would exist and all facilities in 1964 that the President can properly give to the incoming new President will be available to him?

Mr. FASCELL. I would certainly hope so, and I would hate to think otherwise. I think the gentleman will agree. Let me say I do not agree with the gentleman when he says he does not read enough because, having had the privilege and pleasure of serving on the Committee on Foreign Affairs with him, I would say that probably the gentleman from Iowa is one of the best read Members of Congress, and probably reads too much.

Mr. GROSS. I would have to reciprocate and say that I am afraid the gentleman from Florida read some of the amendments I have had to offer too well. I am talking about some of the amendments to cut pretty deeply into the foreign giveaway program. I am afraid the gentleman from Florida read some of those amendments too well.

Mr. FASCELL. I must say I have been taught something now that the gentleman from Iowa has been on the committee. I have been very careful and cautious not only to listen to what he says, but to read everything he offers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 5, line 10, strike out lines 10, 11, 12 and 13 and insert: "(6) Payment of expenses for necessary printing and binding, notwithstanding the Act of January 12, 1895, and the Act of March 1, 1919, as amended (44 U.S.C. 111);".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 6, line 16, strike out "free of postage" and insert after "matter," "including airmail,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 6, line 22, strike out "free of postage" and in line 23 insert immediately after "matter," "including airmail,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 8, line 3 insert a period after "Vice-Presidents-elect". strike out all that follows down through and including the period on line 6, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Any person appointed or detailed to serve a former President or former Vice President under authority of this section shall be appointed or detailed in accordance with, and shall be subject to, all of the provisions of section 3 of this Act applicable to persons appointed or detailed under authority of that section. The provisions of the Act of August 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838; 3 U.S.C. 102, note), other

> than subsections (a) and (e) shall not become effective with respect to a former President until six months after the expiration of his term of office as President."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 8, line 20, immediately before the period insert "but not to exceed $1,300,000 for any one fiscal year".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 8, strike out lines 17 through 25, including the figure "$1,300,000."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment I have offered will take pretty good care of this bill. It simply takes out the money. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] suggested that I would probably offer an amendment cutting $100,000 or some such amount from the $1,300,000. I just want him to know that I do believe in economy and so I shall do a little bit better than he suggested. I hope he will join me in this attempt to economize, and I trust the House will adopt the amendment and take proper care of this piece of legislation by refusing to ante up $1,300,000.

Mr. Chairman, no valid contention has been made here today that any President-elect or this Government has suffered in the absence of this legislation. It provides ill-advised procedures and ill-advised spending.

If there is no record vote on final passage let the RECORD show that I am unalterably opposed to it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. Of course, this amendment would nullify the complete bill by removing the authorization for the funds to implement the bill. I believe I am correct in saying that the Committee on Government Operations held hearings on this bill and there was no expressed opposition to the intent of the bill. I can understand if the gentleman feels it necessary, as is his habit, to offer an amendment to reduce expenditures. But I can hardly reconcile the good legislative process with striking out the implementing section, section 5, which would furnish the authorization for the funds to implement this bill.

The action of the committee was taken after discussion with a number of witnesses who appeared before us including the Assistant Secretary of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Staats. It has the approval of the agencies involved—the Bureau of the Budget. It seeks to do a thing which I think is the laudable and honorable thing to do. When a President's term has ended and a new President is coming in there are a great number of responsibilities which the incoming President has to assume in order that we may have a smooth transition of Government from one administration to the next. Heretofore this money has come from many unofficial sources. I am not saying that anything improper has resulted as the result of this informal arrangement, but it is the public business to have an orderly transition of administrations regardless of whether it may be a Democratic or a Republican President that is coming into office. Any suspicion of a conflict of interest in the donation of funds to affect this orderly transition should be removed.

If it costs hundreds of thousands of dollars, and some testimony seems to indicate more than a million dollars, for the incoming President to properly prepare his staff to interview those people that he wishes to appoint to Cabinet positions, to take care of all the necessary transportation, communication facilities and services that are necessary to effectuate this smooth transition, why should we not face up to this as the orderly and honorable cost of the process of Government and supply this money?

I can bring up a case within my own personal knowledge, and I do not care to name any names nor to indicate the particular President's group that is involved, but I know that there were services rendered by a certain gentleman who was on the staff of an incoming former President. Later on this gentleman tried to subtract a 4-percent override on a defense contract of a California contractor. When this contractor came to me and asked me what to do, I said:

> You should make a statement under oath to the proper congressional committee in regard to this matter.

This gentleman did make a statement to the proper congressional committee and there was an investigation, by a committee other than the Committee on Government Operations, and the man who had been on the staff of that former incoming President was completely discredited. I do not know whether he wanted to extract the 4-percent override on that defense contract because he was on the staff of that incoming President and had made certain contributions of services or money or not. I could not state that. But I do say that we should remove the opportunity for people to come in and expend money for the purposes of a transition of Government and thereby obtain a position of advantage and favor in the eyes of some people which might contribute to their personal financial welfare thereafter.

So I say that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa should be voted down. We should face up to our responsibilities as legislators, recognizing the fact that there are expenses involved in the transition from one administration to another, and face those responsibilities and provide for them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GIAIMO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4638) to promote the orderly transfer of the Executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President, pursuant to House Resolution 454, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Unqualifiedly and unreservedly, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. GROSS moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 4638, to the House Committee on Government Operations with the following instructions: "On page 8, strike out all of lines 17 through 25."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 29, nays 343, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

YEAS—29

Abele
Andrews
Beermann
Colmer
Cunningham
Grant
Gross
Hall
Henderson
Huddleston
Johansen
Knox
Lennon
O'Konski
Pillion
Pool
Quillen
Rich
Rivers, S.C.
Siler
Stephens
Tuten
Utt
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wydler
Younger

NAYS—343

Abbitt
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Alger
Anderson
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Boland
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brooks

Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Casey
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Daniels
Dawson
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Ford
Foreman
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy

Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hutchinson
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McClory
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Mathias
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly

Perkins
Philbin
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Tuck
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—60

Abernethy
Arends

Ashley
Avery

Baring
Belcher

Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Bow
Buckley
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Conte
Daddario
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Delaney
Duncan
Fogarty
Forrester
Gill
Grabowski
Hagan, Ga.

Hébert
Ichord
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kirwan
Long, La.
McCulloch
Madden
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Miller, N Y.
Minshall
Morse
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
Pepper

Pike
Poff
Purcell
Rains
St. George
Saylor
Scott
Shelley
Smith, Iowa
Thompson, N.J.
Trimble
Waggonner
Watson
Westland
Wilson, Charles H.
Wyman

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Trimble with Mr. Conte.

Mr. Pepper with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Wyman.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Avery.

Mr. Pike with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Rains with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Morse.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Westland.

Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Poff.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Minshall.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Matsunaga.

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Watson.

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Forrester.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Gill.

Mr. Duncan with Mrs. Kee.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Smith of Iowa.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Ichord.

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2221. An act to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.;

H.R. 2675. An act to extend for 3 years the period during which certain tanning extracts, and extracts of hemlock or eucalyptus suitable for use for tanning, may be imported free of duty;

H.R. 3272. An act to provide for the free entry of an orthicon image assembly for the use of the Medical College of Georgia, Augusta, Ga.;

H.R. 3674. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that polished sheets and plates of iron or steel shall be subject to the same duty as unpolished sheets and plates;

H.R. 5712. An act to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid; and

H.R. 6011. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle or Tampico fiber.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1122. An act relating to the exchange of certain lands between the town of Powell, Wyo., and the Presbyterian Retirement Facilities Corp.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2513) entitled "An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

JOINT STATEMENT BY SOUTHERN GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention a joint statement issued by 14 southern Governors in the Governors' conference just concluding at Miami, Fla., in which these 14 leaders from the great section of the South recognize the serious need for tax reduction and tax reform.

Attached to the joint statement is a statement of principles by Mr. Henry Ford II and Stuart T. Saunders and other officers of the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963.

I commend this to the attention of the Congress, because I think it appropriate that the Congress take recognition of this statement and action by 14 southern Governors.

The joint statement to which I have referred is as follows:

Joint statement by the following members of the southern Governors conference: Gov. Terry Sanford, of North Carolina; Gov. Donald S. Russell, of South Carolina; Gov. Carl E. Sanders, of Georgia; Gov. Orval E. Faubus, of Arkansas; Gov. John A. Dalton, of Missouri; Gov. George C. Wallace, of Alabama; Gov. Ross A. Barnett, of Mississippi; Gov. J. Millard Tawes, of Maryland; Gov.

Burt Coombs, of Kentucky; Gov. William W. Barron, of West Virginia; Gov. Ferris Bryant, of Florida; Gov. John B. Connally, of Texas; Gov. Frank G. Clement, of Tennessee; Gov. Jimmy H. Davis, of Louisiana.

Poverty, unemployment, underemployment and a sluggish economy cause or aggravate most of our State problems of today.

A new surge of private economic development and investment would improve the opportunities of all of our people, allow enrichment of education and other State services without increased State and local taxes, and strengthen the security of the Nation.

We believe the soundest method of achieving this growth is through the immediate across-the-board reduction of personal income taxes and corporate income taxes, coupled with prudent and appropriate reductions of Federal expenditures. We advocate this action in 1963.

As a focal point for immediate action we approve and commend to the Congress and to our people the attached "Statement of Principles," by Henry Ford II and Stuart T. Saunders, cochairmen, and other officers and members of the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963:

"April 25, 1963.

"STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

"1. We, the undersigned members of the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963, believe that the Federal tax structure inhibits incentives, discourages economic growth and is partly responsible for the present high level of unemployment. We therefore urge a prompt, substantial, and broad cut in individual and corporate tax rates.

"2. The present high and steeply progressive rates of Federal taxation have weakened recovery after each postwar recession. They have retarded longrun economic growth by discouraging private saving and capital investment, especially investment in new enterprises.

"In all these ways, the present tax structure hobbles the economy and slows our progress toward the goals of high employment, efficient use of our productive resources, including labor, and faster economic growth.

"3. We call for broad and substantial tax reductions this year because the private sector of the economy needs the strength that present taxes are draining away from it. We recognize that revision of the tax system in other ways is desirable (although each of us may have different views on this subject). We are convinced, however, that there is need for a strong stimulus to the economy and therefore that controversial tax revision should not be permitted to delay tax reduction. There is clear need for action at this session of the Congress.

"4. At the same time we urge in the strongest possible terms economies in and prudent control of Federal expenditures. Failure on the part of the Congress and the administration to establish and adhere to rigid expenditure discipline could well negate the good emanating from tax reduction. It is merely common sense to recognize that the lower tax rates which we urge can be permanently maintained only if a reasonable balance between Federal income and expenditures be brought about at an early date. Pending the achievement of budgetary balance, it is of the utmost importance that any deficit and particularly that which is contemplated in the next fiscal year be financed in a noninflationary manner.

"5. We urge Congress to enact, during the present session, net reductions of corporate and individual taxes totalling about $10 billion, a substantial part to take effect as early as possible in 1963.

"Specifically, we advocate (a) a substantial reduction in all individual tax rates from the present range of 20–91 percent; and (b) a reduction in the rate of corporate income tax to at least 47 percent.

"6. Believing that these proposals are of primary importance, we have associated ourselves together in a temporary nonpartisan organization called the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963. Its purpose is to promote widespread public understanding and acceptance of the need for prompt and effective tax reduction.

"Membership in this committee shall not preclude the exercise by any member of his right to disagree with any specific features of the committee's proposals, or to advance other proposals of his own.

"We invite others who share our convictions to join with us in attaining the purpose of this organization. We welcome their help in gaining for tax reducation the understanding, acceptance, and support it deserves. U.S. Federal income tax rates are more burdensome than those of any other industrial nation in the world. If we do not delay but instead act quickly to reduce the heavy burden of the tax structure on the private sector of the economy we shall have provided strong impetus for a dynamic growing economy. In so doing, we will enable our nation better to provide jobs for our growing labor force, to compete effectively in world markets, to resolve our critical balance-of-payments problem, and to continue to serve as the firm foundation for the military and economic strength of the entire free world.

RAILROAD LABOR DISPUTE

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two bills relating to the labor dispute between the American railroads and the brotherhoods, which are the bargaining agents for railroad employees.

The first bill would amend the Railway Labor Act so as to provide with respect to railway labor disputes affecting the national health or safety certain emergency procedures, including an 80-day injunction period, similar to those applicable to emergency disputes under Taft-Hartley. Under existing law railroad labor disputes are specifically exempt from Taft-Hartley's provisions.

Thus, this bill would enable the President to go into the court and obtain an injunction for 80 days as a cooling-off period during which efforts to prevent a strike could continue. The bill would not disturb or replace any existing mediation or settlement procedures now in the Railway Labor Act. It would merely add the remedy of the injunction to the present procedures where the Nation's health and safety is involved.

The emergency provisions of Taft-Hartley have worked out well over the last 16 years. They have been used 23 times and have been successful in settling disputes in all but 6 cases which involved maritime or dockworker strikes. In other words, these provisions have been successful in 73 percent of the cases.

The enactment of this bill would round out the President's authority to obtain injunctive relief in all cases where the Nation's health or safety is at stake. He would not be required to use this authority, but it would give him the legal tools needed to prevent a strike, if such tools are needed.

The second bill would outlaw that labor practice known as featherbedding. The bill would invoke the present provisions of the Railway Labor Act needed to prevent loss of jobs because of railway mergers, so that its enactment would not result in immediate loss of the jobs of persons now employed.

The problems of automation are real and must be dealt with by labor, management, and Government. However, the continuance of a useless gimmick such as featherbedding is to refuse to face up to the problems, and to solve them. By continuing featherbedding, we weaken the free enterprise system in the long run, and inhibit the adoption of plans and procedures to deal with automation effectively.

These bills, together, will first, allow the President to prevent a strike so that the Congress need not legislate in an atmosphere of crisis, and second, deal with the underlying cause of the labor dispute which threatens to cause a strike. I urge their immediate consideration.

WAYS AND MEANS OF RELIEVING THE TAXPAYERS OF THIS COUNTRY

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the American people today are carrying the heaviest tax burden in their history. They are saddled with a debt of over $300 billion, which promises to increase to $320 billion this year as spending by the Federal Government continues unabated. Yet year after year they are asked to add to their burden through increased spending on programs for foreign aid, Federal aid to schools, mass transit, area redevelopment, and so on.

It is time that the Congress give its attention to ways and means of relieving the taxpayers of this country. I propose a measure of tax relief on expenses incurred for educational purposes which I believe would provide proper Federal assistance to the cause of education in an area where it is needed. The bill which I introduce today would allow a tax deduction of up to $2,000 on expenses incurred during a taxable year for the education of each taxpayer and/or each of his dependents who attend an accredited school, be it on the elementary, high school, or college level. I might point out that the results of my recent 1963 national issues poll indicated that 73.5 percent of those answering the poll stated a preference for such a tax deductions for education expenses. Parents who prefer to send their children to private or parochial schools would also benefit from such a tax deduction, as would the schools; and thus the issue of church-state relationship, a matter of considerable controversy whenever Federal aid to education is discussed, would be eliminated.

Our country, Mr. Speaker, does not need a massive program of Federal aid to education, notwithstanding the contention of proponents of such aid who have been saying that only the Federal Government can do what has been and is continuing to be done by local communities through State and local efforts. Our citizens, in the traditional American way, are meeting our educational needs today by supporting their schools, with the result that any problem of adequate classrooms and teachers' salaries is decreasing. The May 20, 1963, issue of U.S. News & World Report points out that, even though the public school enrollment has increased from 29,549,000 students in 1954 to 38,837,000 in 1962, the pupil-per-teacher ratio has decreased in grade schools from 30.8 to 28.5, and in high schools from 21.9 to 21.7. The shortage of classrooms since 1956 has decreased from 159,800 to 121,235. The report also states that the salaries of teachers throughout the Nation have increased 125 percent in the past 15 years. The bill I introduce today will help to accelerate this record of accomplishment.

What is needed—and needed now—is assistance from our Government for those who wish and prefer to help themselves: Assistance in the form of tax relief for educational expenses. It is a simple, logical, direct, and less costly method of providing aid than the establishment of new Federal programs of aid to schools and students, and, in addition, does not involve the risk of Federal control over education. It is interesting to note that at the present time there are more than 40 Federal departments, agencies, and bureaus involved in education, spending a total of $2.2 billion every year, with little evidence of coordination among the programs—agencies and bureaus which past history shows will increase in size and expand their areas of operation, in many cases wasting vast sums of taxpayers' money.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Ways and Means Committee to give prompt and serious consideration to this proposal.

DEAL MADE IN HOUSE ON COTTON, AREAS AID

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of all Members an article, with the headline, "Deal Made in House on Cotton, Areas Aid," which appeared in this morning's Washington Post. Presuming this article is essentially correct and true, and I have no reason to question the capability of the Post staff reporter who wrote it, Julius Duscha, then, Mr. Speaker, this is a sad commentary on the workings of this body. We certainly will have reached a strange plateau in passing judgment on legislation. It has been, is, and will continue to be my belief that all legislation should stand on its own merits. So-called alleged deals of "you support my bill and I'll support yours" reflects, I believe, Mr. Speaker, on the integrity and dignity of the House.

I can only hope that the article is somewhat incorrect—that what has bene prophesied will prove to be unfounded when the House votes a second time on the Area Redevelopment Administration's request for an additional $455 million.

But regardless of this most recent development, the facts remain unchanged insofar as the ARA measure is concerned. The ARA's request for more millions of dollars is both unneeded and excessive; the program has been poorly administered; and it was and is not accomplishing the main objective for which it was designed—relieving unemployment. The $455 million increase in funds is more than 10 times that which has actually been committed in the past 2 years of operation of the program.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that when the House acts a second time on this legislation that the rollcall vote will refute the so-called deal as mentioned in the Washington Post article. I am also enclosing that article, which follows, for all Members to read:

Deal Made in House on Cotton, Areas Aid

(By Julius Duscha)

A North-South political trade finally moved the long-stalled cotton bill out of the House Rules Committee yesterday.

The committee voted to let the cotton bill go to the House floor after southern Democrats agreed to support depressed areas legislation that they helped to defeat last month.

Northern Democrats and Republicans who had been opposed to the cotton bill have in turn agreed to support it in exchange for southern backing of the depressed areas program.

All of this logrolling probably will push the depressed areas bill through the House, but it is still doubtful whether the House will approve the cotton legislation.

SECOND CHANCE

Under present plans the House will be given a second chance to pass the depressed areas bill before Democratic leaders ask for a vote on the cotton legislation.

On June 12 the House defeated by a vote of 209 to 204 a bill that would have provided $455 million in additional funds for the Area Redevelopment Administration.

Established 2 years ago as one of the first major innovations of the Kennedy administration, the ARA lends money to depressed areas to help them attract industry.

The program was defeated in the House following charges that it had been badly administered and that projects had been awarded on a political basis. The charges were denied by the supporters of the program.

APPROVED BY SENATE

The Senate approved the additional funds for the program by a vote of 65 to 30 on June 26. Since then the White House and Democratic House leaders have been trying to find a way to resurrect the bill in the House.

The cotton bill seemed to be the best vehicle because the 20 southern Democrats who supported the depressed areas program when it was enacted in 1961 and then opposed it in June included several influential Members who desperately want a cotton bill.

Among them are Chairman Harold D. Cooley (Democrat, of North Carolina), of the House Agriculture Committee and Representative Thomas G. Abernethy (Democrat, of Mississippi), a senior committee member.

Next Monday the House Banking Committee is scheduled to take up the depressed areas program again. The committee is expected to approve a slightly modified version of the legislation as it was passed by the Senate.

The cotton bill, which has been the subject of controversy for more than 6 months, would make it possible for domestic textile mills to buy American cotton at the same price it is marketed abroad.

AN 8½-CENT SUBSIDY

Now U.S. cotton sells for 24½ cents a pound in foreign markets and for 32½ cents in the United States because of an 8½-cent subsidy paid to exporters. Without the subsidy American cotton could not compete with lower-price cotton produced in other countries.

The proposed legislation would subsidize domestic as well as foreign sales of cotton.

The legislation has run into opposition from Congressmen who question the wisdom of piling another subsidy on top of the subsidies already paid cotton farmers through the 32½-cent-a-pound Government price guarantee.

Also complicating the outlook for the legislation is the proposal in it allowing cotton farmers to increase their production if they are willing to market the additional cotton at the lower world market prices.

This proposal, which was put into the bill at the insistence of efficient Western producers, would provide for greater cotton production when there already is a large surplus of American cotton.

AMERICA'S ANSWER TO COMMUNISM

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the other week I previewed a new motion picture that is scheduled to be released nationally in August. I felt the picture so worthwhile that I want to call it to the attention of my colleagues, as it holds tremendous potential for reawakening the flame of true patriotism, with bias and selfish gain omitted.

The theme of this motion picture may well make it one of the most important films ever produced. It shows in dramatic fashion the glaring contrasts of two governments, both spawned in revolution, with one becoming the most despotic, power-mad country the world has ever known—and the other becoming the empire of freedom.

These two governments are the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America.

Now, for the first time in a theatrical motion picture, Americans will be able to see the development of these two governments, and see a realistic example of how communism operates today in America.

The name of this remarkable film is "America's Answer to Communism" and its host is Hollywood star, Richard Carlson, famous for his dramatic portrayals in the television series, "I Led Three Lives."

This motion picture was produced by Americans—for Americans and for all peoples of the world—both the enslaved and the free. It does not follow a rightwing or leftwing approach toward the menace of communism and therein lies the reason for its tremendous potential in the battle against communism.

Over 4 years of research went into the production of this film, both in my home district in east Tennessee and in Hollywood. Over 75 million feet of film was examined to locate important background scenes. For example, old films produced in 1911 or 1912 depicting George Washington at Valley Forge were located for inclusion in the section concerning the development of America. One of the outstanding features of this film is that, for the very first time, the history of America has been recreated from the days of Columbus down to the present time.

At three special prerelease showings of this film, over 4,000 people filled in audience-reaction cards. These cards indicate that these people became better informed on communism and, in the process, better citizens.

I recommend to you this fine motion picture and urge Americans everywhere to see "America's Answer to Communism." This film is an excellent step forward for a national offensive against this cancerous ism that seeks world slavery over human rights.

OUTLAWING OF FEATHERBEDDING BEST SOLUTION IN RAIL CRISIS

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a bill I introduced today would outlaw railway strikes over featherbedding issues. A second bill of mine would set up a special congressional committee to meet the problem of industrywide strikes.

We are faced with a national crisis which should be met squarely. The President's proposal amounts to another 2 to 4 years of buckpassing.

The railway industry is entitled to the same protection against featherbedding strikes as other industry. My proposal would extend to railroads the same protection provided the music industry in the Lea Act and most other industries in the Taft-Hartley Act.

It would give the force of law to work rule changes previously recommended by the Presidential Emergency Board, but it would avoid the compulsory arbitration precedent implicit in the President's ring-around-the-rosie proposal.

Buckpassing in the rail crisis has taken the public on a merry-go-round which goes nowhere. A nationwide rail strike, Government seizure, and compulsory arbitration are all against the public interest and should be avoided if at all possible.

Compulsory arbitration—even in the temporary form proposed by the President—could become the precedent for further Government violation of the right of free collective bargaining.

Seizure would be a big step toward a socialized rail industry.

A nationwide strike would quickly bring chaos to the entire country.

In the face of difficult alternatives, the President is indulging in escapism by seeking to postpone settlement 2 years more after repeated postponements.

Featherbedding practices are the only substantial issues in this strike, and featherbedding should not be permitted to be the basis for this or any strike.

My bill, in outlawing featherbedding, would in effect outlaw the impending strike, but it would leave intact labor's precious right of collective bargaining and avoid the danger of Government takeover of the rail industry.

In Congress, jurisdiction on labor matters is scattered among four different committees—none of which has made any serious study of featherbedding. My companion measure would set up a bipartisan joint congressional committee to study and work out problems related to industrywide strikes. In future situations similar to the railway crisis, we need workable procedures to solve problems of collective bargaining, strikes, and lockouts which might affect an entire industry. The committee I propose would have eight Senators and eight Representatives, equally divided between Democrats and Republicans.

LACK OF CONCLUSIVE ACTION BY GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE SHOWS WHO IS PROVIDING LEADERSHIP ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the apparent head-in-the-sands position on civil rights of the Governors' conference which just closed in Miami Beach demonstrates clearly where the country must look for effective and forceful leadership on the issue.

It is not going to come from the Democrat Party, which by the action of its Governors who were in a majority at the conference, put off any resolution on civil rights until 1964.

The real leadership is going to come from the party of Lincoln—the Republican Party—where concrete action has always been taken to insure equal rights, equal opportunities, equal justice under the law.

The Republican position on civil rights was boldly enunciated again in the remarks of Gov. Mark Hatfield, of Oregon, on Tuesday, July 23, when he made it clear that the Republican Governors at the conference deplored the dilly-dallying and the running away from the issue which characterized the attitude of most of the Democrat Governors at the conference.

So that my colleagues can read the complete text of his remarks as subscribed to by the other Republican Governors, I wish to place this statement in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF GOV. MARK HATFIELD, OF OREGON, IN BEHALF OF ALL REPUBLICAN GOVERNORS

The situation in which we as Governors find ourselves today is the result of unreasoned and abusive use of a technique of discussion last year at our conference. We refer to the filibuster. But because of the action of one of our members, no longer with us, we need not render asunder a free and open confrontation with important issues. We concur that a limitation upon debate is desirable. But it is a travesty of discussion to swallow the proposal that a serious consideration of this most important human concern of our Nation today can be confined to a 5-minute matinee oratorical performance. However, that being the wish of the majority of this body, the Republican Governors do herewith set forth a position on the winning, preserving, and furthering of human rights as set forth by the Constitution and the Supreme Court of the land.

Speaking on behalf of all Republican Governors, our statement, presented as one, reads: It is our belief the majority of Governors here assembled have abdicated a fundamental responsibility of the conference, namely, to have a meaningful conclusion drawn concerning this vital issue. We have had words upon words. We have had petition and press conferences. But our action has been nil.

It is our position civil rights as a subject should be discussed, debated if you will, and the consensus of the conference should be attained through an expression by vote. Those who insist on State prerogatives should welcome this expression to the Congress, to our constituencies, and indeed to the world which watches so carefully the various interpretations that are here given to that great word: "freedom."

We fall flat on our faces, not only before the bar of world opinion, but in maintaining our own self-respect, if we through timidity deny a single soul his right to full citizenship. It is time to count conscience here and now so that the word might go forth from this conference to all enslaved people everywhere and especially to those only 90 miles from these shores where all freedom is denied.

Talk is not enough.

We must resolve.

We Republicans seek today to remove a gag which would enslave this conference to inaction, to provide meaning to individual rights, to confirm our belief in liberty, to keep faith with our words by translating them into action. This is our message. We will not be a party to subterfuge in which the threat of the demise of this conference is used as a club of convenience. We cannot court the cause of humanity at home and let hollow words ring here.

This is the Republican case.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(Subscribed to by: Arizona, Paul Fannin; Colorado, John A. Love; Idaho, Robert E. Smylie; Kansas, John Anderson, Jr.; Maine, John H. Reed; Michigan, George Romney; Montana, Tim Babcock; New York, Nelson A. Rockefeller; Ohio, James A. Rhodes; Oklahoma, Henry Bellmon; Oregon, Mark Hatfield; Pennsylvania, William W. Scranton (by phone); Rhode Island, John H. Chafee; South Dakota, Archie Gubbrud; Utah, George D. Clyde; and Wyoming, Clifford P. Hansen.)

IS THE ADMINISTRATION FEATHERBED "SOLUTION" ON THE WRONG TRACK?

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week the President sent to Congress a proposal to head off the threatened strike in the railroad industry. No doubt enactment of this suggestion would head off a national strike of calamitous proportions, at least for 2 years. It is my belief, however, that the plan offered by the President does not help solve the basic problem facing the Nation which is not the national strike, not the featherbed issue, but the entire question of the economic position of our Nation's railroads. As a member of both the House Banking and Currency Committee and the Joint Economic Committee with a deep and long interest in the economic position of the Nation and the mass transportation system, I feel it is my responsibility to point out several facts in view of the lack of comment that has been prevalent throughout the Nation since the President's message.

The President has proposed:

> For a 2-year period during which both parties and the public can better inform themselves on this problem and alternative approaches—interim work rules changes proposed by either party to which both parties cannot agree should be submitted for approval, disapproval, or modification to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. Speaker, in the 4-year history of the proposed work rules over which this controversy first began, there have been 2 presidential study commissions, meetings with the Secretary of Labor, 12 meetings under the auspices of the National Mediation Board, dozens of meetings between the carriers and the unions themselves, and a Federal court decision approved by the Supreme Court that the implementation of the work rules was legal. The original Presidential Railroad Commission, begun by President Eisenhower, submitted a report to President Kennedy of 576 pages culled from 15,503 pages of testimony and 319 exhibits.

President Kennedy's own three-man Emergency Board met for over a month and submitted a report of recommendations earlier this year. Yet, the President now wants another 2 years of study by another agency to gather information on the problem.

According to the President's recommendations, the Interstate Commerce Commission will give weight to the provisions of section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act in protecting the interests of the railroad employees. Under this section, the Commission must—and I quote:

> Include terms and conditions providing that during the period of 4 years from the effective date of such order such transaction will not result in employees of the carrier or carriers by railroad affected by such order being in a worse position with respect to their employment, except that the protection afforded to any employee pursuant to this sentence shall not be required for a longer period following the effective date of such order, the period during which such employee was in the employ of such carrier or carriers prior to the effective date of such order.

This is the 1940 codification of the so-called Washington agreement between the carriers and the unions. In effect, a union member whose job is no longer required can be paid at his old rate for 4 years whether he works or not. If he does have other employment, either with the same company or in another place, any difference between his new wage rate and the old must also be made up by the carrier. We have the prospect, then, of having on the books of the carriers for an additional 4 years after the 2 required to inform the public and the parties, this featherbed cost regardless of any change in the work rules.

I do not mean to say that a transition period for employees whose jobs are no longer required would not be in order. But to have the prospect of a 6-year postponement of the underlying economic problem is simply incredible.

Mr. Speaker, there is a bill pending before the House Rules Committee, H.R. 3881, which would provide over a 3-year period $500 million in aid to the mass transportation industry. In my capacity as ranking minority member on the subcommittee which has for the past two congressional sessions considered the bill, I have heard both railroad management and labor testify on behalf of the measure. I understand that a railroad management has accepted the Kennedy proposal with the possibility of a 6-year lag before economies go into effect. As I recall, this same railroad management has advertised at times in the press that featherbedding costs $500 million a year.

In the past two sessions of Congress, I have joined my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to provide a bipartisan cosponsorship of mass transportation legislation. I must confess, however, that I will find it difficult if not impossible to explain why the American taxpayer should provide the $500 million needed to cover featherbedding expenses. This is a classic example of the railroads and the unions wanting to have their cake and eat it too, with the President asking Congress to play the part of the baker. The mass transportation bill faced a difficult task as it was; its prospects are now even more gloomy than ever.

It is interesting to note that in the President's message, he also cites a 1916 precedent of President Wilson, who said that the Interstate Commerce Commission would protect the carriers through its ratemaking powers. As the New York Times surmised editorially on July 23:

> Mr. Kennedy even hints that the cost can be lifted from their pocketbooks by the usual expedient of passing it to the public in higher rates.

Significantly, the entire question of railroad rates has been a subject of some controversy in Congress this year. It will also be interesting to note the line taken by the Justice Department from here on in with respect to railroad merger proposals.

The New York Times editorial comes to the conclusion that the President has in fact ducked the issue; that he has left Congress with the choice of either accepting his proposal that solves nothing, or being charged with causing a nationwide strike. In this respect, the railroads' acceptance of his proposal, and the unions' intransigence help put Congress into a corner. Should the railroads follow their responsibility to the national interest and postpone putting the work rules into effect for a temporary, limited period of time, then I believe it will be up to Congress to also act in the public interest. It is our responsibility to consider not just the President's proposal, but whatever other suggestions may be available.

I include in my remarks the editorial comment by the New York Times of July 23, 1963:

A Featherbed Solution

> The author of "Profiles in Courage" has run away from a tough decision to embrace a politically easy one.
>
> Once again the White House has knuckled under to the unions' intransigence on the railroads. The President's announcement that he will seek legislation referring the 4-year-old dispute over featherbedding to the Interstate Commerce Commission would postpone indefinitely—and perhaps forever—the elimination of unneeded train jobs that push the carriers a half-billion dollars closer to bankruptcy every year. He leaves Congress the alternative of doing nothing and thereby accepting the inevitability of a nationwide strike.
>
> The ICC has no special competence in this field. Its members cannot be expected to appraise the incredibly complex issues of work rules and manning practices with anything like the expertness of the able Presidential Commission that submitted its recommendations for squeezing out manpower waste nearly 18 months ago. President Kennedy made that report an exercise in futility by walking away from it on the very day it was presented. He knew the unions would reject it.
>
> Since then the railroads have said "yes" and the brotherhoods have said "no" both to the peace plan put forward by a Presidential emergency board under the Railway Labor Act and to the supplementary settlement formula suggested by Secretary of Labor Wirtz. Now, faced with the choice between a national rail strike and the necessity for forcing a showdown through legislation, President Kennedy retreats into another time-wasting study under circumstances which give the unions every encouragement for continuing to veto the economies essential both for the railroads and for the job security of those workers whose jobs are genuinely needed.
>
> The employers are confronted with the prospect of a 2-year wait before they can hope to reap any of the savings permitted by technological change, with no real reason for belief that the same political considerations that dictated the President's decision will not again frustrate any basic change in their archaic work rules. Mr. Kennedy even hints that the cost can be lifted from their pocketbooks by the usual expedient of passing it to the public in higher rates. The parallel announcement by Mr. Kennedy that he will appoint a Presidential commission on the general problems of automation could not be more ill timed. The precedent he is setting in the railroads is bound to undermine public confidence in the new body even before it begins work.

The inescapable lesson of the entire experience is that Congress must give priority attention to a reappraisal of all our legal safeguards against emergency strikes and the abuse of union power. Waiting for the crisis always leads to political evasions that may prove as damaging in their end effects as the strikes they were designed to avert. President Kennedy has taken the easy way out, and a way that can only do harm to the country, the railroads and, in the long run, to labor as well.

PROVIDING TAX CREDIT FOR EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reid] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would grant a tax credit to parents sending children to college. Under the bill, a taxpayer would be permitted to reduce his taxes by 30 percent of the cost of his educational expenses—tuition, fees, and books—for either himself, his wife, or his dependents.

A growing proportion of the population must face the problem of financing college education. Whereas a generation ago only one out of every seven men and women entered college, today nearly one-half of this group are entering, and the percentage continues to rise. We must find an effective way to increase educational opportunities by reducing the tax burden on the parents.

Mr. Speaker, I favor the tax credit approach over the outright deduction for educational expenses. By adopting the credit plan, each individual paying a given amount in tuition and fees would receive the same tax benefit in dollars regardless of his income tax bracket.

An outright deduction of educational expenses would be of no benefit to more than 37 million taxpayers who elect to use the tax tables or take the statutory standard deductions, instead of itemizing their deductions to reduce their taxes. By the use of a credit, however, these taxpayers will be in a position to avail themselves of the benefit of the educational tax credit in their returns and also use the tax tables or standard deduction in the computation of their tax liability.

Our children represent the future of our Nation. It is my hope the Congress will give this bill favorable consideration; thereby encouraging the pursuit of higher education by a greater number of Americans.

THE NEED FOR INCREASED MINORITY STAFFING ON CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES AND GREATER COMMUNICATION BETWEEN STATE AND CONGRESSIONAL REPUBLICANS

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are confronted with many vital issues these days. Among the most important is the preservation of a constructive two-party system, the foundation of democracy.

For a two-party system to work at its peak effectiveness at the national level, however, there is need for better presentation of the minority viewpoint in congressional committees. I become more aware every day of the injustice in the startling imbalance which presently exists in much of our committee staffing. Republicans who speak for some 50 percent of the voters should be given the tools to make their constructive criticisms and proposals effective.

Those of you who follow my speeches on the floor and my insertions in the Congressional Record will recall that only yesterday, July 24, I paid tribute to Congressman Fred Schwengel, of Iowa, who has been leading this fight for increased minority staffing.

This tribute was particularly timely because of Congressman Schwengel's appearance before the Governors' conference in Miami Beach last Sunday. Mr. Schwengel met with 16 Republican Governors who attended the Governors' conference in Miami Beach, Fla. A special session was arranged through Congressman Jerry Ford, of Michigan, the chairman of the Republican conference, who is dedicated to making the Republican team work more effectively at all levels. Congressman Schwengel discussed ways and means of improving the effectiveness of Republican representation and leadership in Washington, and in the various States. He recommended more constructive minority staff work on congressional committees, and a better liaison between Republican Members of Congress and the offices of Republican Governors.

These remarks provide a blueprint for action which can promote the public interest and give the millions in this country who believe in Republican principles and policies an opportunity to have their viewpoints thoughtfully and effectively considered.

All Republicans should be pleased with the reception Fred was given by the Governors. In private conversation with several of them, he found that the suggestions offered in his remarks met with general approval. There is hope that these suggestions may be implemented through the Republican conference because this is a legislative matter and the conference will be an ideal vehicle to bring them into being.

Many of the Governors expressed their satisfaction with this presentation which came to them as a well-thought-out document from Washington setting forth a blueprint for coordinated action at the National and State level.

The text of Fred Schwengel's challenging remarks before the Governors' conference follow:

Representative Schwengel's Address to Republican Governors at Governors' Conference, Miami Beach, Fla., July 21, 1963

Honored sirs, I should like to share with you some of my thoughts on a subject of major concern to a number of congressional Republicans as well as to you as Governors of your respective States—namely the absence of any meaningful exchange of information and ideas between Republicans in State capitals, both Governors and legislators, and their congressional counterparts in Washington.

Many of you either in person or through your staffs have told me how frustrated you have been to see large numbers of Federal programs, directly affecting your States, planned and then executed without your advice. You have told me of your experiences in the face of the relentless Washington bureaucracy that is dedicated to the destruction of the integrity and presumption of the prerogatives of the State and local governments. You and the citizens you represent are the ones who end up getting stuck with the errors, the impracticalities and the cost of unrealistic crash programs at the Federal level. You have to put up with the unhappy results of faults which we in Congress see only in the abstract.

NEED FOR CONSTRUCTIVE ALTERNATIVES

At present, the Republican minority in Congress is at a disadvantage to prevent these unworkable and extravagant programs from being enacted into law. Also in too many cases, we are unable to come up with constructive alternatives. Why? There is one basic reason. Frequently, if not usually, we Republicans perforce must legislate without adequate staff work occurring in advance. The minority staffing in terms of quantity, but I am happy to say not quality, on congressional committees is inadequate. We lack the human resources either to point out the many flaws in administration bills and to produce intelligent amendments and substitutes of our own. Also because of the absence of communication with our fellow Republicans at the State level we do not gain the benefit of their knowledge and wisdom. Often we do not know what our Governors and State legislators would like to see contained in these bills, if anything. Perhaps the entire legislation is undesirable. Thus, our vote often has to be somewhat of an educated guess.

On the other side of the aisle the Democrats at least do not have the problems of staffing. Their difficulties are basic ideological differences which are best solved by not letting the right hand know what the left is doing. On most of their committee staffs they have more than enough men to investigate pending legislation. Also the entire executive bureaucracy stands at their beck and call for information, research, and propaganda. In addition, the Kennedy administration, aided by its weapons of patronage, contracts, and installations, also Federal grants, can produce at any time selectively a horde of Democratic Governors, legislators, county officials, and mayors seeking Federal handouts ready to testify in support of any Federal program taking the responsibility off their backs and in effect squandering the substance of the American taxpayer. With such a bewildering barrage of manpower and propaganda at its disposal, it is most surprising that the administration has not been successful in getting its program through Congress. The reason is the programs themselves have been so faulty.

REPUBLICAN DUTY TO REDUCE ODDS

We Republicans have a duty to act to reduce these overwhelming odds by our diligence, effectiveness, and quality of effort. In the interest of the people we represent, as well as in the interest of preserving our very Nation and our way of life, we must point out how our people have traditionally and successfully solved problems and moved our country ahead through private initiative, and when it is necessary to use the Federal mechanism be ready to offer programs that mesh with rather than conflict with the private sector, and State and local government.

We, 177 Congressmen, 33 Senators, and 16 Governors must set up a mechanism to exchange Republican knowledge, ideas and experiences, and thus to increase the flow of information between the State capitals and the Halls of Congress. We must seek a unity of purpose and a coordination of endeavor which the homogeneity of Republican beliefs permit us to do. Only thus can we fully prevent the passage of unsound legislation and present imaginative Republican proposals to meet the needs of our times, such as, for example, the Manpower Training Act—a GOP accomplishment which the Democratic administration was forced to grudingly accept and even now fails to properly and vigorously implement, although never ceasing to try take credit for it.

Although we are at the moment a small minority—controlling approximately one-seventh of the governorships, one-third of the U.S. Senate, and two-fifth of the House of Representatives, we have a responsibility and yet at the same time a golden opportunity to maintain the historical and splendid image as well as the actual functioning of the party by meeting the needs of the people we serve.

I am satisfied the American people believe in individual initiative; they believe in State and local governments and they are convinced that the Republican approach to the problems of government is more constructive and works better than the cynical system of neofederalism being promoted by the Democratic Party.

NEED TO PROJECT UNIFIED POSITION

In recent conversations with my fellow Republicans in Congress I have found a strong feeling that we must do something to project a unified Republican position on national issues. It is frequently pointed out that even though the Republican Governors, as a group, command the most impressive national party forum, it is used all too rarely. There are many reporters who only write about Republican Governors in connection with the presidential nomination. One of the major reasons perhaps is that the Republican Governors rarely comment on national issues, perhaps because they feel this is stepping into the area of the Republicans in the Federal Congress, just as I know the Republican Congressmen are chary about sounding off on State and local matters. However, with a little coordination both groups could be talking up and backstopping each other.

The Republican Party has a position on the national issues of the day but if the party and all of its members do not speak out we are obviously weakened. As a minority party we cannot compel, as does the Kennedy administration, specific Governors through threats of political reprisal to speak out for the party on particular national issues. Nor would we if we were in power. However, it does not take much of a genius to see that if some of our party's most powerful spokesmen continue to remain silent on issues of national concern, our endeavors to further the programs and policies of our party will be seriously impaired.

On the other hand, it is of course not helpful and is often harmful to have uninformed pronouncements on national affairs emitted from a Governor's office. Just as I can imagine the cringing that goes on in State capitals when uninformed statements are made by Republican Congressmen on State and local problems. Nothing is more frustrating for a Congressman or a Senator who has wrestled for a number of months, sometimes years, with a legislative problem than to have his position completely undercut by a statement from the Governor's office receiving widespread publicity back home.

I am convinced that once the lines of communication were fully open between the two groups we could begin materially to strengthen the image of the party in the eyes of the public and at the same time show up the Democrat Party for the unholy coalition it is. The Republican Party ideologically is truly a national party. The unity we can achieve is one that is not attainable by a party including such diverse points of view as those held by Governor Wallace, of Alabama, and Gov. Pat Brown, of California, for example, or by Senator JIM EASTLAND, of Mississippi, and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota. The only issue of substance they agree upon is that Democrats should have the patronage and the political spoils.

Today I'd like to do three things: First, discuss briefly what most of us would agree to be the philosophy behind the Republican approach to government. Secondly, refer to some concrete examples of legislation that has been, is now, or will be before Congress that affects State Governors and concerning which it would have been helpful to have greater communication between us. In this connection, I want to touch upon the inadequacy of minority staffing on congressional committees to point out how it is harmful to you as well as to us. And thirdly, I should like to suggest a program which might be adopted to improve the situation. At the end of my remarks I would certainly be most interested to hear comments any of you might care to make.

GOP APPROACH TO FISCAL SOUNDNESS

At this point in our Nation's history I believe that the need for a reaffirmation of the basic Republican philosophy of government is manifest. In an inaugural speech of not too long ago, we were encouraged, if not entirely, reassured, by a reiteration of the principle that individuals should concern themselves with what they can do for the country rather than being preoccupied with what the country can do for them. As recently as a few months ago we were told, "If the Government is to retain the confidence of the people it must not spend more than can be justified on the grounds of national need or spent with maximum efficiency." It seems incredible to me that such statements are made by the same political leader who since taking office has doubled the rate of increase in the expenditure level of the Federal budget from $3 to $6 billion. The last Eisenhower year expenditures were $81 billion. In fiscal year 1962 this was upped to $87 billion. Fiscal year 1963, this became $94 billion; fiscal year 1964 it is $99 billion, with a request for new obligational authority in the 1964 budget of $108 billion which insures that this expenditure increase will continue at this rate in the future and these increases are all planned to be financed out of deficits. This same leader, who spoke those inspiring words about the responsibility of the individual, has, during his term of office, sent to the Congress nearly 300 different spending proposals which, if the Republicans had not girded their loins and stopped them, would have, in my judgment, destroyed private enterprise and individual liberty. In his view the sole cure for the ills of our society seems to be to throw Federal money at them.

Regardless of the fact that our Federal Government is the biggest spender, the biggest employer, the biggest property owner, the biggest tenant, the biggest insurer, the biggest lender, and the biggest borrower in all the world, we find a growing impatience on the part of many in the Kennedy administration to make the Federal Government—the executive branch of the Federal Government, that is—even bigger. Thus we are told that it is the Federal Government which must grant aid to schools, compulsory medical care for the aged, a permanent system of extending unemployment compensation benefits, an expanded food stamp plan, and expansion of area redevelopment and public works, enlarged public assistance programs, increased public power projects, enlarged housing projects, increased subsidies of all sorts.

Facing as we are today a severe crisis in our balance of payments, one might expect a note of financial responsibility to creep into this fiscal wonderland. One might expect a real effort to control Federal expenditures and thus in the near future have some hope of a balanced budget.

Instead, the Kennedy administration proposes the demonstrably bankrupt solution of the 1930's expanded Federal spending and planned budget deficits. We are told that a tax cut at this juncture dramatically increasing the budgetary deficit would be prudent and wise. We are informed that the old Puritan ethic of pay-as-you-go has been replaced once and for all by the Roosevelt-Truman-Kennedy ethic of spend-yourself-rich.

The results of this fiscal insanity are easy to see. We are witnessing a waning in the intensity of citizen determination to protect liberty and opportunity as we increase our efforts to achieve economic security through the bounty of government. We are voting to spend the other fellow's money to make us secure without pausing to realize that the other fellow is being just as successful in voting to spend our money to feather his own economic nest. We are pursuing government policies designed to create statistical results—many of them bad—without adequate concern for the quality of government. In our early history the French philosopher De Tocqueville warned us that whenever it became possible for men to vote themselves benefits out of the public treasury, self-government by responsible men would cease to be a reality. One can only speculate how far or near that perilous pass may be today. The Federal Government, of course, when it overspends can do something States cannot do—print money.

REEXAMINE PARTY PRECEPTS

It is time for us Republicans to reexamine the precepts on which this Nation as well as our own party were founded. In my view no other nation in the world has a more inspiring historic tradition in terms of ideals and principles which guided our forebears in establishing the institutions of our governmental system. These illustrious patriots committed our Nation to a political system which recognized the preeminence of human liberty and opportunity over statism and which recognized the creative superiority of private enterprise over government enterprise. Pursuant to these precepts of government our Nation has grown in strength and stature to its present position in world affairs.

At its birth the Republican Party committed itself to the continuation of these basic principles. It recognized the dignity and worth of strong State and municipal governments. It saw that human liberty could be preserved only if individuals were permitted to work out their own solutions to local problems at the local level. Only if they failed in this attempt was Federal assistance justified. The Republican Party further recognized the unmistakable connection between governmental economy and individual freedom as earlier expressed by the eloquent words of Thomas Jefferson when he said:

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers bond us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them, we will be happy."

These principles are little different from those of the party today, and I think all of us would maintain that they are as sound today as they were more than 100 years ago. Yet when it comes to a concrete implementation of this philosophy, we are often accused of having no program save sheer negativism. One columnist recently asked: "If pressed, could you jot down on the back of an envelope one or two concrete steps the Republican Party, if in power, would take to get the economy moving better? And what would the Republicans propose to do besides talk to get rid of Castro? Do they want a nuclear test ban? A tax cut? What kind of a civil rights bill?"

"If you have trouble," he stated, "don't blame yourself. The fact is," he concluded, "that the Republicans are long on criticism, strong on large generalities and short, woefully short, on concrete proposals. The present strategy of most of the party, most of the time, with some lonely exceptions, is to stand idly by with open mouth hoping that the Kennedy administration will make enough mistakes to lose."

Of course this is in large part journalistic demagoguery, or maybe well-meant needling and not an accurate description. We fail to project and merchandise Republican achievements. What party has best maintained peace and American security in the past 30 years? What party alone has stood for frugal government so that responsible tax reduction could twice be enacted while that party was in power? What party has best protected our aged from the ravages of inflation and has best fostered the opportunity of our youth? What party has sought to encourage private enterprise so that our citizens did not have to look to the Government for this economic security? The record clearly shows greater Republican achievement than that attained by the Democrats but the shouting has been all theirs. Because of the lack of communication between our elected officials on a State and local level and our elected representatives at the national level, we often seem to have no unified position on a given issue and lose the battle for the confidence of the people.

CIVIL RIGHTS

One classic example of such a case is the present national ignorance of the Republican Party's constructive position on civil rights. Although I know all of us here would not agree completely on the contents of a civil rights bill, the fact is we would have a far larger area of common agreement than the Democrats. The Kennedy administration's legislative record in the field of civil rights has been abysmal. In contrast there are several Republican bills now being considered by committees of the House and Senate which were introduced well in advance of the President's package. This brings into focus the basic proposition I am presenting to this group today to the effect that if we in Congress had the means to communicate with you and adequate staffs to brief you on the intricacies of the various legislative proposals now pending it would be possible for you to participate more effectively in the solution of these issues that are of concern at both the Federal and State levels.

While we are on the subject of bills now before the House Judiciary Committee, I'd like to refer briefly to another one on which it would have been helpful to us to have had some consultation with Republican State officials, particularly the State attorneys general. I am speaking of the Federal public defender bill. All of us have seen the growing need for some action to provide defense counsel for indigent citizens brought before Federal courts. The Kennedy proposal would at the option of the district judge create the office of a Federal public defender. The defender would be appointed by the judge for a 4-year term and would appoint his own assistants. Thus we would witness the growth of another Federal bureaucracy paralleling the U.S. attorney's office, and a defendant would thus be defended in a Federal court against a Federal prosecuting attorney by a representative of a third benevolent Federal agency. Of course one can easily see how the posts of public defender could be handed out as patronage plums to deserving Democrats by the scores of Democrat judges which President Kennedy has appointed to the Federal bench within the last 3 years. Also it is clear how a lazy judge might bring pressure to bear on his own appointee to keep his calendar clear of tiresome jury trials and the like. Yet our ability to point out the obvious flaws in the Kennedy bill does not absolve us from the responsibility of coming up with an alternative.

The Republican substitute which might well be accepted merely provides for Federal funds to pay the reasonable fees and expenses of court-appointed attorneys. Yet wouldn't it have been helpful to you and to us if when drafting this bill, the Republican members of the House Judiciary Committee could have conferred with Republican State attorneys general to find out what local public defender programs were already in existence and how the Federal program might assist rather than compete with them?

COMBATING UNEMPLOYMENT

Another area where information and advice from Republican Governors and State legislators would be of great use to Republican Congressmen is the development of programs to combat continuing unemployment. The Kennedy administration during the course of this session has sent up a number of proposals purportedly designed to meet this problem. Three of the major ones are the Area Redevelopment Act of 1963, recently defeated in the House, the so-called Blatnik accelerated public works bill, and the youth employment bill. Many Republicans in Congress have long contended that the key to a long-term solution of the unemployment problem lies in education and training programs rather than Federal make-work projects. This means not only equipping the unemployed with needed skills but also encouraging those workers presently holding jobs to upgrade their skills thus avoiding technological unemployment as well as producing job openings for those further down the ladder. It was with this objective in mind that most of us supported the Manpower Training Act passed during the last session of Congress.

In contrast the Kennedy administration's cure for this disturbing and continuing problem in our economy is to send Congress a package of legislation providing the discredited solutions of the thirties for the problems of the sixties. To expose fully the economic fallacies underlying all three bills would take more time than any of us have today, but let me just comment briefly on each of the three. The Area Redevelopment Act, for which the House wisely denied continued authorization in early June, has proven to be an extremely costly boondoggle which has accomplished practically none of its desired results. Rather than creating new jobs in many cases it has merely used Federal funds to transplant employment. In other cases it has permitted staggering expenditures to create a miniscule number of jobs. In the depressed area of Minnesota, for example, the redevelopment agency approved loans and grants totaling nearly $19 million to build a convention auditorium near Duluth. In the agency's own words, the purpose of these loans and grants was to "supplement convention, entertainment, recreation, and cultural facilities of the area." The auditorium will ultimately provide the magnificent total of 22 jobs, at a cost to the taxpayers of only $277,272 per job. This sort of bargain will, I am sure, be of substantial comfort to the iron ore miners of Duluth and victims of hard-core unemployment in other depressed areas.

The pork-barrel Public Works Acceleration Act for which the House recently passed an additional authorization of $450 million has been a similar success. Ignoring the fact that public works construction has never been effective as an anticyclical measure during an economic recession, the Kennedy administration ballyhooed the additional authorization as a needed short-term shot in the arm while the economy waited for the long-term accomplishments of the Area Redevelopment Act. The past performance of this program gives little hope for future results. The act has been unable to provide immediate employment because of the large leadtime needed for surveys and studies before work can actually begin. Also in many cases because of its matching grant features it has diverted community resources from necessary high-priority long-term projects to less-needed short-term projects which will qualify for Federal assistance. Furthermore, a high percentage of the cost of these projects has inevitably gone for the purchase of materials and equipment and for the employment of already-employed skilled and professional people.

One example of how little employment is produced for each dollar spent was provided by one of my Republican colleagues during the debate on the floor of the House several months ago. Among next year's projects is a recreational facility at Lexington City, Mo., costing $881,000 which will employ the grand total of nine people. Thus we will have created nine new jobs at the bargain basement price of $90,000 each. Gentlemen, this bill has been presented to America as one answer to the unemployment problem. I say it is rather a fantastic pork-barrel slush fund which will undoubtedly be used by the Kennedy brothers to help elect more Democrats to Congress.

The third part of the Kennedy program to combat unemployment, the so-called youth employment bill, deserves even less comment. Its provision for a Youth Conservation Corps impresses me as an extremely cruel hoax. Under the terms of this bill, young people would be taken off the city streets for periods varying from 6 months to 2 years and trained to plant trees and shrubs, use a pick and shovel, and chop wood. It is extremely difficult to see how this type of training will equip them to operate complex machines or work in the advanced laboratories of the future. Even the Washington Post and Times Herald labeled the bill as a mere "patch" on the main problem and criticized it as providing only "make work and stopgap jobs." A sound Republican alternative was presented in the Senate by Senator PROUTY, of Vermont, which would have provided increased funds under the Manpower Training Act to train unemployed young people for the skilled jobs now available. Needless to say, this constructive proposal was rejected by the Democratic majority, which persists in thinking of New Deal solutions for New Frontier problems.

GOP VIEWS NEEDED ON OTHER ISSUES

Other instances of some specific examples of legislative activity in which our party could have have been more effective in having its views prevail are found in the following actual case histories.

There exists in this country a public assistance program which finds Federal and State funds prevailing for benefit and administration costs with the actual administration of the program ostensibly conducted by the respective State programs. We have recently found evidences of the Federal agency responsible for the Federal operation of the program seeking to greatly increase its authority over the State administration. A striking and shocking instance is found in Michigan, but I hasten to add that this is not the only State in which such evidence exists. In the State of Michigan the Republican legislature and a distinguished Republican Governor worked diligently to provide a program of benefits for children whose parents are unemployed. This program would have been available with respect to unemployed individuals who had a reasonably recent experience in the labor market. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare determined arbitrarily that this requirement of recent experience in the labor market was discriminatory, and, therefore, there is danger that the State of Michigan may lose its eligibility for Federal funds to match State funds in providing public assistance benefits to needy individuals and families. This Federal action was taken despite a specific inclination in the Federal statute reserving to the States the definition of "unemployment."

Another instance of the Federal bureaucracy seeking to expand its control over State administered programs is found in the area of the Federal-State unemployment compensation program. Here again we find a program expressly enacted by the Congress to be administered at the State level. The Federal bureaucrats have joined with the advocates of a planned economy that abound in the ranks of organized labor to urge the establishment of Federal standards controlling the level and duration of benefits, the tax rates applied to employers, and eligibility requirements. The Congress in providing for State administration of the plan recognized the advancing economic and social criteria that exists in different parts of the country and therefore anticipate differing kinds of unemployment compensation programs. It is the purpose of those urging increasing Federal standards to deny to the States the opportunity to meet efficiently and effectively the needs of their citizens who may become unemployed and eligible for benefits.

There is currently pending before the House Committee on Ways and Means a tax matter that should be a very genuine concern to you Governors in view of your primary responsibility for the fiscal affairs of your respective States. The administration has proposed the present provision in our tax law permitting the deductibility for Federal income tax purposes of certain State and local taxes should be changed so that such deductibility would no longer obtain. This would substantially increase the Federal tax burden imposed on the taxpaying citizens of your States and would make more onerous the payment to State and local governments for the cost of maintaining our schools and other services provided by State and local governments. The Committee on Ways and Means has given tentative approval to this administration's proposal to the extent of disallowing the deductibility of certain sales taxes now imposed at the State and local levels. I point out to you that this disallowance, once the principle is established, is only a beginning step toward a more comprehensive disallowance of deductibility. It represents a very substantial encroachment upon the ability of State and local governments to find taxpayer acceptance of the State and local tax burden.

AREAS FOR COOPERATION

There are many other areas besides the ones which I have mentioned in which cooperation and consultation between State Republicans and those of us on Capitol Hill would be helpful and constructive. Let me mention only a few:

The Agriculture and Forestry Committees of the House and Senate, as many of you know, consider a wide range of legislation affecting every agricultural commodity. All of us have seen the consistent failure of the Democrats to provide any constructive program for reducing farm surpluses. We have seen only a succession of the ad-hoc hodgepodge programs with no consistent overall objective. Would it not be helpful for a group of Republican State agricultural commissioners to meet with minority members of the Agriculture Committees of the House and Senate to consider Republican proposals for getting the Nation out of this unending mess?

Before the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate come every proposed Federal expenditure. It would seem evident to me that in this day of continuous budget deficits and rampant Federal spending that a group of Republican State budget commissioners might well have constructive suggestions to make to the minority members of these committees on ways to reduce excessive Federal spending.

There is now pending before the House Armed Services Committee a proposed $175 million Federal matching grant program to give assistance to nonprofit institutions, such as schools, hospitals, and State and local governments, in the construction of fallout shelters for new or existing buildings. The question of civil defense is a broad one, I know, about which many people differ. Many of you Governors have already made considerable progress in this area in your own States. However, would it not be helpful for Republican State civil defense officials to meet with minority members of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees to discuss what, if any, additional Federal programs ought to be undertaken? Or perhaps they would conclude that present Federal expenditures for civil defense could properly be reduced.

The Banking and Currency Committees of the Senate and the House besides considering normal banking legislation also have jurisdiction over Federal housing programs. As you know, within the past several years the Kennedy administration has proposed several massive Federal housing programs. It would be most helpful to the minority on the Banking and Currency Committees if Republican State and local officials concerned in this area could meet with them to determine which of such programs would be useful and supplementary to their own efforts rather than destroying local initiative.

Before the Education and Labor Committees of the Senate and the House pass a vast body of legislation of vital concern to the States; as you know, for example, there is a great controversy over what form, if any, Federal aid to education should take. We Republicans in the Congress have often been afraid, as I am sure you have been at the State level, that the wrong kind of Federal aid in massive amounts would lead to total Federal control of our educational system. It would be most helpful to the minority on the Education and Labor Committees of the Senate and House if the State Republican education commissioners could meet with them to discuss the development of sound Republican programs in this area.

In the field of labor legislation it would also be helpful to the minority members to discuss with the State labor commissioners the impact on their State of various legislative proposals which frequently come before the committee.

Before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House there is at present a Federal wilderness bill. Because of the opposition of the committee chairman the Kennedy bill in its original form has little chance of being reported out at this session. All of us on both sides of the aisle are vitally concerned about the matter of conservation of our national parks and wilderness. Nonetheless, the opponents of the present bill contend that it would give the Secretary of Interior almost unlimited power to add acreage to the national wilderness preserve. A veto of the House or Senate would be the sole restraint. Without discussing the merits of the controversy at this point, I think it would be most constructive to the minority members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the House and Senate to meet with the State officials concerned to discuss a positive Republican program in this area.

The Committee on Public Works, of course, considers legislation of vital concern to the States. For example, the massive Federal highway program due to be completed in 1972, as well as the rivers and harbors bill, are primary concerns of this committee. One Republican on this committee has introduced a bill which would begin a study of the Interstate Highway System which many have contended will be inadequate when completed. It would be most helpful if the minority members of the Public Works Committee could meet with the State highway commissioners to develop a Republican program for future expenditures on our Interstate Highway System.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee also considers legislation of great importance to State governments. For exemple, the Interstate Commerce Commission and its control over our Nation's ralroads are under the constant surveillance of this committee. Although one could not immediately point to the need for a major Republican program in many of the areas under the jurisdiction of this committee there are many specific pieces of legislation on which it would be helpful to have consultation between the minority Congressmen and the State Republican officials concerned.

INADEQUACY OF MINORITY STAFFS

One of the factors that has aided this Federal encroachment upon the States is the total inadequacy of minority staffing on congressional committees. This critical lack has played no small part in our inability to establish a closer relationship with you Governors and other Republicans in the State capitals. As you may be aware the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 supposedly established the concept of nonpartisan civil service type committee staffs. This has turned out on all but a few committees to be a complete sham. The same act was amended to permit the appointment of staffs by a majority vote of the committee concerned. Ever since, in most cases the entire committee staff has been hired and fired by the chairman. It is only through his benevolence that the ranking minority member is tossed an occasional bone in the form of one or two employees.

The Education and Labor Committee is one typical example. Last year the ranking minority member was informed by the Democratic chairman that the minority would have to give up one of its two staff rooms to make room for additional majority staff. When the ranking Republican refused, the chairman informed him that the Republican staff was forthwith reduced from four employees to two. This Republican staff of 2 compares with an approximate total of 50 employees for the majority. Such complete inequity obviously hinders us in undertaking adequate investigation of Kennedy proposals and in drafting sensible Republican alternatives. It also leaves us no one to keep in contact with you or your staffs.

In fact, Democratic abuse in the use of committee staffing has, without question been one of the factors the Democratic Party has used to maintain its majority status.

The problem of stimulating a public outcry against this unfair allocation of committee staff has been receiving the constant attention of a number of my colleagues in both Houses—Hugh Scott and Carl Curtis from the Senate and Gerry Ford, and Tom Curtis in the House, have been active in the fight. Nonetheless, we need all the outside help we can get if this situation is ever to be corrected. I therefore commend this fight for adequate minority staffing as a cause most worthy of your continuing attention and support.

PROGRAM FOR ACTION

Having outlined all of these various problems, is there anything constructive that we, as a group, can do to meet them? I believe there is but first we have to make some basic decisions. First and foremost we must conclude that effective liaison between Republicans in Congress and Republicans in State capitals as well as adequate congressional committee staffing are essential prerequisites for the formation of concrete alternatives to Kennedy administration programs. We must also conclude that the development of such alternative is the only certain way to Republican victory. Once we agree on this, I think our path of action is clear.

First we must set up some mechanism for continuous communication between your office and ours. Perhaps the easiest way would be for you 16 Governors as a group to sponsor 1 or 2 men with a secretary to be your representatives in Washington. We could also find one or two people on our staffs to work with them. Second, it would be extremely helpful if each one of you would designate one of your personal staff as your congressional representatives. A list of these men could then be distributed to each Republican Congressman. We would then have someone to contact in each Governor's office, and he in turn would hopefully come to know some of us. Lastly, I would hope that all of us would give the minority staffing fight our constant support for without adequate staff resources we cannot hope to develop sound proposals.

If such a program of action were adopted, I think its positive effect on the image, the functioning, and the morale of the party would be dramatic. Just imagine how much more effectively your State would be represented in Washington if you as Governor received a periodic report concerning the progress of legislation significantly affecting your State and/or others headed by Republican Governors. Wouldn't it be helpful for you to have direct access to the Republican Members of Congress on a given committee rather than having usually to go through an intermediary? Would it not be helpful to the party to have occasional conferences between Republican Governors and key Republican Congressmen to issue position papers on issues affecting the national interest? Would it not be helpful to you and to the party to have Republican Governors testify before congressional committees on issues about which you are informed rather than appearing as mere spectators totally removed from the legislative process?

I think the answers of all of us here to the above set of questions would be a resounding "yes" to each one. I can only add that for those of us who believe in effective government at the Federal, State, and local levels as well as in the future of a constructive Republican Party, the time to act is now.

VACANT MIGRANT HOUSING IS WASTEFUL

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Talcott] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is contended by some who wish to discontinue the bracero program that the growers or farmers should provide housing accommodations for the entire migrant family which follows the crops. This is an unreasonable requirement and an impracticable solution for the migrant's plight.

A normal harvest season may be for 2 or 3 months' duration, but often less. After one harvest is complete the migrant family must move on to another harvest. After this harvest, another move. This pathetic migration goes on and on, harvest after harvest, year after year. Harvest seasons cannot be changed. A crop may require supplemental labor for only 2 or 3 months during the year. Farmers have provided good, clean, sanitary housing accommodations for single workers in dormitory or barracks-style buildings. Growers have furnished good, clean, wholesome food of a kind preferred by workers in cafeteria style. A few farmers can permit these dormitories and cafeterias to remain vacant and idle during the nonharvest seasons.

I believe that there is no builder or financier of housing in America, including the Federal Government, who can afford to build family-style housing which must remain vacant for 5 to 9 months of a year. Family housing, particularly for large, migrant families, would be an enormous and unconscionable waste. To have crops which matured consistently every day of the year would be a panacea which would be welcomed by everyone, grower, employee, and consumer; but not even Congress can legislate such a nice solution.

I am seeking consideration for, and understanding of, the farmer, the domestic, the local community, the employer in allied industries, and the consumer—not the bracero.

The bracero program was a well-considered solution to the problem of supplying labor when and where it was required in the most efficient, effective, and humanitarian way.

COTTON BILL

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Broyhill] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, one more milestone was passed yesterday when the Rules Committee granted a rule for the consideration of H.R. 6196, the bill to correct some of the inequities of the two-price cotton problem.

The struggle for relief from the two-price cotton system has been uphill all the way, but it now seems that the Congress will at least have a chance to consider the matter. This, I feel, is a victory in itself.

I have long and strenuously contended that the Nation's cotton textile industry, which is importantly represented in North Carolina, has been trapped in what amounts to a "no man's land" between the armies of the opposing factions. This legislation is admittedly a compromise proposal and does not solve, at a single stroke, all the problems of the cotton economy. It does, however, enable American mills to buy American cotton at a price at least as low as it is sold to their foreign competitors.

The present difficulties in cotton are largely due to an unwise exercise of discretion by the Secretary of Agriculture in artificially setting the support price at too high a level. This has hurt both the cotton mills and the cotton farmer. If an amendment can be added to remove some of this discretionary power and pinpoint by law the price of cotton, and thus remove the price of cotton from purely partisan political consideration, it would be a start toward getting the cotton program back on the right track.

There are reports of behind-the-scenes efforts whereby the Kennedy administration is willing to trade passage of the two-price cotton legislation in return for a switch in votes on the White House's area redevelopment administration bill. If this is true, it is a new high in political double dealing. It also exposes the Kennedy administration's hand once and for all, that it has been, at best, only lukewarm about the cotton textile problem all along and that it is willing to kill legislation that attempts to correct an intolerable situation created entirely by bureaucratic meddling. The Area Redevelopment Administration bill is wholly unrelated. It was considered by the House once and voted down. I certainly hope that Congress will not barter away its integrity and accept the administration's political honeypots as a price for accomplishing not only what is right, but what should have been done long ago.

FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PRESS

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Lloyd] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, our society depends on a press that is free, but not beyond the law. It requires freedom for the newsman to report fairly and freely, but not to be unanswerable for misstatements injurious to others.

Our difficulty is in finding that point of balance between freedom and responsibility of the press.

Senator Keating introduced recently a bill which proposes to give in Federal courts an immunity to newsmen's sources of information. There is a danger—as the Senator himself observed and as the Washington Post editorialized—that the protection might be too broad and extend not only to the initial source of a story but to the facts stated in a story.

His purpose was simply to give legal support for a newsman's refusal to reveal the names of his confidential informants—not to cloak the newsman with immunity for the accuracy of his material.

The bill I am introducing today narrows and defines that which may be held confidential—from "source of information" in Senator KEATING's bill to "identity of a confidential informant" in mine. A "source" could be the available public record, and there is no reason for such a record being confidential. A "confidential informant," however, could be only a person who gives information leading to exposure of wrongdoing.

I have also added language which states clearly that the protection is limited to the source; that a newsman remains liable under existing law for the content or nature of his publication.

Perhaps my bill may be further improved. I urge that Congress support this legislation as a necessary tool in defense of a right claimed by the fourth estate but for which supporting law has been lacking.

TRUSTING THE COMMUNISTS

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy is playing with fire in agreeing to weaken our defenses by halting nuclear testing in an agreement with Soviet Russia. There is no reason to believe that the Communists will abide by the agreement. The President can demand no guarantee that the agreement will be kept. Indeed, what difference do terms of agreement make to Khrushchev? The negotiator of the present agreement, Averell Harriman, is the same man who negotiated the Communist victory in Laos. Yet, the President asks the American people to believe that he is now acting wisely in the interest of peace.

There is grave danger to the security of the United States in this agreement and I, for one, hope it will not be approved.

To remind us of the futility of dealing with the Russians, I include this short item from the current issue of U.S. News & World Report.

It is being pointed out, now that another agreement with the Russians is near, that 53 agreements have been entered into with Russians since World War II, of which the Russians have violated 50.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN BUFFALO

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on July 10, 1963 a conference relating to chronic unemployment was held in Buffalo, N.Y. This conference was sponsored by the New York State AFL–CIO.

Mr. Raymond E. Davies, Sr., vice chairman, New York State Legislative and Education Board, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Buffalo, introduced the following resolution which was adopted by the delegates:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE OPERATING RAILROAD UNIONS

(Proposed for adoption to the delegates to the New York State AFL–CIO statewide conference on the problems of unemployment, Statler-Hilton Hotel, Buffalo, N.Y., July 10, 1963)

The railroad workers of this Nation are today faced with the impending loss of 45,000 jobs.

These workers have been made the victims of an unparalleled and extensive advertising and propaganda campaign aimed at deceiving the public that these jobs and these workers on the railroads are and have long been unneeded in the road's operations and are a deadly drain on the finances of these carriers.

The truth, however, is that these workers are, in fact, necessary for the safe operation of trains and the protection of the public, because while train weights, sizes, speeds and complexity of operation have constantly increased, the crew size has remained the same or has been reduced in many cases, and each of these crewmen fulfills an essential function.

The railroads, despite the tricky bookkeeping they present to the public in their propaganda barrages, are not losing money. And while it is true that over the years the labor force on the railroads has been decreased by tens and hundreds of thousands of workers, the management personnel not only has not decreased, but has even risen—demonstrating that there is featherbedding on the railroads, but that it is featherbedding by management.

However, a reprieve to such a sudden-death lopping off 45,000 workers has been offered to the railroad unions—the acceptance of compulsory arbitration of this dispute. This alternative has been rejected by the railroad unions, and rightly so.

These workers realize that were they to accept compulsory arbitration in this matter they would be providing the opening wedge to the enemies of free labor to impose this same requirement on all workers, thus effectively sounding the death knell of free collective bargaining.

The railroad workers have demonstrated their concern for the public convenience and interest by offering to continue passenger, commuter and military and public welfare freight movements and to donate the wages they would earn to public charity, but this offer has been coldly rebuffed by the railroad managements: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we the delegates to this New York State AFL–CIO conference on the problems of unemployment here go on record as fully supporting these railroad workers in their efforts to protect the jobs of these 45,000 workers and in their refusal to submit to compulsory arbitration and we pledge our support in their efforts to obtain by free collective bargaining a just settlement of their problems which face not only these workers on the railroads of the Nation, but all of us within the ranks of free labor.

SWAMP WAR TO SPACE FLIGHT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the strategy and operations of our Nation's defense have been revolutionized by the events of recent years. And today, more than ever, a successful defense program depends on a continuing fruitful Government-industry relationship. We in Congress are acutely aware of the Government's role in answering the challenge; but we perhaps sometimes forget that parallel demands are being placed on industry.

For this reason I am inserting in the RECORD today "Swamp War to Space Flight: Challenges to Industry," which appears in the current issue of the General Electric Forum, a magazine I have commended previously to the attention of my colleagues. Written by Robert J. Brown, general manager of defense programs operations for the General Electric Co., this article discusses the important defense responsibility fulfilled by this Nation's industries. I strongly recommend it to all my colleagues and to all those who read the RECORD:

SWAMP WAR TO SPACE FLIGHT: CHALLENGES TO INDUSTRY

(By Robert J. Brown)

(The revolutions in defense strategy and operations have leveled revolutionary requirements on industry. Old guidelines no longer work. What are some of the new demands being placed upon the industrial member of the defense team? Where can Government and industry, working together, streamline their efforts in tackling the tough technical tasks that lie ahead? Case examples?)

The American astronaut orbiting the earth and the Vietnamese soldier wading through swamps have something very basic in common: each is meeting the challenges of world communism. And while the one requires equipment of near-unbelievable sophistication, the other has no less need for equipment—be it an automatic rifle or a length of piano wire. The struggle in which the free world is engaged is such that it must be met head on wherever it appears.

Characteristic of this fight for freedom is the changing nature of the struggle. We are still confronted with the same essential challenges of the cold war as we knew them in the late 1940's; however, the requirements to meet these challenges have shifted steadily over the years. As a consequence, the aerospace and defense industry finds itself racing to meet—sometimes, to identify—its challenges. At any point in time since World War II, it would have been accurate to say that the industry was in a transition stage. And it would be accurate today to say this.

SERVING NATIONAL OBJECTIVES

In the broadest sense, the aerospace and defense industry exists for the purpose of serving this Nation's foreign policy and national security objectives. Viewed in this light, these changes in requirements placed upon the industry are understandable. The industry is not in the business of making missiles and guns. Rather, it is in the business of serving the aforementioned objectives.

Industry finds itself constantly confronted with revolutionary requirements. Consider, for example, the development of nose cones.

In 1955, the U.S. Air Force awarded General Electric a contract to develop a reentry vehicle for Atlas-Thor. At that time, the press called this task "an industrial challenge unequalled in modern research and manufacturing."

The major technical problem to be overcome was to invent a nose cone that would shield the ICBM warhead and instrumentation through the heat of reentry into the earth's atmosphere.

Thirty months after receiving the contract, an operational nose cone was delivered to the Air Force. In order to accomplish this, the company had to pull together a team of nearly 2,000 scientists and engineers and provide them with approximately 1 million square feet of floor space. Today, the missile and space division of General Electric employs some 13,000 people and its fields of interest have broadened considerably beyond nose cones.

AEROSPACE AND DEFENSE INDUSTRY GROWTH

This type of growth is not uncommon in the aerospace and defense industry. Business expansions and contractions of dramatic dimensions are more or less taken for granted and the reasons for them are understood. Understandable though they may be, however, such expansions and contractions pose major challenges to the managers of companies affected by them. These challenges, and others found in the aerospace and defense field, are unique in our free-enterprise economy. How well they are met will determine, to a marked degree, the Nation's success in defeating the menace of world communism.

What are these challenges?

THE TECHNOLOGICAL CHALLENGE

First, of course, there are the technological problems that must be met and solved both in the laboratories and in operations. Quantum jumps in the technologies of virtually all the physical sciences are near-mandatory if we are to achieve, for example, our objectives in space. Such breakthroughs do not come easily. They require the skill, patience, and devotion of thousands upon thousands of scientists and engineers from both large and small business, from Government laboratories, and from educational research centers. They require expensive facilities and unusual equipments. And, finally, they require a creativity that is permitted to express itself in an atmosphere which encourages imaginative exploration.

ADDED DIMENSIONS

The technological challenges facing us today surely are comparable to any faced in the past—comparable, and then some. But today, there are added dimensions to these challenges:

Time—for we are constantly under the pressure of meeting the Communist threat.

Cost—for the Nation's resources are not without limit.

Reliability—for, in today's weapons and space systems, a single equipment failure could prove disastrous in terms of national prestige and perhaps, even national survival.

HEAVY INDUSTRY COMMITMENTS

Nothing in its history indicates America's aerospace and defense industry is not equal to these challenges. The companies comprising this industry have proved over and over again their abilities to achieve the near impossible. These companies have heavy commitments in financial resources, manpower, and facilities to serve the Nation's objectives. Equally important, the industry recognizes and accepts the responsibilities its sheer existence places upon it.

If the challenges confronting the aerospace and defense industry were purely technological, its future success would almost certainly be assured. But this industry's existence in a free economy poses a whole new set of challenges. And these challenges are not exclusively the industry's. Rather they must be met jointly by industry and Government if free enterprise is to continue to be a way of life in this Nation.

GOVERNMENT-INDUSTRY RELATIONSHIPS

The relationship between the Government and the industry member of the defense team calls for the very highest degree of understanding if this country's geopolitical aims are to be served efficiently. It is a relationship unique in history whereby a large part of a government's defense posture relies upon a private segment of that government's economy.

In wartime, this relationship proves most effective because the political objectives of the Government and the economic objectives of the industry become secondary to the objective of defeating the enemy. However, in times of peace, this relationship requires constant attention to keep it in balance because it is so complex. While both industry and Government are dedicated to combating world communism and are partners in this cause, a true partnership does not, perhaps cannot, exist. It is Government's responsibility to determine the best and most efficient ways to direct the Nation's effort. It is Government which is served. And it is industry that serves.

HOW BEST CAN INDUSTRY SERVE?

The problems that arise in this relationship most frequently stem from the question, "How best can industry serve?" The Government has a very real interest in finding the answer to this question because, in addition to achieving its defense objectives, the Government has a responsibility to all citizens to see that it gets the most for its defense dollar.

It is worth noting here that, in our economy, there is nothing new about this situation for industry. Whether the customer happens to be the Government or a single housewife, the company supplying that customer must provide the greatest value for the dollar it receives. If it does not, the competitive forces in our economy will soon seal the fate of such a company. Thus, there is no divergence of opinion between the Government and industry on the matter of supplying the most defense for the defense dollar. It is not a question of whether this should be done; rather, it is a question of how.

GOVERNMENT SURVEILLANCE

The Government's response to this question is to state clearly through specifications the work to be accomplished and to require industry to report regularly on the degree of accomplishment and the costs incurred. Unfortunately, due in part to some unhappy experiences in the past, the Government must maintain close surveillance over the entire process to insure that the important work being performed on public funds is accomplished in an effective and efficient manner. However, when some Government practices are applied to specific projects, managers in industry sometimes have difficulty accommodating these requirements with their business experience.

Some of the inspection and evaluation processes which must be met for weapon systems offer an example. If applied to commercial or industrial products or systems, such procedures might prove so costly that, in many cases, it would be impossible to market a product. Nonetheless, in aerospace and defense, the importance of an effective military posture is so great that reliability and effectiveness of the weapon system is paramount. Therefore, industry participating in the defense market must accept and meet this challenge.

PRODUCTS AND PAPERWORK

Another example of near unique requirements in defense is the need to support and maintain a product or system at remote locations for extended periods of time. In addition to comprehensive spare parts complements, industry must generate drawings to Government specification, spare parts lists, instruction manuals, and reports which represent a major expenditure when compared to the hardware costs. The challenge to both Government and industry is to achieve this ability to operate and maintain comprehensive weapon systems at remote locations without undue expenditure of defense funds.

These are but two examples of the various challenges that face both the Government and industry in the joint effort to obtain more defense per dollar.

PROCUREMENT PROBLEMS

There are many other challenges, but use of time may be the greatest problem confronting industry and the Government. Many programs are carefully scheduled to the point where the technical need is established, and firm dates are set for "in-place" hardware, operating personnel training, and logistic support, but frequently the procurement/fund allocation/contract negotiation and award cycle uses up a major portion of the planned "lead time." As a result, a contractor often takes "advance-release" action without contract coverage to meet the needs of the program. Many in the industry believe too little attention is given to the extent of this problem.

These are the kinds of problems industry and Government are challenged to solve. To solve them a creative, cooperative effort is called for. Enough progress is being made in the solution of similar problems dealing with Government regulations to indicate that a reasonable approach to such areas is productive.

CHALLENGES MUST BE MET

Unfortunately, Government and industry have more pressing problems to deal with. The Government must stay on top of the shifting Communist threat and anticipate requirements it makes upon the free world. For its part, industry must tackle the formidable technical task it has to accomplish.

While I mentioned earlier that the aerospace and defense industry is equal to the technological challenges it faces, let there be no mistake about this: there is nothing automatic about accomplishing these.

INDUSTRY INVESTMENT

Going back to General Electric's current position in the space field, it is worth mentioning a few statistics of a single company facility to give an indication of the resources which a company must employ to participate in this industry.

The General Electric investment in its Valley Forge Space Technology Center is in excess of $30 million.

Total square feet at Valley Forge is 800,000.

Total manpower is 3,600, of which engineers and scientists wholly engaged in technical activities account for 800.

The center is the largest privately financed facility for space research and development in the free world. By any standards, the above figures represent a substantial investment by any company to participate in any industry. And the task of managing these resources, in itself, represents a very great challenge to the heads of this business. The more industry can turn its attention to this task, the more it can contribute to the country's defense effort.

CIVILIAN BENEFITS

No discussion of this Nation's aerospace and defense industry should overlook the fact that while the industry-Government team goes about the task of building this Nation's needed defense posture, America's citizens gain benefits far beyond those of deterrence in peacetime and protection in case of conflict.

The U.S. taxpayer gets a substantial return for the dollars expended for the military and space, whether those dollars are spent by the Government per se, paid out to industry, or are used to foster university research.

During World War II, military efforts produced the basic technologies which made possible the development of such postwar boons to civilians as penicillin, radar, nuclear powerplants, turbojet and turboprop engines, packaged foods and the like. The Korean war emphasized the advantages to civilians of the helicopter, new surgical techniques, miniaturization, and numerous others. Within the past decade, the nonmilitary portion of the economy has benefited from the transistor, the Tiros weather satellite, the Telstar and Relay communications satellites, improved plastics and metals, and other military-financed advances.

FUEL CELL DEVELOPMENT

A most recent example of such advances is the General Electric fuel cell development which was announced on April 23 of this year. The General Electric Research Laboratory succeeded in the direct conversion of such common hydrocarbon fuel gases as methane and propane to electricity. Even gasoline, kerosene, and diesel oil have worked surprisingly well in the new fuel cell. This is a major step toward the ultimate development of a generally usable fuel cell that may convert 60 to 80 percent of the energy of common fuels to electricity, in silence and without noxious exhaust.

General Electric's extensive research on fuel cells has had substantial support from the military, and this most recent development offers an excellent example of great tangible benefits for the economy in general that may come from research and development based on military requirements.

CONFIDENCE FOR THE FUTURE

It is certain that other projects Department of Defense and NASA are now presenting to industry will inevitably provide comparable side benefits for civilians in the future.

As we look forward to the challenging and exciting future of this industry, I believe we have earned the right to look with confidence. We are equal to the technological problems we face. And as for the problems confronting both the industry and Government in maintaining the most productive relationship, we are no less equal. Reasonable men working with reasonable men have made this Nation a world leader. There is no reason to believe it will not remain so.

PANAMA CANAL ZONE

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in an address in the House on April 9, 1963, on the subject, "Congress Must Save the Panama Canal," I dealt at length with public remarks made by Gov. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., of the Canal Zone on December 10, 1962, before the Panama section of the American Society of Civil Engineers. Again, in an address on the Manion Forum Network on June 2 on the subject, "Wake Up America. Your House is on Fire." I gave a condensation of the earlier one. On both occasions, the removal of Governor Fleming was urged.

The result has been not only a number of requests for the texts of my own addresses, but also of the Governor's December 10, 1962, remarks.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, it should be explained that, after studying the indicated statement of the Governor, on January 14, 1963, I called it to the attention of Secretary of the Army, Cyrus R. Vance, who represents the President on Panama Canal matters, and requested certain information. The ensuing exchange of letters with him about the Governor's statement is quite revealing and forms an important part of the record in the case for Governor Fleming's removal.

In order that the Congress and the Nation may be fully informed of the text of the indicated remarks by Governor Fleming and related correspondence with Secretary Vance, I quote the address and the ensuing exchange of letters:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 14, 1963.

Hon. CYRUS R. VANCE,
Secretary of the Army,
Department of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I desire to call your attention to the speech of Gov. Robert J. Fleming, Jr. of the Canal Zone on the evening of December 10, 1962, at the annual meeting of the Panama Section, American Society of Civil Engineers.

The Governor's address begins with what he called a semiapology. In general effect, this was an apology for what has been most progressive and successful in America and has given our country its place in the world. Furthermore, it gave expression to the Governor's low regard for engineers before a gathering that included Panamanian engineers as well as American, and on the scene of one of the greatest engineering feats in history, which was accomplished only because of the determined efforts of our progressive statesmen and engineers.

Moreover, the address is the most disconcerting statement ever publicly uttered by a Governor of the Canal Zone. Its author appears to have realized its disconcerting flavor and to have reveled in it. Even if he had begun by saying that he was going to speak off the record, in his private capacity modestly laying "claim to some degree of distinction," it would still have been an atrociously bad-mannered and ill-bred utterance.

Though it has many points that could be challenged, a detailed criticism will not be attempted. It is important to note, however, that the address:

(a) Reflects the philosophy of the international socialist elements in, and on the fringes of, our public affairs,

(b) Advocates what amounts to a permanent state of social revolution, which advocacy is certainly not a valid function of the Governor as the chief administrative officer of that part of the soil of the United States through which courses the great interoceanic waterway constructed by our Government.

(c) Belittles the historic slogans of "States rights" and "100 percent Americanism" as mere platitudes, implying that something less than 100 percent Americanism is superior to unconditional loyalty to the national interest, and that, while apparently ready to concede that the sovereignty of the United States over the Canal Zone is heavily encrusted with incumbrances that have grown up over the years, he wishes nothing to stand in the way, at home, of the untrammeled and unconditional exercise by Federal agencies of our Government of powers without regard to constitutional limitations.

(d) Condemns the past in our history without discriminating between that which is great and enduring and that which is ephermeral.

(e) Fails to present the Constitution of the United States in its true light—the great contract under which the three separate and independent agencies of our Government, created pursuant to its terms, were made the means for perpetuating the liberties of our people usurped by officials of the British Central Government and regained through the War of Independence.

(f) Concludes with an illiberal assault upon those who differ with his views as having "small minds" bent on preserving the "status quo" and thus, in effect, as being mental cases or "as dangerous" to our country as foreign enemies.

Because of the speaker's position as the head of the Canal Zone Government and as a member of a task force engaged in important diplomatic discussions with Panamanian officials, many who heard, or read, his condemnation of the "status quo" and "100 percent Americanism," have interpreted his remarks as (1) a deliberate administrative attack against the present diplomatic and juridical foundation of the Panama Canal enterprise and (2) an attempted public intimidation of these standing up for the sovereign rights, power and authority of the United States over it. Thus, the address invites further aggressions from international Socialists and Communists in Panama against the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the United States over the Canal Zone territory.

In these connections, I wish again to state to you, in your capacity as the special representative of the President charged with supervision over the Panama Canal, that the territory known as the Canal Zone is, constitutionally, a domain of the United States, acquired pursuant to law and treaty for canal purposes, and that its banks are parts of the coastline of the United States.

This public statement of the Governor, who, under Federal statute, is bound by oath "to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic," is an invitation to acquiesce in the proposition that "change is inevitable" and "will come faster than" his audience could suppose, and that resistance to change qualifies those who resist as enemies.

As a student of isthmian history and problems over many years, as one who has visited the Canal Zone and Panama repeatedly, and as a member of the subcommittee charged with the formulation of Panama Canal appropriations, I have had unique opportunities to study the broad aspects of the canal question. I know and share the concern of our citizens on the Isthmus, civilian and military, and of informed leaders in the Congress over the security of our sovereign status in the Canal Zone, and do so for the same historical reasons as they.

It is of the highest importance to state that up through the days of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles the policy of the Department of State has publicly emphasized the determination of our Government to maintain our unequivocal and unitary sovereignty over, and throughout, the Canal Zone, and all things situated therein, as well as over all persons permanently or "temporarily existing within it." Thus, the Governor's address, aside from being in extremely bad taste, explicitly violates the past policy of the Executive as well as the will of the sovereign people of our country, which, as shown in other correspondence, has been formally expressed in the Congress.

I wish other information on the following questions:

(a) Was the Governor's address cleared prior to delivery?

(b) If so, by which departments was it cleared and by which officials therein?

(c) Were any committees of the Congress consulted?

(d) If so, which committees?

An early reply to the preceding questions is requested.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., January 31, 1963.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I appreciate your letter concerning the remarks made by the Governor of the Canal Zone to the Panama Section, American Society of Civil Engineers, on December 10, 1962. I am enclosing the complete text of the speech in the event that you may not have had access to it.

At the outset, let me say that I share fully your concern with the protection of the vital interests of the United States in the Canal Zone. I am equally certain that Governor Fleming shares that concern and is devoting himself wholeheartedly to that end.

It seems to me, in opening his remarks, that the Governor intended no derogation of the engineering profession. Rather, he suggested that both the education and the work of the engineer must be informed by a concern with the whole spectrum of human affairs. I am sure that one involved in such a broad range of matters as yourself will agree.

It appears to me that the substantive thrust of Governor Fleming's remarks is that change is symptomatic of human relations and progress. I fail to detect in this a bias toward socialism. Instead, I find an emphasis on idealism as opposed to materialism, on moral force as opposed to physical strength, and on individualism as opposed to collective conformity. These expressions, of course, are consistent with both our history and our present national aims.

I agree that there is room for disagreement with Governor Fleming's comments concerning conservatism, although here I judge that he was concerned with indiscriminate clinging to the status quo rather than with the intelligent conservation of our fundamental values. At any rate, I find no attack on our basic democratic philosophy or governmental structure.

In response to your specific questions, this speech was not cleared in advance nor were any congressional committees consulted.

Let me assure you again that both the Governor and I are determined to protect our country's interests in the Canal Zone and to sustain its essential and honorable position there.

I deeply appreciate your interest and advice in this matter.

Sincerely,

CYRUS R. VANCE,
Secretary of the Army.

REMARKS BY GOV. ROBERT J. FLEMING, JR., AT ANNUAL MEETING OF THE PANAMA SECTION, AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS, IN TIVOLI GUESTHOUSE, C.Z., DECEMBER 10, 1962

Tonight I want to start out with a semiapology to the members of this society who are Panamanians because I am going to talk particularly to my countrymen here. To this extent my remarks will be in the character of a family discussion.

This evening I am going to say again something which I think needs saying again and again and again. I am particularly grateful for the opportunity of making this talk tonight to an engineering society. In the past I could lay claim to some degree of distinction as an engineer myself. I still carry a card in the union and still feel that I am a member in good enough standing to preach a sermon on certain shortcomings of the engineering profession and the individual engineer. These shortcomings arise basically out of an engineer's education and are fortified by his working environment. Engineering education tends to concentrate on material and finite facts. Similarly the engineer's working environment is concerned with material and finite facts, often to the exclusion of any consideration of sociological and human factors. Often this double-barreled preoccupation with the practical makes the engineer a sucker for snow jobs and a gullible recipient of the most distorted opinions and foreboding prophecies of doom. The complex sociological problems of modern life will not be solved or even understood by a man whose main tool is a slide rule. Modern mass communications have given a tremendous speed and worldwide range to ideas—bad as well as good. And the challenge of these ideas will not be met or understood by any man who is conditioned only to look up a formula in a handbook.

This evening I am going to talk about change. I don't mean the kind you jingle in your pocket but the type which the dictionary defines as alteration or difference. Change. The history of man is the story of change; of the struggle between various forces, of physical strength versus moral courage, of the conflict of idealism and materialism—between what people know they should do and what they want to do. In short, man's history is a story of change. Sometimes along the road there have been periods of reaction when through some perversity men have denied progress and have even sought to go backward. Sometimes men have struggled so hard to gain an advantage that they become exhausted and resist further change because they want the time to enjoy their advances. And ever so often, possibly every century or so, the demands for change join one on top of the other until a revolution bursts forth, overwhelming barriers and upsetting standards which men opposed to change had considered sacred.

The peoples of the world, in their long and stormy history since the first two of our ancestors decided to climb down from trees, have experienced many revolutions. Some have been economic, others have been political, others have been social and moral revolutions.

People have seen political revolutions which have changed the form of systems of government. In the late 18th and 19th century the industrial revolution started a complete change in the economic regulation of the world. One hundred to one hundred and fifty years ago we began to substitute machines for muscles. Now we are beginning to substitute machines for the minds of men, thus freeing man's mind for even further assault on his frontiers and introducing even further turmoil and challenge into our economic environment.

In this century the world has been going through turmoil and struggle which has become more costly in terms of human efforts and human lives than any struggle before. We have experienced and are now experiencing one of the great revolutions of world history. It is a revolution in which moral force—call it idealism, call it propaganda or what you will—has now become equally as important as physical forces. In this 20th century of revolution or turmoil, America and her Allies have fought two great wars. Now, in reading history, one occasionally comes across the statement that wars are fought for economic or political reasons only. That may be partly true but I would like to advance the thought that in part America fought those two wars for sociological and humanitarian reasons. We fought them against totalitarian states, we fought them because we were revolted by the idea of a master race of superior beings dictating to other people. We came out of those two wars with the self-determination of peoples, with the good neighbor policy and with an instinctive sympathy for colonies against colonial powers as firmly established features of American foreign policy. In this period of turmoil we have slaughtered many sacred cows of the 19th and early 20th centuries. And we have drastically modified others. In short, America has changed and America has grown up. Many changes have not yet been accomplished. Still others are being bitterly resisted and will, in our great cycle of compromise become modified and accepted in spite of fanatically minded opposition. In this 20th century, America has had world leadership thrust upon it. It has met successfully the challenge of that leadership, and I believe the whole world is fortunate that the ideals of the American dream are leading the social revolution of today. Because to furnish that leadership is America's great opportunity today.

We Americans have lived up to opportunities before and we will in the future, but only as long as we continue to be venturesome, imaginative and bold. Conservatism, conformity and complacency should have no part in either our guide for the present or our approach for the future. As a Nation, we Americans are the product of one of the most progressive periods in the history of the world. We are the products of rebellion. There may be a few here who can trace to the *Mayflower*, or the first families of Virginia, or to the Spanish adventurers, but most of us are products of the great immigrations from the middle of the 19th century on. People—your ancestors and mine—came to America because they rebelled against conditions in the Old World, because they refused to conform to a society which was degrading to the individual and because they had the initiative and the guts to take a chance. The people who made this country were not stodgy; they did not waste their energy trying to turn back the clock. But because of folklores stemming from the era of the rugged individualist and of the pioneer, modern Americans tend to place terrifically overromanticized values on conservative and even reactionary ideas. We make a fetish of the chivalry of the prewar South when, in fact, it was an economic system based on human slavery. We glorify, through our shoot-them-up books and television programs, the fastest gun in the West, usually a hired thug who was an insult to human decency and a roadblock to common justice. Oversimplified slogans like "States rights" and "100 percent Americanism" become platitudes that support, not principles, but vague and cloudy dreams of things that never existed. The good old days ain't what they used to be and they never were. This presents a paradox. Progressive in all of our attitudes, the sentimental attachment to the past sometimes makes us suckers for prophets of doom and for those characters among us who try to cling to the past. We Americans always want to uphold the goodies and always want to chastise the baddies but when some of our self-appointed messiahs try to cast suspicion on things which they cannot understand, or to label as appeasement or surrender anything which conflicts with their own personal interests, then I think it is high time that some of the rest of us get up and say "nuts."

Change is inevitable and it will come a lot faster than any of us here in this room think. My generation has seen the greatest technological advances the world has ever known. This advance has not ended yet. We are on the threshold of even greater breakthroughs. Change is coming in practically every aspect of human existence except in the basic truths and the basic principles of human behavior. You will still have timidity and boldness, fear and bravery, complacency and vision, ability and baseness, charity and selfishness. Human society reflects these human characteristics. The more material that society becomes, the more costly goods it accumulates, the more satisfied and complacent and conservative it becomes and the more it wastes its vital energies in unreasoning and silly resistance to change. America has enemies abroad but equally as dangerous to your America and mine are ourselves. The moment we forget our heritage, the moment we begin to resist change we become dangerous to ourselves. History remembers with awe and affection only the great nonconformists who guided change. It has either forgotten or overwhelmed those small minds whose main aim in life was to preserve the status quo.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., February 19, 1963.
Hon. Cyrus Vance,
Secretary of the Army,
Department of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: Acknowledgment is made of your letter of January 31, 1963, in which you go on record to the effect that the public address by the Governor of the Canal Zone, delivered on December 10, 1962, before the Panama Section, American Society of Civil Engineers, had not been submitted beforehand to his superiors in Washington, in the executive branch, and to the further effect that no committees of the Congress were consulted about the sentiments which this official intended to express on that occasion.

You also state that you find no attack on the basic philosophy or on the governmental structure of the United States in the address in question. Instead, you report that you find emphasis on idealism as opposed to materialism and on individualism as opposed to collective conformity; and you appear confident that your opinion will be accepted that these expressions of the Governor are consistent with both our history and our present national aims.

On February 2, 1960, the House of Representatives, by a vote of 381 to 12, adopted House Concurrent Resolution 459, 86th Congress, which reads:

"That it is the sense of the Congress that any variation in the traditional interpretation of the treaties of 1903, 1936, and 1955 between the United States and the Republic of Panama, with special reference to matters involving the provisions of such treaties concerning territorial sovereignty, shall be made only pursuant to treaty."

On February 9, 1960, the House agreed to the Gross amendment to the Department of Commerce appropriation bill, which, as enacted, reads:

No part of an appropriation contained in title II of this act shall be used to construct a flag pole, platform, or any other device for the purpose of displaying the flag of Panama in the Canal Zone, the sovereign control of which is vested in the U.S. Government by virtue of long standing treaty."

Will you be good enough to inform me whether you consider the above quoted resolution adopted by the House and the Gross amendment enacted in law by the Congress are consistent with both the history and the present national aims of the United States?

Will you also advise me whether the Governor of the Canal Zone or his predecessor were officially informed of the indicated actions by the House and the Congress? Were either invited to comment upon them and, if so, are you prepared to communicate voluntarily to the Congress the texts of both the invitations and the comment they elicited?

Sincerely yours,
Daniel J. Flood,
Member of Congress.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., March 25, 1963.
Hon. Cyrus Vance,
Secretary of the Army,
Department of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: On February 19, 1963, I addressed you in a letter, a copy of which is enclosed, but I have received no reply.

I shall very much appreciate the courtesy of an early reply.

Sincerely yours,
Daniel J. Flood,
Member of Congress.

Department of the Army,
Washington, D.C., March 28, 1963.

Dear Mr. Flood: This is in reply to your letter of February 19, 1963, concerning U.S. policy in the Canal Zone.

I am familiar with House Resolution 459 of the 86th Congress and the Gross amendment to the Department of Commerce appropriation bill in 1960. As you know, it was subsequent to these expressions by the Congress that President Eisenhower directed the Secretary of the Army to arrange to fly the flag of Panama in the Canal Zone. These actions by the President and the Congress were both designed to further the interests of the United States, but represent a difference in viewpoint as to how these ends could best be achieved.

The then Governor of the Canal Zone was informed of House Resolution 459 and the Gross amendment at the time these actions were taken by the Congress. As no change in the interpretation of existing treaties was contemplated, no comment on Resolution 459 was sought or received from the Governor. The Gross amendment, of course, required that the President provide other funds in order that the Panamanian flag could be flown in the Canal Zone, but this was a matter handled in Washington. The Governor was queried only in reference to the estimated costs, and he was later informed of an appropriate allocation of funds from sources outside the Canal Zone budget. No other comment upon the Gross amendment was sought from him.

Sincerely,
Cyrus R. Vance,
Secretary of the Army.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., April 9, 1963.
Hon. Cyrus R. Vance,
Secretary of the Army, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: Your letter of March 28, 1963, relative to the official display of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone as evidence of Panamanian sovereignty makes certain statements that seem to require correction, which I quote:

"As no change in the interpretation of existing treaties was contemplated, no comment on Resolution 459 was sought or received from the Governor. The Gross amendment, of course, required that the President provide other funds in order that the Panamanian flag could be flown in the Canal Zone, but this was a matter handled in Washington."

As regards the above statement, Panama certainly contemplated a change of interpretation of existing treaties. It has claimed sovereignty all over the Canal Zone as the basis for such display, and today its flag is being displayed.

The statement concerning the 1960 Gross amendment is misleading. It was not enacted to require the President to fly the flag through the provision of other funds but to prohibit any formal display of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone. Although the amendment applied only to the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, it clearly established the intent of the Congress as regards the display of the Panama flag and any other interpretation is counter to the overwhelming vote on House Concurrent Resolution 459, 87th Congress.

Sincerely yours,
Daniel J. Flood,
Member of Congress.

PUERTO RICO'S 11TH CONSTITUTION DAY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the 11th anniversary of Puerto Rico's Constitution. For more than a decade that document has symbolized a relationship certainly unprecedented in American history and probably unique in the history of the world. Freely entered into by the people of Puerto Rico and ourselves, it is a relationship compounded of political wisdom and responsibility. We have every reason to be proud of our conduct in this matter and of the remarkable progress made by Puerto Rico under the present arrangement.

At the same time, we ought never to forget that precisely because United States-Puerto Rican ties are unique they are also experimental. Our relationship was designed to meet the circumstances it was possible to foresee at the time of that Constitution's construction.

Today Puerto Rico is fermenting with new ideas and new vision. It is our duty to respond to those new ideas with the same kind of wisdom we displayed 11 years ago. This should be a year of reevaluation and reappraisal. Unfortunately, the significance of our bond with Puerto Rico is too little understood in this country.

The 25th of July represents a dual anniversary for Puerto Ricans: The date the Commonwealth Constitution was proclaimed in 1952, and the date American troops landed on the island in 1898. Our military governed Puerto Rico during the next 2 years. In 1900 the Foraker Act established a civil government, but only in the lower house of the legislature were the islanders given a political voice. The President appointed the Governor and his Cabinet, the upper house, and the justices of the island's highest court. In its economic aspects the Foraker Act was more imaginative and liberal. Puerto Ricans were excused from paying Federal income taxes; excises collected in the United States on Puerto Rican goods were returned to the island's treasury; and a temporary tariff on shipments of goods between the island and the mainland was imposed for the benefit of Puerto Rican finances.

The Jones Act, which took effect in 1917, granted U.S. citizenship to the islanders and empowered them to elect both houses of their legislature. All other vital positions, however, continued to be appointed by the President, and it was not until 1946 that a native Puerto Rican, Jésus T. Piñero, was named Governor.

The economic situation in Puerto Rico in the years following World War I was desperate. A Brookings Institution study in 1929 reported that the average weekly wage of a Puerto Rican working-class family was 85 cents per person, or 12 cents a day. A later survey found that 94 percent of these weekly earnings had to be spent on food, mostly polished rice. Puerto Rico came to exhibit all the economic ills of a country in the grip of a one-crop economy.

By 1930—

Wrote Earl Parker Hanson—

> the island's social, economic and political system was geared almost exclusively to sugar * * * nearly all existing industries served sugar; business depended largely on sugar for its well-being; politics was dominated almost completely by the absentee-controlled sugar industry.

The Foraker Act had provided that no corporation or person could own or lease more than 500 acres, but this provision was simply not enforced. Until the reforms of the forties, four sugar companies, owned largely by mainland citizens and corporations, controlled about 20 percent of all suitable farmland.

Rexford Guy Tugwell was appointed Governor of the island in 1941. During his tenure, which lasted until 1946, much was done to reform the economy. Land reform, in particular, was vigorously pursued. Tugwell was succeeded by Piñero. In 1947, after the Jones Act had been amended to give Puerto Ricans the right to elect their own Governor and to permit him to name his own cabinet, the island chose Luis Muñoz-Marín to fill the office.

Muñoz-Marín has been the towering political figure in Puerto Rico since 1940 when his Popular Democratic Party first won both houses of the legislature. An early independence zealot, he had in the late thirties come to believe that domestic economic reform was Puerto Rico's prime need and that this could best be furthered in close association with the United States. And where Muñoz-Marín led, Puerto Ricans followed.

In 1950 our distinguished colleague, Antonio Fernós-Isern, then as now the island's Resident Commissioner in the House of Representatives, introduced a bill to permit Puerto Ricans to write their own constitution under a compact with the United States. The bill passed as Public Law 600, and on June 4, 1951, the people of Puerto Rico, in referendum, voted approval by a large majority.

Under the chairmanship of Dr. Fernós Isern, a constitutional convention elected by the people of Puerto Rico proceeded to devise a model constitution. After acceptance by the Puerto Rican people, Congress gave its assent, with some amendments, and President Truman signed the measure on July 3, 1952. Eight days later the constitutional convention accepted the amendments and on July 25, 1952, Governor Muñoz-Marín formally proclaimed the birth of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The constitution of the Commonwealth provides for a republican form of government with executive, legislative, and judicial branches. Its human rights provisions are more advanced than those of our own supreme law. They include a more specific guarantee of freedom of the press. The constitution prohibits discrimination on account of race, color, sex, birth, social origin or condition, and political or religious ideas. It also recognizes the right of labor to organize, to bargain collectively, to strike and to picket according to procedures established by law.

The preamble of the Puerto Rican Constitution contains a brilliant summary of the aspirations of the Puerto Rican people:

> We consider as determining factors in our life our citizenship of the United States of America and our aspiration continually to enrich our democratic heritage in the individual and collective enjoyment of its rights and privileges; our loyalty to the principles of the Federal Constitution; the coexistence in Puerto Rico of the two great cultures of the American Hemisphere; our fervor for education; nor faith in justice; our devotion to the courageous, industrious, and peaceful way of life; our fidelity to the individual human values above and beyond social position, racial differences, and economic interests; and our hope for a better world based on these principles.

It is difficult to define the precise political status of Puerto Rico. It is not a dominion in the British sense, nor a commonwealth as the Philippines were. It is not a State of the Union, although it enjoys many of the powers of a State. It is not an independent nation, but neither is it an incorporated territory of the United States. Perhaps the Puerto Rican phrase is most apt—"Associated Free State."

In their local affairs Puerto Ricans are just about as autonomous as the citizens of any State of the Union. They elect their own officials and pass their own laws. Their constitution is rooted in American political philosophy and based upon American forms and practice. Puerto Ricans are citizens of the United States and may travel freely into and out of the mainland. They are subject to the draft; about 65,000 of them, mostly volunteers, served in our Armed Forces during World War II, and more than 43,000 took part in the Korean war.

The citizenship status of Puerto Rican residents is limited in three major respects: They are not subject to Federal taxation; they do not vote for President and Vice President of the United States; and their representative in Congress may not vote.

The defense and foreign relations of Puerto Rico, as of the States, are in the hands of the Federal Government. The same services supplied to States by Federal agencies are generally extended to the island. There are no tariff or trade barriers between it and the mainland. Puerto Rico is also the beneficiary of many of the same grants-in-aid offered to States. Puerto Ricans use the Supreme Court as their final court of appeals.

Like the States, Puerto Rico sets, collects, and keeps its own taxes. In addition, however, all excise taxes collected in the United States on Puerto Rican rum are returned to the island. Custom duties collected in its ports on goods from countries other than the United States are retained by the Puerto Rican Treasury.

In a world of new countries deeply suspicious of Western imperialism and colonialism, our relationship with Puerto Rico stands out as a beacon of enlightenment. The story is told that David Ben-Gurion, former Prime Minister of Israel, once asked the Puerto Rican Secretary of State just what the United States got out of this unusual arrangement.

"Not as much as the people of Puerto Rico," replied the secretary.

"Then the Commonwealth is truly a tribute to the political system of the United States," said Ben-Gurion.

Thousands of others have come from foreign lands to study this phenomenon. They have come from India, Ghana, Thailand, Morocco, and numerous other underdeveloped countries to examine not only the island's political evolution but its amazing economic and social development as well. They have come to learn how a land once poverty stricken has lifted its standard of living.

This impressive development has come about under a program of self-help called "Operation Bootstrap." One of the major goals of this program is to build an economy based on diversified manufacturing industries. To develop and attract such industry, the Puerto Rican Government has built factories, advertised the island's Federal income tax freedom, and awarded 10-year tax exemptions. At the same time, and with considerable good sense, it has discouraged U.S. companies wanting to replace a mainland establishment with a Puerto Rican one.

Some 800 new factories are now in operation as a result of Puerto Rico's industrial development program, directly creating 54,000 new jobs, plus another 60,000 indirectly in services and trade. The gross national product has risen from $287 million in 1940 to almost $1.8 billion in 1961. Puerto Rico's income from manufacturing in 1940 was $26 million; in 1962 it was $384 million.

Other statistics illustrate even more sharply the enormous economic and social gains of recent years. Per capita income has more than quadrupled in the last 20 years; Puerto Rico now ranks highest in the Caribbean area and second in all of Latin America only to oil-rich Venezuela. Family income has soared from $660 million in 1940 to more than $3 billion in 1961.

During the same period, the infant mortality rate decreased 63.2 percent, the death rate dropped 63 percent, and life expectancy rose 51.2 percent. When Puerto Rico first came under U.S. control, 80 percent of the island's population was illiterate. In 1960 the figure was 17 percent.

These accomplishments have been achieved despite great barriers. Puerto Rico works with a population pressure that is almost unbearably intense. If every human being on earth, except those in India and Pakistan, were suddenly to move to the United States, only then would our population density match the ratio of 650 persons per square mile that exists today in Puerto Rico. In addition, the island is almost devoid of useful minerals. In the light of its past history and its meager resources, Puerto Rico's achievements are truly heroic.

Much, however, remains to be done. The population continues to rise at an alarming rate. Unemployment remains high and the growing mechanization of agriculture, which is still the largest source of employment, has cut the number of available jobs by 34 percent during the past two decades. Meanwhile, much of the newly acquired industry is approaching the end of its taxless period, and some may leave the island when these benefits end.

Puerto Rico's future political status also presents problems. There is no question that the island has made good use of the present compact. But it has become increasingly apparent that Puerto Rican leaders desire at least a modification of the present arrangement.

Three points of view have been expressed. One, espoused by the Statehood Republican Party, wants Puerto Rico to become the 51st State of the Union.

A second group desires complete Puerto Rican independence. If election returns are any guide, only some 3 percent of the island's residents favor this course.

The Commonwealth supporters led by Governor Muñoz-Marín, have won substantial majorities in every election since World War II. They point out the financial burdens of statehood. They hope Congress will agree, in the Governor's words, "To perfect the Commonwealth within its association with the United States."

In a letter to President Kennedy Muñoz-Marín explained what he believes should be the guidelines for any new arrangement.

First. The indispensable principle of the Commonwealth is self-government for Puerto Rico in permanent association with the United States on the basis of common loyalty, common citizenship, mutual dedication to democracy, and mutual commitment to freedom.

Second. The moral and juridical basis of the Commonwealth should be further clarified so as to eliminate any possible basis for the accusation, which is made by enemies and misguided friends of the United States and Puerto Rico, that the Commonwealth was not the free choice of the people of Puerto Rico acting in their sovereign capacity, but was merely a different kind of colonial arrangement to which they consented.

Third. The governmental power and authority of the Commonwealth should be complete, and any reservations or exceptions which are not an indispensable part of the arrangements for permanent association with the United States should be eliminated. Methods should be devised for forms of participation, appropriate to the Commonwealth concept, by the people of Puerto Rico in Federal functions that affect them.

On December 3, 1962, Puerto Rico's Legislative Assembly approved a joint resolution asking Congress to implement these goals. More concretely, the resolution proposes that Puerto Ricans be permitted to vote in national elections and that the Resident Commissioner be given a vote in the House of Representatives. It suggests that a formula be devised whereby Puerto Rican residents might contribute to the U.S. Treasury. Congress is urged to agree to a permanent status for the island. Finally, it proposes that the Puerto Rican people choose in a free plebiscite among statehood, independence, and commonwealth status.

President Kennedy has, I believe, echoed the sentiments of the American people by declaring himself "in full sympathy" with whatever course Puerto Rico may choose to take. To further this democratic process, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 6076, which provides that a commission be established to draft a compact of permanent union between Puerto Rico and the United States based upon the principles expressed in the Puerto Rican joint resolution. In addition, my bill calls for submission of such a compact, after Congress has approved, to the people of Puerto Rico in a referendum, with provision made for the free expression of the will of the people of Puerto Rico. In this plebiscite the people will decide between the perfected commonwealth status, independence, or statehood.

Mr. Speaker, the record of the past few decades assures us that the people of Puerto Rico will face the future with dignity, courage, and wisdom. It is my hope that in this eleventh year of the Commonwealth, Congress will not only congratulate the people of Puerto Rico but also provide the means for them to make the ultimate determination as to their future political status. In this way Congress will make clear its commitment to self-determination for our fellow citizens of Puerto Rico.

THE IDAHO POWER SITUATION AND SECRETARY UDALL'S EXECUTIVE ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HARDING] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, on July 8 the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] inserted in the RECORD a speech which he entitled "Udall Ukase and Addled Economics."

This speech was very critical of the newsletter of one of Idaho's greatest Senators of all time, my able colleague and good friend, the distinguished public servant and senior Senator from Idaho.

The speech was also extremely critical of a former Member of this House who is now serving with distinction as the Secretary of Interior. The gentleman's speech criticizes the Secretary of Interior for including southern Idaho in the Bonneville Power Administration marketing area. He is critical of the newsletter of the senior Senator from Idaho because it is laudatory of Secretary Udall's decision and points out the many benefits that the people of Idaho are going to receive as a result of the Secretary's action.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman states that he called the action of the Secretary ukase because a ukase was an official decree of the czar, having the force of law. Throughout this article, and in a series of articles currently being inserted in the daily RECORD by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, he is attempting to give my colleagues in the Congress the impression that the people of Idaho do not approve of the executive order of Secretary Udall which included southern Idaho in the BPA marketing area. This is simply not true. However, the thing that I object to most about this current series of articles by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is the title which he is giving them: "Southern Idaho's New Slogan: Bonneville—Please Include Us Out."

Mr. Speaker, the State of Idaho has in Washington in the Congress of the United States two Senators and two Congressmen. I feel that any one of the four is capable of determining new slogans for southern Idaho without the help of our good friend and able colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDING. I would be most happy to yield for a question only.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman seems to be questioning the veracity of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]. Did the gentleman notify him that he was making this speech this afternoon?

Mr. HARDING. I would like to point out to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] that I am not questioning the veracity of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. However, I am questioning his presentation of his own views as those of southern Idaho. I attempted to notify him and I did notify his office that I intended to mention his name.

We have just had a rollcall, and I looked for him on the floor of the House during the rollcall and since that time to notify him personally.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HARDING. I would like to suggest that if the gentleman from Pennsylvania continues with this series of articles that he use some other entitlement, possibly "A Congressman from Pennsylvania Opposes BPA on the Basis of Information Furnished by the Idaho Power Co." or whatever title he may select of this nature. However, I question the propriety of his attempt to speak for southern Idaho when we have two elected U.S. Senators and two elected U.S. Congressmen whom the people have authorized to be their spokesman.

As I said earlier, throughout this series of speeches our good friend from Pennsylvania is implying that the people of

Idaho did not approve of the action of the Secretary of the Interior. Throughout the last campaign the inclusion of southern Idaho in the BPA marketing area was a major issue. On May 3, Senator Church, my then colleague, Congresswoman Gracie Pfost, and myself met with Secretary Udall and requested him to make a study of the feasibility of including southern Idaho in the BPA marketing area. This was reported as follows in the Pocatello (Idaho) State Journal:

Idaho Democrats Propose Bonneville Power Be Brought Into Idaho

Washington.—Senator Frank Church and Representatives Gracie Pfost and Ralph Harding have asked the Interior Department to extend the direct marketing idea of the Bonneville Power Administration to all of Idaho.

The three Democratic members of the Idaho congressional delegation made their request in a letter to Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall.

They asked that retail sale of Bonneville power be permitted throughout the Gem State. It is only available now to special preference customers in northern Idaho, they said.

They said their request was made necessary by two developments.

The first is the blocking of legislation to authorize the Burns Creek Dam by the combined efforts of the Utah Power & Light Co., the Idaho Power Co. and their nationwide allies in the private utility lobby. This means that the REA co-ops and municipalities which purchase and distribute public power in southern Idaho will soon be starved for lack of available electricity at rates their customers can afford.

The second new development is the large general increase in rates which the Idaho Power Co. is now seeking. Unless southern Idaho is given access to low-cost BPA power, the granting of these increases will impede the growth of Idaho's phosphate processing industry, severely limit our possibilities for attracting new industry and bind much of Idaho in an even tighter economic straitjacket.

"The extension of the BPA marketing area to the rest of Idaho would offer to us great advantages to which we have long been entitled," they wrote.

Like the other States of the Pacific Northwest, Idaho has no coal to enable it to compete for industrial development. In Oregon and Washington, where abundant, low-cost hydropower has served as a compensating inducement to attract new industry, both population growth and per capita income have surpassed our own.

And these successes in the areas served by the BPA were accomplished, it should be noted, without injury to the private utility companies operating in those States. On the contrary, the private utilities have prospered and expanded with the growth of population and industry in the areas they serve.

When you consider that southern Idaho is a part of the Columbia River Basin—we furnish 25 percent of the water that goes down to turn the generators in Oregon and Washington—we are entitled to participate as full partners in the Columbia River Basin and in the Bonneville power marketing area.

After a very extended study of more than 1 year, Secretary Udall took the action in signing the executive order to include us in this area. As for the approval of the people of southern Idaho, this was a lively campaign issue, and I would like to read some newspaper clippings that indicates our stand on this issue in the last campaign.

I have here from the Idaho Daily Statesman of May 13, 1962, a report of a speech I made giving the reasoning for wanting to include southern Idaho in the Bonneville area:

Harding Gives Reasoning for BPA Power in Idaho

Pocatello.—Representative Ralph Harding said here Saturday morning that including Idaho in the Bonneville Power Administration marketing area would "let Idaho have its rightful share of the low-cost power generated by water originating in Idaho."

Harding arrived from Washington by plane Saturday morning to address a Democratic breakfast.

He explained the request that he, Senator Frank Church, and Representative Gracie Pfost made to have Idaho included in the BPA marketing area.

Harding said those who are fighting the admission of Idaho to the marketing area "under the guise that it is socialistic simply do not understand the facts.

"The Bonneville Power Administration sells not only to REA's and municipalities, but also to private power companies, such as Idaho Power and Utah Power & Light, and to large industrial users," Harding said.

He said the power "generated by water originating in Idaho will be distributed by our cities, REA's and private power companies with all Idahoans benefiting from low-cost power."

He described as "pure political folly" statements that the emergence of Bonneville Power in Idaho would hinder the tax base of local and State governments.

"One only has to visit our neighboring States in the Northwest and go through the aluminum plants which are there solely because of the availability of BPA power to realize the new industries and the new jobs which will be available in Idaho with lower power rates.

"Such power in our State would make a vital contribution to the potential growth of manufacturing industries in Idaho. We have barely scratched the surface in processing our huge deposit of phosphate, as well as agricultural products, because our power rates have been prohibitive," Harding said.

Harding attended a Democratic dinner at Gooding, Saturday night. Also the dedication of the Gooding post office earlier in the day.

Today, Harding will return to Malad High School, from which he was graduated, to give the baccalaureate address. He will return to Washington Sunday night.

A little later during the campaign, on July 20, 1962, I have a report from the same paper of a speech made by the senior Senator from Idaho, Senator Church on BPA:

Extension of BPA Market Said Aid to Power Firms in Statement by Church

Washington.—Extension of the Bonneville Power Administration marketing area to southern Idaho would increase the earning potential of private power companies, Senator Frank Church, Democrat, of Idaho, said Thursday.

"The history of private companies in the existing BPA marketing area proves that such private utilities flourish, and that the BPA is not a threat to their existence, but a stimulant to their growth and profits," Church said.

"Availability of low-cost power for wholesale customers in Idaho will attract new industry and new population, as it has in Oregon, Washington, and western Montana."

Church cited data compiled by the Interior Department to show that private utility companies in the BPA marketing area have enjoyed a continual increase in operating revenues since 1938, when power first became available from Bonneville Dam.

He said the Portland General Electric Co., and the Pacific Power & Light Co., both showed tremendous increases in net incomes between 1940 and 1960.

"Both Oregon private utilities are selling power for residential service today substantially below the rate level of 1938," he said. "In contrast, the Idaho Power Co.'s residential rate for 500 kilowatt-hours per month is today higher than it was in 1938. Moreover, the commercial and industrial rates for Idaho Power Co. have not declined to the level of the Oregon utilities."

Church said that based on the yardstick of what has happened in other areas where BPA power is available, private utility rates tend to shift to a low profit margin and high sales volume principle, with net profits going up.

"This would mean," Church said, "that if we can extend the BPA marketing area to southern Idaho, all the people of the region will eventually have lower rates, new industry will be attracted, and tax receipts to the Federal, State, and local treasuries will be increased.

Church said the Idaho Power Co. earned $1.5 million in net income in 1940, and that this had increased to $8.8 million in 1960. During the same period, he said, net income of the Pacific Power & Light Co. went from $2.7 to $16.7 million, and net income of the Portland General Eletcric, from $1.3 to $7.5 million.

A typical net monthly bill for residential service (500 kilowatt-hours) cost a Portland General Electric subscriber $8.07 in 1938, but only $6.40 by 1961. The Pacific Power & Light subscriber, Church said, paid $10.24 in 1938, and $8.57 in 1961. The Idaho Power Co. Boise subscriber paid $8.60 in 1938 and $8.80 by 1961.

Church said that in southern Idaho a Federal power supply has been available on a limited basis for more than 50 years from the Bureau of Reclamation, and has been widely used by cooperatives in rural areas which private companies did not find it economical to serve.

"However, this Bureau of Reclamation power has not been in adequate quantity or at a sufficiently low cost to attract large power-using industries such as those which have been established in Oregon, Washington, and western Montana. For this reason, it is in Idaho's interest to determine the feasibility of extending the BPA marketing area to the whole of our State, the Senator said.

Then on October 10, 1962, there is a report from the Blackfoot News of the endorsement of BPA for southern Idaho by my able colleague who is so ably representing the people of the First District of Idaho in the Congress, Congressman White:

Compton White Endorses BPA

Nampa, Idaho.—Compton I. White, of Clark Fork, Democratic nominee for Congress in the First District, Tuesday, urged inclusion of southern Idaho in the Bonneville Power Administration marketing area.

"Idaho has every right by geography and simple equity to its just share in the economic stimulus of low-cost Bonneville power," said White in a statement.

Then again on October 11 we have another statement reported in the Blackfoot Daily News, in which a then Member of the House and a candidate for the U.S. Senate, Gracie Pfost, made a statement supporting BPA for southern Idaho:

BONNEVILLE POWER GOOD FOR IDAHO, SAYS MRS. PFOST

WASHINGTON.—Representative Gracie Pfost, Democrat, of Idaho, spoke out in favor of Bonneville Power for southern Idaho on the House floor Wednesday, saying it would provide beneficial competition to private utilities.

"Just look at what's happened to the private utilities in Washington and Oregon who face Bonneville's Federal power competition," she said. "Their rates are down and their sales and profits and stock market values are up.

"They have learned how to make more money by selling more power at less cost. None of them is applying for a 13½-percent rate increase.

"They are selling residential power for less today than they did in 1938. Idaho Power is not. But their profits are just as big as Idaho Power's. They have gained and their customers have gained.

Mrs. Pfost said she believes there is a place for both private power and public power in southern Idaho and predicted lower power rates would result from extension of Bonneville Power and would accelerate the State's industrial growth.

"If we can lower our power rates, we can create more business opportunity and more jobs for Idaho people," said Mrs. Pfost. "The Idaho Power Co., too, can profit and prosper in a healthy, vigorous, and growing Idaho economy."

I might further point out, Mr. Speaker, that the Young Democrats at Idaho State College joined in this controversy and adopted a resolution supporting BPA as reported here:

YOUNG DEMOCRAT AT ISC JOINS IN BPA CONTROVERSY

POCATELLO.—The president of the Idaho State College Young Democrats said Saturday that a Republican attack on the Bonneville Power Administration is "typical of statements made by people who know little about the facts."

Lee Schlender, president of the Idaho State College Young Democrats, was answering an attack on the BPA by James Annest, Burley, Republican candidate for Congress from the second district.

Annest had attacked a proposal by Senator Frank Church and Representatives Gracie Pfost and Ralph Harding that Idaho be included in the marketing area of the BPA.

"Bonneville Power Administration last year lost $13 million and now Mr. CHURCH and his cohorts are proposing that Idaho taxpayers underwrite an even greater loss," Annest said.

Schlender said Saturday that "it would help if Mr. Annest knew something of the conditions under which Bonneville power operates before he makes statements such as the one he made.

"The fact of the matter is that the reason Bonneville Power Administration is losing money is because of the excess capacity. There are facilities now present at Bonneville Power Administration dams for producing far more power than there is presently needed.

"We in Idaho are interested in obtaining some of this excess capacity power. By our entering the Bonneville market we will help to lessen the deficit now being incurred by the BPA.

"Therefore, it is evident that the entire question of the Bonneville Power Administration is one of whether or not we are going to enjoy these benefits and help in reducing the present deficit," Schlender said.

Again, the platform of the great Democratic Party of the State of Idaho included a plank urging the inclusion of southern Idaho in the BPA marketing area.

The Democratic Party and its congressional candidates in Idaho were on record as favoring extension of the BPA marketing area to include all of our great State.

I would like to point out that during the campaign I visited with a very attractive young housewife at a community meeting in eastern Idaho and she said she would like to vote for me but she could not because her husband was employed by the Utah Power & Light Co. This company had made it plain to all of its employees that if Gracie Pfost, Frank Church, Compton White, and Ralph Harding were elected, it was going to mean Bonneville Power Administration would be coming into southern Idaho and she said if that happened, her husband was going to lose his job.

FRANK CHURCH, COMPTON WHITE, and RALPH HARDING were elected and Bonneville power has come into southern Idaho. Her husband is still on the job and, as I pointed out in a speech in this House on June 10, he will still be on the job for many years to come because the inclusion of southern Idaho in the Bonneville power-marketing area is going to work to the advantage of not only the people of Idaho but also the power companies that are now so vigorously opposing this inclusion.

I might further point out that on April 21 an Assistant Secretary of the Interior was in Boise, Idaho. He met with Democratic leaders of the Idaho Legislature who furnished him with a petition signed by 49 members of the Idaho Legislature to be forwarded to Secretary Udall urging the Secretary to include southern Idaho in the Bonneville Power Administration's marketing area. I would like to read an account of this event from the Idaho Daily Statesman of that date.

BPA EXTENSION SOUGHT IN DEMOCRATS' PETITION

A petition signed by 49 Democratic members of the Idaho Legislature urging extension of the sale of Bonneville Power Administration electricity to southern Idaho was handed to Assistant Secretary of the Interior John A. Carver, Jr., Wednesday.

The petition urges the Secretary of the Interior to take steps to implement this petition at the earliest practical date.

Carver, here on his way to a timber conference in Portland, Oreg., was handed the petition by Representative Darrell Manning, Democrat, of Bannock.

The Assistant Secretary said that he understands a preliminary outline of a feasibility study on the proposal generally indicates that it is feasible. He said the matter is in the review stage by Department officials.

Democratic members of the Idaho congressional delegation proposed the extension of Bonneville power to southern Idaho for irrigation and industrial use last Summer.

The petition refers to a rate increase granted the Idaho Power Co., saying it will "tend to discourage consumption of electricity and exchange and industry."

The petition declares that Bonneville rates are substantially lower than those of the Bureau of Reclamation, which provides power for irrigation pumping, and says they are less than half of Idaho Power's rates.

It says that Bonneville rates would make it possible for Idaho's phosphorus industry to quadruple by 1980, with an increase of 3,000 jobs in the industry and 6,000 in supporting and service industries.

It estimates that one-half million acres of new land can be brought under irrigation in the next 20 years, mostly by means of ground water. It says BPA could assure ample pumping power at low rates.

I could go on and give other instances of the people of Idaho asking the Secretary to include southern Idaho into the Bonneville Power Administration's marketing area. However, I do not feel that this is necessary, as this decision was based on the facts revealed by the study as well as on the requests of Idahoans. President Harry Truman pointed out on May 26, 1952, in a speech that:

> There is a terrible barrage of propaganda going around these days on behalf of the poor private power producers. * * *
>
> The power companies are spending millions and millions of dollars on their propaganda program * * * and they are running what I call a vicious campaign. * * * This propaganda campaign is based on the old theory of scaring the people, of trying to frighten and confuse them instead of arguing on the basis of facts. They set out to play upon the emotions of church-goers, Boy Scouts and schoolchildren. They try to control the people's thoughts by using slogans and scare words, taking a leaf out of the book of Karl Marx and Adolf Hitler.

I would like to say that this deplorable power company propaganda that President Truman exposed in 1952 has been very evident in Idaho since the action of Secretary Udall in including southern Idaho in the BPA marketing area.

The two private power companies serving southern Idaho immediately launched into the type of propaganda campaign that President Truman deplored. They were spending thousands and thousands of dollars to put forth a barrage of newspaper advertisments containing distortions, half-truths, exaggerations and outright falsehoods, and telling what a flop the Bonneville Power Administration had been in Washington, Oregon, and western Montana.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDING. I will be happy to yield to my able and distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman mentioned Oregon and Washington I cannot help but stand up and pay a little tribute to the Bonneville Power Administration's work in my own State of Washington, as well as in our closest neighbor State, Oregon. A year ago in August I had the privilege of attending an event at Portland, Oreg., honoring Bonneville's 25 years of service to the region. It was interesting to me to see there the members of industry, labor, agriculture, transportation, all gathered for the single purpose of paying tribute to the successful operation of the Bonneville Power Administration during the past 25 years and also for the purpose of paying tribute to the manner in which it conducted its affairs and for the service it had given to the States and to the area.

Interestingly enough they added a particular tribute to its able and young manager and Administrator, Charles Luce, of my own native State.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to quote from President Kennedy's message of August 20, 1962, on the occasion of that 25th anniversary:

> When you help build a region, you help build your Nation. This is the real significance of Bonneville Power Administration's first 25 years.

Then he goes on and points out:

> Other regions also have benefited. The economic growth of the Pacific Northwest has created a bigger market for Detroit cars and Pittsburgh steel and Boston shoes and Atlanta textiles. The list is almost without end, and proves again that the economic vitality of one region affects the economic vitality of all other regions.
>
> Twice in Bonneville's relatively short lifespan our Nation has been required to fight wars to preserve freedom. On each occasion, Bonneville's great hydro and transmission resources played an important role in victory.

Mr. Speaker, with that I would like to conclude and say again that Bonneville has genuinely contributed not only to the Northwest but to the entire economic health of our Nation.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington. I want to say that we in southern Idaho are happy to be a part of the Bonneville Power marketing area. I feel just as the gentlewoman does about the good work that is being done by BPA in the Northwest.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDING. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, from time to time individuals from regions other than the Pacific Northwest, either from ignorance or misunderstanding, criticize the Bonneville Power Administration. Those of us who live in the Northwest and who have seen the differences that have come from the development of the Columbia River Basin, know what a vital benefit BPA has been.

Oldtimers in Oregon can still remember the power trust scandals of the pre-Bonneville days when the cost of electricity was so high that no one had more than a few droplights in their home and there were no stoves, no electrical irons, few washing machines, and virtually no farm electricity. They also recall the tremendous opposition from private industry to the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams, and saw the Oxbow damsite sit idle in the hands of private capital for nearly 50 years before the possibility of a high Hells Canyon dam jarred private utilities into action.

Today no other river system in the world exceeds the hydroelectric development of the U.S. Columbia River power system. We are now nearing the end of the 26th year of Bonneville operation and we can look back with real pride over the magnificent accomplishments which it has achieved on behalf of the Northwest and the country. We must also look back with some sorrow at opportunities that have been lost due to the lack of vision in Government leaders at various times, and from this take warning that men today lacking in vision will also try to hinder the full development of Bonneville's capacity. A case in point is the proposed extra-high-voltage intertie for which we are seeking appropriations this year. While I do not intend to discuss the merits of this intertie today, I am sure that the principal reason for much of the recent campaign against BPA is to prevent that line from being built by the Government on behalf of the people.

While Bonneville at the outset had to face opposition of many people even within the Northwest, today there is support for its programs from every segment of the economy. This is so because Bonneville has been administered in such a way as to provide benefits for all, for the homeowners, for the small businessman, for the private utilities, and for great industries. Twenty-five years ago the Pacific Northwest was almost entirely dependent on farming, lumber, mining, and fishing, and except for mills and a few fishing canneries there was little industry. Today electricity is used to provide the power so vital to modern industry, and BPA's 14 electro-process customers alone represent a gross investment of nearly $400 million. These plants account for close to one-third of the Nation's aluminum ingot production, as well as substantial production of several other minerals and chemicals, and also for a great pulp, paper, and plywood industry. The three major aluminum companies alone, in 1961 produced one-half million tons of primary aluminum, had an annual payroll of $51 million, spent $24 million on transportation, $22 million on materials, supplies, and services, and paid over $5 million in State and local taxes. This money could not have been spent were it not for development of the Columbia under BPA, and the U.S. Bureau of Mines estimates that within the next three decades primary aluminum production will be four times the 1961 figures.

Before Bonneville came along to provide a great reservoir of low-cost power, the lumber industry in the Northwest was greatly limited in any efforts at refined processing. Today's electrified sawmills, paper and plywood plants together with wood fabrication of all kinds provide employment for two out of every five workers gainfully employed in manufacture in the Pacific Northwest.

During the last 20 years the quick-frozen food industry has enjoyed amazing expansion due largely to the availability of abundant low-cost power. Most spectacular has been the great growth of frozen cooked potato products which in 1959 represented 76 percent of the total U.S. pack. Today, the Northwest accounts for one-half of the berries, one-third of the vegetables, and one-fourth of the frozen fruit packed in the entire United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Northwest is not blessed with great reserves of coal or oil which can be used to fuel furnaces or to provide energy for home and industry. The only great power resource that the Pacific Northwest has is water. As this water falls in the great mountains of the Rockies and the Cascades and runs down creeks into rivers and finally empties in the Pacific Ocean at the mouth of the Columbia River, tremendous power is spent, which for hundreds of years was completely wasted. Not until Franklin Roosevelt and Harold Ickes had vision to see what could be done with the Columbia River and its power resources was there any great move toward developing the hydroelectric capacity of the region. Mr. Speaker, every time a new step has been proposed in developing the power resources of the Columbia Basin, private interests opposing low-cost power have said that we were just going to have a surplus, that there was not anybody to use it. These men failed to recognize that when you develop power sources, users will come. This is exactly what has taken place in the Northwest.

Demands on power in the Northwest continue to grow. Bonneville during the past decade has supplied more electric energy to the region than all other utilities combined. The Columbia River delivers more water than any other U.S. river except the Mississippi, and there are yet many areas in the Columbia Basin waiting to be developed. At every dam water is lost over the spillway, wasted instead of being funneled through turbines, because the river has not been fully controlled. Upstream storage is vitally needed, not just for the power there, but for the power that will be developed downstream.

Thus there is still much to be done, but in closing Mr. Speaker, I ask those who criticize the BPA to come to Oregon and see. Come and see whole towns which had scarcely any electricity 25 years ago, as brightly lighted as downtown Washington. Come and see industry which 25 years ago would have been thought out of the question in an area where there was no coal or oil. Come and see a population far greater than the population which could ever have been supported in the Northwest 25 years ago, people who not only supply benefits to themselves but consume automobiles from Detroit, and textiles from the southeast, and manufactured goods from New England. Come to Oregon and ask the farmers or the small businessman or the great industrial leaders what abundant, low-cost power has meant. The critic will discover that Bonneville is not a political issue. It does not divide men along party lines because we all know it has helped create a great economy, and is the cornerstone of the future for an area rich in potential and vital to America—the great Pacific Northwest.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HARDING. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman for a very fine presentation which he is making this afternoon and for bringing to the attention of the House the best available evidence which we could ask as to the attitude of the people of Idaho on this subject that admittedly has been a subject of some controversy. Personally I do not pretend to be an expert on what Idaho needs or what Idaho wants. I would not expect any better authorities on that subject to be cited to the House than those provided by the men elected by the people of Idaho to speak for that State. On that score the gentleman who is in the well of the House has certainly proven himself to be an articulate, able, and courageous fighter for the causes in which his State is interested; and I would like to commend him for the presentation he is making here this afternoon.

I might state further, without getting into the question at all of what Idaho wants, that I join him in deploring the attack which has been made upon the distinguished Secretary of the Interior, an able and very accomplished former Member of this body. I think anybody who accuses our present Secretary of the Interior of being a czar and a dictator, who does not consult with the people, simply is not acquainted with his record and with his manner of doing business. I have had the pleasure, while a member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of working with and observing in action three different gentlemen who served as Secretary of the Interior. I think all of them have been fine gentlemen, courteous gentlemen, and I have no quarrel with any of them. But my own judgment is that the Secretary of the Interior who has been most responsive to public opinion on issues that affect national policy has been the gentleman who presently occupies that position in the Cabinet of President Kennedy. I think that he has shown in the conduct of his office that he believes in going to the people and consulting them on questions; that he believes in going to their Representatives in the Congress of the United States and consulting fully with them. And I believe that when he has reached his judgment, based on that consultation, on the evidence, he has been frank and bold and courageous in seeking action to meet the problems of the Nation. I think that frankness and that boldness has been shown on the national scene today. I think they are qualities which are commendable in the Secretary of the Interior.

I appreciate the defense of the Secretary which is being voiced in the well of the House today, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARDING. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma. May I say on that point that I concur with him on the fine job that the Secretary is doing. I am sure that while we have a man running the Interior Department who is interested in the welfare of the people the way the Honorable Stewart Udall is, we are not going to have another Teapot Dome scandal.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDING. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. I should like to add my commendation of the work which our able Secretary is doing, and also to commend the gentleman from Idaho for the strenuous and courageous effort he is making on behalf of his people in the great Northwest.

We in the State of West Virginia, of course, do not benefit directly from these projects, but I assure the gentleman from Idaho that we appreciate the great contribution to the strength of the economy of the United States of America which these projects make.

The gentleman from Idaho referred to the scare words which were being used by power companies against these projects. I can recall reading that the power companies called Bonneville and Grand Coulee an area which was populated only by rattlesnakes, jackrabbits and sagebrush before these projects went into effect. They said this power would not be needed. They said this was a barren land. But I think that events have since proven that these great power projects do benefit not only the people of the Northwest but the people of the entire Nation. At a time when we in the United States of America are really the showcase of democracy to the world, I believe that we need to add to and strengthen these projects in order to strengthen the entire Nation and its economy.

Once again I commend the gentleman from Idaho for his remarks and the fight he is making on this issue.

Mr. HARDING. I want to thank the able gentleman from West Virginia for his contribution on this subject. Our colleague from West Virginia, as you all know, is a college professor and is one of the best-read Members of the House. I am sure there is no one that knows better than he the arguments that have been made by private utilities in the past against Grand Coulee, against Boulder Dam and other developments, in the West. He has shown great courage here on the floor of the House in supporting projects that were in the national interest though he knew that his action may not be the most popular thing in West Virginia; but we know that his decisions were right because American prosperity, whichever section of the country it occurs in, benefits the whole Nation.

Those reclamation projects out in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho are using tractors, combines, and other machinery that are built with steel that in turn is made from iron ore and coal and other products of the States of the East.

I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

May I point out that this campaign of propaganda that has been carried on by these two private power companies has resulted in their spending thousands and thousands of dollars that they have collected from the power consumers; one of them was only recently granted a rate increase, and the other one presently has an application for an increase in its power rates. They have published these full-page, half-page, and quarter-page ads frequently in the papers of Idaho. In return, they expect the editors of the papers to write editorials favorable to their viewpoint. When they find an editor who writes editorials favorable to their position, they immediately reprint these editorials and send them around to all the other editors asking them if they cannot reprint them in their papers. If an editor still holds out, he can expect a visit from the manager of the local power company to ask when he is going to join the fight against what they call "socialism."

Then they follow up with forwarding this type of information to people such as our able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who during the past 5 days has been inserting it in the RECORD as the views of the people of Idaho, which, as I am pointing out to you, is just simply not so.

I want to say further, I am glad there is a wide divergence of opinion between the views of the people of Idaho and the views of most of the editors of the 8 daily papers and the 40-odd weekly papers that serve my district. I am sure that from this half a hundred papers, you can count on the fingers of one hand those that have ever supported a Democratic candidate for office or the views of the Democratic Party that have made this Nation great. Yet, in spite of editorial opposition and in spite of being outspent in campaign spending, the Democratic Party won a major victory on its platform which asked for the inclusion of the State of Idaho in the BPA marketing area; and with the election of three out of four congressional candidates, who publicly called for this inclusion, to the Congress of the United States.

I want to point out further that the power companies in the State of Idaho are losing their fight, public relations wise, because in spite of all their heavy expenditures in week after week publishing paid advertisements against BPA, and in spite of many letters to editors by their supporters, and a current house campaign, when I visit my district I have people come up and pat me on the back and say: "Congressman HARDING, keep it up. We realize that BPA is the only answer to the ever-increasing power rates of the Idaho Power Co. and the Utah Power & Light Co."

These people are often known members of the Republican Party. I am sure they are not going to make these statements publicly, but they feel that way in their hearts. It was interesting to note in the last copy of the Idaho Sunday Statesman that came to my office that in spite of all the Idaho Power Co. advertising, in spite of the fact that every editorial concerned with BPA in this paper has been against BPA and further in spite of the fact that the only political column carried by the Statesman is opposed to BPA, the only letter to the editor in this paper on the subject of BPA supported it, and I would like to read from the Idaho Sunday Statesman of July 14 an unsolicited letter from Hal Baker:

BONNEVILLE POWER OPERATION VIEWED

EDITOR, THE STATESMAN:

I doubt that many readers of the Statesman's Letters to the Editor, haven't found out that the deficits charged against the Bonneville Power Administration have not put the BPA project behind in its payout requirements.

As of June 30, 1957, BPA was $78 million ahead in its payout requirements. Private power companies constructed powerplants to displace purchases from BPA which during the past 5 years has had $125 million worth of unsold power, that the private power companies could have bought all they needed at cost less than at their own plants.

As of June 30, 1962, BPA was still $20,100,000 ahead of its payout requirements.

Remember that "brown out" that we would have unless private enterprise rushed construction of a large power project? The Chairman of the Federal Power Commission said in his findings that power cost at Brownlee plant would be 6.9 mills per kilowatt-hour. The rates charged by BPA for wholesale power averaged 2.03 mills to 2.45 miles per kilowatt-hour. And it was going to waste.

During the first 20 years of Bonneville operations, the Pacific Power & Light Co. and the Portland General Electric Co. have increased their Federal, State and local tax payments from about $4 million in 1940 to nearly $20 million in 1960. But of course they lost their monopoly. I think that is the little item that is causing pain in our local area.

HAL BAKER.

I do not know Mr. Baker but I compliment him on his knowledge and on his courage.

Mr. Speaker, I realize this will probably result only in another barrage of power company instigated letters to the editor in every paper in the State.

The power companies expect their friends to write letters in their behalf. We do not. We merely hope that the people of Idaho will continue to get all of the facts of this matter and that they will continue to study both sides of the issue. I am sure that if they do that they will continue in the future, as they did last November, and have in the past, to support the inclusion of southern Idaho in the BPA marketing area.

Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to Secretary Udall for responding to the request of the Idaho congressional delegation, members of the State legislature, and the many others who have requested this action on his part.

I want to say further, Mr. Speaker, that I am not antiprivate power company. I pointed out in a speech recently on the floor of the House how the private power companies in the State of Oregon and Washington, in cooperation and in competition with the Bonneville Power Administration, had increased profits, had increased returns to their stockholders, and had a much better year last year than our local power companies without BPA. It is my sincere hope, and I express it here again today, that the two private power companies which serve the southern part of my State will drop their expensive campaign of propaganda and will work in competition and cooperation with BPA for the economic development and for the development of all of the State of Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDING. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the remarks of my senior colleague from Idaho. I believe that the experience in the First District of Idaho justifies Mr. HARDING's wish to have Bonneville power extended into the second district of Idaho. Bonneville power has been marketed in northern Idaho since the beginning of BPA. We also have private power companies marketing power in cooperation with this public utility. The spirit of competition between public and private power has given my constituents lower rates, better service, and healthier private power companies than are now enjoyed in southern Idaho. Development of the water resource in the northern portion of the Columbia drainage is justifiably envied by those residing in the remaining southern portion of this drainage. Therefore I commend the marketing order of the Secretary of the Interior to extend Bonneville power into the entire topographic and geographic region possessing this tremendous water resource. I am sure that the benefits will eventually demonstrate the wisdom of the administration in announcing this extension, which is now technically and economically feasible.

In view of the current series now appearing in the back pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding House Resolution 430, one would believe that advocacy of the extension of Bonneville power into southern Idaho could only be undertaken by a Congressman with more courage than sense. However, despite the considerable sums spent by those private power companies, not experienced at cooperation with either public utilities or the public, in order to conjure up a horrendous image of the BPA, I believe that the greater majority of consumers welcome inclusion within the marketing area. I respect the right of the private power companies to resist this change, but I do dispute the manner of resistance. Costly advertisements in newspapers, mailings to stockholders and consumers and hired spokesmen are all a part of an acceptable way of pressing a point. However, when these same means of communication are used to present not a slanted view of the case, but accusations of socialism and the whole battery of terms so frequently and loosely hurled about by the fanatics, I believe it is time for the representatives of this campaign's victims to speak out. That is why we are here today. My part is to state categorically that Bonneville power has not ruined any industries in my district. Rather it, in cooperation with enlightened private power firms, has been a tremendous asset to the industrial and cultural development of northern Idaho. I sincerely hope that the same benefits will soon be enjoyed by the remainder of the State, and I believe they will through the extension of BPA.

It seems rather curious to me that opponents to the Bonneville Power Administration must travel across the continent to find a sponsor for House Resolution 430. History taught European rulers the folly of absentee rule. Our Founding Fathers wisely provided that Congressmen be residents of the States they represent. In our age of modern communication, it seems that it is nearly impossible for a Member from the East to understand the problems of Idaho. A sprinkling of editorials is presented to the Congress as an accurate representation of Idahoans' convictions concerning BPA. In order to correct this inaccurate portrayal of my constituents' consensus, I hereby offer an example of a more accurate expression of their opinion by Mr. Sam Day of the Lewiston Morning Tribune.

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, May 21, 1963]

SMOKE, FIRE, FURY AND THE BPA

It is one of life's little ironies that the flames of political passion sometimes spring from the least likely fuel. The hottest emotions are not necessarily aroused by emotional topics such as love and religion. The fires of faith and conviction feed more fiercely in such dry and brittle fields as taxation and foreign policy. And nowhere do they burn better than in a field one might suppose to be occupied exclusively by noncombustible facts—the field of hydroelectric power distribution. But the debate over power is a torrid one, and it was no surprise that the flames of passion were kindled instantly last weekend when it was learned that the Bonneville Power Administration plans to extend its marketing area to southern Idaho.

The reaction from the president of Idaho Power Co., Thomas E. Roach of Boise, was so swift, and so vehement, that the facts of the proposal quickly disappeared in a cloud of smoky oratory. A member of the Bonneville Regional Advisory Council, State Senator Carl C. Moore, of Lewiston, succeeded in blowing away some of the smoke. But Roach sounded the called to arms, and reinforcements soon will be pouring into the breach. If the pattern of the past holds true, the line of ideological conflict will harden and the smoke of battle may long obscure the facts of the BPA plan.

What is this terrible thing that BPA proposes to do?

Effective today, the Department of the Interior has extended the BPA marketing area from Oregon, Washington, western Montana, and northern Idaho into southern Idaho and small adjoining areas in Wyoming, Montana, and Nevada. This means that the marketing area, which formerly covered the lower and middle portions of the Columbia River Basin, will now cover the entire basin.

BPA is a Federal agency which markets at wholesale rates the power produced by Federal projects within its area, chiefly those of the U.S. Reclamation Bureau (like Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (like Ice Harbor on the Lower Snake). The extension of the BPA marketing area into the Upper Columbia Basin means that BPA will take over the marketing of power produced by five Reclamation Bureau dams in that area.

BPA expects during the first year to sell power in southern Idaho at a rate about 40 percent lower than the rate now offered by the Reclamation Bureau, which is in turn lower than the Idaho Power Co. rate. BPA can do this because of the savings effected by integration of its power supply and demand throughout the basin. The Reclamation Bureau rate, by contrast, was circumscribed by the far smaller output of its five projects in the upper basin. One of the key considerations here is that the lower basin has its peak power demand in the winter because the biggest consumers are cities and industries, while the upper basin has its peak demand in the summer because the biggest consumers are irrigation pumpers. Integration of the two systems will mean more economic use of the available power projects. BPA estimates that the saving from this consideration alone will amount to more than $100 million by 1980, more than enough to build the Lewiston-Soda Springs transmission line which will be necessary for expansion of the system.

Neither BPA nor the Reclamation Bureau sells power on the open retail market, as do the private utility companies. Instead, they sell it at wholesale to certain preference customers, specified by law, such as cooperatives, municipalities, public agencies, some heavy industries, and private utility companies. These in turn sell or provide the power to the individual users, so that, although the direct customers are relatively few in number, the benefits penetrate deeply into the economy.

The significance of this for an economy such as that of southern Idaho, which is severely limited by high freight rates and by distance from the market, should not be overlooked. BPA estimates that the phosphate industry, which is dependent on cheap power if it is to survive, would with BPA power create 9,000 new jobs in southern Idaho by 1980 in the production of chemical fertilizer.

The ability of BPA to provide a climate for industry through low cost power has been the key to the success and acceptance of BPA in Washington and Oregon. New industries have been attracted to the BPA area by low cost power, and they in turn have attracted population and retail business, stimulating the demand for retail power. This is why the private utility companies, far from being hurt by BPA, have flourished side by side with it.

Why is it that BPA can sell power so much more cheaply than private utility companies can? Its costs are far lower. BPA does not have to pay the bond interest rates which are a major part of the cost of financing private hydroelectric projects. It does not have to satisfy the demands of stockholders. It pays no Federal, State or local taxes. It can take advantage of economies which stem from large scale operations. But, contrary to the claims of some private utility companies, BPA is not directly subsidized by the Federal Government and it does not make a practice of selling power below cost. Its costs are fully met from power revenues.

Do the advantages which BPA enjoys over private utility companies constitute a form of unfair competition? This depends on one's attitude toward ownership of the basic means of production in a society. If one holds that all productive means which can be turned to private profit are properly the field for private ownership, then certainly it is unfair to inject governmental competition into one of those fields. But if one draws a distinction between the productive means which are basic to an economy and other forms of production the rule does not apply. Such a distinction can be drawn between the production and wholesale distribution of hydroelectric power, on the one hand, and such activities as the retail sale of power.

The distinction is an important one because a privately owned company producing power and selling it at wholesale cannot be equated, for example, with a barber shop. One must weight the impact of governmental competition on the barber and the power company against the impact upon society. The public benefits of government barber shops are few, if any. But publicly owned power systems can, as has been shown many times, have incalculable benefits for society. They have stimulated productive capacity, established taxable wealth, opened vast new fields for the utility companies, among others, and created far more private enterprise than they have destroyed.

No, the BPA won't really hurt the good folks of southern Idaho. But with help from Idaho Power Co. it could come close to scaring them to death.

Mr. Speaker, I say this is a more accurate expression of their convictions because I have heard both the pro's and con's of private versus public power on location in Idaho. If there is any question about this, my files are open to prove the true views of the Idaho people concerning the extension of Bonneville power.

At least ostensibly the purpose of reprinting editorials from Idaho opposing the BPA is to gain support of House Resolution 430. I submit that an identical proposal has already been rejected by the House Interior Committee. An amendment to this effect was offered to H.R. 994, but was promptly and soundly voted down bipartisanly by members of the committee. I believe it is rather late to attempt to recall the exercise of a statutorially granted power by the Secretary of Interior, particularly in view of the committee's action.

We have been patient with the attempts to discredit the Bonneville Power Administration. Today, however, we are coming to an end of patience, because we resent a distortion of facts concerning the BPA and the views of our constituents. We will continue to represent our constitutents in this manner as long as it is necessary.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment my colleague from Idaho on the very fine presentation he has made. I might point out that the excellent record he has made in the Congress during the 6 months he has been here and his knowledge of the resources of the Northwest, including those mining resources that are so important to the currency of this Nation, have just resulted in his appointment today to the House Committee on Banking and Currency, on which he will serve along with his previous assignment to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I feel that he did a fine job in presenting the views of his constituents.

I would like to ask my colleague at this point, "Do you know of any elected official in the State of Idaho in either party who has been critical to the point of demanding that the Bonneville Power Administration not include southern Idaho in its marketing area?"

Mr. WHITE. I will say to the gentleman I know of no such elected individual in the State of Idaho who has been so critical.

Mr. HARDING. When we have a U.S. Senator elected from each party and when we have a Governor elected from the opposite party of the gentleman from the First Congressional District and myself, I would feel if they thought this was such a bad thing, they would be inserting all of these critical editorials and demanding that the Secretary of the Interior not take this action. But I feel that the elected Representatives of Idaho of both parties feel a tremendous undercurrent of the people of Idaho. They know this is right, they know that southern Idaho is in the Columbia Basin geographically.

They know that we furnish the water, and they know that we deserve the benefits of BPA. For that reason elected officials in Idaho who have not supported BPA have remained on the fence or remained silent on this great issue.

THE CONGRESS MUST DEVELOP A REALISTIC GOVERNMENT-WIDE POLICY ON FEDERALLY OWNED LAND—THE PRESENT POLICY FAVORS FISH AND WILDLIFE OVER HUMAN BEINGS, AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ALASKA'S KATMAI NATIONAL MONUMENT WHICH WAS VISITED BY ONLY 900 VISITORS DURING THE PAST 2 YEARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the administration of the many and often conflicting statutory provisions regarding disposal of federally owned land is scattered widely among a number of executive departments and agencies. These provisions represent a patchwork, crazy quilt of conflicting purposes, and do not make consistent good sense.

For some time now I have been trying to obtain the return to the State of Delaware of certain excess federally owned lands at the Fort Miles Military Reservation, Del., a large portion of which was originally ceded without cost to the Federal Government for defense purposes.

The present law provides that excess federally owned lands may be purchased by the States at 50 percent of fair market value if the conveyance is for public recreation and park purposes.

If the conveyance is earmarked for public health or education purposes such excess lands as those at Fort Miles can be made available without monetary consideration to States and local governments.

Similarly, conveyance can also be made for public airport purposes, and for fish and wildlife refuges.

In other words, our Federal land policy now presents the paradox of the Federal Government favoring fish and wildlife over human beings.

Our present Federal land disposal policy makes it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for Delaware to obtain the return of lands on any basis which many Delawareans would consider fair to the first State.

At the same time, the present policy of the Federal Government favors such programs as that which established Alaska's Katmai National Monument, which is twice the size of Delaware and was visited by only 900 people during the past 2 years.

Delaware feels justified in trying to secure the return without cost of that portion of the excess land at Fort Miles, which was ceded by Delaware to the Federal Government without cost.

On the other hand, Delaware is quite willing to pay for the remainder of the excess land at Fort Miles the sum which the Federal Government paid Delaware for it, but is not inclined to pay more.

There is no reason which justifies paying more than that original amount to the Federal Government. Surely there is no justification for the Federal Government making a vast profit on lands which Delaware itself once owned and which it ceded, without regard to profit, for defense purposes. The present policy, if continued, will make it increasingly difficult for the Federal Government to obtain land at a reasonable price, for each State would have to take steps to see to it that it got all that the market would allow in every land transaction with the Federal Government.

One of the distinguishing characteristics of our Federal Government is that it normally functions without regard to profitmaking at the expense of the public. The present Federal land policy would end this happy state of affairs. A hard-bitten attitude on the part of the Federal Government, as spelled out in the present laws governing disposal of excess federally owned lands, is most likely to defeat the great purposes of the Federal Government itself. Conveyances of federally owned lands back to the States from which they were originally obtained at a profit to the Federal Government may make some bureaucrat look good to his superiors, but it speaks little for the traditional fairness of the Federal Government itself.

It is high time, then, that the Congress enacted legislation which would provide a realistic and equitable Federal disposal policy with regard to excess land, a policy which will make such land available for public purposes where the people are.

Prime recreation facilities are essential in view of the rapid expansion of the Nation's urban areas as well as of our population. This is recognized by such groups as the citizens' committee for the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission report, and the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, which stated in its report to the President and the Congress on January 31, 1962:

Excerpt from "Outdoor Recreation for America," the report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to the President and the Congress, January 31, 1962:

"DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS FEDERAL LANDS

"Recommendation 8-8: Surplus Federal lands suitable for outdoor recreation purposes should be made available to State and local governments at no cost, with appropriate reversion clauses.

"Many Federal properties, such as coastal defense installations, Coast Guard stations and lighthouse facilities, old forts and military posts, and tracts of land located within or near cities, when no longer needed for their original purpose, can serve public recreation needs.

"Present laws permit the disposition of Federal surplus properties to Federal or State agencies at no cost for purposes of wildlife conservation, preservation of historic values and some educational activities. State and local governments, however, must pay 50 percent of the appraised value of land suitable for public park and recreation use. Appraisals of these properties often are high because of their potential commercial or industrial values. For this reason, 50 percent of the appraised amount is frequently out of reach of State and local governments. As a result the properties are sold to private commercial developers, and potential public park or recreation areas are lost.

"A modification of existing law to allow transfer at no cost for recreation purposes would help alleviate the shortage of park, recreation, and open space areas.

"Agreements covering the transfer of Federal property should provide for retention of mineral rights and reversion in case of an inappropriate use."

Excerpt from President Kennedy's message to the Congress on conservation, March 1, 1962: "I recommend that the Federal Surplus Property Disposal Act be amended to permit States and local governments to acquire surplus Federal lands for park, recreation, or wildlife uses on more liberal terms."

Mr. Speaker, a policy is needed which will make our excess federally owned lands available to all of the people all of the time, not just to some of the people some of the time.

Furthermore, this need will increase as more and more of our God-given shoreline—a precious national resource—is conveyed into private holdings.

I have, therefore, introduced a bill, H.R. 4705, which incorporates the principal substantive provisions relating to programs administered by the Department of the Interior which were included in the draft bill submitted to the Congress by the President on May 16, 1962, and again early this year. These administration-backed measures were designed to place all surplus real property disposal programs on a realistic and consistent basis.

My bill would amend the provisions of law relating to the disposition of surplus property for park and recreation areas, historic monument, and fish and wildlife conservation purposes.

I hope my bill will be supported by my colleagues who live in the most populous States as well as by my colleagues from the States of the Far West and North.

In order to get this matter before the Congress in the most complete form I have introduced today a companion measure to S. 1508 which was sponsored by Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, on May 13, 1963. In his introductory speech Senator McCLELLAN said:

This bill is being introduced at the request of the Administrator of General Services, as a part of the GSA legislative program for 1963. A similar draft bill was submitted by the President in the 87th Congress and referred to the Committee on Government Operations. The staff, with the cooperation of the legislative counsel of the Senate, made a detailed study of the proposed legislation, but the bill was not given consideration by the committee during the last Congress.

I include some related items as part of my remarks:

[From the New York Times, July 14, 1963]

VAST ALASKA PARK BIDS FOR TOURISTS—AREA TWICE SIZE OF DELAWARE HAD 900 VISITORS IN 2 YEARS

WASHINGTON.—Twice as big as Delaware, Alaska's Katmai National Monument far outstrips in size all other U.S. national parks and monuments. Yet this fantastic region of fumaroles, snow-skirted peaks and sparkling lakes has been visited by only about 900 persons in the last 2 years.

Spurred by recent efforts to open the remote area to more visitors and the opportunity to walk among restlessly slumbering volcanoes, Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, recently flew and hiked over the region. He reported on his journey in the National Geographic magazine.

Katmai (pronounced "catmy") gained world attention with one of the biggest bangs in history. In June 1912 the region literally shook itself to pieces, spewing molten rock across the landscape. Seething debris poured over a 42-square-mile area to a depth in places of 700 feet or more. Dust, blown high into the sky, caused gloomy days and spectacular sunsets in Nova Scotia.

NOISE WAS ENORMOUS

If such an eruption had occurred at New York City, it would have been heard in Chicago and if winds were right sulfurous fumes could have corroded clothes hanging on the line in Denver, according to the late Dr. Robert F. Griggs who led a series of National Geographic Society expeditions to the scene.

Today, Senator GRUENING writes, the smokes are almost gone. In the Valley of Ten Thousand Smokes, where Dr. Griggs and his colleagues cooked over steaming vents and piled blankets on the hot ground to keep cool at night, there are perhaps a dozen smoking fumaroles.

"Looking about," Senator GRUENING reported, "I realize that the dying of the smokes was not all a loss. I knew that this cooler phase of the valley's life also interests volcanologists, geophysicists, and other scientists. More important to Katmai's future tourists, no longer do myriad steam clouds hide the eerie panorama of the valley."

The author described Katmai as "a vast solitude of mountains and desert and desolation; a land of snowfields and glaciers and airy pumice stones and deep crevices; a never-never land where sun and rain and fog and drizzle take turns and a volcano could go off at any time."

On the still-steaming side of 2,760-foot Novarupta, center of the 1912 holocaust, "you leave tracks deep as a bear's on the putty-like incline," Senator GRUENING said. "Suddenly one foot breaks through and you sink to your knee. Perhaps a smoldering cavern lies beneath. You don't stay to find out."

Katmai is 65 miles southwest of Anchorage. Small planes airlift visitors to Lake Grosvenor and to Brooks River, 15 air miles southwest of Lake Grosvenor.

Besides spectacular scenery, Katmai offers wildlife ranging from moose to sea lions and superb fishing.

As Dave Bogart, Katmai's ranger-in-charge, told the author, "Most of our national parks and monuments are known for one feature or another. In Katmai we have them all—and space to boot. Man doesn't dominate here."

H.R. 4705

A bill to amend the provisions of law relating to the disposition of surplus real property for park and recreation area, historic monument, and fish and wildlife conservation purposes, and for other purposes

SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 amends the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 by adding a new subsection (p) which would authorize the Administrator of General Services to assign surplus real property to the Secretary of the Interior for sale or lease to States and their political subdivisions and instrumentalities for public park, public recreational area, historic monument, or fish or wildlife conservation purposes.

Under present law the Administrator is authorized to dispose of surplus real property, on the recommendation of the Secretary, for park and recreation area purposes at 50 percent of current fair market value; to donate such property for historic monument purposes; and to transfer such property without reimbursement, to the State agency exercising administration over wildlife resources, for the conservation of wildlife other than migratory birds. A provision of the 1949 act (sec. 203(k)(1)(C)) authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to fix a public benefit allowance in the case of property disposed for education or public health purposes, but this authority does not extend to the disposal programs of interest to the Secretary of the Interior.

The effect of section 1 is: (1) To repeal the requirement that park and recreation property shall be transferred at 50 percent of fair market value; (2) to permit disposal to States and political subdivisions for wildlife purposes which may include the conservation of migratory birds; and (3) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a public benefit allowance with respect to all of these disposal programs, including property transferred for historic monument purposes.

The bill also makes two procedural changes. The proposed paragraph (p)(1)(A) authorizes the Administrator to withhold property from disposition for a reasonable period of time, on the recommendation of the Secretary, to afford applicants the opportunity to complete plans for the proposed use of the property and to apply for a transfer. The proposed paragraph (p)(1)(B) provides that the Secretary, rather than the Administrator, shall make the determination of need, suitability, and desirability for a specific public park, public recreational area, historic monument, or fish or wildlife conservation use. The Administrator, however, will make the determination of availability for the proposed use.

Section 2 is a technical amendment to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

Section 3 preserves that part of the 1948 act which relates to transfer of excess real property to the Secretary of the Interior for use in carrying out the national migratory bird management program, and makes it a part of the 1949 act.

Section 4 repeals the 1948 act, relating to disposals for fish or wildlife purposes, and section 13(h) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, relating to disposals for park, recreational area, and historic monument purposes. Under the bill all of these authorities will be pulled together in one place as subsection 203(p) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

H.R. 4705

A bill to amend the provisions of law relating to the disposition of surplus real property for park and recreation area, historic monument, and fish and wildlife conservation purposes, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (p):

"(p)(1) Under such regulations as he may prescribe, the Administrator is authorized in his discretion—

"(A) upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior to withhold from disposal for a reasonable period surplus real property, including buildings, fixtures, and equipment situated thereon, to afford applicants a reasonable period of time to complete plans for proposed uses of and to apply for a conveyance of such property for public park, public recreational area, historic monument for the benefit of the public, or fish or wildlife conservation; and

"(B) upon receiving a recommendation from the Secretary of the Interior, together with appropriate justification, that such property is needed, suitable, and desirable for a specific public park, public recreational area, historic monument, or fish or wildlife conservation use, together with a request therefor, to assign to the Secretary for disposal such property as the Administrator determines is available for the proposed use.

"(2) In determining whether property is available for the uses proposed under this subsection, the Administrator shall take into consideration the highest and best use of the property, good property management practices, and whether the proposed use is more in the overall national interest than other possible uses or dispositions of the property.

"(3) Upon assignment of property under subsection (p)(1)(B) above and through such officers or employees of the Department of the Interior as he may designate, the Secretary of the Interior may sell or lease such real property for public park, public recreational area, historic monument, or fish or wildlife conservation purposes to the States and their political subdivisions and instrumentalities: *Provided,* That no property shall be assigned for use as an historic monument unless it is in conformity with the recommendation of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments established by section 3 of the Act approved August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 463), its area does not exceed that necessary for the preservation and proper observation of the historic monument situated thereon, and its historical significance relates to a period of time more than fifty years before the determination of need, suitability, and desirability for such use.

"(4) In selling or leasing property pursuant to the provisions of subsection 203(p)(3) above, the Secretary of the Interior shall grant to the grantee a public benefit allowance in consideration of any benefit which has accrued or may accrue to the United States from the use of such property by the grantee. The amount of the public benefit allowance shall be determined by the Secretary of the Interior on the basis of standards and guides which shall be promulgated by him: *Provided, however,* That the President may prescribe such policies not inconsistent with the provisions of this subsection as he shall deem necessary to effectuate the provisions of this subsection, which policies shall govern the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out his functions hereunder.

"(5) The deed or other instrument used to effect the sale or lease of property pursuant to this subsection shall contain appropriate clauses which will—

"(A) grant the United States without charge the right to make exclusive or nonexclusive use and have exclusive or nonexclusive control and possession of the property during any national emergency declared by the President or the Congress;

"(B) require the use of the property by the grantee for the purposes for which the sale or lease is being made and restrict such use to such purposes;

"(C) impose such additional terms, reservations, restrictions, and conditions as may be determined to be necessary to safeguard the interests of the United States; and

"(D) provide that in the event any of the terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions upon or subject to which the property is sold or leased are not met, observed, or complied with, all of the property or any portion thereof shall, at the option of the Secretary of the Interior, revert to the United States in its then existing condition, including improvements made thereto."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (C) of subsection 203(k)(2) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(C) the Secretary of the Interior, in the case of property conveyed pursuant to the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U.S.C., App. 1622(h)) the Act of May 19, 1948, as amended (16 U.S.C. 667b–d), or this Act, as amended, to States and their political subdivisions and instrumentalities for public park, public recreational area, historic monument, or fish or wildlife conservation purposes;".

SEC. 3. Subsections 202 (g) and (h) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 483 (g), (h)) are redesignated subsections 202 (d) and (e), respectively, and section 202 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (f):

"(f) Whenever the Secretary of the Interior determines that any excess real property and related personal property is useful for wildlife conservation and has particular value in carrying out the national migratory bird management program, and the Administrator determines that such property is available for such purposes, the Administrator is authorized in his discretion, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior such property including, in the discretion of the Administrator, any improvements situated thereon wtihout reimbursement or transfer of funds. In determining whether property is available for such uses, the Administrator shall take into consideration the highest and best use of the property, good property management practices, and whether the proposed use is more in the overall national interest than any other proposed use or disposition of the property, including a proposed use by another Federal agency."

SEC. 4. The Act of May 19, 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 240: 16 U.S.C. 667–b–d) and section 13(h) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 765; 50 U.S.C., App. 1622(h)), are hereby repealed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. FASCELL) for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. PIKE (at the request of Mr. ROSENTHAL) for Thursday, July 25, 1963, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HARDING, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. HEMPHILL (at the request of Mr. BOLLING), for 60 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDOWELL (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON), for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HEMPHILL (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON), for 60 minutes, on Monday, July 29, 1963.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. SNYDER.

Mr. ROBISON.

Mr. HALPERN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SHELLEY.

Mr. Tuck.

Mr. Albert.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Evins.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Talcott.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 646. An act to prohibit the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in any residential area in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 489. An act to amend the act of March 5, 1938, establishing a small claims and conciliation branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia;

S. 490. An act to amend the act of July 2, 1940, as amended, relating to the recording of liens on motor vehicles and trailers registered in the District of Columbia, so as to eliminate the requirement that an alphabetical file on such liens be maintained; and

S. 1036. An act to amend the inland and western rivers rules concerning anchor lights and fog signals required in special anchorage areas, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1933. An act to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," as amended, with respect to the minimum age limitation for registration;

H.R. 4646. An act to declare a portion of the Benton Harbor Canal, Benton Harbor, Mich., a nonnavigable stream; and

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 29, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1071. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the eighth report on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment is submitted by the Office of Civil Defense, Department of Defense, for the quarter ending June 30, 1963, pursuant to subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1072. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a Reserve Officers' Training Corps (2-year program) and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1073. A letter from the President, Panama Canal Company, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the amortization of fixed assets of the Panama Canal Company that are classified as nondepreciable"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1074. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting additional material relating to executive communication No. 834, listed in the Congressional Record of May 20, 1963, which proposes an amendment to H.R. 7552; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee of Conference. H.R. 3872. A bill to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 578). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 7525 A bill relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 579). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 5179. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into agreements for the transportation of mail by passenger common carriers by motor vehicle, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 580). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 7594. A bill to designate the McGee Bend Dam and Reservoir on the Angelina River, Tex., as the Sam Rayburn Dam and Reservoir; without amendment (Rept. No. 581). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 6237. A bill to amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize grants for the collection, reproduction, and publication of documentary source material significant to the history of the United States, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 582). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 5623. A bill to amend the provisions of title 14, United States Code, relating to the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of officers of the Coast Guard and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 583). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1007. An act to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 590). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 7500. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 591). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2260. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rozsi Neuman; with amendment (Rept. 584). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2303. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Kolloian; with amendment (Rept. No. 585). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3648. A bill for the relief of Fiore Luigi Biasiotta; with amendment (Rept. No. 586). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary, H.R. 3762. A bill for the relief of Anna Krystyna Chmielewska; with amendment (Rept. No. 587). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4075. A bill for the relief of Noriyuki Miyata; with amendment (Rept. No. 588). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4863. A bill for the relief of Etsuko (Matsuo) McClellan; without amendment (Rept. No. 589). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 7766. A bill to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 7767. A bill to provide Federal assistance to States and their political subdivisions to assist them to carry out projects for the establishment of proper ethical and community responsibility standards; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 7768. A bill to provide means for settling the current dispute between the railroads and their employees over work rules, to prevent such disputes from arising in the future by prohibiting featherbedding practices in the railroad industry, and to provide various forms of assistance for employees displaced by changes in work rules, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 7769. A bill authorizing the State of Rhode Island or its instrumentality to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge across Mount Hope Bay subject to the terms and conditions of the act approved March 23, 1906; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7770. A bill to establish in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration an Inspector of Programs and Operations; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. GILL:

H.R. 7771. A bill to amend various acts providing Federal assistance for education to assure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LATTA (by request):

H.R. 7772. A bill to change the name of the Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial National Monument, to provide for the acquisition of certain lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 7773. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 7774. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to improve the administration of transfers and conveyances of certain real property for various public uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H.R. 7775. A bill to incorporate the National District Attorneys' Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 7776. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 7777. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize relocation payments thereunder in certain additional cases for losses resulting from the displacement of property from an urban renewal area; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 7778. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for certain educational expenses incurred at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 7779. A bill to provide means for settling the current dispute between the railroads and their employees over work rules, and for preventing such disputes from arising in the future, and to require various forms of aid for employees displaced by changes in work rules, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 7780. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 7781. A bill authorizing the State of Rhode Island or its instrumentality to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge across Mount Hope Bay subject to the terms and conditions of the Act approved March 23, 1906; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 7782. A bill to amend the Public Works Acceleration Act to increase the authorization for appropriations under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 7783. A bill to promote the conservation of the Nation's wildlife resources on the Pacific flyway in the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, Upper Klamath, and Clear Lake National Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California and to aid in the administration of the Klamath reclamation project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 7784. A bill to designate the Curwensville Dam on the West Branch of the Susquehanna River at Curwensville, Pa., as the James E. Van Zandt Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 7785. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special U.S. postage stamp in commemoration of the crusade against cancer; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 7786. A bill to clarify the meaning of "section 38 property" in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H.R. 7787. A bill to provide that news reporters shall not be required to disclose the identity of a confidential informant in Federal courts or before committees of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLAY:

H.J. Res. 575. Joint resolution to create a joint congressional committee to study and report on problems relating to industrywide collective bargaining and industrywide strikes and lockouts; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.J. Res. 576. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.J. Res. 577. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.J. Res. 578. Joint resolution authorizing the continued shipment of the drug Krebiozen in interstate commerce in order to insure the continued availability of such drug for the treatment of patients now being treated with such drug for terminal cancer patients; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. Con. Res. 209. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress on the need for a healthy domestic gold mining industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. Res. 460. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to germaneness; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 7788. A bill for the relief of Jack B. Fisher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 7789. A bill for the relief of Luigi Minichillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 7790. A bill for the relief of Michael Myo Aung; to the Committee on Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 7791. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Cioffi Carson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 7792. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Geranios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 7793. A bill for the relief of Petros Magemeneas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 7794. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Bottone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7795. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo DeLucia and Angela DeLucia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 7796. A bill for the relief of Eduardo B. Sapigao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 25, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, who art in heaven, on the earth, and in all Thy works, and who dwelleth in contrite hearts who give Thee room, our glad and grateful hearts are singing "This is my Father's world, He shines in all that is fair, He speaks to me everywhere."

We pause in the midst of thronging duties and confused issues to commune with Thee, source of goodness and beauty and truth. May we know no glory but the supreme satisfaction of rendering to the Nation and to the world selfless service unsullied by base motives. Keep us free, we pray, from pessimism, cynicism, and despair, that we may be used of Thee to advance on earth Thy kingdom of love and freedom, of joy and of peace.

With the golden gift of this new day, we pledge at this white altar of devotion integrity of character and clean hands in the high and holy calling as servants of the Republic in a day which calls for our utmost and best.

For Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 24, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5(a) of Public Law 307, 73d Congress, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 25, 1963.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 6518. An act to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution;

H.R. 7195. An act to amend various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal-aid highway systems; and

H.R. 7638. An act to authorize additional appropriations for prosecution of the comprehensive plan in the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 489. An act to amend the act of March 5, 1938, establishing a small claims and conciliation branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia;

S. 490. An act to amend the act of July 2, 1940, as amended, relating to the recording of liens on motor vehicles and trailers registered in the District of Columbia, so as to eliminate the requirement that an alphabetical file on such liens be maintained; and

S. 1036. An act to amend the inland and western rivers rules concerning anchor lights and fog signals required in special anchorage areas, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Public Works:

H.R. 6518. An act to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution;

H.R. 7195. An act to amend various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal-aid highway systems; and

H.R. 7638. An act to authorize additional appropriations for prosecution of the comprehensive plan in the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Edward D. Re, of New York, to be a Member of the Foreign Claims Commission, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE RAILROAD RULES DISPUTE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today the American railroads announced that they would postpone the initiation of new work rules for another 30 days. This represents the seventh time the carriers have postponed putting these rules into effect.

I believe I speak for the entire Senate when I express high praise for the good faith the carriers have shown in this matter. They have once again demonstrated the kind of industrial statesmanship that is essential for the economic health of the country. What is even more gratifying is that the carriers took this action independently and without formal action by the Congress.

As Members are aware, the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Representative HARRIS, had urged the carriers to postpone the initiation of the new rules until Congress could consider the President's plan for settling the issues between the railroads and the operating unions. In addition, the minority leader and I, along with the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], had intended to offer a concurrent resolution calling on both sides to refrain from any action which would disrupt rail service until 30 days had elapsed, during which time the Congress would have had opportunity to act. I am grateful, too, as I am sure the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] is, to the Honorable George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, for suggesting such a resolution.

The action of the carriers has made the resolution unnecessary. The carriers have once again shown their bona fides. Now, Mr. President, the responsibility for a similar demonstration of good faith rests on the Congress and the brotherhoods. It will serve little purpose if, at the end of 30 days, no congressional action has been taken to bring about a resolution of the dispute. We should seize this opportunity to act—expeditiously and wisely—on legislation that will make possible a resolution by reason at the conference table, instead of a stalemate of force on the picket lines.

The distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] and I intend to do everything in our power to give this body a fair chance to act on the President's program. Senators understand the unhappy situation in which we find ourselves regarding the holding of committee meetings during sessions of the Senate. While the objections that have been made have nothing to do with the rail dispute, inevitably they prevent the Commerce Committee from meeting to consider that bill, while at the same time disabling the Judiciary Committee from considering civil rights legislation. Because of the splendid cooperation and high public spirit of the Senator from Rhode Island and his colleagues on the Commerce Committee, these objections have not prevented the committee from meeting in the evening on the railroad question.

To assist the committee in meeting during more normal hours, we shall move to adjourn the Senate from today until Monday, and we shall not attempt to bring up major legislation today, in order that we may conclude our labors at a reasonably early hour. We understand the Commerce Committee plans to meet this afternoon, twice tomorrow, and on Saturday.

Clearly the committee intends to respond to the carriers' good faith by expediting its consideration of the President's bill. We believe the Senate will do the same when it receives the bill.

Lastly, Mr. President, I should like to make a few remarks on the proposal offered by the President.

In the New York Times of July 25, 1963, there appears a letter to the editor by the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Willard Wirtz. In challenging the accuracy of two critical Times' editorials on the Pres-

ident's legislative proposal for a settlement of the railroad dispute, Mr. Wirtz has proven again that he is a man of exceptional honesty and directness.

His challenge is well rooted in accuracy, for it is not accurate, as the editorials purport, that changes in work rules will be delayed for 2 years; and it is not accurate, as the newspaper purports, that the proposal is simply another "time-wasting study" or an "entering wedge for permanent administrative" control over labor-management decisions.

Mr. Wirtz properly, it seems to me, challenges the implied preference of the editorials for seizure or compulsory arbitration over the President's proposal which is designed to avoid both of these drastic courses, and then arguing, in effect, that this would be the best way to preserve the collective bargaining process.

The truth of the matter is, Mr. President, that the administration is doing its best to safeguard the interests of the general public, as well as those of the two parties to the difficulty. The railroad companies have a real problem in trying to modernize their operations so that they can compete effectively in an era of rapid technological changes. But would the New York Times suggest that the problems of the Brotherhoods are any less real? Indeed, they have a most serious human problem in trying to protect their members—some of whom have given most of their lives to railroading—from the economic and other hardships which rapid technological change would impose upon them.

To say that the government has a responsibility for preventing a strike, as the Times states, and then to suggest that it has no responsibility for seeing that the settlement of the dispute is equitable to all concerned, is a most irresponsible and callous position. I cannot accept the implied premise of these editorials, Mr. President, that the only thing that matters is technological progress. The human cost also matters, at least as much.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the President's proposals—whatever shortcomings, if any, they may have—are at the least an honest and human effort to meet a difficult problem on a temporary basis and with minimum government involvement. They are infinitely to be preferred to seizure or compulsory arbitration which would involve drastic government intervention. Instead of criticizing this effort—and doing so on the basis of an erroneous reading of the proposals—one would hope for a constructive contribution from an editorial page with the great and deserved reputation for public service of the New York Times. I commend Secretary Wirtz for the accuracy, directness, and conviction of his response of July 25 to the editorials entitled "A Featherbed Solution," published in the New York Times of July 23, and "A Dangerous Precedent," in the issue of of July 24, and ask unanimous consent that both editorials and the response thereto be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 23, 1963]

A FEATHERBED SOLUTION

The author of "Profiles in Courage" has run away from a tough decision to embrace a politically easy one.

Once again the White House has knuckled under to the unions' intransigence on the railroads. The President's announcement that he will seek legislation referring the 4-year-old dispute over featherbedding to the Interstate Commerce Commission would postpone indefinitely—and perhaps forever—the elimination of unneeded train jobs that push the carriers a half billion dollars closer to bankruptcy every year. He leaves Congress the alternative of doing nothing and thereby accepting the inevitability of a nationwide strike.

The ICC has no special competence in this field. Its members cannot be expected to appraise the incredibly complex issues of work rules and manning practices with anything like the expertness of the able Presidential commission that submitted its recommendations for squeezing out manpower waste nearly 18 months ago. President Kennedy made that report an exercise in futility by walking away from it on the very day it was presented. He knew the unions would reject it.

Since then the railroads have said "Yes" and the brotherhoods have said "No" both to the peace plan put forward by a Presidential Emergency Board under the Railway Labor Act and to the supplementary settlement formula suggested by Secretary of Labor Wirtz. Now, faced with the choice between a national rail strike and the necessity for forcing a showdown through legislation, President Kennedy retreats into another time-wasting study under circumstances which give the unions every encouragement for continuing to veto the economies essential both for the railroads and for the job security of those workers whose jobs are genuinely needed.

The employers are confronted with the prospect of a 2-year wait before they can hope to reap any of the savings permitted by technological change, with no real reason for belief that the same political considerations that dictated the President's decision will not again frustrate any basic change in their archaic work rules. Mr. Kennedy even hints that the cost can be lifted from their pocketbooks by the usual expedient of passing it to the public in higher rates. The parallel announcement by Mr. Kennedy that he will appoint a Presidential commission on the general problems of automation could not be more ill timed. The precedent he is setting in the railroads is bound to undermine public confidence in the new body even before it begins work.

The inescapable lesson of the entire experience is that Congress must give priority attention to a reappraisal of all our legal safeguards against emergency strikes and the abuse of union power. Waiting for the crisis always leads to political evasions that may prove as damagaing in their end effects as the strikes they were designed to avert. President Kennedy has taken the easy way out, and a way that can only do harm to the country, the railroads and, in the long run, to labor as well.

[From the New York Times, July 24, 1963]

A DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

In his testimony yesterday on the administration's bill to refer the railway featherbedding controversy to the Interstate Commerce Commission, Secretary of Labor Wirtz said the White House definitely expects the ICC to order modernized work rules into effect within 120 days after Congress passes the new law. If this expectation is realized—and it is a big if—the proposal will look less than it did like a device for endless delay in eliminating manpower waste.

Nevertheless, what President Kennedy has invited, in his eagerness to achieve the effects of compulsory arbitration without using the politically obnoxious term, is a precedent under which the ICC might become permanently the court of last resort for disputes that defy settlement under the creaky processes of the Railway Labor Act. This unpalatable possibility results from the studied rejection by the railroad unions of all the peace formulas put forward by two Presidential Commissions, Secretary Wirtz, and the President himself.

If Mr. Wirtz' clarification of the legal remedy sought by the White House is followed by deletion from the proposed joint resolution of what could be loopholes in the timetable for imposing new work rules, fears would be diminished that the price of avoiding a strike would be capitulation to the unions through an indefinite freeze of the old manning schedules.

But any notion that the changes ordered by the ICC would operate for only 2 years or that they would stimulate collective bargaining remains a delusion. If Congress decides that the only way to protect the Nation against intolerable hurt is through coercive legislation, it would be preferable to face the need through a direct law for seizure or compulsory arbitration than through a measure that would give the ICC and other quasi-judicial administrative agencies an entering wedge for permanent control of labor-management decisions.

[From the New York Times, July 25, 1963]

WIRTZ DEFENDS RAIL PLAN—SECRETARY OF LABOR TAKES ISSUE WITH CRITICISM OF PROPOSAL

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In fairness to your readers it should be pointed out that your two editorials on the administration's proposal for ending the current railroad dispute bear little relation to the facts.

On July 23 you asserted that "the employers are confronted with the prospect of a 2-year wait" before any work-rules changes could be made, and that this proposal "would postpone indefinitely—and perhaps forever—the elimination of unneeded train jobs."

In fact, the Interstate Commerce Commission will be asked to rule within 120 days or as soon thereafter as is practicable, and all changes approved by such ruling would go immediately into effect. Unless changed by collective bargaining, these rulings will be in full effect for 2 years, a period which in the course of recent bargaining both parties had accepted as reasonable.

You asserted that "the ICC has no special competence in this field." In fact, no other temporary or permanent body has as much experience as the ICC in dealing not only with the economics of railroad progress—and its effect on public safety—but also the job security of railroad employees adversely affected thereby. Under section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act, the Commission has for 23 years applied similar standards and procedures in more than 80 separate situations.

COMMISSION'S FINDINGS

The resolution provides, moreover, that the Commission draw upon the findings of the Presidential Commission and Emergency Board which previously reviewed this case.

You asserted that "once again the White House has knuckled under to the unions' intransigence" with "the easy way out" * * * that "can only do harm to * * * the railroads." In fact, the Association of American Railroads has unanimously endorsed this proposal while the employee spokesmen quoted thus far in your newspaper have raised objections to it.

You asserted that the administration measure is simply "another time-wasting study designed to give the unions every encouragement for continuing to veto the economies" these rule changes propose. In fact, this measure calls for specific disposition of each proposed rules change by the ICC, encouraging and preferring collective bargaining solutions but permitting no veto by either side.

ENTERING WEDGE

On July 24 you asserted this measure "would give the ICC and other quasi-judicial administrative agencies an entering wedge for permanent control of labor-management decisions." In fact, this is a temporary resolution which amends no permanent statute, is confined to this one case, mentions no agency other than the ICC and is designed to avoid the precedent you mention.

You asserted that a direct law for seizure or compulsory arbitration would be preferable. You do not make clear how, under the facts of this case, you would justify seizing the railroads from the carriers, with all the legal and financial hardships that would bring. And as for compulsory arbitration, "the dangerous thing about it is that it sets a precedent of undermining the collective bargaining process"—or so you stated in your editorial of July 19.

To paraphrase Melbourne's immortal words about Macaulay, I wish I could be as certain of anything as the New York Times is of everything.

W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
U.S. Secretary of Labor.

WASHINGTON, *July 23, 1963.*

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I concur quite generally in the statement made by my friend the distinguished majority leader. In a controversy of the kind before the Senate some things are often forgotten, and if it is not generally known, there ought to be a reminder to the country.

When we last conferred with the President on Monday the proposed legislation was actually not drafted. As I recall, we came away from the White House at a quarter after 12. I asked the President pointblank whether the joint resolution or bill was in draft form. Some preparations had been made, but the joint resolution had not been completed.

So within a matter of about 4 hours those who were drafting the resolution were expected to complete work on the joint resolution and then send it to the Congress.

I remember that at 5 o'clock that afternoon the majority leader himself came to my office. I entertained the hope that perhaps I could examine a joint resolution of the kind proposed so that we could conjointly submit it on the same day.

At best my examination had to be encompassed within the space of an hour.

These are involved questions. It is impossible to spell out the references to the parent act. Even now one of the members of my legislative staff thinks the joint resolution refers to the wrong section of the Interstate Commerce Act. I do not know whether that is the case, but I do know that unless there is some time given without constraint and pressure, a good workmanlike legislative job cannot be done.

I salute the carriers for this very generous concession, and particularly so because this matter has been in process for 4½ years. There have been findings by at least three boards. Obviously, it will cost the railroads a great deal of money for every day's delay. So I salute them. I think they were very generous. But the action will enable the Congress to take a little time fully to examine the whole issue, so that a proper, correct, and, above all else, a durable solution may be found for the problem.

As the majority leader has indicated, everyone knows that seizure is no answer. It never was an answer. The Congress has never had any disposition toward compulsion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired. Without objection, the Senator is given an additional minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The minority leader for himself has often expressed a feeling of constraint in excising the word "compulsion" from his dictionary because it is antipodal to our whole concept of freedom. So now we have an opportunity to embrace a vehicle which has existed for more than 75 years, and which in that length of time has been dealing with all the problems related to public transportation, but very particularly to rail transportation. We can now take a breather. The members of the committees do not have to be sweated. I understand that the Committee on Commerce met until 11 o'clock last night. I have always had doubt about the wisdom of late meetings and the fruit thereof, because too often at that hour of the day, when one has been in legislative harness for the whole day, it is difficult to come to a sound conclusion. I remember that General Marshall once observed to the Appropriations Committee in wartime when we went to see him on questions pertaining to war that after 3 o'clock in the afternoon ideas were of rather doubtful validity. I believe that statement should be modified, because I would dislike to have such an appraisal made of some of the dinner speeches that I make around the country at the hour of 8, 9, or 10 o'clock at night, and even later.

But the fact is that at the hour of 11 o'clock the mind and the body do fatigue after a long day. We must approach the problem with acuity and sharp minds to get the right solution. So I am delighted that we have this respite. I do concur with what the majority leader has said.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana has the floor. Does he yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. MANSFIELD. First, I desire to make a unanimous-consent request and a statement.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF POSSIBLE CHANGE IN ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, and after discussion with the distinguished minority leader, I should like to notify the Senate that if anything extraordinary develops in the meantime, which we do not anticipate, the Senate should be on notice for requests from the combined leadership to come back into session, if the need should arise.

THE RAILROAD RULES DISPUTE

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield? If so, to whom?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, first I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to make an observation and then an announcement. I join with my colleagues, the majority leader and the minority leader, in congratulating the railroads upon having heard the voice of the Congress and, I believe, the voice of the country. Also I wish to congratulate Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, upon the leadership which he showed in coming forward with the suggestion which we have heard.

I should like to make a few observations. The railroad industry's decision creates an atmosphere of cooperation, which is an excellent backdrop for the Congress to act. It is my hope—and I think my credentials are pretty good with the railroad brotherhoods as are those of many other Senators—I see the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] is present in the Chamber—that although we know that the railroad brotherhoods have a very grave problem in protecting their members—and no one knows it better than many of us here—they will follow suit and adopt a statesmanlike attitude toward the President's recommendation for concluding these disputes. We know there are many aspects of the President's proposed solution, of which they disapprove. I think it is still the best solution offered to prevent a national disaster, and will remain so unless the railroad unions can come forward with a better one. I think this is a very important responsibility.

This is one suggestion. For example, not only can the brotherhoods come forward in relation to the technique that the President wishes to use as to the work rules themselves, but there may be something that can be done intra the unions. For example, a settlement in the airline industry was arrived at because of a unification of the flight engineers union and the pilots union.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 30 seconds.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from New York is given an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. JAVITS. It may very well be that some unification of the engineers and the locomotive firemen unions might be brought about. In short, the unions are not restricted to reacting to the President's proposal. There is room for statesmanship by them. Again I salute the railroads. I hope and believe the unions will follow suit. I appreciate the courtesy of the majority leader in giving me that opportunity to speak.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I, too, wish to congratulate the carriers for what they have done in extending for 30 days the time in which the rules would be put into effect. I realize—and I think most people realize—that they really took that action because of the prior action taken by the majority leader and the minority leader. They have done a wonderful piece of work in bringing the problem properly to the attention of the public and to the carriers. At the same time, Senators should take into consideration what the railroads did in extending the order 30 days. But I do not believe that the action ought to have any bearing whatsoever on what we do in the future. In the future we as individuals should do what we think is best for our Nation. I realize that we have before us the recommendations of the President. I hope that they will receive immediate consideration and will be given close study, so that something along the line proposed can be done before the 30-day extension expires. I hope that we shall not wait until the last day of the period in order to act. I commend the majority leader and also Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, for the work that they did along this line.

OBJECTION TO COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate that a few moments ago the majority leader said that the committees had to meet.

I have noted that the majority leader intends to adjourn the Senate in a little while. The motion I am about to make at the present time is already covered in the rules of the Senate. I am merely calling it to the attention of the Senate. No committee can meet, unless the committee obtains permission, during a session of the Senate.

I am now entering an objection to any committee meeting today. I think this afternoon, before the committee goes into session, judging from what the Senator has said, the Senate will probably be adjourned, and it will not come back into session until Monday. The committee can work until Monday. On Monday the Senate can act in accordance with the situation in which it finds itself at that time.

So I enter my objection to any committee meeting today while the Senate is in session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is consistent. The pattern is very clear and very evident. At some future date we shall have a colloquy on these occurrences.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I think we shall have to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

S. 1938. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for the completion of the improvement of the Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway authorized by the act of August 30, 1935; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

S. 1939. A bill to prohibit the use of appropriated funds by officials or agencies of the Government for the purpose of influencing the vote in any referendum or election held pursuant to an act of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SIMPSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 1940. A bill to amend title 35 of the United States Code, "Patents," and the Trademark Act of July 5, 1946, as amended, with respect to appeals in patent and trademark cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1941. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide gold star lapel buttons for the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in war or as a result of cold war incidents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. 1942. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1943. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William H. Quasha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FONG, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S.J. Res. 105. Joint resolution to authorize appointment of a Presidential Commission on Automation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS and Mr. MORSE on pp. 13171 and 13172 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, and also the remarks of Mr. JAVITS in the RECORD of today, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

USE OF GOOD OFFICES OF UNITED NATIONS ON BEHALF OF THE ENSLAVED BALTIC STATES

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 54) using the good offices of the United Nations on behalf of the enslaved Baltic States, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF JOINT COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "THE FEDERAL REVENUE SYSTEM: FACTS AND PROBLEMS 1961"

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 177); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Joint Economic Committee one thousand copies of the joint committee print entitled "The Federal Revenue System: Facts and Problems 1961," of the Eighty-Seventh Congress, first session.

TO PROHIBIT UNAUTHORIZED USE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR PUBLICITY OR LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, by the Constitution of the United States, Congress is given the responsibility and authority to appropriate the moneys in the Federal Treasury. Again and again the Congress has required that the money appropriated be used only for the purposes for which it has been appropriated. Title 31 of the United States Code, section 628, states that—

> Sums appropriated for the various branches of expenditure in the public service shall be applied solely to the objects for which they are respectively made, and for no others.

In addition to this general restriction, Congress has specifically and repeatedly stated that the appropriated moneys should not be used for unauthorized publicity and lobbying activities. Public Law 87–844, section 701, states that—

> No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

Public Law 87–741, section 301, again expresses the intention of Congress:

> No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

Congress has felt so strongly about the unauthorized use of appropriated money that in addition to the statute restricting the use of appropriated funds, we have a criminal statute which carries a penalty for any Government employee who is convicted of using appropriated funds to influence Members of Congress.

Title 18, section 1913, of the United States Code reads:

> No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.
>
> Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, violates or attempts to violate this section, shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, shall be removed from office or employment.

The meaning is clear, Mr. President. Government employees can communicate with Members of Congress about legislation and appropriations they want only when requested to do so by the Member of Congress with whom they communicate. This is as it should be. In addition, the Government employees and agencies can present their needs and problems to the Congress as a whole by the "proper official channels."

It is not the purpose of this statute to limit the use of appropriated funds in the exercise of the basic responsibilities of the executive branch to informing and consulting with the Congress on legislative considerations, drafting bills, and urging in messages, speeches, reports, committee testimony, and by direct contact, the passage or defeat of various measures—House Report 3138, 81st Congress, 2d session, page 51.

However, 18 U.S.C. 1913 does have a real purpose by imposing limitations on what an administration can do with taxpayers' moneys to further its position. It is this—the misuse of appropriated funds by the administration to enhance its own image and its own program at the expense of all else—that concerns me.

These statutes, the restrictive statute and the criminal statute, have been set forth to protect the taxpayers' money; yet, in too many instances the administration has used appropriated moneys, taxpayers' dollars, to improperly influence Members of Congress. We are being bribed by our own money.

The Honorable Durward G. Hall, in the House of Representatives, called to the Nation's attention on May 6 of this year that a Mrs. William B. Akin, an early Kennedy supporter, who is one of 35 congressional liaison officers employed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, bragged that she is a lobbyist for the King-Anderson bill. If the other liaison officers on Capitol Hill feel as does Mrs. Akin, they should be removed from the public payroll as should Mrs. Akin.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point of my remarks the statement and newspaper clipping submitted for the Record by Representative Durward G. Hall, of Missouri.

There being no objection, the statement and the article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HEW Employee Is Self-Styled Lobbyist

(Extension of remarks of Hon. Durward G. Hall, of Missouri, in the House of Representatives, Monday, May 6, 1963)

Mr. Hall. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members of the Congress will be interested to know that an employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been quoted as referring to herself as a Federal lobbyist.

Mrs. William B. Akin, one of 35 congressional liaison officers employed by that Department, in an interview in Chicago last week told Reporter Judy Klemesrud, "I am really just a lobbyist."

I submit that this confession amounts to a disregard for the laws passed by the Congress and that the Secretary of HEW should consider her dismissal under the provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 1913.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, if the other 34 HEW congressional liaison officers hold views similar to Mrs. Akin's quotation as to their job description, they too should be dismissed and the Congress should strike funds for their salaries from the HEW appropriation measure now before the Senate.

The question arises, Mr. Speaker, if Mrs. Akin's self-announced title is accurate, just what is she lobbying for?

The answer to this question can be found in the interview which Mrs. Akin gave to a Chicago Daily News reporter between puffs on the cigar which is apparently her trademark. She is a lobbyist for passage of the King-Anderson bill, 1963 version, and if these are her duties, then she should not be drawing her salary from the taxpayers, but rather from one of the organizations supporting that measure such as the Forand Senior Citizens Council.

The interview also suggests that she is using her present position as a springboard for a congressional race, and that she is a past Democrat national chairman for Texas who has been shifted to the Federal payroll.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to the fact that the U.S. Public Health Service has indicated on countless occasions that there is a direct link between smoking and lung cancer. It hardly seems fitting that an employee of HEW, the supervisory agency for PHS, should call attention to her unusual smoking habit. I realize this is a free land and she has every right to smoke but is not the parallel between her cigar trademark and her employment by the Department of HEW rather incongruous?

The article follows:

"JIM SMOKES CIGARS, PLUGS HEALTH CARE—WOMAN'S INTUITION TELLS HER BILL WILL PASS THIS TIME

"(By Judy Klemesrud)

"A pretty, cigar-smoking Texan named James (Jim for short) was in Chicago Monday to defend President Kennedy's hospital care for the aged program.

"She's James Grant Akin (Mrs. William B.), 35, and she's a congressional liaison officer for the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—the only woman among 35 such employees in the executive branch of Government.

"'I'm really just a lobbyist,' she said, puffing on a small cigar.

"(Ten cigar butts overflowed an ash tray on a bedside table in her Sheraton-Chicago Hotel suite.)

"'And right now I'm sure that the King-Anderson bill will pass this session. Last November's election changed a lot of minds on Capitol Hill.'

"Mrs. Akin, an only child, said she was named for her 'badly disappointed father,' James W. Grant. She and her husband, an independent oil operator, have two children, a girl, James William, 10, and a boy, John, 9. Their home is Dallas.

"'I can always tell when people know me well. They say, "He's a great friend of mine,"' she quipped.

"'Jim,' an all-American skeet shooter (1952–54), entered the University of Chicago as a political science student when she was only 15.

"She said she loves politics violently, and would like to run for Congress some day.

"She's a past Democratic national finance chairman for Texas, and knows Vice President Lyndon Johnson very well but says she got her Federal job because she was one of President Kennedy's first supporters in Texas.

"Mrs. Akin was in Chicago to debate the hospital care for the aged bill with Dr. Ernest B. Howard, assistant executive vice president, American Medical Association.

"The debate was at the 16th annual Senior Adult Conference at the Bernard Horwich Center, 3008 West Touhy. The conference was sponsored by the Jewish Community Centers of Chicago."

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I feel that the administration has a duty to inform the public of the facts. It should not be advocating one approach at the expense of all other possible solutions to a problem which confronts the Nation.

I do not intend to point to all of the instances in which this administration has used appropriated funds to influence Members of Congress—there are far too many; but I do want to point out these few in order to emphasize the need for better enforcement of our existing laws by the Attorney General. It must be remembered that our laws are no better than the people who enforce them.

Mrs. Akin, to whom I have referred, was, and probably still is, lobbying for the King-Anderson bill. It is well known that the administration did use all the political pressure at its disposal in an effort to pass the bill.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare published, at taxpayers' expense, a 159-page book which, in my opinion, lobbied for the enactment of the King-Anderson bill. Representative John W. Byrnes, of Wisconsin, protested the spending of tax funds for the booklet, and asked the Comptroller General to refuse to approve payment of printing costs. This expenditure of appropriated funds was clearly in violation of the criminal statute 18 United States Code 1913.

After a complaint was made, the Department of Justice did promise to review the alleged violation; but to date there has been no prosecution. Unfortunately, the political activities of the Department of Justice do not always permit the equal and fair enforcement of the law.

Another glaring instance in which this administration ignored the existing law was in September 1962, when every Member of Congress received a 520-word telegram soliciting his support and vote on a bill which would give Federal aid to higher education. This cost the taxpayers of America $3,562. This was a clear-cut violation of 18 United States

Code 1913. Was the law enforced? Of course not. The offender was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Celebrezze.

Soon we shall be discussing the merits of another program sponsord by the administration—the Domestic Peace Corps, or more properly labeled the national service program. The President has appointed a study group to consider the feasibility of such a program. Now that the group has determined that there is a need for a Domestic Peace Corps, which was a foregone conclusion by the administration before the study group was appointed, the employees of the Government are out lobbying for the enactment of the proposed legislation which would establish the Corps.

This taxpayer-supported study group sent an employee to my office, without an invitation or request, in an attempt to favorably influence me in regard to its program. Further, the study group has printed a very nice publication stating the supposed need of their pet project. I was told that the reason for the printing was to show Congress the great need for this program. I feel that these activities are clearly in violation of title 18, United States Code, section 1913.

I have learned that at the recent hearings held by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the Senate the information obtained by the study group was testified to and then the complete text of the study group report was made a part of the record.

I suggest that this is an expensive way to get information to Congress. Not only have the taxpayers financed the study group, but they have paid for the printing of the same information four times—once in the publication of the general report; the second time in the records of the hearings held by the Senate committee as it was testified to; the third time when the general publication was incorporated in the record of the committee hearing; and the fourth time in the records of the hearing as it was testified to in the House of Representatives. The report itself comprises 102 printed pages.

Of course we must not forget that the taxpayers will again have to pay for the printing of this same information when the proponents of the national service program come before the House of Representatives and the Senate. This will be the fifth and sixth times that the taxpayers' money will be used to get the same printed information before Congress.

Mr. President, the unauthorized use of appropriated funds is a serious violation of the trust that the people of America have placed in their Government. Congress has properly seen fit to make a violation of that trust a crime. I have not attempted to list all of the serious violations of the public trust. I want only to call attention to the abuses that we do have, and ask that preventive steps be taken.

Congress has wisely provided that appropriated moneys should be used only for the stated purpose. In addition, we have a criminal statute which makes it a crime to use appropriated moneys to influence Members of Congress; but we do not have a statute which makes it a crime to use appropriated moneys to improperly influence the general public.

This administration has improperly used moneys to influence and prejudice the American public. This was demonstrated most dramatically this spring when the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, and the Department of Agriculture spent great sums of unauthorized moneys in an effort to trick the wheat farmers of America into voting for a program which fortunately was defeated by a tremendous margin.

Secretary Freeman mobilized his entire field organizations in the wheat States to lobby for a "yes" vote. Hundreds of TV and radio tapes, thousands of Government employees, and millions of copies of pamphlets, brochures, and letters were put to work at Government expense, taxpayers moneys, to force on the farmers something that they did not want. None of these activities was authorized by Congress and yet appropriated funds were used by the Department of Agriculture.

The Congressional Record for the last part of April and the month of May is full of instances in which the farmers were receiving quantities of Government literature, sent at Government expense, urging a "yes" vote.

The Department became so desperate that it sent out multiple mailings of its propaganda. Some families reported receiving as many as 20 separate envelopes, in addition to correspondence that came from the local Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service. To insure that every conceivable voter was blanketed with biased and slanted information, the Department of Agriculture had several of its agencies sending out information.

One of my constituents, who has never been a wheat farmer, is not now a wheat farmer, and never intends to be a wheat farmer, received in the mail a letter from the Farmers Home Administration with four enclosures advising her of the need for a "yes" vote. My constituent was not complaining because she was being informed but because she was not being given a fair and factual presentation. Two of the inserts received have already been printed in the Record, but the others have not. I feel that it is important that the taxpayers know what type of material is being sent out by their Government and at their expense.

I ask for unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record these two pieces of propaganda which were sent out at the taxpayers' expense.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Wheat Referendum

(Excerpt from talk by Under Secretary of Agriculture Charles S. Murphy before the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, Washington, D.C., April 3, 1963)

Now I would like to speak to you briefly about another subject which is of primary interest to this group—the wheat referendum.

I have not said anything about this before. The Secretary has spoken about it and a good many other people in the Department have also been faithfully performing their duty of disseminating objectives and unbiased information on the subject. I have not been gagged. It just happens that I have been attending to other matters. However, I have some thoughts on the subject that I would like to get off my chest, and I think this is the time and place to do it.

This group contains representatives of of grain cooperatives through which a large proportion of the wheat crop is marketed every year. I have been told that the interest of these grain co-ops is the same as the interest of the farmers who are their members, and that these co-ops exist for the purpose of serving these farmer members. I have also been told that these co-ops are influential in molding opinion among wheat farmers—that it is around the country elevators that decisions are really made about what wheat farmers favor and what they oppose.

If both of these things are true, I suppose your top priority business from now until May 21 will be to inform wheatgrowers why they should vote "yes" in the referendum, and I suppose the wheatgrowers will follow your advice and everything will be hunky-dory. Surely, you will make every effort to see that wheat farmers do not lose $700 million by voting "no" in this referendum.

There are some high stakes in this referendum. It seems to me there may be some misunderstanding about just what is at stake. One thing that is not at stake is Orville Freeman's job as Secretary of Agriculture. He is just as solid in that job as the Rock of Gibraltar. He will be right there if he is willing to stay no matter what the outcome is in this referendum—win, lose, draw. Another thing that is not at stake is the position of the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture is 100 years old, and it, too, will continue to be right there no matter what the outcome of this referendum is. And, as a matter of fact, it probably will save several hundred million dollars in 1964 if this program is defeated in the referendum.

Also, I might add that the administration will probably be better off politically if this referendum fails. I have had some experience in presidential elections, and I think I know something about the subject. Throughout the country as a whole, farm programs are not popular. I am reminded of this everyday when I come in contact with the outside world. This is unfortunate, but it is very true, and the farmers really have a rather thin line of leaders in the administration and in the Congress protecting their programs from onslaught from many directions. Only 8 or 9 percent of the people are farmers these days. If the administration approached this question on a coldly political basis, I shudder to think of the direction that might be taken. Farm programs are not generally popular, and, I repeat, politically the administration would probably be better off if the wheat referendum failed.

The principal thing at stake in this referendum is the farmers' income and welfare. The difference between $2 and $1 wheat ought to be so plain as to require no elaboration. If wheat farmers vote to cut their gross income $700 million in 1964, they won't have much net income left.

Also, at stake in this referendum may be the future of a particular farm organization. How anyone claiming to speak for the farmer could oppose a "yes" vote in the referendum I do not understand. It seems to me that any farm organization taking this position is bound to lose no matter what the outcome of the referendum. If the referendum carries, the loss of face and prestige is obvious. On the other hand, if the referendum loses, the result for the farm organization responsible could be much worse.

In North Carolina in 1932, farmers who were no longer able to buy gasoline and parts for their automobiles put shafts on them, hitched them up to horses and mules, and called them Hoover carts. They used to have Hoover cart parades. If this wheat referendum fails to carry, it may be that in Kansas in 1964 you will see farmers hauling $1 wheat to your elevators with signs on the side of their trucks saying, "Shuman Wagons."

Also in 1932, I recall there was a magazine called Literary Digest that took a postcard poll as to how the election was to turn out. They found that Hoover was going to win by a large margin. Shortly after the election, the Literary Digest went out of business.

It's too bad we cannot learn better from the experience of others. Tobacco farmers in North Carolina voted against the price support program once in the late 1930's. Since then, the favorable percentage has ranged around 98. This is an awfully hard way to learn a lesson, and I hope the wheat farmers will spare themselves this.

Your president, Bill Thatcher, has a saying that farm prices are made in Washington. I expect he would agree with me that this is only partly true. In this case, Washington has already done its part. Now the rest of it is up to the farmers themselves.

Personally, I am optimistic about the outcome of the referendum. I simply don't see how farmers could be misled so badly as to vote "no." However, I have been wrong about such things before and could be wrong this time.

Be that as it may, I will be watching very closely, and I am sure that all of you will be doing all you can.

Now, Mr. President, I hope that my remarks on this subject have not been too blunt, but the farmers have some vital issues at stake here, and I think the circumstances call for plain speaking.

U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Farmers Home Administration,
Powell, Wyo., May 7, 1963.

To: FHA borrowers.
From: County supervisor.
Subject: General Information.

Please keep your FHA record books up to date. Your record book can be a big help to you in analyzing your operation and planning for the future.

We are enclosing three pamphlets about the wheat referendum, as we think it is of interest to many of you. The vote must be cast in person on May 21, 1963, at your local ASCS office from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. Small growers (under 15 acres) must sign 1964 intentions prior to May 13, 1963, in order to be eligible to vote. Signing this form and returning the green copy of the allotment notice which you received recently would obligate you to stay within your 1964 allotment. It also would make you eligible to participate in a diversion program should it become available, as well as vote in the referendum, but it does not obligate you to do so. If you have raised wheat or taken payments for diversion of wheat acreage within the last 3 years, and are not sure if you are eligible to vote, contact the local ASCS office before May 13, 1963. If you have questions about how much wheat you are allowed to raise, you should also contact the ASCS office.

The ASCS office has recently received some information on the voluntary feed grain bill which was passed by the House of Representatives on April 25, and is expected to pass the Senate. The bill provides for the interchange of wheat and feed grain acres on your farm. This substitution feature will provide farmers an opportunity to grow the feed grains best suited to their operation (on their combined wheat and feed grain acres) without increasing the total supply of grain.

R. W. Knoll,
County Supervisor.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, every effort was made to secure a "yes" vote. The truth, cost, and means were not important. Columnist Richard Wilson wrote an article which appeared in the Chicago Daily News on June 15, 1963, and in the Washington Evening Star on June 19, 1963, which told how the farm bureaucracy openly and threateningly brought pressure on federally licensed radio and TV stations to give free time for the Government's version of the issues in the national wheat referendum.

I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Arm Twisting of the Wheat Vote—Pressure for Radio and TV Time for Government Version Is Charged

(By Richard Wilson)

Arm twisting, one of the favorite techniques on the New Frontier, has been disclosed on a new and rather more impressive level.

The arm-twisting method was noted previously in the steel price controversy, the Cuban prisoners deal, and the more benign drive for funds for a $30 million National Cultural Center. This technique has attained respectability in the Kennedy administration and officials can see nothing wrong in it for they conceive their cause to be just.

The method consists of psychologically suggestive pressure on individuals or corporations to support or go along with Government actions. When skillfully applied, the individual cannot honestly charge that he was threatened with reprisal or tempted by reward; he only knows he has been shaken up. He may have an antitrust suit pending and have his mind on this when exposed to Government persuasion; but the persuaders, of course, say they do not have this in mind at all, only the public welfare.

In the new instance the pressure was perhaps more overt. In fact, it was crude. The farm bureaucracy openly and threateningly brought pressure on federally licensed radio and TV stations to give free time for the Government's version of the issues in the national wheat referendum.

No subtlety was involved. A national directive went out to State managers and local committeemen of the farm program to bring to the attention of radio and TV stations that they are federally licensed for 3 years only and the renewal of their license could depend upon the adequacy of their public service programs. This responsibility was particularly compelling, it was stated, with respect to public service agricultural programs.

The innuendo of the directive was amazing. Public service programing, it was stated, is promised by radio-TV stations "in return for two special favors granted by the Government," exclusive use of a broadcast frequency, and "the policy of the Government not to establish federally operated stations in competition with stations being operated commercially." Of course, the directive added, this does not make stations subject to dictation.

The directive was sent out by Ray Fitzgerald, deputy administrator for State and county operations of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, presumably with the approval of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman.

With vague images evoked of licenses revoked or Government-operated competitors, a good many radio and TV stations complied. A spot check shows that prime time was wangled in Indiana, Kentucky, and Minnesota, and probably elsewhere on a broader scale. Some of the stations gave their time willingly enough; they wanted just such programs. Others felt they were highly pressured.

It might be supposed that this was only in the interest of serving the wheat farmers with a factual, unbiased view of the issues before them.

But Mr. Fitzgerald's directive belies this trusting view in one sentence: "As you know, interests representing one point of view in the referendum are blanketing radio and television stations with material in heavy quantities. It is not expected that we can match the flood of material from this group, which is also in a position to buy time. But it is essential that we act aggressively to make use of public service time of radio and television stations at times of day when farm people are listening."

Farm people listened and voted. The Government could not get even a majority for the adoption of its compulsory control program for wheat. A two-thirds majority was necessary for its adoption. Rather than submit either to authoritarian control of their farms or the methods of the not-so-hidden persuaders, wheat farmers were ready to take the risk of lower income.

Now the same bureaucracy which had so little knowledge of the people it was serving has adopted a dog-in-the-manger attitude toward new legislation. Wheat farmers would readily consider a new program patterned after the voluntary programs for feed grains coupled with acreage retirement.

But the bureaucracy still has its mind on arm twisting. Let the farmers suffer a little, and they'll come back with their tails between their legs. This was a bad technique in the beginning. It is bad now. Mr. Kennedy would do well to bring it to an end and make a constructive beginning on a new wheat program that farmers want.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, Congressman Jim Battin, of Montana, received a letter from four Government employees who were protesting the instructions given them as county officials of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service by the U.S. Agriculture's fieldmen to carry out certain activities that would tend to influence a "yes" vote in the wheat referendum of May 21.

In addition to these instructions, the local officials were informed that a fund slightly in excess of $900 had been made available and was earmarked for use in their county to promote a "yes" vote.

To the best of my information, nothing has been done by the officials of the Agriculture Department to correct this wrong. It thus appears that the administration is running at the taxpayers' expense a huge lobbying group which is attempting to force its will on the American people.

Although the statutes are clear that appropriated moneys are to be used solely for the purposes for which Congress intends and for no other use, some officials of Government ignore their duties and their responsibilities. There is no room in good government for these types of persons. And, I should add that those who fail to enforce the law as it exists are equally undesirable in Government.

It is patent that Secretary Freeman and his Department of Agriculture violated the law and used the appropriated funds illegally, but there is no statute which establishes criminal punishment for this unauthorized use of taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, I now introduce for appropriate reference a bill patterned after 18 U.S.C. 1913 which will make it a crime to use appropriated funds directly or indirectly to influence the vote of any person in any referendum or election held pursuant to an act of Congress or to influence public opinion in favor of or against any matter or issue to be voted upon by the Congress or either House thereof.

It should be stressed that this much-needed bill would not prohibit any Government employee or official from furnishing to any person upon request a factual explanation of the matter to be voted upon by the Congress or by the people in a referendum.

It is sad to think that our form of Government would need such a criminal statute, but the need does exist. Not only is there the need for such a law, but there is also the need for strong enforcement of this law. I ask Congress to pass this proposed legislation, which will protect the public funds and the people of America from lobbying pressures by Government employees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1939) to prohibit the use of appropriated funds by officials or agencies of the Government for the purpose of influencing the vote in any referendum or election held pursuant to an act of Congress, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SIMPSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 35, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO PATENTS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 35 of the United States Code, "Patents," and the Trademark Act of July 5, 1946, as amended, with respect to appeals in patent and trademark cases.

The purpose of the bill is to abolish the statutory requirements for "reasons of appeal" in patent and trademark litigation before the U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1940) to amend title 35 of the United States Code, "Patents," and the Trademark Act of July 5, 1946, as amended, with respect to appeals in patent and trademark cases, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GOLD STAR LAPEL PINS FOR CERTAIN KIN OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide gold star lapel buttons for the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in war or as the result of cold war incidents.

It so happens that I had the high honor, as a Member of the House of Representatives, to author the original gold star lapel button bill, which provided a fitting symbol for each Gold Star Mother. That measure is now Public Law 80-306, and I am very proud of the fact that it was the first bill of mine in the Congress of the United States to be enacted into law.

The measure I am introducing today will provide gold star lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces of the United States who lost or lose their lives during World War I, World War II, or any subsequent war or period of armed hostilities in which the United States may be engaged. The bill broadens the 1947 act to include the next of kin of Armed Forces personnel who dies or die after July 1, 1958, as a result of cold war incidents. Specifically, this is done through the elimination of the requirement that deaths occur during periods of armed hostility.

The retroactive date of July 1, 1958, was adopted because it was the official date for the beginning of the Vietnam operation and the initial date for awarding the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal established by Executive Order 10977.

This is a humane piece of legislation. It will grant recognition to the relatives of members of the Armed Forces who have made the ultimate sacrifice during active cold war conflict and will permit the next of kin to wear the gold star lapel button. Certainly Americans who are killed by hostile acts during the cold war are entitled to the same recognition as those who are casualties during wartime. In the same vein, the relatives of those so killed should be entitled to receive the lapel button as an expression of the deep appreciation of our Nation for the sacrifices made by their husbands, brothers, sons.

I can see no logical reason for drawing a distinction between awarding the buttons to those whose loved ones actually died in wartime, and those whose loved ones died because of hostile cold war occurrences.

I am hopeful that Congress will act favorably on this measure and fill an unnecessary and unwarranted void. Its enactment will significantly honor survivors whose loss is equally as great as that of those who have lost loved ones during wartime.

The cost of this measure would be small, but the meaning tremendous. The essential consideration is the meaning of the lapel button, not the cost. We are forever in the debt of the survivors whose husbands, brothers, and sons have died for our Nation. The Gold Star Mothers and Gold Star Wives have an eternal claim on the affection of all Americans for the sacrifices they have made, and our esteem for the thousands of hours they donate every year in veterans hospitals.

Because of my deep and continuous interest in honoring the loved ones of those who have made the supreme sacrifice for our Nation, I pledge my continuing efforts to gain passage of this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1941) to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide gold star lapel buttons for the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in war or as a result of cold war incidents, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 57 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"§ 1124. Gold star lapel button: eligibility and distribution

"(a) A lapel button, to be known as the gold star lapel button, shall be designed, as approved by the Secretary of Defense, to identify widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces of the United States—

"(1) who lost their lives during World War I, World War II, or during any subsequent period of armed hostilities in which the United States was engaged before July 1, 1958; or

"(2) who lost or lose their lives after June 30, 1958—

"(i) while engaged in an action against an enemy of the United States;

"(ii) while engaged in military operations involving conflict with an opposing foreign force; or

"(iii) while serving with friendly foreign forces engaged in an armed conflict in which the United States is not a belligerent party against an opposing armed force.

"(b) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary concerned, upon application to him, shall furnish one gold star lapel button without cost to the widow and to each parent of a member who lost or loses his or her life under any circumstances prescribed in subsection (a). Gold star lapel buttons shall be furnished, upon application and payment of an amount sufficient to cover the cost of manufacture and distribution, to the next of kin other than the widow and parents of any such deceased member.

"(c) Not more than one gold star lapel button may be furnished to any one individual except that, when a gold star lapel button furnished under this section has been lost, destroydd, or rendered unfit for use without fault or neglect on the part of the person to whom it was furnished, the button may be replaced upon application and payment of an amount sufficient to cover the cost of manufacture and distribution.

"(d) In this section—

"(1) 'widow' includes widower;

"(2) 'parents' includes mother, father, stepmother, stepfather, mother through adoption, father through adoption, and foster parents who stood in loco parentis;

"(3) 'next of kin' includes only children, brothers, sisters, half brothers, and half sisters;

"(4) 'children' includes stepchildren and children through adoption;

"(5) 'World War I' includes the period from April 6, 1917, to March 3, 1921; and

"(6) 'World War II' includes the period from September 8, 1939, to July 25, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon."; and

(2) by adding the following new item at the end of the analysis:

"1124. Gold star lapel button: eligibility and distribution."

Sec. 2. The Act of August 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 710), as amended (36 U.S.C. 182a–182d) is repealed.

INCORPORATION OF JEWISH WAR VETERANS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.

The Jewish War Veterans, established in 1896 by Civil War combatants, stands as the oldest active war veterans group in America.

The fight against anti-Semitism in all of its twisted forms has been an avowed aim of the Jewish War Veterans since its foundation. But its dynamic progressive program is not limited to discriminatory areas. Instead the association's activities encompass such diverse fields as community relations, veterans service, and legislative action.

The Jewish War Veterans seeks concord in community relations, "the advancement of group cooperation in all areas of American life." Toward the achievement of this objective, the JWV, with allied veteran groups, continuously advocates "legislative action aimed at closing existing gaps in the exercise of civil rights"; attempts to solidify the unity of all ethnic, racial and religious groups in the community; and sponsors educational projects to acquaint the public with veterans' needs and problems.

The Jewish War Veterans is universally recognized as the servant of veterans. The organization is accredited to represent cases before both the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense. A prime example of the fine work done by the Jewish War Veterans is the free professional guidance and counselling program offered. Thousands of veterans and veterans' dependents benefit annually from this valuable service which is available to any veteran applicant regardless of race, color, or creed. An information service is extended to all veterans and their families who require aid from Federal, State, municipal, or private social agencies.

The JWV performs the vital function of presenting the views of a large segment of the American Jewish community to Members of Congress, Government officials, and military personnel. Liaison between these disparate sectors of the population is an all important, necessary activity.

Enemy to all prejudice, the Jewish War Veterans maintains a dynamic interest in American foreign relations, recognizing foreign affairs to be an integral part of the community relations problem. The organization's alert committee on foreign affairs has "recommended appropriate action programs and taken public stands on pertinent foreign affairs issues."

The JWV preserves the memory of those brave Jewish soldiers who died serving America so valiantly. Jewish community effort has financed the establishment of a National Shrine to the Jewish War Dead, which is located here in Washington.

For 67 years the JWV has rendered invaluable service to America and her combatant heroes. I sincerely hope that this bill will receive favorable consideration as a small but meaningful tribute to this fine organization.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record, and lie on the desk for 1 week, in order to permit other Senators who may wish to do so to cosponsor it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New York.

The bill (S. 1942) to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, introduced by Mr. Keating (for himself and Mr. Dirksen), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following-named persons, to wit, Morris J. Mendelsohn, Brooklyn, New York; Abraham Kraditor, New York City, New York; Harry Schaffer, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Frederick S. Harris, Meriden, Connecticut; Benjamin Kaufman, Trenton, New Jersey; Maxwell Cohen, Boston, Massachusetts; Milton H. Richman, Bloomfield, Connecticut; Major General Julius Klein, Chicago, Illinois; Meyer Dorfman, St. Paul, Minnesota; Jackson J. Holtz, Boston, Massachusetts; Henry Albert, Jamaica, New York; Paul Ginsberg, Atlanta, Georgia; Harry T. Madison, Oak Park, Michigan; Joseph F. Barr, Washington, D.C.; Rubin Kaminsky, Hartford, Connecticut; William Karmen, Brookline, Massachusetts; Benjamin J. Chasin, New York, New York; Samuel Shaikowitz, St. Louis, Missouri; Bernard Abrahms, Jersey City, New Jersey; L. Feuer, Youngstown, Ohio; Theodore Brooks, Brooklyn, New York; Martin L. London, Teaneck, New Jersey; Daniel M. Heller, Miami, Florida; Morris Lurier, Worcester, Massachusetts; Freman Miller, Syracuse, New York; Samuel Michelson, Baltimore, Maryland; Alfred Schwartz, Atlanta, Georgia; Frederick R. Turkow, Fort Wayne, Indiana; and their associates and successors, are hereby created a body corporate by the name of "Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America" (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation").

Sec. 2. The persons named in section 1 of this Act, or their successors, are hereby authorized to meet to complete the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers, the adoption of a constitution and bylaws, and the doing of such other Acts as may be necessary for such purpose.

Sec. 3. The objects and purposes of the corporation shall be—

(a) to maintain true allegiance to the United States of America;

(b) to foster and perpetuate true Americanism;

(c) to combat whatever tends to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free institutions;

(d) to uphold the fair name of the Jew and fight his battles wherever assailed;

(e) to encourage the doctrine of universal liberty, equal rights, and full justice to all men;

(f) to combat the powers of bigotry and darkness wherever originating and whatever their target;

(g) to preserve the spirit of comradeship by mutual helpfulness to comrades and their families;

(h) to instill love of country and flag and to promote soundness of mind and body in the members and children of members of the corporation;

(i) to preserve the memories and records of patriotic service performed by the men and women of the Jewish faith and to shield from neglect the graves of the heroic dead of the Jewish faith.

Sec. 4. Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members shall be determined according to the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

Sec. 5. (a) The corporation shall be nonpolitical and, as an organization, shall not promote the candidacy of any person seeking public office.

(b) The corporation shall have no power to issue capital stock or engage in business for pecuniary profit or gain.

Sec. 6. The corporation shall have perpetual succession and power—

(a) to sue and be sued;

(b) to take, hold, and dispose of such real and personal property as may be necessary for its corporate purposes;

(c) to accept gifts, legacies, and devices which will further the corporate purposes;

(d) to adopt and alter a corporate seal;

(e) to adopt and alter a constitution and bylaws not inconsistent with law;

(f) to establish and maintain offices for the conduct of the affairs of the corporation;

(g) to establish, regulate, and discontinue subordinate regional, departmental, and district subdivisions and local chapters or posts;

(h) to promote the formation of subordinate ladies' auxiliaries and youth organizations, the membership requirements of which shall be determined according to the constitution and bylaws of the corporation;

(i) to publish a magazine or other publications;

(j) to adopt emblems and badges; and

(k) to do any and all acts and things necessary and proper to carry into effect the purposes of the corporation.

Sec. 7. The corporation may acquire any or all of the assets of the existing organization known as Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, or any auxiliary thereof, upon discharging or satisfactorily providing for the payment and discharge of all its liabilities.

Sec. 8. The corporation and its regional, departmental, and district subdivisions and local chapters or posts shall have the sole and exclusive right to use in carrying out its purposes the name of "Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America."

Sec. 9. As a condition precedent to the exercise of any power or privilege herein granted or conferred, the corporation shall file in the office of the secretary of each State in which subdivisions, chapters, or posts may be organized, the name and post-office address of an authorized agent in such State upon whom local process or demands against the corporation may be served.

Sec. 10. The provisions of this Act shall take effect on the filing, in the office of the clerk of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, of affidavits signed by the incorporators named in section 1 of this Act, to the effect that the corporation known as the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America has been dissolved in accordance with law, but only if such affidavits are filed within one hundred and twenty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 11. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION ON AUTOMATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, together with Senators Morse, Randolph, and Inouye, a joint resolution to authorize the appointment of a Presidential Commission on Automation. At my request, on yesterday, the joint resolution was not printed.

I now ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may lie on the desk until tomorrow night for additional sponsors, and that it then be printed.

I ask unanimous consent that there be joined as additional sponsors of the joint resolution the names of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], in addition to the cosponsors who were upon this joint resolution yesterday. I understand it has a number, and is Senate Joint Resolution 105.

Mr. President, may I have a ruling on my unanimous-consent request?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New York.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 105) to authorize appointment of a Presidential Commission on Automation, introduced by Mr. Javits (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I note with gratification the bipartisan effort regarding a joint resolution on the establishment of a Presidential Commission on Automation which was indicated in remarks in this forum yesterday by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] and the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits].

It has been my privilege for almost 5 years to serve with both of these capable and conscientious Senators on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. As a member of three subcommittees of this committee, the Subcommittee on Labor, the Subcommittee on Education, and the Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment, of which I was chairman in 1960, in company with the gentleman from Oregon and the gentleman from New York, and other Senators, I have heard much testimony on the problems generated in our society by the process of technological development.

This process, now commonly referred to as automation, not only cuts across the jurisdictional lines of the subcommittees within the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, but it impinges on the areas of concern of many other congressional committees as well, and, indeed, on the entire fabric of American life.

Though the displacement of manpower by machine power has been going on, I suppose, since man discovered the wheel, the present rate of acceleration has placed the problem in entirely new dimensions. I referred to this fact recently on the floor of the Senate when I quoted the estimate of the Department of Labor that we must provide 24 million new jobs in the next decade merely for those who will be displaced by an average annual increase of 3 percent in our productivity. This figure does not include the jobs which must be created to keep pace with our population growth, amounting to another 12 million.

Automation is permeating virtually every area of the American economy—in agriculture, in manufacturing, in mining, in distribution, and in marketing. And I believe it is factual to state that at this point many of the innovations, while solving technological problems, have created even more difficult economic and social problems. The work force in the bituminous coal-mining industry has been drastically cut to one-third of what it was 15 years ago. Less massive, but still significant reductions have taken place in other fields of the mining industry, in the steel industry, in automobile manufacturing, in the food packing industry and others.

Within the past 5 years or so we have seen not only the increasingly rapid application of automatic machines to the production process; we are witnessing their application to the logical and decisionmaking processes as well—this later development having been termed "cybernation" from the Greek word for "steersman." Thus we now find the machine also impinging on the highest levels of decisionmaking in Government and industry.

The implications of the new technology, Mr. President, are of immense significance to the future nature of American society. And we have delayed too long in addressing the problem systematically.

In 1939, almost a quarter of a century ago, as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, I proposed House Joint Resolution 31, which would have authorized the Secretary of Labor to investigate the effects of technological changes on labor. In that same year, I introduced H.R. 7487, for the promotion of the welfare of those displaced by scientific development. I followed this with the proposal of House Resolution 119, to authorize the House Committee on Labor to investigate the effects of technological changes on the employment of labor.

World War II, with its accompanying labor shortages, distracted the attention of Congress from the more deepseated currents of technological change. We have been too long in redirecting our attention to the problems which some of us saw in their embryonic state many years ago. I therefore welcome this bipartisan move to introduce a joint resolution on the establishment of a Presidential Commission on Automation and I pledge my most diligent efforts in its support.

FREEDOM OF THE BALTIC STATE REPUBLICS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is doubtful whether there is any national group in this wide world with such fierce fidelity to freedom as the peoples of the Baltic State Republics. I have had occasion to visit with many of them who were in a refugee status in East and West Germany long ago and I never cease to be amazed at their willingness even at advanced ages to start life anew in an atmosphere of freedom if it could not be achieved for their homelands.

The Baltic peoples who reside in this country have enriched the culture and tradition of our people and at the same time retained those ancestrial ties and that devotion to freedom which makes them stand apart.

Their unending search for this great boon to mankind merits every possible encouragement and to that end I present a concurrent resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred and that it also be printed as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 54) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the Communist regime of the Soviet Union did not come to power in the middle eastern European countries by legal or democratic processes, but has flouted even the solemn assurances and agreements entered into at the Yalta Conference of February 1945; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has denied self-determination by free election in those countries, resorting not only to heavily manned occupational forces, but also to genocidal activities in the cases of the Baltic State Republics; and

Whereas the sovereignty and independence of the former free Governments of the Baltic States were duly recognized and continue to be given diplomatic recognition by the United States, as confirmed by H. Res. 346 of the Eighty-Third Congress, agreed to July 27, 1953; and

Whereas the suppression of human freedoms and the denial of free trade and communications with other sovereign countries present a threat to peace, intolerable either to the United States, other free nations, or the international law agencies; and

Whereas the Governments and peoples of the Baltic States have always been in close relation with the United States and constantly continue to prove their belief in democracy through the work and blood of their peoples: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is hereby requested to take such action as may be necessary to bring before the United Nations for its consideration the question of the forceful incorporation of the Baltic State Republics into the Soviet Union, and a resolution declaring that:

(a) The Soviet Union shall withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists and controls from the Baltic States;

(b) The Soviet Union shall return all citizens of the Baltic States to their homelands from places of exile in Siberia, and dispersion in prisons and slave labor camps throughout the Soviet Union; and

(c) The United Nations should conduct free elections in the Baltic States under the direct supervision of the United Nations and sit in judgment on the Communist counterparts of the Nazi war criminals convicted at the Nuremberg trials.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, S. 808, which would amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the setting aside of an area within the Canal Zone to preserve and conserve its natural features for scientific study, for providing and maintaining facilities for such study, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services when it was introduced.

Since this bill relates to a subject within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of S. 808 and that this bill be rereferred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TOWER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1321) to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CHANGES IN THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. JAVITS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1823) to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROSECUTION OF PROJECTS IN CERTAIN RIVER BASIN PLANS—AMENDMENT

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. Keating) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 6016) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY AND OPPORTUNITIES IN THE NATION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENTS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 18, 1963, the names of Mr. Clark, Mr. Fong, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Javits, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Pell, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey were added as additional cosponsors of the amendments, intended to be proposed by Mr. Morse, to the bill (S. 580) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation, submitted by him on July 18, 1963.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 25, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 489. An act to amend the act of March 5, 1938, establishing a small claims and conciliation branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia;

S. 490. An act to amend the act of July 2, 1940, as amended, relating to the recording of liens on motor vehicles and trailers registered in the District of Columbia, so as to eliminate the requirement that an alphabetical file on such liens be maintained; and

S. 1036. An act to amend the inland and western rivers rules concerning anchor lights and fog signals required in special anchorage areas, and for other purposes.

NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR—ROBERT MOSES' COMMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, New York City will celebrate the 300th anniversary of its founding with the opening of the New York World's Fair, 1964–65, an event which will bring to the city millions of visitors from all parts of the world. There is every likelihood that this fair not only will surpass anything seen before but also that it will prove to be a compelling force for better understanding among all the peoples of the world. As the greatest city in the world, New York can be expected to put on display all aspects of the way its people live, including their tradition of hospitality. A great city has many faces and, in a recent press conference, Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair, properly cautioned against the distortion in presenting only lurid descriptions of New York.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the remarks of Robert Moses, at the first press conference on the progress of the World's Fair, June 27.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Robert Moses, President of New York World's Fair, 1964–65, at the First Press Conference on Fair Progress, Press Building, Flushing Meadow, Thursday, June 27, 1963

We at the fair build. The press in its many manifestations reports. Who am I to explain our respective missions and to acknowledge our dependence upon you?

These are the three big dilemmas we all share—to accept without rancor the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune and still believe in divine providence, to witness the gullibility of the public and still believe in the democratic process, and to recognize the fickleness of the electorate and still believe that in the long run the people are right.

We have a faith beyond logic which inclines us to believe in a sort of built-in super eustachian tube and a sixth or common sense which keep the feet of the people, and maintain balance and equilibrium in our democracy.

It all gets down, does it not, to education? That's where you of the fourth estate come in. You are the great communicators. Your job, day in and day out, is to provide not merely the news but the unvarnished facts and unbiased comment on them. If your words and pictures are illuminated by occasional gleams of humor, so much the better.

At the risk of boring you, let me state briefly our 10 objectives at Flushing Meadow. They are:

(1) Promotion of peace through understanding; but the fair offers more than a bright symbol and an eloquent slogan. We aim to show that, on a shrinking globe in an expanding universe, the continents and people draw closer together and must learn to live in harmony.

(2) Attractions which will insure respect for New York on its 300th anniversary. Help us to show that, in the three centuries of welcome to strangers yearning to breathe free, New York has not evolved, as one might occasionally think from the more lurid press exposures, into a place of moneygrabbing wrath, and tears.

(3) Free competition of all peoples in the Olympic tradition of the finest in art, talent, skill, discovery, and invention. In this competition we expect that the advantages of American free enterprise will become obvious. We cannot precisely define democracy. Only by our works shall you know us.

(4) No dictated, centrally controlled design. No predominant architectural school or movement. Design and content left to exhibitors, subject only to simple rules to insure safety, sanitation, space, and landscaping.

(5) Special attention to religious pavilions and to those of new republics.

(6) Fun as well as culture and industry, but no cheap midway.

(7) Adequate access by all means of travel, including a permanent arterial system to serve future needs.

(8) At least 70 million visitors.

(9) A cash balance at the end of the fair sufficient to pay all debts and to complete Flushing Meadow Park.

(10) Opening on time.

You cannot blame us for believing that in pursuing these objectives energetically we are entitled to the support of all decent citizens who are proud of our town and loyal to it. Ours is a private nonprofit corporation authorized by special act to build and operate a great exposition and at the close to have a sufficient balance to finish a great city park.

Error is the besetting sin of journalism, perhaps occasionally acknowledged in the confessional, but almost never publicly. At worst it is no more reprehensible than incompetence in administration and insolence in office which are our besetting sins, the existence of which we, too, usually vehemently deny.

So let there be some mystery about our respective professions, and let us admit that we are all human and potentially brothers. This realization will lead to much pleasant companionship. Let's be working partners in bringing the world to New York in 1964 and 1965. Go easy on our deficiencies. We strive for, but make no claim to, omniscience and perfection. Do not, we ask, overemphasize the absentees. At the end of the first season they may be sorry they stayed out.

As a step in this direction, we start this afternoon the first of a series of press conferences on fair progress. We are not shrinking violets or sensitive plants and constructive questions won't irritate us. The heads of the staff are here so that you will be speaking directly to those who are shouldering the responsibilities.

INTERNATIONAL BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the position taken by the administration on its interest equalization tax has roused widespread discussion on the question of balance of payments throughout the country.

In this connection, I call to the attention of the Senate an excellent commentary on the administration's recently announced program to deal with our balance-of-payments deficit by the distinguished journalist, Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the July 23 edition of the Washington Post.

In his analysis Mr. Lippmann makes two very important points with regard to the most controversial element in the President's proposal—the interest equalization tax on foreign securities. One is that none can be certain that the proposed tax will reduce our payments deficit caused by long-term capital outflows. The second is that should the tax be effective it may cause a substantial reduction in the world's liquidity, which is provided by the dollars we are channeling abroad. If deflationary pressures would develop as a result, Mr. Lippmann states "there will be needed big reforms in the international monetary system."

On July 10 I introduced a resolution calling for such reforms to be carried out through a world monetary conference.

Mr. Lippmann is correct in criticizing the Treasury's attitude that consideration of reform of the world monetary system should come only after our balance-of-payments deficit has been substantially reduced or eliminated. The Treasury's reasoning is that serious consideration of such a proposal would indicate weakness and thereby shake confidence in the dollar.

This line of reasoning is fallacious. We are not dealing with our balance-of-payments deficit from weakness—far from it. The strength of the dollar, the question of confidence in the dollar, must be measured against the great strength of our industrial machine, the enormous size of our overseas investments, the size of our foreign trade and our great military strength.

I do not believe that the measures taken thus far by the administration recognizes this basic strength or that these can meet this critical problem effectively. While I agree that we must in the first instance take all necessary steps that can be taken in the sphere of domestic economic policy—without jeopardizing our economic growth—the resolution of our balance-of-payments problem in the not so distant future must be dealt with within the framework of basic reforms in the world's monetary mechanism.

Rather than to pursue this discussion in an extemporaneous manner now, I wish to deal with it once again in detail next Monday on the floor of the Senate. I hope that interested colleagues will participate in this discussion.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 23, 1963]

THE DEFENSE OF THE DOLLAR

(By Walter Lippmann)

The administration program for dealing with the deficit in our balance of payments is quite evidently provisional. Something had to be done because the deficit has not really been reduced in the past year. But only provisional measures were judged to be practical in the present climate of international finance. The most serious proposal is to check the outflow of dollars for foreign investment. This is to be done by taxing the sale to Americans by foreigners of the long-term foreign securities. This tax is to last for 2 years, ending on August 16, 1965. It would make it more expensive for foreigners to raise money in the U.S. capital market. Direct investment abroad by American companies in plant and equipment would not be affected.

No one can be certain that these measures and the underlying situation will bring American payments into balance in 2 years. However, even if they do, as the President allowed, "as we close our payments gap, we will cut down our provision of dollars to the rest of the world." This will put serious difficulties in the way of an expansion of world trade and economic development. If deflationary pressures develop, as is probable, there will be needed big reforms in the international monetary system.

It is perhaps fair to say that while the administration has been in the past opposed to such reforms, they have been favored by the British, who share with us the burdensome honor and privilege of providing the world with a reserve currency. There are many American experts within the administration and outside it who favor major reforms. And the President himself has recently shown concern and interest.

But the Treasury has been taking the position that the open discussion of any major change in the world monetary system would shake confidence in the soundness of the dollar. The only reforms and remedies that are safe and sound are those which can be arranged privately and carried out with a minimum of publicity by arrangements with foreign finance ministers and central bankers. The Treasury is hoping to maintain confidence in the dollar by the time-honored banking rule of not allowing anything to let the dollar be questioned. While measures may be necessary to enlarge the reserves at the base of the international monetary system, these measures must not be talked about publicly or treated as important but must be made to appear as an unalterable rocklike monetary system. The rule of our conduct must be, therefore, that the reform of the monetary system must come after, and not before, we have closed our own payments gap.

Proceeding according to this austere principle, the Treasury has been active in devising arrangements to protect the dollar against bear raids by speculators. And in this it has had admirable cooperation from foreign central banks and finance ministers, including notably the French. But these arrangements were not designed to solve the underlying balance-of-payments problem. With regard to that, as Secretary Dillon told the Joint Economic Committee on July 8, progress has been "disappointingly slow and uneven over the past 12 months."

That is why the President has just sent his long message to Congress which includes among other things the proposal for a 2-year emergency tax to cut down American foreign investments. Despite all the efforts at home and abroad to close the gap, the "hard core of our deficit" is greater by well over a billion dollars than the apparent deficit. For the accounts include a number of what Secretary Dillon calls "special transactions," which cannot be repeated very often. Thus there has been prepayment on old debts. There have been advanced payments on military purchases which will soon be completed.

Not counting these special transactions, the deficit is still at the 1962 level, which is much too high. This leaves the administration with the task of trying to increase our dollar receipts by increasing our exports and encouraging investment by foreigners in the United States, and of reducing our dollar outflow by (1) cutting military expenditures abroad, which are $2.4 billion, (2) cutting foreign aid, which is $3.5 billion, (3) cutting down on private foreign investment, which is $2.5 billion.

Although the President and the Secretary of the Treasury are trying to sound confident, it is a hard task which they have set themselves. A big expansion of export trade is not going to be had easily in this time of sharpening commercial competition. The military expenditures cannot prudently be reduced until and unless there is a much greater accommodation with the Soviet Union than is yet in prospect. Foreign aid, which looks like the easiest mark, turns out on examination to consist increasingly of "tied loans" which call for the export of goods but not of dollars. That leaves foreign investment, which in a gingerly way the administration proposes to tax.

It is a plausible guess that within the 2 years of the emergency tax the Treasury will become increasingly interested in international monetary reform. It will be realized generally that the burden of providing a reserve currency for the world cannot be solely an American and British task but is in fact a world obligation.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS BETWEEN THE TOWN OF POWELL, WYO., AND THE PRESBYTERIAN RETIREMENT FACILITIES CORP.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask the Presiding Officer to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on the bill, S. 1122.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1122) relating to the exchange of certain lands between the town of Powell, Wyo., and the Presbyterian Retirement Facilities Corp., which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept from the town of Powell, Wyoming, a deed conveying to the United States all right, title, and interest of the town of Powell, Wyoming, in and to all or part of the property comprising block 116 conveyed to such town by patent numbered 1056913, dated August 23, 1932.

(b) Upon the receipt of a deed from the town of Powell, Wyoming, conveying the property comprising all or part of block 116 to the United States, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey by patent or other appropriate conveyance to the Presbyterian Retirement Facilities Corp. all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to such property upon the condition that—

(1) the Presbyterian Retirement Facilities Corp. convey to the United States fee simple title to a parcel of property of approximately equal value to that property received by it from the United States under this Act;

(2) If it is determined after an appraisal by the Secretary of the Interior that the parcel of property to be conveyed to the United States under paragraph (1) of this subsection is of less value than the property conveyed by it to the Presbyterian Retirement Facilities Corp., the corporation shall pay to the United States an amount equal to that difference in value.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey by patent or other appropriate conveyance to the town of Powell, Wyoming, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that parcel of property conveyed to the United States by the Presbyterian Retirement Facilities Corp. pursuant to the first section of this Act.

(b) The conveyance authorized under subsection (a) of this section shall be made subject to the same covenants, conditions, and limitations as those contained in patent numbered 1056913, dated August 23, 1932, referred to in the first section of this Act.

SEC. 3. The town of Powell, Wyoming, and the Presbyterian Retirement Facilities Corp.

shall pay to the United States such sum as may be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior to compensate the United States for its administrative costs in carrying out the provisions of this Act, which sum shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the House has passed with minor amendments the bill which my colleague from Wyoming and I have cosponsored. Their amendments are technical and make no significant changes in the bill, which was unanimously passed by the Senate on June 24. My colleague and I have agreed to accept the provisions inserted into S. 1122 by the House of Representatives. It is our hope that this bill can be enacted into law so that the people of Wyoming can take the appropriate action to develop a privately owned retirement home for the elderly citizens of that area.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 1122.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the majority leader will be gracious enough, I should like to address a question or two to him relative to Calendar No. 347.

On Monday of this week, in my absence from the Senate, the majority leader was kind enough to report for me and for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that bill, which is S. 1703, introduced by the two able Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK].

The bill would extend for 1 year the provisions of the so-called Mexican farm labor bill.

I am glad to advise the majority leader that both the committee report and minority views have been printed and are available. Various people are here, mostly from the West, who have a keen interest in this bill and are asking me almost hourly when I think the bill can be brought up for debate in the Senate.

May I ask the distinguished majority leader if he has any plans at this time which he can disclose as to the possible time for consideration of that measure?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Florida, as he knows, the pending business is H.R. 6016, the so-called river basin bill. Nothing will be done on that bill today, but it will be considered on Monday, when debate and consideration will start. That bill will take at least a day, and perhaps two.

It is anticipated that following consideration of that bill, on Wednesday, the Senate will proceed to consider S. 1703, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] who is now in the Chamber, and his colleague from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], who is coming in the door now, which was reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] on the 22d of this month.

Following disposition of that bill it is the intent of the leadership to have the Senate proceed to consider S. 1642, a bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, to extend disclosure requirements to the issuers of additional publicly traded securities, to provide for improved qualification and disciplinary procedures for registered brokers and dealers, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader. That information will enable me to give something more specific by way of information, not only to the authors of the bill in question, but also to the numerous people from the West who are here and greatly interested in passage of the bill, S. 1703.

I thank the majority leader.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield for a moment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wish to express to the senior Senator from Florida the deep appreciation of all of those in the West, to whom this bill means so much. There is no question that failure to pass the bill or some similar bill this year would result in the closing of many small canneries throughout the West and inflict hardship on a great many farmers, particularly those who raise vegetables in Colorado and throughout the West.

We are greatly appreciative—I am surely appreciative—of the fact that the distinguished majority leader has agreed that the Senate will consider this bill next week. I am sure the people of the West will be happy to hear that.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the concurrence of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 348, H.R. 3272, and the measures on the calendar which follows, in sequence, which were reported by the Committee on Finance, unanimously. To the best of my knowledge and understanding, the measures are noncontroversial.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first measure.

FREE ENTRY OF ORTHICON IMAGE ASSEMBLY FOR MEDICAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA

The bill (H.R. 3272) to provide for the free entry of an orthicon image assembly for the use of the Medical College of Georgia, Augusta, Ga., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 375), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 3272 is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit, free of duty, one orthicon image assembly imported for the use of the Medical College of Georgia, Augusta, Ga.

GENERAL STATEMENT

H.R. 3272 would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit, free of duty, an orthicon image assembly for the use of the Medical College of Georgia, Augusta, Ga. This assembly has been delivered and installed at the medical college hemodynamic center, and the bill provides for reliquidation of the entry and appropriate refund of duty in the event liquidation of the entry has become final.

Image orthicons are photo emissive camera tubes which are used in high-quality television cameras. A complete assembly consists of an X-ray source or generator, an X-ray table for the patient, an image intensifier tube (or a fluoroscopic screen/optical enlarger system), a television camera, a TV amplifier, and a TV monitor. The assembly is used in medical diagnosis, research, or education to enlarge and display X-ray views of portions of the human anatomy.

In answer to the question as to whether there was a domestic instrument of equivalent scientific value or adequate performance characteristics available at the time of purchase, the president of the Medical College of Georgia furnished the following information: "This equipment is a Marconi-type image amplifier which uses an orthicon-type camera and a mirror optical enlarger in place of an image intensifier tube. This system gives an image resolution of 1,025 lines and uses a 12-inch viewing screen. There are several American manufacturers such as Westinghouse, Phillips, Machlett, and others, who either manufacture image amplifiers or who assemble such equipment from imported parts. All of these systems, however, use an image intensifier in their circuits which causes distortion of the image. These systems have a screen of only 9 inches, and can resolve only 525 lines. They are not satisfactory to properly perform the research activities to which we are obligated under a grant from the National Institutes of Health. There is no other known source of supply for equipment having these performance specifications. Any report to the contrary is based upon either misinformation or misunderstanding of the specifications required. This misunderstanding may be based on the fact that the American systems employ an orthicon camera to make a picture from the image intensifier, whereas the Marconi system does not employ this intermediate image intensifying system but makes its picture from the X-ray screen which is amplified by a mirror optical system. To recapitulate: our specifications call for a 12-inch viewing screen with a system capable of image resolution of 1,025 lines, which does not use image intensification as an intermediate step. There is no American-made equipment which can meet these specifications."

FREE ENTRY OF MASS SPECTROMETER FOR USE OF STANFORD UNIVERSITY

The bill (H.R. 2221) to provide for the free entry of mass spectrometer for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 373), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 2221 is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty the mass spectrometer (and its accompanying spare-parts assortment) imported for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif., which was entered during October 1962 pursuant to consumption entry 1232.

GENERAL STATEMENT

H.R. 2221 would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty the mass spectrometer (and its accompanying spare parts) imported for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif., during October 1962 and provies for reliquidation of the entry and appropriate refund of duty in the event liquidation of the entry has become final.

The instrument for which free entry would be provided by this bill is now being used in the Stauffer Laboratory of the Chemistry Department of Stanford University for research in inorganic chemistry.

The research in which the instrument in question is being used is sponsored by various governmental agencies, including the Atomic Energy Commission, the Naval Research Laboratory, and the National Science Foundation. It is indicated that at the time Stanford University determined its requirements and specifications for a mass spectrometer, no domestic instrument of equivalent scientific value or adequate performance characteristics was available from domestic sources.

DUTY ON POLISHED SHEETS AND PLATES OF IRON OR STEEL

The bill (H.R. 3674) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that polished sheets and plates of iron or steel shall be subject to the same duty as unpolished sheets and plates was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 376), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 3674 is to eliminate an unintended tariff classification anomaly in the Tariff Act of 1930 that permits polished stainless steel sheets to enter the United States at a lesser duty than is applicable to stainless steel sheets that are unpolished.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Sheets and plates of iron or steel, not polished, planished, or glanced, are currently dutiable under various tariff paragraphs. Those of concern are dutiable under paragraphs 305, 308, and 309 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as modified, at various combination rates ranging, in terms of ad valorem equivalent, from 9 to 14 percent ad valorem. The highest rate, 14 percent ad valorem, is applicable to unpolished sheets and plates of alloyed steel, primarily stainless steel. There is, however, a specific provision in paragraph 309 which prescribes the duty rate on sheets and plates of iron and steel that have been polished, planished, or glanced. This rate is 1¼ cents per pound, a statutory rate having a current ad valorem. The lowest equivalent rate in this range, approximately 2.9 percent ad valorem, is applicable to polished stainless steel sheets.

Under the existing classification, importers of stainless steel sheets can thus avoid the duty rate of 14 percent ad valorem and take advantage of the lower 2.9 percent ad valorem rate by simple expedient of the polishing process. This is an illogical and paradoxical result.

The explanation for the existence of this inequity in the law is largely historical. Stainless steel is of comparatively recent commercial importance, not being in production in significant quantities until well after World War I. The provision in section 309 predates by many years the advent of stainless steel and was apparently intended initially to apply to high-tonnage carbon steel. When applied to the substantially higher valued stainless steel sheets, however, it has presented an opportunity for tariff avoidance.

Because of the existence of this unintended anomaly, in recent years imports of polished stainless steel at the lower rate have increased tremendously, as is illustrated by the following table compiled by the U.S. Department of Commerce.

U.S. imports—Sheets or plates of iron or steel, polished, planished, or glanced (schedule A No. 6039700)

	Pounds	Value
1955	32,755	$19,102
1956	30,478	18,881
1957	32,574	31,168
1958	42,952	11,020
1959	15,650	14,251
1960	736,746	257,160
1961	1,872,909	814,059
1962	16,561,669	6,555,205

The Congress has already recognized this rate anomaly in the tariff law, and in the revised Tariff Schedules of the United States, the adoption of which is provided for in the Tariff Classification Act of 1962, approved May 24, 1962 (Public Law 87-456), provision is made to eliminate it. Under the revised schedules, sheets and plates which have been polished, planished, or glanced will be dutiable at the same rate as those which have not been so processed.

Under Public Law 87-456, however, the revised Tariff Schedules of the United States are to be made effective by proclamation of the President. However, negotiations have not been completed, and any further delay in taking action to eliminate this anomaly appears unjustified. In this connection, the report from the Department of Commerce states:

"Although the target date for implementing the revised tariff is now September 1, 1963, a further delay may develop which would delay the adjustment of this rate inequity. In view of this possibility, we favor correction of the problem through enactment of H.R. 3674. Enactment would not change any U.S. trade agreement concession or result in the United States violating any trade agreement obligation and would make applicable to imports of polished stainless steel sheets and plates a rate similar to the rate provided for in the revised tariff."

The necessity for the action recommended is underscored and emphasized by the further very substantial increase in volume of polished stainless steel imports that has occurred within the past year. The Tariff Commission advises that in the first quarter of 1962 approximately 1,156 tons were entered at the lower duty rate. The figure for the same period of 1963 is approximately 2,276 tons, an increase in volume of almost 100 percent.

CONTINUATION FOR TEMPORARY PERIOD EXISTING SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON CERTAIN ISTLE OR TAMPICO FIBER

The bill (H.R. 6011) to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle or Tampico fiber was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 378), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 6011 is to continue until September 5, 1966, the existing suspension of duty on dressed or manufactured istle or Tampico fiber.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Istle or Tampico fiber, not dressed or manufactured, has been duty free since 1930 under paragraph 1684 of the Tariff Act. The dressed or manufactured fiber was dutiable under a catchall provision in paragraph 1558. Sections 1 and 2 of Public Law 85-284, approved September 4, 1957, transferred the dressed or manufactured fiber to paragraph 1684 for a 3-year period, and Public Law 86-456, approved May 13, 1960, extended the suspension of duty to the close of September 4, 1963. H.R. 6011 would continue this treatment for a further period of 3 years.

Istle or Tampico fiber is derived from several species of the agave plant which is indigenous to Mexico. It is one of the best known and most widely used of all vegetable brush fibers. Its principal use in the United States is in the manufacture of brushes.

The situation at the time of enactment of Public Law 85-284 was that there was no domestic production of the raw fiber and an insignificant production of the dressed fiber from imported raw fiber; that good grades of raw fiber were in short supply; and that the brush industry and other importers indicated that the prices of dressed fiber had risen, with resulting increases in the cost of production and in the price of the finished product. The purpose of the suspension was to reduce the burden of the higher prices on domestic users of the fibers. Conditions continue to warrant the suspension of this duty.

SUSPENSION FOR TEMPORARY PERIOD OF THE UNPAID DUTY ON HEPTANOIC ACID

The bill (H.R. 5712) to suspend for a temporary period the unpaid duty on heptanoic acid was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 377), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 5712 is to continue the existing suspension of the import duty on heptanoic acid for a period of 3 years from the date of enactment.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Section 1 of Public Law 86-795, approved September 15, 1960, suspended the duty on heptanoic acid for a period of 3 years. H.R.

5712 would continue this treatment for 3 years from the date of enactment.

Heptanoic acid is used in making special lubricants and brake fluids for use particularly in military aircraft. The Department of Commerce has advised that "at the present time there is no U.S. production of this acid, and U.S. consumption is dependent entirely on imports."

Heptanoic acid is classified under paragraph 1 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and is dutiable at a rate of 12½ percent ad valorem. The dollar value of present imports is low.

EXTENSION OF TIME DURING WHICH TANNING EXTRACTS MAY BE IMPORTED FREE OF DUTY

The bill (H.R. 2675) to extend for 3 years the period during which certain tanning extracts, and extracts of hemlock or eucalyptus suitable for use for tanning, may be imported free of duty was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 374), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 2675 is to extend for an additional 3 years (1) the period during which certain tanning extracts may be imported free of duty, and (2) the period during which extracts of hemlock or eucalyptus suitable for use for tanning (regardless of their chief use) may be imported free of duty.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Public Law 85-235, approved August 30, 1957, temporarily transferred from paragraph 38 of the dutiable list of the Tariff Act of 1930 to the free list of that act certain tanning extracts, establishing a separate provision therefor in a new subparagraph (b) of paragraph 1670. This suspension of duty was extended by Public Law 86-427, approved April 22, 1960, to the close of September 30, 1963, at which time, in the absence of further legislation, it will expire.

Section 4 of Public Law 85-645, approved August 14, 1958, made special provision for eucalyptus extract in paragraph 1670(b), and Public Law 86-288, approved September 16, 1959, made special provision for hemlock extract in the free-list provision. The original terminal dates for the duty-free treatment provided for in Public Law 85-645 and 86-288 were the same as the terminal date provided in Public Law 85-235. Public Law 86-427 extended the terminal dates of suspension in all three instances to the close of September 30, 1963. H.R. 2675 would further extend this terminal date to the close of September 30, 1966.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection. No further legislation will be considered today. It is the intention of the leadership, at the first available opportunity, to adjourn the Senate until Monday next.

THE RAILROAD RULES DISPUTE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I was glad to learn that the railroad companies have postponed for 30 days the pending strike. However, I do not think Congress should take this postponement as an indication that the problem no longer exists or that it can continuously be postponed. We have the responsibility to make it our top priority business.

I regret that there has not been a little more aggressive action and interest taken on this question by the Congress. In my opinion, from the moment the President submitted the question to us, we should have made it our top priority business, suspending all other activities until a bill has been approved.

I have been somewhat disappointed that the President sidestepped the issue and shirked his own responsibility in handling it. Certainly he portrayed no profile in courage in dealing with this question. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial which appeared in the Wilmington Evening Journal of Wednesday, July 24, 1963, entitled "The President Dodges the Issue."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT DODGES THE ISSUE

By asking Congress to refer the rail work rules dispute to the Interstate Commerce Commission President Kennedy has once again avoided facing the issue squarely. The net effect is a further delay in eliminating the unnecessary jobs that are costing the railroads $600 million a year.

If Congress accedes to the President's request by next Monday, the five operating brotherhoods will have found more than ample justification for the intransigence they have displayed throughout the 4 years of this dispute. A Presidential commission appointed by President Eisenhower, the Federal courts, and a Presidential emergency board appointed by President Kennedy all have upheld the position of the railroads and ruled against the unions.

But the unions, which never once made any effort to bargain in good faith, steadfastly refused to accept any of the recommendations. They were banking on the Government to pull their chestnuts out of the fire because a nationwide rail strike would be intolerable. The Government has not let them down; President Kennedy failed to give his strong support to the recommendations of the two commissions, even though these would have gone far toward alleviating the problems of the workers the new work rules will create, and now he is asking another 2-year hiatus while yet another Federal body studies the issue.

If the Interstate Commerce Commission could bring some special competence to this issue that the earlier special commission could not, there might be reason to applaud the President's action. But the fact is that it cannot; it would need much of the 2 years allotted to it in the President's proposal just to familiarize itself with the work rules issue and the railroads' manning requirements. In the meantime, the railroads are asked to pay out another $1 billion or so in unnecessary wages while they wait for the ICC to begin making its rulings.

Mr. Kennedy also asserts that his proposal will retain the necessary emphasis on collective bargaining by letting any agreements reached through bargaining supercede any rulings the ICC may make. But the history of this case gives little reason for anyone to believe that there will be any more bargaining in good faith in the future than there has been in the past. The unions have made that clear.

At the root of this dispute is automation, and the President chose to announce appointment of a special commission to study this subject at the same time he announced his proposed procedure for delaying settlement of the railroad dispute. Unfortunately, the commission will begin life under the cloud of the administration's sorry record in the railroad work rules dispute.

President Kennedy has made an easy political decision, but he has danced away from the tougher decision that would have forced a settlement now.

Perhaps Congress will do better. At the very least, it should give immediate attention to the legal safeguards against emergency strikes and abuses of union power. Beyond that, it is time that the Nation's entire transportation policy is reevaluated with an eye to removing the utter reliance on Government intervention that the on-train unions have displayed throughout this dispute.

IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday I took a few moments of the Senate's time to comment on the proposed immigration law which had been presented by President Kennedy to the Congress. In this morning's New York Times there is a fine editorial entitled "A New Immigration Law," in which the editorial writer reminds us that President Kennedy, as Senator Kennedy, wrote a pamphlet the theme of which was summed up in its title, "A Nation of Immigrants."

The editorial makes much of the fact that the President, as Senator, was deeply interested in the whole subject of immigration. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that it was my privilege to be a cosponsor, with the then Senator Kennedy, now President Kennedy, of immigration legislation very much along the line of the proposal which he has sent to Congress.

I should add that the proposal of yesterday in his special message on immigration policy is a more comprehensive proposal, and I think it gets at the roots of some of the real difficulties that have plagued our country's immigration policy.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "A New Immigration Law," be printed at this point in the record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW IMMIGRATION LAW

Five years ago a Senator named Kennedy wrote a pamphlet the theme of which was summed up in its title, "A Nation of Immigrants."

As so many others have done before and since, he pointed out that the post-World War I immigration law was discriminatory because of its national origins quota system, whose only test was whether or not an immigrant was born in the right place. And then he concluded: "The most serious defect in the present law is not that it is restrictive but that many of the restrictions are based on false and unjust premises."

President Kennedy strongly supported his own long-held views on immigration this week. His message to Congress calling for abolition of the quota system within 5 years would not let down the bars completely, but it would break the pattern of inconsistency that has limited immigration from southern Europe and Asia. Eventually 165,000 persons from all countries would be able to come here annually—not a very formidable total in a nation nearing the 200 million mark.

These new arrivals would be selected on the basis of a new set of immigration rules deriving primarily from this country's needs for skill and talent and also from a desire to serve compassionate ends by facilitating the reunion of separated families. In practice, as the President points out, the present system results in much needless hardship because some of the nations most generously favored with quotas have few would-be immigrants, while other nations with vast numbers of potential immigrants have smaller quotas. About 60,000 quota numbers are thus wasted each year, while tens of thousands from less favored lands must wait and wait.

The President's proposed changes in an immigration law that is still based on the 1920 census would go far to remove the worst of its inequities. Under the present system of priorities, people who come from the lands where Galileo, Copernicus, and Confucius were born are not considered equal to those from the lands which produced Shakespeare and Heinrich Heine. This is senseless reasoning, but so is the quota system.

The diversity of America's population is one of its strengths. Immigrants from everywhere conquered this vast country, created its riches, contributed to its Armed Forces in war and peace. Today we know that each immigrant's worth is best judged by personal qualities and skills, not by group stereotypes. Adoption of the President's wise recommendations would be an act of justice and wisdom, as well as evidence that we fully understand the true nature of the changed world—now grown so small—in which all humanity lives.

THE RAILROAD RULES DISPUTE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I join the majority leader and the minority leader in commending the railroad carriers on their extending for 30 days the deadline for placing the new work rules into operation. This was a constructive and cooperative action on the part of the carriers. I hope, however, that during this 30-day period the participants in this dispute, the carriers and the brotherhoods, will see the importance of the railroad and transportation industry's settling its own problems and not relying upon the Government of the United States as the arbitrator or as the judge and final authority. There is no substitute for collective bargaining; and there has been little or no collective bargaining in this dispute for over 4 years. Rather there has been collective stalemate.

It appears to me that, in the 30-day period, while Congress is examining all the facts relating to this dispute, and while Congress is taking testimony on the proposals sent to it by the President, there may be some relief in the dispute. The parties have the responsibility to engage in collective bargaining in the manner this Nation is accustomed to.

Therefore, I respectfully urge upon the carriers and brotherhoods that they enlist the services of the mediation service, under the terms of the Railway Labor Act, and immediately proceed to the conference table, and not merely to the committee tables in Congress. There is much to be gained by our private enterprise system in favoring collective bargaining as a responsibility of the trade unions and of business management.

The day on which the Government of the United States takes over the job of settling these disputes will be the day the hand of Government gets deeper and deeper into the private affairs of the country. I hope the 30-day period will not be used merely by the Senate and the House. I hope that in this 30-day period the Senate and the House will take some testimony, through appropriate committees, on the substantive matter before them, and that during that period of time the railroad carriers and the brotherhoods will make up their minds that it is in their interest and the national interest for them to settle this dispute.

I have reviewed many of the facts in this case, and I have reviewed much of the material that has been presented by the carriers and the brotherhoods. I must say that there has been a shocking lack of true collective bargaining and negotiation. There has been a failure to cooperate with the Mediation Service. Unless the parties to this dispute make up their minds that they are capable of settling their affairs, the Government of the United States will have to do it for them.

I want the record to be clear, and I want no member of the private sector of our economy to criticize me for having voted for legislation which will bring about a settlement of the dispute if the parties to the dispute refuse to settle their own problems.

I submit that the carriers have a responsibility to offer counterproposals, and the unions have the same responsibility. I submit that in the 4½ years of argument over this railroad dispute there has been so little effective and true collective bargaining that it almost fails to fall under the title of collective bargaining. There have been closed minds and little else.

I thank the carriers for their cooperative and responsible action, and I ask them to do something else, and I ask the brotherhoods to do something else: "Take your case to the conference table, and do not rely upon Congress to settle it for you."

There is no assurance that Congress will pass legislation, as has been requested. I have a feeling that with the weight of the President's influence and the President's message before Congress some legislation will result. However, I do not think that either party ought to rely on being bailed out by Congress. They must act responsibly and sensibly and make collective bargaining work. In this case the entire labor movement has a stake. If collective bargaining cannot work when the chips are down, the whole process of collective bargaining is in danger.

I call upon the leaders of every union in America to use their good offices for collective bargaining in this dispute, and I call upon management in every sector of the private economy to urge the carriers to bargain at the conference table, rather than to take their disputes to the Secretary of Labor or to the President, or to Congress.

If they keep that up, Congress will indeed write laws which could very well be detrimental to the private enterprise system and to the freedom of choice which collective bargaining and free enterprise give them.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Before the Senator came to the Chamber there was a discussion on this subject. It brought out fully what the Senator has said. I congratulate him on his eloquent and forceful statement.

There is one further thing that the unions can do. They can work out some internal problems. For example, the two airline unions combined to settle a grave problem in the airlines industries, as we remember. It may be necessary for the locomotive engineers to combine with the firemen in order to form a practical base for what will happen when some kind of new work rules go into effect in the railroad industry. All of that is within the control of labor.

I again congratulate the Senator on his wise words. His credentials as far as labor is concerned are unparalleled. I urge the unions and management to proceed as he has suggested.

Management has made a pretty good record, one must say in all frankness. The unions must be careful not to be left behind in terms of public contemplation of them in what is happening now and what is bound to happen in the future, in which they all want to be given recognition by the American people.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. And, again, let me stress the need for honest collective bargaining, honest give-and-take at the conference table. We must proceed on that basis.

I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE NUCLEAR TEST-BAN TREATY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in today's Washington Post there appears an editorial entitled "Test-Ban Treaty." That editorial summarizes for us the issues involved in the proposed test-ban treaty. The test-ban treaty is in our national interest.

I believe that within the hour the negotiators in Moscow will initial the draft treaty. When that is done, our negotiators will return to the United States for consultation with the Members of the U.S. Senate. Subsequently the delegation will return to Moscow for the signing ceremony. It will then be our responsibility in the Senate to ratify the treaty.

Therefore, as one who has served for several years as chairman of the Subcommittee on Disarmament, and who 7 years ago recommended such a treaty as is about to be initialed—and the matter of a nuclear-test ban has been close to my heart—I wish to say a word or two about the significance of the action which will take place, I am confident, within a few hours—if not minutes.

The agreement on a draft treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, outer space, and underwater represents the first significant breakthrough in the field of arms control since World War II.

I remind my colleagues in the Senate that we have been trying to do this ever since the Baruch plan of 1946, 1947, and 1948. We have been trying to obtain some kind of control over the great, powerful force contained in the atom. Today it appears that we have taken the initial step.

The initialing of the agreement is not only an achievement for the negotiators, but it will also represent a victory for mankind. I am confident that if the agreement is initialed and if it comes to us for consultation and advice, after the treaty is signed, the Senate will ratify it. Failure to ratify would be a tragic dereliction of this Nation's political and moral responsibility and leadership.

I emphasize the moral responsibility. After all, we were the Nation that created the atom bomb. We first harnessed the atom, not only for peaceful purposes, as we have done of late, but also for purposes of war and defense, as we had to do for our security in World War II and the cold war.

The nuclear test ban agreement is consistent with our national interest and is an integral part of our national security policy. I disagree with those who say that this proposal will weaken our security. To the contrary, the proposal will strengthen our security. It is also a giant step forward for peace. The American people and American Nation are dedicated to peace. It is a giant step forward toward better understanding between nations and for the health and protection of mankind.

I call to my colleagues' attention an article which appeared in the Washington Post entitled "Radioactive Rain Tied Statistically to Malformations, Doctor Believes." Radioactive pollution of the atmosphere is something that we cannot ignore. We have a responsibility to see to it that it is stopped.

Finally, I am hopeful that when the agreement is initialed and if it is signed, as I am sure it will be, and ratified by the Senate, I hope other nations will promptly join and heed the plea of mankind and also sign the agreement. This will bring to an end the testing of nuclear weapons in the three environments which have been mentioned.

The new agreement marks a historic turning point in international relations. Not only does it impede the spread of weapons, but it also slows down the arms race. It brings some economic benefits to mankind, and it brings reason to the conference table. It puts aside bitterness. It opens new opportunities for negotiation between the United States and the Soviet Union and other vital areas of political, economic, and arms control issues.

When this agreement is initialed, we will really be able to say in all reverence, "Thank God. Mankind is making some progress." It is progress that can have untold benefits if we will but pursue patiently, sensibly, and constructively an opening that has been given to us now.

It is in this spirit that I hail the achievements of our negotiators. I commend that remarkable statesman, that great American, Averell Harriman, who is performing an outstanding service; the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk; and the Director of the Arms Control Agency, Mr. Foster. They have carried out the expressed will of Congress and the President and have done so in a manner which is a credit to our Nation and to themselves.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in connection with the oncoming nuclear test ban treaty, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Where We Stand," written by Joseph Alsop and published in Washington Post of yesterday, July 24, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE WE STAND

(By Joseph Alsop)

The most obvious effect of the agreement on a nuclear test ban is to freeze the existing American and Soviet nuclear weapons systems except in the limited areas where progress can be made by underground testing.

We are undoubtedly due to hear much heated argument about the advantages and risks of this nuclear version of the old children's game called "Still pond, no more moving." Hence it may be in order to offer a cool assessment of the present stage of United States and Soviet nuclear weapons development.

In the current stage of the grim nuclear art, it must be noted, the test of success is not mere destructiveness. The main test is, rather, what some of the scientists call the weight-to-bang ratio.

In other words, if you can pack more kilotonnage or megatonnage of destructive power into a given weight of bomb than your rival has managed to do, you are in the lead. The weight-to-bang ratio is so important, in turn, because light bomb-weights make for simpler delivery systems; and the delivery systems nowadays count far more than bomb stocks in all calculations of the balance of nuclear striking power.

When this test of the weight-to-bang ratio is applied to United States and Soviet nuclear weapons development, what emerges is quite wonderfully banal. We are ahead of the Soviets in the kind of weapons we want and have tried extra hard to develop. And the Soviets are ahead of us in the kind of weapons they want and have emphasized in their development program.

Nothing could be less unexpected. Yet the cry is already being raised in some quarters that the nuclear test ban has been agreed to when "the Soviets are ahead." In hard-nosed Soviet circles, meanwhile, one may be pretty sure that there is grumbling about a test ban's being agreed to when "the United States is ahead." In both cases, the question to ask is, "Ahead how and where?"

To be more specific, the Soviets are ahead, in terms of the weight-to-bang ratio, in the development of weapons of very high megatonnage. They have tested a 100-megaton bomb; but its estimated weight of hundreds of thousands of pounds, though fairly low for its destructive power, still forbids the use of this bomb in combination with a rocket-delivery system.

More important, the Soviets have also tested a 30-megaton bomb, whose weight is thought to be low enough to make it deliverable by their very large, powerful but cumbersome intercontinental ballistic missiles. Warheads of this pattern may well be used for some, at least, of the second generation Soviet ICBM's (comparable to our late-model Titans), which are now beginning to be deployed in Russia.

The American military theorists, in contrast, have consistently held that 10 megatons was about the limit of the really useful explosive power of a nuclear weapon. Hence the U.S. nuclear weapons program has emphasized warheads and bombs of powers up to 10 megatons, and in this range the United States has the lead.

The weight-to-bang ratio of the American weapons is particularly good, as might be expected, in the warheads designed for use with Polaris and Minuteman missiles. The numbers of Polaris and Minuteman missiles in the American program considerably exceed the numbers of second-generation ICBM's being deployed by the Soviets.

The U.S. missiles are smaller, more dependable, and much more accurate—advantages considered greatly to outweigh their smaller warheads. And in this range of destructive power, the Soviets have not tested any warheads as efficient as ours—which means that they will not find it easy to go forward, as we have gone, from liquid-fueled to solid-fueled rockets.

Such, then, are the main features of the balance sheet. Even if we were to test an improved American warhead comparable to the Soviet 30-megaton type, we would not have any rockets capable of delivering it unless we made the retro-grade step of returning to a liquid-fueled delivered system.

Meanwhile, as noted, the Soviets have somewhat handicapped themselves for the forward step to a solid-fueled rocket delivery system. In practical terms, therefore, it is hard to see why the United States will lose by the ban.

And this is all the more true since the omission of underground tests will keep the Atomic Energy Commission's weapons development laboratories in being and at work. A complete ban, which would all but annihilate the laboratories, would be a very different proposition.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, because the nuclear test ban treaty has received so much attention lately, I express the hope that there will be no tacit understandings or agreements, implied or otherwise, to tie the nuclear test ban treaty to side issues such as, for example, the nonaggression pact about which Mr. Khrushchev is reported to be much concerned. I think it would be most unfortunate if the proposed treaty could not be debated on its own merits, without having something else enter into the picture which could jeopardize its full and fair consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I agree with the Senator from Iowa. I am happy to tell the Senator that there is no tie-in. I am also happy to announce in the Senate that the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union today initialed a treaty banning nuclear weapons testing in the air, in outer space, and under water. This is a most historic moment for mankind.

This is a day of fulfillment for me and, I am sure, for millions of people. A nuclear test ban with adequate controls has been a personal objective of mine in the field of foreign policy and international relations. Many other Senators have likewise dedicated themselves to this possibility.

We can, and should, as the distinguished Senator from Iowa has put it so well, discuss the treaty on its own merits, on the basis of what it will accomplish; not on the basis of tie-ins or any indirect benefits. The proposed treaty should be considered on the basis of what it proposes. I am pleased that a draft of a treaty has been formulated and that those who have been instrumental in drafting it will now be in consultation with the officers of our Government. That is reassuring.

It now appears that we are on the road to significant developments. I understand that our negotiator, Mr. Harriman, will be returning to the United States and will be in consultation with the appropriate committees of Congress, to discuss with us in detail his work on the provisions of the draft treaty.

I hope the Senate will have a smile on its collective face today—individually, yes, but collectively, as well—because we are now in a position to do something which will lend itself toward achieving world peace and freedom and, at the same time, security for our people and others. It seems to me that this is a happy day and a notable day for all humanity.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his assurance and his remarks. I do not need to remind the Senate that articles have been published recently in the newspapers indicating that Mr. Khrushchev and other leaders in the Kremlin were very strong in their feeling that there should be a nonaggression pact. In the opinion of many of us, such a pact would fix forevermore the present captive status of a number of nations.

I am pleased to say that I have noted in many articles the fact that our negotiators and representatives indicated that the policy of the United States has been to consider those issues separately. Therefore, I appreciate the assurance of the Senator from Minnesota that that is the case and will continue to be so.

THE FEDERAL DEFICIT AND MORALITY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on July 22, the Washington Evening Star published an excellent article entitled "Morals and Deficit," written by the distinguished columnist David Lawrence. Mr. Lawrence points out what many of us have been pointing out for a long time, namely, that there is a moral consideration in the continuing decline in the purchasing power of the people's money. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORALS AND THE DEFICIT—ALL IDEAS SEEM TO HAVE BEEN SCUTTLED FOR CURTAILING FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

(By David Lawrence)

In these days when spokesmen for the administration are piously stressing reminders of conscience and moral issues in the equal rights crusade, it may be wondered why those symbols of national behavior don't seem to apply also to the fiscal policy of the Government.

It might be assumed that it's all right to spend the total revenues taken from the citizens during the year and then to borrow still more and spend it, thus increasing an already recordbreaking debt. If the citizen were to conduct his affairs by that code, could he, too, plead that just a few years ago somebody else spent as much, if not more, and never paid off a dollar of debt?

In the parlance of the day, it has become a fad to denounce anyone who wants to balance the budget as some kind of reactionary or rightwinger. If the argument is offered that a conservative is a fellow who wants to conserve his savings and his property, the retort usually is that this is the obsolete and unsophisticated doctrine of a past generation.

If fears are expressed, moreover, about the future value of the dollar—that it may buy less when it is taken out of the savings banks than when it was put in there, the answer given is that the national welfare demands such confiscation.

In the face of such euphemistic arguments, it is in the public interest for attention to be called to some salient facts which President Kennedy failed to make clear in his recent summary of the Nation's finances for the fiscal year which ended June 30.

The President said that last January his budget experts estimated that the fiscal year 1963 would show a deficit of $8.8 billion, but he added that it now is only $6.2 billion. This drop of $2.6 billion is supposed to bring sighs of relief, since it is pointed out that $1.7 billion of this decrease has been made possible by a cut in Federal spending and that $900 million more than expected came in from tax receipts, sales of assets and other payments to the Government since the January estimate was made.

Now $900 million isn't the only increase in revenues. For, actually, the total receipts of the Government in the fiscal year 1963 went up $5 billion above the 1962 figure. Of this sum $3 billion was contributed by tax money. But all of this was eaten up in Government spending just the same, and the budget was still left unbalanced with a deficit of $6.2 billion.

How can any institution remain in good health, fiscally speaking, if it uses up all of its increased receipts each year to pay current expenses and incurs also even a bigger deficit which requires the borrowing of still more money? Any thought of reducing the public debt, moreover, seems to have been abandoned altogether.

Yet this dilemma, which has gone unresolved for many years, doesn't appear to bother most of the politicians in Washington. They point out that it must be all right because in the peacetime years since World War II there has been a deficit every year with few exceptions and there is still enough unborrowed billions to send a man to the moon.

But the important fact to bear in mind is that fiscal unsoundness doesn't always reach its climax overnight and that, when the climax does come, it is too late to restore confidence.

The President, after surveying his own figures—showing that the current deficit isn't as bad as last January's estimate—finds comfort in a budget of $92.6 billion because it isn't as high as the $94.3 billion estimated last January. Yet the Federal budget was $87.8 billion just 12 months ago—in the fiscal year 1962. Why couldn't the U.S. Government have gotten along in 1963 with that big budget of $87.8 billion? How can a reduction in tax rates now be considered sound finance? Even if business is stimulated and tax receipts should grow in volume next year, why should the Government's expenses go up just the same?

These are the simple questions that are left unanswered today in the "moral" atmosphere of the National Capital where the preachers of "equal rights" and "equal protection of the law" show no signs of becoming conscience stricken over the age-old principle that it's wrong "to rob Peter to pay Paul."

RACIAL UNREST IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, several weeks ago Newsweek magazine deployed a 40-man task force under the direction of Washington Bureau Chief Benjamin Bradlee to probe beneath the surface of the current racial unrest in the United States. The results are shown in an article published in this week's edition. It is one of the most comprehensive articles yet on the subject. I believe that anyone who would assess this most important question should read the series of articles set out in the magazine. In the lead paragraph of the main article, the writers sum up what this movement is all about:

> History would mark it: The summer of 1963 was a time for revolution, the season when 19 million U.S. Negroes demanded payment of the century-old promissory note called the Emancipation Proclamation.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "The Negro in America," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEGRO IN AMERICA

History would mark it: The summer of 1963 was a time of revolution, the season when 19 million U.S. Negroes demanded payment of the century-old promissory note called the Emancipation Proclamation.

For white Americans, the events are plain enough: Negroes marching against police dogs and firehoses. Negroes overflowing the jails, singing as they ride off in paddy wagons. Negroes lining up for the vote in the long-taboo registrars' offices of the Mississippi Delta. Negroes sprawling inside New York's City Hall in an around-the-clock lie-in. Negroes pausing to mourn a fallen leader named Medgar Evers—and taking to the streets again as soon as they had buried him.

But where did the revolution come from? The wellsprings of the river of Negro protest lie in a world as remote and as unfamiliar to most white Americans as the far side of the moon—the dark side. Who are these revolutionaries? What do they want? How deep is the tide of protest? How will Negroes fight—and how hard?

Revealing answers emerged last week in Louis Harris' first national poll for Newsweek—an unprecedented anatomy of a revolution in full stride. While Newsweek reporters exhaustively interviewed 100 Negro leaders, a Harris task force asked the same questions of 1,157 Negro men and women carefully chosen as a cross section of the Negro community across the Nation.

Their findings:

The wave of protest is an authentic, deep-seated, broadly based revolution. It has won the allegiance of vast majorities of Negroes wherever they live and whatever their age or economic lot. Its leaders are militant partly by choice—and partly because they have no choice.

The Negro wants no less than an end to discrimination in all its forms. He wants a better job, better pay, a better home. He wants the right to join the white man—to live next door if he chooses, to work beside him, to send the kids to school with his, to eat at his restaurants and stop at his hotels and pray at his churches. And the Negro is hungry for a bigger share in the plenty—for dishwashers and clothes driers as well as human rights.

The first-rank heroes of the revolution are Martin Luther King, Jr., the NACCP—and, to a degree stunningly close to unanimity, John F. Kennedy. Nine out of ten would vote for Mr. Kennedy against any of the GOP front-runners—against liberal Nelson Rockefeller as well as conservative Barry Goldwater.

The revolution is anti-Jim Crow—not antiwhite. Negroes have their doubts about the white man; two in five think he wants to keep them down, and one Negro in five is so deeply alienated he is not sure he would fight for the United States in a war. But Negroes overwhelmingly reject the antiwhite separatist doctrine of the Black Muslims. Most think the white man is better than he used to be and will get better still.

The revolt is committed to nonviolence—though one Negro in five thinks some violence is inevitable. Negroes would far rather work at the bargaining table and in the courts than on the streets.

The Negro will, nonetheless, do what he feels he must to win. Three in five would boycott a store if asked, and roughly half say they would join a demonstration or go to jail for the cause.

Above all, the revolution is one of hope. Even in a toe-to-toe facedown with whites, a majority of Negroes—trusting in God, justice, or their own talents as street fighters—feel they could prevail against 10-to-1 odds. But Negroes don't think it will come to that; in any event, they certainly will not call off the revolt. They think things are already getting better. They are playing to win. They think they can.

The revolt has deep roots in the world of the American Negro. That world was born in the rural South, where Negroes still live in old, unpainted shacks with collards in the garden, petunias in a coffee can on the front porch, a slab of Hoover ham frying on the stove at daybreak, a dime-store picture of Christ or an almanac ad for Sweet Railroad Mills Snuff tacked on the wall.

But the Negro has been moving steadily from the country into town, into the cluster of railroad-red houses in the section just beyond the tracks known to whites as Catfish Row or Baptist Town or maybe Niggertown, into Birmingham or Raleigh or Buttermilk Bottom in Atlanta, where a lucky man can find a decent job. The Negro has been moving north as well—an exodus that will continue. Southern Negroes are no longer so sure that north is the other side of Jordan, but two in five would go if they could.

Sometimes the Negro escapes the worst of the ghetto—if not to a $50,000 house with a pool in Atlanta's Collier Heights or a terraced luxury apartment in Harlem, at least to that citadel of the American dream that nearly every Negro now shares; a home of his own.

If he is not lucky, a Negro winds up in the slums, where the unemployment rate soars to 25 percent, where families crack and break, where one family in eight sees its kids forced out of school by need or lured out by the streets, where even the crime rate, though rampant, pays poorly ($5 for a stolen $90 suit), where numbers runners sell hope, saloons and narcotics pushers peddle oblivion, and nationalist street-corner orators fan the coals of alienation.

Why now? Yet Negroes think they can make theirs a better lot. But why are they striking out now? Not, ironically, because things are so desperate but because they are more hopeful than ever. The Negro breakthrough into action after a century of grievance is propelled by the cumulative impetus of his own economic gains, his advances in education and leadership, and the shining temptations of a white man's prosperous world. The fight is not so much a revolution of despair—Negroes tend to feel they are doing better all around than they were 5 years ago—as a revolution of rising expectations. It is, in a sense, a televsion revolution. There is a TV set in 9 Negro homes out of 10, poking out an antenna that senses the white world and its ways as never before. In a world of hungering men, even a soap commercial can throw sparks of revolt if its setting is a modern suburban kitchen.

Perhaps the American Negro has always been in revolt, since the churches first set his eyes over Jordan and his heart on freedom, since the field hands swapped the first subversive tales of how an underdog named Br'er Rabbit had put one over on Br'er Fox, since the first underground railroad escapes in slavery days and the first recorded sit-in in 1871. But the milestones in the march toward 1963 were World War II, the desegregation of the Armed Forces in 1948, the emergence of an independent Black Africa, and—most important of all—the Supreme Court desegregation decision in 1954. Three Negroes in five doubt the revolt would have come so far without that ruling.

In the years since, Negroes have built up a new leadership cadre—young, talented, articulate, educated, middle class, and, most of all, militant. The Montgomery bus boycott of 1956 thrust Martin Luther King, Jr., into the front rank—and, with him, the strategy of nonviolent mass protest. With that strategy erupting and spreading from Birmingham this spring, leaders and followers alike have forced even northern Negroes to revise their old image of their southern cousins as sleepy-eyed, countrified Uncle Toms.

"We, the Negro people, are now not afraid," says Mrs. Carrie Allen, who runs a grocery store in Union Springs, Ala. "We have woke up." And a New York writer remarked: "For the past 35 years or so, the country has been talking about the new Negro. The new Negro is here. The new Negro is not afraid, and he will not quit."

The question, actually, is not why he is now protesting his past and fighting for the future. The wonder is that he kept his silence for so many years.

DEFINITIONS OF DISCRIMINATION

To most white Americans—even to many who practice it—discrimination is just a word. But to the Negro in America it is a fact of life—the central fact. And discrimination is what the revolution of 1963 is all about.

Question 25e in the Newsweek poll sought to determine the nature of discrimination as the Negro sees it: "During your whole lifetime, as far as you personally are concerned, if you had to name one thing, how has discrimination affected you the most?"

The answers came in a torrent of personal, poignant, and explicit recollection.

Discrimination starts young. "As a kid I hated myself because I was black," said Richard Macon, of Detroit, "because black to me means the other side of the tracks, third-class citizenship, taking the brunt of the jokes." One doctor recalled: "I had to walk 5 miles to school. I passed three white schools on the way to this broken-down school."

Discrimination marches off to war. "In military service," said Charlie Jones, of Chicago, "I had whites spit at me and scream 'Nigger.' I was headed overseas, and the thought of fighting and possibly dying for nothing made me feel that I was fighting without a cause."

Discrimination is served up at mealtime. It "sears you and burns you," said Mrs. Ruth M. Batson, of Roxbury, Mass. "When I was 10 years old, I went to buy lunch at a restaurant in Boston, and they served me raw hotdogs. I will never, never forget that humiliation, of paying for those raw frankfurters."

"I didn't do it": Discrimination encompasses. It is "the feeling of being choked," said one of its 422,000 Harlem victims. And discrimination doesn't discriminate. "It feels like being punished for something you didn't do," said a railroad yardman in New Orleans.

Discrimination is not an easy thing to measure statistically. The Newsweek poll found, for example, that 12 percent of Negroes are unemployed (more than twice the white unemployment rate)—and some of them have been out of work since 1932. But how much of this can be traced to discrimination, direct or indirect? Of those who do have jobs, one in three works in some such low-echelon category as unskilled labor or domestic service. But is this because of outright discrimination by employers or labor unions—or does it reflect the more deep-seated results of discrimination in schools? The statistics cannot say precisely, but they can report how the Negro feels about the matter.

At the top of the Negro almanac of blame stands white business, charged with salary discrimination; only one Negro in three feels he would get equal pay for equal work performed. Next, Negroes singled out real estate companies for restricting housing and for charging them higher rents. More than half of U.S. Negroes (68 percent in the North) feel they would pay higher rents than whites for the same housing. Negroes put major blame on State and local governments for denying them public jobs. One Negro in ten blames unions for keeping them out of skilled jobs, especially in the building trades and in the North.

"We want in": "Break the unions," says one northern Negro. "Convince them to accept apprentices regardless of race. Even our skilled tradesmen are excluded from the better jobs because they are not union members."

Traditionally, minorities in America have recognized education as the ladder to equality, and the Negro is no exception. A whopping 97 percent want their children to complete high school, but the realities of discrimination have intervened. The Newsweek poll found one out of five Negro families had a child drop out of high school—one out of three drops out for financial reasons. Almost half (47 percent) of U.S. Negroes feel that even without dropouts, their children are not getting as good an education as whites. Only a third (35 percent) think their children get an equally good education. In the South, 59 percent of the Negroes think their children get an inferior education, and only one-fourth think their kids are getting as good an education as whites. One southern Negro mother summed up: "When a white child comes home from school he carries four or five books, but the Negro has only one notebook and maybe a TV Guide."

One of the most telling hallmarks of discrimination is its tendency to feed on itself. The person most discriminated against has the worst-paying job and therefore the least money and therefore the poorest housing and the least chance to get the education required to climb the ladder out of the ghetto into the better jobs. Discrimination breeds despair—and nowhere is this more dramatic than in the answers to question 29d: "If the United States got into a war today, would you personally feel this country was worth fighting for, or not?"

Most Americans shared Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy's incredulity when author James Baldwin told him in May that some Negroes would not fight for the United States. Baldwin overstated his case, but he knew what he was talking about. One out of five Negroes says he wouldn't fight or is not sure he would.

Nine percent stated flatly, and often bitterly, that the United States is not worth fighting for (more in the low-income North, but even among the educated leadership, 5 percent said they would not fight). "There's no stripe in the flag for a Negro," said an unemployed man in Wichita. "If he fights for his country he should have a stripe."

But despite all this deep-seated bitterness, despite the all-pervasive feeling of discrimination, nowhere was the Negro voice more eloquent than in expressing his love for America and his willingness (81 percent) to fight for his country:

"I guess white people wouldn't fight if they were us, but we love America. It's our country, too. * * * We love it."—Frances Rembert, of Detroit.

"In 1944, I took the oath with my mouth. In 1954 I took it with my heart; because the Armed Forces had been integrated and I was no longer a colored lieutenant, but a lieutenant in the U.S. Army."—Dr. Byron Briscoe, of Oklahoma City.

And despite "white only" signs, despite the raw hot dogs, despite the ghetto life, Negroes choose America 4 to 1 over any other country as the place where Negroes and other minorities get the fairest break. Twenty-one percent picked America, and the next closest were France (5 percent), England (3 percent), and Africa (2 percent). No other country got as much as 1 percent—and only 5 percent bought the Communist claim that there is no discrimination in the Soviet world.

COMPLETE EQUALITY, NOTHING LESS

"My mother bore me in the southern wild,
"And I am black, but O, my soul is white."
—WILLIAM BLAKE, 1789.

For far too long, the American Negro is convinced, he has been the underprivileged urchin with his nose pressed to the window, longing for the goodies inside. What he wants now is to open the door firmly, walk confidently inside, and partake of them himself.

This is the real nature of the Negro revolution, expressed in terms of what he hopes to gain from his struggle in the streets and in the courts. The Newsweek poll clearly shows that he does not want to take anything away from the whites. He doesn't want the white man's job, or his home, or his school. And it isn't just that he wants a better job, a better home, or a better school. What he really wants is to join with his white brethren in the good things of life. What he wants, in short, is real integration with the vast mass of middleclass America—not just legally but in the everyday mode of his life.

But there is no mistaking that, to the Negro, joining the whites means literally that. Sixty-six percent of all Negroes, and that is more than 13 million of them, say that if they could live anywhere they want, they would prefer to live in mixed neighborhoods with whites. The figure is even higher—75 percent—among lower income Negroes who are now the most segregated.

Moreover, 42 percent of all Negroes living in the South say that they would now rather live in the North. Since this means some 5 million Negroes, it is quite clear that the cities and suburbs of the North would be overrun should such a migration take place.

"Mean and hard": The voices of the Negroes when they talk about integrated living are strong and clear. True, there is a minority who have no desire to move into white neighborhoods simply because they are more accustomed to their own race. "I wouldn't know how to act in a white neighborhood," says William Thornton of Dallas. "I like to be around my own people. I'm used to them," says Willie B. Ellison of Oklahoma City. Some Negroes also seem to fear the consequences of moving in with whites. "They probably would burn down my house if I lived around whites," says a Mississippi schoolteacher. "White younguns are so mean and hard to get along with," adds Grady G. Stowe, of Selma, N.C.

But there are far more who want to move to White Town. Among these some—curiously—turn on their own race. "Some of our colored people are terrible," says a Chicago housewife, "the way they live, their mouths, their actions." "Living in an all-Negro neighborhood, it is dirty," says the wife of a postal clerk in Illinois. And more bluntly: "I don't like niggers!" says Lucy Howell, of Memphis. But by far the most Negroes want to live with whites simply because this, to them, is what integration is all about—coming together and getting to know each other. On the lower end of the economic scale, this feeling is expressed in earthy terms. "If they get to know us," says Esther Simpson, of Mount Vernon, N.Y., "they'd find out we don't all carry knives and are just as good as they. In fact, I know some I feel I am better than they are." One midwestern Negro says: "We want to show whites we are not inhuman."

At the higher end of the scale, the response becomes less emotional. "I think I am intelligent enough to be able to communicate with any of them," says Mrs. Samuel M. Hill, a housewife from Wichita. "This is one of our largest problems." Carmen McGill, a social worker in New York City, shares this view: "I feel there is no sense in segregating ourselves when we are seeking for integration."

The open door: Just as the majority favor mixed living with whites, so do they favor working with whites and sending their children to mixed schools. A hefty 75 percent would prefer to work alongside whites at their jobs, and this figure rises to 88 percent among middle- and upper-income Negroes of the North. Similarly, 71 percent say they would like to have their children go to school with white children.

When it comes to the vital matter of jobs, the great cry of the Negro is for equal opportunity, for he knows full well that in many cases he is denied a job or kept in a servile position because of his color. "I ain't got no job and can't find one," says Joe Lee of Jackson, Miss. "I get one and they lay me off to have a white." A midwestern laborer says: "A Negro has to dig the holes while the white man lays the bricks."

Some Negroes also recognize that, because of their long subjugation, many may not yet be ready for better jobs, or able to deliver if they finally land one. "The Negro has failed on his part to be qualified for promotion," says a businessman from Louisville, Ky., bluntly. "Once you are accepted," says Jesse Hawkins of Houston, Tex., "you have to prove you are capable of following through on what you demanded."

Even so, the Newsweek poll shows that Negroes aspire to almost unrealistic heights. Fully 30 percent of the rank and file think they are qualified to rise to the professions or white-collar business, which is considerably more than the national average of 24 percent in these categories. Twenty-eight percent of rank-and-file Negroes think they are qualified to become skilled laborers (10 percent already are).

School bus: While 71 percent of Negroes would like to see mixed schooling, not that many are sure they would want to have their children picked up by bus and transported to a white school, if that were necessary. Only 51 percent favor bus pickup, while 30 percent think this process would be too much of a hardship on their children. Not many Negroes, however, have any real doubt that their educational facilities, their teachers, and even their textbooks are often inferior to those in the schools where white children go.

These are some typical comments on inequality in the schools:

"The schools are overcrowded and they have two and three shifts—our children can't get as good an education as white children"—Lucia Jones, of New York City.

"Some of the Negro teachers are not trained properly. The young girls today go into teaching because they are in demand and are guaranteed a job"—John H. Smith, of Chicago.

"Children that come around me, there is something wrong. Their English is so terrible"—A pensioner from Chicago.

There can be little doubt that mass communication and mobility have to a very great extent whetted the appetite of the Negro for the good things of life—the modern kitchen the Negro housewife sees on TV or the pleasant white suburb the family spots while out driving. Among low-income Negroes of the North, for example, 80 percent own television sets while only 31 percent have a bathtub, and only 21 percent have central heating. These same ratios hold true very largely for the poorer, farming-class Negro of the South. And overall, 92 percent of Negroes own TV sets.

Additionally, 61 percent of them own cars. The low-income northern Negro fares worst in car ownership with 38 percent, but the rural southern Negro can boast of 62 percent ownership, and among middle and upper income Negroes of the South the figure rises to 94 percent.

While the Negro has his eye firmly fixed on the larger goals of integration, he also is greatly concerned with everyday wants. Today most Negroes have running water (93 percent) and electricity (99 percent). Sixty-two percent also have clothes washers of some kind. But among rank-and-file Negroes, only 14 percent have a clothes drier and only 5 percent a dishwasher. And they make it plain they want these, too—the comforts of an affluent society.

Clean up, paint up: In fact, responding to a question of what improvement they would make in their living accommodations, most Negroes say that they simply want what they now lack. Among the lower income groups, that may be more room if their quarters are now cramped, redecorating, fresh paint, another appliance. "I'd paint the walls and wash up everything, including myself," says William Turner, of Chicago. Since they have most of the basic necessities, the wants of the upper income groups get a bit fancier. Some told the Newsweek poll they wanted central air conditioning, and one said he would like a patio and a swimming pool. Rich or poor, however, the overwhelming majority of Negroes (85 percent) say that if they had their choice of any kind of living quarters, they would prefer a private home.

Of such things is the Negro revolution made. For the Negro feels that nothing should be denied him—not homes, not jobs, not schools, not anything else—simply because of the color of his skin. He feels that if you strip away his black skin, underneath, in reality, his soul is the same as the white man's.

In the bull's eye: Housing

	Rank and file	Non-South	South	100 leaders
In living in a neighborhood, if you could find the housing you want and like, would you rather live in a neighborhood with Negroes, or in a neighborhood that had both whites and Negroes?				
Negro neighborhood	20	11	27	6
Mixed neighborhood	64	75	55	86
Not sure	16	14	18	8

FOUR FACES OUT OF 19 MILLION

Forty-seventh Street, just west of Cottage Grove on Chicago's South Side, is the heart of one of the largest black ghettos in the whole United States. Some 80,000 Negroes live there in raucous noise and rotting filth, in teeming misery and grinding poverty. At the corner of 47th and Langley, a dingy record shop blares nonstop jazz. Down the street is a shoe repair shop, but everybody knows the back room is a bookie joint.

By day, 47th Street swarms with kids in tattered cotton trousers and grimy T-shirts. They play on the side streets under the porches of the tumbledown shacks or in the gaping doorways of the ancient tenements, where the broken windows are stuffed with rags and newspapers. By night, 47th Street is a grown-up world—tired old men leaning against the parking meters talking idly of nothing, younger men and women heading for the gaudy, neon-bright bars, where a prostitute can be picked up for $4. (A few blocks farther west the neighborhood gets a bit better, and the price is $5.)

Life is mean and hard in the Negro slum, yet it is home to James Wright, 43. It is, in fact, almost the only home he has ever known.

A slight, sinewy man, Wright has a thin mustache and a gold tooth that shines when he smiles. He doesn't smile often. For Wright is a bitter man—bitter at his lot and bitter at his race.

"The hell of it is," he cries out, " this could be a great world and a great city. Chicago is a great city, but it's blighted and cancerous. And the Negro is helping to kill it. They misuse freedom. They think getting drunk and having a good time is freedom."

On the side: Wright's own share of the world at the moment is a dingy little barbecue shop on 47th Street where he serves up spareribs and sausages—with a side of cole slaw—to a thin trickle of take-out customers. One evening last week, when business was slow, Wright poked at the charcoal coals glowing in the grill that fills the front window of his store and told a visitor of his life as a slum dweller.

"I was born to a man named James Julius Caesar Wright," he said slowly and rather dubiously, "but they always said I favored Will Turner." He doesn't remember either man, and has only the most fleeting—and not very pleasant—memories of his mother. In 1928, when Wright was 8 years old, he was sent to live with his mother's parents in Des Moines and he stayed there, through the terrible first years of the depression. "We used to make many a meal off the city dump," he recalls.

When he was 14, Wright ran away, back to the slum and his mother in Chicago. "My only ambition," he says, "was to be good and stay with my mother, while everybody else was stealing milk bottles and snatching purses." It was no go. His mother had been a domestic, but Wright remembers: "Then she met a young man and he taught her how to sell whisky and run a good-time house." Like so many thousands of Negro youths before and since, Wright, who had progressed to the first year in Chicago's Wilson Junior College, quit school and struck out on his own.

"A thief am I": Wright soon learned to steal from his employer. It began when he was working for $10 a week at a liquor store and paying $3.50 of that for a room for himself and his wife—the first of four he was to marry, not always with the benefit of divorce.

Wright frankly stole to live better—"like a king," as he puts it now—but he eventually got caught and had to make restitution to escape the police.

"I was just cocky enough not to realize what I had done," he says. "Everybody encouraged me to do wrong. I had no compunctions about stealing, so I thought I'd go to work for the telephone company and steal some of their nickels." But his reputation had followed him. The telephone company wouldn't hire him and neither would the electric company, the bus company, or other liquor stores. Wright hasn't stolen since. Instead he has tried to make a living on his own—with a motorcycle and sidecar, as a hot-dog peddler on the streets, then with a barbecue shop on 63d Street, another pulsating artery of the ghetto, and finally with the shop he opened on 47th Street this month.

Wiping his hands on his apron, Wright drifts to the back of his store, pleased that he has cleared a few dollars on the day's business. "I'd like to move up to Evanston (a pleasant northern suburb of Chicago)," he says, waving his hand at his squalid living quarters. "It's quiet up there. I like that. But moving out of here is just turning your back on it. I'd rather just stay here and fight."

Let them die: Yet Wright seems to sense that even at 43 he is part of a generation that may be lost beyond redemption. "The sooner the old crop dies off the better," he says. "The kids will be better—they will be better."

Wright's greatest despair is that he no longer sees any of his former wives or the three children he fathered, and lives in his bitter world alone. "You have to have something to love," he cries, "something and someone to work for." And then, he throws his arms across his face and breaks into sobs.

A bit later, when James Wright has recovered his composure, he confides that he has found someone to love and work for in Rodney Scott, a little boy who lives across the street in a rundown tenement with six other kids and a father who doesn't work. Rodney is 9 and in the second grade, but he can just print his name and knows only the simplest words. It has become Wright's self-appointed mission to teach him to read.

This evening, pinch-faced little Rodney, clad in faded gray overalls and a soiled blue and yellow shirt, comes into the barbecue shop, lured by the glass of milk that Wright offers him if he will study. Wright sits him down at the kitchen table and asks: "What was that big word I taught you yesterday?"

Rodney, rubbing his finger in his collar, doesn't remember.

"It began with an S," Wright prompts. "S-s-s-s-s-segregation. Now what does it mean?"

Rodney tugs at the laces of his tattered sneakers and giggles.

"Segregation?" the little boy ventures. "Is it like a parade?"

From the grim slums of Chicago to the steep foothills of the Piedmont of South Carolina is roughly 680 miles by air and at least several light years in the life-mode of the Negro. There the southern sharecropper scratches out a bare subsistence from the undernourished loam of gray sand and hostile red clay. In this peaceful rural setting, segregation touches the sharecropper very little or not at all, except perhaps when he goes to town and can't eat in a restaurant. Yet, as James Wright is chained to the slum, so is tenant farmer D. Frank Cobb, 54, chained to the soil, and longing wistfully for a better life.

Cobb is a dark Negro, gnarled from a lifetime of hacking a hoe against the stubborn soil or wrestling a plow behind a mule. He tills 12 acres of land in Oconee County. His home, with its narrow wooden steps and rickety handrail, stands drably on pillars of flat stones, thinly shaded from the burning summer sun by a lone chinaberry tree.

Cobb toils in his fields from dawn to after dusk, yet he also reads a daily newspaper and keeps up with the continuing struggle of his race to escape from segregation. Without a trace of rancor he says: "The reason they are demonstrating is they see the white man ride by in his fine cars and they want some of that, too. The white man has got all the money and he keeps the Negro pushed down."

Swatting flies: A visitor to Cobb's home is shown politely—and a bit self-consciously—into the living room, where strips of flowered wallpaper are tacked to the walls and sunlight pierces through holes in the ceiling. In faded overalls, bare feet thrust into weatherbeaten shoes, Cobb sits stiffly on a sheet-covered sofa and slaps at flies with a homemade swatter fashioned from a stick and a piece of wire screening. He tells you that not too long ago he was pretty discouraged with farming, but that he has bucked up lately.

"I feel better than I did about it," he says in his slow, deliberate speech. "If I can raise my stock, I can make it. But I'd quit if I could get a better-paying job."

Cobb raises enough tomatoes, okra, beans, squash, and corn to feed himself and his wife in season and to store in a freezer bought from Sears Roebuck & Co. on time, against the winter. Wheat he swaps at a local mill for flour, and his 16 hogs and 30 chickens supply meat and eggs. As rent he pays half of the field crops he harvests, and to bring in a little money he takes odd jobs. But Cobb laments that the things he must buy are so much dearer now than they used to be when he and 15 brothers and sisters grew up on the tenant farm of his father nearby. "It wasn't so awfully bad then," he says. "You could take 50 cents and get you half a side of hog, nearly."

Oh, for a TV: The Cobbs have no central heating, no running water, no inside toilet, and their only entertainment comes from a six-tube, table-model radio. They would dearly love a television set. Cobb's pleasant, smiling wife, Eunice, insists that she doesn't mind cooking on her cumbersome Home Comfort-brand wood stove. She likes it, in fact, "because it makes the food taste better." But from the kitchen she volunteers: "Us colored folks like conveniences as much as anybody."

Cobb, who went to a log-cabin school but had to quit in the fourth grade when his father died, feels strongly that Negro youth must have an education and a chance for a better life. He and his wife saw to it that their only child—an adopted son—went through high school. He went on to college and is now a schoolteacher at Batesburg, S.C. "You can't hardly walk down the road now without a high-school education," Cobb says.

As for himself, Frank Cobb still clings to a long-held flickering hope so many Negroes share: a place of his own. "If I just had me about 15 acres of land of my own and a house on it, I'd be doing all right," he says. "As long as I could call it mine, I'd be doing all right."

Yet, deep in his heart, Cobb knows—or at least suspects—that it is only a dream. Shuffling out to his porch, with its gaping cracks between the floorboards and two old automobile seats serving as makeshift sofas, Cobb peers out at the land.

"If I don't make it here," he says simply, "I don't make it."

The hot mid-afternoon sun filters through the starched white curtains of the stuffy living room and throws into sharp relief the slender figure of Cornet Tyiska, a 46-year-old Los Angeles Negro. Tyiska runs a trash-collection business of his own, and that moves him up several rungs on the economic ladder from the sharecropper and the slum dweller. In a good week, with his 1946 Chevy truck, he can make as much as $125, and his wife takes in another $90 or so with the small beauty shop she runs in their home. Tyiska does not seem too concerned about civil rights, and besides, Los Angeles is a far-away place where the drums of racial strife seem dim and distant.

"Being frank, I don't think I'd get out there and mix around the demonstrations and such," Tyiska tells a visitor, speaking softly between badly spaced teeth. As he views the struggle, "all they need to have is a meeting and they'll come to some kind of agreement."

"Way I see it," Tyiska goes on to say, "the Government—the President and his brother, and so forth—oughta sit down and work out all these problems without all that fighting. I don't go for sicking dogs on people and kicking colored folks. There's a better way to settle things, like you and me, we is talking now. That's the way to solve problems."

But while Tyiska sees himself largely divorced from the struggle, he is able to sympathize with the aspirations of his fellow Negroes battling discrimination in the South, and to make those aspirations his own.

He's all wrong: "Down South, things look a bit bad," he says. "You can't blame them for wanting schooling. I think it's right to want to vote and get education. That Governor Wallace is wrong. I saw him on TV, and the things he was saying was wrong. That's no way for a Governor to act. You got to give them people down there a chance to improve."

Tyiska lives about 6 miles south of downtown Los Angeles on busy four-lane Normandie Avenue. He bought his three-bedroom home about 2½ years ago for $14,500, with $10,500 of that still owed on the mortgage. And though the house is faded and worn, it is clean and marked with hard-won comforts—plenty of furniture, an upright piano by the living room door, a TV set in the corner. Tyiska's son, Cozayne, 16 (he also has a daughter, Veronica, 14), plays the piano, and his father says with a proud wide grin: "He been playing piano since he was 7 years old and he's good. Every time he walks by that thing he just has to touch a note."

A certain expertise: Tyiska, who moved to California from Overton, Tex., in 1941, never got beyond the eighth grade, but to survive in business he has picked up a certain expertise in the ways of his trade. "I got to know how to bid," he explains. "You know, hauling rubbish you got to figure gasoline and dumping costs into the price, but you can't go overboard."

Tyiska professes to find little segregation in Los Angeles and none at all in the restaurants he can afford to patronize. A grieved voice floats from the kitchen, where his attractive wife, Elease, is preparing a supper of liver, cornbread, candied yams, and salad. "I don't ever get to go out," she calls. "We're always eating at home."

Yet, safe in their little home, the Tyiskas can be touched by the blight on their race, even if the effects are indirect.

"Around here, it's a little rough on jobs," Tyiska says of his adopted hometown. "There's signs out all over, but my brother-in-law went out to this tire factory today and they gave him an application, but he saw only white races and Spanish people working."

Just then the phone rings and Elease answers it. It's a call from another relative, asking about her brother.

"No," she says, "he didn't get the job."

Charles D. Saxon, Sr., is an erect, handsome, distinguished looking man with curly salt-and-pepper hair and just the faintest touch of gray beginning to creep into his neat mustache. At 50 he is the father of three lively, sports-minded sons, a 22-year employee of the Atlanta Post Office, and an enterprising building contractor on the side. With a family income after taxes of $9,300 a year, Saxon falls into the upper-middle-income group of his race. Except for the color of his skin and his segregated home, he begins to touch the life enjoyed by the vast bulk of U.S. whites.

"We have imitated you very well," Saxon tells a white visitor with a twinkle in his eye.

Indeed he has. Saxon's comfortable six-room bungalow in the southwest section of Atlanta was built for him in 1945 and paid off within 36 months. His lawn is sparkling, freshly mowed Bermuda grass, pleasantly dotted with shrubs and trees, and in the driveway sits a 1962 bronze Chevrolet Bel Air, as shiny as the day it was bought. Inside, Saxon's home is bright and immaculate and filled with handsome furniture—end tables with tooled leather tops, comfortable armchairs and tasteful occasional pieces. On either side of the living-room mantel are built-in bookshelves holding the 5-foot shelf of Harvard Classics. A well-thumbed set of the World Book Encyclopedia is in a hall bookcase. A Magnavox record player is stacked with jazz albums, for one of Saxon's enthusiasms is music. "You talk about an Ellington fan," he says, "man, I'm the most Ellington fan there is. Ellington, Count Basie, Les Brown, Harry James—I'm just a big-band man."

Private enterprise: Although he needs the help of his wife, Marie, who teaches third grade, to reach his ample income, Saxon has other irons in the fire. In 1957 he went into contracting and built his first house, a concrete-block affair which he still owns and rents out, though he says the rent is hardly enough to repay his outlay. Since then he has built half a dozen houses, most of them on contract from buyers, and just recently, with a partner, an eight-unit brick apartment building. He and his partner are retaining ownership of the building, and in a very real sense it is Saxon's hedge against the uncertainties of the future.

Right now, for Saxon, the future looks rosy, though he is disturbed at times by the thought that if it were not for the color of his skin, he might have made it bigger. "I think I had higher goals in life than what I achieved," he says. "I'd like to be a big builder. If the real-estate market in Atlanta was as good as it was a few years ago, I know exactly where I'd be."

Saxon also has a nagging feeling that his progress could have been better at the post office, where he is a window clerk with a GS-4 Government rating. "There is definite discrimination in promotion there," he says. But with his long seniority at the post office, he gets along very well with his white co-workers, even joshes with them about the problems of race: "Sometimes I tell them, 'Man, what you need is to get yourself a Supreme Court.' We have a good laugh."

Sports bugs: Saxon came to Atlanta from Brunswick, Ga., when he was 21 years old with $10 in his pocket. At Brunswick High he had played end on the football team and this left him with an abiding love for sports which he has imparted to his sons. The eldest, Charles, Jr., 21, a junior at Johnson C. Smith University in Charlotte, N.C., is a tennis bug, and Robert, 19, a sophomore at the same school, was quarterback of his Atlanta high school team. The youngest, Eric, 13, is showing promise as a basketball player.

Saxon makes it plain that in the upward struggle of his race he intends to rely on himself more than on anyone else. "I tell my white friends: 'You expect me to know more than you with less education, to survive with fewer political rights, to live better with less economic opportunity.' That's not the specification for an inferior man. That's the specification for a superior man."

THE NATURE OF THE REVOLUTION

Revolution is always untidy, and so it is with this one. No one leader or council directs the Negro's fight for equality; chance, as much as anything, determines the site of the next skirmish.

But what the Negro lacks in a grand design for equality he makes up in fervor and zeal and dedication. In their cause the Negroes stand united. Their passivity has ended. In their hearts they believe their moment has arrived. The emotion of millions was expressed by Miss Betty Ann Wilson of West Palm Beach: "All Negroes are tired of waiting for the white man to get ready to give him something that is his."

By its nature, this is a rebellion of both young and old. All have joined together to take the first step of any successful revolution—to dare to challenge the old order.

In intent, it is a peaceful revolution. It began with passive resistance and—so the Negroes hope—will end in victory through nonviolence. But nobody yet knows whether great violence can be avoided. For although the Negro is fighting to preserve, rather than overthrow, the existing Government and Constitution, he is nevertheless employing all the classic weapons of revolution—petitions, appeals to reason and justice, protest meetings, ultimatums, mass demonstrations, and, where he has had no choice, violence.

The churches' role: The foundation of the Negro's peaceable intentions rests on his own religious tradition (96 percent of all surveyed professed a religion) and the revolutionary role of his own churches. In his present troubles the church has been tactical headquarters and sanctuary. Even in the South the police rarely interfere with the Negro's right of assembly so long as he is in church. What he has heard in church about the brotherhood of man and the justice of his struggle, plus what he has heard outside the church from racists, have given him a deep conviction in the moral rightness of ending discrimination. For Negroes this is a holy war, in which all are joined. Miss Ora Bradley of Jackson, Miss., put it simply: "When you got your hand in God's hand, you got to help each other."

The churches, say 6 of every 10 Negroes, have borne the burden of the fight thus far. "My minister is a great race fighter," said Henry Butler, a waiter in Augusta, Ga. Of her pastor in Philadelphia, Mrs. Edna Mae Murchinson said: "He's a good preacher man. He gives us a lot of wisdom. Now he tells us to get ready because our day will come." From their ministers the Negroes borrow strength, courage, and principle. "The preacher is scared just like the other people are," said a sawmill worker in Mississippi. Givens Bryant, a San Diego truckdriver, said: "They teach us not to hate in spite of our problems."

On the firing line: With this conviction that God marches with them, Negroes all over the Nation have followed their ministers out of the churches and into the streets to employ the most visible of their revolutionary weapons—demonstration. The sit-in, the pray-in, the picketing, and the jailings have caught the imagination of Negroes from Charleston, S.C., to Cambridge, Md., to Los Angeles, Calif. The statistics tell the story: As of now, 40 percent of Negroes say they have already taken part in a sit-in, marched in a mass protest, or picketed a store. The Negro leadership has been even more intensely involved. Of every 10 Negro leaders interviewed, 4 reported that they have taken part in a sit-in, 5 have picketed a store, 6 have marched in a demonstration, and 2 have gone to jail in behalf of the cause.

Have the demonstrations been effective? Some 80 percent of American Negroes are sure they have. "The demonstrations have done more than anything else to win rights for us," said Mrs. Mary B. Reddon, a Washington, D.C., housewife. "Some of the white leaders wouldn't even consider sitting down with Negroes to discuss the situation before the demonstrations."

The spur: The questions on the effectiveness of demonstrations produced a flood of opinion ranging from glee at the white man's discomfort to sober comment on the impact abroad. "Got the white folks shaking," said William Turner, an unemployed Chicagoan. "It showed those whites we ain't gonna take that stuff no more," said Mrs. Doretha Aldridge, a Philadelphia housewife. "It shut Faubus' mouth," said Mrs. C. E. Martin, a Houston religion educator. "It has awakened many white and Negro people to the moral degeneracy of apathy, it has opened many public accommodations, and it has instilled militancy among Negroes," said Thomas Burrell, a Chicago advertising copywriter. "The demonstrations have just about upset the whole world," said Albert W. Robinson, a St. Louis house painter. "They have let the white man know we want our rights."

Among a minority of Negroes, some doubt lingers about the wisdom of demonstrating. "Just got a lot of people jail records," said Mrs. Roy Houston, a St. Louis housewife. "I don't see where they have done anything yet," said Odell Mathieu, a Chicago laundry worker in his sixties. "I'm an old man, and you see, when I was down South, they didn't think about all that mess. We had to get off the sidewalk for the white man. We were scared in them days. It's these young teenagers raising all the hell."

While the demonstrations have grabbed the headlines, the Negro has also been fighting his battle for equality with another powerful but less visible weapon—the boycott. The Newsweek poll showed that 1 Negro in 4—perhaps 5 million in all—has already boycotted stores and products because of reports that a company was discriminating. "We hear about it in church," said a Philadelphia lawyer. "And wherever the boycott goes into effect, I stop buying." The chief targets, according to the poll, have been Wonder bread, Bond bread, and the dime stores—Woolworth, Kress, and Grant. In the North, Negroes have also shunned Borden's dairy products; in the South, some won't buy Baird's bread, Falstaff beer, or Coca-Cola. It is economically significant that most of the boycotting has been done by the Negroes with the most money to spend. Among the Negroes upper- and middle-income brackets, more than half say they have refused to go in a store because the owner employed no Negroes.

Bargaining power: In months to come the boycott may turn out to be a blockbuster of a weapon, for there is growing evidence that Negro leaders are beginning to understand how they can use their economic power to bargain for jobs. Two-thirds of all Negroes with incomes from $5,500 up say they stand ready to boycott any company that practices discrimination.

Yet the Negro's present militant manner conceals what, in more reflective moments, he will frankly admit: He cannot win his battle for equality without white help. Not only is he reasonable, he is more or less persuaded that eventually the white man himself will comprehend the injustice of discrimination. "A person can't go on being wrong all his life," said a farm laborer in Stateburg, S.C. "After the whites have considered that we are human regardless of our color, and that we are praying to the same God, then their attitude will change," said Ezery Jones, of Alexandria, La.

The leaders, in particular, understand that ultimately the Negro can get the jobs and education and rights he demands only with the help of a white Congress, a white President, and a white Supreme Court. Actually, Negroes are skeptical of Congress' ability to act. Certainly Negroes want a Federal public-accommodations law, and 4 in 10 believe it will take such a law to get them into restaurants, movies, hotels, and motels. But only 1 in 10 actually expects Congress to pass such legislation. "You can't count on a Congress dominated by southerners," said a Dallas yardworker.

What they do count on is President Kennedy and the Supreme Court. Two-thirds of all Negroes give the Supreme Court credit for their biggest breakthroughs toward equality. In their words, "The Supreme Court gave us heart to fight," and, "It started the ball rolling." Negro leaders believe the courts will continue to do most to win them their rights. But among the rank and file, almost twice as many put their faith in the President as in the courts. Said Mrs. Willie Jones of Memphis: "The President will keep on protecting us Negroes and he'll send the troops."

Danger signs: If neither Mr. Kennedy nor the courts can bring the Negro deliverance, then the nature of this revolution may take a new and dangerous course. For although the hope of nonviolence reaches through all ranks of Negro life, the potential for violence is sobering. The Negro is determined; the demonstrations have given him the taste of victory; and he is not frightened of what the white man may do to him. He is certain to push ahead—even if that means bloodshed.

It has been said, in southern capitals and northern police stations, that the Negroes do not realize the dangers they face in mass protests. Nothing could be further from the facts. The Newsweek poll contains irrefutable evidence that the Negro is fully aware of the risks he is taking. Three out of every four Negroes questioned said they knew that demonstrations may cause violence, bloodshed, loss of life, damage to property, riots, jail, hatred, even the murder of their own leaders. "It takes all of that to get rights," said Miami's Charlie Roe, unemployed. "Fights, shooting, but it takes that to make the world better." The very same idea was expressed by New Orleans attorney Nils Douglas. "Certainly there are dangers," said Douglas. "The demonstrators quite often flirt with riot. However, this is the price that has to be paid."

In the face of this danger the Negro attitude is a blend of stoicism and defiance. "We always have faced danger," said Ike Hall, a Detroit crane operator. "Being a Negro has been dangerous to start with. We have been beat and lynched and killed anyway." In Negro society, a visit to jail has been transformed from a mark of shame to a badge of honor. The poll shows that a full 48 percent of all Negroes—9 million Americans—say they are willing to take part in mass protests even if, as in Birmingham, it means mass arrests and jailings. The meaning is clear: Negroes can duplicate the Birmingham pattern in every major city in the country.

From the slums: The gravest threat of bloodshed today comes from the slums of big cities North and South, where one Negro in five believes he will have to use violence to win his rights. It is here, in the casbahs of Harlem and Chicago and Detroit and Memphis and scores of other cities, that the powder keg is stored. The situation is ominous; though the weight of authority and leadership is on the side of nonviolence, once a Negro mob comes out of a slum, conflict and bloodshed may be unavoidable.

For all his effectiveness in mobilizing marching, and winning some recognition, the Newsweek poll shows that the Negro has seriously neglected a free society's greatest weapon—the vote. Throughout American history, politics has been the classic method for a minority to gain recognition. The Irish and the Italians, for example, have done well in modern times; so have unions. While the Negro everywhere has been handicapped in political activity by poor education, and while he has been deliberately barred from voting in the South, the fact is that he has displayed great political apathy even where he was encouraged to enter politics. In the long struggle to come, the ballots actually cast could be the most powerful weapon of all.

POLITICS: IT'S KENNEDY 30 TO 1

No politician and no party ever did more for anyone than Abraham Lincoln and the Republicans did for the Negroes by freeing the slaves in 1863.

But 100 years later, the Negro in America has overwhelmingly endorsed John F. Kennedy and the Democrats as Lincoln's heirs.

So overwhelmingly that among Negroes it's Kennedy by a thumping 30 to 1 over Nelson Rockefeller, George Romney, or Barry Goldwater.

So overwhelmingly that only 4 Negroes out of 100 feel the Republicans will do more than the Democrats to help Negroes in the next few years.

So overwhelmingly that almost one out of two Negroes (48 percent) nominate Republican Dwight D. Eisenhower as the President who did less for Negro rights than any other President since 1932. (Three out of four—73 percent—say Mr. Kennedy has done most.)

In short, the debate inside the GOP over how strong a stand to take on civil rights is almost academic to the Negro. In his view, the Republican Party already has become virtually a white man's party.

The short-term implications of this massive disenchantment are plain. In the 1964 election, if the trend holds, it means another 580,000 Negro votes for Mr. Kennedy. (In the 1960 election, this would have meant that instead of squeaking past Nixon by 119,000 votes, Mr. Kennedy would have won with a convincing plurality of 1,279,000 votes.)

For 1964, it will take nothing less than a miracle to change the Republican Party's image among Negroes enough to win their votes to any significant degree. The Newsweek poll asked Negroes why they felt the Republicans or the Democrats would do more to help them in the next few years. Some of their answers:

"Republicans are for power and money," said Laura Turpin, a 32-year-old Washington, D.C., housewife.

"The Democratic Party raises wages and makes it possible for everyone to live on a higher level. The Republican Party lowers wages," said Mrs. Juanita Colbert, 43, of Oklahoma City, Okla.

"The high aristocratic Republicans think nothing of us," said Mr. Mary Warren, a Cincinnati, Ohio, housewife.

"I feel that the Republicans are for the rich and the white," said a Phoenix, Ariz., domestic.

Negro leaders are twice as Republican as the Negro rank and file, the Newsweek poll shows; 1 in 5 leaders considers himself a Republican, instead of 1 in 10 among the rank and file. Here the Negroes closely parallel other minorities, who tend to vote Republican as they climb up the economic ladder. (One New England politician calls this the two-bathroom syndrome—when a poor man adds a second bathroom he changes his party affiliation from Democratic to Republican.) But any Negro leader who tries to deliver the vote to the Republicans in 1964 would likely find himself at the head of a nonexistent army—as John L. Lewis did in 1940 when he tried to take the CIO vote from Franklin D. Roosevelt. Where only 55 percent of the Negro leaders consider themselves card-carrying Democrats, 74 percent of the rank and file so consider themselves, and 89 percent of them think John F. Kennedy has done a good job as President.

Paradoxically, there are a number of dangers for both Negroes and Democrats in the almost monolithic nature of the Negro commitment.

For the Negroes, the danger is that they may lose much of their political leverage. On the one hand, the Republicans may decide that the Negro vote cannot be had, and may therefore abandon any thought of helping the cause of civil rights. On the other hand, the Democrats may be tempted to take the Negro vote so much for granted that they similarly will flag in the cause.

Herein, of course, lies the danger for the Democrats. For in the long run, American politics have proved that a vote unwooed is a vote unwon. Voters, as the old Alben Barkley story went, keep asking: "What have you done for me lately?" If the Democrats don't deliver for the Negroes—deliver big—the Negro voter may well go elsewhere.

The Negro vote, 1960 and 1964

	Rank and file	Non-South	South	100 leaders
How would Negroes vote in the next presidential election?				
Kennedy	89	85	91	67
Rockefeller	3	4	3	20
Not sure	8	11	6	13
Kennedy	91	90	92	88
Goldwater	2	2	2	3
Not sure	7	8	6	9
Kennedy	89	87	90	81
Romney	3	4	2	5
Not sure	8	9	8	14
How did they vote in 1960?				
Kennedy	85	86	84	72
Nixon	11	10	12	28
Can't recall	4	4	4	-------
What is their political affiliation today?				
Democrat	74	77	71	55
Republican	11	6	12	20
Independent	9	10	9	23

"I can't vote": When Negroes can't vote at all, the voices are sullen, angry, beaten. "You had to pay a white guy—in order to vote—and if you tried you were threatened," says a 29-year-old Jackson, Miss., painter. "They say I didn't pass the part about the Constitution," adds a Jackson maid. "It's no use; they don't want you to vote here," a 45-year-old Woodville, Miss., construction worker states bluntly. A Woodville tractor driver says: "I know I can't vote if I wanted to." But strangely, this anger is not directed against the people (Democrats) who prevent them from registering or voting.

In fact there is every indication that southern Negroes are massively hopeful about their chances of persuading or forcing Democratic officials to put them on the voter's rolls in the next 5 years (none think they will be any worse off). Here again, Negroes are ready to integrate into regular (Democratic) political parties—61 percent versus only 11 percent who think Negroes should work independently, outside the regular party organizations.

Most significantly, the Newsweek poll shows that Negroes are ready to move politically, ready to break out of their traditional inaction and to influence elections importantly. Obviously meeting oriented in connection with the fight for civil rights, one Negro in three has been to a political meeting; even in the South the ratio is one in four. One Negro in three has asked people to register to vote, and one in four has asked people to vote for one candidate over another. This is tempting arithmetic to Kennedy Democrats, for its shows that if the political torch is thrown to the Negroes, the fire will burn fiercely.

The big question for Republicans: are southern Negroes so susceptible to a major political drive that eventually they can be won back to the GOP?

Trouble: For the short term, however, the GOP is in trouble—at the moment. Negroes equate their self-interest with the Democratic Party's fortunes. "If President Kennedy wins reelection next year, do you think it will help Negro rights, set them back, or not change things much one way or another?" Negroes were asked. More than 17 out of 20 southern Negroes (87 percent) said Mr. Kennedy's reelection would help Negro rights, and among southerners most likely to vote—the urban group and the middle- and upper-income groups—the proportion rose to 92 percent and 89 percent respectively. (Nationally, 82 percent of the Negro rank and file thought Mr. Kennedy's reelection would help their cause.) A Kennedy defeat would specifically hurt the fight for Negro rights, according to 43 percent of southern Negroes, though more than 1 out of 4 (29 percent) thought the civil-rights revolution was already rolling so fast that a Kennedy defeat would make no appreciable difference.

When the Negroes' self-interest is equated with the politics of 1963, their opinion of President Kennedy is even higher. "How would you rate the job John F. Kennedy has done as President?" asked the Newsweek poll. Eighty-nine percent characterized it as either "excellent" (62 percent), or "pretty good" (27 percent). For those who fear a Kennedy dynasty, the arithmetic is equally discomforting. When the same question was asked about Robert Kennedy, 82 percent gave the Attorney General either "excellent" (55 percent) or "pretty good" (27 percent), and among 100 Negro leaders, Robert Kennedy even outscored his brother, by 88 percent to 82 percent.

President Kennedy's popularity among Negroes places him right after the NAACP and Martin Luther King Jr. in the leadership triumvirate. This fact, more than any other today, dominates the story of the Negro in politics.

NEWSWEEK'S 100

In selecting 100 Negro leaders to interview, Newsweek followed the advice of Negroes themselves, did not merely pick front-page names. A handful were unreachable or refused to be interviewed. Those who agreed:

Rev. Ralph Abernathy, Atlanta minister.
T. M. Alexander, Atlanta businessman.
Horace C. Anderson, Palo Alto engineer.
Bernard T. Bailey, Detroit editor.
James Baldwin, New York author.
Claude A. Barnett, Chicago journalist.
Mrs. Ruth M. Batson, Boston social worker.
George Beavers, Los Angeles businessman.
Edwin C. Berry, Chicago, Urban League.
Rev. James L. Bevel, Cleveland, Miss., SCLC.
M. Leo Bohanon, St. Louis social worker.
Horace J. Bond, Atlanta, SNCC.
Thomas Bradley, Los Angeles attorney.
Dolores Branche, Chicago social worker.
Wiley A. Branton, Atlanta attorney.
Edward W. Brooke, Massachusetts attorney general.
Dr. H. H. Brookins, Los Angeles minister.
Gwendolyn Brooks, Chicago poetess.
Basil W. Brown, Michigan State senator.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., San Francisco attorney.
Ernest Calloway, St. Louis union official.
Kenneth E. Campbell, Chicago alderman.
David Carlisle, Los Angeles businessman.
A. M. Carter, Augusta, Ga., businessman.
Yolande H. Chambers, Detroit businessman.
Dr. Kenneth Clark, New York psychologist.
William L. Clay, St. Louis alderman.
Albert B. Cleage Jr., Detroit minister.
Warren R. Cochrane, Atlanta YMCA.
Frank Collier, Oakland journalist.
William B. Collier, Jr., Chicago businessman.
Dr. Daniel A. Collins, San Francisco dentist.
Mrs. Oliver Crawford, Chicago housewife.
Sammy Davis, Jr., Los Angeles entertainer.
Holmes (Daddy-O) Daylie, Chicago disk jockey.
Lloyd Dickens, New York assemblyman.
Edward Dudley, Manhattan Borough president.
John D. Duncan, Washington commissioner.
Rev. Joseph H. Evans, Chicago minister.
Joseph A. Faison, Philadelphia businessman.
James L. Farmer, New York, CORE director.
Rev. Walter Fauntroy, Washington minister.
Arthur Q. Funn, New York attorney.
Dick Gregory, Chicago entertainer.
Mrs. Grace T. Hamilton, Atlanta housewife.
Gladys Harrington, New York social worker.
George S. Harris, Chicago businessman.
Aaron Henry, Clarksdale, Miss., pharmacist.
Rev. R. A. Hildebrand, New York minister.
Donald Hollowell, Atlanta attorney.
Mrs. Ruby Hurley, Atlanta NAACP.
Rev. E. F. Jackson, Washington, D.C., minister.
Rev. E. W. Jarrett, Gadsden, Ala., minister.
Bernard Jefferson, Los Angeles judge.
Mrs. Emily Johnson, Los Angeles businesswoman.
John H. Johnson, Chicago publisher.
Dr. Jack Kimburough, San Diego dentist.
Jewel Lafontant, Chicago attorney.
Westley W. Law, Savannah, Ga., mailman.
Dr. T. K. Lawless, Chicago dermatologist.
Louis Lomax, New York author.
Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, Atlanta educator.
Harold L. Miles, Chicago police captain.
Billie Mills, Los Angeles councilman.
Della Mitchell, High Point, N.C., beautician.
Natalie Monagas, Philadelphia musician.
Cecil B. Moore, Philadelphia attorney.
Fred H. Moore, Charleston, S.C., attorney.
Rev. H. Randolph Moore, Los Angeles minister.
Allan Morrison, New York journalist.
Dr. James Nabrit, Jr., Washington educator.
Jesse Owens, Chicago businessman.
James V. Paschal, Atlanta businessman.
Matthew J. Perry, Columbia, S.C., attorney.
Cecil F. Poole, San Francisco, U.S. attorney.
Lincoln G. Pope, Jr., Massachusetts State representative.
Jackie Robinson, New York businessman.
George Schuyler, New York journalist.
Harvey N. Schmidt, Philadelphia attorney.
Cornelius Scott, Atlanta editor.
Marshall L. Shepard, Philadelphia councilman.
Rev. Robert L. T. Smith, Jackson minister.
Mrs. Muriel Snowden, Boston housewife.
Vaino Spencer, Los Angeles judge.
Rev. A. K. Stanley, Greensboro, N.C., minister.
Chester E. Stovall, St. Louis welfare director.
Dempsey J. Travis, Chicago banker.
Richard M. Walker, Boston businessman.
Willis F. Ward, Detroit attorney.
Dr. Clinton E. Warner, Atlanta physician.
Bennetta Washington, Washington educator.
James L. Watson, New York attorney.
Rev. S. Leon Whitney, Jackson, Miss., minister.
Roy Wilkins, executive secretary, NAACP.
Howard B. Woods, St. Louis, Mo., editor.
Abe Woodson, San Francisco athlete.
Malcolm X, New York minister.
C. R. Yates, Atlanta businessman.
Whitney Young, Jr., New York Urban League.
Paul Zuber, New York attorney.

THE BIG MAN IS MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

"Hurry up, there go our followers," says Whitney Young, executive director of the National Urban League. His wry warning points to the single overriding fact that confronts every Negro leader today: the leadership is locked into a course of action by the militancy of the rank and file.

Overwhelmingly, the leaders endorse the major Negro goals—economic equality and opportunity, and complete integration. Overwhelmingly, they agree with the rank and file's means to a solution—nonviolence, reliance on corrective legislation, and negotiations with the white leadership. Overwhelmingly, they concur that the need for progress is urgent. "My definition of now is yesterday," says Cecil Moore, lawyer and NAACP leader in Philadelphia.

Indeed, the leaders have to be in full agreement with the rank and file on all these matters; for if they weren't, the rank and file would soon find others to lead them. This is what the statistics of the Newsweek poll say loud and clear.

To get a reading on the attitudes of Negro leaders, and how the leaders are rated by their own people, the poll moved in two directions. For the first part of the answer, from a list of some 500 people nominated by Negroes across the land, 100 were selected as representative Negro leaders (listed above); these were then interviewed, with the same questionnaire used for the rank and file, by Newsweek correspondents in 25 cities. For the other part of the answer, both the rank and file and the leaders were themselves asked to rate individual Negroes and civil rights organizations as to the effectiveness of their leadership.

The summit: In the Negro's eyes, one leader and one organization tower above all others in the field. The leader is the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.; the organization is the NAACP.

King gets an 88-percent favorable rating from the Negro rank and file and a 95-percent favorable rating from the 100 leaders in Newsweek's sample. There are a handful of dissenters like Atlanta student leader Horace Julian Bond, who complains that King has "sold the concept that one man will come to your town and save you." But a devoted and overwhelming majority agree with Earbie Bledsoe, a St. Louis construction foreman. "He has proved himself to be a leader of the Negro people and gives his life for the cause. There is no greater love than to fight for his brother under any conditions."

The NAACP rates a 91 percent favorable response from rank and file and leadership alike. Both groups emphasize that this 54-year-old veteran of civil-rights leadership has proved itself over the years. As Mrs. Ruth Batson, of Roxbury, Mass., states the case: "When nobody was doing anything, the NAACP was out there fighting, fighting, fighting."

What about the much-publicized Black Muslims and their leaders Elijah Muhammad and Malcolm X? How much appeal is there in the impassioned Muslim plea for separatism?

The verdict: almost none.

As a matter of fact, 41 percent of rank-and-file Negroes simply don't recognize the Muslims by name, and even many who are familiar with the name are hazy on the Muslim cause. Mrs. Edna Mae Murchinson, of Philadelphia, says: "I don't know nothing about them. Some people say they eat fish and grow beards."

"Crazy": The Black Muslims are rejected as an organization by better than 8 to 1. "They're crazy," says Mrs. Carrie Allen, of Union Springs, Ala. "I don't dig them," says Gloria Burns, of Washington, D.C. "They're trying to tear down what we've fought for for years," says Mrs. Esther Simpson, of Mount Vernon, N.Y.

When asked specifically about the Muslim's doctrinal goal—a separatist, black-only state—a resounding 22-to-1 majority of Negroes score this as another form of segregation. Influential Chicago disk jockey and entertainer Holmes (Daddy-O) Daylie says: "I don't believe in segregation in any form by any race—if I sit down at the piano I use all the keys to get beautiful music." Only in the caldron of northern slums do the Muslims find any backing; and even there, only 13 percent favor them. The rest, in essence, hold with Robert Murray, of Jackson, Miss., who says: "If they ain't got nothin' to give me I don't want no part of it."

After Martin Luther King and the NAACP, the popularity ratings of other Negro individuals and organizations take a dip, especially among the rank and file. The 51-year-old Urban League, for example, is rated favorably by 54 percent of the rank and file and by 77 percent of the leaders. The Congress of Racial Equality (CORE)—which was born in New York in 1942 and rose to prominence with the freedom rides of 1961—gets 59 percent of the rank-and-file vote and 78 percent of the leaders'. The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC or "Snick")—which was born in 1960 out of the Greensboro, N.C., sit-in campaign—is rated favorably by only 18 percent of the rank and file, and 74 percent of the leaders.

Who are the leaders—How they rate

	Ratings by rank and file		Ratings by the leaders	
	Favorable	Poor	Favorable	Poor
Martin Luther King, Jr	88	1	95	1
Jackie Robinson	80	1	82	2
James Meredith	79	1	81	1
Medgar Evers	78	1	92	1
Roy Wilkins	68	1	92	0
Thurgood Marshall	64	(1)	94	1
Ralph Bunche	62	2	87	2
Dick Gregory	60	1	80	3
Harry Belafonte	56	3	73	2
Lena Horne	55	3	68	2
Floyd Patterson	53	3	50	9
Adam Clayton Powell	51	7	52	16
James Baldwin	40	1	67	3
Elijah Muhammad	15	29	17	65

[1] Less than 1 percent.

These lower ratings do not reflect opposition, however. What they signify is simply that one-third to three-quarters of the Negro rank and file are unsure of what these organizations are and what they have done. Even Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference goes unrecognized by a third of Negroes polled. Clearly the roots of the Negro revolution lie not so much in the strength of its leadership as in the consciousness of the rank and file.

Some findings on other individual Negro leaders:

Harlem Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL got plus marks from 51 percent of the rank and file, 52 percent of the leaders. But some downrate him. New York piano mover Raymond Telefair says: "When things get thick he thins out."

U.S. Circuit Judge Thurgood Marshall wins 64 percent approval among the rank and file and a sky-high 94 percent among the leaders. Basil Wilmington Brown of Highland Park, Mich., assessed him this way: "He was great because of the many, many years of legal work culminating in the segregation decision in the Supreme Court."

Bestselling Writer James Baldwin, high priest of the Negro's anguish, gets a favorable reading from only 40 percent of the rank and file but goes up to 67 percent among the leaders.

Among Negro entertainers, it is the militant ones who get the highest marks. A relative newcomer like Chicago Comedian Dick Gregory, who was conspicuously jailed during the Birmingham riots, scores higher (62 percent favorable) than such an internationally known name as Harry Belafonte (58 percent).

In short, it is a dictate of this social revolution that the leaders must prove themselves on the civil rights battlefields—and the poll statistics make it clear that the leaders have won their spurs the hard way. Compared with 4 percent of the rank and file, 21 percent of the leadership or their families have gone to jail sometime during the fight for civil rights. Thirty-nine percent have joined in sit-ins; 54 percent have picketed a store; 62 percent have marched in a demonstration; and 70 percent have boycotted stores. Mrs. Ruby Hurley, the NAACP's southeastern regional director in Atlanta, says: "There are easier ways to make a living."

All through the leadership interviews ran the common theme of urgency. "Progress shouldn't be made yesterday," said Massachusetts Attorney General Edward W. Brooke. "You don't stop beating your wife with all deliberate speed, you stop right now," added Philadelphia Councilman at Large Marshall L. Shepard. Seven out of ten Negro leaders (compared with 50 percent of the rank and file) agree that the pace is now too slow; and 42 percent of them confess to feeling differently lately about getting personally involved in the revolt. "I used to feel that I as a minister shouldn't get involved. But when I saw these young students willingly and cheerfully going to jail I felt ashamed. Now I feel it's a disgrace not to get involved," says the 64-year-old Shepard.

Shopping lists: But involved how? The leaders offer an extensive battery of specific proposals for winning the fight. "A Negro should be employed in the registrar's office and the polls kept open every day," says the Reverend E. W. Jarrett, of Gadsden, Ala. "Complete unification of all civil rights groups" is the need, according to New York Lawyer Paul Zuber. "Better roles for Negroes in TV and movies," suggests Dick Gregory. "Open occupancy laws," urges New York Businessman Jackie Robinson. "Congressional legislation requiring an educational-desegregation plan" is one thing the NAACP's Roy Wilkins wants. And the National Urban League's Whitney Young calls for nothing less than "a massive domestic Marshall plan giving special preferential aid to Negro citizens, the same conscious effort to include that the society historically has exhibited in exclusion."

But specific proposals will be listened to by Negroes only insofar as they fall within the clearly held consensus that civil rights progress must be made. The magnitude of this hope and determination means that the leadership could not compromise any of the goals, even if it wanted to.

The leaders know victory will not be easy. Better off materially, they are nevertheless more aroused than the rank and file over unfair rents, and all the other hallmarks of discrimination. They invest significantly less blind faith in the omnipotence of the President or even the demonstrations to cure all these evils. Three out of four of them are sharply conscious that the demonstrations could give rise to the violence they deplore. And almost directly opposite from the rank and file, they are overwhelmingly convinced that if it came to outright race war the whites would win. But paradoxically, the leadership answers even more hopefully about the outcome of the struggle. By a 23-to-1 margin the leadership believes that a white attitude which has already gotten better will improve even more dramatically in the next few years. "I must believe it or blow my head off," says Dr. Daniel A. Collins, a California Urban League board member. And Philadelphia pianist Natalie Hinderas says: "You can suddenly see the silver lining."

WHAT THE NEGROES THINK OF WHITES

What does the Negro think of the white world around him? How does he feel about the white man? Forty questions were aimed at finding out. Chief conclusion: the Negro considers the white man his greatest burden, but the burden grows lighter every day.

At the lower end of the economic scale, he tends to be distrustful of the white man and his motives. Only one in four rank-and-file Negroes thinks the white man sincerely wants to see him get a better break. Forty-one percent think the white man wants to keep the Negro in his place, and 17 percent say the whites simply don't care.

On the upper levels, and among the Negro leadership group, the degree of trust rises sharply, though it is by no means an overwhelming vote of confidence. Middle- and upper-income Negroes of the North give the whites a 33 percent favorable vote, while their counterparts in the South make it 45 percent. The leadership group votes favorable by a bare majority.

Fear pattern: In expressing their feelings about the white man, a good many Negroes think that he has been pushed into patterns of discrimination by fear—fear of losing his job to a Negro, fear of intermarriage, even fear of losing a servile class to wait on him.

Morris Narcisse, Jr., of New Orleans, said: "The poor white man especially thinks a Negro might get his job." John Fontenot, of Los Angeles, observed: "They think they going to get too many two-toned babies." "They're afraid they'll lose their maids," said Richard Harris, a Louisville, Ky., trackman.

Others think the white just naturally wants to feel superior. "Without the Negro, the white man has no one to look down on," said Mae Powell, of Washington, D.C. "He certainly can't look down on the Jew. The Jew made an ass of him." "White men have gotten so they think they own the whole world," said Mable Ratcliff, a Brooklyn laundress. "They're not going to settle for smiles and talk, no."

Negro optimism: In spite of all this, however, the Negro is clearly optimistic about the future he wants to share with the whites. Fifty-two percent think the white man's attitude toward the Negro has improved over the last 5 years and 73 percent feel his attitude will continue to become more accommodating in the next 5.

"The American white man has a conscience and the nonviolent method appeals to that conscience. Nobody tolerates kicking a man when he's down. Like Medger Evers, no one condones shooting a man in the back," was a typical response.

All in all, the Negro puts more trust in the white man's government and institutions than he does in the individual.

Of all whites, Roman Catholic priests, who conduct extensive and little publicized settlement work in Negro communities, are most trusted (by 55 percent of Negroes). Contrary to supposition, Negroes think well of Jews. But the Negro himself is not free from bias. Puerto Ricans are considered harmful (by 20 percent, with 70 percent saying they are not sure).

The Negro is divided on white churches in general. Fifty-four percent say they don't know whether churches have been helpful or not and the rest are split down the middle (23 percent to 23 percent). Labor unions get mixed reviews with only 38 percent thinking they are helpful.

Negroes judge the shifting patterns of the white man's attitude in the smallest of details. Mrs. James Lowe, of Washington, D.C., remembers the time when "the white man would not use a capital 'N' in Negro."

Thelma Brown, of Houston, Tex., sees progress in a tincup.

"My husband says they have one cup for kegs of water at work now—nobody thinks anything about it."

For Dorothy Hampton, a 28-year-old welfare case, there hasn't been any change at all.

"What they really feels on the inside never changes. Eventually they will wind up calling you a nigger."

Underneath the trust and hope for the future felt by the Negro leadership is a dark warning. In the low-income areas and urban slums, resentment toward the white man is deep, bitter, and potentially explosive. Six percent of low-income Negroes outside the South feel the white man really wants to see Negroes improve themselves. The large majority of this Northern slum group (81 percent) think the whites want to keep the Negro down or simply don't care one way or the other.

10-to-1 odds: If protests and jailings do bring open conflict, the typical Negro is not only willing to fight, but he even thinks that he can buck the white man's numerical odds (10 to 1) and win.[1] Some are confident because "God is on our side," but most say they would win simply because Negroes are better street fighters. "I think the average Negro can handle about 10 whites," said John Jones, a Bladenboro, N.C., carpenter. "Ten Negroes, if they are real men, can chase 50 white men in the lake—if they just stand up for their rights," said a Chicago housewife who lives on a pension. And a St. Louis woman handicapped the 10-to-1 bet this way: "You give a Negro a good, sharp knife and he can get you 10 whites any day."

"Besides," echoed Leola Williams, of West Palm Beach, Fla., "there are also nine scary whites to every Negro."

So far, the threat remains only a threat. While prepared to use violence, most Negroes (63 percent) think the white man will come around eventually through persuasion. But an alarming number (22 percent) today feel he will yield only to force.

"The white man is all mix up," said a 70-year-old Chicago woman living on a pension. "He'd like to do better, but he's all mix up."

Boycotts: Weapon of the future?

	Total	Non-South	South	100 leaders
Have you stopped buying in certain stores in town because they won't hire Negroes?				
Yes	29	24	30	55
No	71	76	70	45
Have you stopped buying certain companies' products because you have heard they discriminate against Negroes?				
Yes	19	14	18	52
No	81	86	82	48
If asked, would you do the following? (Percentage affirmative.)				
Picket a store?	47	54	40	57
Stop buying at a store?	63	66	59	66

Dislikes: Targets of the present

	Total	Non-south	South	100 leaders
What 2 or 3 white leaders and organizations do you dislike the most and trust the least?				
Ku Klux Klan	31	32	28	42
(White) Citizens Council	26	20	27	52
Ross Barnett	8	8	8	11
George C. Wallace	8	10	6	10
Barry Goldwater	3	5	1	8
Orval Faubus	2	2	1	5
American Nazi Party	2	2	1	10
John Birch Society	3	3	1	15

THE FUTURE: NOT HOW MUCH—BUT WHEN

As certain as the rhythms of the seasons, the Negro revolution will outlive the summer of its birth. It will not end when the leaves redden, when the cotton is baled, when night comes charitably early to hide the slums of Harlem and the South Side and Buttermilk Bottom from themselves. It will go on.

It will go on, says a New Orleans insurance executive, "for the same reason the original 13 colonies took up arms against George III. For, like the colonies, we have beseeched. We have implored. We have supplicated. We have entreated. * * * In short, we are writing our Declaration of Independence in shoe leather instead of ink."

Given his choice, the Negro would prefer ink—on bargaining agreements with whites, on court pleadings, on the ballot—and he will use it wherever he can. But the white man won't always bargain, and Negroes are losing their patience with gradualism. ("The moderates don't mind if Negroes get a better break," says Mrs. Laura Turpin of Washington, D.C., "but 25 or 30 years would be all right with them.") The courts are slow. And the power of the ballot is restricted for the Negro, nationally at least, by his own monolithic attachment to John F. Kennedy and his party. Negro leaders—unable to bargain with the GOP—can only try to roll out a massive Kennedy vote and hope for leverage by sheer weight of numbers.

So the Negro will go on fighting for his rights with his shoe leather—and with his wallet. There is an immense reservoir of support for a boycott campaign, with 62 percent of all Negroes waiting—so they say—only to be asked. There are manpower pools almost as big for sit-ins, mass marches, picket lines, and, if need be, going to jail—a reserve that means no city with a substantial Negro enclave is immune.

Walk tall: The Negro feels his faith in mass protest has already moved mountains. If nothing more, it is enough to make a man walk taller. "Anything I want," says Dane Vick, a blind pensioner in Oklahoma City, "the white people are respectful. Now the whites say 'yes, sir' to me." Even more, the Negro is convinced that demonstrations work. "The leaders sitting down together would, of course, be the best way," says Mrs. W. F. Jeltz, minorities representative for an Oklahoma City employment service. "But we found it didn't work and sit-ins did."

Violence will remain a constant risk of the revolution. Underlying the confident and hopeful consensus in the Newsweek poll is a minority marked by portents of alienation, hostility, and danger. One Negro in five thinks the cause cannot be won without violence, and some are already fighting mad. Mrs. Clyde Durham, a St. Louis housewife, says: "Them white folks get scared when a Negro gets mad, and we gonna have to get good and mad and let them know we mean business."

Danger signs: The flash point is likeliest in the northern slums, where one Negro in four thinks violence is inevitable, where one in eight approves of the Black Muslims, where one in two thinks the white man wants to keep him down. ("Maybe up here they just show us one side of their face," says a Detroit truckdriver, "but we understand what they mean.") More often than Negroes elsewhere, the northern slum dweller sees a desperate streak in the demonstrations; the Negro is simply "tired of being pushed around." More often than Negroes elsewhere, he is likely to push back.

But in the mainstream, the church-oriented, middle-class Negro leadership and an overwhelming majority of the rank and file, North and South, are committed to moderate means, to persuasion where possible, to nonviolent protest where necessary. For all this sense of restraint, they will not settle for less than across-the-board victory. Even if the President's civil-rights legislation passes Congress intact, the revolt will not be over. To the Negro majority, it is simply not enough. When a Negro demands freedom, he means freedom from all the disabilities that go with a dark skin.

For the future, the crisis point will come if and when the irresistible force of Negro protest meets the immovable object of white intractability. In polls for the Washington Post, Louis Harris found majorities of white Americans in favor—at least in principle—in taking Federal action to secure the Negro's rights. But the white man's commitment thins in practice. Three in five don't think the Negro is ready to hold a better job or live in a better neighborhood, and nearly three in four feel Negroes are moving faster than whites will accept them. The white man's resistance is particularly strong at the prospect of a Negro moving into the house next door to his; just as deeply, the Negro wants the right to move there if he chooses. The combination makes housing potentially the most explosive of all the issues at stake in the Negro revolution.

---

[1] Four percent of Negroes interviewed claimed census figures were wrong and 2 percent said there are actually more Negroes than whites anyway.

The final door: The final question will be not so much what the Negro will settle for—he is united and insistent—as how much the white man will give him. Negroes think that he will change, that he will start treating them better because of his conscience, because he fears their militancy, or simply because he is an American. But whether or not the white man is willing to open the final door, the Negro will not stop knocking.

"I want to be a whole man this very instant," says Dr. Daniel A. Collins, a Mill Valley, Calif., dentist. And Susie Huzzard, a Cleveland domestic, has her own definition of freedom: "I want some of these flowers before I die."

A. M. PIPER, EDITOR OF COUNCIL BLUFFS NONPAREIL, STILL CARRIES ON

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the July 1963 issue of the ASNE Bulletin contains a well-deserved article on one of the most respected newspapermen in the State of Iowa. He is A. M. Piper, editor of the Council Bluffs Nonpareil. At the age of 83, he still carries on, producing about a thousand editorials a year. A stalwart Republican, he still believes that the Nation's strength lies in a strong two-party system. If either party deviates from his standards, he is willing to say so—in print.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "A. M. Piper: Iowa Republican, Solid Baptist, Recent Groom," and written by Harry Mauck, Jr., managing editor of the Nonpareil, be placed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A. M. Piper: Iowa Republican, Solid Baptist, Recent Groom

(By Harry Mauck, Jr.)

At 83, Alvin Meade Piper has made one concession to age. No longer will he drive an automobile.

For the balance of modern life, count him in.

On a Thursday, this last mid-May, the willowy, gray-thatched gentleman who has directed the editorial page of the Council Bluffs Nonpareil for more than a quarter of a century announced he planned to marry on Sunday. Mr. Piper had been a widower for 13 years.

His lovely bride, Susan Brinsmaid of San Francisco—formerly of Des Moines—and her late husband had been friends of the Pipers for 35 years.

Would we help with some of the details?

Had he arranged for blood tests, required by Iowa law? Taken care of, he replied. The minister? All set.

How about the marriage license? He'd get it tomorrow.

He was reminded that Iowa law requires a 3-day waiting period between application and issuance—and he was bucking a courthouse that closed on Saturday. He thought for a moment.

"I guess they've fixed it so I can't be impetuous."

He was married on Monday.

This is a man of many facets, but impetuosity is not one of them. This is a man of inherent integrity, and built-in dignity. He can, and does, change. He is firm, but not immovable.

For years he was an ardent prohibitionist. Yet he was one of the State's first editors to call for Iowa to legalize liquor by the drink, a job the legislature finally accomplished in 1963.

"Prohibition just didn't work," he will tell you. "Bootlegging and illegal tavern sales were worse than regulated saloons."

His friends at ASNE are responsible for his first drink of liquor—at age 63.

"We walked into the cocktail lounge at the Willard at the close of an afternoon session. Someone ordered martinis. I'd never even seen one before. I must have drunk it too fast. When I got up my feet didn't operate properly."

Mr. Piper has been an ardent Republican since the days of McKinley.

"I became a Republican when I was 16. That was in 1896 when William Jennings Bryan ran against McKinley. I just didn't like Bryan's platform of free silver. My family were all Democrats but I wasn't and I'm still not sorry I changed family horses before I was old enough to vote."

Yet he has been known to editorially support a Democrat at the local level. And he voted for Woodrow Wilson for President in 1912.

Many of his friends in government are Democratic. He renews these acquaintances each year in Washington, usually for a week after ASNE meetings.

"This year I told Senator Humphrey the way things were going I had better enlarge my Democratic acquaintances because I have a feeling there are going to be fewer and fewer Republicans."

Some years ago (long before Goldwater), Mr. Piper wrote:

"The more I read of history the more I think Harry Truman will be more highly regarded in the future than when he was President. He had to make many great decisions. They weren't all right ones, but he made them."

Stalwart Republican that he is, he believes the Nation's strength lies in a strong two-party political system. To this, he says, you must couple a people with strong religious convictions.

A solid Baptist (they part on the liquor issue), he's the best source in the office for a needed Biblical quote. If he doesn't remember it verbatim, he knows in what book to find it. And the same goes for American history.

Each Sunday his lead editorial deals with religion as a philosophy of life. Time and again he has rallied faltering southwest Iowa Democrats to support their cause. To this free enterpriser, competition in politics is as essential as competition in business.

He is proud of his friendships on Capitol Hill, the great and near great, which span such political chasms as former President Hoover, Senator Taft, Richard Nixon, Vice President Johnson, and Senator Harry Byrd.

"The last time I saw Senator Byrd I told him one of my greatest regrets is that I never had the opportunity to vote for him for President.

"Before Nixon was nominated for President I told him I had two words of advice for him in his campaign. The words were, 'Be yourself.' If he had been himself I believe he would have been elected.

"I also told Senator Bill Knowland before he retired that I believed the near future of the Republican Party might depend on California, and I hoped the party leaders in that State wouldn't get into a hassle among themselves. He didn't answer, but began to talk about other matters. His candidacy for Governor later upset the party applecart."

Great Presidents? "Washington and Lincoln, and maybe Andrew Jackson, Theodore Roosevelt, Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt."

You understand the importance of the political scene in Mr. Piper's life when you learn that twice it has been instrumental in separating him from a job. And twice it has returned him to work.

At 20 he left Iowa Wesleyan College at Mount Pleasant, near his birthplace, to become a reporter for the Iowa State Register at Des Moines.

A year later, the opposition Des Moines Leader printed an editorial on the death of McKinley. It drew warm praise over the State.

Acting on a tip, Mr. Piper did a bit of research.

"It was practically word for word parts of Beecher's famous oration on the death of Lincoln. The Leader editor had substituted McKinley's name for Lincoln, and Ohio for Illinois.

"I called this to the attention of my editor. He had me do a story, and we printed it along with the Leader's editorial and Beecher on Lincoln side by side. It created quite a stir.

"Later, when the papers were combined, the editor of The Leader was made city editor and assigned the task of reorganizing the staff. He knew I had handled the story about his editorial, and when the names of the new staff were posted I wasn't surprised to find I was not on the list."

Des Moines was the home of Peoples Popular Monthly, a family magazine circulated throughout the Nation. Mr. Piper joined the staff, soon became editor, and later business manager.

"We had no trouble getting subscriptions, it was 50 cents a year. But we lost money on each subscriber. Our problem was advertising—the lack of it. We went along for over 20 years, making some money one year and losing it the next. Depression spelled death in 1931."

It was a time to do some thinking. He had saved some money, so the family headed for its favorite vacation spot, Estes Park, Colo. In a short time he joined the Boulder, (Colo.) News-Herald, a Republican paper. Later he was to play a part in its merger with the Boulder Camera, Democratic.

"It was a situation not unlike Des Moines. Both papers were getting along, but neither making much money. The Camera name prevailed, and I was retained as a Republican columnist."

The bank holiday closed two of Boulder's institutions. From Washington came an edict they could not reopen without merging and increasing the capital stock by $100,000.

"Getting the money was slow. I had an idea I could get the job done if I could be temporarily relieved of my newspaper duties. My publisher agreed to let me try.

"I had just one sales talk. I told depositors their money was tied up and they would not get it unless we could get a new charter. I urged them to take 10 percent of their deposits and buy bank stock.

"We raised the money, at the rate of $10 a share, and ended up with 5,800 stockholders in the new bank."

Boulder congratulated him on a civic job well done.

"Then, to my amazement, I found I was through at the Camera. The Camera was becoming even stronger Democratic, and I was told that as a Republican I was becoming too well known."

The Republicanism that had cost him two jobs now brought a new one. He went to work for the GOP in Colorado, and later for the national committee, touring Nebraska, Kansas, and Colorado.

After this job ended he learned the Nonpariel was seeking an editor, a man with Republican "proclivities." He joined the paper in 1937.

Prolific, his agile mind produces about a thousand editorials a year. While politics is his true love, Mr. Piper's interests are broad; economics, history, the fine arts. He loves music and the theater. Living in the Nation's fifth largest railroad center, he is an oft-quoted authority on the problems that beset this industry.

Whatever the subject, his basic philosophy is best summed in his Freedom Foundation award editorial of 1960, the last sentence of which reads:

"The United States will be a great and prosperous Nation only so long as the State is the servant of its citizens, not the master of its subjects."

On May 2, 1857, in volume 1, No. 1, the Nonpariel's first editorial stated:

"In politics the Nonpariel partakes of the Republican cast—that party being nearest representative of our political proclivities. Yet we do not wish to be understood as committing ourselves totally to the policies of that organization, but reserve the right to adopt whatever coincides wih our views, and to condemn what we cannot reconcile with our beliefs, in an independent way, dealing plainly but kindly with all."

This is our man.

PROPOSED LIMITATION OF COMMERCIAL TIME ON BROADCAST STATIONS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have received a copy of a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Iowa Broadcasters Association in a meeting at Iowa City on July 11, 1963, relating to the proposed rulemaking to limit commercial time on broadcast stations. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission has invited public comment on proposed rulemaking to limit commercial time on broadcast stations; and

Whereas the Iowa Broadcasters Association through its board of directors is opposed to any rule or regulations which invades or controls the exercise of free and voluntary program standards by individual broadcast station management and ownership; and

Whereas any such rule or regulation is, in effect, a dictation of program composition and is, therefore, in direct conflict with the Communications Act, which specifically forbids the FCC from invading or dictating program content: Now be it

Resolved, That the Iowa Broadcasting Association, through its board of directors, opposes and petitions the FCC to withdraw from further consideration any such proposed rule which, in the opinion of the Iowa Broadcasters Association, will strangle and inhibit the free development of programing according to the needs, tastes and desires of each community served by broadcasters, as expressed by the public to individual stations; and be it further

Resolved, That the Iowa Broadcasters Association urges every State association of broadcasters to actively work to defeat this and other attempts to control and dictate the programing content of stations in the United States and possessions.

Adopted by the board of directors of the Iowa Broadcasters Association in meeting at Iowa City, Iowa, July 11, 1963.

Gene Claussen,
President.

FUND RAISING ACTIVITIES OF KXEL, WATERLOO, IOWA, FOR MARCH OF DIMES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the March of Dimes, humanitarian accomplishments long ago etched a permanent place in the roster of worthwhile organizations. Because of this, I direct attention to a venture of no small undertaking being planned by KXEL Radio of Waterloo, Iowa, in cooperation with the Linn and Black Hawk County March of Dimes chapters. A representative of the radio station will depart on September 15 in an effort to travel around the world in 80 hours to promote fund-raising activities of the March of Dimes and to distribute polio vaccine in 11 nations.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter written by Al Laval, general manager of KXEL, to fellow Iowa broadcasters explaining the purposes underlining the undertaking be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

KXEL Broadcasting Co., Inc.,
Waterloo, Iowa, July 12, 1963.

Dear Fellow Broadcaster: On Monday, July 15, 1963, KXEL Radio, in cooperation with the Linn and Black Hawk County March of Dimes chapters, is launching what is no doubt the most extensive promotional venture ever attempted by one broadcasting facility.

By Gosden, a member of the KXEL staff, who for the past many years has extended his efforts for the benefit of charities, will embark from Waterloo and will travel "around the world in 80 hours" for the purpose of raising funds for the March of Dimes and distributing polio vaccine in 11 nations around the globe. Our financial goal, due to the national and international flavor, has been set by the two county polio chapters as $50,000.

The date of departure will be Sunday, September 15, 1963, with special ceremonies and projects at both Waterloo and Cedar Rapids airports. Gosden will travel with visiting dignitaries to Cedar Rapids for further ceremonies and then will be traveling alone to Chicago for take-off time. Time of 80 hours begins on the runway of O'Hara Field. Gosden will then pick up refrigerated cases of polio vaccine at San Francisco to be presented at each foreign stop. Telephone calls will be made by Gosden on each stop, calls which will be recorded by KXEL to be played back by many area sources.

Following the vaccine stop at San Francisco—the stops include Honolulu, Hawaii; Tokyo, Japan; Hong Kong; Bangkok, Thailand; New Delhi, India; Tehran, Iran; Istanbul, Turkey; Moscow, Russia; Prague, Czechoslovakia; Vienna, Austria; Paris, France. Following the delivery of the final case of vaccine, Gosden will embark from Paris for New York, Chicago, Cedar Rapids, and home to Waterloo; around the world in 80 hours.

As a fellow broadcaster, we wish for you and your organization to be the first to be informed of this venture and we hope as the campaign progresses toward departure time, you will understand our enthusiasm in working toward the success and achievement of this trip.

With kindest regards.

Al Laval, *General Manager*.

GENEROSITY OF LONG ISLAND LABOR UNIONS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, due to the many man-hours unselfishly donated by union labor in Long Island, the Waldemar Cancer Research Center in Bellmore will open its doors early in October. This research center is the latest in a series of projects sponsored by the Nassau-Suffolk Building and Construction Trades Council in Long Island, which has contributed all construction labor.

The council, under the very able leadership of its president, John E. "Buddy" Long, has sponsored these projects in various communities in Long Island which under other circumstances might have had to forego or lower the standards of these very necessary facilities. Other projects they have either constructed, rebuilt, or expanded include the Nassau County Cerebral Palsy Center, St. Francis Cardiac Hospital in Port Washington, the Retarded Childrens' Center in Brookville, the Suffolk Rehabilitation Center for the Physically Handicapped, and a private residence given away as a prize in the annual Long Island Hospital Star Night, a fund raising project. Similar to buildings constructed under private contracts, all of these facilities must meet deadlines and the rigid standards of the building code.

Mr. President, at present 11 unions are associated with the trades council working on the Waldemar project. These union men, together with skilled management personnel have given up much of their free time on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays to make these projects possible. So far, well over 1,000 men have been associated with the Waldemar Research Center.

In addition, the generosity of these workers has inspired many others to make contributions toward the completion of these public facilities. Donations have included everything from air conditioners to laboratory supplies, electrical equipment and even beer and sandwiches for the workers' lunches.

These public welfare activities have not only benefited the Long Island community but have been most beneficial to the image of organized labor. I join with the people of the State of New York in saluting these fine workers for the outstanding job they are doing.

Mr. President, an article entitled "Generosity Has No Bounds," which appeared in the July edition of the Industrial Bulletin, describes the activities of the union men, the extent of their projects and the capabilities of their very able leader, Buddy Long. I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks the text of the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Generosity Has No Bounds

In how many ways can you grasp the meaning of 470,000 man-hours of effort and how many things could you do in that time?

One way: It's roughly the man-hours of time it took just one division of Hitler's army to overrun the low countries in World War II.

Another way: It's the number of man-hours spent by one medium-size New York State community on golf, fishing, and tennis, in a single summer.

But we're concerned here with another way. It is conservatively—the number of man-hours of time donated by union labor on Long Island for construction of 6 major public welfare projects.

One of union labor's brightest exhibits in its own gallery of public welfare activities, the Long Island project has been going on since 1947. Organized and sponsored by the Nassau-Suffolk Building and Construction Trades Council under President John E. "Buddy" Long, the long-range, continuing project currently is focused on the Waldemar Cancer Research Center in Bellmore, Long Island. When this $1,200,000 building opens its doors late this summer to the cancer-fighting activities of 50 or more handpicked scientist, union labor will have donated every hour of construction time to the effort.

Labor's gift of 470,000 man-hours of work (so far) to public welfare projects on Long Island is no fair-weather picnic. As with private construction work, the volunteers work under hardheaded professional superintendents—men from the management side of construction, also contributing their time. As with the private jobs, too, the volunteer work must meet rigid deadlines, and must pass the customary building code inspections.

For Buddy Long, founder and leader of the whole effort, it has been his weekend and holiday full-time avocation almost without a break since 1947. The almost—the short time he had to take a break—came late last year when he fell 12 feet from a bricklayer's scaffold to the ground while working on the Waldemar Center project. He was laid up for a while. His back and shoulders still ache. But he's on the project with the rest of the volunteers every offday.

How did this whole business start? George Morton Levy, general counsel for Roosevelt Raceway, and an active participant in many civic undertakings, called his friend Buddy Long one day more than 16 years ago. Would Buddy care to visit the Cerebral Palsy Center in Hempstead and give some advice on what labor might do to help the unfortunate children? Buddy Long made the visit. And what could labor do?

"I told Mr. Levy I'd like labor to speak for itself. We arranged to have the Council delegates (Nassau-Suffolk Building and Construction Trades Council) visit the old building in Hempstead and see for themselves.

"They turned out—43 of them. We went through the building, we talked to the children. When we finished the tour, I said to the delegates—'what do you say, fellows?' There wasn't one of them that answered me, not one. They couldn't talk. They were all choked up."

The plight of Hempstead's Cerebral Palsy Center was desperate. No bank would extend a mortgage and you couldn't blame the banks. To construct a new building would cost $1 million or more; since it was a construction project, most of that money would represent labor costs.

"Our council voted unanimously to take over the labor part of the project, at no cost whatever to the cerebral palsy organization," Buddy Long recalls. "Then every bank on Long Island was falling all over itself to offer a loan. All of the labor was contributed. Management provided the direction we needed, and a lot of materials were contributed. It's been that way on every project, ever since."

How do you recruit labor—from a standing start—to join in a volunteer work project that goes on thereafter for years and years?

The compact, streamlined set-up of the Nassau-Suffolk Building and Construction Trades Council was a big help in itself. Through this organization, as through the switchboard of a telephone exchange, the work was passed to the constituent locals. Then—as now—secretary-treasurer Irwin Fleischer conveyed the requirements to the member locals. Buddy Long personally recruited the bricklayers, since they were of his own craft.

Out of the plea of George Morton Levy and the response of Buddy Long and his colleagues, grew the very first of the donated labor projects in the whole effort. The Nassau County Cerebral Palsy Center was started in 1947. Erected on Washington Avenue in Roosevelt, Long Island, the $1-million project took 3 years to build, and occupied the weekends and holidays of many hundreds of union members.

The second volunteer program to command the efforts of Long Island building trades union members was a $45,000 private home. Why a private residence? The home was dreamed up as the first prize in the annual Long Island Hospital Star Night. The gala annual entertainment, climaxed by award of a prize, was attended by 35,000 persons in 1951. In 1952, when the labor-sponsored home was built and available for presentation, the fabulous prize boosted attendance to 100,000. Thus, the volunteer work of labor—with donation of some of the materials and supervision by management—increased the take of the hospital fund to well over the $45,000 value of the home itself.

The third labor of love for Buddy Long's council was a year-long construction and rehabilitation project for St. Francis Cardiac Hospital in Port Washington. Much of the old hospital had been destroyed by fire. The challenge here was to rebuild and expand, in minimum time, with minimum materials cost. Again, hundreds of construction workers turned out, made new quarters in the hospital basement, built new laboratory facilities, and refurbished the hospital grounds.

One full year's work for the Retarded Childrens' Center in Brookville was next on the agenda for the Long Island volunteers. This time, the problem was to rehabilitate an old mansion, make substantial changes and repairs, and equip it with classrooms for retarded children whose ability to learn is so low that they cannot be integrated with normal children in public schools.

Another project on the list was the Suffolk Rehabilitation Center for the Physically Handicapped. This took 3 years. The cost of labor for the $750,000 project—meaning the value of the physical plant in today's market—nothing.

The sixth and current project, the Waldemar Cancer Research Center, started last year, will be ready for installation of the scientific equipment in late summer or fall this year.

Joining in the work at Waldemar—as was true for the earlier projects—are members of 11 unions, all associated with Nassau-Suffolk Building & Construction Trades Council.

But far more than a marshaling of union labor's efforts, a project such as Waldemar Center also brought forth volunteer efforts by management men, to help plan and direct the work. It gained still other help from firms contributing materials, supplies, and equipment.

Management principals on the Waldemar job include William Lind, construction superintendent and engineer. Bill Lind is a vice president of John T. Brady, a New York contracting firm. Another management man working without pay on the Waldemar job is Jay Raddock, of Sands Point. He is an apartment house builder; on the Waldemar job he serves as construction coordinator.

The long list of contributors would extend beyond the space available here. The contributions include beer and sandwiches for workers' lunches; photographic supplies and equipment for the center's laboratory; air conditioning; aggregate for concrete; bacteriological microscopes; intercom equipment; welding supplies; electrical equipment; sheet metal and stair components; plumbing and heating supplies; and structural steel and building blocks. Much of the heavy equipment needed in construction also is donated.

Giving can be contagious, Buddy Long and his associates have learned. The Salvation Army of Nassau County long since has added its name to the lists of contributors. Every weekend and holiday, a giant red Salvation Army emergency food service truck journeys to the Waldemar site. The nearby Plainview Fire Department is supplying water for the job. Local officials help by expediting permit reviews, and publicizing the need for volunteer help. So many workers turn out to give their time that parking becomes a serious local problem. Local and parkway police help by suggesting places to park, instead of doling out tickets.

Waldemar Center was started on June 1, 1962. It is hoped that the construction work will be completed in October of this year. Some 200 and more men have been working, but here, too, the arithmetic is not a fair gage. From week to week, they're not the same 200-odd. True, the keymen like Buddy Long, Bill Lind, Jay Raddock, and many of the business agents, are on hand every time. But the long roll of names—those who have worked 1 day or more—runs well over a thousand.

As a prominent example of the many projects handled by the Long Island workers over the last 16 years, the Waldemar job is impressive. It extends for 268 feet in the main wing, with a width of 75 feet. A wing, 100 feet long, carries the structure out to an L-shaped arrangement. When completed and in use, Waldemar will house, initially, between 40 and 55 cancer-fighting scientists.

The fight against cancer is a long and bitter campaign. The battlefronts are the laboratories, the clinics, the bedsides of the sufferers. And the Waldemar project, it's been suggested, indicates that other fronts in the war include the construction sites. Read some pertinent comments from Waldemar News, a bulletin of the Waldemar Medical Research Foundation: "The story of the building is a labor of love for hundreds of engineers, bricklayers, masons, steelworkers, construction men, laborers, and union leaders, who are contributing their time and their skills free of charge.

"Despite the bitter cold of recent months, these volunteer workers have been out at the Woodbury site, weekend after weekend, moving construction forward, girder by girder, and brick by brick. As a result the roof is now on the laboratory section and the entire project should be completed by mid-July. To the officers of Waldemar this unprecedented display of dedication is almost miraculous. It demonstrates that when men and women embrace a cause, as they have in the fight against cancer, their generosity and humanity knows no bounds."

To Buddy Long, the long-range goals of Waldemar—and of the other projects he and his men have worked on—represent the payoff for their time.

"If all of our work saves just one life that would have been lost to cancer," he comments, "it's worth all the struggle. A great many people over the last 16 years have asked me why I, personally, spend my weekends and holidays on these jobs. For one thing, I can't picture myself playing golf or fishing while these fellows are working away. I'm part of it, too. But for another thing, I enjoy it. I get a big kick out of seeing a worthwhile project come to life."

There's special cause for pride, to Buddy Long, in the fact that the labor effort on public service building projects is done without fanfare, without a public relations man. But the word gets around, and the image of organized labor generally benefits. At the last national AFL–CIO convention, President George Meany took more than 30 minutes to tell the delegates about the volunteer labors of the Nassau-Suffolk Building & Construction Trades Council.

As the sparkplug behind the Long Island effort, what kind of man is Buddy Long? During his union, working hours, 5 days—and often nights—each week, he is a hard-driving business agent for the bricklayers and busy manager for the Nassau-Suffolk Building and Construction Trades Council. Characteristically, he spends little time behind a desk. If you want to contact him, you're given a choice of three or four phone numbers. Buddy Long is out in the field, making calls on constituent locals, advising on negotiations, conferring with local officials, and otherwise taking care of union matters.

Weekends and holidays, Buddy Long can be found on the site of whatever public service project his council has undertaken. He has plenty to do. He helps to see that the volunteers sign the roll book. He checks on the labor supply with Secretary-Treasurer Irwin Fleischer. He makes the rounds of the job and exchanges greetings with workers and officials; that was what he was doing late last year when he was standing on the 12-foot-high scaffold and fell. Someone had called, "Hey Buddy, come here a minute, will you?" He turned around to answer, then stepped—the wrong way.

The on-site responsibilities for Buddy Long run the full gamut from checking with police about the parking problem to working out schedules for the following weekend. Construction boss Bill Lind tells Buddy Long how many men he needs. Long and Fleischer must work out the contacts with locals, to meet the needs.

Buddy Long began his career as a worker and as a union official in 1919. His first job was that of apprentice bricklayer. In 1923 he was initiated as a journeyman bricklayer, worked at his trade for 7 years, and then moved to Brightwater so that he could be close to a new assignment. Meanwhile, he had become interested in labor union activity and worked his way up to a post as a member of the executive committee of the Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers—a post he has held since 1933. He has served as president of the Nassau-Suffolk Building and Construction Trades Council since 1947. He also serves as a vice president of the New York State Building Trades Council.

Active in many public service endeavors, Buddy Long currently serves as president of the Suffolk Rehabilitation Center, and as a member of the board of directors of the Waldemar Center. He is a director of the Boy Scout Council in Nassau and Suffolk, and is a trustee of the Long Island Fund, a financing organization which serves the needs of 21 hospitals and 6 agencies on Long Island.

The Long family includes mom and three children. Married 40 years this year, the Longs have seven grandchildren. Buddy Long's list of hobbies is headed by "family."

"But," he says, "I guess the fishing, golf, and swimming will have to wait. I'm too busy right now."

FOREIGN AID AUTHORIZATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it has just been revealed that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in its consideration of the foreign aid bill adopted an amendment eliminating the policy statement in this legislation. I find it very hard to understand the reasoning behind such a move. It is important to the success of the foreign aid program that we pursue certain broad objectives, and it seems to me it is very clearly the responsibility of the Congress to provide some guidance to the AID agency in expending the millions of dollars that will be spent next year on our foreign aid effort.

The statement of policy includes such principles as the repudiation of discrimination by AID recipients toward American citizens. It includes the statement that we give consideration to those nations which share the view of the United States and which do not divert their economic resources into military or propaganda efforts against other AID recipients. It calls for sound planning and programing, and emphasizes the need for the country receiving U.S. aid to mobilize their resources and help themselves as much as possible. It reaffirms our support for increased economic cooperation and trade among nations, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, freedom of navigation in international waterways, and recognition of the right of all private persons to travel and pursue their lawful activities without discrimination as to race or religion.

Mr. President, it is somewhat disturbing to me to learn that at the same time the committee acted to eliminate this statement of policy and purpose in our foreign aid program, it has also been receiving one report after another from the Comptroller General pointing to ineffective programs, wasteful programs, and programs which apparently contributed nothing to the countries receiving it.

Mr. President, what is clearly needed is the establishment of more stringent guidelines, more definite priority in our foreign aid program, not an elimination of these guidelines altogether.

Mr. President, while the Senate committee has been eliminating the principle of Congressional guidelines in foreign aid, the House Foreign Affairs Committee has been, in my judgment, very properly adopting language to deny aid to nations which prepare for aggression against their neighbors. Although I am not wholly satisfied with the language adopted by that committee, I hope it will be strengthened, it is surely far preferable to the action taken in the Senate committee. Certainly if the Senate committee does not reverse itself and provide policy guidelines, I and a number of others will move to insert such language on the floor of the Senate.

PUERTO RICAN CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, today Americans throughout the country are joining the Puerto Ricans in recognizing Puerto Rican Constitution Day. Just 11 year ago, on July 25, 1952, a congressional resolution was enacted which elevated Puerto Rico to the status of a free Commonwealth associated with the United States.

Under this form of government, Puerto Rico has prospered and thrived economically, culturally, and educationally. Operation Bootstrap has brought industry to the Island, created jobs, and given a high standard of living to the people. Operation Serenity inaugurated a program of government assistance to the arts and to education which has emphasized the cultural heritage of Puerto Rico and brought tourists by the thousands to concerts and festivals on the Island.

Mr. President, the Puerto Ricans love for dignity and liberty is clearly demonstrated in their Constitution. Similar to our own Constitution, their constitution calls for the separation of powers and a system of checks and balances. The two houses of the legislature and the Governor are all elected by popular vote and are directly responsible to the needs of the people. Church and state are separated in Puerto Rico and the rights and liberties of individuals are guaranteed.

It well may be that some time in the future, the people of Puerto Rico will elect, of their own free choice, some other form of government. Both independence and statehood have been mentioned, and certainly, the decision on whether or not to continue the present form of alliance with the United States should be primarily theirs. Meanwhile, we on the mainland are proud of their accomplishments and proud to have them as our close friends and fellow citizens.

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to salute the Governor and the people of Puerto Rico and congratulate them on the celebration of the annniversary of their Constitution.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO MY DOCTOR

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on Saturday of this week, one of my longtime friends will celebrate his 80th birthday. He is Dr. William R. Lovelace, founder of the Lovelace Clinic in Albuquerque and responsible for the creation of the Lovelace Foundation for Medical Education and Research.

There have been many giants who have brought great credit and honor to the medical profession in this country—men like Dr. Charles and Dr. Will Mayo of the world-renowned and respected Mayo Clinic, Dr. George Crile, Jr., of Cleveland, and a long list of distinguished physicians and surgeons to whom America owes much and for whose lives whole sections of our land will forever be grateful.

In his own way, Dr. Lovelace has held a similar spot in the lives and affections of the people of New Mexico and the Southwest. I had my first contacts with him in March of 1918, and in April of that year he performed an extremely difficult operation on me at a time when I was in a tuberculosis sanitarium and was in a very dangerous condition as far as my general health was concerned. He had me on the operating table for 2¾ hours and I have always been grateful to him for the surgical skill and medical knowledge which he brought to my case and which permitted me to survive.

Perhaps I am a little prejudiced as I appraise his virtues and successes but I hope that will be excused on the grounds that he has been my physician for 45 years; that he brought both of my children into the world and now goes on administering medical care to a new generation. Therefore, I have felt impelled to call the attention of this Congress and of the people of New Mexico to his oncoming 80th birthday in order that I and they may wish for him continued good health and many more years of usefulness to society and to the profession to which he has devoted his life.

Dr. William R. Lovelace was born in humble circumstances in Missouri on July 27, 1883. He received his medical degree from St. Louis University Medical School in 1905 and then interned at St. Mary's Hospital. The onset of pulmonary tuberculosis necessitated his moving to Sunnyside, N. Mex., in 1906, where he became surgeon for the Lantry Sharp Construction Co. and the Santa Fe Railroad. His first two patients were two men who had been involved in a shooting scrape—one was shot through the shoulder and the other through the side of the neck.

In 1908 he moved to a new office in Fort Sumner, N. Mex. There were no local hospitals; and emergency operations and deliveries were done at the homes in Fort Sumner and in the homes of surrounding ranches and farms. All calls were made by horse and buggy.

In September 1913 Dr. Lovelace moved to Albuquerque, N. Mex., and opened up an office for private practice. He soon became surgeon for the Santa Fe Railroad and joined the hospital staff at the St. Joseph's Hospital and Sanatorium where he was instrumental in the expansion program under the successive administrations of Mother Superior Philip Neri and Sister Mary Lawrence. Between 1914 and 1915 he served as president of the Bernalillo County Medical Society and 21 of the 37 years between 1913 and 1950 he was a member of the State board of medical examiners. He also joined the staff of the Southwestern Presbyterian Hospital and Sanatorium and the Methodist Sanatorium.

Repeated visits to surgical centers in this country and abroad aided his progress in the specialty of surgery, including early thoracic surgery for the treatment of pulmonary tuberculosis. Publications on the surgical treatment of pulmonary tuberculosis followed.

In 1935 he became a consulting surgeon at the Veterans' Hospital. In 1938 Dr. Lovelace became a member of the founders group of the American Board of Surgery and in 1950 a founding member of the Southwestern Surgical Congress and of the founders group of the International College of Surgeons. He was president of the International College of Surgeons, U.S. section, between 1952 and 1954. He is a member of the Bernalillo County Medical Association, the American Medical Association, the Southwestern Medical Association, the Southwestern Surgical Congress, an honorary member of the Academy of Medicine of São Paulo, Brazil, and an honorary member of the Academy of Surgery of Peru.

Dr. Lovelace was a member of the Board of Regents of the University of New Mexico from 1931 to 1937, and during the last 2 years served as president of the board. During these 6 years, with the assistance of the Public Works Administration, the campus building program at the university increased appreciably and the university became accredited by the Association of American Universities.

The idea for establishing in Albuquerque a clinic patterned after the Mayo Clinic came, in large part, from a longstanding friendship and numerous discussions with Drs. William and Charles Mayo beginning in 1915. In 1916 he became a life member of the Mayo Surgeons' Club. The organization which ultimately became the Lovelace Clinic had its inception in 1922 when Dr. Edgar T. Lassetter joined Dr. Lovelace in practice. Dr. J. Dan Lamon, a surgeon, was added to the staff the following year.

The Lovelace Clinic was reorganized in 1947 as a voluntary association of 16 salaried physicians engaged in the private practice of medicine. During the next 16 years, the staff expanded to 64 physicians who represent most of the medical and surgical specialties of medical science.

The Lovelace Foundation for Medical Education and Research, a nonprofit organization, was created in September 1947. Dr. William Randolph Lovelace, Dr. Edgar T. Lassetter and Dr. W. Randolph Lovelace II, the owning partners of the Lovelace Clinic, gave the title, equipment, library, and goodwill of the clinic to the foundation.

The objectives and goals of the foundation were set forth in the founding charter to encompass activities in medical education and research, including investigation in clinical medicine as well as in the basic sciences related to medicine. The foundation is not involved in the practice of medicine. It is directed by a board of trustees, the majority of whom are laymen. The board, headed by Mr. Floyd Odlum, is empowered to determine the policies, develop and operate the program, and administer the assets and income. The trustees serve gratuitously.

Initially, it was recognized that staff, facilities, and equipment consistent with these objectives would have to be assembled and realized. The early course chosen visualized two essential needs: First, the creation of a research organization with adequate housing, equipment, and staff to provide significant research contributions and educational accomplishments; and second, the encouragement of parallel developments that would bring a clinic-hospital-foundation complex into being which could and would support education and clinical research for studies of the processes of disease from their earliest to their latest manifestations.

Today, under the direction of Dr. Clayton S. White, there are active programs of basic, applied, and clinical research in the foundation. These include major activities in cardiopulmonary physiology, microbiology, biochemistry, pathology, and biomedical aspects of high-energy blast waves. Also, specialized work is underway involving the effects of the inhalation of fission products, the use of an electronic digital computer, and various aspects of aerospace medicine. There is a modest expanding educational program. The staff has grown to 180, many of whom are either physicians, doctors of philosophy, or have master degrees oriented toward medicine. Several of the members of the staff are physical scientists. It is anticipated that the staff will grow to 300.

Since moving to the new location near the Albuquerque Veterans Hospital in 1951, the physical facility has been expanded on three occasions, and is now in the process of expanding a fourth time because of a pressing need for more space. The buildings occupied by the clinic have been designed specifically for medical use.

The foundation has received funds for research from the National Institutes of Health, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Atomic Energy Commission, Defense Atomic Support Agency, U.S. Air Force and many other agencies. Many of these projects receive some additional support from the foundation's own funds received as rent from the Lovelace Clinic, and from private donations. Many other projects are supported entirely by the Lovelace Foundation.

The primary source of income has been through donations by generous trustees and friends and from research grants. These have made possible, with matching funds from the U.S. Public Health Service, the acquisition of buildings and equipment which are basic requisites for developing an energetic and productive research program. The foundation now has 108,000 square feet of floor space in three buildings and another building under construction will increase the space available to over 220,000 square feet in late 1963. Another large facility, designed for the fission product program and now under construction by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission at Sandia Base, will be operated by the foundation staff.

Dr. Lovelace has seen and has been instrumental in the changes from the horse and buggy days in medicine to the hospital-clinic-foundation complex for clinical research and education. Today there are broader goals for improved care of patients, for exploration of space, for determination of the effects of nuclear energy, and to help narrow the gap that all too frequently exists between medical practice and the research laboratory.

Today I salute my longtime friend and physician and express the hope that Saturday will find him healthy and cheerful, ready to celebrate a happy birthday.

FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEMS FACING ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I call attention to an informative and important editorial-advertisement presented as a public service, in the New York Times on Monday, May 13, 1963, by Mr. A. N. Spanel, founder and chairman of International Latex Corp., titled "Anatomy of Naked Neglect."

Mr. Spanel's many editorial articles have earned him recognition as one of our most profound students of foreign affairs.

In a sympathetic but very objective manner, this article explains some of the fundamental problems facing the Alliance for Progress. It is noteworthy that Mr. Spanel has repeatedly written since 1956 on the subject of our neglect of Latin America. He predicted its peril, indeed, long before the advent of Castro. More than that, Mr. Spanel carefully outlined the remedial steps that were basic to any constructive program by the United States in the 20 countries of Latin America.

This is a most significant contribution by the chairman of the International Latex Corp., and we are all greatly indebted to him for it.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that this article by Mr. Spanel be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 13, 1963]

ANATOMY OF NAKED NEGLECT

(A. N. Spanel, chairman, International Latex Corp.)

When the story of our time is recorded, American aid to other countries will surely be acknowledged as a remarkable and unprecedented phenomenon. The backbreaking generosity of the American people since the end of the war has been of a magnitude of $100 billion—a total greater than all the voluntary giving of wealth between nations in 5,000 years of history.

Are critics wrong who say that it has merely bought us enemies? The all-important truth is that American foreign aid, beginning with the Marshall plan, played a primary role in rehabilitating a war-torn Europe, helping to save France, England, West Germany, Italy, Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, Greece, and Turkey from chaos and the grasping claws of communism.

Among these, of course, are the six countries of the European Common Market. Had we failed in the herculean enterprise, it is doubtful if the Common Market could have been born in this century. Revival of tens of thousands of war-wrecked European factories, mines, businesses provided pockets of permanent employment and in the aggregate these made possible the economic and political stability of Western Europe.

FAILED TO WOO PRIVATE BUSINESS

Why then has the Alliance for Progress, noble in inspiration and intent, and endowed with able leadership failed to produce results to match, in the Western Hemisphere? One answer is in our long neglect of Latin America while we concentrated on European recovery. Secondly, is the fact that the basic problems of Europe and Latin America are in no way comparable. Worst of all is that our Alliance program started out almost entirely as a Government aid-giving process that failed to harness the free enterprise system in which businessmen of America and Europe are best equipped to generate mass employment.

The medicine that worked magic in restoring the health of Europe cannot be prescribed for an area in which the disease is quite different. Specifically, the job in Latin America is not, as it was in Europe, to revive industrial capacity but to create it. The job is to provide centers of continuing employment where none have existed.

Our Government has committed immense capital to construction of roads, dams, schools, hospitals, etc. This is necessary, much of it is indispensable. But for the most part, the employment it generates is of a temporary, emergency nature. All too little of it is geared to develop permanent and expanding employment.

This initial bypassing of business interests in the Western Hemisphere and especially in Latin American countries, added to the jitters caused by Castroism and local extremist movements, stampeded Latin American capital into being exported to Switzerland and to the United States for safekeeping. The guesstimates are that no less than $7 billion have thus been siphoned off in the last 3 years; a bleeding process which transfusions of U.S. dollars could not begin to compensate.

In sum, much of the failure of the Alliance for Progress is attributable to its strange neglect to encourage and attract branch factories from the United States, Canada, and our Allies in Europe, notably from France, England, West Germany, Italy, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, and Sweden.

HANDOUTS: DEAD-END ROADS

This vestibule process to industrialization cannot be accomplished through Government handouts. It is a task for American and free world industry, rich in capital and business acumen—in partnership, wherever possible, with Latin American businessmen. Government aid could then be most resultfully utilized, where necessary, in helping to finance those plants through low-interest business loans.

That is why since 1956 the writer has repeatedly projected in these columns a plan for a Latin American Common Market, on the European model, backed by a crash program for building branch factories of American and other free world industrial enterprises.

We pointed to the significant experience in Puerto Rico. There, over 600 such branch plants have given the island the highest standard of living in all of Latin America. To achieve comparable results in Latin America as a whole, it would take 40 times such branch manufacturing units.

True, the goods manufactured in Puerto Rico have a ready-made market, being exported duty-free to the United States. But in Latin America the need for every conceivable commodity is so great that—given a semblance of purchasing power born of steady employment—the continent itself could readily absorb everything produced by these factories, and more. This presumes, of course, the removal of strangling tariff walls between Latin American nations through a common market. To conquer its poverty, Latin America must be helped to overcome its splintered, tariff-ridden, economic disunity.

"It may be objected," we wrote in 1961, "that private investments on that scale would drain American currency at a time when Washington tries to stem its outflow. But conventional grants-in-aid, too, are a drain on gold reserves, and this without the prospect of greatly increased employment, higher standards of living or any return in the form of profits. In addition there is another answer."

INCENTIVES TO CONQUER POVERTY

"We could and should invite private business in France, England, West Germany, Italy, Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, Sweden, and other free-world nations to join as partners of American private enterprise in Latin America. It is just as important for Canada, for example, to make her presence felt in this development as it is for England to be a living part of the European Common Market.

"Further, these European countries are developing surplus capital which, guaranteed by the presence and leadership of the United States, could be drawn into this common undertaking, in partnership with Latin American businessmen, wherever possible."

In line with this thinking we therefore urged a three-point plan which we first published in 1956 and reprinted many times thereafter:

"1. It is proposed that the 20 countries of Latin America enter into a mutual agreement to drop all existing trade barriers between them. In return, the United States will declare tax exempt all profits earned through new investments of its citizens in the aforesaid countries prior to the transfer of these profits to the United States; and upon transfer, the profits be taxed no higher than at capital gain rates. Furthermore, in order that the volume and scope of such investments may be realized, the United States will assume responsibility for effecting a minimum private investment of a billion dollars a year for 5 years (preferably as loans and for the most part to private enterprises).

"2. The U.S. commitments will hinge upon the Latin countries agreeing that, except for petroleum and minerals, the profits on such private investments shall not be taxed more than 10 percent per annum and that this maximum rate shall apply either to corporations or to individuals but not to both. In this way, the free-world investors would not have their incentives stifled by self-defeating, high Latin tax rates.

"3. The 20 Latin American nations will agree to the free and unrestricted movement of both profits and capital from one country to another, in order to encourage the pioneering development not just of some but of all their countries."

Our 1956 proposal ended with words that, in the light of the Cuban tragedy and explosive political pressures in other Latin American countries since then, are even more urgent and pertinent today:

"Whatever costs the United States might incur as a consequence of reduced tax receipts would be inconsequential compared to the overwhelming financial burdens it would otherwise be forced to undertake in the future in helping to snuff out the hemispheric fires of communism or fascism."

FARGO ENDORSES "OPEN CITIES"

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, Hon. Herschel Lashkowitz, mayor and president of the Board of City Commissioners of Fargo, N. Dak., forwarded to me a copy of a resolution adopted by the city commissioners, proposing the idea of friendly, reciprocal, city-to-city and village-to-village visiting and hospitality among nations. This is a new and novel idea, but a good one. Through an exchange of people would come an exchange of ideas and understanding, which in turn would improve world climate for peace. I, therefore, commend the resolution to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the "open cities" idea has been submitted to the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Fargo for its consideration as an idea of promoting peace throughout the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Fargo, N. Dak., recognizing that facilitation of neighborly visiting and hospitality among peoples promotes peace among them, urges the Government of the United States to take effective action toward the purpose of the "open cities" idea of friendly, reciprocal, city-to-city and village-to-village visiting and hospitality among nations and herewith endorses the "open cities" idea as a policy of waging honorable peace and understanding among man; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be urged to provide that all funds appropriated and designated by Congress for this purpose be expendable not abroad, but only in the United States or its possessions; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be inscribed upon the permanent records of the Board of

City Commissioners of the City of Fargo, N. Dak., and that a certified copy of the herein resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Honorable John F. Kennedy, the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk, the U.S. congressional delegation from the State of North Dakota, and the legislators from the ninth legislative district of the State of North Dakota.

HERSCHEL LASHKOWITZ,
Mayor and President, Board of City Commissioners, Fargo, N. Dak.
Attest:
WM. G. JOHNSON,
City Auditor.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASIN PLANS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6016) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930, RELATING TO MARKING OF PACKAGES OF IMPORTED ARTICLES TO SHOW COUNTRY OF ORIGIN

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2513) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE TFX CONTROVERSY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I rise primarily to call the attention of the Senators to a very interesting, analytical, and informative article which appeared in the July 22, 1963, issue of the Minneapolis Morning Tribune. The article was written by Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, the Washington correspondent for the Cowles publications, and deals with the whole subject of the TFX contracts, which have occupied so much of the time of the McClellan investigating subcommittee for many, many months, and which have been reported widely to the taxpayers through the media of radio, television, and the press.

I should like the article to appear in the RECORD, primarily because some misunderstanding has arisen in certain quarters as to the purpose of the investigation. Some witnesses and writers have indicated that they think that the investigation has as its target an effort to challenge the statutory right of the civilian Secretaries to make the basic procurement decisions and to override, if they choose to do so—as they did choose to do so in the $6.5 billion TFX contract—the advice, counsel, and recommendations of the uniformed people who deal with the development of the contracts and the uniformed services which must utilize the weapons which are being procured.

There never has been, and there is not now, any question in the mind of any member of our committee about the statutory right of civilian Secretaries to exercise such authority. There is legitimately a question in the minds of many Senators both on and off the committee as to the wisdom involved in the manner in which the civilian Secretaries exercised that admitted right in the instant case. Actually, our committee is involved primarily in one problem, and it is one which can be stated in a single sentence:

Did the United States get the best available plane of the TFX design at the lowest possible price? That is what the committee wants to know. That is what the American taxpayers want to know. People who sometimes watch us in the committee room laboring month after month, week after week, and hour after hour every day when the permission of the Senate is granted for the committee to meet, ask, "What do you hope to accomplish by this long investigation and these long drawn-out hearings?"

Mr. President, all we hoped to accomplish when we started and all we hope to accomplish now is to ascertain the facts and make the facts available to the people. But as a first immediate target we hope to find out and report the answer to the question:

In the letting of the TFX contract as it was let, all circumstances considered, did the United States get the best available plane at the lowest possible price when the contract was awarded to General Dynamics?

We hope, at the end of the trial, to be able to answer that question with facts, figures, references, and authoritative statements from competent witnesses.

Secondly, we hope to help to provide guidelines for the handling of such vast procurement defense contracts as the one involving TFX—guidelines which will utilize the established practices which have demonstrated their effectiveness in the past in the procurement of efficient armament at economical rates. We also hope to point out the lack of wisdom involved in scrapping and discarding established rules and safeguards which have worked well, by decisions made by civilian Secretaries which overrule a unanimity of findings of facts and figures and performance criteria involved.

Defense procurement in America is big business. I suspect it has become the biggest business in America. It is big not only in terms of its costs, but also in terms of its importance. It is big, in the first place, because our national survival depends on the proper decisions being made in the procurement and utilization of the best available weapons in the various areas in which we need defense hardware. It is big, in the second place, because our national solvency is involved in the exercising of due economy and due regard for the financial status of this country in the procurement of defense hardware.

Let us look at this single defense contract called the TFX. It is the biggest single governmental contract ever let by any government in the history of the world. If there were no other reason why a prudent Congress should want to explore how that contract was awarded, its size alone would justify the attention of Congress to the facts involved.

A $6½ billion contract, reduced to understandable terms, adds up to quite a tidy sum for the individual American taxpayer. Roughly speaking, today a billion dollars represents $8 per man, woman, and child in America; so a $6.5 billion contract represents a contract of about $50 for every American individual. For the average American family of five, this means that this contract alone involves a cost of $250 for the head of the average household in America, an out-of-pocket expense that he will be compelled to spend for the procurement of the TFX contract as originally conceived.

We were told recently in the hearings, however, that if the Navy has its way it will more than double the number of TFX airplanes which will be procured. We were told recently in the hearings—the facts of which were released subsequently—that the Navy's expansion program, coupled with what would be expected to be a corresponding expansion of Air Force use of these planes, would build this contract to the astronomical size of $10 billion or $12 billion, which is reaching the point where it would mean a $500 bill taken out of the billfold or the pocket or the household budget of the head of every American family of average size in this country. All of this for a single contract for one specific product in our ever expanding weapons system.

So it is important. Because of its importance, I feel that the review and analysis and report by Clark Mollenhoff is of special importance. Mr. Mollenhoff's report begins by quoting one of America's outstanding military men, one of its most outstanding public citizens. He starts out, under the Washington date line, by saying:

> Adm. Arleigh Burke warned Sunday that the TFX warplane contract investigation discloses practices that could result in "destruction"—

I repeat the word. It is a strong word from a strong man whose counsel has well been heeded in the past. The counsel of Admiral Burke might well be heeded in the future. I repeat the words:

> Could result in destruction or political perversion of our entire military procurement system.

When a man of the high national and international reputation of Arleigh Burke uses strident terms and strong words like "destruction or political perversion" in that connection with this kind of case, it merits the scrutiny of a senatorial committee.

The Mollenhoff article continues:

> His—

Referring to Adm. Arleigh Burke—

> warnings were aimed at Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's decision to overrule the unanimous recommendations of the high-level Pentagon Source Selection Board and take the first steps which could lead to awarding a $6.5 billion TFX warplane program to General Dynamics Corp.
>
> McNamara has admitted that he had no independent cost studies available on the low bid by the Boeing Co., but had used figures out of his head and "rough judgment" to discard the Boeing bid.

If our investigation does nothing else, I hope it will put a prompt and permanent end to any Government official grabbing figures out of his head and awarding on a basis of a rough personal judgment a $6½-billion Government contract to anybody for any purpose. Our hardpressed taxpayers are entitled to a more careful scrutiny than that.

I continue to read from the Mollinhoff article:

> In addition to criticizing the specific TFX contract procedure, Burke expressed concern over a memorandum prepared by Dr. John H. Rubel, one of McNamara's top aids, which proposes an end to the "recommendations" of source selection boards such as those that have caused McNamara so much embarrassment in the TFX investigation.

I interpolate to say that we have had the Rubel testimony before us, and the memorandum has been made a part of the public record of our hearings.

> Dr. Rubel's memorandum proposes that such source selection boards be abolished and that in their place a source evaluation would be established. This evaluation group would simply make factual reports and evaluations, but would have no power to "recommend."
>
> "This pattern of practices and proposals opens the way for destruction or political perversion of our entire military procurement system," Burke said.

I knew very little about how a $6½ billion contract was parceled out to contractors when the McClellan investigation began. I was compelled, as the ranking Republican member of the committee, to meet my assignment and to spend an unconscionable number of hours sitting and listening to testimony about the TFX contract, when I would have preferred to be working on legislative proposals of more immediate interest to South Dakota or of more immediate concern to the present speaker.

When one has a committee assignment, either he shirks it or he works at it. Since this involved a $6½ billion contract, it was no place for shirking. It was a place for hard work and long study and careful analysis. I have devoted myself therefore to this assignment.

The greatest single impression I have received from the entire hearings is the care and the prudence and the caution which have been utilized in the past through the Pentagon procedure of putting in motion source selection boards, evaluation teams, consultative meetings of uniformed personnel, channeled all the way up, with careful briefings and preparation, so that when the recommendations to our civilian Secretaries are finally made they are based on the best judgment of the best available cost accountants, the best available scientists and engineers, and the best fliers—in this particular case, because this was an air contract—that America possesses.

I think it would be a backward step toward the jungle of complete inefficiency and political patronage if we were now to discard, as Dr. Rubel suggests, the source selection system which has served America so well, for so long.

When the hearings are over, it may or may not be demonstrated by the Pentagon witnesses—and I certainly am not casting any verdict at this time—that in this particular instance they were justified in overruling, as they did, peremptorily, the unanimous recommendation of the source selection and evaluation groups. Whether they were justified in this instance or not—this we will find at the end of the trail—there is no question in my mind that the system which has served us so well for so long should not be discarded simply to avoid embarrassment for civilian Secretaries in the event they decide—and they did in this case—to overrule the panels of experts.

This system has served us well—so well, in fact, that when we asked the witnesses to give us other precedents and other examples of important contracts where the civilian Secretaries had avoided and overruled and discarded the recommendations of the technical teams, they could come up with no other example. So I say it has served America exceedingly well.

Going on with the article by Mr. Mullenhoff:

> He stated—

Referring to Admiral Burke—

> that McNamara undoubtedly does not intend to engage in such destructive action—

I would agree with him emphatically, because I entered those hearings as one who had a high regard for Secretary McNamara, and I continue to retain it, even though there is a presumption, at least, that he may have made a horrendously bad decision in the instant case.

This I do not know. The evidence is not all in. We will get it in the hearings. But even if it were determined, developed, and demonstrated that he was totally wrong in what he did in exercising his judgment to overrule the technical experts in this case, my high regard for Secretary McNamara would continue. I am sure, if he made this mistake, it was an honest one. It was not because of political persuasion, in my opinion. It was certainly not because of any financial consideration, I know. Being human like the rest of us, I am sure he makes mistakes, as the rest of us do. He may be a little more reluctant to admit his mistakes than the average man, but I think the idea persists that even he may be in error at times. But I know he is a man of high character and dedicated service.

So listen to what Burke said:

> McNamara undoubtedly does not intend to engage in such destructive action, but that "the danger of destroying the integrity of our military procurement is inherent in the policies that were used in the TFX decision and the standardization of those policies as frankly proposed in the memorandum of Dr. Rubel."
>
> It is stated frankly (in the memorandum) that the proposed policies to abandon recommendations * * * is for the purpose of making it easier.

Note the words, Mr. President. Note the words, readers of the Congressional Record. Note the words, those who are interested in informing the public—the memorandum frankly states it is for the purpose of making it easier for "the Defense Secretary or other political appointees to make arbitrary multibillion-dollar contracts."

Mr. President, has public business become so exclusively the property of an individual political appointee with a high title that we want to make it easier for him to spend the public's money in disregard of the prudent policies which through the years and over hundreds of billions of dollars' worth of contracts have enabled us to become the best armed and best equipped country in the world and still maintain our national solvency?

Who wants to make it easier for civilian Secretaries to disregard that policy; and, most of all, why should it be made easier? Whose interest are we concerned in protecting? The embarrassment of a civilian Secretary who may make a mistake, or the duty of preserving the solvency of our country and the greater, overriding importance of developing the best weapons system for America that the state of the art will provide?

This, we have been told by witness after witness, is the end result which has been obtained in the past, and which I believe is obtainable in the future—by utilizing the evaluation, the processes, and the source selection methods which have served us so well.

I trust that Congress will preserve this procedure and deny the recommendation of Dr. Rubel that we scrap that policy, whereby arbitrary decisions can be made more easily, with less embarrassment.

I do not know whether Dr. Rubel knows of the investigative processes of Congress, but I doubt that his proposal would succeed in anyone's avoiding embarrassment, because Congress has the sticky habit of having investigations into certain procedures and loyalty matters and other subjects of interest to the general public. I suspect that the investigative committees of the Congress would be much busier than otherwise if contracts should be awarded on this casual basis suggested by Dr. Rubel instead of through the meticulous attention which has been devoted to them as in the consideration of the TFX contract by the lower level experts.

Continuing with the Mollenhoff article:

> Burke said he is "gravely concerned" over the TFX warplane contract decision because he wanted the United States "to have the best possible weapons system and at the best price."

That is our target in this investigation. That is what most Americans want. That is of greater concern than the avoidance of embarrassment. That is of greater concern than any other single factor that we should consider—the best possible weapons system at the best price.

Who could ask for more? Why should we settle for a system which will give us less? This ought to be the target at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue.

I should like to go back and read another paragraph in this article, Mr. President.

He says:

> Certainly this point cannot be minimized when we realize that we must continually do our best to maintain an advantage over the Communist world.

That bears repeating. We are not having this investigation in a vacuum. We are not living in a remote pearly tower someplace off on cloud nine, where we can look at this thing and dispassionately say, "We need only look at this thing theoretically." Way off to the east there is a fellow who also has technicians and contractors and designers to create weapons systems. So—we are confronted with a fact of life—not a theory. We ought to ponder that statement of Admiral Burke:

> We do not want to find that we have lost the edge over the Communists because of our method of selection.

That reminds one of the ringing words of Gen. Curtis LeMay when he testified on the TFX matter before our committee. He detailed his reasons for preferring the Boeing design—and Boeing as a contractor. He said it was because the Boeing design had an edge over General Dynamics in performance. We asked him how much of an edge. He said that there was an advantage to both planes, but on balance it was an edge for Boeing, and in the mortal business of fighting in the air, an edge is indispensable and an edge is all important, whether it is a mile, 1,000 miles, or 10 miles a minute, or an hour; it is an edge for the one who has superiority, and it involves whether one wins or loses the contest.

I read another paragraph.

> He declared that the TFX decision and the Rubel memorandum "could promote a pattern of arbitrary decision under a policy that is admittedly designed to avoid the embarrassment of overruling the recommendations of persons with experience and expertise.

I have already read portions of the article, but I ask unanimous consent that this highly significant and informative article, written by Clark Mollenhoff, be printed in the RECORD in full at this point. Mr. Mollenhoff, probably more thoroughly than any other reporter, has read, day after day, the long and technical and complicated transcript released from the committee room after it has been censured by the Pentagon.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SYSTEM THREATENED?—ADMIRAL SEES DANGER IN TFX DECISION

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Adm. Arleigh Burke warned Sunday that the TFX warplane contract investigation discloses practices that could result in "destruction or political perversion" of our entire military procurement system.

Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations, is now director of the Center for Strategic Studies at Georgetown University. He voiced his grave concern over the TFX warplane contract procedures, and stated that he hoped the proposals to eliminate recommendations would be discarded.

His warnings were aimed at Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's decision to overrule the unanimous recommendations of the high-level Pentagon Source Selection Board and take the first steps which could lead to awarding a $6.5 billion TFX warplane program to General Dynamics Corp.

McNamara has admitted that he had no independent cost studies available on the low bid by the Boeing Co., but had used figures out of his head and "rough judgment" to discard the Boeing bid.

The Pentagon Source Selection Board had recommended Boeing on the basis of a higher performance rating and a price that would be lower by $100 million to $415 million.

In addition to criticizing the specific TFX contract procedure, Burke expressed concern over a memorandum prepared by Dr. John H. Rubel, one of McNamara's top aides, which proposes an end to the recommendations of source selection boards such as those that have caused McNamara so much embarrassment in the TFX investigation.

Dr. Rubel's memorandum proposes that such source selection boards be abolished, and that in their place a source evaluation would be established. This evaluation group would simply make factual reports and evaluations, but would have no power to recommend.

"This pattern of practices and proposals opens the way for destruction or political perversion of our entire military procurement system," Burke said.

He stated that McNamara undoubtedly does not intend to engage in such destructive action, but that "the danger of destroying the integrity of our military procurement is inherent in the policies that were used in the TFX decision and the standardization of those policies as frankly proposed in the memorandum of Dr. Rubel."

"It is stated frankly (in the memorandum) that the proposed policies to abandon 'recommendations' * * * is for the purpose of making it easier for the Defense Secretary or other political appointees to make arbitrary multibillion-dollar contracts," Admiral Burke said.

Burke said he is "gravely concerned" over the TFX warplane contract decision because he wanted the United States "to have the best possible weapons system and at the best price."

"Certainly this point cannot be minimized when we realize that we must continually do our best to maintain an advantage over the Communist world," Burke said. "We do not want to find that we have lost the edge over the Communists because of our method of selection."

He declared that the TFX decision and the Rubel memorandum "could promote a pattern of arbitrary decision under a policy that is admittedly designed to avoid the embarrassment of overruling the recommendations of persons with experience and expertise."

"Such a pattern can destroy the integrity of the source selection system," Burke said. "That integrity in military procurement is vital to the morale of the military and civilian experts in the Pentagon, and vital to the relationship with the industries that do business with the Pentagon."

Burke stressed that the professional military officials have the responsibility for safeguarding the longtime defense posture of this Nation.

Burke declared that military procurement must be handled in such a manner that these military people "have the conviction that expert advice is of value, and that recommendations that are soundly based will be given thoughtful consideration and not arbitrarily brushed aside."

"The industries dealing with the military procurement system must have a confidence in the integrity of the system," Burke said. "They must believe that it is a system devised to bring military advice, engineering advice, and other technical advice to the problems. They must be convinced that it is a system devised to bring fair and honest competition."

The former Chief of Naval Operations stated that above all there must be a conviction that arbitrary action will not prevail and that political influence or other improper influence cannot be successfully used to gain multibillion-dollar contracts.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in conclusion, let me say serving on a committee of this kind is not a pleasant task. It is not one that any Senator seeks out, to become involved in this kind of testimony of many months' duration. It is never good to have to question the judgment of people one respects, of people with whom one has had friendly social contacts. It is never pleasant to have to ask questions which embarrass witnesses who come from positions of high responsibility.

One of the things that one must do in an investigation of this kind is to try to find out what other possible reasons might motivate men to make judgments based on other than performance and criteria and price statistics. Therefore, this is standing operating procedure to ask witness after witness, "Do you own any stock in General Dynamics? Do you own any stock in Boeing? Are you a member or an officer of a corporation that does business with Boeing or does business with General Dynamics? Have you served as a lawyer for either one of them? Have you a commitment of going back to work for them after the investigation is over?"

These questions are not asked with malice. Often they are asked with no remote idea of what the answer will be.

When we ask them of witnesses, they color up, manifest temper, and stand on their dignity and resent the fact that we perpetuate a probe in the way any honest probe must proceed if it is not going to be a farce insofar as an investigation is concerned.

I have had to ask some of these questions. I have been unhappy over the reactions we have sometimes had. I have certainly formed no judgment on the basis of their replies, but so long as I am on the committee I am not going to participate in a travesty. I refuse to participate in something that could be called an investigation but which would operate under such unrealistic rules that one cannot ask appropriate questions of important people, because if we ask the important questions of important people they rise up on the dignity of their importance and resent it, and think that they are being accused of doing something wrong.

So far as I am concerned, this investigation must consider in the future, as it has up to now, all possibilities of conflicts of interest, all possibilities of political intercession, as well as all possibilities of good or bad judgments made with a clear conscience by men who have the constitutional or statutory authority to make them. To do less would be to squander the taxpayers' money in something that is parading as an investigation but which would in fact be a coverup or a useless exercise. I can assure you neither Senator McCLELLAN nor I nor any member of our investigating committee is interested in such an exercise of futility and deception.

I hope that witnesses, as they appear before the subcommittee, will therefore recognize that Senators on an investigating committee have a responsibility to ask questions, and sometimes embarrassing questions. There is no other way in which we can ascertain the truth. There is no other way in which honest men who have made mistakes, or who may have decided wisely, can have an opportunity to answer questions, to protect themselves.

I wish some of the witnesses could have an opportunity to read some of the mail I receive from people I do not know, whose correspondence unhappily I do not have staff enough to answer—letters which come to me from Texas, from California, from New York, and many other States, and telephone calls and telegrams—all kinds of rumors and all kinds of charges, which we ignore, except in rare instances in which it seems justified to give them to a staff member to determine whether any element of truth or fact is involved.

If we are to maintain the integrity of what is considered to be one of the most important functions of Congress, its investigative procedure, we cannot maintain that integrity by failing to ask important questions of important people. Otherwise those who write, or many more who would be impelled to write, could well believe that this is only window dressing, that no attempt is being made to get the facts, or to determine whether or not there were any other factors operating than those which appear on the surface of the decisions involved.

I have no preconcieved concept whatsoever as to where this road will lead. I have made no judgments whatever imputing political intercession, or conflict of interest, or connivance on the part of any individual. But merely because I lack that evidence and lack that information, I refuse to be hog-tied, and I refuse to be stifled in the exercise of the interrogatory function of the Senate; namely, to ask people the questions that ought to be asked. Let them answer them the way they will. Let the public judge from the written record, when it is complete. We seek to pillory no one. We seek only to publicize, with neither prejudice nor favor, all the facts and all the factors involved. Only by this policy can public business be publically determined.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have listened with the greatest interest to the remarks of the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] about the TFX hearing. I had not intended to discuss that subject, but I am moved to do so by what I have heard. The hearings are in executive session. Transcripts, so far as they are not subject to security, are issued regularly, morning and afternoon; so although the public has a window on the details of the hearings, the public is not privy to the general thrust of the hearings, except on the rather rare occasions when the subject is discussed on the Senate floor. I had not intended to open the subject at this time; nonetheless, since it has been opened by the Senator from South Dakota—I just advised him that I would say a word or two about it—I think a few observations are necessary.

I have sat in on the hearings, not as many of them as has the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], or the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], or the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], but enough to get, I think, the full flavor of what is going on. First, of course, I think it must be said, in thorough agreement with what has been said, that no Senator should be inhibited as to the questions he asks or how he asks them, and that no high official should be insulted by those questions or should resent them. This is an inquiry which Congress is making through an appropriate committee, and questions must be answered with equanimity and good will.

I think that is a quite proper attitude. It is a very different attitude from that of an affront to the dignity of those officials.

I noticed in one interchange that one official was called "Mr. General Dynamics." If nobody is rushing to a conclusion as to what the situation is with respect to the contract, certainly the implication going out to the public that a high official is so biased in favor of the successful bidder that he is called "Mr. General Dynamics" is not a very dispassionate approach to the nature of the hearing. I believe that calls for discipline not only on the part of witnesses but also on the part of Senators, for high officials serve often at very great personal sacrifice. It is a great honor to be a high official of our Government, but it is by no means an unmixed blessing. We often find it difficult to get the best people to take these jobs because of hearings like the very one now investigating the TFX contract. That means that hearings should be conducted in such a manner that we do our utmost to minimize the pain which is involved. So far as the men with responsibility in Government are concerned, they should not be exculpated from a single fault; nevertheless we should treat them with the same dignity with which we would expect them to treat us.

Having placed this statement in the RECORD, I hope very much that there will be an equal amount of discipline on both sides of the investigating table.

Second, sooner or later Congress will have to ask, "How long will this investigation continue? At what point will decision time arrive?" I am not prepared to say that that is now; but I point out that the investigation has been in progress for many months. I have asked witness after important witness what I consider to be a fundamental question: "Is there any impact upon the morale of the armed services which is attributable to this hearing, and is the TFX contract itself being any way impeded in its fulfillment by reason of the hearings?" The uniform answer I have received has been, "Not yet." But that does not mean forever. It does not mean that no matter how much we may wish to expand the need for interrogation of the most profound kind, even by provocative questions, a witness has to answer the same kind of question and give the same set of facts not once, but twice, three times, four times, or more. There must be some terminal point in the investigation as there is in other hearings, as there is in judicial proceedings, or anything else.

So for today I only raise that question; I say nothing more. I make the point that before too long we shall have to come face to face with some terminal point in respect to the hearings and the unlimited amount of time which it takes from the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, and all the military officers who are concerned, who are giving the investigation their concentrated attention.

From everything I can see, what the investigation will produce will be perhaps an analysis of how such decisions are arrived at, so that there may be, let us hope, an improvement in the future. But I doubt very much that there will be a change in anything so far as the TFX contract itself is concerned. I believe that, too, must be a factor in respect to the determinations.

The other factor which I think is important is that, for understandable reasons, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Secretary of the Navy are all unwilling to say that this is a confrontation between a military and a civilian decision and that it raises a question whether the civilian is paramount to the military in respect to the conduct of the defense affairs of the country. I believe that this is precisely the question raised in the whole situation, so highly controverted are the facts on both sides when we finally get down to the end of the road.

I do not believe that as yet there has been any demonstration of abuse of discretion, fraud, dishonesty, improper political interest, or anything else of that nature, that would invalidate the contract; but I can see a very big argument with respect to judgment and discretion. I would not say, standing here today, that I would necessarily have decided as Secretary McNamara, Secretary Zuckert, and Secretary Korth have decided—though I may very well have done so.

But I do say that in the absence of some overriding consideration other than the exercise of judgment, I believe the fundamental tradition and policy of our

Government is to sustain the paramountcy of the civilian decision. The civilian decision is dependent not alone on the final report of this committee; the civilian decision and the question of whether it will be respected in the country are also conditioned by the day-to-day evidence adduced, the quality and character of the questions asked and the answers given, and the duration of the hearings. All of these condition the public mind, in arriving at a determination as to whether the civilian decision can be trusted, in terms of being paramount over the military decision, in the final analysis of these matters. So these circumstances, which are being discussed today on the floor of the Senate, also have a bearing on the final decision.

Therefore, Mr. President, I conclude as follows: I had not intended to raise this subject; but in view of the fact that it has been raised, it was my intention to give something of a balance to the points which have been made as we are seeking the best public understanding of what is occurring. Therefore, I thought it important—inasmuch as I am a participant in the hearings, as a member of the subcommittee, though a new one, for this is the first investigation in which I have participated as a member of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations—that I should place these facts on the Record.

I hasten to add that within the limits of the deep feelings of those involved, including the members of the subcommittee, I believe the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], is doing his utmost to conduct the hearings as fairly as possible; but I do not think that should confuse us as to the importance of the length of the hearings; the way in which questions are asked—which I believe is also an important factor; the way in which witnesses are dealt with, in terms of what is implicit in the questions asked—even though in their answers they may deny it; and the general quality and character of the hearings—all of which are also, in my opinion, subject to the public test of whether what is being done is in the best interests of the Nation.

As I say, I do not believe the time has yet come to make an issue of the length of the hearings; but I do believe the time has come to indicate that that question is very likely to be at issue before too long.

IN DEFENSE OF THE NATION'S BILLPAYERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, while we are marking time on a number of major pieces of legislation, I should like to call the Senate's attention to a number of achievements during the past few years which have been registered on behalf of the Nation's billpayers. We hear a great deal about the taxpayer, Mr. President, but we sometimes forget that he also pays, as a consumer, other bills besides taxes and he is entitled to at least as much consideration and attention in the one capacity as in the other.

First of all, it is apparent that this administration is deeply conscious of the consumer's interests. This great concern for the economic well-being and safety of every American is not accidental. It stems from specific actions which President Kennedy requested shortly after he took office, many of which have found their way into legislation.

It stems from a specific program deeply rooted in President Kennedy's declaration of consumer rights which he put forth in a message to Congress last year.

These rights include:

First. The right to safety—to be protected against the sale of goods which are hazardous to health or life.

Second. The right to be informed—to be protected against fraud, false advertising or other deceitful practices, and to be given the facts we need to make a knowledgeable choice.

Third. The right to choose—to be assured, wherever possible, of access to a variety of products and services at competitive prices.

Fourth. The right to be heard—to have a voice in the formulation of Government policy that affects consumer interests.

These are the rights of the American billpayers and these are the rights which the Kennedy administration is taking strong and vigorous steps to guarantee.

I do not mean to imply that the Government has suddenly become aware of the consumer in this administration. Ever since legislation was enacted in 1872 to protect the consumer from frauds involving the use of the U.S. mail, the Congress and the executive branch have been increasingly alert to their responsibility to make certain that our Nation's economy fairly and adequately serves consumers' interests.

However, as the President has pointed out:

> The march on technology—affecting, for example, the foods we eat, the medicines we take, and the many appliances we use in our homes—has increased the difficulties of the consumer along with his opportunities; and it has outmoded many of the old laws and regulations and made new legislation necessary. The typical supermarket before World War II stocked about 1,500 separate food items—an impressive figure by any standard. But today it carries over 6,000. Ninety percent of the prescriptions written today are for drugs that were unknown 20 years ago. Many of the new products used every day in the home are highly complex. The housewife is called upon to be an amateur electrician, mechanic, chemist, toxicologist, dietitian, and mathematician—but she is rarely furnished the information she needs to perform these tasks proficiently.
>
> Marketing is increasingly impersonal. Consumer choice is influenced by mass advertising utilizing highly developed arts of persuasion. The consumer typically cannot know whether drug preparations meet minimum standards of safety, quality, and efficacy. He usually does not know how much he pays for consumer credit; whether one prepared food has more nutritional value than another; whether the performance of a product will in fact meet his needs; or whether the "large economy size" is really a bargain.

All this has made it necessary that existing Government programs be strengthened, that Government organization be improved, and, in certain areas, that new legislation be enacted.

President Kennedy has provided exceptional leadership in this connection. In the Senate, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], among others, have been most diligent on behalf of the American bill payer.

Much already has been done along these lines in the past 2½ years. Much remains to be done.

I would like to review briefly some of the achievements which have already had and will continue to have a beneficial impact of the well-being of the people of the Nation.

The most important purchase most Americans make in a lifetime is a home. It is the average billpayer's largest single bill.

When this administration took office, housing and community development were suffering from 8 years of indifference and neglect. Homebuilding was at its lowest level in a decade, and interest on mortgages at one of the highest.

At the President's direction, interest rates on FHA-insured mortgages were reduced from 5¾ to 5¼ percent. As a result, those who have purchased homes with FHA-insured mortgages under the Kennedy administration will save thousands of dollars in interest charges.

The Housing Act of 1961—which was one of the first legislative achievements of the Congress in the present administration—reduced the downpayments required on FHA-insured mortgages. At the same time it extended the maximum term of these mortgages. This brought homeownership within the reach of 700,000 additional American families—and it made it possible for 3 million other families to buy better homes than they could previously afford.

Major charges on the resources of the Nation's billpayers also include food and clothing and other such consumer items. Every day brings new products on the market. In many ways the Department of Agriculture and the Fish and Wildlife Service contribute to the diversity and quality of these products. The Fish and Wildlife Service, for example, has established high-quality standards for additional frozen seafood products. Department of Agriculture researchers have come up with more instant foods. Their scientific discoveries have led to shrinkproof woolen fabrics, stretch cottons and clothes especially designed for the handicapped.

Most important, however, significant steps have been taken under this administration to insure that the drugs taken by the men, women, and children of the Nation are safe and effective. Under 1962 amendments to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, all drug manufacturers must now be registered, and they must prove to the Food and Drug Administration not only that a new drug is safe, but that it will do what they claim it will do.

It is not necessary to overemphasize the benefits of such measures. The Senate is well aware of them. True, the successful development of more than 9,000 drugs in the last 25 years has saved countless lives and relieved millions of victims of acute and chronic illnesses.

But it is equally true that new drugs had been placed on the market which have been not only ineffective, but harmful. In Europe, the drug thalidomide caused the birth of thousands of permanently deformed children. No such sweeping disaster occurred in the United States, but the lesson of thalidomide was heeded and our laws were strengthened to prevent other tragedies from occurring in the future.

Now the administration is seeking further improvements in food and drug protection. Legislation has been introduced to require that cosmetics be proved safe and that medical appliances and devices be proved safe and effective before they are placed on the market. Factory inspection authority would be strengthened.

The consumer is indeed well protected in the United States. Nowhere can one buy and use foods and drugs with any greater confidence in their purity and safety. But this is not accidental. In back of it all is the generally high ethical standard of American business, which in turn is backed up by the law of the land. Likewise, the dynamic technology of American industry is constantly providing new products and improvements in existing products. But progress also creates new problems of consumer protection, requiring action to keep our statutes and their enforcement up to date.

A case in point is the widespread use of pesticides. The whole question of what is safe—and what is not—has become so controversial throughout the Nation, the President has asked his Science Advisory Committee to look into it and come up with its own observations and recommendations. The Committee's report, issued last spring, recommended, among other things, tighter Federal control on what is put on the market, a bigger research effort to discover safer products, and Federal public education programs to alert consumers on the use and toxic nature of pesticides.

Much has been done in other areas of consumer interest. If you are among those who opened their gas bills recently and found a rebate instead of another rate increase, you can thank the Federal Power Commission. In 1961 when the newly appointed commissioners took office, the Federal Power Commission launched a campaign to give more protection to the interests of the consumer. It took prompt action to clean up a billion dollar backlog of natural gas price increases which it had inherited from the previous administration. Today, many people throughout the Nation can see the results each month in the form of lower gas bills.

The Commission has disposed of 99 pipeline rate cases and has ordered refunds of nearly half a billion dollars in unjustified rate hikes that went into effect prior to the Kennedy administration. The FPC not only stopped the upward spiral of gas prices which had doubled during the previous decade, but it has also reduced future rates by about $63 million, a savings which is repeated each year.

To my knowledge, the refunds which the FPC has ordered in the last 2 years constitute the largest amount of money ever returned to customers of a regulated industry in a comparable period.

These refunds were paid by the pipelines to local gas distribution companies. The Federal Power Commission is conducting a survey and publishing the results to spotlight the amount of the refunds paid to each distributor and the extent to which these refunds are passed on to the ultimate customer. The survey shows that many of these companies are returning all or part of the refunded money to their customers.

The Commission has also revitalized its work in the electric power field. It is conducting a national power survey to stimulate greater industry utilization of cheaper ways of generating electricity and bringing it to consumers, and this should help reduce electric bills in the future. In addition, the FPC is investigating the wholesale rates of the electric power companies to the municipalities, cooperatives, and small private companies who purchase power in interstate commerce so that consumers may benefit from the savings of our technological improvements in the electric power field.

By this time, many Americans have made use of the Post Office's new A B C D service which makes possible 4-hour deliveries in the business district of many communities. This has brought so much enthusiastic comment from the public, the Post Office was not prepared for the scribbled note from one man who complained that the service was too fast.

By the end of the year, A B C D service will have been installed in 277 cities. In addition, the new zoning improvement plan—known as Zip code—will further speed up deliveries and facilitate mechanical handling of mail. This service will save the taxpayers—the Nation's billpayers—about $15 million during the first year of operations. And the savings will increase annually.

Among other things, we can look forward to more educational television as a result of new legislation which provides for the construction of educational TV stations with Federal matching grants. And, under another new law, 1964 TV sets will come equipped to receive all channels, giving more choice and diversity of programs.

Thanks, also, to the Federal Communications Commission, after 9 p.m. station-to-station interstate telephone rates have been reduced. This means a 3-minute call from Bangor, Maine, to Los Angeles can be made for as little as $1, saving 75 cents.

The benefits of the administration's consumer program also extends to travelers and vacationists. The Federal Aviation Agency has increased grants to local airports and is improving air traffic control through the use of radar and other modern devices. These are important steps to make air travel safer and more efficient.

The Secretary of Commerce has established an Office of Highway Safety in the Bureau of Public Roads to promote public support of highway safety standards, coordinate use of highway safety research findings, and encourage cooperation of State and local governments, industry, and allied groups.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, which also has stepped up its safety program, reports that intercity bus fatalities are down to the lowest on record. It is the Commission's job to protect the consumer by insuring that the rates and practices of public carriers are nondiscriminatory racially, as well as economically, and a strong step in this direction was taken in 1961. At the request of the administration, ICC issued broad rules prohibiting interstate buses from discriminating against passengers on the basis of race, color, or creed. Today, all interstate bus passengers are assured of unsegregated services.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has taken action to protect air travelers from abuses of overbooking and unrealistic schedule advertising. It also has established an Office of Community Relations to help you get improved air service in your community.

The Federal excise tax on air travel has been lowered from 10 to 5 percent and has been lifted entirely from train and bus fares There are thousands of acres of new picnic, camping, and fishing sites available for vacation and weekend enjoyment. This has been made possible by the Interior Department which slashed rental and purchase fees of public lands in 1961 to encourage State and local governments to develop more recreational grounds. In addition, three new seashores have been added to the national park system. They are located at Padre Island, Tex.; Point Reyes, Calif.; and Cape Cod, Mass.

Most importantly, there is the administration's crackdown on deceptive and monopolistic trade practices and all types of fraud. For example, there is now more protection for every billpayer against wasting his money on worthless vitamin pills, useless correspondence courses, and shady guarantees on home appliances.

The Federal Trade Commission has issued an alltime record number of orders halting unlawful business practices. New procedures have been adopted to guide businessmen away from illegal methods of competition. And more preventive and aggressive approaches should help to lessen the drain on the billpayer's pocketbook. The Commission's intensified consumer protection program affects a variety of goods, including refrigerators, house paint, sewing machines, vacuum cleaners, kitchen utensils, food wrapping, and carpets. It also protects against mislabeling of furs and textile products and from the distribution of dangerously flammable fabrics.

This year, by way of illustration, there is a labeling requirement for shoes so that the buyer—the billpayer—will know exactly what he is getting for his money. This may seem like a little thing, but if you have paid for shoes which you assumed were 100-percent leather, and later found that they were only half leather and half cardboard its value can be readily appreciated.

Directly in line with consumer interest is the Justice Department's hard-hitting program to prevent price fixing and to enforce the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act and the Clayton Antitrust Act.

As the Attorney General has pointed out, price fixing is economic racketeering. It corrupts our economic system and, in the end, it is the consumer who pays.

The Antitrust Division of the Justice Department has made it known, through its actions, that there is no room in this country for corruptive price-fixing practices. In 1961 and 1962 it handled a record number of cases, including 177 cases filed in the U.S. district courts. Two-thirds of these involve price-fixing.

The cases range from some of the relatively small companies to some of the very largest. The products cover such items as bakery goods, school supplies, prescription drugs, steel forgings, paving materials, commercial temperature controls and a variety of others. The cases arose in every part of the country, from the East coast to Hawaii.

The Justice Department also is blowing the whistle on all types of fraud. Swindling imposes a $750 million annual toll on our economy, resulting not only in an impact on the buying public, but in a diversion of a huge sum from the channels of legitimate business.

Important steps are being taken to help assure more adequate protection for the savings that we may lay aside for the purchase of a home, for a rainy day, for our children's education, or for retirement.

Legislation enacted in 1961 has strengthened the insurance program of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

The Securities and Exchange Commission this year is asking for new legislation that will help protect from fraud or deception millions of prospective buyers of stocks and bonds in American industry.

The Postmaster General and the Department of Justice are cracking down on mail frauds. Convictions last year totaled 21 percent over the previous year.

The many types of frauds which are devised to bilk the public annually range from land swindles to work-at-home projects. Just recently in the West, three men were indicted on mail fraud charges stemming from the sale of land which they advertised as "king-sized western estates." They sold this property to at least 3,000 persons through mail-order advertising. When the victims, usually elderly retired couples, arrived to see their property, they found it in the middle of nowhere on land that would not grow even sagebrush.

Advertising for such fraudulent sales has played on retirement hopes, on the promise to the West, and on the lure of easy credit—such as $1 down and $10 a month. The administration is going to great lengths to stop it.

The billpayer's interests, the interests of his parents and children, are being furthered by the new Consumers Advisory Council which was created last year at the direction of the President. Special assistants already on hand have been given specific responsibility for consumer problems. They will make available to the people more information on the results of Government research pertinent to consumer interest.

I have reviewed some of the recent gains for the bill payer which have been registered in the last couple of years by action of the President and the Congress. There are more—such as major amendments to the Social Security Act and the Public Welfare Act which liberalized benefits and increased payments, and the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 which it is expected will stimulate trade between this country and Europe and further economic growth.

New legislation is pending in Congress, such as the truth-in-packaging bill which will assure proper labeling and an end to certain misleading practices, and the truth-in-lending bill which provides that he who pays the bill will at least know how much of an interest bill he is actually paying.

Overshadowing these specific advances, is the President's overall proposal for a $10 billion tax reduction which, if enacted by the Congress, will unlock the door to more progressive and prosperous times for the Nation.

It is estimated that the purchasing power and investment released by the tax cut will add $30 to $40 billion to our Nation's annual output and create 2 to 3 million new jobs.

To sum up, steps already taken by the administration—and legislation yet to come—are designed to further the well-being of every American and thereby, of the Nation as a whole. A beginning has been made. The President's consumer program has been well launched. Some of the advantages to the consumer—to the bill payer—are already there to be taken and they will accumulate in the years ahead.

REPORT OF JOINT MEETING OF NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS' ECONOMIC COMMITTEE AND WORKING PARTY ON ATLANTIC COMMUNITY COOPERATION WITH LATIN AMERICA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to report to the Senate, albeit briefly, upon a meeting which took place in Paris, which I attended together with the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who has been my associate in this effort. The meeting related to an effort of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference to bring about greater interest by private European capital in providing aid to Latin America, parallel with the Alliance for Progress.

On July 12 I had the privilege of presiding over a joint meeting of the NATO Parliamentarians' Economic Committee and the Working Party on Atlantic Community Cooperation with Latin America which was held in Paris. I am Chairman of the Committee, and I am also a delegate from the Congress to the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference. The senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who has closely cooperated in the work of the parliamentarians with respect to Latin America, was present at this joint meeting. He made a distinguished and important contribution to our deliberations; and I wish to express my deep appreciation to him for attending the Paris meetings, notwithstanding another important mission which he had in Europe.

Present at this meeting and the countries they represent were: Senator van Buggenhout, of Belgium; Mr. Dube, of Canada; Dr. Burgbacher, of Germany; M. Farmakis, of Greece; Senator Micara, of Italy; M. Fandel, of Luxembourg; Mlle. van Stoetwegen, of the Netherlands; Mr. Helland, of Norway; Mr. Tavares, of Portugal; Mr. Gulek, of Turkey; Lord Listowel and Mr. Kershaw, of the United Kingdom; and Senator HUMPHREY and myself, from the United States. Mlle. van Stoetwegen, Mr. Helland, Mr. Tavares, Mr. Gulek, Mr. Kershaw, and I were also serving as members of the Working Party on Atlantic Community Cooperation with Latin America.

Mr. President, about half of this joint meeting was devoted to a report on and discussion of work of the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America—ADELA—organized under the sponsorship of the Working Party of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference. I am pleased to say that this initiative, designed to bring extensive Western European participation into the development efforts of Latin America—alongside public and private efforts by the United States under the Alliance for Progress—is making considerable progress. ADELA was established on April 5, 1963, in implementation of a recommendation of the Plenary Session of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference adopted at the November, 1962 meeting. The bulk of the undertaking by ADELA itself is scheduled to be finished by the end of this year—carrying out within the space of about 1 year the assigned task.

ADELA is proposing an initiative in the form of a development company or companies which would have subscribed capital from North American, European, and possibly, Japanese banks and industries. This development company would participate on an equity basis with local private enterprise in Latin America—at first in a limited number of Latin American countries which offer the most attractive investment opportunities and conditions. It is hoped that the example given by those countries in attracting private capital, especially from Europe, will be followed by others and will permit expanded operations.

The joint meeting in Paris resolved that "ADELA, in participation with the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Organization of American States, and inviting the support of Prince Bernhard (of the Netherlands), shall call a conference on November 8–10 to consider the recommendations of ADELA as authorized by the Working Party of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference."

It is expected that this conference will attract 60 or more Latin American, European, and North American leaders, who will discuss not only the proposal for a development company, but also other important aspects of Atlantic community interest in Latin American economic development, in freedom—including such problems as the balance of payments, trade, public assistance and technical assistance, technical training, and private and public investment.

The three Executive Directors of ADELA are Dr. Aurelio Peccei of Italy; Warren Wilhelm of the United States; and Dr. Julio Gonzales del Solar of Argentina, who is also the representative in Europe of the Inter-American Development Bank. The Executive Directors of ADELA have spent the last 2 months in extensive travel throughout Latin America and Western Europe, developing and testing the concrete proposal for a private development company based on European, North American, and indigenous Latin American capital and an improved foreign investment climate in selected countries. The response on both continents, among both private and public leaders, has been positive and encouraging. Especially in Europe, from whence a major part of this private investment must come, the reception of this concept has been excellent. Furthermore, the Inter-American Development Bank has given its support, and looks forward to backing up this kind of equity participation in Latin American countries with the credit power available to it, as do other international agencies and interested governments.

Mr. President, I conclude this report by stating that this is a venture which I have had the honor to pioneer in the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, together with the invaluable brotherly cooperation of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. This endeavor has been privately financed—financing which I have been instrumental in obtaining from private sources. It has enlisted outstandingly capable Executive Directors which is extremely important to make the project a successful one; it has enlisted the sympathetic and cooperative attention of the U.S. Government and other major governments; and it has also enlisted the talents and initiative of some of the outstanding business leaders of the United States, of Latin America, and of Europe.

This is a most auspicious beginning; and it indicates what can be done by private means with governmental sympathy, support, and cooperation, and the ways in which public officials, such as Senator HUMPHREY and I, can utilize such prestige as we have in order to bring about activities of the greatest public benefit, but which need not necessarily be based upon legislation or the use of governmental funds.

Mr. President, I am confident that what we are attempting to accomplish can be achieved; and I certainly feel that Senator HUMPHREY and I and our colleagues from the other countries which are concerned will give their utmost attention and dedication to the effort to obtain success in terms of making a major contribution to Latin American development.

WHY I AM PROUD TO BE AN AMERICAN

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I quote the forceful, stimulating, energetic, and patriotic words of a young teenager in the State from which I come:

> I am, indeed, proud to be an American. I am proud to be a member of a society in which individualism is the most highly encouraged facet of character development. Ours is a society in which we are free to develop our own thoughts and ideals. Inquisitive minds are encouraged to search for answers and all minds are stimulated into creative thinking. I am proud to be a member of a society in which we are free from the fear of indoctrination.

Those are the opening sentences of a winning essay by Miss Susan Savell, who is in the 10th grade in one of the public schools of California—South Pasadena High School.

Her essay, entitled "Why I Am Proud to be an American," was delivered at a Fourth of July picnic in a contest sponsored by the South Pasadena, Calif., Junior Chamber of Commerce. Her comments won her the prize.

All too often we hear comments that the youth of America are not aware of their priceless American heritage of American freedom. But the fact of the matter is that we may be proud of the youth of our country. And the splendid words of this young lady prove it, once again.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the excellent American statement by a young American, to demonstrate that the youth of our land will be equipped to keep faith and to protect the freedom which our generation answeringly intends to pass on to them.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY I AM PROUD TO BE AN AMERICAN

(By Susan Savell, South Pasadena High School, 10th grade, May 30, 1963)

I am, indeed, proud to be an American. I am proud to be a member of a society in which individualism is the most highly encouraged facet of character development. Ours is a society in which we are free to develop our own thoughts and ideals. Inquisitive minds are encouraged to search for answers and all minds are stimulated into creative thinking. I am proud to be a member of a society in which we are free from the fear of indoctrination. Our thoughts are not controlled and ideas are not instilled in our minds before we have the chance to develop our own set of values. I am proud to be a member of a society which strives—as a world power—to meet the vast demands being made upon us in this rapidly advancing world society of which we—as a nation—are a member. A society in which the citizen is of utmost importance in the well-being of the nation, and in which this citizen and the government can merge into one unit—and in this way fulfill the needs and desires of both.

I am proud to live in a society in which friendships grow and are strengthened in an atmosphere of love and brotherhood. A society in which education is considered a privilege, and the opportunity to learn is offered to all. Through this acquired wisdom and knowledge we try to understand others—and hope, ourselves, to be understood. At all times we are searching into the heart of the individual, the government, and the nation as a whole—finding worth in our own system and way of life, and then sharing it with others. We live in a society in which "truth" is a reality—not merely a spoken word.

We are all aware of our freedoms of speech, press, and religion. But I believe that there is a deeper significance underlying these basic freedoms. We have the freedom to believe in these ideals. And this right, to me, is the importance of their existence.

I am proud to live in a society whose heritage is known and respected throughout the world. Our country fought for democracy and independence in 1775, and since that time has continued fighting peacefully to extend the aims of our hard-won ideology.

It is an honor to live in a country which is proud of itself; a country which is capable of carrying the burdens of a trouble-laden world upon its shoulders, while still carrying its head high with pride. Circulating through the atmosphere of the world are the eternal foes of democracy: deceit, contempt, and communism, but circulating through the minds of our people are the everlasting truths: faith, brotherhood, and humanism. I am proud to live in a country in which these truths represent the goals toward which we strive.

In essence, I am proud to live in a democratic society; a society in which we are the citizens, we are the government, and we are the nation.

KAISER STEEL CORP.-UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA LONG-RANGE SHARING PLAN

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I read into the RECORD a news release dated today from Fontana, Calif.:

> FONTANA, CALIF.—Results of the fourth month's operation for the Kaiser Steel Corp.-United Steelworkers of America long-range sharing plan were announced today. Cost savings under the plan for the month of June 1963 amounted to $1,480,000. Under the formula provided by the plan, $470,000 will be distributed in paychecks to eligible union employees.
>
> More than 4,700 employees will receive payments under the plan. Payments are equivalent to 24 percent of standard hourly wage rates as an average for all participants, and range from 17 percent to 47 percent. The average hourly payment for employees participating in the plan amounts to 62 cents per hour.
>
> Cost savings under the plan during the next few months are likely to be reduced as a result of the general decline in orders for steel experienced in recent weeks. Although the plan has built-in compensatory factors for varying levels of operations, the greatest possible cost-savings opportunities exists under high-level, optimum production conditions.

Mr. President, long has California been known as the breeding ground for men with ideas—ideas that spawn advances in the natural and physical sciences, in engineering and design, in conservation, and very importantly, Californians have brought forth new ideas in human relations.

We are justly proud of these men of ideas, not only for the contributions they have made to California and the United States, but to all of mankind as well.

I bring to the attention of the Senate today this excellent example of one idea, born of frank and aboveboard discussions, that is leading to an imaginative and realistic solution to a problem faced jointly by labor and management. This idea, reared in an atmosphere of mutual cooperation and understanding, was allowed to be nourished because a company and a labor union refused to be bound by historical patterns of labor-management negotiations and because they recognized that they must find a better way, a new avenue of approach.

The fruits of this new idea can be found at Kaiser Steel Corp.'s mill at Fontana, near the great metropolitan city of Los Angeles. This is the plant where the unique long-range sharing plan of Kaiser Steel and the United Steelworkers of America has been operating since this past March.

I wish to pay tribute to one of the great executives of Kaiser Steel, Mr. Edgar F. Kaiser, whom I am pleased to call a friend. Mr. Kaiser is a public-spirited citizen who has served the Government of the United States in many capacities during the last several years; and with vigor and enthusiasm he and his company have cooperated with the leaders of the United Steelworkers of America to create and construct a new avenue toward the solution of important problems.

Undoubtedly, my colleagues in the Senate have read various descriptions and analyses of this unique plan that already shows great promise of being eminently successful. What Kaiser Steel and the Steelworkers, with the help of three of the best known experts in the labor-management field, have done deserves the attention of all of us. It is not that this solution is the be-all and the end-all that will resolve every problem of industrial relations. Far from it. It was designed to fit one plant and one company. And Kaiser officials hasten to add that the plan must bear further observation and that only time will tell if it is exactly what fits the needs of Kaiser and the Steelworkers. However, it is of interest to us because it sets forth a whole new approach, and fosters an entirely different attitude in discussions between men who have common problems. It is, in essence, a plan that was arrived at with generous use of imagination, commonsense and a spirit of a willingness to work together.

If I may, Mr. President, I would like briefly to recall for Senators what the plan seeks to do. In summary, the long range sharing plan—

First. Guarantees employees protection against the loss of jobs or income because of technological change;

Second. Provides each employee in the plan with 32.5 percent of any cost reductions saved through increased efficiency;

Third. Guarantees wages and fringe benefits equal to or better than their colleagues in the steel industry might receive; and

Fourth. Assures incentive workers income at least as high and possibly higher than they have been receiving in the recent past if they choose to accept membership in the plan.

In addition to these benefits, the plan offers the opportunity of completely eliminating contract deadlines based on economic issues. Thus, Kaiser Steel and the United Steelworkers will not have to face each other across the bargaining table under the heat and pressure of deadlines to agree on matters of money.

Moreover, major areas of inequity that have been the subject of many disputes in the industry have been eliminated and each employee now shares the opportunity to benefit from incentive pay.

In light of these significant advances toward industrial peace, it would be well for us to consider how Kaiser and the USWA came to agree on such a plan. Perhaps the most informative way to learn of the plan's genesis is to listen to the explanation of Edgar F. Kaiser, board chairman of Kaiser Steel and president of Kaiser Industries Corp.:

> In 1959, the steel industry had a long and bitter strike, which hurt everybody, the workers, the companies, and the public. Management representatives spent hours, days, weeks, and months in negotiation, deadlocked on many issues. I believe the two most difficult ones were wages and the so-called "2-B," which was the number of a paragraph in the contract that prevented management from exercising a unilateral right in establishing crew sizes on existing equipment. I qualify with the words "existing equipment" merely to clarify something that not everyone realized at the time; namely, that there is no limitation on crew sizes on new equipment. The latter is a management function.
>
> I participated in those discussions and, in the course of conversation with David McDonald and Arthur Goldberg, who was then General Counsel for the Steelworkers, I suggested that we might solve our difficulties by abandoning the old contracts and approaching it from an entirely different viewpoint. Both David and Arthur concurred in principle, but stated that it would be impossible to do it quickly and that if we thought we were in trouble then, from a time standpoint, it would be even worse if we were trying to work out a brand new approach.
>
> While leaving the industry group to make a separate settlement for Kaiser Steel is germane only because that episode in our history specifically stimulated an attempt to arrive at a new type of agreement, I will comment on it briefly, simply to say we made an independent settlement because the negotiations had arrived at a point where we believed, considering estimated productivity, the settlement was an equitable and noninflationary solution to the differences of opinion. I will only add that our decision to make an independent settlement was not a hasty one. We spent more than a week in discussions with the industry on this particular point before making the decision.
>
> David McDonald and Arthur Goldberg suggested that we include in the contract settlement a provision for establishing what we called a "long-range committee" consisting of three members from the public, three from the union, and three from the company. The purpose of this committee was to develop an economic formula under which these strike deadlines could be eliminated and, further recognizing that such a formula should provide for an equitable sharing of savings by the public, Kaiser Steel workers, and the company. Dr. George Taylor, of the University of Pennsylvania, the chairman of the committee, put it well when he said: "We needed some social inventiveness."

Mr. President, at this point, I wish to observe that in addition to Dr. Taylor, the other public members are David L. Cole, well-known arbitrator of labor disputes, and Dr. John T. Dunlop of Harvard University. Besides Mr. Kaiser, management of the company is represented by E. E. Trefethen, Jr., vice chairman of the board, and C. F. Borden, executive vice president. Serving for the union are Mr. McDonald, Charles J. Smith, director of USWA District No. 38, west coast, and Marvin Miller, special assistant to the president. An important point to note here is that the committee was not absolved when the plan went into effect. Indeed, it is set up as a continuing body to constantly review the workings of the plan.

Mr. Kaiser further explained:

> One of the most important ground rules of the nine-man committee was that the talks would be explorations, not negotiations, and the big advantage was that these explorations would go on when there were no deadlines—when there was no reason for tension or argument. It was agreed that both parties could be perfectly frank and honest without fear of being committed or held to any idea, no matter how worthwhile or valid it might be. The ground rules were such that a company member could toss out an idea on the table and 5 minutes later, or 5 months later, take it back. Nothing was decided until everything was decided.
>
> There were subcommittees formed and there were hours and weeks of meetings over the 3-year period and, last December at Fontana, the long-range committee reported its recommendations to the parties. The union and the company accepted their recommendations on what is called the long-range sharing plan. The Fontana workers by a 70 percent vote on a secret ballot accepted the plan and it went into effect on March 1.

As the plan began on that date just 4 months ago, labor and industrial leaders waited to find out if it would work. By April 25 they had their answer. For on that day Kaiser Steel and the Steelworkers announced that 3,930 employees at Fontana who were eligible under the plan would receive a total of $312,000 for their efforts to reduce the cost of producing steel during the month of March. This amount represented 32.5 percent of the $962,000 saved by the company. Individually, employees received an average of 55 cents an hour above their basic wage rates.

At the time of the announcement of the first month's results, the company and the union explained the reasons for the amount saved:

> The basic cost used as the starting point in determining savings are those experienced in the Fontana operations for the year 1961. Therefore, the payments for the first month under the plan not only reflect additional efforts of employees during that month, but also reflect the effect of a companywide cost reduction program which has been underway for the past year.

Let us quickly take a look at the amounts saved for the following 3 months of the plan's operations. During the month of April, 4,100 Kaiser workers shared in cost savings of $389,000, or a total of $1,196,000. This month, employees got an average of 66 cents per hour extra. During the following month, May, total cost savings under the plan amounted to $1,080,000, of which 4,400 employees received 32.5 percent, or $339,000. This gave employees an average of 50 cents an hour.

And just today, announcement was made that $1,480,000 was saved by producing steel more efficiently during June. This amount is the largest sum saved in any month since the plan began. However, Kaiser and the USWA also declared in today's announcement that—

> Cost savings under the plan during the next few months are likely to be reduced as a result of the general decline in orders for steel experienced in recent weeks. Although the plan has built-in compensatory factors for varying levels of operations, the greatest possible cost-savings opportunities exist under high-level, optimum production conditions.

For the 4 months, a total of $4,718,000 has been divided by the workers and the company. During this time, each employee enrolled in the plan has received, on the average, a total of about $350. This is quite an increase in the wages of any man.

I have heard the question asked, "Well, I understand how the company and the employees are benefiting, but how does the public share in these fruits of progress?" The answer is that the public benefits in three ways: One, the public receives one-third of the amount saved each month in taxes because taxes normally take 50 percent of the company's profits, two, the public is freed from the effects of strikes or lockouts suffered in breakdowns of previous negotiations, and three, since the efforts of the employees to reduce costs will keep steel prices competitive with both domestic and foreign competitors, the public will benefit.

There is no doubt that thus far the plan is sound and has great merit. And it is true that it is only one answer to one company's situation, but its founding principles may prove, with time, to be applicable elsewhere.

To find out why the plan was working so well, I asked the Kaiser people to what did they attribute the success of the plan. Their immediate response was that the employees are earnestly trying to save the company money by using their time and materials to greater advantage and they have adopted a fresh, new attitude toward their work. They fully realize, a Kaiser official explained, that not only will their paychecks be larger next month and next year and so on, because of their efforts to cut costs, but they also understand that their very future and the future of the community depends upon the economic health of Kaiser Steel. The workers, I am told, now have a greater interest in and appreciation for the short- and long-range goals of the corporation.

An excellent example of how the bonus-inspired workers are helping to save money was reported recently in the Wall Street Journal, which states in part:

> Among clerical employees, one Kaiser official calculates, sick leaves have dropped 15 percent; the employees don't accumulate sharing-plan benefits while out sick. Other workers, says Gerald Balsley, a Kaiser vice president, "are getting back to work from lunch hours and coffee breaks faster since the plan started."
>
> More striking, perhaps, has been the spontaneous organization of worker cost-cutting committees. "We had expected to start this sort of thing ourselves later on," says C. F. Borden, Kaiser executive vice president. "But we never expected them to do it on their own."
>
> The committees have been scrutinizing operations minutely. In the machine shop, says welder Verne Maxie, workers are retrieving nuts and bolts from machinery that's worn out. Also, when a piece of equipment comes in for overhaul, we used to burn off nuts and bolts with a torch and put the equipment back together with new ones. Now we save, wash and reuse the old ones. Some nuts and bolts cost 50 cents, the next one may cost $4 and some big ones $10, and that can mount up.
>
> Bigger savings have been found, too. Before the sharing plan, conveyor belts that carry raw materials to Kaiser blast furnaces usually wound up on the scrap heap when they became worn. Now workers have hit on the idea of refurbishing old belts by using a technique to vulcanize them, and they're being reused. Tom Steger, a Kaiser superintendent, figures this is saving several thousand dollars a belt.

If, Mr. President, the plan achieves nothing else but a fresh new approach of the workers toward their jobs and the goals of management, it will have provided another avenue toward industrial peace. For it is this attitude, this understanding, from which mutual cooperation and respect may arise.

A basic, underlying reason why this plan has proved successful is the philosophy and personal credo of my friend, Edgar Kaiser. While recently addressing a group of California businessmen, he put it this way:

> I believe you can solve almost any problem if you work at it hard enough and are dedicated to the proposition that you will find an answer. Therefore, I think the right way to approach this problem is for each business management to define its own problem, work at it long enough and hard enough to formulate some policy thinking, then sit down with the counterparts in labor at a time when no crisis exists and find a mutually satisfactory approach.
>
> In most cases the reason we have government in our business, regulation or legislation, is because we have failed ourselves to do something about the problem." Mr. Kaiser continued by saying that "Labor relations is in reality about as simple as the golden rule. If you treat people fairly and work with them and not against them, share your problems honestly, people will respond."

Mr. President, America is beset by the burden of unemployment, some of which is the result of the greater use of automation. As I have said before, Kaiser's plan is not necessarily the answer for other companies, other unions, or other industries. But the very fact that those men defined their problem and then took constructive steps to resolve it, should encourage all of us to hasten the pace of our search for answers to this problem.

As Edgar Kaiser has declared:

> Our responsibility, yours and mine, is to find a better way so that this country of ours and the system we believe in, dignity in the individual, equality, and equal opportunity for all, will endure forever.

DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT ON BIBLE READING AND PRAYER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have been requested by the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs to have printed at this point in the RECORD two editorials, one from the May 1963 issue of the Crusader and the other from the June 1963 issue of Missions, both of which deal with the decision of the Supreme Court relating to Bible reading and prayer in public school classrooms.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Crusader, May 1963]

THE SUPREME COURT DECISION

Any day now the Supreme Court of the United States is due to announce its decision in the Bible reading and Lord's Prayer cases originating in Pennsylvania and Maryland.

In the Pennsylvania litigation, attorneys for the Abington Township School Board are endeavoring to reverse a Federal district court decision that the law requiring the reading of at least 10 verses from the Bible each day in public school classrooms is unconstitutional.

In the Maryland suit, attorneys for William J. Murray III and his mother, Mrs. Madalyn E. Murray, are attempting to prove that the State's court of appeals erred in a 4 to 3 decision upholding reading from the Bible and the use of the Lord's prayer in public school classrooms.

Pro and con oral arguments were heard on February 26 and 27. A decision is expected in May. We anticipate that the Court will rule against religious devotions in the cases presented. There are no advance leaks and we have no inside information. But we simply do not see how the justices can decide otherwise unless they are prepared to reverse much longstanding precedent in church-state matters.

The first amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Subsequent interpretation has decreed that this prohibition upon Congress applies to State legislatures, as well.

The nub of the question, therefore, is this: does the use of the Bible and the Lord's Prayer in public school classrooms constitute "an establishment of religion" and/or violate "free exercise thereof?"

Non-Christians see this preferment for the indicia of the Christian religion an establishment real or potential of one religion over another.

Speaking for a three-man court in the previous Pennsylvania decision, Circuit Judge Biggs declared that the Bible's essential character is religious and that the reading of this book can hardly do less than inculcate * * * religious doctrines in childish minds. He concluded that such reading aids and prefers the Christian religion, and, in conjunction with school attendance factors, violates the free exercise clause.

Attorneys who have claimed that these practices are intended only to teach morality have been hard pressed to explain why, if this is so, children can be excused on request of parents.

In any case, if the Supreme Court rules against these practices, expect chaos primeval to leap from press and pulpit. Leading the assault will be:

1. Those who don't understand the decision. Without bothering to read the text of the pronouncement or to understand its precise meaning, many will assume that the Court has outlawed religion in all areas of public life. They will claim that the justices have legislated secularism and have deprived the Nation of its longstanding spiritual traditions. They will revile the Unitarians and atheists who instituted the legal actions, and attempt to find ways to curb the Supreme Court. There will be a rash of proposed constitutional amendments introduced in Congress, each attempting in one way or another to legalize classroom religious devotions.

How unfortunate.

How unfortunate, especially, if the proposed amendments to the Constitution make substantial headway. Any Baptist inclined to side with such movements would do well to consider the Pandora's box that would be opened up thereby. If such amendments were approved, then schools that inculcate religion (Bible reading, the Lord's Prayer) would continue to get public funds. On what grounds, then could anyone deny public money to parochial schools which simply go a little farther and make religion a little more evident?

2. Those who understand the decision only too well. This group would include the Roman Catholic hierarchy which would surely see its pitch for public funds for private schools almost certainly aborted. This is a decision for which it would likely never forgive the Supreme Court. It might well mark the beginning of a determined drive to downgrade the Court in our system of jurisprudence. It would surely put these prelates on the side of constitutional change.

If the Court decides as we think it will, are the traditional moral values of the American way of life in danger? Not really, for these belong principally to church and home. Few can honestly assert that the perfunctory reading of the Bible or the recitation of prayers—often led by those who have no respect for such things—accomplishes very much for the national character.

If the decision comes through as we think it will, examine it closely. It will likely be much more limited than newspaper headlines will make it appear. In any case, such matters as the use of chaplains in the Armed Forces or in Federal institutions will be unaffected. To refuse such ministries to men who have been sent overseas or segregated from society would in fact be prohibiting the free exercise of religion.

None appears to argue that the Bible should be excluded from the classroom when it is being used to study history or literature. It is the use of the Bible or prayer for religious devotion to which objection is made.

The Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs wrote recently: "When one thinks of prayer as sincere outreach of a human soul to the Creator, required prayer becomes an absurdity." To which we would add: when we contemplate the evils certain to follow the confusing of the separate functions of both government and religion, we are prepared to let our children devote themselves at home to the Bible and prayer and in school to history and math, with the hope that spiritually alert parents and wise teachers will join hands to provide total preparation for total life.

[From Missions, June 1963]

Bible Reading and Prayer in the Public Schools

Before it adjourns, this month, the Supreme Court of the United States is expected to rule on the constitutionality of the use of Bible readings and the Lord's Prayer in the public schools in Maryland and Pennsylvania.

In Maryland, William J. Murray III, a student attending a public school in Baltimore, and his mother, are challenging the constitutionality of a ruling that requires a reading from the Bible and/or the use of the Lord's Prayer in the opening exercises of the school day, even though the ruling, as later amended, stipulates that any child shall be excused from attending the exercises upon written request of his parent or guardian. The Murrays contend that the regulation violates their freedom of religion and the principle of the separation of church and state.

In Pennsylvania, Mr. and Mrs. Edward Lewis Schempp, parents of three children attending the public schools in Abington Township, declare that the Federal Constitution is violated by a Pennsylvania law which requires that at least 10 verses of Scripture shall be read, without comment, at the opening of each day in the public schools.

In all probability, the Supreme Court will declare both these State laws unconstitutional—and rightly so, just as it did in the case of the regents' prayer in New York State (June 1962). All that the Court did in the New York case, and all that it most likely will do in the Maryland and Pennsylvania cases, is to say what the first amendment to the Constitution said long ago—that Congress "shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." As the 14th amendment made this provision applicable to the States, the Court ruled, in the New York case, that the board of regents had no constitutional right to prescribe an official prayer for the public school children to read or recite at the beginning of the school day.

Now, that ruling, far from opposing religion, actually supports religion; it is not against religious liberty, but for it. Its intention is to prevent the state from interfering in religious affairs—to keep religion free from political regulation or control. It should go without saying that if a state has the right to prescribe a prayer acknowledging dependence on God, it has the same identical right to prescribe a statement denying the existence of God. In short, the Court said that religion must be kept free—free from governmental control, free for people of all faiths or no faith at all. It said, as the 1st and the 14th amendments had said, that in matters of religion, both the Federal and the State governments must be neutral, must keep hands off.

There is, of course, a vast difference between required readings from the Bible as a religious service at the opening of the school day and using the Bible as a source or reference work in courses in history, literature, and social studies, which are a part of the regular school curriculum. Inasmuch as the scriptures of other faiths, such as Islam, Buddhism, and Hinduism could be used in the same way, there would be no discrimination against any religious group, or against avowed nonbelievers.

The importance of a Supreme Court ruling on this intricate problem may be seen in the present confusion over it. Whereas 26 States require or permit Bible reading, and often the Lord's Prayer, 10 States forbid such activities. An Illinois law passed in 1910 is the exact opposite of one in Georgia passed in 1921. In the interest of upholding the Constitution, as well as keeping intact the wall of separation between church and state, we are in desperate need of uniformity on this national issue.

Until that happy state of affairs arrives, we Americans must not forget that we came by our religious freedom the hard way. Though the desire for freedom from England's established church brought many colonists to America, they soon found themselves in similar difficulties here. As late as 1776, at least 8 of the 13 colonies had government-established churches. Despite the crusade led by Roger Williams, William Penn, and others, it was not until after the Revolution that religious freedom for all, including minority groups and nonbelievers, made significant headway.

In time, however, the principle of the separation of church and state, with religious liberty as its corollary, captured the imagination of the founding fathers and was written into the basic documents of our national life. In "A Memorial and Remonstrance on the Religious Rights of Man" (1778), James Madison wrote: "We maintain * * * that in matters of religion no man's right is abridged by the institution of civil society; and that religion is wholly exempt from its cognizance." And in the Virginia Statute of Religious Liberty, drafted by Thomas Jefferson and enacted in 1786, were these words on the separation of church and state: "No man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place or ministry whatever, nor shall * * * suffer on account of his religious opinions or beliefs, but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge or affect their civil capacities."

At last, in 1791, came the first amendment to the Constitution, written by Madison and adopted as a part of the Bill of Rights. "Congress," the amendment stated, "shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

So was erected what Jefferson, in a letter to the Danbury Baptists, called "a wall of separation between church and state," which has stood the test of time. Whether it will survive current efforts to breach it, remains to be seen. The choice is between religion dictated by conscience and religion regulated by law. So long as the wall stands, there will be religious freedom for all citizens. If the wall falls, or is breached, that freedom will vanish. The outcome is in the hands of the American people.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR KUCHEL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the Republican whip, leaves the Chamber, I wish to send him a political love message across the aisle. The Senator from California knows how fond I am of him and what a high respect I have for the record of statesmanship that he has made ever since he came to the Senate. He also knows that in a situation such as this partisanship never bothers me. I am always interested in the position that statesmen take on the merits of issues irrespective of any partisan alinement. I believe the American people feel that way, too.

But I understand that one of the leading newspapers published in the State of California, in a remarkably long editorial, has invited the Senator from California to "join Wayne Morse."

I want the Senator from California to know that nothing would please me more. I stand with outstretched, open arms, any time he wants to join me and come over, because there is room for him on this side of the aisle. He would be a great attribute to the Democratic Party, as he is to the Republican Party.

He is somewhat in the same position as a former State senator in my State, who served the Republican Party with great distinction for years. He is one of the liberals of the Republican Party. There are not so many of them, but he is one of them. He resigned from the Republican Party the other day and joined the Democratic Party. He said he resigned because the "queen bee of the Birchers" gave him no other course of action. I merely paraphrase what he said, that "the queen bee of the Birchers" in Oregon dictated his course of action, because it was made very clear to him that that wing of the Republican Party did not want legislators who decided questions on their merits. They wanted legislators they could control. The conclusion was that they could not control this wonderful liberal Republican in our State.

So I want my friend from California to know that I wrote this Oregon legislator a most affectionate letter yesterday, telling him how happy I was that he had followed the course of action that I followed some years ago.

I am pleased to know that at least there are those in California who would not look askance at my friend from California following the same course of action. All I can do is give him assurances that the welcoming sign is out.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted to yield to my good friend from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is a term called proselyting.

Mr. MORSE. "Pirating."

Mr. DIRKSEN. That means wooing one from his faith. For the Record, I must formally and personally and fervently protest this effort to proselyte away from us my very distinguished stalwart Republican colleague, my assistant leader, who has done such noble and yeoman service for the Republican Party.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator's evaluation of his great record.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will my friend from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield. I shall not be surprised if my first invitation to the Senator from California is rejected, but I do not know what the word "quit" means.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, to have any one of my friends in the Democratic Party who sit in the Senate say pleasant things about me is heart warming, and I am grateful.

To have the leader of the Republican Party in the Senate say what he has just said is most gratefully appreciated by me. For I am profoundly honored to sit beside my great Republican leader, Everett Dirksen, here in the Senate.

Mr. President, with the permission of my friend from Oregon, I should like briefly to spell out in a sentence or two part of my own concept of the responsibility of any American citizen who finds himself the recipient of an exalted gift from the people of his State—membership in the U.S. Senate.

My public philosophy has been building over the years. Before the war I served in the Legislature of California. After the war that great man, then the Governor of California, now Chief Justice of the United States, Earl Warren, appointed me first the controller of my State and then, 7 years later, a Senator of the United States. He extracted one promise—no more—from me when he appointed me. He said, "Follow your own conscience. Represent the people's interest."

Mr. President, I am a Republican. I intend to remain a Republican. I draw my republicanism from Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Hiram Johnson, Bob Taft, and Dwight Eisenhower, profound examples of great men, who served the people, and who wanted their party to serve the people. I, too, want my party to represent the interests of the many and not of the selfish few.

The Republican Party has been dedicated to human freedom ever since the days of Abraham Lincoln, though I regret that today some few members of the Republican Party would change it. They will fail. Republicans in America intend to fight to keep our party together and eternally dedicated to the Lincoln cause.

I hope my friends in the Senate will permit me to say that that is what I have tried to do. I have tried to keep the faith of the people.

I sincerely believe in a two-party system, and I quite well recognize the fact that within each of the two great American parties are honest divergences of view.

Earlier today my friend from New York told about participating in one of the NATO Parliamentary Conferences, of prime importance, in my judgment, to the people of our country. In past years, I have attended Parliamentary Conferences of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Some occurred before General de Gaulle came to power.

I saw, in the Parliament of gallant France, coalition governments formed temporarily, when small minorities of parliamentarians elected to the French National Assembly were able to come together and synthesize, but strictly on a temporary basis, in order to operate the Government of that great country.

Like the present occupant of the chair, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], I saw the parliamentary coalition fail and the government of France go down, and another group of splinter parties coalesce, to form a new government. And the process was repeated, again and again.

I do not want in America a multiplicity of political parties. But with equal determination I do not want in America one political party, all powerful, without any given opportunity for constructive, organized and decent opposition in the interests of our people. That is why I have battled as best I could in California, as my able friend has battled in his State, for what I believe to be the public interest. I have done it first as an American citizen. But I have done it, too, as a member of the Republican Party to which I am proud to belong.

It is not easy to go home and have some people sneer and jeer at your efforts for the people. We do not like to be called bad names. None of us likes to be referred to as a Socialist or as a Communist, because we loathe communism and reject socialism. We despise any system that creates slavery for our fellow man. Yet that unhappy series of epithets and abuse has been the lot of many of us in this Chamber. We simply seek to make a better America for all of us. If the penalty for working for that cause is a little animadversion from the selfish, it is really not much penalty. We intend to preserve America, to go forward to assure a better life for the people. And we intend to remain strong, that we may be free.

So, though I am grateful for the comments my friend has made, I prefer to tell my very good friend: "Wayne, come back over here."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very glad I gave the Senator from California an opportunity to make the wonderful statement of political philosophy which he has made. I quite agree with the Senator that we do not want a multiplicity of political parties in this country. We are in complete agreement on that point.

I do not want a multiplicity of Republican parties in this country, either. That is why I extended this invitation, so that one with a Democratic philosophy might come over to my side of the aisle.

But I wish him well no matter where he goes. I want him to know that the door is unlatched and the welcome sign is out whenever he decides to come over to the group which predominantly represents what I consider to be his basic political philosophy.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in the Senate I try to represent the best interests of all the people of my State and of my Nation.

Once again I thank my able friend for the comments he made.

Mr. MORSE. I am very pleased to have given the Senator from California an opportunity to make a public confession of political faith, which is good for the soul, political or otherwise. I fully understand and highly respect it. But I am hopeful.

DEFECTS IN CONSTRUCTION OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL IN BOSTON

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, some time ago I called attention to the fact that in the construction of the Veterans' Administration hospital in Boston there had been discovered a substantial deficiency in materials and construction and suggested that the matter should be referred to the Department of Justice.

In that connection I have received a letter from the Department of Justice stating that "on the basis of the information we now have, legal action against the builder and/or the architect engineers appears warranted."

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hon. John J. Williams,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: This is in reply to your letter of June 27, 1963, regarding legal action against the builder of a Veterans' Administration hospital in Boston.

The Corps of Engineers notified us that a contract has been awarded for the repair of the front wall of the hospital. We have worked closely with the corps on provisions in the repair contract which will allow its engineers to make continuous inspections as the old wall is torn down. The corps will furnish us detailed reports on the type and extent of defects in the original construction, which will shed light on the responsibilities for the defects and the money damages attributable to them.

On the basis of the information we now have, legal action against the builder and/or the architect engineers appears warranted. If that is our final decision, it is probable that suit will not be filed until the facts bearing on the nature of the defects, the responsibility for them and the extent of the damages are more fully developed.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated. If I can be of further assistance to you, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. DOUGLAS,
Assistant Attorney General.

THE RAILROAD RULES DISPUTE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, first I extend my sincere compliments to the representatives of the carriers in the prevailing labor dispute, which has plagued this country, for a voluntary agreement to postpone for 30 days the posting of new work rules. We know the courts have already made perfectly clear that it is within the prerogative of the carriers to post these changes. But we also know the posting of which will bring about a serious nationwide railroad strike—a strike which, the President has said, will very quickly, after it starts, place some 6 million workers out of employment; will cost the American people $1 billion in 30 days; will impair the fiscal soundness of this Republic, because it will create an additional crisis in connection with the balance-of-payments problem; will do injury to many, many businesses, throwing them quickly into bankruptcy.

One has only to listen to the pleas of the producers of perishable products to know what damage a railroad strike of any duration would cause. One of the saddest experiences I ever had in the field of labor relations was in New York City earlier this year in the course of the dock strike, when I saw businessmen break down and weep because the strike was causing them losses, when they were unable to have unloaded and delivered out of the ports of New York and other ports along the Atlantic coast perishable foods and vegetables and other food supplies. It meant complete bankruptcy to many small businessmen. I shall never forget that experience.

There is no doubt that a nationwide railroad strike of any considerable duration would multiply those instances by the hundreds. Coming in the middle of a national harvest, it would produce chaos on the farms of America. That is why I said that good reason and commonsense dictate against it, for it is the kind of dispute that cannot be settled on its merits except in an atmosphere and environment of adjudication, not economic force.

If there were at stake an issue that involved the preservation of a great, precious freedom—the right to bargain—it would be a different matter; but the right to bargain has not been impaired.

So I say to the carriers that I think they are to be congratulated in the wise choice they have made.

The leadership asked me to speak to representatives of some of the carriers yesterday, and I did so. I said to them, in effect, what I said on the Senate floor last night. I received assurance that they would give consideration to the request I had conveyed to them. I told them that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] would officially present the request at the beginning of the hearing, when they first appeared to testify, which he did; and they replied this noon, favorably.

In a very real sense the carriers have responded to a request made of them by Representatives of the Congress of the United States. These Members did not purport to speak for the whole Congress, but were speaking for themselves. Yet it was perfectly obvious that, since the request they were making came from Members of Congress holding positions of responsibility, their wishes would carry wide influence in the Congress. In making these representations to the carriers, it was made very clear that all the leadership was seeking was adequate time to consider legislation, while not under pressure for hasty action, but when there was time for calm deliberation. This would give assurance to the parties themselves, and to the American people, that the judgment reached by the Congress would be a wiser judgment, after there was adequate time to hear all the evidence and analyze all the evidence that the parties would present to the committees of the two Houses, and after adequate time had been given for full consideration of the subject matter on the floor of both Houses.

I cannot conceive of anyone even suggesting that it cannot be done within 30 days. It should be done in a period of time much less than 30 days.

The Senator from Rhode Island, in his statement today, has made perfectly clear that his committee will continue with the same dispatch—full steam ahead, so to speak—as would have been the case if the carriers had not agreed to postpone posting the rules for 30 days.

At least the country will be fully informed as to the intention of those of us in Congress who urged the postponement. This is not a proposal to wait for another 30 days before Congress acts, but a proposal to give Congress 30 days in which to act wisely and deliberately and at the same with all reasonable dispatch.

Having said that about the carriers' position, I wish the RECORD to show that I am greatly saddened by some very strong representations that have been made to me since my speech last night by representatives of the brotherhoods, who are not happy with that speech. However, to the members of the brotherhoods I say from the floor of the Senate today: I repeat, by reference, every word I said last night. When my attention is called by labor to the fact that labor has supported me all the years that I have been in American politics and therefore is unhappy about the position I am taking on the railroad case, I want the RECORD to show what I told some spokesmen of labor who made that representation to me: They did not buy me with their support. I assume they supported me because I have demonstrated to them that I would exercise honest independence of judgment on the merits of each issue in accordance with the facts as I found them, and testing those facts against the question: What do the facts show the public interest to be?

That is exactly the principle I followed in connection with this case. In applying that test, which is the very basis of my political philosophy and my view as to my obligation as a Senator, I do not find myself in agreement with the position of the brotherhoods in connection with this case as to the procedure which they have followed.

I do not know what the merits are in respect to the substantive issues. How are we going to find out what the merits are with regard to the substantive issues of the railroad dispute until a hearing can be held in which the record can be made? I said to a group of these spokesmen: "Do not blame me because you parked your minds outside the door of the White House the day you turned down the President's request that the case be submitted on its merits to Mr. Justice Goldberg in the adjudicating atmosphere of an arbitration courtroom. It is not my fault that you exercised such bad judgment."

I say to the brotherhoods: "If you do not want to go along with the procedure that has been offered legislativewise, I renew the suggestion I made to you many days ago, which I made in conference and in another speech on the floor of the Senate." That speech is in the RECORD. I said in that speech: "If you do not want to appear voluntarily in the arbitration courtroom before one arbitrator for a determination of the issues in regard to which you have not been able to reach agreement with the carriers, why do you not suggest to the President a board of three?"

I renew that suggestion today. What the brotherhoods are faced with is the need to make a determination as to whether or not, if they are unable in the days immediately ahead to mediate their differences with the carriers, they will settle it by the adoption of voluntary procedures for settlement, or whether they are to decide to return to the jungle law of economic force in an attempt to settle it by a strike.

As a friend of labor—and no Senator can raise a question as to my record of friendship to labor in respect to its legitimate rights over the years—I say to the brotherhoods: "If you bring about a strike on this issue, you will lose it, and you should, because the people will not be with you."

There is not a labor organization in this country, or a combination of labor organizations, powerful enough to beat American public opinion. Thank God, American public opinion still rules this country, when all is said and done.

I am sorry that circumstances, and representations made to me, made it necessary for me to make these comments. However, I wish to make it clear that I represent all the people of my State in the Senate, and no single economic bloc. The best service that I can render American labor in a situation such as this is to give them my honest judgment and advice. They will have to follow whatever course of action they wish to follow after they have received that advice. I suggest that they not act precipitately on that advice in opposition to it, but give it consideration, for I am perfectly certain that it is the advice that American public opinion will support.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my speech against the foreign aid bill today will be one of my briefer ones. Nevertheless, it deals with a very important question of procedure that I will suggest for the handling of the foreign aid bill by way of amendment.

Within the next few days I intend to submit amendments which would reduce foreign aid funds to a whole series of countries. I shall do so despite the traditional handling of foreign aid funds on a general rather than on a specific basis. I know that whenever it is suggested that the aid program in a given country is excessive, the reply always comes back, "Do not single out any countries by name in the foreign aid bill." Yet, when a reduction is proposed in a whole category, such as supporting assistance, the reply comes back, "You are using a meat ax. Why do you not tell us exactly where you want the cuts made?"

My parliamentary tactic this year will be to offer both general and specific amendments. Many of the countries receiving the largest amounts of foreign aid can be handled together. I intend, for example, to offer one amendment that will reduce economic and military aid to Pakistan and India.

Much of our aid to those countries has intensified the conflict between them and, in my opinion, has done little to advance American interests.

If we cannot reach an understanding with the AID officials and the State Department before there is a final vote on the bill in the Senate, I shall also offer a specific amendment which will contain a specific prohibition. It will be an amendment that would prevent the U.S. Government from supplying approximately $1 billion to build a steel mill in India.

In the first place, the existing steel mills in India are not operating anywhere near their capacity now. Second, India does not have the skilled personnel to operate the kind of steel mill that is talked about. In the third place, I am satisfied from the evidence that has been presented to me as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations that India could not begin to supply the raw materials necessary to operate any such massive steel mill.

In the fourth place, we need to build some modern steel mills in the United States. It no longer is true that the most modern steel mills in the world are located in the United States. One of the reasons for that sad fact is that a large amount of our foreign aid money has been used to build modern steel mills elsewhere in the world, and those mills are now in competition with steel mills in the United States.

I voted for that foreign aid, and I would do so again, because under the Marshall plan and the subsequent aid programs, the money was used for the rehabilitation of the European continent, especially the countries that were our allies and were in the war before we were. They fought our battle, for a time, against the threat of Nazi and Fascist totalitarianism. But the time has come for us to begin to pay some attention to our own productive power in this country.

That causes me to say to American businessmen and corporations that are desirous of making an "easy buck" by investing in Europe: "What is the matter with your patriotism? What is wrong with your putting ahead of your profit dollar incentive the economic welfare of your own country?"

We are not supposed to make a suggestion in Congress about restricting the flow of American capital abroad. Apparently American dollars should be free to go anywhere it is desired to send them for investment. I reject that theory, for many reasons. First, it is not consistent with the position we are taking in connection with the Alliance for Progress program. What we are saying in no uncertain terms to Latin American countries is: "We will help you economically, but you will have to stop the flight of your capital on the part of your oligarchs to Swiss and New York banks." I think that practice should be stopped, because the sad fact is that in a real sense we are pouring more U.S. dollars into Latin American countries all the time, while the oligarchs of Latin America are taking their money out of their countries and investing it in New York and Swiss banks. Apparently, they do not have faith in the economic potential and future of their countries.

So we have said—and it was an argument I made as a delegate of this body at Bogotá together with the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and an argument that we made again at Punta del Este—"We will help you, but you will also have to help yourselves by tax reform, land reform, and various types of social reform."

There must also be some reforms with respect to what Latin American countries will do with the accumulated profits made by the wealth of their economies in Latin America that is not being reinvested in the economic future of Latin America. To the everlasting credit of American corporations, which for a long time have been operating in Latin America, they have a splendid record of reinvesting in Latin America.

Today, the United States has a serious balance-of-payments problem. It is being worsened because more and more American businesses are building more and more plants for production in Europe and elsewhere, to compete with goods manufactured in the United States. I do not believe in a rule-of-thumb proposal for handling this situation; but, in my judgment, we shall have to tackle this problem if the balance-of-payments problem is to be handled successfully.

I was called yesterday by the publisher of a great newspaper in Lexington, Ky. He had just returned from 60 days in Europe. He said he had been reading my daily speeches in opposition to the foreign aid bill. He was kind enough to express his view that I am dead right. He said, "Senator, the European countries ought to be sending us money, instead of our sending money to Europe." Then he added, "Behind their hands, they are laughing at us."

If the administration thinks that the pouring of millions of American dollars into Europe through NATO is winning us friends, respect, and confidence, the administration is dead wrong. So I shall be offering some amendments designed to stop throwing that money away. I suggest that we keep it here and use it to strengthen our own economy. I shall offer amendments that will deal with specifics, if that becomes necessary. I shall offer an amendment that will seek to prohibit a single dollar going to India for the building of a billion dollar steel plant.

I intend to offer an amendment that would reduce both military and economic aid to a group of countries in the Middle East; namely, the United Arab Republic, Jordan, Iran, Syria, Saudi Arabia, and Israel. Here, too, we have found ourselves in the position of fanning the flames of discord among nations that are receiving our aid. The evidence that we get any return in proportion to what we spend in all those countries is nonexistent.

It does not make sense to be supplying funds, either military or economic, to protagonists who seem to be headed straight to war.

Mr. President, if we continue to build up the power of such countries to start a war, it will be necessary to sacrifice the lives of many more American boys. Certainly aid of this kind is not in the best interests of the United States.

Whenever we find that even a suspicion as to the peaceful intentions of these countries is raised, let us stop our aid to them. I shall give the Members of Congress an opportunity to stand up and be counted on the question of supporting that principle, before we are through with this bill on the floor of the Senate.

Another amendment which I shall offer will call for reduction of our aid to Taiwan and to South Korea. Mr. President, the Taiwan Army has more generals, who are receiving big, fat pay, than the total number of generals in all of our Military Establishment. Talk about featherbedding. We had better take a look at some of the featherbedding we are supporting in various countries.

I am interested in having someone tell me what has happened in South Korea in the last 18 months that would justify our pouring millions of dollars into that country. I am not frightened by the bugaboo argument that if we do not support Taiwan and the South Koreans, the

Communists will take over. We have our own Army in South Korea and our fleet protecting Taiwan from invasion. It may be that one of the greatest services we could render freedom in various parts of the world would be to let some air out of the inflated military establishments of these countries and give their people a chance to decide what kind of government they want. Why should the people of Taiwan not have the chance to decide whether they want to continue to be governed by the Chiang Kai-shek regime, for example?

These two countries are advertised as needing large amounts of aid because they are on the periphery of the Communist bloc. Mr. President, that is the old "line" of the Defense and State Departments. I have sat for years in the Foreign Relations Committee and have listened to the annual recitation of these "lines" of the State Department; but they remind me more of a cracked record than of logic.

So let us analyze their argument. Taiwan is not contiguous to her Communist opponent. She is protected by a considerable body of water, and also is protected by the American 7th Fleet and the American Air Force. They are what will stop a Communist attack on Taiwan. So let us stop fooling the American people. In my judgment, the military aid we have been giving Taiwan will be worthless if ever we get into a military combat with Red China. The very large sum of money we spend on Taiwan military forces is, in my opinion, largely a waste of money; and I favor stopping it. As it is, my amendment will only make a modest reduction in the program planned for Taiwan in fiscal 1964.

Taiwan has received very huge sums from us. It is often considered a showcase of what aid can do to raise living standards and productivity; but in terms of what we have spent, I do not believe the results have been so remarkable. Moreover, political freedom for the 7 million or so Taiwanese whom we delivered to the Chiang regime seems as remote as ever. Mr. President, when that chapter of American history in the field of foreign policy is written 50 years from now, when you and I, Mr. President, are dust, it will not be very pleasant reading for future generations.

The people of that island did not ask Chiang Kai-shek to take over; he was not their choice. The United States in effect imposed him upon them as a puppet, and has been supporting him ever since; and it is about time for us to withdraw at least part of this drain on the American taxpayers.

Still another amendment which I shall offer will reduce all aid to Greece, Turkey, Portugal, and Spain. Our expenditures in those countries are largely for the defense of Europe. It is time that we made Europe aware of the fact that she must help support these countries and must help maintain American bases in them, if Europe, in fact, seeks American protection. That goes for Great Britian, France, Italy, the low countries, and Norway; and it goes for our NATO Allies, who are perfectly willing to have the United States continue to pay huge sums of money for aid to Greece and Turkey and to continue to pay an exorbitant "rent." Mr. President, before we get through with this debate, it may be necessary to call upon the administration to lift some of its "top secret" labels from information which, in fact, belongs to the American people. Certainly they should be told the facts. I know of really no reason why the American taxpayers should not be told about every dollar of military aid and economic aid that our country is spending anywhere in the world, for how can American public opinion function as a reliable jury on an issue of foreign policy—and our foreign policy belongs to them, not to the President of the United States, not to the Secretary of State, not to the Secretary of Defense, not to the Director of AID—and how can the American public render an intelligent judgment on the merits, unless the people of the Nation know all the facts?

Mr. President, I realize that I must continue to comply with the restrictions upon my lips in regard to secret information; but I am going to continue to protest the making of so much of it secret, because if more of it were known there would be an intensified demand by American public opinion to make drastic cuts in this foreign aid bill. The public opinion revolt has begun. The publisher of the Lexington, Ky., newspaper, to whom I referred a few moments ago is typical of community leaders across this land who have come to the same conclusion that I have reached; namely, that the time has come to make substantial reductions in the foreign aid program.

Mr. President, the reductions I shall propose probably are not as drastic as they should be; but certainly it is time to "put the finger" on the places where the expenditures are excessive.

The net result of the amendments which I shall offer would reduce the amount of the foreign aid bill by approximately 25 percent, or more than $1 billion. Certainly the taxpayers are entitled to no less. In my judgment, even larger reductions would still be in the best interests of the American people; but I hope I am enough of a realist to be aware that if this large chunk of waste is taken out of the foreign aid bill—by reducing the total by more than $1 billion—it may serve as a lesson to the administrators of foreign aid that when they come to us next year, they must do the job which should have been done this year. That is, to squeeze the waste and the water out of the foreign aid bill and present to us a bill which they can defend before all the American taxpayers if they give them all the facts about foreign aid.

I know that when any specific reduction is suggested, many will say they want to cut somewhere, but not there. My answer is that the only way to cut is to cut. The countries that will be covered by my amendments receive the great bulk of foreign aid funds, outside of the Alliance for Progress which I shall deal with as a whole. If we do not reduce the outlay to the countries I have discussed today, foreign aid will not be reduced appreciably at all.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, July 29, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate July 25, 1963:

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

Edward D. Re, of New York, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for the term of 3 years from October 22, 1963. (Reappointment.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 25, 1963:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Jay G. Hitchcock, Auburn.
John S. McGriff, Sr., Dutton.
Christopher L. Gholston, Jr., Laverne.
Joyce B. Rodgers, Shorter.

ARIZONA

Vivian V. Kenemore, Kearny.

ARKANSAS

Lewis E. Pruitt, Gurdon.
Jimmie R. Harris, Hatfield.
Franklin L. Brown, Marianna.
Otto C. Miller, Parkdale.
Donald E. Eddington, Tyronza.

CALIFORNIA

Irene V. Hunter, Buttonwillow.
Lena M. Butler, Byron.
Frank W. Murphy, Chester.
Fae S. Freude, Frazier Park.
Harold L. Hemmingsen, Glendale.
Betty J. Laskey, Johannesburg.
Eugene T. White, Laguna Beach.
Ray A. Crettol, Lathrop.
Loren A. Kibby, Mount Hermon.
Murrel C. Jensen, Murrieta.
Joyce A. Sibley, Nestor.
Kathryn S. Wilson, Pasadena.
Marshall C. Kelley, Rialto.
Royse E. Barnette, San Bernardino.
Eric Lundquist, Sanitarium.
John T. Connolly, San Lorenzo.
Mila M. Waltz, Santa Margarita.
James R. Chapman, Winters.

COLORADO

F. Keith Bowman, Hugo.
Kermit R. Hurst, Palisade.

CONNECTICUT

Robert V. Laws, Canterbury.
Elizabeth P. Cohen, Colchester.
Donald P. Markham, East Hampton.
George F. Beebe, East Lyme.
Richard E. Venus, Ridgefield.
Joseph R. Kasper, Terryville.

FLORIDA

Carl R. Garrett, Fort Walton Beach.
Myrtle I. Finch, Indian River City.
Edna M. McDonald, Middleburg.
J. Sidney Batten, Penny Farms.
Herman E. Raulerson, Pierson.

GEORGIA

James M. Herring, Barney.
Francis E. Allen, Cairo.
Sidney M. Hall, Hawkinsville.

GUAM

Alejandro P. Cruz, Agana.

IDAHO

William E. Farley, Kellogg.
Calvin J. Wittaker, Leadore.
Lucille L. Laws, Weippe.

IOWA

William J. Walrod, Belmond.
Harold L. Leazer, Corydon.
Thomas B. Barry, Danbury.
Billy D. Bassett, Drakesville.
Kenneth R. Bowers, Essex.
Wayne E. Exline, Exline.
Katherine M. Kennedy, Farley.
Loraine F. McLane, Garnavillo.
Robert E. Lynott, Jr., Hawarden.
Arthur M. Lundberg, Lake City.
Marjorie G. Rogers, Lucas.
Walter D. Dunlop, Moorhead.
Don M. Wright, Moulton.
W. Cecil Coleman, Mount Auburn.
Joseph J. Mazur, Rowley.
Gerald W. Anderson, Stanton.

KANSAS

Edgar L. Tressler, Colony.
John P. Lenahan, Eudora.
Donald G. Sands, Holton.
Arvin J. Mettlen, Lucas.
Opal G. Thomas, Mayetta.
Larry K. Harris, Moscow.
Mabel B. Hoss, Ness City.
Ellen M. Mohney, Ozawkie.
Anna J. Mills, Russell.
George R. Hess, Towanda.

LOUISIANA

Jacob E. Foil, Bogalusa.
Beulah R. Amedee, Geismar.
Frank E. Walters, McDade.
Lawrence Harrington, Vinton.

MAINE

Charles C. Lewis, Fryeburg.
Gordon L. Stitham, Mars Hill.
Allan G. Pinkham, Moody.
William D. Duhamel, Old Orchard Beach.

MASSACHUSETTS

John C. Hancock, Lincoln.
Margaret C. Hahn, North Hadley.
Marion W. Bulter, Oakham.
John H. Higgins, West Wareham.

MICHIGAN

Everett E. Underwood, Brethren.
Norma L. Beckwith, Jones.
Kermit R. Moore, Manton.
August W. Delgoffe, Menominee.
Barbara J. Tryban, Mullett Lake.
Harry L. Smith, Pickford.
Gustav E. Leder, Portage.
Clarke D. Gordon, Saline.
John P. Grynwich, Sawyer.
Frederick W. Rawsthorne, Jr., Trenton.
William Salerno, Yale.

MINNESOTA

Richard M. Melbye, Hitterdal.
F. Lowell Johnson, Lake Park.
Lester R. Isackson, Leonard.
Clarence J. Schaber, Rogers.

MISSISSIPPI

Eupal G. Byram, Golden.
Fred A. Jackson, Sturgis.
Ann G. Wise, Washington.
James H. Simpson, Winona.

MISSOURI

Jerry M. Eidson, Camdenton.
Wayne U. Thomas, Deepwater.
Dorothy A. McDaniel, Gray Summit.
James Mote, Iberia.
Poly B. Sims, Koshkonong.
William E. Griffith, Plattsburg.
Christopher C. McLemore, South Greenfield.
William C. Brandenburg, Wellsville.

MONTANA

William M. Dysart, Harlowton.
Herbert Oster, Melstone.
William H. Kempfer, Philipsburg.

NEBRASKA

Waldo E. Smith, Arthur.
Louis A. Piva, Chappell.
John I. McKelvey, Falls City.
Victor W. Wendland, Holbrook.
Kenneth P. Lewis, Lincoln.
Carl Tisthammer, Newman Grove.
Gertrude M. Lane, Rulo.
Nellie L. Lockard, Stella.
Marvin F. Anderson, Virginia.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Roger E. Hebert, Hooksett.
Agnes P. Pascoe, West Ossipee.

NEW JERSEY

Charles P. Rue, Jobstown.
Matthew J. Sheridan, Northfield.
John B. Gildawie, Pequannock.
Richard M. Johnson, Ridgefield.
Frank A. Maressa, Stratford.
Lawrence H. Friedman, Teaneck.

NEW MEXICO

Mateas P. Serna, Magdalena.

NEW YORK

John J. Murray, Albany.
Thomas H. Brogan, Auburn.
Frederick C. Piche, Deferiet.
Stanley T. Sokel, Eastport.
William J. Hopkins, Jamesville.
Wilfred F. Smith, Livingston Manor.
William J. Barber, Nyack.
Sister Mary Dominic Scheg, Stella Niagara.
Thomas J. Byrne, Suffern.
Helene R. Scharett, Union Hill.
James E. Hawes, Valois.
Roy E. Laine, Wading River.
Eva R. Weber, Yulan.

NORTH CAROLINA

James A. Jarvis, Dobson.
G. Cody Steagall, Draper.
Evelyn W. Jarvis, Engelhard.
Milton B. Garner, Goldston.
Thomas F. Trivette, Lewisville.
James V. Roberson, Lilesville.
Oliver C. Tew, McLeansville.
Benjamin T. Aycock, Wake Forest.
William M. Young, Walkertown.

NORTH DAKOTA

Lyle M. Westemeier, Bisbee.
Reid A. Hill, Emmet.
Emerald E. Knodel, Hurdsfield.
Clarence L. Olson, Kindred.
Harold E. Nelson, Manvel.
Fred H. Tufte, Northwood.
Gwendolyn R. Young, Rutland.
Clifford R. Salzwedel, Sheldon.
Donald Smith, Souris.

OHIO

Charles W. Perry, Holland.
Charles E. Wellman, New Knoxville.
Robert G. Prindle, Orient.
Grover J. Neikirk, Republic.
Janet M. Lesher, Spring Valley.
Ralph H. Gibson, Wharton.

OKLAHOMA

Harold W. Thomason, Boynton.
Alan N. Case, Marland.
Margaret B. Moody, Ratliff City.
Roger S. Wilcox, Seiling.

OREGON

Nellie L. Netter, Aurora.
Bettejane B. Cass, La Pine.
Robert L. Snider, Roseburg.
Robert J. Cooper, Wilsonville.

PENNSYLVANIA

Henry J. Minnig, Branch Dale.
Wayne H. Winton, Centerville.
Dale A. Daugherty, Evans City.
Russell J. Greenwalt, Kempton.
Herman O. Todd, Lake Como.
Charles A. Knoll, McKees Rocks.
F. William Battaglia, Meadville.

SOUTH CAROLINA

John E. Boulware, Belton.
John P. Sullivan, Jr., Jackson.
Gilbert L. Shaw, Longs.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Duane A. Larson, Chester.
Lyle E. Singrey, Hazel.
Richard V. Bell, Hecla.
Robert E. Iverson, Hudson.
Daniel C. Wiest, Newell.

TENNESSEE

Millard M. Brown, Livingston.
Kenneth E. DePriest, Lobelville.
Bobby L. Price, Mosheim.
Horace M. Hughett, Robbins.
Byerly L. Morgan, Spring City.
George R. Gunn, Jr., Springfield.

TEXAS

Joe H. Childs, Brownwood.
Shirley R. Clark, Cleburne.
Ladislav L. Zbranek, Hardin.
David E. Holster, Jr., Midland.
James H. Latimer, Olmito.
Ann M. Postlethwait, Sabine Pass.
Sidney L. Lockwood, Santo.
L. V. Teston, South Houston.
Henry H. Hawley, Jr., Sweetwater.
James A. Terrell, Van Horn.
James E. Scott, Wolfe City.

UTAH

Fannie W. Lowe, Elsinore.
Howard M. Hardy, Hinckley.
Glenda L. Green, Wendover.

VERMONT

Justin M. Lanou, Irasburg.
Dwight H. Cooley, Passumpsic.

VIRGINIA

Mamie G. Turner, Carrollton.
William E. Scheid, Falls Church.
Burton S. Hamersly, Farmville.
E. Brown Porter, Max Meadows.
Marvin S. Minter, Providence Forge.
James W. Stafford, Sr., Radford.

WASHINGTON

Samuel M. Howe, Mercer Island.
Hubert R. Cartland, Milton.
William H. Boyes, Monroe.

WEST VIRGINIA

Frederick T. Newbraugh, Berkeley Springs.
Floyd F. Edmunds, Bramwell.
William H. Foster, Freeman.
Virginia L. Eddy, Friendly.
Martin M. Strganac, McMechen.
Howard E. Shamblen, Mammoth.
Marguerite L. Hammett, Willow Island.

WISCONSIN

James W. Hankerson, Fair Water.
George E. Pronold, Genesee Depot.
Jon D. Lysdahl, Grantsburg.
Orlen E. Heldt, Merrill.
Neil E. Schell, Norwalk.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Nuclear Test Ban Talks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday night, July 28, on Channel 5, WNEW-TV, at 11:30 p.m. I will make the following remarks concerning the nuclear test ban talks which are currently proceeding in Moscow. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my remarks:

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TALKS

After 15 tension-filled years in which we more than once went to the brink of war, we now find ourselves talking seriously of an accommodation with Russia. Khrushchev, who only yesterday was pounding a U.N. desk with a shoe and threatening to bury us, now is playing a new role—that of the benign world leader whose sole interest is peace—and telling us that with a little give and take on both sides we can ease the tensions of the cold war and perhaps even be good friends. Some sort of a nuclear test ban agreement seems certain and this, of course, is heartening.

Is there really any basis for solid optimism? There is, I think, but it must be guarded optimism. It is inconceivable to me that Khrushchev has undergone any basic change in his thinking toward the United States. We are the prime capitalist power and still the obstacle in the path of the Kremlin drive toward world domination. What, then, is behind this striking about-face on Khrushchev's part? The answer, I think, is obvious: He is faced with a rising new rival—Communist China—and one that is potentially a greater and more immediate threat to Russia than the United States. On the surface, the split between Mao Tse-tung and Khrushchev is a matter of Marxist doctrine, with Mao advocating the hard line toward what he calls Western imperialism.

But I feel the split is far deeper than that—that, basically, it is a power struggle. What is happening is that Khrushchev is facing a two-front cold war—one with an aggressive, grasping China, and one with ourselves. Now, for the first time, he is willing to make certain concessions—hence the progress of the nuclear ban agreement—in order to ease the pressure. But in our relief at Khrushchev's new attitude we must not forget to bargain from our position of strength.

Thus far, Khrushchev has spoken only of "easing cold war tensions." He has not yet offered to remove any of the causes of these tensions. We must not forget that the Berlin wall—a monument to tyranny—still stands; that Khrushchev's Caribbean puppet, Fidel Castro, dominates a Soviet satellite only 90 miles from our shores; that skilled Russian agents are teaching revolution-for-export in Cuba and infiltrating more and more Latin American governments every month; that the enslaved nations on Russia's perimeter are still as enslaved as they ever were, and that the Kremlin's espionage apparatus is as active in and against this country as it ever was.

Now, it seems to me that we might profit from this rift between Red China and Russia. Not by attempting to exploit it actively—that might draw the two back together again—but by putting it up to Khrushchev to demonstrate his good faith at the bargaining table.

If, as he claims, Khrushchev is sincere in desiring a truce with the West, then let him prove it. Is he willing to demolish the Berlin wall and permit the unhindered passage of Germans from East to West? Is he willing to permit self-rule in Moscow-dominated eastern and central Europe? Is he willing to halt his underground interference in the internal affairs of the countries in the free world? Is he willing to cut the Kremlin strings that support Castro and let the Cuban dictator fall—as he must without Russian support?

These are the causes of the cold war; unless Khrushchev is willing to remove them, no amount of dialogue at whatever level, ambassadorial or at the summit, will succeed in easing the tensions. In itself, a nuclear test ban agreement is in reality a detail; it doesn't remove the reason for the bombs. Nor will treaties without concessions amount to more than airy promises. When our people sit down to bargain with Khrushchev, I sincerely hope they will recall a report of the American Bar Association, and I quote:

"During the last 25 years the United States has had 3,400 meetings with the Communists, including Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, Panmunjom and Geneva. The negotiators spoke 106 million words. All this talk led to 52 major agreements and Soviet Russia has broken 50 of them."

This time, let's be as hard-headed as Khrushchev.

Federal Food Stamps for Alcholic Beverages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House a rather lengthy article which appeared in the July 18, 1963, issue of the Lexington (Ky.) Leader, entitled "Governor's Home County Also Home to Mammoth Bootlegging Operation."

This article gets into quite a discourse and controversy over the political situation in Floyd County, which is a dry county in eastern Kentucky. The point that I think is so important for this body to be cognizant of appears in the following paragraph:

> Where do the people of Floyd County get the money for whiskey that sells for $2.50 a half-pint and $8 a fifth? According to several sources, the Floyd bootleggers will accept food stamps from those on relief.

It is quite evident that the use of Federal food stamps to purchase alcoholic beverages is not in keeping with the purposes of the program.

I have today written to the Department of Agriculture asking that they immediately investigate this story. Such an abuse of the taxpayers' funds is unconscionable and, I think, points up one of the fallacies of the food stamp program.

Despondent, Disillusioned Domestics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the migrant life is a cruel life for families and children. It can be cruel and disappointing for the worker and breadwinner also.

Some people, in an effort to defeat the bracero bill, are dreaming of many ways to develop a domestic migrant farm labor program. No idea yet has been advanced which is as efficient, practicable, or humanitarian as the Public Law 78 program.

Even though row crop agriculture can utilize labor of low or simple skills, not everyone can do the work.

A massive governmental recruiting program throughout the United States, in pockets of great unemployment and in big city slums, may produce some, but not enough, satisfactory fieldworkers. It will produce many times more disappointed, displaced, disgruntled people—who are entitled to more consideration.

Qualifications for row crop employees cannot be determined by interview alone. Actual tryout on ranches is required. To select inexperienced applicants from industrial areas and transport them to California and expect them to qualify for row crop vegetable work seems utterly fantastic to anyone in the farm labor recruitment service. Proponents of this idea either have no appreciation of the problem or no genuine concern for the individual worker.

It may sound good to the unemployed industrial worker for some politician to claim "I will get you a job out in California," but I would like to be present in California with that same politician when the worker does not qualify, does not want to work longer, wants to be home with his family, and is despondent and disgusted, without a job, home, or security.

It is a serious matter to dislocate sincere, desperate workers who may be misled by political, governmental, recruiting propaganda into thinking they can perform work in which they have no experience.

Practically no consideration has been given to tryouts of applicants for row crop vegetable work. The cost of this would be enormous in and around big cities and in the heavy unemployment pockets. Then there would be the great costs of transportation from the East or South. All for 2, 3, or 5 months of low-skilled work. Then the trip back.

Growers in California have recruited as diligently as any govermental agency, State or Federal, will ever do short of conscription. The assiduous recruitment has produced first, a few qualified workers; second, many derelicts who had no intention of working after a free trip to California—who should have been prosecuted for defrauding the growers who paid their transportation, but who were so irresponsible they flouted most all laws and responsibility; and, third, many conscientious jobseekers who could not do the work and who became disillusioned, despondent, and destitute, and a public charge in one or many ways. Some struggle back to their homes where they want to be and belong; many roam like nomads from one place to another seeking employment or relief wherever they can find either or both.

Do we really want the Federal Government to get into a program like this? The great cost may not deter us. But we will disillusion a lot of sincere work seekers and embarrass a lot of politicians. It may help the farm labor problem, at best, only slightly.

Can we not continue the bracero program, which is working effectively and satisfactorily, until some better, workable, recruitment plan for domestics has been devised?

Presidential Inability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, today the House is scheduled to consider and act upon H.R. 4638—a bill to promote the orderly transfer of the powers and responsibilities of the Presidency at the time of a change in administrations.

In my judgment, the bill serves a useful and necessary purpose, and I congratulate the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] for his efforts in bringing the bill before us, and I am pleased to lend him my support.

However, there is another problem also involving the orderly transfer of Presidential powers and responsibilities under different circumstances which—without intending to take anything away from the merits of the pending bill—I think is of far greater importance, and even more worthy of congressional consideration.

I refer, of course, to the still unresolved question of what to do when a President, because of mental or physical incapacity, becomes unable to personally carry forward the burden of his office.

As I am sure most of us know, the Constitution is wholly silent on this point. Fortunately, however, this void in our governmental scheme has been of concern on only rare instances in our history. Just the same, on those rare instances—and most of us can remember several of them—those who were charged in point of fact if not of law with the responsibility for carrying on the business of the Chief Executive, were placed in an unnecessarily uncomfortable and uncertain position, and, without wishing either the present or future occupants of the White House anything but the best of health, none of us has any assurance that such an unsatisfactory experience might not again be repeated.

There is, to be sure, some difference of opinion as to how this procedural void should be filled. In my judgment, the safest and surest route to follow would be to adopt an amendment to the Constitution—as my bill, House Joint Resolution 210, proposes to do—specifically declaring that in case of the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office, such powers and duties shall automatically devolve on the Vice President until such inability shall terminate, and further giving to Congress the authority to prescribe a method both for determining and terminating Presidential inability in this context.

I should think that all of us who remember those uncomfortable days when the lack of such a plan for the orderly transfer of Presidential powers and responsibilities was of real concern to the country—and that we would remember those days with a certain twinge of conscience over our failure to subsequently have done anything about them. I know that the Committee on the Judiciary, where my bill presently languishes, is now extremely busy on other matters, but I would most sincerely hope that, when it has time, it will have been reminded by the passage of H.R. 4638 of the wisdom of giving its early attention to this collateral, but far more serious, problem.

Law To Prevent Racial Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on June 27 I introduced in the House of Representatives a bill (H.R. 7329) that I regard as an effective instrument with which to put an end to the racial troubles now shaking the entire Nation. This proposed legislation would bar any person, irrespective of his race, creed, or color, from crossing a State line for the purpose of demonstrating in violation of law or otherwise fomenting lawlessness or inciting to riot.

I have been greatly encouraged by the fact that the response which has come to me with respect to this bill is highly favorable. Letters of endorsement have been received from all parts of the Nation. Of the many messages sent me, only one has expressed disapproval.

My bill has been referred to the Judiciary Committee, and I have respectfully requested the chairman of that committee to refer it to a subcommittee for study. So far no such action has been taken.

The country vitally needs this legislation and the public generally approves of it. I hope that my bill may be favorably considered in the Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, and that it may be acted upon favorably at this session of Congress.

Although the President of the United States and his Attorney General brother may now be concerned over the current outbursts of law defiance and disorder in many places throughout the North and South, it seems to me that they display a strange blindness as to the essential causes of these riots and acts of law violation.

When I consider the disgraceful concerted defiance of law which has occurred in communities such as Danville, Va., in my own congressional district, it is perfectly obvious that the participants are responding to incitation from outsiders, people who are not Virginians, who do not know Virginia or her people, and who do not have the welfare of Virginians, black or white, at heart.

For various motives, these persons and organizations from afar have been stirring up the people to fever pitch and are working incalculable mischief. This situation is being reenacted in many places. In virtually every case the disobedience to law has been shown to have been methodically inculcated into what were ordinarily peaceful and peace-loving people. If we are to avoid a major tragedy on a national scale, these uprisings and organized floutings of law must stop.

The way to stop them is to prohibit outsiders from invading States where they have no business except to stir up disorder, or from conspiring to do so. The law I have in mind would have equal application to everyone. It would apply to the Ku Klux Klan and any kindred organizations; it would apply to the NAACP, or to CORE, or to the Communist Party. In short, it would apply to all persons who travel in interstate commerce for this sinister purpose. My bill is clearly within the purview and intent of the Constitution, and is something that is needed for the protection of the great bulk of our population, the law-abiding public that bears the responsibility of our industry, our government, and our religion.

There is nothing strange or novel about my bill when viewed against the background of existing law. Since 1910, when Congress adopted the Mann Act—18 United States Code 2421—this legislative body has enacted a substantial number of criminal laws to free interstate commerce of corruptive influence and to aid the States in law enforcement.

The Mann Act was aimed at the suppression of the white slave traffic. It prohibited the transportation of female persons across State lines for immoral purposes. Later, in 1919, Congress made it a Federal offense to transport stolen automobiles in interstate commerce—18 United States Code 2312—and this was later expanded to cover other kinds of stolen goods—18 United States Code 2314.

In 1934, Congress enacted the Fugitive Felon Act, prohibiting interstate travel to avoid prosecution for crime, and this enactment was expanded in 1960 and 1961—18 United States Code 1073, 1074. Clearly, if it is sensible to penalize interstate flight to avoid prosecution, it makes even better sense to prohibit interstate travel which is undertaken with the intent of violating the law. Such an enactment has the effect of deterring wrongdoing at its very inception.

Congress has seen the wisdom of this approach. In 1961 it enacted a law prohibiting travel in interstate commerce with the intent to carry on, or commit, any crime of violence to further any of a number of specified activities—18 United States Code 1952.

My bill merely carries this approach to its logical conclusion by penalizing travel across State lines with the intent to riot or violate State law.

The legislation I propose would have prevented some of the riots and community outbursts which have bothered the Nation at times for generations. Even the famous Hatfield-McCoy feud of the last century, with all its sadness and family suffering, might never have happened if such a law had been in existence.

Without exception, I feel that States are capable and desirous of enforcing the law on a local basis. This can be accomplished if they are protected from the vicious outside influences which snub our laws and ignore our community mores, resulting in the chaos prevalent among us today.

It is a sad day in America if our local and State officials are deprived of exercising their police power. This power historically rests with the localities and with the States.

I believe the law I propose is one that the right-thinking people of this Nation deserve. It will protect the sound, taxpaying, law-abiding element from the lawlessness and threat of riot and violence brought in by outside agitators.

The language of my bill is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) Congress finds that the recent and increasing practice of certain persons and organizations, with diverse ulterior motives, to enter States, territories, Commonwealths, or possessions of the United States, of which they are not residents, for the purpose of fomenting disobedience to their laws has led and leads to violent disorders gravely disrupting the peace and threatening the welfare of the entire Nation.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this Act to promote the general welfare and assure peace and order by prohibiting in interstate commerce, or from conspiring to do so, where the purpose of such travel is to incite to riot or to engage in the violation of any law.

Sec. 2 (a) Title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after chapter 53 the following new chapter:

"Chapter 54.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Travel in for Unlawful Purposes.

"Whoever moves or travels in interstate or foreign commerce with the intent (1) to incite to riot or to commit any act or engage in any conduct which would tend to incite to riot, or (2) to violate any law of any State, Territory, Commonwealth, or possession of the United States shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(b) If two or more persons conspire to violate subsection (a) of this section and one or more such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be punished as provided in said subsection (a).

"(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed in anywise to limit the exercise of jurisdiction by any such State, Territory, Commonwealth, or possession over any crime or offense committed therein or cognizable under the laws thereof."

House Small Business Committee Expresses Opinion Legislation Not Needed for Cooperative Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, following the completion of recent hearings by the House Small Business Committee on cooperative advertising, Mr. Larston D. Farrar, correspondent for several newspapers and trade publications, conducted an interview regarding this type of advertising as revealed by these hearings. This interview has recently been printed in the IGA Grocergram.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this interview in the Record, as follows:

House Small Business Committee Expresses Opinion Legislation Not Needed for Cooperative Advertising

(Note.—An exclusive interview between Larston D. Farrar, Washington representative of IGA Grocergram, and U.S. Representative Joe L. Evins, Democrat of Tennessee, chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, conducted on the day after Congressman Evins concluded his investigation into the Federal Trade Commission's controversial advisory opinion on cooperative advertising.)

Larston D. Farrar. First, Congressman Evins, I wish to thank you on behalf of the readers of the IGA Grocergram for taking your time to discuss the subject of cooperative advertising by independent retailers and the facts and factors uncovered by your committee's investigation.

Representative Joe L. Evins. I am delighted to respond, Larston, for I realize that the publication of information about governmental development is a vital part of our work as legislators. As you know, Members of Congress strive to stay aware of the many problems facing small businessmen in many fields. We tackled this problem at once, through the House Small Business Committee, because we felt that the situation demanded attention and because of its importance to so many thousands of independent retailers in many fields.

Mr. Farrar. Will you relate the events, in sequence, which have precipitated the current wave of fear on the part of retailers concerning their cooperative advertising?

Congressman Evins. Well, to start at the beginning, it seems that the National Association of Retail Druggists asked the Federal Trade Commission for an advisory opinion regarding the legality of a certain proposed cooperative advertising plan designed to be used by groups of retail druggists in various cities and towns throughout the country.

Under the plan, independent retail druggists located in a given community or town would place a joint ad in the local newspaper featuring certain items at sale prices which would be offered by the participating druggists whose names would be listed in the ad. The group of druggists would pay for the advertising by pooling their advertising allowances received from manufacturers of the items advertised.

The Commission advised that since the druggists agreed with each other to sell the items at the advertised prices, the plan was a price-fixing device that would contravene laws enforced by the Commission.

The drug association made public the Commission's advisory opinion and since great numbers of retail grocers, hardware stores, appliance stores, independent merchants, and others were placing joint ads under a plan that was identical, or similar, these small businessmen became alarmed and interpreted the Commission's ruling as a threat to their own cooperative advertising programs.

Mr. Farrar. It is of great interest to those in this field as to the opinion of the Department of Justice's Antitrust Division with respect to the FTC advisory opinion. Didn't Lee Loevinger, head of the Antitrust Division, testify before your committee?

Congressman Evins. Yes, he did, and in his remarks Judge Loevinger made it clear that the Department of Justice had known about the small business joint ads all along but had found no occasion to intervene or to interfere with the practice. His view differed from that of the Commission. He explained that the Antitrust Division has brought no cases against the practice.

Judge Loevinger testified that he did not want to make a general statement that cooperative advertising was legal or that it was illegal. He explained that it depends upon the facts and circumstances in each case. He did testify that small retail businesses may, if they do it properly, engage in cooperative advertising and mention prices without being in violation of the law.

Mr. Farrar. Isn't it a fact that Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, the Senate majority whip, has introduced legislation to make it clear that the FTC position must not be maintained in enforcement procedures?

Congressman Evins. Yes, that is true. His bill, as I read it, would place the joint advertising programs of small business retailers under the supervision of the Federal Trade Commission. The bill authorizes the FTC to issue rules that would permit the small retailers to place such ads without being in violation of the antitrust laws.

In addition to Senator Humphrey's bill, I might mention that Senator Gale McGee, Democrat, of Wyoming, has introduced a concurrent resolution in the Senate which, if adopted, would prevent the Federal Trade Commission or the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice from proceeding for a period of 1 year against small retailers placing joint ads. At the time Senator McGEE introduced this resolution, I believe he explained that the moratorium was needed because the small merchants were asking for immediate action or assurances so that they could continue their advertising programs without fear of criminal prosecution.

I think our committee's hearing has clarified the matter, and has supplied the small business community with these assurances. We feel that we have been of real service to small business.

Mr. FARRAR. In view of all the facts which you uncovered in your hearings, and the reaction of congressional small business spokesmen generally, what is the best thing for Congress to do to assure small businessmen of their right to advertise cooperatively? What chance do you give to the proposed new legislation of Senator HUMPHREY, or similar legislation which you may sponsor, during this session of Congress?

Congressman EVINS. At this time, I doubt that I will sponsor any legislation dealing with this problem.

It is true that the testimony developed at the hearings held by my committee—the House Small Business Committee—made it very clear that the release of the Federal Trade Commission advisory opinion had a real impact upon small business retailers. Members of Congress became concerned because they, as well as others, recognize that small business must continue to have the privilege of placing these joint ads when it is necessary to do so to compete effectively.

Most important of all though, is the fact that the testimony and information developed by our committee's hearings clarified the situation. Chairman Paul Rand Dixon of the Federal Trade Commission told us that the Commission was merely answering a request for advice—not dealing with a question of enforcement. He added that the Commission has not proceeded against any of these small business groups in these situations and that it has enough to do to try to keep its backlog of cases from getting any larger. He said that no one has complained to the Commission about the joint ads and I have a feeling that the Commission has no present plans or intentions of proceeding in these types of matters.

Also, as I mentioned earlier, Judge Loevinger told our committee that the Department of Justice all along has been aware of the joint advertising programs conducted by small retailers and they have seen nothing to attack in it; that the Department has not found a situation in which they thought it appropriate to institute any type of proceedings against small retailers for cooperative advertising.

The Sherman Act was passed in 1890 and some of the other antitrust statutes and the Federal Trade Commission Act were enacted as long ago as 1914. It should be remembered that during all these years these two agencies have not instituted a single case against groups of small retailers for placing joint ads—and certainly they have had knowledge of the practice.

It seems, therefore, that the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice have made it clear—at least to me and to our committee—that they are not going to proceed against these small retailers in their cooperative advertising programs.

Without doubt, the release of the advisory opinion proved to be a disturbing thing to many groups of small business retailers. Some became confused because one of the Commissioners dissented and a short time later the Department of Justice announced its disagreement with the Commission's ruling.

It was under these circumstances, of course, that the Senators introduced their bills and resolutions, and our committee has held hearings on the problem. As I have said, these hearings, I believe, have "cleared the air," so to speak, so that now there may not be a pressing need for legislation.

Mr. FARRAR. Again, Congressman EVINS, I want to thank you on behalf of our readers for your candid and earnest responses to my questions. We are grateful to you and to your committee for this, and for all the fine efforts you and your colleagues are making for the small businessman in every line of endeavor.

Medicine and Modern Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, the distinguished Member of this House from the State of Rhode Island, has devoted a great measure of his time and effort in the advancement of medicine and allied sciences in our advanced schools of learning.

It was through his individual efforts, although he is not prone to admit it, that appropriations have been made available for financial aid to students aspiring to these professions. His efforts have been recognized by Members of Congress and the medical faculties and by the public press, which on many occasions commended his untiring work to promote the health and welfare of the people of this great Nation.

Congressman FOGARTY's recent address on June 11 at the commencement exercises of Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, a renowned institution of medical learning, summarizes his expanded knowledge on the subject of the urgent needs and the requirements to meet such needs in this dedicated professional field. It is well that his discourse on the subject of urgent medical needs in these United States be forcibly brought to the attention of our people through every media possible.

Mr. Speaker, for this reason I insert in the RECORD a copy of the text of Congressman FOGARTY's address to the faculty, students, and others who attended the commencement exercises at Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, and who were fortunate to hear directly from a recognized authority on this subject which will have such a vital impact on this and future generations in this country:

MEDICINE AND MODERN DEMOCRACY

(Commencement address by Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY)

President Fay, honored guests, members of the faculty, members of the 111th class to graduate from the Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, and their families and friends, it is an inspiring experience to be present as this group of outstanding young women is about to take its place in the noble company of those who have entered the profession of medicine from this great college in an unbroken procession of graduates since the year 1851.

And it is with a feeling of genuine humility and appreciation that I receive the honor you have bestowed upon me today. It has been my privilege to serve for the past 16 years either as chairman or ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee which deals with the health sciences. I have come to know and to appreciate the work of physicians in a way which is not granted to many men. And I have considered it my food fortune that I have been able to do my part in assuring proper levels of Federal support in cooperation with State, local, and private institutions for the advancement of medical education and research. Consequently, I am well aware of the greatness and excellence of the Woman's Medical College, from which 2,664 women doctors have been graduated to help make the place and role of women in medicine what it is today.

In the year 1963 it can be said that the struggle to gain for women their righful place of recognition in medicine has indeed been won. It has been written that "The measure of man's cooperation with man in the conquest of nature is the true measure of progress." In modern medicine progress is being measured by the constant cooperation of men and women physicians in botn research and practice. And I have no doubt whatever but that the members of this graduating class will play their part to the fullest extent in pushing the frontiers of medical progress even further forward.

As their role will be important to their noble profession, so it will be equally important to their country in the great struggle of our times to preserve world peace and advance the cause of liberty and democracy in the face of the threats and dangers which confront us.

The work of doctors and medical researchers everywhere in the world is a mighty force for peace and freedom. As one who has long been identified with the U.S. participation in the work of the World Health Organization, I have been very much impressed with this fact. Wars and dictatorships are bred in poverty and disease. Those who help to eradicate malaria, those who labor to develop community water supply programs, those who promote international cooperation in fighting the great plagues of mankind—are all helping to create world conditions that will be favorable to the growth of free societies and a more secure peace.

When, in 1960, Congress passed the International Health Research Act, that measure was primarily intended to help support medical research by foreign scientists whenever and wherever it is evident that their work will advance the health status of the United States, as well as that of the country in which the research is conducted. It was my privilege to introduce that legislation in the House, and I have been gratified not only by its scientific aspects but also by the way in which it has brought about projects of international cooperation that have survived a number of periods of grave international tension.

In the World Health Organization today, American doctors and medical research scientists are actively engaged in helping to disseminate research information. They are seeking for more effective ways to surmount language barriers so that the explosion in medical literature, which is quite a problem even here at home, can be handled more efficiently for the mutual benefit of physicians and other workers in the health sciences. I am confident that as their work progresses, it will serve not only to improve the world's health, but also to prevent the spread of the disease of war.

Here at home, we must also realize the essential part which medicine and all the branches of medical research play in keeping America strong and free. In adding up our country's resources for national strength, the health sciences must be given a leading place. Medicine ministers directly to human beings and human beings continue to be the most valuable, the most remarkable, and the most significant creatures on this planet. In an age of machines and advanced technology man is not becoming obsolete. The recent wonderful performance of Gordon Cooper in bringing his space vehicle back to earth under manual controls is dramatic evidence that the human factor still counts for a good deal, even in such a highly technical field as that of space flight.

As man moves out into space a whole new branch of medical study will move with him. And we can be sure that the work of free doctors in a free society will have an ever-increasing importance for the winning of those victories for democracy which will be gained by our astronauts of the future—among whom there will in time be numbered a good many physicians. It is in fact quite likely that one or more of today's graduates may have the distinction of being a woman pioneer in this field as Dr. Ann Preston once pioneered in the field of winning recognition for women in medicine itself.

But if American medicine is to play its full and proper part in the life of our modern democracy, we must solve two problems which will not yield to pure laboratory research. First we must greatly increase the number of qualified physicians and other professionals in the health sciences. Then we must also work out more equitable ways of bringing the wonders of modern medicine to all of our people—regardless of their race, age, creed, or economic situation. And we must do both of these things without in any way interfering with the traditionally free and private character of the practice of the science and art of the physician.

Earlier this year, a nationally distributed Sunday magazine carried an article by Dr. Fay in which she convincingly discussed the gravity of the increasing shortage of physicians. The plain fact is that just to maintain the present ratio of physicians to population will require, over the next 10 years, a 50-percent increase in the number of graduates from our medical schools. And that is a minimal figure for the protection of the health of the people.

Where are we going to find the money to build and operate the equivalent of 20 new medical schools which will be needed? I see no practical answer to that question which does not include extensive Federal aid. As Dr. Howard Rusk has put it, "After 10 years of frustration, delay, and defeat, it now appears likely that Congress will at last enact a program of Federal aid to medical education."

Dr. Rusk was, of course, referring to the bill known as H.R. 12—the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963—which the House passed on April 12 and sent to the Senate. This legislation is a step forward because it does provide for a 3-year, $175 million program of matching grants for the construction of teaching facilities for medical, dental, and other health personnel, and for a 3-year, $30 million program of loans for students of medicine and allied sciences.

I am, of course, disappointed about the omission of a scholarship program in this bill. I believe that a significant proportion of those who have the potential to become physicians are not doing so because they simply cannot afford the expense of medical school education. These people are handicapped—not by lack of brains, but by lack of funds. The present student loan program offers up to $2,000 a year to the student at a reasonable rate of interest and is, in a measure, going to offset the economic handicap, but I still believe a scholarship program—not requiring repayment—would have been better.

I am also disappointed at the sacrifice of a provision which would have forgiven a portion of the student repayment in those instances where young doctors set up practice and remained in areas of severe physician shortages—but this sacrifice was not too high a price to pay for the passage of a measure so long delayed and so desperately needed. The measure now goes to the Senate, where it is hoped and believed that a friendly reception awaits it. This is particularly gratifying to me and to some of my colleagues, who have tried so often and failed in the face of a situation which has continued to deteriorate while our colleagues continued to deliberate. I believe that we have a breakthrough, at last.

With medicine, as with other sciences, we have not yet developed all the social and political techniques which will enable the whole country to benefit from the rapid advance of research. Through grants administered by the National Institutes of Health we have expanded the freedom of medical research to undertake projects that could not have been possible 10 or 15 years ago. Now we must also develop forms of national health insurance which will widen the freedom of the American people to make use of the benefits of medical knowledge.

You who graduate today will have the high privilege and the grave responsibility of one of our most honored professions. As you exercise that privilege and undertake that responsibility with a full awareness of your equally important role as women and citizens, you will make your lasting contribution to the interdependent causes of the health, the peace, and the freedom of mankind.

Commonwealth Day—11 Years of Fulfillment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on July 25, 1952, a concept unique in all the America's—indeed in all of man's history—became a reality. On that day the Governor of Puerto Rico, with the blessing of the U.S. Government, proclaimed the establishment of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Slightly less than a State in stature, but more autonomous than all other territories, Puerto Rico was accorded all but the last full measure of political maturity while retaining the economic concessions so vital to an experiment that promised to dismay the collectivists and inspire the free.

Politically, a precise definition of the island's status has yet to be coined. Neither an independent entity, a State, nor an incorporated territory, Puerto Rico reflects the dignity of a free people; its citizens, who are citizens of the United States, enjoy practically all the privileges of statehood, save that of national suffrage, while being free of Federal taxation; and, in local affairs self-rule is complete. In Puerto Rico the Governor is popularly elected; this privilege was never enjoyed by the people of either Alaska or Hawaii until these incorporated Territories became States. What, then, is the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico? Actually, it is an inspired design for living adapted to the needs of a people not yet fully prepared to meet the economic demands of statehood, but who merit the right to rule themselves. They cannot vote for President, and they have a nonvoting Resident Commissioner to represent them in the Congress; but for all local offices, as well as problems, they are the final arbiters. It might well be that the Puerto Rican definition of status captures the essence of this political and social phenomenon: Associated Free State.

Mr. Speaker, the men of Puerto Rico have the same military obligations as their fellow citizens on the mainland. They have followed the Stars and Stripes in battle since World War I, long before the attainment of Commonwealth status. More than 91 percent of the Puerto Ricans engaged in the Korean conflict were volunteers. In terms both of patriotism and valor their record has been a distinguished one.

The standard of living on the island has risen spectacularly; the millenium, however, will be some time in arriving. Although per capita income is four times larger than it was 20 years ago. Net Commonwealth income continues to rise at a phenomenal rate; in fiscal 1962 it attained a level 11 percent higher than that recorded the previous year.

Measured in terms of mainland figures, Puerto Rican progress is less than overwhelming; when contrasted with pre-World War II conditions the advance is staggering. In 1940 family income totaled only $660; in 1961 it climbed to $3,003. Net income from manufacturing rose from $26 million in 1940 to $384 million in 1962.

Progress in other areas has been even more remarkable. Life expectancy at birth in 1940 was only 46 years; in 1960 it was 70 years—precisely the same as it was in the continental United States. The death rate in Puerto Rico from tuberculosis in 1940 per 100,000 persons was 260.2; in 1961 it was approximately 26.0. The death rate from all causes in the island in 1961 was 6.8 per 1,000 population; in the States it was 9.3.

Mr. Speaker, these magnificent achievements are attributable in very large measure to the vision, talents, and industry of one of America's greatest statesmen, Luis Muñoz-Marín. In the middle 1940's he and a coterie of dedicated associates instituted Operation Bootstrap, a daring program of economic reform by which the island was to be transformed from the "poorhouse of the Caribbean," dependent almost entirely upon the cruel vagaries of sugar quotations, into a proud showcase of democracy at work.

Painfully cognizant that only through industrialization could its people realize the American dream of the good life, the island government, through an imaginative program of tax write-offs and other concessions, induced stateside industries to establish parent or branch plants in Puerto Rico. Incidentally, only those firms whose departure from mainland localities would not leave an economic void in those areas were invited; Operation Bootstrap has never been a piratical venture. As a result, the stateside economy has escaped damage while the venturesome businesses have realized, in the main, substantial profits; and the once stricken land has already become a model not only for its Latin American neighbors, but also for underdeveloped areas throughout the world, free and otherwise.

Commonwealth Day is a day for rejoicing by all Americans.

International Labor Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, none of us need be reminded that the problem of human rights and human dignity is one of worldwide proportions. Recently the United States has been fortunate in having an opportunity to show and prove its leadership in support of such rights in a major world forum. I refer to the recent dramatic month-long sessions of the International Labor Organization at Geneva, Switzerland, which took place during June 1963.

As you know, sir, the ILO is the oldest major international organization. It was organized in 1919 as an agency of the League of Nations. The United States has been a member since the 1930's. It survived, almost alone, the collapse of the League and became a human bridge to the United Nations of which it is now an affiliate. Its unique tripartite organization provides direct representation and participation by and for government, workers, and employers.

At the Geneva conference, the United States had a strong 45-man tripartite delegation with an exceptionally able chairman in George L. P. Weaver, our Assistant Secretary of Labor, as leader of the U.S. Government section. He also had the full support of our congressional delegation and of the representatives of organized labor and business, including AFL–CIO President George Meany and former U.S. Chamber of Commerce President Richard Wagner.

During the course of the sessions, the issue of racial discrimination focused on the segregationist racial policy of South Africa. As a result, the African delegates, the workers delegates from almost all of the 108 nations represented at the conference, including President Meany, delegates from Latin America, the Arab bloc, Israel, and Asia, all left the conference session as a protest, while the employers' delegate from South Africa was speaking.

In this crisis and ensuing discussions, the issues of human rights and the right of all parties in a dispute to be heard seemed to be in a conflict. It was through the determined and skillful efforts of another American, David Morse, director general of the ILO that the conference was prevented from breaking up. In essence, our U.S. delegation supported both the right of the South Africans as duly accredited delegates to be heard and the right of the others to protest the South African policy of apartheid. Out of this situation the United States emerged with the respect of the world for our determined support of both the principles of equal rights and the right of democratic due process.

I feel, as many others do, that this most important ILO conference has not received adequate coverage either in our American press or over the air. I wish, therefore, Mr. Speaker, to have included in the Congressional Record at the conclusion of my remarks, a very able series of six articles on the conference by John Herling, the able and highly respected Washington correspondent, who covered the ILO Geneva Conference for the Washington Daily News and the national newspaper syndicate which carries Mr. Herling's syndicated column on labor affairs to other leading American newspapers. I commend Mr. Herling's articles as background for the current discussions on the place of South Africa in the international community and the U.S. policy in connection with it. At the end of Mr. Herling's series, I have included a pertinent question and answer exchange between Mr. Herling and President Kennedy which I feel is most timely and significant:

ILO—One of a Kind

(By John Herling)

Geneva, Switzerland.—The folks back home are probably not aware that some of our leading spokesmen for labor, management, and government are participating here in the 44th annual conference of the International Labor Organization. As the oldest international agency, organized in 1919 as an agency of the League of Nations, the ILO represents the spine of continuity between the old League and the United Nations.

It is one of a kind. It is the only tripartite international organization. This means that the delegation from each country includes representatives of government, employers, and unions. They make up the structural framework of the organization.

For the United States, the ILO has special significance. One of its founders was AFL–CIO President Samuel Gompers. It is headed by an American, David A. Morse. Mr. Morse has been reelected to the post of director general for a series of terms since 1948, when he resigned as President Truman's Under Secretary of Labor. But just as important is the fact that representatives of organized labor and organized business participate as separate but equal delegates in developing the policies and progress of the ILO.

Ever since the United States belatedly joined the ILO in the mid-1930's American labor has moved in ILO activities with considerable energy, while American business went along with varying degrees of enthusiasm. Today, however, the business skepticism of this perennial international exercise has been replaced by keen interest and enthusiasm.

This does not mean that American labor and American business see eye to eye with each other on many specific issues which range widely over the whole field of labor relations, social and economic development. ILO's deliberations crystallize into "conventions" and "recommendations." When such international instruments are adopted by the annual conference of the ILO—a process which moves with all deliberate speed—then they are dispatched to the various nations for approval or for guidance.

As is true of any organization of such scope,. it has undergone a series of shifts and changes arising from the profound transformations in the world. For one thing, when the ILO was first organized the power forces were located largely in Western Europe, the United States, and Japan. Since World War II, the new and developing nations have multiplied to such an extent that the 108 nations affiliated with the ILO—UN membership makes a nation eligible for membership although special application must be made—now bring to the ILO a cross section of their bread and butter as well as related political problems to the ILO.

At this annual conference, for the first time, the ILO has just elected an African as its conference chairman. He is the Nigerian Labor Minister, Joseph Modupe Johnson.

The U.S. delegation is made up of four official delegates: two governmental—Assistant Secretary of Labor George Weaver and Philip Delaney, special assistant to the Secretary of State—one for labor, Rudy Faupl, who also serves as American labor's representative on the ILO governing body, which is the executive body between conferences; and Richard Wagner, chairman of the executive committee of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, who has been an informed and energetic employers' representative since 1960.

Bias Issue Within ILO

(By John Herling)

Geneva, Switzerland.—The issue of racial discrimination, whether in Africa or in the United States, becomes an all-pervading issue of the International Labor Conference. More than 1,500 delegates from 108 nations are attending the ILO conference here.

Chairman of the U.S. Government delegation is George L. P. Weaver, Assistant Secretary of Labor. Mr. Weaver is a Negro. For the first part of the conference, his congressional adviser was Representative Adam Clayton Powell, chairman of the House Labor Committee, one of the most active and controversial spokesmen for the Negro race.

In addition, Harold Snell, U.S. labor attaché at Beirut, Lebanon, and William M. Steen, African specialist at the Labor Department, have joined the delegation as specialists. Both Mr. Steen and Mr. Snell are Negroes.

Thus, out of the 15-man delegation representing the United States (apart from the employer and worker delegations), 4 of the personnel are Negroes. This was not a planned exercise, but a recognition of competence, regardless of color. It is a fact which impresses observers from other nations.

At past conferences, the position of the American Negro was a favorite theme, spun out in all directions by anti-U.S. delegations.

More often than not, the American delegation found itself on the defensive. Not so now.

No sooner had this conference opened when the spokesman for Tanganyika, Secretary of Labor M. M. Kamaliza, attacked the the Governments of South Africa and Portugal for their "outrageous and discriminatory policies."

He then went on to say that his government "is firmly opposed to those governments which practice or permit repressive racial measures. We are against racial discrimination and oppression wherever it may occur, from Sharpeville in the Transvaal to Birmingham, Ala."

Well, there was considerable interest among the ILO delegates in the manner in which U.S. spokesmen would counter this. They soon found out.

In an impressive statement, his first of the conference, Mr. Weaver said: "We support, and indeed have anticipated, the suggested extension of the ILO's concern for individual expression, the right of the individual to petition his government, and, in particular, the right of collective protest.

"Because my country is an open society, and hides nothing, it is no secret that a struggle for basic human rights is now being waged by American Negroes in the last section of the United States where there has been large-scale denial of these rights. In this they are being supported by the overwhelming majority of the American people.

"We are proud," said Mr. Weaver, "of this legitimate effort of the American Negro to accelerate the attainment of the basic rights guaranteed him by the Constitution of the United States. Our country was established on the principles of freedom, justice, and equality of opportunity for all. The inconsistency between the Nation's principles and its practices has diminished over the years."

How was this done?

"Constitutional amendments, court decisions, acts of Congress, executive orders, administrative rulings, State and local legislation, the work of private agencies, trade unions, efforts by Negroes and other minority groups—all of these have helped remove many of the barriers to full citizenship for all," Mr. Weaver said.

America's Face Is Reflected

(By John Herling)

Geneva, Switzerland.—Here at the International Labor Organization, when you move from one committee room to another, or look down from the press gallery at the sessions of the 108-nation meeting, you watch the world's problems under a magnifying glass. And you see America's face in a reflecting mirror of intensive precision.

You realize how much American domestic developments have become the world's business, whether we like it or not. What happens in the United States one afternoon finds its expression the next morning on the agenda of even so well organized a conference as this. It seeps its way in.

Frequently, the spokesmen for the new nations will discuss technical matters with considerable legal sophistication. Suddenly they bitterly turn their comments to the state of their retarded economic development as the heritage of their colonial past. In this way, many of the advanced industrial nations are promptly placed on the defensive.

In such an exercise, the representatives of the Communist countries aid and abet the attack, although it has become increasingly clear that few of the African nations are deceived by the Communist motives. Nevertheless, they take help no matter what the source.

But the tragic news from the United States—the shooting of the NAACP leader in Mississippi, the riots and clashes in one Southern State after another—provide the frame of reference of the discussion for practically every topic on the agenda. For example, several years ago, the ILO passed a "convention"—an international agreement requiring the governmental compliance of member nations—on the subject of discrimination in employment. A discussion on discrimination in employment immediately impels all eyes to turn to the American delegates. An answer is required.

It is given in two ways: the energetic action taken by President Kennedy and the Justice Department are given top billing in the European newspapers which the delegates eagerly examine. The dramatic confrontation between Deputy Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach and Gov. Wallace of Alabama—and the Governor's backing away—brought great satisfaction and relief to many delegates who were as distressed with the shape of events as the Americans themselves.

Secondly, the answer is given directly by the spokesmen for the American delegation. On successive days, Assistant Labor Secretary George Weaver poured it on in an eloquent factual recital of the great advances made against discrimination in and through daily living as well as through legislation. But above all, the obvious hour-by-hour concern expressed in the American press as well as affirmative deeds of the Federal Government carry their persuasive impact.

In such international forums, we see the recording of world public opinion. In the ILO this is especially true because structurally it is made up not only of governmental representatives but of labor and employers. Here the focus of opinion becomes sharper, more articulate, and more intimate. The dialog goes on in the professional vocabulary of the special groupings. The arguments become more specific and are directed toward specific remedies and relevant standards.

Yet, for many of the new countries, the discipline required to stick to the matter at hand sometimes snaps. Despite the growth in maturity and in competence, there comes a time when some delegates of the new nations would rather demonstrate than cogitate, rather yell than think. This happened in a dramatic incident affecting the representatives of South Africa. I'll report on this in my next column.

Incredible Uproar

(By John Herling)

Geneva, Switzerland.—The International Labor Organization is being wracked by a crisis of massive proportions. It is probably the most serious since its beginning when it was a matter of touch and go. It comes at a time when the 44th International Labor Conference was preparing to subject itself to intensive analysis of its program and stood ready to consider the restructuring of its operations and administration. This much was anticipated in the report of the director-general, David Morse, which is the ILO "state of the union" message.

But what was not anticipated was the development of a sustained drive by the African States to take the center of the ILO stage in a way which they have not done in any other international body—in a highly disturbing show of contempt for the processes of the ILO that brings the organization to the brink of possible disaster or of fragmentation.

But it was not the prominence of the African States which caused this crisis. It was their insistence that they would not live in the same organization with the Republic of South Africa. The representatives of black Africa roared their anger at white segregationist South Africa, and then followed it up with the preparation of an ultimatum that either South Africa be expelled, or they, the African states, will walk out of the conference.

In what seemed like a carefully staged demonstration, delegates from the African States unleashed a deafening barrage of rhythmic chants, door poundings, and shouts of "assassins," "criminals," as they sought to prevent the South African employers' delegate, W. F. Hamilton, from speaking. He had been finally granted the floor, after parliamentary moves to prevent this had failed.

By prearrangement, the African delegates, the workers' delegates from practically all 108 nations, and some of the government delegates from Latin America, the Arab bloc, as well as Israel, various Asian delegates, and the Communist bloc—all moved down the aisles to the doors at the end, in open protest against the South African.

AFL–CIO President George Meany joined other leaders of the non-Communist labor organizations in the walkout. It was to have been a strong, silent manifestation of rejection of the apartheid segregationist government of South Africa.

But in a few moments it became clear that the African delegates were not going to leave silently. They clogged the doorways of the hall, and then all hell seemed to break loose. The sustained pandemonium which lasted for about 15 minutes, or as long as the South African spoke, almost wrecked the proceedings of the ILO, which proudly describes itself as the "Grand Assize of international social policy."

The reason for such a demonstration had its origins in places great distances from the conference hall of the Palais des Nations. It was triggered by African bitterness, and powered by an atomic slagheap of frustrations, personal and national, built up over many years. It was fused by a highly emotional and new-found sense of African solidarity.

The incredible uproar was all the more unfortunate because, the day before, the conference delegates, through ILO's tripartite system of electoral colleges, had given wide representation to the new African nations on the 48-man governing body, the key legislative and policy organ of the ILO. But perhaps both the combination of new-found power and the almost primitive need to pour forth this vocal vehemence in the face of the enemy spilled over the bounds of reasonable argument and parliamentary restraint.

Morse's Finest Hour

(By John Herling)

Geneva, Switzerland.—The International Labor Organization has been having the fight of its life, a fight for both survival and the maintenance of its integrity. This three-part organization—government, employer, and labor—has in the past 2 weeks of its annual conference been under the blasting guns of the new African nations, which now number about a third of the total organization, and the old sapping operations of the Communist bloc. For a long time, the Communists have looked on the ILO, despite its frequently slow-paced operations, as a potential challenge. What they can't control, they would rather destroy. This year it became clear that they would be prepared to bury the ILO.

The man, more than any other, who has prevented this, and indeed has led the ILO into new areas of expansion and development, is the director general, David A. Morse, the ILO's director general for the past 15 years.

Dave Morse has occupied a difficult position. As an American, a former Under Secretary of Labor, he has been the target of those who regard him as an instrument of American policy. They could not conceive that he would administer his post with strict adherence to the requirements of international obligations.

As the only American heading up an international agency, Mr. Morse successfully won the confidence of skeptics, which abound even outside the Communist orbit. At the same time, he was subjected to some criticism by Americans, who, pleased with an American as head of this world agency, frequently thought Mr. Morse bent over backward in his efforts to prove his impartiality.

In this conference, the moment of truth for Mr. Morse and the conference arrived on the issue of racial discrimination and, in particular, on the issue of South Africa. Over the recent past, the ILO and Mr. Morse have spent an increasing part of administrative time and budget on the African programs. He sought and arranged for fuller participation by Africa in the ILO, and, indeed it can be said that in the ILO the African nations found a greater sense of ease and confidence.

This whole conference, as one French delegate said, has been a "hymn to Africa." But the increased power and recognition—an African was elected conference president for the first time—finally led them to an effort to prevent a South African delegate, whose right to sit had not as yet been challenged, from speaking.

Out of this came a struggle which wracked the conference. Clearly the issue was not the attitude of ILO toward the extreme apartheid racial policies of South Africa. That had already been made clear. But the Africans insisted that they didn't care about the ILO free speech argument; they wanted South Africa evicted from the premises forthwith. This the ILO would not do. Speaker after speaker passionately inveighed against apartheid but insisted that unless due process of law was observed, the foundations of ILO were endangered.

Finally after unprecedented demonstrations by Africans on and off the floor, and intensive efforts by Mr. Morse to build a bridge of communication to the African delegations, the ILO was confronted with the reality of a full-scale secession on the part of African states, aided and abetted by the Communist and Arab bloc.

Before packed galleries of the Assembly Hall in the Palais des Nations, David Morse rose and gave the speech of his life. Indeed, observers believe it was one of the most memorable in the history of international organizations. Great statements are sometimes made by leaders of national delegations, but seldom by an international official. Only the famous reply of Dag Hammarskjold to Khrushchev's attack can stand comparison. Mr. Morse's immediate efforts to persuade the Africans to reconsider their intention to quit the conference failed. They had apparently gone too far down the path of public—and political—commitment to retreat from their decision.

"We must fight discrimination," said Mr. Morse, "but we must fight it with truth and we must fight it with the dignity that comes from truth." Then with a voice deepened by intense emotion, Mr. Morse, a Jew, told the awed, hushed audience, "You don't have to tell me about racial discrimination: I need no lessons in racial discrimination.

"Racial discrimination is the enemy of the civilized world community, a challenge to world peace, to world order. We must—I pray you—engage this enemy effectively. This cannot be done by quitting the conference, this particular field of battle."

RASCALS AT WORK

(By John Herling)

GENEVA.—The policies of the Soviet Union may now be geared to more peaceful methods. The establishment of a "hot line" between Moscow and Washington may give us all a chance to continue the dialog of clarification. But there is no doubt that, hot line or not, the intentions of the Soviet Union are to give the free world a hotfoot whenever possible. In short, the rascality of the Communist tactics continues by other means.

Evidence of this was clearly established at the dramatic conference of the International Labor Organization just concluded. You will recall that the main issue centered around the whole question of apartheid in South Africa. This was surely an extension of the intense preoccupation of the entire world, including the United States, with the problems of racial tensions and racial discrimination.

When the ILO conference was nearly wrecked by the dramatic walkout of the 32 African nations, the issue, for a moment, seemed blurred. Some said that the ILO's passion for due process was narrow and procedural and that it should not have been too particular about finding even questionable means for throwing the duly accredited delegates of South Africa out of the Palais des Nations.

Now, the decision to hear the South African delegate was unanimously made by the officers' committee of the conference. This group included Sergei Slipchenko, the Soviet Ukrainian, one of the three vice presidents of the conference. It was at the behest of the officers that Rudy Faupl, the highly respected U.S. delegate, another vice president, took the chair. He carried out the ruling to hear the South African.

In the ensuing uproar which accompanied the departure of the 32 protesting African delegations from the ILO conference, the Communists began to get their licks in. In one way or another, they began to sharpen their knives, procedural and ideological, to cut the ILO to ribbons.

Despite Mr. Slipchenko's participation in the ruling, they presumed to act as the voice of the departed Africans—much to the dismay of some African leaders who had remained in Geneva to follow the proceedings, and then to participate in the ILO governing body sessions which follow the conference.

In addition, the Soviet bloc, whose delegates have long been using parliamentary sharpshooting to block the work of international organizations they cannot control, tried to boobytrap the ILO through sheer unadulterated rascality.

For example, they fought against the approval of the ILO budget on the grounds that the departure of the Africans had not been official and therefore the conference was not competent to establish the necessary quorum. When the ILO rejected this poisonous point of order, the Communist bloc tried again.

Since the ILO conference was determined to follow through on its 1961 resolution against South Africa's apartheid it was now ready to act on an "urgency" resolution introduced by the Latin American countries. This calls upon the U.N., the parent body, to take action on South Africa. But none other than Serge Slipchenko, the smiling Soviet spokesman, gave this the knife.

Under the rules of the conference, any "urgency" resolution required the unanimous approval of the conference officers. Mr. Slipchenko in executive session vetoed the antiapartheid resolution. His motives were clear: by preventing the ILO from taking this action again South Africa, the Communists could place the ILO on the defensive on this issue. Which is exactly where the Soviet Union and its allies want it to be.

The obvious duplicity of this action brought full-scale exposure of Soviet skulduggery on the whole South African problem.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that President Kennedy has kept closely in touch with the developments in this area which is of deep concern to all of us.

At the last Presidential news conference on July 17, Mr. Herling asked the President the following question:

> Mr. President, may I ask you, sir, about the recent demonstrations by the African States at the International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva with respect to South Africa? What is our American position with regard to South African participation in the United Nations and many of its agencies?

To this question, the President replied:

> Well, we have condemned the racial policy of South Africa which is inimical, I think, to the future of South Africa as well as repugnant to us. We also do not believe that it is useful to begin to expel nations of the United Nations. I think you have enough pressures on the United Nations. I think these countries ought to stay in the United Nations. The United Nations has every right to express hostility to policies which are pursued, and which are a threat to peace, but it would seem to me unwise to expel nations from the United Nations—because the hand will move, others will come, and the United Nations will be fragmented. I think it [the U.N.] ought to be as broad as possible a coverage but I think we ought to be very clear in our hostility to the concept of racial segregation.

Address by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson Before the Governors' Conference, Miami Beach, July 23, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, addressed the Governors' conference at Miami Beach, Fla., on July 23, 1963. I am sure that all who heard him felt as I did after reading his speech—that he had not only articulated the great questions of our day but that he had added a new dimension of understanding to contribute toward their solution.

The Vice President described us as "moving now with a favoring wind in the world and at home." He admonished the conference to use this advantage now toward the realization of our important national goals. This is sound advice from a seasoned skipper.

The speech is as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, MIAMI BEACH, FLA., JULY 23, 1963

One hundred seventy-six years ago, our Constitution anticipated our many differences of section, State, and philosophy. That Constitution was ordained and established in the faith that those many differences would be overcome in a single will to unite—to unite as Americans, knowing no North, no South, no East, no West; favoring no creed, despising no color, and holding against no individual any condition of his birth or ancestry.

In that same faith, I come to speak tonight—not of those differences among us which will eventually pass, but of that higher unity which will inevitably prevail.

I know it is not the fashion at present in some quarters to speak hopefully or confidently of the future. Despair, despondency and defeatism have their disciples among us. But I cannot accept the proposition that hope is wishful or innocent. It is defeatism that is naive. For this generation of Americans, at this moment in our national history, optimism is the only true realism.

In the world and at home, we are beset with old, difficult, and continuing problems. Old perils remain. Old challenges still confront us. The fact of this year of 1963 is that—both abroad and at home—new breezes have begun to blow and we are sailing now with a favoring wind.

In the world, this year of 1963 is developing as a year of unusual portent and significance. For the first time since the beginning of the cold war, there are omens of change in the climate between East and West.

New forces are at work behind the Iron Curtain.

Profound changes are developing in relations among members of the Communist bloc.

New attitudes toward dealings with the West are being manifested by the principal nation of the Communist bloc.

On the basis of present evidence, no man can responsibly imply that the millennium is at hand in relations between East and West or in the success of freedom's cause. But no responsible man will insist that we keep the door closed against the opportunities which seem to be opening. It is a tragic perversion of American leadership—and a betrayal of American character—to ask the people to greet with suspicion any talk of peace and to greet with applause all talk of war.

We sit honorably at the negotiating tables today instead of standing anxiously at the nuclear brink not because we have accommodated the adversaries of our system, but because we have refused to accommodate them—in Greece and Turkey, in Iran and Italy, in Western Europe and West Berlin, South Korea and South Vietnam. Communism's designs have been repulsed in the Middle East, rejected in Africa, repelled in southeast Asia, and forced into retreat from Latin America. Of the six guerrilla wars launched by communism, five have ended in defeat of Communist forces and, in the sixth, American support is turning the tide in Vietnam.

Communism's one desperate effort last October to escape the ring of containment by establishing missile bases in this hemisphere ended in an historic retreat—a retreat which history may mark as the vital turning point of the entire cold war.

Furthermore, let it not be forgotten that, since the start of the cold war, more than 50 new nations have come into being—and not one has chosen communism. But many have adopted as their own the concepts and forms, and even the language, of our own constitutional system.

In the world of today, we must recognize that the winds and the waves are with us. This is the time for us to steer straight and true toward the horizons we have for so long hoped to reach.

But we should also recognize that favoring winds are rising at home. Our record in space is a prime example. We started late. We moved too slowly at first.

But the record shows now that where the Soviet Union has successfully launched 43 payloads into orbit, the United States has launched 144.

Our ratio of successes to failures in launchings prior to 1961 was only 1 to 1—but it has now reached the ratio of 5 to 1.

The Soviet continues its lead in the ability to launch heavier weights into space. But we are pulling far ahead in developing practical uses of space with weather, communication, and navigation satellites.

We are not racing for prestige in space. We are engaged in a deadly serious race for peace—and for control of our own destiny. This is a race freemen must win.

As we act to grow stronger in space, we are also acting to grow stronger on earth.

Since January 1961 we have increased—

Our nuclear warheads in the strategic alert forces by 100 percent.

Our ship construction and conversion to modernize the fleet by 100 percent.

Our special forces trained to deal with threats of guerrilla warfare by 200 percent.

Our airlift capability by 60 percent.

Our number of combat-ready Army divisions by 45 percent.

Our number of tactical air squadrons by 30 percent.

We have increased the muscle of our defenses while trimming away the fat. During the fiscal year of 1963, savings of more than $1 billion were realized in the Defense Department through improvements in operating efficiency. As these improvements continue to take effect, we can look forward to savings by 1967 of nearly $4 billion a year.

Achievements such as these are coming on impressively. But in our domestic economy, too, the favoring winds are blowing briskly.

Since January 1961 our gross national product has risen from $500 billion to $589 billion, up 16 percent. Personal income has risen from $400 billion to a record annual rate last month of $462 billion, up 15 percent.

Corporation profits are up from $39 billion to $53 billion, a gain of 36 percent.

Employment has for the first time in the history of the Nation passed 70 million jobs.

Average weekly wages for factory workers have for the first time in the history of the Nation passed $100.

Farm income last year was up more than $1 billion over 1960, a gain of 11 percent.

This economic expansion has come with consumer prices holding comparatively stable while wholesale prices and industrial prices have actually declined. Moreover, as a consequence of this expansion, the flow of revenue to the Treasury has increased so that the cash deficit for the last fiscal year is only half as large as estimated 6 months ago.

What does this mean for us?

I believe the answer is self-evident.

Now, while the favoring winds are with us, we should be doing those difficult things which responsibility demands that we do to perfect our system.

That list is long. Many of the items upon it are old: education, unemployment, medicare for the aged, retraining of displaced workers, redevelopment of depressed regions, renewal of blighted cities, revitalizing the family farms, conserving our forest and soil, developing our water resources, curing the problems of mass transit, overcoming the congestion of our city streets.

America is not a nation with its work all done.

America is a nation in which much of the most vital work has not yet begun.

The demands of the future press down upon us.

Every day, our population over 65 increases by 1,000.

Every day, our population of 16 year olds increases by 3,000.

Every day, our school-age population grows by nearly 5,000.

Every day, our need for new jobs increases by more than 7,000.

If we are to meet the human needs and the humane obligations of our future, we must move today—while the winds are favoring us—to stimulate our economy, reduce our excessive tax rate, that in some cases is practically confiscatory, overcome the drain on our balance of payments, and restore our national fiscal house to order.

But we remember at all times that governments are not instituted among freemen merely to make budgets and balance them or levy taxes and collect them.

If we are to meet the tests of our future, our foremost challenge is to face and dispose of the problem of human rights which has burdened and compromised our society for 100 years—the problem of the inequality of our Negro citizens.

In saying this, I could not be more aware than I am of the many views of the question represented by this audience—or, in turn, by the people each of you represents.

To some, the issue is human rights.

To others, it is property rights.

Some say Negro rights. Others say white rights.

Some say States rights. Others say moral rights.

The descriptions vary. Slogans are many.

But let us strip away the slogans, the descriptions, the cliches and labels. What is it that we must do? We must attack the wrongs in our society—not the rights.

Whatever the legalisms or traditions, it is wrong that taxpaying, arms-bearing, vote-casting Americans should be unable to find a bed for the night or meals for their children along the highways of our free and decent society. Whatever the reasons, it is wrong that Americans who fight alongside other Americans in war should not be able to work alongside the same Americans, wash up alongside them, eat alongside them, win promotions alongside them, or send their children to sit in schools alongside children of other Americans.

I know of no valid right in our system which is jeopardized or compromised or weakened by correcting the wrongs which we know exist among us. On the other hand, I would suggest that the human rights and property rights of all of us will be strengthened and protected by ending the corrosion of these wrongs.

When I first entered the Senate, Arizona's Senator CARL HAYDEN told me there were two kinds of public officials: show horses and workhorses, talkers and doers.

This question will be answered by the workhorses and by the doers, by those who remove the beam from their own eye before concerning themselves with the mote—or the beam—in the eye of others.

This is not a regional problem, but a national problem.

Men who were denied the right to work last week on a Harlem hospital being built with public funds can understand the plight of their brother in a Birmingham cafe. Discrimination is not confined to the smaller community of Danville, but infects metropolitan Philadelphia as well. The problem is in Brooklyn and Baltimore, in Charleston and Chicago, in San Antonio and Santa Fe.

In the room in the White House where Jane Adams hung out her wash, the President has talked with labor leaders and businessmen; with Governors and mayors; with editors and women leaders; with educators and Negro leaders. No President in my 30 years of life in Washington has met with so many Governors as has President Kennedy in his search for a solution to the civil rights problem.

Among the people, there is a will to resolve this issue—not prolong it. It is especially noteworthy that throughout the Nation—especially in some of the most difficult States and cities—newspapermen from editors to deskmen are showing the highest order of responsibility and constructiveness.

Americans such as these are doing the workhorse jobs. They are getting results—

quietly but effectively. Two hundred of the five hundred largest cities in the Southern and border States—nearly half of them—have taken affirmative action on local public accommodations problems. Right here in Miami, outstanding progress has been made in a short time by the efforts of ministers and medical society members and department store owners and county commissioners and union leaders.

The trust of public leaders will not be kept by exploiting the issue for partisan ends or discouraging its resolution for personal advantage.

American politics must not be less responsible than the electorate it serves. There can be no Democratic answer or Republican answer, no White House answer or State House answer, no 1964 answer or 1968 answer—but only a responsible American answer achieved by all of us, at all levels, working together all of the time for and with the people.

Let us all recognize this one thing: While the Negro has long been the object of studied neglect, many of the conditions he protests today are blind to color. If the Negro is now the first victim, he will not be the last if we fail to cure the ills within our society—of underemployment, undereducation, underdevelopment of our potential, underuse of our productive capacity.

We are moving now with a favoring wind behind us—in the world and at home. If we are to resolve these problems within our society, we must act now before those winds fall—or change to blow against us.

In response to the challenge before our Nation now, some say "Now"—others say "Never." But the clear response of the American majority is "Together"—together, for there is no other way.

SENATE

Monday, July 29, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord and Master of us all, whatever our name or sign, before we plunge into the baffling confusion and thorny problems within the walls of this Chamber drenched with history, here at the hearthstone of Thy mercy we would renew our inner strength, for collectively and individually we stand in need of courage and fortitude and stability.

We come to Thee, soiled by the world's common life, with all its delusive allurement, and in dire need of Thy cleansing grace.

In preparation for the weighty responsibilities Thy servants here must face in this and the coming weeks, may they be stripped of pride and made humbly receptive to Thy will.

May the temporary triumph of party and the transient success of our individual desires be surrendered to the true welfare of the Commonwealth.

As we thus pray at noontide of this new day, come down Thine own secret stairway to our own deepest needs, as we open our hearts to Thee. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 25, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 25, 1963, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 582) to extend for 2 years the definition of peanuts which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Breskin, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1122. An act relating to the exchange of certain lands between the town of Powell, Wyo., and the Presbyterian Retirement Facilities Corp.;

H.R. 2221. An act to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.;

H.R. 2675. An act to extend for 3 years the period during which certain tanning extracts, and extracts of hemlock or eucalyptus suitable for use for tanning, may be imported free of duty;

H.R. 3272. An act to provide for the free entry of an orthicon image assembly for the use of the Medical College of Georgia, Augusta, Ga.;

H.R. 3674. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that polished sheets and plates of iron or steel shall be subject to the same duty as unpolished sheets and plates;

H.R. 5712. An act to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid; and

H.R. 6011. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle or Tampico fiber.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Property Acquisitions of Emergency Supplies and Equipment

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment, for the quarter ended June 30, 1963; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Officers Assigned to Permanent Duty in the Executive Element of the Air Force at the Seat of Government

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that as of June 30, 1963, there was an aggregate of 2,192 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment of Title 10, United States Code, To Provide for Establishment and Maintenance of a Reserve Officers' Training Corps

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a Reserve Officers' Training Corps (2-year program), and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amortization of Certain Fixed Assets of Panama Canal Company

A letter from the President, Panama Canal Company, Balboa Heights, Canal Zone, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the amortization of fixed assets of the Panama Canal Company that are classified as nondepreciable (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment of Section 24 of Federal Reserve Act, Relating to Certain Limitations on Real Estate Loans by National Banks

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371) relating to certain limitations on real estate loans by national banks (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report Entitled "Oceanography: The 10 Years Ahead"

A letter from the Director, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Oceanography: The 10 Years Ahead" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Board of Visitors to U.S. Coast Guard Academy

A letter from the Chairman of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board's visit to the Academy, dated April 26, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Research Cruise of Research Vessel "Chain" to the Equatorial Atlantic and Caribbean

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the research cruise of the research vessel *Chain* to the equatorial Atlantic and Caribbean, during the period January 1 to June 30, 1963; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Refugee-Escapees

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, reporting, pursuant to law, on refugee-escapees, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1963; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Adjustment of Salary Schedules

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of an additional section, to be added to a proposed draft of legislation for adjusting statutory salary schedules, transmitted under the date of May 16, 1963 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Amendment of Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act, as amended, with regard to filing designation of beneficiary (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Resolution —

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation consenting to the northeastern water and related land resources compact

"Whereas the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact provides a means for coordinated planning of resource development in New England with consequent benefit to the people of the region; and

"Whereas the compact has been entered into and enacted into law by the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Rhode Island and requires only approval by the Congress to become effective: Now, therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact pending legislation consenting to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Senate, adopted, July 15, 1963.

"Thomas A. Chadwick,
"*Clerk.*

"House of Representatives, adopted in concurrence, July 17, 1963.

"William C. Maiers,
"*Clerk.*

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Resolution 20

"*Resolved (the Senate concurring)*, That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to support and enact appropriate legislation to incorporate or charter the organization known as the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officer of each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution adopted by the Board of Stewards of the First Methodist Church of Coral Gables, Fla., favoring an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for Bible reading and prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Stephen K. Bailey, and 42 other members of the Maxwell Graduate Faculty of Syracuse University, of Syracuse, N.Y., relating to pending civil rights legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the mayor and council of the Borough of Lavallettee, N.J., favoring the enactment of House bill 2585, requesting the Administration of Veterans Affairs to construct a new veterans' hospital in the southern part of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of June 1963. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the Record together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Federal Personnel in Executive Branch, June 1963 and May 1963, and Pay, May 1963 and April 1963

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for June 1963 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In June numbered—	In May numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In May was—	In April was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,509,028	2,491,848	+17,180	$1,363,047	$1,310,613	$52,434
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,459,004	1,437,535	+21,469	776,506	750,107	26,399
Department of Defense	1,050,024	1,054,313	−4,289	586,541	560,506	26,035
Inside the United States	2,346,255	2,322,809	−23,446			
Outside the United States	162,773	169,039	−6,266			
Industrial employment	564,887	561,345	+3,542			
Foreign nationals	163,617	164,665	−1,048	27,612	28,017	−405

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

Table I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during June 1963, and comparison with May 1963; and pay for May 1963, and comparison with April 1963*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	June	May	Increase	Decrease	May	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	115,115	105,985	9,130		$54,675	$50,340	$4,335	
Commerce	32,358	30,971	1,387		20,443	20,227	216	
Health, Education, and Welfare	81,063	78,564	2,499		43,054	41,342	1,712	
Interior	72,549	[1] 70,413	2,136		39,113	[1] 36,469	2,644	
Justice	32,081	31,649	432		22,043	21,124	919	
Labor	9,581	9,247	334		5,806	5,689	117	
Post Office	587,161	584,217	2,944		287,938	284,221	3,717	
State [2] [3]	42,428	42,018	410		22,854	21,718	1,136	
Treasury	86,579	88,082		1,503	54,536	52,930	1,606	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during June 1963, and comparison with May 1963; and pay for May 1963, and comparison with April 1963*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	June	May	Increase	Decrease	May	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	388	375	13		$284	$260	$24	
Bureau of the Budget	514	477	37		445	397	48	
Council of Economic Advisers	61	42	19		38	32	6	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	77	75	2		48	37	11	
National Aeronautics and Space Council	30	29	1		27	27		
National Security Council	39	39			35	34	1	
Office of Emergency Planning	477	439	38		391	366	25	
Office of Science and Technology	68	46	22		32	32		
President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation	10	16		6	3	3		
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	36	33	3		24	23	1	
American Battle Monuments Commission	422	421	1		92	85	7	
Atomic Energy Commission	7,121	7,038	83		5,651	5,388	263	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	622	606	16		428	405	23	
Civil Aeronautics Board	851	827	24		683	649	34	
Civil Service Commission	4,085	4,040	45		2,675	2,571	104	
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5			4	5		$1
Commission of Fine Arts	7	7			6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	79	74	5		53	53		
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2			3	2	1	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	300	287	13		257	203	54	
Farm Credit Administration	238	238			183	187		4
Federal Aviation Agency	46,337	45,949	388		33,150	31,101	2,049	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			5	5		
Federal Communications Commission	1,515	1,416	99		1,067	1,022	45	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,236	1,252		16	868	819	49	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,252	1,231	21		883	842	41	
Federal Maritime Commission	251	238	13		188	175	13	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	398	390	8		366	347	19	
Federal Power Commission	1,218	1,127	91		860	831	29	
Federal Trade Commission	1,177	1,147	30		881	832	49	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	144	132	12		78	66	12	
General Accounting Office	4,647	4,504	143		3,157	3,019	138	
General Services Administration	32,652	32,212	440		16,745	15,421	1,324	
Government Printing Office	7,214	7,136	78		4,524	4,261	263	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	14,160	13,991	169		9,427	8,847	580	
Indian Claims Commission	21	21			21	21		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,427	2,384	43		1,767	1,696	71	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	29,937	28,013	1,924		22,888	23,662		774
National Capital Housing Authority	453	455		2	219	210	9	
National Capital Planning Commission	69	63	6		41	43		2
National Capital Transportation Agency	86	81	5		62	61	1	
National Gallery of Art	315	308	7		148	140	8	
National Labor Relations Board	1,982	1,987		5	1,498	1,430	68	
National Mediation Board	143	140	3		130	114	16	
National Science Foundation	1,099	961	138		690	631	59	
Panama Canal	14,966	15,036		70	5,144	5,166		22
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	56	52	4		38	35	3	
Railroad Retirement Board	1,995	1,964	31		1,173	1,120	53	
Renegotiation Board	223	211	12		191	182	9	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	163	165		2	104	104		
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,388	1,367	21		1,005	967	38	
Selective Service System	6,916	6,933		17	2,369	2,254	115	
Small Business Administration	3,387	3,266	121		2,272	2,161	111	
Smithsonian Institution	1,615	1,440	175		786	732	54	
Soldiers' Home	1,073	1,085		12	372	352	20	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	20	27		7	22	22		
Subversive Activities Control Board	25	26		1	22	22		
Tariff Commission	288	267	21		212	205	7	
Tax Court of the United States	157	154	3		127	123	4	
Tennessee Valley Authority	18,075	17,979	96		11,533	11,253	280	
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	153	139	14		145	105	40	
U.S. Information Agency	11,793	11,691	102		5,334	5,249	85	
Veterans' Administration	172,903	173,139		236	83,976	79,430	4,546	
Virgin Islands Corporation	721	1,187		466	194	204		10
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,459,004	1,437,535	23,812	2,343	776,506	750,107	27,212	813
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			21,469				$26,399	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,247	2,190	57		1,805	1,737	68	
Department of the Army	375,933	379,092		3,159	203,023	195,009	8,014	
Department of the Navy	343,971	341,999	1,972		200,583	190,779	9,804	
Department of the Air Force	296,982	299,942		2,960	164,554	156,897	7,657	
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,006	2,018		12	1,072	1,015	57	
Defense Communications Agency	572	567	5		293	369		76
Defense Supply Agency	25,032	25,314		282	13,106	12,721	385	
Office of Civil Defense	1,133	1,058	75		920	867	53	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	39	40		1	36	36		
Interdepartmental activities	12	14		2	9	9		
International military activities	59	59			41	44		3
Armed Forces information and education activities	421	422		1	228	216	12	
Classified activities	1,617	1,598	19		871	807	64	
Total Department of Defense	1,050,024	1,054,313	2,128	6,417	586,541	560,506	26,114	79
Net change, Department of Defense			4,289				$26,035	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [4] [5]	2,509,028	2,491,848	25,940	8,760	1,363,047	1,310,613	53,326	892
Net increase, including Department of Defense			17,180				$52,434	

---

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

[2] June figure includes 16,782 employees of the Agency for International Development, as compared with 16,690 in May and their pay. These AID figures include employees paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The June figure includes 4,689 of these trust fund employees and the May figure includes 4,232.

[3] June figure includes 1,121 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 1,038 in May and their pay.

[4] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

[5] Includes employment by Federal agencies under the Public Works Acceleration Act (Public Law 87-658) as follows:

Agency	June	May	Change
Agriculture Department	3,291	5,268	−1,977
Interior Department	3,681	7,365	−3,684
Tennessee Valley Authority	158	148	+10
Veterans' Administration	39	144	−105
Department of the Army	242	642	−400
Total	−7,411	13,567	−6,156

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during June 1963, and comparison with May 1963*

Department or agency	June	May	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	113,921	104,643	9,278	
Commerce	31,692	30,311	1,381	
Health, Education, and Welfare	80,439	77,957	2,482	
Interior	72,028	[1] 69,818	2,210	
Justice	31,723	31,294	429	
Labor	9,478	9,137	341	
Post Office	585,710	582,756	2,954	
State [2,3]	10,868	10,651	217	
Treasury	85,949	87,453		1,504
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	388	375	13	
Bureau of the Budget	514	477	37	
Council of Economic Advisers	61	42	19	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	77	75	2	
National Aeronautics and Space Council	30	29	1	
National Security Council	39	39		
Office of Emergency Planning	477	439	38	
Office of Science and Technology	68	46	22	
President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation	10	16		6
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	36	33	3	
American Battle Monuments Commission	6	6		
Atomic Energy Commission	7,088	7,006	82	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	622	606	16	
Civil Aeronautics Board	850	826	24	
Civil Service Commission	4,081	4,036	45	
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5		
Commission of Fine Arts	7	7		
Commission on Civil Rights	79	74	5	
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	300	287	13	
Farm Credit Administration	238	238		
Federal Aviation Agency	45,289	44,906	383	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7		
Federal Communications Commission	1,513	1,414	99	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,234	1,250		16
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,252	1,231	21	
Federal Maritime Commission	251	238	13	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	398	390	8	
Federal Power Commission	1,218	1,127	91	
Federal Trade Commission	1,177	1,147	30	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	100	90	10	
General Accounting Office	4 551	4,415	136	
General Services Administration	32,639	32,199	440	
Government Printing Office	7,214	7,136	78	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,970	13,801	169	
Indian Claims Commission	21	21		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,427	2,384	43	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	29,926	28,002	1,924	
National Capital Housing Authority	453	455		2
American Battle Monuments, etc.—Con.				
National Capital Planning Commission	69	63	6	
National Capital Transportation Agency	86	81	5	
National Gallery of Art	315	308	7	
National Labor Relations Board	1,949	1,954		5
National Mediation Board	143	140	3	
National Science Foundation	1,085	947	138	
Panama Canal	169	166	3	
President's Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity	56	52	4	
Railroad Retirement Board	1,995	1,964	31	
Renegotiation Board	223	211	12	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	163	165		2
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,388	1,367	21	
Selective Service System	6,765	6,781		16
Small Business Administration	3,331	3,210	121	
Smithsonian Institution	1,598	1,423	175	
Soldiers' Home	1,073	1,085		12
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	20	27		7
Subversive Activities Control Board	25	26		1
Tariff Commission	288	267	21	
Tax Court of the United States	157	154	3	
Tennessee Valley Authority	18,074	17,978	96	
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	153	139	14	
U.S. Information Agency	3,304	3,236	68	
Veterans' Administration	171,910	172,143		233
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,394,765	1,372,784	23,785	1,804
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			26,981	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,183	2,124	59	
Department of the Army	327,072	327,223		151
Department of the Navy	319,686	317,511	2,175	
Department of the Air Force	271,706	272,129		423
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,006	2,018		12
Defense Communications Agency	546	537	9	
Defense Supply Agency	25,032	25,314		282
Office of Civil Defense	1,133	1,058	75	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	39	40		1
Interdepartmental activities	11	13		2
International military activities	38	38		
Armed Forces information and education activities	421	422		1
Classified activities	1,617	1,598	19	
Total, Department of Defense	951,490	950,025	2,337	872
Net increase, Department of Defense			1,465	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,346,255	2,322,809	26,122	2,676
Net increase, including Department of Defense			23,446	

---

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

[2] June figure includes 2,731 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 2,740 in May.

[3] June figure includes 758 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 681 in May.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during June 1963, and comparison with May 1963*

Department or agency	June	May	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,194	1,342		148
Commerce	666	660	6	
Health, Education, and Welfare	624	607	17	
Interior	521	595		74
Justice	358	355	3	
Labor	103	110		7
Post Office	1,451	1,461		10
State [1,2]	31,560	31,367	193	
Treasury	630	629	1	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	416	415	1	
Atomic Energy Commission	33	32	1	
Civil Aeronautics Board	1	1		
Civil Service Commission	4	4		
Federal Aviation Agency	1,048	1,043	5	
Federal Communications Commission	2	2		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	44	42	2	
General Accounting Office	96	89	7	
General Services Administration	13	13		
Housing and Home Finance Agency	190	190		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	11	11		
National Labor Relations Board	33	33		
National Science Foundation	14	14		
Panama Canal	14,797	14,870		73
Selective Service System	151	152		1
Independent agencies—Continued				
Small Business Administration	56	56		
Smithsonian Institution	17	17		
Tennessee Valley Authority	1	1		
U.S. Information Agency	8,489	8,455	34	
Veterans' Administration	993	996		3
Virgin Islands Corporation	721	1,187		466
Total, excluding Department of Defense	64,239	64,751	270	782
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			512	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	64	66		2
Department of the Army	48,861	51,869		3,008
Department of the Navy	24,285	24,488		203
Department of the Air Force	25,276	27,813		2,537
Defense Communications Agency	26	30		4
Interdepartmental Activities	1	1		
International Military Activities	21	21		
Total, Department of Defense	98,534	104,288		5,754
Net decrease, Department of Defense			5,754	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	162,773	169,039	270	6,536
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			6,266	

---

[1] June figure includes 14,051 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 13,950 in May. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The June figure includes 4,689 of these trust fund employees and the May figure includes 4,232.

[2] June figure includes 363 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 357 in May.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during June 1963, and comparison with May 1963*

Department or agency	June	May	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,951	3,851	100	
Commerce	5,858	5,568	290	
Interior	9,532	8,748	784	
Post Office	257	254	3	
Treasury	5,194	5,187	7	
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	276	256	20	
Federal Aviation Agency	3,037	3,060		23
General Services Administration	1,721	1,740		19
Government Printing Office	7,214	7,136	78	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	29,937	28,013	1,924	
Panama Canal	7,466	7,589		123
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	162	159	3	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,805	14,800	5	
Virgin Islands Corporation	721	1,187		466
Total, excluding Department of Defense	90,131	87,548	3,214	631
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			2,583	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 137,987	[2] 137,883	104	
Outside the United States	[1] 4,394	[2] 4,665		271
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	197,513	195,446	2,067	
Outside the United States	1,271	1,285		14
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	130,640	131,556		916
Outside the United States	1,130	1,120	10	
Defense Supply Agency:				
Inside the United States	1,821	1,842		21
Total, Department of Defense	474,756	473,797	2,181	1,222
Net increase, Department of Defense			959	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	564,887	561,345	5,395	1,853
Net increase, including Department of Defense			3,542	

---

[1] Subject to revision.
[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of June 1963, and comparison with May 1963*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	June	May	June	May	June	May	June	May
Canada	35	33					35	33
Crete	63	62					63	62
England	2,990	3,031			123	115	2,867	2,916
France	21,260	20,932	17,550	17,571	11	11	3,699	3,350
Germany	79,262	80,075	67,179	67,828	85	86	11,998	12,161
Greece	250	250					250	250
Japan	51,306	51,513	18,220	18,391	14,553	14,468	18,533	18,654
Korea	6,202	6,206	6,202	6,206				
Morocco	1,642	1,958			751	753	891	1,205
Netherlands	52	52					52	52
Trinidad	555	553			555	553		
Total	163,617	164,665	109,151	109,996	16,078	15,986	38,388	38,683

STATEMENT OF SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

THE MONTH OF JUNE 1963

Civilian employees

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of June totaling 2,509,028 compared with 2,491,848 in May. This was a net increase of 17,180 including a net decrease of 6,156 in temporary employment under the public works acceleration program authorized by Public Law 87-658.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1963, which began July 1, 1962, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July 1962	2,510,950	14,455	
August	2,512,199	1,249	
September	2,485,324		26,875
October	2,482,982		2,342
November	2,498,312	15,330	
December	2,486,628		11,684
January 1963	2,477,940		8,688
February	2,483,511	5,571	
March	2,485,738	2,227	
April	2,495,347	9,609	
May	2,491,848		3,499
June	2,509,028	17,180	

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of June was 1,459,004, an increase of 21,469 as compared with the May total of 1,437,535. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in June was 1,050,024, a decrease of 4,289 as compared with 1,054,313 in May.

Civilian agencies reporting larger increases were Agriculture Department with 9,130, Post Office Department with 2,944, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with 2,499, Interior Department with 2,136, National Aeronautics and Space Administration with 1,924, and Commerce Department with 1,387. The largest decrease was reported by Treasury Department with 1,503. Agriculture, Interior, and Treasury Department changes were largely seasonal.

In the Department of Defense the largest increase in civilian employment was reported by the Navy Department with 1,972. The largest decreases were reported by the Army Department with 3,159 and the Air Force Department with 2,960.

Inside the United States, civilian employment increased 23,446, and outside the United States, civilian employment decreased 6,266. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in June totaled 564,887, an increase of 3,542.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

Foreign nationals

The total of 2,509,028 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 163,617 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies during June who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in May was 164,655. A breakdown of this employment for June follows:

Foreign nationals

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Canada	35			35
Crete	63			63
England	2,990		123	2,867
France	21,260	17,550	11	3,699
Germany	79,262	67,179	85	11,998
Greece	250			250
Japan	51,306	18,220	14,553	18,533
Korea	6,202	6,202		
Morocco	1,642		751	891
Netherlands	52			52
Trinidad	555		555	
Total	163,617	109,151	16,078	38,388

SUMMARY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1963, ENDED JUNE 30, 1963

There was a net increase of 12,533 in civilian employment by executive branch agencies of the Federal Government during fiscal year 1963 which ended June 30, 1963. The total at the end of the year was 2,509,028 as compared with 2,496,495 in June 1962.

Civilian and military agencies

There was an increase during the year of 32,115 in employment by civilian agencies of the Government, and a decrease of 19,582 in civilian employment by military agencies. Employment by civilian agencies at the year-end totaled 1,459,004 as compared with 1,426,889 a year ago. Civilian employment by military agencies totaled 1,050,024 as compared with 1,069,606 in June 1962.

Inside and outside the United States

There was an increase of 10,283 in employment within the United States by Federal executive agencies, and an increase of 2,250 in employment outside the United States. Employment inside the United States as of June 30, 1963, totaled 2,346,255 as compared with 2,335,972 a year ago. Employment outside the United States as of June 30, 1963, totaled 162,773 as compared with 160,523 a year ago.

Employment for the year is summarized as follows:

Federal civilian employment, June 1962–June 1963

	June 1962	June 1963	Increase or decrease
Total	2,496,495	2,509,028	+12,533
Civilian agencies	1,426,889	1,459,004	+32,115
Military agencies	1,069,606	1,050,024	−19,582
Inside the United States	2,335,972	2,346,255	+10,283
Outside the United States	160,523	162,773	+2,250

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal stockpile inventories as of May 1963. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES, MAY 1963

INTRODUCTION

This is the 42d in a series of monthly reports on Federal stockpile inventories. It is for the month of May 1963.

The report is compiled from official data on quantities and cost value of commodities in these stockpiles submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare, Interior, and the General Services Administration.

The cost value of materials in inventories covered in this report, as of May 1, 1963, totaled $14,281,659,162, and as of May 31, 1963, they totaled $14,199,994,358, a net decrease of $81,664,804 during the month.

Different units of measure make it impossible to summarize the quantities of commodities and materials which are shown in tables 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, but the cost value figures are summarized by major category, as follows:

Summary of cost value of stockpile inventories by major category

Major category	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month
Strategic and critical materials:			
National stockpile [1]	$5,848,005,200	$5,838,070,100	−$9,935,100
Defense Production Act	1,500,918,000	1,500,410,200	−507,800
Supplemental-barter	1,327,935,503	1,331,724,514	+3,789,011
Total, strategic and critical materials [1]	8,676,858,703	8,670,204,814	−6,653,889
Agricultural commodities:			
Price support inventory	5,154,449,936	5,078,707,963	−75,741,973
Inventory transferred from national stockpile [1]	127,659,288	127,608,991	−50,297
Total, agricultural commodities [1]	5,282,109,224	5,206,316,954	−75,792,270
Civil defense supplies and equipment:			
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense	35,929,985	36,515,880	+585,895
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	184,878,436	185,856,386	+977,950
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment	220,808,421	222,372,266	+1,563,845
Machine tools:			
Defense Production Act	2,208,900	2,208,600	−300
National Industrial Reserve Act	93,224,500	91,807,300	−1,417,200
Total, machine tools	95,433,400	94,015,900	−1,417,500
Helium	6,449,414	7,084,424	+635,010
Total, all inventories	14,281,659,162	14,199,994,358	−81,664,804

[1] Cotton inventory valued at $128,409,100 withdrawn from the national stockpile and transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation for disposal, pursuant to Public Law 87-548, during August 1962.

Detailed tables in this report show each commodity, by the major categories summarized above, in terms of quantity and cost value as of the beginning and end of the month. Net change figures reflect acquisitions, disposals, and accounting and other adjustments during the month.

The cost value figures represent generally the original acquisition cost of the commodities delivered to permanent storage locations, together with certain packaging, processing, upgrading, et cetera, costs as carried in agency inventory accounts. Quantities are stated in the designated stockpile unit of measure.

The appendix to this report includes program descriptions and statutory citations pertinent to each stockpile inventory within the major categories.

The stockpile inventories covered by the report are tabulated in detail as follows.

Table 1: Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), May 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month).

Table 2: Agricultural commodities inventories, May 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 3: Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, May 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 4: Machine tools inventories, May 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 5: Helium inventories, May 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), May 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Aluminum, metal:									
National stockpile	$487,680,600	$487,680,600		Short ton	1,128,989	1,128,989			
Defense Production Act	435,153,900	436,195,600	+$1,041,700	do	861,311	863,515	+2,204		
Total	922,834,500	923,876,200	+1,041,700	do	1,990,300	1,992,504	+2,204	1,200,000	792,504
Aluminum oxide, abrasive grain: Supplemental—barter	11,261,236	12,548,141	+1,286,905	do	37,697	42,033	+4,336	(²)	42,033
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude:									
National stockpile	21,735,100	21,735,100		Short dry ton	200,093	200,093			
Supplemental—barter	22,747,400	22,747,400		do	178,266	178,266			
Total	44,482,500	44,482,500		do	378,359	378,359		200,000	178,359
Antimony:									
National stockpile	20,488,000	20,488,000		Short ton	30,301	30,301			
Supplemental—barter	11,524,168	11,775,508	+251,340	do	19,947	20,387	+440		
Total	32,012,168	32,263,508	+251,340	do	50,248	50,688	+440	70,000	(³)

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), May 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Asbestos, amosite:									
National stockpile	$2,637,600	$2,637,600		Short ton	11,705	11,705			
Supplemental—barter	5,924,830	5,924,711	−$119	do	23,662	23,662			
Total	8,562,430	8,562,311	−119	do	35,367	35,367		45,000	(2)
Asbestos, chrysotile:									
National stockpile	3,356,200	3,356,200		Short dry ton	6,224	6,224			
Defense Production Act	2,102,600	2,102,600		do	2,348	2,348			
Supplemental—barter	3,934,500	3,934,500		do	5,532	5,532			
Total	9,393,300	9,393,300		do	14,104	14,104		11,000	3,104
Asbestos, crocidolite:									
National stockpile	702,100	702,100		Short ton	1,567	1,567			
Supplemental—barter	6,727,635	6,727,616	−19	do	25,055	25,055			
Total	7,429,735	7,429,716	−19	do	26,622	26,622		(2)	26,622
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type:									
National stockpile	13,925,000	13,925,000		Long dry ton	879,740	879,740			
Defense Production Act	18,168,000	18,168,000		do	1,370,077	1,370,077			
Supplemental—barter	87,724,621	88,179,044	+454,423	do	5,667,614	5,698,306	+30,692		
Total	119,817,621	120,272,044	+454,423	do	7,917,431	7,948,123	+30,692	2,600,000	5,348,123
Bauxite, metal grade, Surinam type:									
National stockpile	78,559,800	78,552,500	−7,300	do	4,962,851	4,962,706	−145		
Supplemental—barter	45,365,900	45,365,900		do	2,927,260	2,927,260			
Total	123,925,700	123,918,400	−7,300	do	7,890,111	7,889,966	−145	6,400,000	1,489,966
Bauxite, refractory grade:									
National stockpile	11,347,800	11,347,800		Long calcined ton.	299,279	299,279		137,000	162,279
Beryl:									
National stockpile	9,770,200	9,770,200		Short ton	23,233	23,233			
Defense Production Act	1,425,800	1,425,800		do	2,543	2,543			
Supplemental—barter	22,739,500	28,633,100	+5,893,600	do	11,321	11,372	+51		
Total	33,935,500	39,829,100	+5,893,600	do	37,097	37,148	+51	23,100	14,048
Beryllium metal:									
Supplemental—barter	11,784,070	6,291,789	−5,492,281	do	101	54	−47	(2)	54
Bismuth:									
National stockpile	2,674,300	2,674,300		Pound	1,342,402	1,342,402			
Defense Production Act	52,400	52,400		do	22,901	22,901			
Supplemental—barter	5,518,600	5,519,000	+400	do	2,506,493	2,506,493			
Total	8,245,300	8,245,700	+400	do	3,871,796	3,871,796		3,000,000	871,796
Cadmium:									
National stockpile	21,260,000	21,236,300	−23,700	do	10,829,640	10,817,585	−12,055		
Supplemental—barter	12,312,700	12,312,800	+100	do	7,448,989	7,448,989			
Total	33,572,700	33,549,100	−23,600	do	18,278,629	18,266,574	−12,055	6,500,000	11,766,574
Castor oil:									
National stockpile	53,261,800	52,639,400	−622,400	do	204,864,895	201,842,565	−3,022,330	68,000,000	133,842,565
Celestite:									
National stockpile	1,412,300	1,412,300		Short dry ton	28,816	28,816		22,000	6,816
Chromite, chemical grade:									
National stockpile	12,286,800	12,286,800		do	559,452	559,452			
Supplemental—barter	21,442,795	21,442,800	+5	do	678,609	678,608	−1		
Total	33,729,595	33,729,600	+5	do	1,238,061	1,238,060	−1	475,000	763,060
Chromite, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	264,765,600	264,674,200	−91,400	do	3,799,176	3,797,409	−1,767		
Defense Production Act	35,879,900	35,879,900		do	985,646	985,646			
Supplemental—barter	224,615,366	224,671,600	+56,234	do	1,543,114	1,543,114			
Total	525,260,866	525,225,700	−35,166	do	6,327,936	6,326,169	−1,767	2,700,000	3,626,169
Chromite, refractory grade:									
National stockpile	25,149,300	25,149,300		Short dry ton	1,047,159	1,047,159			
Supplemental—barter	5,578,370	5,578,370		do	198,624	198,624			
Total	30,727,670	30,727,670		do	1,245,783	1,245,783		1,300,000	(4)
Cobalt:									
National stockpile	169,313,100	169,286,000	−27,100	Pound	76,768,118	76,746,986	−21,132		
Defense Production Act	52,074,600	52,074,600		do	25,194,122	25,194,122			
Supplemental—barter	2,169,000	2,169,000		do	1,077,018	1,077,018			
Total	223,556,700	223,529,600	−27,100	do	103,039,258	103,018,126	−21,132	19,000,000	84,018,126
Coconut oil:									
National stockpile	16,240,200	15,856,800	−383,400	do	107,175,713	104,643,733	−2,531,980	(2)	104,643,733
Colemanite:									
Supplemental—barter	2,636,400	2,636,400		Long dry ton	67,636	67,636		(2)	67,636

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), May 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Columbium:									
National stockpile	$23,860,500	$23,928,900	+$68,400	Pound	7,488,954	7,487,499	−1,455		
Defense Production Act	50,255,500	50,255,500		do	8,222,684	8,222,684			
Supplemental—barter	799,100	799,200	+100	do	388,877	388,877			
Total	74,915,100	74,983,600	+68,500	do	16,100,515	16,099,060	−1,455	1,900,000	14,199,060
Copper:									
National stockpile	522,407,200	522,655,900	+248,700	Short ton	1,008,375	1,008,336	−39		
Defense Production Act	61,148,700	60,801,100	−347,600	do	109,077	108,435	−642		
Supplemental—barter	8,207,614	8,198,600	−9,014	do	12,382	12,382			
Total	591,763,514	591,655,600	−107,914	do	1,129,834	1,129,153	−681	1,000,000	129,153
Cordage fibers, abaca:									
National stockpile	37,767,000	37,741,400	−25,600	Pound	149,842,510	149,737,510	−105,000	150,000,000	(3)
Cordage fibers, sisal:									
National stockpile	42,940,500	42,872,500	−68,000	do	317,265,126	316,649,462	−615,664	320,000,000	(3)
Corundum:									
National stockpile	393,100	393,100		Short ton	2,008	2,008		2,000	8
Cryolite:									
Defense Production Act	7,548,000	7,242,300	−305,700	do	27,334	26,227	−1,107	(2)	26,227
Diamond dies:									
National stockpile	487,700	490,300	+2,600	Piece	15,856	16,057	+201	25,000	(3)
Diamond, industrial, crushing bort:									
National stockpile	61,609,500	61,609,500		Carat	31,113,411	31,113,411			
Supplemental—barter	15,456,700	15,456,700		do	5,523,748	5,523,748			
Total	77,066,200	77,066,200		do	36,637,159	36,637,159		30,000,000	6,637,159
Diamond, industrial, stones:									
National stockpile	100,501,500	100,501,500		do	9,315,183	9,315,183			
Supplemental—barter	186,481,478	186,481,478		do	15,452,658	15,452,658			
Total	286,982,978	286,982,978		do	24,767,841	24,767,841		18,000,000	6,767,840
Diamond tools:									
National stockpile	1,015,400	1,015,400		Piece	64,178	64,178		(2)	64,178
Feathers and down:									
National stockpile	38,064,500	37,966,300	−98,200	Pound	9,187,880	9,164,188	−23,692	8,800,000	364,188
Fluorspar, acid grade:									
National stockpile	26,167,500	26,167,500		Short dry ton.	463,049	463,049			
Defense Production Act	1,394,400	1,394,400		do	19,700	19,700			
Supplemental-barter	33,524,800	33,525,900	+1,100	do	673,232	673,232			
Total	61,086,700	61,087,800	+1,100	do	1,155,981	1,155,981		280,000	875,981
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	17,332,400	17,332,400		do	369,433	369,443			
Supplemental—barter	1,508,100	1,508,100		do	42,800	42,800			
Total	18,840,500	18,840,500		do	412,423	412,243		375,000	37,243
Graphite, natural, Ceylon, amorphous lump:									
National stockpile	937,900	937,900		do	4,455	4,455			
Supplemental—barter	341,200	341,200		do	1,428	1,428			
Total	1,279,100	1,279,100		do	5,883	5,883		3,600	2,283
Graphite, natural, Madagascar, crystalline:									
National stockpile	7,056,200	7,056,200			34,233	34,233			
Supplemental—barter	145,659	210,312	+64,653	do	1,268	1,857	+589		
Total	7,201,859	7,266,512	+64,653	do	35,501	36,090	+589	17,200	18,890
Graphite, natural, other, cyrstalline: National stockpile	1,896,400	1,896,400		do	5,487	5,487		2,100	3,387
Hyoscine: National stockpile	30,600	30,600		Ounce	2,100	2,100		2,100	(3)
Iodine:									
National stockpile	4,082,000	4,082,000		Pound	2,977,648	2,977,648			
Supplemental—barter	1,041,200	1,041,400	+200	do	994,920	994,920			
Total	5,123,200	5,123,400	+200	do	3,972,568	3,972,568		4,300,000	(3)
Iridium:									
National stockpile	2,525,800	2.525,800		Troy ounce	13,937	13,937		4,000	9,937
Jewel bearings:									
National stockpile	3,982,600	4,055,500	+72,900	Piece	51,163,963	51,270,565	+106,602	57,500,000	(3)
Kyanite-mullite:									
National stockpile	811,600	811,600		Short dry ton.	9,387	9,387		4,800	4,587
Lead:									
National stockpile	319,298,100	319,298,100		Short ton	1,050,370	1,050,370			
Defense Production Act	1,980,700	1,790,900	−189,800	do	5,229	4,728	−501		
Supplemental—barter	78,281,300	78,282,200	+900	do	327,998	327,998			
Total	399,560,100	399,371,200	−188,900	do	1,383,597	1,383,096	−501	286,000	1,097,096

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), May 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Magnesium:									
National stockpile	$131,228,100	$131,112,100	−$116,000	Short ton	180,769	180,602	−167	107,000	73,602
Manganese, battery grade, natural ore:									
National stockpile	21,025,500	21,025,500		do	144,485	144,485			
Supplemental—barter	14,512,798	14,512,798		do	142,351	142,351			
Total	35,538,298	35,538,298		do	286,836	286,836		50,000	236,836
Manganese, battery grade, synthetic dioxide:									
National stockpile	3,095,500	3,095,500		Short dry ton	21,272	21,272			
Defense Production Act	2,524,700	2,524,700		do	3,779	3,779			
Total	5,620,200	5,620,200		do	25,051	25,051		20,000	5,051
Manganese, chemical grade, type A:									
National stockpile	2,133,300	2,133,300		do	29,307	29,307			
Supplemental—barter	8,064,284	8,063,500	−784	do	117,607	117,607			
Total	10,197,584	10,196,800	−784	do	146,914	146,914		30,000	116,914
Manganese, chemical grade, type B:									
National stockpile	132,600	132,600		do	1,822	1,822			
Supplemental—barter	6,841,500	6,840,800	−700	do	99,016	99,016			
Total	6,974,100	6,973,400	−700	do	100,838	100,838		53,000	47,838
Manganese, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	248,240,100	248,240,100		do	5,851,264	5,851,264			
Defense Production Act	176,710,900	176,710,900		do	3,056,771	3,056,771			
Supplemental—barter	233,176,289	234,006,134	+829,845	do	3,407,407	3,419,628	+12,221		
Total	658,127,289	658,957,134	+829,845	do	12,315,442	12,327,663	+12,221	6,800,000	5,527,663
Mercury:									
National stockpile	20,039,500	20,039,500		Flask	129,525	129,525			
Supplemental—barter	3,446,200	3,446,200		do	16,000	16,000			
Total	23,485,700	23,485,700		do	145,525	145,525		110,000	35,525
Mica, muscovite block:									
National stockpile	27,644,200	27,631,200	−13,000	Pound	11,626,674	11,621,211	−5,463		
Defense Production Act	40,857,700	40,857,700		do	6,456,251	6,456,251			
Supplemental—barter	4,694,943	4,794,511	+99,568	do	1,429,538	1,459,476	+29,938		
Total	73,196,843	73,283,411	+86,568	do	19,512,463	19,536,938	+24,475	8,300,000	11,236,938
Mica, muscovite film:									
National stockpile	9,058,100	9,058,100		do	1,733,083	1,733,083			
Defense Production Act	633,300	633,300		do	102,681	102,681			
Supplemental—barter	932,746	953,946	+21,200	do	95,535	97,996	+2,461		
Total	10,624,146	10,645,346	+21,200	do	1,931,299	1,933,760	+2,461	1,300,000	633,760
Mica, muscovite splittings:									
National stockpile	40,598,300	40,598,300		do	40,040,294	40,040,294			
Supplemental—barter	6,225,800	6,225,800		do	4,826,257	4,826,257			
Total	46,824,100	46,824,100		do	44,866,551	44,866,551		21,200,000	23,666,551
Mica, phlogopite block:									
National stockpile	303,600	303,600		do	223,126	223,126		17,000	206,126
Mica, phlogopite splittings:									
National stockpile	2,580,500	2,580,500		do	3,079,062	3,079,062			
Supplemental—barter	2,102,007	2,190,891	+88,884	do	1,793,712	1,870,499	+76,787		
Total	4,682,507	4,771,391	+88,884	do	4,872,774	4,949,561	+76,787	1,700,000	3,249,561
Molybdenum:									
National stockpile	86,695,400	85,295,900	−1,399,500	do	81,793,112	80,516,745	−1,276,367	59,000,000	21,516,745
Nickel:									
National stockpile	181,988,600	181,988,600		do	334,304,655	334,304,616	−39		
Defense Production Act	104,143,800	103,501,000	−642,800	do	110,258,946	109,289,693	−969,253		
Total	286,132,400	285,489,600	−642,800	do	444,563,601	443,594,309	−969,292	323,000,000	120,594,309
Opium:				Pound					
National stockpile	13,661,700	13,661,700		do	195,757	195,757		172,800	22,957
Palladium:									
National stockpile	2,079,000	2,079,000		Troy ounce	89,811	89,811			
Defense Production Act	177,300	177,300		do	7,884	7,884			
Supplemental—barter	12,170,200	12,170,200		do	648,124	648,124			
Total	14,426,500	14,426,500		do	745,819	745,819		340,000	405,819
Palm oil:									
National stockpile	4,739,300	4,739,300		Pound	26,330,769	26,330,769		(2)	26,330,769
Platinum:									
National stockpile	56,879,900	56,879,900		Troy ounce	716,343	716,343			
Supplemental—barter	4,024,500	4,024,500		do	49,999	49,999			
Total	60,904,400	60,904,400		do	766,342	766,342		165,000	601,3425
Pyrethrum:									
National stockpile	415,000	415,000		Pound	67,065	67,065		66,000	1,065

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), May 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Quartz crystals:									
National stockpile	$69,060,700	$69,060,700		Short ton	5,601,481	5,601,481			
Supplemental—barter	3,128,684	3,128,700	+$16	do	232,252	232,252			
Total	72,189,384	72,189,400	+16	do	5,833,733	5,833,733		650,000	5,183,733
Quinidine:									
National stockpile	2,039,700	2,039,700		Ounce	1,768,377	1,768,377		1,600,000	168,377
Quinine:									
National stockpile	4,049,900	4,047,900	−2,000	do	6,399,732	6,399,732		(2)	6,399,732
Rare earths:									
National stockpile	7,134,900	7,134,900		Short dry ton	10,042	10,042			
Supplemental—barter	5,653,659	5,668,507	+14,848	do	6,848	6,948	+100		
Total	12,788,559	12,803,407	+14,848	do	16,890	16,990	+100	5,700	11,290
Rare earths residue:									
Defense Production Act	657,800	657,800		Pound	6,085,570	6,085,570		(2)	6,085,570
Rhodium:									
National stockpile	78,100	78,100		Troy ounce	618	618		(2)	618
Rubber:									
National stockpile	781,801,600	776,324,900	−5,476,700	Long ton	1,011,208	1,004,175	−7,033	750,000	254,175
Ruthenium:									
Supplemental—barter	559,500	559,500		Troy ounce	15,001	15,001		(2)	15,001
Rutile:									
National stockpile	2,070,100	2,070,100		Short dry ton	18,599	18,599			
Defense Production Act	2,725,100	2,725,100		do	17,592	17,410	−182		
Supplemental—barter	1,061,300	1,061,300		do	11,632	11,632			
Total	5,856,500	5,856,500		do	47,823	47,641	−182	65,000	(3)
Rutile, chlorinator charge:									
Defense Production Act					7,052	7,052		(2)	7,052
Sapphire and ruby:									
National stockpile	190,000	190,000		Carat	16,187,500	16,187,500		18,000,000	(3)
Selenium:									
National stockpile	757,100	757,100		Pound	97,100	97,100			
Supplemental—barter	1,070,500	1,070,500		do	156,518	156,518			
Total	1,827,600	1,827,600		do	253,618	253,618		400,000	(3)
Shellac:									
National stockpile	8,781,200	8,724,100	−57,100	do	17,516,046	17,402,027	−114,019	7,400,000	10,002,027
Silicon carbide, crude:									
National stockpile	11,394,500	11,394,500		Short ton	64,697	64,697			
Supplemental—barter	26,811,800	26,814,100	+2,300	do	131,805	131,805			
Total	38,206,300	38,208,600	+2,300	do	196,502	196,502		100,000	96,502
Silk noils and waste:									
National stockpile	1,916,400	1,865,800	−50,600	Pound	1,414,712	1,382,487	−32,225	970,000	512,487
Silk, raw:									
National stockpile	486,600	486,600		do	113,515	113,515		120,000	(3)
Sperm oil:									
National stockpile	4,775,400	4,775,400		do	23,442,158	23,442,158		23,000,000	442,158
Talc, steatite block and lump:									
National stockpile	496,800	496,800		Short ton	1,274	1,274		300	974
Talc, steatite ground:									
National stockpile	231,000	231,000		do	3,901	3,901		(2)	3,901
Tantalum:									
National stockpile	10,905,500	10,981,000	+75,500	Pound	3,422,865	3,420,478	−2,387		
Defense Production Act	9,734,400	9,734,400		do	1,531,366	1,531,366			
Supplemental—barter	21,100	21,100		do	8,036	8,036			
Total	20,661,000	20,736,500	+75,500	do	4,962,267	4,959,880	−2,387	2,420,000	2,539,880
Thorium:									
Defense Production Act	42,000	42,000		Pound	848,574	848,574			
Supplemental—barter	16,905,351	17,130,658	+225,307	do	8,157,700	8,278,975	+121,275		
Total	16,947,351	17,172,658	+225,307	do	9,006,274	9,127,549	+121,275	(2)	9,127,549
Tin:									
National stockpile	822,438,700	820,601,400	−1,837,300	Long ton	338,241	337,486	−755		
Supplemental—barter	16,404,000	16,404,000		do	7,505	7,505			
Total	838,842,700	837,005,400	−1,837,300	do	345,746	344,991	−755	185,000	159,991
Titanium:									
Defense Production Act	176,755,800	176,692,200	−63,600	Short ton	22,449	22,442	−7		
Supplemental—barter	32,097,700	32,097,700		do	9,021	9,021			
Total	208,853,500	208,789,900	−63,600	do	31,470	31,463	−7	(2)	31,463

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), May 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Tungsten:									
National stockpile	$369,129,300	$369,127,900	−$1,400	Pound	120,072,509	120,071,339	−1,170		
Defense Production Act	318,770,700	318,770,700		do	78,186,563	78,186,563			
Supplemental—barter	18,648,200	18,648,200		do	5,762,319	5,762,319			
Total	706,548,200	706,546,800	−1,400	do	204,021,391	204,020,221	−1,170	50,000,000	154,020,221
Vanadium:									
National stockpile	31,567,900	31,567,900		do	15,730,893	15,730,893		2,000,000	13,730,893
Vegetable tannin extract, chestnut:									
National stockpile	11,939,800	11,939,800		Long ton	42,795	42,795		30,000	12,795
Vegetable tannin extract, quebracho:									
National stockpile	49,237,700	49,219,200	−18,500	do	199,003	198,928	−75	180,000	18,928
Vegetable tannin extract, wattle:									
National stockpile	9,915,700	9,845,800	−69,900	do	39,314	39,037	−277	39,000	37
Zinc:									
National stockpile	364,339,400	364,339,400		Short ton	1,256,866	1,256,866			
Supplemental—barter	79,588,200	79,588,200		do	323,896	323,896			
Total	443,927,600	443,927,600		do	1,580,762	1,580,762		178,000	1,402,762
Zirconium ore, baddeleyite:									
National stockpile	710,600	710,600		Short dry ton	16,533	16,533		(3)	16,533
Zirconium ore, zircon:									
National stockpile	284,600	270,500	−14,100	do	4,810	4,571	−239	(2)	4,571
Total:									
National stockpile	5,848,005,200	5,838,070,100	−9,935,100						
Defense Production Act	1,500,918,000	1,500,410,200	−507,800						
Supplemental—barter	1,327,935,503	1,331,724,514	+3,789,011						
Total, strategic and critical materials	8,676,858,703	8,670,204,814	−6,653,889						

---

[1] Maximum objectives for strategic and critical materials are determined pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98-98h). The present objectives represent quantities of materials estimated to be necessary in the event of a 3-year war in which oversea sources would not be available.

[2] No present objective.

[3] Not in excess of maximum objective.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration and the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 2.—*Agricultural commodities inventories, May 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month
Price-support inventory:							
Basic commodities:							
Corn	$779,043,451	$693,927,586	−$85,115,865	Bushel	653,778,744	575,466,755	−78,311,989
Cotton, extra-long staple	4,350,336	4,350,336		Bale	15,865	15,865	
Cotton, upland	809,608,080	808,295,937	−1,312,143	do	4,683,675	4,676,156	−7,519
Peanuts, farmers' stock	8,883,533	7,365,034	−1,518,499	Pound	78,039,071	63,995,427	−14,043,644
Peanuts, shelled	6,003,860	8,165,174	+2,161,314	do	33,329,655	46,405,553	+13,075,898
Rice, milled	407,221	167,186	−240,035	Hundredweight	42,206	17,012	−25,194
Rice, rough	516,747	4,893,714	+4,376,967	do	96,914	907,491	+810,577
Wheat	2,294,444,155	2,305,695,156	+11,251,001	Bushel	1,153,265,642	1,156,480,749	+3,215,107
Bulgur	1,757,232	829,637	−927,595	Pound	32,403,285	15,308,649	−17,094,636
Total, basic commodities	3,905,014,615	3,833,689,760	−71,324,855				
Designated nonbasic commodities:							
Barley	$24,096,835	$31,097,110	+$7,000,275	Bushel	27,975,270	35,541,601	+7,566,331
Grain sorghum	769,344,683	754,747,058	−14,597,625	do	702,009,752	689,309,139	−12,700,613
Honey	129,950	113,825	−16,125	Pound	1,037,746	910,259	−127,487
Milk and butterfat:							
Butter	226,658,843	234,453,815	+7,794,972	do	388,423,220	402,506,460	+14,083,240
Butter oil	52,816,448	54,307,400	+1,490,952	do	65,647,136	67,562,608	+1,915,472
Cheese	25,136,983	20,722,635	−4,414,348	do	66,969,774	55,373,274	−11,596,500
Ghee	369,883	369,883		do	455,322	455,322	
Milk, dried	101,605,247	106,796,628	+5,191,381	do	684,870,473	723,467,953	+38,597,480
Oats	8,943,358	10,017,108	+1,073,750	Bushel	14,881,350	16,592,907	+1,711,557
Rye	540,353	1,305,104	+764,751	do	497,850	1,224,452	+726,602
Total, designated nonbasic commodities	1,209,642,583	1,213,930,566	+4,287,983				
Other nonbasic commodities:							
Beans, dry edible	3,113,188	3,701,469	+588,281	Hundredweight	485,985	543,610	+57,625
Cottonseed oil, refined	1,014,923	1,014,923		Pound	8,339,550	8,339,550	
Flaxseed	8,299,014	14,032,982	+5,733,968	Bushel	2,790,587	4,730,933	+1,940,346
Soybeans	12,425,839	4,286,019	−8,139,820	do	5,252,945	1,843,083	−3,409,862
Turpentine	433,546	433,546		Gallon	826,233	826,233	
Vegetable oil products	14,506,228	7,618,698	−6,887,530	Pound	79,015,507	41,457,220	−37,558,287
Total, other nonbasic commodities	39,792,738	31,087,637	−8,705,101				
Total, price support inventory	5,154,449,936	5,078,707,963	−75,741,973				

TABLE 2.—*Agricultural commodities inventories, May 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month
Inventory transferred from national stockpile: [1]							
Cotton, Egyptian	$103, 874, 843	$103, 874, 843		Bale	122, 955	122, 955	
Cotton, American-Egyptian	23, 784, 445	23, 734, 148	−$50, 297	do	47, 288	47, 188	−100
Total, inventory transferred from national stockpile.	127, 659, 288	127, 608, 991	−50, 297	do	170, 243	170, 143	−100
Total, agricultural commodities	5, 282, 109, 224	5, 206, 316, 954	−75, 792, 270				

[1] Transferred from General Services Administration pursuant to Public Law 85-96 and Public Law 87-548.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 3.—*Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, May 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense:							
Engineering equipment (engine generators, pumps, chlorinators, purifiers, pipe, and fittings).	$10, 023, 273	$10, 023, 273		10-mile units	45	45	
Chemical and biological equipment	1, 772, 582	1, 772, 521	−$61	(1)			
Radiological equipment	24, 134, 130	24, 720, 086	+585, 956	(1)			
Total	35, 929, 985	36, 515, 880	+585, 895				
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:							
Medical bulk stocks, and associated items at civil defense mobilization warehouses.	140, 767, 711	142, 210, 155	+1, 442, 444	(1)			
Medical bulk stock at manufacturer locations	5, 420, 642	5, 420, 642		(1)			
Civil defense emergency hospitals	37, 645, 897	37, 531, 514	−114, 383	Each	1, 930	1, 930	
Replenishment units (functional assemblies other than hospitals).	1, 044, 186	694, 075	−350, 111	(1)			
Total	184, 878, 436	185, 856, 386	+977, 950				
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment	220, 808, 421	222, 372, 266	+1, 563, 845				

(1) Composite group of many different items.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Defense and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 4.—*Machine tools inventories, May 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month
Defense Production Act:							
In storage	$21, 700	$21, 400	−$300	Tool	4	7	+3
On lease	2, 144, 300	2, 144, 300		do	103	103	
On loan	42, 900	42, 900		do	7	7	
Total	2, 208, 900	2, 208, 600	−300		114	117	+3
National Industrial Reserve Act:							
In storage	84, 536, 200	82, 780, 700	−1, 755, 500	do	7, 774	7, 547	−227
On lease	27, 500	27, 500		do	1	1	
On loan to other agencies	2, 036, 900	2, 036, 900		do	201	201	
On loan to school programs	6, 623, 900	9, 662, 200	+338, 300	do	1, 566	1, 648	+82
Total	93, 224, 500	91, 807, 300	−1, 417, 200		9, 542	9, 397	−145
Total, machine tools	95, 433, 400	94, 015, 900	−1, 417, 500		9, 656	9, 514	−142

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration.

TABLE 5.—*Helium inventories, May 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning o. month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month
Helium:							
Stored above ground	$351, 579	$357, 983	+$6, 404	Cubic foot	28, 600, 000	29, 100, 000	+500, 000
Stored underground	6, 097, 835	6, 726, 441	+628, 606	do	751, 600, 000	804, 500, 000	+52, 900, 000
Total, helium	6, 449, 414	7, 084, 424	+635, 010	do	280, 200, 000	833, 600, 000	+53, 400, 000

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of the Interior.

APPENDIX

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

National stockpile

The Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) provides for the establishment and maintenance of a national stockpile of strategic and critical materials. The General Services Administration is responsible for making purchases of strategic and critical materials and providing for their storage, security, and maintenance. These functions are performed in accordance with directives issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. The act also provides for the transfer from other Government agencies of strategic and critical materials which are excess to the needs of such other agencies and are required to meet the stockpile objectives established by OEP. In addition, the General Services Administration is responsible for disposing of those strategic and critical materials which OEP determines to be no longer needed for stockpile purposes.

General policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling are contained in DMO V–7, issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning and published in the Federal Register of December 19, 1959 (24 F.R. 10309). Portions of this order relate also to Defense Production Act inventories.

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration is authorized to make purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials, for Government use or resale, in order to expand productive capacity and supply, and also to store the materials acquired as a result of such purchases or commitments. Such functions are carried out in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

Supplemental—barter

As a result of a delegation of authority from OEP (32A C.F.R., ch. I, DMO V–4) the General Services Administration is responsible for the maintenance and storage of materials placed in the supplemental stockpile. Section 206 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1856) provides that strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural products, unless acquired for the national stockpile or for other purposes, shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). In addition to the materials which have been or may be so acquired, the materials obtained under the programs established pursuant to the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbian-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (50 U.S.C. App. 2191–2195), which terminated December 31, 1958, have been transferred to the supplemental stockpile, as authorized by the provisions of said Production and Purchase Act.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The price-support program

Price-support operations are carried out under the charter powers (15 U.S.C. 714) of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, in conformity with the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421), the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1741), which includes the National Wool Act of 1954, the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1442), the Agricultural Act of 1958 and with respect to certain types of tobacco, in conformity with the act of July 28, 1945, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1312). Under the Agricultural Act of 1949, price support is mandatory for the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—and specific nonbasic commodities; namely, tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat. Under the Agricultural Act of 1958, as producers of corn voted in favor of the new price-support program for corn authorized by that act, price support is mandatory for barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums. Price support for wool and mohair is mandatory under the National Wool Act of 1954, through the marketing year ending March 31, 1966. Price support for other nonbasic agricultural commodities is discretionary except that, whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other must be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market. This program may also include operations to remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities for the purpose of stabilizing prices at levels not in excess of permissible price-support levels.

Price support is made available through loans, purchase agreements, purchases, and other operations, and, in the case of wool and mohair, through incentive payments based on marketings. The producers' commodities serve as collateral for price-support loans. With limited exceptions, price-support loans are nonrecourse and the Corporation looks only to the pledged or mortgage collateral for satisfaction of the loan. Purchase agreements generally are available during the same period that loans are available. By signing a purchase agreement, a producer receives an option to sell to the Corporation any quantity of the commodity which he may elect within the maximum specified in the agreement.

The major effect on budgetary expenditures is represented by the disbursements for price-support loans. The largest part of the commodity acquisitions under the program result from the forfeiting of commodities pledged as loan collateral for which the expenditures occurred at the time of making the loan, rather than at the time of acquiring the commodities.

Dispositions of commodities acquired by the Corporation in its price-support operations are made in compliance with sections 202, 407, and 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and other applicable legislation, particularly the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691), title I of the Agricultural Act of 1954, title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Agricultural Act of 1958, the act of August 19, 1958, in the case of cornmeal and wheat flour, and the act of September 21, 1959, with regard to sales of livestock feed in emergency areas.

Inventory transferred from national stockpile

This inventory, all cotton, was transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation at no cost from the national stockpile pursuant to Public Law 85–96 and Public Law 87–548. The proceeds from sales, less costs incurred by CCC, are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts; therefore, such proceeds and costs are not recorded in the operating accounts. The cost value as shown for this cotton has been computed on the basis of average per bale cost of each type of cotton when purchased by CCC for the national stockpile.

CIVIL DEFENSE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

Civil defense stockpile

The Department of Defense conducts this stockpiling program pursuant to section 201 (h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as amended. The program is designed to provide some of the most essential materials to minimize the effects upon the civilian population which would be caused by an attack upon the United States. Supplies and equipment normally unavailable, or lacking in quantity needed to cope with such conditions, are stockpiled at strategic locations in a nationwide warehouse system consisting of general storage facilities.

Civil defense medical stockpile

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare conducts the stockpiling program for medical supplies and equipment pursuant to section 201(h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as delegated by the President following the intent of Reorganization Plan No. 1, 1958. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare plans and directs the procurement, storage, maintenance, inspection, survey, distribution, and utilization of essential supplies and equipment for emergency health services. The medical stockpile includes a program designed to pre-position assembled emergency hospitals and other medical supplies and equipment into communities throughout the Nation.

MACHINE TOOLS

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration has acquired machine tools in furtherance of expansion of productive capacity, in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

National industrial equipment reserve

Under general policies established and directives issued by the Secretary of Defense, the General Services Administration is responsible for care, maintenance, utilization, transfer, leasing, lending to nonprofit schools, disposal, transportation, repair, restoration, and renovation of national industrial reserve equipment transferred to GSA under the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451–462).

HELIUM

The helium conservation program is conducted by the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Helium Act, approved September 13, 1960 (Public Law 86–777; 74 Stat. 918; 50 U.S.C. 167) and subsequent appropriations acts which have established fiscal limitations and provided borrowing authority for the program. Among other things, the Helium Act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to produce helium in Government plants, to acquire helium from private plants, to sell helium to meet current demands, and to store for future use helium that is so produced or acquired in excess of that required to meet current demands. Sales of helium by the Secretary of the Interior shall be at prices established by him which shall be adequate to liquidate the costs of the program within 25 years, except that this period may be extended by the Secretary for not more than 10 years for funds borrowed for purposes other than the acquisition and construction of helium plants and facilities.

This report covers helium that is produced in Government plants and acquired from private plants. Helium in excess of current demands is stored in the Cliffside gasfield near Amarillo, Tex. The unit of measure is cubic foot at 14.7 pounds per square inch absolute pressure and 70° F.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The cost value of Federal stockpile inventories as of May 31, 1963, totaled $14,199,994,358. This was a net decrease of $81,664,804 as compared with the May 1 total of $14,281,659,162.

Net changes during the month are summarized by major category as follows:

Major category	Cost value, May 1963	
	Net change during month	Total, end of month
Strategic and critical materials	−$6,653,889	$8,670,204,814
Agricultural commodities	−75,792,270	5,206,316,954
Civil defense supplies and equipment	+1,563,845	222,372,266
Machine tools	−1,417,500	94,015,900
Helium	+635,010	7,084,424
Total	−81,664,804	14,199,994,358

These figures are from the May 1963 report on Federal stockpile inventories, compiled from official agency data by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, showing detail with respect to quantity and cost value of each commodity in the inventories covered.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

So-called strategic and critical materials are stored by the Government in (1) the national stockpile, (2) the Defense Production Act inventory and (3) the supplemental-barter stockpile.

Overall, there are now 94 materials stockpiled in the strategic and critical inventories. Maximum objectives—in terms of volume—are presently fixed for 76 of these 94 materials. Of the 76 materials having maximum objectives, 63 were stockpiled in excess of their objectives as of May 31, 1963.

Increases in cost value were reported in 23 of the materials stockpiled in all strategic and critical inventories, decreases were reported in 29 materials, and 42 materials remained unchanged during May.

National stockpile

The cost value of materials in the national stockpile as of May 31, 1963, totaled $5,838,070,100. This was a net decrease of $9,935,100 during the month. The largest decreases were $5,476,700 in rubber, $1,837,300 in tin, and $1,399,500 in molybdenum.

Defense Production Act inventory

The cost value of materials in the Defense Production Act inventory as of May 31, 1963, totaled $1,500,410,200. This was a net decrease of $507,800. The largest increase was in aluminum, offset by decreases in nickel, copper, and cryolite.

Supplemental—barter

The cost value of materials in the supplemental-barter stockpile as of May 31 totaled $1,331,724,514. This was a net increase of $3,789,011. The largest increases were in beryl, aluminum oxide, manganese, and bauxite.

OTHER STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Among the other categories of stockpiled materials covered by the report, the largest is $5.2 billion in agricultural commodities. Major decreases in agricultural commodities during May were reported for corn and grain sorghum, partially offset by an increase in wheat in the price support inventory.

Inventories of civil defense supplies and equipment showed increases in radiological equipment and medical stocks; the machine tools inventories showed a net decrease; and the helium inventories showed a net increase during May.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated July 22, 1963, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 1944. A bill for the relief of Constantinos N. Geranios (Konstantinos N. Geranios), his wife, Dionyssiak Nicholaou (Mouzak) Geranios, and their children, Nicholas K. Geranios and Demitre K. Geranios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. METCALF):

S. 1945. A bill to provide for the reservation of certain federally generated power for use in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGOVERN (for himself, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S. 1946. A bill to provide for a voluntary wheat adjustment and price support program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCGOVERN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 1947. A bill to amend section 110(h) of the Housing Act of 1949; and

S. 1948. A bill to limit financial assistance under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, after July 1, 1965, to projects which cannot be self-liquidating under applicable State laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. TOWER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MOSS):

S. 1949. A bill to provide a system of health and safety rules and regulations and proper enforcement thereof; health and safety inspection and investigation; health and safety training and education for metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines); and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. METCALF when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1950. A bill to amend the act of May 21, 1928, relating to standards of containers for fruits and vegetables, to permit the use of additional standard containers; to the Committee on Commerce; and

S. 1951. A bill for the relief of George Elias NeJame (Noujaim); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1952. A bill to extend and broaden the authority to insure mortgages under sections 809 and 810 of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 1953. A bill authorizing construction of a bank protection project on the Guyandot River at Barboursville, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1954. A bill for the relief of Patrick K. Yen and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1955. A bill for the relief of Mihailo Radosavljevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PREFERENCE OF POWER FOR MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, from time to time I have addressed the Senate on the wealth of natural resources that we have in Montana. The current discussion of this authorization bill and, more specifically, the Knowles project, give me cause to comment again on this situation. Water is considered by many to be the State's most important resource. The rivers of Montana have provided sites for some very important and successful hydroelectric power projects, both public and private. These generating facilities have supplied the energy to meet the local demands, but also have provided the additional incentive to bring into the State new industry and the resulting benefits. In addition, these projects have contributed to the overall generating scheme of the Columbia and Missouri River Basins.

Montana is an upstream State; and because of its developed and undeveloped reservoir sites, it contributes a great deal of power generation and flood control downstream. Montana is a State which is just beginning to flex its muscles in its transition from a largely rural State to one with growing metropolitan areas and potential industrial development. Many of us see low-cost hydroelectric power as one of the major instruments in this development. Therefore we have come to be sensitive about keeping a reasonable amount of the power generated at these large upstream projects for use within our own State, and not merely permit the energy and benefits to flow downstream.

This attitude may appear to be somewhat parochial—and if it is, I have no apologies to make; but I am sure that my colleagues here in the Senate find similar attitudes in each and every State. If they have a resource of which they are justly proud, they want to see that the major benefit is realized in their own immediate area. This statement is not being made without a full awareness of the problems that arise from regional development and cooperation. We live in a Federal system; and the interests of our sister States must be, and should be, considered. The people of Montana want to be placed on record as stating that they are willing to cooperate; but they will not stand idly by while their resources are drained off for the benefit of those downstream.

Mr. President, I now introduce, and send to the desk, proposed legislation which would give Montana a preference for at-site power and a portion of the benefits realized downstream at all new federally-constructed projects in Montana. The language is identical to that contained in Senate bill 3558, of the 87th Congress. I realize full well that it will be opposed in certain quarters of the executive and legislative branches of the Government, but it is a matter which should be discussed. It is a subject of considerable concern to the Montana congressional delegation and—more importantly—to the people of Montana. In the instance of Knowles Dam, if it is to be built, then the people of Montana should realize most of the benefits. A preference as provided in my bill will establish these guarantees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this bill printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the Congressional Record.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1945) to provide for the reservation of certain federally generated power for use in the State of Montana, introduced by Mr. Mansfield, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the at-site capability of power and energy generated at Federal projects now under construction or hereafter constructed within the State of Montana, or such portions thereof as may be required from time to time to meet loads under contract within this reservation, shall be reserved for use in the State of Montana: *Provided,* That at-site capability of the Yellowtail project shall be reserved for use in the State of Montana hereunder in the same percentage as the waters of the Big Horn River are allocated to the State of Montana by subdivision 2, paragraph B, of article V of the Yellowstone River compact, consented to by the Act of October 30, 1951 (65 Stat. 663).

Sec. 2. An equitable share of the increase in system firm power generated at downstream Federal projects by reason of the storage and release of water from Federal projects in Montana shall be reserved for use in the State of Montana. In determining said reservation there shall be considered, among other relevant factors, machine capacity, amounts of water, and transmission facilities utilized in distributing and marketing the system firm power. Portions of the reservation made pursuant to this section not required to meet Montana loads under contract may be sold for use outside the State subject to recall on reasonable notice.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield to my colleague.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am in complete concurrence with the remarks of my distinguished colleague. Montana's rivers are our State's greatest resource, and dams have been built on the rivers of Montana. The Washington Power & Light Co. has built dams at Noxon Rapids and at Cabinet Gorge, and that power is completely exported from Montana; there is no way to save it for our State.

The only way by which we can preserve for the State of Montana this vital and necessary power is to have enacted into law a measure such as the one my senior colleague has introduced, and thus develop those rivers by means of public power—a Federal power system.

The Knowles Dam bill, which will come before us later today, is a case in point. The Hungry Horse Dam is another case in point. The power we have lost at the Fort Peck Dam is another case in point.

I am in complete accord with this measure, Mr. President; and I ask unanimous consent that my name be listed as a cosponsor of it.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague for his kind and cooperative remarks.

Inasmuch as he has mentioned the Cabinet Gorge Dam and the Noxon Rapids Dam, both within the State of Montana, and both generating 200,000 kilowatts of power, I would state that the entire 400,000 kilowatts of power generated at those two dams—built, not by the Montana Power & Light Co., but by the Washington Power & Light Co.—are sent—all of those 400,000 kilowatts of power—outside the State of Montana. So I think it is time that we wake up to the fact that these resources, which are ours, should be used primarily for the benefit of Montana, and only secondarily for the benefit of the States downstream.

SELF-LIQUIDATION OF URBAN RENEWAL PROJECTS THROUGH THE USE OF INCREASED TAX REVENUES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 110(h) of the Housing Act of 1949.

This proposed legislation would provide for self-liquidation of urban renewal projects through the use of increased tax revenues derived from the project area itself. It has been estimated, and realistically so, I believe, that some 75 percent of urban renewal projects which are now receiving Federal financial assistance are designed to create in the project area, new capital values which can then be assessed to provide the city with substantial increases in tax revenues. I feel States should be encouraged to enact State laws allowing the localities to pledge these increased tax revenues as security for the financing with which to pay for the project—these projects could then be made self-liquidating. The tax burden on the Federal taxpayer would be eliminated. It is my understanding California has such a law.

The successful disposal of these self-liquidating revenue bonds to financial institutions would require assurance in advance of the scope and nature of improvements going into the project area. This would mean more and better planning at an early date—in this way soundness of the projects can be better assured.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and approximately referred.

The bill (S. 1947) to amend section 110 (h) of the Housing Act of 1949, introduced by Mr. Tower, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

URBAN RENEWAL PROJECTS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to limit financial assistance under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, after July 1, 1965, of projects which cannot be self-liquidating under applicable State law.

This proposed legislation would change the Federal urban renewal statute so that funds would be available for new urban renewal projects only if they are undertaken by cities or other local governments or their agents, purpose being to place urban renewal projects in the future under the effective control of the city or other local government.

Presently, urban renewal projects are for the most part undertaken by housing authorities or urban renewal agencies which have their own separate corporate status or varying degrees of autonomy. It is true members of these separate agencies are generally appointed by the mayor or city fathers, but these urban renewal officials are in office for prescribed terms, and are just not under the effective control of the city or other local governments.

I am of the opinion that officials undertaking the projects should be completely responsible to the city or other local government, and this would be true under this proposed legislation. However, I wish to make it clear that the amendment would not prevent a public corporate body such as a redevelopment agency or a housing authority from undertaking an urban renewal project for the city, if the city actually has full legal and practical control over the operations involved.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1948) to limit financial assistance under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, after July 1, 1965, to projects which cannot be self-liquidating under applicable State law, introduced by Mr. Tower, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HEALTH AND SAFETY RULES FOR CERTAIN METALLIC AND NONMETALLIC MINES AND QUARRIES

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide a system of health and safety rules and regulations and proper enforcement thereof; health and safety inspection and investigation; health and safety training and education for metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries—excluding coal and lignite mines; and for other purposes.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill lie on the table until next Monday, August 5, 1963, so that other Senators may have an opportunity to join in sponsoring this proposed legislation. I also ask unanimous consent that the bill and an explanatory statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill be printed in the Record at this point.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will remain at the desk as requested by the Senator from Montana, and the bill and explanatory statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1949) to provide a system of health and safety rules and regulations and proper enforcement thereof; health and safety inspection and investigation; health and safety training and education for metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries—excluding coal and lignite mines; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr, Metcalf (for himself and Mr. Moss) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, is hereby authorized and directed to promulgate and enforce a code of reasonable standards, rules, and regulations necessary to the protection of life, health, and safety of employees in metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries, the products of which regularly enter commerce or the operations of which substantially affect commerce, and to render safe such employment and places of employment and to prevent injury to such employees. Every employer shall furnish and maintain employment and places of employment which shall be reasonably safe for employees in all metallic and nonmetallic mines as defined in this Act, and shall install, furnish, maintain, and use such devices and safeguards, with particular reference to equipment used by and working conditions established by such employers as may be determined by the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, as is required by such a code of reasonable standards, rules, and regulations or by order or otherwise.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, in enforcing and administering the provisions of this Act, is authorized in addition to such other powers and duties as are conferred upon him—

(a) to make studies and investigations with respect to safety provisions and the causes and prevention of injuries in employments covered by this Act and from time to time make to Congress such recommendations as he may deem proper as to the best means of preventing such injuries, and in making such studies and investigations to cooperate with any agency of the United States or with any State agency engaged in similar work;

(b) to utilize the services of any agency of the United States or any State agency engaged in similar work (with the consent of such agency) in connection with the administration of this section;

(c) to promote uniformity in safety standards in employments covered by this Act through cooperative action with any agency of the United States or with any State agency engaged in similar work;

(d) to require the submission by employers covered by this Act of reports of accidents involving bodily injury or loss of life and occupational diseases, at such time and in such form as may be prescribed, and to compile, analyze, and publish, either in summary or detailed form, the information obtained regarding such accidents and occupational diseases;

(e) to make available for public inspection copies of all findings, recommendations, orders, reports, studies, statistics, and information obtained or issued pursuant to this Act as soon as practicable;

(f) to provide for the establishment and supervision of programs for the education and training of employers and employees in the recognition, avoidance, and prevention of unsafe working conditions in employments covered by this Act, and to consult with and advise employers as to the best means of preventing injuries; and

(g) to hold such hearings, issue such orders, and make such decisions, based upon findings of fact, as are deemed to be necessary to enforce the provisions of this Act, and such orders may require the immediate withdrawal of all persons from an unsafe place except for the purpose of making it safe, and then only after proper precautions have been taken to protect persons while doing such work.

Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, or any duly authorized representative of such Bureau, may inspect such places of employment, question such employees, and investigate such conditions, practices, or matters in connection with employments subject to this Act, as he may deem appropriate to determine whether any person has violated any provision of this Act, or any code provision, rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder, or which may aid in the enforcement of the provisions of this section. No employer or other person shall refuse to admit the Secretary or his authorized representatives to any such place or shall refuse to permit any such inspection.

(b) Any employer may request the advice of the Director of the United States Bureau of Mines or his authorized representative, in complying with the requirements of any code provision, rule, or regulation adopted to carry out the provisions of this Act. In case of practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships, the Director of the United States Bureau of Mines in his discretion may grant variations from any such code provision, rule, or regulation, or particular provisions thereof, and permit the use of other or different devices if he finds that the purpose of the rule, code provision, or regulation will be observed by the variation and the safety of employees will be equally secured thereby. Any person affected by such code provision, rule, or regulation, or his agent, may request the Director of the United States Bureau of Mines to grant such variation, stating in writing the grounds on which his request is based. Any authorization by the Director of the United States Bureau of Mines of a variation shall be in writing, shall describe the conditions under which the variation shall be permitted, and shall be published as provided in section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237), as amended. A properly indexed record of all variations shall be kept in the office of the Director of the United States Bureau of Mines and open to public inspection.

Sec. 4. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, shall create and establish an advisory committee composed of not more than six members to exercise consultative functions in connection with the administration of this Act. Such committee shall be composed of representatives of metallic and nonmetallic mine and quarry owners and of representatives of metallic and nonmetallic mine and quarry workers in equal number. The members of such committee shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior without regard to the civil service and classification laws.

(b) The advisory committee shall advise the United States Bureau of Mines in the promulgation of a code of reasonable standards, and rules and regulations pertaining to safety and health conditions and practices in metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries pursuant to this Act.

(c) Each member of the advisory committee shall be compensated at the rate of $50 for each day of actual service on the committee (including each day he is traveling on official business) and shall, notwithstanding the Travel Expense Act of 1949, be fully reimbursed for traveling, subsistence, and other related expenses incurred in such service.

Sec. 5. Any employer who, willfully, violates or fails or refuses to comply with the provisions of this Act, or with any lawful rule, regulations, or order adopted to carry out the provisions of this Act, and any employer or other person who willfully interferes with, hinders, or delays the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines or any duly authorized representative of such Bureau in carrying out his duties under this Act by refusing to admit the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines or any duly authorized representative of such Bureau to any place, or to permit the inspection or examination of any employment subject to the provisions of the Act or place of such employment, or who willfully hinders or delays the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines or any duly authorized representative of such Bureau in the performance of his duties in the enforcement of this Act [section], shall be guilty of an offense, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished for each offense by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $3,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding sixty days, or by both, and in any case where such employer is a corporation, the officer who willfully permits any such violation to occur, shall be guilty of an offense, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished also for each offense by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $3,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding sixty days, or by both.

Sec. 6. The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, shall have authority to appoint, subject to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, such officers and employees as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and to prescribe the powers, duties, and responsibilities of such officers and employees.

Sec. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 8. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communications between any State, territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, and any other State, territory, possession of the United States, or between any State, territory, possession, or the District of Columbia and any foreign country, or wholly within any territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, or between points in the same State if passing through any other State or through any territory, possession, or the District of Columbia or through any foreign country.

(b) The term "metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries" includes all types of mine and mining operations, including but not limited to mines, quarries, open pit operations, and strip mines, but not including coal and lignite mines, and all types of operations for the processing of metallic and nonmetallic minerals extracted from such mines. The term "operations for the processing of metallic and nonmetallic minerals" as used in this paragraph means the sizing, shaping, classifying, crushing, grinding, milling, precipitation, separation, concentration, mixing, roasting, pelletizing, smelting, refining, and such other work of processing such metallic and nonmetallic minerals as is usually done by the operator at or in the vicinity of the mine site or at places located in relation to the mine site with regard to the availability of transportation, fuel, power, water, and/or other factors, and does not include such other work of processing such metallic or nonmetallic minerals as is usually done by a consumer or others in connection with the utilization of such minerals.

(c) The term "operator" means the person, partnership, association, or corporation, [and], or subsidiary of [such] a corporation, operating a mine and owning the right to do so.

SEC. 9. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any persons or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of this Act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. METCALF is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

This bill is based in part on provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, bills introduced in previous Congresses to establish a permanent Federal health and safety program for metallic and nonmetallic mines, and from the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Safety Act (Public Law 85-742).

The principal differences in approach between the present draft bill and the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act are that the former provides for broad enforcement powers, rather than specifically limited enforcement authority as in the Coal Mine Safety Act, and that it does not exclude smaller mines or have a "grandfather clause" permitting the continued use of unsafe equipment in use at the time of passage of the act.

Principal provisions of the bill would:

1. Direct the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the U.S. Bureau of Mines, to promulgate and enforce a health and safety code for metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries.

2. Grant right of entry for inspection purposes.

3. Require submission of accident and occupational diseases reports as may be prescribed.

4. Empower the Secretary of the Interior to order withdrawal of all persons from an unsafe place except for the purpose of making it safe.

5. Provide criminal penalties for obstruction or failure to comply with orders.

6. Create advisory committee with equal representation of labor and management.

7. Define metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries to include all types of mine and mining operations other than coal and lignite mines, and specified related processing operations, including milling, smelting, and refining and other enumerated operations performed by the mine operator at or adjacent to the mine site or at places located in relation to the mine site with regard to economic factors.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROSECUTION OF PROJECTS IN CERTAIN RIVER BASIN PLANS FOR FLOOD CONTROL AND NAVIGATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. SIMPSON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 6016) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and joint resolutions:

Authority of July 18, 1963:

S.J. Res. 101. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000: Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. PELL, and Mr. SCOTT.

Authorities of July 18 and 24, 1963:

S. 1914. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FONG, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

Authority of July 24, 1963:

S. 1937. A bill to promote equal employment opportunity by securing equal treatment in the various incidents of employment, to establish an Equal Employment Opportunity Administration in the Department of Labor, and for other purposes: Mr. ENGLE, and Mr. MCCARTHY.

Authority of July 25, 1963:

S.J. Res. 105. Joint resolution to authorize appointment of a Presidential Commission on Automation: Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. LONG of Missouri.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

John H. Phillips, of Mississippi, to be U.S. marshal, northern district of Mississippi, for a term of 4 years, a reappointment.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Monday, August 5, 1963, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 29, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1122) relating to the exchange of certain lands between the town of Powell, Wyo., and the Presbyterian Retirement Facilities Corp.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address delivered by Senator KEFAUVER before the Great Lakes Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., on June 22, 1963.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY—ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the extraordinary informative and somber address delivered to the Nation on Friday, July 26, by the President of the United States, on the proposed partial nuclear-test ban treaty.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 27, 1963]

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO NATION ON A-TEST TREATY

Good evening, my fellow citizens.

I speak to you tonight in a spirt of hope. Eighteen years ago the advent of nuclear weapons changed the course of the world as well as the war. Since that time, all mankind has been struggling to escape from the darkening prospects of mass destruction on earth. In an age when both sides have come to possess enough nuclear power to destroy the human race several times over, the world of communism and the world of free choice have been caught up in a vicious circle of conflicting ideology and interests. Each increase of tension has produced an increase in arms; each increase in arms has produced an increase in tension.

In these years, the United States and the Soviet Union have frequently communicated suspicions and warnings to each other, but very rarely hope. Our representatives have met at the summit and at the brink; they have met in Washington and in Moscow, at the United Nations and in Geneva. But too often these meetings have produced only darkness, discord or disillusion.

Yesterday a shaft of light cut into the darkness. Negotiations were concluded in Moscow on a treaty to ban all nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. For the first time, an agreement has been reached on bringing the forces of nuclear destruction under international control—a goal first sought in 1946 when Bernard Baruch submitted our comprehensive plan to the members of the United Nations.

INSPECTION HURDLE

That plan, and many subsequent disarmament plans, large and small, have all been blocked by those opposed to international inspection. A ban on nuclear tests, however, requires on-the-spot inspection only for underground tests. This Nation now possesses a variety of techniques to detect the nuclear tests of other nations which are conducted in the air or under water. For such tests product unmistakable signs which our modern instruments can pick up.

The treaty initiated yesterday, therefore, is a limited treaty which permits continued underground testing and prohibits only those tests that we ourselves can police. It requires no control posts, no on-site inspection and no international body.

We should also understand that it has other limits as well. Any nation which signs the treaty will have an opportunity to withdraw if it finds that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of the treaty have jeopardized its supreme interests; and no nation's right to self defense will in any way be impaired. Nor does this treaty mean an end to the threat of nuclear war. It will not reduce nuclear stockpiles; it will not halt the production of nuclear weapons; it will not restrict their use in time of war.

Nevertheless this limited treaty will radically reduce the nuclear testing which would otherwise be conducted on both sides; it will prohibit the United States, the United

Kingdom, the Soviet Union and all others who sign it from engaging in the atmosphere tests which have so alarmed mankind; and it offers to all the world a welcome sign of hope.

For this is not a unilateral moratorium, but a specific and solemn legal obligation. While it will not prevent this Nation from testing underground, or from being ready to resume atmospheric tests if the acts of others so require, it gives us a concrete opportunity to extend its coverage to other nations and later to other forms of nuclear tests.

This treaty is in part the product of Western patience and vigilance. We have made clear—most recently in Berlin and in Cuba—our deep resolve to protect our security and our freedom against any threat or aggression. We have also made clear our steadfast determination to limit the arms race. In three administrations, our soldiers and diplomats have worked together to this end, always with the support of Great Britain. Prime Minister Macmillan joined with President Eisenhower in proposing a limited test-ban treaty in 1959, and again with me in 1961 and 1962.

But the achievement of this goal is not a victory for one side—it is a victory for mankind. It reflects no concessions either to or by the Soviet Union. It reflects simply our common recognition of the dangers in further testing.

This treaty is not the millenium. It will not resolve all conflicts, or cause the Communists to forgo their ambitions, or eliminate the dangers of war. It will not reduce our need for arms or allies or programs of assistance to others. But it is an important first step—a step toward peace—a step toward reason—a step away from war.

Here is what this step can mean to you and your children and your neighbors.

First, this treaty can be a step toward reduced world tensions and broader areas of agreement. The Moscow talks reached no agreement on any other subject, nor is this treaty conditioned on any other matter. Under Secretary Harriman made it clear that any nonaggression arrangements across the division in Europe would require full consultation with our allies and full attention to their interests. He also made clear our strong preference for a more comprehensive treaty banning all tests everywhere, and our ultimate hope for general and complete disarmament. The Soviet Government, however, is still unwilling to accept the inspections such goals require.

No one can predict with certainty, therefore, what further agreements, if any, can be built on the foundations of this one. They could include controls on preparations for surprise attack, or on numbers and types of armaments. There could be further limitations on the spread of nuclear weapons. The important point is that efforts to seek new agreements will go forward.

NEW CHALLENGES

But the difficulty of predicting the next step is no reason to be reluctant about this one. Nuclear test ban negotiations have long been a symbol of East-West disagreement. If this treaty can also be a symbol—if it can symbolize the end of one era and the beginning of another—if both sides can by this treaty gain confidence and experience in peaceful collaboration—then this short and simple treaty may well become a historic mark in man's age-old pursuit of peace.

Western policies have long been designed to persuade the Soviet Union to renounce aggression, direct or indirect, so that their people and all peoples may live and let live in peace. The unlimited testing of new weapons of war cannot lead toward that end—but this treaty, if it can be followed by further progress, can clearly move in that direction.

I do not say that a world without aggression or threats of war would be an easy world. It will bring new problems, new challenges from the Communists, new dangers of relaxing our vigilance or of mistaking their intent.

But those dangers pale in comparison to those of the spiraling arms race and a collision course toward war. Since the beginning of history, war has been mankind's constant companion. It has been the rule, not the exception. Even a nation as young and peace-loving as our own has fought through eight wars. And three times in the last 2½ years I have been required to report to you as President that this Nation and the Soviet Union stood on the verge of direct military confrontation—in Laos, in Berlin, and in Cuba.

A war today or tomorrow, if it led to nuclear war, would not be like any war in history. A full-scale nuclear exchange, lasting less than 60 minutes, could wipe out more than 300 million Americans, Europeans, and Russians, as well as untold numbers elsewhere. And the survivors, as Chairman Krushchev warned the Communist Chinese, "would envy the dead." For they would inherit a world so devastated by explosions and poison and fire that today we cannot even conceive of all its horrors.

So let us try to turn the world from war. Let us make the most of this opportunity and every opportunity, to reduce tension, to slow down the perilous nuclear arms race, and to check the world's slide toward financial annihilation.

FALLOUT FEARS

Second, this treaty can be a step toward freeing the world from the fears and dangers of radioactive fallout. Our own atmospheric tests last year were conducted under conditions which restricted such fallout to an absolute minimum. But over the years the number and yield of weapons tested have rapidly increased—and so have the radioactive hazards from such testing. Continued unrestricted testing by the nuclear power, joined in time by other nations which may be less adept in limiting pollution, will increasingly contaminate the air that all of us must breathe.

Even then, the number of children and grandchildren with cancer in their bones, with leukemia in their blood or with poison in their lungs might seem statistically small to some, in comparison with natural health hazards. But this is not a natural health hazard—and it is not a statistical issue. The loss of even one human life, or the malformation of even one baby—who may be born long after we are gone—should be of concern to us all. Our children and grandchildren are not merely statistics toward which we can be indifferent.

Nor does this affect the nuclear powers alone. These tests befoul the air of all men and all nations, the committed and the uncommitted alike, without their knowledge and without their consent. That is why the continuation of atmospheric testing causes so many countries to regard all nuclear powers as equally evil; and we can hope that its prevention will enable those countries to see the world more clearly, while enabling all the world to breathe more easily.

Third, this treaty can be a step toward preventing the spread of nuclear weapons to nations not now possessing them. During the next several years, in addition to the four current nuclear powers, a small but significant number of nations will have the intellectual, physical and financial resources to produce both nuclear weapons and the means of delivering them. In time, it is estimated, many other nations will have either this capacity or other ways of obtaining nuclear warheads, even as missiles can be commercially purchased today.

I ask you to stop and think for a moment what it would mean to have nuclear weapons in many hands—in the hands of countries large and small, stable and unstable, responsible and irresponsible, scattered throughout the world. There would be no rest for anyone then, no stability, no real security, and no chance of effective disarmament. There would only be increased chances of accidental war, and an increased necessity for the great powers to involve themselves in otherwise local conflicts.

If only one thermonuclear bomb were to be dropped on any American, Russian or other city—whether it was launched by accident or design, by a madman or an enemy, by a large nation or small, from any corner of the world—that one bomb could release more destructive force on the inhabitants of that one helpless city than all the bombs dropped during the Second World War.

Neither the United States, nor the Soviet Union, nor the United Kingdom, nor France can look forward to that day with equanimity. We have a great obligation—all four nuclear powers have a great obligation—to use whatever time remains to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, to persuade other countries not to test, transfer, acquire, possess, or produce such weapons.

This treaty can be the opening wedge in that campaign. It provides that none of the parties will assist other nations to test in the forbidden environments. It opens the door for further agreements on the control of nuclear weapons. And it is open for all nations to sign. For it is in the interest of all nations—and already we have heard from a number of countries who wish to join with us promptly.

GAIN IN SECURITY

Fourth, and finally, this treaty can limit the nuclear arms race in ways, which on balance, will strengthen our Nation's security far more than the continuation of unrestricted testing. For in today's world, a nation's security does not always increase as its arms increase, when its adversary is doing the same. And unlimited competition in the testing and development of new types of destructive nuclear weapons will not make the world safer for either side.

Under this limited treaty, on the other hand, the testing of other nations could never be sufficient to offset the ability of our strategic forces to deter or survive a nuclear attack and to penetrate and destroy an aggressor's homeland. We have, and under this treaty we will continue to have, all the nuclear strength that we need.

It is true that the Soviets have tested nuclear weapons of a yield higher than that which we have thought to be necessary; but the 100-megaton bomb of which they spoke 2 years ago does not and will not change the balance of strategic power. The United States has deliberately chosen to concentrate on more mobile and more efficient weapons, with lower but entirely sufficient yield; and our security is not, therefore, impaired by the treaty I am discussing.

RISK OF CHEATING

It is also true, as Mr. Khrushchev would agree, that nations cannot afford in these matters to rely simply on the good faith of their adversaries. We have not, therefore, overlooked the risk of secret violations. There is at present a possibility that deep in outer space, that hundreds and thousands and millions of miles away from the earth illegal tests might go undetected. But we already have the capability to construct a system of observation that would make such tests almost impossible to conceal, and we can decide at any time whether such a system is needed in the light of the limited risk to us and the limited reward to others of violations attempted at that range. For any tests which might be conducted so far out in space, which cannot be conducted more easily and efficiently and legally underground, would necessarily be of such a magnitude that they would be extremely difficult to conceal. We can also employ new devices to check on the testing of smaller weapons in the lower atmosphere. Any violation, moreover, involves, along with the risk of detection, the end of the treaty and the worldwide consequence for the violator.

Secret violations are possible and secret preparations for a sudden withdrawal are possible, and, thus, our own vigilance and strength must be maintained, as we remain ready to withdraw and to resume all forms of testing, if we must. But it would be a mistake to assume that this treaty will be quickly broken. The gains of illegal testing are obviously slight compared to their cost and the hazard of discovery, and the nations which have initialed and will sign this treaty prefer it, in my judgment, to unrestricted testing as a matter of their own self-interest, for these nations, too, and all nations, have a stake in limiting the arms race, in holding the spread of nuclear weapons and in breathing air that is not radioactive. While it may be theoretically possible to demonstrate the risks inherent in any treaty, and such risks in this treaty are small, the far greater risks to our security are the risks of unrestricted testing, the risk of a nuclear arms race, the risk of new nuclear powers, nuclear pollution, and nuclear war.

NATIONAL DEBATE

This limited test ban, in our most careful judgment, is safer by far for the United States than an unlimited nuclear arms race. For all these reasons, I am hopeful that this Nation will promptly approve the limited test-ban treaty. There will, of course, be debate in the country and in the Senate. The Constitution wisely requires the advice and consent of the Senate to all treaties, and that consultation has already begun. All this is as it should be. A document which may mark a historic and constructive opportunity for the world deserves a historic and constructive debate. It is my hope that all of you will take part in that debate, for this treaty is for all of us. It is particularly for our children and our grandchildren, and they have no lobby here in Washington. This debate will involve military, scientific, and political experts, but it must be not left to them alone. The right and the responsibility are yours.

If we are to open new doorways to peace, if we are to seize this rare opportunity for progress, if we are to be as bold and farsighted in our control of weapons as we have been in their inventions, then let us now show all the world on this side of the wall and the other that a strong America also stands for peace. There is no cause for complacency.

We have learned in times past that the spirit of one moment or place can be gone in the next. We have been disappointed more than once, and we have no illusions now that there are short cuts on the road to peace. At many points around the globe the Communists are continuing their efforts to exploit weakness and poverty. Their concentration of nuclear and conventional arms must still be deterred.

DANGERS REMAIN

The familiar contest between choice and coercion, the familiar places of danger and conflict are still there, in Cuba, in southeast Asia, in Berlin, and all around the globe, still requiring all the strength and the vigilance that we can muster. Nothing could more greatly damage our cause than if we and our allies were to believe that peace has already been achieved and that our strength and unity were no longer required.

But now for the first time in many years the path of peace may be open. No one can be certain what the future will bring. No one can say whether the time has come for an easing of the struggle. But history and our own conscience will judge us harsher if we do not now make every effort to test our hopes by action, and this is the place to begin. According to the ancient Chinese proverb, "A journey of a thousand miles must begin with a single step."

My fellow Americans, let us take that first step. Let us, if we can, get back from the shadows of war and seek out the way of peace. And if that journey is 1,000 miles or even more, let history record that we, in this land, at this time, took the first step.

Thank you and good night.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at the present time the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are meeting, in informal session, to hear a briefing on the proposed partial test-ban treaty by the Under Secretary of State, the Honorable Averell Harriman, who is accompanied by Mr. William Foster. At the meeting the questions are both searching and blunt, judging from what I can gather; and I am sure everyone would agree that the proposed agreement was openly arrived at and could be considered an open agreement.

In response to questions, the distinguished Under Secretary of State, Mr. Harriman, stated that there were no gimmicks or side issues attached to the proposal, which shortly will be before the Senate.

In connection with the proposed partial nuclear-test-ban agreement, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a statement issued by me over the weekend, relative to this most important matter.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

The proposed partial test ban agreement represents a breakthrough in the cold war and could, if properly observed by both sides, be the first break in the clouds in many years.

It is a tribute to the persistence, bipartisanship and wisdom, first, of President Eisenhower in 1959 and, then, of President Kennedy and of the many Members of the Senate and Congress as, for example, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the majority whip [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] whose resolution in favor of an agreement along the lines which have been reached is cosponsored by 33 other Senators, members of both parties.

These men recognized the need for an end to above-ground tests—on public health grounds, if no other—and refused to be discouraged in spite of many setbacks and disappointments. They thought in farsighted terms and in human terms—of this generation and of children yet to be born—American children, Russian children, indeed, all the world's children.

The agreement would not mean a cutback in defense appropriations but a stabilization rather than an increase of those expenditures.

In a sense it is a gamble, but in view of the critical nature of the problem and the fact that we can continue underground testing, it is in my opinion worth the effort. The escape clause protects us in an honorable manner and safeguards rather than weakens our defense. The fact that our chief negotiator was Averell Harriman who has never been taken in by the Soviet Union, ever since he first served as Ambassador to the Soviet Union two decades ago, is an earnest that our rights have been fully protected. The agreement, in my opinion, serves the interests of our country, our people and our security.

If this agreement is approved it does not mean that there will be total or unilateral disarmament either soon or in the future. What this new agreement will give us is more clean milk and water and food for our children, less strontium to pollute the air, and some basis for hoping that future generations will grow up as normal, healthy human beings.

This agreement will, in my opinion, serve the people's interest, give us some time to face up to other differences, and allow more "breathing" space to the end that a better kind of peace for mankind can be achieved.

It would be wrong to make too much of this agreement. But, even more, it would be wrong to make too little of it. A step, however, small, in the direction of preserving a world fit for human habitation is an immense stride in the history of human civilization.

PASSING OF NORTH DAKOTA REPRESENTATIVE HJALMAR NYGAARD

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, on July 18 North Dakota Congressman Hjalmar Nygaard died of a heart attack in Dr. Calver's office in the Capitol. His untimely passing came as a terrible shock to all of us. He seemed to be in good health and spirits right up to the time of his death.

Hjalmar Nygaard in his 3 short years of service in the Congress established a most commendable record and, along with it, far more than the usual number of friends and admirers.

Hjalmar Nygaard was born and reared on a farm in North Dakota during a period when there were but few years of prosperity. Early in life he came to know what poverty and hardship meant. He worked his way through college, taught in rural schools for a period, and then went into the retailing business, an occupation which he continued until his death.

As a young businessman Hjalmar became interested in community affairs, serving in many important capacities. In recognition of his outstanding community service, he was soon urged by community leaders to be a candidate for the State house of representatives. Here he became one of the truly fine leaders of the North Dakota Legislature, serving both as majority leader and as speaker of the house of representatives. Three years ago he was elected to the U.S. Congress.

In the short period he served here, his many fine qualities were recognized. He quickly established himself as a man of integrity and principle. He was a sincere, humble person who commanded the respect and admiration of all who knew him. He was a good and faithful public servant.

On coming to Congress, Hjalmar was assigned the position he sought on the House Interior Committee where he served with distinction. He did much to further the cause of the Garrison diversion irrigation project in which all of North Dakota is greatly interested. His loss on this committee is an irreplaceable one to the State of North Dakota.

North Dakota has lost one of its finest citizens and, I, one of my best friends.

May I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his lovely wife, Tommy, and to all his wonderful family.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert as part of my remarks several North Dakota newspaper and television editorials in tribute to our departed friend.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum, July 21, 1963]

REPRESENTATIVE NYGAARD GAINED OFFICE ON BASIS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

Unexpected death cut short a career of service Thursday when it claimed North Dakota's Representative Hjalmar C. Nygaard in the Nation's Capitol in Washington.

Because of his high elected office, the Republican Congressman may have been regarded by some as a successful politician. This he was, but he was successful in politics because from the start of his public career he envisioned a public office as one of service to the people, and not as an opportunity to build his own personal fame.

Representative Nygaard has been a teacher, newspaperman, and merchant, but at the same time he has been a mayor, a member of the city council, the school board, the county school officers association, the North Dakota House of Representatives and the U.S. House of Representatives.

During his time in the North Dakota Legislature and in the U.S. Congress, he never operated on the theory that there was a pat solution to everything. He strived for the workable solution, whether it be in the field of education or in getting congressional approval for the Garrison Dam diversion and irrigation project.

He did not win votes because of a great ability to flatter or to stir emotions, but because he was a sincere workman at whatever job he undertook.

It is unfortunate that he was not allowed more time to serve in the public office which he found so interesting. Nevertheless, no one can take away the fact that he did an outstanding job in all the many offices he held.

[From the Minot (N. Dak.) Daily News, July 20, 1963]

NORTH DAKOTA SUFFERS A GREAT LOSS

North Dakota has lost a fine citizen and outstanding public official, and the First District a highly respected Congressman, in the sudden death of Hjalmar Nygaard.

Only a few minutes earlier Congressman Nygaard was on the floor of Congress and it was in the office of the physician to Congress that he died without pain.

In the North Dakota State Legislature Hjalmar Nygaard demonstrated his ability to think clearly and stand firm by his convictions. He earned the respect of both majority and minority members because of his absolute fairness.

It is indeed tragic that a man of only 57 who had earned high office and success should be taken at so early an age. North Dakota needs leadership by men such as this modest, sound-thinking individual, especially when legislation is pending of great importance to North Dakota.

We believe the Governor is justified in calling a special election in the first district to choose a successor. Without reservation we suggest the voters in the eastern half of the State could win distinction by drafting Fred J. Fredrickson, of Valley City, whose close association with the water program over the years qualifies him to render a great service.

[From the Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Herald, July 21, 1963]

Death of U.S. Representative Hjalmar Nygaard in the National Capitol last Thursday was a great loss not alone to his many friends but to this State at large, for in his public life he had won respect and wide acclaim.

His sudden and untimely death at 57 was a shock to the State he had served so well in several capacities, always devoting his full energy to the faithful discharge of the duties entrusted to him.

There are those in public life—all too many, alas—whose first concern is the headlines they will achieve or the public applause they can evoke in the performance of even the routine tasks of public office.

This was never Mr. Nygaard's concern; he was never a headline hunter. To have sought fulsome acclaim for discharging his duties to the best of his ability would have been a compromise with the high standards that had always fixed his course in public life.

Mr. Nygaard was devoted to the principles of the Republican Party, through which he saw the greatest opportunity of service to his State and Nation, but above that he was first a loyal and devoted citizen of his State and country.

North Dakota—and every State and community—can ill afford to lose citizens of Mr. Nygaard's caliber, whether in public or private life. Naming a worthy successor will be no small task.

Politically, Hjalmar Nygaard was a moderate. He had strong convictions, but he tolerated opposing convictions. He was a conservative, but not a reactionary conservative.

Personally, he was a friendly, outgoing man, honest and sincere, easy to know and just as easy to like. He was, more than most political figures, just like the neighbor across the street or next door. As we said at the beginning, more than most he typified the average North Dakota citizen.

These were the attributes that made him successful in politics and which probably would have raised him to a position of high respect and influence in Congress. They're the attributes of a man even his political foes could trust, respect and like.

His death Thursday is a sore loss to the State he represented.

[From the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune, July 20, 1963]

HJALMAR NYGAARD, GOOD CITIZEN

Hjalmar Nygaard epitomized, to a large degree, the typical citizen who rises to a position of political leadership.

He was a farm boy who worked his way in college to a teaching certificate, then taught in rural schools for several years, including in Emmons County.

From school teaching, he went into the small town grocery business and eventually into hardware retailing, an occupation which he was to continue through his business life.

And in the small town he interested himself in public affairs, serving on the school board and as mayor of his town.

To this point, he was as one with thousands of other North Dakota people.

Eventually, through no effort of his own—he actually resisted the idea—Hjalmar Nygaard was nominated for the State House of Representatives, serving his first session there in 1949. Quite naturally, educational matters were his major interest.

To begin with, Hjalmar Nygaard cut no wide swath in the legislature. He minded his business and worked hard, but he had a knack for getting along with other legislators both of his party and of the opposition. So before long he was looked to for leadership, and he became first a floor leader and then the presiding officer, the house speaker. And, when in 1960 Republicans were sorting through potential candidates for Congress, it was natural again that Nygaard should be a top choice. He was nominated, won that year and again in 1962, so that upon hs death Thursday he was serving his second term in the U.S. Congress.

In Congress, Nygaard followed the course he followed in the State legislature. He made few speeches and sought no headlines, but buckled down to serious work in committee and cloakroom, where personal influence is most effective. His absence will hurt during coming months when North Dakota's Garrison diversion project comes before House committees, where his shepherding would have been important to success.

[From the Jamestown (N. Dak.) Sun, July 20, 1963]

(By Bill Wright)

Hjalmar Nygaard was a gentleman, and we mourn his death.

The Enderlin hardware merchant, only in November elected to his second term in the House of Representatives, showed fine prospects of becoming one of the State's most accomplished men to have ever served in that body.

It was the consensus of those who watched him in Washington that here was a man who would distinguish not only himself, but the people and the State he represented.

Hjalmar Nygaard was a humble man—plain, friendly, honest, decent; never haughty, never cruel, never cold.

He had a quiet manner among his constituents, a way of reassuring them merely by his presence and by his calm Scandinavian philosophy and accent.

He knew his faults, admitted them publicly. We've heard him say many times, "There's not much I can do as a freshman Congressman." But as a second-termer Hjalmar Nygaard was beginning to move in a circle of effectiveness that is impossible for a freshman Member.

His greatest achievements, legislatively, were ahead of him when he suddenly died. It is a frailty of Congress that ability is almost always ranked second to seniority. Yet, when the two qualities are present, as they were in Mr. Nygaard, the effectiveness of the Member is boundless.

We feel something of a personal loss, because the Congressman was a good friend. We worked with him on some matters, campaigned with him, and was the recipient of his kindly counsel.

We drove miles across North Dakota's highways, while Congressman Nygaard and Senator YOUNG talked of many things, mostly politics.

Once at a hotel in Fargo, the room clerk put us into his and Mrs. Nygaard's room by mistake.

The Congressman, arriving from Washington late at night, tired and under strain of a busy schedule that would start early in the morning, merely laughed as the two of us struggled with the transfer of luggage, and all the accoutrements of a campaign, from one room to another.

Mr. Nygaard was never cross, never excited.

His administrative assistant, Mrs. Irene Edwards, was the longtime "Girl Friday" of the late Senator Bill Langer.

The Senator, she told us, often fired her at the drop of a hat, then rehired her before she could get to her desk.

She marveled at Congressman Nygaard's composure, his restraint, his tolerance and expressed amazement at the contrast between her two bosses.

She will be a very sad woman at the death of this boss, as she was when Senator Langer died.

She is not alone in her grief.

This was a very good man.

North Dakota Broadcasting Co., Inc.,
July 19, 1963.

(By Fred Froeschle)

All North Dakota has been saddened by the death of Congressman Hjalmar Nygaard.

The State will miss his broad experience in government and the fine associations he had developed during his relatively brief time in Congress.

One of his unique qualities was his ability to inspire the friendship and confidence of diverse political associates. This was in part due to his dedication to the welfare of North Dakota and the Nation and also in part to the courtesy he accorded to his political adversaries, as well as to his friends and associates.

In the North Dakota Legislature he displayed his capacity as a student of legislation, and this was a special quality which offered promise of a successful career in Congress.

His service to the State included offices at almost every level of government. He was more a public servant than a politician, and this perhaps led to his success in politics.

The management of this station joins all North Dakotans in mourning the death of a great citizen and an outstanding public servant.

[From the Ransom County Gazette, July 25, 1963]

No Excuses Needed for Nygaard Tribute

If the death of U.S. Representative Hjalmer Nygaard was a blow to North Dakota, one can readily imagine what a loss it was to residents of Ransom County.

Representative Nygaard embodied things governmental as we know them today, many of which are representative only of our era and which will never be repeated. He was a conservative, not as we think of conservatism on the Barry Goldwater level, but one who could forgo hardline conservatism if he thought it was for the good of all. He represented North Dakota first and foremost in an effort to fulfill the duties of a station given to him by the people.

His rise to political stature is indicative of the struggle of a populace to have its capable men represent them in Government. His candidacy for the first time was encouraged by those who recognized his ability more than he did.

In the wake of Hjalmer's untimely passing, this excerpt from a publication of the U.S. Press Association "The Right To Mourn" seems particularly appropriate:

In these days of timesaving devices when we are inclined to streamline the flow of life and worship at the shrine of efficiency, the experience of giving final tribute to a great man should give us pause for consideration. In so doing, we consider that only the inspiring grandeur of a funeral procession fulfills the yearning of the living to express their love of the departed.

"Recently we have experienced a wave of materialistic rationalizing designed to convince us that the burial of the dead is merely a disposal problem that should be simplified and conducted along economic and sanitary lines. Such advocates forget, or are insensible of the fact that the removal of ceremony also removes dignity, respect, sentiment—and the right to mourn."

The death of an honored man among North Dakotans and the beauty and splendor of his interment should serve to remind us that the living should not only keep but should treasure the rituals of bereavement and respect. If there are those whose passing deserves particular attention, certainly the man from Enderlin who has done his best to serve North Dakotans is among them.

[From the New Rockford Transcript, July 25, 1963]

Dedicated Servant

If you could be sure of anything it would have been that Congressman Hjalmar Nygaard never thought he would one day serve his State in Washington. He was a humble man. This was the foremost of his many fine qualities—qualities many people never knew he possessed simply because of his quiet, unpretentious way of doing things.

While serving in the State legislature he gained the confidence and respect of his colleagues; he served them, not himself. As his circle of friends grew, more and more people recognized that this quiet, small-town businessman was the type that could be depended upon to follow the dictates of his conscience and to act unselfishly while in public office.

His philosophy of government was ingrained in him by his parents whose firm belief in free enterprise and democracy never wavered. Neither did his. He had confidence in people, not in government, and he wanted to continue this great, free land for posterity.

When Hjalmar died so unexpectedly at the age of 57 last week, North Dakota lost a dedicated public servant. He was the rare type individual that never played politics simply for politic's sake. He wasn't a fence-straddler and never hesitated to make his position known. There are too few diplomats in public office today and our State suffered a setback with his untimely demise.

North Dakotans will remember Hjalmar Nygaard because he was their type of person—honest, sound, conscientious and sincere. He was a dedicated public servant with a world of admirers.

[From the Bottineau Courant, July 24, 1963]

The sudden death of Congressman Hjalmar Nygaard was a shock to everyone in our State. Although Mr. Nygaard had not served in office very many years, he had won the admiration and support of most people in our State. He was highly recognized in national circles and his office was recognized as being capably and efficiently managed. Mr. Nygaard was for North Dakota, and while his politics may have differed from others, he had the interest of the people of our State at heart at all times.

We had met Mr. Nygaard several times and our regard for him was the highest. We felt he was a personal friend. His loss to our State will be great. His death at his young age is a great loss.

[From the McLean County Independent, July 25, 1963]

A Grave Loss

All of North Dakota suffered a grave loss last week with the swift and unexpected death of Congressman Hjalmar Nygaard. Few have served North Dakota so well in such a relatively short period of time.

Although a representative of eastern North Dakota, following his reelection last November, Hjalmar nonetheless ably served all of North Dakota.

Quiet and unassuming, he disproved the statement that "good guys always come in second." Hjalmar was, in every respect, a good man, a man who was fair in his political deliberations, who sought full knowledge where diverse opinions were expressed, who moved about without fanfare as he effectively pursued the goals in which he sincerely believed.

Only in his sophomore term as a Congressman, Hjalmar had a bright future in Washington. His seat on the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, where reauthorization of Garrison Diversion will be considered first, was and is needed by North Dakota.

It was as a member of the State legislature that Hjalmer was best known to most North Dakotans. He was no overpowering figure in the House where he served as majority leader and speaker in later sessions * * * and many were somewhat surprised when the Republicans tabbed him for the nomination as a Congressman at their 1960 convention.

Like other members who had served their legislative district and their State well in Bismarck, Hjalmar was relatively unknown outside of his home area, away from the legislative halls in 1960. But through his six terms in the statehouse, he had demonstrated to his party associates and even to those of the opposition that he carried within that distinguished stature honesty, fairness, diligence to duty.

Death is always tragic * * *. It is especially tragic when it strikes a man in the "bloom" of his life.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I join the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota in the remarks that he has made about our late colleague Representative Nygaard of North Dakota. As a neighbor, we, too, feel his loss. I wish to take this opportunity to express to his family our deep sorrow, and extend our deep condolences and sympathy in his passing.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I appreciate those comments very much.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR KUCHEL

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, one of the most distinguished Members of this body, Senator Thomas Kuchel of California, is to be commended for his courage in dealing with the far-rightest movement in the United States.

Some of these extremists have attempted to infiltrate and take control of many fine organizations in the United States, including the Young Republican organization.

I am very proud of the position taken by the president of the Young Republican Federation in North Dakota, Allan C. Young. He is one of the most able and sound conservative thinking young men in our State. Allan is no relative of mine, but I would be happy if he were.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks a letter under date of July 6, 1963, from Allan C. Young to my good friend, Senator Thomas Kuchel.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Devils Lake, N. Dak.,
July 6, 1963.

Senator Kuchel,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I have just returned to North Dakota after attending our National

Young Republican Convention in San Francisco. While I enjoyed your State and the wonderful welcome I received, there is a matter so shocking that I felt this letter necessary.

The display by the California Young Republicans at that convention was more akin to a nightmare than the responsibility which was expected. These people, led by Robert Gaston, were almost unbelievable. I naturally have read in the press and elsewhere about the activities of the extreme right. However, I must admit that I didn't fully accept what I read, but I do now.

After several conversations with California Young Republicans, I couldn't believe that they were attacking not only yourself but were telling me what they were going to do after they had gotten rid of the Republican Senator from California. In North Dakota there are certain Young Republicans who are not in favor of our senior Senator, Milton Young, but happily their number is small. The attacks and charges made against you were the worst kind of political back stabbing and hate mongering. Of all of this, I am sure you are aware, yet I feel that I should let you know that not all Young Republicans are of an irresponsible nature and that if the great bulk of Young Republicans were given proper leadership, this current wild-eyed bunch of extreme conservatives would fade quickly from young Republican organizations.

Perhaps a word from a Young Republican in North Dakota cannot contribute a great deal to ease the pressure from other young people in California. Nonetheless, this letter does allow me to take a burden off my mind and to continue strengthening the Young Republicans of North Dakota to the end of electing Republicans and not the confused course which I witnessed in California.

Senator, my best wishes go out to you and I encourage you in your fight to maintain a responsible, honest and Republican position.

Again with best wishes.

Yours,

Allan C. Young.

PAPER CRANES IN SUPPORT OF TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the San Francisco Women for Peace sent letters to all Members of the U.S. Senate urging support of the test ban negotiations. Accompanying each letter was a folded paper crane. The significance of the crane and the story of the activity of the San Francisco women is told in the following news release.

I ask unanimous consent that the news release be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

Paper Cranes Fly for a Test Ban

Many Women for Peace and their children will mail 1,000 paper cranes to the negotiators of the United States, U.S.S.R., and England, meeting in Moscow. They will be mailed at the post office at Haight and Clayton Streets at 1:30 p.m. on July 15, sent to urge that a comprehensive test ban agreement be reached now. We have met in the Haight-Ashbury district in San Francisco to make these 1,000 paper cranes during the past weeks to express our wish for life.

There is an ancient legend in Japan that a crane lives 1,000 years. Following the bombing of Hiroshima in 1945, the children who had been hospitalized from radiation effects developed a story of their own drawn from that legend—that if a child could make 1,000 paper cranes, he would be granted his wish to live.

The children called themselves "The Club of the Paper Cranes." In 1954, 9 years after the bomb, a little girl named Sadako contracted leukemia as a result of radiation exposure she had suffered as an infant. She was put with the other children into one of the A-bomb hospitals, and she too joined the children in their terrible quest for hope. On the day that Sadako made her 964th paper crane, she died. And at her funeral the children placed with her 1,000 paper cranes. Sadako has become a symbol of the children's movement; the paper cranes have become a symbol of peace, of the hope that there will be no more Hiroshimas.

We send a paper crane to our Nation's Senators asking that they actively support such a test ban treaty as a first step toward general and complete disarmament under effective international controls.

On this day balloons, sent aloft by our children, will carry brightly colored paper cranes on their way and with them our children's trust in the future.

We ask all who cherish life to act now to express their desire to preserve it.

Mr. METCALF. In addition to its significance in connection with the test ban, the story has an interesting sidelight. Under the present law such a demonstration as children launching balloons could not take place here. Unless Congress acts on H.R. 7643 and S. 1897, such an innocent and colorful demonstration can never take place in Washington, D.C.

THE TFX CONTRACT

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I spent a very interesting weekend studying the carefully censored transcript of testimony before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, headed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] which is investigating the TFX contract. I do not hesitate to say that I was jolted by what I read.

In reviewing the July 25 comments of my colleague, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], and in studying testimony by Navy Secretary Korth before the committee, I was shocked to see spelled out publicly the obvious business and political cross currents which figured in Secretary Korth's judgments on the aircraft contract.

There is, in my mind, a parallel that cries for discussion. If my recollection of the Dixon-Yates case is correct, the courts determined there should be great concern for Government officials entering into relationships which are fraught with temptation. To use the court's words, "The statute"—meaning the conflict-of-interest statute—"is more concerned with what might have happened in a given situation than with what actually happened." One of the basic considerations in drafting the conflict-of-interest statute was the effect it could have on preventing honest Government agents from succumbing to temptation. Every attempt was made to prevent officials from entering into relationships which—to again use the words of the statute—are "fraught with temptation."

It is patently obvious in studying even the well sanitized transcripts from the July 23 hearings that the factors in the TFX contract were extremely "temptation fraught."

The Secretary, by his own admission, is a man of integrity. He knows that his judgments as the Navy's civilian in the Pentagon can have a profound effect on the future of our great Nation. He should have avoided the temptations, for by anyone's standards, they were monumental. He was president of the Texas bank which loaned something under $600,000 to the financially distressed General Dynamics Corp.; he was also a substantial stockholder in that bank. It was axiomatic that much of the moneys lent by Korth would be spent in Korth's State, if General Dynamics got the TFX contract. It was equally obvious that a nod toward General Dynamics would cause much good to accrue to the New Frontier, and the whole transaction would greatly enhance the Fred Korth image in the banking circles he hopes to rejoin when he disentangles himself from the Kennedys.

Mr. President, if I were to define temptation, I could find no more graphic example than Secretary Korth's TFX dilemma. Seldom has one man allowed himself to be pressured so much by so many while claiming to maintain superbly balanced judgment. I would venture the guess that the conflict-of-interest statute was authored with "temptation fraught" situations such as this in mind.

Let us take a closer and more analytical look at the time when Korth—with Zuckert and McNamara—overruled the combined judgment of evaluation teams and military greats, the caliber of General LeMay and Admirals Burke and Anderson—the latter since cashiered out of the Pentagon. Did Korth reveal to his confederates his staggering conflict of interest? If he did not, he should have. If he did, then McNamara and Zuckert are equally culpable. These Secretaries owe the public answers to many questions stemming from this judgment. In what camouflaged vacuum, in what logic-tight compartment, were these decisions rendered that fly in the face of fact?

From my seat on the Senate floor, Mr. President, it becomes patent that the cost factors, the performance factors, the other military, economic, and national security considerations which would be expected to determine the largest single contract ever entered into by any government in the history of the world—it may reach $12 billion—were not of primary importance to this administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Metcalf in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wyoming may have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SIMPSON. It became obvious many months ago, that TFX and the administration's standards of what might be called "TFX ethics" are shot through with political interest and favoritism. There are facts pointing to a misuse by some of the trusts and responsibilities which repose in public office.

The July 23 testimony of Secretary Korth is shocking almost beyond belief. The implications and the connotations in his revelations are even more surprising.

I sincerely believe, Mr. President, that the TFX hearings should be continued until all parties involved have made full disclosures of the motives for their judgments in this gigantic contract.

GOLDWATER ON EXTREMISTS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an excellent article in a recent issue of Newsweek by Raymond Moley entitled "Goldwater on Extremists."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Goldwater on Extremists

(By Raymond Moley)

Governor Rockefeller's attack upon extremists was immediately interpreted in some sections of the press as a pointed criticism of Senator Goldwater. The Governor later, in response to press questioning, said that "while I have great respect for Barry's patriotism, his dedication to political life. * * * I have some concern whether * * * he may not end up as a captive of those elements." This raises certain questions which I shall attempt to answer in this and a subsequent article. The first is what has been Goldwater's attitude toward extremists and extremism? Another, considering the fact that the Rockefeller statement made a great deal of the racial issue, what has been Goldwater's record on the racial issue?

The Governor is somewhat late in bringing up the question of extremism. In August 1959 in a piece entitled "All-or-nothing?" I referred to people who "in the past or recently have expressed, either in print or personally, unhappiness concerning political leaders whose views and votes have not completely and specifically met their own convictions. The vice of such irreconcilability is that it defeats the very objectives which most conservatives are earnestly seeking. This habit, it seems to me, is much more a threat to sound government than all the power and prattle of radicals. The all-or-nothing attitude means a house divided, which cannot stand."

THE SENATOR AGREES

Almost immediately after this appeared in print, I had a totally unsolicited letter from Goldwater which expressed thorough agreement with my statement.

Ten months later I returned to the subject in a piece entitled "The Irreconcilables," in which I wrote: "Goldwater is not irreconcilable. He realizes that to throw into sharp reverse the trend of the past 25 years would be inexpedient and self-defeating. What is needed is to slow up the drift to the left before it is too late."

Again I had a letter of commendation and agreement from Goldwater:

"Your column is good and I hope we can get the conservatives to take up this line. To put it in a very simple way, the Democrats have their political liabilities, but they say they are Democrats and they vote for Democrats in the hope that they can change them, but with a Republican the answer has been, 'We just don't vote for him—that will teach him a lesson.' "

Essentially, Goldwater believes in attaining reasonably conservative ends through supporting the Republican Party and all its candidates. His moving speech at the Republican convention seconding the nomination of Richard Nixon urged his followers, who were crying out for his nomination, instead to get into the Republican ranks and work and support the ticket. In the campaign which followed, Goldwater made innumerable speeches supporting the Republican Party and all its candidates.

RECORD ON CIVIL RIGHTS

In 1962 he was asked whether, if he were a voter in New York, he would support Senator Javits. He said he would, and as chairman of the senatorial campaign committee he actually raised funds for Javits, as he did for all other Republican candidates for the Senate.

In the Rockefeller statement a considerable space is given to the racial issue. For several years after 1946, Goldwater was a member of the NAACP. He was and is a member of the Urban League. As a powerful officer in the Arizona Air National Guard he brought about its integration. When he went to high school in Phoenix the school was integrated. Later it was segregated. But when he was a member of the NAACP after the war he helped to bring about the reintegration of the school and gave money to fight the case in the courts.

Thus the implications in Rockefeller's language are not only unfair to the Arizona Senator himself, but a grave reflection upon all those who want to support Goldwater for President. Nobody who has any sense can believe that this man, who has stood so firmly in the minority for conservative principles for so many years, could be a "prisoner" of anybody or anything except his convictions.

SENATOR GOLDWATER'S SPEECH BEFORE YOUNG REPUBLICAN CONVENTION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a very fine speech delivered by our distinguished colleague the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] before the Young Republican National Convention in San Francisco, Calif., on June 27, 1963.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Text of a Speech by Senator Barry Goldwater, Republican, of Arizona, Before the Young Republican National Convention, San Francisco, Calif., June 27, 1963

In the last 4 or 5 years, I have spoken in many places. But never have I felt more at home than I do with the young Republicans. In this group here today I firmly believe there is more potential leadership than you could find in any group of similar size anywhere in this country.

Some people have been surprised at the large number of young people who are coming into the Republican Party: people like yourselves—able, energetic, and intelligent leaders of the new generation. And this movement has been a source of great concern to the liberals.

At first, they began writing articles to show it wasn't really happening. Then they began to concede that maybe just a little handful of students might have become interested. Then they began to show panic. Well, I have been back and forth across this country in hundreds of meetings and I am here to say that there really is a profoundly important move taking place especially among the more able young people. The liberals have good reason for their panic.

I well remember a meeting not long ago in a Middle Western State. There are several very large universities in that State each with more than 25,000 students. The Conservative Club at one of these universities had invited me to speak on campus. The school I'm referring to is well known for its very liberal atmosphere. Out of more than 1,000 faculty members, I would be surprised if you could find more than six who would confess to being Republicans among the faculty. Only two faculty members would even let their names be associated with anything named the Conservative Club.

But how about the students?

It turned out that they were far more openminded than their faculty. You know it was the faculty, not the students, who were slaves to political conformity. This Conservative Club contracted for the largest auditorium on the campus, and that night the auditorium was completely filled, with an overflow crowd outside. Not filled with faculty members. Few of them were there. It was students. And their questions were keen—not hostile—but keen and searching. They were looking for answers. It was a wonderful and refreshing experience.

Again and again I have found this to be true. And it is not so much the quantity of young people who are coming into the Republican Party that impresses me most. No. It is the quality of the young people who are coming in which is the great thing. We are getting the best. It is the high leadership potential among the young Republicans which is the great, heartening thing for the future. I know that right here among you today there are probably six future U.S. Senators. There are as many Governors. There are here in this room today a score of future Congressmen. There are many of you here in this room today who will hold important and responsible local offices.

I don't say this to make you happy. If all of you were fully aware of what happens to a man when he runs for office, you would not be entirely happy at the prospect. Or if you knew some of the trying and exasperating experiences you can have once you have been elected to office, you would not talk of officeholding as a totally happy experience.

But there is something about discharging your duty as a public officer which is very bracing. It is a deeply satisfying endeavor. And if you have strong beliefs about the nature of man and the meaning of government, you can't stay out of this fight. It isn't easy to confine yourself just to making a living, raising a family, and going fishing on weekends if the very basis of life, as you understand it, is in critical danger.

No, the young people of this country are realizing that there is something profoundly wrong with the way things are going. Of course, there are some people who are so lacking in vision or imagination that they cannot see or comprehend an attack unless war has actually been declared, and armed forces are on the move. It takes some imagination to see that the greatest victories are won sometimes without a shot being fired. Yes, and the great defeats we have suffered have not been through a declared war, but at a time when we were supposed to be at peace. The great country of China was lost to us not when we were technically at war, but when we were thought to be at peace. It was not a military failure, but a failure of our political leadership.

And now, most recently, our enemy, the Soviet Union, has secured a military base only 90 miles from our shore. No shot was fired by American forces. In fact, our Armed Forces were instructed by their Commander in Chief not to fire a shot. I will say to you that the loss of Cuba was, in all probability, a greater and more dangerous defeat than any we have suffered in any war. No one can fathom the depth of the danger presented to us by the Soviet military occupation of the nearby island of Cuba. And this defeat was caused, I say to you, by the failure of our national political leadership to understand and deal firmly with the Soviet threat. We have suffered defeat after defeat like these. These have been failures of political vision and political imagination. And why, I ask you, does a leadership, which calls itself liberal, always underrate any threat which comes from the left?

I ask you here tonight—how many more defeats can we take? How much longer dare we keep a weak and indecisive national leadership?

At this juncture in history, the risks of politics have clearly become too great for us to leave in the hands of ambitious opportunists. Our political leaders must stand for something. There must be the kind of firmness and clarity in the judgment of our political leadership that comes only from strong political principles. Vacillation in leadership is inevitable if there is no firm belief in the basic principles, and no clear understanding of the nature of our enemy.

If you ask the liberal Democrats what they stand for, they will list for you a multitude of programs.

Now, program is no substitute for principle.

A lot of talk about a school lunch program, for example, will not serve to distract us from the basic fact that an atheistic society is confronting us and has an unyielding determination to destroy us.

I firmly believe it is this very vacuum of principle which young and idealistic people sense in today's liberals. It is, in part, the fundamental moral and intellectual bankruptcy of modern-day liberalism that is causing young people to turn increasingly to the Republican Party.

All of us know there are defects in our society which we all wish were not there—defects we all wish could be corrected. Young people especially are very sensitive to the fact that even in our own country, wealthy beyond any society known in history, pockets of poverty remain. And we all know of other imperfections in our country.

Well, these liberal reformers long ago set about correcting all of the evils that man is heir to. It meant a tremendous program of social engineering. In fact, it meant a whole series of programs. It meant programs within programs. It got so that no one was politically respectable unless he had not one, but a whole set of programs. For more than 30 years there has been a tremendous bustle across the Nation as the modern liberal politicians have gone about their multitude of programs, most of which had to do with taking from one group and giving to another. It was all very forward looking. More than anything else, it looked forward to getting more votes for liberal politicians.

Now, during these past 30 years a vast number of programs—a few large ones, many small ones—have been carried through to completion. Some of them have been enacted into law. A few of these programs have actually led to some noticeable improvement in social conditions. About all we can say for some others—like the farm program—is that we have been able to survive them.

It really is a great tribute to the underlying productivity of this country that we have not been bankrupted by some of these hair-brained schemes. It says a great deal for the stamina and the productive forces in this country that they have not only been able to overcome the severe handicaps imposed upon them by the modern liberal reformers, but they have gone through and over these barriers to achieve a level of productivity unimagined only a generation ago.

Can you imagine what level—what economic peak—we should have reached by now if we had not been carrying the tremendous and steadily increasing burdens of the last 30 years?

Can you imagine the rocketing effect on the economy, the vast increase in employment, if some of the tax brakes had been taken off and the basic productive forces really let loose? A burst of energy would have been released in this country to bring about economic benefits so great that they would have transcended even the utopian dreams of the liberal reformers.

Now, this is no dream. We have seen what this country can do under a heavy burden of liberal handicaps. The lack of vision on the part of the liberal reformers has not been completely fatal. But it has held us back.

Let me say, it is not just that the liberals' understanding of the economy has been defective. After all, economic matters constitute only one aspect of our civilization. Important as economics may be, there are other aspects—moral and cultural—of much greater importance for all of us. Defects in economic thinking could be tolerated, as long as they were not completely and overwhelmingly disastrous, provided other more important aspects of our civilization were well understood, and kept in a same perspective. But it is exactly here that the narrowness of the modern liberal vision has been most strikingly apparent.

Yes, the narrowness of the modern liberal view has been that all problems are seen as essentially economic in character. This is the Marxist view, and it has had a deep effect on the modern liberals in this country.

This same narrow perspective has caused the modern liberals to view the profoundly complex problems of foreign policy as basically economic, and capable of simple economic solutions. For years we have measured the strength of our ties with other countries by the amount of economic aid we were giving them.

Now, what could be more narrow or more unreal than the idea that our good friends are the ones we give the most money to?

What could be more foolish than the belief that our good friends will become enemies if we stop paying them?

Only men with the narrowest economic vision could believe that money will buy friendship. Yet, the policy of the liberal politicians shows that this strange, unreal and dangerous myth is actually their basic belief. I say we do not dare to continue on such an unreal basis.

Or, turning to the domestic scene, what could be more ludicrous than the idea that the problem of the quality of education in this country can be solved merely by appropriating very large sums, so we can build bigger and more elaborate facilities?

The naive and narrow idea that spending our resources in larger quantities will somehow solve every dangerous and complex problem of foreign and domestic policy is the characteristic—and fatal—weakness of the liberals. They are obsessed with economic solutions for every problem. This makes them incapable of seeing our problems in their full complexity. Obsession with economics makes them blind to the deeper motives of men and at the same time incapable of any sound and realistic assessment of our national problems.

Some 30 years ago, the liberals began the propagation of the myth that it was the economic solutions that were basic and total. The "standard of living," for example, came to be the measure of our civilization. And "standard of living" came to mean only economic well-being. Almost everyone was taught to forget that a truly human standard of living involves many aspects of life which are not economic, and which cannot be understood through economic measurement.

Yet, as we look back on the depression of the thirties, we find that one of the most evil aftereffects of that depression was the widespread belief which had been drilled into our people by the reformers, that a rising economic standard of living was the sole and total solution to our problems.

Now I would by no means suggest that a rising economic standard of living is unimportant. It is very important. But I would say that the most important elements of life are beyond economics. It is the modern liberal blindness to these other far more important areas which constitutes their essential danger. And this blindness can lead to social evils of the very greatest consequence.

A view of life which sees all problems in terms of economic solutions is, I say, a false view, and such a view leads inevitably, inescapably to false solutions. And I say to you that the application of false solutions to important and dangerous problems make those problems actually worse, more dangerous, more threatening. We cannot afford to leave the destiny of our great Nation in the hands of men who actually believe that spending money is the basic solution to all problems.

But it is not alone the crude narrowness of vision on the part of the modern liberals which makes them both dangerous and unworthy as leaders of the American nation.

Perhaps the most disturbing and dangerous fact about these modern liberals is that they are not really liberals at all, by any standards. They have betrayed the very standards they profess. They use the standard of liberalism to deceive people of good will into believing that the idealism of the liberals of 50 years ago—the inspired reformers, for example, who won the vote for women—is the same as these modern liberals.

Now, years ago there were evils in this country which demanded some attention. There are defects in our society today which we dare not ignore. And liberals of 50 years ago fought some of those evils with sacrifice and an admirable sense of dedication.

But where are those self-sacrificing and dedicated liberals today?

Do you find them wintering in the great mansions of Palm Beach? Do you find them summering in the great mansions of Hyannis Port?

Mind you, I don't believe that the possession of a great family fortune necessarily precludes the possibility of idealism. It just makes it a little harder to come by.

Fifty years ago, there were some liberals in this country—liberals like Lincoln Steffens, who led a campaign to clean up the moral and political corruption of our big cities. They led a fight to destroy the corrupt city political machines which lived off graft and hidden connections with vice and crime. These men were genuine liberals. They really believed in what they were doing. They led a genuine fight to break the power of these corrupt, big-city political machines whose power had become so great they could dominate whole State and National party organizations.

The evil growth of these sinister big-city machines was like a cancer inside the body politic. It was well known that their tentacles reached deep into the offices of the Governors of great States, and even into the Halls of Congress. The White House itself was not immune to these influences.

Now, I ask you to look at the situation today.

You who are here from New York City, do you really believe that the Tammany machine is broken? Do you believe that government in your city is free from the graft and corruption so characteristic of big-city machines?

I seem to recall some investigations during the last several years that seem to suggest that business is going on very much as usual in New York City. In fact, only several days ago the press reported that an emissary from very high places made a special trip to visit with Carmine de Sapio. You know who it was—it was one of the relatives.

And you who are here from Pennsylvania. What about the Green machine in Philadelphia? Has there ever been a tougher, more tightly controlled political machine in the history of Philadelphia? Has there ever been a political machine in your city more capable of delivering a machine vote—for a price?

And what about you people here from Illinois? Let me ask you about politics in Cook County.

What about the ruthless Cook County machine in Chicago? Is it any different from the Kelly-Nash machine of which it is the heir? Is this bastion of modern liberal strength any less corrupt than it ever was?

I ask you, is it just coincidence that the political power of the infamous Cook County machine in Chicago is based especially on just those precincts which are the most vice-ridden—on those wards which have the highest crime rate?

I ask you, is it just a coincidence that this evil and corrupt political power is generated in just the most crime-infested areas of Chicago?

If we want to know what this kind of political power means, let us remember the police scandals in Chicago during recent years. And by all means, let's not forget the vote frauds of 1960.

Now, it is sometimes charged that corrupt big-city politicians of the North who constitute the chief base of modern liberal political strength also pay off political favors to criminal elements in the big cities, through a selective enforcement of the law. Some people whose politics are not considered "right" find the laws are enforced against them with the greatest severity. Others, whose politics are helpful to the ruling machine, can operate "wide open" without regard for the law.

In Chicago, they went a step further. Everyone knows that some of the city police under the rule of the corrupt Cook County machine became themselves so corrupt they went into actual competition with the criminals.

Now, the corruption of the political machines in the big cities of the North is well known. It is no secret. It is one of the great scandals of American politics. It is one of the worst evils on the American scene.

But have you heard any of the so-called liberals in the national administration condemning this wholesale corruption? No, you have not. And why do they keep silent?

Fifty years ago, American liberals were fierce in their attacks on these evil big-city machines with their deadly and growing influence which had spread through the whole American political system from the municipalities right up through Congress itself, and even into the White House.

What about today?

No one can deny that the northern big-city machines are more powerful than ever. No one can deny that their evil influence is greater than ever before in history.

Where are the self-styled liberals of today?

How do we account for the deafening silence among the modern liberals with regard to this paramount national evil, this national disgrace?

How is it that this evil which 50 years ago inspired a flood of liberal pamphlets and books, which led to national crusades and fervent speeches across the land—how is it that this evil, now far worse, far more pervasive, far more influential than ever before—is greeted by absolute silence on the part of the modern liberals?

The cause of this silence is clear and unmistakable.

I charge that there is today a cynical alliance between the politicians who call themselves liberal and the corrupt big-city machines whose job it is to deliver the bloc votes of the big northern cities. It is the corrupt big-city machines which elect these men to public office.

I charge that the politicians who have inherited the tradition of liberalism in this country today are not liberals at all, but merely ambitious men who have become the captives of the big-city machines. These ambitious men know that the tradition of liberalism in this country demands that they carry on an appearance of righteous crusades, but as capives of the big-city machines of the North, they can now carry on only those few token crusades that actually tend to strengthen the big-city machines. It is a fact that they dare not attack in any way the evil forces that generate the power of these city machines of the North—least of all the profound and spreading evil of the corrupt machine itself.

I charge the liberal politicians of this country with moral bankruptcy.

Narrow as the liberal vision may be, obsessed as it now is with economic solutions to all problems, there once were some noble elements in liberalism before the modern liberals became the captives of the big-city machines.

But now they are not even liberals.

They are only allowed an occasional sham crusade which will support the political needs of the big-city machines, whose captives they are.

They have now become the phony liberals.

And just because they are phony liberals they have become extremely dangerous. Conscious of the very questionable claim they have to the title of liberal, they are tempted into bringing into a fierce heat those few problem areas where their political owners allow them, from time to time, to make a liberal show.

Yes, in those last remaining few areas where they have not sold out completely, they find it necessary to create a tremendous furor so their absence in the really critical liberal areas will not be so noticeable.

Perhaps the saddest thing about American politics is this liberal bankruptcy. In spite of other very severe shortcomings, it could at least be said, several generations ago, that there was still a residue of idealism among the liberals.

Now, we are only machine politicians bringing out as a matter of ritual—as a way of deceiving the voter—the tattered but honorable flags of yesterday's liberalism—a liberalism which they no longer understand, even in limited form.

It is this moral bankruptcy of the liberal politicians which is causing the young people to move toward the Republican Party. For we are the only party in this country which is free of political obligations to the big-city machines.

The stern, cold fact is that no Democrat can be elected to national office today who is not under deep and unbreakable obligation to the corrupt big-city machines.

This is the cold, chilling fact about the so-called liberals of the North. They cannot break out of this bondage. The modern liberals have made this alliance with the corrupt city machines and the price is no less than their liberalism itself. They cannot go back down this road. They have bartered their ideals in order to gain and keep political power.

This was the death of any genuine liberal movement. It was the beginning of the reign of the hard-bitten opportunists who have preserved only the liberal label.

Because sensitive liberals are aware of the political dead-end of liberalism in this country, they are no longer going into the leadership of the Democratic Party as they once did. In their place are the cynical opportunists who are quite comfortable in their alliance with the big-city politicians. They are satisfied just to make a show of their apparent liberalism from time to time. These opportunists hope to capture a few marginal votes among people who still doggedly keep some hope for liberal politics, in the face of all the facts.

There has developed a great confusion in the use of the terms "liberal" and "conservative" in this country. One of the major reasons for this confusion, in my view, is that the liberal politicians in this country have ceased to be liberal within any customary meaning of this term. And the term "conservative" has been so carefully smeared by a generation of liberal propagandists that they have made it sound like the word "reactionary."

And this brings me to one other aspect of modern liberalism.

I am referring now to its intellectual bankruptcy. I am referring now to the fact that liberalism has lost its bearings. Liberalism has lost its central idea. Liberalism has lost its core of meaning. In a word, liberalism has degenerated intellectually into a vague, mushy kind of sentimentality.

Now perhaps some of you have heard of the little magazine called Partisan Review. It is not read by many people but I am told it is the most influential modern liberal magazine. Modern liberals read it like a Bible.

A leading liberal, Mr. Irving Howe, put it this way in their leading journal. He said this: "To call oneself a liberal one doesn't really have to believe in anything."

I'll say that again: "To call oneself a liberal one doesn't really have to believe in anything."

I believe Mr. Howe is correct. Mr. Howe is a leading authority. I would not argue with this view of modern liberalism.

Now there are a number of catch-words the professional liberals use in place of ideas—words that have very little precise meaning but which serve as useful slogans.

"Conformity" is one of these words. Every respectable liberal stands four-square against "conformity." Well, let's take a look at the meaning of "conformity."

You are young people here. Many of you are only a few years out of college. In fact, some of you are students. You all have fresh memories of college.

Have you ever been on a campus where the overwhelming majority of the faculty considered themselves "liberals"? Have you ever listened to a group of these so-called liberal professors talking among themselves about some nonconformist who happened to be a conservative? It is a fact that these liberal professors often find ways to punish with the greatest severity any colleagues who do not conform to their liberalism. They demand absolute uniformity on this point.

I am willing to say there is no conformity so great as the conformity of the professional liberals.

Let us look at the "way-out" liberals. I am talking about the beatniks. They are the emancipated, you know. They are supposed to be the absolute nonconformists. They are the self-conscious rebels.

You all know the standard uniform of these rebels. It is about as rigidly prescribed as a military uniform. Take, for instance, a female beatnik. Start with the soiled sneakers, the long black stockings. Then the soiled clothing, the pale lipstick, the heavy eye makeup. Finally, there is the long straggly hair.

Then, of course, there is the disillusioned look.

Now I ask you to imagine a party of these liberal beatniks. Now I ask you to imagine that at this time there turns up at this beatnik party a nonconformist girl with clean clothes, clean hair, and not even wearing black stockings or dirty sneakers. This nonconformist girl is even cheerful, which is the unforgivable sin.

Can you imagine the outraged contempt of the uniformed beatniks as they faced this nonconformist?

What I am saying is that there is no demand for conformity in our country which is so severe as is the demand for conformity among the liberals, and this is especially true among the extreme liberals.

It is this sterile conformity among the so-called liberals which is causing the imaginative, energetic, and intelligent young people of this country to turn to the conservatives and to the Republican Party.

Here in the Republican Party we cultivate dissent and dynamic growth. We expect only a decent respect for the best traditions which have been handed down to us by our ancestors, at the cost of much blood, hardship and sacrifice.

Within this great tradition of freedom there is room for the most diverse opinions. In this great Republican Party we cherish a great and rich diversity of talents and points of view.

It is time we realized more clearly that the modern liberals who are hopelessly confined to an economic view of man, who are the helpless captives of the big-city machines of the North, are not only morally bankrupt but they are also intellectually bankrupt.

They have not had a new idea in 30 years.

They are dead and finished.

They are sterile and rigid.

Modern liberalism is only a form of rigor mortis. The old, respectable—sometimes noble—liberalism of 50 years ago is gone for good.

The young people of this Nation are looking to the Republican Party. Only in the Republican Party can the young people now find scope for their idealism, scope for their energy, and scope for their imagination.

BIG BEND DAM CLOSED IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the sixth and final dam in the Missouri Basin development program was closed last week. Water is now being diverted through the enormous power house tunnels adjacent to the dam.

The Big Bend Reservoir will now link up with the reservoirs at Fort Peck, Mont.; Garrison, N. Dak.; Oahe, S. Dak.; Fort Randall, S. Dak.; and Gavins Point, S. Dak.; to comprise the Missouri Basin system. Big Bend Dam, while one of the smallest of the Missouri River structures, will be an important source of electric power and recreation.

I ask unanimous consent to include an article from the Sioux Falls Argus Leader of July 24 telling the story of the Big Bend Dam closure.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIVER CLOSED AT BIG BEND DAM

FORT THOMPSON, S. DAK.—The mighty Big Bend Dam, sixth and final dam in the present Missouri Basin development program, was closed Wednesday.

Giant earthmovers and bulldozers shoveled tons of dirt into the Missouri to bridge the final gap in the mammoth earthen structure.

Final phase of the closure will come this fall when the Big Bend embankment, including the diversion dike, is raised to its final elevation of 1,440 feet above sea level.

Closure of the dam sealed off the natural channel of the river and forced the waters through powerhouse tunnels adjoining the dam.

LARGE RESERVOIR

When filled, the Big Bend Reservoir will curl 80 river miles upstream, its waters approaching the base of the giant Oahe Dam at Pierre. The reservoir will have a shoreline of about 200 miles.

Big Bend, one of the smallest of the Missouri River dams, will impound just under 2 million acre-feet of water behind a rolled earth structure 100 feet high and nearly 2 miles long.

The main contribution of the dam will be power generation.

Eight hydroelectric generators, with a total capacity of 458,000 kilowatts, will make Big Bend Dam the second largest power producer in the system.

First power on the line is scheduled next July. All eight units will be completed by April of 1966. Big Bend is presently scheduled for completion by June of 1967.

Big Bend, bordered by the Crow Creek and Lower Brule Indian reservation, is expected to become one of the major recreational areas of central South Dakota.

Big Bend also will provide benefits from flood control, irrigation and downstream navigation.

STARTED IN 1959

Cost of the project is estimated at $112 million. Work at Big Bend was kicked off in August 1959 and is presently in its second stage of earthwork. The dam is one of six authorized by Congress in 1944 under the Picks-Sloan plan.

Nearly 200 spectators, including officials of the U.S. Corps of Engineers which is supervising the project, were present during the closure.

THE PRESIDENT'S IMMIGRATION BILL

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the President has asked Congress to enact a new immigration law which would basically change American immigration policies.

I am heartened that he recognized a compelling need to enact an immigration law that "serves the national interest and reflects in every detail the principles of equality and human dignity to which our Nation subscribes."

He has proposed a bill which would eliminate altogether the national origins system for allocating quotas; the Asia Pacific triangle; and other racially discriminatory aspects of our present immigration laws.

The proposed legislation, S. 1932, also would establish a series of priorities for admission: first, to immigrants with skills and training needed in our national economy; second, to persons related to individuals already in the country; and, third, to all other immigrants on a first-come, first-served basis, with no one nation receiving less than 200 or more than 10 percent of previously established quotas.

By seeking an immigration policy reflecting America's ideal of the equality of all men without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin, we would accomplish two purposes:

First. We would enhance America's image as leader of the free world in according equal dignity and respect to all peoples of the world, and thus accomplish a significant forward stride in our international relations.

Second. We would recognize the individual worth of each immigrant and his potential contribution to the development and growth of our national economy.

These basic changes in American immigration policy are long overdue. I have, therefore, joined in sponsoring the administration's bill.

Earlier this year I joined in sponsoring a bill, S. 747. Although I feel that both S. 747 and S. 1932 are meritorious and deserve the most careful examination, I feel S. 747 is preferable, for two reasons:

First, S. 747 would allot each nation a definite quota, figured according to a formula which is based on world population ratios and patterns of immigration to the United States during the last 15 years. This quota cannot be reduced unless all other quotas are readjusted under the same formula.

Second, S. 747 does not provide for as much administrative discretion, so that there is less room for the law to be administered in a discriminatory way.

On the other hand, under the President's proposal, existing national quotas would be reduced at the rate of 20 percent annually until the allotments were wiped out in 5 years. These quota numbers would go into a reserve pool for redistribution under the system of priorities I mentioned earlier.

The power to redistribute quota numbers lies entirely in the hands of the President himself, with the advice and help of a new seven-man immigration board. An extraordinarily wide latitude of discretionary power is thus lodged in the hands of a single person.

In any case, the decision now lies with Congress, which I believe, should explore fully all the implications of both proposals. I am completing an exhaustive study of our immigration laws and policies to present to the Senate in the near future. I shall strongly support efforts to basically revise our immigration laws and policies.

PEACE CORPS RATES HIGH PRAISE

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, less than 2 years have elapsed since Congress established a permanent Peace Corps. This is a very short time for any international program to show results. For the Peace Corps, handicapped from the start by a cloud of skepticism, it is a particularly short time.

Yet the Peace Corps has already had unprecedented results in getting the people in underdeveloped nations to help themselves and in creating good will toward Americans and America. It gives me great satisfaction to read the enthusiastic accounts of the work of the Corps appearing in the press. Recent editorials in the Los Angeles Times and the New York Herald Tribune endorse the administration's request for an increased budget for the program and give high praise to the first battalions of the Peace Corps. I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, July 2, 1963]

PEACE CORPS PAY DIVIDENDS

The Peace Corps has requested $108 million for its next year's work, almost double its present $58 million budget.

On its record over the past 2 years, the Peace Corps petition for increased funds seems justified. Indeed, it can be argued that the Peace Corps has made more effective use of its money than almost any other U.S. agency operating abroad.

As ambassadors of good will, the Peace Corps volunteers have gone into villages over the world, largely as teachers, to guide and to help the villagers to a better life.

They live austerely, far from the plush centers of diplomacy. It costs only $9,000 per year to keep the average Peace Corpsman overseas, demonstrating a record for lean living seldom approached by our other official missions abroad.

That the Peace Corps has been effective is attested by what a sales executive would call repeat business. The countries where they have served are clamoring for expanded Peace Corps programs. They like the product.

There can be little doubt that the U.S. image has been enhanced by the selfless work of the Peace Corps groups at this person-to-person level.

If they can maintain their austere and dedicated purpose, without becoming another fat, complacent Federal bureau going through stereotyped motions, the Peace Corps will continue to be effective. There has been no indication to date of any letdown in the Peace Corps drive.

The country can be proud of their performance. They have earned the added funds they seek. The relatively minor cost of the Corps has been a sound investment so far.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, July 8, 1963]

Onward Peaceful Soldiers

The first battalions of the Peace Corps are returning from their respective fronts after 2 years of service overseas. There are no great parades, no waving of flags, not even any audible cheers. Yet these battalions have scored some of the most notable victories in the peacetime history of the Republic.

They have gone into some of the most backward areas of Africa, Asia, and Latin America to teach young and old how to read and write; to apply the scientific knowledge of the West to the unyielding agricultural soils of the South and the East; to organize community groups to clear slums, build houses, construct roads.

They have won the envy and the enmity of the Communists; and the admiration and affection of the 47 countries in which the 6,869 Peace Corpsmen have been stationed. Day after day, more countries called for more corpsmen.

Could there be a better recommendation to Congress for the increased budget which Director Sargent Shriver has asked for the Corps?

PIONEERS OF CATHOLICISM AND SLOVAK LIFE IN YOUNGSTOWN DIOCESE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Slovak Catholic Sokol concluded its convention in Youngstown, Ohio, recently. At the convention, there was read to those in attendance a history of Slovak life in Youngstown. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the history was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Pioneers of Catholicism and Slovak Life in Youngstown Diocese

(By John C. Sciranka)

On the occasion of the 19th national convention and Slet and track and field meet of the Slovak Catholic Sokol which were held in Youngstown, Ohio, from July 11 to 19, 1963, it is timely to review the history of pioneers of Catholicism and Slovak Sokol life in Youngstown diocese.

Although the St. Vincent's archabbey of Latrobe, Pa., is credited as the cradle of Slovak higher education in America and especially for training of priesthood, the State of Ohio gave us first Slovak leaders. However, prior to their arrival to this country, there were others among the Slavonic nations, who have blazed the way.

The first American Slovak leader, who gained national prominence came to Ohio about 1882. He was Stephen Furdek, later ordained Catholic priest, who aided the organization of the first Slovak parish of SS. Cyril and Methodius in Youngstown, Ohio.

Father Furdek was sent to Bohemia, Moravia, and Slovakia by Bishop Richard Gilmour to recruit seminarians and priests for the work among the American Slovaks in Ohio.

Through the efforts of Father Furdek, Peter V. Rovnianek later known as founder of the first Slovak fraternal organization in America, the National Slovak Society, came to America on September 5, 1888. The first Slovak society in Youngstown, Ohio, known as Assembly 8, under the patronage of SS. Cyril and Methodius, whose 11th centenary we are observing this year and special tribute was paid them by this Sokol convention, was organized here on March 16, 1890, with 20 members.

However, before going into the Youngstown Slovak history, it is proper to show that other Slavs have blazed the way in this territory.

In 1770 Jacob Sadowski and his sons were among the first pioneers to come from New Cork to Kentucky and the city of Sandusky, Ohio, is named after them. We have also Poland Manor here.

Prior to them a Moravian Slovak missionary, Frederick Post, who is credited with starting the city of Pittsburgh, lived for a while among the Indians in Ohio. However, it was Rev. Frederick Baraga, born on June 29, 1797, in Slovenia, present Yugoslavia, who after ordination to priesthood on September 21, 1823, fulfilled his desire to come to America to work among the Indians. Father Baraga started for the new land on October 29, 1830, and landed in New York on December 31, 1830. He proceeded to Cincinnati, Ohio, where he was received by the first Bishop of Ohio, the Most Rev. Edward Fenwick.

Father Baraga stayed with Bishop Fenwick until the spring of 1831. During the winter he labored among the German and Slav speaking people of Cincinnati.

Bishop Fenwick had a very interesting career. He was an American, who belonged to a Dominican Order in Kentucky. He came to Ohio in 1814 and was one of the first priests to labor in Ohio besides the Jesuit Fathers, who worked among the Hurons. Father Fenwick celebrated mass under a large tree in Canton, Ohio, in 1817. Father Fenwick was consecrated bishop on January 13, 1822. His cathedral in Cincinnati, Ohio, consisted of a log cabin and an attic, which served as his episcopal residence. But while moving his church, it fell apart. He was discouraged and went to Rome, where Pope Leo XII, refused to accept his resignation and he returned back to his diocese. In 1832 he died during the cholera epidemic on September 26, 1833, at Wooster, near Canton, Ohio. Bishop Fenwick was informed about the Slovaks and the Slavs from Father Baraga, who studied in Vienna, and later became first bishop of Marquette, Mich. Due to his efforts, many seminarians and priests came from present Yugoslavia to America and several of them became bishops in Minnesota. Even Bishop Baraga's sister came to aid him. She—a noblewoman—worked among the Indians and taught their children until she took ill and moved to Philadelphia, where she founded a school for girls. She also founded the Order of Slovenian Sisters, who later taught in parochial schools. Bishop Baraga is a candidate for sainthood.

Another great bishop of Ohio of Bohemian origin was Most Rev. Joseph M. Koudelka, who became auxiliary bishop in 1907 in Cleveland, Ohio, and gave missions among the Slovaks. He died in Superior, Wis.

The first Slovaks came to Youngstown, according to Matthew Mraz, Msgr. Oldrich Zlamal, John A. Willo and Rev. Joseph L. Kostik, who delved into the Slovak history of this region, before 1878. In that year John Hamrak, the father of present Msgr. John G. Hamrak, Martin Farkas, J. Zabrinsky were already settled here. In 1890 they formed a society of SS. Cyril and Methodius, which became assembly 8 of the mentioned National Slovak Society. This is the oldest Slovak society in Youngstown.

Martin Seman, J. Tomajko, Michael Willo, John Sefcik, Stephen Franko, Matthew Melega, A. Jancar, John Babik, Paul Puklas, Michael Murar, John Cuj, John Knapik, Michael Ondrusko and Andrew Olejnik are some of the early pioneers.

In 1910 Rev. Oldrich Zlamal, who was pastor of SS. Cyril and Methodius Parish, organized the Youngstown Slovak News, which was published here for about 20 years and edited first by Father Zlamal Milan Salva, and later by Matthew Mraz. The Slovaks had also two financial institutions. The Youngstown State Bank and Youngtown Home Savings Co., whose president was the late Michael Willo, father of one of the first Slovak lawyers, John A. Willo.

The Slovak Catholic Parish of SS. Cyril and Methodius was founded on May 19, 1896. John Smigovsky, Martin Kramer, Joseph Rusinak and Michael Willo were the first committee for the organization of the parish. Msgr. John W. Klute aided them and Father Furdek also attended the first organization meeting called by the St. Martin's society. John Begalla, the father of Msgr. Begalla, was among the first collectors for the new church. Others were Stephen Smigovsky, Andrew Rys and Stephen Franko.

Rev. A. Kollar, followed by Rev. J. Becka were the first priests. They were followed by Rev. Joseph Novak, who died here on June 30, 1908. Father Zlamal became pastor of SS. Cyril and Methodius parish and aided much in organizing other Slovak parishes. Rev. John M. Liscinsky was a noted leader, writer and publisher. While the first priests were Czechs, who spoke the Slovak language, Father Liscinsky was a Slovak.

Founding of other Slovak churches followed; namely, Holy Trinity, Struthers, Ohio, whose first pastor was Rev. Paul Herman and Rev. Melchoir Furst. Due to shortage of Slovak priests, clergymen of other nationalities served the people.

The Slovak Lutherans founded their parish of John Hus in 1903. Their present pastor is Rev. J. Roh. The Slovak Presbyterians founded their parish on January 4, 1911. Rev. M. J. Tomasula and others labored in this congregation.

In sequence the Holy Name Slovak Catholic Church was established on January 18, 1914. The laymen who labored for the parish are: John Roth, Matthew Kucko, Martin Dolak, and Joseph Lipjanec. Rev. J. Stipanovic, a Croatian, one of the successors of Bishop Baraga, was its first pastor followed by Rev. Francis J. Dubosh, now monsignor and protonotary apostolic of Lakewood, Ohio. After him Msgr. Stephen G. Kocis established a great record. Msgr. Stephen G. Kocis established a great record. Msgr. Stephen W. Begalla is a present pastor. Campbell, Ohio, had organized a Slovak Baptist Church in 1907 by John Kana, who later became a copublisher of New York Daily Slovak paper. The late Rev. M. Hiben worked in this congregation.

This was followed by organization of the St. Matthias Slovak Catholic Church in 1913. Rev. J. Gerenda was its first pastor followed by Rev. Francis Kozelek. The present pastor is Msgr. John G. Hamrak.

St. John the Baptist Slovak Parish of Campbell, Ohio, had a very hard beginning. It was founded in 1914 and continued to grow under the leadership of Rev. John W. Krispinsky, Msgr. John Hamrak, Rev. George Novák, Rev. P. Sikora, and the present pastor, Msgr. Michael M. Tondora.

The Slovak Lutheran Church of Emmanuel was founded on July 30, 1922. Rev. Andrew Hvidzdzak, Rev. L. A. Jarosi, Rev. John Zornan, and Rev. M. D. Marcis are some of its pastors.

The last of the Slovak parishes to be organized is St. Elizabeths at Campbell, of which Rev. Joseph L. Kostik is pastor since April 22, 1922. After many struggles he built one of the most beautiful churches in this valley.

There is also SS. Cyril and Methodius Parish at Warren, Ohio, which was founded in July 1928 when the late Bishop Joseph Schrembs sent Rev. George Bobal for its first pastor. Father Bobal was followed by Rev. John M. Kandrac. The present pastor, Msgr. Joseph A. Krispinsky, VF, built a beautiful church, which was dedicated on May 21, 1950, by the late Bishop James A. McFadden.

The youngest of the Slovak parishes in the Youngstown diocese is St. Joseph Parish, Newton Falls, Ohio, which was founded in 1923. Rev. Francis Tomanek was first pastor followed by Rev. George Bobal, Rev. John M. Kandrac, Father Schafer, Rev. John M. Liscinsky, and the present pastor Rev. Albert Klein.

The Slovak parishes have given many priests and Sisters to the church.

The Slovak Franciscan Fathers established a friary at Columbia, Ohio, with plans for a minor seminary. The present prior is Rev. Bonaventure Babik, OFM.

The Slovak Catholic Sokol was founded in this area in August 1908, when assembly 26 was organized in what is now Campbell, Ohio. In 1910 the junior assembly 6 was founded here. Later Anton M. Palkovic was elected supreme president of the organization. Rev. Martin B. Rubicky of Struthers and later of Clairton, Pa., was active here and is buried in this city. He was the supreme chaplain of our Sokol. The late John Janci was supreme auditor of the Sokol. Joseph L. Maruskin was supreme commander. The present supreme officers are Stephen R. Olenick, supreme auditor; John A. Olejar, supreme vice president and Mrs. Helen Sapara, member of supreme court. There are other Slovak fraternalists like Mrs. Mary Slifka, Mrs. M. Kubina, Mrs. Mary Dolak, Mr. J. Schromovsky, Mr. Palenchar, George Varga, and G. Vaschak, who deserve mention.

Attorney Theodore Macejko is supreme counselor for the First Catholic Slovak Union. Then there is Mrs. A. Jablonsky of the Ladies Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union and former Slovak Catholic Sokol supreme officers, namely Mrs. Ann Roth, Mrs. M. Magda, and Michael Palkovic, who deserve mention.

This is but a brief summary of Slovak pioneers and fraternal leaders, to whom we paid tribute during this Slovak Catholic Sokol convention hoping that new leaders will be inspired to carry on the work of our predecessors.

U.S. TRAVEL SERVICE

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, Gov. John A. Burns, of Hawaii, recently completed a good will trip to Japan. While there he was favorably impressed with the activities of the U.S. Travel Service in that country.

Upon his return, the Governor wrote a letter to Voit Gilmore, Director of the U.S. Travel Service. I respectfully request permission to have the Governor's letter printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

July 13, 1963.

Mr. Voit Gilmore,
Director, U.S. Travel Service, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Gilmore: As you know, I was able to spend considerable time in Japan several weeks ago during the Hawaiian Festival promotion then in progress. During my visit I had a fine opportunity to study the operations of the U.S. Travel Service.

I must say that I was impressed with the "Visit U.S.A." program being conducted by your Tokyo office. From personal observation and through talks with the Honorable Edwin O. Reischauer, our Ambassador to Japan, as well as with other officials and travel industry representatives, I was pleased to learn that the "Visit U.S.A." program was well publicized throughout the length and breadth of Japan.

Your program in Japan is being conducted in a vigorous and effective fashion. I am sure we will see a vivid demonstration of this next spring when currency restrictions on pleasure travel are relaxed and the surge of travel from Japan to Hawaii and the U.S. mainland at long last begins.

You and the staff of the U.S. Travel Service are performing a valuable service for the people of America. You have my best wishes for continuing success and an expanded program in the future.

With warmest personal regards. May the Almighty be with you and yours always.

Sincerely,

John A. Burns,
Governor of Hawaii.

THE LAW AS IT AFFECTS DESEGREGATION: IMPLICATIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT DECISION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, much has already been written about the need for civil rights legislation this session of Congress. Much more will be written before Congress adjourns sometime this fall. While there is no dearth of material dealing with this critical national issue, I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to a frank and forthright essay, "The Law as it Affects Desegregation: Implications of the Supreme Court Decision," prepared by Miss Pauli Murray, tutor of law, Yale University Law School. This essay was delivered at the Radcliffe Alumnae College, June 14, 1963, in Cambridge, Mass.

Miss Murray has served as visiting professor of law at the Ghana School of Law and is the author of "States' Laws on Race and Color" and coauthor of the "Constitution and Government of Ghana." Aside from these qualifications, Miss Murray notes that she was one of the earlier generation of freedom riders when the struggle for equality was a far more lonely one, and a leader of successful nonviolent sit-in demonstrations in Washington restaurants exactly 20 years ago. Thus Miss Murray freely admits to a certain lack of scholarly objectivity when she writes of the current civil rights crisis.

Nevertheless in this essay Miss Murray achieves a remarkable combination of personal involvement and legal objectivity. She examines four major questions: First, what is the central issue in the present conflict? Second, what has been the role of the law, and particularly of the courts, in resolving this issue? Third, what are the new factors which demand new solutions? Fourth, what is the role of the law in solving the present crisis?

Miss Murray's essay was written prior to President Kennedy's historic message on civil rights and consequently she was unable to consider these proposals in her analysis. While this paper represents only the views and opinions of the author, it is worthy of the attention of every Member of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this essay be printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Law as It Affects Desegregation: Implications of the Supreme Court Decision

INTRODUCTION

During the past several weeks, American Negroes have confronted the Nation with what has been described as a "massive insistence" upon drastic changes in the social structure to achieve rapid and total integration. They have abandoned their traditional role of patience; they have rejected tokenism and gradualism; they are saying, "One hundred years of fractional citizenship is enough. We want full citizenship now."

This mood pervades the entire Negro community as seen in the tremendous outpouring of hundreds to tens of thousands of Negroes into the streets of the Nation. Police violence, kicking, beating, the use of fierce dogs and fire hoses, even murder—none of these has stopped them. For the 7-day period ending June 2, an estimated more than 30 demonstrations took place in widely separated areas of the country. A week later, the New York Times reported that demonstrations had occurred in nearly 50 localities since May 1. This week has been marked by defiance of the Governor of Alabama in a confrontation with the Federal Government, a televised appeal to the Nation by President Kennedy and the fatal shooting in the back of an NAACP official in Mississippi. Clearly, this is our most serious domestic crisis since the Civil War.

Describing it as the "Second American Revolution," the Washington Star editorialized on June 2 that the real problem in this situation is—

> "* * * how best to cope wisely with a rapidly developing revolution. The current outbreak of mass demonstrations by Negroes * * * is a manifestation of as genuine and justified revolution as any of the revolutions in history, history being largely an account of a sequence of revolutions."

Actually, we are experiencing the climax of a phase of the continuing social revolution in the United States which began with our Declaration of Independence and our war to throw off colonial rule. Periodically our country has been thrown into convulsions as various groups of the population have taken the initiative in reaffirming their fundamental rights and freedoms. These upsurges have been part of the growth and maturing of our democracy.

Now in the 1960's, Negroes are engaged in a desperate effort to end segregation and discrimination everywhere in the United States. All the evidence indicates that they will not be stopped short of their goal. President Kennedy correctly placed this struggle in its proper historical perspective, when he observed in his recent Vanderbilt University address, that it was in the best American tradition.

The issues involved in this confrontation are moral as well as legal; the alternatives have become total equality or total repression, and there is no turning back. Each of us is caught up in an atmosphere of impending conflict, of a mounting urgency to come to fundamental grips with our most longstanding and explosive domestic issue and one which rates high priority among the most crucial issues of our foreign policy.

At this turning point of our history, I find it difficult to maintain a balance between academic objectivity and deep personal emotional involvement. As one of an earlier generation of freedom riders with a prison sentence as a reminder of the days when the struggle was a lonely one, and as a student leader of successful nonviolent sit-in demonstrations in Washington restaurants exactly 20 years ago, I cannot pretend a scholarly detachment from these events.

In our time we are being compelled to return to our revolutionary roots. Potential violence has been inherent in this issue from the beginning of our history. I am glad that this long unsettled business of democracy is now coming to a head. I rejoice that Negroes in ever greater numbers are today standing where the American patriots stood in 1776; that they are now willing more than ever to risk their lives for personal liberty and human dignity. They are reenacting the American Revolution in 20th century form. I believe that if the American people as a whole could identify Negroes with our revolutionary traditions of liberty, we will have taken the first significant step toward eliminating the schism which has so divided and almost destroyed us as a nation in the past.

This revolutionary upheaval has not come about through formal decision of any single group, but through a consensus made up of individual commitment by thousands of people taking a stand, igniting and inspiring others to do the same. Many of the demonstrations have been planned; others are spontaneous. Out of this personal commitment to the struggle for liberty is emerging a new self-image, a new self-respect. And if I read the signs correctly, the Nation is gaining a new image of the Negro, for it is our tradition that when people have self-respect, nothing can keep them from asserting the inalienable rights of free men, women, and children.

I emphasize children here, for in reality, Negro children in the South, for the past 9 years, have led the crusade for human dignity. I need not remind you of the children who have braved hostile communities to exercise their right to attend nonsegregated schools. You are aware of the Birmingham children who recently, as if by prearranged signal, marched out of a school assembly and into the streets to demonstrate for their rights leaving an astonished faculty and an empty school building. You have doubtless read of the schoolchildren of Mississippi carrying signs directed to their adults which read: "We have gone to jail for you. Will you register and vote for us?"

In Washington, one of my friends is having difficulty with her teenaged son who remonstrates with her because she has not let him join some of the demonstrations in nearby Maryland. He feels ashamed because his cousin—a mere girl—has already demonstrated, been arrested and taken to prison. This fire and idealism among Negro schoolchildren today is so intense that their parents are left no alternative but to join the demonstrations themselves to maintain their honor and their children's respect.

By now, it must be clear to all of us that, for the second time in our Nation's history, we stand on the threshold of a major decision on human rights of the most fundamental character. In 1963 it has been forcefully brought home to us that our Nation cannot endure with fractional degrees of equality or citizenship. The right to human dignity is indivisible.

Against this background, let us address ourselves to the following questions: (1) What is the central issue in the present conflict? (2) What has been the role in the law, and particularly of the courts, in resolving this issue? (3) What are the new factors which demand new solutions? (4) What is the role of the law in solving the present crisis? In approaching these questions, we must continually bear in mind that the law operates in a moral climate and reflects that climate.

I. THE CENTRAL ISSUE IN THE RACIAL CRISIS

As a point of departure, let me tell a story which seems relevant. I have a friend who would be described as a white Anglo-Saxon Protestant and who lives in suburbia. One day her little girl came home from school weeping uncontrollably and her mother was unable to get her to tell what happened. So the mother went to school to investigate. She learned that her daughter's playmates had refused to let her join a ropeskipping game. She was a fat little girl and not a good ropeskipper, but what really broke her heart was that the other children would not even let her hold the rope and turn it for others to skip. When she could talk about it she told her mother, "Mommy, what hurt me so was that they wouldn't even let me be a steady-ender."

The exclusion from participation as an equal with one's fellows, in work and in play in any society, makes one an outcast. It robs the individual of a feeling of personal worth and of belonging. The permanent effects of such exclusion may be apathy, self-depreciation, violence and aggression, stunted growth, lack of ambition, or sometimes refuge in the exclusion itself as an excuse for poor performance.

In the language of my friend's little daughter, for three centuries the Negro has not even been allowed to be a "steady-ender" in American life. It is against the crushing weight of these three centuries, and against a background of a world revolution in human rights that Negroes now rebel in mass upheavals. Dr. Martin Luther King has explained this mood of impatience as a father who finds it difficult to wait for promises.

"When you suddenly find * * * your speech stammering as you seek to explain to your 6-year-old daughter why she can't go to the public amusement park that has just been advertised on television, and see tears welling up in her little eyes when she is told that Funtown is closed to colored children, and see the depressing clouds of inferiority begin to form in her little mental sky, and see her begin to distort her little personality by unconsciously developing a bitterness toward white people; when you have to concoct an answer for a 5-year-old son asking in agonizing pathos: 'Daddy, why do white people treat colored people so mean?'"

The central issue in this rebellion is human dignity—the inherent rights of free men and women. This issue is not merely the American dream: it is the foundation of our society. We cannot reaffirm too often the principle upon which our Nation stands or falls:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed—That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to affect their safety and happiness."

These rights are entrenched in the U.S. Constitution. Therefore, they are not only inherent in our beings; they are also guaranteed by our fundamental law and placed beyond the reach of transient legislative majorities. No government can rightfully take them away or permit others to impair them.

II. THE ROLE OF THE LAW AND THE COURTS

In the American legal system, as you know, the Supreme Court has the function and the authority of ultimately interpreting and applying the constitutional principles underlying guaranteed rights to myriad fact situations, and of adjudicating between various rights if they are in conflict. Having declared what the supreme law is, the Court's interpretation is binding upon all the people. Hence, we say that our society is based upon the rule of law and not upon the rule of men.

From its inception, however, our fundamental law contained an irreconcilable contradiction, in that the same basic document which affirmed basic human rights also recognized the institution of slavery—the complete denial of these rights to some men. How was this intolerable contradiction in the law to be resolved?

In 1857, Chief Justice Taney of the Supreme Court attempted to resolve it in the Dred Scott case by determining that some human beings have inherent rights and others do not. He concluded that Negroes were not intended to be included in the Declaration of Independence or in the term "people" in the opening phrase of our Constitution—"We the People of the United States"; nor were any persons of African descent, whether slave or free, intended to be citizens of the United States; "that they had for more than a century before been regarded as beings of an inferior race, and altogether unfit to associate with the white race, either in social or political relations, and so far inferior that they had no rights which the white man was bound to respect." Thus, according to Taney, the framers of the Declaration of Independence "knew that it would not in any part of the civilized world, be supposed to embrace the Negro race, which, by common consent, had been excluded from civilized governments and the family of nations, and doomed to slavery."

This attempt by the Supreme Court to resolve the issue by exclusion did much to make the conflict irrepressible. When the supreme law of the land is consistent with human dignity, controversies as to which rights are paramount can be determined peacefully within the orderly legal processes of our constitutional system. History has shown again and again, that when the fundamental law is interpreted in such a way as to be inconsistent with human dignity, conflict is inevitable.

After a bitter Civil War of 4 years, the Nation reaffirmed and made more explicit inherent human rights in the form of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution of the United States. Congress was expressly given the power to enforce these amendments by appropriate legislation. The purpose of this constitutional change was to sweep away all political and legal barriers to the exercise of equal rights with all other citizens.

Since the institution of slavery had been supported by detailed legislation in the various slaveowning States, and since these formerly rebellious States attempted to reenslave Negroes through the enactment of the black codes after the war, the thrust of the 14th amendment was against State action. That amendment provides in part:

"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

It was clear to the framers of the Reconstruction amendments that Federal protection was necessary for the full and free exercise of citizenship rights. In the 10 years following the Civil War, it also became clear that these rights had to be protected from violation by private persons as well as by State action. These rights also had to be protected uniformly throughout the United States, if citizenship was to be meaningful. Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1875 which declared in part:

"That all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of inns, public conveyances on land or water, theaters and other places of public amusement; subject only to the conditions and limitations established by law, and applicable to citizens of every race and color, regardless of any previous condition of servitude."

The act made it a misdemeanor for any person to violate the law by denying to any citizen the full and equal enjoyment of public accommodations, and granted a civil remedy of damages up to $500 to persons aggrieved by such denial.

What was not sufficiently clear to Congress or to the Nation at the time of Reconstruction was that the institution of slavery over a period of two centuries had had a dehumanizing effect upon blacks and whites alike in the entire region where it had become entrenched and had affected the moral climate of the Nation as a whole. A national effort of rehabilitation and restoration of the dignity of impoverished whites and newly freed Negroes in the former slaveowning States ravaged by war was essential if the Nation was to recover from this dehumanization. This was not done. The Freedmen's Bureau, created at the end of the war to give relief to the needy Negroes and whites in the conquered South, was imperfectly conceived, poorly administered and short lived, lasting only 7 years. What was sorely needed was a 19th century version of UNRRA or Marshall plan for the South. The absence of such planning set in motion forces of reaction, and we are today reaping the whirlwind of those forces.

At the judicial level, there followed perhaps the most inglorious period in our history with reference to human rights. Judges of the Supreme Court were conditioned by the same attitudes which produced the Dred Scott case; the majority of the Court found it expedient narrowly to interpret the Reconstruction amendments, permitting the Nation to drift backward instead of marching forward. Bit by bit the Court whittled down the broad protection of these amendments. First, it limited the concept of "privileges and immunities" in the 14th amendment and the rights which flow out of Federal citizenship. In light of the current issue of desegregation, two of the Court's important decisions are relevant to our discussion.

In the famous civil rights cases of 1883, the Court, by an 8-to-1 decision, declared that the Civil Rights Act of 1875, prohibiting discrimination by private persons in places of public accommodation throughout the country, was unconstitutional and void on the ground that Congress had no power to enact legislation operative upon individuals in this field under either the 13th or 14th amendments. While it conceded that the language of the 13th amendment was broad enough to reach individuals, it rejected the argument that the 13th amendment was intended to abolish not only the technical legal relationship of master and slave but also all of the incidents of slavery and the badges of inferiority the institution had imposed upon Negroes, whether slave or free. The Court also held that the 14th amendment applied only to State action and not to individual invasion of private rights. Presumably, suggested the Court, these rights could be protected by resort to the laws of the various States.

Mr. Justice John M. Harlan, a former slaveowner from Kentucky who had bitterly opposed the abolition of slavery before the war but who was dedicated to the supremacy of the Constitution, wrote an eloquent and masterful dissent on both of these points and left a beacon light to guide future lawyers upholding human rights. In light of the President's speech on Tuesday night calling for another Federal statute on public accommodations, Mr. Justice Harlan's dissent warrants rereading today. Unquestionably, the decision in the civil rights cases opened the door to widespread discrimination by private persons against Negroes, leaving the protection of the most basic aspect of human dignity—the right not to be humiliated by unequal and exclusionary treatment—to the whim of the various States. In my opinion, the civil rights cases were wrongly decided and are an important factor in the current unrest. As late as 1959, the Supreme Court refused to reexamine a case brought under the 1875 act. Around the same time several lower Federal courts also denied the applicability of this act to restaurants on interstate highways. Having no remedy in the courts, as President Kennedy aptly pointed out in his nationwide address, Negroes took the issue into the streets. It is significant that the first mass sit-in cases arose in early 1960 following the latest refusal of the Supreme Court to declare an available remedy.

In 1896, the Supreme Court decided the case of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* and upheld the constitutionality of a Louisiana statute which provided separate railway cars for Negroes and whites in circumstances (a) where regulating intrastate commerce and (b) where such accommodations were "separate but equal." Here the Court denied the view that a segregation statute implied inferiority of Negroes. Although it conceded that the object of the 14th amendment was to establish absolute legal equality, it held the amendment was not intended to abolish distinctions based upon color. Again Mr. Justice Harlan dissented vigorously. His reasoning against the background of contemporary events has been proven to be eminently sound. His words were prophetic. He wrote:

"In my opinion, the judgment this day rendered will, in time, prove to be quite as pernicious as the decision made by this tribunal in the *Dred Scott* case. * * * What can more certainly arouse race hate, what more certainly create and perpetuate a feeling of distrust between these races, than State enactments which in fact proceed on the ground that colored citizens are so inferior and degraded that they cannot be allowed to sit in public coaches occupied by white citizens? * * * The sure guarantee of the peace and security of each race is the clear, distinct, unconditional recognition by our Governments, National and State, of every right that inheres in civil freedom, and of the equality before the law of all citizens of the United States without regard to race. State enactments, regulating the enjoyment of civil rights, upon the basis of race, and cunningly devised to defeat legitimate results of the war, under the pretense of recognizing equality of rights, can have no other result than to render permanent peace impossible and to keep alive a conflict of races, the continuance of which must do harm to all concerned."

The Plessy decision opened the door to massive segregation laws in the Southern States and various degrees of permissive segregation in other areas. Legislative intervention in many Northern States following this decision took the form of State civil rights statutes forbidding discrimination in public accommodations. These laws, however, varied as to places covered and as to degree of enforcement.

Distinction and exclusion on grounds of race and color became fixed in our law. As late as 1927, the Supreme Court upheld a Mississippi court ruling that it could constitutionally segregate children "of the brown, yellow, and black races" from white children in the public schools, and denied a child of Chinese ancestry the right to enroll in white schools in that State.

Rigid enforcement of segregation laws in the South, desolutory enforcement of civil rights laws in the North and West, constituted the posture of the country with reference to racial segregation as it moved toward World War II. With the exception of a 1917 decision outlawing a Louisville ordinance which, in effect, created residential segregation, the Court showed no inclination to question legally enforced segregation.

Beginning in 1938 with an attack on the exclusion of Negroes from the State universities of the South, the Court, in a case-by-case approach began the task of realining the law with our fundamental constitutional principles. In 1946, it struck down segregation on interstate carriers, incidentally, declaring void as to interstate passengers, the Virginia statute under which I was arrested and imprisoned 6 years earlier. Bit by bit it overturned the barriers erected on the legal foundation of the Plessy case, but it was not wholly clear until the school desegregation cases of 1954 that the Court was deciding foursquare on the issue of inherent and constitutionally entrenched human rights and their incompatibility with legal segregation. Here the Court met the real issue in the following words:

"Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race even though the physical facilities and other 'tangible' factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities? We believe that it does. * * * To separate them from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone."

With this decision, the Supreme Court sounded the death knell of all segregation where the exercise of state power is involved. Since 1954, that Court has handed down numerous decisions reiterating and applying the basic principle of that case, ordering desegregation of State or municipal public facilities, and more recently, reversing convictions of sit-in demonstrators and their leaders under trespass, and other statutes in cases where a local segregation ordinance was present, or local officials voiced a policy of segregation. The Court put over for further argument a case in which there is no segregation law or ordinance or no declared official policy of segregation, and yet sit-in demonstrators are arrested for trespass at the request of the owner of a place open to the public. Thus, by radical surgery in a series of operations, the "separate but equal" doctrine on grounds of race has been removed from our constitutional law. What remains to be decided or legislated is an affirmative remedy for privately enforced segregation or exclusion from public facilities.

III. THE NEW FACTORS WHICH DEMAND NEW SOLUTIONS

With the Supreme Court giving this reaffirmation of basic rights and slowly correcting the earlier deviations from our fundamental law, why have we suddenly found ourselves in a national crisis? This present explosion, of course, is not sudden. Warnings by Negro leadership have been sounded for years, but most of the Nation has been too preoccupied to listen. One important factor is the difference in outlook and tempo between Negroes and the rest of the Nation with respect to the central issue. As Dr. Ralph Bunche pointed out last week, no government ever does enough when people are denied their basic rights. The Nation has been looking at how far Negroes have come in the past two decades, while Negroes, on the other hand, are looking at how far they have to go. They see the slow pace of desegregation—four-tenths of 1 percent of Negro children attending desegregated schools in the 11 States of the old Confederacy 9 years after the Supreme Court decision. They look at their limited employment opportunities, their disproportionately high rate of unemployment, the de facto school segregation in the North which is just as damaging to the personalities of their children as the legally enforced segregation condemned by the Supreme Court in 1954. They find their way out of the ghetto to decent integrated housing blocked by various devices, one of which was used in the infamous Deerfield, Ill., case where local authorities in collusion with certain local residents condemned an integrated housing project in process of being built and took over the land for public parks. They experience the daily affronts and humiliations with reference to exclusion from public facilities. The very fact that important improvements have been made in recent years has whetted the appetite for total inclusion. It is axiomatic that the closer one gets to one's goal of human dignity, the more intolerable become the remaining indignities.

A second factor is the rise of a generation of Negroes born during or since World War II into a climate of opinion in which the Universal Declaration of Human Rights represents the common aspirations of peoples everywhere and into a world of revolutionary upsurge of colonial peoples against foreign rule with its implications of racial superiority. This generation has grown up in an atmosphere of incredible speed of events. Gradualism and patience form no part of its heritage, as those of you with children readily appreciate.

A third factor is that by accepting gradualism as the timetable for the solution of this problem, we have permitted the gains of a bloodless social revolution to be threatened by a violent counterrevolution. My good friend, Dr. Caroline F. Ware, social historian and a Ph. D. from Radcliffe, constantly reminds me that social revolutions are not violent; that violence comes into play after social change has occurred or is plainly in sight, and counterrevolutionary efforts are then made to turn the clock back.

What is new about the present revolt is the realization by many Negroes that there is an effective answer to violence and an effective alternative to sullen endurance. There is a new consciousness of strength pervading the whole of the Negro community, a total involvement including children and a mass reaction to the problem.

Dr. Martin Luther King and other leaders of his type have been able to harness seething revolt to organized, disciplined, nonviolent direct action. The legal implications of this action are that it is within the protection of freedom of expression guaranteed by the first amendment. The moral implications are, in my opinion, far more significant.

There is a growing national consensus that racial discrimination is essentially a moral problem. If so, it must be attacked at the moral as well as legal level. Nonviolent direct action is based upon the conviction that in social conflict, the power of the spirit is stronger and more enduring than the power of force in a physical contest. By discipline of the spirit, the nonviolent demonstrator determines that violence, if at all, will be on only one side of the controversy. Thus, the demonstrator exercises a certain amount of control over the conflict situation because he eliminates or reduces the immediate provocation to retaliate and transfers the struggle to the conscience of the opponent. He believes that the opponent's hatred, if given only itself to feed upon, must eventually run its course and that, in these circumstances, reconciliation is more possible after the conflict has been resolved. The Negroes have seen this method work with Ghandi in India and have adapted it to peculiarly American situations. Where this method has consciously been used in the demonstrations, despite indignities on the part of the police, violence has been minimized.

As Dr. King wrote in his book, "Stride Toward Freedom":

"We will match your capacity to inflict suffering with our capacity to endure suffering. We will meet your physical force with soul force. We will not hate you, but we cannot in all good conscience obey your unjust laws. Do to us what you will and we will still love you. Bomb our homes and threaten our children; send your hooded perpetrators of violence into our communities and drag us out on some wayside road, beating us and leaving us half dead, and we will still love you. But we will soon wear you down by our capacity to suffer. And in winning our freedom we will so appeal to your heart and conscience that we will win you in the process."

The wider significance of these nonviolent demonstrations by Negroes and their white supporters is that they have brought together two revolutionary ideas: the equality of the rights of man and the assertion of those rights through a spiritually and morally powerful nonviolent technique. They are outpacing the application of the law and making a creative contribution to rapid social change with a minimum of violence. Historians may well record this as one of the important social developments of the 20th century. Nonviolence has filled the vacuum between the declaration and the implementation of the fundamental law.

IV. THE ROLE OF THE LAW IN THE PRESENT CRISIS

At the beginning of our discussion, I said that we are a society built upon the rule of law and not rule by the passions of men. What, then, is the role of the law in resolving the current conflict?

It cannot be too strongly emphasized here that the history of race relations in the United States has proven conclusively that the right to be free from discrimination because of race or color—and I might add sex—is so crucial to human dignity and the exercise of the rights of citizenship, that we have been tragically wrong to leave the protection of this right in so large degree to local regulation. Local laws and policies can supplement but not substitute for a clearly formulated and enforceable National policy binding upon all persons.

The public humiliations which do such violence to human dignity are dramatized by laws, customs, and attitudes of exclusion in places of public accommodation, and amusement. Congress rightly saw in 1875 that this issue was so important it must be resolved in a manner which operated uniformly throughout the United States. It recognized that there could be no piecemeal or fractional coverage in a matter which involves such explosive human emotions. And so it granted total coverage.

Negroes have lived too long with uncertainty to make the recognition of their rights dependent upon any other individual's degree of color-blindness, or whether he operates in interstate or local commerce. The quest for certainty is at the bottom of the present revolt. As Martin Luther King, replying from an Alabama prison to the statement of local white religious leaders that the Birmingham demonstrations were "unwise and untimely," put it:

"I guess it is easy for those who have never felt the sting of darts of segregation to say 'wait.' But when you take a cross country drive and find it necessary to sleep night after night in the uncomfortable corners of your automobile because no motel will accept you; when you are harried by day and haunted by night by the fact that you are a Negro, living constantly at tip-toe stance never quite knowing what to expect next, and plagued with inner fears and outer resentments; when you are forever fighting a degenerating sense of 'nobodiness'—then you will understand why we find it difficult to wait."

CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRESS IN AMERICA: A FURTHER INSTALLMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last week I announced that periodically I would call to the attention of the Senate the encouraging news of civil rights progress in the United States.

It is just as important to report the hopeful and optimistic news as it is to acknowledge the hard facts of civil discord and discrimination that still exist in all sections of the Nation. Much remains to be accomplished—to be sure—but we should not overly minimize the definite progress that has been achieved.

One of the clearest, firmest, and most impelling voices calling for such continued progress belongs to the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON. At Gettysburg and again at the Governors' conference, the Vice President raised the moral imperative of prompt action by private persons and at all levels of government to guarantee equality and justice for all Americans.

The Washington Post recently published an editorial praising the Vice President for his courageous leadership in the cause of civil rights. This editorial commendation is thoroughly merited and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the July 27 edition of the Washington Post be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Also, the mayor of Atlanta, Ga., the Honorable Ivan Allen, Jr., delivered a most moving and courageous statement in behalf of racial justice in his testimony before the Commerce Committee.

Obviously the mayor of Atlanta comes before the Congress with excellent credentials to speak in behalf of the President's civil rights legislation. Atlanta has achieved a measure of desegregation of public accommodations, facilities, and schools that serves as evidence of what is possible when men of good will sit down together and seek mutually beneficial arrangements to banish segregation and discrimination from a community.

The mayor of Atlanta has told the Congress to finish the job started a century ago with the Emancipation Proclamation. I devoutly hope that Congress will heed the advice of this outstanding public servant and statesman.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial praising Mayor Allen printed in yesterday's New York

Times be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 27, 1963]

A Powerful Advocate

Vice President Lyndon Johnson has been speaking out on civil rights issues with increasing frequency, force, and clarity. He is doing a great deal to shape public opinion and alter public outlook. Frequently he gets to the gist of the matter with a directness and vigor that pierces the fog of legal dispute into which we so frequently become mired. In his address at the Governors' conference in Miami he made his point with a paragraph notable for its moral tone and simple eloquence:

"Whatever the legalisms or traditions, it is wrong that the tax-paying, arms-bearing, vote-casting Americans should be unable to find a bed for the night or meals for their children along the highways of our free and decent society. Whatever the reasons, it is wrong that Americans who fight alongside other Americans in war should not be able to work alongside the same Americans, wash up alongside them, eat alongside them, win promotions alongside them, or send their children to sit in schools alongside the children of other Americans."

The Presidency always has been known as a great platform from which to appeal to the mind and heart of America. The Vice Presidency is being made into a great platform by Vice President Lyndon Johnson.

[From the New York Times, July 28, 1963]

Atlanta's Mayor Speaks

On rare occasions the oratorical fog on Capitol Hill is pierced by a voice resonant with courage and dignity. Such a voice was heard when Mayor Ivan Allen, Jr., of Atlanta, testified before the Senate Commerce Committee in support of President Kennedy's bill to prohibit racial discrimination in stores, restaurants, and other public accommodations.

On the basis of the very substantial accomplishments that his city of a half million, the largest in the Southeast, has made in desegregating publicly owned and privately owned facilities, he might have come as a champion of States rights and of the ability of localities to banish discrimination without Federal law. Certainly, he would have had much more warrant to espouse that view than the Barnetts, the Wallaces, and the other archsegregationists who raise the specter of Federal "usurpation" as a device for keeping southern Negroes in subjection.

But Mr. Allen was not in Washington to boast. He was there to warn that even in cities like Atlanta the progress that had been made might be wiped out if Congress turned its back on the Kennedy proposal and thus gave implied endorsement to the concept that private businesses were free to discriminate. He left behind this charge to finish the job started with the Emancipation Proclamation a century ago: "Now the elimination of segregation, which is slavery's stepchild, is a challenge to all of us to make every American free in fact as well as in theory—and again to establish our Nation as the true champion of the free world."

THE CRISIS IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in this mail over the weekend I have received from Mr. Maurice R. Franks, president of the National Labor-Management Foundation and editor of Partners magazine a copy of the editorial which Mr. Franks is going to have in the next issue of the magazine.

Because this editorial is so timely in view of impending congressional consideration of legislation effecting the crisis in the railroad industry, I called Mr. Franks, requesting permission to have this editorial inserted in the Congressional Record prior to its publication in the forthcoming edition of Partners magazine. Mr. Franks granted his consent and I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the Record for all my colleagues' information.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Crisis in Collective Bargaining and the Need for Statutory Definition of Its Functional Domain

(By Maurice R. Franks)

The 4-year-old railroad work rules dispute which today has culminated in the threat of a disastrous nationwide rail strike next Tuesday, points to the need for clarification by act of Congress just what constitutes the legitimate domain of collective bargaining and what in all common sense and economic justice lies outside its proper bounds.

Although collective bargaining is one of the proudest institutions of a free society like ours, the obviously required surveys have yet to be made and lines defining and delimiting the legitimate province have yet to be established. Instead, an unruly expansion by means of creeping encroachment has been allowed to take place. Labor unions, encouraged by successive triumphs in that direction and strengthened in their determination to pursue such advances by the sanctioning thereof by shortsighted and politically oriented NLRB rulings, have gradually extended the concept of conditions of employment—established by law as negotiable—to include the employer's very right to manage his enterprise in lines of sound business acumen.

So long as this process has continued—as for well over a decade it has—and unions have devoted themselves to a creeping invasion of management, more and more difficulties were set in the way of successful collective bargaining, more and more negotiations became deadlocked and more and more strikes and threats of strikes became inevitable. The long and economically harmful steel strike of 1959 was the result of the union's stubborn challenge of management's right to manage, matched for 155 days by the steel companies' equally stubborn resistance to that painful challenge. The present railroad crisis is one of essentially similar character.

The emergency, whatever may be its stopgap resolutions, is one of utmost seriousness. The Nation can ill afford an extended rail strike. Neither labor nor management can afford a lengthy work stoppage. In an area as sensitive as general transportation the public interest is closely and deeply involved. The national safety might well be jeopardized. Because of these considerations, it is reasonable to suppose that one strong measure or another would be restored to by the Federal Government, should other measures fail and should railroad operations cease and begin to stagnate. But no strong measures are possible that would not at the same time deal a devastating blow to the very institution of free collective bargaining. Compulsory arbitration, no matter the guise under which it may be presented, strikes at the very heart of free unionism. Just as government seizure of property and industrial operations strikes at the heart of free enterprise. And free unionism and free enterprise together constitute indispensable supports of our American free society.

Both labor and management, however aware they may be of these simple, basic facts, appear to be compelling each other to ignore them if only because of their fruitless endeavor to resolve nonnegotiable issues by means of collective bargaining.

The truest and deepest crisis—as both sides must agree—is thus one that must treat the work rules issue per se as merely incidental. The crisis that really hurts is built into the very vitals of free collective bargaining as an approach to cooperative effort and the economic necessity of labor-management partnership. It is the bargaining table itself that may be faced with collapse and with being swept away along with the economic debris resulting from a widespread, long-drawn-out rail strike. And simply because, as an institution, collective bargaining has been allowed to spread from an orderly domain into a jungle of wild, unruly, supergrowth—because no judicious limits were placed upon its offices in the first place and because it therefore expanded well beyond its national province until it got completely out of hand.

Looking at the picture without partisan emotion and with nothing but the required amount of everyday commonsense, I am convinced that the time has unquestionably arrived to determine what in the very nature of labor-management relations properly belongs to labor, what properly belongs to management, and what properly belongs to their partnership in production. Needed is a responsible survey to determine and establish just what conditions of employment are negotiable and what conditions of employment are not—and never can be—legitimately negotiable. Only when such a basic survey has been made can the creative offices of collective bargaining be truly and fully realized and overall economic justice be achieved on the industrial scene.

Should such a survey be made and should the domain of collective bargaining be fairly and intelligibly established by statute, we may be sure that the threat of calamitous strikes over work rules in the transportation industry and elsewhere in the Nation's economy would be far less likely to arise. For neither management's right to manage or the union's right to be and to operate as a full-fledged and independent organization of labor would be challenged by the party of the other part or by any public opponent. No management would be permitted to invade the organization or in any way determine the operations of the union bargaining agent; and no union negotiators would be permitted to invade the employer's organization with a schedule of demands which, if acceded to, would rob that organization of the very efficiency required for it to survive the competition that is a part of its very environment—and which by this circumstance would be tantamount to surrendering its managerial right to manage and handing it over the union.

The fact that this underlying issue is built into the present work rules crisis should not be overlooked by any observer—and certainly it should not be overlooked by the Congress of the United States. The very least we have a right to expect of our Senators and Congressmen, if together they are to respond to the challenge now tossed in their laps—and respond with the long-term vision the situation most truly invites—is that the authentic function of free collective bargaining shall be understood and that its areas shall be effectively defined so as to wall out perversion of that rightful function and prevent a jungle land of misconception from taking over.

The difficulty that has led to the present crisis in the railroad industry—and that will lead to many more such crises within the American economy—is that productive efficiency is primarily a management problem, whose solution is inseparable from managerial prerogative and is therefore not negotiable with any union. Which means that the imposition of work rules devised to save an industry from economic decay and prostration does not fall within the authentic domain of free collective bargaining.

Frankly yours,

MAURICE R. FRANKS.

DEATH OF OMAR B. KETCHUM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I rise to express my tribute to a great American whose obituary appears in Friday's Washington Evening Star and whose contributions to our American way of life have long been admired and applauded by millions of Americans, especially by the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars which organization he served so faithfully and fruitfully for so many years. I refer of course to the sad passing of Omar B. Ketchum, the beloved and effective head of the Veterans of Foreign Wars office here in Washington.

Omar Ketchum was an American leader whose courage matched his convictions and who could always be counted upon to battle valiantly for any patriotic purpose or any pro-American cause. He and the VFW organization which he served so ably were in the vanguard of every fight to protect our great Republic against the subversive forces of communism and to promote the strong national defenses of our country. His leadership in these trying times will be sorely missed.

Under unanimous consent of the Senate I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point the full text of the obituary from the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the obituary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OMAR B. KETCHUM, 65, HEAD OF WASHINGTON VFW OFFICE

Omar B. Ketchum, 65, head of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Office in Washington for more than 20 years, died yesterday at Suburban Hospital after a long illness.

A veteran of World War I, Mr. Ketchum became commander of the Philip Dillard Post No. 1650 at Topeka in the 1930's and served as national chief of staff from 1939 to 1940. He then served as national organization director of membership.

In 1941 Mr. Ketchum was appointed national legislative director and then to his latest position, which includes supervision of all functions of the Washington VFW office.

A strong believer in citizens' participation in government, he often urged veterans to become active Americans.

"Join a veterans' association. Get into politics. Be active Americans. Then you can complain," he once said.

Following his own advice, he tried politics himself in the 1930's. From 1931 to 1935 he was mayor of Topeka, Kans., and in 1934 he was the Democratic nominee for Governor of Kansas, losing to Alfred M. Landon.

In 1936 he ran on the Democratic slate for the U.S. Senate against Arthur Capper, losing by a narrow margin.

A native of Hardy, Ark., Mr. Ketchum was educated in Kansas schools. He served four terms as president of the Topeka Typographical Union.

He leaves his wife, Edna G., of 5905 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, the home address; five children, Ronald, of 2939 Bryan Street, Alexandria; Arlene, of the home address; Thomas, of Topeka; William, of Coffeyville, Kans., and Mrs. James Rexroat, of Kansas City, Kans.

Another son, Jack B., an Air Force pilot, was killed in Europe during World War II.

Also surviving are two sisters, Mrs. Jane Ulrich, of Topeka, and Mrs. Alta Maggard, of Arvada, Colo.

TAXATION OF MUNICIPAL SECURITIES—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Ithaca, N.Y., relating to taxation of municipal securities.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION—

RESOLUTION ON TAXATION OF MUNICIPAL SECURITIES

Whereas State and municipal securities have historically received immunity from taxation by the Federal Government; and

Whereas Federal securities and property have historically received immunity from taxation by State and local governments; and

Whereas the exemption from Federal taxation of interest on securities of State and local governments is threatened by the U.S. Treasury Department in its interpretation of the Life Insurance Company Tax Act of 1959, Public Law 86–69; and

Whereas the tax of States and municipalities will be made immeasurably more difficult if they cannot borrow on reasonably favorable terms in the private market: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Common Council of the City of Ithaca, N.Y., does urge the Congress to enact legislation which would leave no doubt as to the tax exempt treatment of State and local bond interest; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk is authorized and directed to address certified copies of this resolution to the Honorable JACOB JAVITS and KENNETH KEATING, Senators from the State of New York and the Honorable HOWARD ROBISON, Congressman from this congressional district.

FRANCIS CARDINAL SPELLMAN ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at the recent dedication of a new housing development in New York City, His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman delivered an address which should, in my view, be brought to the attention of my colleagues. The cardinal's statement is particularly notable because it emphasizes the positive aspect of what is happening in our Nation today in the drive for equal rights for all. While in no way denying how much is left to be done, Cardinal Spellman quite properly specifies exactly how integration actually works in New York in particular situations. His statement is also valuable because it stresses the important role which the church plays in this most vital movement toward making our constitutional guarantees a reality.

I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY CARDINAL SPELLMAN AT DEDICATION OF CORNELIUS J. DREW HOUSES, JULY 11, 1963

The dedication of the Cornelius J. Drew Houses is an extremely happy and gratifying occasion for me. Naturally I am always pleased when a priest of this archdiocese is honored, but I am especially pleased today, because Monsignor Drew was one of our truly great priests. Selfless and dedicated, the last thing he ever wanted during his lifetime was honor for himself. But the memory of such a man deserves to be enshrined, and I can think of no more fitting way to perpetuate the memory of Monsignor Drew than by giving his name to this magnificent housing project, built for the people he so loved, and whom he served with such devotion.

Monsignor Drew was a practical priest. His eyes were fixed on heaven but he never lost sight of this earth, its people and their daily needs. He not only brought the glad tidings of the Gospel to those he served; he also labored that they might have a fair measure of the material things of life, without which it is difficult to respond to the demands of the spirit. A starving child finds it hard to pray. A family in a cramped, unsanitary tenement is scarcely able to function as a family—to stay together and to pray together in the way a family should. Monsignor Drew saw this clearly, and he brought the principles of a living faith to his people, eagerly cooperating with his fellow citizens to improve the housing, the education, and the general welfare of all the people of the neighborhoods where he ministered as priest and pastor.

This new development, therefore, is dedicated to the memory of a priest whom I knew well and admired as a dedicated public and religious servant. When he had finished a brilliant career as a missionary on the New York Apostolate, at a time when he could well have asked for a light assignment, he came and asked me to give him the honor of succeeding Msgr. William McCann as pastor of this parish of St. Charles. He knew, he said, that he could not hope to continue the great work of this devoted apostle, but he would do his best. This dedication today is a testimony to the success of his ministry here. In recent years when Monsignor Drew's strength began to fail I went to him and offered him an assignment which would be less demanding on his physical energies. His answer was characteristic—"Allow me," he said, "to die as I have lived—among my friends and neighbors in Harlem."

I know that Monsignor Drew would not want his name to be used on these buildings today unless it were clearly understood that it stands as a symbol for the devoted and dedicated priests, brothers, sisters and laity who for more than 50 years have cherished the privilege to live, to work, and to die among their friends and neighbors in Harlem.

Happily there is a growing awareness in our country of these basic needs of people. This housing project is one evidence of that awareness. The Cornelius J. Drew Houses are a tribute to the public housing programs of our city and State. Public housing under the Federal, State, and city programs, helps fill the need for decent dwellings for many of our fellow Americans of all races, creeds, and colors, and, therefore, deserves the approval and the encouragement of all our citizens. New legislation embodying a creative approach to the problems of public housing and bringing new and imaginative solutions may be helpful to perfect the programs so well under way.

When we speak of all races, creeds, and colors we touch upon something which is on everyone's mind today, and about which it is impossible to remain silent on such an occasion as this—and that is the crying need for full justice and equality for our fellow American citizens who are Negroes. The inequities inflicted upon them have been a festering problem in our society for many decades. There is simply no reason—there never was and there never can be—why the color of a man's skin should limit his opportunities in a society that boasts of freedom.

The Negro is asked to give as much as any other man for his country. He has a right to receive back from his country in equal measure. On my trips over many years to visit our soldier-sons all over the world, I have seen white and Negro soldiers serving our country, suffering the same hardships and confronting the same hazards of war. Yet contrary to every Christian principle and in downright defiance of the glorious American ideal of equal justice for all, some of those same Americans who risked their lives for America—for you and for me—are denied the right to vote, the right to receive an adequate education, the right to live where they desire and their means enable them to live and to receive the normal courtesies befitting their dignity as human beings.

They are denied these rights for only one reason—the color of their skin. How lamentable that some Americans who would die together today, will not eat together, will not travel together, will not live together. This is an outrage which America cannot tolerate. Doors cannot continue to close in the faces of Negroes as they search for jobs, as they strive for membership in some unions, as they seek the chance for specialized job training. Surely the spirit of justice and equality which lives in the very heart of our great Nation will not permit these inequities to continue.

People today are restless and impatient with the painfully slow progress that has been made in solving this problem of racism. The tradition of America is to get things done promptly and efficiently. Her tradition is also to get them done peacefully. In other lands, and unfortunately also in our own, violence has often been the companion of change. That is not the right way in America. That is not the American way. We must accomplish what has to be done working together, as one people with a common ideal, working calmly but with determination to progress and to succeed in making our ideals a reality.

These ideals could be effectively realized if all Americans regardless of religion would drop the barriers of discrimination, if employers would hire qualified Negroes—and provide training opportunities so that more Negroes may become qualified, and freely admit Negroes to unions and to apprenticeship programs.

In the field of housing, the excellent laws against discrimination in New York City and New York State must be supplemented by the active interest and vigilant efforts of all our citizens. Different races can live side by side harmoniously. While emphasis is placed on trouble spots, we can point to many areas where integrated living goes on as it should. One such is the area in the northeast Bronx where both the Parish of Our Lady of Grace and the neighborhood as a whole has taken the initiative to demonstrate that people of different races and colors can live together in mutual respect, go to school together, worship together, and be full American citizens enjoying the blessings of democracy in action.

Pope John XXIII—in that wonderful manner of his, distinguished by faith, love and warm friendliness—made a declaration on this very point. In his encyclical, "Peace on Earth", he states: "even though human beings differ from one another by virtue of their ethnic qualities, they all possess certain essential common elements and are inclined by nature to meet each other in the world of spiritual values, whose progressive assimilation opens to them the possibility of perfection without limits. They have the right and duty, therefore, to live in communion with one another."

In this immediate neighborhood stands the Lieutenant Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Memorial Community Center. Established in May, 1954, this community center serves over 2,000 individuals in 34 different activities. There everyone who desires or needs its services is welcome. Such has been the consistent policy of our archdiocesan institutions in the 156 years of the history of the archdiocese of New York, for this is Catholic faith—catholicism and Americanism in action.

In the field of education, we seek schools that are honestly integrated. I am proud that our parochial schools, high schools, colleges and universities are open and have been open through the years to boys and girls of every color. Our own new 16 classroom parochial school of St. Charles Borromeo, soon to open, is an evidence of how educational opportunity is being expanded to give solid instruction to all the children. The Catholic people gladly make this contribution to the community and to our beloved country. Better education is necessary, and we are ever seeking to improve the minds and hearts of all our children, and Catholic people make tremendous sacrifices to build our schools and to maintain them. This we could not possibly do if it were not for the heroically generous contribution of their very lives by the sisters and brothers who teach in our Catholic schools. And when this new St. Charles Parochial School opens its doors, it is my intention that it bear the honored name of Msgr. Cornelius Drew.

The American Catholic bishops declared in 1958 that "the heart of the race question is moral and religious. It concerns the rights of man and our attitude toward our fellow man." Only last week when President Kennedy visited our new holy father, Pope Paul VI, His Holiness said, "We are ever mindful in our prayers of your efforts to insure all your citizens the equal benefits of citizenship which have as their foundation the equality of all men because of their dignity as persons and children of God."

I had the opportunity in 1949 of sending my congratulations and good wishes to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on its 40th anniversary, of which I have the honor of being a life member. I said then, and now I repeat: "The Catholic Church repudiates as abhorrent to her very nature the pernicious doctrine that men are born with the stamp upon them of essential racial superiority or inferiority. She recognizes no master race, but proclaims the God-given equality before God of all souls, for whose salvation our Blessed Redeemer suffered and sacrificed."

Our own Catholic Interracial Council has done much to turn the attention of people to the problems of racial injustice. Many of our parishes have conducted workshops and study programs in an effort to further integrated living and equal educational opportunity for all and to end discrimination in employment and in union membership.

But much—ever so much—remains to be done. The great Christian and American principle of equality must be reduced to action in local circumstances and in specific ways. We need civil rights measures enacted into law; but we also need the attitudes of justice and charity to be applied by every person in our society to the concrete problems of housing, employment and education. This is the challenge which 1963 has set squarely before us and it must at all costs be faced and solved.

Our Negro brother wants more than a house in America. He wants a home in America. He wishes to feel at home here. He belongs fully to America and he wants to feel fully accepted here. Until his desires are fulfilled none of us can be assured of the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity.

America has met her problems in the past, and has met them successfully and without turmoil. We must believe that she will meet this problem and that it too will be successfully resolved.

May we, through our cooperative efforts and our humble prayers, beseech Almighty God, the Creator and the loving Father of all peoples and all races, to hasten the day when in our beloved land liberty and justice will prevail for all men.

THE FRIGHT PEDDLER

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, last week the distinguished minority whip expanded his views on a menace familiar to all of us, the fright peddler, in an article in the New York Times Sunday magazine.

The senior Senator from California also set forth a precise battle plan to combat the professional purveyors of scares and hoaxes for money and madness. In the concluding paragraphs of the article, he wrote:

> I think that both of our political parties must take the fright peddlers on frontally, especially at the community level. They must be met head on by every reasonable, self-respecting American. We, each single individual among us, Republican, Democrat, or independent, have a solemn duty to speak out vigorously against those who sow hate and fear among our people and against our institutions. For the fantastic charges of the fright peddlers fall apart when held up to the light of fact and reason.
>
> As with the Communists, the fright peddlers themselves cannot be converted by reason. But those upon whom they attempt to prey can be armed with the truth to combat them. The overwhelming majority of Americans in the middle eternally reject communism. I am confident that if they are given all the facts the same majority will ultimately repudiate the fright peddlers, their works and their fellow travelers.

For this reason and in this spirit, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"A PLOT TO OVERTHROW AMERICA"—A CAMPAIGN OF HYSTERIA IS BEING WAGED BY SELF-STYLED PATRIOTS WHO PEDDLE FEAR—HERE A SENATOR EXAMINES SOME FRIGHT MAIL HE HAS RECEIVED, AND ASSAYS ITS EFFECT

(By THOMAS H. KUCHEL)

WASHINGTON.—Of the 60,000 or so letters I receive each month, usually about 10 percent are what I call fright mail. They are written to inform me of what the writers consider "the latest plot to overthrow America."

The information is unfailingly coupled with a prayerful or furious or hysterical demand that I do something about it immediately—or else.

Some of the more memorable plots that come to mind include these: 35,000 Communist Chinese troops, bearing arms and wearing deceptively dyed powder-blue uniforms, are poised on the Mexican border, about to invade San Diego; the United States has turned over—or will at any moment—its Army, Navy, and Air Force to the command of a Russian colonel in the United Nations; almost every well-known American or free world leader is, in reality, a top Communist agent; a U.S. Army guerrilla-warfare exercise in Georgia, called Water Moccasin III, is in actuality a United Nations operation preparatory to taking over our country.

All these tales, of course, would be amusing rather than tragic, were it not for the fact that thousands of Californians—and heaven knows how many other Americans—swallow them whole and generally resist any efforts to refute them. Every public official I have ever talked to on the subject confirms receiving an unhealthy share of mail from people taken in by such claptrap. Being from the most populous State, I can no doubt lay claim to the dubious distinction of receiving as much as or more than any of my Senate colleagues. But Senators from much smaller States have told me that sometimes up to 30 percent of their mail fits into the fright category.

The hoaxes are most often the handiwork of what I have called "fright peddlers"—hundreds of self-styled "patriotic" individuals or groups that, I firmly believe, are doing America much harm. Just who are the fright peddlers?

In many cases, they appear to be a scattered few poor souls with a mimeograph machine, a chauvinistic title, some star-spangled paper and a limited mailing list. In others, they appear to be well-financed organizations with printing presses, "research staffs" and solid subscription lists.

Some, of course, are simply the old standby commercial bigots who have found rejuvenation and greater acceptance with the Supreme Court's striking down of segregation. Others seem to be amateur newcomers, attempting to achieve rank and perhaps ultimately to turn "pro"—and get incorporated. For this may be the gateway to radio and television programs, personal tours and lots of speechmaking to compatible groups, which is a long way from merely drumming up organized letters-to-the-editor campaigns.

In any event, the fright peddler is the self-appointed savior of our land who finds conspiracy, treason and "sellout" in almost every act or pronouncement of government or government official here, there and everywhere, and puts forth his findings with astonishing fecundity.

The Water Moccasin hoax, which was intertwined with the aging but ever-popular "Russian colonel" scare, makes perhaps the most fascinating and instructive case study of the work of the fright peddlers.

Water Moccasin III, last March, was one in a continuing series of field exercises conducted by the Army's Special Warfare Center at Fort Stewart, Ga., to provide realistic training for guerrilla and counterguerrilla warfare, such as is now going on in South Vietnam against the Communist Vietcong. It involved 600 officers and men, including 124 officers from 17 foreign countries of the free world; 4 of these were Africans from Liberia.

The first Water Moccasin fright letters arrived in my office in late February and early March. Accompanying several of them were printed copies of a letter purportedly written by one P. A. Del Valle, president of something called the Defenders of the American Constitution, and national defense chairman of something else called the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies. The letter said, in part:

"The undersigned is convinced this [Water Moccasin] * * * signified rehearsals of the U.N. takeover of the U.S.A. under the Disarmament Treaty [sic] promulgated under Public Law No. 87-297 * * * The urgency of this message is obvious. This appears to be the beginning of a crash program to disarm the U.S.A. and make us a province of the U.N. May God in His mercy help us prevent this catastrophe."

Shortly afterward, it appears, a Congressman got into the act with a newsletter describing Water Moccasin as "fantastic" and "frightening." "It is my belief that this operation comes squarely under article 43 of the United Nations Charter," he wrote darkly. (Article 43, which has never been invoked, deals with a permanent international peace force.) His newsletter was reprinted and circulated, probably throughout the entire country, by something called the Network of Patriotic Letter Writers. Reprints sold for 2 cents apiece or 100 for $1.75.

About this time, I began hearing from terrified constituents that one Theodore Jackman, of Greenville, S. C., had made talks in California about the "frightening military maneuver," operation Water Moccasin. On a hunch, I checked some John Birch literature I always keep near at hand and, sure enough, Rev. Theodore Jackman is listed as an available orator of the American Speakers Bureau, operated by the John Birch Society, whose major contributions to the welfare and security of the United States to date have been to "unmask" Dwight Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles as traitors.

Some apostles of fear on radio and TV apparently were also now running amuck with the story. Before long I had received several thousand letters from swindled souls writing, and writhing, in hysteria. The following are just a few sample excerpts:

"Frightening * * *. It is time Congress demands the facts about exercise Water Moccasin II, the United Nations war operations and NATO operations."

"There are African Negro troops, who are cannables [sic], stationed in Georgia."

"How come these pagan, ruthless, brutal, Godless savages? Yes we know of the U.N. plans to place Mongolian and Congolese troops over our dear United States (the same kind of troops which ravaged Katanga)."

"I have a report at this time that there are 15,000 United Nations personnel from 15 countries participating. Sixteen thousand African soldiers * * * complete with nose and earrings."

This, then, is just a small illustration of the use some fright peddlers made of a legitimate and, I think, valuable U.S. Army exercise. And I am still receiving hundreds of letters about Water Moccasin.

Through them runs the persistent theme that the United Nations, the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and even NATO were behind the "sinister plot." For these institutions—not to mention the income tax—are all key targets for demolition of almost all of the "I am a better American than you are" outfits.

Many of the Water Moccasin letters—plus thousands of other fright letters over the years—tell me that the goal of most of the plots is to turn over our military to the command of a "Russian colonel" in the U.N.

In recent months, my constituents have sent me letters as well as leaflets and clippings by the thousands from, for example, the U.S. Flag Committee of Jackson Heights, N.Y., the United Societies of Methodist Layman of Austin, Tex., the Cross and the Flag run by Gerald L. K. Smith, and a California newspaper reporting a speech by a Birch Society organizer, former Congressman John Rousselot—all telling me again the old story, familiar to hundreds of beleaguered legislators, that the Russian colonel (sometimes "promoted" to general) is, in effect, "military chief" of the United Nations.

The man they refer to is the Under Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs. The post is customarily filled by a Russian member of the Secretariat, currently Vladimir P. Suslov, one of a number of U.N. officials with Under Secretary rank. But not only does no Russian "command" any U.N. forces, the Russians have consistently refused to vote for or help pay for U.N. military operations.

The originator of this package of fright is one Myron Fagan, director of something called the Cinema Educational Guild in Hollywood. He first told the story of the Russian colonel who was military chief of the United Nations in, of all things, a play he wrote in the 1950's.

Mr. Fagan is well known to many legislators as the industrious author of many tracts and booklets. He was also well known to the California State Senate Fact Finding Subcommittee on Un-American Activities of the 1961 regular California Legislature, which reported: "We do not wish to impugn the sincerity of Mr. Fagan, but we do wish to make public the facts about his Cinema Educational Guild, and our opinion concerning the erroneous nature of many of the statements contained in its publications. * * * There are many evidences of anti-Semitism throughout many of the booklets and in many of the Fagan speeches."

The fright peddlers are, I believe, a serious danger to the country. Their slogans—get the United States out of the U.N. stop all foreign aid; repeal the income tax; abolish NATO—constitute a program that could hardly delight Nikita Khrushchev more. I honestly believe that if he could—and maybe he can—underwrite the cost of these un-American goals, he would eagerly do so.

At the very least, by huckstering half-truths and downright falsehoods, the fright peddlers scare the daylights out of many Americans and divert our attention from the real menace to our freedom and our way of life. They sow suspicion and hatred. They attempt to undermine faith in our Government, its institutions and officials. In my opinion, they degrade America and Americans and do it as well as or better than the Communists. And they defile the honorable philosophy of conservatism as thoroughly as the Communists defile the honorable philosophy of liberalism.

I am also concerned because the followers of the fright peddlers have shown for the most part either ignorance or indifference regarding the anti-Semitism, anti-Catholicism, and racism that often are underlying themes of fright literature.

Since I spoke on the Senate floor on May 2 against the fright peddlers I have received hundreds of letters, some on fine quality stationery, reeking with bigotry and hate.

I believe these manifestations represent a latent danger. A number of constituents lately arrived from Europe have, indeed, written me to note a parallel between the activities of some of the "frightists" and the activities of some of those who first wore swastikas around their arms in the 1920's.

Another disturbing aspect of the fright peddlers' worth is that their power reaches down into local affairs—municipal elections, school board contests, public library operations. For the person who sees a Communist conspiracy in the White House or the Congress or the U.S. Army is likely to see the same conspiracy in a fluoridation vote or a schoolbook or a Steinbeck novel.

There are, naturally, peddlers of fright and deceit on the extreme left, also. And they stimulate letters hysterically and furiously demanding peace at any price, unilateral disarmament, love and kisses for Castro, et al. But they account for less than 1 percent of the fright mail I receive.

Why have the fright peddlers of the far, far right found such a great response in the United States?

Some analysts attribute their success to a sort of cold-war battle fatigue. They may be correct. Many of the victims of the fright peddlers seek and see only simple causes and simple solutions to complex problems of long standing.

There is evidence, moreover, that fright-seeking, like horror movies, can be fun for some. A few Birchers have written to me that their gatherings have provided them with some of the nicest social evenings and best refreshments they have ever had.

I do not doubt that many of the victims believe sincerely that they are striking a blow for freedom against communism. That delusion makes me only more concerned. For as J. Edgar Hoover wrote in the Journal of the American Bar Association in February 1962: "Today, far too many self-styled experts on communism are plying the highways of America, giving erroneous information. This causes hysteria, false alarms, misplaced apprehension by many of our citizens. We need enlightenment about communism but this information must be factual, accurate, and not tailored to echo personal idiosyncrasies."

On the brighter side, since my speech of May 2, 4 out of every 5 of the more than 15,000 persons who have written to me about the fright peddlers have written to support my position. What can they, and the rest of us, do about this insidious campaign?

I think that both of our political parties must take the fright peddlers on frontally, especially at the community level. They must be met head on by every reasonable, self-respecting American. We, each single individual among us, Republican, Democrat, or independent, have a solemn duty to speak out vigorously against those who sow hate and fear among our people and against our institutions. For the fantastic charges of the fright peddlers fall apart when held up to the light of fact and reason.

As with the Communists, the fright peddlers themselves cannot be converted by reason. But those upon whom they attempt to prey can be armed with the truth to combat them. The overwhelming majority of Americans in the middle eternally reject communism. I am confident that if they are given all the facts the same majority will ultimately repudiate the fright peddlers, their works, and their fellow travelers.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS GI EDUCATION BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am proud to announce that the National Education Association has announced its support for the cold war GI bill. This great national organization is composed of more than 860,000 educators and administrators from the elementary schools, junior high schools, high schools, junior colleges, colleges, universities and educational agencies across this country. The members of this association, all of whom have dedicated their lives to the education of the youth of this land, are familiar with the financial difficulties which face the cold war veteran in continuing his education.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this time the letter of July 17, 1963, from Mr. John M. Lumley, the director of the division of Federal relations of the National Education Association, pledging their active working support of the cold war GI bill. This letter is the latest evidence of the continuing and ever growing support which is being expressed for the cold war GI bill by the educators of this country, and an indication of the ground swell of public opinion which is rallying for the passage of S. 5. The Nation needs this bill; nobody realizes that better than the educators who spend their lives for the education of youth.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., July 17, 1963.

Hon. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: we are pleased to learn that S. 5 has been approved by the committee and will now receive consideration.

The National Education Association will continue to do everything possible to secure favorable action in this session. However, we know that it is through your untiring efforts that the bill has been approved.

Congratulations on a job well done.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. LUMLEY,
Director, Division of Federal Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

STOCKPILING STUDY

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, our stockpiling program is much in the news these days and is a matter of great public and congressional interest. I cannot but feel that the picture has been somewhat distorted, both by the public and in Congress.

The Armed Forces Chemical Journal for June 1963 has published a well-thought-out, sane appraisal of our stockpiling program, giving the history of its inception and pointing out its essentiality. This study was written by a man highly competent to do so. The author is Robert Redwine, known to me for many years when he was chief of the Associated Press Bureau for Arizona, and more recently as the professional staff expert for minerals for the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, a committee on which I now have the honor to serve.

Mr. President, in view of the timeliness of Mr. Redwine's study in relation to an immediate, pressing public problem, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STOCKPILE—OR PERISH

(By Robert W. Redwine)

"Stockpile: A reserve supply of raw materials or goods * * * not yet being used."—Webster's 20th Century Dictionary unabridged.

There is nothing basically new about the general idea of stockpiling—that is the methodical storing up of goods in times of plenty and tranquillity against the days of evil that are bound to reoccur if the lessons of history are to be relied upon.

Not only man, but certain creatures of the animal world engage in stockpiling, notably the bees, the ants, and the squirrels.

In the Book of Genesis it it recorded that Joseph was appointed Pharaoh's stockpile administrator, and that he gathered up and stored all the surplus food during 7 years of plenty in the land of Egypt, and then "opened all the storehouses" and sold off the stockpile when famine came and stalked all the then known world.

Today, as Uncle Sam's so-called national stockpile and its future is weighed in the balance, discussed and "cussed," there are those who profess to see in the Biblical account of early day stockpiling both an economic and military lesson that should be heeded as America faces the troubled days ahead. Their plea is don't open the storehouses except in times of extreme emergency. Others, just as sincere, say it's too big and we need all we can get by selling off the surplus to help balance the budget.

The average citizen is left confused and befuddled by the controversy sparked and fanned by the congressional hearings just ended. He or she does not comprehend that the national stockpile, composed mainly of minerals, but also having in it such diverse items as feathers and down, iodine, diamonds, sperm oil, silk, and opium, is only one of many Government stockpiles.

The supplemental stockpile, the Commodity Credit Corporation barter pipeline, the Defense Production Act inventory, all orphaned half-brothers of the national stockpile, and the well-publicized reserve supply of surplus agricultural products have a total book value slightly in excess of the value of all of Uncle Sam's gold stored in the caves of Fort Knox.

But this is not all by a wide margin. Recently it was revealed that the Department of Defense has on hand some $8 billion worth of items "in long supply," such as stocks of weapons and ammunition built up during World War II and the Korean conflict and "still considered handy to have just in case."

Another stockpile of major proportions is the reserve merchant marine fleet, made up largely of the Liberty ships built during World War II. These 1,830 vessels, swinging at anchor, side by side in ghostly parade, cost $6,200,000 annually to maintain. Yes, there is a continuous maintenance cost because barnacles form on the hull of an idle ship just as they do on one in active service or on one used as a storage bin for surplus grain, the sad fate of scores of these patriarchs of the sea now in moth balls.

To construct these Liberty ships and the few remaining lumbering old freighters of World War I held in the moth ball reserve fleet the American taxpayer paid some $7,464,371,140.

At this point it might be well to give the cost of acquisition for the other stockpiles heretofore mentioned. All figures are for as of February 28, 1963. National stockpile, $5,870,072,100; Defense Production Act, $1,500,308,600; supplemental-barter, $1,312,701,632; surplus agricultural commodities (food reserve, $5,031,575,805.

Then, in addition, there are the little items of civil defense supplies and equipment: $215,708,551, and machine tools: $94,790,200.

In the current controversy over stockpiling the general tendency, for some peculiar reason, has been to ignore all stockpiles except the mineral reserves listed in the national, DPA, and supplemental stockpiles. The hue and cry has been directed toward proposals for disposal of large segments of mineral stocks on hand.

Many individuals, both within and without the mineral industries, including some leading economists and fiscal experts, are fearful of any plan that calls for substantial disposals from the mineral stockpile. They recognize the importance of the mineral extractive industry in the economy of the Nation, indeed in the worldwide economy of the age in which we live, civilization built upon the widest use of metals and chemicals in the history of the world.

They cite dangers inherent in disrupting historic trade and price patterns by selling from reserves rather than from current production except, and only except, in times of short supply during an emergency such as warfare.

Such experts are prepared to and do cite examples to show and prove the validity of their fears that unbridled disposal of these minerals in stock, as is being proposed in some quarters, could easily result in economic chaos at home and violent complications in international affairs.

It is even logically being envisioned that the national budget would be bruised and lacerated far more than soothed by any attempt to convert a large part of the stockpile into dollars. Such disposal inevitably would result in a considerable slowdown in raw material production patterns with an accompanying reduction of employment in the country's mines. This reduction in employment would be quickly followed by an increase in demands upon unemployment insurance and welfare funds and by a reduction in the taxpaying capabilities of a large number of workers, and their employers. All levels of government, local, State, and Federal, would be adversely affected.

Many informed military-minded experts see substantial sales from reserves, if permitted by the Congress, weakening national security by forcing the closing down and ultimate destruction for all practical purposes, of numerous domestic mining operations thus increasing the Nation's dangerous dependence upon foreign sources for many strategic and critical minerals. This latter crime, it is averred, would be compounded by the inevitable contribution it would make to the imbalance in our import-export trade and the draining away of our gold reserves.

Advocates of "no sales of critical and strategic minerals from the stockpile," including the American Mining Congress whose technical committees have probably studied the problem as thoroughly as any group, point out that during World War II Nazi submarines sent to the bottom of the ocean 6,402 merchant ships, many of them carrying vitally needed mica, manganese, copper and tungsten from foreign lands to the United States.

The Allied sealanes shipping position became so critical at one time that bombers were diverted from the front to serve as cargo planes to bring in critical minerals demanded by this Nation's all-out war effort.

America's continuing dependence upon foreign ores, in varying degrees as to mineral but in almost every category, and particularly during war when the demand increases many-fold, makes it imperative, if national security is to be served maximally, that the national stockpile of minerals be maintained at its present level.

On the other hand, the same considerations seem to call for a technical review of the mineral stockpile to the end that a judgment be made to convert several items in it into more readily usable forms best suitable for stockpiling and storage techniques.

Woven into the fabric of the organic statutes providing for the procurement and maintenance of the strategic and critical minerals stockpile is congressional mandated authority to upgrade, beneficiate and refine, "through normal commercial channels," individual items making up the various stockpiles.

Congress, in granting this authority, unquestionably was motivated by recognition of the fact that the best national interests would be served by having stored materials in a readily usable form best suitable for stockpiling; and further, that inherent in such proscribed beneficiation or refinement also would be the stockpiling of electric power, manpower, and plant facility utilization, all of which very likely would be in short supply in time of national emergency.

In Congress and elsewhere whenever the question of a substantial upgrading program arises the problem of how it is to be financed looms up large and loud with the seemingly inevitable effect of killing the subject temporarily. Fatal flaws are found in the suggestion that processors or refiners might be compensated by payments-in-kind, including the obvious one that it would result in market glutting.

In consideration of any suggestion that desirable upgrading be financed by cash payments weight must be given to the present status of the budget and a judgment be made as to which things come first in Government programing.

And yet it cannot be denied: (1) the national interest and security would be served by refining several items in the stockpile; (2) an upgrading program would stimulate employment and generally strengthen the economy; (3) the end result from an upgrading program would be a material increase in the dollar value of the stockpile without any increase in the totality of holdings, a very desirable plus; (4) raw materials, which in some instances are now wasting assets through exposure to wind and rain erosion, would be converted into readily storable and nonwasting form.

The four benefits listed above, and others, could easily be achieved by adoption of a program whereby processors or refiners would be compensated for their services through payment in surplus agricultural commodities which do not store well and which, international traders aver, can be absorbed in certain foreign areas without disturbance of dollar sales patterns.

It would seem needless to expand upon the far-reaching beneficial effects this would have on the U.S. balance-of-payments trade deficit and drain on gold reserves which is of such serious concern today.

There would be still another plus to the Government of equal importance, that is the tremendous saving in financing, insurance and storage costs on the agricultural commodities involved in such a disposal plan. Current Government statistics show that these costs, for many agricultural products, in from 4 to 5 years equal or exceed the original investment.

The deterioration and storage cost ratios of minerals and metals, particularly in refined form are generally infinitesimal when compared with those of agricultural products. For example, in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962 the cost of storage and maintenance of the critical and strategic stockpile items, including minerals—with a value of $8,683,082,332—was only $12,429,080 compared with a storage and maintenance cost of $391,208,665 on $5,031,575,805 worth of agricultural product reserves.

No cogent argument has ever been advanced against upgrading per se, that is limited upgrading that does not impair the flexibility and availability of a material to press the future needs of developing weapons systems and changing technologies.

Carefully thought out refining of a material would enhance the sale or use value of that portion of the stockpile far beyond the cost of processing and without increasing the totality of stockpile holdings, the latter being a must in the eyes of some people.

It would appear that a program of stockpile upgrading as herein outlined, if prosecuted with vigor, would provide a happy solution for two widely differing schools of thought. For those seeking to convert the stockpile into dollars there would be the tremendous savings in storage costs on agricultural commodities and a lift rather than an assault on the Nation's balance of trade and gold reserve positions and, in addition, a retained asset of increased value. For the other group there would be a more valuable stockpile, easier to store and more readily available for ultimate use, without any increase in the totality of holdings.

For John and Jane Public and their children the world would be a little safer place to live, because: "Stockpiles not only provide protection in the event of war; the knowledge of their existence may also be an important deterrent to the outbreak of war."—AMC.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McGOVERN obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASIN PLANS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, H.R. 6016, be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6016) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments, on page 1, after the enacting clause, to strike out "That the monetary authorizations for the following river basin plans, under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army, are hereby increased as follows:" and, in lieu thereof, to insert "That the following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the provisions of 201 and 202 of Public Law 874, Eighty-seventh Congress (76 Stat. 1180), and to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided*, That the necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this Act with funds from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program: *Provided further*, That the projects authorized herein shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements: *Provided further*, That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission: *And provided further*, That the monetary authorizations for the river basin plans, under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army, are hereby increased and additional projects authorized as follows:"; on page 2, after line 21, to strike out:

WEST BRANCH SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN

An additional sum of $2,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the West Branch of the Susquehanna River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of September 3, 1954.

On page 3, after line 2, to insert:

CAPE FEAR RIVER BASIN

The project for the comprehensive development of the Cape Fear River Basin, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 508, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,143,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct joint investigations and surveys of the upper tributaries of the Cape Fear River in the interest of watershed protection and flood prevention, and the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water, such surveys and investigations and the report thereon to be prepared and submitted in compliance with the provisions of Public Law 639, Eighty-seventh Congress, and said surveys and investigations are hereby authorized.

After line 18, to insert:

SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GEORGIA-SOUTH CAROLINA

The Trotters Shoals Dam and Reservoir on the Savannah River is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated June 11, 1963, at an estimated cost of $78,700,000.

On page 4, line 2, after the word "of", to strike out "$21,000,000" and insert "$4,000,000"; after line 6 to insert:

APALACHICOLA RIVER BASIN, GEORGIA

The general plan for the comprehensive development of the Flint River Basin, Georgia, for flood control and other purposes recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, is approved and the construction of the Spewrell Bluff Reservoir on the Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in said report at an estimated cost of $63,200,000.

In line 18, after the word "of", to strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$14,000,000"; on page 5, line 2, after the word "of", to strike out "$157,000,000" and insert "$31,000,000"; after line 6, to insert:

That the modification of the existing project for the Dardanelle lock and dam, Arkansas, in order to provide for the construction of a sewage outfall system for the city of Russellville, Arkansas, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1185), is hereby modified to provide that the United States shall assume the full cost of constructing said facilities, at an estimated additional Federal cost of $404,000.

In line 16, after the word "of", to strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$1,000,000"; at the top of page 6, to insert:

RED RIVER BASIN

The Waurika Dam and Reservoir on Beaver Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated May 6, 1963, at an estimated cost of $25,100,000: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the acquisition of additional lands for establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the reservoir.

After line 9, to strike out:

An additional sum of $80,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

The comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented, is further modified to include such bank protection or rectification works at or below the Garrison Reservoir as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army may be found necessary, at an estimated cost of $3,000,000.

In line 23, after the word "of", to strike out "$150,000,000" and insert "$47,000,000"; on page 7, after line 3, to insert:

The project for the Big South Fork of the Cumberland River, Kentucky and Tennessee, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 175, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $151,000,000.

After line 9, to insert:

The proviso contained in the authorization for the project for flood control and allied purposes on Laurel River, Kentucky, authorized by Public Law 86–645, approved July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 496), is hereby modified to read as follows: *Provided*, That construction of the project shall not be commenced until the power marketing agency has informed the Corps of Engineers that the power generated by the project can be sold at rates which will insure repayment wthin fifty years, with interest, of all costs allocated to power.

After line 18, to strike out:

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

An additional sum of $11,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Upper Mississippi River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented.

On page 8, line 2, after the word "of", to strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$12,000,000"; in line 8, after the word "of", to strike out "$195,000,000" and insert "$36,000,000"; after line 13, to insert:

The Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Montana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 403, Eighty-seventh Congress: *Provided*, That such project shall be operated and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, and the sum of $50,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the partial accomplishment of said project.

The project for the Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir, Snake River, Idaho, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 130, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $52,000,000.

And, on page 9, line 4, after the word "of", to strike out "$100,000,000" and insert "$16,000,000".

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota further yield to me, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am happy to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator yields for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A VOLUNTARY WHEAT ADJUSTMENT AND PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, for myself and Senators BURDICK, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, NELSON, and YOUNG of North Dakota, a voluntary wheat-crop adjustment and price support bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table 5 legislative days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table, as requested.

The bill (S. 1946) to provide for a voluntary wheat adjustment and price support program, introduced by Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the bill would make the wheat certificate plan in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 an entirely voluntary program, to become effective with the 1964 wheat crop, by repealing the compulsory features, which were the principal target of the opposition in the wheat referendum in May. Otherwise it would make little change in the program which our Agriculture Committees considered very carefully, and the Congress enacted about a year ago.

I have submitted this proposal to agricultural analysts in the Legislative Reference Service and had it studied and discussed unofficially with experts at the Department of Agriculture. Without any exception, the experts who have been consulted have agreed that the voluntary wheat certificate plan, with the penalty provisions for overplanting wheat acreage allotments removed, would achieve very desirable results.

First. They report that it would permit farm income to go to a more favorable level than any other voluntary program which has been proposed. If the compulsory wheat certificate plan had been adopted, wheat producers in 1964 would have received 70 cents per bushel certificates on 950 million bushels of food and export wheat, enhancing their income $665 million. They could, by voluntary action, get certificates up to this full amount under the proposal now being introduced.

Second. The proposal would permit continued orderly reduction in Government stocks of wheat. The analysts believe that 70 to 80 percent of producers, and a like amount of the total wheat crop, would be in voluntary compliance to become eligible for certificates, thereby reducing production sufficiently to allow sale of some wheat from CCC stocks.

Third. The proposal would reduce Government costs.

Fourth. The proposal would avoid any increase in the price of food since the price of wheat for food use would remain stable.

I feel very strongly that Congress should take early action to avert overproduction and a deep cut in the income of wheat farmers in 1964. Consequently, I think that this proposal, or the proposal to extend for another year or two the old voluntary acreage reduction program effective on this year's crop, or any other constructive suggestion, should have early consideration by Congress.

It is true that wheat farmers rejected a compulsory certificate plan in May by a majority of "No" votes. It is true that the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 provided an alternative in such an event: 50 percent of parity price supports for those producers of wheat who stay within their share of a national acreage allotment. This is support at about $1.25 per bushel compared to an average support of $1.81 per bushel on the 1963 crop.

It is also true that there is little demand for enactment of a new wheat program coming to Members of Congress from the country. A wheat crop is now being harvested which will bring producers prices based on food value. The effect of the May referendum will not be felt directly for another year. The effect will be evident July 1964, after another wheat harvest has started, and after it is too late to do anything about controlling the size of the crop or preventing a price break. Then farmers will find that their wheat is bringing only $1.25 per bushel or less and then the full effects of the May referendum will be felt.

In my opinion, it is our obligation, as the elected representatives of the citizens of the Nation, to be foresighted and to avoid just such serious developments, whether there is demand from the country or not. We do not postpone the military defense of our country until we are attacked and our citizens are crying for help. Neither should we delay now in taking steps to safeguard our agricultural economy against an otherwise certain disaster a year hence.

Unless something is done before winter wheat planting gets well underway in the Southern wheat-producing States in late August and September—within 60 days from now—we can expect a 1964 wheat crop of several hundred million bushels more than our needs, and an unnecessary drop in farm income of a half billion dollars or more.

The reduction in Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of the past 2 years will be ended. The strengthening of total farm income wil be reversed. Most of the gains of the past 2½ years in agriculture will be offset or lost without any benefit to consumers, or to the National Government in terms of lower agricultural program costs.

The New York Times for May 22, 1963—a day after the May referendum—quoted bakery officials to the effect that the anticipated decline in wheat price would not result in a decline in bread prices. Wheat, they explained, is too small a part of the cost of a loaf of bread for the price of wheat to affect the retail price of bread. In the words of one bakery spokesman quoted by the Times:

> As long as the customer wants a fresh, wholesome loaf of bread produced by a decently paid bakery employee in an extremely competitive market, we will have to spend the money on preservative chemicals, vitamins and other additives, packaging, salaries, and other things, of which flour is the least important factor.

But if the price of wheat is dropped for a year to livestock feed value—down to $1.25 per bushel or less—an effort to get the price back up to $2 per bushel will be opposed on the ground that it will raise retail bread prices and penalize consumers.

Our real hope of maintaining wheat farm income without arousing the real or imaginary fears of consumers is to maintain a stable wheat price structure through 1964, as the voluntary wheat certificate plan would do if we act on it promptly.

Before discussing the studies of the proposed voluntary wheat certificate plan I have just offered, I would like to reiterate that I think all constructive suggestions to meet the wheat problem should be studied. If there is a more feasible proposal than the one I have suggested, I shall be most happy to support it.

President Kennedy, shortly after the wheat referendum, assured administration support of any plan which would improve farm income, reduce Government costs and permit reduction of surplus stocks. My studies indicate that the voluntary certificate plan will meet all these criteria. Perhaps there are other plans which will do so. I am concerned with meeting the problem, and averting a serious upset in 1964—not in passing any particular bill.

The House Agriculture Subcommittee on Wheat, headed by Congressman GRAHAM PURCELL, of Texas, has started hearings and will consider various proposals. I commend the Congressman and his subcommittee for getting at the problem. I have proposed the voluntary wheat certificate plan to them, to consider along with others.

The studies of the voluntary certificate plan which is now being proposed indicate that it would have real advantages over either the existing legislation that will otherwise prevail in 1964, or over other proposed voluntary programs.

THE PROPOSED PLAN COMPARED TO EXISTING WHEAT LEGISLATION FOR 1964

If no legislation is enacted in this session of Congress and no special acreage diversion programs are put into effect for the 1964 wheat crop, production is expected to exceed domestic food and export needs by several hundred million bushels. If a special acreage diversion program is undertaken under existing administrative authority, the cost of the voluntary feed grain acreage diversion program will be increased by $200 million or more.

Taking into account the acquisition cost, and cost of storage and handling for several years, of additional feed grains, and perhaps some wheat acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation because of the excess production of wheat in 1964 Government costs run even higher—as high as $500 million or more if no acreage reduction program is undertaken.

As compared with prospective Government costs for the 1964 crop of $200 to $500 million under existing legislation, a voluntary wheat adjustment and price support program utilizing marketing certificates, as authorized in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, would hold wheat producers' incomes up to 50 percent higher, permit a great reduction in total grain stocks, and hold Government costs to less than $200 million.

Government savings and increased farm income combined could run to three-quarters of a billion dollars or more.

FEED GRAINS AS WELL AS WHEAT PRODUCERS WOULD BENEFIT

The results of a voluntary wheat program based on the certificate plan in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 may be compared with anticipated results from two other voluntary programs which have been proposed.

The voluntary program authorized in S. 1617, introduced in the Senate on May 27, 1963, with Farm Bureau backing, and similar bills, would provide for wheat price supports at about livestock feeding value levels plus a massive Government financed cropland retirement program estimated to cost up to $2 billion a year. Its low support levels for both wheat and feed grains, its high cost, and the unfavorable experience with the soil bank program, make it an unattractive alternative.

The voluntary combined wheat and feed grain program authorized by H.R. 6546, introduced in the House of Representatives on May 23, 1963, by Representative QUIE and others, would provide minimum price supports at 65 percent of parity for wheat with acreage diversion payments equal to 50 percent of the value of the crop not produced. Analysts indicate that such a program might not result in sufficient wheat acreage diversion to permit an orderly reduction in Government stocks because of the low supports. The Government cost of a program of this type also would be substantially higher than the Government cost of the current voluntary feed grains program and substantially higher than the cost of continuing the current feed grains program in conjunction with a voluntary wheat certificate program under provisions of the Food and Agricultural Act of 1962.

Unless some effective voluntary wheat adjustment program involving relatively low Government cost is developed and enacted, wheat producers will produce several hundred million bushels of wheat in 1964 which will have no other market outlet than livestock feed. This extra wheat used for livestock feed would depress feed grain prices and, in turn, livestock prices. There is no greater threat to the income of our livestock producers than a glut of cheap surplus feed on the market.

With 75- to 80-percent participation in the voluntary wheat certificate program, the amount of wheat going into the feed market would be minimized. Additionally, money paid by processors and exporters for certificates to cover wheat produced by the noncompliers, but not earned by them, would go to the Government and could be used to finance further feed grain diversion to offset the effect of noncompliance wheat which does get into the feed markets. Noncompliers would not receive certificates or price supports.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL TO AUTHORIZE A VOLUNTARY WHEAT ADJUSTMENT AND PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM

The bill I have introduced to authorize a voluntary wheat certificate plan repeals those sections of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, and prior acts on which it was built, so there will be no penalties on wheat producers for planting more wheat than the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be needed in a marketing year.

It also repeals those sections of existing legislation which provide for withholding and storage of any excess wheat which might be produced.

It makes no changes in the way the national wheat marketing quota and the farm acreage allotments of wheat would be established when the supply of wheat is excessive.

It makes no change in the way the national marketing allocation of wheat would be established.

It makes no change in the provision for small farm acreage allotments.

It makes no change in the wheat-feed grain acreage substitution provisions in the 1962 act.

It makes no change in the marketing certificate provisions of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 except to state that individual producers must comply with the wheat acreage allotments and conservation acreage requirements established for their farm in order to receive their pro rata share of the wheat marketing certificates.

This bill, by removing the Government-imposed penalties for overplanting wheat acreage allotments, eliminate the "loss of freedom" issue which was a dominant factor in the recent referendum vote. Yet, the economic incentive for complying with wheat acreage allotment and conservation reserve requirements in order to be eligible to receive wheat marketing certificates is so great that the analysts assure us a very high proportion of the wheat producers will comply.

CONCLUSIONS

Despite the outcome of the May referendum on the compulsory wheat certificate plan, we cannot ignore potentialities for improved farm income, Government savings, and reduction of stocks which this or some other program offers. It would be hard to justify making no effort to pass such legislation, even though there is little present demand for a wheat bill from the country. It would mean closing our eyes to the painful economic consequences that are presently in store for wheat farmers and our related farm producers. It would amount to turning our backs on three-fourths of a billion dollars of Government saving and increased farm income. I am sure that no one wants to ignore such potential betterment of our budget, and our national income.

Danger lies in delay; in postponing action until it is too late to deal with the 1964 crop.

I realize that some top administration officials have honest doubts about the wisdom of pushing now for new wheat legislation in the wake of the recent wheat referendum which ran so decisively against the expectations of the administration and many of us in the Congress.

I am also aware that few people believe it is possible to enact legislation this year but I have a great deal of faith that with three-fourths of a billion dollars at stake along with the welfare of agriculture, Congress can and will take necessary action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to put in the Record a press release prepared by my office concerning my proposal and, for the benefit of those who wish to study the bill in greater detail, a copy of the bill and three supporting memorandums prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service; also, a special newsletter on the wheat situation prepared by Prof. Francis Kutish of Iowa State University on July 18, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Brewster in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator George McGovern introduced legislation today, Monday, for a voluntary wheat program to cover the 1964 crop.

The measure is designed to appeal both to farm producers who want to be free from Government controls and to those who are willing to reduce production in return for higher prices. McGovern said the plan would offer farmers who voluntarily comply with acreage allotments a return of about $2 a bushel. Those producers who do not comply would not be penalized but would not qualify for the income supports feature of the plan.

In offering the bill to the Senate, McGovern, a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, recognized that Congress has received little demand for a wheat program since the defeat of the May referendum. He also said that "top administration officials have honest doubts about the wisdom of pushing now for new wheat legislation."

The South Dakota Senator contended, however, that unless Congress acts, wheat producers will be buried in cheap surplus wheat next year that will also depress both feed grains and livestock prices.

"In my opinion, it is our obligation to be foresighted and to avoid just such serious developments, whether there is demand from the country or not," McGovern said.

"We do not postpone the military defense of our country until we are attacked and our citizens are crying for help. Neither should we delay now in taking steps to safeguard our agricultural economy against an otherwise certain disaster a year hence," he said.

McGovern's proposal would provide a price support of $1.25 a bushel plus a 70 cents per bushel certificate to be paid by processors to farmers complying with the program.

The Senator estimated that there would be enough voluntary compliance under his proposal to reduce wheat surpluses, cut Government storage costs and stabilize farm income.

A Bill To Provide for a Voluntary Wheat Adjustment and Price Support Program

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to provide for a voluntary wheat adjustment and price support program, the following provisions of law relating to penalties, wheat acreage diversion payments, and the wheat marketing quota referendum are repealed or amended as follows:

(a) The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1281 et seq) is amended—

(1) By striking from the first sentence of section 334(a), section 334(b), and the last sentence of section 334(c)(1), respectively, that part beginning with a colon and the word "Provided" down to but not including the period;

(2) By striking out section 334(d);

(3) By striking out the exception at the end of the first sentence of section 334(h);

(4) By striking from section 334(i) the sentence relating to paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress;

(5) By striking from section 335 the first sentence and the next to last sentence;

(6) By striking out section 336;

(7) By striking out section 338;

(8) By amending section 339(a)(1) to read as follows: "(a)(1) During any year in which marketing quotas for wheat are in effect, the producers on any farm (except a new farm receiving an allotment from the reserve for new farms) on which any crop is produced on acreage required to be diverted from the production of wheat shall be ineligible to receive price support on wheat or wheat marketing certificates unless (1) the crop is designated by the Secretary as one which is not in surplus supply and will not be in surplus supply if it is permitted to be grown on the diverted acreage, or as one the production of which will not substantially impair the purpose of the requirements of this section. The acreage required to be diverted from the production of wheat on the farm shall be an acreage of cropland equal to the number of acres determined by multiplying the farm acreage allotment by the diversion factor determined by dividing the number of acres by which the national acreage allotment is reduced below fifty-five million acres by the number of acres in the national acreage allotment."

(9) By striking "wheat," from section 372 (a);

(10) By striking from the second sentence of section 379c(a) and "(i)" and that part which begins ", plus (ii)" down to but not including the period; and

(11) By striking out the last two sentences of section 379c(b).

(b) Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1340) is repealed.

(c) Section 107 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1445a) is amended—

(1) By striking from subsection (4) the following: "or for which marketing quotas have been disapproved by producers"; and

(2) By striking the last two sentences out of subsection (5).

SEC. 2. (a) Section 107(5) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out "and (ii)" and inserting the following: "(ii) participates in any acreage diversion program which may be in effect for feed grains to the extent required by the Secretary, and (iii)".

(b) The first sentence of section 379c(b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "or in which the producer does not participate in any acreage diversion program which may be in effect for feed grains to the extent required by the Secretary."

SEC. 3. This Act shall be effective beginning with the 1964 crop of wheat. The voluntary adjustment and price support program provided for by this Act shall be in effect for the 1964 crop without further proclamation of marketing quotas or allotments.

MEMORANDUM PREPARED BY THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS AT THE REQUEST OF SENATOR GEORGE MCGOVERN, DEMOCRAT, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, ON ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF A VOLUNTARY WHEAT CERTIFICATE PLAN

The wheat certificate program, authorized under subtitles B and D of Public Law 87-703, the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, could be changed into a voluntary program by eliminating section 332 and related language in other sections which authorizes national marketing quotas. In place of the marketing quota requirements, wheat producers, to be eligible for certificates on their pro rata share of the wheat used for food and export, might be required to comply with the wheat acreage allotment and conservation reserve requirement set for the farm by the Secretary of Agriculture. The conservation reserve requirement under such arrangements, would include the minimum acreage diversion from feed grains under the feed grain program, as well as a minimum wheat acreage diversion. Wheat producers who voluntarily complied with the wheat and feed grain diversion programs would be eligible to receive wheat marketing certificates. Wheat producers who overplanted their wheat allotments or failed to divert the minimum feed grain acreages specified would be ineligible to receive the wheat marketing certificates or price support loans. However, under a voluntary wheat certificate program no penalty would be imposed. Ineligibility for wheat certificates worth 70 cents per bushel on approximately 75 percent of a producer's marketings in recent years and ineligibility for wheat and feed grain support loans, would be sufficient penalty to assure a high degree of voluntary participation.

A wheat producer with a 200-acre wheat allotment and a 100-acre feed grain base in 1963, under a voluntary program for 1964, might have approximately the following alternatives:

Voluntary cooperation with wheat certificate and feed grain programs

160 acres wheat at 20 bushels per acre equals 3,200 bushels at $1.25 per bushel	$4,000
80 acres grain sorghum at 20 hundredweight per acre equals 1,600 hundredweight at $1.60 per hundredweight	2,560
60 acres conservation reserve (diversion payments)	820
3,000 bushels wheat certificates at $0.70 per bushel	2,100
1,600 hundredweight grain sorghum price support payment at $0.15 per hundredweight	240
Total wheat, feed grain and conservation reserve income	9,720

Voluntary cooperation with wheat certificate and feed grain programs—Continued

UNDER NONCOMPLIANCE

200 acres wheat at 20 bushels per acre equals 4,000 bushels at $1.25 per bushel	5,000
100 acres grain sorghum at 20 hundredweight per acre equals 2,000 hundredweight at $1.60 per hundredweight	3,200
Total income under noncompliance (production costs also would be higher because of cropping of 60 additional acres)	8,200

With appropriate amendments a voluntary wheat certificate plan probably could be operated at no greater cost to the Government than the mandatory program provided for in Public Law 87-703.

It could be operated in such a manner as to provide for an orderly reduction to desirable levels in Commodity Credit Corporation wheat stocks.

A voluntary wheat certificate plan based on amendments to Public Law 87-703, as outlined above, would not hold farm income quite as high as a mandatory program (at any specified support level for wheat used for food and export), but it would hold farm income substantially higher than a voluntary wheat and feed grains acreage diversion program with wheat price supports based on the feeding value of wheat.

The Government cost of a voluntary wheat certificate plan, plus the cost of the 1964-65 voluntary feed grains program, also would be less than the Government cost of a combined voluntary wheat and feed grains acreage diversion program for these and later years.

Savings in Government cost achieved by a voluntary certificate plan for wheat, as compared with a voluntary acreage diversion program results from the collection of the face value of the wheat certificate from the wheat millers and exporters.

Cooperators in a voluntary wheat certificate plan do not improve market price for noncooperators.

A voluntary wheat certificate program would not be subject to the limitations of most voluntary production adjustment programs where the noncooperators benefit from the substantial market price enhancement resulting from the production adjustments of the cooperators. Instead, through the certificate arrangement, cooperators are permitted to get premium prices for their food wheat from the market system in return for their contribution to helping adjust the production of wheat and feed grains used primarily for livestock feed. Since the market price of wheat would be related to the market price of feed grains on a feeding value and location basis, the extra wheat produced by the noncooperators would affect wheat market prices only as it affected all feed grain prices.

SOME WHEAT CERTIFICATE INCOME WOULD BE AVAILABLE TO FINANCE FEED GRAIN ACREAGE DIVERSION PROGRAM

On the basis of the program announced by the Secretary of Agriculture, the 1964 wheat marketing allocation for food and export would have been 950 million bushels with the wheat certificates valued at $0.70 per bushel. A marketing allocation of this amount allowed for a 150-million bushel reduction in Commodity Credit Corporation stocks. On this basis wheat producers would have received marketing certificates worth $665 million (950 × $0.70). Flour millers, wheat processors, and exporters would have purchased these as they purchased wheat for domestic food utilization or for export.

Under a voluntary plan the same marketing allocation would be made and the same requirements would apply to wheat purchased by wheat processors and exporters. All such wheat would have to be accompanied by certificates. If, however, 20 percent of the wheat producers (on a volume basis) chose not to comply, $133 million of the certificate funds collected from the wheat processors and exporters would not be paid out to the noncooperating wheat producers. These funds could be used to help finance the feed grain acreage diversion program.

Assuming producers having 10 million wheat allotment acres chose to stay out of a voluntary wheat certificate plan and over plant allotments by 30 percent, they would increase wheat plantings by 3 million acres and wheat production by 60 to 75 million bushels. The estimated $133 million collected on wheat marketing certificates, not paid out to noncooperating wheat producers and available for feed grain acreage diversion payments, would be sufficient funds to induce additional voluntary participation in the feed grain program, fully offsetting the extra wheat produced by the noncooperating wheat producers. This would be true even though only 70 or 75 percent of the wheat producers (on a wheat acreage basis) cooperated in a voluntary wheat certificate plan.

In summary a voluntary wheat certificate plan would have the same administrative problems in handling the certificates as a mandatory program. It would have the same equity problems in allocating wheat acreage allotments and in the determination of normal yields as a basis for awarding wheat marketing certificates. Difficulties associated with the administration of penalties for overplanting wheat allotments, however, would be eliminated. Producers whose allotments did not "fit" their current farming operations could grow as much wheat as they desired and sell it at market prices based on its livestock feeding value. Their only penalty for overplanting would be the denial of wheat marketing certificates and price supporting loans for both wheat and feed grains. In this respect noncomplying wheat producers would be in the same position as noncomplying feed grain producers.

The Secretary of Agriculture could provide for an orderly reduction in CCC wheat stocks when setting the annual wheat marketing allocation, by its sales policy and by a loan program for wheat (at about feed grain prices).

The cost to the Government of a voluntary wheat certificate plan would be approximately the same as for a mandatory program. The level of farm income would be slightly lower than for a mandatory program.

The level of farm income would be substantially higher, however, and the cost to the Government would be substantially lower than if wheat were added to the 1964-65 voluntary feed grains program with price supports for wheat based on its livestock feeding value.

MEMORANDUM PREPARED AT THE REQUEST OF SENATOR GEORGE MCGOVERN BY THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, ON COST COMPARISONS, 1964 WHEAT PROGRAM UNDER "NO" VOTE VERSUS VOLUNTARY CERTIFICATE PLAN

If no special acreage diversion programs are put into effect for the 1964 wheat crop, production is expected to exceed domestic food and export needs by about 300 million bushels. If 200 million bushels of this additional

wheat is fed to livestock it will displace about the same amount of corn. Hence the net effect of producing 300 million extra bushels of wheat may be the addition to CCC stocks under price-support loans of:

	Millions
100 million bushels of 1964 wheat at $1.25 per bushel	$125
200 million bushels of 1964 corn at $1.07 per bushel	214
Government cost of acquisition of extra wheat and corn	339
Government cost of storage and handling for 5 years before disposal at 15 cents per bushel per year: 300 million bushels $0.75	225
Total cost to Government of producing 300 million bushels excess wheat in 1964 under "No" vote	564

Technicians have estimated that there may be higher participation and additional acreage diversion under the 1964 voluntary feed-grain program as a consequence of the defeat of the wheat referendum. If increased participation and acreage diversion in the feed-grain program reduced feed-grain production by 200 million bushels at a payment-in-kind cost equivalent to $1 per bushel (approximate cost of the 1963 program), Government costs of the wheat program in 1964 under the "No" vote would be:

	Millions
Cost of additional diversion of 200 million bushels of feed grains	$200
CCC acquisition of 100 million bushels of wheat at $1.25 per bushel	125
Government cost of storage and handling for 5 years before disposal at $0.75 per bushel	.75
Total Government cost with increased feed-grain acreage diversion	400

In contrast to estimated Government costs of $400 to $600 million for increased feed-grain acreage diversion or for acquiring and disposing of approximately 300 million bushels of excess wheat, direct Government costs of a voluntary wheat certificate plan, based on amendments to the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, would not be expected to exceed $100 to $200 million.

If there was 80 percent voluntary participation, with the marketing allocation set at 950 million bushels (as announced by the Secretary prior to the referendum), producers would be eligible to receive 760 million bushels certificates having a face value of $0.70 per bushel or $532 million.

These certificates would accompany the 1964 wheat marketed by producers who were in voluntary compliance with the announced diversion and conservation reserve programs. After the certificates had passed into the hands of the first purchasers of the wheat, the Commodity Credit Corporation would stand ready to buy them at their face value of $0.70 per bushel. If CCC purchased the entire 760 million, its investment in the certificates would be $532 million. It would then offer them for sale to the domestic millers, food manufacturers, and exporters at the same face value. Domestic millers and food manufacturers would utilize about 500 million bushels of wheat and would be required to purchase an equal number of these certificates. Since the current export subsidy is about $0.60 a bushel and the certificates have a face value of $0.70 per bushel, the Government, on this basis, would receive a net of 10 cents a bushel on the certificates acquired by the exporters. The accounting for the certificates would be about as follows:

	Millions
Government cost of purchase of 760 million certificates from graintrade	**$532**
Less:	
Sales of 500 million certificates to domestic millers and manufacturers	350
Net from sales of 600 million certificates to exporters (face value $0.70 less $0.60 export subsidy)	60
Total received by Government	410
Government cost of voluntary certificate plan for 1964	122

The Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 authorizes acreage diversion payments on the wheat acreage diverted to comply with the 1964 wheat acreage allotments. If acreage diversion payments were made a part of a voluntary wheat certificate plan, even though made as payments in kind, they would increase the net government cost $100 to $200 million. Although acreage diversion payments would not be required for the success of a voluntary wheat certificate plan they would avoid an equivalent drop in wheat producers' incomes.

SUMMARY

A voluntary wheat certificate plan, similar to the one authorized in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 without acreage diversion payments, would result in Government savings of $200 to $400 million as compared with the Government's obligations under existing legislation, with wheat marketing quotas for 1964 disapproved by the producers. If diversion payments were added to a voluntary wheat certificate plan, the Government cost would be no higher and might be $100 to $200 million less than under existing legislation.

A voluntary wheat certificate plan for 1964 with the wheat certificates valued at 70 cents a bushel would not increase the cost of wheat to domestic millers as compared with current prices, and would increase the net cash income of wheat producers $400 to $500 million as compared with their prospective income, since 1964 wheat marketing quotas have been disapproved. If acreage diversion payments were made a part of a voluntary wheat certificate plan, wheat producers incomes would be held $500 million or more higher than their prospective income under existing legislation or at about the level expected if marketing quotas were in effect.

MEMORANDUM PREPARED AT THE REQUEST OF SENATOR GEORGE MCGOVERN BY THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Cost comparisons, existing 1964 wheat program versus voluntary certificate plan, assuming 70 percent participation

This is in response to a request for a supplement to the memorandum of June 21 on the same subject.

There are several reasons why participation in a voluntary wheat certificate plan in 1964 might be expected to be substantially higher than in the voluntary feed grain program:

1. Much wheat is produced in high-risk areas and the income insurance incentive for participating in a voluntary wheat program is greater than for a feed grains program.

2. Wheat producers who overplant their acreage allotment under existing legislation would lose history in setting future allotments. This acts as an incentive to encourage compliance with a voluntary program.

3. The income from the sale of certificates at 70 cents per bushel on the producer's share of the wheat marketing allocation is much higher in relation to the value of the crop which might be grown on the diverted acres than the combined price support and diversion payments for feed grains.

For comparative purposes, a wheat producer with a 400-acre 1963 allotment and a 25-bushels-per-acre yield might be compared with a corn producer with a 400-acre base and a 60-bushels-per-acre yield:

WHEAT FARM

400-acre 1963 allotment, 25 bushels yield.

Marketing allocation: 70 percent of normal yield.

Normal production, 10,000 bushels.
Marketing certificates, 7,000 bushels.
Diverted acres, 80.

Value of certificates	$4,900
Value of diverted production (2,000 bushels at $1.25)	2,500
Increase in gross income	2,400

FEED GRAIN FARM

400-acre base, 60 bushel yield.
Normal production, 24,000 bushels.

Price support payment: $0.15 times 19,200 bushels	2,880
Diversion payment: $0.25 times 4,800 bushels	1,200
Total payments	4,080
Value of diverted production (4,800 bushels at $1.10)	5,280
Reduction in gross income	1,200

(More than offset by reduction in production costs.)

The wheat producer, by complying, would have $2,400 higher gross income, plus some reduction in production expenses. However, his gross income would be 15 to 20 percent lower than under the 1963 program, when price supports were $1.82 per bushel.

In contrast, the corn producer might expect $1,200 less gross income by diverting 20 percent of his base acreage. This reduction in gross income would be more than offset by the reduction in production expenses. These estimates assume $1.10 per bushel, the loan rate, as the value of the corn which might have been grown on the diverted acres.

In view of these differences between the voluntary feed grains program and a voluntary wheat certificate plan, even though only 58 percent of the feed grain base acres participated in 1963, it does not appear unreasonable to expect 80 percent of the wheat allotment acres to participate in a voluntary program. (A well-informed official of a wheat organization is reported to have guessed that voluntary participation would reach 90 percent or more.)

However, if only 70 percent of the wheat acreage participated in a voluntary program and 20 percent diversion were required to be eligible for certificates, wheat seedings by cooperators would be reduced by 7.7 million acres. If wheat seedings were increased 20 percent by the nonparticipants, 3.3 million acres of the reduction would be offset. If a modest reduction in CCC wheat stocks were programed, about 100 million bushels of wheat largely produced on these extra wheat acres would be utilized as livestock feed. To this extent, a more extensive feed grain acreage diversion program would be needed. However, the certificates not allocated to the non-compliers would have a face value of $199.5 million. This saving in wheat certificate funds more than offsets the additional cost of an expanded feed grains program, as it is equivalent to $2 per bushel of wheat added to the feed grain supply.

The wheat certificate accounting with 70 percent participation, might be about as follows:

	Millions
Government cost of purchase of 665 million bushel certificates from grain trade	$465.5
Less:	
Sales of 500 million bushels to domestic millers and manufacturers	350.0
Net from sales of 600 million bu. to exporters (face value $0.70 less $0.60 export subsidy)	60.0
Total received by Government	410.0
Net cost to Government of wheat certificates	55.0
Estimated Government cost of expanded feed grain program to divert 100 million bushels additional feed grains at $1 per bushel	100.0
Direct Government cost with 70 percent participation	155.5

In summary, it appears that a voluntary wheat certificate plan would have direct Government costs of about $155 million, even though participation in it were as low as 70 percent of the wheat acres.

This compares with an estimated Government cost of perhaps $500 million under existing legislation, taking into account the acquisition cost, and cost of storage and handling for several years, of additional feed grains and perhaps some wheat acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation because of the excess production of wheat in 1964. (Wheat stocks are expected to increase under existing legislation rather than decline as in recent years.)

Wheat producers incomes also would be increased by about $400 million in 1964 under a voluntary wheat certificate program with 70-percent participation as compared to the situation under existing legislation. Also, the otherwise burdensome effect of excess wheat on feed grains and livestock supplies and prices would be eased by a voluntary certificate plan.

A voluntary certificate plan would have an additional advantage. President Kennedy already has announced the delegation of emergency powers to Secretary Freeman to take such action as is necessary and is legally authorized, to prevent U.S. wheat for export from being offered for sale at less than the minimum prices specified in the International Wheat Agreement. Emergency Government management of commercial wheat exports could be avoided under a voluntary certificate plan. All wheat for export under such a program would have to be accompanied by certificates, and the Government could sell the certificates to the exporters at their face value and then grant them a subsidy as necessary to keep U.S. wheat competitive in world markets.

THE IOWA FARM OUTLOOK LETTER

(Prepared by Prof. Francis A. Kutish, of Iowa State University, July 18, 1963, Ames, Iowa)

Wheat * * *

Time is beginning to run out on the chances for new wheat legislation for the 1964 wheat crop.

Two main types of wheat proposals have been introduced into Congress: the Farm Bureau backed a proposal which would provide for wheat price supports at about livestock feeding values plus a massive Government financed cropland retirement program. The other is a voluntary combined wheat and feed grain program introduced by Representative Quie and others. It would provide for wheat at 65 percent of parity with acreage diversion payments equal to half of the value of the crop not produced.

A third wheat proposal now is being drafted by Senator McGovern. It is essentially the wheat certificate plan which was defeated in the May vote, except that participation in it would be voluntary; there would be no penalties on wheat producers for planting more wheat than the Secretary of Agriculture determines needed in a marketing year; and there would be no diversion payments. This proposal avoids compulsion and institutes the economic incentives of the certificates for the land diversion payments of the present feed grain program. Part of the cost thus would be borne by the consumers rather than by the public treasury.

In the absence of any new legislation and no special acreage diversion programs, about 300 million bushels of additional wheat are expected to be harvested next year. About a third of this probably would come from acres diverted from land planted to feed grains in 1963—mainly, grain sorghum, oats, and barley. This would leave the estimated net addition to the feed grain supply in the neighborhood of 200 million bushels of feed wheat.

This could be enough to upset the feed grain diversion program. And it could have some important implications to the livestock and poultry industry. Certainly some of this additional wheat would find its way into broilers and turkeys—which compete with Midwest pork and beef, as well as affecting the Midwest turkey industry directly. And some would find its way into additional egg production, which affects the Midwest egg producer

Some of the wheat would replace corn that would otherwise be fed to livestock. Then this corn would go under loan and be taken over by the CCC. The net result could be to offset as much as three-fourths of the reduction in feed grain stocks next year than would otherwise take place. And if weather were good and participation drops off a little more, it could completely offset the diversion brought about by the 1964 feed grain program.

In the face of this possibility, the USDA has outlined several administrative actions which tie the wheat situation in more closely with the feed grain legislation which was passed by Congress this spring.

The possibilities being considered by the USDA include a feed grain program with higher payments which diverts additional acres of feed grain—enough to offset some of the increased wheat which will be planted this fall and next spring. Another possibility being considered to establish cross compliance between wheat allotments and the feed grain program. That is, to participate in the feed grain program, the wheat producer must also stay within his wheat allotment.

A third possibility being considered is to permit substitution between wheat and feed grain on the wheat allotment land and the permitted feed grain acres. This was one of the provisions in the wheat program which was voted on in May. An additional proviso now would be that the farmer would be required to make an extra diversion of grain acreage in excess of the minimum as a condition for exercising the privilege of substitution.

The problem is to develop and enact some effective voluntary wheat adjustment program that involves relatively low Government cost. The danger we face is that wheat producers will produce several hundred million bushels of wheat next year for which there will be no market other than livestock feed. This extra wheat first will depress feed grain prices next spring and summer. Then, when it is fed, the resulting increased livestock and poultry marketings in the fall of 1964 and in 1965 will depress livestock and poultry farmers' incomes.

More is at stake than solely the wheat farmer's interests. It is impossible to run a reasonable cost, effective feed grain program in the face of unlimited wheat production.

THE SUPREME COURT RULING ON BIBLE READING IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have received many comments from my State relating to the Supreme Court's decision on Bible reading and prayer in public schools as I am sure other Members of the Senate have received.

Reactions from the people from Florida have been of every kind—approving and disapproving, moderate, and immoderate, carefully drawn and carelessly stated.

One of the most thoughtful comments I have seen is an editorial which appeared in the June 27 issue of the Florida Baptist Witness which is published in Jacksonville.

I am glad to ask that this editorial be inserted in the Record for the attention of all Senators and all citizens.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Florida Baptist Witness, June 27, 1963]

THE RULING ON BIBLE READING IN THE SCHOOLS

Because many educators, churchmen and journalists had already accurately forecast the Court's decision, there was no great surprise when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled last week that required reading of the Bible and recitation of the Lord's Prayer in public schools are unconstitutional.

Coming at an opportune time—when most of the school children are out of the classroom on a long summer vacation—the ruling will not occasion an abrupt halt to practices which the Court has ruled unconstitutional as "religious ceremonies."

The Court held that required recitation of the Lord's Prayer and reading of the Bible in public schools constitute "religious ceremony" and violate the first amendment to the Constitution which forbids "establishment" of religion by government.

Obviously, if the Court was to be consistent, in view of last year's ruling regarding the so-called Regent's Prayer in New York, it could reach no other conclusion.

It is estimated that the Court required nearly 50,000 words to hand down its decision in the Pennsylvania and Maryland cases on which the ruling was made.

Justice Tom C. Clark, in private life a prominent Presbyterian layman, delivered the opinion of the Court, but only Chief Justice Earl Warren, Associate Justice Hugo L. Black and Associate Justice Byron White fully concurred with him.

Justice William J. Brennan, Jr., the only Roman Catholic member, delivered a separate concurring opinion, nearly 25,000 words in length.

Justice Arthur J. Goldberg, the only Jewish member, with whom Justice John Marshall Harlan joined, also delivered a separate concurring opinion, but it was brief, a little more than 1,000 words long.

Justice William O. Douglas again voiced his very strong personal views on church-state separation in a short separate opinion.

Justice Potter Stewart delivered a 4,000-word dissent in which he did not actually disagree with the findings of the majority but said he thought the issues were so complicated that the cases should be remanded to the lower courts "for the taking of additional evidence."

In delivering the opinion of the Court, Justice Clark said that the Constitution requires the Government to be absolutely neutral with respect to the religious beliefs of its citizens.

"The place of religion in our society is an exalted one," he declared, "achieved through a long tradition of reliance on the home, the church, and the inviolable citadel of the individual heart and mind."

"We have come to recognize through bitter experience that it is not within the power of government to invade that citadel," he warned, "whether its purpose or effect is to aid or oppose, to advocate or retard."

"In the relationship between man and religion, the state is firmly committed to a position of neutrality," Justice Clark stated.

He went to quite some length to insist that the Court is not hostile to religion. "It is argued," he said, "that unless these religious exercises are permitted, a 'religion of secularism' is established in the schools."

"We agree, of course, that the state may not establish a 'religion of secularism' in the sense of affirmatively opposing or showing hostility to religion, thus 'preferring those who believe in no religion over those who do believe.' "

"We do not agree, however, that this decision in any sense has that effect," said Justice Clark.

"In addition," he said, "it might well be said that one's education is incomplete without a study of comparative religion or the history of religion and its relationship to the advancement of civilization. It certainly may be said that the Bible is worthy of study for its history and historic qualities."

"Nothing we have said here," he emphasized, "indicates that such study of the Bible or of religion when presented objectively as part of a secular program of education, may not be effected consistent with the first amendment."

"But the exercises here do not fall into these categories," he asserted. "They are religious exercises required by the States in violation of the command of the first amendment that the Government maintain strict neutrality, neither aiding nor opposing religion."

In showing that the "free exercise" clause of the first amendment is not violated by the Court's ruling, Justice Clark said, "While the free exercise clause clearly prohibits the use of state action to deny the rights of free exercise to anyone, it has never meant that the majority could use the machinery of the state to practice its beliefs."

He also made it plain that such practices as the opening of congressional sessions with prayer, the presence of chaplains in the Armed Forces, etc., are not prohibited by the ruling.

Justice Arthur J. Goldberg, with whom Justice John Marshall Harlan joined, concurred in the result of the ruling but warned that the Constitution must not be interpreted in a manner hostile to religion.

"It is said, and I agree," said Justice Goldberg, "that the attitude of the state toward religion must be one of neutrality. But untutored devotion to the concept of neutrality can lead to invocation or approval of results which partake not simply of the noninterference or noninvolvement with religion which the Constitution commands, but of a broader and persuasive devotion to the secular and a passive—even active—hostility toward religion."

Such hostility is "not only not compelled by the Constitution," said Justice Goldberg, "but it seems to me is prohibited by it."

SOME OBSERVATIONS

While the Court has ruled that it is unconstitutional for a government to require by law the reading of the Bible and the recitation of the Lord's Prayer in public schools, it has not so ruled on voluntary prayer or Bible reading.

The Court has clearly expressed itself regarding the relevance of religion to our American heritage and its significance to our way of life.

The Court has, it now appears, left the way open for objective study of the Bible (especially for its history and historic qualities) in the public schools as a valid part of a secular program of education.

The ruling, and particularly the concurring opinion of Justice Douglas, makes it harder for the proponents of public aid for parochial schools to bring to fruition their demands to help out of public tax funds.

The ruling forces upon parents anew a more serious consideration of their responsibility for the moral and religious training of their children in the home and the church.

The decision has served to accent again the tremendous contribution to freedom which has been and is being made by the American principle of separation of church and state.

While there are some implications of the ruling, some appearances of a trend, with which we cannot be happy, we believe that in the long run it holds for us more good than bad. Admittedly, the first reaction of many people is well expressed by the accompanying cartoon by Jack Hamm. We believe, however, that after careful study and reflection upon it, a great many Baptists will conclude that it is not an evil ruling.

WHEAT LEGISLATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to commend the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] on his initiative today in proposing this farm legislation, and, above all, on his dedication to the economic and social well-being of our family farms. The Senator from South Dakota is one of the most able and competent authorities on the subject of agricultural policy, having served in the House of Representatives on the Committee on Agriculture, and having taken a keen interest in agricultural legislation throughout his entire public career.

The Senator is presenting to the Senate a proposal on wheat legislation which I believe deserves the careful attention and consideration of Congress. I am confident it will receive such consideration.

This is one of the most difficult assignments we must carry out in Congress. I hope that, whatever we do in the future in connection with agricultural legislation, we will keep in mind the central theme of better utilization of our abundance.

I recall that the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] made a brilliant speech in the Senate earlier this session, as he has done many times, in which he urged the use of our great productivity, not merely surplus disposal; and, better yet, that we look upon our agricultural resources as a valuable asset for strength in America and throughout the world. I am convinced that this can be done; and that we can use this abundance and at the same time improve the price structure for our agricultural producers.

The farm families of America need a program, a policy, and an attitude of Government which lends itself to better marketing and distribution of the products of our farms at fair and reasonable prices—products which provide not merely sustenance but a fair profit on investment and labor and managerial talent.

I have just returned from a weekend visit to my home State of Minnesota. Incidentally, I went to South Dakota to see my mother. I flew over these fertile fields, from the southwestern corner of Minnesota into the Sioux Falls area, across Minnehaha County, up to Huron, and over Beadle County and Codington County, to Watertown; then due east from Watertown to Minneapolis. Anyone who sees that land and those farm homes and the investments which those farmers have in property and facilities, such as machinery, seed, and buildings, as well as in plain skill and competence, cannot help being impressed with the importance of our agricultural economy and the great value of it to our Nation. Therefore, we must be greatly concerned with what happens to prices.

I flew back to Washington last night with a member of the Board of the Farm Credit Administration. He pointed out to me that if the wheat price collapses, many of the assets of the Farm Credit Administration, as well as of other agricultural credit organizations, will be destroyed, because those loans were made to farmers and farm producers predicated not upon wheat at $1 or $1.25 a bushel, but at $1.75 to $2 a bushel.

We should face the fact that unless something is done dangerous consequences can result.

What is to be done is the debatable question. Many proposals are before us. I do not intend at this moment to argue what I consider to be the merits of those proposals, but I say to the administration, as one of its loyal supporters, that we cannot content ourselves with doing nothing. Let that be clear. Nor can we content ourselves with blaming somebody else if things go wrong. As Senators, we have a responsibility regardless of political party. The Government has a responsibility, because the prices of farm products are directly related to the general prosperity of the Nation.

I wish there were as much concern for the development of our agricultural economy as there is for the Common Market in Western Europe. I wish we could see as clearly the potentialities for an expanded merchandising and sale of goods and equipment in the agricultural economy of America if our farmers received fair prices for their goods as we apparently see in the possibilities in foreign trade. I believe in foreign trade, but I believe it is easier to do business with fellow Americans than it is to do business overseas. If we were to devote as much attention to developing the American economy in terms of fair prices and reasonable returns upon investment as we do in terms of trying to develop other economies, some of our balance-of-payments problems and other problems would diminish.

We do not need to think of the problem as being "either/or". I do not say we should ignore our foreign responsibilities. To the contrary, I believe in foreign aid; I support it. I believe in the Export-Import Bank and its operations. I will continue to support it. I believe in our program of an expanded foreign trade. We must do everything we can to expand trade in the European trade area, in Latin America, in Asia, and in Africa.

But if we could have wheat selling at $2 a bushel, dairy products at somewhere between 80 and 90 percent of parity, and poultry products and other farm products at anywhere near parity, the factories of America would have to expand to provide the goods and services that could be and would be purchased in rural America. Some of the most urgent needs in rural America are yet unmet. The possibilities for housing and home furnishing, the possibilities for the automobile industry, the possibilities for a thousand and one products are unlimited.

That is why the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] or any other Member of this body who seeks to find a better way to provide an opportunity for a reasonable return on investment in the farm areas of America is doing a service, in particular for agriculture, but also for everyone else.

I wish the Senator from South Dakota well in his enterprise. I know that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will carefully consider his proposal. Frankly, I have not had the opportunity I would have liked to have to study the proposal in detail. I know it is based upon the principles of a fair agricultural program, a program which has worked well.

What is important is that there are persons who exercise independence of judgment, regardless of what anyone says either in the executive branch or the legislative branch, persons who are willing to make proposals that they believe are in the national interest.

I assure the Senator from South Dakota of my interest in his proposal and of my desire to be helpful. I shall study his bill with careful attention.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I join the senior Senator from Minnesota in commending the junior Senator from South Dakota for his proposal on wheat legislation. I am impressed, because the Senator from South Dakota represents a great wheat-producing State. It is my understanding that South Dakota is one of the most predominantly farming States in the Nation. The Senator from South Dakota is an expert in agriculture and a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There has been much pessimism on the part of farmers who have felt that because of the wheat referendum, there is now no hope, and that the wheat farmer is sure to suffer a drastic drop in income. If the wheat farmer suffers such a drop in income, all Americans will suffer, and substantially so.

The farmer is an important segment of our economy. He buys more steel than anyone else, including the automobile industry. He buys more oil than is purchased by any of the armed services. He buys enormous amounts of electricity. If the farmer's income drops, there will surely be a depressing effect on the economy.

I believe it is important that we act on this kind of constructive legislation, provided it will not increase the cost to the Government, and will significantly improve opportunities for wheat farmers to earn the kind of income which they deserve.

REFORM OF FEDERAL BUDGET—THE FACTS CONGRESS DOES NOT HAVE ON FEDERAL SPENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Federal budget is undoubtedly the single most important economic document of the Federal Government. It contains within it the dollar magnitudes of every policy decision which is made by the executive and legislative branches of our Government. It is a focal point for any decisions which this Government must make concerning the impact of the Government upon our private economy. It is the tool through which we obtain—or try to obtain—efficiency in Government operations. It is also the primary instrument for redistributing incomes among individuals, and it is the primary tool in influencing the levels of employment and economic activity. We in Congress have a responsibility to understand this document because it is we who must make the final decisions contained in it.

Because of the importance of the Federal budget, a member of the staff of the Joint Economic Committee, Mr. Roy Moor, who is a brilliant economist, was asked by the Committee over a year ago to do a study of the nature of the Federal budget and its usefulness in analyzing the economic impact of the Federal Government. This study, entitled "The Federal Budget as an Economic Document," and published by the committee in 1962, is, I believe, the most definitive study ever done on this subject.

It received wide acclaim from economists and other experts, including budget directors in the various States, before our committee. Following the publication of this study, the Statistics Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, of the Joint Economic Committee, held hearings on the usefulness of the Federal budget and the types of changes in the document which could make it more useful, both to Congressmen and to others interested in financial details of government. These hearings were notable for the high degree of unanimity among the witnesses concerning the types of changes that should be made in the budget.

REPORT ON BUDGET DUE

The subcommittee will shortly release its report on these hearings, summarizing the views of the witnesses as well as the members of the subcommittee. I urge every Member of this body at least to examine the recommendations contained within this report. The recommendations are practical; they are a means by which to make the budget more useful for each of us in Congress. It is my intention, Mr. President, during the next few meetings of the Senate, to give a series of short speeches summarizing and emphasizing the nature of the conclusions contained within this report.

The first—and undoubtedly the most important—single recommendation in the subcommittee report concerns the arrangement of the materials contained in the document. At present, the entire budget, with the exception of one page, is arranged by individual agencies. There is, of course, historical justification for this arrangement. It is an individual agency which must go before the Bureau of the Budget and later the Appropriations Committees of the Congress in order to obtain grants of new obligational authority. An agency cannot, in general, be held responsible for the actions or expenditures made by other agencies of the Government. Moreover, in an earlier day, specific functions of government were generally associated with a single, a particular, a specific agency.

However, times have changed. Now virtually any given function that we can name is performed in more than one agency of the Government. The effect, therefore, is that a budget presented along agency lines never gives information on the total amounts appropriated or spent by the Government for each of the various functions of the Government. The effect, in essence, therefore, is that we who make final decisions concerning Government expenditures never know the total amounts that are being spent for these purposes.

Let me give several examples. We are all concerned at the present time about our balance-of-payments situation.

HOW MUCH DO WE SPEND ON FOREIGN AID? NO ONE KNOWS

Only a few minutes ago the Joint Economic Committee concluded the first day's hearings on the subject of balance of payments. As a member of that committee I heard witnesses on the report of the Brookings Institution, an outstanding research foundation.

We have heard the views of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Under Secretary of the Treasury on this subject.

Congress generally, and the Joint Economic Committee in particular, is deeply concerned about our balance of payments. The Secretary of the Treasury recently told us that unless we are able to improve the situation in the next year or two, it may be necessary for the Government to take drastic and painful action. By that, the Secretary was referring, of course, to the possibility of curtailing our commitments to our friends and allies throughout the world. It may be necessary for our Government to take action which might conceivably have a harmful effect on the ability of this country to defend the free world against communism.

One of the principal ingredients in our balance-of-payments position is the amount of our foreign aid. Yet I defy any Member of the Senate to tell me from the budget how much we are spending in total assistance to foreign countries. Let us assume that one of you took me up on my dare and attempted to determine this amount. You would presumably first look in a neat little volume presented by the Bureau of the Budget called the "Budget in Brief." This gives an amount for "international affairs and finance." However, it does not indicate amounts spent by a series of agencies such as the Department of Defense and the Office of the President for military assistance. The amount does not include Public Law 480 funds provided through the Commodity Credit Corporation. It does not indicate amounts contained within various special loan programs of quasi-independent agencies.

If you continued in your search for the total funds spent on foreign assistance, you would probably next go to the large appendix volume indicating appropriation requests. The index to this volume indicates a reference to the Agency for International Development. However, some 23 other agencies and activities also have the term "international" in their titles, and this does not involve the activities listed under "foreign" or the activities which are foreign in character but not so designed in the budget. It is literally impossible to determine from the budget or any other published source how much our Government is spending overseas. But how can we assess what we may do or should do with respect to our balance of payments if we do not know what our Government is doing? Furthermore, I hereby challenge anyone in the administration to provide Congress with information on the total amount of Federal funds spent overseas. How much does our Government spend? The fact is no one knows.

EDUCATION? SAME STORY—NO ONE KNOWS

Many similar examples could also be given. How much does the Federal Government spend for education? Apparently some 66 different educational programs are provided by at least 9 different departments of the Government, and at least 23 additional programs are given by 11 other agencies. No single figure in the budget indicates the total expenditures of the Federal budget for education. How can we in the Congress possibly make decisions concerning the appropriateness of the educational activities of the Federal Government when we cannot even find out what these are?

Similar examples can be given for the health activities of the Federal Government, for research and development programs, for lending operations, for insurance programs, and so on. One might almost conclude that adherence to outmoded historical customs in the budget has been used as a device to conceal from the American people what the Government is doing.

ADEQUATE INDEX REQUIRED

What can we do to remedy this situation? The first step must be to establish an index system based on the types of activities in which the Federal Government engages. Thus, if we as Congressmen or as citizens wish to know the total amount of foreign expenditures being provided by the Federal Government, we would simply look in the index under the heading of "foreign expenditures." I do not wish to minimize the difficulty of this first step. In order to do it successfully, it is necessary to catalog and describe the actual activities of the Federal Government. However, I would simply ask this question: How can we possibly know what the Government is doing unless such a cataloging is made?

The Bureau of the Budget has certainly gone a short distance along this route. It has established a classification system in order to show a single page in the budget which describes in most general—and, I should say, inadequate—terms a functional breakdown of expenditures. However, this classification system is used solely for the purpose of constructing this single table in the budget.

The second step in the reform of the budget, after such an index system has been established, would be to send this index to each of the various agencies of Government and to instruct the agencies to classify their dollars of expenditures under the various functional headings. Once this has been done, the Bureau of the Budget could then simply accumulate the amounts under each of the detailed headings. The result would be a budget organized along program lines, rather than along agency lines. This is what budgetary users, including Congressmen, are interested in—namely, the total expenditures by individual programs or functions of the Government.

Is this approach feasible?

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT SHOWS THAT THE PROGRAM BUDGET WORKS

Would it permit us to cut our spending? The fact that this approach can work brilliantly is demonstrated by the operation of the Defense Department under the Kennedy administration. Under the outstanding leadership of Secretary McNamara, the Defense Department, our largest single spending agency, arranges and presents its expenditures and requests for new appropriations under five major functional categories: military personnel; operations and maintenance; procurement; research and development; and military construction. Until that was done, no one could tell how much we spent on military personnel or on procurement. But now the answer is available. Certainly it is a relevant and pertinent fact, and should be known. It is known now because the Defense Department is now organized in an efficient way which enables this information to be made available.

This is a major reason why the Department of Defense may be able to achieve savings of $4 billion per year, as Secretary McNamara has indicated that he may be able to do.

TIME AGENCIES DISCOVERED THE SCORE

There is a broader answer to the question of feasibility. The question can be rephrased, in effect, to ask: Do the agencies know what they are doing? If agencies are aware of the nature of the products and services that they are producing, then they should be able to associate costs with those activities. If they do not know the nature of their own output, then it is certainly time for the Bureau of the Budget to force them to discover what they are doing. The key point here is that no one else, including the Congress, can learn about these activities unless the agencies present them in an understandable manner.

Let me make clear that this recommendation involves no change with respect to our appropriation process. Since individual agencies will be assembling the material concerning appropriations and expenditures, one cross-classification of this material will be to retain the agency groupings for purposes of presentations to the Appropriations Committees. At the same time, however, the Appropriations Committees will have more information upon which to base appropriations decisions, since the expenditures within each agency will be subdivided by the functions to be performed.

COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGES

Mr. President, many advantages will stem from the revised approach that our subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee has recommended. A principal advantage is that we in Congress shall be able to relate the functions being performed by the Government to the costs of these functions. As a result, we shall be able to compare costs incurred by different agencies for the same types of functions, such as various educational programs being provided by the Government. We shall, therefore, be able to determine which agencies are high-cost producers of services and which agencies are providing benefits more efficiently.

Incidentally, Mr. President, it is no accident that Secretary McNamara has introduced into the budget of the Defense Department this type of comparison. He is an eminently successful businessman, and he has also been successful in teaching business administration at Harvard Business School. He knows how this procedure operates, and he knows that it is perhaps the only way to bring some discipline and force—obtained from the system which has made American private enterprise so successful—into the operation of the Government. This method is working well in the Defense Department. Why should we not try it throughout the Government establishment?

More basically, however, we shall begin to learn what the total costs of services are; and, therefore, we shall be able to judge more effectively which services can be efficiently expanded and which should be curbed because of their high cost. This, I believe, is an essential prerequisite to effective budgetmaking by the executive branch and the Congress, and I urge my colleagues in the Senate to support this recommendation of the subcommittee.

OUR PARALYZED CONGRESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on July 28, the Milwaukee Journal published as a feature story in its editorial section an article by its outstandingly capable Washington reporter, Ira Kapenstein. The article is a very disturbing one. It is entitled "'Scandal' in Washington: Our Paralyzed Congress." In the article Mr. Kapenstein points out that whereas throughout the world there is a great deal of concern about the Great Britain scandals involving security, sex, and so forth, the growing scandal of U.S. congressional inactivity and paralysis may have more far-reaching and permanently adverse effects on our Government. Both the Milwaukee Journal and Mr. Kapenstein are responsible and careful. Mr. Kapenstein is a very thoughtful reporter, and the editors of the Milwaukee Journal are very careful about what it prints, and deliberately avoid any sensationalism.

This analysis in one of the Nation's outstanding newspapers by a topflight reporter deserves careful consideration by the Members of Congress, particularly in accordance with the recommendations made by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"SCANDAL" IN WASHINGTON: OUR PARALYZED CONGRESS—SENSE OF CRISIS GROWS IN CAPITAL AS TIME SLIPS BY WITHOUT ACTION ON BILLS NEEDED TO DEAL WITH URGENT PROBLEMS; REFORM MEASURES, TOO, BOG DOWN IN COMMITTEES

(By Ira Kapenstein)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—There is a growing scandal in the Nation's Capital that is casting a shadow across the entire country. It is not so sensational as the sex and security scandal that is rocking the Government of Great Britain, but it is perhaps even more dangerous to the United States because it imperils the Nation stealthily, without arousing widespread public awareness.

It is the paralysis of Congress. As month after month slips by and the 88th Congress seems increasingly helpless to deal with the crucial issues confronting it, the scandal which seethes just below the surface on Capitol Hill threatens to break out into the open.

Every year, the reformers raise their voices in anguish and plead with Congress to modernize its machinery and its methods so that democracy can be put to work in the legislative branch of Government.

Every year, reform bills have been introduced, but only once in the last 50 years—in 1946—has even a partial reform effort been successful.

HELPLESS 88TH CONGRESS

But now, there seems to be a slowly growing awareness that something has to be done. The utter helplessness of the 88th Congress might provide the spur that the reformers need.

"The biggest roadblock to democracy in this country," one Capital observer said recently, "is the Congress of the United States."

While that judgment might be too harsh, it symbolizes the frustration that the executive branch faces in trying to get its program through Congress and the monumental task that the reformers face in trying to change the system.

The defects that cause the paralysis of Congress have existed for many years. The big difference is that the urgency of the problems has become so dramatic.

In January, 3 days before the 88th Congress began, James Reston of the New York Times made a safe prediction. He wrote:

"The 88th Congress starting in a few days promises to be a standoff, a scoreless tie, a dull battle between the Kennedy offense and the committee chairmen or defensive unit of the Congress.

"The proceedings will be largely formal and technical. The President will go to the Hill and define the state of the Union in iambic pentameter. He will speak in continents and epochs and define the challenge of change.

"Then, after partisan applause and general approval of the soaring phrases of Ted Sorensen, the Chinese Bandits will take over. The vast panorama of the Nation in the world will be cut up into little pieces. Each committee chairman will vanish into his privileged sanctuary with his special part of the picture. And the vast, decentralized, congressional machine will begin to grind."

Congress is actually a loose association of virtually autonomous committees. The committees are headed by powerful chairmen, who get their important positions not according to ability but according to seniority.

The function of congressional leadership is scattered among the chairmen of more than 300 committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and select committees.

Southern Democrats, because they come from politically safe States or districts where they keep getting reelected, dominate the chairmanships of the most important committees.

The case of Representative OTTO E. PASSMAN, Democrat, of Louisiana, is an illuminating one. Passman is chairman of the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Appropriations. He also is one of the stanchest opponents of foreign aid in Congress.

Despite his loudly stated dislike for foreign aid, PASSMAN remains as the key man in the appropriation of funds for the program.

HITS OWN PARTY'S AIMS

"The spectacle of an appropriations chairman loudly proclaiming his opposition to this basic policy of the Democratic Party which gave him his assignment, is symptomatic of the disorganization of Congress," the Washington Post said in a recent editorial.

Of all the proposed congressional reforms, those aimed at modifying or abolishing the seniority system have the least chance of getting anyplace. Yet many of the other problems in the organization of Congress stem from the seniority system.

One Democrat in the House complained recently that congressional time is poorly organized, that sessions are too long, that the Rules Committee holds back bills, that committee chairmen have too much power to block bills or ram through pet projects, that too many old men are in control, that some chairmen abuse their powers by taking junkets and failing to call committee meetings.

"If you could put a check on the seniority system, most of these problems would disappear," he said. "Knowing that they might be replaced, the committee chairmen would get to work early in the session, stay on the job and push hard to move the program.

Old men, with no assurance that they could cling to power, would give way to younger men.

Major proposals to reform the seniority system include election of committee slates in the party caucuses without following seniority, election of committee chairmen by the members of the committee and an age limit of 70 for a chairman.

Other suggested reforms in committee procedures include uniform published committee rules of procedure, elimination of overlapping jurisdictions and a time limit on consideration of bills by a committee.

In addition to the problems of seniority in the committee system, the reformers list six other major areas of concern:

1. The rules of House and Senate often prevent effective action, thus thwarting the majority will.

2. The fiscal machinery of Congress leads to a fragmented appropriations process because of the system of first passing authorization bills and later providing the funds in appropriations bills.

3. The workload and scheduling is getting heavier every year, because of the increase in the number of measures and the scope of problems that Congress has to consider and because of the increase in the number of constituents.

4. Unethical conduct by some Members of Congress has cast a pall over all Members. Nepotism, junketing and conflicts of interest have badly hurt congressional prestige, while little has been done by Congress to eliminate the abuses.

5. The elective machinery, with its inequitable districting, leads to an imbalance of constituents among House Members, creating inequities in workloads and representation.

6. Election costs have skyrocketed while sources of legitimate campaign funds are harder to find.

PROPOSED CURBS ON RULES

Proposals to change the role of the House Rules Committee include making it merely a scheduling committee and making it an instrument of the majority leadership. One proposal would forbid the Rules Committee to pass on the merits of legislation and would permit committee chairmen or the majority leader to call up a bill for a vote after a limited time. Another proposal would allow the majority leader to appoint the committee chairman.

Other House rules changes include granting the minority more control of time in House debate and reducing the number of names needed on a petition to discharge any House committee from consideration of a measure from the current number of 218, which is a majority of the House.

Proposals to change Senate rules include measures which would lower the votes needed to limit debate from two-thirds of those present and voting to either three-fifths or to a simple majority of 51.

There also have been suggestions to limit individual Senate speeches to 3 hours, to require that debate be relevant, to eliminate various stalling tactics and to ban written Senate speeches except by the floor manager of a bill and leader of the opposition.

Suggestions to ease the workload include increasing allowances for congressional staffs, delegating authority for appointing postmasters and approving service academy appointments, delegating immigration and naturalization and small claims bills to independent agencies and delegating constituent case work problems to an independent constituent service agency.

Problems of unethical conduct would be corrected by placing closer curbs on trips at Government expense and by creating a code of ethics which would: Require disclosure of major financial interests and stock transactions, forbid the use of confidential information for private purposes, require disclosure of communications with contracting or regulatory agencies on matters under consideration by them and forbid outside employment. Nepotism also would be ruled out.

LA FOLLETTE'S REFORMS

Proposed changes in the elective machinery would extend direct primary elections to all States, increase the terms of House Members to 3 or 4 years, limit the number of consecutive terms a Congressman may serve, provide Government funds for campaigns, set strict limits on expenditures and create more equitable congressional districts.

The last time Congress took a searching look at its own establishment, it set up a joint committee on the organization of Congress, with the late Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., Wisconsin Progressive-Republican, as chairman. The vice chairman was Representative A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma. MONRONEY is now a Senator.

The La Follette-Monroney Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 abolished a large number of obsolete committees, consolidated the remaining ones and made a number of other streamlining reforms.

A number of bills to get the reform process started again have been introduced in this session of Congress. A Senate rules subcommittee held a 1-day hearing a month ago on a bill by Senator CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, to set up a 12-member Commission on Congressional Reorganization to be comprised of six Members of Congress and six experts appointed by the President. The subcommittee has not acted on the bill.

Senator CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, one of the most consistent voices heard in favor of sweeping congressional reforms, has introduced a resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Congressional Organization.

Representatives REUSS, Democrat, of Milwaukee, and LINDSAY, Republican, of New York have introduced legislation to create commissions made up of Congressmen and outsiders to study reorganization. Representatives HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, and CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, have been seeking foundation assistance to set up a nonpartisan study.

Whether any of the proposals to get a study going will succeed in this session is not known. There is a great deal of skepticism.

But the voices of protest are growing louder as the stalemate in Congress continues. A sense of crisis is beginning to pervade the Capital.

SENATE CONSIDERATION OF TEST-BAN TREATY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senate has now begun its consideration of the treaty banning atomic testing in the atmosphere, under the seas, and in outer space, prior to determining whether it shall advise and consent to this treaty.

This morning members of the three committees—the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the Committee on Armed Services—met and discussed the treaty.

I hope that the Senate's consideration will be searching, objective, and fair. This is an extremely important document—a treaty that will affect our national security and, of course, our international position. It is my personal conviction—a conviction reached after the most detailed study over a period of many years—that such a treaty is in the national interest of the United States and is in the interest of a more just and peaceful society. But I also will expect the various representatives of the administration to establish the case for this treaty before the appropriate committees of the Senate and the Senate itself. Nothing should be taken for granted in a matter of such importance to this Nation and the world.

The right to full and searching debate ought to be exercised by both those disposed toward this treaty and those who currently harbor doubts and uncertainties. The coming discussion and debate on the proposed treaty to ban nuclear test in the three environments could very well give us an excellent opportunity for a far-reaching and a far-ranging discussion of American foreign policy, particularly our relationships with the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries. I am hopeful that such will be the case. It is my view that a sensible, constructive, and thoughtful debate on the subject of our relationships with the countries behind the Iron Curtain is long overdue. We need a little more light and studious consideration on the subject, and possibly not quite as much pettifogging and emotion about it. We have a grave responsibility in the matter. A careful and searching examination of all the facts relating to this treaty is a definite prerequisite toward meeting this responsibility.

We need to ask ourselves whether or not the proposed treaty would adversely affect our military posture. We need to ask ourselves whether or not the treaty would deny us the opportunity for the improvement of our vehicles of delivery or our delivery systems. We need to ask ourselves whether or not the treaty would complicate our research in the field of atomic energy. I believe there are many other questions that should be asked. We will expect precise and factual replies from the various administration witnesses coming before the appropriate Senate committees.

This morning we were able to underscore the fact that there had been no secret understandings that would in any way prejudice the treaty or expand its application. We were able to discuss objectively and sensibly some of the motivations, as we see them, for the Soviet Union's willingness to accept such a treaty. All those questions will be gone into in great detail—and properly so. The American people have a right to know whether or not the proposed treaty will lend itself toward reducing the arms race, toward curtailing the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and possibly toward opening more new and honorable discussions of the differences that now, and for so long, have existed between the Soviet system, on the one hand, and the system of freedom, as we know it, on the other. I am hopeful that such discussions will take place. I do not see any immediate solution to our difficulties, but there are no solutions to be found in refusing to study, to search, to probe, and to negotiate.

The most eloquent case in behalf of ratification was presented Friday night by the President of the United States. Hopefully, it sets the tone for the debate and consideration that will occur in the coming weeks on the Senate floor.

I hope that every Member of Congress will read the speech. Most of us heard it. It was, indeed, a moving and thoughtful address. I understand that the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] has already inserted the President's message in the RECORD. Therefore, I shall not ask that it be reprinted again. But I do hope that every Member will find time in their busy schedules to read it carefully.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a column, "Historic Achievement?—Test-Ban Accord May Go Down as a Great Deed in Statecraft," by Arthur Krock that appeared in yesterday's New York Times, and an editorial, "Weighing the Dangers," that appeared in yesterday's Washington Post, also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 28, 1963]

HISTORIC ACHIEVEMENT?—TEST-BAN ACCORD MAY GO DOWN AS A GREAT DEED IN STATECRAFT

(By Arthur Krock)

From the moment science made it known that as a result of fallout from indefinite testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, the earth's inhabitants could be born cancerous and eventually eliminated, the public pressure on statesmen of the atomic powers for a test-ban agreement has mounted steadily.

When it became a commonsense conclusion that no thorough shelter system could be devised for the masses of population within the radius of a nuclear bombing attack, this pressure moved the Governments of the United States and Great Britain to a momentous decision. It was, that the necessity of concluding a test-ban treaty with Communist Russia far outweighed the risks implicit for the West in any treaty whose effectiveness is dependent on the sincerity of the Kremlin's professed veto of nuclear war as a means to conquer the world.

Now this decision has materialized in the test-ban articles signed at Moscow between the three principal nuclear powers, to which a fourth—France—has the option of adhering. And, though the fifth great nation with a rising nuclear weapons potential—Communist China—is not considered in the least likely to avail itself of the same option, the Moscow articles, if carried out in good faith by all the signatories, will strongly restrain that potential in time and degree—perhaps even confine it to its present primitive status.

PLACE IN HISTORY

Viewed from the humanitarian aspect, the test-ban treaty takes its place in history as a step toward what conceivably could become one of the greatest accomplishments of civilized statecraft. If duly ratified, and scrupulously executed by the immediate signatories, it could rescue earth's creatures from the threats of extermination—one, by nuclear warfare; the other by slow but sure deterioration of the fiber of all life on the planet. And, in these circumstances, history would add the names of President Kennedy, Prime Minister Macmillan, and Premier Khrushchev to the small top roster of statesmen who have permanently advanced the condition of mankind.

POLITICAL GAIN

But the agreement must also be inspected from the standpoint of the political gain it may contribute to the first two heads of state, and perhaps even to the third (although the closed Soviet society makes impossible a reliable assessment of this, or Khrushchev's need of it). And the logical conclusion from this inspection is that the signing has given a powerful lift to the present political influence of the President and the Prime Minister; and that this effect will be lasting if the treaty attains its stated objectives. Should it do that in their time, and also supply a foundation for general, though gradual and practically limited, disarmament, there can be little question that the constituencies of Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Macmillan will give them generous political reward.

Both of them need it, which was not the case with President Eisenhower. He sought a test-ban treaty for a much longer period, and against a series of obstructions by the Kremlin that even his endless patience and firm resolve could not dispel. A test-ban treaty was not a campaign issue when the general was elected to his first term. And, when Adlai E. Stevenson in the 1956 campaign proposed a halt to testing—he shifted from his proposition that this be done unilaterally by the United States—Washington-Moscow relations were so hostile that President Eisenhower's rejection of his opponent's idea as an obvious threat to national security was overwhelmingly endorsed by the American people.

EISENHOWER PLAN

But in his second term, by constitutional fiat his last, Eisenhower pursued the goal of a test-ban treaty as persistently and patiently as if his official tenure depended upon the outcome of the enterprise. It was he who first proposed the formula of agreement on which is based the treaty that has now become a part of the executive record of the general's successor. Since there was no political gain for Eisenhower in the terms of keeping or holding office, this record qualifies him for a share in whatever benefits to humanity the test-ban treaty eventually may bestow.

These benefits, as the enormous loopholes in the text disclose, are very far from assured. For example, the text can be read to commit the signatories against the use of nuclear weapons in war, even as retaliation against an attack with conventional weapons. It can be read to assert national jurisdictions in outer space—a principle which the United States entirely rejects. The constitutional duty of the Senate is to examine the treaty microscopically, and in that period it might be disclosed that the administration paid a price for the signature of the U.S.S.R. that, as former Vice President Nixon remarked, could be too high for the merchandise, and dangerous as well. In the judgment of many, such a price would be new "understandings" in Europe and elsewhere by which the U.S.S.R. would consolidate all that it has seized by external aggression and internal subversion.

SENATE APPROVAL?

But the administration is certain to wait on the Senate before conferring with Soviet Russia on the "nonaggression" pact the Kremlin seeks as a supplement to the test-ban treaty. And the forces for Senate approval would seem to be stronger than those opposing. While the text makes it obvious that any of the signatories can cheat, perhaps successfully, in outer space, and also employ the 3-month notice of withdrawal in secret preparations for new testing, thus shattering the heart of the treaty, the factors which create the pressure for Senate approval appear to be much more powerful as political considerations.

It has been a long time since Bernard M. Baruch, representing the United States, offered the U.S.S.R. the choice between the quick and the dead that he said was presented by our proposal of a nuclear weapons test ban, effectively supervised. The total absence of this proviso from the Moscow compact demonstrates, not only that time has passed, but also the whole concept that our national security can never be risked on the good faith of the U.S.S.R.

[From the Washington Post, July 28, 1963]

WEIGHING THE DANGERS

President Kennedy's sober and earnest speech to the Nation on the test-ban treaty was a very good summary of the objectives of American policy. He was properly cautious in enumerating the advantages of the treaty. He appropriately warned against the hope or expectation that this one transaction might usher in the millennium. The treaty can, as the President pointed out, reduce tensions and pave the way for further steps toward peace, make progress toward freeing the world from the fears of radioactive fallout, contribute to limiting the spread of nuclear weapons and curtail the arms race in ways that will further this Nation's security.

The posture of this Nation, and of the West, in the present circumstances, is one of such subtlety and refinement that it is bound to be attacked by those who prefer simplified solutions. The United States faces Soviet power with a sword in one hand and an olive branch in the other. To those who bluntly believe in reliance upon military power alone this will seem an equivocal position. To those who believe that only an appeal to peace and a resort to unilateral disarmament is required, the policy will seem both equivocal and immoral. Let us hope, however, that the overwhelming majority who take counsel of both their hopes and their fears will find this middle position the sound one and support the Government in both its pursuit of peace and its preparation for war.

No doubt the critics of the President's course and of his speech, will not wait long to point out that the proposed treaty is a departure at points from the position he enunciated on March 2, 1962, when he announced the resumption of thermonuclear testing by this country. The President said then that this country would never be in the position of offering again an uninspected moratorium. He went so far as to suggest that it would be impossible to keep in a state of readiness to test during a moratorium and declared that this alternative had been thoroughly explored and found impossible of execution. Yet, he now is proposing an uninspected moratorium and suggesting that in the event of future jeopardy, we could withdraw from the treaty and resume testing.

The only answer to this contradiction is that the President in March dealt with the then existing knowledge of the situation and now he deals with more and better information. There is greater assurance now than there was then that violations of a ban on experiments in the atmosphere or in outer space can be detected. And it is no longer believed that it is utterly impossible to maintain a state of readiness to resume testing, as the President mistakenly thought last March.

The President also said in 1962 that it was necessary for this country to test in the atmosphere as well as underground in order to carry on research in missile penetration and missile defense, but he is now proposing a treaty that places a limitation on everything but underground testing. We have since conducted our own tests above ground and presumably we did advance our knowledge of the problems involved in the perfection of antimissile missiles but no one has said we have perfected them. But the Soviet Union has not done so either and the test ban's interference with the perfection of this art must work an equal handicap on both and confer advantages on neither.

Upon the resumption of tests, the President spoke regretfully of the damage that increased fallout would inflict upon mankind, but he minimized it as an inconsiderable increase to natural radiation damage and justified the risk as a necessity. He was on higher moral ground on Friday when he said that the loss of one human life or the malformation of one baby should be of concern to us all.

The President was right to describe the treaty as only a first step toward the reduction of world tensions and the elimination of the possibility of thermonuclear war, the horrors of which he so accurately described. It is even a timid first step. Unless it is taken, however, there may be no subsequent steps. It must be acknowledged that it is a step that involves dangers. So will each subsequent step. Danger lies all about us in this thermonuclear age. What we need to know is whether this treaty increases or diminishes the danger, and on that point the evidence available argues eloquently for the treaty.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it would seem to me to be very good for Senators during the days ahead, while we are giving thought and consideration to the proposed treaty, to incorporate into the RECORD the thoughtful and well-researched articles that will be published in the press throughout our great country. I make that statement because this period of our deliberations in the Senate will be considered by future generations as a very historic period. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ought to be a source of information on the processes of democratic government. It also ought to be a source of information for research purposes for scholars and students of international politics. Therefore Senators can be helpful to the students of international politics and civic leaders throughout our Nation if we bring together from time to time in our hearings before the committees, as well as here in the RECORD, the articles that Senators believe merit the thoughtful consideration of their colleagues.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS AND A NATIONAL ARTS FOUNDATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate a speech and an article relating to a bill which I have introduced which would establish a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation. This bill, S. 1316, would allow the United States to provide grants-in-aid to private groups and States in support of programs and projects which will make significant public contribution in the arts. Through such assistance, the U.S. Government could nurture the precious resource of the Nation's creative ability. The speech delivered by Mrs. Adelyn Breeskin at the annual meeting of the American Federation of the Arts this May dealing with the beneficial effects that the proposed National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1963 could have on the arts in general and the article in the Washington Post of June 30, 1963, on traveling exhibitions in Virginia refer to the type of worthwhile project which a National Arts Foundation could help support.

Mrs. Breeskin was previously director of the Baltimore Museum of Art and is now director of the new Washington Gallery of Modern Art. She reports that the Washington Gallery has been an outstanding success and that such a success has been difficult to achieve because little financial help is available to further the arts. Mrs. Breeskin believes that the National Arts Foundation could be an important means of implementing the policies of a National Arts Council as proposed by President Kennedy, by providing funds to match State, city, and private funds to make grants-in-aid in support of programs and projects which will make a significant public contribution to the arts. Such a foundation would not only encourage cultural and artistic production, but also, provide support for artists, artistic presentations, research, surveys, and planning in the arts, as well as artistic appreciation courses, public lectures, and training classes. All these activities would greatly stimulate artistic and cultural development in the United States.

The Nation should encourage artistic and creative abilities and the appreciation of them. Yet, the United States is the only major nation in the Western World where the Government offers no financial assistance to the arts. The United States has a long way to go to catch up with the policies of other Western nations and S. 1316 is the first step in this direction.

The article reports on the ingenuous new way art is being made available to people in every section of Virginia. Two artmobiles—traveling exhibitions mounted in specially constructed trailer trucks—have visited every corner of the State. Schoolchildren and other inhabitants of remote towns have been stimulated by seeing superb works of art previously unavailable to them. Thus, at a relatively low cost, Virginia has benefited by having her people's appreciation of and ability in creative endeavors increased. Through encouraging such projects at the local level, S. 1316 would similarly benefit the entire Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech and article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW MUSEUM IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

(Address by Mrs. Breeskin)

Certainly the fact that the new Washington Gallery of Modern Art is in the Nation's Capital does add a certain significance to it. Otherwise it would be just one more of the many new art museums being constantly launched throughout our country. But Washington is different. The challenge is great to make of this new undertaking a smashing success. The National Gallery, the Freer, the Corcoran, and Ducan Phillip's are all well established art centers, attracting Washingtonians as well as the many thousands of visiting tourists. But a group of 15 art enthusiasts—some of them collectors—felt that there was need of one more gallery here, one that focused on modern art. When I was asked if I would become the director of this Washington Gallery, I did not hesitate to accept since the challenge appealed to me tremendously. I accepted therefore as of December a year ago, came over for monthly board meetings during the spring of 1962, helped to pass on the building—which was bought on July 6 of last year—and worked through last summer on the opening exhibition, the Franz Kline Memorial show, which was launched about November 1 with three separate openings.

We are now all of between 6 and 7 months old. We have a most attractive building, air conditioned, four stories with an elevator which was ordered last July but is not quite completed as yet. The location of our building is excellent, just cater-cornered from the Ducan Phillips Gallery, one block from Dupont Circle, in the heart of Washington. Gradually we are building a permanent collection. So far we have almost 50 works of art in it, all most acceptable gifts. We are also building an art library. We have a sales and rental gallery, a staff of four plus a handyman-guard and a remarkable group of volunteer receptionists and docents. For support we have some foundation grants at least for the next 3 years, and over 1,200 memberships, without any concentrated drive as yet. We charge 50 cents admission, except for school and college classes who are admitted free of charge. To date we have had five major exhibitions, three of which we organized ourselves. For each group we have arranged special evening lectures, plus daily gallery tours.

So far the response to our efforts has been very rewarding indeed. Embassy personnel have been constant visitors. The fact that Mrs. Kennedy is an honorary trustee and has visited us is also most helpful. I cannot say that Senators and Congressmen have flocked to us in any great numbers but this is one of my aims—to attract as many of them as possible and try to interest more of them in what we are doing.

For the 20 years that I was director of the Baltimore Museum of Art, it was necessary for me to appear each year before the board of estimates of the city council to defend our museum budget. The Baltimore museum is dependent on city funds for over two-thirds of its $400,000 yearly budget. Those were hard-boiled politicians who had to give their consent to our budget, with little or no interest in the arts. On one occasion I remember being needled by one such councilman who asked me questions that demanded quick mathematical calculation, which I stumbled over but was then immediately helped out of my difficulty by another of the councilmen who supplied the necessary addition for me. I was so grateful that upon the completion of my arduous session, as I stepped down from the front platform, I took a rosebud that I was wearing in my buttonhole and presented it to my councilman friend in need. This made everyone laugh and resulted in my getting just what I had asked for. One must sometimes resort to such stage play in dealing with uninterested politicians. And I see very little difference between city councilmen and Federal Congressmen by and large.

However, there are some marked exceptions to the general rule, especially the group of superior Senators who introduced the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1963, to establish a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation. The Senators supporting this are Senators HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota; PELL, of Rhode Island; JAVITS, of New York; CLARK, of Pennsylvania; and RIBICOFF, of Connecticut. As you have heard the President is about to establish a National Arts Council by Executive order. That will indeed be a fine first step toward the gaining of congressional support of this bill. The National Arts Foundation could then be considered as the means of implementing the Council with the necessary funds with which to match State, city, and private funds to provide grants-in-aid in support of programs and projects which will make a significant public contribution in the arts. This 1963 bill, unlike earlier bills S. 741 and 785, does not limit the arts concerned to the vague visual and performing arts mentioned in these two bills.

Instead, in addition to encouraging artistic and cultural production, it provides for the support of projects by private groups or States that will encourage and assist artists, the commissioning of works, artistic and cultural presentations, and research, surveys and planning in the arts. The bill has been drafted to include the activities of museums, such as eligible artistic appreciation courses, public lectures, training classes, as eligible to receive assistance. This detailed listing is, for all of us, a very important addition.

The Foundation would be subject to the supervision and direction of a board of 21 trustees appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The administrative activities of the Foundation would be supervised by a Director with a salary of $22,500 a year.

With such Government matching funds the training of museum personnel would be a most worthwhile activity and one that is badly needed. Then, too, there is the adequate national representation in all of the various international art exhibitions, such as those in Venice, Sao Paulo, Tokyo, the Documenta in Germany, etc., which demand the expenditure of considerable funds. And we might even be able to commission our artists to provide some of their best works for our embassies around the world. The time has come for us to ask for such matching funds to supply these and many other demands to establish proper representation of our arts throughout the world and to keep abreast of the work of the Arts Council in England and government support of the arts throughout other countries.

Actors' Equity is supporting this proposed bill. The American Federation of Arts might well consider doing likewise, especially now that the scope of the bill has been broadened to include museums and art centers. In connection with the plans for the National Cultural Center in Washington, the arts have been limited to the performing arts. One reason for this is the power of Actors' Equity and ANTA. Also the fact that many performing people feel that theater, ballet and symphony orchestras are in greater need of help than are museums. But this is not so. Our greatest need at this time is, I think, for well-trained personnel—from packers to top administrators. Museum salaries are still too low to compete with either business or the universities. For promotion, too, we need people who are trained to understand what museums are truly about—not people trained just in business. With Government matching funds, our museums could better afford to train personnel. We could also expand our activities, such as lectures, concerts, symposia, etc.

The time has come to strike out for this. Since I am now in Washington, I feel I can try to speak up whenever an opportunity occurs to extend the New Frontier to include the arts more fully and directly. My board of trustees includes in its 15 people a number who are connected with Government. The head of our hospitality committee is the wife of the chief liaison officer of Capitol Hill. The wife of Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and Congressman MOORHEAD, also of Pennsylvania, are both on that committee. Senator HUMPHREY is a good friend who keeps in close touch with what we are doing at our gallery.

Altogether I find being in Washington tremendously exciting and stimulating. There is much that can be accomplished and the future looks bright. Our gallery has made a good beginning, and I think our place in the Nation's Capital is assured. It is especially interesting to be there at the beginning of this new era. As Mr. Heckshir said, "So far, the area of the arts, nationally speaking, is uncharted." There are just a few men in each House who are actively interested.

I hope that our gallery can arouse the interest of more of them. This summer we are to show the Museum of Modern Art's exhibit entitled "Alumni of Government Art Projects" meaning WPA and Treasury. Every Congressman is to receive a very special invitation to see this exhibition. It may help to make them realize how tremendously worthwhile Government help to the arts can be. And more directly, it may win more support for the National Arts Foundation bill which I hope will have your full support, not generally speaking, but as Mr. Nagel suggested yesterday, actively, by writing or speaking to your Congressman and letting him know that you will appreciate their support of this bill which is number S. 1316.

After hearing Mr. Commager's brilliant banquet speech yesterday evening, there seems to be no further need of stating that Government help for the arts is not so dangerous that we should avoid it. The Smithsonian Institution is a good example of successful art activity under Government support that includes the National Gallery, the Freer Gallery, and the National Museum.

I realize that to most Congressmen, modern art is a very special bugaboo. They mistrust it entirely but that is all the more reason to expose them to it. After all, we like what we know. It is up to our Washington Gallery to try to arrange that they see enough of modern art to learn to take it in their stride by becoming more familiar with it. This, therefore, is one of our aims. Another is to make our exhibitions international in scope, since the arts, as Harold Rosenberg pointed out recently, have become completely global.

Many of our visitors are members of foreign embassies. They are keen to study the American art of today but they also are pleased to see the art of their own countries. And artists from abroad are all eager to have their work shown in Washington. You may surmise that diplomay is needed to contend with the pressures brought to bear on us. However, to offset such a situation the fact that an exhibition schedule is set for the next two seasons, is helpful.

In closing, may I invite you all to come to visit our gallery and then may I urge that each of you will do your best to promote Government support of the arts through the National Arts Foundation bill.

[From the Washington Post, June 30, 1963]

ARTMOBILE EXHIBITS FOSTER CULTURE

The circulating exhibition has been an important part of museum services throughout the United States for many years. The Museum of Modern Art in New York, the American Federation of Arts, the Smithsonian Institution and other organizations have exhibition services that bring art to regional centers that otherwise would have no opportunity to see original work of high caliber.

But there is one difficulty inherent in all circulating exhibitions, and that is the lack of local facilities to display and present these materials. Even when wall space is available, there are such problems as lack of proper lighting, labeling, insurance protection, and public relations. These lacks can make a fiasco of an often carefully arranged and studied group of works. Even so seemingly simple an operation as wrapping and unwrapping the objects, installing them or taking them down, can lead to countless difficulties if the work is done by someone who does not know how to take proper care of fragile displays.

For these reasons, circulating exhibits tend to be of less value than if they could be properly displayed and protected. Indeed, in many cases the shows must be completely expendable, so hard is travel on the mounts, frames and works of art themselves. In addition, such heavy objects as sculpture often cannot be shipped at all because the cost of freight and insurance would be prohibitive for many small communities.

One unusual and highly original idea has been put to use by the Museum of Fine Arts in Richmond. Borrowing a leaf from the traveling bookmobiles, the museum decided to design a traveling art trailer that would be completely self-contained, able to arrive and depart from each community as a complete unit in itself without depending upon varying local facilities.

The staff of the Virginia museum put their heads together and came up with their first artmobile, a truck and trailer, the interior dimensions of which are 34 feet in length, 7 feet 10 inches in height, with the cab adding another 10 feet in length. The specially designed traveling gallery opens out when it is parked to cover an area 51 feet long and 22 feet wide. Side flaps are raised to reveal information charts on the sides of the trailer, and an information booth is added at the back. The artmobile is designed to be set up where an electrical supply of 220 volts to work the lights, air conditioning, humidity control and burglar alarms is available.

From the outside, Artmobile I looks like any big trailer truck. But when it is parked in a town square or schoolyard, it is transformed in about 2 hours into an independent museum on wheels. Out come the side flaps to create an awning on each side of the truck, and stairs are quickly set up on each side so that the spectators may enter by one door and leave by another, thereby relieving congestion. The information booth is attached to the rear of the truck, where material about the exhibit and the activities of the Virginia museum can be dispensed. Two loudspeakers attached to the outside front of the trailer supply music and announce the exhibit.

The interior is simply designed: an open space which lends itself to changing displays. Paintings may hang against the plain, fabric-covered walls, lit individually by spotlights from above; or pedestals and cases may be arranged in the interior to show scale models or displays of small sculptures or artifacts. Labels explain in simple language the history and source of the material, while a special loudspeaker system delivers a lecture on the exhibit.

On the back of the truck is a panel listing the names of those who have contributed toward making Artmobile I possible: Miller & Rhoads, the Richmond department store, which donated the trailer as a public service; the Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs, which has made great financial contributions toward initial operating costs, and still sponsors the artmobile's statewide tours; and several individuals.

Since 1953 the artmobile has visited every corner of the State of Virginia from border to border. Some of the exhibits it has conveyed in that time have been "The Little Dutch Masters," "Art in Ancient Egypt," "Italian Paintings of the Renaissance," and "Art Before Columbus." A new exhibit is installed every 3 years, at which time the artmobile repeats its travels throughout the State.

Before the artmobile arrives in any community, the museum in Richmond writes to the members of the local women's club, who act as hostesses for the exhibit. A folder is sent, giving instructions about the arrival, installation, and running of the artmobile; advance publicity is suggested, and filmstrips prepared by the Virginia museum are shown in the local schools. A member of the club is always on hand to explain the exhibits and to see to their protection. In addition, the driver of the artmobile is a trained curator, who not only sets up the exhibit but is qualified to discuss it and direct visitors. Upon completion of each showing, questionnaires are filled out by each club to give the museum an account of the trip and suggestions for the future.

The main function of Artmobile I has been to serve schools and clubs in smaller communities. But out-of-town chapters and affiliates of the museum are increasing and the demand for more and finer art displays has become overwhelming. The success of Artmobile I demanded that another exhibit trailer be built to serve the statewide confederation of chapters and affiliates. Once again the museum swung into action and, profiting by the experiences of Artmobile I, designed an even bigger and more elaborate trailer truck, Artmobile II. It was donated to the State by the Old Dominion Foundation.

The largest display vehicle in the world, Artmobile II is 54 feet long with cab, and over 10 feet wide. It requires a special permit and police escort to travel on Virginia roads. It is entirely automated, with its own power generator which allows it to be set up anywhere. The generator is housed in the truck, and from it air-conditioning, humidity controls, sound equipment, lighting, fire, and theft protection, and all other needs are met. The canopies, reception desk, information panels, lights, and so forth can be set up in less than 20 minutes by the driver who pushes buttons which activate hidden electric motors. The speed with which this can be done and the independence from power outlets means the Artmobile can be moved several times in 1 day. (Virginia now pays the operating expenses of both artmobiles, but the women's clubs still help to organize the visits of Artmobile I in each community it visits.)

Artmobile II brings three exhibitions a year to each chapter and affiliate of the museum. The museum sends its very finest art on these tours.

One of the most important aspects of the artmobiles is the regional art activities they inspire. The program recently undertaken by the northern Virginia chapter of the Virginia museum, at the time of the big artmobile's recent visit to Arlington, is an example of the scope of activities "generated" by the artmobile.

The artmobile was set up on the grounds of the America Legion post on Washington Boulevard. A festival already had been announced, to include music and dance groups, demonstrations by expert craftsmen in enameling, serigraphy, stitchery, pottery, and silhouette cutting, as well as an exhibit of art work by Potomac area artists.

The first evening included the formal unveiling of the artmobile exhibition, "Landscape Paintings, 1650–1960," with paintings from Claude Lorrain to Charles Sheeler. In addition an area art exhibit opened, which included work by 72 of the most outstanding Washington artists, installed in the main hall of the American Legion post. A further feature of the evening was a guitar recital by Thomas Hartman, who has been accepted for study this summer by Andres Segovia. The following evening saw a program of music and ballet, a string quartet from Arlington and a dance presentation by the McLean School of Ballet. On the next evening the Venus Orchestra played under the direction of John Ozolins. Meanwhile, afternoon demonstrations of work in various media were being held by such artists as Vally Possony in pottery and Edna Main in weaving, while artist Merry Bean made quick portrait sketches of visitors. The northern Virginia chapter estimates that 700 people attended the 3-day festival.

Each year as the two artmobiles make their tours of Virginia, more people are exposed to better art, and more children are given the opportunity to see the artistic legacies of the great ages they study in school. While it might be supposed that these rural tours would cut the number of visitors to the museum in Richmond, quite the opposite has proven to be the case. Stimulated by what they have seen in the artmobiles, more visitors are going to Richmond than ever before to study the museum's larger and more specialized collections.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AUDITORIUM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, speaking of cultural centers and the arts, I note that last week the distinguished

Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and I were privileged to speak to the interns in Washington, D.C. The interns are young college students working in the executive branch of the Government, and in the legislative branch and judicial branch as well. There are several thousand of them. It is a marvelous experience for these young people, and I am sure it is very helpful to the agencies of Government. I am privileged to have some of the interns working in my office. I find them most helpful. They are bright, able, and conscientious. I trust that their experience will be of some assistance to them in their education.

In this connection, there is not a place in this city in which a large group can hold a meeting, outside of the Washington Coliseum and Constitution Hall. I hesitate to note that both of those are totally inadequate.

We have built an auditorium in practically every other country in the world. It seems to me we should build one here. Every country I have ever visited has had a marvelous auditorium, and all those countries have been recipients of generous aid from the United States. Perhaps we should offer an amendment to the foreign-aid bill to build a decent auditorium in Washington.

We are still fiddling around, talking about a National Cultural Center. It seems to me that somewhere along the line between the stadium, in which we lose ball games, and the Washington Coliseum, where one can lose his hat because of the sweep of the huge fans that run through it, and Constitution Hall, where one can almost lose an audience because of poor acoustics—somewhere between these extremes—we should be able to provide a decent auditorium for the Nation's Capital.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator from Minnesota has a good idea. If the Senator can persuade the Washington, D.C., contractors to take their pay in dinars, rupees, or zlotys, I might support his proposal.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I might offer that suggestion. With the eloquence and persuasive ability of my good friend from Vermont we might be able to put it over.

This is my "gripe" morning. I think on Monday every red-blooded American ought to have an opportunity to complain about something. I thought I would use this day for that.

I have another complaint, while I am about it.

LONG-DISTANCE TELEPHONE RATES TO DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was at the Dulles International Airport the other night. That place is no beehive of activity. Anybody who is feeling under strain and tension, who would like to have a good rest, should go to Dulles Airport. It is about as quiet as outer space. It is marvelous out there. The only thing missing is a hotel. None has been built. One could pitch a tent. There is a vast area of space nearby.

It is a beautiful airport, particularly when one is flying over it and looking down at it, when he can see the lights on it, but no activity. But we must build for the future, I suppose.

The most interesting thing about Dulles Airport is that it is so far away from civilization. When a person gets out there he has to call long-distance.

We put up a fantastic sum of money needed to construct the airport, and for the mobile lounges, that give such a jolly, rich ride from the terminal out to someplace else, where a person boards a plane. That is a good idea; interesting, new, different, expensive. What did they cost? I believe the cost exceeded $250,000 each. But they may be an important innovation—time will tell. We must withhold judgment until Dulles gets some passengers.

The business of paying long-distance telephone tolls from Dulles Airport into Washington, D.C. is something else. I suppose one can absorb a $250,000 jolt, but the business of paying 25 cents to call home—merely to let a wife know that her husband has arrived; or to call an office and say, "Would you mind having somebody at least be alerted to the fact that I am back in town," when constituents are looking for some Member of Congress—is something else. It is necessary to call long distance to do that.

I thought that Dulles Airport was supposed to be the major airport to serve the Nation's Capital? If its purpose is to serve Herndon, Va., that will be all right, and then they can have long-distance telephone calls. If it is to be a sort of commuter airport, where Piper Cubs are to be brought in, to take off from runways and land on them with small planes, that will be all right, and long-distance rates will be fine to Washington.

But I think the Federal Communications Commission had "better get on the stick," as we say in my home area, and do something. I do not phone much, myself, but I have heard many other people complaining.

When I got back that night when I was charged for a long-distance call I wrote myself the following note:

> I was at Dulles Airport the other night and I find that all telephone calls from Dulles into the Washington metropolitan area are long-distance. Dulles Airport is a national airport to serve this metropolitan area.

I have to delete the next few words, because I was writing to myself, and I wanted to be more specific. I said:

> Why the telephone company has to have a long-distance toll on this is beyond me. Suggest that we call the Federal Communications Commission or write an appropriate letter to them protesting sharply. I want to do something about it. I understand there have been a host of complaints about it and nothing done so far.

I understand there have been many complaints. I took this matter up with the Federal Communications Commission. The processes of Government are slow and methodical. There is more protocol in these letters than there is in the entire State Department.

I wrote a short letter to Mr. E. William Henry, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. I will make this a part of the RECORD. I noted what I thought was the problem. I said:

> I am writing to protest vigorously the policy of charging long-distance rates for a telephone call from Dulles International Airport to the District of Columbia.

I pause to interpolate that it has been stated that George Washington threw a dollar across the Rappahannock River. I do not know whether he really could throw a dollar that far. We have thrown dollars farther than that lately.

Anyway, when George Washington threw the dollar across the river, if he did so, it was not more distant from Washington than the Chantilly region, where Dulles Airport is.

Now the telephone company says that the distance from here to Dulles Airport requires long-distance rates.

I said further:

> I do not know if the FCC is the appropriate body to which I should make this complaint. If not, I would appreciate your referring it to the proper Federal agency.
>
> Dulles Airport is a national airport designed to serve the Washington metropolitan area. It seems to me that some special arrangement will have to be worked out whereby calls from this airport are charged only local rates. Various safety factors constituted the reasons why Dulles Airport was located 25 miles in Virginia.

That was only one reason for building Dulles out in the country. I suppose there are others. Only a short distance away, at Baltimore, there is Friendship Airport. I ask the Presiding Officer (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair), Is that not correct?

There is a good airport at Friendship.

I also said.

> It seems to me highly unfair that these factors should then be used by the telephone company as a basis for charging long-distance rates on what otherwise would be local calls.
>
> I would like to know what steps must be taken to correct this situation.

I want to make it clear in the RECORD that I am protesting in behalf of a large body of public citizens—the daring souls who use Dulles Airport.

I received a letter in reply, dated July 9. I sent my letter on June 24. That was pretty good.

If I had been that slow in replying to letters sent to me from constituents in Minnesota, I would have been a one-term Senator. I give prompt replies to letters. So does my esteemed colleague the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Anyway, I received a letter in reply. The letter came from the Federal Communications Commission. In the letter it was stated:

> This refers to your letter of June 24, 1963—

There it is. The reference is to June 24, in the letter of July 9—

> relative to telephone rates between Dulles International Airport and the District of Columbia.

The letter went on to say:

> Public telephone service at Dulles Airport is furnished by the Piedmont Telephone Co., an independent (non-Bell) company. Serv-

ice to Washington is provided by means of interconnection of the facilities of the Piedmont Co. with those of the Chesapeake & Potomac Co. of Virginia (C. & P.).

We spend millions of dollars to build a highway to get out to the airport. It seems to me that if the Federal Government has the ability to spend millions to build a highway, someone in this Government might ascertain how to put a direct telephone line between Dulles Airport and the District of Columbia. That is supposed to be an international airport, but it is served by the Piedmont Telephone Co.

Do not misunderstand me, Mr. President—Piedmont Telephone Co. is a fine company. I am perfectly willing and content for that company to put in the line. I do not want to choose sides as between Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. and the Piedmont Telephone Co. I want somebody to figure out how a telephone line can be installed so that in making a call one does not feel like he is talking to "Aunt Nellie" in Hackensack, Minn.

Twenty-five cents is not much money to talk for 4 minutes, but, on the other hand, it is not much time, knowing how Senators like to talk. Most Members of Congress would find themselves talking at least for the next 5 minutes or longer, and having to pay another quarter or more.

I have read from the letter for the RECORD. I had not expected to do that today, but this is a bad day. I had hoped to be enjoying myself by a lake in Minnesota. Who would not rather be there, but Senate business brought me to Washington. We have our responsibilities here. This is blue Monday; and decided to talk about this subject.

So long as we are putting in a four-lane pavement, wonder if a ditch could be dug alongside the road at the same time and a cable installed, in order to have direct phone service.

It seems to me that we ought to do several things to bring this town up to date. First, I wish the Washington Senators would win more ball games, but that is a local matter. They are doing much better recently, I understand. Win, lose, or draw, we have a beautiful stadium in which the team plays. Let us hope the team will keep improving as it has in the past weeks.

Secondly, the Washington Coliseum is the No. 1 Turkish bath. The acoustical properties of the arena are about as good as one would expect in talking down a salt mine. Boxing is one thing; speeches are another.

Then, we have Constitution Hall, in which a whole orchestra can be absorbed and one can never hear a note.

Somewhere between these extremes there ought to be a way to have a cultural center for Washington within the next 10 years. I invite people to see how it is done in West Berlin. The auditorium in any European city is beautiful. In Washington, D.C., it is nonexistent.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. First let me finish this thought about the telephone line. I am proud of our telephone systems. It is one of the greatest in the world. The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. gives remarkable service. So does the Bell System. So does General Telephone. All the telephone systems are excellent. All I ask is that an arrangement be evolved whereby, if Dulles is not to be merely a commuter airport, it will truly become an international airport. Let us make it a part of the community. If anyone wants to call it a country airport that became a little overgrown, that is all right with me. But if it is to be an international airport, let us make it a metropolitan airport.

If the Federal Communications Commission does not get that communication, I think it is slower than I suspected. The Federal Communications Commission can save a great deal of paper. It does not have to write to me and give me the answers. I knew the answers before I received them. I suggest that the Federal Communications Commission do something like what the Bureau of Public Roads has been able to do; namely, provide a road out to Dulles Airport, so that Members of Congress, friends, natives, and countrymen may save 25 cents.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I point out to the Senator from Minnesota that before Washington gets a cultural center, an adequate telephone line, or an auditorium, it must have a "fish palace" or aquarium. First things must come first.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will not be dragged into that controversy. I have been in the Senate long enough to know that I should not make new enemies; I have enough old ones. I thank the Senator for any observations he wishes to make in his own right.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of the correspondence between the FCC and myself printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 11, 1963.

E. WILLIAM HENRY,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I appreciate your helpful reply of July 9 to my earlier letter concerning telephone rates from Dulles International Airport to Metropolitan Washington.

I would, indeed, like to be kept informed as to the feasibility studies currently under way by the C. & P. Telephone Co. to determine whether Dulles can be incorporated in the Washington metropolitan exchange area. I also see the reasons behind your justification for the 25-cent rate charged for the 23-mile distance between Washington, D.C. and Dulles Airport. I might make only one point: there seems to me to be a distinction between a long distance call over 23 given miles and a call from Dulles Airport to Metropolitan Washington. Dulles, in effect, is an integral part of the Washington metropolitan area and it seems to me that some special considerations could be justified for persons making calls from the airport to the downtown city. I realize there are problems with this proposition, but I believe it warrants consideration.

I would appreciate being kept informed as to any developments in this area.

Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., July 9, 1963.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: This refers to your letter of June 24, 1963, relative to telephone rates between Dulles International Airport and the District of Columbia.

Public telephone service at Dulles Airport is furnished by the Piedmont Telephone Co., an independent (non-Bell) company. Service to Washington is provided by means of interconnection of the facilities of the Piedmont Co. with those of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of Virginia (C. & P.). At present the rate for such service is $0.25 for a 4 minute station-to-station call. This rate is in accordance with the nationwide schedule of interstate long distance rates for calls between points 23 airline miles apart which is the mileage in the case of Washington, D.C., and Dulles. A reduction in this rate for calls between Washington and Dulles without a similar reduction in rates for all calls between points involving the same distance would raise a serious question of unlawful discrimination. A general reduction at this distance does not appear warranted in the light of known costs of providing service at such a distance.

However, consideration is being given by the C. & P. Co. to the possibility of including Dulles in the Washington metropolitan exchange area and thus providing service to Dulles on a local exchange basis. There are a number of problems connected with this approach which will have to be resolved. As mentioned above, public service at Dulles is provided by the Piedmont Co. and an agreement between that company and the C. & P. Co. must be reached as to the provision of joint local service. Moreover, there are a number of localities closer to Washington and more fully developed than the area around Dulles which do not now have metropolitan exchange area service and which must be considered in connection with any plans for extending such service to Dulles. Expansion of the metropolitan exchange area to encompass these localities as well as Dulles is estimated to cost several million dollars in additional plant investment.

The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. is presently engaged in an engineering and economic study of the feasibility of expanding the Washington metropolitan exchange area as mentioned above. We expect to hear from them regarding the results of the study in the near future. We shall be glad to keep you advised as to the developments in this matter.

Yours sincerely,
E. WILLIAM HENRY,
Chairman.

JUNE 24, 1963.

E. WILLIAM HENRY,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to protest vigorously the policy of charging long distance rates for a telephone call from Dulles International Airport to the District of Columbia. I do not know if the FCC is the appropriate body to which I should make this complaint. If not, I would appreciate your referring it to the proper Federal agency.

Dulles Airport is a national airport designed to serve the Washington metropolitan area. It seems to me that some special arrangement will have to be worked out whereby calls from this airport are charged only local rates. Various safety factors constituted the reasons why Dulles Airport was located 25 miles in Virginia. It seems to me highly unfair that these factors should then be used by the telephone company as a basis for charging long distance rates on what otherwise would be local calls.

I would like to know what steps must be taken to correct this situation. I am prepared to introduce appropriate legislation if that is required.

Sincerely yours,
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

THE MANPOWER REVOLUTION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the May-June edition of Think magazine, published by International Business Machines, includes an article by the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], entitled "Almost Everyone Wants to Work." It is an excellent summary of the progress made so far under the Manpower Development and Training Act, as well as several other Federal and State retraining programs.

As the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Senator RIBICOFF has an opportunity to experience at first hand the many educational challenges posed by automation and technological change. While he was Secretary he worked closely with those of us who were fighting for passage of the Manpower Development and Training Act. It was under his administration as Secretary that the program was launched.

This article is derived from that experience. It deserves to be read by every Member of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent for its inclusion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALMOST EVERYONE WANTS TO WORK

And almost no one likes to do made work. We all want—and need—an honest day's pay. More than that: We want and need the satisfaction of a job well done.

Unemployment, technological change, automation, the erosion of jobs—these are academic words if you have not suffered their consequences. Ralph McGill, in the Hartford Courant, reported their effect on an unhappy trucker who drove a cab part time, whenever he was laid off from his regular work. But lately, he had been driving a cab more and more. His regular job? Driving one of those big carriers that deliver new automobiles, mostly on long-haul trips.

"But then the railroads waked up and got into the act," he said. "They moved in so fast they have put a lot of us out of work. It looks like they are going to kill off a lot of the good jobs. About all that's left now is the short-haul stuff where the trains don't go. * * * I'm not bitter about it. I know these things happen. But it's just that you never expect it to hit you."

Here in the United States we have begun a massive nationwide effort to give stories like this one happier endings, and I'm proud to say that in this effort Connecticut has pioneered. As early as 1959, our State carried out successful retraining programs. Here are a few of the men and women who have recovered their wage-earning stride under these programs. Their backgrounds are varied; so are their ages and experience:

A sales clerk had worked for a lumber company 27 years when the firm went out of business. "None of the lumber companies around was looking for a sales clerk," he said. "But they tell me there's a demand for machine tool operators." So, with 15 other Naugatuck Valley men, he learned his new trade at a technical school in Bridgeport, and landed a job.

One of the top earners at a rolling mill in Bridgeport was displaced by automation. After 7 months without a job, he joined one of the first machine shop classes under the retraining program. With his newly acquired asset, he landed a job as a machinist learner. In half the normal time, he moved to the top skill group in the company and was soon a supervisor.

A young high school dropout floated from job to job for several years, and then, under the retraining program, finished a basic machine shop operator's course. He is now in full apprenticeship, working toward journeyman's status.

A talented young Negro girl in Norwalk wanted to go to college, but after finishing her college preparatory work and graduating from high school in 1960, she was unable to continue her education. She worked around—as a cafeteria kitchen helper, on an assembly job in an appliance shop, as a domestic day worker—but never had any solid training. Then she started retraining in an electronics assembly course in July 1962. Connecticut's Department of Labor recently got a letter from her employer saying that his new employee reached full proficiency in her work after only one week on the job. He credits her training for her excellent performance.

More and more of these happy-ending stories are now being told across the Nation. Last September, the Federal Government launched an ambitious program to improve the match between people like these Connecticut citizens and jobs. Under the Manpower Development and Training Act, signed into law by President Kennedy in March 1962, we will try to retrain some 400,000 unemployed and underemployed workers.

This is only a fraction, of course, of the number of these workers. But we must begin to help them. For we have in the United States today an ironic and dangerous situation. We have jobs opening up at higher levels, and a record high number of jobholders—some 70 million employed men and women. But we also have, month after month, a chronically high level and rate of unemployment—over 5 percent.

Why is this so? Simply because the unemployed and underemployed often lack skills. (The unskilled worker accounts for only 5 percent of the entire working population, but makes up almost 20 percent of the long-term jobless.) So they often find it enormously difficult to enter the increasing ranks of the employed—at a time when rapid automation and technological change require both new and additional skills.

The trick, then, would be to find a way to help our labor force keep its skills up to date and learn new ones. This is what the Federal Government's Manpower Development and Training Act seeks to do. Under this act, our retraining program is off to a good start.

How does a man get into the program? To qualify for training in a new skill, or having an old skill brought up to date he applies to his local State employment service. He must be unemployed, or employed less than full time, or be a member of a farm family with an income of less than $1,200 a year. And he must be able to demonstrate the ability to acquire one of the skills needed in his area or State. Most important: No one is trained unless there is the possibility of a job at the end of the training period. This is a basic specification of the act.

A man is paid while he is in training if he is the unemployed head of a family or household with at least 3 years of gainful employment experience, or if he is over 19 but under 22 and doesn't qualify for the regular allowances. These allowances are equal to his State's average unemployment compensation. The average training cost throughout the country is $512 per trainee, and the average subsistence allowance paid each trainee is about $700.

Under the Manpower Act, the States and Territories may enter into agreements with two Federal departments—the Departments of Labor, and of Health, Education, and Welfare—to conduct manpower training programs, usually through their State vocational education agency. Almost all the States and territories have signed with both Departments and have programs underway.

Let's return to Connecticut, a leading example of the Nation's retraining efforts, for a look at retraining on the State level. Connecticut was the first State to initiate a major retraining program of its own, the first to sign the required agreements with the Federal Government, and already has a larger number of successful trainees who have graduated into employment.

The Connecticut retraining effort was begun under Gov. John Dempsey's direction. The pilot program, in Bridgeport, Conn., formulated the methods and philosophy which set a pattern for the State and for the Nation. Which workers could be effectively adapted to new skills and demands? How much retraining would be required? How could the public and private training facilities in the area best be utilized? These were the questions the Bridgeport program sought to answer.

The Connecticut State Employment Service, through its interviewing, testing, and counseling service, chose the candidates. They were men who not only needed new skills but who would also definitely benefit from retraining.

The first group of 15 unemployed workers completed a 6 weeks' training course as machine shop operators in June 1961. Its success attracted wide attention.

The program soon spread to other parts of the State. As in Bridgeport, no program was undertaken before a labor market survey determined the exact job needs of local industry. As in Bridgeport, the whole community—local industry and business as well as organized labor—had to participate actively in the retraining effort and be convinced of its value.

In other words, the basic philosophy of Connecticut retraining has been to make it meaningful in terms of the economic facts of life of each participating community. To be avoided: the training of workers for nonexistent jobs. To be reasonably assured: the placement of successful trainees upon graduation.

All the major communities in Connecticut have now taken part in the retraining effort, which has been expanded as a result of receiving some $1,050,000 under the Federal Manpower Development and Training Act.

There has been outstanding, exciting success, like the program of the Electric Boat Division of the General Dynamics Corp. in New London. Electric Boat urgently needed new skilled workers to help build nuclear submarines. But it could not recruit them from New London, which had one of the lowest unemployment rates in the State. It could, and did, proceed to recruit them from the nearby Danielson area, under the retraining program.

THEY TRAINED FOR NEW JOBS

Welders, pipefitters, shipfitters, electricians, machinists and sheet metalworkers—all have been trained under Electric Boat's mammoth retraining project. Forty-five courses in these trades have been completed; 613 of the 677 graduate trainees from the Danielson and Norwich-New London areas are now at work. Among them:

A Marine Corps veteran, the father of three, was a truckdriver in eastern Connecticut when he was laid off because of a cutback. He found it tough to get work (he hadn't finished high school) until he joined a welding class under the retraining program. He landed a job at Electric Boat, and after 3 months with the company, got a special meritorious pay increase.

A 45-year-old World War II veteran had worked on and off as a laborer and was unemployed for 7 months until he qualified for pipefitter training at Electric Boat. His $1.95 an hour and scheduled raises are appreciated by his wife and three kids.

A Korean war veteran in his early thirties is also making good money as a pipefitter—after training. Married, and the father of two children, he had worked as the driver of a light delivery truck and had been out of work 6 months when he heard about retraining.

On a national scale, operations under the Manpower Retraining Act actually began in September 1962. Four and a half months later, 493 projects to retrain 18,000 people were underway. Men and women are now being trained for 115 occupations under the national retraining program. Over a quarter of them are in clerical or sales occupation courses, and most of these are learning to be stenographers and typists. Another 25 percent are training for metal working skills. Interestingly enough, about 10 percent are in health occupation courses, a field in which there are, of course, severe shortages.

In Connecticut, 111 courses have been successfully completed; 2,426 persons have participated in these courses, and 1,823 trainees have graduated. There are 11 courses now in progress, with 359 persons attending. Most of the courses have been of an industrial nature, like the ones which have prepared workers for skilled jobs at Electric Boat. But there have been a few in the commercial and service trades, like typing, and several courses are now going on to train cooks and waiters. Many of these, though they are for full time, 3-to-8-week periods, are orientation courses, and training is continued on the job in apprenticeship programs.

In Connecticut—and in the Nation—the retraining effort has had a catalytic effect. Private industry's interest in apprentice programs and other on-the-job training has been aroused. We are all more training conscious, and will become more so.

But we have a long way to go. We have many questions to answer. How, for example, do we train the so-called untrainables? How do we teach effective occupational skills to men and women who have never been really in the labor force? Can we provide real quality training for the inexperienced, unskilled and uneducated adults?

About 65 percent of the present trainees are high school graduates, and 80 percent of the high school graduate trainees have been placed in jobs. This shows quite clearly that we are, at the moment, only skimming the cream from the unemployed into the training program. For the millions of hard-core unemployed are often the very young high school dropouts, older workers, minority group members—the unskilled and uneducated.

Many are also "functional illiterates." They can read and write, but they cannot read well, understand simple arithmetic or grasp fundamental ideas. It has been estimated that, in one State, about half of the unemployed cannot be retrained and cannot get jobs because of such deficiencies. Yet a person with some degree of literacy stands a good chance of being selected for training. An illiterate does not.

Sweden, the Washington Post reported recently, has had outstanding success with its 10-year-old retraining program, and has a negligible unemployment rate of 1.5 percent against our present rate of about 5.5 percent. She retrains about 15,000 people a year out of her blue-collar work force of 1.5 million—about 1 percent. Her experts estimate that to be effective such a program must retrain at least 1 percent of the labor force each year to keep up with shifting patterns of occupational skills.

To equal this working record, we would have to retrain about half a million workers a year. And if we are to do this, we must get to the heart of the matter: the high school dropout and the older worker whose job has been erased by technology, or who simply never could hold a job because he can't use the fundamental three R's.

It stands to reason that we must get on with this job. We must enact the Youth Employment Opportunities Act, of which I am proud to be a sponsor, and which the Senate passed in April. And we must make President Kennedy's program to combat illiteracy—a key part of his education proposal—the law of the land.

Then unemployed youngsters would be included in our retraining effort—most important, those at loose ends in our big cities. And the older man or woman who never really had any education or training would have a constructive chance.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is remarkable how great the political lag in Congress can be. For 30 years, dramatic alterations have transpired in the kind of a labor force our economy requires—changes brought about, in the main, by technological change. Yet only recently has there been sufficient awareness in Congress of the very profound challenge which these changes pose if we are to achieve, or even approximate, full employment.

Farsighted observers have long warned us of the many transitional difficulties working families will experience as we move further and further into an "innovating economy" based on a highly sophisticated technology. For several decades they have forecast what I have come to call the "manpower revolution," a revolution calling for substantial modification in the way we educate our citizens for work, in the way relations between labor and management are handled, in the role of Government in the labor market.

It was no great surprise to me to discover recently that among those who first perceived the changes looming on the horizon was my good friend, the prophetic senior Senator from Illinois. Over 30 years ago he was telling those in vocational training and guidance of the radical changes afoot in the labor market.

In October 1932, Prof. Paul Douglas of the University of Chicago, wrote an article for Vocational Guidance magazine which could stand side by side today with testimony the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower has received in recent weeks on the Nation's manpower problems. Only the figures would need changing, the examples updating.

Let us hope that another 30 years will not pass before the Congress and the Nation face up to the many challenges of the "manpower revolution."

I ask unanimous consent that Professor Douglas' article be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Vocational Guidance Magazine, October 1932]

TECHNICAL CHANGES AFFECTING VOCATIONAL CHOICE

(By Paul Douglas, professor of industrial relations, University of Chicago)

In the little New England village in which I grew up, the trade of carriage-making was thought by all of us to be peculiarly attractive. The work was interesting, the pay adequate and the future seemed assured. But when I last visited my former home, I found the carriage shop not only closed but actually in ruins, and learned that some of my former playmates had moved west to Detroit and to Flint to help build the new mechanism by which man travels on roads; namely, the automobile. That is one of the troubles in choosing the line of work one wishes to enter. It is hard enough at best, even in a static society, to choose the kind of job for which one wishes to prepare. But this choice is made even more difficult because the prospects of various industries and professions are so constantly changing. Our industrial world is full of change and as new inventions are made and human desires alter, the trades which were once prosperous decrease in importance and new ones rise. Old jobs decrease and in some cases disappear, and new ones emerge. Men and women who thought themselves placed for life find they must seek new posts. It is important, therefore, for those who stand on the threshold of earning their living to try to look into the future and see what is likely to happen to various occupations to which at the moment they are attracted.

When it is, of course, impossible to foresee the future in any very complete sense, we can perhaps obtain some idea of what is likely to happen by observing the changes which have occurred in the past. Fifty years ago nearly 44 percent, or three out of every seven Americans who worked for their living, were farmers. Today only approximately one out of every five is so engaged. In other words, improved machinery, better methods of farming, combined with the fact that city life and indoor work cause us to eat less than formerly, have made it possible for a farmer to feed twice as many people. Millions of farm boys and girls have therefore been either squeezed out of or released from farm work. There is every prospect that this trend will continue in the future. New machinery, notably the tractor plow and the combined reaper-thresher, is steadily increasing the amount of wheat and corn which a man can produce. Since our consumption does not keep pace with production because of the inelastic nature of the demand for farm products, it would seem almost certain that many more of our farm young people will be forced to seek their careers in the towns and cities. If and when a more or less mechanical cottonpicker is introduced in the South, there will be still more people who will be driven in from the soil, since King Cotton can then be handled with a much smaller staff of workers.

The increased use of oil, better methods of burning coal and generating power, combined with improvements in coal mining, have also decreased the number of miners who are needed and have caused tens of thousands of the younger miners to abandon their former work and hunt jobs elsewhere.

Within our towns and cities in turn, other great changes have been taking place. For decades a larger and larger proportion of our population went into the factories, but within the last 12 years the tide has turned very definitely in the other direction. Even before the depression of 1929, there were actually nearly 500,000 fewer wage earners in our factories than there had been 10 years before, despite the fact that there were 16 million more people in the country. Electrical machinery, automobiles, and printing came, however, to employ more men, while cotton and woolen mills employed less. Pianos have wasted away as the phonograph and the radio have come in. Shoes have suffered as men ride more, while hosiery boomed with the advent of short skirts. Soft drinks, milk, and chocolate have increased in importance as the American production of beer and whisky has declined. The numbers employed on both the steam and the electric railroads, moreover, diminished as the automobile rose in importance. The Committee on Recent Economic Changes even went so far as to estimate that in 1927 there were more workers attached to bus and truck transportation than there were to the railroads, namely 1,900,000 as compared with 1,856,000.

Two sets of occupations, however, have been increasing during these past periods. The first is clerical work. In 1899, there was but one salaried worker in manufacturing for every 13 wage earners, while in 1927, there were slightly over two. The relative numbers in the office staffs had doubled, therefore, in the course of these 28 years. In addition to this, the numbers employed in banks and governmental offices, of course, have also greatly increased. Indeed, between 1910 and 1920, the total number of clerical workers rose from 1,700,000 to 3,100,000, an increase of over 80 percent. The second group of occupations which greatly expanded were the professions, trade, and the so-called service industries. There were more teachers, insurance agents, salespeople of all descriptions, and more in hotels and the amusement trades. In 1910 there were 3,400,000 persons in trade or 10.5 percent of the total, whereas by 1930 this number had increased to 7,500,000 or to 15.5 percent. Thus in the space of 20 years the proportion so employed rose from one-tenth to nearly one-sixth. Moreover, the numbers employed in the field of professional service advanced from 1,700,000 in 1910 to 3,400,000 in 1930, and this doubling in absolute numbers was equivalent to a relative advance of from 4.4 percent to 7 percent. The numbers employed in governmental service who were not listed in other occupations also showed an increase from 1.2 percent of the total in 1910 to 2.2 percent in 1930. Domestic and personal service which had declined from including 9.9 percent of all the workers in 1910, to 8.2 percent in 1920, rose during the last decade because of the expansion of hotels, etc., back to the 1910 figure. If, indeed, we take the total numbers employed in 1930 in trade, public service, professional service, and domestic and personal service, we have a grand total of approximately 17 million people. This is approximately 35 percent of the total number gainfully employed and is almost exactly equal to the total numbers in manufacturing, the building trades, railway transportation, and mining.

Some of these trends may undoubtedly be expected to continue in the future. As agriculture and manufacturing become more efficient so that a man can turn out a greatly increased product, we may expect a greater proportion of society's energies to be devoted to the production of services rather than of material commodities. We may, therefore, probably expect to find a smaller proportion, although not necessarily a smaller absolute number, employed in the so-called basic industries and a larger proportion in the less mechanized occupations where personal service is more important. If wholesale and retail trade could be made more efficient, however, apparently we could distribute the products of society with a much smaller proportion of energy than is now the case. If this improvement, therefore, comes about there will be a decline in the relative proportions absorbed in trade.

There is one possibility which I should like to throw out as a kind of challenge. We are frequently asked where the new industries will come from which will do for the coming generation what the automobile, the radio, and electric refrigeration did in taking up the slack for the decade which has just passed. There is certainly one great need which is evident to all those who know anything about our cities. That is the extraordinarily bad way in which our city workers are housed. For while our cities have been growing during the last 20 years on their outskirts they have been rotting at their centers until our unskilled and semiskilled urban workers are more poorly housed than are those of Northern and Western Europe. The east side of New York, the west side of Chicago, and the working class regions of Philadelphia are dreary, dismal places which were bad enough 15 years ago but which are far worse now. In order that even the skilled workers with family incomes of from $1,800 to $2,500 a year may be decently housed, it is necessary to cut rentals on new and decent buildings to $8 per month per room, or from $32 to $40 a month for 4- and 5-room apartments. If great improvements in building construction are made and restrictive practices are abandoned then it may be possible to reduce cost to somewhere near this figure. But there will still remain the great mass of unskilled and semiskilled workers whose wages of from 40 to 50 cents an hour, when deductions are made for illness, part-time and unemployment, can average hardly more than $1,000 to $1,200 a year, and who, therefore, cannot afford to pay $8 a month per room. To help this group, some type of better financing which may involve a governmental subsidy is needed if they are to be decently housed. If such improvements in construction and in financing are made, then we may look forward to many years of expanded activity in the building trades and in the factories which serve them. If these events do not happen, then building, which has constructed more office buildings and expensive apartment houses than are likely to be needed for some time, will decline. Its next great task is clearly the building of decent housing quarters for the workers of America. If it cannot solve that problem, then, in the words of Disraeli, "it will have a brilliant future behind it."

I have suggested one possibility for the future, and I should like to conclude with a reality that still is little realized. Sixty years ago every ambitious boy looked forward to the time when he would be master of his business and an independent proprietor in his own right. He read with hungry interest in the novels of Horatio Alger, so many in number yet so uniform in theme, of the country boy who came to the city and swept out his employer's office and who, by dint of never watching the clock, finally married his employer's daughter and came into proud possession of the business. Those days are largely over. Technical changes now demand the investment of so much capital that modern industry in manufacturing, transportation, and mining is carried on by big companies. So, to an increasing extent, is banking and trade. The large majority of American workers are wage earners or clerks and will always remain such. Thus in 1923, 38 percent of all the wage earners in manufacturing were employed in establishments with over 500 wage earners, and 71 percent in establishments with over 100. When we remember that a large company quite commonly has at least several, and in some cases many, establishments under its direction, the degree of concentration is even greater than is indicated by these figures. It is arithmetically impossible, under these conditions, for the mass to become individual proprietors and managers of the type celebrated by Horatio Alger and by some of the present-day magazines which exalt individual success.

It is but wisdom, therefore, that the younger generation should realize this as they enter industry, and should prepare themselves not only for the individualistic struggle for success in a changing world, but also for all the methods whereby the group of wage and salaried workers may cooperate to make their lives more truly satisfying. Vocational guidance properly conceived should not only prepare workers for better jobs than those which they or their parents now occupy, it should also prepare them for a more abounding life in that station in industry to which the exigencies of industry are likely to confine the vast majority. Sometime Americans will recognize that, as a whole, they cannot forever live above themselves, and will settle down to cooperate with other members of their class in building a more satisfactory life both within and without their working hours. Toward that end vocational guidance should aid.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, which I have the honor to chair, is currently engaged in an extensive set of hearings probing the problems of the "manpower revolution" in depth. Our investigations have received added impetus from the current railroad labor dispute and from the Negro's battle for his rightful place in the labor market. Both railroad labor and the Negro are being hit by separate aspects of the manpower revolution; one by innovating technology which has drastically curtailed the need for certain classes of railroad workers, the other by society's failure to give him the educational and social assets necessary to compete in an economy of fewer and fewer pick-and-shovel jobs.

The subcommittee expects to have ready, by the end of this year, recommendations pertinent to these and other challenges posed by the "manpower revolution."

Meanwhile, the subcommittee intends to do its part in assuring that Congress and the Nation are fully aware of the task ahead if we are to achieve even a reasonable approximation of full employment.

It is heartening to see an increasing awareness of the problems of manpower and employment and unemployment in the press. For too long majority affluence has blinded us to the economic cancers of poverty and unemployment which still afflict the life of the Nation. These twin diseases must be treated now or the malignancy will inevitably spread. We can no longer allow the deceptive comforts of majority well-being to divert us from a proper diagnosis and treatment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point the following articles:

"One Generation Is 'Lost,' but Must it Happen Again?" from the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot.

"The Second Battle of Homestead," from the Reporter, July 18, 1963.

"The Point of No Return for Everybody," from Life, July 19, 1963.

"Expanding Apprenticeship for All Americans," from the American Federalist, July 1963.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot]

THE UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM: ONE GENERATION IS LOST, BUT MUST IT HAPPEN AGAIN?

The problem of unemployment is being overstated, Henry Ford argued in a recent interview.

He says:

(1) The Government's unemployed statistics are inflated because too many workers temporarily laid off are included in the totals.

(2) There are thousands of jobs going begging because people won't take them.

(3) Time will solve the problem of chronically depressed areas, with which Pennsylvania is especially plagued.

Government statistics on joblessness have been under fire for a long time, and an intensive special study now is in process by the Labor Department to see if changes are warranted. It is emphasized by critics that we consider workers unemployed in this country, such as part-time working wives and students, who never would be listed in other countries.

Edwin A. Lahey, of the Chicago Daily News Service, who interviewed Ford, asked about the middle-aged workers who have been automated out of jobs or who have been in a declining industry such as mining. "Ford is one of the few thoughtful industrial leaders to be frank about it," Lahey wrote, pointing out as many high Government officials do that we have neglected this problem so long that now nothing can be done about it. "These pockets will eventually disappear," Ford says.

His observation recalls the candid comment by Pennsylvania's David L. Lawrence, in the final days of his term as Governor, when he conceded in an interview with the Patriot-News that we unhappily have in Pennsylvania "a lost generation" of middle-aged steelworkers and aged or middle-aged miners for whom there never will be jobs comparable to the ones they used to have, if there will be any jobs for them at all. On top of their lack of skills in demand on the job market is their age.

This is the specter now haunting so many railroaders in the bitter dispute over work rules. The economic facts are on the side of the railroads, as independent fact-finding boards unanimously have established. But this leaves the very sore point, and one few public figures are willing to face openly and frankly:

There are, as Ford argues, "thousands and thousands of jobs going begging in this country because people won't take them."

What is involved here is the very human unwillingness of a man to downgrade himself when the good job which he has known for so long suddenly is wiped out. Newsman Lahey posed this question:

"What will thousands of diesel firemen do when someone finally decides they've had it?"

The railroaders will have a lot of company as other industries continue to automate and improve their production processes. Before the 1960's end, a Labor Department survey forecasts, 24 million jobs will have been affected by technological change. That's an average of 200,000 jobs a month, 2.4 million jobs every year.

It is little wonder that many Americans are urging a much more elaborate program of retraining of idled workers than now exists.

It is little wonder that programs such as Pennsylvania's PIDA and the Federal ARA for depressed areas hold such human appeal on top of their stark economic necessity.

And the need to give our youth far better educational opportunities, especially opening up training for many of them in technical skills, calls for a lot more effort than so far has been forthcoming—in Harrisburg and at Washington. One "lost generation" a century should be enough.

[From the Reporter, July 18, 1963]

THE SECOND BATTLE OF HOMESTEAD

(By Joseph G. Colangelo, Jr.)

Across the Monongahela River, 7 miles around a bend from downtown Pittsburgh's revitalized "Golden Triangle," lies the town of Homestead. Its most outstanding feature, now as always, is a steel mill—an agglomeration of huge iron sheds stretched out in a mile-long arc parallel to the riverbank.

Seventy-one years ago, the millworkers in this town fought a brief but violent battle when Carnegie Steel Corp.'s Henry Clay Frick attempted to make the mill safe for strikebreakers by sending in armed Pinkerton agents. Instead of submitting as they had in the past, the millhands literally took over the town and defeated the Pinkertons in a bloody engagement that stretched into the night on July 6, 1892.

Today, the town library is named after Carnegie, a patch of unkempt foliage on the hill is called Frick Park, and the millhands are up against a different kind of enemy—the forces of technological advance, economic readjustment, and a declining national growth rate. The issue is job security and the weapons are negotiation, arbitration, and the vagaries of contract. The recent steel settlement, for example, granting a 13-week vacation every 5 years to long-term employees, attempts to spread the work rather than raise the pay.

The superintendent of the Homestead mill is Robert McClure, who started in the steel industry as a laborer during the unionizing drives of the depression but who never joined the union and never wanted to. McClure will not give out figures on how many men have been laid off in his plant. The United States Steel Corp., heir to the Carnegie holdings, will not permit it for competitive reasons.

What McClure will say is that "the Homestead mill isn't new, but we've kept the equipment modernized and we've got a good competitive situation. We haven't been full recently, but we've been a damn sight closer to maintaining a respectable operating level than a lot of other mills in the area." That respectable level, he told me, is between 55 and 65 percent of capacity.

Capacity, however, means steel, not people. Homestead has 25 open-hearth furnaces gathered into 2 different shops, called OH-4 and OH-5. The former, which has 14 open hearths each capable of turning out 150 tons of metal three times a day, has been open only once since July 1960. Of the 11 furnaces in OH-5, only 7 to 9 operate with any regularity. Each of these can produce 300 tons of steel three times a day. Since it takes as many men to operate a single 150-ton furnace as it does a 300-ton furnace, less than half the men are needed to maintain 55 percent of capacity in the open-hearth division. This explains the good competitive situation. But if increased demand should require United States Steel to relight the 14 furnaces of OH-4, it would raise the average cost per unit of steel produced by the Homestead mill.

Elsewhere in the plant the pattern is similar. In one rolling mill the work force has gone from 1,700 to 1,200. In another, the drop has been from 1,500 to 1,000. There were 1,000 men in the plant's forge 5 years ago; there are 650 now. In all, there are only 6,000 union men at work in the mill today as compared with 9,700 5 years ago and 10,400 10 years ago. Nor are all of the men left on the job working full time. Some are only scheduled 4 days a week. Others are on a week, off a week. Occasionally a section of the mill will shut down early in a shift for lack of orders to be processed.

The possibility—or the hope—that some of the layoffs may be only seasonal or temporary keeps many of the workers from facing up to the realities of their situation. Just between April and June of 1962, for example, more than a thousand men were let go in a temporary cutback. "If we get even 800 back," I was told by Barney Shields, a member of the plant grievance committee, "we'll be lucky. When things level off, they never level off where they were before."

The steelworkers' contract specifies that a man's employment is not officially terminated until he is on layoff continuously for 2 years. Even then he has the option of collecting his severance pay or continuing his layoff status for another 3 years in the hope that he will be called back. Each time a man is rehired, however, even if for only a day or two, he begins another 24-month waiting period.

Unlike in the old days, when men were laid off without regard to rank or length of service, a steelworker today is almost always able to calculate when his turn will come. It is fixed by the date he was hired. "Steelworkers," according to Shields, "talk about only two things—sex and seniority." Seniority determines who will be laid off, who will be rehired, and who, instead of being laid off, can qualify for a lower paying spot in the labor pool.

A certain reserve of men is likely to be needed around any mill on a regular basis to perform odd chores. Back in 1955, Local Union 1397, the Homestead local of USW, set up the first permanent labor reserve staffed by senior men laid off their normal jobs. (The international union has since adopted the system throughout the industry.) But things are so tight in Homestead today that unless a man was hired before March 4, 1942, he can't even qualify for the labor pool.

THE PRICE OF PROGRESS

What, in addition to a lack of steel orders, is causing this more or less steady decline at the mill? Shields blames the permanent cutbacks on technological advance, cost cutting, and "contracting out." Automation comes last.

As recently as 7 years ago, Shields informed me, it took almost 14 hours to run a 150-ton "heat" of steel through a Homestead furnace. Today, with oxygen injected into the furnace to increase temperatures and with better materials handling, twice that amount can be produced in half the time. Recently United States Steel has announced that it will install in its nearby Duquesne works two "oxygen converter" furnaces that can whip out a heat of steel in as little as 52 minutes. Paul Morrow, superintendent of the open-hearth division at Homestead, has said that the blueprints are in his top drawer if the company should ever decide to do the same at his mill. Two of these furnaces could produce as much steel as the 14 unused open hearths in OH-4. And it takes as many men to operate one open hearth as it does to operate one oxygen converter.

Contracting out has been a particularly difficult problem at Homestead, although it is common to most of the steel industry. The issue is simply this: outsiders have been getting jobs in the mill that the Homestead millhands want. These outsiders are not scabs or strikebreakers; they are union members of the construction and building trades who work for outside contractors hired by United States Steel.

Local Union 1397 claims that its men should be hired for these jobs. Superintendent McClure admits that they are capable—"a damn sight better, in fact"—but protests that the contracts were let in boom times when the local men weren't available, that his maintenance division isn't equipped to do new construction, and that the outside contractors can do some of the work more cheaply. Such explanations offer little consolation to the group of boilermakers, for example, who were standing in line for their unemployment checks recently at union hall. Through a window that faced the plant, the men could see boilermakers from another union at work under contract putting a patch on one of the open hearths, a job they would normally do. "They came to me and asked me what I was going to do about it," Shields told me. "I told them I couldn't do anything about it, which I can't. We'd already arbitrated this thing and lost."

At the end of April 1962, when the wholesale temporary layoffs began, the men tried to do something about it themselves. They held a dues checkoff, and stopped every workman entering the mill gate, asking to see his union card, ostensibly to determine whether his U.S.W. membership was paid up. Anyone without U.S.W. credentials was kept out. At one point, Shields ran across a handful of steelworkers venting their rage on another unpopular figure in the current Homestead struggle—foreign cars. The men were about to dump a Volkswagen on the railroad tracks beside the plant. Shields stopped them, because for one thing, the foreman was still in the car. When the skirmish ended, the rules of modern industrial warfare prevailed and the problem of contracting out was referred to a labor-management committee.

As for automation, Superintendent McClure has said flatly, "Anybody who thinks he's going to run a steel mill with pushbuttons is out of his mind." United States Steel already has had one unfortunate experience with automated rolling mills at the Duquesne works. The management there found that every time a slight modification was introduced in the automated rolling procedures, some 14,000 punchcards had to be altered. Moreover, an experienced rolling machine operator could turn out more steel in less time. Duquesne has now gone back to manual operation.

But smaller operations have been automated quite successfully. The Homestead chemical laboratory is an example. Before the Second World War, analysis of finished steel to determine whether it met customers' specifications was done by a wet chemical process that required the services of 132 men. In 1949, the mill installed spectographs that speeded up operations considerably, but an increase in steel orders and the need for experienced personnel to interpret data from the machines kept the work force at the existing level. Then a "Quantometer," a device that made its own interpretations but missed a few of the elements, was put in and the chem lab force dropped from 132 to 65. Three years ago, the company installed a "Quanavac," which reads all elements, and now only 36 men are left.

Despite the layoffs, Homestead doesn't look depressed. "Sure there may be a couple of thousand men out of work," a local newspaper reporter remarked, "but there are 7,000 or 8,000 still employed. And that's a hell of a lot of people pouring out onto the street at lunch hour in a town this size."

Then men out of work are protected from immediate desperation by State unemployment compensation and industry supported supplemental unemployment benefits. When this is used up, usually in 32 weeks, a worker can, if necessary, get welfare payments, which carry with them a lien on the man's home, if he is lucky enough to own one.

Today in the Homestead area there are 550 public assistance cases and 5,000 to 6,000 men receiving unemployment compensation. On the average, 200 to 250 of the unemployment-compensation claims run out every month, but perhaps the most dramatic statistic is the drop in population. Since 1950, a fourth of Homestead's people have moved out.

Some of those who lost their jobs but stayed on have found other work, but most companies are reluctant to hire men still technically on layoff status at Homestead. They know that for the most part the men will return to their old jobs and former seniority if the mill ever gets back to full production.

One laid-off worker, Gene Zuger, tried to escape this trap. With his brother-in-law, he decided in August 1961, to drive out to Valparaiso, Ind., where the National Steel Corp. had just opened a new mill. Another brother-in-law, also out of work, had just landed a job there. They left at noon. At 3 p.m., after months without a word from the company, the mill telephoned his home to ask if he could come in the next morning. His wife took the message and got in touch with her husband in Valparaiso late that evening. Zuger hitchhiked back that night to Homestead. He worked 9 days, and was laid off again. When he returned to Valparaiso, all the available openings were filled. The brother-in-law who was fortunate enough not to be called back has been employed steadily at the Indiana mill ever since. The Zugers, who have 6 children, are now living on $121.30 every 2 weeks from the county welfare department. To them the second battle of Homestead, which is actually a kind of siege, is no less painful than the first was to the earlier steelworkers, who not only won their fight but were able to confront the enemy directly.

[From Life magazine, July 19, 1963]

The Point of No Return for Everybody

An executive in an automated plant was describing a machinist's new job. "All he has to do," he explained, "is press the button to start the machine and then monitor it. All he has to know is what his machine looks like so he can find it when he comes to work."

There are 426 things that can go wrong with William Jensen's machine. Yet, says Jensen, "the job gets boring. You spend most of your time loading it, rewinding the tape, and sometimes you spend 45 minutes just watching it."

But Frank Martoglio, who started out 46 years ago as an 18-year-old apprentice machinist and now works on the machine, says, "It's hard to explain but I take great pride in the job. It makes me feel I'm part of the future. But the machine is the brain."

Neither Jensen nor Martoglio nor thousands like them have any complaint about automation. It has not taken their livelihood. In fact it has given them better-paying, less arduous—if less interesting—jobs. But in places like the coal mine region of Kentucky, the jobs vanish as small mines close one by one. They are unable to compete with the bigger mines which have become automated with the consent and, even more, the prodding of the United Mine Workers. The blazing-eyed Kentucky miner can only howl his resentment in the union hall. "I can't get a job nowhere," shouts Jason Combs, 54 and hopeless. "Boy, it kills me. It burns me up."

I HAD TO FORGET MY SENIORITY AND START ALL OVER AGAIN

When the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. installed automatic glass-cutting machines in its Ford City, Pa. plant last year, Nicola Yanoff, a glass cutter with 11 years' seniority, became a statistic in the lists of U.S. unemployed. Yanoff was 43 but, he decided, "I'd better forget my seniority and start all over again." With 14 others he joined up for a 26-week course at Ford City High School set up under the Federal Manpower Development and Retraining Act. He studied chemistry, physics and mathematics, aiming for an inspection job in some plant.

"It wasn't easy to go back to school," he recalls, "but my wife made me stick it out." The Yanoffs, with four children, got by on a $33-per-week Federal retraining allowance, $21-per-month service pension and $15-per-month's work of free U.S. surplus food.

When Nicola Yanoff graduated from retraining, Pittsburgh Plate Glass took him back as a quality control technician—a better job. "Age wasn't a consideration," says Yanoff, marveling at his luck while sympathizing with 3,200 of his neighbors still unemployed.

UNEMPLOYED HUSBAND

Automation hit Walter W. Peterson, of San Diego, Calif., last February on the same day he received a pin from the Convair Division of General Dynamics Corp., in recognition of 20 years' service. As a tool and diemaker, a member of the International Association of Machinists Local 1125, he was highly skilled and proud of it. But Convair, his bosses told him, was not doing well in the commercial aircraft field and was regearing toward missiles. Also, new types of automatic machinery could make tools and dies better than he.

Peterson was 45, married, with three children. He owned his own comfortable home on a hill overlooking the Pacific, had two cars, and over the years he had built up $10,000 in his savings account. Now he had to go home and tell his wife that for all their hard work and thrift they were in trouble. He walked through the doorway and said, "Well, you're now looking at an unemployed husband."

Stunned by unemployment, Walter Peterson putters around his garden. "Many mornings I wake up and just decide to lie there," he says. "Finally I decide, 'Well, I might as well start the day.'"

Mrs. Peterson has a long, long breakfast in the kitchen with her husband. "You know," she says, "you never really think about the unemployment situation until you're a part of it. You may say, 'Isn't it awful' but you don't really worry about it. Somehow unemployment doesn't seem very real. Then when it happens to you, it's all of a sudden very real."

Mrs. Peterson cleans up before she heads out for her $1.40 an hour, 4-hour-a-day job at a school cafeteria. Her husband will make the rounds of plants and union hall seeking a job.

Big Labor Hunts for the Hard Answers

(By Keith Wheeler)

Recently John I. Snyder, Jr., a conscientious man of 54, sat in the darkened Park Avenue boardroom of U.S. Industries Inc. in New York City watching his mindless monsters at work. They both pleased and troubled him. Snyder is chairman of the board of USI, whose chief pursuit is the design of automated production machines.

On a movie screen, two of USI's mechanical gremlins were showing what they can do. Now and then a pair of flesh and blood hands would appear and demonstrate that almost anything that hands born of woman can do the gremlins can do better, faster, more cheaply.

Snyder knows well that his contraptions—and their bloodless brothers now being turned out by about 200 American firms—already have provoked crises in the human hives of organized American labor. But extension of this thought goes beyond the problems of labor unions—and worries him even more. It is the idea that, unless society summons the will and imagination to alter itself to the rhythms of a new kind of technology, his kids and yours and mine may grow up with nothing much to do but loaf.

Snyder's worry is not new and his is by no means the only mind wrestling with it. But it is too big a problem for the imagination to take a firm grip on it. A few weeks ago in a labor-industry-Government seminar on what to do about automation, labor-management relations counsel John F. O'Donnell from Columbia University thought the conference was shot through with unreality.

"We now have 68.1 million people working and 4 million out of work," he said. "But if the Labor Department's own 5-year projections are correct and if you convert percentages into people, we'll have only 64 million working and 14.6 million crying for work in 1968."

However, there is more than one way to skin a statistic. Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz recently held a 2-day meeting with the country's labor press editors in Washington. During the discussions, Robert Myers, a department statistician, used the same general statistical projections to estimate that our unemployment will have increased by only 1.6 million by 1967.

Under Secretary of Labor John F. Henning suggested a less sanguine prospect by calculating that in the 1960's the economy must provide 36.5 million new jobs to stay even. Population growth, he said, will produce 12.5 million new humans in the work force, while at the same time the increase of productivity per worker—largely as a result of automation—will eliminate 24 million jobs in this decade. These are the rough dimensions of the problem and worthy of all the attention they can get.

Nobody—not even the labor unions most directly affected—asserts that automation, by itself, is an evil. The people, the economy, the Nation already reap enormous benefits from the technological explosion. It provides more goods and services of higher quality at lower prices. The highly automated telephone industry, for example, has tripled its volume of traffic in 23 years; were it not for automation, the phone companies alone would now need the services of nearly all the working women in the country as operators to handle their increased business load. Also, as its momentum gathers, automation creates new industries of its own—and with them, new jobs of its own. Importantly, it helps the Nation maintain a competitive position in world markets.

But while automation promises a fuller life for most people some day—if it can be understood and controlled—it offers no comfort to human beings caught right now in the undertow of the technological tide. This article will show how the machines lie somewhere near the core of today's surprising wave of anger against American labor unions. It will suggest that, at the same time, the machines have begun to force a subtle but healthful change in the traditional, hidebound hostility between labor and capital. It will outline some of the more imaginative and fruitful, but so far inadequate, efforts to save man from his own creations.

But first, a look at two of the machines and their maker. One of John Snyder's performers, called by the glamorless title of vibratory bowl feeder, is a lustrous disk with a spiral ramp rising at the edge. It can be loaded with a helter-skelter of things—erasers, screws, metal parts. The disk appears to be rotating but is not; the illusion is caused by an invisible vibration which sets the load into a sedate, outward trending waltz until, one by one, the pieces leave the dance floor and move up the ramp. Crisis awaits them at the top: Those which arrive right side up and front end to are allowed to pass; but any maverick which comes upside down, backward, topsy-turvy, or is in any way defective or unlike its fellows is contemptuously flicked back to try again.

The other machine, with the sexier name of TransfeRobot, is a swinging arm and hand, but infinitely superior to any human arm or hand. It is absolutely tireless. Whatever it picks up and puts down it always picks up and puts down in the same place and attitude to within .002 of an inch.

Alone or in combinations, the disc and arm sort things or take things from one place to another or, getting more complicated, bring together and assemble the parts of complex electrical switches or, getting delicate, sort, select and pack boxes of chocolates. The hand can exert any kind or degree of force, from that of a vise to something more tender than a lover's caress, and can be adapted to use mechanical fingers, electromagnets or, for such oozy stuff as a chocolate cream, a gentle vacuum.

"So far," Snyder says, "we have not been able to find any material or any shape or any size it can't handle.

How many human hands might these machines replace?

"Depends on the job and depends on how far you want to carry the process," Snyder says. "The number could be close to infinite. We built an automated stamping line for Nissan Motors in Japan. It has six presses with TransfeRobot-type machines to take the stuff out of one press and feed it to the next. One man watches raw sheet metal go in and one more watches finished fenders come out. It replaces, oh, maybe 20 men altogether. But that's not all; you could extend the process right up to bolting the fender to a car. Even considering how cheap labor is in Japan, the thing saves money."

What, then, does all this mean to the muscles and hearts and minds of men who not only need to work in order to live but also, by eons of instinct, have been conditioned to understand that they need work for the sustenance of their souls?

"It means they are out of work," Snyder says. "Optimists like to compare this to the industrial revolution—but the analogy is wrong. People got hurt then because we were breaking out of an agrarian society to build an industrial society. Today we live in an industrial society, but with these new tools we are obsoleting not only our conventional machines but modern men as well. The industrial revolution created jobs. Now we're using sophisticated machines to destroy jobs."

When you destroy the job, do you also destroy the man?

"Very likely. Take yourself. Say you're sent home and there's nothing to do and no prospect of anything to do. How long does it take you to go crazy? A month, a week, a day, or just 15 minutes? Probably the last."

Well, then, why are we doing it?

"Because we must. It can't be stopped. They tried it in the industrial revolution. They even legislated against the powered spindle—but it didn't work because England had to export. It won't work today for the same reason. We're living in a competitive world."

All right, it's a competitive world. But what happens in the paradox of a world competing to make more things better and cheaper for the use of man while, simultaneously, the facts of competition begin to eliminate the need for man's muscles and, by the same token, threaten to eliminate his paycheck as a customer for the things? Obviously the first to ram into the question head on are organized labor and industry. But the question is a cosmic one and the ultimate answer cannot yet even be sensed.

Still, under the unprecedented pressures of the new technology, a few wondrous things have come to pass. The most significant came on that traditionally bloody battleground between the steelworkers and the industry. There, just a month ago, labor and management negotiated an amicable settlement guaranteeing at least 2 years of labor peace. The agreement's chief feature was one designed to spread the diminishing work by giving senior employees a 13-week vacation every 5 years. The agreement, which includes no wage increase as such, was worked out by the labor-management human relations committee, which was created to ease the agonies of automation and salve the frictions of strike deadlines by keeping the two sides in continuous contact.

This was the first big payoff in what one observer describes as "a feeling that some parts of both labor and capital are trying to find a new place to stand. There's a small but noticeable trend away from the old idea of 'the hell with him, he's my enemy,' and toward the hope that maybe they can work it out as partners."

Here and there, the groping for sensible answers—though it sometimes hurts—results in tangible action. To save King Coal from fading into a dethroned memory, the United Mine Workers cooperates with management to automate the mines. American Motors shatters industry precedent by offering its employees a profit-sharing plan. One aristocratic union, New York Local No. 1 of the Amalgamated Lithographers, led by its energetic and unorthodox president, Edward Swayduck, violates all union tradition by paying for full-page ads denouncing featherbedding and opting for all the automation the industry can devise. In partnership with one employer, Kaiser, the steelworkers actually agree to go whole hog for ultra-advanced technology and split whatever it saves. The Chicago local of the Flat Janitors Union digs its treasury out of the mattress and risks it all on a creative project designed to make more jobs for its members.

But these are the brilliant exceptions. For the most part, both management and labor still stand toe to toe and ready to slug it out. Now, however, there is a mighty difference. Thirty years ago labor marched in the battle for wages and hours and for the right to organize. Today the machines are marching against the blue-collar working man and the battle is elemental—the struggle for survival.

The unfortunate result is that lately organized labor has been causing and catching more hell than it has for a generation. The most compelling force in the railroad crisis has been the battle to save almost all of an entire occupation—the firemen—from extinction. In their grim efforts to hang on somehow, the firemen are denounced for "featherbedding," hanging around the neck of the economy like a decaying albatross. They are by no means alone; uncounted thousands of other American workers whose jobs have been eliminated by improved technology still cling to them, although their actual usefulness has become highly debatable.

The struggle to hang on in the face of widening automation was behind the costly and resentment-breeding newspaper stoppages in Cleveland and New York and the east and gulf coasts' longshoremen's strike.

To the printers the real enemy was punched or electronic tape which, when fed to the keyboards of modern line-casting machines, can reduce the composing room work force by two-thirds; so the printers fought the tape for use in setting such material as stock market reports. The beasts opposing the longshoremen were called by the perplexing new names of prepalletizing, containerizing or unitizing—all modern cargo-handling techniques which are estimated to have reduced the longshoreman's work by about 10 percent in the last 5 years.

The trouble was that these strikes tramped on a lot of more or less innocent toes. It has been estimated that the strike and lockout of 3,000 New York printers threw at least 20,000 out of work in the newspaper industry and cost the city in general at least $250 million in business.

The strike turned up such a blast of temper that even President Kennedy condemned the stoppage as "long past the point of public toleration."

The strike by 70,000 longshoremen crippled vital shipping along half the Nation's coasts and racked up costs in lost work and the breakdown of commerce that amounted to $975 million.

President Kennedy's concern about such burdens on the economy brought the reactivation last May of a long-dormant labor-management committee to fend off strikes affecting the public interest. Meanwhile, as the unions get roundly damned as barefaced pickpockets of the Nation, none of organized labor's present goals escapes suspicion. George Meany's announcement that the AFL–CIO will drive for a shorter workweek fetches a howl of condemnation to the effect that, in blind greed, labor demands ever more for doing ever less.

Making a survival drive for countrywide and industrywide contracts, the unions stand charged as ruthless monopolists—and there is talk of antitrust legislation. Actually, however, the strength of organized labor has been waning for at least 10 years, rapidly in the last 5. In 1955, when at last the A.F.L. and C.I.O. reached the altar in a loveless marriage of convenience, President Meany pledged that the couple would then go out and "organize the unorganized." Eight years have passed but the only major union to pick up significant new membership has been Jimmy Hoffa's Teamsters—who are not even recognized as respectable in-laws. Total union membership in the United States today is about 18 million—almost exactly where it was in 1955 when, of course, the population was smaller. The grand total of members is only one fourth of today's civilian work force of 72 millionplus.

Various excuses are advanced for the dwindling of the ranks. It is said that the crusading fervor of the '30s and '40s has faded into fat-cat complacency. Some say that labor's reputation is too hoary and heavy-handed to win acceptance by the growing white-collar class. It is charged, and justifiably, that jealous unions wrangle so over who is going to organize whom that nobody gets organized. A company-to-union liaison officer in General Electric's big Schenectady, N.Y. plant believes that "unions have become an anachronism to workers. In this plant the average guy makes about $138 a week, has two cars, a house, and a kid in college."

While such opulence may still be true of skilled workmen—though that second auto would seem hard to come by on $138 a week—it is anything but true of the area where machines are hitting first and hardest. This is on the production lines of basic manufacturing, traditionally the largest sector of the economy. Since 1957, the Labor Department reported in a recent manpower survey, 775,000 actual production jobs have been wiped out; automation was cited as a major contributing villain to this destruction. As individual unions, the heaviest sufferers so far have been the auto workers, down 168,000 members since 1953, despite the glittering fact that 1963 is that industry's all-time Golconda; the steelworkers, down 200,000 since 1956; the mine workers, down 500,000 working miners since 1945; all railroad workers down 670,000 since 1947. The erosion of production jobs of all kinds became clear by 1956 when, for the first time, white-collar workers began to outnumber blue collars in America.

The revolution has brought the coinage of new terms to describe people who have no work. They are called "the unhired." These displaced or unplaced humans represent not only despair for themselves but, for organized labor, a painful and ironic loss of both manpower and revenue.

"It may sound cynical but a lot of these people probably are not ever going to be hired at all or hired again," says a veteran labor observer. "Practically speaking, as long as a man has no work and so is not a factor in the economy, how can you organize him? Marginal workers can never bring back in dues what it costs to organize them. Unions, too, must think about cost accounting."

In the superheated climate of public resentment, the unions are accused of being just too disgustingly rich. But until very recently few outsiders could even guess what any one union might be worth. The first opportunity for the public to take a worthwhile peek into the counting houses of labor came with passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill, which required unions to file annual financial statements.

The first batch of reports for 1961 is still being digested by the Department of Labor, but the Department has recently disclosed that labor is far less affluent than supposed. The report fixed the total of wholly owned union wealth at about $1.5 billion, which comes to something less than $100 each for every union member in the country. The Department's list of the 10 wealthiest unions included: International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, $111 million; United Mine Workers, $110 million; Ladies Garment Workers, $44 million; Teamsters, $38 million; Steel Workers, $31.5 million; Auto Workers, $30.7 million; Locomotive Firemen, $29.3 million; Bricklayers, $26.3 million; Machinists, $22.9 million; Hod Carriers, $21.3 million. But some were worse than broke—notably the International Longshoremen, which reported itself $694,000 in the hole.

The "richest" list provoked indignant denial from the Electrical Workers' president, Gordon Freeman. He declared that the listed total included $102 million which actually belonged to the union's pension and death benefit fund. He pointed out that even the entire reported total wealth of all unions, $1.5 billion, would still be peanuts compared, say, to the $24.6 billion assets at A.T. & T.

Calculation of labor's wealth has frequently been distorted by this confusion between union-held treasure and the very much larger capital accumulations in the Nation's pension and welfare funds. The Labor Department has disclosed that 120,510 such funds held assets of $52.2 billion at the close of 1960 and were then growing at a rate of $4.5 billion a year. Most such funds are trusteed, however, and only 1 percent are exclusively controlled by union officers. Moreover, the workers who are designated as the eventual beneficiaries of the funds include far more nonunion than union employees, up to and including corporation presidents.

It is fortunate that such cushions for the jolt of economic dislocation do exist; it seems likely that something similar eventually will have to be devised to protect a lot more humanity. Thus far the foremost victims of automation have been the most helpless to fight back. They are the very young looking for a first job, especially school dropouts who possess neither training, experience nor seniority; the elderly, who are ill equipped or temperamentally unwilling to have their lives uprooted; and the nonfavored minorities, Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

The plight of the minorities, indeed, adds a powerful surge to this year's tides of racial strife. Hammering at the door for social and educational equality, the Negroes are ready to fight, and fight now, for equality in jobs and access to them. Here again the unions, particularly the building-trades unions which have long been all but closed to Negroes, stand accused.

But it is clear that automation is eliminating not only the unskilled or semiskilled production worker. Indeed, it already has penetrated beyond unions as such, is reaching deep into the white-collar class and, as it develops, seem unlikely to respect anybody. For example, the machines have taken much more than a bridgehead in the communications industry—as anyone knows who ever dialed a Los Angeles telephone number direct from New York or Chicago without the aid of a human operator.

It was once optimistically believed that the still growing service industries might soak up the extra labor supply. But the army of mechanical hands ready to perform countless service functions is expanding too fast to be ignored. We are already accustomed to automatic elevators, cigarette machines, drink and candy vendors, laundromats, machines that collect tolls or make change. It does not often come to mind that each gets rid of one or more human beings.

Not long ago Macy's, New York, even tried out a machine that sold 36 different garments, in 10 sizes and styles. Moreover, it would accept coins, or $1 and $5 bills and make change, and scornfully kick back counterfeit currency. The store gave up the experiment, deciding rather reluctantly that we had not yet quite reached the stage of shopping for soft goods in a slot machine. But if the thing is ever perfected, it raises the interesting possibility that a store could get everybody off the payroll except the complaint clerk. The machine did not surrender tamely: it is now set up in post offices in 10 cities, selling stamps, envelopes and post cards, and spurning phony money.

President Joseph Beirne of the Communications Workers predicted in his recent book "New Horizons for Labor" that the day will come when most U.S. workers will be "people in white coats babysitting for pushbuttons." The prediction cannot be taken lightly. Machines which need very little help from humanity are well past the point of mere "automation," which is to say, doing repetitive physical chores more accurately and rapidly than man and without such human fringe needs as vacations or hospital insurance. The electronic computer long since settled down comfortably as a day-to-day workhorse, taking over much of the routine and even the sophisticated clerical and statistical work of business and government.

The U.S. Veterans' Administration has installed computers to chop away all but 3,000 of 17,000 employees who once processed insurance claims. A city department store gives a computer the chore of checking 50,000 transactions in 30 minutes. An airline has tied all its ticket offices together in a computer system which keeps track of traffic, assigns passengers to seats and even joggles moonstruck human clerks with a reminder to take down the customer's phone number.

The next step is called "cybernation." This is a fairly new term coined by dismayed man from the Greek kybernêtês, which means "steersman." It describes a world controlled by electromechanics in which machines take over most of man's functions, mental as well as physical—excluding only eating, sleeping, dreaming, complaining, and making love.

Cybernation takes account of both automated doing machines and computerized analyzing and deciding machines. When the most sophisticated of the doers and thinkers are mated, they can reduce most of mankind to the wretched role of "consumer," foreseen by Aldous Huxley in his grisly 1932 science fiction, "Brave New World."

Let no stubborn optimist hope that the robots will not be mated, for they already are. Photon, Inc., of Wilmington, Mass., which manufactures photoelectric typesetting machines, has come up with a new gadget named, with terrifying accuracy, "Zip." Zip links the old model-T, semiautomated photographic typesetting principle to computers capable, when so instructed, of remembering, selecting, and giving orders. The result is a device which can set type at the rate of 450 characters a second while, at the same time, revising and updating such rapidly changing material as telephone books. Zip is roughly 50 times faster than the best previous man-machine combinations for doing the same thing. Zip could reset the entire Manhattan telephone directory, all 1,804 pages of it, in just 29 hours and 43 minutes.

The Fund for the Republic recently financed a study of the outlook for cybernation which was conducted by the Center for the study of democratic institutions. Commenting on the versatility of so-called learning and decisionmaking machines, the study remarked rather snottily that some now seem capable of only "a fair amateur game of chess." But it admitted that the same machines are whizzes at checkers. They get so good that, after 10 to 20 hours of instruction, they begin to devise original strategy and tactics and to beat the human who taught them the game.

"It is no fantasy, then, to be concerned with the implications of the thinking machines," the study observes. "There is every reason to believe that within the next two decades machines will be available outside the laboratory that will do a credible (a last-ditch human would have said creditable) job of original thinking, certainly as good thinking as that expected of most middle-level people who are supposed to 'use their minds.'"

Finally, in the envisioned society which promises the elimination of most human effort, except for a tiny elite of bosses and technicians who build and teach and more or less understand the machines, the big question must be asked: What do we do with the people?

Many old-style human brains are worrying about the problem today. There are even a few people actually doing something about it. Unluckily the worriers outnumber the doers.

The head worrier is Secretary of Labor Wirtz. But the Secretary sounded none too confident in recent testimony before a House subcommittee. "We have been assuming that the developing technology—what we call automation—will provide as many new jobs as it replaces," he said. "I say we have been assuming that. I am not sure it is right. * * * I assume we shall find those jobs because we must find the jobs."

What appeared to worry the Secretary most is the paradox that while we are fast running out of use for people, we are at the same time ironically producing people faster than ever. In the decade of the fifties, he said, we added 8.3 million new people who needed jobs, but in the sixties we are producing 12.6 million brandnew job applicants. Naturally, since humans are somewhat disorderly in their habits anyhow, this piling up of surplus new humanity does not proceed in an entirely orderly fashion. Lately every crop-year of new 18-year-olds has been a bumper one—averaging in the neighborhood of 2.5 million; but in this staggering decade the 1964–65 crop-year of 18-year-olds (babies born in 1946–47) figures to be the alltime humdinger with nearly 4 million.

Recently Secretary Wirtz took part in a daylong communal worry about the matter at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York City. He said he can foresee the development of a "human slag heap." The Waldorf session was unique because, for the first time, it brought together all three of the vitally concerned forces—labor, management, and Government—in a common effort to tackle a monstrous human dilemma that no one or two can handle alone. However, there is little present evidence that all three together can handle it either.

Among those doing something about it, the Federal Government exhibits abundant concern but has not yet made much of a dent in the labor surplus. The administration's Manpower Development and Training Act became Federal law in 1962 but did not get moving until last September, when funds were appropriated. In the months since, 40,000 persons have been "approved" for training or retraining; 20,000 had actually begun training by last June 1 and 5,700 had completed training. By next year, if it gets the appropriations, the MDTA program hopes to have as many as 100,000 in training. After the third year, by law, the program's future will be at the mercy of State legislatures, which will have to put up half the cost—estimated at $2,000 per trainee.

Not long ago, speaking on the "stark realities" of the technological revolution, John Snyder attacked "the myth that those who lose their jobs to automation can be retrained and put into other jobs requiring higher skills and paying more money. Not only are there fewer jobs available today, but many workers are not retrainable in the first place, due to the level of intelligence, age, or aptitude * * *. You cannot force people into retraining, nor can you manufacture jobs out of thin air."

This proposition is not disproved by the occasional miracles which do occur. The alltime champion retrainee is, beyond doubt, a meatcutter who, displaced by layoff at the Cudahy packing plant in Omaha, went into retraining and ended up as a professor of languages at the University of Omaha.

Some of the biggest unions are trying hard to upgrade their people to the future. The 793,000-member Brotherhood of Electrical Workers has put 50,000 employees through courses in modern industrial electronics. These schools are financed, roughly, one-half by the union and the other half jointly by union and management through the Joint Apprenticeship Committee. On its own, the IBEW conducts courses in the care and feeding of nuclear powerplants. Topgrade men, chosen by locals all over the country, are sent to Washington to take the course and thereafter are expected to instruct fellow members in this new atomic energy technique. Similar courses are planned in the Midwest and on the west coast.

But, for the most part, the actual things done have been isolated efforts to take a chewable mouthful. Some seem only remotely related to the looming crisis of automation but, in a larger sense, as the new technology evolves, each job saved or created is a human being rescued from the machines.

One of the more exciting efforts to meet the automation crisis is paradoxically one of the smallest. It is exciting because it is dramatic and successful, and because—although its primary purpose was a frank desire to create jobs and profits for the men who undertook it—the project also embraced a much larger and unselfish concept. It is most exciting of all because of who did it. The doers were, of all people, the 9,000 members of the Chicago Flat Janitors Union.

The janitors financed, built, own and now also sweep the halls of the most spectacular new crag on the skyline of Chicago. This is Marina City, two dazzling 60-story cylindrical towers for housing people and autos, raised on the banks of the Chicago River and soaring over a commercial complex which includes everything from a bowling alley and a legitimate theater to a 700-yacht boat basin.

The janitors were prodded into the adventure by their 68-year-old president, William L. McFetridge, who had just retired from wearing his second hat as president of the parent union, the Building Service Employees International. McFetridge had been brooding for years because Chicago, like many cities, was decaying at the center while people fled from their apartments to houses in the suburbs where, naturally, they no longer needed a janitor. He wanted jobs for janitors and other crafts in the union. And he believed that his union people owed some mystic obligation to help rejuvenate their town.

At first McFetridge felt the union might risk a few hundred thousand dollars. But he got title to a unique piece of real estate—about 3 acres on the riverbank, just outside the famous Loop. It was "lot 1, block 1" in Chicago's original 1857 city plat. He then commissioned a 36-year-old real estate promotor, Charles R. Swibel, and a 49-year-old architect, Bertrand Goldberg, to do justice to this fancy acreage. "Justice" simply ran away with itself. Eventually the union men had $3,100,000 of their own hard dollars on the line. Architect Goldberg's problem was to think big and imaginatively. Swibel's biggest problem was to mesmerize the Federal Housing Authority into a semantic rewriting the rules in order to guarantee an $8 million mortgage. The janitor's problem was to keep a collective stiff upper lip.

Today the janitors own a $36 million ultramodern city-within-a-city. Land next door to that which they bought for $18.50 a square foot now sells for $45. Three other projects, inspired by Marina City and totaling investments of something over $500 million, are underway nearby. The union could sell out for a profit of millions. Meanwhile, it has picked up 43 new jobs inside its own property and stands to pick up hundreds more in the neighboring new projects.

A more direct frontal assault on automation has been the highly controversial handiwork of a New York labor leader, Harry Van Arsdale, Jr., business manager of Local 3 of the Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. A year ago he forced New York's construction industry to accept a 25-hour week, plus 5 hours of mandatory overtime, for his 9,000 elite "A-card" members, the journeymen electrical construction workers.

Van Arsdale's pitch was that new fabricating and installation techniques have "engineered all the labor out of the job." This creates more electrical work but it doesn't create more jobs.

"They wanted to know why I was insisting on it right now when there's a lot of new building going up in the city. They thought I was just building a cushion for a lot of overtime and would kill off construction by pricing it out of the market," Van Arsdale says. "But I told them I had to do it now because if I tried it some other time, they wouldn't give it to me."

To ease the blow, Van Arsdale made certain concessions. He has agreed to take in 1,000 new apprentices in a union traditionally so closely held that about the only way to get in was to be the son of a member. He also declared there would be no abuse of overtime. "To get more, you've got to give more," he told his members.

Whether the 25-hour week will prove out to the eventual advantage of both union and employers, there is no doubt whatever that Van Arsdale believes in it as an article of faith. "America will be a much better place when everybody works 4 hours a day and attends some kind of classes 4 hours," he says.

Nor is he kidding about attending classes. The local has financed 345 scholarships for the children of members and is now conducting a campaign to prevent children of lower-paid members from dropping out of school. Seeking out latent talent and hoping to develop the union's future leaders, the local created what it calls the "futurian society," in which more than 50 college-trained members—mostly construction workers—have conducted citizenship courses for more than 2,000 other members. Because Van Arsdale believes that every man owes it to himself to learn to use his noodle, more than 5,000 members have passed through Bayberry Land, a Long Island estate where the union conducts intensive one-week seminars in such unelectrical abstractions as literature and world politics.

Still another, different but just as controversial, attack took effect last March 1 at the Fontana, Calif. plant of the Kaiser Steel Co. The device is called the long-range sharing plan. This is not a profit-sharing plan as such—and thus differs in principle from the American Motors plan. Instead, this is an agreement that company and workers will share—approximately two-thirds to the company and one-third to the workers—whatever can be saved by automation. Improvements in technique or greater efficiency in the use of time and materials.

To the union the company promises that no worker will lose his personal employment because of automated technology. Instead, if his job is eliminated, he will go into a reserve labor pool and will continue to draw his pay. Men in the reserve will be occupied by whatever chores can be found for them or, if none can be be found. will be a force ready to fill in for absentees or possibly to fabricate items which the company would normally buy outside. From the company's point of view, the reserve pool is an asset; instead of being off somewhere fishing or looking for another job, men will be ready at hand whenever expanded production requires more human bodies. It has been calculated that the reserve pool should not grow unbearably burdensome since the normal 8 percent annual rate of personnel attrition by death or retirement should about equal the rate of elimination of jobs by automation.

The proposal was submitted to the 5,500-member Kaiser local last January and the members voted it in by a majority of 74 percent of the production and maintenance crews and 90 percent of the clerical staff. The vote amounted mainly to acceptance in principle; many steel workers in the production end, by long tradition, enjoy certain bonus rights contractually described as incentive pay. Historically these have made for a chaotic mishmash of pay rates, but those entitled to such bonuses are understandably reluctant to give them up. The long range sharing plan entailed the surrender of all incentive pay for those electing to take part in it. Most of the crews with incentive pay contractual rights elected to wait and see how it worked out.

Meanwhile, a surprising thing happened. Employees and employee groups began coming in with suggestions on ways to speed things up or save materials. A work gang suggested ways to calculate estimates of needed material more closely in order to save waste. Another reported that some expensive tools had been stored out in the open and should be taken in under cover before rain, rust, and dust ruined them.

Early in May, Kaiser announced the result of the first full month's operation of the plan. The improved techniques had saved $962,000 in March—a whopping windfall of $312,000 for the 3,930 workers who had got all the way in—an average of $79 per employee. By the third month the benefits had grown to $1,083,000.

"This is a good agreement," says Marvin Miller, assistant to Steel Workers President Dave McDonald and the union officer chiefly concerned in the long negotiations. "We took our time and worked out most of the bugs."

"Of course," he adds, "it's not the full answer to automation, but nothing else is either. What this does is slow down the process of eliminating people—but we know it doesn't stop the process."

Asking what the whole machine-instead-of-man process costs is like asking how high the sky is. Secretary Wirtz calculated that the Nation already loses about $30 to $40 billion a year in unused and unusable human resources. Harry Van Arsdale uses a longer yardstick: "This country cannot afford to throw away the $90 billion in gross national product that goes unproduced because people who could work can't," he says.

John Snyder, who builds automatic machines and was introduced at the start of this article, is profoundly concerned by the human implications of what he does. He has arrived at his own unique partial answer. Every time he sells a machine to displace flesh and blood, he "taxes" it up to $1,000. The money thus set aside supports an institution unique to American industry, the American Foundation on Automation and Employment. The foundation is now making depth studies into several facets of the problem: The short workweek, early retirement, the older worker, Western European legislation on the subject, retraining, the kinds of education which will be demanded by the age of cybernation.

"What the total answers are nobody knows, but we are trying to find some of them," Snyder says. "I think it possible that the day will come when the machines will do nearly all the work and produce nearly all of our goods and services—even decisions—and, since there'll be little work for humans, the machines will also have to pay our taxes.

"This implies a total reorientation of human society. Humans will become wards of the machines, supported by the machines. But the great unanswerable question is, What, then, will happen to the souls of people? We will have to build things from the inside out. People—living, breathing, feeling and thinking people—somehow will have to learn how to do nothing in a constructive way."

[AFL–CIO American Federationist, July, 1963]

EXPANDING APPRENTICESHIP FOR ALL AMERICANS

(By John F. Henning)

(John F. Henning is Under Secretary of Labor. As Manpower Administrator of the U.S. Department of Labor, he also serves as chairman of the 15-member Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunity in Apprenticeship and Training. Formerly he served as director of the California Department of Industrial Relations and chief labor adviser to Governor Brown. Previously he was with the California AFL–CIO.)

American Negro demands for fair employment have turned sharply to a precise area of dispute: apprenticeship training.

The new emphasis is hardly surprising. Skilled journeymen are the income elite of manual labor. They look to a brightening future. All responsible projections of U.S. labor force needs cite the continuing call for skilled labor and the declining proportions of unskilled work.

Back in 1957 the U.S. Department of Labor issued its now historic projections of the labor force requirements of the 1960's. The study estimated that in 1970 America will need 42 percent more professional and technical workers than in 1960, 24 percent more sales and service personnel, 22 percent more skilled workers and 18 percent more semiskilled. The percentage of the unskilled will be down.

The prophecy presumes a full employment economy in 1970. Without economic growth, both skilled and unskilled will suffer. But not alike. For example, during the past 5 years, the national unemployment rate has approximated a disturbingly high 5.5 percent, but in this period the jobless rate among the unskilled has been at least twice that of the skilled. Whatever the course of the economy, the days of the unskilled appear numbered.

Long ago Benjamin Franklin observed that he who hath a trade hath an estate. The difficulty is that he who hath a trade usually hath a white skin.

As in Franklin's time, the one certain road to journeyman training is the apprenticeship system. To some the road seems a narrow, twisted trail, bordered by bigotry and privilege. Whatever its hazards, more than 150,000 young Americans today are found in registered apprenticeship programs.

The average apprenticeship embraces 4 years of on-the-job training and normally entails 144 hours of related classroom instruction a year.

The tri-partite forces of labor, management and government shape the character of apprenticeship training. But the shape of things does not satisfy any American sensitive to the demands of democracy.

Federal responsibility came to apprenticeship with the adoption of the Fitzgerald Act in 1937.

The Fitzgerald Act called for Federal and State government promotion of labor-management apprenticeship programs. The Government role has been noncontrolling in that actual on-the-job training has been directed by the employer, usually under union-negotiated conditions.

The Government role has been significant in that the U.S. Department of Labor and the several State apprenticeship agencies fix minimum standards for program registration. Registration entitles apprentices in approved programs to employment on federal public works projects and assures approved programs of the services of the Labor Department's Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training or the services of the pertinent state agency. Historically, Federal registration of programs has applied alike to State-sponsored as well as federally directed programs.

Thirty States manage their own apprenticeship agencies. In the remaining 20, the Federal Government alone sponsors and guides apprenticeship.

Civil rights spokesmen long have held the idea that Federal registration should be denied any program stained by ethnic discrimination. AFL-CIO President George Meany agrees. Meany backed a 1961 attempt to write such a denial into Federal law. Meany noted, however, that discrimination in apprenticeship is only part of total job discrimination. He urged enactment of a National Fair Employment Practices Act with full powers of enforcement.

But the immediate question is—what can be realized in the absence of a national FEP law?

In July 1961, then Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg announced the Department of Labor would thereafter require the inclusion of a specific nondiscrimination statement in all apprenticeship standards of firms handling Government contracts. He further declared a similar provision would be required in the registration of any new apprenticeship program regardless of its relationship to Federal works.

Labor Department action did not die with the Goldberg pronouncement. The following achievements merit attention:

I

Within the past year, the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training assigned four minority consultants to the task of opening opportunities to Negroes and other minority peoples. Now located in Washington, New York, Chicago and San Francisco, they counsel with employers, joint apprenticeship committees and unions on a regional basis to encourage acceptance of qualified minority applicants. Additionally, they advise minority groups on apprenticeship fundamentals and admission processes.

II

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz on February 27, 1963, announced the appointment of a National Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunity in Apprenticeship and Training. The committee consists of 15 members: 4 from management, 4 from labor, 5 from minority organizations and 2 from the public.

The Advisory Committee held its first meeting in Washington on May 14 under the chairmanship of the Under Secretary of Labor. The committee developed a five-point action program:

First. The establishment of apprenticeship information centers in certain critical cities throughout the Nation.

Second. The fostering of apprenticeship information centers through State apprenticeship councils wherever feasible.

Third. The creation of research programs to measure the present depth of minority participation in apprenticeship programs.

Fourth. The implementation of present antidiscrimination provisions in apprenticeship programs registered with the U.S. Department of Labor.

Fifth. The consideration of preapprenticeship programs for the training of young workers not qualified for admission to apprenticeship programs.

III

The Department of Labor, in cooperation with the District of Columbia Apprenticeship Council, the District of Columbia Commissioners and school authorities, the U.S. Employment Service, labor, and management, opened its first Apprenticeship Information Center on June 17 in the Nation's Capital.

The information center, which the Department proposes to extend throughout the Nation, offers young apprenticeship applicants personal and group counseling, aptitude testing, information on educational requirements, and related data pertaining to District apprenticeship programs. It also offers an orderly system of referral to joint apprenticeship committees and serves as a point of contact for unions, employers, and minority groups.

The values of the information center are intended for all young Americans, whatever their race, color, creed, or national origin. But the center should be of particular value to Negroes and other minorities from whom the knowledge of admission procedures and requirements often has been withheld.

IV

Secretary of Labor Wirtz issued a directive to all joint apprenticeship committees of the District of Columbia June 5, 1963, on the discrimination crisis in the District jurisdiction. The Secretary listed the following requirements for programs hoping to enjoy Federal registration rights:

1. If apprentices are not selected by a merit system alone, selections must be made in a manner that demonstrates equality of opportunity.
2. Waiting lists which reflect previous discriminatory practices must be subjected to whatever action is necessary to offset such discrimination.

V

President Kennedy on June 4, 1963, directed the Secretary of Labor to require that "admission of young workers to apprenticeship programs be on a completely nondiscriminatory basis."

VI

Following Secretary Wirtz' order of June 11, 1963, the Bureau of Apprenticeship began a 50-city check of Negro apprenticeship participation in Federal construction projects.

The varied activities here cited indicate the commitment of the Kennedy administration to equality of opportunity in apprenticeship.

The President held a national conference with 300 labor officials at the White House June 13 in which he called for the end of job discrimination at every level of union jurisdiction. This was one of a number of conferences on civil rights held with businessmen, educators, clergymen, and lawyers.

However, the President noted that genuine equality of opportunity could be meaningful only in a full employment economy.

National morality and the times will permit nothing less than full job equality, but without full employment this means sharing job scarcity regardless of race, color, creed or national origin. Job equality must mean sharing the bounty, not the scarcity of national life. But apprenticeship at its fullest would hardly have the capacity to solve youth unemployment. The problem is beyond that.

During the calendar year 1962, teenage unemployment averaged 13 percent against an overall national figure of 5.6 percent. During 1962 the average teenage unemployment total was 816,000 workers.

Between 1957 and 1962 the total number of registered apprentices in training averaged 150,000.

Apprentices in training today average only 3 percent of the 5,077,000 teenage workers in the U.S. labor force. Of the teenage total, 3,017,000 are male.

The apprenticeship solution assumes even less promise when pictured against a 50-percent mortality rate. The consistent national experience suggests that only one-half of those now in training will know journeyman status.

The proportionate place of apprenticeship must also be seen in the perspective of the awesome burdens the American economy will confront in the 1960's.

The U.S. Department of Labor tells that the economy must provide 34.5 million new jobs in the 1960's to match the demands of population growth and technological change.

The labor force will realize a net increase of 12.5 million through population expansion. This involves an increase of 26 million young workers. Death and the retirement of older workers will determine the 12.5 million net figure.

The technological impact will be greater. The Labor Department estimates the annual rate of productivity increase will be about 3 percent throughout the 1960's. This means the output per man-hour will jump about 3 percent each year. The job displacement statistics become frightening when the 3 percent productivity rate is applied to an annual average employment figure of 74 million workers. For the sixties this means the economy must provide 2.2 million new jobs each year to care for technological progress. The decade's demand will be 22 million jobs.

The statistics are germane because apprenticeship, unlike vocational education, always has been a job-related training system. Unless employers determine to hire apprentices there is no apprenticeship system. Further, unions relate the number of admitted apprentices to the number of employed journeymen.

Given full employment, apprenticeship could come to its greatness.

But at this hour, the immediate crisis of apprenticeship discrimination plagues the national conscience and cries for action.

The Kennedy administration reforms must succeed. There is hope and precedent in the experience of California.

Four years ago Gov. Edmund G. Brown named apprenticeship bigotry a special evil and called for remedies. Adoption of an FEP law in 1959 helped greatly but was not quite enough. The subtleties of apprenticeship bias often escape FEP enforcement.

California's plan has won national praise. It features (1) statewide and local committees on apprenticeship opportunities for members of minority groups; (2) local apprentice information centers for making vital data available to high school students and graduates.

The statewide opportunities committee was founded in 1960. It is comprised, like the National Advisory Committee, of labor, management, and minority group representatives and includes Government spokesmen.

The California committee last year developed two precedent-smashing surveys of the depth of discrimination.

The initial study approached the ethnic identity of the more than 20,000 apprentices receiving training in California. The second involved an ethnic sampling of journeymen who completed their apprentice training in 1955.

The first survey, based on a one-third return of questionnaires, revealed the startling evidence that there were 283 American Indians participating in California apprenticeship programs as against 150 Negroes. Mexican-Americans numbered 521, Japanese-Americans 31, and Chinese-Americans 18.

The findings suggest that Negroes number just a bit more than 2 percent of California's apprentices. In the Federal census of 1960, Negroes formed 5.8 percent of the total State population and 4.7 percent of the State's male labor force.

The State committee data on minority representation among journeymen certified in 1955 also are revealing.

A one-fourth return of inquiries pegged Negro participation at 1.5 percent.

The journeymen survey indicates the rewarding nature of skilled employment. Seventy-two percent of the graduate apprentices were earning $7,000 or more a year, while 52.4 percent were earning over $8,000 per annum. Only 11.2 percent were earning less than $6,000 per year.

Ninety percent were enjoying full employment on a yearly basis.

Both surveys confirm the skilled labor problem of the Negro. But the totals do not necessarily prove discrimination. For example, in certain survey areas Negroes had rarely, if ever, applied for apprenticeship admission. The failure could represent either resignation to bias or the absence of training qualifications.

Traditionally, Negroes have been the particular victims of hasty and frequently indifferent counseling in the high school systems. In California's soaring school population, a senior student is fortunate if he receives 1 hour of personal counseling in his final year. This obtains for any student whatever his race or skin. The national practice is scarcely different.

Each year thousands of young Americans emerge from the secondary schools without any sense of occupational direction. Adequate high school counseling would be of particular benefit to the children of Negro families recently removed from the agrarian South. These young people suffer the same lack of skilled labor tradition as did most of the 19th century European immigrants who poured into America searching for freedom and opportunity.

But where immigrant Europeans could seek manual labor in coal and steel and maritime employment, today's young Negro faces a labor market in which there is little future for the unskilled.

Not only because of discrimination but also because of lack of skills, Negro unemployment is consistently twice the overall national average. In the calendar year 1962 the rate of unemployment among Negroes was 11 percent against a national average of 5.6 percent. Negroes represent 11 percent of all American workers but represent 22 percent of all unemployed.

As indicated earlier, economic growth is the first requisite of full employment in the 1960's, the full employment that will give job opportunity to all Americans.

Economic growth, however, will not find employment for the unskilled.

America needs an active labor market policy to accompany the fiscal and monetary policies of growth. An active labor market policy would directly answer the training needs of the U.S. labor force. The rate of unemployment among unskilled workers in the calendar year 1962 was 12 percent against the national average of 5.6 percent.

An active labor market policy also would end racial and ethnic discrimination in employment.

But it would do more than that. It would also achieve these ambitions:

First. An updated labor market informations service for workers and employers.

Second. An employment service warning system for impending technological changes and other changes causing serious job displacement.

Third. An effective informational service for career guidance and counseling.

Fourth. An educational system, vocational as well as academic, which would answer current and upcoming manpower needs.

Fifth. An expanded apprenticeship training program.

Sixth. An improved system of job placement services.

Seventh. A program for aiding the mobility of workers.

In summary, it is obvious that Negro discrimination in apprenticeship has its unique and general features. The Negro suffers because of his skin. But he suffers also because he often is an unskilled worker in an economy which has limited place for the unskilled. Finally, he suffers because he is a worker in a society which has not yet found the way to full employment.

The issue of employment discrimination is not peculiar to apprenticeship. It will be found everywhere, including the banking, insurance, and newspaper worlds. It will be found in the professions and the religions of America. Indeed, discrimination is often strongest in sectors of nonunion employment.

American labor must persist in its efforts to realize full employment and the abolition of the last measure of job discrimination. The efforts must reach to the State councils, local councils, and local unions.

The matter is moral. For more than 100 years labor has served as the social conscience of the Nation. Unpurchased and unafraid, it has led the everlasting struggle to attain a society in which bread, security, and freedom shall be the right of all Americans whatever their racial, religious, or ethnic identity.

Labor holds priceless credentials of sacrifice and struggle. It must use these credentials now as mortal conflict shakes the Nation. The honor and duty of leadership rest with the trade union movement.

Where Labor Stands

"There is general agreement that the demand for skilled workers will grow very rapidly in the next decade, while the opportunities for unskilled workers will continue to shrink.

"Therefore our interest—and the national interest—must look to an across-the-board increase in apprenticeship training.

"In order to insure—as we must and we should—full opportunity for Negroes and other minorities to enter these skilled trades, we must have full opportunity for all candidates.

"Let me put it this way: We are opposed to the exclusion of any candidate for apprenticeship on grounds of race, creed, color, or national origin. We are also opposed to the selection of any candidate on those grounds. We want a place for every qualified candidate, on an open and equal basis. We believe this bill, with the improvements I have suggested, will help toward that end; and I repeat, we endorse it.

"The problem demands much more than a piecemeal approach. It demands vigorous action to stimulate employment; it demands a strong, enforceable fair employment practices law.

"The legislative branch of our Government has lagged far behind the executive and judicial branches in recognizing the imperative need for wiping our segregation and discrimination. It is our hope that the present bill represents only a first step in redressing the balance."—AFL–CIO President George Meany, testifying before a House Education and Labor Subcommittee on a bill to promote equal opportunity in apprenticeship programs, August 21, 1961.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASIN PLANS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6016) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO LIMIT DEBATE ON PENDING MEASURE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader whether he has given further consideration to limiting debate on amendments on motions, and on the bill itself.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question asked by my distinguished colleague, the minority leader, he will recall that we had a conversation earlier today on the subject. With his permission and with the permission of the Senate I should like at this time to propound a unanimous-consent request, as follows:

That beginning at the conclusion of the morning business tomorrow, 30 minutes of debate be allowed on each amendment to be offered to the pending legislation, and that the time be equally divided between the proponent of the bill and the majority leader or the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara]; that 2 hours of debate be allowed on the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Reserving the right to object, I ask the distinguished Senator from New York whether that meets with his agreement on the amendment which he proposes to offer, and whether it would be regarded as germane to the pending bill.

Mr. JAVITS. I have an amendment to the bill. It is numbered 144. It relates to the Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway in New York State. I could propound a parliamentary inquiry, and the question could be settled that way; the Senator could make the unanimous-consent agreement apply to the amendments at the desk. I propound the parliamentary inquiry as to whether or not amendment No. 144 is considered germane to the bill, within the concept of the unanimous-consent agreement which is now sought.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator from New York will yield——

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would be perfectly willing to have this amendment included in the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would suggest one modification. I believe that on the motion to recommit an hour and a half ought to be allowed, with 45 minutes on each side.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would be happy to ask for 3 hours on the bill, instead of 2 hours, to make sure that sufficient time will be allotted to the motion to recommit.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then an hour would be allowed on each amendment; is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. A half-hour on each amendment, and 3 hours on the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. That is agreeable, so long as it is understood that the amendment I intend to offer is preserved.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; I would be willing to make it 40 minutes on each amendment, with 20 minutes to a side.

Mr. President, I modify my unanimous consent request to provide for 1 hour of debate on each amendment, 30 minutes to a side, the time to be divided equally between the proponent of the amendment and the majority leader or the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara]; and 2 hours of debate on the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. It is understood that the amendment which I shall offer is considered to be within the context of that agreement. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. I add also the usual conditions with respect to germaneness, and so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, later reduced to writing, is as follows:

Unanimous-Consent Agreement

Ordered, That, effective on Tuesday, July 30, 1963, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6016) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader or the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara]: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designed by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill (except amendment No. 144 by Mr. Javits which shall be in order) shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, yesterday I had occasion to have an interchange on the civil rights situation in the country today, which I believe is pertinent to what we face today.

Yesterday a distinguished member of the other body, the chairman of its Committee on Education and Labor, made a statement in New York at the church, of which he is the pastor, which, generally speaking, said that white leaders should take a secondary position in the civil rights struggle.

Normally one would not react to such a statement. But I was asked for a comment; and as it seems to typify the civil rights struggle, and as my credentials in that struggle are considered fairly good, I believe it might be useful to say a word about it.

My response to the request for comment was that I thought a host of liberals, white and Negro alike, had worked far too hard and too long on civil rights to accept the proposition that there are any second or first places in this struggle, either for whites or for Negroes.

I ask this important question, which I believe is central to the civil rights debate,and probably it is a question most apposite for a person like myself to ask.

Since when has a minority succeeded by alienating a friendly majority? The answer is obvious. A minority, to succeed, must keep the loyalty and support of a friendly majority. That is perhaps best illustrated by what will happen in the struggle which will be involved in passing even the present President's limited civil rights package, and will be further illustrated when we seek to add a provision against discrimination in jobs—what is popularly called the FEPC provision—or a provision giving general authority for the Attorney General to sue in civil rights cases; for example, in such cases as those that brought on the Birmingham disorders and which militated so very heavily against the United States in the world and shocked the conscience of our country.

Since that essentially related to the subject of police activity, it could be reached by general authority of the Attorney General to sue in civil rights cases.

Measures of that character, added to the President's package—and even the President's package itself—will be difficult enough to pass without anybody who is sympathetic and friendly and desirous of helping, being ruled out of the struggle.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, appearing in the New York Tribune related to these occurrences of yesterday, may also be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune,
July 29, 1963]

POWELL'S BIAS-FIGHT DICTUM: A BACK-SEAT ROLE FOR WHITE LIBERALS

(By Earl G. Talbott)

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat, of New York, rattled a civil rights saber at "white liberals" yesterday, telling a Harlem rally that white supporters must accept a secondary role in the struggle and calling for accelerated demonstrations by Negroes, but without violence.

His remarks drew an immediate rebuttal from Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, who pointed out that "there are no second or first places in this struggle for liberals or Negroes."

In his speech, Mr. POWELL, who heads the House Education and Labor Committee, also threatened to bypass normal procedure and seek a showdown in the House on a bill establishing a fair employment practices commission and another one to withhold Federal funds from segregated schools at every level of education.

"No white man, any more, is going to tell me what I should do in the field of civil rights," the Congressman told a meeting at the Abyssinian Baptist Church, 132 West 138th Street.

"They never have, and never will," he added, somewhat contradictorily.

Referring to what he called "the black revolution," Mr. POWELL said white liberals took the lead in its first phase, which lasted for several years, but now, in its secondary stage, Negroes had taken over, and no effort by the whites to regain control would be tolerated.

"We are not antiwhite," he insisted. "We welcome the support, physically, morally, mentally, spiritually, and financially, of whites. But the white liberal has got to make up his mind he must accept a secondary role.

"The white man might as well make up his mind all he's going to be facing from now on is black unilateral action. On tomorrow at 12:30 I will consult my leaders—A. Phillip Randolph, Martin Luther King, Roy Wilkins, Whitney Young, Jim Farmer, John Lewis, and I will do as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor what they tell me to do."

(Mr. Randoph is president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, the Reverend Dr. King is president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Mr. Wilkins is executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Mr. Young is executive director of the National Urban League, Mr. Farmer is national director of the Congress of Racial Equality, and Mr. Lewis is national chairman of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee.)

Asked to comment, Senator JAVITS, one of the country's leading liberal lawmakers, said:

"A whole host of liberals, white and Negro alike, have worked far too hard and too long on civil rights to accept Congressman POWELL's statement of yesterday proposing to relegate white liberals to second place in the civil rights struggle. There are no second or first places in this struggle for liberals or Negroes.

"Also, the fight for civil rights is, and has been, traditionally bipartisan. It will take all the friends of civil rights to bring full success now.

"Since when has a minority succeeded by alienating a friendly majority? It will be hard enough to win in the Congress for the President's civil rights package, FEPC and other urgently needed civil rights legislation without barring any sincere friend of the cause.

"There is neither room nor need for Negro or other exclusivity in civil rights. It can only bring chauvinism and change the character of the struggle.

"The majority of the country, which is white, is being won to civil rights so much by the fair, wise, and broad understanding of the Negroes and of Negro leadership and by the Negroes' determination to fight for the true character of America.

"It is a time when this policy is succeeding. Let it not be jettisoned on the threshold of full success."

In his speech Mr. POWELL referred to a civil rights conference last week at which the 40 leaders present rejected his proposal for a showdown on FEPC and the school fund cutoff plan. But, he added, all but three of them were white. One of those at this "nearly lily white" talk said he didn't want any "unilateral action," Mr. POWELL said.

Both bills have passed Mr. Powell's committee, but not much chance is given them of clearing the House Rules Committee in the usual way. If the Congressman does jump the gun and invoke his right as a committee chairman to force action through the Calendar Wednesday procedure, he is apt to provoke a bitter preliminary battle which, in the opinion of parliamentary observers, would lead to nothing but an angry stalemate.

Under Calendar Wednesday, which is rarely used, a committee-approved bill can be offered for a vote without clearing the Rules Committee, but action on it must be completed on the same legislative day or it is dead for the rest of the session.

The procedure is called Calendar Wednesday because Wednesday is the day set aside for calling up committee-approved bills. In 1909 it supplanted the "morning hour," a fixed period of 60 minutes.

Mr. POWELL and his adherents want to get the FEPC bill (which establishes a commission to guard against racial discrimination in hiring) to a vote on or before the mass civil rights march on Washington, August 28.

Others, however, are afraid of a knockdown struggle in Congress on just one or two phases of the issue and prefer to concentrate their big guns on President Kennedy's omnibus civil rights package, which does not include either of the proposals being pushed by Mr. POWELL.

It is considered highly unlikely that the President's program could get action in either House or Senate by August 28. This week, committees of both Chambers will continue public hearings and are expected to write their own recommendations within a few days.

At yesterday's rally, Mr. POWELL voiced his approval of the mass march but said the participants should be confined to registered voters, except for persons from areas where the Negro hasn't got the vote.

"It shows a lack of self-respect and an insult to our racial dignity for a man or a woman to make a trip 500 miles from New York to Washington, D.C., who won't make a trip 5 miles downtown to become a registered voter," he said.

At a press conference at the church, he said he favored a quota system to get Negroes jobs in construction and other industries as "the only way to break the backlog of jobs overdue." This would not be a permanent solution, he conceded, and added that he opposed preferential treatment for members of his race.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the question with respect to the situation to which I have referred, which occurred yesterday, goes even deeper than that, because an interesting reflection is cast upon it by a very comprehensive survey undertaken by Newsweek magazine, which appears in its current issue.

The Newsweek survey, taken by the famous pollster, Louis Harris, indicates interesting attitudes on the part of the Negro community, which, at the present state of the struggle, bear great note so far as the country is concerned.

In the first place, it is indicated that a substantial minority—22 percent—believe that if the Negro is to get justice in this country, he has only himself to rely on; that there may even be violence in the course of trying to obtain justice; and that the white man will yield only to force. I would describe this position as generally the extreme point of view.

The important thing to me, is that 63 percent of the Negroes believe the white man will come around eventually to persuasion; 52 percent think the white man's attitude toward the Negro has improved over the past 5 years and 73 percent are optimistic about the next 5 years through an alliance with the majority of the country. To me, this is the most hopeful aspect of the survey and bears out, on the whole, the discipline, understanding, and great wisdom which have been evidenced by the quality of the protests and demonstrations undertaken under the leadership and inspiration of such men as Martin Luther King, Roy Wilkins, Whitney Young, James Farmer, and others, who have led in this very determined but, at the same time, understanding way, and which, on the whole, has not offended our laws and has not resulted in any major violence, certainly on the part of the demonstrators.

There are laws in the Southern States which purport to be offended; but I am not speaking of them because I believe that most of us as lawyers understand that although it will take some time, perhaps, to cause them to be invalidated in the Federal courts, laws which seek to perpetuate discrimination and segregation, and which establish special rules of conduct for Negroes on account of color or to suppress their lawful determination to fight for the expression of their grievances, will not long stand in the courts of our country and in our day.

However, we do draw certain very clear lessons from the status of the civil rights struggle today. I should like to spell those out now. I shall address myself to them in even greater detail as we go along. But the occurrence of yesterday so impressed itself upon my mind that I should like to spell out some of the things which appear important to me at this time in the struggle.

First, as I said when I began, there is no exclusivity about it. In short, the help of all Americans, white and Negro, is welcome in this struggle. Their help is needed. It will be difficult enough to pass a law in any case; so every ounce of talent, every ounce of skill, every ounce of strength will be needed in that cause.

An exclusivity that will confine itself solely to Negroes will jeopardize the hope of success, will bring about a program of chauvinism which will hurt the struggle.

The second tenet is clear, because of the gains already made by pursuing the kind of policy I have described—of no violence, but of peaceful protest demonstrations, and a testing of laws which, in many cases, are either directly unconstitutional or anachronistic, and which seek to inhibit the authority of the individual and the right of the individual to seek redress of grievances by proper and lawful means. That is the second tenet—no violence.

The third tenet, which comes from testimony taken before the Subcommittee on Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I have the honor to be a member, is that accelerated training is vital. It now appears that almost the whole structure of equal rights in this country must ultimately be built upon the economics which are involved. The most striking and depressing factors are the rate of unemployment among Negroes, which is somewhat more than twice that among whites; the annual per capita income of Negroes, which on the whole hovers around 50 percent of that of whites; the fact that in the higher echelons of management and the professions, Negroes are all too infrequently present, certainly not nearly of the size and consequence which are warranted by the proportion of their total number to the population of the Nation.

It is most marked in the higher professional and executive occupations.

As one seeks, as I have personally sought, to open up opportunities, one is constantly met with the claim that there is an inadequate number of qualified persons. So I would say that accelerated training for persons in all levels of the economy, especially Negroes, is important.

The training field is one place where we can make up for the accumulated wrongs which have been visited upon the Negro community for many years, including the denial of opportunity. So I would expect that in our governmental training activities and in the training activities of private business, whether profit or nonprofit, a special effort would be placed upon giving the Negro opportunities for training. There I should like to see that emphasis materially exceed the percentage which Negroes represent in the population.

It is for that reason that the struggle over apprenticeship plans and apprenticeship rules, as, for example, in the building and construction industry, is so critically important and so elementary a part of the civil rights struggle. Although I realize that in some quarters this position may be taken in order to seek to discredit unions and find fault with them by those who are against unions, nonetheless justice must be done in an evenhanded way. The requirements which we would impose generally must be imposed wherever they seem to be required. There are some unions which have been remiss in this particular area, both in providing an opportunity for jobs and membership in the unions, and particuarly in providing opportunities for apprenticeship training, in which unions are directly involved with the employers, and which will heavily determine the economic opportunities available to Negroes.

So in the case of accelerated training, I would strongly favor specially weighting in favor of the Negro at this time.

On the other hand, when it comes to job equities, I could not favor such a program, because I cannot see any excuse for discrimination against the white worker or displacing the white worker in order to give a Negro a job. It is our job to provide training and equal opportunity. Training makes for equal opportunity, whereas job quotas impose a form of discrimination.

I think there is a very clear line of demarcation. I am favorable to seeing, where the Government is involved, not only the affording of opportunities, but also sustaining a position during the training period, to a degree which would collectively and properly carry Negroes into fields where they would have a better opportunity, because they would have an equal opportunity, having been equally trained. But I cannot see the justification for job quotas which have built into them their own form of discrimination.

Finally—and perhaps this is the other of the two salient points I wish to make today—there is a great opportunity opening up for American business and for the private sector in respect of the civil rights situation. I know that American business, especially big American business, is looking around now very carefully and very interestedly in order to determine what opportunities which have been closed to Negroes could now be opened to them.

I think that is all to the good; and, first and foremost, I very strongly commend this acceleration of training and the weighting of training in favor of Negroes, who for all these decades have been denied these opportunities.

I also hope for an enlargement in management's point of view in order to accommodate the use in higher echelons of management of Negroes who have that capacity, or at least seem likely to have that potential, and to give them training of the type which will enable them to function in the higher echelons of management. In short, there is an extraordinary dearth of Negroes who serve as vice presidents in all the echelons of American business—in banks, in insurance companies, in great industrial companies, in transportation companies—a dearth entirely inconsistent with the fact that Negroes constitute 10 percent of our population. Indeed, generally speaking, I believe it is only in government, where, in late years, Negroes have begun to serve in important policymaking positions, and there is recognition of the fact that Negroes are an important part of the American community. This is equally true in the leadership of trade unions, although I happen to know some extraordinarily fine examples of trade union leadership by Negroes. There, too, the opportunities are great, and they should be made available. However, in my opinion, the primary emphasis should be in the business area, where a very great deal can be done on the basis of self-help and mutual cooperation in order to open to Negroes doors which heretofore have been closed to them. Those doors should now be opened to all, so as really to afford a concrete basis for equality of opportunity and equality of enjoyment of the privileges of American life to all our citizens, regardless of their color.

Furthermore, Mr. President, this policy of presenting most forcefully to the Nation the desires and demands of the Negro community—a policy which, on the whole, up to now has had extraordinary success, and which, I agree with three-fourths of the Negro community, will have even more extraordinary successes in the days to come—depends even more heavily upon the fact that what is, with sincerity of conviction, sought to be developed is the truly fundamental belief in justice and fairness by the great majority of the American people. These have been the hallmarks of the success of the Negro community; and I see the danger of exclusivity, whether in the Black Muslim movement or solely in manifestations of extremism, including the use of violence or in other ways.

So I realize the very great values which have been gained, and which are to be gained in the days ahead, by bringing the country to a realization of the moral force of what is advocated and its rightness in terms of the social order, the tranquillity of our people, the efficiency of our governmental structure, and the soundness of our economy.

Recently, at my request, a study was made by the Council of Economic Advisers, which arrived at the conclusion that the affording of equal economic opportunity, in terms of the development of the economic potentials of the Negro community of the United States, would add from $13 to $17 billion to the Nation's gross national product, which today is so far behind.

Mr. President, in this frame of reference, I do not believe either the country or the Congress has anything to fear from the demonstration which will take place on August 28 in Washington, D.C. This morning, I noticed that a distinguished Catholic organization has decided to urge its members to be present on that occasion; in fact, more and more I observe that this is an across-the-board, cooperative venture for all those in American life, Negroes and whites alike, who wish to solemnize by their presence, their prestige, and their voices, the fact that justice, though long deferred, should at last be done our Negro citizens, and who believe this surely will work out for the general good so long as there is no sense of exclusivity about it, and so long as the emphasis is placed on developing the finest attributes of the character of all the American people.

Mr. President, in my judgment, this development will be greatly assisted and helped if the American private enterprise system will realize the indispensable part it can play in this entire effort. For example, I am very much interested in the testimony on the public accommodations bill now being presented before the Senate Committee on Commerce. However, there seems to be very little realization by some of the true meaning of freedom. Some who oppose the bill argue that there should be freedom either to give or to deny to the Negroes the services or facilities of restaurants, hotels, motels, or places of amusement which are in the stream of interstate commerce. But, Mr. President, those who take that position forget all too often that true freedom involves exercise of all the responsibilities which freedom brings—including the responsibility of groups of merchants or all those in particular areas, in functioning as true Americans and as merchants, not to engage in discrimination or segregations, and to seek the restraint of law only in order to deal with the recalcitrant 10 percent, rather than to assume that such attempts at inhibition represent the actual feelings of all Americans.

Long ago freedom was defined as the exercise of responsibility under the Constitution—not a license, under the guise of freedom, to destroy the Constitution and the securities and safeguards it gives.

So, Mr. President, I hope very much that we shall keep in focus what is occurring. Notwithstanding the tensions and intensities of the hour, which justifiably are great, in view of the indignities and injustices which have been heaped upon the Negroes in America, and notwithstanding all the deep emotions, which are understandable, and the intensity of the demonstrations, I hope that nonetheless the great majority of the American people, even including at present three-fourths of the Negro community, will have confidence that the character of our Nation is high and moral. I believe that the great majority of the American people are determined that this issue will be resolved on the basis of justice and fairness, and that there is also widespread recognition of the fact that 90 percent of all Americans understandably have a very great interest in discharging their responsibilities in such a way that freedom may truly be realized by this 10 percent of our population who are being denied the finest benefits of freedom, and who wish to be treated in the way that all other Americans are.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 4638) to promote the orderly transfer of the Executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 4638) to promote the orderly transfer of the Executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASIN PLANS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6016) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be considered original text for the purpose of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield without losing his right to the floor so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McNAMARA. I would be happy to yield to the majority leader for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the measure before us, H.R. 6016, provides for additional authorizations of appropriations for existing comprehensive river basin projects, and authorizes the start of several new projects.

It is normal for the Congress to consider a rivers and harbors omnibus bill in the even years at 2- to 4-year intervals.

While nothing prevents either House from originating such measures at any time, practice has established that this interval is sound.

Now we have here, in effect, a junior omnibus bill containing 17 projects, with a total authorization of $609,547,000.

I would like to explain to the Senate the circumstances which brought this bill to us.

Last year the Public Works Committee, under the chairmanship of the late Senator from New Mexico, Dennis Chavez, after several months of work, prepared an omnibus rivers and harbors bill, authorizing a total of 205 projects, costing $3,553,519,800.

Included in this bill was sufficient monetary authorization to allow work to continue through fiscal year 1965 on 11 river basins:

	Millions
Arkansas River Basin	$182
Brazos River Basin	21
Central and Southern Florida	30
Columbia River Basin	226
Missouri (Corps of Engineers)	140
Ohio (Corps of Engineers)	120
Upper Mississippi	31
West Branch, Susquehanna River	5
White River Basin	11
Missouri River (Department of Interior)	100
Great Lakes-Hudson Waterway	1
Total	905

In addition, the committee determined that good and sufficient reason supported the inclusion in the bill of the following projects: New Hope Dam and Reservoir, Cape Fear River Basin, North Carolina; Flint River, Georgia; Waurika Dam and Reservoir, Oklahoma; Devils Jump Dam and Reservoir, Kentucky-Tennessee; Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Montana; Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir, Idaho.

The Senate sustained the committee on these projects, added the Trotters Shoals project on the Senate floor, and sent the bill to the House. Had the bill been accepted by the House, or a reasonable compromise worked out in conference, it would have been unnecessary for us to have to consider H.R. 6016 today.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator from Florida correctly understand that all of the projects added by the Senate Committee last year and excluded in conference had been approved by the Corps of Engineers and were ready for authorization?

Mr. McNAMARA. That was true of all projects.

Mr. HOLLAND. That was true of all projects which were included in the committee report, in the committee bill, and also the project which was added on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct. In the case of Trotters Shoals, the project had been approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and was subsequently approved by the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McNAMARA. But the judgment of the House was to eliminate the authorizations of additional appropriations for continuing the river basins, which made it necessary to write legislation this year.

Further, the House insisted that the added Senate projects should not be included.

The argument of the House on this matter was that it had not as yet held hearings.

In conference the Senate receded to this position after receiving what it considered an iron-clad agreement that the House would hold hearings early this year.

The written conference report stated:

> EARLY HEARINGS
>
> The managers on the part of the House made a commitment that the Committee on Public Works of the House would hold public hearings as soon as practicable after the next Congress convenes on the following projects which were considered by the conferees and which are not included in this conference report: Cape Fear River Basin, N.C.; Flint River, Ga.; the South Fork of the Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn.; Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Mont.; Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir, Snake River, Idaho; Waurika Reclamation project, Oklahoma; Savannah River-Duke Power Co., South Carolina and Georgia, and Trotter's Shoals Reservoir, Savannah River.

But the chairman of House conferees and of the House subcommittee which handled that bill gave the complete verbal understanding in his report to the House on October 12, 1962, when he said:

> We recognize that the basin authorizations must be taken up early next year. With the consideration of the basin authorizations we are going to take up the Duke Power project, the Trotters Shoals project, along with, if I may say, the Devil's Jump project, the Knowles project, the Flint River project, the Cape Fear project, the Burns Creek project, and the Waurika project, along with the basins. We have promised and reduced it to writing in the conference report that early in January we will have further hearings in order to bring them out to the floor in advance of any consideration that the Appropriations Committee will give to these projects in the late spring or early summer.

That is a direct quotation by the chairman of the conference.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I believe last year a project of the Duke Power Co. was added on the floor of the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. McNAMARA. The Trotters Shoals project was added.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Duke Power Co. is a private corporation which was authorized to build the project.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Duke power project was added in the House. The Trotters Shoals project was added in the Senate.

Does that answer the Senator's question in regard to that portion of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Is it not true that when the bill came from the Senate committee the item was in the bill?

Mr. McNAMARA. That is correct. The Trotters Shoals project was in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Since then the Duke Power Co. has signified that it does not wish to go forward with building the dam; is that not true?

Mr. McNAMARA. I do not have that information.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I do. I have a letter from them stating they do not care to go forward with the building of the dam this year.

Mr. McNAMARA. The committee did not have that information.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is the reason why the item is not in the bill. That is what I wished to bring out.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON. It was at their own request. They are furnishing their own money. They ask that it not be included this year. Is that not true?

Mr. McNAMARA. I think that is true. This is the portion which was put in by the House, and not by the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON. They wrote to me and gave me the information that they did not want it this year. I think they will want it in the future.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, thus the Senate accepted the House position of eliminating the Senate-added projects—with the full understanding that the House agreed to hold hearings early and report a bill.

The House did, in fact, hold hearings this year.

But not until June 24 did the House adopt a river basin measure—and that one contained only increased authorizations for current programs, the very authorizations which were taken out of last year's measure.

As for the new projects which the Senate included last year, not a one was included.

Recognizing the need for prompt action, a meeting of the Public Works Committee was called 7 days after receiving the bill from the House, but because of the July 4 recess we were unable to obtain a quorum.

The earliest date at which the committee could meet to act was July 17.

We are handling this measure within 4 weeks after receiving it from the House, despite a lengthy recess. It took the House nearly 6 months to send the bill to us.

The bill we received from the House called for authorizing additional appropriations of $784 million for 11 basin projects.

The Public Works Committee determined after consultation with the Corps of Engineers that three of these projects need no money for fiscal year 1964, and that the remainder need only $161 million for 1964.

The decision of the committee was to reduce the authorizations to the amounts needed for fiscal year 1964, in order to have the time next year to review these continuing projects to determine what their proper future should be. We did not take time to review them this year.

It was then the judgment of the committee to amend the bill further by adding those projects which the Senate adopted last year, and by including two small, new projects which are basically technical corrections of continuing work.

The Senate additions totalled $448,547,000, and are $175 million under the House figure.

The projects which the Senate added, with estimated cost, are:

Cape Fear River Basin	$25,143,000
Trotters Shoals Dam and Reservoir, Ga.-S.C.	78,700,000
Flint River, Ga	63,200,000
Dardanelle lock and dam, Ark	404,000
Waurika Dam and Reservoir, Okla	25,100,000
Missouri River Bank Stabilization	3,000,000
Devil's Jump Dam and Reservoir, Ky.-Tenn	151,000,000
Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Mont	50,000,000
Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir, Idaho	52,000,000
Total	448,547,000

New Hope Dam and Reservoir, Cape Fear River Basin, N.C., estimated cost, $25,143,000, benefit-cost ratio 2.5. This project will provide needed flood control and will augment low stream flows along the main stem of the Cape Fear River, and provide a valuable water supply for municipal and industrial use.

Trotters Shoals Dam and Reservoir, Ga.-S.C., estimated cost $78,700,000, benefit-cost ratio 1.54. This project provides optimum development of the water resources between Clark Hill Reservoir and Hartwell Dam, and is needed to serve effectively the future power load of the area, and for increased demands for recreation facilities.

Flint River, Ga., plan provides ultimately for five reservoirs for multiple purposes in the basin. Only one, Spewrell Bluff Reservoir, is authorized in this bill. Estimated cost $63,200,000, benefit-cost ratio 1.2. This reservoir is to be undertaken as the initial step in the development for flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, and allied purposes.

Dardanelle lock and dam modification, Arkansas, estimated cost $404,000, to provide Federal payment for relocation of sewage facilities for the city of Russellville, Ark., necessitated by construction of this multiple-purpose project on the Arkansas River.

Waurika Dam and Reservoir, Okla., estimated cost $25,100,000, benefit-cost ratio 1.9, multiple-purpose project for flood control, water supply, recreation, and other purposes in a semiarid area, with incidental irrigation feature. Over 50 percent of the cost of the project will be repaid by local interests.

Missouri River bank stabilization, estimated cost $3 million. Technical amendment to permit correction of severe bank caving below Garrison Reservoir, N. Dak., caused by degradation, caused by power releases from the reservoir, causing loss of valuable farm land.

Devil's Jump Dam and Reservoir, Ky.-Tenn., estimated cost $151 million, benefit-cost ratio 1.2. Multiple-purpose dam and reservoir for power, flood control, and other purposes on Big South Fork of Cumberland River. Needed for development of the water resources of the Cumberland River Basin.

Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Mont., total estimated cost $247 million, benefit-cost ratio 1.3. This bill authorizes an initial amount of $50 million for partial accomplishment. This is a major unit of the plan for the Columbia River Basin, and is essential for development of the water resources of that basin.

Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir, Snake River, Idaho, estimated cost $52 million, benefit-cost radio 1.7. Snake River is one of the major tributaries of the Columbia River. Floods damage residential and commercial property and irrigated land. Additional conservation of water for multiple uses is urgently needed.

These projects have been studied by the Corps of Engineers, who have found them feasible and have recommended them.

They have been studied by the Senate, which has found them feasible and adopted them.

They have been studied by the House Public Works Committee, which has taken no action on them.

They are called controversial, but will be no less controversial next year, or the year after.

The question is not controversy but feasibility. These are feasible projects which would serve the best interests of the people, and should be adopted.

I hope this will serve as a brief explanation of the position of the Committee on Public Works. We understand there are some amendments to be offered when the bill is considered tomorrow. We are prepared to proceed with consideration, according to the unanimous-consent agreement reached earlier today.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have an amendment which was submitted to the Senate in behalf of the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], and myself, which we have discussed with the chairman of the committee. I believe an agreement can be reached and that it can be disposed of in a short time, without the necessity for a rollcall vote. If it pleases the chairman of the committee, the Senate could consider that amendment at this time.

Mr. McNAMARA. I think first we must consider the necessity of agreeing to the committee amendments, prior to consideration of other amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments have been agreed to.

Mr. McNAMARA. Then I have no objection to considering the other amendment at this time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, my explanation will be brief. I invite the attention of the Senate to the final proviso in H.R. 6016, which I mentioned briefly the other day when I was discussing the possibility that the proposed legislation might be brought to the attention of the Senate. Since that time I have conferred with a number of Senators from the Missouri River Basin States and with the chairman of the committee, and we believe our objection to the bill can be taken care of by a simple amendment, which is printed and on the desks of Senators, identified as amendment No. 142. I shall read the amendment for the information of the Senate.

> On page 9, starting on line 11, strike out the words "*Provided*, That no part of the funds authorized" and the remainder of the sentence down to and including "by Act of Congress" on line 16. Insert a period after the word "Interior" on line 11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator please send his amendment to the desk?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment on behalf of myself and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, starting on line 11, it is proposed to strike out the words "*Provided*, That no part of the funds authorized" and the remainder of the sentence down to and including "by Act of Congress" on line 16. Insert a period after the word "Interior" on line 11.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to leave intact the good work of the Committee on Public Works in the Senate, insofar as it proceeds to authorize new projects, and so far as the full text of the bill is concerned. It would also leave intact the existing arrangement and prevailing authorizations, which in the main were made in 1944 and 1946 in the Flood Control Acts, as amended at that time, wherein most of the presently authorized units in the Missouri River Basin were authorized, which have been printed in Senate Document No. 191.

These projects in the main were authorized under terms of the Pick-Sloan plan, which brought together a marriage between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers of the Army for the development of major dams on the main stem of the Missouri River, in the Missouri River Valley, and on its various tributaries in the nine States which represent the Missouri River Basin.

The projects which are of especial concern to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and myself, and other Senators from this area, do not involve the big multiple-purpose main stem dams, which necessarily must be authorized by Congress specifically and identified as such, but are the smaller supporting projects authorized by previous legislation.

We do not feel that the Congress should at this time in one fell swoop deauthorize all these projects.

I suggest there are a great many of these projects, some of which are moving forward and some of which are completely dormant. In my own State of South Dakota there are 15 such projects which would be deauthorized by the present language of this bill. For the purpose of identifying them, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list of the projects in my own State which fall in this category.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH DAKOTA PROJECTS REQUIRING REAUTHORIZATION IF H.R. 6016 PASSES UNAMENDED

Compilation of units in S. Doc. 191 which, on the basis of current planning, are known to have a high degree of identifiability with original plan

Identity		Estimated cost		Acreage		Kilowatts		Reservoir capacity		State
S. Doc. 191	Present	S. Doc. 191	Present	S. Doc. 191	Present	S. Doc. 191	Present	S. Doc. 191	Present	
1. Fort Randall Unit [1]	Crazy Horse unit	$75,000	$137,000	900	500					South Dakota.
2. Culdesac unit	Culdesac unit	395,000	2,902,000	5,660	5,400					Do.
3. Fort Thompson unit	Fort Thompson unit	551,000	2,825,000	7,710	7,500					Do.
4. Big Bend unit	Grass Rope unit	580,000	1,355,000	8,520	4,300					Do.
5. Greenwood unit [1]	Greenwood unit	217,000	1,608,000	4,210	4,900					Do.
6. Red Cloud unit	Iron Nation unit	162,000	906,000	1,850	1,700					Do.
7. Joe Creek unit	Joe Creek unit	509,000	2,356,000	6,560	4,400					Do.
8. La Roche unit	La Roche unit	194,000	1,143,000	2,720	1,800					Do.
9. Rousseau unit	Rousseau unit	305,000	1,380,000	3,310	2,200					Do.
10. Tower unit [1]	Tower unit	105,000	444,000	2,130	2,000					Do.
11. Yankton unit [1]	Yankton unit	156,000	438,000	2,390	1,100					Do.
12. Belle Fourche pumping	Belle Fourche pump	276,455	1,003,000	5,030	5,000					Do.
13. Rapid Valley irrigation										
14. Shadehill irrigation										
15. Pine Ridge irrigation										

[1] 15 projects total; 4 subject to feasibility studies currently.

Mr. MUNDT. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter received by me from Commissioner Dominy, under date of July 25, 1963, in response to a telephone request I made of him on July 24, in which he analyzes and identifies and lists the number of projects of this type which are presently authorized in the Missouri River basin.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D.C., July 25, 1963.

Hon. KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: In response to your telephone request of July 24, 1963, we enclose two tabulations which, when taken together, represent a listing of those units of the Missouri River basin project now considered to be economically justified and which were authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944, as amended. Although the tabulations do not group the units by States, we have indicated the location of each unit in the right-hand margin of the several sheets.

Analysis of the tables, as thus amended, shows that the several units are distributed by States as follows:

Colorado	2
Kansas	2
Montana	53
Nebraska	3
North Dakota	13
South Dakota	15
Wyoming	17

In addition to the units shown on the attached tabulation, there are potential irrigational developments on the Shadehill and Rapid Valley units on which construction has been initiated in the form of dam and reservoir storage facilities.

Sincerely yours,
FLOYD E. DOMINY,
Commissioner.

Mr. MUNDT. It will be seen that there are 13 specific projects in South Dakota. In the final paragraph of Mr. Dominy's letter he said:

> In addition to the units shown on the attached tabulation, there are potential irrigation developments on the Shadehill and Rapid Valley units on which construction has been initiated in the form of dam and reservoir storage facilities.

This totals 15 South Dakota projects which would be deactivated by H.R. 6016 as presently written.

In my own State, as is true in other States in the Missouri River basin, many of the presently authorized projects have not been studied to the point where there is any imminent likelihood of expenditure of funds so far as construction is concerned, but in all these areas are some that since 1944 have moved forward to the period when we can look forward to early construction. There are four such projects in South Dakota: Fort Randall unit, Greenwood unit, Tower unit, and Yankton unit, on which considerable work has been done. We are hopeful construction can soon be ordered on these if the feasibility studies so justify.

I am sure it is not the purpose of the Senate Public Works Committee, which has moved forward on the development of the natural resources of this country elsewhere, to stop authorization for commendable projects, and to rule out by general language all of these previously authorized projects in the Missouri River basin.

So the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and I have joined in this amendment, which would delete the language which would have the effect of completely decapitating and deactivating a host of worthwhile projects in the Missouri River basin.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Technically, section 2 on page 9 of the bill, dealing with the Missouri River basin, is not a Public Works Committee matter.

This is a reclamation project, which properly is under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department, and thus the Interior Committees of the House and Senate.

Its legislative history indicates that it first was offered as H.R. 5312, which was favorably reported to the House by the House Interior Committee. However, when H.R. 6016 was before the House on June 24, the language of H.R. 5312 was offered as an amendment to H.R. 6016.

According to the debate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—page 11417—the chairman of the House Interior Committee said he was authorized to offer the amendment. The amendment was adopted by the House without further debate.

The senior Senator from South Dakota stated in the Chamber Wednesday that this section was "highly controversial," and he would fight to the death to defeat the entire bill, if necessary.

I would like to state for the record that for something so "highly controversial," it is a little strange that the Senate discussion on Wednesday was the first time the issue has been raised.

From the time the bill was received in the Senate Public Works Committee on June 25, until July 24, no protest had been lodged with us. And, if I may repeat, the House debate, as shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, indicates the language was adopted without the slightest opposition in that body. Thus, we on the Senate Public Works Committee had no reason to believe the matter was so highly controversial.

I state these facts simply to clear the record. I do not mean to suggest that the matter is not controversial or that the opponents do not have meritorious arguments. I think perhaps there is merit in the arguments.

For that reason, I am prepared to accept this amendment to that section so that we may bring the matter before the conference committee.

The Senator refers to section 2, page 9, of the bill, which, it will be noted, deals only with new projects. It would not affect currently authorized projects covered in prior sections of the bill. This means new projects.

Mr. MUNDT. These projects would be affected by the last two lines, which read "which is not hereafter authorized by act of Congress." That language would have the effect of deactivating projects not included in this bill which were authorized previously.

Mr. McNAMARA. It would not have any affect on the next omnibus bill that would be before Congress.

Mr. MUNDT. Of course not.

Mr. McNAMARA. We are prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. First, I compliment the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for offering the amendment. Second, I commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee who is handling the bill for the explanation he has given. I believe, on the basis of the debate up to this time, a question has been raised; and, in my opinion, the initiative undertaken by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota could well resolve this question by the acceptance of the amendment for the deletion of the last proviso in the bill before the Senate, beginning on line 11 and concluding on line 16.

I am delighted that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has acceded to the request of the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator.

Let me say to my genial friend from Michigan that, as he well knows, as an experienced and mature legislator, controversial issues develop only after those intimately acquainted with the problem are advised as to what has been done. He knows that sometimes legislation is passed in either House when many Members are not on the floor. I presume, on the House side, when the language was adopted, many of those from the Missouri River basin area which is vitally interested in it were not present. In all events, I first studied this bill when it came out of the Senate Committee on Public Works—since I am not a member of that committee—and it immediately became controversial with me and I then announced on the floor of the Senate that if my amendment were defeated I would fight its passage with all of the parliamentary tools at my command.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Does the Senator from South Dakota know what the Interior Department's position is on this vital matter?

Mr. MUNDT. No. I do not want to suggest what it is although I presume, being interested in developing these projects, it would be happy to see them continued.

Mr. McNAMARA. At any rate, if the Senate adopts the amendment, it will properly be before the conference and we can go into it at that time.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; and if the Senator agrees that he will not fight the amendment, I suggest that it be adopted by voice vote.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it correct that this amendment, and in fact the entire section of the bill, section 2, relates to no truly public works projects to be performed by the Corps of Engineers, but relates wholly and solely to reclamation projects?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Do this amendment and this provision of the bill refer to the so-called Pick-Sloan omnibus authorization that was passed some 18 or 19 years ago?

Mr. MUNDT. Many of the authorizations were in the Pick-Sloan bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that at that time 300 or more projects were included under the single Pick-Sloan authorization usually with so little consideration that there were one-line authorizations for each project, with the total running to hundreds of millions of dollars of Government spending?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not know how many there were. I think the original authorizations were reduced to about 100, and they have since been winnowed down considerably.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Last year, I recall, the question of the Glen Elder project arose. I thought it was bad, to deal with this $60 million project on the basis of a one-line authorization 18 years old. I feel very strongly that, if there is any language in the bill to stop that kind of omnibus authorization of huge amounts of the taxpayers money, there should be an opportunity for fuller consideration. I feel that would be appropriate in view of the fact that a top staff member of the Public Works Committee has told me that the committee already has approved everything in the Pick-Sloan project that is likely to be funded in the future.

Mr. MUNDT. I can say to the Senator that if the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana and myself is adopted and the status quo prevails, it does not mean that any agency of the Government can go ahead automatically.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It would have to go before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MUNDT. They would still have to be cleared with the Appropriations Committees and by both Houses of Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And they have to be approved legislatively, as well.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct for some of them.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand that the purpose of the amendment is to provide that we would not have to go through the careful authorization process before the Interior Committee that studies the merit of this spending endeavor but only rely upon the Appropriations Committees. Is that correct?

Mr. MUNDT. A great many projects included within Pick-Sloan have involved multiple-purpose reservoirs worthy of being reauthorized by both committees. Our amendment prevents the automatic deauthorization of the minor projects which have been authorized and on which progress is being made with respect to feasibility studies and engineering studies and with respect to which we are looking forward to ultimate construction. Even then, however, these would have to be reconfirmed and reapproved by both Houses of Congress.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have great respect and admiration for the Senator from South Dakota. He is an extraordinarily able man. Without any personal feelings in this situation, let me say that I wish to be recorded as voting against the amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I wish to identify myself with the amendment to strike any language which may appear to repeal Missouri basin authorizations, or to set a precedent for wholesale deauthorizations. If there are projects authorized which are not now advisable, Congress should be informed of them, and of the changes in Missouri basin conditions, or development plans, which makes deauthorization advisable. We should act only with full knowledge of the projects on which we are taking action, and the reasons for such action in each case.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Montana and the Senator from South Dakota. Such wholesale deactivation and discontinuance of worthy and authorized projects, I believe, would be as bad as anything that has been suggested by any of the committees involved.

Passage of H.R. 6016 is important from a national point of view, as far as the Columbia basin is concerned. The inclusion in this omnibus authorization bill of a substantial program of development will put other water resource development projects in the pipeline for construction.

At the present time the major project authorized and not under construction in the Columbia basin is Libby. The Libby project is stalled by negotiations with Canada on the ratification of the Columbia River Treaty. Negotiations are going forward and it is possible that they will be successfully completed before the end of the year, thus clearing the way for immediate construction of Libby. In that case there will be no further major authorized projects and water resource development in the Columbia basin will grind to a halt. If the negotiations are not satisfactory then the need for additional storage facilities is even more urgent and important.

Passage and approval of H.R. 6016 will complete the work done last year when Bruces Eddy and projects in the Willamette basin were authorized. It will provide for planned and continuous development in the next few years so that planning can go forward while construction is underway on Bruces Eddy and on Libby if suitable agreement is reached with Canada. The passage of H.R. 6016 as amended will assure continuous development of important multiple-purpose water resource projects all over the United States.

The inclusion of Knowles Dam in western Montana is an example. Construction of this multipurpose flood control, recreation, and power project will benefit an entire area. When Knowles is completed, together with storage at Bruces Eddy and Canadian storage developed as a result of the Columbia River Treaty, we will have a storage capacity on the Columbia of 26,400,000 acre-feet. This approaches the flood control goal set for the Columbia and its tributaries by the Corps of Engineers.

For a generation the Montana Power Co. has consistently come in with an alternative proposal to development of this reach of the Flathead River every time Congress came to grips with the recommendations of the Corps of Engineers. When there is a possibility for authorization the Montana Power Co. becomes eager to build low-head run of the river dams. When the Montana Power Co. campaign is successful and development at the Knowles or Paradise site is halted, then the company forgets all about its proposal.

Now, at this time, I want to reiterate a position that I have always taken on water resource development of America's rivers.

Projects that are single purpose and for power production without storage can best be constructed by the private power companies. The multiple-purpose projects that have public interest uses over and above those of power production can best be constructed by the Federal Government. To use the symbols of private and public power—there is room for both Willy Wired Hand and Reddy Kilowatt in the power business.

President Kennedy has taken the same position. Meeting with the Committee for Economic Development, and in response to a question from the president of the Montana Power Co., President Kennedy said:

> If a private company can develop a site and provide a service more satisfactorily than the Federal Government, then the private company should go ahead. Indeed, as I said, I would put the burden of proof upon the Federal Government to prove either that the site will not be adequately developed, that the service would not be satisfactory, and that only the Federal Government can do it, before I would support the project.

In accordance with those standards Knowles Dam should be authorized by this Congress.

Such a policy justified construction of Cabinet Gorge and Noxon Rapids Dams by private companies further down the river. But neither the Montana Power Co. nor any other private company has proposed to developed a dam at the Knowles or Paradise site of multiple use. This is no situation analogous to High Mountain Sheep where the question is public or private construction of the same dam. This is a question of a private proposal to inadequately use the resource against a public construction for full and complete use.

The record shows that the Montana Power Co. has, and for 43 years, failed to follow through on its stated goal of construction of run-of-the-river dams at the Buffalo Rapids sites.

President Wilson signed the Federal Water Power Act into law on June 10, 1920. Nine days later, in docket No. 5 in the Federal Power Commission files, the Rocky Mountain Power Co., a subsidiary of Montana Power Co., applied for a preliminary permit on five power sites on the Flathead River, including the two now suggested by the company. The FPC voted suspension of the application until receipt of a report of a commission appointed to investigate the Columbia basin project. In 1928 the Rocky Mountain Power Co. applied for a license on only one of the sites. This license was approved and Kerr Dam was constructed.

In 1953, in FPC docket No. 2135, the Montana Power Co. applied for a preliminary permit at the Buffalo Rapids site 4 miles downstream from Polson. It was issued in 1954. It was extended in 1955. It was extended again in 1956, then allowed to lapse.

In 1954, in FPC docket No. 2163, the Montana Power Co. applied for a preliminary permit at Buffalo Rapids No. 2, 10 miles below Polson. It was issued in 1955. It was extended in 1956. It too was allowed to lapse.

In 1954, in FPC docket No. 2164, the Montana Power Co. applied for a preliminary permit at Buffalo Rapids No. 4, 19 miles below Polson. In 1955 the permit was issued. In 1956 the permit was extended. It too was allowed to lapse.

Then in November 1960 the Confederated Kootenai and Salish Tribes applied for preliminary permits on Buffalo Rapids sites 2 and 4. This prompted the company again, in March 1961, to apply for a preliminary permit in the same two sites.

I suggest that this record, spanning almost a half a century, does not reflect a great desire on the part of the company to develop these inferior sites. Rather, it suggests to me a desire to prevent development by either the Federal Government or the Indian tribe which has a considerable stake in this river's development.

The authorization of Knowles will permit the Secretary of Interior to begin negotiations with the Salish-Kootenai Tribe for the value of the power sites and tribal lands inundated. During the hearings last year before the Senate Public Works Committee and this year before the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives, the Salish-Kootenai tribal council presented its own plan for development of the damsites located on the Flathead Indian reservation. An interesting sidelight in the statement presented by the engineers for the Flathead Tribe is the following observation "It should be noted that, very shortly after the tribes' filing for a preliminary permit on these sites with the U.S. Federal Power Commission, the Montana Power Co.—which had previously and some years past held a preliminary permit but had allowed it to lapse—filed an application for a construction permit on these same sites with the Commission. Both filings are pending determination by the Commission at this time." So the Indians, too, have observed the dog-in-the-manger tactics of the Montana Power Co.

But the Secretary of Interior is without authority to negotiate with the tribes unless and until Congress authorizes construction of Knowles.

One method of compensation suggested at the hearing was the reservation of a block of power for a perpetual income for the tribe, allowing the tribe to take advantage of its tribal assets by using such a block of power to attract industry to or near the reservation and providing additional economic opportunities for members of the tribe and nearby communities. It may be that a combination of outright payment and power reservation, or some other provision, will be the ultimate result of such negotiations. But until there is authorization these negotiations cannot begin.

In connection with the discussion of the Salish-Kootenai Tribe, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a letter written by Mrs. S. R. Logan, of Charlo, Mont., under date of March 11, 1963, which explains this matter in much greater detail than I have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. METCALF. The subject of reservation of a block of power for the Salish-Kootenai Tribe brings up the other important negotiation that will come about as a result of authorization in this bill. That is a power reservation for Montana.

If all or part of the tribal compensation consists of setting aside a block of power, then such block may be all or part of the at-site power reservation for the State of Montana that Senator MANSFIELD, Representative OLSEN, and I have specified must be a part of the agreement for final construction. However, other alternatives open up with this authorization.

The senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] introduced a bill earlier today, of which I have become a cosponsor, and with which I agree in principle, that provides for a power reservation for Montana at all Federal projects. The enactment of this measure would solve the question of a power reservation without further legislation on that subject. Such power reservation is justified for upstream States for a variety of reasons that have been frequently cited on the floor of the Senate.

If the suggestion that general legislation favoring the claim of upstream States for a priority of use for a block of power in return for the storage benefits provided is not adopted then it will be necessary, as was done at Hungry Horse to write such a special authorization legislation or make a provision therefore in the appropriation bill.

In closing I can do no better than quote Mrs. S. R. Logan, in her testimony before the House Committee on Public Works:

> The choice is clear:
>
> Three million acre-feet of flood control storage versus none, with the present $38 million annual flood damage potential increasing to $51 million as flood plains become more heavily populated.
>
> Two hundred fifty-six thousand kilowatts of installed capacity at site and 686,000 kilowatts at 17 downstream dams; 7 Federal, 10 non-Federal, versus 240,000 kilowatts of installed capacity at site and no incremental power downstream. A lesser amount if the Canadian treaty is ratified, but still three times as much as Montana Power Co.'s alternative.
>
> Abundant low-cost power, versus limited supply with the prospect of continued high rates.
>
> Opportunity for Montana to raise its per capita income by increasing employment in manufacturing, versus a far slower rate of change from our present dependence on extractive industries.
>
> Provision of additional power to supply growing demands of 8 private utilities and 19 industries plus new potential customers of B.P.A. versus discrimination against the many and favoritism to one utility.
>
> Full development of the river for the benefit of Montana and the Northwest, versus partial development guaranteeing perpetual waste.

President Kennedy said, when he congratulated Bonneville Power Administration on its 25th birthday:

> "When you build a region, you build your nation.

And in the President's tribute to Senator George Norris, he said:

> Let us all * * * resolve that we, too, in our time will build a better Nation for generations yet unborn.

This bill will carry out President Kennedy's declaration and will result in an investment for a region, and a better Nation for generations yet unborn.

EXHIBIT 1

CHARLO, MONT., *March 11, 1963.*

Rev. HAROLD E. FEY,
Editor, the Christian Century, 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR REVEREND FEY: In order to indicate the point of view from which I am writing, may I state at the outset that from January 1913 to July 1919 I was the first superintendent of the 600-square-mile school district which included a majority of the Flathead Indians. I was a friend, and for a time a tenant, of Antoine Moiese, a descendent of the Moiese who journeyed to St. Louis to ask the Black Robes to come to his people.

We completely integrated the Indian children with all the other children in the public schools, one of the first school districts to do so. When John Collier was Indian Commissioner under Secretary of the Interior Ickes, this reservation, with the assistance of my old friend, John Holst, of the Indian Bureau of Education, was the first to adopt a constitution for self-government as a unit of the American system. It has long been considered one of the best educated Indian groups.

While I was superintendent of the Winnetka, Ill., public schools I was a faithful reader of the Christian Century, which was always on the side of the people, and took the long view, always opposed to monopoly, dictatorship and brainwashing practices. I was honored by the friendship of its editor, Paul Hutchinson and his family. Since my retirement I do not see it regularly. It is therefore particularly distressing to me when just today I read your editorial heatedly denouncing the Knowles Dam.

Obviously the editorial was based on inadequate and inaccurate information. My association with my friend, Father Byrne, to whom it referred, and with leaders and members of the Confederated Tribes, leads me to believe that they would not agree fully with your statement of the case.

I know that many of the Indians who have studied the matter strongly support the Knowles project because they believe it is in the best interest of all of the Indians, both as members of the tribes and as citizens of Montana and the United States.

Primarily the controversy is a tug of war between the Montana Power Co., which wants partial, no-storage and extremely wasteful dams at Buffalo Rapids tribal sites, which would preclude full, multipurpose development, and a Federal dam at Knowles, one of the three remaining storage sites on the Columbia River in the United States. What Knowles would accomplish will be discussed later.

Though the tribal council passed a resolution "unalterably" opposing Knowles, it appears they are really less interested in who builds what dam, or whether it is full Federal development in the interest of all the people or an extension of private monopoly, than they are in who will pay them most in settlement of their claims. Walter Morigeau, chairman of the tribal council, made this clear at the hearing in Washington on the project last September.

"Senator Fong. From your statement just made, I get the impression that if negotiations were entered into prior to the authorization of this project, and, in looking at your statement, that if you were assured that you would be compensated for tribal values, a substantial part of the objection of the tribal council would be dissipated?

"Mr. Walter Morigeau. That is true.

"Senator Fong. Is that correct?

"Mr. Walter Morigeau. That is true.

* * * * *

"Senator Metcalf. If you were convinced, in order to bring out what I think Senator Fong was aiming at, if you were convinced that the best deal for the Indians was to get a block of power reserved and Knowles Dam built, you would be for Knowles?

"Mr. Walter Morigeau. If it proved to be a better deal than two and four would be."

There appears to be little desire among the Indians to try to build the dams themselves. Hiring an engineer to report on such a possibility was apparently designed to strengthen their bargaining power. The engineering proposal can scarcely be considered a serious one. For example, the engineer who reported on the four-small-dam alternative, said it could be built very cheaply. But he did not include the cost of relocating the railway, highway, and other utilities which constitute nearly half the cost of the Knowles project, and which would be required for the four-dam alternative.

Section 7 of the Federal Power Act states that in order to grant a license for a dam the Commission must be convinced the project is: "best adapted to develop, conserve, and utilize in the public interest the water resources of the region, if it be satisfied as to the ability of the applicant to carry out such plans."

Licensing of the small, Buffalo Rapids dams would be a more shocking violation of this basic principle of river development and the principles of conservation enunciated by Theodore Roosevelt than was the licensing of the Idaho Power Co. dams to the exclusion of Federal Hells Canyon, for the reason that the Idaho Power project did provide some storage, whereas dams at Buffalo Rapids would provide none. They would penalize both Indians and whites and the whole Northwest and the Nation by precluding flood control, recreation and cheap power. Knowles would produce six times as much power, which would be sold through the Bonneville marketing system at its postage stamp rate.

Senator Metcalf stated categorically at the hearings last fall that settlement of Indian claims would be made by negotiation, not by condemnation. I am sure that the Indians would receive more pay in power and/or cash settlement from the Government than they could hope for through some sort of deal with the power company, which is concerned with profits only. The company's interest in Buffalo Rapids dams is limited to the goal of defeating or delaying Knowles to keep competition from cheap power (wholesale only) out of its territory.

You refer to the treaty of 1855, implying that the tribes' best interest is to see that it is carried out to the letter. I submit that this is a backward view. The tribes' interests will be better served by considering all the alternatives for the present and the future. There are four:

(1) Maintenance of the status quo: Lake County is a depressed area. The situation was so bad it was one of two counties selected for a special economic study by the State college several years before the Area Redevelopment Act was passed. It was one of the first to be designated a depressed area after the passage of the act.

The problem of unemployment is at least as serious for Indians as for whites. There is general agreement that industry with year-round payrolls is needed.

(2) Construction of Buffalo Rapids run-of-river-dams by Montana Power Co.: These dams would pay taxes and would to that extent assist county government. However, there has been one company dam in Lake County since 1939 and it has done little to improve economic conditions. It employs 16 men, and its rates are too high to attract industry. Contrast the 1.67 mills per kilowatt-hour paid by Anaconda Aluminum Co. to Bonneville, which markets power from Hungry Horse, with the 5 to 5.5 mills per kilowatt-hour which Anaconda Copper Co. pays to Montana Power.

True, the company does pay the Indians rent for Kerr Dam site. But they are not as "ready and willing" to pay it as their publicity would lead one to believe. In 1954 the company installed a third generator at Kerr Dam, enabled to do so by storage from newly constructed Federal Hungry Horse Dam. The Indians claimed additional rent for the third generator, but the company refused to pay it. The Indians took their case to court and won, but the company appealed, so the tribes have had to incur the expense of long drawn out litigation to force the company to pay. The case was not finally settled until 1962. So the company's protestations of solicitude for the Indians' welfare must be scrutinized carefully, not taken at face value.

Most of the Indians fear entanglements with the company, and with good reason. Entanglements would most probably ensue if Knowles is not authorized.

(3) Construction of Buffalo Rapids dams by the tribes: If Knowles fails of authorization the tribes might conceivably succeed in getting a license to build the small dams, because the Federal Power Act gives preference to public bodies. (Sec. 7.) Possibly they could raise necessary funds through sale of revenue bonds and hire competent management. But how or where could they market their power?

They could use some of it on the reservation to establish industries of their own, or attract new industry set up by others. For the rest would they not be "captive" to Montana Power Company which has the only transmission lines? Canyon Ferry, a Federal dam across the Continental Divide is just such a captive dam. The company has the only transmission line. It buys power at ridiculously low rates at the dam and sells it at its own high rates at Helena, only a few miles away.

The company would have the tribes over a barrel.

(4) Knowles Dam: Knowles is required for flood control storage on the Columbia. Damage now averages $24 million annually. It will increase as population in the lower valley increases.

In 1948, 38 lives were lost. No one knows when the next great flood will occur, but that it will come is statistically predictable.

The Clark Fork-Pendoreille is a heavy contributor to floods, ranking only a few percentage points below the main stem of the Columbia and the Kootenai, and well above the Snake, Salmon or any other tributary.

Choice of sites: The Paradise site is better than Knowles because it would control two rivers with one dam. It has been ruled out by the Corps of Engineers because the cost of relocating two mainline railroads was prohibitive.

Knowles, about 7 miles upstream from Paradise, is the next best site, and economically feasible. It is on a "harnessed" stretch of the Flathead River: there are dams both above and below it. If Knowles is not authorized, flood control requirements will necessitate several dams farther upstream, in Glacier Park, the Bob Marshall Wilderness and the Upper Blackfoot.

If it were a question of wilderness versus Indians, I would say without question, "Sacrifice the wilderness." But I do not believe Knowles will hurt the Indians: rather it will help them.

Knowles and power: If the corps had not planned to include generating facilities at Knowles the dam would undoubtedly have been constructed long since. But Theodore Roosevelt said, back in 1903:

"It seems clear that justice to the taxpayers of the country demands that when the Government is or may be called upon to improve a stream the improvement should be made to pay for itself, so far as practicable."

For many years this has been the accepted policy of both political parties. Now users of electricity, not taxpayers, pay for the portion of the cost of multipurpose dams attributable to power, and often subsidize a portion of irrigation costs as well.

Senator Metcalf's article in the July issue of Public Power gives power statistics for Knowles and the Buffalo Rapids Dams. You will see that in addition to developing 267 megawatts at site, compared to only 148 megawatts at Buffalo Rapids, Knowles develops, at practically no additional cost, 686 megawatts at downstream dams, public and private alike, as shown on the Bonneville River chart. The Buffalo Rapids dams, because they create no storage, do not add a single kilowatt downstream. So the comparison is 953 to 148, or 6 to 1.

Montana Power Co. versus Knowles: Since it could buy power from the public dam more cheaply than it could generate power at Buffalo Rapids, why does Montana Power Co. oppose Knowles? It now buys 50,000 kilowatts of Bonneville and has just signed a 30-year contract for 80,000 kilowatts from Hanford.

This is a question many of the company's stockholders might ask if they were aware of the fact. But this is one of the facts the company does not include in its propaganda.

The answer, I believe, is that the company has, by its own account, a 70-percent monopoly of electric distribution in the State of

Montana. Since it operates within the State only, its rates are subject to the Montana Railroad & Public Service Commission, but not to the Federal Power Commission. As in many other States, regulation by commission is a farce.

A look at the rate map prepared from Federal Power Commission rate schedules, shows that Montana Power has the highest rates of any utility in the Columbia River basin.

An article by Dr. Arnold Hirsch, a rate specialist, "Effective Rate Regulation: Fact or Fiction," shows that the largest private utility in Montana (Montana Power Co.) tops the list for the entire country in its rate of profits. His study was based on operating reports all utilities are required to file with the Federal Power Commission.

With the highest rates in the Northwest, and the highest rate of profit in the country, Montana Power does not want to be disturbed by competition. The example of Hungry Horse is clear and close at hand. Hungry Horse Dam is in the territory of Pacific Power & Light Co. When cheap power from Hungry Horse came on the line a few residents of Kalispell met to discuss the possibility of establishing a municipal distribution system. Before they could form a committee and hold a second meeting Pacific Power & Light Co. reduced its rates.

Montana Power is fighting to keep cheap power out of its territory by every device known to the power lobby. So far it has succeeded in keeping Montana one of only two States in which there is no municipal distribution of power.

Knowles and the Indian tribes: Why would Knowles be better for the Indians? They would be compensated for the value of their powersites in any case, and because Knowles is a bigger pie than any alternative, their slice would be larger.

In the case of Yellowtail Dam on the Crow Reservation, Indian grazing lands were valued at $47,000, but Congress negotiated a settlement of $2.5 million for the powersite values, granting in addition the right to sue for higher compensation, which the Crows are now doing. The Interior Department offered to pay part of this in a block of power but the Crows turned it down.

Senator Metcalf indicated at the September hearing on Knowles that a block of power would be offered to the Confederated Tribes. Their attorney replied:

"Mr. Chairman, one of the things that has motivated the tribes is what is to their advantage, and it is even to their financial advantage to take power, because they have seen these charts of the Corps of Engineers showing the tremendous way in which the value of power is going up in years to come. If they are on a flat rental as they get from Montana Power Co., with inflation that money is worthless.

"If they have power, as we go necessarily to steam generation and ultimately to atomic generation, the value of that block of power will be enhanced greatly. And they are anxious, of course, to make the best deal for themselves that they can."

Senator Metcalf also suggested a proviso that at least a part of this block be reserved for use on the Flathead Indian Reservation. Such a geographical reservation can be made only for a Federal dam: it would be constitutionally impossible for a privately owned dam.

Earlier in the hearing this exchange took place:

"Mr. Cragun. It seems to me that the Indians have some deep moral rights. And this, I think, is also perhaps an intangible that should be given weight.

"Senator Metcalf. And it can and it should and it will."

During the morning session Mr. Cragun had stated: "I want to say that in my dealings with the Montana delegation I have been assured throughout that they recognize the tribal property and realize that it must be compensated."

The tribes' consulting engineer, Ivan Block, estimated generating costs for the Buffalo Rapids dams, if built by the Indians, at 4.17 mills per kilowatt-hour. The average price of Columbia River power marketed by BPA during 1962 was 2.36 mills per kilowatt-hour. This difference in price might well mean the difference between being able to attract industry and not being able to. As suggested under alternative 3, if the tribes built the small dams themselves, they might be left with more power than they could use or market on the reservation, and find themselves at the mercy of Montana Power Co.

In choosing between these four alternatives I have no hesitation in selecting Knowles as in the best interest of the Indians.

There is now severe unemployment on the Flathead Reservation, and something must be done to increase employment.

The tribes will be paid for the value of their powersites, and since the power developed by a Federal dam will be considerably cheaper and therefore more attractive to industry, I am convinced that the Indians will derive greater benefits from the Federal dam than from constructing the small dams themselves, or from renting their powersites to Montana Power Co.

In addition, the rest of the Northwest and the Nation will derive great benefits from Knowles, and would be harmed by extension of Montana Power Co.'s monopoly. The rights and welfare of these millions of non-Indians, in common with their Indian fellow citizens, also deserve to be considered.

Father Byrne, whom you mention, assisted me at various times in registering and persuading the Indians in his parish to vote. During our long drives together we seemed to be in full agreement, and at that time he did not seem to think Federal Knowles Dam a threat, but rather an opportunity for the Indians and their children to realize their aspirations more fully. That was before the tribal council decided to employ an engineer to help them establish an asking price for their claims. Like me, at that time he did see the power monopoly as a menace.

I believe that members of the tribes generally regard Senator Lee Metcalf, Senator Mansfield, and Congressman Olsen, all supporters of Knowles, as was the late Senator Murray, as their true friends and champions. Father Byrne also often expressed this belief to me. All three have recognized the Indians' right to settlement for their power sites, and have insisted that the claim should be settled by negotiation, not by condemnation.

COMMENTS ON SOME STATEMENTS IN YOUR EDITORIAL

You state, "Recreational facilities and property holdings along the shores of the low dam pools would have high value compared with Knowles." I live within 15 miles of the Buffalo Rapids sites, within 40 miles of the Knowles site. I know the terrain well. I cannot believe that anyone who has seen it could reach such a conclusion. This is one of the statements which occasioned my initial comment that your editorial is based on inadequate information. It is part of the company's propaganda put out for nonresident consumption.

The land above the Buffalo Rapids sites is low, flat, dry grassland. The only trees are in the river bottom and would be destroyed by the water.

In contrast, the reservoir created by Knowles would be 72 miles long. It would include, in addition to this flat treeless area a deep canyon winding between steep mountain walls, some bare and rocky, some covered with forests, for more than 30 miles upstream from the dam. Arms of the lake would reach up into side canyons. It is a much more picturesque section, more attractive for water-based recreation and tourists, than the upper portion. A transcontinental highway runs along the south shore.

The Indian reservation extends to within a short distance of the dam so that they would be able to take advantage of the best sites on this long and varied shoreline to develop tourist facilities. The tribes have already had experience in this field. They have built and operate a bathhouse at Hot Springs. And they have leased tribal property at Blue Bay on Flathead Lake to a private operator for a motel and lodge.

The opposition has made much of the "mudflat" argument against Knowles. Because it is a storage project it does have a seasonal drawdown. So does Hungry Horse Dam, and so does Flathead Lake. But both are fine recreation attractions. They are full during the summer recreation season just as Knowles would be. This is necessitated by the fact that they are operated as flood control projects to catch and hold destructive spring and early summer runoff, hold it until late fall and winter when normal riverflow is low, and then release it. The Columbia is fortunate in that, unlike many other areas, most of its water uses, including recreation, require the same water management schedule.

Both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have estimated the recreation potential of the Knowles Reservoir as far greater than that of the Buffalo Rapids small pondage reservoirs. As you know, an act of 1958 now makes recreation one of the main purposes of Federal reservoirs, not just an afterthought. Since the tribes own a great deal of the shoreline they are in a position to benefit greatly.

Your editorial mentions that the area to be flooded is "essential to four Indian cattle associations." The minutes of the tribal council for July 12, 1962, show that though 4 associations would be affected, only 35 of the many Indians who raise cattle belong to these associations to which tribal grazing lands are leased. Furthermore, it has been reported to me by a member of the tribe that they pay rent of only $3,762. According to some of my Indian friends there is a great deal of dissatisfaction with this arrangement.

Nor is Indian dissatisfaction limited to favoritism in the matter of grazing lands. There is such widespread dissatisfaction and distrust of the council as presently constituted that a group calling itself the Flathead Kootenai Organization has sprung up. It claims membership of over 50 percent of the enrolled members of the tribes living on and in the vicinity of the reservation. Its president testified in favor of Knowles at the Washington hearing last September.

I am enclosing a folder put out by Montana Power Co. last spring. The company reported to the Federal Power Commission that it circulated 296,000 copies, more than enough to supply every family in the State. The mailing list included its customers in Montana and its stockholders throughout the country.

Senator Metcalf found the material in the folder "so grossly misleading and erroneous" he felt obliged to comment on it in a speech on the Senate floor. A copy of this speech is also included so that you may compare the two.

Just as the company tried to win support for its small dams from wildlife enthusiasts with the false allegation that Knowles would destroy the Bison range, and from water users with the false charge that future water rights would be threatened by Knowles, in like manner it has undertaken to set friends of the Indians against Knowles by misrepresentation.

I believe the true interests of the Indians will be best served by a rational study of present day alternatives and by patient and considerate negotiation.

Since Knowles Dam, an essential part of the full, all-purpose development of the great Columbia River, is of fateful importance to the entire Northwest, I urge you to have a competent person whose disinterestedness you can trust, study all sides of the several alternatives thoroughly before you arrive at conclusions.

Otherwise your position, ironically, may contribute to the defeat of your true desire to assist the Indians.

Sincerely yours,

S. R. LOGAN.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to my colleague from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I commend my distinguished colleague for his ever-active interest in the development of the natural resources, not only of our State of Montana, but of our region of the Northwest, the Rocky Mountain area, and the Nation as a whole. His record has been consistent. In my opinion, he is one of the solid, sound, and great Senators of our generation. He does his homework; he knows whereof he speaks; and when he speaks, he is listened to.

Statements have been made about power development in western Montana and the Montana Power Co. The shining light, so far as we are concerned, is the Hungry Horse project, about which I should like to say a few words, not because it is in the bill; it is not. It has been authorized, money has been appropriated, it is operating, and it is providing a financial return to the Government.

I believe the RECORD should show that while the Montana Power Co. is opposed to Knowles Dam, as it was opposed to the Hungry Horse project in the Flathead country, because of Hungry Horse Dam the following has occurred:

First. The Montana Power Co. was able to install a 56,000-kilowatt generator at Kerr Dam on the Flathead River because of the storage facilities at Hungry Horse.

Second. The Montana Power Co., though opposed to the construction of Hungry Horse, has a 20-year contract, entered into in 1955, and it is my understanding that it is renewable every year—this statement is subject to correction—for 50,000 kilowatts of Bonneville power from Hungry Horse, which it buys at the rate of 2.5 mills and feeds into its own system to sell to its customers at a higher rate.

Third. The rates of REA's in western Montana have been reduced because of Hungry Horse power, from between 8 and 9 mills per kilowatt to 3.1 mills per kilowatt.

Fourth. Because of Hungry Horse, the Anaconda Co. built an aluminum plant at Columbia Falls, Mont., which at the present time employs around 600 persons. With the expansion of the plant, it is anticipated that several hundred more will be added.

Fifth. In Flathead County, where the Hungry Horse project is located, the assessed value of the county has increased from around $35 million to around $100 million.

Sixth. Because of Hungry Horse power, the Victor Chemical Co. of Silver Bow, between Butte and Anaconda, and other industrial facilities have come into western Montana.

Seventh. Because of these new industries, the tax base has been broadened rather than restricted, with the result that more people are paying more taxes to the counties in which these industries are located, to the State of Montana, and to the Federal Government.

Eighth. The repayment on the schedule of Hungry Horse is current, and over $35 million has been paid to the U.S. Treasury.

Ninth. Hungry Horse Reservoir has developed into a tremendous recreational and fishing area and has contributed to the well-being of thousands of our people not only from Montana but from over the Nationa as a whole.

Tenth. Nobody has been hurt by Hungry Horse because the county in which it is located, western Montana which it serves, the Montana Power Co., and the REA's have benefited.

Eleventh. The Hungry Horse is an investment in America for the benefit of the people of my State and Nation; is fully repayable, and it is anticipated that it will be paid out in 50 years or less.

Twelfth. Actually, structures of this type will produce power for hundreds of years, even after they are paid for, and should be looked on as assets, not as liabilities.

Thirteenth. A block of approximately 200,000 kilowatts of Hungry Horse power has been allocated to Montana—the first such preference ever made and one which I hope will be the pattern for all Federal projects in Montana in the future.

Mr. President, having that in mind, it was my privilege and that of my distinguished colleague from Montana [Mr. METCALF], to introduce once again a bill which would seek to place in Montana a priority or a preference, so far as power allocations are concerned, as it affects projects which are developed in our State on a multipurpose basis.

I join with my colleague in saying that so far as dams built only for the purpose of generating electricity are concerned, I believe private utilities should come first. But as to projects having a multipurpose effect, such as Knowles, Hungry Horse, Libby, and Yellow Tail, which is now under construction, whose uses will include recreation, flood control, reclamation, irrigation, as well as power, I think the Federal Government has a clear-cut responsibility to the people.

If private power companies were willing to build multipurpose projects and give to the people the same benefits, I would favor the private power companies, not the Federal Government, building such projects.

I hope the bill will be passed. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. METCALF. I am grateful to my colleague from Montana for his comments. He has eloquently told the history of Hungry Horse Dam. It is a story that could be repeated over and over again with respect to the other multipurpose dams built in upstream States. It is essential to the development of the resources of the States in which these dams are located that at-site power reservations be provided.

I reiterate what my distinguished colleague has said: If Montana Power Co. or any other private power company will come before Congress and say that it will build a dam of the same quality and size so as adequately to fulfill the purposes of a multipurpose project, such as Knowles Dam will do, I will support it, just as my colleague has said he will support it. But Montana Power Co. has never come before Congress and asked to build Knowles Dam. It has always come before Congress with an insufficient, inadequate program of partial construction. We in the State of Montana can no longer afford to waste our resources.

So I am very grateful to my distinguished colleague, who is responsible—more than any other man in the Nation—for construction of the Hungry Horse Reservoir and the development of the area of western Montana to which he has referred. I am very grateful to him for drawing the analogy and making the comparison between Hungry Horse Dam and its development and the potentials which exist at Knowles.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, at the bottom of page 3 of House bill 6016, a Federal project known as the Trotters Shoals Dam and Reservoir is authorized to be constructed. This is a project to be located on the Savannah River, which is the border of South Carolina and Georgia, approximately halfway between two other existing Federal dams and reservoirs, Hartwell Dam and Clark Hill Dam. It is my intention today to voice the very strong objections of the people of South Carolina, and a great many in Georgia, who oppose construction of this third Federal dam. The Senate Public Works Committee, in amending House bill 6016 so as to include the authorization of this particular project, did so without the benefit of any hearings. Last year this item was added to the bill on the Senate floor without hearings, but was deleted in conference. As a matter of fact, the Senate committee has held no hearings on this project, either this year or previously. On the other hand, the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives has held hearings on this project, and it has declined to act upon it favorably. At the House hearing, numerous individuals, testifying on behalf of themselves and local civic, business, and governmental bodies, voiced their very strong opposition to this project. The hearings which were held by the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives were concluded earlier this year. However, Mr. President, they have only been printed in the last few days and, therefore, have not been available for public review and discussion. These are the only hearings from which the Senate might judge the issue, based upon the facts presented by the people and groups most closely concerned, that are available to us.

There are many strong and appealing reasons for the defeat of this proposal, and the proponents of it lack the factual arguments to sustain their position.

Earlier this year, the President of the United States delivered an address to the Committee for Economic Development. At the conclusion of his remarks, there was a question-and-answer period. In response to one question, President Kennedy said, as reported in the Wall Street Journal of May 10:

> In deciding whether a specific damsite should be publicly or privately developed, "I would put the burden of proof upon the Federal Government to prove that the site will not be adequately developed, that the service would not be satisfactory, and that only the Federal Government can do it, before I would support the project."

Judged in the light of this criteria which was announced by the President, this project should, by all means, be defeated. If this project is authorized and constructed, it would have a very adverse effect upon both South Carolina and Georgia and, indeed, the Nation. While this controversy was at first of only local significance, it is now attracting national attention. In the July 1963, edition of Nation's Business, an article, entitled "United States Undercuts Own Job-Making Goal," is devoted to this particular project. This is a very concise and to-the-point article, and I should like to read from it, for the benefit of my colleagues in the Senate:

[From Nation's Business magazine, July 1963]

UNITED STATES UNDERCUTS OWN JOBMAKING GOAL—WATER PROJECT POINTS UP CONFLICT IN POLICIES

The New Frontier, in its efforts to move ahead with vigor on many fronts, sometimes gives the impression that its left hand is unaware of what its right hand is doing.

A current example is arousing increasing attention in Congress and heated debate in two Southeastern States.

The Department of the Interior wants to build a $79 million Federal dam at Trotters Shoals on the Savannah River, which forms the boundary between South Carolina and Georgia.

Opponents contend that the dam would prevent $500 million in private industry from locating along the river, bringing with it jobs, payrolls, and tax revenue vitally needed in an area which includes more than nine counties classified as depressed by the Area Redevelopment Administration.

Citing the proposed dam, Republican Representative WILLIAM H. HARSHA, of Ohio, a member of the House Committee on Public Works, says:

ECONOMIC VALUE OF ADDING TO EXISTING RECREATIONAL FACILITIES IS QUESTIONED

"One of the Nation's most pressing problems is unemployment. More than 4 million persons are unemployed. The administration wants to spend more money, establish more corps, build more public works, make more loans, establish more Federal agencies, add to the Federal payroll—all in the hope of cutting the unemployment rate. Everyone shares in that hope.

"But much of the New Frontier's program will not create lasting jobs because it ignores the basic process by which jobs are made. When the New Frontier pushes some programs, you wonder about the sincerity of its efforts to cut unemployment."

Trotters Shoals, which would stem the Savannah River about 55 miles above Augusta, Ga., is part of an 11-dam plan approved by Congress in 1944 for Federal development of the river. Two of the dams have been built. The Clark Hill Dam and Reservoir lie at the southern end of the disputed 29-mile stretch of river, Hartwell Dam and Reservoir at the northern end. The reservoir formed by Trotters Shoals would flood 24,000 acres to bridge the gap creating a string of three lakes linked together by dams.

This remaining stretch of river between the two existing reservoirs is described as "the finest industrial area in the entire Southeastern United States" by Charles E. Daniel, board chairman of the Daniel Construction Co., an international industrial contracting firm located in Greenville, S.C.

EXPERTS SAY AREA IN DISPUTE IS SUITABLE LOCATION FOR PLANTS IN DISPUTE IS SUITABLE

"We have located eight major sites here suitable for large processing plants, and behind these plants would grow up supporting plants," Mr. Daniel says. "This area is blessed with a tremendous amount of free-flowing water. One of the largest natural gas lines in America crosses it. Equally large liquid petroleum lines cross it. There are two railroads and truck and air transportation. More important, there are many thousands of people on both sides of the river who desperately need jobs.

"My firm has 47 industrial prospects that want to build new plants in the Southeast. Every year it becomes more difficult to find sites such as this for plants which require a great amount of water. I confidently believe that we can have more than $500 million worth of industry along this stretch of river and in the supporting areas within the next 10 to 15 years.

"But if the Trotters Shoals Dam is built, it will knock out the possibility of the primary plants along the river and their satellite plants."

Gov. Donald S. Russell of South Carolina has spoken out in opposition to Trotters Shoals, and Georgia Gov. Carl E. Sanders says that he might alter his earlier approval of the dam if private development is an immediate probability. Congressional delegations from the two States are split.

In the light of growing opposition from the region involved and the apparent inconsistency with the administration's professed aims of boosting employment and encouraging industrial development of depressed areas, why is the Interior Department pushing for congressional authorization of Trotters Shoals?

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall says:

"The Southeast is one of the few areas where clean, fresh water is still available in substantial supply. In our judgment, the only prudent course is to develop and conserve these great water resources expeditiously and judiciously.

"This is a project with substantial power potential in an area where the preference customers need more power.

"Located between the Clark Hill and Hartwell projects, the three contiguous lakes will form a recreation complex of national significance.

"In addition, since this is developing into one of the great industrial areas of our Nation, abundant clean, fresh water will be available for municipal and industrial use."

WHAT ADVOCATES SAY

Supporters of the Trotters Shoals project contend that it would create jobs and strengthen the economy of the region by enhancing its recreational facilities and by attracting industry to the reservoir's water supply. Local business and civic leaders, however, point to the Clark Hill and Hartwell installations as evidence that this just doesn't happen.

"We judge the future by the past. The building of the Clark Hill and Hartwell projects has formed industrial deserts with thousands upon thousands of acres of water down the middle," declares E. H. Agnew of Starr, S.C., former president of the South Carolina Farm Bureau Federation and a trustee of Anderson County School District No. 3.

"What we need is not more recreational facilities, but more jobs and more tax income for an expanding educational economic opportunity. It's the damage that Trotters Shoals would bring to the industrial and agricultural future of our area that really hurts. It hurts because it clouds the chances for economic progress and educational advancement. Our youth must be well trained. Training includes better schools. Better schools cost more money, and Trotters Shoals offers no money. Private industry does—it pays taxes."

The counties on both the South Carolina and Georgia sides of the Clark Hill Reservoir are listed as depressed, as are all of the Georgia counties extending up to the Hartwell Reservoir. These and other adjoining counties are suffering a constant loss of population as their residents, particularly young people, go elsewhere looking for jobs. Industrial development has not taken up the slack in employment created by the region's declining agriculture.

"My experience has been that water-using industries won't locate on a Federal reservoir," says Walter W. Harper, director of the South Carolina State Development Board. "No industrial development has resulted from either the Hartwell or Clark Hill projects. The proposed Trotters Shoals project cost the area at least one substantial industrial prospect because of the threat of a Federal dam."

McCormick County, which adjoins the Clark Hill Reservoir, is the single South Carolina county in this area listed as depressed. Frank E. Harrison, a McCormick attorney, says:

"Clark Hill has created tremendous problems that those of us who are trying to attract industry have spent a great deal of time attempting to overcome in the past 10 years. We fear that another reservoir will undo what progress we have made. When a corporation finds that it must get Federal approval to locate on the reservoir, it just moves on. The town of McCormick had to get a special act of Congress in order to buy water from Clark Hill.

"The recreational facilities offered by the reservoir haven't produced any jobs, either. The people that come to Clark Hill may spend a little money for gasoline, bait or food, but most of them come from less than 100 miles away and bring it with them."

THE VIEW FROM GEORGIA

On the Georgia side of the Clark Hill Reservoir, the picture is much the same. Harry C. Stewart, mayor of Lincolnton and an automobile dealer, describes it this way:

"Most of our timberland in Lincoln County was flooded by the lake. Our population is decreasing and per capita income is less than $900 a year, among the lowest in the State. The only commercial establishment produced in our county by Clark Hill is a fishing camp on the lake. It was built for $100,000 and has been sold three times, the last time for $40,000."

The situation at the more recently completed Hartwell project offers no more encouragement. No new industry can be cited which came because of the reservoir. In fact, one factory which was located there before the dam was built—the Utica-Mohawk plant of J. P. Stevens & Co.—is currently trying to recover damages estimated at $1.5 million as a result of the Federal installation.

James M. Stepp, a professor of agricultural economics at Clemson College who made a study of the Trotters Shoals project for the South Carolina State Development Board, offers this analysis:

"The most important test of any proposed resource development project is simply this: Will the net longrun effect of the project be more and better jobs or fewer and poorer jobs for the people of the area? I am convinced that the net effect of the Trotters Shoals project would be to reduce both the quantity and quality of employment opportunities in South Carolina and Georgia.

"The proposed project would severely restrict and perhaps destroy the ability of the area near the reservoir to compete for the large group of industries known as wet-process industries."

Professor Stepp lists these factors: Existing sites would be flooded by the reservoir; industrial effluent must receive more costly treatment if discharged into a reservoir instead of a flowing stream; large water-using industries ordinarily provided their own water supply facilities and prefer river-bank sites where water rights are included in real estate property rights; uncertainty would result from the reservoir's control by a Federal agency which has no responsibility for local industrial development and is governed by policies and political pressures originating far from the area.

"Since World War II," Professor Stepp adds, "about 30 new wet-process plants have been built on the free-flowing portions of South Carolina's rivers, whereas only one has been built adjacent to a reservoir—and that reservoir is owned by the county in which the plant is located."

He points out that there are strong reasons for doubting claims that federally owned reservoirs on the middle Savannah River would form the basis for a tourist industry that would provide sizable employment. This could happen only if large numbers of tourists from other areas were persuaded to vacation there.

REA HAS A HAND

Because of the prospect of more Federal hydroelectric power from the dam for preference customers—Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives and municipal power facilities—a significant part of the support for Trotters Shoals has come from REA cooperatives. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., staff engineer and counsel of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, says:

"Power generated at Trotters Shoals would be marketed by the Southeastern Power Administration in Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina with priority to preference customers. REA-financed systems in those States now obtain wholesale power from Government dams, via the Southeastern Power Administration, and from investor-owned utility companies. The major portion of the energy purchased by the cooperatives comes from investor-owned utilities.

"Federal Power Commission estimates show that loads are doubling each 14 years in the area to be served by Trotters Shoals. If Federal power is to remain a significant factor in regulating wholesale rates in that area, it must continue to constitute an effective fraction of total capacity. This means new multiple-purpose reservoirs, and Trotters Shoals is among the best yet remaining undeveloped."

Local residents point out, however, that expanding power needs will be met by private enterprise if the obstacle of the proposed Federal dam is removed. Duke Power Co. of Charlotte, N.C., which supplies power to the region, owns a site on the river 8 miles below the Hartwell Dam and has long planned to build a large steam-generated powerplant there.

Congressional approval is needed for Duke to build a small dam to provide cooling water for the plant. A bill authorizing this construction died in the past session of Congress, and Duke was forced to change its plans and build new facilities in North Carolina to supply the pressing power needs of its customers.

"We still want to build a steamplant on the Savannah River," says William B. McGuire, president of Duke Power. "Since the postponement of the plant we have been making studies to determine when it will be possible for Duke again to include it in our plans. It now appears that Duke can economically use generation from the Savannah River plant beginning sometime during the period 1970–75."

Mr. McGuire adds, however, that the proposed Trotters Shoals Dam would flood the location of the small dam which Duke must build in connection with its plant. To surmount this problem, he says, "the practical and economic considerations would be so great that, as best we can now determine, we would not build the dam."

WHAT COMPARISONS SHOW

An interesting comparison of the relative merits of buying power from Duke or from REA cooperatives is provided by Mr. McGuire. In 1961 the average charge to residential customers of South Carolina REA cooperatives was 2.42 cents per kilowatt-hour; Duke's average charge was 1.95 cents.

The $210 million steamplant which Duke hopes to build on the Savannah would generate 11.4 billion kilowatt-hours of power annually in comparison with 471.4 million for Trotters Shoals Dam. Duke would pay annual taxes of $7.4 million to the Federal Government and $5.95 million to State and local governments, while Trotters Shoals would pay none. Yearly operating and payroll expenditures would be $3 million for Duke and $483,000 for the Federal installation. In addition, Duke would buy $24 million worth of coal each year from mines in West Virginia, Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee, States which also contain depressed areas. Trotters Shoals, being hydroelectric, would not require fuel.

Another major corporation which owns a plant site on the disputed section of the Savannah River is the Mead Corp. of Dayton, Ohio, a manufacturer of paper and paper products with operations in 17 States. In 1956 Mead bought a 1,000-acre site on the river near Calhoun Falls. Since then it has invested $1 million in nearby timberlands and committed itself to an additional $2 million.

If Trotters Shoals is built, it would flood most of the Mead site and eliminate the free-flowing water needed for treatment of the effluent from the proposed plant.

"This would make an industrial development such as ours impossible," says Ford T. Shepherd, a Mead vice president. "We intend to use the site for the purpose for which it was purchased when economic conditions justify the huge investment involved. However, this important decision can't be made until we are assured of our water supply and a flowing river for adequate treatment of our effluent. If Trotters Shoals is built we are dead.

"If we knew that Trotters Shoals was not in the picture, I think the only barrier would be economic conditions. Our planning indicates that we need additional capacity within 5 years."

The paper mill which Mead contemplates building would cost nearly $40 million and employ from 600 to 650 people with an annual payroll of about $5 million. The mill would require about $8 million worth of pulpwood each year, produced by 2,500 men working on the farms and forest lands outside the plant. It would pay Federal, State and local taxes of nearly $4 million.

A papermill would give the local economy an unusually strong boost. Unlike many manufacturing industries found in farm communities, a papermill makes use of a local natural resource. Cotton has declined sharply as a factor in the economy of the region, and much of the land has been planted in timber. Without a nearby mill, however, the pulpwood market has become increasingly depressed as the large coastal mills have come to depend largely on timber producers closer to them.

PRICE DEPRESSION THREATENS

"Unless a market in the form of a pulpwood consuming mill is soon provided, upper South Carolina faces a serious oversupply of pulpwood and this will lead to a depression of prices, farm income, commerce and land values," according to J. Wesley Hughes, manager of the Abbeville County [S.C.] Development Board.

Holcombe M. Verdery, Jr., a lumber dealer in nearby Harlem, Ga., says:

"A papermill would provide a market for timber, jobs for people required to harvest wood, and jobs for manufacturing personnel. It would stimulate the economy and provide a healthy business community, able and capable of paying more taxes. More taxes would provide better schools. Residents would be able to find work within commuting distance of their homes. Young people would have job opportunities. At the present time they have to look for work in distant cities."

Federal officials have questioned whether the plant proposed by Mead would be able to treat its effluent satisfactorily so that it would not contaminate the Clark Hill Reservoir downstream. Mr. Shepherd has assured Congressmen that it can do so.

Supporters of Trotters Shoals also have contended that the Federal project would not be incompatible with the Duke steamplant. However, as Governor Russell points out:

"The difficulty is that, while the Corps of Engineers asserts that its proposal is compatible with the Duke plant's construction, Duke has not concurred in this conclusion. Duke cannot be compelled to accept the judgment of the Corps of Engineers."

In the same manner, a significant number of government, business and civic leaders in South Carolina and Georgia feel that they cannot be compelled to accept the judgment of the Federal Government that the Trotters Shoals project will be good for their States or for the country.

Mr. President, I believe that a little economic comparison as to the two competing facilities on the Savannah River is in order. H.R. 6016 authorizes the construction of this Federal project at an estimated cost of $78,700,000. Other estimates of the project run as high as $100 million. This cost, of course, would come from the coffers of the U.S. Treasury. This hydroelectric facility will have no requirements for fuel after construction, and will, of course, pay absolutely no taxes to either the National, State, or local governments. On the other hand, if the Duke Power dam were to be authorized and constructed, the total capital expenditures upon completion would be $210 million, all from private sources. In addition to this, it would require approximately $24 million worth of coal per year, because it would be a steam generated plant, and basically different from the hydroelectric project. Other operation and maintenance costs, exclusive of fuel, would be $3 million per year for the Duke facility, as compared with only $483,000 for the Federal project. The Duke Power project would pay annual local and State taxes to the extent of $5,950,000, in addition to $7,400,000 annual Federal income tax. This is, of course, in comparison to no taxes which would accrue to any level of Government from the construction of the Federal project.

The diversion dam, which would be built by Duke Power Co., would be approximately 40 feet high and would not adversely affect further development of the Savannah River Valley. It would flood only about 1,500 acres of land, and this 1,500 acres is now privately owned by Duke Power Co. and would continue to be on the tax rolls.

In contrast to this, the Trotters Shoals Dam would be approximately 180 feet high and would flood approximately 24,000 acres, all of which, of course, would be removed from the tax rolls. Included in these 24,000 acres are 8 prime industrial sites, 4 on the Georgia side and 44 on the South Carolina side, which are badly needed to boost the economy of this entire region, on both sides of the river. Senator Charles E. Daniel, the board chairman of the Daniel Construction Co., has said that:

> This area is blessed with a tremendous amount of free-flowing water. One of the largest natural gas lines in America crosses it. Equally large liquid petroleum lines cross it. There are two railroads and truck and air transportation. More important, there are many thousands of people on both sides of the river who desperately need jobs.
>
> My firm has 47 industrial prospects that want to build new plants in the Southeast. Every year it becomes more difficult to find sites such as this for plants which require a great amount of water. I confidently believe that we can have more than $500 million worth of industry along this stretch of river and in the supporting areas within the next 10 to 15 years.
>
> But if the Trotters Shoals Dam is built, it will knock out the possibility of the primary plants along the river and their satellite plants.

Of primary concern is the planned construction by the Mead Pulp & Paper Corp., of a $40 to $50 million plant on the Savannah River in Abbeville County, S.C. The counties most closely concerned with this in Georgia are: Lincoln, Wilkes, Elbert, Hart, Franklin, Stephens, Madison, Oglethorpe, McDuffie, and Columbia. The counties most closely concerned in South Carolina are: Abbeville, McCormick, Greenwood, Edgefield, Saluda, Newberry, Anderson, Oconee, Greenville, and Laurens. In all of these counties, in both South Carolina and Georgia, tree farming is the largest farm crop. As a matter of fact, the annual growth in these counties presently exceeds the annual cut. Sixty percent of the entire area is in forest land. If the Mead Corp. should build this paper plant, they would purchase $9.5 million worth of pulp wood annually, according to the testimony of Mr. Ford T. Sheppard, vice president of Mead Pulp & Paper Corp. They would pay an annual freight bill of $4.5 million. The mill would employ 675 people at an annual payroll of $5 million. The people who would be employed in the woods and on the farms as a result of this mill would be approximately 2,500, and taxes accruing to National, State, and local governments would be approximately $4 million annually. However, the Mead Corp. has stated that it could not erect this plant if the Trotters Shoals government dam is built, because the site it now owns would be flooded by the reservoir which would be created.

Mr. President, the sole argument in favor of the construction of this Government project, other than the production of power, centers around its value as a recreational area. It should be noted, however, that in addition to other recreational facilities, in this immediate vicinity there are already two large reservoirs as a result of existing Federal dams, and these provide more than sufficient recreational sites. What is needed is not more recreational sites, but more jobs and a healthier economy, so that those recreational facilities now existing can be utilized to their full capacity.

Mr. President, after carefully weighing all of these considerations the South Carolina General Assembly adopted a resolution memorializing the Board of Engineers for rivers and harbors of the U.S. Army not to authorize the construction of this project. I would like to read this concurrent resolution:

Resolution —

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to prohibit the construction of the Trotters Shoals Reservoir project until ways and means have been provided to assure that the areas of the State affected will not be rendered undesirable for industry

Whereas the General Assembly of South Carolina has been informed that the U.S. Army Engineer Division, South Atlantic, of the Corps of Engineers, has recommended the construction of a hydroelectric dam at Trotters Shoals on the Savannah River which will back water from the Clark Hill Reservoir to Hartwell Dam, and with the Clark Hill and Hartwell Reservoirs, completely stop the free flow of water from the headwaters of Hartwell Lake to Augusta, Ga.; and

Whereas the general assembly looks with great concern upon any project which will thusly affect our waters which are so important to the industrial development and economy of the State; and

Whereas the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors plans to review these recommendations and has requested suggestions and recommendations from the interested parties; and

Whereas the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in studying the plans for the Trotters Shoals development, has clearly indicated that the effect that this proposed dam will have on the waste assimilative capacity of the Savannah River is not known; and

Whereas, if the proposed project becomes a reality, it will pour upon the State an additional quantity of electric power for which there is no foreseeable need as people of the State now are served adequately by both public and private sources at reasonable rates; and

Whereas Trotters Shoals Dam will on one hand give the State an excess of electric power, it will on the other hand render the area affected undesirable for private industry, thusly depriving the State of much-needed tax revenue and opportunities for gainful employment of a segment of its people; and

Whereas the industrial site which is now owned by a major industry will be rendered unusable if the capacity of the waters of the Savannah River to assimilate municipal and industrial wastes is reduced, and

Whereas the South Carolina water pollution control act sets up certain purity standards, the complying with which will result in great additional expenditures to municipalities and industries alike if they are to treat wastes before discharging them into lakes of the State; and

Whereas the U.S. Government has made no provision to defray this increased cost to municipalities and industries; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that the effect upon water pollution control that the impoundment of waters of the Savannah River by the Trotters Shoals project should be first determined, and that funds for the construction and operation of necessary treatment plants be provided before the project is finally approved, and that these additional costs should be considered a part of the overall cost of the entire project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors is hereby memorialized not to authorize the construction of the Trotters Shoals Reservoir on the Savannah River until definite plans have been made to assure industry that those areas of the State affected by the reservoir will not be rendered undesirable for industry: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each U.S. Senator from South Carolina and Georgia and to each Representative in the Congress of the United States from South Carolina and Georgia, and to the Chairman of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors.

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

Mr. President, in line with the wishes of the people of South Carolina, and their elected officials in the State legislature, the former Governor, Ernest F. Hollins, disapproved the construction of this project. After the election of our present Governor, the Honorable Donald S. Russell, the burden of making a decision with regard to this matter was renewed. Governor Russell went to great lengths to have the views of all interested parties so that he could make an informed decision. He held two public hearings in our State capitol, Columbia, S.C., and heard much testimony. In addition, he appointed the president of the University of South Carolina, Dr. Thomas F. Jones, to act as consultant engineer. After carefully reviewing all of the evidence presented, Governor Russell sent the following letter to Lt. Gen. W. K. Wilson, Jr., the Chief of Engineers, Department of Army, officially disapproving this project.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 14, 1963.

W. K. WILSON, Jr.,
Lieutenant General, U.S. Army, Chief of Engineers, Headquarters, Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL WILSON: I have reviewed the tentative plans for the construction of what is known as the Trotters Shoals Reservoir on the Savannah River near Calhoun Falls, S.C. Such reservoir is part of a larger plan, developed by the Corps of Engineers originally in 1944 and intended to cover the entire Savannah River Basin. Already, as a part of this overall plan, dams have been constructed at Clarks Hill and Hartwell on the Savannah River. The present project would cover the approximately 30 miles of the Savannah River between the Clarks Hill and Hartwell developments.

There is a difference of opinion in this State with respect to the wisdom of the proposed project and its impact on the industrial growth of this State. I understand that this plan was not approved by my predecessor in office; I am requested to alter that decision.

In order to obtain all facts and information available to guide me toward a wise judgment in this regard, I held two public hearings, afforded all interested citizens and groups an opportunity to present their views on this project.

After due consideration, I am of the opinion, as Governor of South Carolina, that I cannot approve the plan for the Trotters Shoals Reservoir as presented to me by the Corps of Engineers.

I shall not review the conflicting arguments submitted to me at the hearing. I shall confine myself to some of the reasons which prompt my decision.

I

Both those supporting and those opposing the project are largely in agreement that they desire to see a proposed steamplant of Duke Power Co. completed on the upper part of the Savannah River involved in the Corps of Engineers project. This steamplant will require a small dam across the Savannah River. It is the position of the proponents of the Trotters Shoals project that this Duke steamplant is compatible with the Trotters Shoals project; and they accordingly support both projects. And the report of the Corps of Engineers, submitted in February 1962, states flatly that the construction of the Duke steamplant is compatible with the construction of the Trotters Shoals Reservoir.

The Duke plant offers many advantages to South Carolina and its subdivisions. It is estimated that this plant will add approximately $7 million per year to the taxable revenue of this State and its subdivisions. On the other hand, it is disputed whether Trotters Shoals, if constructed, would add anything appreciable to the taxable revenues of the State. Moreover, it would produce almost 25 times as much electric power as the proposed Trotters Shoals Reservoir. South Carolina accordingly has an important stake in the successful construction of this Duke plant.

The difficulty is that, while the Corps of Engineers asserts that its proposal is compatible with the Duke plant's construction, Duke has not concurred in this conclusion. Duke cannot be compelled to accept the judgment of the Corps of Engineers. At the hearings before me Duke pointed out that, if the Corps of Engineers should in its final plans construct the Trotters Shoals project with a certain height or other features, the Duke project, in its judgment, would not be compatible either from an engineering or an economic viewpoint. Since there is no agreement between the Corps of Engineers and Duke on the compatibility of the two projects, the State of South Carolina has no assurance that the Trotters Shoals project will not eventually preclude the Duke construction. South Carolina would not wish to put in jeopardy the Duke project.

II

In another vital area, the report of the Corps of Engineers leaves open a matter which might be of serious consequence to many municipalities and industrial plants now using the Savannah River and its tributaries for waste discharge. Thus, on page 32, this report states: "No specific items of local cooperation are proposed due to the nature of the project and benefits. Several communities and industries in the area use the river and its tributary streams for the disposal of raw and partially treated domestic and industrial wastes. For example, the city of Anderson, S.C., discharges partially treated domestic and industrial waste into a branch of Rocky River and into Big Generostee Creek; the city of Elberton, Ga., discharges raw sewage and industrial waste into Beaverdam Creek; and the Rocky River plant of the Bigelow-Sanford Carpet Co. dumps partially treated industrial waste into Rocky River. While the situation is currently permitted or tolerated, the pollution of streams and related problems is a matter within the responsibility of State and local government agencies and this responsibility would not be altered by construction of the Trotters Shoals project. A detailed survey has not been made specifically for this report of all sources or the magnitude of existing pollution problems in the area."

This same point is emphasized anew in the letter of January 28, 1963, from the Chief, Corps of Engineers, to me in these words: "The U.S. Public Health Service has stated that the effects of existing and foreseeable waste discharges on possible recreational, municipal and industrial water supplies should be studied. This matter will be investigated further during preconstruction planning if the project is authorized. At that time, correction of any adverse effects on waste treatment plants or water intake structures for which there may be a project responsibility, such as plant alterations necessitated by the rise in water surface will be planned in detail. However, Federal responsibility is not considered to extend to participation in the cost of constructing new or expanded waste treatment measures solely because a reservoir is provided, unless this is the more economical way of correcting a condition which otherwise would be a Federal responsibility."

What steps the city of Anderson and other municipalities might subsequently be required to take in connection with their waste disposal and who would bear the expense of the same, if this project is constructed, is a matter of substantial importance to the taxpayers of Anderson and the other municipalities which might be involved. These and other related questions are unanswered.

Further, this proposed development, with its control over the water resources of the area, will affect the industrial growth of an important area of our State. The rules which the Federal Government will apply in connection with waste discharges will be of considerable interest to any industrial prospect. It was suggested at the hearing that one industry already located in the area would, if this reservoir is constructed, have to spend three-quarters of a million dollars on waste controls. Certainly, any new industry would want to know what would control the use of the water impounded in the reservoir. The plan submitted leaves all this to future review.

III

Many opponents of the proposed project base their objection on the ground that the project, if constructed, would eliminate the possibility of a large paper and pulp plant, now under consideration for this area by the Mead Corp. It seems agreed that this plant could not be built on a site now owned by the Mead Corp. in Abbeville County, if the Trotters Shoals Reservoir is built.

The Mead Corp., through its chief executive, appeared at the hearings to oppose the Trotters Shoals Reservoir. It stated that it expected to build a new plant in the next few years, and this Abbeville area seemed an excellent location. It pointed to its purchase of a substantial amount of timberlands in this area as evidence of its serious intentions. It was, however, unwilling to commit itself definitely and indicated that its decisions would be determined by future demands for pulp products.

The value of a pulp plant in the Abbeville area is recognized. It would provide a market for the pulp produced in volume in this section of our State. Moreover, it would contribute substantially to tax revenues and employment in this State.

IV

It should be noted that the Trotters Shoals development is part of a general plan developed in 1944. Many changes have taken place since that time. It is entirely conceivable that a fresh review of the overall development plan for the Savannah River might alter this plan. Recent years have given greater urgency to wise and judicious use of water both for domestic and industrial purposes. The letter to me from Dr. Jones, hereto attached, emphasizes this point and suggests that the State of South Carolina might well conduct such a review.

The economic justification of the project was seriously questioned in the hearings. To discuss such question would unduly prolong this letter. I have already stated my conclusions on the plan as presented.

Very truly yours,

DONALD RUSSELL.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the question which is presented to us today can be stated very simply. Should this area be developed by our free enterprise system or by the Federal Government? In this case, private enterprise is both willing and able to develop the area. The power which would be generated by the Duke Power dam is 25 times greater than that which would be generated by the Trotters Shoals hydroelectric facility.

In line with the statement of the President of the United States before the Committee for Economic Development, I feel that private enterprise should be given the opportunity to develop this area and provide what is needed: More jobs for our people, increased payrolls, more tax receipts, better prices for our pulpwood, and cheaper electric power for our people.

Mr. President, numerous chambers of commerce in this area have voiced their opposition to the construction of this project. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, resolutions from the Greenwood, S.C., Chamber of Commerce; from the McCormick, S.C., Chamber of Commerce; and from the Anderson, S.C., Chamber of Commerce. Also I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, resolutions of the Georges Creek Grange, No. 479; the Hollywood Grange, No. 642; and a copy of an original resolution adopted by the Abbeville County Farm Bureau, and subsequently adopted by numerous other organizations, supporting the planned construction of the Mead Corp. facility at their site on the Savannah River. I ask unanimous consent that a list of the organizations which subsequently adopted this original resolution be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, the following items showing opposition to the construction of the Trotters Shoals project:

An editorial from the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., of October 11, 1962, entitled "Should Break Political Impasse."

An editorial from the Calhoun Falls News of Calhoun Falls, S.C., of February 22, 1962, entitled "Can Calhoun Falls Afford a Dam?"

An editorial from the Greenville Piedmont, of Greenville, S.C., of February 24, 1962, entitled "Trotters Shoals Dam."

An editorial entitled "Hearings Slated on Trotters Shoals Dam," from the

March 14, 1963, edition of the Clinton, S.C., Chronicle.

An editorial from the Laurens, S.C., Advertiser of March 20, 1963, entitled, "Trotters Shoals Affect County."

An editorial entitled "Idiotic and Outrageous" from the Georgetown, S.C., Times of Thursday, March 28, 1963.

An editorial from the Columbia, S.C., State of April 25, 1963, entitled "A Fight for Right."

An editorial from the Greenwood, S.C., Index Journal of April 29, 1963, entitled "A Rare Opportunity."

Another editorial from the State of Columbia, S.C., of April 30, 1963, entitled "Free Enterprise at Stake."

An editorial from the Spartanburg, S.C., Herald-Journal of May 5, 1963, entitled "Governor Has Key Roll in a Vital Decision."

An editorial from the News & Courier of Charleston, S.C., of May 13, 1963, entitled "Stop Trotters Shoals."

Another editorial from the Charleston News & Courier of May 16, 1963, entitled "A Wise Decision."

An editorial from the Greenville, S.C., Piedmont, of May 18, 1963, entitled "Trotters Shoals Dam."

An editorial from the Orangeburg, S.C., Times and Democrat of May 28, 1963, entitled "Trotters Shoals Power Project Vital Issue for South Carolina."

An editorial from the Augusta Chronicle-Augusta Herald of Augusta, Ga., of April 28, 1963, entitled "We Oppose Trotters Shoals."

An editorial from the May 6, 1963, edition of the Macon News, Macon, Ga., entitled "Does Georgia Want Industry?"

An editorial from the May 9, 1963, edition of the McDuffie Progress, Thomson, Ga., entitled, "Private Enterprise versus Government."

An editorial from the Augusta, Ga., Chronicle of May 16, 1963, entitled "Decision Founded on Facts."

Another editorial from the Augusta Chronicle of May 22, 1963, entitled "Opportunity For Industry."

Another editorial from the Augusta Chronicle of June 6, 1963, entitled "Duke Has Strong Argument."

Excerpts from an editorial which appeared in the Advocate-Democrat of Crawfordville, Ga., entitled "Free Enterprise and Trotters Shoals."

Excerpts from an editorial which appeared in The News-Reporter of Washington, Ga., entitled "Mead Versus Trotters Shoals."

The May 13, 1963, edition of my newsletter entitled, "Big Dam Foolishness."

Mr. President, after reviewing the amendments made by the Senate Public Works Committee to H.R. 6016, especially the addition of the Trotters Shoals project, I shall be unable to support the bill and would like for the RECORD to show my opposition to this legislation.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF GREENWOOD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas the Greenwood Chamber of Commerce is aware of the fact that the Mead Paper Corp. owns a site on the Savannah River upon which the company plans in the future to build a pulp and paper mill; and

Whereas such a mill would create a ready market for forest products from Greenwood County farms as well as from other counties in South Carolina and Georgia; and

Whereas the proposed mill would create an annual payroll of $5 million with another $9.5 million spent annually for pulpwood purchases; and

Whereas this would mean an increase in employment in the area of 675 persons at the mill and about 650 workers in the woods; and

Whereas the market for local forest products has been declining in recent years while the total acreage in forest land is being steadily increased: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the Greenwood Chamber of Commerce, That the Mead Paper Corp. be invited, in fact urged, to construct a pulp and paper mill at its site on the Savannah River at the earliest possible date; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of the resolution be sent to Mr. Howard W. Whitaker, chairman of the board, Mead Corp.; Gov. Donald S. Russell; Senator Olin D. Johnston; Senator J. Strom Thurmond; Congressman W. J. Bryan Dorn; and the South Carolina State Development Board.

Approved and adopted this fifth day of March 1963.

FRANK H. EDWARDS,
President.
ALVIN W. PARKER,
Manager.

RESOLUTION OF THE MCCORMICK, S.C., CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas the Honorable Donald Russell, the Governor of South Carolina, has called a hearing in Columbia, S.C., on March 18 to gather the public viewpoint of the proposed construction of a $78 million proposed dam at Trotters Shoals on Savannah River; and

Whereas on November 2, 1959, this chamber adopted a set of resolutions opposing any further Federal reservoirs on the Savannah River in this area from the headwaters of Clark Hill Lake to the Hartwell Dam; and

Whereas this chamber's purpose for adopting these resolutions opposing further Federal reservoir projects in the area mentioned are based upon the convictions that this organization from our own experience that Federal reservoir projects do not promote the industrial development of this area but conversely does hinder such industrial development; and

Whereas this chamber is further informed that Mead Paper Corp. proposes to build a pulpwood mill near Calhoun Falls on the Savannah River and that the proposed Federal Trotters Shoals Dam and Reservoir would make this proposed pulpwood plant impossible: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the McCormick Chamber of Commerce favors the proposed pulpwood plant to be built by Mead Paper Corp. which this chamber feels is vitally needed to boost our local lumber industry both as to production and market price of pulpwood timber and related forest products; that this second-ranking industry in our area is now in a depressed state and a pulpwood plant is vitally important to this area; that construction of a pulpwood plant at the proposed Mead site would place McCormick County in the primary producing area of the plant and would further improve market and price conditions in this industry; and be it further

Resolved, That this chamber is opposed to the construction of the Federal Trotters Shoals Dam and Reservoir as being incompatible with the proposed Mead paper plant and with further industrial development of this section of the Savannah River; and be it further

Resolved, That the President name a representative or representatives to present this resolution to the Governor's hearing on March 18 in Columbia and to further submit the chamber's position on this matter as outlined in its resolutions of November 2, 1959.

This resolution unanimously passed at a special called meeting the 21st day of February 1963.

W. N. SMITH,
President.
Attest:
FRANK B. HARRISON,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF ANDERSON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas on November 11, 1959, the board of directors of the Anderson Chamber of Commerce adopted a resolution in opposition to construction by the Corps of Engineers of the then proposed Carter's Island and Goat Island Dams on the Savannah River between Clark Hill Reservoir and Hartwell Dam. This resolution also embodied opposition to any other Government dams on this stretch of the Savannah River; and

Whereas on March 13, 1962, the board of directors of the Anderson Chamber of Commerce adopted a resolution in opposition to the construction by the Corps of Engineers of Trotters Shoals Dam on the same stretch of water on the Savannah River. This resolution, likewise, embodied opposition to the construction by the Government of any dams on this area of the Savannah River; and

Whereas on August 17, 1962, the board of directors of the Anderson Chamber of Commerce, proceeding under the belief that a compromise on these positions would help Anderson County secure approval of Congress for Duke Power Co. to construct a 2-million-kilowatt steam powerplant on the Savannah River at Middleton Shoals in Anderson County, and assuming that Trotters Shoals Dam and the Duke plant would be compatible, passed a resolution asking for the construction of both the Duke powerplant and Trotters Shoals Dam, and

Whereas it now appearing that the latter resolution did not have the desired result and it also appearing at the present time that the Trotters Shoals Dam would probably not be compatible with the Duke plant because definite information is not available at this time as to the final plans of the Corps of Engineers, and it further appearing that the construction of the Trotters Shoals Dam would utilize virtually all that section of the Savannah River from Clark Hill Reservoir to Hartwell Dam, particularly if pumpback storage is included in the Engineers plans; and

Whereas the board of directors of the chamber of commerce still believes that the utilization of this section of the Savannah River by private taxpaying business and industry would best serve the interests of this county, South Carolina, and Georgia through employment of hundreds of people on construction jobs and permanent jobs in plants which would be established there if Trotters Shoals or other Government dams are not built. The board can see no benefits from Trotters Shoals Dam which would come to this area of South Carolina and Georgia. We can foresee tremendous benefits from the Duke plant and other potential industrial plants to be located along both sides of this free-flowing section of Savannah River: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Anderson Chamber of Commerce board of directors in regular meeting assembled does hereby revert to its original position in opposition to Trotters Shoals, Carter's Island, Goat Island, or any Government dams on the Savannah River in this area, and hereby urge all constituted authorities, particularly the Governor of South Carolina who has a hearing arranged on the Trotters Shoals Dam March 18 at Columbia, to oppose any effort on the part of the Corps of Engineers to located additional Government dams on this section of the Savannah River.

Approved at Anderson, S.C., this 12th day of March 1963.

John A. Holman, *President.*
Z. W. Meeks, *Manager.*

Resolution of Georges Creek Grange No. 479

Whereas the Georges Creek Grange No. 479 is perpetually interested in matters concerning the farmer, knowing that whatever benefits the farmer, will in turn benefit all people; and

Whereas tree farming is one of our greatest means of earning a livelihood, and is now bringing in more farm income than any other single crop in South Carolina; and

Whereas our Georges Creek Grange watershed project, when complete, will contain thousands of acres of land planted with millions of pine seedlings; and

Whereas the thousands of acres of young pines now growing will be ready for harvest in a very few years, and the location of a pulp and paper mill close by will provide a ready market for this product: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Georges Creek Grange go on record as requesting our members of Congress, the Honorable Olin D. Johnston, senior Senator from South Carolina; the Honorable J. Strom Thurmond, junior Senator from South Carolina; and the Honorable W. J. Bryan Dorn, Member of Congress from the Third Congressional District of South Carolina, to use their influence and efforts to persuade the Mead Co. to locate a paper and pulp mill on their Savannah River site in South Carolina.

Respectfully submitted.

Claude Leslie,
Raymond Hughey,
Sam H. Robinson,
Committee.

Unanimously adopted during our annual spring rally and covered dish supper, March 11, 1963.

Mrs. Charles Carson,
Secretary.
John R. McCravy,
Master.

Resolution by Hollywood Grange No. 642, Saluda, S.C.

Whereas Saluda County is situated on the slate belt that passes through South Carolina and Georgia, and the slate belt is known to be the fastest timber growing soil in the Southeast; and

Whereas timber is a natural resource and tree farming is our largest industry; and statistics show in 1959 that 53.9 percent of the total land in Saluda County was in forest land and more acreage being planted to pines each year; and

Whereas 62 percent of Abbeville County is in forest land; approximately the same for Elbert, Hart, Lincoln, and Wilkes Counties in Georgia, and McCormick, Greenwood, and lower Anderson Counties and others in South Carolina; and

Whereas the grange realizes the urgent need in our area for a more convenient market for our pulpwood; and that three farming brings in more farm income than any other single crop in South Carolina; and

Whereas with a pulpmill on Savannah River, truckloads of wood could be hauled direct to the plant; and this would call for far less handling and more profit to the tree farmers in the above mentioned counties in South Carolina and Georgia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of Hollywood Grange No. 642, Saluda County, go on record as favoring a Mead pulp and paper mill on their Savannah River site; and be it further

Resolved, That we feel that the individual timber farmers in the above mentioned counties would also favor this project since it would mean much profit to them; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be sent to Mr. Howard W. Whitaker, chairman of the board, Mead Corp., 118 West First Street, Dayton, Ohio; and copies to Gov. Donald S. Russell, of South Carolina; Senators Johnston and Thurmond; Walter Harper, director of the South Carolina State Development Board; and William Jennings Bryan Dorn, Member of Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

Fred W. Long,
Master.

Resolution of Abbeyville County Farm Bureau

Whereas the maintenance of a secure and stable market for pulpwood is of vital importance to the economy of our area, especially to the farmers, landowners, and merchants; and

Whereas we are faced with declining prices and loss of markets for pulpwood in our area; and

Whereas there is a pressing need for the development of a strong market for hardwood pulpwood in our area, which does not now exist; and

Whereas the establishment of a pulp mill in our area will solve these problems in addition to creating many new jobs and stabilizing the jobs of many other workers; and

Whereas we find that the Mead Corp. represents the very highest qualities of management policies, personnel, and community cooperation and responsibility: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved: 1. That we do urge the Mead Corp. to build, maintain, and operate a pulp mill at their site on the Savannah River;

2. That we as members and citizens of this community area do commit ourselves to every effort to make this proposed venture by the Mead Corp. successful; and

3. That we do urge all our officials, public and private, to give their complete support to the securing of all necessary rights, permits, and agreements to make possible the construction and successful operation of this facility.

List of Organizations Supporting the Resolution of the Abbeville County Farm Bureau

During the month of February 1963, the Abbeville County Farm Bureau adopted a resolution in support of plans of the Mead Corp. to build a pulp and paper mill at their site on the Savannah River. This resolution was published in several area newspapers.

The following listed organizations subsequently considered and adopted this resolution and requested that all appropriate parties and officials be informed of their overwhelming support for the position of the Abbeville County Farm Bureau:

Abbeville County Pomona Grange No. 8, Abbeville, S.C.

Donalds Grange No. 497, Donalds, S.C.

Greenwood County Farm Bureau, Greenwood, S.C.

Greenwood County Agricultural Committee, Greenwood, S.C.

Greenwood County Pomona Grange No. 21, Greenwood, S.C.

Phoenix Grange No. 593, Greenwood, S.C.

D. Wyatt Aiken Grange No. 598, Coronaca, S.C.

Greenwood Beef Producers Association, Greenwood, S.C.

McCormick County Farm Bureau, McCormick, S.C.

Buffalo Grange No. 630, McCormick, S.C.

Board of Directors, Carolina-Georgia Lumbermen's Association, Washington, Ga.

Lincoln County Farm Bureau, Lincolnton, Ga.

City of Lincolnton, Lincolnton, Ga.

Broad River Forestry Association, Washington, Ga.

Wilkes County Chamber of Commerce, Washington, Ga.

Board of Commissioners, Washington, Ga.

City of Washington, Mayor and Council, Washington, Ga.

Washington-Wilkes Jaycees, Washington, Ga.

Kiwanis Club, Washington, Ga.

Washington Lion's Club, Washington, Ga.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Oct. 11, 1962]

Should Break Political Impasse

If, as appears quite likely, Congress fails to authorize construction of a small retaining dam on the Savannah River for the Duke Power Co.'s huge steam electric generating plant, thousands of citizens of both Georgia and South Carolina, and much of the rest of the Southeast, stand to suffer untold loss and harm.

The fact that the simple enabling resolution may be lost because it became involved in a political tangle with the recently proposed public power dam at nearby Trotters Shoals makes the matter even worse. It smells of politics unworthy of the Representatives and Senators of the two States.

The trouble arose in the Senate and the only hope of resolving the difficulty may lie in the ability of Senators Johnston and Thurmond of South Carolina and Russell and Talmadge of Georgia to play the role of statesmen and place the welfare of the region as a whole ahead of the special interests of a relatively few.

Here is how the situation stands now and how it developed:

The annual rivers and harbors bill came over to the Senate from the House of Representatives a few days ago with the authorization for the Duke Dam approved without opposition. Indeed, members of the Georgia House delegation worked with the South Carolinians in putting it through.

In the Senate, however, a series of amendments were adopted to write into the bill, or its own version of the House bill, authorizations for several public power (hydroelectric) projects in various parts of the country at an ultimate cost of hundreds of millions.

Among these was an amendment concurred in by Senators Russell and Talmadge of Georgia and Johnston of South Carolina calling for construction of the Trotters Shoals dam at what the Army Engineers euphemistically call an initial cost of more than $78 million.

Senator Thurmond, of South Carolina, made a futile attempt to have the two proposals—the Duke authorization and the Trotters Shoals item—considered separately and on their respective merits. The Senate adopted the bill, amendments and all, on a voice vote.

The bill or bills were then sent to a joint conference committee of Representatives of the two Houses to adjust and compromise differences. The House refuses to accept the Senate amendments and the Senate (or a few Senators anyway) just as firmly insists that the upper chamber has just as much right as the House to initiate appropriations.

In some quarters, the impasse is being described as a contest between the interests of South Carolina and those of Georgia and certain South Carolinians are being accused of selfish behavior, or worse, and of blocking both items.

There is no real conflict as we can demonstrate. Construction of the Duke plant will benefit both States almost equally and the lake required to provide water for cooling for reusing the steam used to turn the turbines will hurt neither State to any appreciable extent, if at all.

In fact, compared to the high dams such as Clark Hill and Hartwell, it will look more like a farm pond and the flooding effects will be negligible.

But a comparison of the power it will produce with the output of the proposed installation at Trotters Shoals is in order and is highly revealing.

Its proponents claim that it will generate over 400 million kilowatt-hours of electricity each year.

According to engineering studies completed on this phase of the project, the powerplant would have a rated capacity of 310,000 kilowatts. Under optimum average water level conditions, it would produce about 340 million kilowatt-hours of energy per year.

The Duke steamplant would have a rated installed capacity of 2 million kilowatts and would produce a steady and reliable 10 billion kilowatt-hours of electrical energy every year.

Let's repeat those figures:

Trotters Shoals—310-million-kilowatt capacity; 340 million kilowatt-hours annual production.

Duke steamplant—2-million-kilowatt capacity; 10 billion kilowatt-hours annually.

The Duke plant's production would go primarily to South Carolina, and much industrial development depends on its availability. But it also would be tied in with the distribution system of the Georgia Power Co. under existing reciprocal agreements and would directly provide power for Georgia consumers.

On the other hand, Trotters Shoals would flood hundreds of thousands of acres of farm and timber land. It is now a known fact that the Mead Paper Co. plans a $35 million plant in the vicinity, but flooding of the site land and the timberland would make it impossible. Much railroad trackage and property would be inundated.

Yet that paper plant would provide a market for pulpwood now being grown on the land involved in both South Carolina and Georgia. And the profits the growers would receive would be far greater than they can now realize because they have to ship to a distant market.

The Trotters Shoals proposal has yet to be completely studied and judged on its merits. The Army Engineers report was not published until March of this year and further studies are indicated. It has not even been approved by President Kennedy's Budget Bureau.

That is why we say the two matters should be separated and considered on their respective merits. The Duke project, which will cost the taxpayers nothing and will pay millions in Federal, State and local taxes, is ready to go.

The other is not. There is plenty of time to study it, for there is no money yet available to start it.

There is too much at stake for the citizens of both South Carolina and Georgia to allow the present political stalemate to continue.

[From the Calhoun Falls (S.C.) News, Feb. 22, 1962]

CAN CALHOUN FALLS AFFORD A DAM?

The recent efforts of the Army Corps of Engineers to establish a dam at Trotters Shoals indicates these men are making an all-out determined effort to build this dam, which in turn can cost the people of Calhoun Falls, Abbeville County, the State of South Carolina as well as our neighboring State of Georgia, enormously.

We feel, perhaps, the people of our area do not realize the real danger and threat that lies in such a construction.

First, there is no reason for the dam, except to take the taxpayers' money from throughout the Nation and put it into a concrete wall that will destroy some of the best industrial sites in the United States. We do not need the dam for power. We have an abundance of power in our area plus the fact that Duke Power Co. has plans now for a $280 million powerplant just outside of Abbeville County in Anderson County. This alone would be ample power supply with the present sources from which we now receive our power.

If power is not the reason, maybe flood control could be considered. But the area certainly has not had a flood in over 50 years, and with Hartwell above us and Clark Hill below, the chances are even more slim that further flood protection is needed.

Power supply and flood control do not justify the great sum of money to be spent for such a dam. Actually the Army Corps of Engineers will tell you this. The real reason they want to see the dam is that it will be something that would be marveled at the world over. This may be true, to a certain extent, but we cannot see that such a small dam as this would be a great engineering achievement compared to the great Hoover Dam or the many dams in the Tennessee Valley.

We believe these engineers want to take land that can make our town, county, State, and neighboring State grow into a prosperous industrial center, and turn it into a big lake that can only be used for recreation. True, this would be a great wonder for all to see in the making, but the ultimate cost does not justify it. Our American engineers are great; they have proven themselves all over the world. They have even proven themselves here with the Clark Hill and Hartwell Dam.

As a place for recreation, it would possibly provide new fishing grounds for several years, but they would soon grow old, and the anglers would be back on the other lakes and rivers. As for attracting fishermen and skiers from other areas, it would serve little purpose with the other lakes in the area that are closer to these people.

Would the actual construction work of the dam provide many new jobs in the area? Actually these construction companies bring in their own skilled help and when the week end arrives they go back home to their families. As for the purchasing of local materials, we doubt that it would be enough to count. Those who would get jobs for the relatively short period of time would probably make more money on jobs in local industry with permanent sitations. When the dam is completed the jobs would end with these construction companies.

What advantage does the dam have for the people of Calhoun Falls and area? None. What damage can this do to us? Plenty. It will kill all prospects of any new industry of certain types for this area. It will put extra miles on those traveling from Elbert County into Abbeville County to their jobs each day and vise versa. It could cause Calhoun Falls to lose its highway through town and could possibly cause the loss of the Seaboard Railroad. The reason is because the dam would be located several miles below the Calhoun Falls Memorial bridge (which would be under water) and the only crossing would be on the dam or below.

It will cost the taxpayers of the United States some $80 million for no purpose at all. It will cost the counties into which the water would back up the loss of taxes paid on the land. It could put Rocky River Mills on a peninsula which would probably create a complex situation for them.

Can Calhoun Falls afford a dam? To those now in Calhoun Falls it may not be the worst thing that could happen, but for the future generations it would greatly limit opportunities.

What can be done about it? A big question with many unsolved problems. One step is to first understand what the dam does mean. The Abbeville County Development Board will be glad to meet with any group of interested citizens and discuss the problem. Then, it will take a unified effort from us to take it to our Congressional leaders in Washington. This is where it can be stopped. Let's get to work and beat it before it licks us.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont, Feb. 24, 1962]

TROTTERS SHOALS DAM

There appears to be a difference of opinion between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and members of the Abbeville County Development Board over a recent recommendation by the engineers to construct a $78.7-million multipurpose dam and reservoir on the Savannah River at Trotters Shoals.

Could this be Federal incursion on State property?

The Abbeville County board seems to think so—and with good reason.

John T. McGee, president of the board, has expressed shock over the proposal to construct a 480-foot dam on the river, especially after the Corps of Engineers had stated publicly about a year ago that dams in the area proposed "are not an essential part of the development of the Savannah."

Mr. McGee seems particularly perturbed over the fact that such a dam as the new one proposed would inundate some choice industrial sites and cause other harm to the area.

However, news that the Corps of Engineers had proposed to erect a new dam on the Savannah with millions of dollars in taxpayers' money was greeted in other quarters—not the Abbeville County Development Board—with a great deal of enthusiasm.

There appears to be some sort of contagion which smacks of prosperity (with a capital P) whenever Federal projects of this nature are announced. People seem to get the fever and feel they are getting something for nothing.

Perhaps there is a real need for a big dam at Trotters Shoals.

Possibly it is an eminently satisfactory thing.

The answer remains to be revealed.

[From the Clinton (S.C.) Chronicle, Mar. 19, 1963]

HEARING SLATED ON TROTTERS SHOALS DAM

Governor Russell has called a public hearing in Columbia on March 18 (next Monday) on the proposed Trotters Shoals Government dam on the Savannah River.

This dam would cost the taxpayers approximately $100 million (the estimated figure, which would more than likely be raised by 50 or 100 percent if it follows the usual course of Federal projects).

Further, it would flood almost all of the Mead Co.'s pulpmill and papermill site on the Savannah River in Abbeville County. This projected mill would be built on about the only remaining site on which such a mill could be built in this area. The mill would furnish a market close at hand for thousands of our farmers who have converted their former cotton lands to the growing of pulpwood.

Then, too, if the Trotters Shoals Dam were built it would push out of the picture a tremendous Duke Power Co. generating plant, which is proposed to be built on the Savannah River at a cost, we understand, of about $300 million. This would be a taxpaying project—and would cost the taxpayers not a dime.

Georgians, across the river, are opposing the Duke plant in South Carolina while South Carolinians do not think the Trotters Shoals Dam should be built.

Laurens County citizens should join with others from the State in attending the hearing in Columbia on Monday and express themselves vigorously in opposition to the Government project at Trotters Shoals.

[From the Laurens (S.C.) Advertiser, Mar. 20, 1963]

Trotters Shoals Affects County

This country was founded on the principle of the least government, the best government. That is not so today. We have sat by and let the Federal Government, which continues to gnaw away at our every basic freedom, move into our church, our school, and our business.

Another illustration is the proposed Trotters Shoals Dam between Clarks Hill and Hartwell Dam. We, along with many other opponents, believe that the construction of the Trotters Shoals Dam would destroy fine industrial sites and become just another fishpond or skiing resort.

Mead Paper Co. has made public their intentions of building a papermill in that area provided the dam is not built. This papermill would affect Laurens County directly in that our pulpwood growers would have a tremendous market.

Laurens County now ranks 15th in pulpwood production with a total of 245,000 acres planted in woodland. As there are only 448,640 acres in Laurens County, it is not difficult to see the importance of our pulpwood industry.

[From the Georgetown (S.C.) Times, Mar. 28, 1963]

Idiotic and Outrageous

For a simple proposition, try this:

What is better? A $200 million investment by private, tax paying industry to develop the world's largest steam generating plant and a large papermill or a $78 million project for a Government dam and huge reservoir that will produce no tax revenue and flood vast acres of private property?

It seems almost inconceivable that such a question would ever arise, but it has. To our way of thinking it raises very serious doubts about the direction of the Federal Government and the economic values that motivate many men in it.

In upper South Carolina, a potentially huge industrial complex stands on the horizon for Abbeville, Anderson, Edgefield and McCormick Counties with economic advantages spilling over into many counties in Georgia.

Duke Power Co. wants to build the world's largest steam generating plant in Anderson County to produce electricity. Mead Paper Co. wants to construct a papermill that will employ about 650 persons on a 1,000-acre site in Abbeville County. Both developments would mean large sums of tax revenue for the counties involved, the State of South Carolina and the U.S. Government.

But what has happened? Both projects are being blocked by the proposed Trotters Shoals Dam that is being proposed by the Federal Government. Instead of producing tax revenue, this project would be financed by tax revenue.

What pray tell has happened on the New Frontier?

Instead of getting the country moving again, it seems that a group of politicians and their bureaucratic bedfellows are hellbent on shoving it backwards.

Great ballyhoo is made of economically depressed areas, but few counties in the United States are any more depressed than McCormick County, S.C. The Federal Government owns well over half of the total area of the county, which is dismally poor. Yet projects of taxpaying industries that could immeasurably benefit the county are being stymied by political intrigue in the Federal Government itself and by political interests in Georgia.

Great concern is being expressed by the Kennedy planners about the plight of railroads. Yet here are two projects, a steam generating plant and a papermill, that would be of vast benefit to railroads and not cost the Federal Government a cent.

Great distress is portrayed as agricultural employment declines and unemployment increases. Yet here is private industry wanting to create jobs and provide more desperately needed employment, only to be stymied in the foul bed of politics.

Economic development in the United States is being denied in the Savannah River Valley to taxpaying enterprises for the sake of a tax-free Federal dam that at best would provide only a handful of jobs and create no tax revenue for local governments or the Federal Government itself.

If this is good government, good economics, good sense, we simply do not see it.

The whole business smells to the high heavens with politics at its foul worst. It is idiotic and outrageous.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Apr. 25, 1963]

A Fight for the Right

Jobs and income necessarily come before men's recreation; otherwise, there would not even be the means of getting to the places of recreation.

One of the prime issues over the proposed publicly financed Trotters Shoals Dam has now been boiled down to jobs versus recreation. Those favoring the development have admitted that highly suitable sites for industry would be inundated by the waters of the project, but point to the recreational advantages the lakes would provide.

It is not a good argument that potential employment would indeed be drowned out but that a large new facility for recreation would be created. It is a very unsound argument. It places the cart before the horse.

It was Representative W. J. Bryan Dorn who drew from an officer of the Corps of Army Engineers the admission that this development would wipe out excellent industrial locations, and it was this officer whose rebuttal cited the recreational benefits which would come. The officer cited the success of the Clark Hill development, on the Savannah River, below Trotters Shoals, as a center for the recreational pleasure of citizens, his point being that Trotters Shoals would serve a similar purpose.

This argument becomes doubly fallacious when one remembers how close Clark Hill is to the area where Trotters Shoals' lakes would appear. Why not let industry grow in the Trotters area and let the holders of the new jobs and their families use the Clark's Hill center for their recreation?

We believe in adequate facilities for recreation. We aren't blind to the fact that properly practiced outdoor enjoyments do indeed recreate. But neither are we blind to the hard necessities of sustenance through income-earning employment.

The privately owned utility (Duke Power Co.) which would build a very large electric generating plant in the Trotters Shoals area would not risk so much private capital if it did not have reasonable assurance of industrial development there. Duke has been restrained by those who want the public project. Those who adhere to the idea that government should do what private enterprise cannot do are silenced in this instance. Private enterprise stands ready to provide.

The publicly financed project should be abandoned. Duke should be permitted to proceed with its job-giving, taxpaying enterprise. Jobholders with the incomes which the employment would provide would get their recreation.

Mr. Dorn and those with him are making a fight for commonsense. They fight for the right as represented by firm realities which should not be questioned.

[From the Greenwood (S.C.) Index Journal, April 29, 1963]

A Rare Opportunity

A controversy over the proposal to construct a Federal dam at Trotters Shoals on the Savannah River has developed considerable bitterness. That is greatly to be regretted, but the issue is so clear-cut that there is little room for compromise, and perhaps some bitterness is to be expected.

The position of the Index-Journal has been that much greater economic benefits would accrue to the entire area from the construction of the Mead Corp. paper mill and the Duke Power Co. steam plant than ever would result from the dam.

One of the points at issue is whether Mead really intends to build a paper mill on its site near Calhoun Falls. That is a valid point, but it seems that the statement of Fort T. Shepherd, Mead vice president, before the subcommittee hearing in Washington last week is about as close as a company can give to positive assurance that the plant will be built.

"We intend to use the site for the purpose for which it was purchased when economic conditions justify the huge investment." Mr. Shepherd said, "However, this important decision cannot be made until we are assured of our water supply and a flowing river for the adequate treatment and processing of our effluent."

No corporation could pledge unconditionally the expenditure of millions of dollars in new plant construction for some time in the future. The conditions are the same as when the Chemstrand Co. said when it began construction here that it expected additional construction in the future if economic conditions and its own market conditions warranted it.

That is about all that can be said.

Mead also cannot build without some assurance that its water supply will remain accessible. In a kind of chicken-and-egg situation, Mead says it cannot build until this assurance is given. Proponents of Trotters Shoals say they want the dam because there is no assurance the plant will be built.

On this page today is a large part of the address given before a joint session of the South Carolina General Assembly by H. T. Whitaker, chairman of the board of Mead Corp. In it he gives some information on what construction of the Mead plant would mean to this section. He also gives some idea of the tremendous proportions of the paper industry in the South.

A pulpwood truck, battered as a rule from the hard treatment it receives, would hardly be chosen by the uninformed as the symbol of the South that the region is attempting to build. Yet Mr. Whitaker says that each such pulpwood truck represents about $25,000 in annual income to the community in which it operates.

At Chillicothe, Ohio, where one of the large Mead plants is situated, pulpwood trucks almost fill the highways. They bring a load of pulpwood to the mill and the owner or operator returns home with a check in his pocket.

It is our feeling that Mead has demonstrated as convincingly as it can that it wants to use the site for the purpose for which it was bought. We would like to see them given that opportunity. We can think of few industries which would spread its economic benefits over such a wide area of this section as would a paper mill. The opportunity to have one seems too valuable to be wasted.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Apr. 30, 1963]

Free Enterprise at Stake

The man who may hold the decisive hand in the dispute over whether a public power development or one of private ownership should be built on the upper Savannah River is Gov. Donald S. Russell. And now is the time for the Governor to make his decision. It would be a mistake for him to delay it. He is the man in the middle.

Reduced to its basic terms, the controversy lies between those who want the Federal Government to build at Trotters Shoals another in its growing series of dams along the Savannah River and those who wish to preserve the last remaining stretch of the upper Savannah for development by private industry.

Some effort has been made to label the dispute a fight between South Carolina and Georgia, since the greater measure of support for the Federal project comes from Georgia, and the greater opposition from South Carolina. But no real case for such a classification can be made out, since there are overlaps of both support and opposition.

The issue is not South Carolina versus Georgia; it is socialism versus free enterprise. The very alignment of forces on each side proves the point. The chief promoters of the Federal project are those linked directly or indirectly with the Rural Electrification Administration and who constantly seek to expand the public power empire.

Opposing them are businessmen, chambers of commerce, civic organizations, industrialists, and others who see a greater future for the region, the State, and the Nation if free enterprise is allowed to develop its potential for providing jobs, payrolls, and taxes.

In this particular fight, South Carolina already has lost heavily because of the "dog in the manger" attitude of some Georgia Congressmen and the public power bureaucrats. Duke Power Co., which was ready to proceed with the construction of the largest steam-generating plant in the world at Middleton Shoals, was thwarted in its effort, causing a loss in tax revenues alone to local, State, and Federal Governments of more than $13 million a year.

If public power partisans succeed in building their Federal dam at Trotters Shoals, they will effectively destroy all hopes for a multi-million-dollar paper mill pledged to the area by the Mead Corp. That mill, by its wood consumption, its employment, and its taxpaying, would have a tremendous impact on the region's economy.

The issues are clear. The facts are at hand. The Flood Control Subcommittee of the U.S. House Committee on Public Works is ready to vote on the matter. The man yet to be heard from is the Chief Executive of South Carolina, and his attitude will carry great weight, perhaps to the point of being the controlling factor, in the congressional vote.

Donald Russell has been both an articulate champion and a successful product of the American system of free enterprise and competitive private industry.

South Carolinians await his decision with more than passing interest. He must declare himself, and soon.

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Herald-Journal, May 5, 1963]

GOVERNOR HAS KEY ROLE IN A VITAL DECISION

A decision of exceeding importance to South Carolina is about to be made.

The struggle, embroils Georgia, South Carolina, Columbia and Washington.

Subject: Trotters Shoals Dam.

Line of battle: Private industrial development for the creation of jobs and payrolls versus Government production of electricity.

The site is in Abbeville County, on the Savannah River.

A key role in the dispute belongs to Gov. Donald Russell, whose position on the matter is being awaited anxiously in Washington as well as in South Carolina.

The Governor has had a hearing on the question. He wants to see an engineering study being made by the University of South Carolina. His position will have a significant bearing on the issue.

U.S. Representative BRYAN DORN, of Greenwood, has put his political figure on the line in standing for industrial development and against Government monopoly of the Savannah.

In doing so, he opposes an extremely powerful political combine in his own district—that of Anderson Publisher Wilton Hall and Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON. Both are advocates of Federal power production in preference to private development.

Word is that the Senator's brother, Bill, is likely to oppose DORN in the next congressional election. And DORN has been placed on the liberal and labor union list for political purging.

But in the Trotters Shoals case, the Congressman has the power of fact with him.

A Federal dam at Trotters Shoals would flood thousands of acres of land, including vast and valuable industrial sites. This is not disputed. The only retort is that other sites would be created, but the argument is extremely weak.

Mead Paper Corp., for instance, owns a site now. It plans to construct a plant which would create employment for more than 1,300 people in that section of the State.

Its annual payroll would be about $5 million. It would pay local taxes (not counting income taxes) of $400,000 a year. The economic impact of such as industry would be tremendous.

Mead's site would be flooded by a Federal lake. It could not build its plant.

Yet, a Government dam would cost the taxpayers more than $78 million. The facility, being Government, would pay no taxes. Its employment would be nil. In fact, it would go into competition with private firms which do employ people and pay taxes.

Why, then, this push for a Federal dam?

It's a drive for Federal monopoly of river resources. Today, only a 29-mile section remains free, from Clark Hill on the south to Hartwell Dam on the north. Trotters Shoals would complete the chain all the way to the nuclear plant at Aiken.

Usually the claim for Federal programs is that they are justified where private enterprise cannot or will not fulfill the needs of the people.

Aside from Mead's plans, Duke Power Co. has been stymied in its proposal to construct the world's largest steam-generating plant in the same area.

The point is abundantly clear: Private development offers a great deal of progress and prosperity for a large area of South Carolina; Federal development obstructs that progress.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, May 13, 1963]

STOP TROTTERS SHOALS

Gov. Donald S. Russell is expected to give his decision on the controversial Trotters Shoals project soon after he receives a special engineering report being prepared for him by President Thomas F. Jones of the University of South Carolina. The weight of the Governor's office is likely to be felt in this matter in the near future.

We hope that Governor Russell will apply this weight against construction of the Trotters Shoals Dam on the Savannah River. As leading South Carolinians have testified, building of this Government dam would deprive South Carolina of industrial payrolls and jobs that its people need.

Representative WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN recently pointed out the $78 million dam would wipe out industrial opportunities from private enterprise investors. If the dam is constructed, the Mead Pulp & Paper Corp., for instance, will be unable to proceed with its proposed $50 million pulp mill. This mill alone would provide substantial tax revenue to the State of South Carolina. The mill would purchase timber from Abbeville, McCormick, Greenwood, Edgefield, Saluda, Newberry, Anderson, Oconee, Greenville, and Laurens Counties. Loss of this plant, in order to gain another dam paid for by the taxpayers, would be an industrial setback for the State.

Charles E. Daniel, of Greenville, who understands better than most men the State's industrial situation, recently said it would be a tragic mistake if South Carolina let a Federal dam flood prime development land.

"It is my experienced opinion," he said, "that the 29-mile stretch of free-flowing water between Hartwell Dam and the backwaters of Clark Hill represents the finest industrial area in the entire Southeast."

South Carolina can't afford to flood its economic future to please those who dream of public power empires. The State's chief assets are land and abundant supplies of fresh water. These assets must be put to work, through the agency of private enterprise, to produce jobs for South Carolinians and income for the essential projects of the counties and the State.

We hope that Governor Russell, an experienced businessman, will prepare his message on Trotters Shoals so as to move the State along the free enterprise path, rather than the route of Federal projects that don't pay a cent in taxes.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, May 16, 1963]

A WISE DECISION

Gov. Donald S. Russell deserves the congratulations of his fellow South Carolinians for his firm rejection of the unwise plan to construct the Trotters Shoals Dam on the Savannah River.

In so doing, the Governor put his administration firmly on the side of progress for this State through the medium of more free enterprise rather than Federal spending. Governor Russell noted that the dam would flood an area where a paper company plans a giant mill. He also said that the State would lose an estimated $7 million a year in taxes if the public power dam were built. This is the amount that the Duke Power Co. would pay on the facilities it proposes to build. The private powerplant could not be built, of course, if the Federal project were to be started. It is believed that the Trotters Shoals Dam will not be constructed, in view of the Governor's opposition.

South Carolina needs greater investment by companies that pay taxes to the counties and the State. Governor Russell was mindful of this fundamental need, in making his decision.

Advocates of a public power empire will be sorely disappointed with Governor Russell's rejection of the Trotters Shoals Dam.

Even President John F. Kennedy has begun to see the need for Government caution in the field of Federal power. In a recent statement before the Committee for Economic Development, Mr. Kennedy said that in public versus private power questions, the "burden of proof" must be with the Government before it approves a power project.

"Deeds must follow words," said one executive on hearing Mr. Kennedy's comment. "But it's encouraging to hear the President lay it right out that way."

Reporting these statements, Newsweek magazine said: "Administration insiders say that the President is convinced that where the private economy can supply power needs as efficiently as the Government, there must be a compelling nonpower benefit to justify a public project."

Governor Russell, in his rejection of Trotters Shoals, clearly envisioned a compelling benefit to South Carolina taxpayers in rejecting another Federal power project.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont, May 18, 1963]

Trotters Shoals Dam

Gov. Donald S. Russell gave the best possible reason when he announced he could not approve the Trotters Shoals Dam on the Savannah River.

It would, he said, interfere with the plans of private firms to build plants in the area. He amplified: The dam would thwart a plan of Duke Power Co. to build a multi-million-dollar powerplant in Anderson County, it would flood the site of a proposed paper and pulpmill of the Mead Corp. of Dayton, Ohio, it would interfere with the discharge of municipal and industrial waste.

The proposal to build the dam, its approval by the Government finally or its disapproval can be reduced to a mathematical formula so far as it affects the welfare of South Carolina and its citizens.

If it is built, the power and paper plants will not be built and thousands of acres of land will be lost to the State.

If it is not built, the power and paper plants will be, adding thousands of jobs to the State's economy and contributing millions of dollars a year in local and State taxes (in the case of Duke alone, $7 million a year).

Put it on a dollar-and-cent basis and the disadvantages of the dam to South Carolina far outweigh any possible advantages.

[From the Florence (S.C.) Morning News, May 28, 1963]

Trotters Shoal Power Project Vital Issue for South Carolina

This section of South Carolina is only indirectly concerned with the Trotters Shoals controversy on the Savannah River. But in its broad, economic implications, it concerns the whole State. Indeed, it is a national issue of free enterprises versus mounting Federal control of the power industry.

Simply stated, the Trotters Shoals project proposes construction by the Federal Government of another power dam on the Savannah River, one of a series of dams in which Hartwell and Clark Hill projects are the other principals.

Opponents of the project see in this section of the Savannah River the only remaining portion where private industrial enterprises can be developed. They also see in it an unnecessary extension of the Federal power bureaucracy.

Supporting their claims, they point to a million-dollar papermill which the Mead Corp. wishes to build in the very area to be inundated by Trotters Shoals. The effect of this mill upon the wood industry, employment, and tax revenue would be to boost the area's economy very substantially.

In a statement before the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the House Committee on Public Works, E. H. Agnew said that "the threat of Trotters Shoals has made it impossible for Mead Paper Co. to build as planned, near Calhoun Falls. This was also a blow to the agricultural economy of Anderson County. We have planted over 15,000 acres to pine seedlings during the past 10 years."

A parallel situation for the Pee Dee would be Government construction of a series of public power dams along the Pee Dee River which would freeze out the possibility of such a paper industry as is now under construction by the Stone Container Corp. in Florence County, and eliminate the river area along its full course as prime territory for industrial sites.

In his testimony to the subcommittee, Mr. Agnew said that "the Federal Government is already the biggest land owner, property manager, renter, mover, hauler, medical clinician, lender, mortgage banker, employer, spender, debtor, taxer (not taxpayer), and the biggest insurance company in all history. There is no sense in saying that it must be the biggest producer of electric current in order to complete the job of rural electrification which is 98 percent complete already."

Trotters Shoals, he added, would be built altogether with tax funds. It would never return any tax income to any government—county, State, or Federal.

Moreover, it would dry up sources of tax revenue by eliminating private industrial development in the Trotters Shoals area, with all the implications of such development in terms of employment, development, and consumption of natural resources, and additional tax revenue from individual and corporate sources.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, Apr. 28, 1963]

We Oppose Trotters Shoals

When plans were advanced some 20 years ago for development of the Savannah River, residents of this area—both in Georgia and South Carolina—were advised that an 11-dam complex would be required to effect the Government's program. Salient point scored by the Government engineers was that these were to be multipurpose dams designed to provide flood control, navigation, water supply, recreation, as well as electric power.

Both the Chronicle and the Herald endorsed the program. In the years since they have supported that original concept. We hailed the construction of the Clark Hill Dam and, later, Hartwell Dam. In the instance of the latter we were told that it was necessary to raise the level of the river below Augusta and to lower the water temperature for the Savannah River Plant of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Now, however, we find that proponents of Trotters Shoals Dam have apparently lost sight of that original concept. In their advocacy of the project they are content that it will be, first and foremost, a dam to produce hydro-electric power. Only in a "minor, secondary way," as one proponent told us, will it aid flood control.

On that basis, therefore, the Chronicle-Herald finds itself unable to lend its support to the proposed dam, which would be located near Elberton. To do so would be to give full endorsement to public power. This we do not propose to do.

While that is our primary motive in opposing the Trotters Shoals project, we do not lose sight of the fact that if the Government does not construct its dam, that area of Georgia and South Carolina will reap an even larger financial benefit by way of private enterprise.

It is our understanding that if no Government dam is ordered, Duke Power Co. proposes to erect a huge power plant in Anderson County which will produce approximately 10 times the electric power that would be generated at Trotters Shoals. In addition, the Mead Corp. has a site at Calhoun Falls on which it tentatively plans to build a $40 million paperboard plant employing some 1,400 men for construction and between 600 and 650 on a regular basis thereafter. It would have a payroll of some $6 million and a wood-purchasing program amounting to some $9 million annually.

If a dam is constructed at Trotters Shoals, the Mead site would be flooded.

Testimony before the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the House Public Works Committee also indicates that other industrial sites would be lost. Additionally, the Trotters Shoals Dam would substantially decrease the "bold" waterflow, which, while not militating against all industry that might want to locate between Hartwell and Clark Hill, would materially limit the type.

We do not believe that the people of either Georgia or South Carolina are willing to sacrifice—nor should they be asked to sacrifice—potential industrial sites in order for the Southeastern Power Administration to be able, as Administrator Charles Leavy testified, to market power for the Interior Department. Yet that is what would occur if Congress authorizes the Trotters Shoals Dam.

While it had been commonly believed that it was only South Carolina that was against the public power dam, and that Georgia wanted it, a surprisingly large number of Georgians have appeared before the subcommittee hearing in Washington to oppose the plan. Many South Carolinians also have voiced their objections.

Of them all, we like what 15-year-old Sam W. Jacks, Jr., of Abbeville, S.C., had to say in his testimony:

"We boys and girls bitterly oppose Trotters Shoals because we'll have to look other places for work since there will be none at home if Trotters Shoals is built."

[From the Macon News, May 6, 1963]

Does Georgia Want Industry?

Gov. Carl E. Sanders recently returned from an industry-hunting trip to New York. Well and good. But the Governor should now turn his attention toward his hometown area where industry may take a beating.

Encouragement of industry is absolutely necessary if a State is to create a climate favorable to new factories and plants. Yet the Savannah River area may lose valuable industrial facilities because not enough Georgians are fighting to keep an unjustified public power facility out and needed private enterprise in.

The Federal Southeastern Power Administration wants to build a high-level dam at Trotters Shoals on the river separating Georgia and South Carolina. It is unneeded. There are two other dams, Hartwell and Clark Hill, less than 50 miles away. The proposed dam would cost many millions but the amount of electricity developed would benefit only a comparatively few people along REA lines. Already there are recreational facilities in the area far superior to other areas.

Most important, the flooding which would result would drive away two important industries, and possibly others who would later move into this part of the country.

Duke Power Co. wants to build a private powerplant which would produce 10 to 20 times as much electricity as the proposed public facility. Anderson County, S.C., would benefit by approximately $3 million a year in taxes.

Mead Corp. wants to construct a pulp and papermill at Calhoun Falls. It would be a $40 million plant. Some 1,400 workers would be hired for construction and 200 of the estimated 600 operating employees would probably come from Georgia. About $6 million of the $9 million worth of wood needed annually would be purchased in Georgia. Approximately $400,000 a year in taxes from construction of the Mead plant alone would accrue to Abbeville County, S.C.

These obvious industrial advantages to Georgia and South Carolina will be lost if the empire-happy Federal power officials manage to sell Congress that their plans should be carried out. A potentially fine industrial stretch along the Savannah River will be made useless for the location of plants and factories from now on.

We urge Governor Sanders to use his influence against congressional authorization for the $78.7 million Trotters Shoals project. We urge all Georgians interested in economic growth and industrial expansion in this State to request their Congressmen to do likewise.

[From the McDuffie Progress, May 9, 1963]

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE VERSUS GOVERNMENT

The proposed Trotters Shoals dam between Clark Hill backwaters and Hartwell dam seems to have turned into a Federal Government versus private enterprise controversy since two large corporations testified in hearings recently that they intended to establish plants in the area to be flooded by the dam.

And, at the moment anyway, private enterprise seems to be gathering enterprise in their efforts to stop erection of the power dam.

Duke Power Co. officials declared that it had plans to build a steamplant in the area of Middleton Shoals about 8 miles below Hartwell Dam. The Duke official who testified said the company would spend $1.8 million each year for operation and maintenance of the plant, exclusive of fuel.

A spokesman for Mead Corp. said his company planned to build a paper mill in the area, probably within the next 5 years.

Employment in the mill, when completed would run from 600 to 650 persons with an annual payroll of $5 million. To produce the pulpwood needed would require an additional 2,500 persons on the farms and forest land outside the plant.

Proponents of the dam say it is needed for power, recreation, and continued development of the Savannah River basin. The dam would provide power for REA lines.

There is nothing wrong, of course, with the Government building a dam. However, since these two large companies, both reputable firms, have testified that they plan to construct plants which will provide employment for so many in both North Carolina and Georgia, it seems the Government could find another site just as good for its proposed dam.

The paper plant, particularly, could have a tremendous effect on the already sagging pulpwood business in this area. We hope they get an opportunity to build their plant.

But, either way, it's refreshing to see so many people take a stand for private enterprise.

[From the Augusta Chronicle, May 16, 1963]

DECISION FOUNDED ON FACTS

We share the elation of those foes of the proposed Trotters Shoals Dam who see in the opposition of South Carolina Gov. Donald Russell the death knell of this public power project.

Ostensibly designed for the prime purpose of augmenting the supply of electrical energy disbursed by the Southeastern Power Administration, the proposed dam flies in the face of wholesome economics and sound resources management.

It would, were it to be constructed, very likely eliminate any possibility of either the Duke Power Co. or the Mead Co. going through with their projected plans to invest millions of dollars in the area. It would provide short-term industrial gains to the detriment of long-range financial benefits; it would inundate and make valueless some eight industrial sites, two of which are planned to be used by Duke and Mead.

These were factors taken into consideration by Governor Russell in the opposition he voiced to the proposed Federal dam. The Governor had solid facts on which to base his conclusions.

Some of them could have come from an address made recently on the floor of the House by Representative WILLIAM H. HARSHA, JR., a Republican, from Ohio, and a member of the Public Works Committee. It questioned why Secretary of the Interior Udall continues to push for construction of Trotters Shoals Dam in light of the economic statistics involved.

Trotters Shoals would be constructed with some 78,700,000 tax dollars; it would flood in excess of 22,000 acres of land, remove them from the tax books and eliminate—through this inundation—eight major industrial sites. Maintenance and operation cost of the dam would come to some $483,000 annually; employment figures have not been revealed.

If Trotters Shoals Dam is not constructed, said HARSHA, the Mead Co. plans to build a $40 million paper plant at the site, and Duke Power Co. is expected to build a steamplant at an estimated cost of $210 million.

Each would be built with private capital, not tax dollars, and each would contribute immeasurably—more so than would a Federal dam—to employment and prosperity in the areas of South Carolina and Georgia (Abbeville and Elbert Counties) in which Trotters Shoals Dam is proposed.

"Mead," said Harsha, "would employ 1,400 men for 2 years in constructing its plant." New capital investment, creating new construction jobs, would be required every year thereafter. When finished, the plant would employ 600 to 650 persons with an annual payroll of about $5 million. The mill also would absorb pulpwood annually at a value of $9 million, putting to work some 2,500 men all year on nearby farms and forests. Freight movements from the plant, averaging 18,000 carloads a year, would create other jobs.

"During height of construction, Duke," the Ohio Congresman said, "would employ 1,000 men." It would take 3 years to construct just one unit of the plant, and he said several units are planned. Additional construction jobs would be required every year, while the plant also would employ 135 persons in permanent work. The payroll would run to $825,000 annually, while Duke also would spend some $24 million every year on coal, drawing the fuel from Virginia, West Virginia and Kentucky. It would require some 38,000 railroad cars each year, creating additional employment.

On top of this, Duke's plant would produce 11.4 billion kilowatt-hours of energy per year as opposed to 471.4 million suggested for Trotters Shoals Dam. A lake Duke would create would inundate only 1,500 acres of land compared with the 22,000 of the Federal project.

Additionally, Mead would pay local, State and Federal taxes amounting to some $3.8 million annually, while Duke would pay an additional $13.3 million.

"If Trotters Shoals is not built," said HARSHA, "instead of spending some $78 million of tax money, the governments would receive over the 50 years (basis for figuring the benefit-cost ratio) some $850 million in taxes, besides about three times as much electric energy would be provided annually."

In light of these fiscal statistics and the pressing problem of unemployment, it is difficult to reconcile Secretary Udall's staunch support of the Federal project.

It is not difficult, however, to understand the opposition expressed by Governor Russell, an opposition which probably will lead Congress to turn thumbs down on the proposed dam.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, May 22, 1963]

OPPORTUNITY FOR INDUSTRY

Private industry now has its chance in the upper Savannah River valley.

South Carolina Governor Donald S. Russell's disapproval of the proposed Trotters Shoals Federal dam project has virtually killed the proposal for this session of Congress. Now Georgia Governor Carl E. Sanders has indicated he may follow Russell's lead if plans jell for private development in that area.

With one Governor of an affected State opposed to it, funds for Trotters Shoals are considered certain to be denied by Congress for at least another year. With both Governors against it, and new private construction in the area, the Federal project likely would be permanently abandoned.

In a South Carolina news conference Saturday, Sanders called upon Duke Power Co., the Mead Paper Corp. and any other private industry considering developing the Trotters Shoals area to issue a statement outlining the extent of their projects and giving a date for start of construction. If they will do so, said Sanders, he would not object to abandonment of plans to construct another Federal dam on the Savannah.

This appears to us a fair proposition. Many Georgians and South Carolinians feel, as does the Governor, that Federal funds should never be used in an area where private enterprise will do the same job. But that does not mean private enterprise can delay its development indefinitely and still retain its place of preference.

Both Mead and Duke have indicated their definite interest in locating plants on the South Carolina side of the Savannah in the Trotters Shoals area. Other choice industrial sites lie on both sides of the river in that locality. But no actual commitment has been made. Provided he will give them a reasonable time to produce proof of their intentions to build, Sanders has acted equitably in seeking such proof before he reviews Georgia's official position on Trotters Shoals.

When and if the Governor's review becomes a reality, other advantages of private over public development merit his consideration. One is the private versus public power factor. Another is the pressing need for a pulpwood-consuming industry such as Mead's proposed paper mill in the vicinity of Georgia's Piedmont region.

Just last week, the Georgia Forestry Commission Board of Commissioners passed a resolution citing that area's vast forest products potential and the need for new forest industry there. The Mead mill, if built, would be just across the State line from the heart of northeast Georgia (Piedmont) pulpwood country.

There is no question in our minds but that private enterprise can serve the interests of Georgia, South Carolina and the Nation better than can another Federal dam. We hope the private firms will prove it with an early response to Governor Sanders' challenge.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, June 6, 1963]

DUKE HAS STRONG ARGUMENT

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL's acknowledgement that the proposed Trotters Shoals Dam project is a dead issue for this session of Congress received the widespread attention it was due. But too little notice may have been given, a few days earlier, to a statement that can have important bearing when the issue is revived.

The statement came by way of a letter from W. B. McGuire, president of Duke Power Co., to Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina. It clarifies, to a greater degree than has any previous evidence, the question of the proposed Federal project's compatibility with the steam generating plant Duke wants to build in the same section of the river valley. And it points up the unfortunate result of Congress' failure to approve the Duke project last year.

Challenging JOHNSTON's charge that politics motivated Duke's decision to postpone its plant last fall, McGuire said the Senator "completely overlooks the change in the situation between August 10 (when Duke said it would build the plant) and November 15 (when the power company postponed its plans), which necessitated the postponement of Duke's plant. This change was the adjournment of Congress in October without passing a bill to authorize the construction of the dam needed for our steam plant."

McGuire added:

"We had repeatedly emphasized the necessity for Congress granting approval for our dam before it adjourned. The failure of Congress to pass our bill * * * compelled our company to provide the needed generation at a plant which would be ready when needed. This was done at a location in North Carolina where no congressional authorization was required. I do not believe I can more clearly state the effect of the failure of Congress to act."

Establishment of the plant in North Carolina, McGuire indicated, has not eliminated plans for the Savannah River facility. But it has delayed the need for additional power from this potential source until 1970 or 1975. Construction, of course, would begin well in advance of operation of such a plant.

Insofar as compatibility is concerned, the Duke president said original Corps of Engineers plans for the Trotters Shoals facility were compatible with Duke's proposal. Recently, however, the Federal Engineers injected into the Trotters Shoals project the possibility of building it so as to install "pump-back" at the Hartwell Dam. Such a development, said McGuire, would so affect Duke's plans as to create "a problem of compatibility * * * which we had not understood to have existed theretofore."

Many original supporters of the Federal project based their positions in part on the apparent compatibility between the two proposed power developments. If revised plans of the Corps of Engineers bring it down to a question of private power versus public power, they may want to reassess their stands.

Insofar as this newspaper is concerned, the arguments of opponents already outweighed the flimsy justification offered by proponents of another Federal power project in the Savannah River Basin. If it develops that the public power facility would definitely rule out plans for a worthwhile private investment, that factor just adds more weight on the heavy side of the scales.

[From the Advocate-Democrat, Crawfordville, Ga.]

Free Enterprise and Trotters Shoals

The Augusta Chronicle-Herald has editorially opposed the Government building Trotters Shoals Dam on the Savannah River near Calhoun Falls, S.C.

The Augusta paper says it doesn't intend to give its full endorsement to public power. We agree with the Augusta paper.

We understand that Duke Power Co. intends to erect a huge powerplant in Anderson County, S.C., which will produce more than 20 times the electric power that the Government would generate.

The Mead Paper Corp. has a site at Calhoun Falls on which it intends to build a $40 million paperboard plant that will employ some 1,400 men for construction and between 600 and 650 on a regular basis.

The wood-purchasing program would reach into this county and amount to some $9 million annually. We need more markets for our pulpwood. It is estimated the mill would have a payroll of some $8 million.

Twelve Georgia civic clubs and organizations are supporting a resolution for the Mead Corp. to build a pulp mill at their site.

Let's give free enterprise an opportunity to do a job instead of Government spending.

[From the News-Reporter, Washington, Ga.]

Mead Versus Trotters Shoals

It is our belief that neither the people of Georgia nor South Carolina are willing to sacrifice potential industry sites in order for the Southeastern Power Administration to be able, as administrators testified in Washington last week, to market power for the Interior Department. Nor should these people be asked to make this sacrifice. Yet, that is what would happen if Congress authorizes the Trotters Shoals Dam at Calhoun Falls.

It has been commonly believed that it was only South Carolina that was against the public power dam, and that Georgia wanted it. A surprisingly large number of Georgians appeared before the subcommittee hearing in Washington last week to oppose the plan. Many South Carolinians also have voiced their objections.

Of the 300,000 acres in Wilkes County, some 70 percent or 210,000 acres are pine and hardwood forest lands. These forest lands have been, by far, our most important economic hope. Within a 50-mile radius of the proposed site of the Mead plant at Calhoun Falls, there are 5,026,560 acres of land. About 70 percent of this land is pine and hardwood forest land, as in the case of Wilkes County. Thus we see that within 50 miles of the proposed site of the Mead plant, there are about 3,518,592 acres of pine and hardwood forest lands. Of course, much pulpwood would be shipped from even greater distances than 50 miles. The economic value of having such a plant as Mead proposes to build, located in this great forest area, would be tremendous. The advantages of landowners and the general economy of the whole area would be very significant.

Let us not lose sight of the fact that if the Government does not construct its dam, this area of Georgia and South Carolina will reap an even larger financial benefit by way of private enterprise.

Big Dam Foolishness

(Report to the people by Strom Thurmond, U.S. Senator from South Carolina)

May 13, 1963.

A matter which has until recently been a local issue on both sides of the Savannah River, in South Carolina and Georgia, is attracting national attention. This is the proposal to construct another big Government dam across the Savannah at Trotters Shoals in Abbeville County. Because of its effects on South Carolina, I have given this matter great study, and have concluded that this project is not in the best interest of our State or Nation, for the following reasons:

First, Duke Power Co. has offered to build the world's largest steam generating plant in Anderson County near the Trotters Shoals site, but the company has indicated it would not do so if the Federal Government builds the Trotters Shoals hydroelectric power dam. Duke would build a small 32-foot dam which would not adversely affect development of the Savannah River Valley. The Government dam would cost $78.7 million to construct, and it would be so high that it would flood 24,000 acres of land, including some of the best industrial sites in this country. The Duke plant would provide 25 times the electric power proposed by Trotters Shoals, and since steampower can be generated cheaper than hydroelectric power, the Duke officials have testified that they would provide power to REA customers at a cheaper rate than could the Government dam. Mr. Hugh Agnew, former president of the South Carolina Farm Bureau, has also testified to this effect. In addition to this, the Duke plant would pay $7.4 million annually in taxes to the Federal Government and $6 million annually in State and local taxes. The Government dam, of course, would pay no taxes, only cost tax dollars.

Second, the Mead Pulp & Paper Corp. has announced its plans to build a $40 to $50 million plant on the Savannah River in Abbeville County. However, the company has stated that it could not erect this plant if the Trotters Shoals Government dam is approved, because the Government dam would flood its site.

The papermill would provide employment for 675 persons with an average annual payroll of $5 million. The average per annum wage would be $6,600. An additional 650 persons would be given employment in the woods, and an annual pulpwood market of $9½ million would be created, netting for pulpwood producers more than $1.3 million aditional above the amount they would receive if the same wood were delivered to coastal mills. The tax gains for all levels of Government would be $4 million annually. Over a 50-year period, taxes from Duke and Mead, not to mention other potential industries, would total almost $1 billion.

Third, if the Government dam is constructed, not only would the Duke and Mead sites be destroyed, but other sites for industries already making plans to build along the remaining 29 miles of free-flowing water on the Savannah River, between the backwaters of the Clarks Hill Reservoir and the Hartwell Dam, would be destroyed. This would leave this area a virtual industrial desert.

Fourth, the question boils down essentially to one of development of the area by our free enterprise system or the Federal Government. In this case, private enterprise is both willing and able to develop the area. In addition, private enterprise could provide cheaper power, and 25 times as much power, as could the Government dam.

Fifth, with the Federal Government already owing $308 billion, which together with other U.S. obligations and commitments total about $1¼ trillion, we should not commit the Government to new projects, unless absolutely essential. A minimal figure for Trotters Shoals construction, $87.7 million, is no small sum.

Sixth, the Government dam would not provide major multiple benefits, as claimed for Government hydroelectric projects. Besides providing electric power, the proponents of the Government dam have not cited any major advantages to accrue to the area from construction of the dam, such as flood control, increased navigation, etc., except for recreation. Interior Secretary Stewart Udall has testified that the Government dam could be used as a great recreation area for the teeming populations of the East. He did not stress, however, that such recreation would have to be subject to Government policies and orders.

We don't particularly need Government-controlled recreation areas in South Carolina, as we have a plentiful supply of good local recreation areas now, but we do need more jobs for our people, increased payrolls, more tax receipts, better prices for our pulpwood, and cheaper electric power for our people.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], has given a very thorough explanation of H.R. 6016. I merely wish to add a brief statement.

I hope the Senate will see fit to approve H.R. 6016 as reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works.

I am fully aware of the fact that there is considerable disagreement about several of the proposed projects included in this bill.

I sincerely hope that the disagreements over these projects will not result in the failure of the Congress authorizing the badly needed work which is covered in H.R. 6016.

Generally speaking, I think there is agreement between the House and the Senate on the projects in the bill as approved by the House of Representatives and as referred to the Senate Committee on Public Works. As it was received from the House, H.R. 6016 included continuing authorizations for a number of basinwide surveys now being conducted.

All of these are important projects and I certainly hope that we will be able to carry on the work that has already been started in these basinwide surveys.

When we received the bill in the Public Works Committee we decided that a number of other projects should be added to it.

This list includes the projects that were considered and approved by the Senate last year but were not accepted by the House in conference.

These projects include specific authorizations for construction of a number of badly needed projects throughout the Nation.

For the most part these projects were not acceptable to the House last year because hearings had not been held on some of them, because there was not enough information available at the time, or because there was some disagreement on the merits of the projects.

It is true that there is still some disagreement about some of these projects, but I hope the Senate will vote to approve the bill as reported by the Senate committee.

I say this because the members of the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate are fully acquainted with the disagreements concerning all of the projects, and it would be far better in my opinion for these disagreements to be discussed and worked out by a conference committee.

I say this because I think this is the wisest course of action for the Senate to take in view of the importance of carrying on a sound program of water resources development throughout the Nation.

I think it would be a terrible mistake for us to get into a situation where the entire bill would die because of the disagreements over some of the projects, and I do think there is a possibility that the bill would die if we began amending it or if we undertook to recommit it to the Senate Public Works Committee.

For these reasons I sincerely hope that Members on both sides of the aisle will see fit to vote for the bill and allow the differences between the House and Senate to be adjusted in conference.

Mr. President, naturally I am a little bit prejudiced in favor of the Cape Fear River Basin. This basin project was authorized last year, and the appropriation for the basin has already been made. We have the money with which to start construction. All we lack is the authorization from the House and from the Senate. It has had the unanimous approval of the Senate Committee on Public Works, as have also other bills. I hope that the Senate will accept it. I hope the Senator will let this provision go to conference, and let it be handled there, as I know it will be, fairly for all concerned.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from North Carolina for his excellent remarks. It is wrong for us to give in to the House in everything, without doing a little thinking for ourselves. Therefore, I commend the Senator for the action he has taken and for what he has said today with respect to the committee and the work that has been done up to now.

One of the projects included in the bill is very close to my heart. It is in the county and section of my State from which I come. For that reason I am very much interested in it. It was a campaign issue when I was running for the Senate last year. The Governor, my opponent, took the opposite view. Throughout this section of my State in every one of these counties, I was favored by the voters 3 to 1. For that reason it is my duty to advocate the things I advocated when I was campaigning for my seat in the Senate last year.

Mr. President, the Savannah River forms a boundary between Georgia and South Carolina, and therefore, both the States of South Carolina and Georgia are deeply interested in the development of this project.

It is most unfortunate that South Carolina is not as unanimous in its support of Trotters Shoals as is the State of Georgia. However, I want the Senate to understand that I am supporting Trotters Shoals and so are the rural people of South Carolina, including 120,000 rural electric cooperative families who consume electricity that will be generated by this great multipurpose dam, Trotters Shoals. There are thousands of other South Carolina families who want Trotters Shoals to be constructed because of the recreational value that will result. In past years I supported the construction of Clark Hill Reservoir and Hartwell Dam, both of which are located on the Savannah River. Practically the same people who were opposed to the Clark Hill Reservoir and Hartwell Dam are now opposed to Trotters Shoals.

As the chief of the Corps of Engineers has so ably determined, Trotters Shoals Reservoir is the next logical step toward effective and efficient development of the Savannah River.

In the Senate Public Works Committee report the State of South Carolina is listed as being opposed to this project. It is true that our distinguished Governor has stated that based upon the information he has gathered on this subject he opposes this project. However, under the law which provides for the Federal Government to receive the opinion of the Governor of South Carolina or any other State on a project of this sort, it is important to remember that the opinions of the Governors are merely advisory and in no way necessarily reflect the majority opinion of the people of a State nor what is necessarily the right decision.

The decision rests with us in the U.S. Senate. There is a growing demand for electrical energy in this area of the Savannah River Basin. Trotters Shoals has an unusually favorable economic ratio, justifying its construction from the economic standpoint. I hope the Senate will approve this legislation containing authorization for Trotters Shoals.

I hope the Senate will reject any motion to recommit the bill. It is time for the Senate to act on this very important subject.

Mr. President, this is not a new subject to me; I have discussed it before. On May 22, 1963, I wrote a long letter, from which I should like to read an excerpt. I shall not read it all now, for we are rushed for time. I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 22, 1963.

Lt. Gen. W. K. WILSON, Jr.,
Chief of Engineers, Headquarters, Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL WILSON: I have been forwarded a copy of the letter which Gov. Donald Russell of South Carolina sent to you stating that he could not approve at this time the plan for the Trotters Shoals Reservoir as proposed by the Corps of Engineers.

As one who has consistently supported the overall development of the Savannah River, I feel compelled to bring to your attention my views and some facts concerning the future of Trotters Shoals. In the first instance, I wish to emphasize that my opinions and statements in no way are to reflect upon the sincerity of purpose and the unquestioned honesty of the Governor of South Carolina in the decision which he has rendered on this matter. The purpose of my letter is to urge, despite the Governor's reluctance to go along with the project at this time, that the Corps of Engineers continue to pursue construction of Trotters Shoals.

The authorization for the Corps of Engineers to consult with Governors of States where projects of this nature are to be located was contained in the Flood Control Act of 1944 (Public Law 534, 78th Cong.). This policy of the Congress to have the Corps of Engineers consult with Governors of various States concerned carried no authorization that would permit the opinion of the Governor of any State to be used to veto, block, or hold up any project. The opinions of Governors are solicited as a policy of the Congress in an advisory capacity only and cannot be accepted as a device to arbitrarily stop a project such as Trotters Shoals when deemed practicable and necessary in the overall development of a navigable stream for the people of a large section of our country. The U.S. Congress has been given unquestionable control over the development of navigable streams in all the States by the Constitution of the United States. Certainly the Congress must accept in good faith the comments of the Governors of the States and should weigh these comments in whatever action is taken on any particular project.

One of the main questions that has been raised is that if Trotters Shoals is constructed the Duke Power Co. may not proceed with construction of their own powerplant and that as a result South Carolina would lose millions of dollars of taxable revenue. Ever since the Duke Power Co. conceived of its diversionary dam for steamplant cooling purposes and ever since Trotters Shoals was conceived, all parties concerned have been in agreement that both projects must be constructed compatible with one another. In other words, Duke Power Co. could build no dam that would make it impossible to build Trotters Shoals and the Government would not build Trotters Shoals so that it would make it impossible for the Duke Dam to be built. My resolution to permit the Duke Power Co. to construct its dam declared that it be made compatible with Trotters Shoals or it could not be constructed. The Corps of Engineers' report asserts unequivocally that Trotters Shoals is compatible with the Duke plant. While the Duke Power Co. has not concurred with the Corps of Engineers on the question of compatibility, we cannot expect the future development of the Savannah River to be totally dependent upon such concurrence of one private power company to construct its plant. We would not wish to jeopardize the entire future of the Savannah River development just because the Duke Co. cannot agree with the Corps of Engineers. The Duke Power Co. last fall advised me it could not construct its dam on the Savannah River as planned and was going ahead with other plans to construct another plant elsewhere to meet its power needs. We cannot afford to wait another 20 years for Duke Power Co. to decide what it intends to do on the Savannah River.

Last summer the Duke Power Co. was lobbying heavily to have its resolution approved so that it could construct its dam and connecting steamplant on the Savannah. The resolution itself, as I have stated, required that the Duke Dam be constructed compatible with the Corps of Engineers' plans for future development of the Savannah River. It stands to reason that if the Duke Power Co. was ready to accept this compatibility prerequisite last summer that it should have stood ready to accept this prerequisite last fall. I cannot believe that the intervening general election in any way could have affected Duke Power Co.'s plans along the Savannah River. I attended the very first meeting when the Duke Power Co. requested the resolution by Congress to permit it to construct the diversionary dam across the Savannah River. I agreed to introduce the resolution provided it required the Duke Dam to be compatible with Trotters Shoals and this was agreeable with the Duke Power Co. as late as August 10, 1962. On that date, Mr. W. B. McGuire, president of the Duke Power Co., wrote Congressman HAROLD D. COOLEY concerning Duke Power Co. plans as follows:

We have proposed the construction of such a plant on the Savannah River, the first unit of which would begin operation in 1967. We already own the land required for this plant. Two units are planned for initial construction with ultimate total plant capacity to be 2 million kilowatts. In order to build this plant it is necessary to build a retaining dam in the river to provide cooling water for the plant. The dam can be built only with congressional authority. H.R. 6789 introduced by Congressman DORN and S. 1795 introduced by Senators JOHNSTON and THURMOND were introduced on May 3, 1961, to give this authority. These bills are similar to an act passed by Congress to authorize the dam needed for our plant on the Dan River, which act was passed without opposition. Under the bills, plans for the dam must be approved by the U.S. Army Engineers. The Department of the Army has advised the committees of the House and Senate that the Army has no objection to the enactment of these bills.

It was indeed a shock to me that on November 15 the Duke Power Co. placed an advertisement in the newspapers stating it could no longer proceed with plans to construct the dam. I wrote Mr. McGuire on November 17 to express my regrets and to explain that I would look forward to reintroducing the resolution this year. However, Mr. McGuire wrote me on November 19 as follows:

"I note you state in your letter you hope that the project will be approved in the next Congress. Our statement makes clear that we have been compelled to postpone construction of the Savannah River plant and provide generating capacity elsewhere. Were our project to be approved in the next Congress we would not be able to go ahead with the construction of our plant. We certainly do not want to ask Congress for approval of a project on which we do not plan immediate construction and we will not be asking that our bill be passed in the next Congress.

"As we have said in our published statement, we still want to build the Savannah River plant, but we are not now able to say when this will be. We appreciate very much your interest in our project and your efforts in its behalf.

This turn of events and statements by Mr. McGuire is in sharp contrast of his letter to Congressman COOLEY only a short time previously. The only real change in the situation between August 10 when he wrote Congressman COOLEY and November 15 when he printed his ad in the newspapers was the conclusion of the November general election. I fail to see where the future plans of the Duke Power Co. in view of the foregoing facts could or should have any bearing on the plans for the development of the Savannah River by the U.S. Government for the benefit of the people of South Carolina and Georgia. Should the Duke Power Co. ever desire to build its steam plant and require the construction of a diversionary dam, I would be most pleased to introduce the necessary legislation to make this possible. Compatibility would be the same requirement then as it was last summer.

As for the question raised concerning the possible effects upon municipalities and local governments dealing with the problem of wastes and pollution discharges, this problem, in my opinion, would not be aggravated by the construction of Trotters Shoals. There are already two lakes resulting from Hartwell and Clark Hill Dams and the real problem concerning waste discharges, or you might say the overall water problem, will be the handling of waste and the shortage of water in future years resulting from population growth and industrial expansion. So, the problem of increased water usage, coupled with the problem of increased industrial wastes into the rivers and streams, will have to be met by the local communities as the population rises and as industry develops, regardless of whether or not Trotters Shoals or any other dam is constructed.

Another main objection to the construction of Trotters Shoals came from the Mead Paper Corp. which stated that it expected to build a new plant sometime in the future on a site which would be flooded if Trotters Shoals were to be constructed. In the first place, I personally question whether or not a pulp plant of this type would be a desirable industry for this particular location. It would appear to me that the location of a pulpmill would aggravate whatever existing waste sewage problem already exists in the area. Certainly the odor and waste discharged by a pulpmill is most undesirous. While the U.S. Government does not directly control waste and sewage being dumped into the streams and rivers, this being primarily a State and local problem to control, the Federal Government through the Public Health Service does have authority to seek cease and desist orders through the courts to stop the operation of any plant or mill discharging waste into navigable streams which endangers the life and health of wildlife and human beings. I feel this would be resultant in the construction of a pulp plant on the upper reaches of the Savannah River. If the Mead Corp. could possibly build a pulp plant that could not give off foul odors and dangerous wastes, there would be no reason why a new location in this general vicinity could not be found by Mead to replace the presently owned location. However, the future of the Mead Corp. plans on the Savannah River are just as uncertain as they have been for the last 7 years. The Mead Corp. purchased its tract of land in 1956 but has failed to do anything toward constructing an industry during all this time except to issue statements whenever Trotters Shoals was projected. It is my opinion that the Mead Corp. does not have any real plans for a new industry in the foreseeable future at this location and even if it did have, this would not justify penalizing the future development of this great stretch of the Savannah River where Trotters Shoals would be located.

In conclusion, I would like to underscore what I have said to you by providing you with a copy of a letter addressed to me by the Secretary of Interior, Stewart A. Udall, on this very subject. One of the most important points made in Secretary Udall's letter is that Trotters Shoals from an economical standpoint "is the best project in the southeastern part of the United States which the Department of the Interior has been called on to examine since 1950." If this is true, then this is the very best development project the United States has in the Southeast. I think it is most important for us to come up with a comprehensive and sound development program designed to bring to our people maximum benefits from this great natural resource God has given us. The first step in this direction should be the development of Trotters Shoals and I am urging that authorization for and construction of Trotters Shoals be programed as quickly as possible.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

OLIN D. JOHNSTON.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, in my letter to the Corps of Engineers, I expressed commendation for their decision and for saying that it was possible to build both dams on the Savannah River—that is, the Duke Power Dam and the Trotters Shoals Dam.

I then said:

> Another main objection to the construction of the Trotters Shoals Dam came from the Mead Paper Corp. which stated that it expected to build a new plant sometime in the future on a site which would be flooded if Trotters Shoals were to be constructed. In the first place, I personally question whether or not a pulp plant of this type would be a desirable industry for this particular location.

Remember, this site is far inland, and one can imagine what would happen to the entire stream from that point to the Atlantic Ocean.

> It would appear to me that the location of a pulpmill would aggravate whatever existing waste sewage problem already exists in the area. Certainly the odor and waste discharged by a pulpmill is most undesirable. While the U.S. Government does not directly control waste and sewage being dumped into the streams and rivers, this being primarily a State and local problem to control, the Federal Government through the Public Health Service does have authority to seek cease and desist orders through the courts to stop the operation of any plant or mill discharging waste into navigable streams which endangers the life and health of wildlife and human beings. I feel this would be resultant in the construction of a pulp plant on the upper reaches of the Savannah River. If the Mead Corp. could possibly build a pulp plant that could not give off foul odors and dangerous wastes, there would be no reason why a new location in this general vicinity could not be found by Mead to replace the presently owned location. However, the future of the Mead Corp. plans on the Savannah River are just as uncertain as they have been for the last 7 years. The Mead Corp. purchased its tract of land in 1956 but has failed to do anything toward constructing an industry during all this time except to issue statements whenever Trotters Shoals was projected. It is my opinion that the Mead Paper Corp. does not have any real plans for a new industry in the foreseeable future at this location and even if it did have, this would not justify penalizing the future development of this great stretch of

the Savannah River where Trotters Shoals would be located.

I strongly favor the construction of both the Duke Power Co. Dam and the Trotters Shoals Dam. I have corresponded with the Duke Power Co. at various times. Under date of November 19, 1962, I received a letter from W. B. McGuire, president of Duke Power Co., which reads as follows:

Duke Power Co.,
Charlotte, N.C. November 19, 1962.

Hon. Olin D. Johnston,
U.S. Senator,
Spartanburg, S.C.

Dear Senator Johnston: Thank you very much for your letter of November 17 in regard to our statement of November 15 relative to our proposed Savannah River plant.

I note you state in your letter you hope that the project will be approved in the next Congress. Our statement makes clear that we have been compelled to postpone construction of the Savannah River plant and provide generating capacity elsewhere. Were our project to be approved in the next Congress we would not be able to go ahead with the construction of our plant. We certainly do not want to ask Congress for approval of a project on which we do not plan immediate construction and we will not be asking that our bill be passed in the next Congress.

I desire the Senators to realize why we were not pushing the Duke Power Co. for this particular plant. I conclude my reading of the letter:

As we have said in our published statement, we still want to build the Savannah River plant, but we are not now able to say when this will be. We appreciate very much your interest in our project and your efforts in its behalf.

Sincerely yours,
W. B. McGuire,
President.

I replied to Mr. McGuire on December 3. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

December 3, 1962.

Mr. W. B. McGuire,
President, Duke Power Co., Charlotte, N.C.

Dear Mr. McGuire: With reference to your letter of November 19, I wish to express deep regret over the fact that Duke Power Co. has decided not to go forward with construction of the Savannah River plant and plans to provide generating capacity elsewhere.

I am sorry you are not able to build this plant because I feel it is absolutely necessary that more power be made available in this area for the industrial expansion of our State. I had looked forward to approval of my Duke Power authorization bill during the last Congress, but unfortunately such approval was not forthcoming. It is indeed a disappointment to everyone concerned who looks forward to the full development of the Savannah River and abundant low-cost power in this area of our State that the Duke Power Co. now finds it will not construct this plant even if Congress enacts authorization next year.

I would appreciate any information you may have available as to when Duke Power Co. could possibly proceed with this project, as I am deeply interested and would like to be of help in obtaining the necessary congressional authorization.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely,
Olin D. Johnston.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, personally I am unhappy because the Duke Power Co. is not seeking authorization for this dam. I favor public power and private power. I want public power if private power cannot be provided. Power is needed at this time in this particular section of my State. In my opinion, not one, but perhaps hundreds of little industries will move into that section of my State when there is sufficient power to serve their needs.

Therefore, I shall vote for the Trotters Shoals Dam and shall vote against any motion to recommit the bill at this time.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the business for today has been concluded, the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASIN PLANS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6016) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I desire to discuss for a few minutes the very real and urgent problem of flood control which exists in Los Angeles County, the most populous area of my State. I ask the attention of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], chairman of the Committee on Public Works.

For many years, Congress has authorized for expenditure by the Corps of Engineers in the County of Los Angeles $289,741,000. Los Angeles is a great and growing metropolitan area. The previous authorization for work expired on June 30. Late last month I received a letter from Brig. Gen. Jackson Graham, director of civil works for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in which he said, in part:

Headquarters,
Department of the Army,
Office of the Chief of Engineers,
Washington, D.C., June 28, 1963.

Hon. Thomas H. Kuchel,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Kuchel: Knowing of your interest in the Los Angeles flood control project, I am writing this letter to advise you of the status of the monetary authorization for the Los Angeles River Basin.

The various authorizations for work under the Los Angeles County drainage area project have specified a limit on the total amount of funds which could be appropriated to carry out such authorized work. The total authorization on appropriations to the Los Angeles River Basin contained in past flood control acts amounts to $289,741,000. The appropriations to the project through fiscal year 1963 total $287,139,000, leaving a remaining balance of monetary authorization in the amount of $2,602,000.

The amount of the remaining authorization is adequate to meet expenditure requirements on contracts already in force, together with Government costs, for only about a 1-month period. It is likely that most of the work on the project will close down around the first of August unless further monetary authorization is provided at an early date. Our contract procedures provide that a contractor be notified of an impending exhaustion of funds 30 days in advance of such exhaustion. On this basis, the district engineer at Los Angeles will begin issuing notices of funds exhaustion to seven contractors about July 1, 1963, involving a total remaining contract value of $8,500,000. Under the terms of the contracts, the contractors may elect to terminate the contracts or to continue with their own resources pending provision of additional authority. However, the Corps of Engineers, as previously mentioned, will be without authority to make further payments for work beyond the extent of $2,602,000 unless further authorizing legislation is forthcoming.

As you realize, the work of the Corps of Engineers in improving the floodways in Los Angeles County involves a plan of construction which is closely coordinated with local requirements for utility and road relocation work. The stoppage of our work, therefore, will also necessitate a cessation of local construction. This will mean leaving our work in an incomplete status and subject to damage from floods; delays in return of streets to full service; increased costs for the construction work; and inconvenience to the general public.

The Corps of Engineers has been proceeding under a normal program as contemplated in the President's budget recommendation for fiscal year 1964. As you know, a bill has recently passed the House of Representatives—

Parenthetically, Mr. President, I observe that is the bill which now is before the Senate—

which would authorize increases in the monetary limits for seven basins, including the Los Angeles River Basin.

I trust that the information furnished will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,
Jackson Graham,
Brigadier General, U.S. Army,
Director of Civil Works.

Mr. President, I want this record to show the singular urgency of the situation which faces the people of Los Angeles County.

I hold in my hand several letters from Members of Congress who represent the Los Angeles County districts. I shall read several of them. The one I now read is dated July 27, and comes from the Honorable Glen P. Lipscomb, who represents a portion of the County of Los Angeles. I shall read to the Senate a part of his letter, as follows:

Two flood control projects in the 24th District—

Which is served by Representative Lipscomb—

are affected by this legislation, involving construction of approximately 7.3 miles of reinforced concrete open channel when completed. The monetary authorization for these projects, and others in the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin, I understand will be depleted in a few days. Unless additional authorization is provided this vital work will be subject to a closedown.

The projects in the 24th District, as well as in other areas of Los Angeles County, involve a plan of construction closely coordinated with local requirements for utility and relocation work. Work stoppage therefore will also cause a cessation of local construction. This would mean leaving the flood control projects in an incomplete status subject to damage to life and property from flood waters, delays in returning streets to full service, increased construction costs, and inconvenience to the public. As just one specific example, stoppage on one of the projects in the 24th District could have a serious adverse effect on the Los Angeles County Fair, the largest county fair in the Nation, which will open September 13, due to the fact that at present work on the project is concentrated in the fairgrounds area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter from Representative LIPSCOMB be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 27, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: It is my understanding that H.R. 6016, the river basin authorization bill, is scheduled to come up for consideration in the Senate on July 29.

Knowing of your interest in this and related legislation with regard to its significance to Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin flood control projects, I am writing to let you know about the status of certain of these projects which are located in the 24th Congressional District which I represent.

Two flood control projects in the 24th District are affected by this legislation, involving construction of approximately 7.3 miles of reinforced concrete open channel when completed. The monetary authorization for these projects, and others in the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin, I understand, will be depleted in a few days. Unless additional authorization is provided this vital work will be subject to a closedown.

The projects in the 24th District, as well as in other areas of Los Angeles County, involve a plan of construction closely coordinated with local requirements for utility and relocation work. Work stoppage therefore will also cause a cessation of local construction. This would mean leaving the flood control projects in an incomplete status subject to damage to life and property from floodwaters, delays in returning streets to full service, increased construction costs, and inconvenience to the public. As just one specific example, stoppage on one of the projects in the 24th District could have a serious adverse effect on the Los Angeles County Fair, the largest county fair in the Nation, which will open September 13, due to the fact that at present work on the project is concentrated in the fairgrounds area.

As you know, H.R. 6016 was passed by the House on June 24 but has been amended substantially by the Senate Public Works Committee. I strongly favor the House-passed version and believe it is in that form that H.R. 6016 should be enacted by the Congress. Also, as I am sure you know, the House on July 24 by unanimous consent passed H.R. 7638, to authorize appropriations to continue the work in the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin. In the event delay is encountered in achieving passage of H.R. 6016 in an acceptable form, I believe it imperative that every effort be exerted to achieve enactment of H.R. 7638 to allow continuation of the work on flood control projects in the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin without costly and dangerous interruption.

Best regards.

Sincerely,

GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
Member of Congress.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from Representative H. ALLEN SMITH, of the 20th District, also a part of the Los Angeles County; and, first, I shall read to the Senate a portion of his letter, as follows:

> Work on the Los Angeles flood control will have to stop around August 1 if we don't get this bill passed, and it will be particularly inconvenient to many of my constituents because work is in progress on the Burbank-Sunset Canyon portion of this overall flood control, and many residents cannot get into their homes.

He also urges that Congress proceed with this authorization, so that this work, which represents an investment of almost one-third of a billion dollars by the Government of the United States, will be completed.

I now ask that the entire letter from Representative SMITH be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 22, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOMMIE: I am sure you are aware of the serious situation and are doing everything you can to try and get the bill passed in the Senate. In any event, I wanted you to know the House did pass H.R. 6016 on June 24, 1963, and it is in the Senate committee.

Work on the Los Angeles flood control project will have to stop around August 1 if we don't get this bill passed, and it will be particularly inconvenient to many of my constituents because work is in progress on the Burbank-Sunset Canyon portion of this overall flood control, and many residents cannot get into their homes.

After we get H.R. 6016 passed, then we will have to get the appropriation bill out, and that will probably take another month. Anything you can do to help this along will certainly be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

H. ALLEN SMITH,
Member of Congress.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of telegrams which have come to me from newspaper publishers in that area: from Carroll Parcher, of the Glendale News-Press; from A. T. Richardson, editor of the Progress-Bulletin, of Pomona, Calif.; from Robert Shaffer, past president of the Pomona Chamber of Commerce, and area general manager of the General Telephone Co.; and from Bob Erskine, president of the Pomona Chamber of Commerce. All of them urge that this action be taken.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GLENDALE, CALIF.,
July 26, 1963.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge efforts for Senate concurrence H.R. 7638 as emergency measure to continue Los Angeles basin flood control projects. Stoppage now would create serious problems in Burbank eastern storm drain area.

CARROLL PARCHER,
Glendale News-Press.

POMONA, CALIF.,
July 26, 1963.

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Passage of H.R. 7638 is necessity. This money required to complete big storm drain through valley. Small rain during conditions would mean loss of millions. Delay will cause traffic obstructions, inconvenience to general public, increased cost due to contractor having to call off men and equipment, danger to partially completed construction. Property owners adjoining project becoming aroused.

A. T. RICHARDSON,
Editor, Progress Bulletin.

POMONA, CALIF.,
July 26, 1963.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: Passage of H.R. 7638 urgent. Present construction goes through parks and housing where children are attracted to dangerous open trenches. Potential flood danger will be at maximum because half constructed drains not yet ready to do so. Will receive water from newly completed Fingerling drains. Cost will mount if contractor must shut down then start up. Present construction interferes with main road. Los Angeles County Fair traffic will be hopelessly snarled. Counting on you to avoid stoppage of this most important project.

ROBERT SHAFFER,
Past President Pomona Chamber of Commerce, and Area General Manager, General Telephone Co.

POMONA, CALIF.,
July 26, 1963.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: Am telegraphing to urge necessity for passage H.R. 7638, Los Angeles County emergency flood control measure. Present construction interferes with main roads. Los Angeles County Fair traffic will be hopelessly snarled. Costs will mount if contractor must shut down then start up. Potential flood danger will be at maximum because half constructed drains not yet ready to do so. Will receive water from newly completed Fingerling drains. Present construction drains go through parks and housing where children are attracted to dangerous open trenches. Counting on you to do the job.

Kindest regards,

BOB ERSKINE,
President, Pomona Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Lack of Funds Perils Flood Control Project." This article was published in the Progress-Bulletin, of Pomona, Calif., on July 17, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pomona (Calif.) Progress-Bulletin, July 17, 1963]

LACK OF FUNDS PERILS FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT—QUICK ACTION BY CONGRESS NECESSARY

County supervisors warned today that construction of a $2 million flood control channel through west Pomona will stop July 31, leaving the work half finished, unless Congress authorizes money to continue.

About $1.5 million is needed to finish the job before fall rains. A half million was authorized last year by Congress to get the work started 4 months ago.

Six other county flood control projects, totaling nearing $15 million in works, will stop at the end of the month unless Congress is quick with funds, said Supervisor Frank Bonelli. One of these is Emerald and Live Oak Washes, which are being reconstructed in La Verne at a cost of $1,059,000.

Bonelli said the U.S. Corps of Engineers, which is doing the county's flood control work, will run out of money for the works by the end of the month.

The work consists of enlarging existing ditches and paving them. In Pomona, Thompson Creek-San Jose Wash are being improved from Fulton Road, near Ganesha Park, to Nicholet Street near Cal Poly. The distance is 3½ miles.

Bonelli said the corps is not free to spend funds budgeted for completion of work in fiscal 1964 until additional authorization is obtained by congressional legislation. Two bills, providing funds to keep the work going, are before the Senate Public Works Committee.

ACTION URGED

County supervisors have adopted a resolution urging Congress to be quick. Adoption of similar resolutions by cities involved is suggested by the supervisors.

The seven projects are part of the comprehensive flood control program which has been constructed jointly during the last 27 years by the Army and the county flood control board.

Bonelli said a work stoppage on the facilities would prolong traffic disruption, including several detours in Pomona; delay completion of vital projects needed to protect the area from flood hazards and create serious unemployment problems among the many trades and crafts engaged on the jobs.

Contractor on the job here is MacDonald & Kruse, general engineering constructors, Montrose. A Corps of Engineers employee here today said excavation work by the end of the month will be 90 percent complete, but paving of the rectangular, open channel will be less than half finished.

Copies of the county's resolution have been sent to Congressmen representing Los Angeles County, to Senators Thomas H. Kuchel and Clair Engle and to the Senate Public Works Committee.

Besides Pomona and La Verne, county areas affected include Long Beach, Cypress, Los Alamitos, Beverly Hills, West Los Angeles, Glendale, and Burbank.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I think no Member of the Senate or no Member of the House of Representatives questions the wisdom, the feasibility, or the urgency of the Los Angeles County flood-control-district program. I recognize that with all the difficulties under which a group of legislators acts, sometimes it is difficult for the Members of both bodies to arrive at agreement. I hope the bill authorizing these flood-control projects will quickly be passed by the Senate, and soon thereafter will be signed into law by the President.

It is impossible to give sufficient emphasis to the fact that the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, advised me that on or about July 1, cancellation notices would be sent to the contractors constructing these vital public works in Los Angeles County. The notices have been sent out; and now, Mr. President, as we approach the end of July, the contractors who are doing the work are not going to be paid. If they have sufficient funds of their own, I suppose they can stay on the job, use their own funds, and hope that Congress will, before too long, bail them out. But that is not a proper way for the Government to operate.

So I wish to ask a question of my able friend, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, under whose leadership this bill will be passed by the Senate: Is it correct that the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House are keenly aware of the situation in Los Angeles County, which is unique in the entire country, and which does require urgent action by the Congress?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in response to the question asked by the Senator from California, I would say that we agree in general with what he has said. The bill we are now considering does authorize sufficient funds to take care of these projects, according to the estimates of the Army Engineers, for a full year; and we understand that this is all the money they could use during the coming year.

Next year—being an even year, as I have already stated, for the Record—we shall have an omnibus bill which will provide for continuation of these projects in the normal course of events.

We think the Senator from California is in the very best possible position when he supports our bill, which will authorize these appropriations for 1 year; and I hope the Senator from California will urge his colleagues in the House to support this position and to ask the House conferees to support it, because this bill will be better than any other bill before our committee or any other bill which has been introduced, inasmuch as the pending bill does take care of the needs for a full year. I believe that less than what is proposed would not do the job. I am sure that Senators are all in accord with the proposal.

Mr. KUCHEL. First, I thank my friend for what he has said. I am not acquainted with the rules of procedure in the House of Representatives. For example, I have been told that one Member of the House of Representatives who objects can prevent all of his colleagues from sending a bill to conference. I am told that under the rules of the other body difficulties over which my friend and I have no control could arise. My question is as follows: When and if the bill passes the Senate, is it the intention of the distinguished Senator to urge that as soon as possible a conference be held with conferees from the House and the Senate participating?

Mr. McNAMARA. Yes. We shall press immediately for a conference. We want no delay. There are other projects in a category similar to the project in which the Senator from California is interested.

We need continuing funds for the development of other river basins. We shall press immediately for a conference, and we hope to be successful in the conference.

Mr. KUCHEL. I join in that hope for success. The Government of the United States—the legislative and executive branches together—have a clear responsibility to the people of the United States to continue to completion flood control projects which, under the Constitution, have been undertaken. On this occasion I raise my voice for one of the most heavily populated areas in the country—the Los Angeles County area, which I have the honor to represent. I recognize, too, the basis on which the kind of legislation proposed is considered. It is my fervent hope that before too many days will have elapsed, the Congress will have sent to the President a measure which will discharge the moral responsibility of the Government of the United States to continue the flood-control authorization for the Los Angeles Flood Control District, for after the authorization has been approved, it will, of course, be necessary for Congress to appropriate moneys for the authorization.

I greatly regret that the bill has not been before the Senate until now, but I am most grateful to my friend the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] for his comment in respect to this matter which is of overriding importance if we are to protect effectively from flood damage the millions of people in the Los Angeles Basin area.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Senate is considering a public works bill, H.R. 6016, which ordinarily would be a routine bill to grant additional authorizations for projects now in the process of construction. But the Senate committee, of which I am a member, has seen fit to add authorizations for a number of other projects that have not heretofore been authorized. We have taken the House bill which, according to custom, made 2-year authorizations for projects, and cut such authorizations to 1 year. On the surface such action would show a savings in authorizations. Actually, there are no savings at all, inasmuch as the projects which the Senate cut are in the process of construction, and additional authorizations will have to be made next year. It is like saying that a military project will cost only $500,000, knowing that a year from now an additional $500,000 will have to be authorized.

I should like to discuss in some detail a few of the new projects which the Senate committee proposes to authorize. In my opinion, inadequate hearings were held on some of the projects last year during our committee's consideration of the omnibus Rivers and Harbors bill. On one of those projects no hearings were held. In fact, the Corps of Engineers had not even reported the project. Another project had been considered over a period of 5 years by committees of the House and Senate, and after exhaustive hearings the House refused to authorize it.

Devils Jump in Kentucky on the Cumberland River with an authorization of $151 million is a glaring example of a project that is not only unnecessary, but violates every symbol of economics. It is not only uneconomical, but is proposed for construction in the heart of a coal area that has been depressed for years. This uneconomical project would not only be a burden upon the taxpayers, but would further depress an already depressed coal industry and deny coal miners employment.

Taking the Corps of Engineers' own figures, excluding taxes foregone and excluding the Federal subsidy on interest rates, the power produced at the project would cost at least twice as much as it would cost to produce power in a conventional coal-burning steam plant. Not only that, but power produced at the proposed Devils Jump plant would only be available 10 percent of the time, whereas power from a steam plant would be available all the time.

The bill also proposes authorization of the Knowles Dam on the Flathead River in Montana. The authorization is for $50 million. However, we know that the dam would cost at least $258 million. This $258 million would build a 256,000-kilowatt hydroelectric project, a project that would cost in excess of $1,000 per kilowatt. But the cost as estimated by the Corps does not include compensation to the Indians for taking from them their dam sites and lands which they now hold under treaty.

I understand that it would comprise approximately 19,900 acres of Indian grazing and farming land, which would literally cripple the Indian economy. The aboriginal ownership of dam sites on the reservations of the tribes is affirmed in the treaty of Hell Gate of 1855. In addition, the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 gives the tribes the right to prevent the sale of such lands. Their constitution and charter further emphasized the protection of their lands.

I point out that during the campaign in 1960 our President declared as follows:

> There will be no change in treaty or contractual relationships without the consent of the tribes concerned. There will be protection of the Indian land base.

Furthermore, it does not consider the expense of flooding out a bison range and wildlife refuges. It also does not consider the economic loss of flooding thousands of acres of presently irrigated lands. I think one of the most objectionable features of the project is that it would involve an expenditure of over $100 million for the relocation of existing railroad tracks.

Mr. President, we talk about free enterprise, and even the President of the United States is quoted as saying that when free enterprise can do the job, it should be permitted to do so; that the burden of proof is upon the Government to demonstrate that it is in the better interest of the people for it to do the job. On this project, private enterprise proposed to construct two dams in lieu of the proposed Knowles Dam. The two private enterprise dams would produce substantially the same amount of power as would the proposed Federal development. Not only that, but they would not flood presently irrigated lands and would not require relocation of the railroad tracks. Something that we seem to give no consideration to is the fact that the private dams would pay taxes—Federal, State, and local—which would add to the economy rather than being the drain on the economy as would Federal construction.

Mr. President, in connection with the Knowles Dam project, I ask unanimous consent that the minority views appearing on page 330 of the report of the Committee on Public Works of the Senate, Calendar No. 2220, Report No. 2258, 87th Congress, 2d session, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY VIEWS ON THE KNOWLES PROJECT AND THE CHINA GARDENS PROJECT

The undersigned believe the testimony before the committee raised reasonable grounds for further consideration of the Knowles project and the China Gardens project. We believe the two projects should be deleted from this bill.

The Knowles project on the Flathead River in Montana was quite controversial with impressive testimony, as the printed hearings show, raising considerable doubt on the following points:

1. It is an economic detriment to the area.
2. It is not a feasible project.
3. It is not needed for flood control.
4. It would be detrimental to recreation and fish, wildlife, and other conservation resources.
5. There are feasible alternative projects available.
6. Treaty rights of the Flathead Indians are jeopardized by the project.

The China Gardens project on the Snake River in Idaho and Oregon would also function as a regulating project for the High Mountain Sheep project upstream. The High Mountain Sheep project has been deferred. Therefore, it seems the China Gardens project should be deferred for further consideration.

A non-Federal entity that has a pending license application with the Federal Power Commission for High Mountain Sheep has committed itself, during hearings before the subcommittee, to undertake the construction of the China Gardens project if a license is issued to it for the High Mountain Sheep project. The question of license should be resolved within a year.

It is evident that no construction funds for China Gardens are to be voted, and that none have been or will be requested in the current year.

The non-Federal entity has indicated no objection to Federal construction of China Gardens should a license for High Mountain Sheep be denied to it. Accordingly, nothing is lost by postponing action on China Gardens.

We see no justification for Federal construction of a project where a competent, resourceful, non-Federal body stands ready to build the same project and provide the same public benefits.

J. CALEB BOGGS.
JACK MILLER.
JAMES B. PEARSON.
MAURICE J. MURPHY, JR.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, another project included in the proposed authorization is the Burns Creek hydroelectric development on the Snake River in Idaho. This project is proposed for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation. The project has been under consideration by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the House and Senate for at least 5 years. The House, after exhaustive hearings, refused to approve the project, and found it unnecessary and uneconomical. Standing alone, the project falls more than $300,000 short annually of even meeting interest payments. There was an attempt to make it seem feasible by integrating it with an existing successful irrigation project—the Palisades. For many years, we have been going under the theory that power is a paying partner of irrigation and that power revenues should be used to assist in paying irrigation costs that were beyond the ability of the water users to pay. Burns Creek reverses this policy. It has the water users subsidizing power. Why did this project ever come before the Public Works Committee? If Reclamation is to build a project the appropriate committee to pass on it is the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, but since it could not get past Interior and Insular Affairs, we now find the Army Engineers proposing it before the Public Works Committee, but proposing it for construction, not by the corps, but by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Army Engineers witnesses admitted they had not made even a cursory examination of the project but accepted without question the Bureau of Reclamation findings. Of course, no consideration was given to the fact that uneconomical power produced at the taxpayers' expense at this project would replace power being produced in coal-burning steamplants under private ownership. The fact that this would deprive presently unemployed coal miners of future work has apparently been given no consideration. There is an adequate amount of power in the area being produced by Utah and Wyoming coal-fired steamplants, so why should the overburdened taxpayers be saddled with this unnecessary expense?

Mr. President, Trotters Shoals, with an authorization of $78,700,000 also added to H.R. 6016 by the Senate committee, is another example of bad economy. The Senate included Trotters Shoals in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill last year. The project was authorized by the Senate without benefit of hearings before the Public Works Committee and without benefit of an Engineers' report. This year the Senate committee has included it for authorization without hearings.

If Trotters Shoals is built it will flood out some 22,000 acres of timberland and several valuable industrial sites. Now let us compare the economic advantages of Trotters Shoals as against potential private investments that will be impossible if Trotters Shoals is built. Trotters Shoals would cost approximately $80 million. When put into operation, it would offer permanent employment to 50 or 60 people. It would provide no taxes—Federal, State, or local—and would be financed with Treasury funds at a subsidized interest rate. As against this, if Trotters Shoals is not constructed, the Mead Paper Corp. contemplates construction of a $40 million papermill which would offer permanent employment to some 600 to 650 people at the plant itself, and in addition would provide employment to around 2,500 men annually in providing logs for the papermill. In addition to that, if Trotters Shoals is not built, the Duke Power Co. contemplates construction of a $210 million steamplant. This plant would offer permanent jobs to around 135 people. In addition to that, the company would spend some $24 million per year for coal which would provide employment in the coal mines and on the railroads that would haul the coal. Furthermore, the

Duke Power Co.'s development would only flood about 1,500 acres of land or 7 percent of the amount that would be flooded by Trotters Shoals. This would leave over 20,000 acres of land on the tax rolls.

During the 50-year period considered for amortization of Trotters Shoals the Duke Power Co. and the Mead Paper Corp. alone would pay around $850 million in taxes, and of course, those earning wages from supplying wood to the papermill, the coal miners, coal producers, and the railroads, would also contribute taxes. This considers only two developments that would be made if Trotters Shoals is not built. There would be others. And if we are concerned with power, the Duke plant would produce over 24 times as much power as would Trotters Shoals.

All of us seem deeply concerned over unemployment, and we should be; and we are all concerned about budget deficits, as indeed we should be. It would seem inconsistent for any person truly interested in employment and in the fiscal responsibility of our Federal Government to contemplate construction of a project which would be a drain on the taxpayers while depriving Federal, State, and local areas of almost a billion dollars in taxes, plus depriving thousands of job opportunities.

The Army Corps of Engineers is charged with the responsibility of developing rivers for flood control and navigation. Electric power is supposed to be a byproduct of such developments when economically feasible. The four projects I have discussed are substantially 100 percent power. They offer no flood control or navigation benefits. The only benefits offered that could logically be included under legitimate functions of the Corps of Engineers would be recreation, fish and wildlife, and these benefits have only recently been recognized as a legitimate function of the corps. They are supposed to be secondary to the primary function of legitimate corps developments.

Mr. President, in my opinion the projects I have discussed are outside the primary functions of the Corps of Engineers. Moreover, these projects violate reasonable standards of economy at a time when we are in a bad deficit position and the value of our dollar is steadily going down. Before we consider obligating hundreds of millions of dollars of tax funds, we should at least take time to expose these projects to a complete and careful examination.

I hope that my comments will serve this purpose.

TRIBUTE TO DR. FRANCIS W. REICHELDERFER

Mrs. SMITH. It is my understanding that there is soon to retire from public service after a long, distinguished, and extraordinary career, Dr. Francis W. Reichelderfer, the Chief of the Weather Bureau. His service of 45 years to the Nation—20 years of which were spent in the Navy and almost 25 years as Chief of the Weather Bureau—spans a period which has witnessed dramatic innovations in science and in his chosen field of meteorology to which he has given leadership not only at home but throughout the world. It seems almost incredible that the man who led the Weather Bureau into the era of weather satellites started his service to mankind in a period when kites and flimsy aircraft were used to obtain not too reliable observations of the upper air. The "ocean of air" has become a safer and more efficient medium for the world's air commerce as a result of the contributions of this man, and farmers throughout our country rely daily and almost hourly for weather information which comes to them over the agricultural weather networks.

Dr. Reichelderfer is a modest, unassuming man, and while his achievements are well known to members of his profession throughout the world, it is well that they be set forth here for his many friends on both sides of the aisle in the Senate and in the House who know him for a loyal and honest public servant.

He was born into the home of a minister in Harlan, Ind., on August 6, 1895, and it is evident from those who know Dr. Reichelderfer that he well learned in his youth those homely precepts of the Golden Rule, the Ten Commandments, and other homespun virtues which used to be set forth in maxims in the copybooks of our schools and which furnished the strong moral fiber of countless Americans. He was graduated from Northwestern University in 1917 with a degree in science and in 1918 did graduate work in meteorology at Harvard University. In 1931 he studied at meteorological institutes in Norway, London, Berlin, and Paris. As a matter of fact, his report on his studies under Dr. Bjerknes in Norway constituted the first detailed treatise on air mass and frontal concepts which was available to most professional meteorologists in the United States. His alma mater in 1939 recognized his contributions to meteorology and awarded him an honorary doctor of science degree.

The professional career of Dr. Reichelderfer commenced in 1918 when he was commissioned an ensign in the U.S. Navy and was assigned to Harvard's Blue Hill Meteorological Observatory for training. Following service as a meteorologist at the Naval Air Station in North Sydney, Nova Scotia, he received primary and advanced flight training, and in May 1919 was sent to Lisbon, Portugal, to provide weather information and forecasts for naval aircraft making the first trans-Atlantic flight.

In 1920 he married Beatrice Hoyle of Rhode Island. She like many other Navy wives went with her husband from one home port or station to another. Throughout his career he has received strong and sympathetic family support. A busy, energetic man always finds time for his family and Dr. Reichelderfer participated in father-and-son pursuits with their son, Bruce, who served as a Navy officer for 8 years.

The "Chief," as he is affectionately known by his associates, has intimate knowledge of the problems of flight resulting from his experience as a pilot of airplanes, airships and free balloons combined with his skill as a "weatherman." Following the flight of the NC-4 in 1919 he took free-balloon flight training at the Naval Air School in Akron, Ohio, and participated in the National Balloon Races in 1919, 1923, 1929, 1930, and 1931, and in the Gordon Bennett International Balloon Races—Brussels—in 1923 as pilot and meteorologist. Later, as a naval dirigible pilot, he took part in a number of cruises of the airship USS *Los Angeles* and while executive officer at the Naval Air Station in Lakehurst, N.J., he served as observer in 1936 on the German airship *Hindenburg*. He was preparing for another flight on the *Hindenburg* in 1937 when the airship burned at Lakehurst.

Out of the experiences with lighter-than-air craft and heavier-than-air craft, grew an understanding of the need for national and international weather systems to meet the challenge of aviation as well as the daily pursuits of all men everywhere. Dr. Reichelderfer can be counted among the pioneers of the air and space age in coping with the great unknowns. Research in connection with these flights, particularly on turbulence and electromagnetic phenomena, contributed to the development of radar.

As a member of the U.S. National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics—NACA—from 1938 to its transformation into NASA in 1958, Dr. Reichelderfer has continually pressed for developments which would contribute to greater air safety. During this period NACA made major contributions to flight safety through its studies of aircraft icing, turbulence and lighting hazards.

As officer in charge of the Naval Aerological Service from 1922 until 1928, this energetic and resourceful man organized and developed new weather services and new forecasting and training methods for the Navy. Throughout the period he worked in close cooperation with the Weather Bureau.

In 1938 a vacancy occurred in the position of Chief of the Weather Bureau occasioned by the sudden death of Willis R. Gregg. A committee of distinguished scientists, including two Nobel Prize winners, was asked by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Weather Bureau then being a part of that Department, for nominations for Chief of Bureau. They chose Comdr. F. W. Reichelderfer of the Navy and he was appointed Chief by President Franklin Roosevelt in December 1938. The nonpartisan characteristics of the appointment have been carried out through the years by Dr. Reichelderfer in his administration of the Bureau for as he has often remarked, "Weather knows no political boundaries."

The Weather Bureau first established a network of stations for probing the upper air with radiosonde instruments the year that Dr. Reichelderfer became Chief. Under his leadership, the Bureau has adapted the myriad developments of modern technology for observing, analyzing, and forecasting the weather. Today, the Bureau uses high-powered radar to track the movement of rain, thunderstorms, snowstorms, hailstorms, tornadoes, hurricanes, and squall lines. Automatic stations observe weather in remote areas on land and at sea and transmit the measurements to manned weather stations. The most modern high speed data computers are applied to problems of weather forecasting. Since the launching of the first Tiros weather satellite on April 1, 1960, the information relayed to earth from seven satellites has been used by the Bureau to provide more timely weather forecasts and warnings to the people of the United States and the world. The satellites have opened new avenues of weather research by gathering data never before available.

Some men lead and point the way toward new developments during their careers only to have some of the developments for which they sowed the seeds outgrow their leadership. But this is not so of Dr. Reichelderfer, as those of us who sit on committees concerned with either finance or meteorological functions can well attest, for he has continuously directed our attention to the new and coming developments in atmospheric sciences. In doing this he has always balanced gains against costs and the potential benefits to be achieved. Always mindful of economy in the administration of the Weather Bureau he like many farmers has "made a piece of harness strap do for a hinge for the hen house door," which while it did not glitter, served the purpose, and in so doing he has risked criticism from those who do not always bear in mind the cost to the taxpayer.

When Dr. Reichelderfer came to the Bureaus, weather maps were plotted by hand at individual field stations. Through his initiative, the National Meteorological Center was established to serve as a centralized analysis and forecast service for the entire Bureau. Weather reports from all over the northern hemisphere come to the Center where they are analyzed and issued as the basic material for the preparation of forecasts. Today, through the application of modern technology, much of the Center's work is accomplished by high speed electronic equipment.

The loyalty and dedication to duty of Weather Bureau station personnel throughout the country is in no small way attributable to the close attention which the Chief has taken in personnel matters. In his first months as Chief of Bureau, he initiated an intensive program of inservice training in modern techniques of forecasting. Recognizing that not many universities had programs leading to degrees in meteorology he not only encouraged them to start such programs but he has consistently encouraged and assisted Bureau personnel to improve their professional qualifications. He has set the example for Weather Bureau staff for service to the Government and mankind.

At the outset of America's entry into World War II, Dr. Reichelderfer was made responsible under Executive order for coordinating U.S. civilian meteorological operations, special meteorological assignments in connection with the development of transocean air commerce, and international meteorological meetings and missions abroad. He assisted in organizing the Joint Meteorological Committee, Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Combined Meteorological Committee, Combined Chiefs of Staff, and was member and at times chairman of these bodies.

Dr. Reichelderfer reorganized the resources of the Weather Bureau to assist the military in planning and carrying out military operations on land, sea, and in the air. Upper-air observations were increased, communication networks were extended, and the Alaskan and Caribbean weather services were expanded. Special forecasts and warnings were furnished to Army and Navy flying fields, to the Army for large-scale maneuvers, to amphibious commands, and to munitions plants.

Following World War II, the Weather Bureau under Dr. Reichelderfer's leadership expanded its research program in atmospheric sciences. Intensive research projects have vastly increased the knowledge of the causes and characteristics of thunderstorms, tornadoes, and hurricanes. Weather Bureau scientists are seeking solutions to the riddles of the ever-changing atmosphere. They probe storms with aircraft; they study weather on a large scale by means of satellites; they probe the upper air with rockets and balloons. The results of these researchers are put to use in improving forecasts and warnings.

Recognizing the need for accelerating the advancement of the atmospheric sciences as a whole rather than the role of the Weather Bureau in research and development, Dr. Reichelderfer urged the National Academy of Sciences to appoint a Committee on Atmospheric Sciences. This was done in 1956 and its work has been most noteworthy.

A leader in international scientific affairs, Dr. Reichelderfer was an active participant in the planning and negotiations that led to the creation of the World Meteorological Organization, a specialized agency of the United Nations. This agency was established to facilitate the worldwide exchange of weather information, improve weather observing networks, and advance the science of meteorology through research and training. The delegates to the first congress of the World Meteorological Organization in 1951 chose Dr. Reichelderfer to serve as the first President and his leadership from 1951 to 1955 set the pattern for the successful future of the organization. Resisting all efforts to draft him for a second term, he established the the principle that this was an honor which should be shared by as many international colleagues as possible. Since his incumbency as President of WMO he has served as a member of the WMO executive committee and in this capacity has been a guiding force in the peaceful application of outer space in the planning for a world weather watch, with continuous satellite observations of global weather and world and regional weather centers providing analyzed data to national weather services.

Drawing upon his extensive international flying experience Dr. Reichelderfer, who is one of the few persons to be licensed to fly airplanes, airships—still valid—and balloons, contributed significantly to the development of the concepts used in setting up the first Trans-Atlantic Air Service Safety Organization—TASSO. The procedures developed and applied by TASSO across the North Atlantic laid much of the groundwork for similar international agreements in other parts of the world and were subsequently drawn upon in drafting the early International Civil Aviation Organization regulations. During the difficult formative years of ICAO, Dr. Reichelderfer's support helped gain greater recognition by meteorologists of aviation's needs. Consequently when the jet age arrived weather services around the world were prepared to move ahead to meet the challenge.

Hour by hour, every day of the year, the Weather Bureau is concerned with a broad scale of activities ranging from the issuance of warnings for the protection of life and property to such homey matters as answering the telephone to tell a lady caller whether she can hang out her clothes without fear of rain, or an inquiring farmer who does not want to get his hay wet, or a pilot who impatiently awaits improvement in zero/zero weather which keeps his aircraft earthbound. Probably no other agency of the Government makes so many decisions every day that are checked up on by so many people who are quick to note mistakes. The responsibilities of being the chief officer of such an organization weigh heavily and are enough to make most men lose any sense of humor which they might have once possessed. Yet Dr. Reichelderfer has a fine sense of humor which has never left him.

During a career so filled with a rare combination of scientific "derring-do" and administrative conservatism, Dr. Reichelderfer has received many honors, some of which are listed. He is a member of the National Academy of Sciences, a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and a fellow of the Institute of the Aerospace Sciences. He was one of the charter members of the American Meteorological Society and its president in 1940–41. The Robert M. Losey Award of the Institute of Aeronautical Sciences was received by him in 1943 for "his pioneering work and continuing activity in advancing the science and practice of meteorology as applied to aeronautics." The President of the United States conferred upon him a certificate of merit for his outstanding services as Chief of the Weather Bureau during World War II and he has also received the Exceptional Service Award of the Department of Commerce.

Men can receive many honors and awards which are of an institutional nature during their careers but those who know Dr. Reichelderfer realize that the thing that he most cherishes is the esteem, respect, and friendship of his fellow men. The people of our country would not call him "Mr. Meteorology" but in affectionate yet respectful terms he is indeed "Mr. Weatherman." Yet in spite of all this he has never sought the limelight but has, as any one of his associates will attest, been quick to give credit where credit was due and stand by any of his staff when they were unfairly criticized over a "busted forecast" when he knew that the real fault lay with man's lack of knowledge of the atmosphere.

Dr. Reichelderfer will be missed. Yet somehow it is difficult to think of this vigorous man in retirement and one cannot help but expect that he will continue to apply his mature wisdom to the meteorological problems of the world. We understand he plans to devote some of his time to "meteorology in promoting international cooperation." We wish him well.

In closing, Mr. President, I want to say that I can speak from personal knowledge about Dr. Reichelderfer. Many years ago I introduced and sponsored the original legislation to set up the weather stations in the Arctic region. In recent years I have served as the ranking minority member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee having jurisdiction over appropriations for the Weather Bureau. In that position I have had an opportunity to judge Dr. Reichelderfer's performance, and I can commend him and his performance without reservation.

ASSATEAGUE ISLAND

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the July 28 issue of the Washington Post there appeared an article by Mr. William Chapman entitled "Assateague Promoter Now Favors Park."

In this article, Mr. Leon Ackerman, who in recent years has been trying to promote this area as a beach development, is quoted as saying that he is "100 percent with Udall" for public ownership. Presumably the Department of the Interior is considering taking over this land on the basis that it is extremely valuable for building lots, and so forth.

I am very familiar with this area, and I strongly recommend that before the U.S. Government invests any money in this area on the premise that it is extremely valuable real estate or that it has great possibilities as a resort area, a disinterested group of private appraisers examine this real estate at a normal high tide rather than basing such appraisal on the glowing advertisements with which the area was originally described by the same promoter who now says that the island "is not practical as a housing development."

At this point I ask unanimous consent that the articles which appeared in the Washington Post of July 28, and the Sunday Star of the same date, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSATEAGUE PROMOTER NOW FAVORS PARK

(By William Chapman)

Leon Ackerman, who promoted desolate Assateague Island into a multimillion-dollar real estate venture, now believes the Federal Government should develop that coastal reef as a public seashore.

"I'm 100 percent for public ownership," says Ackerman, who spent more than $1 million advertising Assateague as an Atlantic playground for private owners. "I'm 100 percent with Udall."

He was referring, in an interview, to Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall's proposal for Federal development of the entire 33-mile strip of sand lying off the shore of Maryland and Virginia.

Ackerman said he thinks that conditions have changed since the early fifties, when his promotional campaign encouraged 2,500 persons to buy about 4,500 lots on the island.

"It's a different world now," the 64-year-old Washington real estate dealer said. "The people I sold to were buying for their future dreams. No one thought of needing water and sewerage then. Today you've got to have both."

Ackerman also contended that only a large public expense can now make the island safe from storms and uncertain tides, conditions which he said no one considered dangerous when he was promoting the island for summer homes.

His views are stoutly disputed by property owners banded together in the Ocean City Club, Inc., whose president, Philip F. King, said, "Ackerman should have thought of all that 15 years ago." King's group and the Worcester County, Md., commissioners want Assateague to remain in private hands.

Widely known for the religious advertisements he places in newspapers, Ackerman is one of the key figures in the long and somewhat cloudy history of Assateague.

In 1949 he bought 15 miles of beach off the Maryland shoreline from four parties for $200,000. During 5 years of aggressive salesmanship, Ackerman's sales on Assateague amounted to almost $4.5 million.

Large amounts were spent for advertising, construction of a 9-foot retaining wall that later washed away, and other developments. Asked to estimate his net profit on Assateague sales, Ackerman said only, "I made a living."

He also put a large part of the proceeds into full-page newspaper ads carrying religious messages, his favorite being, "If you hate your brother whom you have seen, how can you love God whom you have not seen?"

Advertising for the Ocean Beach development did not mention that it was located on Assateague Island, or any island, for that matter. A typical ad described the Ocean Beach "exhilarating surf," "magnificent clean, white sand," and "sparkling, blue ocean."

It also said that the Chesapeake Bay Bridge and new highways, then under construction, "will make Ocean Beach, Md., quickly accessible to the Nation's Capital." It did not say that the only direct access from Maryland's shore to Assateague was—and still is—a ferry.

Ackerman said that prospective lot buyers were taken on the ferry to see the property and, "They all knew what they were buying. Nothing was sold through the mail."

His promotion campaign promised neither a bridge to the island nor roads on it. In 1953, Ackerman's Ocean Beach, Inc., posted a $200,000 bond with the State of Maryland to help a separate corporation win authority to build a bridge across Sinepuxent Bay. The corporation never built the bridge.

Most of the Ocean Beach lots were 100 by 200 feet and sold for $450 each. The purchaser could put down $65 and pay off the balance in monthly installment of $10. Only a few owners ever built cottages at Ocean Beach and the big storm in March 1962 left many lots under water.

The Maryland State Department of Health now says that septic tanks would not work on the low-lying reef, although it approved their use in the early 1950's when Ackerman filed plats for his subdivided property.

"Everybody in those days was buying undeveloped beach property and never gave a thought to water and sewerage," Ackerman said. "It wasn't needed then."

Although Assateague is subjected to constant tidal erosion and was sliced away from the main peninsula by a 1933 storm, Ackerman said he did not believe in the early 1950's that natural forces would prohibit private development. The 1962 storm, which swamped the shore and moved the northern tip 420 feet to the northwest, changed his mind, he says.

The Interior Department's plan to begin acquiring Assateague is under study by the Bureau of the Budget. A Bureau spokesman said that a report on the feasibility of stabilizing the island's shore is being prepared by Army engineers.

ASSATEAGUE DEVELOPER BACKS U.S. OWNERSHIP

The man who developed Assateague Island, Leon Ackerman, said yesterday he favors Federal ownership of the 33-mile island along the Maryland-Virginia eastern shore.

Mr. Ackerman, the Washington developer who in the years since 1949 sold 4,500 lots on the island to individuals, said "I would prefer 100 percent to see a public park there."

His statement is the latest development in the controversy over whether the island should remain in the hands of its private owners or be taken over by the Interior Department for a public park.

BUREAU EYES PUBLIC USE

A plan to acquire the island for public use is being studied by the Budget Bureau.

Mr. Ackerman said he feels that only the Federal Government could afford to improve the island.

"They will do a beautiful job. They'll spend from $12 to $18 million," he said.

The 2,500 property owners, he said, "will get their money back plus." The island, he said, "is not practical as a housing development."

CITES COUNTY REVENUE

He said that Worchester County, which wants the island to remain in private hands, is complaining because "it's been a picnic for the county. They have received over $500,000 in taxes and never spent a penny there."

The 64-year-old developer who lives in Washington said he sold his Assateague Island Development Co. last year. The company, Ocean and South Ocean Beach Corp., now is owned by three men in Ocean City, Md.

"JUNK" MAIL

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, when the Senate passed the legislative appropriation bill it included my amendment, the purpose of which was to repeal the special privilege of the Members of Congress to send unaddressed mail to every boxholder. This was referred to as the amendment which cancelled the junk mailing privileges of Members of Congress.

In last Friday's issue of the Washington Daily News a "key Congressman" is quoted as having threatened that unless the Senate will yield on this amendment the House will reject the bill in its entirety, and he indicated that such action would result in the salary of the President being held up.

The Congressman is slightly in error. First. The provision for the President's salary is not included in this bill; that authorization was provided for in a previously enacted bill.

Second. The salaries which are affected under this bill are those of the Members of Congress and the legislative employees, and I doubt that the Congress will adjourn without approving its own salaries solely on the basis that they do not want to give up their special junk mailing privilege. As to the thought that the Senate's insistence on the retention of this amendment would result in further amendments dealing with congressional expenditures, my only reply is, "Good."

I ask unanimous consent that the article appearing in the July 26 issue of the Washington Daily News be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Junk Mail Feuder Would Cut Off J.F.K.'s Pay Check

(By Seth Kantor)

A key Congressman in a House-Senate feud over junk mail today threatened to:

Cut off President Kennedy's pay during the current fiscal year.

Grind the multimillion-dollar operations of the U.S. Capitol to a halt.

Keep U.S. Senators from getting free hair oil.

The Congressman, Tom Steed, Democrat, of Oklahoma could do so by blocking the legislative appropriations bill, already passed by both houses of Congress, unless the Senate backs down on the amendment it passed against junk mail.

AMENDMENT

The amendment, offered by Senator John Williams, Republican, of Delaware would prevent House Members, all of them up for reelection in 1964, from using their franking privileges next year to flood their home districts with free political mail addressed only to "occupant."

Representative Steed is chairman of the House Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee. Both versions of the bill were passed last month. But Representative Steed has refused to meet with Senate conferees to work out differences "until the Senate backs down."

According to the rules, Senator Mike Monroney, Democrat, of Oklahoma, conference chairman in the Senate, cannot back down because the Williams amendment was passed, 59 to 29, in a rollcall vote.

It was passed over objections by Senator Monroney and others on the Senate floor that traditionally the Senate cannot legislate rules for the House.

He listed their free supply of hair oil, fingernail polish and bath oil that they wrote into their part of the bill as a minor example.

INSISTS

Representative Steed insists that, the way things stand, he will take the entire $168-million bill into conference committee in an unprecedented move and agree to a settlement only if the Senate accepts some terribly embarrassing amendments of my own.

The Oklahoman, a longtime friend of Senator Monroney, said he is "gathering facts the Senate guards jealously—facts I am not afraid to disclose which will show how the Senators really spend the people's money."

COMMUNIST TARGETS FOR 1964: ROCKEFELLER, KEATING, AND DODD

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, recently in the Senate I spoke on the tactics of the so-called rightwing extremists in our country, and what they are doing to undermine the faith of the American people in American government and in our two great political parties, and how they attempt to use our political parties for their own odd and dangerous purposes.

The Worker, official organ of the Communist Party of the United States, in its issue for June 23, 1963, has provided another chapter in my theme that the aims of the ultrarightists and ultraleftists are inextricably intertwined, though they express abiding hatred for each other. The fact is that while they loathe each other, they loathe with equal vigor the Republican and Democratic Parties who have kept the American government out of their hands. This is not to say that either extreme would not at various times infiltrate both of our great political parties in an attempt to achieve their thoroughly un-American political aim. They would, and they have, when it has suited their ultimate goal and role as the self-appointed and self-anointed "savior."

In the June 23 issue of the Worker, Gus Hall, the verbose strawboss and general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States and lackey of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, has outlined the party line for all to see. His recent remarks on "Political Parties and Movements and the 1964 Elections" are reprinted—all 20 columns of them. These remarks were originally delivered in May to "a group of active political workers."

Hall, who urges "unity of the left in this coming election period," warns that there must be no "overtone of trying to take control." His longrun aim is clearly to win electoral status for the Communist Party, his shortrun aim is stated as forging coalitions with "all developments which contribute to the formation of a new political party." But his immediate aim, which is the aim of this American arm of Moscow, is to single out specific public servants, in both parties, for defeat.

After 17 involved columns reconciling the class struggle with a strange analysis of mid-20th century American politics, Hall finally gets to the meat of what he is about. Take away all the froth as to workers' rights, and peace, and the denunciations of the ultraright, and the Red message comes through loud and clear: Hall's first object, and thus the Communist Party's first object, is the elimination of two of our esteemed Senate colleagues, one a Republican and the other a Democrat. But then let the general secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., state it himself:

> In each State the left should single out specific ultraright officials for defeat—such individuals as Keating and Dodd, as well as a number of others.

There you have it, Mr. President. Ken Keating and Tom Dodd, two of our ablest colleagues, two of the most devoted fighters of our country, and two of the earliest and most vigorous opponents of the radical right and radical left are pegged by Gus Hall as members of the ultraright. On March 30, 1961, Tom Dodd joined with me in the Senate in denouncing the leadership of the John Birch Society. And his whole lifetime is a history of militant, courageous anticommunism. Ken Keating has spoken in a similar vein on numerous occasions. Keating must go, since, says Hall, he "froths at the mouth about Cuba." Thus, the crime of both Keating and Dodd, in the Marxian view of American politics, is that they are dedicated American patriots and outspoken and courageous Senators, recognizing the evil in all extremes, devoting themselves to making our country stronger.

It has always been an interesting paradox to me that one set of depraved and twisted minds sees men like Dwight D. Eisenhower and the late John Foster Dulles as ultraleftists and another and equally depraved and twisted set of minds sees these same two great Americans as ultrarightists.

Of course, the simple truth is that all of these men are neither. They are simply Americans who refuse to knuckle under to the demands of either extreme.

The Communists advocate, in the words of Hall, "a multiparty system." They specifically state that the electoral monopoly of America's two great political parties "cannot be broken by only attacking it from the outside. It will be broken by an attack both from within and without." This is exactly what Robert Welch and the John Birch Society advocate. Both of these extremes will attempt to infiltrate the major parties where they can, they will set up splinter parties where they can, in an attempt to corrupt either major party, and they will establish front groups with sanctimonious and resounding names where they can to do their evil bidding and nefarious deeds.

Along with our two Senate colleagues, the Red party line reserves a particularly high place on its purge list for Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, To Hall and the Communists, and the dupes who follow the party line, Nelson Rockefeller is "without doubt one of the most sinister and dangerous political figures on the scene." The Communist Party, U.S.A., accuses Rockefeller of building a "fake liberal front" on domestic and state issues while never hiding "his imperialist claws and aims on foreign policy questions. He is possibly the most active and the oldest cold warrior around."

But the Communists give Governor Rockefeller what, to any patriotic American, should be regarded as an even higher accolade when Hall writes that—

> Years before Churchill hoisted the cold-war signals at Fulton, Mo., Rockefeller had already been carrying on his cold war anti-Communist policies.

I wonder how the ultrarightists who have also marked Nelson Rockefeller for political extinction will react to that one? His crime is that he knew and saw, and tried to do something to halt Communist imperialism, years before others saw the danger. I am sure that the Governor's early endeavors will be equally galling to the "I'd rather be Red than dead" crowd and to the professional radicals of the right who think that they discovered the menace of Russian and Chinese imperialism and aggression in the last 5 years.

Mr. President, I believe this is sufficient to give each of us, Republican Senators and Democratic Senators, an insight of what we can expect in the months ahead—we will see courageous public servants smeared by the Communist hucksters and their lackeys just as we have seen these courageous public servants smeared by a more native variety of extremist. I am confident that the overwhelming majority of the American people will continue to repudiate both types of deceivers.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to express my gratitude personally to the distinguished Senator from California for these words. As he has said, this declaration of war on me by the Communist Party was a source of pride rather than concern. The Senator from California has again demonstrated the level-headed approach, the thoughtful moderation, which make him a leader in this body and throughout the country. All men of good will, whatever political persuasion, must respect his criticisms of the radical left, just as they welcomed his expose of some of the mouthings of the radical right.

Mr. Hall, the Communist Party, and the Daily Worker certainly do not speak for any substantial segment of the American people. Anyone can be proud of the fact that these groups oppose him as a threat to their own insidious objectives.

I am grateful to the Senator from California for his kind words. I assure the Senator that I will not in any way lessen the activities which the Communist Party has found so objectionable. It is extremely important, as the Senator has said, to recognize that anticommunism and militant opposition to communism, are not the exclusive province of the ultrarightists, or of those who proclaim themselves as the self-appointed apostles of all that is patriotic and American.

No doubt many of these fanatics are well motivated, but in the opinion of the average American citizen, they do not help the cause of freedom. We are faced with a militant and determined international foe, who has essentially never proclaimed anything except the doctrine of burying us whether by war or by peace. Our opposition to that philosophy must be carefully planned and skillfully executed. It must be directed by those who have studied the problem and know something about the Communist menace. It is not helpful, therefore, for extremists of the right to set themselves up as the only ones who know how to cope with communism. The Senator from California has again demonstrated his knowledge of the real dangers both in this country and throughout the world. We should all be grateful to him.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from New York. He, like the Senator from Connecticut, can wear this denunciation by the Communist Party as a badge of honor. What the able Senator from New York has said with respect to extremists is abundantly true throughout the country.

Several weeks ago I read in a magazine the suggestion that the political spectrum of America is usually described as a straight line going from left to right. The magazine suggested that the political spectrum might well be a circle, so that the extreme left and the extreme right would meet, because on many, many occasions the position of the extreme left and the position of the extreme right on public issues in America are precisely the same.

The extreme right wishes to get the United States out of the United Nations. The Communist Party would love that. The extreme right has said:

> Bring our boys back home. Abandon the overseas military bases.

The Communist Party in the United States and in Moscow would like that, too. The extreme right of America says:

> Get out of collective security arrangements like NATO.

It has been basic Communist doctrine for years to destroy NATO.

Those are only a few of the examples that come immediately to my mind.

At any rate, I say to my colleagues, to KENNETH KEATING, with whom I am proud to serve on the Republican side of the Senate, and to TOM DODD, with whom I am proud to serve in the Senate, "I salute you for the enemies you have made."

CARDINAL SPELLMAN EMPHASIZES MORAL BASIS FOR EQUAL RIGHTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, recently made an extremely powerful speech on the subject of human rights at the dedication of the Cornelius J. Drew Houses in New York City.

Monsignor Drew, in the words of Cardinal Spellman, was a practical priest:

> His eyes were fixed on heaven, but he never lost sight of this earth, its people and their daily needs.

He "brought the principles of a living faith to his people, eagerly cooperating with his fellow citizens to improve the housing, the education and the general welfare of all the people of the neighborhoods where he ministered as priest and pastor."

In paying tribute to the accomplishments of Monsignor Drew, Cardinal Spellman reminded his audience of the continuing challenge we face in obtaining "full justice and equality" for our fellow American citizens who are Negroes. Cardinal Spellman has traveled throughout the world visiting American servicemen overseas. He has seen white and Negro soldiers serving our country, suffering the same hardships and confronting the same hazards of war.

> How lamentable—

He comments—

> that some Americans who would die together today, will not eat together, will not travel together, will not live together.

Cardinal Spellman's address is a strong affirmation of the moral basis of the struggle for equal rights. His words will be an inspiration to all men of good will, to work together to achieve liberty and justice for their fellow man.

This is a most timely and beautiful address which I know will be of interest to many Members, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY CARDINAL SPELLMAN AT DEDICATION OF DREW HOUSES, JULY 11, 1963

The dedication of the Cornelius J. Drew Houses is an extremely happy and gratifying occasion for me. Naturally I am always pleased when a priest of this archdiocese is honored, but I am especially pleased today, because Monsignor Drew was one of our truly great priests. Selfless and dedicated, the last thing he ever wanted during his lifetime was honor for himself. But the memory of such a man deserves to be enshrined, and I can think of no more fitting way to perpetuate the memory of Monsignor Drew than by giving his name to this magnificent housing project, built for the people he so loved, and whom he served with such devotion.

Monsignor Drew was a practical priest. His eyes were fixed on heaven but he never lost sight of this earth, its people and their daily needs. He not only brought the glad tidings of the Gospel to those he served; he also labored that they might have a fair measure of the material things of life, without which it is difficult to respond to the demands of the spirit. A starving child finds it hard to pray. A family in a cramped, unsanitary tenement is scarcely able to function as a family—to stay together and to pray together in the way a family should. Monsignor Drew saw this clearly, and he brought the principles of a living faith to his people, eagerly cooperating with his fellow citizens to improve the housing, the education, and the general welfare of all the people of the neighborhoods where he ministered as priest and pastor.

This new development, therefore, is dedicated to the memory of a priest whom I knew well and admired as a dedicated public and religious servant. When he had finished a brilliant career as a missionary on the New York Apostolate, at a time when he could well have asked for a light assignment, he came and asked me to give him the honor of succeeding Msgr. William McCann as pastor of this parish of St. Charles. He knew, he said, that he could not hope to continue the great work of this devoted apostle, but he would do his best. This dedication today is a testimony to the success of his ministry here. In recent years when Monsignor Drew's strength began to fail I went to him and offered him an assignment which would be less demanding on his physical energies. His answer was characteristic—"Allow me," he said, "to die as I have lived—among my friends and neighbors in Harlem."

I know that Monsignor Drew would not want his name to be used on these buildings today unless it were clearly understood that it stands as a symbol for the devoted and dedicated priests, brothers, sisters and laity who for more than 50 years have cherished the privilege to live, to work and to die among their friends and neighbors in Harlem.

Happily there is a growing awareness in our country of these basic needs of people. This housing project is one evidence of that awareness. The Cornelius J. Drew Houses is a tribute to the public housing programs of our city and State. Public housing under the Federal, State, and city programs, helps fill the need for decent dwellings for many of our fellow Americans of all races, creeds and colors, and, therefore, deserves the approval and the encouragement of all our citizens. New legislation embodying a creative approach to the problems of public housing and bringing new and imaginative solutions may be helpful to perfect the programs so well underway.

When we speak of all races, creeds and colors we touch upon something which is on everyone's mind today, and about which it is impossible to remain silent on such an occasion as this—and that is the crying need for full justice and equality for our fellow American citizens who are Negroes. The inequities inflicted upon them have been a festering problem in our society for many decades. There is simply no reason—there never was and there never can be—why the color of a man's skin should limit his opportunities in a society that boasts of freedom.

The Negro is asked to give as much as any other man for his country. He has a right to receive back from his country in equal measure. On my trips over many years to visit our soldier-sons all over the world, I have seen white and Negro soldiers serving our country, suffering the same hardships and confronting the same hazards of war. Yet contrary to every Christian principle and in downright defiance of the glorious American ideal of equal justice for all, some of those same Americans who risked their lives for America—for you and for me—are denied the right to vote, the right to receive an adequate education, the right to live where they desire and their means enable them to live and to receive the normal courtesies befitting their dignity as human beings.

They are denied these rights for only one reason—the color of their skin. How lamentable that some Americans who would die together today, will not eat together, will not travel together, will not live together! This is an outrage which America cannot tolerate. Doors cannot continue to close in the faces of Negroes as they search for jobs, as they strive for membership in some unions, as they seek the chance for specialized job training. Surely the spirit of justice and equality which lives in the very heart of our great Nation will not permit these inequities to continue.

People today are restless and impatient with the painfully slow progress that has been made in solving this problem of racism. The tradition of America is to get things done promptly and efficiently. Her tradition is also to get them done peacefully. In other lands, and unfortunately also in our own, violence has often been the companion of change. That is not the right way in America. That is not the American way. We must accomplish what has to be done working together, as one people with a common ideal, working calmly but with determination to progress and to succeed in making our ideals a reality.

These ideals could be effectively realized if all Americans regardless of religion would drop the barriers of discrimination, if employers would hire qualified Negroes—and provide training opportunities so that more Negroes may become qualified, and freely admit Negroes to unions and to apprenticeship programs.

In the field of housing, the excellent laws against discrimination in New York City and New York State must be supplemented by the active interest and vigilant efforts of all our citizens. Different races can live side by side harmoniously. While emphasis is placed on trouble spots, we can point to many areas where integrated living goes on as it should. One such is the area in the Northeast Bronx where both the Parish of Our Lady of Grace and the neighborhood as a whole has taken the initiative to demonstrate that people of different races and colors can live together in mutual respect, go to school together, worship together, and be full American citizens enjoying the blessings of democracy in action.

Pope John XXIII—in that wonderful manner of his, distinguished by faith, love and warm friendliness—made a declaration on this very point. In his encyclical, "Peace on Earth," he states: "Even though human beings differ from one another by virtue of their ethnic qualities, they all possess certain essential common elements and are inclined by nature to meet each other in the world of spiritual values, whose progressive assimilation opens to them the possibility of perfection without limits. They have the right and duty, therefore, to live in communion with one another."

In this immediate neighborhood stands the Lt. Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Memorial Communty Center. Established in May 1954, this community center serves over 2,000 individuals in 34 different activities. There everyone who desires or needs its services is welcome. Such has been the consistent policy of our archdiocesan institutions in the 156 years of the history of the Archdiocese of New York, for this is Catholic faith—catholicism and Americanism in action.

In the field of education, we seek schools that are honestly integrated. I am proud that our parochial schools, high schools, colleges and universities are open and have been open through the years to boys and girls of every color. Our own new 16 classroom parochial school of St. Charles Borromeo, soon to open, is an evidence of how educational opportunity is being expanded to give solid instruction to all the children. The Catholic people gladly make this contribution to the community and to our beloved country. Better education is necessary, and we are ever seeking to improve the minds and hearts of all our children, and Catholic people make tremendous sacrifices to build our schools and to maintain them. This we could not possibly do if it were not for the heroically generous contribution of their very lives by the sisters and brothers who teach in our Catholic schools. And when this new St. Charles parochial school opens its doors, it is my intention that it bear the honored name of Msgr. Cornelius Drew.

The American Catholic bishops declared in 1958 that "the heart of the race question is moral and religious. It concerns the rights of man and our attitude toward our fellowman." Only last week when President Kennedy visited our new holy father, Pope Paul VI, his holiness said, "We are ever mindful in our prayers of your efforts to insure all your citizens the equal benefits of citizenship which have as their foundation the equality of all men because of their dignity as persons and children of God."

I had the opportunity in 1949 of sending my congratulations and good wishes to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on its 40th anniversary, of which I have the honor of being a life member. I said then, and now I repeat: "The Catholic Church repudiates as abhorrent to her very nature the pernicious doctrine that men are born with the stamp upon them of essential racial superiority or inferiority. She recognizes no master race, but proclaims the God-given equality before God of all souls, for whose salvation our Blessed Redeemer suffered and sacrificed."

Our own Catholic Interracial Council has done much to turn the attention of people to the problems of racial injustice. Many of our parishes have conducted workshops and study programs in an effort to further integrated living and equal educational opportunity for all and to end discrimination in employment and in union membership.

But much—ever so much—remains to be done. The great Christian and American principle of equality must be reduced to action in local circumstances and in specific ways. We need civil rights measures enacted into law; but we also need the attitudes of justice and charity to be applied by every person in our society to the concrete problems of housing, employment and education. This is the challenge which 1963 has set squarely before us and it must at all costs be faced and solved.

Our Negro brother wants more than a house in America. He wants a home in America. He wishes to feel at home here. He belongs fully to America and he wants to feel fully accepted here. Until his desires are fulfilled none of us can be assured of the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity.

America has met her problems in the past, and has met them successfully and without turmoil. We must believe that she will meet this problem and that it too will be successfully resolved.

May we, through our cooperative efforts and our humble prayers, beseech Almighty God, the Creator and the loving Father of all people and all races, to hasten the day when in our beloved land liberty and justice will prevail for all men.

A SENATE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am very pleased to join with the distinguished minority leader in cosponsoring Senate Resolution 176, a resolution to provide for a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

In the early days of this Congress I joined with several of my colleagues in cosponsoring a bill (S. Res. 48) for this same purpose. Since coming to the Senate I have consistently sponsored legislation and actively worked to establish a Veterans' Committee, so that veterans' matters could be fully and carefully handled in one committee, rather than, as is now the case, in two different committees.

At present, legislation on veterans' matters is divided between the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Finance. It is not criticism of these committees to recognize that practicality dictates a more cohesive and efficient means of dealing with such legislation.

The 1946 congressional reorganization bill, as reported to the Senate although generally cutting down on the number of congressional committees, made specific provision for a Veterans' Committee, thereby recognizing the need for a group with complete jurisdiction in this area. This provision was deleted on the Senate floor to speed consideration.

At the present time there are well over 20 million veterans in the United States. Their problems and the laws that affect them are specialized and complex. A single committee for veterans would provide a forum and staff for the best and most efficient handling of the problems of these Americans who served their country in its time of need.

In the early days of the 86th Congress, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] and I were cochairmen of a subcommittee of the Rules Committee to investigate the situation to see if there was a need for a veterans committee. Our study revealed a very definite need.

Mr. President, nearly half of the Members of the Senate have recognized the need for a veterans' committee by cosponsoring various resolutions for this purpose. I strongly support this resolution, and hope that the Rules Committee will act favorably upon the recommendations made by Mr. CANNON and myself in 1959, as incorporated in our earlier bill (S. Res. 48) and now also incorporated in this resolution.

PRIVATE U.S. EFFORTS IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the improvement of inter-American relations and the encouragement of inter-American business are becoming increasingly important to all U.S. citizens. Recently an article written by Kenneth F. Sparrow appeared in the Syracuse Herald-American, outlining the proposals made by Mr. J. Stanley Coyne, president of the Coyne Industrial Laundry, Inc., in this area. Mr. Coyne's suggestions for the promotion of private enterprise in South America deserve serious consideration. Among other points, Mr. Coyne suggests the establishment of an Inter-American Industrial Development Council which could encourage the conditions necessary to attract thousands of large and small corporations.

U.S. policy in the Western Hemisphere must work toward the stabilization of South American governments and economies. We must take account of any concrete and constructive suggestions from individuals with experience and imagination in this field.

Mr. President, I commend Mr. Coyne for his initiative and ask unanimous consent that the text of the article published in the Syracuse Herald-American be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COYNE FAVORS PRIVATE-STYLE ENTERPRISE

(By Kenneth F. Sparrow)

Private enterprise, properly encouraged by Government loans, guarantees and tax concessions, could do a better job of industrial development in South America than by outright grants to individual countries.

That is what Syracuse industrialist J. Stanley Coyne, president of Coyne Industrial Laundries, Inc., favors—the establishment of industrial development corporations in each country.

Coyne, who presently operates a subsidiary company in Venezuela, is studying the feasibility of expanding his operations into Brazil and Argentina. He points out that the U.S. Government has been pouring billions of dollars in assistance to Central and South American countries, but contends that little has been accomplished in this manner.

He recently conferred with Romulo Betancourt, President of Venezuela, in Caracas and discussed with him the importance of private American enterprise in helping to create employment and strengthen the economy and democracy of the country. He reports that Betancourt is in accord with this line of thinking.

Coyne has just returned to Syracuse, where the company maintains its headquarters, at 132 Cortland Avenue, after inspecting the activities of the subsidiary, Coyne Lavanderias, in Caracas. He contends that development of the country's economy through private enterprise would be one of the greatest offensives that could be launched against the infiltration of communism.

"When the people are employed and taking home a paycheck every week, they have more security and won't be so receptive to the harangue of the agitators who seek to sow the seeds of discontent," he asserted.

Coyne was drawing on his experience in Puerto Rico. Nine years ago, at the invitation of the industrial development corporation established in the island commonwealth, he established a plant to manufacture work clothing to serve expanding industry. That operation has proved a success.

Three years ago Coyne moved into Venezuela and established Coyne Lavanderias in Caracas. He started with five people. Today he has a work force of 75. He provides services—linens, bed sheets, gowns for doctors and nurses in hospitals and homes for the aged; uniforms for restaurants, food plants, the ice cream and milk industry and service stations.

He believes that an industrial development corporation in Venezuela, or any other South American country, could accomplish what has been done in Puerto Rico.

An American industry, seeking to locate in a country where there is an industrial development corporation, could have a plant built to its specifications and then lease it. The same private enterprise could obtain loans to purchase necessary equipment. It would have assistance in recruiting personnel.

This, according to Coyne, would provide positive action, an accomplishment that is not attaining the same results under the system of outright grants.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, if there is no further business to be transacted, I move, in compliance with the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 30, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 29, 1963:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Donald A. Dumont, of New York, a Foreign Service Officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Burundi.

Frank K. Hefner, of Virginia, a Foreign Service Officer of class 2, to be the Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency, vice William I. Cargo.

U.S. MARSHAL

John H. Phillips, of Mississippi, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Mississippi for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires August 26, 1963.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Thomas M. Healy, of Georgia, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the term of 5 years from August 29, 1963. (Reappointment.)

FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BOARD

Kenneth T. Anderson, of Kansas, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring March 31, 1969, vice George W. Lightburn.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Glynn R. Donaho, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captains, USAF (Chaplain)

Francis J. Bartos, AO3061022.
Reynold A. Czarnota, AO3061061.
Richard E. Sprowl, AO3059587.

To be captains, USAF (Judge Advocate)

Michael J. Cicchini, AO2220484.
Charles A. Riccio, Jr., AO1872915.

To be captains, USAF (Medical)

Arthur J. Axlerod, AO3122959.
Richard B. Byrd, AO3042550.
Frederick W. Clemenz, AO3091727.
Albert W. Conerly, AO3091333.
Richard P. Hill, AO3075079.
Donald W. Hobbs, AO3114153.
William H. King, AO3089161.
Richard M. Narkewicz, AO3069415.
Frank Panettiere, AO3122984.
William B. Reinbold, AO3111092.
Oren R. Smith, Jr., AO3092211.
Joe H. Trickey, Jr., AO3114644.
Robert P. Turk, AO3091385.

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

Eric E. Beardslee, AO3111223.
Joseph J. Berte, AO4012003.
Evan D. Francis, AO3110488.
Ronald M. E. Gibson, AO3110957.
Frank W. Grayson, AO3112420.
Richard S. Gust, AO3089046.
William O. Richardson, AO3123619.
Jerome Schell, AO3089984.
James H. Simonton.
Henry C. Staab, AO3111350.
James L. Stobie, AO3089275.
Lane E. Weiss, AO3061699.

To be captains, USAF (Nurse)

George E. Farrell II, AN3044600.
Mary C. Jorgenson, AN2243521.
Frances R. Miller, AN2244474.
Anthony F. Santacroce, AN3045337.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (Chaplain)

Jerry L. Rice, AO3060583.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Judge Advocate)

Alan I. Herman, AO3103821.
Theodore F. Jordan, Jr., AO3068708.
Peter D. Newhouse, AO3103993.
David Orser, AO3115903.
Anthony W. Ptacek, AO3084766.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Dental)

James W. Burks, Jr.
Harry J. Costanza, Jr., AO3114302.
William H. Long, AO3113681.
Anthony E. Plotzke, AO3113983.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Nurse)

Willie S. Shuler, AN3111038.
Barbara A. Silbaugh, AN3090015.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (Medical Service)

Samuel B. Chapman, Jr., AO3092887.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captains

David H. Adrian, AO2210249.
Clifford H. Allen, Jr., AO3004334.
Michael A. Altieri, AO3028414.
Glendon L. Ammon, AO3028366.
Edward N. Anaka, AO3053618.
Russell J. Anderson, AO2224758.
Roger F. A. Arias, AO2210986.
Francis L. Asbury, AO2210164.
Clinton H. Aslin, AO2209026.
Clyde F. Autio, AO3033994.
Gary D. Baetz, AO3026682.
James E. Bailey, AO2211116.

Kenneth W. Bainum, AO3013792.
Carrol C. Ballard, AO3013096.
William L. Ballard, AO3031926.
Richard F. Barkley, AO3005245.
John F. Barkwill, AO3051399.
John B. Barnes, AO3031324.
John R. Barr, AO3021715.
Robert P. Barry, AO2249657.
William G. Beaver, AO2209030.
George L. Bergeron, Jr., AO3012233.
Franklin A. Billingsley, AO2228207.
Walter A. Black, AO3036927.
Lawrence H. Blackman, AO2225673.
Robert C. Bogue, AO3046201.
Ronald R. Bohrer, AO3036004.
James A. Boswell, Jr., AO3005808.
Richard S. Brennan, AO3010593.
William N. Brevard, AO3011624.
Billy E. Bristow, AO3019407.
America P. Bruno, AO3031928.
Raymond J. Bubick, AO2205782.
Lyle L. Bulmer, AO3023813.
Delmar E. Burkett, AO3048372.
John S. Burklund, AO2230385.
Bruce W. Busch, AO3056689.
Jimmie D. Caldwell, AO3031761.
Ralph O. Chadwick, AO3015087.
Kenneth K. C. Chang, AO3032989.
Richard C. Chapin, AO3058828.
Kenneth N. Chapman, AO2210887.
Joseph H. Cheney, AO3021490.
William E. Chess, AO3048278.
Allan R. Christensen, AO2204873.
Melvin F. Chubb, Jr., AO3056693.
Raymond F. Chumley, AO2249048.
Billy V. Clark, AO2246217.
Richard H. Coan, AO3051593.
William F. Cocke, AO2236488.
Philip P. Combies, AO3004563.
Don R. Conway, AO3009803.
Leonard F. Corey, AO2221019.
Charles E. Cotton, AO3035274.
Clyde D. Cox, AO3005435.
Warren L. Crawford, AO3036713.
Vernon I. Cross, AO2208190.
James L. Crouch, AO3027945.
Lawrence W. Crowley, AO3052431.
Richard L. Curtis, AO3018603.
Thomas G. Dandy, AO3008335.
Larry K. Darby, AO3024018.
Ernest L. Davis, AO2207798.
Richard N. Davis, AO3018121.
Norman A. Degenhardt, AO3057732.
Howard R. Denman, AO3028847.
Vernon E. Dudley, AO3024400.
Walter N. Duffett, AO3015526.
Ronald K. Dutton, AO2205282.
Robert D. Eaglet, AO3064312.
Stanley G. Ebner, AO3050624.
Arne Ellermets, AO2209915.
Paul J. Ellmer, AO3007865.
Gordon D. Elmquist, AO940684.
William A. Fahlgren, Jr., AO3003740.
Gordon Feltman, AO2210050.
Herbert R. Fields, Jr., AO2206981.
Jefferson R. Finch, AO3022619.
Marvin S. Flower, AO2221091.
Joseph E. M. Fontaine, AO3006872.
Richard W. Fouss, AO2206089.
Irl L. Franklin, AO3054000.
Robert E. Furry, AO3004321.
James R. Garey, AO3038085.
George H. Gibson, Jr., AO2204885.
Laurence G. Goebel, AO2248601.
Shepperd B. Gold, AO2251444.
Richard A. Goldhammer, AO3011592.
John L. Grassel, AO2248746.
Daniel S. Griffin, AO3038656.
Arthur M. Gustavson, AO3019474.
Edward W. Haag, AO2206210.
Kenneth D. Hadeen, AO3014551.
Edward M. Hanki, AO3030760.
Solomon Harp III, AO3022961.
James Harrell, AO3029307.
James H. Hathaway, AO2206905.
David Hawkins, AO2208591.
Donald R. Hefty, AO2230452.
Edward J. Heinz, AO3031579.
Thomas L. Hennagan, AO3025743.
Richard C. Hicks, AO3013750.
Charles L. Hill, AO2254999.
Joseph J. Hillner, AO2238180.
Frank T. Hines, AO3020910.
Charles W. Holmes, AO3039391.
Ben B. Hoskins, AO2224700.
William R. Houser, AO3048660.
David B. Hubbard, Jr., AO3023055.
Leigh W. Hunt, Jr., AO3025222.
Bert L. Jenks, AO2221174.
James M. Jennings, AO2209570.
Thomas F. Kasbohm, AO2206739.
Walton G. Kilbourn, Jr., AO3012668.
Philip E. Klein, AO2235045.
Donald R. Komm, AO3022274.
Donald G. Krause, AO3049396.
Ronald J. Krejci, AO2223865.
Herbert T. Kruse, AO2224652.
Jimmy D. Lamb, AO3037503.
Roland T. Lambert, AO3040946.
John B. Latterner, Jr., AO3028637.
James A. Lenzmeier, AO3019563.
James W. Lester, AO2238433.
Lycurgus E. Lines, Jr., AO2249233.
Wallace C. Lohse, AO2230709.
Herman R. Luchs, Jr., AO2224786.
Ralph W. Maack, AO3048568.
Gerald C. Malicki, AO3051913.
Raymond L. Matthews, AO1860709.
Paul T. McClellan, Jr., AO3013680.
William W. McCormick, Jr., AO3026858.
James L. McKelvey, AO3027965.
Martin P. McNulty, AO3011357.
Terrence L. Mish, AO3052054.
James R. Mitchell, AO3018459.
Glenn L. Moore, AO2238029.
James B. Morris, AO1864685.
Homer C. Munson, Jr., AO3002474.
Bobby K. Murray, AO3019364.
Edward R. Naylor, AO2250800.
James W. Nelson, AO2238438.
Bob G. Oehmcke, AO2207142.
Thomas F. O'Neill, Jr., AO2209621.
Timothy F. O'Neill, AO3018047.
James T. Owen, AO2208455.
James C. Owens, AO1907392.
John W. Pachankis, Jr., AO3022974.
George B. Painter, AO3006237.
John R. Paulk, AO2227021.
Donald N. Paulson, AO3038882.
Guido J. Pizzeck, Jr., AO3002920.
Henry L. Pozas, Jr., AO3051212.
Robert L. Purcell, AO2211564.
Kenneth E. Rankin, AO3013206.
Robert B. Ray, AO3057453.
Travers A. Read III, AO3027613.
Charles W. Richard, Jr., AO2249630.
Gordon H. Ringenberg, AO3036241.
Neal S. Roark, AO3003986.
Joseph F. Roche, AO3023100.
Wayne V. Rosholt, AO3049546.
John F. Ryan, AO2253016.
Irving B. Sauls, AO3009572.
Donald B. Schneider, AO3052395.
Sam R. Sciotto, Jr., AO2224830.
David R. Seyfarth, AO2230674.
William C. Shirey, AO1907970.
William Sims, AO2252879.
Chauncey D. Smith, Jr., AO3029444.
Christopher C. Smith, Jr., AO3027200.
Robert B. Smith, AO2210577.
Delmar V. Snodgrass, AO2209085.
Robert L. Sonke, AO2226505.
Walter B. Spellman, AO3006212.
Franz W. Staugler, AO3036158.
Jerry C. Stewart, AO3057409.
Arnold L. Strasheim, AO3012217.
Rondall H. Stull, AO3028617.
John A. Suitor, AO2251464.
Bobby J. Tanner, AO2248803.
Cortlandt M. Taylor, AO3050772.
Andrew G. Terry, Jr., AO3027747.
William M. Thompson, Jr., AO2246982.
John D. Thornton, Jr., AO3047621.
Nicholas R. Trifilio, AO3005543.
Robert L. Van Meter, AO2224683.
Maurice F. Vaughn, AO2236266.
Ronald C. Walsh, AO3033797.
Jack D. Waterfield, AO3003518.
David W. T. Watt, AO3029878.
Richard E. Webb, AO2229657.
George V. Wish, AO3015459.
Thomas E. Wizoreck, AO2226885.
John H. Wood, AO3019526.
Herbert A. Woodcock, Jr., AO2225314.
John D. Woytych, AO3007752.
Robert G. Young, AO3022668.

To be first lieutenants

Gary G. Allison, AO3109761.
Lee R. Allmann, AO3102688.
Arthur J. Aparicio, Jr., AO3095557.
Michael L. Arnold, AO3095670.
Maurice D. Ashbaugh, Jr., AO3103059.
Claude R. Baldwin, AO3096152.
Roland E. Barth, AO3105160.
Franklin D. Bates, AO3103650.
Charles F. Blount, AO3099644.
Jon K. Bodahl, AO3096027.
James R. Bollman, AO3103863.
Edward A. Branch, AO3101812.
John E. Burns, AO3103670.
Edward K. Call, AO3101752.
Robert E. Ceruti, AO3105410.
Henry V. Chace, AO3103731.
Jack E. Chesnut, AO3100014.
James F. Collier, AO3101830.
Gene C. Cook, AO3103455.
John E. Cronin, AO3103639.
John L. Curry, Jr., AO3099236.
David R. Davis, AO3106611.
Joseph E. Davis, AO3106175.
Charles E. Day, Jr., AO3103906.
Jerome A. Denier, Jr., AO3109779.
Carl A. Dobrot, AO3105921.
Ronald W. Everett, AO3101555.
Maxamillian C. Falk, AO3100692.
Anthony J. Farrington, Jr., AO3104655.
James W. Garbart, AO3110003.
Edward N. German, AO3103681.
James D. Gillmore, AO3028148.
Joel T. Goff, AO3103032.
Karl A. D. Goss, AO3093969.
Donald R. Gray, AO3107032.
Joseph E. Hall, AO3041274.
Dale V. Hardy, AO3105100.
Russell D. Harrison, Jr., AO3099162.
James R. Haugen, AO3097079.
John L. Hawes, AO3097361.
Harley L. Henderson, AO3103467.
Ralph D. Hilton, AO3110012.
Melvyn A. Holzman, AO3095015.
David A. Jacobsen, AO3041158.
Franklin M. Johnson, AO3097932.
Bruce C. Jones, AO3097721.
Edward T. Kast, AO3103968.
Robert H. Kaulbach, AO3110105.
Douglas N. Kelly, AO3105475.
Wayne E. Kinder, AO3103563.
Carl D. Kingsley, AO3109980.
John K. Kline, AO3110074.
Wilford J. Klump, AO3103749.
Bobby G. Knapp, AO3093196.
Donald L. Koch, AO3100905.
Joseph M. Kovac, Jr., AO3109981.
Phillip F. Kurtz, AO3018997.
George P. Kyriazis, AO3072762.
Andre L. Lachance, AO3103517.
Thomas L. Legler, AO3109985.
Howard E. Leidy, AO3103692.
Charles D. Lenz, AO3106074.
Judd E. Lundt, AO3109807.
Aubrey J. Lynch, Jr., AO3101720.
Arnold L. Mabile, AO3095744.
Conrad P. Marcotte, AO3109809.
John R. McCall, AO3101961.
Robert A. Mercer, AO3109814.
William G. Mercer, AO3109815.
Robert B. Meyers, AO3109961.
Alan S. Michael, AO3103480
Arthur M. Moody III, AO3105746.
Terrance P. Murphy, AO3103987.
Joseph P. O'Connor, AO3103893.
William A. Olsen, AO3103810.
Francis L. Owens, Jr., AO3098754.
John F. Randall, AO3099535.
Garry L. Ratliff, AO3106926.
Eddie L. Rhodes, AO3109604.
Clifford E. Saunders, AO3103567.
Russell R. Schindehette, AO3103894.
Robert L. Sipes, AO3103770.
Douglas L. Smith, AO3099395.
William E. Spence, Jr., AO3106863.
Terry J. Spring, AO3103568.

Joseph K. Stapelton, AO3103711.
Tommie N. Thompson, AO3103663.
Eugene L. Thornton, AO3103664.
Donnie M. Tribble, AO3103321.
Jesse P. Undlin, AO3103772.
Herman M. Vilella, AO3098629.
Jerome P. Vitarelli, AO3099579.
William J. Watt, AO3096270.
Francis J. Wawrzyniak, AO3109923.
Allan P. Weber, AO3100006.
John H. Wells, AO3109925.
John M. Whittier, AO3100928.
David N. Wilkinson, AO3098541.
Edwin R. Wilkinson, AO3098465.
Ronald O. Woods, AO3096122.
Dennis E. Wooton, AO3098984.

To be second lieutenants

Distinguished Officer Candidate Graduates

Dennis T. Lawrence, AO3129201.
William B. May, AO3128091.
Brian Tilbury, AO3129229.

Distinguished Aviation Cadet Graduates

Ronald P. Campbell, AO3130057.
Thomas E. Hodge, AO3139031.
William B. Lehner, Jr., AO3139007.
Theodore J. Marano, AO3139035.
Melvin M. Marvel, AO3139037.
William H. Severns, AO3139049.
Walker M. Williams III, AO3139021.

Distinguished Officer Training School Graduates

Clifford H. Anderson, AO3129798.
Paul V. Anderson, AO3135414.
Glenn W. Armistead, AO3129840.
Roger D. Bacon, AO3128714.
Raymond E. Bacot, AO3129775.
Samuel Bailey, Jr., AO3135403.
Douglas G. Balan, AO3134981.
Curtis B. Balston, AO3134840.
Joseph M. Barkofski, AO3135408.
Norman J. Barry, Jr., AO3135439.
John J. W. Battin, AO3135445.
Jerry E. Beck, AO3135451.
Larry D. Berry, AO3135504.
James A. Bishop, AO3135616.
William W. Bitterli, AO3135636.
Floy F. Black, AL3137086.
Lloyd C. Blackburn, Jr., AO3134510.
Walter B. Bolton, AO3121190.
William R. Brady, AO3129070.
Walter L. Brothers, AO3129833.
Anthony K. Brown, AO3128473.
Donald L. Brown, AO3134842.
Ronald Brown, AO3134700.
Richard P. Buckner, AO3135986.
James M. Callan, Jr., AO3136017.
Paul N. Carey, AO3136043.
Alice I. Champagne, AL3137090.
Clifton H. Chastain, AO3136084.
Ross W. Churchill, AO3136151.
David L. Cohen, AO3136317.
George B. Connor, AO3135780.
John A. Cooper, AO3135856.
John R. Cooper, AO3135862.
Michael C. Curley, AO3136217.
Danny E. Dail, AO3136241.
Joseph C. Daily, AO3136244.
Clair D. Densley, AO3128266.
David L. Donaldson, AO3135484.
Stephen P. Drayer, AO3135602.
John P. Duane, AO3135791.
Kenneth K. Dunham, Jr., AO3134548.
Alfred C. Eynon, AO3136358.
George A. Fergusson, AO3136367.
Donald E. Flynn, AO3136378.
John R. Fry, AO3136391.
Charles R. Funk III, AO3136287.
John P. Gleason, AO3136406.
Harvey L. Goldstein, AO3136409.
Ralph Goodman, AO3136410.
John A. Gould, AO3136414.
Anthony C. Graffeo, AO3136419.
William B. Greer, AO3136424.
Richard J. Griffiths, AO3136427.
Arthur E. Grills, AO3136429.
Ronald Gruchy, AO3136431.
Gordon E. Gumble, AO3136434.
Frank D. Hale, AO3136439.
Harold B. Harris, Jr., AO3136456.
Richard D. Hennen, AO3136472.
Ronald E. Henry, AO3136474.
Allan R. Herbert, AO3136475.
John H. Herrington, AO3136477.
William J. Hilliard, AO3136484.
LeRoy Hoden, AO3136490.
Carroll E. Hokanson, AO3136496.
Blaine S. Hollimon III, AO3136502.
Mark A. Hulbert, AO3136517.
John P. Huseth, AO3136524.
Basil E. Huston III, AO3136525.
Harry E. Hutchinson, Jr., AO3136526.
Clarence P. James, AO3137080.
Bobbie R. Johnson, AO3136538.
David S. Johnson, AO3136541.
Duane M. Johnson, AO3136543.
Steven B. Johnson, AO3136548.
Johnnie L. Jones, AO3136551.
Orvin C. Jones, Jr., AO3136553.
Leland G. Jordan, AO3136554.
Benjamin E. Kajer, AO3136558.
Robert Katz, AO3136561.
Jack E. Keeter, Jr., AO3136565.
Richard S. Kimball, AO3136581.
David A. Kirkwood, AO3136585.
Clifford E. Kobland, AO3136591.
Henry R. Koch, AO3136592.
Lawrence F. Kolasa, AO3136595.
Robert T. Kramer, AO3136602.
Calvin J. Kreunen, AO3136604.
David M. Kriech, AO3136605.
Jerome P. Lagemann, AO3136610.
Richard E. Lahti, AO3136611.
David G. Landor, AO3136613.
Barry M. Landson, AO3136614.
John J. G. Lane, Jr., AO3136615.
Crissman R. Lawrence, AO3136621.
Eileen D. Lenart, AL3137100.
Cecil E. Leonard, AO3136628.
Timothy J. Long, AO3136634.
Roger L. Loos, AO3136635.
Duarte A. Lopes, AO3136636.
Ramon A. Lopez, AO3136638.
Lester J. Mahlen, AO3128929.
Burton H. Margolis, AO3136655.
Karen V. R. Marsh, AL3137101.
John J. Martancik, AO3136661.
Duane W. Martin, AO3136662.
Jerry T. Mattox, AO3136671.
Robert N. McDaniel, AO3136684.
Daniel A. McHugh, AO3136690.
Clinton S. McIntosh, AO3136691.
Robert K. McLeod, AO3136699.
Leonard B. Merchant, AO3136713.
Bruce M. Miller, AO3136720.
Sharon I. Miller, AL3137102.
Alan H. Monsees, AO3136734.
David P. Montague, AO3136736.
Richard T. Morse, AO3136748.
Walter R. Neal, Jr., AO3136758.
Bruce W. Nordby, AO3136769.
Thomas E. O'Brien, AO3136775.
Philip M. Ordway, AO3136784.
Edward M. Oswald, AO3136787.
Roger G. Owens, AO3136790.
Newman S. Peery, Jr., AO3136801.
Walter S. Penniston, AO3136803.
Carl F. Pfaff, AO3136809.
Samuel E. Porter, AO3136821.
Albert A. Powers, AO3136824.
Robert E. Rawls, AO3136853.
Daniel G. Rearick, AO3136841.
Peter Reilly, AO3136847.
Robert D. Renken, AO3136849.
Dean I. Rhoads, AO3136851.
James O. Rice, AO3136856.
Herbert B. Ringsdorf, AO3136861.
Lynn I. Robertshaw, AO3136865.
Lansing J. Robertson, Jr., AO3136864.
John A. Rosicky, AO3136872.
Robert L. Rushmore, AO3136878.
Frank J. Santafede, AO3135786.
George B. Schmoyer, AO3136905.
Miller L. Shamburger, AO3136922.
Leroy C. Simpkins, AO3136933.
Herbert W. Speckman, AO3136950.
William G. Stickelmaier, AO3136966.
Herman L. Stricklen, AO3136974.
Bryan T. Sugahara, AO3136977.
Joseph O. Tanner, AO3136982.
Henry A. Taylor, AO3136984.
George T. Theis, AO3136989.
John W. Thomas, AO3135896.
William E. Tippett, AO3136997.
Ronald W. Tirabassi, AO3136998.
John B. Tower, AO3137004.
Charles P. Turner, AO3137009.
Joseph H. Verdery, AO3137014.
Denis J. Vineys, AO3137015.
Joe F. Watson, AO3137031.
Louis P. Westefield, AO3137037.
Charles E. White, AO3137040.
Jimmy G. White, AO3137042.
David C. Whitlock, AO3137044.
Richard J. Willis, AO3137048.
Francis C. Wilson II, AO3137055.
Lawrence V. Witt, Jr., AO3137062.
Alvin J. Wooten, AO3137066.
Charles E. Wortz, AO3137067.
Arthur E. Wunder, AO3137068.
Richard Yagoda, AO3137070.
Donald E. Zimmer, AO3137079.

Subject to medical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following distinguished military students of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Samuel Y. Adair, Jr.
Terrence J. Ahearn
James C. Akers
Robert L. Akin
Thomas R. Allen
John R. Amos
John V. Anderson II
Terry Anderson
Swanson W. Angle
Michael J. Arganbright
Louis F. Armbruster
James T. Armour
Phillip N. Ashbaker
Thurman O. Ashe
Lewis E. Atha
Laurence D. Bachman
Harlan L. Bagaus
Jack C. Bailey
Kenneth E. Baker
Larry K. Baker
William J. Ballee
James E. Barineau
Laurence J. Barkley
Gary L. Barnes
Joe W. Barnhart, Jr.
Howard A. Barrere
James H. Bassham
Larrie C. Bates
John S. Baughman
Byron D. Baur
Bruce C. Bechtel
Gary W. Bennett
Richard B. Bennett
Stephen L. Bennett
Thomas A. Bennett
Kenneth B. Benson
Phillip M. Berg
Paul E. Bergstrom
John S. Bernhard
Johnnie O. Bernier
William G. Berringer
James R. Best
Richard M. Betty
James E. Biltz
Alvin D. Bird
Kenneth L. Blankenship
Bennie B. Blansett, Jr.
Francis M. Blomme
James J. Blommers
Frederic K. Blume
Jay D. Blume, Jr.
Joseph T. Bocklage
Andrew Bohutinsky
Ronald R. Bousek
Joseph H. Bowers
Daniel D. Boyer, Jr.
John G. Breland, Jr.
Charles R. Brown, Jr.
Richard D. Brown
Wesley Brown
William P. Burckel
Elmer R. Burkart, Jr.
Bruce L. Burke
William R. Burnette
Michael L. Burton
Robert B. Butler
Thomas C. Camp, Jr.
Timothy L. Campbell
Thomas D. Carbeck
Gary W. Carlson
Peter A. Carson
Edward G. Carter
Russell L. Cayler
William L. Chada
Paul B. Chader
Carl D. Chambers
James W. Chandler, Jr.
Richard A. Chartrain
Harry W. Christie, Jr.
James R. Clapper, Jr.
Wilbur H. Clark
Norman J. Cochrane
Eugene G. Coco, Jr.
Paul E. Coesfeld
David B. Cole
Edward M. Collins, Jr.
Brian E. Comerford
Lanny P. Conerly
John L. Conley
William A. Cook
Philip W. Corbett
Charles E. Couchman IV
Raymond C. Cox
Thomas P. Crawford
Richard E. Curp
Gerhard S. Damron
Steven C. Davee
Emanuel F. Davi
Dale L. Davis
John S. Davis
Paul R. Davis
Thomas D. Davis
Richard A. Decaire
Arthur Dederick III
Frederick T. Dehner
John W. Diercks
Francis C. Diodate
Raymond L. Ditterline
David R. Dollahite
Alfredo Domingo
George J. Dooley III
David R. Downer, Jr.
Bruce C. Ducat
John A. Duncan
Robert M. Duncan
James S. Dunn
Bernard F. Ellrodt
Richard D. Emmons

Robert A. Entrican
Bruce B. Epperly
Eugene R. Evans
James A. Evans
Armand A. Fannin, Jr.
Joe C. Farr, Jr.
John C. Fasick, Jr.
Charles M. Ferguson
William D. Findley
Michael S. Fleischmann
Raymond R. Flowers, Jr.
Edward R. Foechterle
Harry G. Forbes, Jr.
Morris K. Ford III
Robert C. Ford
Roger E. Ford
Charles H. Foss
Leslie H. Fox
Richard D. Freeborn
Wayne W. Frenier
Francis C. Frese
Frederick A. Fresh
Kent W. Freshwater
Robert A. Freyer
John C. Fryer, Jr.
Marvin T. Furusho
Esequiel L. Garcia
Samuel R. Gardiner
Charles W. Gearhart
Jon L. Geerlings
Andrew Gemelaris
Phillip M. Gibson
Joseph C. Giles
William T. Gladis
Martin J. Godfrey
Melvin S. Goldberg
Stanley R. Goldberg
Richard A. Gooch
David A. Gootee
Bruce B. Greene
Duff S. Greene
Walter A. Greiner
John C. Griffith
Ronald L. Grotbeck
Thomas A. Grygotis
Richard A. Gustafson
John R. Haack
Stefan D. Haag
David D. Hahn
Samuel Hale, Jr.
Lawrence W. Hall, Jr.
Jerry E. Hammett
Paul T. Hancock
Dorrel T. Hanks, Jr.
Francis J. Hanley
Frederick D. Hannum
William W. Haralson
James A. Harrass
Calvin E. Harris, Jr.
Paul D. Harris
Benjamin J. Harrison
Michael J. Harrold
Robert L. Hartman
John V. Hartzell
James S. Hawkins
Houston T. Hawkins
David L. Hawley
Edward J. Head
Charles W. Heckman
John D. Henderson
Dieter A. Hentschel
William T. Higham
James M. Hinkle
David M. Hirzel
William H. Holderness, Jr.
Stephen K. Holland
John E. Hormuth
Wayne K. Hostetter
Larry R. Houge
Steve J. Hughes
Robert G. Hunter
John A. Hurry
Jackson F. Hurst
John R. Imhof
Ralph D. Irwin
Larry C. Jackson
James C. Jalbert
Lawrence T. James, Jr.
Thomas M. James
Ross B. Jasper
Edward D. Jenkins, Jr.
David L. Jenney
Harold G. Jensen
Jerald N. Jensen
John M. Johns
Kenneth L. Johnson
Robert B. Johnson
Thomas H. Johnson
Eben D. Jones
Larry A. Jones
Ronald L. Jones
Fulton A. Jordan, Jr.
Lawrence W. Jordan
Kim A. Karst
Joseph F. Keeler, Jr.
Arthur C. Kelley
Henry K. Kellner
Kenneth J. Kerkering
Michael C. Kiefl
Daniel R. King
William F. King III
John J. K. Klesch
Kenneth E. Kolb
George E. Koleszar
Kenneth R. Kolthoff
Joseph L. Kottak
Imants Kringelis
Edward T. Kubiak
Sheldon L. Ladd
Thomas R. Lange
Allen Langston, Jr.
Brant A. Larrimer
Thomas A. Lasco
Kenneth R. Latour
Joseph E. Latt
Larry L. Lee
Michael R. Lee
Robert C. Lemert, Jr.
Jung Leong
Joseph A. Levisky
Dee M. Lineberger, Jr.
Marlin L. Logan
Carl J. London
Robert W. Long
Richard F. Lord
Rodger F. Lotz
Joseph B. Lovell
Harold W. Lowe
Jack L. Lowther
Tommy R. Luce
Michael H. Lythgoe
Arthur E. Malcarney
John W. Mansur
Ronald G. Marlar
James P. Marsh
Frank S. Martin
Jose J. Martinez
James L. Marxer
Paul M. Maslona
Dale V. Mathis
Alvin M. Mavis
James W. Mayo III
Larry B. McBride
William O. McCabe
Robert J. McCarthy
John W. McCary
Thomas J. McClelland
James L. McCloskey
Charles P. McDowell
Robert U. McDowell
Alton B. McGill, Jr.
John O. McGraw
James V. McMahon
Garth W. McMillen
Jay W. Mercer
Alan G. Merten
Marshall H. Messimer
Lee A. Mietz
Walter H. Mihata
Conway D. Miller
Warren Miller
Francis L. Mills
Michael A. Moherek
William J. Monahan
Leonard R. Moon
Alvin D. Moore
Victor G. Morris
Michael S. Morse
Warren A. Mosby
Gary G. Moss
James A. Moss
Charles G. Mutz
Marshall W. Nay
Dennis S. Nelson
Floyd W. Nolte
James F. Nooney
Frank V. Norwood
Howard J. Oakes
Wayne L. O'Hern, Jr.
Richard E. O'Neill
Darwin N. Orrell
Harry M. Orth, Jr.
Donn O. Owens
Dudley E. Owens
Thomas A. Palmberg
John D. Parr
Patrick R. Parrish
George F. Pavarini
Charles G. Peckham
John T. Pehler, Jr.
Lawrence E. Pence
Robert A. Penn
Michael G. Pennacchio
John L. Penrod
Arvid O. Peterson
Angelo M. Pezzani
Frederick T. Phalin
James T. Plummer
David J. Polzin
Joseph V. Potter
Peter W. Potter
John H. Pronsky
Gene W. Quick
James D. Quinn
William J. Quinn
Tillman J. Ragan
Robert L. Rapson
Charles B. Rawson, Jr.
Clarence E. Reaver, Jr.
David C. Rechlitz
Jackson E. Rendleman
Stephen P. Richard
Reuben R. Richards
Dudley G. Rickenbaker
Quentin B. Ridgley
James J. Ridgway
David A. Robinson
James F. Rockaway
George A. Roegler
Jack C. Rogers
John S. Rogers
Carl D. Rogge
Albert J. Rosa
Lewis R. Rose
Lester J. Roundtree
Larry D. Rucker
Charles T. Russell
Ronald C. Sacre
Patrick B. Sampey
Charles R. Sanders
Jake L. Saye, Jr.
George J. Schaerer
Ronald F. Schloemer
John E. Schmidt
Donald E. Schnoor
Neil H. Schultz
Charles F. Schwab
John S. Segura
Thomas B. Seitz
Allen F. Shapiro
James F. Shunk
Larry L. Shupe
Douglas W. Simon
William E. Simon, Jr.
Peter F. Simonetti
Robert E. Sims
Gary L. Smith
George L. Smith
Jerry R. Smith
John H. Smith
Ronald L. Smith
Thomas M. Snowden
Guy C. Spitale
Ernest P. Squarzini
William C. Stanley
James R. Steele
Douglas R. Stenger
Loyd M. Stephens
Rutherford D. Stickell
Allan J. Stinson
John H. Storm
Robert G. Streeter
Richard D. Stromfors
Paul R. Sullivan
Dain F. Sutton
Michael R. Syptak
Joseph J. Tarnowski, Jr.
Joseph G. Tarpley II
David I. Tatman
Donald M. Taylor
Edward W. Taylor
Charles R. Terry
John R. Theorell
John R. Thompson
Neil M. Tobie.
Paul D. Tolleson
Frank M. Townsend, Jr.
John C. Truesdell
Robert J. Tufts
Stephen L. Turner
John J. Veth
Jerry E. Vion
John L. Vitelli
Peter S. Vogt
James L. Von Boeckman
George E. Vranesh
Mark A. Vycital
Richard C. Wagner
Lawrence E. Wagy
Gerald R. Walker
Thomas G. Walker
James A. Wallace, Jr.
Thomas G. Wallace
Gail D. Walston
Joe K. Walters
Verne V. Wattawa
Virgil H. Webb
John G. Weber
Joseph B. Webster III
Charles F. Weitz
Kenneth L. Wells
Walter C. Wells
Robert A. M. White
Ellis H. Whitehead
Jerry F. Whitley
John C. Whitney
Gary M. Wieck
Fred H. Williamson, Jr.
Larry J. Wilson
James M. Wimberly
Jon L. Wingo
James E. Wiseman
Robert A. Wiswell
William L. Withuhn
Sun K. Wong
Ronald L. Woodall
Edward Woods
Fredrick J. Wozniak
Larry D. Zach
Jon A. Zadra
Milan Zimer
Joseph F. Zmuda
Dennis J. Zurbay
Ronald J. Zwolinski

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 29, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Henry J. von Schlichten, pastor, Lutheran Church of Our Savior, Port Washington, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Lord bless our Country's President,
Our Halls of Congress, too;
The people on our continent,
The good we try to do.
Lord, keep us in Your loving care,
Unharmed by night and day,
On land and sea and in the air,
At home and far away.

Lord, make Your gracious face to shine
Upon a troubled world,
That needs a spark of light divine
To keep our faith unfurled;
Lord lift Your holy countenance
Upon the ways of men
Who look to You for sustenance,
And grant us peace.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 25, 1963, was read and approved.

FREEDOM EXCHANGE

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the State Department has announced that action will be taken to suspend passport privileges for 58 fellow travelers now in Cuba. This would mean that upon their return to this country, these fellow travelers would be prohibited from further foreign travel. It is to be hoped that the Justice Department is also planning prosecution in this matter to the limit of the law. Such action conforms with our Government's policy aimed at curbing inter-American travel to Cuba.

However, in the light of developments, I would seriously urge that the State Department explore yet another course of action in this matter, one more appropriate in dealing with U.S. citizens who find life in Castro's Cuba so much to their liking that they violate their own country's laws to travel there.

What I propose is that our State Department not only make clear to these 58 fellow travelers that they have the option of remaining in Castro's Cuba, but actively encourage them to do so. If Cuba today is indeed the island paradise for democracy that these 58 have proclaimed in Castro-sponsored propaganda announcements, there is really no reason to anticipate that they would return to the United States.

Let those who would voluntarily remain in Cuba do so, with the blessings of our Government and the American people.

On the other hand, there are other people in Cuba today, under the repressive heel of the Castro regime who despise the Communist tyranny and can appreciate the gift of freedom provided in this country.

Therefore, I ask that the possibility of an exchange—not a prisoner exchange, but a freedom exchange—be explored. For the U.S. Castrophiles who enjoy Communist-style "freedom," or for any of these 58 who voluntarily choose to remain in Cuba, let us have 58, or any number, freedom-loving victims of the present Cuban regime, who, suffering Communist tyranny, deserve American liberty.

AVERELL HARRIMAN'S MISSION

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, what every mother and father in every section of our beloved country prays for is a world in which children may grow up pursuing their quest for peace and contentment in a climate of peace and universal good will.

No one is so rash, and careless with words of prophesy, as to say that the millennium has been reached, that our prayers indeed have been answered.

But there has been a flash of light in the blackness of the midnight. It may prove a shooting star, trailing the sky with a pencil of brilliant light and then gone, reabsorbed in the blackness. Or it may prove as the star of Bethlehem, leading mankind to the cradle of peace on earth, good will to men.

Averell Harriman has returned to this country successful in his mission. To him and to Secretary of State Rusk, to Dr. Foster, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and to the others in the delegation, go the thanks of a grateful Nation. Failure to ratify the test ban treaty they have negotiated could prove the tragedy of history.

PROPOSED NUCLEAR TEST BAN

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, the rush is on to pressure the U.S. Senate into ratifying the test ban proposals which have been recently agreed by the Soviet Union, the United States, and Great Britain in the test ban negotiations in Moscow. Already Members of both Houses of the Congress are indicating their approval of the proposed treaty before the appropriate committees of the Senate have had an opportunity to have hearings on this important subject.

Mr. Speaker, I have just had an opportunity to read a sobering and incisive analysis of national security considerations which should be studied thoroughly by Members of the Congress in reaching a judgment on the test ban agreement. The article to which I refer was printed in the New York Times of July 21, 1963, and was written by Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin. The article is entitled "Test Ban: Risks Weighed—Soviet Lead in Some Areas of Nuclear Development Is Balanced Against Possible Psychological Gain."

So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read and study this outstanding and important article, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the New York Times of Sunday, July 21, 1963:

TEST BAN: RISKS WEIGHED

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

WASHINGTON, July 20.—The Nation's Capital watched the nuclear test ban negotiations in Moscow this week with mixed emotions.

Hope, fear, and skepticism—particularly skepticism—were the dominant feelings in Washington as once again the United States and the Soviet Union tried to reach an agreement that might influence the arms race.

Judgments were mixed, first, about the advisability of agreeing to any kind of nuclear test-cessation compact, and, second, about the form such an agreement should take if one proved to be possible. There was an even larger schism between those who applaud the political olive branch offered to the Kremlin in the President's American University speech of June 10, and those who have grave apprehensions about what former Secretary of State Dean Acheson has called the "flirtation with Moscow."

At the weekend, the discussions in Moscow were still in the preliminary stage and had not advanced far enough to warrant firm predictions about either the ultimate possibility of an agreement or the form such an agreement might take.

EARLIEST FOUNDATION

But there was a belief that, primarily because of the Chinese-Soviet frictions, some type of limited agreement might be possible. The form was expected to follow the offer made long ago by President Eisenhower and finally picked up by Premier Khrushchev some weeks ago of an unpoliced ban for all atmospheric, space and underwater tests, with no attempt to restrict underground tests.

The advantages of such an agreement, as seen by disarmament advocates, are that it would by-pass the thorny problem of on-site inspections and yet would result in stopping tests that add to the radioactivity in the atmosphere. It is generally agreed that atmospheric tests and tests in space and under water can be detected by monitoring devices outside the borders of the country conducting the tests.

On the other hand most experts believe that underground tests of small-yield nuclear weapons in certain types of soil can be concealed or "de-coupled" and that detecting instruments outside national boundaries would not be able, with complete confidence, to discriminate between such small-yield nuclear detonations and earthquakes.

It would appear, then, that if a test ban is agreed upon, it will halt for probably an undefined period United States, British and Soviet nuclear detonations in the atmosphere, in space and under water, but not underground.

From the point of view of weapons testing this would mean, in the opinion of most military and intelligence experts, that the United States would be able to test the type of weapons—small size tactical weapons—in which it has a clear-cut lead, but would be unable to test the weapons in which it is apparently lagging.

WHAT IT MEANS

But this appreciation of what a test ban might mean is dependent, first, upon exactly what can be accomplished by underground testing, and, second upon an appreciation of the present relative standing of the United States and the Soviet Union in the nuclear arms race.

The Atomic Energy Commission and the Pentagon have discovered in extensive underground testing in the past 2 years that these tests could be extremely useful in certain areas and were not as expensive or as time-consuming as we had once believed. However, the limitations and disadvantages are definite. Tunneling and mining deep into the earth is required in order to trap radioactivity, and the larger the explosion the deeper and more extensive the mining must be.

Practically, most underground tests are limited to small yields, usually a few kilotons, because of the extensive excavation required. Instrumentation permits collection of data about the explosion itself and its efficiency, and some limited data about the effect the heat, blast and radioactivity may have upon structures or weapons. Scientists can then extrapolate or calculate on the basis of the data gained what a larger explosion might do.

But there is no way in an underground explosion to simulate accurately what would occur from fission in the thin atmosphere high above the earth, or of determining what would happen to communications, including radar, if a megaton bomb exploded in the skies.

There is disagreement as to exactly what can be accomplished by underground testing, but there is pretty general agreement that it cannot completely replace, technically and scientifically, tests in the atmosphere and in space.

Similarly, there is disagreement as to our exact standing vis-a-vis the Soviet Union in the nuclear arms race. There is rather general agreement that quantitatively we have far more nuclear weapons than Russia has.

SOVIET ADVANCES

There is also rather general agreement that we have a greater variety of nuclear weapons, particularly in the tactical or small yield category than the Russians have. But there is a widespread belief which is not, however, shared by all in Washington, that the last extensive series of Soviet tests, plus developments since then, have demonstrated a Soviet lead in three major fields of weapons technology.

One is the anti-ballistic missile. The Russians conducted many high-altitude tests of multi-megaton weapons and recorded the widespread effects. In one test they intercepted and destroyed two incoming missiles with one giant explosion. Since the tests ended, installations believed to be the first operational anti-ballistic missile launching facility in the world have been detected near Leningrad.

The U.S. technology in radar, rocket engineering and so on is believed to be equal to the Soviet Union's in this field, but we have not conducted anywhere near as many or as large tests in the upper atmosphere or inner space.

The Russians are also believed to be ahead of us in practical tests of some so-called penetration aids, or devices to assist ballistic missiles to elude destruction, and to neutralize enemy defenses.

THE BIGGER BOMBS

The third area in which the Russians clearly have a lead is in the development of the superbombs themselves. The biggest bang in the world's history was the 58-megaton explosion the Russians conducted in their last test series in the Arctic.

The Soviet Union made major improvements in yield-to-weight ratio of its nuclear weapons—that is, the size of the weapon as compared to its explosive power—in its last series of tests. Our largest weapons are in the 30-megaton category and they can be carried, so far, only by planes.

The fear of many, but not all informed observers here is, therefore, that a freeze on space and atmospheric testing now would tend to consolidate these Russian advantages. The nightmare of a few experts is that a number of Russian superweapons exploded in the skies above the United States might blur our radar, knock out or confuse command and control systems, perhaps fuse or destroy our electrical circuits and thus prevent the launching of deterrent missiles. Similarly, some of those missiles that were launched might be knocked out of the skies or their fissionable warheads neutralized by intercepting Soviet antiballistic missiles with powerful warheads.

THREE INTANGIBLES

Thus any assessment of whether or not a nuclear test cessation would hurt us more than the Russians is dependent upon three intangibles: first, the kind of treaty that is agreed upon; second, an accurate estimate of our exact standing in the nuclear race vis-a-vis the Soviet Union; and, third, a balancing of the possible technical and scientific risks against the possible political and psychological gains.

Probably no one in Washington is able today to weigh all these intangibles accurately and to say with assurance that a nuclear test ban is or is not in the national interest.

Many, who side with a powerful group of presidential advisers, hold that it is less risky to put even a small check to the arms race than it is to continue it. A limited test ban, they hope, might lead to less strain and tension at least between Moscow and Washington, and the beginnings of political accommodations. Such a ban might also put new life into the long-stalemated disarmament discussion. The effect might be more psychological than substantive, but it would be an undeniable factor in a world that has been ruled by tension.

But those who hold that such a limited ban has little political pragmatic meaning point, not only to its restricted nature, but to the fact that neither France nor Communist China would be bound by its terms. If France continues testing and the Chinese Communists begin to test, as many observers think likely within the next 3 years, an agreement between the great nuclear powers, the United States, the Soviet Union and Britain, could be strained and perhaps nullified.

Thus the Moscow talks, at their best, are only a very faint beginning on the long, long road to peace.

PROPOSED NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the President of the United States for his July 26 address to the Nation concerning the recently initialed nuclear test ban treaty.

Two years ago on July 25, 1961, the President also addressed the Nation. At that time we were perhaps closer to war than at any time since the Korean war. The Berlin crisis passed only to be followed 1 year later by the Cuban crisis. Once again the world teetered on the nuclear brink. In a sense the test ban treaty is the child of past crises, for through them we realized that, with the advent of thermonuclear weapons, the security of nations in the conventional sense is illusory. It is the irony of our times that, although we are militarily stronger than at any time in our history, we face for the first time the possible total destruction of society. It has become clear that at the end of the thermonuclear road awaits mankind's greatest disaster. With full knowledge of the perils of continuing down this road, the President has chosen another path.

The test ban treaty may well go down in history as the great turning point in the history of mankind.

It may well be looked upon by future historians as that time when mankind chose the path of peace rather than the road toward nuclear war. It is premature to assess its full impact upon the future. But it is not premature to state that it is a major breakthrough in the quest for peace.

However, even if the treaty remained but an eddy in the turbulent seas of the cold war, its value to our security would be more than sufficient to justify its prompt ratification. The treaty will end the pollution of the atmosphere with radioactive material allowing our children and grandchildren to breathe the air without peril. It should also apply brakes to the increasing proliferation of nuclear weapons. In a world of many nations with nuclear weapons none can be secure. Already Australia, Canada, Egypt, India, Ireland, and New Zealand have endorsed the treaty. Hopefully all nations will see the benefit to them and to mankind in agreeing to the treaty.

Mr. Speaker, the world is changing. The great challenge of our time is to respond to the changing world situation in ways which lead to peace and freedom. The President has taken the first step toward that end. It is mankind's hope that the test ban treaty will be the beginning and that the single step will be followed by many others until the "journey of 1,000 miles" is over.

Mr. Speaker, the text of President Kennedy's July 26 address follows:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S REMARKS ON TEST BAN TREATY

WASHINGTON, July 26.—Good evening, my fellow citizens:

I speak to you tonight in a spirit of hope. Eighteen years ago the advent of nuclear weapons changed the course of the world as well as the war. Since that time, all mankind has been struggling to escape from the darkening prospects of mass destruction. In an age when both sides have come to possess enough nuclear power to destroy the human race several times over, the world of communism and the world of free choice have been caught up in the vicious cycle of conflicting ideology and interests. Each increase of tension has produced an increase in arms; each increase in arms has produced an increase in tension.

In these years, the United States and the Soviet Union have frequently communicated suspicions and warnings to each other, but very rarely hope. Our representatives have met at the summit and at the brink; they have met in Washington and in Moscow, at the United Nations and in Geneva. But too often these meetings have produced only darkness, discord or disillusion.

A SHAFT OF LIGHT

Yesterday, a shaft of light cut into the darkness. Negotiations were concluded in Moscow on a treaty to ban all nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. For the first time, an agreement has been reached on bringing the forces of nuclear destruction under international control—a goal first sought in 1946 when Bernard Baruch submitted our comprehensive plan to the members of the United Nations.

That plan, and many subsequent disarmament plans, large and small, have all been blocked by those opposed to international inspection. A ban on nuclear tests, however, requires on-the-spot inspection only for underground tests. This nation now possesses a variety of techniques to detect the nuclear tests of other nations which are conducted in the air or under water. For such tests produce unmistakable signs which our modern instruments can pick up.

The treaty initiated yesterday, therefore, is a limited treaty which permits continued underground testing and prohibits only those tests that we ourselves can police. It requires no control posts, no on-site inspection and no international body.

We should also understand that it has other limits as well. Any nation which signs the treaty will have an opportunity to withdraw if it finds that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of the treaty have jeopardized its supreme interests; and no nation's right to self-defense will in any way be impaired. Nor does this treaty mean an end to the threat of nuclear war. It will not reduce nuclear stockpiles; it will not halt the production of nuclear weapons; it will not restrict their use in time of war.

RADICAL REDUCTION

Nevertheless, this limited teaty will radically reduce the nuclear testing which would otherwise be conducted on both sides; it will prohibit the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and all others who sign it from engaging in the atmospheric tests which have so alarmed mankind; and it offers to all the world a welcome sign of hope.

For this is not a unilateral moratorium, but a specific and solemn legal obligation. While it will not prevent this Nation from testing underground or from being ready to resume atmospheric tests if the acts of others so require, it gives us a concrete opportunity to extend its coverage to other nations and later to all forms of nuclear tests.

This treaty is in part the product of Western patience and vigilance. We have made clear—most recently in Berlin and in Cuba—our deep resolve to protect our security and our freedom against any threat or aggression. We have also made clear our steadfast determination to limit the arms race. In three administrations, our soldiers and diplomats have worked together to this end, always with the support of Great Britain. Prime Minister Macmillan joined with President Eisenhower in proposing a limited test ban treaty in 1958, and again with me in 1961 and 1962.

VICTORY FOR MANKIND

But the achievement of this goal is not a victory for one side—it is a victory for mankind. It reflects no concessions either to or by the Soviet Union. It reflects simply our common recognition of the dangers in further testing.

This treaty is not the millennium. It will not resolve all conflicts, or cause the Communists to forgo their ambitions, or eliminate the dangers of war. It will not reduce our need for arms or allies or programs of assistance to others. But it is an important first step—a step toward peace—a step toward reason—a step away from war.

Here is what this step can mean to you and your children and your neighbors.

First, this treaty can be a step toward reduced world tensions and broader areas of agreement. The Moscow talks reached no agreement on any other subject, nor is this treaty conditioned on any other matter. Under Secretary [W. Averell] Harriman made it clear that any nonaggression arrangements across the division in Europe would require full consultation with our allies and full attention to their interests. He also made clear our strong preference for a more comprehensive treaty banning all tests everywhere, and our ultimate hope for general and complete disarmament. The Soviet Government, however, is still unwilling to accept the inspection such goals require.

EFFORTS GOING FORWARD

No one can predict with certainty, therefore, what future agreement, if any, can be built on the foundations of this one. It could include controls on the preparations for surprise attack, or on numbers and types of armaments. There could be further limitations on the spread of nuclear weapons. The important point is that efforts to seek new agreement will go forward. But the difficulty of predicting the next step is no reason to be reluctant about this one. Nuclear test ban negotiations have long been a symbol of East-West disagreement. If this treaty can also be a symbol—if it can symbolize the end of one era and the beginning of another—if both sides can by this treaty gain confidence and experience in peaceful collaboration—then this short and simple treaty may well become an historic mark in man's age-old pursuit of peace.

Western policies have long been designed to persuade the Soviet Union to renounce aggression, direct or indirect, so that their people and all peoples may live and let live in peace. The unlimited testing of new weapons of war cannot lead toward that end—but this treaty, if it can be followed by further progress, can clearly move in that direction.

I do not say that a world without aggression or threats of war would be an easy world. It will bring new problems, new challenges from the Communists, new dangers of relaxing our vigilance or of mistaking their intent.

WAR MAN'S CONSTANT COMPANION

But those dangers pale in comparison to those of the spiraling arms race and collision course toward war. Since the beginning of history, war has been mankind's constant companion. It has been the rule, not the exception. Even a nation as young and peace-loving as our own has fought through eight wars. And three times in the last two and a half years I have been required to report to you as President that this Nation and the Soviet Union stood on the verge of direct military confrontation—in Laos, in Berlin, and in Cuba.

A war today or tomorrow, if it led to nuclear war, would not be like any war in history. A full-scale nuclear exchange, lasting less than 60 minutes, could wipe out more than 300 million Americans, Europeans and Russians, as well as untold numbers elsewhere. And the survivors, as Chairman Khrushchev warned the Communist Chinese "would envy the dead." For they would inherit a world so devastated by the explosions and poison and fire that today we cannot even conceive of all its horrors. So let us turn the world from war. Let us make the most of this opportunity, and every opportunity, to reduce tension, to slow down the perilous nuclear arms race, and to check the world's slide to final annihilation.

HOPE OF ENDING FALLOUT PERIL

Second, the treaty can be a step freeing the world from fears and dangers of radioactive fallout. Our own atmospheric tests last year were conducted under conditions which restricted such fallout to an absolute minimum. But over the years the number and yield of weapons tested have rapidly increased—and so have the radioactive hazards from such testing. Continued unrestricted testing by the nuclear powers, joined in time by other nations which may be less adept in limiting pollution, will increasingly contaminate the air that all of us must breathe.

Even then, the number of children and grandchildren with cancer in their bones, with leukemia in their blood or with poison in their lungs might seem statistically small to some in comparison with natural health hazards. But this is not a natural health hazard—and it is not a statistical issue.

The loss of even one human life, or the malformation of even one baby—who may be born long after we are gone—should be of concern to us all. Our children and grandchildren are not merely statistics toward which we can be indifferent.

Nor does this affect the nuclear powers alone. These tests befoul the air of all men and all nations, the committed and uncommitted alike, without their knowledge and without their consent. That is why the continuation of atmospheric testing causes so many countries to regard all nuclear powers as equally evil; and we can hope that its prevention will enable those countries to see the world more clearly, while enabling all the world to breathe more easily.

Third, this treaty can be a step toward preventing the spread of nuclear weapons to nations not now possessing them. During the next several years, in addition to the four current nuclear powers, a small but significant number of nations will have the intellectual, physical and financial resources to produce both nuclear weapons and the means of delivering them. In time, it is estimated, many other nations will have either this capacity or other ways of obtaining nuclear warheads, even as missiles can be commercially purchased today.

PERIL OF WEAPONS SPREAD

I ask you to stop and think for a moment what it would mean to have nuclear weapons in many hands—in the hands of countries large and small, stable and unstable, responsible and irresponsible, scattered throughout the world. There would be no rest for anyone then, no stability, no real security, and no chance of effective disarmament. There would only be increased chances of accidental war, and an increased necessity for the great powers to involve themselves in otherwise local conflicts.

If only one thermonuclear bomb were to be dropped on any American, Russian or other city—whether it was launched by accident or design, by a madman or an enemy, by a large nation or small, from any corner of the world—that one bomb could release more destructive force on the inhabitants of that one helpless city than all the bombs dropped during the second World War.

Neither the United States, nor the Soviet Union, nor the United Kingdom, nor France can look forward to that day with equanimity. We have a great obligation—all four nuclear powers have a great obligation—to use whatever time remains to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, to persuade other countries not to test, transfer, acquire, possess or produce such weapons.

POSSIBLE OPENING WEDGE

This treaty can be the opening wedge in that campaign. It provides that none of the parties will assist other nations to test in the forbidden environments. It opens the door for further agreements on the control of nuclear weapons. And it is open for all nations to sign. For it is in the interest of all nations—and already we have heard from a number of countries who wish to join with us promptly.

Fourth, and finally, this treaty can limit the nuclear arms race in ways, which, on balance, will strengthen our Nation's security far more than the continuation of unrestricted testing. For in today's world, a nation's security does not always increase as its arms increase, when its adversary is doing the same. And unlimited competition in the testing and development of new types of destructive nuclear weapons will not make the world safer for either side.

Under this limited treaty, on the other hand, the testing of other nations could never be sufficient to offset the ability of our strategic forces to deter or survive a nuclear attack and to penetrate and destroy an aggressor's homeland. We have, and under this treaty we will continue to have, all the nuclear strength that we need.

It is true that the Soviets have tested nuclear weapons of a yield higher than that which we have thought to be necessary; but the 100-megaton bomb of which they spoke 2 years ago does not and will not change the balance of strategic power. The United States has deliberately chosen to concentrate on more mobile and more efficient weapons, with lower but entirely sufficient yield; and our security is not, therefore, impaired by the treaty I am discussing.

It is also true, as Mr. Khrushchev would agree, that nations cannot afford in these matters to rely simply on the good faith of their adversaries. We have not therefore overlooked the risk of secret violations. There is at present a possibility that deep in outer space that hundreds of thousands and millions of miles away from the earth illegal tests might go undetected. But we already have the capability to construct a system of observation that would make such tests almost impossible to conceal, and we can decide at any time whether such a system is needed in the light of the limited risk to us and the limited reward to others of violations attempted at that range.

For any tests which might be conducted so far out in space which cannot be conducted more easily and efficiently and legally underground would necessarily be of such magnitude that they would be extremely difficult to conceal.

We can also employ new devices to check on the testing of smaller weapons in the lower atmosphere.

Any violation, moreover, involves along with the risk of detection, the end of the treaty, and the worldwide consequences for the violator.

SECRET VIOLATION POSSIBLE

Secret violations are possible, and secret preparations for a sudden withdrawal are possible. And thus our own vigilance and strength must be maintained as we remain ready to withdraw and to resume all forms of testing, if we must.

But it would be a mistake to assume that this treaty will be quickly broken. The gains of illegal testing are obviously slight compared to their cost, and the hazard of discovery.

And the nations which have initialed and will sign this treaty prefer it, in my judgment, to unrestricted testing as a matter of their own self-interest. For these nations, too, and all nations, have a stake in limiting the arms race, in halting the spread of nuclear weapons, and in breathing air that is not radioactive.

While it may be theoretically possible to demonstrate the risks inherent in any treaty and such risks in this treaty are small, the far greater risks to our security are the risks of unrestricted testing, the risk of a nuclear arms race, the risks of new nuclear powers, nuclear pollution, and nuclear war.

ARMS RACE WORSE

This limited test ban in our most careful judgment is safer by far for the United States than an unlimited nuclear arms race. For all these reasons I am hopeful that this nation will promptly approve the limited test ban treaty. There will, of course, be debate in the country and in the Senate. The Constitution wisely requires the advice and consent of the Senate to all treaties, and that consultation has already begun.

All this is as it should be. A document which may mark a historic and constructive opportunity for the world deserves a historic and constructive debate. It is my hope that all of you will take part in that debate, for this treaty is for all of us.

It is particularly for our children and our grandchildren, and they have no lobby here in Washington.

This debate will involve military, scientific and political experts. But it must be not left to them alone. The right and the responsibility are yours.

If we are to open new doorways to peace, if we are to seize this rare opportunity for progress, if we are to be as bold and farsighted in our control of weapons as we have been in their invention, then let us now show all the world, on this side of the wall and the other, that a strong America also stands for peace.

NO CAUSE FOR COMPLACENCY

There is no cause for complacency. We have learned in times past that the spirit of one moment or place can be gone in the next. We have been disappointed more than once. And we have no illusions now that there are shortcuts on the road to peace.

At many points around the globe, the Communists are continuing their effort to exploit weakness and poverty. Their concentration of nuclear and conventional arms must still be deterred.

The familiar contest between choice and coercion, the familiar places of danger and conflict are all still there—in Cuba, in southeast Asia, in Berlin, and all around the globe, still requiring all the strength and the vigilance that we can muster.

Nothing could more greatly damage our cause than if we and our allies were to believe that peace has already been achieved and that our strength and unity were no longer required. But now for the first time in many years the path of peace may be open. No one can be certain what the future will bring. No one can say whether the time has come for an easing of the struggle, but history and our own conscience will judge us harshly if we do not now make every effort to test our hopes by action, and this is the place to begin.

According to the ancient Chinese proverb, a journey of 1,000 miles must begin with a single step.

My fellow Americans, let us take that first step. Let us, if we can, step back from the shadows of war and seek out the way of peace. And if that journey is 1,000 miles, or even more, let history record that we, in this land, at this time, took the first step.

Thank you, and good night.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, on July 25 I obtained permission to insert in the Congressional Record some material that had been printed in the Record in 1956. I find that this exceeds the limitation under the rule. I am advised by the Government Printing Office that the cost to insert it in the Record would be $2,632.50. I ask unanimous consent that irrespective of the cost this material be printed in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

AID TO INDONESIA

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, again in an editorial yesterday, July 28, 1963, the Washington Post attacked a Member of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Broomfield]. In this instance the editor castigated our highly respected colleague because he had the courage to successfully offer an amendment to the foreign aid bill in committee.

Mr. Broomfield's amendment, which may or may not appear in the final draft of the bill, has the effect of establishing some guidelines for the President in administering the program in Indonesia. The editor deplores such action, terms it an example of "mischief," and chides the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Broomfield] by suggesting that he has appointed himself "Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East."

The Post persists in its apparent policy of downgrading the legislative branch of our Government. The ultimate result could be to destroy our very form of constitutional government.

Showing Sukarno

Representative William S. Broomfield, a Michigan Republican, has appointed himself Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East. He is annoyed with President Sukarno of Indonesia, and has decided that the House Foreign Affairs Committee should declare war by stopping all military and economic aid to that country. Initially, the committee voted down Diplomat Broomfield, but in an unfortunate reversal the House unit tacked on the amendment that would require President Kennedy to make an invidious finding before any help went to Indonesia.

Mr. Broomfield's views on southeast Asia policy are interesting, and deserve to be heard. But the results of congressional dictation of foreign policy, which has already caused so much mischief in our relations with Poland and Yugoslavia, demonstrate the wisdom of our Founding Fathers in making the conduct of diplomacy an Executive function, carried out with the advice and consent of the Senate. The first virtue of a diplomat is patience, a trait not in excessive supply on the House floor, and a kick at Sukarno at the very moment when there is more moderation in Djakarta is not in the national interest.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION REQUESTS INCREASED FUNDS

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article from the Washington Post and a series of articles from the Indianapolis Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to insert in the Record an article which appeared in this morning's issue of the Washington Post again telling of the alleged deal between Members of Congress and the administration with regard to the passage of both area redevelopment legislation and the cotton legislation. Again I think all Members of the House should be aware of this and read this article. Again I would say, as I did last week, I think this is a reflection upon the entire House. I think Members will agree that legislation should stand on its own merits. If this is true, it should be seriously considered.

I submit also for the Members of the House a series of articles from the Indianapolis Star as well.

In what now must be considered the worst kept secret of all time on the unusual efforts of some to have the House of Representatives vote a second time on the request for $455 million in increased funds for the Area Redevelopment Administration, I would like to point out another interesting news story on this subject to all Members. The "Inside Report" column by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, appearing in today's Washington Post under the headline, "The ARA Fights Back," certainly is an intriguing article to say the least. May I particularly call to your attention to one extremely enlightening sentence in the article. I quote:

> Bureaucratic intrigues and legislative manipulation doesn't seem enough to save the ARA unless it really mends its way.

In a nutshell, that sentence pretty well sums up the views and feelings of the majority of Members who, last month, voted down the request for additional funds by a 209 to 204 margin.

The ARA, if it does not get its $455 million, is not going out of business. It has remaining ample funds to demonstrate conclusively to Congress that it can mend its ways; that it can get out of politics and concentrate on its true purpose—create new jobs.

The news articles I refer to follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 29, 1963]

Inside Report

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

THE ARA FIGHTS BACK

The Area Redevelopment Administration, beset by foes within and without, is struggling valiantly to save its hide.

Created 2 years ago to run President Kennedy's programs of aid to economically depressed areas, the ARA is having troubles that shouldn't happen to any self-respecting bureaucrat. It faces both short-term and long-term threats to its very existence.

The short-term threat: A bill authorizing more money for the ARA was killed by the House June 12 (though later passed by the Senate). Unless the House reverses itself the dollarless ARA will be a walking corpse.

The long-term threat: A Presidential Commission headed by Under Secretary of

Commerce Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., is drafting a comprehensive development plan for the 10-State Appalachian region, which includes the Nation's worst economic trouble spots. Such a regional approach would make the hit-or-miss ARA the least-needed agency in Washington.

The ARA has lashed at the long-term threat with all the fury of a bureaucratic infighter. When this column reported on July 16 that Roosevelt's Appalachian commission might sound taps for the ARA, roars of protest ascended to the highest levels of Government. Assurances had to be made—in writing—that nobody was after the agency's scalp.

Although the Kennedy administration is not of one voice about the ultimate fate of the ARA, it is united in fighting the short-term threat in Congress. In fact, Roosevelt is playing a key role in trying to get the House to pass the money authorization.

Strategy was plotted recently during a secret meeting on Capitol Hill attended by Roosevelt and two of the craftiest House liberals, Representatives ALBERT RAINS, of Alabama, and JOHN BLATNIK, of Minnesota. They decided to bring the bill back to the House floor as soon as possible, ahead of the civil rights bill.

Attempting to lure new supporters, they agreed to trim down the money authorized. More important, they devised a vote swap. Southern conservatives would be asked to vote ARA money in return for support of cotton subsidies by big city liberals.

This maneuver is so delicate that prospects for success are only fair.

Bureaucratic intrigue and legislative manipulation don't seem enough to save the ARA unless it really mends its way. There's no sign of that, as witness one recent action by the agency.

Shortly after its bill was beaten in the House, the ARA announced $23.9 million in spending for four West Virginia tourist projects that would "help to create thousands of new jobs in that State." But ARA's weekly activity report listed only about 785 jobs (at a Federal cost of about $30,000 a job) resulting from the four projects.

That $23.9 million might better have been spent on improving narrow mountain roads. Highway development (a major part of Roosevelt's Appalachian plan) might indeed promote tourism and, more important, attract industry.

There is one footnote to all this: The President might pick up some Republican help if he started toward a regional approach now. But bipartisanship isn't in the air. For instance, the House Banking Committee's Republicans weren't notified until late Friday about a hearing on the ARA money authorization today.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, June 30, 1963]

U.S. SPENDING CHAOTIC—BUREAUCRATS CAN'T UNTANGLE AMAZING MAZE

(By Edward H. Frank)

The many-fingered puppeteer of the Federal Government has created a dazzling array of Federal bureaucracies in the field of aid to rural developments and subsidy to urban and rural business—all aimed at creating new jobs and a better way of life.

All told, there are at least 100 different Federal agencies—many competing directly against each other—pumping billions of dollars into thousands of projects in every State in the Nation.

Trying to unwind this maze is like trying to untangle a fishing line that a 3-year-old has played with all day.

Even the bureaucrats in Washington can't do it.

They can go on for hours telling you about the wonders of their particular programs. But ask them to compare the function of their agency with an agency across the hall, and they become completely lost.

This confusion is understandable. For instance:

If a community wants to borrow Federal funds or obtain a Federal grant for a water works project, it possibly can receive the assistance from the Area Redevelopment Administration, or through the accelerated public works program, or through the Housing and Home Finance Agency's Community Facility Administration or even from the Department of Agriculture's Farmers Home Administration.

Or, if you are a businessman and want a Federal loan to start a new business or expand an existing one, you can turn to the Small Business Administration or to the Area Redevelopment Administration if the business site is in a depressed area.

And, if you need money to install electrical equipment, the Rural Electrification Administration might come up with the loot.

If you are a businessman and want the Federal Government to train some workers for your firm, the Area Redevelopment Administration (ARA), again may come to the rescue. But also don't forget the Federal Office of Manpower, Automation and Training which is seeking $176,093,000 from Congress for training programs in 1964.

How was this confusing bureaucracy spawned in the first place?

One of the best answers comes from Howard Evans, community planning expert for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, who said:

Someone sells the President or a Congressman on the need for a particular program and the first thing you know someone is up on the Hill screaming for a multimillion-dollar program to meet this need.

"They don't ask for a pilot study to see if the program will meet the need. No, they ask for millions from the outset, and bang, a new bureaucracy is created and millions are being spent.

"The tragic fact is that few of these programs have, or ever will, meet the need for which they were intended."

Picture yourself as the mayor of a community seeking Federal assistance to build a new waterworks or sewage facility. Your first call might be to:

1. Accelerated Public Works.—This $850 million program administered by the Department of Commerce, provides matching funds for construction of public works in communities with unemployment of more than 6 percent for 9 of the last 12 months. In areas of extreme unemployment, designated depressed areas, this program may provide 75 percent of the funds.

As of May 31, the Kennedy administration had approved 54 projects in Indiana totaling $6,098,000 under accelerated public works (APW). Purpose of the program is to provide short-term employment during the construction of these projects.

If APW doesn't come through, you then might go to:

2. Area Redevelopment Administration—also administered by the Department of Commerce with a congressional appropriation of $394 million for the 4-year period ending June 30, 1965. At the present time, President Kennedy is asking for another $455,500,000 for the program.

The controversial ARA provides loans and grants to communities for public works needed to serve industry. Purpose of this program is to create permanent employment through new or expanded industries.

But to qualify for these handouts you must be located in one of the State's 27 depressed counties that have been designated such by the ARA because of "substantial and persistent unemployment."

To date, the ARA has okayed 18 projects totaling $4,642,472 in Indiana. This includes loans to seven industrial firms, six of them in the southern part of the State.

If ARA doesn't provide the waterworks funds, you might go to:

3. Communities Facilities Administration—an agency under the Housing and Home Financing Agency, it provides low-interest loans to communities of less than 50,000 for public works projects.

However, cities of up to 150,000 persons in depressed areas also can qualify for such loans.

If rejected by the Communities Facilities Administration, a mayor, if his city has a population of 2,500 or less, might turn to the:

4. Farmers Home Administration—an agency of the Department of Agriculture which grants 40-year loans to small cities and towns for water facilities. Thirteen projects totaling $3,121,865 in loans have been approved or tentatively approved in Indiana.

This unending entwinement of bureaucracy does show one thing, however. It shows why few persons can understand the workings of the Federal Government.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, July 1, 1963]

DEPRESSED AREA SPENDING "EASY GO"

(By Edward H. Frank)

No single domestic spending program of the Kennedy administration has drawn more nationwide criticism than the $394,000,000 depressed areas program which is administered by the Area Redevelopment Administration.

For the intended purpose of creating new permanent jobs in areas of chronic unemployment, the ARA has doled out funds for:

1. A $576,000 grant to West Virginia to rehabilitate an abandoned railroad for a tourist attraction—17 jobs.

2. A $48,000 grant to Alaska for a study of the feasibility of harvesting, processing, and marketing sea lions.

3. $195,000 to renovate an old railroad in a tourist center near Marquette, Mich.

4. $1,610,000 to construct fancy ski resorts in Michigan and Idaho.

5. $10,331,000 in loans and grants for construction of a tourist center on Lake Eufaula in Oklahoma.

6. $3,424,000 to construct four new hotels and motels in Detroit where the hotel occupancy now is less than 50 percent and where two existing hotels have gone bankrupt in the last 2 months.

7. A $457,500 loan and grant to Crescent City, Calif., for construction of a seawall and beach front for commercial recreational facility.

With such "accomplishments" to its record, the ARA now is seeking an additional $455,500,000 for the ARA program for 1964 and 1965 despite the fact that the legislation creating the ARA allocated $394 million for the 4-year period ending June 30, 1965.

Amid charges that the added $455,500,000 would serve nothing more than a political slush fund for next year's presidential election, the House rejected the request by a 209–205 vote early in June, handing the President his worst legislative defeat of the present session.

But the spending request also had been introduced in the Senate where it has been approved, thus setting up a second showdown ARA vote in the House in the near future.

As of June 15, the ARA had spent only $137,915,377 of its original $394 million appropriation. But ARA officials claim that pending applications far exceed the remaining $156,084,623, and that the ARA will be out of business by the end of this year if more funds are not forthcoming.

Just how does a community or a business qualify for ARA funds?

You must be located in one of the Nation's 1,019 depressed areas which have been classified as such by the ARA.

When the ARA program went into operation in May 1961, there were only 123 areas in the Nation classified as depressed, but before long the total zoomed to more than 1,000.

There are two classifications of depressed areas, urban and rural.

Urban areas are declared depressed if unemployment has averaged at least 6 percent for various lengths of time. Rural counties are classified depressed if farm income and farm production are low.

Loans to business firms under the ARA Act are for 25 years at 4 percent, and the ARA lends up to 65 percent of the cost of land, buildings, and machinery.

The applicant is required to put up at least 5 percent in equity and 10 percent must be secured from a State or local redevelopment agency. The remaining 20 percent would come from private financing.

The ARA stresses, but there are instances to the contrary, that it will not lend funds for relocation of a plant or for working capital.

However, a firm can turn to another agency of the Federal Government, the Small Business Administration, for a working capital loan.

Cities also can obtain ARA funds, either loans or grants, for installation of utilities to new industries. Such loans are for 40 years at 3⅝ percent interest.

A high-powered ARA publicity department grinds out hundreds of news releases and booklets on the accomplishments of the program.

However, there are numerous instances that the program is not working, that politics plays a major role in the decisions, that the Federal Government is underwriting high business risks or firms which do not need Federal help and that figures of jobs created are highly exaggerated.

Representative CLARENCE E. KILBURN, Republican, of New York, tells this story about the ARA:

There was a pending ARA application for a project in Norfolk, N.Y., which is in his district. Many persons in the area asked him to check with the ARA to see what was holding up approval.

He was told that the approval would be announced November 8, 2 days after the election. "That was fine with me.

"However, what happened was that on November 5, the day before the election, my Democratic opponent, Mr. Smith, called up the president of the local redevelopment commission and told him the project would be announced immediately.

"And sure enough it was."

On November 5, Mr. Smith received the following telegram from the ARA:

"Area Redevelopment Administration will announce on November 8 approval of $844,000 industrial loan to assist the development corporation of Norfolk and the St. Lawrence Pulp & Paper Corp. to reopen and modernize abandoned mill at Norfolk. Delighted at this opportunity to join with you in helping to provide 150 new direct jobs in the area where new employment is so urgently needed."

Representative KILBURN said the project actually was not approved until almost 4 months later. But the premature announcement by the ARA cost him 2,000 or 3,000 votes.

"But my kick isn't on that. My kick is using the taxpayers' money of all the people * * * purely for political reasons."

The question is asked often what happens if a business which received an ARA loan goes bankrupt. An experience in West Virginia provides the answer:

The ARA lent the Ohio Valley Industrial & Business Development Corp., $272,000 to construct a building for the West Virginia Ordnance Co., which was to manufacture M-14 rifles for the Defense Department.

The Small Business Administration had previously rejected the loan when it learned that the rifle company would sign only a 20-month lease for the building.

But the ARA lent $272,000 for 25 years, only to find a short time later that the company didn't receive the rifle contract and folded.

The result: The Government is stuck for the $272,000 unless the local redevelopment company can find another tenant for the building.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, July 2, 1963]

U.S. FUNDS POURED INTO SOUTHERN INDIANA

(By Edward H. Frank)

In the green vistas of southern Indiana, the Kennedy administration's Area Redevelopment Administration is pouring out the other kind of green stuff for new industrial plants, utilities to serve the plants and training programs for the unemployed.

"We've done a heck of a job there," said Russell J. "Red" Craven, the former $3,900-a-year Indianapolis smoke inspector who now serves as Indiana field coordinator for the ARA at $11,500 a year.

Craven, who hustles around the State rounding up applicants for ARA funds, got his job via U.S. Senator R. VANCE HARTKE, of whom he is a close political pal.

Craven's specialty is "serving" firms whose plants have been destroyed by fire and are in need of funds to rebuild. Two of the seven industrial loans ARA has granted in Indiana have been for this purpose, and at least two similar applications are pending.

"The ARA is a fantastic program," Craven said, pointing to his statistics which show that the ARA has allocated $4,642,472 for 18 projects in Indiana which reportedly will create more than 3,000 new jobs.

Assisting Craven in another phase of the ARA program is Paul J. Bitz, of Evansville, a former State senator, who was HARTKE's campaign manager in 1958.

Bitz was quietly put on the Federal payroll in May as field coordinator of the accelerated public works program in Indiana, Ohio, and Illinois.

The accelerated public works program is a $850 million Federal-aid plan which provides funds for public works construction for short-term employment.

The ARA public relations office in Washington refused to disclose Bitz' salary, and admitted a public announcement was not made when Bitz was put on the payroll.

"I believe Mr. Bitz should be the one to disclose his own salary," said Al Herrington, an ARA public relations spokesman. It was learned, however, that Bitz also gets about $11,500 a year.

In explaining the ARA program, Craven stresses that his agency will not allocate funds for a project unless the firm or city has been unable to raise the money itself and unless a local redevelopment agency puts up at least 10 percent of the total cost.

"It's the community spirit involved in this work that makes ARA tick," Craven added.

The ARA issues loans to business firms for construction of new plants or expansion of existing facilities for 25 years at 4 percent.

And this is the gimmick that finds ARA hundreds of customers.

To prove to the ARA that he can't finance the project himself, all an applicant has to do is obtain two letters from banks stating that they could not issue the applicant a 25-year loan at 4 percent.

Just ask your banker if he will loan you $400,000 or $500,000 for 25 years at 4 percent. He probably will laugh you out of his office.

Craven's claims of creating 3,000 new jobs in Indiana are highly doubtful to say the least.

For instance, he says that an ARA loan of $115,000 to the North Vernon Processing Co. to help rebuild a forging plant destroyed by fire saved 60 jobs and created 40 jobs.

Edward Rogers, the plant manager, said 35 persons are employed in the plant—the same number as before the fire.

An ARA loan of $441,923 for construction of a shoe factory at Salem for the Bata Shoe Co. created 600 jobs, the ARA reports.

A total of 150 persons now are employed in the plant, with the possibility it may reach 500 in the next 5 years, the company says.

HARTKE's home city of Evansville has been the biggest recipient of ARA funds in the State, receiving a total of $1,788,294, including $1,490,000 for a street and sewer project to a new shopping center which Craven said created 500 new jobs, and $298,294 to train 130 machine operators and automobile mechanics.

Evansville and New Castle are in the only two urban counties in the State classified "depressed" by the ARA and eligible for ARA loans and grants. There also are 25 rural counties in Indiana labeled "depressed."

While HARTKE's Evansville has received 38 percent of all ARA funds allotted in Indiana, 10th District Representative RALPH HARVEY's New Castle is yet to receive that first cent. HARVEY is a Republican.

"We've just never had a project over there," Craven said, adding, "I think the local people have brought in some new industry themselves.

"We encourage local communities to do it themselves. We just plant the seed and let them run with the ball," he added.

Tonight in Evansville, Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, Senators Hartke and Birch E. Bayh, Jr., Democrat of Indiana, and Eighth District Congressman Winfield K. Denton, Democrat of Indiana will stage a gala celebration removing Evansville from the depressed area list.

The question now is whether these Federal officials also will stage similar celebrations in Martin and Pulaski counties which also are coming off the depressed area list—but without the aid of ARA money.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, July 3, 1963]

FEDERAL LOANS MAKING TROUBLE IN HOTEL FIELD

(By Edward H. Frank)

The hotel business in Detroit, as in so many other cities, is in desperate financial straits.

Room occupancy for the year is running less than 50 percent capacity—down 5 percent from just a year ago.

Two Detroit hotels have gone bankrupt in the last 2 months and hotels in the motor city have been forced to reduce their staffs 47 percent since 1958.

But these alarming facts do not appear to faze the "job creating" Area Redevelopment Administration in its lust to dole out taxpayers' money.

In the last 12 months, the ARA has approved $3,424,500 in long-term, low-interest Federal loans for the construction of three new hotels and motels and the modernization of a fourth in Detroit.

As a result, the hotel industry in Detroit is screaming profusely.

Harry Paulsen, manager of Detroit's Tuller Hotel and president of the Detroit Hotel Association, charged that the result of this Federal spending will push more established hotels into bankruptcy.

"The ARA claims it creates jobs. All it is doing here in Detroit is destroying existing jobs and tranferring some of them to these new hotels," Paulsen said.

He said that the hotel association protested recently to the ARA and to the Detroit mayor "and we were promised there would be no further hotel or motel loans."

Biggest of the new Federal-aid sponsored Detroit hotel projects involved a $1,895,000 ARA loan to construct a swank 430-room hotel to be known as the Ponchartrain. It is now under construction near the new Detroit Civic Center.

"We never could have stopped that project," Paulsen said. He explained that some top political figures and the owner of one of the city's leading department stores are in the Ponchartrain Hotel venture.

Loans for new hotels and motels are favorite handouts for the ARA boys, evidenced by figures which show that for the first 3 months of 1963, 25 percent of all loans were for such projects.

This is at a time when hotel occupancy nationwide is running far below 50 percent capacity.

The hotel situation gives rise to complaints similar to many others voiced against the ARA since its inception in 1961.

In a recent letter to all members of the U.S. House of Representatives, Edwin P. Neilan, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, said:

"While ARA administrators can produce statistical evidence of the job-creating efforts of the ARA loans and grants, there also is substantial evidence that many ARA-financed projects are destroying as many existing jobs as the number of new ones created.

"Thus, we have the spectacle of a wasteful program of economic blood transfusion, involving the mere transfer of jobs by using tax resources from healthy communities to subsidize economically unsound projects in other communities."

Because a firm is able to obtain long-term, low-interest Government money from ARA, it often is able to underprice an existing competitor who must rely on his own private resources.

This has not, as yet, been the case in ARA loans approved in Indiana. But the day may soon be here.

Pending in Washington is an application for a whopping $1,950,000 ARA loan for construction of a prefabricated housing plant at Martinsville to be operated by a firm known as Completed Homes Corp.

James R. Price, board chairman of National Homes Corp. at Lafayette, gave notice last week that his firm will vigorously oppose the issuance of this Government subsidy to Completed Homes.

"The housing market in Indianapolis is down 23 percent from a year ago, and the facilities for producing homes are adequate, not only for Indianapolis, but for the entire State.

"Competing is rough enough without someone coming along with Federal money backing their business," Price said.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, July 4, 1963]

"REASONABLE" FINANCING OF ARA HELPS BIG FIRMS

(By Edward H. Frank)

If you had the choice of borrowing $100 at 5-percent interest from a bank or at 4-percent interest from the Federal Government, which would you choose?

A majority would choose the lower interest rate.

And this is exactly the situation involved in the construction of two new industrial plants in southern Indiana occupied by two of the world's leaders in their respective fields.

With the Area Redevelopment Administration providing $1,051,418 in long-term, low-interest loans to construct the gleaming plants, the Bata Shoe Co. recently started production in a new plant at Salem and the Borden Cabinet Co. moved into its new facility at Borden.

A glance at the financial ratings of these giants make it obvious that neither would have trouble obtaining financing from private sources.

The Bata Shoe Co., Inc., is the world's largest shoe manufacturer, operating 67 factories throughout the world.

The Borden Cabinet Co. is a subsidiary of the fast-growing Jasper Corp., which also owns the W. W. Kimball Co., manufacturers of pianos and organs; the Habig Manufacturing Co., and about 10 additional corporations.

Both Bata and the Jasper Corp. are given the highest credit rating possible by Dun & Bradstreet Inc.

But the ARA supplied these firms with 4 percent, 25-year loans—financing virtually impossible to obtain from commercial banking sources.

Both qualified for the loans because the plants are located in 2 of the State's 27 depressed counties and because they were able to prove that "reasonable" financing was not available from private sources.

The word "reasonable" is the real kicker in the ARA bureaucracy since the ARA considers any financing higher than 4 percent and shorter than 25 years unreasonable.

Firms also are able to cash in on the ARA loot because many new plants are located in small communities where local banks are limited by law as to how much they can lend.

But this was true before the birth of ARA and there is nothing to keep an industry from obtaining capital from a metropolitan bank or other large financial institutions.

Augustin Dolezal, president of the vast Bata Shoe empire, said his firm had decided to locate in Salem long before it knew anything about the ARA.

While trying to finance the Bata plant privately, the company learned from community residents that because Salem is a depressed area, ARA financing might be available.

"We would have built in Salem anyway," Dolezal said. "We were not so keen about the ARA, but the local bankers could not provide the capital," Dolezal said.

The building housing the Bata plant actually is owned by the Salem Redevelopment Corp., which has a lease-purchase contract with Bata.

In addition to a $474,300 ARA loan, the Salem Redevelopment Corp., put up $113,700 and the local Salem banks came through with $170,000.

ARA also provided Salem $235,000 in loans and grants to extend the water and sewage facilities to the new plant. And ARA also chipped in with $64,452 to train workers for the plant.

By the end of this year, Bata hopes to be producing 60,000 pairs of shoes a week.

Thirteen miles southeast of the Bata plant on Indiana 60 is the new $919,000 facility of the Borden Cabinet Co., the only industry in Borden, which has a population of less than 400.

The old Borden plant was destroyed by fire April 6, 1962, but with $577,118 in ARA financing, a new plant was built and back in operation in 4 months.

Arnold F. Habig, board chairman of the Jasper Corp., which has annual sales topping $20 million, said there is little doubt that his firm would have rebuilt in Borden without ARA help, "but we probably could not have been back in production so rapidly."

In addition to the $577,118 ARA loan, the new Borden plant was financed with $50,000 from the company, $200,000 from insurance and $92,000 from the Clark County Redevelopment Corp.

The plant now is employing 270 persons, about 100 more than before the fire.

Just a short distance away is still another ARA venture involving the development of a silica sand plant near Corydon.

The plant, to be operated by the Indiana Glass Sand Corp., is being financed with a $470,750 ARA loan and $35,000 raised by the Harrison County Rural Development Corp.

The Rural Electrification Administration even got in on this venture by providing an additional $187,000 loan through the Harrison County REMC for the purchase of electrical equipment in the plant.

JOHN Q. FINANCES FANCY SKI LODGE

(By Edward H. Frank)

In northern Michigan where inland lakes, trout fishing and skiing provide a vacation paradise for thousands of Americans, stands a $890,000 tribute to all taxpayers whether they ski or not—the Shanty Creek Lodge.

This magnificent year-round resort at Bellaire, Mich., was built with an $890,000 low-interest loan from the Area Redevelopment Administration for the avowed purpose of creating 72 new jobs.

That's $12,361 per job.

In addition, the ARA spent $4,000 to train the waitresses employed in the lodge who are described as "pretty and sharp" by Jackson Goolsby, editor of the Antrim County News in Bellaire.

And in order to squeeze a couple of extra months out of the winter skiing season, a portion of the ARA loan was used to purchase a snow-making machine.

Roy Deskin, a wealthy Chicago industrialist, who heads the General Steel Corporation, is the operator of the Shanty Creek Lodge.

"Luxurious relaxation, 91 superbly appointed rooms, double level cocktail lounge, elegant dining, year-round swimming, trout fishing in the lodge's private stream and pond" are some of the lodge facilities described in its brochure.

The lodge was designed by Architect Jack Begrow who formerly was associated with the famed Japanese architect Minoru Yamasaki.

Sloping roofs and huge wooden beams used throughout the structure typify Japanese architecture.

The beams, according to Editor Goolsby, were shipped in by special convoy from Wisconsin.

Shanty Creek isn't the only ski resort to receive Federal aid through the ARA. But it's probably the most luxurious.

A $250,000 ARA loan and a $150,000 grant were allotted to enable the Gogebic Range Ski Club of Ironwood, Mich., to build a skiing complex which includes an 80-meter ski jump, 120-meter ski flying slide, chair lift and other facilities.

ARA claims this project will provide 30 new jobs directly and an estimated 350 jobs indirectly in supporting trades.

And a $320,000 loan was approved by the ARA last year to develop a ski resort at Sandpoint, Idaho.

To date, Indiana has not been able to cash in on any juicy ARA loans for tourist resorts. But one is pending.

Under consideration by the ARA is an application for a $210,000 loan for a 120-acre recreational center to be known as Lincoln Hills, Inc., near Gentryville in Spencer County.

It would include a 33-unit motel, swimming pool, restaurant, cabins, and camping facilities in the area now being developed as Lincoln Trails. Total cost of the project is estimated at $350,000.

In the face of mounting criticism that has been leveled against the ARA since its inception 2 years ago, President Kennedy will have a rough battle in the House of Representatives to win an additional $445 million for the program in the next 2 years.

The House rejected the proposal in June, but the Senate since has approved the measure and sent it back to the House for another crucial vote.

Opposition to the ARA expansion was summed up recently by Matt Triggs, assistant legislative director of the American Farm Bureau Federation, who warned:

"For each dollar of ARA loan funds, an identical number of dollars must be extracted from the private economy, either in taxes, or by borrowing to finance the additional deficit thus created.

"The same money left in the private economy could well engender as much, and likely more, employment than if taken out of the private economy.

"In the United States we have historically left the allocation of resources for commercial development to be determined primarily by economic factors, rather than by administrative decisions."

MAJ. ROBERT A. RUSHWORTH

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, Maine is justly proud of one of her native sons, Maj. Robert A. Rushworth, who has exhibited great ability and courage as a pioneer in space flight.

Maj. Robert A. Rushworth qualified for the coveted Air Force astronaut wings during his 15th flight in the X–15, an experimental supersonic rocket aircraft. On June 27, he achieved an altitude of 286,000 feet, over the 50 miles needed to win the fourth set of wings for manned flight above the altitude and the second set to be awarded for flight to that altitude in a winged aircraft.

On July 25, 1963, in an impressive Pentagon ceremony, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff watched as Mrs. Rushworth pinned the astronaut wings above her husband's bright rows of ribbons. The ceremony was a milestone in Major Rushworth's career as an Air Force experimental flight test pilot.

Major Rushworth, born in Madison, Maine, on October 9, 1924, was chosen as the U.S. Air Force's alternate X–15 pilot in 1958 and made his first flight in the manned rocket plane on November 4, 1960, reaching an altitude of 50,000 feet and a speed of mach 2—twice the speed of sound.

After graduation from Madison Memorial High School, Major Rushworth attended Hebron Academy at Hebron, Maine, for a year, and then entered military service as an aviation cadet, receiving his pilot's wings in September 1944. During World War II, he served in the China-Burma-India theater where he chalked up 178 missions in transport aircraft, dropping supplies to men fighting in the jungles.

After graduation from the University of Maine, Orono, Maine, in 1951 with a bachelor's degree in mechanical engineering, Rushworth was called to active duty with the Maine National Guard in February 1951. He remained in Maine at Dow Air Force Base as a jet fighter pilot until August 1953, and then completed a course in aeronautical engineering at the Air Force Institute of Technology at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

Rushworth remained there as staff assistant and aero engineer in the directorate of flight and all-weather testing until July 1956, when he entered the USAF experimental flight test pilot school at Edwards Air Force Base, Calif. Upon graduation in January 1957, he was assigned as a test pilot at the flight test center there. Prior to his assignment to the center's manned spacecraft section and the X–15 program, he participated in testing the Century fight series, including the F–101, F–104, and F–106.

Decorations and awards received by Major Rushworth include the Air Medal with one oak leaf cluster; the Distinguished Flying Cross; the American Campaign Medal; the World War II Medal; the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal; and the National Defense Service Medal.

Major Rushworth now resides at Edwards Air Force Base with his wife, the former Joyce Butler of Norridgewock, Maine, and 6-year-old daughter, Cheri.

Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the great measure of pride that Major Rushworth's attainments have brought to his wife, his daughter, and his mother.

I want to take this opportunity of joining with a legion of others in saluting Major Rushworth and extending to this distinguished son of Maine my very warm congratulations on his latest achievement at the threshold of space.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit today while the House is in session during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CUBA AND THE COLD WAR

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, it has been 10 years since the Moncado episode in Cuba. Castro has taken over the island and has failed to carry out a single one of the pledges he made at that particular time. Today we are on the brink of signing a test-ban treaty.

Lest we forget what has happened in the Western Hemisphere, Members of both sides of the aisle are joined together today to present a discussion of the cold war and Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH] and I are acting as coordinators for other Members on both sides of the aisle to present to the Members of the House a series of talks on a concerted plan to help fight the cold war and to win back Cuba for democracy. Our purpose is, first, to alert the American public to this problem and, second, to let Latin America know that we in Congress truly care about the fate of our sister nation, Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, we shall review many actions taken in the past in relation to Cuba and make recommendations for a coordinated future program for our allies in the Western Hemisphere. We shall present a varied program which is bipartisan in nature and is not meant to be one of lambasting and whipping over the history and the personalities of the past involved in the present posture of Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, we shall recognize speakers who have previously requested time. It is then our intention to recognize all of those who wish to be heard during the coming hours.

At the conclusion of the speeches the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH] and I shall review for you some of the significant features of this program.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH].

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER] for this opportunity to present a few comments on a serious subject that affects not only the security of the Americas but indeed the security of the world.

Mr. Speaker, only a hasty glance at the headlines of the current newspapers is necessary to find testimony of the relentless drive of the Sino-Soviet empire for world conquest. This steady march for world domination has continued for nearly a half-century. Having crushed Tibet the Red dragon of China sits astride countless miles of the territory of India. Along the banks of the Mekong River in South Vietnam can be heard the ugly chatter of machineguns where there is being waged a war that is both brutal and vicious and not so cold. Yet it is along the banks of the Mekong River that could well be determined the future of all southeast Asia. Never for a single moment have the Soviets ceased in their relentless determination to ring down on freedom's lonely stage the iron curtain of Red slavery in Berlin. The Red standard that flies from over a dozen capitals of Eurasia has now been firmly planted in the Caribbean where it is intended to be a beachhead for a revolutionary assault upon all of Latin America, a revolutionary assault that will be waged not only militarily but, rather, will be waged psychologically, economically, and politically, where in the arsenal of their weaponry will be espionage, subversion, sabotage, guerrilla warfare, terrorism, and violence.

Mr. Speaker, on the Cuban island there are being trained revolutionaries who study the guerrilla doctrines of Mao Tse-tung, Ho Chi Minh, and Che Guevarra. Here are being trained the guerrillas to infiltrate Latin America and wage there a form of warfare that was waged by the Castro movement in the late fifties so successfully.

Mr. Speaker, the Soviets placed their missiles on the Cuban island and this

Nation, scarcely 10 months ago, was confronted with a situation of deadly peril. Militarily, there was sought to be changed the balance of power in nuclear weaponry. Last fall we discovered that there were on the Cuban island missiles undoubtedly intended for American targets.

Mr. Speaker, the world was apprehensive during our quarantine and the resulting confrontation; America was proud of the bold and decisive and courageous action that was taken so successfully at that time, with the full support of the American people, and in cooperation with our allies including the Organization of American States.

However, the strategy directed at Cuba by the Soviets was not just in the military arena using missiles but, rather, it is twofold. The second phase of that strategy is continuing now in the same relentless methods of conquest so characteristic of the international Communist conspiracy.

It is this second form of strategy—the subversion of Latin America from a Cuban base—that we need to be concerned about, which poses now a real threat to the security of all the Americas.

Yet the Cuban situation is not a partisan issue; it is not an issue of any party, but, rather, it is an issue that should be discussed bipartisanally to form a concerted action for those who seek to preserve and extend the boundaries of freedom.

The issue is really freedom versus slavery, for now we see the colonial power of the Soviet Union intervening and denying to the Cuban people the right of self-determination, the Soviet Union seeking to enforce their rule through the police state by stationing Russian troops on the island who might employ in Havana the tactics learned in Budapest.

This is our challenge, it is a challenge to all Americans. It is not a party challenge, because it is one that each of us must meet, indeed we must meet it not only for the freedom of this Nation, but indeed for a free world.

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania again for permitting me to make these remarks.

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Virginia for the fine background for our discussion today on the cold war and Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I am pleased to join with the other Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle in a very bipartisan approach to this problem, one that does concern the American people. As we consider this problem of Cuba and what has been done and what should be done, the American people will be impressed with the fact that it is not just Members of Congress from Florida who are concerned about this problem but there are Members from Pennsylvania, Virginia, Washington, on the other side of this country, California, Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Missouri, Minnesota, and Kansas who are concerned. As a matter of fact, all States in this Union are concerned.

It is incumbent upon the Congress to generate the concern and to start the leadership in many lines necessary to get rid of Castro and communism in this hemisphere. Of course, there are two approaches: unilateral action by the United States alone as well as multilateral action through the Organization of American States.

May I say, as I have tried to say many times before on the floor of this House, multilateral action comes only after unilateral leadership by the United States. The greatest example of multilateral action following strong leadership or unilateral action by our country was what took place in October 1962, when the President set up embargoes on Cuba and immediately and for the first time we had 100 percent cooperation, a joinder by the Organization of American States.

One of the things I have been concerned with particularly is the economic action that can be taken against Castro. This is a field that I think can bring immediate hurt to Castro and communism, can make Russia's task so much more expensive and so much more difficult that it helps to destroy the reason for Russia even being concerned with Cuba. Furthermore I think by sealing off Cuba in this hemisphere, as can be done, that this would destroy the very reason for Russia being there. If we can prevent the travel to and from Cuba, if we can prevent the transfer of funds throughout the hemisphere to Cuba, if we can cut off telecommunications between Cuba and the rest of the hemisphere, then the very reason for Russia having their people there, which is to subvert the rest of the hemisphere, would be destroyed, and I think that is the very first step to be taken by this Nation and the nations of this hemisphere.

I am concerned about Allied shipping into Cuba. In January of this year the shipping from our well-known allies was down to about 12 ships, but since that time we have seen an increase in this shipping until last May it was up to about 44, and in June it was up to about 38 or 39 from the latest reports, and it is possible that even those reports can increase because many of the intelligence sources that come in and are checked out require some time. At any rate we are seeing a steady increase in Allied shipping again back into Cuba which simply takes the burden off of Russia in using its own ships to come in and supply the goods that are very necessary for this Cuban island to exist. So the lifeblood and the method of feeding communism into Cuba right now is being carried on by such of our supposedly good friends as Britain and many other nations, people who have professed great friendship with us and yet are letting their own ships be used to carry on this policy of undermining the very purposes of freedom in this hemisphere and undermining the policies of our own Government.

Mr. DEVINE. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield in order that I may ask a question of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. WEAVER. Would the gentleman from Florida care to yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield for a question.

Mr. WEAVER. I will yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to compliment the gentleman from Florida. I have seen him in the well and time and time again in this session of Congress on this very subject. I know he is vitally interested due to the proximity of his district to the island of Cuba, that here as he said is a bipartisan problem that should be faced directly. The gentleman from Florida has been a consistent fighter in this regard. I might say just last weekend a group, a task force from this side of the aisle, directed a letter to the administration on the very subject on which the gentleman is talking, and I wish again to compliment him on his continued fight for what is a solid American principle.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and appreciate, too, his continued interest in trying to do something about this problem of Cuba. I was delighted to see the letter that was sent to try to encourage stronger action in cutting off this shipping. I would like to ask all Members who are concerned to join me in sponsorship of this bill that I introduced a number of days back, H.R. 7687, which has as its purpose, in effect, the closing of American ports to the ships of any nation which allows any of its ships to go into Cuba. This is the only way we are going to be able to cut it off. Halfway measures are not going to work. We have seen our Government make representations to some of these so-called allies and other friends of ours, asking them, "Won't you please cut off your shipping to stop Russia from building up Cuba? Won't you please stop your shipping to Cuba?"

They say, "Oh, well, we would like to help you, but somehow we just can't go this far."

The administration took a halfway step in saying that any ship that goes into Cuba cannot come into an American port after that for 120 days. Well, it is very easy to get around that. They simply let one ship do that while all the other ships come into American ports and carry on all the trade they want to.

I think we ought to let them make a quick decision as to whether they want to trade with the United States of America or whether they want to trade with Russia and Cuba. The best way to do it is for the Congress itself to take action; to say that this is the congressional intent, this is going to be the law, this is what we want done. We want our American ports closed to any ship from any nation if it permits any one of its ships to go into Cuba carrying these Russian goods.

The Congress can do this. And I solicit the support, as I am sure we have it here in the Congress, of other Members to unite in joint sponsorship of this approach. Let us pass a law to cut off this shipping. Let them quickly make their decision, and I am sure it will be quickly done, because any country which has large trade with the United States will make that decision very quickly; because all of the trade to Cuba represents only about 1 percent of their trade. And yet look what it is doing in taking the burden away from Russia.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the things I think we can do in the Congress quickly to show our intent, just as we did when we passed that bill some time back, when we said that we wanted to prevent Cuban goods from coming into this country. When this House unanimously passed that bill, immediately after, even though it did not have a chance to pass the Senate because it was in the closing days of the last Congress, the Executive immediately recognized the intent of the congressional bill and cut off that trade. So we can direct policy here by taking some positive action. The American people want it.

I certainly want to compliment all of my colleagues from all over this country who are sufficiently concerned about this problem to speak up and to demand some action and some leadership to get rid of Castro and communism in this hemisphere.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida who has been a champion from the very beginning of action on Cuba. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN].

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH] for spearheading this discussion today to offer some constructive proposals and ideas to do something about the deplorable situation in Cuba.

I am particularly pleased to see my colleagues from both sides of the aisle entering into this discussion, opening it up for review in the way they have. I think the American people are more concerned, more deeply concerned, with this situation that faces us in Cuba and in fact around the world, than they are with any other problem with which this country is faced today. The American people want some positive action here. I think the people around the world are watching the United States to see what we are going to do.

This is not just a Communist buildup in Cuba. It is not just a threat to the United States that we are talking about, but this is a threat to the entire free world. I think that the prestige of America started into a sharp decline at the time we allowed the Russians to build up their Communist foothold in this hemisphere. I think this is well demonstrated by the fact that Mr. de Gaulle now wants to build up his nuclear force in France. If America does not have the guts and the willingness to stand up for freedom when communism is established 90 miles off our shores, are we going to have guts enough to stand up and help the countries of Europe when the Russians push communism into their countries? I do not blame Mr. de Gaulle. If I were in France or in any other free country I think I would take a second look at it, too, when we say we are for freedom and yet allow the Communists to establish the foothold that they now have in Cuba.

I think the American people are correct in saying that they are tired of this business of being concerned with how popular we are instead of how right we are, and they, as do I, believe that the Kennedy brothers ought to get as tough with Castro and communism as they did with the American steel industry.

I, along with many of my colleagues, have, for over a year, recommended positive action in Cuba by establishing an economic blockade of Cuba, initiation of hard-hitting negotiations with our Allies to stop trade and aid to Cuba, and the recognition of a free-Cuban Government in exile, including the granting of technological and military assistance if necessary to help the Cuban people regain freedom.

We could squeeze out the Castro-Communist government now, and without war, if we would initiate action immediately, but if we allow Castro to continue to build up his military strength and the Russians to solidify their position in this hemisphere, we could be forced into war to rid ourselves of this Communist threat on our southern shores.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity of taking part in this discussion and I commend my colleagues for bringing it to the attention of the American public in the very constructive manner they have today.

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN].

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join this discussion with a sense of great responsibility—also urgency. Responsibility, because I believe to be born free is an accident, to live free is a responsibility, to die free is an obligation; urgency, because our Nation is involved in a cold war that can be just as deadly to the noble purposes of our Government as that type of conflict proclaimed by flaming muzzles and screaming bombs.

We as a nation spend billions of dollars on defense, following our policy of deterrence through strength, a policy which I support. But each of us must be aware that this deterrence keeps an arena of combat open. This is an arena where the fight is for the hearts and minds of men, and this battle is being waged around the clock. This is a fight where the weapons of our opponents are subversion, propaganda, lies, and brutality—anything to obtain their objectives.

As a Congressman I receive much mail from my constituents decrying our lack of foreign policy, or, in the alternative, frustration over our schizophrenic policy. We are supporting a coalition with Communists in Laos, yet we fight against Communists in Vietnam. The administration vows determinedly to rid the Western Hemisphere of Communist domination, yet we erect insurmountable obstacles against anti-Castro forces who want to rid themselves of this savage, godless ideology.

In making these remarks and joining with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, my intention is to make constructive and affirmative suggestions concerning ways in which I believe our policy can be made realistic, can be made effective and demonstrative of the leadership we must assume. In this context I object strongly to a statement recently made by Mr. McGeorge Bundy, the Presidential adviser on foreign policy.

Speaking on a panel conducted by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and referring to Cuba, Mr. Bundy said:

> Honest critics should say whether they prefer these acts of war to the Kennedy policy.

Implicit in this statement is the assumption that there is no action that can be taken, no alternative, no improvements made between our "wait and see" policy and war. I submit that a positive, affirmative program in this area would lessen the chances of war, not increase them. I further submit that this "all or nothing" approach of Mr. Bundy's does a disservice to the cause of building a sound, effective Cuban policy, free from unbridled partisanship.

Last April, Freedom House, in collaboration with the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, brought together a group of nonpartisan experts who studied the Cuban problem. One conclusion of that group bears directly on this subject:

> The net effect of examining such factors is to suggest that a simple policy of risk avoidance can lead only to the certainty of a worsening position for the United States. Indeed, it is more likely that an improvement of our position will occur only from a process of intelligent risk taking. This was demonstrated in the October confrontation. The administration took manageable risks rather than accept the certainty that the nuclear balance would swing in Russia's direction and that Khrushchev's capability for blackmail and attack would be increased by the presence of Soviet missiles in Cuba. Unfortunately, while it was clearly willing to take risks in order to obtain a Soviet pledge of an inspected withdrawal of the missiles, there was not willingness to take the risk of a follow through. Is there any practical value in running risks to gain a pledge, and running no risks to enforce it?

A brief look at any map or globe clearly shows the importance of the island of Cuba in relation to the challenge that faces the United States, the Western Hemisphere, and the free world. The important cities and military installations of the United States mainland are now open to Soviet attack by conventional weapons, eliminating the necessity for building large stores of long range Russian weapons.

The island's proximity to the United States makes it an ideal base from which our radio and television frequencies can be jammed. Evidence indicates the strong possibility that Cuba is already being used as a base for Russian submarines. But of equal importance, or perhaps of more importance at this juncture of American history, is the obvious fact that this island is a launching pad for subversion for the entire Western Hemisphere, and particularly for Central and South America.

The evidence is also overwhelming that Cuba is being used as a training school for subversion. An 8-nation committee of the Organization of American

States recently wrote a 60-page report proving the existence of this threat and describing the extent of its progress. The report states:

> Undoubtedly Cuba now constitutes the regional center for subversive action by international communism in America.

The report adds:

> It is no exaggeration to say that Cuba has now been converted into a Soviet military camp. It is also clear that Cuba is being used as a base for training in communism and for the spread of communism.

Pedro G. Beltran, former Prime Minister of Peru, recently gave a vivid picture of the results of this increase in subversion coming from Cuba. Speaking before the Catholic Press Association of the United States and Canada, he said:

> Cuba has thus become a model campus of the modern college for subversion of the Americas. The Communists are mounting an attack on our countries from within. How can you expect to control this sort of indoctrination and infiltration? The boys who are taken to Cuba, whether from Peru, Bolivia, Colombia, and Ecuador or any of these countries, need no passport in order to travel. Once they are over the border, Castro agents furnish them with money and transportation. They are welcomed to Havana without documents and when they leave they are provided with forged passports which do not mention their stay in Cuba. Certainly they will not return home through regular channels. The fact is that as long as the Russians are in Cuba, it will continue to be a model campus of the modern college for subversion of the Americas.

The same story of subversion can be written about any Latin America country. The OAS report I referred to before estimates that there are now more than 250,000 Communist Party members in Latin America. Of these, only about 60,000 are reported to be in Cuba.

There are many changes in policy that would, in my opinion, strengthen our world position, reestablish our leadership in the Western Hemisphere, and which would remove "Subversion University" from our back doorstep.

First, it is imperative that we as a people, and as a government, put ourselves unequivocally and unflinchingly on the side of the Cuban people who are willing to fight for their freedom. I recently talked to a large number of political exiles at Guantanamo Naval Base. Their message was clear and convincing:

> Help us get Khrushchev out of Cuba and we will take care of Castro ourselves.

It is unfortunate that it is necessary for this Nation to make a declaration such as this, measured against the principles of liberty that presided at our birth and that have been our heritage. There should be no question that we support those who fight for freedom and oppose those who live and rule by tyranny. This has always been our national purpose.

I suggest that this evening you go down to Haines Point and read the firm, unequivocating pledge of Thomas Jefferson, inscribed in that magnificent memorial, for all to see and savor:

> I have sworn upon the altar of God Eternal, hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man.

Unfortunately, our past actions regarding Cuba bear bitter fruit. The abandonment of our demands for on-site inspections, the apparent willingness to accommodate ourselves to Communist control of Cuba, the chastisement of Cuban exile groups, the forsaking of the clear-cut intent and meaning of the Monroe Doctrine—all these individual actions form a composite picture that leaves serious doubt as to how far we will actually go to defend freedom in this hemisphere.

Such a declaration of support for those Cuban patriots would serve notice to the world that we are ready to reassume the robes of leadership. It would do much more—it would serve notice to those brave Cuban people that they do not fight alone and that their cause does not go unnoticed at our counsel tables.

One of the great shortcomings of our foreign policy has been our apparent ignorance or disregard of the undeniable fact that there is in progress today, at this very moment, an impressive revolt in Cuba. The Castro movement has failed utterly and miserably to capture the support of the Cuban people. Cuba was not a case of "stomach communism" initially as many people mistakenly believe. Rather, Castro's rise to power and with him communism, was caused by the middle and upper classes being willing to accept the benefits of freedom without assuming the attendant responsibilities. It seems inconceivable that our foreign policy architects, do not appreciate fully the valiant struggle being waged every hour around the clock by Cuban peasants and patriots, yet no evidence of that awareness is manifest. These Cuban liberty fighters desperately need physical help—food, arms, ammunition—the tools of guerrilla warfare. In the absence of that help, they are equally desperate for our moral support. They need to know that in spirit we are fighting by their side, yet they have not received that assurance.

The story of those fighting for freedom in Cuba, a David and Goliath battle, is an inspiring one. In order to put this story into proper perspective, I think we must look at the earlier Castro-led revolution. It is not correct to assume that the pre-Castro Cuba was a nation of impoverished peasants, on the brink of mass revolt. This is a beguiling notion, but it simply is not right. Pre-Castro Cuba was no paradise, no home of economic and social democracy, but neither was it a sink of poverty and misery. Its per capita income was much higher than that of post-war Japan and about on a par with post-war Italy. Many of these peasants no doubt were misled by the demogogic Castro who represented that they were at that time fighting for their individual liberty, when in fact the Communist conspiracy was lurking in the wings.

Cuban resistance started almost the day the true facts were known. As early as December 14, 1960, Castro proudly announced that all counter revolutionaries had been wiped out. He has made the same claim several times in the past 2 years. Yet the current revolt persists and grows in size.

Castro himself is authority for the proof of its growth. On June 18 and again on June 27 of this year, he announced that half the counterrevolutionary bands in one province had been eliminated—14 in number. Accepting Castro's statement at face value, simple mathematics indicate 14 bands of patriots remain in this single province—and there are 6 other provinces in Cuba.

The story of this sabotage is revealed in cold facts. Listed below are the sugar production figures for the last 6 years:

[In tons]

1958	5,610,600
1959	5,788,100
1960	5,688,900
1961	6,567,300
1962	4,693,100
1963 (estimated)	3,000,000

Castro first came to power in January 1959. Only seven sugar mills were seized by him in this year, so most of the sugar was produced under private industry. In 1960, following the harvest, Castro confiscated all the mills, and in 1961 he declared free operation—no quotas—and every stalk of cane was cut. Consequently, the 1962 crop, harvested in 1963, was the first Communist sugar harvest. That crop was less than half the peak production of 1961.

The means by which this reduction in production occurred is a story of courage and ingenuity. Much of the sabotage has been accomplished through the elementary process of setting the canefields on fire. One successful technique is a vignette of persistence. The peasants catch rats, tie a rag to the tail, soak it in gasoline, set it afire and send the rat scurrying through the fields. The immediate result? As if by magic a series of fires will spring up in various parts of the fields, destroying sugar. The long-range result? Another blow to Communist control.

The government of Las Villas Province recently admitted that 5 million arrobas of cane had been burned. Since one arroba equals 25 pounds of sugar, the sabotage efforts of Cuban peasants in a single province translate into 125 million pounds of sugar.

Another means of sabotage used by counterrevolutionaries is the simple technique of refusing to work. The effect of this "stay away" strike is most apparent in the operation of the sugar grinding machinery. Once the grinding machine starts during the sugar season it is necessary that it stay in constant operation day and night until the grinding is completed. It becomes economically prohibitive to start and stop the machines. Yet the reports of delays that are heard over the Communist radio network tell the story of Communist failure. For a single example, this report was heard from Dos Amigas in Oriente Province:

> Closed. Time lost, 24 hours. Reason: no cane cutters.
>
> Total time lost for February and March, 500 hours.

Each of these delays, and there are hundreds of them, demonstrate the failure of the Communist Party to terrorize the Cuban peasant into submission. Conversely, it is notice to all who will look, that these people are fighting and will continue fighting tyranny.

Testimony to the success of the revolt comes from the top Cuban officials themselves. Rigoberto Fernandes, the head of the regime's so-called "labor service" said that even the "volunteers" were sabotaging the canefields. "It is necessary to rotate volunteer sugarcane cutters and laborers, then put others who do not resist to cutting the cane. We will not continue the dangers that cause the loss of grinding of sugar and put our revolution in danger," he stated.

Communist Party Secretary Felipe Torres said:

> Volunteers are deserting their labor and even those staying in the canefields are refusing to work.

On April 30, 1963, Minister of Industry Ernesto Guevara described the frustration that besets the Communist leaders when he stated almost plaintively:

> We must look carefully to find out where the canecutters have deserted to.

No less than Raul Castro has said:

> We have an economic problem of the greatest nature. The regime mobilized 50,000 workers from other jobs and sent them to the fields as permanent volunteer canecutters but despite their help and despite everything we have not been able to maintain normal sugar grinding.

Finally I cite the bearded leader. Fidel Castro made the following statement on return from his recent visit to Russia. It takes no great insight to imagine the conversation between Castro and Khrushchev that prompted this remark:

> We have not complied with our sugar commitments for various reasons known to all of us. We have an unfavorable trade balance of $200 million a year.

The same story of sabotage can be written concerning the other Cuban crops. In 1958 the tobacco production was 628 million units for export and domestic consumption. In 1959, Castro's first year of power, production fell to 322 million units and exports fell from 79 8 million to 69.8 million units. In 1960, exports dropped to 54.6 million units, and in 1961 they fell to 32.7 million units. An article in Cuba Socialista, an official government magazine, said:

> The export of cheap tobacco has fallen during 1961 and 1962 to a level of about 33 million cigars with a value of only $6 million.

The production of coffee is not a major crop for Cuba, but an interesting story lies in this area. Coffee is produced in the mountainous region of Cuba, best suited to counterrevolutionary activities. At first, the peasants broke the limbs off the coffee trees and production dropped to almost nothing. Consequently, the Castro government has moved these people to the collective farms on the plains and sent city workers to the mountains. They still are not trusting of them, however, so they work in groups of not larger than 10. Of the 10 workers, the No. 1 worker is a government man, the No. 2 is a Cuban G-2 employee, and the third is a Young Communist. The production of coffee has not increased despite these measures.

Even in this sea of heartbreak, there are islands of humor, caused by the Communist frustration. Recently this story appeared in the Communist Cuban paper "Hay." The column called "A Thousand Eyes" reports that a comrade on duty in a warehouse was cleaning his boots. He was using gasoline. Then he lit a cigarette and inadvertently threw the lighted match directly into the gas can, causing a fire of $100,000 magnitude. The article tersely cautioned against such negligence.

If there is a doubt about the effectiveness of this sabotage activity by the Cuban people, consider Castro's repressive order 988:

> Anyone caught burning cane, giving one mouthful of food to Cuban revolutionary bands or giving assistance to guerrilla bands is to be shot within 48 hours.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I have today written a letter to Secretary of State Rusk as follows:

> Dear Mr. Secretary: Evidence clearly shows that Cuban patriots are in an impressive stage of revolt against Castro's Communist government. Will you send to me the nonclassified mass of evidence your Department has compiled, detailing the extent of this revolt? I also ask that you make this information available to the people of the United States and to the world. I make this request for the following reasons:
>
> 1. Freedom's fight, whether it be heralded by the boom of cannons on the battlefield, or the lonely stillness of sabotage and guerrilla warfare, should be told. The world should know when there is concerted, effective opposition to the Communist conspiracy.
>
> 2. Those Cubans who are fighting need to know that you and the American people are aware of their valiant efforts. Since last October we have not indicated by our actions that their fight is our fight.
>
> 3. The people of the Latin American countries who are subjected to Communist subversions with ever-increasing intensity should know what their Cuban neighbors, already under the Soviet fist, are doing to rid themselves of its punishment. They will be awakened to the danger before it is too late.
>
> 4. The American people should know the fight is being waged. We need desperately to affirm our determined opposition to Soviet intrusion in our hemisphere. Our "wait and see" policy, coupled with prominent domestic issues have driven the Cuban problem from the front pages. Yet who can deny the stake the American people have in a correct solution? You and I are working for them—they have a right to know.
>
> 5. This disclosure, accompanied by the firm declaration that we are on the side of the Cuban people fighting Castro will serve notice to the world that we are ready to reassume leadership for the cause of liberty, freedom, and dignity of man.

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEAVER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Weaver] and those who have joined in continuing to call the attention of the Congress and the American people to the dangers of a Communist base existing here in the Western Hemisphere. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Brotzman] who just concluded, called to the attention of the House a report issued recently by the Organization of American States.

I would like to remind the gentleman and the Congress of the hearings conducted in February and early March by the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on Castro-Communist subversion in the Western Hemisphere and the report that was issued following those hearings. In that report, the subcommittee members pointed out that while Latin America has been a target for Communist conquest since the early 1920's with the coming into power of Fidel Castro in Cuba in 1959 the existence of an operational base in the heartland of the Americas brought a grave new dimension to the Communist threat to the inter-American system.

From its inception the Castro regime has sought to export revolution to other countries of the hemisphere. Direct military efforts, in the form of small rebel force landings in the hemisphere, failed in 1959. Cuba then rapidly became a base for subversion and guerrilla training, as well as propaganda campaigns aimed at the overthrow of existent Latin American governments.

By 1960, Soviet and outside Communist influence and control over the Castro revolutionary apparatus had become obvious. In December 1961, when the Cuban dictator proclaimed his allegiance to the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, his appeal to indigenous non-Communist elements in Latin America diminished, but the campaign to export revolution by subversive aggression was intensified.

This stepped-up campaign continues to be carried out by three basic means: First, exploitation of nationalist and ultra leftist groups; second, the dissemination of propaganda; and, third, the intensive ideological indoctrination and development of antigovernment forces through guerrilla training.

These and other observations are contained in the subcommittee's report, which I mentioned a few moments ago, as well as recommendations which subcommittee members felt would be helpful in combating subversive activities throughout the hemisphere. I commend to the Members of the House both the printed hearings on Castro-Communist subversion in the Western Hemisphere, and the report that followed those hearings.

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Weaver] for yielding me this time.

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Selden].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one comment?

Mr. WEAVER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I just want to say I know of no Member who has been more diligent in trying to do something about this Cuban problem than the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Selden]. His work, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin America of the Committee on Foreign Affairs is a position where he has been able to become knowledgeable on what is being done and what is not being done, and certainly his leadership has been helpful in trying to bring some positive policy into so many things that need to be done. I certainly want to join with other Members of the House in commending his strong interest and leadership.

Mr. WEAVER. I too commend the gentleman from Alabama for his leadership and wise comment on this subject.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one comment?

Mr. WEAVER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. The other day when Castro announced he was going to confiscate our Embassy I checked with the State Department to find out whether any such attack had ever been made on any of our Embassies. They came up with the report that only in one instance was it done, in Vietnam when the Japanese moved in, they did take over temporarily our Embassy in Saigon. However, in no other case did it happen. The Germans did not bother our Embassy during the war. The Italians did not bother it and neither did the Japanese in Tokyo. Even the Chinese have not made a move at all toward our Embassy. It seems to me this is a direct attack on the United States just the same as if they attacked Miami, or Washington, or any other part of the United States, because that Embassy is the United States.

I certainly regret that our President and our Secretary of State have not made a very strong and determined effort to see that if this confiscation is going to proceed, then I think we have to take some direct action.

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the gentleman from California for his observations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] be yielded 40 minutes so he may in turn yield to other Members of Congress on the subject of the cold war in Cuba.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER] for yielding me this time. I want to compliment my colleagues for the very forceful and certainly the very nonpartisan attitude that has been displayed here this afternoon in discussing this problem which is not just a problem of this administration or of Florida, or of the United States, but is a problem of the whole free world. It is not just a problem of our State Department, nor of the Senate of the United States, but it is also a problem of this body. It behooves all of us to use our most constructive thoughts and to manage our time so that we will bring to bear on this most sensitive subject and on this most important subject the best thoughts of this body. It is with this in mind that I make a few remarks before I yield, about the possibilities and the probabilities and the desirabilities of recognizing a provisional government, or a government in exile to represent the Cuban people during this very strenuous time. I know that many people have said that this is an unwise decision to make; that we should not get involved with any group of refugees, or with any other people in trying to set up some government to represent them while Castro is in power.

But after having read all of their arguments and after having read the arguments on the other side, and based upon some personal experience that I have had in working in this type of situation I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it would be most wise and most desirable for this country to recognize some provisional government to represent these exiles and to represent the people inside of Cuba who are seeking freedom. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this would be a step toward unity.

I know that in the city of Miami there are as many as 25 different exile groups, freedom-loving groups that need direction and maintenance and stability. I know in my own city there are freedom-loving groups of Cuban refugees and first generation Cubans who would like to work together in throwing off Castroism in our hemisphere. But all of these people seem to be milling around and looking to someone else for leadership. I say that that leadership must be found within them; it is within the people who are now temporary visitors in our country as exiles and the people who are fighting inside of Cuba, as Mr. BROTZMAN so ably pointed out, who will have to bring some direction and some stability to this movement.

Of course, it would be much better if we could recognize a provisional government inside of Cuba. Maybe a few months or a few years ago this would have been possible, but it will not help us at all today to think about the past. We must think about the future. If it is impossible, and it is probably impossible, to recognize this provisional government in exile on the island of Cuba, certainly we should assist these people to try to set up under some democratic process here in this country or in one of the other Latin-American countries, a unified front to oppose Castro. This provisional government would include within its people who are now on the island of Cuba and those who are now outside the island of Cuba. A provisional government would help in establishing a sound situation in Cuba after Castro leaves or after we have run Castro out of that area. It could set out clearly the aims and the objectives and the principles for which a new and free Cuba would stand. It could set forth what would be done about bringing about a firmer economy on the island of Cuba; what would be done about free elections in Cuba; what would be done about the whole cause of freedom in Cuba. A provisional government could establish a positive ideological attack upon this cancer that resides in the island.

This government in exile or this provisional government, once set up, could establish through democratic processes its own leaders. It could, by the use of means of communication, radio and printed material, take the message of freedom and coordinate the message of freedom and fight for freedom on the island. It would be such an agency to which this country could legitimately under international law and under the laws of this country render substantial economic and military aid.

But all this would not be enough. In addition to this, it is my thought that we in the Congress and we in America must think about what is going to happen once we get rid of Castro.

I believe that the whole area of Central and South America, as was ably pointed out in the hearings of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs this last February and March, is ripe for revolution. It is no longer a question of supplying South Americans with the guns, arms, and ammunition to carry on a revolution, because about 65 very violent and semiviolent revolutions have occurred in Central and South America since the end of World War II and they already have all of the arms and ammunition that they need.

From reading the hearings and listening to the testimony of Mr. John McCone, Mr. Martin, and others, it is obvious that the Central and South American people already have the guns to carry on any kind of revolution they want to. But we have arms enough here in our country to prevent the spread of communism into Central and South America, but the real question is, Do we have the ideological strength, do we have the determination to keep communism out of Central and South America? I think we do, but I think we need to take constructive steps to keep it out.

One of the constructive steps I should like to suggest would be a vast speedy expansion of our cultural and educational exchange program in Central and South America. I know that through the Alliance for Progress, the Peace Corps, and the State Department we are now carrying on these programs, but the programs unfortunately are not enough. They are not adequately financed, and that is the responsibility of this Congress.

It seems to me we can also introduce a new program, a program designed to get very quickly to the minds and the hearts of the future leaders of Central and South America by establishing a program that would go to the educators, the teachers, the instructors particularly in the secondary schools of Central and South America, to bring them to this country in an exchange program. We have brought college professors here with some success, but let us bring the secondary teachers here to demonstrate to them how freedom works in our country, to help them take the message of freedom and a free economy back to those very fine minds that are in the secondary schools in the Americas.

We have seen through the American Field Services Program demonstrated in this country the fine exchange program where students come here from all over the world as well as the Americas to live in the homes of America. I have seen this is a very wonderful program in action. I urge the continuation, the reinforcement, and the expansion of this type of program. We can invite those students of high school age, high school seniors particularly, before they go to college, to live here, to see freedom as it actually works, to live in American homes. I know there are many American homes that will welcome the students and have welcomed them. In this way we will have an opportunity of planting in the minds of these future leaders the spirit or our wonderful American revolution of freedom and equality.

I am ashamed to say that in a nation where we can sell soap, cigarettes, whisky, and other things better than any other nation in the world yet we have neglected the opportunity to sell the message of the wonderful American revolution, this freedom revolution, throughout the world, and particularly throughout Central and South America. It chagrins me to recognize that while we are militarily strong and yet we are not ideologically strong and have not used our ingenuity and our wealth to spread this message of freedom.

We, the Congress, have failed to give to the USIA, for instance, sufficient money for its needs. Yet we spend more money for one nuclear submarine than we spend on the whole information and education program throughout the world of spreading this idea of what Americanism and what freedom really is. I think we need to change this approach. We must step up our program of information, education, and cultural exchange with the Americas. We can do this by bringing in more Latin American students and teachers and sending them more of our students and teachers. We must also step up our program in the Americas for the ideological attack for freedom through the USIA and other agencies.

The responsibility of supporting these programs and for creating new ones rest with this Congress. We must not fail.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may need to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON].

Mr. STINSON. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding at this point.

Mr. Speaker, Cuba's economic life is vitally dependent on certain major exports and a vast number of imports. The current difficulties in the realization of its ambitious industrialization program show that the country is extremely vulnerable to any interruption of the flow of foreign trade. Whenever it has been possible to collect facts on Cuban trade, it has become abundantly clear that the Communist world is unable to supply all of the basic essentials so desperately needed by Cuba. In pre-Castro days, the United States functioned as major supplier and purchaser of Cuban needs and exports. Now that the United States embargo on Cuban exports and imports is in operation and the Sino-Soviet world cannot supply Cuba's needs, many free world countries have stepped in to take a percentage of Cuban trade. The United States has asked its free world partners to assist in enforcing the embargo, but significant cooperation on the part of the free world countries has been disappointing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this point to include a list of these 66 countries that are currently trading with Cuba.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The countries referred to are as follows:

United States, Aden, Austria, Belgian-Luxembourg, Denmark, Finland, France, West Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Australia, Cambodia, Ceylon, Hong Kong, India, Japan, Malaya, New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand, Vietnam, Argentina, Panama, Surinam, Uruguay, United Kingdom, Canada, Israel, Sudan, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Malta, Syria, Algeria, Chad, Guinea, Morocco, Rhodesia-Nyasaland, Senegal, South Africa, Tunisia, Brazil, British Guiana, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Netherlands Antilles, Nicaragua, Peru, Trinidad, Venezuela.

Mr. STINSON. Many of the nations of the world have also been providing the necessary ships and aircraft to carry on the trade and passenger transport so essential to the survival of communism in Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent to include a list of shipping that has been going into Cuba, as provided by the Department of Commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The list referred to is as follows:

LIST OF FREE WORLD AND POLISH FLAG VESSELS ARRIVING IN CUBA SINCE JANUARY 1, 1963

(Rept. No. 10)

SECTION 1. "Pursuant to the National Security Action Memorandum No. 220, dated February 5, 1963, addressed to the Secretary of State; the Secretary of Defense; the Secretary of Agriculture; the Secretary of Commerce; the Administrator, Agency for International Development; and the Administrator, General Services Administration, concerning U.S. Government shipments by foreign-flag vessels in the Cuban trade, the Maritime Administration is making available to the appropriate Departments the following list of vessels which have arrived in Cuba since January 1, 1963, based on information received through June 14, 1963, exclusive of those vessels that called at Cuba on U.S. Government-approved noncommercial voyages and those listed in section 2:

FLAG OF REGISTRY, NAME OF SHIP	*Gross tonnage*
Total, all flags (118 ships)	961, 368
British (37 ships)	355, 354
Ardgem	6, 981
Ardmore	4, 664
Ardrowan	7, 300
Arlington Court	9, 662
Athelcrown (tanker)	11, 149
Athelduke (tanker)	9, 089
Athelmere (tanker)	7, 524
Athelmonarch (tanker)	11, 182
Athelsultan (tanker)	9, 149
Avisfaith	7, 868
Chipbee	7, 271
Fir Hill	7, 119
Hazelmoor	7, 907
Ho Fung	7, 121
Ivy Fair	7, 201
Linkmoor	8, 236
London Confidence (tanker)	21, 699
London Independence (tanker)	22, 643
London Majesty (tanker)	12, 132
London Pride (tanker)	10, 776
London Splendour (tanker)	16, 195
London Victory (tanker)	12, 132
Lord Gladstone	11, 299
Maratha Enterprise	7, 166
Overseas Explorer (tanker)	16, 267
Overseas Pioneer (tanker)	16, 267
Pampas	7, 589
Shienfoon	7, 127
Silverforce [1]	8, 058
Silverlake [1]	8, 058
Tulse Hill	7, 120
Vercharmian	7, 265
Vergmont [1]	7, 381
West Breeze	8, 718
Yungfutary	5, 388
Yunglutaton [1]	5, 414
Zela M	7, 237
Greek (30 ships)	244, 484
Aegaion [1]	7, 239
Aldebaran (tanker)	12, 897
Americana	7, 104
Apollon	9, 744
Capetan Petros	7, 291
Despoina	5, 006
Efcharis [1]	7, 249
Eftychia [1]	7, 223
Embassy	8, 418
Galini	7, 266
Gloria	7, 128
Hydraios III	5, 239
King Theseus	5, 153
Kyra Hariklia	6, 888
Maria Santa	7, 217
Mastro-Stelios II	7, 282
North Empress	10, 904
North Queen [1]	9, 341
Pamit	3, 929
Pantanassa	7, 131
Penelope	6, 712
Perseus (tanker)	15, 852
Pollux [1]	9, 956
Polyxeni [1]	7, 143
Redestos	5, 911
Seirios	7, 239
Sirius (tanker)	16, 241
Stylianos N. Vlassopulos	7, 244
Timios Stavros [1]	5, 269
Western Trader	9, 268
Lebanese (19 ships)	125, 860
Akamas	7, 285
Aiolos II	7, 256
Antonis [1]	6, 259
Astir [1]	5, 324
Carnation	4, 884
Giorgos Tsakiroglou	7, 240
Ilena	5, 925
Kalliopi D. Lemos [1]	5, 103
Malou	7, 145
Mantric	7, 255
Mousse	6, 984
Noelle	7, 251
Noemi	7, 070
Olga	7, 199
Parmarina	6, 721
Razani	7, 253
St. Anthony [1]	5, 349
St. Nicolas	7, 165
Vassiliki [1]	7, 192
Italian (7 ships)	53, 415
Achille	6, 950
Annalisa	2, 479
Arenella	7, 183
Cannaregio	7, 184
Linda Giovanna (Tanker)	9, 985
Nazareno	7, 173
San Nicola (Tanker)	12, 461

See footnotes at end of table.

FLAG OF REGISTRY, NAME OF SHIP—Con.

	Gross tonnage
Polish (7 ships)	44,734
Baltyk	6,963
Bialystok	7,173
Bytom	5,967
Chopin	6,987
Chorzow [1]	7,237
Kopalnia Miechowice [1]	7,223
Piast	3,184
Norwegian (6 ships)	58,359
Benny Viking (now Benny)	3,857
Kongsgaard (Tanker)	19,999
Lovdal (Tanker) [1]	12,764
Ole Bratt	5,252
Polyclipper (tanker)	11,737
Tine	4,750
Yugoslav (5 ships)	35,841
Bar	7,233
Cavtat	7,266
Cetinje [1]	7,200
Dugi Otok	6,997
Trebisnjica	7,145
Spanish (2 ships)	4,565
Castillo Ampudia	3,566
Sierra Madre	999
Swedish (2 ships)	14,295
Dagmar	6,490
Atlantic Friend [1]	7,805
German (West) (1 ship): Adolf Leonhardt	7,066
Japanese (1 ship): Meishun Maru	8,647
Moroccan (1 ship): Toubkal	8,748

[1] Added to Rept. No. 9 appearing in Federal Register issue of June 6, 1963.

SEC. 2. In accordance with the provisions of National Security Action Memorandum No. 220 of February 5, 1963, the following vessels which called at Cuba after January 1, 1963, have reacquired eligibility to carry U.S. Government-financed cargoes from the United States by virtue of the persons who control the vessels having given satisfactory certification and assurance that no ships under their control will, thenceforth, be employed in the Cuba trade so long as it remains the policy of the U.S. Government to discourage such trade:

(a) Since last report: None.

(b) Previous reports:

Flag of registry	*Number of ships*
British	1
Danish	1

SEC. 3. The ships listed in sections 1 and 2 have made the following number of trips to Cuba in 1963, based on information received through June 14, 1963:

Flag of registry	Number of trips					
	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June
British	5	8	8	17	13	2
Greek	4	6	8	8	11	2
Lebanese	1	------	2	8	6	2
Norwegian	------	2	4	------	1	1
Italian	1	1	1	2	3	1
Yugoslav	------	2	1	1	1	------
Spanish	------	------	2	------	------	------
Danish	------	------	1	------	------	------
German (West)	------	------	------	------	1	------
Japanese	1	------	------	------	------	------
Moroccan	------	------	1	------	------	------
Swedish	------	------	------	1	------	1
Total	12	19	28	37	36	9
Polish	2	1	1	2	2	1

NOTE.—Trip totals in this section exceed ship totals in secs. 1 and 2 because some of the ships made more than 1 trip to Cuba.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, both Spain and Mexico currently are flying their transport aircraft into Cuba. In addition, Communist Czechoslovakia also has its airlines scheduled into Cuba.

One of the most effective ways to stifle the Communist dictatorship in Cuba would be to eliminate trade by the nations of the free world to which we are currently giving our foreign aid. If we were to ask nations in the free world to stop trade and shipping to Cuba, some of their reactions would be that as long as the United States is shipping material to Cuba that they will continue themselves. However, if the United States were to cease shipping all material to Cuba and demand that other nations do the same, I believe that very rapidly we would see a complete cessation of trade by the free world with Cuba. Now that the ransom deal has been completed with Cuba and they have some $53 million of American medical supplies and foodstuffs, I can see no reason why we should continue to trade with them in any way.

There is a possibility that if we ask some of the free nations of the world to stop trading with Cuba that they might not do so. Therefore, I am going to propose an amendment to the foreign aid authorization act that would suspend all foreign aid for 1 year to any nation that continues to trade or ship with Cuba after 60 days after the passage of this bill. This suspension would be renewable if the nation continues trade or shipping to Cuba. It seems inconsistent to the welfare of the United States that we should help finance and support those nations who are trading and shipping to Cuba for profit. This is a peaceful, nonmilitary, positive action that will be effective in curtailing communism in Cuba. I believe that this kind of positive leadership will be applauded by both nations of the Western Hemisphere and those nations throughout the world that believe that communism should be stopped. Today, almost all of the free world countries which are currently trading and shipping to Cuba are receiving some form of American foreign aid. The Iron Curtain countries would have an extremely difficult time in providing all of the various materials that are necessary to keep communism alive in Cuba. They would also be hard pressed to provide the necessary shipping to preserve the trade of Cuba. If the aircraft of those nations who are receiving American aid did not fly into Cuba, the flow of Communist agents to the free world would be greatly curtailed.

In addition, all nations currently permitting their ships and aircraft to travel to Cuba should be denied access to our harbors and airports.

These proposals are designed to prevent the American taxpayer's money from going to those nations who would knowingly help to preserve a Communist dictatorship just 90 miles from our shores.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON] on his fine statement with regard to trade with Cuba and efforts to curtail it. I also congratulate the gentleman on his announcement of his intention to introduce an amendment to the foreign-aid bill which would help accomplish this.

Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman is familiar with the fact, and it has disturbed me, that a number of amendments were passed to the 1963 Foreign Aid Appropriation Act which have not been followed, which have been openly and notoriously violated.

I think it would be well at this point in the RECORD to place them in the RECORD. Public Law 87-872 provided very specifically that no foreign aid should go to any country that did business with Castro and Cuba. The act flatly banned U.S. aid to a country which permits any ships under its registry to carry to Cuba petroleum and certain other goods of a military or strategic character. That is an absolute ban.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure, and the gentleman knows, that tankers from a number of free nations have been carrying and are now carrying—and have been for the past 6 months—fuel to Cuba, including the United Kingdom, Greece, Italy, and Norway. However, the language of the law presents an absolute ban on this. It is incomprehensible that aid should continue to go to countries that send strategic materials to Cuba.

The second provision in the act prohibits economic aid to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry items of economic assistance to Cuba unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest and reports such determination to the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I have been informed authoritatively that no such notification of such request has been made to any of the committees mentioned. My question is this: The administration is in direct violation of the mandate of the Congress of the United States as passed in Public Law 87-872. Myself and others have joined—I have just joined today in asking the General Accounting Office to inquire into what right the President has, if any, or the administration, to violate the mandate of the Congress which prohibits foreign aid funds from going to any country that does business with Cuba and to determine what actions can be taken regarding these illegal expenditures of funds.

Does not the gentleman feel that any administration, be it this or any other, which has a mandate from Congress with unequivocal language that the Chief Executive has the duty in spending funds to follow the mandate set out by Congress which, of course, is an expression of the will of the people of the United States of America? Is not the gentleman disturbed, as I am, that this or any other administration would continue to permit trade by free nations to whom we are giving foreign aid with

Castro's Communist government in direct violation of the laws of the land?

Mr. STINSON. I thank the gentleman for bringing up this point. I have to admit that I have a very difficult time in understanding why the administration has not taken a more positive stand in this respect. I believe we should put this amendment into the foreign aid authorization bill but without an escape clause and underscore the law, you might say, that has already been enacted.

I further think we should bring this to the attention of the American people so that public opinion will be aroused to the point where they will demand that this foreign aid be stopped to these countries currently trading with Cuba.

I thank the gentleman very much for bringing this information at this time.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am very conscious of the facts that the gentlemen have brought out on the floor of the House concerning limitations to foreign aid appropriations. They have done considerable work in reference to the United Nations technical programs and special fund aid that has gone in a round about way to Cuba. They have introduced a bill in this House to limit such appropriations to the 33⅓ percent that prevails so far as the rest of the United Nations are concerned.

I would like to compliment the gentlemen on what they have brought forth today, then, to go back, in addition to the remarks about the situation of foreign aid the gentleman from Washington has so beautifully brought out, to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], and his remarks about the chagrin he feels about our lack of will and the deterioration of our backbone and the lack of our ideology in preventing these things, including the sanctity of the Monroe Doctrine and many others. The review that this group has brought to the floor today under the special order concerning everything from the overflights to the McCone report of the Subcommittee on Preparedness of the Senate Armed Forces Committee, to the United Nations funds and the seizure of our Embassy by Cuba's Castro and the conspiracy in spite of all that the Swiss can do about it has been enlightening. We pay tribute in spite of the old American adage we would rise in our defense but not one cent for tribute. We are the Nation that sent the Marines to Tripoli under a far less excuse than the seizure of our Embassy in Havana, which is American property.

What has happened to the will, what has happened to our determination? Wherein lies the fault of the people that we as Representatives in Congress and others do not seem to realize. We should cut off, as someone very clearly suggested, not only the food of Cuba but the black gold that is flowing to Cuba in the form of oil.

We made a good start on this and we should see, by all means, as the gentleman has beautifully said, that the Red Star in Cuba is in its descendancy and let us be careful to see that it loses brightness in going over the horizon.

Mr. STINSON. I thank the gentleman. Many people think that the moral fiber of the American people has deteriorated to the point where they will not fight anymore. I happen to disagree with this philosophy. I believe the American people are willing to fight to remain free and have their children live in freedom. I think if the decision were to be made by the American people, we would very rapidly see a very tough policy advocated toward the Communists in Cuba.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I want to thank all of you gentlemen who are making possible this special order today. It is high time that the two sides of the aisle of this House join together in forcing the administration into legitimate action and seeing to it that they do not go forward in illegitimate acts. Does any of you have information relative to the imprisonment of Cuban women? I was waited upon the other day by a woman who was a Cuban—she is now an American, of course—and a Cuban. They had a good deal to say about the women who are imprisoned in Cuba and who are being treated just awful. The only other country that could compare with the treatment was Turkey. I had a friend in a Turkish prison for 3 years, and the situation there was one that could not be imagined. The only one I have ever heard since then that could be compared with the Turkish situation is what is being done to these women. I hope this group will look into the matter and see what can be done to accelerate some sort of freedom and for some kind of decent treatment for those women down there.

I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Mr. GIBBONS. I thank the gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON] for his fine remarks.

Now I yield to my colleague from Florida, that very able and distinguished gentleman [Mr. FUQUA] who has been most active in this fight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Florida and my other colleagues who joined with us today in this bipartisan effort to bring to light some of the ways in which we might rid ourselves of Communism not only in Cuba but in the rest of this hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, we come here today not as Democrats or Republicans, but we come here as Americans. It is in this light I think that we should attack this problem which threatens the very foundation on which this country was founded. President Kennedy said during the October crisis in Cuba that the greatest risk lies in not acting with decisiveness. Action is required. This I think is the time for this country to take decisive action in trying to rid Cuba and this hemisphere of godless Communism.

It has been said here earlier today that Cuba's normal economic life depends on certain major exports and imports coming into that country from other parts of the world. We have seen, since the Communist takeover in Cuba, the Soviet Union and other of their Communist bloc countries that have tried to overcome this disruption by attempting to supply the essential foods and other essential goods that once came from the United States,which was one of the greatest importers into Cuba. Currently we have about 13 Communist countries who are participating in about 75 to 80 percent of the total Cuban export and import trade. Wherever we find the facts of the Cuban trade it is very clear that the Communist world is unable to supply them and the cost is too high to supply the basic essentials which are so desperately needed by the people of Cuba. Since the United States placed an embargo on Cuban exports and imports, the operations of the Sino-Soviet world cannot supply many of the vital needs to the people of Cuba.

The United States has time and time again through our State Department and other means asked our allies and our partners of the free world to stop trading with this Communist country. We tried to enforce through all types of moral persuasion, ways in which we can stop this trading with our known enemy, one that has had missiles pointed at us in the October crisis and which has caused the greatest amount of subversion in this hemisphere emanating from that island. However, it has been said this met with very disappointing success and that they continued to trade with them.

I would like to cite you some figures of countries who are our allies in the free world and cite the amount of trade they are doing with Cuba and the foreign aid that these countries are getting from this very country, the United States.

We are feeding the hand that is feeding our enemies.

Great Britain in the year 1962 received $27.5 million in foreign aid. In the time between January 1, 1963, and June 14, 1963, Great Britain had 37 ships carrying 355,354 gross tons into Cuba.

Greece, one of our other allies, received $82.8 million in foreign aid. In this same period of time, less than 6 months, they had 30 ships carrying 244,484 gross tons.

Lebanon, receiving $.1 million in aid had 19 ships going into Cuba with 125,860 tons.

Italy, receiving $105.3 million in foreign aid had seven ships carrying 53,415 tons into Cuba.

Poland—there is a question whether they are an ally or not, but they are receiving $8.1 million in foreign aid. In this same period they had 7 ships going into Cuba carrying 44,734 tons.

Norway received $24.9 million in aid. They had 6 ships going in carrying 58,359 gross tons.

Yugoslavia had $116.7 million in aid. They had 5 ships carrying 35,841 tons.

Spain: $67.5 million in aid. They had 2 ships carrying 4,565 gross tons.

West Germany received $2.2 million in aid. They had one ship carrying 7,066 tons.

Japan received $141.8 million in aid and they had one ship carrying 8,657 tons.

Morocco received $49.8 million in aid. They had one ship carrying 8,748 tons.

These are our friends. Hence the obvious question has arisen as to why the United States continues to give aid to those countries who find themselves unable to acquiesce in the U.S. request for cooperation in the economic embargo against Cuba.

The large foreign aid this country has been giving other countries, many of them still trading with Cuba, has resulted in our current problem with balance of payments. It was necessary for this country to borrow $500 million from the International Monetary Fund to assist us through this crisis.

With all this in mind, how can we justify this aid to these countries who in turn aid our enemy?

The time has now come that the Congress should take positive action by amending the Foreign Aid Authorization Act to prohibit aid to these countries who continue to trade with Communist Cuba, with our avowed enemy. I hope that the Congress will act, and I will support the amendment to the authorization act when it comes to the floor affecting these countries that are receiving this aid.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTCN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, that bill passed and what the gentleman is suggesting was supposed to be done. The administration has been told that they must stop giving aid to those countries who are going against us in that particular manner. What can we do further to insist that the administration obey the law?

Mr. FUQUA. I think we should pass another amendment this time and make it very clear that they may not trade with these other countries. Perhaps we should make it clearer than the amendment that we had to the Foreign Aid Authorization Act of last year.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate my able colleague from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] for those very fine and constructive remarks. He so ably pointed out that this is not a question of whether America must fight to do something about Cuba. As he so ably pointed out, there are many things short of fighting that we could do to turn this cold war in our favor. I would urge my colleagues not to be trapped by the old argument that in order to do something constructive we must fight or we must invade Cuba. That is not the question.

The question is what other peaceful and ideological means we can use to gain freedom for the Cubans and for the rest of the people in Central and South America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the very able and distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD].

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Members here today for their continued interest and concern in the problem of Cuba. Let me take a moment or two to attempt to place the question of Cuba in the context of the world situation. I think there is a danger that the discussion today could leave the impression that some had a fixation on Cuba, as has been charged against those of us who have studied and concerned ourselves with this problem. I believe that the question of Cuba is much more important than simply Cuba. It represents, I believe, one specific instance of the serious problem which this Nation has as a leader of the free world. I would suggest that how we conduct ourselves with respect to Cuba could do much to determine the fate of the remainder of this hemisphere and indeed much of the world.

More than a century and a quarter ago the French scholar, Alexis DeTocqueville, visited our country and made the following prophetic observation. He said:

> There are at the present time two great nations in the world, which started from different points, but seem to tend toward the same end. I allude to the Russians and the Americans. Both of them have grown up unnoticed; and whilst the attention of mankind was directed elsewhere, they have suddenly placed themselves in the front rank among the nations, and the world learned of their existence and their greatness at almost the same time. * * * The American struggles against the obstacles which nature opposes to him; the adversaries of the Russians are men. The former combats the wilderness and savage life, the latter civilization with all its arms. The conquests of the Americans are therefore gained by the plowshare. Those of the Russians by the sword. The Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends, and gives free scope to the unguided strength and commonsense of the people; the Russian centers all the authority of society in a single arm. The principal instrument of the former is freedom; and of the latter, servitude. Their starting point is different and their courses are not the same. Each of them seems marked out by the will of Heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe.

These were DeTocqueville's observations in 1832.

Just 20 years ago the Communist world included 8 million square miles of territory and 70 million people. Today it includes 16 million square miles of territory and the number of human beings behind the Iron Curtain is 970 million. Within four decades communism has grown from a gleam in Lenin's eye to absolute domination of almost 1 billion people. Historians will certainly ask the questions why and how. I believe the principal reason for these enormous gains has been the Communists' ability to conceive of this struggle for power going on in the world today in larger dimensions than the free world.

Through infiltration and control of student groups, teachers unions, labor organizations, schools, and political parties, the Communists are able today to achieve their goals by playing this multiheaded network like an orchestra, varying the mode of approach—military, paramilitary, political, psychological, technological, and economic—to suit the problem, the time, and the place. Their weapons are of unlimited variety. In short, they score victories in the cold war because they know they are in it and they have polished the weapons necessary for victory.

Inexorably, bit by bit, more pieces of the free world have been lost. Whenever the West has won a round, as in Korea or Lebanon, it was in the defense of the status quo. When the Communists have won a round, as in Czechoslovakia, China, Laos, or Cuba, they have gained access to ground previously closed to them.

The greatest need and the greatest hope for the United States and the free world today lies in the establishment and maintenance of some stability in the world, particularly in Latin America. Today, however, words will no longer achieve this stability. Much of the world unfortunately believes, and with much justification, that the Communists very possibly could ultimately win. Until the United States changes this attitude, this atmosphere, the pendulum will not swing our way.

Today many smaller nations watch and wait. Some are swinging to communism. To change this attitude, the United States must demonstrate a clear desire and willingness to preserve freedom. I believe sincerely that our posture with respect to Cuba will determine the fate of all Latin America. We need deeds to convince the waivering nations of our resolution and that ultimately freedom will prevail.

In a report from Freedom House, it was stated that:

> Americans are agreed that a Soviet Cuba is intolerable to the Western Hemisphere.

The reasons bear upon our security and freedom as well as the independence and integrity of the other nations in this hemisphere.

> The facts about Castro and Communist Cuba are beyond debate. Six million people who won their freedom from Batista's dictatorship found themselves betrayed into the hands of a new dictatorship. They are denied the right to vote, to speak, to publish, to think. More than 100,000 Cubans have been jailed for refusing to accept communism. Another 250,000 have fled, preferring exile to tyranny at home; 180,000 more are awaiting transportation and countless others dream of escaping terror.
>
> Cuba has become an overt Soviet Satellite—the only one in the Americas. The Castro regime deliberately handed over the island to the Russian dictator and allowed it to be transferred into a launching pad for potential aggression against the United States and the other countries of this hemisphere.
>
> Present conditions do not suggest that the evil has been abated much less eliminated. Even if we could be certain that every offensive military weapon has been removed from Cuba we would still live in the presence

> of the 20th century's most efficient offensive weapon—communism itself. This time bomb is still to be defused.
>
> American policy must rest on three objectives:
>
> 1. The elimination of the Soviet political and military bases in Cuba;
> 2. The halting of Castro-Communist subversion, sabotage, and guerrilla warfare against Latin-American peoples; and
> 3. The liberation of the Cuban nation from Castro's brutal police state. Americans will unite behind any program that gives hope of achieving these goals.

There are many steps which can be taken and should be taken and have not been taken to achieve our common goals in the cold war. Many have been mentioned today, and I will not belabor them. They are sound and constructive, but I would suggest that the first step that must be taken, the step without which all the others will be meaningless, is for this Nation, the people of this country, and the administration, to admit that we are in the cold war and to demand policies that will meet the threat that we face. Unless we as a nation, the Congress, the administration and the people, take this step, all of these other suggestions, as constructive, positive and sound and worthwhile as they might be, can amount to nothing.

I would congratulate the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fuqua], on his point that the suggestion, as some claim, that any step to stop the tide of Communist aggression on this globe and to rid this hemisphere of communism will result in a nuclear holocaust or war, is not supported by the facts. Each time this Nation has stiffened its backbone, as in October 1962, we have avoided war and received the overwhelming support of the free world.

As the President has said, and as history shows, the greatest risk of all may very well be the failure to act, when action is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues today to discuss this question and to voice my concern, indeed, alarm, with the drift of American foreign policy. I congratulate them on their thoughtful and responsible approach to this difficult and complex problem. I know that each of the Members here today have been working for months, indeed years, on the problems of the cold war.

I would like to call particular attention by way of example to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Marsh] who has labored long, hard, and effectively to improve national knowledge of the cold war and is certainly recognized nationally as an expert in this field. I consider it a high privilege to serve in the Congress with him.

Let us hope and indeed pray, in closing, that when this body convenes next month or next year, that Brazil or Haiti or one or more of the other nations of Latin America will not have fallen to the Communists, whether by bluff or by war.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBONS. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his very fine and constructive remarks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Weaver].

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the gentleman from Florida and the Members who have spoken up to now. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in this discussion and to commend the gentlemen who have arranged today's discussion, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Weaver], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fuqua], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Marsh], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Stinson].

Mr. Speaker, I think that the discussion we have witnessed today, and are witnessing now, can indeed make a tremendous contribution toward a better understanding of the vast problem that lies ahead in the ultimate liberation of Cuba from Communist rule.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate these gentlemen for the bipartisan effort that they have demonstrated here today. I do not think they have tried to dig into past closets looking for skeletons, because indeed the road is full of these skeletons. But, rather, they have tried to discuss a positive program of action. I think this is the way that Cuba is ultimately going to be liberated.

Mr. Speaker, I for instance do not agree with statements made here earlier that we are having an aimless drift of American foreign policy. On the contrary, I think this administration and the previous administrations have tried to meet this problem. They realized that this is a problem of international significance and certainly what we do in Cuba—if we could isolate our problem in Cuba just to Cuba, there would be no question that two good battalions of Marines could flush out Castro and his communist hordes and the ball game would be over—has worldwide repercussions.

Mr. Speaker, nobody can certainly question the fact that we could if we wanted to follow that path we could get rid of Castro very quickly. However as has been stated repeatedly by learned scholars on the international scene, what happens in Cuba has ramifications all over the world. For this reason I think the suggestions made here today are certainly ones worthy of serious consideration by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers], has introduced H.R. 7687, which provides, as follows:

> That no article shall be transported in interstate or foreign commerce to or from the United States aboard vessels of any foreign country which allows vessels sailing under the flag of that country to be used, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, in trade or commerce with Cuba [except U.S. installations in Cuba].

Certainly this is a very sweeping proposal, but one which I think would put teeth into the concern shown here today by the speakers in the well of the House who have tried to understand why, despite the great pleas by the United States, many of our finest friends and allies continue to deal with Communist Cuba. Certainly the bill which has been introduced by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers] is one that should be considered by the Congress and I shall be happy to cosponsor this resolution.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld] has suggested that we close off the Panama Canal to ships that are going to Cuba. I certainly think that this is a worthwhile suggestion which should be considered very seriously by the responsible authorities.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. Stinson] has suggested that we might amend the Foreign Aid Act to bar any foreign aid to countries which continue to deal with Cuba. This is an excellent idea, and I am sure one that is going to get great consideration from the Congress, although I think that a close examination will show that there are relatively few countries now receiving foreign aid, if any, that are actually shipping into Cuba. But, nevertheless, this is a subject which I think should be considered favorably by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I, myself, 3 years ago, helped organize a Cuban Freedom Committee which today is broadcasting, and has been for several years, standard wave band broadcasts to Cuba. I see on the floor of the House this afternoon the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bruce], who is a director of this committee. I think our committee has been doing a great job in bringing the truth about communism and particularly the failure of communism to the people in Cuba, day in and day out. We receive reports out of Cuba that these standard wave band broadcasts are being listened to with great interest. We have purchased time from commercial stations in Florida at Key West. These broadcasts are being beamed in the Spanish language to the people in Cuba and, certainly, in my judgment they are having a profound effect. The fact that Mr. Castro is finding tremendous difficulties all over the island attests to that. There is widespread sabotage throughout Cuba. There is tremendous resentment among the Cuban people against Castro and this resentment is growing. So in my opinion we can look forward to the day when Cuba will be liberated from within.

However, Mr. Speaker, I think all of these things that have been discussed here today, in a bipartisan vein, will serve a definite purpose. It is my opinion that this is the road to liberating Cuba from communism.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that when we have discussions such as we are having here today and we can dispassionately discuss the problem which we have at hand and the various solutions that are available to us, we will indeed be able to find a way to liberate these people and again bring Cuba back into the family of free nations.

Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time it is my intention to introduce a resolution in Congress for the establishment of a Presidential Joint Commission for the Liberation of Cuba.

This commission would have as its membership representatives of the State Department, representatives of the CIA, representatives of the Defense Department, and representatives of the appropriate committees of Congress. I think that all the things we have been discussing here today should be considered by a committee like this. The establishment of such a committee, in my judgment, would meet the test that has been mentioned here—of strengthening our will to win. It would certainly serve notice on the rest of the world that we are determined that the Communist menace must be removed from the Western Hemisphere, certainly from Cuba.

It is my hope at the time when this resolution is introduced it will receive consideration by the Congress.

There is no lack of will, either by this administration or the previous administration or by the Congress of the United States, to get the Communists out of Cuba. All Americans, whether they are in office or out of office, whether they belong to the Republican Party or Democratic Party, whether they serve in the State Department or in the CIA or in the executive branch of the Government or legislative branch of the Government, are agreed there must be a return of freedom to Cuba. We are all agreed that communism must be driven out of Cuba. Where there is disagreement is in the method of getting this accomplished, and as we listen to the debates of the Organization of American States and as we listen to the ramifications of the United Nations, we realize no unilateral action is going to do this job. In order to rid Cuba and the Western Hemisphere of Communists, we must have a bilateral unified action of all the American States in this hemisphere and, if we can, the free nations of the United Nations.

We have a tremendous problem. In my judgment, the establishment of a Presidential joint commission that would reflect the many views expressed here today, the suggestions that have been made here today, would give meaning to our ultimate purpose. That purpose is the liberation of Cuba in a peaceful way.

I recently asked the people of my district for their views on the various alternatives to the solution of this problem of ridding Cuba of Communism. There were three sets of questions submitted for the consideration of my constituents.

The first question was: Do you favor our continued surveillance over Cuba to make sure there are no offensive weapons down there? The answer was, of course, "Yes."

The second question was: Do you favor continuing economic pressures to bring about the economic collapse of Cuba? Here the answer was overwhelmingly "Yes."

Finally I asked: Do you favor our continuing efforts to inspire a revolt in Cuba? The answer was "Yes."

The next question: Do you favor a total naval blockade of Cuba at this time? The answer was "No."

The second part of the question was: Do you believe such a total naval blockade is an act of aggression? The answer was "Yes."

The next question was: Do you think such an act of aggression would lead to war? The answer was indecisive. Some thought yes and some thought no.

Finally, the last question I asked was: Do you favor an immediate invasion of Cuba? Here the answer was overwhelmingly "No."

The second part of that question was: Do you believe an invasion of Cuba at this time would lead to nuclear war? Here the answer was overwhelmingly "Yes."

These answers from a representative group of people in one district of the United States indicate the American people agree on most of the solutions that have been discussed here today, economic pressures, an amendment in foreign aid, closing of the Panama Canal, and adopting a resolution such as the one offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS]. The response to these questions shows that the American people have a profound and sound judgment on these matters and agree with most Members of this Congress who reject the concept that the solution to the Cuban problem is invasion, a unilateral invasion of Cuba at this time.

I agree with the sponsors of this discussion today. I think the discussions such as we have had today, with the exchange of ideas that have been presented, will result in an effective, workable formula for liberating Cuba of its Communist rulers and bring Cuba back into the family of other nations again.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I again congratulate the sponsors, and I am privileged to have been invited to participate in this discussion.

Thank you very much.

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the gentleman from Illinois very much for his fine statement.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEAVER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for his fine statement on all the subjects he covered. He did mention, however, that he had some doubts that there were very many of the free world countries who were actually trading with Cuba and receiving foreign aid. I have to agree with the gentleman that it is hard for any Member of Congress to believe the list of countries of the free world trading with Cuba is as long as it is. I would like to ask you to refer to the record in which I have included a list of the free world countries who are trading with Communist Cuba. It includes 66 countries.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Are they presently receiving foreign aid?

Mr. STINSON. Fifty-four of the 66 countries trading with Cuba are receiving some form of foreign aid from the United States. It is an incredible thing, I quite agree, and it is very difficult for us to comprehend here in Congress.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I should be very happy to join the gentleman in supporting his amendment. If it is indeed a fact that we are giving foreign aid to countries that in turn deal with Communist Cuba, I should be very happy to join the gentleman in offering an amendment to bar supporting them with foreign aid.

Mr. STINSON. I wish to thank the gentleman for his support and congratulate him once again.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEAVER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Personally I thank the gentleman and also the Members of Congress who have participated in this discussion here today. I think it is a healthy thing and something we should do. However, I want to call the attention of the Members to the fact that Cuba of course is not just a new situation but it has been with us for a long time. It has been a rather remarkable thing to me that the Cuban situation has been allowed to continue when in a way the answer is simple. There is at least one measure this Nation could have taken and still can take I think to get rid of Castro Cuba. As the gentleman well knows it has been suggested that the American Government sponsor a government in exile. I think that is the first step we should take in this Nation to cure this situation. I call the attention of the Congress to the fact that just off of Cuba is the Isle of Pines where I understand, and I have very reliable information in this, that there are over 100,000 political prisoners, that is, on the Isle of Pines. Many of these prisoners over there are trained military men. They have nothing to lose because they are now incarcerated there and are doing slave work, with no hope until Castro is destroyed. Why this country does not go in there and supply this 100,000, or whatever number of military or ex-military men are on that island, and supply them with enough military material really to start a revolution and take over this island and allow this Government to recognize a government in exile there and have a foot in the door, is something I cannot understand. That is so plain to me that the stupidity of our own people who have a responsibility here to protect the security of our United States, in the administration, is something I do not understand and the governments of South and Latin America must be confused because of our lack of action. Why they have not done it I do not know. It seems to me that would be a firm step and would be a step which would bring about the downfall of the Castro regime in Cuba and we could get rid of that cancerous growth.

All of this talk will never get us anywhere until somebody in the administration, somebody important in the military affairs of this country, takes the necessary steps to get the necessary force to go in there and remove this cancer.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida and I shall decline to yield any further.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. WEAVER. I shall decline to yield any further until this next speaker has concluded. There will be another special order on the same subject which will follow and there will be plenty of time in that period.

I would like to ask unanimous consent at this time, Mr. Speaker, that all Members speaking here today may be allowed to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Horton].

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Weaver], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Marsh], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fuqua], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons], and others who have arranged this special order today in order to focus the spotlight of attention on this problem that we face in Cuba.

International communism's foothold in the Caribbean, Castro's Cuba, continues to be a sore spot in our foreign policy. The menace promises to persist, too, unless and until the United States assumes a more decisive role in its removal.

So far, the major effort of the administration seems to be counting the movement of Soviet men and equipment going to and coming from the island. There is little evidence of last October's determination in dealing with this threat to our security.

Any advance communism makes should trouble us. This is why we are participating in the defense of South Vietnam and why our troops are stationed around the world in potentially explosive areas. Yet, we are reluctant to exercise a similar concern over an area in our own backyard.

Every American knows that Cuba is a Russian-dominated country; that the Red Army is within 90 miles of our coast; and that our own administration is failing to take any action. We cannot feel secure in our own homes, our own localities, or our own country until something is done to correct the situation.

If we are to remove communism from Cuba there must be a positive restatement of the Monroe Doctrine. Based on the principle that a foreign government shall not colonize in the Western Hemisphere, this doctrine is fully applicable today.

Every day's delay in enunciating a firm U.S. policy toward elimination of the Communist grip on Cuba and taking the steps necessary for its implementation only serves to convince the Communists that we are capable of waging only a "war of words." Khrushchev and Castro must be told emphatically and clearly that we mean business.

There is no alternative to action. Whatever must be done to rid Cuba of communism must be done.

The risks of an allout conflict rise in proportion to our hesitancy. Instead of quarantining the Cuban exiles we should quarantine Cuba; rather than protecting the shores of Cuba we should be giving support to the exiles who are trying to increase the pressure on Castro. Instead of slapping the exile in the face we ought to be patting him on the back and giving him our encouragement to free Cuba.

America always has worn proudly the mantle of leadership. It is expected from our allies. Still, recent events have shown the administration's lack of willingness to act forthrightly in this area.

How can we in the United States proclaim that we will risk our cities in defense of those in Europe when less than a hundred miles from our own shores there is a Communist regime maintained and supported by the whole Communist bloc?

Many proposals have been advanced by responsible leaders of the free world which would embark us on the kind of course needed to free Cuba. I petition the administration to listen to these views.

The focus of this Nation should be on complete and total isolation of Cuba. Its very insular nature makes it almost totally dependent on outside commerce. This fact can be exploited. Through established legal means the United States can limit Cuban commerce and bring Castro to his knees.

Psychological warfare is another means which the United States can employ to counter Castro. Reports continue to come from Cuba of popular discontent with the Communist rulers. We need to step up our efforts to nurture that feeling through Voice of America broadcasts and through pledging support of the Cuban people's desire for freedom.

Positive results demand positive action. The time for assessing the situation is long since over. Before it is too late, before those who look to the United States as the defender of right and justice turn away disappointed and disenchanted, and before communism so mercilessly stifles the voice of liberation inside Cuba, let us put Khrushchev on notice that unless there is a summary withdrawal of the Soviet warmaking machine from Cuba, this Nation will see to its accomplishment.

Once devoid of his Soviet support, Castro will fall of his own weight.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEAVER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman from New York has been speaking of the economic pressures which might be applied against Cuba and has emphasized that these economic pressures could be very effective in bringing about the downfall of Castro's government. There are those who say it cannot be done. But in a similar situation, Nasser has been denying the use of the Suez Canal to the Israelis for many, many years. We, as a matter of fact, tried to put greater pressure on Nasser to bar him from doing this. Certainly if he can do it I think we can certainly apply some economic pressures to relieve the Cuban situation. Will the gentleman agree?

Mr. HORTON. I believe the gentleman has made a good point. Certainly this has not brought about a nuclear war in the Middle East, but all sorts of pressures have been brought by the free world to free up the Suez Canal. I think this is a good point the gentleman has made, especially when he talks about blocking commerce to Cuba. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me as my other colleagues have agreed that it is very important for this country to do all it can to isolate Cuba and prevent commerce from going into the island.

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his yielding, and congratulate all those who have helped put the spotlight on this very important problem which is taking place just a few miles from our shores.

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I should like now to talk about the Punta del Este Resolution 2 and other agreements and treaties.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PUNTA DEL ESTE RESOLUTION 2

The problem of what to do about communism in the Western Hemisphere is ever present with Castro in Cuba. The Monroe Doctrine has been discussed as a legal weapon wherewith we should proceed to act in aid of the restoration of Cuba to democracy. However, it is well for us to note that certain multilateral treaties have established a firm foundation for the collective action of the nations of this hemisphere.

A. RIO TREATY OF 1947

At Rio de Janiero, September 2, 1947, the nations of the Western Hemisphere gathered together and signed an inter-American treaty for reciprocal assistance between the United States of America and the other American Republics. Article VIII of this treaty states:

> For the purposes of this treaty the measures on which the Organ of Consultation may agree will comprise one or more of the following: recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; partial or complete interruption of economic relations or of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, telephonic, and radiotelephonic or radiotelegraphic communications; and use of armed forces.
>
> ARTICLE 6
>
> If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory of the sovereignty or political independence of any American State should be affected by an aggression which is not an armed attack or by an extracontinental or intracontinental conflict, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the Organ of Consultation shall meet immediately in order to agree on the measures which must be taken in case of aggression to assist the victim of the aggression of, in any case, the measures which should be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the continent.

You might summarize the Rio Treaty as providing for collective self-defense for all nations of the Western Hemisphere.

B. CARACAS DECLARATION OF 1964

The 10th Inter-American Conference of March 28, 1954, at Caracas, Venezuela, put forth a declaration of solidarity against international Communist intervention:

> The Fourth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs recognized that, in addition to adequate internal measures

> in each state, a high degree of international cooperation is required to eradicate the danger which the subversive activities of international communism pose for the American States.
>
> The aggressive character of the international Communist movement continues to constitute, in the context of world affairs, a special and immediate threat to the national institutions and the peace and security of the American States, and to the right of each state to develop its cultural, political, and economic life freely and naturally without intervention in its internal or external affairs by other states.

According to the declaration:

> The domination or control of the political institutions of any American State by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of an extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America, and would call for a meeting of consultation to consider the adoption of appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties.

The declaration says further:

> That, without prejudice to such other measures as they may consider desirable, special attention be given by each of the American governments to the following steps for the purpose of counteracting the subversive activities of the international Communist movement within their respective jurisdictions:
>
> 1. Measures to require disclosure of the identity, activities, and sources of funds of those who are spreading propaganda of the international Communist movement or who travel in the interests of that movement, and of those who act as its agents or in its behalf; and
>
> 2. The exchange of information among governments to assist in fulfilling the purpose of the resolutions adopted by the Inter-American Conferences and Meetings of Ministers of Foreign Affairs regarding international communism.

Thus to supplement the Rio Treaty for collective self-defense, the Caracas Declaration recognized the aggressive character of international communism and is a pledge of solidarity against Communist intervention.

C. ACT OF BOGOTÁ, 1960

Since President Eisenhower's statement of July 11, 1960, foreshadowing the Act of Bogotá of the Alliance for Progress, the United States has moved to disassociate itself from the extreme conservatives at the top of the Latin American oligarchy. With this the confidence of the other democracies of the Western Hemisphere was gained.

D. RESOLUTION 2 OF PUNTA DEL ESTE CONFERENCE, JANUARY 1962

The Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs was held at Punta del Este, Uruguay, January 22–31, 1962. Here a final act was adopted which provided specifically another step toward the idea of collective self-defense which was originally set forth in the Rio Treaty. Punta del Este recognized fully the meaning and the threat to the Americas of international communism. Resolution 2 spelled out what actions could be taken by member states. I quote this resolution agreed to at the Conference and endorsed by the administration.

> The Council of the Organization of American States, meeting as the provisional organ of consultation, resolves:
>
> To urge the member states to take those steps that they may consider appropriate for their individual or collective self-defense, and to cooperate, as may be necessary or desirable, to strengthen their capacity to counteract threats or acts of aggression, subversion, or other dangers to peace and security resulting from the continued intervention in this hemisphere of Sino-Soviet powers, in accordance with the obligations established in treaties and agreements such as the Charter of the Organization of American States and the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance.
>
> To recommend that the member states in accordance with articles 6 and 8 of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, take all measures, individually and collectively including the use of armed force, which they may deem necessary to insure that the Government of Cuba cannot continue to receive from the Sino-Soviet powers military material and related supplies which may threaten the peace and security of the continent and to prevent the missiles in Cuba with offensive capability from ever becoming an active threat to the peace and security of the Continent.

Latin Americans who first tended to view the Castro Cuban situation as primarily a bilateral problem of the United States and Cuba now consider this a multilateral problem for the whole hemisphere. Thus the implementation of multilateral action through the Punta del Este Resolution 2 and the Monroe Doctrine could add to the strength and forcefulness of a new United States position in the eyes of Latin America.

By cooperative leadership we can work with other hemispheric countries along the two parallel lines of peaceful democratic and political resolution. These measures of economic development and social reform are envisioned by the Alliance for Progress. Political and, if need be, paramilitary, antiguerrilla measures also can be taken to protect this revolution from the scavengers of Havana.

For too long the United States has not been able to carry the message to the Latin American nations that this country believes in the principles of nonintervention and self-determination. This means Americans recognize the right of peoples to organize their way of life freely in political, economic, and cultural spheres and to express their will through free elections without foreign interference.

By uniting together we can then mutually urge, as member states, to take those steps that are considered appropriate for individual or collective self-defense and to cooperate to strengthen the capacity to counteract threats or acts of aggression, subversion or other dangers to the peace and security. These factors arise from the continued intervention in this hemisphere of Sino-Soviet powers. This cooperation must be in accordance with the obligations established in treaties, agreements such as the Charter of the OAS—Organization of American States—and the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance. The organization of a Latin American Treaty Organization could function similarly to NATO. Thus a LATO could be the mutual task force of action when it is deemed necessary.

There are those who would say that the Cubans asked for the Sino-Soviets to come to their island to protect them from invasion. But at this point in our history Cuba stands not only as a Communist satellite, but completely dependent upon the graces of the Sino-Soviet alliance, shaky as it may be. Continued occupation of this island implies nothing more than Russian imperialism imposed upon the Western Hemisphere. The collective action of the United States with its allied Western Hemisphere nations, putting into effect the Punte del Este Resolution 2, can then work together to overthrow the Castro regime through peaceful efforts.

There is no question about the intervention of the Soviets in Cuba. There is no question that the United States wishes to give the Cubans an opportunity to express their self-determination and national sovereignty free of this foreign yoke.

We who stand here today on the floor of Congress speak out in many individual ways, but with a collective tone. We Members of Congress want Cuba free from Soviet interference. We want the Cubans to have the basic inherent rights of choosing their own future through democratic processes.

CUBA AND THE COLD WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to recognize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, today I am privileged to join my other colleagues in the House to discuss the problem created by Castro's Communist Cuba. I think what all of us are searching for in calling attention of the administration to the need for action, is that we find there is no discernible program of action, providing hope for a solution of the Communist problem in Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed the catastrophe at the Bay of Pigs. Up to that time we were led to believe that we would provide support for Cubans in exile who undertook the military invasion of their homeland. Yet, at the crucial moment, we found that such a program did not exist or was changed and the support was withdrawn.

Again, when the official announcement was made of the presence of nuclear missiles on the island of Cuba, we were convinced that a positive program existed, first, to rid the island of Cuba of these nuclear missiles; and, second, to assure the people of this country and of the free world that physical inspection of the island would assure us that the missiles were removed. But, the physical inspection of the missile bases on the island of Cuba never took place. Instead—and I do not suggest that this was part of any agreement or understanding—we discontinued our missile bases that we had maintained up to that time in Turkey and in Italy.

Mr. Speaker, we know that certain steps have been taken with regard to Cuban shipping. But we know too that shipping is taking place through the ships of free nations who are entering Cuban ports and supplying Castro and the Communists with much-needed civilian goods—as well as other goods for all we know.

Mr. Speaker, we thought that if the exiles organized and launched attacks on or against Cuban shipping that these would be supported. But instead this was frowned upon and action taken to prevent it.

Mr. Speaker, we were distressed when we found that the U.N. through the financial facilities at its disposal, was providing economic aid for an agricultural experiment project in Cuba, with very little done on our part to prevent it.

During all these episodes and these events we have been dismayed that there appears no positive and aggressive program to rid the island of Cuba of Castro's communism.

So we are searching here today for something beyond passive attitudes, and we are seeking more satisfactory answers as far as our American constituency is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, we must adhere to the proven efficacy of the Monroe Doctrine. We know without its enforcement, without limiting the Western Hemisphere to free countries and preventing the encroachment of hostile foreign nations that our entire national safety and security are jeopardized.

So in the interest of our national security and our national safety, and to encourage the development of a program behind which we can all lend our support and which will have the wholehearted support of the American people, we speak out and speak forth. United, from both sides of the aisle, we urge and implore that such a program be developed and that appropriate and necessary action to carry it out shall take place.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from Illinois has, of course, reviewed the past. I have previously congratulated the sponsors of this program for arranging today's discussion to see whether or not we may look forward to discussing concrete plans that might throw some light and hope on the day when Cuba will be liberated from its Communist rulers. So long as my distinguished and pleasant colleague from Illinois, just north of me, wants to go back into the closets, I suggest that we do not stop with the Bay of Pigs invasion, serious as it may have been. Perhaps you should go back a little further. The gentleman very conveniently ignores the fact that Mr. Castro came to power on New Year's Day, 1959, when the previous administration was in power, the previous administration that had brought Mr. Castro to the city of Washington. We all remember the very fine reception given that young man in this city. He was wined and dined and we heard speeches in the Statler Hotel. Certainly Mr. Castro was brought here by an administration other than this one.

The present administration, when the time came, when it became apparent that Mr. Castro constituted a clear and overt threat to the security of the United States and the Western Hemisphere, when we uncovered the missile launching platforms in Cuba, this administration, as President Kennedy so magnificently stated last Friday, did not hesitate to serve notice on the Soviet Union and Mr. Castro that if those offensive weapons were not removed forthwith we would shower the island of Cuba with full retaliation. Nobody can find any wishy-washy attitude of the President, Mr. Kennedy, when he was in command of the situation in October of 1962.

We have heard a great deal about the Bay of Pigs invasion, clearly ignoring the fact the Bay of Pigs was organized by the previous administration under the then Director of the CIA appointed by a previous administration. Our young President came into office in January 1961 and 2 months later he was faced with the decision of starting war over Cuba. His caution is understandable. But after he had established himself, when he had full control of the situation, Mr. Kennedy did not hesitate in October 1962, to say we are ready to stand up in the defense of freedom, even at the cost of a nuclear holocaust. He certainly spoke candidly to Mr. Castro and Mr. Khrushchev and the Communists and they had to retreat.

So, as long as we are going to have a record, let us have a complete record. It is my hope there will be more of these special orders on a bipartisan basis and with a bipartisan approach, where we are going to be able to discuss, as we have discussed today, concrete forward-moving proposals that are not going to lament the past but, rather, give us all hope that the future can bring an assurance that communism will be eradicated from the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the bipartisan approach to this subject. I assume that the reason we have Members from both sides of the aisle speaking up today is because we want to give support to a bipartisan program. I do not want to suggest that there were no errors committed before the Bay of Pigs. Nevertheless, I think there is a general dissatisfaction with respect to that and the other events affecting our Cuban policy which I enumerated. There is a desire today for something more positive; a program directed toward Castro's Cuba to which Republicans and Democrats alike can turn to find an answer and can support. I know that is what the American people want. In reviewing some of these blunders and these incidents it is quite clear that the administration's action did not reflect such a policy. Recognizing the need for a forward looking program and a positive program, I think it is necessary to review to some extent events that have occurred during the time this administration has been in office. I support the Members on both sides of the aisle who are today looking for an answer and who, I assume, are commending to the executive and administration, which has charge of our foreign affairs, a positive and identifiable program behind which we can rally. Quite obviously that program does not exist or else we would not be speaking up as we are here today. It is the lack of that program and the need for it which we feel. It is such a program which we want to encourage, and which we are confident can benefit the entire free world.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding. I too am delighted to see this discussion with regard to the problem which Cuba presents, particularly as it relates to subversion in the hemisphere. The findings of all the committees that have looked into it, the Selden subcommittee, the Stennis subcommittee, and others, are unequivocally of the opinion that the island of Cuba is being used intentionally and purposely in a planned manner by the international Communist conspiracy for the purpose of subverting not only Cuba, which has already been accomplished, but other nations in this hemisphere. That program too is well on its way to accomplishment in a number of areas and if time permitted we could discuss the extent of the growth of the Communist Party in Puerto Rico, the extent of the growth of the Communist Party in the Dominican Republic, the happenings in Haiti with regard to Communists having a foothold there; we could discuss the Grand Cayman situation which arose just the other day where Great Britain is permitting Cuban planes to land and take off, and I understand now they have shifted their activity from Grand Cayman to Little Cayman, just a little bit to the north, because protests were received about that. We could talk about British Guiana and what Cheddi Jagan is doing there with regard to the encouragement of communism and Communist activity; we could talk about Venezuela and the extent to which uprisings are occurring there, and the fact that humiliations never before known to any nation, particularly not known to the United States, have been caused by raids of Communists on the United States military installations there with instances of U.S. officers even being required to remove some of their clothing. All of this is being done at the instigation of the Communist movement which has as its base and foundation the activities running from Moscow through Cuba. I repeat, from Moscow, where the international Communist conspiracy has its fountainhead, through Cuba.

We could talk about Brazil and the fact that in the cabinet presently of the Brazilian Government are a number of known Communists; we could discuss the Communist subversion and the extent of it in Latin America without any fear of contradiction, and go on ad infinitum.

Now what is being done about it? We have heard a lot today about general recommendations made by a number of Members and many of them are extremely sound and most of them have been made before, but the important thing is practically all of them are being ignored.

The concern of many of us has been the fact that there is no policy relating to getting rid of Castro and communism in Cuba at the present time. Certainly there is none that could accomplish the objective. Why, we saw just the other day the situation where seven or eight of the Organization of American States nations refused to follow our leadership in trying to find ways to cut off economic assistance and to cut off travel of subversive trainees to Cuba from Latin American nations because seven or eight of those Organization of American States nations refused to join us in that effort.

Why are we not making any real headway? Where are all these gains that are being claimed for freedom in this hemisphere by this administration? Why are not the Alliance for Progress funds being used for the purpose of accomplishing freedom in this hemisphere through other nations in this hemisphere? Why are not Alliance for Progress funds being withheld from the five Latin American nations that still recognize Cuba? Some of these nations still do business with Castro, and I am talking principally now about Mexico, although there are others that still do business with Cuba and still get our Alliance for Progress funds. If you want something concrete, why does not the administration withhold Alliance for Progress funds or use it as a lever at least to require these nations to withdraw recognition and support of Cuba or stop doing business with Castro in Cuba?

No, this is not being programed. And as a matter of fact the administration has announced that it does not have the intention of doing so, as they said in a letter to me, in discussing that matter.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask you this question: What is happening now with regard to the military buildup in Cuba? Yes, we had the blockade. And I say this to my friend from Illinois. What happened after the blockade? Why did we let our guard down? Why did we not insist on doing those things that would have given us unequivocal assurance that missiles were out of Cuba, offensive missiles and other offensive weapons? And one of which is on-site inspection. Anyone can refer to the report of the Selden subcommittee, as well as the hearings of that subcommittee, as well as the Stennis committee, and he will come to the unequivocal conclusion that the only way we can be assured missiles have been withdrawn is by an on-site inspection. Even today—evidence is very substantial that a number of missiles were hidden in the caves or at least the caves are there and substantial activity is going on. But we have no absolute proof that all missiles were actually removed from Cuba. That is what those reports and hearings indicate. And the only way it could be proved would be by on-site inspection, according to the Stennis report.

Now, what happened? Why did we drop our guard? We had the Communists on the run. We could have had on-site inspections. Why did we not insist upon on-site inspections so that the security of this hemisphere would have been assured? Today it is a question mark. What is going on in this island?

My distinguished friend from Florida [Mr. Haley] mentioned the Isle of Pines today. Reports are coming out of Cuba from some of the refugees who came across in these ships, some of those who were prisoners on the Isle of Pines, that there is a tremendous Communist activity and buildup there. They say that the Isle of Pines is the transshipment point for arms drops to Latin America, and that the Russians are now asking that the Isle of Pines be turned over for use exclusively by the Russians for such arms buildups and as an available depot for arms drops to other Latin American countries.

Reports are persistent from the islands on the north shores of Cuba that there is constant military buildup in a secretive manner, with not even the Cubans being permitted to be on the islands to see what is going on. How, then, can we be assured of what is going on in Cuba?

Air surveillance? What is happening with regard to air surveillance? In recent months low-level flights have been discontinued. I repeat, in recent months low-level flights have been completely discontinued. Higher surveillance flights have been curtailed substantially. So how do we know what is going on in Cuba? But more important, what steps are we taking to make certain of what is going on in Cuba, looking to the security of this hemisphere, that it be adequately protected? I say not enough. I say we should reinstate low-level surveillance flights so that we will know what is going on with regard to our security as it relates to Cuba. We should also insist on on-site inspections and let Castro defend his refusal to permit this proof of nonaggression intent to the world.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield

Mr. CRAMER. If the gentleman from Virginia will permit me to yield to the gentleman from Illinois, I should be glad to yield.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, there are several people who are scheduled to take time, but because of the questions that have been raised by the gentleman from Florida, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] for 2 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman from Florida asked me if I might venture a guess as to what happened to on-site inspections. The gentleman recalls that negotiations were held and Mr. Castro just flatly refused. Is the gentleman suggesting that we ought to send in the marines and establish an on-site inspection beachhead? Is that the answer?

If the gentleman wants to send troops in there, let him say so. Why does he not say so?

Mr. CRAMER. The answer is that we should have kept up the Cuban blockade until we got on-site inspection. But instead of that, we withdrew it. We cannot let Castro dictate our policies unless we want failure. And Castro at that very time, on October 28, had the intestinal fortitude to make five demands on the free world, the United States in particular, even while the quarantine was in effect; and we have given in on two of them already, his demands that the United States stop all commando raids and arms drops from our shores and secondly from Puerto Rico.

Mr. PUCINSKI. All of them were rejected.

There is one point the gentleman makes. The gentleman has made this statement before, and I have listened to it with great interest, about this on-site inspection. I am for on-site inspection and I am sure everyone else is. But the gentleman has never come right out and said, "If we cannot get on-site inspection, let us invade Cuba." Why does he not make that statement if that is what he wants?

Mr. CRAMER. I have listened to this for a long time. The gentleman is preaching a war-scare, do-nothing approach. If we are to do nothing because of a war scare then we would do nothing—period. You have constantly protested against anybody making concrete recommendations about what should be done about Cuba, on the basis that if anybody really wants to do anything about Cuba now, they are calling for an invasion. That is about as asinine a position as could be taken, and the purpose is to poison the well. Too many in high places today are preaching this war-scare psychosis as an excuse for inaction. Anything being said by anybody but the administration is interpreted by the administration, and the President, as a call for war. Do the critics of this administration's Cuban policy want to go to war? Of course not. But they do want action now which is the best deterrent against a full-scale war later. Nobody wants to go to war. You are rendering a disservice to this great Nation when you suggest, in downgrading proposals made, that anybody on this floor, myself included, wants war. It is not necessary that we go to war with regard to Cuba. There are many steps that can be and should be taken that are far short of war. Until we take those steps, nobody knows what the ultimate steps must be to get rid of communism. But if military action is the only way to get rid of Castro after all other steps are taken, and the evidence convinces most people who have looked into this matter that this military buildup and subversive activity is continuing at a very substantial rate, if it is essential in invoking the Monroe Doctrine and that means kicking the Communists out of Cuba to preserve our security, that is the step we are going to have to take. But I say there are many other steps, some of which have been proposed, that we could and should take, all short of war and I will develop the rest of them in a moment.

We could invoke a complete trade ban, not one with loopholes as the present one has, but one that would cut off all trade between this country and other free nations with Cuba. Our foreign-aid bill was amended and passed to accomplish this. The mandate was written into the law passed last year by the Congress of the United States, Public Law 87-872. The mandate was written in there, and I am sure the House is familiar with it. It is a mandate relating to strategic materials and specifically refers to petroleum, denying foreign aid to any nation shipping such materials to Cuba. I listed earlier in the discussion nations that are shipping petroleum to Cuba in direct violation of that mandate. If the administration really wants to do something, the least it could do would be to uphold and carry out the laws of the United States as enacted by the Congress of the United States, and not spend money in contravention of this mandate which was in the appropriation bill on foreign aid.

The second provision in Public Law 87-872 requires no aid to any country that is carrying on any trade with Cuba unless the President advises the committees of Congress his reason for permitting such aid despite such trade. No such advice has come to Congress—and aid is still going to countries doing business with Castro—again in direct violation of the law.

Now we should recognize, as has been said before, and by myself for many months, a government in exile. As a matter of fact, during the campaign I remember well the President's reference a number of times to the need for a government in exile and suggested that was one of the solutions to the problem.

We should have adequate patrols to prevent arms drops in the Caribbean. We do not presently have adequate patrols. Arms drops are presently taking place and have been taking place for some time.

What are we going to do about it? We have not beefed up our military sufficiently to provide adequate surveillance. Everybody knows that.

What are we doing to prevent travel to Cuba for subversive training—even from the United States? You see these are the things that are bothering the American people. Why are U.S. citizens even being permitted to still go to Cuba? Ninety-seven of them last year, in 6 months. Why are they permitted to go? And only one so far has been prosecuted; Mary Levi Travis.

Why are 58 American students presently in Cuba extolling the virtues of the Cuban revolution erroneously? Why were they permitted to go? Why? And as I stated on the floor, so far the State Department has announced that their only intention is to withdraw their passports and not prosecute the leaders who perpetrated this thing.

What is being done with regard to the other Latin American countries in cutting off this travel and subversive training from these other Latin American nations?

When are we going to announce without equivocation our intention to take the steps necessary to rid this hemisphere of communism? Some of them I have mentioned. Some of them have been mentioned on the floor. One was a restatement and full implementation of the Monroe Doctrine.

I would like to ask unanimous consent to place in the Record at this point my resolution on this subject, House Joint Resolution 227, which was introduced on February 4 of this year, and which does what the Congress refused to do last year on the floor of this House when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Broomfield] by amendment brought this up. My resolution clearly restates the Monroe Doctrine and calls for its full implementation.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The resolution referred to is as follows:

H.J. Res. 227

Joint resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba, to restate and implement the Monroe Doctrine, and to encourage adherence to the principles of self-determination and human freedom

Whereas President James Monroe, announcing the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, declared that the United States would consider any attempt on the part of European powers "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety"; and

Whereas in the Rio Treaty of 1947 the parties agreed that "an armed attack by any State against an American State shall be considered as an attack against all the American States, and, consequently, each one of the said contracting parties undertakes to assist in meeting the attack in the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations"; and

Whereas the Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States at Punte del Este in January 1962 declared: "The present Government of Cuba has identified itself with the principles of Marxist-Leninist ideology, has established a political, economic, and social system based on that doctrine, and accepts military assistance from extracontinental Communist powers, including even the threat of military intervention in America on the part of the Soviet Union"; and

Whereas the international Communist movement has increasingly extended into Cuba its political, economic, and military sphere of influence, despite the fact that such action is clearly in violation of the Monroe Doctrine and the principles of self-determination and human freedom; and

Whereas due to the continuing inaction and indecision of the United States Government and the following offensive weapon "quarantine" of Cuba in October 1962, and commenting on the negotiations entered into between Khrushchev and the United States, mostly secret in nature, including the abandonment of on-site inspection of offensive weapons in Cuba, Khrushchev has enunciated and is implementing the "Khrushchev doctrine" as a replacement for the Monroe Doctrine as he restated the Communist aims in the Western Hemisphere at the recent Supreme Soviet when he stated: "Socialist Cuba exists. Cuba remains a beacon of Marxist-Leninist ideas in the Western Hemisphere. The impact of her revolutionary example will grow. The Government of the United States has given a pledge not to invade Cuba."; and

Whereas Castro, on January 16, 1963, announced his intention to use his externally supported massive military power to continue the enslavement of the Cuban people and to "bring the masses to battle" through revolution in Latin America; and

Whereas if the Monroe Doctrine is to be preserved it must be restated and fully enforced at this critical period when communism is openly and notoriously arming Cuba with massive modern weapons, tens of thousands of Russian troops, technicians and advisers, electronic missile jamming and tracking devices and "fishing" ports capable of accommodating Russian missiles, all of which constitutes a military capability of such proportions that it is offensive in nature and design: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States is determined—

(a) to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the international Communist movement operating through the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from enslaving the people of Cuba and threatening the security of the Western Hemisphere, and from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere;

(b) to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported military capability enslaving the freedom-loving people of Cuba and endangering the security of the United States; and

(c) to work with the Organization of American States and with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination.

Sec. 2. That the Congress of the United States urges the President, in accordance with existing law, to take, and supports him in taking, jointly with other free nations or unilaterally, such political, diplomatic, economic, or military action as may be necessary to implement and enforce the Monroe Doctrine throughout this hemisphere and to continue to encourage adherence to the principles of self-determination and human freedom.

Mr. **CRAMER**. I also would like to place in the Record a resolution by the gentleman from Montana and a similar resolution submitted with regard to a restatement of the Monroe Doctrine.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The resolution and restatement referred to are as follows:

H.J. Res. 498

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled—

(a) That the United States regards the Monroe Doctrine as continuing to be fundamental to its foreign policies;

(b) That the United States regards the existence of a military base in Cuba supported by Soviet equipment and Soviet personnel as a clear violation of the Monroe Doctrine;

(c) That the objective of the policy of the United States with relation to Cuba must be—

1. Termination of Soviet intervention;
2. Establishment of conditions under which the Cuban people may freely exercise their right to self-determination;
3. An end to Communist subversion, sabotage, and guerrilla warfare against the people of the Western Hemisphere.

Restatement and Full Implementation of Monroe Doctrine Relating to Cuba and Communist Subversion Called For

Mr. Cramer. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Battin], chairman of the Republican Task Force on Cuba and Communist Subversion in the Western Hemisphere, having the privilege myself of being vice chairman of this task force, in calling for the restatement and full implementation of the Monroe Doctrine. The Republican policy committee and the Republican National Committee have recently endorsed this position.

I am particularly encouraged that this position, as reaffirmed by the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Montana, is firmly announced by the Republican Party, having introduced a similar resolution, House Joint Resolution 227 on February 4, 1963. It is becoming more and more obvious that the New Frontier is seeking "accommodations" with the Communists throughout the world as well as in this hemisphere.

The aim of today's resolution and House Joint Resolution 227 is the implementing of such political, diplomatic, economic or military action as may be necessary to enforce the Monroe Doctrine throughout this hemisphere.

The failure of the President to take any firm and meaningful action with regard to the Communist threat in Cuba and throughout this hemisphere makes it incumbent upon the Congress to express its position in a resolution of this nature.

I do not believe the American people or the Congress can long condone the New Frontier apathy that exists toward this very real threat to the peace and security of all the Americas—which is leading the United States toward a coexistence accommodation with Communists.

The President has recently called for a "reexamination of our attitude toward the Soviet Union." Our reexamination should be one looking toward a tougher policy.

In light of the recent reports by the Organization of American States, the Stennis committee and Selden subcommittee reports, pointing to Communist infiltration and subversion in this hemisphere, a reaffirmation and implementation of the Monroe Doctrine would be an obvious necessary start toward a tougher, more realistic policy toward Soviet influence in this hemisphere.

I am gravely and deeply concerned about the signs that point toward seeking an "accommodation," an expression used by the President at his American University commencement address this year in redefining the New Frontier foreign policies in calling also for a reexamination of our attitude toward the Soviet Union—in Cuba and elsewhere.

I am concerned when we open up commercial air corridors to nonscheduled airlines owned and operated by Castro's Communist government over the United States as was done a few weeks ago by a regulation of the FAA—so long as these planes going to and from Canada, trading with Canada which is a country for transshipment from many of the Iron Curtain countries, stop in one of our major cities for inspection—one of which is Dulles Airport outside Washington, D.C. Thus, Castro's planes can be flying over and landing within a few miles of the Nation's Capital. Apparently the quid pro quo for this "accommodation" is that Cuba will now guarantee safety of U.S. commercial airplanes over Cuba and the FAA has issued an order permitting such flights.

Perhaps this is why the New Frontier is so unconcerned about Russian trawlers violating our territorial waters.

Perhaps this is why little is being done to discourage other free nations from trading with Cuba—a practice that is ever increasing in recent weeks. I cite as justification for this Monroe Doctrine resolution introduced today and House Joint Resolution 227 the second interim report of the Subcommittee on Special Projects on Cuba and Subversion in the Western Hemisphere.

Second Interim Report of the Subcommittee on Cuba and Subversion in the Western Hemisphere—A Task Force of the Republican Policy Committee, Subcommittee on Special Projects

PREAMBLE

Within the past week the President of the United States has made a foreign policy address calling for a reexamination of the attitude of Americans toward the Soviet Union. The theme of this address was that the Soviet Union could be led to adopt a more enlightened attitude if the United States changed its attitude toward peace and put aside its belief that the Russian people are lacking in virtue.

It must be presumed that the purpose of the President in making his remarks of June 10 was to indicate the direction of American foreign policy. We believe that the President is completely wrong in believing that the attitude of the American public toward the Soviet Union is a major cause of the Nation's conflict with communism and that Khrushchev's heart can be melted if this Nation adopts a more cordial attitude toward him.

It seems to us tragically irrelevant for the President to urge upon the Nation a deeper admiration of the Soviet Union for such attributes as courage and industry at a time when the ink is hardly dry on an OAS report declaring "intervention by Sino-Soviet powers in this hemisphere, by way of Cuba, has increased considerably during the past year."

The report which follows is offered in the hope that it will direct attention back to the type of basic decision that must be made by the leaders of this Nation in order to win the cold war.

SECOND INTERIM REPORT

The Nation needs a Cuban policy. It has no Cuban policy primarily because the President and the Democratic Congress have failed to make up their minds about the Nation's goal.

To a President who is fond of nautical metaphors, we say that a course cannot be charted until the port which we want to reach has been determined. Until the destination has been firmly fixed, the Nation will continue to drift.

The statements so far issued by administration leaders to define the goal of Cuban policy have been ambiguous, inconsistent, and incomplete. The joint congressional resolution signed by the President on October 3, 1962—perhaps the most authoritative statement of the national policy goal—is deficient in clarity, in comprehensiveness, and in courage.

Consequently, the Congress should adopt, and the President should sign, a new joint resolution stating the goal of the policy of the United States toward Communist Cuba.

THE AMBIGUITY OF THE GOAL OF CUBAN POLICY

The joint congressional resolution, like the President's statements of September 4 and 13, 1962, expresses opposition to the establishment in Cuba of an offensive military capability which threatens the security of the United States or of other nations in the hemisphere. It expresses opposition to the export of communism to other Latin American nations by force or the threat of force.

It is silent, however, on the attitude of the United States toward a Soviet military presence in Cuba which is defensive in character or which does not immediately threaten the security of the United States or of other American nations. It is silent on the attitude of the United States toward Communist subversion carried on by means other than the use or threat of force.

Many of the statements that relate to our Nation's goals are open to the interpretation that this Nation is ready to coexist with a Communist Cuba if it or Cuba does not seek to impose communism on other nations.[1] They suggest that a Soviet presence in Cuba which does not involve offensive weapons, though abnormal, is something which our Nation can live with.

Confusion about the objective of our national policy is reflected in the utterance of the President as well as in those of lesser leaders of the administration. The President has refrained from reaffirming or repudiating the Monroe Doctrine but has offered a truncated version of the doctrine, which one administration lieutenant called the Kennedy doctrine.[2] The President spoke boldly before the released Cuban prisoners about the return of their flag to a free Havana in Miami in December 1962. But, less than 3 months later, at San Jose he omitted from his remarks the statements in his prepared text calling for a restoration of freedom to Cuba. The Vice President said, "We want to get rid of Castro," only to have this declaration revised by McGeorge Bundy to read "we cannot sympathize" with Castro's "course of policy" and "we must range ourselves" against it.[3]

From time to time the administration has given the impression that the presence of Soviet troops and military equipment in Cuba produces important advantages for the United States. Sometimes it is said that the Soviet presence makes Cuba "a showcase of Communist failure" and turns the people of other Latin American states away from Communists. Sometimes it is said that the maintenance of Soviet forces in Cuba imposes an economic strain on the Communist world. Sometimes it is said that the Soviets exercise a restraining influence on the volatile Cuban Government.

The inadequacies of statements of policy would be less important if the actions of the administration revealed a consistent and purposeful movement toward a clearly recognized objective. But the actions of the administration have been as inconsistent as its words.

The Attorney General, who said in April 1961, "The neutrality laws were never designed to prevent individuals from leaving the United States to fight for a cause in which they believe" has confined a score of Cuban exile leaders to the Miami areas. He has shown great vigor in providing immunity from exile attack to Cuba and to Cuban shipping. The President, who declared that the quarantine of last October would be maintained until United Nations inspection of the withdrawal of Soviet missiles was obtained, ended the quarantine without securing on-site inspection to verify the removal of the missiles.

---

[1] The uncertainty about the Nation's objectives is evidenced in a recent report from Freedom House entitled "What Can We Do About Cuba?" The report, stating the consensus of the deliberations of 25 experts on Cuba in late April 1963, declares that the following are troubling questions: "Is American Cuban policy geared to a negotiated accord with Khrushchev on the kind of Cuba with which the United States could coexist?" Is the administration "looking toward some kind of reconciliation, perhaps on the basis of a Tito-type arrangement for Cuba?"

[2] "The President has been careful not to declare openly that the Monroe Doctrine either does not apply in the Cuban case at this particular time or that it is an obsolete political concept in terms of present-day realities. But the administration spokesmen have made it fairly clear that the President does not believe that the Monroe Doctrine is really applicable under the present circumstances," Ted Szule, New York Times, Sept. 23, 1962.

[3] "Issues and Answers" ABC–TV Oct. 14, 1962.

There can be no doubt that the administration would prefer that the Soviet Union pull out of Cuba and that it hopes that Castro will disappear. This wishful thinking, however, does not constitute a policy goal. There is a world of difference between a wish that the existing situation change and a determination to do all within our power to bring about a change.

A PROPOSAL FOR A NEW CUBAN RESOLUTION

This Nation has a historic policy opposing intervention in this hemisphere by despotism based in other parts of the world—a policy laid down on December 2, 1823, by James Monroe.

President Monroe asserted that "we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing" Latin American states "or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any light, than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States." He warned that "we should consider any attempt" on the part of European powers "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety."

The Monroe Doctrine barred any further "interposition" by European powers to extend their system or exercise control in this hemisphere. It said simply, "Hands off." It made no distinction between offensive and defensive weapons or between forcible and pacific means of intervention.

The purpose of the Monroe Doctrine, as Elihu Root once explained, was to prevent the development of a situation that could endanger hemispheric security. The Kennedy doctrine, by contrast, appears to permit intervention by non-American states in this hemisphere up to the point at which a danger to security has reached an acute stage. The difference between the Monroe Doctrine and the Kennedy doctrine is the difference between preventative medical care and treatment which begins after the development of a high fever.

In earlier periods of our history the Government of the United States asserted that the Monroe Doctrine barred the presence of Spanish troops in Santo Domingo and the establishment of a French puppet emperor in Mexico. In 1940 Secretary of State Cordell Hull served notice that the Monroe Doctrine prohibited the exercise on any authority by Axis Powers over any part of the hemisphere.[4] In 1940, Franklin D. Roosevelt extended the Monroe Doctrine to Greenland and sent American troops to that island to forestall Nazi occupation.

In 1912, when Mexico proposed leasing to a Japanese fishing company, a port area in Lower California, the U.S. Senate, relying on the Monroe Doctrine, asserted "* * * when any harbor or other place in the American Continents is so situated that the occupation thereof for naval or military purposes might threaten the communications or the safety of the United States, the Government of the United States could not see without grave concern the possession of such harbor or other place by any corporation or association which has such a relation to another government, not American, as to give that government practical power of control for national purposes."

In 1954 Secretary of State John Foster Dulles declared that "the intrusion of Soviet despotism (in Guatemala) was a direct challenge to our Monroe Doctrine, the first and most fundamental of our foreign policies." With the assistance of the United States, loyal Guatemalans removed their Communist rulers forthwith.

Along with the United States, the other nations of the hemisphere have used the language of Monroe to serve notice that trespassing is forbidden to communism. The Ninth Inter-American Conference at Bogotá in 1948 condemned "interference by any foreign power, or by any political organization serving the interest of a foreign power, in the public life of the nations of the American Continent." The 10th Inter-American Conference at Caracas in 1954 declared that "the domination of control of the political institutions of any American State by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of any extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America."

Three years ago Khrushchev told the world that the Monroe Doctrine was dead, saying "the remains of this doctrine should be buried as every dead body is, so that it does not poison the air by its decay." The Eisenhower administration replied, "* * * the principles of the Monroe Doctrine are as valid today as they were in 1823 when the doctrine was proclaimed." The Kennedy administration has so far failed to contradict Khrushchev either by word or by deed.

What is needed is the positive policy of the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine is being violated by the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba—whatever their strength, whatever the nature of their equipment.

The doctrine is being violated as long as there is any type of Soviet intervention in Cuba.

The removal of Soviet troops and the elimination of other types of Soviet intervention in Cuba is an urgent policy objective.

The ultimate objective of U.S. policy must be the elimination of the Communist regime in Cuba and its replacement by a government freely chosen by the Cuban people.

Let the President and the Congress act.

APPENDIX I—ATTITUDES ON THE SCOPE AND STATUS OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE BY RESPONSIBLE SPOKESMEN OF THE LAST FOUR ADMINISTRATIONS

Franklin D. Roosevelt (1933–45), Cordell Hull, July 5, 1940:

"The Monroe Doctrine is solely a policy of self-defense, which is intended to preserve the independence and integrity of the Americas. It was, and is, designed to prevent aggression in this hemisphere on the part of any non-American power, and likewise to make impossible any further extension to this hemisphere of any non-American system of government imposed from without. * * * It made clear that the future transfer of existing possessions to another non-American state would be regarded as inimical to the interests of this hemisphere. This has become a basic policy of the Government of the United States."

Cordell Hull, April 12, 1940:

"There is an express application of the Monroe Doctrine by the United States regarding Greenland. There appears to be no serious question about Greenland forming part of this hemisphere as contradistinguished from the European side of the Atlantic. * * * The German forces occupying Denmark could easily cause the Government of Denmark to issue orders about Greenland, as they could about Danish shipping throughout the world. For this reason it's important that Greenland should receive our attention under the Monroe Doctrine."

Public Law 32, 77th Congress, approved April 19, 1941:

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* (1) That the United States would not recognize any transfer, and would not acquiesce in any attempt to transfer, any geographic region of this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power."

Harry S. Truman (1945–53), President Truman, December 27, 1945:

"We believe that the sovereign states of the Western Hemisphere, without interference from outside the Western Hemisphere, must work together as good neighbors in the solution of their common problems."

President Truman, April 5, 1947:

"When we hear the cry of freedom arising from the shores beyond our own, we can take heart from the words of Thomas Jefferson. In his letter to President Monroe, urging the adoption of what we now know as the Monroe Doctrine, he wrote: 'Nor is the occasion to be slighted which this proposition offers of declaring our protest against the atrocious violations of the rights of nations by the interference of any one in the internal affairs of another.'

"We, like Jefferson, have witnessed atrocious violations of the rights of nations.

"We, too, have regarded them as occasions not to be slighted.

"We, too, have declared our protest.

"We must make that protest effective by aiding those peoples whose freedoms are endangered by foreign pressures.

"We must take a positive stand. It is no longer enough merely to say 'We don't want war.' We must act in time—ahead of time—to stamp out the smoldering beginnings of any conflict that may threaten to spread over the world."

Dwight D. Eisenhower (1953–61), John Foster Dulles, June 30, 1954:

"This intrusion of Soviet despotism [in Guatemala] was, of course, a direct challenge to our Monroe Doctrine, the first and most fundamental of our foreign policies."

John Foster Dulles, June 30, 1954:

"If world communism captures any American state, however small, a new and perilous front is established which will increase the danger to the entire free world and require even greater sacrifices from the American people."

John Foster Dulles, March 4, 1954:

"It is time to make it clear with finality that we see that alien (i.e., Communist) despotism is hostile to our ideals, that we unitedly deny it the right of prey upon our hemisphere and that if it does not heed our warning and keep away we shall deal with it as a situation that might endanger the peace of America * * *. There is no place here for political institutions which served alien masters."

Henry Cabot Lodge, June 20, 1954:

"I say to you, representative of the Soviet Union, stay out of this hemisphere and don't try to start your plans and your conspiracies over here."

Department of State, July 14, 1960:

"The principles of the Monroe Doctrine are as valid today as they were in 1823 when the Doctrine was proclaimed."

John F. Kennedy (1961 to date), John F. Kennedy, September 13, 1962:

"Question. Will it require force to contravene the Monroe Doctrine or does the presence of a foreign power in any force, but not using that force in this hemisphere, amount to contravention of the doctrine?"

---

[4] It is interesting to note that the argument used by Hitler's government and rejected by Hull in 1940, contending that U.S. participation in the affairs of Europe made the Monroe Doctrine obsolete, was adopted by Senator JOHN SPARKMAN.

"The nonintervention in the affairs of the American Continent by European nations which is demanded by the Monroe Doctrine can in principle be legally valid only on condition that the American nations for their part do not interfere in the affairs of the European Continent," Von Ribbentrop, July 1, 1940.

"This change has greatly altered the conditions governing our implementation of the Monroe Doctrine, which was based in part on the assumption that the nations of the Western Hemisphere would remain uninvolved in the conflicts of Europe," Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Sept. 20, 1962.

"The PRESIDENT. Well, I have indicated that if Cuba should possess a capacity to carry out offensive action against the United States, that the United States would act. I have also indicated that the United States would not permit Cuba to export its power by force in the hemisphere."

Congressman WAYNE HAYS, Democrat, of Ohio, September 26, 1962:

"I think if a determination is made that the buildup in Cuba reaches a point where it is a threat to the United States, then it is a violation of the Monroe Doctrine.

Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, September 20, 1962:

"This change has greatly altered the conditions governing our implementation of the Monroe Doctrine, which was based in part on the assumption that the nations of the Western Hemisphere would remain uninvolved in the conflicts of Europe. But in discharging our obligations under the Monroe Doctrine, we must act with full regard for the fact that the problem of Cuba and of Communist designs in the Western Hemisphere is not an isolated one but part of our worldwide struggle against Communist imperialism."

Senator Dennis Chavez, Democrat, of New Mexico, September 20, 1962:

"How can we justify saying we object to the Russians being in Cuba when we have a base within 60 miles of the Russian border in Turkey? I have been at our airbase in Turkey, 60 miles from Russia. How can we justify that and at the same time object to the Russians being in Cuba?"

Senator STEPHEN YOUNG, Democrat, of Ohio, September 20, 1962:

"The Monroe Doctrine has been altered because we have foreign commitments and responsibilities.

"I submit, therefore, that we can neither morally nor realistically take action which would jeopardize the security and independence of our allies.

"It is not the same Monroe Doctrine as that of 1823; and our historians have been reporting that fact to us for some decades. They are correct."

Congressman CORNELIUS GALLAGHER, Democrat, of New Jersey, September 26, 1962:

"The Monroe Doctrine of 150 years ago has been amended by the necessity of a Kennedy doctrine which recognizes that a few sailing ships and men armed with muskets differs critically from a thoughtless armed action which can escalate into a nuclear holocaust and incinerate the Western Hemisphere."

Congressman ELMER J. HOLLAND, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, September 28, 1962:

Mr. HOLLAND inserted an editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 15, pages 20882 and 20883, which was entitled "Monroe: Obsolete Doctrine." The editorial said, "The Monroe Doctrine is dead." Congressman HOLLAND called it "An excellent editorial on the present 'hot' cold-war situation. * * * It is good to know that we have responsible and levelheaded publishers and editors throughout the Nation who are dedicated to reporting the facts."

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, is there any doubt what the intention of communism is in this hemisphere? Castro has stated it as clearly and unequivocally as he could. Khrushchev has stated it as clearly and unequivocally as he could as I cited in my resolution.

What is bothering many of us further are the accommodations that are being sought and being accomplished between this Government and that of Cuba and Castro.

We are concerned about flights being permitted to fly over the United States with the acquiescence and the approval of the Federal Aviation Agency—that is nonscheduled Cuban flights.

We are all concerned about Canadian flights over the United States trading with Cuba.

We are concerned about these trade loopholes I mentioned.

We are concerned about this travel to Cuba.

We are concerned about the fact that the United States demanded no further refugee raids not only from the United States but from Puerto Rico as well. I repeat—that was the first of Castro's demands on October 28 of last year when the blockade was in effect—that we must stop all refugee raids on Cuba. This has been accomplished as an accommodation.

We ought to require adequate surveillance of these Communist arms drops to these other countries in this hemisphere.

We are also concerned about this latest deal or accommodation that is being discussed.

I am reading from the Washington News of Friday, the 26th:

> The spokesman for a commercial refugee transportation project from Havana to Miami says about 600 Cuban refugees will arrive here by boat within the next 10 to 14 days.
>
> The refugees will be the vanguard of an attempt to remove about 325,000 Cubans from the Communist island who hold U.S. visa waivers, attorney Jack Nageley said yesterday.
>
> Mr. Nageley represents Harold Derber, president of Empress Lines, Ltd., promoters of the project.

I called this to the attention of the House last week. Apparently a deal has been made with Castro so far as this company is concerned, to open up the shipping lines between Key West and Havana.

I made a protest about this, and I hope it is not accomplished. But in investigating this matter I found out this interesting fact. That following the quarantine there were 19 air repatriation flights in which some 87 to 160 persons claiming U.S. citizenship and their immediate dependents were permitted to come back to the United States. Then Castro cut it off. This following information is what I am talking about when I talk about deals and accommodations.

On February 27 a negotiation took place between the Castro government and someone on behalf of the United States. Through the Swiss Embassy, the State Department advises. Through James Donovan other sources advise.

Five ships have come through as a result of the deal that was worked out. Some 4,100 passengers from Cuba have been brought to this country. Of those, do you know who named 50 percent of them under this deal? Do you know who decided who 50 percent of these people coming into the United States on these 5 ships should be? Fidel Castro is who. The ships were the *Survey*, two trips, the *Morning Light*, and the *Maximus*. The United States decided only who 50 percent of the people on these ships would be. Fidel Castro decided on the other 50 percent. This has nothing to do with the ransom deal. These are additional refugees permitted to be brought into this country. We named 50 percent of them, because of our interest, and justifiably so, in getting 900 additional Americans out of Cuba. But the price we had to pay was that Castro had the right to name the other 50 percent or 2,050 persons coming into this country on those ships in recent months.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are concerned about. Why should such deals as these be made with Fidel Castro? Why should such accommodations as these be made? What does the rest of the world and what does Latin America think of such accommodations? They obivously think we are weak, that we do not have any real determination to meet this threat of Communism in this hemisphere. That is the concern of many of us—this sign of weakness, particularly to the Latin American nations. They understand and admire signs of strength—they justifiably abhor signs of softness and weakness.

Mr. Speaker, to conclude, permit me to say this: The Organization of American States is a fine instrument to accomplish the objective of getting rid of communism and subversion in this hemisphere. But only under one condition—strong U.S. leadership. Many Latin American governments acknowledge this privately. Only with strong unequivocal leadership, only, with a definite plan of action by the United States of America, can the growing Communist cancer in this hemisphere be stopped.

U.S. leadership is what has made the Organization of American States effective in the past. That is what has given us the results at the conferences that were mentioned by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER], in combating communism. It is because of the U.S. leadership. That is what has done it.

Mr. Speaker, if the United States permits a vacuum in this leadership to exist, which exists today, or to persist in permitting such vacuum as exists today, then the Organization of American States is not going to be the instrument through which this can be accomplished.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that the United States announced a firm, positive, step-by-step plan of action intended to be taken and ask for support of the OAS. In my opinion you are not going to have these recalcitrant Latin nations that we have today with that firm leadership—and the first step is to restore and announce our intention to fully implement the Monroe Doctrine.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSH. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, but I would point out to the gentleman that several other Members hope to speak on this subject.

I yield to the gentleman for the purpose of his responding to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman from Virginia. I do not think I shall consume that much time.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that no one will find violent disagreement with what the gentleman from Florida suggested. The program he suggests is one that has been discussed here on the floor of the House throughout the afternoon and

I would support it. However, the point we made in the earlier colloquy is that it does not serve any purpose here to try to define or elaborate upon the methods and the steps which led to earlier failures, because if one wants to do that one would have to go all the way back to the Rio treaty which was signed by Mr. Dulles and which stated that no American state shall interfere, overtly or otherwise, in the internal affairs of another American state.

Mr. Speaker, I protested against that treaty at that time, and I still protest against it today. Therefore, I think it is those who try to confuse the unity of America in trying to rid Cuba of communism by digging into these past actions who are really doing the great disservice to this country. I think those who really want to do something about Cuba and who are interested in getting rid of the Communists in Cuba will engage in the kind of discussions that we have had here today, where sound suggestions are made and where they are subject to full discussion by the Members of Congress.

I think that this kind of action on the part of the Congress will demonstrate not only to the administration and the people in the State Department but to all of our neighbors in South America, yes, throughout the world, and most important to Mr. Khrushchev and the Kremlin, that the Congress of the United States, speaking for the people of the United States, wants to do everything humanly possible to get the Communists out of Cuba and the Western Hemisphere just as quickly as possible.

I can only repeat to my friend from Florida this is the road to victory in the Western Hemisphere, not confusing the issue about whether or not we got on-sight inspection or did not get it. We did not get on-sight inspection because Mr. Castro did not want to agree to that. I said before and I will say again, those who say we ought to go in there and do it ought to go the full length and say "Let us invade Cuba." I say, as other gentlemen have said, there are other ways of bringing the Communists to their knees. Many of these ways were discussed today. There are other peaceful ways of ridding Cuba of communism. I feel certain that the day when communism will be driven out of Cuba is not too far away.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke during this special order today, including myself, may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Virginia for giving me this opportunity to participate in the discussion today. It is passingly strange, and certainly it is more than coincidental, that the two gentlemen who serve as coordinators for this particular emphasis on Cuba should come from the various States that they do. I refer to my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER], who is one of the representatives from the great State of Pennsylvania where the first bells of freedom tolled many years ago for this country, and, then, also to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH], who represents a State which probably has given this Nation more of our leaders in the past than any other State in the Union—the man who represents the State from which Thomas Jefferson came, who said we should always oppose the forces of tyranny. It is passing strange that you who represent these particular States should be taking the lead in this discussion as we are trying to find a bipartisan approach to bringing liberty and freedom to the oppressed people of Cuba.

I was very interested in the discussion a moment ago as to whose fault is it that we are presently confronted with this great problem. As I heard the discussion I was reminded of the story that was told of the man who introduced a new deodorant and he merely called it "Stereo." It did not kill the odor, but it fixed it so you could not tell where it came from.

If we are going to try to place positively and affirmatively the fault for our present situation, then we can debate here ad infinitum, and we are going to defeat the very purpose of this discussion here today.

Our sole objective is to try to focus the attention of Congress, the administration, and the American people on this particular problem, with the hope of encouraging positive steps toward a solution to it. I do not care whether you would try to attribute it to past administrations or not. The fact is that the past administration is past, and any attempt to place blame there, although justified, serves to make a solution more difficult. We can only deal with the present administration, and we can only solve the problem as we have it today. So, as a consequence, I hope all of you will construe these remarks as being directed toward trying to find a solution to the problem, rather than trying to be especially critical of any particular administration or any particular action which has occurred in the past.

We do have a serious problem. I believe that this discussion here will silence, once and for all, those who have said that many of us have been only critical and never constructive concerning our foreign policy, or the absence of a foreign policy, in reference to Cuba. Because we, during the past two and a half hours, and probably for another half an hour or so, have repeatedly advanced concrete, positive programs with regard to something which should be done in order to rid the Western Hemisphere of this Communist cancer in Cuba. So I believe without question that the American people are no longer going to listen to the cry that there are many in Congress and throughout the Nation who will be critical of our foreign policy about Cuba but who are not offering constructive proposals for doing something positive about it.

We have had numerous proposals here, time and again, in which the speakers have said, "We support your proposals and we believe they deserve the serious consideration of Congress, of the Executive, and of the American people." So this discussion should silence once and for all those who would say that we would be obstructionists, that we would be critical without offering positive alternatives for improvements in the relationships that exist between this country and Cuba.

Another thing that is very logical—and I believe a very helpful proposition as far as this discussion is concerned—is that this discussion should allay the fears of those who would say that any positive step would be an act of war and would precipitate a nuclear holocaust, or would bring about an escalation into a nuclear war. Franklin, I believe, said "I have no way to shed light upon the future except from the lamp of the past."

Let us look at our experience on this score, because every one of you and the others in this body and the American people do not want war. The American people have been the champions of peace and freedom from time immemorial. I have known war personally—and I am not being a demagog here—as I am sure others of you have seen it in past wars. It causes me a great deal of concern to realize that we have weapons of destruction which are unimaginable, comparatively speaking, to the power and destruction which we had in World War II. Why, I understand even one nuclear submarine has sufficient destructive fire power on it to equal all of the combined bombs that were dropped during World War II. We do not want war, and I believe veritably that experience will show that the positive steps suggested here will not lead to war. Indeed, just the opposite may very well be true; they are necessary to preserve peace.

From time immemorial the Communists have proven they only recognize force. We can enter into treaties, we can try to bargain with them, but their basic principle is, "I will keep what I have, and we will bargain with what you have." We have to be firm and strong. Experience has shown that when we stood firm the Communists backed down. Look at what happened in October, and bear in mind that in October there were missiles on Cuba pointed toward this great land of freedom. There were approximately 20,000 Soviet soldiers in Cuba at that time. However, we took a firm stand in October, and, notwithstanding the facts that they had their missiles pointed toward us and that they had approximately twice as many Russian soldiers as they allegedly have now—and we do not have any truly accurate way of determining the correct number—there was no nuclear war. Is it not reasonable to conclude—and we all are logical and reasonable men—that if the Russians did not precipitate a war and did not move into war at that time when Cuba had the missiles which they presumably do not have now, and where they had twice as many men in Cuba, which they presumably do not have now, then how can we justifiably say, following logical reasoning, that if we were to take positive, definite steps at this time it would precipitate a nuclear war? History does not bear that out. We need to be firm and positive.

There is certainly one thing which will allow a continued buildup in Cuba and which will allow a continued extension of subversion throughout the Western Hemisphere, and that is to continue doing nothing, to have half-hearted approaches. To be sure, we have imposed an embargo on the particular vessels which go into Cuba.

As someone pointed out earlier, this is about as ineffective as anything anyone possibly could propose. Some shipping lines will use only one vessel in trading with Cuba and then use all of their other vessels to come to the United States.

I would like to see us extend this embargo, making it not only apply to the individual vessel but, rather, applying it to the shipping line. We will say to him, Mr. Shipper, if you deal with Cuba, not only will that one vessel be prohibited from coming into our ports, but all of your vessels will be prohibited from coming here. And if that is not effective, let us go one step further and say to the foreign countries involved that if these shipping lines continue to trade with Cuba, then we will consider withholding foreign aid.

We need to take positive, definite steps. Unfortunately, with regard to any step that is proposed, the argument could be raised against it that it is a step of aggression and will precipitate a nuclear war. Let me say again, as I have underscored before, that if the Russians did not—and they did not—precipitate a war back in October when they were much stronger militarily in Cuba, then if we take positive steps in the way of extending and tightening our embargo and in the matter of recognizing some provisional, free Cuban government somewhere in the Western Hemisphere, those steps will not precipitate a war.

Over the last few months, we have had a lot of discussion on the subject of Cuba. I dare say that we have had no less than 75 individual resolutions which have been introduced, during my limited service here in the Congress of the United States. We can continue to discuss this matter, but I think it is high time that we do something to implement our discussions. Personally I am quite concerned, as I am sure most of you are, with the fact that so many of these resolutions that have been applauded by the American people and have been approved by many of you individually, have not been acted upon by the various committees of this Congress. I realize that we have serious domestic problems confronting us. But I will tell you truly that no problem is more important than this matter of Cuba.

We can talk to the uncommitted nations of the world until we are blue in the face and say that "if you side with us, we will fight for you." But they will take a look and say, "Well, what have you done to the Communist menace just 90 miles off your shoreline?" We can try to impress upon them that we are lovers of freedom and believe in going to any extent to keep the Western Hemisphere free from the Communists, but as long as we let Cuba remain in its present condition we are tilting at windmills. We may as well face up to it that all of these other actions, all of these other theoretical proposals, nice sounding as they might be, are going to amount to absolutley nothing in convincing the uncommitted nations that we will stand up for freedom as long as we allow Castro to remain and to keep the people of Cuba under bondage. It is a choice tnat we have got to make, and if the Executive is not willing to face up to it, we as Members of Congress must face up to it. The reason I say that is because, ultimately, it will be our responsibility if, as has been suggested, actual invasion might be necessary.

In that connection, America has never been a coward. America has never backed off in the matter of preserving freedom and giving freedom to the peoples of the world simply because it might mean war.

I repeat, as we stand firm in supporting these measures which have been proposed here, that I believe these will be the steps not toward the war which all of us wish to avoid, but these will be steps toward peace and toward the downfall of Castro and of all those who would follow his Communist line in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN].

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join in this discussion with great interest for as many of you know I have long been deeply concerned by these problems. I have some questions, some observations, and some recommendations.

When are we going to take affirmative action to get the Communists out of Cuba? When will we face up to the fact that no amount of help to other Latin or South American countries can be effective as long as the dike is breached in Cuba? When will we admit that as long the Castro government receives massive aid from the Soviet Union, both military and economic, it is not going to fall from within?

It is little short of criminal that this Nation has not long ago acted firmly and decisively to run the Communists out of Cuba. The great majority of the American people would solidly support such a policy, even one in which the use of force might become necessary.

We look foolish urging Britain not to let the Communists take over British Guiana when Communists stole Cuba and are holding it right under our noses. British Guiana is nowhere near the concern to Britain that Cuba is to the United States. We are fine ones to urge leadership and decisiveness on others when we do not exercise it ourselves.

Under the separation of powers, the responsibility for Executive control of the Government is in the Executive, not the Congress.

We have passed resolutions asking the Executive to act in Cuba. Members of this body have spoken repeatedly indicating support for firm Executive action, yet none has been forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, the dismal truth is that we have no policy on Cuba to amount to a hill of beans. With all due respect to the various high offices involved in the executive department whose responsibility it is to deal with such situations, we have witnessed for far too long, addleheaded, chicken-hearted, and ignorant timidity on the part of the American Government faced by Communist military action in Cuba. We once had a Monroe Doctrine, but you would scarcely know it in the State Department or the White House. We started on the right road in October only to abandon it in short order and then sit back while the situation has deteriorated to our disadvantage ever since.

It is astonishing but true that instead of building up and supporting Cubans who want to liberate their homeland and replace Castro with a government friendly to the United States, we have dispersed the Cubans all over this country. Hit-and-run attacks with their stimulus to morale and their obvious annoyance to the Communists we officially prevented. There has been no call or even demand by this country backed up by anything other than the usual diplomatic hogwash, to inspect the island of Cuba, although every person in the executive branch must admit that we do not know whether offensive missiles once there have all been removed or what has been brought back by submarine or in the dark of night.

To listen to the Department of State, one would get the impression that it is believed that there can be negotiations with Communists that will result in agreements that can both be relied upon for Communist performance and will operate in the interests of the United States if performed. This is a dismal ignorance of the true nature of the Communist beast. Communists and communism simply will not enter into any agreement that does not serve Communist purposes, nuclear test ban treaty or what have you. Neither will Communists perform any commitments undertaken by treaty or otherwise when it is in their interest not to perform. Communists are not ordinary, reasonable men and women, with conscience and honor and principle. Communists are 20th-century nihilists, international gangsters, ruthless murderers, saboteurs, espionage agents and atheists. Their single goal, their fanatic determination, their obsessed and obsessing objective is the destruction of this country by force or any way they can do it. Khrushchev was the butcher of the Ukraine. Does any one really believe he has changed? Do leopards change their spots?

Mr. Speaker, I fail to see how any government of this country regardless of party can make claim to the right to continue as a government when it fails the American people in this hour of need, in this crucial contest. No government worthy of the name can tolerate continued Communist military potential in Cuba or any other place in Central or Latin America. The political party of the Chief Executive makes no difference when it comes to such an issue. As

Chairman of the Internal Security Committee of the National Association of Attorneys General in San Francisco in July of 1960, I was extremely critical of then President Eisenhower's lack of firmness in dealing with Castro's expropriations of U.S. interests in Cuba. At that time, more than 3 years ago, I spoke of the construction in Cuba of Soviet missile launching bases. Let no man, whether he is President of the United States or the Secretary of Defense or the Chief of the Central Intelligence Agency, claim that it was not and has not been known day in and day out, month in and month out, year in and year out, that the Communists in Cuba have been steadily building a military potential directed against the United States of America.

Consider carefully the full implication of these facts. It is a damning indictment of individuals and governments who call themselves American who want the cheesecake, the black limousines, the titles and the rank but who when the chips are down have not got the guts nor the will to lead to win against the Communists.

This situation has not changed to date. We have no policy. We have no courage. We have no will to win at the top. And this is deeply distressing to men and women all over America—to Members of this House on both sides of the aisle who know that this is not properly a partisan problem.

And while I'm on the subject of the military buildup in Cuba, let me say this. We have not been told all about the bad things that have been built there. We the people have not had pictures of submarine installations nor reports of the locations and contents of the many hundreds of caves, nor the concrete works and the disappearing turrets, nor many such installations, none of which can fairly or justly be said to relate to the defense of Cuba. They are offensive against the United States. They have no business being there, Mr. Speaker. They should be razed. They should be destroyed. Affirmative action to do this is not imperialism. Before God and in the name of justice and freedom no Communist government has a right to exist in this hemisphere except as its peoples may voluntary elect it—which never happens.

Now what should be our policy? Three things are fundamental.

First. There must be a continuing inspection of all of the island of Cuba at will and on a daily basis by inspecting teams, preferably of the United Nations with United States membership, but if not, by United States inspecting teams. If this inspection discloses offensive weaponry of war—which it will—this weaponry should be dumped into the sea. Again, preferably by the United Nations with United States participation, but if not, by the United States alone.

Second. The United States should declare that Castro must go, and that he must not be succeeded by a Communist leadership, and that—and here is the important part, the teeth—this Government is prepared to blockade by sea, land, and air until Castro and communism withers on the vine. It may be that in the course of the withering there will be much suffering and perhaps some loss of life, but this is a small price to pay measured against the horrible destructions certain to be inflicted upon the United States and its allies from a Communist controlled and monitored Cuba, armed to the teeth as an outpost as well as a staging and resupply area.

Third. This Government should announce that it is opposed to Communist governments in this hemisphere and is willing to use force if need be to prevent their establishment.

What about the inspections? Let us be frank. We know the United Nations will not order the inspections, so the United States must be prepared on the basis of the Monroe Doctrine and our national security to act outside the United Nations if necessary and to act soon. If this means Mr. Stevenson's resignation, that is tough turkey. If this means that some people are going to say that this Nation is a big bully and picking on poor little Cuba, that is tough turkey too. Because, believe me, this must be done. But then again, do not take my word for it. Ask the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Ask any military, naval or Strategic Air Command officer who has thought this thing through. They are to a man in favor of inspection of Cuba backed up by force.

Assuming then that the United States decides to proceed on its own initiative and independent of the United Nations, what course should we take? Inspection teams of perhaps 12 competent U.S. specialists composed of a majority of military personnel, but including civilian and scientific personnel, and photographic equipment, should be presented to the Cuban Government with a demand for the grant of continuing right to inspect the island of Cuba any place, any time. And, Mr. Speaker, again the teeth, because as we all know, requests in diplomatic language and letters of protest against Soviet shooting down our aircraft in times past and the like, do not get anywhere unless there is some teeth—this request should specify a time for the first inspection unit to arrive in Cuba and indicate explicitly that if denied permission to inspect we will commit military, naval, and air forces of the United States in support of such an inspection.

Now does this mean war? I do not believe it does. It may mean for a while some limited warfare. But it will not escalate to atomic destruction for one reason. This is because we have enough atomic deterrent staring the Communists in the face to incinerate the Soviet Union and every Communist country, even if they made an initial attack. And as long as this is the case, there will be no atomic warfare.

However, Mr. Speaker, if we wait, if we delay for more months and more years in eliminating this cancer in Cuba, the situation will only further worsen. There will be more Cubans indoctrinated in Moscow to hate us. There will be more subversives planted in Latin and South America. There will be more military equipment on the island of Cuba and a greater and greater export of it along with the Communist propaganda leaflets and unrest throughout this hemisphere.

We must act and act now. The risk of limited war is great, but no nation ever stayed on top nor lived up to its responsibilities as the champion of freedom and justice that was unwilling to take risks.

I have used the phrase "tough turkey" several times. I have done this deliberately, because the Communists that we are up against are, indeed, tough turkeys. Given the opportunity, presented by the astonishing spectacle of a rich, fat, materially comfortable American Government unwilling to fight for freedom, these tough turkeys will take advantage of every means to build up their military and propaganda potential. This is not propaganda for a peaceable change to a different system. This is not the case of an ideological conflict. This is not a cold war in the true sense. It is hot. It is real. It is to the death. And Mr. Speaker, along with a good many millions of Americans, I have children and I want them to be able to start adulthood in a hemisphere that is free from communism. It is said that World War I was fought to make the world safe for democracy; World War II to preserve the world from the insane brutalities of Hitler's fascism. Today, under the umbrella of atomic stalemate, Communist military operations are proceeding to destroy our favorable balance of power because we have been unwilling to even risk limited warfare in the defense of freedom.

Are we decadent bourgeois? I wonder.

No foreign aid programs, no Alliance for Progress, no economic projects of any kind to invest strength and stability in Latin America can possibly be effective with a continuing Communist Cuba. If we fail to risk a showdown now to achieve a free Cuba, we will have to risk it when the next Latin American nation falls to communism, only to find us in a much more vulnerable position.

With the passage of time, this Cuban situation is not going to get any better. Khrushchev boasts of some kind of commitment that the President made him in return for having backed off at the time of the quarantine in October 1962. I understand there are some 40 letters between the American President and the Soviet dictator at this time. Yet, in spite of demands by the Congress, the representatives of the people, this correspondence has never been made public. Incidentally, neither was F.D.R.'s with Stalin—not even to this day.

The President, in a special address to the Nation and to the world after adequate consultation with the Secretary of State, with the Cabinet, with the National Security Council, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, should announce an American policy of firm insistence upon inspection of Cuba and that we will achieve such inspection by the use of military force if need be. Later on, in page 2, there must be the further policy position that the same principle will be of continuing application against any further or new attempt at Communist penetration of this hemisphere.

The vast majority of the people of this Nation would welcome such positive, pro-American, pro-national-security decisiveness. Such a program is militarily defensible. It is of urgent necessity if the national security is to be preserved against exposure to atomic attack, subversion, infiltration, guerrilla warfare, sabotage and espionage throughout the entire hemisphere. Nothing less is compatible with honor, with principle, with American tradition, with the Monroe Doctrine, with commonsense in awareness of the true nature of communism and the full meaning of its military offensive operations 90 miles from Florida.

Every hour that passes finds the situation materially worsening. The American Executive must act, and act now for God, for country, for our survival, and for our children's future.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY].

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, in March of this year, 1963, at Costa Rica, President Kennedy made this ringing statement:

> We will build a wall around Cuba [not a wall of mortar or brick or barbed wire but] a wall of dedicated men determined to protect their own freedom and sovereignty.

He vowed fierce and unyielding resistance to the spread of foreign tyranny in the Western Hemisphere.

> The Soviet Union through its Cuban puppets absorbed the Cuban nation into its despotic empire—and it now seeks to extend its rule to the shores of Continental America—

Said the President.

> At the Organization of American States, at this meeting and wherever Americans gather to consult about the future of their continent, we will continue to strengthen the structure of resistance to subversion.

These words were received by the listening Latin American Presidents at Costa Rica with hope and enthusiasm. However, the hard facts of the cold war and Cuba tell a different tale about the wall around Cuba and the spread of tyranny to Latin America.

Almost exactly a month before about the same time of the President's speech to our Latin American neighbors, the Nation's Intelligence Chief, M. R. McCone, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, reported to a subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House, that a dangerous, widespread, and highly organized Communist subversive apparatus was being built around Latin Americans trained in Cuba. He said that 1,000 to 1,500 trainees from every Latin American country save one, went to Cuba in 1962 to receive training in guerrilla warfare, sabotage and terrorism.

What can be done to transform the President's words into action? What can be done to stop the traffic of subersives between Cuba and Latin America revealed by our CIA?

There is a way and there is an organization to implement the way.

The Organization of American States is the oldest large organization of nations in the world, long preceding the League of Nations or the United Nations. All nations in the Western Hemisphere are members, save Canada.

One of its principal aims has been mutual security for the member nations. In 1940, at Havana, a resolution of the OAS declared:

> Any attempt on the part of a non-American state against the integrity of inviolability of the territory, the sovereignty or the political independence of an American state shall be considered an act of aggression against the states which sign this declaration.

In 1947, the American nations signed the Rio Treaty. This historic document is actually a collective defense treaty. Its purpose was to anticipate what has happened in Cuba and provide machinery to do something about it.

Now then, what does it provide. In article 6, if a situation endangers the peace of the Americas it states that the OAS should meet immediately to agree on measures for the common defense and for maintenance of peace and security of the continents.

Article 8 lists the measures which may be authorized and among them are: "partial or complete interruption of economic relations on rail, sea, air communications, and use of armed forces."

Most of the member nations are violently opposed to communism in general and the Castro regime in particular.

For example, at the meeting of the American foreign ministers on October 2 and 3, 1962, recognized in forceful language the threat of the Communist Cuba regime to all of Latin America.

During the Cuban crisis the OAS Council met on October 23, and adopted unanimously a resolution which: First, called for withdrawal from Cuba of all missile and other offensive weapons; and second, that member states, to be all measures, individuals, and collectively in dealing with the armed forces to insure that Cuba would not continue to receive military supplies from the Soviet bloc.

The OAS backed up the United States to the hilt.

Eight countries offered the United States military aid.

What does all this show? That what is urgently needed, what the nations of the hemisphere are crying for is forthright, aggressive leadership on the part of the United States. As the most powerful nation, as the leader of the free world, they must rely upon us to back them up in decisive action against Castro and communism. When we provided aggressive leadership, as in the beginning of the Cuban crisis, the Latin American States were solidly with us.

What can be done? One solution is simple. Overnight, much of the subversive pressures against Latin America from Cuba would be largely eliminated if this simple action was taken by the Organization of American States: First, forbid all travel between Cuba and the Latin American States; and, second, stop all trade between Cuba and the Latin American States; Castro's bad economic plight would be worsened.

Let us look at an example. The principal route of subversive trainees into and out of Cuba is through Mexico City and via Cubana Airways. Mexico is our closest Latin American neighbor. Vast quantities of American dollars in aid and in trade bolster the Mexican economy each year. It is time to talk turkey with Mexico and insist on her putting an end to this pipeline of subversives.

This Nation has embarked in a massive foreign aid program in Latin America—the Alliance for Progress. The whole foundation for foreign aid program is to halt the progress of communism throughout the world. It occurs to me that a prerequisite of this aid should be cessation of trade with Cuba. What better way to fight communism?

If all of the members of the Organization of American States will not go along with this simple two-point program, then I suggest it is time to separate the wheat from the chaff—let us extend the hand of friendship and of aid to our friends and withdraw it from those who prefer to flirt with Castro and communism.

I say further that when we assume a role of clear-cut leadership in this hemisphere against Castro and communism, we will find the Organization of American States and its individual members rallying to our cause.

The Latins respect strength. We had no trouble getting their unanimous support during World War II against the Nazi-Axis aggression. Nor will we now in 1963 against the Communist goal of world conquest, if we will but assume the role of leadership in this hemisphere.

Most of the Latin American nations are openly and solidly with us, despite the Cuban fiasco. The rest will be with us when we start acting more like the great world power that we are.

I have not sought here to probe the many other measures that could be taken.

I have sought to point out that the Organization of American States can be an effective weapon in this cold war with communism in Cuba.

The Organization of American States is like a fertile field waiting eagerly the planting of the seeds of leadership. Let the United States plant these seeds of leadership, and reap the harvest of a strong hemisphere, free from foreign, Communist domination.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I join with my colleagues in bringing attention to the most serious international problem facing this Nation. It also is with great hope that I associate myself with this bipartisan group of eminent statesmen—hope that a solution presented here today will be accepted and vigorously implemented.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I feel the word "hope" is the key to our dangerous predicament. By our spectacular failure to oppose the admission of Hungary's totalitarian Communist regime into the United Nations, we snatched hope away from the oppressed peoples of Eastern Europe as though the torch of freedom had suddenly disappeared from the upraised hand of Our Lady of New York Harbor, the Statue of Liberty.

Likewise, this country's obvious acceptance of a totalitarian Communist regime in Cuba, crowned by the extreme measure of even hampering the operations of Cuban freedom fighters, has tarnished the hope held by Western European countries in NATO to say nothing of the hopes of the Cuban people. To me there is little wonder that the much maligned President of France, Charles de Gaulle, has seen fit to involve his country in unilateral defense preparations. Whether this attitude is warranted by the facts is debatable. But the image of the United States as the great hope for the defense of freedom-loving peoples has been tarnished, and President de Gaulle is understandably alarmed.

This great Nation has led the tide for freedom and self-determination from the days of our colonial patriots. But now there are grave doubts in the minds of free peoples as to whether we are still leading this cause, whether we still are waving the banner of hope to those who are captives behind the Iron Curtain, whether we have traded total peaceful victory of freedom in exchange for appeasement of communism as it steadily takes over the world.

Mr. Speaker, there have been many proposed solutions to the problem of Cuba. Some of them tread on dangerous ground. Others are reasonable economic and political sanctions that could lead to gradual, peaceful rejection of communism in this hemisphere. I need not go into their provisions in detail here, but I will wholeheartedly pledge myself here and now to support and work for the enactment of any reasonable legislation that will restore the United States, in the eyes of the world, as the leader of freedom.

May I call the attention of this honorable body to the list of at least 22 measures aimed at the Cuban situation. I think that it is pertinent to note at this point that although this legislation is authored by our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, the administration has seen fit to give them the cold shoulder. For the sake of brevity, I will summarize their subject matter very briefly now, but will place their numbers and description in the RECORD for the convenience of the Members.

Monroe Doctrine: House Joint Resolutions 227, 237, and 278 would express the determination of the United States to implement the Monroe Doctrine.

Liberation of Cuba: House Joint Resolutions 229, 250, and 310 call for the liberation of Cuba by whatever action necessary and House Concurrent Resolution 22 also calls for release of U.S. citizens imprisoned in Cuba.

Bay of Pigs: Senate Resolution 54 and House Concurrent Resolutions 51 and 82 would authorize studies of the Bay of Pigs invasion.

Economic sanctions: Senate Resolution 83 asks support for a free world embargo on Soviet shipments to Cuba; House Joint Resolution 244 urges the President to notify recipients of U.S. aid that general trade with Cuba will result in termination of such aid; H.R. 2657 and H.R. 3954 would prohibit the shipment in commerce of articles imported from Cuba; Senate Concurrent Resolution 31 urges closing the Panama Canal to shipments of war material to Cuba; H.R. 2423 and H.R. 2494 would set the U.S. policy that foreign vessels used in trade with Cuba and certain other Communist countries may not carry cargoes under U.S. programs; House Concurrent Resolution 146 proposes that the United States urge the Organization of American States to impose economic sanctions against Cuba; House Joint Resolution 302 provides for reductions of future U.S. contributions to certain special aid programs of the United Nations if aid thereunder is given to Cuba.

Cuban refugees: House Concurrent Resolution 150 would establish a Cuban National Council as a rallying point for Cuban refugees and as a legal organization with which the United States and other countries could deal; House Joint Resolution 318 would create a Commission on Cuban Refugees to study the refugee problem and to relocate them throughout the United States.

Soviet military occupation: House Resolution 290 asks the Organization of American States and the United Nations to join the United States in demanding Soviet military withdrawal from Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, some of these proposals may constitute a solution, or an approach to a solution, to this serious encroachment into the Western Hemisphere. The solution may be among other proposals made to this body. Whatever it is, it must restore this Nation's prestige among our friends and the respect of our adversaries. It must elevate us again as the shining example of self-government for all nations, old and new, to emulate. And by our own individual example, we can show the freedom-loving peoples of the world how to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps, like many of us here on this floor have done.

I have anxiously joined with my colleagues in this call for action on Cuba, Mr. Speaker. I am sure your mail shows, as mine does, that the American public is concerned with the administration's lack of policy and lack of action in this matter. How long can we afford a policy of inaction and still remain secure?

The hope of freedom-loving people throughout the world hinges on our providing the answer. It is time to move.

Let us show these friends that Uncle Sam still possesses a little guts and determination in carrying out our expected role of leadership.

The following bills have been introduced in the 88th Congress, 1st session concerning Cuba:

Senate Resolution 54, GOLDWATER: Authorizes a study of the facts surrounding the Bay of Pigs invasion. January 23, 1963.

House Concurrent Resolution 51, MINSHALL: Authorizes a study of the facts surrounding the Bay of Pigs invasion. January 24, 1963.

House Concurrent Resolution 82, MINSHALL: Establishes a special joint committee to conduct a full and complete study to determine the facts concerning the Bay of Pigs invasion. February 5, 1963.

House Concurrent Resolution 22, PEPPER: Expresses the sense of the Congress with respect to citizens of the United States now unlawfully imprisoned in Cuba and the liberation of Cuba from the curse of Castro and communism. January 9, 1963.

Senate Resolution 83, MAGNUSON and MORSE: Expresses the sense of the Senate to support the American merchant marine's efforts to obtain a free-world embargo on Soviet shipments to Cuba. February 6, 1963.

House Joint Resolution 227, CRAMER: Expresses the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba, to restate and implement the Monroe Doctrine, and to encourage adherence to the principles of self-determination and human freedom. February 4, 1963.

House Joint Resolution 229, JOHANSEN: Expresses the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba. February 4, 1963.

House Joint Resolution 237, FULTON of Pennsylvania: Expresses the determination of the Congress that the United States maintain, implement and enforce the Monroe Doctrine throughout the Western Hemisphere. February 7, 1963.

House Joint Resolution 244, WATSON: Urges the President of the United States to advise all nations receiving aid under the foreign assistance acts that further commerce by such nations with Cuba in commodities—humanitarian items excepted—will result in termination of such aid. February 7, 1963.

House Joint Resolution 250, WILLIAMS: Expresses the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba. February 11, 1963.

House Joint Resolution 278, HARSHA: Expresses the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba, to restate and implement the Monroe Doctrine and to encourage adherence to the principles of self-determination and human freedom. February 25, 1963.

House Joint Resolution 310, WYMAN: Expresses the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba. March 6, 1963.

House Resolution 290, PEPPER: Calls upon the Organization of American States and the United Nations to join the United States in demanding the Soviet Union to remove its armed forces from Cuba. March 11, 1963.

House Concurrent Resolution 150, WALLHAUSER: Expresses the sense of Congress that the President should provide for the establishment of a Cuban National Council. The Council would first provide a rallying point for the Cuban refugees in the Western Hemisphere; second, provide an effective legal instrument through which the United States and interested Latin American governments could offer material and financial aid, in the fight to regain freedom for Cuba; third, provide a focal point of communication with the freedom-loving fighters still carrying on inside Cuba; fourth, assure the Cuban people and the world that the United States is not accepting the Castro government as the permanent Government of Cuba; and fifth, lay the legal basis for domestic support for the activities of the Cuban refugees. May 8, 1963.

House Joint Resolution 318, PEPPER: Cuban Refugee Commission Act. Establishes a commission known as the Commission on Cuban Refugees, composed of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Commerce, to conduct a program of relocation of the refugees from Cuba in Florida to other parts of the United States and to conduct a study of this problem. March 11, 1963.

House Concurrent Resolution 146, ROGERS of Florida: Expresses the sense of the Congress that the United States should propose to the OAS that certain economic sanctions be taken against the Communist Government of Cuba. May 2, 1963.

H.R. 2657, DEVINE: Prohibits the shipment in commerce of articles imported into the United States from Cuba. January 24, 1963.

H.R. 3954, HEMPHILL: Prohibits the shipment in commerce of articles imported from Cuba and prohibits introduction into commerce any article intended for export to Cuba. February 21, 1963.

House Joint Resolution 302, MONTOYA: Provides for reductions of future United States contributions to certain special aid programs of the United Nations if aid thereunder is furnished to Cuba. March 4, 1963.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, SCOTT: Expresses the sense of Congress on closing the Panama Canal to ships carrying war materiel to Cuba. March 14, 1963.

H.R. 2423, PELLY: Declares as the policy of the United States that foreign vessels which trade with Cuba or certain other Communist countries may not participate in the carrying of cargoes under programs of the United States. January 21, 1963.

H.R. 2494, GARMATZ: Same as H.R. 2423. January 24, 1963.

H.R. 7687, ROGERS of Florida: Purpose to close U.S. ports to the ships of any nation which allows any of its ships to be used in sea trade with Cuba.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE].

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding me time, and I wish to join my colleague in extending thanks to the men on both sides of the aisle who have obviously worked long hours in preparing for this presentation this afternoon.

I think we all recognize and probably anticipate that any time you get close to touching paydirt the "babysitters of past error" are going to rise in wrath. Any time you get close to putting your finger on what has been wrong and to making firm recommendations about what should be done the cry will be raised by those whom I choose to call the "babysitters of error" that you are urging the paths that will lead to war. I think you all anticipated this in advance and expected it.

The fact remains that those who have studied the pattern of Communist operation worldwide were most disturbed in a prior administration by some of the action or lack of action or misdirected action that laid the groundwork for Castro to take power in Cuba.

The time has come when we must have some of the type of operation we have had this afternoon, where men on both sides of the aisle are willing to clearly and forcefully come up with proposals as you gentlemen have done, and in addition to that are going to have to be willing to analyze without animosity between us the errors in the past. Certainly if we are going to propose programs that have any chance of being put into action it is essential that we understand why the failures took place before.

I think it is important as well to recognize that while I know the center of attraction this afternoon is based on Cuba, communism in Cuba is only an extension of a worldwide operation that has been going on for a long time, and I know there is not a person present this afternoon who is not aware of that.

The mere elimination of Castro from Cuba under any guise of an operation of agreement would be hardly satisfactory; and there have been rumblings here and there that there might be a possibility of Castro, perhaps, either removing himself or being removed. We can settle for nothing less than the elimination of a Communist dictatorship under any other name as well as Castro in Cuba.

One of the points which I thought was well made this afternoon was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] who pointed out that to this day the United States has still to establish clearly the intent of winning the cold war. This, I think, is the key; and while we might have a temporary victory in an isolated spot, unless there is a coordinated program that brings together the divergent areas of policy aimed at establishing victory in the cold war, the entire survival of the free world is, indeed, in jeopardy.

I will say I view with apprehension certain aspects of policy when one of the most prominent spokesmen in the other body not once but twice will rise before the public and say, What would we do with victory once we achieved it? The essential ingredient that is necessary is a policy aimed at victory over a force that is composed of three basic elements. The Communist operation is not just military. It is first of all a faith. It is, secondly, flesh, and it is, third, force. Any policy that does not take into cognizance all these phases of communism is doomed to fail. Castro did not come to power in Cuba by force alone. He came to power primarily because he was a Communist and he utilized the faith of the Communists together with the flesh. The missionaries of communism throughout the world, including those in the United States, sold a false line to non-Communists on the virtues of Castro. Castro used the faith and the flesh to reach a position where he could impose the force. Because we failed to combat the faith; because we failed to recognize the manipulation and the operation of the flesh, the force was allowed to gain a position where it could be imposed.

Again let me commend the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER], and all of the rest of my colleagues who have spoken. May I commend them for their fine work this afternoon. Keep it up.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND].

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and a pleasure to participate in this special order. I would like to commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER], and others who have arranged this discussion as a bipartisan effort to crystallize thought and inspire constructive action. My remarks shall be addressed to but one phase of this many faceted problem: "The Cuban Caves," which, to me, present a good example of the necessity of facts in facing a complicated matter. Facts coupled with firmness and sound judgment can go a long way toward solving complex problems.

Last winter when the great debate was raging as to whether or not the missiles had been removed from Cuba, it occurred to me it would be wise to find out if there was any place in Cuba where missiles could be hidden. On February 28 I called to the attention of the House a letter I had received from the Library of Congress in answer to my inquiry concerning the presence of caves in Cuba. I was surprised to find out that this was the first direct inquiry that had been made. I was also surprised to find that in the Library of Congress there was remarkably little information about the presence and size and location of caves in Cuba. It seemed strange to me then and it seems strange to me now that in a situation where we had complete access to the caves in Cuba for many, many years, our intelligence had not thought to look into such an important strategic potential which could be used contrary to the interests of our country.

Again, on March 7 of this year, I called to the attention of the House that although the Library of Congress did not have much information on caves in Cuba, this apparently had been a matter which had concerned Army intelligence. Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch, testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee, actually stated there were indeed innumerable caves, in fact, countless thousands of caves in Cuba. He went on to point out that they were definitely large enough and suitable for storing military weapons, including missiles. He also revealed that aerial reconnaissance indicated roads recently built to known cave locations.

Mr. Speaker, at that time I called on the people of this country who might have knowledge of Cuban caves to send their information to the Library of Congress. It is interesting to note that as a result of this, many people indeed did send the Library of Congress information picked up over the years either as sightseers or archeologists or engineers working or visiting in Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, on March 11 the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cederberg] inserted in the Record stories which appeared in the Chicago Tribune and Manchester Union-Leader, concerning this matter of Cuban caves and some of the response which had resulted from my previous insertions in the Record.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, on April 1 of this year I inserted in the Record an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post on the secret caves of Cuba. This editorial wrapped up information then existing and pointed out the highly significant fact it was possible for some caves, fronting on the ocean, to contain submarine pens. There has been additional information since then which would lead us to believe this is so.

Mr. Speaker, when I inserted that editorial from the Saturday Evening Post I called to the attention of my colleagues the fact that this information had been sent to me by my friend, Ambassador Robert C. Hill, a constituent of mine who lives in Littleton, N.H. I think it is important to remember that Ambassador Hill, when Ambassador to Mexico, was not fooled by the Castro regime or the bearded demagog who heads it.

Had the Ambassador's earlier warnings been heeded many of the mistakes made since might well have been avoided.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to cite a few additional facts which I think my colleagues should have. As a result of a recent questionnaire which I sent to my constituents, I am convinced that most of them are not satisfied with this administration's policy toward Cuba. I am also convinced of the fact that the American people dismiss as unwarranted the suggestion that those of us who are criticizing present policies toward Cuba are warmongers calling for an open invasion of Cuba. There are many effective measures (and many of them have been well detailed here this afternoon) that can and should be adopted which in no way involve direct military action.

Working much more closely with the OAS and bringing to bear the full economic power at our disposal is certainly one course of action that has not been vigorously pursued, and certainly should be.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. MARSH. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I met with Ambassador Hill when he was here in Washington recently. He indicated that if we employ our full economic power and engage in skillful and concerted action through the OAS, the Castro regime could be brought to terms and brought down without the use of military force.

Mr. Speaker, we hear so often the unfounded criticism that those of us who challenge the wisdom of our present Cuban policy are warmongers calling for open invasion. We are accused of spoiling America's international image.

It is becoming increasingly clear that a lack of firmness, vacillation, and lack of well-defined and well-prepared policy is what is really damaging our image.

Mr. MARSH. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons].

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding to me. I join with those speakers today who have taken a bipartisan approach to this great American problem. This problem of how to win the minds and hearts of the people of this world to the idea of freedom that is best expressed in our American Revolution.

Mr. Speaker, we are not here in this Congress to write history or to criticize history. We are here to try to understand history and to make history. It is in this spirit of making history that we should frame our remarks and continue our discussions. That is our responsibility. Let us leave the history writing to the historians.

To sum up briefly some of the things we can do short of armed conflict to rid Cuba of Castroism and communism, let me say first of all as a broad title we can cut off trade with Cuba. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers] and myself and quite a few others have introduced legislation that would call for the closing of all American ports to ships of any country that persist in trading with Cuba. I think all of us would see that immediately that would place upon our friends such as Great Britain who since the first of this year had 41 ships visit Cuba, some 13 of which were large tankers, the choice of whether they, the British, wanted to trade with us or trade with the Castro Communists. Of course, the answer to that would be easy. They would want to trade with us.

Thereby, we would throw the burden of supporting Communists upon those who should support it, their advocates, the Russians. I believe stretched as the Russian economy is that throwing this additional burden upon them of supporting Cuba would in time bring about the downfall of Cuba.

It would also serve to weaken the cause of Russian communism. We can also cut down Cuban trade by inserting provisions in future legislation that no country that continues to trade with the Communists will receive any foreign aid. We can close the gates of the Panama Canal to those who persist in trading with Cuba. We can insist that those countries who continue to fly airplanes into Cuba will no longer receive any foreign aid and that they no longer be permitted to trade with us. Also we can in Central and South America expand our educational and our cultural exchange program. We need to do this. We have been woefully neglectful in this area.

We can convert the technique and principles we have developed in selling our products throughout the world to selling this idea of freedom by expanding the operations of the USIA and other programs of this kind. In short, Mr. Speaker, there are many avenues of approach to the defeat of Cuban communism that we can and must follow. It is the responsibility of this Congress to make a vigorous start.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Weaver] for a period not to exceed 15 minutes.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, today we have presented a coordinated bipartisan congressional review and recommendations on the cold war as it applies to Cuba. The problem has been communism in Cuba in respect to the Western Hemisphere. We have sought informally, with individualistic approaches, solutions so that we might eliminate communism from Cuba and this hemisphere.

The review and recommendations made have included the following basic points:

First. U.S. action.

Second. Role of the Organization of American States.

U.S. ACTION

I. Punta del Este Resolution No. 2: It is apparent that we in the United States must develop a determined and immediate liberationist policy to eradicate communism from Cuba. This we must make evident not only in the United States but to the people of Latin America. The Monroe Doctrine has been discussed as to its reevaluation and application to the Cuban situation.

One of the more important additional actions which it is felt could be made is through reassertion of the Punta del Este Resolution No. 2. The implementation of this resolution, developed by the OAS nations, makes a firm commitment of American policy in relation to the Sino-Soviet bloc in Cuba. We feel under this resolution there is an opportunity for positive action which will show leadership as well as cooperation to the Latin American nations.

II. Economic blockade: There is a growing feeling for an all-out economic blockade of Cuba in which all U.S. ports of entry—air and sea—shall be closed to any nation dealing with the island country. The closing of the Panama Canal to Cuba and other countries dealing with them has been reemphasized. We must, likewise, persist in asking our Western Allies to desist from their dealing with Castro. A blockade of oil shipments of all nations to Cuba has been proposed.

III. Foreign aid program: Restrictions have been proposed on U.S. foreign aid to countries dealing with Cuba. This means that congressional foreign aid amendments will place restrictions on monetary, economic, and other forms of foreign aid to any country which deals with Castro.

IV. Provisional Cuban Government: It is evident that we need some means of coordinated information and action relating to the restoration of Cuba to democracy. Some feel that the recognition of a well-balanced and representative provisional government could be this focal point for the Cuban people.

Through this organization we can help develop the principles of our traditional policy of nonintervention and of self-determination for Cubans and all other subjugated countries in the Western Hemisphere. I label Russia an aggressor and a Castro ally. We feel that all forms of internal revolution could be aided by such a provisional government through the development of good will, creation of military forces, establishment of a program of sabotage, the setting up of rebel bases on adjoining islands, and the formation of a radio-free-Cuba.

If such a provisional government is set up it would include not only those in exile from Cuba but also those in absentia who are leading the attack from within the island. Thusly, we can help to prepare for the development of a proper democratic atmosphere for post-Castro Cuba.

V. Military surveillance: It is essential that our low-level, U-2, and high-level plane surveillance continue so that we can be prepared to meet any threat to our Nation. We feel the CIA can be more effectively used. We need constantly improving security maintenance and intelligence information. On-site missile inspection policy in Cuba has been advocated. Of additional importance is psychological warfare aimed at Soviet and Cuban troops to counteract this type of cold warfare which the Communists have used relentlessly.

VI. Western Hemisphere economic aid and education programs for underdeveloped countries: The U.S. cultural leadership and exchange programs for Western Hemisphere nations should be maintained. Students, educators, scientific and technical personnel should continue to be exchanged. The development of democratic educational processes can be then carried out in these nations. I personally have been impressed by the Peace Corps teachers as well as privately sponsored teachers and their potential in the education systems of the Western Hemisphere countries. The great need for teachers due to the 50-percent illiteracy rate in many of the Western Hemisphere countries must be filled by us or the vacuum will be filled by Communists.

It is apparent that the Alliance for Progress with its high motives and its great beginning needs a modification of its role. It must be reoriented in order to carry out what is being discussed here. We must fully utilize communication medias for this program.

VII. Freedom academies: Freedom academies have been proposed—one in the United States and the other in Latin America. These academies can serve the purpose of preparing leaders and the people for the psychological impact of the fourth dimensional warfare we now face in the cold war.

VIII. Kennedy-Khrushchev correspondence: The correspondence between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev during and following the October confrontation should be published to put to rest the rumors and misunderstanding in the Western Hemisphere and the world over the contents of these communications. There have been allegations of a deal having been made over Cuba.

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Proposals have been made concerning the OAS. A cooperative embargo could be placed on shipping and travel to and from Cuba to prevent exportation of Communist subversion to the Western Hemisphere. This would eliminate use of Little Cayman, Grand Cayman, and other Caribbean islands for bases in Castro's scheme of exporting subversion to other Latin American countries.

The Alliance for Progress must not be considered as a substitute to direct military opposition to communism.

We should support democratic Latin American States. We should aid exiles of Communist or neo-Communist states. We should give a definitive U.S. policy and leadership to the OAS. We must show that we have the virility and the gumption to carry on a decent leadership in cooperation with other nations. We could urge the OAS to set up a quarantine of Cuba similar to that applied to the Dominican Republic under Trujillo. We could urge all Latin American nations to break off their relations with Cuba and withdraw recognition of Cuba. We feel an OAS task force could be established similar to NATO—perhaps a Latin American Treaty Organization.

This would combine all democratic nations who, like us, have the determination to keep this continent free from communism. They could act as a policing organization in conjunction with the U.S. forces. This would illustrate to these nations our willingness to cooperate and be a part of the united effort.

Today, we have also seen a comprehensive review of the bills before Congress relating to Cuba. As you will note, there are many bills. Few have come before committees or the Congress as a body. It is time we coordinated the actions of these bills. It is time that the legislative branch of Government shows leadership in finding solutions to the Cuban and cold war problems.

CONCLUSION

Today, a little over 10 years since the Moncada operation in Cuba, we stand here as Members of Congress discussing the cold war in Cuba. We realize that Communists have a bastion on this island. We feel we can remove communism from there by means short of armed intervention by the United States. The alternatives are not peaceful coexistence or nuclear war. We have seen the results of appeasement in the past in the era of Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo. We see the threat of such a philosophy now with British Guiana, Venezuela, Brazil, all on the threshold of capitulation to communism.

We recognize that there is risktaking involved, but the risks will be greater if we continue to procrastinate in eliminating Castro.

Action on Cuba would not split the OAS. We feel, rather, it would tend to unite Latin America behind us as they have united on other occasions, particularly in the missile crisis of October 1962. What divides these nations from us is our own indecision and inaction. This, in turn, promotes similar indecision and inaction everywhere in the hemisphere, leaving a vacuum. Our action on Cuba should reaffirm to those who are behind the Communist wall in Latin America and elsewhere that it is the policy of nonintervention and self-determination that we advocate.

The Soviets in Cuba are the interveners. They are the interlopers, the imperialists. Our objective is to give the Cubans an opportunity to express their own self-determination in national sovereignty, free of foreign domination. Under international agreements now in existence, the Rio Treaty of 1947 provided for collective self-defense. The Caracas Declaration of 1954 specifically was directed at Communists and now Resolution No. 2 of Punta del Este, 1962, is our latest and most specific of all. It carries another step forward to the idea of collective self-defense contained in the Rio Treaty. It has been buried away by officialdom. We urge the administration to implement this resolution.

Finally, speaking from the floor of Congress, we who are Congressmen from both sides of the aisle, say to the people of America that the legislative branch of Government has not deserted Cuba, but is actively, deeply interested in the restoration of Cuba to the democratic nations. We from both sides of the aisle speaking here today likewise say to those of you behind the Communist curtain of Cuba, you who have suffered, you who are fighting for democracy and feel neglected, that we are with you, that we will do all that we can to see that you are restored to your rightful place of self-determination in your government.

We have not forgotten you. We not only want a free Cuba but we are determined to help it become free. We also say to all the nations of the Western Hemisphere that Members of the Congress are anxious and eager to develop a determined coordinated leadership by the United States. Through such a plan and policy the United States can join with you to keep this hemisphere free from communism.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, as we draw to a close the special order that has been devoted to Cuba as well as the special order that preceded it of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER], I should like to thank those on both sides of the aisle who participated in this discussion in order to present a bipartisan approach to a very serious problem in the Caribbean that is really only a part of a larger problem, a worldwide problem that indicates the scope and thrust of Soviet aggression and their desire for world domination through the international Communist movement.

I might point out that America has a brilliant history in the conduct of psychological warfare. In the American

Revolution certainly some of the finest examples of effective psychological warfare operations were waged under the direction of such men as Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin. In the American Revolution the psychological warfare effort that was aimed at the members of the Hessian forces that fought under George III in the colonies was highly effective in causing desertions in the Hessian ranks.

It is very vital and necessary that we undertake a similar psychological warfare effort directed at the members of the Soviet military forces stationed on the Cuban island. Certainly this Nation that is expert in marketing and in communication can package and tell the story of the American Revolution, can create and foment unrest in the Soviet ranks and make it extremely difficult for the warlords of the Kremlin to maintain the esprit de corps and the morale of their forces in the Cuban island. It is vitally necessary we undertake such an effort aimed at subversion of the Russian troops in Cuba themselves. But even more, this effort must also be directed at labeling the Soviet Union as being the real interventionist in Latin American affairs, in labeling the Soviet Union as being the first and foremost colonial power of the twentieth century, and we must remind the people of Latin America that this colonial power that now holds Cuba also holds in the Red grip the satellite nations of Europe, that it is the Soviet Union that is denying the right of self-determination to not just the citizens of Cuba but indeed from the citizens of the satellite countries of Europe, that it is the Soviet Union that has made Cuba indeed a captive nation.

These are some of the things that we must undertake, some of the things we must do in the days and months ahead. Certainly it is our task and obligation to be certain that we preserve for our posterity the blessings of liberty. It is the obligation of the American citizens to be certain that the 20th century does not go by default to the heirs of Ghengis Khan. It shall be in this decade that we shall have cast the die of the image of society. I submit to you that no die should be cast other than the die that is in the image of the American Republic.

Ultimately the price that will be paid as the price to purchase freedom for the people who walk the streets of Havana will be the price Americans are willing to pay, but I am convinced that American citizens are willing to pay that price, that they support the declaration of October 1962, wherein it was stated that we are determined to prevent by whatever means are necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist ideas being extended throughout this hemisphere and so endangering the liberties of the peoples of the Americas. We intend to join with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination. The Cuban people are not enjoying this now because of the nature of the Communist regime which seeks to extend its slave empire, and seeks to do it by guerrilla warfare, espionage, and subversion.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD a statement from the Free Cuba News, a publication of the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba dated June 1, 1963, wherein this very able publication, a very sound and documented publication, points out the scope of the guerrilla effort extending from Cuba into the Latin Americas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this that the gentleman is going to insert in the RECORD and who prints it?

Mr. MARSH. It is pages 7 and 8 of the Free Cuba News.

Mr. HAYS. Who is the Free Cuba News? The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is supposed to be accurate. Have you any information that this is anything more than propaganda from a bunch of Cubans who have an ax to grind?

Mr. MARSH. Yes; I am convinced that it is something more than that. Its editor is Daniel James, the writer. There are members of the advisory committee such people as Adm. Arleigh Burke and other distinguished American citizens. It is simply a newsletter that is published on events occurring not only in Cuba but throughout the Latin American countries.

Mr. HAYS. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what bothers me a little bit is how fast people can get to be experts on this subject when the military that has devoted a lot of study to it does not seem to know all the answers. But some of these outsiders can in a few weeks get all the answers once they get on the payroll. I presume this writer that you are talking about is on somebody's payroll, and they can solve all the problems concerning Cuba and Russia and communism and what have you, just as long as somebody is giving them a paycheck. It is a little more difficult, I would point out to the gentleman from Virginia, when you are sitting in the driver's seat to make the decisions.

I am not going to object to the gentleman's request in this instance, Mr. Speaker, but I do point to the fact that there is a good deal of a possibility of putting things in the RECORD that do not have much real value and which are not very authentic. I am a little worried about putting in things from such organizations that must have an ax to grind—or they would not be in existence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Free Cuba News, June 1, 1963]

INSIDE LATIN AMERICA

CUBA OFFICIALLY PROMOTING SUBVERSION

Further evidence that the Cuban Government is openly promoting subversion in Latin America is provided by its delegate to the Fifth Labor Congress in Prague, which began May 1, where he told Communist bloc representatives that the Castro regime was dedicated to the task of overthrowing the existing governments of Latin America. The delegate, Benito Sanchez, declared that Communist Cuba was making an effort principally "to stimulate support for the people of Venezuela, Colombia and Nicaragua * * * with the aim of overthrowing the governments of those countries."

CASTRO CONSPIRACY IN ANDES

Fidel Castro made the boast not long after taking power in Cuba: "We shall convert the Cordillera of the Andes into the Sierra Maestra of South America." Stories of increasing Communist violence in the Andes, in recent weeks, indicate that the Cuban Communist dictator is making progress toward realizing his boast.

These Andean republics are feeling increasing Castro-Communist pressure:

Bolivia: This landlocked country at the "roof of South America," one of the five Latin republics that maintain diplomatic relations with Cuba, is a center of Communist arms running, espionage and subversion in the Andes. The Cuban Embassy in the capital of La Paz, according to our sources, supplies money and material aid to native and neighboring Communists. An elaborate chain of Communist way-stations, beginning in Chile, has one of its important terminuses in La Paz.

Chile: The capital of Santiago is reportedly the GHQ for Castro-Communist operations in the Andes. It is said to be headed up by two veteran Bulgarian Reds, Ivan Tenev and Konstantin Telalov, who are reportedly members of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party.

Tenev and Telalov are said to have set up a series of Red way-stations stretching into five neighboring countries: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Ecuador and Peru. Arms and money are funneled through the stations. Through Arica on the Chilean-Peruvian border, for example, arms are dispatched into Peru. The Arica station also connects up with La Paz, since it borders Bolivia, too.

The Cuban Embassy in Santiago, according to the Cuban Student Directorate, has more staff than its normal requirements call for and reportedly engages in the illicit arms traffic. It recently established a "Chilean-Cuban Cultural Institute" in Santiago, which is considered a front for other cultural activities.

Peru: The existence of the Communist chain of stations in the Andes came to light through a Peruvian colonel, G. C. Victor Zapata Cesti, who captured several Communist youths when they attacked Puerto Maldonado, in southeast Peru not far from Brazil, on May 20. Col. Zapata Cesti learned that the attack was part of a Castro-Communist plan to unleash guerrilla warfare, terror and sabotage upon the area, and to initiate similar operations against Lima, the national capital, and the ancient Inca center of Cuzco.

The Communist guerrillas captured by Col. Zapata Cesti were part of a group of 69 young Peruvians who had been to Cuba for 6 months of training in guerrilla war, terrorism and sabotage under the direction of Maj. Ernesto "Che" Guevara, Castro's guerrilla expert. The roundabout way they returned to Peru from Cuba exposed the operation of the Red way-stations.

The youngsters had gone to Havana via Arica, the Chilean border town, where they were picked up by Cubana Airlines. They were sent back, however, not to Arica, Chile, but Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. From Rio the group journeyed to Sao Paulo by truck, thence to Cochabamba, in southern Bolivia, by train. They then headed for Santa Cruz, and crossed into Peru through the Beni jungle. Once in Peru they made their way to a destination called Aposento Farm, where they hired a guide to take them through more jungle and finally on to Puerto Maldonado.

The leaders of the youthful Communist band appear to have come from good social backgrounds. One, Alain Elias, is the son of a Peruvian aviation hero, Capt. Renan

Elias, whose family is well-to-do. Another, Javier Heraud, who was killed, had studied at the Catholic University of Lima and had won a prize as Peru's best young poet.

Mr. MARSH. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that the insertion is along the lines of the Seldon subcommittee report on Cuba, describing it as a base for subversion and espionage and as a training ground for this real threat aimed and directed at our country and the Latin American countries.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues who have participated in this discussion for the contributions they have made here today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, because of the work I have done in the past in collecting and evaluating information on the Cuban situation, I am happy to participate in this discussion.

I have previously made several reports on the Cuban matter and would like to include excerpts from these reports.

On May 20, I spoke on the interim report of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Armed Services. The recently issued interim report of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Armed Services dealing with the Cuban military buildup throws light on hitherto obscure aspects of the Cuban situation during the summer and fall of 1962. Consequently, this unanimous report of a subcommittee composed of four Democrats and three Republicans is an important first step toward better understanding of the background of American policy during that crucial period. Its appraisal of past errors and present dangers sounds an emphatic warning to those responsible for formulating policy toward Cuba.

Perhaps the most valuable part of the subcommittee's report is the enumeration of 11 considerations that lead it to conclude that Cuba now represents a grave threat to our national security. This is a needed antidote to the plethora of statements from official and unofficial spokesmen of the administration designed to minimize, and divert attention from, the seriousness of the Cuban problem.

We hope that these words of the subcommittee's report—again the unanimous judgment of its members—will be heard throughout the land:

The matter of basic and fundamental importance * * * and the source of the real threat, is that international communism now has a firm foothold in this hemisphere and that, if we permit it to do so, it is here to stay.

By (a) process of erosion our neighbors to the south may fall nation by nation until the entire hemisphere is lost and the Communist goal of isolating the United States has been attained.

In a report dated June 16, I reviewed the history and implications of the Monroe Doctrine and urged a return to the positive policies of that doctrine:

Three years ago Khrushchev told the world that the Monroe Doctrine was dead, saying "the remains of this doctrine should be buried as every dead body is, so that it does not poison the air by its decay." The Eisenhower administration replied, "the principles of the Monroe Doctrine are as valid today as they were in 1823 when the doctrine was proclaimed." The Kennedy administration has so far failed to contradict Khrushchev either by word or by deed.

What is needed is the positive policy of the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine is being violated by the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba—whatever their strength, whatever the nature of their equipment.

The doctrine is being violated as long as there is any type of Soviet intervention in Cuba.

The removal of Soviet troops and the elimination of other types of Soviet intervention in Cuba is an urgent policy objective.

The ultimate objective of U.S. policy must be the elimination of the Communist regime in Cuba and its replacement by a government freely chosen by the Cuban people.

In another report of July 19, I listed nations now receiving U.S. economic and/or military assistance and still carrying on trade with Cuba:

In late September 1962, the administration announced that a four-point program of restrictions on free world ships involved in the Cuban trade would shortly be put in effect. The announcement was made after months of official indecision during which the volume of free world shipping to Cuba increased drastically and freed Communist ships for the transportation of military equipment to Castro. The administration noted on October 2, 1962, that two-thirds of the ships going to Cuba were free world ships.

The announcement that a four-point program of restrictions would be imposed was late. The restrictions proposed were inadequate. And down to the present day this announcement has remained an idle threat. The only restriction on free world ships so far imposed by the Government has been the totally ineffective ban on the transportation of Government-financed cargoes from United States ports on ships in the Cuban trade.

Finally, the administration has spurned the weapon placed in its hands by Public Law 87-872, the Foreign Aid Appropriations Act of 1963, which contains two restrictions which are being ignored.

The act flatly banned any United States aid to a "country which permits any ships under its registry to carry to Cuba petroleum" and certain other goods of a military or strategic character.

Tankers of the following free nations which are receiving aid from the United States have traveled to Cuba in the first 6 months of 1963: United Kingdom, Greece, Italy, and Norway.

Further, the act prohibited economic aid "to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry items of economic assistance to Cuba, unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest and reports such determination to the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives."

Economic aid is being furnished by the United States to countries apparently in violation of this provision of the law. Inquiry made of the staff of the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives discloses that the President has not submitted to these committees the required certification.

A substantial volume of trade between Cuba and the free world continues. The most recent reliable figures, covering the calendar year 1962, place it at $250 million or 20 percent of the entire foreign trade of Cuba. If goods for military use from the Communist bloc were eliminated from the totals, free world trade would constitute a significantly higher percentage of Cuban foreign trade.

The Government of the United States should pursue the following immediate objectives in its economic campaign against Communist Cuba:

1. Cessation of the use of free world ships to transport goods to and from Cuba.
2. Reduction of free world trade with Cuba to a negligible amount.
3. Curtailment of trade between Cuban and the Communist bloc and/or increase of the economic cost to the Communist world of supporting Castro.

The Government of the United States should take the action necessary to bring to a complete halt within the next 30 days the use of any free world ship to transport goods to or from Cuba. Such action is long overdue. Denial of free world shipping to Castro would deprive him of approximately 50 percent of the vessels that now sustain his faltering economy.

And last week, I and several of my colleagues addressed the following letter to the President in a further effort to impress those concerned with the seriousness of the Cuban matter of free world trade with Cuba.

JULY 24, 1963.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The undersigned Members of the House of Representatives respectfully urge that you take speedy action to bring to an end the use of free world ships in trade with Cuba.

We are shocked to find that as much as 50 percent of the goods that sustain the economy of Communist Cuba are carried in vessels flying the flags of free nations. In the first quarter of 1963 between one-third and 40 percent of the oil that was delivered to Cuba was brought there on free world tankers.

The announced objective of your administration is the isolation of the Communist regime in Cuba. This objective is being thwarted by the use of vessels under the control of nations which are our friends and allies. The effect of such measures as have been taken to put pressure on the Cuban economy by the United States is to a considerable degree nullified by this shipping.

It should be possible to end this traffic within the next 30 days. Since the problem is largely one of persuading two nations, the United Kingdom and Greece, to withdraw their vessels from Cuban trade, a firm request by the United States should suffice. If a request is not enough, we would favor closing the ports of this country to all vessels of any nation which permits any of its ships to carry goods to or from Cuba, directly or indirectly.

May we further invite your attention to section 107 of Public Law 87-872, the Foreign Aid Appropriations Act of 1963. In conformity with this section, Mr. Joseph W. Reap of the State Department informed the press on January 11 of this year that "aid shall be cut off to countries whose ships carry goods to Cuba." No action of the type promised by Mr. Reap has been taken.

You can be sure you will have the support of the overwhelming majority of the Members of the Congress in effective steps to terminate the use of free world ships in Cuban trade.

Yours respectfully,

James F. Battin, William C. Cramer, E. Ross Adair, John M. Ashbrook, Edward J. Derwinski, Samuel L. Devine, Durward G. Hall, Clark MacGregor, Garner E. Shriver, Members of Congress.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Weaver] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following material on Cuba:

[From the Washington Post, July 26, 1963]

Dark Decade

It is a suggestive coincidence that the 10th anniversary of Fidel Castro's rebellion comes in the same week that the United Nations is in pitched debate over colonialism. On July 26, 1953, when Castro led the abortive attack on a military barracks that gave his movement its name, the assault was in part prompted by nationalist ideals. Cubans resented their island's semicolonial status based on sheer proximity to the United States, a one-crop economy and a tradition of Yankee paternalism.

That form of indirect colonialism has ended, but what has taken its place? Ernesto Betancourt, once Castro's July 26 representative in Washington, points out elsewhere on this page that the very terms used by the Afro-Asians to arraign Portugal can be applied to Cuba today. No longer the insolent rebel, Castro has become an apologist for a foreign capital, and his people the exposed hostage of a distant country. This new relationship was made humiliatingly clear in Castro's June 6 report in Havana on his trip to Moscow—quite possibly the saddest and most fumbling oration of his career.

The phrases of honeyed adulation he used to describe Premier Khrushchev were worthy of an Ulbricht—after all, the Soviet leader was the man who first installed and then removed missiles in Cuba, in both instances treating the island as a satrap. On economic matters, Castro rebuffed with annoyance all specific questions from his servile press panel. World sugar prices have risen over the levels paid by the Soviet Union, yet incredibly, Castro said "it was not correct" to bring the matter up with the Russians. What would he have said to any Cuban who held out a hat rather than bargain with the United States on sugar prices?

In one passage, he remarked: "At this time, it can be said that the general situation of our country is one of security—a situation of security. Security against the danger which has been besetting us since the very outset of the revolution—of a direct invasion by the United States."

With this admission, Castro knocked the ideological prop from his totalitarian state. The prisons have been filled, neighborhood spy systems set up, newspaper freedom smothered, elections denied and Cubans mercilessly shot—all on the pretext that an invasion was imminent. If Cuba is secure, why must a Soviet garrison remain on the island? Why does Castro shift his military commands so nervously and keep weapons and ammunition locked up from his militia? Why did he appoint, last week, an Eastern European Communist, Fabio Grobart, as chief of operations of the rebel army?

In the decade since July 26, 1953, much has happened which can never be undone. It would be a cruel caricature of history to suggest that Castro was always a villain and this country always the spotless lamb. Castro now talks about reconciliation. But the first requisite is a demonstration that he really speaks for his people and that his regime is not pinned together with Soviet bayonets. As a beginning, why doesn't he grant his own people some of the freedom he so solemnly promised in years gone by?

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 25, 1963]

Bleak Anniversary

The betrayal began just 10 years ago tomorrow, and it began as a failure. A young man—a crypto-Communist named Fidel Castro—headed a group of equally young revolutionaries in an attack on the Moncada barracks in Santiago de Cuba. The attack, aimed at overthrowing the regime of Fulgencio Batista, was as unbelievably mismanaged as the so-called military operation that occurred a long time later at a placed called the Bay of Pigs.

Yet, despite its having been a fiasco costing scores of lives, the Moncada operation—carried out on July 26, 1953—was seized upon by Fidelistas as as inspirational event. Out of it came the "July 26 Movement," under which the Cuban people were led in due course to where they are today—in the iron grip of a Communist dictatorship. This is a despotism far worse than Batista's, which, whatever its vices, had the undeniable virtue of being anti-Red, pro-West, and highly sympatico with the United States.

It is interesting that Batista spared Fidel's life after the Moncada adventure. Certainly the situation in Cuba and the Western Hemisphere would be better today, less tense, happier, had Batista's regime dealt as harshly with Castro and his revolutionaries as those revolutionaries have dealt with Cubans who have sought to maintain their freedom. The Fidelistas, in any case, with their drumhead courts and their countless executions, have shown a degree of cruelty—of brutishness, of contempt for the most basic norms of justice and humanity—that has never before been experienced by the Cuban people.

Above all, these people have this to lament: The July 26 Movement, in the 10 years since its bloody setback at the Moncada barracks, has managed—not without the help of stupidities in our own country—to betray Cuba into becoming a captive of the Kremlin, which maintains about 20,000 troops and technicians on the island. The place thus is a Soviet satellite and a dangerous one. As such, it constitutes not only a thorn in the American side (or a bone in the throat, as Mr. Khrushchev would say), but also a depressing symbol of how inadequate our country can be in anticipating, evaluating and heading off just such threats as Castroism.

Thus, is a bleak anniversary that we mark. After a decade of existence, the Castro tyranny is worse than ever, and apparently more entrenched. If any bells are to be rung to mark the birthday, they should give out the sound of a tocsin for all the Americas.

Ten Years After Moncada

(Statement by Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, Inc., Washington, D.C.)

Ten years ago today, Fidel Castro led approximately 100 young Cubans in an attack on Moncada barracks, in eastern Oriente Province, in what turned out to be a futile attempt to overthrow the dictatorship of Gen. Fulgencio Batista. From that day on, July 26 became a symbol of freedom for the Cuban people, and the July 26 revolutionary movement which was founded 2 years later became the vehicle through which they hoped to win their freedom.

Now, a decade later, July 26 has gone down in Cuban annals as a day of infamy, and the movement named after it has been cruelly destroyed by its very founder and inspirer, Fidel Castro. Today, the Cuban people, instead of being free are enslaved by a despotism worse than Batista's, and the chief author of their enslavement is the same Castro who launched the Moncada attack avowedly to free them.

In the speech he made at his trial following Moncada, which was later published under the title of "History Will Absolve Me," Castro laid down eight major requirements for a free Cuban society. They included the necessity for holding free elections, a free press, individual freedom (the right of habeas corpus), the restoration of the democratic 1940 constitution (which Batista had set aside), an end to rule by force and violence, an end to despotism, the exercise of self-determination, and the practice of true national sovereignty.

Castro in power has failed to fulfill a single one of his own requirements as a revolutionary. On the contrary, he has utterly negated them and has imposed upon his unhappy country the most cruel and sanguinary dictatorship the Americas have ever seen. Only a few days ago, the date of Cuba's independence, May 20, 1902—equivalent to our Fourth of July—was eradicated from Cuban history by Government decree.

At his trial, Castro said: "Cuba should be the bulwark of liberty and not the shameful abode of despotism."

He added this ringing statement: "We were born in a free country willed to us by our fathers. The island will first sink into the sea before we will consent to be the slaves of anyone."

But Cuba is today a bulwark of despotism and Cubans the slaves of a foreign power. If Castro meant what he said in 1953, let him free Cuba from the domination of Soviet imperialism and its colonial arm, the Cuban Communist Party. If he is a true patriot, he will address himself at once to the overriding task of expelling from his country the foreign armed forces that now occupy it.

Let him also fulfill the pledges he made at his trial to fight for the holding of free elections, for establishment of a free press, and for defending all the rights of free individuals including the right to own property and the right to habeas corpus and trial by jury. Let him restore the democratic Constitution of 1940 which sanctified those and other rights, and upheld, in particular, the right of the Cuban worker to be free and to organize into trade unions of this own choosing headed by democratically elected leaders. Let Castro end the rule of terror which he once asked Batista to end, and which has claimed many thousands of lives and warped the minds and souls of a whole generation of Cubans. Let him end the despotism of the Communist police state he has imposed upon his people. Above all, let him permit the Cuban people to exercise their self-determination and national sovereignty, by expelling all Soviet and other foreign Communist armed forces and technicians from Cuba, and then prepare the way for truly free elections under the conditions he himself proposed during the Moncada trial.

If Castro lacks the courage and conviction to carry out his revolutionary ideals, let those of his followers who still believe in them join in a concerted struggle to do so. Let the old fighters of the July 26 movement now wage war against the worst tyranny Cuba has ever known.

The Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba calls attention to the fact that Cuba, under Castro, is a bristling fortress that menaces her Caribbean neighbors as well as the Cuban people themselves. Nearly 300,000 Cubans are today under arms, led by an estimated 30,000 to 40,000 Russians and other foreign Communists in Cuba as soldiers or military "technicians," notwithstanding Castro's many exhortations against "militarism" in the years before he took power.

In those years, he called for the "reorganization of the armed forces and the separation of same from political and partisan activities, so that the armed forces may never again be instruments of any caudillo (fuehrer) or political parties" (Aug. 20, 1958). But the Cuban armed forces today are the servant of the Communist caudillo, Castro, and of a foreign political party.

Today, these forces are employed internally to suppress the rebellious people of Cuba. But, tomorrow, they may be exported to overwhelm weaker Latin countries in revolutionary warfare.

Castro justifies the militarization of Cuba on the grounds that he must defend himself against Cuban exile plots. But one must ask, Why are there exiles in the first place? Let the Castro of the Moncada period answer:

"Those tens of thousands of families away from Cuba constitute a grave accusation against the bad governments that the Republic has had to tolerate. We say that the problem of Cuba will be solved when the exiles can return."

How much graver is the accusation against Castro himself when one considers that, at the latest estimate, some 350,000 Cubans have had to flee their country because of his tyranny. Another 230,000 Cubans have passports and visa waivers, but lack transportation. Still another 385,000 are trying to get their immigration papers into shape. The flight of Cubans since Castro took power has no parallel in the history of the Western Hemisphere.

To add to the misery of the Cuban people under Castro, an estimated 7,000 of them have been executed by firing squads alone since he came to power, and at least 3,000 more have been killed in battle against his forces. Probably many thousands more have died in silent engagements with the secret police, the armed forces, and perhaps also the Russian occupation army. Another 80,000 to 100,000 languish in prisons and concentration camps and have doubtless given up their quota of dead to the all-consuming dictatorship.

On this 10th anniversary of the Moncada attempt, it is well to know that the full story of it has yet to be told and that authorities are still trying to piece it together and unravel the tangled skein that continues to obscure much of Fidel Castro's past.

Castro has always said publicly that he launched the Moncada attack to overthrow Batista. But there are those who contend that, rather, Castro knew in advance it would fail and deliberately intended to sacrifice lives—those of others, not his own or his brother's—in an effort to lift himself from obscurity to the national spotlight.

The famous Cuban historian and onetime University of Havana professor, Dr. Herminio Portell Vila, relates that Castro told him just before the Moncada attempt that if it involved producing a few muertecitos—"little corpses"—to obtain recognition of his leadership in the anti-Batista struggle, so be it. Neither Castro nor his younger brother Raul intended to be among the muertecitos, continues Dr. Portell Vila, because they had planned not to be in the line of fire during the attack. They took precautions, he points out, not out of cowardice but for coldly calculated political reasons.

In August 1955, Fidel Castro founded the July 26 revolutionary movement, and used it as the means to attain power. Although its public image was that of an amorphous, democratic movement composed chiefly of young students, professionals, and members of the middle class, inside it there functioned a tiny, secret group of Communists and Communist sympathizers who exercised iron control. That group was headed by the Castro brothers and Ernesto "Che" Guevara, the Argentine Communist who is now Cuba's Minister of Industry. Not long after taking power, the Castro-Guevara group began systematically destroying the July 26 movement, and today it is no more; it has been supplanted by the official United Party of the Socialist Revolution, the formal name of Cuba's Communist Party.

Today is a day of mourning in Cuba, when it should have been a day of happiness. But the Cuban people have known before, during times of struggle against other tyrannies, how to conquer adversity, and the day is not distant when that traditionally freedom-loving people will cast out their new oppressors and install a truly free government on their island once and for all.

The Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba calls upon all Americans to do everything possible to enable the Cuban people to win their freedom. For the cause of a free Cuba is, in the last analysis, the cause of a free America.

DR. POSSONY DEMOLISHES THE OVERKILL ARGUMENT

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on June 17 the American Security Council's Washington Report carried a remarkably perceptive article by Dr. Stefan T. Possony which breaks directly on our military security, particularly in light of the proposed partial test ban treaty. The article is as follows:

Overkill Sophistry

(By Dr. Stefan T. Possony)

Among the gibberish which nowadays passes for strategic nomenclature, the word "overkill" had made a remarkable career. Originally, this term meant that too much nuclear yield was assigned to a specific target. The problam was never considered to be too significant: If the target were a city, the whole city was aimed at anyway, and the surplus yield would have been absorbed by the town's uninhabited environs. Similarly, if the target were an isolated military installation, the surplus yield would do no harm. Hence, "overkill" can result in unintended casualties only if there were an attempt to destroy specific targets within cities. If the yield placed upon an urban oil refinery, for example, were too large, the surrounding population would be killed.

With present types of nuclear weapons, a strategy of selective bombing does not seem feasible. In the future, discriminating weapons might change the situation, and clean weapons, of all yields, would considerably reduce casualties resulting from fallout. Yet nuclear progress is being hampered by the very people who are worrying about "overkill."

Recently, Seymour Melman, of Columbia University, presented a strategic overkill argument. On the basis of remarkable arithmetic, Mr. Melman thinks that almost $23 billion can be cut from the present defense budget without impairing present capabilities: Procurement would be reduced from 16 to 10 billion; research, development and tests would be cut by 97 percent; atomic energy by 69 percent; and military construction, civil defense, and military assistance would be eliminated entirely. With about 3,400 delivery vehicles carrying about 22,000 megatons, the United States allegedly can "overkill" the Sino-Soviet bloc by 500 times, and the Soviet Union by 1,250 times. Our global overkill capability is 125 times, supposedly. How come? There are 2,000 cities with a population of over 100,000 each and a total population of 600 million including 370 cities in the bloc and 140 cities in the Soviet Union. At Hiroshima 100,000 persons were killed by a 20-kiloton weapon. If 30 percent of the U.S. delivery means fail to reach their targets, we would drop 2.5 megatons on each slice of 100,000 urban people. Thus, since only 20 kilotons are required to wipe them out, we would "overkill" these target populations by 125 times; similar arithmetic "discloses" our overkill capabilities against the Communists.

It is not explained whether the "overkill" makes any difference to the casualties. Whether a soldier is killed by a bullet or a 16 inch "overkill" shell, hardly is a cause of worry. Reducing the average yield from 2.5 megatons to 20 kilotons, far from saving anything, would be quite expensive. To preserve adequate assurance of hit, as yield is being reduced, the number of shots would have to be increased. For example, against a 5 PSI target and with an accuracy of 3,000 feet CEP, 4 missiles with 20-kiloton warheads would have to be launched to achieve full assurance of destruction, or 2 missiles to achieve a probability of 92 percent. With a 2-megaton warhead, just one missile is needed. But let us disregard such vexing "details."

This much is certainly true. If 3,400 weapons with a yield of several megatons each were dropped on the surprised and unprotected populations of every city, millions of people would be killed. But what strategy would be directed toward ticking off one town after the other around the globe or even in enemy countries? It is ridiculous to calculate military requirements in this fashion. If we had applied this sort of calculation to estimate how much ammunition we needed to win World War II, someone could have deduced that not more than 200,000 tons of steel were required.

According to Mr. Melman's sources, the United States has 1,300 strategic bombers, 1,150 Navy bombers, and 940 strategic missiles. The Soviet Union has 200 long range and 1,400 medium range bombers, 85 ICBM's 700 MRBM's, and 100–200 submarine-launched missiles. Weapons of a more tactical nature were ignored. Naturally, the Soviet Union hardly will risk a war with the United States, so long as they can threaten us merely with 85 initial ICBM's and 200 bombers. Since Europe according to this battle order, rates 700 MRBM's, it would seem self-evident that the United States must rate about 1,000 ICBM's; but let us assume that the Soviets prepare for us only 300 ICBM's. For the United States to be able to use strategic bombers which carry the main punch, defense suppression is mandatory. Suppose there are in the Soviet Union about 750 ground-to-air and antimissile rocket sites; add to those 300 ICBM's, 700 MRBM's and perhaps 100 airbases; this totals 1,850 targets. If those targets were moderately hardened (30 p.s.i. on the average), and if they are to be destroyed by airbursts, then two shots with 2 megaton warheads would have to be used against each target to destroy it with a probability of 90 percent; 3 shots would give a probability of 97 percent. If we decide to attack the ICBM and MRBM sites with two weapons each and the other targets with one weapon, the requirement would be 2,850 weapons on target or 3,700 weapons on the pad.

However, according to Mr. Melman, we possess but 940 missiles. This would allow us to place only about 650 missiles on target, just enough to take care of the Soviet ICBM's and of about 50 defense suppression targets. Certainly, some aircraft might break through without benefit of previous defense suppression. But so long as the Soviet ground-to-air missiles are not knocked out, these bombers would find it difficult to demolish Soviet cities systematically. Even if they were successful, in the interim Europe would have been struck by 700 MRBM's.

If the Soviets strike the first blow, their stipulated 300 ICBM's might knock out 150 American ICBM's. Disregarding the damage done in the United States by the Soviet strike, we could then send about 400 ICBM's against a mixture of defense suppression targets and airbases. Paradoxically, in this situation our aircraft would have somewhat greater freedom of operations than in the first strike case. But we still would possess precious little power to do anything about the 700-odd MRBM's which could hold virtually all European cities as hostages; and we would not have too much punch to prevent the Soviet army from seizing Western Europe. Certainly, our tactical nuclear forces might enter into the breach, but the overall situation would be much worse if the Soviets were to acquire effective antimissile defenses, as they undoubtedly will. In brief, our forces do not have, in any shape, form, or manner, an overkill capability. On the contrary, the best that can be said about our present posture is that it leaves Europe (and Japan) unprotected.

Continuous research and development and procurement are hardly needed to add to our "overkill" capability. Granted that 22,000 megatons is a great deal of firepower (actually, Professor Melman overlooked that airplanes if they can "live" in the hostile environment, are capable of more than a single mission). But such a figure standing by itself, is meaningless. How hard are the targets? How effective are the means of delivery and defense? What is the accuracy of delivery and how good is the target intelligence? How many of the targets are fixed or mobile? And so on. With 22,000 megatons, no less than 100,000 towns could be "Hiroshimized," if we had the requisite delivery system; but the same firepower, if it can be delivered according to target specifications, is just about enough to take care of 1,000 missile sites.

Continuous procurement is needed to equip our forces with new weapons, not to increase our firepower. The B–47's which, in Mr. Melman's calculations, account for 6,000 megatons are being phased out. There is no replacement for the B–52 which is credited with a 12,000 megaton punch. Simple arithmetic shows that if we want to maintain our firepower, while replacing bombers by Minuteman, we must substitute about 18,000 Minuteman missiles for the B–47's and B–52's. Since we are not planning to do this, our kill capability is being reduced. Continuing research and development and procurement also are mandatory, to achieve antimissile defense capabilities, and to enable our forces in Europe, as well as our allies, to acquire offensive and defensive weapons in order to balance the Soviet MRBM and medium bomber threat. Unless our weapons are modernized constantly, we will lose our military power and the "overkill" capability will be owned by the enemy exclusively. Our difficulty is not that we possess an imaginary overkill capability but that in the face of the growing Soviet threat, our military strengths and deterrent powers are declining. Let us hope, to paraphrase Burke, that the sophisters and calculators will not extinguish the glory of America and Europe.

MARCH BY COLORED CITIZENS ON CAPITOL HILL, AUGUST 28

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SILER] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, it is quite generally understood that a large delegation, about 100,000 people, I believe, consisting of our colored citizens, will march to the Capital on August 28 in the interest of civil rights legislation.

Now about the time when this plan was first announced one of our Democratic Senators stated publicly that if such a delegation should come to his office, he, the Senator, would himself physically and personally eject them from his office.

Having lived among colored people all my life and having helped them and served them on many occasions. I want to say that none of them will be ejected from my office or mistreated in any way whatsoever. On the contrary, they will be most welcome and will receive my personal greetings as well as my utmost respect. Of course, I hope some of these visitors will be from my own congressional district or at least from my State of Kentucky. But regardless of where they may live, they will be treated with real courtesy, kindness, and civility. I will plan to meet the situation in this specific manner:

First. I will have coffee and doughnuts served to my colored guests.

Second. If any of them are here without means for a night's lodging, I will offer to pay for lodging for my guests.

Third. If my guests have a minister among them, I will call on him for a prayer for our Nation and all of its people of all races and creeds.

Fourth. If my guests have some singers among them, I will call on them for some spirituals or some other good songs.

I guarantee you that we will have such a good time together that they will all have cause to say "this is about the whitest white man we have been with for some time."

Yet, Mr. Speaker, I must in all fairness to you and to my prospective guests say right now that I will not vote for any civil rights bill that undertakes to consider every private business out on the main streets of America as some sort of an interstate commerce enterprise or that undertakes to make Bobby Kennedy the policeman of our entire Nation with power to run the private affairs of John Q. Public while the latter is operating his own establishment. Such a bill would not encompass freedom, nor Americanism, nor the best interests of our country. So, while I promise to our colored friends on August 28 warm hospitality, yet I do not promise them the unconstitutionality of a bill that may come before us in the House of Representatives as now proposed by Bobby Kennedy.

TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD, I wish to include my current Washington report on the subject of the pending nuclear test ban treaty.

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman JAMES B. UTT)

The U.S. Senate will soon be debating the ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty. Adoption of this treaty by the United States would be one of the most dangerous steps it has ever taken.

It seems paradoxical that an apparent step toward peace lays the groundwork for nuclear destruction of the American people. Our citizens have been conditioned by massive propaganda to believe that a test ban treaty is the only alternative to annihilation. With this conditioning, they are then supposed to urge their Senators to adopt this treaty. The American public has been prevented from knowing the truth by reason of highly managed news based on three erroneous concepts: First, the subject is too secret to trust you with; second, it is too complex for you to understand; and third, it is too incredible for you to believe.

Russia has violated 51 of its 53 treaties, and why should we believe that it has any intention to keeping this treaty? The leopard has not changed its spots. Khrushchev still intends to bury us. The open conflict between Russia and Red China is being used to persuade America that the "Butcher of Budapest" is really a good guy. The break with China is simply over whether or not America should be destroyed before dinner or after dinner. The end result is the same. International communism has developed into a German-Panzer type of pincer movement. One pincer travels on the doctrine of coexistence. The other pincer travels on the track of militant military action. The final result is that the object of their disaffection is pulverized.

We should learn something from very recent history. During the test ban treaty of 1958, our nuclear strategic weaponry remained in status quo. During those 3 years, Russian scientists moved rapidly ahead and increased the efficiency of their nuclear weaponry over 500 percent so that when, in 1961, Russia openly engaged in a series of nuclear tests, they had explosive weapons equal to 50 million tons of TNT. In 1958, we had a superiority in this field of weaponry by at least 2 to 1. Today, Russia has a 2 to 1 superiority over the United States in nuclear weaponry. The Joint Chiefs of Staff know this, but the Pentagon denies it and so does the Disarmament Agency. You are not being told the truth. Senator GOLDWATER, as an Active Reserve Air Force general in the Senate, possesses this knowledge which is being withheld from you by the Pentagon and the Disarmament Agency.

On the other hand, this country is reducing its military power unilaterally and clandestinely. One B–52 bomber is capable of delivering the equivalent of 60 million tons of TNT. The Polaris missile can deliver but 1 ton. The maximum destructive power of one bomb at Pearl Harbor was only 1 ton, and yet the surprise attack nearly destroyed the U.S. Navy. Today, a single Russian missile can deliver the equivalent of 50 million tons of TNT. This will give you some idea as to what could happen with a surprise attack. Missiles launched from Russia would take half an hour to reach this country. The same missile launched from Cuba would take but 1 minute, and that is why Khrushchev needed a missile base in Cuba.

If the President had not acted promptly last October, most of us would not be here today. It was not the embargo that stopped the launching of those missiles, it was the knowledge Khrushchev had that our Strategic Air Command was in the air with enough destructive power to have killed 90 percent of the Russian people. While Khrushchev has said he would bury us, he has also said that he will not permit his own people to be destroyed with us, and therefore he had to write off his bold venture in Cuba until such time as he could launch a surprise attack against this country.

Why then should we give him another test-ban treaty to further perfect his nuclear weaponry? He can transfer his operations with all his plants and scientists to the heart of Red China, and all the inspection of Russia would not reveal this operation. The only alternative to annihilation is strategic nuclear strength. All of the tactical strength in the world will not revive a pulverized nation. Every American citizen should demand that his Government stop disarming the United States by withdrawing our strategic bombers from the periphery of Russia. The Strategic Air Command has a total capability of 30,000 million tons of TNT, while the total capability of all of our nuclear submarines, armed with Polaris missiles, is in the neighborhood of 200 million tons. This is less than 1 percent of SAC capability, and you are being told that our bombers are old-fashioned and should be phased out as being obsolete.

Khrushchev cannot launch a surprise attack without first destroying our Strategic Air Command. Why should we do it for him?

THE RELIGIOUS ISSUE REGARDING BRACEROS

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Talcott] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, opponents of a bracero-type program for providing an adequate supply of supplemental farm labor to harvest crops at peak harvesttime often cite resolutions from "executive committees" of organizations with religious-sounding names to engender sympathy, avoid contradiction and feign morality. Credentials of these committees are seldom, if ever, given. Their factual basis, their knowledgeability, their reasoning is never given.

I talked and corresponded with one cleric who testified at the subcommittee hearings. It turned out that he is opposed to the cruel migrant family life—not the bracero program. He had observed, in his small parish, the deplorable plight of the migrant farm family and thought the bracero employed elsewhere suffered similarly. I think he would now agree with me that we should minimize rather than maximize the nomadic existence of the farm workers' families.

It is my understanding that some religious-sounding committees have passed resolutions without conducting hearings—or if hearings were held only opponents of the bracero program were invited or heard.

If you want a religious or moral answer to the bracero program may I suggest that you consult with your own pastor or priest.

DO NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE SOVIET INCLUDE RECOGNITION OF RUSSIAN RIGHTS TO CONTROL CUBA?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Alger] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, while the Senate prepares to study the test-ban treaty with the Soviet Union, President Kennedy and his special envoy, Averell Harriman speak of bright prospects for a nonaggression treaty to follow.

What are they talking about? We have been guilty of no aggression, only Russia has. Will a nonaggression treaty freeze Russian control of those territories it has seized through subversion, subterfuge, and outright invasion? Will we agree that Soviet Russia be recognized as in control of the Government of Cuba? Just what has the President in mind to give away to Khrushchev in exchange for more meaningless promises? Congress and the American people should demand a forthright answer to these questions, not just beautiful speeches about the glory of peace nor the details of the horrors of war.

All Americans want peace. All Americans recognize the futility of war, but we demand peace with honor and not at the expense of other people's freedom.

Before we believe the statements now coming from the White House, let us demand an explanation from President Kennedy on Cuba. He denies the Russians are building power there and yet all reports coming out of Cuba are to the contrary. Before agreeing to any kind of treaty with the Soviet Union, let President Kennedy answer the charges made in the following news article from the Dallas Morning News of July 25, written by a very capable and able reporter, Robert Baskin.

Group Says Isle of Pines Under Control of Russians

(By Robert E. Baskin)

Washington.—Evidence has come out of Cuba that the Russians have taken full control of the Isle of Pines and apparently are developing it as a submarine base, the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba reported Wednesday.

Refugees have revealed intense Russian military and construction activity on the 40-square-mile island which is the site of a prison for some 6,000 of dictator Fidel Castro's political opponents.

The island contains large caves which refugees said are being reinforced with concrete for submarine operations.

The Isle of Pines lies 60 miles off the coast about 100 miles south of Havana and was under U.S. jurisdiction until 1934 when the treaty between the two countries was revised.

Jose Miguel Reyes, who fled to Florida a few days ago in a yacht belonging to an Isle of Pines fishing cooperative, reported that possibly more than 3,000 Russians are on the island, which has a civilian population of 12,000.

"The luxury hotels are filled with Russian officers and technicians," Reyes said.

Some Cuban militiamen remain on the island, Reyes said, but they are there only to handle the prisoners, who are gradually being transferred to the mainland.

Corroborative reports have come from two other recent refugees, the Committee for a Free Cuba said.

Li Chih, a Cuban-Chinese who fled from the Isle of Pines in May, giving up his restaurant and hotel in the principal city of Nueva Gerona, said the Russians had taken over the entire area of Siguanea (San Pedro).

"They are building something permanent of a military nature," Li said. "The entire area has been declared a military zone, and no Cubans are permitted to enter.

"They have taken over all major hotels, and the place is swarming with Russians, mostly in uniform.

"The belief among the Cubans in the area is that the sea caves are being converted into 'natural' submarine caves. The same sort of construction is going on in Key Largo, southeast of the Isle of Pines, where some 10,000 Cubans and Russians have been working for over 6 months."

Dario Prohia, who was released from the Isle of Pines prison and sent to the United States during prisoner exchange negotiations, told the committee that the Russian military buildup at Siguanea could be seen from the cell blocks.

"Russian ships transport arms from this depot to other areas," he said. "We have watched them load, and believe from talking to guards that these arms are being transported to Latin America aboard submarines."

The Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba was organized recently by a group of nonpartisan experts on Latin America and has established a broad network of intelligence on what is going on in Castro's island.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in our exuberance at the possibility of a thaw in the cold war through the proposed nuclear test-ban treaty, let us not forget that under communism, that which is black today may indeed appear to be white tomorrow. The strategy of communism is well indicated by the following statement made by Dimitry Z. Manuilsky at the Lenin School of Political Welfare in Moscow in 1930.

I commend it to the attention of the House and the Senate as well.

> War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 to 30 years. To win, we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist.

Mr. Speaker, in view of this 33-year-old dire prediction, are we giving adequate attention to paragraph 2 of the preamble of the proposed and initialed "test-ban treaty"? It strikes me to the contrary, that an ominous silence has been maintained about this basic premise of the treaty and its negotiators.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Science and Astronautics has reported out H.R. 7500, authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 1964 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In anticipation of the consideration of this bill by the House, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the following extract from the book, "National Security, Political, Military, and Economic Strategy in the Decade Ahead," pages 582–584, published July 17, 1963, by Frederick A. Praeger for the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace. The material cited, from the section titled, "An Approach to American Strategy," is by Dr. James D. Atkinson, associate professor of government at Georgetown University, research associate at the Center of Strategic Studies headed by Adm. Arleigh Burke, president of the American Military Institute, and author of various books and articles in the field of military affairs:

The psychopolitical advantages accruing from a nation's ability to exercise power in and through the space environment are immense. The propaganda advantage alone would constitute a valid reason for giving consideration to space strategy. But it is historically correct that military control of an environment permits psychopolitical advantages from their ability to exercise control in the sea environment and later in the air environment. It would appear obvious, therefore, that space can be used by us or against us. To state that this is obvious does not mean that it is accepted as such. Despite much evidence that the Soviets treat the scientific side of space as quite incidental to the military, many Americans continue in the naive belief that we can treat space as a peaceful arena.

Space military capabilities would broadly appear to be:

(1) Intelligence operations: observing, recording, detecting.

(2) Direction: of land, sea, air, or combined operations.

(3) Offensive actions: against land, sea, or air targets; against other space vehicles.

(4) Defensive actions: neutralizing attacking missiles; counteracting other space vehicles.

(5) Psychopolitical operations in advance of or in support of military actions.

The transference of classical military operational concepts to space remains to be accomplished and the next decade will see this taking place apart from the obvious projections of well-understood military operations. Space offers intriguing new possibilities for the exercise of power at low intensity levels, but with enormous strategic import.

The following is suggested as an exploratory concept for the United States to adopt in space/earth control: (1) The creation of a global intelligence system for detecting, observing, tracking, recording, and analyzing movements in space. This system would follow and report all satellites in orbit, spacecraft, and space stations. It would be initiated through the use of existing space surveillance nets, and would be followed up by measures to bring about a space-global communications-control network based on land stations, ships on all the world's seas, satellites, and manned space platforms. The state-of-the-art in space exploitation is such that we undoubtedly plan on the launching of manned space platforms during the coming decade. Such manned space platforms would form a significant part of a space/earth control system. The nation-state which develops such a control structure will enjoy unique advantages in the exercise of power; (2) If we were to follow such a course of action with vigor, a control system could be operative at about the time when much of the world would increasingly be dependent on communications satellites, possibly around the turn of the decade. By having such a control device, the United States would be able to inform a trouble-inciting or trouble-making nation that unless it abandoned its untoward activities, we would find it necessary to disrupt the offender's communication and command systems nets, thus severely obstructing both at-home control and external communications. The possibilities for the nonviolent exercise of power accruing from a program of this nature are vast; (3) Although much of the world would be reliant on communications relayed by space vehicles, there would still be countries willing to risk communications breakdowns. Hence, the suggested control of communications would be a low intensity action which would be employed to signal our willingness to employ, if necessary, appropriate weapons from space against the trouble-inciting or troublemaking nation. If the United States has effectively preempted her enemies from controlling their space-based communications, surveillance, and target location means, then the United States should be able to neutralize weapons carrying satellites or spacecraft. By controlling both the communications utility and the military threat of attack from space, one nation-state could preclude another from effective functioning on earth and from operating (such as delivering an attack) in and from space.

COTTON ON WOOL: A GOOD JOB

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, for months now, with many of my colleagues I have been doing all in our power to urge upon the President, a course of action to save our domestic wool industry from strangulation by a rope of cheap foreign imports. We have been urging the President to keep his commitments of 2 years to help the wool industry.

In my own State of New Hampshire, the problem is particularly graphic—involved are 14,000 wool industry jobs. Countless communities look to wool products as their chief source of livelihood. Toward a solution of this crisis, none has worked harder or longer or with more insight than the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire, Norris Cotton.

Senator Cotton has just received excellent commendation for his unstinting efforts on behalf of the wool industry. The outstanding afternoon daily, the Claremont (N.H.) Daily Eagle has commended the Senator for his "dedication and energy on behalf of the New England textile industry."

Included in the editorial are Senator Cotton's supplemental views filed recently with the Special Senate Subcommittee on the Textile Problem. I urge all of my colleagues to read the editorial and Senator Cotton's forthright views which follow:

Cotton on Wool: A Good Job

Senator Cotton is to be commended for his dedication and energy on behalf of the New England textile industry.

Particularly for the woolen industry here in New Hampshire the problem has been critical; a problem caused by foreign competition.

Relief for local woolen industry is beyond the reach of Congress to remedy, at least practically; the situation now reposes with the President and the executive branch, as it has since 1961 when a seven-point textile program was announced, and when the delegation of treaty authority in terms of tariff and duty was turned over to the Executive.

Negotiations with other nations exporting wool to the United States are continuing. The situation is complicated. It is delicate.

But in the meantime, time for domestic processors and producers of wool is running out. Even now, a solution will be too late for many who have already gone out of business.

A special Senate subcommittee to study the textile industry has issued a third supplementary report on the situation dated July 18, together with supplemental views of Senator Cotton which the Eagle reprints and commends to the attention of its readers.

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF SENATOR COTTON

"While I agree with the comments and recommendations contained in the body of this report and commend my colleagues for their sincere efforts in behalf of the textile industry, I believe that the report should more emphatically express a sorely needed sense of urgency, particularly with respect to the future of the woolen and worsted industries.

"The encouraging steps inaugurated by the President in May of 1961 with his seven-point textile program brought a new spirit of hope to the industry. Ringing pledges and firm commitments from a whole roster of administration officials assured the industry that 'something would be done' to prevent it from being completely inundated in a flood of foreign imports.

"These promises have not been kept. Woolen imports have continued to skyrocket, up 56 percent in 1962 and up an additional 41 percent in the first quarter of 1963, as compared with the same periods a year previous—and the Government has done nothing to stem, or even slow the tide. Since January of 1962, an additional 26 woolen textile mills in 10 States have been liquidated, with a loss of over 5,300 jobs.

"The domestic woolen textile industry, after listening to the bright promises of administration officials, is confronted with the bleak absence of any effective action, and I believe it deserves better treatment. Unfortunately, except in relatively minor areas involving certain customs loopholes, discussed in this report, there is no action which Congress itself can take to alleviate the plight of the industry. Congress, relying upon the promises of the Executive, surrendered its power to deal with this type of problem when it passed the 'Trade Expansion Act of 1962.' As long as this law remains in effect, only the President has the power to meet this problem.

"The administration's promises to the industry and its employees must be fulfilled soon, or it will be too late."

NORRIS COTTON.

TREASURY FINANCING

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving a lot of mail recently and have seen articles in the press concerning so-called "back-door spending."

I wonder how many people really know the meaning of "back-door spending." Actually it is an invidious connotation improperly applied to Treasury financing.

Long before there was an Appropriations Committee, the Congress enacted bills which carried both an authorization and an appropriation which when enacted into law authorized the spending and appropriated the money therefor. In recent years, for purposes, first, of "expedition" and second, allegedly better control, the legislative committees of Congress sponsor the bills authorizing the appropriation and the Appropriations Committee, subsequent to the enactment of the legislation, sponsors the bills appropriating the money.

All of the members of each of these committees are elected by the same process and all have the same power and privileges as Members of the House of Representatives and all of them are required to vote for or against legislation which reaches the floor of the House. I for one refuse to believe that a person on one committee rather than another can do a better job of authorizing and appropriating funds.

Even after the Appropriations Committee method was adopted the Congress has traditionally authorized and appropriated moneys required for lending operations of the Government. This process has never prevented any Member of Congress or the appropriate committees of Congress from performing their duty to make certain that Government agencies did not mishandle these funds. As a matter of practice, the Appropriations Committee reviews the operations and the lending and spending for administration purposes of those agencies which get their money by Treasury financing rather than by the appropriation method. The strange part of it all is that, with rare exceptions, the agencies which have been accorded the privilege of Treasury financing have been the best operated and managed and free from scandal.

MIGRANT WAY OF LIFE IS DIFFICULT

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last week the House was told that the migrant way of life is difficult. I could not agree more. We were also told that the best thing we can do for migrants is to eliminate the need for migrating, because such a way of life is "cruel, undesirable, un-American."

In fact, I am informed that migrant, nomadic life of any kind is cruel and undesirable and un-American, no matter who the migrant might be—Congressman, baseball player, rodeo performer, or salesman.

Since all of us here are often on the road or in the air traveling to and fro, I am sure that my colleagues will know what I am talking about. Migrating is cruel and undesirable and un-American. Therefore, we should do away with all kinds of migrants, and thus bring peace and tranquillity to our fast-moving country.

If we had thought of this earlier, we could have prevented all that cruel migration that resulted in the settling of the West. We could have prevented the gold rush, the building of railroads, canals, and the rest of the country—because all that settling and building required a lot of migrating. In fact, if we had been foresighted enough—or our forefathers had been—we could have prevented that migrant Columbus from having discovered America.

But since all these tragedies are past, we should not worry about them. Rather, we should steadfastly look to the future to prevent migration and all its cruelties. Rather than permitting ourselves to migrate, we should find foreigners to do it for us.

There are numerous areas in which we could use foreign workers to replace migrants. For example, we Congressmen could hire foreign replacements to do our traveling. Then, we could all stay at home and avoid the un-American experience of traveling to and fro constantly.

Then we could eliminate all out-of-town baseball games or at least hire foreigners to do the traveling. The same goes for football, basketball, rodeo, volleyball, track, gymnastics, field hockey, car racing and go-kart driving. I understand that marble contests sometimes require the athletes to migrate from place to place. This should be eliminated. Furthermore, we should not allow our ping-pong and bridge teams to engage in constant and degrading travel, but should hire foreign workers who can do the job for them.

Even as a child I was awestruck by the hardships that befall that well-known migrant, the circus performer. Traveling constantly, they are the epitome of pity. Migration is un-American. We should hire all foreigners to perform in the circus.

Too, the stage requires its performers to flit about from town to town. Musicians, actors, singers—all are required to migrate. This should be halted.

Think of the hardships that afflict airline stewardesses, who must travel thousands, perhaps millions of miles every year. No American should have to undergo that.

Can you picture a sadder sight than truck drivers, bus drivers, trainmen, pilots, mariners and taxi drivers who must constantly be on the move? Theirs is a plight we should be cognizant of.

And think of the insecurity that plagues the lowly astronauts, who must migrate from place to place in the daily discharge of his duties—indeed, he must sometimes drag his family from Houston to Hawaii to Washington, just for public appearances. We ought to get some foreigners to do that job, too.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially concerned about our servicemen. Constantly on the move, these poor migrants must drag their families all over the world. Their children have a deadly impact on the local schools, and none is literate because his education is so often interrupted. We ought not to permit all this nomadic existence. It is un-American. We certainly should hire foreign men to do all this traveling.

And while we are at it, we need to replace traveling salesmen, executives, carpenters, sandhogs, roughnecks, cropdusters, newsmen, Presidents, Secretaries of State, diplomats, Peace Corpsmen, engineers, surveyors, Senators, Governors and many, many others.

Mr. Speaker, the point of all this is to show quite simply that Americans are capable of performing the work that requires to be done in this country. Many jobs are tough and dirty—like garbage collecting or stable cleaning or any of a hundred others—but stil we find men to do them. Many jobs also require travel.

We are not going to benefit the migrant agricultural worker by taking his job away from him, any more so than it would help the workers I have mentioned above.

If we are going to help the migrant farmworkers of this country, we ought to do so by first eliminating the bracero program. Then we can enact the proposals of Senator WILLIAMS—which are designed to ease the life of the migrant agricultural laborer.

GENERAL AVIATION IN AMERICA TODAY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, for many years before coming to the Congress and since coming to the Congress, I have had a great deal of interest in general aviation in this country. Later, as a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives I was assigned to the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics, which has general jurisdiction over the aviation effort in this country, and I have been most concerned over the lack of interest in and promotion of general aviation in this Nation. I am advised, although I do not have the source of statistics, that 70 percent or more of the rated pilots of this country are over 35 years of age, which means that the younger people of this country are not taking a great deal of interest in general aviation. I realize that these young people are faced with so many problems of an age of jet and atom and space, but I do not think that it is any challenge or any frustration that has caused some lethargy as there is in the programs of general aviation, but rather that the cost of light, business and pleasure aircraft, the cost of training has been a serious handicap. Thanks to various aero clubs over the country, many people are now taking an interest in learing to fly.

Recently there was originated on Capitol Hill a club known as the Congressional Flying Club, membership in which is and has been open to Members of Congress and their staffs. This club is one of numerous clubs throughout the United States of America and it offers, as other clubs offer, an opportunity for the membership to become acquainted with the joys, conveniences and business possibilities of private flying. Congressman JOHN BELL WILLIAMS of Mississippi is president of the club and Mr. Lou Davis of the National Aeronautic Association has been the coordinator and guiding light of the activity. May I pause here to salute Mr. Davis not only for what he has done but for his help to general aviation through this club. We might pause also to study the economic importance. May I present at this point a significant statement on the subject as prepared by Mr. Roy E. Moor, fiscal economist, Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States.

ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE OF GENERAL AVIATION

(By Roy E. Moor, Fiscal Economist, Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States)

Two basic economic problems face any nation: (1) to obtain the maximum production of goods and services in the most efficient manner, and (2) to obtain the most efficient distribution of those goods and services to consumers. General aviation assists significantly in solving these two problems. A major purpose of the congressional flight survey was to determine the various ways in which general aviation facilitates more effective operation of the U.S. economy.

One of the ways general aviation serves the economy was demonstrated in Ocean City, Md. A primary source of income to the area is tourism. The significance of general aviation is in substantially expanding the market that can obtain these tourist benefits. Ocean City is reached from Washington by a private plane in an easy 45-minute ride rather than a tiring 3-hour drive. Comparable figures can be given for other metropolitan areas along the east coast and inland. The effect, therefore, of general aviation is to reduce the barriers between potential consumers and the services they desire.

Another type of economic role for general aviation was demonstrated in the second stop of the Survey, at the Flying-W Ranch outside Medford, N.J. Here the industry is general aviation itself. As the owner of the operation indicated, he has launched a "massive assault on the American dollar," using private aviation as the basic product. Essentially, the Flying-W Ranch is a private airport facility at which personal planes are sold. The interesting economic feature of the Flying-W Ranch concerns the merchandizing techniques. A wide range of attractions has been created to lure individuals to this airport, including swimming, riding, golfing, and catering services. In addition, most types of service accommodations for aircraft, including instruction, repair, maintenance, radio work, and so on, have been incorporated into the general operation. The effect has been to attract customers from a wide area. The ranch is ideally situated as a stopping point en route along the eastern seaboard. The ranch also provides a major source of employment and income to the local community.

A third economic role of general aviation was displayed at Westchester County Airport in White Plains, N.Y. General aviation is not only a means of obtaining consumption and a form of final consumption; it is also a principal factor in production. Westchester County Airport provides facilities for many of the largest business air fleets in the country. The planes in these fleets provide an indispensable means of operation because they permit maximum efficiency in the movement of men and material between operating points. Facilities must exist to serve this need for mobility and the airport at White Plains is a classic example of such service.

Most of the economic functions performed by general aviation can be observed in one place at Hartford, Conn. Hartford has two aviation facilities: Bradley Field which serves various large corporate concerns, and Brainard Field which facilitates short-haul, light-plane traffic, service, and private plane travel. Hartford is primarily a financial center providing services that penetrate the core of our economy. Insurance and banking firms furnish funds that must flow throughout the economy, and airplanes provide the medium through which men can follow the flow of funds. Moreover, Hartford is geographically located so that air travel to other major metropolitan areas can save both time and energy—both essential economic factors.

Reading, Pa., provides yet another example of a type of economic service furnished by general aviation. The Spaatz Airport in Reading is not only a dealer in new and used aircraft and a center for maintenance work; it also provides scheduled third-class air carrier service from local communities to larger metropolitan areas. The economic significance of such commuter service is twofold. First, it can permit homeownership in local areas well removed from larger metropolitan areas, thereby relieving the pressures on congested cities and making more effective use of open land. Secondly, air commuter service permits large industries to serve the wants of small towns more effectively.

Finally, general aviation itself invloves production of a commodity—the aircraft. Lock Haven, Pa., is an excellent example on the east coast of a community where the primary industry is the production of aircraft. Employment of men and capital in Lock Haven centers around the Piper Aircraft Corp. A striking byproduct of this manufacturing operation is the evident satisfaction which the employees of the company have in the product they create. Piper has provided both long-term and expanding employment to the residents of the community, and this type of satisfaction cannot be overlooked in any economic appraisal of the role of general aviation.

Probably the most general economic conclusion from a trip such as the congressional flight survey concerns the range of possibilities by which general aviation can raise the level of economic activity within particular communities which Congressmen represent. The list of such possibilities is long, and only a few hints of the economic potentials of general aviation can be suggested in a memorandum such as this.

Recently, in an effort to promote appreciation of general aviation in this country, the Congressional Flying Club sponsored a congressional flight survey in which we invited Members of the U.S. Congress, whether they belonged to the club or not, to participate in an aerial survey to certain parts of the country. At this point I include a statement of the Honorable JOHN BELL WILLIAMS in connection with that aerial flight survey.

THE 1963 CONGRESSIONAL SURVEY FLIGHT—A NEW AID TO CONGRESS

Wings have brought fascinating new dimensions to business, Government, and industry. Many new human problems and technical barriers generated by rapidly advancing technology have broadened airplane and helicopter service opportunities in a complex and intensely competitive world.

The mission of the Congressional Flying Club, formed by Members of Congress, is to develop ways and means of using the airplane to assist our lawmakers in the increasingly critical task of keeping the Nation's political and governmental progress apace that of our scientific and engineering advancements.

For years many States have conducted legislative air tours to assist the lawmakers in developing understanding and appreciation for vital matters of state and forces which influence its economy, business, industry, public welfare, and interest. Such tours provide flexibility and objectivity that is not possible through any other means, especially where time and distance is the underlying taskmaster.

We believe the basic congressional flight survey objective for the 1963 tour will become a valuable instrument or tool of the Nation's lawmakers for researching economic, political, and social problems—those which cannot be accomplished by any other means. The airborne platform for observation is also an ideal base from which Congress may observe rural and urban developments with realistic perspective and objectivity.

The 1963 congressional flight survey is the first event of its kind. It is designed to serve Congress, by Congressmen. It is truly a pathfinder project in which we need your help and suggestions.

On behalf of your chairman, and the many other persons who are assisting with this exploratory project, I extend thanks and appreciation.

Have a good flight. Happy landings to you all.

JOHN BELL WILLIAMS,
President, Congressional Flying Club.

To again salute the people from various organizations that helped make this trip such a success, I would like to insert my note of thanks, as chairman of the survey, to those who helped with this mission.

A TRULY COOPERATIVE EVENT

It is significant that the first congressional flight survey of the five Northeastern States area is the product of truly cooperative effort extended in the interest of serving Congress and the public welfare.

Six organizations have combined resources and effort to assist the Congressional Flying Club in the production of this first flight survey. They have combined efforts to aid in the advancement of aviation understanding and to assist Congress in its effort to learn more about the economic problems and issues of our times.

On behalf of all congressional Members of the survey flight and members of the Congressional Flying Club, I wish to extend thanks to the following organizations for their guidance and assistance: Federal Aviation Agency, National Aeronautic Association, National Association State Aviation Officials, National Business Aircraft Association, National Pilots Association, Helicopter Association of America, Utility Airplane Council—AIA and the National Aviation Trades Association.

In this broad mission of public service, each organization, regardless of its parochial interests, has found a way to serve the national welfare in the truly American spirit of cooperation and mutual trust.

I thank all of the persons and organizations responsible for making this joint project feasible and fruitful to Congress.

ROBERT W. HEMPHILL,
Chairman.

Those participating in the aerial survey gave us a weekend in order to become better acquainted with general aviation and I salute the sacrifices made. At each stop, each member paid the hotel bill and whatever other incidental cost such as food, transportation, and the like, as a part of the expenses. I included the summaries of the various flights and stops. Some of these instructions, I think, are important in consideration of what we were trying to show and accomplish. Also, for those who missed the trip I would like to catalog the activities for them:

WASHINGTON, D.C., TO OCEAN CITY, MD.—DEPARTURE TIME, FRIDAY, JULY 19, 3 P.M.

As our fleet of 10 airplanes departed from Washington's National Airport, the back-seat pilots of Congress instantly became mindful of one simple fact. That was this: radio provides a vital, positive service to safe and on-time flight. Our pilots worked to radio and electronic navigation equipment indications during every minute we were airborne. This is the "why?" of our meeting the schedule with community groups at each stop even though the weather necessitated instrument departures from Hartford, Conn.

Another immediate reaction was the marked difference of flight time compared to ground travel time within close proximity to Washington. The flight from the airport to North Beach, on the Chesapeake Bay, a straight-line distance of 28 miles, was completed in 10 minutes. This includes extra distance in the climb and a flight detour around the southern edge of Andrews Air Force Base. Driving time requires the better part of the hour or even more.

The 123-mile flight route took our party over Cambridge, Delmar—just 5 miles north of Salisbury—Berlin and Ocean City. This area of Maryland is known as the frozen food capital of the United States. Poultry farms dominate the scene. New trunkline roads are in evidence but the lack of good ground transportation on off mainline routes was also apparent from our aerial platform of observation. Salisbury is served by Allegheny Airlines from Washington with a daily round-trip flight. Choptank Air Taxi Service provides airlift from Salisbury and Cambridge to Baltimore's Friendship Airport and to the Capital's National Airport. Hinson Aviation Co. operates air taxi service to Ocean City, Md., during the summer season. Baltimore is the main market center. Philadelphia and Washington share a smaller portion of the trade.

Ocean City was selected as a stop on the tour for several reasons:

(1) It is a community of less than 1,500 citizens during the winter months and its summer population swells beyond the 150,000 mark; (2) its airport, which benefited from Federal aid, is an important part of the developing economy; and (3) its market habits and growth potential are due to change radically upon the completion of the new auto tunnel under the Chesapeake Bay, between the Northampton County Peninsula and Norfolk, Va.

Community leaders expect this new gateway to the South to deliver many important economic benefits to the area where industrial and commercial business development is concerned. It is expected that Norfolk, Philadelphia, and to some degree, New York City, will create more intense competition to Baltimore's current strategic position as a market center.

The airplane as we employed it will play an important part in this changing pattern. Our flight was completed in less than 40 minutes—more than 3 hours are required to make the same journey by auto on normal traffic days. It is evident that the Baltimore and Washington flying businessman enjoys many competitive advantages and more travel flexibility by the use of the airplane over that which is possible via the highway route.

Our hosts at Ocean City, headed by Mayor Hugh T. Cropper, escorted our party in an inspection of the reconstructed beachfront and boardwalk, which were ravaged by storms last year. Informal discussions of the community's future planning were very instructive to our group, although the summer resort attractions obviously will continue to comprise the lion's share of Ocean City's assets.

OCEAN CITY, MD., TO MEDFORD, N.J.—SATURDAY, JULY 20

The "good morning" call was at 7 a.m. By 8:30 a.m., all planes were en route to Medford, N.J., and the Flying-W Ranch, where an outstanding, old-fashioned chuckwagon breakfast awaited us.

En route, during the 40-minute flight northward, along the Atlantic coast, we studied another excellent resort from the air—Rehoboth Beach. It has long been popular among our Washington congressional family. From our lofty point of observation, it was obvious that travel by airplane and a good airport enhances its attractiveness.

We crossed the bridgeless Delaware Bay at a point west of Cape May. The open country of southern New Jersey was open to full view from a cloudless sky. Here too, agriculture and poultry farms abound. The region covered can surely be termed the "breadbasket" of Philadelphia and New York City—with emphasis upon the appetites of the latter city's 12 million citizens. Surprisingly, large areas of pine trees and undeveloped land still serve as important wildlife preserves.

We approached the thickly populated area around Philadelphia within 30 minutes, long before the auto traveler could have reached Milford, Del., on roads forced to follow the west bank of the Delaware Bay. Even though the highways via Dover and Wilmington, Del., to the historic City of Independence are excellent, traffic density and extra distance slow driving time to 2½ and 3 hours.

Here again, the small airplane demonstrated the ease with which cities and resorts of more distant places are accessible to businessmen and the citizen who uses the airplane as an instrument of transport. It makes it possible for businessmen to explore and tap markets which are otherwise out of reach via rail or highway.

The unique and refreshing Flying-W Ranch is the concept and development of an ex-airline pilot named William C. Whitesell. "Bill," as we know him, was injured in an automobile crash about 4 years ago and, as a result, he was unable to fly scheduled airlines again. Determined to stay in and near the air, he bought a large 150-acre farm north of Medford, N.J. He set out to prove his theory that aviation, like everything else, is sold by sound merchandising means; and, when the facts are weighed, that airplanes are not sold until the whole family is sold. For this reason, he built the Flying-W Ranch as a place where the whole family can have fun while dad flies. In 2 years of operation this philosophy has proved to be sound. Bill's customers reach into the hundreds. Man and wife teams have started to fly. Whitesell has sold more than 70 airplanes and his oasis is a popular retreat for pilots from distant ports. During this period industry aircraft have used his privately owned and operated installation and the community of Medford has benefited by the attraction of new industry and business because of the airport.

Community leaders, assembled as part of the receiving group, endorsed the Flying-W Ranch as a real asset to the economic development of the area. The Honorable Edward Hulse, freeholder, county of Burlington; Hobert L. Berlinger, mayor of Lumbarton; Robert Stevens, mayor of Mount Holly; and Ephraim Tomlinson, mayor of Medford were members of the host committee.

An informal discussion and tour of the facilities followed breakfast. Our members were shown the riding stables, picnic grove, restaurants, training rooms, airplane-shaped swimming pool, etc. All are attractions designed to make the installation a popular family recreation center. Discussions included matters of cost, taxes, community service, etc. It was emphasized that Flying-W Ranch is but one of the thousands of privately owned airports in the United States—exceeding 4,000 in number—which make an important contribution to the national air transportation system.

Here, in this environment, we felt that the airplane is something more than a toy for a privileged few—that it is a practical instrument of transport for the Nation, once the proper marketing stride has been reached. In short, like the boat business, the real potential has yet to be measured by practical means.

FLYING-W RANCH TO WHITE PLAINS, N.Y.

On this leg of the flight, requiring 35 minutes for the faster aircraft and 55 minutes for the slower planes, we had an excellent opportunity to view and examine the greater metropolitan area of New York. In fact, the airplane is an excellent platform from which to study the urban sprawl which threatens the city core. It is a vantage point for viewing housing, highways, rails and waterways as they relate to the whole.

In this case, the flight demonstrated how businessmen are using and can use aircraft to skirt high density traffic areas of the main transportation terminals, to achieve travel flexibility and a high degree of utility.

Westchester County Airport is famed for its service as the center for corporate and business operated aircraft. The airport is also renowned for its economic case history of making tremendous contributions to the local area's economy—in accelerating industrial development.

Net worth of business aircraft based at Westchester exceeds $40 million. They are large twin-engined planes of the Convair, Martin, Fairchild, Gulfstream, Douglas DC-3, and Lockheed Lodestar types. Our hosts provided us with complete statistics and facts about the key role this port plays in the economic welfare of the area.

Other airports serving a similar function for business aviation in the greater metropolitan area include: Teterboro Airport in New Jersey, Morristown and Caldwell Airport, N.J., and MacArthur Airport on Long Island. The remote location of the latter, to the major metropolitan district, restricts its ability to prove of much value to city industry.

The former Air Force base at Mitchel Field, Nassau County, was ideally situated to serve the 6 million persons of the western Long Island area. It was offered to local officials by the Government but they refused to accept it. All studies indicate that Long Island needs a general aviation airport that will help relieve some of the traffic pressure from Idlewild and LaGuardia terminals, as Westchester County is doing in its district.

At Westchester our flight survey was received by John Remmert, manager, Westchester County Airport, Col. William Moore, New York Air National Guard, Representative Ogden Reid (Republican, of New York) and county, township, and community officials.

WHITE PLAINS, N.Y., TO HARTFORD, CONN.

This relatively short flight of 30 minutes included some of the most colorful country of the Northeast. The heavily forested foothills of the Green Mountains is home base for the suburban residents of New York City and the growing industrial communities which are expanding along new trunkline highways.

As you approach the Hartford area, tobacco farms begin to dominate the rural landscape. This is a surprise to many people who tend to think of tobacco farms as being confined to the sunny South.

The many lakes and rivers which dot the Connecticut countryside give evidence to the fact that this part of the Northeast is very popular as a resort and summer home retreat for nearby New York City businessmen.

Some of our party was able to fly along the Long Island Sound shores to view the tremendous amount of boating activity centered there. This is truly the eastern capital of water sports—sailing, motorboating, and fishing.

The trunk highways linking New York City and Boston and trailing the coastal shores, provide rapid surface transport between the two great cities. However, travel to off-trunkline centers, such as from Bridgeport to Elmira, N.Y., is still a long, laborious journey by surface vehicle. In this type of travel the business airplane saves hours of the day and gives business new opportunities over the more conservative management organizations that are still chained to rail and highways.

Although most nonflying people tend to think of the airplane as being less useful in the crowded Northeast, it is readily apparent that the business and private airplane has utility matching that of the wide open Plain States of the West. This is true, providing the airport itself is convenient and accessible. Radio, radar and electronic navigational aids have contributed much to small-plane reliability and safety in this part of the country.

In Hartford, the broad relationship of transportation and all of its many forms to the complete economic health and growth of the market center, is condensed into an effective "package." Hartford is a city with deep roots and great American heritage, yet its leadership is displaying foresight and perspective in planning a balanced future; pacing city core modernization along with good roads, adequate airports, etc.

Through the wonderful service of host organizations, our survey party inspected the downtown area redevelopment work now in process. It is significant that the city center area, as a tenement section, produced but $90,000 in annual tax returns to the city. It is estimated that the rehabilitation now in process will return more than $1 million a year. Much of the financing is being accomplished by private means with the Travelers Insurance Co. playing a stellar role in the project.

Hartford has two major airports. Bradley Field is north of the city and readily accessible by a special freeway that expedites airport traffic. Brainard Field, the former municipal airport and first in the Nation, has been retained as a general aviation facility. Both of these air facilities provide Hartford with a great degree of flexibility and accessibility by air. Brainard attracts the short haul light plane traffic from communities within a radius of 200 to 400 miles.

Bradley, on the other hand, is the modern all-weather terminal for giant jet transports as well as the longer ranged and larger general aviation craft. This new port has turned Hartford into an eastern terminal for west coast airline flights. It is also a natural backup to Idlewild for international traffic.

It is important to note that scheduled airlines rack up more than 10 million passenger miles between New York City air terminals and Hartford, annually. Thirty-one outstanding and international insurance companies headquartered in Hartford, generate a large amount of this air traffic. At the same time, these vast resources in brainpower, plus the contribution from Trinity College and the University of Hartford, contribute much to the city's forward thinking and planning program.

Hartford is "home" for major portions of the aerospace industry. The United Aircraft Corp., and some of its divisions, the Kaman Aircraft Co., the Combustion Engineering Co. and others have had a profound effect upon the community's attitude toward air transportation. They too generate a sizable portion of the present air traffic.

Modern throughways to the airport provided easy, comfortable access to Bradley Airport, by bus in approximately 30 minutes. However, the return trip—made possible by United Aircraft helicopters—landed us on the Statehouse grounds within walking distance of our hotel, in less than 10 minutes. The helicopters provided an excellent vantage point from which to study the "new" and the "old" Hartford.

Our host group of about 30 members of the Greater Hartford Chamber of Commerce was headed by James E. Bent, president, and was assisted by Col. William Whetherell, director of Aeronautics for the State of Connecticut. They displayed a high degree of teamwork and cooperative spirit behind this progressive work. Our members were impressed by the fact that much of this progress is being accomplished without heavy reliance upon Government aid.

The friendship and hospitality accorded us was of the highest order.

HARTFORD, CONN. TO READING, PA.—SUNDAY, JULY 21

The 195-mile flight to Reading, Pa., was another excellent example of business plane flexibility. Some airplanes in the fleet made the flight in 1 hour and 10 minutes, others with a slower cruising speed took a few minutes longer. To drive this distance by auto would have taken 5 to 6 hours; by train it's longer; and by scheduled airlines, the total en route time would equal or exceed driving time.

Our flight took us over the northern fringe of New York City, over Easton, Phillipsburg and Bethlehem, Pa. Through our charts, we were surprised at the number of small airports along the route. These are all facilities permitting General Aviation operation with small twin-engined aircraft or single-engined planes. Many of these airports cannot accommodate airline transports.

At Spaatz Airport, a Reading owned facility (named for Air Force Gen. Touhy Spaatz), we visited with Sime Bertolet and officials of Reading Aviation Co. Congressman GEORGE RHODES, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, was also a member of the receiving party. The company is known as a fixed base operator. It offers General Aviation sales, training, aircraft maintenance and overhaul services. It operates the local airport and provides air taxi service to Newark, N.J., Philadelphia, and other points.

An outstanding industry meeting, called the Aircraft Maintenance and Operations Conference, is held at this airport each year, usually around the 7th and 8th of June. Business pilots flying all types of business aircraft exceed 300 to 400 in numbers and come from all parts of the United States.

Reading is a good example of the importance of an airport to the stimulation of new business for the community. Bertolet and others briefed us on the economic benefits to the community during the coffee stop.

Spaatz Airport is a surplus military installation, taken over by the city following World War II.

Reading, an industrial—textile, machinery, railroad center, is located in the heart of the Pennsylvania Dutch farm country.

READING TO LOCK HAVEN, PA.

The 90-mile flight from Reading to Lock Haven, Pa., lent sharp contrast to the coastal shores and was magnificent with the blue-green color of the Allegheny Range of the Appalachian Mountain chain. The ridge crests do not exceed 2,300 feet along the route. But, the well-defined lines of forested hills against the rich and fertile tilled lands of the valleys spread an inspiring portrait before the air traveler. Here, too, the utility of the aircraft matches that of the Plains and Rocky Mountain areas. It was apparent that much time can be saved and flying is completely safe, just as long as proper and safe flight rules are followed.

Lock Haven, Pa., is home base for the Piper Aircraft Co., one of the four major producers of general aviation aircraft. It has joined forces with the others—Aero Commander, Beech, Cessna—in providing airplanes for this first congressional flight survey.

Lock Haven is an industrial community hemmed in by mountains. It is situated at the junction of the west branch of the Susquehanna River and Bald Eagle Creek. It is approximately 35 miles west of Williamsport, Pa.

This colorful community, steeped in the heritage of early American history, welcomed the Piper Aircraft Co. to its fold in the early thirties. In those days, Mr. William Piper, Sr., said, "We told the bankers we didn't have a penny—that we could get rich or go bankrupt. Despite our condition, they welcomed us with open arms and encouraged us through the years when times got rough and critical."

Today, the Piper Aircraft Co. employs many hundreds of people from the area. From its factory doors thousands of general aviation types of planes have gone forth to serve the U.S. private and business pilot, as well as those of other lands around the world. Piper is known as the Ford of aviation.

Our hosts include Mr. William "Bill" Piper, Sr., William Piper, Jr., and other officials of the company and community. While our aircraft were arriving, demonstrations of agriculture aircraft and the sport of gliding were flown. Following this short exhibition, all guests toured the factory and then joined our hosts at a luncheon at the nearby Lock Haven Country Club. This cool, picturesque spot offered a fitting climax to our 3-day flight.

Mr. William Piper, Jr., sketched the economic portrait of the general aviation industry, as it dovetails into our overall economy. His father talked about the importance of small airports.

HOMEWARD BOUND

In about 1 hour after takeoff at Lock Haven, at 5 p.m., the Government buildings of Washington were below us. Our 850-mile flight had been completed in about 6 hours of flying. Had the same trip been made by auto or rail the total mileage would have exceeded 1,200 miles.

The mountains were with us until leaving the Harrisburg area. Then the terrain settled down to gently rolling hills and farm country where the Dutch and the Amish have tilled the land since this area was first opened to settlers. Some of our aircraft passed over historic Gettysburg and near to "Betsy Ross" land at Frederick, Md.

Time permitted some of us to see:

The Frederick, Md., airport which has been instrumental in bringing a new industry to the community.

The housing buildup along Route 40 eastward toward Baltimore. As we turned toward Washington, the spreading population between Baltimore and Washington gave credence to predictions that both cities will be as one within another decade.

The suburban sprawl which is now taking place around Washington in the Wheaton, Silver Spring, and Bethesda areas.

As we cruised above the Potomac on time, toward the landing at Washington National Airport, we made these observations:

The first congressional flight survey was a success. It demonstrated a new and potentially useful service to Congress. As back-seat pilots we had ample time to gain the "feel" for business flight in a practical, utilitarian sense. By the evidence presented here, it is apparent that the project proved instructive and beneficial to our basic mission—that of keeping pace with the developments of our times.

During the flight political boundaries, city limits, and county lines were nowhere in evidence—we were again impressed with the fact that here in America progress and problems extend beyond civil government boundary lines. Our view was a realistic portrait of this important part of our Nation, its ever changing contours and character. The airplane provided a rare opportunity to meet with men and women of these five States and six communities and to benefit from their views and plans for tomorrow.

The congressional flight survey was originated as a pathfinder program to serve Congress. In our opinion this objective has been met.

We hope, Mr. Speaker, that general aviation will be benefited by our efforts. Certainly we thank every Congressman that participated and every other person and organization whose interest in general aviation is in the interest of a great future for our country.

LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to join my colleagues in introducing legislation to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act. The measure would liberalize the existing statute, particularly in respect to the discriminatory quota system imbedded in the law.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to introduce in the Record an editorial from the Washington Post of July 16, 1963.

Immigration: A New Door

President Kennedy has on his desk this week a legislative problem that evokes sighs of despair among those who must grapple with it. For years it has been evident that existing immigration laws need to be recast. Foreign governments and many Americans are affronted by a law which makes national origin an invidious test and which sets up an iron framework of national quotas. In actual experience, desperate improvisation has been needed to bring the law into accord with reality—poultices and patches have been added to permit families to reunite and to provide asylum for Hungarian refugees. In the past decade, Congress has had to pass 12,000 time-consuming private bills to provide urgent relief in hardship cases.

What can be done? One approach, taken by the State and Justice Departments, is to build on existing laws but to broaden and liberalize the statute. Chairman Celler of House Judiciary has been urging a more basic reform that would eliminate the national origins system and create a new commission that would allocate entry permits on a different basis. In season and out, no Member of Congress has fought harder for liberalization than Mr. Celler. Any measure he offers deserves a respectful hearing.

But the hazard is that a fight on the same old ground would lead to the same sterile result—more poultices and patches instead of basic surgery. One problem common to all reform proposals is their complexity. Category is piled on category, calculation on calculation, with the end result resembling a Rube Goldberg contraption, blurring the issue and smothering public interest in a snowbank of statistics.

Indeed, the problem has a singular resemblance to the past fights over tariff laws. Experience in that field may offer a parallel. Last year, rather than struggle in the same trenches over renewing the Reciprocal Trade Act, the White House swept the field clean and proposed a daring and different measure—the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Surely it is worth asking whether the same medicine could not be prescribed again—recognizing that there are differences between trade and immigration. For example, the President might first propose that Congress set an overall ceiling on annual immigration—300,000 would be a reasonable round figure, because under existing laws immigration has already risen from 253,265 in fiscal 1958 to 283,763 in the past fiscal year. Secondly, Congress could stipulate that existing quotas would continue until Mr. Kennedy negotiated multilateral agreements aimed at encouraging the free movement of people, particularly in the Atlantic Alliance. All such agreements could be placed before Congress on the basis used for other executive orders—that they would go into effect in 90 days unless rejected by a majority of both Houses.

The essential purpose would be to give Mr. Kennedy authority to negotiate for several broad purposes. The first would be to remove any restrictions on Americans working abroad. While tourist visas are readily available for Americans, work permits are hard to obtain even in such countries as Canada, Mexico, France, Britain and Italy. A second aim would be to encourage a multilateral approach to the liberalization of restrictions on immigration from nonwhite areas.

A useful mechanism already exists in the 30-member Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, a Geneva-based organization that has had experience in resettling 1.3 million Europeans since 1951. Like GATT, the ICEM could serve as a clearinghouse for recommending overall policy to member states.

The United States, along with the rest of the free world, has a national interest in seeing that safety valves are open for the movements of people. Technology has made even more imperative a new multilateral approach to an old problem. In a narrower political sense, immigration policy—like trade—could be used creatively to strengthen the sense of community among the Atlantic democracies. There are no quotas for immigrants from Latin America; surely in the years ahead the same liberal policy should prevail in all the North Atlantic.

Finally, the virtue of a new approach is that it would lift the arguments over immigration from an ancient rut and give an entirely new focus to the problem. It worked with trade; just possibly it could work with immigration.

UNIFIED NATIONAL EFFORT NEEDED TO MEET ECONOMIC CHALLENGE IF TEST-BAN TREATY SHOULD LEAD TO DISARMAMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the entire world is watching with enthusiasm the current discussions going on between the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union in reaching a partial test-ban agreement on nuclear testing in the atmosphere.

President Kennedy deserves the highest praise for helping chart a course which makes this treaty possible but the President quite properly advised the Nation to proceed with caution in evaluating the full meaning of this treaty already initialed in Moscow.

The President has asked for the broadest discussion of this treaty, and this is in line with his complete intellectual sincerity in not trying to attribute to this treaty things that are not there.

It is most significant to me that not only President Kennedy but also Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Assistant Secretary of State for Political Affairs Averell Harriman, who negotiated this treaty, have all cautioned against placing too much hope for a complete resolution of the world's problems on this treaty.

But all of this notwithstanding, it must be perfectly clear that we may very well be witnessing a revolutionary change in the structure of the cold war.

I am sure we can all agree it would be the height of folly to suggest any reductions in arms spending or curtailment of our Defense Establishment on the basis of this one single harbinger of hope.

But, if indeed, this partial test-ban treaty should lead to new agreements toward partial disarmament based on foolproof inspection techniques, it stands to reason that there will be substantial cuts in our defense budget in the future.

If the present peace offensive really catches hold, I believe the United States will have to have a unified national effort to meet the new economic challenge which would face America as a result of substantial defense spending reductions, should such treaties actually be effectuated.

While all humanity welcomes the very prospect of easing international tensions caused by treaties such as the one limiting nuclear testing, I believe we Americans cannot ignore the fact that basic changes in our economy would naturally follow, and the time is now for Americans to find new ways to sustain a peacetime economy if the present negotiations ultimately lead to a reduction in the arms race and comparable reductions in military spending.

We may well be moving in a direction where civilization will finally reject the principle that man's differences must be settled by armed aggression. If this be so, it should be a source for universal rejoicing, but our Nation must realize that a whole series of adjustments must be made if we are to sustain our present level of economy and employment in the wake of curtailed military expenditures.

The cold war may very well be shifting to the economic front. Premier Khrushchev has boasted that his system will bury us. I do not believe this can happen if all Americans will put aside partisan bickering and replace it with a unified national effort to show the world that free enterprise has the vigor no other system can match. I am confident we can not only meet but beat the Soviet economic offensive if we work together as Americans toward the triumph of freedom over communism.

We are now experiencing one of the longest economic recoveries since World War II. There are more people employed in the United States today than ever before, and the average weekly salary of an American factory worker has reached an alltime high of $101 per week.

Indeed, while we continue to be concerned about the unemployed, the fact remains that we are experiencing an economic upswing in this country which not only surpasses all expectations, but also exceeds all previous records.

We know, however, that a free enterprise system such as ours experiences hills and valleys. We must start planning now for the next economic valley.

Even if there were no relief in sight in the cold war and no reason to hope that we can begin reducing the arms race, reliable sources have reported the Joint Chiefs of Staff are estimating a $12 billion reduction in military spending next year because of improved technology.

With the partial test-ban treaty, it is entirely possible further agreements may be reached for arms reductions with effective inspection. Should this become a reality, our military budget would have to be reduced even further.

There are very few factories in America which are not effected directly or indirectly by defense contracts. This is certainly true in the 11th District which I represent on Chicago's Northwest Side. Substantial cuts in defense spending are bound to affect the labor market, but I am confident that our enterprising American business community can substitute production of consumer goods for defense items to keep the wheels of industry rolling.

If, however, we are to sustain our economy in the light of curtailed defense spending, I should like to suggest the following proposals for our immediate consideration:

First. Enactment of a Federal tax cut as quickly as possible. It is estimated Congress may reduce budget requests by perhaps as much as $6 billion this year. A meaningful tax cut would not only stimulate consumer purchasing power but would also serve as an inducement to industry to experiment with new consumer products which in turn create new or additional jobs.

Second. A more aggressive trade expansion program to capture foreign markets for American-made goods. There is a strong demand for consumer goods throughout the world. If, indeed, we work out a foolproof peace treaty, the United States should make a strong bid for consumer markets behind the Iron Curtain. We know the Communists have been so preoccupied building war materials they have completely neglected their consumer goods production. Every reliable report describes tremendous shortages of consumer goods not only behind the Iron Curtain but throughout all of the underdeveloped nations of the world. These markets can keep American industry going for a long time.

Third. A nationwide effort to improve the quality of American-made products. We should strive to gain a worldwide reputation that American-made goods excel all others. Such superior quality will not only stimulate demand for our products throughout the world but also here at home. Commensurate with this, however, we should encourage Americans to demand quality products in their purchases. An increase in quality will create a vast number of additional jobs.

Fourth. An improved manpower retraining program to retrain those displaced by automation and those who lose defense jobs. It is my hope Congress will approve my amendment which would permit direct payments to an employer to retrain those of his workers he might otherwise discharge because of automation. It costs us now approximately $1,000 to retrain a worker under existing programs. I believe we should make possible agreements with an employer and pay him directly for retraining programs rather than rely on the bureaucracy to establish such programs.

Fifth. Lower interest rates on consumer credit. We are a credit nation. But when interest rates become as prohibitive as they are now, they stifle consumer demand. Vast numbers of potential American consumers are being driven out of the marketplace because of mounting interest rates on credit purchases.

I do not have the slightest fear of Mr. Khrushchev's boast. I am confident we Americans are willing to take him on in an economic offensive, and I am sure we will win.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. TOLL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for July 29 and 30, 1963, on account of death in family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY (at the request of Mr. STINSON), for 30 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. PUCINSKI (at the request of Mr. MARSH), for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. MARSH), for 5 minutes, today, to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ALBERT.

Mr. HEALEY.

Mr. GATHINGS.

Mr. SHELLEY.

Mr. RUMSFELD (at the request of Mr. STAFFORD) to revise and extend the remarks made by him today and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STAFFORD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. TALCOTT.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. OSTERTAG.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MARSH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. NIX.

Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. POWELL in 5 instances.

Mr. COLMER.

Mr. GALLAGHER.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2221. An act to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.;

H.R. 2675. An act to extend for 3 years the period during which certain tanning extracts, and extracts of hemlock or eucalyptus suitable for use for tanning, may be imported free of duty;

H.R. 3272 An act to provide for the free entry of an orthicon image assembly for the use of the Medical College of Georgia, Augusta, Ga.;

H.R. 3674. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that polished sheets and plates of iron or steel shall be subject to the same duty as unpolished sheets and plates;

H.R. 5712. An act to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid; and

H.R. 6011. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle or Tampico fiber.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1122. An act relating to the exchange of certain lands between the town of Powell, Wyo., and the Presbyterian Retirement Facilities Corp.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2221. An act to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.;

H.R. 2675. An act to extend for 3 years the period during which certain tanning extracts, and extracts of hemlock or eucalyptus suitable for use for tanning, may be imported free of duty;

H.R. 3272. An act to provide for the free entry of an orthicon image assembly for the use of the Medical College of Georgia, Augusta, Ga.;

H.R. 3674. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that polished sheets and plates of iron or steel shall be subject to the same duty as unpolished sheets and plates;

H.R. 5712. An act to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid; and

H.R. 6011. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle or Tampico fiber.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly, at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 30, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1075. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the report of actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes for the quarter ending June 30, 1963, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1076. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371) relating to certain limitations on real estate loans by national banks"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1077. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to certain activity that was undertaken by the Geological Survey during the reporting period January 1 to June 30, 1963, pursuant to section 2 of the act of September 5, 1962, Public Law 87-626; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1078. A letter from the Governor, Canal Zone Government, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Canal Zone Government for the period July 1, 1962, to June 30, 1963, pursuant to section 2673 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1079. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, relative to refugee operations that were continued in Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, and Lebanon, during the 6-month period ending June 30, 1963, pursuant to the act of July 14, 1960, as amended by the act of June 28, 1962; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1080. A letter from the treasurer, Jewish War Veterans-U.S.A., National Memorial, Inc., transmitting the financial report of the Jewish War Veterans, U.S.A., National Memorial, Inc., for the period April 1, 1962, to March 31, 1963, pursuant to Public Law 85-903; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1081. A letter from the Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency, relative to a grant made to Georgetown University in the amount of $250,000 during the fiscal year 1963, pursuant to Public Law 85-934; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1082. A letter from the Director, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report entitled "Oceanography: The 10 Years Ahead"—embodying for the first time the coordinated plans for the decade 1963-72 of the 20 Federal agencies which conduct and sponsor oceanographic research; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 2671. A bill authorizing construction of a bank protection project on the Guyandot River at Barboursville, W. Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 592). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 5478. A bill authorizing a survey of the Frio River in the vicinity of Three Rivers, Tex., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 593). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 6923. A bill authorizing a survey of Cedar Bayou, Tex, in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 594). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 192. Joint resolution relating to the validity of certain rice acreage allotments for 1962 and prior crop years; without amendment (Rept. No. 595). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 596. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1388. An act to add certain lands to the Cache National Forest, Utah; with amendment (Rept. No. 597). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 752. An act for the relief of Janos Kardos; without amendment (Rept. No. 598). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1201. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eurina P. Richards; with amendment (Rept. No. 599). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1280. A bill for the relief of Jan Owsiak; with amendment (Rept. No. 600). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7022. A bill for the relief of Marguerite Lefebvre Broughton; without amendment (Rept. No. 601). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 7797. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 7798. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 7799. A bill to provide a system of health and safety rules and regulations and proper enforcement thereof; health and safety inspection and investigations; health and safety training and education for metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines); and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 7800. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act with respect to national emergencies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 7801. A bill to authorize the payment of certain claims for structural or other major defects in homes covered by Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages, and to require indemnification bonds in the case of certain new construction under Federal Administration insured mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 7802. A bill to provide a system of health and safety rules and regulations and proper enforcement thereof; health and safety inspection and investigation; health and safety training and education for metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines); and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 7803. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER (by request):

H.R. 7804. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 7805. A bill to prohibit transportation in interstate or foreign commerce or articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 7806. A bill to provide a system of health and safety rules and regulations and proper enforcement thereof; health and safety inspection and investigation; health and safety training and education for metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 7807. A bill to amend section 102 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to provide for a study by the Secretary of Labor of the military manpower needs of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7808. A bill to provide for an Administrative Counsel of the Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 7809. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 7810. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to encourage travel to the United States on the part of nationals of Japan by requiring the Secretary of State to waive visa requirements with respect to such nationals coming to the United States as no immigrant visitors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEADER:

H.R. 7811. A bill to provide for holding terms of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan at Ann Arbor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 7812. A bill to provide a system of health and safety rules and regulations and proper enforcement thereof; health and safety inspection and investigation; health and safety training and education for metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 7813. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an accelerated amortization deduction in certain cases for industrial or commercial plants and facilities constructed or established in economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 7814. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 7815. A bill to aid in the protection of the rights of vessels of the United States engaged in the fisheries and related activities in international waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 7816. A bill to provide a system of health and safety rules and regulations and proper enforcement thereof; health and safety inspection and investigation; health and safety training and education for metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 7817. A bill to provide a system of health and safety rules and regulations and proper enforcement thereof; health and safety inspection and investigation; health and safety training and education for metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7818. A bill to amend section 4005 of title 39, United States Code, relating to fraudulent, false, or misleading and lottery mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 7819. A bill to provide for the appointment in the competitive civil service by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 7820. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to require that motion pictures photographed outside the United States, and any advertisements thereof, shall set forth the country of origin; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.J. Res. 579. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 580. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL

H.J. Res. 581. Joint resolution designating the 1st day of August as Marcus Garvey Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.J. Res. 582. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.J. Res. 583. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 584. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KARTH:

H. Res. 461. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate expenditures for research programs conducted by or sponsored by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Res. 462. Resolution providing for a White House Conference on Cancer; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H. Res. 463. Resolution creating a standing Committee on Small Business in the House of Representatives, and to grant it full authority in legislative matters; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of the rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to including Black Butte Dam and Reservoir in the Federal Central Valley project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting support for and enactment of legislation to incorporate the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 7821. A bill for the relief of Wladyslawa Pytlak Jarosz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.R. 7822. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yehudith Tenenhaus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 7823. A bill granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to render judgment on certain claims of N. M. Bentley against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

208. By Mr. HOSMER: Petition of certain residents of the 32d District of California, requesting the Congress of the United States to begin at once an investigation of the State Department because of its failure to act and its no-win policy which is responsible for the Soviet Union's ultimatum to the United States to refrain from intervention in Cuba or be subjected to massive nuclear attack launched from Russian soil; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

209. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Charles A. Perlik, Jr., secretary-treasurer, American Newspaper Guild, Washington, D.C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing opposition to three proposed constitutional amendments which the Guild says would be too great a concentration of power in the hands of a minority if approved; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

210. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting passage of legislation updating certain terminology on the U.S. dollar; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

211. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting that there be published a House document showing the exact location of the gravestones of all former Members of Congress buried in the District of Columbia, as well as other U.S. citizens deemed of historical interest; to the Committee on House Administration.

212. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Yellowstone National Park, Wyo., requesting that there be published a House document on the political and economic comments and opinions of the late Will Rogers of Oklahoma; to the Committee on House Administration.

213. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., relative to the impending railroad strike; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

214. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Yellowstone Park, Wyo., requesting that the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, change the name of the Hopewell Village National Historic Site to the Valley Forge National Historic Site, and other suggested changes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

215. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Yellowstone Park, Wyo., requesting passage of the Kennedy administration's civil rights proposals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

216. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Yellowstone Park, Wyo., requesting that there be created a standing committee in the House of Representatives known as the Committee on Peace; to the Committee on Rules.

217. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Yellowstone Park, Wyo., urging the U.S. Government to press its efforts in the international race to the moon; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

218. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Yellowstone Park, Wyo., requesting the passage of legislation requiring the John Birch Society to register with the U.S. Attorney General, and expressing his disapproval of the group; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

219. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Yellowstone Park, Wyo., requesting an investigation to determine if Abraham Lincoln was a Communist, because it is reported that a committee of Congress is having the FBI investigate a certain Negro leader as to his Communist affiliations; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

220. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Yellowstone Park, Wyo., expressing opposition to reducing any percentages of the tax rate on income and profits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Independence of Upper Volta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 5 the Republic of Upper Volta will celebrate the third anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President and Prime Minister of Upper Volta, Maurice Yameogo; and His Excellency, the Upper Voltan Ambassador to the United States, Frederic Gweer.

In early August 1960, a number of formerly dependent countries of French West Africa became sovereign nations. Among them was the republic of Upper Volta. On July 11, 1960, she had signed an agreement with France providing for its unconditional sovereignty and independence. On August 5, which was also an ancient traditional festival day in Upper Volta, joyous independence celebrations marked the official emergence of this West African country approximately the size of our State of Colorado as a sovereign member of the community of nations.

The political history of Upper Volta is a fascinating tale of the rise and decline of empire, the penetration of the French and the establishment of a protectorate, and the transition from colony to autonomous republic and then to sovereign nation. The empire-building Mossi, thought by historians to have come from east Africa sometime in the 11th century A.D., established a feudal kingdom in Upper Volta which lasted well into the 19th century. By the time the French reached the area in 1896, however, the ancient customs and rigid feudal structure which had flourished for several centuries had begun to dissolve. The French established a protectorate over the kingdom of Ouagadougou, and in 1919 converted the original protectorate into the territory of Upper Volta.

As a French territory Upper Volta was transformed from an ancient feudal empire to a modern democratic state, slowly at first but more rapidly after World War II. The constitution of the French Union approved in 1946 gave French West Africa representation for the first time in the French National Assembly and thus some lever of influence in the French Government. An enabling law of 1956 gave Upper Volta direct universal suffrage. In May 1957 its first cabinet of ministers was formed. The transition from colony to independent state continued to August 1960, its impetus becoming ever swifter.

As independence approached, Upper Volta planned wisely and with foresight for the future under the able leadership of its President, Mr. Maurice Yameogo. Reversing the unfortunate trend to Balkanization which is one of the less happy African heritages, the heads of government of Upper Volta, Niger, Ivory Coast, and Dahomey decided in 1959, prior to independence, to form a close-working union, the Counseil de l'Entente. They agreed to adopt identical constitutions and parliamentary and electoral systems, to harmonize the organization of their armed forces, to initiate common economic policies including a customs union and common level of taxes, to set up a joint amortization fund for the guarantee of loans, to concert diplomacy and share ambassadors, and to coordinate foreign policy.

Association in the Conseil de l'Entente has been of considerable advantage to Upper Volta. Although the country itself is landlocked, it has assured Upper Volta of outlets to the sea. Cooperation has enabled the Entente countries to rationalize scarce resources. Upper Volta has also continued close relations with France, and as a result has received substantial French development grant aid.

On the third anniversary of independence we congratulate President Yameogo and the people of Upper Volta for their rational approach to the problems facing them as a newly independent nation and wish them continued success in solving them in the years to come.

The Late Honorable John H. Folger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last my distinguished colleague and the able Representative of the Fifth District of North Carolina in this body, Ralph Scott, called attention in appropriate language to the passing into the Great Beyond of our former colleague from that district, the Honorable John Hamlin Folger. Unfortunately, I was engaged in other duties at that moment and was thereby denied the opportunity to join with my friend, Ralph Scott, in paying tribute to the memory of this great son of North Carolina. I have particularly regretted this because it was my pleasure to have served in the House during the 1940's when the late John Folger represented the district now so ably and well represented by Congressman Scott.

John Folger made his mark and impression upon the Nation's House of Representatives in his comparatively brief service here. I recall that he was rated among the great advocates of causes he espoused. Possessed of splendid oratorical talent, he was most impressive in the well of this House on the occasions that he felt it his duty to "speak his piece."

Quiet and deliberative generally, he never hesitated to speak out in behalf of the causes that he thought were in the best interest of his State and Nation.

I should like, Mr. Speaker, to associate myself with the remarks of tribute paid to our former colleague by my colleague, Ralph Scott, and others who extolled his memory. And, I join with them in expressing my deepest sympathy to his widow and other survivors.

Machines Will Replace Domestics as Well as Braceros

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURT L. TALCOTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, if Congress eliminates the bracero as a source of supplemental labor for harvesting crops at the crucial peak times, other harvesting methods must be devised or the crops will spoil. There never has been sufficient domestic labor to harvest row crop vegetables or strawberries. Supplemental labor was imported 80 years before the bracero.

Machines are one answer. Machines have always been a dread worry to farmworkers. They take the jobs of the bracero and domestic alike.

Libby, McNeill & Libby estimates that 75 percent of their frozen peas were harvested by machines in 1962, compared with less than 10 percent 5 years ago.

A snap bean harvester can replace 100 hand pickers. Sixty percent of the snap beans were harvested by machine last year compared with none in 1955.

Even asparagus and tomatoes may be harvested by machines if an adequate supply of hand harvesters is not available.

Farmworkers displaced by machines cannot obtain jobs in factories or other industries as can displaced miners, factory, or railroad workers. They seldom have other skills.

The machines which are developed to replace the bracero will displace the domestic also. With no more work on the farms, their last migration will be to the cities. I hope the cities have a job and a place for them.

Union-forced mechanization of the vegetable fields will have the same effect upon the employee that union-forced mechanization of the railroads and the coalfields had upon those workers. It will eliminate jobs in the newly mechanized or automated industry and force the displaced employees into competition with other low-skilled city workers who need the competition least of all workers.

The skilled mechanic or machine worker may find new and greater employment related to the new farm machinery developments. Union representatives of the skilled worker should have more consideration of the low-skilled worker. More effort should be made to improve the status of the farmworker than to eliminate him.

The bracero program protects the domestic farmworker.

Liberian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am submitting for inclusion in the Congressional Record these remarks calling attention to the celebration in that country of Liberian Independence Day, this date, July 26, 1963.

On this date, in 1847, the free and independent Republic of Liberia was established on the agriculturally and historically rich shore of West Africa. It was because of herculean efforts by pioneering former American slaves, substantially aided by American philanthropic societies, that this still vital and growing constitutional democracy joined the family of nations. Thus, under a constitution modeled after our very own, these ex-slaves and descendants of slaves gave further proof that men must and will be free of oppression and suppression even if they are compelled by circumstances to build their own nation toward that end.

Since that time, the Republic of Liberia has come to contain 1,300,000 people—1960 U.N. estimation—approximately equal to the population of the State of Arizona. Liberia occupies 43,000 square miles, being slightly larger than the State of Tennessee and somewhat smaller than my own State of Pennsylvania.

The Liberian Republic enjoys a relatively healthy economic condition and is experiencing considerable growth and development along economic lines—a further tribute to the industry and aspirations of her capable and resourceful people. In 1958, 94.8 million pounds of rubber were produced along with 46.8 million pounds of other forestry products which were exported. In 1959, 2 million pounds of coffee were exported as part of the yield of an increasingly prosperous agricultural endeavor. Estimated iron ore deposits have been set at 80 million tons of 67.8 percent pure iron, out of which 2.6 million long tons were exported in 1959.

Total imports increased from $26.7 million valuation in 1956 to $69.2 million in 1960. Exports, too, increased significantly during the same period, climbing from $44.5 million valuation to $78.8 million. Nearly 1,000 main-line ships called at Liberia's ports, principally the free port of Monrovia, during 1959. The nation has under registry 10.93 million tons of ships. The main importer of Liberian goods is the United States, which received $41.6 million worth of her exports in 1960; and that little nation reciprocated by importing $37 million in U.S. goods in that same year. She belongs to that area of Africa which led in American private investments with $290 million in 1960. The Liberian dollar has been at par with the American dollar since 1944; and the nation was placed in the American account area in 1952.

With no Sino-Soviet bloc ties or commitments whatever, the free and independent Republic of Liberia stands now and has always stood firmly with the free nations of the world against totalitarianism and exploitation. Moreover, her multimillion-dollar Robertsfield Airport is a strategic U.S. base, while her well-developed port of Monrovia is a potentially vital submarine facility.

In view of her rich history, her noble and substantial accomplishments, her sturdy and resourceful people, and her fine record in international relations—as well as with regard for her kinship to the United States—I take great pleasure in according recognition to the Republic of Liberia on the occasion of her 141st anniversary. The words and title of her national anthem are well taken, "All hail, Liberia, hail."

Gene Kinnaly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the words of tribute which are being paid by my colleagues in the House to Gene Kinnaly your longtime right hand and capable administrative assistant. Gene is completing 45 years of outstanding and devoted service to the House of Representatives. Gene has served as our esteemed Speaker's right-hand man for 35 years and has been associated with Speaker McCormack from the first day he arrived in Washington as Congressman representing the 12th Massachusetts District.

Forty-five years of public service in the House of Representatives is an impressive record. Gene's record is far from being just one of quantity, but rather is an outstanding record of quality. The great fund of knowledge that Gene has acquired in nearly a half century of service in the U.S. Congress has made him an invaluable aid both to the Speaker and many Members of the House. I know that I speak for hundreds of my colleagues when I say that Gene's helpfulness and courtesy is deeply appreciated. I know that from the first day I took the oath of office in this great body, Gene Kinnaly has been a great source of wisdom and advice to me. He is now a credit to the office of the Speaker, but even before that, to the entire Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

I am delighted to join with my colleagues in congratulating Gene on his 45th year of loyal and tireless service and hope that Gene will continue to serve the Speaker and the House of Representatives for many years to come.

Subversive Character of NAACP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 23, 1956, I spoke under special order on the subject of the "Subversive Character of NAACP." Records from the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. House of Representatives, of quite a number of the officers, members of the board of directors, legal, health, and other committees, as well as certain members of the executive staff of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, were incorporated at that time. Since only a few copies of this particular Record are available today, I have been requested to ask permission to again incorporate a good portion of this material into the Record, so that the same may be made available to anyone who may desire it.

A copy of "NAACP in Action—Report for 1961," the most current copy of this booklet which is available at this time, has been used as a guideline in checking over the current members of the staff of officials, board of directors, and various committees of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Out of the 77 persons listed as officials of the NAACP in the Congressional Record of February 23, 1956, 59 are still active and serving in an official capacity as of 1961. All of those who are not at this time associated with the NAACP as revealed by this publication have been deleted from the material which is being incorporated herewith.

Remarks made by me with respect to the original founder of the NAACP, Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, together with a statement with reference to or regarding the history and development of the American Negro movement in the United States, are also included herewith. The colloquy on the floor of the House between various Members is not being made a part of the current extension of remarks.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include certain material contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 23, 1956, which came from the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the U.S. House of Representatives, regarding various officials of the NAACP, as of 1961, together with a brief statement made by me with respect to the history of the American Negro movement in the United States:

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Roy Wilkins, national administrator and executive secretary, NAACP, 1961

"The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The Daily Worker of July 15, 1949 (p. 5), in an article datelined Los Angeles, July 14, reported that 'Roy Wilkins, acting secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, told a press conference * * * he voted for Benjamin J. Davis, Negro Communist, at the last election. Davis is now on trial for his Communist beliefs, along with 11 other national Communist Party leaders in New York City. Wilkins, however, refused any comment on the trial itself.' The same information appeared in the Daily People's World of July 13, 1949 (p. 1).

"Mr. Wilkins was a member of the national committee, International Judicial Association, as was shown on the leaflet entitled 'What is the IJA?' and a letterhead of the group dated May 18, 1942; he was identified as being from New York State. The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the International Judicial Association as 'a Communist front and an offshoot of the International Labor Defense' (report 1311 of March 29, 1944); the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as having 'actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line' (report dated September 17, 1950, p. 12.)

"A letterhead of the Conference on Pan American Democracy dated November 16, 1938, contains the name of Roy Wilkins in a list of sponsors of that group, cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included on his consolidated list released April 1, 1954); the special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Conference as a Communist-front organization which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International (report 1311 of March 29, 1944; also cited in report dated June 25, 1942).

"According to the Daily Worker of September 24, 1937 (p. 6), Roy Wilkins was one of the sponsors of a joint meeting of the American League Against War and Fascism and the American Friends of Chinese People.

"The American League Against War and Fascism was cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also consolidated list of April 1, 1954); it had previously been cited by the Attorney General as a 'Communist-front organization' (in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10); and as 'established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union.' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7683.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American League * * * as 'completely under the control of Communists' (reports of March 29, 1944; January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; and June 25, 1942). American Friends of the Chinese People was also cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist-front organization (report of March 29, 1944).

"The Daily Worker of January 23, 1937 (p. 8), reported that Roy Wilkins spoke for the International Labor Defense in Brooklyn. The International Labor Defense was cited by the Attorney General as the legal arm of the Communist Party and as subversive and Communist. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7686; and press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the ILD as the legal arm of the Communist Party (reports of January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944); the Committee on Un-American Activities also cited the group in a report released September 2, 1947.

"Roy Wilkins spoke at a New York State convention of the Workers Alliance, as reported in the Daily Worker of February 11, 1939 (p. 1), and February 7, 1939 (p. 5). The Workers Alliance was cited as a Communist-penetrated organization and later as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7684; and press releases on December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The special committee cited the Workers Alliance as among the successes in the Communist-front movements (report dated January 3, 1939; also cited in reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944).

"In an article by Blaine Owen which appeared in the Daily Worker of June 17, 1936 (p. 1), entitled '1936 Communist Party Convention Significant to Negroes,' he stated: 'The greatest significance undoubtedly attends the 1936 convention of the Communist Party,' Roy Wilkins, assistant national secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and editor of the Crisis, said today. 'It must be patent to anyone who has kept track of the news that the political leftwing—and especially the Communist program—has been an important factor in bringing the plight of the Negro people, along with other underprivileged groups, more sharply to the attention of those parties which have been in power. * * * Nevertheless, there is no doubt in my mind that the program and demands of the Communists have had a very wholesome effect of the Negro people themselves. They have been emboldened by the basic and basically right demands put forth.' This, it was pointed out to Wilkins, is what the Communist Party means when it bases its entire campaign on the proposal for and toward the realization of the broad People's Front. He nodded.

To understand the civil rights movement as propagated by the NAACP, I feel that a person must know something of the history and development of the American Negro movement here in the United States subsequent to the reconstruction period.

In 1895, Booker T. Washington, president of Tuskegee Institute, Alabama, was selected to speak for the southern Negro at the Atlanta Exposition. Dr. Washington stated his position clearly and with great effect. I would like to quote several paragraphs from Booker T. Washington's address which I feel sum up the entire philosophy enunciated by him and his group:

"The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremest folly, and that progress in the enjoyment of all the privileges that will come to us must be the result of severe and constant struggle rather than of artificial forcing. No race that has anything to contribute to the markets of the world is long in any degree ostracized. It is important and right that all privileges of the law be ours, but it is vastly more important that we be prepared for the exercises of these privileges. The opportunity to earn a dollar in a factory just now is worth infinitely more than the opportunity to spend a dollar in an opera house."

Also:

"Cast it down in agricultural, mechanics, in commerce, in domestic service, and in the professions. And in this connection it is well to bear in mind that whatever other sins the South may be called to bear, when it comes to business, pure and simple, it is in the South that the Negro is given a man's chance in the commercial world, and in nothing is this exposition more eloquent than in emphasizing this chance. Our greatest danger is that in the great leap from slavery to freedom we may overlook the fact that the masses of us are to live by the productions of our hands, and fail to keep in mind that we shall prosper in proportion as we learn to dignify and glorify common labor and put brains and skills into the common occupations of life; shall prosper in proportion as we learn to draw the line between the superficial and the substantial, the ornamental gewgaws of life and the useful. No race can prosper till it learns that there is as much dignity in tilling a field as in writing a poem. It is at the bottom of life we must begin, and not at the top. Nor should we permit our grievances to overshadow our opportunities."

There was an entirely different school of thought, however, which was headed by Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, of Atlantic University. Dr. DuBois was a very bitter critic of the Washingtonian movement, which he referred to as "the Tuskegee machine." Dr. DuBois was the leader of the leftwing element of American Negro Society which, in 1905, met at Niagara Falls, N.Y., and devised plans whereby complete social equality could be attained. This group was subsequently called the Niagara movement.

The Niagara movement was not very effective, because it was hampered by lack of funds. However, in 1908, a race riot occurred in Springfield, Ill., the home of Abraham Lincoln, which aroused the interest of the dormant abolitionist movement in the North. As a result of the feeling which was aroused by the Springfield race riots, William English Walling made a strong appeal for the emancipation of the American Negro in the fields of political and social equality. This appeal later became the clarion for the formation of a new organization, called National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which joined the white liberals of the northern abolitionist traditions with the Negro liberals of the Niagara movement.

Dr. DuBois was one of the founding fathers of the present-day NAACP, which was founded in 1909. This Dr. DuBois, who broke away from the Booker T. Washington group, was the leader of the Niagara movement. His record of citations from the House Committee on Un-American Activities takes up nine pages single spaced:

“FEBRUARY 21, 1956.

“Subject: Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, founder NAACP, leader Niagara movement.

“The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

“The Worker (Sunday edition of the Communist publication, the Daily Worker) on April 27, 1947, reported that ‘almost 100 Negro leaders, headed by W. E. B. DuBois, Paul Robeson, and Roscoe Dunjee, last week called upon President Truman to “repudiate decisively” steps to “illegalize the Communist party.” * * * As Negro Americans * * * we cannot be unmindful that this proposal to outlaw the Communist Party comes precisely when our Federal Government professes grave concern over the democratic rights of peoples in far distant parts of the world’ (p. 8 of the Worker).

“Dr. DuBois sponsored a statement attacking the arrest of Communist Party leaders (Daily Worker, Aug. 23, 1948, p. 3); he sponsored a ‘Statement by Negro Americans’ on behalf of the Communist leaders (the Worker of Aug. 29, 1948, p. 11); he filed a brief in the Supreme Court on behalf of the 12 Communist leaders (Daily Worker, Jan. 9, 1949, p. 3); he signed statements on behalf of Communist leaders, as shown in the following sources: Daily Worker, January 17, 1949 (p. 3); February 28, 1949 (p. 9); Daily People’s World, May 12, 1950 (p. 12); Daily Worker, September 19, 1950 (p. 2); and in 1952, he signed an appeal to President Truman, requesting amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act (Daily Worker, Dec. 10, 1952, p. 4); also an appeal on their behalf addressed to President Eisenhower (Daily People’s World, Nov. 17, 1954, p. 2). Dr. DuBois was one of the sponsors of the National Non-Partisan Committee To Defend the Rights of the 12 Communist Leaders, as shown on the back of their letterhead dated September 9, 1949.

“A statement on behalf of Eugene Dennis, a Communist, contained the signature of Dr. DuBois, identified as an educator (Daily Worker of May 5, 1950, p. 2); he signed a telegram of the National Committee To Win Amnesty for Smith Act Victims, greeting Eugene Dennis on his 48th birthday (Daily Worker, August 11, 1952, p. 3); Eugene Dennis was formerly secretary general of the Communist Party.

The Daily Worker of August 2, 1949 (p. 2), disclosed that Dr. DuBois endorsed Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., well-known Communist leader; he was honorary chairman of the Committee To Defend V. J. Jerome, chairman, cultural commission of the Communist Party, United States of America (letterhead dated June 24, 1952). A leaflet of the Civil Rights Congress (dated March 20, 1947) named Dr. DuBois as having defended Gerhart Eisler, Communist. He was one of the sponsors of the Committee To Defend Alexander Tractenberg, former member of the national committee of the Communist Party (Daily People’s World of April 17, 1952, p. 7; and the Daily Worker of April 18, 1952, p. 6).

“The Daily Worker of February 16, 1948 (p. 16), reported that some ‘80 leading New York civic leaders, trade unionists, and professionals yesterday joined Dr. William Jay Schieffelin, president emeritus of the citizens union, to demand the prompt seating of Simon W. Gerson to the city council seat made vacant by the death of Councilman Peter V. Cacchione, Brooklyn Communist. * * * The civic leaders’ statement is directed to Mayor O’Dwyer and city council majority leader Joseph T. Sharkey. It is a reprint of a letter to the New York Times by Dr. Schieffelin in which he charges that the real reason for the refusal to seat German (sic. Gerson) is “the current anti-Communist hysteria.”’ Dr. DuBois was named as having signed the statement. (See also advertisement in New York Times of February 19, 1948, p. 13.)

“Dr. DuBois was a member of a committee formed to protest the arrest of Pablo Neruda, Communist Chilean senator and world famous poet; he signed a statement of the organization in support of Neruda. (Daily Worker of April 7, 1948, p. 13, and April 10, 1950, p. 2, respectively.) He was sponsor of a reception and testimonial for Harry Sacher, defense attorney for the Communist leaders. (Daily Worker of December 5, 1949, p. 2.)

“When Earl Browder (then general secretary, Communist Party) was in Atlanta Penitentiary serving a sentence involving his fraudulent passports, the Communist Party’s front which agitated for his release was known as the Citizens’ Committee to Free Earl Browder (special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944); the Attorney General of the United States had cited the Citizens’ Committee as Communist (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7687, and press release of Apr. 27, 1949). Dr. DuBois was a member of the Citizens’ Committee * * * in 1942, as shown on their letterhead dated February 11, 1942; he sponsored a dinner of the group, according to the Daily Worker of February 5, 1942, and signed the call to the National Free Browder Congress, as shown in the Daily Worker of February 25, 1942, pages 1 and 4.

“A 1950 letterhead of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born carries the name of Dr. W. E. B. DuBois in a list of sponsors of that organization; the same information appears on an undated letterhead of the group, distributing a speech of Abner Green at the conference of December 2–3, 1950; a letterhead of the Midwest Committee for Protection of Foreign Born dated April 30, 1951, names him as a national sponsor of the organization. He signed the group’s statement opposing the Hobbs bill (Daily Worker, July 25, 1950, p. 4); he signed their statement opposing denaturalization (Daily Worker of August 10, 1950, p. 5); and signed a telegram prepared and dispatched by the organization to the Attorney General of the United States, protesting holding nine noncitizens without bail under the McCarran Act. (Daily Worker of November 24, 1952, p. 3.) He was also listed in the Daily Worker of October 21, 1954 (p. 2) as one of 95 sponsors of the National Conference to Defend the Rights of Foreign Born Americans, to be held December 11 through 12 in New York City by the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

“The special committee cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as ‘one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States’ (report of March 29, 1944; also cited in report of June 25, 1942); the Attorney General cited the organization as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450, see consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

“ ‘For years, the Communists have put forth the greatest efforts to capture the entire American Labor Party throughout New York State. They succeeded in capturing the Manhattan and Brooklyn sections of the American Labor Party but outside of New York City, they have been unable to win control’ (Special Committee’s Report 1311 of March 29, 1944). Dr. DuBois spoke at a State conference of the American Labor Party (Daily Worker of December 12, 1950, p. 5); he spoke at a dinner, April 18, opening the presidential campaign in New York City (Daily Worker of April 14, 1952, p. 8, an advertisement; and the Daily Worker of April 21, 1952, p. 1); he spoke at an election rally in Madison Square Garden, May 13, held under the auspices of the American Labor Party (Daily Worker of May 8, 1952, p. 8, an advertisement; and May 14, 1952, p. 1); and he spoke at an election rally in Madison Square Garden, October 27 (Daily Worker of October 22, 1952, p. 8, an advertisement; and October 29, 1952, p. 2).

“The Daily Worker of March 29, 1948 (p. 7), named Dr. DuBois as a member of the executive board and of the Policy Committee, Council on African Affairs; he signed the council’s petition to the United Nations as shown in the Daily Worker of June 5, 1950 (p. 4); drafted their statement against the policy of the United States in Korea (Daily Worker of July 25, 1950, p. 3) and spoke at the council’s conference on April 24 at Friendship Baptist Church in New York City (Daily Worker, April 23, 1954, p. 8 and April 26, 1954, p. 6). The Attorney General cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948); also redesignated—consolidated list of April 1, 1954.

“The Attorney General cited the Jefferson School of Social Science as an ‘adjunct of the Communist Party’ (press release of Dec. 4, 1947); also redesignated—consolidated list of Apr. 1, 1954); the Special Committee reported that ‘at the beginning of the present year, the old Communist Party Workers School and the School for Democracy were merged into the Jefferson School of Social Science.’ (Report 1311 of Mar. 29, 1944.) Dr. DuBois was honored at the Jefferson School, as shown in the Daily Worker on Feb. 1, 1951 (p. 2); it was announced in the Daily Worker on Jan. 2, 1952 (p. 7), that Dr. DuBois was scheduled to conduct a seminar on ‘Background of Africa Liberation Struggles’ at the Jefferson School; the Jan. 26, 1952, issue of the same publication (p. 7), named him as a faculty member of that school, as did the Worker, October 4, 1953 (p. 10) and the Daily Worker, Oct. 14, 1953 (p. 8)—advertisement. He signed statements on behalf of the Jefferson School as shown in the Daily Worker, Nov. 25, 1953 (p. 2) and the Daily People’s World, July 6, 1954 (p. 7).

“In a report of the special committee, dated Mar. 29, 1944, the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was cited as having been, in recent months, the Communist Party’s principal front for all things Russian (report dated Mar. 29, 1944); the organization has been cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (press releases of Dec. 4, 1947, and Sept. 21, 1948; also redesignated consolidated list of Apr. 1, 1954). Dr. Dubois signed a statement of the national council in 1947 (Daily Worker, Oct. 17, 1947, p. 4); he signed the organization’s statement protesting the Iron Curtain, as reported in the Daily People’s World on May 20, 1948 (p. 5); he signed a statement of the council, praising Henry Wallace’s Open Letter to Stalin in May 1948 (from a pamphlet entitled ‘How To End the Cold War and Build the Peace,’ p. 9); he signed their statement calling for a conference with the Soviet Union (Daily Worker, June 21, 1948, p. 3); he signed their Roll Call for Peace (Daily Worker of Aug. 31, 1948, p. 5); he sent greetings through the national council on the 31st anniversary of the Russian Revolution (Daily Worker, Nov. 10, 1948, p. 11); he signed the council’s appeal to the United States Government to end the cold war and arrange a conference with the Soviet Union (leaflet entitled ‘End the Cold War—Get Together for Peace,’ dated December 1948); he spoke at the Congress on American-Soviet Relations, Dec. 3–5, 1949, arranged by the national council and signed the council's letter to the American people, urging that a unified democratic Germany be established (Daily People's World, Aug. 13, 1952, pp. 4 and 6).

"A letterhead of the Conference on Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, dated Aug. 21, 1949, lists the name of Dr. W. E. B. DuBois as having signed an open letter of the organization, addressed to Senators and Congressmen, urging defeat of President Truman's arms program; he answered a questionnaire of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy in favor of recognition of Chinese Communist Government, as shown in Far East Spotlight for December 1949-January 1950 (p. 23).

"The Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact was cited as a meeting called by the Daily Worker in July 1949, to be held in Washington, D.C., and as having been instigated by 'Communists in the United States (who) did their part in the Moscow campaign' (Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 378 on the Communist Peace Offensive dated Apr. 1, 1951). The Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy has been cited as Communist by the Attorney General (press release of Apr. 27, 1949); also redesignated-consolidated list of Apr. 1, 1954.

"A page of signatures from the Golden Book of American Friendship with the Soviet Union, 'sponsored by American friends of the Soviet Union, and signed by hundreds of thousands of Americans' was published in the November 1937 issue of Soviet Russia Today (p. 79); the Golden Book was to be presented to President Kalinin at the 20th anniversary celebration. The page carried the title, 'I hereby inscribe my name in greeting to the people of the Soviet Union on the 20th anniversary of the establishment of the Soviet Republic,' and a facsimile of the name, W. E. B. DuBois, appeared on that page.

"The Golden Book of American Friendship was cited as a 'Communist enterprise' signed by 'hundreds of well-known Communists and fellow travelers (Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944).

"A letterhead of the New York Committee To Win the Peace, dated June 1, 1946, contains the name of W. E. B. DuBois in a list of New York committee members. The National Committee To Win the Peace, with which the New York committee is affiliated, was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General. (Press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated consolidated list of April 1, 1954.)

"Dr. DuBois sponsored a petition of the American Council for a Democratic Greece, as disclosed by the Daily People's World of August 23, 1948 (p. 2); he signed a statement of the same organization, condemning the Greek Government, as reported in the Daily Worker of September 2, 1948 (p. 7). The American Council for a Democratic Greece has been cited as subversive and Communist, an organization formerly known as the Greek-American Council (Attorney General of the United States in press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948); also redesignated—consolidated list of April 1, 1954.

"Dr. DuBois was a sponsor of a conference of the National Council of Arts, Sciences and Professions, October 9–10, 1948, as shown in a leaflet entitled 'To Safeguard These Rights,' published by the Bureau of Academic Freedom of the National Council; a letterhead of the National Council (received for files January 1949) named him as a member-at-large of that organization; he was named as vice chairman of the group on the leaflet, Policy and Program Adopted by the National Convention, 1950; a letterhead of the same organization's southern California chapter, dated April 24, 1950, lists him as a member-at-large of the national council; he was elected vice chairman of the group in 1950 (Daily Worker, May 1, 1950, p. 12); a letterhead of the group dated July 28, 1950, names him as vice chairman of the group; he endorsed a conference on equal rights for Negroes in the arts, sciences, and professions sponsored by the New York Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions (Daily Worker, November 9, 1951, p. 7); the call to the conference contained the same information. A letterhead of the national council, dated December 7, 1952, named him as vice chairman.

"The call to a Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, issued by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions for New York City, March 25–27, 1949, as well as the conference program (p. 12), and the Daily Worker of February 21, 1949 (p. 9), named Dr. DuBois as one of the sponsors of that conference; he was a member of the program committee of the conference, honorary chairman of the panel at cultural and scientific conference (program, p. 7), and spoke on the Nature of Intellectual Freedom at that conference (p. 78 of the edited report of the conference entitled 'Speaking for Peace').

"The National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Committee on Un-American Activities in its review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, released April 19, 1949; in the same review, the Scientific and Cultural Conference was cited as a Communist front which 'was actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations.'

"The Daily People's World of October 28, 1947 (p. 4), named Dr. DuBois as one of the sponsors of a national conference of the Civil Rights Congress in Chicago, November 21–23, 1947; he sponsored their Freedom Crusade (Daily Worker, Dec. 15, 1948, p. 2); the call to a Bill of Rights Conference, called by the Civil Rights Congress, for July 16–17, 1949, in New York City, named him as one of the sponsors of that conference; the program of the National Civil Rights Legislative Conference, January 18–19, 1949, called by the Civil Rights Congress, lists him as one of the conference sponsors; he was chairman of a conference of the Congress, as reported in the Worker of January 2, 1949 (p. 5); Dr. DuBois was defended by the Civil Rights Congress (Daily Worker, Feb. 13, 1951, p. 3); he signed the organization's open letter to J. Howard McGrath, U.S. Attorney General, on behalf of the four jailed trustees of the bail fund of the Civil Rights Congress of New York (advertisement paid for by contributions of signers which appeared in the Evening Star on Oct. 30, 1951, p. A–7); he participated in the organization's sixth anniversary dinner in New York City, March 26, 1952 (Daily Worker, Mar. 28, 1952, p. 4).

"The Civil Rights Congress was formed in 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations, the International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; it is 'dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party' and 'controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it' (Rept. 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities, dated Sept. 2, 1947); the Attorney General cited the congress as subversive and Communist (press releases of Dec. 4, 1947 and Sept. 21, 1948); also redesignated—consolidated list of April 1, 1954.

"Dr. DuBois spoke in Washington, D.C., on May 9, 1947, under the auspices of the Washington Book Shop, as shown by a leaflet of the Book Shop, cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General; it had previously been cited by the Attorney General as follows: 'Evidence of Communist penetration or control is reflected in the following: Among its stock the establishment has offered prominently for sale books and literature identified with the Communist Party and certain of its affiliates and front organizations' (press releases of Dec. 4, 1947, and Sept. 21, 1948; also redesignated—consolidated list of Apr. 1, 1954; and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7688, respectively). The special committee cited the Washington Book Shop as a Communist-front organization (report of Mar. 29, 1944).

"The Workers Book Shop catalog for 1948 (p. 5), advertised Dr. DuBois' 'The World and Africa' for sale; the 1949–50 catalog (p. 11) advertised his 'Black Folk Then and Now'; the Worker for March 1, 1953 (p. 16), carried an advertisement of Dr. DuBois' books, 'The Battle for Peace' and 'Black Reconstruction' on sale at the Workers Book Shop, New York City. The Workers Book Shops are a chain of Communist bookshops which are official outlets for Communist literature.

"As shown on the following sources, Dr. DuBois was a member of the advisory council of Soviet Russia Today: Letterhead of the publication dated September 8, 1947; a letterhead of September 30, 1947; and an undated letterhead received April 1948. The Daily People's World of November 6, 1952 (p. 7), reported that Dr. DuBois had written an article for the November issue of New World Review; and his article entitled 'Normal United States-China Relations' appeared in the issue of August 1954 (pp. 13–15). He was also shown by the Daily Worker of October 20, 1954 (p. 7), as one of those who attended the annual banquet held by New World Review on October 14 at which special tribute was paid to Mr. and Mrs. Paul Robeson. Soviet Russia Today has been cited as a Communist-front publication by the special committee in reports of March 29, 1944, and June 25, 1942; the Committee on Un-American Activities also cited it as a Communist-front publication in a report dated October 23, 1949. Soviet Russia Today changed its name to New World Review, effective with the March 1951 issue.

"The Daily Worker of July 6, 1951 (p. 7), reported that Dr. DuBois was author of the pamphlet, 'I Take My Stand for Peace,' published by the New Country Publishers, official Communist Party publishing house which has published the works of William Z. Foster and Eugene Dennis, Communist Party chairman and executive secretary, respectively. (Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of May 11, 1948.)

"In 1947 and 1948, Dr. DuBois was contributing editor on the staff of New Masses magazine and later, of Masses and Mainstream. (New Masses, July 22, 1947, p. 2; Masses and Mainstream, Mar. 1948, vol. 1, No. 1; and issue of August 1950, p. 1; June 1954, inside front cover.) He contributed articles to the following issues of New Masses and Masses and Mainstream-New Masses for September 10, 1946 (p. 3) and June 10, 1947 (p. 20); Masses and Mainstream for April 1951 (pp. 10–16); and February 1952 (pp. 8–14).

"In 1940, Dr. DuBois signed New Masses' letter to President Roosevelt as shown in New Masses for April 2, 1940 (p. 21); he was honored at a dinner in New York City, January 14, 1946, arranged by New Masses and at which awards were made for greater interracial understanding (Daily Worker of Jan. 7, 1946, p. 11, cols. 1 and 2); he endorsed New Masses, as reported in the Daily Worker of April 7, 1947 (p. 11): he sponsored a plea for financial support of New Masses, as disclosed in the issue of that publication for Apr. 8, 1947 (p. 9); he received the New

Masses award for his contribution in promoting democracy and interracial unity at the publication's second annual awards dinner (New Masses of Nov. 18, 1947, p. 7); the February 1953 issue of Masses and Mainstream carried a chapter from Dr. DuBois' book, 'The Soul of Black Folk,' written 50 years ago (Daily Worker, Feb. 23, 1953, p. 7); he was author of 'In Battle for Peace,' described as the story of his 83d birthday, and which was published by Masses and Mainstream (the Daily Worker of June 18, 1952, p. 7; Daily People's World of Sept. 17, 1952, p. 7; the Daily Worker of Sept. 23, 1952, p. 7; and the Worker of Dec. 21, 1952, p. 7).

"The Attorney General of the United States cited New Masses as a Communist periodical (Congressional Record of September 24, 1942, p. 7688); the special committee cited it as a nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party (report of March 29, 1944; also cited in reports of January 3, 1939 and June 25, 1942.) Beginning with the March 1948 issue, New Masses and Mainstream (Marxist quarterly) consolidated into what is now know as Masses and Mainstream, with the announcement that 'here, proudly, in purpose even if not in identical form, is a magazine that combines and carries forward the 37-year-old tradition of New Masses and the more recent literary achievement of Mainstream. We have regrouped our energies, not to retire from the battle but to wage it with fresh resolution and confidence' (Masses and Mainstream for March 1948, p. 3).

"A letterhead of the Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg case, dated March 15, 1952, carried the name of Dr. W. E. B. DuBois in a list of sponsors; he joined in a request of that committee for a new trial for Ethel and Julius Rosenberg (Daily Worker of June 2, 1952, p. 6); he participated in a rally October 23 in New York City, to demand clemency for the Rosenbergs (Daily Worker, Oct. 27, 1952, p. 8); he signed an amicus curiae brief presented to Supreme Court in Washington, D.C., urging a new trial for the Rosenbergs (Daily Worker of November 10, 1952, p. 3; and the Daily People's World of November 13, 1952, p. 8). He wrote an article entitled 'A Negro Leader's Plea To Save Rosenbergs' (The Worker of November 16, 1952, p. 3M); and the Daily Worker of January 21, 1953 (p. 7), reported that he had urged clemency for the Rosenbergs.

"The Daily Worker of April 11, 1949 (p. 5), reported that Dr. DuBois was a member of the Sponsoring Committee of the World Peace Congress in Paris; he was cochairman of the American Sponsoring Committee of the Congress, as disclosed on a leaflet entitled 'World Congress for Peace, Paris,' April 20–23, 1949, he was proposed as a candidate for the World Peace Prize, awarded by the World Peace Congress (Daily People's World of December 7, 1951, p. 4); he was a member of the Executive Committee of the World Peace Congress (Daily Worker of September 14, 1950, p. 5); he was one of the sponsors of the Second World Peace Congress in Sheffield, England (Daily Worker of October 19, 1950, p. 3); he was elected to the Presiding Committee of the World Peace Congress (Daily Worker of November 17, 1950, p. 1); he was a member of the World Peace Council of that Congress (Daily Worker of November 24, 1950, p. 9); a mimographed letter dated December 1, 1950, contains his name in a list of sponsors of the American Sponsoring Committee for Representation at the World Peace Congress.

"Dr. DuBois was a member of U.S. Sponsoring Committee of the American Intercontinental Peace Conference (Daily Worker of December 28, 1951, p. 2, and February 6, 1952, p. 2); the Peace Conference was called by the World Peace Council, formed at the conclusion of the Second World Peace Congress in Warsaw; he was awarded the International Peace Prize for "six world figures" by the World Peace Council (Daily People's World of January 29, 1953, p. 7; the Worker of February 8, 1953, p. 5; and Daily People's World, November 25, 1953, p. 4). He awarded the Stalin Peace Prize for 1953 to Howard Fast in ceremonies held in the Hotel McAlpin in April 1954. (See Daily Worker, April 26, 1954, pp. 3 and 6 and the Worker, May 9, 1954, p. 9.)

The Daily Worker of June 20, 1950 (p. 2), reported that Dr. DuBois signed the World Peace Appeal; the same information appears on an undated leaflet of the enterprise, received by this committee September 11, 1950. A mimeographed list of individuals who signed the Stockholm World Appeal To Outlaw Atomic Weapons, received for filing October 23, 1950, contains the name of Dr. DuBois. He was chairman of the Peace Information Center where the Stockholm peace petition was made available. (Daily Worker of May 25, 1950, p. 2; and August 16, 1950, p. 5.)

"The World Peace Congress which was held in Paris, France, April 20–23, 1949, was cited as a Communist front among the 'peace' conferences which 'have been organized under Communist initiative in various countries throughout the world as part of a campaign against the North Atlantic Defense pact' (Committee on Un-American Activities in reports of April 19, 1949; July 13, 1950; and April 1, 1951). The World Peace Council was formed at the conclusion of the Second World Peace Congress in Warsaw and was 'heralded by the Moscow radio as the expression of the determination of the peoples to take into their own hands the struggle for peace.' (Committee on Un-American Activities in a report dated April 1, 1951.)

"The World Peace Appeal was cited as a petition campaign launched by the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress at its meeting in Stockholm, March 16–19, 1950; it 'received the enthusiastic approval of every section of the international Communist hierarchy' and was 'lauded in the Communist press, putting every individual Communist on notice that he "has the duty to rise to this appeal." ' (Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of April 1, 1951.)

"The American Peace Crusade, organized in January 1951, was cited as an organization which 'the Communists established as a new instrument for their 'peace' offensive in the United States' (Committee on Un-American Activities in its reports of Feb. 19, 1951, and Apr. 1, 1951); Dr. DuBois was one of the sponsors of the crusade (Daily Worker of Feb. 1, 1951, p. 2); minutes of the sponsors meeting which was held in Washington, D.C., March 15, 1951 (p. 4), named him as one of the initiators of the crusade and also as having been proposed as cochairman of that meeting; he was a sponsor of the American People's Congress and Exposition for Peace, which was held in Chicago, June 29–July 1, 1951, called by the American Peace Crusade to advance the theme of world peace (Daily Worker, Apr. 22, 1951, p. 2; May 1, 1951, p. 11; the American Peace Crusade, May 1951, pp. 1 and 4; the Daily Worker of May 9, 1951, p. 4; Daily Worker of June 11, 1951, p. 2; a leaflet of the congress; Daily Worker of July 1, 1951, p. 3; a leaflet entitled 'An Invitation to American Labor To Participate in a Peace Congress'; the call to the American People's Congress; the Daily Worker of July 3, 1951, p. 2). He signed a petition of the crusade, calling on President Truman and Congress to seek a big-power pact (Daily Worker, Feb. 1, 1952, p. 1); he attended a meeting of Delegates Assembly for Peace, called by the crusade and held in Washington, D.C., April 1 (Daily Worker, Apr. 3, 1952, p. 3); he was one of the sponsors of a peace referendum jointly with the American Peace Crusade to make the end of the Korean war a major issue in the 1952 election campaign (Daily People's World of Aug. 25, 1952, p. 8).

"Dr. DuBois issued a statement on the death of Stalin which read in part as follows: 'Let all Negroes, Jews, and foreign born who have suffered in America from prejudice and intolerance remember Joseph Stalin' (Daily Worker of Mar. 9, 1953, p. 3); the Daily Worker of January 18, 1952 (p. 8), reported that he had renewed his fight for a passport in order to attend the American Intercontinental Peace Conference in Rio de Janeiro; it was reported in the Washington Evening Star on May 10, 1952 (p. B–21), that Dr. DuBois was refused admission to Canada to attend the Canadian Peace Congress because he refused to undergo an examination by the Canadian Immigration Service. On September 14, 1952, the Worker (p. M6) reported that Dr. DuBois had experienced passport difficulties when leaving the United States; and on May 4, 1953 (p. 2), the Daily Worker reported that U.S. delegate Betty Sanders told the opening session of the Continental Cultural Congress in Santiago, Chile, that DuBois would have attended in person 'as well as in spirit,' if he had not been denied a passport."

According to Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, "subversion" means "act of subverting, or a state of being subverted; overthrow; utter ruin; destruction. That which subverts."

The time element would prevent my reading all of these citations on the various individuals who compose the high echelon of this organization. I will, however, read excerpts from some of them and would like to ask later for permission to incorporate each of them in full in the Record.

"October 13, 1955.

"Subject: Arthur B. Spingarn, national president, member of board of directors, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Arthur B. Spingarn is listed as an individual participating in the Conference on Africa, held by the Council on African Affairs in New York City, April 14, 1944, according to the Council's pamphlet, for a New Africa (p. 37).

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The Attorney General redesignated the organization April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

"An undated leaflet, 'The Only Sound Policy for a Democracy' and the Daily Worker of March 18, 1945 (p. 2), listed Arthur Spingarn, president NAACP, New York, N.Y., as one who signed a statement of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties supporting the War Department's order on granting commissions * * * to members of the Armed Forces who have been members of or sympathetic to the views of the Communist Party. An advertisement in the New York Times, April 1, 1946 (p. 16), listed Arthur B. Spingarn as a signer of a statement of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties opposing use of injunctions in labor disputes.

"The Attorney General cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The group was cited previously by the Attorney General as part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7687.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation as 'one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party.' The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the National Federation * * * as among a 'maze of organizations' which were 'spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law.'

"An undated letterhead of the Public Use of Arts Committee listed Arthur B. Spingarn as a sponsor of the organization. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 112), cited the Public Use of Arts Committee as a Communist front which was organized by the Communist-controlled Artists Union."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Grace B. Fenderson, national vice president, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The pamphlet, 'For a New Africa' (p. 37), proceedings of the Conference on Africa held under auspices of the Council on African Affairs, April 14, 1944, named Mrs. Grace B. Fenderson as a conference participant.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: A. Philip Randolph, national vice president, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The Daily Worker of September 12, 1950 (p. 2), reported that A. Philip Randolph, president, AFL Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, opposed the jailing of the Communist leaders.

"The Attorney General of the United States reported that A. Philip Randolph, president of the National Negro Congress, refused to run in April 1940 'on the ground that it was "deliberately packed with Communists and Congress of Industrial Organizations members who were either Communists or sympathizers with Communists"' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688).

"Walter S. Steele, in testimony in public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 21, 1947 (p. 92), referred to A. Philip Randolph as follows:

"'A. Philip Randolph, one-time president of the National Negro Congress, resigned his position because of the Communist control thereof. At the time of his resignation, at a meeting held in Washington, D.C., he charged that the congress was controlled by the Communist Party, through which he found it was chiefly financed.'

"George K. Hunton, testified in public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 13, 1949 (p. 451), concerning the Communist infiltration of the National Negro Congress with reference to A. Philip Randolph as follows:

"'In the National Negro Congress they did make progress. That was a sound, constructive organization started about 10 years ago. It was a good organization, with a sound, constructive program, and the Commies moved in, and within a year and a half the white Communist members completely outnumbered the Negro members and took over. Be it said to his credit that the then president, A. Philip Randolph, roundly denounced them and then resigned, and said no longer would the National Negro Congress represent the feeling of the Negro people who organized it * * *.'

"Manning Johnson testified in public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 14, 1949, as follows concerning the National Negro Congress and A. Philip Randolph:

"'Mr. TAVENNER. What was the relationship of that commission (Negro Commission of the Communist Party) to the American Negro Labor Congress, the League of Struggle for Negro Rights, and the National Negro Congress?

"'Mr. JOHNSON. The Negro League was formed by the Communist Party, and its program was identical with the program of the Communist Party for the Negro.

"'The majority of members of the American Negro Labor Congress were Communists or fellow-travelers. It was a very narrow, sectarian organization, and the party decided to change its name and broaden its activities, so the name was changed to the League of Struggle for Negro Rights. * * *

"'The League of Struggle for Negro Rights was never successful in penetrating any broad sections of the Negro people. It remained a very narrow and sectarian organization. So the party, after having received the open letter, which was really drawn in Moscow and called for breaking away from narrow organizations, in line with this open letter, at a meeting of the national committee which, as I recall, was in the latter part of 1934 or early part of 1935, we discussed the general situation among Negroes, and the conclusion was that there was considerable unrest among them and that the time was historically right for the formation of a broad and all-inclusive organization.

"'As a result of that discussion and that conclusion, the national committee of the party, upon the recommendation of one of the members of the Negro commission present at that meeting, decided to set up the National Negro Congress. The national committee gave James W. Ford the responsibility, along with the Negro commission of the national committee, to form that congress.

"'We were fishing around for someone to head the congress, and we found there was no finer person to get who was not a member of the party than A. Philip Randolph. He was approached and agreed.

* * * * *

"'The third—and fatal—National Negro Congress was held in Washington, D.C. The Communists had become so drunk with power, and they felt they had such strong control over the congress, that they thought they could walk roughshod over the liberals, and they antagonized A. Philip Randolph and he began to fight James W. Ford and others.

"'James W. Ford and others insisted I fight A. Philip Randolph, and I refused to do so, and at that time I predicted they were on the road to breaking up the congress.

"'The fight widened to such an extent that Randolph began to speak openly against Communist domination. I used to wonder how Randolph could be so naive as to not know it was a Communist-front organization.

"'Before the third congress met, we got wind that Randolph was going to resign. We had Communists go to that congress representing various paper organizations so as to give them control in voting.

"'When Randolph saw the congress was packed with Communists, Randolph resigned and walked out * * *.' (Pp. 510–512.)

"A. Philip Randolph supported a statement to Congress issued by the American League Against War and Fascism against neutrality measures as reported by the Daily Worker of February 27, 1937 (p. 2). The Daily Worker of April 22, 1938 (p. 2), reported that A. Philip Randolph was one of the signers of a letter urging open hearings on the neutrality act which was sent to Congress under auspices of the American League for Peace and Democracy. A. Philip Randolph was nominated as a member of the National Labor Committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy at the American Congress for Peace and Democracy held in Washington, D.C., January 6–8, 1939, as shown by the pamphlet, '7½ Million * * *' (p. 32). Letterheads of the China Aid Council of the American League for Peace and Democracy dated May 18, 1938, and June 11, 1938, name him as a sponsor of the council. He was a sponsor of the Easter drive of the China Aid Council of the American League * * *, as shown by the Daily Worker of April 6, 1938 (p. 2). A photostatic copy of a letterhead of the American League for Peace and Democracy dated April 6, 1939, listed A. Philip Randolph as a national sponsor of that organization.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the American League Against War and Fascism as subversive and Communist, in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front organization (in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 53), cited the American League Against War and Fascism as 'organized at the First U.S. Congress Against War which was held in New York City, September 29 to October 1, 1933. Four years later at Pittsburgh, November 26–28, 1937, the name of the organization was changed to the American League for Peace and Democracy. * * * It remained as completely under the control of Communists when the name was changed as it had been before.'

"The Attorney General cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the group previously as established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism 'in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union * * * The American League for Peace and Democracy * * * was designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7683 and 7684). The special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 69–71), cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as 'the largest of the Communist-front movements in the United States.'

"A letterhead of the organization, Commonwealth College, dated January 1, 1940, listed A. Philip Randolph as a member of the National Advisory Committee. He endorsed the reorganization plan of Commonwealth College, as shown by the August 15, 1937, issue of Fortnightly, a publication of the college (p. 3).

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited Commonwealth College as a Communist enterprise in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 76 and 167). The Attorney General cited the Commonwealth College as Communist in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

"An undated leaflet of the League for Mutual Aid listed A. Philip Randolph as a member of the executive committee of that organization. He was a guest of honor at the 17th annual dinner of the League for Mutual Aid held February 1, 1937, as shown by New Masses, January 26, 1937 (p. 37).

"The League for Mutual Aid was cited as a Communist enterprise by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 76).

"A. Philip Randolph was a sponsor of the Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, as shown by letterheads of the organization dated July 6, 1938, and February 2, 1939. The Daily Worker of June 2, 1938 (p. 5), reported that A. Philip Randolph was a supporter of a meeting of the Medical Bureau * * *.

" 'In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations.' Among these was the Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report Mar. 29, 1944, p. 82.)

"New Masses for October 26, 1937 (p. 11), reported that A. Philip Randolph was chairman of the National Negro Congress. A. Philip Randolph was president of the National Negro Congress, as shown by the Daily Worker of January 1, 1938 (p. 4), January 13, 1938 (p. 3), April 19, 1938 (p. 3), and the pamphlet, Second National Negro Congress, October 1937. He was president of the Third National Negro Congress, as reported by the June 1940 issue of the Communist (p. 548). The official proceedings of the 1936 National Negro Congress (p. 41), listed A. Philip Randolph as a member of the national executive council of the organization. He spoke at a gathering of the congress, as reported by the Daily Worker of March 8, 1938 (p. 3). The Daily Worker of February 15, 1938 (p. 7), reported that A. Philip Randolph contributed to the official proceedings of the Second National Negro Congress.

"The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front group (Congressional Record, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as 'the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes * * *.'

"A. Philip Randolph was a consultant of the Panel on Citizenship and Civil Liberties of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, as shown by an official report of the organization, dated April 19–21, 1942. The call to the second conference, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, April 14–16, 1940, listed A. Philip Randolph as a sponsor of that conference.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 147), cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist front which received money from the Robert Marshall Foundation, one of the principal sources of funds by which many Communist fronts operate. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 12, 1947, cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist-front organization 'which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South' although its 'professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States.'

"The Daily Worker, issues of March 28, 1938 (p. 3) and April 4, 1938 (p. 3), listed A. Philip Randolph as a sponsor of the World Youth Congress. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 183), cited the World Youth Congress as a Communist conference held in the summer of 1938 at Vassar College.

"A. Philip Randolph signed a petition of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy to lift the arms embargo as shown by the Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 4). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 82), cited the American Friends of Spanish Democracy as follows: 'In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy.'

"A. Philip Randolph is listed as a sponsor on a letterhead of the American Relief Ship for Spain dated September 3, 1938. The American Relief Ship for Spain was cited as 'one of the several Communist Party front enterprises which raised funds for Loyalist Spain (or rather raised funds for the Communist end of that civil war).' (Special Committee on Un-American Activities Report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 102.)

"The proceedings of the Congress of Youth of the American Youth Congress, July 1–5, 1939 (p. 3), listed A. Philip Randolph as a signer of the call to the congress.

"A. Philip Randolph was a sponsor of the Conference on Pan-American Democracy (letterhead, Nov. 16, 1938). The booklet, These Americans Say, published by the Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo, named him as a representative individual. He was a sponsor of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights (program of conference, Feb. 12, 1940).

"The Conference on Pan-American Democracy (known also as Council for Pan-American Democracy) was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 161 and 164), cited the organization as a Communist front which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 137 and 138), cited the Coordinating Committee To Lift the (Spanish) Embargo as one of a number of front organizations set up during the Spanish civil war by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation.

"The Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights was cited as a Communist front which was succeeded by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (special committee report, Mar. 29, 1944, pp. 96 and 129). The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights among a 'maze of organizations' which were 'spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general, but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law.'

"A. Philip Randolph was a sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign, as shown by the back cover of a pamphlet, Children in Concentration Camps. He signed the call to a United May Day conference, according to the Daily Worker of March 17, 1937 (p. 4). An undated letterhead of the United May Day Committee listed him as chairman.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Spanish Refugee Campaign as a Communist-front organization (report, Jan. 3, 1940, p. 9).

"The United May Day conference was cited as 'engineered by the Communist Party for its 1937 May Day demonstrations' and also organized by the party in 1938 (special committee report, Mar. 29, 1944, pp. 124 and 139).

"The Attorney General cited the United May Day Committee as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U.S.A., which seeks 'to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means.' (Letter released December 4, 1947; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.)

"The Daily Worker of January 23, 1937 (p. 3), announced that A. Philip Randolph was scheduled to speak at the Southern Negro Youth Congress, Richmond, Va., February 12–14. 'The People Versus H.C.L.' listed him as a sponsor of the Consumers National Federation. He was shown as a sponsor of the Public Use of Arts Committee on an undated letterhead of that organization.

"The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U.S.A., which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means. (Attorney General, letter released December 4, 1947; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on April 1, 1954, consolidated list.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1940 (p. 9), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947 (p. 14), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as 'surreptitiously controlled' by the Young Communist League.

"The Consumers National Federation was cited as a Communist-front group by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155).

"Public Use of the Arts Committee was cited as a Communist front by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 112)."

"February 13, 1956.

"Subject: L. Pearl Mitchell, national vice president, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The Daily Worker of April 18, 1936 (p. 3), named L. Pearl Mitchell, identified as national director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, as chairman of a committee for a benefit dance which was held by the Joint Scottsboro Defense Committee, Cleveland, Ohio, for the purpose of raising money to be sent to New York.

"The Scottsboro Defense Committee was cited as a Communist front by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in its reports of January 3, 1939 (p. 82); and March 29, 1944 (p. 177).

"Miss L. Pearl Mitchell, of Cleveland, Ohio, was one of the endorsers of the National Negro Congress, as shown by the call for National Negro Congress, Chicago, Ill., February 14, 1936.

"The National Negro Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included in the Attorney General's consolidated list of April 1, 1954.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities stated that 'the officers of the National Negro Congress are outspoken Communist sympathizers, and a majority of those on the executive board are outright Communists' (special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, January 3, 1939, p. 81; also cited, reports, January 3, 1940, p. 9; June 25, 1942, p. 20; March 29, 1944, p. 180; and included in the Attorney General's consolidated list of April 1, 1954)."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Bishop W. J. Walls, national vice president, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"As shown in Soviet Russia Today for December 1942 (p. 42), W. J. Walls was a sponsor of the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship. He was named as a sponsor of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship on a letterhead of the group dated March 13, 1946, and a memorandum issued by the organization March 18, 1946.

"The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954); the special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Council * * * (in a report dated March 29, 1944) as having been 'in recent months, the principal front' of the Communist Party.

"Bishop W. J. Walls, Chicago, Ill. supported the National Negro Congress, as shown in the Daily Worker of February 3, 1936 (p. 2). The National Negro Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954); the Attorney General had previously cited the National Negro Congress as 'sponsored and supported by the Communist Party' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7687–7688). The special committee cited the National Negro Congress as 'the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes' (report of January 3, 1939; also cited in reports of January 3, 1940; January 3, 1941; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944).

"A petition to the United Nations, drafted and circulated by the Council on African Affairs, contained the signature of Bishop W. J. Walls, according to the Daily Worker of June 5, 1950 (p. 4). The Attorney General cited the council as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

"Bishop Walls also signed a statement of the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt (anti-Communist) Bill, according to the Daily Worker of April 3, 1950 (p. 4). The national committee * * * was cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as 'a registered lobbying organization which has carried out the objectives of the Communist Party in its fight against antisubversive legislation' (report of the Committee on Un-American Activities on the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill, released December 7, 1950).

"Identified as secretary of the board of bishops, A.M.E. Zion Church, Bishop W. J. Walls was named as having endorsed the World Peace Appeal (undated leaflet received by the committee September 11, 1950), and the Daily Worker of August 14, 1950 (p. 2). The World Peace Appeal was cited as a petition campaign launched by the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress at its meeting in Stockholm, March 16–19, 1950; as having 'received the enthusiastic approval of every section of the international Communist hierarchy'; as having been lauded in the Communist press, putting 'every individual Communist on notice that he "has the duty to rise to this appeal" '; and as having 'received the official endorsement of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. * * *' (report of the Committee on Un-American Activities on the Communist Peace Offensive, April 1, 1951).

"Bishop Walls was one of the sponsors of the American Sponsoring Committee for Representation at the World Peace Congress, as shown on a mimeographed letter of December 1, 1950; he was a delegate to the World Peace Congress, as shown in the Daily Worker of November 7, 1950 (p. 2); he signed a protest made by the American Sponsoring Committee for Representation at the World Peace Congress (Daily People's World of Nov. 20, 1950, p. 2). The protest was made against exclusion by the British Government of more than 50 Americans, five-sixths of the U.S. delegation to the World Peace Congress. In the latter two sources, he was identified as secretary of the board of bishops of A.M.E. Zion Church.

"The World Peace Congress was cited as a Communist front among the 'peace conferences' which 'have been organized under Communist initiative in various countries throughout the world as part of a campaign against the North Atlantic Defense Pact' (report of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated April 1, 1951).

"According to the Daily Worker of October 28, 1949 (p. 2), Bishop W. J. Walls, of Chicago, endorsed Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., Communist, and urged his reelection to the New York City Council. Benjamin J. Davis was 1 of the 11 leaders of the Communist Party on trial."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: John Haynes Holmes, national vice president, NAACP, 1954–61.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Rev. John Haynes Holmes was shown to be a member of the advisory board of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born on a letterhead of the organization dated April 27, 1938, on a letterhead dated January 1940, and in the call to the third annual conference. The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as 'one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States' (report, March 29, 1944, p. 155; also cited in report, June 25, 1942, p. 13).

"In a bulletin, Spot News (p. 1), John Haynes Holmes was listed as a sponsor of the American Committee To Save Refugees, which was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944 (pps. 49, 112, 129, 133, 138, 167, 180).

"A letterhead dated November 18, 1936, showed John Haynes Holmes to be a member of the general committee of the medical bureau, American Friends of Spanish Democracy. 'New Masses' (January 5, 1937, p. 31) also listed John Haynes Holmes as a member of the general committee of that organization. 'In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy' (special committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944, p. 82).

"The Daily Worker (January 11, 1937, p. 2) reported that John Haynes Holmes was a sponsor of the New York City Conference Against War and Fascism. The Daily Worker (February 23, 1938, p. 2) reported that he signed a letter which was sponsored by the American League for Peace and Democracy. A contribution from him appeared in Fight (September 1935, p. 2), a magazine published by the American League Against War and Fascism; he was identified as minister, Community Church, New York. The following is quoted from an editorial comment on the article:

" 'In a recent sermon Dr. Holmes made an eloquent appeal for unity of Christians and Communists in opposition to the forces of reaction driving toward war and fascism, and in struggle for the achievement of a better world based on brotherhood and cooperation among men.

" 'If churchmen will unite with Communists, Socialists, trade unionists, and everyone else opposed to war and fascism, our forces will be tremendously strengthened, and war and fascism will not be inevitable. Already the American League Against War and Fascism has brought together in its ranks people of diverse political and religious beliefs, liberals, radicals, and revolutionists, of all races and creeds * * *.

" 'The American League Against War and Fascism was organized at the First United States Congress Against War which was held in New York City, September 29 to October 1, 1933. Four years later at Pittsburgh, November 26–28, 1937, the name of the organization was changed to the American League for Peace and Democracy. There was, however, no fundamental change in the character of the organization. It remained as completely under the control of Communists when the name was changed as it had been before' (special committee report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 53; also cited in reports, Jan. 3, 1939, pp. 69 and 121; Jan. 3, 1940, p. 10; June 25, 1942, p. 14). The Attorney General of the United States cited the league as subversive and Communist (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released Dec. 4, 1947, and Sept. 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released Apr. 1, 1954). The Attorney General cited it as a 'Communist-front Organization,' in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942 (p. 10) and said it was 'established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union' (Congressional Record, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7683).

"The Daily Worker (Sept. 24, 1940, p. 5) reported that an open letter sponsored by the Communist Party and the American Civil Liberties Union, demanding discharge of Communist Party defendants in Fulton and Livingston Counties, was signed by John Haynes Holmes.

"The Daily Worker of February 13, 1937 (p. 2), reported that 'aroused by the Fascist tactics displayed by the Brazilian Government in its treatment of hundreds of political prisoners held without trial since November 1935, outstanding among them Luiz Carlos Prestes, leader of the liberation movement of the Brazilian people, and Arthur Ewert, ex-deputy in the German Reichstag, outstanding Americans have signed their names to a cable of protest forwarded to President Vargas of Brazil.' Among those named as signers was Dr. John Haynes Holmes, Community Church. A letterhead dated November 16, 1938, of the conference on Pan American Democracy, listed John Haynes Holmes as a sponsor. The Attorney General cited this organization as subversive and Communist (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and Sept. 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released Apr. 1, 1954). The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as a Communist front which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International (report, Mar. 29, 1944, pp. 161 and 164; also cited in report, June 25, 1942, p. 18).

"The Daily Worker of February 13, 1939 (p. 2), reported that Dr. John Haynes Holmes was a member of the Descendants of the American Revolution. The Daily Worker (Jan. 21, 1938, p. 2), also referred to him as a sponsor and as a member of the advisory board of that organization. A pamphlet, Descendants of the American Revolution (back page), listed him as a member of the advisory board of the organization. The special committee (report, June 25, 1942, pp. 18 and 19) cited the Descendants of the American Revolution as 'a Communist-front organization set up as a radical imitation of the Daughters of the American Revolution. The descendants have uniformly adhered to the line of the Communist Party. * * * The educational director * * * is one Howard Solzam, an instructor at the Communist Party's Workers School in New York.'

"A program of the conference (February 12, 1940), named John Haynes Holmes as a sponsor of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights. This conference was cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front which was succeeded by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (report, March 29, 1944, pp. 96 and 129). It was also cited by the congressional Committee on Un-American Activities (report No. 1115, September 2, 1947, p. 3).

"An open letter to the U.S. Senate, initiated and distributed by the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, in protest of the Dempsey deportation bill and the McCormack rider attached to the Walter espionage bill, was signed by the Reverend John Haynes Holmes (photostat of open letter). 'It will be remembered that during the days of the infamous Soviet-Nazi Pact, the Communists built protective organizations known as the National Emergency Conference, the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, which culminated in the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties' (Committee on Un-American Activities, report No. 1115, September 2, 1947, p. 12). The special committee cited the National Emergency Conference * * * as a Communist front in the report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 48 and 102).

"The Daily Worker of February 8, 1939 (p. 7), reported that John Haynes Holmes was contributor to a booklet published by the League of American Writers. The league was cited as a Communist-front organization in three reports of the special committee (report, January 3, 1940, p. 9; June 25, 1942, p. 19; March 29, 1944, p. 48). It was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released June 1, and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). Previously, the Attorney General (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, pp. 7685 and 7686) stated that the overt activities of the league 'leave little doubt of its Communist control.'

"An undated letterhead listed John Haynes Holmes as a sponsor of the New York Tom Mooney Committee, which was cited as a Communist front by the special committee (report, March 29, 1944, p. 154).

"An undated leaflet published by the Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder named Dr. John Haynes Holmes, Community Church, New York City, among those who appealed to President Roosevelt for justice in the Browder case. The Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder was cited as Communist by the U.S. Attorney General (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7687; letter to Loyalty Review Board, released April 27, 1949; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). 'When Earl Browder (then general secretary, Communist Party) was in Atlanta Penitentiary serving a sentence involving his fraudulent passports, the Communist Party's front which agitated for his release was known as the Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder * * *' (special committee report, March 29, 1944).

"Soviet Russia Today for December 1933 (p. 17) listed John Haynes Holmes among the endorsers of the National Committee, Friends of the Soviet Union. A pamphlet issued by the Friends of the Soviet Union entitled 'Welcome. "Land of Soviets" Moscow-New York 1929' listed John Haynes Holmes as a member of the Reception Committee for the Soviet Flyers. The Attorney General cited Friends of the Soviet Union as Communist (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The special committee cited it as 'one of the most open Communist fronts in the United States' whose purpose 'is to propagandize for and defend Russia and its system of government' (report, January 3, 1939, p. 78).

"Rev. John Haynes Holmes, New York, N.Y., was shown to be a sponsor of the Mid-Century Conference for Peace on the call to that conference. The conference was cited by this committee at a meeting held in Chicago, May 29 and 30, 1950, by the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact and as having been 'aimed at assembling as many gullible persons as possible under Communist direction and turning them into a vast sounding board for Communist propaganda' (report 378, April 25, 1961, p. 58).

"A letterhead dated March 16, 1937, listed John Haynes Holmes as a member of the National People's Committee Against Hearst, cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a subsidiary organization of the American League for Peace and Democracy, which was described on page 2 of this report (report, June 25, 1942, p. 16).

"A letterhead dated March 20, 1926, listed Rev. John Haynes Holmes as a member of the advisory board of Russian Reconstruction Farms, Inc., cited by the special committee as a Communist enterprise which was directed by Harold Ware, son of the well-known Communist Ella Reeve Bloor (report, March 29, 1944, p. 76).

"New Masses for March 31, 1936 (p. 2) named John Haynes Holmes as a member of the League for Mutual Aid, cited as a Communist enterprise by the special committee (report, March 29, 1944, p. 76).

"According to the Daily Worker of February 16, 1958 (p. 16) Rev. John Haynes Holmes signed a statement to the mayor and city council in behalf of Simon Gerson, a Communist. An advertisement in the New York Times (February 19, 1948, p. 13), listed him as a supporter of the Citizens Committee to Defend Representative Government, supporting the seating of Gerson.

"The following was reported in the Daily Worker on September 22, 1948 (p. 5): 'Prof. Ralph Sarton Perry of Harvard University released yesterday the names of 93 prominent educators, churchmen, and individuals in other cultural fields, who have formed a committee of welcome for the Very Reverend Hewlett Johnson, D.D., dean of Canterbury Cathedral. Dean Johnson had been invited to visit the United States by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship for a countrywide tour under its auspices. A visa was refused him on the ground that the sponsoring organization was on the Attorney General's list. The Committee of Welcome had extended to Dean Johnson an invitation to come to the United States under its independent auspice in November and December of this year and to speak at public gatherings.' The article named Dr. John Haynes Holmes, minister, the Community Church, New York, among the members of the committee.

"The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The special committee cited the National Council * * * as 'the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian' (report, March 29, 1944, p. 156).

"The Daily Worker of February 19, 1951 (p. 2), reported that Rev. John Haynes Holmes was a signer of a statement addressed to the Attorney General, urging withdrawal of contempt of Congress proceedings against a number of persons who had been indicted for refusing to answer questions before congressional committees.

"The Daily People's World of August 1, 1951 (p. 2), reported that the Rev. John Haynes Holmes endorsed a statement attacking the Smith Act, which was anti-Communist legislation. It was reported in the Daily Worker of January 15, 1953 (p. 8), that Rev. John Haynes Holmes, minister-emeritus, the Community Church of New York, signed a letter to President Truman asking for amnesty for 11 leaders of the Communist Party arrested under the Smith Act.

"In testimony before this committee on July 7, 1953, Benjamin Gitlow, former member of the Communist Party, said: 'Before the creation of the front organizations, the ministers who carried out the instructions of the Communist Party or collaborated with it were limited in numbers. The outstanding ones among them were * * * Rev. John Haynes Holmes * * *' (Communist Activities in the New York Area, p. 2077).

"The Daily Worker of January 1, 1953 (p. 1), reported that Rev. John Haynes Holmes signed a petition for clemency for the Rosenbergs. The same newspaper on January 13, 1953 (p. 2), published a list of 'the clergymen of various faiths and other religious leaders who have urged President Truman to use his power of clemency to save the lives of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg.' The name of Dr. John Haynes Holmes, New York, appeared on the list. The Rosenbergs had been convicted of conspiracy to commit espionage and sentenced to death."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: William Lloyd Imes, national vice president, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"William Lloyd Imes was one of those who signed a statement on December 14, 1939 (the day before the 148th anniversary of the Bills of Rights), 'warning against denying to the Communists, or to any other minority group, the full freedom guaranteed by the Bills of Rights' (letter signed by Dashiell Hammett dated January 1940, attached to the statement).

"A pamphlet entitled 'The People vs. H.C.L.' which was dated December 11–12, 1937, named William Lloyd Imes as one of the sponsors of the Consumers National Federation, publishers of the pamphlet.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the Consumers National Federation as a Communist-front organization.

"He supported the National Negro Congress (Daily Worker, Feb. 3, 1936, p. 2); spoke at the Second National Negro Congress in October 1937 (program of the congress); and supported a conference of the congress to push passage of the antilynch bill (Daily Worker, Mar. 17, 1938, p. 4).

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations redesignated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist front (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as 'the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes * * *'

"William Lloyd Imes sponsored a dinner-forum called by the Protestant Digest Associates on the subject, 'Protestantism Answers Hate,' which was held in New York City, February 25, 1941.

"Protestant Digest was cited as 'a magazine which has faithfully propagated the Communist Party line under the guise of being a religious journal' (special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 48).

"He signed a petition of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, as shown on a mimeographed sheet attached to a letterhead dated January 17, 1940; and sponsored a citizens rally of the same organization, on April 13, 1940, in New York City (according to a leaflet announcing the rally).

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 25, 1944 (p. 13), cited the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom as a Communist front which defended Communist teachers.

"William Lloyd Imes sponsored the Fourth Annual Conference of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, as shown on a letterhead of the conference which was held in Washington, D.C., March 2 to 3, 1940.

"The Attorney General cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversives and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as 'one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States.'

"Dr. Imes contributed to Fight magazine, official organ of the American League Against War and Fascism (Fight for August 1935, p. 4); he was chairman of a rally of the American League which was held in Harlem (Fight for September 1935, p. 14); he spoke at the National People's Committee Against Hearst of the American League (Daily Worker, Oct. 21, 1936, p. 4); he supported a statement of the league, addressed to the United States Congress (Daily Worker, Feb. 27, 1937, p. 2); he was a member of the National People's Committee Against Hearst (letterhead of Mar. 16, 1937); he spoke in New York City at a joint meeting of the American League and American Friends of the Chinese People (Daily Worker, Sept. 23, 1937, p. 2); and was one of the sponsors of the China Aid Council of the American League, as shown on a letterhead of the council dated May 18, 1938. As shown by the Daily Worker of April 6, 1937 (p. 5), Rev. William Lloyd Imes, pastor, St. James Presbyterian Church, was guest of honor at a dinner of the American League Against War and Fascism, April 6, 1937, New York City.

"The Attorney General cited the American League Against War and Fascism as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a 'Communist-front organization' (in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10); and 'established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7683). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 53), cited the American League Against War and Fascism as 'completely under the control of Communists.'

"A letterhead dated November 3, 1937, lists William Lloyd Imes as a member of the national executive committee, People's Congress for Democracy and Peace; he sponsored the Boycott Japanese Goods Conference of the American League for Peace and Democracy, February 5, 1938 (Daily Worker, Jan. 11, 1938, p. 2); he signed a letter of the American League, as was shown in the Daily Worker of February 23, 1938 (p. 2); he signed a statement of the league concerning the international situation (New Masses, Mar. 15, 1938, p. 19); a letterhead of the New York City division of the American League named him as a member of the advisory board as of that date (Sept. 22, 1938); a letterhead of the City Executive Committee, New York City division, American League for Peace and Democracy, dated September 26, 1938, contained the name of the Reverend William Lloyd Imes in the list of members of the advisory board; he endorsed the American Congress for Peace and Democracy, January 6–8, 1939, in New York City, as shown on a letterhead dated December 7, 1938. A letterhead of the New York City division, American League for Peace and Democracy, dated March 21, 1939, listed him as a member of the advisory board of the league. A letterhead of the Baltimore division, American League for Peace and Democracy, dated May 18, 1939, contained the name of Dr. Imes in the list of members of the national committee; a letterhead of the league, dated July 12, 1939, furnished the same information, and also a pamphlet entitled '7½ Million * * *,' which was published by the league.

"The Attorney General cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism 'in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7683 and 7684). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 69–71), cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as 'the largest of the Communist front movements in the United States.'

"The Daily Worker of August 13, 1940 (p. 5), named Dr. Imes as one who endorsed the Emergency Peace Mobilization; he was one of the sponsors of the Greater New York Committee of the Emergency Peace Mobilization, as shown on an undated letterhead.

"The Attorney General cited the Emergency Peace Mobilization as follows: 'The American Peace Mobilization was formally founded at a meeting in Chicago at the end of August 1940, known as the Emergency Peace Mobilization' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7684). The special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944, cited the Emergency Peace Mobilization as a Communist front which came forth, after Stalin signed his pact with Hitler, to oppose the national defense program, lend-lease, conscription, and other American 'warmongering' efforts. It immediately preceded the American Peace Mobilization in 1940.

"Dr. Imes sponsored the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, as shown on the call to the conference, June 7, 1940; he signed a letter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, addressed to Attorney General Jackson, in defense of ballot rights of minority parties (Daily Worker, Sept. 24, 1940, p. 1); he signed a statement of the federation, opposing use of injunctions in labor disputes, according to an advertisement which appeared in the New York Times of April 1, 1946, in which source he was identified as president of Knoxville College.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America as 'an important part of the solar system of the Communist Party's front organizations' (Report, Mar 29, 1944, p. 102). The Attorney General cited the conference as one as a result of which was established the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7687).

"The Attorney General cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as 'part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program * * *' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7687). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as 'one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party.'

"Dr. Imes signed an open letter of the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights (Daily Worker, May 13, 1940, pp. 1 and 5); he was one of the sponsors of the Conference on Pan-American Democracy, as shown on a letterhead of that group dated November 16, 1938.

"The National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights was cited as a Communist front organization by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 48 and

102). The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 12), cited the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights as follows: 'It will be remembered that during the days of the infamous Soviet-Nazi pact, the Communists built protective organizations known as the National Emergency Conference, the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, which culminated in the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.'

"The Conference on Pan-American Democracy (known also as Council for Pan-American Democracy) was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 161 and 164), cited the Conference on Pan-American Democracy as a Communist front which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International.

"Dr. Imes was one of the sponsors of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights, as shown on the program of the conference, February 12, 1940. He spoke before the American Youth Congress (Daily Worker, Jan. 29, 1938, p. 3); and endorsed the American Youth Act, as shown on a press release of the American Youth Congress.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its March 29, 1944, report (pp. 96 and 120), cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights as a Communist front which was succeeded by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. The organization was cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities (report, Sept. 2, 1947, p. 3), as among a 'maze of organizations' which were 'spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law.'

"The American Youth Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The group was cited previously by the Attorney General as 'originated in 1934 and * * * has been controlled by Communists and manipulated by them to influence the thought of American youth' (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7685). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 25, 1942 (p. 16), cited the American Youth Congress as 'one of the principal fronts of the Communist Party' and 'prominently identified with the White House picket line * * *.'

"According to the proceedings and report, and to 'Equal Justice' for July 1939, he sent greetings to the National Conference of the International Labor Defense. He signed a letter to President Roosevelt, defending the publication, New Masses (issue of April 2, 1940, p. 21).

"The Attorney General cited the International Labor Defense as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The group was cited previously by the Attorney General as the 'legal arm of the Communist Party' (Congressional Record, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7686). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 75–78), cited the International Labor Defense as 'the legal defense arm of the Communist Party of the United States.'

"New Masses was cited as a 'Communist periodical' by the Attorney General (Congressional Record, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7688). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 48 and 75), cited New Masses as a 'nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party * * *.' "

"February 13, 1956.

"Subject: Dr. W. Montague Cobb, chairman of the national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"According to the Bookshopper for July 1948 (p. 2), Montague Cobb, professor, Howard University, lectured at a membership meeting in January 1948 of the Washington Cooperative Bookshop, 916 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

"The Attorney General of the United States found that 'evidence of Communist penetration or control [of the Washington Cooperative Bookshop] is reflected in the following: Among its stock the establishment has offered prominently for sale books and literature identified with the Communist Party and certain of its affiliates and front organizations * * * certain of the officers and employees of the bookshop, including its manager and executive secretary, have been in close contact with local officials of the Communist Party of the District of Columbia' (Congressional Record, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7688); subsequently, it was cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954). The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as a Communist front (report 1311 of March 29, 1944).

"Dr. W. Montague Cobb, identified as professor of anatomy, Howard University, spoke at the 1947 convention of the Association of Internes and Medical Students, according to their official organ, the Interne (January 1948, p. 61); the same publication (February 1950, p. 27) reported that he had spoken at a convention of the organization; the printed program of the 16th Convention of the Association of Internes and Medical Students which was held in December 1950, revealed that he had spoken at the convention.

"The Association of Internes and Medical Students was cited as an organization which 'has long been a faithful follower of the Communist Party line,' and which supported the International Union of Students' Second World Student Congress in Prague in August 1950 (report of the Committee on Un-American Activities on the Communist Peace Offensive, dated April 1, 1951).

"An advertisement which appeared in the Washington Post of May 18, 1948 (p. 15), disclosed the name of Dr. W. Montague Cobb as having signed a statement against the Mundt (anti-Communist) bill."

"February 13, 1956.

"Subject: Westley W. Law, Savannah, Ga., national board of directors, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"An undated press release, General Youth Statement (p. 3), listed W. W. Law, Savannah, Ga., as an endorser of the Youth Statement of the Mid-Century Conference for Peace (May 29–30, 1950).

"The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist Peace Offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 58), cited the Mid-Century Conference for Peace at a meeting held in Chicago, May 29 and 30, 1950, by the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact and as having been 'aimed at assembling as many gullible persons as possible under Communist direction and turning them into a vast sounding board for Communist propaganda.'

"The Daily Worker of June 23, 1949 (p. 2), reported that W. W. Law, past national chairman, National Association for Advancement of Colored People, youth division, Savannah, Ga., signed a statement against the North Atlantic Pact."

"February 13, 1956.

"Subject: Dr. J. M. Tinsley, national board of directors, national health committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"As shown by the official proceedings of the National Negro Congress, 1936 (pp. 5, 41), Dr. J. M. Tinsley, Virginia, was a member of the presiding committee and a member of the national executive council of the organization. J. M. Tinsley, Richmond, was treasurer of the National Negro Congress (Daily Worker, Apr. 7, 1936, p. 3).

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations designated previously pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front group (Congressional Record, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as 'the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes * * *.'

"J. M. Tinsley endorsed the Southern Negro Youth Congress (Daily Worker, Feb. 25, 1938, p. 3).

"The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited by the Attorney General as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U.S.A., which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means (letter released Dec. 4, 1947; redesignated Apr. 27, 1953, and included on Apr. 1, 1954, consolidated list). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1940 (p. 9), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947 (p. 14), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as 'surreptitiously controlled' by the Young Communist League."

"February 14, 1956.

"Subject: Dr. Harry J. Greene, Philadelphia, Pa., national board of directors, national health committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"On the call to a Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America at Washington, D.C., June 7–9, 1940, the name of Dr. Harry J. Greene of Philadelphia, Pa., appears in a list of the sponsors; he was one of the sponsors of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, as shown on their letterheads dated September 10 and November 6, 1940, in which sources he is shown as being from Philadelphia.

"The printed program of a National Action Conference for Civil Rights which was scheduled to be held in Washington, D.C., April 19–20, 1941, named Dr. Harry J. Greene, Philadelphia, as one of the sponsors of that conference, called by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (formed as a result of the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, June 7–9, 1940), as 'part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations * * * by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their programs'; and as subversive and Communist. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7687; and press releases of Dec. 4, 1947, and Sept. 21, 1948, respectively; also included on consolidated list released Apr. 1, 1954.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as 'one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party' (report of Mar. 29, 1944; also cited in reports of June 25, 1942, and Jan. 2, 1943). The Committee on Un-American Activities also cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties in a report released September 2, 1947.

"Dr. Harry J. Greene was chairman of a discussion group on 'Denial of Citizenship Rights' at the Second National Negro Congress, October 15–17, 1937, in Philadelphia, as shown on the printed program of that congress (p. 19) in which source he is identified as being from Philadelphia, Pa., and president of the Philadelphia branch, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. A booklet of the National Negro Congress entitled 'We Are Rising' (April 1939, p. 2) named one Harry Green as vice president, Philadelphia council of the congress.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Negro Congress as 'the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes' (report of Jan. 3, 1939; also cited in reports of Jan. 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and Mar. 29, 1944). The Attorney General cited the Congress as 'an important sector of the democratic front, sponsored and supported by the Communist Party' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688); later, the Attorney General cited the congress as subversive and Communist (press releases of Dec. 4, 1947 and Sept. 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list released Apr. 1, 1954).

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Roscoe Dunjee, national vice-president, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The Daily Worker for April 16, 1947 (p. 2), reported that Roscoe Dunjee, attorney, Oklahoma City, Okla., was one of the signers of a statement defending the Communist Party. He was one of the signers of a statement condemning 'punitive measures directed against the Communist Party' as shown by the April 20, 1947 issue of the Worker (p. 8). The Daily Worker for April 27, 1947 (p. 24), shows Roscoe Dunjee as one of the signers of a statement against the ban on the Communist Party. Roscoe C. Dunjee, publisher of the Black Dispatch, Oklahoma City, was a sponsor of a statement attacking the arrest of the Communist Party leaders, according to the Daily Worker, August 23, 1948 (p. 3). He sponsored the 'Statement by Negro Americans' in behalf of the arrested Communist leaders as shown by the August 29, 1948, issue of the Worker (p. 11). The Daily Worker for March 7, 1950 (p. 4), reported that Roscoe Dunjee attacked Judge Medina in the case of the Communist leaders.

"Roscoe Dunjee was a member of the initiating committee, of the Congress on Civil Rights held in Detroit, Mich., April 27 and 28, 1946, as shown by the summons to the congress. The Daily Worker of April 16, 1947 (p. 2), reported that Roscoe Dunjee, of Oklahoma City, Okla., was one of the signers of a statement released by the Civil Rights Congress defending the Communist Party. The Civil Rights Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States (letters to the Loyalty Review Board, 1947 and 1948; included in consolidated list released Apr. 1, 1954). The Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as being 'dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party' and 'controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it' (report No. 115, Sept. 2, 1947, pp. 2 and 19).

"The pamphlet Seeing Is Believing, 1947, and the testimony of Walter S. Steele, public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 21, 1947 (p. 135), show Roscoe Dunjee as a member of the Council on African Affairs, Inc. The Council on African Affairs was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General (letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. He redesignated the organization on April 27, 1953; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954.)

"Roscoe Dunjee was a sponsor of the Win the Peace Conference of the National Committee To Win the Peace, as shown by the Daily Worker March 5, 1946, a letterhead of the organization dated February 28, 1946, and the call to a win-the-peace conference, National Press Building, Washington, D.C., April 5–7, 1946. The National Committee To Win the Peace was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General (letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released in 1947 and 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954).

"The Daily Worker for October 19, 1948 (p. 7), reported that Roscoe Dunjee was one of those who signed a statement released by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. The council was cited as a Communist front by this committee in its review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace (April 26, 1950—original release date April 19, 1949, p. 2).

"Roscoe Dunjee was a signer of the call to the Second Southern Conference for Human Welfare, Chattanooga, Tenn., April 14–16, 1940. A letterhead of the conference, dated June 4, 1947, shows Roscoe Dunjee as vice president and a member of the national committee of that organization. He was also shown as vice president of the organization in an undated leaflet, The South Is Closer Than You Think, and the testimony of Walter S. Steele, public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 21, 1947, page 139. The Southern Conference for Human Welfare was cited as a Communist front which received money from the Robert Marshall Foundation, one of the principal sources of funds by which many Communist fronts operate. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944, p. 147.) In its report of June 12, 1947, the Committee on Un-American Activities described the conference as a Communist-front organization 'which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South,' although its 'professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States.'

"The New York Times of October 9, 1944 (p. 12), reported that Roscoe Dunjee was one of the signers of an open letter to Gov. Thomas E. Dewey for the pardon of Morris U. Schappes, which was sponsored by the Schappes Defense Committee. The Schappes Defense Committee was cited as a Communist organization by the United States Attorney General (letter to the Loyalty Review Board, released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953). The special Committee on Un-American Activities described the Schappes Defense Committee as 'a front organization with a strictly Communist objective, namely, the defense of a self-admitted Communist who was convicted of perjury in the courts of New York.' Morris U. Schappes 'was on the teaching staff of the College of the City of New York for a period of 13 years. In 1956 his superior on the college faculty refused to recommend him for reappointment. This action led to prolonged agitation by the Communist Party' (report, March 29, 1944, p. 71).

"Roscoe Dunjee was a member of the advisory board of the Southern Negro Youth Congress according to a letterhead of that organization dated June 12, 1947, the testimony of Walter S. Steele, public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 21, 1947 (p. 97), a letterhead dated August 11, 1947, and a page from a leaflet published by the organization. The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U.S.A., 'which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means' (U.S. Attorney General, letter to Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947; redesignated April 27, 1953; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The Committee on Un-American Activities said it was 'surreptitiously controlled' by the Young Communist League (report No. 271, April 17, 1947, p. 14). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities also cited the organization as a Communist front (report, January 3, 1940, p. 9).

"According to the Daily Worker for April 1, 1945 (p. 6m), Roscoe Dunjee was asked what he thought of New York's new antidiscrimination law, and was quoted as replying: 'It shows a trend in the direction which the United States as a nation must take if we rise to the level of Russian morality * * *.'

"Photographs of Roscoe Dunjee are found in the Daily Worker, issues of December 9, 1941 (p. 7), and April 1, 1945 (p. 6m).

"Roscoe Dunjee, editor of the Black Dispatch, Oklahoma City, Okla., was quoted in the March 28, 1944, issue of New Masses (p. 15), as follows:

"'I attended a Lincoln and Douglas meeting held under the auspices of the Communist Party, February 12 * * * Most assuredly Americans should stop and listen to what Communists have to say. The Russian experiment as expressed today in Soviet life is too effective for anyone to attempt to overlook this. As president of the State conference of branches of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, I have every year for the past 10 invited the Communists to address our meeting. Alan Shaw, secretary of the Communist Party in Oklahoma, addressed our State conference at

Tulsa last November * * * personally I endorse the idea of an international State * * * as espoused by the Communist Party.'

"The following is quoted from the Daily Worker of April 8, 1952 (p. 2):

" 'Roscoe Dunjee, editor of the Oklahoma Black-Dispatch, leading Negro newspaper in the Southwest, has hailed in a long editorial the victory won by William L. Patterson, head of the Civil Rights Congress, in securing acquittal on a contempt of Congress charge.'

"(Note citation of Civil Rights Congress on p. 1 of this report.)

"Roscoe C. Dunjee, Oklahoma City, was listed as one of four sponsors of a statement which appeared in the Sunday Worker, August 29, 1948 (p. 11), from which the following is quoted:

" 'THE FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE

" '(Statement by Negro Americans to the President and Attorney General of the United States)

" 'We, the undersigned Negro Americans, strongly condemn your hysteria-breeding arrests of national leaders of the Communist Party, and call upon you to take positive action to protect civil rights instead of persecuting political minorities.

" 'We raise here no defense of the principles of the Communist Party. Our concern is to defend the right of political and other minorities, especially the Negro people, to fight for the kind of society which they consider necessary to give full expression to the principles of American democracy * * *

" 'The obvious purpose of these Gestapo-like arrests of Communist leaders is to frighten people away from the Wallace movement and progressive people's organizations generally, practically all of which have been slandered as Communist or subversive * * *

" 'We call upon our Government to halt its Fascist-like attacks upon opposition minorities, and to act for the protection of minority rights * * *' "

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Dr. S. Ralph Harlow, national board of directors, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The program of the fifth national conference of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, Atlantic City, N.J., March 29–30, 1941, listed S. Ralph Harlow as a sponsor.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as 'one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States.'

"S. Ralph Harlow was an endorser of the Committee for Citizenship Rights as shown by a letterhead dated January 10, 1942. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 95), cited the Committee for Citizenship Rights as an organization which defended the 'interests of the Communist Party.' The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the Committee for Citizenship Rights as among a 'maze of organizations' which were 'spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law.'

"Prof. S. Ralph Harlow signed a statement calling for international agreement to ban use of atomic weapons attached to a press release of the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, December 14, 1949 (p. 9). He was identified in this instance as associated with Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

"The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist Peace Offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 54), cited the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact as an organization which was formed as a result of the Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, and which was located, according to a letterhead of September 16, 1950, at 30 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.; and to further the cause of Communists in the United States doing their part in the Moscow campaign.

"As shown by Soviet Russia Today of November 1937 (p. 79), S. Ralph Harlow was a signer of the Golden Book of American Friendship With the Soviet Union, cited as a 'Communist enterprise' signed by hundreds of well-known Communists and fellow travelers:

" 'January 23–25, 1948, New York City' conference call of the National Conference on American Policy in China and the Far East, listed Dr. S. Ralph Harlow, Smith College, as a sponsor of the conference. The Attorney General cited the National Conference on American Policy in China and the Far East as Communist, and a conference called by the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy in a letter released July 25, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

"A news release of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties dated December 26, 1941, listed S. Ralph Harlow as a signer. He signed the organization's 1943 message to the House of Representatives (leaflet, attached to undated letterhead); and the group's statement supporting the War Department's order on granting commissions to members of the Armed Forces who have been members of or sympathetic to the views of the Communist Party (undated leaflet, 'the only sound policy for a democracy * * *' and Daily Worker, March 19, 1945, p. 4).

"The Attorney General cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7687). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as among a maze of organizations which were spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law.

"As shown by the Daily Worker of September 17, 1940 (pp. 1, 5), S. Ralph Harlow signed a telegram of the New York Conference for Inalienable Rights to President Roosevelt and Attorney General Jackson in behalf of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union defendants. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the New York Conference for Inalienable Rights as a Communist-front group.

"S. Ralph Harlow sponsored the call for the Protestantism Answers Hate dinner-forum held under auspices of the Protestant Digest, New York, February 25, 1941, as shown by a leaflet. He was identified in this instance as professor of sociology, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 48), cited the Protestant Digest as 'a magazine which has faithfully propagated the Communist Party line under the guise of being a religious journal.'

"According to the New York Times, October 9, 1944 (p. 12), S. Ralph Harlow, chairman, department of religion, Smith College, Northampton, Mass., signed an open letter of the Schappes defense committee to Gov. Thomas E. Dewey asking a pardon for Morris Schappes."

"The Schappes defense committee was cited as Communist by the Attorney General in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as 'a front organization with a strictly Communist objective, namely, the defense of a self-admitted Communist who was convicted of perjury in the courts of New York.' (Report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 71).

"Prof. S. Ralph Harlow endorsed the World Peace Appeal as shown by an undated leaflet, Prominent Americans Call for * * * (received Sept. 11, 1950), and the Daily Worker, August 14, 1950 (p. 2).

"The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist peace offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 34), cited the World Peace Appeal as a petition campaign launched by the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress at its meeting in Stockholm, March 16–19, 1950; as having 'received the enthusiastic approval of every section of the international Communist hierarchy'; as having been lauded in the Communist press, putting 'every individual Communist on notice that he "has duty to rise to this appeal" '; and as having 'received the official endorsement of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., which has been echoed by the governing bodies of every Communist satellite country, and by all Communist parties throughout the world.' "

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Robert C. Weaver, national board of directors, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Robert C. Weaver, identified from Washington, D.C., as an economic adviser to the Secretary of Interior, was discussion leader of a panel on 'The Federal Housing Program and the Negro' at the Second National Negro Congress as shown by the program of that congress which was held in Philadelphia, October 15–17, 1937.

"The National Negro Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The special committee in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as 'the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes.' The Attorney General had cited the group previously as follows: 'From the record of its activities and the composition of its governing bodies, there can be little doubt that it has served what James M. Ford, Communist vice presidential candidate elected to the executive committee in 1937, predicted: "An important sector of the democratic front," sponsored and supported by the Communist Party' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688).

"The Daily Worker of February 8, 1939 (p. 2), listed Robert C. Weaver, identified as Assistant Housing Administrator of the Department of Interior, as one of the signers of the Negro People's Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy letter to lift the Spanish embargo. The special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 180), cited the Negro People's Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy as a Communist-front organization.

"Robert C. Weaver, Washington, D.C., contributed financially to Social Work Today as shown by the January 1941 issue of that publication (pp. 16–18). Social Work Today was cited as a Communist magazine by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 129).

"R. C. Weaver, 1206 Kenyon Street, Washington, D.C., was listed as a member of the Washington Book Shop on a 1941 membership list of the organization subpenaed by this committee. The Washington Book Shop Association was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The Attorney General cited the organization previousy as showing 'evidence of Communist penetration or control' according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942 (p. 7688). The special committee in report of March 29, 1944 (p. 150), cited the organization as a Communist-front organization.

"Robert C. Weaver was the author of The Negro Ghetto which was reviewed by Herbert Aptheker in the August 1948 issue of Masses and Mainstream (p. 85). The congressional committee, in its report on the Congress of American Women, April 26, 1950 (p. 75), cited Masses and Mainstream as successor to New Masses, a Communist magazine."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Lewis Gannett, national board of directors, NAACP, national vice president, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"On December 18, 1934, the Daily Worker (p. 5) reported the following: 'A reception to mark the 10 anniversary of International Publishers took place * * * December 14, in * * * the new school for social research * * * Scores of prominent writers, artists, and editors were present to pay tribute to International Publishers' decade of achievement * * * Among those present were * * * Lewis Gannett, book-review columnist of New York Herald Tribune * * *'

"The Attorney General of the United States cited International Publishers as "The (Communist) Party's publishing house,' headed by Alexander Trachtenberg (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7686); and as the 'publishing agency of the Communist Party' (brief for the United States in the case of William Schneiderman, p. 145). The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited International Publishers as an 'official publishing house of the Communist Party in the United States' (Reports of January 3, 1940, and June 25, 1942); the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as the 'Official American Communist Party publishing house' (Report No. 1920 dated May 11, 1948).

"Lewis Gannett, Harvard, was a member of the sponsoring committee of dinner sponsored by the American Student Union for 'alumni of the student movement and present members' as shown in Student Advocate for February 1937 (p. 2). The American Student Union was cited as a Communist front which 'the result of a united front gathering of young Socialists and Communists' in 1935. The Young Communist League took credit for creation of the organization (Report of the special Committee on Un-American Activities dated Jan. 3, 1939; also cited in reports of Jan. 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1949).

"A letterhead of the American League for Peace and Democracy dated April 6, 1939 contains the name of Lewis Gannett in a list of members of the Writers' and Artists' Committee of that organization; the same information is shown in public hearings before this committee July 21, 1953 (p. 3639). The American League was cited by the Attorney General as 'designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7683 and 7684); and subsequently, as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The special committee cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as 'a bold advocation of treason' (reports of January 3, 1939; Jan. 3, 1940; Jan. 3, 1941; June 25, 1942; and Jan. 2, 1943).

"The special committee cited the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom as a Communist front which defended Communist teachers (report of June 25, 1942; also cited in report of March 29, 1944); a letterhead of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, dated May 26, 1940, contains the name of Lewis Gannett in a list of members of the organization's national executive committee.

"A letterhead of the American Russian Institute for Cultural Relations With the Soviet Union, Inc., contains the name of Lewis Gannett in a list of members of its board of directors; the letterhead was dated July 14, 1938. The Attorney General cited the American Russian Institute as Communist (press release of April 27, 1949; also included on consolidated list dated April 1, 1954).

"Lewis S. Gannett was a member of the board of directors of the American Fund for Public Service, as shown on a photostat of their letterhead dated September 8, 1930. The 'American Fund for Public Service was established by Charles Garland, son of the wealthy James A. Garland. Young Garland, conditioned against wealth through radical acquaintances at Harvard, declined to accept his inheritance for his own personal use. Instead, he established, in 1922, the American Fund for Public Service with the sum of $900,000 which consisted largely of conservative securities. During the lush twenties, the fund grew to some $2 million.

"'A self-perpetuating board of directors was set up for the purpose of handing out this easy money. Sidney Hillman was among them. Associated with Hillman as directors were Roger N. Baldwin, William Z. Foster, Lewis Gannett, * * *.' (From report 1311 of the special committee dated March 29, 1944.)

"An undated booklet of Friends of the Soviet Union contains the name of Lewis S. Gannett in a list of members of the Reception Committee for the Soviet Flyers, under auspices of that organization; he contributed a review of Maxim Gorki's 'A Book of Short Stories to Soviet Russia Today' (September 1939, p. 26). The Attorney General cited Friends of the Soviet Union as Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954); the special committee cited the organization as 'one of the most open Communist fronts in the United States' (report of January 3, 1939; also cited in reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944). Soviet Russia Today was published by Friends of the Soviet Union.

"Soviet Russia Today for November 1937 (p. 79) published a list of individuals who signed the Golden Book of American Friendship With the Soviet Union under this statement: 'I hereby inscribe my name in greeting to the people of the Soviet Union on the 20th anniversary of the establishment of the Soviet Republic.' The Golden Book of American Friendship With the Soviet Union was cited as a 'Communist enterprise' signed by hundreds of well-known Communists and fellow travelers (Report 1311 of the special committee dated March 29, 1944).

"The Daily Worker of January 18, 1939 (p. 7) reported that Lewis Gannett was a committee sponsor of the League of American Writers, cited as a Communist-front organization by the special committee (reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944). The Attorney General cited it as being under 'Communist control' and as subversive and Communist (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7685 and 7686; and press releases of June 1, and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

"New Masses for March 16, 1937 (p. 26) named Lewis Gannett as one of the sponsors of a sendoff dinner for the ambulance corps under the auspices of the American Artists and Writers Committee, Medical Bureau, American Friends of Spanish Democracy; an undated letterhead of the Writers' and Artists' Committee for Medical Aid to Spain also contains his name in a list of sponsors; the letterhead also carries the notation 'Affiliated with the Medical Bureau to Aid Spanish Democracy'; he signed a petition of American Friends of Spanish Democracy to lift the arms embargo, as shown in the Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 4).

"During 1937 and 1938, the Communist Party campaigned for support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, 'recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy' (Report 1311 of the special committee dated March 29, 1944).

"Another such organization which was cited by the special committee (see last paragraph above) was the Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy; their letterhead of July 6, 1938, contained the name of Lewis Gannett in a list of members of the Writers' and Artists' Committee.

"The Liberator for September 1921 (p. 11) contained Lewis Gannett's interview with 'Bill Haywood in Moscow'; he also contributed an article to the July 1922 issue of the same publication (p. 30). The special committee cited the Liberator as a 'Communist magazine' (report of June 25, 1942).

"Lewis Gannett contributed articles to New Masses for February 16, 1937 (p. 21) and August 10, 1943 (p. 20); he signed New Masses' Letter to the President of the United States, as shown in New Masses of April 2, 1940 (p. 21), which source identified him as literary editor, New York Herald Tribune. New Masses has been cited by the Attorney General as a 'Communist periodical' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7688); the special committee cited it as the 'nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party * * * whose ownership was vested in the American Fund for Public Service' (report of March 29, 1944; also cited in reports of January 3, 1939 and June 25, 1942).

"A letterhead of the All-American Anti-Imperialist League, dated April 11, 1928, contains the name of Lewis S. Gannett in a list of members of that organization's national committee. The Attorney General cited the

All-American Anti-Imperialist League as a 'Communist-front organization' (in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10); the special committee cited the group as a Communist front (report of March 29, 1944)."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Dr. Buell G. Gallagher, national board of directors, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"According to the Communist publication, the Daily Worker of April 13, 1936 (p. 3), Buell G. Gallagher, identified as president of Talladega College, endorsed a peace strike of 500,000 students who planned a demonstration for April 22, 1936. The strike was sponsored by the American Student Union which was cited as a Communist-front organization by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in reports dated January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

"The Daily People's World, the Communist journal on the west coast, listed Dr. Buell Gallagher as a member of the Draft Cross Committee, in connection with a move to draft Mayor Laurence L. Cross, of Berkeley, Calif., as candidate for Congress from the Seventh District of California. (See Daily People's World of January 28, 1948, p. 3.) In the February 17, 1948, issue of the Daily People's World (p. 3), we find that 'the committee originally formed to draft Mayor Laurence Cross for Congress has resolved to stay together in support of the candidacy of Dr. Buell G. Gallagher in the Seventh District.' According to Judge Louis J. Hardie, committee chairman, 'In Dr. Gallagher, we feel that we have found a congressional candidate who possesses those qualities of intelligence, integrity, and idealism which we admire in Dr. Cross. His deep acquaintance with social and economic problems and his broad experience in community activities insure the voters of the Seventh District a candidate who will honestly and ably serve them in the 81st Congress' (ibid.).

"In the March 10, 1948, issue of the Daily People's World, we note that the 'Alameda County CIO Council voted endorsement last night for Dr. Buell Gallagher, pro-Wallace candidate for Congress in the Seventh District. Dr. Gallagher, endorsed previously by the AFL Central Labor Council and Building Trades Council, will run in the Democratic primary in June against Dyke Brown, the Truman candidate. Congressman from the Seventh District now is Republican John J. Allen, who voted for the Taft-Hartley law' (p. 3).

"Under date of February 10, 1951, Dr. Gallagher addressed a letter to the chairman of this committee detailing an analysis of the information reflected in the public files of the committee, and stating, 'at no time have I ever been a member of, or sympathizer with, the Communist Party; nor a member of, or sympathizer with, any organization which I knew or believed to be a front for communism.' The chairman, in a letter to Dr. Gallagher dated March 3, 1951, advised him that his analysis would be made a part of the committee records and quoted in any future releases."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Judge Hubert T. Delany (also spelled Delaney), national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Hubert T. Delaney was a member of the Council on African Affairs, as shown in the following sources: Pamphlets entitled 'Africa in the War,' 'Seeing Is Believing' (1947), 'For a New Africa,' (p. 36), '8 Million Demand Freedom' (inside back cover); leaflets headed 'The Job To Be Done' and 'What of Africa's Place in Tomorrow's World' (June 26, 1944). New Africa for December 1943 (p. 4) and a letterhead of the council dated May 17, 1945, contained the same information. Mr. Walter S. Steele testified in public hearings before the Committee on Un-American Activities July 21, 1947 (p. 135), that Judge Delany was a member of the Council on African Affairs. According to the Daily Worker of March 29, 1948 (p. 7), Judge Hubert T. Delany was a member of the executive board of the council. The Daily Worker of April 26, 1947 (p. 12), named him as having signed a statement issued by the council.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954).

"A 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers Guild, which was made available to the special Committee on Un-American Activities, contains the name of one Hobert T. Delany, 30 Broad Street, New York City. The name of Hubert T. Delany appeared on a letterhead of the guild dated May 28, 1940, as director ex officio. The New York Guild Lawyer for September 1950 listed him as vice president of the New York chapter of the guild. A list of officers of the National Lawyers Guild (as of December 1949) contains the name of the Honorable Hubert T. Delaney in a list of members of the organization's executive board; he is so named in a list dated May 1950. Both of these lists were printed in a report on the National Lawyers Guild, prepared and published by the Committee on Un-American Activities September 17, 1950.

"Convention News of May 1941 (pp. 2 and 4), issued by the fifth annual convention of the National Lawyers Guild which was held May 29–June 1, 1941, in Detroit, Mich., named Hubert T. Delany as a member of the convention resolutions committee; he was also named in the same source as a member of the national executive board, National Lawyers Guild. Judge Delaney presided at an annual convention of the guild in Chicago, Ill., in 1951 (Daily People's World, October 18, 1951, p. 2); he also spoke before the guild in 1951, as reported in the Daily Worker of April 10, 1951, page 5. In the latter three sources, he was identified with the domestic relations court of New York City.

"The Daily Worker of October 7, 1952 (p. 3), reported that Judge Delany was to lead a workshop at the national conference on civil rights legislation and discrimination to be held in New York City, October 10–12, under the auspices of the National Lawyers Guild; a letterhead of the New York City chapter of the guild dated October 17, 1952, listed Hubert T. Delany as vice president. The Daily Work of February 20, 1953 (p. 6), announced that he would speak at a panel session on civil rights and liberties, February 22, at the annual convention of the guild, February 20–23, in New York City. According to the Daily Worker of May 27, 1953 (p. 8), Hubert T. Delany was reelected vice president of the New York City chapter of the National Lawyers Guild at the annual membership meeting May 26. He was elected one of the vice presidents of the National Lawyers Guild, New York City chapter, for the years 1954–55, as reported in the Daily Worker of May 26, 1954 (p. 8).

"The National Lawyers Guild was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in report No. 1311 dated March 29, 1944. In a report on the guild, prepared and released September 17, 1950, by the Committee on Un-American Activities, it was shown that the National Lawyers Guild 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.'

"Hubert T. Delany was a member of the Lawyers' Committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy, as shown on their letterhead dated April 6, 1939. The American League for Peace and Democracy was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; consolidated list of April 1, 1954); he had previously cited the organization as 'established in the United States * * * in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7683 and 7684). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American league as 'the largest of the Communist-front movements in the United States' (report of January 3, 1940).

"The catalog of the George Washington Carver School (winter term, 1947) contains the name of Judge Hubert T. Delany as a member of the board of directors of that school, cited by the Attorney General as 'an adjunct in New York City of the Communist Party' (press release of December 4, 1947; included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

"Hubert T. Delany was named as a representative individual who advocated lifting the arms embargo against Spain in a booklet entitled 'These Americans Say,' which was prepared and published by the coordinating committee to lift the embargo, cited as one of the number of groups set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation. (From a report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated March 29, 1944.)

"A letterhead of the Lawyers Committee on American Relations with Spain dated March 5, 1938, and a prospectus and review of the organization both name him as a member of that group.

"In a report dated March 29, 1944, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities had the following to say concerning the Lawyers' Committee on American Relations with Spain: 'When it was the policy of the Communist Party to organize much of its main propaganda around the civil war in Spain, the lawyers' committee * * * supported this movement.'

"A letterhead of the medical bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy dated July 6, 1938, contains the name of Judge Delany in a list of members of that group.

"During 1937 and 1938, the Communist Party wholeheartedly campaigned for support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and setting up so-called relief organizations such as the medical bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy. (From report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated March 29, 1944.)

"Hubert T. Delany was one of the sponsors of a testimonial dinner in honor of Ferdinand C. Smith, Communist Party member and national secretary of the National Maritime Union; identified as tax commissioner, New York City, Judge Delany was listed by Labor Defender (issue of October 1935) as one of the individuals who signed a petition for the freedom of Angelo Herndon, a Communist."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Norman Cousins, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"In an article which appeared in the Daily Worker of January 13, 1948, it was reported that 'Thirty-five well-known authors, editors, clergymen, and other public figures today called on the new Federal Employees Loyalty Review Board to prevent injustices to individuals in the Government loyalty check.' Norman Cousins was one of those who signed the letter, addressed to Seth W. Richardson, board chairman. This article also appeared in the New York Times on the preceding day, January 12, 1948 (p. 10).

"In a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities entitled 'Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace,' dated April 19, 1949, we find the following statement concerning a speech of Norman Cousins before that conference:

" 'In answer to this totalitarian philosophy of dragooning culture, Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, declared amid a great deal of hissing and booing, that "Democracy must mean intellectual freedom, that it must protect the individual against the right of the state to draw political and cultural blueprints for its painters and writers and composers or to castigate them, or to enter into those matters of mind in which the individual is sovereign." ' (See p. 13 of the Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference.)"

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Dr. Algernon D. Black, national board of directors, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Dr. Algernon D. Black was one of the sponsors of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, March 25–27, 1949 (conference program, p. 12, and conference call). The Daily Worker of February 21, 1949 (p. 2), announced that he was a member of the program committee of that conference. Speaking of peace, edited report of the conference, March 25, 26, 27, 1949, listed Algernon Black as a speaker on 'A Warning Against Sectarian Prejudice,' and gave biographical data concerning him (pp. 121, 139).

"In 1948 and 1949, Dr. Black signed statements of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions (Daily Worker, Dec. 29, 1948, p. 2; letterhead received in January 1949; New York Star of January 4, 1949, p. 9, an advertisement). He spoke before the group in February 1949 (Daily Worker, Feb. 28, 1949, p. 2).

"The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions and held in New York City on March 25, 26, and 27, 1949, April 26, 1950, cited the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions as a Communist-front organization. In this same report the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the scientific and cultural conference as actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations.

"The call to a national conference on American policy in China and the Far East, held in January 1948, included the name of Dr. Algernon Black in the list of sponsors (Call, January 23–25, 1948, New York City); the conference was called by the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy. In the December 1949–January 1950 issue of Far East Spotlight, which is the official organ of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, Dr. Black answered a questionnaire issued by that committee, favoring recognition of the Chinese Communist government.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy as a Communist organization in a letter furnished the Loyalty Review Board and release to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

"The Daily Worker of June 21, 1948, reported that Algernon D. Black had signed a statement of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, calling for a conference with the Soviet Union; he signed an appeal of the same organization to the U.S. Government to end the cold war and arrange a conference with the Soviet Union (leaflet entitled 'End the Cold War—Get Together for Peace' which was dated December 1948); he signed a statement in praise of Henry Wallace's open letter to Stalin (May 1948), as shown in the pamphlet How To End the Cold War and Build the Peace (p. 9), prepared and released by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

"The Attorney General cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 156), cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as 'in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian.'

"Dr. Black contributed an article to the pamphlet We Hold These Truths (p. 22), which was issued by the League of American Writers. He was named as a member of the executive committee of Film Audiences for Democracy in the June 1939 issue of Film Survey, official organ of Film Audiences, cited as a Communist-front organization by the special Committee on Un-American Activities (report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944, p. 150).

"The Attorney General cited the League of American Writers as subversive and Communist in letters furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press by the U.S. Civil Service Commission June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as 'founded under Communist auspices in 1935 * * * in 1939 * * * began openly to follow the Communist Party line as dictated by the foreign policy of the Soviet Union.' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7685 and 7686.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its reports of January 3, 1940 (p. 9), June 25, 1942 (p. 19), and March 29, 1944 (p. 48), cited the League of American Writers as a Communist-front organization.

"A letterhead of the nonpartisan committee for the reelection of Congressman Vito Marcantonio, dated October 3, 1936, listed the name of Algernon D. Black as a member of that committee. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 122), cited the nonpartisan committee for the reelection of Vito Marcantonio as a Communist-front organization.

"Algernon Black was a member of the advisory board of the American Student Union, as shown in a pamphlet entitled 'Presenting the American Student Union.' The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated January 3, 1939 (p. 80), cited the American Student Union as a Communist-front organization.

"A letterhead of the Veterans Against Discrimination of Civil Rights Congress of New York, dated May 11, 1946, listed the name of Algernon Black as one of the public sponsors of that organization. The Attorney General cited the Veterans Against Discrimination of Civil Rights Congress of New York as subversive in a letter released December 4, 1947; included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

"Mr. Black signed an open letter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, as shown in the booklet '600 Prominent Americans' (p. 16). The Attorney General cited the National Federation as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as 'part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program.' The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as 'one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party.' The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the National Federation as among a 'maze of organizations' which were 'spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law.'

"The printed program of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights, February 12, 1940, reveals the name of Algernon D. Black as vice chairman of the group. A letterhead of the American Russian Institute, received July 26, 1949, contains the name of Dr. Black as a member of the interchurch committee of that institute. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (pp. 96 and 129), cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights as a Communist front organization. The Attorney General cited the American Russian Institute as a Communist organization in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

"Dr. Black was a member of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy (letterheads dated March 13, 1931, and February 21, 1938); and described as a representative individual in a booklet entitled "These Americans Say" which was published by the Coordinating Committee to Lift the (Spanish) Embargo. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 82), cited the American Friends of Spanish Democracy as a Communist front organization. The Coordinating Committee to Lift the (Spanish) Embargo was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report dated March 29, 1944 (pp. 137 and 138), as one of a number of front organizations set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation.

"In a pamphlet entitled 'News You Don't Get' (dated Nov. 15, 1938), Algernon

Black was named as one of those who signed the call to a conference on pan-American democracy; a letterhead of the organization dated November 16, 1938, named him as one of the sponsors of the conference. The Attorney General cited the Conference on Pan-American Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (pp. 161 and 164), cited the Conference on Pan-American Democracy as a Communist front organization.

"Algernon Black signed a declaration of the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee honoring Dimitrov, as shown in the New York Times of December 22, 1943 (p. 40). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 112 and 156), cited the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee as a Communist front organization.

"Dr. Black signed an open letter in defense of Harry Bridges. (See Daily Worker of July 19, 1942, p. 4.) Letterheads of the Citizens Victory Committee for Harry Bridges dated June 8, 1943, and January 10, 1944, listed Algernon Black as a committee member or sponsor of that group. The open letter in defense of Harry Bridges was cited as a Communist front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 87, 112, 129, 166). The Citizens' Committee for Harry Bridges was cited as Communist by the Attorney General in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 90 and 94), cited the Citizens' Committee for Harry Bridges as a Communist front organization.

"The Daily Worker of March 29, 1951 (p. 9), reported that Dr. Algernon D. Black signed a letter of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born attacking the McCarran Act. Algernon D. Black was shown as a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born in the Daily Worker, April 4, 1951 (p. 8), a leaflet: 'Call—Mass Meeting and Conference,' October 27, 1951, Dearborn, Mich., and a photostatic copy of an undated letterhead of the 20th anniversary national conference * * *, U. E. Hall, Chicago, Ill. (Dec. 8–9, 1951). The Daily Worker of August 10, 1950 (p. 5), reported that Dr. Algernon Black signed a statement of the American Committee Against Denaturalization.

"The Attorney General cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as 'one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States.'

"On June 13, 1949, the Daily Worker reported that Dr. Black was one of the sponsors of an organization formed to oppose the Mundt-Nixon anti-Communist bill; a press release of the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill, dated June 15, 1949, revealed the same information. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt bill dated January 2, 1951, cited that organization as 'a registered lobbying organization which has carried out the objectives of the Communist Party in its fight against antisubversive legislation.'

"A letterhead of the Voice of Freedom Committee dated June 16, 1947, listed Algernon D. Black as a sponsor of that organization. An invitation to a dinner held under the auspices of the group, January 21, 1948, listed him as a member of the dinner committee. He signed a petition of the organization as shown by a leaflet published by the Voice of Freedom Committee. The Attorney General included the Voice of Freedom Committee on his April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

"Algernon D. Black, New York Ethical Culture Society, signed an open letter of the Conference on Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact to Senators and Congressmen urging defeat of President Truman's arms program, as shown by a letterhead dated August 21, 1949.

"The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist peace offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 56), cited the Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact as a meeting called by the Daily Worker in July 1949, to be held in Washington, D.C., and as having been instigated by Communists in the United States (who) did their part in the Moscow campaign.

"The Daily Worker of December 10, 1952 (p. 4), listed Dr. Algernon D. Black as a signer of an appeal to President Truman requesting amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act."

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Dr. Ralph Bunche, national board of directors, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this commmittee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Dr. Ralph Bunche was a member of the executive board of the Washington committee, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, as shown on their letterhead of June 4, 1947. The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist-front organization in its report of March 29, 1944. In 1947 the Committee on Un-American Activities released a report on the conference, in which it was cited as a Communist-front organization which sought to 'attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South,' although its 'professed interest in southern welfare' was 'simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States' (Report No. 592 of June 12, 1947).

"Ralph Bunche was a sponsor of the Conference on Civil Rights of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, April 20–21, 1940, as shown by the conference call, page 4. A letterhead of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action dated April 26, 1940, named Dr. Bunche as one of the sponsors of that group.

"The Washington Committee for Democratic Action was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General, April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included in the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Attorney General had previously cited the group as an affiliate or local chapter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7688 and 7689). The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as successor in Washington to the American League for Peace and Democracy and an affiliate of the national federation (reports of June 25, 1942, and Mar. 29, 1944).

"Official proceedings of the National Negro Congress for 1936, pages 5 and 40, named Dr. Ralph Bunche, Washington, D.C., as a member of the presiding committee and a member of the national executive council of that organization.

"The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Negro Congress as a Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes, and reported that 'the officers of the National Negro Congress are outspoken Communist sympathizers, and a majority of those on the executive board are outright Communists' (report of January 3, 1939). The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as a Communist-front organization (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688; press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; consolidated list of cited organizations, dated April 1, 1954).

"The Washington Post and Times Herald, May 29, 1954, p. 6, reported that 'A Federal loyalty board announced today that it has unanimously cleared Dr. Ralph J. Bunche of any and all charges,' the article quoted the official announcement as follows:

" 'The full board had its second meeting with Dr. Bunche yesterday following which it unanimously reached the conclusion that there is no doubt as to the loyalty of Dr. Bunche to the Government of the United States.

" 'This conclusion has been forwarded to the Secretary of State for transmittal to the Secretary General of the U.N. At the same time it has been informally transmitted to Dr. Bunche.'

"Reference to the loyalty board's clearance of Dr. Bunche is found also in the Washington Evening Star, May 28, 1954, p. A–1."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Dr. H. Claude Hudson, national board of directors, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The Daily People's World of May 2, 1947 (p. 8), listed Dr. H. Claude Hudson as a sponsor of the Los Angeles chapter of the Civil Rights Congress.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 2 and 19), cited the Civil Rights Congress as an organization formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties); 'dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party' and 'controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it.' "

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Alfred Baker Lewis, national board of directors, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual.

This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or finding of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"On July 11, 1942, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties addressed an open letter to the President of the United States urging him to reconsider Attorney General Francis Biddle's order to deport Harry Bridges; the letter also stated that: 'It is equally essential that the Attorney General's ill-advised, arbitrary, and unwarranted findings relative to the Communist Party be rescinded.' Alfred Baker Lewis, executive board, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and executive board member, Union for Democratic Action, New York, N.Y., signed the open letter, as shown in the pamphlet entitled '600 Prominent Americans Ask President To Rescind Biddle Decision,' published September 11, 1942, by the National Federation of Constitutional Liberties and incorporating the open letter in full. The open letter, together with a list of individuals who signed it, appeared in the Daily Worker on July 19, 1942 (p. 4).

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as 'Part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program,' and as subversive and Communist. (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7687; and press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948, respectively; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the federation as one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party (report of March 29, 1944; also cited in reports of June 25, 1942, and January 2, 1943). It was also cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law (Report No. 1115 of September 2, 1947).

"An undated letterhead of the League for Mutual Aid, 104 Fifth Avenue, New York City, contained the name of Alfred Baker Lewis in a list of members of the organization's advisory committee. The league was cited as a Communist enterprise by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944.

"'Greetings and best wishes for success to the second national Negro congress' were contained in the printed annual program of that congress, sent by A. Philip Randolph, chairman, and Alfred Baker Lewis, secretary, Negro Work Committee of the Socialist Party. (Printed annual program, second national Negro congress, Philadelphia, Pa., October 15, 16, and 17, 1937, p. 61). The National Negro Congress was cited as an important sector of the democratic front, sponsored and supported by the Communist Party; and later, as subversive and Communist. (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688; and press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Congress as the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes (report of January 3, 1939; also cited in reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944)."

"February 13, 1956.

"Subject: Dr. James J. McClendon, national board of directors, national health committee, NAACP, 1961

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The Daily Worker of March 18, 1945 (p. 2), and an undated leaflet, The Only Sound Policy for a Democracy, named Dr. James J. McClendon as one of the signers of a statement, sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, which supported the War Department's order on granting commissions to members of the Armed Forces who have been members of or sympathetic to the views of the Communist Party. Dr. McClendon was identified as president of the Detroit National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Dr. J. J. McClendon was one of the sponsors of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, as shown by the program, Action Conference for Civil Rights, held in Washington, D.C., April 19–20, 1941; and on letterheads dated September 11, 1940, and November 6, 1940.

"The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General in press releases dated December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included in his consolidated list of April 1, 1954. The Attorney General described the organization as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program' (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7687). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities stated that 'There can be no reasonable doubt about the fact that the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties regardless of its high-sounding name—is one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party' (special committee report, March 29, 1944, p. 50); also cited in reports, June 25, 1942 (p. 20), and January 2, 1943 (pp. 9 and 12).

"Dr. James J. McClendon was named in the Daily Worker of March 16, 1942 (pp. 1 and 4), and on a letterhead dated April 2, 1942, as one of the sponsors of the National Free Browder Congress.

"The National Free Browder Congress was cited as a Communist front which arranged to meet March 28–29, 1942. Earl Browder was general secretary of the Communist Party, United States of America, who had been convicted and sentenced to Atlanta Federal Penitentiary for passport fraud. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944 (pp. 69, 87, and 132).)

"Dr. James McClendon was one of the sponsors of the sesquicentennial bill of rights celebration, held under the auspices of the Michigan Civil Rights Federation, Detroit, Mich., December 1–2, 1939, as shown by the call of conference. Dr. James J. McClendon was one of the sponsors of a statewide conference, held under the auspices of the Michigan federation in Detroit, Mich., September 12, 1943, as shown by call of the conference. He was identified as president of the Detroit chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

"The Michigan Civil Rights Federation was cited by the Attorney General of the United States as 'an affiliate of the Communist front, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; and as subversive and Communist organization which has been succeeded by and now operates as the Michigan chapter of the Civil Rights Congress' (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7687; and press releases of December 4, 1947, June 1 and September 21, 1948; also including in his consolidated list of organizations, dated April 1, 1954). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities and the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Michigan Civil Rights Federation as a Communist-front organization. (From Report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944; and Report No. 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities, dated September 2, 1947, p. 3.)"

"February 13, 1956.

"Subject: James Hinton, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

"The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"James M. Hinton, identified as president of the State conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People for South Carolina, was one of the sponsors of a Congress on Civil Rights, as shown on the call to the congress which was held in Detroit, Mich., April 27–28, 1946. (See pp. 21 and 22 of Rept. No. 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities on the Civil Rights Congress, September 2, 1947.)

"The Civil Rights Congress was founded at a conference in Detroit April 27 and 28, 1946, effectuating the merger of the International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. The Civil Rights Congress was 'dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party' and 'controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it' (pp. 2 and 19 of Rept. No. 1115).

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated."

"February 13, 1956.

"Subject: Theodore M. Berry, national board of directors, national legal committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"A 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers Guild which was made available to the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 1939, contains the name of Theodore M. Berry, 308 West Fifth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio, as a member.

"The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.'"

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Earl B. Dickerson, national board of directors, national legal committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"According to the Daily Worker of February 28, 1949 (p. 9), Earl Dickerson, attorney, Illinois, was one of the signers of a statement defending the 12 Communist leaders. He signed a statement in behalf of the attorneys in the Communist cases as shown by the July 31, 1950, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 9). This same information was shown in the February 1, 1950, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 3). As shown by the Daily People's World of May 12, 1950 (p. 12), Earl B. Dickerson was a signer of a statement to the United Nations in behalf of the Communist cases.

"Earl B. Dickerson protested approval of the Smith Act by the Supreme Court as 'having a disastrous impact upon * * * struggle of Negro people' (Daily Worker, October 1, 1951, p. 1). He filed a petition with the clerk of the United States Supreme Court supporting the pending application for a hearing on the constitutionality of the Smith Act as shown by the Daily Worker, October 4, 1951 (p. 15). Mr. Dickerson was identified in this source as a Negro attorney in Illinois. He spoke against the Smith Act according to the February 12, 1952 issue of the Daily People's World (p. 3), and was coauthor of a memorandum to the Supreme Court 'on the menace of the Smith Act to the Negro people' (Daily People's World, July 15, 1952, p. 1). Earl B. Dickerson, president, National Lawyers Guild, Chicago, was a signer of an appeal to President Truman requesting amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act (Daily Worker, December 10, 1952, p. 4). As shown by the Daily Worker, December 29, 1953 (p. 8) and the Worker, January 3, 1954 (p. 6), Earl B. Dickerson was one of 39 prominent Midwest citizens signing a plea for Christmas amnesty for Communist leaders convicted under the Smith Act, which was wired to President Eisenhower. He was one of the initiators of an appeal for reduced bail for Claude Lightfoot, Illinois Communist leader, indicted under a section of the Smith Act as shown by the September 12, 1954, issue of the Worker (p. 16).

"According to the December 25, 1952, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 8), Earl D. Dickerson was a signer of an open letter to President Truman asking clemency for the Rosenbergs. The Daily People's World of March 13, 1953 (p. 3), reported that Earl B. Dickerson contributed a statement to the pamphlet, The Negro People Speak Out on the Rosenbergs, distributed by volunteers for the East Bay Committee To Save the Rosenbergs, Oakland, California.

"Earl B. Dickerson was a signer of an appeal to the Greek Government protesting the court martial of Greek maritime unionists as shown by the Daily Worker, August 19, 1952 (p. 1).

"Earl B. Dickerson was listed in the spring 1943 (p. 22) and fall session 1943 (p. 27) catalogs of the Abraham Lincoln School as a member of the board of directors. He was named in the same source as a guest lecturer at the school (p. 19).

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the Abraham Lincoln School as an adjunct of the Communist Party in a letter to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947. The Attorney General redesignated the school April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 82), cited the Abraham Lincoln School as successor of the Workers School as a Communist educational medium in Chicago.

"A pamphlet entitled 'For a New Africa' (containing the proceedings of the conference on Africa, New York, April 14, 1944) names Earl B. Dickerson as a member of the National Negro Congress.

"The National Negro Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front group (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as 'the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes.'

"He was a member of the Council on African Affairs, as shown in a pamphlet entitled 'Eight Million Demand Freedom,' and the pamphlet For a New Africa (p. 36). Earl B. Dickerson is listed as a member of the Council on African Affairs in a leaflet, issued by the organization, The Job To Be Done, a leaflet entitled 'What of Africa's Place in Tomorrow's World?' a pamphlet entitled 'Seeing Is Believing' (1947), and a letterhead of the group, dated May 17, 1945, and a pamphlet, Africa in the War.

"The Attorney General cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

"The name of Earl Dickerson, of 35 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill., appears on a 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers' Guild on file with this committee. In 1949 he was president of the Chicago chapter of the guild and chairman at a meeting on anti-Communist legislation, as shown in the Daily Worker of March 15, 1949 (p. 6); in the same year he attacked the Marshall plan as shown in the Daily Worker of July 19, 1949 (p. 5), in which source he was identified as president of the Chicago chapter of the guild; he participated in a discussion entitled 'Status of Civil Liberties' fifth annual convention, National Lawyers' Guild, Book-Cadillac Hotel, Detroit, Mich., May 29–June 1, 1941, as shown by the convention program printed in Convention News, May 1941 (p. 2), published by the guild. This same Convention News (pp. 3 and 4) listed him as a member of the convention nominations committee of the fifth national convention of the National Lawyers' Guild. He submitted a report of the guild, denouncing lynching and discrimination, as shown in the Daily Worker, November 30, 1942 (p. 1). As shown by the October 15, 1951, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 1), Earl B. Dickerson was president of the Chicago chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild; he spoke at the national convention of the organization in Chicago. The October 18, 1951, issue of the Daily People's World (p. 2), reported that Earl B. Dickerson was elected president of the National Lawyers' Guild. He was shown as president of the National Lawyers' Guild in the Daily Worker, January 25, 1952 (p. 1), and February 20, 1953 (p. 6), and the Daily People's World, January 25, 1952 (p. 8). The January 18, 1952, issue of the Daily People's World (p. 3) reported that Earl B. Dickerson was to speak on the Smith Act, the Constitution, and You, at a gathering of the San Francisco chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild on February 1, 1952. The Daily Worker of February 24, 1953 (p. 6), reported that Earl Dickerson, president of the National Lawyers' Guild, addressed the annual convention of the group held February 20–23, at the Park-Sheraton Hotel, New York City, and stated that 'a new foreign policy is needed if the drive against liberties is to be halted.' The Daily People's World of July 6, 1953 (p. 3), announced that he was to be honored by the Los Angeles-Hollywood chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild at a luncheon. The Daily Worker of August 28, 1953 (p. 2), reported that Earl B. Dickerson, president of the National Lawyers' Guild, issued a statement opposing the American Bar Association's call for disbarment of Communist lawyers. As shown by the September 6, 1953, issue of the Worker (p. 6), Earl Dickerson protested the placing of the National Lawyers' Guild on the list of subversive organizations by the Attorney General.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers' Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Nations Lawyers' Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the group as a Communist front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.'

"One Earl Dickerson (with no middle initial shown) spoke at the morning session of the Congress on Civil Rights which was held in Detroit, Mich., April 27–28, 1946, as shown in the program, Congress on Civil Rights (p. 1); Earl B. Dickerson signed a statement of the Civil Rights Congress which was in defense of Gerhart Eisler, according to the Daily Worker of February 28, 1947 (p. 2); he was one of the sponsors of the National Emergency Conference for Civil Rights which was held in New York City on July 19, 1948, according to the Daily Worker of July 12, 1948 (p. 4); a photostat of a letterhead of the Civil Right Congress, Illinois, dated December 18, 1948, listed Earl Dickerson as a sponsor. As shown by the Daily Worker of November 1, 1950 (p. 4), Earl B. Dickerson was a sponsor of the Civil Rights Congress. A handbill, 'Dodge Local 3 Supports FEPC Rally,' listed Earl B. Dickerson as one of those who would speak at a rally to be held under partial auspices of the Civil Rights Congress of Michigan on April 16, 1950.

"The Attorney General cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 2 and 19), cited the Civil Rights Congress as an organization formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties); 'dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party' and 'controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it.'

"According to the printed program of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace (p. 14), Earl B. Dickerson was one of the sponsors of this conference which was held in New York City, March 27–27, 1949, under the auspices of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions; he signed a statement of the council which was reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 7, page 9435. Earl B. Dickerson was a signer of a Resolution Against Atomic Weapons as shown by a mimeographed list of signers attached to a letterhead of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and

Professions dated July 28, 1950. Mr. Dickerson signed a statement to the American people, 'We uphold the right of all citizens to speak for peace' released by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, as shown by the handbill, 'Halt the Defamers Who Call Peace Un-American', He spoke at a conference on equal rights for Negroes in the arts held by the New York Council of the National Council of the Arts, New York City, November 10, 1951, according to the November 7, 1951 (p. 3) and November 14, 1951 (p. 7), issues of the Daily Worker. The Daily Worker of June 2, 1952 (p. 3), listed Earl B. Dickerson as one of the endorsers of the national council resolution calling for a hearing on Tunisia's demands in the United Nations. He spoke at a conference for equal rights for Negroes in the Arts, Sciences, and Professions held by the Southern California Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, on June 14, 1952, in Los Angeles (Daily Worker, June 20, 1952, p. 7).

"The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, April 19, 1949 (p. 2), cited the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions as a Communist-front organization. In this same report the committee cited the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace as a Communist front which 'was actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations.'

"Earl B. Dickerson was a national sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, as shown by letterheads of the group dated February 26, 1946, February 3, 1948, May 18, 1951, and January 5, 1953. He signed an open letter of the organization to President Truman on Franco Spain as shown by a letterhead and mimeographed letter of April 28, 1949. He signed a petition of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee to President Truman 'to bar military aid to or alliance with fascist Spain' as shown by a mimeographed petition, attached to a letterhead of the group dated May 18, 1951.

"The Attorney General cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 174), cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as a Communist-front organization.

"Mr. Dickerson was chairman of the Illinois Legislative and Defense Committee of the International Labor Defense, as shown in Equal Justice, September, 1939 (p. 3). He spoke before the International Labor Defense, together with Earl Browder, according to the Daily Worker of October 1, 1942 (p. 5); October 6, 1942 (p. 5); and October 11, 1942 (p. 3). The pamphlet Victory in Oklahoma, October 1943, back cover, listed Earl B. Dickerson as a member of the National Committee of the International Labor Defense.

"The Attorney General cited the International Labor Defense as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as the 'legal arm of the Communist Party,' (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7687). The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 1 and 2), cited the International Labor Defense as 'part of an international network of organizations for the defense of Communist lawbreakers.'

"Earl B. Dickerson was a speaker at the Conference on Constitutional Liberties, the founding conference of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, as shown in the printed program, Call to a Conference, page 2, June 7, 1940.

"The Attorney General cited the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America as a conference as a result of which was established the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, 'part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program' (Congressional Record, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7687). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 102), cited the conference as 'an important part of the solar system of the Communist Party's front organizations.'

"The program and call to a national conference of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, held in Cleveland, Ohio, October 25 and 26, 1947, listed Earl B. Dickerson as one of the sponsors of the conference; he was one of the sponsors of the sixth national conference, which was held in Cleveland, May 9 and 10, 1942, as shown in a leaflet of the conference, page 4. In the latter source, Mr. Dickerson was identified as a member of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practices. Earl Dickerson was a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as shown by a 1950 letterhead, an undated letterhead (received for files, July 11, 1950), an undated letterhead (distributing a speech of Abner Green at the conference of the American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born of December 2–3, 1950), and a letterhead of the Midwest Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (April 30, 1951). Mr. Dickerson, identified as president of the Chicago Urban League, was a sponsor of a dinner given by the Midwest Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born for Pearl Hart (Daily Worker, Apr. 6, 1950, p. 4). A letterhead of the sixth annual conference of the Midwest Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born dated May 16, 1954, Chicago, listed Earl B. Dickerson as a sponsor.

"The Attorney General cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as 'one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States.'

"In 1942 Earl B. Dickerson was a patron of the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, as shown on a letterhead of the congress, dated October 27, 1942; he was named in Soviet Russia Today (December 1942 issue, p. 42) as one of the sponsors of the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship; the call to the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, November 6–8, 1943, listed Earl B. Dickerson among the sponsors. He signed a statement of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, praising Wallace's open letter to Stalin, May 1948, as shown in a pamphlet, How To End the Cold War and Build the Peace, page 9. He was identified in the last-named source as an attorney at law, Chicago. A photostatic copy of a letterhead of the Chicago Council of American-Soviet Friendship dated September 17, 1951, listed Earl B. Dickerson as a sponsor of that group. A photostat of a letter of the national council dated March 19, 1952, listed Mr. Dickerson as a sponsor.

"The Attorney General cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 156), cited the National Council as 'in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian.'

"The Daily Worker of October 21, 1942 (p. 1), named Earl B. Dickerson among the list of members of the National Emergency Committee To Stop Lynching. He signed an appeal to lift the Spanish embargo, which appeal was made by the Negro People's Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, according to the Daily Worker of February 8, 1939 (p. 2). He contributed to the June 22, 1943, issue of New Masses (p. 9). He signed a petition of the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder, as shown in an official leaflet of the organization.

"The National Emergency Committee To Stop Lynching was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Negro Communist-front organization, whose secretary was Ferdinand C. Smith, high in the circles of the Communist Party (report, March 29, 1944, p. 180).

"The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 180), cited the Negro People's Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy as a Communist-front organization.

"New Masses was cited as a Communist periodical by the Attorney General (Congressional Record, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7688), and the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (report, Mar. 29, 1955, pp. 48 and 75).

"The Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder was cited as Communist by the Attorney General in a letter dated April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist organization (Congressional Record, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7687). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 6 and 55), cited the Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder as follows: When Earl Browder (then general secretary, Communist Party) was in Atlanta Penitentiary serving a sentence involving his fraudulent passports, the Communist Party's front which agitated for his release was known as the Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder.

"An open letter demanding discharge of Communist Party defendants in Fulton and Livingston Counties contained the name of Earl B. Dickerson in the list of persons who signed, according to the Daily Worker of September 24, 1940, page 5. He was attorney for Eugene Dennis, general secretary, Communist Party, as shown in the Daily Worker of November 19, 1947, page 7, being identified in this source as a former member of the city council, Chicago. Reference to Earl Dickerson as attorney for Eugene Dennis appears in the Worker, November 30, 1947, page 4; the Daily Worker of January 15, 1948, page 5; and the Daily Worker of October 27, 1948, page 10, in which source he is identified as a Negro leader, of Chicago.

"Earl B. Dickerson was a sponsor of the American Peace Crusade, Illinois assembly, as shown by a letterhead dated April 12, 1951, the Illinois Peace Crusade, May 1951 (p. 4), and a photostat of a letterhead dated June 21, 1952. He was a sponsor of the American People's Congress and Exposition for Peace, held by the American Peace Crusade in Chicago, Ill., June 29, 30, and July 1, 1951, as shown by a leaflet, An Invitation to American Labor To Participate in a Peace Congress, the call to the American People's Congress, and the leaflet, American People's Congress * * * Invites You To Participate in a National Peace Competition, June 20, 1951, Chicago, Ill. He was a sponsor of a contest held by the American Peace Crusade for songs, essays, and paintings advancing the theme of world peace as reported in the Daily Worker, May 1, 1951 (p. 11).

"The Attorney General included the American Peace Crusade on his January 22, 1954, list of organizations designated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its statement issued on the March of Treason, February 19, 1951, and report on the Communist Peace Offensive April 1, 1951 (p. 51), cited the American Peace Crusade as an organization which the Communists established as a new instrument for their peace offensive in the United States and which was heralded by the Daily Worker with the usual bold headlines reserved for projects in line with the Communist objectives.

"Masses and Mainstream for February 1952 (pp. 52–56) listed Earl B. Dickerson as coauthor of an amici curiae brief to the Supreme Court supporting an appeal for a rehearing of its decision upholding the Smith Act, dated September 27, 1951.

"According to the April 30, 1950, issue of the Worker (p. 15), Earl B. Dickerson was a sponsor of the Midcentury Conference for Peace, cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as a meeting held in Chicago, May 29 and 30, 1950, by the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact and as having been 'aimed at assembling as many gullible persons as possible under Communist direction and turning them into a vast sounding board for Communist propaganda' (report on Communist peace offensive, Apr. 1, 1951, p. 58).

"Earl B. Dickerson was a sponsor of the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill as shown by the pamphlet, Hey, Brother, There's a Law Against You (p. 2); a release of June 15, 1949 (p. 2), and a photostat of a letterhead dated May 5, 1950. He signed a statement of the organization according to the Daily Worker of April 3, 1950 (p. 4).

"The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill, December 7, 1950, cited the organization as 'a registered lobbying organization which has carried out the objectives of the Communist Party in its fight against antisubversive legislation.'

"Earl B. Dickerson signed a letter defending the 12 Communist leaders, as shown on a letterhead, dated January 7, 1949; he later signed a statement asking for the release of the Communist leaders, as shown in the Daily Worker of November 8, 1949 (p. 6). He signed a brief on behalf of the attorneys who represented the Communist leaders, as shown in the Daily Worker of November 2, 1949 (p. 2); he signed a statement on behalf of the attorneys, as shown in the Daily Worker of December 7, 1949 (p. 5); he represented the attorneys who represented the 11 Communist leaders, according to the Daily Worker of January 24, 1950 (p. 3)."

"February 13, 1956.

"Subject: Benjamin E. Mays, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The Daily Worker, March 4, 1948 (p. 2), named Benjamin E. Mays as one of the signers of a letter in behalf of Communist deportation cases, which was sponsored by the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. A letterhead of the group contained his name as one of the sponsors (letterhead December 11 and 12, 1948).

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist in letters furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press by the U.S. Civil Service Commission June 1 and September 21, 1948. The group was redesignated by the Attorney General April 29, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the committee as 'one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States.'

"Benjamin E. Mays, president, Morehouse College, was a member of the initiating committee for a Congress on Civil Rights which was held in Detroit, April 27 and 28, 1946. (See, Urgent Summons to a Congress on Civil Rights.) He was an honorary national chairman of the Civil Rights Congress, New York, as shown by an undated letterhead concerning a conference held October 11, 1947. He signed a call for a national conference of the Civil Rights Congress to be held in Chicago (Daily Worker, Oct. 21, 1947, p. 5).

"The Civil Rights Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The group was redesignated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 2 and 19), cited the Civil Rights Congress as an organization formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties); 'dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party' and 'controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it.'

"Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, president, Morehouse College, Atlanta, Ga., signed a statement by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship in praise of Wallace's open letter to Stalin, May 1948 (pamphlet, How To End the Cold War and Build the Peace, p. 9). A leaflet, 'End the Cold War—Get Together for Peace' (December 1948), named Benjamin E. Mays as one of the signers of the National Council's appeal to the U.S. Government to end the cold war and arrange a conference with the Soviet Union. He was a member of the Sponsoring Committee of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Committee on Education, as shown by a bulletin of the group, dated June 1945 (p. 22).

"The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The group was redesignated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 156), cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as 'in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian. * * *'

"Dr. Mays signed an open letter sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties denouncing U.S. Attorney General Biddle's charges against Harry Bridges (Daily Worker, July 19, 1942, p. 4); booklet, 'Six Hundred Prominent Americans,' p. 25). He also signed a statement sponsored by this organization hailing the War Department's order on commissions for the Communists, as shown by the Daily Worker, March 18, 1945 (p. 2).

"The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The group was redesignated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The group was cited previously by the Attorney General as 'part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program' (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7687). The special committee, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the federation as one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the federation as among a maze of organizations which were spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law.

"Letterheads, dated June 12, 1947, and August 11, 1947, of the Southern Negro Youth Congress, list Dr. Mays as a member of the advisory board. A leaflet of the organization (exhibit 46, public hearings, July 22, 1947, Steele) also contained the name of Dr. Benjamin Mays.

"The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U. S. A., which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means by the Attorney General in a letter released December 4, 1947. The group was redesignated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The special committee in its report of January 3, 1940 (p. 9), cited the organization as a Communist front. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947 (p. 14), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as surreptitiously controlled by the Young Communist League.

"The Daily Worker, April 27, 1947 (p. 24), reported that Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, Georgia, signed a statement against the ban on the Communist Party. He signed a statement against the North Atlantic Pact, according to the Daily Worker of June 28, 1949 (p. 2). He spoke at a conference on 'Jim Crow in the Nation's Capital' (Daily Worker, December 21, 1950, p. 8)."

"October 25, 1955.

"Subject: A. T. Walden, national legal committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The Daily Worker of October 7, 1952 (p. 3), reported that A. T. Walden, Georgia, was to lead the National Lawyers Guild workshop discussions at a national conference on civil rights, legislation, and discrimination, New York City, October 10, 11, and 12.

"The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the group as a Communist front which is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party; its front organizations and controlled unions and which since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.

"A mimeographed letter addressed to the House of Representatives, May 12, 1948, included a list of signers opposing the Mundt anti-Communist bill. Austin T. Walden, Georgia, was one of those signers."

"OCTOBER 25, 1955.

"Subject: Arthur D. Shores, national legal committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"According to letterheads of the Southern Negro Youth Congress, dated June 12 and August 11, 1947, Arthur D. Shores was a member of the advisory board of this organization. A page from an undated leaflet of the organization also listed Mr. Shores as a member of the advisory board. Arthur Shores, Negro attorney, was associated with Nesbitt Elmore in the defense of Senator Glen H. Taylor, of Idaho, who was fined $50 and ordered a 180-day suspended jail sentence for defying Birmingham's segregation laws at a meeting of the Southern Negro Youth Congress in Alabama (Daily Worker, May 6, 1948, p. 4).

"The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as 'surreptitiously controlled' by the Young Communist League (report 271, Apr. 17, 1947, p. 14). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated January 3, 1940, page 9, cited the Congress as a Communist front. The Attorney General of the United States cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, United States of America, which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means (letter furnished the Loyalty Review Board, released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission, Dec. 4, 1947); the Attorney General redesignated the congress pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450 of April 27, 1953, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

"Arthur D. Shores, prominent Negro attorney, told the Daily Worker that 'outlawing the Communist Party would "pave the way for a one-party dictatorship in this country"' (Daily Worker, March 19, 1947, p. 5).

"The Worker for December 14, 1947 (p. 8, southern edition), reported that Arthur Shores, identified as a leading Negro civil-rights lawyer, was assisting in the case of Mrs. Ruby Jackson Gainor, 'outstanding Negro teacher fired by the Jefferson County Board of Education. * * * Mrs. Jackson is the leading petitioner in contempt-of-court proceedings against the board for its refusal to equalize salaries of Negro teachers in accord with a Federal court decree * * *.' The article, which identified Mrs. Gainor as president of the Birmingham teachers' local of the United Public Workers, also reported: 'The outcome of Mrs. Gainor's case has become the keystone of the fight of all the Negro teachers in Jefferson County for equal pay. The United Public Workers nationally is supporting the fight * * *.'"

It is noted that the United Public Workers of America was formed in 1946 by a merger of the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America and the United Federal Workers of America. Both of these unions were cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 18 and 19), as among the CIO unions in which the committee found Communist leadership strongly entrenched. The Congress of Industrial Organizations, by vote of the executive board, February 15, 1950, expelled the United Public Workers of America, effective March 1, 1950, on charges of Communist domination (press release, 12th CIO convention, November 20-24, 1950)."

OCTOBER 13, 1955.

"Subject: Lloyd Garrison, chairman, national legal committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Lloyd K. Garrison was a member of the National Committee of the International Juridical Association according to a letterhead of the organization dated May 18, 1942, and the leaflet, What is the I. J. A.? Lloyd K. Garrison, dean, University of Wisconsin Law School, commended the International Juridical Association bulletin in that pamphlet.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the International Juridical Association as a 'Communist front and offshoot of the International Labor Defense.' The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950 (p. 12), cited the International Juridical Association as an organization which 'actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line.'

"The Daily Worker for March 18, 1945 (p. 2), and an undated leaflet, 'The only sound policy for a Democracy,' listed Lloyd K. Garrison, National War Labor Board, as one of the signers of a statement sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties hailing the War Department order on commissions for the Communists. A photograph of Mr. Garrison is found in the Daily Worker reference.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The Attorney General redesignated the organization April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as 'part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program * * *' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7687). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as 'one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party.' The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as among a 'maze of organizations' which were 'spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law.'

"Lloyd K. Garrison, Madison, Wis., former Chairman of NLRB, was listed as a member of the Committee on Legal Research and Legal Education of the National Lawyers Guild and his book was reviewed in the newsletter of the National Lawyers Guide, July 1937 (pp. 2-3). Convention News, May 1941 (pp. 3 and 4) published by the National Lawyers Guild for the fifth annual convention, listed Lloyd K. Garrison as a member of the convention nominations committee of the fifth annual convention, Book-Cadillac Hotel, Detroit, Mich., May 29 to June 1, 1941.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.'

"The pamphlet of the Second National Negro Congress, October 1937, listed Lloyd Garrison as one of those who sent greetings to the congress.

"'The Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes is known as the National Negro Congress. * * * The officers of the National Negro Congress are outspoken Communist sympathizers, and a majority of those on the executive board are outright Communists' (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, January 3, 1939, p. 81; also cited in reports, January 3, 1940, p. 9; June 25, 1942, p. 20; and March 29, 1944, p. 180). The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as a Communist-front organization as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 24, 1942 (pp. 7687 and 7688).

"The Daily Worker for February 23, 1939 (p. 3) reported that Lloyd Garrison spoke at a conference of the Wisconsin Conference on Social Legislation, Madison, Wis., February 18, 1939. The Attorney General cited the Wisconsin Conference on Social Legislation as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list."

"OCTOBER 25, 1955.

"Subject: Sidney A. Jones, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Sidney A. Jones, attorney, was an endorser of the National Negro Congress as shown on the call for National Negro Congress, in Chicago, Ill., February 14, 1936.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7687-7688). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as 'The Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes. * * *'

"It was reported in the Daily People's World of December 2, 1947 (p. 4), that Sidney A. Jones, Jr., was vice president of the Chicago Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild, and was further identified as being associated with the National Association for Advancement of Colored People, Urban League, Chicago. Mr. Jones was shown as an executive board member of the National Lawyers Guild from Chicago as of December 1949 and May 1950 in the Committee on Un-American

Activities report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950 (pp. 18–19).

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the group as a Communist front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.'

"The Daily Worker of April 3, 1950 (p. 4), listed Sidney A. Jones, attorney, Chicago, Ill., as one who signed a statement of the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill. A photostat of a letterhead of the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill (Chicago chapter), dated May 5, 1950, listed Sidney A. Jones as a Chicago sponsor of the organization.

"The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill, December 7, 1950, cited the organization as 'a registered lobbying organization which has carried out the objectives of the Communist Party in its fight against antisubversive legislation.'

"Sidney Jones, vice president of the National Association for Advancement of Colored People, sent greetings to Paul Robeson according to the Daily Worker of April 29, 1947 (p. 12). He signed Labor Day greetings to the Daily People's World, which appeared in the August 29, 1947 (p. 4), issue of that paper; signed statement by Negro Americans, in behalf of arrested Communist leaders (the Worker of August 29, 1948, p. 11); and he signed a statement on release of Communist leaders, and was identified as a Negro attorney in Chicago as noted in the Daily Worker of November 8, 1949 (p. 6).

"The Daily Worker of December 25, 1952 (p. 8), listed Sidney Jones, attorney, Chicago, as a signer of an open letter to President Truman asking clemency for the Rosenbergs."

"OCTOBER 25, 1955.

"Subject: W. Robert Ming, Jr., national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"An election campaign letter of the National Lawyers Guild, dated May 18, 1940, listed Robert W. Ming, Jr., as the candidate for delegate to the national convention, Washington, D.C., chapter. Robert Ming, Jr., Washington, D.C., was a member of the convention nominations committee, fifth annual convention of the National Lawyers Guild, Book-Cadillac Hotel, Detroit, Mich., May 29 to June 1, 1941.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.'

"A 1941 membership list of the Washington Book Shop listed Robert W. Ming, Jr., Howard University, Washington, D.C., as a member.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the Washington Book Shop Association as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously cited. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7688). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 150), cited the Washington Book Shop Association as a Communist-front organization."

"OCTOBER 25, 1955.

"Subject: Arthur J. Mandell, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee . It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The News Letter of the National Lawyers Guild, July 1937 (p. 2), named Arthur Mandell, Houston, Tex., as a member of the Guild's committee on American citizenship, immigration, and naturalization; and a copy of the 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers Guild, made available to the special Committee on Un-American Activities by the organization, contained the name of Arthur Mandel, Shell Building, Houston, Tex.

"The National Lawyers Guild was cited as a Communist front by the special Committee on Un-American Activities (report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 149); and it was the subject of a separate report by the Committee on Un-American Activities (H. Rept. No. 3123, Sept. 21, 1950), wherein it was cited as a Communist front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.'

"Arthur J. Mandell, attorney, Houston, Tex., was shown in the call to the First Congress of the Mexican and Spanish American Peoples of the United States, March 24–26, 1939, Albuquerque, N. Mex., as one of the signers of that call. The Congress of the Mexican and Spanish American Peoples * * * was cited as a Communist front by the special Committee on Un-American Activities (report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 120).

"A leaflet, attached to an undated letterhead of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, named Arthur J. Mandell, attorney, Houston, Tex., as a signer of the organization's January 1943 message to the House of Representatives. The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties has been cited as being subversive and Communist (Attorney General letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated by the Attorney General pursuant to Executive Order 10450, see consolidated list, April 1, 1954); as 'part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program' (Attorney General, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7687); as 'one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party' (special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 50; also cited in reports, June 25, 1942, and Jan. 2, 1943) ; and as being among a 'maze of organizations' which were 'spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law' (Committee on Un-American Activities, report, Sept. 2, 1947, p. 3).

"Arthur Mandell was a member of the resolutions committee at the Congress on Civil Rights in Detroit, Mich., April 27–28, 1946, as shown by a mimeographed release issued by the congress; and Arthur J. Mandell, Houston, was listed as a sponsor of the National Conference of the Civil Rights Congress in Chicago, November 21–23, 1947, in the printed program, Let Freedom Ring. The Civil Rights Congress has been cited as a subversive and Communist organization by the Attorney General (letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated, see consolidated list, April 1, 1954; and, as an organization formed in April 1946 by merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties), 'dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party,' and 'controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it' (Committee on Un-American Activities, House Report No. 1115, Sept. 2, 1947, pp. 2 and 19)."

"OCTOBER 26, 1955.

"Subject: Robert W. Kenny, national legal committee, NAACP, 1961

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Reference to Robert W. Kenny is found in the appendix to this committee's public hearings regarding communism in the United States Government, part 2, September 1950 (pp. 2991–2992), as follows:

"'Robert W. Kenny: Kenny, attorney general of State of California during the years 1943–47 and president of the National Lawyers Guild during the years 1940–48, has been associated with the defense of a number of Communist cases. He was also one of the attorneys for the Hollywood 10. He sent greetings to the Biennial National Conference of the International Labor Defense held April 4–6, 1941; this organization was cited by the former Attorney General Francis Biddle as the 'legal arm of the Communist Party.'

"'The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born has specialized in the legal defense of foreign-born Communists such as Gerhard Eisler. Kenny was a sponsor of its national conference held in Ohio on October 25–26, 1947, and again in 1950. He spoke in behalf of Communists held for deportation, according to the Daily People's World, Communist publication, dated March 8, 1948.

"'On repeated occasions, Mr. Kenny has attacked the trial of the 11 Communist leaders convicted for teaching and advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence, particularly as reported by the Daily People's World of July 22, 1948, and the Worker of October 30, 1949.

"'He signed a statement in behalf of arrested leaders of the Communist Party of Los Angeles, according to the Daily Worker of October 19, 1949, and the Daily People's World of November 7, 1949. Statements opposing the outlawing or restricting of the

Communist Party have been signed by Robert W. Kenny and have appeared frequently in the Communist press. Mr. Kenny has opposed Government loyalty procedures on various occasions.

" 'On the eve of the 1947 May Day celebration, Pravda, the official newspaper of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, hailed Robert W. Kenny as a "friend of the Soviet Union in the United States." Another Communist government, namely that of China, selected Mr. Kenny to defend its legal interests, according to the Daily People's World of April 26, 1950 (p. 4).

" 'Robert W. Kenny has a number of affiliations and associations with Communist-front organizations. These include the American Youth for Democracy (formerly known as the Young Communist League), the National Committee To Win the Peace, of which he was vice chairman, Civil Rights Congress, Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, American Committee for Yugoslav Relief, Hollywood League for Democratic Action, California Labor School, Lawyers Committee on American Relations With Spain, Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, and the American Slav Congress.'

"Subsequent to this committee's release which contained the above reference to Robert W. Kenny, he had served as counsel for 66 witnesses before this committee."

"October 25, 1955.

"Subject: Milton R. Konvitz, national legal committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

A membership list of the National Lawyers Guild contains the name of Milton Konvitz, 744 Broad Street, Newark, N.J. (List in committee files.) The National Lawyers Guild was cited as a Communist-front organization by the special Committee on Un-American Activities (report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 149). The organization was cited as a Communist front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents' (Committee on Un-American Activities, report on the National Lawyers Guild, Sept. 21, 1950)."

"October 25, 1955.

"Subject: Loren Miller, national vice president and national legal committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"One Loren Miller, 837 East 24th Street, Los Angeles, Calif., was a signer of Communist Party election petition No. 120 in California in 1932.

"An article entitled 'Why I Will Vote "Red" ' written by Loren Miller appeared in the Daily Worker of July 11, 1932 (p. 4). In a note which accompanies this article, the following information is given concerning the author: 'Loren Miller, until recently city editor of the California Eagle, Los Angeles, Calif., largest and oldest of western Negro newspapers, is now en route to the Soviet Union.' Excerpts from this article follow:

"I regret very much that I will not be present to take an active part in the struggle that Negroes must wage to pile up a huge vote for William Z. Foster and James W. Ford, Communist candidates for President and Vice President.

* * * * *

"It must be evident to anybody who thinks through the things about which I have been talking that the Communist Party is our party. It is fighting our fights, warring against our enemies, struggling for our welfare. Commonsense dictates that we should support our party with every means at hand."

Loren Miller wrote an article for the Daily Worker while he was traveling in the Soviet Union with a group of Negro writers, workers, etc., observing conditions. This article concerned the equality of races in the Soviet Union and appeared in the Daily Worker of September 24, 1932 (p. 4). Mr. Miller compared racial equality in the Soviet Union and the United States, stated that the Communist Party in the United States was the only political party which promised equality, and concluded as follows:

" 'Only the Communists with their straightforward platform on relief for the por (sic) farmers and workers, their demand for self-determination for Negroes in the Black Belt, and with a Negro, James W. Ford, as nominee for the Vice Presidency deserve the vote of the Negroes of the United States. It is for these reasons that I wish to renew my plea to Negroes everywhere in the United States to vote Communist.'

"The Daily Worker of January 26, 1948 (p. 10), reported that Loren Miller, attorney, Los Angeles, defended Claudia Jones, Communist. He signed a statement opposing the Mundt anti-Communist bill as shown by the Daily People's World of May 12, 1948 (p. 3). According to the Daily People's World of July 22, 1948 (p. 3), Loren Miller, attorney, Los Angeles, attacked the arrest of the Communist Party leaders.

"In the Daily Worker of December 24, 1931 (p. 3), Loren Miller was named as a reporter for the Worker. Reference to Loren Miller as a reporter for the Worker appeared in the Daily Worker of December 21, 1935 (p. 3). Loren Miller has been a contributor to the Daily Worker as shown in the issue of May 4, 1938 (p. 7), as well as the two issues already cited.

"The Worker is the Sunday edition of the Daily Worker, which was cited as 'official Communist Party, U.S.A., organ' by the Committee on Un-American Activities in report 1920, dated May 11, 1948. The publication was cited as 'chief journalistic mouthpiece of the Communist Party' by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in report 1311 of March 29, 1944; it had previously been cited as a Communist publication in reports of the special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated January 3, 1939, January 3, 1940, January 3, 1941, and June 25, 1942.

"Loren Miller was named as editor of New Masses in the issue of August 20, 1935 (p. 5), and as associate editor in the issue of January 14, 1936 (p. 5). He was shown as contributing editor in the following issues of New Masses: June 2, 1936 (p. 5), January 5, 1937 (p. 22), May 11, 1937 (p. 9), September 7, 1937 (p. 9), January 11, 1938 (p. 9), and September 20, 1938 (p. 14). He was a contributor to New Masses, as shown in the issue of August 20, 1935 (p. 26), and was named as a contributor to New Masses in the Daily Worker of April 3, 1963 (p. 3).

"New Masses was cited as a 'Communist periodical' by the Attorney General of the United States (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7688). It was cited as a 'national circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party' by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in report 1311 of March 29, 1944. New Masses had been cited previously as a Communist publication in reports of the special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated January 3, 1939, and June 25, 1942.

"As shown by an undated letterhead of Book Union, Inc., Loren Miller was a member of its advisory council. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in report 1311 of March 29, 1944, cited Book Union as 'distributors of Communist literature.'

"According to a letterhead of August 24, 1939, Loren Miller was a member of the Harry Bridges defense committee, southern division.

"In report 1311 of the special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944, the Harry Bridges defense committee was cited as one of the Communist fronts formed to oppose deportation of Harry Bridges, Communist Party member and leader of the San Francisco general strike of 1934 which was planned by the Communist Party.

"As shown in the call for the National Negro Congress held in Chicago, Ill., February 14, 1936, Loren Miller, Los Angeles, Calif., was one of the endorsers of the National Negro Congress.

" 'From the record of its activities and the composition of its (National Negro Congress) governing bodies, there can be little doubt that it has served as what James W. Ford, Communist vice presidential candidate elected to the executive committee in 1937, predicted: "An important sector of the democratic front," sponsored and supported by the Communist Party' (Attorney General, Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, pp. 7687–7688). The National Negro Congress was cited as a Communist front in reports of the special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated January 3, 1939, January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. The Attorney General cited the group as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

"Loren Miller, author, was a signer of the open letter to American liberals, as shown in Soviet Russia Today, issue of March 1937 (pp. 14–15).

" 'In March 1937 a group of well-known Communists and Communist collaborators published an open letter bearing the title given above. The letter was a defense of the Moscow purge trials' (report of the special Committee on Un-American Activities, June 25, 1942).

"As shown in the proceedings of the Second United States Congress Against War and Fascism, held in Chicago, Ill., September 28, 29, 30, 1934, under auspices of the American League Against War and Fascism, the report of the publications committee was presented by Loren Miller. (See public hearings, appendix, vol. 10, p. 22.)

" 'The American League Against War and Fascism was formally organized at the First United States Congress Against War and Fascism held in New York City, September 29 to October 1, 1933. * * * The program of the first congress called for the end of the Roosevelt policies of imperialism and for the support of the peace policies of the Soviet Union, for opposition to all attempts to weaken the Soviet Union. * * * Subsequent congresses in 1934 and 1936 reflected the same program' (Attorney General, Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7683).

"The American League Against War and Fascism was 'established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union' (Attorney General, Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7683). The Attorney General cited the American League Against War and Fascism as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front in reports of the special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated January 3, 1939, January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

"In connection with the testimony of Harper L. Knowles and Ray E. Nimmo before the special Committee on Un-American Activities on October 25, 1938, a brief relating to activities of the Communist Party among professional groups was presented and incorporated in the record. In this brief Loren Miller is described as 'contributing editor to New Masses and a member of the Communist Party' (public hearings, p. 1997). According to this same source, he was a participant in the Western Writers Congress, cited as a Communist front by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in report 1311 of March 29, 1944.

"A pamphlet, 'Equality, Land and Freedom' published by the League of Struggle for Negro Rights, December 1934 (p. 44), listed Loren Miller as a member of the national council of that organization.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the League of Struggle for Negro Rights as follows: 'The Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes is known as the National Negro Congress. Practically the same group of leaders directing this directed the League of Struggle for Negro Rights, which was, until 2 years ago, the name of the Communist front for Negroes. The name was later changed * * * in 1936 to the National Negro Congress.'

"It was reported in the Daily People's World of September 28, 1950 (p. 5) that Loren Miller was one of a group of Los Angeles lawyers who signed a brief against a Communist registration ordinance. The brief was presented in connection with the case of Henry Steinberg, county legislative director of the Communist Party, who was charged with failing to register with the sheriff's office in accordance with provisions of the ordinance. Reference to Loren Miller as one of the attorneys who signed a brief charging Los Angeles County's Communist registration ordinance with being 'basically unconstitutional' also appeared in the Daily People's World of October 9, 1950 (p. 3). The brief was filed in connection with a hearing on a demurrer against the ordinance filed by attorneys for Gus Brown, Furniture Workers Local 576 business agent.

"The Daily People's World of May 17, 1950 (p. 3), listed Loren Miller as one who signed a statement against the loyalty oath."

"OCTOBER 26, 1955.

"Subject: Morris L. Ernst, national legal committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"In testimony of Walter S. Steele before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, August 15, 1938, Morris Ernst was named as a member of the board of the American Fund for Public Service (public hearings, p. 388). The following issues of New Masses named Morris L. Ernst as treasurer of the American Fund for Public Service, November 1930 (p. 19), November 1931 (p. 31), and January 2, 1934 (p. 2). He was named as treasurer and a member of the board of directors of the American Fund for Public Service on a letterhead (photostat dated September 8, 1930).

"The American Fund for Public Service (Garland Fund) was 'established in 1922 * * * it was a major source for the financing of Communist Party enterprise' such as the Daily Worker and New Masses, official Communist publications, Federated Press, Russian Reconstruction Farms, and International Labor Defense. William Z. Foster, present chairman, Communist Party, and Scott Nearing, a leading writer for the party, served on the board of directors of the fund (special Committee on Un-American Activities, report of March 29, 1944, pp. 75 and 76).

"A letterhead of the American League for Peace and Democracy (a photostat dated April 6, 1939) carried the name of Morris L. Ernst as a member of the lawyer's committee of the league. The American League for Peace and Democracy was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General in letters furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission, June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. It was established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism 'in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union.' (Attorney General of the United States, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7683 and 7684.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the league as 'the largest of the Communist front movements in the United States' (report of January 3, 1939).

"The Daily Worker of February 19, 1937 (p. 4), reported that Morris Ernst spoke at a meeting of the American Youth Congress in Washington, D.C. The American Youth Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list). The Attorney General cited the organization as 'originated in 1934 and has been controlled by Communists and manipulated by them to influence the thought of American youth' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7685). The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American Youth Congress as 'one of the principal fronts of the Communist Party' (report of June 25, 1942, p. 16).

"Mr. Ernst spoke at a meeting of the League of American Writers in New York City, as was revealed by the Daily Worker of December 5, 1936 (p. 5). He spoke for the League for Mutual Aid on 'Dethroning the Supreme Court,' February 1, 1937, as shown in New Masses of January 26, 1937 (p. 37).

"The League of American Writers was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948) and was redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450, April 27, 1953; and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The League of American Writers previously had been cited as a Communist front by the Attorney General and by the special committee. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7685 and 7686; and reports of January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942 and March 29, 1944, respectively.) The special committee cited the League for Mutual Aid as a Communist enterprise (report of March 29, 1944, p. 76).

"Morris L. Ernst was named on a letterhead of the Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, dated July 6, 1938, as a member of the lawyers' committee of that organization. 'In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations' such as the Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy (report of the special committee dated March 29, 1944, p. 82).

"Morris L. Ernst, identified as treasurer, American Fund for Public Service, was shown as a stockholder of New Masses on a photostatic copy of the statement of ownership of that publication, dated October 1, 1930. New Masses was cited as a 'Communist periodical' by the Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7688) and as the 'nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party' by the special committee (report of March 29, 1944, pp. 48 and 75).

"The Nonpartisan Committee for the Reelection of Vito Marcantonio was cited as a Communist front by the special committee in the report of March 29, 1944 (p. 122). Mr. Ernst was chairman of the Nonpartisan Committee for the Reelection of Vito Marcantonio, as was shown on a letterhead of the organization dated October 3, 1936.

"A newsletter of the National Lawyers Guild, dated July 1937 (p. 2), listed Mr. Ernst, of New York City, as chairman of the guild's committee on the relation of government to business. The Daily Worker of February 10, 1939 (p. 2), reported that he spoke at a meeting of the National Lawyers Guild; a letterhead of the guild, dated May 28, 1940, named Mr. Ernst as director ex-officio of that group; a membership list (1939) of the guild, on file with this committee, contains the name of Morris L. Ernst, 285 Madison Avenue, New York City.

"On September 17, 1950, the Committee on Un-American Activities released a report on the National Lawyers Guild in which it was cited as a Communist front and the 'foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions.' An earlier report of the special committee (report of Mar. 29, 1944, p. 149) cited the guild as a Communist front.

"An editorial in the Daily Worker of December 10, 1947 (p. 9), criticized Morris Ernst for his proposed legislation to register front organizations. Morris L. Ernst, of New York City, testified voluntarily before the Committee on Un-American Activities, February 11, 1948, regarding legislation before the committee which would seek to curb or outlaw the Communist Party. He stated, in part, as follows:

" 'Mr. KERSTEN. Would you say we would have to have the freedom of expression on the parts of teachers in our schools, professors in our universities, the freedom of expression to the extent that the president of this particular institution could, if he wants to, permit his teachers to teach to the students, for example, the tenets of communism?

" 'Mr. ERNST. Well, may I state my position on that? I have got to cut down underneath it a bit.

* * * * *

" 'I think the Communists or the Klan have a right to elect the Government of the United States. Not having elected the Government of the United States, I take it to be the mandate of the people to the officials elected to make sure that neither Klan nor Communist policy is infiltrated or injected into the Government.

" 'Under those circumstances, it seems to me I would say that no klansman should be in the Bureau of Education of the United States Government even though on an open debate and an election with nightshirts off, they may elect the Government, that's what we are gambling on.

" 'Now, I have got faith that they are not going to elect the Government, if they take their shirts off.

"'Mr. Kersten. The question is, however, do you think a university president has the right or teachers have the right in that university, if they wish to exercise it, to teach the student the tenets of communism?

* * * * *

"'Mr. Ernst. I should say that if it is an avowed Communist or a teacher said this is what communism is, I would like to see that taught in the schools without nightshirts, yes. I would like to see it taught.

"'Now that doesn't mean that I am at all in favor of a school being sneaked upon, as our schools were in New York by Communists sneaking their perfidious stuff underground. I am not afraid of the thesis of communism aboveboard, not at all. Americans will beat it down at every point. We are not afraid of them at all, haven't got the least fear of that crowd, and they are not all crackpots. They are fanatics, maybe, but not crackpots, but I have great fear of any secret group for this reason.

"'Up to now the problem of America has been the protection of minorities against majorities, oppression by majority or minority. From now on in, I suggest our problem is reversed, because a tightly regimented controlled minority in a labor union, in any place in life with the complexities of modern life can oppress a majority, and that is what the Communists are doing to the decent part of the American labor movement today.' (Public hearings, pp. 291, 292.)

"Reference to Mr. Ernst was made by Maj. Gen. Charles Willoughby, a witness during public hearings before this committee, August 22, 1951, as follows:

"'Without going into details which are in this file, the International Red Aid, Soviet-Comintern sponsored, becomes the International Labor Defense, and the American Labor Defense becomes the Civil Rights Congress. And, incidentally, again Weiss, as an organizer, develops other agencies, such as the American Committee for the Defense of the Foreign Born, and several other organizations, all of which have been analyzed and commented on adversely by Mr. Morris Ernst, a reputable New York lawyer, who resented, apparently, ever having been mixed up with this group.' (American Aspects of Richard Sorge Spy Case, p. 1188.)"

"February 13, 1956.

"Subject: Z. Alexander Looby, national board of directors, national legal committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"A 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers Guild, on file with this committee, contains the name of Alexander Looby, 419 Fourth Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 23, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions,' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.'

"The Daily People's World of April 25, 1948 (p. 11), reported that Alexander Looby, attorney, Nashville, Tenn., had spoken before the Southern Negro Youth Congress. The Worker of May 16, 1948 (p. 2), disclosed that Z. Alexander Looby, attorney, Nashville, Tenn., had spoken before the same organization.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U.S.A., which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means (letter to Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947). The Attorney General redesignated the group April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1940 (p. 9), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947 (p. 14), cited the organization as 'surreptitiously controlled' by the Young Communist League."

"October 25, 1955.

"Subject: Karl N. Llewellyn, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Prof. K. N. Llewellyn, Columbia Law School, spoke at a conference of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights as shown by the program, February 12, 1940.

"The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 96 and 129), cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights as a Communist front which was succeeded by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights as among a 'maze of organizations' which were 'spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law.'

"A letterhead of the Non-Partisan Committee for the Reelection of Vito Marcantonio dated October 3, 1936, listed Karl N. Llewellyn as vice chairman of the organization.

"The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 122), cited the Non-Partisan Committee for the Reelection of Vito Marcantonio as a Communist-front organization.

"An undated letterhead of the International Juridical Association listed Prof. Karl Llewellyn, New York, as a member of the national committee.

"The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the International Juridical Association as 'a Communist front and an offshoot of the International Labor Defense.' The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950 (p. 12), cited the International Juridical Association, as an organization which 'actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line.'"

"October 25, 1955.

"Subject: Shad Polier (Isador Polier), national legal committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Who's Who in America (vol. 25, 1948–49, p. 1971) shows that Justine Wise Polier married Shad Polier in 1937. 'Who's Who in American Jewry (vol. 3, 1938–39, p. 818) shows that Justine Wise Polier is the daughter of Rabbi Stephen S. Wise and that she married Isadore Polier, March 26, 1937, New York City. It is noted further that Max Lowenthal, a witness during public hearings before this committee, September 15, 1950, when asked if he were acquainted with Shad Polier, stated: 'Yes, he was Rabbi Wise's son-in-law.' (Communism in the U.S. Government, pt. 2, p. 2984.) Therefore, this report includes references from the public records, files and publications of this committee which appear under the name, Shad Polier, and references which appear under the name, Isadore Polier.

"Shad Polier was named in the election campaign letter of the Washington, D.C., chapter of the National Lawyers Guild, dated May 18, 1940, as a candidate for delegate to the national convention of the guild. Convention News for May 1941 (p. 3) listed Shad Polier, New York City, as a member of the nominations committee of the National Lawyers Guild Fifth Annual Convention at the Book-Cadillac Hotel, Detroit, Mich., May 29–June 1, 1941. Shad Polier is shown as the writer of an article in the Lawyers Guild Review, vol. VI, pp. 490–491.

"The National Lawyers Guild was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (Rept. 1311, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 149), and was the subject of a separate report by the Committee on Un-American Activities, September 17, 1950, in which it was cited as a Communist front that 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.'

"A letterhead of the International Juridical Association, dated May 18, 1942, carries the name of Shad Polier, New York, as a member of the organization's national committee. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the International Juridical Association as 'a Communist front and an offshoot of the International Labor Defense' (report of Mar. 29, 1944, p. 149); the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the International Juridical Association as an organization which 'actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line' (Rept. 3123, Sept. 21, 1950, p. 12).

"A 1941 membership list of the Washington Book Shop, on file with this committee, contains the name of Shad Polier, 3610 Idaho Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 'The Washington Cooperative Book Shop, under the name "The Book Shop Association," was incorporated in the District of Columbia in 1938. * * * It maintains a bookshop and art gallery at 916 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D.C., where literature is sold and meetings and lectures held. Evidence of Communist penetration or control is reflected in the following: Among its stock the establishment has offered prominently for sale books and literature identified with the Communist Party and certain of its affiliates and front organizations.' (United States Attorney General, Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7688). The Attorney General also included the Book Shop on lists of subversive and Communist organizations furnished the Loyalty Review Board (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948) and redesignated it pursuant to Executive Order 10450 (memorandum of April 29, 1953, released by the Department of Justice); and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities also cited the Washington Bookshop as a Communist front (report of March 29, 1944, p. 150).

"The newsletter of the National Lawyers Guild for July 1937 (p. 2) named Isadore Polier, New York City, as chairman of the guild's committee on constitutional and judicial review. A leaflet, What Is the IJA?, contains the name of Isadore Polier as a member of the National Committee of the International Juridical Association. An undated letterhead of the group listed him as executive director, and this committee's report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950 (p. 13), reported that Isadore Polier was executive director of the International Juridical Association at 'the time of its inception.' See citation on page 1.

The Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 4), reported that Isadore Polier signed a petition, sponsored by the American Friends of Spanish Democracy, to lift the arms embargo. 'In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy' (report of the special committee dated March 29, 1944, p. 82).

"The booklet, These Americans Say (p. 8), compiled and published by the Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo, named Isadore Polier among the representative individuals who advocated lifting the Spanish embargo. The Coordinating Committee To Lift the (Spanish) Embargo was cited by the Special Committee as one of a number of front organizations, set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation (report of March 29, 1944, pp. 137 and 138)."

"October 25, 1955.

"Subject: Jawn Sandifer, national legal committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The Daily Worker of April 10, 1951 (p. 5), reported that Jawn A. Sandifer was a speaker for the National Lawyers Guild. The October 7, 1952, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 3), reported that Jawn L. Sandifer, New York, was to lead workshop discussions at the national conference of the National Lawyers Guild on civil rights, legislation, and discrimination to be held at the Park Sheraton Hotel, New York City on October 10, 11, and 12, 1952.

"The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front, which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.' "

"October 25, 1955.

"Subject: Sidney R. Redmond, national legal committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"S. R. Redmond signed the open letter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties denouncing the Attorney General's attack on the Communist Party and decision in the Harry Bridges case as shown by the Daily Worker of July 19, 1942 (p. 4), and the booklet, '600 Prominent Americans' (p. 27). Sidney R. Redmond, editor, National Bar Journal, St. Louis, Mo., signed a statement of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties supporting the War Department's order on granting commissions 'to members of the Armed Forces who have been members of or sympathetic to the views of the Communist Party' according to an undated leaflet, 'the only sound policy for a democracy' and the Daily Worker, March 19, 1945 (p. 4).

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as 'part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program' (Congressional Record, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7687). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as 'one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party.' The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the National Federation * * * among a 'maze of organizations' which were 'spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law.' "

"Subject: George M. Johnson, national legal committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"George M. Johnson, Washington, D.C., was a member of the executive board of the National Lawyers Guild as of 1949. (See the committee's report on the National Lawyers Guild, p. 18.)

"The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers' Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist-front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.' "

"October 25, 1955.

"Subject: Edward P. Lovett, National legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"A 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers Guild listed Edward P. Lovett, 615 F Street NW., Washington, D.C., as a member of that organization.

"The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.' "

"October 25, 1955.

"Subject: Louis L. Redding, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"A 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers Guild listed Louis Redding, 1002 Franch St., Wilmington, Del., as a member of the organization. Louis L. Redding, a member of the Delaware bar, was among the speakers at a panel session on Civil Rights and Liberties as part of the National Lawyers Guild annual convention, February 20–23, 1953, New York City, according to the Daily Worker, February 20, 1953 (p. 6).

"The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.'

"The official proceedings of the National Negro Congress, 1936 (pp. 5, 6, 41), listed Louis L. Redding, Delaware, as a member of the National Executive Council and a member of the presiding committee and general resolutions committee.

"The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953 and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist front (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as 'the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes.' "

"October 25, 1955.

"Subject: Joseph B. Robinson, national health committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

“One Joseph B. Robinson signed the call for the National Emergency Conference, Washington, D.C., May 13 and 14, 1939.

“The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 49), cited the National Emergency Conference as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 12), cited the National Emergency Conference as follows: ‘It will be remembered that during the days of the infamous Soviet-Nazi pact, the Communists built protective organizations known as the National Emergency Conference, the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, which culminated in the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.’ ”

“October 25, 1955.

“Subject: Dr. Edward L. Young, national health committee, NAACP, 1961.

“The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

“Dr. Edward L. Young was an initial sponsor of the American Peace Crusade as shown by letterheads dated February 1951 and February 1953. He signed a petition of the American Peace Crusade calling on President Truman and Congress to seek a big-power act as reported by the Daily Worker of February 1, 1952 (p. 1), in which source he was identified with the Harvard University Medical School. The Daily Worker of February 1, 1951 (p. 2), listed Dr. Edward L. Young, Committee on Physicians for Improvement of Medical Care, Brookline, Mass., as a sponsor of the American Peace Crusade.

“The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its statement issued on the March of Treason, February 19, 1951, and report on the Communist peace offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 51), cited the American Peace Crusade as an orangization which ‘the Communists established’ as ‘a new instrument for their peace offensive in the United States’ and which was heralded by the Daily Worker ‘with the usual bold headlines reserved for projects in line with the Communist objectives.’ The Attorney General of the United States designated the American Peace Crusade January 22, 1954, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

“Dr. Young was a United States sponsor of the American Continental Congress for Peace as shown by an official leaflet published by the Congress.

“The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist peace offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 21), cited the American Continental Congress for Peace as ‘another phase’ in the Communist ‘peace’ campaign, aimed at consolidating anti-American forces throughout the Western Hemisphere.

“According to a statement attached to a press release of the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, dated December 14, 1949 (p. 10), Dr. Edward L. Young, Committee of Physicians for Improvement of Medical Care, Brookline, Mass., signed a statement calling for international agreement to ban use of atomic weapons.

“The Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact was cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as an organization which was formed as a result of the Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact and which was located, according to a letterhead of September 16, 1950, at 30 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.; and to further the cause of ‘Communists in the United States’ doing ‘their part in the Moscow campaign.’

“A mimeographed petition, attached to a letterhead of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee dated May 18, 1951, listed Dr. Edward L. Young, Brookline, Mass., as one who signed a petition to President Truman ‘to bar military aid to or alliance with Fascist Spain.’

“The Attorney General cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 174), cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as a Communist-front organization.

“Dr. Edward L. Young was shown as a member of the board of directors of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions on a leaflet, Policy and Program Adopted by the National Convention, 1950, a letterhead dated July 28, 1950, and a letterhead dated December 7, 1952 (photostat). He was a sponsor of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, New York City, March 25–27, 1949, as shown by the conference program (p. 13), the conference call, and the Daily Worker, February 21, 1949 (p. 9). As shown by the conference program (p. 10), he spoke at the conference, and according to Speaking of Peace, edited report of the conference (p. 49), Dr. Young introduced the discussion on psychiatric aspects of today's international crisis. He signed a statement supporting a rehearing of the case of the Communist leaders before the Supreme Court and protesting the Smith Act as shown by We Join Black's Dissent, a reprint of an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 20, 1951, by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. The Daily Worker of February 28, 1949 (p. 2) reported that Dr. Young was a speaker for the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. He signed a statement of the organization as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 7, page 9435. He signed a resolution against atomic weapons released by the National Council as shown by a mimeographed list of signers attached to a letterhead of July 28, 1950. He signed a peace appeal in a drive of the National and New York Councils of the Arts, * * *, as reported in the Daily Worker of May 16, 1952 (p. 2).

“The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 19, 1949 (p. 2), cited the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions as a Communist-front organization. In this report, Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, the committee cited the conference as a Communist front which ‘was actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations.’

“As shown by an undated leaflet, ‘Prominent Americans Call for * * *’ (received by this committee September 11, 1950), and the Daily Worker of August 10, 1950 (p. 1), Dr. Edward L. Young signed the World Peace Appeal.

“The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist peace offensive, April 1, 1954 (p. 34), cited the World Peace Appeal as a petition campaign launched by the permanent committee of the World Peace Congress at its meeting in Stockholm, March 16–19, 1950; as having ‘received the enthusiastic approval of every section of the international Communist hierarchy’; as having been lauded in the Communist press, putting ‘every individual Communist on notice that he “has the duty to rise to this appeal”; and as having received the official endorsement of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., which has been echoed by the governing bodies of every Communist satellite country, and by all Communist Parties throughout the world.’

“The following is quoted from a ‘Statement of Principles for the Defense of Democracy Against McCarthyism,’ as reported by the Daily Worker of March 31, 1954 (p. 8):

“ ‘Minority opinion is being suppressed by such devices as blacklisting, dismissal from employment, and even jailing.

“ ‘Teachers, lawyers, doctors, writers, artists, actors, and other professionals should be free to practice their professions without discrimination because of their political beliefs or associations, whether they be Republican, Democrat, Socialist, or Communist.’

“The Daily Worker article reported that ‘the signers of the statement urge support for an eight-point program, including abolition of the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations, reinstatement of teachers dismissed in recent inquiries, and amnesty for those in jail on charges of “conspiracy to teach and advocate” their political views.’ Dr. Edward L. Young, Brookline, Mass., was named as a signer.

“The call to a bill of rights conference, New York City, July 16 and 17, 1949, named Dr. Edward L. Young, Massachusetts General Hospital, as a sponsor. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, a member of the national committee of the Communist Party, in writing about the conference for her column in the Daily Worker (July 25, 1949, p. 8), stated that one of the highlights of the conference was the fight for the 12 defendants in the current Communist cases. She reported that seven of the defendants were present and participated actively. The New York Times (July 18, 1949, p. 13) reported that ‘the 20 resolutions adopted unanimously by the 2-day conference registered opposition to the conspiracy trial of the 11 Communist leaders, the Presidential loyalty order * * * deportation for political belief * * * among others. The conference also called for an end to the investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation into political, rather than criminal, activities.’ ”

“October 25, 1955.

“Subject: Viola Bernard, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

“The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

“The Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 4), listed Viola Bernard as one who signed a petition of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy to lift the arms embago.

“The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 82), cited the American Friends of Spanish Democracy as follows: ‘In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy.’ ”

“October 25, 1955.

“Subject: Dr. Russell L. Cecil, national health committee, NAACP, 1961.

“The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"A pamphlet, 'Relighting the Lamps of China,' listed Russell L. Cecil as a medical sponsor of the China Aid Council.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 25, 1942 (p. 16), cited the China Aid Council as a 'subsidiary' of the American League for Peace and Democracy, cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism 'in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union * * *' (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, pp. 7683 and 7684). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 69–71), cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as 'the largest of the Communist "front" movements in the United States * * *.' "

"October 25, 1955.

"Subject: Dr. C. Herbert Marshall, national health committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"A membership list of the American League for Peace and Democracy which was compiled by the special Committee on Un-American Activities from original records of the organization, subpenaed in 1939 by the committee, contains the name of one C. Herbert Marshall, of 2712 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948. The Attorney General redesignated the organization April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism 'in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union' (Congressional Record, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7683 and 7684). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 69–71), cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as 'the largest of the Communist front movements in the United States. * * *'

"C. Herbert Marshall was shown as a sponsor of the Washington Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder in an advertisement of the organization which appeared in the Washington Post of May 1942 (p. 9). 'When Earl Browder (then general secretary, Communist Party) was in Atlanta Penitentiary serving a sentence involving his fraudulent passports, the Communist Party's front which agitated for his release was known as the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder * * * Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, one of the few outstanding women leaders of the Communist Party in this country, headed it' (special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944, pp. 6 and 55). The Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder was cited as Communist by the Attorney General in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

"The call to a conference on civil rights, April 20–21, 1940 (p. 4), lists C. Herbert Marshall, M.D., as a sponsor of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, under whose auspices the conference was held. A letterhead of the organization, dated April 26, 1940, also shows C. Herbert Marshall as a sponsor. In 1941, Dr. C. Herbert Marshall was a member of the executive committee of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, according to a letterhead dated May 23, 1941.

"The Attorney General cited the Washington Committee for Democratic Action as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as an 'affiliate' or 'local chapter' of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. 'The program of the Washington committee followed that of the national federation. National Communist leaders have addressed its meetings, and conferences sponsored by it have been attended by representatives of prominent Communist front organizations' (Congressional Record, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7688 and 7689). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 25, 1942 (p. 22), cited the Washington Committee for Democratic Action as follows: 'When the American League for Peace and Democracy was dissolved in February 1940 its successor in Washington was called the Washington Committee for Democratic Action.'

"As shown by an advertisement in the Washington Post, May 18, 1948 (p. 15), Dr. C. Herbert Marshall signed a statement against the Mundt anti-Communist bill."

"February 13, 1956.

"Subject: Gloster Current, director of branch department, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Gloster Current and his orchestra were scheduled to play at the Independence Day picnic to be held July 3–4, 1938, under the auspices of the Communist Party of Michigan, according to a leaflet entitled 'Where's Everybody Going?' which announced the picnic.

"The Civil Rights Federation (affiliated with the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties) issued a call to a statewide conference, September 12, 1943, in Detroit, Mich.; the name of Gloster Current appeared on the call in a list of sponsors and he was identified as secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Detroit chapter.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the Michigan Civil Rights Federation as an affiliate of the Communist front, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; and as a subversive and Communist organization which has been succeeded by and now operates as the Michigan chapter of the Civil Rights Congress. (Congressional Record, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7687; and press releases of Dec. 4, 1947, June 1 and Sept. 21, 1948; also included on his consolidated list of organizations.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities and the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Michigan Civil Rights Federation as a Communist-front organization. (From Report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated Mar. 29, 1944; and Report No. 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated Sept. 2, 1947.)

"In July 1947 Mr. Walter S. Steele testified in public hearings before this committee, at which time he named Gloster Current of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People as a council member from the United States to the World Federation of Democratic Youth (from Steele testimony, p. 81).

"The World Federation of Democratic Youth was founded in London in November 1945 by delegates from over 50 nations. From the outset, the World Federation of Democratic Youth demonstrated that it was far more interested in serving as a pressure group in behalf of Soviet foreign policy than it was in the specific problems of international youth. (From Report No. 271 of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated Apr. 17, 1947.)"

"February 13, 1956.

"Subject: Ruby Hurley, southeast regional secretary, Birmingham, Ala., NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Ruby Hurley was a sponsor of the World Youth Festival, Prague, July–August 1947, as shown by the World Youth Festival, page 7, and the booklet, "The Bright Face of Peace," published by the U.S. Committee for the World Youth Festival. As shown by the call to World Youth Festival (p. 3), the festival, held in Prague from July 20 to August 17, 1947, was sponsored by the World Federation of Democratic Youth and the International Union of Students.

"The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947 (pp. 12 and 13), cited the World Federation of Democratic Youth as follows: 'The AYD (American Youth for Democracy) is affiliated with the World Federation of Democratic Youth, which was founded in London in November 1945 by delegates from over 50 nations. * * * From the outset the World Federation of Democratic Youth demonstrated that it was far more interested in serving as a pressure group in behalf of Soviet foreign policy than it was in the specific problems of international youth.'

"The International Union of Students was cited as follows by the Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of April 17, 1947 (p. 13): 'The World Federation of Democratic Youth brought into being the International Union of Students, which held a meeting in Prague on August 17–31, 1946. The administration and direction of this project was entrusted to a 17-man executive committee of whom 12 were known Communists.' "

"February 13, 1956.

"Subject: Thurgood Marshall, director counsel, NAACP Legal Defense Fund and Educational Fund, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Thurgood Marshall was a member of the national committee of the International Juridical Association, as shown in the pamphlet, What Is the I.J.A.? The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the International Juridical Association as 'a Communist front and an offshoot of the International Labor Defense' (Rept. No. 1311, dated March 29, 1944). In a report on the National Lawyers Guild, prepared and published September 17, 1950, by the Committee on Un-American Activities, the International Juridical Association was cited as an organization which 'actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line.'

"A list of officers of the National Lawyers Guild, as of December 1949 (printed in the committee's report on the National Lawyers Guild, p. 18) contains the name of Thurgood Marshall, New York City, among the members of the executive board. He was shown to be an associate editor of the Lawyers Guild Review in the issue of May–June 1948 (p. 422). It was reported in the Daily Worker of November 30, 1942 (p. 1), that Mr. Marshall, special counsel of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, was one of those who submitted a report denouncing lynching and discrimination which was adopted by the national executive board of the National Lawyers Guild. It was also reported in the Washington Evening Star (February 8, 1948, p. A–22 and February 12, 1948, p. A–82), that Mr. Marshall, identified as special counsel, NAACP, criticized the loyalty program in a public forum held under the auspices of the National Lawyers Guild in Washington, D.C.

"The National Lawyers Guild was cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front in Report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944 (p. 149). In the committee's report on the organization, released in 1950, the guild was cited as a Communist front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.'

"The Daily Worker of November 24, 1947 (p. 4) reported that Thurgood Marshall was among a group of attorneys who sent a telegram to New York Congressmen asking them to oppose the contempt citations in the case of the so-called Hollywood 10."

"February 13, 1956.

"Subject: Clarence M. Mitchell, director, Washington Bureau, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or finding of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Clarence Mitchell, a representative of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities, May 3, 1950, in opposition to H.R. 7595, at which time he stated that he was not then and had never been a member of the Communist Party. He stated that the question as to whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party 'is an unfair question, because it immediately precludes from appearing before this committee many of the people who would be on trial under a bill of this kind (H.R. 7595). Presumably there are people who may, for sincere and personal reasons, wish to be members of the Communist Party, but they may want to come here and object to this bill, but I suppose if they had to answer that question they very likely would not come.' (Public hearings, pp. 2296–2302.)

"It is noted by the Daily People's World of February 12, 1952 (p. 2) that Clarence Mitchell, director of Washington bureau of the National Association for Advancement of Colored People, 'blasts civil rights record of presidential hopeful.' The Daily Worker of February 15, 1952 (p. 1) reported that Clarence Mitchell, director of Washington bureau, NAACP, appeared before the Senate Armed Forces Committee in protest of universal military training."

"February 13, 1956.

" 'Subject: Henry Lee Moon, director, public relations department, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"A membership list of the Washington Book Shop which was subpenaed by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in 1941 contains the name of Henry Lee Moon with address shown as 1206 Kenyon Street NW., Washington, D.C.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the Washington Book Shop Association as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 150), cited the Washington Book Shop Association as a Communist-front organization.

"Henry Lee Moon, New York, was a member of the national executive council of the National Negro Congress, as shown on the official proceedings of the congress for 1936 (p. 40).

"The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. A. Phillip Randolph, president of the congress since its inception in 1936, refused to run again in April 1940 'on the ground that it was "deliberately packed with Communists and Congress of Industrial Organization members who were either Communists or sympathizers with Communists." Commencing with its formation in 1936, Communist Party functionaries and fellow travelers have figured prominently in the leadership and affairs of the Congress, * * * according to A. Phillip Randolph. John P. Davis, secretary of the congress, has admitted that the Communist Party contributed $100 a month to its support.' (Attorney General, Congressional Record, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7687, 7688.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as 'the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes.'

"A review by Abner W. Berry of Henry Lee Moon's book, Balance of Power: The Negro Vote, was published in the Daily Worker of May 28, 1948 (p. 12). The review reads, in part:

" 'As a newspaperman who spent the war years in Washington and later was associated with the CIO Political Action Committee, Henry Lee Moon has written, in Balance of Power a helpful survey of Negro suffrage in America. He defends the Negro voter against the charge of venality and corruptibility with the materials of history, and traces the long fight for the franchise.

* * * * *

" 'It is the only volume brought to our attention which gives a detailed national picture of the Negro vote. It is too bad the author felt impelled to defend the two-party system and the Negro. And it is worse that he chose this otherwise useful contribution as the bearer of his offering of fuel for the cold war.'

"A photograph of Henry Lee Moon was published in the June 16, 1932, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 2).

"The Daily Worker of June 17, 1946 (p. 2), reported that one Henry Moon (no other identification shown) was one of the signers of a statement of the Action Committee To Free Spain Now which protested the delay in breaking diplomatic relations with Franco Spain.

"The Attorney General cited the Action Committee To Free Spain Now as Communist in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

"The Daily Worker of February 16, 1949 (p. 13), reported that Henry Moon was nominated as commentator of the Voice of Freedom Committee.

"The Attorney General included the Voice of Freedom Committee on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450."

"October 25, 1955.

"Subject: Clarence A. Laws, regional director, New Orleans, La., NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"An undated letterhead (1947) of the Committee for Louisiana, affiliated with the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, listed Clarence A. Laws as a member of the executive committee of the organization.

"The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 147), cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist front which received money from the Robert Marshall Foundation, one of the principal sources of funds by which many Communist fronts operate. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 12, 1947, cited the Southern Conference * * * as a Communist-front organization 'which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South' although its 'professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States.'

"February 13, 1956.

"Subject: Robert L. Carter, assistant special counsel, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Robert L. Carter wrote an article which was published in the Lawyers Guild Review (vol. VI, pp. 553–54, and 599–601). The Lawyers Guild Review was cited as 'an official organ of the National Lawyers Guild' by the Committee on Un-American Activities, report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 21, 1950 (p. 13).

"The National Lawyers Guild was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front organization in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149). It was cited as a Communist front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.' (Committee's review on the National Lawyers Guild, September 21, 1950.)

"It was reported in the Times Herald of April 28, 1948 (pp. 1 and 4) that Robert L. Carter, of the American Veterans' Committee, was a sponsor of a conference against anti-Communist legislation.

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Torea Hall Pittman, assistant field secretary, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The official proceedings of the National Negro Congress for 1936 (p. 6) listed Mrs. Torea Pittman, of California, as a member of the general resolutions committee of the National Negro Congress.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. A. Phillip Randolph, president of the congress since its inception in 1936, refused to run again in April 1940 'on the ground that it was "deliberately packed with Communists and Congress of Industrial Organizations members who were either Communists or sympathizers with Communists." Commencing with its formation in 1936, Communist Party functionaries and fellow travelers have figured prominently in the leadership and affairs of the congress * * * according to A. Phillip Randolph, John P. Davis, secretary of the congress, has admitted that the Communist Party contributed $100 a month to its support.' (Attorney General, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as 'the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes.'"

The Bracero Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in the July 18 issue of the Gilroy Evening Dispatch in my home city of Gilroy, Calif., the following news article appeared:

> The apricot season starting this week brings a need for women and young people to pick and cut the fruit, there is also a need for berrypickers, and for families to pick cucumbers, according to Arnold Hamilton, local State department of employment manager.
>
> During the past week 200 continued and 45 initial claims were filed at the local office. In the same period 316 agricultural and 10 other placements were made.

Mr. Speaker, this article is of great significance when one considers the question of whether the bracero program should or should not be continued. The Gilroy Dispatch in the above article is performing a public service in advising prospective workers that harvest labor is needed to handle apricots, berries, and cucumbers. It is interesting to note that the second paragraph of the same news story reports that even with this labor shortage, 200 persons drew their unemployment insurance for the week and 45 persons made initial claims.

Mr. Speaker, what more dramatic evidence could be found to show that today's unemployed are either not able or willing to do the type of work which is required to harvest agricultural commodities?

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that California agriculture requires the importation of bracero laborers.

Independence of the Central African Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 13, the Central African Republic will celebrate the third anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of the Republic, David Daco; and His Excellency, the Central African Republic Ambassador to the United States, Jean-Pierre Kombet.

The Central African Republic is celebrating its third birthday on August 13. The country is appropriately named, for the geographical center of the African continent lies just a few miles to the west of Bangui, the capital of the Central African Republic. Americans, however, may be more familiar with the country's more romantic but less modern-sounding former name, Ubangi-Shari, a composite of the names of two of the republic's chief rivers.

The ancient history of Ubangi-Shari is suitably shrouded in mystery. All that is known prior to French occupation of the area is that there were successive waves of migration from the northeast resulting in complex ethnic and linguistic patterns. The French first reached the area in 1887 and the first French outpost was established at Bangui in 1889. The area was constituted as a territory in 1894. In 1906 it was united with Chad, another former French West African dependency, to form the Ubangi-Shari-Chad colony. In 1910 Ubangi-Shari became one of the four territories of the Federation of French Equatorial Africa; the administrative structure it then received was retained through World War II. It is interesting to note that during World War II thousands of Ubangi men joined the ranks of the Free French Forces under De Gaulle, and that several of them were awarded the Cross of the Liberation, the highest decoration instituted by General de Gaulle.

The first representative assembly was created in Ubangi-Shari in 1945, and from then on events moved swiftly. In 1958 Ubangi-Shari chose its new name, the Central African Republic, and became a self-governing state within the French Community. It was then but two years to complete independence.

As a sovereign nation the Central African Republic has lived in peaceful and cooperative relations with its neighbors and has shown its concern for furthering international efforts toward maintaining and strengthening the peace as a responsible member of the United Nations. On the domestic scene concentrated efforts have been made to improve the country's economy by the democratic government under the presidency of David Daco.

The constitution of the Central African Republic is dedicated to the principles of democracy and self-determination. Governmental powers reside in a 50-member legislative assembly elected by universal suffrage, a president invested by the Assembly, and an independent judiciary. Both the President and the Assembly may initiate legislation.

In the sphere of economic development, the government has wisely focused its efforts on improving agriculture, which is the chief economic activity of the Central African Republic. In an autumn 1962 address to the National Assembly President Daco stressed the need for increased agricultural production and the diversification of crops. He also pointed out that industrialization should be commensurate with locally available raw materials and needs. Other major areas of development effort in the Central African Republic are the expansion of education and speedier Africanization of the administration.

President Daco and the people of the Central African Republic, we commend you on the third anniversary of your independence for your unceasing efforts at cooperation with the other members of the world community and for your realistic and determined approach to your own development problems.

Puerto Rican Commonwealth Day, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, 11 years ago today, a form of government without precedent in all the world was established on the island of Puerto Rico under the ensign of the United States.

Since then, this experiment in elevating a people from semicolonial status to virtual autonomy within the Federal Union has proved to be one of the happiest political concepts devised. The despair that once stalked the streets and fields of an impoverished land has given way to a confidence and serenity inevitable with a government fostering self-rule, a progressively higher standard of living, and the development of the whole man. Gov. Muñoz-Marín and his people are justifiably proud of the island's vastly improved economic posture; they are pleased almost as much with the ever-widening periphery of cultural attainments.

On the mainland of the United States, the thousands of Puerto Ricans who have traveled northward to live have experienced a corresponding economic and social uplift, ever since the first group of immigrants settled in the Metropolitan New York area. It is always difficult to be the most recent immigrant arrival, and there will always be some bitterness and prejudice at the lower end of the economic ladder. But the initiative and industry of the Puerto Rican people, combined with the encouragement of the Federal, State, and local governments in urging equal employment opportunity, fair housing, and better education have provided a progressively better living situation. My own district contains an excellent example of a Spanish-speaking community making great strides toward social betterment.

The Puerto Rican people, whether in the Commonwealth or in the States, have experienced enormous progress in every area of man's quest. The economic, social, and cultural advancement on the island itself serves also to inform and correct the naive and the gullible. Certainly, Puerto Rican progress is an indispensable weapon in our fight to stem the advance of the antihumanists who seek to establish communism in this hemisphere. But it is primarily, in the last analysis, a tribute to the hard work and dedication of the Puerto Rican people.

Independence of the Ivory Coast Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 7, the Republic of the Ivory Coast will celebrate the third anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President and Prime Minister of the Ivory Coast, Felix Houphouet-Boigny, and His Excellency, the Ivory Coast Ambassador to the United States, Konan Bedie.

Unique is a word which may readily be applied to the Ivory Coast. This Republic achieved its independence quietly and without revolution. Furthermore, since independence was declared, there have been no political struggles for power, assassinations, or internal dissension. Now entering their fourth year of sovereignty, the people of the Ivory Coast owe their continued peaceful progress to their able President, Houphouet-Boigny.

Our Attorney General, Robert Kennedy, when attending the ceremonies in the Ivory Coast which commemorated the Republic's first year of independence, compared President Houphouet-Boigny to George Washington and said that he is an international statesman, respected throughout the world. Through the efforts of this astute personage, the Ivory Coast gained political freedom from France on August 7, 1960, under the best of circumstances. Close ties with its former protector have remained, especially in the economic fields. There resides in the capital city a large French community, still retaining important Government positions and guiding the economic affairs and destiny of the country.

Although France has a monopoly on trade with the Ivory Coast, recent missions have sought development capital elsewhere. M. Houphouet-Boigny came to the United States in May 1962 and received assurances from President Kennedy that the United States would be responsive to the need for development in his country. As such, aid for projects in education, agriculture, fisheries, and development of the southwest region were discussed and projected.

Much progress has been accomplished in the 3 years of its sovereignty. The capital, Abijan, once a small fishing village, has expanded rapidly since a ship canal was dredged to the sea, enabling the city to become a modern seaport. It now has the honor of being the fastest growing city in all Africa. Education, so important to the development of a new country, is taking first priority in government projects. By the end of its third educational development plan, over 45 percent of all children are now attending schools.

Agriculture remains the basic livelihood of 90 percent of the Ivory Coast population, with coffee and cocoa its two leading crops. But with development capital from abroad, industrialization is forging ahead. Manganese is now being mined and processed. There is now a plant to process instant coffee sold as a commodity mainly to the United States. And even a television network will be installed in Abidjan this year.

President Houphouet-Boigny is not only looking out for the interests of his own country in international affairs. He is also a leading figure among all African states, especially those which were former French colonies. His address at the Addis Ababa Conference brought his country to the fore as an exponent of African unity. His numerous trips to other African states have solidified and stabilized the political force of Africa. By being the first African state to ratify the Charter of the Organization of African Unity established by the Addis Ababa Conference, the Ivory Coast proclaimed its good and since intentions and permanently established its leadership in pan-African affairs.

The Ivory Coast is fortunate to have such an able and energetic leader as President. It has been successful in retaining close and friendly relations with its former colonial ruler. It is a stable country, welcoming foreign investments and guaranteeing protection for these investments. It is a leader among the French community of nations, the African states, and the world community. Thus the Ivory Coast is unique.

On this their third anniversary of independence, we in the United States extend to the people of the Ivory Coast our congratulations for their progressiveness and unifying activities in Africa.

Indians Recognize Edmondson's Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, another group of Indians in Oklahoma last week recognized the congressional service of our colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, the Honorable Ed Edmondson.

At Chewey, in the heart of Cherokee country, in Adair County, Congressman Edmondson was made an honorary member of the Seven Clans Society of the Cherokee Nation.

The ceremonies, conducted before the sacred fires of the society by Alex Smith and other organization leaders with the assistance of Cherokee General Counsel Earl Boyd Pierce, honored the nearly 11 years of Congressman Edmondson's service as representative of Oklahoma's Second District.

Other distinguished Oklahomans honored in the same ceremonies included Area Director Virgil Harrington of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, a former constituent of mine who has an outstanding record in the Department of Interior, and District Judge E. G. Carroll of Oklahoma, one of our State's most distinguished trial judges.

The recognition of Congressman Edmondson's service to the Indians is a logical result of his able service on the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

As ranking Democratic member of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee, Ed Edmondson has won the commendation of many tribes and leaders of the National Congress of American Indians for his consistent support of measures to improve Indian health, educational and employment opportunities.

In 1956, the Otoe-Missouria Tribe conferred honorary membership upon our colleague and named him Chief Cha-Doe-Ye-Na, or Little Buffalo.

In 1960, the Quapaws made him honorary chief with the name of Gah-Ne-Tunga, or Big Thunder.

Outside Oklahoma, as well as at home, Indian leaders have acknowledged the role of ED EDMONDSON as an able champion of Indian progress.

The tribal chairman of the Menominees expressed that tribe's appreciation in 1960 and wrote, "We know now why the Indians of Oklahoma evaluate your service so highly."

A top executive of the National Congress of American Indians appropriately referred to Congressman EDMONDSON as "one of the best friends the Indians have in Congress."

In this body, where almost every week produces some new legislation or matter where Indian rights are involved, it is good to have in our midst an able and conscientious student of Indian history and problems, with the ability and dedication of ED EDMONDSON.

It is also good to note that the Indian people are aware of his service and appreciate it, and we congratulate our colleague upon the honor just conferred upon him.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include my newsletter of July 20, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, 5TH DISTRICT, TEXAS, JULY 20, 1963

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

The Presidential message on balance, that is, imbalance, of payments once again shows the President's misunderstanding of problem and solution to the problem. Because of Government programs and controls our Nation yearly must pay others more than they pay us. Further, others can collect by demanding our gold for their dollars while we hold foreign I O U's. While our foreign assets (according to the President) exceed our debts by $27 billion we are, because of our Government's policies, in danger of losing all our gold and devaluing the dollar. So the stage is set for our economic collapse. Because of our Government's fiscal policies, the world can demand $24 billion in gold and we have less than $4 billion with which to pay off, before dipping into the approximately $12 billion of gold which backs up and gives our dollar its value. All our gold now equals only $15.6 billion. So what does the President do? He imposes more financial straitjacketing. He seeks to cure the results of Federal controls and dictates by more Federal regulation and control, a 15-percent tax called interest equalization tax on the purchase by Americans of new or outstanding foreign securities—a tax on the free flow of money, a wall to prevent the financial activities we have always encouraged in the past.

The President, despite the lengthy analysis, skirted the basic problems at the heart of the situation. Capitalism, the private enterprise system, thrives on freedom, not Federal intervention. The tax he proposes on the flow of money is no solution. Why doesn't the President and his advisers turn instead to fiscal responsibility? The President and his deficit financing advisers have forgotten the reasons for and the need for a federally balanced budget, reduction of debt, and straightforward reduction of taxes including tax rate reduction, instead of the fuzzy tortuous Presidential tax reform recommendations. If the President really wants to reduce the imbalance of payments why does he not stop giving our money away. While we have the greatest debt in the world we continue to continue to give foreign aid all over the world. Even our increased exports are recognized to be the result largely of our own subsidy. We give foreign nations money and they buy from us. This is artificial growth. Further, that money remaining in foreign hands can be converted into our gold at their discretion. Is it any wonder that foreign nations have built up such dollar reserves, callable in gold? Indeed, in many instances foreign nations have refused to lower their tariffs after agreeing to do so to match our reduction because they have pleaded dollar shortage. Our foreign giveaway and disproportionate support of the U.N. are instances of our inability to live within our means and exercise financial self-discipline. It is high time the New Frontiersmen and other new Socialists including our President, Schlesinger, Heller, Galbraith, and others realize the imbalance of payments result from the big spending policies, deficit financing, Government in business and the increasing regulation and control of our society by Federal Government, under the liberal-radical Democrats.

Besides foreign aid gifts of our money, as an example of the liberal Democrats failing to see the answer, look at their political charges in the past of the need for low interest rates and criticism of increasing interest rates. Democrats demand low interest rates; as a result U.S. capital flows abroad to get higher rates. If the interest rates were higher at home the money would stay here. So instead of recognizing the need for raising the interest rates, the President seeks to prevent the outflow by taxing the money sent overseas.

DANGER IN TEST BAN NEGOTIATIONS

Most important development this week was the beginning of talks on a nuclear test ban agreement with the Soviet Union. The danger is that the people of the United States could lose World War III without ever knowing that it had begun. Besides the cruel facts of history showing that the Soviet Union never honors its agreements, and that they ruthlessly broke the last test ban moratorium when it suited their purpose, my concern over the present negotiations is even greater because of a talk by Dr. Edward Teller. Recognized as one of the world's greatest scientists, Dr. Teller's warnings should make us consider the implications of entering into agreements with the Russians on test bans. Here are some thoughts he gives us to ponder. "It is my conviction that today the Russians are ahead of us in nuclear weapons. I cannot prove this statement, but I will say to you categorically that no one can prove its opposite." With even the slightest indication that Russia is leading the United States in the development of nuclear explosives, how can anyone in this country be optimistic about a test ban agreement which will bind us because we honor our agreements, but will have no effect upon the activities of the Soviet Union because history proves they do not.

Dr. Teller also points out that he believes the Russians may be close to developing an antimissile missile. If they succeed, or if they can make us believe they are about to succeed and we have not developed such a weapon, then we have no defenses. Dr. Teller says: "In order to develop missile defenses one needs to test in the atmosphere, but one does not need big tests. No one, in or out of the Disarmament Agency has claimed that nuclear explosives under 1 kiloton, in the atmosphere can be detected. With experiments using small explosives, missile advances can be conducted. These small explosions made by the Russians, may seal our doom."

There are two conclusions here that should be apparent to even the most naive and certainly should be clear to the President, (1) We cannot detect their testing and, (2) We must continue our testing.

IN THE HOUSE THIS WEEK

Comic relief came in the guise of "boiled peanuts" and any laughter relieves tension on the floor. Yet if laughter seemed hollow it was because of the realization that this plea to remove boiled peanut acreage from Government control leaves other peanut and additional crop growers still under Federal Government dictation.

Grief came in the sudden death of Hjalmar Nygaard (a relative newcomer and younger Member in his second term) of a heart attack during debate on the ADP bill, and reminds us of our tensions. I was privileged to visit Hjalmar in his district and to know him. Once again the flags at half mast were an unwelcome sight at morning going to work.

Automatic data processing equipment (ADP) comprises the electronic brain computing machines now widely used by many agencies of the Government. In an effort to streamline Government, increase efficiency, and eliminate cost at an estimated savings of $100 million yearly, a bill (H.R. 5171) was presented to place the coordination of their joint use under the GSA (General Services Administration). Eight Government agencies disapproved, yet the Comptroller General recommended this program. Even though generally not well understood, the bill passed (ALGER for). Charges embodying economy and false economy were exchanged. I believe this effort to be sound and can succeed without transgression on each agency's jurisdiction and peculiar needs.

Swiss National Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Swiss people are known throughout the world for their individualistic love of freedom and their readiness to defend their nation; for their careful attention to the obligations of citizenship, and for their success in maintaining a harmonious and stable country. We all know neutral Switzerland as a country where Latin and Teuton, Catholic and Protestant, worker and banker can live together in peace and harmony. Not so many of us realize that this remarkable combination of diversity and harmony has a history which dates back almost seven centuries. Today we have an opportunity to salute the gallant people of Switzerland, because August 1, 1963, is the 672d anniversary of the Swiss Confederation.

On August 1, 1291, the citizens of three cantons within what is now Switzerland—Uri, Schwyz, and Lower Unterwalden—banded together into a defensive league. During the next several centuries more cantons were added to this league, and in 1798, after considerably more territory had been acquired, a unified Helvetic Republic was formed. In 1803 Napoleon Boneparte gave the Swiss a new constitution and the number of cantons—the confederate parts of Switzerland—increased to 19. Switzerland acquired two further constitutions during the 19th century, of which the second survives to the present day. Despite domestic crises and foreign interventions, the Swiss Confederation has remained intact through almost seven centuries. Today, as we note the anniversary of the founding of the Swiss Confederation, we greet all friends of Switzerland everywhere.

Americans have long enjoyed a special bond of friendship with the Swiss people. One reason may be that our countries respect many of the same principles of government. The Swiss people, who have been called the most democratic in the world, exercise a direct voice in their Government, and have been able to reconcile the interests and ideas of diverse groups.

Some have suggested that the remarkable success with which the Swiss have preserved their national independence through the centuries is a reflection of the physical characteristics of the country. Formerly the traditional isolation of the Swiss mountain folk was only partly tempered by the mountains and rivers that link Switzerland with the outside world. But in the 20th century, when rapid means of transportation and communication have reduced the importance of natural barriers between peoples, the Swiss continue to defend their national independence and neutrality, despite the cataclysms of war that have taken place around them. One suspects that mountains have been less important in preserving Swiss independence than the steadfast determination of the Swiss people. I am happy to salute Switzerland and her friends around the world on the anniversary of the founding of the Swiss Confederation.

Independence of Niger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 3, the Republic of Niger will celebrate the third anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President and Prime Minister of Niger, Hamani Diori; and His Excellency, the Niger Ambassador to the United States.

In 1960 Niger, the largest of the eight territories that formerly comprised French West Africa and a country about the size of our States of Texas, Oklahoma, and New Mexico combined, became an independent nation. In his message to President Diori on the occasion of Niger's independence President Eisenhower observed that the United States had followed Niger's progress toward independence with great interest and welcomed with deep satisfaction the event, which was achieved in friendly cooperation with France.

On August 3, 1963, the third anniversary of Niger's independence, we once again salute Niger's independence. We assure the people of Niger that our interest in their country has not waned and that Niger's cooperative spirit has remained a deep source of satisfaction to us and to the rest of the community of nations. Niger has continued to maintain close financial, trade, and commercial ties with France in the 3 years since independence, to the advantage of both countries. In addition, Niger has enjoyed friendly relations with all the neighboring African countries and has cooperated with them in common enterprises. As a member of the Conseil de l'Entente, together with Dahomey, Ivory Coast, and Upper Volta, Niger has worked closely with three of its neighbor states in a customs union and political pact of mutual benefit.

Furthermore, Niger's constitution establishes it as a democratic republic. The preamble to the constitution reaffirms Niger's adherence to the principles of democracy, human rights, and civil liberties. The constitution itself states Niger's determination to establish relations of cooperation and solidarity with all the states in the French Community. In practice, Niger's relations with the whole world community have been cooperative and friendly.

Economically Niger is chiefly an agricultural country whose main cash crops are peanuts, cotton, livestock, and livestock products. Approximately 97 percent of the population is engaged in farming and stockraising, and industry is limited essentially to companies processing agricultural products. We commend the Niger Government for recognizing that the economic development which is one of the primary goals of every new independent nation must be achieved within this framework.

The 1961–63 development plan was one of modest and realistic goals, not of pipe dreams which were impossible of realization. Recognizing the necessity of establishing the essential preconditions of a long range development plan before launching into such a program, the Niger Government has concenterated on four basic objectives: First, increasing school attendance; second, improving the rate of national income growth to 4 percent annually, with chief emphasis on agricultural development and land reclamation, the development of the livestock industry, and the more rapid flow of rural products into the money economy; third, to develop internal and external trade in order to convert Niger from a subsistence to a money economy; and fourth, to increase and diversify exports, while gradually replacing imports with local manufactures in order to increase the supply of foreign exchange available for needed equipment.

In summary, we congratulate President Diori and the people of Niger for their accomplishments in the first 3 years of independence. Niger has shown itself a responsible member of the world community and a country of admirable and realistic domestic policies.

Senator Keating Honored by Assembly of Captive European Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week was observed the week of July 14-20 to focus worldwide attention upon the imperialistic policies of the Soviet Union in subjugating and oppressing the peoples of more than two dozen nations throughout the world. During this observance we gave reassurance to these captive peoples that the free world has not forgotten them and pledges its efforts to restore liberty and justice to their nations.

One of the highlights of the week was the program conducted by the Assembly of Captive European Nations at the National Press Club on July 17. On that occasion the assembly honored U.S. Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, and other outstanding leaders for their stanch support of the cause of the captive nations.

Senator KEATING delivered an incisive address concerning our policy toward the captive nations and their Communist oppressors, and I request unanimous consent to have Senator KEATING's remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues and the Nation.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KEATING AT CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK DINNER, JULY 17, 1963

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a privilege for me to be here to join with you in commemorating the fifth annual observance of Captive Nations Week.

I am especially pleased to see my good friend, Senator DODD, here today. Some of you may have heard that TOM and I recently received a very high honor from Moscow. When the Kremlin issued a directive a few weeks ago ordering a worldwide purge of outspoken anti-Communists, the two of us were singled out for special attention. One might say that we made the top of the Communist hate parade.

Fortunately, this is one of those occasions when it's nice to be unpopular. It's quite heartening, as a matter of fact, for a Senator to know that his words and actions are not to the liking of the Soviet hierarchy.

This unexpected testimonial from Moscow was prompted in no small measure, I am sure, by our strong support of, and participation in, the annual observance of Captive Nations Week. Mr. Khrushchev and his chief lieutenants are terribly touchy about this subject—and I don't blame them.

It's understandable that they would prefer to have the world forget their suppression of national independence throughout the Red empire in defiance of solemn treaties and agreements.

I am sure they want the world to forget the anguished cries for freedom that were heard in East Germany in 1952 and again in Poland in 1956. I am certain they don't want the world to remember the roar of Russians tanks patrolling the blood-drenched streets of Budapest.

These cold, hard facts, brought to the surface during Captive Nations Week, give lie to the twisted distortions of the Red propaganda machine. And so, as we recommit ourselves today to supporting the just aspirations of the people of the captive nations, let us hope that our message travels far and wide alerting the whole world that we are here giving national recognition to Communist perfidy, duplicity, and tyranny.

Unfortunately, as we commemorate this fifth anniversary of Captive Nations Week, there is a disquieting note in the air—one which has me greatly disturbed.

It occurs to me that this year's observance has been greeted with something less than enthusiasm by our national policymakers. The weak wording of the proclamation, and the lack of attendant publicity and promotion in connection with the observance leaves me both puzzled and dismayed.

To my mind, a token observance of Captive Nations Week—one lacking enthusiasm and inspiration—would be worse than having no official observance at all.

Downgrading of the event, year after year, by this country's leading spokesmen will doubtless force a diminution of its importance to Americans. For the observance to be truly meaningful and truly national in scope, our Government must be more purposeful in its display of enthusiasm in the future.

I am disturbed also by some of the new language that is cropping up in our foreign policy statements. In recent weeks, the word "accommodation" has been given a new measure of respectability—and I don't mean the reference to public accommodations in the civil rights bill.

We have heard reference to our helping to make the world "safe for diversity." We have heard the contention advanced that the Soviet Union has a "deep interest in a just and genuine peace."

I shudder to think of how such policy statements are received by the victims of Communist oppression behind the Iron Curtain. Do these prisoners think their jailers have a deep interest in a just and genuine peace? Do they want the world safe for the kind of diversity that has them in bondage? Do they appreciate the newfound fashionableness of the word "accommodation"? I hardly think so.

And what about the response of the oppressors themselves? Are they moved by this new language into mending their ways? On the contrary, they are encouraged at least to continue—and perhaps intensify—their old ways of conquest.

Khruschchev's reaction was typical. He viewed the new approach as an indication that we are losing confidence in our own strength.

It is significant that he made an immediate reference to Western strength because this is one commodity he understands and respects.

Whether translated in terms of military might or national determination, our strength has always been the roadblock barring his path to world domination. For this reason, perhaps his comment was more of a wish than a thought.

However, regardless of his motivation, we must never allow the notion that we are losing confidence in our own strength. We need not constantly flex our military muscle to convince the world of our power. We need only to conduct ourselves in a manner befitting the strongest nation on the face of the earth.

In our zeal for constructive negotiation, we must never allow ourselves to be bullied into a posture of accommodation.

And in our desire to protect those who enjoy freedom in the world, we must never turn our backs on those from whom freedom has been wrenched by the forces of communism.

While capitalizing on our own strength, we should be mindful of the Red empire's growing weaknesses.

We have already seen the signs of discontent in the Sino-Soviet world. An ideological split is threatening to turn warlord against warlord. Russia's technological advances have extracted a high price from the Russian people in terms of material necessities. Collectivized agriculture has failed, resulting in widespread hunger throughout the Red domain.

Finally, the innate desire of God's creatures to forge their own futures and control their own destinies must be reckoned with. Surely a paramount weakness is the still-burning desire of the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain to throw off the yoke of tyranny they now bear. In any crisis, these suppressed peoples will not be loyal supporters of Communist aggression. Instead they will seize upon the opportunity of international turmoil to rebel against their captors and aline themselves with the forces of freedom.

In light of these festering weaknesses, I view this year's observance of Captive Nations Week as a golden opportunity for this country's leaders to strengthen the spirit of our enslaved brethren behind the Iron Curtain and to bolster their faith in our resoluteness.

We must demonstrate this week—and throughout the ensuing weeks—that we are not only strong and determined but that we recognize our unqualified commitment to work for their eventual liberation.

This week, representatives of the United States, Britain, and Soviet Russia are meeting to discuss the possibility of a nuclear test-ban treaty.

This is a thoroughly worthwhile effort, which I believe has the support of the great majority of the American people. A ban on atmospheric nuclear testing is important to the whole world.

At the same time, there is reason to believe that Russia may seek a package agreement, couping a valuable test-ban treaty with a nonaggression pledge between the NATO countries and the Warsaw Pact nations.

This would be an obvious attempt by Khrushchev to force the West into a disastrous acceptance of the status quo in Central and Eastern Europe.

Whether or not any formal agreement is entered into, the mere participation by the West in serious discussions of such a pledge would be inexcusable.

Anything short of an outright refusal to discuss the proposal might well be considered by the captive peoples as a sellout.

We have absolutely nothing to gain by consideration of such a nonaggression pledge. We know from the lessons of history that agreements in the hands of Communists are valueless. And if the mere signing of a document constitutes a guarantee, then the Charter of the United Nations should be guarantee enough.

On the other hand, we have much to lose in this connection. Such discussions would build a wave of disrespect in the free world and discouragement in the slave world.

The only answer to a NATO-Warsaw nonaggression proposal is to stand firmly on the historic position that any and all pledges of this nature must come after, and not before, the granting of the right of self-determination to the peoples of the captive nations. Until this happens, we shall not dignify these totalitarian satellite regimes by the slightest hint that we might enter into a deal with them.

Standing fast on these principles, we must continue to identify ourselves not with the torturers but with the tortured; not with the ruthless, self-imposed rulers but with the unwilling subjects and their desire to recover the right of free choice in their own internal affairs.

I stand before you as one who staunchly believes this right of free choice will be recovered. It will not happen overnight, but it will happen.

And while the people of the United States continue to pray for—and work toward—this goal, let us not lower our standards, let us not settle for a world free for diversity, but rather for a world free for all men.

Israel and Our Policy in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, this past week President Nasser celebrated the 11th anniversary of his rise to power in Egypt by an impressive display of military might, including rockets, Mig–19 and 21 fighter planes, Ilyushan bombers, and a new "Arab" submarine.

A military display of this kind by the Egyptian dictator underscores the seriousness of the threat to the small State of Israel. In his anniversary speech, President Nasser once again made his intention clear when said:

> The liberation of Palestine does not depend on words for local consumption but on one plan with armies, with missiles, and everything.

Since Israel was established, with the approval of the United Nations and through the assistance of our own Nation, the surrounding Arab States have attempted to destroy her, either by outright military power or by economic boycott and blockade.

In 1948 and in 1956, Israel relied on the superior quality and morale of its fightingmen to overcome the numerical superiority of her hostile neighbors. But the rapid advance of modern military technology has offset this advantage. It does not require a great deal of skill to push the buttons which shoot missiles capable of destroying cities. And with the aid of German scientists and the Soviet Union, Nasser now has rockets of such capability.

The time when the Arab States feel confident that they can destroy Israel is rapidly approaching. And they have made it clear that when that time comes they will attack.

We cannot allow that moment to arrive. As Myer Feldman, deputy special counsel to President Kennedy, said in a recent speech:

> The peace of Israel is a test of man's conscience. A world which allows Israel to falter or fail could not itself survive anarchy.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution for a collective defense agreement with Israel, joining some of my colleagues in the House and in the Senate, who have proposed such a resolution in order to protect the territorial integrity and political independence of Middle East States which wish to join in a collective agreement.

The resolution reads:

> Whereas on May 25, 1950, the United States, the United Kingdom, and France issued a three-party declaration pledging themselves to hold inviolate the borders between Israel and the Arab States and to assure and guarantee those borders; and
>
> Whereas the Congress, on March 9, 1957, adopted a joint resolution authorizing the President to "cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East desiring such assistance in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence," and to undertake in such area military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations desiring such assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism; and
>
> Whereas the outbreak of armed conflict in the Middle East would be likely to spread to other areas; and
>
> Whereas recent events in the Middle East, including an arms buildup by the Arab States with the encouragement and support of the Soviet Union, constitute a serious threat to international peace: Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved,* That the President is urged to invite the United Kingdom, France, and any other interested nations to join with the United States in a collective defense agreement with Israel, and any other Middle East state which is willing to join and carry out its obligations under such an agreement, and to provide such military and other assistance and cooperation as may be necessary to protect the territorial integrity and political independence of any nation in the Middle East which is a party to the agreement against armed attack by any other nation.

In Europe and in Asia we have joined with other free nations to mutually guarantee the defense of our common interests. These agreements have served to prevent aggression. And when aggression did occur in one or two instances, the United States has immediately come to the aid of her ally. Such an agreement with Israel would serve notice that we will not countenance any attack upon her and that, in addition, we are mindful of our responsibilities for the maintenance of world peace.

But Nasser's ambition does not end with the liquidation of Israel. He has ambitions which encompass all the Middle East. At the moment, Syria, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia, are being subjected to subversion, threats, and invective. In Yemen, Egyptian troops are engaged in wholesale massacre. Eyewitness reports charge that Egyptian bombers have been using poison gas against helpless villagers. Despite the fact that Nasser agreed some months ago to withdraw all his troops from Yemen, Egyptians are still actively engaged there.

Nasser obtains the armaments for his campaign in Yemen and for his buildup against Israel from the Soviet Union. But it is our foreign aid which allows him to purchase quantities of sophisticated Soviet weapons. Our aid may be for economic development—it may consist in great part of surplus foods—but the fact is that our aid does ease the economic burden at home so that Egypt can afford to buy the armaments for aggressive adventure abroad.

The immediate need in the Near East is stability and an agreement which will guarantee the peace.

But the real key to peace in the Near East does not lie with security agreements or with limiting the acquisition of arms. To achieve a lasting peace and to spread development and a higher standard of living throughout the whole region, Israel, and Arab leaders must sit down and negotiate their differences.

I have introduced a resolution calling upon our delegation to the United Nations to introduce and support a resolution favoring direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab States "as an indispensable condition toward the attainment of peace and cooperation." The text of the resolution is as follows:

> Whereas warlike threats in the Middle East, accompanied by increased arms shipments to the area from the Soviet Union are taking place; and
>
> Whereas continuing Arab-Israel conflict is a threat to the peace, menacing the security of all the peoples of the Middle East and disrupting their progress and development because of the wasteful diversion of their resources for armaments; and
>
> Whereas article II, section 3 of the United Nations Charter provides that "all members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means"; and
>
> Whereas the United Nations should be strengthened in its efforts to uphold that provision of the United Nations Charter: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved,* That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States delegation to the United Nations introduce and support a resolution favoring direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab States as an indispensable condition toward the attainment of peace and cooperation and the settlement of all outstanding disputes between them.

Two weeks ago, at his first press conference, the new Prime Minister of Israel, Levi Eshkol, reiterated Israel's willingness to meet with President Nasser "or any other Arab leader at any time, anywhere * * * without making any prior conditions." It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that our Government should do everything in its power to bring about such a meeting. I urge that in the next session of the U.N. General Assembly our delegation call for efforts to lead the Arab leaders to the peace table.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I wish to insert some pertinent excerpts from recent statements of the American Jewish Committee:

> The United States, as leader of the free world, must assume a primary and continuing responsibility, both directly and through the United Nations, for the maintenance of peace and security in this turbulent region. * * * The United States should vigorously pursue all avenues of negotiation, particularly with the Soviet Union, to remove the Middle East from the cold war arena. * * * A peace settlement between Israel and the Arab States is essential to the creation of a stable and secure Middle East. We urge our Government steadfastly to continue its efforts toward this prime objective.
>
> The American Jewish Committee believes that implementation of U.S. policy requires our Government to (1) clearly define what it would consider aggression; (2) intensify efforts to end the arms race in the area, meanwhile assuring that the balance of arms is not upset; (3) provide a formal guarantee, upon request, of the independence and integrity of any state in the region; (4) vigorously discourage the violent hate campaign against Israel conducted by the Arab States; and (5) reevaluate the present U.S. policy of impartiality toward peaceful nations and those nations pursuing belligerent policies inimical to the peace and stability of the Middle East.

Independence of Dahomey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, the Republic of Dahomey will celebrate the third anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of Dahomey, Hubert Maga; and His Excellency, the Dahomey Ambassador to the United States, Louis Ignacio Pinto.

Dahomey is one of the smallest and most densely populated countries in West Africa. Its area covers no more than 44,290 square miles, but it has an estimated population of over 1.7 million. Nonetheless, although small and overpopulated, it has achieved considerable advancement toward the goals of a modern democratic state. Even prior to independence Dahomey had the highest per capita school attendance of all the countries in French West Africa, and because of the continuing emphasis on education Dahomey today has one of the most advanced and best educated populations in Africa. Approximately 25 percent of the country's entire budget is being devoted to education.

Dahomey is also coping realistically and successfully with its other development problems. The most crucial immediate problem is to expand the agricultural economy sufficiently to meet the needs of the rapidly growing population; to this end Dahomey has instituted and is extending crop yield and quality improvement projects. Efforts are also underway to expand trade, in particular to increase exports in order that Dahomey's longstanding unfavorable trade balance might be redressed. Dahomey has a relatively good transportation system, and its port facilities have been improved since independence. A modern deepwater port at Cotonou, the capital, costing more than $21 million, is scheduled to open sometime this year. It will hold four times the amount of traffic of the previously inadequate facilities.

In the political sphere Dahomey has a responsible government willing to cooperate with other countries on the African continent and in the world community. Executive power is held by a president elected for a 5-year term by universal suffrage. Legislative power belongs to a

National Assembly, also elected by universal suffrage every 5 years. Dahomey is one of the four countries which make up the Conseil de l'Entente, a West African cooperative association comprising a customs union and financial assistance fund; the four Entente countries also coordinate development plans and attempt to work out common policies in the fields of taxation, public administration, labor legislation, public works, and transportation and communication.

On the inter-African scene Dahomey has been a steadfast supporter of efforts toward inter-African unity. First it joined the other French-speaking African States in adopting the charter of African and Malagasy Union which provided for the coordination of members' foreign policy and the harmonization of economic and defense policy. Recently, at the Addis Ababa conference of independent African States it was one of the signers of a charter which for the first time provides for cooperation among all the African States, those in North Africa as well as those south of the Sahara. On a global scale, Dahomey became a member of the United Nations shortly after its accession to independence. Its votes in the United Nations have borne out its dedication to the goals of maintaining the peace and furthering economic and social development throughout the world.

Thus, we salute you, President Maga, and your people for 3 years of praiseworthy accomplishments as an independent nation, both on the domestic scene and in the world community.

Address by Senator Kefauver on Resolution of Rail Merger Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] delivered a thoughtful and incisive address, "A Positive Resolution of the Rail Merger Problem," before the Great Lakes Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners.

In this speech Senator KEFAUVER, chairman of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, pointed out that the magnitude and extent of proposed railroad mergers before the ICC indicates the wisdom of declaring a suspension of final decision on every pending application until clearly defined regional and national merger policies have been established by the Commission.

The proposed mergers of many of our great railroad systems would have the profoundest impact on the economy of this Nation. I urge my colleagues to read this address by Senator KEFAUVER which deals directly and frankly with this vital problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of "A Positive Resolution of the Rail Merger Problem" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A POSITIVE RESOLUTION OF THE RAIL MERGER PROBLEM

(By Senator ESTES KEFAUVER)

We have now come far enough along with these rail merger proposals to know that most of the railroad industry is involved in a massive movement toward consolidation and concentration of economic power in transportation. With the Interstate Commerce Commission openly encouraging rail mergers (but without real guidelines), and with the administration not aggressively opposed to a merger movement, we know we are on the threshold of a restructuring of our railroad network. The key question is: Are we as a Government strong enough, and knowledgeable enough today, to effectuate the best rail alinements and discourage, and if need be reject, those merger proposals which will do violence to a healthy, competitive private transportation system. This question has given me great concern.

The cards are now on the table, for the Congress, for the Commission, and for the administration. There will be no turning back after this game is played. The decisions made during the next few years by those responsible for our transportation policy will be irrevocable, and more, they will be cruicial to the growth of our country, the preservation of our security, and the perpetuation of our concept of private enterprise under regulation. These are indeed high stakes, demanding the highest ability of the players, and the keenest interpretation and enforcement of the rules. There is no room for cowardice or mistake in meeting this rail merger problem and in solving it in the public interest—and by the public interest I mean the direct interest of the consumer and the shipper, as well as the carrier. Railroad consolidation and reorganization is everybody's problem, and the Federal Government, not the industry, has the final responsibility as to how that problem is solved.

Recognizing the importance of rail mergers as a part of its general concern over the concentration of economic power throughout American industry, the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, conducted an investigation and held extensive hearings. What we found was enough to sicken the heart of anyone holding faith in the concept of economic regulations in transportation. The plain fact of the matter is that the Commission was not prepared for the size and extent of the merger proposals which descended upon it, and it is still in search of a merger policy when most of the industry is before it demanding approval of its plans.

In the first place, we found that the Interstate Commerce Commission, although entrusted with plenary authority to approve rail mergers, is unequipped to make these vital social and economic decisions. The law under which it operates is so vague as to provide no definitive criteria which could have been followed by the railroads in choosing their merger courses. Instead of making any general investigation of the mass merger movement, and coming out with policy directives designed to establish definable public interest standards and safeguards, and thereby discourage bad mergers, the Commission did nothing. Now, today, its own staff has told the Commission that further economic research is necessary to develop patterns and methods of testing applicants' cases, and that the Commission is in no present position to appraise fully the effect of mergers on competition between railroads and between railroads and other modes of transport. It stated that the local and regional impact of mergers is not now adequately assessed. This should be of particular interest to State commissioners and other State representatives concerned with local and regional growth.

I directed a letter to the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission and to the Secretary of Commerce asking these agencies concerned with transportation whether they had made any investigations, studies, or reports with respect to some 16 factors highly relevant to the testing of rail mergers. The general answer was that they had done nothing.

The point was made that the Commission relies on the participants in merger cases to develop the facts, that the Commission makes its determination solely on the record made, and does not engage an independent analysis. When we looked into this, we found many one-sided cases, with those best able to challenge applicant cases and provide crucial testimony withdrawing from the litigation or not appearing at all. In many instances those carriers and shippers remaining in the cases gave only token participation. Recognizing this danger of collapsing records and the need for an independent testing of mergers, the Commission called in its staff members to "bolster the record" in only two cases. Careful perusal of the records in these cases has left me with the impression that Commission experts, as well as other public interest participants, have not presented a sufficient independent testing of applicants cases. I must say that the recent testimony of Commission experts in the Pennsylvania-Central case gives promise of improvement in this area. The Department of Justice has been attempting to put into perspective many issues on brief, but it has not had the manpower or the expertise to develop the record sufficiently. These cases are indeed too vital for us to rely solely on the challenge of other carriers and shippers whose interests may not be sufficiently hostile to provide adequate examination of public interest criteria.

I am reminded of the testimony of Commissioner Paul A. Rasmussen of the Minnesota Railway & Warehouse Commission, a friend to many of you, and I should like to quote from his testimony with respect to the Northern Lines proceeding:

"When the railroads find it necessary to take 6 years in preparing a merger application, it is both unrealistic and unfair to even anticipate that the U.S. Department of Justice, the State governments, industries, and labor organizations that are opposed to the merger should be allowed only a few months to react to a petition that has been compiled by the best legal minds in the United States, outstanding statisticians, accountants, and research experts. Many State utility commissions found themselves abruptly confronted with the responsibility of protesting railroad mergers in the interest of the economy of their respective State and yet in a position where not $1 had been appropriated for this type of an expense.

* * * * *

"The point, gentlemen, I am trying to make is that the protestants should have an opportunity to be as thoroughly and well prepared as the petitioning railroads. In a matter of such importance, something more than token opposition should be expected of States and the parties of record who protest a merger proceeding."

What else did we find in our investigation into this rail merger problem? The railroad industry, taking advantage of the Commission's mergers, the broad merger criteria, and the adversary case-by-case approach without objective challenge, proceeded to submit some of the most extraordinary combinations of railroad power ever proposed. These mergers are based upon the concept of creating regional monopolies, shrinking rail capacity and eliminating service. I don't have to go into the details of these applications, except to point out a few examples. One proposal would combine the first and second largest railroads in the United States with over 50 percent of the traffic within the regions in which they now compete, and with even greater combined power at the crucial gateways and interchange points.

Another proposal involves the creation of three strong and wealthy competitive trunkline systems with some 26,000 miles of trackage extending over 17 States and some four times larger than its nearest competitor. Still another would give these large systems a near monopoly of rail transport in Southeastern United States. All proposals seem to be posited on the philosophy of eliminating as much rail competition as possible and ripping up as much trackage and facilities as possible, not to mention the possible job losses of over 200,000 men in the process. It is on these two crucial points—competition and rail plant contraction—that the Commission has yet to firm up a definitive policy, and as its staff are still researching these issues, it may be some time before the Commission will have the information and data upon which it can make an adequate determination.

It is not surprising that receiving no general instructions from the Commission with respect to the maintenance of competition, economic balance, the preservation of service and the protection of community growth, that the big financial interests would seek to merge the strong with the strong, ignore the weaker roads, scrap service and capacity and eliminate competition, thereby creating giants of monopoly rail power as a spearhead to acquiring monopoly control over all transportation.

The sad fact is that the Commission by sitting on its hands and taking no positive policy action, has encouraged these giant mergers to be presented at great expense to all parties, and because they are the only combinations attainable at the moment, the Commission may be pressured into approving them even though they are not really in the public interest. Certainly, gentlemen, this is one time when the interests of good government should rise above the demands of financial expediency, and the fact that other types of mergers have not been proposed should by no means deter the Commission from making its objective decisions and flatly rejecting those alliances that are bad, regardless of the time and money put in by the applicants.

I was particularly shocked to find from the subcommittee inquiry that while all these merger cases are going forward and no policy seems to have been developed, neither the Department of Commerce nor the Commission has made any investigation or studies into what interest groups own, control, or influence these carriers. Again reliance is only on the record if opponents wish to place the facts before the Commission, but I must emphasize that our Government does not know today where the real lines of financial power are extended. At a time, gentlemen, when we are talking about putting giants together, we have no satisfactory information as to what supergiants we may well be creating. What is the role of the insurance companies, of the banks, of the brokerage houses, of other financial institutions in these mergers. I'd like to know, and I feel that the Commission should obtain this information for Congress and for the people. Are these new combinations of railroad power to be completely independent and separate in their politics? What control do these giant railroads have over other modes of transport? Are certain of the larger shippers interlocked with railroads such that they can obtain preferences to the detriment of their competitors? How does the development of such financial power such as a combined Pennsy-Central or a Great Northern-Northern Pacific affect business activity in the area served? We found no answers to these questions from those responsible for restructuring our transportation network.

But enough of this criticism and the hashing over of past mistakes. It is not too late for the Commission to extricate itself from the mess it is in, and take the initiative in the public interest to preserve a healthy competitive national rail network. The Commission has before it in one way or another most of the major carriers servicing the lion's share of the country. Indeed with its special powers it should be able to obtain what additional information and policy it needs for an overall view of these proposed mergers on a national level. What I am now suggesting is that the Commission not rubberstamp these mergers because they are the only ones approved by the financial interests, but rather consolidate cases for decision on a regional basis, determine the most appropriate lineups, rejecting those applications which do not conform to what is best for the public. At the same time it should indicate to the railroad community what types of alinements will be acceptable to the Commission, and work with the railroads to bring such alinements into effect. What I am saying, and I want to be clear here, is that the Commission should forthwith suspend final decision on every pending merger application. It should then assess each application to determine whether sufficient facts have been, or are being, adduced upon which it can make a determination as to the best competitive lineup of carriers within each region. Where such decision needs the consolidation of two or more cases, such consolidation should be ordered. If the merger proposals fit in reasonably with the overall policy for the region, the Commission should approve; if they don't, the Commission should reject the application, subject to being reopened if the parties rearrange their combinations to meet the appropriate regional policy.

The power of the Commission to consolidate cases for overall decisional purposes, to approve or reject cases according to an established policy of definitive criteria, and to render advisory opinions is manifest in the Interstate Commerce Act. The magnitude and extent of the mergers now being proposed, which combinations cut across broad areas of the country demand this overview approach, demand the establishment of regional and national merger policy by the Commission before it renders any further merger decisions. And the railroad industry is entitled to know how best it can cooperate with the Commission to create the best merged network. In the East, such policy initiative on the part of the Commission is not only crucial, it is mandatory. There, the three party package plan submitted by the industry on a take it or leave it basis is most unfortunate. The plan provides no substantial protection for many smaller railroads, it seeks the elimination of vast amount of rail competition. It creates a dangerous economic imbalance between proposed systems, it will result in unreasonable contraction of the rail plant in the Northeast, and will place a monopolistic ring around New England. Because of this the Commission could well flatly reject the Pennsy-Central merger, but in doing this by combining eastern cases for final decision, it might further find that a different network of competitive systems spearheaded by an independent New York Central system and by an independent Pennsylvania system would be practical and acceptable, providing that the smaller roads are absolutely protected. Although I would prefer to see the smaller roads merged into existing trunkline systems, and the Pennsylvania whittled down in size in the interest of greater efficiency and competition, such restructuring may not now be feasible. Thus, as an alternative to the monopolistic Pennsy-Central merger plan, I would reluctantly accept a network built around these two carriers operating separately and competitively as the best of an otherwise complicated solution to the eastern rail merger problem.

It is the responsibility of the Commission to bring these better systems into being and encourage the cooperation of all financial interests for the good of this country. Similar initiative on the part of the Commission to prohibit the development of the vast Great Northern-Northern Pacific-Burlington monopoly, and suggest competitive rearrangement of lines is also mandatory. The Milwaukee, a good progressive road, must not be allowed to die at the hands of a carrier over four times its size. A stronger, augmented Milwaukee, tied to one or more of the Western carriers, is absolutely essential to the growth of this Northwest region.

I could go on around the circuit with these examples. In the Southwest, recent developments involving the Union Pacific, the Rock Island and the Southern Pacific, and the Santa Fe's negotiation with the MoPac certainly call for an overall view by the Commission as to our future southwestern network, and indeed a stay of pending cases in that area, and an ultimate consolidation af cases when the negotiations are completed.

In the Southeast, the Commission might well consider consolidating the Illinois Central's application for control of the Louisville & Nashville, because that carrier is an important competitive factor in the potential imbalance between a combined Atlantic Coastline-Seaboard system and the Southern system.

All over this country, railroads are seeking to combine. They are so vocal in their reasons supporting this getting together. Certainly they should be willing now to cooperate with what the Commission may consider to be the better policy of good order and competitive protection.

Now, I am well aware that I will be met with the argument that the 1940 Transportation Act outlawed the idea of a Commission merger plan, and provided for merger initiative to come from the carriers to be presented for approval or rejection by the Commission.

My answer to this is that the 1940 act did not take away entirely the planning and policy function of the Commission in promoting an adequate transportation network.

It intended the Commission and other branches of Government to study, educate, and assist in the development of railroad consolidations. And the Interstate Commerce Act, aside from setting forth a positive mandate for the Commission in its National Transportation policy, also has given to that body full authority and power at any time to investigate on its own motion any matter within its jurisdiction (49 U.S.C. 13(2)). In addition the act permits the Commission to determine its own procedure under any provision of the law "in such manner as will best conduce to the people dispatch of business and to the ends of justice" (49 U.S.C. 17(3)). Furthermore, section 5 of the act by setting up positive criteria for the protection of carriers not a part of the merger application imposes on the Commission a responsibility to analyze carefully the regional and interregional relationships between all carriers affected by a proposed merger and make certain that such carriers are protected from any imbalances caused by the merger. With so many mergers pending, this responsibility demands a total view which can only be accomplished by special investigation and consolidation of appropriate cases for final decision.

But let us not get bogged down in legal niceties as to the Interstate Commerce Commission policy function. The stark fact is that the exigencies of the situation now demand positive leadership by the ICC. The magnitude of the cases before it, a magnitude I'm sure never contemplated by the Committee of Six or Committee of Three, demands a coordinated merger policy by the Commission and a broad analysis of appropriate system relationships on a regional, and if need be a national basis, with special emphasis on retaining balanced rail competition, and direct instructions to the railroad community as to what combinations will be formed or what definitive issues must be met where pending merger proposals are rejected by the Commission.

The President of the United States set up the Interagency Committee to formulate more specific guidelines and more specific procedures for applying them in merger cases. The President was particularly concerned about maintaining competition between the same modes of transport. The Committee studied the problem, and came out with 10 general, but nevertheless helpful, criteria in a recent report. But the ICC is under no obligation to accept the President's suggestions at this time. This Interagency Committee, through the Department of Justice, should forthwith petition the ICC for an investigation of these criteria leading to the possible adoption by the Commission of rules or a policy implementing its present general criteria on merger cases. At the same time the Interagency Committee should seek in the Commission a stay on all merger decisions until its views can be considered by the Commission, and some definitive policy developed. Otherwise, what good is this President's Committee? The Commission certainly should as a matter of courtesy, if for nothing else, give the President a chance to be heard on these crucial merger issues. Also, the Interagency Committee should continue its work, and let the Commission know how its views and policies are applicable to the situation involved in the cases. By its action, so will we judge the sincerity and worth of this important committee. The time for it to act is now.

Finally, Congress has before it important rail merger legislation. My bill or Senator MAGNUSON's bill, if passed, will provide breathing time for the Commission to conduct its policy investigation. Senator HARTKE's bill seeking a select committee to investigate railroad finances and interlocking financial relationships goes to the jugular vein of the rail merger problem. With the passage of this legislation, which I understand looks good at the moment, a merger moratorium is a must. But regardless of what Congress does, the responsibility is squarely on the shoulders of the Interstate Commerce Commission to process these mergers in the best possible way. If it accepts the industry packages as they are now proposed, without more than a liberal consideration of cases on a piecemeal basis, cases untested by objective experts, it will be giving to this Nation a tragic transportation system at a time when we need the best competitive, growing network of carriers we have ever had. It will be going against our national transportation policy, and letting down the public interest. The future of transportation in this country will be fixed by what we do with these rail mergers. Commission policy is the first step toward that future.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 30, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 55: 6: *Seek ye the Lord while He may be found, call ye upon Him while He is near.*

Almighty and ever-blessed God, we are again turning unto Thee for guidance and wisdom, for courage and hope to face difficulties which seem well-nigh insurmountable.

Make us more sensitive and responsive to Thy call and command, the promptings and persuasions of Thy divine voice, lest we walk and wander in darkness and despair.

May Thy spirit of peace and power lay hold upon our confused minds and troubled hearts, releasing them from those devastating fears which paralyze our energies. Gird us with that strong faith which inspires us with confidence and joy.

Wilt Thou illumine our souls with a glorious vision of the fulfillment of Thy gracious promises when all our doubts shall be dispelled and Thy righteousness and truth shall be victorious.

Hear us in the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file reports on two bills, H.R. 1696 and H.R. 1135.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what are the bills?

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, one of the bills is a bill introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], relating to public and private interests in reservoir projects, a bill which was passed by the House last year. The second bill is one introduced by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], relating to the naming of a dam.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIBRARIES AND MEMORIALS, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Libraries and Memorials of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit during the session of the House today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE OMAR B. KETCHUM

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deepest sympathy and sorrow on the death of a dear friend who passed away last Thursday.

I refer to Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, director of the Washington office of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

It was my privilege in 1957–58 to serve as national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and during this period of service to the great veterans organization, I came to greatly respect and admire the tremendous abilities of Omar B. Ketchum.

More important, the warmth and enthusiasm of Mr. Ketchum's personality was an inspiration to all of us engaged in work for the VFW.

Omar Ketchum typified the highest qualities of American leadership in both private and public life. His courage certainly matched his convictions and we could always count on him to lead the way in any patriotic and pro-American endeavors.

He and the VFW organization which he served so ably were in the vanguard of every fight to protect our great Nation against the subversive forces of communism and to promote the strong national defenses of our country.

His contributions over the more than 20 years he directed the VFW office in Washington are many, and included great advances in membership, activity, and prestige.

The leadership and guidance of Omar Ketchum will be sorely missed by all Americans, and especially by the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

We have not only lost a great leader, but a wonderful comrade friend.

My deepest sympathy are extended to his beloved wife, Edna. I know her loss is a great one. I know Omar's passing is a loss to every American ex-service man or woman. For Omar Ketchum spent the greater part of his life—toiling with compassion for those who bore the brunt of battle—and the widows and orphans of such war veterans. He was a great and unselfish man. He was my dear friend and comrade.

A BIOGRAPHY OF OMAR B. KETCHUM

Omar Bartlett Ketchum, director of the VFW Washington office, was born at Hardy, Ark. Mr. Ketchum attended grade schools and high school in Galena, Kans.; Sarcoxie, Mo.; and Topeka, Kans. During his high school days in Missouri and Kansas, he was very active in debating and sports, among other varied interests.

Ketchum served four terms as president of the Topeka Typographical Union, and in 1930 was selected as a member of the International Typographical Union Committee on Laws. In addition to his work in the printing industry and his busy labor and civic activities, he found time to write a weekly labor column for the Topeka Daily Capital and also broadcast a biweekly radio program sponsored by the Topeka Federation of Labor.

Ketchum served as mayor of Topeka for two terms, 1931–35, and in 1934 he was the Democratic nominee for Governor of Kansas running against Alf Landon (who later became the Republican candidate for President). In 1936 he ran again on the Democratic slate, this time for U.S. Senate against Senator Arthur Capper.

Since 1930, when Ketchum became commander of the Phillip Billard Post No. 1650, VFW, in Topeka, he was an active leader in VFW affairs. In 1939–40 he served as national chief of staff and in 1940–41 served as the national organization's director of membership.

In 1941 he was appointed national legislative officer and later to his final position which included all functions of the national legislative service, public relations division and the VFW's national rehabilitation service.

As head of the Washington VFW office, Ketchum dealt with Congress and other governmental agencies and officials with respect to laws and administrative regulations of concern to veterans and current members of the Armed Forces, their widows and dependents. Well known in Washington circles, he kept an eye on matters of national security and public welfare. He was also a member of the Federal Advisory Council of the U.S. Department of Labor.

Ketchum served in Company A, 110th Engineers, 35th Division. His regiment was decorated for gallantry in action and he was wounded twice. His oldest son, Jack B., a bomber pilot with the 8th Air Force, was killed in the European theater.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many of us were shocked to learn of the passing of our good friend, Omar B. Ketchum, on Thursday last. He was not only my friend, but the friend of a great many Members of this House and even this entire Congress. Most of all he was a friend of the millions of veterans who have served our country in time of war.

Omar B. Ketchum was director of the Washington office of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. As director of that office he was continuously alert to his responsibility for the passage of legislation beneficial to the veteran and to the furtherance of plans and programs with the Veterans' Administration that would be good for those men who have a veteran status whether they were members of the organization he belonged to or a member of some other veteran organization.

It was my privilege to meet Omar B. Ketchum many years ago when I was commander of Post 1000, Veterans of Foreign Wars in Independence, Mo. Although he came to Washington several years ago he never forgot to return to his adopted State of Kansas and to visit his friends in western Missouri. Perhaps the happiest years of his life were spent in Topeka, Kans., which is not very far west of Kansas City, Mo.

It was there that he served the city of Topeka as mayor for two terms and offered himself as a candidate for the Governor of the State of Kansas and also a candidate for the U.S. Senate from the State of Kansas.

Our next association with Mr. Ketchum came to be in our first term in the 86th Congress as a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. Quite frequently, Mr. Ketchum would appear as a witness but he was always regarded by members of the committee as a well informed witness with a reasonable, moderate viewpoint and one that was always willing to demonstrate the merit of a particular bill that he was seeking to have reported out by the committee. He was a witness that was impressive but was always one that was straightforward and never in a single instance was there anything said that might mislead the committee. He will probably best be remembered because of his annual appearance before the committee each year in February or March at the time of the annual appearance of the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. He would sit at the right hand of the commander because in truth and in fact he was the right arm of the commander in chief when he was in the city of Washington.

Omar Ketchum was a courageous man and one who had the courage to speak out in favor of his convictions. Among his strong convictions was the belief that the loyal citizens of the United States must be constantly vigilant against the threat of the subversive forces of communism and that every citizen must also be constantly alert to the need for a strong national defense of our country.

Our departed friend was the sort of person who would not allow a breach of arrangements or an upset in plans to derail his purpose or objective. He was a person that persevered in everything he did, but with it all, he was an optimist and a man who believed in the Biblical passage which states, "all things work together for men of good will."

Members of the VFW will miss the leadership which has been provided for so many years by Omar B. Ketchum. His life was dedicated to the VFW but this was so because he was a true patriot, and yet, it was also true because he forever maintained a desire to serve his fellow men. We have all lost a leader and a friend.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow that we learned of the passing of a distinguished American, Omar B. Ketchum, here in Washington last week. Mr. Ketchum came to Washington from Kansas, where he had served the city of Topeka as mayor and had sought the governorship and the U.S. Senate of my State. He was a dedicated American who fought for the millions of veterans who have served our country in time of war. His leadership and devotion to the Veterans of Foreign Wars gained for him a lasting place in the hearts of his comrades everywhere.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Stars and Stripes which echoes the sentiments of this Nation's veterans:

OMAR B. KETCHUM

Omar B. Ketchum of the Veterans of Foreign Wars has answered the last rollcall. His death, after a long illness, will sadden thousands of members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for whose cause he fought most zealously in the Nation's Capital.

Coming to Washington in 1941 as the national legislative director of the VFW, Ketchum soon carved a niche for himself in the history of veteran benefits. Possessing a pleasing personality, a fluent manner of expression and a thorough knowledge of the intricacies of veterans laws and regulations, Ketchum soon won the esteem and confidence of Members of Congress in his able presentations before congressional committees on matters pertaining to veterans.

He was active in presenting the VFW viewpoint in the fight for the passage of the GI bill of rights. His duties as national legislative director encompassed a large field of legislative activity and he was thoroughly conversant with all of the many facets of the entire VFW program.

In recent years Ketchum was the executive director of the VFW Washington office with supervision over many of the phases of the organization's functions.

The VFW and the veterans of America will miss the knowledge and experience which the Kansan brought to his office. He was a sincere, devoted and accomplished representative and his handiwork in the Nation's Capital will long be remembered by all who came in contact with him.

All of us have lost a stalwart champion and an able and energetic defender of veterans' benefits. We share with thousands and thousands of others the loss of this outstanding veterans' spokesman. May he rest in peace.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has lost one of its outstanding citizens in the tragic death of Omar B. Ketchum, the distinguished director of the Washington office of the Veteran of Foreign Wars.

Arkansas-born and Kansas-reared, Omar Ketchum was known as "Mister VFW" to many Members of the Congress. For more than 20 years he spoke eloquently and worked effectively to advance the many fine causes supported by this great veterans' organization.

As much as any other man, Omar Ketchum was responsible for many improvements in our veterans' benefits programs. He was also a strong and consistent champion of measures to strengthen our armed forces and internal security.

In addition to this, he was a warm friend, a worthy comrade, and an unselfish servant of noble causes.

The VFW has lost a pillar of strength in the Nation's Capital, and the veterans have lost a stalwart champion.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, many throughout the Nation were saddened by the death on July 25 of Omar B. Ketchum. He served his country with distinction in time of war and peace. A combat veteran of World War I, he returned to his home in Topeka, Kans., following the war where his unusual talents soon found expression in a distinguished career of public service.

As mayor of Topeka from 1931 to 1935, he made a record for which he is still held in the highest esteem by those who knew him in the old home town. His outstanding qualities led to his selection as the nominee of the Democratic Party for Governor of Kansas in 1934. Though he was defeated by Alfred M. Landon's bid for reelection to a second term, he was again the nominee of his party in 1936 to oppose Arthur Capper, the senior U.S. Senator from Kansas. He was defeated in a very close race by the popular Kansas Senator but soon returned to a career of service when he became a national officer of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Omar Ketchum served in the Washington office of the Veterans of Foreign Wars from 1941 to the time of his death. As legislative director of the VFW and later as executive director of the Washington office, he was well known as an aggressive and articulate spokesman for veterans and their dependents.

Omar Ketchum knew war as a soldier. He also knew war as did the parents of boys killed in the service—his oldest son, Jack, was killed while serving as a bomber pilot in the European theater during World War II. So, I say Omar Ketchum gave much to his country—he will be long remembered for his many talents and long period of service.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have the balance of the legislative week in which to extend their remarks on the passing of Omar B. Ketchum, director of the Washington office of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I will be glad to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleague from Indiana in the sentiments he has expressed with regard to a fine American citizen, Omar Ketchum.

Through the years that I have had occasion to discuss with him matters of mutual interest, I have always found Omar Ketchum to be a man dedicated to the cause of the veterans. At the same time, may I add, he was dedicated to the cause of the whole country which we all love so much. Mr. Ketchum was a man of courage and deep conviction, always honest and straightforward in his approach to the problems with which he was concerned. I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman that we all shall miss him as an able, conscientious and effective servant of the organization for which he worked so many years.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I thank the distinguished minority leader and yield back the balance of my time.

COTTON ACREAGE PRODUCTION

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 464, Rept. No. 602) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6196) to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

OFFICE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the establishment of the Office of Community Development in the Executive Office of the President of the United States.

It is high time that we coordinated our efforts in providing one-stop service for local and State officials in working out their community problems. This legislation will provide this at small cost to the taxpayers.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 105]

Adair
Ashley
Blatnik
Buckley
Celler
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Denton
Diggs
Edmondson
Evins
Flynt
Forrester
Glenn
Goodling
Gray
Griffin
Grover
Hardy
Healey
Hébert
Hoffman
Holifield
Johnson, Calif.
Lesinski
Macdonald
Martin, Mass.
Miller, N.Y.
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Powell
Quillen
Robison
Roosevelt
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Smith, Iowa
Thompson, La.
Tollefson
Ullman
Van Pelt
Weltner

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 385 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Saturday, August 3, to file a report including supplemental views, on H.R. 7824.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight, August 5, to file a report including supplemental views on H.R. 7544.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT EXTENSION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 3872) to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 578)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3872) to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

Wright Patman,
Albert Rains,
Abraham J. Multer,
William A. Barrett,
Clarence E. Kilburn,
William B. Widnall,
James Harvey,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Joseph S. Clark, Jr.,
John J. Sparkman,
William E. Proxmire,
Harrison A. Williams, Jr.,
Maurine B. Neuberger,
Thomas J. McIntyre,
John G. Tower,
Jacob K. Javits,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3872) to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes, report that the conferees have been unable to agree.

Wright Patman,
Albert Rains,
Albert J. Multer,
William A. Barrett,
Clarence E. Kilburn,
William B. Widnall,
James Harvey,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That (a) section 2(c)(1) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 is amended by striking out '$1,000,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$2,000,000,000'.

"(b) Section 6 of such Act is amended by striking out '$6,000,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$8,000,000,000'.

"(c) Section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out '$7,000,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$9,000,000,000'.

"Sec. 2. Section 8 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 is amended by striking out

'June 30, 1963' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1968'.

"SEC. 3. Section 9 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 is amended by striking out 'semiannually' in the first sentence of that section and inserting in lieu thereof 'annually', and by striking out 'and December 31' in the second sentence of that section."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PATMAN moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and ask for a further conference with the Senate.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, there are certain differences between the House and the Senate over the bill to extend the life of the Export-Import Bank and for other purposes. Your conferees have had several meetings with the conferees on the part of the Senate in an attempt to resolve these differences, but so far without success.

The Export-Import Bank is an extremely important agency of the Federal Government, especially so at this particular time when we are suffering from balance-of-payments difficulties and most economic policies of this administration are being made with reference to these balance-of-payments difficulties. The Export-Import Bank is a force tending to correct the deficit in our balance of payments. The reasons for this are twofold.

First, under the program which the Export-Import Bank has operated now for about 30 years, it makes certain foreign loans where the result will be to help American exporters sell equipment, goods, and services to develop the facilities for which the loans are made. In these cases, the dollars lent never leave the country. They are paid to the American exporters. Furthermore, when such loans are made, a downpayment in dollars is required of the foreign country or the foreign national to whom the loan is made. This brings in dollars immediately. In addition, the Export-Import Bank usually charges certain fees and, of course, interest charges which are also payable in dollars.

Beginning with an amendment to the act made in 1961, the Export-Import Bank has been developing an export credit insurance program similar to that which such countries as Great Britain and Germany have for many years offered their exporters. The purpose of the Export-Import Bank's insurance program is to promote export sales from the United States; this is a most important part of our policy in trying to promote exports from the United States so as to correct the deficit in our balance of payments.

Accordingly, I am hopeful that an agreement can be reached with the Senate and that further conferences will bring about such an agreement. We have no alternative but to try to reach agreement because as a practical matter we cannot afford to let the Export-Import Bank die.

This is what my motion does. It calls for the appointment of new conferees to go back into more conferences with the Senate, to try to reach agreement. I am hopeful, furthermore, that the Senate will ultimately see the wisdom of the House's position and accept the House's position.

On June 30 of this year, the Bank's charter expired. Several Members have insisted that House Joint Resolution 508, recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations and passed by the House on June 25, 1963, authorizes the Export-Import Bank to continue operations through August 31, 1963, during which time it is hoped that its charter will be renewed.

The Board of the Export-Import Bank and its chief counsel has, however, taken the position that the continuing resolution does not give the Bank legal powers to continue operating in view of the fact that its charter has expired.

In any case, what the liabilities of the corporation would be and what the liabilities of those private companies in which it enters into contracts would be is a matter which would ultimately have to be decided by the courts. The Export-Import Bank enters into contracts with private banks and private insurance companies in the United States in which there are contingent liabilities on two parties on both sides of the contract.

We should clear up this matter and renew the charter of the Bank so that it can operate without any legal cloud and at the same time give the Bank the increased authority that it has asked for to expand its loan and insurance operations.

Now what is the disagreement? There is no disagreement over the merits of the Bank. I believe everyone agrees that the Bank should have its charter renewed and have the additional authority it has asked for.

The disagreement between the House and the Senate is a question of how the Bank should be financed.

The Bank has now been in operation for almost 30 years. During this time it has had authority to borrow the funds it needs from the Treasury, within limits, and under the restrictions which have been specified in the several acts of Congress under which it has operated. In other words, both the House and the Senate have enacted bills permitting the Bank to take certain funds from the Treasury for certain purposes merely upon the recommendations of the respective Committees on Banking and Currency of the two Houses and without prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations.

H.R. 3872, as passed by the House on May 1, made a change in this method of financing to require that the Appropriations Committee first recommend such funds as the Congress might authorize the Bank to take from the Treasury. The Treasury borrowing method, as everybody knows, is referred to as back-door spending.

Now let me define the issue a little more precisely.

Some Members of the House, and some Members of the Senate, think that great principles and large jurisdictional prerogatives are involved in this dispute. The task, as a practical matter, however, is to get the Export-Import Bank back into operation.

It will help to clarify matters to state some of the issues that are not involved.

The question whether the funds used by the Export-Import Bank are within the Federal debt ceiling is not involved here. These funds require the Treasury to issue debt obligations and those debt obligations come within the debt ceiling, whichever method of financing is used.

The question whether the funds used by the Export-Import Bank are included in the President's budget is not involved. Whichever method of financing is used, the estimated amount of funds to be used is in the budget. In the budget for fiscal year 1964, the estimated use of funds for the Bank appears in detail at page 827 of the large volume of the budget.

The question whether appropriating the funds would increase President Kennedy's budget for fiscal year 1964 is also not involved. Several Members have thought mistakenly that if the $2 billion of additional lending authority which the Bank has requested were appropriated, these $2 billion would be added to President Kennedy's budget and thus raise the budget total to a figure in excess of $100 billion. This is incorrect. The $2 billion of additional authority which is being requested is to cover a period of 5 years. The facts are, therefore, that the actual amounts of funds withdrawn from the Treasury or anticipated to be withdrawn from the Treasury within any given fiscal year will appear in the budget whether the funds are appropriated with the approval of the Committees on Appropriations or whether they are borrowed from the Treasury under the present method of operations.

Furthermore, the question whether or not the House Appropriations Committee has control over the use of funds by the Bank is also not involved. The Appropriations Committee has a final say in any case.

Under the Government Corporations Control Act, the House Committee on Appropriations has for many years set the ceilings on the amount of funds that can be used within any one fiscal year by the Bank for administrative expenses.

Furthermore, beginning year before last the House Appropriations Committee moved in on the matter on the funds that the Bank might lend, within any one year, and it placed ceilings on the amounts that it might lend or use in its other operations.

To summarize, the dispute is not about whether the funds are subject to the debt limit; it is not about whether the funds appear in the Federal budget; it is not about whether changing the method of financing will increase President Kennedy's budget; it is not about whether the House Committee on Appropriations has control and has the final say over how much funds the Bank may use. All of these things remain precisely the same in any case.

The dispute is merely over the question whether the House Committee on Appropriations will have sole authority to initiate recommendations on which the

House will act, as well as to control the use of funds after the House has authorized their use.

Under present practices, expenditure measures coming under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committees are originated by the Appropriations Committee of the House. We do not permit the Senate to initiate expenditure measures where these measures are called appropriations.

On the other hand, according to past practices, the House has permitted the Senate to originate expenditure measures where the expenditures were recommended to the Senate by some committee other than the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. In other words, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency might recommend to the Senate some banking operation, such as the Export-Import Bank, and the House has either concurred or disagreed with such bills, depending upon the merits of the bill. H.R. 3872 passed by the House, would put a stop to that, and under present practices, foreclose the possibility that the Senate might in the future initiate some bill to enlarge the lending powers of the Export-Import Bank.

The conferees on the part of the Senate have as yet been unwilling to accept this proposed arrangement.

Ultimately, however, I think the Senate must realize that the position it is taking is only one of form and not of substance. The truth of the matter is that the committee which controls the purse strings controls the whole legislation, any way you look at it.

In all practical respects the House Committee on Appropriations already has control over the amount of funds which the Export-Import Bank may use, if for no other reason than it has control over the amount of funds which may be used for administrative expenses, and for what kinds of administrative expenses. We have an example of that in the Area Redevelopment Act legislation which the Committee on Banking and Currency is now considering.

When the Area Redevelopment Act was passed, it contained one section authorizing a revolving fund, or a borrowing of funds from the Treasury.

The House Committee on Appropriations, however has effectively prohibited the Area Redevelopment Act from using this borrowing authority, and it has never been used. The committee specified in its appropriation measure that none of the funds being appropriated could be used for administrative expenses in connection with any program or activity involving the use of funds borrowed from the Treasury.

The appropriation process, it seems to me, is obviously the wave of the future.

The Senate's position is really not a matter of substance, and I hope that the Senate will agree to the House's position.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield to me at this point?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. I first yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] and then I shall yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the chairman of the House conferees most highly, and his fellow conferees, for the position that they have taken in sustaining the position of the House in this matter. Moreover, I want to compliment the chairman for the position that he is now taking in presenting this motion to the House. I concur most heartily in that motion.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to compliment the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] for the very excellent statement that he has made, with one exception. The gentleman from Texas has stated the facts and he has stated the issues exceedingly well, except that I do not think this is a question relating to the House Committee on Appropriations. It is a question involving the entire House of Representatives. It is a question of whether the House of Representatives is going to abrogate to the Senate its right that it has exercised throughout the years, and we think it is a constitutional right, to initiate appropriations. We do not believe that the House should surrender its powers to the Senate through the process of back-door spending.

Mr. Speaker, I might add that certainly in this case it is not necessary—I want to endorse everything that the gentleman has said about the Export-Import Bank. It is a most important operation. It is an excellent operation. It has a marvelous record against loss. It is making money. Now, any Federal agency about which one can truthfully say all those things is entitled to the endorsement of this House. But I have here—and I shall not take the time to read it—a statement which was made in the hearings before our Treasury and Post Office Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in which the Secretary of the Treasury said definitely that it was not necessary for the Bank to borrow money in this case; that an appropriation would serve every purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I also have here testimony from the President of the Bank—and these hearings have not yet been printed, but they are the hearings of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee—in which the President of the Bank says that they now have a surplus of $1,400 million and with anticipated repayments of $400 million each year, they estimate that during the next 5 years they will have to supplement that with an additional $400 million a year. Therefore, multiplying the $400 million by 5 they have arrived at the $2 billion that is provided in this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to giving them the authority to use that $2 billion when it is necessary and to the appropriation of that amount. I think I can truthfully say to the gentleman that it will be appropriated very promptly. But even if it is not, they have enough money for the present, according to the statement of the President of the Bank. Their estimated need is $400 million a year.

They have $1,400 million. Frankly, the testimony showed that while they estimate a $400 million annual need for the next 5 years, the past experience shows that $350 million will be sufficient. So they will have enough money to operate on from 3½ to 4½ years if they do not get another penny right now.

Therefore, we can strike out the entire question as to how the money shall be provided and simply extend the charter of the Bank for another 5 years at the present time. We can then handle the question of providing the necessary funds on which it may operate in a subsequent bill, if necessary, but I see no reason why the Senate should not yield to this position of the House. It is a longstanding rule that we have the authority to initiate appropriations, and I do not think we should, at this late date, turn that authority over to the U.S. Senate.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, as one of the conferees, I would like to concur in what the gentleman has said with respect to the instructions of the House. I fully support the motion offered by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

At the time the House met before on this matter a division vote was cast of 110 to 0. The Senate has argued in conference that this was not the will of the House because it only represented about 25 percent of the House membership and that the vote in the Senate was a record vote and fully confirmed their position.

That is the reason for our coming back to the House for further instructions. There is no conflict at all as to views with respect to continuation of the activities of the Export-Import Bank. Everyone in the House, I believe, is for that. Everyone knows also that there is about $1.5 billion now in the hands of the Bank that can be used without any further authorization for future loans and commitments. That is larger than originally stated at the time we were before the House because of prepayments of France and Holland to the Bank to the extent of over $200 million.

At the time we went to conference we had the opinion of Frank Weitzel, Assistant Comptroller General, that under the continuing resolution which went into effect on June 29, 1963, the Export-Import Bank had the ability to make loans and commitments and could go ahead with the operations of the bank. Some statements have been made in the press that obstructionists are trying to prevent the enactment of legislation continuing the activities of the Bank. That is far from the truth. It seems to me that the Export-Import Bank itself has chosen at this time to state that they are out of business when in the opinion of Mr. Weitzel they are in business, and if they are worried about being in business because of failure to extend the charter by official act of the Congress, they have made no such separate request that could be enacted into law in minutes by both the House and Senate.

I believe we should support fully the resolution that has been offered.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a week ago last Monday the President submitted his balance-of-payments message to Congress. There was considerable alarm expressed at that time that our annual balance-of-payments deficit for fiscal 1963 might reach as much as $4 billion. In the last week our committee headed by our able chairman has been listening to testimony. We have heard Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, Dr. Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. Martin. All of this testimony has illustrated the very serious nature of this matter, and we have therefore been considering the President's various proposals to counteract this adverse balance-of-payments deficit. However, I say to you that one of the things which is right at the heart of this adverse balance of payments is this annual deficit that the United States of America has been running each year for several years, or at least for the past 10 years in both administrations, and the methods which have been used to finance that particular deficit. Since I have been here, that is, since January 1961, we have already had several pieces of legislation before this Congress to increase the temporary debt ceiling. Each time we get such a request, and let me say we have had the good fortune this last week to hear Secretary Dillon say we would not have to have an immediate increase but that he would be back again I believe in September to urge another increase in the temporary debt ceiling. But every time this bill to increase the temporary debt ceiling comes up I hear these comments from those who are for it. They say, "This is not the way to curb spending. Those of you who want to curb spending, let us do it in the appropriation bills."

Well, I say let us now put the Export-Import Bank in the appropriation bill so that we can take a look at it each year and, if necessary, so that you can curb spending in the future. It makes sense that we have a single committee here in Congress that is responsible for all of the spending approved by this House of Representatives, just as President Kennedy and the administration have a single bureau, the Bureau of the Budget, which is responsible for all expenditures by the executive department.

I think that the American people have a real stake in this issue and I certainly want to compliment our chairman who has stated that "the way of the appropriations process is the way of the future at the House of Representatives." I agree with that wholeheartedly.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS].

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, of course the real issue of the so-called back-door spending of Treasury financing is not before us. Actually, we are only asking to be returned to conference in disagreement in continuation of the original position of the House in support of the bill which our Banking and Currency Committee brought to the floor of the House. However, the gentleman from Virginia made some remarks about Secretary Dillon's testimony before his committee and I thought he would be interested to know of some new and recent statements by Secretary Dillon, so I will read them.

On July 15, 1963, Secretary Dillon wrote to Senator CLARK, who is one of the Senate conferees, and the following is the letter of Secretary Dillon. I read this only to get it into the RECORD.

> THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
> *Washington, D.C., July 15, 1963.*
>
> Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK,
> *U.S. Senate.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR CLARK: You have asked in your letter dated July 12 for my position as to the preferable method of providing $2 billion in additional funds for the Export-Import Bank. H.R. 3872, which is now being considered by conferees representing the Senate and House of Representatives, includes a provision for such an increase.
>
> In my previous correspondence on this subject, mentioned in your letter, I stated that, in my view, Treasury financing for the Export-Import Bank was peculiarly appropriate and that I concurred in this method of providing additional funds for the Bank.
>
> In my testimony before the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, I was asked whether the $2 billion increase could not be provided in the form of a direct appropriation. I replied that it could. In so doing, I did not intend to imply that this was the preferable method. From the standpoint of what is technically possible, these funds can be provided to the Bank through either the Treasury financing approach or through the appropriations approach. While there is obviously room for a difference of opinion on this point, in my view, the more appropriate method for the Export-Import Bank would be to provide the funds through Treasury financing.
>
> The Export-Import Bank is unique in that it operates in an area where wide fluctuations take place in the requirements for credit. This means that it must have available at all times substantial amounts of uncommitted funds. Similarly, U.S. exporters, in order to plan their financing requirements in an orderly fashion, must be assured that the Bank has ample funds available. Where this type of margin in uncommitted funds is desirable, the utility of the appropriations process, with its emphasis on precise amounts to be expended, would seem doubtful because there is no basis for determining from past experience the proper amount which should be granted to the Bank. On the other hand, the Treasury financing method, which in effect provides for a drawing account, and which would be accompanied by appropriate safeguards, is, as I have said before, peculiarly suited to this type of operation.
>
> I should like to add that the expiration of the charter of the Bank on June 30 has already caused considerable concern among our exporters. Their future financing plans are uncertain, and this can only have a deleterious effect on the future level of exports and our already troublesome balance-of-payments situation. I would urge prompt enactment of legislation to renew the charter of the Bank and provide it with adequate resources.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> DOUGLAS DILLON.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RAINS. I yield.

Mr. ALGER. Does the gentleman who is now addressing us stand with the House position or Mr. Dillon's?

Mr. RAINS. I want the gentleman to understand that as long as I am a conferee I stand with the House position as long as that can be maintained; and he should know that.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA].

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the committee chairman for the opportunity to bring before the House one aspect of this argument that I do not think has been adequately stressed. I think we are missing in this debate the importance of the competitive position of the Export-Import Bank vis-a-vis the credit that would be extended to the competitors of the United States who are in the world market.

We have heard from a lot of people, but I have heard no one quote directly from a person or an organization who uses this credit as to what their position is. I should like to bring to the attention of the House part of the telegram that I have received from Mr. Douglas who has a large aircraft plant in the gentleman from California's [Mr. HOSMER] district which employs many people who live in my district.

If you will look at the export business of the United States, this is what you will find. We are the largest exporter in the world, and out of our exports the largest single export is aircraft. This is what Mr. Douglas, in part, states in his telegram.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. In speaking of his position on the balance of payments, Mr. Douglas says:

> SANTA MONICA, CALIF.,
> *July 6, 1963.*
>
> Representative RICHARD T. HANNA,
> *House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.:*
>
> As exporters of jet aircraft, the Douglas Aircraft Co. contributes significantly to correction of the current deficit in the U.S. international balance of payments. Virtually all of our foreign sales are implemented through Export-Import Bank participation in the financing involved. Without such support, we would be noncompetitive against foreign aircraft manufacturers who enjoy liberal credit support by similar agencies of their governments. We note that the House of Representatives on May 1, 1963, passed H.R. 3872, extending the life of the Export-Import Bank for 5 years which would otherwise have expired June 30, 1963. This legislation authorized the Congress to make appropriations up to $2 billion for funding the Bank's increased lending authority.
>
> The Senate on June 24, 1963, passed H.R. 3872 also extending the Banks life for 5 years but amending it to authorize the Bank to borrow directly from the Treasury. As in the past the Douglas Aircraft Co. feels strongly that limiting the Export-Import Bank's activities to an amount provided by annual appropriation will inhibit its activities in our valid interest as exporters. This requires the extension of credits over periods up to 7 years to match action of the credit agencies of other exporting countries. In furtherance of their foreign trade the Douglas Co. is engaged in worldwide sales activi-

ties embracing the DC-8 type of long-range jet aircraft and more recently has embarked upon the DC-9 program for manufacture of a new short-range jet airplane. This program will involve the employment of some 6,000 people directly and several times this number by our subcontractors in 16 States. For the program to be successful a substantial portion of our output must be sold abroad. The ability of the Export-Import Bank to extend, judiciously, credit in our favor extending over a period of 7 years is critical to our success in the foreign field. The continued ability on the part of the Export-Import Bank to look to Treasury support, we believe, will be a major determinant in their ability to make commitments of a term required by foreign competitive pressures. We urge that you favorably support the Senate amendment of H.R. 3872 allowing the Export-Import Bank to continue to borrow from the U.S. Treasury.

DONALD W. DOUGLAS, Jr.

It seems to me that, as Mr. Douglas has put it, the continued ability on the part of the Export-Import Bank to look to the Treasury for support will be a major determinant in their ability to make commitments of the term required by foreign competitive pressures. He is asking here for flexibility in our program to meet what they have to meet in foreign competition.

Mr. Speaker, I am including at this point in my remarks a listing of what the balances of the U.S. Treasury borrowing have been for the last 10 years at the end of the fiscal year. I think you will find this of some interest for, as a matter of fact, although the activity of this Bank has been increasing the balance of what they have been borrowing from the Treasury has been decreasing. This would indicate to me that the additional funds would be utilized in the same manner, in a way in which there would be less outstanding at any one point of time in the year.

Mr. Speaker, the letter to which I refer is as follows:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK
OF WASHINGTON,
Washington, D.C. July 2, 1963.

Mr. WILLIAM SUMMERS JOHNSON,
Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: With respect to your question on Treasury borrowings by Eximbank over the past decade, I am giving below the amount of the notes payable to the U.S. Treasury in millions of dollars at the end of June of each of the following years:

[In millions]

1963	$1,476
1962	1,830
1961	1,698
1960	1,631
1959	1,923
1958	1,508
1957	1,178
1956	1,207
1955	1,271
1954	1,347
1953	1,227

You will understand that the balance due Treasury varies from day to day depending on receipts from interest and repayment of principal as well as on disbursements to borrowers. I trust this information will meet your needs.

Sincerely yours,
GLENN E. McLAUGHLIN,
Vice President.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to restrict the flexibility of export credit extended to companies in this country and we are going to be doing much more damage to the balance-of-payments program by this position than any assistance that would be given the payments problem in the President's program now before us. As a matter of fact, looking at the bad that will be done on the one hand and the good that will be done on the other, it will be like a pussycat in a fight with a tiger.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 379, nays 11, answered "present" 1, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]

YEAS—379

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Addabbo
Albert
Alger
Anderson
Andrews
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Boggs
Boland
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards
Ellsworth
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Ford
Foreman
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Rains
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—11

Bolling
Corman
Dingell
Fraser
Gill
Hechler
McDowell
Rivers, Alaska
Ryan, N.Y.
Sisk
Staebler

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hanna

NOT VOTING—41

Adair
Ashley
Blatnik
Buckley
Cooley
Davis, Tenn.
Denton
Edmondson
Elliott
Evins
Flynt
Forrester
Glenn
Goodling
Griffin
Grover
Hardy
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Hoffman
Lesinski
Macdonald
Martin, Mass.
Miller, N.Y.
Morrison
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Quillen
Robison
Roosevelt
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Smith, Iowa
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Van Pelt

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Tollefson.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Glenn.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Grover.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Robison.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Van Pelt.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Goodling.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Edmondson.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Ashley.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.
Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Cooley.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Smith of Iowa.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Forrester.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PATMAN, RAINS, MULTER, BARRETT, KILBURN, WIDNALL, and HARVEY of Michigan.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to sit while the House is in session today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

WELL - DESERVED RETIREMENT LEGISLATION FOR VETERANS OF TWO WORLD WARS

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to certain veteran officers of the two World Wars in which our Nation has been engaged during the lifetime of our elder and rapidly passing generation. The aim of my bill is to grant maximum retirement to a small but a uniquely deserving group of veteran officers of the uniformed services. The benefit proposed would render belated justice to a group who, by reason of their advanced age, will soon have passed beyond the reach of our benevolence.

My bill would propose special retirement benefits; namely, maximum retirement pay of 75 percent of basic pay; for this small but worthy group, now responsibly estimated to number not over some 3,500 persons. Since their average age exceeds 70 years, it is obvious that the cost of my proposal would be minimal, and would rapidly diminish by reason of the inevitable attrition of age.

That the group whom my bill would seek to benefit is one uniquely deserving of our favorable consideration will be evident from its history, which I can here but briefly sketch. The members of this group of veterans are the men who served in the military and naval forces of the United States in World War I, who then in Reserve or National Guard status maintained their availability and their competence in military leadership during the long, 23-year preparedness hiatus between the wars, and who were again called upon and again served in World War II, and subsequently after at least 20 years of total service retired with a small modicum of retired pay, on which most of them now frugally subsist. Of necessity, this is an extremely limited category. Few indeed are the surviving men who, by and large, gave up their school and college careers to fight our battles in World War I; who stuck it out in reserve status and training during the lean years of depression and military neglect; and who then abandoned full-fledged careers and professions, most of which they never regained in postwar years, to answer their country's call in its second major hour of crisis.

There is little need for me to enlarge upon the special character of such men of persistent patriotism, nor upon their special need for our consideration now. Most of us know them in our own districts, we know their characters, their example to the youth of our later generation, the respect in which they are held by their communities, the influence they exert out of all proportion to their meager numbers, and the unavoidable frugality of their lives. Their lost careers—which I could, and in due course well may, detail to you—has left the large majority of them dependent upon the very limited income provided by what we call title III retirement. This may run from $125 per month to $150 per month in most cases, though the average is probably below those figures.

In simple fact, these men with few exceptions sacrificed educations on the one occasion, and on the second the careers in business and the professions whose peak they had achieved by the time of the onset of World War II, in pursuance of an intensity of patriotism which has cost most of them very dearly indeed in the economics of their lives and the lives of their families, as it has in their standards of living. They watched with patience their nonparticipating colleagues take over in the war years their clienteles and their hard-won stations in the business world, and perforce consoled themselves with the satisfaction of a duty well performed. This doubly performed patriotic service they rendered without hope or intent of securing any of the monetary benefits or economic security which the Congress has later provided for their successors in the military services. Theirs was a freely offered active duty service in our Armed Forces with no motive other than simple patriotism.

It has long seemed to me that simple justice requires that we recognize that these men have made a notable, selfless, and unique sacrifice for our common defense. I believe that we should at long last accord to the few remaining survivors of this group at least as generous a measure of retirement security as is accorded any other person or group who have served in our military forces so far above and beyond the call of duty.

Let me add that there is nothing new in the granting by the Congress of special retirement pay for service in World War I. Such consideration has been granted Regular officers of all grades in all the services, irrespective of disability, in addition to all disability retired persons, and to various other categories in both enlisted and commissioned grades. Such special consideration for World War I service, where followed by retirement under any provision of law, has been embodied in a whole series of laws enacted by the Congress. It is extraordinary that this group alone of two World War men has been singled out for a neglect which my bill would terminate, and for which it would in a measure atone. The measure of that atonement, of course, is severely limited by the age of the survivors, and by the paucity of their numbers.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope, and also believe, that my colleagues of this Congress will join me in granting this long-deserved and much belated justice to these two World War veterans, while there is yet time to do so.

AN ALLTIME LOW IN JOURNALISM

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the article titled "Unfit for South?" appearing on the front page of the Evening Star on Saturday, July 27, 1963, by David Barnett of the North American Newspaper Alliance, is an alltime low in journalism. I am certain that every Member of Congress believes in the freedom of the press. However, when a person reads an article that is filled with lies from the beginning to the end, it makes a person wonder whether the press is entitled to this honor. There is not one word of truth in the article so far as I personally am concerned.

I should be accustomed to misrepresentations, lies, and innuendos appearing in the press in their zeal to smear me as chairman of the House District Committee. However, when I take my valuable time to answer a squirrel-headed reporter's questions and then he prints the exact opposite, I think the Speaker should bar him and all others of his type from the U.S. Capitol.

Reporter Barnett telephoned me and asked if I had seen the new issue of "Baby Books" carrying photographs of colored babies. I advised him that I had not seen one of these books. He further asked if I intended to stop my allotment and I advised him that I did not—and would like to have twice as many books as I was receiving as I had borrowed and traded for thousands of baby books in order to meet the demands of my constituents. My allotment of baby books was 150 per month until recently when they were increased. However, during the past 15 years I have been mailing out to new mothers in my district between 800 and 1,000 books each month which made it necessary for me to borrow and trade with other Congressmen for additional books. I advised the reporter that I had no intention of discontinuing to send baby books to the new mothers in my district. I doubt if there is a Member of Congress on Capitol Hill that has done as much for the colored people personally and legislatively as I have during the past 25 years. However, we have irresponsible reporters and news media who would like to stir up an issue between me and the colored race. I can think of no other reason why the Evening Star should carry this item written by David Barnett.

Again I want to brand the article so far as their reference to me is concerned as an outright intentional lie.

I think the Evening Star, which is supposed to be a reputable newspaper, should check items of this nature before giving publicity.

OFFICE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my colleagues today in introducing a bill to create an Office of Community Development in the Executive Office of the President. This bill will, if enacted, at long last provide one-stop service for State and local officials who seek information and guidance about the wide variety of Federal programs available for our towns and cities.

Last year, when the President's proposal for a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing was before us, I was deeply troubled that the suggested reorganization plan did not meet the need for coordination in community programs. At that time, however, I stated that—

> I stand ready to support the creation of an agency within the structure of the Federal Government which could administer or coordinate the plethora of Federal programs which affect our cities.

I think that this bill will not only provide a central reference point, but will give us an opportunity to think creatively about the multiplicity of problems that face our communities today. The bill authorizes a thorough study of the administration of Federal programs with a view toward reallocating their functions for greater efficiency and recommending imaginative new approaches to specific problems.

The central fact that creates the need for coordination in this field is that 70 percent of the American people today are living in urban places of various sizes. Any community which has to handle problems of housing, expanding school population, increasing pressures on transportation facilities, and water and air pollution in the face of shrinking tax bases can benefit from coordinated research and planning.

Since I first started discussing this proposal with my colleagues and with my friends back home I have been impressed and heartened by the favorable response that an Office of Community Development has received. The problems of our communities are growing more complex every day and every day that we postpone action the progress of our towns and cities is held back by the confusion and chaos in our urban programs. Too often communities miss out on participation in Federal programs that would be of tremendous benefit to them merely because they lack adequate information and guidance.

I am particularly pleased that our distinguished colleague from New York, the ranking Republican member of the Government Operations Committee, has taken the lead in sponsoring this legislation. I hope that the committee will act promptly on the bill.

I include a section-by-section analysis of the bill in the RECORD at this point:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE BILL TO CREATE IN THE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AN OFFICE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Section 1: Establishes an Office of Community Development in the Executive Office of the President and provides for a Director and Deputy Director to be appointed by the President.

Section 2(a): Authorizes the Director, with the approval of the President to appoint personnel, consistent with the civil service laws and regulations.

Section 2(b): Authorizes the Director to procure contract services, appoint advisory committees, designate representatives, maintain liaison with other departments and agencies and with the States, and to use the services of other agencies and of the States with their consent.

Section 2(c): Requires that Executive agencies provide information requested by the Director.

Section 2(d): Authorizes the Director, subject to the approval of the President, to promulgate rules and regulations and to delegate authority to other employees of the Office.

Section 3(a): Directs the Office of Community Development to take action to coordinate programs which have a major impact on the Nation's urban areas.

Section 3(b): Provides that the Director shall maintain close liaison with other departments and agencies and consult with State and local officials and other interested groups concerning urban problems.

Section 4: Establishes a division of information on community development within the Office to compile and make available to State and local officials and other interested groups, information and assistance regarding Federal programs affecting urban areas.

Section 5: Directs that the Office undertake research and studies to achieve more effective coordination of Federal, State and local programs to meet urban needs, and to improve the administration of the programs to achieve greater efficiency and economy.

Section 6: Provides for the creation of a Community Development Council, composed of the Secretaries of Labor, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Treasury, and the Administrators of Housing and Home Finance and Veterans' Affairs, and such other members as the President may designate. Council members are to meet not less than twice a year to discuss the broad range of urban problems and will receive expenses only.

Section 7(a): Establishes a Commission, composed of 12 members from private life with experience in community development problems, to study the feasibility of transferring functions to and from relevant agencies. The Commission is authorized to employ and compensates staff. Its members are to be compensated at the rate of $50 per day of service and may receive travel and per diem expenses.

Section 7(b): Directs the Commission to conduct a thorough study of the distribution of functions relating to housing and urban affairs, the effectiveness of the present distribution and the extent to which further coordination would increase efficiency and effectiveness. The Commission is to report to the President no later than January 1, 1964.

Section 7(c): Directs the President to prepare and submit to Congress reorganization plans, based on the Commission's report, to promote efficiency in the administration of programs relating to housing and urban affairs.

Section 8: Directs the Director of the Office of Community Development to submit to the President a report on the activities of the Office by January 31 of each year for transmission to Congress.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today, together with seven of my Republican colleagues, a bill to establish an Office of Community Development in the Executive Office of the President.

This proposal is designed to overcome the genuine problems which face many of our urban communities in their efforts to properly utilize the numerous and widely dispersed Federal programs having a bearing on urban development.

It represents a better and more reasonable solution to these problems than that presented to the 87th Congress in the form of a reorganization plan to create a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Federal programs relating to urban problems are spread among a number of existing departments and agencies. There is a justifiable concern among State and local officials that there is neither adequate coordination of these various programs nor centralized and authoritative liaison maintained by the Federal Government with the State and local levels concerning the broad spectrum of available assistance.

The administration proposed to answer this concern by merely elevating just one of these agencies, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which administers only a portion of the urban-oriented programs to Cabinet status. This would have done nothing to solve the problems occasioned by general lack of coordination and by absence of a single Federal official who could speak authoritatively with the States and communities about the entire range of urban problems and available Federal assistance. Our proposal goes to the heart of the matter and is designed to solve these very problems.

The Director of the Office of Community Development, as a staff arm of the President, would have both the authority to cut across established bureaucratic lines and the responsibility for bringing some semblance of coordination to the various urban-oriented programs of the Government. He would be responsible for maintaining continuous liaison with State and local officials concerning these programs. The Office would also provide expeditious and effective one-stop service for State and local officials seeking information and available Federal assistance in working out community problems.

None of these functions would have been possible under the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

The Office of Community Development would be assisted by an advisory body and a research and planning commission. A Federal Community Development Council, composed of the heads of the relevant departments and agencies and public members, would supply overall direction of Federal policy. A research and planning commission would study methods of integrating and simplifying the existing complex of agencies.

The Office of Community Development would carry out its role without expanding the bureaucracy, without adding materially to expenditures and, most importantly, without diminishing the local responsibility which is fundamental to our system of government. The emphasis is neither on increased Federal control nor on an increased Federal role. It is merely on bringing about better management and utilization of the programs we already have.

By bringing about more effective management and making possible better utilization of our urban-oriented programs this proposal will benefit all communities faced with increasingly complex problems in the face of shrinking tax bases. Any governmental unit forced to cope with problems of housing, urban renewal, education, sewage, water and air pollution, and transportation can benefit from a central reference point.

I urge my colleagues to get behind the passage of this proposal.

A section-by-section analysis follows:

Section 1: Establishes an Office of Community Development in the Executive Office of the President and provides for a Director and Deputy Director to be appointed by the President.

Section 2(a): Authorizes the Director, with the approval of the President, to appoint personnel, consistent with the civil service laws and regulations.

Section 2(b): Authorizes the Director to procure contract services, appoint advisory committees, designate representatives, maintain liaison with other departments and agencies and with the States, and to use the services of other agencies and of the States with their consent.

Section 2(c): Requires that executive agencies provide information requested by the Director.

Section 2(d): Authorizes the Director, subject to the approval of the President, to promulgate rules and regulations and to delegate authority to other employees of the Office.

Section 3(a): Directs the Office of Community Development to take action to coordinate programs which have a major impact on the Nation's urban areas.

Section 3(b): Provides that the Director shall maintain close liaison with other departments and agencies and consult with State and local officials and other interested groups, concerning urban problems.

Section 4: Establishes a division of information on community development within the Office to compile and make available to State and local officials and other interested groups, information and assistance regarding Federal programs affecting urban areas.

Section 5: Directs the Office to undertake research and studies to achieve more effective coordination of Federal, State, and local programs to meet urban needs, and to improve the administration of the programs to achieve greater efficiency and economy.

Section 6: Provides for the creation of a Community Development Council, composed of the Secretaries of Labor, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Treasury, and the Administrators of Housing and Home Finance and Veterans' Affairs, and such other members as the President may designate. Council members are to meet not less than twice a year to discuss the broad range of urban problems and will receive expenses only.

Section 7(a): Establishes a Commission, composed of 12 members from private life with experience in community development problems, to study the feasibility of transferring functions to and from relevant agencies. The Commission is authorized to employ and compensate staff. Its members are to be compensated at the rate of $50 per day of service and may receive travel and per diem expenses.

Section 7(b): Directs the Commission to conduct a thorough study of the distribution of functions relating to housing and urban affairs, the effectiveness of the present distribution and the extent to which further coordination would increase efficiency and effectiveness. The Commission is to report to the President no later than January 1, 1964.

Section 7(c): Directs the President to prepare and submit to Congress reorganization plans, based on the Commission's report, to promote efficiency in the administration of programs relating to housing and urban affairs.

Section 8: Directs the Director of the Office of Community Development to submit to the President a report on the activities of the Office by January 31 of each year for transmission to Congress.

A BILL TO BAN FISH IMPORTS FROM FOREIGN NATIONS WHICH SEIZE AMERICAN FISH BOATS IN INTERNATIONAL WATERS

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing H.R. 7815, a bill to impose a prohibition on the importation of fish or fish products from any foreign country which seizes or interferes with American fishing vessels in international waters. This proposed legislation is designed to aid in the protection of the rights of fishing vessels of the United States engaged in the fisheries and related activities. Specifically, I have in mind the incidents whereby two American tuna vessels, the *Ranger* and the *White Star*, were seized last May by Ecuadoran authorities and on June 5, a fine of $9,504 was imposed on the *Ranger* and a fine of $11,184 on the *White Star*. Together with license fees and other costs which were assessed, the total cost to the two vessels amounted to $26,272.50. Small fines were also imposed on the captains of these two vessels.

Mr. Speaker, the Ecuadoran law has arbitrarily set a territorial sea of 200 miles from the Ecuadoran coast, whereas, as is known, the international law has been 3 miles, and in effect, these fines represent international blackmail. The United States, I am informed, has no intention of changing its traditional policy regarding the breadth of the territorial sea. That position is that there is no obligation under international law to recognize more than 3 miles of territorial sea for any other nation.

Accordingly, retaliation for such illegal actions against our American fishermen seems only fair, by banning any further imports of fish products from countries such as Ecuador. I am sure that Congress will recognize that our fishing industry is entitled to protection. Our very Constitution gives American fishermen the right to call on their Government "to punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas and offenses against the law of nations." I hope all Members of this House who represent legislative districts having coastal waters will join in support of this measure.

I point out that under the provisions of my bill, the prohibition against importation into the United States of fisheries products is limited to persons subject to the jurisdiction of the offending country. On the other hand, the prohibition would cease when the Secretary of State is satisfied that the foreign country involved will refrain from taking such action in the future, and the Secretary of State may require such a country to make appropriate restitution for losses occasioned by the seizure or interference.

I hope my bill will have an early committee hearing and that consideration and passage of the bill will be expedited.

THE LATE HON. OMAR B. KETCHUM

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, with the death of a fellow Kansan Omar B. Ketchum last Thursday, July 25, American veterans of all wars lost a true friend and our country a true patriot, who for over a quarter of a century maintained a keen interest in veterans' affairs and in serving his fellow veterans.

At his death, Omar Ketchum was executive director of the Washington office, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. A veteran of World War I, Mr. Ketchum served as commander of the Philip Dillard VFW Post No. 1650 in Topeka, Kans., in the 1930's; as national VFW chief of staff from 1939 to 1940, then as national organization director of membership, and in 1941 was appointed national legislative director, and, finally, executive director of the Washington office, with the responsibility for supervision of all functions of the office in the Nation's Capital.

Legislation of particular interest to Omar Ketchum was the Veteran's Preference Act of 1944, the GI bill, and legislation through the years relating to compensation and hospitalization benefits. A powerful speaker, and constantly in demand, Omar had visited every State in the Nation, some as often as 15 times.

Comrade Ketchum was a strong believer in citizens participation in government and strongly believed that veterans who had risked their lives for the preservation of our Republic should be active and not sit idly by or avoid participation in government and politics. Based on this belief, from 1931 to 1935, he served as mayor of Topeka, Kans. In 1934 he was the Democrat nominee for Governor of Kansas, and in 1936 narrowly lost his bid for a seat in the U.S. Senate against incumbent, Arthur Capper.

Surviving are his wife, Edna G. Ketchum, of 5905 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.; five children, Ronald, of 2939 Bryan Street, Alexandria; Arlene, of the home address; Thomas, of Topeka, Kans.; William, of Coffeyville, Kans.; and Mrs. James Rexroat, of Kansas City, Kans. Another son, Jack B., an Air Force pilot, was killed in Europe in World War II.

Omar Ketchum was dedicated to the Veterans of Foreign Wars principle that we should "Honor the dead by helping the living," and I feel certain thousands of comrades throughout the land, who were privileged to know him, will do so to honor the memory of a friend and comrade.

SUPERULTIMATE IN MISREPRESENTATION BY WASHINGTON POST—"SLIPPERY WETBACKS"

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, there is an editorial entitled "Slippery Wetbacks" in this morning's, July 30, Washington Post.

This article is the superultimate in misrepresentation and inaccuracy. The editors of the Post should be thoroughly ashamed of themselves. The title or heading "Slippery Wetbacks" is indicative of the fact that the Post editors know absolutely nothing about the bracero program. Mexican farm laborers, imported under the provisions of Public Law 78, are in this country, legally and properly, for short periods of time to help with the harvesting of our crops, pursuant to Federal law and a treaty with the Republic of Mexico. They cannot be employed if there is a domestic laborer who wants a job.

The term "wetbacks" refers to illegal entrants who swim the Rio Grande—when there is any water in it—to get across the border. Before the Public Law 78 program, a million of these wetbacks, or illegal entrants, came to this country every year. Since Public Law 78, the number of wetbacks has dropped to a few thousand. Anyone who knows anything about the situation believes the number of illegals will rise sharply again if Public Law 78 is not extended.

There are scores of newspapers in California with editors just as humanitarian and just as prolabor as those who write for the Washington Post. The difference is that they know the truth about the bracero program and know it works to the benefit, not only of the farmer, but also to related industry and domestic labor—such as canneries, cannery workers; packinghouses, packinghouse workers; and trucking concerns and truckdrivers—to say nothing of the housewife and merchant. If the bracero program were abolished, the problems of school, welfare, and police officials would be greatly increased. There is neither time nor space here to elaborate on this side effect, but any such public official in bracero-using regions knows very well that this statement is completely accurate.

Excerpts from two of these liberal, progressive, humanitarian, friendly-to-labor California newspapers follow. They are typical of many more.

[From the Ventura County (Calif.) Star-Free Press, June 3, 1963]

UNCERTAIN FUTURE FOR AGRICULTURE

Congress works in mysterious ways. For many years now, Congress has authorized crop support payment to farmers, most of whom are concentrated in the South and Midwest, to assure them a profit. The program has been carried out only at great expense to the Nation. Yet, this same Congress turns around and in one swoop pulls the rug out from under California farmers, who receive no subsidies or other assistance, by ordering the bracero program out of existence at the end of this year. It has been opposed by moralists who view the program as some sort of slave system; how, then, do they explain the fact that Mexican nationals fight for the privilege of crossing into the United States to work under the program?

[From the Fresno (Calif.) Bee, June 5, 1963]

CURB ON BRACERO LABOR WOULD HIT FARMERS HARD

In effect, the House as much as said it cares not whether the California farmer gets help in the quantity he needs to harvest his crops. All those vitally concerned only can hope Congress will reconsider, that it more patiently will hear the valid testimony which so strongly argues the case for the use of braceros. Meantime, this is the dilemma in which California finds itself.

Fact No. 1: Without braceros, California is short by 60,000 laborers in the number needed to harvest its crops. This becomes especially significant when it is considered this lack of labor seriously endangers a $3.25-billion-a-year industry, and the $14 billion agriculture contributes to the total State economy through allied services and industries.

Fact No. 2: American farm laborers will not hire out for stoop labor. How many farmers have complained they just could not recruit domestic help for this kind of labor, however much they offered?

Fact No. 3: The agitation by organized labor opposing the bracero program is built upon myths and quarter truths. The bracero does not take labor away from the domestic workers; he merely fills a job nobody else will do.

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, for the past 5 years, I have had the privilege of serving on the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy. On the Board's visit to the Academy this year, I was honored by being elected chairman of the 1963 Board of Visitors.

As chairman, I should like to call the attention of the Members to the enclosed Report of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, New London, Conn., on April 26, 1963.

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY, NEW LONDON, CONN., APRIL 26, 1963

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.
The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

GENTLEMEN: Pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, the following Senators and Members of the House of Representatives were designated to constitute the 1963 Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

By the President of the Senate: Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut. By the Senate Committee on Commerce: Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington (ex officio): Senator E. L. BARTLETT, Democrat, of Alaska; Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

By the Speaker of the House: Representative WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, Democrat, of Connecticut; Representative PATRICK MINOR MARTIN, Republican, of California.

By the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee: Representative HERBERT C. BONNER, Democrat, of North Carolina (ex officio); Representative EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Democrat, of Maryland; Representative ALTON LENNON, Democrat, of North Carolina, and Representative WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, Republican, of California.

MEETING

A meeting of the Board of Visitors was held at the Academy on April 26, 1963. The following members of the Board were present: Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut; Senator E. L. BARTLETT, of Alaska; Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania; Representative WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, of Connecticut; Represenative PATRICK MINOR MARTIN, of California; and Representative WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, of California (chairman).

The following officials of the Coast Guard were also present: From headquarters: Vice Adm. Donald McG. Morrison, Acting Commandant; Capt. Mark A. Whalen, liaison officer; Comdr. Robert D. Johnson, aide to Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; and Comdr. John D. McCann, administrative aide to the Commandant; from the Academy: Rear Adm. Willard J. Smith, Superintendent; Capt. Frank V. Helmer, Assistant Superintendent; Capt. Chester I. Steele, commandant of cadets; Capt. Stanley L. Smith, dean of academics; Capt. Thorburn S. McGowan, USPHS, senior medical officer; Comdr. James W. Moreau, chief, plant and personnel division; Comdr. Otto E. Graham, chief, athletics activities division; Comdr. Alvin N. Ward, comptroller; Mr. Paul H. Johnson, librarian, and other members of the Academy staff.

ARRIVAL, BRIEFING, AND INSPECTION OF BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Upon arrival at the Academy, military honors were rendered to the visiting members of the Congressional Board of Visitors. The Superintendent and selected staff officers then met with the Board of Visitors for an informal briefing session in connection with the progress of the construction program at the Coast Guard Academy. Members of the Board then made a tour of the Coast Guard Academy grounds and buildings. Following this, Board members were guests of the corps of cadets in the cadet wardroom for the noon meal.

BOARD SESSION

After lunch the Board members were joined by Coast Guard officers in formal session. Representative **WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD** was unanimously elected chairman of the 1963 Board of Visitors.

SYNOPSIS OF THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD SESSION

1. The chairman expressed for the Board of Visitors satisfaction for the privilege of membership on the Board and its association with the U.S. Coast Guard Academy. At the suggestion of the chairman, the Superintendent made a summary, outlined herein, of his written statement to the Board of Visitors.

2. The Superintendent initially made comments concerning some of the matters discussed at the 1962 meeting of the Congressional Board of Visitors. Information presented by Rear Admiral Smith indicated that an electronic digital computer had been acquired for educational use at the Academy and that delivery was expected sometime after July 1, 1963. The Academy library received additional financial support during the past fiscal year and it is anticipated that additional funds will become available for the forthcoming fiscal year. The Superintendent announced that five new civilian faculty members had been appointed to the staff and that two appointments were made recently to the permanent commissioned teaching staff at the Academy. An item of great interest to the Board of Visitors was the Superintendent's announcement that the Commandant of the Coast Guard, following the recommendation of the Coast Guard Academy Advisory Committee, had approved the use of the college entrance examination board test as the criterion for the Academy's annual nationwide competitive entrance examination. The CEEB will be used for the first time on December 7, 1963, commencing with the class of 1968. Annually thereafter, the competitive entrance examination for appointment as cadet, U.S. Coast Guard, will consist of the scholastic aptitude test, including the verbal and mathematical sections, plus the achievement tests in intermediate or advance mathematics (option) and English composition. Following the Superintendent's remarks on these matters, members of the Board of Visitors expressed their interest in the continuing support of the Academy library and their satisfaction that the acquisition of the digital computer had become a reality. It was pointed out by various members of the Board that the Coast Guard officers of the future would have occasion to use the knowledge acquired as a cadet in the field of computer science.

ACADEMIC DIVISION

1. The educational philosophy of the Coast Guard Academy has a threefold application: (1) to provide through precept and example a situation that will graduate young men with sound bodies, stout hearts, and alert minds with a liking for the sea and its lore; (2) to provide an educational background that will contribute to the constant search for knowledge that must accompany the future administrators of the service; (3) to provide professional training so that graduates may assume their immediate duties as junior officers afloat.

2. Changes in the curriculum are made from time to time with the approval of the Academy advisory committee and the Commandant of the Coast Guard. The Academy insists on physical education and an intensive sports program as one of the major means of implementing (1) above. Physical education classes are required in all 4 years.

3. During the past academic year, it was reported that Coast Guard cadets had attended and participated in various college student conferences in the United States, among them being the 14th Student Conference at West Point; the Texas A. & M. SCONA VIII Conference at College Station, Tex.; the Principia College Conference at Elsah, Ill.; the Air Force Academy Assembly in Colorado and the Naval Academy's Foreign Affairs Conference at Annapolis, Md.

4. Members of the Board noted that 217 cadets were named to the academic honors list after the completion of the fall term 1962–63. Of this number, 23 cadets were named for high honors awards. This latter distinction requires a semester average of not less than 90.00.

5. The Superintendent reported that the Academy advisory committee, composed of distinguished educators, professional and businessmen, had concluded its 68th meeting at the Coast Guard Academy during the period April 1–3, 1963. This committee is chiefly concerned with matters pertaining to the curriculum and the faculty. Detailed visits made by individual members of the advisory committee to the various academic departments and divisions of the Academy insures the continuing review of the Academy academic program and thereby assists the Superintendent in his efforts to maintain the high standards necessary for educating and training cadets for lifetime careers as officers in the U.S. Coast Guard.

ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION

1. In discussing the cadet administrative division, Board members commented favorably on the efforts made by the Commandant of cadets and his staff of company officers to develop in cadets qualities of leadership and character essential for commissioned officers in the U.S. Coast Guard. It was pointed out that the company officer has command responsibility to the company to which assigned, including training, administration, discipline, morale, health and welfare. In order to develop leadership qualities and capabilities in the senior cadets, the company officer supervises the operation of the cadet company through the cadet chain of command.

2. Cadets attend divine services of their own choosing each week either at the Academy chapel or at a local church. Prominent religious leaders are often invited to be present as guest speakers. A Protestant and Roman Catholic chaplain are assigned to the Academy staff by the U.S. Navy. A local rabbi, a representative of the Jewish Welfare Board, is available for special religious ministry to Jewish personnel.

ATHLETIC ACTIVITIES DIVISION

1. The Superintendent reported to the Board of Visitors that the philosophy at the Coast Guard Academy, in relation to athletics, recognizes the values of physical activity, teamplay, and competitive sportsmanship, as essential elements of a cadet's education. Every cadet is required to participate in either a varsity or an intercompany sport in two out of the three seasons during the sports year. Physical education is compulsory for all cadets during the 4-year course of study. Sports activities at the Academy have been limited somewhat in the past because of the shortage of facilities. However, the projected fieldhouse and renovation of the present gymnasium will serve to remedy this situation. A noteworthy item mentioned was that more than one-third of the cadet corps competes in some form of varsity or junior varsity athletics during each season of the year. Approximately three-fourths of the athletic coaches are faculty members of academic departments and coach part time on a collateral duty basis. The objectives of the physical education program are to develop and maintain a high degree of physical fitness, to develop understanding, appreciation, and skills in a wide variety of sports activities to develop leadership through athletic competition, and to create a desire to enjoy and participate in exercise and sports throughout an officer's career.

SUMMER TRAINING

1. The instruction cadets receive in professional subjects during the academic year is supplemented by summer programs of practical application and professional training. These summer training programs afford cadets opportunities to apply the principles that they have learned in class and to develop the basic seagoing proficiency, service competence, and leadership ability needed to enable them to perform effectively at the junior officer level. A large part of this practical training is accomplished afloat. For this purpose the cadet practice squadron formed each year consists of the 1,800-ton training bark, *Eagle*, plus two modern class A Coast Guard cutters. The *Eagle* is manned and operated almost entirely by Academy officers and cadets, plus a small unit of enlisted men. The cutters are manned by their regular operating crews, somewhat reduced in size, supplemented by cadets and a few officers from the Academy.

2. The *Eagle* paid a visit to Washington, D.C. in August of 1962. Members of the Board who attended the ceremonial visit by the President aboard the *Eagle* remarked that this was an occasion long to be remembered. Furthermore, this demonstrated the President's active interest in the overall program of instruction and leadership training at the Coast Guard Academy.

3. While the long summer cruise for the first and third classes is in progress, cadets of the new fourth class undergo an intensive 6-weeks period of military orientation, indoctrination and training in basic seamanship, physical education, Coast Guard history and service traditions. Cadets of the second class participate in this program as leaders and instructors. Additionally, cadets of the second class undergo shore base training in aviation indoctrination, combat information center instruction and observe firsthand the operations of a Coast Guard district office, including search and rescue, maritime law enforcement, aids to navigation, merchant marine inspection, ocean station patrol, port security, and military readiness.

CADET FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION

1. Members of the Board noted with some alarm that the estimated balance in a cadet's account has progressively deteriorated over the past several years. The balance available to a cadet upon graduation is critical inasmuch as it should be sufficient to cover the cost of necessary items of officers' uniforms and equipment, a modest wardrobe of civilian clothing, and living expenses during the 30-day graduation leave. Members of the Board recalled that the 1962 Congressional Board of Visitors recommended to the Department of Defense that the inadequacy of present cadet/midshipmen compensation be remedied. To date, no action has been taken on this recommendation.

PLANT AND PERSONNEL DIVISION

1. The Board of Visitors was pleased to note that the last portion of the project to convert the garage and shop areas for academic use was completed in time for the opening of the fall term, September 1962. Equally gratifying was the progress noted on the enlisted men's barracks building scheduled for completion in June of this

year. Upon transfer of enlisted personnel to this new facility, the present Yeaton Hall will undergo alterations and conversion from a barracks building to spaces for professional studies. As noted elsewhere in this report, major improvements scheduled for the next fiscal year include alterations to the present infirmary building and construction of a field house.

2. In order to maintain properly the physical plant and to operate efficiently the various messes, laboratories, shops and equipment at the Academy, the Coast Guard Academy maintains a personnel allowance of 303 enlisted men. Assisting this military force is a group of 57 classified and 41 wage board civil service employees.

MEDICAL DIVISION

1. Members of the Board were informed that the infirmary is administered by the senior medical officer assigned by the Public Health Service, under the direction of the Superintendent of the Coast Guard Academy. This officer has additional duty as senior medical officer for the U.S. Coast Guard Training Station, Groton, Conn.

2. The primary mission of the infirmary is the care of cadets and the supporting Academy staff, and in addition the necessary medical care for the 1,400 active duty personnel assigned to the training station and Coast Guard Institute at Groton is provided. Members of the Board expressed satisfaction with the operation of the medical division. It was the consensus that when the facilities of the infirmary are renovated that steps should be taken to provide an adequate professional staff in terms of number and professional competence.

CONCLUSION

1. Following the presentation of the Superintendent's report to the Congressional Board, a general discussion period ensued. Various members of the Superintendent's staff responded to questions from members of the Board. All Coast Guard participants were then excused and the Board of Visitors met in executive session. At the conclusion of the executive session of the 1963 Board of Visitors, various cadets met with members of the Board in an informal manner. Following this meeting with cadets, the 1963 Congressional Board of Visitors were honored by a military review of the cadet corps.

2. The Board of Visitors wishes to make public its appreciation to the Superintendent, Rear Adm. Willard J. Smith, and all members of his staff, for the efforts made to maintain the high standards required in all phases of the Coast Guard Academy's program. Additionally, members of the Board extend their thanks to Vice Adm. Donald McG. Morrison, Acting Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard, and Capt. Mark A. Whalen, liaison officer, for the assistance rendered. The chairman and members would like to remark that the highlight of the entire visit was the opportunity to talk directly with cadets and to see firsthand the dedicated enthusiasm of these outstanding young Americans toward their chosen profession.

Wm. S. Mailliard,
Chairman, Representative from California.
Thomas J. Dodd,
Senator from Connecticut.
E. L. Bartlett,
Senator from Alaska.
Hugh Scott,
Senator from Pennsylvania.
William L. St. Onge,
Representative from Connecticut.
Patrick Minor Martin,
Representative from California.

ELEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to insert into the Record a telegram sent by the mayor of the great city of New York, the Honorable Robert F. Wagner to the Honorable Luis Muñoz Marín, Governor of Puerto Rico on the occasion of the 11th anniversary of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

I consider it a great privilege to do this inasmuch as a substantial portion of my constituency consists of those who were former residents of Puerto Rico. As Mayor Wagner says in his message:

> The social, economic, and political achievements of Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans are sources of pride for us all.

Text of telegram follows:

> On the occasion of the 11th anniversary of the Commonwealth, I extend to you and to Puerto Rico the best wishes of the 8 million people of New York City. So closely linked together are we in a hundred ways that today every New Yorker feels closely related to Puerto Rico, and your inhabitants in turn consider New York their second home.
>
> New Yorkers have observed with prideful wonder the dynamic political status achieved by Puerto Rico 11 years ago. There has been an expanding recognition of this unique status not only in Washington but throughout the world.
>
> Similarly dynamic has been the increasing economic interdependence between Puerto Rico and the mainland.
>
> The social, economic, and political achievements of Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans are sources of pride for us all and of congratulations to all of you.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Robert F. Wagner,
> *Mayor, City of New York.*

PRICE OF RAW SUGAR FALLS TO 7 CENTS A POUND

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the published import price of raw sugar, duty paid, at New York, fell yesterday a half cent a pound to 7 cents. This is good news for American housewives and consumers. It is a figure only thirty-seven hundredths of a cent higher than the price last January and within the range of the so-called normal price of raw sugar. Futures prices were also down the maximum from the day before, and on the world contract, some futures sales were being made at less than 6 cents a pound.

Mr. Speaker, the price of raw sugar reached 13.2 cents a pound on May 23 when the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency was assigned by committee chairman, Wright Patman, to look into the price spiral in sugar. Our inquiry is still in progress, as we continue to piece together the facts behind the fantastic surge in sugar prices at every level of distribution.

Retail prices of sugar have been slow in following the wholesale price downward, just as the wholesale price has been slow in following down the reductions in raw sugar quotations. However, in fairness, it should be pointed out that on the upsurge, wholesale and retail price increases had also lagged behind the sensational increases in raw sugar prices—which almost doubled between April 1 and May 23.

Some refiners, I understand, are buying some raw sugar on long-term purchase commitments at prices above the level at which they are selling refined sugar. The entire industry was turned upside down by the price spiral, and the consumer has suffered accordingly.

Now that the sugar situation is gradually returning to normal, housewives should look for further cuts in retail prices, and I wouldn't be surprised to see some of the stores once again featuring sugar as a sales leader. In the meantime, the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs intends to follow through with our study of the factors, including tremendous speculative activity and a great deal of hoarding, which contributed to the spiral this spring. We have to know the history of what has happened in the past in order to prevent similar occurrences in the future.

ALLIED SHIPS TO CUBA NOW OUTNUMBER REDS'

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the traffic in allied ships which continue to call in Cuba now outnumbers the ships Russia itself is sending to the island.

This shocking new evidence means that our allies are now carrying more than half of Russia's supply burden to Communist Castro.

It is clear U.S. efforts to discourage allied shipping to Cuba have not been successful.

In a news conference earlier this month, State Department spokesmen remarked that "regarding the degree of cooperation we are receiving, we are in general satisfied." Well, information I have obtained from the Navy and the Maritime Administration shows no record to be satisfied with.

For example, during the month of May 44 allied ships went to Cuba as compared to 38 Russian ships. Tentative figures for June show 39 allied ships, as compared to 31 Russian ships, and July figures which are incomplete as yet, show 16 free world ships as compared to 14 Russian vessels.

Not only does continued allied shipping to Cuba aid the Castro economy, but allows the Soviets to divert ships normally employed in Cuban supply runs to use in other parts of the world.

There is no reason for our allies to continue this shipping. The American people want it stopped. I have introduced legislation, H.R. 7687, which would close U.S. ports to any nation which allows its ships to go to Cuba. Enactment of my bill would cut this shipping off.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, in the short time the Alliance for Progress has been in existence, over 140,000 homes, 8,200 classrooms, 1,500 water systems and wells, and 900 hospitals and health centers have been constructed. Although this represents only the beginning, the Alliance for Progress should feel very proud of its success. Its initial emphasis on the development of institutional structures for self-sustaining growth are evident by these visible signs of progress; 140,000 homes means that 700,000 people were settled in their own dwellings these first 2 years.

Over and above that, this program has been the first development of a major and significant nature in 30 years that our country has made to assert its natural leadership in the Western Hemisphere. At this crucial juncture in which we will soon be debating the future development from our standpoint of the Alliance for Progress, I feel it is incumbent upon us to realize some of the definite strides and successes that have been made under the leadership and the efforts of the Alliance for Progress, under its distinguished Ambassador, Teodoro Moscoso.

Mr. Speaker, I am including in my remarks a very dramatic and eloquent article which appeared recently in a local newspaper. It reads as follows:

Self-Aid Programs Urged on the Latins

(By Dan Kurzman)

President Kennedy valiantly tried to fire the hopes and imaginations of the Latin American masses when he announced plans in early 1961 for an Alliance for Progress designed to revolutionize their continent socially and economically.

The program, a multination effort, the President stressed, would be geared primarily to an improvement in the living standards of the people, reaching down to the most remote mud-hut village.

The announcement, however, produced relatively little enthusiasm among most Latin Americans, who, exploited for centuries by domestic oligarchies and United States economic interests, have good reason to be cynical.

"The Alliance for Progress," one Panamanian peasant told me several months ago, "has something to do with politics. It does not concern people like me."

The success of the Alliance may depend on our convincing such humble Latins in the near future that it does indeed concern them. How persuasive has the United States been so far? After a slow start, it appears to be gradually making headway.

One reason for the slow start is that Alliance officials never have been able to agree on how best to channel economic and technical aid into the villages and city slums. Some have stressed long-term economic projects, such as dams, highways, and factories, whose benefits gradually would seep down to the peasants and workers. Others have emphasized social projects—hospitals, schools, water systems—that would have a direct impact on the people.

At first, the accent was on economic aid, but in the past several months, greater interest has been manifested in the social aspects of the program. Since the Alliance was inaugurated, committed funds intended at least partly for social purposes have totaled $1.2 billion, slightly more than half of all U.S. aid granted to Latin America.

The Alliance so far has produced 140,000 houses, 8,200 classrooms, 4 million textbooks, 160,000 agricultural credit loans, 1,500 community water systems, and 900 medical centers. Food for Peace has fed about 15 million people.

These figures represent only a tiny fraction of Latin America's social needs, but they nevertheless constitute a substantial accomplishment considering that the program started from scratch only 2 years ago.

Even so, quite a few Latins fail to identify many of these projects with the Alliance, nor do some particularly appreciate such projects. They feel, incredibly enough, that if their fathers and grandfathers got along without modernization, so can they. And in any event, even factory bosses and feudal landlords who have exploited them have often grudgingly granted them, paternalistic benefits, if only to ease troubled consciences.

The answer to such grassroots indifference now is being sought to an increasing extent in a previously minor aspect of the Alliance—community development, the systematic participation by the people in the national development process.

Only if the people themselves are taught to organize development programs, and to implement them, experts are convinced, will the Alliance have real meaning to them. A community that is suddenly presented with a school on a silver platter is strangely prone to criticize the location, the size of the classrooms or the teaching system. But a community that itself decides it needs a school, and builds it, never fails to cherish its creation.

Equally important, community action is the first step toward a practical understanding of democracy, requiring individuals to think for themselves.

Some Peace Corps leaders say that the Agency for International Development, which doles out most of the U.S. aid funds, is neglecting community development in favor of grandiose development projects of less impact. And within AID itself, experts are divided on the role the agency should play in this field.

But for all these differences, U.S. officials dealing with the Alliance appear to agree unanimously on the necessity of expanding community development programs.

In view of the Peace Corps' intrinsically grassroots function, it has probably had greater impact on Latin Americans—in the areas where it is operating—than any other agency. More than 1,700 volunteers are helping impoverished Latins to identify and meet their needs, which may include athletic fields, rural clinics, aqueducts, wells, bridges, schools, cooperatives, and libraries.

Though AID tends to think less in terms of intimate impact assistance than in terms of long-range development, it, too, is gearing its operations closer to the community level, often against the advice of economic and technical experts.

Perhaps its most successful experiment has been a mobile medical unit program in Central America. Sixty hospital-jeeps each with a doctor and nurse, make the rounds of about 600 villages in 6 countries. While patients wait for treatment, a public health official of the recipient government explains what the Alliance means.

Peasants who never before paid for medical services are charged a nominal fee, which is contributed to a village fund to be used for community development purposes.

In Venezuela, AID has granted $30 million for slum clearance, municipal improvements, and the establishment of cooperatives—a sum matched by the Venezuelan Government. In September a program will be inaugurated in Caracas to train students from other Latin American countries in community development techniques.

In Colombia, AID is helping to finance several housing and school construction projects in which the people are participating. In hungry northeast Brazil, a U.S. community development expert plans to use American surplus food as payment for work on village projects as a means of stimulating community action.

AID, moreover, hopes to sign a contract with Cornell University this month under which Cornell experts will try to convert 2,400 impoverished villages in Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador into prosperous model communities through self-help techniques. The Agency also plans to back community development projects in the Dominican Republic.

Many of the most dramatic examples of community development can be traced to private voluntary agencies and foundations which are contributing an estimated $100 million a year to community health, child feeding, educational and other projects.

Perhaps the most remarkable of these organizations is a private peace corps called Action, which today maintains about 80 volunteers in Venezuela. With a $230,000 annual budget, the organization is helping to make slum areas livable with water pipes, baseball fields and community centers. It is establishing factory cooperatives to show what free enterprise can do.

Although financed largely by many of the largest American and Latin private companies, including the United States Steel Corp. and Gulf Oil Corp., Accion recently has accepted some assistance from AID as the result of increasing expenses. The organization plans to expand its activities to Mexico, the Dominican Republic and other Latin nations soon.

With community projects among the most successful efforts undertaken since the Alliance was born, many observers view increased use of this approach as the best possible answer to Communist activity in the slums and villages—and the surest way to spur peaceful revolution.

THANKS OF THE CONGRESS TO ALABAMA TUBERCULOSIS ASSOCIATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the House is indebted to our colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Roberts] for recently arranging respiratorial tests for Members of Congress. We are also deeply indebted to those individuals and institutions from the great State of Alabama who have developed these tests and made these available to us. I, for one, was particularly gratified that at least four of these fine citizens gave up their vacations in order to make this service to the Members of Congress possible. Every Member knows the entire staff worked tirelessly while they were here.

Mr. Speaker, a brief history of this matter will be of interest to the House.

Several months ago in December 1962 during the national Conference on Air Pollution, the executive director of the Alabama Tuberculosis Association, Mr. K. W. Grimley and the director of this association, Mrs. Julia Townsend, contacted the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] with an important request concerning the recently discovered lung disease, emphysema.

They pointed out that due to the cooperative efforts of 31 Alabama county tuberculosis associations, the Alabama Medical Center, and the U.S. Public Health Service an examination had been developed which could detect the first symptoms of emphysema which is now believed to be one of the leading causes of death and disability.

The examination was made possible by a device developed by the brilliant young physician, Dr. Ben Branscomb of Birmingham, Ala.

This device, known as the flow volume loop machine, tests the ability of people to exhale or expel air from their lungs. Emphysema comes from the Greek word meaning "elasticity."

One's lungs work like a blacksmith's bellows and this disease was first discovered among horses which were described as "windbroken."

So it was that man's early form of transportation became first seriously affected by this disease.

Due to the increase in urbanization, this disease is more widespread than ever before in our country. This is due to the fact that over 100 million of our people are now living on 10 percent of the land area. The transformation of our country from an agricultural nation to one of urban living is responsible, it is believed, for this situation.

Persons over 40 are most seriously affected by emphysema. It is a serious disease for people who have any illness affecting the lungs and is fatal in a great many cases. Its effects can be reduced with modern drugs and medical techniques.

It now costs this country at least $60 million a year in social security payments.

The diligent care and extreme devotion to duty exercised by the officers and directors, the nurses, office personnel and technicians, and the cooperation of the Public Health Service and the Department of the Army were most commendable, and the thanks of the Congress are due these wonderful people who came to Washington at the invitation and suggestion of our colleague [Mr. ROBERTS] chairman of the Public Health and Safety Subcommitee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

I am sure that I speak the unanimous sentiment of the House when I extend my heartfelt thanks to these dedicated and wonderful people.

MORE ERRONEOUS STATEMENTS ABOUT THE BRACERO PROGRAM

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, another false impression concerning the bracero program has been created by an insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 8, 1963, page 12197.

I believe that if there are valid arguments against the bracero program, resort to false and misleading statements should not be necessary.

A Miss Fay Bennett, an assumed name of a married person who has never been to California—hearings, page 256—and knows nothing firsthand of the bracero program in California, other than what she reads in newspaper clippings—hearings, page 357—is quoted in the RECORD. "Miss" Bennett is an executive secretary of the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor—consisting of no farmers or farm laborers—of East Nineteenth Street, New York City. The letterhead of this organization includes William L. Batt, Jr.—our ARA Administrator? if so, he should stick to ARA or farm labor problems—mutually, exclusively—Helen Gahagan Douglas, Norman Thomas and others I do not know.

She is an executive director for at least one other nonprofit organization called National Sharecroppers Fund. I do not know the names of any other participants in this organization.

She cited some "statistics" showing that 96.6 percent of Imperial County, Calif., farm wages were paid by farmers whose annual wage payments exceeded $5,000 to prove that "most braceros are employed on large-scale and prosperous farms."

In my section of California we have many small farmers who hire more than 2 people and pay more than $5,000 a year in farm wages. Her figures falsify the true situation.

The publisher of the above insertion wrote "20 percent of the larger growers can get cheap labor at perhaps 50 cents an hour."

I challenge the publisher to produce any evidence of a single bracero who was paid 50 cents an hour. I contend, without fear of contradiction, that no bracero was paid as little as 50 cents an hour in 1962 or 1963—not even in Texas. The suggestion that 20 percent of the growers, large or small, pay as little as 50 cents per hour is nothing less than false.

Bracero labor is not "cheap." In California, both the bracero and domestic farm laborer are paid at least $1 per hour and an average wage of approximately $1.40 per hour. Does any industry pay better for the work done or the skills required?

GOLD FLOW PROBLEM

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, last week I inserted in the RECORD an editorial on the gold flow problem which was broadcast over radio station WCNL of Newport, N.H. Mr. W. Richard Carlson, owner and operator of the station has again come clearly to the point of a current situation and at the same time demonstrated the value of forthright expression of opinion over the radio. This time his editorial concerns my own bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to remove the tax on telephone and telegraph service to and from points outside the United States. Once again, because both the subject matter and the question of broadcast editorials themselves are current ones, I thought my colleagues would be interested in Mr. Carlson's excellent editorial which follows:

A WCNL EDITORIAL, SUNDAY, JULY 21, 1963

Here is a WCNL editorial, presented as a public service by this station.

This past week, Congressman JAMES C. CLEVELAND introduced in the House of Representatives a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the tax on toll telephone service and telegraph service to or from points outside the United States. WCNL endorses this legislation, and, as a matter of record, we have urged that such legislation be adopted in correspondence dating back several months.

Naturally, we have a personal interest in the legislation, and readily admit to it, but at the same time, we have supported such legislation for the very reasons which Congressman CLEVELAND advanced in his remarks on the floor of the House—because it is a tax which is legally avoidable and which is therefore unenforcible, and penalizes only those who don't use their Yankee ingenuity to avoid it.

Any family with relatives overseas, for example, who wish to talk by phone with those relatives, need only, (1) write them a letter and tell them to call on such-and-such a date and time, (2) receive the call on the appointed date and time, and (3) then send their check overseas to pay for the call on the other side. This does two things, both of which are undesirable from the point of view of our Government, and both of which will be avoided with the elimination of the tax. First, when we pay for a call on the other side of the ocean, the earnings accrue—not to our American Telephone & Telegraph system, but to the foreign company, which is unfair to the U.S. industry, and second, we further add to the flow of dollars from our country, something which Mr. Kennedy wants to slow down. Thus, it seems sound thinking on the part of our Congress to act promptly to pass this amendment.

The precedent for the amendment already exists. There is a transportation tax on fares paid to U.S. airlines operating domestic flights; foreign carriers can be made to collect these, too, when they operate over U.S. territory, but since foreign carriers could not be made to collect U.S. taxes on international flights, our Government very soundly dropped any attempts to collect the transportation tax on all international flights, lest they put U.S. carriers at a disadvantage by trying to collect such a tax on fares for their use—a tax which couldn't be collected on fares charged for international flights by foreign flag carriers. In just the same manner, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. should not be made to collect a 10-percent tax on the use of international facilities, because foreign governments or companies do not have to charge such a tax to their subscribers on the other end when the call originates outside the United States. And any person using this means of avoiding the tax—which most Americans deem an "unfair" tax anyway—is quite legally within bounds by using the method which I have described.

Congressman CLEVELAND said in his remarks, "In fairness to all, such a tax should be repealed. No tax which can be so easily avoided, is in fact being avoided in a widespread manner, and is incapable of proper enforcement, should be allowed to stand on the books." To which we say "Amen," and we hope that the majority of Representatives and Senators will also say "Aye" when the measure comes up for a vote.

This WCNL editorial has been presented as a service to our listeners. Your comments are always welcome.

WELCOME WORDS

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may extend her remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on April 11, 1963, at Live Oak, Fla., Edward P. Cliff, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, made a significant speech concerning the individual woodland owners of America. This speech has attracted much attention on the part of landowners, foresters, and other interested individuals througout the Nation.

I would like to submit for the RECORD a very complimentary editorial about Mr. Cliff and his remarks at Live Oak, Fla., that appeared in the Seattle Post Intelligencer on July 8, 1963:

WELCOME WORDS

Pacific Northwesterners always take an interest in a newly appointed Chief Forester of the United States.

We think Forest Chief Edward P. Cliff looks better all the time. Recently, in open meeting and right out loud, he said, "The small tree farmer is not a statistic. He or she is a person, an individual."

This in itself is a breath of fresh air from the regions of bureaucracy. But the Chief Forester did not stop there. He said: "No forestry program, private or public, can be expected to succeed unless it gives full consideration to the needs and desires of the individual landowner. * * * The woodland owner may choose to dedicate a 30-acre field in his forest to a profitmaking fish pond and to upland game fee hunting.

"To the owner needing these extra dollars it can be the chance to secure an income from multiple use of his land while his trees grow into a more profitable size."

Coming as it does from a highly placed Federal official this may be considered heresy in some quarters. However, we think it's great.

THE WORLD WE MAKE FOR YOUTH

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may extend her remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the American Home Economics Association held its 54th annual convention on June 25, 1963, at Kansas City, Mo., and the keynote address was delivered by Richard W. Reuter, Director of our Nation's food-for-peace program.

Mr. Reuter, in his remarks, spoke in very human terms of the scope, aims and accomplishments of Public Law 480 and the food-for-peace program and I would like to submit for reprinting in the RECORD the substance of his speech.

THE WORLD WE MAKE FOR YOUTH

(By Richard W. Reuter)

We talk sometimes almost glibly of one-half to two-thirds of the people being hungry. One of the World Food Congress studies suggests that out of the total, some 16 nations are well fed, some 419 million or 15 percent of the world population. Twelve nations have inadequate diets, diets which are short of animal protein. They constitute another 15 percent of the world population. Of the total 61 nations, almost 2 billion people, 69 percent of the population of this world, are poorly fed or hungry.

It is very difficult to talk of food surpluses when this is the case. There is actually a danger—and this was recognized so well in the last 2 weeks—of becoming hypnotized by the mere figures and forgetting the implications and the impact above this upon human beings.

At the conference in Quito, Ecuador, we did make an attempt to develop a pattern of cooperation among U.S. officials in the field to see if we couldn't use our own food resources and to help develop their food resources more effectively in the development process.

One of the disturbing facts that was staring us in the face as we met in Quito, Ecuador, was that fact that only 500,000 people in that country are consumers. Three and one-half million people never really take part in the economy of the country, never really go to the marketplace.

Is not this really our basic problem, then? How do we bring the consumers, the potential consumers of the world, into the marketplace?

I recognize as I say this that it is much easier to say than it is to do. But we are determined that we shall do all within our power to see that more people are brought into the consuming part of our population, for their future should be to share in the bounties we are able to produce.

Another example that perhaps drives it home even more clearly is in the value of food consumed per person per day. In India it is a bare 10 cents a day. In the United States it is $1.07 a day. Yet food expenditures account for some three-fifths of the per capita income of India. Better than 60 percent of the wage is spent on food, and yet on an average it is a total of 10 cents a day.

The United States for the first time of any nation in history is now spending less than one-fifth of our per capita income on food. This last fall it dropped to something better than 19 cents out of $1 as the cost of providing food and living better than any people have ever lived before in the world.

As this starts to impinge upon our awareness I think it is very understandable that hardly a week goes by that we don't get one or two letters in the White House saying, "Why don't we use our surpluses to feed the hungry in the world?" This is always embarrassing because we in the last calendar year moved some $2,200 million worth of food, and I would think that the movement of that much commodity would not be such a well kept secret.

I haven't planned to talk too much about the food-for-peace program today and yet as I was with many of you yesterday I recognized how many even of the professionals in this room are not really familiar with much of the detail, and I think it is one of the exciting success stories of America, our use of food and our food producing capacity to meet human needs around the world.

The food-for-peace program is an effort to use our food resources as an asset rather than as a liability. When I talked to the International Federation of Agricultural Producers in Dublin who spent most of their time trying to find out how we can limit our production worldwide, I emphasized that the kind of thing we are trying to do in the United States is to make a hero out of the farmer instead of a villain for his ability to produce food. And we can do that only as we develop the institutions and the machinery for getting that food to people, people who need the food, people who now are learning to want that food, and develop the economies of people to the point in which they can purchase that food and so expand the whole circle of normal trade of the United States and of the world. I am convinced that we are not going to look toward a peaceful world until that day does come.

We are using our food to attempt to achieve America's foreign policy goals, and I say that without the least bit of reluctance, because our whole postwar history through each administration has emphasized that America's foreign policy goal lies in the strengthening of the nations of the free world. It is a building up of their independence and the strength and the ability of the individuals in those countries to live a better life. I am proud to be part of a country that has that as its foreign policy goal, because it is in our interest to have a stability and a growth in the world today, and the food that we have in abundance here and can help others to produce in abundance can really be a keystone in the development of that improved living for people everywhere.

Since 1954 when Congress passed Public Law 480, which is the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, with the enabling legislation for the food-for-peace program, the United States has shipped overseas each day, Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays included in the more than 8 years the equivalent of three 10,000-ton shiploads of food. I think it would be also interesting when you are doing your dreaming some day driving along to think for a moment what would happen to our economy if some week those three ships didn't leave each day carrying the bounty of our farms.

Under the donation phases of the program alone we are providing some form of supplementary ration to more than 100 million people every day in the year. About 75 percent of these are children, for we have found that as we move from the European phase of our operation in which we were primarily concerned with relief into the developing countries, it was not adequate to provide just relief; it was important to use our food in the kind of an organized program that strengthened the people who were the recipients to the point they no longer needed food assistance, or otherwise you had the danger of tending to pauperize, to destroy the initiative for production in the country itself. We found that one of the key ways, of course, is as we are doing in the United States with the same food, and this food is first made available for our own uses, we found that one of the key ways was the distribution through schools—pre-school children whenever you can reach them—but especially as you can develop a partnership with host countries in the development of a daily ration in the schools. You find, and some of you may have heard me say this, that many a father will send a child to school in order to get the ration even if he has to take an education at the same time.

We are reaching today one out of four children of school age in Latin America. Many people say, "Why doesn't the Alliance for Progress reach more people? Why doesn't it get through to human beings?" I just wish we would all stop for a moment and recognize that our use of food is the Alliance for Progress, this is a part of it, and we are reaching every community in many of the countries of Latin America with some form of food as we strengthen their educational system.

I wish you could have stood with me at a graduation—I think it was about the fifth grade—in one of the little schools and have seen the difference between those children who were leaving that day, having had a daily ration supplement, having gotten milk, having gotten a bun and lately many of them having cheese, having had an education, and seeing the brightness of those eyes and the alertness of those faces; and then have looked to the parents who were there, seeing the difference.

We are making a major contribution to the new generation and we are not going to solve the problems in countries for them; it is only going to be solved when these people come and start to have the strength and the ability and the interest and the desire to solve them for themselves, and it is going to start with this kind of a strengthening of the young people in countries—I think there are about 50 of them now sharing in some form of a school lunch, a national school lunch effort.

We have even gone so far in Sierra Leone at the present time as to distribute food in some of the outlying villages, in the tribal areas, and getting the parents together to help in the distribution of food to children, not who are in school but the school age children, and to see if we can start to use the ability to provide the food as an incentive to the parents to build the simple thatched shelter which is all they need for a school, and set up a school; instead of waiting until they have the school to feed the children, get the children who should be in the school and see if you can develop an interest on the part of the community to provide the facilities themselves. I think this is the kind of imaginative use of food that you would want us to do and that is going to really go a long way toward achieving this kind of a strengthening of people.

One of the newer uses of food actually has been in what is known as food-for-wages schemes. We are reaching now some 5 million people with programs in which they do a community program and in return receive some form of food as the wage because, as in Algeria where you had 8 years of bitter, violent civil strife you have almost half of the population without any opportunity at the present time for gainful employment and with little skill if the opportunity were there. We are providing food as wages for these people who have lived for 8 years by the gun to live now with the shovel and the hoe and their own hands, and to plant trees in a major reforestation effort in that country. If we are successful we will have helped Algeria make the transition from destruction to construction. We will have started to rebuild the concept of the dignity of work. We will have provided some skilled training to those people. And the cost of it? The cost of it has been the kind of cooperation which is required from Algerian and American, and in this case also French leadership, and American so-called surplus food which is making it possible to do this kind of an activity.

There is a pattern actually that the Incas had in Latin America that we have been able to capitalize on which is known as the mit'a. The mit'a is a form of community work. Long before we thought of community development they had a pattern in which the Indians of the area provided 1 day a month for work on a community project. This has somewhat fallen into disuse; it has fallen into some abuse. We are trying to reestablish this, and while we were outside of Quito we went up on a little mountainside and here were the Indians in a village who had never had a cash part in the economy in the past, here were Indians who were themselves, on their own time, building a road along the side of that mountain by their hands—when you realize what we could do with one bulldozer—but by their hands carving out this little road so that they could get into a deposit of stone and sand on the mountainside and sell this for road construction particularly in the city of Quito. For the first time these Indians in the small village will start to have a cash economy. They did it, not by waiting for somebody from outside to come in and save them, they did it because of this pattern of the mit'a, encouraged by food, which they can't give their time without some form of reward for this because they are on the verge of starvation. But with the food that we are able to provide they are now going to become—to a very large degree—self-sufficient with the result of their own hands.

I could go on in terms of the kind of imaginative uses that we are trying to make as we reach better than 100 million people every day with some form of food. This is the donation phase of the program. Most people in the United States think of our use of food under food for peace exclusively as a giveaway, as a donation. Actually this accounts for 28 percent of all the food that is shipped out of the United States. Seventy-two percent is under a form of sales pattern. Much of this at the present time, while some of it is under sale for long-term dollar credit, a little is under barter, but much of it is sale for the local currency of the country. I used to make speeches, and many of you have heard them, and some of you perhaps have given them, about we are kidding ourselves when we say this is a sale program because really it is kind of phony currency that you get.

We will save this year better than one-third of a billion dollars in dollars on our balance-of-payments problem by paying bills around the world with local currencies that were generated by the sale of our foods instead of by the sale of our dollars. Better than one-third of a billion dollars that was appropriated by the Congress to carry out the normal processes of government around the world—I am not talking about aid programs, the normal processes of government—one-third of a billion dollars will go back in the U.S. Treasury to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation and we will actually pay those bills using the food which we have sold to generate the currency which we have for what is known as U.S. uses.

We have been providing about $82 to $100 million a year under these sales programs for the encouragement and extension of private enterprise activities, under the so-called Cooley loans, in which we have generated currencies which, in turn, are loaned to U.S. firms and to local firms in trade relationships with U.S. firms in order to try to encourage and expand the free enterprise basis of our world trade.

Almost $1 billion will be provided in this current year for economic development loans made possible by moneys that have been raised through the sale of our foods under this local currency pattern.

The whole program for the development of the dam project in Pakistan, which is as exciting in its concept as was TVA when we started it in the 1930's, this program would not have been possible if we did not have significant quantities of Pakistani rupees which we had gotten by selling food for Pakistani rupees to provide as a loan to Pakistan to pay the costs for the laborers, for the sand, for the locally procurable materials that go into that tremendous program and the Indus River development scheme is being financed by some five different countries, but it would not have been possible if foreign exchange had had to be provided for the total cost. We just wouldn't have had it. And we are making this possible by the provision of our food to people who also need the food.

I would just suggest that in many ways it is even more useful to provide your local currencies this way because some 90 percent of the expenses of the people in Pakistan who are receiving this money now as wages for the first time, some 90 percent will be spent for food and shelter. The inflationary pressure of these people moving into the marketplace would probably have priced that out of a possible achievement at all as a development program if it hadn't been for the fact that we helped to meet the demands for food by the very food that we used to generate the currency. As these loans are paid back over the next 20 to 30 years for the development of that project they will also come back for U.S. uses so that we are building a long-term hedge on our continuing need for local currencies around the world and continuing to build a support for our balance-of-payments position.

We have done a tremendous amount in terms of market development. As you expand the availability of foods you are starting to develop people around the world who now drink milk. I remember so well some of my experiences in Hong Kong where you can't get the peasant who has fled from the mainland to serve milk to the child. We used to make the mistake of distributing milk to the family on the junk, and they wouldn't use it; they would sell it as they do the long grain rice we provide. They just can't afford to eat it. So we found again that through the Ki Fong, a little neighborhood association, providing it to the youngster and through the school system was the one way you could develop a pattern of acceptability to milk, because just the pressure of the group got the child into drinking the milk and of course as he started to drink it he started to have a liking for it. This is happening around the world in many places.

We have developed a new product in this area of the country that is particularly important—vulgare. Vulgare is a processed wheat which has been used for generations in the Middle East. We have now learned with the encouragement of 480 how to produce this commercially. Two of the plants are located in Kansas, of the eight plants. It is a whole new use of wheat. This is the kind of a wheat product which can be consumed by rice-eating peoples without a major change in dietary patterns. So as a result of this kind of a programing, we have encouraged the use of this, first, through donations, then through sales to the point that now this is being used in our own school lunch programs because it is such a good product and many of you working in the schools have suddenly found that this is now available to use in our own country.

We are doing about $2 billion to $2,250 million worth a year of the use of our commodities in terms of meeting needs around the world. I think that America's agricultural abundance is perhaps the most important asset we have in building a better world for people in the newly free countries. One-third of all our foreign aid money now is in the form of food or food-generated currencies.

The world is moving very fast. We are facing it in civil rights. We are going to have civil rights. We are going to have really a United States in which there is equality. I am convinced this is happening because it is right. We are facing exactly the same kind of a pattern around the world. The newly free nations, whether they were ready for freedom, whether they had enough trained people to run their new governments or not are free and they are going to run it. And we are going to have a chance, perhaps it is one chance in a lifetime, to work with them to develop the stability and the future that we say we are looking for. We are going to do it because we have Peace Corps men, because we have the kind of a spirit we have in the United States, and because we are willing to use our food creatively in this kind of programing to try to meet needs and help people to become legitimately economically and socially free, as well as politically free.

We have the technology and the scientific knowledge to feed everybody in the world for the first time in history. We also have the know-how to blow everybody up and incinerate them. The choice that we make, and we can help make it, may very well be determined by the training, the strength, the moral courage being developed now, as in yesterday, in our homes, in our schools, and in our churches.

The world we make for youth and the youth we make for the world of tomorrow will be determined much less at Canaveral than it will be in the community. And this is your job. Can we really focus on families? This is the strength of America and it can be of the world.

THE RAILROAD DILEMMA: A PLAN FOR LONG-RANGE ACTION

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce identical measures to those introduced earlier by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], dealing with the current railroad dispute, and some of the problems it has in common with industrywide bargaining in general.

The proposals introduced by the President merely dodge the problems raised by this controversy and put off a final determination of the underlying issues involved for 2 more years, or until the Interstate Commerce Commission proposes a solution. Such an approach is at best a stopgap solution and ignores the problems central not only to this dispute but to industrywide strikes in general. This forces the considerations made by Congress into the wrong perspective. The aura of emergency surrounding this dispute is hardly conducive to reasoned consideration. While the resolution we reach here is of vital importance to the continued economic strength of the Nation, we must not ignore the long-range effects of any solution at which we arrive.

With regard to the present controversy, I believe that the recommendations of the President's Emergency Board 154, which was created under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, dealing with the action to be taken by the carriers with respect to employees displaced by changes in work rules, takes cognizance not only of the needs of the workers involved but of the problem of the gap between education among the work force and technical opportunity in our economy. These proposals would deal effectively with the structural unemployment that has been created by the technological advances in the railroad industry.

Further, the railroad industry is not affected by section 8(b)(6) of the Taft-Hartley Act designed to prohibit featherbedding. I believe that the same standards should be applied to the railroad industry in this connection as are given credence in other areas. This will cut down a good deal of stagnation in this area and ultimately help both the workers and the economy in general, in that as these people are retrained in accordance with either the first section of this bill or the Manpower Retraining Act, they will be able to find new and better job opportunities in our expanding economy.

The second proposal I am introducing today hits at the splitting of authority in the Houses of Congress themselves in trying to deal with the problem of industrywide bargaining and strikes. It would establish a joint congressional committee to study and report on problems relating to industrywide bargaining and industrywide strikes and lockouts.

The Congress has failed to take more than a fragmented look at this general area in the past because there has been no effective vehicle by which the entire problem could be surveyed. The House Committee on Education and Labor, the seemingly obvious body to deal with this problem shares its jurisdiction with the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the Judiciary Committee. Each of these deals with its own peculiar bailiwick in this area, and a comprehensive approach is lacking. The same fragmentation takes place in the other body. With the increasingly interrelated nature of our economy, this lack of capacity on the part of the Congress to deal with these broad problems should be rectified.

The committee would consist of eight Members of each House of the Congress with the membership split equally between the majority and minority parties.

I sincerely hope that this will provide an atmosphere for intensive study of these problems that would be free from the pressure of partisan politics. This committee would have power to recommend legislation after its studies that would reflect reasoned and deliberate congressional thinking on the matter.

I believe that these measures which I am introducing today would not only provide a meaningful solution to the current railroad crisis, taking account of the needs of all the parties involved, but would also provide a mechanism by which the Congress could, in the future, deal comprehensively with these situations before they reach the stage when the danger to the Nation from inaction or unhurried action is acute.

CAB DECISION REMOVING NORTHEAST AIRLINES FROM THE NEW YORK-TO-FLORIDA ROUTE

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Aeronautics Board decision to remove Northeast Airlines from the New York-Florida route amounts to nothing less than corporate decapitation by governmental decree. It is one of the most unreasonable decisions to emerge from the bureaucratic wonderland in Washington. The CAB's action strikes a deathblow to Northeast by chopping off its most profitable run, and then offers to keep the headless, bleeding corpse alive, by gracious transfusions of governmental subsidies.

This decision is unwise in principle and practical effect. By leaving the eastern seaboard's major air routes in the possession of only two airlines, it is a clear step toward a Government-subsidized monopoly at the expense of the taxpayer and at the expense of New England.

In the CAB's decision there is a strong dissenting opinion by CAB's Vice Chairman Murphy and by Member Minetti. Their forceful dissent points out the need for at least three carriers in the growing New York-to-Florida eastern seaboard market as there are on all other major runs.

They said:

> By once again entrusting it to two carriers, we are turning back the clock, downgrading the needs and convenience of the traveling public, and risking the loss of noticeable improvements of service resulting from Northeast's entry into the market.

The Wall Street Journal of today, in its lead editorial entitled "An Air of Monopoly," calls attention to the serious implications of this unwise decision. Because of the importance of this matter, this excellent editorial follows in its entirety:

AN AIR OF MONOPOLY

> The case of Northeast Airlines is a dramatic reminder of the scope of Federal control of this industry. And the question arises if this control is not itself an important cause of the industry's present difficulties.
>
> For some time the Civil Aeronautics Board has been accused of insisting on "excessive

competition"—more carriers on given routes than demand warrants. Now it seems to be changing; it voted to remove Northeast from the New York-Florida route, leaving two carriers in one of the world's largest passenger markets and confining Northeast literally to that geographical area.

Whether this is good or bad policy, it is a death sentence for the company. Or rather, it would be except for one thing: The CAB generously offers to let its victim hang on through the device of Federal subsidy of its reduced operations.

At the same time the agency seems to be unfavorably disposed just now toward a more natural way of reducing "excessive" competition, the way of mergers. It recently rejected, without explanation, the proposed combination of Eastern and American.

Surely such policies and procedures pile anomaly atop anomaly—misjudging markets, then summarily evicting a carrier, then throwing it a sop of subsidy while frowning on a normal business solution. It is hard to believe that real competition would have done a worse job than all this bureaucratic control.

But even that, unedifying as it is, is not the whole of the matter. Part of the present competitive confusion stems from the CAB's record of inherent opposition to competition of various kinds; it is almost as though it had been established to form an airlines cartel.

One thing it did after setting up shop a quarter-century ago was to restrict, quite drastically, entry into the industry, always a prime effort of monopolistic entities. The policy was supposedly a boon to the old established carriers, and perhaps for a time it was, as air travel expanded so greatly in the postwar years.

All along, however, the CAB has also followed a policy of discouraging price competition, another familiar attitude of monopolists. It is actually empowered to fix maximum and minimum rates in some cases, and it must approve all rates. The upshot is a pretty inflexible rate structure, which has led the carriers to engage in a frantic, and sometimes rather ridiculous, competition in services.

More importantly, it has made costs to the air traveler higher than they would otherwise be. In addition, it seems clearly to have aggravated the carriers' financial troubles. A notable instance is the introduction of jets. In the absence of real price competition, the lines felt compelled to race each other in putting these costly planes into service, and they very likely did so faster than their own and economic conditions justified.

These rigidities, inefficiencies and high costs are, again, what you would expect when Government creates a monopoly-oriented structure. Certainly the years of Government "protection" have not left the industry in a healthy state.

It is true that poor management has been a source of trouble in some cases. It is true that many in the industry wanted and welcomed the "status" of Government control. It is true that the CAB is circumscribed by the law of Congress which gave it birth.

But the answer to that is to change the law. For a guide, Congress might consider the conclusions reached in an authoritative article by Sam Peltzman in the New Individualist Review:

"If what we mean by 'public interest' here is the satisfaction of market demands, in all their variety, at lowest social costs, and, as part of this, the quick adaptability to changing market conditions, then our history indicates that this interest is best served by competition free of arbitrary interference by State power.

"We have not given free competition a chance in this industry. We might do worse than to try it."

CUBAN EXILES SAY CUBA HAS LONG-RANGE MISSILES

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, continuous and mounting evidence that Cuba still has offensive weapons builds up with no inclination on the part of the administration to find out for sure. Many suggestions for reinstating low-level reconnaissance flights, for renewal of onsite inspection demands and other steps to determine what offensive weapons still exist in Cuba have been made by myself, other Members of the Congress and even the Stennis committee in its report indicated that the only way to make sure what is still in Cuba is on-site inspections.

The Miami Herald polled the leaders of some 10 Cuban exile groups on this question and came up with some interesting and alarming information—and the conclusion that Cuba has long-range missiles.

It would be safer for this Nation to insist on on-site inspections to determine the facts than to risk ignoring such authoritative sources as these exile leaders—and the Stennis committee. We made the mistake of misjudging the Russian activities before—we cannot afford to make the same mistake twice.

The article from the Miami Herald of recent date follows:

CUBA HAS LONG-RANGE MISSILES, EXILES SAY

(By Al Burt)

Almost every Cuban exile leader in this area believes Cuba still has long-range missiles—despite U.S. intelligence reports which say this is not true.

A poll of 10 top figures among the exiles revealed only 2 who said they doubted missiles capable of reaching the United States were on the island.

"Insofar as we can be sure, there are no long-range missiles in Cuba," a U.S. official said. "This position cannot be 100-percent foolproof, but the weight of the evidence is to the contrary.

"You must remember that the Cubans have surface-to-air (antiaircraft) missiles, and cruise missiles (40-mile range) and that it would be easy for an untrained person to mistake these for medium or intermediate range missiles."

The United States feels it has adequate means of making these determinations—in addition to its reconnaissance flights—and that it can be confident that as of now Cuba has no capability for delivering strategic missiles.

"With Russian help, the Cubans have improved their defense for an air or naval attack with the short-range missiles, and this activity has caused a fresh stir of exile reports about strategic weapons," an official said.

The official also pointed out that the exiles are dedicated to a campaign of propaganda which would result in more U.S. action against Cuba, and that such a dedication sometimes colors their reports.

But despite this U.S. assessment, the 10 exiles polled by the Herald said the long-range missiles are on the island, that at least 22,000 Soviets are in Cuba, and there is a probability that nuclear warheads for the missiles exist.

These are the 10, and the positions they expressed, based on their own sources:

Cuban student directorate: At least 22,000 Soviets; at least 44 long-range missiles hidden on the island; an indication without proof that there are nuclear warheads.

Alpha 66, second national front of the Escambray, and people's revolutionary movement: "Many troops but we cannot be precise about the number"; thinks the missiles exist but has no proof; suspect nuclear warheads may be present at Sancti Spiritus.

Unidad revolucionaria: Estimate 30,000 Soviets; evidence of great activity in caves in central Cuba and along coast and believe it is "very much possible" these contain missiles; no evidence of nuclear warheads.

Commandos L: Decline give specific number of Soviets; reliable sources indicate missiles may be in Portales de Cortina in Pinar del Rio Province; no information on nuclear warheads.

Dr. Salvador Lew, reputable Cuban newsman: More than 30,000 Soviets; definitely long-range missiles and have proof of 6 at Rancho Luna near Cienfuegos held there in underground platforms; nuclear warheads stored in Punta de Mulas near Banes, Cuba.

Luis Conte Aguero, of Christian anti-Communist front: More than 40,000 Soviets (he claims 9,000 entered Cuba in May alone); definitely long-range missiles near Havana and along northern coast; believe nuclear warheads and expect to have proof soon.

Carlos Zarraga, of Cuba Libre: 20,000 to 25,000 Soviets; know of long-range missiles in Las Villas Province at farm called Valle Blanco, about 11 miles from Manicaragua; no proof of nuclear warheads but suspect some in hands of Russians.

Manolo Quiza, commando leader: 20,000 to 25,000 Soviets; doubts existence of long-range missiles; have reports of possible nuclear warheads in caves near Matanzas.

Cuban Revolutionary Council: 80,000 Soviets; long-range missiles in caves but has no locations to offer; believes nuclear warheads but has no proof.

AAA, headed by Dr. Aureliano Sanchez Arango: 25,000 Soviets; believe U.S. intelligence knows whether missiles exist; believe United States knows whether there are nuclear warheads.

A HIGH PRICE FOR SALVE

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, prior to the payment of indemnity by the United States to Castro for the Bay of Pigs invasion—better known as the ransoming of Cuban prisoners—I expressed my opposition.

Now that the ransom deal has been completed and the final ransom ship has been unloaded, I am hopeful the administration and the American people will take a closer look into that blackmail deal which saw, for the first time in the history of this country, a bearded dictator on a small island pull the beard of Uncle Sam while the world looked on in shock and horror.

The United States was humiliated in the eyes of the world by its weakness in giving into Communist Castro.

For these reasons, I opposed the deal—and still do.

The time has now come to face the real question. When will this administration do something about freeing all of the people of Cuba? The ransom deal, evidencing weakness rather than strength on our part, has failed to free Cuba or to make medicines available to Cubans. It has lowered our prestige in the eyes of the world. It has not stopped the spread of communism in this hemisphere.

All it accomplished was filling the medicine chests and pantries of the Russians and Chinese who, it is reliably reported, wound up with the bulk of the medicine and food in payment for weapons. An excellent editorial on this subject appeared in the July 1, 1963, issue of the Tampa Tribune:

A HIGH PRICE FOR SALVE

The SS *Maximus* sailed into Havana last week bearing a cargo of food and medical supplies, bringing to a close one of the most shameful incidents in U.S. history.

The ship, of course, was taking to Cuba the last payment in a monstrous ransom deal which saw the United States pay Fidel Castro $53 million in foods and medicines plus $2 million in cash, for the lives of 1,113 Cuban rebels captured in the 1961 Bay of Pigs invasion, which this country instigated then failed to support.

So immense was the payment that since last December when the prisoners were released, 9 ships and 36 planes have been employed to haul the 42,710 tons of supplies to Cuba.

The size of the payment, however, does not compare with the size of the humiliation the United States has sustained not only in bowing to Castro's terms but in promulgating the myths that the U.S. Government was no way involved in the deal.

The first myth, of course, was the administration's contention that Attorney James Donovan, who went to Cuba to negotiate the deal, was doing so without the Government's support. The truth is that he was working hand and glove with Attorney General Robert Kennedy.

The second myth was that American pharmaceutical houses and food firms were voluntarily contributing the ransom goods to the American Red Cross for distribution in Cuba. The truth is that administration officials were directly soliciting the goods, and the contributing firms, fully cognizant of the vast powers that can be wielded by a displeased Federal Government, came through.

After this performance, marked by repeated duplicity, will the confidence of the American people in their Government ever be fully restored? We don't believe so.

Attempts now are being made to show that the United States has gained a great propaganda coup through the ransom deal. Recently, upon return from one of his many jaunts to Cuba, Donovan reported that the United States was harvesting a vast crop of good will because of the presence of American-labeled ransom goods on Havana grocery shelves. We doubt, however, that the Cuban people take much joy in the circumstances which placed the goods there—circumstances which promise little for a free Cuba.

We doubt, too, that the confidence of other hemispheric nations in the leadership of the United States will be quickly restored. The prestige gained in the touch-and-go Caribbean confrontation with Soviet Russia last fall was all but frittered away a few weeks later when the United States decided to grovel at the feet of Castro. Can the nations of Latin America really depend on U.S. help in the event of further Communist inroads into the hemisphere? Surely they must have serious reservations.

It is true, of course, that in agreeing to the deal, the United States again proved its humanitarian instincts. But we paid an outlandish price in money and lost prestige for salve to soothe a guilty conscience. If anything has been learned from the incident, it is that paying blackmail is a worthless salve for conscience.

CUBAN COMMUNISM IS SPREADING

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to once again express my concern over the steady and increasing spread of communism in this hemisphere from its subversive base in Cuba.

Of particular concern are the Communist activities of recent dates in Venezuela and British Guiana. I am sure they are of concern as well to the vast majority of the people in this hemisphere.

These stepped up Communist activities prove conclusively that the Administration's so-called policy of containment is not working. Communism is not being contained to Cuba. On the contrary, it is being spread from Cuba at an alarming and frightening rate.

For a deeper insight into this problem, I am inserting in the RECORD a column by Roscoe Drummond which appeared in the Washington Post on July 7, 1963:

CUBAN COMMUNISM IS SPREADING

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Is another Communist Cuba in the making in Latin America? This is the haunting question raised by events in Venezuela and British Guiana.

The administration defends its quiescent attitude toward the Castro regime on the ground that one Communist satellite is no direct threat to the United States if we can keep the virus from spreading.

But what if containment fails to contain? What if we wake up some morning sooner than we think and find that one Communist satellite has become two?

This is one of the central concerns brought out by the recent Freedom House report on what to do about Cuba. The report itself summarized the findings and the warnings of a 2-day conference attended by 27 Latin American specialists. At one point it said: "thoughtful observers are by now aware that Cuba is the Western Hemisphere base from which the Communist knife is aimed at the soft underbelly of the hemisphere—Latin America. A long history of economic and political errors has filled Central and South America with internal discontent, thus making it vulnerable to conquest by external forces. How many more Cubas can we sustain?"

In Venezuela, the Castro-Communists, trained and supported by Havana, are mounting a campaign of violence and sabotage aimed to make it impossible for the liberal Betancourt government to be succeeded by another government democratically elected. Their aim is either to seize power themselves or create such havoc that a military dictatorship will be the only alternative. The Communists well know that a rightwing dictatorship is just one step removed from leftwing dictatorship.

In British Guiana on South America's northern coast, the outlook is even more ominous. Events are steadily slipping into a Castro pattern. Instead of leading his people along the road to peaceful independence—which the British hoped he would be able to do—the Marxist-minded Premier, Cheddi Jagan, is creating economic chaos and explosive racial strife.

Premier Jagan is being powerfully prodded by his American-born wife, Janet, whose Communist convictions are openly proclaimed.

By his threats to pass legislation which would put all labor unions under government control, Jagan has precipitated a paralyzing national strike and has fomented racial strife between the Negroes and Indians. The 3-to-1 Indian population is primarily rural. The Negroes make up most of the urban labor force whose unions Jagan, who ran on an anti-Negro platform, is seeking to repress.

The British want to give this colony its full independence. It is about as ready for independence as the Congo and if the restraining hand of the British is removed, the situation will be ready-made for a Communist regime.

The conclusion is becoming more compelling all the time that containment is no adequate answer to the threat to the whole Western Hemisphere posed by the Khrushchev-Castro dictatorship in Cuba.

This is why the Freedom House report contends that "to dislodge not only the Soviet troops but communism itself from Cuba" is essential to the security of the Western Hemisphere.

REPUBLICAN GOVERNORS ORGANIZE PERMANENT ASSOCIATION AND NAME GOV. ROBERT E. SMYLIE, OF IDAHO, AS PERMANENT CHAIRMAN

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, July 21, I had the privilege of addressing the Republican Governors in attendance at the annual Governors' conference in Miami on the need for a better liaison between the Republican Governors of the Nation and the Republican Members of Congress. In my address to the distinguished State leaders, I also pointed out how additional staff personnel responsible to the minority on congressional committees would be beneficial for all the people in the country who depend on an effective two-party system.

It is gratifying to note that one of the actions taken by the Republican Governors at the conference was the organization of a permanent Republican Governors' Association with Gov. Robert E. Smylie of Idaho as permanent chairman.

Governor Smylie sees this as a major breakthrough in projecting the position of the Republican Governors on important State and national issues as well as working in concert with the Republicans in Congress to project alternatives to ill-advised New Frontier programs.

Governor Smylie will give strong leadership to the association. He is already moving to set up a meeting to advance a plan of action. From my conversations with the other Republican Governors in Miami I know that he commands strong respect because of his understanding of Federal-State relations and his knowledge of what is needed to give the American people stronger leadership in these critical times.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I offer a copy of the news release of July 24 which announces the organization of the permanent Republican Governors' Association. This is an important step forward in implementing what my colleagues and I feel will be an advancement of the Republican drive for victory in 1964. The release follows:

> The Republican Governors of the United States have organized a permanent Republican Governors' Association, Gov. Mark Hatfield announced Wednesday afternoon.
>
> Gov. Robert E. Smylie, of Idaho, was unanimously selected as permanent chairman of the association.
>
> Smylie is serving a third term as Governor of Idaho. He has served longer as Governor than any Governor in the Nation. Smylie is 48, lives at Boise, is married and has two sons.
>
> Governor Hatfield said that the Governors felt that the informal liaison which they established for the 1963 Governors' conference had provided a desirable forum for the Republicans and that a permanent association would be of great assistance in projecting the position of the Republican Governors on important State and National issues.
>
> The new association will meet regularly for the purpose of establishing concerted action with the House and senatorial party leadership and with the Republican National Committee.
>
> Smylie said methods will be developed to assist in providing for joint staffing for the new effort.
>
> The association will act as a caucus when the conference is in session, Smylie said. Between conferences it will provide continuing communication between Republican Governors on vital issues.
>
> Governor Smylie said he hoped to be able to call a meeting of the group in the fall.

PEARL HARBOR LESSON FORGOTTEN

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Americans are deeply disturbed that the administration may be bargaining away the security of the free world by faith alone.

The administration is willing to give in on Cuba, foreign missile bases, and atomic testing to insure some illusory, temporary security. Forgotten is the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor and its bitter lesson to a complacent United States.

Surviving another Pearl Harbor would be extremely difficult—perhaps impossible. Yet our defensive diplomatic strategy against offensive bargainers courts another Pearl Harbor.

From the heartland of America comes an articulate editorial from The Area News, Gillespie, Ill., July 17:

Surprise Attack

> The daily newspapers have been playing up the split between the Russian and Chinese Reds. They are making it sound as though it is a victory for the West, with the Red Russians edging toward our camp. It will be well for our leaders and our people to remember that the only differences in this rift is the method of conquering. Both sides are Red to the core, and strictly adhere to the principles of Marxism.
>
> Perhaps due to the Chinese Reds being unable to feed their hordes of starving people, they are more impatient and are willing to gamble on an all out nuclear war.
>
> The Russian people have attained a somewhat higher standard of living, therefore Khrushchev can play a waiting game, as he wants our cities standing. This because what we have is far superior to anything to be found in Russian cities. The people whether Americans or Russians mean nothing in the Red book.
>
> The buildup in Cuba, is not without a plan. It is not for the friendship of the Russian people. The fact is that missiles can be rained upon strategic defense posts in 15 minutes, compared to 30 minutes from Russia. They also took into consideration that our military stations could be completely disabled in these 15 minutes without warning. While with our warning systems it would take 30 minutes for the U.S. missiles and aircraft to be put into action for retaliation.
>
> Surprise attacks have happened before—remember Pearl Harbor. Everyone said it could not happen, but it did. Let's not be so naive as to say it cannot happen again. Remember our radar system is turned to the north, over Canada and Alaska, and that missiles from other directions cannot be detected, so it stands to reason the enemy will strike from our unprotected directions.
>
> To prove that we desire peace, we are withdrawing our most effective weapons from European countries, so we would have very little with which to counterattack.
>
> For the first time in our history, our Nation has the defeatist attitude, by saying a war cannot be won, we must accept the world as it is today, while the Reds drive on to their objective, with one thought uppermost in their minds—victory. Victory was formerly a popular American word, that went out with patriotism.
>
> We only hope that the American people do not sleep too long, and awaken to find the surprise attack has happened, and that we are no longer a free people, that we are a captive Nation.

NATIONAL CHIROPRACTIC ASSOCIATION SPONSORS CHIROPRACTIC DAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1963

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Berry] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the health of our Nation should be foremost in our minds, for we all know good health is as vital to the individual human as is peace of mind. It is for this reason, then, that I call to the attention of my colleagues a special observance to take place in September. The chiropractic profession—the Nation's second largest profession of healing—will observe its annual Chiropractic Day.

Chiropractors throughout the United States, Canada, and many foreign countries, will celebrate the 68th anniversary of the discovery of chiropractic by the late Dr. Daniel David Palmer. This observance will be held on September 18, 1963.

In connection with this important observance, I wish to submit for the Record a statement by Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, director of industrial relations, National Chiropractic Association, Washington, D.C.:

Statement by Dr. Emmett J. Murphy

> On September 18, chiropractors will look back to survey 68 years of progress wherein the chiropractic profession has been raised to a firm basis of professional skill and ethical standards and to the point where chiropractic today enjoys the prestige, standing, and material rewards of other professions.
>
> Recognizing the goals already reached by this prominent profession, and the confidence of 33 million people who have received chiropractic care in the United States and Canada, it is indeed proper that we all should pause for a moment to consider the basic principles which form the foundations for this growing profession in our Nation today.
>
> A fresh concept in the art of healing based upon the neurological, physical, and mechanical approach, rather than the chemical, was given to the world 68 years ago. For it was in 1895 that Dr. Palmer brought to the modern world the benefits of chiropractic principles.
>
> After exhaustive research, Dr. Palmer in 1895 introduced to our world these principles which have been carried on by chiropractors who are devoted to the prevention and treatment of disease and to the promotion of public health and welfare.
>
> The specific function by which the chiropractor is distinguished from other modes of healing is his adjustment of vertebral subluxations of the spinal column to restore normal nerve function.
>
> The remarkable effectiveness of chiropractic methods in health care has won for chiropractic a permanent place in the family of health sciences, and in the hearts and homes of suffering humanity.
>
> The rapid acceptance of this science in the past 68 years leads us to inquire of the standards in use today. And extremely exacting standards they are found to be.
>
> Chiropractic colleges are required to give 4,000 academic hours in a standard 4-year course to obtain accredited ratings. A basic course of 4,400 hours is recommended. Up to 2 years of preprofessional (college) education is required by many State chiropractic laws of licensure.
>
> The following salient facts concerning public acceptance of chiropactic need to be considered:
>
> 1. Chiropractic is the second largest healing profession in America. It is classified as one of the four major healing professions, along with medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, by the Executive Office of the President of the United States, Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D.C.
>
> 2. More than 600 insurance companies recognize claims for services rendered by the chiropractors.
>
> 3. The U.S. Civil Service Commission recognizes certificates of illness for leave purposes signed by doctors of chiropractic, which means that all Federal agencies are directed to recognize such certificates.

4. Chiropractic care for veterans has been endorsed by the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans.

5. Major unions of Federal employees have endorsed legislation to widen the use of chiropractic in Federal compensation work.

6. Scores of employers provide regular chiropractic treatment for their employees.

7. The Railroad Retirement Board accepts statements of sickness signed by chiropractors.

8. Physicians in West Germany (a country noted for thoroughness in research) have been investigating chiropractic and are giving it warm acceptance.

9. The Kerr-Mills Act providing medical assistance to the aged passed by the U.S. Congress makes provision for payments to doctors of chiropractic.

Throughout the Nation and world, chiropractors will hold observance of Chiropractic Day on September 18, 1963, with the fullest understanding that because of the freedoms enjoyed in the Western World, a new profession can gain public acceptance on its merits as has the profession of chiropractic in a short 68 years.

NORTHEAST AIRLINES DECISION

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Bates] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, the recent decision of the CAB in respect to Northeast Airlines is not in the best interest of New England nor the country as a whole.

This airline has continued to progress and appeared to fulfill the hope entertained by the CAB when the routes south of New York were granted.

There are many courses of action that could now be taken. The Department of Justice is investigating the matter and Northeast has not yet made clear what action it might take in the event this unwarranted decision becomes finalized. In any event, it can only be hoped that a reconsideration by the Board will materialize.

National policy in this area has been confusing and contradictory. I am enclosing herewith an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of July 30, 1963, expanding upon this point. It is as follows:

An Air of Monopoly

The case of Northeast Airlines is a dramatic reminder of the scope of Federal control of this industry. And the question arises if this control is not itself an important cause of the industry's present difficulties.

For some time the Civil Aeronautics Board has been accused of insisting on "excessive competition"—more carriers on given routes than demand warrants. Now it seems to be changing; it voted to remove Northeast from the New York-Florida route, leaving two carriers in one of the world's largest passenger markets and confining Northeast literally to that geographical area.

Whether this is good or bad policy, it is a death sentence for the company. Or rather, it would be except for one thing: The CAB generously offers to let its victim hang on through the device of Federal subsidy of its reduced operations.

At the same time the agency seems to be unfavorably disposed just now toward a more natural way of reducing "excessive" competition, the way of mergers. It recently rejected, without explanation, the proposed combination of Eastern and American.

Surely such policies and procedures pile anomaly atop anomaly—misjudging markets, then summarily evicting a carrier, then throwing it a sop of subsidy while frowning on a normal business solution. It is hard to believe that real competition would have done a worse job than all this bureaucratic control.

But even that, unedifying as it is, is not the whole of the matter. Part of the present competitive confusion stems from the CAB's record of inherent opposition to competition of various kinds; it is almost as though it had been established to form an airlines cartel.

One thing it did after setting up shop a quarter-century ago was to restrict, quite drastically, entry into the industry, always a prime effort of monopolistic entities. The policy was supposedly a boon to the old established carriers, and perhaps for a time it was, as air travel expanded so greatly in the postwar years.

All along, however, the CAB has also followed a policy of discouraging price competition, another familiar attitude of monopolists. It is actually empowered to fix maximum and minimum rates in some cases, and it must approve all rates. The upshot is a pretty inflexible rate structure, which has led the carriers to engage in a frantic, and sometimes rather ridiculous, competition in services.

More importantly, it has made costs to the air traveler higher than they would otherwise be. In addition, it seems clearly to have aggravated the carriers' financial troubles. A notable instance is the introduction of jets. In the absence of real price competition, the lines felt compelled to race each other in putting these costly planes into service, and they very likely did so faster than their own and economic conditions justified.

These rigidities, inefficiencies and high costs are, again what you would expect when Government creates a monopoly-oriented structure. Certainly the years of Government protection have not left the industry in a healthy state.

It is true that poor management has been a source of trouble in some cases. It is true that many in the industry wanted and welcomed the status of Government control. It is true that the CAB is circumscribed by the law of Congress which gave it birth.

But the answer to that is to change the law. For a guide, Congress might consider the conclusions reached in an authoritative article by Sam Peltzman in the New Individualist Review:

"If what we mean by public interest here is the satisfaction of market demands, in all their variety, at lowest social cost and, as part of this, the quick adaptability to changing market conditions, then our history indicates that this interest is best served by competition free of arbitrary interference by State power.

"We have not given free competition a chance in this industry. We might do worse than to try it."

PEONS, COOLIES, AND BRACEROS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the importation of foreign workers is no new thing; the bracero program is just another variation on a very old theme.

History shows that this country in its formative years was short of labor. To fill the gap, indentured servants were used. Indentured servants were bound to a master for a specific length of time—not unlike the modern bracero. In addition to indentured servants, we had slaves to perform what is now called stoop labor. As time passed and man progressed, both indentured servants and slaves passed from the scene.

In the era of railroad building, we find that the railroads utilized another form of cheap, captive labor. Thousands of Chinese were used in railroad construction gangs. These coolies were often brought in under a contract which exchanged their labor for passage to the United States. The importation of Chinese labor eventually reached such proportions that legislative remedies were demanded—the Oriental Exclusion Act resulted.

But there were yet other markets for cheap labor. Many entrepreneurs turned to Europe. Workers, skilled and unskilled alike, would be contracted to perform work for a company or persons over a period of 2 or 3 years in exchange for passage to this country. By the 1880's this contract labor reached scandalous proportions, and again legislative remedies were demanded.

In 1885, a law was passed which prohibited the contracting of foreign laborers. Thus it would seem that the system of captive labor had at last come to an end. But here today, in the 20th century—78 years later—we find that the contracting of foreign labor is carried on with the blessing of our Government.

There is essentially no difference between the indentured servant and the bracero; nor is there much difference between the coolies of the 19th century and today's bracero. Neither is there much difference between the contracted laborer of the 1880's and today's bracero. Yet all these captive laborers passed from the scene by 1885. I would respectfully urge my colleagues not to perpetuate Public Law 78—let us end one more form of captive labor.

THE ANSWER TO EXPORTED AGGRESSION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, an effective defense program must be able to respond to all levels of aggression. Today we find increasingly that the challenge to free and democratic government is in the form of guerrilla warfare in the underdeveloped areas of the world. Ignorance, not ideology, causes such areas as southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America to be the seedbeds of Communist activity; discontent in these strategic areas makes them liable to Communist propaganda.

Militarily, guerrilla warfare demands radically different organization, strategy and equipment from those of conventional combat. The Honorable Roger Hilsman, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, personally experienced in this special kind of warfare, discusses this problem in his article, "The Answer to Exported Aggression," which appears in the current issue of the General Electric Forum.

As I have already done with other excellent pieces from this magazine, I am calling to the attention of all my colleagues, along with all those who read the Record, this provocative analysis of our crucial task in an ever more important field:

An expert on counterinsurgency tactics suggests that "Vietnam's twilight war for the villages may yet rank as one of the decisive battles of world history." Secretary Hilsman, a former World War II guerrilla fighter himself, stresses that this form of hidden aggression poses a threat to the entire free world—that the Communists see guerrilla wars in Africa, Asia, and Latin America as the best way to expand their empires with the least risk. To meet this exported aggression effectively, Secretary Hilsman says:

"We must adopt the methods of the guerrilla himself—the very tactics our ancestors learned from the Indians.

"Our long-range goal must be 'nation-building'—aid which includes the many things an American pioneer village needed.

"The really important appeal of the West is the respect for the individual which is built into Western culture."

Question. Secretary Hilsman, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have defined counterinsurgency as the military, political, economic, psychological, and civic actions taken by existing governments to defeat subversive insurgency. Would you subscribe to this definition?

That is a very reasonable definition, particularly as applied to the Far East—namely, the Philippines, Malaya, and currently Vietnam. But I would broaden it slightly by stating that the real problem is one of extending government control to areas where governments have never had control throughout history. In a broader sense this means providing government services to the villages, knitting the people into the fabric of the whole community and national life.

In southeast Asia today, there is no pervasive national spirit as we know it. The villagers in the back country still feel no deep loyalty to their government, which seems much further from them than ours does from us. Since most of the villagers make nearly all the material goods they use, they have relatively little commercial, political, or psychological contact with other villages or the provinces around them.

In such circumstances, there does not have to be a basic discontent with the government for a guerrilla unit to thrive. It is just a question of the villagers' isolation.

Recently, in northeast Thailand, a government team visited 40 villages—not particularly isolated ones, either. In 10 of them the people had never seen a government official—no policemen, no firemen, no health inspectors, no one.

In villages like these, it is relatively easy for an outside subversive power to recruit young men for guerrilla bands by simply promising sheer adventure, just to get away from the boring, monotonous tasks of an agricultural life.

For example, in my personal experience with the OSS in Burma during World War II, we found only about 10 percent of the people to be pro-West. Another 10 percent were proenemy, but the rest were either indifferent or else just so isolated that they had no ideological convictions one way or the other. Yet we were able to recruit over 30,000 guerrillas for OSS operations in Burma, and in spite of our white faces.

To draw a parallel with a situation closer to home, one may ask whether the citizens of Chicago "supported" the hoodlum gangs which flourished during the 1920's. Certainly the shopkeeper hit by the protection racket did not support the gangs, but he often had no choice except to go along with them. The same thing is true in many of the isolated villages in some of the underdeveloped areas of the world.

Question. In the past, you have defined this guerrilla activity in southeast Asia as internal war, or hidden aggression. What do these terms imply?

The terrorist activity in Vietnam is really aggression in the truest sense of the word. Over the centuries international law has categorized aggression as an overt attack. But here we have, as President Kennedy has said, "a subterranean war," which doesn't fit easily under the doctrines of international law.

I call it hidden aggression, or twilight warfare, because it is an attack directed across an international boundary. It is clearly an attempt by one state to bring down another by exported terror. From North Vietnam, the Communists are sending in trained cadre, propaganda, money, equipment, and directions to the Viet Cong terrorists in South Vietnam. All the while they try to maintain the fiction that it is an internal uprising.

The pattern of the Vietnam war so far has followed closely Mao Tse-tung's three stages of guerrilla warfare. In the first stage, sympathizers are recruited and indoctrinated, and a base is built from which weapons, rice, and other supplies can be distributed. The second stage is one of terror, hit-and-run tactics, ambushes, night attacks, and assassinations. This is the stage in which we are engaged now. Finally, in the third stage Mao says there must be a change to a true civil war where the terrorist bands are turned into conventional armies to fight the regulars by conventional means. As a practical matter, the Communists hope to create enough political chaos and instability so that the government will fall by a coup d'etat, letting them move in and skip the third stage.

WE MUST ADOPT GUERRILLA TACTICS

To fight this exported aggression effectively, we must adopt the methods of the guerrilla himself—the very tactics our ancestors learned from the Indians. We must realize that the guerrilla does not care about north or south, or east or west. He doesn't care about this town or that piece of real estate. He lives to fight, to ambush, to kill. His only goal is to kill—not to seize and hold territory.

It is nonsense to assume that regular forces trained for conventional war can handle jungle guerrillas adequately. Regular forces are essential for regular military tasks, but twilight warfare is something special. It is a war of shadows in the night which calls for radical changes in organization, combat doctrine, and equipment. The main ingredients for success are constant patrols, good communications, mobility, and a capacity for rapid concentration. Our key units might be decentralized groups of 50 men, self-reliant and able to operate autonomously, fanned out into the surrounding countryside.

Let me again draw on my experience in Burma. At one stage my outfit—consisting of 4 Americans and 200 Burmese—kept an entire 3,000-man Japanese regiment marching and countermarching through the mountains far away from the front where they would have done more good. What we would have feared most would have been smaller groups patrolling steadily. The Japanese were much better soldiers than our guerrillas. They were better trained, tougher, and more mobile. But they fought us as if we were regular troops. We never tried to take or hold ground. We laid ambushes, fired our weapons, and ran just as fast as we could. After a month of chasing us, this 3,000-man regiment had over a hundred casualties; we had only 1.

ONE OF HISTORY'S DECISIVE BATTLES

Vietnam's twilight war for the villages may yet rank as one of the decisive battles of world history. In one sense, it is no more or less decisive than an effective deterrent against a Korea-type war, nor is it more or less decisive than an effective strategic nuclear deterrent. However, even as we have prepared for both conventional and nuclear wars, the Communists have been giving increased emphasis to internal warfare. Of course, we can take some credit for their change in strategy. Our nuclear force buildup has paid off and so have our efforts to build ground forces, our alliances, and our sacrifices in Korea.

Now the Communists are beginning to see possibilities for guerrilla wars in Africa, Asia, and Latin America as the best way to expand their empires with the least risk. So the Vietnam war is quite decisive, in the first place, because unless we develop an effective counter there, we may well find ourselves in the same difficulty in some of these other areas. Secondly, this war is decisive in that the steps needed to fight it are the very steps needed for building the new nations of the world into independent, self-sustaining states. Our job in Vietnam is as much political and economic as it is military—the long-range task is nation building.

WHAT ARE THE STEPS INVOLVED IN NATION BUILDING?

To become a stable nation, Vietnam needs much more than dams, power stations, steel mills, and other giant foreign-aid projects which will have to come sooner or later. This sort of foreign aid is important, of course, but on a longer-term basis. In the short term, these people need more simple aid such as communication routes, so that goods and services can flow freely from village to village throughout the country. There must be a way for information about the needs of the people to flow upward, and a way for government services to flow downward to answer these needs. They need health programs, police security, educational systems, economic help, sewer systems—the very things many an American pioneer village needed over 100 years ago.

STRATEGIC HAMLET PROGRAM

An important part of this nation-building program is to provide the villagers with the physical security so necessary to peaceful progress. This is what the strategic hamlet program does. We are helping the villagers ring their villages with barbed wire, much as our frontier towns were protected with stockades. Then 20 or 30 in a village of 200 are trained to use weapons such as hand grenades, shotguns, and carbines. And they are given a radio with which they can contact province headquarters for help if they are attacked by a large band of terrorists.

But the strategic hamlet program involves far more than just physical security. It is also a vehicle for getting government services to the people to help enlist popular support for the government. And as the government becomes more popular, and as more villages are secured, the Viet Cong will be isolated more and more from their key sources of supply—the villages of the back country. No longer will marauding bands of five or six guerrillas be able to walk into villages and either seize or buy rice.

If they can't get into the villages, and if they are occasionally ambushed themselves, will the Viet Cong then start to wither?

That's right. By cutting off this important supply line to the villages and by keeping them on the move, we will begin to make the guerrillas suffer from lack of food, from hunger, and from discomfort. They will begin to dry up.

Of course, we are not at that stage yet in Vietnam. However, we have come a long way and have made much progress recently. During the last half of 1962, outlying villages containing roughly half a million people were made secure by the government, bringing the share of rural population in secured villages to about 51 percent. The Viet Cong controls about 8 percent.

This still leaves around 40 percent of the rural population unsecured. It is to this group that the Government must extend its services and control in the next phase.

In the mountain regions during the last year we have helped the Vietnamese train over 37,000 Montagnard tribesmen in the use of simple weapons, how to set up village defenses, and how to patrol areas between villages. But one Special Forces team I know of is most proud of a completely nonmilitary kind of project—a village market. They went to the province capital and persuaded a tailor, a tobacco merchant, and a general store operator to move to the Montagnard village where they were stationed. Then they persuaded the villagers in the area to start producing a surplus of what they grow, and to bring the excess to the market where they could sell it and buy thimbles, needles, thread, pots, pans—the instruments for a better life that they could never have before.

This isn't warfare in the usual sense and it isn't killing Viet Cong. But it is the real way to fight the Communist terror. It is a vital step in nation building, and that is our long-range goal.

Question. Secretary Hilsman, it has been said that the Communists are offering a "spiritual" challenge to the people in Asia, telling them, "We need you desperately, whoever you are, whatever you can do. Ours is the revolution of the future. You can be the liberators of mankind."

In contrast, it has been said that the American appeal offers no such "cause" but merely a slight material gain through our aid and assistance programs. We have been told that there really isn't an "American side." Is this theory true, or half-true, or is it completely inaccurate or obsolete?

There is no question in my mind that this theory is completely obsolete. In terms of appeals, the Communists are not doing at all well. The normal Communist ideology does not cut much ice anymore. Where they do make headway, they capitalize on an appeal to nationalism, or they use threats of terror and retaliation.

The theory about American appeals is also obsolete. We have a spiritual appeal that is a truly revolutionary one—a government interested in the wants and needs of the people. In the past, government has usually meant—if anything—an official who collects grain or yams and gives nothing in return. So we have a revolutionary appeal to excite and inspire these people—the simple but very effective concept that government exists to serve and protect them.

In a sense, the whole nation-building program has a revolutionary, spiritual appeal, not only in Vietnam but in all the world's underdeveloped areas. This is really the guts of the Alliance for Progress program, except that in Vietnam nation building must proceed under the guns of Communist terrorism. The barbed wire and guns of a strategic hamlet program would not be needed in a country not under attack as Vietnam has been, but the civic action certainly would.

But the really important appeal of the West is the respect for the individual which is built into Western culture. In contrast, the whole Communist bloc leans toward a monotonus grayness—the Tibetans should act like the Chinese, the Chinese like the Russians, and the Russians like the Poles. There is not the diversity which is found in the free world.

What can industry here in the United States do to help these countries build their civilizations? For example, Dr. Wernher von Braun has said that much of the success of the space program has resulted from the individual contributions and innovations of private industry. He told us that he spends a substantial part of his time "trying not to drown in all the many ideas which come to us." Do private companies face this same kind of challenge in "nation building programs" as they have already faced in aerospace and defense?

They most certainly do. There are many areas of science and technology where new ideas can help Vietnam and similar countries to discover new approaches to their problems. Right now scientists in this country are on the brink of some discoveries in genetics which are just as dramatic and exciting as the discovery of the nuclear reaction. Some of them may help to solve many of the tremendous problems in disease, overpopulation, and food shortages.

To help break the illiteracy problem we may be able to use a communications satellite, providing a country with a complete television network which could be picked up on television sets powered by wood-burning generators. We could increase a teacher's exposure a hundred times.

Chemistry, biology, electronics, physics—every science you can name—may have some answers if we can get researchers to focus on the problems.

Question. How optimistic are you that our nation-building program will succeed in Vietnam? Do you have a time-goal in months or years?

Right now about Vietnam I am optimistic—but cautiously so. It is not a question of winning a battle or defeating an army. It is a question of building a nation, and that takes time. So far things are going rather well, but we have to think in terms of years instead of months. It will be some time before you can go anywhere in Vietnam with a feeling of complete safety and security.

Of course all the new nations like Vietnam need time. No magic of science can transform their way of life overnight. It took 7 years to eliminate guerrillas in Malaya. It may take more than this in Vietnam, or it may take less. But I think time is on our side.

SPENDING BILLIONS SOUNDS PAINLESS—LIKE TAKING WATER FROM A WELL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss again the subject of personalizing government costs in a way that taxpayers can apply the affect of appropriations to themselves.

Let us be frank and admit that in congressional testimony and debate on appropriation bills the principal emphasis is given to benefits. We let the people know the advantages to them but when it comes to explaining the cost and disadvantages inherent in such benefits it is a different matter. Total expenditures, of course, are given but seldom do the proponents of legislation spell out in much detail who is to pay for a program or how much the cost will be to taxpayers individually. Reference is made to millions or billions of dollars and it sounds very much as if the amount was not a charge against the individual taxpayers at all. It sounds as painless as taking water from a well.

In a series of speeches to the House I have been urging that Members of Congress mention the subject of who pays the costs every time an appropriation is considered. In this connection, I was highly gratified to note that Senator MUNDT a few days ago had done this very thing in a speech in the Senate. The Senator was referring to the $6.5 billion TFX contract which, as he said, is the largest single Government contract ever let by any government in the history of the world. He pointed out that reduced to understandable terms this $6.5 billion adds up to what he called a tidy sum for the individual American taxpayer. To illustrate, he said a billion dollars roughly is $8 per man, woman, and child in America, so a $6.5 billion contract represents about $50 for each individual or for a family of five the contract involves a cost of $250 out-of-pocket expense, as Senator MUNDT commented, to the head of the family.

The Senator went on to explain that if the Navy has its way it will more than double the number of TFX airplanes, thereby increasing the contract to $10 billion or $12 billion. He described such a cost as being the same as a $500 bill taken out of the billfold or the pocket or the household budget of the head of every American family of average size in this country.

Mr. Speaker, when we consider costs as with the TFX where politically appointed civilians in awarding the contract overrode the judgment of the military boards composed of experts which had previously evaluated the respective competitive bids, a full understanding is the more important. The people should have the entire story. The citizens who must ultimately pay the bill through Federal income taxes on incomes and pensions are going to be outraged to the nth degree if they feel political considerations as well as their money were involved in awarding of contracts.

In general, to proceed with my remarks Mr. Speaker, many people realize, of course, that when the taxpayers' money goes to Washington, D.C., a great deal of it comes right back to them in the way of Federal aid to the States. However, what is overlooked is that this trip to the Nation's Capital and back again costs money. I was interested in reading a column by Ken Thompson in the Dallas Morning News in which the issue was raised that the round trip of these tax dollars does not come cheap. He said if programs where the money goes and then comes back to the States were eliminated $8.7 billion could be saved in the Federal budget. Next year, he said, these Federal benefits to the States are expected to cost the taxpayers $10.4 billion. What he failed to say, however, was that this next year's cost of $10.4 billion represents $224.62 a family. That is what the Federal Government's cost would be per average family to administer these Federal programs to aid the States where the money came from to start with.

One aspect of expenditures that needs explaining to taxpayers, is back-door spending. Under this device the outlay of money does not appear in the budget, nor does it show in the total appropriated by the Congress. Instead, an agency is authorized to borrow and spend without the normal congressional appropriation. Thereby the attention of the taxpayers is bypassed and right at this point I want to discuss this back-door spending.

Right now there is a real controversy going on over so-called back-door spending. The President asked Congress to add $2 billion to the capital of the Government-owned Export-Import Bank. He asked that the Bank be given authority to borrow the $2 billion from the Treasury of the United States. In this way the President's budget request for fiscal year 1964 was $2 billion less than otherwise. This device kept it below $100 billion. The House of Representatives has wanted the capital increase to be granted by means of an appropriation, while the administration position was supported by the Senate. The House has opposed back-door spending because it wants under one committee, the Appropriations Committee, the control over all spending so one congressional committee can weigh the urgency and need of each expenditure in relation to other spending programs and the overall condition of the Treasury. But what I want to point out is that the $2 billion in question averages $43.32 per taxpayer family whether it is in the budget or whether it is hidden under the classification called borrowing from public debt receipts which is commonly called back-door financing.

And while on this subject, let me emphasize that the extent of back-door spending and its burden to the taxpayers when covered up is the same as when included in the annual budget.

To illustrate this, taking the figure I obtained from the Treasury Department a year or so ago it showed various agencies of Government had blank check authority to go to the Treasury and borrow in excess of $24 billion. This amount, $24 billion, except for the limit set by the national debt ceiling law could be borrowed and expended without control by Congress. Those various agencies were already borrowing so that they already owed the Treasury at that time $33 billion. Thus using the example I cited earlier of $1 billion being $8 for every man, woman and child in America that would make 33 times 8 or $264 average each as the per capita back-door financing outstanding. But here is the rub—in previous years agencies have borrowed money in this manner and it was lost or given away by the Government agencies so that more than $16 billion of such borrowing from the Treasury had to be canceled or forgiven by Congress. Thus the taxpayers, through back-door spending, lost $346.56 for each taxpaying family in America because as I mentioned in previous speeches on this subject there are 43.6 million families and the $16 billion loss averages $346.56 a family. Perhaps those who advocate back-door spending do not do it because it withholds the true financial facts about our Government from the American people but that is the net effect.

My hope, Mr. Speaker, is that the people will discover what is going on. Especially, I want the 28,887,841 taxpayers whose incomes are $6,000 a year or less to get the stark truth and why such a big bite is taken out of their incomes and pensions each month. I figure the taxpayers whose incomes are $500 a month or less are the ones who will support economy most of all if they get the facts.

Today in high places there are college economists or history professors who believe the Government can spend the citizens' money better than the citizens can themselves. These self-styled liberals believe in massive and deficit Government spending.

Frankly, I disagree with these intellectuals. I believe our Government, where possible, should live within its means. I believe in decentralization of power so that citizens can have closer supervision and more say in the management of their affairs.

However, regardless of philosophy, I say, wherever the Federal Government exercises responsibility the respective costs of programs in relation to benefits should be spelled out.

Of course, this is not always easy because our Government is so vast, but I am sure the people will always support the right decisions if sufficient information is given them. In this connection, I suggest that the Members of Congress must do a better job of explaining the nature and extent of public spending. Indeed that is about all a minority party can do when, as with Congress today, it does not have the votes to defeat the majority party bills when the majority follows a policy of planned deficits and pork-barrel spending programs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. TOLLEFSON (at the request of Mr. PELLY) on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. FARBSTEIN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 10 minutes, Wednesday, July 31, 1963, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DULSKI and to include extraneous material.

Mr. PUCINSKI and to include extraneous matter.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. STAFFORD) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. SHORT.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. BATES.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. HEALEY.

Mr. STEED.

Mr. KARTH.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida in three instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly, at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 31, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1083. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 204 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1084. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the fifth annual supplement to the Commission's publication FPC S–130, "Hydroelectric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1961"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 464. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 6196, a bill to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 602). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 1194, An act to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 603). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 82. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses; with amendment (Rept. No. 604). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3198. A bill to promote the economic and social development of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 605). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7219. A bill to amend sections 3288 and 3289 of title 18, United States Code, relating to reindictment after dismissal of a defective indictment; without amendment

(Rept. No. 606). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BUCKLEY: Committee on Public Works. Sixth interim report pertaining to right-of-way acquisition practices in Massachusetts (Rept. No. 617). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 1135. A bill to designate the dam to be constructed and the reservoir to be formed on the Des Moines River, Iowa, as the Red Rock Dam and Lake Red Rock; without amendment (Rept. No. 618). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 1696. A bill defining the interest of local public agencies in water reservoirs constructed by the Government which have been financed partially by such agencies; with amendment (Rept. No. 619). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4786. A bill for the relief of the State of New Mexico; without amendment (Rept. No. 620). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1263. A bill for the relief of Rickert & Laan, Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 607). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1311. A bill for the relief of Jolan Berczeller; with amendment (Rept. No. 608). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1742. A bill for the relief of the Wetzel County Hospital, New Martinsville, W. Va.; with amendment (Rept. No. 609). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1759. A bill for the relief of Rebecca K. Clayton; with amendment (Rept. No. 610). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1874. A bill for the relief of Eugene Ahrends; with amendment (Rept. No. 611). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2445. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Barbara Ray Van Olphen; without amendment (Rept. No. 612). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2754. A bill for the relief of Mercedes Robinson; with amendment (Rept. No. 613). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5583. A bill for the relief of Brig. Gen. Fred C. Gray; with amendment (Rept. 614). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SHRIVER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5753. A bill relating to the effective date of the qualification of the Steamship Trade Association of Baltimore-Waterfront Guard Association pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; without amendment (Rept. No. 615). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7491. A bill for the relief of William L. Berryman; with amendment (Rept. No. 616). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 7824. A bill to continue, for the period ending November 30, 1963, the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7825. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7826. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of May 13, 1954, commonly referred to as the St. Lawrence Seaway Act, to provide that the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation shall not engage in certain activities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 7827. A bill to consolidate and simplify laws relating to easements and permits upon certain federally owned lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 7828. A bill to provide means for settling the current dispute between the railroads and their employees over work rules, to prevent such disputes from arising in the future by prohibiting featherbedding practices in the railroad industry, and to provide various forms of assistance for employees displaced by changes in work rules, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 7829. A bill to provide a program of national health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 7830. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 7831. A bill relating to the retired pay to which certain veteran officers who served in both World War I and World War II are entitled; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 7332. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit, for 1 year, the granting of national service life insurance to certain veterans heretofore eligible for such insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 7833. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the distribution of the land and assets of certain Indian rancherias and reservations in California, and for other purposes", approved August 18, 1958 (72 Stat. 619); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 7834. A bill to amend the act of July 4, 1955, as amended, relating to the construction of irrigation distribution systems; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 7835. A bill to establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Community Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 7836. A bill to establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Community Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 7837. A bill to establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Community Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 7838. A bill to establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Community Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 7839. A bill to establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Community Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 7840. A bill to establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Community Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.J. Res. 585. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 13th day of September as Commodore John Barry Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.J. Res. 586. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.J. Res. 587. Joint resolution to create a joint congressional committee to study and report on problems relating to industrywide collective bargaining and industrywide strikes and lockouts; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.J. Res. 588. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.J. Res. 589. Joint resolution authorizing the continued shipment of the drug Krebiozen in interstate commerce in order to insure the continued availability of such drug for the treatment of patients now being treated with such drug and for terminal cancer patients; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.J. Res. 590. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.J. Res. 591. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. Res. 465. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to establish a standing Committee on Small Business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. Res. 466. Resolution creating a standing Committee on Small Business in the House of Representatives, and to grant it full authority in legislative matters; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 7841. A bill for the relief of Marcia Patricia Connell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 7842. A bill for the relief of Nunsia (Nancy) Francesca Badali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 7843. A bill for the relief of Sin Hee Yuen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 7844. A bill for the relief of John Mistkawi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 7845. A bill for the relief of Maria Carmen Anihin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

221. By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Petition of residents of Orange County, N.Y., to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

222. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Thomas G. Dunne, city manager, Salinas, Calif., relative to requesting prompt action for the continuation of the supplemental labor program made possible by Public Law 78; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 30, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. A. Reid Jepson, interdenominational minister, Charleston, W. Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Maker of heaven and earth, the God and Father of our Lord, Jesus Christ, and of all who trust Him: We approach Thy throne of grace in time of need to find grace and wisdom to help. Without Thee, we can do nothing. Ignoring Thee, we stumble. Unless Thou dost hold us, we shall falter and fall.

We thank Thee for the Bible—the world's bestseller, the Book that could be taken from us, but which is still with us. O God, let it be that we shall never be deprived of the Scriptures which have made us strong.

May there be love in our hearts toward those who deny Thee. Help us to pray for those who oppose spiritual progress. Teach us how to live together; and while maintaining or trying to gain rights of freedom, may we not forget that eternal freedom has been purchased through the blood sacrifice of Him who said, "Whom the Son of God makes free is free indeed."

Today, and each day of deliberation, give, we beseech Thee, this and other such high institutions Thy guidance. May the individuals who deliberate here realize that they represent the people who have sent them here, and that in a real sense they are responsible to them and to Thee, before whom we must all one day appear to give an account of ourselves.

Help us all to fear God and do righteously.

In the name of the Lord, Jesus Christ, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 29, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—CONSIDERATION OF FARM LABOR BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the press and in various other organs of communication, I note stories to the effect that Calendar No. 347, Senate bill 1703, having to do with farm labor, is being unduly hurried to the floor of the Senate for consideration, and that there seems to be afoot some plot to push it through without due deliberation.

This bill was reported on July 22 from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—exactly 8 days ago. Last week I was asked by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] what the schedule for this week would be. At that time I pointed out to him that there were on the calendar only three measures which could be brought up: First, the so-called river basin bill, which is the pending business, or will be shortly; next, the bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933; and, third, the bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes—the bill introduced by the distinguished Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK].

There has been no desire on the part of the leadership—and the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the minority leader, is present and will corroborate this statement—to rush this bill through. It was stated that it would be brought up at the conclusion of consideration of the bill having to do with the river basins; and it will be brought up at that time. But I believe the RECORD should be made absolutely clear that no chicanery is involved. We are operating under the regular procedures; and so far as the present leadership on both sides is concerned, that will continue to be our policy.

REPORT ON SCIENCE RESEARCH FUNDS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency, reporting, pursuant to law, on science research funds, for the fiscal year 1963; which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Salinas, Calif., favoring the continuation of the supplemental labor program; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

STATEMENT OF PRESBYTERY OF LONG ISLAND ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it has always been my firm conviction that the quest for equal justice and equal opportunity rests on a firm moral as well as constitutional basis.

Recently the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. at its 175th General Assembly adopted a statement describing the struggle for civil rights "as the most urgent moral issue of our times."

It was my privilege today to meet with representatives of the Commission on Religion and Race of the Long Island Presbytery. The members of this commission deserve the highest commendation for their efforts to translate religious principles into everyday practices for all Americans.

A statement approved by the commission sets forth eloquently and concisely the important considerations involved. It is a statement of great importance which I know will be of interest to many Members. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the statement be printed in the RECORD and be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the statement was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF COMMISSION ON RELIGION AND RACE, PRESBYTERY OF LONG ISLAND

The United Presbyterian Church in the United States at its 175th general assembly held in Des Moines, Iowa, in May 1963, singled out the Negroes' struggle for civil rights as the most urgent moral issue of our times, and committed the church to a program of action in support of this issue. The Presbytery of Long Island, consisting of 60 Presbyterian churches in Nassau and Suffolk counties, has also appointed a commission on religion and race to implement this program of action.

An immediate concern of the commission is the legislation on civil rights now pending in the Congress of the United States. We call upon you as our elected representatives in Congress to give this legislation priority over partisan political considerations.

What justice has long required, conscience now demands that all of the citizens of our country be given the equal rights and privileges claimed for them in the Declaration of Independence, guaranteed to them under the Constitution, and bestowed upon them by the Creator of all men.

If America is to lead the free nations of the world, she must also provide that moral leadership which makes our talk of freedom more than lipservice within the borders of our country.

We believe that the Congress must take a courageous and determined stand on civil rights and pass a bill which will terminate the present practices of discrimination and segregation against any minority groups in our country.

The Commission on Religion and Race of Long Island Presbytery, representing 31,000 Presbyterians, is concerned that this be done now.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Eugene P. Foley, of Minnesota, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

John E. Horne, of Alabama, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Vietnam;

Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., U.S. Navy, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Portugal;

Donald A. Dumont, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Burundi;

James I. Loeb, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Guinea;

Howard Rex Cottam, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the State of Kuwait;

Claude G. Ross, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Central African Republic;

W. Michael Blumenthal, of New Jersey, to be a Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, with the rank of Ambassador; and

Dr. Walter Adams, of Michigan, and Dr. Mabel M. Smythe, of New York, to be members of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I also report favorably sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service. Since these names have previously appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations are as follows:

Francis O. Allen, of Pennsylvania, and sundry other persons, for promotion in the diplomatic and foreign service.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 1956. A bill to clarify the provisions of law authorizing the commitment of a defendant to the custody of the Attorney General for a study after conviction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Missouri when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1957. A bill for the relief of Andre Condom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 1958. A bill for the relief of Ivanka Pekar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1959. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, to provide educational assistance to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from an injury or disease arising out of active military, naval, or air service during a period of war or the induction period; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1960. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Norma Y. Teixeira, her husband, and their minor unmarried children, and Mrs. Greta Teixeira, her husband, and their minor unmarried children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1961. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and

S. 1962. A bill to authorize the transfer of a vessel to the State of Minnesota for nontransportation use in the training of seamen, stevedores, and other merchant marine personnel; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCARTHY when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1963. A bill to establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Community Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1964. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to increase the fee charged for learners' permits; and

S. 1965. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix and collect rents for the occupancy of space in, on, under, or over the streets of the District of Columbia, to authorize the closing of unused or unsafe vaults under said streets and the correction of dangerous conditions of vaults in or vault openings on public space, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 1966. A bill for the relief of Glenda Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 1967. A bill to extend until June 30, 1967, the authorization contained in section 6 of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS):

S.J. Res. 106. Joint resolution providing for appropriate Federal recognition of the Bowne House, Flushing, N.Y.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S.J. Res. 107. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the 91st annual session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, to be held in Washington, D.C., in July 1965, to authorize the granting of certain permits to "Imperial Shrine Convention 1965, Inc.," on the occasions of such sessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CLARIFICATION OF PROVISIONS OF LAW AUTHORIZING THE COMMITMENT OF CERTAIN DEFENDANTS TO CUSTODY OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the 85th Congress passed a statute designed to reduce so far as possible the widespread disparity in sentences pronounced by Federal judges. The act provided for the holding of institutes and conferences to discuss sentencing policies and also authorized courts to commit convicted offenders to prison for observation, diagnosis, and recommendation as to disposition. The act on the whole has worked well and many judges have taken advantage of its provisions relating to observation and diagnosis particularly of those offenders who have committed some bizarre offense, manifested mental problems, or about whom the court wishes additional information.

However, a difference of opinion has arisen among Federal judges as to the necessity for returning prisoners to court following the receipt of a report from the Director of the Bureau of Prisons diagnosing the case and making recommendations as to disposition as authorized by subsection (b) of section 4208 of title 18 of the Federal Criminal Code. Some judges feel they must return the prisoner to court if they reduce the sentence originally imposed while others feel this is unnecessary.

Courts of appeal also differ as to the necessity of returning such cases to court and they also differ as to when the right to appeal in such cases attaches—*Corey* v. *U.S.*, 307 F. 2d 839; *U.S.* v. *Behrens*, 312 F. 2d 233; *U.S.* v. *Johnson*, 315 F. 2d 714.

The legislative history of Public Law 85-752, section 3, August 25, 1958, 72 Stat. 845, clearly indicates that Congress did not intend that a prisoner need be present in the court when the final action on his sentence is taken—House Report 1956, 85th Congress, 2d session at page 10. The Senate report indicates that the final action is by way of a modification of sentence—Senate Report 2013, page 4.

Nevertheless, because of the confusion which has arisen, I am introducing today a bill to clarify the situation and leave no doubt as to the intention of the Congress. It will accomplish the intended purpose of section 4208 by adding subsection (e) affirmatively stating that it is not mandatory to return a defendant when the court takes its final action. The court can, of course, order the prisoner returned if deemed desirable. This, as indicated, merely writes into the statute what the legislative history shows to be the intent of the Congress. It also clearly indicates that a defendant is entitled to bail pending appeal and the right to appeal runs from the date the original sentence was imposed.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to clarify the provisions of law authorizing the commitment of a defendant to the custody of the Attorney General for a study after conviction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1956) to clarify the provisions of law authorizing the commitment of a defendant to the custody of the Attorney General for a study after conviction, introduced by Mr. Long of Missouri, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AN ACT TO EXTEND THE EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS OF THE WAR ORPHANS' ASSISTANCE ACT TO CHILDREN OF TOTALLY AND PERMANENTLY DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act. The purpose of this bill is to extend the eligibility provisions of the act to include the children of veterans who have been permanently and totally disabled by service-connected disabilities. Under present law, orphans of veterans are entitled to educational assistance from the U.S. Government, but children of totally and permanently disabled veterans are not. This bill gives the child of a totally and permanently disabled veteran the same educational opportunities as a veteran's orphan.

As in the present War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act, the benefits of this bill will be extended to the children of certain veterans who have served during the induction period as well as those who have served during wartime. The term "induction period" as defined in the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act includes:

First. September 16, 1940, to December 6, 1941.

Second. January 1, 1947, to June 26, 1950.

Third. February 1, 1955, ending on the day before the first day thereafter on which individuals—other than individuals liable for induction by reason of a prior deferment—are no longer liable for induction for training and service into the Armed Forces under the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

A disability incurred as a result of service during the induction period must be shown to have directly resulted from, and the causative factor thereof must be shown to have arisen out of, the actual performance of active service unless the disability was incurred as a result of participation in an armed conflict or extra hazardous service. In all other cases the same criteria for determining service connection applies to the war orphans' program as applies to disability and death compensation and other benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration.

The legislative intent of the Congress in passing the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act was expressed by an amendment adopted in 1959:

> The Congress hereby declares that the educational program established by this chapter is for the purpose of providing opportunities for education to children whose education would otherwise be impeded or interrupted by reason of the death of a parent from a disease or injury incurred or aggravated in the Armed Forces during the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the induction period and for the purpose of aiding such children in attaining the educational status which they might normally have aspired to and obtained but for the death of such parent.

The justice and equity expressed in this quote is equally applicable to the situation which confronts the children of a totally and permanently disabled veteran. As a practical matter, the child of a veteran who has been permanently and totally disabled often faces an even greater financial hardship in continuing his education than does the war orphan.

In many cases, where the father is a deceased veteran, the widow has remarried, or has been able to secure employment. In the case of a totally disabled father, however, the mother is often unable to supplement the family income and the added expenses incident to the care of a totally disabled person precludes the saving of any substantial sums to provide higher education for the children.

Mr. President, the same sense of justice and equity which led the Congress to pass the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act justifies the passage of this bill to provide educational assistance to the children of those men who have been permanently and totally disabled as a result of serving their country.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1959) to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, to provide educational assistance to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from an injury or disease arising out of active military, naval, or air service during a period of war or the induction period, introduced by Mr. Yarborough, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1701(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "who died of" the following: ", or who has a total disability permanent in nature resulting from,".

(b) Section 1701(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(10) The term 'total disability permanent in nature' means any disability rated total for the purposes of disability compensation which is based upon an impairment reasonably certain to continue throughout the life of the disabled person."

(c) Section 1701(d) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out the word "death" both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "disability or death".

Sec. 2. Section 1712(a)(3) ,of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(3) if the Administrator first finds that the parent from whom eligibility is derived has a service-connected total disability permanent in nature, or if the death of the parent from whom eligibility is derived occurs, after the eligible person's eighteenth birthday but before his twenty-third birthday, then (unless paragraph (4) applies) such period shall end five years after, whichever date first occurs (A) the date on which the Administrator first finds that the parent from whom eligibility is derived has a service-connected total disability permanent in nature, or (B) the date of death of the parent from whom eligibility is derived;".

Sec. 3. Section 1762(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "whether eligibility is based upon the death or upon the total permanent disability of a parent".

Sec. 4. In the case of any individual who is an "eligible person" within the meaning of section 1701(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, solely by virtue of the amendments made by this Act, and who is above the age of seventeen years and below the age of twenty-three years on the date of enactment of this Act, the period referred to in section 1712 of title 38, United States Code, shall not end with respect to such individual until the expiration of the five-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT TO ENCOURAGE THE REDUCTION OF EXCESS MARKETINGS OF MILK

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage, strengthen, and protect the dairy industry of the United States.

This bill is slightly different from the bill I introduced last April (S. 1317), but it provides the same general program. It authorizes, as before, a class I base plan, and the language takes into account recent communications between representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the National Milk Producers Federation. In this section, my bill is almost identical to S. 1915, introduced by Senator Proxmire.

The bill also contains the same provision as S. 1317 for producers under Federal market orders: the Secretary could make surplus reduction payments of up to $2.50 per hundred for the amount of reduced marketings. However, it clarifies the section which permits direct payments of up to 50 cents per hundred to be made to producers outside marketing orders. Under the bill I am introducing today the Secretary could make these direct payments to producers outside Federal orders at different rates. He could offer one level of payments for those who agree not to expand production and a higher rate to those producers who agreed to reduce their production by 5 percent. In effect, this bill differs from S. 1317 only in providing the Secretary with a little more flexibility in securing reduction of excessive surpluses.

The dairy situation continues to be a very serious matter. Price supports were dropped to 75 percent of parity over 15 months ago—from $3.40 per hundred to $3.11—there has been little change in the amount of milk produced. The latest Department estimates show that for the current marketing year the Commodity Credit Corporation will have to purchase about the same amount of milk as last year, or the equivalent of nearly 9 billion pounds of the 118.4 billion pounds which will be marketed. The net cost for the CCC this year is estimated at $453 million as compared to $480 million last year.

Under the program which I am proposing, according to best estimates, it will be possible: first, to cut Government costs by approximately $37 million as compared to the existing program; second, to reduce surpluses by more than 50 percent—from 8.8 to 4.2 billion pounds; and third, to increase the net income of dairy farmers by at least $150 million.

The bill provides for voluntary participation. It requires no farmer to reduce his production. It maintains the present basic price support level at 75 percent of parity. But it does provide a temporary adjustment program for the next 18 months in order to reduce the excessive surpluses in dairy products and to bring the market back into relative balance, while at the same time making a substantial increase in the net income of dairy farmers.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1961) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCarthy, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of section 8c(5) the following new subparagraph (H):

"(H) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, providing:

"(i) for allocating, or providing a method for allocating, to each producer under a marketing order, a share of the total sales of milk received from producers classified in, and subject to the minimum price or prices applicable to, the highest use classification or classifications under the marketing order and such reserves of producer milk as may be found essential thereto, which share shall be determined on the basis of total deliveries of milk made by each such producer during the year 1962, or such other representative period as the Secretary may prescribe in the order as more appropriate, due allowance being made in the provisions of the order for (a) abnormal conditions, (b) hardship cases, and (c) producers under the order engaged in milk production at the time provisions hereunder are incorporated in the order but who did not produce milk during all or part of the representative period. Dairy farmers who were producing and marketing milk prior to the date when provisions hereunder were incorporated in the order and who were not on such date delivering milk as producers under the order shall upon becoming producers under the order be provided, with respect to milk delivered under the order, allocations on the same basis as those who were producers under the order when such provisions become effective. Provisions shall also be made for allocating to any new producer under an order who was not engaged in dairy farming prior to the incorporation in the order of provisions hereunder an equitable share of the allocated sales on such terms and conditions as prescribed in the order, due consideration being given to the current and prospective supply conditions in the regulated market. The application of allocations hereunder shall be subject to such provisions as may be incorporated in the order under section 8c(5)(D). Allocations to producers and the history of deliveries of milk upon which such allocations may be based under this subparagraph may be transferable under an order on such terms and conditions as may be prescribed if the Secretary of Agriculture determines that transferability will be in the best interest of the public, existing producers, and prospective new producers. The allocations or bases hereunder may be adjusted from time to time or new allocations or bases may be established by amending the order or under provisions incorporated in the order;

"(ii) that in distributing to producers the amounts of money required to be paid by handlers on milk each producer shall be paid (1) for milk delivered by him which exceeds his allocation at the lowest class price specified in the order and (2) for milk delivered by him within his allocation a blend price, based on utilization in such higher class uses plus reserve, representing his pro rata share of the remaining funds available for current distribution to producers under the order, after the computation has been made under (1) hereof. The payments under (1) and (2) above shall be subject to adjustments prescribed in the order under section 8c(5)(B) or other provisions of the Act and to such provisions as may be incorporated in the order under section 8c(5)(D);

"(iii) in marketing orders where individual handler pools are approved as provided by subparagraph 8c(5)(B)(i) the provisions of this subparagraph may be applied to each handler individually and to the producers delivering milk to such handlers;

"(iv) in the case of any producer who during any accounting period delivers a portion of his milk to persons not fully regulated by the order, provision may be made for reducing the allocation of, or payments to be received by, any such producer to compensate for any marketings of milk to such other persons for such period or periods as necessary to insure equitable participation in marketings among all producers;

"(v) the order may provide for such reports and the keeping of such books and records by producers and by the person or persons to whom he may dispose of milk as the Secretary may prescribe and upon request of the Secretary such persons or persons shall make required records available for inspection;

"(vi) the provisions authorized under this subparagraph may be made applicable to a regulated handler's own production of milk;

"(vii) order provisions under this subparagraph shall not become effective in any marketing order unless separately approved by producers in the same manner provided for the approval of marketing orders. Disapproval of order provisions under this subparagraph shall not be considered disapproval of the order or of other terms of the order. Order provisions under this subparagraph may be terminated separately whenever the Secretary makes the determination with respect to such provisions as is provided for the termination of an order in section 8c (16)(B);

"(viii) any producer for whom an allocation or base is established under the authority of this subparagraph may obtain a review thereof as prescribed by the order and rules and regulations thereunder, which shall constitute the exclusive procedure for review thereof and section 8c(15)(A) of this title shall not apply thereto. Under such order, rules, or regulations any officers or employees of the Department or any committee or boards of producers under the order created for the purpose may be vested with authority to perform any or all functions in connection with such review proceedings, including ruling thereon. Committees or boards created for this purpose shall be deemed agencies of the Secretary within the meaning of subsection 8c(7)(C) and section 10 of this title. The ruling upon such review shall be final if in accordance with law. The producer may obtain a judicial review of such ruling in accordance with the provisions of section 8c(15)(B) of this title; and

"(ix) the provisions of section 8a(5) shall not apply to any producer in the application of this subparagraph or regulations issued pursuant thereto."

Sec. 2. (a) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that a program of surplus adjustment payments to dairy farmers would result in net savings to the Government under the Dairy Price Support Program, the Commodity Credit Corporation is hereby authorized to make payments to dairy farmers who agree to restrict their marketing of milk and butterfat during any one or more marketing periods as determined by the Secretary to the quantity of milk marketed by them during the base period, or a percentage thereof: *Provided, however,* That no payment shall be made with respect to marketings after the 1st day of April 1965. Payments hereunder shall be made only with respect to milk marketed for manufacturing usage and shall be at such rates not to exceed 50 cents per hundred pounds of milk or milk equivalent as the Secretary determines appropriate to effectuate a restriction on the marketing of surplus milk and butterfat. Payments shall be made to producers who agree to limit their marketings or who agree to reduce their marketings, on the quantity of milk that they market and different rates of payments may be established for individual producers according to the amounts by which they restrict or reduce their marketings: *Provided, however,* That payments to producers marketing their milk under Federal milk marketing orders shall be made on the quantity by which they reduce their marketings from their base quantity, at such rates, not to exceed $2.50 per hundred pounds of reductions in marketings, as the Secretary determines. Such payments may be made at such times, in such areas, and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the Government and accomplish the objective of surplus reduction.

(b) The Secretary shall establish a marketing base for each producer in the continental United States, excluding Alaska, who desires to enter into an agreement with Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to subsection (a) of this section. Such marketing base shall be the number of pounds of milk, or the number of pounds of milkfat, or such units of dairy products as the Secretary may deem appropriate for the administration of this subtitle which is the lower of (i) the producer's marketings during the marketing year ending March 31, 1963, or (ii) the Secretary's estimate of what would be marketed in a marketing year by the producer based on the rate of his marketings when he enters into the agreement with Commodity Credit Corporation, adjusted for seasonal variation. In establishing a marketing base, the Secretary may make such adjustments in the producer's marketings as he deems necessary for flood, drought, disease of herd, personal health, or other abnormal conditions affecting production or marketing, including the fact that the producer may have commenced production and marketing after April 1, 1962. A producer's marketing base for the marketing year shall be apportioned by the Secretary among quarterly marketing periods thereof in accordance with the producer's prior marketing pattern, subject to such adjustments as the Secretary determines necessary to enable the producer to carry out his herd management plans for the marketing year. The quantity thus apportioned to a quarterly marketing period shall be the producer's marketing base for such period.

(c) The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as are necessary for the enforcement and the effective administration of this Act and may require buyers, processors, and handlers of milk and butterfat to furnish reports with respect to purchases and utilization of milk and butterfat.

PROPOSED OFFICE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I believe that the increasingly urgent problem of coordinating Federal activities affecting urban areas can be most effectively met by creation of an office within the Executive Office of the President, to function somewhat on the same lines as the Bureau of the Budget.

Federal programs dealing with public health, highways, railroads, airports, water and air pollution, juvenile delinquency, unemployment, civil defense, fire protection and prevention, education, open spaces, and enforcement of labor standards have an impact on urban areas, and require interdepartmental coordination.

Further, many mayors and other community leaders have appealed for a one-stop service in Washington where they can take their problems and have them evaluated, and referred to the proper agencies.

Much stress has also been given to the need for long-range planning and research so that we will be able to foresee problems before they arise, and have appropriate remedies ready, as well as achieving greater efficiency and economy.

For these reasons I am, today, introducing a bill which will authorize formation of an Office of Community Development in the Executive Office of the President.

This legislation would not increase Federal control over local affairs, whereas other solutions which would involve a large and uncontrolled bureaucracy might.

In short, there is a much greater need for an executive staff with authority to cut across established bureaucratic lines than for a new bureaucratic establishment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1963) to establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Community Development, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

BOWNE HOUSE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to recognize the historical significance of the Bowne House in Flushing, N.Y.

It was in Flushing, in 1657, that one of the significant documents in the struggle for religious liberty in America was issued. Peter Stuyvesant, the Governor of New York, had issued an edict against the Quakers which was answered by the citizens of Flushing in a letter which has come to be known as the Flushing Remonstrance. In boldly defying the Governor, the citizens wrote:

> If any of these said persons come in love unto us, we cannot in conscience lay violent hands upon them, but give them free egresse and regresse unto our town and houses as God shall persuade our consciences.

John Bowne, a citizen of Flushing and the owner of Bowne House, invited the Quakers to use his home for their meetings. Bowne was eventually arrested, fined, and banished to Holland for his actions, but his home stands today as a reminder that the spark of religious freedom and tolerance burned bright on this continent even before the founding of this Nation.

In these troubled times of conflict and strife throughout the world when, in so many countries, religious freedom for all men is being trampled beneath a heavy Communist boot, I am proud, as the people of New York State are proud, to pay tribute to this site which played such a part in the history of American religious freedom. It is fitting that Congress act to have appropriate tablets placed at Bowne House marking its historical significance for the whole Nation and honoring the concept of religious liberty which it symbolizes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks the text of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 106) providing for appropriate Federal recognition of the Bowne House, Flushing, N.Y., introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas by the Flushing Remonstrance of 1657, the freeholders of Flushing in defiance of measures of religious persecution undertaken by Governor Peter Stuyvesant, insisted on the right to have and enjoy liberty of conscience and to welcome in their homes "any sons of Adam who come in love among us"; and

Whereas Bowne House was constructed in 1661 from timbers hand hewn by John Bowne who moved to Flushing in his determination to find a community and a home where he could worship God according to his convictions; and

Whereas despite the promise of religious liberty originally contained in the charter of the town of Flushing, John Bowne was arrested in 1662 and fined with a warning to abstain in future from religious meetings of the Society of Friends; and

Whereas he was transported to Holland for further sentencing and offered such an eloquent plea for tolerance and liberty of conscience that he was released, the governing body of the province declaring that "the consciences of men, at least, ought to remain free"; and

Whereas the trial and acquittal of John Bowne is one of the landmarks of religious freedom in this Nation, comparable to the trial of John Peter Zenger in the history of freedom of the press, one of the stepping stones that led to the drafting of the Bill of Rights in the United States Constitution; and

Whereas Bowne House, in which the proscribed religious meetings were held, was acquired by the Bowne House Historical Society in 1945 in celebration of the tercentenary of the community of Flushing, dedicated by Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia on October 10, 1945, as a national shrine to religious freedom and tolerance, and opened to the public on Independence Day, 1947; and

Whereas Bowne House today stands with much of its original construction and with contemporary furnishings intact and has been designated in the journal of the American Institute of Architects as one of the twenty "structures of national importance in New York City which should be preserved at all costs": Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to provide, with the consent of the Bowne House Historical Society, for appropriate recognition by the Federal Government of the national historical and architectural significance of the Bowne House, Flushing, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am most pleased to join my colleague [Mr. KEATING] today in introducing a resolution which bestows appropriate recognition upon one of New York's and our Nation's most important historical monuments, the Bowne House in Flushing, N.Y.

Recognition of this beautiful home as a symbol of religious tolerance is particularly appropriate at this time when our Nation is so arduously seeking solutions to the problems of tolerance and understanding of minority groups on many fronts. Bowne House became a national shrine to religious freedom in the mid-1600's when, despite Gov. Peter Stuyvesant's harsh ban on the harboring of Quakers in the New York colony and the holding of religious services, the home built by John Bowne became a haven for Quakers. The spirit of tolerance of the members of the town of Flushing, who proclaimed that they would not only welcome Quakers to their homes but would not "condemn, punish, banish, persecute, or lay violent hands upon anyone, in whatever name, form, or title he might appear," provides an outstanding example of human understanding from which we today might well learn. The attitude of religious tolerance was eloquently expressed in 1657 by the Flushing Remonstrance, the first declaration of religious tolerance by a group of American citizens motivated solely by the conscience of freemen.

Bowne himself was imbued with this spirit of freedom and, although imprisoned and banned to Holland, never renounced his right to question governmental authority to restrict the free exercise of religion.

The house which John Bowne built was so expertly constructed that today a major portion of it is in almost the same condition as it was in 1661. It has been the aim of the Bowne House Historical Society to preserve the charm and symbolic significance of this historical monument.

It was a great honor and pleasure for me to have served in 1957 as honorary cochairman of the New York State joint legislative committee for the celebration of the 300th anniversary of the signing of the Flushing Remonstrance, and I am glad now to join my colleague in this effort to honor properly this nationally important shrine and symbol of religious freedom.

INCORPORATION OF CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill S. 1914, to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, that the name of the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] be added as a cosponsor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PENSIONS FOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the names of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] added as cosponsors of S. 1918, a bill introduced for me on July 18, 1963, which would provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITOL HILL AND THE WEST MALL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 22, 1963, the names of Mr. CLARK, Mr. LAUSCHE, and Mr. MCCARTHY were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1920) to authorize and direct the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress building in square 732 in the District of Columbia, to provide that such building shall be designated the "President James Madison Memorial Library," and to provide that additional facilities for the Library of Congress shall be built in squares 637 and 691 in the District of Columbia in order to render unnecessary the construction—at a cost of $39 million—of a special memorial to President James Madison, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS on July 22, 1963.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of Graham A. Martin, of Florida, to be Ambassador to Thailand.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

NOTICE CONCERNING H.R. 4157, A BILL TO ENACT PART II OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE, ENTITLED "JUDICIARY AND JUDICIAL PROCEDURE"

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Standing Subcommittee on Revision and Codification of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the subcommittee now has under consideration H.R. 4157, 88th Congress, 1st session, and the accompanying report thereon, House Report No. 377, regarding revision and codification of part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure."

The purpose of this notice is to advise any and all interested parties of the consideration of this legislation by the subcommittee and that the subcommittee desires to have any statements or comments relating to the proposed legislation. The statements or comments requested are for the purpose of allowing any and all persons to express their views as to such legislation.

It is requested that such statements or comments be forwarded to the Subcommittee on Revision and Codification of the Committee on the Judiciary, room 341, Old Senate Office Building, on or before August 20, 1963.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]; the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]; and myself, as chairman.

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY REV. CLEMENS L. KOORS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, during the course of a year there are many important days that our American citizens commemorate. Three of them, which have an impact one on the other, are Memorial Day—when we honor the memories of those who gave their lives to preserve our Nation; July 4, on which we commemorate the Independence Day of this great Nation; and September 17, on which we commemorate Constitution Day—the day set aside to honor the writers of this great document and the document itself, the outstanding charter upon which our whole life in our freedom-loving country is based.

The Fourth Degree Knights of Columbus in Lake County, Ind., in remembering the valor of our mighty dead, conducted a memorial service on Memorial Day, 1963, at Wicker Park in Hammond, Ind. The Reverend Clemens L. Koors, faithful friar of the organization, and pastor of St. Francis Xavier, delivered an excellent address; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL DAY, MAY 30, 1963, WICKER PARK

On Pentecost Sunday, May 29, 1955, the first of these wayside crucifixes was dedicated at Jordan Park, by members of the Abraham Lincoln General Assembly Fourth Degree Knights of Columbus. Each crucifix bears the inscription, "For God and country, dedicated to the memory of the men and women whose love for this Nation enabled them to make the supreme sacrifice of life itself in its defense." Today, we are joined by members of the Army, the Navy, the Marines, the nurses, the Boy and Girl Scouts, and lovers of patriotism, as we pause at each crucifix to place a wreath expressing our continued remembrance and loyal appreciation of their sacrifice.

One hundred and eighty-seven years ago a new nation was born in this world. That nation not only exists today but through its unlimited resources, its ingenuity, its loyalty and ideals, has grown into the greatest nation the world has ever known. Its ideals are clearly expressed in the preamble to the Declaration of Independence in these words, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." As long as men and women will live and die, as those we honor today, for these ideals, it will remain the greatest nation under Heaven. Many indeed, are the trials and tribulations visited upon its life. But its ability thus far to encompass, enfeeble, to encounter and enforce its rights in each and every instance, proves the caliber of its origin, its life and destiny among the nations of the world. Through the years, I believe, the outstanding characteristics that have kept America alive, alert, strong, healthy, vigorous, and self-supporting, has been its concepts of religion, patriotism, and citizenship.

Religion and patriotism must go together, for they support, strengthen and complement each other. Without religion and its moral standards, patriotism loses its entity and dignity. As religion teaches us how to love, serve, and obey God, patriotism teaches us the love and obedience to our country. Thus religion gives to patriotism a foundation, a strength and a permanence that comes from God. There are two words, "morale" and "morals" that express the power and force embodied in the preamble. "Morale" as we know means courage, high purpose and readiness to serve. "Morals" on the other hand is the sense of right and wrong, divinely taught, courageously followed and conscientiously lived. Both serve the same cause. Morale makes man strong in his duties as a citizen. Morals makes him strong in his duty to God. Thus blended together, these two forces of morale and morals form a bulwark of national defense, and personalize that union of religion and patriotism. In the storm of world events in which America finds itself, in the cold war that presently prevails, we can find security only in the knowledge that our Ship of State is firmly held by these two anchors. While we do not just begin our service to our country today, we should rededicate and reconsecrate anew to its service. With our morale built firmly upon good morals we must patiently and courageously face the challenges of the times as true soldiers. It is only with confidence in our cause, guided by sound reason and true understanding for our fellowman throughout the world that we can hope to win.

Our founders too, recognized the fact that a race or civilization does not stand still; that it either progresses or retrogresses; that man either grows or decays; and therefore, that government being comprised of the people for the people must follow the same cycle. Any failure on the part of our Government then, cannot be the fault of its founders, or of the system created, but must be the result of our own shortcomings, our own failure to assume and discharge the responsibilities of citizenship. We must understand at all times, that the whole theory of citizenship is based on self-control and self-constraint, with a sense of mutual obligation whereby we grant to each other the same privileges and rights with the right to exercise such privileges and rights that we claim for ourselves. Furthermore, the right to the pursuit of happiness, recognizes the right of the individual to work out his own destiny. For every right guaranteed to us as citizens, there is a corresponding duty. By the neglect of your responsibility the exercise of your rights is weakened. If you maintain your conscientious sense of obligation and duty, your rights of citizenship will remain firm regardless of the attacks of our enemy; the Nation will grow as a whole in strength and beauty, for ours is a government of laws, not men. Laws are enacted by duly chosen representatives of the people through the right of franchise under political liberty. This is the most sacred right possessed by our citizenship.

Today then, we pause to commemorate the valor, the heroism, the unselfish courage and sacrifice of our war dead. Certainly these men and women have given without the slightest reserve, their lives for the welfare and in the service of others. These are the men and women who loved and who sacrificed for that love. "Greater love no man hath than to lay down his life for his friends." They have given their life, their liberty, their pursuit of happiness. Why? That you and I may enjoy and use them. No war in the history of the world was as costly in material resources, in human life than World War II. Never in history has an enemy been so ruthless, so inhuman, so cruel in the treatment of prisoners of war. Nor had international law been so utterly disregarded. Realize then in this atomic age the need of right living and thinking. These patriots have died that peace, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness could exist. No matter how great the odds, how tremendous the sacrifice, we must stand united to preserve this peace, not for ourselves alone but for peoples everywhere in the world, or these will have died in vain. Our cause is not nor never has been a selfish one, but rather a magnanimous one. Americans have fought and will continue to fight for life, liberty, and happiness not only for themselves but for every people in the world. These memorial services tend to honor, esteem, and appraise the heroic deeds of our men and women who have given their lives in every service of our country. To them, then, we and the world owe our unswerving loyalty, our incessant prayers and our undying gratitude.

Clemens L. Koors,
Faithful Friar.

INDEPENDENCE DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR DIRKSEN TO STERLING JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on July 4, I delivered an address to the officers, members, and guests of the Sterling Junior Chamber of Commerce, in connection with their July 4 program. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To the Officers, Members, and Guests of the Sterling Junior Chamber of Commerce Fourth of July Program Commemorating the Independence Day of the United States of America

You have wisely chosen as your theme for this program, "The Concept of Freedom of Our Founding Fathers."

On August 16, 1962 in the Senate Chamber, I introduced a joint resolution declaring the 17th day of September in each year a legal holiday to be known as Constitution Day. In supporting this resolution, I noted that in this historic document of independence men set out the self-evident truths, and the principles of government. They also set out for all mankind to know the causes which impelled them to their determination. I noted that it bound together people who put aside their provincial thoughts in order to achieve a common victory against a common oppressor. By the fire of war they were welded into one great Nation, a bond that has never been broken, although it has been severely tried by issues which have from time to time divided different parts of this great country.

These concepts of freedom of our Founding Forefathers have withstood the test of time. We have seen a continent grow from a wilderness to the greatest economic power in the world. Empires have risen and fallen but the concept of our forefathers has endured many insurmountable obstacles and has set a pattern for the free people throughout the world.

But, my dear friends, although there are times when we feel some people take too much for granted these great sacrifices, that gave us our great liberties, it takes occasions such as Independence Day to remind us of our liberties; Memorial Day to honor the dead who preserved our great liberties; and Constitution Day to reawaken all of us to the many blessings this country has given to us and to reemphasize our solemn duty to preserve it for our children and our children's children for ages unto ages. So to you, in this year 1963, ring out again the bells of freedom, ring out again the enthusiasm of your forefathers of the basic concepts which made this country so great, and be ever mindful that these precious rights that were gained through sacrifice, hardships and the shedding of blood shall not be lost by a slowly chipping away of the basic individual freedoms because of some false philosophy, by some, that only the Federal Government can determine what is best for each and every American.

You are God's children, living in God's open country, endowed with God's blessings. Let no man restrict your freedoms with liberty and justice for all.

CIVIL RIGHTS SIT-INS AND DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on July 24, there appeared in the Chicago American an editorial, under the caption "Voices of Good Sense," which in truth and in fact sets forth a commonsense view with respect to some of the sit-ins and demonstrations attendant upon the civil rights controversy. I believe the editorial fully merits insertion in the Congressional Record; and, therefore, I request that it be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Chicago American, July 24, 1963]

Voices of Good Sense

The community is deeply indebted to Sam Riley, Chicago chairman of the Congress of Racial Equality, both for a welcome truce in the long seige of demonstrations against the school board and for his sensible protest against "the ultramilitant tactics of the kids." Riley was referring to the 9 days of sit-ins at the board of education offices which had been conducted chiefly by young Negroes.

The CORE leader has decided to resign as chairman of the organization because, as he has told us: "I prefer to plan and negotiate. I am sick of sit-ins and picketlines."

Certainly Chicago is sick of demonstrations. It is time, we think, for responsible Negro leaders in general to realize that whatever value street disturbances may have had in calling attention to injustices earlier, the point has now been made. And Riley certainly was talking sound reason when he said that issues must be resolved by planning and negotiation. Whatever changes CORE feels should be made in public school regulations to end inequalities will have to be made in calm discussions, not through fighting or screaming in the streets.

As for the truce which has ended the demonstrations, Riley arranged it by telephone with Clair Roddewig, president of the board of education, who was in Washington. Under its terms, Riley and the Reverend Elton Cox, executive director of CORE, will meet with Roddewig in Chicago tomorrow to arrange a meeting for July 30. At this, CORE's recommendations for changes in school rules will be discussed.

Chicago also is deeply indebeted to the Reverend Joseph H. Jackson, pastor of Olivet Church and president of the National Baptist Convention, for the timeliness and commonsense of his warning that the struggles for civil rights can become an antireligious crusade.

The Reverend Mr. Jackson based his observation on the fact that his big Negro church was picketed by Negroes last Sunday—an incident which he accurately described as "a dangerous turn in the civil rights struggle."

"Any time people picket a church," he added, "they are not fighting for civil rights. That kind of spirit is antichurch, antireligious and anti-American. It is, in fact, a step toward curbing freedom of religion."

We hope the voices of moderation will be heeded from now on both in Negro groups and in white. What both sides need is leadership dedicated to the future. Americans of both races must cooperate for the expansion of freedom now, and we must live together in friendship for a long, long future. The fewer pits we dig between races now, the fewer we will have to climb out of and fill up before we can settle down together in peace and harmony.

OBJECTION TO COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senate will shortly resume consideration of the river basins bill, which is a very important measure, involving hundreds of millions of dollars, and vitally affecting thousands of our citizens, I wish to enter my objection to the holding of any committee meetings while the Senate is in session today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The objection will be noted.

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY SENATOR HRUSKA ON 12TH ANNUAL TRACTOR POWER AND SAFETY DAY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on Thursday of last week, the 12th Annual Tractor Power and Safety Day was held at the new University of Nebraska Field Laboratory, near Mead, Nebr.

The tractor field day has become something of an institution in Nebraska, and the success of the event is attested to by the attendance of 12,000 persons at this year's program.

For the past several years the field day was staged on the College of Agriculture campus, in Lincoln. The move to the new facility at Mead was in the nature of an experiment, and it was a most successful experiment.

This new large laboratory gives Nebraska and the Great Plains a major research and educational facility dedicated to the solution of practical farm problems. Accessible to farmers, students, and others interested in agriculture, it will channel research results to the people who need them and can use them.

My colleague, Senator HRUSKA, was the featured speaker at the 1963 Tractor and Safety Day. Because his remarks so captured the progressive spirit of the unique mission of the University of Nebraska's College of Agriculture, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from them be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY SENATOR HRUSKA ON TRACTOR POWER AND SAFETY DAY, UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA FIELD LABORATORY, MEAD, NEBR., JULY 25, 1963

Each year for many years, the University of Nebraska College of Agriculture has held this tractor field day. While each program has had many similarities, each year also sees many changes.

One great change this year is the location of the event. For the first time it is being held on a new part of the College of Agriculture campus, a World War II ammunition depot converted into a splendid 1963 research facility.

I know that you will forgive me if I take some special pride in this occasion because of the part that my colleagues in the Congress and I were able to play in bringing about the transfer of the Mead depot to the university.

For Chancellor Hardin and Dean Frolik this is the realization of a dream. Many an hour was spent with them planning for the day we could begin the work which you see here at this facility.

And I cannot overlook the important part played in the negotiations by George Round, one of the best friends the Nebraska farmer has, and Carl Donaldson, the university's business manager. Together with Chancellor Hardin and Dean Frolik they were extremely capable negotiators during some rather difficult times.

Perhaps you have the idea that it is a simple matter to transfer a piece of real estate from a Federal agency to a State. If so, let me correct that impression. There were problems almost every step of the way, not the least of which was the matter of contamination of a large area by stored ammunition. That came up literally at the last minute. But like the other difficulties, it was overcome, thanks to the patient persistence of your university officials. I was proud to work along with them.

But in a much more important sense, we can take pride in this laboratory because it is in the best tradition of the University of Nebraska. I believe it was Chancellor R. G. Gustavson who first gave voice to the notion that the boundaries of the University of Nebraska campus are coterminous with the boundaries of the State.

In other words, the university is much more than just a place to send our children after they have been graduated from high school. It is an institution dedicated to serving the whole State.

In none of the colleges and schools of this great and growing institution is this philosophy more painstakingly practiced than in our College of Agriculture. The basic industry of Nebraska is agriculture. It is, therefore, singularly appropriate that the Ag College should conceive its mission to be, not only to train young people in the science of agriculture, but to conduct a continuing program of service and information to those of you who are the backbone of the Nebraska economy.

The worldwide recognition of the success Nebraska has achieved in carrying out this mission is testimony to the high quality of its work. An exciting footnote to the fine history written by the college under the able leadership of men like Dean Burr, Vince Lambert and now, Elvin Frolik, is the work Marvel Baker and his colleagues have accomplished in the Attaturk experiment in Turkey.

We Nebraskans have many good reasons to be proud of our university and none is more self-evident than the progress achieved by the College of Agriculture.

As you know, this annual tractor day heretofore was held on the Ag campus in Lincoln at the unique and world-famous tractor testing laboratory. I assume, Professor Hurlbut, that from now on it will be held here at Mead so that more people can witness actual field operations such as that marvelous haying contraption you have here. That's quite a change from my own "hay day" when the only equipment was a fork at least 1 foot taller than the boys who wielded them. If there was any automation it came from us Butler County boys with blisters on both hands.

There have been many changes in the tractor since those early years—most of them for the better. One of the biggest changes, though, and not a cause of rejoicing is in prices.

As we think of tractors and farm machinery, however, it is fitting to stress farm safety.

Statistically, the farmer just does not have as good a safety record as his city cousin. Each hour in this country, an accident claims the life of a farm resident. Every 40 seconds there is a disabling accident on a farm somewhere in the United States.

I am advised by the Economic Research Division of the Department of Agriculture that 325 farm people each year are killed accidentally in Nebraska—virtually one a day. Now, not all of these accidents occur on the farm, of course, but they reflect a disturbing and serious aspect of the hazards in farm operation which we must do all we can to overcome.

One of the chief reasons for a higher accident rate on farms than in industry is the fact that farmers work much longer hours. When fatigue, fading daylight and farming are mixed together, somebody is going to get hurt. It is in order to constantly educate on this and other points.

So, I congratulate the Department of Agricultural Engineering for its continuing campaign to promote safety on the farm and for making it a part of the program here today.

WATER RESEARCH CENTERS

I'd like to talk with you now about some of the things which the future holds for the University of Nebraska and its College of Agriculture.

This spring I responded to an invitation from Senator ANDERSON of New Mexico, himself a former Secretary of Agriculture, to cosponsor a bill which will establish water resources research centers at land grant universities like Nebraska. The bill—which is known as S. 2—has already passed the Senate and I am hopeful that it will soon be considered in the House.

The bill is patterned after the Hatch Act of 1887 which authorized the agricultural experiment stations which have played such a prominent part in the development of agriculture in America.

Each State center will be entitled to as much as $100,000 a year on a continuing basis, plus matching funds for specific research or experimental projects. This is in the best tradition of Federal-State partnership in creating a better agriculture for our Nation.

The bill would implement a recommendation of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources. This committee 2 years ago issued a report which shows how rapidly we are approaching the point at which shortages of available water supplies will constitute a significant barrier to our economic and social progress.

I would like to read to you one very challenging statement from the report:

"Regardless of which of the programs is adopted, five regions—the upper Missouri, upper Rio Grande and Pecos, Colorado, Great Basin and South Pacific—will be short of water under the assumptions made, and will require maximum regulation by 1980."

My friends, this brings the problem very close to us because the upper Missouri region mentioned in that paragraph contains our entire State of Nebraska. In fact, Nebraska is the only State which lies entirely within the boundaries of the Missouri River Basin.

And the year in which the report says we will be short of water—1980—is only 17 years away.

When one considers the life-and-death importance to Nebraska agriculture of an adequate water supply, the importance of sound decisions and a clear policy are immediately apparent.

For example, we sometimes are disposed to think that our underground water supply is virtually inexhaustible. But we should have scientific proof of its adequacy. Suppose that studies showed a tendency toward depletion in the years ahead. It would be essential to have sound technical advice on what system of appropriation to apply to prevent overpumping and what system of priorities to apply to the 24,000 wells now in existence. It would be important to know whether these priorities should be on a statewide basis, or on a river valley basis, and the exact boundaries of such valleys.

We need research that will indicate more efficient uses and storage practices of our precious water resources. The list is almost endless.

Dean Frolik and I have been in touch concerning the preliminary planning to establish a water resources research center at the University of Nebraska. I have told him that if the House acts in time, we may be able to get funds to get the project started in this fiscal year. That, however, would be an optimistic forecast. More likely, we will not be able to get underway until fiscal 1965.

The establishment of that center, together with this fine facility here at Mead are just two links in an ever-lengthening and ever-strengthening chain which is being forged to help the university fulfill its goal of service to Nebraska agriculture.

FARMER TO KEEP PACE WITH PROGRESS

A major change has been in ferment in American agriculture for quite a while. Some call it a revolution and compare it to the economic revolution of an earlier era or the sweeping changes brought about in industry today by automation.

Nebraska farmers, like their counterparts throughout America are determined to keep pace with this rapid technological progress. In that determination there is no room for the philosophy that the way to "solve the farm problem" is to make a virtual public utility of agriculture, to regulate it as we do the railroads, or telephone companies or radio stations.

The farmer is determined to modernize his operation with the kind of machinery we see here today but he reserves the right to make for himself the decision of how he will modernize, just as he himself makes the decision between a John Deere or an Oliver, an International, a Massey-Ferguson tractor or what have you.

The role of Government in this matter is to help the farmer to keep pace with progress and there is no better example of that kind of help than in this field laboratory, run by an arm of the State government and supervised by men who are close to the people they serve.

Nobody needs to tell the farmer that this is proper. He is one of the few remaining breeds of independent thinkers. He has time to think things out for himself and he uses that time well. He is a capitalist with a considerable investment to protect.

He looks on such undertakings as this laboratory or the proposed water research center or the experiment stations around the State as investments in the future—his future—the future of agriculture.

Those who seek to restrict the farmer and to control him are seriously underestimating both his intelligence and his independence. They show an appalling lack of faith in the farmer and his future.

I reject this cynical attitude as unworthy. Nebraska's strength lies in its progressive agriculture and in the independence of its people.

Those who would have Government manage agriculture overlook a basic economic truth: there is great competition within the industry we call farming. Only highly restrictive and repressive measures that the farmer will not accept will dull the edge of this competitive sword.

It is in that spirit of independence and healthy competition that I congratulate not only the University of Nebraska for its remarkable progress here at Mead but I congratulate those interested in Nebraska agriculture, for all of us are the true beneficiaries of such progress and interest.

NEEDED: A CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, recently a subcommittee of the Senate Rules Committee, under the chairmanship of the wise and beloved senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], held hearings on Senate Concurrent Resolution 1. This resolution proposes the creation of a joint committee to study the organization and operation of the Congress and to recommend improvements. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, and it was my pleasure to testify in its behalf.

It is of importance to the Congress and to the maintenance of the balance which exists between the branches of our National Government that this resolution be approved. The Congress must keep its house in order if it is to continue its participation in decisionmaking. If it does not, it is inevitable that national policy will be made elsewhere in other ways.

I urge again that the Congress give its approval to this resolution.

There are many areas of congressional activity which need attention, many problems crying for solution. Let me address myself today to but one of these problems, one which was not discussed in the recent hearings: How the Congress is to deal with science.

SCIENCE'S GIANT GROWTH

Science has become a major sector of our economy; it takes a large share of Federal spending. In fiscal 1963 at least $14.7 billion was appropriated for scientific and technological research.

This is an increase of $3.5 billion—or 31 percent—over the 1962 level of $11.2 billion.

The President has requested an additional $2.7 billion for fiscal 1964 over and above the 1963 figure. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point two tables prepared by the National Science Foundation outlining the phenomenal increased Federal investment in the field of science.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Obligations and expenditures, fiscal years 1940–63

[Millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Total budget expenditures	Research and development and R. & D. plant [1]	
		Obligations	Expenditures
1940	9,062	(2)	74
1941	13,262	(2)	198
1942	34,046	(2)	280
1943	79,407	(2)	602
1944	95,059	(2)	1,377
1945	98,416	(2)	1,591
1946	60,448	(2)	918
1947	39,032	610	900
1948	32,955	868	855
1949	39,474	1,105	1,082
1950	39,544	1,175	1,083
1951	43,970	1,812	1,301
1952	65,303	2,194	1,816
1953	74,120	3,361	3,101
1954	67,537	3,039	3,148
1955	64,389	2,747	3,308
1956	66,224	3,269	3,446
1957	68,966	4,381	4,462
1958	71,369	4,908	4,990
1959	80,342	7,121	5,803
1960	76,539	8,079	7,738
1961	81,515	9,606	9,278
1962	89,075	11,238	10,195
1963	[3] 92,537	[3] 14,448	[3] 12,337

[1] Beginning with fiscal year 1953, amounts include pay and allowances of military personnel in research and development for both obligations and expenditures.

[2] Not available.

[3] Estimates are based on requested amounts presented in the budget, 1963. Hence, data for 1963 do not reflect congressional action.

NOTE.—Data for fiscal year 1952 and subsequent years are based on surveys of the National Science Foundation. Prior data were prepared by the Bureau of the Budget. Since the NSF surveys, agencies have submitted revised data to effect historical comparability occasioned by change of definition and scope of coverage

TABLE 1.—*Summary of Federal obligations for research and development and R. & D. plant, fiscal years 1961, 1962, and 1963*

[Millions of dollars]

Item	Actual, 1961	Estimates	
		1962	1963 [1]
Total obligations for research and development and R. & D. plant	9,606.3	11,238.5	14,447.8
Research and development	9,057.8	10,268.2	12,683.7
Total research	2,337.3	3,184.6	4,418.8
Basic research	803.5	1,126.0	1,486.4
Applied research	1,533.8	2,058.6	2,932.4
Development	6,515.4	6,877.5	8,058.3
Pay and allowances of military personnel in R. & D.	205.1	206.1	206.6
Performers of the Government's R. & D.:			
Domestic: [2]			
Federal Government	1,898.6	2,088.4	2,462.1
Profit organizations, proper	5,445.8	6,100.1	7,763.6
Profit organization research centers	455.9	407.7	434.7
Educational institutions, proper	539.8	731.6	905.5
Educational institution research centers	421.1	551.2	667.8
Other nonprofit organizations, proper	138.2	182.2	221.1
Other nonprofit organization research centers	79.8	117.0	125.4
Other	15.6	18.4	20.5
Foreign	63.0	71.8	83.1
Total research, by field of science:			
Life sciences, total	636.8	850.1	983.5
Psychological sciences	50.7	64.1	83.9
Physical sciences, total	1,511.9	1,995.4	3,025.0
Social sciences	44.4	64.7	95.2
Other sciences	93.5	210.3	231.1
Basic research, by field of science:			
Life sciences, total	237.9	322.7	387.2
Psychological sciences	20.9	29.9	36.8
Physical sciences, total	525.5	747.7	1,028.7
Social sciences	11.4	17.5	24.2
Other sciences	7.7	8.2	9.5
Research and development plant	548.5	970.3	1,764.2

[1] Estimates for 1963 are based on requested amounts included in the budget, 1963; hence, they do not reflect congressional action, which increased the total for research and development and R. & D. plant to $14,700,000,000.

[2] United States and territories.

NOTE.—Detail may not add to totals because of rounding.

Source: National Science Foundation.

The Federal commitment in research and development if plotted on a graph acts very like a hyperbolic function. Before the war Federal investment in science was minimal. Spending in this field gradually increased through the early 1950's and began to climb in great geometric progressions after the explosion of the H-bomb in 1952 and the successful sputnik launching in 1957. Federal expenditures for research and development now increase in giant steps from year to year. They will certainly continue to do so with ever bigger steps in the years ahead.

In fiscal 1960 the United States spent a little over $500 million on space exploration. In 1961, $900 million. In 1962, $1,800 million. In 1963, $3,600 million. This year NASA is requesting $5,700 million. If we add the space activities of the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Weather Bureau, and the National Science Foundation, we have a total in fiscal 1964 of $7,614 million.

The costs of our man on the moon program have just begun.

It is our National purpose as expressed by the President and endorsed by the Congress to have a man on the Moon by the end of the decade. Cost estimates have ranged from $20 to $40 billion to get him there. These are no doubt educated guesses but they are still guesses. No one knows how much it will cost. No one knows now what will come after Project Apollo. After the Moon landing, voyages to Mars and Venus are probable. Space stations and the like can be expected. It is certainly a reasonable estimate that our annual space budget by 1970 will be in the neighborhood of $20 billion a year. It could easily be far higher. In the decade of the 1970's we cannot now even predict what our space efforts or our costs will be. On Earth our expenditures on research have grown apace. They will continue to do so in such fields as medicine, in transport, in agriculture, and in commerce.

A MAJOR PARTNERSHIP

What began essentially with the ad hoc wartime Manhattan project has grown into a major partnership. Science and Government in the United States are irretrievably and irrevocably bound together. The Federal Government's commitment to research and development is expanding, increasing, and deepening. This is a fact. This is so and neither man nor party will be able to halt or reverse the trend.

This division of the resources of our economy to new and uncharted areas brings about change everywhere at every level. The aero-space-scientific industries in the United States are the ones investing money in creating new jobs. They get the dollars; our older industries do not. As Senator HUMPHREY has pointed out, three-quarters of the research sponsored by the Federal Government goes for defense, space, atomic energy, and public health, whereas such basic industries as building and construction, textiles, apparel, and food processing provide but 4 percent of the research and development. These are industries constituting 30 percent of the manufacturing components of our gross national products.

The jobs are where the aerospace plants are. The Pacific States receive half the military budget. The Middle Atlantic States receive 20 percent and the great Midwest receives but 8 percent of the total. These Federal investments have their accelerator and multiplier effects, bringing boomtown prosperity to the communities with aerospace investment. At the same time the Midwest, the Great Plains, the New England and the Appalachian regions have felt the chill of departing capital and population.

The aerospace industry has made demands upon our universities and colleges. Scientists, engineers, and technicians are called for and paid for. The concept of the educated man, learned in the arts and balanced in his culture, is not encouraged by this whirlwind demand for the specialist.

The aerospace industry is the only major industry actively creating new jobs. These are jobs for the highly skilled; for the college graduate; for the research scientist and engineer. There are fewer jobs today then there were yesterday for the unskilled; for the untrained and uneducated. There will be even fewer jobs for them tomorrow.

The economy, the geography, the culture and the structure of our society are being changed by this burst of science and the change will ever more quicken.

SCIENCE AND THE CONGRESS

Any committee studying the Congress should give its attention to this incredible growth of science—best in size and importance. It is disturbing but true that at the present time the Congress does not understand science and it is also true that science does not understand Congress. Communication between the two must be improved and the Congress must inform itself—for its own protection and that of the people—on the activities of the sciences.

Increasingly, policy decisions made on programs and funds for science and technology affect in their full relevancy not only the security of the country but the liberty and privacy of every human being everywhere. If democracy and representative government are to prevail in this nation, it is necessary that the Congress understand the importance of these decisions and that it have a role in the making of them. At the present time Congress does not appreciate the importance of scientific decisions and as a result they are made, not in the halls of Congress but elsewhere, not by the elected representatives but by unknown administrative officials.

In this world of cataclysm, change, and of almost impossible complexity representative democracy is put to severe test. How is a popularly elected government to control its own activities? How are elected officials to direct development of something they cannot understand with implications they do not comprehend. It is this problem to which I would direct the attention of the committee.

EISENHOWER, SNOW, AND BETHE

President Eisenhower in his last address to the people as President, warned of the danger the democracy implicit in the scientific upheaval. He had this to say:

> We must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific technological elite.
>
> It is the task of statesmanship to mold, to balance, and to integrate these and other forces, new and old, within the principles of our democratic system—ever aiming toward the supreme goals of our free society.

The English novelist and scientist, C. P. Snow, in his 1960 Godkin lectures at Harvard, raised the very same issue when he asked how government may make sound strategic decisions on questions in which science is involved. He has warned as has the eminent physicist, Dr. Hans Bethe, that the important decisions being made today are made not by the Senate nor by the Congress nor by the President, but are made in secret by small groups of officials. These "secret choices," as Snow calls them, are made at the lower levels of administration by scientists and officials. The implications of these decisions are understood by only a few men; by the time we in Congress learn of the decision, the implications are already upon us. I can think of four cases current in which scientific decisions of grave implication were not adequately understood by the public nor by the majority of Congress: First, the apparent discarding of the radiation protection guides in the measurement of fallout. Second, the high level test of an atomic weapon which altered the Van Allen belt and disrupted radio signals. Third, the placing of millions of copper needles into space. Fourth, the proposed construction of a harbor in Alaska by atomic explosion. Secret choices are made not because—or not often because—there is a conspiracy of secrecy. These choices are made by the highly trained few because we in the Congress and until quite recently, officials in the executive, were unequipped and uninterested in participating.

It is in the nature of government and things that action will proceed and decisions will be taken. If the Congress does not insist upon participating in these decisions, they will be made by others elsewhere. In time, the power will pass to those who make the decision, leaving but the mantle and circumstance for the Congress.

The President has shown a recognition of the importance of insuring informed and adequate civilian supervision over science and military technology, research, and development. In the organization plan No. 2, 1962, President Kennedy established the Office of Science and Technology as a permanent part of the Office of the President. This is to be a small agency with great knowledge. It is the responsibility of this office to keep the President informed on Federal programs and problems in the scientific field; to coordinate functions, review policies, and establish priorities. To assist it in its work, the President's Science Advisory Committee has been established composed of eminent scientists throughout the country, who meet monthly to furnish scientific advice on national policy. The services of over 300 expert consultants in scientific and technological fields are called upon from time to time as needed. Thus it is that the President has initiated a coherent effort to bring order and control in a field of government where there is little of either. No doubt the Office of Science and Technology will grow substantially in the coming years. It must do so if the Executive is to fulfill his constitutional responsibilities.

The Congress has taken no step similar to that of the President. It is true that in specific questions we have the House Science and Astronautics Committee and the Senate Aeronautics and Space Sciences Committee. We have also the Joint Atomic Energy Committee whose responsibility it is to oversee the Atomic Energy Commission. These are congressional committees. They are staffed with professional personnel of high caliber. They are not, however, staffed with practicing scientists. They are dependent for their information upon whatever information is presented to them in hearing, and much too often this is limited to Government witnesses and testimony.

This, quite obviously, is not enough. Almost every committee of the Congress is called upon in this day to pass on questions of science, research, and advancing technology.

The Appropriations Committees must pass on multibillion dollar money bills involving the funding of three-fourths of all the research and development carried on in this Nation.

These committees are without scientific personnel. They are without direct access to responsible scientific opinion. They are unable to obtain in an easy manner responsible and critical evaluation of proposed Government programs by scientists not directly involved.

There is no pool of scientific wisdom to advise the Congress on the assignment of priorities.

We have water research bills, fish research bills, mineral development research bills, urban psychological study programs, supersonic airplane bills, satellite communication bills, air pollution, water pollution, environmental hazard bills, cancer, heart disease and mental health bills, retardation and epilepsy programs, moose conservation and forestry research bills. Who is to tell the Congress what is redundant, what is unnecessary, what is duplication, and what is vital?

This is the challenge that the Congress must face. I am not certain how it is to be faced.

THREE SUGGESTIONS

It has been suggested that a Joint Committee on Science would be useful. It has been suggested that a scientific accounting office similar to GAO would be useful. It has been suggested that scientific advisers for each of the principal legislative committees would be useful. I believe that careful consideration should be given to all three suggestions.

Each of the above three suggestions presents limitations. A single committee on science would, as time goes on, take over more and more of the functions of the other legislative committees. At the same time, it would not provide a readily accessible source of scientific knowledge for the use of other committees or of Congressmen or Senators not on the committee.

A scientific accounting office would be helpful in tracking down waste and foolishness after it had occurred. It would not be useful in assisting the Congress in making decisions on programs yet to be initiated. In the years ahead, the pace of events and the magnitude of projects will not allow us to discover our errors in judgment only after they are made.

A scientific staff for each major committee raises personnel problems. It would be difficult to obtain high-level and distinguished scientific advisors on a full-time basis for each of the major committees. Scientific thought of the stature needed would not be content with what would be a job of a sporadic, off-again on-again nature.

ESTABLISH COST

Perhaps a new approach is needed; one of scope and flexibility adequate to meet the increasing demands of the revolution in science. It is my thought that the basic structure of the President's Office of Science and Technology offers a guide for the Congress.

I would suggest the establishment of the Congressional Office of Science and Technology—COST—as a creature of Congress, responsible only to the Congress.

This office would have a small, highly skilled, permanent, professional staff and a large body of consultants, available to the Congress to furnish advice, evaluations, and reports. It is important that this office be completely and totally separate from the executive branch. It should have what access to information is held by the Congress. It would be the task of the permanent staff to ask questions for Congress, to answer questions of Congress, and to assist the Members in handling the scientific matters which come before them. It would also be the responsibility of COST to report to the appropriation committees whatever achievements, happenings, or failures in the scientific world appear to be of importance.

There have been discussions among scientists as to whether in the coming years scientists will be on "top" or on "tap." They should not be on top merely because they are scientists. They should not, on the other hand, be merely on tap. It is necessary that the very best scientific opinion be brought to bear, both pro and con, on the important decisions of our society and its Government. It is also important, however, that these decisions shall be made by those responsible to the people.

I believe that the Congressional Office of Science and Technology would provide important assistance in this regard.

AGATE FOSSIL BEDS NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, last Thursday, I responded to an invitation to address the Western Nebraska United Chambers of Commerce meeting in the beautiful State park in Chadron, Nebr., and to discuss the prospects for passage of S. 1481, which was introduced by me and cosponsored by my colleague [Mr. CURTIS] and others which would create a national monument at the agate fossil beds in western Nebraska.

The meeting was very timely because the National Park Service, through the Department of Interior, had very recently completed its study of this proposed national monument. Its proposal is now in the hands of the printer and should be available at an early date. It is a very well composed analysis and report. It describes well the geologic history, the setting, the significance of developing the area, and other pertinent features of the fossil beds. In due time copies of this proposal will be made available to the members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and others interested. However, at this point I should like to read into the RECORD its conclusions and recommendations:

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The agate fossil beds are nationally significant because of their numerous, concentrated, well-preserved Miocene mammal fossils, which represent an important chapter in the history of life, one that is not now adequately represented in the national park system. This site is significant too because of the important contributions made here by the early pioneers of scientific research in the West. The area also meets suitability and feasibility requirements for a national monument.

Based on these conclusions it is recommended that the area described in this report be established as the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument, and that the necessary steps be taken as soon as possible to achieve the establishment of this area as a unit of the National Park system.

The business and professional leaders attending the meeting displayed great enthusiasm for the legislation and for the prospect of preserving the rich archeological treasure which abounds at the agate beds, and of all the collateral results which would stem from creation of the monument.

It is the hope of those of us sponsoring S. 1481, Mr. President, that the bill can be considered in timely fashion both here in the Senate and in the House, where Representative DAVIS MARTIN has offered identical legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that extracts from my remarks to the Western Nebraska United Chambers of Commerce on July 25 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTRACTS FROM THE REMARKS OF SENATOR ROMAN L. HRUSKA, WESTERN NEBRASKA UNITED CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE, CHADRON, NEBR., JULY 25

It is a great pleasure to meet this evening with the Western Nebraska United Chambers of Commerce and to discuss the prospects for the establishment of a national monument at the Agate fossil beds.

This morning I spoke at the Nebraska Agricultural Field Laboratory at Mead. It was my good fortune to play a part in obtaining that site for the university. The success of that venture may be a good omen for our success in passage of the bill to establish the Agate National Monument.

Many of you are already familiar with the situation regarding the proposed national monument. My purpose today is to respond to your invitation to bring you up to date.

Following a fascinating field trip to the fossil quarries in company with Mrs. Cook, representatives of the National Park Service and civic leaders from across the Nebraska panhandle, I introduced, on behalf of Senator Curtis, Senator Simpson of Wyoming, and myself, S. 1481, on May 8, which would provide for the Agate Monument under the development of the Park Service. Since that time Senators Allott and Dominick, of Colorado, McGee, of Wyoming, and Mundt, of South Dakota, have joined as cosponsors.

On the same day, Congressman Dave Martin introduced an identical bill in the House of Representatives.

Among the many letters of support we received was one from your president, John Elwell, together with an excellent resolution from the Western Nebraska United Chambers of Commerce pointing out the archeological treasures at Agate and the importance of their preservation.

Senator Curtis and I on the Senate side, and Dave Martin in the House, have requested hearings on the bills as soon as possible. Before the hearings can be held, the committees must call for reports from interested departments and agencies. In this case, the principal agency involved, of course, is the Department of Interior in which is located the National Park Service.

Just before leaving Washington, I checked with the Park Service on the status of its report. I was informed that the regional headquarters in Omaha had sent its report to the printers last weekend and it is expected to be received in Washington within a few days. Allowing for the normally slow flow of paper on the banks of the Potomac, it is expected to find its way to the Congress within the next 30 days.

It is gratifying to report to you that the Interior Department's recommendation will be highly favorable. The first hurdle, then, is successfully cleared.

What is the reason for all this effort to make a national monument out of the Agate fossil beds: One of the best answers was contained in your organization's resolution. Another is that the opportunities to preserve and restore historical sites in this Nation are dwindling fast. This is especially so in the case of natural features, such as Agate.

Unless we act promptly to save these priceless areas, they will be lost forever.

Although the rich Agate site has been worked off and on for many years, it still remains one of the great untapped deposits of fossils of the Miocene period. The most attractive aspect of the proposal is that visitors will be able to watch "in-place" reliefing operations on the quarry face as workmen with jackhammers, chisels, and picks cut away the rock to expose the fossil bones. The tourist can also watch through a window as technicians in the preparation rooms clean the fossils and assemble them into prehistoric skeletons.

We Americans have a high sense of our history. We carefully preserve and restore the treasures of our past. How thrilling it is to realize that at Agate we will be dealing with creatures which roamed this area 15 million years ago.

The Park Service is especially eager to acquire the Agate quarries because they represent a link that is missing in a chain of the National Park System. You might consider this a chain of life of the geologic past. The beginning of life, exemplified by the fossil algae, is represented in Glacier National Park in Montana. The Grand Canyon National Park has remains of the prehistoric invertebrates. Fossil plant life is found in the Petrified Forest in Yellowstone Park. The age of reptiles is represented by the Dinosaur National Monument in Utah and Colorado.

Agate represents the golden age of mammals and would complete the National Park System's chain of life.

The importance of Agate's fossil deposits have been recognized by scientists from all over the world. Dr. C. Bertram Schultz of the University of Nebraska museum has pointed out that, "Nearly every important European museum has fossils from Agate."

Ardent paleontologists as Dr. Harold Cook and his illustrious father, Capt. James H. Cook, who owned the Agate quarries, were the first to appreciate their importance. Mrs. Margaret Cook, the kindly gracious lady who is the widow of the late Dr. Cook, has been most cooperative in the negotiations concerning Agate. Through the efforts of many individuals devoted to the preservation and development of these quarries, they will be protected and appreciated by countless numbers of Americans in the future.

Most of you are businessmen and I know you will not mind if I turn for a moment to the economic aspects of a national monument at Agate.

The most conservative estimates of the National Park Service place the number of visitors to Agate at around 120,000 by the time it is fully developed—in about 5 years. Based upon a 1960 traffic flow map, the Park Service has estimated that 212,000 visitors a year can be expected.

That's quite a spread. Whether it is the higher or the lower figure will depend in large measure in how the monument is promoted, what kind of facilities are offered the visitor in the way of food, lodging, service stations, shopping, and so forth, and in what kind of highways and roads are available to him.

That will be your job. It is a tremendous challenge. I am confident you will meet it.

Let us look at the most modest projections of the economic benefits.

Suppose we have 120,000 visitors. Two-thirds of these will be from other States and from eastern Nebraska. They will require meals and overnight lodging.

Recent economic studies by the University of Michigan and the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission show that tourists spend between $7 and $10 per person per day in visiting park areas. Again taking the conservative view, let's use the figure of $7. This would mean $560,000 of new money added to the economy of western Nebraska from this source alone.

In addition, the National Park Service plans a development program of $1,900,000 during the first 5 years, about 90 percent of which can be spent locally on labor and supplies and materials.

When fully staffed and developed at the end of 5 years, the operating program for management and protection and maintenance of the area will require about $135,000 a year.

At least 75 percent of the employee salaries are spent locally and most of the supplies and materials can be obtained from this vicinity. Thus, you can see that the economy of western Nebraska will benefit by about $2 million during the first 5 years of this project, exclusive of tourist expenditures.

After 5 years, the economic benefit from National Park Service operations and tourist expenditures will increase with increasing visitors, to more than a million dollars a year.

This, of course, is not the whole story. We have the same effect you get when you drop a rock in the pond. When the motel man's business grows, he adds more units and that's good for the construction man and the furniture dealer. When their businesses improve, so does the grocer's and so on and on.

Now, I trust that none of you is going to jump up and rush out to start building a motel or a filling station. We still have a little way to go. But it is not too early to start planning for this development.

Meanwhile, Dave Martin, Carl Curtis, and I will do what we can in Washington. The rest is up to you.

TIME FOR CANDOR ON THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, last week President Kennedy sent Congress a special message dealing with the continuing deficit in the U.S. balance on international payments, and with his policies and plans to meet this problem.

It is not my purpose to discuss each of the detailed points covered in that message. The message is more noteworthy for what it omits than for what it contains. It omits to describe the dangerous position we have already reached in our international financial relationships, and the further dangers we shall face if the present trend is not abruptly checked. The message exudes a note of rosy optimism. We are told that "there is much from which to take heart," that "our gold outflow has been halved," that "the deficit in our balance of payments has been reduced," that "our basic strength is vast, real, and enduring," and so on. The message plays up every encouraging aspect, while glossing over the less palatable facts.

In my judgment, this problem is of the utmost seriousness, affecting the future stability of the dollar and the entire financial structure of the free world; and the President would have been better advised to lay it before us in those terms.

Let me put the problem in capsule form. We are funding a deficit of major proportions in our balance of payments, which threatens to become chronic, and which shows no immediate signs of diminishing. Omitting special Government transactions, the deficit was larger in 1962 than in 1961 and, during the first quarter of 1963, seasonally adjusted, was running at a rate larger than in 1962. Five years ago our total short-term liabilities to foreigners was about $15 billion; today they have increased to more than $25 billion, not counting foreign holdings of readily marketable long-term securities such as U.S. Government bonds. Five years ago our gold stock was about $22 billion; today, the gold stock, including holdings of convertible foreign currencies by U.S. monetary authorities has declined to less than $16 billion. In other words, we have lost ground to the extent of more than $15 billion in the 5-year period. Most of our gold is required as backing for the Federal Reserve notes and the deposit liabilities of the Federal Reserve banks. Five years ago our free gold, available for meeting our liabilities to foreigners, amounted to about $11 billion; today, it is less than $4 billion.

Furthermore, the situation is not getting better, nor have we made any progress in solving it. For over 2 years we have been told repeatedly of all the steps being taken by the Treasury and other Departments to improve our position, yet today our basic deficit—that is, considering regular transactions only—is as large as ever. Meanwhile, our foreign liabilities steadily grow, while our dwindling gold reserves continue to hemorrhage away, month by month and year by year.

Two weeks ago the Secretary of the Treasury discussed this subject before the Joint Economic Committee in somewhat different—and considerably more candid—terms than those used by the President. The President in his message told us that our deficit had been reduced from $3.9 billion in 1960 to $2.4 billion in 1961 and $2.2 billion in 1962. By implication, he would have led us to believe that the deficit is being steadily diminished. Secretary Dillon, by contrast, conceded that the apparent improvement in our balance of payments for each of the years 1961 and 1962 was almost entirely due to special one-shot Government transactions which cannot be continued indefinitely and actually do not affect the underlying picture. Omitting such special transactions, he figured that the deficit amounted to over $3.0 billion in 1961 and to $3.6 billion in 1962, and that during the first quarter of 1963 it was running at an annual rate, seasonally adjusted, of about $3.7 billion. In other words, it has increased again about back to the average level of 1958–60. With all our running, we have barely succeeded in standing still.

The difference between the pictures presented by the President and his Secretary of the Treasury is fundamental. There is a difference in the figures, but more important, there is a difference in candor. It is essential that we know whether we are making any progress in solving this problem or not. The President implies that we are, but Secretary Dillon's testimony, and the figures themselves, show clearly that we are not.

In this context, it is hard to look on the new administration proposals as more than half-measures. The most the President claims for them is a gain of $2 billion, compared with the annual deficits of more than $3 billion we have experienced during each of the last 5 years. Furthermore, the proposal to tax new American purchases of foreign securities has already—within a week of the message—been watered down by postponing the effective date and by a special exemption of new bond issues for Canada, the most important foreign country affected. Thus, much of the hoped-for saving will be lost. Even if all the President's estimates prove correct, his program does not even pretend to match the magnitude of the deficit.

Mr. President, we are not likely to solve this problem until we are willing to face up to it frankly. The sands of time are running out. The distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] a few days ago estimated that our free gold—that part of our gold stock which is available for meeting our international obligations—will last only about 18 months more, at the present rate at which it is being dissipated. Eighteen months would carry us past the election. I do not accuse this administration of intending to stall off the crisis until after election. I merely say this: the longer the delay in facing up to the unpleasant realities, the sterner the day of reckoning when it comes.

It is clear that the temporizing measures employed to date have not been effective and will not be effective, and that we may face the necessity for real austerities within the foreseeable future. No one likes austerity, yet it is a sign of maturity when we are ready to recognize its necessity. During the last few days there has been considerable debate in this Chamber about the advisability of the increase in the discount rate by most of the Federal Reserve Banks from 3 to 3½ percent. It has been suggested, for example, that a cut in our foreign aid and military spending abroad would have been preferable. I am in sympathy with that thought, but I suspect we may have both increases in interest rates, and drastic reductions in foreign aid and foreign spending, as well as other considerable readjustments that some people may find painful.

In practice, the United States does not have many alternative policies from which to choose in dealing with this dilemma. It is unthinkable for us to devalue the dollar, and almost as much so to talk of imposing exchange controls. Lacking those alternatives, the standard recourse for most countries in dealing with intractable adverse balances has been to raise the discount rate. During the past decade alone, the Bank of England on three separate occasions has had to raise bank rate to a full 6 percent, and on one occasion, to 7 percent. I am not suggesting that such discount rates will be necessary or desirable here. No one wants high interest rates, but it would be well to get it out of our heads that the United States is somehow immune from the discipline of the balance of payments. It may be that we have not had to accept that discipline in the past, at least not for the last half century or so, but every other nation—ancient and modern—has had to accept it. It now appears that we too must learn to live with it, whether we like it or not.

TREATY SHOULD BE RATIFIED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I shall speak out in favor of the limited nuclear test ban treaty. The debate in the Senate on ratification will be prolonged and historic. After hearing 7 hours or more of testimony of high officials including Secretary of State Rusk and Under Secretary Harriman, and studying all aspects of the treaty, I am convinced that this treaty ending nuclear testing in the atmosphere, outer space and under water is solidly rooted in our vital national interests. I believe the Senate will ratify this treaty.

It accomplishes the objective patiently sought by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy in spite of repeated discouragements, rebuffs and notwithstanding opposition at home.

The treaty will not end the cold war nor the threat of Communist aggression, but it will stop one area of armament competition. It may pave the way for progress in other areas. We will continue to maintain our Nation's supremacy.

As President Kennedy, speaking in a spirit of hope tempered with realism, said:

> It is an important first step—a step toward peace—a step toward reason—a step away from war.

Designed to take some of the destructive sting out of the nuclear age, it is a positive step toward limiting the spread of nuclear weapons, easing world tensions, and relieving the anxiety of all Americans over nuclear fallout.

Yes, we take a risk when your Senate ratifies this treaty, the same risk we take in any agreement with the Soviet Union. However, it seems certain that Premier Khrushchev is desirous as we are to end contamination in the atmosphere and the spread of nuclear weapons. If the Communists violate any provisions of this treaty this Nation is immediately released from its obligation.

Some Senators want opinions from our military leaders and indicate they will vote against ratification unless such assurances and approval are forthcoming. If Pentagon reports are true, the admirals and generals are not opposed to this treaty. Furthermore, before and during these negotiations, our President was in constant consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the military implications of the treaty. The constitutional duty for final decision belongs to our President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Founding Fathers decreed that civilian authority must always be supreme over military authority. I hope the time never comes when generals and admirals dictate the foreign policy of our country.

Those who oppose this treaty exaggerate the risks of cheating. They minimize the risk of continuing the arms race. This treaty contains the specific reservation that our Nation may scrap the agreement if deemed necessary by our President for our national security. The United Kingdom and the Soviet Union have the same right. Also, were the Soviet Union to violate any provisions of the treaty that would void the treaty immediately. Furthermore, each nation may continue underground tests as long as radioactive debris is not deposited outside its territorial limits. We shall not rely solely upon Soviet good faith. We shall rely on our farflung detection network that instantly warns of atmospheric or underwater tests anywhere in the world.

Armament races ultimately led to World Wars I and II. Let us hope this treaty signals the beginning of the end of today's armaments race. There would be no victor in a nuclear war.

During the debate on this treaty, let us keep in mind President Kennedy's remarks in his great speech at American University:

> World peace, like community peace, does not require that each man love his neighbor—it requires only that they live together with mutual tolerance.

THE YEMEN

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, last fall, at a time of substantial tension in the Yemen, I was in Cairo and Saudi Arabia. Our apparent policy was one of recognition of the so-called Republican government that had revolted against the Royalist government in Yemen. The so-called Republican government had received the aid of a substantial number of Egyptian arms of various kinds and thousands of Egyptian troops. The Republican government seemed to be on the verge of establishing law and order, and creating the ability to maintain the international commitments of the Yemen.

In any event, contrary to the opinion and the judgment of many people, our country decided in December to recognize the new Government, the so-called Republican government of Yemen.

Prior to that time, and at that time, while the Egyptians were sending in thousands of troops to aid the so-called Republican revolution, Saudi Arabia and Jordan, on the other hand, sent aid to the Imperialist forces, or the former royal family forces, in Yemen that were resisting the Republican revolt.

In any event, with the recognition which we accorded—contrary, as I say, to the advice and opinion of many people who were quite knowledgeable in that field—there came an agreement, and there is not much question about it, which we were supposed to have exacted from Mr. Nasser and his government in Egypt, and from the Governments of Saudi Arabia and Jordan, on the other hand, that they would disengage, that each would pull its forces out and take its assistance away from the Yemen, and that peace would be established.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 more minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, it was agreed that they would proceed to establish a peaceful situation.

Seven months have gone by. The Egyptians have not withdrawn their forces. If anything, they have stepped up their activities in the Yemen against the tribesmen, against the former government.

Saudi Arabia and Jordan have in substantial degree done exactly what they said they would do. They have withdrawn their participation with the former government. Egypt has failed in every detail to keep its agreements and understandings, upon which recognition was based.

I have been considerably concerned about this matter because I had some firsthand exposure to it late last fall at the time of recognition, in the countries of Egypt and Saudi Arabia.

On July 16 I wrote a letter to the Secretary of State. I shall not read the letter in full, but I shall ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Briefly, in the letter I recited the events, and I said that the Egyptians had not carried out their commitments. I said that, among other things, they had stepped up their military activities and had increased their use of napalm bombs.

I quote one sentence from the letter:

> From all available reports there is strong evidence that the Egyptian forces have enlarged the area of attack and have used increasing patterns of aerial bombardment with napalm bombs and other weapons and have on occasions used gas with poisonous and lethal capability.

These things have been established. In other words, the situation is growing worse rather than better.

I suggest to the Secretary of State and to the administration that, unless the situation is corrected immediately and the Egyptian troops withdraw according to the agreement, we should seriously consider withdrawing the recognition which we granted to that government in December.

I go further and say that, so far as I am personally concerned, unless we do something to correct the operation—which, up to now, has been a mistaken operation, I shall consider the advisability of submitting a resolution for consideration by the Senate, which would state that it is the sense of the Senate that the United States should withdraw recognition.

I realize the difficulty, and often the impropriety, of filing such resolutions declaring the sense of the Senate to be thus and so. I realize that such resolutions should not be used very often; but I believe there are occasions when, in the public interest, we can submit and act upon such resolutions.

Today I received a reply to my letter of July 16, on behalf of the Secretary of State, signed by Mr. Phillips Talbot, Assistant Secretary, in which he canvasses the situation. He admits that many of these conditions were part and parcel of the understanding of recognition. He has other explanations, however, for the failure to act with vigor and dispatch in this regard.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter of July 16, 1963, to the Secretary of State, and, following that, the letter of Mr. Phillips Talbot, Assistant Secretary, in reply, which I received this morning, may be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 16, 1963.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
The Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY RUSK: The political and military situation in Yemen seems to be one of continuing uncertainty. As you know, I was in Egypt and Saudi Arabia last November just prior to the time when our country, in mid-December, recognized the so-called Republican forces which had revolted against the existing Royalist regime with the full military and logistical support of Egypt. The Royalist regime had the sympathy and material support, in a limited way, of Saudi Arabia and Jordan.

It is my understanding that recognition of the present Government was based on the theory that while the revolutionary forces had only succeeded in capturing the major cities and coastal plains, nevertheless, it was in a position to establish peace and stability and carry out the international commitments of Yemen. It is also my understanding the Egyptian forces were to be withdrawn and that the assistance of Saudi Arabia and of Jordan to the previous Royalist regime would be withdrawn.

Seven months have gone by, and while it seems that Saudi Arabia and Jordan have carried out a substantial part of their withdrawal from participation in this conflict Egypt has neither withdrawn nor diminished its military and other activities there. Peace has not been established in Yemen and the new regime has not been able to consolidate and pacify the country. From all available reports there is strong evidence that the Egyptian forces have enlarged the area of attack and have used increasing patterns of aerial bombardment with napalm bombs and other weapons and have on occasions used gas with poisonous and lethal capability. There are reports of other excesses by the Egyptian forces contrary to the agreements and understandings of last December, upon which recognition of the new government in Yemen was based.

Without going into detail, it seems to me, in view of the circumstances, that our Government should give immediate consideration to the question of withdrawal of recognition of the present Government of the Yemen, unless the conditions upon which that recognition was based are promptly carried out. This includes, of course, among other things, the prompt disengagement and withdrawal of Egyptian forces as well as the withdrawal of Saudi Arabian and other aid to the other side.

If the present conditions continue in Yemen I am considering offering a resolution in the Senate proposing that it is the sense of the Senate that we withdraw recognition from the existing Government of Yemen and perhaps suggesting such other matters affecting cooperation with Egypt as might be considered proper. I think the use of resolutions of this kind should be given careful consideration, but I think occasions do arise from time to time when such expressions are valuable in the determination of our national attitudes on specific international problems.

With highest personal regards, I am.

Sincerely yours,

BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 26, 1963.

Hon. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HICKENLOOPER: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of July 16 in which you discuss the political and military situation in Yemen and recommend certain lines of U.S. Government action. I welcome your interest in a problem of considerable complexity and am most happy to comment on your reasoned and constructive letter.

You are correct in your understanding of the basis for U.S. Government recognition of the Yemen Arab Republic (YAR). This recognition was based essentially on (1) YAR control of the apparatus of government; (2) apparent popular support; (3) YAR control of most of the country; and (4) YAR willingness and capability to honor its international obligations. In addition, we realized that only by recognizing the regime could we play a useful role in preventing an escalation of the Yemen conflict causing even more foreign interference and placing in serious jeopardy major U.S. economic and security interests in the Arabian Peninsula. Furthermore, our presence in Yeman—including an AID mission—could not have been continued for long without recognition. The AID mission was originally established in Yemen for the purpose of maintaining a beachhead of U.S. influence in the face of a sustained Communist interest and a growing Soviet presence.

You are correct also in your understanding that Egyptian military forces are to be withdrawn from Yemen in accordance with the disengagement agreement negotiated by Special Presidential Emissary, Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, and subsequently agreed to by the parties with the U.N. Secretary General. It should be remembered that although the disengagement agreement was negotiated in early April, it did not go fully into effect until late June when United Nations observers began to arrive in Yemen to supervise the disengagement operation. In fact, the U.N. Secretary General has stated that he considers the operation to have officially begun only on July 4 when observers were placed in Jizan. During the regrettable delay in putting the agreement into effect, there was no net reduction of Egyptian forces in Yemen nor did Saudi Arabia fully terminate its aid to the Royalists. However, we are satisfied that the Saudis have terminated their assistance since the date the disengagement went fully into effect and are hopeful the United Arab Republic will fulfill its part of the agreement.

Peace has not been established in the country, as you indicate. United Arab Republic troops are still tied down coping with guerrilla warfare mounted by the tribes—who are traditionally opposed to any central government—but it is our view that the intensity of the tribal resistance will abate once the drying up of the Saudi supply line takes full effect and a stabilizing of the situation permits reconciliation of tribal factions. We are not aware that the United Arab Republic troops have enlarged the area of attack in recent days. The United Arab Republic is not prohibited by the disengagement agreement from fighting tribes who continue to operate against the Central Government. However, the agreement does prohibit punitive attacks against tribes on the basis of resistance mounted before the agreement went fully into effect.

Regarding your suggestion that we give immediate consideration to withdrawing our recognition of the Yemen Arab Republic unless United Arab Republic troops are promptly removed from Yemen, I would like to make the following comments. In the first place, the original basis for our recognition of the Yemeni regime still applies. Whether or not the regime enjoys the same degree of popular support is a controversial question which it would be impossible to answer categorically without establishing a stable situation that would enable the populace to express its views freely. However, this does not mean that those disaffected with the leadership of the new Republican regime favor the restoration of the wholly discredited Imamate. Second, we do not believe that withdrawing our recognition would advance U.S. interests. Our essential concerns in Yemen are with: (1) keeping the Yemeni conflict and its repercussions from spreading and endangering vital U.S. and and free world interests in the Near East outside of Yemen, particularly in Saudi Arabia and Jordan; (2) preventing the development by the Soviet bloc of a predominant position in Yemen; and (3) encouraging the prospects for a relatively stable and independent Yemen. Withdrawing recognition would not be in consonance with these objectives. On the contrary, U.S. Government effectiveness in containing and resolving the Yemeni conflict would thereby be seriously impaired; the Yemen Arab Republic could be expected to place greater reliance on the U.S.S.R.; and the viability of the Republican regime would be placed in jeopardy. The restoration of the notoriously despotic Imamate would not be supported by the Yemeni people at large and is generally acknowledged to be out of the question. In view of the sustained Communist interest and activity in Yemen, the most probable alternative to a Republican regime beset by tribal anarchy and without United Arab Republic help at least in the form of a military training mission would be one with a Communist coloration heavily dependent on Soviet support. It therefore behooves the free world to find ways and means of insuring the viability of the Republican regime while seeking to insure that it adequately represents all shades of Yemeni opinion.

I should like to add further that it is doubtful whether withdrawal of U.S. Government recognition of the Yemen Arab Republic would in fact achieve the desired result of inducing prompt UAR troop withdrawals. The UAR voluntarily entered into the disengagement agreement; it recently supported approval by the Security Council of the disengagement effort; it is paying one-half the costs of the United Nations operation; and UAR military forces currently are cooperating with the United Nations observation mission in Yemen as it gets established. In other words, the UAR wants to withdraw its troops from Yemen. Its delay in doing so appears to result, therefore, not from any lack of desire. Rather it seems to flow from the continuance of tribal guerrilla warfare in the Yemen highlands and perhaps also from the multiplicity of problems facing the new Government. I do not wish to imply that we feel these factors justify UAR foot-dragging; this is merely by way of explanation. Some observers believe that a broadening of the base of the Yemen Arab Republic leadership might strengthen the hand of the Government, reduce tribal disaffection and facilitate a more rapid UAR withdrawal. Withdrawal of U.S. Government recognition of the Yemen Arab Republic would only tend to weaken the Republican regime and put further pressure on the UAR to delay its withdrawal. This would not be in the interest of the United States, the Saudi Arabian Government, the UAR, nor the people of Yemen.

In the last paragraph of your letter you suggest the possibility that the United States review its program of economic assistance to the UAR in the light of the UAR performance in Yemen. I would like to note that we have witnessed a number of examples in recent years of the dangers and limitations of using foreign aid in a bludgeon fashion in forcing actions by foreign governments. This is particularly true in the highly sensitive and complex Middle East. Our experience shows that this type of action does not advance the objectives it is designed to promote, but instead has exactly the opposite result. It could ultimately have the effect of seriously damaging our security interests in the Near East by leading to greater UAR dependence as well as YAR dependence on the Soviets for aid. In our opinion such tactics would also be publicly disapproved by most of the Arab States on the nonalined countries.

In conclusion, I would like to assure you that we fully agree that the UAR should adhere to the terms of the disengagement agreement and should withdraw its troops from Yemen in a phased and expeditious fashion. You can rest confident that we are bringing to bear the full weight of U.S. influence in this connection. We consider it essential to have some flexibility in the measures we take to try to achieve the desired result and would find limitations that might be imposed by Congress an unnecessarily inhibiting factor.

I should be most happy to keep you informed periodically of further developments. If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

Phillips Talbot,
Assistant Secretary.

RETIREMENT OF JOHN D. RHODES, OFFICIAL REPORTER OF DEBATES, U.S. SENATE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, it is with deep regret that I view the retirement of John D. Rhodes, Chief Official Reporter of Debates of the U.S. Senate. We shall miss him very much because he has been a great source of strength to all of us in the Senate.

He has a magnificent record of 44 years of service to the Senate as an official reporter—service that is outstanding in the intelligence, dedication, and patience that he gave for the benefit of the Senate, its Members, and our country.

In the more than 14 years that it has been my privilege to serve in the Senate, I consider one of the highlights to have been the very pleasant association that I had with John D. Rhodes. No one has been more considerate and understanding—and I am sure that every other Member of the Senate feels the same as I do about him.

In his retirement, which he has so richly earned and deserves, I wish him the very best of health and happiness and many, many more years of success and happiness with his wonderful wife. I am confident that in the real meaning of the word, he will never retire but instead continue to serve the most useful purposes whatever his chosen activity may be.

And I am sure that I speak the sentiments of the Senate membership at large that he return to the Senate floor to visit us as often as he can.

ADDRESS BY FORMER SENATOR KNOWLAND BEFORE NATIONAL SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, one of the strongest leaders this body ever had, a gentleman many of us remember with great affection, was former Senator William Knowland. Bill Knowland is now busily engaged in the newspaper business in Oakland, Calif., but he finds time in his busy schedule to address organizations across this country. He continues in his strong, clear way to present his basic conservative philosophy wherever he appears.

Recently in Portland, Oreg., he addressed the National Sheriffs' Association, and because I believe his remarks to be worthy of attention by my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address of William F. Knowland Before the National Sheriffs' Association, Portland, Oreg., Multnomah Hotel, Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the National Sheriffs' Association, last November I received your invitation to speak at this Portland convention. A great deal has happened, at home and abroad, since that time.

Like most small boys I considered sheriffs and locomotive engineers to be the tops in future occupational possibilities.

The change from steam locomotives to diesels modified my views of one and the substitution of prowl cars for horses lessened my enthusiasm for the other.

After 6 years in the legislature of my State of California and over 13 years in the Senate of the United States, 6 of which were as majority or minority leader, I developed a deep-seated conviction that the real strength of our Nation is in local government of which your people are an integral part.

The men who founded this Republic were very wise. They knew the history of the world up to their time. They knew that where people had lost their freedom it was because of the concentration of power in the hands of a single individual in a nation's capital.

As a result the Constitutional Convention which met in Philadelphia in 1787 determined to guard future generations of Americans from tyrannical government. They did it by:

1. Making our's a government of laws and not of men.
2. Providing that government was the servant and not the master of the people.
3. Dividing power in the Federal Government between three coequal branches as checks and balances one against the other.
4. By choice, making the Federal Government one of limited and specified powers and reserving all other powers to the States or to the people thereof.

They were still not satisfied that they had completely achieved their objective so in 1789 there were proposed and by 1791 the requisite number of States had ratified our first 10 amendments which we know as the Bill of Rights guaranteeing certain rights to the people which neither the Federal, State, or local governments can take away from them.

Since that time we have amended our Constitution 23 times. To be sure this is, as it should be, a long and a difficult process.

We must never quietly permit the Constitution to be short circuited because some "whiz kid" decides that in this age of space travel and automation the American Constitution is antiquated or too cumbersome.

Neither executive fiat, judicial legislating or congressional resoluting should change the basic frame of structure of our Government or the guaranteed constitutional rights of our people.

Civil rights are far more broad than racial rights alone.

These include the right to walk our streets day or night without danger to life, limb or property; the right to own, manage and dispose of property; the right to associate with friends of one's own choice; the right to have gainful employment and to stay or leave the job based upon one's own choice and judgment. These are also civil rights entitled to the protection of Federal, State, and local authorities.

Whenever a mob can deny these rights regardless of the composition of those who would take over the streets from their use by peaceful citizens and from the duly constituted civil authorities we have a breakdown of constitutional government.

It is too bad that those who have led the fight for one segment of civil rights have not equally stressed civil obligations and civil responsibilities.

Every American citizen has the right to register and vote according to the qualifications for voting established by each of our 50 States and to do this without having discriminating standards applied to the individual applicant or voter because of race, creed, sex, or color.

Every American citizen has a right to patronize or withhold his purchasing power according to the choice he and his family make in the marketplaces of the Nation.

By his political action and economic participation an opportunity is given to every citizen to have his say in influencing events now and over the future years.

But he has no right to ride roughshod over the constitutional rights of the rest of our citizens. No pressure group minority can impose by unconstitutional means its views upon the majority of our people without their consent. Changes can only be made through the constitutional process of amendment.

The American people are a just people, they are a patient people, they are an understanding people, and they are a law-abiding people.

But if pushed too far (as King George III, Kaiser Wilhelm, Hitler, and Tojo learned to their sorrow) they are capable of taking the necessary political or military steps to remove the dangers to their constitutional form of government. The ballot box can and will serve the majority as well as the minority.

The citizen who preaches civil obligations and responsibilities along with civil rights must practice what he preaches.

He cannot, as in the movie "High Noon," leave the problem of the bad men and gunmen to the lone law-enforcement official. The attitude, too often prevalent among our people, "this is your problem, not mine" is not in keeping with American tradition.

Too often our newspapers, radio, and television carry reports where the offender against the law has the moral if not the physical support of citizens as against the law officer carrying out his duty. The very least the officer has a right to expect is, in the words of the early frontiersman: "If you can't help me at least don't help the bear."

In this the press has a part of the responsibility. So do the sheriffs and police officers. The overwhelming number of law-enforcement officers are dedicated men of integrity and courage. A few, a small percentage, from time to time betray their trust, but so do a few bankers, political officials, newspapermen, or civic leaders. The rest should not have the tar brush of guilt by association applied in an indiscriminate way.

The first amendment to the Constitution reads as follows:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

This constitutional guarantee of a free press was for the protection of the people not just for the protection of newspapermen.

I do not say to you that there are no arbitrary or unreasonable men in the fourth estate but I do say that the overwhelming majority of them are trying to discharge their obligation to keep the public informed about the news of the day—local, area, State, National, and international. They are working against deadlines where their mechanical problems make 5 or 15 minutes vital in making an edition. Returning a city editor's or a reporter's call 2 hours or an hour after receiving it can mean the public is not as informed as it should be.

Sometimes public officials on the National, State, and local level forget that they are public servants and that public business is the public's business. They classify as secret or confidential that which is not necessary to so classify by any legitimate security standards.

As one who has been both a public official and a newspaperman may I suggest that you invite your city editor, editor, and publisher down to your office to get a better understanding of your problems and that you in turn (if you have not already done so) visit your newspaper plant to learn more about the problems of publishing a metropolitan, suburban, or rural newspaper. I have found in life that, for the most part, the better we know a person the less difficult it is to deal with him. There are, of course, exceptions to the rule, but not many.

We have discussed some domestic problems. Now let us turn to the foreign field. Experience has taught you as lawmen that you cannot appease the criminal or the gangster. As in foreign affairs the road to appeasement is not the road to peace but in fact is only surrender on the installment plan.

In order to gain our independence the Founders of our Republic pledged to each other "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor".

Ninety miles from our shores there is a Soviet base in Cuba. We have had a vacillating policy relative to Castro. We have at one time or another encouraged him, tried to ignore him, entertained him, encouraged but failed to support an invasion against him, paid him ransom and tribute of millions of dollars in cash and supplies to release the Bay of Pigs prisoners, subverted our own judicial and legal processes by releasing Cuban criminals and gunmen in exchange for Americans held in Cuban prisons.

In dealing with the Soviet base in Cuba we marched up the hill last October and since then have marched most of the way down again.

Last October the strong stand of the President which had the support of a united Congress, widespread public approval, the wholehearted support of our Latin American States and the backing of our NATO allies has been frittered away.

Khrushchev was not prepared for a showdown 90 miles from our bases and 5,000 miles from his. He may be in the future when his Cuban base is augmented by others.

Despite the Monroe Doctrine and a current expression from the American Congress that foreign bases and missiles in the Western Hemisphere would be contrary to our vital national interests the Soviet Union challenged us in our own back yard.

During the October exchange of letters between President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev the latter has suggested we get our missiles out of Turkey and Italy in exchange for his getting Soviet missiles out of Cuba.

Our Government denies any "deal." But without advance consultation and agreement with our allied Italian and Turkish Governments we have taken our missiles out of those two countries.

Was it historic coincidence or was it a deal with Khrushchev? I don't know. Members of Congress of both parties have told me they don't know either.

During the Korean war the obstructionists to the winning of that war as advocated by Gen. Douglas MacArthur said that our further involvement (bombing the Chinese Communist bases across the Yalu) would be fighting the wrong war, in the wrong place at the wrong time.

As a U.S. Senator I did not agree with that defeatist policy then and as a private citizen I do not agree with it now after 13 years of reflection upon those events.

American forces were required to fight with restrictions never before placed on our fighting men. They had to leave in the privileged sanctuary of north of the Yalu the bases from which Chinese Communist forces were attempting to decimate our divisions and shoot down our airpower.

At that time (in 1950–52) we were in exclusive possession of the atomic weapon and an effective means of delivery.

We accepted what at best may be considered a stalemate because we wouldn't pursue the enemy to his lair or even to use a tight blockade to prevent petroleum products including aviation gasoline from getting to the enemy while we were suffering 160,000 casualties in Korea.

This didn't make sense to me then and it doesn't now. It was too high a price to pay for the good will of the neutralist states.

Mr. Nehru's neutralist views regarding Chinese Communists have changed some since the overrunning of Tibet and the invasion of India.

Mine, regarding Communists, are the same as they were before, during and since the Korean war.

Even if one agrees that because of distance the Yalu bases where in the wrong place at the wrong time to meet the challenge to human freedom, can anyone say that Cuba is the wrong place and October of 1962 was the wrong time?

Or have we become so much a captive of the "peace at any price" and "better Red than dead" philosophy that we are prepared to surrender bit by bit and piece by piece at the constant nibbling tactics of the Soviet Union.

From that high point of last October where President Kennedy appeared to be functioning in the President Theodore Roosevelt tradition we have been brushing Castro's beard with a feather duster.

Last October we demanded the removal of the missiles and on-the-ground inspection to see that this was carried out.

Though history is replete with examples that the word of the Soviet Union is not worth the paper upon which it is given we backed down from our on-the-ground inspection requirement and took the word (without boarding their ships to inspect) of the Soviet Union that the canvas covered objects on deck were indeed all the missiles going back to the Soviet Union from Cuba. How naive can we be?

We did not insist on the immediate withdrawal from Cuba of all Soviet armed forces though these as well as the missiles were both there contrary to the Monroe Doctrine and the Rio Pact.

An Assistant Secretary of National Defense, Arthur Sylvester, has enunciated the doctrine of the "right to lie" to the American people. He has not to this date been repudiated by either Secretary of Defense McNamara or by the President of the United States.

This is not "refusing to comment" or "declining to give out a release" on an inquiry by the press. The "right to lie" is deliberately misleading the American people.

The administration has not escaped the penalty of such a policy. Millions of Americans no longer know when they are being lied to and when they are being told the truth. I sincerely regret this is so for if there is ever a need for a people to have confidence in the statements of the Government it is when we face the menace of international communism.

The only way confidence will be restored is for Assistant Secretary Sylvester to be removed from his job of managing the news of the Defense Establishment and for his "right to lie" doctrine to be repudiated by both President Kennedy and Secretary McNamara. Anything less will insult the intelligence and continue to shake the confidence of the American people.

Senator KEN KEATING, of New York, had more accurate information on Cuban missile bases than the administration weeks in advance of October 22. At least the Defense Department was denying their existence until the President's speech to the country. Why? The Cubans knew the missiles were there for they had imported them. The Soviet Government knew they were there for they had supplied them.

Only the American people where deceived and they were the ones at whom they were aimed.

On Sunday, October 21, 1962, the newspapers reported that a Defense Department spokesman denied the cancellation of the trip of President Kennedy, Secretaries Rusk and McNamara had anything to do with the Cuban or Sino-Indian crisis.

Monday afternoon, October 22, 1962, the President discussed for the first time the proof of Soviet missile bases in Cuba.

Weeks earlier Members of the Senate and the House had pointed out that Soviet missile bases were in Cuba.

On September 17, 1962, at the Los Angeles Rotary Club, I said: "The buildup of a missile base in Cuba—90 miles from our shores—is a clear violation of the Monroe Doctrine."

In April of this year President Kennedy in his press conference said that about 4,000 Soviet troops had been withdrawn from Cuba.

This still left from 12,000 to 13,000 Soviet troops in Cuba even if the 4,000 were a net withdrawal.

Senator KEATING states that approximately 3,000 to 4,000 have been sent to Cuba while the others were being withdrawn. These facts have also been released by a report released May 9 by the Senate Preparedness Committee.

I believe Senator KEATING and the Senate committee under Senator STENNIS have done a great service in giving the American people the whole picture on Cuban troop movements rather than just half the picture.

This administration after its less than half-hearted aid to the free Cubans at the time of the Bay of Pigs disaster when only air cover could have assured success of the venture has now withdrawn support from the Cuban exiles. Not only are they forbidden to use U.S. territory as a point of departure which is at least understandable from a point of view of international law but we go further and along with the British to intercept them when they depart from other countries and are on international waters.

It seems to me we are applying naval sanctions upon the wrong people.

Thirteen years ago we gave the Communists a sanctuary across the Yalu. Now we give both Cuban and Soviet Communists a sanctuary 90 miles from our shores.

This is not a partisan question. Not long ago I spent several days in Washington. Democratic as well as Republican Members of the House and Senate are deeply troubled over Cuban policy or lack of one.

The answer one gets from the whiz kids whose advice finds its way to the President is: "Would you have this country invade Cuba and risk the danger of all-out war?"

They try to slam the door on congressional and public discussion while at the same time spoonfeeding the public only what they want the public to know.

On this they will not be successful. A great debate is now underway at every crossroads, village and town in America. It will spread until we will have an American policy that is sound and defensible.

Let me tell you what it will not be before I give you my views on what it should be.

1. It will not pay extortion or permit the payment of ransom to any nation, Communist or otherwise.

2. It will not torpedo the Monroe Doctrine as a basic cornerstone of American policy.

3. It will not be founded upon lies, half truths or news blackouts in order to make it swallowable by the American people.

Recognizing that there are risks involved in any policy we follow other than complete surrender or appeasement which is a form of surrender on the installment plan, I would be prepared to take whatever risks are involved for my country, for my family and for myself.

Our general worldwide guideline to our State Department and to our Foreign Service should be: The U.S. Government and the American people are dedicated to human freedom. What advances it we will support and what undermines or destroys it we will oppose.

In support of this general directive the Government of the United States will examine the facts and then take whatever steps our national interests require.

We shall neither feel required to telegraph our punches in advance nor will we establish privileged sanctuaries of operations for communism while communism is engaged in a worldwide conspiracy to destroy human freedom.

Now to the specific Cuban cancer:

1. The President should proclaim that the Monroe Doctrine has been reestablished as a keystone of American policy in the Western Hemisphere.

2. The President should address another private letter to Mr. Khrushchev stating that the continuation of Soviet forces in Cuba is in clear violation of the Monroe Doctrine and that in the interest of our mutual desire to maintain the peace of the world they should be withdrawn.

3. If a completely satisfactory reply is not received by the President he should ask to speak to a joint session of the House and Senate. At this session he should ask the Congress for a joint resolution in support of the President to secure the removal of every Soviet soldier from Cuba. He should request legislation permitting the immediate recruitment, equipment, and training of "freedom volunteer corps." I believe many more Americans would make their contributions to such a corps than contributed to the blackmail ransom taxfree donations of last year.

If Khrushchev should be cooperative the President could offer to furnish sufficient U.S. transports and cargo vessels to return all troops and their equipment to the Soviet Union. If Khrushchev is not cooperative it should include:

1. Joint action by all the Western Hemisphere countries (or as many as will cooperate) notifying the Soviet Union that if all such troops and their equipment is not out of Cuba by a stated date that all Soviet Embassies will be closed and diplomatic relations will be suspended with the Soviet Union until such troops are withdrawn.

2. The placing of U.S. air, naval, and ground forces on an alert basis at least equal to that which existed in October of 1962.

3. If the Soviet forces are not withdrawn by the date set pursuant to paragraph (1) a joint blockade (both sea and air) to cut off all shipments to Cuba except for food and medical supplies.

4. If the Soviet forces are not fully withdrawn the United States should encourage the creation of a freedom volunteer corps (air and ground). This would be open to free Cubans, Hungarian freedom fighters, members of U.S. Reserve troops who could volunteer without losing their retirement or other rights, veterans of Polish, Czechoslovakian World War II forces, volunteers from trained units of free Chinese and free Korean forces, and any other experienced fighters who are prepared to strike a blow for freedom. The plane cover would be flown by experienced combat fliers like Chennault's Flying Tiger volunteers in China.

Since these would be volunteers and since the use of Chinese Communist volunteers at the time of the Korean war were not looked upon by the United Nations as being a casus belli by the Chinese Communist regime we have ample precedent and quotable quotes for any who might feel called upon to object at the Security Council of General Assembly of the United Nations.

Such volunteers would be adequately equipped with air, ground, and naval forces to make decisive landings and/or feints simultaneously along the Cuban coasts.

Its international banner could be the torch of freedom that is held aloft from the Statue of Liberty and has been an inspiration to men and women who love freedom everywhere.

5. Notice would be served that following the removal of Castro and the Soviet forces

that a trusteeship would be established under the Organization of American States until free elections could be held by the Cuban people.

6. U.S. ground, naval, or air forces would not be used unless the Soviet Union attempts to reinforce its garrison or commit a hostile act against the United States or its allies.

This I would call the progressive squeeze policy to offset the Communist nibbling process.

Of course risks are involved. But if the signers of the Declaration of Independence had not taken risks we would not be here now. Risks have been taken throughout our history to gain, preserve, and protect our way of life.

The risk of doing nothing is, in my judgment, far greater to our ultimate survival.

To international communism the time is rapidly approaching, if indeed it has not already long since passed, for the free world to say: "You have gone far enough" and for Americans to say, "Indeed you have gone too far when you have established your bases in Cuba, 90 miles from our shores."

If we have no confidence in ourselves, no real devotion to our way of life, no determination to "pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor" to maintain the freedom others provided, how can we hope to hand a free society to our children and grandchildren?

FLOW OF DOLLARS ABROAD

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, writing from Rome where he now temporarily lives, that eminent columnist, Mr. Constantine Brown, has some very interesting and at the same time annoying things to say about the position of our dollar in relationship to the outflow of gold and the confidence of foreign financial circles in our ability to maintain the integrity of our unit of currency.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD so that Members of the Congress can have the opportunity to peruse Mr. Brown's very cogent observations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLOW OF DOLLARS ABROAD

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME.—The tax on foreign securities purchased by Americans, proposed by President Kennedy in order to stem the dangerous ever-increasing flow of dollars abroad is regarded in high financial circles in Western Europe as a mere palliative which cannot bring any sizable results. It is said in banking circles that the real trouble is the tendency of the American people to lose confidence in their national currency.

The question of vitality of the dollar in contrast with the strong European currencies backed by substantial quantities of gold—kept at their disposal in America—has been worrying Europe's bankers for a long time. They have wholeheartedly cooperated in the past with Washington in pegging the dollar at its present unrealistic value. But they have not failed to warn our Government that nothing but a drastic policy can revitalize our dollar.

Privately they did not mince words. "Drastic measures" would consist of a substantial curtailment of America's expenditures at home and abroad with the view of eventually achieving either a balanced budget or at least one which shows a definite tendency toward balancing. Nothing has been done in that direction by the administration. The national budget tends to mount stratospherically, and so does the national debt.

It may be strange for the average American to hear that those nations which have achieved their present unbelievable prosperity and financial stability, thanks to the American bonanza, are now wondering why the U.S. Government still insists on spending billions on foreign aid. The explanation that it is needed to the tune of $4 billion a year in order to prevent the "further advance of communism," especially in the underdeveloped nations of Asia and Africa, is being ridiculed in Western European financial circles.

Germany, France and even Great Britain are equally interested in these nations which in the past had been a part of their empires. But the assistance they offer is on a strictly business line and well within the means of each. The bulk of the NATO allies can well afford to—and does pay for needed military hardware.

Americans' lack of confidence in the dollar has filled the coffers of the Swiss banks to bulging with dollars. U.S. investors who change their national for foreign currencies, placing them either on deposit or investing them in stocks and bonds, are not enjoying the same yield as they would at home. The stocks usually pay lower dividends. Moreover, in Switzerland the foreigner pays 30 percent on the yield of their investments to the Swiss Federal Treasury.

The Swiss and German banks have imposed drastic restrictions on the Americans. They pay only 1½ percent on long-term deposits. But the gimmick in such a case is that the depositor must give the bank 9 months' notice before he can withdraw either part or the full amount.

By and large, the American investors would do much better either in purchasing American stocks and bonds or by enjoying a substantial yield of 3½ or 4 percent from building associations in the United States. Also, he can withdraw his deposits at a moment's notice.

Why then, it is asked here, do so many Americans prefer to submit themselves to banking regulations far more stringent than at home. Why do so many Americans prefer a lower income from their investments? The inevitable answer is lack of confidence in the fiscal probity of the Government; the fear that someday, somehow, their investments at home might become jeopardized by some strange measure suggested by the financial whiz kids in Washington.

In recent conversations with a leading Swiss banker regarding the gold outflow, he pointed out that while some 5 years ago only Americans of substantial wealth brought part of their capital to Switzerland, there are now tens of thousands of accounts opened in Geneva and Basle from "little capitalists." That is, those who possess only small sums between $10,000 to $50,000. They seem quite satisfied with the 1½ percent yield, and neither do they object to the prohibiting of withdrawal without 9 months' advance notice.

"The lack of confidence in your own money," he went on, "does not stem from Europe but from your own people themselves who have become alarmed by the spending sprees of your Government."

"A GATHERING OF EAGLES"

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the other evening it was my pleasure to see a motion picture produced by an old friend of mine, Mr. Cy Bartlett, entitled "A Gathering of Eagles." I may be overly prejudiced in my liking of this picture because of my former connection with the Air Force, but I believe it to be a picture that all Americans should see to understand how the great deterrent power of SAC is organized and how it operates so efficiently. The American people can also gain some idea of the tremendous sacrifices made by the men of SAC and with this understanding, come to a better and stronger support of the military pay bill that will be before this body shortly. Military men from privates to generals make sacrifices, not just in times of war, but in times of peace. All of them in all of the services could lead happier, more peaceful, quiet lives and more remunerative lives if they were in some other profession than the military, but their loyalty and their patriotism keeps them on the job of defending the rest of us. This picture is a strong argument for the maintenance of our posture as the No. 1 military power, regardless of those who would like to see us disarm, but in the support of the argument, must go better pay and conditions for those in all of the services. In this text I ask unanimous consent that a column written by Mr. George Todt be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GREAT SAC MOVIE

(By George Todt)

One of the finest motion pictures I have ever seen is "A Gathering of Eagles," which is an authentic version of everyday life in the Strategic Air Command of the U.S. Air Force. Right on the money, too.

For this reason alone, everyone ought to see it. For, to use the pungent words of Churchill in the Battle of Britain 23 years ago: "Never have so many owed so much to so few." Ours are truly dedicated men.

It is SAC, actually—not the attention-getting United Nations or striped-pants diplomats about the world—which is the real keeper of global peace, such as we have, today.

REDS FEAR SAC

Gen. Thomas Power of SAC, or Gen. Curtis LeMay, the tough boss of the USAF, are worth 1,000 of the likes of Adlai Stevenson at the U.N. when it comes to maintaining restraint on the international Communist conspiracy.

Let me say this straight from the shoulder: Without mighty SAC, the U.N. would disappear overnight. The Reds would laugh it out of existence. But they cannot become amused with SAC shoring up the U.N. behind the scenes.

The only coherent reason the wily Reds pretend to take us seriously in the blundering councils of the world peace organization—if they ever do—is because of the unholy fear they possess of our magnificent Sunday punch.

If they ever had the correct answer to it, if they might one day catch up and surpass us in military firepower, or if SAC dropped out of "number one" contention—then the Communist warlords would really commence to roll without delay.

And we would likely get an ultimatum to surrender within 24 hours.

Over the past 3 years I have been invited twice to heavy orientation courses at SAC headquarters in Omaha, Nebr. What I saw there has filled me with respect and just a little awe. SAC is tops.

GREAT BLAST POWER

It has about 90 percent of the blast power of the free world in its bomb bays and missiles—but mostly in its precision jet bombers.

The workhorse B–52 has done yeoman work over the past decade but it is now obsolescent and is wearing out. Incredibly, there are no new replacements for them coming off the assembly lines of our aircraft plants today.

And the 2,000-miles-per-hour B-70 bomber, which we need to replace the present 650-miles-per-hour B-52, has been slowed down and stalled out of existence to all intents and purposes. This, I believe, is a monumental mistake. Most military experts agree.

THE GREATEST EVER

It stems from the impractical belief of some college professors, now in Government, that our previous 3-1 military superiority over the monstrous Reds gives them "tensions." We should relieve them.

Therefore, it is reasoned (?), if we knock down from 3-1 overall superiority to merely 50-50 ratio—well, the murderous Communists will respect us and become "good guys." Then, peace it's wonderful.

Whatever you may think about this fantastic nonsense, please go see "Gathering of Eagles." It shows the readiness of SAC to protect our Republic at all times. These warriors are simply the greatest ever. Hats off.

DEDICATION OF MORTIMER HAYS HALL, NEW CANAAN, CONN.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I was privileged this past Sunday, July 28, to join the many friends of the late Mortimer Hays at dedication ceremonies of the Mortimer Hays Hall held by the Silvermine Guild of Artists in New Canaan, Conn. Mortimer Hays was an outstanding attorney, philanthropist and—in the last years of his life, artist. He served as president of the Silvermine Guild and it was appropriate indeed that the beautiful exhibition hall at Silvermine be named in his memory.

The furtherance of the arts is a matter of concern for all Americans. At Silvermine, where the arts flourish in their highest form, I spoke of the need for our Federal Government to do what it can to encourage and stimulate serious artistic endeavors. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks before the Silvermine Guild be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR ABRAHAM RIBICOFF AT THE DEDICATION CEREMONY, MORTIMER HAYS HALL, SILVERMINE GUILD OF ARTISTS, NEW CANAAN, CONN., SUNDAY, JULY 28, 1963

It is legend at the Players Club that the god of all the arts once whispered into the ear of young Edwin Booth, and this is what he said:

"I shall give you hunger, and pain, and sleepless nights. Also beauty and satisfactions known to few and glimpses of the heavenly life. None of these you shall have continually and of their coming and going you shall not be foretold."

You whose lifework is the arts—and the introduction of others to the arts—you have known the sleepless nights, as well as the satisfactions and "glimpses of the heavenly life" your art offers.

You have worked ceaselessly over the years to further the cause of the arts in Connecticut—to share your "glimpses of the heavenly life" with others. Forty-three years ago, a group of pioneer Connecticut artists in the Silvermine area—"the knockers"—fell into the habit of meeting informally to discuss and "knock" each others work. Soon, needing a permanent home for their growing number of activities, they converted a large barn on Silvermine Road into a gallery, and incorporated as the Silvermine Guild of Artists—a nonprofit organization devoted to fostering art appreciation and education.

How you have grown. Here at Silvermine now, the Silvermine College of Art is in its 12th year. Fifty full-time students are enrolled; over 600 part-time adult and child students attend year-round extension courses, studying painting, sculpture, ceramics, drawing, graphics, design, ballet, modern dance and art history.

Here at Silvermine, the Silvermine Guild of Artists has developed a thriving educational institution and art center. Your activities are manifold. Anyone interested in the arts can taste your riches. You hold exhibits and gallery tour; you operate a rental and purchase plan for works of art; you have established the outstanding Silvermine Guild Chamber Music Center; you have achieved prominence for many special events—the annual New England Exhibition of Painting and Sculpture, or the Children's Art Festival.

Today we meet at Silvermine to honor the memory of one of your number—Mortimer Hays—and to dedicate this exhibition hall in his name. I can think of no more appropriate name to give this distinguished place. Mortimer Hays was, of course, a lawyer, and a good one. He was a philanthropist, and a good one. He was a man of character and conscience—with wide varied interests ranging—in true Renaissance style—from public affairs and politics to sports.

But in his later years—when many distinguished citizens are content to rest on their laurels—Morty Hays was above all an artist, and a good one.

In 1956, as you, his friends and coworkers well know, he suffered a heart attack. And while he was convalescing he took up painting.

But his art was no sedentary sideline. To his art, as to his other life work, he was committed. His enthusiasm and his sense of dedication were contagious—infecting everyone around him. Other outstanding men of our time—the best known of whom, of course, are Eisenhower and Churchill—have turned to painting in their later years.

None, I venture to say, has been more successful than Mortimer Hays. His work was hailed by Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review and Raymond Baxter Dowden of the Cooper Union Art School described his work as "the emergence and development of an exciting, individual style, or professional competence."

After Morty Hays had a successful one-man show at Silvermine Guild, he had no regrets about the heart attack which led him to painting. "You see things you didn't see before," he said. "A mild heart attack * * * is a wonderful thing for a longer, happier life." He went on to have two sell-out one-man shows at the Hammer Galleries in New York City.

The list of Morty Hays' achievements is long. At the time of his death in 1962, he was a member of the administrative committee of the American Jewish Committee. In 1953, he received an award from the Joint Defense Appeal for distinguished service in behalf of human rights. He was past president of Temple Israel, Lawrence, L.I., and counsel to Jewish students at Columbia University. He was a trustee of the Wellesley Summer Institute and Woodmere Academy.

For a time, he was treasurer of the Fusion Party in New York City. He served as a member of our State housing authority and State labor board.

As senior partner in one of our Nation's leading law firms, he was known for his forceful and efficient examinations in court and for his excellent memory for facts and figures in complex corporate cases.

He was a member of the American Bar Association, the New York County Lawyers' Association and the Bankers' Club. In addition to his law affiliations, he was a director of the Pepsi-Cola Co., the General Bronze Corp., United Aircraft Products, Inc., and the Norwalk Town Hall.

But I think it was here at the Silvermine Guild that his achievements brought him the most personal and lasting satisfaction. You elected him your president in 1956—after he served on your board of trustees and it was under his leadership that the Silvermine School of Art acquired the status of a college. He recognized that for the serious young art student, a superior education in the visual arts alone is not enough. So a broader curriculum in the humanities was introduced, and shortly thereafter the school received State accreditation as a 2-year degree-granting college.

The word "educate" comes from the Latin verb "lead out." Just as Mortimer Hays and the Silvermine Guild lead many people out of themselves and into a common enjoyment and fulfillment in the arts, so our Nation must lead many more of her citizens toward this same goal.

Interest in the arts has developed rapidly in the United States in the past years. Our museums are packed on Sundays—Americans go to concerts and to exhibits as they go to ball games and watch TV. Community theater and opera groups mushroom across the land.

Never has there been a time when interest in the arts at the seat of government been so high. The President, the First Lady, and the members of the Cabinet have set the example—and the Nation has responded. Starting with the inauguration itself, great writers and musicians—and artists of all sorts—have performed at ceremonial functions. They hold new, more respected positions in our society. This is, I think, all to the good.

Yet much remains to be done. The condition of the professional arts in our affluent country is not satisfactory.

There are too few Mortimer Hayeses—too little leadership—and most of all, too little support for serious artistic endeavors.

We must all work together—in Government and out—to foster such artistic and cultural endeavors.

While I was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, I supported the creation of a Government group—an Advisory Council on the Arts—for this purpose. President Kennedy recently created such a council by executive action.

Now there is pending before the Senate a bill of which I am proud to be a cosponsor: The National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1963. This bill, introduced by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, would give the arts in our Nation a healthy needed boost. Its passage is an end toward which people like yourselves should strive.

The national arts bill is broader than previous legislation of this sort. It includes "the arts" generally. Under its provisions, aid could go to museum activities, such as artistic appreciation courses, public lectures and training classes.

It would give statutory authority to the President's Advisory Council on the Arts.

And most importantly, it would establish a National Arts Foundation to provide grants-in-aid to private groups and States in support of programs and projects which will make a significant public contribution in the arts.

As you can see, this is an arts bill with real meaning. Ironically, we American realists live in the only major nation in the Western World where the Government offers no financial assistance to the arts.

This bill also would provide a coordinating group between private and governmental activities in the arts which could point out where official encouragement might be helpful, yet which would always be sensitive to the need for the fullest possible freedom of creativity.

For in fostering and encouraging the arts, we must have it strictly understood that the Government cannot and does not wish to speak through the arts. The arts must be free and not an official mouthpiece. A play is not a state paper. The only test for an actor or a director or a painter or a musician should be the excellence of his endeavor before the judgment of his peers.

Not only must we encourage the arts generally by giving recognition and encouragement by the Federal Government, but there is a very specific action we can take of great importance to individual artists. Too often an artistic career experiences long months and even years of low income or even unemployment, and then suddenly there is success, and with it high income in a very short period of time. Our income tax laws should be changed so that the burden of this tax does not fall all at one time. Instead there should be recognition that sudden income from sale of a book or a painting often represents years of work, and the taxation of this income should reflect this fact. To accomplish this I will support a change in our income tax laws to permit artists to average their incomes over a reasonable period of years. I am hopeful this will become part of the tax legislation now being considered by Congress.

In this crucial moment when the currents of history are swift and changing, we who bear the responsibility of Government seek to build. We know that the old ways alone will not do—that we must seek new ways and find new means.

And all segments of American society are responding. Each is examining its role and its potential. Each is dedicating itself to constructive action for the common good.

You whose lifework is the arts—you too are examining your role and your potential.

As we dedicate this hall today, I can ask no more from you than that you do your best, in the spirit of the man whose name it bears—Mortimer Hays.

I ask you to achieve the high levels that you yourselves value, and to inspire in your students an appreciation of the enduring and the beautiful.

I ask you to strive to reflect the times in which we live—to understand them—to teach from them—to improve upon them. We must work to make our arts so rich—so exciting—so inventive—that they mirror our life together as did the arts of the Greeks and of the Elizabethan Age.

For when all is said and done, our culture will be remembered through the ages not so much by its material as by its cultural achievements. It is a matter of high importance that we move as a Nation to encourage creative minds and the creative spirit.

CRITICISM OF OUR CUBAN POLICY

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, all Americans, regardless of party affiliation, want our foreign policy to succeed. For our very survival as a nation depends in large measure on the success of our foreign relations.

Traditionally, on foreign policy the American people rally around their President, whether he is Republican or Democrat, in demonstration to the world of our national unity.

As a U.S. Senator, there are many occasions when I am called upon to support the President's foreign policies. Where he was right, I have wholeheartedly supported him and in many instances I voted to strengthen his hand.

Where I thought he was wrong, I have not hesitated to differ with him. This is the duty of all Members of Congress. Though we strive for unity, the very substance of our constitutional form of government insures our citizens the right to make independent judgments.

As the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg, Republican architect of bipartisanship in foreign policy, said:

> Frank cooperation and free debate are indispensable to ultimate unity. * * * Every foreign policy must be totally debated * * * and the "loyal opposition" is under special obligation to see that this occurs.

One distinguished Member of the U.S. Senate, KENNETH B. KEATING, has contributed significantly to the debate over our Cuban policy as a responsible critic.

An important article assaying Senator KEATING's nonpartisan criticism has appeared in the May 1963 issue of Reader's Digest.

This is an article which I believe is outstanding for its accurate narration of the quiet, temperate, but effective way in which the Senator has alerted the Nation to the encampment of Soviet military power only 90 miles from American shores, and the inadequacy of American policies to meet that threat.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in full the text of the article, "KENNETH KEATING, Critic of Our Cuban Policy," by James Daniel, in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Reader's Digest, May 1963]

KENNETH KEATING, CRITIC OF OUR CUBAN POLICY

(By James Daniel)

Again, last January and February, controversy flared over Cuba. And again the uproar was touched off by Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, the mild-mannered but intent man who last fall warned the country that Cuba was being turned into a Soviet nuclear missile base. Rising in the Senate on January 31, he sought to correct what he considered the dangerously complacent view taken by President Kennedy and the administration.

Though the President, in his latest press conference, had minimized the Cuba danger, saying, "There is no influx of military equipment," KEATING pointed out that Soviet bloc ships had been arriving in Cuba at a rate of more than one a day since last October, often with military supporting equipment, such as helicopters. Even as the President spoke, KEATING said, a Soviet ship laden with arms was steaming into Cuba. To block U.S. aerial reconnaissance, the ships unload at covered docks or by means of trucks lowered into the holds. (These facts were verified by such sources as the U.S. Navy and the Maritime Administration.)

To what purpose all this feverish preparation? Obviously not to attack the United States directly. KEATING said, "What the Russians are planning to do—are already doing—is mount an increasing wave of sabotage, terrorism, political subversion. Already riots in Venezuela, Peru, and Brazil are demonstrably the work of Communists trained and armed in Cuba. The time will come when the United States will have to make a hard choice: either get rid of this advance Communist arsenal no matter how, or give up in Latin America. Furthermore, the Soviets are building Cuba up militarily to the point where it will be impossible to get them out with conventional weapons. Cuba is becoming an impregnable fortress."

As in last October, the latest KEATING blast provoked instant and indignant denials. In an effort to make the Republican Senator eat his hat, the White House staged a televised photo intelligence briefing by Defense Secretary Robert McNamara that lasted 1 hour and 45 minutes. Scores of pictures flashed on the screen. Aerial photographs showed some missile sites plowed up, some missiles and missile-supporting equipment being shipped out. But the pictures also told another story, an ominous and thought-provoking one which confirmed KEATING's charge of a military buildup. They showed an immense amount of conventional weapons, of the latest Soviet types, including delta-wing MIG–21 fighters, antiaircraft rockets, nuclear-capable torpedo boats.

Yet in spite of all this armament—in spite of the 17,000 Russian soldiers (plus thousands more Red Chinese troops and Communist-bloc military technicians) then remaining—the Secretary of Defense brushed aside the rest of KEATING's charge: "I have no evidence that Cuba is being used as a base for subversion against other Latin American countries."

Next day at his press conference, President Kennedy backed up McNamara. What concerned him, the President said, was not so much the threats of military attack or of subversion but the basic economic conditions in Latin America which attracted the Red adventurers.

The two biggest propaganda guns of the administration had been brought to bear. To what effect? KEATING's fundamental charge—that Cuba is a base for Communist subversion and as such a growing threat to the security of the United States and the whole hemisphere—stood uncontradicted.

Other voices—not only Republican—now joined in criticizing the Cuba policy. Senator JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, declared himself unconvinced by McNamara. Representative ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, of Alabama, began a House Inter-American Subcommittee probe of subversion spreading out of Cuba. He went to the White House and spoke bluntly: "Why let people in the CIA and Pentagon feed the truth about the Red offensive to KEATING and then watch him tell it to the Nation? That way you have to deny, then confirm everything he says. It would be much better if you put the truth before the American people yourselves."

When an administration spokesman, Under Secretary of State, George Ball, publicly appealed to critics to "stop all this talking" about Cuba policies, Walter Lippmann answered that he and other pundits had been badly deceived by the administration's deliberate misrepresentations on Cuba last fall. "This is how Senator KEATING won the right to be listened to," wrote the dean of Washington columnists. Approving letters and telegrams poured into KEATING's office. And the White House itself sent CIA Director McCone over to get KEATING's off-the-record recommendations for stronger action in Cuba.

More important still, the policy of keeping from the public the frightening facts about the Soviet-Cuba-based offensive was relaxed. McCone was allowed to tell the Selden committee—and the Nation—in flat contradiction of McNamara and in confirmation of KEATING, "The daily record of events and our intelligence sources through this hemisphere all agree on one conclusion: Fidel Castro is spurring and supporting the efforts of Communists to overthrow and seize control of the governments in Latin America. The main thrust is in the supply of the inspiration, guidance, training, communication, and technical assistance that revolutionary groups require. Today the Cuban effort is far more sophisticated, covert, and deadly."

It was a rare spectacle: a single U.S. Senator, not of the majority party and not a member of any committee directly concerned with our defense posture, yet commanding as much public confidence on a vital matter of national security as—or more than—the officials directly entrusted with it. The situation reflects the deep national concern over our Cuba policy. Beyond that, it is a tribute to Senator KEATING himself, to his conscientiousness and clear-headed integrity.

KENNETH KEATING fits into no pat category—neither a liberal nor a conservative, he says. Born in 1900, the son of a Lima, N.Y., general storekeeper, KEATING started school at age 7—in the sixth grade. (His mother had found him so apt a learner that she began teaching him at home when he was three.) He was barely 15 when he entered the University of Rochester. After Harvard Law School, the former boy prodigy became one of Rochester's most skilled lawyers.

During World War I he had enlisted, but Armistice Day came before the young sergeant reached the trenches. On December 7, 1941, after hearing the first radio flash about Pearl Harbor, he told his wife, "I'm going in." In his last year of service in India he was executive assistant to the deputy supreme commander of the Southeast Asia Command. In 1948 he was made a brigadier general, a rank he still holds.

The war brought KEATING an intensified interest in world affairs—and politics. Elected to Congress in 1946, he served 6 terms in the House of Representatives before moving to the Senate in 1958.

As a legislator, KEATING has amassed a notable record for attendance and meeting rollcall votes. As a matter of principle, he considers it wrong to duck an issue. Thus in 1960, for example, he had the Senate's second-best record for voting and taking a stand on issues, while Senator John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts—in hot pursuit of the presidential nomination—had the second worst.

No sudden-born crusader, KEATING has long been known for his steady, nonsensational opposition to expansion of communism's world influence. East-West trade and the sale of strategic goods to the Soviet bloc have been an area of special study and concern to him. Thus last fall he rapped Britain for her moves to sell troop-transport Viscounts to Red China while at the same time hustling to supply military aid to invaded India.

Another area in which KEATING has distinguished himself is civil rights. He was the House author of the 1957 civil rights bill, first such measure passed by Congress since the Civil War. And last year when the Kennedy administration was unable to obtain confirmation of Thurgood Marshall, former counsel of the NAACP, as a U.S. circuit judge, it was KEATING who flushed the nomination out of the Dixie-controlled Judiciary Committee where it had gathered cobwebs for a year. He did it by rising daily in the Senate to read the names and the sometimes less impressive qualifications of other judicial nominees whose nominations the committee had rubber-stamped.

Senator KEATING's criticisms of U.S. policy on Cuba have been the more telling because they are clearly—and rigorously—nonpolitical, nonpartisan. Last October, after President Kennedy at last spoke out on Cuba and announced a blockade, some Republican critics grumbled that it was "too little, too late" and worried about the effect on elections. Not KEATING. He said, "If the price the Republicans must pay for the President's action is the loss of some congressional seats or some votes, I think it's a pretty small price."

As a member of the Senate Internal Security Committee, KEATING was voicing public concern about the risks of a Communist Cuba as early as 1959. In January 1960, he criticized the Eisenhower administration for lack of attention to the danger, called for a "massive reappraisal" of policy, a "reevaluation and rewriting of the Monroe Doctrine in terms also of this present internal threat to our hemisphere." He warned: "Cuba is nearing an almost complete takeover by the Communists."

After the 1961 Bay of Pigs disaster, KEATING was among those who hopefully applauded President Kennedy's ringing pledge to "reexamine and reorient our forces of all kinds, our tactics and our institutions" so as to keep more Cubas from happening. But then, last summer, he watched in fascinated horror as the Russians began to convert Cuba into a major military base.

In 10 major addresses on the floor of the Senate, KEATING detailed each step of the buildup. His facts were the identical facts gathered and verified by official Government sources; they were even more fully available to the White House than to him; yet they were ignored and indignantly denied by top members of the administration.

Since the October crisis—during which it seemed for a time that the President had stopped Khrushchev in his tracks—Senator KEATING has watched with mounting uneasiness the steady retreat from Kennedy's strong original stand. The mile-posts:

(1) Removal of the naval blockade in November without obtaining the promised on-site inspection.

(2) The disbanding of the ransomed Cuban Freedom Fighter brigade, nucleus of any liberation army.

(3) The emasculation of an order curtailing trade with Cuba. Originally intended to prohibit a shipping company from carrying U.S. Government cargo if any of its ships calls at Cuban ports, the order now provides merely that the same ship cannot do both. And even this is not rigidly enforced. When the Agriculture Department threatened to keep the Norwegian freighter *Nora* from picking up a cargo of surplus tallow at Peekskill, N.Y., because it was engaged in Cuban trade, the State Department got the decision reversed.

(4) The creation in January of a special task force within the State Department to improvise a new Cuban policy. Though the unit claims carte blanche to recommend ways of getting rid of Castro, such new policies as have been disclosed seem to be only the old policy of containment. As President Kennedy himself announced at his March 6 press conference, "We feel the wisest policy is the isolation of communism in this hemisphere."

We are now trying to cut off Castro's traffic of Red money, arms and—most important of all—agents trained by Cuban schools of subversion. The prospects for success are not promising. According to Castro's chief of training, Lionel Soto, Cuba has 351 revolutionary schools with 14,000 students, including, as Kennedy admitted, 1,200 who came last year from other Latin countries.

"Containment is not a policy," says KEATING, "but an acceptance of the status quo in the pious hope that it won't get worse—which it obviously will in Latin America, once the Communists are assured the United States has only a do-nothing policy on Cuba. Someday, unless there is a sharp change, this country is going to find the separate pockets of contained communism all joined up together, and the southern half of this hemisphere one huge, boiling Communist caldron.

"I believe that Americans of all parties will stand behind the President in any firm, realistic step he takes to reverse this trend. And I believe that if we make our position clear enough soon enough, leaving no doubt of our intention to back it up with what it takes, we can reverse the trend without war."

JAPANESE OPEN DOOR FOR MORE AMERICAN CONSUMER GOODS

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, several weeks ago, when I introduced three studies on the accelerated pace of Japan's economic growth, I urged that Japan be more fully integrated into world trade councils—particularly the Atlantic community.

I pointed out that, as an outstanding example of a free economy achieving a high level of development, Japan is an admirable bridge between the industrialized Western nations and the developing African and Asian nations. I said:

> America's policies should continue to be those of encouragement and promotion of closer ties binding Japan to the United States and the rest of the free world in a community of nations.

Recently the Wall Street Journal published an article on the increasing entry into Japan of American manufacturers of consumer goods—not only food products, but also paper products and hardware goods.

Of course, this is only a relatively modest beginning to ultimately establish firm links between the Atlantic community and Japan. But it is nonetheless encouraging.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Wall Street Journal article, "Japanese Open Door to More U.S. Makers of Consumer Goods," by Norman Sklarewitz, appearing on page 1 of the July 26, 1963, issue, be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 26, 1963]

JAPANESE OPEN DOOR TO MORE U.S. MAKERS OF CONSUMER GOODS—YANK VENTURES TURN OUT HEINZ BABY FOOD, "MAXWELL" COFFEE; BUT AN ORANGE DRINK FLOPS

(By Norman Sklarewitz)

TOKYO.—When the time came to add vegetables to her baby's diet, the Japanese mother once had no choice but to boil, chop and strain them into digestible form. Since April, however, she has been able to buy 15 varieties of vegetables already processed for baby by Nichiro Heinz Co., a partnership of H. J. Heinz Co. of Pittsburgh and Nichiro Fisheries Co. of Tokyo.

This production of American-style baby food here points up a trend likely to have considerable impact on the Japanese economy and on American investors. For through a variety of arrangements, and with the grudging permission of the Japanese Government, Yankee makers of consumer goods increasingly are moving into Japan.

In the past, the Japanese limited the American role in their domestic industry mainly to technological help in essential fields. Most of the 2,000 links between United States and Japanese firms covered the licensing of patents and processes to Japanese oil, chemical, steel, electronics, and aviation companies. In this way the Japanese hoped to take advantage of Yankee industrial knowledge and still keep to a minimum the U.S. dollars American firms took out of Japan when the yen revenues were converted into these dollars.

Recently, however, the Japanese attitude has been changing, mainly because many bans on imports into Japan are scheduled to be eased in the next 2 years. As Government officials see it, sales of such imports from the United States then would drain off increased amounts of U.S. dollars from Japan. Thus, they reason, as long as Japanese consumers want to buy U.S.-style products, fewer dollars will be lost if these products are made here.

DIRECT INVESTMENTS

To be sure, the Japanese hardly have opened the gates to unlimited U.S. participation in consumer goods production. Permission to make U.S. products classified as "nonessential" has been granted to less than two dozen enterprises. But most of these ventures represent direct investment by American firms rather than mere licensing of Japanese producers to turn out U.S. goods.

Besides Heinz, other leading U.S. food processors that have entered into partnerships with Japanese firms include Kellogg Co. Its breakfast cereal has been produced and marketed here since April through Japan's Ajinomoto Co. Kellogg and Ajinomoto hope to persuade enough Japanese to substitute corn flakes for their traditional breakfast fare of rice, soybean soup, and pickles to take in about $2.7 million in sales within 2 years.

The trend toward production of U.S. consumer goods in Japan is by no means limited to the food field. Sanyo Scott Co., 50 percent owned by Scott Paper Co., plans to start producing American-quality toilet tissue and other household paper products this fall in its $1 million plant at Kaisei City, south of Tokyo.

Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. hopes eventually to offer its Scotch-Brite scouring pad in Japanese hardware stores through its Japanese affiliate, Sumitomo 3M, Ltd. Sumitomo already makes scotch tape as well as industrial and magnetic recording tape.

PRICE COMPETITION

U.S. firms have been encouraged to move into Japan by the enthusiasm of many Japanese consumers for Yankee-style products. Even so, as some U.S. companies have learned, success is not automatic. Rivalry is keen in many fields and American quality standards and an initially low output often make it difficult for U.S.-style goods to meet price competition from completely Japanese products.

One firm linked to a U.S. company was forced to withdraw a canned orange drink from the market because of competition from a lower priced Japanese product. Officials of the firm say that although the Japanese beverage contained only a small percentage of orange concentrate, Japanese food laws permitted it to be labeled the same as their pure food drink.

Lovable Brassiere Co. of Japan, the partner of Lovable Brassiere Co. of Atlanta, found that its American-style bra was a luxury item for most Japanese women; they could buy a competitive Japanese product for around 70 cents.

"You just can't make a product with American quality features in it for anywhere near 70 cents and we weren't going to try," says an official of the Lovable Co. here. The firm now concentrates almost exclusively on production for export.

To achieve success in Japan, American firms often have to adjust their products to local conditions. When General Foods, Ltd., the wholly owned Japanese subsidiary of General Foods Corp., set out 2 years ago to produce its coffee in tea-drinking Japan, it decided to start with instant coffee. General Foods reasoned that although few Japanese had percolators, they all had pots in which to boil water.

General Foods also dropped the word "House" from its Maxwell House brand name as too cumbersome for the Japanese. It cautiously introduced the Maxwell instant coffee in a 25-gram bottle, the equivalent of about 1 ounce, and a 50-gram bottle. "We're up to the 150-gram size now and doing well," says John Winkles, general manager of General Foods, Ltd. "This is certainly no get-rich-quick market," he adds. "We see it as a growing but long-range market."

Although General Foods, Ltd., can produce and sell its products in Japan, Government regulations don't permit it to transfer its yen earnings out of the country, because it is a wholly owned subsidiary of a foreign company. Among other consumer goods subsidiaries in Japan is Vicks (Japan), Ltd., wholly owned by Richardson-Merrell, Inc., the big U.S. drug manufacturer. These firms are hoping the Japanese eventually will ease currency controls to release their blocked yen profits.

The current rules, however, do permit U.S. firms that have entered into partnership with Japanese companies to repatriate their profits. To appease the Japanese Government most U.S. firms forming such partnerships agree to majority ownership by the Japanese partner. For example, Nichiro Co. owns a 51 percent interest in its joint venture with Heinz to produce baby food.

Negotiations between an American firm and its prospective Japanese partner generally are conducted in strict secrecy to forestall opposition from domestic competitors. Japanese trade associations also traditionally oppose most foreign companies entering the country, fearing that such firms are more efficient and have more financial backing than some Japanese companies.

Earlier this year thousands of independent Japanese shopkeepers organized a protest movement to block a proposed tieup between Safeway Stores, Inc., the U.S. supermarket chain, and the Sumitomo Trading Co. The merchants took their case to the public, the press and the Government. As a result of their clamor against "unfair competition," Sumitomo dropped plans for the venture.

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS AND SURPLUS FOOD

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the fine work being done by a private organization in Latin America, the Great Plains Wheat, Inc., in conjunction with the food for peace program and the Alliance for Progress. Great Plains Wheat has demonstrated to the peoples of America the important role that private organizations can play in such an important effort as the Alliance.

In Peru, where surplus food is provided for lunches for schoolchildren, attendance has jumped from 35 percent to as high as 80 percent in 1 year.

I believe that this demonstrates the farsighted thinking that our food for peace and Alliance for Progress officials have shown in combating two of Latin America's greatest evils—malnutrition and illiteracy.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record this article appearing in the Kansas City Star, dated June 12, 1963, entitled "Children Go to School To Eat." I would specifically like to commend Mr. Harlan Parkinson of Great Plains Wheat for his fine work in providing surplus food to the deserving youngsters of Peru.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, June 12, 1963]

A Farm Report: Children Go to School To Eat

(By Roderick Turnbull)

Children in the United States go to school to learn. In Peru and other South American countries they are going to school to get a good meal.

Learning is incidental, yet important.

THEY'RE LEARNING, TOO

The thousands of youngsters who are going to school to get a hefty midday lunch actually are learning to read and write.

This learning is basic in a policy through which it is hoped to alter the course of history in countries in which extreme poverty is traditional.

This policy assumes that as people become educated they also will become producers of more products as well as consumers. They also will demand more stable governments.

They will, incidentally, too, perhaps, become consumers of more U.S. wheat.

This brings Harlan Parkinson, a handsome young Kansan, into the story. Because Parkinson, employed by Great Plains Wheat, Inc., has the job of promoting the use of American wheat and he is doing it by organizing school lunch programs in South America.

Parkinson's headquarters in South America are in Lima, Peru. Currently he is back in the United States with his wife and baby daughter. They will return to Peru next month.

The young food missionary, who is highly enthusiastic about his task, is from Scott City, Kans., where his father is a banker and wheat farmer.

The Parkinsons are well acquainted in Kansas City. Harlan's sister, Miss Carolyn Jane Parkinson, was American royal queen in 1961.

LAWYER IN DENVER

Young Parkinson, a graduate of the University of Michigan law school, practiced law for a year in Denver, where he was associated with Charles F. Brannan, former Secretary of Agriculture.

Then came the opportunity to take the position with Great Plains Wheat as director of that organization's South American program.

Parkinson's wife, whom he met in this country, was a Hungarian refugee. With her parents she fled her homeland ahead of the Russians in 1945.

Great Plains Wheat is an association of growers in several of the Plains States. Its objective is to promote the use and sale of U.S. wheat all over the world.

The Kansan arrived in Lima in 1961. He set out almost immediately to get school lunch programs going, following a policy which he contends is extremely important, of working with the people.

The people contribute as well as the U.S. Government and Great Plains Wheat. A total relief program, he argues, just doesn't work.

Parkinson's efforts are coordinated with those of America's food for peace program, the Alliance for Progress, CARE, and Catholic relief agencies.

The main source of funds is the U.S. Public Law 480 program; the foods contributed by the United States come from farm surpluses.

FEW TO SCHOOL

In Peru and some other countries of South America, school is for the privileged few. Great masses of the people get little or no formal education. One reason is the children are working in fields, begging in the streets, or even scavenging in dumps or garbage cans for food.

When food is offered free in the public schools attendance jumps from 35 to as high as 800 percent, Parkinson said.

The school itself often will be an unheated room without water or lights and sometimes without a roof. The teachers mostly are women and classes are taught up to the sixth grade.

Parkinson's first start in a typical South American country is at the American Embassy. There he gets acquainted with the officials of the Government and they, in turn, permit him to talk to the people with whom he is to work.

In Peru, he was introduced to Leticia, a slum area outside Lima.

He was told that if he could get a program going in Leticia, undoubtedly he could succeed anywhere, because this was supposed to be the worst example of poverty in the nation.

After some initial barriers were broken between the stranger from North America (he is 6 feet 5 inches tall and blond) and the natives of the Peruvian shantytown, Parkinson was able to get the people's confidence. He discovered they were highly enthusiastic about the prospects of providing free lunches for their children.

ALL WANT TO HELP

He told them the community would have to build a lunchroom and the women would have to serve the meals. Therefore, the community contributed all the money it had, men gave their labor in constructing a building and the women were ready to take over the food distribution.

The building was only partly constructed when the community ran out of money. Here Parkinson stepped in with an unusual offer. Great Plains Wheat granted Leticia an interest-free loan to complete the job.

In the meantime, a mothers' club had been formed to serve the school lunch. The women were trained by a dietician working for Great Plains Wheat.

This is another part of the wheat growers program—to provide recipes for the use of wheat and to show people how to cook it. In Peru the food staples are corn and rice.

The first meal was served in Leticia to 232 children in December 1961. All the while, the Peruvian Government, noting the enthusiasm for the program in Leticia, had agreed that starts would be made also in other poor areas of the nation.

The U.S. Government is supplying wheat, often as bulgur, a cooked grain product which needs only to be mixed with water or milk, to be served; corn meal, powdered milk, butter, and other vegetable fats.

The Peruvian Government supplies fresh foods such as fruits and vegetables and some times meat or fish.

The lunch given each child contains from 1,800 to 2,000 calories and is designed to provide more than half of the daily minimum requirements of vitamins, proteins and minerals.

TO OTHER COUNTRIES

With a start in Leticia, Parkinson, along with his staff of two other men from the United States and a much larger group of native employees, quickly initiated the program in other countries. A good part of Parkinson's time is spent traveling by air from one country to another.

The best indication of how the school lunch program has ballooned since only 1961 comes from the figures on the number of children being fed.

In Peru, Parkinson said, 400,000 now are getting the school lunches and the number will reach a million by the end of 1964.

In Colombia, 5,000 are getting the lunches now and the total will be 20,000 by the end of this year.

In Ecuador, where the program is being carried on in cooperation with CARE, 50,000 get the lunches. In Chili, again in cooperation with CARE, the program is getting started with a rush and should reach several hundred thousand persons in the not too distant future. The program in Brazil is in the pilot stage.

Within a decade, Parkinson predicted, from 10 to 15 million children will be getting the free lunches at school.

Great Plains Wheat, he said, regards this as a magnificent opportunity to use wheat to help people to improve their standard of living.

The assumption is that eventually each government will take over the program.

The hope is, too, that as the countries become better educated they will, in time, become dollar customers for U.S. wheat.

IN OTHER PROGRAMS

The school lunches are not the only efforts of Great Plains Wheat. In Bogotá capital city of Colombia, the wheat organization has set up a trade school to teach any kind of trade, with emphasis on baking. Students from Ecuador and Peru as well as Colombia are attending.

Baking students at the school learn how to make products which require quality wheat such as that produced in the United States.

Some of the South American countries are making great industrial strides, Parkinson said. He mentioned Peru as a good example.

Also, he said, the South American countries have the largest birth rate and are increasing in population faster than other countries in the world. This is one of the major problems. When tens of millions of children have been educated, there will be more tens of millions coming on for whom provision must be made.

SENATOR KEATING'S CIVIL RIGHTS PROPOSAL

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Congress of the United States is engaged in a serious and conscientious effort to find a solution to the present deeply disturbing crisis in civil rights. It is our responsibility—as it is the responsibility of all men of good will throughout the country—to study these problems diligently and to offer suggestions, both critical and constructive, as to how we can meet the challenge of equality for all our citizens.

In line with this obligation, Senator KEATING has proposed a dual approach to civil rights legislation, emphasizing both the legal power of the interstate commerce clause and the moral force of the 14th amendment. We all know Senator KEATING's long-standing commitment to the achieving of equal civil rights. He has made an important contribution to our efforts in this field by his suggestion.

I support this approach, offered in a bipartisan spirit by Senator KEATING and approved in a similar spirit of cooperation by the Attorney General, and I believe it should be given wide support. It has strengthened chances for passage of the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the text of an editorial from the New York Times of July 27 discussing Senator KEATING's approach to civil rights legislation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 27, 1963]

PLUS THE 14TH AMENDMENT

Legality plus morality is the dual basis underlying Senator KEATING's useful amendment to the administration's civil rights bill. He would give equal weight to the 14th amendment and to the commerce clause as the constitutional bases for the bill.

Constitutional lawyers, law school deans, the Attorney General's office, and any number of Congressmen have been honestly divided on the proper way to validate the proposed ban on discrimination in public facilities. This is the touchiest part of the civil rights package and, legally, the most controversial. The question in recent days has become less "why?" than "how?"

The administration up to now has been relying on the commerce clause of the Constitution, which authorizes Congress to regulate interstate commerce. The commerce power is strong and it has been invoked and upheld many times on laws to achieve social ends. The administration position is that discrimination places an intolerable burden on interstate commerce.

Senator KEATING's proposal to add the 14th amendment's "equality" approach to the commerce clause's "business" approach would give the bill added constitutional weight. The amendment empowers Congress to negate State actions that deny citizens equal protection of the laws. What the Keating proposal does is to add a moral clause stating that discrimination deprives a citizen of his rights.

So far as the Negro, too long denied first-class citizenship, is concerned, the semicolons of the proposed civil rights package are not important. What counts is a strong law that recognizes him as a human being in every American way.

TRIBUTE TO FATHER ERNEST J. ZIZKA

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have long admired the fine work of the Benedictine Order which has especially devoted itself to scholarly, literary, and artistic pursuits. For this reason it gives me great pleasure to pay tribute today to a man who has exemplified the finest traditions of this splendid order, Father Ernest J. Zizka. Earlier this year, Father Zizka celebrated the 40th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood, and during these years he has made outstanding contributions to the United States, to his church and his community, and to the Czechoslovak people.

Father Ernest Zizka was born in Humpolec, Czechoslovakia, in 1889 and he came to the United States in 1903. He studied at John Carroll University, in Cleveland and St. Bernard Seminary, in Rochester, and in 1917 he joined the Benedictine Order.

During his years of training for the priesthood at St. Procopius Abbey and Seminary, Father Zizka became acquainted with many of the leaders of the Czechoslovak fraternal and civic organizations. His first assignment was at St. Procopius Church, in Chicago from 1923 to 1926. While at St. Procopius he organized a program of educational and recreational activity for the youth of the parish, and he took part in many of the activities of the district and national alliances and fraternal organizations.

In 1926, Father Zizka was assigned to teaching sociology and the Czechoslovak language at St. Procopius College and Seminary where he developed a course in the Czechoslovak history and culture. He received a scholarship from the University of Prague and received a Ph. D. from this university in 1931. On his return to the United States he was reassigned to teaching at St. Procopius College and continued his work in promoting the Czechoslovak language and culture.

From 1938 to 1941, Father Zizka served as editor of the Narod, a Czechoslovak Catholic newspaper, presently the only free newspaper of its kind in the world. At this time he took an active part in the liberation movement of Czechoslovakia and met many representatives of the Government, including President Benes and John Masaryk.

In 1943, Father Zizka became a military chaplain serving in German prisoner-of-war camps in Abilene and El Paso. After the war he spent some time at Notre Dame working on the translation of a Czechoslovak book on psychology. This training in psychology was put to good use during the 8 years which he spent as psychiatric chaplain at the Central Louisiana Hospital, in Pineville. In a letter of congratulations to Father Zizka on his 40th anniversary, Dr. Arthur L. Seale, superintendent of this hospital, wrote:

> Your love for the Divine Master and your concern for His loved ones was reflected in your every action while you were here at Central. Your priestly character touched each of us, leaving the imprint of your courageous personality upon our souls.

During the latter part of 1947 and 1948, Father Zizka returned to Czechoslovakia where he gave 70 lectures and had numerous run-ins with the Communists. For many decades he has been grand chaplain of the Czechoslovak Catholic Union and editor of the publication, Messenger. He has written extensively in the field of psychology and psychiatry and he is currently writing his biography under the title, "My Rendezvous With 70 Wonderful Years."

Throughout his years in the priesthood Father Zizka has served his fellow man with ability and dedication. I am delighted to commend him and to wish him many more years of service and happiness.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY DESERVES RATIFICATION—LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT AND NEWSPAPER EDITORIAL REFLECT CONCERN

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I wish to read to my colleagues and establish for the Record that my support will be given in this forum for the ratification of a nuclear test ban treaty. This is done in part in the following letter of July 27 to the President of the United States.

It is as follows:

> U.S. Senate,
> *Washington, D.C., July 27, 1963.*
>
> Hon. John F. Kennedy,
> *President of the United States,*
> *The White House,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> Dear Mr. President: Please know that I will support a nuclear test ban treaty with my vote and voice in the U.S. Senate.
>
> It is my conviction that the agreement entered into by the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union will receive ratification by more than the necessary two-thirds majority for approval.
>
> I listened carefully to your plea of last night. The citizens of our Republic will, I hope and believe, respond to your somber warning. They have, in your leadership, a responsibility to reflect constituent affirmation.
>
> Members of the Senate, I have faith, will join in this significant step toward the goal of world peace.
>
> Very truly,
>
> Jennings Randolph.

Mr. President, I also ask your attention to the following editorial of the Charleston Gazette of July 26, 1963:

World Opinion Will Help Make Nuclear Ban Stick

> We have refrained from commenting on the nuclear test ban proceedings in Moscow, because in the past, when we wrote about similar efforts to make sense of this anxious age, our optimism invariably proved to be short-lived and ill-conceived.
>
> Now, however, it does appear the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union have reached agreement on forbidding nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space, and under water. Although most persons of good will undoubtedly sigh for more, certainly this is a beginning that had to be made.
>
> Indeed, from this beginning other pacts to assure peace in our time may be arrived at. Breakthroughs in one direction often produce lively and consequential results elsewhere.
>
> The sole remaining stumbling block to the nuclear agreement at hand appears to be the U.S. Senate, which must ratify it by a two-thirds majority.
>
> A majority seems assured, but the two-thirds provision may present an insuperable barrier.
>
> It would be irony beyond comparison, were this Nation—the Nation which has been continually pressing for peaceful solutions to atomic dilemmas since the day World War II ended—to fail to sign the first treaty the Russian Government has agreed to on nuclear testing.
>
> Nor do the overwhelming majority of American citizens wish this to happen.
>
> Granted, there are complications. France and President de Gaulle on our side and Red China and Premier Mao Tse-tung on the Communist aren't parties to the treaty, and their capacity for mischief is well known.
>
> Still, if Russia and Great Britain are prepared to accept such complications, so, too, should the United States.
>
> Furthermore, world opinion is increasingly becoming a factor in determining national conduct. Neither France nor Red China can afford to lose friends, which surely would occur, were either to persist in testing atomic weaponry in the teeth of this agreement.
>
> And speaking of world opinion, what will be its response, should a minority of U.S. Senators nullify this Nation's attempts—to say nothing of the world's hopes—to decrease opportunities for nuclear war?

Mr. President, the subject will receive scrutiny by the Senate in the best tradition of the democratic process. It is my hope that affirmative action will be forthcoming in the reasonably near future. Toward this desired result I pledge my earnest efforts.

PIONEER DAY IN UTAH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it was my privilege to be in Utah last week when we celebrated the 116th anniversary of the arrival of the Mormon pioneers in the Salt Lake Valley.

It was on July 24, 1847, when Brigham Young led his small and hardy band down out of the Wasatch Mountains into a sagebrush-filled desert, surveyed the valley and said, "This is the place."

And what a place it is. Those of my colleagues who have visited Utah know how through irrigation and unremitting toil the people of Utah have turned their desert valley into fertile, blooming farmlands. They have seen the stately city which has been built in the center of that valley—a garden city, really, filled with grass and flowers and wide, tree-lined streets. Salt Lake City has often been referred to as one of America's most beautiful cities, and rightly so.

The Mormons, or the members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, came to Utah to escape religious persecution—to worship God as they pleased. Their own long battle to be allowed to follow the dictates of their conscience has made Utah one of the most tolerant States in the Union. It is a State remarkably free of religious intolerance.

Because we are proud of our history, and of the kind of a State we have established, we celebrate each year the anniversary of the arrival of the original pioneers in our valley. In Salt Lake City, and throughout the State in other towns and communities, planning for what is officially called Pioneer Day begins far in advance. In Salt Lake City, a "Days of '47" committee is formed supported by the Sons of the Utah Pioneers, the Daughters of the Utah Pioneers, and other leading citizens to direct what has become a week of celebration. The titles "Pioneer Day" and "Days of '47" are now used interchangeably.

We celebrate with both reverence and with joy. A pageant entitled "Valiantly Onward," which tells the story of the cross-country trek which one pioneer band experienced, is presented several evenings in the Salt Lake Tabernacle. There are sunrise services, pioneer luncheons and dinners, a "Days of '47" rodeo at the fairgrounds, and many other colorful events, climaxed by a mammoth parade down Salt Lake City's main street on July 24.

This year the theme of the celebration was "Parade of Progress." The events were not only a mingling of pioneer and western history, but of the present with the past. As a contrast to the pioneers in their covered wagons, the "Days of '47" committee decided that this year there should be an astronaut—a pioneer in space. The pageant committee asked me, therefore, to secure the services of one of America's astronauts for the Pioneer Day celebration.

Through the cooperation of Administrator James E. Webb, Astronaut Edward H. White II was sent from the NASA manned space aircraft center at Houston, Tex., to Salt Lake City to participate in the Pioneer Day celebration. Thursday, July 18, was declared Astronaut Day, and Astronaut White participated in a press conference held in the tabernacle and rode through Salt Lake City in a great young people's parade. Thousands saw and cheered Captain Ed White.

It added both zest and great interest to our annual tribute to our pioneer ancestors to be able to pay tribute, through Astronaut White, to the men of today who are pioneering this Nation's way into space. I am sure I speak for all of the people of Utah when I thank Administrator Webb, and NASA, for making Astronaut White's visit possible.

The events of the "Days of '47" were in themselves a contrast between yesterday and today. I went from a conference with Astronaut White to a luncheon with Mrs. Hilda Anderson Erickson, who is turning 104, and is one of the two remaining Utah pioneers, people who crossed the plains and mountains to arrive in Utah prior to the advent of the railroad in 1869. She is active and alert and she lives alone in her home in Grantsville. I enjoyed my visit with her and felt greatly honored to be in her presence.

The main parade on July 24 was also spectacular. There were over 100 floats, two dozen bands, dozens of fine ponies and beautiful horses, mounted posses, and dramatic personifications of Western and pioneer figures who have become legend. Jetplanes overhead, and a police motorcycle escort on the ground, led the parade—in themselves symbolic of progress over the last 100 years.

Because this annual celebration has such deep meaning to the people of Utah, I ask unanimous consent to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a few of the most significant news stories and editorials which appeared in Utah newspapers this year in connection with this annual event.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Ogden (Utah) Standard-Examiner, July 14, 1963]

THEY STRUGGLED WEST TO TAME A HOSTILE LAND

(By Ron Wormald)

A land founded by a people seeking refuge from intolerance and persecution, a land called America—and later a land in America called Utah.

Appropriately "All Faces West," which has become Ogden's own passion play, depicts symbolically the rigors of a forced migration, west by pioneers from the persecutions by non-Mormons in Illinois.

While it concerns the original party led by Brigham Young, it speaks eloquently through music and narration of a bitter migration that eventually left 6,000 American men, women, and children in graves known but to God across some of the most inhospitable and barren country in North America.

More, it shows the inner strengths of a people secure in the belief that God is with them.

INSISTENT THEME

Roland Parry's music expresses hauntingly and with insistence that basic tenet. Mrs. Parry's lyrics combine to tell the story.

To understand some of the rigors of the trek one should read the words of one unnamed pioneer, written of Nauvoo, the Mormon capital carved from swampland in Illinois beside the Mississippi.

The first wagons rolled from the city February 10, 1846. In 2 weeks the city was virtually deserted. As mob rule became more the rule and less the exception, the exodus picked up.

A SILENCE FALLS

Wrote the unknown writer: "As we passed through the city we saw many houses that had been abandoned—indeed the city itself seemed almost deserted.

"Looking across the Mississippi we saw long trains of wagons strung out over the high rolling prairies. Everything that formerly hummed with industry and life was now lonely, saddened, and forlorn and silent."

In wagons, with handcarts and on foot the young and the old, the sick and infirm headed west—a heartbreaking odyssey away from Nauvoo the Beautiful and its magnificent temple—leaving mob rule and looting to wreak a senseless vengeance upon the city and any life remaining.

PAUSES TO PRAY

Nine miles from the frozen river, at Sugar Creek, they took their first pause in the trek of misery. A wall of unknown ahead and on all sides, the most natural of man's instincts came to the fore, and the assistance of the Almighty was invoked, a poignant scene captured by composer Parry in a "Prayer for a Safe Journey."

The first lines are those of men from the time of Israel, "O God, we bow our heads before Thee,

"We ask Thy blessings, we ask Thy mercy."

Resolution inspired by that prayer was forthcoming and the march resumed.

TREK RESUMES

Mr. Parry captures that solidarity of purposes and rigidity of character in "All Faces West," the title tune.

Such lines as "Courage it takes to go on" and "There isn't room for doubt and fear, let's cast them out right here."

The journey continued amid dust, heat, cold, sleet, illness and death into regions where the Indian ruled—areas where a white man often realizes a sudden and violent death.

A DRIVEN PEOPLE

Yet the Indians were not aliens. The majesty of the red man, long nurtured as a semimaniacal savage, came forth—in history and in the recreation of the march in "All Faces West."

Friendship, not enmity, from a people quick to recognize injustice and privation from a point of those who suffered similar oppression.

Parry's "We too Are a Driven People," symbolizes much of this—and the journey went on.

Breaks in the trek occurred. Food was planted for those yet to come. Children were born, and children died, yet the odyssey continued. And it comes to life on stage.

LONELY GRAVES

The dust is there, the monotonous landscape rises and falls, ever dotted by the lonely graves.

There is time for relaxation too, a dance which changes the vicious routine to a fragment of the life now far behind.

These are lighter moments.

Love blossoms and grows en route, symbolized on stage by the Mary Ann and Carter romance and the haunting, "Goodnight, My Love."

A nation which turned its back upon its people asks help at winter quarters at Council Bluff, Iowa.

And it was given, with sorely needed young men being assigned to fight the war in Mexico.

So it continues through the historical writings and the reenactment on stage. Through it all historical writings and Mr. Parry's music verify, a genuine and heartfelt faith in God and His mercy supporting a homeless people.

JOURNEY'S END

Then the promised land is reached and the heartache is trebled. It is a dead land, bereft of trees, avoided by man, a land of sand and salt. To a people who inched 1,200 miles it is a bitter sight and an empty promise.

Yet it was settled, crops were gouged into the inhospitable land, homes of indescribable crudity were built and the work went on—and above all the faith endured.

Crops prospered, then disaster loomed, graphically reenacted on stage in Mary Ellen Bailey's choreography. Multitudinous clouds of crickets descended—and the prayer of a driven people rises to a God they have so long entrusted themselves to.

HE ANSWERS

"Prayer of Supplication" begins with man's deepest despair to He who created all, "Oh God, our God, be merciful unto us * * *" and the Lord hears and answers.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, July 24, 1963]

UTAH'S PAST OFFERS PATTERN FOR FUTURE

If the past is prologue in Utah, the future bodes both bright and grim for the former state of Deseret.

When the Mormon vanguard arrived in the valley of the great Salt Lake in July 1847, members prayed and made entries in their diaries. Then they set the pattern for the new Zion by damming City Creek, softening the parched earth and planting crops.

This was the land nobody wanted and Brigham Young hoped the saints, persecuted and driven out of Missouri and Illinois, would find sanctuary in the mountains on the edge of the desert. The great colonizer recognized the limitations of the arid land, however, and decreed that water and timber were community owned, to be husbanded and conserved.

Scenery was not a primary concern of Utah's first settlers.

As Dale L. Morgan says in "The Valley of the Great Salt Lake," a Utah Historical Society booklet, "Salt Lake Valley is one of the handsomest on all the broad face of America." No other city has a more scenic natural setting. The valleys along the Wasatch are fertile and productive where water can be utilized. Water has been a limiting factor from the outset, however, and making the best use of water will play a leading role in the future of this valley and State where the Anglo-Saxons first irrigated the land.

Although statehood was not accorded the transplanted orderly society for 59 years after the pioneers arrived, July 24 is celebrated throughout Utah as most other States commemorate the day they joined the Union.

All honors are due the first pioneers but other historical notes are worth noting. The discovery of gold in California brought the forty-niners, who, by trading with the saints as they passed through, helped save the settlement from economic strangulation. It is still shocking today that a U.S. Army should have been sent to occupy Zion in 1858, but this, too, was an economic blessing in disguise. Camp Floyd and Fort Douglas (1862) were excellent markets for Utah farm and mill output. And when Camp Floyd was abandoned (incident to the Civil War), Utah residents received their first bonanza of Government property at a fraction of its worth.

This year marks the centennial of Utah's first mining district, created by Col. Patrick Edward Connor and his California-Nevada volunteers.

Their explorations bore no fruit until the seventies, but mining became a leading Utah industry—after the coming of the Union Pacific in 1868–69. The destruction of the physical isolation of Utah by the railroad was made more complete by the two world wars. The latter brought an end to a serious business depression and left here permanently the great steel complex of Utah, Iron and Carbon Counties, Hill Field and other defense installations. And the cold war period has dotted the Wasatch Front with light industries, most of them related to the missile age.

The Agrarian Society on which Utah originally was founded has changed in many ways. No doubt it will change more as more raw materials are found useful, mined, developed and refined economically, and marketed. The potentialities of the tourist industry likely have only been scratched.

Great changes are taking place in the valleys which the pioneers thought of in terms of permanent pastoral simplicity. Subdivisions spring up within a few weeks in former orchards and on sagebrush sidehills; factories compete with farms and householders for choice spots in the valleys.

The thoughtfulness, planning and orderliness that marked the first 50 years of Utah's settlement and development may be required to save these lovely valleys from becoming ugly slums in the future. If "the past is prologue," let's take a long, hard look at Utah in the spirit of the first settlers.

[From the Provo (Utah) Herald, July 24, 1963]

UTAH SETTLERS BUILT "LAND OF HONEY BEE" THROUGH FAITH AND PERSEVERANCE

(By Kathryn D. Groesbeck)

Into the West came the saints, led by their 46-year-old president, Brigham Young. Looking out of the carriage for his first view of the Great Salt Lake Valley, he is reported to have said, "It is enough. This is the right place."

What all his followers beheld before them was a brown, arid desert, desolate and lonely. The three women of the party, one of Brigham Young's wives, Clarissa Decker Young, one of his brother's wives, Tarriet Page Young, and one of Heber Kimball's wives, Ellen Saunders Kimball, looked upon it and wept. Here was to be their home.

MADE DESERT BLOSSOM

And here began a miracle. Walled in as they were from the outside world in a vastness of the Rocky Mountains, these pioneers of Zion built their kingdom of Desert, where they could observe God's will and await the last days. Here they made the desert blossom as the rose, a noble work for which accomplishment they stand out in history. Out of a frontier they created a beautiful and rich land. They never stopped building. Their work is one of cooperation, frugality, labor, and church obedience.

It was not easy to clear the land of sage, till the soil, dig the ditches, plant the grains and potatoes and garden vegetables, cut the wood for timber for cabins and for fuel, and make the adobes they did with so much to be done immediately after their arrival on July 24, 1847. It was not easy to institute the needed industry. There had been nothing. That is the point. These stalwarts of Zion began the life that is Utah. They built it every step of the way.

BRIDGER'S REPORT

Jim Bridger ("Old Gabe") had spoken favorably to Brigham Young of the Great Basin—this land that was to be the Saints'. Fremont's reports mentioned the fertility of the soil near its outer rim. Thus Brigham Young knew what he was talking about when he said, "This is the place." And the toil upon toil of the Saints, their great labor in cultivation, made possible the fair fields and gardens of beans and pumpkins and squash. It was the paradise "Old Gabe" had described to the "Lion of the Lord."

Then came the black ravenous crickets, devouring everything in their path for food. Only the arrival of the gulls that darkened the sky with their approach, saved the crops from total loss. There was enough left for the Saints. They made out and even had enough left to send with relief parties that were going east to aid others on their way to Zion. Yes, the gulls were another miracle.

JOHNSTON'S ARMY

Though all the early years were hard ones, the year 1857 was especially hard for the Saints, because Col. Albert Sidney Johnston was leading an army to escort President Buchanan's newly appointed Governor, Alfred Cumming, to Utah Territory to replace Brigham Young. The Saints felt the last days were night; they would lose their leader; they would be routed again from their homes to flee—where?

Yet what appeared to be for the worst proved a blessing. Was it another of God's miracles? The army marched through a deserted city and moved on to build Camp Floyd about 40 miles to the southwest. The Saints returned to their homes from the canyons and the southern area. And the soldiers spent money in the territory that had little. When they broke camp in 1860 just before the Civil War, Brigham Young and the Saints bought what was not taken east. Thus many needed materials and all kinds of equipment came into their hands.

UTAH GROWTH

Wagons with rumbling wheels continued to roll over the trail to Zion. No frontier ever grew so fast. As Zion grew and progressed, cabins gave way to stable farmhouses and substantial homes. Businesses, industries, and pleasures increased.

Yet trouble was bound to come, for the rest of the world looked askance at polygamy. When Federal agents entered the scene, they sought out polygamists, imprisoned those they caught, confiscated their businesses and property, and eventually confiscated all property of the church. That was too much. Rather than see the end come, Wilford Woodruff, then president of the church (Brigham Young had died August 29, 1877), with the approval of the church leaders, issued the Woodruff manifesto for the discontinuance of polygamy. On January 4, 1896, almost 50 years since Brigham Young had come down into the valley, President Cleveland welcomed Utah as a State of the Union.

These pioneer forbears of ours were stalwarts. Honor them today for their labor, their frugality, their cooperation, their church obedience, their achievement—their building the "land of the honeybee" out of a western frontier.

[From the Ogden (Utah) Standard-Examiner, July 24, 1963]

TRIBUTE TO UTAH'S PROUD HERITAGE

Utah completes its observance of Pioneer Days tonight with final performances in the Ogden rodeo and everyone should agree that the 1963 celebration was one of the best yet.

The parade today was a thrill to watch. The three presentations of "All Faces West" drew well-earned applause. The rodeo drew capacity crowds just about every night and performers complimented those who arranged the western show. The art exhibits at Municipal Park were well worth viewing.

All in all, Pioneer Days in Ogden area had a satisfactory air—a fitting tribute to Utah's proud pioneer heritage.

And that's the way it's been for years.

* * * * *

Twenty years ago the United States was in the middle of World War II so the observance had predominantly military overtones.

The 1943 parade had sections from Bushnell General Hospital, Hill Field, the Utah Army Service Forces Depot, Clearfield Naval Supply Depot, and Ogden Arsenal.

But even then, the Armed Forces floats and other parade units emphasized the Pioneer Days traditions with the story retold of the Mormon pioneers making their heroic march across the plains to their new Zion.

In 1913, the parade was praised—then as now—as the "greatest in Ogden's history." The parade 50 years ago was over a mile long and included many of the old wagons that actually had been used for the 1847 trek.

In that 1913 parade were eight prairie schooners that the Standard-Examiner files note as showing marks of rough roads and much traveling. The horses and oxen that drew the schooners along the parade route to old Glenwood Park were not the unusual sight in downtown Ogden that they are today.

It is interesting to note that one of the floats 50 years ago had among its riders two prominent Scotch citizens of Ogden. One of them was then-Bishop David O. McKay, now the president of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Celebration of Pioneer Days is the most deeply entrenched tradition in Utah, as it well should be.

[From the Deseret News, July 24, 1963]

AS PIONEER DAY WAS CELEBRATED IN A RURAL UTAH COMMUNITY

(By Alma Hanson)

We, Hyrum, Utah, kids were out early that July 24 morning, 1883. Who could sleep, anyway, with all those anvil explosions shaking the earth every minute. I had delivered promptly the cows for Little Olsen to take over the river south, on their range for the day. I had spent little time eating breakfast—mush and molasses with a trace of butter, accompanied by bread and milk. Getting my face and hands cleaned up and a clean shirt, 20 cents in my pocket, I was soon headed toward town.

For several days I had prepared for the great day by doctoring the cracks and sores on my feet with mutton tallow; so now I was pretty well healed up and ready for any eventuality—races, fun and frolic.

My friend, Ren Swenson, joined me on the way; we arrived on the public square in time to see the flag raising. The committee of four men was performing this patriotic service. The 20-year-old tree was a large one but was beginning to rot down by the ground. Heavy planks had been planted around it to insure safety. Old Glory was really large, I thought, as they began hoisting her to flutter in the breeze. Way up there to the top she looked small—but how beautiful, waving in the sky. This was the first time we had a closeup view of our beloved national emblem.

The big explosions were over now and the boys had flocked into the public square. The firecrackers were popping on every hand. Ren and I spent a nickel each and joined the crowd in shooting firecrackers.

A different kind of excitement now hove into sight. A tall man with a black, broadbrimmed hat, one side of it pinned to the crown, sword dangling by his side, mounted on a prancing horse, with collar marks, evidently a glorified workhorse, came riding at the head of a Marine band. These flutes and snare drums were really stirring; we could hardly contain ourselves as they marched and played "Marching Through Georgia," and "The Girl I Left Behind Me." Following the band came marching about 30 infantrymen with muskets on their shoulders, revolvers in their belts. They were of the U.S. Army.

They marched onto the public square and made camp, setting up a tent and preparing for breakfast. The general's horse was taken away by a boy and tied across the street. Three or four sentinels were stationed a short distance from camp.

Soon a band of "Indians" from below the hill appeared. They stopped and surveyed the encampment. Evidently they decided to "take" the soldiers during breakfast. Suddenly, they came pellmell at breakneck speed. The guards fired the muskets and retreated into camp, where there was a fury of firing to meet the attack.

With whoops and yells the Indians circled the camp several times, firing muskets and pistols, also some arrows. But they were met by the steady musket fire of the soldiers. One or two Indians sprawled from their horses supposedly wounded; also a couple of soldiers lay prone and quiet. Then the Indians gave up the fight and rode away to the hills from whence they came. The wounded were revived and disappeared. It was exciting while it lasted. But from the blare of a horn up the street to the east something else was coming.

Soon we could hear the Marine band playing, "As We Go Marching Along." The general had now turned marshal of the day. His sword had been taken off, instead he wore a red sash hanging down his side. Following him was the band on foot, leading the long parade through Main Street and the center of the town.

Then came the bewhiskered bullwhackers with their motley medley of covered wagons drawn by the mixed up teams of horses, mules, oxen and cows, with everything and everybody looking dusty and tired—even the dogs. There was a grim reality about the whole thing. The handcart company came next, loaded with equipment for living and camping—pulled and followed by hungry-looking men, women, and children, dressed in old wornout clothes—giving the impression of weariness and despair.

Nearby me on the sidewalk was Sophie Monsen, weeping. She was hard hit and crying, with kerchief to her face. "It is too much. It is all too true," she was exclaiming. Some 15 or 20 years before she had been a member of an ill-fated Mormon handcart company, caught in an early winter, leaving many of their friends buried in the snow, out on the plains of Wyoming.

Some distance back of the parade came a band of Indians led by "Chief Pocatello." His face was so long and ugly he could have drunk buttermilk out of a Mormon churn.

It was time for the program—people were streaming into the meeting house. Inside, the building was decorated with small flags and bunting. The meeting opened by singing "The Star-Spangled Banner," followed by prayer. The speaking was mainly pioneer incidents by the best speakers.

The original pioneers were seated on the stage in a special group. The martial band gave a couple of lively numbers.

A large bowery with a willow covering for shade for spectators had been built for these summer occasions—the 4th and 24th of July. The spectators were using the rough, improvised seats, or lolling about on the grass in the shade waiting for the sports.

Then came the races for boys and girls, the greasy pole climb, the burlap sack race (which I happened to win, much to my surprise); the running jump, horseshoe pitching, and wrestling. Oh yes, let me not forget the horseracing event, always an exciting event in these celebrations.

Nearing the finish of the day's excitement came the afternoon dance for children, and the grand ball at night with its plain quadrilles and graceful waltzes.

But before this last hilarious event was over, we youngsters had taken our weary way homeward to the farms and the chores and Little Olsen, off the range now was tooting his horn to have us take the cows off his hands and home for milking.

KSL Editorial

A noted American historian some years ago wrote of the trials and persecution that led to the journey of the Mormon pioneers across the plains and mountains to the valley of the Great Salt Lake.

Persecution was like the fire in a crucible, he wrote. It separated the dross from the gold. It weeded out the faithless. It put the physically weak into early graves and sent the timid back to the security of former homes.

In the end, when the journey was finished, he wrote, only the strong and faithful remained.

Only the strong and faithful. What a tribute to the men and women whose courage and faith and dedication laid the foundations of the civilization we enjoy in these valleys today. What a challenge to us, their heirs, to lay upon that foundation our own strong bricks of good citizenship and self-reliance and brotherhood.

Only the strong and faithful remained. At this Days of Forty-seven season, 116 years after their arrival, it remains for us to resolve to make ourselves worthy of that heritage.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR McGEE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, recently I was privileged to attend an appreciation dinner for my good friend and neighbor to the east, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee]. It was indeed a wonderful occasion; and the people of Wyoming made quite clear their regard for Senator McGee and their appreciation of the effective work he has done on behalf of their State and the West.

The Wyoming Eagle, a daily newspaper in Cheyenne, Wyo., published two excellent editorials on this dinner. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wyoming Eagle, July 13, 1963]

Friends of McGee

Friends of Wyoming's senior Senator Gale W. McGee this evening will pay him one of the biggest tributes ever paid to a living U.S. Senator.

The occasion will be the McGee appreciation dinner, being held to pay tribute to the Senator for his "outstanding service" in the U.S. Senate since his election in 1958. The $25-a-plate dinner is scheduled to begin at 7 p.m. at the big Frontier pavilion in northwest Cheyenne.

Heading up the star-studded cast for the affair will be no less a personality than Vice President of the United States Lyndon B. Johnson.

The Vice President's attendance, alone, would speak eloquently for the respect and stature Senator McGee enjoys in our Nation's Capital.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall will be here for the dinner, too, and both he and Vice President Johnson will address the dinner audience.

Besides the Vice President and a member of President Kennedy's Cabinet, dignitaries who will be special guests at the McGee appreciation dinner will include:

Assistant Secretary of Labor Esther Peterson; Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd Dominy; Mike Manatos, administrative assistant to President Kennedy; Steve McNichols, former Governor of Colorado; and no fewer than 14 U.S. Senators.

U.S. Senators who will be here for the dinner include: Senators Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Clair Engle of California; Alan Bible, of Nevada; Howard Cannon, of Nevada; Lee Metcalf, of Montana; Frank Moss, of Utah; George McGovern, of South Dakota; E. L. (Bob) Bartlett, of Alaska; Ernest Gruening, of Alaska; Stephen Young, of Ohio; Daniel Inouye, of Hawaii; Quentin Burdick, of North Dakota; Daniel Brewster, of Maryland; and Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia.

Former President Harry S. Truman is honorary chairman of the bipartisan dinner committee, which is headed by former Wyoming Senator J. J. (Joe) Hickey.

The list of nationally prominent personalities who will attend tonight's dinner is an impressive testimonial to Senator McGee. It reflects the respect and friendship he enjoys in Washington as the senior U.S. Senator from Wyoming. It gives one big indication of why he has been and still is so effective in working for Wyoming and the West.

But an equally great tribute to Senator McGee is the fact that so many Wyoming citizens purchased tickets, at $25 each, that it was necessary to move the appreciation dinner from the Plains Hotel, where it was originally scheduled, to the huge Frontier pavilion.

[From the Wyoming Eagle, July 16, 1963]

Challenge Returned

Last Saturday morning, these editorial columns predicted Saturday night's appreciation dinner honoring Wyoming's senior Senator Gale W. McGee would be "one of the biggest tributes ever paid to a living U.S. Senator."

Some Republicans scoffed at that prediction and at least one Republican newspaper editorially challenged it.

Said the editorial: "An unusually heady draught of ether in prints other than our own has proclaimed this occasion as 'one of the biggest tributes ever paid to a living U.S. Senator.'"

Then it asked, "Is it? We wonder."

This morning, we should like to return the challenge.

How many times—think hard now—have you, our skeptical Republican friends, seen or heard of a Senator's being honored at a dinner in his home State, with so many top-ranking national officials on hand?

Vice President Lyndon Johnson was a featured speaker at the dinner, which was held in the big Frontier pavilion in northwest Cheyenne. A Cabinet member, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, also was a featured speaker. Others present included Assistant Secretary of Labor Esther Peterson, Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd Dominy, and Mike Manatos, administrative assistant to President Kennedy.

How many times have 14 U.S. Senators traveled all the way from Washington to Wyoming—or to any other State—to pay tribute to a fellow Senator?

Among those attending Saturday night's dinner were Senators Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Clair Engle, of California; Alan Bible, of Nevada; Howard Cannon, of Nevada; Lee Metcalf, of Montana; Frank Moss, of Utah; George McGovern, of South Dakota; E. L. (Bob) Bartlett, of Alaska; Ernest Gruening, of Alaska; Stephen Young, of Ohio; Daniel Inouye, of Hawaii; Quentin Burdick, of North Dakota; Daniel Brewster, of Maryland; and Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia.

Both the officials of the Kennedy administration and the visiting Senators were abundant in their praise of Wyoming's Senator McGee, and in their expressions of friendship for Senator and Mrs. McGee.

Name, if you can, any previous occasion in Wyoming's history when more than 1,250 persons, from all over the State, paid $25 a plate to attend a dinner in honor of a U.S. Senator.

Again we urge you, who have been so vociferous in your skepticism—think hard.

The huge Frontier pavilion originally was set up to accommodate 1,000 persons—and, as most any political observer will tell you, that's a mighty big crowd for any such function in Wyoming. But the hall filled rapidly, and more tables were hurriedly set up. The additional tables were filled and there was standing room only long before the featured speakers made their addresses.

Tickets of those who could not be fed at the pavilion were honored at the Plains Hotel, following the addresses, and the big Wyoming room at the Plains was filled. Others enjoyed the program at the pavilion and then went to other restaurants in town for dinner.

Early official estimates placed the attendance at the McGee appreciation dinner at 1,200. Later, as guests continued to arrive, the estimates were revised upward. One official told us 1,350 ticketholders—friends of Senator Gale McGee—showed up to pay tribute to the Senator for his "outstanding service to Wyoming" in the U.S. Senate.

So, this morning, we repeat: It was one of the biggest tributes ever paid to a living U.S. Senator. And we challenge our doubting Republican friends to disprove that statement.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE HJALMAR C. NYGAARD

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I was saddened last week to learn of the untimely passing of my colleague from North Dakota, Representative Hjalmar C. Nygaard.

One of the last occasions on which I saw Hjalmar Nygaard, was at the unveiling ceremony June 28 for North Dakota's first statue in Statuary Hall, that of former Gov. John Burke. The ceremony took place in the Capitol rotunda where the acoustics are poor. Many speakers could barely be heard by spectators in the back rows, but Hjalmar's voice rang strong and clear. Little did we suspect that his end was so near.

Hjalmar was thoroughly a product of North Dakota, born on a farm near Sharon and educated in public schools and colleges of the State. A schoolteacher and proprietor of a grocery and later a hardware business in Enderlin, he knew and understood the life and attitudes in North Dakota because of his deep roots in the State.

A public-spirited and responsible man, Hjalmar served as mayor of Sharon, N. Dak., and later as a member of the school board. He was elected to the North Dakota State House of Representatives in 1948 and rose to leadership positions, serving as majority leader and later as speaker. He was elected a Congressman at large in 1960, replacing me after my election to the Senate. Then, in 1962, he was reelected, this time as Representative of North Dakota's First District in the eastern part of the State.

Although Hjalmar and I were on the opposite sides of the political fence, he and I have worked closely together in Washington, particularly on North Dakota matters. As members of the House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees, he and I collaborated to advance the Garrison diversion unit, a project of great significance to the development of North Dakota. Hjalmar was at all times friendly and cooperative, and dedicated to serving our State.

I respected Hjalmar Nygaard's integrity and will miss him, as will the people of North Dakota.

TRIBUTE TO ADM. EDWIN JOHN ROLAND

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in his year as Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, Admiral Roland has done a superb job in his handling of all the responsibilities that have fallen to him.

He combines the ability to lead and to command with breadth of view and gentleness of manner. The Coast Guard is indeed fortunate to have the services of this outstanding officer and, as a member of the Coast Guard Reserve, it gives me particular pride to call the attention of the Senate to his distinguished record.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point a copy of the citation that accompanied the Legion of Merit he recently received from the President of the United States.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Supplement No. 1 to the Commandant's Bulletin No. 29-63

The Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington.

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Legion of Merit to Adm. Edwin John Roland, U.S. Coast Guard, for services as set forth in the following citation:

"For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service from June 1962 to July 1963, as Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard. Admiral Roland has demonstrated the very highest level of professional skill and resourcefulness in planning and coordinating the operations of the Coast Guard. His formulation of policies and procedures has produced a readiness posture unparalleled in the peacetime history of the Coast Guard, and has contributed greatly to the enhanced position of the Coast Guard in the Military Establishment. His exceptional leadership and strong initiative have resulted in the excellent morale and outstanding esprit de corps prevailing in the Coast Guard. Admiral Roland's keen foresight, broad vision, and skillful interpretation of maritime, legislative, and military trends have produced accomplishments of great value to the service and the United States. His continuing leadership, professional ability, diplomacy, and zealous devotion to duty reflect the highest credit upon himself and the U.S. Coast Guard."

Douglas Dillon
(For the President).

OPPOSITION TO EXTENSION OF MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have received letters from a number of individuals, organizations, and groups of individuals who strongly oppose the extension of Public Law 78, the Mexican farm-labor program. This measure is scheduled for consideration by the Senate tomorrow.

I ask unanimous consent that a representative selection of these letters be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Owatonna, Minn.,
July 30, 1963.

Hon. Eugene McCarthy,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: As a Protestant minister and chairman of Steele County Aid to Migrants Committee I feel Senate bill 1703 to extend Public Law 78 another year, would decrease work opportunities for our migrant citizens, and therefore urge you to vote against this bill.

James Parker,
Medford, Minn.

National Consumers League,
Washington, D.C., July 29, 1963.

Hon. Eugene J. McCarthy,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator McCarthy: Our organization was very disappointed to learn that the Senate would consider a bill to continue the Mexican farm labor importation program (Public Law 78). It is unfortunate that the Senate Agriculture Committee has adopted the unusual procedure of reporting this highly controversial measure without holding any hearings whatsoever.

The National Consumers League believes that consumers must be concerned with the conditions under which the goods they purchase are produced. We have therefore long been concerned with the condition and plight of farmworkers, the most poverty-stricken work group in the United States. That is why we are so strongly opposed to Public Law 78. This law has been an important means for keeping farm labor wages so low and for maintaining a large surplus of agricultural labor.

Some of the supporters of Public Law 78 claim that the end of the Mexican farm labor importation will increase consumer prices. This is, as the House Agriculture Committee's minority report states, "self-serving poppycock." Farm labor costs represent less than one-twentieth of the consumer price of vegetables, fruits, cotton and sugar. For example, a 20 cents an hour increase in farm labor costs in the cultivation and harvest of lettuce would increase the consumer price by one-fifth of a cent a head.

Quite frankly, consumers resent being given the blame for the atrocious farm labor conditions. The growers and their supporters make it appear as if the consumers' desire for inexpensive food make necessary the existing plight of farmworkers and Public Law 78's harm. This is simply not true.

We respectfully urge you to reject these false arguments and to oppose S. 1703 or any other bill to continue Public Law 78.

Very truly yours,

Sarah H. Newman,
General Secretary.

Industrial Union Department,
Washington, D.C., July 29, 1963.

Dear Senator: I am writing to you on behalf of the Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, in opposition to the passage of S. 1703, extending the Mexican contract labor program for another year.

We are opposed, unequivocally to the extension of this program for any period of time, and we urge you to vote against S. 1703 or any variation thereof.

Public Law 78 was enacted by the Congress at a time when this country faced a labor shortage resulting from the war in Korea. This country now suffers from a tragic labor surplus. Furthermore, Congress stipulated that this law was to be administered so as to preclude any adverse effect on the wages and working conditions of domestic farmworkers. It is a notorious fact that the importation of contract workers has had adverse effects on our people, and it is our firm conviction that there is no way in which this law can be administered which will not produce adverse effects.

Hired farmworkers have been denied protection under virtually every Federal labor law enacted in the last 30 years. They carry the burden of their own unemployment because they are denied protection under the Unemployment Compensation Act; they are denied protection under the wage and hour provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act; they have been denied protection in the right to organize and bargain collectively under the acts governing the National Labor Relations Board; they even suffer from inadequacy of the law covering them under old-age security. State laws are no better, and in only a handful of States is there mandatory coverage under workman's compensation in what is admittedly the third most hazardous industry.

On top of, and in the face of this consistent discrimination, the Congress has repeatedly extended Public Law 78, thereby enabling growers and processors to evade the normal consequences of even the influence of supply and demand on farm wages. This has made a travesty of any free labor market in agriculture at the same time that farm operators and processors have insisted upon and enjoyed one of the most elaborate systems of price protection in history.

We believe that the proper relief for farmers or processors having difficulty in recruiting adequate labor is to substitute for this un-American crutch a program of domestic recruitment and labor standards as set forth, for example, in H.R. 4518 and S. 527. We would have been glad to have seen such a program launched much earlier so that Public Law 78 could have been phased out in an orderly fashion without hardship to any.

But the very political and economic groups which have fought for the extension of Public Laws 78 have grimly opposed any rationalization of the domestic recruiting program, in the face of vast numbers of people displaced from the land each year and millions of unemployed in the cities. This leads us to believe that no decent domestic recruitment program can be enacted until this contract labor tranquilizer has been withdrawn from its beneficiaries, and we have no choice other than to urge you to vote to defeat the Mexican contract labor program right now and then join in enacting a decent program for domestic recruitment to meet the legitimate labor requirements of farmers and processors.

Finally, and particularly in view of the action of the House on Public Law 78, it strikes us as exceedingly strange and distressing that the Senate Agriculture Committee has approved S. 1703 without benefit of a single hearing. There have been no hearings on this issue in the Senate for 2 years. Therefore, it would seem clear that a bill intimately affecting the lives of hundreds and thousands of American migrant workers, at the very least, deserves the benefit of a careful and thorough Senate committee hearings and testimony.

Sincerely,
WALTER P. REUTHER,
President, Industrial Union Department AFL–CIO.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE
CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE U.S.A.,
New York, N.Y., July 29, 1963.

Hon. EUGENE J. MCCARTHY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARTHY: I enclose a statement of the general board of the National Council of Churches entitled, "Resolution regarding the future of the Mexican agricultural worker importation program (Public Law 78, 82d Cong.)."

This resolution, adopted in February 1960, reflects the long experience of the National Council of Churches through its Ministry to Migrants. This led us to the conviction that the Mexican farmworker importation program, introduced as a wartime emergency measure and continued year after year long after the emergency had ceased, should be gradually eliminated during a specified phaseout period.

Since that time the widespread introduction of mechanization has resulted in an automatic phaseout process in which the number of braceros brought into the country has decreased each year. This fact, together with the widespread and increasing unemployment among both farm and other workers in this country, has reinforced the conviction that the importation program should not be again extended.

I am sending this to you for your information on a matter of public interest before the Congress at this time. We believe you will be interested to know of the principles relating to this issue adopted by this body of men and women from our churches and the accompanying brief statement of reasons therefore.

Sincerely yours,
CAMERON P. HALL.

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE USA

RESOLUTION REGARDING THE FUTURE OF THE MEXICAN AGRICULTURAL WORKER IMPORTATION PROGRAM (PUBLIC LAW 78, 82D CONG.)

(Adopted by the General Board of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA, February 25, 1960)

Whereas Public Law 78 (82d Cong.) providing for the importation of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico will expire on June 30, 1961 unless extended by Congress; and

Whereas the present practice of our Government in authorizing the importation of Mexican nationals for agricultural labor in the United States involves human and ethical issues of grave concern to the conscience of Christian people; namely:

(a) The importation program has injurious effects on the family and community life both of the Mexican nationals who are imported and of the domestic workers who, because of the presence of Mexican nationals, are deprived of employment or find it necessary to migrate in search of employment;

(b) Importation tends to produce a labor surplus thereby depressing wages and labor standards for domestic agricultural workers; and even if the United States has failed to make the necessary adjustments to enable all farmers to secure an equitable share of the national income there is no moral justification for perpetuation of substandard wages for agricultural labor;

Whereas the General Board of the National Council of Churches has, from time to time, adopted policy positions which are relevant to this statement:[1] Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA is opposed to the extension of Public Law 78 (82d Cong.) in its present form; but, to avoid hardships on employers and workers who have come to rely on this program, we approve the extension of the farm labor importation program (Public Law 78) in amended form for a temporary period with a specific date of final termination and with definite provisions for annual reductions in volume written into the act;

Furthermore, even for this period of transition, we recommend that amendments be adopted designed to bring about the following improvements in the legislation;

(a) Limitation of the program to temporary labor shortage situations and to unskilled, nonmachine jobs;

(b) Assurance that diligent efforts have been made by both employers and the Bureau of Employment Security of the Department of Labor to recruit domestic labor at a wage adequate for health and welfare before any certification of need for Mexican nationals is made by the Department;

(c) Removal of the certification for need procedures as fully as possible from undue local pressure by growers;

(d) Determination of prevailing wage rates for Mexican nationals by the Department of Labor at a level that will not depress wages which might be offered to domestic workers or prevent their seeking such employment;

(e) Inclusion in the law of specific provisions with respect to promulgation of rules and regulations by the Secretary of Labor which will insure observance of the intent of the law; and adequate provision for enforcement including authorization of sufficient inspection and enforcement personnel, and appropriate penalties for violations;

(f) Establishment of an appeal procedure available to growers or workers where findings of violation are made; be it further

Resolved, That in taking this position we recognize that certain other aspects of our national policy are intertwined with the operation of the Mexican importation program and that we recognize that a responsible policy which provides for early termination of that program must also come to grips with the following related issues:

(a) The necessity of providing adequate enforcement of the immigration laws on the Mexican border to prevent resurgence of the vast influx of so-called wetbacks of a few years ago and strict interpretation of the provisions of the immigration laws so as to prevent circumvention of the termination of the Mexican importation program;

(b) The readiness of the United States Government to develop, with the Mexican Government, such programs of economic and technical aid as may be required at least to offset any injury the Mexican economy may suffer from the termination of the Mexican importation program; be it further

Resolved, That the general board authorize representatives of the National Council of Churches to testify at hearings in respect to Public Law 78 (82d Cong.) along lines indicated above.

AMALGAMATED MEAT CUTTERS
AND BUTCHER WORKMEN,
Chicago, Ill., July 29, 1963.

Hon. EUGENE J. MCCARTHY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARTHY: The Senate Agriculture Committee has reported S. 1703, a bill to continue the Mexican farm labor importation program or Public Law 78, without holding any hearings. Even though the House of Representatives defeated an extension of Public Law 78 by a 158–174 vote on May 29 because the importation increases farm labor unemployment in the United States, organizations were not given an opportunity to demonstrate the great harm Public Law 78 does.

Under Public Law 78, some 195,000 Mexican farmworkers were imported into the United States to work on less than 1 percent of American farms—generally large, corporation-type farms. This importation depresses farm labor wages and limits job opportunities of U.S. farmworkers. It is a major factor in causing the terrible poverty of U.S. farmworkers.

---

[1] Pertinent national council statements: (a) "We believe that churches should support measures intended to provide more effective utilization of domestic seasonal labor; the importation of foreign workers only when necessary to supplement the domestic labor supply, with adequate provision made for their welfare; the discouragement of the practices of importing foreign workers from economically depressed areas as a means of their rehabilitation, with emphasis instead on the encouragement of efforts such as the point 4 program." (The church and the agricultural migrants, statement by the general board, September 19, 1951); (b) "A violation of the Christian concept of justice exists in the fact that wage workers in agriculture are denied most of the legal and economic protections long accorded to wage workers in industry." (Ethical goals for agricultural policy, statement by the general board, June 4, 1958.)

Unemployment among U.S. farmworkers is increasing because of sharply rising agricultural mechanization. In 1962, 7.3 percent of farmworkers were employed and an additional 9.5 percent underemployed. In the cotton harvest alone, some 250,000 jobs were lost between 1959 and 1961 and an additional 120,000 jobs are expected to disappear by 1964, according to the U.S. Department of Labor. Under these circumstances, it is a mockery to continue to import Mexican farmworkers.

S. 1703 would extend Public Law 78 for a year, but it would not necessarily end the program then. Please remember that Public Law 78 was enacted as a "temporary program" more than 12 years ago. At various times, supporters of Public Law 78 have said that a particular Public Law 78 extension bill was the last one. But 2 years later they asked for still another extension. S. 1703 would be the sixth extension of Public Law 78.

This is no time to increase unemployment. Please vote against S. 1703 and oppose any other extension of Public Law 78, as the House of Representatives has already done.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS J. LLOYD,
President.
PATRICK E. GORMAN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

NATIONAL CATHOLIC RURAL
LIFE CONFERENCE,
Washington, D.C. July 29, 1963.

Hon. EUGENE J. MCCARTHY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARTHY: It is my understanding that S. 1703, the bill to extend the Mexican farm labor program for 1 year, is expected to come to the Senate floor very soon, perhaps in the next day or two.

Those of us who oppose the extension of the bracero program are both astonished and disappointed that legislation rejected by the House should be rushed to the Senate floor without hearings. On a matter as controversial as this it seems essential that all interested parties should have the opportunity to have their views heard.

Particularly is this true of the many church bodies which have long and uncompromisingly opposed the bracero program. To mention only Catholic organizations, the following have repeatedly gone on record as opposed to any extension of Public Law 78: the National Catholic Rural Life Conference; the Social Action Department, NCWC; the Bishops' Committee for Migrant Workers; the Bishops' Committee for the Spanish Speaking; the National Council of Catholic Men; the National Council of Catholic Women; and the National Federation of Catholic College Students. A list as long and as weighty could be given of Protestant and other church groups as well as innumerable other citizen organizations.

Surely the unanimous voice of virtually everyone except the handful of bracero-using employers and their spokesmen should be heard.

I appeal, therefore, to you, Senator, to add your voice and vote to the effort to end this program once and for all. With every good wish I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

Rev. JAMES L. VIZZARD, S.J.,
Director of Washington office.

THE NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the proposal to create a National Service Corps has evoked a widespread and enthusiastic response throughout our country. This response is typified by a series of editorials broadcast over one of New Jersey's leading radio stations—WJRZ. WJRZ clearly and eloquently depicts the humanitarian objectives of the corps. Enumerating the critical areas of need existing in America today, these editorials forcefully attest to the vast potential of corps operations.

WJRZ continues to stimulate public awareness through enlightened and well-reasoned discussion of important legislative measures. I commend these statements to your attention both because they illustrate community reaction to the National Service Corps and because they highlight WJRZ's positive role in expanding civic knowledge, action and responsibility.

There being no objection, the editorials were order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOMESTIC PEACE CORPS—PART I

(WJRZ editorial, June 5, 1963)

We believe it is important for you to know about the proposed Domestic Peace Corps. First, it is actually called the National Service Corps. But it is known informally as the Domestic Peace Corps because it would be modeled on the familiar Peace Corps that is now in operation in many foreign countries.

The objectives of the Domestic Peace Corps are also essentially humanitarian. Its goals are to aid underprivileged persons in both city and rural areas of this country. Those who serve would set an example for more fortunate citizens to share their energies, resources, and talents with their less privileged neighbors.

There is a critical need for assistance in the following areas: Education, mental health, the migrant farm worker problem, the American Indian problem, the Cuban refugee problem, and aid to the elderly. Those who serve in the Domestic Peace Corps would minister to these people. In future editorials, we will analyze each of these areas of need and concern. And we will demonstrate how the proposed Domestic Peace Corps will attack these problems. We'll also show how New Jersey would benefit from the proposed Domestic Peace Corps.

DOMESTIC PEACE CORPS

(WJRZ editorial, June 6, 1963)

On April 11, 1962, President Kennedy proposed the establishment of a Domestic Peace Corps. The purpose was to rally into one concerted domestic effort the same kind of energy and conviction which has gone into the Peace Corps overseas. The legislation which would set the Domestic Peace Corps in motion is now pending in committees of the House and Senate.

How would the Domestic Peace Corps function in a specific area. Let's take the problem of unemployed youth in the city of Newark, for example. This is a very, very serious problem indeed. It is growing every day as more and more Newark teenagers drop out of school. When a youngster drops out of school, he is usually untrained and therefore unemployable. The most recent statistics show that in grades 9 to 11, there were 3,375 dropouts in Newark schools, a number which defies belief.

What could the Peace Corps do about this problem? It could rally and send into Newark a small army of trained and dedicated workers. These workers would organize training programs designed to teach our teenage dropouts the basic skills needed to obtain and hold down productive jobs. After the training, the workers would help these youngsters to find and apply for these jobs.

Make no mistake about it, the thousands of unemployed teenagers loitering on the streets of Newark need real and dramatic help. The Domestic Peace Corps is an exciting and productive way to marshal the resources of the Nation and the talents of dedicated workers in creating and sustaining this help.

MENTAL ILLNESS

(WJRZ editorial, June 18, 1963)

At least one New Jerseyan in every 10 has some form of mental or emotional illness. That's 600,000 emotionally disturbed New Jerseyans—a figure that is equivalent to 1½ times the population of Newark.

The problem of mental illness is of vital concern—a problem which plagues every community and cries out for solution. But how do we solve it? By means of a well-organized, well-disciplined volunteer program, comprised of people who care—intelligent, sympathetic people who want to help.

Officials of institutions have told us that mentally disturbed people need the feeling that they are wanted; they must not feel rejected. Those who work with the mentally ill must show an abundance of concern and sympathy toward their patients. To hire people with this concern is costly. But to organize such people on a volunteer basis is not. Under the Domestic Peace Corps, which has been proposed by President Kennedy, corpsmen would serve in two areas of attack upon the problem of mental illness. First, they would actually work with the mentally ill, the emotionally disturbed, the mentally retarded children of our communities. Second, they would communicate to others in the community a better understanding of the problems associated with mental illness. They would work to erase the negative attitudes that many people still have toward mental illness. Mental illness is yet another field in which the proposed Domestic Peace Corps can effectively operate.

THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the first members of the Peace Corps are returning home after their 2-year tour of duty abroad. To these men and women we owe our sincerest thanks for a job well done. They left this country with the eyes of the Nation upon them, and proved beyond doubt to those who were skeptical that they could do the job required. The success of these individuals should make us all proud to be Americans.

The testimony of those members of the Corps who have returned home indicates that they place great value on what they have learned from their experience in the country in which they were working. I think this is very significant. When the Senate was discussing the Peace Corps proposal, very little emphasis was placed on what we might learn from the nation to which we were sending the Corps man. We emphasized only what we might teach that nation. Let us not forget, however, the importance of the exchange of knowledge. The fact that these Corps men are returning home with extensive knowledge of some of the problems facing the nation they spent their tour of duty in can only lead to the benefit of the United States.

Mr. Jim Puccetti is a fine example of a man who values highly the knowledge he acquired while in Colombia for the past

2 years. In a recent article published in the Daily Journal of Elizabeth, N.J., Mr. Puccetti eloquently described the changes he has undergone because of his experiences. As a result of his duty in the Peace Corps, he plans to continue to help others by joining CARE in a post in the Philippines rather than go on to business school as he had previously intended.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place this article from the Daily Journal in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORIGINAL RUTGERS PEACE CORPS FINDS ITS ATTITUDES CHANGED

(By Ward Cannel)

NEW YORK.—It is now exactly 2 years since 62 young Americans assembled on the campus of Rutgers University to lead this country on a new, dramatic and dangerous step in international relations as the first contingent of the U.S. Peace Corps.

Today, with Peace Corps volunteers on 2-year tours of duty in almost every underdeveloped nation in the world, the pioneer squad is coming home—considerably changed after 24 months in Colombia, the heartland of explosive South America.

"We went out there idealists," says Jim Puccetti, volunteer leader of the northeast region. "We're coming home realists."

SIMPLE ASSIGNMENT

The assignment handed to Puccetti and his fellow volunteers was wrapped up in the misleading simple two words: "Community development." In a nation and a continent where individualism and initiative have been punished and corrupted for five centuries, the prospect of a community acting to help itself is something less than hopeful.

"But after 9 weeks of training at Rutgers and another 6 weeks in Bogotá," Puccetti says, "we went out to the job feeling that we could walk right in and change everything.

"Well, we were wrong, Changing attitudes like those we found will take a long, long time."

It is a situation that has cost U.S. business and industry millions of dollars in executives and their families who cannot adjust or cope and must be brought home. But in 2 years, the pioneer corpsmen suffered no casualties from the difference in culture.

With no precedent to follow, and no book of rules on how to get things done, the Colombia Corps had to make its own way. The first step was to win the local priests' support. The second, to get the women to join in the campaign.

NEED EXPLAINED

Both, however, were easy compared with getting rural communities to see that by group effort they could solve many of their own problems.

"Getting a well dug," Puccetti says, "is easy by comparison with getting a community to express its need for a well—or a school, or a bridge, or anything else."

Once the Corps gained the confidence of the campesinos, the project would be accomplished quickly, easily and, most important, inexpensively. A school that might cost the Colombian Government 25,000 pesos to build for an area, would, if a community wanted it and helped build it, cost less than 10,000 pesos. Bridges that might never have been built now cross dozens of streams in interior of a country that farms, buys and sells much as it did in the times of the Spanish conquest. In many areas, cooperatives set up by the Corps are bringing 20th-century methods to Colombia.

PERSONAL CONTACT

"We didn't do it by bringing the people up to our level," Puccetti says, "or by lowering ourselves to their level. It had nothing to do with levels. It was simply a matter of plain, personal contact that made the difference."

And if that contact made a difference to Colombians it was equally effective on the young Peace Corps men and women who worked 7 days a week for $119 per month among people who had hardly heard of the United States.

Four of the Colombian Corps, like Puccetti, have married Colombia girls. Most of the pioneer group are going back to college for graduate studies or, like Pucetti who has joined Care with a post in the Philippines, into foreign assignments in health and welfare.

"It changes you," Puccetti says. "Before the Peace Corps came along I was going to San Francisco State College studying business and management. My friends were going into real estate or teaching.

"But when the Corps came along, well, I could never go back to a life like that. I see things differently. I'm different. The world is different."

ATLANTIC CITY AS SITE FOR NEXT DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, as we all know, the Democratic National Committee has chosen Atlantic City, N.J., as the site for the 1964 nomination convention. As Democratic Senator from that State, I am very pleased at the choice, and I feel sure that the delegates attending the convention will be pleased too. The citizens of Atlantic City and the State of New Jersey are grateful that they have been chosen to host the convention and are looking forward to this great event.

The hospitality and friendliness of Atlantic City is known by all who have ever been fortunate enough to spend time there and by many who have not been so fortunate. The world famous 6 miles of boardwalk, bordered on the one side by the wide beaches and on the other by the shops and places of entertainment, is one of the city's great attractions. The delegates to the convention will find the convention hall an ideal meeting place as have delegates to other conventions for many, many years. Recently remodeled at the cost of $3½ million, the convention hall is deservedly world famous. The sumptuous hotels, and restaurants, will be welcome to the tired delegate after a long day on the floor of the convention or an afternoon of swimming in the clear water of the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. President, I recently received a letter from Mr. Bertram E. Whitman, city clerk of the city of Atlantic City. He enclosed a resolution made by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Atlantic City thanking Gov. Richard J. Hughes; Thorn Lord, chairman of the New Jersey State Democratic Committee; and others for efforts made in having Atlantic City chosen as the site for the 1964 Democratic convention. As the recipient of this document attesting to the gratitude of the city of Atlantic City, I ask unanimous consent that the letter and enclosed resolution be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF BERTRAM E. WHITMAN,
CITY CLERK,
Atlantic City, N.J., July 2, 1963.

Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: It is with great pleasure I am enclosing herewith a certified copy of a resolution which was adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Atlantic City on June 27, 1963, officially thanking Governor Hughes, Hon. Thorn Lord, and you for securing the 1964 Democratic National Convention for Atlantic City.

Cordially yours,
BERTRAM E. WHITMAN,
City Clerk.

APPRECIATION AND GRATITUDE OFFICIALLY EXPRESSED FOR OBTAINING 1964 DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION FOR ATLANTIC CITY

Whereas the Democratic National Committee has selected Atlantic City, world renowned resort and playground, as the site for the Democratic National Convention to be held in August 1964; and

Whereas the final choice of the city of Atlantic City as the site for the State convention was the result of the Herculean effort and splendid teamwork on the part of all levels of government in the State of New Jersey; and

Whereas the said Democratic National Convention will prove a great boon to the city of Atlantic City and the State of New Jersey; and

Whereas the city of Atlantic City, its official family and the people thereof are looking forward with pride and anticipation to acting as the host for the Democratic National Convention in August 1964; and

Whereas the inspired leadership in the spirited drive for the convention on the part of His Excellency Gov. Richard J. Hughes, U.S. Senator Harrison Williams, and Thorn Lord, chairman of the State Democratic Committee, is deserving of public recognition and commendation; and

Whereas the city of Atlantic City desires to publicly proclaim its gratitude and appreciation to His Excellency Gov. Richard J. Hughes, U.S. Senator Harrison Williams, and Thorn Lord, chairman of the State Democratic Committee, for their zealous and selfless dedication to the task of bringing the Democratic National Convention to the city of Atlantic City: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Atlantic City, That the appreciation and gratitude of the said board of commissioners and the people of the city of Atlantic City be and is hereby officially expressed to His Excellency Gov. Richard J. Hughes, U.S. Senator Harrison Williams, and Thorn Lord, chairman of the State Democratic Committee, for their leadership and dedicated efforts resulting in bringing the Democratic National Convention to the city of Atlantic City in August 1964; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution duly signed by the said board of commissioners and attested by the city clerk be forwarded to His Excellency Gov. Richard J. Hughes, U.S. Senator Harrison Williams, and Thorn Lord, chairman of the State Democratic Committee.

Adopted: June 27, 1963.

JOSEPH ALTMAN,
Mayor.
WM. F. CASEY,
RICHARD S. JACKSON,
MEREDITH B. KERSTETTER.
——— ———.

Attest:
BERTRAM E. WHITMAN,
City Clerk.

MIGRATORY FARM LABOR

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, important clarification of the issues respecting the extension of Public Law 78 was obtained today in a public hearing conducted by the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor. Under Secretary of Labor John F. Henning, in expressing the administration's views on Public Law 78, stated that it would be unthinkable to pass a 1 year extension of the law without the administration's recommended protection of our own citizen farm workers. Secretary Henning said, and I quote:

> We would oppose any further extension of Public Law 78 without amendments which would bring the required job offers made to Mexicans and to domestic workers more closely together.

This clear-cut, outright opposition of the Administration to the 1 year extension now pending on the Senate calendar is in direct conflict with the following language in the Agriculture Committee's report on S. 1703:

> The Secretary of Labor has advised the Congress that areas of need for supplemental labor still exist, and has requested a 1-year extension of the program.

It is imperative that the Senate be apprised of this situation, in view of the fact that the bill, S. 1703, has been reported by the Agriculture Committee without any hearings and is scheduled for consideration tomorrow.

The importance of knowing the administration's true position on this measure, and the relevant facts, is further, highlighted by the fact that the House of Representatives recently overruled its Agriculture Committee which had recommended a 2-year extension of Public Law 78. The hearings on the House side, as we know, provided a favorable forum for proponents of Public Law 78. Contentions for another extension of Public Law 78 were warmly received by the House Committee on Agriculture. More than 44 witnesses testified before the House Agriculture Committee. A hearing record of 349 pages was compiled. Notwithstanding all of these favorable forces for Public Law 78, the House of Representatives rejected the House Agriculture Committee's bill by a vote of 174 to 158. In short, the House killed the program.

Yet, this highly controversial measure, which has been hard fought both in the Senate and the House during each of its five extensions in the past, has managed to find its way to the Senate Calendar under circumstances normally reserved for matters on which all parties are agreed.

I quote briefly from Secretary Henning's statement of this morning:

> We find, further, the incredible situation where alien workers are offered better terms and conditions of employment than are afforded our own agricultural workers competing for the same jobs. The simple fact is that under the present system an employer can refuse to offer to domestic workers the same terms and conditions that he is required to offer alien workers. If the domestic worker refuses to accept the job at less favorable terms, the employer is permitted to bring in Mexican workers who are then afforded the very terms and conditions which were denied to our own workers.
>
> This situation exists basically because of the limited authority vested in the Department of Labor under Public Law 78. The legislative history of that law makes it abundantly clear that the Congress did not intend to permit the Secretary of Labor to require, as a condition of obtaining Mexican workers, that all of the same terms and conditions afforded Mexican workers be offered first to domestic workers. It is for this reason that we would oppose any further extension of Public Law 78 without amendments which would bring the required job offers made to Mexican and to domestic workers more closely together.

The Secretary's full statement presents a well-reasoned, throughly documented thesis against the enactment of the pending 1-year extension, and I commend it to the attention of all my colleagues. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed in its entirety at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Under Secretary of Labor John F. Henning Before the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on Farm Labor Recruitment Legislation, July 30, 1963

I am very happy to have this further opportunity to appear before you on the need for legislation to improve coordination between agricultural employment needs and available workers.

On June 12, I had the privilege of presenting to this committee the administration's views on the need for legislation along the lines of S. 527—to furnish improved employment service techniques for this coordination. In my statement then, I pointed out that ways must be found to bring our farm employers' peak seasonal labor needs and our great numbers of unemployed and underemployed agricultural workers together.

There is still a heavy reliance in this country on foreign agricultural workers to meet employers' peak needs even though unemployment and underemployment among our rural population has been estimated at the equivalent of 4 million workers. This indicates a serious maladjustment in our farm labor supply system. All indicators point inescapably to the conclusion that this situation will be further aggravated in the years ahead. For example, some 26 million new young workers will be entering the labor market in the decade of the 1960's. This means a significant influx of farm youth into the job market competing for available farm job opportunities.

The administration is of the opinion that the heavy reliance on foreign agricultural workers to meet employers' peak needs and the large reservoir of unemployed persons in this country are inextricably interrelated problems. We do not think our failure to meet farm employer needs with domestic workers can be separated from our failure to condition the use of foreign workers upon adequate recruitment of domestic workers.

Improved methods of making domestic workers available to farm employers cannot be fully effective in solving the problem unless we can avoid subjecting our own workers to unfair competition from foreign workers. Efforts to provide an efficient domestic farm labor supply will be thwarted unless certain realistic steps are taken to protect available employment opportunities for domestic workers. This dictates the necessity for greater similarity between the terms and conditions of employment afforded foreign workers and those offered domestic workers.

In particular, I am speaking about needed improvements in the Mexican labor program, the source of the largest foreign supply of farmworkers. Originating as a temporary program devised to meet the special demands of the labor market during World War II, the program was extended from time to time and mushroomed to a point where 445,000 Mexican workers were used in agricultural employment in the United States in 1956.

As pointed out by the President when he signed the last extension of the program in 1961, studies of its operation "clearly established that it adversely affected the wages, working conditions, and employment opportunities of our own agricultural workers." The President went on to state, "The Secretary of Labor, on the basis of the studies that have been made of the Mexican labor program, proposed amendments to title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949 designed to provide needed safeguards for our workers and to prescribe more specific standards. While the enactment (the 1961 extension) includes some of these safeguards, a number of the more significant ones have been omitted."

The President also directed the Secretary of Labor to use the full scope of his authority under the law to institute policies which would safeguard domestic workers against adverse effect resulting from the use of Mexican workers.

The availability of a large supply of alien workers has created an anomalous situation in our agricultural labor market seriously interfering with the free interplay of supply and demand. The certification which permits the admission of any alien workers into the United States for temporary employment must essentially be conditioned upon a shortage of available domestic labor. It is axiomatic that in such a normal labor shortage situation the bidding for available domestic labor would produce more competitive job offers. In these circumstances we could generally expect better terms and conditions of employment than would prevail in labor surplus areas.

With an inexhaustible supply of alien workers at our very borders we find, conversely, that the terms and conditions of employment offered domestic workers not only remain static but in many cases are less favorable than those offered domestic workers in areas where no alien workers are employed. We find, further, the incredible situation where alien workers are offered better terms and conditions of employment than are afforded our own agricultural workers competing for the same jobs. The simple fact is that under the present system an employer can refuse to offer to domestic workers the same terms and conditions that he is required to offer alien workers. If the domestic worker refuses to accept the job at less favorable terms, the employer is permitted to bring in Mexican workers who are then afforded the very terms and conditions which were denied to our own workers.

This situation exists basically because of the limited authority vested in the Department of Labor under Public Law 78. The legislative history of that law makes it abundantly clear that the Congress did not intend to permit the Secretary of Labor to require, as a condition of obtaining Mexican workers, that all of the same terms and conditions afforded Mexican workers be offered first to domestic workers. It is for this reason that we would oppose any further extension of Public Law 78 without amendments which would bring the required job offers made to Mexicans and to domestic workers more closely together.

In 1962 the Department issued certifications authorizing the use of approximately

195,000 Mexican workers in 24 States. Last year, 33,214 farms in these States, consisting of 2,264 individual employers, 57 food processors, and 231 associations comprised of 24,492 members, obtained Mexican workers through the Mexican labor program. At the same time, through the vast network of the U.S. Employment Service local offices, through the annual worker plan, and through various farm recruitment programs, the Department of Labor has extended every effort to meet farm labor needs from our domestic agricultural labor force.

The use of Mexican workers dropped from approximately 291,000 in 1961 to 195,000 in 1962. This was due largely to mechanization and the application of the 1961 amendments to Public Law 78, prohibiting the use of Mexican workers in the operation of mechanical equipment and in other than seasonal employment. Against this background we would normally expect some significant increase in the employment of domestic workers. Actually there was a decline in the average seasonal employment of all farm workers during this period.

We are now being asked, despite rapidly changing circumstances so far as employment is concerned, to extend this program without change for another year. The impact of mechanization, automation, improved production techniques and methods, which has affected farm employment so sharply, is now becoming manifest throughout our entire economic system.

Unemployment now stands, on a seasonally adjusted basis, at 5.7 percent. This appears to be due fundamentally to a marked rise in the labor force in recent months without adequate compensating gains in employment. In this situation, the most vulnerable workers are those who must compete for a dwindling supply of unskilled jobs with limited skills to offer. They are the ones who fall into the category of the "hard core" unemployed, the young untrained worker, the worker who has been replaced by machinery or by changes in the economic demand, and fitting into all these categories—the farm worker. Of this group the migratory farm worker is in the most disadvantaged position. In 1961, these workers earned on an average less than $900 from all employment.

We realize all the unemployed cannot be used in agricultural activities. At the same time, we must exercise every caution to assure that qualified domestic workers are given preference for all available job opportunities. That this has not been the case is highlighted by the fact that in the State of California in 1962, 127,000 Mexican workers were contracted and recontracted. During this same period there were an estimated annual average of 395,000 domestic workers unemployed in that State. In Arizona, 16,906 Mexicans were contracted while 24,900 domestic workers were unemployed. In the State of Arkansas, 12,410 Mexicans were contracted; 42,400 domestic workers were unemployed. Texas used 36,289 Mexican workers while 174,600 domestic workers were unemployed.

Faced with these indications of growing problems in our labor market, and in view of the dramatic changes taking place in the utilization of agricultural labor, including the Mexican worker, we think that it is even more imperative now than in 1961 that needed protections for domestic employment opportunities be provided if the program is to be continued.

In a very real sense, the availability of domestic workers depends largely upon the terms and conditions of employment offered. The exemption of agricultural employment from most social legislation such as minimum wage, unemployment insurance, and to a significant extent old-age and survivors' insurance, makes such employment unattractive to our own unemployed domestic workers. Low wages, poor working conditions, inadequate housing facilities in the area of employment, complicate the recruitment picture. With a large reservoir of foreign workers available there is a propensity to depend upon this source of labor supply rather than to extend more attractive offers to domestic unemployed workers. The result—employment of Mexican workers in this country at the expense of unemployment of domestic workers.

We are thus confronted at this time with the simple question of whether we should continue to any extent subsidizing, at the expense of the taxpayers of this Nation, a farmworker program which prolongs and aggravates this situation. The resultant unemployment not only saddles the local communities with all the costs attendant upon giving public assistance and other aid to unemployed workers, but it exacts a terrible price in loss of human dignity and human resources—a price that dictates the need for everyone to extend every effort to avoid these consequences.

The amendment recommended by the administration and transmitted to the President of the Senate on March 26 is designed to narrow the existing differential. Its objective is to make the job offers more attractive without imposing any undue burden on agricultural employers. It would require employers seeking to obtain Mexican workers to offer to domestic workers workmen's compensation or occupational insurance coverage, housing and transportation expenses equivalent to that furnished to Mexican workers. None of these provisions would require employers to incur any greater expense in obtaining domestic workers than they are now assuming in obtaining and utilizing Mexican workers. The costs of employing domestic workers under this proposal would be substantially less than the costs of employing Mexican workers.

Employers are already required to obtain either workmen's compensation or occupational insurance coverage for Mexican workers. In some States coverage for all agricultural workers is already mandatory. For example, in the State of California where more than half of all Mexican braceros are used, workmen's compensation is already compulsory under State law. In other States whose workmen's compensation laws contain elective provisions, many agricultural employers cover both their Mexican and domestic workers.

The housing required to be furnished under the standard work contract to Mexicans is of the barracks type, but must meet certain safety and sanitation requirements. The administration proposal would not require any different housing for domestic workers. Where it is impracticable to house them in barracks-type housing, equivalent allowances could be offered.

Many agricultural employers who pay transportation for their Mexican workers oppose any requirement for providing transportation to domestic agricultural workers. The argument generally advanced is that too frequently domestic workers whose transportation is paid either do not perform any work upon arrival or leave their jobs before completion of the harvest. We believe, on the basis of experience of farmers in the high-wage areas, such as the States of Washington and Oregon, that this type of turnover can be minimized by establishing better employer-employee relationships. The fact is that many workers return year by year to work for the same farmers where sound working relationships have been established. Even in the Mexican labor program, when the condition of the crop has been poor, where wages are low, and where an indifference to the importance of good working relationships has been manifest, Mexican workers have left their jobs before the completion of the harvest and returned to Mexico. The proposal for payment of transportation is one of the most important factors in attracting the worker to the job and getting him there.

The administration considers these improvements to be vital if we are to continue the large-scale use of foreign agricultural workers even for another year. We are not meeting our responsibilities to our own workers until we condition the use of this large foreign worker force upon realistic job offers to domestic workers. In our judgment, the present limitations in the law do not provide for a realistic test of whether our unemployed workers will accept available farm jobs.

In closing, I would like once again to focus attention upon the human aspects of the problem. In terms of human values, in terms of human necessity, in terms of the overall welfare of the Nation, we must place the emphasis of our efforts upon preserving and enhancing the rights of our own workers to job opportunities in this country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

THE WORLD FOOD CONGRESS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, last month the World Food Congress concluded its historic 2-week session in Washington, D.C. Over 1,300 delegates from 104 countries participated in the Congress, called by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, with the United States in the role of host Nation. The purpose of the Congress was to focus worldwide attention on the problems of hunger and malnutrition that affect over half the world's population, to evaluate the efforts made during the past 20 years to combat world hunger, and to propose specific recommendations for policy, programs, and organization of the global attack on hunger embodied in the international freedom from hunger campaign launched by the FAO in 1960 and endorsed by the 104 member nations of that organization.

I think it fitting that a brief report of this important international event should be placed into the official record of the U.S. Senate together with certain major documents that were issued by the Congress at the conclusion of its sessions. My purpose here is to afford the Members of the Senate an opportunity to study the deliberations and recommendations of the World Food Congress as they relate to this country's international relations policy and programs in the years ahead.

President Kennedy, in his opening address to the World Food Congress, made three major contributions. First, he set the climate and temper of the Congress when he said:

> We have the ability, as members of the human race. We have the means, we have the capacity to eliminate hunger from the face of the earth in our lifetime. We need only the will.

Second, he laid down five basic guidelines for the World Food Congress to follow in the course of its deliberations which became a blueprint for action throughout the entire 2 weeks of the meeting and will affect basic policy of the international freedom from hunger campaign of the FAO in the future. And, third, he pledged the full support of the United States for the campaign through all of the facilities of our Government.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full text of President Kennedy's address to the opening session of the World Food Congress delivered on June 4, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT OPENING CEREMONY, WORLD FOOD CONGRESS, DEPARTMENTAL AUDITORIUM

Dr. Sen, President Radhakrishnan, Secretary Freeman, members of the World Food Congress, I welcome you on behalf of the people of the United States to this country and to its Capital.

Twenty years ago, in May 1943, the first World Food Congress was held. Today we have gathered to rededicate ourselves to the objectives of that Congress, the objective that all nations, all people, all inhabitants of this planet have all the food that they need, all the food that they deserve as human beings. We are here to renew a worldwide commitment to banish hunger and outlaw it.

At the launching of the first World Food Congress, President Franklin Roosevelt declared that freedom from want and freedom from fear go hand in hand, and that is true today.

During the past 20 years there have been revolutionary changes affecting these matters in farm technology, in trade patterns, in economic development, in world trade. Today the average farmer in the United States can produce three times as much as he did in 1945. New trading blocs have been formed, blocs which can be used to strengthen the world or to divide it. This Nation and others have provided economic and technical assistance to less wealthy nations struggling to develop viable economies.

And population increases have become a matter of serious concern, not because world food production will be insufficient to keep pace with the 2 percent rate of increase, but because, as you know, the population rate is too often the highest where hunger is the most prevalent.

The same central problem that troubled President Roosevelt when he called together the first World Congress in 1943 is unfortunately still with us today. Half of humanity is still undernourished or hungry. In 70 developing nations, with over 2 billion peoples, malnutrition is widespread and persistent.

So long as freedom from hunger is only half achieved, so long as two-thirds of the nations have food deficits, no citizen, no nation, can afford to be satisfied. We have the ability, as members of the human race. We have the means, we have the capacity to eliminate hunger from the face of the earth in our lifetime. We need only the will.

In the Food and Agriculture Organization, which is sponsoring this meeting, we have the machinery. Under the able leadership of Dr. Sen, the FAO has embarked on a vigorous and imaginative program which is now at a halfway mark. Through thousands of projects initiated during the 2½ years that we have just passed through, the freedom from hunger campaign has already helped to conquer livestock diseases, increase crop yields, and multiply fishery catches.

The United States pledges its full support for this campaign through food for peace shipments, Alliance for Progress operations, the Peace Corps, and the international efforts directed by the United Nations and the Organization of American States.

Through our Food for Peace program, the people of the United States have contributed more than $12 billion of food and fiber to others during the past 10 years. These donations now bring food to 100 million people in 100 countries, including 40 million schoolchildren. We are grateful for the opportunity that nature has made possible for us to share our agricultural abundance to those who need it, but the distribution of the food to the needy is only part of the job. It can take care of the emergency needs from floods and famines. It can be used to feed refugees and needy children. It is a useful supplement to perennially short diets in many parts of the world, but it is not a permanent solution.

All of our stored abundance, even if distributed evenly throughout the globe to all of the undernourished, would provide a balanced diet for less than a month, and many nations lack the storage and the transportation and the distribution facilities. Many people are inhibited by traditional eating habits from using food that provides rich nourishment. And perhaps most importantly, modern, efficient agricultural training and education is too often unavailable to the very nations that are most dependent upon it.

The real goal, therefore, must be to produce more food in the nations that need it. Know-how is not the problem. For the first time in the history of the world we do know how to produce enough food now to feed every man, woman, and child in the world, enough to eliminate all hunger completely. Farm production has undergone a scientific revolution which is dwarfing the industrial revolution of 150 years ago, but this means that agricultural departments and ministries and governments and citizens must make a greater and more systematic effort to share this knowledge. For the first time to know how to conquer the problem and not conquer it would be a disgrace for this generation. We need to help transmit all that we know of farm technology to the ends of the earth, to overcome the barriers of ignorance and suspicion. The key to a permanent solution to world hunger is the transfer of technology which we now have to food deficit nations, and that task, second to none in importance, is the reason for this Congress.

It would be easy to say that this task is too great for any Congress. Most of man has been undernourished since the beginning of man. Even today, as the death rate drops, it merely means that people live longer in hunger and misery, but a balanced, adequate diet is now possible today for the entire human race and we are gathered to devise the machinery to mobilize the talents, the bill, the interest, and the requirements to finish this job.

We realize, of course, that the problem in its great dimensions neither begins nor ends on the farm. It involves the whole economic and social structure of a nation. It involves the building of new institutions, of training young people. Above all, it involves and requires the priority attention of us all in this decade.

In the course of your deliberations over the next 2 weeks, I would hope that we would agree on at least five basic guidelines to be kept constantly in mind:

First: The persistence of hunger during this decade is unacceptable either morally or socially. The late Pope John, in his recent encyclical, spoke of the conviction that all men are equal by reason of their natural dignity. That same dignity in the 20th century certainly requires the elimination of large-scale hunger and starvation.

Second: We must recognize the fact that food-deficit nations, with assistance from other countries, can solve their problem. The freedom from hunger campaign is based on this solid premise.

Third: International cooperation, international organization, and international action are indispensable. A contracting world grows more interdependent. This interdependence requires multinational solutions to its problems. This is not a problem for a single nation. It is a problem for the entire human race because we cannot possibly be satisfied with some nations producing too much, as the President of India said, while others produce little, even though they are both members of the great human race.

Fourth: No single technique of politics, finance, or education can, by itself, eliminate hunger. It will require the coordinated efforts of us all, all of us, to level the wall that separates the hungry from the well fed.

Fifth, and finally: World opinion must be concentrated upon the international effort to eliminate hunger as a primary task of this generation. Over 1,900 years ago the Roman philosopher Seneca said, "A hungry people listens not to reason nor cares for justice nor is bent by prayers." Human nature has not changed in 1,900 years, and world peace and progress cannot be maintained in a world half fed and half hungry.

There are many struggles, many battles, that the human race now faces. There is no battle on earth or in space which is more important than the battle which you have undertaken, nor is there any struggle, large as this may be, that offers such an immediate promise of success. No Congress that Washington has seen in recent years is, I believe, more important than this.

I know that this conference will not consist merely of oration, but will represent in 2 weeks a solid determination to develop the means in this decade to make a dent in this problem which will give us promise in our lifetime of making sure that all people in the world have an opportunity to eat.

Another problem will come in the next generation, and that is the problem of how to deal on a worldwide basis, as well as in this, with the problem of surpluses, but the first problem is to produce enough for all in a way that makes all available to people around the globe. To that task I can assure you the United States of America is committed.

Thank you.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the U.S. Government participation in the World Food Congress was under the able leadership of our Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, who as a representative of the President extended the invitation to the FAO to hold its Congress in the United States. President Kennedy appointed Mr. Freeman Chairman of his Interagency Government Committee for the Congress and Mr. Freeman was elected Chairman of the World Food Congress at its opening session.

Throughout the 2 weeks of meetings Mr. Freeman guided the Congress in its deliberations and worked continually with the officers and staff of the FAO and committee chairman of the four main commissions of the Congress leading to the important conclusions and recommendations that came out of the conference.

No man played a more important role in the Congress than our Secretary of Agriculture, no man gave more of his time and energy in making the Congress a success and no man made a greater contribution to the overall work and accomplishments of this historic meeting. The people of the United States and people all over the world who look upon the International Freedom from Hunger Campaign and the World Food Congress as a leap forward in the fight against hunger and malnutrition in the world have a stanch supporter in the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States. His leadership, his insight into the basic causes of hunger in the world and his untiring efforts in this great cause have been demonstrated during the course of events which took place during the sessions of the World Food Congress. His efforts and support of the principles laid down by that Congress will contribute greatly to its success in the future.

It is recognized that the success of the International Freedom from Hunger Campaign in eliminating hunger from the face of the earth cannot depend solely upon governments but must have the support of peoples and nongovernment organizations in all of the participating countries. The World Food Congress was not a meeting of governments but a people-to-people meeting under the sponsorship of the 104-member governments of the food and agriculture organization of the United Nations. Support for the FFH Campaign and the World Food Congress came in great measure from citizen organizations and nongovernment institutions in the 104 participating nations who must assume responsibilities, along with their respective governments, for carrying out the objectives and programs of the campaign in their own countries if the goal of eliminating hunger is to be achieved.

When the World Food Congress opened some 60 countries had organized National Freedom from Hunger Committees within their own countries. In the United States, at the request of President Kennedy, the American Freedom from Hunger Foundation was established in January of 1961 to take citizen leadership in the U.S. participation in the campaign. President Kennedy designated the foundation as the National Citizens Host Committee for the World Food Congress in January of 1962. I would like to take this opportunity to report to the Senate on the way in which the foundation has discharged its responsibilities for organizing the nongovernment activities of the Freedom from Hunger Campaign in the United States and this country's participation in the World Food Congress.

Under the leadership of James G. Patton, foundation president and president of the National Farmers Union, the foundation organized the national campaign in the United States with the assistance of over 100 national organizations representing farm organizations, labor unions, church groups, business organizations, and a wide range of civic, fraternal, and oversea relief groups. This task was accomplished in a few short months and led to a most successful observance of a National Freedom From Hunger Week in March of this year and to the building of a proper climate and public awareness of the World Food Congress here in Washington.

As the National Citizens Host Committee for the Congress, the foundation was responsible for all of the nongovernment activities of the Congress, including information facilities, entertainment of delegates, hospitality, delegate tours and a hundred other arrangements and facilities that are needed to hold a successful international meeting of this scope. In addition, the foundation raised the funds to finance over 60 delegates from over 40 countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America so that they could attend the Congress. This added great depth to the meetings and assisted materially in the people-to-people aspect of the Congress. Much of the success of this important international conference was due to the efforts of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation and the 60 trustees who form its organization body.

The Government and the American people owe a debt of gratitude for the fine work of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation and the many organizations and private citizens whose support for the foundation made its contributions to this great cause possible. The delegates to the Congress were loud in their praise of these efforts in their behalf, and I believe that many returned to their own countries with a warm feeling toward the United States and its people, due to the fine efforts of the foundation during the World Food Congress.

So important is the non-Government activity in the international freedom from hunger campaign, representing total involvement of citizens and citizen organizations, that the Congress passed a resolution stating that all National Freedom From Hunger Committees now in existence should be retained on a continuing basis and that national committees be established in all participating countries where they did not already exist. I feel sure that the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation will continue to contribute to the U.S. participation in the International Freedom from Hunger campaign, representing the deep interest in the program by the American people. I feel sure too that the foundation will have the support of all citizens and citizen organizations in its efforts for this great cause.

On the closing day of the World Food Congress the Director General of the Food and Agriculture Organization, the Honorable B. R. Sen, delivered an address summing up the deliberations, conclusions and recommendations of the Congress. It is a remarkable document and is the nearest thing I have read that gives a summing up of the work of so many people on so complex and difficult an undertaking in so little time. It is a tribute to Mr. Sen and his great knowledge of the basic problems involved in the tremendous task we face in the years ahead to banish hunger from the earth. In it lies not only a hope for the future but a blueprint for action for achieving the goal the world has set itself to win—in our time.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the full text of Dr. B. R. Sen's closing address to the World Food Congress on June 18, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Dr. B. R. Sen, Director General of FAO, at the Concluding Session of the World Food Congress

The World Food Congress will conclude its session today. The question is naturally being asked, What has this congress achieved in terms of winning freedom from hunger? Let me preface my remarks, Mr. Chairman, by saying that this congress has come at a crucial point of time. To meet the basic needs of the 6,000 million people who will inherit this planet by the end of this century, the world productivity of food and other basic needs will have to be trebled or quadrupled, and this will need an effort involving nearly three-fourths of the human population—a great majority of them in the very early stage of economic development. The time left to us is barely 35 years from now. Can this gigantic task be accomplished within this period? This has been the main theme of the congress.

The congress addressed itself to two major aspects of the problem; first, the problem of matching the rapidly increasing needs of a fast growing world population with the development of national and human resources in order to provide a life of plenty and dignity for all; and second, the problem of matching the revolution of rising expectations with a concurrent revolution in organized will. The temper of the congress was set by President Kennedy in his inaugural address when he said: "So long as freedom from hunger is only half achieved—so long as two-thirds of the nations of the world have food deficits—no citizen, no nation can afford to feel satisfied or secure. We have the ability, we have the means, and we have the capacity to eliminate hunger from the face of the earth. We need only the will."

THE BASIC ISSUES

In order to secure a wider understanding of the nature of these problems I feel it necessary, even at the risk of repetition, to refer to the main elements of the situation in more precise terms. More than half of the world's population is undernourished or malnourished. Hunger and poverty form a vicious circle of economic stagnation. For hunger is both a cause and an effect of low productivity. It is associated with other elements of underdevelopment: widespread ignorance and illiteracy; substandard health, and static institutions.

The acceleration of population growth adds a new dimension to the problem. The world's population in 1960 was about 3,000 million; by the year 2000 it is likely to be doubled. For whatever is done to bring population growth under control it will be some decades before it can have any significant global effects.

The world supply of food person is apparently above the prewar level, but nearly all the gains have been made in the high-income industrialized countries where food supplies often exceed requirements. In the less-developed regions where population grows most rapidly, per caput production is no greater than before the war. Any improvement in nutrition results from curtailed exports or increased imports of food.

The heart of the world food problem lies in the Far East, where half the world's population lives on only one-quarter of the world's food supply. Food production in that region has barely made up the ground lost during the war. Hunger and malnutrition is a grim reality in many parts of Africa, the Near East, and Latin America.

The differences in nutrition levels reflect differences in levels of income. In underdeveloped countries, average annual incomes are a little over $100 per head; in developed countries they are about 10 times that figure. The gap between the two groups of countries is continually widening.

Low incomes and inadequate diets have insidious and cumulative effects. Underfeeding leads to high infant mortality, to retarded growth in children, poor working efficiency in adults, and general apathy. In developing countries the length of human life averages about 35 years; in economically developed countries about 60 to 70 years.

To avoid the worst evils of underfeeding, an average diet of 2,400 calories per person per day, including 70 grams of protein, should be the minimum goal of all countries which have not already reached or surpassed this level. To reach this standard, taking into account the expected growth of population, it is estimated that by the year 2000 something like a fourfold increase will be needed in the supply of food in Asia and the Far East, scarcely less in Latin America, a threefold increase in the Near East, and a two- to three-fold increase in Africa.

One of the most important needs in preventing malnutrition is improving the quality of the diet, and especially in raising the consumption of high-quality protein food. This situation exacts a terrific penalty on the health of children in the age range from weaning time to 5 years and the damage is frequently irreparable. The present consumption of animal protein averages about 8 grams in Asia, the Far East, and in many sectors of Latin America; 11 grams in Africa, and 14 grams in the Near East, compared with a minimum of about 20 grams for health and strength.

With the attainment of freedom by the countries of Asia and Africa, the first demand of the people is for a better supply of the basic needs of life. Their governments are under great pressure to provide for higher standards of living, better nutrition, and better social services.

It is obvious that there can be no single technique to deal effectively with a problem so vast in dimension and so complex in its ramifications. A concerted attack on such a problem must embrace the entire spectrum of a nation's economic and social life and all existing and potential channels of international cooperation. The Congress gave its attention to the techniques of action that are required to be adopted in the individual sectors of development as well as to the integrated and organic process of economic and social growth. I cannot obviously summarize all that has been said at the Congress, but shall attempt to recapitulate the major conclusions that have emerged from the discussions in which so many of you, leaders in your respective fields of activity, have taken a part.

POPULATION AND RESOURCES

One question that has dominated the discussions has been that of population growth in relation to resources. This remains the major long-term determinant of the world situation. All plans for national development and international action must take this fully into account. The increase in population has attracted world attention, but mainly in its negative aspects. It is obvious that the increase in numbers cannot continue at the present rate, let alone at an accelerated pace, if the food supply invariably lags behind. In the final analysis it will be up to the individual to decide, bearing in mind his responsibility to his family and to his society, how he should conduct himself. Even so, the time may soon come when not only the nation to which the individual belongs, but also the world as a whole may have to take a more direct and a more dynamic role in assisting family planning measures through social education and hygiene.

And yet, there are also positive aspects to this problem. Several speakers have reminded us that the underemployed labor in the developing countries which now represents a threat to their stability and social peace, could become their most important resource. The physical resources are not to be viewed mainly in material terms and as fixed quantities, but in relation to man's determination and assiduity in exploiting them. They also vary according to the scientific and technical knowledge which is constantly advancing. The great scientists who addressed us opened up wide vistas of hope and achievement.

There are also the prospects of new sources of food to which Professor Bovet referred: the systematic cultivation of marine algae; the use of fresh water algae, particularly chlorella, and of plankton, the synthesis of the elements essential to human nutrition through chemical and fermentation processes, the production of carbohydrates and fats, of certain of the essential amino acids now acquiring industrial importance. Also Professor Langier spoke of the unlimited possibilities offered by the photosynthesis of raw materials that occur abundantly in nature—solar energy, carbon dioxide and water. The awesome responsibility that Professor Langier held out for the Director General of FAO for ordering the winds, rains, storms of this planet, reclining in his office chair, even exceeded the powers Shakespeare had dreamt up for his Prospero in "The Tempest."

THE STRATEGY OF DEVELOPMENT

The major objectives of development are to raise productivity and income as a means of securing better levels of living and nutrition; to expand education and employment as a step toward social equality based on mutual respect; to use renewable resources in ways that safeguard the welfare of future generations; to achieve economic no less than political independence. In this broader sense, therefore, development involves the whole economic and social structure in each nation. There can, however, be no standard plans for development since in each case it must be dictated by social and economic factors obtaining in the country.

Until only a few years ago there was general resistance to the idea of planning, and the confusion between planning and coercion persisted in the minds of many. Now it is generally accepted that to achieve the fullest use of resources, development planning; that is, a conscious and integrated orientation of effort, is essential. The techniques of planning, however, need to be given more attention, and the essential condition that success depends on persuasion and the enlistment of enthusiasm rather than on simple dictates from above need to be better realized.

This Congress has fully endorsed what FAO has persistently advocated as the only sound policy of development for the predominantly agricultural countries; namely, agricultural development must be the cornerstone of economic growth. Although the recognition of this basic premise is gradually spreading, there is still need for an increased awareness of its significance amongst the planners and policymakers of the developing countries. When it is fully understood that a major factor limiting economic development is a low level of agricultural productivity, programs can be planned to increase that productivity at a proportionate rate. This is not to say that there is any conflict between agriculture and other sectors of the economy. In fact, in many countries, where the man/land ratio is high, industrialization is a plain necessity for a long-range solution of their economic problems. Development is an organic process, and is a complex of interrelated growth. Nevertheless, it must be stressed that no drive for industrialization has much chance to be successful if not preceded and accompanied by a rather decisive rise in productivity in agriculture. The principal tasks of agriculture at this stage are: to produce the additional food to meet the needs of a growing population and the increased demand arising from higher income, and to correct serious dietary deficiencies; to produce fibers and other raw materials for the expanding domestic industry; in the early stages of development, to provide the main flow of savings for the development of other sectors of the economy; to provide the growing requirement of foreign exchange for development by export earnings and import savings; by raising productivity, to make possible the release of manpower from rural to other occupations; and to provide an expanding market for the products of the emerging industrial sector.

Investment of personnel and capital in efforts to obtain a fuller utilization of the work force in agriculture and in measures to increase agricultural productivity must, therefore, be given high priority in national development plans. It is also important that plans for improved levels of nutrition are included in national development plans, not only with the object of correcting nutritional deficiencies but through such action to improve the general economy by increasing the productivity of manpower.

MEASURES FOR RAISING AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTIVITY

If agriculture is to have primacy in the development process, how is this problem best approached? It is true that there are large areas capable of development which still remain unused. If these lands still remain uncultivated, in spite of the increasing pressure of population, there must be some good reasons for that. In all these cases, there is often the need, over a long period, for heavy investment which is not forthcoming. There are also the social difficulties which arise from internal labor migrations and the political difficulties from migrations to other countries. While these problems must continue to receive the attention both of the national governments and international organizations, the immediate possibilities appear to be more in the increase of crop yields and livestock productivity by processes already tried with success in some of the developed countries than in extending acreage on any considerable scale. We should, however, not discount the possibility of dramatic breakthroughs which may come with the advance of science and technology such as in desalinization of seawater for irrigation.

In all countries which show the most spectacular advance in agricultural productivity, the use of fertilizers has been a crucial factor. The use of fertilizers, however, must be accompanied by the supply of a whole complex of other requisites suited to the local ecological conditions—better seeds, pesticides to control diseases and insect infestation, regulated irrigation and drainage, better tools and implements, and so on. The efforts now being made by FAO to enlist the cooperation of the fertilizer industry in extending the use of fertilizers in the developing countries and helping them to install their own plants, need the full backing of the aid-giving governments. The same considerations apply to the food processing industries and other industries which have an important contribution to make toward increased productivity.

Simultaneously, more attention must be given to make animal husbandry more productive through improved breeding, larger and more balanced supplies of foodstuffs, and measures of disease control. Also the fullest use must be made of land and water resources through soil conservation measures, large or small scale irrigation schemes, improved methods of farm management, including double cropping, distribution and rotation of crops, and allocation of pasture and forest to the areas to which they are best adapted. Timber trend studies show that the years ahead will be an opportune time for developing countries well endowed with forest resources or enjoying favorable conditions for the production of timber to develop these resources. Planning the fuller utilization of forest resources is therefore of the utmost importance for these countries.

INSTITUTIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL IMPROVEMENT

Existing scientific knowledge capable of transforming subsistence agriculture cannot in most cases be transferred to the developing countries without adapting it to their particular needs and ecological environments. The institutional impediments to the transfer of such knowledge and techniques to the developing nations are indeed formidable. It presupposes the existence of a basis of general and specialized education which is too often lacking in these countries. A system of education which is not geared to the needs of improved farming often leads to the escape of educated rural youth to the questionable amenities of cities, and thereby accentuating the problems of urban unemployment. Rural education in the developing countries clearly stands in need of a new orientation. The objective should be "education for economic development" and not for its own sake, as Sir George Allen emphasized. No rapid progress in this field can be achieved unless the present system of instruction and examination is replaced by a more pragmatic emphasis on the needs of the rural community. Agrarian research and extension services must be linked to the needs of the farming communities in order to bring about a cumulative chain reaction of progress. Perhaps the most important single contributing factor in the advance of American agriculture was the land grants college system set up 100 years ago.

In your address, Mr. Chairman, you gave the first priority to general education for all of the people, without which farmers face almost insurmountable handicaps in achieving greater efficiency and higher levels of living. This view is fully supported by the experience, not only in the United States, but also in most of the other developed countries. However, conditions in the developing countries vary and suitable adjustments will, therefore, be necessary. The value of sending students to advanced countries for the study of agricultural sciences and methods should be reexamined because all too often it creates misfits rather than leaders in their native communities. There was general concensus that it would be more worthwhile to use the funds to build up educational and training centers in the underdeveloped countries themselves. Training abroad should be restricted mainly to graduate students and already trained people who wish to learn a particular technique.

Apart from education and training, efficient and honest administrative services geared to the task of economic reconstruction need to be set up, without which neither planning nor its implementation can be effective. Services to agriculture must be strengthened; community development and extension services must be placed on a proper footing. Improvement of infrastructure, transportation, marketing, and credit facilities are also essential if agricultural advance is to maximize its contribution to higher levels of living.

The most serious impediment in many countries, however, is the lack of will and ability of those in power to adjust their systems of land ownership and tenancy to the needs of raising agricultural productivity. Even when new laws are passed they are often full of loopholes and their enforcement is generally lax. It is debatable, however, whether land reform according to the traditional pattern of private ownership will always be the right policy line. Whatever type is considered most appropriate, land reform should be carried through resolutely and boldly. To have a continuous campaign for radical land reform often carried on by the highest officials of a country, and creating general uncertainty about the future, while actual tenure conditions are left in the inherited quasi-feudal pattern, is, as Professor Myrdal said, certainly to have the worst of both worlds.

I have already referred to the importance of adaptive research in increasing crop yields as promising the most immediate results in our fight for freedom from hunger. Adaptive research must, therefore, be given high priority in all national programs. The benefits of research and of extension services must be made available to farmers at all times. It is important that as far as possible training for such services should be undertaken in the developing countries themselves, in the physical and economic environment in which they will operate. Only at the higher levels is training abroad to be preferred. The most fruitful use to which external technical assistance can be put will usually be to train an adequate cadre of both specialized and general purpose extension workers, who in turn can transmit knowledge of improved agricultural methods to working farmers. These extension men should be stationed in the villages which they have to serve, and not in the larger towns as is so often the case. Similarly, training centers should be established for the development of extension services in home economics so that food production will be accompanied by efficient food management in homes and institutions at the local level.

Farmers' cooperatives to supply the economic services they need, such as short-term production credits at moderate rates of interest, facilities for the timely purchase of production requisites, and efficient marketing services can be a key to accelerated progress. Commission IV discussed the experience of Japan where the Government takes the responsibility for the purchasing, storage, and price stabilization of food grains, and for the distribution of credit and fertilizers, but uses the farmers' cooperatives as its official agents. This provides cooperative associations with a round-the-year function and a regular source of income which adds greatly to their economic strength and their usefulness to farmers. On the important subject of agricultural credit, the idea of exploring the creation of an international fund to support national credit organizations was discussed in Commission II and calls for attention.

ACTION ON THE INTERNATIONAL LEVEL

At the international level, trade and aid are two of the most important factors now affecting the rate of overall growth of the developing countries. Urgent action is needed, on the basis of international solidarity, (a) to strengthen efforts to reduce obstacles to the exports of developing countries; take initiatives for establishing commodity agreements, including new types of agreements, together with measures to increase international liquidity, and a further exploration of compensatory financing or other schemes for reducing the impact of fluctuations in the foreign exchange earnings of developing countries; (b) to undertake a world plan, in quantitative terms, to meet the world's nutritional needs and to coordinate national plans to arrive at a better balance between export supplies and import demand, based on projections of future trends.

As for external aid, there is a growing realization that to be effective it must be more closely linked to national development plans and adequate resource surveys. If hunger and malnutrition are to be eliminated by the end of this century, a much faster rate of economic growth than envisaged so far appears clearly necessary. Emphasis was laid in this connection on the need for a much closer coordination between international financial assistance and international technical assistance. In particular, it was stressed, (a) that international organizations should be adequately strengthened to increase the effectiveness of their technical assistance operations; (b) that governments of both developed and developing countries should make a special effort to provide experts at all levels, voluntary agencies should also contribute to this end; (c) that intercountry technical surveys covering ecological zones where the problems of agriculture and forestry are similar should be undertaken to provide a basis for national or regional development plans; (d) that the development of watersheds and river valleys should be undertaken under international auspices where desirable, as in the case of the Mekong; (e) that a series of spearhead development zones should be established in each ecological region to facilitate the exchange of experience and the mobilization of common efforts.

UTILIZATION OF FOOD SURPLUSES

In connection with external aid, considerable interest was taken in food surpluses for economic and social development. In my report to the 32d session of the Economic and Social Council under the title "Development Through Food," I visualized a world utilization of food surpluses amounting to at least $12.5 thousand million over the next 5 years, very largely on a bilateral basis, of which three-quarters should be devoted to economic and social development and the balance to emergency aid. This involved a substantial increase over the current levels, but I felt that it was considerably less than what the developed countries could afford, or what the developing countries could absorb, provided of course that the level of nonfood aid also increased. The joint UN/FAO world food program which has been established, as an offshoot of these larger discussions, for a 3-year period, is intended on an experimental basis to help establish internationally acceptable principles to this end. I have already referred to the importance attached by several eminent speakers at this Congress to international measures to assist in the mobilization of the vast masses of idle manpower in the developing countries and securing their participation in the task of development and helping them to help themselves. If the world food program succeeds in establishing internationally acceptable principles to utilize food surpluses to aid economic and social development, it will not only help to expand its own usefulness, but also to guide along sound lines the vastly greater bilateral effort which now flows in this area. The discussions in the commissions emphasized that the utilization of world development is a task which should be devised increasingly in a multilateral setting and the world food program itself should be continued and strengthened with this end in view.

In the context of action at international level the current efforts for bringing about universal disarmament was referred to and the hope was expressed that the vast sums now being spent on armaments will become increasingly available for the elimination of hunger and malnutrition and the promotion of human well-being. A suggestion was also made for the establishment of an international Solidarity and Development Fund from the savings from military expenditure.

PEOPLE'S INVOLVEMENT

On the important question of involvement of people, Commission IV has come up with conclusions which call for special attention. The task of eliminating the scourge of hunger and malnutrition requires continuous consultation and ceaseless exploration of every means of cooperation and development. To this end it has been suggested that (a) the freedom-from-hunger campaign should be continued until the final objective is achieved and for this purpose national committees should be established in all countries where they do not yet exist and should be placed on a continuing basis; (b) a World Food Congress should be held at periodic intervals; (c) at each Congress, the Director-General of FAO should present a world review of the food situation in relation to population and overall development, together with a proposed program for future action. The world review and program should take into account the progress of national development programs, institutional reforms in various countries, the findings of technical and economic surveys; the scope and problems of international cooperation for the elimination of hunger and malnutrition and the developing countries' requirements for technical and financial assistance for rural development programs; and (d) in preparing this world review and program, the Director-General of FAO should have the assistance of high level committees appointed for this purpose in each country participating in the freedom-from-hunger campaign.

CONCLUSION

I have touched on the major issues discussed at the Congress very briefly. In the light of these discussions, there has emerged a declaration to be adopted as the final act of this Congress. Twenty years ago another international conference at Hot Springs, Va., laid the basis of a charter for FAO which continues to remain our guide in the struggle against world hunger. What has happened since Hot Springs to call for a new declaration now? This is a question which, I think, should be answered, for in it lies also the direction of future course of action.

For one thing, the dimension and urgency of the problem of hunger have increased tremendously since 1943, and vast new pressures for economic and social betterment have arisen in the underprivileged parts of the world. While it is clear, as this Congress has demonstrated, that the technical difficulties have been grossly exaggerated, one also finds that many of the development programs, drawn with technical perfection, have not been implemented for lack of adequate measures and for the failure to mobilize mass enthusiasm for development. The condition of the rural masses in many countries has deteriorated, and social injustice continues to hamstring the efforts for progress in many lands. Independence has been accompanied by inevitable growing pains; and the burden that the transition entails on the administration has often been aggravated by the pursuit of selfish interests and private wealth. In some countries, too, the problem of pressure on the land, of ignorance and backwardness, is a reflection of odious discrimination between man and man.

At the international level, the effort which is being made now is certainly a multiple of what was being done a decade ago; but it is small, small in relation to needs and small in relation to what could be done. The difficulties in international negotiations on commodity agreements or on the coordination of international trade have been described as technical; perhaps there is an element of truth in this. The main reason, however, is the reluctance of governments to undertake measures which might weaken their national powers of control.

Yet at the same time there is, below the surface, a stirring of forces which can transform the scene. It is these forces which distinguish the climate of 1943 from that of 1963. In the first place, we now have the certainty of possessing the know-how for abolishing hunger and malnutrition. It is true that even in 1943 scientific advance was far ahead of application in both the developed and developing countries. But there had not been at that time the massive drive of science which has dwarfed mankind's every previous achievement. And there had not been the staggering increases in agricultural productivity in some countries which show what may follow if ever the right policies are applied. The concept of survey and mobilization of human and physical resources for initiating a process of development was hardly known. In fact, planning was associated with only one type of political regime. Administrators, technicians, biologists, economists, and scientists worked in almost complete isolation from one another, and there was little attempt at coordination either at the national or international level. These new concepts of survey and coordination are now regarded as commonplace and enter into all our plans and programs.

Secondly, there is now a much greater awareness of the existence of world hunger. What is more important, the consequences of the growth of inequality, of the growing misery of the developing countries, and of the ever-increasing enrichment of the rich, are now better realized. That surpluses are surpluses only in name, and that they must be used to help the developing countries to help themselves, was perceived by few in 1943. It took at least 10 years for action to be initiated, and nearly 20 years for this philosophy to become the consensus of world opinion. It is now realized by public leaders, by men of good will everywhere and by the rising elites in the developing countries, that peace and war will be determined by the outcome of the race between population and resources. This is all the more so since we have had an extension in communications which has forged the interdependence of mankind and led to its unity as never before in history. A striking evidence of this new solidarity is the response which the freedom-from-hunger campaign has evoked in the developed countries, for it has strikingly shown that common people everywhere are ready to work together in the task of development.

It is not astonishing, therefore, and this is the third major difference between 1943 and 1963, that it has become the established policy in the developed countries to extend assistance to countries in the process of development. The questions on which agreement is yet to be reached are now more of scale and form. It is true that principles are still to be established to insure that the distribution of the burden, though burden is not quite the right word, is equitable, and that all countries participate in the task of international reconstruction. But the very acceptance of the principle of international aid suggests that the time may not be far distant when a system of progressive international taxation, similar to that which applies on a national scale, will be regarded as a logical development even if for juridical reasons it may be termed contribution rather than taxation.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, this historic Congress is now coming to an end. But in every sense it is not an end but a beginning—a beginning of a new worldwide effort in the war against hunger. We have taken the measure of the situation with which we are confronted; we have discussed the strategy and tactics of the battle we are engaged in; we have renewed our solemn pledge to work together in order to abolish hunger. All this will be fruitless if we fail to act, and we shall meet with disaster the proportions of which we can foresee even today. We stand before the bar of history. Let not future generations accuse us of failure to take action while there was time. Let the clarion call go forth from this great assembly to the people of the world that freedom from hunger can be won and must be won within our lifetime.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in conclusion, I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate the declaration that represents the last act of the participants of the World Food Congress. In it lies a hope for the millions who go hungry around the world and a banner that can be unfurled by nations and people everywhere. It is an expression of the conscience of humanity in an undertaking that can and will banish forever hunger and malnutrition in the world—in our lifetime.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the "Declaration of the World Food Congress" issued June 18, 1963, and subscribed to by the 1,300 participants representing the people of 104 nations to that Congress.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECLARATION OF THE WORLD FOOD CONGRESS

We, the participants of the World Food Congress assembled at Washington under the freedom-from-hunger campaign to take the measure of the problems of hunger and malnutrition, and to explore the means for their solution, having in mind that freedom from hunger is man's fundamental right and that all human beings—without distinction of any kind—are entitled to its realization through national effort and international cooperation;

Conscious that today, in spite of 20 years of effort since the Hot Springs Conference which led to the foundation of FAO, the curse of hunger, malnutrition and poverty still afflicts more than half of mankind;

Alarmed by the extent to which the explosive growth of population, at a rate unmatched by adequate increases in productivity, is intensifying human needs and is giving still greater urgency to the attainment of freedom from hunger;

Profoundly aware that the recent attainment of political independence by many hundred millions of the world's population gives a new urgency and a new dimension to the aspiration for higher levels of living, of which freedom from hunger is the first prerequisite;

Convinced that scientific and technological progress now make it possible to free the world from hunger, but that such freedom can only be accomplished if all the available human and natural resources of the world are mobilized to this end through balanced economic and social development: Hereby declare

That the persistence of hunger and malnutrition is unacceptable morally and socially, is incompatible with the dignity of human beings and the equality of opportunity to which they are entitled, and is a threat to social and international peace;

That the elimination of hunger is a primary task of all men and women, who must recognize their duties as well as their rights as members of the human race, and must fight to achieve freedom from hunger in every corner of the earth; this obligation being also inherent in the pledge of the nations under the U.N. Charter to take joint and separate action, to achieve higher standards of living, full employment and conditions of economic and social progress and development as indispensable elements of peace;

That the responsibility to free the world from the scourge of hunger lies jointly with the developing countries themselves who must take all measures within their power which are necessary to achieve this objective; with the developed nations who must cooperate with the developing countries in their efforts, realizing that freedom from hunger cannot long be secure in any part of this interdependent world unless it is secure in all the world; with the United Nations and the specialized agencies who must intensify and coordinate their efforts to assist the nations in this task; with other international organizations and with nongovernmental organizations; e.g., religious, youth, women's organizations, and other voluntary groups, agricultural and labor organizations and associations of trade and industry, who must inform and stimulate the people so that they can play their part with understanding and vigor: Therefore urge

That the task of elimination of hunger from the face of the earth should be conceived in the framework of a worldwide development dedicated to the fullest and most effective use of all human and natural resources, to insure a faster rate of economic and social growth; and

That to this effect, speedy, and decisive action be taken:

1. By all governments of the developing countries, (a) for a planned and integrated use of resources which at present are largely underutilized; (b) for the adaptation of their institutions to the requirements of economic and social progress; and, more specifically, to secure the most effective administrative machinery, to give incentives to increased production through insuring just and stable prices, and to reform, where required, unjust and obsolete structures and systems of land tenure and land use so that the land might become, for the man who works it, the basis of his economic betterment, the foundation of his increasing welfare, and the guarantee of his freedom and dignity.

2. For the maximum utilization of the stock of scientific and technical knowledge and the promotion of both short- and long-term adaptive research suited to the conditions and requirements of the developing countries.

3. For the massive and purposive education of the rural populations, so that they will be capable of applying modern techniques and systems, and for universal education to expand the opportunities for all; further urge

That to assist national efforts, and allow speedier implementation of development programs within a worldwide framework, international cooperation be strengthened, in particular so that:

1. Present adverse and disturbing tendencies in the trade of the developing countries be reversed and that for that purpose adequate and comprehensive commodity agreements be devised, development plans be coordinated, and other appropriate measures taken; and

2. The volume and effectiveness of financial, material, and technical assistance be increased; and

3. There be a more equitable and rational sharing of world abundance, including an expanded and improved utilization of food surpluses for the purpose of economic and social development;

Express the hope that the current efforts for bringing about universal disarmament will succeed and that the vast sums now being spent on instruments of destruction will become increasingly available for the elimination of hunger and malnutrition and the promotion of human well-being.

Therefore, pledge ourselves and highly resolve to take up the challenge of eliminating hunger and malnutrition as a primary task of this generation, thus creating basic conditions for peace and progress for all mankind; to mobilize every resource at our command to awaken world opinion and to stimulate all appropriate action, public and private, national and international, for this overriding task, and to this end give our wholehearted support to the freedom-from-hunger campaign until its final goal is achieved.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASIN PLANS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business, H.R. 6016.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6016) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum; and I ask unanimous consent that the time necessary for the call of the roll not be charged to either side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 144.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. 3. The project for the Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway authorized by the first section of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes", approved August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1028, 1030), as modified by the Act of October 23, 1962 (76 Stat. 1173), is further modified to authorize the appropriation of such further sums, estimated at $6,800,000, as may be necessary to permit the completion of the improvement of the Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway authorized by such Act of August 30, 1935.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York has 30 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on this amendment we in New York face a very important problem with respect to the barge canal. My colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and I have joined in the effort to see what can be done properly about the problem.

I have arrived at an agreement with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] who very graciously has consented to follow what I think is the proper course in this regard, with respect to this agreement.

I should like, therefore, to spread my views very briefly upon the RECORD, following which I propose to withdraw the amendment, based upon an understanding arrived at with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA].

The amendment contains the text of a bill which has been introduced by my colleague [Mr. KEATING] and myself as S. 3072, in the 87th Congress, with respect to this same project, the Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway, and was last Thursday reintroduced as S. 1938.

The problem relates to the need for improving the barge canal in the State of New York, which connects the Hudson River with Lake Ontario. It is an extremely important artery, so far as we are concerned, for commerce and industry in our State, and a great deal of work has been done in past years in improving it.

Last year the Congress amended the 1935 authorization act for the whole Great Lakes-Hudson River project by authorizing an increase of $1 million in the monetary ceiling for the deepening of the barge canal, from $27 million to $28 million. Approximately $25 million has already been spent by the Federal Government, leaving $3 million unspent.

The New York Port Authority tells us that it needs an additional $6.8 million in authorization, based on the fact that the State of New York has appropriated $15 million, and intends to spend this amount and to be reimbursed by the Federal Government out of the additional $6.8 million which is requested for authorization, both in this amendment and in the bill to which I have referred, which, together with my colleague [Mr. KEATING], I have introduced.

I have been advised that the Corps of Engineers believes that although an additional $6½ million is needed to complete the barge canal project, there is no present need for the increased authorization, because, it is said, New York has not established sufficiently that it intends to spend the unspent $3 million or any additional funds in the near future; and, second, that further project expenditures should await completion of a Corps of Engineers feasibility study.

I am told that the date for the completion of the feasibility study might be considerably accelerated, and that if that could be done, the Congress would be possessed of the findings of the Corps of Engineers, which we have great confidence will substantiate the position of the New York Port Authority, which maintains that these improvements must be pushed in the economic interests of the State of New York and the whole Nation. We believe that the Congress, being apprised of this information, would reach the same conclusion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself another 5 minutes.

We believe that there will be no question about Congress recognizing the justice of the additional authorization which is sought by the amendment.

I have conferred with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] on this subject. He has very graciously assured us—and I am sure he will confirm it now—that he will accord us a prompt hearing on the bill (S. 1938) which we have introduced. I am hopeful that the cooperation which the Senator from Michigan has extended to us will produce a beneficial result and will stimulate the Corps of Engineers to give us a report on the subject much faster than has been possible up to now.

I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I join in expressing appreciation to the Senator from Michigan for his assurance, which I am sure he will give, that there will be early hearings on this problem.

Mr. President, as a cosponsor of H.R. 6061, I would like to emphasize the importance of this amendment. It authorizes additional appropriations for the completion of the improvements on the Great Lake-Hudson River Waterway as specified by the act of August 30, 1935. Under this act, improvements included deepening between locks to 14 feet below normal level, widening at bends and elsewhere, and increasing the overhead clearances at bridges and other obstructions to 20 feet.

The project is necessary because of increased cargoes to meet present day costs and continuing protests on the part of shippers who are finding it inexpedient and uneconomical to ship in large bulk on the canal because of existing conditions.

A uniform clearance of 20 feet would allow shipment of lumber, automobiles, ores, steel products and other such commodities which cannot be shipped at present because of their bulk. In addition it has been noted that completion of the bridge-raising project would enable shipment of materials vital to our national defense which are too large to be carried on State highways and railroad facilities.

Today the necessary and previously authorized work is only 80 percent completed. Thirteen bridges must still be raised and reconstructed in some form or another, and in several sections of the canal, embankments must be further sustained. The act of 1935 authorized $27 million in Federal funds. An additional $1 million was authorized last year. Work has progressed slowly. However, the Second World War intervened. The $27 million has been spent, yet essential work must still be done. It is evident that any sum of money originally allocated to meet specific demands in 1935 is inadequate to do the same work today.

Mr. President, I submit it would be most wasteful and foolish to let the $27 million in Federal funds already spent on this project go down the drain.

Unless the remaining bridges are raised, there can be no gain from those already raised. For even if all the work is done with the exception of one bridge, barges will be deterred by that sole bridge. It is as difficult to strip down a barge to fit under 1 bridge as it is to fit under 13 bridges of the same size. The increment in commerce and the value of expediting and facilitating conditions in the canal cannot be realized until the entire project is completed.

I am aware that the Army Engineers are still studying various aspects of the canal, and specifically the question of whether it should be taken over by the Federal Government. This is a valid and important question, I agree, but it is no reason to delay an already authorized project and prevent the $28 million already expended from being fully utilized.

Completion of the improvements along the barge canal will encourage industrial growth in upper New York State. The completed system will open up many opportunities and will be an asset to the large part of the country for which it expedites and facilitates service, with the further authorization of an estimated $6,800,000 to complete work approved in the act of 1935.

This waterway will be able to play the dynamic part that it ought to play in the transportation complex of upstate New York and the Great Lakes and other areas that it also serves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include, following my remarks, some excerpts of views by barge canal users as to the value of this project which appeared in the publication New York Waterways, May–August 1962 issue.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIDGES GO UP—CHANNEL DEPTHS DROP

John J. Gallagher, vice president, operations, Moran Towing & Transportation Co.: "We all know the effect and impact containerization has had on oceangoing vessels. Raising of those bridges on the New York State Barge Canal will definitely encourage and make very attractive transshipment of containers right on up through the canal and into the lakes * * * and vice versa. The potential is tremendous."

Bernard Feeney, Feeney Enterprises: "We're going to be able to build boats with higher sides * * * going to be able to load deeper * * * all of which will mean increased capacity per barge for our customers. With those bridges raised, means we'll be able to load some light dry cargo on deck. It's difficult to be competitive with other modes of transportation today in present conditions of the canal, but with bridges up and depths down it's a step in the right direction. Then we can go to our customers and offer them container service * * * we can offer 'em self-unloading facilities. Way it is now, you are restricted what you can carry * * * have to slow up when you come to a low bridge with light tows. Big remaining problem is that size of the locks are not big enough to let us build boats that will do the job we could do for our customers. We're limited today by locks that were modern 'way back in 1924, 1925, and 1926. There's much left to be done * * * but when modernizing is finally completed, mark my words, you'll see industry spring up along the banks.

Capt. George Hassall, marine superintendent, Cargo Carriers, Inc.: "Higher bridges will eliminate the need for telescoping pilothouses, having to strip your boat down each time you come to a low bridge—allow you to use more modern hatch covers. As far as depth goes, naturally, the deeper the water, the more grain you can carry. However, it wouldn't do much good having low bridges and deep water, because the more draft you're carrying, of course, when your boat is light you need that much more increase in bridge height. If you don't have it, you have to ballast, pump down to get under certain low bridges. We presently have four boats on the canal. If this canal is finally improved, shippers might be able to move grain from some lake ports right on through the canal to New York City. Way it is now, though, you have to bring it by big lake ships to Oswego or Buffalo and elevate, then down through the canal by barge, reelevating at Albany to ships. Then those ships must stop off to top off their load at New York City. New channel depth and bridge heights will mean through traveling for grain, nonstop from lakes to New York City."

Charles Maller, oil dispatcher, McAllister Bros., Inc.: "We could load our barges down to full capacity at 13 feet. And that would mean we'd be practically competitive with the pipelines. Our trouble is that because of the present draft conditions at 11 feet we're not competitive. We can give the pipeline a pretty good battle once we're down to 13 foot draft, because then we've full barge loads. And the bridges when they're finally raised will help us in a lot of ways—we'll need very, very little ballast coming down. (Takes 4 or 5 hours now to ballast * * * new bridges would reduce ballasting time to 1 hour. This should be able to save the oil industry many hundreds of thousands of dollars in pumping and discharging delays at low bridges.) Right now we have to take about 9 feet of ballast coming down the canal because of those bridges. By raising them 5 feet, this will mean that we would have to have very little ballast in the barges. And, as well, there's also the possibility of dry deck cargo."

M. J. Cardillo, Michigan Atlantic Corp.: "No question but what it's going to increase capacity and reduce costs. Right now we're limited by draft and height and clearance. We can't compete in some instances because we can't carry the volume. We move both liquid and dry cargoes * * * and when the bridges are up and the new channel is in we'll be able to carry additional tonnages of your light cargoes, such as soda ash or grain. We'll be able to build bigger boats with higher sides that can give us the additional cubic capacity. Another saving will be not having to ballast. And still another is the improved time—when you go along with a boat 'smelling bottom,' you're just not making the time you should. And you're damaging your hull and propellers also. Something else we won't have to face is high water delays when those improvements are all finally completed. No question that the additional capacity of the barges will make us a more efficient form of transportation * * * more attractive to potential shippers. We'll be able to load another 2 feet more * * * those higher sides will increase our barge capacity up to maybe 17 percent."

Joe Herrmann, president, Conners Standard Marine Corp.: "That 14-foot channel will permit us to carry 10 to 15 percent more per trip—you don't start to carry until you get deep. Vessel of 1,550 tons draws down about 12 feet—but that vessel at 10 feet only carries about 1,000 to 1,100 tons. It's those last couple feet, where your beam is broadest, that you really begin to carry the payload. Higher bridges would permit you to build a vessel with a higher superstructure, which means you are more versatile, letting you operate from the lakes right on through to coastwise. Coast Guard restrictions we operate under now are basically because of the lower superstructure on these canal vessels. Soon as the bridges are up, we'll have higher superstructures and then we will be able to serve a wider area—lakes, canal, and coastwise."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to my colleague for his intercession and for his agreement with me that this is the proper way to proceed. I again thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I am happy to repeat to the Senator from New York what I said to him privately. I believe that the nature of the project and the state of it at this time are such that it would be well to bring the record up to date. For that reason I will be glad to receive the bill that has been introduced by him and hold hearings before the committee at a comparatively early date.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator. I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks certain basic information which has been prepared by the U.S. Army Engineering District of New York, with respect to the canal and the need for its improvement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The New York State Barge Canal System consists of four interconnected canals, the Champlain, Erie, Oswego and Cayuga-Seneca Canals, all originally constructed by the State of New York during the early part of the 19th century, and reconstructed with further improvement in 1918. The system consists of 512 miles of canal and 10 miles of harbor areas with 57 locks and appurtenances, including dams, water supply reservoirs, and feeder canals. The canals were completed to a depth of 12 feet below normal pool level, with widths of 75 feet in earth cuts, 94 feet in rock cuts and 200 feet in canalized rivers and lakes.
>
> The canal system, completed at a cost of about $200 million, is owned by the State of New York. The cost of operation and maintenance is borne entirely by the State.
>
> Acts of Congress adopted May 28 and August 30, 1935, authorized the allotment of Federal funds to the State of New York for expenditure, under Federal control and supervision, for the improvement of the sections of the canal system connecting Lake Ontario with the Hudson River, a length of 184 miles. These sections comprise the eastern portion of the Erie Canal extending from Waterford at the Hudson River terminus to Three River Point, 160.2 miles, and the Oswego Canal extending from Three River Point to Oswego and Lake Ontario, 23.8 miles. The acts provide for deepening between locks to 14 feet below normal pool level, widening at bends and elsewhere and increasing the overhead clearances at bridges and other obstructions to 20 feet at maximum navigable stage. The widths of the channel are to be 104 feet in earth cuts, 120 feet in rock cuts and 200 feet in river sections. The acts stipulated that the amount to be expended by the Federal Government for the above work was not to exceed $27 million. The River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945, authorized the lowering of the lock sills to 13 feet. The foregoing improvements are underway.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, before I withdraw my amendment, I again express my gratitude for the fine cooperation of the Senator from Michigan. The maintenance of the canal is fully carried by the State of New York. As my colleague from New York has said, the question of whether the Federal Government will take it over is being considered. We say that it is extremely important that the State of New York should be rewarded, not penalized, for having had the initiative to go forward in improving a major waterway in terms of the national system of waterways, rather than holding back until the Federal Government actually provides the financial assistance to complete all the work necessary including the reconstruction of 13 bridges and embankment construction, still to be carried out.

I am sure, as a result of the cooperation of the Senator from Michigan, already expressed, that the position of the committee will be that the State should be encouraged, not penalized, for showing the kind of initiative that has been shown by the State of New York. I am hopeful that this waterway will contribute fully to the economic development and growth of New York State on the national waterway system.

Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, beginning with line 22, strike out all through line 2 on page 9.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I have offered an amendment to H.R. 6016 which would deny the authorization of the Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir. The needless construction of this $52 million project would bring damage to the development of Wyoming's great coal reserves, weaken the financial structure of the very successful Palisades reclamation project, develop additional electrical power for an area which already has an abundant supply, and serve no purpose other than to cause economic distress to the communities and facilities presently existing in this general area.

The Burns Creek project as proposed by the Senate Public Works Committee, which has jurisdiction over all legislation concerning flood control, would be "authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 130, 87th Congress." The Chief of Engineers recognizes that the Burns Creek project is not a flood control project and recommends in Senate Document No. 130 that "the project be designed, constructed and operated by the Bureau of Reclamation as a part of the existing Palisades project of that Bureau in accordance with the provisions of Federal reclamation law."

The Burns Creek project will be located on the Snake River in Bonneville County, Idaho, about 30 miles downstream from the Palisades Dam of the Bureau of Reclamation and 25 miles from the Wyoming border. It would be integrated electrically, hydraulically, and financially, with the existing Palisades project. The dam would be a 176-foot high earth-rolled dam, 1,900 feet long. It would impound about 234,000 acre-feet of water and it would have installed in it 90,000 kilowatts of generating capacity. Of the storage capacity behind the dam, 17,000 acre-feet would be for reregulating the flow of the Snake River below the Palisades Dam; 100,000 acre-feet would be used for irrigation storage and the remaining 117,000 acre-feet would be inactive capacity.

Because the Senate Public Works Committee has not held recent hearings on this case to determine the actual cost of the dam and reservoir nor the proper allocation of costs, I only have the figures and statistics reported in Senate Document No. 130. Senate Document No. 130 states that the proposed cost of the dam would be $48,721,500. This bill would authorize $52 million. Of this figure, 98 percent of the costs are allocated to the production of power. The remainder of the costs are allocated to reclamation or irrigation, recreation, and fish and wildlife. It is clear that the reason for the construction of the Burns Creek project is to produce the Federal power. Not 1 cent is allocated to river reregulation; not 1 cent is allocated to flood control.

The legislative history of the Burns Creek project is very interesting. The Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir was originally proposed for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation in 1956. Hearings were held by the House and the Senate by the respective Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs. The Senate passed the bill authorizing the Burns Creek project in 1959 and in 1961. The House held hearings on this reclamation project in 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961. The House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has rejected the Burns Creek proposal as being unnecessary, uneconomical, and unworthy of construction.

A few months after the House Interior Committee rejected the project in 1962, the administration, in an almost unprecedented move, instructed the Corps of Army Engineers to include a request that the Bureau of Reclamation be authorized to construct the Burns Creek project in the corps request for authority from the Public Works Committee. With the 87th Congress having less than 2 weeks to live, the master strategists tried to force the Burns Creek project into an omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill with the thought that it could thus be steamrolled through the Congress and signed into law.

In this Bureau's 1956 report on Burns Creek, which is the same project we are now considering with no alterations or modifications, the corps' analysis indicated that flood-control benefits, if any, are somewhat nebulous and probably so small as to be overbalanced by the cost of flood-control outlets and operation. The corps states that this is because of the accuracy of forecasts and the fine degree of regulation, both of which would be required to achieve any control with 100,000 acre-feet of irrigation storage space.

The advocates of the Burns Creek project have attempted to tie it to reclamation, because there are many of us who believe in reclamation and support it. I am one who believes that reclamation is good for this country. I am one who will support reclamation when it is good for the country, and I will support a project which is truly a reclamation project. It is projects such as the Burns Creek project which give a black eye to reclamation in the West.

In the description for the proposed dam it will be found that 100,000 acre-feet of the storage capacity of the reservoir would on occasion be used for irrigation purposes. But according to the spokesman for the Bureau of Reclamation, water stored in this space would be used by irrigators only two or three times in any 50-year period. In fact, the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, in effect, admitted this when he wrote:

> The relatively minor part of the irrigation of this project will have little bearing on the success of this project.

Neither on the basis of the project's irrigation benefits, nor on the basis of the allocation of the project cost to irrigation, nor on the basis of its repayment schedule does it appear to be fair or appropriate to assert, as do the advocates of this project, that Burns Creek should be approved to assist in irrigation of arid and semiarid lands in the upper Snake River Valley, Idaho.

The facts are that the Burns Creek project would be detrimental to reclamation, to water users, and to the taxpayers. The Palisades project standing alone without Burns Creek would repay all its reimbursable costs by 1988; and by the year 2006 a surplus of $22,245,333 would be built up from earnings of Palisades alone. Under existing law this would go to the Treasury and, should Congress so decide, it would be available to finance additional reclamation projects, the cost of which might be beyond the financial capacity of water users.

But should Burns Creek be included in this Public Works bill, and should Burns Creek and Palisades market their power at the Palisades rate, then all the reimbursable costs of the two projects would not be recovered until the end of the year 2006. Palisades alone by this date would have a surplus of $22,245,333; thus this sum of money would be diverted from the Treasury to subsidize the users of Burns Creek power. This would be a radical departure from the normally accepted principle of Federal reclamation policy: that power is the paying partner of reclamation.

Rather than power revenues helping to finance the irrigation of western arid lands, the water users would be penalized to subsidize power production. Those persons who have planned and proposed the Burns Creek project realize that it is not a reclamation project, for they have allocated 98 percent of the costs to power; less than 2 percent of the costs of this project are allocated to the irrigation and reclamation.

The Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir project is not a flood control project, and it was never planned to be a flood-control project. But when it was determined that Congress would not authorize it as a reclamation project because it did not satisfy the requirements for reclamation, it was decided that the only hope for ramrodding this project through Congress was to label it a flood-control project so that the Public Works Committee would handle it rather than the Interior Committees of the respective Houses of Congress. The House Committee on Public Works has never held a hearing on Burns Creek. The Senate has never held a hearing which would establish to any reasonable man that Burns Creek was for the purpose of controlling floodwaters.

No money has been allocated to flood control. This is a johnny-come-lately idea, hoping to salvage this project so that the advocates of Federal power will have another feather in their cap. I have always supported the generation of electric power where such power is a proper adjunct to the development of water for agricultural, industrial, or culinary purposes, but I am unalterably opposed to Federal projects having as primary purpose the generation of electric power. Federal projects built for power production only, follow neither the intent nor the spirit of true reclamation law.

The proponents of this power project, the Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir, have attempted to masquerade the project as a flood control project. The Department of Interior witnesses have actually admitted that there are no flood control or significant wildlife benefits involved in it. The feasibility report on the project admitted that reclamation storage would be kept at a minimum to maximize power revenues. The report said:

> Assignment of more than 100,000 acre-feet of this total to irrigation is not financially feasible because of the reduction in power revenues that would result (85 Cong. House Doc. 147, p. 12).

The proponents of this project attempt to tie it in with the very successful reclamation project Palisades as a reregulation reservoir. We must call a spade a spade. The Burns Creek project is a power project and it is a very expensive power project. It would cost over $500 per kilowatt as compared to Palisades' $185 per kilowatt. It would impose upon the Palisades reclamation project ill advised financial responsibility and thus substantially delay the time when power revenues from Palisades could be put to more beneficial purposes. It is an uneconomic power development standing by itself as a power installation or as an adjunct to an otherwise sound project—the Palisades.

The Burns Creek power project would fail by over $300,000 per year to meet its own interest obligations at 3 percent on its proposed allocation investment. Combined with Palisades, Palisades would have to pick up this deficit. This would result in the postponing of the payout of the Burns Creek project to some 26 years.

For the power facilities of the Burns Creek project to pay out in 50 years, the resulting power would have to sell for an average of at least 4.88 mills per kilowatt-hour. Nevertheless, the Department of Interior has indicated that the power from Burns Creek would be marketed at the same rate as the power from the Palisades Dam. This would mean that on the average it would be sold at about 1.18 mills per kilowatt-hour less than its cost of production with a deficit resulting from Burns Creek power authorization being made up of whatever surplus might result from Palisades.

It should be noted that the Idaho Power and Utah Power & Light Cos. are the principal power suppliers in this marketing area. The report which they filed with the Federal Power Commission indicated that there will be between now and 1972 always be a substantial area reserve or surplus capacity available after making generous allowance estimates for future load growth including continual increase for irrigation pumping. It is into this type of an area which the Bureau would like to introduce and build at the taxpayers expense a $52 million powerplant with an unneeded 90,000 kilowatts installed capacity.

This is a needless waste of the taxpayers' money which would bring damage to those persons and companies which have shown the initiative to build for the future to meet the demands of a growing area.

Mr. President, not only do I as a U.S. Senator object to the needless construction of the Burns Creek power project; but as a Senator from the State of Wyoming I object because this Federal powerplant would dump an additional 90,000 kilowatts into an area which already has a surplus of hydropower. Mr. President, the citizens of the State of Wyoming object to such a needless, extravagant project. In Senate Document 130 there is a letter from the then Governor Gage protesting the construction of this project. The present Governor of Wyoming, Cliff Hansen, opposes the Burns Creek project.

In the general area of Burns Creek there is a huge deposit of subbituminous coal. This coal has a high moisture content, slacks readily, and cannot be hauled by rail as economically as the higher grade bituminous coals in the area. Therefore, the economic development of such coal is dependent upon an industry which will consume the coal at the site.

The Kemmerer Coal Co. executed an agreement with Utah Power & Light Co. which provides that the power company will build a 300,000 kilowatt steam electric plant at the Kemmerer site. This plant is now in operation. The power company plans on an ultimate capacity of one-half million kilowatts at this site. Wyoming coal will supply the power to generate the electricity. "Coal by wire" will light the West if the Government will not cripple private enterprise by building at the taxpayers expense an unneeded Federal powerplant.

The proposed Burns Creek project, which would generate 90,000 kilowatts and one-half billion kilowatt-hours per year in a surplus hydropower area, would dilute the amount of coal consumed in the area by 250,000 tons per year and would materially hinder the development of the coal deposit in the Kemmerer area. From the standpoint of its economic effects to this community, it should be pointed out that a reduction of 250,000 tons of coal mined annually, as a direct result of constructing Burns Creek, would mean an annual loss of $275,000 in mine payroll, an annual reduction in the supplies purchased in the amount of $225,000, an annual reduction in State and local taxes of $18,000, and an annual reduction in the payment to United Mine Workers of America, health, welfare, and retirement fund of $100,000.

Mr. President, as can be seen from those figures, the construction of the Burns Creek project with Federal funds would deal a crippling blow to the economy of southwest Wyoming.

I plead with my fellow Senators to reject this bid by the Federal bureaucracies to build another Federal powerplant. When we take away all the colorful frills and names, we find that this is purely a powerplant. This is another brazen attempt by the Federal power advocates to increase their domain.

The Burns Creek power project would cause irreparable damage to the economic development of Wyoming. It is not a reclamation project. It is not a flood control project. It is a Federal power project.

As a Federal power project, it is unnecessary, uneconomic, and unworthy of construction.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to read into the RECORD a telegram received from Clifford P. Hansen, Governor of the State of Wyoming, as follows:

> Please convey my sincere objections to authorization of the Burns Creek project, which I understand is included in the bill before the U.S. Senate today. This project, as you know, has been called everything from stream reregulation to reclamation, and again only last year it was altered by the Corps of Engineers to include flood control. No matter what tag is used to label this project, it is primarily a hydroelectric plant, and made feasible only by using the revenues of a good reclamation project, Palisades. It is important to note that no shortage of electric power exists in the area to justify expenditure of public funds of $52 million.
>
> It has been proclaimed policy of the Congress that coordination is mandatory of not only Federal agencies concerned in the development of our water resources, but equally important with the respective States of a given basin wherein a proposed plan is under consideration. Based on such proclamations of the Congress, wherein the Congress has recognized States' interests and responsibilities, statutory procedures have been carefully defined by public law, affording such coordination between Federal agencies and State governments.
>
> In this respect, as Governor of the State of Wyoming, I have received no communications whatsoever from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, in compliance with congressional policy, which communication is required prior to submission of any plans, proposals, or reports of a flood control project. I will be requesting the Chief of Engineers to furnish me, in compliance with such policies and procedures set by the Congress, any such plans, proposals, or reports for my review and subsequent comments.
>
> I must object strongly to inclusion of this project which will have a significant, lasting, and disastrous effect on the economy of a substantial area of Wyoming. I want to note that at no time since I became Governor have I received any material on this project from the Corps of Engineers—nor have I, or any other Wyoming citizens that I know of, been given any opportunity whatsoever to comment on the project or appear to present testimony on the economic impact such a project would have on Wyoming.
>
> Because this opportunity to be heard, either before the committee or to comment on the project plans initiated by the Corps of Engineers, has been denied to our State, I would respectfully ask that the Burns Creek project be deleted from the bill now before you.
>
> CLIFFORD HANSEN,
> *Governor of Wyoming.*

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time made available to me.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to my colleague from the Committee on Public Works [Mr. METCALF].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 5 minutes on the bill.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I have asked the chairman of the Public Works Committee to yield this time to me in order that I may respond to a statement made yesterday on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Iowa, as follows:

> In my opinion, inadequate hearings were held on some of the projects last year during our committee's consideration of the omnibus rivers and harbors bill. On one of those projects no hearings were held.

The record of the hearings speaks for itself. I have before me several volumes of hearings. One of them—part I of the 1963 hearings on the rivers and harbors and flood control bill—comprises 1,106 pages; and part II comprises 436 pages.

The junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] criticized several projects—the Burns Creek project, which is the subject of the pending amendment; the Knowles project, the Devils Jump project, and the Trotters Shoals project. From what he said, I assume that his comment that "on one of these projects no hearings were held," referred to the Trotters Shoals project, because that project was added to the bill last year, during the debate on the floor of the Senate.

However, this year the House committee held an extensive hearing comprising 782 pages, on the Trotters Shoals project; and copies of that hearing are available to all who wish to read them.

Last year at the hearings before the Senate committee the Trotters Shoals project was justified, not only by the Corps of Engineers, but also by Mr. Charles Robinson, who testified for the National Rural Electric Consumers Association.

As for the other projects—the Knowles project, the Devils Jump project, and the Burns Creek project—anyone who wished to testify on them was privileged to do so, and extensive hearings for the benefit of the entire group were held.

The chairman of the committee will remember that last year the chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors was the late distinguished Senator Kerr, of Oklahoma. He was then engaged in holding hearings on the tariff bill; and I was privileged to hold hearings on the Devils Jump project and the Knowles Dam. The result is more than 400 pages of hearings on the Knowles project are available. Anyone from the State of Montana or anyone from the Pacific Northwest who wished to testify had the privilege of appearing and testifying. The entire committee was present; the distinguished Senator from Delaware, the Senator from Iowa, and other Senators were present, and participated in the hearings. At all times the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the ranking minority member, was in attendance.

The same was true in connection with the Devils Jump project. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] asked many persons to come to the hearings. Representatives of the utilities and the coal mines opponents and proponents came there; and we listened to the testimony of all who wished to testify.

The voluminous record of the hearings speaks for itself. However, in order that this RECORD may be correct, I wish to state that there have been completely adequate and thorough hearings on the Burns Creek project, the Devils Jump project, the Knowles project, and the other projects which were added to the bill by the Senate Committee on Public Works.

The only project on which no hearings were held or on which inadequate hearings might be said to have been held is the Trotters Shoals project; but the House committee held extensive, thorough, and comprehensive hearings on April 23, 24, 25, and 26 of this year; and the record of those hearings has been made available to members of the committee.

Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding this time to me.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] such time as he may require.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I suppose no project in recent years has been given more careful consideration by the Senate than the Burns Creek project, which the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] seeks to have stricken from this bill. The project was considered by the Senate during the 85th Congress, during the 86th Congress, and during the 87th Congress; and each time the Senate approved it. On two of those occasions, the project was the subject of exhaustive hearings before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, where the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation took testimony from many witnesses, both pro and con; and, on each occasion, after those hearings, the full Committee approved this project. In the 87th Congress, further hearings were held—with the same result—before the Public Works Committee.

This project has been brought three times to the floor of the Senate for debate; and each time, after thorough and searching consideration of all the objections which have been raised to it, the Senate in its wisdom has approved it.

This is the fourth time the project comes before us. And it is still just as meritorious, Mr. President, as it was the first time it was brought before this body.

In fact, I know of no project in the recent history of Idaho that has had more general approval than Burns Creek. To begin with, the project has had the support and endorsement of two national administrations—the Eisenhower administration and the Kennedy administration. Indeed, during the very time that the Eisenhower administration was pursuing a policy of "no new starts" in dam and river development projects, Burns Creek was the exception. This dam was singled out for the support of the Republican national administration, which well bespeaks the special merit of the project.

Under the Kennedy administration also, the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers have given their endorsements, so that the executive branch of the Government has consistently been for the project from the time it was first considered in the Senate.

Beyond that, the people of Idaho have overwhelmingly been for the project. Not alone the electric co-ops and the municipalities that will buy the power generated at Burns Creek, but also the farmers' groups and the irrigation districts have supported it. The Idaho

Reclamation Association again and again has endorsed the project, indicating that the 100,000 acre-feet of supplementary storage water it will supply does have meaning to the irrigators of my State, and the project cannot be categorized as purely a public power project.

From the time I first came to the Senate, Burns Creek has had the approval of the entire Idaho congressional delegation, including Republicans and Democrats alike. That aisle has not separated the support that we in Idaho have given the project. I am happy to say that we have never treated it as a partisan matter.

I should like to examine the arguments that have been offered against the project on the floor this afternoon by the junior Senator from Wyoming. First, he has charged that Burns Creek is not a flood control project. But I call to the attention of Senators page 23 of the committee report. On that page, the flood problem in the affected region of my State is described in the following words:

> Flood problem.—Floods frequently experienced along the Snake River from Heise to American Falls affect about 300 acres of residential and commercial developments in Roberts and Idaho Falls and 90,000 acres of land devoted to irrigated row crops and hay. With control from existing storage reservoirs and levee protection, the remaining average annual damages under 1962 conditions are about $300,000.

At bottom of page 23, in listing the annual benefits to be derived from the project, there appears under "flood damages prevented" an annual estimated benefit of $120,000.

It is interesting, too, when referring to the benefits, to note that Burns Creek will confer an irrigation benefit, a power benefit, and a recreation benefit, in addition to its flood control. These indicate that the project has a multiple-purpose character.

Mr. President, it is true that the major revenues from the project will be power revenues. But I dispute the charge of the junior Senator from Wyoming that the project will not stand on its own feet. He has said we have tied the project to Palisades, and that if this project were not built, Palisades would pay off sooner.

Of course, if we do not build Burns Creek, we will pay off Palisades sooner. But I must emphasize, as I have before, that the Burns Creek project, from the beginning, has been considered an integral part of the Palisades development. The first reason for building it is to provide Palisades with a reregulating reservoir. I was told by my former colleague, Senator Dworshak, who served for so many years in this body, that when the Palisades authorization bill was first before the Senate, serious consideration was given to including the Burns Creek project with Palisades in one package because the two are meant to operate together. For reasons of legislative tactics, at the time, it was decided to move ahead by first authorizing Palisades, and then later asking authorization for Burns Creek.

So today, Mr. President, Burns Creek is needed to provide for the reregulation of the Palisades Reservoir. One cannot help but get an entirely distorted and inaccurate picture of the feasibility of the project by trying to separate from its parent, Palisades.

A reregulating reservoir is as integrally connected with its parent project as a child is connected with its mother by an umbilical cord. If the public is to receive its full money's worth from Palisades and if we are to operate the generating facilities there at maximum capacity, we must have a reregulating basin below the dam. If we build Burns Creek, the thing that the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] fails to say is that the direct result will be to double the firm power output at Palisades. That is why Burns Creek is necessary to give us the full potential of the investment we have already made at Palisades, so that the public can obtain the maximum production of electricity from the water resource at that site.

Of course, if we are going to build a reregulating reservoir, then it makes sense to build it in such a way that we can utilize it fully. We should not build a small reregulating dam at that site, just to provide a reregulating function. So limited a facility would waste the water, and we cannot afford to waste water anymore.

So a dam has been designed that will provide the reregulating function, increase the firm power output at Palisades, and, at the same time, generate 90,000 kilowatts of electricity at the new site. This is in the best tradition of prudent comprehensive development of our water resources.

The final argument is that somehow this project would threaten the private utility companies. Mr. President, now we come to the crux of the matter. The only real opponents of the project are the private utility companies. The arguments presented here today again and again have been reiterated by the private utility companies. And yet, curiously enough, neither the Idaho Power Co. nor the Utah Power and Light Co. need have any fear of Burns Creek. The power that will be generated there will be sold to customers that have traditionally purchased their power, not from either of the private utilities, but from the Federal Government. These customers are the REA's, the co-ops, and the municipalities which have electrical systems of their own.

They have always purchased their power from the Government. They will purchase the additional power that is generated at the Burns Creek Dam from the Government.

So the dam cannot constitute a threat to the private utility companies. When it is argued that the main reason for the dam is that Government bureaucracy wants to extend its domain, I say the facts show the very opposite to be the case. The private utility companies are opposed to the project because they desire to extend their domain. For the first time, they want to invade a market that heretofore has been supplied by the Government dams in Idaho, a market that is restricted to REA's, co-ops, and municipalities. They know that the construction of the Burns Creek Dam would block them from soon invading the public power market in southern Idaho, which they would like to take over for themselves.

Mr. President, therein lies the aggrandizement. I am not an opponent of the private utility companies. I believe there is plenty of room in Idaho and the Northwest for both public and private power. But I say today that Burns Creek Dam does not constitute a plausible threat to private power, because the power generated there will be sold exclusively to preference customers which, for more than 40 years now, have purchased their power from the Federal Government.

I repeat, the charges raised against this project are without foundation. Again and again, they have been refuted. I hope that the Senate, having considered and given its approval to the project in the past, will do so again today.

I am hopeful that Senators will remain mindful of the fact that this project has had bipartisan endorsement of both Republican and Democratic Presidents; that it is in conformity with the best principles of comprehensive development; that so far as the coal miners in Kemmerer, Wyo., are concerned, the Utah Power & Light Co., has built the coal plant in Kemmerer in anticipation of the natural growth of its own market. The plant is now operating satisfactorily. As the whole region grows, the plant will expand.

I say to the junior Senator from Wyoming that his figures with respect to the alleged economic damage Wyoming would sustain through the construction of this project, are groundless. I heard the same arguments presented again and again when the project was before our various committees. Never was it possible to substantiate such figures.

Three years ago it was said that the Kemmerer plant would not be built—but it is built. It was said the plant would be operating at reduced capacity—but it is not. There is plenty of room in our big, growing region for both public power and private power.

I submit, on the record, confirmed by two separate Senate legislative committees which have looked thoroughly into the merits of this project, that Burns Creek will not infringe upon the prerogatives of the private power companies, or upon their future markets.

For these reasons, I am hopeful that the Senate will today reject the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Wyoming and ratify what it has done three times before in approving the Burns Creek project, by keeping it in the bill.

I thank the chairman of the committee for the fine support he has given this project in the past, and for the careful attention which has again been given to it by the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. President, I yield back the remaining time on the amendment on this side.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I yield back my remaining time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] is absent because of illness in his family.

I further announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick].

If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "nay" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 60, as follows:

[No. 119 Leg.]

YEAS—28

Allott
Beall
Bennett
Boggs
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Lausche
Mechem
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Robertson
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NAYS—60

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Moss
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—12

Bayh
Byrd, Va.
Dominick
Edmondson
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Magnuson
Morse
Nelson
Russell
Williams, N.J.

So Mr. Simpson's amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOSS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Public Works. On that question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. Brewster in the chair). The Chair inquires how much time the Senator from Illinois yields himself.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield myself 20 minutes. Mr. President, it may seem a little invidious, coming from a Member of the Senate—and I know actually how invidious warnings are—But I think the time has come to warn the Senate and the House of Representatives also, as to the delicacy of our international and national fiscal problem. We are on thin ice when we continue to authorize and appropriate astronomical sums, completely heedless and wholly unmindful of what is before us. Let me illustrate, if Senators missed it somewhere along the line.

In June, the new Prime Minister of Canada thought it would be a great idea to impose a 30 percent tax upon American money which came into Canada in order to get a good, big bite into Canadian corporations. It required but a day for the repercussion to begin on the exchanges in Montreal and Toronto. A panic occurred within 24 hours. It was not headlined in this country because of the time change by virtue of the international dateline. It took an extra day to get reaction from Japan. But the reaction in Tokyo was sharp, and the market plummeted. It was necessary for one of the ministers of the Canadian Treasury to go to the floor of the Toronto Stock Exchange to stop the panic and to say that the action was temporarily suspended. That is how delicate the anatomy of the fiscal structure is. When it is said that the action is temporarily suspended, that means that "temporarily" will be a long, long time.

What has happened in the United States? The Federal Reserve Board raised the rediscount rate on short-term paper by a half of 1 percent. Perhaps that should have been done before. But then came the rest of the President's program, in which a tax was proposed on American funds which are invested in foreign securities, ranging, depending upon the maturities, from 2¾ to 15 percent.

How long did it take the market to react? It reacted almost immediately. It was not possible, even, to trade in Canadian securities on the New York Stock Exchange. Immediately an accommodation was proposed, to see if the difficulty could not be solved. I understand that the fiscal wizards are now in our own Capitol, trying to solve the problem.

Why all this sensitivity? There is a reason for it. The gold is still leaving us. We have about $3,500 million left as a cushion, after making provision for deposits and outstanding Federal Reserve notes. Do not believe for a minute that there is not deep concern and uneasiness in the Treasury Department and in the White House. What we are experiencing now is a succession of experiments of one kind and another to stop the outflow of gold.

Now comes a report from the Brookings Institution. The Brookings Institution was specially commissioned to make a report. What did they say? They told the Joint Economic Committee that in 5 years the balance will probably be closed; but in 5 years, it may be too late. Perhaps 1 year will be too late.

One thing that John Maynard Keynes said that could not be controverted was his statement, "In the long run, we will all be dead." He ought to know, because he is dead.

Is there time? How much time is there? Now there is a struggle over one expedient after another. What is involved? Is it the gold metal? Oh, no. It is the entire structure of that elusive, indefinable thing that we call national and international commerce.

Do not think for a moment that there is too much confidence abroad. A friend of mine, whose son works in a Swiss bank, reported to me last week that he learned from high authority that those who should know are not speaking idly when they talk about the devaluation of the dollar. Notwithstanding that, he says the dollar has to be defended at all hazards. It does have to be defended.

But I am thinking of this whole delicate and fragile structure in terms of what we in Congress do. We have not done much about the budget—a $99 billion cash administrative budget. What have the cuts amounted to? They have been only token cuts. That is about as far as the reduction in the budget has gone.

There is a constant hue and cry for tax reduction. I cannot vouch for this, but I spoke with a member of the House Committee on Ways and Means last week, and he was second guessing. He thought that perhaps by the middle of September the Committee on Ways and Means might report a bill to the House, and that the House would then send the bill to the Senate.

I ask my friends, the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], and other Senators who are members of the Committee on Finance, How long will it take before such a bill will be reported by the Committee on Finance? The distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], who is a keen student in this field, has given his opinion on occasion. I think I quote him correctly as having said that he does not believe the administration wants a tax reduction bill in 1963. From the way the tax bill is set aside to take testimony on a mental retardation bill, and then is set aside to take testimony on the proposal to allow $309 billion as the debt ceiling until the last day of November, and then to take up something else, rather indicates that the administration is not too deeply concerned, and that there is no overriding urgency to have a tax bill reported by the committee.

Something in the tax field to bring relief might help. Probably bringing some of the troops back from Europe would help. There are a number of actions that could be taken.

Only within the last month, it was necessary to deal anew with the question of continuing the $100 limit on tourist imports from abroad. There is also the problem of the outflow of gold.

Today the international bankers abroad have roughly $25 billion in short-term paper that they can demand in terms of gold or dollars. If that does not put us on crucial ground, frankly I do not know what critical ground really is.

But Congress has a responsibility. The customary practice is to throw a rock at the President, or to say that the Secretary of the Treasury is not equal to his responsibility, or that the agencies handling international affairs are not creditably doing their work. We have perhaps as large a responsibility as those on the other side, if not larger. There is now before the Senate a bill which came from the House. The House changed the 2-year authorization on works in progress to one year, and then included 9 new projects. In the main, I presume they are power projects. One project in Kentucky is rated at 98 percent power and 2 percent recreation. Do Senators mean to tell me that in the face of our international monetary difficulty we are justified in authorizing that amount of money now?

Out of good grace, I hardly dare to refer to the project in Montana, and I shall not do so, except to say that Senators ought to examine all the data that have been adduced with respect to the Knowles Dam project. The distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] undertook to strike out the Burns Creek project, but he received only 20 votes. It is amazing that in the United States Senate, when the country is on such delicate ground with respect to funds, we all want to get our hands in the till.

I do not know that I blame the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF]. For one who faces a re-election campaign—although he does not—it is a wonderful thing to be able to go back home with the bacon. I realize that situation; I have tried that procedure before.

But, Mr. President, once there came out of a cruel mouth something in history that we can remember—when Caesar said, with his dying breath, while he was looking at Brutus, "Et tu, Brute?"

What did Brutus say, in reply? He said, "Not that I love Caesar less, but that I love Rome more."

Mr. President, it is wonderful to have a Missouri River project, an Illinois River project, or a Mississippi River project. It may be said, "Get your hands into the pork barrel if you can." I am willing to do my full share if and when this country has its feet on a sound fiscal track.

But I would be recreant in the performance of my duty if I did not utter a warning now, in view of what happened in Canada and in view of what happened on our own stock exchange—all of which shows how dangerous the present money situation is for our own country. Let me read to the Senate a letter I received from a gentleman I know. I have not seen him for two years; but he manages one of the world's largest empires, and he is in Canada. I shall not even read to the Senate the date of his letter; but first I shall read the letter, and then I shall read the telegram he sent to me.

He wrote to me the following letter:

> DEAR EVERETT: Last week I wired you as per copy attached. I was in quite a panic when I sent the telegram and in more of a panic now as the effect of the announcement has practically stopped trading in Canadian securities and I am afraid the effect on the Canadian economy is going to be quite bad.
>
> I do hope that the 15 percent tax on purchases of Canadian securities by U.S. citizens will be rescinded. Otherwise I see no hope for Canada to rally from the effect of it.

That is the essential part of his letter.

A few days before he wrote the letter, he sent me the following telegram—and I know what he manages, and I know its operations runs into the billions of dollars:

> DEAR EVERETT: The proposed tax of 15 percent on foreign stock purchases if passed by your Congress will make a shambles of the economy of your closest friend, Canada, and could conceivably turn our two countries into banana states. Canadian trade with your country in 1962 was as follows: Imports $4,310 million. Exports, $3,745 million. Of all the money borrowed from Americans by foreign countries in the first 6 months of 1963, 67 percent was Canadian. It seems incongruous that the countries who receive no foreign aid from your Government are the countries who are going to have to pay the foreign aid to such countries as Yugoslavia, Egypt, India, Ghana, Poland and who are in no way affected by this proposed 15-percent tax.

Because it applies to only 22 industrialized countries—

> We have had the sharpest decline in the Canadian stock market in years and today some of our biggest issues such as Bell Telephone are without a bid. If this is approved by Congress it means that practically all government and municipal projects will have to be suspended for lack of funds. Should this happen it will add to already great unemployment a situation that will be intolerable. I urge you please on behalf of both countries to make a thorough study of the consequences of this proposed act.

Can Senators conceive of a situation in which, on an exchange such as the Montreal Stock Exchange or the Toronto Stock Exchange, American Telephone & Telegraph Co. stock did not receive even one bid? If that in itself is not a warning, I do not know what can be done to make the situation impressive.

But we shall continue to make authorizations. How do Senators think we can induce confidence among the skillful financiers all over the world—in Germany, France, Italy, Britain, Japan, Canada, and elsewhere—when they consider the lack of willingness of the Congress to face its responsibility in a critical hour.

Let me state how well we have done in the last 3 years and what a craftsmanlike job we have done to saddle our country with commitments:

For public works acceleration, $900 million.

For 128 new buildings, $1,320 million.

For 29 buildings—construction of the exterior, and so forth—$38 million.

For 103 building authorizations, $223 million.

For pollution control we are committed to the expenditure of $630 million.

For ABC highways, every year, $975 million.

For the Interstate Highway System we are committed to the expenditure of $37 billion.

That list does not include all the other commitments. For example, one in which every Senator should be interested is our commitment to the civil service retirement system, which involves some of the salary received by every Senator. I am approaching the age when I am thinking seriously about the actuarial soundness of the operation of that fund. In my file is the latest report from the civil service retirement fund. Do Senators know how much the Government owes that fund? The Government now owes it $37 billion. All Government employees who have been on the payroll have dutifully paid their share into the fund; they could not avoid doing so, because the money was taken from their pay. But Uncle Sam has not contributed to the fund his share, because the Congress has not voted to have that done. On occasion, under the Eisenhower administration, I tried to have it done; but I was soundly rebuked by the Bureau of the Budget. The head of the Bureau of the Budget said, "What are you trying to do? Are you trying to throw our budget out of gear?" So the Government owes that fund $37 billion.

Mr. President, what proposal is now pending? It is to require the Government to pay one-half of 1 percent more for 22 years, although not to require those on the payroll to increase their contributions. Under this proposal the Government would make an additional contribution, and every agency would carry it in its budget; it is hoped that at the end of the 22 years they would be "even with the board," and finally would reach a position of actuarial soundness—if before that time nothing should crack.

But, Mr. President, who knows? Frankly, I am alarmed about the fiscal situation; and I am confident that the President of the United States is, too. He would not have made this proposal for a tax on foreign securities sold in our markets—with the result that dollars leave our country—if he had not been concerned. That is a rather desperate move; somehow, it disturbs the tranquillity of the markets. In Toronto, in Tokyo, in London, in Montreal, in Rome, in Paris—on every exchange—we see the panic evidences of it.

By means of the letter and the telegram I have read to the Senate, I have shown that one of the great businessmen has said he has noted the panic, and that trading has virtually stopped.

What will the end be? Are we to increase the size of our administrative budget until it is as high as the sky? Are we to continue to add authorization on top of authorization, but not discharge our responsibility?

If the Swiss, German, and French bankers, or any of the adept financiers who virtually have our destiny in their hands, rush our market with their short-term securities, what will we have to do?

The President would have to apply a moratorium. But the day that a moratorium is applied, I say, "Look out for the market, and look out for the economy." We cannot read the market today and see blue chips going sideways in what is supposed to be an expanding market without a sense of alarm. I would that we would take that situation to heart and look at every dollar that is authorized before we make the authorization.

The Senate Committee on Public Works first changed the bill by adding certain new projects and then negating the efforts of the House to tighten up on a surveillance effort. But the projects are there. What was cut out for 1 fiscal year is on a continuing project.

When the Senate got through, the House had put in $784 million of projects. We put in $161 million, and then put in the new projects. They are all there, and are very carefully spelled out. I see Devils Jump project, the Big South Fork, Cumberland River Basin, Ky. Ninety-eight percent of the benefits of that project are attributable to power, and two percent to recreation. That is the report. The Engineers are not concerned about spending money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 10 minutes.

I spent a day at Cape Canaveral. I was the guest of the commanding general. Scientists came and took me here, there, and elsewhere. They told me about the great project that was in the offing. They told me how big it would be. When they indicated in feet the diameter, I began to step off the distance. I said, "I do not believe it. I do not believe that kind of tonnage can go into the air." After I got all the details I asked, "What will it cost?"

He said, "I have not the slightest idea. All we know is that it must be done." There are many things that do not have to be done when the country is on unstable ground so far as its budget is concerned.

It is now proposed to keep the debt at $309 billion until the end of November. This morning I went over the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury. That will not be the end of it. We must not deceive ourselves. Another time will come when we shall be asked to raise the debt ceiling further. How long can we continue to raise the debt ceiling, spend willy-nilly, and still retain the confidence that is so necessary both at home and abroad to avert disaster?

We are not dealing with gold. We are not dealing with water courses. We are not dealing with power projects particularly. We are dealing with the delicate and fragile fabric of our entire monetary system. A President is struggling for expedients to get off the hook, and our cushion is now down to $3.5 billion in gold. If that does not add up to crisis, I do not know what would. As a result, it seems to me that one of the contributions that the Senate could make today is to put aside all personal interest in projects, wherever they may be, return the bill to the committee, and leave it there for a while.

I do not say that all the proposals are bad. I do not say that in some form or other the projects should not at some time be authorized. But I say there is a time to do it and a time not to do it. As the old preacher in Ecclesiastes used to say:

> To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven.

When we do not have the necessary funds, projects ought not to be authorized.

I am always intrigued by the quaint language used in the appropriation bills. I never grow tired of alluding to the language that is used. Almost invariably appropriation bills start with the language—

> There is appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

When we take into account the public debt, there is nothing in the Treasury. I merely utter the warning. I wish to be on record. That is all. The future looks a little uncertain. When we stop to consider that those in the executive branch are struggling for some way out of our gold dilemma, it ought to be our first responsibility to help them. One way to do so is to guard the Treasury and not place undue burdens upon it.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask my colleague from Illinois one or two questions. Can the Senator tell us whether or not any of the proposed nine new projects that were added by the committee are contained in the budget proposed by the President?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I cannot tell the Senator offhand whether they are or not. So far as I know, some of the projects are certainly unbudgeted.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask that question of the Senator in charge of the bill. I would like to know whether or not any of the nine projects added by the committee are contained in the President's budget.

Mr. McNAMARA. Some of the projects have already had approval by the Budget Bureau, but the real consideration of the proposal will be given at the time of the appropriation. Then budget consideration would be much more appropriate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When authorized projects reach the appropriation stage, the Senator from Iowa knows the pressure that is exercised. Whether 10 or 5 percent of the necessary money is appropriated, once the projects are started, they will continue. Thirty years of experience in the Congress indicates to me that once the camel's nose is under the tent, before too long, the beast will be inside.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one last question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. In view of what the Senator from Illinois has said about the $3.5 billion gold cushion, as I believe the Senator referred to it, is he aware of the fact that Members of the House and Senate Joint Economic Committee, which has been meeting on the international balance-of-payments crisis are now being told by some economists that what we ought to do is to remove all of the gold requirements supporting our currency, so that we will not have to meet that problem so soon?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I saw that observation. I believe it came from the distinguished group in the Brookings Institution commissioned by the executive branch to make the study. But I wonder whether, quite aside from the money that is involved, the group ever thought of the psychological impact. That is another thing. By the promises in the market which are honored, men live, move, and business is done. It is not expressed by a dollar sign. It is expressed in terms of faith and confidence. If the proposed action should take place, what will happen? This is still the people's country, and the people will do some reacting of their own.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the distinguished Senator for the most eloquent and closely reasoned defense and advocacy of fiscal responsibility that I have heard on the floor of this body. I am so impressed by the force and clarity of his argument that I am prepared to refer this $610 million bill back to committee, including its $14 million for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Brazos River Basin of my State.

I note further that as a part of the cumulative effect of profligate spending, this proposal would have the effect of further undermining foreign confidence in the American dollar.

I raise the point that there has been an attrition of our gold reserve of $7 billion in the past 10 years, to the extent that those reserves have fallen from $23 billion to $16 billion in that period of time; while currently there are claims of $25 billion against the American dollar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded by the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes from the time on the bill.

Mr. TOWER. I further note that not only the monetary integrity, but also the economic security of the United States, are at stake. In addition, the monetary systems of many free nations are pegged to the monetary system of the United

States. Should our system fall others will also fall. That would be calamitous for the whole free world.

I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Texas for being so forbearing with respect to a project in his own State. That gives me the opportunity to say that I am as selfish as any other Member of the Senate when it comes to getting a little "bacon" for my own State. It is the old story of whether one sees the trees instead of the forest. The forest is the whole country and its solvency at an exceedingly critical period. This obviously calls for sacrifice on the part of everybody, regardless of any political implications which may be involved.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am glad to join the minority leader in the motion to recommit the bill. I point out to the Senate that we will not be recommitting a $600 million or a $700 million bill. If the bill is passed and sent to conference as it is presently written it will be close to a $1½ billion bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And perhaps closer to a $2 billion bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is right. It may be closer to $2 billion. The reason is that the bill came from the House providing a sum of $784 million in new authorizations, and although the Senate committee struck from the $784 million a total of $623 million, it added $448½ million worth of new projects. The result is that if the bill should go to conference, there would be in conference all that the House originally provided and all the new projects that the Senate has added. That would total $1,232,500. Then the amendment which was accepted yesterday struck out the language repealing some prior authorization, and that action added another $300 million.

This will be one of the greatest "backscratching" operations ever when the conferees get together with $1.5 billion in the political kitty to divide.

The bill should be sent back to the committee.

As the Senator from Illinois points out, much has been said about a tax cut. I have said many times that I do not think the administration is sincere in that regard. I think the administration wants to wait and talk about a tax cut in the next presidential election year. That is when the proposal will be before the Senate.

The American citizens will not get a bona fide tax cut as long as it can be financed only by increasing the national debt and borrowing the money.

No government can ever spend itself into prosperity on borrowed money.

I was talking the other day with one of the leading financiers of this country, who had been touring European capitals and talking with financial ministers of most of those countries. He said that the question he was asked most as he toured those capitals was not "Will the United States devalue its dollar?" but "When?"

Unless we can establish some degree of fiscal responsibility into our expenditures during this Congress there is a grave danger that in a very short time we shall be forced to devalue the American dollar. If that were done it would further pauperize the aged in this country. Those who have to live on a fixed retirement income suffer the most under inflation.

Such action would not hurt those who have investments in real estate, oil wells, or fixed assets of this country, because it is immaterial whether a man has $1 million worth of fixed assets or whether those same assets are valued at $2 million; he still owns "X percent" of America. But those who are living on fixed incomes, on retirement income, on social security, on life insurance, or on the savings bonds which they have been buying will have their life savings taken away if the dollar is devalued.

Under the planned deficit spending program of the New Frontier and the deficits of the preceding administrations we have been pauperizing those same elderly people for whom we see so many crocodile tears shed by the same group.

I hope the Senate will take a constructive step and send this billion-and-a-half porkbarrel back to the committee. At least, if we are to pass a bill, let us vote on a bill which will tell the American people the truth as to what is in it. Let us not make a great display of virtue and say, "We have cut the House bill from $784 million to $609 million," when in reality we have not done anything of the kind. In fact, what has been proposed is to put a $1½ billion bill into conference.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct. I thank the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

While it is in my mind, Mr. President, since I know the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] is in the Chamber, I remember when the Senator took the floor with respect to a project now in the bill, Trotters Shoals on the Savannah River. My information is that if that project were consummated it would flood out 22,000 acres, including 8 major industrial sites, and remove the land from the tax rolls. The project would prevent the construction of a $40 million paper manufacturing plant, and would flood out the timber lands for the factory. It would flood out the site of a proposed $210 million steam power plant. It would cost, under the estimates submitted, about $78 million.

I earnestly hope that my distinguished friend from South Carolina will join forces with us to send the bill back to the committee, where it belongs, in the light of the fiscal situation which confronts our country.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator has made a convincing argument. I shall be pleased to join him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] from the time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished minority leader. I shall support the motion to recommit the bill.

I endorse what the minority leader has said about the fiscal peril to this Republic and the need to hold down spending. I speak as an individual Senator in whose State there are under construction at this time certain water conservation projects; and as an individual Senator who will be asking for more.

But I am in favor of an absolute pay-as-you-go system for this Government. I have a constitutional amendment along that line to propose.

Furthermore, I am ready to support a proposal that will call a halt to all public works, highways, area redevelopment, urban renewal, reclamation, flood control, and everything else, applied to all 50 States, until the budget is balanced. I believe that worthy projects not only are good, but that they are worth paying for now.

I shall support the motion to recommit. It seems to me that the needs of our time would be better met by having the committee report to the Senate the bill as passed by the House.

I wish to speak particularly about the Aspinall amendment. Representative ASPINALL added this language in reference to the Missouri River Basin:

> That no part of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this section shall be available to initiate construction of any unit of the Missouri River Basin project, whether included in said comprehensive plan or not, which is not hereafter authorized by act of Congress.

I think that is orderly procedure. The State of Nebraska is the only State that lies wholly within the Missouri River Basin. The Flood Control Act of 1944 will soon be 20 years old. The junior Senator from Nebraska offered the resolution that led to the investigation which resulted in the joint Army Engineers-Bureau of Reclamation plan. But for a number of years there has been a practical rule of carrying out what Representative ASPINALL has had written into the bill.

These authorizations are many years old. Local conditions change. Costs change. So it has been the practice to seek reauthorizations under this resolution. Last year the Senate passed reauthorizations of the Mid-State project, the Farewell project, the Ainsworth project, and so forth.

In other words, project by project, Congress has taken a look at such projects, even though it might act as a slowing process, and even though that process might be against the views of some persons from the State which I have the honor in part to represent. My feeling is that an orderly process in a program, in the control of the Congress, is in the long run in the interest of sound conservation. After all, we want to conserve our soil, water, and natural resources, including the credit of the United States, and the integrity of our dollar. One cannot be a conservationist only in part, and at the same time desire to waste a part of that system.

While I should feel no great alarm if this language were taken out of the bill, I feel that Representative ASPINALL has acted for the best interests of irrigationists and conservationists, in the long run. I hope the conferees will retain his language.

It is entirely possible that some additional authorization is necessary. I think the Senate bill, in its present form, goes too far, in view of the fact that there is no money in the till. I would like to see our spending held down each and every year to a total amount equal to our revenue. I think it could be done and we could still have the necessary and essential developments in our country taken care of.

However, because I believe the language of the Senate bill, in the amount authorized, is a bit excessive, and because I feel that we are doing this without proper regard for the fiscal consequences, I shall support the motion of the minority leader to recommit the bill.

I am sure the committee, in taking a look at the bill, will still have an opportunity to meet the urgent needs.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield five minutes on the bill to the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have pondered what course I should follow with respect to this motion or bill. Within the bill are encompassed several Ohio projects, and, from that standpoint, I would like very much to give my support to the recommendations made by the Senate committee. On the contrary, I would be untrue to the citizens of Ohio unless I stated that, in my opinion, except for the maintenance of adequate defenses, we have no graver responsibility in the U.S. Congress than to prevent the wild plunging movement toward a fiscal situation that might eventually drive us to the devaluation of the dollar.

The first grave sign of the problem appeared, I believe, in 1961, when, to my great amazement, I read the announcement that a pool of $6 billion was created primarily for the purpose of saving the United States and the United Kingdom in the monetary problem that confronted those nations. My recollection is that we posted 33 percent of the funds. We then were already in the "hole." Since that time we have been digging the hole deeper and deeper, making it ultimately more difficult to extricate ourselves from it.

Within the past several days Mr. McChesney Martin made a statement to the House in which he said:

> I hope and pray the time won't come when we would have to devalue the dollar. It would not be the end of the world, but it would take years to recover.

Within the past 3 months Mr. Schweitzer, the new President of the World Bank, made the statement that when an individual is suffering physically from an ailment, he takes remedies to cure the ailment. He goes on a diet, perhaps. The classical way to fight what is fiscally happening in our country is to go on a diet. But that we refuse to do.

Per Jacobsson, the former, and now deceased, President of the World Bank, cautioned, a year ago, about the need for the U.S. Government to do something concerning its yearly imbalances in the dollar exchange; namely, what we owe to other countries in relation to what they owe to us.

What have we done? By word and deed alike, since 1961, we in the Congress and those in the administration have lulled the poor citizen into the belief that all is well. How many of us in the Congress have warned the people about what lies ahead? Very few. When someone has had the courage to speak up, he has been looked upon with disdain by those who proclaim that all is well and who seem to have no worries about deficit operations.

We have asked our foreign creditors not to ask for payment of their debts in gold. We are borrowing from ourselves. Three years ago we said we would increase world trade; that we would sell more goods in the world. Instead, we have allowed prices to go up and have made our position worse. We said we would have foreign tourists visit our country. Our tourists are going into foreign countries and spending money there, but foreign tourists are not coming into the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask that I may be permitted to proceed for 3 more minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr, President, yesterday, what was foreseen happened. A study group employed by the Joint Economic Committee recommended that the 25 percent support on the Federal Reserve notes which are being issued be removed. About 2 weeks ago I raised the question: If we do not have a 25 percent gold support, what have we? We have the ever changing judgments of politicians in high public office and in Congress ordering the printing of money interminably, solely for the purpose of creating artificial prosperity.

The witch doctors are at hand. They are at the doors of the Federal buildings. They are at the doors of the United States Senate and of the House of Representatives. They say they will bring us the elixir of some new fangled remedy to cure the problem that is worrying everybody who has any knowledge of it.

There are classic remedies, and they are the only remedies. As the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], has said, the bill does not involve $610 million; it involves $1.2 billion.

Classic remedies must be adopted. Unless they are adopted trouble will come. Among other things deficit operations must be stopped.

In conclusion, I observe that in the gallery are reporters from certain Ohio newspapers.

If they want to do me a favor, I ask them to tell their readers in Ohio that in my judgment calamity lies ahead; that they should tell them to waken to the distress being created by extravagant and imprudent and careless spending by the Congress.

Unless they learn and unless they protest, they will suffer greatly in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on the motion to recommit, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have been listening with a great deal of interest to the breastbeating which has been going on in this Chamber this afternoon. I have heard one Member of the Senate after another state that he is willing to give up a project in his State or in his area. I have heard the expression "backscratching" used. I have heard the expression "hand in the till." I have heard about the gold outflow. I have heard the word "panic" used. I have heard the allegation of a Swiss banker that there would be a devaluation of the U.S. dollar.

I do not know what all this has to do with the proposed legislation now being considered by the Senate. I do not know, for example, nor do I think, that the Cape Fear River Basin project is located in some faraway country like Ghana. The Savannah River Basin is not located in Timbuctu. The central and southern Florida project is not located in Afghanistan. The Appalachicola River Basin is not in some part of south-central Asia. The Brazos River Basin is not located overseas. The Arkansas River Basin is not located in Europe or Australia, or Australasia; nor is the White River Basin, the Red River Basin, the Missouri River Basin, the Ohio River Basin, the Columbia River Basin, or the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin.

These projects are all located within the continental confines of the United States. They are all fully repayable. They represent an investment in our own country, for the benefit of our own people. I would hope that we would keep this in mind when we speak of authorizations affecting the welfare and the best interests of Americans.

What is wrong with investing American money to make this country a better place in which to live? Certainly it is far better to put the money into the United States, than it is to put money into many foreign lands, which is what we have been doing year after year.

Furthermore, any investments under this authorization bill are, I repeat, fully repayable, with interest, to the United States. It is about time for us to begin to look after our own. It is about time, instead of finding fault and raising specious arguments, to recognize that we have underdeveloped areas in this country. There is nothing wrong about investing in America, its people, and its future.

I hope, therefore, that the motion to recommit will be defeated and that the bill will be passed.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I take this opportunity to say that the statement by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is one of the finest I have heard during the time I have been privileged to be a Member of Congress. He spoke eloquently on the subject of fiscal integrity, which we are supposed to practice in Congress. I believe that his suggestion ought to be followed. I propose to vote in favor of the motion to recommit the bill.

For the benefit of my esteemed colleague the majority leader, I point out that, while I appreciate his lesson in geography, in my statement yesterday I pointed out that Devils Jump is in Kentucky, that the Knowles Dam is on the Flathead River in Montana, that the Burns Creek development is on the Snake River in Idaho.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that I, too, subscribe to the policy of investing in America and improving our country.

I agree, further, that we ought to do more things at home before we do more things overseas.

However, that is not the point that was made by the minority leader; nor is it the point that I wish to make. The point is that there is a time for everything. If there is not a time, what is there to prevent us from authorizing twice, 3 times, or 10 times, the number of projects in the bill, and to justify doing so on the basis that we are investing in America?

But that is not the point. The point is with respect to the time. The time is very important because, as has been said, we are facing some crises. The situation must be serious when the President, the leader of the Democratic Party, has to take the courageous step of calling for an increase in the interest rate on our short-term obligations, a step which is in the face of the longstanding policy of his party. The President certainly did not want to do that; but he felt that it was in the best interests of our country that he do so. I believe that he was right in doing so.

Our Nation is facing a critical situation. We ought to do something about the reasons for the crisis. One reason for the crisis is that a majority of the Members of Congress do not have the political and moral courage, to use the statement or phrase of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], to practice fiscal integrity with the hard-earned money of the people. We do not have the political and moral courage to say, "No, we will not spend more money than we receive." What is the result? The dollar depreciates in value. Persons in high places may say that it is not planned to devalue the dollar. That is praiseworthy, but they do not have anything to say about the international money market. It is in the international money market that the dollar will be devalued, and those who say it will not be devalued cannot prevent it from being devalued, unless Members of Congress see to it that fiscal integrity is practiced.

It ought to be pointed out that during 1961 the people of the United States felt inflation to the tune of $7 billion. During 1962, it was another $7 billion.

During the first 6 months of this year, according to Economic Indicators, published by the President's Council of Economic Advisers, the inflation was $4.8 billion. If this rate continues, the amount of inflation for this year will be $9.6 billion.

What does that mean? It makes no difference how purchasing power is taken away from the people, whether by taxation or by inflation; the result is the same.

I said on the floor of the Senate not long ago that the people of my State of Iowa suffered from inflation to the tune of about $90 million a year during 1961 and 1962. That is the same as placing a 2½-percent sales tax on their backs during each of those 2 years. That is what it means. The only trouble is that most of the people have not yet realized what has hit them. That is what has happened to the people of Iowa.

Because of the authorization of multimillion-dollar projects, many of which are not requested by the President, we are reaching a day of reckoning. There is a time for some of these projects, but the time is not now. That is why the bill should be recommitted.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to respond to some statements made by those favoring the motion to recommit. I oppose the motion. I am a member of the Committee on Public Works, and since the death of our lamented friend, Francis Case, I have been the ranking Republican member of that committee.

I respect the views that have been stated by Senators; but unwittingly, perhaps, they may have left an impression about the bill which I say is not a correct impression.

I served on the Public Works Committee throughout the hearings last year. The hearings lasted a month and a half. Every member of the committee who wanted to object to the projects was given the opportunity to do so. Executive hearings were held. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Public Works, but with minority views in opposition to one project—and one only—the Knowles Dam project. There was extensive debate on the floor of the Senate. Only one Member of the Senate offered an amendment to strike any project from it. That was the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs]. I respect his opinion, and the courage of his position when he stood on the floor last year and moved to strike two projects from the bill. His motion was defeated by a voice vote.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] offered an amendment to add Trotters Shoals to the bill. That is one of the projects which is being attacked today. There was not a voice in opposition to that amendment, except that of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond]. The amendment passed by a voice vote, and then the bill passed by a voice vote with no audible dissent.

The statement has been made that the bill is a subterfuge in its reduction of the authorization for river basins. This is not correct. The House authorized $784 million for 11 river basins—for projects which are under construction or are to be under construction in 1964 and 1965. The Corps of Engineers advised that only $161 million was needed for fiscal 1964. There will be an omnibus bill next year, when additional authorizations can be made to continue those projects.

Our action can contribute to savings this year and in the budget. It will be a saving, because money for these projects will have to be appropriated. The reduced authorization means that in this year, instead of appropriating up to $784 million, the Committee on Appropriations can only appropriate up to $161 million. So there is a saving in money. The additional projects that have been added by the Public Works Committee do not call for any appropriations.

I admit, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] said, that the authorizations make the projects eligible for appropriations; and perhaps at some time in the future appropriations will be made for them. But not a dollar is added this year to any appropriations. That fact ought to be known and understood.

Seven of the projects to which objection is made were in the bill passed by the Senate last year. As I said a moment ago, with the exception of the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs] and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond], no Senator opposed a single one of these projects at the time the bill was passed last year.

I should like to see something done about public works bills. I should like to see new legislation proposed which would enable the Corps of Engineers to advise Congress about the priority which should be given projects in river basins. We do not have that information and we have not had it in the past.

Since this bill includes an authorization for a project in my State, I have to be charged with whatever interest I may have in the bill because of that authorization. However, I am pointing out the facts.

A few moments ago it was said that we must show courage; but I point out that last year the authorization bill was literally loaded down with authorization projects all over the country. That was a time to show courage. I do not seek to embarrass Senators who have spoken, but I advise them to read last year's bill and see whether it includes projects in their States. Last year no voice except that of Senator Boggs and Senator Thurmond was raised against the bill which contained dozens of projects in many States. But this year, a cry is raised against seven projects.

The bill must be placed in proper perspective. It has not been placed in proper perspective by the speeches which have been made. I owe it to the facts and to the work of our committee to make this statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Nelson in the chair). The time yielded to the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the

House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3872) to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes; asked a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PATMAN, Mr. RAINS, Mr. MULTER, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. KILBURN, Mr. WIDNALL, and Mr. HARVEY of Michigan were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT EXTENSION

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the majority leader has requested that I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives in regard to House bill 3872.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3872) to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes, and requesting a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McNAMARA. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a further conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CLARK, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. McINTYRE, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. JAVITS conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASIN PLANS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6016) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes on the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, this afternoon Senators have heard again, as they heard last year, and as they have heard on other occasions—and understandably so—from certain quarters that these public works projects are pork barrel in nature.

Mr. President, perhaps it is timely to state in essence what I said in 1962—namely, that these projects, instead of being labeled "pork barrel" are actually projects in the national interest and for the public welfare.

Last year our bill included several developments for the State of West Virginia—flood control projects which, on merit, were proven to be acutely needed in the areas of the State where there has been erosion soil of the hills, where there have been devastating floods in the valleys, where there has been considerable loss of life, where financial losses have recurred, where homes and businesses have been destroyed and where there have been a climate and an atmosphere conducive to the construction of a strong economic base which would lend itself, not only to manufacturing, but also to increased productivity and the well being of our people, who are eager to utilize and learn new skills in a changing period in our history.

In the Ohio River Basin we are requesting that the additional monetary authorization for fiscal 1964 of $47 million will be used in part on projects in West Virginia as follows: Beach Fork Reservoir, Summersville Reservoir, and the East Lynn Reservoir.

Mr. President, I believe it is well for us to consider this afternoon what the Chief Executive of this Republic has stressed in connection with certain expenditures.

The President of the United States said:

> I do not know why it is that expenditures which deal with problems that are so much with us—

And, Mr. President, I interpose to say very frankly that these problems are very real with those of us in West Virginia and these challenges are with those in most of the other States.

President Kennedy continued:

> in the 1960's, why they are always regarded as the waste—I repeat, the waste—in the budget—

And then he concluded:

> and that the expenditures for defense are always regarded as the untouchable items of the budget.

Mr. President, I do not detract from the defense effort or from the space effort or from the national security effort when I counsel with you, my colleagues, that the strength of our country and the well being of our people cannot rely solely on Minuteman missiles or Polaris submarines. The security of the United States of America ultimately depends on the strength of its people, the well being of its children, conservation of natural resources and the development and the forward movement of projects intended to strengthen our economic base and to give the men and women of America opportunities to prosper.

So, Mr. President, once again I repeat that we must not be deterred from our duty by the claim that this measure is filled with waste or that it is pork barrel legislation. The opposite is true. These projects are investments. They contribute to progress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I see no point in recommitting the bill.

Some statements have been made about the amounts of money involved. However, no amount of money is actually involved in this bill, for it is an authorization bill; and the appropriations will have to come later.

The bill includes approximately $609 million of authorizations; and some of these projects extend over a long period of years.

Today, dire things have been charged in connection with the bill. Perhaps the committee should be flattered, for when we brought this measure before the Senate, we did not realize that this was so world shaking a bill.

However, I point out that the projects involved have already been considered, debated, and approved by the Senate.

Therefore, I hope the motion to recommit will be rejected.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of the time available to me on the motion to recommit, if other Senators have concluded their remarks on this subject.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the very forthright Senator from Michigan yield for an inquiry?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am glad to yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is it not true that projects included in the pending bill were given the most careful scrutiny; testimony and was adduced from literally hundreds of witnesses; the hearings consumed, not days, but weeks on weeks. Last year the Public Works Committee brought the authorization bill before the Senate as a result of intensive study; and now our committee again brings the additional authorization bill into this forum as a result of work well done. Is that true?

Mr. McNAMARA. Yes, it is true. The Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], a member of the committee, made that quite plain earlier during the debate. You have underscored the facts. It is helpful to stress the job we have done.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me on the motion to recommit.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 3 minutes on the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I heard what the distinguished majority leader had to say about the fact that this is an authorization bill which applies within the confines of our own country, and that the bill does not relate to expenditures abroad. I understand that fully; and it gives point, I believe, to the fact that the foreign aid domain is another place where we can seek to cut expenditures. I hope that when the foreign aid authorization bill comes to this floor, it will be sharply cut; and I propose in my own time to offer some amendments of my own, because I think there, too, we can bolster some confidence in our fiscal willingness to face the monetary picture.

There has been no chicanery about this bill, Mr. President. The point is that new projects have been included. The Senate committee voted to take out all of them except $161 million worth. That left in the bill the items for certain authorized projects. We cannot quarrel about them, for they are in a continuing stage. One does not have to be an engineer to know that. But then came the new projects; and the vote on them will be the important one.

I have said a dozen times on this floor that the 1964 budget includes $9 billion worth of new functions. If we were in better fiscal condition no one would quarrel about it. But we are rapidly approaching a situation in which some heed must be paid. We must cooperate and accept our share of the responsibility in keeping our country on an even keel when the solvency of the country is involved.

One further point. I know how easy it is to say that no money is involved. Certainly not. Anyone who has the slightest familiarity with legislative techniques and the rules of this body knows that an authorization carries no money. An authorization is a veritable contract unless it is rescinded. The only time I have ever seen an authorization rescinded was after the war was over. We then reached in and took back an authorization. Where there were balances of appropriations, we put them back into the Treasury.

So Senators should not be misled by the fact that the bill would not cost anything at the moment. It is like the end of the dinner at the Waldorf. When the check comes, that is the bad news. After a sumptuous dinner the waiter expects the diner to lay it on the line. I have never yet seen anything like the present situation when we did not finally have to lay it on the line. Because we have ignored that principle, today we have an administrative budget which is within hugging distance of $100 billion a year. That is the cash budget. If we add the trust accounts, we start talking in terms of $137 billion.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. I yield myself another minute.

Students of history may correct me, but I believe that back in 1914, when someone said to Speaker Reed that we had reached a budget of $1 billion, he replied, "It is a $1 billion country."

Our country may be a $100 billion country, cashwise, so far as our budget is concerned. But whether it is a $1 billion or $100 billion country, the question is, "Can we pay the bill without the amazing fallout that goes with it?" We talk about fallout in connection with nuclear weapons. There is another type of fallout. That is the fallout in the form of damage to confidence here and abroad, and in the willingness of our country to face its fiscal problems.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with my remarks there be printed in the RECORD a brief analysis of every one of the new projects involved.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On June 24 the House passed H.R. 6016 to authorize additional appropriations for prosecution of projects on certain river basins for hydroelectric power, flood control, navigation, and other purposes. The appropriations involved previously authorized projects and covered 2 years—1964 and 1965. The House also amended H.R. 6016 by adding to it the text of H.R. 5312, a bill to authorize additional appropriations for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin. H.R. 5312 also contains the proviso that no part of the funds authorized to be appropriated shall be available to initiate construction of any unit in the Missouri River Basin which is not hereafter authorized or reauthorized. The House Interior Committee report on this bill (H. Rept. No. 304) stated that this proviso was necessary to give Congress proper surveillance and control over further development in the Missouri River Basin.

The Senate Public Works Committee changed H.R. 6016 in some significant respects. First, it added to it projects which have not been authorized, in effect, negating the effort on the part of the House to tighten up congressional control even in the case of authorized projects; and even though the Senate bill allegedly reduces money appropriations, it actually is committing the Nation to expenditures far in excess of those contemplated in the House bill.

The Senate bill achieves its alleged reduction in expenditures by cutting the appropriations for the various river basins to 1 year. This, however, will only result in delaying previously authorized projects and hampering the planning and work of the Corps of Engineers. Below is a comparison of the amounts the House approved for 2 years and the amount the Senate is allowing for only 1 year:

[In thousands]

	House	Senate
Arkansas	$157,000	$31,000
Brazos	30,000	14,000
Central and southern Florida	21,000	4,000
Columbia	195,000	36,000
Los Angeles-San Gabriel	30,000	12,000
Missouri	80,000	0
Ohio	150,000	47,000
Upper Mississippi	11,000	0
West Branch Susquehanna	2,000	0
White (Missouri and Arkansas)	8,000	1,000
Missouri (Department of Interior)	100,000	16,000
Total	784,000	161,000

In addition, the Senate committee added 9 new projects to the bill and changed existing legislative language with respect to a 10th project which opens the door for its construction.

The nine new projects added by the Senate involve a total ultimate expenditure of at least $747,937,000, although the Senate bill calls for appropriations of only $448,547,000.

Considering the incomplete appropriations requested by the Senate for the projects which it has added, together with the reduced appropriations proposed for the previously authorized river basin projects, the Senate bill, therefore, is asking for appropriations of only $609,547,000, whereas it is actually committing the Nation to expenditures of at least $908,937,000 not including additional amounts required to complete projects in these basins that will be underway in 1964. Actually, total ultimate expenditures will be well over $2 billion.

Most of the new projects added by the Senate have been shown to be of questionable economic justification, producing costly, unnecessary low-load factor electric power which is detrimental to the future of the coal industry and its employees. Most of them were removed for these reasons last year from the rivers and harbors and flood control bill.

New uneconomic, unnecessary power projects added by the Senate:

Devils Jumps project, Big South Fork, Cumberland River, Ky.: (Appropriation proposed by Senate, $151 million). Ninety-eight percent of the benefits of this project are attributable to power and 2 percent to recreation. The Corps of Engineers studies also show that this project would provide only 10 percent load factor power. During hearings this year before the House Public Works Subcommittee, the Southeastern Power Administrator testified that power from Devils Jumps could be marketed in Indiana, Kentucky, parts of Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania and in the TVA area, all areas which are now adequately supplied with far less costly power than would be produced at this project. Taking the corps' computations, which include no allowance for taxes foregone or Federal subsidization of interest rates, power can be produced in conventional coal burning steam plants at less than one-half the cost of power at the proposed hydroelectric development. The proposal is to construct this unnecessary, uneconomical hydroelectric development in the heart of a presently depressed coal area.

Knowles, Flathead River, Mont.: (Appropriation proposed by Senate committee: $50 million. However, total project cost is $258 million). This would be a 256,000-kilowatt hydroelectric project constructed by the Corps of Engineers. If constructed, it would flood out Indian lands, part of a bison range, wildlife refuges, several thousand acres of irrigated farmlands, and railroad tracks whose relocation would involve over $100 million. In addition to being a highly uneconomic power project, it is unnecessary because, by the Department of Interior's own admission, there is a surplus of power in the area until at least 1973.

Burns Creek, Snake River, Idaho: (Appropriation proposed by Senate committee, $52 million). This is purely a power project with 90,000-kilowatt capacity. It has been before Congress for several years. In 1962, the House Committe on Interior and Insular Affairs refused to report it out and the project subsequently was included by the Senate in the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill which brought the project before a different committee, the Public Works Committee. In an attempt to justify the project economically, it would be tied to the Palisades project, thereby extending the payout period of Palisades. Standing alone, Burns Creek is shown as not economically feasible and, among other things, falling more than $300,000 annually short of even meeting interest payments. This project has been turned down by the Congress several times because it would interfere with the orderly development of the coal resources of Wyoming and Utah, which development is now taking place.

Trotters Shoals, Savannah River, Ga., S.C.: (Appropriation proposed by Senate, $78,700,000). Trotters Shoals would flood out an estimated 22,000 acres of land, including eight major industrial sites, removing this land from the tax rolls. The project would prevent construction of a $40 million paper manufacturing plant and flood out the timber lands for this factory. It would also flood out the site of a proposed $210 million steam powerplant by Duke Power Co. Consequently, this project would eliminate substantial employment opportunities.

Laurel River, Ky.: Although there is no appropriation proposed by the Senate committee for this project, the committee has made a language change in the original authorization of this project which now opens the way for its construction, involving a cost of $23 million. The Laurel project was authorized in 1960 with the proviso that construction should not be commenced until the agency designated to market power had entered into an agreement which would insure that the power would be sold at rates sufficient to repay with interest within 50 years all costs allocated to power. The Senate has now amended this language to permit the initiation of construction when the power marketing agency informs the Corps of Engineers that the power generated can be sold at rates which insure repayment within 50 years.

Flint River, Ga.: (Appropriations proposed by Senate, $63,200,000 but the ultimate cost is $154,590,000). This would be a navigation, flood control, and power project, with the major benefits attributable to power. However, the power features of the project are of questionable economic justification.

Other projects added by the Senate:

Cape Fear River Basin, N.C.: (Appropriation proposed by Senate, $25,143,000). This would be a large-dam project for flood control, but it has been opposed by conservation groups and residents in the area who maintain the objective can be better attained by small projects for watershed protection. A joint study of the Corps of Engineers and the Department of Agriculture has supported the small project rather than the big-dam approach.

Arkansas River Basin-Dardanelle lock and dam: (Appropriation proposed by Senate, $404,000). This project is already under construction and the sum proposed here was originally the part of the cost of the project that was to be borne by local interests. This action of the Senate committee transfers the cost to the Federal Government.

Waurika Dam and Reservoir, Okla.: (Appropriation proposed by Senate, $25,100,000). This is primarily a flood control and water supply project.

Missouri River Basin—bank stabilization: (Appropriation proposed by Senate; $3,000,000).

No financial feasibility studies have been presented for any of the projects which would be authorized by H.R. 6016 as amended by the Senate Public Works Committee. Between projects there is no uniformity used in the standards to determine benefit-cost ratios. In some cases, such as Cape Fear and Knowles, it is specifically noted that the economic justification was determined on the basis of a 100-year period of analysis.

This is a departure from the traditional maximum period of 50 years of analysis normally used to determine the merits of a public investment. Government bonds currently sold to furnish money for these projects are commanding interest in the neighborhood of 4 percent, yet all these projects are evaluated at under 3 percent. Furthermore, the varying and devious methods used in estimating benefits, in computing costs particularly with respect to relocation, land acquisition, interest rates, and periods of amortization, in allocating costs, and in ignoring objections raised by those the projects would hurt, not only demonstrate the absence of any really effective standards, but raise questions as to whether those that do exist are so designed and adopted to make it possible to present any proposal in a favorable light.

The Bureau of the Budget's comments on the Devils Jumps project, in pointing out that its costs should be reallocated when evaluation standards are adopted, emphasize this vacuum that exists. How can anyone tell whether power revenues, which have obvious ceilings, would be adequate to cover costs when no one knows what power costs are going to be? The record which has been established with respect to H.R. 6016 and its predecessor bills covering some of these same projects in the 87th and earlier Congresses should be sufficient evidence even to the most callous mind as to the need for the Congress to clearly set forth criteria and standards which must be met before projects are presented for authorization for construction by the Federal Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes, and yield the time to the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, as Senators vote on the bill they should remember that it is not a $609 million bill as was stated by the Senator in charge of the bill. On the contrary, should the bill go to conference as presently written it will represent approximately $1.5 billion of new authority—$784 million was included in the bill by the House. The Senate tentatively reduced that amount by $623 million, but the Senate added another $448 million in new projects, which means that all those items totaling $1,232 million will be in conference. In addition, the amendment adopted yesterday would restore another $250 to $300 million.

In order that the people of our country may see just how liberal the Senate is and how far we have drifted from the sound economic philosophy of our ancestors, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement made by the founder of the Democratic Party, Thomas Jefferson. People may then note how far the free-wheeling spenders on the New Frontier have drifted from the sound advice of the founder of the Democratic Party.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Wisdom of Thomas Jefferson

I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and our comforts, in our labors and our amusements. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they must become happy.

Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am prepared to vote. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to recommit the bill. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] is absent because of illness in his family.

I further announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a live pair with the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd]. The senior Senator from Virginia is absent because of illness in his family. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. LAUSCHE (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 64, as follows:

[No. 120 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Allott
Beall
Bennett
Boggs
Case
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Javits
Keating
Mechem
Miller
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Robertson
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NAYS—64

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—11

Bayh
Byrd, Va.
Dominick
Edmondson
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Lausche
Magnuson
Mansfield
Morse

So Mr. Dirksen's motion to recommit was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 6016) was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. DIRKSEN obtained the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). How much time does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, while Senators are in the Chamber in goodly numbers I should like to make inquiry of the distinguished majority leader concerning the schedule for tomorrow, and for the remainder of the week; and, insofar as he knows, for the early part of next week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the query raised by the distinguished minority leader I should like to point out that at this time there are exactly 11 measures on the calendar, including the bill under consideration. Of those 11 measures, 8 cannot be brought up at this time, for various reasons, into which I need not go.

Following disposal of the pending business, H.R. 6016, it is the intent of the leadership to have the Senate consider Calendar No. 354, S. 1642, a bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, to extend disclosure requirements to the issuers of additional publicly traded securities, to provide for improved qualification and disciplinary procedures for registered brokers and dealers, and for other purposes.

Following that, it is the intent of the leadership to have the Senate consider tomorrow Calendar No. 347, S. 1703, a bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, the so-called bracero bill.

It is hoped that later this week the Senate will find time to consider the domestic Peace Corps measure, which has been ordered to be reported from the Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

It is anticipated that some time early next week, the military pay raise bill will be before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASIN PLANS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6016) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has the minority leader any time left under the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader has 17 minutes remaining under the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

THE URGENT NEED FOR AGRICULTURAL LEGISLATION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, while Senators are discussing legislation dealing with the general subject of the utilization of our natural resources, it seems to me highly appropriate to call to the attention of the Congress and the country some of the things which are happening to one of our basic natural resources, namely, agriculture. I was impelled to do so as a result of picking up a copy of the Argus-Leader, the foremost daily newspaper published in the great farm State of South Dakota, the issue of July 26, 1963, which carries the headline "Farm Income Below Year Ago," and contains an interesting wire service résumé," out of Washington, D.C., concerning the agricultural income of this country, which has dropped 3 percent from a like period a year ago, a drop of about $400 million—almost half a billion dollars less being received by the farmers of America than was true 1 year ago.

One paragraph of this article reads:

> The report said farmers had taken in more this year than last. But production costs had more than offset the increase in gross returns.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that in certain wide areas of agricultural endeavor, nothing whatsoever has been done by this Congress to meet the urgent and challenging circumstances which confront our farmers today. We have, for example, the situation which our southern friends complain of; namely, the production of cotton and its sale at a reasonable price.

I am sure Senators are also aware of the fact that the dairy industry is generally in distress.

A third area of urgency deals with the great wheat acreages of the United States, which now find themselves virtually without a wheat program of any kind. Several valid proposals have been introduced on meeting the disastrous prospects confronting next year's wheat producers and one or the other of these proposals should be enacted into law. Some areas of the country will soon be planting next year's wheat crop. It seems to me that in this period of easy-going legislative procedures one way in which the Congress might well spend its time profitably would be to meet the challenges which exist in the field of agriculture today. I believe it would be perfectly possible, for example, for farm legislation to be enacted promptly on the Senate floor, inasmuch as the cotton producers have a pretty clear-cut agreement as to what they would like to have. We could quickly agree on a wheat program, at least on an emergency basis which would carry us over next year's menacing problems which will confront us if nothing is done and by a little cooperation between those concerned about cotton and those concerned about wheat we should be able to pass legislation of real benefit to both products. Further delay works a serious economic handicap on both groups.

I point out that in this area of agriculture, by merely bringing farm income up to somewhere near what it deserves to be, we have the opportunity to regenerate the entire American economy, which will enable us to collect additional taxes to pay the high bills which confront us.

It is a pretty well established mathematical formula that our total national income averages, year after year, about seven times the total income which comes from our natural resources, the most important and prominent of which is farm income. Instead of losing nearly half a billion dollars in the past 12 months for our farmers, if we could have increased their income by half a billion dollars we would be enjoying a pretty comfortable situation from the standpoint of national income available for taxation.

In order to particularize this situation, I quote briefly from a recent newsletter which I sent to the people of South Dakota, the entire statement on agriculture from which I shall put into the RECORD:

> Where does the American farmer stand today?—

I asked in my newsletter—

> Latest Government statistics show: The parity ratio between the farmer's production costs and what he gets for his production has fallen to 77 percent, the lowest point since the depression of 1939.

Throughout my service in Congress I have been repeatedly told by officials of the Department of Agriculture that parity is a realistic index by which the economic status of the farmer is measured.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on behalf of the minority leader, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

This is a pretty serious statistic when we stop to consider that the parity index is today the lowest it has been since the depression year of 1939. This surely is a far cry from what Mr. Kennedy promised the farmers during his 1960 campaign.

I suggest that the time has come when the Secretary of Agriculture might well return from Russia and look at the agricultural problems of America, instead of trying to analyze and improve conditions which may prevail in the U.S.S.R.

I read further from my newsletter:

> The price index for farm products (what the farmer receives) has dropped to 241 from its 242 standing a little over 2 years ago. However, the farmer's cost index (what the farmer pays) has risen during the same period from 301 to the highest point in history, 311. In 1960 the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar was 39 cents. Today it is only 37 cents. Since the present administration took office, there has been a continuing drop in the number of farms, some 369,000 less today than nearly 3 years ago, and a correspondingly higher drop in the number of farmers. Falling farm prices, the reduction in farm population (but an increase in USDA employee rolls), and uncertainties in administration and in farm programs, present an unhappy situation of "decline and confusion" confronting American agriculture—a situation which holds no promise of improvement under present conditions in which "positive action" is most conspicuous by its absence.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the article to which I referred from the Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Argus-Leader of July 26, 1963, and the full text of that portion of my newsletter for July 30 dealing with farm problems under the head of "Cost-Price Squeeze Tightens."

There being no objection, the article and excerpt were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader, July 26, 1963]

FARM INCOME BELOW YEAR AGO—BEET PAYMENTS MADE IN SOUTH DAKOTA—3 PERCENT DROP NOTED BY AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

WASHINGTON.—The Agriculture Department reported that farm income is running 3 percent below a year ago.

A farm income situation report said the aggregate net farm income realized from farming in the first half of 1963 was at the annual rate of $12.3 billion, down about 3 percent from the like period last year. Net farm income is the amount left from marketing receipts and Government payments after deducting production costs.

LITTLE CHANGE

On an individual farm basis, the department said there was little change from a year ago because the number of farms had declined about the same percentage as the drop in total net income.

The report said farmers had taken in more this year than last. But production costs had more than offset the increase in gross returns.

It predicted that Government payments to farmers for retiring cropland and for participating in other farm stabilization programs this year probably will be higher than last year's $1.7 billion. It said this year's wheat and feed grain programs—paying farmers to idle a part of their land—are expected to cost slightly more than $1.1 billion.

Payments are made also for participating in sugar and wool stabilization programs.

COSTS INCREASE

The report said farm production costs during the first half of the year were at the annual rate of $28.5 billion or half a billion dollars more than a year earlier.

The report said the aggregate volume of farm marketings this year is expected to be slightly above the record of last year. Sales of livestock and livestock products are expected to exceed last year's record, while sales of crops likely will be close to the level of the past 3 years.

COST-PRICE SQUEEZE TIGHTENS

Among the many problems confronting the country these days which received a good deal of lipservice during the presidential campaign by way of promises in 1960 but which are suffering from a combination of administration-congressional inaction are the difficulties facing the American farmer. President Kennedy took office pledging "positive action to raise farm income to full parity of income level." Described by Mr. Kennedy as the "strongest pledge ever given to the farmers of America," it is 3 years later taking its place at the head of the list of famous "might have beens," for the American farmer today is caught in the worst cost-price squeeze in nearly three decades. And, unhappily, the prospect for the future is not bright, for legislative recommendations (as in the case of wheat, for example) simply are not forthcoming from the administration—in fact, the only major move in recent weeks was that by the Secretary of Agriculture in flying several thousand miles to survey agriculture in the Soviet Union.

Where does the American farmer stand today? Latest Government statistics show the parity ratio between the farmer's production costs and what he gets for his production has fallen to 77 percent, the lowest point since the depression of 1939. The price index for farm products (what the farmer receives) has dropped to 241 from its 242 standing a little over 2 years ago. However, the farmer's cost index (what the farmer pays) has risen during the same period from 301 to the highest point in history, 311. In 1960 the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar was 39 cents. Today it is only 37 cents. Since the present administration took office, there has been a continuing drop in the number of farms, some 369,000 less today than nearly 3 years ago, and a correspondingly higher drop in the number of farmers. Falling farm prices, the reduction in farm population (but an increase in USDA employee rolls), and uncertainties in administration and in farm programs, present an unhappy situation of decline and confusion confronting American agriculture—a situation which holds no promise of improvement under present conditions in which positive action is most conspicuous by its absence.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I share the Senator's concern about the deteriorating farm situation. One of the chief causes of the low income of farmers is the increasing cost of everything he must buy. In past years he used to buy a tractor for $2,000 or $3,000. Today many tractors cost $10,000 or more. Many repairs today are 10 times as much as they were a few years ago. If nothing is done with respect to wheat, we can expect low prices. July futures are already selling as low as $1.50 to $1.55 in Kansas City and Chicago. That is what the price will be next year. If that means prosperity for wheat farmers, I will miss my guess.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is absolutely correct. The cost of everything the farmer has to buy has gone up, and has reached an alltime high in American history. I believe that dramatizes the seriousness of the situation.

I point out one further action which Congress should take promptly in connection with the farm situation. That deals with the 7,400,000 soil bank acres which are scheduled to come back into production next December 31, when the contracts expire, unless we enact legislation providing a procedure whereby these acres, now locked into the soil bank, can continue in that status. Think what will otherwise happen to farm prices and to our farm surpluses if we permit 7,400,000 acres, impregnated with fertility, to come fresh out of the soil bank and develop their productive capacity in the following crop year.

We should act now if we are to do anything effective to continue inactive and unproductive the soil bank acres. In certain sections of our country farmers are already confronted with making a decision as to what to do with that land next year. If it cannot be preserved in the soil bank, they will have to plow it and cultivate it now. Already some of these acres are moving back into the production stream. This is the time to take action or it will soon be too late to avert trouble. The time to decide what to do about the soil bank acres is already past. We should have taken action a year ago. We should have done it at least 5 months ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

At least we should take action now. We have a little legislative leisure time now before we become involved in problems related to foreign aid and civil rights and taxation and other subjects, which are going to keep our noses to the grindstone for quite a long while. Now is the time to do something for the American farmer, who has been discriminated against by the legislative procedures of this Congress and by the recommendations or lack of recommendations from the administration.

I hear the Department of Agriculture say, and some of its friendly news commentators repeat, that the farmers are not demanding action; that they are not worried. All I can say to them is that I will be happy to show the skeptics some of the mail that is coming to my office. I receive a stream of letters from wheat farmers and other farmers, who are disturbed about the tragically low parity ratio and who say the time has come to act. The time has certainly come to act in connection with our soil bank acres and in the development and passage of sound wheat and cotton programs.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I yield such time to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], as he may require.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I support the pending measure.

The Waurika project is unique in that it has twice been approved by the Senate of the United States, the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Commerce, the State of Oklahoma, and the Public Works Committee of the Senate. It has been approved by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate on one occasion. This project was approved by President Eisenhower and by President Kennedy.

The Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers have both found it engineeringly sound and economically feasible. Where else is a project of such broad and convincing justification to be found?

The people of Oklahoma, through the Office of the Governor and the local cities and towns, have pledged the repayment of the appropriate share of the costs under the terms of the Water Supply Act of 1958. They enthusiastically support it.

The Waurika project is located on Beaver Creek in Jefferson County near the town of Waurika. Beaver Creek is wholly within Oklahoma and is a tributary of Red River. The project will provide water quality control which will be beneficial to the quality of water in Red River.

The project, consisting of a dam, reservoir, and water transmission facilities, will cost $25,100,000, of which the local interest will return $13,876,000 with interest to the Federal Government. The benefit-cost ratio is $1 costs, $1.90

benefits. Annual charges are $1,044,500, and annual benefits are $2,068,800.

Project economies

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$450,400	$343,200	$793,600
Maintenance, operation, and replacements	80,500	170,400	250,900
Total	530,900	513,600	1,044,500
Annual benefits:			
Flood control			252,300
Water supply			713,000
Water-quality control			618,000
Irrigation			54,500
Recreation			375,000
Fish and wildlife			56,000
Total			2,068,800

This project was first passed in the Senate in early 1962 as a Bureau of Reclamation project. When the House refused to consider the project, it was placed in the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and flood control bill late in the last session of the 1962 Congress. It was added to the present bill by the Senate Public Works Committee, thus making the third time the Senate has approved the project, the last time as a Corps of Engineers project.

During the period 1926–57, inclusive, 41 floods have occurred at the Waurika dam site and 35 at the town of Waurika, averaging more than one per year. Within the flood plain downstream from the dam site there are about 11,090 acres, of which 710 are urban in the town of Waurika, 3,710 are rural above the mouth of Cow Creek, and 6,670 are rural below the mouth of Cow Creek. Value of property in the flood plain is estimated at $10,256,000 in the town of Waurika, and $7,769,000 in the rural areas. Average annual value of crops in the flood plain is estimated at $209,400. From the standpoint of damages, the May 1955 flood is considered the maximum of record. Based on July 1962 prices and conditions, repetition of a flood of that magnitude would cause damages estimated at $640,000. Average annual damages on Beaver Creek downstream from the Waurika dam site are estimated at $202,700.

Ground water supplies in the four-county area are limited in both quantity and quality, resulting in resort to surface sources by the larger municipalities. The communities of Lawton-Fort Sill, Walters, Duncan, and Comanche and the DX-Sunray oil refinery near Duncan have reservoirs outside Beaver Creek basin with a total dependable yield of 27.55 million gallons per day. In addition, the communities of Waurika and Temple have 34 wells with an aggregate yield of 0.28 million gallons per day. If water supplies are developed in the Beaver Creek basin at reasonable cost, the refinery and town of Temple plan to abandon their present sources, which would result in an aggregate yield for the 7 users of 25.65 million gallons per day. The U.S. Public Health Service has made a study and prepared a report on the present and future needs for municipal and industrial water supplies in these communities, as well as the requirements for water-quality control in the streams draining them. Their estimates indicate that additional supplies in the following amounts for the years shown will be needed for expected economic growth.

[Quantity in Million Gallons per Day]

Use	1970	1990	2014
Municipal and industrial supply	8.6	20.2	34.8
Water-quality control	14.4	14.6	0
Total	23.0	34.8	34.8

The Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Department of the Interior, made a separate study of irrigation potential in the four-county area—House Document No. 232, 87th Congress, 1st session—and found that for the Waurika Reservoir, as planned by that agency, 2,000 acres west of the mouth of Beaver Creek could be irrigated profitably with an average annual water demand of 4.5 million gallons per day.

The Waurika project would provide 290,300 acre-feet of storage consisting of 95,300 for flood control; 155,000 for municipal and industrial water supply, water-quality control, and irrigation; and 40,000 for 100-year sediment deposition. The conservation storage would provide an optimum dependable yield of 34.8 million gallons per day and an additional 4.5 million gallons per day 97 percent of the time, which is allotted to irrigation on 2,000 acres in accordance with the plans of the Bureau of Reclamation.

In addition to the reservoir, the plan provides for conveyance facilities to the towns of Lawton, Walters, Temple, Duncan, Comanche, and Waurika, and the DX-Sunray refinery, consisting of three pipelines totaling about 61 miles in length, a pump station at the dam, and two relift pump stations. These lines would convey municipal and industrial water to the waterplants of the various users, and would deliver additional quantities at Lawton and Duncan for water-quality control until the municipal and industrial needs equal the dependable yield of the reservoir.

The U.S. Public Health Service estimates that there will be ample quantity for water-quality control until about the year 1990, after which municipal and industrial needs will become paramount and quantities for water-quality control will diminish to zero at about the year 2014. That agency assumes that by the year 2000 pollution treatment practices will have advanced to the point which would reduce appreciably the need for quality control water in the area.

Facilities developed for the irrigation plan by the Bureau of Reclamation would consist of a streambank pumping plant, a 1,200-foot pipeline emptying into a concrete-lined main canal 7 miles long with a relift pump station at about mile 2.27, about 4.1 miles of concrete-lined laterals, and about 3.6 miles of open drains to serve the project lands.

Provision would be made for recreational facilities on project lands to serve the area need. In addition, the project would partially meet the fishing and hunting needs in the area. Accordingly, recreation and fish and wildlife have been designated project purposes in the multiple-purpose reservoir.

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield the Senator from Florida such time as he may require.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question or two of the distinguished chairman of the committee. I am deeply concerned about the reduction in the additional authorization for the Central-Southern Florida flood control program from $21 million to $4 million. I understand that the $4 million, with the small backlog authorization still existing, will take us through the Federal appropriation now pending, which is for 1964, but that it leaves no additional authorization. As the distinguished Senator knows, the project, which is a large one, is current and is under way. It would be extremely disappointing and disruptive of the program to have to accept a cut, without an appropriation next year, and without carrying the work forward as planned. Some continuing contracts will be under way, and will require continuation next year.

I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan if the cutting of this item from $21 million, as allowed by the House, to $4 million, as reported by his committee, indicates any disposition on the part of his committee to restrict or curtail the Federal participation in this very important joint program between the Federal Government and the State of Florida.

Mr. McNAMARA. The distinguished Senator from Florida is correct. The amount of money in the bill now before the Senate is $4 million. It is the amount plus what is already on hand that will be available for use next year.

I believe the Senator from Florida made reference to the continuity of these programs and the fact that the money is generally appropriated at least for a 2-year period. However, these authorizations and appropriations usually are made in the even years. The amount in the bill will bring it up to the even year amount. There is no intention of curtailing the project in any manner. That is not the intent of the committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for that assurance. If I correctly understand, the intent of the committee by its action in an uneven year is simply to carry the project forward until the next year, when it is the intention to bring out the additional authorization, making a backlog authorization to cover 2 years of appropriations at that time. Is that correct?

Mr. McNAMARA. Two years or more.

Mr. HOLLAND. Am I correct?

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. Not only is this a continuing item of very great importance, under which benefits have already been realized, but the partial completion of the project, as is true in all such cases, visits some damage upon some areas when the project is not completed.

A grave question would be raised in the event construction had to be discontinued. Furthermore, the legislature of Florida, which has just adjourned, appropriated the sums required to meet the State part of this joint effort, not only for 1964 but also for fiscal 1965.

I very much hope that the Florida delegation in Congress will not be left in the position of having to say to the people of Florida, "Yes, you are carrying your part of the load"—and it is a very considerable portion, as the distinguished Senator from Michigan knows; I think it is larger in its requirement of participation by the State than in any other such case pending in the Nation—"but we find ourselves unable to supply the Federal funds by reason of the want of an additional authorization."

The assurance of the Senator from Michigan that his distinguished committee intends not to abandon or handicap the project, but to support it, so that it can go forward in its full vigor, with a 2-year authorization next year, pleases me very much. I thank him for giving us that assurance in the Record.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Kentucky such time as he may desire.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, a part of what I intended to say I said when I spoke earlier on the motion by the Senator from Illinois to recommit the bill. Nevertheless, I wish to speak on the bill itself for a short time, because it will be going to conference, where some of the questions that were raised last year will again be raised. I think it proper that a record be made in the debate in the Senate.

As passed by the House, H.R. 6016, the bill now before the Senate, provided for the authorization of additional funds for the construction of multipurpose projects in 11 river basins throughout the United States in the amount of $784 million, covering the fiscal years 1964 and 1965. The river basins are as follows: Arkansas; Brazos; central and southern Florida; Columbia; Los Angeles-San Gabriel; Missouri; Ohio; Upper Mississippi; West Branch Susquehanna River; White River, Mo. and Ark.; Missouri. As the usual biennial omnibus bill will be before the Congress in 1964, and will authorize funds needed for fiscal years 1965 and 1966, and as the Corps of Engineers has advised that the sum of $161 million would be sufficient to cover its needs during fiscal year 1964, the Senate Committee on Public Works reduced the authorization in the House bill from $784 million to $161 million, which will meet the needs of the corps for its work in the 11 river basins during the fiscal year 1964.

I emphasize that the $161 million provided in the bill before us is only an authorization, and that it will still be necessary for the Corps of Engineers to justify its requests before the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, and before the House and Senate.

To the extent that the Committees on Appropriations and the Congress reduce appropriations below the $784 million authorized in the House bill—and this must occur if the lesser sum of $161 million fixed by our committee prevails—there must be a reduction in appropriations and the budget for fiscal year 1964. I make this clear, because it was said earlier in the debate that our reduction is a kind of subterfuge. The statement is not correct. Our action will have the effect of reducing appropriations and the budget for fiscal year 1964.

The Committee on Public Works amended the House bill, as it had a right to do, by authorizing a number of additional projects which had been considered and approved by the Corps of Engineers.

I wish to address myself specifically to seven projects which were added by the Committee on Public Works to H.R. 6016. They are:

First. Cape Fear River Basin, N.C.

Second. Waurika Dam and Reservoir, Red River Basin, Okla.

Third. Devils Jump Dam and Reservoir, Big South Fork of the Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn.

Fourth. Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Columbia River Basin, Mont.

Fifth. Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir, Snake River, Columbia River Basin, Idaho.

Sixth. Trotters Shoals Reservoir, Ga. and S.C., Savannah River Basin.

Seventh. Flint River Reservoir, Ga.

Last year, with the exception of the Trotters Shoals Reservoir project, these identical projects were considered by the Committee on Public Works, and with the exception of the Trotters Shoals project, they were included by our committee in the omnibus bill, S. 3773. When the bill came to the floor of the Senate, House bill 13273 was substituted for the Senate bill, which included all the projects which had been approved by the House. The bill was then passed by the Senate by a voice vote.

As I remember, the Trotters Shoals project was added on the Senate floor by an amendment offered by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell]. I make the point I made earlier in the debate: With the exception of the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs] to strike the Knowles Dam project, and an amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond], not a single objection in the form of an amendment was made on the floor of the Senate to any of the seven projects I have named above, and which are in this bill. No voice was raised in the debate against them. The bill as passed went to the Senate-House conference.

The late Senator Robert S. Kerr was chairman of the Senate conferees. I participated in the conference as the ranking Republican Member of the Senate conferees. We had four long conferences. The House conferees objected to the seven projects named above, on the ground that the House had not been able to conduct hearings on them.

After long discussions, in four meetings, it became clear that the House conferees, acting under instructions from the House, would not agree to the inclusion of the seven projects, so the Senate receded. However, as appears in the conference report on the bill, the House conferees agreed to conduct hearings early in this year of 1963 on the seven projects.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the statement in the conference report agreeing to the holding of hearings on the seven projects.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EARLY HEARINGS

The managers on the part of the House made a commitment that the Committee on Public Works of the House would hold public hearings as soon as practicable after the next Congress convenes on the following projects which were considered by the conferees and which are not included in this conference report: Cape Fear River Basin, N.C.; Flint River, Ga.; the South Fork of the Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn.; Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Mont.; Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir, Snake River, Idaho; Waurika Reclamation project, Oklahoma; Savannah River-Duke Power Co., South Carolina and Georgia, and Trotter's Shoal Reservoir, Savannah River.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I think it was understood that the House would conduct its hearings and reach a decision on these seven projects—and would do so prior to the passage of the river basin authorization bill which is now before the Senate—because it was known that if the House approved these seven projects, or any of them, such projects could become a part of the bill before us.

A subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works has conducted hearings but has not yet voted on these specific projects. I understand that it has conducted hearings on five of the seven projects.

Last year the Senate hearings contained 1,600 pages of testimony on these projects. Approximately the same number of pages are contained in the House hearings on these projects. I note this because it has been said on the floor of the Senate during the debate that adequate hearings were not held with respect to the seven projects.

I served on the committee last year, as I do this year. Everyone had the right to testify—including Members of the Senate. Those who object today did not testify against these projects or ask for longer hearings. To the contrary, the Senate approved these seven projects in 1962 without a dissenting voice, except that of Senator Boggs and Senator Thurmond to three specific projects. For these reasons, our committee thought it proper to include them again in the bill now before the Senate. Our action will present to the House an opportunity to conclude its hearings in its Committee on Public Works, and to make its decision on the projects if it so desires. It will bring to a decision their approval or disapproval of the seven specific projects.

Again, I wish to emphasize that if these seven projects are authorized by the Senate and by the House, the authorization bill will not commit any funds for their construction; it will still be necessary for the Corps of Engineers to present its case for funds or preconstruction advanced engineering and design, and then for funds for actual construction, to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate for their decision, and subsequently for the decision of the House and the Senate. I want this to be clearly understood, because it has been stated—at least in my State—and it has been implied today that the authorization of these seven projects would commit funds for their construction this year. That is not correct.

Objection has been made to the sufficiency of the hearings. I would like to speak of the hearings which were held by the Senate Public Works Committee on the omnibus bill for fiscal year 1963, and on the seven projects which have been brought into question. Hearings were commenced on August 24, 1962, and continued until September 21, 1962. There were 13 days of public hearings. Executive sessions were then held, and the bill was reported October 1, 1962. Everyone who desired to appear in opposition to the bill had the opportunity to do so. Hearings were held on Cape Fear River Basin, Flint River, Ga., Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Burns Creek, and Devils Jump. I understand, also, that hearings were held by the Senate Interior Committee on Waurika Dam in Oklahoma. The records of the hearings fill over 1,500 pages.

Mr. President, I desire now to turn my attention to the Devils Jumps Dam and Reservoir on the south fork of the Cumberland River. The site of Devils Jumps Dam is in McCreary County, Ky., about 48 miles above the confluence of the Big South Fork and the Cumberland Rivers at Burnside, Ky. The main area of the reservoir would be situated in Tennessee, but part is in Kentucky.

Yesterday, in the course of his speech, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] specifically mentioned this project as one which should be rejected. I was not in the Chamber at the time and did not know that he intended to discuss Devils Jumps. I had left the Senate for a short time, to go to my dentist, as I knew no votes would be taken. I notified Senator MILLER this morning that I would discuss Devils Jumps today.

During the hearings in the Senate, testimony was heard from the Corps of Engineers confirming their approval of the Devils Jumps project, and every witness desiring to testify on the project was heard. Mr. Rayburn Watkins of the Associated Industries of Kentucky and Mr. A. K. Stewart, vice president of the Kentucky Utilities Co., testified in opposition to the project.

I want to be fair about this project. But necessarily, because of time, I cannot go into every detail related to its approval by the Corps of Engineers, and its approval by every affected agency of the Government, and by the States of Tennessee and Kentucky, and the arguments that have been made for and against its authorization. I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the body of the RECORD a statement I made before the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the House Public Works Committee, which provides information concerning the long study which led to the approval of Devils Jumps by the Corps of Engineers, and by the U.S. Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF KENTUCKY

I thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify before your committee, and to support the authorization of Devils Jumps Dam and Reservoir on the Big South Fork of the Cumberland River. The dam would be constructed in Kentucky about 48.1 miles above the confluence of the Big South Fork of the Cumberland at Burnside, Ky. I know the area well, because my home is in the adjoining county of Pulaski, at Somerset, Ky.

As the committee knows, this project was approved in 1962 by the Senate Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, after full hearings had been conducted by the committee. It was then approved by the Senate without any dissenting vote. In conference, members of your committee informed the Senate conferees that they could not approve this project and seven others which had been approved by the Senate, because they desired to conduct full hearings. I appreciate very much the early hearings that your committee is undertaking under the leadership of your chairman, Congressman DAVIS.

Representatives of the Corps of Engineers will testify concerning their findings, upon which their favorable report to the Congress is based. I think it proper to leave to the Corps of Engineers and other governmental agencies which are concerned, the discussion of their findings, which led to the approval of the Devils Jumps project on the basis of criteria fixed by Congress. I would like to reserve the opportunity to file a more detailed statement, but today I will limit my discussion to several points which emphasize the thorough consideration which has been given this project, and its wide support.

First, I point out that the Devils Jumps project was given the closest study by the Corps of Engineers at every level for a period of nearly 10 years. After this extensive and thorough examination, the project was approved at every level by the Corps of Engineers and its authorization and construction has been recommended to the Congress. The corps found that the cost-benefit ratio was 1.2 to 1 over a 50-year amortization period. Today other projects are being considered and approved upon cost-benefit ratios, based on a 100-year period.

Second, the committee will note from the report compiled by the Secretary of the Army that every agency of the Federal Government to which the report was submitted, approved the project or, at minimum, expressed no opposition. It is interesting to note also reports of the agencies embraced the administrations of President Eisenhower and President Kennedy, and that in both administrations, the departments and agencies called upon for reports gave their approval to this project. Under the administration of President Eisenhower, final approval was postponed because the Bureau of the Budget asked in late 1960 for further advice on the marketability of the power to be generated at the Devils Jumps project. In 1961, after further studies by the Southeastern Power Administration, Federal Power Commission, it was again determined that the power generated at the Devils Jumps project was marketable. Following this determination, the Bureau of the Budget, as an office of the President of the United States, under the present President, gave its approval to the submission of the favorable report to the Congress. I review, if briefly, these facts to emphasize the careful study and consideration given the Devils Jumps project by the Corps of Engineers and other concerned agencies, and the unanimity of approval of its authorization and construction by two administrations.

This fact is, I believe, the most important matter under the consideration of your committee.

I know that objection has been made, and will be made, that the power from this project is not marketable at a favorable rate. But, I believe that the committee and the Congress can rely on the report of the Corps of Engineers resulting from a study which was carried on over a period of 10 years under criteria fixed by the Congress; the conclusion of the Southeastern Power Administration that the power is marketable at a rate sufficient to repay with interest within 50 years all costs allocated to power; and the statement of the Federal Power Commission that the project is economically feasible even under severe economic criteria.

The third point I make is that this project has been approved, as is required by law, by the States of Tennessee and Kentucky, and is strongly supported by the governments and officials of both States. Only this year the legislative bodies of Tennessee and Kentucky, enacted resolutions requesting the authorization and construction of Devils Jump. Further, I think it important to note that many Members of the congressional delegations of Kentucky and Tennessee are here today, supporting the authorization of this project. Congressman EUGENE SILER of Kentucky and Congressman HOWARD BAKER of Tennessee, in whose districts the dam and reservoir would be located strongly support its authorization.

Again, I believe the committee will note from the resolutions filed that the local governments of the area, and civic bodies, support fully its authorization.

At the Senate hearings only two witnesses appeared in opposition to the authorization of Devils Jumps, and it was suggested that the project lacked local support. The resolutions which have been filed with the committee today by the governmental bodies of the area give answer to any suggestion that local governments and people of the area are not wholeheartedly in support of the Devils Jumps project. Living in the area, and knowing its people, I will say on my responsibility that it has the support of the people of the area.

The private utility companies of our State of Kentucky, and perhaps the private companies of other States, oppose the construction of Devils Jumps Dam and Reservoir. At the Senate hearings, representatives of the Kentucky Utilities Co. testified that they considered there was no market for the power, and its costs make the project uneconomical. As I have said before, the detailed answer to this contention is one which is within the competence of the Corps of Engineers and agencies of the Government. But I want to emphasize as strongly as I can that the Corps of Engineers, which I know holds the confidence of the Congress because of its objective engineering decisions, and the Southeastern Power Administration, which is charged with this responsibility, and the Federal Power Commission, have found the power can be marketed and at a rate sufficient to amortize the cost of the project.

I think it is fair to take into consideration—and I am sure the private utilities would agree with my statement—that it is their general policy to oppose public hydroelectric installations of this type. I also believe the committee has the right to take this fact into consideration, and weigh the statements of the utilities concerning marketability and cost of power against the statements of objective governmental agencies. The Corps of Engineers arrived at its decision after thorough study, over a period of years—one I believe more detailed and more comprehensive than has been given by the private power companies.

Mr. W. O. Gilreath and other citizens of the area have testified concerning the favorable effect the construction of this project would have on the economy of the area. I have not dwelt on this factor, important as it is, because I know the committee and the Congress is limited in large degree to the consideration of the criteria which it has prescribed. But considering that the Corps of Engineers and all other concerned departments have agreed that the criteria have been met, and recommend approval of Devils Jumps, I will say that the statements of Mr. Gilreath and others concerning the economic situation of the area, and the effect of the project, are correct.

I have lived in this area all my life, as has my family for 170 years. I know the people. I am interested in them—and I know that this project would be of great help.

I hope very much that the committee will recommend its authorization.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, after 10 years of study, the Devils Jumps project was approved by the Corps of Engineers and by every interested agency of the administration; it was approved by agencies under the administration of President Eisenhower, as well as by agencies under the administration of President Kennedy.

During the hearings before the House Committee, objection to Devils Jumps was made by private utility companies on several grounds, and I would like to discuss these briefly.

First. Objection was made that the power developed by the Devils Jumps project, with a capacity of 480,000 kilowatts, could not be marketed.

Second. Objection was made that the cost per kilowatt-hour was excessive.

Third. Objection was made that the cost of the project—$151 million—could not be repaid in the 50 years over which its cost would be amortized.

I am not an engineer, and I must rely, as I believe the Congress must rely, upon the findings of the Corps of Engineers and the findings of the various agencies of the Government—particularly the Federal Power Commission and the Southeastern Power Administration of the Department of the Interior—charged with the duty of marketing power developed at Corps of Engineers projects.

Mr. Kuykendall, who was Chairman of the Federal Power Commission during the administration of President Eisenhower, wrote in his report that this project was justified and met the Commission's severe criteria. I ask that his report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C. June 29, 1960.

Lt. Gen. E. C. ITSCHNER,
Chief of Engineers,
Department of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL ITSCHNER: This is in reply to your letter of May 19, 1960, inviting comments by the Commission relative to your proposed report and to the reports of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and of the district and division engineers on Big South Fork, Cumberland River, Kentucky and Tennessee. Your letter mentions the desirability of transmitting these reports to Congress at an early date and of receiving the Commission's comments thereon as soon as possible.

The Commission has cooperated with your Department over a period of years in studies relating to the development of the Cumberland River Basin, including those involved in the formulation of existing and authorized projects in the comprehensive basin plan. The cooperative studies relative to development of the Big South Fork, Cumberland River, have included the furnishing of information on power markets and power values.

The Commission notes that the cited reports of your Department recommend improvement of Big South Fork, Cumberland River Basin, for power, flood control, and other purposes, by the construction of a dam at the Devils Jumps site, about mile 48.1; additional reservoir clearing at the existing Wolf Creek project; and modification of the operation of Lake Cumberland by transferring 255,000 acre-feet of flood-control storage to the Devils Jumps Reservoir. The estimated cost for construction of these improvements is $151 million.

Commission studies of the recommended improvements show that the proposed high Devils Jumps project with an installed capacity of 480,000 kilowatts would appropriately develop the power potential of the Big South Fork, Cumberland River. Commission staff computations indicate that the average annual output of the project would be about 450 million kilowatt-hours, as compared with the 475 million kilowatt-hours shown in your Department's reports. Load analyses of the Commission staff indicate that the 10 percent load-factor power that would be provided by the project could be utilized in Power Supply Areas 12 (Indiana) and 19 (Kentucky) by 1965 and at a somewhat later date in Power Supply Area 20 (Tennessee).

It is noted that the economic analysis of the recommended plan as shown in the reports of your Department includes an annual downstream power benefit of $1,067,000 creditable to Devils Jumps. Of this amount, $963,000 represents the value of an estimated increase of 86,000 kilowatts in the system dependable capacity at the Wolf Creek project. By operating Wolf Creek with no change in the project's basic minimum regulated flow, the drawdown would be decreased with provision of the Devils Jumps storage upstream and a dependable capacity gain would be realized at Wolf Creek.

The Commission is of the opinion that with increases in regional loads the abovementioned estimate of the gain in dependable capacity at the Wolf Creek plant might be realized in the future without the upstream storage by reducing the drawdown and consequently the load-factor operation at Wolf Creek. Considered over the period of analysis, therefore, the estimated downstream power benefits creditable to Devils Jumps may be too high. However, if the total downstream capacity benefits are excluded and if all of the project power is assumed to be marketed in Power Supply Area 20, where the alternative power source would be a Federal steam-electric plant, the resulting annual benefits of Devils Jumps would approximately equal the annual project costs shown in the report. Thus, the proposed project appears to be economically feasible even under these severe criteria.

Based on its consideration of the reports of your Department and on the studies of its own staff, the Commission concludes that the recommended high Devils Jumps project would constitute a desirable addition to the Cumberland River Basin plan. The Commission will be pleased to cooperate in any further studies necessary to develop final plans for the project.

Sincerely yours,
JEROME K. KUYKENDALL,
Chairman.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed also in the body of the RECORD the testimony of Mr. Charles W. Leavy, Administrator of the Southeastern Power Administration, which discusses these issues. He stated unequivocally to the House subcommittee that the power could be marketed, that the cost of Devils Jumps could be repaid in 50 years, and that the cost per kilowatt-hour of power produced at Devils Jumps was comparable—even lower—than similar power produced at installations of private power companies in the State of Kentucky. To be absolutely fair, it must be said that the Corps of Engineers and the Southeastern Power Administration made their computations on this project, as they do on all Corps of Engineers projects, on the rate of interest fixed by the Government.

I have never heard many complaints about this basis of computation, except as it is applied to power projects. Although there is debate about the construction of power projects in the development of our rivers, nevertheless a power project repays appropriations to the U.S. Treasury. This cannot be said of flood control projects—valuable as they are—or of many other Corps of Engineers projects.

I read the concluding paragraph from the statement by Mr. Leavy:

> After having made an examination of the usability of Devils Jumps power, the costs associated with its production, and the potential value of the power in the anticipated markets, we are convinced that the power which can be produced at this project can be marketed at rates sufficient to repay all costs associated with the production and transmission of the power, including interest, within a period of 50 years. We are also convinced that the power from the project will make a valuable and substantial contribution to the power supply of the area and permit a more efficient utilization of other power sources. We therefore endorse the authorization of the project and recommend that construction be undertaken as early as possible.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF CHARLES W. LEAVY, ADMINISTRATOR, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LEAVY. As I understand it, sir, you wish me to proceed with Devils Jumps at this point?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEAVY. I have a statement which I would like to read and which I hope will in part, at least, answer some of the questions that I am sure are in Mr. HARSHA's mind.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I wish to thank you for the opportunity to appear before you on behalf of the authorization of the Devils Jumps project.

My name is Charles W. Leavy, and I am the Administrator of the Southeastern Power Administration, the headquarters office of which is located in Elberton, Ga.

Southeastern Power Administration is a bureau within the Department of the Interior to which has been delegated, for a 10-State area in the Southeast, the Secretary of the Interior's responsibilities under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944. As such, it is the marketing agency for power generated at Corps of Engineers reservoir projects in the Southeast. It is presently marketing power from the Wolf Creek, Center Hill, Dale Hollow, Old Hickory, and Cheatham projects in the Cumberland River Basin and will market power from the Barkley project which is now under construction.

It will be the marketing agent for any additional power produced in the Cumberland River Basin and, as such, is vitally interested in the river's future development.

The Southeastern Power Administration has been asked by the Corps of Engineers to furnish information concerning the marketability of the power output of the Devils Jumps project on a number of occasions over the past 5 years. Early in 1958 our preliminary marketing studies, which were based upon the assumption that the Tennessee Valley Authority would be the market for the power produced at the project, indicated that the output of the project as then planned could not be marketed when it became available if construction were begun in the next few years. Later that same year this conclusion was affirmed and its was questioned whether the rate required to pay the project out in 50 years would not exceed the costs to TVA of capacity from an alternate source. At that time, we did state that changes in the circumstances affecting costs or in the prospective market might alter these conclusions and that another review of the situation in a few years might bring a different conclusion.

In April of 1959 we estimated that the maximum revenue that could be anticipated from the sale of power from the project, based on the assumption that it would be sold to TVA, would be $6 million annually. At that time we also commented upon the then estimated operation and maintenance and major replacement costs.

Marketing studies which have been made subsequent to that time have differed from those previously made in two very important respects. Since the TVA bond financing act was passed in August 1959 the effective interest rate applicable to TVA's financing of its future power supply is estimated to average 4 percent rather than the 2½ percent previously used in estimating the value of power to TVA. In view of this increased interest cost, we now feel that the costs of Devils Jumps power would be very close to the value of such power to the TVA system.

The second change which has occurred since the earlier studies is that, upon the specific authorization of the Secretary of the Interior, we have given consideration to marketing outside the 10-State area, but within economic transmission distance of proposed projects. It may be noted that the only limitation on Southeastern Power Administration's area of activity is that imposed by the Secretary himself in his delegation of authority and that his authority under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 is in no way geographically limited.

In 1960 Southeastern began marketing studies to examine the feasibility of marketing Devils Jumps power in Federal Power Commission power supply area 9, which includes most of Ohio and a small portion of Pennsylvania; area 12, which includes all of Indiana and a small part of Ohio and Michigan; area 19, which includes most of Kentucky; and area 20, which includes a part of Kentucky and all of the TVA service area. In 1961 the Bureau of the Budget was informed by the Interior Department that Southeastern had concluded that there would be an adequate market for the power produced by the Devils Jumps project by the time the project could be completed at rates which would be sufficient to repay within 50 years all costs allocated to power. This statement was premised upon the assumption that the total annual charges to be covered would not exceed approximately $6,400,000.

This was our position in April of 1961 and this is our position today. We feel that the Devils Jumps project as proposed by the Corps of Engineers is a sound project which will produce power that will provide widespread benefits to both preferred agencies and private utility systems in the area. It is our position that by the time Devils Jumps power can be available it will be usable and will be needed in the area.

As you know, the power requirements of this country are growing at a rate resulting in a doubling of the requirements every 10 years. This means that during the next 10 years power capacity must be added equal to the approximately 190 million kilowatts of capacity that has been placed in operation since the beginning of the power industry. The power requirements in power supply areas 12 and 19 alone are presently increasing at a rate of 400,000 kilowatts per year and a total of 3¼ million kilowatts of new capacity must be constructed by 1970 to meet anticipated load growth in these two areas alone. There is thus no question that the 480,000 kilowatts of capacity which Devils Jumps would contribute will be needed.

What is more important, this capacity will not only be needed, but can be used in this area even though it can be operated at full load during critical water periods for only 10 percent of the time. Our studies indicate that 10-percent load factor power in an amount in excess of 1 million kilowatts can be utilized effectively and provide full capacity value by 1970 in power supply areas 12 and 19.

We are also confident that the costs of Devils Jumps power will be such as to make it marketable in the light of the costs of alternate sources of peaking power. The preparation of cost estimates is, of course, the responsibility of the Corps of Engineers. We think that they do a good job of estimating costs and we feel that the estimated construction costs for Devils Jumps are reasonable. We have noted that the actual construction costs of three Corps of Engineers projects now under construction or recently completed have all been less than the cost estimates 5 years ago. Cost estimates have decreased from $95 million in October 1959 to $87 million in January 1963 for the Hartwell project, from $87 million in May 1959 to $76 million in January 1962 for the Walter F. George project, and from $182 million in July 1958 to $151 million in January 1963 for the Barkley project.

Although a 100-year period may be used to determine the economic feasibility of a project by comparison of benefit-cost ratios, we base the financial feasibility, which involves a comparison of anticipated revenues with costs, upon a 50-year period of analysis. All of our analyses concerning the Devils Jumps project have been upon a 50-year period and the statements made in April 1961 were also based upon the assumption of a 2⅝ percent interest rate.

We believe the present estimate of the Corps of Engineers of the estimated operation and maintenance costs to be reasonable. It should be noted that the operation and maintenance costs per kilowatt of installed capacity of hydroelectric projects decreases substantially as the size of the installation increases. While we believe that the estimated costs of major replacements might properly be increased 10 percent or $11,000 per year, this amount has no appreciable effect upon project feasibility.

Our financial costs used in determining economic feasibility have not included the so-called taxes foregone, which are now also excluded from the economic costs of the project under the new criteria for formulation and evaluation of water resources prepared by the President's Water Resources Council.

Considering all the project costs involved, it is our conclusion that the annual charges to power to be repaid from power revenues using a 50-year period of analysis and a 2⅝ interest rate will be approximately $6,350,000. Addition of Southeastern's marketing costs (exclusive of transmission costs) would increase this amount to $6,400,000. If the energy added to the Cumberland system by the Devils Jumps project is evaluated at 2 mills per kilowatt-hour, a capacity cost of $9.42 per kilowatt of dependable capacity added to the Cumberland system would be required to recover the above annual charges to power.

That power is marketable at these rates in the areas in question seems clear. The at-site value of power produced at Devils Jumps was estimated for power supply areas 12 and 19 in October 1958 by the Atlanta regional engineer of the Federal Power Commission. These estimates, it should be noted, have been discounted from $3 to $4 per kilowatt to account for increased transmission costs which would be required to transmit Devils Jumps power into these areas. This allowance is, we believe, more than adequate. The regional engineer estimated that, as so discounted, the power value for power supply area 12 would be $19.85 for capacity and 2 mills for energy, and for power supply area 19 would be $21.80 for capacity and 1.8 mills for energy.

We have noted from Federal Power Commission records that in 1961 Kentucky Utilities Co. purchased 2,130 kilowatts of firm power from Louisville Gas & Electric Co. at rates of $18 per year per kilowatt, plus 4.6 mills per kilowatt hour, including fuel adjustments, and also purchased 20,000 kilowatts of firm power from Ohio Power Co. at overall rates of $20.40 per year per kilowatt plus 4.6 mills per kilowatt-hour including fuel adjustment.

The rate of $9.42 per year per kilowatt and 2 mills per kilowatt hour average out to an overall cost of 12 mills per kilowatt hour for 10-percent load factor power. This is, in our opinion, a reasonable cost for peaking power. We have noted, for example, from Federal Power Commission records that in 1961 Plant Tyrone of Kentucky Utilities Co. was operated during the year at a 14-percent load factor. The average production cost was 6.5 mills per kilowatt hour with the fixed cost for the year amounting to 17.4 mills per kilowatt hour, so that the total average cost of power from the plant for that year was 23.9 mills per kilowatt hour. Plant Noblesville of the Public Service Co. of Indiana was operated at about an 8-percent load factor in 1960, with production costs of 10.5 mills per kilowatt hour and fixed costs of 26.6 mills per kilowatt hour, for a total average cost of 37.1 mills per kilowatt hour. Plant Paddy's Run of the Louisville Gas & Electric Co. was operated in 1961 at approximately a 30-percent load factor, with production costs of 4.4 mills per kilowatt hour and fixed costs of 6.5 mills per kilowatt hour, for a total average cost of 10.9 mills per kilowatt hour for 30-percent load factor power.

After having made an examination of the usability of Devils Jumps power, the costs associated with its production, and the potential value of the power in the anticipated markets, we are convinced that the power which can be produced at this project can be marketed at rates sufficient to repay all costs associated with the production and transmission of the power, including interest, within a period of 50 years. We are also convinced that the power from the project will make a valuable and substantial contribution to the power supply of the area and permit a more efficient utilization of other power sources. We therefore endorse the authorization of the project and recommend that construction be undertaken as early as possible.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to allude briefly to a statement made by the opponents about the use of the Devils Jumps project—namely, that it would be used only 10 percent of the time. Let me say that in computing the costs per kilowatt-hour of the power produced at Devils Jumps, and in computing the repayment of the total cost of the project, I am advised by the Corps of Engineers that their computations were based on a 10-percent use of the project.

The testimony of the Corps of Engineers and Mr. Leavy provide the reasoning for a 10-percent use of the Devils Jumps project. The power facilities would be used at certain times to provide the high output of power called "peaking" power, which is needed to meet the demands at certain periods of the day when power requirements are the greatest. These are, I am informed, in the early morning, when the workday begins, and in the evening when the lights go on all over electric power systems.

Because of the great height of this dam, over 500 feet, and the water storage, Devils Jumps would develop high output of power at the times it is urgently needed to meet increased power demands.

The Corps of Engineers and the Southeastern Power Administration have testified that the most economic and economical use of the power to be generated by Devils Jumps is at these times when the demands are greatest. And I repeat, for emphasis, that the corps and the Southeastern Power Administration has determined that even if it is used only 10 percent of the time, that sufficient power can be marketed—and at a price which will repay the cost of Devils Jumps within 50 years.

I point out that the Congress has approved many projects providing for amortization and repayment of appropriations in 100 years, and I have heard little objection.

One of the arguments made yesterday by my friend the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] was that comparable power could be produced by a steamplant.

I have lived in the area all my life, and I know of no power company that has proposed to build a steamplant in the area.

I support the Devils Jumps Dam and Reservoir on its merits, and on the basis of its approval by the Corps of Engineers and other governmental agencies—under the administrations of both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy.

LAUREL RIVER PROJECT

Mr. President, I speak now of an amendment in the bill which concerns the Laurel River Reservoir in Kentucky.

I shall explain it.

When the Laurel River Dam and Reservoir was authorized in 1960, one unusual provision was required by the Bureau of the Budget with respect to this particular project. I ask unanimous consent that the proviso be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the proviso was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Provided, That construction of the project shall not be commenced until the agency designated to market the power has entered into an agreement which would insure that the power would be sold at rates sufficient to repay with interest within 50 years all costs allocated to power.

Mr. COOPER. The effect of the proviso has made it very difficult for the Southeastern Power Administration to negotiate for the sale of power from Laurel Reservoir. My attention and that of my colleague [Mr. Morton] has been called to this fact. So on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. Morton], I offered in the Committee on Public Works the amendment which is found in the bill. The amendment was approved by the committee, and the committee report explains its purpose. I ask unanimous consent that the modified provisio contained in the amendment, which has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the amended proviso was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

That construction of the project shall not be commenced until the power marketing agency has informed the Corps of Engineers that the power generated by the project can be sold at rates which will insure repayment within 50 years, with interest, of all costs allocated to power.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, approving the amendment be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Executive Office
of the President,
Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C., July 19, 1963.

Hon. John S. Cooper,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Cooper: This is in reply to your letter of July 18, 1963, requesting the views of the Bureau of the Budget on an amendment to H.R. 6016, such amendment to modify the conditions of authorization for the Laurel River Reservoir project as incorporated in Public Law 86–645, approved July 14, 1960.

We believe the amendment adopted by the Senate Committee on Public Works preserves the intent of the original proviso and, accordingly, the Bureau of the Budget would have no objection to enactment of the amendment.

A copy of this letter will be forwarded to the committee chairman, Senator McNamara.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip S. Hughes,
Assistant Director
for Legislative Reference.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am sure the Senate will approve the amendment so that this worthy project—Laurel Reservoir—can go forward.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** All time has been yielded back. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 6016) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H.R. 6016 with the Senate amendments be printed.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and ask for a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McNamara, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Cooper, and Mr. Fong conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara]. As usual, he has shown his ability to do a good, thorough, and brief job in presenting proposed legislation. He wastes no words. He makes his points quickly. Every Senator understands what the proposed legislation which he is managing entails. Once again this afternoon he has exhibited his skill, his technique, and his sound generalship.

SECURITIES ACTS AMENDMENT OF 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 354, Senate bill 1642.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 1642) to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, to extend disclosure requirements to the issuers of additional publicly traded securities, to provide for improved qualification and disciplinary procedure for registered brokers and dealers, and for other purposes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Securities Acts Amendments of 1963".

Sec. 2. Section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following four paragraphs:

"(18) The term 'person associated with a broker or dealer' means any partner, officer, director, or branch manager of such broker or dealer (or any person occupying a similar status or performing similar functions), or any person directly or indirectly controlling and controlled by such broker or dealer, including any employee of such broker or dealer. The Commission may by rules and regulations classify, for the purpose of any portion or portions of this title, persons, including employees, controlled by a broker or a dealer. By rules and regulations the Commission shall appropriately exclude from the scope of subsection (b) (other than paragraph (3) thereof) of section 15 of this title persons associated with a broker or dealer whose functions are clerical or ministerial.

"(19) The terms 'investment company', 'affiliated person', and 'insurance company' have the same meanings as in the Investment Company Act of 1940.

"(20) The terms 'investment adviser' and 'underwriter' have the same meanings as in the Investment Advisers Act of 1940.

"(21) The term 'person associated with a member' means a person who is registered with a registered securities association pursuant to its rules or who is associated with a broker or dealer which is a member of such association."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 12(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is amended as follows:

(1) Subparagraphs (I) through (K) of paragraph (1) are redesignated as (J) through (L), respectively.

(2) A new subparagraph (1)(I) is added to read as follows:

"(I) material contracts, not made in the ordinary course of business, which are to be executed in whole or in part at or after the filing of the application or which were made not more than two years before such filing, and every material patent or contract for a material patent right shall be deemed a material contract."

(3) A new paragraph (3) is added to read as follows:

"(3) Such copies of material contracts, referred to in paragraph (1)(I) above, as the Commission may require as necessary or appropriate for the proper protection of investors and to insure fair dealing in the security."

(b) Section 12(f) of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(f) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, any national securities exchange, subject to the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth, (1) may continue unlisted trading privileges to which a security had been admitted on such exchange prior to the effective date of subsection (g)(1) of section 12 of this title, or (2) upon application to and approval of such application by the Commission, may extend unlisted trading privileges to any security duly listed and registered on any other national securities exchange. If an extension of unlisted trading privileges to a security was originally based upon its listing and registration on another national securities exchange, such privileges shall continue in effect only so long as such security shall remain listed and registered on any other national securities exchange.

"No application pursuant to this subsection shall be approved unless the Commission finds, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing, that the extension of unlisted trading privileges pursuant to such application is necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

"The Commission shall by rules and regulations suspend unlisted trading privileges in whole or in part for any or all classes of securities for a period not exceeding twelve months, if it deems such suspension necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors or to prevent evasion of the purposes of this title.

"On the application of the issuer of any security for which unlisted trading privileges on any exchange have been continued or extend pursuant to this subsection, or of any broker or dealer who makes or creates a market for such security, or of any other person having a bona fide interest in the question of termination or suspension of such unlisted trading privileges, or on its own motion, the Commission shall by order terminate, or suspend for a period not exceeding twelve months, such unlisted trading privileges for such security if the Commission finds, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing, that such termination or suspension is necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

"In any proceeding under this subsection in which appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing are required, notice of not less than ten days to the applicant in such proceeding, to the issuer of the security involved, to the exchange which is seeking to continue or extend or has continued or extended unlisted trading privileges for such security, and to the exchange, if any, on which such security is listed and registered, shall be deemed adequate notice, and any broker or dealer who makes or creates a market for such security, and any other person having a bona fide interest in such proceeding, shall upon application be entitled to be heard.

"Any security for which unlisted trading privileges are continued or extended pursuant to this subsection shall be deemed to be registered on a national securities exchange within the meaning of this title. The powers and duties of the Commission under subsection (b) of section 19 of this title shall be applicable to the rules of an exchange in respect of any such security. The Commission may, by such rules and regulations as it deems necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, either unconditionally or upon specified terms and conditions, or for stated periods, exempt such securities from the operation of any provision of section 13, 14, or 16 of this title."

(c) Section 12 of said Act is further amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"(g)(1) Every issuer which is engaged in interstate commerce, or in a business affecting interstate commerce, or whose securities are traded by use of the mails or any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce shall—

"(i) within one hundred and twenty days after the last day of its first fiscal year ended after the effective date of this subsection on which the issuer has total assets exceeding $1,000,000 and a class of equity security (other than an exempted security) held of record by seven hundred and fifty or more persons; and

"(ii) within one hundred and twenty days after the last day of its first fiscal year ended after two years from the effective date of this subsection on which the issuer has total assets exceeding $1,000,000 and a class of equity security (other than an exempted security) held of record by five hundred or more but less than seven hundred and fifty persons

register such security by filing with the Commission a registration statement (and such copies thereof as the Commission may require) with respect to such security containing such information and documents as the Commission may specify comparable to that which is required in an application to register a security pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. Each such registration statement shall become effective sixty days after filing with the Commission or within such shorter period as the Commission may direct. Until such registration statement becomes effective it shall not be deemed filed for the purposes of section 18 of this title. Any issuer may register any class of equity security not required to be registered by filing a registration statement pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph. The Commission is authorized to extend the date upon which any issuer or class of issuers is required to register a security pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph.

"(2) The provisions of this subsection shall not apply in respect of—

"(A) any security listed and registered on a national securities exchange;

"(B) any security issued by an investment company registered pursuant to section 8 of the Investment Company Act of 1940;

"(C) any security, other than permanent stock, guaranty stock, permanent reserve stock, or any similar certificate evidencing nonwithdrawable capital, issued by a savings and loan association, building and loan association, cooperative bank, homestead association, or similar institution, which is supervised and examined by State or Federal authority having supervision over any such institution;

"(D) any security of an issuer organized and operated exclusively for religious, educational, benevolent, fraternal, charitable, or reformatory purposes and not for pecuniary profit, and no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual; or

"(E) any security of a foreign issuer, including any certificate of deposit for such a security, unless the Commission, by rules or regulations, or by order after notice and opportunity for hearing, on its own motion finds that a substantial public market for the equity securities of such issuer or of a class of issuers which includes such issuer exists in the United States and that continued exemption of securities of such issuer or class of issuers is not in the public interest or consistent with the protection of investors.

"(3) Registration of any class of security pursuant to this subsection shall be terminated ninety days, or such shorter period as the Commission may determine, after the issuer files a certification with the Commission that the number of holders of record of such class of security is reduced to less than three hundred persons. The Commission shall after notice and opportunity for hearing deny termination of registration if it finds that the certification is untrue. Termination of registration shall be deferred pending final determination on the question of denial.

"(4) For the purposes of this subsection the term 'class' shall include all securities of an issuer which are of substantially similar character and the holders of which enjoy substantially similar rights and privileges. The Commission may for the purposes of this subsection define by rules and regulations the terms 'total assets' and 'held of record' as it deems necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors in order to prevent circumvention of the provisions of this subsection."

(d) Section 12 of said Act is further amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"(h) The Commission may by rules and regulations, or upon application of an interested person, by order, after notice and opportunity for hearing, exempt in whole or in part any issuer or class of issuers from the provisions of subsection (g) hereof or from section 13, 14, or 15(d) of this title or may exempt from section 16 hereof any officer, director, or beneficial owner of securities of any issuer, any security of which is required to be registered pursuant to subsection (g) hereof, upon such terms and conditions and for such period as it deems necessary or appropriate, if the Commission finds, by reason of the number of public investors, amount of trading interest in the securities, the nature and extent of the activities of the issuer, income or assets of the issuer, or otherwise, that such action is not inconsistent with the public interest or the protection of investors. The Commission may, for the purposes of any of the above-mentioned sections or subsections of this title classify issuers and prescribe requirements appropriate for each such class."

(e) Section 12 of said Act is further amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"(i) In respect of any securities issued by banks the deposits of which are insured in accordance with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, the powers, functions, and duties vested in the Commission under this title to administer and enforce sections 12, 13, 14(a), 14(c), and 16 thereof (1) with respect to national banks and banks operating under the Code of Law for the District of Columbia are vested in the Comptroller of the Currency, (2) with respect to all other member banks of the Federal Reserve System are vested in the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and (3) with respect to all other insured banks are vested in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation."

SEC. 4. Section 13(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Every issuer of a security registered pursuant to section 12 of this title shall file with the Commission the information, documents, and reports below specified (and such copies thereof as the Commission may require) in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe as necessary or appropriate for the proper protection of investors and to insure fair dealing in the security—

"(1) Such information and documents as the Commission shall require to keep reasonably current the information and documents required to be included in or filed with an application or registration statement filed pursuant to section 12.

"(2) Such annual reports, certified if required by the rules and regulations of the Commission by independent public accountants, and such quarterly reports, as the Commission may prescribe.

Every issuer of a security registered on a national securities exchange shall also file a duplicate original of such information, documents, and reports with the exchange."

SEC. 5. (a) Section 14(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) It shall be unlawful for any person, by the use of the mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce or of any facility of a national securities exchange or otherwise, in contravention of such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, to solicit or to permit the use of his name to solicit any proxy or consent or authorization in respect of any security (other than an exempted security) registered pursuant to section 12 of this title."

(b) Section 14(b) of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any member of a national securities exchange, or any registered broker or dealer, in contravention of such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, to give, or to refrain from giving a proxy, consent, or authorization in respect of any security registered pursuant to section 12 of this title and carried for the account of a customer."

(c) Section 14 of said Act is further amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"(c) Unless proxies, consents, or authorizations in respect of a security registered pursuant to section 12 of this title are solicited by or on behalf of the management of the issuer from the holders of record of such security in accordance with subsection (a) of this section and the rules and regulations thereunder, prior to any annual or other meeting of the holders of such security, such issuer shall, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Commission file with the Commission and transmit to all holders of record of such security information substantially equivalent to the information which would be required to be transmitted if a solicitation were made; but no information shall be required to be filed or transmitted pursuant to this subsection before July 1, 1964."

SEC. 6. (a) Section 15(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) No broker or dealer shall make use of the mails or of any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce to effect any transaction in, or to induce the purchase or sale of, any security (other than an exempted security or commercial paper, bankers' acceptances, or commercial bills) otherwise than on a national securities exchange, unless such broker or dealer (A) is registered in accordance with subsection (b) of this section, and (B) is a member of a securities association which is registered pursuant to section 15A of this title.

"The Commission may by such rules and regulations or orders as it deems necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, either unconditionally or upon specified terms and conditions or for specified periods, exempt from clause (A) or (B), or both, of this subsection (a) any broker or dealer or class of brokers or dealers specified in such rules, regulations, or orders. Clause (B) of this subsection (a) shall be inapplicable with respect to: (i) all brokers and dealers during any period in which there is no registered securities association, and (ii) any broker or dealer during any period in which the rules of each registered securities association preclude the membership therein of such broker or dealer solely because of the geographical location of, or type of business done by, such broker or dealer."

(b) Section 15(b) of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) A broker or dealer may be registered for the purposes of this section by filing with the Commission an application for registration, which shall contain such information in such detail as to such broker or dealer and any persons associated with such broker or dealer as the Commission may by rules and regulations require as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors. Except as hereinafter provided, such registration shall become effective thirty days after the receipt of such application by the Commission or within such shorter period of time as the Commission may determine.

"An application for registration of a broker or dealer to be formed or organized may be made by a broker or dealer to which the broker or dealer to be formed or organized is to be the successor. Such application shall contain such information in such detail as to the applicant and as to the successor and any person associated with the applicant or the successor, as the Commission may by rules and regulations require as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors. Except as hereinafter provided, such registration shall become effective thirty days after the receipt of such application by the Commission or within such shorter period of time as the Commission may determine. Such registration shall terminate on the forty-fifth day after the effective date thereof, unless prior thereto the successor shall, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe, adopt such application as its own.

"If any amendment to any application for registration pursuant to this subsection is filed prior to the effective date thereof, such amendment shall be deemed to have been filed simultaneously with and as part of such application; except that the Commission may, if it appears necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, defer the effective date of any such registration as thus amended until the thirtieth day after the filing of such amendment.

"Any provision of this title (other than subsection (a) of this section and section 5) which prohibits any act, practice, or course of business if the mails or any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce are used in connection therewith shall also prohibit any such act, practice, or course of business by any broker or dealer registered pursuant to this subsection or any person acting on behalf of such a broker or dealer, irrespective of any use of the mails or any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce in connection therewith.

"(2) The Commission shall, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing, by order censure, deny registration to, suspend for a period not exceeding twelve months or revoke the registration of, any broker or dealer if it finds that such censure, denial, suspension, or revocation is in the public interest and that such broker or dealer, whether prior or subsequent to becoming such, or any person associated with such broker or dealer, whether prior or subsequent to becoming so associated, (A) has willfully made or caused to be made in any application for registration or report required to be filed with the Commission under this title, or in any proceeding before the Commission with respect to registration, any statement which was at the time and in the light of the circumstances under which it was made false or misleading with respect to any material fact, or has omitted to state in any such application or report any material fact which is required to be stated therein; or (B) has been convicted within ten years preceding the filing of the application or at any time thereafter of any felony or misdemeanor which the Commission finds: (i) involves the purchase or sale of any security, (ii) arises out of the conduct of the business of a broker, dealer, or investment adviser, (iii) involves embezzlement, fraudulent conversion, or misappropriation of funds or securities, or (iv) involves the violation of section 1341, 1342, or 1343 of title 18, United States Code, as heretofore or hereafter amended; or (C) is permanently or temporarily enjoined by order, judgment, or decree of any court of competent jurisdiction from acting as an investment adviser, underwriter, broker, or dealer, or as an affiliated person or employee of any investment company, bank, or insurance company, or from engaging in or continuing any conduct or practice in connection with any such activity, or in connection with the purchase or sale of any security; or (D) has willfully violated any provision of the Securities Act of 1933, or of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, or of the Investment Company Act of 1940, or of this title, as any of such statutes heretofore have been or hereafter may be amended, or of any rule or regulation under any of such statutes; or (E) has willfully aided, abetted, counseled, commanded, induced, or procured the violation by any other person of the Securities Act of 1933, or the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, or the Investment Company Act of 1940, or of this title, as any such statutes heretofore have been or hereafter may be amended, or of any rule or regulation under any of such statutes or has failed reasonably to supervise, with a view to preventing violations of such statutes, rules, and regulations, another person who commits such a violation, if such other person is subject to his supervision; or (F) is subject to an order of the Commission entered pursuant to paragraph (3) of this subsection (b) barring or suspending the right of such person to be associated with a broker or dealer, which order is in effect with respect to such person. For the purposes of clause (E) of this paragraph, no person shall be deemed to have failed reasonably to supervise any person, if (i) there have been established procedures, and a system for applying such procedures, which would reasonably be expected to prevent and detect, insofar as practicable, any such violation by such other person; and (ii) such person has reasonably discharged the duties and obligations incumbent upon him by reason of such procedures and system without reasonable cause to believe that such procedures and system were not being complied with. Pending final determination whether any such registration shall be denied, the Commission may by order postpone the effective date of such registration for a period not to exceed fifteen days, but if, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing (which may consist solely of affidavits and oral arguments), it shall appear to the Commission to be necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors to postpone the effective date of such registration until final determination, the Commission shall so order. Pending final determination whether any such registration shall be revoked, the Commission shall by order suspend such registration if, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing, such suspension shall appear to the Commission to be necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors. Any registered broker or dealer may, upon such terms and conditions as the Commission may deem necessary in the public interest or for the protection of investors, withdraw from registration by filing a written notice of withdrawal with the Commission. If the Commission finds that any registered broker or dealer, or any broker or dealer for whom an application for registration is pending, is no longer in existence or has ceased to do business as a broker or dealer, the Commission shall by order cancel the registration or application of such broker or dealer.

"(3) The Commission may, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing, by order censure any person, or bar or suspend for a period not exceeding twelve months any person from being associated with a broker or dealer, if the Commission finds that such censure, barring or suspension is in the public interest and that such person has committed or omitted any act or omission enumerated in clause (A), (D) or (E) of paragraph (2) of this subsection (b) or has been convicted of any offense specified in clause (B) of said paragraph (2) within the time specified therein or is enjoined from any action, conduct, or practice specified in clause (C) of said paragraph (2). It shall be unlawful for any person as to whom such an order barring or suspending him from being associated with a broker-dealer is in effect, willfully to become, or to be, associated with a broker or dealer, without the consent of the Commission, and it shall be unlawful for any broker or dealer to permit such a person to become, or remain, a person associated with him, without the consent of the Commission, if such broker or dealer knew, or in the exercise of reasonable care, should have known, of such order."

(c) Section 15(c) of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(4) If the Commission finds, after notice and opportunity for hearing, that any person subject to the provisions of section 12, 13, or 15(d) of this title or any rule or regulation thereunder has failed to comply with any such provision, rule, or regulation in any material respect, the Commission may publish its findings and issue an order requiring such person to comply with such provision or such rule or regulation thereunder upon such terms and conditions and within such time as the Commission may specify in such order.

"(5) If in its opinion the public interest and the protection of investors so require, the Commission is authorized summarily to suspend trading, otherwise than on a national securities exchange, in any security (other than an exempted security) for a period not exceeding ten days. No broker or dealer shall make use of the mails or of any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce to effect any transaction in, or to induce the purchase or sale of, any security in which trading is so suspended."

(d) Section 15(d) of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Each issuer which has filed a registration statement containing an undertaking which is or becomes operative under this subsection as in effect prior to the date of enactment of the Securities Acts Amendments of 1963, and each issuer which shall after such date file a registration statement which has become effective pursuant to the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, shall file with the Commission, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, such supplementary and periodic information, documents, and reports as may be required pursuant to section 13 of this title in respect of a security registered pursuant to section 12 of this title. The duty to file under this subsection shall be automatically suspended if and so long as any issue of securities of such issuer is registered pursuant to section 12 of this title. The duty to file under this subsection shall also be automatically suspended as to any fiscal year, other than the fiscal year within which such registration statement became effective, if, at the beginning of such fiscal year, the securities of each class to which the registration statement relates are held of record by less than three hundred persons. For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'class' shall be construed to include all securities of an issuer which are of substantially similar character and the holders of which may enjoy substantially similar rights and privileges. Nothing in this subsection shall apply to securities issued by a foreign government or political subdivision thereof."

SEC. 7. (a) Section 15A(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph (3) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"(3) the rules of the association provide that any broker or dealer who makes use of the mails or of any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce to effect any transaction in, or to induce the purchase or sale of, any security otherwise than on a national securities exchange, may become a member of such association, except such as are excluded pursuant to paragraphs (4) and (5) of this subsection: *Provided*, That the rules of the association may restrict membership in such association on such specified geographical basis, or on such specified basis relating to the type of business done by its members, or on such other specified and appropriate basis, as appears to the Commission to be necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors and to carry out the purpose of this section; rules adopted by the association may provide that the association may, unless the Commission directs otherwise in cases in which the Commission finds it appropriate in the public interest so to direct, deny admission to or refuse to continue in such association any broker or dealer if (i) such broker or dealer, whether prior or subsequent to becoming such, or (ii) any person associated with such broker or dealer, whether prior or subsequent to becoming so associated, has been and is suspended or expelled from a national securities exchange or has been and is barred or suspended from being associated with all members of such exchange, for violation of any rule of such exchange;".

(2) Paragraph (4) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"(4) the rules of the association provide that, except with the approval or at the direction of the Commission in cases in which the Commission finds it appropriate in the public interest so to approve or direct, no broker or dealer shall be admitted to or continued in membership in such association, if (i) such broker or dealer, whether prior or subsequent to becoming such, or (ii) any person associated with such broker or dealer, whether prior or subsequent to becoming so associated, and who continues to be so associated after such broker or dealer knew or in the exercise of reasonable care should have known that such person (A) has been and is suspended or expelled from a registered securities association (whether national or affiliated) or from a national securities exchange or has been and is barred or suspended from being associated with all members of such association or from being associated with all brokers or dealers which are members of such exchange, for violation of any rule of such association or exchange which prohibits any act or transaction constituting conduct inconsistent with just and equitable principles of trade, or requires any act the omission of which constitutes conduct inconsistent with just and equitable principles of trade, or (B) is subject to an order of the Commission denying, suspending for a period not exceeding twelve months or revoking his registration pursuant to section 15 of this title, or expelling or suspending him from membership in a registered securities association or a national securities exchange, or barring or suspending him from being associated with a broker or dealer, or (C) by his conduct while associated with a broker or dealer, was a cause of any suspension, expulsion, or order of the character described in clause (A) or (B) which is in effect with respect to such broker or dealer, and in entering such a suspension, expulsion, or order, the Commission or any such exchange or association shall have jurisdiction to determine whether or not any person was a cause thereof;".

(3) Paragraphs (5) through (10) thereof are redesignated as paragraphs (6) through (11), respectively, and a new paragraph (5) is added to read as follows:

"(5) the rules of the association provide that, except with the approval or at the direction of the Commission in cases in which the Commission finds it appropriate in the public interest so to approve or direct, no person shall become a member and no natural person shall become a person associated with a member, unless such person is qualified to become a member or a person associated with a member in conformity with specified and appropriate standards with respect to the training, experience, and such other qualifications of such person as the association finds necessary or desirable, and in the case of a member, the financial responsibility of such member. For the purpose of defining such standards and the application thereof, such rules may (A) appropriately classify prospective members (taking into account relevant matters, including type of business done and nature of securities sold) and persons proposed to be associated with members, (b) specify that all or any portion of such standards shall be applicable to any such class, (C) require persons in any such class to pass examinations prescribed in accordance with such rules, (D) provide that persons in any such class other than prospective members and partners, officers and supervisory employees (which latter term may be defined by such rules and as so defined shall include branch managers of members) of members, may be qualified solely on the basis of compliance with specified standards of training and such other qualifications as the association finds appropriate, (E) provide that applications to become a member or a person associated with a member shall set forth such facts as the association may prescribe as to the training, experience, financial responsibility, and other qualifications of the applicant and that the association may adopt procedures for verification of qualifications of the applicant, and (F) require any class of persons associated with a member to be registered with the association in accordance with procedures specified by such rules (and any application or document supplemental thereto required by such rules of a person seeking to be registered with such association shall, for the purposes of subsection (a) of section 32 of this title, be deemed an application required to be filed under this title)."

(4) Redesignated paragraph (9) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"(9) the rules of the association provide that its members and persons associated with its members shall be appropriately disciplined, by expulsion, suspension, fine, censure, or being suspended or barred from being associated with all members, or any other fitting penalty, for any violation of its rules;".

(5) Redesignated paragraph (10) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"(10) the rules of the association provide a fair and orderly procedure with respect to the disciplining of members and persons associated with members and the denial of membership to any broker or dealer seeking membership therein or the barring of any person from being associated with a member. In any proceeding to determine whether any member or other person shall be disciplined, such rules shall require that specific charges be brought; that such member or person shall be notified of, and be given an opportunity to defend against, such charges; that a record shall be kept; and that the determination shall include (A) a statement setting forth any act or practice in which such member or other person may be found to have engaged, or which such member or other person may be found to have omitted, (B) a statement setting forth the specific rule or rules of the association of which any such act or practice, or omission to act, is deemed to be in violation, (C) a statement whether the acts or practices prohibited by such rule or rules, or the omission of any act required thereby, are deemed to constitute conduct inconsistent with just and equitable principles of trade, and (D) a statement setting forth the penalty imposed. In any proceeding to determine whether a broker or dealer shall be denied membership or whether any person shall be barred from being associated with a member, such rules shall provide that the broker or dealer or person shall be notified of, and be given an opportunity to be heard upon, the specific grounds for denial or bar which are under consideration; that a record shall be kept; and that the determination shall set forth the specific grounds upon which the denial or bar is based; and".

(6) Section 15A(b) of said Act is further amended by adding two unnumbered paragraphs at the end thereof, to read as follows:

"The rules of the association shall include provisions governing the form and content of quotations relating to securities sold otherwise than on a national securities exchange which may be disseminated by any member or any person associated with a member, and the persons to whom such quotations may be supplied. Such rules relating to quotations shall be designed to produce fair and informative quotations, both at the wholesale and retail level, to prevent fictitious or misleading quotations, and to promote orderly procedures for collecting and publishing quotations.

"The provisions of this subsection, as in effect prior to the date of enactment of the Securities Acts Amendments of 1963, shall be applicable to the rules of any registered securities association which was registered on such date until July 1, 1964. After July 1, 1964, the Commission may, after notice and opportunity for hearing, suspend the registration of any such association if it finds that the rules thereof do not conform to the requirements of this subsection, as amended by section 7 of the Securities Acts Amendments of 1963, and any such suspension shall remain in effect until the Commission issues an order determining that such rules have been modified to conform with such requirements."

(b) Section 15A(d)(2) of said Act is amended by striking out "(9)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(10)".

(c) Section 15A(g) of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(g) If any registered securities association (whether national or affiliated) shall take any disciplinary action against any member thereof or any person associated with such a member or shall deny admission to any broker or dealer seeking membership therein, or shall bar any person from being associated with a member, such action shall be subject to review by the Commission, on its own motion, or upon application by any person aggrieved thereby filed within thirty days after such action has been taken or within such longer period as the Commission may determine. Application to the Commission for review, or the institution of review by the Commission on its own motion, shall operate as a stay of such action until an order is issued upon such review pursuant to subsection (h), unless the Commission shall otherwise order, after notice and opportunity for hearing on the question of a stay (which hearing may consist solely of affidavits and oral arguments)."

(d) Section 15A(h) of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(h) (1) In a proceeding to review disciplinary action taken by a registered securities association against a member thereof or a person associated with a member, if the Commission, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing, upon consideration of the record before the association and such other evidence as it may deem relevant, shall (A) find that such member or person has engaged in such acts or practices, or has omitted such act, as the association has found him to have engaged in or omitted, and (B) shall determine that such acts or practices, or omission to act, are in violation of such rules of the association as have been designated in the determination of the association, the Commission shall by order dismiss the proceeding, unless it appears to the Commission that such action should be modified in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection. The Commission shall likewise determine whether the acts or practices prohibited, or the omission of any act required, by any such rule constitute conduct inconsistent with just and equitable principles of trade, and shall so declare. If it appears to the Commission that the evidence does not warrant the finding required in clause (A), or if the Commission shall determine that such acts or practices as are found to have been engaged in are not prohibited by the designated rule or rules of the association, or that such act as is found to have been omitted is not required by such designated rule or rules, the Commission shall by order set aside the action of the association.

"(2) If, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing, the Commission finds that any penalty imposed upon a member or person associated with a member is excessive or oppressive, having due regard to the public interest, the Commission shall by order cancel, reduce, or require the remission of such penalty.

"(3) In any proceeding to review the denial of membership in a registered securities association or the barring of any person from being associated with a member, if the Commission, after appropriate notice and hearing, and upon consideration of the record before the association and such other evidence as it may deem relevant, shall determine that the specific grounds on which such denial or bar is based exist in fact and are valid under this section, the Commission shall by order dismiss the proceeding; otherwise, the Commission shall by order set aside the action of the association and require it to admit the applicant broker or dealer to membership therein, or to permit such person to be associated with a member."

(e) Section 15A(k)(2) of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The Commission may in writing request any registered securities association to adopt any specified alteration of or supplement to its rules with respect to any of the matters hereinafter enumerated. If such association fails to adopt such alteration or supplement within a reasonable time, the Commission is authorized by order to alter or supplement the rules of such association in the manner theretofore requested, or with such modifications of such alteration or supplement as it deems necesary if, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing, it appears to the Commission that such alteration or supplement is necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors or to effectuate the purposes of this section, with respect to: (A) The basis for, and procedure in connection with, the denial of membership or the barring from being associated with a member or the disciplining of members or persons associated with members, or the qualifications required for members or natural persons associated with members or any class thereof; (B) the method for adoption of any change in or addition to the rules of the association; (C) the method of choosing officers and directors; and (D) affiliation between registered securities associations."

(f) Section 15A(l)(2) of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing, by order to suspend for a period not exceeding twelve months or to expel from a registered securities association any member thereof, or to suspend for a period not exceeding twelve months or to bar any person from being associated with a member thereof, if the Commission finds that such member or person (A) has violated any provision of this title or any rule or regulation thereunder, or has effected any transaction for any other person who, he had reason to believe, was violating with respect to such transaction any provision of this title or any rule or regulation thereunder, or (B) has willfully violated any provision of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, or of any rule or regulation thereunder, or has effected any transaction for any other person who, he had reason to believe, was willfully violating with respect to such transaction any provision of such Act or rule or regulation."

SEC. 8. (a) Section 16(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Every person who is directly or indirectly the beneficial owner of more than 10 per centum of any class of any equity security (other than an exempted security) which is registered pursuant to section 12 of this title, or who is a director or an officer of the issuer of such security, shall file, at the time of the registration of such security on a national securities exchange or by the effective date of a registration statement filed pursuant to subsection (g) of section 12 of this title, or within ten days after he becomes such beneficial owner, director, or officer, a statement with the Commission (and, if such security is registered on a national securities exchange, also with the exchange) of the amount of all equity securities of such issuer of which he is the beneficial owner, and within ten days after the close of each calendar month thereafter, if there has been a change in such ownership during such month, shall file with the Commission (and if such security is registered on a national securities exchange, shall also file with the exchange) a statement indicating his ownership at the close of the calendar month and such changes in his ownership as have occurred during such calendar month."

(b) Section 16 of said Act is further amended by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e) and adding a new subsection (d) as follows:

"(d) The provisions of subsection (b) of this section shall not apply to any purchase and sale, or sale and purchase, and the provisions of subsection (c) of this section shall not apply to any sale, of an equity security not then or theretofore held by him in an investment account, by a dealer in the ordinary course of his business and incident to the establishment or maintenance by him of a primary or secondary market (otherwise than on a national securities exchange or an exchange exempted from registration under section 5 of this title) for such security. The Commission may, by such rules and regulations as it deems necessary or appropriate in the public interest, define and prescribe terms and conditions with respect to securities held in an investment account and transactions made in the ordinary course of business and incident to the establishment or maintenance of a primary or secondary market."

Sec. 9. Section 20(c) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) It shall be unlawful for any director or officer of, or any owner of any securities issued by, any issuer required to file any document, report, or information under this title or any rule or regulation thereunder without just cause to hinder, delay, or obstruct the making or filing of any such document, report, or information."

Sec. 10. Section 32 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is amended by striking out subsection (b) and by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

Sec. 11. Section 4 of the Securities Act of 1933 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. The provisions of section 5 shall not apply to any of the following transactions:

"(1) Transactions by any person other than an issuer, underwriter, or dealer; transactions by an issuer not involving any public offering; or transactions by a dealer (including an underwriter no longer acting as an underwriter in respect of the security involved in such transaction), except (a) transactions taking place prior to the expiration of forty days after the first date upon which the security was bona fide offered to the public by the issuer or by or through an underwriter, (b) transactions in a security as to which a registration statement has been filed taking place prior to the expiration of forty days after the effective date of such registration statement or prior to the expiration of forty days after the first date upon which the security was bona fide offered to the public by the issuer or by or through an underwriter after such effective date, whichever is later (excluding in the computation of such forty days any time during which a stop order issued under section 8 is in effect as to the security), or such shorter period as the Commission may specify by rules and regulations or order, and (c) transactions as to securities constituting the whole or a part of an unsold allotment to or subscription by such dealer as a participant in the distribution of such securities by the issuer or by or through an underwriter. With respect to transactions referred to in clause (b), if securities of the issuer have not previously been sold pursuant to an earlier effective registration statement the applicable period, instead of forty days, shall be ninety days, or such shorter period as the Commission may specify by rules and regulations or order.

"(2) Brokers' transactions, executed upon customers' orders on any exchange or in the over-the-counter market, but not the solicitation of such orders."

Sec. 12. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect as follows:

(1) The effective date of section 12(g)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as added by section 3(c) of this Act, shall be July 1, 1964.

(2) The effective date of the amendments to sections 12(b) and 15(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, contained in sections 3(a) and 6(a), respectively, of this Act, shall be July 1, 1964.

(3) All other amendments contained in this Act shall take effect on the date of its enactment.

LOSS OF RECREATION FACILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, progress is a wonderful thing. The District of Columbia has made a great deal of progress in the past few years with the construction of new freeways, bridges, stadiums, and schools. However, the price that we have paid for these achievements cannot be measured in dollars alone. We have paid also with an altogether too scarce commodity—recreation facilities. In recent years we have lost baseball and softball diamonds, a football field, tennis courts, a soccer field, a volleyball court, a golf course, handball courts, a miniature golf course, and numerous playgrounds to developments in other areas, and the losses have almost never been adequately replaced.

As the carpets of cement and the walls of brick spread out over the District and swallow more and more of our already limited recreation areas, our children are driven onto the city streets for their games. I feel certain that the juvenile delinquency rate is directly related to the shortage of recreation facilities. As I have stated before, it is my contention that a boy who exercises all day will be too tired to get into mischief at night.

During my term as mayor of Evansville, Ind., I stressed a program of healthy recreation as an important part of our fight against juvenile delinquency. As a result, Evansville, a city one-fifth the size of Washington, D.C., now has eight public swimming pools compared with seven in Washington, and they are so popular that the children must come in shifts. Washington would do well to follow Evansville's example.

Recreation facilities are already in great demand in the District. We must make an effort to build new facilities, not destroy old ones. I certainly do not want to stand in the way of new schools, bridges, or freeways, but I feel that we must not ignore the loss of recreation areas that so often results from this new construction.

In a report prepared for me by Mr. Milo F. Christiansen, Superintendent of Recreation for the District, there is a list of the recreation facilities lost as a result of new construction. In view of the need for more, not less, recreation areas, I find this list a shocking reminder of our neglect. I therefore ask unanimous consent that this list be printed in the Record, so my colleagues and other interested people will realize the seriousness of the problem.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Loss of Recreation Facilities in the District of Columbia

(1) East Potomac Park: Loss, 36 tennis courts. Replacement, 16 tennis courts. Reason, bridge and approaches to the Southwest Freeway.

(2) Sports Center, East Capitol Street at Anacostia River: Loss, five softball and baseball diamonds. Replacement, none. Reason, construction of a municipal stadium. Although the stadium is a worthy addition to the city's recreation facilities, it is not a substitute for the lost softball diamonds.

(3) West Potomac Park, Rock Creek Parkway at Constitution Avenue: Loss, two softball diamonds, one baseball diamond, one soccer field. Replacement, none. Reason, approaches to Roosevelt Bridge.

(4) Garfield Park, Second and F Streets, SE.: Loss, children's playground. Replacement, none. Reason, Southeast Freeway.

(5) Anacostia Park, East bank of Anacostia River: Loss, four softball diamonds, two baseball diamonds, two handball courts, one football field, one volleyball court, one miniature golf course, one 18-hole golf course. Replacement, one 9-hole golf course. Undetermined additional replacement when construction is completed. Reason, construction of Anacostia Freeway.

(6) Losses through school construction: There are both direct and indirect losses because of additions to school buildings and new school construction. School annexes are frequently constructed on existing playground space. Thus less space is available for the increased school enrollment. Recent examples of this type of loss include: H. D. Cooke, 17th and Euclid, NW.; Bancroft, 18th and Newton, NW.; and Rudolph, Second and Hamilton, NW.

New school buildings are frequently constructed with inadequate playground space surrounding them. The plan for recreation facility development calls for the utilization of school facilities for public recreation whenever feasible. Inadequate outdoor facilities at new schools make it impossible to provide the diversified recreation program which the neighborhood demands and deserves. Examples of inadequate playground space at new sites include: Backus Junior High School, South Dakota Avenue and Galloway NE.; J. O. Wilson, Sixth and K Streets NE.; and Drew, 56th and Eads Streets NE.

In some instances new schools have been constructed on land designated on the recreation system plan for future expansion of playground facilities. Thus the new school enrollment overcrowds what was recognized to be an insufficient recreation area. Examples of this type of loss include: Watkins, 12th and E Streets SE. adjacent to Buchanan Playground; and Goding, 10th and F Streets NE. adjacent to Sherwood Playground.

(7) Foreseeable losses in the future: (a) Virginia Avenue Playground, 11th and Virginia Avenue SE.—At least 50 percent of area will be lost to 11th Street Interchange with Southeast Freeway.

(b) Francis Recreation Center, 24th and N Streets NW.—At least 50 percent of area, including a swimming pool, will be needed for the west leg of Inner Loop.

(c) Washington Monument grounds and Ellipse—Landscaping and beautification of these areas may result in the loss of these very popular outdoor sports areas.

(d) Congress has designated 27 acres in West Potomac Park as the site for a proposed memorial to Franklin D. Roosevelt. The Recreation Board has gone on record as favoring a park with active and passive recreation areas well landscaped as a suitable memorial to the ex-President.

(8) Replacement possibilities: Funds available under Capper-Crampton Act have been exhausted. Thus the District Government must now obtain funds and acquire land for recreation purposes. In 1963, $88,000 was appropriated for a four-acre playground in Northeast Washington. It has not yet been acquired.

Through the 6-year public works program the Recreation Department has requested funds for acquisition and development of one new 10-acre site. The approved program, however, has consistently deferred this acquisition.

Land purchase and development is possible through urban renewal. There is a possibility that two playgrounds will be enlarged in the Adams-Morgan area. Plans for Northwest Area No. 1 will enlarge the play space surrounding Terrell and Walker-Jones Schools.

The District Commissioners have promised to consider transferring to the Recreation Department the Fire Department and Eastern Market properties at 7th and North Carolina Avenue SE. when the market is closed.

SOUTHERN GOVERNORS ADVOCATE TAX REDUCTION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the progressive outlook of the Southern States was demonstrated again early this week when 14 southern Governors joined in a statement of principles advocating an across-the-board tax reduction this year. This declaration, made at the recent Governor's conference in Miami Beach, has important implications for the entire Nation.

No State better typifies the nationally oriented attitude of the South than does our State of Florida. Its close economic ties with the entire Nation are widely recognized. But it is just one of the complex of Southern States which have made tremendous economic progress and which, taken together, have become an important and integral unit of the American economy.

The South looks forward to still greater progress. Having already demonstrated amply its willingness and ability to work hard for economic improvement, the South is now redoubling its efforts toward faster economic growth. This attitude is the moving force behind the declaration of the 14 southern Governors in support of substantial reduction of personal and corporate income taxes.

It is clear from the words of their joint statement:

> A new surge of private economic development and investment would improve the opportunities of all of our people, allow enrichment of education and other State services without increased State and local taxes, and strengthen the security of the Nation.

I am proud of this forward-looking attitude on the part of the southern Governors and the States for which they speak.

In calling attention to their joint statement my purpose is to stress their hope for and determination to achieve a stronger economy providing full employment and a rising standard of living for all. They state their belief that a tax reduction will provide us with our greatest single opportunity to accomplish this worthy purpose.

It is a great source of pride and satisfaction to me that the southern Governors are in the forefront among those who are advocating constructive measures to strengthen our economy and raising the standard of living, which all of us seek.

I ask unanimous consent that a press release and joint statement of principles signed by the 14 southern Governors be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT

A joint statement by the following members of the southern Governors conference: Gov. Terry Sanford, of North Carolina; Gov. Donald S. Russell, of South Carolina; Gov. Carl E. Sanders, of Georgia; Gov. Orval E. Faubus, of Arkansas; Gov. John A. Dalton, of Missouri; Gov. George C. Wallace, of Alabama; Gov. Ross A. Barnett, of Mississippi; Gov. J. Millard Tawes, of Maryland; Gov. Burt Coombs, of Kentucky; Gov. William W. Barron, of West Virginia; Gov. Ferris Bryant, of Florida; Gov. John B. Connally, of Texas; Gov. Frank G. Clement, of Tennessee; and Gov. Jimmy H. Davis, of Louisiana.

Poverty, unemployment, underemployment and a sluggish economy cause or aggravate most of our State problems of today.

A new surge of private economic development and investment would improve the opportunities of all of our people, allow enrichment of education and other State services without increased State and local taxes, and strengthen the security of the Nation.

We believe the soundest method of achieving this growth is through the immediate across the board reduction of personal income taxes and corporate income taxes, coupled with prudent and appropriate reductions of Federal expenditures. We advocate this action in 1963.

As a focal point for immediate action we approve and commend to the Congress and to our people the attached statement of principles by Henry Ford II and Stuart T. Saunders, cochairmen, and other officers and members of the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

(1) We, the undersigned members of the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963, believe that the Federal tax structure inhibits incentives, discourages economic growth and is partly responsible for the present high level of unemployment. We therefore urge a prompt, substantial, and broad cut in individual and corporate tax rates.

(2) The present high and steeply progressive rates of Federal taxation have weakened recovery after each postwar recession. They have retarded long-run economic growth by discouraging private saving and capital investment, especially investment in new enterprises. In all these ways, the present tax structure hobbles the economy and slows our progress toward the goals of high employment, efficient use of our productive resources, including labor, and faster economic growth.

(3) We call for broad and substantial tax reductions this year because the private sector of the economy needs the strength that present taxes are draining away from it. We recognize that revision of the tax system in other ways is desirable (although each of us may have different views on this subject). We are convinced, however, that there is need for a strong stimulus to the economy and therefore that controversial tax revision should not be permitted to delay tax reduction. There is clear need for action at this session of the Congress.

(4) At the same time we urge in the strongest possible terms economies in and prudent control of Federal expenditures. Failure on the part of the Congress and the administration to establish and adhere to rigid expenditure discipline could well negate the good emanating from tax reduction. It is merely common sense to recognize that the lower tax rates which we urge can be permanently maintained only if a reasonable balance between Federal income and expenditures be brought about at an early date. Pending the achievement of budgetary balance, it is of the utmost importance that any deficit and particularly that which is contemplated in the next fiscal year be financed in a noninflationary manner.

(5) We urge Congress to enact, during the present session, net reductions of corporate and individual taxes totaling about $10 billion, a substantial part to take effect as early as possible in 1963.

Specifically, we advocate: (a) A substantial reduction in all individual tax rates from the present range of 20–91 percent; and (b) A reduction in the rate of corporate income tax to at least 47 percent.

(6) Believing that these proposals are of primary importance, we have associated ourselves together in a temporary nonpartisan organization called the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963. Its purpose is to promote widespread public understanding and acceptance of the need for prompt and effective tax reduction.

Membership in this committee shall not preclude the exercise by any member of his right to disagree with any specific features of the committee's proposals, or to advance other proposals of his own.

We invite others who share our convictions to join with us in attaining the purpose of this organization. We welcome their help in gaining for tax reduction the understanding, acceptance, and support it deserves. U.S. Federal income tax rates are more burdensome than those of any other industrial nation in the world. If we do not delay but instead act quickly to reduce the heavy burden of the tax structure on the private sector of the economy we shall have provided strong impetus for a dynamic growing economy. In so doing, we will enable our Nation better to provide jobs for our growing labor force, to compete effectively in world markets, to resolve our critical balance-of-payments problem, and to continue to serve as the firm foundation for the military and economic strength of the entire free world.

SECURITIES ACTS AMENDMENTS OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1642) to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, to extend disclosure requirements to the issuers of additional publicly traded securities, to provide for improved qualification and disciplinary procedures for registered brokers and dealers, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBERTSON obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I yield, with that understanding, for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator yields for the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, without losing his right to the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the pending bill, S. 1642, which would amend the SEC law, was reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency by a unanimous vote. I am pleased at the prospect that the bill will similarly be passed by the Senate without objection.

One objection to the bill was raised by the bankers. That was met by an amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] and the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits]. The banks thought that those which were to be included—that is, those with 750 stockholders and $1 million of assets—should be under the jurisdiction of the Federal banking agencies instead of the SEC, and that was incorporated in the bill by the committee, and Senate concurrence will be asked.

THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. President, in view of the fact that it is not necessary for me to do more than urge prompt adoption of the SEC bill upon my colleagues, I wish to take this opportunity to express my grave concern over the delay in continuing the Export-Import Bank. The President has told us that it is very important to continue that Bank. In his statement on the subject of balance of payments he said that we must exert every effort to increase our foreign trade. That is exactly what the Export-Import Bank does. It increases our foreign trade. It lends money to those who make investments abroad, which brings foreign money to the United States. It insures those who ship articles abroad that they will get their money back in currency, or whatever they sell their goods for, and not have it stolen by some foreign firm or government.

I am informed that the House voted today—379 to 11—to stand fast on the House proposal to provide new funds for the Export-Import Bank on an appropriation basis. I urged the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency to accept the original House bill, which provided for annual appropriations. A majority of the committee did not agree with me, and reported a bill for backdoor financing. I predicted that there would be difficulty, and perhaps an insuperable difficulty, in having such a bill approved.

I pointed out that the Secretary of the Treasury had testified that it was not necessary to resort to back-door financing to continue the lending features of the Export-Import Bank, because the Bank needed only about $100 million of additional capital this year besides authority to continue the use of its revolving fund, and that it would be a simple matter to put that authorization in the bill and then appropriate the $100 million. But the majority of the committee did not agree with me. Now a substantial part of July has passed.

The Bank went into liquidation legally on June 30 last. Every day that the Export-Import Bank is prohibited from operating we are losing foreign trade, so essential to correct our balance-of-payments situation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point three telegrams I received today urging action with respect to the Bank.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

New York, N.Y., *July 27, 1963.*

Senator A. Willis Robertson,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Continued successful and unhampered operation of Export-Import Bank is vital to U.S. industry and especially to my company, since increased exports are essential to maintaining and if possible increasing level of employment in Babcock & Wilcox plants in Lynchburg, Va.

Therefore strongly urge your support of Senate amendment to House Resolution 387, permitting Export-Import Bank to obtain funds by borrowing directly from the Treasury as it has done since its inception. With this method of operation Bank has done excellent job of building exports, enlisting cooperation of commercial banks, and aiding balance of payments. I generally favor stop to back-door spending but Export-Import Bank is a lending, revenue producing institution, not a spending or give away agency. Please give this your urgent consideration.

M. Nielsen,
President, the Babcock & Wilcox Co.

Norfolk, Va., *July 29, 1963.*

Hon. A. Willis Robertson,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Export-Import Bank authority to make loans expires tomorrow. Urge immediate reauthorization. Continued functioning of Bank vital to foreign trade.

H. D. Clark,
Executive Director, Virginia State Ports Authority.

Norfolk, Va., *July 26, 1963.*

Hon. A. Willis Robertson,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Deadblock between House and Senate regarding Eximbank extension bill seriously threatens export expansion drive. Prompt action, more important than method of financing although Senate version preferable in this particular case. Urgently request your efforts toward speedy solution.

Michael M. Mora,
General Manager, Norfolk Port and Industrial Authority.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a portion of the speech I delivered last Saturday in West Virginia, at White Sulphur Springs, at the annual meeting of the bankers of the great State of West Virginia, dealing with the subject of the balance of payments.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Balance of Payments

Managing the currency involves not only banks and financial institutions but also the Nation's balance of payments. The United States has incurred a deficit in its balance of payments during 12 of the past 13 years. After allowing for the single surplus in 1957, when the Suez crisis temporarily stimulated our exports, the deficits amounted to $26 billion. To finance these deficits has required an $8 billion reduction in the Nation's gold stock and an $18 billion increase in foreign-held liquid claims against the dollar. Most recently, the Nation's gold holdings are down to $15.7 billion, which leaves only about $3.5 billion of free gold above the $12.2 billion required to back our money supply of currency and demand deposits. Foreign claims on our gold totaled $25.4 billion, including claims of international agencies. In recognition of the seriousness of this problem, the President submitted to the Congress on July 18 a special message on the balance of payments. Shortly before, the Federal Reserve had raised its discount rate from 3 to 3½ percent and increased the interest rate ceiling on short-term time deposits to 4 percent, both specifically directed, according to the Board of Governors, to the balance-of-payments problem.

Of course, the United States has throughout this 13-year period run a surplus in its commercial exports of goods and services. Essentially, the balance-of-payments problem arises because the trade surplus is not enough to finance our present level of tourism, of military and economic spending abroad, and the outflow of short- and long-term investment funds. In 1962, for example, the overall deficit was slightly over $2 billion. In that year, we ran a commercial export surplus of goods and services of over $4 billion; however, there was a deficit on Government spending abroad of $3 billion and a private capital outflow of over $3 billion. If it had not been for special Government transactions arranged specifically to reduce the balance-of-payments deficit—such as prepayment by other countries of loans and military purchases and medium-term borrowings abroad by the Treasury—the deficit in 1962 would have amounted almost to $3½ billion. This year, according to Secretary Dillon, there has been little improvement, and currently officials estimate that the deficit is running at an annual rate of $3½ billion, exclusive of special Government transactions.

The major reliance in the administration's policy to deal with the problem is on raising short-term interest rates, imposing a tax on foreign securities sales in the United States, and on expanding exports, including extension of the Export-Import Bank Act. The reason for raising short-term interest rates is to restrict the flow abroad of short-term capital seeking higher interest rates in European money markets. The new interest equalization tax recommended by the President to the Congress is intended to reduce the outflow of funds caused by Americans buying foreign stocks and bonds. Also, the President announced a $½ million standby credit from the International Monetary Fund.

I can agree with much in the President's proposals, but other portions I regret and some omissions I regret even more. Certainly, we need to expand our exports but that will not be easy. It will be good to stimulate further travel in the United States by allied citizens not only for the balance of payments but also for increased mutual understanding. The maintenance of cooperative arrangements by the administration with European central banks has reduced the danger of "runs" on the dollar, but the administration recognizes that they do not go to the heart of the problem. When it comes to the new tax on foreign stocks and bonds, I regret what may be a necessary limitation upon our vaunted free enterprise system, to curtail the right of U.S. investors to purchase foreign securities carrying a greater rate of return than domestic securities. However, every time a U.S. individual buys a foreign security, he gets the security and the foreigner gets a claim upon our gold.

In my opinion, the tax on foreign stocks and bonds to slow their sales in this country does not compare with the savings from a clear alternative. That alternative is to cut Government spending abroad by reducing both military spending and foreign aid spending far more than the President proposes. Take military spending first. We now have military establishments in 52 countries of the world—and all of the military personnel, plus hundreds of thousands of their dependents, are spending dollars abroad. But as we rely increasingly upon missile deterrents, that grandiose display of military power is no longer necessary. It can and should be substantially reduced, including reductions of our NATO forces and military aid to doubtful allies. As for foreign economic aid, the President's own adviser, General Clay, has called the aid program confused and scattered. I do not see why we cannot more aggressively reduce and consolidate our own foreign spending and at the same time more aggressively negotiate with our allies, particularly industrial countries with balance-of-payments surpluses, to share the burden of common defense and long-range foreign economic development.

What I especially regret about the President's balance-of-payments msssage is the lack of any new concern about priorities in national policy. In my opinion, the balance-of-payments problem should be given top national priority. Instead, the administration in its balance-of-payments statement reemphasizes the need for a tax cut regardless of the budget deficit. At the same time, it increases short-term interest rates with the resulting risk of a slowdown of economic activity or offsetting rate increases in Europe that may nullify its effects on short-term capital outflows. The spend-now-but-tax-later theories of Dr. Heller are more and more being questioned by responsible economists as a way to stimulate economic growth.

Recent study of European economies in the decade of the fifties shows no correlation between budget deficits and economic growth, and so it appears the Europeans have not followed the advice they have given us. Without careful coordination between the Federal Reserve and the Treasury in "twisting" interest rates, to assure that the increase in short-term rates does not spill over into the long-term area, further economic expansion may be stifled. However, cuts in Government spending abroad could reduce our balance-of-payments deficit to the manageable level of around a billion dollars, and we could go ahead with an easy money policy while unemployment is running at almost 6 percent. The foreign aid program in effect means we are buying the securities of foreign governments as well as engaging in giveaway programs. What boots it to deny the citizens of this Nation the right to invest several hundred million dollars in foreign securities of private enterprises, which we all want to encourage, and then to let the Federal Government invest billions of dollars in the equivalent of bonds of foreign governments which may use the proceeds to hinder or stifle further development of free enterprise abroad? Such, for instance, as the proposed steel mill for India.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for about 20 seconds?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I merely wish to say that the Senator from Virginia was born in the State of West Virginia, and we were happy that, in our centennial year he could return to give us of his knowledge; and he gave it to us in full measure in his speech. We welcomed it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I appreciate what the Senator has said. Although I am a native of West Virginia, I also claim to be something of a native of Virginia, because my father's ancestor came to Jamestown in 1619 and three of my mother's ancestors were in the Virginia convention that voted to ratify the Philadelphia Constitution. So I claim some ties with Virginia as well as West Virginia. I appreciate the fact that the Senator from West Virginia has referred to my being born in the great State of West Virginia.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I think it well to say that the distinguished Senator from Virginia not only honored West Virginia by his presence, but he has accepted a post as one of the members of the New Jersey Tercentennial Commission. Our 300th anniversary will be next year. He has not only given of his time, talents, and ability, but he has even suggested that he will try to obtain a modest appropriation from Congress for that purpose.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in the relatively small town of Martinsburg, where I was born, the great Newton D. Baker was born; and he would have graced the White House if certain circumstances had taken place. The senior Senator from Virginia was likewise born in the same town of Martinsburg, W. Va. The same doctor brought us both into the world. Martinsburg is a fine town. I was glad to be there a few weeks ago for the 100th anniversay.

I have not said what I wanted to say. I wanted to commend the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] for his handling of the bill. He has rendered a fine service. It is a good bill. He is responsible for the fact that it was unanimously reported from the committee. I believe it will be passed by the Senate unanimously. He will shortly address the Senate on the subject.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have had communications from Ohio businessmen expressing alarm at the fact that the Export-Import Bank was not able to operate because the authorization for its existence had come to an end. It is my understanding that the life of the Export-Import Bank terminated because of the failure of the Congress to act on June 30.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct; but the committee reported the bill, or at least voted to have it reported, to the Senate, 3 weeks before June 30.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to make a comment on the subject. A short while ago the Senate passed a bill dealing with public works which, I believe, before it is finally passed, will entail a cost of at least $1 billion, instead of $610 million.

I argued against the passage of the bill. I regret that it was passed, although it embraces projects within the State of Ohio. But the Senator from Virginia has stated that in the House, on the question as to whether the Export-Import Bank should be financed by back-door borrowing or on the basis of appropriations, the House voted 378 to 11——

Mr. ROBERTSON. Three hundred and seventy-nine.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Three hundred and seventy-nine to eleven; and in that vote it repudiated the action taken by the majority of the members of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. It might be said, in other words, that by that vote the House sustained the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Who is the chairman?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Your humble servant.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think it is a word of encouragement to learn that the House, with practical unanimity, declared that the principle of back-door financing must come to an end; that financing through the appropriation process lets the country know exactly what is being done. Those who want to spend and not reveal continue to argue for back-door financing. In my judgment, the House made a proclamation today by which good citizens who wish to reestablish fiscal stability and monetary soundness should be encouraged.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am not too sure of the figures, but we have spent some $8 billion by means of back-door financing, some of which were truly revolving funds and went back to the Treasury, but most of that money has not gone back into the Treasury.

This is what is involved in the balance-of-payments problem: Considering all the demands pending against us, a little more than $25 billion could be claimed against our gold reserves. As the minority leader pointed out, the authorization of big flood control and power projects involves inflationary pressures. Even Germany and France, whose economic structure we helped rebuild, could wreck our financial structure if they should demand repayment in gold.

Our country is such a powerful, productive, and resourceful nation that we need not expect a rush of foreign nations to convert their dollars into gold, provided we are cautious in our budgetary policies and do not engage in reckless spending which would be so highly inflationary that other nations would say that our dollars were useless and would demand repayment in gold, when throughout our history our dollar has had a stable value.

There are many worthy projects involved in these flood control proposals, but they could wait. As the Senator has said, by the Senate's cutting out some of the projects the House provided and putting in the bill some that the House did not provide, instead of cutting the bill, it has resulted virtually in enlarging the total.

To come back to the Export-Import Bank, it is very important that we proceed to enact that measure into law.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for half a minute? Is my understanding correct that the bill will now go back to the Senate conferees?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No; it is my understanding that the Senator handling the bill, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], has already asked for conferees. The House has new conferees

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AWARDING OF CONTRACTS FOR SUBMARINE CONSTRUCTION

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, today it became known in the press, and inquiry from the Bureau of Ships discloses, that of six Polaris submarines which will be built in the 1964 fiscal year budget, three will be built at Electric Boat in Groton, Conn.; two at Newport News, Va.; both private shipyards; and one at Government-owned Mare Island in California.

It is a little surprising that the assignment of these submarines has been known even in advance of the appropriations for them. It is even more amazing and distressing to me that five of these submarines should be assigned to private yards, and only one to a Government owned and operated naval shipyard that constructs and works on submarines—and that one should go to the west coast—and the one and only Government shipyard that is entirely left out is the one located at Portsmouth, N.H., and Kittery, Maine, in northern New England.

The continued policy of assigning the construction of these submarines to private yards will rise to haunt us if this Nation requires the talents and skills of shipbuilders at Government yards such as Portsmouth to marshall its defenses.

Last year a total of eight Polaris and attack-type submarines were ordered to be constructed and seven of them were assigned to private yards with Portsmouth getting one of the attack boats. Last year, over my protest, the Congress required that at least 35 percent of the conversion, repair, and overhaul of naval vessels be assigned to private shipyards. These pressures cannot be borne for long by Government yards and, if allowed to continue, will result in their eventual extinction. This we cannot afford, and must not permit.

Undoubtedly a cost factor is involved, and that has loomed large in the mind of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara. However, there is one thing that is the duty of every Member of Congress to remember—especially those who have been here long enough to live with this problem in war and peace—that our Government-owned shipyards, merely because of a minor cost factor, should not be allowed to lose their skills and skilled operatives and, above all, their designing departments. It will result in the loss of morale, which is already being evidenced by continuing rebuffs. If the time should come when this Nation is faced by foreign foes, we will bitterly rue the day we allowed our defense to falter because we gave our work to private yards, where labor troubles and other things can occur.

I find it difficult to restrain myself in condemning this situation.

What I am about to say has no reference to the occupant of the chair [Mr. KENNEDY] who is fighting for New England, I am sure. However, we now have in the White House the second President from New England in more than a century. I am beginning to think, from the standpoint of New England, at least from the standpoint of the State that I represent, that it had better be the last President from New England, because if there is any section of the country that has fought harder to receive less from this administration it is the section of the country that I represent.

There has been much said about Massachusetts. I have not seen so much go there, but I know that little by little in New Hampshire and in northern New England we are being stifled in transportation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How many contracts have been let for the construction of submarines? Is it five?

Mr. COTTON. It is announced that six submarines of the Polaris type will be built. I was about to say that presumably, if the appropriations go through, six contracts will be let for attack-type submarines. I have earnestly requested today that Secretary McNamara assign to Portsmouth more than one of the six attack-type submarines to be constructed this year.

I shall be interested to learn where these boats are assigned when the announcements are made in August or September. I am told—although I am not sure that this will happen—that the announcement may be made during one of those months.

I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say in the beginning of his remarks that announcement had been made that six Polaris submarines and attack submarines would be built under contracts?

Mr. COTTON. What happened was this: I learned from the press that three were to go to the Electric Boat Co. in Groton, Conn.

My office immediately called the Bureau of Ships, and the Bureau gave us the additional comforting, cheering, and joyful tidings, that two would go to Newport News and that one would go to the west coast.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. My understanding is that the Senator has been speaking about New England. Connecticut is a part of New England. It seems to me that Connecticut and New Hampshire are getting two-thirds of the submarines. Where does that leave Montana?

Mr. COTTON. New Hampshire is not getting any.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No attack submarines?

Mr. COTTON. I said I hoped we might get something. I have found from sad experience that what we hope for and what we get are two different things.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What the Senator said is correct.

Mr. COTTON. Let me say to the majority leader that the Groton yard is a private yard in Connecticut. It is a good yard, and it does good work. I am not criticizing it. It should have its share of the work. However, I have noticed—and when I say this I am not speaking only for New Hampshire or New England or any other section of the country—from personal experience what happens to morale and what happens to skills in Government yards when they begin to find that they are not getting the work, and when they face layoffs.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I stand corrected. Only half of the six submarines, that is, three of the submarines, will go to New England. It is my hope that in time the Maine-New Hampshire shipyard at Kittery-Portsmouth—a Government naval shipyard—will get at least one of these submarines, so that in that way, instead of there being a standoff, the odds will be in favor of New England.

Mr. COTTON. The odds will not be in favor of New England. Other ships besides submarines are being built.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We are talking about submarines.

Mr. COTTON. Only two Government yards build submarines. One is at Portsmouth, N.H.—and if my good friend from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] were present she would claim it is at Kittery—and the other yard is in Mare Island, Calif.

Both those shipyards should receive enough of the work so that they can retain their force of skilled workers. That is vitally necessary. Whatever complaint I have about New England, I must say that technically, Groton, Conn., is on the perimeter of New England. If the distinguished majority leader believes he can build submarines out in Montana, he should have his share. However, I doubt that that can be done. The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard has been working since the first *Ranger* was built. John Paul Jones lived in Portsmouth, and took command of the *Ranger* during the Revolution. That yard is the oldest and most experienced yard we have, with its great traditions. It probably has the greatest skills of any shipyard in the Nation. I do not want to see them lost.

That is why I find myself amazed. The unkindest cut of all was that only one out of six was given to a naval submarine shipyard, where we want to keep people working, and where the necessary skills exist. The workers in private shipyards have such skills. Nevertheless, of all the submarine contracts, not one of them went to Portsmouth. Despite the remarks of the majority leader, I still find myself incensed, and justly so. What I shall say this afternoon is but a preface to what I shall say later.

Incidentally, I hope my colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], who has every right to expect some help from this administration, will begin to exercise his influence, which should be effective. I shall cooperate with him. If he gets something for Portsmouth, God bless him. I shall be glad to have him take all the credit. All I want is a fair break for Portsmouth.

I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, without indulging in any geographical preference as regards Massachusetts or Connecticut or New Hampshire, or Montana, I wish to commend the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire for all his previous remarks.

It is extremely important, as the Senator from New Hampshire has said, that the Government shipyards retain their skilled personnel, and that they be able to meet any emergency which may arise. We have exactly the same situation, although not with regard to submarines, as it affects the Brooklyn Naval Shipyard, which has had a long and distinguished history of shipbuilding. The naval shipyards should not be relegated solely to repair work. They should have their fair share, necessary to maintain employment levels, of the shipbuilding work. Why should they be considered expendable so far as the national interest is concerned, and no other considerations? They should have a fair share and must have it because it would be a national disaster to permit the Brooklyn Naval Shipyard or any other naval shipyard, including the Portsmouth Navy Yard, to go downhill——

Mr. COTTON. I did not say we are going downhill; I said we may go downhill.

Mr. KEATING. The only part of the Senator's remarks to which I would take any exception, up to the geographical discussion, would be that Portsmouth has the longest and most distinguished history of any naval shipyard in shipbuilding. I am sure he would be very charitable toward my pardonable pride in the Brooklyn Naval Shipyard.

Nevertheless, his thesis, that the Government shipyards must be kept operating, and that a fair amount of the building of new ships should be in those yards, is absolutely sound. As he has said, we would be very sorry, indeed, and would have occasion to regret it very deeply, if we should get into a serious situation in which, overnight, we needed additional shipbuilding capacity but had allowed the Government shipyards to deteriorate. In such a position, it would not be possible for them to resume their operations overnight.

The Government shipyards must not be allowed to deteriorate. We must not let their personnel drop from, let us say, 12,000 to 2,000, and then when they are needed again, expect them to be able to function overnight. It is not that simple. The personnel must be kept together as an organization.

I am very glad that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire has raised this issue today. Like him, I shall have more extensive remarks to make on the subject later.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York. I shall not take any further time of the Senate, except to close on this note: I have spoken with some emphasis and vehemence. I feel very deeply about this subject. I was amazed and shocked by the developments today.

I do not apologize for standing on the floor and speaking in behalf of the shipyard which is located in my State. What I have said has not been said purely selfishly, from the standpoint of an institution in my State, although its prosperity and effectiveness and the employment it furnishes are vital to us. I have spoken with more emphasis—and it is on this note that I wish to close—on our national policy.

I am sure that Secretary McNamara has the best motives in the world. I am sure he is motivated by his own experience, and that even the difference of a few dollars looms large to him. We should not criticize him for that. But it would be a sad mistake to allow our naval shipyards, operated by the Government, responsible to the Navy and under the control of the Navy, ready at all times to render service, to lose their best and most skilled personnel. We shall be weakening one of the vital links of our defense. In this day, when submarines, both Polaris and attack, are among the most effective arms of the national defense and of the striking power of the Nation, we cannot afford to let this happen. I am confident that the naval men know this.

I hope the situation can be brought to the attention of Secretary McNamara, so that he will realize it. I am sure that the President, who bears so many responsibilities and is laden and busy with such a multitude of duties and details, will, if this situation comes to his attention, use his influence with the Secretary not to let this continue to happen.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, my colleague from New York has stated the case very well. I associate myself with the policies which both the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from New York have enunciated, especially with respect to the Brooklyn Naval Shipyard, which is the particular pride of those of us who come from New York and is in exactly the same position as the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard.

SECURITIES ACTS AMENDMENTS OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1642) to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, to extend disclosure requirements to the issuers of additional publicly traded securities, to provide for improved qualification and disciplinary procedures for registered brokers and dealers, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Senate is now considering S. 1642, the legislative proposals of the Securities and Exchange Commission arising from its special study of the securities markets.

I wish to express gratitude to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency [Mr. Robertson] for his promptness in scheduling hearings, for the prompt consideration of the bill by the committee in executive sessions, and for the generosity of his remarks earlier.

The senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], who is a highly valued member of the full committee and of the subcommittee, has brought his wealth of background, knowledge, and ability from his great city and its central position in the securities markets to our committee. He has been most helpful in developing the proposed legislation, which will close a gap that has too long existed. He comes from an area where the importance of the securities business and of the proposals in S. 1642 have long been recognized.

Other distinguished Senators, members of the committee in prior years, including the former Senator from Delaware [Mr. Frear] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], have proposed the incorporation of over-the-counter securities and issues in the protection provided by the Securities Act and the Securities and Exchange Act.

We are making history. We come to the Senate with a bill that has received the full support of the entire securities industry. We come to the Senate with a bill that has received the full support of the Committee on Banking and Currency. We hope for prompt, but thorough consideration.

S. 1642 contains the legislative proposals of the Securities and Exchange Commission arising out of its special study of the securities markets.

S. 1642 has two principal objectives. First, it would improve investor protection by extending to the larger companies in the over-the-counter market the registration, reporting, proxy solicitation, and insider trading requirements now applicable to companies listed on an exchange. Second, it would strengthen the standards of entrance into the securities business, enlarge the scope of self-regulation and strengthen Commission disciplinary controls over brokers and their employees.

S. 1642 was drawn up by the SEC on the basis of its special study and after extensive consultation with the securities industry. It was introduced by Senator Robertson, the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, on June 4, 1963, by request. Hearings were held by the Securities Subcommittee on June 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, and 25. The Securities Subcommittee considered the bill at an executive session on July 9 and adopted one major amendment proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] and myself. On July 16 the full committee considered the bill in executive session and ordered it reported to the Senate. In view of the importance of the bill, an extensive and thorough report was prepared and filed on July 24.

At the outset I should like to express my appreciation of the careful and constructive way in which the SEC prepared the bill, reviewed it with the securities industry, and modified it so as to obtain complete understanding and virtually complete support for the bill.

The history of the bill is in sharp contrast with the violent controversy over the original Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. It is also in sharp contrast with the earlier bills of Senator Frear, Senator FULBRIGHT, and others who, ever since 1949, have been urging regulation of the major companies in the over-the-counter market. This year strong statements in support of the bill were presented by the National Association of Securities Dealers, the Association of Stock Exchange Firms, the Investment Bankers Association of America, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, and the major stock exchanges.

As I see it, this kind of support marks a substantial change in the attitude of industry from years past. I believe this change is attributable to an awakened understanding on the part of the securities industry to the desirability of providing additional information to those to whom they sell securities and to the need for giving such additional information in order to encourage increased investment in American commerce and industry.

The securities markets play a vital role in the U.S. economy. The markets for distributing securities into public hands and for continuous trading in outstanding securities involve directly or indirectly large numbers of people as owners or traders, and equally important, the performance of the securities markets affects the well-being of the economy and contributes to the Nation's economic growth. For example, during the 5-year period, 1957–61, corporations in the United States raised $39 billion for plant equipment and working capital by issuing stock and bonds. During 1962 alone, the 650-member firms of the Investment Bankers Association raised $15.3 billion of new capital for industry, States, cities and non-Federal governmental agencies. Since World War II this group raised some $215 billion for these purposes. By the end of 1961 individuals had accumulated net financial savings of about $900 billion, of which direct holdings of corporate securities constituted more than one-half, in the hands of some 17 million individuals.

Clearly the size of the securities business and its importance to our Nation's business, commerce and financial structure make it appropriate for the Congress to give special attention to this segment of our economy.

I have mentioned the broad and strong support for the bill. I should like now to describe the bill briefly and then to point out the few aspects which have raised problems.

The first major part of the bill relates to disclosure. At the present time corporations which have stock listed on an exchange and corporations which float new issues must file registration statements, must make annual and interim reports, must submit considerable information along with their proxy solicitations, and insiders—officers and holders of 10 percent or more of the company's stock—are subject to certain insider trading requirements, including disclosure of their holdings and provisions for recapture of their short-swing profits. The bill would subject to similar requirements corporations whose stock is traded in the over-the-counter market, if they have 750 or more stockholders of record—a figure which after 2 years could be reduced to 500 stockholders—and if they have at least $1 million in assets. In addition, a few changes have been made in the requirements applicable to listed securities which would also, under the amendments, be applicable to over-the-counter securities. For example, additional information with respect to material contracts would be required for both listed and unlisted securities, comparable to that which must be included in a registration statement.

In addition, the Securities Act of 1933 would be amended so as to require that a prospectus must be delivered in all securities transactions occurring within 90 days of the commencement of the distribution of a security. This is an extension from the present 40-day requirement. It is considered necessary in order to protect against abuses in connection with hot issues.

The second major part of S. 1642 consists of changes in the provisions of the Securities Exchange Act relating to the qualifications and self-regulation of persons in the securities business.

The Securities Exchange Act adopted the basic principle of self-regulation to a very large extent in improving the standards of the persons in the securities business. This was evidenced in part by the measure of self-regulation carried on through the stock exchanges. It was extended in 1938 by the Maloney Act, introduced by Senator Maloney, a member of the Banking and Currency Committee. This legislation, now section 15A of the Securities Exchange Act, authorizes the creation of national securities associations, which are organizations of over-the-counter broker-dealers established primarily for the purpose of providing, in the over-the-counter market, a medium of self-regulation comparable to the securities exchanges in the listed market. Under the Maloney Act one securities association, the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., has been formed and has operated with a high measure of fairness and effectiveness.

S. 1642 would require that the over-the-counter broker or dealer firms would have to be members of a registered securities association. In addition, registered securities associations would be required to adopt rules establishing standards of training, experience, competence and other qualifications for members and persons associated with members and to establish capital requirements for members. The Commission would also be authorized in disciplinary proceedings to act directly against an individual associated with a broker or dealer instead of proceeding against the entire firm. Many of the changes, relatively less important than the above, would be made in the powers of registered securities associations and in the powers of the Commission in respect to such associations and their members. These are described fully in the committee's report, and I will not stop here to list them all.

The application of the disclosure provisions of the bill to banks and bank stocks was one of the problems which concerned the committee most. The Banking and Currency Committee, of course, is specially charged with responsibility for banks and banking, and the committee is fully aware of the importance of banking to the Nation's monetary and financial structure. To the extent that the additional disclosure and other requirements of S. 1642 would help to strengthen the market for bank stocks and encourage investors to invest in them, the committee felt it desirable to accept the SEC's recommendation that the bill should apply to bank stocks. At the same time, the committee was fully aware of the special situation with respect to banks, the special problems of banks, and the special concern of the Federal Government for the commercial banking system as the source of the Nation's principal money supply—$130 billion of demand deposits.

The SEC in its proposal recommended that each of the three Federal bank agencies be authorized to request delegation to it of the SEC's powers under the bill with respect to banks under its supervision. This arrangement was considered to be unsatisfactory, partly because it might result in having some banks under the SEC's jurisdiction and others under bank agency jurisdiction, and partly because it might leave the SEC with residual authority over the bank agencies.

Accordingly, I proposed a revision of this section, in which the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], joined, placing directly in the three Federal bank supervisory agencies, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the FDIC, the powers, functions, and duties of the SEC with respect to the administration and enforcement of the authority granted by Sections 12, 13, 14(a), 14(c), and 16 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended.

This arrangement was satisfactory to the American Bankers Association. In fact, with this amendment the ABA agreed with and supported the principles and purposes of the bill as it applies to banks. The Comptroller of the Currency would prefer to have these powers given him by amendment to the National Bank Act. The Federal Reserve Board, on the other hand, would prefer to leave the powers in the SEC as the original bill proposed. However, while the Comptroller and the Board did not agree with the method the committee adopted to handle this problem, both agreed with the committee and with the American Bankers Association that additional disclosure was desirable in the case of bank stocks.

Another aspect of S. 1642 which caused concern to the committee was the application of the disclosure provisions to insurance companies. Under the bill, the larger stock insurance companies would be subject to the provisions of S. 1642, like all other large companies in the over-the-counter market. Insurance companies are now covered by the Securities Act of 1933, and some 150 stock insurance companies, including 96 life insurance companies, have made public offerings since 1936 and must now meet reporting requirements of Sections 13 and 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act. The committee considered it appropriate that the disclosure and other requirements of S. 1642 should be made applicable to the remaining larger stock insurance companies in the over-the-counter market.

The committee wished to make it clear that the imposition of regulations relating to registration, reporting, proxy requirements, and insider trading in the case of stock insurance companies is not considered to be regulation of the insurance business and is not intended to affect in any way State regulation of the insurance business.

The committee took special notice of the fact that life insurance companies have unusual accounting problems, and for this reason have developed special accounting procedures which have been formulated and agreed upon by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners. In the past the SEC has followed the method of accounting set up by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners and has not prescribed any method of accounting inconsistent with that. The committee had no intention of changing this practice. Accordingly, the committee obtained a letter from the SEC discussing the accounting problems of the life insurance industry and expressing the Commission's intention to continue to follow in the future its practice of using accounting methods consistent with those of the NAIC. The SEC's letter is printed in the committee's report as evidence of the committee's understanding of this matter, and the report states that—

> Insofar as the life insurance companies are now meeting the SEC reporting requirements without any basic modification of their general accounting procedures, the committee takes notice of the fact that the Commission has expressed an intention to continue this practice in the future, and it expects the Commission to do so.

Another problem which the committee looked into at some length was the proposal in S. 1642 to require all broker-dealers, except those whose business is exclusively intrastate, to become members of a registered securities association. This requirement was proposed by the SEC as part of its program for the upgrading of qualifications of those in the securities business. This principle was written into the Securities Exchange Act in 1938 when the so-called Maloney Act was added as section 15A. Under the Maloney Act, one registered securities association has been formed, the National Association of Securities Dealers, and the SEC has made it clear in a letter printed in the report that additional securities associations may be formed under appropriate circumstances.

Questions have been raised as to the desirability of requiring persons to join an association before entering into a business or profession. The committee recognized the problems involved in a requirement of such membership, including particularly the problems involved in the delegation of governmental powers to a private organization.

After careful consideration of the matter, the committee came to the conclusion that the objections ordinarily felt to a delegation to a private organization would not apply in this case. In the first place, the securities industry has had a long background and tradition of this kind of self-regulation, which has been repeatedly sustained in court and repeatedly reviewed and confirmed by the Congress. In the second place, clearly a securities association registered under section 15A of the Securities Exchange Act is not primarily a private organization. Its charter must contain many provisions set forth in the act. The SEC can require the association to strike out additional provisions which the SEC does not like, and it can require the association to put in additional provisions which the SEC thinks should be in. All actions taken by the association toward its members, such as actions on applications for membership or disciplinary proceedings, can be appealed to the SEC and from the SEC to the courts. In the light of this kind of supervision of these registered associations by the SEC, it seemed to the committee that this was not the kind of private organization which it would be inappropriate to require a person to join.

With the exception of these three provisions, the bill was strongly supported. In view of this fact, I shall not attempt to discuss on the floor the individual provisions of the bill. Instead, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at the end of my remarks a section-by-section summary of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should also like to refer Senators to the committee report which contains a section-by-section analysis of the bill beginning at page 57 and running through page 88.

I urge the Senate to act promptly on S. 1642. I am convinced it is a good bill and a needed bill. The widespread and strong industry support for the bill is most impressive. What little opposition there has been was directed primarily toward relatively minor aspects of the bill, and, in my judgment, the committee has eliminated any substantial basis for this opposition.

We have adjusted some differences, as the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] has said.

Mr. President, I am sure the bill is a good one, and I urge the Senate to act promptly on it.

EXHIBIT 1

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF THE PROVISIONS OF S. 1642

Section 1 (1-1)[1]: Short title "Securities Acts Amendments of 1963."

Section 2 (1-5): Adds four paragraphs numbered (18) through (21) to section 3(a) of the act. These paragraphs define the terms "person associated with a broker or dealer" and "person associated with a member" and adopt the Investment Company Act definitions of the terms "investment company," "affiliated person" and "insurance company," and the Investment Advisers Act definitions of the terms "investment adviser" and "underwriter."

Section 3(a) (3-1): Redesignates certain subparagraphs of section 12(b)(1) of the act and adds a new subparagraph (I) to section 12(b)(1) and a new section 12(b)(3). These new provisions authorize the Commission to require disclosure and filing copies of material contracts not made in the ordinary course of business, including patents.

Section 3(b) (3-18): Amends section 12(f) of the act so as to extend unlisted trading privileges (1) on a "grandfather" basis to securities so traded on the effective date of S. 1642 and (2) on Commission approval to securities which are currently listed on another exchange, but to abolish other unlisted trading as heretofore authorized under section 12(f)(3).

Section 3(c) (6-12): Adds new subsections 12(g) (1) through (4) to the act. (1) Requires registration of any class of equity security held of record by 750 or more persons the issuer of which has total assets exceeding $1 million. After 2 years or longer, if the Commission so determines, the shareholder requirement drops to 500 persons. (2) Provides exemptions from registration under (1) for securities otherwise listed and registered, securities issued by savings and loan associations (other than nonredeemable stock) and similar institutions, charitable organizations, and (except as the Commission determines otherwise) foreign issuers. (3) Terminates registration upon certification that the number of shareholders has dropped below 300. (4) Defines "class" and authorizes the Commission to define "total assets" and "held of record" for purposes of this subsection.

Section 3(d) (10-4): Adds a new subsection (h) to section 12 of the act which authorizes the Commission to grant exemptions from the new subsection (g) and from certain other sections of the act which become applicable upon registration under that subsection and to classify issuers and prescribe appropriate requirements by class.

Section 3(e) (11-1): Adds a new subsection (i) to section 12 of the act which provides for administration with reference to banks by appropriate Federal banking regulatory authority.

Section 4 (11-10): Amends section 13(a) of the act so as to extend its reporting requirements to issuers of securities which are registered under the new subsection 12(g).

Section 5(a) (12-10): Amends section 14(a) of the act so as to extend its proxy requirements to issuers of securities which are registered under the new subsection 12(g).

Section 5(b) (12-22): Amends section 14(b) of the act so as to extend its provisions concerning proxies given by those who hold securities for the account of a customer to such securities registered under the new subsection 12(g).

---

[1] These figures in parentheses refer to the page and line number in the bill at which sections begin. References to "the act" are to the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 as heretofore amended.

Section 5(c) (13-7): Adds a new subsection (c) to section 14 of the act which requires "substantially equivalent" information to be filed with the Commission and transmitted to record holders of registered securities as to which the issuer does not solicit proxies for a meeting of such security holders.

Section 6(a) (13-21): Amends section 15(a) of the act so as to require all brokers and dealers who use interstate facilities to register with the Commission and to be members of a registered national securities association. The Commission is granted certain exemptive powers.

Section 6(b) (14-24): Amends section 15 (b) (1) through (3) of the act. (1) In essence, removes the requirement of use of interstate facilities as to prohibited acts or conduct of any broker or dealer who is registered with the Commission. (2) Permits the Commission to impose a censure or a suspension of broker-dealer's registration for not more than 12 months, instead of having to revoke completely or otherwise impose no sanction at all as present literal wording of the statute seems to indicate. Also (2) adds numerous new grounds for revoking a broker-dealer's registration or imposing one or more of the new, lesser sanctions. (3) Authorizes the Commission to take direct action to censure, bar, or suspend up to 12 months any person from being associated with a broker-dealer, instead of having to proceed against the registration of the broker-dealer and name the associated person as a "cause."

Section 6(c) (21-10): Adds new paragraph (4) and (5) to section 15(c) of the act. (4) Authorizes the Commission to make findings against persons who fail to comply with sections 12, 13, or 15(d) and to order them to comply. (5) Authorizes the Commission to suspend summarily trading in an unlisted security for a period not exceeding 10 days.

Section 6(d) (22-6): Amends section 15(d) of the act so as to mesh the criteria applicable to companies which have heretofore been subject to that section with the criteria applicable to companies which hereafter come within the new section 12(g) and to convert the present so-called "15(d) undertaking" into direct statutory requirements.

Section 7(a)(1) (23-10): Amends paragraph (3) of section 15A(b) of the act to permit registered national securities associations to have rules barring from membership anyone who has been and is (or a person associated with who has been and is) suspended or expelled from an exchange or barred from being associated with members of an exchange because of violation of any rule of that exchange.

Section 7(a)(2) (24-18): Amends paragraph (4) of section 15A(b) of the act to require registered national securities associations to have rules barring from membership persons who (or whose associated persons) have been and are barred or suspended from association with the members of either a registered association or an exchange for conduct inconsistent with just and equitable principles of trade or whose registration as a broker-dealer is under suspension by the Commission or whose association with brokers or dealers is barred or suspended by the Commission. Also the Commission and exchanges and associations are expressly granted jurisdiction to determine what persons are "causes" of sanctions imposed by them.

Section 7(a)(3) (26-6): Redesignates certain paragraphs of section 15A(b) of the act and adds a new paragraph (5). This new paragraph requires registered national securities associations to have rules which spell out certain standards for training, experience, and other necessary and desirable qualifications for members and for persons to be associated with members, including financial responsibility in the case of members. The rules may include the right to classify, to prescribe examinations and other procedures for verifying the qualifications of applicants, and to require registration with the association of persons associated with its members.

Section 7(a)(4) (28-4): Amends redesignated paragraph 9 of section 15A(b) of the act to grant registered associations the power to impose upon their members and persons associated with them the new sanction of "being suspended or barred from being associated with all members."

Section 7(a)(5) (28-12): Amends redesignated paragraph 10 of section 15(A)(b) of the act to extend present registered association rules providing for "fair and orderly" procedures incident to disciplining members so as to include proceedings to discipline associated persons as well as members and to include the new sanction of being barred from association with a member.

Section 7(a)(6) (29-22): Adds two new unnumbered paragraphs at the end of section 15A(b) of the act. The first new paragraph requires registered associations to have rules governing quotations in unlisted securities by its members and their associates, designed to produce fair and informative quotations, wholesale and retail, to prevent fictitious or misleading quotations and to promote orderly quotation procedures. The second new paragraph authorizes the Commission, after a date to be specified in 1964 and after notice and opportunity for hearing, to suspend the registration of any association the rules of which do not conform to section 15A(b), the suspension to continue until the Commission determines that the association rules have been brought into conformity.

Section 7(b) (30-22): Amends section 15A (d)(2) of the act by changing the figure "(9)" to "(10)" to conform to the redesignation of that paragraph.

Section 7(c) (30-24): Amends section 15A (g) of the act to enlarge Commission review of sanctions imposed by registered associations to include jurisdiction to review such associations' newly authorized sanctions (1) against associated persons and (2) barring persons from being associated with a member. Also, although application to the Commission for review ordinarily stays an association's sanction, this amendment would permit the Commission to "otherwise order" after notice and opportunity for hearing on the question of a stay.

Section 7(d) (31-17): Amends section 15A (h) (1) through (3) of the act. The Commission's present authority to affirm, reverse, or modify sanctions imposed by registered associations is here extended to include the two new types of sanctions just above described under section 7(c).

Section 7(e) (33-14): Amends section 15A (k)(2) of the act. This enlarges the Commission's authority to compel changes in the rules of associations so as to cover rules both in the area of the new sanctions described above under section 7(c) and in the area of the new qualifications requirements for members and persons associated with members. Also the general scope of the Commission's authority over association rules is broadened to include not only "any specified alteration of or supplement to its (the association's) rules" which the Commission has requested the association to adopt but also "such modifications of such alteration or supplement as it (the Commission) deems necessary."

Section 7(f) (34-12): Amends section 15A (1)(2) of the act so as to enlarge the Commission's present authority to suspend up to 12 months or to expel association members from membership to include similar power to suspend or bar other persons from being associated with a member.

Section 8(a) (35-7): Amends section 16(a) of the act so that the present requirements for an "insider" (officer, director, or beneficial owner of 10 percent of any class of equity security) to report stock ownership and changes therein, with respect to equity securities of companies listed on exchanges apply also to securities registered under the new section 12(g). This amendment of section 16(a) carries over to sections 16 (b) and (c) which are cast in terms of "such beneficial owner, director, or officer" as described in section 16(a). Thus recovery of short-swing profits (under 6 months) under section 16(b) and prohibitions against short selling and the like under section 16(c) apply to insiders in companies whose equity securities are registered under the new section 12(g) as well as to insiders in companies whose securities are listed on an exchange.

Section 8(b) (36-5): Redesignates subsection (d) of section 16 of the act as (e) and adds a new subsection 16(d) which exempts a securities dealer from sections 16 (b) and (c) when he is engaged in the ordinary course of his business in establishing or maintaining a market for an unlisted equity security which is registered under the new section 12 (g). The Commission is given rulemaking power in relation to this subsection.

Section 9 (36-22): Amends section 20(c) of the act, which formerly prohibited officers, directors, and stockholders of listed companies from hindering or delaying the filing of required documents, reports, or information, so as to include all such filings required by this title or by any rule or regulation thereunder, not just filings by listed companies.

Section 10 (37-5): Repeals section 32(b) of the act which imposed a forfeiture of $100 a day for delays in filing under section 15(d).

Section 11 (37-8): Amends section 4(1) of the Securities Act of 1933 so as to extend from 40 days to 90 days the period during which the provisions of section 5 of that act (effective registration statement and prospectus) shall apply in the case of an issuer which has not previously sold its securities under any prior registration statement. The Commission is authorized to shorten the 40-day and the 90-day period. This amendment also corrects a typographical error in paragraph (2) of said section 4.

Section 12 (38-19): Establishes July 1, 1964, as the effective date of new subsection 12(g)(1) and of the amendments to section 15(a) of the act and provides that the amendments to section 15(d) of the act shall apply to all registration statements under the Securities Act of 1933 which become effective after the date of enactment of S. 1642. All other provisions are to take effect on the date of enactment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am happy to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall not long detain the Senate.

I wish to state that I believe it is a great tribute to the Senator from New Jersey that his chairmanship of the subcommittee has brought us what is essentially an agreed-upon bill. Especially is this true when one realizes the great differences involved in the various viewpoints in regard to the bill.

On the question of who would regulate the bank stocks, we finally decided that the regulatory agencies will regulate the affairs of the banks.

As to what to do about life insurance companies and their required reports, we finally got the SEC to accept the reports they file with the State regulatory agencies.

As to what to do about distribution of the shares of the investment companies, we got the SEC to make it clear that a separate organization of those companies of securities dealers, like the unlisted securities dealers association, would be proper.

I invite attention to the letters of the SEC which are attached to the report, which carry that out. They represent billions of dollars of securities.

Lest this achievement be underestimated, let it be noted that the unlisted securities affected by the bill represent trading in the amount of almost $20 billion a year, and this represents approximately 35 percent of the trading in securities on the registered stock exchanges, which is estimated at approximately $55 billion a year, and involves directly the securities holdings of 17 million Americans, and involves indirectly probably a majority of adult Americans, through life insurance holdings and savings bank deposits. This is the essence of the people's capitalism, which I think is America's greatest contribution to the march of history.

So I am delighted to join the Senator from New Jersey in this very fine work, and I hope it presages an attitude here which will give similar accommodation to the views of the great private enterprise system and will demonstrate our ability to work out these problems at the same time that the public interest is fully safeguarded.

So, Mr. President, I hope the bill will be promptly passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1642) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, first, in addition to what I have already said in regard to the fine work and the sound generalship of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], I wish to add my commendation to the distinguished ranking minority member of the Public Works Committee, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper]. He worked shoulder to shoulder with the chairman. He thoroughly explained the various aspects of the bill, and he was a tower of strength in getting the bill passed—a bill which in my opinion represents an investment in the welfare and the future of America.

At this time I also wish to commend, once again, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] for the way in which he has skillfully generaled Senate bill 1642 through the Senate. This is getting to be a habit with him, because earlier—in one afternoon, I believe—he was able to get through this body five very worthwhile bills having to do with migrant workers.

I also wish to extend my compliments to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], who with his usual keenness and understanding has been able to explain in a very few words what the bill means and its importance to the Nation's economy.

I would be remiss in the performance of my duty if I did not pay a compliment to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], the chairman of the full committee, who cooperated in such great degree with the other members of the committee and with the leadership in bringing the bill to the Senate and in having it considered here.

Mr. President, I think the Senate has performed well this afternoon.

WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, some 1,200 lawyers from 105 nations recently concluded the First World Conference on World Peace Through the Rule of Law. These lawyers were selected by their nation's bar associations to attend this unique conference in Athens, Greece, and there assist in finding a method whereby law can be made to grow strong enough to replace violence as the controlling factor in relations among men and nations internationally.

Each nation had two voting delegates. They were given in advance a working paper summarizing existing world law and world legal institutions. Their task essentially was to so chart the road ahead for world law that law will grow into the controlling factor internationally which it is now within most nations.

In Athens these leading lawyers of the world representing almost every race, creed and form of government in the world, and speaking most of its languages, found they had a common ideal and basis in their universal belief in and respect for the rule of law. In 7 days of intensive debate, discussion and hard work they hammered out four historic documents which I believe all peoples everywhere should read. These are: First, the Proclamation of Athens; second, the General Principles upon which a world ruled by law must be based; third, a global work program designed to strengthen world law rules and world legal institutions; and fourth, a resolution creating a World Peace Through Law Center to direct work of a recommended 85 committees, to coordinate and utilize work of existing institutions and to direct a wide-ranging worldwide program for the world's 1 million lawyers.

Also approved were a World Law Day similar to the very successful Law Day—USA, which has been emulated now in 30 other nations and a World Law Year similar to the International Geophysical Year which was so successful in focusing attention upon science and furthering world cooperation among scientists a few years back.

Accordingly, I ask that the text of the four Athens documents be printed in the Congressional Record.

This conference is a major achievement of the American Bar Association of which Sylvester Smith, Jr., of New Jersey, is president. The inaugural address at the conference was given by the Chief Justice of the United States, Earl Warren. Mr. Smith, His Majesty King Paul and the Prime Minister of Greece and Mr. Charles S. Rhyne of Washington, D.C., also addressed the opening session of the conference. Mr. Rhyne served as general chairman of the conference which was attended by Miriam Rooney, distinguished former dean of Seton Hall Law School, and Joseph Harrison, an outstanding lawyer of New Jersey, and over 100 other lawyers from the United States. Miss Rooney and Mr. Harrison are members of the American Bar Association's Committee on World Peace Through Law.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Proclamation of Athens

This conference of members of the legal profession from more than 100 nations throughout the world, being well aware of and deeply concerned with the fact that violation of the rule of law in international affairs by nations can only lead to disturbance of the peace and destruction of mankind through nuclear holocaust, has concluded and hereby proclaims that law must replace violence internationally as the controlling factor in the fate of humanity.

We firmly believe that a world ruled by law is attainable by those to whom this proclamation is addressed—the 3 billion people who inhabit the earth.

We recognize and willingly accept our special responsibility as professional men technically trained in procedures for the just and peaceful resolution of disputes, to create and support effective and equitable means for the peaceful settlement of transnational differences between men and nations.

We have adopted at this conference a global work program for developing and strengthening rules of international law and international legal institutions and procedures, and we solemnly pledge ourselves to carry it forward with dispatch, enlisting the joint efforts and resources of the 1 million members of the legal profession of all nations. The urgency of the need and the determined leadership now available as a result of this conference, make us confident that our program of research, education, and action will cause the force of law to replace the law of force in the world community.

We call on the people of all nations throughout the world, and especially their governments, to support this Proclamation of Athens to the end that the program here adopted can be translated from idea to reality thereby assuring mankind that the ever-accelerating arms race and the threat of annihilation by war may be ended forever.

Declaration of General Principles

In order to establish an effective international legal system under the rule of law which precludes resort to force, we declare that:

(1) All states and persons must accept the rule of law in the world community. In international matters, individuals, juridical persons, states and international organizations must all be subject to international law, deriving rights and incurring obligations thereunder.

(2) The rule of law in international affairs is based upon the principle of equality before the law.

(3) International law and legal institutions must be based on fundamental concepts of fairness, justice, and human dignity.

(4) International law and legal institutions must be capable of expansion, development or change to meet the needs of a changing world composed of nations whose interdependence is ever on the increase and to permit progress in political, social, and economic justice for all peoples.

(5) All obligations under international law must be fulfilled and all rights thereunder must be exercised in good faith.

(6) A fundamental principle of the international rule of law is that of the right of self-determination of the peoples of the world, as proclaimed in the Charter of the United Nations.

(7) Each individual is entitled to effective legal protection of fundamental and inalienable human rights without distinction as to race, religion, or belief.

(8) Those who are subject to international law must resolve their international disputes by adjudication, arbitration, or other peaceful procedures.

(9) International obligations, including decisions of international tribunals, must be enforced by appropriate international community action.

(10) The United Nations organization is the world's best hope for international peace under the rule of law and must be supported and strengthened by all possible means, and to this end we reaffirm our support of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

LAWYERS' GLOBAL WORK PROGRAM

This world program for the lawyers of the world is based upon the ideas expressed and objectives described at the First World Athens Conference on World Peace Through the Rule of Law, held from July 1 to July 7, 1963. It is not intended to constitute, in any sense, a summary of the papers which were presented during the week but rather a list of some of the subjects lawyers should study in their worldwide joint and cooperative efforts to strengthen world law rules and world legal institutions. While by no means intended to be exhaustive, this program is designed to suggest some of the many steps which may be taken, studied, or supported by the proposed World Peace Through Law Center and by lawyers and jurists throughout the world to help achieve a just and enduring peace under the rule of law. The order in which the items appear below has no significance other than that they were discussed in this order at the Conference.

We, therefore, refer to the center the following subjects which have been raised at Athens and urge the executive committee of the center to consider them and establish priorities having regard to the work being done by other international and national organizations, the intention being to support and avoid interference with such organizations.

I

With respect to the International Court of Justice, the work program should include studies which will:

(1) Encourage states to refer international disputes for adjudication by the International Court of Justice or other international courts, particularly by means of the inclusion in treaties of a provision that disputes relating to their interpretation shall be decided by the International Court of Justice or such other appropriate international tribunals as may be established.

(2) Encourage the respective states to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice or, if such jurisdiction has been accepted with reservations, to withdraw reservations which reserve to the respective states the right to determine whether a matter is within their domestic jurisdiction.

(3) Further the establishment of regional chambers of the Court, sitting from time to time at locations more convenient to the litigant states.

(4) Consider the question of rights of appeal from decisions of regional chambers of the Court to the International Court of Justice.

(5) Consider the modification of the Court's present composition in view of the changes which have occurred in the world since the Court's establishment.

(6) Consider whether the various states should adhere to treaties or adopt law under which decisions of the International Court of Justice, and other international courts, can be enforced through local judicial procedures.

(7) Consider amendment of article 34 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice to permit certain international organizations to have direct access to the Court as parties on a basis of equality with states.

(8) Encourage greater use of the International Court of Justice by the United Nations itself, particularly through requests for advisory opinions.

II

With respect to regional and specialized courts the work should include studies on:

(1) The feasibility of the establishment of regional courts for the principal geographical regions of the world, and specialized courts with jurisdiction over specific subject matter.

(2) Whether there should be a right of appeal from decisions of either or both such court systems to the International Court of Justice.

III

With respect to the promotion and protection of foreign investments the world program should include studies on:

(1) The establishment by intergovernmental action of institutional facilities for the settlement through conciliation, mediation, and voluntary arbitration of international investment disputes in those cases where adjudication is not yet practicable or desirable, perhaps under the auspices of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

(2) The means for and the establishment of effective procedures for the impartial resolution of international investment disputes.

(3) The recognition of the special rights and needs of the developing nations.

(4) The use of multilateral treaties for the clarification of rights and obligations with respect to foreign investments.

(5) The elimination of double taxation, and the adoption of the principles of due process of law in all matters, including those with respect to taxation.

(6) The repeal of laws that discriminate against foreign investors.

(7) The problems involved in expropriation or nationalization and the provision of prompt, adequate, and effective compensation with due consideration of the varied interests involved.

(8) The work of the International Law Commission in this area.

(9) The principle that international investors should be independent of international politics.

(10) A model international investment code.

(11) Creation of domestic foreign investment committees, composed at least in part of lawyers, to make recommendations and take action in this field.

IV (A)

With respect to the development of international trade and international economic associations the work program should include studies to:

(1) Stimulate and encourage greater cooperation on trade and economic matters among the more newly developing nations.

(2) Current legal obstacles to the expansion of international trade, and recommendations for their removal.

(3) Support organizations working on the unification of private international law, especially, but not exclusively, in the areas of arbitral awards, arbitral procedure, contracts, international judicial cooperation, recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments, and sales.

(4) Support the establishment and expansion of common markets whenever appropriate.

(5) Develop international law codes in the areas of law that relate to international business.

IV (B)

With respect to the international protection of industrial property, the work program should include studies to:

(1) Encourage states which have not adhered to the Paris Convention for the International Protection of Industrial Property of March 20, 1883 (as revised to date) to join with the 80 states which are now signatories.

(2) Develop uniform laws in the field of industrial property.

(3) Support the establishment of a system of central examination for novelty of inventions to encourage investment and promote international licensing of patents.

(4) Support the creation of a central notification and search office to identify company names and trademarks as well as common denominations.

(5) Encourage governments to promote international cooperative efforts in the industrial property field in order to remove obstacles to international trade.

(6) Develop a uniform law for the protection of know-how in order to encourage communication of technical knowledge and manufacturing secrets on an international basis and particularly to newly developing countries.

V

With respect to arbitration, conciliation, and related means of resolving international disputes the work program should include studies to:

(1) Promote through research and study the use of nonjudicial means of settling disputes (advisory opinions, conciliation, conferences, good offices, mediation, arbitration, etc.) whenever their use seems appropriate.

(2) Encourage the use of the Permanent Court of Arbitration created by the Hague Conference of 1899.

(3) Further the proposed establishment of continental international arbitration tribunals composed of men of high repute.

(4) Support the principle that fair and effective arbitral clauses should be inserted in all treaties that do not accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice or its equivalent.

(5) Encourage the reporting of public and private arbitral decisions effectively and universally, and effective enforcement measures with respect thereto.

(6) Encourage the study and possible use of the Model Rules on Arbitral Procedure adopted by the United Nations International Law Commission.

VI

With respect to disarmament and peacekeeping the work program should include studies to:

(1) Educate lawyers themselves, everywhere, and government officials of their respective states, concerning the complex problems involved in establishing an effective disarmament program.

(2) Establish committees to draft a comprehensive disarmament treaty for submission to the various states for adoption.

(3) Study the nature, scope, and functions of an international disarmament agency.

(4) Consider and recommend appropriate peacekeeping machinery which would take effect during the process of disarmament, to protect disarming states from attack.

VII

With respect to outer space and space communication the work program should include studies to:

(1) Encourage states to support the following principles adopted by the United Nations General Assembly.

(a) International law, including the Charter of the United Nations, applies to outer space and celestial bodies; and

(b) Outer space and celestial bodies are free for exploration and use by all states, in conformity with international law, and are not subject to national appropriation.

(2) Clarify the legal problems arising from the exploration and use of outer space, including liability for space vehicle accidents, responsibility of states with regard to assistance to and return of astronauts and space vehicles, and space communications,

(3) Assist in the immediate orderly inauguration of a global system of communications by satellite which will meet the present needs of states and will provide ample opportunities for planned expansion of the services to all states. without now burdening those states having no immediate demand justifying their joining the system at this time.

VIII

With respect to the United Nations and regional political organizations as sources of law rules and legal institutions the work program shall include studies to:

(1) Clarify the role of law and legal institutions in the United Nations and their relationship to political factors such as the veto;

(2) To improve the climate of professional attitude toward the United Nations with a view to attracting to it more general support and cooperation from practicing lawyers and judges throughout the world;

(3) Encourage more rapid codification and development of international law by various organs of the United Nations;

(4) Support, in particular, an increase in the work of the International Law Commission by lengthening its sessions and equipping it with additional staff able to prepare preliminary drafts with supporting documentation and commentaries.

(5) Support the use of regional political organizations for developing new rules of international and legal institutions needed to deal with regional problems, on occasion, or where appropriate, with other problems for which United Nations action would not be appropriate or feasible.

(6) Bring to the attention of the lawyers of the world the new rules of law and legal institutions being developed by the United Nations, its specialized agencies and regional organizations, as an example of the dynamism of and constant development of the international legal system.

(7) Encourage and support a thorough historical study and analysis of the utilization of the various articles of the United Nations Charter.

IX

With respect to international cooperation on legal education and research the work program shall include studies to:

(1) Encourage law schools and bar examiners to require from all law students a background in international law.

(2) Encourage and support comparative studies throughout the world of the quality and extent of international law training, and prepare recommendations for improvements.

(3) Encourage expanded programs for exchanges of lawyers, law professors, law students, and law books and materials.

(4) Encourage and support the creation of an international research center in order to proceed with the numerous research projects which the conference has approved.

(5) Encourage and support the creation in the various countries of international law research centers.

X

With respect to international unification of private law the work program shall include studies to:

(1) Encourage and support the worthwhile work of existing organizations and institutions, including the United Nations, that are active in this field.

(2) Encourage and support studies designed to select areas of law most suitable for unification, especially where there are common principles, and perhaps especially in fields of commercial law; to unify the law in such areas; and to develop means of avoiding divergence of interpretation of uniform laws.

(3) Encourage and support studies of the difficulties and obstacles in the way of making certain branches of law uniform and seek means of avoiding or removing them where unification seems wise.

(4) Encourage and support studies of the needs of the more recently developing countries insofar as they relate to possibilities of unification.

(5) Encourage the appointment of permanent national committees of lawyers to study problems of unification and make appropriate recommendations with respect thereto.

(6) Consider the establishment of a permanent top level international consultative committee for the selection of law subjects suitable for unification.

(7) Develop better and broader means, including regular information bulletins, for informing the lawyers and jurists of all countries concerning efforts being made for unification of laws.

XI

With respect to organizing lawyers internationally for effective cooperative action the work program shall:

(1) Establish a permanent World Peace Through Law Center to further the objectives of the conference in the fields of research, education, and action. Such program should include determination of methods of financing, adoption of a charter and bylaws, selection of a headquarters, employment of necessary personnel, and formulation of policies and programs.

(2) Establish regional World Peace Through Law Centers in the major geographic areas of the world.

(3) Foster the creation of national bar associations in every country and work to aid and strengthen those national bar associations not presently active and strong.

(4) Urge national bar associations to establish committees on world peace through law.

(5) Encourage religious organizations of all faiths to express to their followers the concept of world peace through the rule of law.

(6) Organize periodic regional conferences on world peace through law.

(7) Promote a program of technical assistance in the field of law, by exchanging lawyers between developed and developing countries for education and training, exchanging law books, and furnishing financial assistance.

XII

With respect to the problems of stating the general principles of international law the work program shall include studies which:

(1) Support research efforts to determine the general principles of law recognized by the community of nations as well as general principles of international law.

(2) Encourage studies and research in support of the work of the United Nations with respect to the principles of international law concerning friendly relations and cooperation among states, as recommended by Resolution 1815 (XVII) of the General Assembly of the United Nations of December 18, 1962.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE FIRST WORLD CONFERENCE ON WORLD PEACE THROUGH THE RULE OF LAW, ATHENS, GREECE, JULY 7, 1963

This world conference convened at Athens, Greece, on July 7, 1963, in which delegates and observers from 105 nations participated, resolves:

To adopt the Proclamation of Athens, the Declaration of General Principles, and the work program in the form attached to these resolutions;

To participate vigorously in the work program adopted by this conference toward the end of worldwide acceptance and application of the rule of law in international relations; and to that end

To encourage the formation and activity of national committee on World Peace Through Law within associations of lawyers and jurists.

In order to implement the foregoing resolutions, and recognizing the need for immediate and specific action, this conference further resolves:

(1) The World Peace Through Law Center is hereby created to unite the members of the legal profession of the world for the purpose of furthering world peace through law.

(2) The present executive committee of this conference under the continuing chairmanship of the conference general chairman shall prepare and adopt, the charter, and bylaws, designate the first governing board, select the headquarters, the country of incorporation, employ the initial personnel and take any and all necessary action to accomplish the purposes, objectives and resolutions of this conference.

(3) The charter shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

(a) All members of the legal profession and specially invited guests participating in this conference shall be charter members upon their written acceptance and in accordance with the charter and bylaws. Appropriate and additional memberships, and dues shall be determined by the executive committee.

(b) The center shall establish a clearinghouse and information center relative to the activities of the legal profession of all nations concerning the progress, ways, means, and implementation of world peace through law.

(c) Without duplicating the work of other international or national organizations, the center may engage in research, conferences—international, regional or national, and other constructive activities in all phases of international law and especially the rule of law in international affairs, together with available institutions and procedures for the settlement of international disputes.

(d) The center shall operate with existing organizations of the legal profession, law schools, legal centers, the judiciary, and other established organizations engaged in the improvement, research and study of international law.

(e) It shall encourage the teaching and study of international law; recommended and assist exchanges of students, scholars, jurists, and other leaders of the legal profession, especially with the small and emerging nations.

(f) Disseminate the results of such international studies and research through appropriate means and publications to its members, cooperating organizations and all governments.

(4) The center shall limit its efforts and objectives to the improvement and use of

international law and international legal institutions to the end that international disputes shall be prevented and settled through the judicial or legal processes in lieu of force.

That the lawyers here assembled approve the establishment of "World Law Day," and declare their support of it.

That the lawyers here assembled approve a "World Rule of Law Year" during which the lawyers of the world will make a concentrated effort to advance the rule of law in international affairs through a coordinated program of research, education, and cooperative action, utilizing existing national and international institutions and organizations, and establishing such new institutions and organizations as may be desirable for the fulfillment of the objectives and purposes of the world peace through law program.

Blueprint for Controlled Disarmament

(Resolution proposed by J. C. White, New Zealand, seconded by John Carrigan, Ireland, unanimously adopted July 7, 1963)

That this world conference of the legal profession from over 100 nations meeting at Athens, deeply conscious of mankind's need for reaching agreements without delay on a plan for controlled disarmament calls on the executive committee to set up a special committee of experts in international law and representatives of the practicing profession, as representative of world opinion as possible, to prepare a draft plan for an organization to direct and supervise a disarmament agreement containing provisions for settling disputes and provisions to insure compliance with the obligations of the agreement, the plan to be submitted to national organizations of lawyers and governments and to the appropriate organ of the United Nations.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to commend the Senator from New Jersey for the material he has just now placed in the Record.

The other day, an informal organization, known as Members of Congress for World Peace Through the Rule of Law, met at a very interesting luncheon in the Capitol, to hear Mr. Charles Rhyne, the former president of the American Bar Association, and the instigator of this very interesting meeting in Athens, talk about the results of that conference. A great many Senators and a number of Members of the House of Representatives attended the luncheon, and I thought all were enormously heartened by Mr. Rhyne's report; and I believe that all Members of the Senate should read the insertions the Senator from New Jersey has just now placed in the Record; I think they will find them stimulating and interesting evidence of the very real interest which members of the legal profession all over the world are taking in this problem, which I believe to be the No. 1 problem today confronting the world, which happily has achieved peace under the rule of law.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY: A SYMPTOM OF YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I introduce and send to the desk for appropriate reference, a bill extending the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act for an additional 3 years and authorizing appropriations of $10 million per year. I ask that the bill be held at the desk until noon on Thursday, August 1, for additional sponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The bill (S. 1967) to extend until June 30, 1967, the authorization contained in section 6 of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, introduced by Mr. Clark, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 6 of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 (42 U.S.C. 2545) is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "five."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in his message on youth, sent to Congress on February 14, the President effectively summarized the difficulties in finding a cure for that most pernicious ill of urban life, juvenile delinquency. He said:

> There is no single answer and no single cause or cure, but surely the place to begin is the malady which underlies so much of youthful frustration, rebellion, and idleness; and that malady is lack of opportunity.

Joblessness, the dreary prospect of a life lived in futility and without purpose—this, in the final analysis—is what tempts so many youngsters into the nefarious outlets of crime and delinquency.

We owe it to them to create room in society for the gainful employment of their energies; we are obligated to assure them at least a chance to lead useful and fruitful lives.

The President, in his message, indicated how deeply we must go into the causes of delinquency if we are to discharge this obligation. He remarked:

> It cannot be cured without a more perfect educational and vocational training system, a more prosperous full employment economy, the removal of racial barriers, and the elimination of slum housing and dilapidated neighborhoods.

Without these, our disadvantaged youth will find neither the motivation nor the opportunity to employ their talents beneficially.

Delinquency is but one symptom of a far broader national disease—youth unemployment—a problem which the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, in its studies of our national manpower problems, finds looming up as one of the most dangerous potential challenges of the next several years.

Just last Tuesday, the Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, testified before the subcommittee. He aptly summarized the problem of delinquency in terms of unemployment and education:

> In the next 32 months, 2 million youngsters who are not ready, are going to be coming into the work force, at a time when machines are taking over unskilled jobs, and there are not enough jobs to take care of the whole work force.
>
> These people are in a tragic situation. They do not know it yet, and the country does not seem to.
>
> We have not anticipated fully the implications of the fact that 1 million more young people are becoming 16 years old this year than became 16 years old last year.
>
> If we do not train them, the alternatives are that they will be on street corners, they will move into juvenile delinquency of one kind or another, and they will turn into problems so serious that we have simply got to do something about it.

There are many ways, Mr. President, that the Congress of the United States can try to do something about it.

Earlier this year, the Senate passed a Youth Employment Act which can make an important contribution.

Amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act are now before us which make more assistance available to young people under that program.

This bill is another attempt to do something about it. It is directed toward putting idle youth to work as useful citizens. Its aim is to see that unharnessed young energy and talent is employed for the benefit of society, instead of being frittered away in socially destructive delinquency.

The bill would extend the life of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act an additional 3 years so that some of the best of the antidelinquency plans nearing completion in 16 American cities can be put into effect. It authorizes $10 million per year to demonstrate new and comprehensive techniques for getting at the roots of the delinquency problem.

This legislation first passed Congress in 1961. Since that time the Appropriations Committees have made available nearly $19 million of the $30 million originally authorized.

With this money, 16 cities have assembled plans for an across-the-board attack on delinquency. Those plans will be ready soon for action. The best among them will be demonstrated with Federal funds. But action may not come unless Congress extends authority for the program beyond the expiration of the current authorization in June 1964.

Naturally, it takes much longer than a year to demonstrate any effective attack on the basic causes of delinquency. But, as of now, program administrators are unable to commit demonstration funds for more than a year. In order that the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency may be able to give an assurance of Federal support to cities which have, in expectation of Federal funds, expended much energy and money to plan their programs, we must act on this bill now.

The legislation authorizes sufficient money to finance several of the best action programs nearing the final planning stages.

It also continues the existing program for training specialized personnel who deal with delinquent youths.

And finally, it funds current Federal technical assistance programs.

In this request, the administration is not proposing long-term Federal participation in this field. The act is a means for formulating an effective approach toward the complex problems of delinquency. Once demonstrations have provided the answers for which administrators are searching, concrete recommendations will be made to Congress for a more permanent approach.

In my judgment we must extend the program if we are to honor our commitments all across the country.

Failure to extend the program will mean a disillusioning end to the first concerted national attack on delinquency. It will also mean the loss of an important new impetus for local community action in this field at a particularly critical time.

At this point in the RECORD, I request unanimous consent to have printed a table showing those cities where action or planning programs are underway.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Grants made under the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961

DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

	Amount of grant
A. Action program: New York	$1,915,000
B. Planning programs:	
New Haven	155,825
Cleveland	124,228
Houston	260,582
Philadelphia	165,000
Los Angeles	252,906
Minneapolis	149,845
Detroit	202,200
Chicago	292,000
Harlem	230,000
Lane County, Oreg	129,579
St. Louis	134,012
Syracuse	141,284
Charleston, W. Va	131,091
Boston	159,400
Washington, D.C	100,767

Mr. CLARK. These demonstration projects include new and expanded services in education, employment, job training, social work, law enforcement, health, and recreation.

In New York City, Mobilization for Youth, Inc., the only demonstration program fully underway, is designed to provide Lower East Side youths with increased educational and job opportunities by coordinating a variety of programs in education, youth employment, recreation, services to groups and individual and community organizations. The Youth Jobs Center and Urban Youth Service Corps are the heart of the program, which includes evaluation, guidance, work preparation, teaching skill—every program aimed at making it possible for young people to secure stable employment in the competitive labor market.

In Cleveland, a central city district known as the Hough area—long the leading section of the city in youth offenses and social problems is under intensive study before launching a demonstration project.

In Minneapolis, the problems, ambitions, home environments and need for job opportunities for high school students and other youths in the north and south areas of the city are being studied. They hope to embark upon a program of better high school vocational preparation to get at the economic roots of delinquency.

In St. Louis, numerous existing Federal assistance programs are being brought to bear, along with local efforts, in a concerted assault on delinquency. Other Federal programs employed include a National Institute of Mental Health program for work with street gangs, a Labor Department youth employment program, two training programs supported by the Juvenile Delinquency Act at nearby universities, and other programs supported by Ford Foundation money and the Missouri State Employment Service.

It is significant that retraining and education for work are an integral part of these efforts. At this point in the RECORD, I request unanimous consent to insert a list of cities where the Manpower Development and Training Act plays an intimate role in the attack on delinquency.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT PROGRAMS DEVELOPED UNDER THE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

SYRACUSE

Proposes to establish an appliance repair store in a high income area of the city. It will train 30 youths.

BOSTON

Plans to use settlement houses as centers for training and counseling 500 to 1,000 unemployed dropouts.

PHILADELPHIA

Plans to adapt methods which have proven successful with the physically and mentally handicapped so that they will accept training and adapt to employers' requirement. A work adjustment program will be established for 400 youths over a period of a year to prepare them for training in a variety of skilled, semiskilled, and service occupations.

DETROIT

Plans to provide training stations for deprived Negro youth, including a program for training up to 400 Negro youths for admission to the Police Academy which could triple the number of Negro police officers on the city police force.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Plans to train unemployed Negro dropouts for admission into construction trades. With the continuing building boom in the Washington area, the training of youth as helpers in the building trades should assist many of these youths to qualify as apprentices in occupations where virtually no Negroes have been able to qualify or be placed. Local unions have promised cooperation.

NEW HAVEN

Has expanded the commitment of employers to accept trainees in full time employment on completion of training to unemployed youths under the age of 22. Community service workers will recruit hardcore youths to take advantage of a variety of training opportunities in sales, clerical, and skilled occupations. An effort will be made to determine the difference in motivation, job adjustment, and response to training of Negroes and white youths.

SAN FRANCISCO

Will undertake to train 500 unemployed youths for apprenticeship opportunities in the San Francisco naval shipyards as well as a variety of clerical and skilled occupations.

LOS ANGELES

Has designed a program that will have a massive impact on 2,500 Spanish-American youths in East Los Angeles by providing remedial education, upgrading of language skills and specific training.

MOBILIZATION FOR YOUTH, NEW YORK CITY

Continues to expand the varieties of training opportunities available to problem youth on the Lower East Side. Mobilization is subsidizing job opportunities to encourage employers to offer youth essential training.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, delinquency's causes run deep. More than job training is involved. In effect, the solutiton involves revamping the total physical, social and educational setting in which disadvantaged youth are reared.

A special breed of men and women is required to guide and administer such a comprehensive undertaking. Under this act, specialized delinquency workers are being trained. At this point in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that a list showing where such training programs are now underway be printed.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Training projects

	Amount of grant
A. Training centers:	
Southern Illinois University	$182,181
University of Utah	150,000
University of North Carolina	153,744
University of Washington	112,488
Wayne State University	152,201
Western Reserve University	151,500
B. Curriculum development:	
Hunter College	109,200
New York University	7,465
Washington State University	40,423
Harvard University	68,892
University of Michigan	200,014
University of California Law Center	140,000
International Association of Chiefs of Police	50,000
Citizens Committee for Children of New York City	15,125
University of Chicago	90,000
University of Southern California Youth Studies Center	125,000
University of California School of Criminology	75,000
Associated Community Teams, Inc. (Harlem)	250,000
C. Short-term workshops:	
Hunter College	66,940
St. Louis University	84,975
National Council on Crime and Delinquency	80,470
Civic Center Clinic—Brooklyn	800
Brooklyn Probation Department	12,135
Washington State Department of Institutions	5,616
National Federation of Settlements	36,990
Hawthorne Cedar Knolls School	12,074

Mr. CLARK. Secretary Wirtz was properly concerned when he commented last week that unemployment, particularly among youth, is ballooning into an awesome problem with dangerous implications for society.

The rising delinquency rates are a reliable barometer of the social dynamite hiding in youth unemployment.

The rise has been persistent since 1948—faster than the growth of our youth population. Just 3 weeks ago, for example, the Federal Bureau of Investigation reported police arrests of juveniles under 18 increased by 9 percent in 1962 over 1958, yet the population growth for the same age group was only 3 percent. Over a million youth aged 10 through 17 were arrested in 1962; almost 500,000 appeared on delinquency charges before our courts.

Last year, the cost of fighting delinquency in New York City alone came to $90 million. Only 7 years earlier it was $23,500,000. In spite of this enormous increase, the number of delinquency cases disposed by the Children's Court rose 16.3 percent between the years 1950 and 1959.

These are appalling statistics. Quite clearly, money alone is not solving the problem. The fragmented approach we have taken so far toward the conditions which breed delinquency must be converted into a deepened and comprehensive effort to remake the physical, social, and educational setting in which young people are trained and motivated. They must be given the opportunity to seek a way of life in which their talents and energies are employed for the benefit of them and of society.

This legislation is aimed at that goal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point a brief description of the first demonstration program under the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act—Mobilization for Youth, in New York City—published in the New York Times of June 1, 1962.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 1, 1962]

Digest of Federal-City Mobilization for Youth Plan

The Mobilization for Youth project, announced in Washington yesterday, is intended to combat juvenile delinquency by opening new doors and creating new hope for the young people of poor districts.

Mobilization for Youth, Inc., a nonprofit corporation set up to administer the project, summarized its objectives in the following way in a 617-page outline of its program:

"We must concern ourselves with expanding opportunities for conventional behavior. Our program is designed to enlarge opportunities for conformity and so to combat a major source of delinquent behavior among young people."

WIDESPREAD COVERAGE

In pursuing that aim, the project will touch upon nearly every major aspect of the lives of young people. It will deal with 7-year-olds and 21-year-olds and delve into the attitudes of their parents.

One research project even will explore whether established political organizations are serving the aims of people in poorer districts as well as they did in the days of mass immigration, when the Tammany Hall machine was constructed.

The action part of the project is divided into five major parts called "World of Work," "World of Education," "The Community," "Specialized Services to Individuals and Families," and "Specialized Services to Groups."

Under those headings, a number of operations are envisaged to deal with specific parts of the whole social problem of juvenile delinquency, according to the following summary:

The program will create an Urban Youth Service Corps and a Teenage Industries Corp. to build bridges toward adult job careers and show young people where those bridges lead.

In the Urban Youth Service Corps about 250 youth who have left school will be organized to work on public and private service projects. They will be paid $1 an hour for up to 35 hours of work and training per week.

Working in groups of 10 to 20, under the supervision of a skilled craftsman or foreman, they will undertake such tasks as developing playgrounds, planting trees, providing office services, and running errands, and helping in social work.

Within that framework it is proposed to create a semicommercial enterprise to be called Teenage Industries, with about 30 employees. They will make and repair toys, playground equipment, and furniture under the supervision of craftsmen.

Teenage Industries will be established as a New York corporation, with a board of directors including businessmen, labor leaders, and private citizens.

An exploratory work course is proposed to introduce youths to working life, through classroom instruction in the seventh and eighth grades and "work-sampling" in visits to workshops and in visits from persons in various careers.

THE WORLD OF EDUCATION

A Youth Jobs Center, to provide employment services, and a Guidance and Counseling Service, to help young people plan for the future, are also proposed.

Programs are planned for instructing teachers in the methods of teaching poorer children at an elementary school and a junior high school designated as laboratory schools. There will be emphasis on reading and verbal skills in the English language.

Reading centers will be established in each of the elementary schools in the area, and remedial-reading clinics will be set up in two elementary schools, all with the object of overcoming the language difficulties that poorer youngsters have in finding jobs.

Local residents familiar with neighborhood ways will be asked to visit parents at home for discussions of home, school and community problems, with the object of improving the guidance that parents give their children.

There will be experimental classes for 4-year-olds, 5-year-olds and first-graders to prepare them for the coming process of education. Older children may be tutored by high school sophomores and juniors, paid $1.25 an hour.

THE COMMUNITY

The project believes that people who feel strong identity with their neighborhoods and share common values are more likely to try to control juvenile delinquency. Thus the object is to get parents interested in social problems.

Such groups as "hometown" clubs and storefront church congregations, which usually are not reached in community organization efforts, will be invited to join in common action. New groups will be established to "organize the unaffiliated."

SPECIALIZED SERVICES TO INDIVIDUALS

Concrete social services will be strongly emphasized, partly through the establishment of four service centers, or "helping stations," to attract people who would normally shun social services. They will be intended particularly for families with children between 10 and 15 years old.

It is also proposed to establish a pilot narcotics project to work with 50 teenage and young adult addicts, and perhaps a "sheltered" workshop to test the value of work as a cure for addiction.

Visiting homemaker service is envisaged. These social workers would encourage medical and dental checkups, help housewives plan and manage their shopping and budgeting, help organize household routines, and arrange for babysitters.

SPECIALIZED SERVICES TO GROUPS

There will be a "coffeehouse" project, in which three storefront cultural centers will be created on the model of a coffeehouse, intended to attract boys and girls from 16 to 21.

Each coffeehouse will have a distinctive motif. One will be devoted to Negro and Puerto Rican art and culture, where on a typical night a drum and dance troupe of local youths might be the feature attraction.

One would be a Fold Jazz Center, for instruction in jazz groups, playing in rock 'n roll quartets, and cutting records. The third would be the gallery, a showcase for the work of young artists, writers, and sculptors.

For boys 9 to 13 an Adventure Corps is planned, to be organized along paramilitary lines in squads of 20 to 25 boys, with six or seven squads to a division. There will be two divisions of about 150 each.

A corps headquarters of trained professional staff and older boys will coordinate such activities as overnight camping trips, tutoring in school subjects, trip to museums, baseball tournaments, cleaning up empty lots or learning judo.

Each division will have a uniform—a jacket identifying the unit. Each squad will have its own symbol, name and badge of identity. Parents will be asked to help in advisory groups for each division.

For children under 9, there will be a preadolescent project. The plan is to employ skilled social workers to prepare youngsters for the other projects by influencing them at an early age.

Musical talents will be exploited through the formation of steel-drum band and rock 'n' roll workshops.

An objective of the program is to develop new knowledge and technology for dealing with human problems. Data will be gathered on several aspects of juvenile delinquency and the reform of youthful offenders.

As a collateral project there will be a study of what has happened to the strength of political organizations over the last three decades and whether they have shifted their ground to meet new conditions among poorer people.

It is theorized that the social legislation of the New Deal created agencies to care for the welfare needs of the underprivileged and that these agencies have grown in size and number since World War II.

It is further theorized that political organizations in turn have transferred their attention from the poorest classes, which they once wooed with personal services, to those lower-middle and middle-class groups that are seeking recognition.

"The machine is no longer dealing with persons whose only barter goods are their individual votes," the Mobilization for Youth outline says. "Persons with higher status tend to organize the resources in their community, which gives them a position from which they can bargain."

"Instead of the previous parent relationship between machine and voter, a contract is negotiated in which representatives of middle-class communities offer to deliver a body of votes in return for a larger slice of the political pie."

The connection between this study and the problems of juvenile delinquency is not clearly established in the outline, except for a statement that the findings might suggest ways of drawing lower income groups into community and political life.

Job Outlook Gains for Adults, but Worsens for Teenagers

(By John D. Pomfret)

Washington, June 29.—The Nation's employment situation is showing signs of schizophrenia.

And it has Government policymakers worried.

What is happening is that the job picture is improving for adults—not dramatically or rapidly, but improving nonetheless. Among teenagers, however, it is deteriorating. Their situation already is critical and, unless something is done, could develop into one of the most explosive social problems in the country's history, in the view of officials concerned with it.

According to a Labor Department analysis, here is how the situation shaped up during the first 5 months of the year among the three principal groups in the labor force—men, women, and teenagers:

Men: Since January, the size of the adult male labor force—that is, those who have jobs plus those who want them but can't find them—has not changed. But there has been an increase in nonfarm jobs that has both absorbed a decline in farm jobs and cut unemployment by 200,000. The result has been a drop in the unemployment rate among men from 5.1 percent in February to 4.4 percent in May. This is roughly the level that prevailed before the 1960 recession began.

Women: The number in the labor force since January has risen by about a quarter of a million, but since virtually the same number have found jobs, the adult female unemployment rate has remained about stationary at 5.4 percent.

Teenagers: Between January and May, there was a net gain of more than 400,000 in the number of persons 14 through 19 years old in the labor force. But only about one-fourth of the increase was on the employment side. This has meant a dramatic rise in the teenage jobless rate—from 13.9 percent in January to 17.8 percent in May.

The effect of these opposing changes is that employment has risen by about half a million since January to 68,676,000 after adjustment for seasonal changes. Unemployment has risen, but not substantially. It stood at 4,313,000 after seasonal adjustments. The national unemployment rate has been relatively static at just under 6 percent.

But in this case, the parts are more significant than the whole, and the part that is getting the most attention right now is the teenagers.

Labor Department experts do not like to rely too heavily on precise month-to-month changes in the teenage unemployment rate. The number of teenagers in the statistical sample they work with is small enough that relatively small changes can result in rather large swings in the unemployment rate. Further, they point out, whether a teenager is unemployed can be a fairly subjective judgment, particularly if he is still in school.

Despite these qualifications, the experts are persuaded that the figures on teenagers, when interpreted in the light of census and other data, indicate trouble ahead.

The situation is that rising numbers of teenagers are swarming into the labor market to look for jobs at a time when general unemployment is relatively high and many of the unskilled jobs they otherwise might have landed are vanishing under the impact of changing technology.

A million more youngsters will turn 16 this year than last and 16 is the legal school-leaving age in many States. And unemployment rates among the unskilled are consistently higher than among the skilled. To cite the extremes, the jobless rate among professional and technical workers is 1.9 percent and among nonfarm laborers, 11 percent.

The crucial nature of training also is reflected in a recent Labor Department survey of the employment experience of high school dropouts and graduates. The jobless rate of 1962 dropouts was 29 percent, about twice that of June high school graduates.

Negroes were about one in five of the school dropouts—about twice their proportion of the graduates. This imbalance is reflected in the fact that unemployment among Negro teenagers runs about twice the overall rate—a ratio that holds for the general unemployment situation among Negroes as well.

This disparity, with its roots in lack of training, as well as outright employment discrimination, has caused President Kennedy to include a request to Congress for $400 million for stepped-up Federal retraining and education programs in his civil rights proposals.

But prompt adoption of this program would by no means end the Nation's employment woes. The underlying problem—one that affects Negro and white workers, teenagers and adults—is that the economy's performance in creating jobs has left much to be desired in recent years.

The slowing has been in the private sector of the economy, with growth in the public sector taking up some of the slack.

Labor Department experts estimate that unless the economy can be made to grow faster, the unemployment rate will be above 7 percent by 1967.

AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 347, Senate bill 1703, and that it be laid down and be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1703) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment in line 3, after the word "section", to strike out "509" and insert "510"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 510 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking "December 31, 1963", and inserting "December 31, 1964".

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before the Senate adjourns tonight, I should like to make a statement on the nuclear test ban. Before I do so, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business tonight, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPLENDID AMERICAN

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, often we have heard the stories of citizens making mistakes on oversea tours that have not helped the image of America.

That is just one reason why I am extremely pleased today to take a few moments to relate the heartening, dramatic, and true story of a young Californian—and a splendid American.

Indeed, this Californian has, by himself, created a project that is so exciting and rewarding that I wish all America knew of it.

The young man's name is Wil Rose. Mr. Rose, a Purple Heart veteran of the Korean war, was hired in 1958 to do some research filming for Los Angeles State College.

This job took him to 22 countries in Europe and the Middle East, as he documented much of the folklore he saw.

What really caught his eye, however, was the frustration of many Americans living and working abroad. And what bothered him were problems people had throughout these countries that he was sure could be answered by people in American industry.

At the completion of his job for the university, with $1,000, his wife and two children, he went to Palo Alto. Living on $40 a week for 6 months, he created DATA International.

DATA International, simply stated, is a clearinghouse for problems of human needs and possible solutions to them throughout the world.

Mr. Rose saw that such problems could be answered everywhere if someone had the ingenuity to track down the person who could answer that problem.

At first, through word of mouth and then through the Voice of America, DATA received 900 inquiries during the first year of its operation in 1959–60 and answered exactly that many problems, from villages with only polluted water to drink, to a backwood school without books.

Each year since, DATA has progressed, receiving more inquiries than the combined total of all previous years. Today it is well on its way toward answering its 3,000th problem.

More than 150 legitimate problems that can be answered now pour into his headquarters monthly. The part of DATA that answers all problems is called the International Assistance Corps. This is made up of more than 1,000 individuals plus hundreds of agencies, educational institutions, industrial firms and societies, all ready and willing to give freely of time, effort, and knowledge. Problems have come from 111 countries, solutions have gone back to all of them.

The record is phenomenal, the score worldwide—braces for crippled children in Nigeria; a 50-bed hospital in Ethiopia; chicken nutrition in Uganda; beekeeping in the Dominican Republic; a roof for a small chapel in Korea; a seven-bridge road in Madagascar.

DATA problem No. 779, all by itself, is a great American story.

On September 21, 1961, an American missionary, Dr. N. E. Christy, an eye specialist, asked DATA for help in planning an additional surgical wing for his missionary hospital in Pakistan.

DATA immediately called in Dr. Charles B. Beal, who has had wide tropical experience. It also asked the associate administrator of the Palo Alto Stanford Hospital Center, David Starkweather, and a Stanford architectural graduate, Walter Eagle, to collaborate. The three worked as a team against time because Dr. Christy said the surgical addition was badly needed.

Through detailed airmail letters and after many blueprints and specifications, caused by limited space and poor electrical power in the area in Pakistan, Dr. Christy will have the wing for his hospital—and in less than a year and a half from the date of his request to DATA.

Dr. Christy, I am told, operates on an average of 100 cases a day. In fact, he once performed 175 operations in 1 day. So one gets a good idea of the worth of DATA merely from the case of problem No. 779.

Summing up, Mr. President, I simply want to mention that DATA is nonprofit and is supported solely through voluntary contributions. Under the direction of this dedicated young Californian, Wil Rose, it has already accomplished an impressive record. It is a record of generosity, good will, and helpfulness which can make each of us proud to be Americans.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent that articles on DATA and this splendid American, Wil Rose, from the Saturday Evening Post, the Saturday Review, and the Los Angeles Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post]

PEOPLE ON THE WAY UP—GLOBAL-AID MAN

With a direct line to the technical needs of the oversea world, good Samaritan Wil Rose, 31, provides help to neighbors everywhere. Rose heads an unusual organization called DATA (Development and Technical Assistance) International, which he formed 3 years ago in Palo Alta, Calif. "DATA," he explains, "operates like a switchboard. It takes calls, by mail, from Americans overseas who want to help people in other countries progress through technological improvements. DATA relays the 'how to' inquiries to U.S. experts in the particular field. The experts provide an accurate and understandable blueprint, and DATA sends it overseas." The 1,550 volunteer experts on call for DATA have supplied, free of charge, millions of dollars' worth of advice, plans and samples to 107 nations. "We hope" says Rose, "to put a new, more attractive face on the ugly American and to show that Christian principles are better than missiles for shoring up the world." Questions that DATA's experts answer range from "How do you lay out a baseball field?" to "How can our country's cloth-weaving productivity be increased?" A Purple Heart veteran of Korea, Rose lives with his wife, daughter, and son in Palo Alto. He left the family farm in East Townsend, Ohio, when he was 14, later studied photography and electronics in Chicago. In 1958, while making a documentary film for Los Angeles State College, he got the idea for DATA. "Everywhere I went in Europe," he says, "Americans asked me if I knew about such-and-such, so that they could help their new neighbors. They knew that somewhere back home was the answer to their problems, but they didn't know exactly where. A clearinghouse was needed to give person-to-person aid." Rose now spends full working time running DATA, which exists soley on private donations. He sees his work as a crusade, explaining, "You might say we're trying to put Christianity into overalls. We're providing a method with the message."

[From the Saturday Review, Dec. 29, 1962]

BATS IN THE GUAVA TREES

Farming is at best a parlous occupation, and farmers on the West Coast of Africa often encounter hazards that verge on the bizarre. Until recently, for instance, West African guava growers were beset by an infestation of bats. Every day, after the sun set, hordes of these purblind creatures would come swooping down on the guava groves to sink their teeth in the delectable guava fruit. The bats' shrill cries of delight were matched only by the shrill cries emitted by farmers watching their cash crops being devoured.

Then, several months ago, one of the embattled farmers outlined his problem to an American visitor. Did the American by any chance know, he asked, how to get rid of the bats without damaging the crops?

As it happened, the American visitor was a volunteer member of a nonprofit organization in Palo Alto, Calif., called DATA International. Within a few weeks, DATA, working through its network of volunteers, had consulted an expert on bat control, and had forwarded to West Africa a special new pesticide which sent the furry intruders fluttering to their reward.

This operation typifies the work of DATA, a pocket-sized volunteer group that has been called "a stay-at-home peace corps." DATA's rationale is straightforward to the point of naivete. It simply asks Americans who are traveling or living abroad to keep their eyes open for local problems that can be solved by American know-how. When such problems are forwarded to DATA, the staff, most of them volunteers, gets in touch with its expert consultants, who are also volunteers. Especially sticky problems are sent out to several experts, to insure an answer within a few weeks. With an office staff of 7 full-time paid workers and 35 part-time volunteers, DATA (Development and Technical Assistance) International has in its 4-year career processed more than 1,600 difficult questions. The number of new friends it has made for the United States is beyond calculating.

DATA is the creature of Wil Rose, a wry, witty 32-year-old ex-Marine from Ohio. When Rose was wounded in the Korean fighting and given his discharge, Los Angeles City College sent him abroad to make an educational film about folkways in different countries and cultures. This trip, which eventually took Rose to Europe, the Middle East, and Asia, touched him deeply and set him to thinking. Everywhere he saw people struggling manfully but ineffectually with technical problems that Americans had conquered decades ago. Couldn't American know-how be shared, Rose wondered, on an ad hoc, person-to-person basis, outside the formal structure of the Government aid programs?

Returning to America, Rose set about creating DATA early in 1959. The big question, of course, was this: Would highly paid American engineers, scientists, architects, doctors, mechanics, and other experts contribute their time and expertise gratis? Or, for that matter, would Americans living the good life abroad take time out to serve as DATA's eyes and ears?

He needn't have worried. At the moment there are 2,000 representatives overseas and 1,000 consultants in the United States; and problems are coming in at the rate of a hundred a month.

One striking thing about these problems is that many of them get beneath the carapace of politics and government, and give us a sort of X-ray picture of the everyday struggle for life:

From Greece: "I've watched children drinking water full of green scum. * * * Can you put me in touch with someone who can advise?"

From Japan: "Can you supply plans of a homemade tractor for use in rice paddies?"

From New Guinea: "How do you tan crocodile hides?'"

From India: "How do you make a ropemaking machine?"

From Ethiopia and Korea: "How can we make a water-distilling unit utilizing solar power?"

The following is a selection of questions recently received by DATA and still in the hopper awaiting answers:

From Indonesia: "Do you know of a breed of chicken that will live off the land and not need close care and grain feeding?"

From Brazil: "How can we safely shell babassu nuts? Their shell is so hard it can be cracked open only by an ax blade; so we can use only 5 percent of our crop."

From Guatemala: "Can you give me a list of organizations, preferably located in Central America, that help people? I'd like to work with such a group."

Anyone who can answer the foregoing questions, or knows someone who can, is invited to get in touch with Wil Rose at DATA International, 437 California Avenue, Palo Alto, Calif. In fact, anyone of any age, background, or previous condition of expertise can qualify as a DATA consultant, or representative, since the problems it deals with are as variegated as is human need. There remains, of course, a third category of membership: the sponsors, who do not participate directly, but who instead give donations to DATA, and spread the good word generally.

Whatever role they choose to play, DATA members have the immense satisfaction of knowing they are part of a flexible, private-initiative peace corps that operates squarely in the tradition of American selflessness.

—HALLOWELL BOWSER.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Jan. 13, 1963]

ANSWERING SERVICE: VETERAN SETS UP OWN PRIVATE PEACE CORPS

(By Paul Weeks)

If Wil Rose, 31, has his way, every American overseas will become a member of his private peace corps.

And there are some 300,000 overseas, excluding members of the Armed Forces and their dependents.

Suppose a traveling American in British Honduras is asked by the natives if it would be possible to grow avocados there.

Or a man in Malay asks another American how to make mud bricks that won't wash away in the monsoons.

UNITED STATES HAS ANSWERS

Maybe the American won't know the answer—but he knows that somebody in the United States does.

All he has to do is send the question to Rose's nonprofit organization, DATA International (Development and Technical Assistance) at Palo Alto, and the question will be referred to someone who knows the answer.

Rose, a Korean war veteran, got the idea while on a global tour for Los Angeles State College in 1958, accumulating sound and picture archives for a new library.

SAW POTENTIAL

"Everywhere I went, I saw a tremendous number of Americans, who as individuals could be making an impact for America abroad," he said.

With $1,000 of his own, Rose established DATA. Soon he interested industrialists in Palo Alto area, who now provide most of the $60,000-a-year budget to help DATA help others.

Government attacks problems on massive scale. DATA, says Rose, takes on the "bite sized problems."

So far, he's enlisted 2,000 volunteers overseas and 1,000 consultants in the States. He operates with a paid staff of 7, with 35 volunteers in the home office.

Like librarians trained in research, DATA's home staff may not know the answers—but they know how to go about finding someone who does.

Now, they're processing 160 problems a month, and the number keeps shooting up.

To help itself grow, DATA tries to enlist members at $12 each.

They taught farmers in West Africa how to eliminate bats from their guava trees, householders in India how to get rid of rats.

And they also helped introduce avocados to British Honduras, and showed the man in Malay how he could make compressed mud bricks (with a small hand-operated machine) that wouldn't melt in a monsoon.

Any further questions? Just direct them to DATA.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in a matter which involves the safety of the Nation and the health of our people and particularly our children, there is no room for partisanship. Certainly a treaty which would seek to prevent precisely those nuclear explosions which are most contaminative of our physical environment can be regarded as such a matter. Certainly, too, this proposed treaty has implications for the safety of the Nation.

I do not prejudge, Mr. President, the Senate's action with regard to the treaty. But the record of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] in matters of this kind offer great assurance that the question of the treaty will be examined in terms of the highest national interest and free of partisanship.

Moreover, Mr. President, both parties in the campaign of 1960 adopted positions clearly in line with what has now been achieved in the initialed treaty to end nuclear testing. I must say, in all honesty, that the Republican platform is clearer on this point than the Democratic platform. But I am sure that this is primarily a matter of draftsmanship and is not indicative in any way of a lesser desire on the part of Democrats to bring about an end to these dangerous tests. Democrats as a whole are just as concerned as Republicans when the safety and health of the Nation are at stake. In any event, Mr. President, I read into the RECORD at this point the reference to nuclear testing in the Republican and Democratic platforms of 1960.

Democratic platform, 1960, section II, arms control:

> A primary task is to develop responsible proposals that will help break the deadlock on arms control.
>
> Such proposals should include means for ending nuclear tests under workable safeguards, cutting back nuclear weapons, reducing conventional forces, preserving outer space for peaceful purposes, preventing surprise attack and limiting the risk of accidental war.

Republican platform, 1960, foreign policy:

> We are similarly ready to negotiate and to institute realistic methods and safeguards for disarmament and for the suspension of nuclear tests. We advocate an early agreement by all nations to forgo nuclear tests in the atmosphere, and the suspension of other tests as verification techniques permit. We support the President in any decision he may make to reevaluate the question of resumption of underground nuclear explosions testing, if the Geneva Conference fails to produce a satisfactory agreement. We have deep concern about the mounting nuclear arms race. This concern leads us to seek disarmament and nuclear agreements. And an equal concern to protect all people from nuclear danger leads us to insist that such agreements have adequate safeguards.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 31, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 30, 1963:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Graham A. Martin, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Thailand.

WEATHER BUREAU

Robert M. White, of Connecticut, to be Chief of the Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Lorin T. Bice, of Florida, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring March 31, 1969, vice Marshall H. Edwards.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

U.S. Korean Casualties Are Test Ban Pact Casualties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, U.S. casualties in the Korean Armistice border during the past 2 days are directly attributable to the test ban treaty negotiated in Moscow. The escalation of activities by Communist forces there follows calculation by the Red Chinese and Red Korean regimes that border warfare and perhaps even-full-scale resumption of conventional warfare in Korea now can be carried on safely, without fear of U.S. resorting to the discriminate use of nuclear arms to stabilize the situation.

"If the Americans regard nuclear weapons as too terrible to test," they reason, "the Americans surely will regard them too terrible to use except in a final life or death show-down with the Soviet Union."

This reasoning will result in intensified armed conflict wherever Far Eastern Communists forces plan aggressive expansion. As time goes on, we can fully expect the Soviet Union to adopt this successful formula for aggression.

Here, already, is proof that Communist leaders regard the test ban as a green light to intensify aggression by all conventional means free from the fear that nuclear weapons will be used by us to overcome their military advantages from mass manpower and favorable geography.

Rather than bringing peace to the world, evidence already exists that the pact will intensify conflict and war on many fronts, creating universally situations of instability and danger and causing untold American casualties.

RTCA Report on Air Traffic Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics issued its awaited report on the air traffic system in the United States. It defines air traffic control problems currently being experienced and recommends improvement programs.

The 83-page report by RTCA Special Committee 104—SC-104—activated only last January, represents the first step in a group effort by various airspace users and other aviation experts from government and industry to set forth their coordinated views on today's air traffic system.

The report first analyzes broad operational and economic problems or aspects of today's air traffic system taken as a whole, and places emphasis on areas requiring further coordination and planning. Some of the major areas considered are the operational complexity of today's system, the work load on the pilot and on the controller, as well as economic considerations, both ground and airborne, and the international aspects involved.

The body of the report defines air traffic control problems currently being experienced and contains recommendations for immediate improvement. Principally, these recommendations, which cover 69 specific problem areas, call for changes in procedures or for the employment or fuller utilization of developed equipments or known techniques. Included are recommendations for more effective utilization of airspace in terminal and en route areas and of aircraft performance capabilities; more effective dissemination of information essential to the pilot; training and qualifications of controllers; as well as the handling of flight test and military flight operations in common system airspace. Other recommendations are directed toward the development of better capability for all-weather operations; improved weather operating capability at low traffic density airports; an operational trial of a different method of pilot-to-weather forecaster communications; reduction of required position reporting; improved air traffic control data handling and displays; and airport runway and taxiway lighting, marking and configuration requirements, including takeoff areas for light aircraft.

The report recognizes that some activities aimed at resolving current problems are already underway. In those instances where the actions coincide with those recommended in the report, RTCA's recommendations are intended as an endorsement and stimulus to such actions. In a number of instances, the report indicates where additional effort is required. In those areas where no action is in progress, or where the current effort is at variance with the recommended solutions, responsible agencies are urged to give prompt consideration to the solutions offered.

For all in the Congress, who themselves frequently use our Nation's airlines, I recommend the reading of the entire report.

Over the past several years I have become acutely aware of the problems which have been multiplying in the area of air traffic control. I personally feel the Congress has fulfilled its responsibility by providing sufficient funds for the Federal Aviation Agency to have done a far better job in improving the state of air traffic control.

It is my hope that the FAA will quickly incorporate the recommendations and suggestions made by the RTCA into their planning, thereby giving greater assurance to the air traveling public that their safety is assured.

Tabulation of Replies to a Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in June of this year I sent out a newsletter to the people of the 41st Congressional District, reporting on the activities of the 88th Congress to date, and on the impact of several Federal programs in western New York.

A portion of this newsletter included a 10-part questionnaire. The tabulated results are, I think, varied and fascinating. Especially notable is the fact that 71.6 percent of all my responding constituents supported at least three-fourths of the programs advanced by President Kennedy. Worthy of the attention of the House are the following complete statistics:

Question	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you favor taking whatever steps are necessary, including military action, to overthrow the Castro regime?	63.0	31.3	5.7
2. Do you favor a medicare plan which provides for a compulsory health program for the aged under social security?	78.2	19.8	2.0
3. Do you favor an income tax cut at this time?	86.1	11.1	2.8
Percent			
If so, would you prefer an increase in the personal tax exemption 65.6			
Or would you prefer an across-the-board cut in income taxes? 20.5			
4. If Federal aid is granted to public schools, would you favor including aid to parochial and private schools?	62.1	35.6	2.3
5. Should the United States remain in the United Nations?	77.6	17.8	4.6
6. Should we compete with Russia in providing foreign aid to uncommitted countries such as Brazil, India, Ghana, Indonesia?	43.9	49.8	6.3
7. Do you favor the expenditure of billions of dollars for the purpose of putting a man on the moon?	32.6	63.4	4.0
8. Do you favor establishment of a domestic National Service Corps modeled after the Peace Corps?	55.7	35.6	8.7
9. Are you in favor of a $100 monthly pension for World War I veterans, regardless of need or disability?	41.6	42.4	16.0
10. Do you approve of the programs advanced by President Kennedy?			
Percent			
Replies indicating 100 percent support 29.0			
Replies indicating 75 percent support 42.6			
Replies indicating 50 percent or less support 25.0			
No opinion 3.4			

The 125th Anniversary of Georgetown, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, as described editorially by the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune of Lawrence, Mass., Georgetown "is a busy, beautiful, growing community, rightly proud of its past, and rightly confident of its future," and I am very proud as its Congressman, to extend heartiest congratulations on its 125th anniversary.

The current observance of this anniversary is of special interest to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and beyond, for its citizens have contributed immeasurably to the growth and development of the State and Nation. Large numbers of its citizens have distinguished themselves in the field of public service, and have served and lost their lives in the defense of our country.

Georgetown was incorporated as a town in 1838, but Georgetown's proud history dates back 294 years to 1669, when it was a parish under the name of New Rowley. Its first settlers were a band of weavers from Yorkshire, England, who started their lives there as farmers.

In the early 1700's, a boot and shoe factory was established. It was in Georgetown that the first pegs were made, and where the first pegging machine ever used in the world was employed. The introduction of this machine revolutionized the art of shoemaking which had been done before that time by hand. At this time, it is reported that nearly every farmer had his little shoeshop connected with his farm and worked in it in winter as regularly as he planted his crops in the spring.

Shipbuilding also flourished in this little town for a short time in the latter part of the 18th century. The oaks from one of Georgetown's hills provided timber for the construction of *Old Ironsides*.

Georgetown opened its celebration recently with a testimonial banquet to Robert Fisher Metcalf whom the Eagle-Tribune describes as "a distinguished personality not only in Georgetown, where he was born and has lived for 83 years, but in all Essex County. He is a lawyer by profession and a good citizen by nature. For almost half of Georgetown's years, he has been earning the title now generally and justly bestowed on him, 'Mr. Georgetown.'"

I am happy to extend to the people of Georgetown and its distinguished citizen the greetings and best wishes of the Sixth Congressional District.

Two Thousand Women Political Prisoners in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on July 25, 1963, representatives from the Commission for the Protection of Women Political Prisoners in Cuba, an organization dedicated to freeing some 2,000 women being held in Cuban prisons, were in Washington and stopped by to see me. These women are concerned over the inhumane treatment of these women behind the Cuban prison walls, and they urge that these women be freed.

I am greatly concerned over this situation, and feel that the Organization of American States and the International Red Cross should send in investigating teams to examine this situation. The inhumane treatment that these women are suffering is another instance that may be added to a long list of human suffering in Communist Cuba. The Cuban people have nothing better to look forward to, until communism and Castro have been removed from Cuba. I urge that the results of the Organization of American States and the International Red Cross investigations should be made public, and positive action taken to aid in the release of these women prisoners.

Kerr-Mills Law Being Vindicated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to receive a report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare today, showing that 32 States out of the 54 States and territories have now placed the Kerr-Mills program for medical care for the aged into effect.

North Dakota, of course, has had the Kerr-Mills program in use since July 1, 1961, and it seems to have been effective in caring for our aged citizen's medical needs. It has been said that our State provides the broadest and most comprehensive medical care of almost all the States using the Kerr-Mills two-way program.

Of the 22 remaining, the HEW report shows that South Dakota has submitted a plan which will be effective as soon as it is approved by the Department.

Of the 21 remaining, Iowa has a plan drafted, and the appropriation will be available after July 4, 1963.

This leaves 20 unaccounted for, and we find 5 States had enacted legislation, but their plans have yet to be submitted to the Department for approval. These States are Kansas, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Carolina, and Virginia.

Of the 15 remaining, we find Missouri has passed legislation through both its houses of the legislative assembly, and Wisconsin now has pending legislation.

Of the 13 remaining, Georgia has already enacted legislation to use the MAA portion of Kerr-Mills, and is merely awaiting funds in order to implement the legisation. New Mexico has its legal authority for MAA, but since its 1963 legislature denied a request for funds, it must go through this action again. Nevada enacted its law in 1963, but also has to vote the necessary tax funds to implement the law.

This leaves 10 States unaccounted for. Among these, we find Alaska, Delaware, and Mississippi need legislation; Arizona, Colorado, Montana, Ohio, and Rhode Island have considered legislation during 1963; Indiana has already passed a law but the Governor vetoed it, and Texas has passed a resolution for a constitutional amendment—necessary under its State constitution. If this is ratified by popular vote, it may be followed by necessary enabling legislation.

Considering the fact that the Kerr-Mills law was enacted and placed on the books in late 1960, I feel this is a fine showing and a vindication of my contention that we should wait to see if the States would—if given enough time—put the law into use for their aged citizens medical care. We must remember this act is voluntary, would be State administered, and yet would provide a comprehensive program of medical benefits to those who really need the care. This is in the true American tradition—and surely the local and State authorities are in a far better position to know the true facts concerning needs in their area than a Federal Government bureau, far removed from the scene. I expect to see these HEW reports on the use of Kerr-Mills improve as the months go by.

President Kennedy's Inconsistencies on the Test Ban Require Explanation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on occasions prior to his radio-TV speech to the Nation last Friday, President Kennedy has taken precisely opposite positions on several aspects of the test ban treaty. He has a duty to resolve these inconsistencies. The following quotations from prior statements which require explanation are placed on the RECORD for the information of Members of the Congress and the public:

EXTRACTS FROM PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S RADIO-TV ADDRESS TO THE NATION, MARCH 2, 1962, ANNOUNCING RESUMPTION OF ATMOSPHERIC TESTING FOLLOWING BREACH OF MORATORIUM THEREON BY THE SOVIET UNION

I find it deeply regrettable that any radioactive material must be added to the atmosphere—that even one additional individual's health may be risked in the foreseeable future. And, however, remote and infinitesimal those hazards are judged to be, I still exceedingly regret the necessity of balancing these hazards against the hazards to hundreds of millions of lives which would be created by any relative decline in our nuclear strength.

In the absence of a large shift in Soviet policies no American President—responsible for the freedom and safety of so many people—could in good faith make any other decision.

Until mankind has banished both war and its instruments of destruction, the United States must maintain an effective quantity and quality of nuclear weapons. Only through such strength can we be certain of deterring a nuclear strike, or an overwhelming ground attack, upon our forces and allies. Only through such strength can we in the free world—should the deterrent fail—face the tragedy of another war with any hope of survival.

That deterrent strength, if it is to be effective and credible when compared with any other nation, must embody the most reliable and the most versatile nuclear weapons our research and development can produce. The testing of new weapons and their effects is necessarily a part of that research and development process.

Our nuclear posture affects the security of all Americans and all free men.

If we are to be alert to new breakthroughs, to experiment with new designs—if we are to maintain our scientific momentum and leadership—then our weapons progress must not be limited to theory or to the confines of laboratories and caves.

Should we fail to follow the dictates of our own security, they (the Soviets) will chalk it up, not to good will, but to a failure of will—not to our confidence in Western superiority, but to our fear of world opinion, the very world opinion for which they showed such contempt. They could well be encouraged by such signs of weakness to seek another period of no testing without controls—another opportunity for stifling our progress while secretly preparing, on the basis of last fall's experiments, for the new test series which might alter the balance of power.

The basic lesson of some 3 years and 353 negotiating sessions at Geneva is this—that the Soviets will not agree to an effective ban on nuclear tests as long as a new series of offers and prolonged negotiations, or a new uninspected moratorium, or a new agreement without controls, would enable them once again to prevent the West from testing while they prepare in secret.

We know enough now about broken negotiations, secret preparation and the advantages gained from a long test series never to offer again an un-inspected moratorium. Some may urge us to try it again, keeping our preparations to test in a constant state of readiness. But in actual practice, particularly in a society of free choice, we cannot keep top-flight scientists concentrating on the preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place on an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some other nation to break an agreement. This is not merely difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly and found it impossible of execution.

EXTRACTS FROM PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S PRESS CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 7, 1962

Question. Mr. President, would the United States be willing, without further nuclear tests in the atmosphere, to sign a formal treaty with the Soviet Union banning such tests?

The PRESIDENT. Well, I have stated that our concern would be—I stated before, since, and as I said afterwards, that we would sign an agreement which provided for adequate inspections system, that is correct. But adequate inspection in regard to preparations as well as testing, because otherwise—

Question. My question was hinged on further tests in the United States.

The PRESIDENT. I understand. We will support the passage of an effective treaty which provides for effective inspection, but we cannot take less in view of the fact of our experience of the past months where it takes us many months to prepare for tests in the atmosphere.

The Soviet Union prepares in secret. Unless we have adequate protection against a repetition of that incident, any such test agreement obviously would be extremely vulnerable.

Question. Mr. President, on the test issue, if I understand what you have been saying correctly you introduced a new element into these negotiations. That is, inspection which would cover any possible secret preparations for tests. Is this in fact a new element that the United States is introducing and, if so, how might you meet that problem in an inspection system?

The PRESIDENT. I think this is a matter which should be discussed at the disarmament conference, but I think that any agreement—not to have an agreement whereby some time would go by and then when the Soviets have exhausted the information they have acquired from this series of tests suddenly overnight begin another series of tests, meanwhile 2 years have gone by and many scientists and others who might have been working on this may have gone into other occupations.

It is a deadly business, this competition, and I don't say that much security comes out of it. But less security would certainly come out of it if we permitted them to make a decisive breakthrough in an area like an ICBM so we would certainly have to have some assurances against a repetition against this before we would feel that the treaty is a satisfactory one. But it is a matter which I think will be discussed in March.

Address by Hon. Sam M. Gibbons, of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg, our friend and colleague, the Honorable SAM M. GIBBONS, of the 10th District of Florida, dedicated the memorial to the honored men of Florida on that historical ground. He took that occasion to draw attention to the dangers of hate and bitterness which have been recently expressed by violence in our country. He called on all responsible Americans to work for the betterment of human relations within the framework of our Republic—the ballot box, the legislature, and the courts of the land—not in the streets.

Because of the warning voiced to Congress by J. Edgar Hoover, "Because communism thrives on turmoil, the party is continuously attempting to exploit all grievances—real or imagined—for its own tactical purposes," and other concerned Americans, I include the address by the Honorable SAM M. GIBBONS, Member of Congress from Florida, in the RECORD:

SPEECH BY HON. SAM M. GIBBONS, 10TH DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Exactly 100 years ago at this hour and place, history recorded the turning point of the bloodiest war ever fought in the Western Hemisphere. In this bitter struggle, our Nation found part of the meaning of freedom. We must not lose it now in hate, violence, and dishonor. The burden of the fight for freedom now rests on us.

As responsible Americans working for better human relations, we abhor the use on our citizens of the snarling police dogs, the fire hose, and electrically charged cattle prodding stick. On the other hand, we find no place in our America for the agitating opportunist, who for his own monetary or political gain, pits one race against another, sometimes urging mob violence.

As responsible Americans working for freedom for others throughout this troubled world, it is our duty to practice freedom and equality here. In our country freedom and equality will be brought about by understanding, honestly practiced; education, earnestly pursued; opportunity, freely given without discrimination.

Our disagreements must no longer be settled by armed conflict, as here a century ago. Our racial conflicts must be removed from the streets and our differences resolved the American way in our courts, our legislative bodies, and the ballot box.

If we should fail—and we will if leadership passes to the extremists—then man's best chance for freedom and equality under law will have been eclipsed. Those who died here, and on other American battlefields, will have died in vain.

The effects of the battle we mark at this ceremony were largely confined to this country. But such is not the case today, for now, America's racial conflict has immediate worldwide significance. We cannot hope to win men's minds in our battle with communism if America becomes a land in which freedom, equality, and opportunity are only for the white man.

Much progress has been made in human relations in this last 100 years. Let us resolve to preserve our progress and to strengthen it—not wreck it.

This monument which we now dedicate to the hundreds of Floridians who met in conflict here bears this inscription:

"They fought with courage and devotion for the ideals in which they believed. By their noble example of bravery and endurance, they enable us to meet with confidence any sacrifice which confronts us as Americans."

This afternoon when the Confederate and Union soldiers met on this battlefield, they met with hands held out in welcome and friendship, and not with fire and bayonet. May this gesture be accepted in our streets and in our hearts.

May this become the true lesson of Gettysburg.

Statement on 30-Year Optional Retirement Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to my three bills to benefit postal and other Government employees, which are before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I hope these bills will receive committee approval and will be enacted this year. My bills are H.R. 7287, to authorize retirement of Federal employees after 30 years of service without reduction in annuity, H.R. 7659, to adjust Government and postal employee salaries to achieve comparability with industry pay; and H.R. 7288, to prevent the use of stopwatches and other measuring devices—work measurement systems—in the postal service.

With permission, I wish to insert in the RECORD my recent statement before the Subcommittee on Civil Service, urging approval of a 30-year optional retirement law. I have not yet given testimony to the committee on my two other above-mentioned bills, but will do so at the proper time. My statement on H.R. 7287 follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES C. HEALEY, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE, OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JULY 24, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate your courtesy in permitting me to testify on a subject very close to my heart—optional retirement from the Federal service after 30 years of employment.

As you know, I have given evidence of my interest in this matter by introducing one of the retirement bills under discussion, H.R. 7287.

Mr. Chairman, I favor a 30-year optional retirement law for many reasons, some humanitarian, some practical.

From a humanitarian point of view, let me say that after a man or woman has devoted 30 years of life to the arduous and demanding tasks involved in most postal and Federal jobs, he or she should have the privilege of retiring in reasonable comfort and security.

The Federal retirement system was rather late in coming into being. Employee organizations—notably the National Association of Letter Carriers—fought for more than 30 years to get a retirement act on the books. The Civil Service Retirement Act was finally signed into law as late as May 22, 1920. Ever since that time the retirement policies of the Federal Government have lagged significantly behind accepted standards in private industry. In my opinion, enactment of an optional 30-year retirement law would be an important step toward bringing Federal practices into line with those generally followed in the private sector.

There are other reasons why I think this important improvement in our retirement laws should be made. We are all concerned over the stubborn unemployment figures in this country which seem to resist all attempts to reduce them. Certainly, a 30-year retirement law would help this situation by creating vacancies in the Federal employment structure.

We are also disturbed by the lack of career inducements in the postal service. Recruitment of first-class young talent is becoming more difficult each year. I believe enactment of this legislation would alleviate this situation. Next to pay and promotional opportunities, the young person of today is most interested in the retirement provisions in the career he is about to choose. If we make the retirement program in the Federal establishment more modern and more generous, we shall be making the service more attractive to desirable young people.

There is a further practical reason, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, which should be carefully considered at this time. Our present rigid retirement program in the Federal Establishment is actually costing us more money than we should be spending.

It is demonstrable that men become more accident-prone as they grow older. This is particularly true in the postal service, where the jobs are physically demanding.

Last year, 50,524 Federal employees retired.

It may surprise some members of this committee to learn that one-third of those retirements—16,728—were for disability. The average age of those employees retiring for disability was 55.4 years.

Actually, almost half of the 526,000 persons on the Federal retirement rolls—a total of 210,000—are receiving benefits under disability retirement.

If we permit postal and Federal employees to retire with full annuities before they reach the age when they are most accident-prone, we shall be eliminating a great deal of unnecessary misery and we shall be saving a considerable amount of money as well.

I have just one point to add. The opponents of this legislation have painted a rather lurid picture of flocks of valued employees leaving the Federal service en masse as soon as the retirement provisions are liberalized.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a gross exaggeration. I think this for the simple reason that the annuities that we pay to our retired employees are too low to induce mass retirements.

No, the people who would take advantage of this law would be those who need it most. The study of geriatrics has shown us that some people age faster than others. It is these people—the tired, the early-aged, the least robust—who will benefit most by this legislation. Those who are still vigorous—by and large—will prefer to stick at their jobs rather than try to subsist on the pittance which the Federal Government bestows upon its superannuated employees.

Mr. Chairman, this is necessary legislation. It is forward-looking legislation. And it is legislation that the Federal and postal employees need and deserve.

Thank you very much.

Toward More Federal Responsibility?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, in this day of wide interest in Federal-State conflict and rights responsibilities, the following speech by Oklahoma's junior Senator, Hon. J. HOWARD EDMONDSON, delivered nearly 2 years ago, has an even greater significance now.

It follows:

TOWARD MORE FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY?

(By Gov. J. HOWARD EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma, before the American Bar Association Convention, St. Louis, Mo., Aug. 9, 1961)

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people," so reads the 10th amendment or final article of the Bill of Rights to the Constitution of the United States. From this provision, and from these principles so eloquently spoken by the framers of our Constitution has grown the great debate of the 20th century.

For a person to proclaim the so-called theory of State's rights, he is declared a conservative. For another to seek Federal action in the fields formerly considered exclusive to the States, he earns the title of a liberal.

How often do we hear the conservative resist Federal legislation on the grounds that it invades the realm of State's rights? How often does the editor seek letters to Congressmen that would resist legislation described as socialism.

To this the liberal shouts: Congress must take action to promote the welfare of all and not the few. He argues that a Nation as rich as ours can ill afford to turn its back on the ill-housed; the indigent; the children whose educations are poorly suited for the nuclear age. And so the debate continues. The people seek understanding and decision, only to become more confused by the so-called logic of the adversaries.

All of us have seen either by personal observation or from the pages of history, that we have gone a long way from the original concept of the 10th amendment. Few objective historians would claim that Jefferson ever specifically intended that the Federal Government provide for the mother of four illegitimate children.

The fact of the matter is that we have been and are living in an age of the vanishing sovereignty of the several States. Can you think of a single State governmental activity that today is within the exclusive province of the several States?

Some of these invasions by the Federal Government we accept as a matter of course, mainly because we have had them longer than others. No one today questions either the legality or the wisdom of the Federal Government's spending 50 percent of the money that goes to the State's highway program, or 90 percent of the cost of our Interstate System. We seek such help.

Long ago, we accepted the right of Uncle Sam to provide assistance in the field of public welfare.

They say economics dictated Federal intervention in business and industry.

Chambers of Commerce anxiously solicit Army Corps of Engineer projects in their areas to harness their rivers and provide flood control, hydroelectric power and navigation.

The plight of the isolated farmer brought on rural electrification, and today, we wonder if Madison and Adams really ever expected urban renewal.

The question is not whether the Federal Government can invade these areas. The question is not whether the same is constitutional. The question today is, and should be, how did we get here and what are we going to do about it?

Extremists would contend that power hungry politicians dedicated to a centralized socialistic government sought such legislation and the programs thereunder. But can we honestly say that this was brought about by the conscious design of Congress? Can we honestly say it was the ambition of the President? Did the people, through the Democratic process, intentionally elect Representatives, Senators, and Presidents who were dedicated to such a plan or scheme?

I think that the answer is a most emphatic "No." As a matter of fact, I respectfully submit that action in these fields in the Nation's Capitol has been the direct result of inaction in the States' capitols. Where the States have failed to act, eventually Congress has. In practically every instance the biggest argument is not whether or not the laws are good, but rather whether or not they should be passed on the State level, rather than the Federal. And again I submit, as long as the States fail to act, the trend to centralize will continue.

Look at just a few examples: Can there be doubt in anybody's mind but that the States have had opportunity extending over decades to provide adequate highways even with Federal funds available on a 50–50 basis? Must we not admit that there was a need for the Federal Interstate System? And so as a result of inaction in the State capitols, relief was sought in the Nation's Capitol and relief we got in the form of 90–10 Federal interstate program now underway.

Look in the area of education. The debate on Federal aid to education goes on today in Washington, but the question is not whether we should or should not have any form of Federal aid to education, because we already have it. And the reason that there are those who seek more Federal aid today is because of the failure of first, the local school district, and second, the State, to provide the needed high standards of education necessary in the nuclear age.

How many of you here today have participated in various efforts to locate defense installations in your community? I daresay that practically every one of you have done something to hold a military installation, an aircraft plant or some other facility associated with national defense in your city or area. Most of us have made trips to Washington lobbying for the same. This is plain old commonsense when it comes to good business, because after all, that installation provides jobs, payrolls, and money to be spent in your home. But whereas we sought Government activity through such an installation in our community, did we at the same time provide the necessary educational facilities for the children that came with the employees? On the contrary, it was our failure to act here that necessitated so many of us going back to Washington again and asking Federal aid to our overcrowded schools that were brought about as a result of this extraordinary number of children. The result: Federal aid to education in defense impacted areas.

My remarks are not intended as an attempt to prove that what the Federal Government has done was constitutional or unconstitutional. Neither am I here to argue that it was right for the Federal Government to take such steps. My point is simply that these are the facts. This is what has happened and we will not solve this problem merely by asking Congress not to pass these laws and not to infringe upon States rights. Our solution lies in the State level of our responsibility to see to it that conditions do not get so poor that Congress finds it necessary to further intervene upon our sovereignty.

Unfortunately, it has been my observation that in all too many instances the attitude on the part of the States, and by this I mean Governors, legislatures, and the people of the States, has been to create consciously, or unconsciously, situations that tend toward more Federal intervention.

I cannot help but recall this past session of the Oklahoma Legislature. We were confronted with the problem, as is true in all States, of needing additional funds for education. Time and time again I heard senators and representatives say, "let's wait and see what Congress does." Time and time again I read editorials that said, "Well, if Congress is going to provide Federal aid, why raise taxes in Oklahoma for education." Time and time again in the same session, it was argued on the floor of the legislature that we should not appropriate money for highways until we waited to see what Congress appropriated for highways. As a matter of fact, the best argument today in a State legislature for an increased appropriation is: Well, if I get $50,000 more, the Federal Government will match it with $50,000 or $100,000. Practically every department of the State government seeks its appropriation on the basis of matching Federal funds available for that program.

I was in office only a matter of weeks in January 1959, when a regional official of the Federal Government came to my office seeking more States funds for Civil Defense. When I told him that we were short on funds and trying to avoid a tax increase, he was quick to inform me that we had better increase our State funds or he would decrease the amount of Federal funds available for Oklahoma in direct proportion, and he had the audacity to prove his point by citing what he had done in two of our surrounding States.

I could not help but be amused at the last Governors' conference when I heard several Governors orate eloquently on the subject of States rights, in support of their opposition to Federal aid to education. A few hours later, we began discussions on highways and the same Governors were equally eloquent in their demands that the Federal Government provide more funds to step up the Federal interstate highway construction program.

When in the last session of the Oklahoma Legislature, it was obvious that additional funds were necessary for education, many editors opposed any tax increase to provide those funds. In all too many instances, it was the same editors who opposed Federal aid, stating the States can handle their own problems in education.

The truth is: The States have proved their ability to solve some problems (without Federal help), even where several States are involved. Consider the subject of conservation of oil and gas. Through aggressive imaginative action the States created the Interstate Oil Compact Commission. Through such cooperative action, much has been accomplished—without Federal intervention or control.

Thus we see what can be done on the State level, even on interstate problems.

Now consider the problem of the ever increasing fatalities on our highways.

Are we witnessing today action by States within their borders and between each other? I say there is too little. Some States work at it but the usual picture is one of inaction and complacency.

As a result—at present, a somewhat faint, but ever increasing demand for Federal action. I predict we will see the day when Congress does act through the establishment of a Federal Highway Patrol, unless we do a better job on the State level.

By the same token, I predict that we will see Federal intervention in the field of care of the mentally ill, unless the States move ahead, and yet, I regret to say that in my own State in this past session, we did well to provide a mere nominal increase for our mental health program. In all too many States the same is true. We are only fooling ourselves. We cannot have our cake and eat it. When the Constitution says that the powers not delegated to the United States are reserved to the States, I submit, that with powers goes responsibility to act when action is needed and to do so with imagination and dispatch. We should see less criticism of Federal action and more criticism of States inaction.

Indeed, I seek your demand for States action. As lawyers we have unique opportunities to lead the way. If we increase our own local activity to be more commensurate with the needs of the people, we will see the demand for Federal action proportionally decrease. If we accept and fulfill our responsibilities, reserved to us by the Constitution, then we will see the pendulum swing back to the respective capitols of the States.

And so, the challenge is to us. We have the opportunity, let us not fail to fulfill it.

Who's Kidding Who About Our Cuban Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, News Director Ralph Renick of station WTVJ in Miami recently aired an editorial about the U.S. policy toward Communist Cuba which should be brought to the attention of all interested in this serious problem.

Mr. Renick quoted from the May 22 statement by Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs Edwin M. Martin, and then Mr. Renick added his own comments as follows:

> Secretary Martin. We are engaged in a variety of measures, unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral, which are designed to increase the isolation of Castro.
>
> Mr. Renick. Here we point to reports that shipping to and from Cuba is picking up almost daily with full knowledge of the U.S. Government.
>
> Secretary Martin. To increase his serious economic difficulties.
>
> Mr. Renick. Here we ask why this week's closing off of money transfer to Cuba wasn't done months ago.
>
> Secretary Martin. To prevent by military means, if necessary, any export of aggression from Cuba.
>
> Mr. Renick. Here we point to the relaxation of that once tight quarantine of Cuba and the admission by the State Department this week that Red infiltrators are traveling by air from Cuba to the Cayman Islands and then to other points in the hemisphere. And this admission came only after a newsman broke the story.
>
> Secretary Martin. To thwart Cuban based and supported subversion of Latin American governments.
>
> Mr. Renick. Here we need only mention the rapidly deteriorating situation in Venezuela, British Guiana, and possibly Haiti.
>
> Secretary Martin. To increase the costs to the Soviets of their maintenance of Castro.
>
> Mr. Renick. Here we would ask where the Communists have ever given up; because of high costs.
>
> Secretary Martin. To persuade the Soviets that they are backing a losing and expensive horse.
>
> Mr. Renick. We would call the horse far from losing—it certainly is still in the race.
>
> Secretary Martin. To effect the withdrawal of Soviet military forces in Cuba.
>
> Mr. Renick. Here we only repeat what recently returned Cuban exiles constantly report—the increase of Russian presence in Cuba.
>
> Secretary Martin. And to maintain surveillance of Cuba to insure that it does not again become a military threat to the United States or its allies in this hemisphere.
>
> Mr. Renick. We didn't realize that Cuba had ever stopped being a threat to the United States. That winds up Mr. Martin's official policy statement. Who is kidding who?

While that was the text of the quotes used by Mr. Renick to show the State Department position, and his own comments on each point, one more item of interest should be added.

Back in October of last year, at my personal request, the Select Committee on Export Control of the House of Representatives held hearings on the Castro-Soviet economic and military buildup in Cuba. Of particular interest to this committee was the assistance that had been rendered in the buildup by ships flying flags of free world countries.

At that hearing I pointed out that free-world nations were permitting their ships to carry goods to Cuba. Greek, British, West German, and Norwegian ships were the major offenders. I pointed out that—

> The United States is presented with a clear and present threat from the Soviet buildup in Cuba. The weapons, armaments, and personnel now in Cuba add up to a new Soviet offensive in the Western Hemisphere. This offensive is being aided by the 28 free world tankers which ran petroleum products to Cuba in the June–August period.

And what was the official State Department position then? The record of the hearings show that Under Secretary of State George W. Ball told the committee of the Congress the following:

> As an island, Cuba is entirely dependent upon shipping for the maintenance of its tottering economy. With the decline of the Cuban economy and with the Soviet buildup of arms and aid, ships and shipping have emerged as a special problem * * * as this situation has emerged, the U.S. Government has recognized that it should take steps to curtail or prevent the use of free-world shipping in the Soviet bloc-Cuban trade.

This was on October 3, 1962. Today, almost 1 year later, free world shipping constitutes a majority of all shipping to Cuba, outnumbering Soviet bloc shipping.

Allied shipping continues to keep Castro supplied. The State Department continues to assure the American people that there is no reason for concern.

Mr. Renick might very well ask, "Who's kidding who about our Cuban policy?"

Can America's Libraries Handle Our Colossal Rate of Accumulating Knowledge?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, following are excerpts from a speech I delivered to the members of the Reference Service Division at the American Library Association Conference on Monday, July 15, 1963.

There is a serious problem today in America that unfortunately has not come to the forefront of the Nation's attention. We are experiencing a "knowledge explosion," and unfortunately we have neglected to look into the means to harness this explosion and make efficient use of the rapidly accumulating storehouse of knowledge. The following remarks are directed to this serious deficiency and make explicit the problem facing the future of American intellectual pursuit.

> Your committee was somewhat surprised when I suggested as my title: "Can America's Libraries Handle Our Colossal Rate of Accumulating Knowledge?"
>
> Let me assure you at the very outset that with all due respect to your efforts, in my judgment, the answer is a categorical "no."
>
> You will undoubtedly, in this conference, hear many prophets warn about the crisis in our library services.
>
> These warnings should not be taken lightly. They are true.
>
> We are experiencing a fantastic knowledge explosion throughout the world but, tragically, our own country appears to be dragging its feet in finding adequate ways to harness the intellectual fallout from this explosion.
>
> In too many instances, we still are using horse and buggy methods in our library

services. Even though businessmen are learning that libraries have a real dollars and cents value to them, their interest in their community libraries are miniscule.

In 1961, 18 million persons—16.5 million rural and 1.5 million urban—still had no readily accessible public library service available to them.

U.S. Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppell recently told my committee that 110 million Americans—with 60 million of these living in urban areas—in 1961 had access only to libraries which were inadequate according to minimum State standards.

These libraries offer only limited and outdated book collections, and frequently are ill-housed, understaffed, and open for use only a few hours a week.

The Nation is trying to meet the needs of mid-20th-century intellectual pursuits in a virtual straitjacket.

Fantastically primitive is, I believe, a fair way to describe our library efforts in many parts of America.

Ponder, if you will, this reality: With the possible exception of penal institutions, public library buildings are probably the oldest governmental structures in use today. Studies of the age and adequacy of public library buildings in three States—California, Indiana and Wisconsin—provide some insight into the magnitude of this problem. Thirty percent of the public libraries in these three States were built before 1910. Eighty-five percent were erected before 1920. Of all public libraries, only 4 percent were constructed since 1940. The median age of these structures is now 54 years. Reporting libraries in 13 States estimate that they will need 30 percent more space in the next 7 years. The construction now planned by local libraries, 1.6 million square feet, will fall short of estimated needs by more than 2 million square feet.

Statistics, at best, are boring unless we can relate them to actuality.

Why should we be concerned? Because the library today is becoming the storehouse of knowledge in the community. It is the clearinghouse of information for a nation whose intellectual curiosity is being increased daily as the world grows smaller and complexities increase.

The library today is the average American's university—and the demand for service will grow in ever increasing bounds.

By the end of the decade, there will be an increase of at least 37 million local library users. This is a conservative estimate and applies only to the conventional library—the stampede on special library facilities cannot be properly estimated.

A tremendous effort is being exerted to improve this situation, but I'm afraid it will be a very long, long time before we close the gap.

As you know, my committee voted out a bill to provide Federal assistance to help meet the library crisis. You will be happy to know that this bill has been recalled to remove the Powell amendment, which would bar any Federal funds to segregated library facilities.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has ruled in a decision which apparently has completely missed public notice that the definition of "public" means a building available to all. Any library practicing discrimination is not available to all—ergo, it is not public and thus is not qualified to receive Federal aid.

This is a far-reaching decision. But under this definition, the Powell amendment no longer appears necessary in the library bill. I am sure you will agree the chance of passing the legislation is markedly better without the Powell amendment.

I have dealt so far with the broad aspects of the library problem. But my purpose in visiting you today is to discuss the role of the special library.

As chairman of a special committee studying the need for a data processing and information retrieval center, I am particularly pleased to be with you today.

I submit, ladies and gentlemen, that the word "librarian" is today a misnomer. It will be even more so before this decade is over.

As Christopher Stevenson, manager of the Technical Information Quarterly at General Electric recently stated:

"In addition to its social responsibilities, every profession has also the responsibility to continuously build a core of specialized knowledge in its professional field of work. Whatever peripheral skills may be useful to librarians, our basic core of specialized knowledge is concerned with the organization and utilization of information. This phase of library training has been sadly neglected. During this period of neglect, a tremendous literature of specialization has grown up in the United States, and we librarians find ourselves today unequipped with the tools for organizing and utilizing this literature."

The librarian of tomorrow will be more properly called an information scientist—or perhaps a retrievist—one skilled in the art of retrieving information to satisfy the insatiable lust for knowledge among our people.

My committee is now probing the entire problem of special librarians—what relationship they will have to my proposal for the establishment of a national data processing and information retrieval center.

Let there be no mistake. The demand on our special libraries in the next decade will be staggering.

What trends will effect special libraries within the next decade, the doubling of the gross national product; a fantastic increase in research and development; an increase in the ratio of special librarians to research workers and the need for more technical skills in special librarianship.

Our gross national product in 1980 will approximate 1,000 billion 1959 dollars. Our population will increase 37 percent by 1980 to 246 million. It will require higher skills. Demands on our library facilities will be staggering.

But of greatest interest to me are the reports that by 1969—only 6 years from now, 4 percent of our gross national product, or approximately $28 billion will be devoted to research and development.

If these figures are true—and I believe they are—then our demand for the new version of today's librarian will be beyond comprehension. By 1980, the figure for research and development will reach $40 billion annually, and unless we undertake a drastic revision of our present methods of information retrieval, I fear we will be in serious trouble.

This is why I am so anxious to determine—as chairman of a special subcommittee studying the advisability of a National Data Processing and Information Retrieval Center—if there is a better way to harness the vast knowledge explosion for more orderly use by the entire scientific and educational community.

It is significant to me that 9 years ago the Soviet Union established the U.S.S.R. Institute of Scientific and Technological Information in Moscow. Three years after this institute began functioning, the Soviet Union plunged its first Sputnik into orbit. To this day there is considerable speculation on how important a role did the Soviet research retrieval center play in Russia's spectacular "first" into space.

The Soviet Union's center receives research data assembled from 90 countries, published in 68 languages. All of this material is translated into Russion, codified, digested, and turned into the institute's systematized files for use by the entire Soviet scientific community.

The world total of scientific and technical publications has reached astronomical proportions—400,000. It is humanly impossible for any researcher or team of researchers to keep up with this endless flow of new knowledge being developed in universities and scientific laboratories throughout the world. Unless the United States develops a more efficient way of compiling this vast torrent of knowledge, we may find ourselves again racing against the world in the technological explosion.

There are several nations already substantially ahead of us in the establishment of a central information retrieval center. In addition to the Soviet Union, France, England, Italy and The Netherlands already have information retrieval centers in various forms in operation.

It is my firm conviction that before this decade is over, data processing and information retrieval will be one of the biggest industries in America and the world. The tremendous knowledge explosion which is sweeping the world makes it imperative that this civilization develop more efficient ways of grasping the full meaning of man's intellectual discoveries.

I am fully convinced that just as this Nation spent the forties in nuclear development and the fifties to space exploration, the generation of the sixties will see the advent of a tremendous emphasis on data processing and information retrieval.

Since the beginning of recorded history, man's capability to accumulate and retrieve information has paced his progress. Today we are witnessing a grave threat to this progress.

This threat has been eloquently described by the eminent neurologist, Dr. Grey-Walter:

"During the last two generations the rate of accumulation of knowledge has been so colossally accelerated that not even the most noble and most tranquil brain can now store and consider even a thousandth part of it. Humanity is in a critical state compared with which the constitution of the dinosaur and the community of the Tower of Babel were triumphant.

"The root of this evil is that facts accumulate at a far higher rate than does the understanding of them. Rational thought depends literally on ratio on the proportion and relations between things. As facts are collected, the number of possible relations between them increases at an enormous rate."

Dr. Vannevar Bush, the great American scientist, characterized the urgency of the problem with the following grim note: "Science may become bogged down in its own products, inhibited like a colony of bacteria by its own exudations."

The staggering statistics amply testify to this pejorative state of affairs.

During the last 33 years, there has been a 10-fold increase in the number of scientists and engineers; from 50,000 in 1930 to more than a half million today. Indeed, one authority estimates that the number of scientists now living is greater than the number of all scientists who ever lived before.

The prodigious output flowing from this ocean of creative activity is overwhelming. More than 130,000 research and development projects per year are of Government origin, representing two-thirds of the $15 billion our country now spends on research.

We have more than 120,000 technical journals in the world. Our patent office has more than 7 million patents on file. There are more than 500 specialized science information services.

Indeed we have reached a stage in the accumulation of knowledge where manual searching for information is quickly becoming an impossible and extremely costly task.

We now have bibliographies of bibliographies. The last issue of the "World Bibliography of Bibliographies" contains more than 100,000 separately collated volumes of bibliographies.

And yet, it is painfully apparent that the human capacity to absorb knowledge is almost minuscule in comparison to the fantastic amount of information available.

For example, the average person reading 12 hours a day, for 50 years, can at best read about 16,000 to 18,000 technical books in a lifetime. We have about 30 million books in the world today.

The enormous gap in our capacity to store and retrieve information and at the same time meet the demands and responsibilities of our society has created the most costly and wasteful drain on our resources, which is without parallel in the entire history of mankind.

The appalling figures speak for themselves. One major U.S. company spent more than $250,000 and 5 years of research in an attempt to solve an electronic switching problem only to learn that the information was available 6 months before the project started.

A cloud seeding experiment has recently been made at a cost of $3 million. Shortly after completion of the experiment, it was learned the same information has been obtained at a cost of $256,000.

We could never exhaust this catalog of waste. It is, however, sufficiently dramatic to make us responsive to meet the greatest challenge of our time, a challenge fraught with power to either suffocate our progress or ennoble the aspiration and welfare of mankind.

Indeed, the harnessing of power from scientific knowledge through data processing and information retrieval will surely surpass the rich rewards derived from harnessing atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

It should be a source of concern to all of us that the Soviets appear to be so efficient that Dr. Finley Carter, director of the Stanford Research Institute, was prompted to state:

"In order to better know what American scientists are doing, one must read Soviet journals of abstracts."

John Gunther, the well-known American reporter writes:

"Russian abstracting services are so complete and so well developed that it has come to the point where American scientists learn about new accomplishments by Americans in their field from Russian abstract journals."

The importance of centralizing information has been attested to as one of the key factors in the success the Soviets have had so far. As pointed out by Dr. Michailov, director of the Institute of Scientific Information of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences:

"Nine years of operational service of the Institute of Scientific Information under U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences justify completely the establishment of a centralized documentation agency, since it is only within a centralized documentation service that the world's overall output of scientific publications can be processed and synthesized. Besides, the centralized system of information provides a fair base for effective mechanization and automation development."

The above is supported by Prof. Boris M. Tareev, also from Vinity, who states:

"Experience gained from information work in the U.S.S.R. and in other countries indicates that the complex and important task of providing complete, i.e., 'total' information on all recent scientific and technical developments throughout the world can be accomplished by a central scientific information institute which has at its disposal many highly qualified specialists, suitable technical equipment, and sufficient funds for acquisition of current literature from many different countries. The Institute of Scientific Information is such a center in Russia."

In my bill, H.R. 1946, I proposed the establishment of the National Research Data Processing and Information Retrieval Center to ameliorate some of the abysmal shortcomings and dangers to which facts and figures just stated bear witness. For it is readily apparent that the lack of a central organ, amidst hundreds of abstracting devices and countless specializing information services, lacking efficiency and control over duplication of research projects costing billions of dollars is a deadly danger to the survival of our country.

The timing and need for the center which I have proposed have never been more urgent and necessary. The responsibilities of our Government to our citizens and the scientific community must be met at once with energy, dedication and leadership worthy of our heritage.

"The cries for help from our scientists are desperate and justly demanding. The distinguished vice president of Tulane University, Dr. F. R. Cagle, only a few months ago succinctly captured today's mood of our scientists by saying:

"I speak as a scientist complainant * * * as a biologist frustrated by the difficulties of obtaining articles essential to my research * * * as a bewildered administrator participating in decisionmaking * * * as a frightened observer of the literature problems of my biologist colleagues * * * as an angry critic of our Government for failing to have concern about technical information programs * * *."

It is therefore of little surprise that my proposal has received such gratifying response and support.

The distinguished soldier-scientist, former Chief of Research and Development in the Department of the Army, Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Truddeau, recently pointed out:

"I believe you of industry, our academic allies and the agencies of Government need to get together and back what I think is needed here—let's call it SATIC—A Scientific and Technological Information Center—a national clearinghouse for the most complete and comprehensive acquisition, translation, and exchange of information that we can get from all segments of our Nation and from the rest of the free world."

A Washington University editor writes:

"Above all, in this country we need a central agency to coordinate the overall information effort; winnow the total production; and pick up the loose ends like foreign publications, research bulletins, graduate theses, Government reports and papers delivered at conferences. Organizing and operating such an institution would be an effort no bigger than others we have made, no more ponderous than others the Government has shouldered and carried home. It would deserve to be called investment rather than extravagance."

One of the most distinguished foreign critics on information retrieval, whose expert advice and services have been solicited by various Government agencies for many years, including the National Science Foundation, whose record of objective scientific analysis is unassailable, professor of mathematical logic and linguistics, Y. Bar-Hillel, has recently stated:

"There could, for instance, hardly be any doubt that the establishment of the institution corresponding to the Russian All-Union Institute of Scientific and Technological Information could greatly improve the existing situation in the information field in the United States and could be an overall improvement."

Needless to say, there are many others who voice similar views. Clearly, the establishment of a national center is the most urgent need and merits the highest consideration and priority.

The benefits to be derived from the establishment of a national center are too numerous and too obvious to need further elaboration here. However, there is one outstanding bonus which can be had. It is less obvious, and, therefore, I shall detail some of the hidden rich rewards awaiting the realization of a national center.

We are all too familiar with the current shortages of scientists, the costly expense involved in obtaining a technical education and the difficulty of attracting students to pursue degrees in science. And yet, notwithstanding these obstacles, the establishment of a national center could double the number of scientists by cutting wasteful duplication and mountainous literature searches which consume as much as 70 percent of our scientists' time.

Never before in history have we faced such a titanic challenge. The hour is fast approaching when we must act or be left behind, adrift in a fog of technological confusion. The rewards in accepting this great challenge are boundless. The decision is ours.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 31, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of grace and glory, when with each new day Thou dost spread the mantle of light about us as purple morning breaketh, fairer than morning, lovelier than daylight, dawns the sweet consciousness we are with Thee.

We would yield our flickering torch to the flame of Thy redeeming love, facing whatever the day may bring, sustained by a faith that will not shrink, though pressed by every foe.

Strengthen us, we pray, to carry our share of the burden of mankind's climb to the kingdom of Thy love and to the radiant realm where Thy will shall be done in the Nation and in all the earth. Toward that shining goal our puny mortal strength is unequal to the tests and tasks of the decisive days which are upon us. We dare not trust our own devices and counsels. Because Thy completeness flows around our incompleteness, from the lowly earth where our weary feet so often stumble and falter, may the exultant notes of our faith and hope rise like the lark on morning wing, singing its song at heaven's gate.

For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, forever and ever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 30, 1963, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

NOTICE OF OBJECTION TO COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, knowing some very important subjects will be before the Senate today for discussion, every Senator should be in a position to be in attendance instead of being present at some committee meeting. For that reason, with one exception, I object to any committee meeting today while the Senate is in session. I understand that the committee headed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] is desirous of concluding, or at least continuing, with a hearing today. That committee is excepted from my request.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there have been inferences in the press to the effect that political partisanship may be motivating the distinguished minority leader [Mr. Dirksen] and the chairman of the Republican policy committee, the ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Joint Atomic Energy Committee [Mr. Hickenlooper] in their attitudes toward the nuclear test treaty.

It is most disturbing to me, Mr. President, to witness this effort to fan the flames of partisanship on a matter of such urgent and overriding national importance. I must reject any such inference insofar as it involves the minority leader [Mr. Dirksen] or the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] or, for that matter, any other Senator—Republican or Democrat.

Both are men of the highest patriotism, and have shown time and again a mature and unqualified capacity to place the national interest in foreign relations above partisan consideration. They have consistently supported the main body of American policy through several administrations—administrations of both parties.

Their attitude is entirely in order. It is their responsibility as Senators—not as Republicans—in positions of great responsibility to be most prudent and careful in the consideration of this proposed treaty. And may I say that the same applies to the majority leader and the rest of the leadership on this side of the aisle.

It would have been, indeed, inappropriate at this time for the Senator from Illinois, no less than the Senator from Montana, to have gone to Moscow for the ceremony of signing the treaty.

There is a great backlog of legislation in process in the Senate at this time, highly important legislation to the Nation in many fields; and both the minority leader and the majority leader must continue to try, as we have been trying, to bring this legislation to the point of decision in the Senate.

As it is, an exceptionally appropriate bipartisan group will go to Moscow from the Senate—not necessarily to approve, but to represent the Senate for the signing. That is as it should be, for an occasion which involves the constitutional responsibility of the Senate to advise and consent with respect to treaty ratification. The Senators who are going—the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. Fulbright]; the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], the deputy majority leader, whose name has long been associated with this effort; the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], who as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has great knowledge of the subject matter of the treaty; the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the senior Republican in this body, wise with a long experience in the Senate and in foreign relations and atomic energy; and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], ranking Republican of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees—this group of Senators who are going, Mr. President, is admirably equipped to represent the Senate with dignity and wisdom on this highly significant occasion of worldwide significance.

This bipartisan group, Mr. President, of which I personally am extremely proud of, is in keeping with the spirit of bipartisanship which has guided the policy of the United States from the outset on the matter of nuclear testing. In a matter which involves the safety of the Nation and the health of our people, and particularly our children, there is no room for partisanship. Certainly a treaty which would seek to prevent precisely those nuclear explosions which are most contaminative of our physical environment can be regarded as such a matter. Certainly, too, this proposed treaty has implications for the safety of the Nation.

I do not prejudge, Mr. President, the Senate's action with regard to the treaty. But the records of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. Dirksen], and of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] in matters of this kind, as I have noted, offer great assurance that the question of the treaty will be examined in terms of the highest national interest and free of partisanship.

Moreover, Mr. President, both parties in the campaign of 1960 adopted positions clearly in line with what has now been achieved in the initialed treaty to end nuclear testing. I must say, in all honestly, that the Republican platform is clearer on this point than the Democratic platform. But I am sure that this is primarily a matter of draftsmanship, and is not indicative in any way of a lesser desire on the part of Democrats to bring about an end to these dangerous tests. Democrats as a whole are just as concerned as Republicans when the safety and health of the Nation are at stake. In any event, Mr. President, I read into the Record at this point the reference to nuclear testing in the Republican and Democratic platforms of 1960.

The Democratic platform, 1960, section II, under the heading "Arms Control," states:

> A primary task is to develop responsible proposals that will help break the deadlock on arms control.
>
> Such proposals should include means for ending nuclear tests under workable safeguards, cutting back nuclear weapons, reducing conventional forces, preserving outer space for peaceful purposes, preventing surprise attack and limiting the risk of accidental war.

The Republican platform, 1960, under the heading "Foreign Policy," states:

> We are similarly ready to negotiate and to institute realistic methods and safeguards for disarmament and for the suspension of nuclear tests. We advocate an early agreement by all nations to forgo nuclear tests in the atmosphere, and the suspension of other tests as verification techniques permit. We support the President in any decision he may make to reevaluate the question of resumption of underground nuclear explosions testing, if the Geneva Conference fails to produce a satisfactory agreement. We have deep concern about the mounting nuclear arms race. This concern leads us to seek disarmament and nuclear agreements. And an equal concern to protect all people from nuclear danger leads us to insist that such agreements have adequate safeguards.

Again I say that I am extremely proud of the bipartisan group which has been selected to represent this body and this country at Moscow. I do not believe that under any circumstances a more capable group, or men of greater integrity and patriotism, could have been selected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I appreciate the generous statement by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. Mansfield]. I need no defense for my conduct. I have always been willing to assume full responsibility for what I say and do. Under the Constitution the Senate has the duty and responsibility to advise and consent to a treaty. That action must constitute an independent judgment, and that judgment I will render under my oath, according to my conscience, and within the limit of my perception as I can bring it to bear.

I recall that once a President sought assistance in building up support for a League of Nations. Members of my party followed him throughout the country. He returned from that tour a broken and dejected man. It always hurt me to think that happened to a great scholar who was then the President of the United States—Woodrow Wilson.

For myself I try never to embarrass the President of the United States. I shall always bend over backward to make certain that he is not projected into any awkward situation.

Ten days ago I went to the Press Gallery of this body. The question was asked whether I had been invited to go to Moscow. The answer was that I had not been invited, directly or indirectly, remotely or otherwise, by anyone, anywhere, at any time.

Second, I stated that if I were invited, I would not go. I made that statement publicly on a number of occasions. In so doing, I closed the door for myself and for anyone else who might undertake to invite me. I will never embarrass anyone. I made that abundantly clear. Not the least, of course, of the considerations that entered into that decision is the fact that we are beset with so much work. I did not feel that I could take time off and go to Moscow for that purpose, since the occasion was a ceremony of signing, and no negotiation was involved.

I am deeply grateful to my distinguished friend from Montana for the generous statement that he made on the floor of the Senate. Beyond that, I know of nothing I need say. I have neither encouraged nor discouraged any Member of this body from taking that trip if he were invited to go. Every Senator has equal prerogatives. I do not feel that it is either my responsibility or my prerogative to undertake to tell other Members of this distinguished body what they should do under those circumstances. So I leave the case there.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, last night the President of the United States asked me to go to Moscow as a representative of the United States in the final ceremony preliminary to the signing of the test-ban treaty. Of the 100 Members of the Senate, I do not believe there is anyone who dislikes the thought of a foreign trip any more than I do. But when the President of the United States asked me to take the trip in the interest of the United States, I did not think I had any right to fold my hands and tell him that I did not want to go, and that I am not going.

Mr. President, when any program is initiated that looks toward the easing of tension throughout the world, and has for its purpose the averting of a war throughout the world, even though such program offers only a faint hope—and in my opinion that is what the proposed test-ban treaty does—I do not think I have any right to say that I am not interested in any effort for peace in the world regardless of whether it promises immediate and early success or not.

Mr. President, as one Member of this body who was asked to go to Moscow I can say that I have not been asked to commit myself in any way. I understand that no Member of the Senate will be asked to sign the treaty. I agree that Congress should examine every line of the document when it is submitted to us for our approval or disapproval. It is proper that we should weigh the benefits of approval against any possible disadvantages or risks which we may run. It is probable that we may have to weigh our hopes against our fears. I have heard it said that Congress ought not to be represented at this meeting because Congress did not participate in writing the treaty. May I say that many Members of the Congress were shown the treaty 10 days ago—a week ago last Monday. I have examined it closely. I have read and reread it from end to end and from the middle towards both ends. I know that probably half the Members of the Senate have had the same opportunity that I have had.

I do not believe it is a proper function of the legislative branch of Government to write treaties. It is our function to approve or to disapprove them after they have been prepared by the executive branch of the Government.

In this case I must say that the executive branch of the Government did seek the approval of three committees of the Congress before finally authorizing the initialing of the treaty a week ago.

My position now is that, unless I am shown more evidence than has appeared to date that the treaty will be disadvantageous to the United States, I expect to support its approval when it comes before the Senate for a vote. I reserve the right to vote as I believe proper when the time comes and after full hearings have been held.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. My speech has expired, too.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if I may say only a word about what has been transpiring, as one Republican Senator I am very pleased that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] have consented to serve on this delegation. I understand fully the reservations which my distinguished and beloved colleagues have made.

I never thought that there was any implication in a Senator's going that he would necessarily vote for a treaty. I have thought that it represented merely a visual demonstration of the fact that in the great affairs which face our Nation the parties grasp hands in terms of fundamental purpose, and certify that this is the way they conceive the destiny of our country to travel the paths of peace; and, as President Eisenhower said in that famous phrase, go the extra mile to seek to attain it.

For myself, I am very pleased that such distinguished members of my party are to attend the signing of the treaty, together with equally distinguished members of the majority party. I do not feel it will compromise their independence of judgment whatever.

I thoroughly agree with the majority leader and with the minority leader in the fine statements they have made today. I agree with the President that it is a necessary demonstration of solidarity of our country in a moment of what could be great achievement and that this will be its visual evidence. I could not think of finer representatives for the Senate of the United States than those who have consented to attend.

(At this point Mr. Ribicoff took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

TRIBUTES TO JOHN D. RHODES, UPON RETIREMENT AS OFFICIAL REPORTER OF DEBATES, U.S. SENATE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would offer brief testimony today to one who, after 44 years of service, is retiring from service to the U.S. Senate.

I often think of the Congressional Record as an amazing compendium wherein is recorded actually the unfoldment of this Republic. Everything can be found there—reports which come from the executive branch, allusions to reports from committees, prize-winning essays by youngsters, columns by our pundits and commentators, and everything—but everything—including poetry, whether highly edifying or of the doggerel variety, and great prose. All appear in the Congressional Record.

It has often baffled me how readable the Congressional Record is. Not only is it readable, but also it is authoritative and it is authentic, because everything that happens in the Congress is found there, and it is always in perfect order.

It baffles me when I think of the readability of the Congressional Record, because, when all is said and done, I think it will be agreed that Congress is really the home of the split infinitive, where it finds its finest fruition; this is the place where the dangling participle is certainly nourished; this is the home of the broken sentence; and if there were no dashes I do not know what our distinguished Official Reporters would do. This is the home where, with impunity, we can ignore the comma and the period, we can ignore the colon and the semicolon, we can ignore the exclamation mark and the question mark; and yet, somehow, out of this great funnel it all comes out all right, and it is always readable. And when it goes out, in thousands of copies, to be used by high school youngsters in debate or by college debating teams or by that great concourse of people who read the Congressional Record, including the executive and judicial branches, it is authentic, and, above all else, it is readable; and the reason why it is readable, Mr. President, is to be found in the endeavors of the distinguished group who are the recorders of Senate debate.

I read their names into the Record: John D. Rhodes, Gregor Macpherson, Herbert N. Budlong, Charles J. Drescher, Francis J. Attig, Nicholas J. Cinciotta, Julian R. Serles, Jr., Joseph J. Sweeney.

At the top of the list is our old friend, John Rhodes. He has been in the service for 44 years. I think he began when Thomas Riley Marshall, of Indiana, was sitting, Mr. President, where you are sitting, in his capacity as Vice President of the United States.

When John Rhodes first served the Senate, he could look upon John Bankhead, of Alabama, with whose brother, William, I served when he was Speaker of the House of Representatives.

He served the Senate with that great tower of strength, Joe Robinson, from Arkansas.

Hiram Johnson, from California, was then in the Senate; as was Frank Brandegee, from Connecitcut.

Albert Fall, of New Mexico, was then a Member of the Senate.

James Wadsworth, of New York, who then served, after finishing his distinguished service here, went back to his State and became a candidate for and was elected to the House of Representatives, where I made his acquaintance. He became a firm friend of mine.

Lee Overman, from North Carolina, was then in the Senate; as was Warren Gamaliel Harding, from Ohio, who later became President of the United States.

Tom Walsh, the great inquisitor from the State of our distinguished majority leader, Montana, also served.

Tom Gore was here from Oklahoma.

Charles McNary, of Oregon, who once occupied the place I am now privileged to occupy, served in the Senate then.

Boies Penrose, from Pennsylvania, was then serving in the Senate, as I recall.

Morris Sheppard, from Texas, was also then serving.

Reed Smoot, of Utah, then served.

The great Carter Glass, of Virginia, was a Member of the Senate at that time or soon thereafter.

Claude Swanson, of Virginia, also served in the Senate then.

From the State of Washington there was Miles Poindexter.

The great Robert La Follette, the senior, was in the Senate at that time.

And Irvine L. Lenroot, once a court reporter himself, was then a Senator from Wisconsin.

So, Mr. President, John Rhodes has looked upon the Senate for 44 years. He and his former colleague, Mr. James Murphy, as senior reporters, made the Congressional Record readable. People like me get their names in the marquee lights, sit under the television cameras, or get into the headlines, for their brief and shining hour, but it could not be that way unless there were humble servants serving this great body, who, in the language of a great statement long ago, "also serve who only stand and wait."

John Rhodes, I have come to know you as "John." I have a deep and abiding affection for you. I am distressed that you had such a long tour in the hospital.

How delighted we are that on this day, as you terminate your service with the U.S. Senate, you can be here and that we can salute you and can place upon you the accolade that you so richly deserve, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it falls to me to join the distinguished minority leader [Mr. Dirksen] to inform the Senate of the retirement of Mr. John D. Rhodes, who for so long has headed the extraordinary skilled group of shorthand experts and English scholars who report the debates of the Senate.

It is an occasion of both happiness and sadness. I know that all other Senators join with me in wishing John Rhodes many years of busy and satisfying leisure. I know the Senate shares with me a certain sadness in knowing he will no longer be here every day to see to it that our words are properly and accurately recorded for the Record.

In any event, I express my personal gratitude and the gratitude of the Senate to John Rhodes, a distinguished public servant who in serving the Senate so well for so long has performed an exceptional service for the Nation.

In conjunction with these remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter to me dated July 10, 1963, and a biographic sketch of John Rhodes, prepared by the Secretary of the Senate, Mr. Johnston, be included at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter and sketch were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., July 10, 1963.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mansfield: It is with keen regret that I have come to the conclusion that after my 43 years of service as Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate I should retire and turn the duties of the office over to younger members of our corps.

All the members of our corps are dedicated to their service and are loyal to the Senate. Since you have been the majority leader we have endeavored to carry out what you wanted done, even to anticipating your desires at times, and in our close relations you have ever been courteous and cooperative.

We have been careful in the selection of the members of the corps, and I know they will continue to work with you for the smooth running of the Senate and the accomplishment of the public good.

Permit me to thank you for your uniform courtesy to me as I have endeavored to carry on in my office.

Respectfully,

John D. Rhodes.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

John D. Rhodes, Official Reporter of Debates of the U.S. Senate, is about to retire, after 44 years of service to the Senate in that capacity.

Mr. Rhodes was born in Jackson, Ohio, on January 19, 1880. His family moved to Washington in 1886, and he was educated in the elementary schools and Eastern High School of the District of Columbia. He then studied law at Columbian University (now George Washington), graduated in 1902, and was admitted to the bar of the District of Columbia and the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States.

As a young man, he diligently studied the art of shorthand writing, which he used in his law classes. About the time he completed his study of shorthand—during his senior year in law school—the principal of the shorthand school passed away, and Mr. Rhodes was asked to assume his duties as teacher. He taught the Pitman shorthand system and trained scores of ambitious students in the intricacies of this method. Shorthand reporting was a highly regarded profession. The financial return was sufficient to warrant its consideraton as a future career, and Mr. Rhodes became intrigued by the opportunity to engage in the practice of the art as his chosen profession, as competent reporters were in great demand.

In 1907 he accepted a position with an established firm in Washington, and was soon actively engaged in reporting committee hearings in the Senate and House of Representatives.

One of the attractions that drew Mr. Rhodes to the reporting field was the opportunity it gave him to meet outstanding political, financial, and industrial figures, and in a fashion participate in the recording of their words for posterity. In his first year of reporting he was requested to report the annual convention of the Shorthand Reporters Association, in Biltmore, N.C. The president of the association that year was the venerable and much-loved Benn Pitman, of Cincinnati, who had popularized Pitman shorthand in the United States. Another event in the life of the young reporter in the same year was when he journeyed to Annapolis to hear a lecture by Mark Twain—possibly his last public appearance on the platform. Governor Warfield, of Maryland, had asked Mr. Clemens to come and lecture in the state house, the proceeds to be donated to some worthy charity. It must have been a great thrill to report the lecture, but, according to Mr. Rhodes, when the speaker responded to a demand for an encore, he lifted his pen and focused his eyes on the speaker. He was charmed by the magnetism of the man who had entertained tens of thousands from the public platform. Mr. Rhodes recalls that Mr. Clemens was attired, as usual in his all white evening clothes, as he contended that black was depressing.

At this time the reporting corps of the House of Representatives and the Senate, particularly the latter, were considered the acme of the profession, and young reporters looked up to the gentlemen who graced those aggregations as the very best in what were recognized as exclusive careers. Little did Mr. Rhodes dream of ever becoming a member of the Senate corps, and much less eventually to become the senior member of the group.

In the early days all the reporters used pens—the stenotype not having been invented. All the reporters in the Senate are pen writers, as it is necessary for them to be able to move rapidly from one position to another, especially when a Senator cannot be heard above the confusion that occasionally prevails.

It is said that when Daniel Webster was a Member of the Senate, and it was announced that he would make an address, Members of the House and others would gradually drift in, so that the Senate would soon be crowded. This has been true, to an extent, in modern days, when orators like Borah, Bailey of North Carolina, or other eloquent speakers have made extensive addresses.

When the Democratic Party won the election in 1912, and Woodrow Wilson became President, one of the first activities of the Congress was revision of the tariff, and Senator Furnifold Simmons, of North Carolina, chairman of the Finance Committee, assigned the responsibility of reporting hearings to Mr. Rhodes. The hearings were exceptionally lengthy and tedious. He was commended for his professional service.

When the U.S. Chamber of Commerce was formed, in 1912, Mr. Rhodes was made the Official Reporter, which position he filled for 18 years, covering conventions in many cities.

During these eventful years, Mr. Rhodes maintained one of the busiest general shorthand and reporting businesses in Washington, handling all classes of reporting. Some of the legal cases were of national interest. Among many was the trial of Edward L. Doheny, involved in the so-called oil cases. Mr. Rhodes also reported most of the cases tried by Frank J. Hogan, a leading Washington trial lawyer.

In 1930 Mr. Rhodes was selected by former Representative Robert W. Bonynge, the American attorney with the Mixed Claims Commission, to report the proceedings incident to the trial of the issues arising out of the "Black Tom" explosion and fire in New York Harbor. The claims amounted to millions of dollars. This assignment necessitated a trip to The Hague, Holland, with a reporting and transcribing staff. Mr. Rhodes was assisted in the reporting by Mr. Gregor Macpherson, now an Official Reporter of the Senate, and Mr. Allister Cochrane, now deceased, then an Official Reporter in the House of Representatives. The party also included Messrs. Joseph and Elmer Koons, now on the staff of the Official Reporters of the Senate, and Mr. Charles Parkman, assistant to the Official Reporters of Debates in the House of Representatives.

In 1918 Mr. Rhodes served as a captain in the U.S. Army, being assigned to the Judge Advocate General Corps.

In 1919, on the death of Mr. E. V. Murphy, who from the time of the Civil War had been an Official Reporter of the Senate, Mr. Rhodes was invited to join the corps. He then began his career in the Senate, which has covered the intervening 44 years. The Senate was then engaged in debating the approval of the Versailles Treaty, which involved the question of our country's becoming a member of the League of Nations. Mr. Rhodes participated in the reporting of the debate on this highly controversial issue. The debate was of a very high order, with leading orators taking part—William E. Borah, Hiram Johnson, Henry Cabot Lodge, and other outstanding public men.

Mr. Rhodes has reported many interesting historical sessions of the Senate, as well as many addresses in the Senate by heads of state of foreign governments, when guests of the Senate—including Winston Churchill, Madam Chiang Kai-shek, Konrad Adenauer, and other figures of world renown.

The most dramatic occasion Mr. Rhodes recalls during his career of reporting was when Gen. Douglas MacArthur returned from the Far East, and was received in a tumultuous meeting of the two Houses of Congress. On this occasion, the general made one of his most eloquent addresses, concluding with the quotation of an excerpt from an old barrack room ballad—"Old soldiers never die; they just fade away." The general gave Mr. Rhodes the text he used on this occasion, and with the general's permission Mr. Rhodes presented it to the Library of Congress.

The Official Reporter has never assumed the role of speechwriting, but he is par excellence a trained grammarian, and he uses his editorial ability with the perfection of a skilled craftsman. In the editing of the Senate debates, for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, his knowledge of words and phrases, selecting the proper punctuation and inserting the correct dates and quotations, if any correction appears necessary, he has no equal.

Mr. Rhodes experiences a feeling of pride, as he looks back over the years, with the full knowledge that he has played an important part in the correct recording of our political history, as it has been made day by day in the U.S. Senate, for almost a half century.

John Rhodes played an important part in instructing the younger members of the corps of Official Reporters of Debates in the ideals and traditions of that office. Those who have had the benefit of his advice and counsel will always remember him with esteem and affection.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, day in and day out, our Official Reporters—John Rhodes, Gregor Macpherson, Herbert Budlong, Charles Drescher, Francis Attig, Nicholas Cinciotta, Julian Serles, and Joseph Sweeney—struggle with our voices, our English, and our restlessness. They not only have to figure out what we are saying and take it down, but they have to be sprinters and acrobats as well.

And the assistants—Elmer Koons, Willard Pruett, Placidino Zagami, Joseph Koons, Wilbur Smith, Thomas Loftus, Perry Smith, and Hilda Clardy—work and sweat over the verbiage which pours over their desks from session to session.

These folks must have to take some sort of indoctrination course, because, in spite of the harassment they are subjected to, they retain their sense of humor and their good dispositions.

Over the years, they become part of the Senate and part of the family, and we feel a personal loss when one of them decides to break away.

When John Rhodes steps down today after more than 43 years of service, the Senate will lose one of the family—one who made us mind our p's and q's and yet found time in the midst of a busy day to lend a helping hand. No tribute could adequately express our deep affection and attachment for this man. We shall miss his warmth and his friendship. I hope that he and Mrs. Rhodes can now find time to do the things they held off doing, and that they will have many more happy years together.

I certainly hope they will return many times to visit Vermont.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing congratulations to my good friend Mr. Rhodes, who has been of service to me and, of course, to all other Members of the Senate, in doing what my good friend from Illinois has so ably stated—helping to correct the RECORD. I congratulate him for the work he has done for the past four decades and for the responsible service he has performed in the Senate.

Many persons have had an opportunity to know and to work with him; and they include many great men. Some of them were mentioned by my good friend from Illinois. He overlooked mentioning a great Senator from my State, Huey Long, under whom Mr. Rhodes also served. All have profited from his untiring and extremely competent efforts to report the proceedings of the Senate.

All of us regret his leaving the Senate, but we are hopeful that in retirement he will find time to do the many things he has been wanting to do but which he has been prevented from doing because he was fully occupied in the business of the Senate.

I conclude by saying I wish him well during the vacation which he really and truly needs.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to our good friend John Rhodes, who is leaving the service of the Senate.

No one in the world can possibly appreciate the services of the reporters of the U.S. Senate as much as do Senators themselves. A moment ago the distinguished minority leader referred to the fact that they must even be acrobats. I sit in complete admiration of the way these gentlemen are able to pick up the colloquy and discourse on the floor, no matter where it occurs. Of course, this is not made easier by the fact that some Senators speak with the roar of a lion and some of them, to use an old phrase, mumble in their beards.

I express my own great appreciation to Mr. Rhodes. Not only do you put in the RECORD all of the punctuation; not only do you correct all the words that we would have misspelled if we had had to write them ourselves; but on many occasions you correct the many inaccuracies of quotations which occur on the floor.

When I think of the fact that I was only 12 years old when you came to the Senate, I am astounded as I reflect on the length of time involved. The service you have rendered to all those who have served their country in the Senate is a fitting accomplishment which deserves the highest recognition of all of us.

I wish you and Mrs. Rhodes many wonderful years and much time to do the things I know you want to do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to a truly remarkable man, a fine, kindhearted, and generous man, and one of the most loyal and dedicated public servants the U.S. Senate or any other parliamentary body ever has known. I refer to John D. Rhodes, who is present with us today, and who has been with us for many years.

It is a remarkable achievement to serve an institution such as the Senate of the United States for 44 years, particularly when one looks back over those years and realizes the great developments and achievements of our country.

Mr. Rhodes has had the opportunity to record many of these achievements, at least as they were articulated, discussed, and debated in the Senate.

He began his service in the Senate during the administration of Woodrow Wilson.

He had the responsibility of reporting the hearings of the Finance Committee in the first term of the administration of President Wilson. One of the first activities of Congress at that time was the revision of the Tariff Act. Our good friend, Mr. Rhodes, was there to report the lengthy and sometimes tedious hearings of the committee investigating the subject. He was at that time commended for his professional services.

He started out being good and able and talented, and he has continued to be so each year, and he has even improved on that exemplary record.

Mr. Rhodes was commended many times by his professional reporting organization for his excellence and for his remarkable talent as an Official Reporter of Debates and of conferences and conventions, including such organizations as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

John Rhodes could write a book of current American history which, I believe, would excite the entire Nation. He has faithfully recorded the utterances of Senators. For example, he recorded the controversial debate over the ratification of the Versailles Treaty, one of the most important debates in the history of Congress. He has recorded such great and illustrious men as Winston Churchill, the talented and respected Madam Chiang Kai-shek, the great Chancellor of the Federal Republic of West Germany, Konrad Adenauer, and a host of others. What a great record this is.

I know how difficult must be the task of an official reporter of debates of the Senate, particularly when he must report a speaker like myself, who emits a torrent of words, rapidly, and all too often without the punctuation that is required for the kind of reading and understanding the speaker wishes his words to have.

I thank my good friend John Rhodes for the many occasions on which he has made a rather incoherent speech look as if it were readable, digestible, and understandable. It is a great pleasure at a moment like this to say publicly that one's life has been enriched by sharing the friendship of a man like John Rhodes.

Dear John, we wish you all of the best and hope you will have many more years of happiness and health and the kind of exciting life that you have lived.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as one of the newer Members of the Senate I wish to join in the tributes that are being paid to John Rhodes. He is always gracious, friendly, considerate, and helpful. He has corrected many errors in grammar, as well as other mistakes. I wish for him and Mrs. Rhodes long life and happiness. I hope that in the course of his retirement he will take the time to write a book, because it would be something that all of us and people throughout the Nation would like to read.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I merely wish to add that I appreciate the fine statements that have been made regarding this truly dedicated public servant, our Official Reporter, John D. Rhodes. I wish to call attention to the fact that he was born in Jackson, Ohio. That is something that should not be overlooked at a time when we are saying a fond goodby to this great public servant, who is leaving us today.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to John D. Rhodes, not on any basis of seniority, but because of the great appreciation I have for his service. I remember that on the day I was sworn in as a Member of the Senate, the 29th day of April 1957, John D. Rhodes stopped me in the cloakroom. I do not know how he had found out what church I belonged to, or whether he had asked me. At any rate, he gave me a list of the churches of my denomination in Washington, with the type of membership, and the kind of preaching in each church, so that I could select the church I wished to join. He gave me advice about banks, in case I wanted to open an account in Washington. He also gave me other advice.

He was not only talking as an Official Reporter of Debates in the Senate, but also as one who was interested in the personal problems of others, especially in the problems of newly arrived Members of the Senate. He gave them invaluable information which was available to them from no other source.

Knowing that, and having become acquainted with him, I remember that he would offer a Senator a little advice or exchange a few quips, such as asking me at times how many horses I had shot out from under the Official Reporters.

In talking to him from time to time, especially in those first years, I found that there were not many people connected with the Senate who had a greater jealousy or higher regard for the reputation of the Senate, or probity of expression, or a higher regard for the English language as it is used on the floor of the Senate, or a greater desire to have the language appear in readable form. John Rhodes has been a good guide and counselor to Senators.

We will miss John Rhodes. I say to you, Mr. Rhodes, that I appreciate the advice and assistance that you gave me, not only in the early days, but also in the intervening years I have been in the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, when I first came to the Senate 19 years ago I found Mr. James Murphy as the Chief Reporter, and I found John D. Rhodes as one of his most loyal assistants. I have enjoyed knowing both of those men. Over the years I have discussed with them subjects dealing with the Revolutionary War, and many other matters dealing with our history.

I shall miss John Rhodes, not only as a good reporter, but as a friend with whom I discussed many subjects that were close to my heart. I was glad to find that they were close to his heart also.

I wish him many years of happiness wherever he may go.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I would not let this opportunity pass without expressing my appreciation for having had the opportunity of serving in the Senate when John Rhodes served as one of its outstanding Official Reporters of Debates.

I know that there have been many times when remarks I had made on the Senate floor certainly should not have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without some changes being made in them so as to make them readable, more understandable, and in keeping with the thoughts I had at the time.

Mr. Rhodes not only understood the language I had used, but he also knew the thoughts I had in mind, and changed the language to express my thoughts and my viewpoint. That is something that I always appreciated and for which I have always been indebted to him.

We all wish him well. It has been a pleasure for me to know him as a personal friend. I wish him many years of a well-earned rest in retirement.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in commending the outstanding services of Mr. Rhodes to the Senate and the Nation. I wholeheartedly endorse the statement of the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], who referred to the individual help Mr. Rhodes has been to him. I can testify to the same effect, by reason of my experience of almost 17 years in the Senate. Often when I have spoken extemporaneously, Mr. Rhodes, in examining my remarks, has made them appear much better than when I first spoke them. If I misquoted Shakespeare or someone else, the misquotations were always corrected.

It is with deep sincerity that I commend the devoted services of this loyal citizen who is an outstanding Senate reporter. I regret to see him leave the Senate because, frankly, with all due deference to those who will succeed him, I shall have to be a little more cautious about what I say on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I welcome the opportunity to say a few words about the life and service of Mr. John Rhodes.

I have known him, and have profited from his advice and understanding, since I came to the Senate in 1933. John Rhodes' service to the Senate exceeds in length that of any Member presently sitting in this body, including that of our distinguished President pro tempore.

His grasp of Senate history and tradition is profound. His willingness to share his knowledge and judgment has been helpful to many hundreds of Senators, including the Senator from Georgia, for more than four decades.

Men such as James Murphy, his immediate predecessor in the office of Official Reporter, and John Rhodes form indispensable links in the chain of American parliamentary history. Gentlemen and scholars, they fulfill the highest standards of public service.

I commend Mr. Rhodes for his long service to his country. I join my colleagues in wishing him a blessed and happy retirement. We shall miss him, and we honor him for his efforts in the Senate's behalf.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to join in all the fine remarks and tributes that have been paid this morning to our most excellent Chief Reporter, Hon. John D. Rhodes, who is going on a leave of absence for a well-deserved and deeply earned rest after many years of outstanding and most valuable service.

He has been in the Senate much longer than I have. I remember him most fondly and favorably for the fine work he did day and night through the long months. When he became the Chief Reporter he discharged his added duties and responsibilities with great distinction. He earned, and richly deserves, the respect and admiration of the entire membership of the Senate, as well as of his associates, and also the respect of all who know him. Long years hence his fine services will be remembered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to extend my congratulations and best wishes to John Rhodes, who has served us so magnificently, and to wish him a very long and happy life in the enjoyment of his retirement.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it is with mixed feelings that all of us here in the Senate learned of the retirement of John Rhodes. John Rhodes has been one of the unsung heroes of the American Government. Over my 11 years in the Senate, I can recall him working assiduously, particularly during late evening sessions and around-the-clock sessions. John Rhodes, along with those who are younger in the corps of Official Reporters, never stopped completing his own official labors, so that Senators, and the country at large, would know what transpired in this Chamber.

On many occasions I have had opportunity to enjoy the reminiscences of John. One of my illustrious predecessors from California was the late Senator Hiram Johnson. Apparently Hiram Johnson would take delight in speaking with great rapidity in the Senate and using words more or less for the purpose of seeing whether or not the Reporters of Debates were sufficiently educated, intelligent, and astute to follow what he was saying. On one of those occasions, Senator Johnson used the word "tintinnabulating." Later he asked John whether he had been able to transcribe it properly. John said he had. Mr. President, he was able to do so, because he was one of the excellent, outstanding reporters in this country.

A sweet, affable friend of all of us, he will take with him in retirement the love and affection of those of us in the Senate, those who work for the Senate, and Members of the Senate, as he goes into retirement. He will take with him also the fond prayers that he may have many years of happiness and health in his retirement.

We do not in any sense wish to lose his friendship in his retirement. We hope, quite to the contrary, that John will be with us from time to time to renew the friendship which we treasure, and which we know he does.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] I ask unanimous consent that the testimonials delivered to John Rhodes on the Senate floor today be printed as a Senate document, and that other Senators who may wish to insert remarks on the subject may be permitted to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 653. A bill to provide an adequate basis for administration of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Ariz. and Nev., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 380).

By Mr. MOSS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 27. A bill to provide for establishment of the Canyonlands National Park in the State of Utah, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 381).

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

S. 1321. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States (Rept. No. 382).

AUTHORITY TO REPORT INDIVIDUAL AND MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to submit individual and minority views during the adjournment of the Senate on Senate bill 1321, which is known as the Domestic National Service Corps bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LAUSCHE (for himself and Mr. PROXMIRE):

S. 1968. A bill to prohibit transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. LAUSCHE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 1969. A bill for the relief of Carmencita Montalvo; and

S. 1970. A bill for the relief of Adela Helguera Baldor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROHIBITION OF TRANSPORTATION IN INTERSTATE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE OF ARTICLES TO OR FROM THE UNITED STATES ABOARD CERTAIN FOREIGN VESSELS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill and request that it be appropriately referred. The bill, if adopted, will prohibit transportation in interstate commerce or foreign commerce to or from the United States aboard vessels of any foreign country which allows vessels sailing under the flag of the country to be used, on or after the date of the enactment of this act, in trade or commerce with Cuba.

The Guantanamo Bay deliveries will not be affected by the bill. In simple words, any foreign vessel that either delivered or carried out of Cuba any type of cargo would be prohibited from carrying into or out of the ports of the United States cargoes of this Nation or any other nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1968) to prohibit transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE (for himself and Mr. PROXMIRE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TOWER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1321) to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SETTLEMENT OF LABOR DISPUTE BETWEEN CERTAIN CARRIERS BY RAILWAY AND CERTAIN OF THEIR EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, for myself, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] I submit an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 102) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees, and ask for its appropriate reference.

This amendment is similar to House Joint Resolution 579, relating to the railroad labor dispute, introduced in the House of Representatives on July 29, 1963, by Congressman STAGGERS, of West Virginia—with two exceptions:

First, Representative STAGGERS' bill has no limit on the time that the Special Joint Emergency Committee shall continue. My bill provides that this special committee shall report not later than 60 days.

Second, my amendment contains a minor addition at the end of the last section which discharges the committee when it has finally reported, unless sooner discharged by the Congress.

As Senators know, the bill introduced in the House, and supported by the railroad brotherhoods and the AFL–CIO, asks for additional time to engage in collective bargaining with the railroad carriers. I am submitting this amendment in the nature of a substitute because I believe it will be impossible for us to resolve the questions involved in this controversy with any reasonable certainty within the time limits that we now have.

The railroad brotherhoods contend that the carriers have never bargained in good faith, that the carriers have constantly relied upon the assumption that this administration would not permit a strike, and that eventually the Congress would have to settle this matter. The carriers assert that they have bargained in good faith. It is very difficult for a congressional committee to determine that question. This amendment will give us a fair shot at it.

The carriers contend that they are in hard shape financially. Mr. Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, contends the opposite, with a few notable exceptions.

The carriers assert that there is featherbedding going on in the railroads of upwards of 32,000 jobs, involving a cost to them of some $600 million a year that could very well be eliminated. The unions contend that, although some jobs could be eliminated, the carriers are trying to cut too deep. We are having difficulty in determining how many men are actually surplus to the needs of the railroads.

We have a basic question referred to in the President's message with respect to whether employees are treated fairly when hit by technological advances. The President suggested a study of this problem, but the problem is with us now. We have it on the railroads. Whatever our committee does will in one way or another set a precedent for what may follow. It seems to me that a closer familiarity given by 60 days of watching the collective bargaining process as provided in my amendment will better qualify the Congress to act intelligently on this problem.

If after 60 days, after having done the best we could, we do not come up with a solution to this problem—then it will be necessary for us to move to compulsion of one form or another against either the carriers or the unions in order to prevent a strike that would have a disastrous effect on the economy of this country. I hope that this will not be necessary. In any case, after as long as this controversy has gone on, another 30 or 60 days—the carriers have already agreed to 30 days—will, I believe, enable the Congress to act with better information and more intelligently in this matter—if in the interim we cannot get the parties together. It will help, too, if these parties have to look down the barrel of a gun held by a congressional committee while they are actually in the collective bargaining process.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the amendment in the nature of a substitute that I am now submitting. I ask unanimous consent also that it lie on the desk for a period of 2 days for cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment in the nature of a substitute will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Commerce; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from California.

The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, submitted by Mr. Engle, is as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That until the expiration of this joint resolution or superseding action by Congress on the subject matter thereof no carrier which served the notices of November 2, 1959, and no labor organization which received such notices or served the labor organization notices of September 7, 1960, shall make any change, except by agreement, in rates of pay, rules, or working conditions encompassed by any of such notices, or engage in any strike or lockout over any dispute arising from any of such notices. Any action heretofore taken which would be prohibited by the foregoing sentence shall be forthwith rescinded and the status existing immediately prior to such action restored.

"Sec. 2. The parties to the disputes arising from the aforesaid notices shall immediately resume collective bargaining with respect thereto and shall exert every reasonable effort to resolve such disputes by agreement. The Secretary of Labor and the National Mediation Board are hereby directed to give all reasonable assistance to the parties and to engage in mediatory action directed promoting such agreement.

"Sec. 3. There is hereby established a Special Joint Emergency Railroad Committee of the Congress to consist of five Members of the House of Representatives to be designated by the Speaker of the House and five Members of the Senate to be designated by the President of the Senate. Within ten days from the enactment of this joint resolution, and thereafter at intervals of not more than ten days, the Secretary of Labor and the National Mediation Board shall report to the Special Joint Emergency Railroad Committee the progress of the negotiations directed by section 2 hereof. If at any time the Special Joint Emergency Railroad Committee finds that the procedures herein provided afford no prospect of resolution of the disputes, it shall so report to the Congress together with recommendations for further action by the Congress, provided, however, that the Special Joint Emergency Railroad Committee shall make a final report to the Congress no more than sixty days from the enactment of this joint resolution.

"Sec. 4. The obligations imposed by this joint resolution shall be enforcible through appropriate orders of the United States district courts upon suit by the Attorney General.

"Sec. 5. This joint resolution shall expire when all disputes covered thereby are disposed of by agreement of the parties thereto, or when the Special Joint Emergency Railroad Committee reports to the Congress as provided in Section 3 hereof."

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 24, 1963, the names of Mr. Bayh, Mr. Case, Mr. Clark, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Engle, Mr. Fong, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Moss, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Nelson, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Pell, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Ribicoff, and Mr. Scott were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1932) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Hart (for himself and other Senators) on July 24, 1963.

NOTICE OF ADDITIONAL HEARINGS ON SMALL BUSINESS LEGISLATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I wish to announce additional hearings on S. 298, a bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, in order to receive testimony regarding possible self-dealing by SBIC's.

The hearing will begin at 10 a.m., Tuesday, August 6, 1963, in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

All persons who wish to appear and testify on this matter are requested to notify Mr. Reginald W. Barnes, Assistant Counsel, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921.

INTERNATIONAL OLYMPICS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am delighted to learn that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has voted to report to the Senate my resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 67, extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States.

The approval of the Foreign Relations Committee and the official Government support that the Department of State has expressed are extremely gratifying. A great deal of work has already been done by the Lake Placid Organizing Committee to prepare their formal application, which is indeed a most impressive document.

There is no doubt that Lake Placid offers unique facilities for winter Olympics, some of them dating back to 1932, when the winter Olympics were held there. Others are new and very modern, and plans are underway now for the construction of an additional jumping hill and another downhill course. I was most impressed by all of the fine facilities, particularly the bobsled run. In fact, I was so enthusiastic that someone later warned me that I might be invited to ride down it one day—an invitation that, I must confess, made me a little nervous, as I do not consider myself Olympic caliber.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will move quickly to give its approval to this joint resolution, for it will undoubtedly add force to the Lake Placid invitation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record following my remarks an article by Ronald MacKenzie, published in the Bulletin of the International Ski Federation. The article outlines, even more enthusiastically than I can, the merits of Lake Placid.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Lake Placid, N.Y., U.S.A., 1968 Winter Olympic Games

(By Ronald MacKenzie)

In the month of May 1963, Lake Placid's mayor, Robert Peacock, received from the U.S. Olympic Committee an invitation to bid for the 1968 winter Olympic games. The proposal was accepted and the right to bid was won at Chicago in October when this Northeastern winter sports village was selected to represent the United States in bidding for the 10th winter Olympic games.

In 1932 when the third winter Olympic games were held at Lake Placid, the skiing consisted of nordic events only. Alpine events had not yet become part of the program. However, all facilities constructed at that time have been, and are, in constant use in the year-round sports program of the Adirondack Mountain villages. As this is being written the summer ice skating season is in progress in the Olympic Arena. And preparations are being made for the 17th annual summer ski jumping competition. Participants this year will include United States and Canadian Olympic team members.

The 1950 FIS approved cross-country trail system with start and finish elevations of 1,860 feet still exist and are in use during winter. Many improvements are planned for these courses which were laid in deep forested areas. Reserve tracks are planned at 4,000 feet on Whiteface Mountain.

The 70 meter Intervale Olympic jumping hill, also FIS approved is available. It has press and spectator stands to accommodate 10,000 people. These facilities now in constant use will be utilized for the combined skiing events on the Nordic program. This hill is located directly on the main New York to Lake Placid highway, Route 73. Present plans call for the construction of an 85-90 meter jumping hill in the center of the village. This hill will be constructed to meet FIS standards. Mr. Heini Klopfer is expected to inspect the plans for this hill during the fall of 1963, on a visit to Lake Placid.

The Whiteface Mountain ski area is new construction, begun 5 years ago and not yet complete. During the planning and construction of this development FIS standards were observed. As a result all specifications for the Alpine ski events can be met or exceeded on the present area now in daily winter use, with the exception of the men's downhill course. The addition of one new ski lift to the higher slopes of the mountain will open this area and allow descents of over 3,000 vertical feet. It is from this area of the mountain that the men's downhill course will be prepared. This upper mountain section has a unique feature, a paved motor highway directly to it which can be opened for use in winter. This can be a valuable asset in getting press, TV, and radio people, as well as spectators up the mountain with no interference with competitors. All trails now in use are turf covered, free of stones and stumps. Whiteface is located directly on the main Montreal to Lake Placid highway, Route 86.

The Whiteface Mountain ski area, owned and operated by the Adirondack Mountain Authority, is an agency of the State of New York. President Marc Hodler is expected in Lake Placid in late summer to personally inspect these Alpine ski facilities.

Lake Placid, a community of 3,000 inhabitants, over the years has developed the know-how and the qualified personnel to stage many international events. The area comprising the village of Lake Placid and the town of North Elba is located within the Adirondack Forest Preserve, the largest wilderness area in the United States. Yet the community is readily accessible via two railroads, major motor highways, and jet air service to its own airport. Two hours by car from the Canadian metropolis of Montreal, a junction point for the international airlines.

Playing host to the sports minded vacationer is Lake Placid's only industry. As a result housing facilities are both excellent and numerous. Accommodation for 10,000 can be found in the immediate area and for 25,000 more in communities within a 50-mile radius. Whiteface Mountain is 9 miles from the village of Lake Placid where the Olympic village would be constructed on a 50-acre tract that would be out of bounds for all spectators and unauthorized personnel. In a message to the U.S. Olympic Committee, Nelson Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, said, "Rest assured that if the 1968 Winter Olympic Games are awarded to Lake Placid, the State of New York will do everything possible to assure proper facilities for conducting this great international sporting event."

RONALD MACKENZIE,
Secretary, Provisional Olympic Organizing Committee, 1968 Winter Olympic Games.
JULY 3, 1963.

RECIPROCITY IN UNITED STATES-CANADIAN RELATIONS

Mr. **KEATING**. Mr. President, the relationship between the United States and Canada has for years stood out as one of the best examples of good neighborliness in the world. Mutual good will and cooperation are keystones of continental solidarity.

Yet, there are—and always will be—areas of dispute and difference between the two nations, sources of friction that must be weighed and negotiated between the two countries. These differences should be discussed and, if possible, ironed out through friendly negotiations.

It was in this spirit of accommodation that the U.S. Government agreed to exempt Canadian bonds from the proposal for taxation of foreign securities.

Nevertheless, it is still appropriate to ask what concessions have been made to the United States in return. International finance is and should be a two-way street. Concessions to Canada by the United States should certainly be accompanied by Canadian willingness to assist the United States in a comparable way.

There are two particular points which I have in mind and which have long been a source of concern to me. I believe they should be considered as a reasonable Canadian quid pro quo for the U.S. concession with regard to the taxing of securities.

First, the United States admits Canadian bread duty-free into this country. Canada maintains a duty of 7½ percent ad valorem on U.S. bread. Over the past 5 years, imports of Canadian bread have more than doubled. In the Buffalo area, they have increased nearly tenfold since 1957. Not only does the unilateral Canadian tariff discourage U.S. sales of bread to Canada, it also is causing serious unemployment among bakery workers in the affected areas. Buffalo is not the only area. If the Canadians could be persuaded to eliminate this tariff, it would improve U.S. trade possibilities in this field and add to employment opportunities in the United States.

Second, the Canadian Government in June 1962 lowered the amount of duty-free goods which a Canadian citizen could bring into Canada from the United States from $100 to $25. This was represented as an emergency measure to halt the outflow of Canadian gold. Its effect has been sharply to reduce Canadian purchases in the United States. Surely, in view of the improved Canadian position and the mounting U.S. balance-of-payments problem, a reconsideration of this measure by the Canadian Government would be in order. Yet, in the most recent letter received from the Department of State, I was informed that the Canadian position had not changed.

I am, of course, aware that overall U.S. sales to Canada exceed Canadian sales to the United States by a substantial amount. Nevertheless, in view of the unique dispensation which Canada has been offered by our Government, it would surely not be inappropriate to expect something from Canada in return. I sincerely hope that our Government can be as responsive to the hardships placed on American workers and business by Canadian restrictions as it has been to the difficulties which Canada might have suffered under the security taxation proposal.

With a view toward bringing this issue specifically to the attention of the U.S. officials who negotiated with Canada on the security taxation issue, and encouraging more vigorous and effective representations by the U.S. Government, I have written to Secretary of the Treasury Dillon and Under Secretary of State Ball. I have asked for a report on actions taken to date on these two points and have urged serious consideration of whatever measures may be necessary to bring these issues directly to the attention of top Canadian officials.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, the text of one letter from the Department of State on the question of bread duties and certain relevant statistics, and two letters on the subject of raising the $25 duty-free allowance for Canadian tourists.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 13, 1963.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: I want to thank you for your letter of June 3, 1963, concerning the importation of bread from Canada.

The Department does not consider that the Canadian export situation is one which warrants changing the present customs treatment for breads under the U.S. tariff. Historically, the Congress provided for the duty-free entry of bread in the Tariff Acts of 1913, 1922, and 1930. The United States bound the duty-free status of bread as a trade agreement concession to Norway in exchange for concessions of importance to U.S. exports. The United States also received benefits of concessions granted by Canada and Norway to the United States. Should action be taken which would restrict imports, the United States would be encouraging other countries to take similar action on other products to the detriment of U.S. exports.

U.S. production of bread in 1962 had an estimated value of approximately $2,500 million. In the same year imports were valued at $1.5 million of which 73 percent came from Canada. According to the trade, the imports from Canada are to a large extent concentrated in certain localities along the United States-Canadian border, although in no metropolitan center does the import trade amount to over 2 percent of the particular area's production.

The Department notes that imports of bread are a part of an exceptionally high level of trade between the United States and Canada. Canada is our largest export market buying vastly more from us than it sells to us. In 1962 out of a bilateral trade with Canada of C$7.9 billion, the United States sold Canada nearly C$700 million more than we purchased. In fact, Canada has had a similarly massive trade deficit with the United States over the last 10 years. In 1962 we had a current account balance with Canada which was C$1,116 million in our favor (this includes travel expenditures, interest and dividends, and freight and shipping).

It is our hope, of course, that trade and other business with Canada will be on a two-way basis. We want Canada to be an expanding market for our American exports and this implies that we should be willing to give Canada an increasing opportunity to sell to us. While not indifferent to the welfare of any individual American enterprise, the Department believes that in the absence of adequate justification it would be unwise to propose restrictive tariff action to deal with highly localized situations which would be prejudicial to other American enterprises and to the American economy as a whole.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

TABLE 1.—*Bread, yeast-leavened, other than hard crisp rye: U.S. imports for consumption by principal sources, 1957–62*

[Foreign value]

Country	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961 [1]	1962 [1]
Canada	$519,807	$590,562	$639,693	$778,215	$837,863	$1,081,064
Italy	30,161	47,778	76,510	61,200	47,762	73,425
Sweden	460	----------	----------	97,090	165,895	48,504
All other	7,306	4,241	2,616	19,700	[2] 55,120	[3] 37,987
Total	557,734	642,581	718,819	956,205	1,106,640	1,240,980

[1] Preliminary.

[2] Includes $21,973 imported from Finland, $14,787 from West Germany, $8,823 from the United Kingdom, and $7,586 from Norway.

[3] Includes $9,241 imported from West Germany and $7,945 from Finland.

NOTE.—The figures in this table understate actual imports as all informal entries of imports valued at not more than $250 each, and formal entries less than $250 each, in 1957, and less than $100 each in 1958–62, have not been fully tabulated in import statistics. The statistical sampling of such importations indicates that the value of such imports may have accounted for as much as 47 percent of the total value of the imports in 1957 of the articles covered by this table. It is estimated that this percentage also applies to imports of these articles since 1957.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

TABLE 2.—*Bread, yeast-leavened, other than hard crisp rye: U.S. imports for consumption from Canada, by customs districts, 1957–62*

Customs districts	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961 [1]	1962 [1]
	Quantity (thousand pounds)					
Michigan	3,131	2,967	2,395	2,334	3,125	5,677
Vermont	2,298	3,208	4,028	4,239	4,248	3,932
Buffalo	160	59	50	688	980	1,274
St. Lawrence	37	48	166	177	153	159
Chicago	22	----------	----------	----------	----------	29
Maine and New Hampshire	6	6	2	6	----------	1
Total	5,654	6,288	6,641	7,444	8,507	11,072
	Foreign value					
Michigan	$280,914	$273,397	$222,762	$202,405	$275,507	$513,147
Vermont	205,740	293,750	363,446	430,709	390,650	369,499
Buffalo	14,732	5,079	4,845	63,563	87,804	112,113
St. Lawrence	15,819	17,436	47,637	80,638	83,902	83,457
Chicago	1,702	----------	----------	----------	----------	2,570
Maine and New Hampshire	900	900	1,003	900	----------	278
Total	519,807	590,562	639,693	778,215	837,863	1,081,064

[1] Preliminary.

NOTE.—The figures in this table understate actual imports as all informal entries of imports valued at not more than $250 each, and formal entries less than $250 each in 1957, and formal entries less than $100 in 1958–62 have not been fully tabulated in import statistics. The statistical sampling of such importations indicates that the value of such imports may have accounted for as much as 47 percent of the total value of the imports in 1957 of the articles covered by this table. It is estimated that this percentage also applies to imports of these articles since 1957.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 22, 1963.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: I refer to your communication of August 22, 1962, and my interim reply of August 29, concerning a letter from Mr. Walter Van Vranken, retail consultant to the Glens Falls Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Van Vranken expresses concern as to the effects on New York retail business of the Canadian action limiting the duty-free allowance permitted Canadian residents on foreign purchases. It is regretted that this reply has been delayed.

The Canadian Government determined in late June 1962 to limit the duty-free allowance because it believed the cost of the then existing exemption, in terms of foreign exchange, was higher than Canada could afford in the circumstances. The action was one of several temporary measures designed to deal with a Canadian financial and balance-of-payments crisis. While the Government limited the duty-free allowance, a Canadian tourist is still able to spend any amount he desires abroad for merchandise provided he pays the Canadian import duty, if any applies, when the goods are brought into Canada. In June, when the Canadian Government changed the tourist exemption, it was indicated that no controls would be imposed over the amount of money Canadians would be permitted to spend abroad.

The United States has a strong interest in the financial stability of Canada and in the circumstances the Department recognizes the temporary, emergency nature of the Canadian Government's action. The United States, in August 1961, similarly made a substantial reduction in the duty-free allowance accorded to U.S. residents on foreign purchases. The Department anticipates that the Canadian Government will review the status of the tourist exemption once the financial situation in Canada has been fully corrected.

If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 12, 1963.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: Thank you for your letter of April 2, 1963, in which you inquire concerning the present status of the situation with regard to the duty-free allowance accorded by Canada for purchases made abroad by Canadian travelers. You enclosed a letter from Walter Van Vranken, retail consultant, Glens Falls Chamber of Commerce, who is concerned regarding the effect of the reduced Canadian allowance upon retail trade in Glens Falls.

There has been a considerable improvement in the Canadian balance-of-payments situation over the past several months. This has already led the Government to remove the surcharges on imports that were imposed at about the same time that the duty-free allowance was reduced. The latter allowance remains at $25 per person, however.

Should the Canadian balance-of-payments position continue to improve, it is to be hoped that the allowance will be returned to the level that existed prior to June 1962. It may be noted, however, that, regardless of the fact that the U.S. duty-free allowance for travelers is four times greater than the Canadian, total trade between the two countries continues to result in a substantial deficit for Canada.

The letter from Mr. Van Vranken is returned herewith. If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

A "STANDSTILL" CONGRESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, what I am about to say is bound to be said, because I think it very properly affects every member of the minority. Therefore, I should like to take a few moments to discuss where we stand as tomorrow we begin the eighth month of this session of Congress.

For some time, I have been troubled about the way this session has been going and the way it may affect the country's view of the Congress. I believe what has happened here in the last 7 months has troubled many Americans about the ability of the Congress to hold up its end as the great lawmaking body in our Federal system of checks and balances. I have had this confirmed to me time and again in every part of my own State of New York, and I have little doubt that other Members have run into the same feeling in their States.

I speak today only with the desire to see ourselves, as in a mirror, so that by having a clearer vision of the meaning of what we do or fail to do here, we may assess the responsibility of the majority and minority and do something about it before time literally runs out on us this year.

It seems to me that on the basis of the record to date, we are assigning ourselves a unique niche in history as the biggest and longest running slow-motion show to hit Washington in years. And I believe we are in grave danger of seeing ourselves dubbed the "standstill" Congress, or worse.

We all remember that President Truman, in the heat of the 1948 presidential election, called the Republican 80th Congress the "do-nothing Congress." The present Congress, on the basis of its 7-month record, deserves that description far more than the 80th Congress ever did.

In the first 7 months of the 80th Congress—1947—Congress accomplished the following:

It approved, after extended floor debate, millions in aid to Greece and Turkey, giving congressional support to the first mutual security doctrine.

It approved the first effort after World War II at unification of the Armed Forces.

It approved $350 million in foreign aid.

It approved the Taft-Hartley Labor-Management Act, over the President's veto.

It passed a constitutional amendment limiting the President to two terms of office.

It approved a new procedure for presidential succession.

It approved popular election of the Governor of Puerto Rico.

The Senate ratified peace treaties with Italy, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

In those 7 months, the 80th Congress also approved United Nations site agreements; reincorporation of the Inter-American Institute, American participation in the International Children's Fund, and in the International Refugee Organization; extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation; establishment of a sugar quota system, extension of rent controls and wartime excise taxes; establishment of priorities for critical materials in short supply; extension of the school lunch program, and a freeze on social security taxes.

No matter what one may think of these bills or the many other minor measures passed in the first half of 1947—I was against some of them and for some of them—one must admit that there was plenty of activity on the floor of the House and Senate.

Now let us contrast that record with that of the first 7 months of the present Congress:

This Congress has enacted into law, as of today, only four measures which could conceivably be called major legislation: Extension of corporate and excise taxes; temporarily fixing the national debt limit, the voluntary feed-grains acreage diversion program; and the draft extension.

I think it must be perfectly clear to everyone that if the 80th Congress was called a do nothing Congress, this 88th Congress is on the way toward establishing itself as a "standstill" Congress—for although we are confronted with some of the most crucial domestic and international issues of our times, we have not as yet really come to grips with any of them.

I am not advocating a hasty legislative process. The record of the 80th Congress was not a record of shotgun legislation. Each of the measures I have cited was enacted after full and sometimes extended debate.

If further documentation is necessary, I point out in the 87th Congress—1961—Congress had by this time passed the depressed areas law, minimum wage increase, temporary unemployment benefits, social security extension, aid to dependent children, Sugar Act extension, feed-grains program, reorganization act, Judgeships Act, Highway Financing Act, Water Pollution Act, tax extension, and omnibus housing law, and the Senate had approved the OECD treaty.

While the meager record of this 88th Congress is bad enough, its sad performance is dramatized even more by what has not been passed.

The tax program which the President sent up on January 24 is still in the House committee, after more than 6 months, while the Senate Finance Committee is yet to hold hearings on it.

Education bills are foundering in both Houses; even a higher education bill, which passed both Houses last year, only to fail in conference, has yet to reach the floor of either the House or the Senate.

Health care insurance for the aging has become the year's forgotten issue, with hardly a glimmer of hope for even committee action this session.

Youth employment opportunities, national wilderness, and mass transportation bills have passed the Senate, and are languishing in the other body. The medical school bill has passed the House, and is languishing in the Senate.

The foreign aid authorization bill has not been considered in either House.

There will be those who will alternately point with pride to the urgency now being given civil rights legislation—the most burning domestic issue of our time—or attribute to it our slow pace. But in assessing how the country regards us, let us not forget that although our legislative machinery is reacting with uncommon dispatch to the administration's civil rights package, which was sent to Congress on June 19, those committees could have started hearings on civil rights legislation which had been introduced in both Houses months earlier. Indeed, a group of Senate Republicans as early as March 28 introduced the most comprehensive civil rights legislation in history—at the very time when the signs of Negro unrest were growing more ominous—and sought to get hearings, but in most cases even departmental reports were not received.

Mr. President, we have a crisis in the railroad industry, the result of a failure to anticipate the need for means to deal with national emergency strikes where all settlement efforts have failed; and the failure also to deal with the vital national problem of automation.

We have an international balance-of-payments crisis—which was obvious for months, but for which only recently we received a program; and although the signs of this dollar crisis have been up in neon lights for months, a program took months even to appear.

We have a persistent and burdensome problem of endemic unemployment, which can only grow worse by our failure to act.

Last week the President sent us an immigration message; and although his proposals were similar to reform proposals of President Eisenhower and of President Truman, and have been discussed and debated for years, everyone here wonders whether there is even a prayer that they will get out of committee, let alone reach the Senate floor.

I submit that this is a sorry record. It is a sad spectacle to see the Senate of the United States, in the face of the legislative burdens facing us, and at this time of the year, embarrassed by the real lack of business on the Senate calendar and forced often to hold half-time, every-other-day sessions—and I agree that there is no use in meetings if there is no business on the calendar.

The times cry for action. By seemingly listless behavior here, crisis is being permitted to pile upon crisis. Last year, it was an economic crisis; last month, a civil-rights crisis; last week, a railroad crisis; today, a test ban treaty is before us.

We can do something about it. In the first place, Members of Congress can be aroused to activate themselves to bring some major matters to a conclusion, if for no other reason than a common interest in the prestige and standing of the Congress with the people. The President can be aroused to demand of the majority party, which controls the committees and the Congress, and of which he is the leader, definitive and completed action, with a drumfire of leadership at least equal to the number, fervor, and intensity of his messages. The public can be aroused to demand of legislators the jobs that ought to be done—and done expeditiously.

Our leaders can be aroused. We all know that there are ways in which even incomplete committee action need not stymie us. There is the amendment process on the floor of the Senate, unrestricted by the rule of germaneness; there are calendar Wednesdays, motions to suspend the rule on Mondays, and discharge petitions in the other body. We also know that if rules which tie us up need to be amended—rules such as the prohibition against holding committee meetings while the Senate or House is in session—or if there is a need to ameliorate the rigors of the Rules Committee in the other body, then determined leadership can make changes here, too; and it is high time we heard the voice of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] on that score.

The deliberative process was not meant to be an exercise in continuous futility. But that is precisely what the record of the past 7 months has demonstrated. Congress is in grave danger of seriously jeopardizing its repute with the American people; and with each passing day of legislative inaction, that image is growing worse.

This is a problem for all of us. And I speak today in the hope that my view will be taken up by others and that a new will may seize the Congress, so it will follow the pace demanded by the serious condition of the Nation and its affairs, not the pace of those who think it is of particular interest to slow us up.

Mr. President, I conclude as follows: It is important to point out that the President and his party cannot shun the responsibility for this "standstill" legislative logjam. Everyone knows the Democratic Party has large majorities in both Houses of Congress; they control the committees and the legislative priorities. If that party finds itself so much in conflict with itself that it cannot lead effectively, then the country should know that, too.

But in the final analysis, the responsibility is on all of us to get this body and this Nation off dead center, or time—and history—will be passing us by.

I think I enjoy in this body a reputation for as little partisanship as does almost any other Member; and I make this statement today only in the hope that it will help us and in the hope that others may become conscious of what is happening to the Congress in the eyes of the country. In my opinion, this is the most serious matter of all.

I am not finding fault with anyone; I find no fault with the President, the leaders, or anyone else. As I said when I began, I am only trying to lay before the Senate, as in a mirror, exactly what the country sees, in the expectation that, being wise and patriotic public servants, we shall do something about this situation, as I know we can, and as I hope we will.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from New York very kindly sent to me, in advance, a copy of the speech he has just made, and I had an opportunity to read it briefly prior to the convening of the session today.

What he has said about the 80th Congress is not quite correct, for in my opinion it was not a "do nothing" Congress, as it has been labeled, because it accomplished certain things in the field of foreign affairs, as the Senator from New York has pointed out.

But I find fault with the mirror he has held up—in which I think he sees himself, not the Senate as a whole.

As to the tax program, there is nothing this body can do until the House Ways and Means Committee and the House itself take action on such legislation.

So far as education bills are concerned, I do not notice in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, overwhelming Republican support to report the education bills which are being considered there.

Insofar as health legislation is concerned, I must say in all fairness that in my opinion there is no possibility that a health-care bill will be passed this year; but I hope most sincerely that it will be passed next year—not for political purposes, but because it is long overdue and is a necessity for our elder citizens, who are becoming more numerous and are finding life in retirement more expensive to themselves and more burdensome to their children.

Insofar as the youth opportunities bill, the national wilderness bill, and the mass transportation bill are concerned, as the Senator from New York has indicated, they are, of course, out of the hands of this body, because the Senate has already acted on them and has passed them.

Insofar as the medical-school bill is concerned, it has passed the House; and I understand that in the near future the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare intends to report a bill having to do with aid to medical schools and dental schools.

The foreign aid authorization bill is held up in both Houses; but every year, under both Republican and Democratic administrations that measure is usually sent down a little late; and, because of that, it is always one of the last items to be considered.

Insofar as civil-rights legislation is concerned, at the present time three Senate committees are considering such legislation; and in those three committees we would appreciate Republican help in reporting such measures, so they can be brought to the floor of the Senate for consideration.

The railroad crisis has been mentioned. It was placed in the laps of the Senate and the House a week ago last Tuesday; and in the intervening period the committees have been considering most important legislation in this field.

Insofar as the dollar outflow is concerned, it is something which has plagued both the Eisenhower administration and the Kennedy administration. Both of them, to the best of their ability, tried to curb the outflow of this vital commodity. All of us know what the situation is.

The Senator from New York said:

> We have a persistent and burdensome problem of endemic unemployment, which can only grow worse by our failure to act.

This administration has acted on it, Mr. President, and we are trying to do something about the problem of unemployment. While unemployment is in the vicinity of 5.9 percent of the population, I point out that in our country today approximately 3.3 million people are moonlighting—in other words, they are holding down two jobs—and that situation contributes to the unemployment problem as well.

The Senator said:

> The times cry for action. By seemingly listless behavior here, crisis is being permitted to pile upon crisis. Last year, it was an economic crisis. Last month, a civil rights crisis. Last week, a railroad crisis. Today, a test ban treaty is before us.

So far as Senate committees are concerned, they are living up to their full responsibilities. They are trying, to the best of their ability, to solve the problems before them. Personally I am very proud of their activities and the way they have tackled the problems which confront them.

The Senator said further:

> The President can be aroused to demand of the majority party, which controls the committees and the Congress and of which he is the leader, definitive and completed action with a drumfire of leadership at least equal to the number, fervor and intensity of his messages.

I hope the Senator does not mean that every time a message is sent to the Congress, the President should go on the radio and TV to ask the people to get behind his program, and urge the Senate to do likewise. He does the best he can within the limits of his authority. Despite reports to the contrary, the President of the United States does not have the authority or the power which some people, members of the press, and other media of communication, seem to indicate that he has. He is doing the very best he can to promote programs which will be of benefit to the people as a whole.

Then the Senator talked about reform in the Senate. I believe he knows that attempts have been made to bring about reforms having to do with a dilution of the two-thirds rule down to a three-fifths proposal. He knows that bills have been introduced by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and other Senators to apply the rule of germaneness. He knows that discharge petitions are of little value in this body because of the difficulty in obtaining the required number of signatures. There are other matters. However, I agree with the Senator that there should be a prohibition against one Senator being able, by denying unanimous consent, to hold up meetings of committees while the Senate is in session.

The Senator also referred to the deliberative process as in effect, or at least by implication, an exercise in continuous futility. I do not believe that the deliberative process can be so described. There can be some reforms. But I believe that in due time the Senate, in its wisdom, and deliberately, will see that the necessary reforms are put into operation.

Insofar as the leadership of this body is concerned, I can only say that, by and large, I disagree with much of what the Senator has said. It appears to me to be a political message. I certainly would not agree that the present session could be characterized as a standstill legislative session when, despite the good work of the committees throughout the year, the calendar shows that there is only one bill that can be taken up, and that bill is or will shortly be the pending business.

We do not intend to shun our responsibility.

I agree with the Senator in this statement:

> But in the final analysis, the responsibility is on all of us to get this body and this Nation off dead center, or time—and history—will be passing us by.

I hope that by "all of us," the Senator means Republicans as well as Democrats, and that in the committees the Republicans will do their share to see that proposed legislation is reported. I know that personally the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] will, as always, do his share. I wish his party would do as much.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I was deeply concerned about making the speech to which the Senator has referred. I have the greatest respect for the majority leader and for my other colleagues who have leadership positions, and for the Senate itself. I would not say what I have said lightly. But I am quite an independent person; and inasmuch as I had noted this impact around the country, I felt that this was a useful statement to spread upon the record. I am grateful to the Senator for having taken it as seriously as he has and responding to it almost point by point. I hope other Senators will do likewise. I hope other Senators, however they may feel, will address themselves to the issues. There is something about taking an inventory which is in itself a salubrious exercise.

Though I do not now desire to debate with the Senator individual details of what he said or did not say, or the reasons for our past failures to amend rule XXII, the fact is that my statement showed how I deeply feel the country sees the issues. I welcome the Senator's taking inventory. I hope other Senators will do likewise. I assure the Senator that, so far as I am concerned, I will not rest content with merely stirring myself in every respect that I have mentioned, but I shall also do my utmost within my own party to bring support for the ideas and ideals which so many of us share in common.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I assure the Senator that I appreciate his words. I know that he means what he has said. I am delighted that we had this little get together. I had anticipated that it would come later in the afternoon, and not during the morning hour. I again express my thanks to the Senate for allowing both the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and myself to have the debate in which we have engaged.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My view of this subject is probably a little anomalous. There is a great deal of truth in what Edward F. Gibbon wrote in his monumental treatise, "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire." Gibbon had a great, scholarly mind. He was a natural historian. He wrote that progress is often made not by what goes on the statute books, but what comes off, or what does not go on the statute books. Sometimes we lament the fact that great quantities of proposed legislation should result in some reaction. I doubt whether I share that view. John Garner once said to President Roosevelt:

> Give the cattle a chance to get a little more fat on them before you start cutting off any more.

I think if we give the country a breather and keep some of the proposed legislation from appearing on the statute books, it will be good for our economy and the tranquillity of our people.

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF ROBERT A. TAFT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would not like to have this day go by without at least alluding to the fact that a great American departed this life 10 years ago today. In my office is a portrait—an exquisite work of art. It came from Martha Taft long after she was stricken. She could not talk, but the nurse telephoned me to say that it was her desire and the desire of the Senator that the portrait should hang in my office. Today it is there.

That is the last portrait that was painted of Robert Alphonso Taft. So we think a little about his past. I think of the fortuities of history which in a sense must account for Bob Taft. Certainly they had to account for Abraham Lincoln. There is no other way to explain him than as a divine fortuitant. In due course, when problems were mounting to the skies, and one of the great challenges of the country was monopoly, along came Teddy Roosevelt. Prior to him came a great democratic President, one of the very greatest—Grover Cleveland—and, insofar as I recall, he was the only man who served twice, nonconsecutively, as President. He was a great, courageous President in his own right. But Teddy Roosevelt came to do battle with monopoly.

Then we saw the rise of organized labor, and the power of organized labor. In that period came Bob Taft to do battle.

Some day some giant will come to do battle with giant Government, because it is becoming so big that it is fairly unmanageable.

I allude to Bob Taft this day because he symbolized moderation, restraint, devotion to the Constitution of the United States, and an amazing balance in evaluating the challenges which confronted the country.

So on this, the 10th anniversary of his transition, I merely recollect the fact, and once more pay testimony to a great American who came at the right time, when the challenge appeared.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the executive calendar will be stated.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Eugene P. Foley, of Minnesota, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am very proud of this man and pleased with his appointment.

Gene Foley has devoted years of service in behalf of the Nation's small businessmen. He has worked on the Hill on the staff of the Select Committee on Small Business and recently has served as Deputy to the Secretary of Commerce. He has done splendid work in a variety of areas. He comes prepared to continue the excellent record compiled by John Horne.

My concern for the small businessmen of this country is well known. I have been a small businessman myself and I speak from years of hard knocks and hard experience. Gene Foley understands the problems that face small business today. He has the courage, intelligence, and determination to meet these problems. I am confident that Gene Foley will provide inspiring and effective leadership of this important Federal agency. I am extremely gratified by his selection as Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a biographical résumé and outline of his professional background.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL RÉSUMÉ OF EUGENE P. FOLEY

OUTLINE OF PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND

(1) July 1962 to present—Deputy to the Secretary of Commerce: (a) Review selected policy matters for the Secretary, with appropriate recommendations, (b) clear all Commerce Department memos and correspondence to the White House; (c) assist Secretary with internal management problems.

(2) March 1961–July 1962—Deputy Assistant Secretary, Domestic Affairs: (a) Staff assistant to Assistant Secretary, Domestic Affairs, who had line jurisdiction over: Business and Defense Services Administration, Office of Business Economics, and Census Bureau; (b) cleared all Department opinions on domestic legislation.

(3) November 1961–July 1962, served also as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Domestic Affairs during this period—Administrator, Business and Defense Services Administration: (a) Supervised programs and personnel of 21 industry divisions, representing every manufacturing activity in the United States; approximately 600 personnel; (b) represented Commerce Department on following interdepartmental committees: Oil Imports Appeals Board; Executive Stockpile Committee Task Group on Barter; Executive Stockpiling Committee; Petroleum Study Committee; and White House Committee on Small Business.

(4) January 1959-March 1961—legal counsel, U.S. Senate Small Business Committee: (a) Studied financial and antitrust problems of small business; (b) investigated operations of Small Business Administration in five Midwest States; (c) conducted the following committee hearings:

Shopping Centers—1959, April 28, 29, 1959, relating to the difficulties independent retailers have in obtaining locations in shopping centers. Drafted subsequent Senate Report No. 1016, "Impact of Suburban Shopping Centers on Independent Retailers," January 5, 1960.

Dual Distribution in the Automotive Tire Industry—1959, June 17, 18, 19, 1959; relating to the problems independent tire dealers have when the tire manufacturing companies compete with them at retail.

Mergers and Unfair Competition in Food Marketing, July 2, 1959; relating to the inadequate investigation being made by the Federal Trade Commission in their industry-wide study of food marketing.

Mergers and Unfair Competition in Food Marketing, June 22, 1960; relating to the same subject as No. 3.

Small Business Administration, 1960, July 1, 1960; relating to the secret cutback by the Small Business Administration of their loan programs.

(5) July 1955–January 1959—Practice of law, Foley and Foley, Rochester and Wabasha, Minn.: (a) This is a 50-year family law firm; (b) specialized in trial law and legal problems of small corporations.

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

1952–55: University of Minnesota Law School, Minneapolis, Minn., L.L.B.

1952 (6 months): Institute of European Studies, Vienna, Austria, certificate.

1948–52: St. Thomas College, St. Paul, Minn., B.A., philosophy and political science.

1942–46: St. Felix High School, Wabasha, Minn., high school diploma.

MISCELLANEOUS PERSONAL DATA

Born November 22, 1928, Wabasha, Minn.

Family background: Father, lawyer; three brothers, lawyers; one brother, Air Force colonel (retired); four sisters, housewives; wife, college graduate (St. Catherine's College, St. Paul, Minn., B.A., art), professional sculptress; three children, Anne, 8, Robert, 6, Margaret Mary, 2.

Military, 1946-48: Corporal, U.S. Army Infantry, 24 months (18 months in Korea and Japan).

Foreign travel: (a) 1962, 2 weeks, Paris, OECD meeting, Industry Committee; Geneva, U.N. Lead and Zinc Committee; (b) 1952, 6 months, Vienna, Austria, student; (c) 1946-48, 18 months, Korea and Japan, military duty.

Politics: (a) 1958, Democratic candidate for Congress, First Congressional District of Minnesota; (b) 1960, executive assistant to Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY in Wisconsin and West Virginia presidential primaries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John E. Horne, of Alabama, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the term expiring June 30, 1967.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief statement regarding Mr. Horne. He came to Washington as my administrative assistant in the early part of 1947. He was recognized as one of the most dedicated public servants who ever served on Capitol Hill.

In 1952 and 1953 he served as Administrator of the Small Defense Plants Corporation. When President Kennedy took office in 1961, the President asked him to go to the Small Business Administration.

He has rendered remarkably good service as Administrator of the Small Business Administration. I regret to see him leave that post, but the President of the United States asked that he assume another important position in the Government, the one with respect to which his nomination is pending confirmation.

I know that John Horne will remain the dedicated public servant he has always been and will give to the great savings and loan movement throughout this country, to housing, and to programs under the Federal Home Loan Bank Board the same loyalty and the same tireless effort he has given to the Small Business Administration.

The accomplishments of the Small Business Administration during the time Mr. Horne has been the Administrator will remain as a great compliment to him and to the work he has done.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I join the distinguished Senator from Alabama in paying my respects to John Horne as a fine public servant, for the remarkable service he has rendered as the Administrator of the Small Business Administration. He extended to those of us in the Congress complete cooperation. His record of aid to independent business will stand as one of his finest accomplishments.

Mr. Horne will now move to an important position on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the duties of which are related directly to much of his experience in housing and to his close association with the Senator from Alabama, who has been a leader in the Congress in connection with the housing program. I wish him well. I join in support of the nomination and in commending Mr. Horne.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks by the Senator from Minnesota.

I feel confident that Mr. Foley, whose nomination has been confirmed, and who will succeed John Horne as Administrator of the Small Business Administration, will render an equally dedicated service. I point with pride to something already mentioned by the Senator from Minnesota, that Mr. Foley served as a member of the staff of the Small Business Committee of the Senate. He has had good training and good contacts in this field. He was a very able member of our staff. As the Senator from Minnesota knows, he was counsel of the staff. I know of no one who could better fill the position, following John Horne, than Gene Foley. I wish him well.

Both these appointments are to fill positions with which I have had considerable contact. My subcommittee on Housing has jurisdiction over legislation which has to do with the savings and loan associations and Federal Home Loan Bank Board matters, with which Mr. Horne will be associated. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee handles legislation relating to small business programs. Also, the Senate Select Committee on Small Business is in constant touch with the Small Business Administration in the handling of its program.

I look forward with a great deal of pleasure to the privilege of serving with Gene Foley as Administrator of the Small Business Administration and with John Horne as a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James I. Loeb, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Guinea.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., U.S. Navy, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Claude G. Ross, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Central African Republic.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Howard Rex Cottam, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Kuwait.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Vietnam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Donald A. Dumont, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Burundi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. Michael Blumenthal, of New Jersey, to be a Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, with the rank of Ambassador.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dr. Walter Adams, of Michigan, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for a term of 3 years expiring May 11, 1966, and until a successor is appointed and has qualified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dr. Mabel M. Smythe, of New York, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for a term of 3 years expiring May 11, 1966, and until a successor is appointed and has qualified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations placed on the Secretary's desk, in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

TRIBUTE TO HENRY CABOT LODGE, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, today the Senate has confirmed the nomination of a most remarkable group of nominees for important assignments in the service of the Federal Government. I select only one, on which to speak a word.

I am extremely grateful that the distinguished former Ambassador to the United Nations and former U.S. Senator from Massachusetts, Henry Cabot Lodge, has accepted the assignment to be our

Ambassador to Vietnam. It is indeed a difficult assignment, one which calls for great skill in the diplomatic field, and requires personal sacrifice. I said all of this at the hearing when Ambassador Lodge appeared before the committee, and I wish to repeat it for the record. He has the esteem and respect of Members of the Senate for his great service to our country.

There are others on the list about whom we could make similar complimentary remarks. The Senate has confirmed the nominations of an unusual group today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the Senate confirmed the nomination of my friend and former colleague from Massachusetts, and the former Ambassador to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, to be the United States Ambassador to Vietnam. He will devote his great talents there to the securing of peace and the solving of the complex problems that involve us in the Far East.

Ambassador Lodge is an able French scholar and thus will be able to converse fluently with the people of South Vietnam. Having served for 8 years as the representative of the United States to the United Nations, he understands the problems of diplomacy and how to work with the leaders of the countries of the world.

As our Ambassador to South Vietnam, he will be a real asset to our country. He will put his outstanding ability to work in that country as a public service for the benefit of the people of the United States and, I am sure, the people of the world. I congratulate him upon his willingness to assume this arduous work.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, today the Senate confirmed the nomination of a number of extremely able appointees to various departments within the Government. I should like at this time to confine my remarks to two of those individuals.

One of them is Adm. George W. Anderson, who becomes our Ambassador to Portugal. He has had a distinguished naval career, and has comported himself with dignity and honor to the service, which he so ably represents, and to the country, which he has honored by his service in the Navy through the years.

The United States is extremely fortunate to have a man of the character and integrity of Adm. George W. Anderson become our Ambassador to Portugal, a country which confronts difficult problems at present. It is also significant that this man of the Navy is being designated Ambassador Extraordinary to a country from which at the present time, and for some years past, we have leased naval facilities in the mid-Atlantic.

I know he will represent our Nation well. The appointment is outstanding. I wish him the best of luck in the years ahead.

The other nominee whose appointment was confirmed today, and about whom I should like to say a few words, is Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, a former colleague of ours in this body, a former Ambassador to the United Nations under the previous administration, a combat soldier during the late war, and a man of great ability and devotion to his country.

His assignment is an extraordinary one, because he goes to the Republic of South Vietnam; and he will not lack for difficulties or problems or questions in that new assignment. It is an area which is of great and significant importance to the United States, as well as to southeast Asia and the Asian Continent.

Ambassador Lodge is a man of strong character. He has had much political and diplomatic experience. He has an extremely difficult task confronting him in Saigon.

I take this means to wish him well and to express the hope that he will perform as capably there as he did as a Member of this body, as an officer in the Army of the United States, and as Ambassador to the United Nations. He is a good man, and a strong man; and I know he will represent our country with credit in this most difficult assignment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the consideration of the bill (S. 1703) the staff of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be allowed to be present in the Senate chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE NUCLEAR TEST-BAN TREATY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the nuclear test-ban treaty will be before the Senate soon.

Before I give my approval to so important a treaty, I will want full information on the impact, if any, that compliance with the provisions of the proposed treaty will have on our national security.

I will want the analysis and advice not only of the experts in the State Department and the Disarmament Agency, but also of each of the Chiefs of Staff and of appropriate scientists of our Defense Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and such non-Government persons who by past training, are capable of dealing with the subject matter.

In September of 1961 Red Russia, in violation of its agreement with the United States, did testing in the air with bombs having a capacity of 60 megatons. It is claimed by some that out of those tests Red Russia obtained information that has assisted it in developing an antimissile missile, and methods of rendering ineffective the electronic equipment used in radar and in our weapons guidance systems.

This aspect of the problem is grave and, therefore, must be explored.

Our Government has kept honorably its promises and commitments. Red Russia is noted for its indifference and calloused attitude toward the duty of fulfilling agreements. If this treaty is finally signed and approved, our country contemplates keeping it. If we are to judge the conduct of Red Russia for the future on the basis of its conduct in the past, we would have to declare now that when advantages derived by Red Russia demand it, the treaty will be broken.

If after getting this full information and analysis, I conclude that the security of our country will not be impaired by the approval of the treaty, I will vote for it. If my judgment in the end is to the contrary, I will unhesitatingly vote against it.

In speaking of nongovernmental witnesses, there are many who can be called. I mention the following:

Prof. Henry Kissinger, Centre for International Studies, Harvard University, noted author.

Prof. Edward Teller, who needs no further identification.

Prof. Stefan T. Passony, director, International Studies Program, Hoover Institution on War, Peace, and Revolution, Stanford University; author; formerly professor at Georgetown University; and special consultant to the Air Force.

Robert Murphy, former Under Secretary of State.

Brig. Gen. Frank Howley, retired; vice chancellor of New York University; former commandant of the American Zone in Berlin.

Earl Voss, reporter for the Washington Star; author of the new book "The Nuclear Trap."

Col. William R. Kintner, retired, Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania; well-known author.

Adm. Arleigh Burke, retired.

Gen. Lauris Norstad, retired.

Adm. Arthur Radford, retired.

There are others who could also be called.

The security of our country is involved. This treaty should not be hurried through the Senate solely for the purpose of having it ratified. Full and complete hearings should be held, so that Senators may be able to act intelligently upon the issue, and also so the American public may be fully informed concerning the significance of the treaty and the facts which support or oppose its adoption.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment to say to the Senator from Ohio that I believe the outline of the witnesses he has just presented to us is essential for our hearings. Since the Senator from Ohio is a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and it is my privilege also to serve there, I shall do all I can to see that we have the broadest possible testimony and the most searching testimony possible with reference to the treaty, because it is my view that consideration of this matter will involve one of the most important debates and discussions in the Senate for many a year.

I assure the Senator of my wholehearted cooperation. I do not believe we should attempt to have a onesided presentation. We want to hear from those in Government and outside Government, those who have been associated with Government in the past, and people from every walk of life. The Senator can be assured of that cooperation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I appreciate very much the concurrence in judgment that has just been expressed by the Senator from Minnesota. I am quite certain that within the solitude of our citizens' homes throughout the country there is deep meditation dealing with what our ultimate security will be. It seems to me that on an issue so vital it is essential not only that Senators be fully apprised of the facts, but also that the public should know what is being done, not only with respect to the desired banning of nuclear tests but also the assurance that what we are doing will make certain for our descendants a stable, secure, and living United States.

POLICE CHIEFS SUPPORT YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would like to call to my colleagues' attention the growing support across the Nation among chiefs of police for the youth employment bill which has passed the Senate and is now awaiting action in the House.

During the past month I have received letters of support from police chiefs from Alaska to Maine; from Minnesota to Texas; and from California to South Carolina.

I have in my office a folder of letters from all over the United States and a great number of newspaper clippings dealing with people, representing their communities in important public positions, who support the act.

The response from law-enforcement officers throughout the Nation has been gratifying because these are the men who understand the problems now facing our youth and the tremendous cost delinquency and youth unemployment exacts from their communities.

In addition to the support of hundreds of police chiefs, I am happy to note that the International Association of Chiefs of Police—IACP—has indicated its interest in the youth employment program and its wholehearted support for the underlying aim to give idle hands something constructive to do.

Mr. Quinn Tamm, executive director of IACP, said the police, more so than most groups, are well aware of the mischief—up to and including serious crimes—that idle hands and minds can get into.

Every constructive blow that can be struck at the problem of reorienting aimless and poorly prepared youths toward a productive future deserves the support of all. Mr. Tamm said he is gratified that so many of his police colleagues throughout the country have gotten behind this very promising program.

Following are a few of the numerous excerpts from letters received at my office:

Chief Daniel Joseph of New Kensington, Pa., said:

> It has always been my firm belief that a youth bill of this type is a sound investment.

From Albany, Calif., Chief Ralph Jensen wrote:

> Be assured that I wholeheartedly support your proposed bill. I can well remember how the old CCC (Civilian Conservation Corps) helped the young men who came to "California, the State of Golden Opportunity," from the dust bowls to only find there was no employment.

Chief Lewis Hollaway of Fairbury, Nebr., wrote:

> I have worked 28 years in law enforcement here. * * * I am sure that giving these young people honest work with good supervision is one of the best cures for delinquency that can be had. We are hoping this bill passes because I am sure it will not cost any more than the cost of crime.

From Ann Arbor, Mich., Chief R. J. Gainsley wrote:

> It is my belief, through our national programs as well as State and local programs, much more can be done to keep our youth in school and employed, whereby if they are kept busy we can certainly cut down on our crime rate.

Chief Oliver Felt, of Starbuck, Minn., notes that:

> We have a lot of youngsters growing up in this town besides all other towns around. They come into town looking for something to do and can't find a thing to keep busy. So they try to find some mischief to do. If they can't find anything to do here they go to other towns. I'm behind you 100 percent on this bill and I hope it passes the House.

Chief Charles W. Freeman, of Seymour, Ind., noted:

> We believe the juvenile delinquent is everyone's concern, not just the President's and the U.S. Senators' and judges and law enforcement officers. I feel that the President will get full support from all on this bill.

From Rome, N.Y., Chief James C. Dunn wrote:

> I sincerely believe that this is a very beneficial piece of legislation that merits full congressional concern. I am a police officer of 35 years experience and have during my tenure, been in a position to fully evaluate the dangers of that group of young men between the ages of 16 to 21, who are without employment, and benefit of any trade or skills. They are decidedly a problem group that must be recognized as such, and assisted.

Chief Dunn went on to note the old Civilian Conservation Corps in the thirties had provided lifelong benefits to the beauty of the area in which he lives. Chief Dunn observed:

> A drive through that area today, will evidence the value of that program. Large stands of reforestation provide marvelous soil bank protection for the area. Still in evidence and in use, are numerous firefighting ponds built by the corps. Roads constructed by the corps, and small bridges in that area are still in use. Such a program today would serve a valuable twofold purpose: in the training of these youths, and the material benefit that would be realized in a given area through the program.

Chief John P. Howard of Wauwatosa, Wis., sums up the vital necessity of passage of the youth employment bill in the House this year when he wrote:

> It should be evident to anyone who studies current events that a vast pool of idle, untrained, undereducated and dissatisfied youth in any country provides a fertile field for not only crime and delinquency, but also for demagogs and extremists who use riots, violence and terrorism as tools of their trade. Street mobs from Saigon to Caracas, are made of such material.

Chief Howard concluded:

> The question of cost should not be a deciding factor in the considering of this program. We are going to have to pay for this group of idle young people in some way as long as they are around. Is it not better to spend the money on training and constructive work than on expanded prisons, juvenile detention centers and direct relief?

Mr. President, I would like to stress the fact that the youth employment bill is gaining support from all parts of the country and from Democrats and Republicans alike who are concerned about the future of our youth.

Recent opinion polls conducted by Congressmen and Senators of both parties point out the fact that a majority of Americans favor this type of action in helping our youth. For example, a poll recently conducted by Representative WILLARD S. CURTIN of Pennsylvania, who represents an area that usually expresses deep reservations about Federal programs, disclosed that 67 percent of the respondents favored the youth employment bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a partial list of police chiefs who have given their support to the passage of the youth employment bill.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICE CHIEFS

Martin Almester, Rossford, Ohio.
James Anderson, Frazee, Minn.
Edward Aucone, Beverly, Mass.
Clyde Barden, Carmen, Okla.
Chelcia Barga, New Port Richey, Fla.
Jack Barlow, Boulder City, Nev.
Ed Beck, Shelley, Idaho.
Selmer Bentley, Twin Valley, Minn.
Delmar L. Berger, Centralia, Ill.
Sardner T. Bink, Columbia, Pa.
Paul Bollig, Maple Lake, Minn.
Norman Bowers, Fall River, Mass.
John J. Bornhorn, Covington, Ky.
James H. Brid, Clifton, Tex.
Frank H. Brewster, Rantoul.
John Bussanih, Hampton Bays, N.Y.
Arthur Cadorette, Warrenburg, Mo.
Roy Cannedy, Greenfield, Ill.
Frederick H. Carwile, Crisfield, Md.
Anthony J. Casamassima, Seneca Falls, N.Y.
Woodrow Casey, Chisholm, Minn.
Anthony Casuccio, Ellwood City, Pa.
W. L. Casey, Chisholm, Minn.
Andrew J. Celmer, Amsterdam, N.Y.
Noal Choate, Wagoner, Okla.
Albert E. Clauser, Port Alleghany, Pa.
Glen Clay, Ashville, Ohio.
Marvin A. Clemens, Hemet, Calif.
John T. Costello, Auburn, N.Y.
F. Cubbernuss, Colon, Mich.
C. C. Cunningham, St. Marys, W. Va.
H. L. Dailey, St. Paul, Va.

Joseph P. Darcy, Fitchburg, Mass.
Lloyd E. Detienne, Jr., Zion, Ill.
Arthur C. Diehl, Jr., Bath, Pa.
C. E. Ditmer, Velva, N. Dak.
Edward Donahue, Patton, Pa.
Harold R. Dowd, Maplewood, N.J.
Stanley A. DuCharme, Schenectady, N.Y.
James C. Dunn, Rome, N.Y.
Joe Eason, Whitefish, Mont.
Peter Elar, Freeport, N.Y.
Harry S. Farrar, Luray, Va.
Oliver C. Felt, Starbuck, Minn.
William F. Fitzpatrick, Milford, Mass.
John C. Flanigan, Anchorage, Alaska.
John F. Foley, Gary, Ind.
Leonard G. Foos, Manitou Springs, Colo.
T. E. Foust, Missoula, Mont.
Reuben Freeland, Frederick, Okla.
Charles W. Freeman, Seymour, Ind.
Henry M. Bunk, Independence, Iowa.
R. J. Gainsley, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Boyd Garner, Linden, Tenn.
William H. Garner, North Adams, Mass.
Colin A. W. Gillis, Revere, Mass.
Jim Graham, Sand Springs, Okla.
Clyde Gray, Genesee, Idaho.
James H. Griffin, Edenton, N.C.
Patrick F. Grimaldi, North Tonawanda, N.Y.
Joseph H. Guilfoile, Waterbury, Conn.
Walter Hanson, Belgrade, Minn.
Frank E. Harbach, Franklin, Ohio.
Arthur Harris, Milford, Conn.
William T. Hartley, Jr., Marshall, Mo.
George Hausmann, Pitman, N.J.
Emerson George, Hebron, Ohio.
William Henninge, Greene, N.Y.
Earl Hensley, Oxford, Ind.
Kay Hensley, Liberty, Ind.
Oscar H. Hill, Thornton, Colo.
Ernest Hina, Sturgis, Ky.
Albert L. Hinckley, Hyannis, Mass.
Emil Hlavka, Gregory, S. Dak.
L. Hollaway, Fairbury, Nebr.
Marvin O. Horcher, Wheeling, Ill.
John P. Howard, Wauwatosa, Wis.
O. B. Howard, Port Lavaca, Tex.
Anthony W. Howes, Annapolis, Md.
John E. Hutchison, Rimersburg, Pa.
Harry P. Jenkins, Elk Grove Village, Ill.
Ralph M. Jensen, Albany, Calif.
A. E. Jewell, Oxnard, Calif.
Gene Johnson, Oxford, N.Y.
Daniel W. Joseph, New Kensington, Pa.
Lyman J. Kane, Bar Harbor, Maine.
Justin D. Kaney, Nyack, N.Y.
Vernal Keller, Boise, Idaho.
Albert L. Kendrick, Azusa, Calif.
Roy D. Kerr, Farmington, N. Mex.
Emil Keszler, Lodi, Calif.
Robert L. Ketcham, South St. Paul, Minn.
Ernest King, Hamlet, N.C.
Brice G. Kinnamon, Cambridge, Md.
James R. Klinkhamer, Carpentersville, Ill.
Louis M. Kulpa, Wheeling, W. Va.
Clare W. Kyler, Mansfield, Ohio.
Ralph J. LaRock, Iron River, Mich.
Nels J. Lauritzen, Woodbridge, N.J.
W. F. Law, Tavares, Fla.
John E. Lawver, Coshocton, Ohio.
Leo P. LeBeau, Ogdensburg, N.Y.
Joel P. LeBel, Brunswick, Maine.
John Levitt, Fruita, Colo.
John Lloyd, Foley, Minn.
William A. Long, St. Albans, W. Va.
Mel Lubbers, Circle Pines, Minn.
William McCarley, Washougal, Wash.
Howard G. McPeek, Irvington, N.J.
Elmer Madden, Newburgh, Ind.
Henry J. Maguder, Meriden, Conn.
Noah Marchal, Mount Carmel, Ill.
Charles R. Marshall, Batavia, Ill.
J. W. Massey, Munday, Tex.
Enoch Matthews, McDonald, Pa.
Andrew Mattingly, Hodgenville, Ky.
Allen Miglio, Harper Woods, Mich.
Raymond Miller, Marshall, Ill.
Kenneth A. Minahan, Fox Lake, Ill.
R. A. Miles, Austin, Tex.
Pat Morrell, Swayzee, Ind.
R. A. Morriss, Sabina, Ohio.
Clement J. Mueller, Hartford, Wis.
James F. Mulcahy, Newport, Vt.
P. K. Nail, Conway Springs, Kans.
H. L. Nickle, Newport, Pa.
Jacob J. Novak, North Chicago, Ill.
M. Orlins, Norwalk, Conn.
Bob Oslund, Osceola, Wis.
James Osnato, Scotch Plains, N.J.
Nicholas Pavelko, Jr., Youngstown, Ohio.
W. F. Peach, Newport News, Va.
Paul V. Peiffer, Lebanon, Pa.
Herbert Phillips, Miami, Ariz.
William C. Poole, Lakewood, N.J.
Elmer V. Poss, Sibley, Iowa.
Dan Provenzano, Northlake, Ill.
H. Richardson, Orange, Calif.
Robert E. Richardson, Madison Heights, Mich.
Frank Riddle, Terre Haute, Ind.
I. A. Robinson, Downey, Calif.
Philip M. Rose, Willimantic, Conn.
Ambrose A. Ryan, Hoboken, N.J.
W. E. Schiefenstine, Camden, N.Y.
Clarence Schroeder, Millington, Mich.
Eral Shepard, West Union, Ohio.
M. J. Sheredy, Barnesboro, Pa.
Konstantin Shirkoff, Conneautville, Pa.
Jack D. Skelton, Clemson, S.C.
C. Sloan, Waldport, Oreg.
L. M. Smeltz, Attica, Ohio.
Joseph E. Stavor, Duquesne, Pa.
C. M. Stevens, Hurlock, Md.
Wallace Stouffer, Iron River, Wis.
Arthur Strauch, Gibbon, Minn.
E. A. Susterka, Ypsilanti, Mich.
Charles I. Tarbutton, Centreville, Md.
Estill Tharp, Beattyville, Ky.
Ray M. Thorpe, Detroit Lakes, Minn.
Dominic L. Valesano, Wakefield, Mich.
Francis R. Veltri, Beeville, Tex.
Emiddio Vinciguerra, Berwick, Pa.
Philip Wagenti, Lodi, N.J.
Mearl B. Waldsmith, Mazomanie, Wis.
J. Merritt Wenzel, Wakefield, Mass.
Bernard A. Westemeier, Dyersville, Iowa.
H. G. Whitmire, La Marque, Tex.
Eldon E. Whitworth, Poplar Bluff, Mo.
Bill Wilkinson, Abernathy, Tex.
Richard Wilson, O'Fallon, Mo.
Donald Woodruff, Bellefontaine, Ohio.
Jerry Wright, Colby, Kans.
Al Zeeb, Wilton, N. Dak.
Frank Zentkowski, Moose Lake, Minn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. From time to time I shall place other names in the RECORD, because I believe eventually we shall have the names of more than 5,000 chiefs of police throughout the Nation who will actively support the legislation to which I referred.

PROBLEMS OF DEMOCRACY—A WASHINGTON PERSPECTIVE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on "Problems of our Democracy: A Washington Perspective" by my good friend and associate, Dr. Max M. Kampelman, at a convocation at the Claremont Colleges, Claremont, Calif. Dr. Kampelman is known to many of us as my former legislative counsel in the Senate, now actively practicing law here in the District of Columbia. His constructive community role as chairman of the executive committee of the District of Columbia National Bank was recently commented on favorably on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. This summer Dr. Kampelman temporarily returned to his early profession of college teaching, accepting an appointment as the distinguished visiting professor of political science at Claremont College. I commend his address to this body as a vital commentary on the values of the practical politician to our democracy, a message that requires repetition and understanding in our society.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEMS OF OUR DEMOCRACY: A WASHINGTON PERSPECTIVE

(Convocation address to the Claremont Colleges by Max M. Kampelman, July 2, 1963)

This is the first convocation of the Claremont summer session for 1963 and I am both immensely pleased and highly honored to have been invited to address it. This is our first visit to your lovely community and we look forward to a most stimulating and pleasant summer with you. It may seem strange to you that we would have been invited to make a more than 2,000-mile trip across the country to be with you this sumber, and yet it is appropriate for an educational forum on a political science subject to have a point of view from our Nation's Capital. Not that Washington can claim any monopoly on clarity. In fact, some of us in Washington frequently feel like Senator Green, of Rhode Island, who was still Washington's social butterfly in his late eighties. At one cocktail party he was found fumbling through a handful of invitations. A guest inquired: "Are you trying to figure out where you're going next, Senator?" "No," he replied, "I'm trying to figure out where I'm at now."

In any event, this business of faculties inviting their colleagues in for special lectures from time to time is an old device. An older colleague once said it was so they can be reminded again of the superiority of their own methods.

In typing a theme for a class report on a visit to the Nation's Capital, a young student began with the following typographical error: "Washington, D.C. is hounded on all sides by the United States of America." In point of fact, however, Washington, D.C., is not only hounded and bounded by the United States of America, but also by the world—a world which cannot decide whether to eat its heart out or shoot its brains out.

It is now 15 years since I left the campus, taking what was to be a short leave from Bennington College in Vermont to spend a brief but intensive period examining the actual workings of our National Government. I had been intimately involved with city and State government while studying and teaching at the University of Minnesota. I had written a doctoral dissertation on a vital national problem of democracy; taught and thought a good deal about the operations of our National Government, and was prepared to substantiate my acquired prejudices with actual social scientific observations. In a large measure, I was somewhat like the fellow who said: "I know it's true because I've said it before."

My purpose is not to convey the impression that I was all wrong then or that I am all right now. The change was furthermore not that drastic. It is rather to emphasize the word "perspective" in the title selected for my subject this morning. In fact, what you will be hearing is not only a "Washington perspective," but also a "Kampelman perspective." The importance of recognizing this can best be illustrated, though exaggerated, when you consider placing two painters side by side before the same landscape, and return an hour or so later to see what each has on his canvas. You may find two pictures so different that it will seem impossible that they were drawn from the same model.

A lesson to be derived from this illustration is in the question: "Would you say that either one of the artists has betrayed the truth?"

This is not to say that there is no truth—either in art or in politics. It is rather to say that there is truth in more than one perspective—though not in all perspectives or points of view.

This is a particularly vital comment for an understanding of democracy, which is the main thrust of the subject under review this morning. One of the most noteworthy essays on the meaning of truth in a democracy was written by that famous jurist and American philosopher, Oliver Wendell Holmes, in his opinion of 1919 in the case of *Abrams* v. *U.S.*, when he wrote:

"But when men have realized that time has upset many fighting faiths, they may come to believe even more than they believe the very foundation of their own conduct, that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas—that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market."

We are prepared to demonstrate the truth of our democratic creed in the competition of the marketplace and in the appeal to the hearts and minds of men. Our prior concern, however, is that there may not be the time in which to use the tools and strength of freedom to persevere in the struggle against totalitarianism because humanity itself faces a threat to its survival. It is important that we hold aloft the democratic banner which says that all men are created equal, but we cannot avoid realizing that we are also in danger of being cremated equal. Yet, they are interrelated.

While in India a year ago, I clipped a story from a New Delhi newspaper quoting a Hindu leader as follows: "We can fly in the air like birds; we can swim under the sea like fish; but how to live on earth like men, we know not."

Civilization—that race between enlightenment and catastrophe—is besieged on all sides. We here in the United States have no way of avoiding the consequences of that race, nor can we avoid the responsibilities of participating in it. Young as we are as a nation, ours is the oldest example of a democratic society dedicated to the principles of liberty and equality and committed to adjust those principles to one another and to the realities and complexities of modern life. We know now that whether we have a message that is relevant to the world may determine how well we survive the power struggle in which we are involved. We also know now that our superiority or survival is no longer assured. For a long time we acted as if our democracy were something that perpetuated itself automatically—as if our ancestors had succeeded in setting up a machine that had solved the problem of perpetual motion in politics. The phenomenon of two world wars, the rise of fascism and nazism, the emergence of new nations in Africa and Asia with their own tentative solutions to meet their deep needs, the growing factor of color in the world and in our own country—all of these have placed stresses upon our theories and on our system which have shattered our complacency and self-assuredness. No longer have we a right to say that the growing rationality of man assures the inevitability of democratic victory—or the more we have learned about man, the more we have learned the importance of the irrational in him; and the more we have seen of history, the more can we doubt the inevitability of any development. The task of preserving democracy requires our inventive effort and our creative ability. It also requires a sophisticated understanding that it is not a Utopia we seek, not a pathway to the stars, but only the articles of war if you will, the rules of the game, by which the human race can fight an endless battle with itself as it seeks to climb the evolutionary ladder.

Some definitions are now in order. When we describe democracy as relating to rules of the game we refer to the means by which men and societies govern themselves rather than to the substance of the decisions themselves. Whether steel production or medical care or the water system should be socialized or kept in private hands are important and vital questions to any society and its people, but neither solution is a democratic one per se. Thus, it is nonsense to claim that "economic democracy," whatever that means, requires socialization of the economy or that state ownership is "undemocratic" and only private enterprise compatible with democracy. England is no less democratic than we because of its socialized medicine and we no less than England because of our preference for maximizing private enterprise. The key democratic ingredient is that the decisions are made through the governmental machinery of majority consensus and may be changed in the same way.

This semantic confusion about the meaning of the word "democracy" is far too prevalent. It is a recent development. Until the First World War, its meaning for nearly 2,500 years from the fifth century B.C. when the word first began to appear in the works of the Greek writers on politics was a relatively constant one, meaning either "rule by the people" or "authority in the people." This was modified through the ages by a number of tributary ideas which joined the general stream of democratic thought, such as the stoic idea of human equality, the Roman and Anglo-Saxon concepts of representation, religious freedom, and then the modern conceptions of Locke, Rousseau, Montesquieu, Paine and Jefferson—but it remained constant as a form of self-government. In this form, it also remained highly controversial, with critics of democracy from Plato through 20th century anti-democrats characterizing it as a form of irrational and indefensible mob rule.

It is only with the First World War that "democracy" became a "God-word," like "truth," "justice." We're all for it because it is good. That means we tend to define it to suit our conception of the good: the Communist world describes its one-party elite regimes as "people's democracies"; Mussolini called his corporate state "the realization of true democracy"; the Nazis called their Third Reich "the most ennobled form of a modern democratic state."

Hence my emphasis on isolating and defining the true ingredients of the term, for with the absence of definition and the lack of direction, the idea of democracy and with it the idea of liberty may become confused and eventually subverted in men's minds. For us, the basic quality must not be whether we agree or disagree with the decision or its objective, but whether in fact the institutions of decisionmaking provide that the ultimate power resides in the people governed, with decisions made by officers responsible to the people governed.

And it is here that we reach the essence of what would be my sermon this morning were we meeting on the first rather than the third day of the week. Key to the functioning of democracy is the political process—and the key to the operation of this process is the much maligned and frequently disrespected politician.

I meet many audiences during the course of a year and have been introduced with various degrees of compliments as a professor, lawyer, or public servant; but seldom as a politician. The reason is a tribute to the good manners of the chairman. Yet, I am as much a politician as I am any of the more flattering identifications. To many, a politician is identified with one of the least noteworthy of occupations. But the politician plays a role as vital to the realization of the highest aspirations of man as the teacher or the minister. For upon him depends the feasibility and practicality of democracy being able to function.

Why the disrespect for politics and the politician?

First, there is the feeling that politics attracts those too lazy or too unable to make their mark in the more respectable professions. This should be a familiar criticism to teachers—and I here take note of my audience—as I note the old refrain "He who can, does. He who can't, teaches."

This is further complicated for the politician by the realization that many people who run for or hold public office have their motivations interwoven with personal ambition and the gratification of self. This has led to the cynical observation that political issues and parties exist not because there are two sides to every question but two sides to every office—an inside and an outside.

To grant this, however, is not to forfeit the claim for respectability. We have learned enough about man and his psyche to know that the ego plays an important part for all of us even in our selections of vocations and avocations and that motivations are not simple. Furthermore, a strong case can be made for the proposition that the instinct for survival and the desire to stay in office for the politician may well be the ingredient in a democracy which provides the safety line, the tie between the elected and the elector, those who represent and those to be represented in a democracy. This knowledge that the next election is inevitable and imminent makes it unlikely that the politician will lightly disregard his responsibilities to his constituents.

Then there is the argument that politics requires a compromise with principle; that an adjustment to the realities of power demands various forms of corruption from outright bribery in some cases to a sacrifice of integrity of beliefs in others—and that men of honesty and conviction don't belong in the profession.

This dangerous concept must be laid to rest decisively. We can make short shrift of the outright corruption phase of the position. The most authoritative study of the question of ethics in Government was made about 10 years ago by Senator Paul Douglas who demonstrated once and for all that for every public official bribed, and there are relatively few, there was a greater criminal, the citizen who attempted to bribe him; and that the incidence of crime among public servants was far less than the incidence of criminality of the lack of integrity in many of the more honorable professions.

The more vital point, however, relates to the broader conception of corruption and integrity. It does not help us, in examining democracy and its problems, to think of public policy positions as fixed and immovable ones. To view politics in such a way is to view it as an instrument of fanatics. The distinguished democratic philosopher, T. V. Smith, once said that "politics is the art of compromising an issue without compromising yourself." To "compromise" is not to repudiate or abdicate principle; it might in fact be a furtherance and strengthening of principle. If we as a group should desire to advance the role of education in American life by raising minimum teachers' salaries from $5,000 to $7,000 annually and find that we don't have the votes, the friends, or the ability to persuade the society to go any higher than $6,000, our acceptance of the $6,000 figure and compromising the $7,000 figure downward shouldn't blind us to the advance that we have made and our accomplishment in advancing toward our goal.

The peculiar strength of democratic government is the opportunity that it affords for just this kind of compromise and harmonizing of views, as our society—a large and intensely varied one—strives to arrive at a consensus and make decisions necessary to its progress. There are some who disparage this role—at which the politician is so expert and so necessary—and prefer to hold their banners high without accommodating themselves to differing views in society. They tend to hurl the epithet "opportunist" at the politician, who indeed makes the system work. This is, of course, their privilege, these people of conscience on the right and on the left who insist that their conscience be your guide. I suspect, however, that whatever their motivations in luxuriating in a feeling of a greater purity and spirituality than their fellows, they run the risk of separating themselves from genuine thought about problems, especially the new problems that do not yield to old formuli and incantations, and they will probably never have the responsibility of power in our democracy.

The political role I champion this morning is that of the seeker for votes, the partisan politician whose loyalty to his party is second to his loyalty to his country, but is nevertheless real because he recognizes that it is through our political party framework that the American electorate can best express itself and keep its reins on decisionmaking. It is the give and take of the political campaign and the competition for votes that provides the forum for the discussion of issues, the criticism of government that is so essential, the airing that is so vital for the open society. I warmly recall the refreshing story of the indignant citizen who told the office seeker: "I wouldn't vote for you if you were the Angel Gabriel." And the suave politician's reply: "If I were the Angel Gabriel you wouldn't be in my precinct."

The politician I commend to you is the one who instinctively recognizes the limitations of government and his own decisionmaking powers. Here I think of the Congressman who defined his role in the House Ways and Means Committee as follows: "The art of taxation consists in so plucking the goose as to obtain the largest amount of feathers with the least possible amount of hissing."

This political role has many problems associated with it. It produces mistakes on occasion. Witness the experiment with prohibition. An English writer returned after a visit to the United States during prohibition and, being asked how it was working, replied: "Well, it's a darn sight better than no liquor at all."

This politics also brings with it the campaign speech with its exaggerations. The Harry Golden story of the southern politician running for public office illustrates this shortcoming. His standard political speech went something like this:

"Remember the symbol of the Republican Party. It is an elephant; the giant that stumps through the jungle, clumping little animals underfoot and swinging its weight around. But the symbol of the Democrat is the little mule, the same blessed animal our Savior rode in Jerusalem 2,000 years ago."

Our Government has become bigger and more complicated to meet the new problems of industrialization, automation, the atomic revolution and the awesome international threat we face. The problems of government are more difficult to solve. I sense that this is establishing a humility on the part of the American people. It appears to me that the American people are of late less likely to criticize and more likely to sympathize with the President in his responsibility for decisionmaking. Increasing numbers of Americans feel grateful for the fact that they don't have the responsibility. No longer do parents automatically wish for their children to grow up to be President. What is the significance of this?

I suggest that one of the dangers growing out of this recognition of the complexity of government is the danger of disassociation—the danger of the American people abandoning their responsibility because of the difficulty of making any intelligent sense out of their problems. This gets to be more serious because I am convinced that as the international crisis deepens—and it will—as the struggle for survival increasingly permeates the consciousness of the American people—as it must—there will be increased tensions and strains within the American society. Our democratic institutions will be put to the test of whether they can prevail in the face of these crises. This will require the utilization of all material and human resources with the full, intelligent participation of our citizenry.

Our country needs not less politics, but more politics; not fewer politicians, but more of them, more good ones, more active and dedicated partisans who understand their role to include that of educating the electorate. The politician is indeed the teacher and his student body is the American electorate. We reach toward this objective as we enlarge the dimension and understanding of politics and direct and encourage larger numbers of young people into active political life.

Winston Churchill said that democracy was the worst form of government—next to every other. Justice Jackson once wrote that our system of government "is not a luxury to be enjoyed or a theory to be defended. It is a weapon to be used." Americans are proud of their heritage—and justly so. Prime Minister Gladstone referred to our democratic system as "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." We're proud of that tribute and many of us accept this judgment as a typically British understatement.

The profound theologian Reinhold Niebuhr wrote: "Man's capacity for justice makes democracy possible; but man's inclination to injustice makes democracy necessary." We know how vital democracy is to the realization of our aspirations. We have demonstrated that we are willing to fight for our principles. But a wise man once said that it is easier to fight for our principles than to live up to them. The real challenge we face is our willingness and ability to live up to them. The tools of politics are among those available to us.

I said earlier that I was tempted to deliver a sermon to you and in fact I did so. Concluding on that ecclesiastical theme I remind myself of the advice given by the elder of a church to the new minister about to deliver his first sermon: "We don't have time limits on our sermons, but we feel that very few souls are saved after the first half hour." I fear that I have missed the message but I end with appreciation for your courtesy and attention.

PASSAMAQUODDY TIDAL POWER PROJECT

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, in my continuing efforts to create bipartisan support for the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project, I have written a joint letter to the chairmen of the State committees of the two major political parties in Maine. I ask unanimous consent that my letter be placed in the body of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., July 30, 1963.

Hon. David A. Nichols,
Chairman, Republican State Committee,
Lincolnville, Maine.
Hon. William D. Hathaway,
Chairman, Democratic State Committee,
Lewiston, Maine.

Dear Chairman Nichols and Chairman Hathaway: In connection with the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project, some persons have expressed the feeling that one of the major tasks was to educate the people of Maine on it in order to create support for it from the people of Maine. I am not convinced that this is actually the case.

I do not believe that it is necessary to conduct an educational campaign throughout the State of Maine because I believe the people of Maine are well educated on Quoddy after having heard its potentials discussed for nearly 40 years. And in that education, I believe that the people of Maine are overwhelmingly in favor of the proposed Quoddy project because of the economic benefits that it will bring to Maine.

Consequently, in the spirit of bipartisanship, I would like to propose a joint effort and project by the State committees of the two major political parties in Maine. That project would be the sponsorship and financing by the Democratic State committee and the Republican State committee of a Statewide poll by a recognized national polling concern known for objectivity to determine whether the people of Maine are in favor of the proposed Quoddy project.

I know of no better way to insulate the proposed Quoddy project from political partisanship than to have such a bipartisan project jointly sponsored by your committees. If the poll shows that the people of Maine are overwhelmingly in favor of Quoddy, then there is no need for an educational campaign and this would be the most effective way to keep Quoddy out of politics and future campaigns. If the poll shows that people are dubious about Quoddy, then it will be all the more important to any educational campaign that is conducted because the poll should show not only the reasons they are dubious but as well those sections, regions, and segments of the population that as yet do not favor Quoddy. Then a much better and more effective educational campaign could be conducted.

In short, I think a poll under your joint sponsorship would either eliminate the necessity for an educational campaign or would determine how and where such an educational campaign should be concentrated.

Sincerely yours,
Margaret Chase Smith,
U.S. Senator.

HE MIGHT HAVE BEEN PRESIDENT

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there appeared in last Sunday's newspapers throughout the Nation a profile of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia, Richard B. Russell. The article was written by the Associated Press writer, Jack Bell, who points out that Dick Russell might have become President of the United States if he had not been from the State of Georgia.

Mr. President, many of us here in the Senate and many citizens of this country believe this to be true, and feel that Dick Russell would be an outstanding Chief Executive and render meritorious service to his Nation. It is unfortunate indeed that sectionalism could stand in the way of such a great statesman as Senator Russell.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Associated Press article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Profile: Richard B. Russell—He Might Have Been President

(By Jack Bell)

Washington, July 27.—In the opinion of many colleagues, the man who will bark the signals in the civil rights filibuster might have become President if he hadn't been from Georgia.

Because he is from Georgia, Senator RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL instead will command the corporal's guard of about 18 lusty-lunged southern Senators who will try to talk to death President Kennedy's civil rights program.

The tall, balding Senator with the George Washington nose will be pitting canny strategy and an unequaled knowledge of the Senate's rules against an emotional surge generated by Negro demonstrations and police-dog reaction.

It remains problematical whether RUSSELL's opponents can collect the necessary two-thirds approval of those voting and apply the cloture rule to end debate, thus killing off the filibuster.

Before that happens the cots may go up in the cloakrooms for around-the-clock sessions to test the stamina of RUSSELL's troops.

Whatever the outcome, DICK RUSSELL seems likely to retain his position as the most powerful single individual in the Senate.

At 65, with 30 years of Senate service behind him, RUSSELL remains the quiet, courtly gentleman who reflects his heritage as the bachelor son of a struggling country lawyer who rose to be chief justice of his State.

RUSSELL can turn tiger on the Senate floor when he detects what he believes are unfair assaults on States rights. But his colleagues continue to respect him even as he shows his claws.

As a representative of moderate conservatism, RUSSELL has had two shots at his party's presidential nomination and was defeated in each largely because he was branded as "too sectional."

In the 1946 convention which nominated President Harry S. Truman, southerners piled up 263 protest votes for RUSSELL who wasn't even on hand. When many of his southern brethren bolted, RUSSELL stayed silent, but regular.

In 1952, the Georgia Senator went after the nomination. The fact that he got only 292 out of about 1,200 votes demonstrated again that a man whose record and personality probably would have been acceptable had he hailed from the North, West, or East could not surmount the political disadvantages of his ties to the South.

Philosophical about this, RUSSELL maintains his party regularity despite his strong opposition to parts of his President's program.

"While I am always for those who are running on the Democratic ticket," he said, "I must confess that I have had varying degrees of enthusiasm for various candidates on the ticket."

RUSSELL helped campaign for the Kennedy-Johnson ticket in 1960. But even the persuasive powers of his longtime friend and close associate, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, may not be enough to get him into the 1964 campaign after the President's civil rights stand.

The Georgia Senator didn't mince words in denouncing the Kennedy legislative program, with emphasis on the section which would enforce desegregation on privately owned businesses which serve the public. Nor did he pull punches in criticism of the President.

"The President of the United States has a higher call to leadership than to use threats of mass violence and disregard of reasonable local laws as a means of securing action in the courts and Congress, however desirable he may regard it to be," he said.

And on the accommodations section:

"If the commerce clause will sustain an act to compel the white owner of a dining hall to accept a Negro against his wishes, it can be used to sustain the validity of legislation that will compel his admittance into the living room or bedroom of any citizen."

But outside the field of civil rights, RUSSELL is a man to be reckoned with on major national issues.

When he speaks the Senate listens.

When it votes, the stand he takes is influential—if not always decisive—among his colleagues.

RUSSELL looks upon the Senate as the greatest stabilizing force in preserving our Constitution. He cherishes the Senate's traditions as the last world body of free debate.

Moreover, he is a charter member of the inner circle. "Check it with Dick" is a frequently used phrase when controversial legislation is at hand.

From his vantage point as chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee and high-ranking membership on the Appropriations and Space Committees, as well as the Senate-House Atomic Energy group, the Georgia Senator has a finger on almost every Government activity.

He speaks frankly in White House conferences. He thought Kennedy's quarantine solution to the Cuban missile problem last fall was short of the action needed.

RUSSELL's advice: "Go in there and wipe them out."

When he first came to the Senate, RUSSELL had supported Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal. He voted for social security, the NRA and TVA. He was the author of an amendment out of which the farm parity payment system grew.

But over the years, he has become conservative on fiscal matters. He told his colleagues recently:

"I have voted against increases in the foreign aid program and I have also voted against a number of other big-spend programs, and if a majority of the Members of the Senate had voted as I did, the budget would have been in balance every year since the Korean war."

In the field of national defense, RUSSELL is recognized as pretty much the voice of the Senate. He summed up his position with this observation:

"To me the most important conclusion to be drawn from today's state of world affairs is that we must be militarily strong."

RUSSELL demonstrated his power in the Senate last April when his Armed Services Committee rebelled against him and by a 9 to 8 vote added $196 million to begin the purchase of component parts for the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile.

The Georgia Senator told his colleagues this system would cost $20 billion and in the words of Gen. Curtis E. Lemay, Air Force Chief, would provide a defense for 26 cities "and they would not be defended very well."

Advocates of the Nike-Zeus forced an unusual closed session of the Senate to discuss the matter. When the doors were opened, RUSSELL's amendment to cut out the additional fund was approved by a lopsided 58 to 16 vote.

In that case, RUSSELL backed the judgment of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara. He and McNamara parted company, however, on the issue of building the RS-70, long-range reconnaissance bomber. Russell thinks it would be better to go on with bomber production longer than McNamara wants to do so, but he concedes he hasn't been able to change the Secretary's mind.

But RUSSELL takes defeat as philosophically as he does victory. His theory is that a man does what he thinks is best in his country's interests.

Having done that, he lives well with his own conscience.

FLYWAY MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the Federal Government's attempts to manage the Nation's waterfowl seasons has been a matter of much consternation in Wyoming, as evidenced by a letter sent recently to the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation.

The writer, Wyoming's Game and Fish Commission Director, S. J. Jiacoletti, noted that attempts were made in 1957 to set up a truly workable flyway management plan. He observed, however:

> It was thought that the States would be embraced in a cooperative spirit of joint responsibility for the management of our Nation's waterfowl. That this was not done is evident.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this illuminating letter outlining a problem which is common to most of our waterfowl States be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF WYOMING,
GAME AND FISH COMMISSION,
Cheyenne, Wyo., July 23, 1963.

Hon. T. A. THOMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Your letter of June 17, asking for views on the past performance of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in setting waterfowl seasons, is appreciated.

Ever since 1953, when flyway councils were conceived, it has been a mandate of the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission that a representative from our department be present at the council and technical committee meetings, which were organized for better management of the wildfowl resource.

The early years of the council's approach to waterfowl management were rough ones and in 1957, with the adoption of a flyway management plan, it was thought that the States would be embraced in a cooperative spirit of joint responsibility for the management of our Nation's waterfowl. That this was not done is evident.

For 13 years the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission has been spending funds on the waterfowl resource, through the development of new habitat, creation of new flocks, participation in Canadian banding operations, and research into waterfowl problems within our own State. Other States have done as much and yet the experience of the personnel responsible for waterfowl within the States goes unrecognized by many within the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

During years of high waterfowl abundance the States in the central flyway, as well as other flyways, were thrown an occasional bone by being permitted a relaxation of bag limits and seasons, but at no time were the considered evaluations of experienced wildlife people accepted, but rather the Bureau continued to fall back on the recommendations of pressure groups and insiders seeking personal gain. What a waste of the resource. And, then came the lean years of the sixties; when habitat began to shrivel and waterfowl numbers began to dwindle, and, there is no denying that numbers did dwindle, but these facts, too, were recognized and taken into account by trained personnel responsible for making recommendations to the councils and, subsequently, to the Bureau. Again, no recognition was made of the total years of experience in management represented by the States, and the Bureau saw fit to curtail seasons and harvests beyond those suggested. Again a tremendous waste of the resource.

It appears to us that if the spirit of a formalized management plan is to be adhered to, then greater regards to recommendations from the flyway councils should be granted. Are the States to be partners in the management of the waterfowl resource only during periods of abundance or is it that the Bureau feels we are incapable of intelligent decisions during periods with declining populations?

We certainly agree that the problems of managing waterfowl, which are international in their movements, is a complex one. However, we also feel that the States in each flyway are contributing enough knowledge, through trained personnel, so that reasonable recommendations can be made for waterfowl seasons and bag limits. No State wildlife agency will ever be guilty of recommending waterfowl into oblivion, but neither are they going to be guilty of wasting a natural resource when there is a surplus to be cropped.

All that we ask is that the Bureau adhere more closely to the recommendations of the flyway council or else give up this sham of cooperation which they now practice.

Again, let me say that I appreciate this opportunity to express the feelings of the commission about the present waterfowl management program and I only regret that I will be unable to appear before your committee to testify.

Please call upon me if I can be of further assistance.

Yours very truly,

S. J. Jiacoletti,

State Game and Fish Commissioner.

SATURDAY EVENING POST NARRATES HARDSHIP OF MILITARY SERVICE IN COLD WAR

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the arguments which is often presented in opposition to the cold war GI bill is that this is peacetime and not wartime.

Those who advance this argument seem to believe that our servicemen spend their days eating ice cream in between movies at the base theater. The inadequacy of the argument that we should draw a distinction between veterans who served during a hot war and the veterans of the cold war as a basis for awarding veterans' readjustment benefits is demonstrated by the fate of the *Thresher*, the ever-growing casualty list in South Vietnam and the recent Communist ambush of an American patrol in South Korea which resulted in the deaths of Pfc. William L. Foster III, of Drexel Hill, Pa.; Pvt. David A. Seiler, of Theresa, Wis.; and the wounding of William L. Foster, of Baltimore. A subsequent clash the following day occurred 6 miles south of the demilitarized zone and resulted in the death of a third American soldier, Cpl. George F. Larion, of Davidson, Mich.

The type of duty which our servicemen must face during the cold war is illustrated by Rafael Steinberg's article "The Lonely Line of Armistice," which appears in the July 27–August 3, 1963, issue of the Saturday Evening Post. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Steinberg's article be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. I would like to read the following quote from Mr. Steinberg's article:

> Aside from the dangers, Korean duty is still one of the least attractive assignments in the world. Yet 450,000 Americans have had to serve there since the war ended, and about 50,000 are there today, and will probably be there next year, and the next, for "the longest armistice in history" shows no sign of breaking out into real peace or war.
>
> When the armistice was formally signed 10 years ago, on July 27, 1953, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, then the 8th Army commander in Korea, reminded his troops that "the armistice is just a suspension of hostilities—an interruption of the shooting * * * in itself, it does not end the war. It is simply an agreement * * * to stop all hostile acts while attempting through political discussions to reach a peaceful solution.
>
> "There must be no thought of going home until permanent peace and stability have been restored to Korea." Taylor said, "We are faced with the same enemy, only a short distance away, and must be ready for any move he makes."

Mr. Steinberg's article together with the dangers inherent in such situations as the Marine landings in Lebanon and Thailand, the tinderboxes of Laos and Berlin, and the conflict in South Vietnam reveal the falsity of the argument that we should deny the veterans of the cold war the benefits of the GI bill on the basis that they have served during peacetime.

Everyday, hundreds of thousands of American servicemen defend the interests of this country from Berlin to Guantanamo to Korea and from Greenland to the Antarctic. It is only equitable that we should pass the cold war GI bill to assist these men in readjusting to civilian life when new men replace them along the Korean armistice line, at Checkpoint Charlie, along the radar lines in Alaska, Canada, and Greenland, and the hundreds of bases where U.S. servicemen serve throughout the world.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Lonely Line of Armistice

(Ten years after the shooting stopped, American forces still patrol the battlefields of Korea. A closeup anniversary report on the men who stand guard, risking their lives as they wait for the peace that never comes.)

In an 8- by 10-foot wooden shack on a lonely, bare Korean hill a young American soldier picks up the handset of a field radio, presses the button, and speaks in a flat voice. "Encourage 6. This is Encourage 817, with an all-secure report. Over."

At the same time, a few hills away, an American sergeant quietly briefs his men. "Now, when I halt this man, if he wiggles one little finger, Sergeant Massey's going to shoot him. You just can't take any chance with these people. Remember the password. We have agents up here like anyone else. We don't want to shoot any of ours. Remember, I'll halt him, Sergeant Massey will shoot him." Quietly, keeping 10 yards apart, the men file up a hill to lie in a 4-hour stakeout, awaiting North Korean agents in the demilitarized zone (DMZ).

The code names change monthly. The individual soldiers rotate back to the States every 13 months. But 10 weary years after the shooting stopped, American soldiers remain on guard in Korea, weapons loaded, drilled for battle, skirmishing every so often with Communist agents and troops. In all seasons, and around the clock, they pass the basic message that the armistice is still secure. And by being there, they help guarantee that it will remain so.

Four Americans were killed in Korea's demilitarized zone during the past year, and two have fallen into enemy hands. Two more defected across the line. Aside from the dangers, Korean duty is still one of the least attractive assignments in the world. Yet 450,000 Americans have had to serve there since the war ended, and about 50,000 are there today, and will probably be there next year, and the next, for "the longest armistice in history" shows no sign of breaking out into real peace or war.

When the Korean armistice was formally signed 10 years ago, on July 27, 1953, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, then the 8th Army commander in Korea, reminded his troops that "the armistice is just a suspension of hostilities—an interruption of the shooting * * * in itself, it does not end the war. It is simply an agreement * * * to stop all hostile acts while attempting through political discussions to reach a peaceful solution.

"There must be no thought of going home until permanent peace and stability have been restored to Korea," Taylor said. "We are faced with the same enemy, only a short distance away, and must be ready for any move he makes."

The political conference never amounted to anything; no satisfactory way of peacefully unifying Korea has ever been devised. The war that was not legally a war has become the peace that is not technically peace.

Most of the 16 nations who sent troops to Korea have withdrawn their forces; only the Turks and the Thais maintain small combat units in Korea. It is the South Koreans and the Americans who still face the same enemy. The ROK Army stands guard along most of the 151-mile front, including the rugged mountains of the east; north of Seoul, defending the low-lying so-called classic invasion routes, are two U.S. divisions, the 1st Cavalry and the 7th Infantry.

North of the Imjin River lives the 1st Reconnaissance Squadron of the 9th Cavalry Regiment. Essentially an armored outfit, it has a double mission. Its 600 men must patrol and guard the DMZ, and, if an attack comes, they must delay it until the main body of troops can get south of the river.

"I don't reckon that more than 2 percent of us would ever get across the river," says one platoon lieutenant. "You might say we are expendable."

Meanwhile, the men of the 9th live in heated barracks, have flush toilets and showers, sleep between sheets. There are movie theaters, a hobby shop, and a PX snack bar, serving malteds, cheeseburgers, popcorn, steaks, and other stateside goodies, at less than stateside prices. Some officers' quarters have elaborate stereo record players, and the officers' mess goes formal once a week; instead of uniforms, the officers wear canary-yellow cavalry blazers and little black bow ties. The enlisted men must always be in uniform, but they have Korean houseboys to do their laundry, and to take care of KP chores.

Despite the natural improvements in GI living standards, time seems to have stood still in Korea. Joseph Stalin is dead, but the enemy is still called "Joe," the name he acquired right after the armistice when the command started discouraging the use of "gook" and "gooney." Army food—except for the snack bar where the GI must pay—has not improved much. (Food at the officers' mess is quite good, however, and each officer has his own napkin ring, with his name on it.)

The GI in Korea still uses slang transplanted by the first American troops who rushed over from Japan when the North Koreans struck across the 38th parallel in 1950. A girl is still a "moose," (from the Japanese musume, girl) and a house or barrack is still called "hooch" (from the Japanese word for house, uchi). Not one GI in 10 knows the origin. More leisure and better educational opportunities have failed to increase the tiny store of Korean words in the GI's vocabulary; bahli-bahli (hurry), idi-wa (come here) are about all he can manage.

And the soldier's dreams are still of home. There is probably not one man in Korea who cannot tell you exactly how many more months or days he has to serve there. Everything from the VD rate (high) and the court-martial rate (low) to the amount of duty a GI is expected to pull, hinges on whether he is a long-timer (with his Korean future before him) or a short-timer (soon to leave). The KPCOD, the cut-off date after which a short-timer—or at least the married short-timer—will forgo the companionship of the moose in the villages, is usually calculated at about 6 weeks before departure.

Some men don't depart alive. On a cold, windy night last November, Sp4c. James C. Johnson took over Outpost Susan, in the Able troop sector. With him was another man from Able troop, Pfc. Efran Olivo-Baez, and a TDY (temporary duty) private from a rear-echelon unit, sent up to reinforce the thin ranks of the men in the 9th Cavalry. The Cuban crisis was still alive, and the men of the 9th had been on a death count alert for weeks, their jeeps and armored personnel carriers standing gassed and ready to move into battle on a 30-minute notice. Each troop was manning five outposts around the clock, instead of the normal three, and the men were tired.

On this forgotten, forsaken outpost, a decade after the conflict, 6,000 miles from his Kentucky home, Specialist Johnson got careless. There was one factor that Johnson was not aware of: in the shadowy two-way espionage war which goes on constantly in the DMZ, South Korean or American agents had recently scored a success in the Susan area. The Communists discovered it and apparently felt they had to retaliate. Outpost Susan was the handiest target for their revenge.

As the event was pieced together later by Capt. James R. Brokenshire, from Reading, Pa., who was then the A troop commanding officer, three or more North Koreans crept up to Susan soon after dark. The wind covered any sound. Bushes and darkness hid them from sight. Quietly they waited.

At night, only one man of the outpost detail was supposed to be inside the hut at any time. But shortly after 8:30 p.m. Johnson allowed Olivo-Baez to duck in to get warm at the tiny gasoline stove. A moment later, the TDY private opened the door to enter, too, leaving no one outside on guard.

That was the moment the North Koreans were waiting for. Suddenly they stood and lobbed five hand grenades almost simultaneously at the flimsy, unprotected outpost shack. At least one grenade crashed through the plate-glass observation window and exploded inside, killing Johnson instantly, sending a chunk of metal into Pfc. Olivo-Baez's leg. The TDY private, uninjured, ran back out the door in panic and fled down the slope to the rear.

A jeep on the way to the outpost with another radio met the wounded Olivo-Baez at the foot of the hill. The alert squad and Captain Brokenshire rushed to Susan. "I found the third man as I was coming back down from the OP," the captain recalls. "He was lying by the side of the road. He yelled at the vehicle when I went by. He was pretty shaky then, but when we started talking to him, he became a hero. His story changed every time someone talked to him."

The attack on Susan shocked 1st Cavalry Division and gave it the second recent cause for soul searching. The other occurred in May and August last year. Two young Americans had defected across the truce line—and that had not happened since the armistice.

The first GI to go across was Pvt. Larry A. Abshier, 18, an "8-ball" soldier who had just been busted from private, first class for getting too drunk to stand guard. After his conviction, he had been transferred, as a sort of punishment, to the 9th Cavalry for zone duty. On May 28, a few minutes after he arrived on outpost, he took off down a road to North Korea and disappeared over the demarcation line. A few weeks later, men on outposts heard his voice on loudspeakers, telling them about the "happy life of the North Korean people." Shortly after that, balloons wafted down with booklets showing a grinning Abshier surrounded by pretty North Korean girls.

Whether Pfc. James Joseph Dresnok saw one of these pamphlets or not, the Army says it does not know. An orphan from Glenallen, Va., 20-year-old Dresnok was married but estranged from his wife back home when he met "Shirley" Kim, a hostess at the New Star Club in a village near the Imjin River. Dresnok forged a pass to visit her one night, and for that he faced a summary court-martial on August 16. And perhaps he had tired of Shirley. So, on the 15th, Dresnok walked north. When the men on Outpost Susan spotted him and called out, he just turned and waved. He was already too close to the line to be caught.

After that, the Army started screening men assigned north of the Imjin. Instead of considering zone duty a punishment, the Army specifically kept soldiers with court-martial records south of the river, and no one without some high school education was considered fit for the zone. (Dresnok had gone only as far as the eighth grade.) And in the units of the 9th Cavalry, only one man in six is now a draftee, while the overall proportion in Korea is one in three.

Then came the attack on Susan. "I believe that ——— who went across from A troop led that patrol back in there," says 1st Sgt. Kenneth Lovett. The command didn't think so, but it knew that something had to be done. While the protests were made at Panmunjom, the outposts themselves—"they used to look like hot-dog stands," says one officer—were completely rebuilt. The new shacks, now called guard posts instead of outposts, have thicker walls capable of stopping small-arms fire, and plate-glass windows have been replaced with shatterproof safety glass. Around each outpost, men of the 9th Cavalry laid a double fence of barbed wire, with trip flares to illuminate intruders and tin cans tied on to jangle when disturbed. Col. Stanley Kennedy, Commanding Officer of the 9th, increased the size of the outpost detail, decreed that every outpost building must be just like every other, with everything located in the same place. So precise and detailed were his instructions that they even specified where a man should place his gloves if he had to take them off while on duty. "There's so much chicken," says one enlisted man, "that some guys are more afraid of who's coming out behind them than who's coming out in front. You can get chewed out good if the colonel comes out and finds your gloves on the map board."

Late one afternoon recently, some 20 men of the 9th Cavalry gathered in the operations room of C troop, ready for 6 hours on guard-post duty. Most were men of the troop, and it was old stuff to them. But some were TDY personnel, nervous, silent, fingering their M-14 rifles, staring at the sign on the wall behind the lieutenant: "Halt, or I fire. Chong-gi Chong Sonda."

Second Lt. Thomas Gamble, a 22-year-old from Buffalo, N.Y., stood at the counter and briefed the men in flat, staccato bursts.

"Your mission" he told them, "is to observe the demilitarized zone in visible areas of North Korea, to report all activity in this area, to report all violations, friendly or enemy, of the armistice agreement, to give early warning in case of hostilities, to adjust artillery fire in case of hostilities, and to apprehend all unauthorized persons.

"Let the persons who are to be apprehended get as close as possible. 'Halt, or I fire. Chong-gi Chong Sonda.' Fire a warning shot, fire to wound.

"Apprehended personnel are referred to as 'packages.' Unauthorized persons spotted but not yet apprehended will be referred to as 'crackers.'

"Stay out of minefields. If there's any doubt about an area being mined, stay out of it. Ahh, on December 24, Christmas Eve, we lost a man over in Bravo troop. He walked in where he shouldn't have." Pause. "He got his head blown off. He was dead." Longer pause. "It was a merry Christmas." The men shifted, and looked at each other.

"Now, pyrotechnics. Red (flare) means enemy attack. Green, you need assistance, you can't continue your mission. Your communications are out, you need assistance, send up a green flare. Yellow, is a warning to aircraft, friendly or enemy, that they are over the DMZ.

"The challenge is Pat, P-A-T. The password is Tab, T-A-B. Pat, Tab." Lieutenant Gamble swept his eyes around the room, scanning the white name labels each man wore on his field jacket, watching the men write the password on the backs of their hands. Many wrote "Path" instead of "Pat."

"Jordan, what's the red flare mean?"

Jordan, a big Negro, stammered nervously. "That's the—er—the enemy in trouble on account of the enemy——"

"No, red means an enemy attack. We're the ones who are in trouble."

The men filed out, on their way to a night on guard posts Pansy, Barbara, Laura, Dot, all named after officers' wives. During the war, outposts and hills were named for women that any man would like to spend the night with: Marilyn, Hedy, Ava, Jane Russell.

In the back of the truck on the way to guard post Laura, Pfc. Robert J. Evangelista, a TDY "augmentation" from 12th Cavalry, chatted with two men from C troop. Evangelista, a tall, thin youth with a toothy smile, was a short timer, nearing the end of his Korea tour, and he had been up to the DMZ on guard post and patrol duty before. But to the other men, Pfc. Donald E. Hyndman and Pfc. Irwin Carroll, Evangelista was clearly an outsider, a neophyte.

After hashing it around a bit, the three men agreed on one thing: This DMZ duty was better than being in an infantry battle group to the rear. Evangelista had a simple explanation: "The work is easier here." The other men looked at him but said nothing. He would learn.

Guard post Laura sits on the brow of a sandy hill, overlooking the green valleys of the DMZ and North Korea. It is well within the DMZ itself, just about 250 yards south of the military demarcation line that runs through the center of the zone. Sp4c. Harry Oliver, of Colton, Calif., guard post leader, had been riding up in the cab with the driver of the truck. Now he took over. He was a short timer, and he knew the area well. "About two ridges out in front, there's a North Korean OP. That's Taedok-san, that big hill to our front, and you can see all kinds of bunkers and emplacements, trenches down there."

It was late afternoon and the sun was sinking. Oliver and the other men scanned the valleys in front of them, for it would be dark soon and they would then have to depend on their ears. Far down to the right, in a deserted rice paddy, two deer grazed. "This used to be a pretty jumpy place, people always hearing a lot of noises. Generally they were caused by animals," said Oliver. "Sometimes you'd get people throwing rocks. Probably they were North Koreans, sometimes it might have been imagination. It gets windy up here, and these big leaves of these bushes make a lot of noise, sounds like something's coming up."

Private, first class Hyndman, 18, has been married 8 months and has spent 5 of those months in Korea, but he likes the Army, and has "no serious gripe." Now he was staring out at Route 4 with the binoculars. "I got a GAZ (a Russian jeep) goin' west, Ollie." Oliver picked up his phone again. "Dayton? This is Laura. I've got a GAZ–51 going west on Route 4 at 1859."

Private First Class Carroll, 19, a driver of one of C troop's seven M–41 tanks, was standing behind the shack, looking north. "You lose a lot of sleep on this guard post duty," he complained, rubbing the stubble on his boxer's face. "One day you're on at 12, and the next day at 6. I am glad when I can get back to my tank."

In a foxhole a few yards away from the shack, TDY man Evangelista watched the sun go down. Unlike most of the men of the 9th, he doesn't like the Army, although he enlisted and is RA—a Regular. "I was young and didn't know any better," says short-timer Evangelista. "We believed too much of what we seen in the movies. It wouldn't be so bad if you weren't a private, let's put it that way. If you're lower than a sergeant, you're treated like dirt. But I guess what makes it so hard over here is being away from home."

ALLIES BUT NOT FRIENDS

Inside, after dark, Oliver talked of the Katusa's, the Korean Augmentation to the U.S. Army. Ten percent of the U.S. ranks in Korea are filled out by ROK Army personnel. The Katusa's eat and live with the troops, stand GP duty, and join the GI's on the stakeouts and patrols.

"We get along pretty well," says Oliver. "It is pretty hard to communicate, but it works out pretty good. Most of them work hard, and we get along. It is better to learn about Korea from them than to go out to the village and learn it from the prostitutes and Mama-sans and all. Actually, there is really not a close association between the GI and the Katusa. They don't go on pass together. I am not sure there is any regulation against it, you just do not see it. Mainly, it is the language."

Suddenly there came a shout—the challenge—and the thunk of an M–14 rifle shot. Oliver grabbed his rifle and hurtled out the back door. Two more shots. Crouching low, he zigzagged down the slope. Quiet. He called softly. Evangelista's voice, then Hyndman's. "Something moved down there. A light. We fired." Then two more shots. "I saw it," said Carroll.

Oliver crashed back into the shack. "Before they fire, they are supposed to tell me." He cranked the field phone. "Would you get Lieutenant Gamble out here right away. I think we have got a cracker. We fired a few shots at it." Then he was out again, circling out behind the outpost. Clearly, on the night air came a whistle, a human whistle. Minutes went by while the four men searched the darkness. Then, from the foxhole to the left of the outpost shack, Hyndman noticed something: "There, do you see that faint light? Moving a little. And another one. Looks like lightning bugs." On the other side Oliver was coming to the same conclusion. There was no other sight or sound of movement.

Oliver stumped in, picked up the phone again. Apologetically he said, "Disregard that other thing. The boys got a little excited. We jumped the gun, I guess. I think it was probably lightning bugs."

Then he muttered, "Ever since Susan, some of these TDY boys are a little trigger happy."

Evangelista was the man who fired first. "I feel kinda foolish, shooting at lightning bugs. But I sure thought I saw something move."

Nobody ribbed Evangelista. All three men had fired, and they seemed to feel that it made them safe, even though the target was fireflies. But at the next night's briefing, something new was added. "If you shoot," Sfc. Donald R. Smith drawled at the men of the first platoon, "make sure you know what you're shootin' at. Don't start blasting away at any lightnin' bugs like happened t'other night at Laura." Some of the men started to laugh. "Don't laugh, that's what happened. Make sure it's a human being."

On the morning after that there was gunfire again at Laura, and this time the target was human. In the dawn fog, Sp4c. Henry R. Buyny, a 22-year-old from New Castle, Pa., spotted "a Korean man sneaking through the woods right in front of us. I yelled at him to halt but he turned and ran down a draw. I fired twice and thought I hit him but he kept on going."

Summoned by radio, 2d Lt. Robert E. Rintz, a new West Point shavetail, dashed out to the guard post and found the intruder hiding in a clump of bushes. "We searched him and found only personal effects (but) with him was about a month's supply of food, plus some water. We brought him back to the jeep, tied his hands and feet with our belts, and took him to the S–2 (Intelligence) at squadron headquarters. He was a small guy with a heavy beard, long hair and was really dirty, but when I first saw him all huddled up and pointed my pistol at him, I was scared. It's a good thing for him that he didn't try to run because I probably would have pumped every round into him."

To the veterans, Regular Army sergeants on their third or fourth tour of duty in Korea, "Joe" is a personal enemy. First Sgt. Kenneth C. Lovett, 30, and Sgt. Glen Mizer, 31, are two such veterans now leading the kids of Charley troop. One night recently they sat together in the mess hall, reminiscing. Mizer's boots and uniform were splattered with mud. He had just come off a stakeout—with five other men he had lain for 4 hours in the rain near the demarcation line in an unsuccessful attempt to ambush a North Korean agent. A taciturn man with blue eyes and thinning, sandy hair, who thinks a lot about his 14 head of Black Angus cattle back in Cumming, Ga., he listened to talkative Ken Lovett, a shrewd, impish West Virginian.

"When I came back this time," recalled Lovett, "the first time I went on observation post I wanted to shoot that North Korean patrol down there. But I got a wife and kids back home (in Bartley, W. Va.), and so I held my fire."

Lovett was a paratrooper with the 187th Airborne when they jumped into Munsan-ni in March 1951. "I got hit soon after that, and I went back, and I said then, 'I'll never see this place again.'" But now he is stationed just about 6 miles from the drop zone of 12 years ago, in low but precipitous hills that "remind me of West Virginia—and Kentucky."

"They don't remind me of north Georgia," Sergeant Mizer muttered.

"No, I'm just talking about the landscape, the mountains," said Lovett, as the other men laughed.

"During the war," Lovett continued, "I didn't have to carry a damn pass to look at 'em either. Now I gotta sign for a pass, let Joe spit in my eye, damn near, can't do a damn thing about it. Just sit there and take it. At least then, damn it, we could fight back. Now we can't do nothing but sit there and take it. Kid got killed up there. What can we do? Not a damn thing. Joe says, 'They have been punished, we don't know nothin' about it.' Yeah, they been punished. Probably got a damn medal."

Mizer, also a paratroop man, saved his words for when they were needed. A couple of days later he led a four-man patrol along Charley troop's section of the military demarcation line, a 6-foot-wide barbed-wire corridor that cuts across the Korean Peninsula. Two of his men were oldtimers who had worked with him often; but there was a new man along, Pfc. Herman Holt, a 19-year-old from Los Angeles, out on his first patrol in the demilitarized zone. A jeep took them into the zone and left them a few hundred yards south of the line. The sun beat down on deserted, overgrown rice paddies, and low scrub pine hills. An old farmers' road, now a byway for patrols by day and line-crossers by night, stretched ahead of the soldiers up a long valley to the north.

Mizer gathered his men around him. "We'll go out here 'till we hit the MDL (military demarcation line), and we'll turn left till we get to Virginia. Now, remember, if we make contact with one of Joe's patrols, we'll move to the south side. We'll stand there and let him pass. And I regret to say that if he spits on you, or anything like that, don't hit him, don't do nothing, let him go right on by. This is somethin' we gotta face, so we don't cause a—a riot here. If he tries to give you candy, propaganda booklets, don't let him do it. Keep your hands at your side."

In single file, they set off, Mizer in the lead. Behind him came Holt, Pfc. Steve Sutton, 21, a shy, stammering Negro from North Carolina, and Katusa Sgt. Yung-Ok Suh, 24. Mizer mispronounced the Korean's name. "Shoo's been with me for a long time. He's a good man." Sergeant Suh smiled; if he resented doing a privates job, he didn't show it.

"Joe can see us comin' right now, from that hill way up there," Mizer said. The men plodded on. In daylight, an invisible Joe held no terrors. Old, rusted barbed wire, shell cases, empty C-ration tins, cartridges, bits of wire—the miscellaneous debris of war—lay scattered along the path. But not in great amounts: scavengers, risking minefields and the bullets of patrols, have cleaned out most of it during 10 years of night prowling.

The Charley 3 patrol sloshed through a tiny brook, climbed along the side of a shale knoll, pushed through some willow branches.

A hundred yards before the MDL, Mizer halted. "You come up here at night, and if you've never been here before, you see that sign, you'll swear to God there's a man standing up there."

The sign that looks like a man was one of the 1,292 yellow markers along the 151-mile military demarcation line dividing North from South Korea, the line that starts at the Han River in the west, goes lengthwise through the center of the green baize-covered table of the Military Armistice Commission meeting room at Panmunjom, and then threads through the hills and valleys of Korea, northeast to the Sea of Japan. It represents the final line of contact when the guns stopped shooting, and it cuts a nation in two. No one knows how many men died within sight of it, how many shells exploded within sound of it, or how long the yellow signs will stay. The line is a frozen summary of a million defeats and victories. Each crimp in it, each loop, each corner, was drawn in blood. Yet there is no one who remembers the significance of each turning, and there are no monuments but the thickening underbrush, the wild deer and the mute yellow signs.

Across a narrow green valley, the men see a round, sandy hill, about 400 yards away, beetling down on them—Bunker Hill. Here occurred one of the heaviest sustained two-way artillery barrages of the Korean war: 32,000 rounds of American artillery on the Chinese attackers; 15,000 Chinese shells on U.S. marine positions along the ridge, all in one night. Hundreds of Chinese got through the barrage and breached the American lines twice. The Chinese attack continued all night, but the hill held, and hundreds of dead Chinese were visible on the forward slope at sunrise. Bunker Hill is quiet now, deserted. It lies just north of the demarcation line. Sergeant Mizer's patrol leaves it behind. There is some sagging barbed wire to straighten, a fence post to hammer into the ground with a rock, long stretches of knee-deep water to wade. Up a steep gully, guard post Laura comes into view.

Mizer calls a 5-minute halt, lets his men smoke.

Here, too, there are old bunkers, with rotting sandbags, and foxholes, half-filled in by earth and sand, more debris; cans, wire, frayed canvas. But the lush growth hides most of it. The path between the double barbed wire runs in and out of gullies, climbing up the south side of another rice-paddy valley.

LEISURE IN TEAHOUSES

Although the great majority of patrols and guard-post watches turn up nothing more serious than a scavenger or a few telltale footprints, the men and their commanders take them seriously—for that one-in-a-hundred chance. Only 35 percent of the men of the 9th Calvary are permitted to be away from their unit areas at any given time; only 15 percent can be out of the division area, that is, go as far as Seoul. Consequently, when the men do have leisure, they either go through the "moose gate" to the local village "teahouses" (registered with and inspected by division headquarters) or make their way to one of the recreation centers provided by the Army in all troop areas. There, they have bowling alleys, sports, libraries. There's a division baseball league (the 9th Cavalry is currently in last place with a one-and-nine record), and a weekly division newspaper keeps the men informed of the standings.

Since the Army decreed in 1961 that the traditional R. & R. leaves to Japan would be counted against a man's furlough time, the flow of GI's to Tokyo has dropped steadily. Only a couple of hundred go a month, most preferring to save their leaves for their return home. Consequently, the Korean Government hopes that its $5 million Walker Hill resort near Seoul will eventually pick up a large part of the annual $84 million the Army pays to its troops in Korea.

Originally planned to include a gambling casino and a more-or-less sanitary brothel, Walker Hill ran into trouble when U.S. 8th Army generals started having nightmares about congressional investigating committees. Under threat of being posted "off limits," the Walker Hill management quickly changed its plans, opened for business last spring with a very respectable—and quite scenic—establishment. There is no gambling, except for slot machines; no girls, not even cabaret dance partners, except for the women the customers bring in themselves. As a result, there are not many GI customers either for Walker Hill's five hotels (named Matthew, James, Douglas, Lyman, and Maxwell, for 5 of the U.S. generals who served in Korea), 12 private villas, swimming pool, restaurants, and bars overlooking the Han River. Nor for the gorgeous nightclub, which displays such modern conveniences as a ceiling gondola, in which a luscious showgirl rides, occasionally dropping balloons on the heads of American fighting men below.

Where time stands the stillest in Korea is at Panmunjom. Through 170 meetings of the full-dress military armistice commission, and thousands of lower level conferences of duty officers and secretaries, the two sides have almost never reached agreement on anything, except when to recess and when to meet next. The atmosphere was established when the signers of the armistice declined to shake hands with one another 10 years ago, and a cordial word has not been uttered across the table yet.

Of the 2,274 armistice violations charged against them by the United Nations command, the North Korean-Chinese side has admitted only two, both in 1953. As of the 170th meeting on May 27, the Communists had accused the U.N. command of 5,648 violations, of which the U.N. confessed 76. Latest U.N. "violation": an 8th Army helicopter that strayed into the north side of the DMZ on May 17, while checking zone markers, and was apparently shot down by North Korean gunners.

Urgent, repeated demands by the U.N. command failed to obtain the release of the two pilots aboard the chopper, although Marine Maj. Gen. George H. Cloud admitted an "honest mistake," and expressed regrets. Not until the end of June did the Communists acknowledge that the fliers were alive and in captivity. The Communists claimed the pilots were engaged in espionage (though they carried no arms, no camera). Since the pilots were "criminals," the Communists argued, the U.N. command had no right to demand their return. A trial seemed imminent. The names of Capt. Ben Stutts and Capt. Charleton Voltz may have to be added to the list of U.S. casualties in Korea.

In the operations room of Charley troop, the men for the midnight-to-dawn guard post shift come in to sign for their DMZ cards. A gin rummy game is in progress behind the counter. Sergeant Lovett is on duty; his badge of office, hanging from his belt, is the set of keys that will unlock the ammo supply room if necessary. "You know what I miss most?" he asks. "My 6-month-old daughter that I haven't seen yet. I was in Korea when my oldest was born too."

The radio in the corner hisses and crackles its familiar message: "This is Encourage 576 with an all-secure report. Over."

THE HERITAGE OF POPE JOHN

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, all of us in this body have been deeply moved, I know, by the passage of recent events within the Roman Catholic Church—by the death of Pope John XXIII, by the mounting evidence of the tremendous impact which his brief reign had on the church and on the whole world, and now by the succession to the throne of St. Peter of Pope Paul VI, who, we are told, is determined to continue in the tradition of his beloved predecessor.

The world is already coming to realize how deep and strong the heritage of Pope John runs. Indeed, in this time of flux and change in world affairs, we already may be witnessing a harvest of some of the fruits of his labor. Because his impact was so universal, it is not surprising that Pope John's magnificent contributions have been memorialized in the temporal as well as in the spiritual realm and by men of all faiths. I am particularly happy to call the attention of the Senate to one such memorial by one of our own colleagues, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL]. As a veteran of 7 years' service in the diplomatic corps, some of it behind the Iron Curtain, Senator PELL is well qualified to comment on the legacy of Pope John as a diplomat and peacemaker. As the Senator states, it was Pope John, more than anyone else, who restored the pursuit of peace to respectability and dignity.

It is entirely fitting—and again a tribute to Pope John's universality, that the comments of Senator PELL, an Episcopalian, should be published in America, the Catholic weekly review published by a group of Jesuit Fathers. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "The Heritage of Pope John," by Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, which appeared in the July 13, 1963, issue of America be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HERITAGE OF POPE JOHN

(By Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, of Rhode Island)

Pope John XXIII died on the evening following Pentecost Sunday. It is a day of high significance and joy in the Roman Catholic Church, and it was one of the Pope's favorites; for it commemorates the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the apostles—an act which gave deep spiritual expression to the church in its beginnings.

This year the Pope suffered through the Feast of Pentecost in agony. Yet he was able to rally from the threshold of death and give his special blessing to mankind. In doing so, he imparted his own spiritual meaning and the intensity of his dedication to the world at large.

The prayerful supplications of the thousands gathered to kneel in St. Peter's Square, the prayers of the millions outside of Rome, made him wish, not for his own life, but that copious favors would be granted to the work he had undertaken. He has left us a truly remarkable heritage, certainly the most remarkable of our particular times.

He understood them, the longing and need they imply. He could be politically sagacious to the point of shrewdness; but he was never dogmatic, and always the wisdom was tempered with humility and often with humor directed against himself. He could be almost worldly in demeanor, his eyes full of ebullient inner mirth: an old man enjoying a private jest with an old friend; but those same eyes could express all the authority and dignity of his eminent office. They could betoken an infinity of compassion, sadness, and pain; and when he knelt at the altar and his head, always a trifle bowed, bent lower, he seemed to personify the universal quest for religious truth which men and women of all faiths share—the ultimate, unbroken, serene, and profound communion between man and God.

His extraordinary versatility helped create a beloved image. Perhaps we ourselves laughed inwardly and with delight at the concept of a Pope, in his flowing robes and vestments, blessing a helicopter just landed in the Vatican courtyard, or gaily riding in a police launch while Patriarch of Venice, since a gondola was too oldfashioned a means of conveyance. Possibly we smiled at the picture of the white skull cap perched between the two monumentally grand ears, and the eyes seemed to return our amusement. "Oh Lord," said Pope John once, regarding his reflection, "this man will be a disaster on television." But then we remember the gnarled, short fingers touching the cross, the long vigil below the Vatican bedroom window, and the files of mourners paying their final homage under St. Peter's soaring dome. We feel the impact of immense loss.

Already broadcast to the world are the details of his life—from the humble birth of Angelo Roncalli on the farm in northern Italy through the procession of increasing responsibilities which he assumed. To one, such as myself, engaged in public life, the execution of these responsibilities—merely from a political standpoint—affords a source for stimulating study and inspiration. It is fascinating, for instance, to follow the germination of his ideals for a unified Catholic Church and their practical implementation, as he advanced from the office of Apostolic Visitor to Bulgaria, to Apostolic Delegate to Turkey and Greece and Administrator of the

Latin Vicariate of Constantinople. He tried ceaselessly in those years to establish improving accord between the Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox Churches. Gradually, through his unique blend of gentleness and firmness, and through the labyrinth of conflicting viewpoints and beliefs, his ideals took shape.

They reached fruition on a much broader scale when he summoned to Rome the first Ecumenical Council to be held in 92 years—not this time to deal with problems of doctrinal heresy or political enemies, as in the case of the only 20 previous councils to be convened over a period of nearly 20 centuries—but to examine boldly a new approach to religious harmony. He exhorted the 2,500 assembled bishops to conduct their discussions and debates in the name of holy liberty. Many opposed his ideals as overly liberal; many traditionalists will continue to oppose the sweeping changes he espoused. Nevertheless, in the Pope's own phrase, "a great echo" of approbation has been evoked. Its reverberations are worldwide.

Fascinating, too, is a study of his work as Papal Nuncio to Paris in the difficult days which brought World War II to its conclusion. With enormous tact he helped resolve the differences and the mutual antagonisms existing between the protagonists of Marshal Pétain and the liberating forces of General de Gaulle. Even that most controversial French leader could not but give his swift endorsement to Monsignor Roncalli, and when, in 1958, the future Pope was elevated to the College of Cardinals, he received his red biretta from Vincent Auriol, then President of the French Republic, in keeping with a custom which allows certain heads of state such privilege upon request.

The ceremony, I think, significantly demonstrates Pope John's talents as politician-diplomat-statesman, together with the respect and affection he engendered. He was able to succor hundreds of German prisoners of war in France without upsetting the delicate balance of his office; and he brought these same talents to his discussions with the Soviet Union and to his efforts to improve conditions behind the Iron Curtain. He has shown us that negotiation with the Communist world is not impossible, that it can lead, by a slow process of painstaking labor, to constructive results. Restrictions on the freedom of prelates in Hungary and Poland are being removed. Herein Pope John showed himself to be an astute realist. "False philosophic teachings," he said, "historically must submit to changes, even of a profound nature." He had the keenest appreciation of historic processes; he approached them as a scholar.

His emissaries, quite apparently, were conducting further explorations. We have caught glimpses of this through such reported Vatican contacts as those with Cardinal Wyszynski, Primate of Poland and undisputed courageous patriot; by the visits of Cardinal Koenig, Archbishop of Vienna, to Poland and Hungary; by indications that Cardinal Mindszenty, Primate of Hungary, may be allowed to leave his sanctuary in the U.S. Legation in Budapest; by the admission to the Pope's death chamber, at his own request, of Archbishop Slipyi, Primate of the Ukraine.

We can only speculate on these various deliberations and special missions; but they connote a sense of urgency and purpose. Undoubtedly they must be strenuously pursued if they are to succeed. They reveal, however, that Pope John was constantly probing for a means of easing tensions between East and West; and when the history of his reign is at last fully recorded, this aspect of it may well be seen as one of his major contributions.

"I have tried to preserve my calm and balance while investigating and evaluating things and persons about me, concerned more with what unites than with what divides." These eloquently direct words were the motivating force behind the Pope's every undertaking. They are at the root of his encyclicals: Mater et Magistra, in which he communicated the need for assistance to the impoverished, the distressed and underprivileged of all races and creeds; and Pacem in Terris, in which he addressed himself to the monumental task of creating a strong foundation for universal peace and enhanced international cooperation.

Most significant from the viewpoint of the basic survival of our civilization, is the extraordinary metamorphosis of the word peace during the period of Pope John's reign. He gave both eminent respectability and immense renewed dignity to a word which, upon his election, was being exploited by the Communists, by the Picasso dove, by the facsimiles his followers produced, and by such as Lord Russell.

Fifty-six months later, at the Pope's death, the pursuit of peace had become imbued with the deepest possible meaning and purpose. Bound as we were like lemmings upon paths of headlong destruction, all of us have now the inspiration to resume our search for the goals which he so held aloft.

The two encyclicals are without question among the Pope's most important legacies. They will be examined and reexamined by future generations, and especially by our own. They stand steadfast, true and beyond challenge. We cannot maintain, however, that the Pope alone has given us guidance toward these goals. Many others, during mankind's evolution, have shared in this continuing dialog to express our aspirations.

"Justice, then, right reason and humanity urgently demand that the arms race should cease." What lifts this language far beyond the ordinary is not the actual content—nor just the fact that it stems from a celebrated religious leader, nor that the source is surrounded by the pomp of traditional solemnity and the magnificence of architectural achievement. St. Peter's Square in Rome, with its wide-curving colonnade, the towering interior of the basilica, these are the arenas where the human voice is given opportunity for added consequence. But to me, the Pope's words possess their transcendent value when we view them in a less ornate framework. It was not a lofty, stone-carved balcony which projected Pope John's message and meaning to the world. It was the quietly spoken phrase, and the simple gesture of his hand.

"I am your brother," he said, "I am your parish priest." "I will be called John," he told the Sacred College of Cardinals on the October day in 1958 when he was elected and accepted the papal designation. "The name John is dear to me because it is the name of my father." (Wonderfully moving words, I think, almost heartbreaking in retrospect.) "It is dear to me because it is the title of the humble parish church where we received baptism," he explained. "It is the name which, in the long series of Roman pontiffs, has been most used. * * * We have preferred to shield the smallness of our own name behind this magnificent succession."

In our supposed modern sophistication, we have become wary of humility. Blow your horn, we are frequently and all too glibly instructed: you (or your product) will be accepted at face value; and all around us we are aware of aggressive individuals seeking to overtop other individuals, and aggressive nations striving to dominate and control. What a vast contrast when we confront the genuine and the real.

Pope John was an innovator. He elevated to cardinal the first Negro, the first Filipino, the first Japanese. He decentralized the authority of the Church by expanding the Sacred College to 82 members, with a non-Italian majority of 55. He created the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity as an official organ in Rome. He held many affectionate audiences with Jewish leaders, and the meeting between the Pope and the Archbishop of Canterbury was the first such encounter in more than five centuries. In turn, the standard of the archbishop was lowered to half-staff on Pope John's death—the first time an Anglican primate's flag had so been flown in tribute to the head of another church.

He was a gregarious man; he altered the custom that the Pope should eat alone, and dined with the administrative members of his household. He broke with tradition in making unscheduled visits outside the Vatican to orphanages and hospitals and jails, "You couldn't come to me," he once told a group of prisoners, "so I come to you." It was Christmastime.

Less than a month before he died he was presented with the renowned Balzan peace prize—worth $230,000, which he has set aside for a "perpetual fund in favor of peace." It was the first time ever that a Pope had received a peace award.

Each attribute of his personality has left us a legacy and a heritage. The politician-diplomat-statesman—working with care, with knowledge, with patience and fundamental assurance—has given us a new example, a renewed vision to follow. The scholarly cleric has opened new avenues for church reform, and, above all, church unity. The innovator, with his omnipresent humor and flair for the unpredictable, has taught us that these new avenues can be found, even in old age, even at death's door. The sufferer has shown us once again that "atrocious pain" can be made the springboard to human dignity.

We can surmise that the Pope's work was incomplete in his own eyes. Referring to the reconvening of the Ecumenical Council which had been planned for this coming September 8, and speaking directly to God in his private papers, the Pope wrote: "Will He concede me to finish it? Will He not concede this to me?" It remains for Pope John's successor to carry on his tasks. But what an enormous amount he accomplished during the apex of his life, and in less than a 5-year span.

These accomplishments would have been of lesser stature, of course, had the man responsible for them been austere or remote. We would not have remembered them as easily or with the same outgoing spirit of gratitude. Once overhearing a remark that he possessed the hands of a peasant, he took no offense. "Mine are the hands of a peasant," he is reported to have said later on. "It was such a nice compliment." Sotto il Monte—that was the town of his birth, in the shadow of the Alps. The words in Italian mean "under the mountain"—below it. The mind immediately conceives a symbol in refutation—yet the Pope loved his birthplace and in his earlier years returned often to it, as if the daily hard toil of the farmer refreshed him.

The gift of simplicity is, then, perhaps the greatest of all his legacies. Simplicity and greatness are rarely combined. Spiritual intent is the catalyst; and this, too, is rare enough, especially in 1963. Inescapably, no matter what our personal beliefs and religious preferences happen to be, we feel that Pope John was in close communication with his God. That is only part of the synthesis, however. To me the Pope's crowning attribute is that he was also in close communication with mankind—and that he carried the afflictions of mankind, all the divisive and discordant elements, not as a burden, not as a subject for attack and excoriation, but as a banner of hope.

IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on July 23, President Kennedy sent to the Congress a historic message recommending the removal from our basic immigration law of the national origins quota system. I was privileged to introduce a bill (S. 1932) to carry out the recommendations of the President, and Senators from both sides of the aisle have joined in cosponsoring this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the President's message be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF THE PRESIDENT'S IMMIGRATION MESSAGE TO THE CONGRESS, JULY 23, 1963

I am transmitting herewith for the consideration of the Congress, legislation revising and modernizing our immigration laws. More than a decade has elapsed since the last substantial amendment to these laws. I believe there exists a compelling need for the Congress to reexamine and make certain changes in these laws.

The most urgent and fundamental reform I am recommending relates to the national origins system of selecting immigrants. Since 1924 it has been used to determine the number of quota immigrants permitted to enter the United States each year. Accordingly, although the legislation I am transmitting deals with many problems which require remedial action, it concentrates attention primarily upon revision of our quota immigration system. The enactment of this legislation will not resolve all of our important problems in the field of immigration law. It will, however, provide a sound basis upon which we can build in developing an immigration law that serves the national interest and reflects in every detail the principles of equality and human dignity to which our Nation subscribes.

ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATION BASED ON NATIONAL ORIGINS

Present legislation establishes a system of annual quotas to govern immigration from each country. Under this system, 156,700 quota immigrants are permitted to enter the United States each year. The system is based upon the national origins of the population of the United States in 1920. The use of the year 1920 is arbitrary. It rests upon the fact that this system was introduced in 1924 and the last prior census was in 1920. The use of a national origins system is without basis in either logic or reason. It neither satisfies a national need nor accomplishes an international purpose. In an age of interdependence among nations, such a system is an anachronism, for it discriminates among applicants for admission into the United States on the basis of accident of birth.

Because of the composition of our population in 1920, the system is heavily weighted in favor of immigration from northern Europe and severely limits immigration from southern and eastern Europe and from other parts of the world. An American citizen with a Greek father or mother must wait at least 18 months to bring his parents here to join him. A citizen whose married son or daughter, or brother or sister, is Italian cannot obtain a quota number for an even longer time. Meanwhile, many thousands of quota numbers are wasted because they are not wanted or needed by nationals of the countries to which they are assigned.

I recommend that there be substituted for the national origins system a formula governing immigration to the United States which takes into account (1) the skills of the immigrant and their relationships to our needs, (2) the family relationship between immigrants and persons already here, so that the reuniting of families is encouraged, and (3) the priority of registration. Present law grants a preference to immigrants with special skills, education or training. It also grants a preference to various relatives of U.S. citizens and lawfully resident aliens. But it does so only within a national origins quota. It should be modified so that those with the greatest ability to add to the national welfare, no matter where they are born, are granted the highest priority. The next priority should go to those who seek to be reunited with their relatives. As between applicants with equal claims the earliest registrant should be the first admitted.

Many problems of fairness and foreign policy are involved in replacing a system so long entrenched. The national origins system has produced large backlogs of applications in some countries, and too rapid a change might, in a system of limited immigration, so drastically curtail immigration in some countries the only effect might be to shift the unfairness from one group of nations to another. A reasonable time to adjust to any new system must be provided if individual hardships upon persons who were relying on the present system are to be avoided. In addition, any new system must have sufficient flexibility to allow adjustments to be made when it appears that immigrants from nations closely allied to the United States will be unduly restricted in their freedom to furnish the new seed population that has so long been a source of strength to our Nation.

PROPOSAL IN DETAIL

Accordingly, I recommend:

First, that existing quotas be reduced gradually, at the rate of 20 percent a year. The quota numbers released each year would be placed in a quota reserve pool, to be distributed on the new basis.

Second, that native of no one country receive over 10 percent of the total quota numbers authorized in any 1 year. This will insure that the pattern of immigration is not distorted by excessive demand from any one country.

Third, that the President be authorized, after receiving recommendations from a seven-man immigration board, to reserve up to 50 percent of the unallocated quota numbers for issuance to persons disadvantaged by the change in the quota system, and up to 20 percent to refugees whose sudden dislocation requires special treatment. The immigration board will be composed of two members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two members appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and three members appointed by the President. In addition to its responsibility for formulating recommendations regarding the use of the quota reserve pool, the board will make a continuous study of our immigration policy.

ALL QUOTA NUMBERS USED

But it is not alone the initial assignment of quota numbers which is arbitrary and unjust; additional inequity results from the failure of the law to permit full utilization of the authorized quota numbers. While American citizens wait for years for their relatives to receive a quota, approximately 60,000 quota numbers are wasted each year because the countries to which they are assigned have far more numbers allocated to them than they have emigrants seeking to move to the United States. There is no way at present in which these numbers can be reassigned to nations where immense backlogs of applicants for admission to the United States have accumulated. I recommend that this deficiency in the law be corrected.

ASIA-PACIFIC TRIANGLE

A special discriminatory formula is now used to regulate the immigration of persons who are attributable by their ancestry to an area called the Asia-Pacific triangle. This area embraces all countries from Pakistan to Japan and the Pacific islands north of Australia and New Zealand. Usually, the quota under which a prospective immigrant must enter is determined by his place of birth. However, if as much as one-half of an immigrant's ancestors came from nations in the Asia-Pacific triangle, he must rely upon the small quota assigned to the country of his ancestry, regardless of where he was born. This provision of the law should be repealed.

OTHER PROVISIONS

In order to remove other existing barriers to the reuniting of families, I recommend two additional improvements in the law.

First, parents of American citizens, who now have a preferred quota status, should be accorded nonquota status.

Second, parents of aliens resident in the United States, who now have no preference, should be accorded a preference, after skilled specialists and other relatives of citizens and alien residents.

These changes will have little effect on the number of immigrants admitted. They will have a major effect upon the individual hardships many of our citizens and residents now face in being separated from their parents.

In addition, I recommend the following changes in the law in order to correct certain deficiencies and improve its general application.

1. Changes in the preference structure. At present, the procedure under which specially skilled or trained workers are permitted to enter this country too often prevents talented people from applying for visas to enter the United States. It often deprives us of immigrants who would be helpful to our economy and our culture. This procedure should be liberalized so that highly trained or skilled persons may obtain a preference without requiring that they secure employment here before emigrating. In addition, I recommend that a special preference be accorded workers with lesser skills who can fill specific needs in short supply in this country.

2. Nonquota status for natives of Jamaica, Trinidad, and Tobago should be granted. Under existing law, no numerical limitation is imposed upon the number of immigrants coming from Canada, Mexico, Cuba, Haiti, the Dominican Republic, the Canal Zone, or any independent country in Central or South America. But the language of the statute restricts this privilege to persons born in countries in the Caribbean area which gained their independence prior to the date of the last major amendment to the immigration and nationality statutes, in 1952. This accidental discrimination against the newly independent nations of the Western Hemisphere should be corrected.

3. Persons afflicted with mental health problems should be admitted provided certain standards are met. Today, any person afflicted with a mental disease or mental defect, psychotic personality, or epilepsy, and any person who has suffered an attack of mental illness, can enter this country only if a private bill is enacted for his benefit. Families which are able and willing to care for a mentally ill child or parent are often forced to choose between living in the United States and leaving heir loved ones behind and not living in the United States but being able to see and care of their loved ones. Mental illness is not incurable. It should be treated like other illnesses. I recommend that the Attorney General, at his discretion, and under proper safeguards, be authorized to waive those provisions of the law which prohibit the admission to the United States of persons with mental problems when they are close relatives of U.S. citizens and lawfully resident aliens.

4. The Secretary of State should be authorized, in his discretion, to require reregistration of certain quota immigrant visa applicants and to regulate the time of payment of

visa fees. This authority brings registration lists up to date, terminates the priority of applicants who have refused to accept a visa, and ends the problem of "insurance" registrations by persons who have no present intention to emigrate. Registration figures for oversubscribed quota areas are now inaccurate because there exists no way of determining whether registrants have died, have emigrated to other countries, or for some other reason no longer want to emigrate to the United States. These problems are particularly acute in heavily oversubscribed areas.

CONCLUSION

As I have already indicated the measures I have outlined will not solve all the problems of immigration. Many of them will require additional legislation; some cannot be solved by any one country. But the legislation I am submitting will insure that progress will continue to be made toward our ideals and toward the realization of humanitarian objectives. The measures I have recommended will help eliminate discrimination between peoples and nations on a basis that is unrelated to any contribution that immigrants can have and is inconsistent with our traditions of welcome. Our investment in new citizens has always been a valuable source of our strength.

NEW YORK TIMES DESCRIBES BEAUTY OF SLEEPING BEAR DUNES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, as each day passes, more and more people are visiting the Sleeping Bear Dunes area in Michigan and are recognizing that it has a unique beauty which deserves preservation.

The New York Times of July 28 has a most interesting story, "New Role Looms for the Sleeping Bear Dunes." I commend it to those who may not yet be familiar with this unequaled Great Lakes area, where the senior Senator from Michigan and I are urging the establishment of a national lakeshore.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article be inserted in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

New Role Looms for the Sleeping Bear Dunes

(By Damon Stetson)

Glen Haven, Mich.—Gordon Plowman, a tall, lean man wearing a soft, slouch hat, told us to hop into his balloon tire dunesmobile convertible. Then he headed westward along the shore of Good Harbor Bay and toward the massive Sleeping Bear Dunes.

We leaned back, tilted our faces skyward and breathed deeply of the cool, fresh air blowing off Lake Michigan. Mr. Plowman gunned the engine slightly as we zoomed onto the sand of the giant dune area, which towers 460 feet above the lake and extends 7 miles southward and 2½ miles inland. Riding the winding, twisting, dipping duneways was like a safari into an African desert without the heat.

Occasionally, we passed jagged skeletons of old cedars. Here and there, courageous and persistent poplars and cottonwoods pushed upward from the shifting sands, but mostly there were just acres of rolling dunes.

The dunesmobile swooped down into a valley and then swirled around a curve and into a sharp climb to an overlook point. As Mr. Plowman brought the vehicle to a quick stop, we suddenly found ourselves looking out over the bright blue lake and toward South Manitou Island.

BEACH BELOW

Mr. Plowman said we were 1,100 feet above sea level. The beach lay almost straight down—more than 665 feet below us.

The Sleeping Bear Dunes derive their name from an old Indian legend. Ottawa and Chippewa Indians, according to the tale, said that a black bear and her cubs once attempted to swim across Lake Michigan from the Wisconsin side.

As the bears drew close to the Michigan beach, the cubs grew tired and fell behind. The mother bear, however, continued to the beach and climbed to the top of a bluff to await her offspring. But they never made it.

Nowadays, a solitary dune covered with dark-colored vegetation is identified as the mother bear. Her ill-fated cubs, the legend says, were transformed into the forest-covered Manitou Islands (north and south), which lie a few miles offshore.

Our dunesmobile now headed inland, swooping and almost diving over sharp crests of whirling sands created by the winds from the lake. Suddenly, lying before us to the east, we saw the shimmering expanse of Glen Lake, nested in a forest of green. Then we turned northward, winding among junipers and birches that somehow had found life and sustenance amid the sands.

Pyramid Point was ahead, but we veered to the northeast through a narrow roadway cut out of thick, forested inland vegetation. A few minutes later, still tingling from the thrills of the exciting ride, we were back in Glen Haven and were thanking Mr. Plowman for showing us one of Michigan's most spectacular natural phenomena.

NATURAL LAKESHORE

The Sleeping Bear Dunes, long a tourist attraction, have assumed new significance as the result of two congressional proposals to create a national lakeshore in the area. The bill of Senators Philip A. Hart and Pat McNamara, both Democrats of Michigan, would establish a 77,000-acre national park development in the region. The park would extend from Crystal Lake, on the south, to a point north of Little Traverse Lake, on Good Harbor Bay.

Another bill, by Representative Robert P. Griffin, Republican, of Michigan, would provide a smaller lakeshore area taking in about 37,000 acres.

The Sleeping Bear Dunes region is one of 12 remaining portions of the Nation's shorelines that the National Park Service has designated as being "deserving of preservation by the Federal Government."

The Park Service cited a host of factors that make the sector one of the outstanding recreation and natural areas of the Great Lakes region. Among the factors it listed were the Sleeping Bear Dunes themselves, with the forest-covered Empire Dunes to the south, the miles of excellent sand beaches, the pine and oak forests of the Platte Plains, the giant cedars, dunes, and gull colony of South Manitou Island, the bogs, marshes, lakes and streams of the area, and the wide variety of plants, trees, birds, and wildlife.

BAYS, BLUFFS, BEACHES

The Sleeping Bear area lies almost due west of Traverse City, on the northwest coast of Michigan's lower peninsula. From Point Betsie to the south to Good Harbor Bay to the north, the proposed national lakeshore extends for about 37 miles along bays, bluffs, beaches, and dunes and across inland forests.

The National Park Service describes the area as both remote and accessible—remote in that its natural features are as yet untrammeled and accessible in that it lies within a day's drive of 20 million people in the populous Chicago-Detroit complex. It is 239 miles from Detroit, 294 from Chicago and 400 from Cleveland.

An unusual combination of scenic, scientific, and recreational features enhances the potential of the region of a national park, according to the Park Service.

The towering dunes themselves provide vantage points for viewing the bays and broad blue expanse of Lake Michigan, the green forests to the east and the attractive inland lakes. The beaches along Lake Michigan and the warmer ones inland, such as Platte and Glen Lakes, provides opportunities for boating, fishing, swimming, and water skiing.

The Platte and Crystal Rivers carry enough water for float trips by rowboat or canoe. The forest sections offer many areas suitable for the development of new campgrounds.

On the dunes themselves, erosion is continuing, so that the processes of headland dune formation can be studied firsthand. Geologists say that, at some stage in the distant past, a system of high perched dunes developed along the western face of the Sleeping Bear moraine.

SOLITARY SURVIVOR

The Sleeping Bear Dune itself is now the solitary survivor of this development.

As the moraine diminished to landward, however, the dunes were rejuvenated and blown over the lee, or northeast, slope of the moraine. That is where they lie today.

Although the region has rich possibilities as a national lakeshore open to all, the proposal has run into strong opposition from many local residents and owners of summer cottages. They are worried about visitors roaming indiscriminately on private properties in the region and about losses in tax revenues if the Park Service takes over.

Senator Hart emphasizes, however, that permanent private ownership of existing homes and resort property would be assured in the lakeshore region. Public use areas, he said, would be developed so as to insure privacy for home and cottage owners.

PRICE DISPUTE

In any dispute over the price of any property sold to the Government, Senator Hart explained, a fair market value would be determined, with full judicial protection. He estimates at about $4 million the cost of acquiring undeveloped land needed for public development within the boundaries of the proposed park.

The development proposal for the region would include a system of scenic drives around the high bluffs overlooking the inland lakes. Public use areas and campgrounds would be selected, Senator Hart said, so as to provide buffers to insure the privacy of existing cottages.

SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, there has come to my attention an editorial from the Pontiac (Mich.) Press of July 22 which expresses eloquently the reasons for the continuing widespread support in Michigan and throughout the Midwest for the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore development.

Efforts to preserve our national resources and to provide adequate recreational areas, not only for our generation but for those to come, always are controversial. But it is this very obligation we have to future generations that demands we seek equitable and fair solutions to these controversies.

S. 792, which Senator McNamara and I have introduced, contains many innovations by which both public and permanent private residential and commercial development in the Sleeping

Bear Dunes area can proceed together in the decades ahead.

One of these innovations is a provision for technical assistance to local counties and townships in obtaining the best land use and zoning assistance available in our country.

Special residential development areas, where new residential construction could go forward under provisions of local zoning ordinances, are provided for in this bill.

When I testified before the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee in March of this year, I indicated my support for a provision which would insure that local school districts which have bonding obligations would also be adequately protected in terms of any undue loss of school revenue.

These features, among others, for the proposed Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore which have been developed through private consultation and public meetings represent innovations by which there can be mixed public and private use of areas of special national significance.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Pontiac Press of July 22 be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Congressman Puts New Light on Controversial Dune Topic

The subject of our Sleeping Bear Dunes is so controversial, we'd like to reprint a quotation for the consideration of those who are opposed.

This comes from "Planning and Civic Comment," a quarterly publication, which is the official organ of "American Planning and Civic Association on State Parks."

The statement originated with John F. Shelley, Congressman from California, and we seize this brief excerpt from his bill "to establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people of our Nation." That in itself, is a powerful and suggestive statement.

A student in 2063 is asking a history professor about the people in the United States a hundred years before—in our day. The undergraduate inquires whether these "courageous, farsighted people ever stopped their continuous building of schools, highways, homes and playgrounds."

The professor replies:

"No, they never stopped. They were bold, ambitious, enterprising people—these energetic citizens of the sixties. They went right on building their schools, homes, highways, and playgrounds.

"But they were not so consumed with their own destiny—their own needs and ambitions—that they forgot about ours.

"They left us their spirit—they left us their natural resources—they even left us some of their wilderness as a reminder of our past and our heritage. This they inherited from those who went before them. This they preserved for us. This we must preserve, too."

The Press believes these people of a century hence—2063—deserve the fruits of current thought, consideration, and planning. They should expect a part of our heritage intact. The good of the masses is paramount. Future airports, highways, schools and parks must be planned and started now. And always—always they must inevitably occupy land that belongs to someone.

Can it be otherwise?

But picture the added cost, dislocation and hardships, if these steps were postponed a century.

And the State doesn't confiscate.
It pays its way—which is some mitigation.
We can't block progress.

RESOLUTION ON IMMIGRATION ADOPTED BY UNITED HIAS SERVICE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, for many years United HIAS Service has been in the forefront of efforts to put a just and reasonable immigration law on our statute books. They have done great things in helping to alert public opinion to the need for immigration reform, and share a major responsibility in generating the broadly based support for an immigration reform bill. I pay tribute to the fine record of United HIAS.

At their annual meeting this year, United HIAS adopted a timely and appropriate resolution on immigration. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this resolution be made a part of my remarks at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution on Immigration Adopted at Annual Meeting, United HIAS Service

Whereas for many years the members of United HIAS Service have been urging revision of the basic U.S. immigration and nationality law; and

Whereas there has been recognition by the U.S. Congress of continuing refugee needs by the passage of Public Law 87–510, for which we commend the Congress; and

Whereas this new legislation does provide for the permanent admission of certain categories of refugees outside of quota restrictions and, therefore, is an important forward step in our immigration policy, nevertheless, there has been no action on many of the issues which have been of continuing concern to our members: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the national origins quota system with its implications that some nations and races are superior to others, be abolished and instead, a method of reflecting American democratic concepts concerning the dignity and worth of the individual be incorporated into a new quota allocations system, including provisions for use of unused numbers each year;

That in such system due consideration should be given to family reunion, persons with outstanding skills urgently required by the United States; asylum for refugees, persecutees, and escapees, and finally, to immigrants who have no special ties in the United States, except their ardent desire to live in this free land; be it further

Resolved, That in carrying out our concept of the importance of close family ties, parents, grandparents of American citizens and legal resident aliens and spouses and minor children of legal resident aliens shall be granted nonquota status.

We are gratified by the introduction in the Senate, under broad sponsorship, of a bill designed to accomplish these objectives; be it further

Resolved, That provisions for deportation of aliens be revised so as to eliminate what is basically a double punishment for transgressions; be it further

Resolved, That except for cases of fraud, there shall be no distinction between naturalized and native-born citizens.

We therefore urge upon the membership of United HIAS Service that representations be made to their Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States, to take such appropriate action which would in no way jeopardize our national interest, yet would infuse our immigration and nationality laws with the cherished humanitarian and democratic principles of our Nation, and set an example of leadership in the free world.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF YESTERDAY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, recently Frederick D. Mott, M.D., executive director of Detroit's Community Health Association was a speaker at the meeting of the Third National Congress on Voluntary Health Insurance and Prepayment in Chicago on February 15, 1963. His observations, I believe, will be of interest to the Congress. For this reason I ask that they be made part of the Congressional Record.

The Community Health Association is a medical care plan which has been functioning in the Detroit area for more than 2 years. It is providing thoroughly satisfactory service to a membership which now exceeds 50,000 people. It is growing steadily and has been recognized as a plan available to Federal employees in Detroit. Additionally, Dr. Mott is also president of the Group Health Association of America which represents the medical plans, cooperatives, unions, and others interested in progress in this field.

There being no objection, the observations were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Accomplishments of Yesterday—Independent Programs

(By Frederick D. Mott, M.D., president, Group Health Association of America, Inc.)

Rather than confusing you with a mass of detail about the whole heterogeneous grouping of so-called independent programs, all of those not comprising the Blue plans or insurance company plans, I wish to confine my remarks at this opening session to the direct service, group practice-prepayment plans. As of 1961, upward of 4 million persons were served by these plans of some 10 million in the whole independent plan category.

Direct service plans have their roots far back in our history. George Washington engaged a physician to take care of the people on his estate for £15 a year. The 19th century saw the development of many plans to bring medical care to isolated miners and lumbermen. The employees and management of the Southern Pacific Railway established a program in 1869 that became the forerunner of numerous railway medical and hospital care programs. The Union Health Center set up by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union in 1913 paved the way for today's 65 or more union health centers. The Ross-Loos medical group in Los Angeles broke new prepayment ground in 1929 as a physician-sponsored plan. The first consumer-cooperative prepayment plan was also started in 1929, in Elk City, Okla.

Though the roots of the group-health movement are deep, its major growth has come since the late thirties and particularly since World War II. This growth in recent times is a direct reflection of some of today's major trends in medical care. Among these trends are the remarkable, continuing advances in medical science; the seemingly endless increase in specialization; rising medical care costs; an aging population and increase in chronic illness that are changing the role of medicine; and the increasing demand for broader health insurance coverage in the face of a declining supply of physicians.

These trends point up the need to broaden the availability of all new services, to provide for coordination of services and for continuity of responsibility in the care of the patient, and to conserve our limited medical resources.

Such challenges call for bold new approaches. Today we have a growing group of direct service plans that are making the fruits of medical science more fully available without money barriers, that are bringing order out of the chaotic burgeoning of medical specialization, that are facilitating the long-term medical management of the aging or chronically ill person by his personal physician backed up by an organized medical team that shares his responsibility, and that are achieving the economies and efficiencies of group medical practice at a time when doctors and other health workers are in increasingly short supply.

These group practice-prepayment plans have widely varying sponsorship and differing patterns of facilities and services. They are quite similar, however, in their basic approach. They provide positive health programs, not simply insurance against some of the costs of illness. They offer comprehensive services in the office, home, and hospital. Their philosophy is to promote health, to prevent illness, to detect disease early, to give definitive treatment, and to minimize the effects of inevitable illness or disability. These plans place a great deal of emphasis on quality of care and look to group practice as one of the most consistent ways of assuring high-quality service. Finally, these plans are oriented to the consumer while protecting the role of the physician, and many believe that overall policies should be primarily under consumer or community control.

Let me touch briefly on the programs we are discussing. The two largest, of course, are the Kaiser-Permanente plans on the west coast and Hawaii, and the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York.

The Kaiser Foundation Health Plans with their associated Permanente Medical Groups and their unique network of hospitals and clinics now serve close to 1 million people. Flexibility of approach is maintained, with contract benefits varying from comprehensive to somewhat limited, and with the principle of dual or multiple choice being emphasized, The rate of growth of this program seems to be limited only by the deliberate rate at which new facilities are added—facilities, by the way, that are paid for almost entirely out of the prepayment mechanism. The popularity of the program has been reaffirmed in recent years by the way Federal employees have joined in large numbers.

Health Insurance Plan, directed by a community board which includes a number of distinguished physicians, presents a quite different picture. Here some 650,000 people are served by family doctors and specialists in 32 medical groups. The medical services provided are very broad in scope and are rendered with practically no extra charges. Subscribers carry separate hospital care insurance, usually Blue Cross, and hospitalization is in various New York area hospitals where group physicians can obtain privileges. Noteworthy in Health Insurance Plan are the interest in medical care research and the searching explorations of quality of care that have been undertaken. As an indication of trends, Health Insurance Plan participates in the multiple choice program for State as well as Federal employees.

Other group practice-prepayment plans are scattered around the country—among them are the San Diego Health Association, the Ross-Loos Medical Group in Los Angeles, Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound with its own hospital in Seattle, Group Health Plan in St. Paul, a considerable number of railway employee hospitals and clinics, the Elk City, Oklahoma Community Hospital-Clinic, the Labor Health Institute in St. Louis, the Union Health Service in Chicago, the Community Health Association in Detroit, the hospitals for Spanish-American associations in Tampa, the Miners Memorial Hospitals and a number of clinics serving primarily coal miners, Group Health Association in Washington, the Endicott-Johnson program in Binghamton, N.Y., and a large number of labor health centers that concentrate particularly on preventive, diagnostic, and other ambulatory services.

A forerunner of things to come, with still another form of sponsorship to add to the widely varying sponsorship of the list of plans just given, is seen in the new prepaid group practice plan entered into jointly by New York Medical College-Flower Fifth Avenue Hospitals and the hotel industry and employees in New York City. I believe nine other group centers are projected and that one or more other medical schools may cooperate in this significant program, assuring the sort of built-in quality controls informed consumers are seeking. A number of our medical schools across the Nation, concerned about their teaching resources, are showing interest in the potentialities of a steady clientele of patients linked to the university medical centers through prepayment.

While relatively new as a major force, the growing group practice-prepayment movement is achieving results that deserve serious study by all those looking for solutions to today's perplexing problems of medical care. I wish to deal briefly with certain of these results.

Through these programs several million people have easy access to all of the essential services provided by personal physicians and specialists, not just in the hospital but in the office and home as well, services that typically comprise preventive, diagnostic, therapeutic, and rehabilitative services. As a rule, the obtaining of personal preventive services is positively stimulated. Some restriction in psychiatric services is one of the few limitations often encountered in these plans. Extra charges, if any, are designed to supplement revenues rather than to act as deterrents to needed care.

The thorough study issued by the United Steelworkers in 1960 explored the value of various medical care contracts in meeting costs. They estimated that under the Kaiser plan the costs of 93 percent of physicians' services were being met as compared with 52 percent for Blue Shield and from 46 to 50 percent for commercial insurance. They estimated further that under group practice plans some 80 percent of currently insurable costs are covered as compared with some 60 percent for standard United Steelworker plans. An earlier study, by the Health Information Foundation, showed that HIP was paying 80 percent of the gross costs of physicians' services as compared with 59 percent for Group Health Insurance, New York City's free choice, comprehensive care plan. Another measure of broad coverage is found in the recent Columbia University study, "Family Medical Care Under Three Types of Health Insurance." Families in the Kaiser plan had out-of-pocket family care expenses amounting to almost $50 less than families in the New Jersey Blues and $35 less than in the General Electric comprehensive-major medical plan.

In addition to providing broader coverage at competitive rates, these direct service plans have built-in governors that resist rising costs. These are found partly in the group practice framework with its economies, its budgetable expense for the services of doctors on salary or sharing partnership income, and its system of incentives that differ from those of the solo practitioner on fee for service. Within this framework and that of a broad ambulatory service, there is evidence of some sort of governor holding down increasingly expensive hospital utilization and surgical care.

In 1961 Blue Cross plans nationally had to pay for an average of 1,103 days of care per 1,000 persons. That same year the enrollees in the Kaiser plan in northern California used 614 days, members of Group Health Association in Washington, D.C., used 625 days, and members of Group Health Cooperative in Seattle used 569 days per 1,000.

Since almost all Health Insurance Plan subscribers have Blue Cross coverage for hospital care, special studies are required to learn their hospital utilization experience. One study showed Health Insurance Plan families using 20 percent less hospital care than Blue Shield subscribers in New York City. A second study showed Health Insurance Plan experience at 410 days in contrast to 870 days per 1,000 for Group Health Insurance. A third study, involving ILGWU members, revealed an adjusted rate of 744 days per 1,000 for Health Insurance Plan and 955 for Group Health Insurance. The United Steelworkers' experience was 570 days for Kaiser subscribers, 1,032 days for the Blues, and 1,167 days for commercial insurance. Our new CHA program in Detroit is operating at a utilization rate some 25 percent below that of Michigan Blue Cross.

These numerous factual studies are not invalidated by the recent Columbia study showing approximately the same amount of hospital care being used by samples of Kaiser, New Jersey Blue Plans, and G.E. major medical subscribers. In the preface, Dr. Trussell states that the study "indicated that the more comprehensive the coverage, the greater the use of physicians; yet such accessibility did not push the in-hospital utilization by the Kaiser plan subscribers above that of the other plans." In this study total family outlays for medical and hospital care, both premiums and out-of-pocket expenses, adjusted for area price differences, were lowest for the Kaiser sample. Dr. Trussell writes "* * * the present study has strengthened the 'cost containment' data supporting the trend toward hospital-based group practice * * *."

Having mentioned surgical care as an element of cost control, let me simply say briefly that studies by the Health Information Foundation, the Steelworkers, and the United Mine Workers Welfare Fund have shown sharply reduced surgical rates in the prepaid group practice settings in Health Insurance Plan, Kaiser, and the mine workers program.

This brings me to the subject of quality of care. Those of you who have tried know how hard it is to measure. We proponents of group practice-prepayment are convinced that our programs lead to improved quality of care, a conviction that admittedly must be subjected to new and better methods of analysis in the coming years. In the meantime there are good reasons for our conviction—careful selection of group physicians, performance of specialized services by those trained in such skills, medical staff organization for ambulatory as well as institutional practice, the ever-present judgment of one's peers, easy consultation without economic hindrance, opportunities for teaching and research, adequate and accessible diagnostic facilities, provision for leisure time and vacations, and review of performance by outside authorities. There have been studies—and more are needed—dealing with the percentage of subscribers having a personal doctor, the percentage of youngsters under regular pediatric care, and the percentage seeing a doctor during the year. Of perhaps more compelling significance would be more studies aimed at measuring health improvement, such as the perinatal mortality studies in New York City that showed Health Insurance Plan in such a favorable light.

These group practice plans are achieving results and they will grow and spread because they are in tune with the times. The very technology of medicine, in rapid evolution and with no pause in sight, is forcing the accelerating development of group medical practice. The growing shortage of physicians will further speed this trend. Interest is growing among the private group clinics, as well as the medical schools, in a mutually helpful rapprochement with labor and other consumer groups seeking to obtain broader health benefits at a supportable, reasonably controllable cost. Consumer-oriented group practice-prepayment recognizes the legitimate interests of those who use and pay for the services, and of those professional persons who provide the services. These plans are in line with current trends in medical care, they are in tune with the 1960's, and they are on the move.

CONGRESS NEEDS REFORM

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on August 2, 1946, the 79th Congress passed a Legislative Reorganization Act which, in title I, part 3, section 132, provided:

> Except in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President, the two Houses shall adjourn sine die not later than the last day (Sundays excepted) in the month of July in each year, unless otherwise provided by the Congress.

This year Congress will once again stay in session far beyond this date July 31. We have acted on only a small, relatively unimportant part of the business before us. Important bills have received little attention. One reason for this is dilatory tactics made possible by our anachronistic rules of procedure.

Even as so little business has been done on the Senate floor, so many of our committees have proceeded at a more than leisurely pace. We are all aware of the inaction of some committees on key bills.

Other ills have plagued this body for a number of years. Working against efficiency and decisive action, they have reduced the Senate to its present state.

Our increasing ineffectiveness has not gone unnoticed. Many newsmen and news commentators have pointed this out to the public. Indeed, this session of Congress has unfortunately provided many commentators with a great deal of material.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record several recent articles on this unfortunate situation.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 10, 1963]

Time for Reform—Congress Must Seize the Initiative

(By Roscoe Drummond)

A veteran of the House of Representatives who is retiring undefeated from one of the largest States remarked in private conversation the other day: "In all my 15 years in Congress I have never been able to devote more than one-tenth of my time to doing what I was primarily elected to do—help shape the laws of the land."

The able and respected chairman of one of the Senate's many investigating committees raised his arms in despair the other evening and exclaimed: "The executive has become so big that we [the Congress] have simply lost control. We can't review it adequately; we can't check it adequately; we just don't know what it is doing."

And this: Congress never gives one look at the massive and mounting Federal budget as a whole. It looks at it piecemeal but never in toto. It appropriates piecemeal without ever putting the parts together to know what it is doing, then it abandons responsibility for continuous, overall review—despite the fact that its own rules call for such review.

What do these facts (and others like them) really mean? They mean that the congressional minutiae so gobble up the time of individual Members of Congress that they can't do their primary work; that even the best congressional investigating committees are no longer able to oversee how the executive is carrying out the congressional will; that as the Federal budget grows, Congress is steadily losing control, even losing sight, of what is going on.

The need for congressional reorganization to modernize its creaking, Model-T machinery is no longer seriously questioned. The need is to enable the Congress to lay hold of the means and procedures to transact the public business efficiently and responsibility and to capture its eroded authority.

Fortunately, the prospects for such reorganization are looking up. One step is the bipartisan resolution introduced by Senator Clifford Case, Republican, of New Jersey, and Senator Joseph Clark, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, to create a Commission on Congressional Reorganization to study and propose needed reforms.

Public hearings will be held shortly by a Senate Rules Subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator Carl Hayden, Democrat, of Arizona, aided by a specially appointed staff counsel, former Representative Hugh Alexander, of North Carolina.

Reflecting the almost unanimous endorsement of those in private life who know most about the Congress, the volume of correspondence which Senator Case has had from political scientists is particularly revealing.

Senator Case has received 195 letters from specialists in government. Of these, 160 strongly approve the move for congressional reform, none is opposed, 35 are noncommittal. Eighty-two percent of the letters consider the proposed study very timely and necessary, and hope it will succeed. Some of the specific comments and suggestions are these:

The Commission should focus on this central question: How can Congress remain an independent, productive, efficient, and creative branch of Government?

Many contend that Congress is not measuring up to its potential and to public expectations.

The statement that "congressional reform is long overdue" repeatedly occurs in the letters.

"Congress is in for rough sledding in the coming months and years," one of the political scientists writes. "Unless Congress moves to reform itself, that criticism will grow. Now is the time to begin study of reform so as to bring Congress up to date before even more power passes to the executive branch and before the image of Congress drops further in the minds of our people."

Wouldn't it be well if Congress paused in trying to reform everybody else and took a clear look at its own shortcomings—and did something about them?

[From the Asbury Park (N.J.) Press Intelligence, July 1, 1963]

Senate Reform

A frequent criticism voiced by visitors to the gallery of the U.S. Senate is that the Senate appears to be doing nothing. It is a valid judgment. The fact is that for most of the time, the Senate is in session urgent public business is sidetracked by speeches that have no relation to the subject at hand and more often than not only a handful of Senators is available to maintain the myth that the Senate is the greatest deliberative body in the world.

The move to impose a rule of germaneness under which at least 4 hours a day would be reserved for Senate debate which sticks to the subject at hand deserves far more support than prior attempts have attracted. Senator Case of New Jersey, long an advocate of reform in congressional rules, has persisted in seeking to make some of them effective. The recent resolution by 31 Senators calling for the rule of germaneness should encourage Senator Case to carry on his efforts.

The most frequent impression reported by high school students after their first visit to see Government in action deals with the discovery that seats in the Senate are vacant with one or two Members droning along for the purpose of entering into the Record views and opinions for home consumption. Recently Senator Douglas had to wait 2 hours to speak on President Kennedy's area redevelopment proposal because of interruptions completely foreign to the pending business.

The rule of germaneness is needed if only to save the Senate from its declining reputation as a legislative body. Enough Senators should appear on the floor and stick to the issue until the rule is accepted.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, July 17, 1963]

Congress Needs Reform

Congress is facing a record legislative logjam, and it may be a poor time to suggest consideration of measures not already high on its priority list. Yet it would be a serious mistake to ignore a warning given a few days ago by a bipartisan group of legislators. The gist of this is that Congress should move now for a comprehensive overhaul of its machinery or risk total eclipse in national affairs.

It is painfully evident that Congress is wallowing in a slough of impotency. It has moved at snail's pace in the last 6 months. Major portions of President Kennedy's program have not reached the floor of either chamber. Committee work on tax cut and foreign aid bills, to mention only two measures, is behind schedule, and a rocky road is ahead for civil rights proposals. The customary adjournment target, Labor Day, has been virtually abandoned; most Members think they will be lucky if they get home by Thanksgiving, and it could be much later.

Against this background Senator Case, of New Jersey, told a rules subcommittee that Congress is so bogged down in cumbersome procedures that "the executive and judicial branches have had to take over primary responsibility for conducting the Nation's business." Senator Keating of New York, backed him up, and added: "This is not simply the result, as some contend, of a desire on the part of strong Chief Executives and Chief Justices to assume great power; in major respects Congress itself must bear the blame for its declining role."

It is significant that a prominent place among the critics was taken by Senator Monroney, of Oklahoma, coauthor of the La Follette-Monroney Act of 1946. This was the last major reorganization of Congress, and it must be said that the effects have to a considerable extent worn off. Mr. Monroney favors a vast overhaul, to be brought about after a study by a special joint Senate-House Committee. Senators Case and Clark, of Pennsylvania, have suggested this course.

Senator Case also has proposed a commission of three Senators, three Representatives and six outside experts appointed by the President, but, as Mr. Monroney notes, this is open to the criticism that the Executive would be invading the field of congressional prerogative. The 1946 act was drafted by a Senate-House committee with a staff of experts. While it brought about many needed reforms, it could not get at several evils that still plague Congress—the filibuster, the seniority system and the inordinate power of the House Rules Committee to block legislation.

Whatever the body chosen to make the study, it could well give thought to a recent proposal by Columnist Walter Lippmann. Mr. Lippmann suggested that "the most important and most needed reform would be a rule that measures proposed by the President must, if he labels them urgent, be reported out of committees within a certain time and brought to a vote within a certain time." This gets to the heart of the matter. There is no logical reason why the Nation cannot get prompt action—either yes or no—on an administration proposal. A mere handful of legislators, often responding to sectional pressures, now can cause interminable delays.

The country can no longer afford the luxury of a Congress like the current one is showing itself to be at this session. It is true that the President represents the country as a whole and Congress, in a manner of speaking, its separate parts. Yet Congress has been able to form a national consensus in times of clearly defined peril. What levers can be used to bring about a similar consensus in times of relative peace? The progress of civil rights legislation may well show the scope of the problem; Congress had better start looking into it at once.

[From the Washington Post, July 2, 1963]

Ball-and-Chain Congress

Congress took a fleeting look at its creaking and outmoded machinery last week and then went on another vacation. There was no direct connection between the 1-day hearing on organization problems conducted by a Senate Rules subcommittee and the suspension of all major business for an extended Fourth of July holiday. But the coincidence once more highlights the disturbing incapacity of Congress to meet its obligations and the great reluctance of the leaders to do anything about it.

Senator KEATING told his colleagues that "in major respects Congress itself must bear the blame for its declining role." Instead of being a responsive instrument of the national will, Congress too frequently serves as a ball-and-chain on the leg of national progress. To our way of thinking, Senators CLARK, MONRONEY, CASE, BARTLETT, and KEATING made a powerful case for the appointment of a study group that would seek out the causes of congressional ineffectiveness, as did the La Follette-Monroney committee during the 1940's. But Chairman HAYDEN, of the Rules Committee, adjourned the hearing without fixing a date for its resumption, and fear is being expressed in the cloakrooms that nothing will be done. Congressional apathy is nowhere more profound than in the sphere of injecting new life and more efficiency into Congress itself.

Meanwhile the outlook for the current session becomes increasingly discouraging. Many of the important bills which the administration has recommended to Congress are apparently to be quietly discarded without so much as a committee report or a vote on them. Several high-priority bills are stalled in the House Rules Committee despite the reform that was supposed to have been imposed on that mortuary squad last January.

In 6 months of much talk and legislative meandering Congress has passed only a few minor bills. Most of the topflight measures in the administration's program are still moving sluggishly, or not at all, within the committee structure. As Senator MONRONEY noted, the all-important task of legislation occupies only a minor portion of Congressmen's time. The two Houses are toying with a thousand things without the wit or the discipline to focus their efforts upon major tasks or to pursue a systematic agenda.

No Member of Congress can safely be indifferent to this state of affairs. The legislative branch is bringing disrepute upon itself by slavishly clinging to a stale traditionalism in the atomic age. If this condition is allowed to worsen, the first question to be asked a Congressman returning to his home district may well be, "What have you done to relieve Congress of its ball-and-chain?"

[From the Daily News, June 18, 1963]

Capitol Stuff

(By Ted Lewis)

WASHINGTON, June 17.—As might have been expected, congressional reaction to the Supreme Court's anti-Lord's Prayer decision today was most bitter. It appeared from the comment that Congress was in a fighting mood, determined to curb the Court's powers one way or another.

This is a laugh. This Congress is incapable of anything but negative obstructionism. It is not only dull but inept, and is operating sluggishly under the most mediocre politicians gathered under one tent in decades. For these reasons all the present talk about a constitutional amendment to nullify the school prayer edict is just talk. It will never be anything more.

In contrast to the low state the legislative branch of Government has fallen into, let's give the Supreme Court devil his due. However much many Americans detest certain controversial decisions of the Warren Court, the Court has two attributes which Congress lacks: It has been exciting, not stodgy and it has the guts to take a stand, no matter how unpopular one of its verdicts may be.

What Congress knows is that its own failure to function, while the judiciary branch functions positively and with derring-do, is at the heart of most of the slurs now being aimed at the High Court.

In this exercise in frustration came such spewings-forth today as the damning by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, of the "eight silly old men" who decided the school prayer case. And, of course, in this same category belongs the proposal by Representative ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, Republican, of Wisconsin, that Congress name a board of psychiatrists to give the Court mental tests.

Now that the Court has closed up shop for the summer, leaving the flames of controversy over its behavior higher than ever, it is pertinent to take a good close look at the remarkable switch in governmental processes that has developed in recent years.

When the Constitution was written, the first three articles provided that the legislative powers be vested in Congress, the executive power in the President, and the judicial powers "in one Supreme Court."

If one of these three coequal branches appeared most certain through the years to be more dull, dignified and of less consequence than any other, it was clearly the judiciary. And, by and large, this was true until the Warren Court arrived 10 years ago and tackled dramatically the civil rights issue.

URGE ACTION BEFORE IT'S TOO LATE

Almost coincidentally came the decline in the legislative branch, which has now reached the point where the experts are suggesting that Congress needs to be retooled before it is too late.

There is no dispute right now that the Court has the power to act or the President the power to carry out his constitutional authority or that they do so with a certain efficiency and positiveness. On the other hand, Congress has gradually begun to lose its ability to originate and enact according to its legislative powers and has moved toward a negative stance, capable only of vetoing or compromising what the administration proposes.

How Congress got that way is a long and involved story, but the present situation, concerning President Kennedys' forthcoming civil rights legislative program, points up the heart of the problem.

Because of antiquated rules, committees controlled by aged and often doddering southerners can box up legislation. One-third of the Senate can filibuster a bill to death. But as Kennedy said the other day, "An administration must bill, can well have the support of a majority of the Members of either House but, because of parliamentary procedure, may never be voted on."

NEITHER PARTY HAS VIGOROUS LEADERS

Besides this stubborn adherence to a seniority system which should have gone out with McKinley, this Congress is virtually leaderless—in both parties. Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK and Senate Democratic Leader MIKE MANSFIELD lack the drive to keep Members in line. Similarly, House GOP Leader CHARLES HALLECK and Senate Republican Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN can control their party membership only part of the time. Generally, on a big issue they can speak only for themselves.

So here we have a Congress which for 5 months has fiddled around with a tax reduction bill and still has not got it out of the House Ways and Means Committee, where such legislation must originate. And Congress has yet to act on the foreign aid issue or on any other key measures which must establish its record of accomplishment.

Yet these same legislators find it easy to tee off at the Supreme Court, while it is actually high time they set their own house in order.

Congressmen such as ELLENDER and O'KONSKI could better have said it would be most proper at this time for a board of psychiatrists to give mental tests to the "silly old men" responsible for the decrepit functioning of House and Senate.

EACH HOUSE HANDCUFFED BY PROCEDURE

They know, obviously, that what political scientists such as Prof. Edgar W. Waugh, of Michigan, say about Congress is true. "Each House," say Waugh, "has become, so to speak, a prisoner of procedures which are patently out of step with the swift tempo of the nuclear space age. This needs to be corrected and quickly."

Senator CLIFFORD CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, recently polled more than 200 political scientists on what is the matter with Congress. The generalized response was that Congress has begun to lose its standing in the public mind as an effective arm of the Government.

And Congress, as usual, is doing nothing about recovering its lost status. But, as usual, it takes violent exception to acts of the judiciary and executive branches, even though it knows it is powerless to curb them because it cannot even run itself properly.

Edward P. Morgan and the News

(By American Broadcasting Co.)

A fellow has to wonder now and then what it really would take to get Congress moving. An earthquake? War? A Profumo-type scandal in the Cabinet? The country is crawling with crises but Capitol Hill is not the place to measure them.

With more dawdling than deliberate speed, the Senate and House are sidling up to the fresh packet of civil rights bills as if they half-suspected the whole issue were a false alarm. Key officials of the executive branch were staggered in an emergency meeting with the Democratic congressional leadership on Wednesday on the railway crisis to discover that virtually nobody had given serious thought to what kind of special legislation might be required, what the precedent of compulsory arbitration—the most widely mentioned procedure—really meant and what the political and economic impact of such action might be. Unless something far more hopeful emerges from the fact-finding labors of the emergency four-man panel than appeared likely today, Congress will be confronted with the added crushing burden by July 29 of legislative action to break the labor-management deadlock on the railroads over work rules and expendable jobs.

But it already has a massive backlog of unfinished business. In a careful survey on congressional inactivity over a veritable armada of becalmed bills, the Wall Street Journal reported Tuesday that "no Congress since World War II * * * has talked so much while translating so few Presidential proposals into victories or defeats. As a result nearly all the President's bills are dangling in limbo."

The lawmakers have even faltered in one of their favorite pastimes—congressional inquiries. The Wall Street Journal pointed out that Tennessee Senator Kefauver's Antitrust Subcommittee has not yet issued its findings on the investigation of price-fixing by electrical manufacturers which it made 2 years ago. Nor has Senator McClellan's investigating subcommittee come up with a report on its probe of the Billie Sol Estes scandal, to say nothing of any summation of last year's hearings on alleged profit-pyramiding in the aircraft and missile industry.

Recipes for congressional reform are a dime a dozen. Many responsible speeches have been made and scores of bills drafted to quicken the sluggish legislative pulse. But Congress—to change the figure of speech—is not likely to scrape the barnacles off its august bottom just for the exercise. In fact the amount of self-serving cargo that legislators manage to load upon it is sometimes appalling.

Once, not so long ago that it is ancient history, a Congressman appeared before the House Rules Committee on behalf of a certain bill. "I want you gentlemen to know," he told his colleagues on that key body, "that I support this legislation because I have a personal financial interest in it." This particular public servant was later caught up in the toils of the law—not because of his candor as a witness but because of the deviousness in which he used his elective office for personal gain in promotion schemes. He is not, of course, typical of congressional standards of behavior and yet it cannot be denied that those standards are shockingly low—so low that some observers have questioned Congress capability to function on grounds of public morality—or immorality—alone.

Capitol Hill may not be all that demoralized and as Time Correspondent Neil MacNeil points out in his recent book, "The Forge of Democracy," a study of the House, Congress over its many decades—lest we forget—has reflected "the whole people, their weaknesses as well as their strengths, their foolishness as well as their wisdom, their prejudices as well as their tolerances, their fears as well as their courage."

That being undeniably the case, it behooves the public then, assuming hopefully that it is at least a little dissatisfied with its own image as Congress reflects it, to demand some changes. Public pressure for reform is one of the vital ingredients lacking. A handful of public-spirited Members of Congress—notably including Republican Senator Clifford Case of New Jersey and Democratic Senator Joseph Clark of Pennsylvania—have tried to build up a head of steam for action but the response of their colleagues has been less than breathtaking. On June 28, Senator Carl Hayden of Arizona, chairman of a Subcommittee on Senate rules, held a 1-day—repeat, 1-day—hearing on the subject.

The canny octogenarian who is also the seniority—and prestige—conscious chairman of the vastly important Senate appropriations committee, first tried to bury his 1-day exercise on reforms even deeper by scheduling it right after the Memorial Day weekend when virtually no Member would be present. Under pressure he made it later and then conceded that more time should be given to such an important issue as congressional reform. But to eager questions of "when?" and "how much time?", Hayden has only hemmed and hawed an answer. If the country in righteous anger would demand one, he and other key committee chairmen with a vested interest in the congressional status quo might be obliged to listen and respond.

PROPOSED TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, recently Mr. Walter Lippmann contended in one of his columns that "test ban foes are short of solid arguments." At this point I do not classify myself as either a friend or a foe of this treaty, but I do have some very serious reservations about it, and I can assure Mr. Lippmann that there are plenty of solid arguments against it. Mr. Stefan Possony, director of the international political studies program of the Hoover Institution, is one of the most knowledgeable men in the United States in this whole field, and he has presented in a very brief paper some rather solid arguments against the treaty. I ask unanimous consent that this paper be made a part of my remarks at this point in the Record.

And, further, Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader, Senator Dirksen, yesterday issued a press release that points out two possible consequences of some rather loose language contained in sections 1, 2, 4, and 5 of article III of the proposed treaty. I am not trying by the mention of this release to indicate any position on the part of the minority leader, but I think he has acted in his extremely wise manner and in his customary way of carefully scrutinizing the language of this proposed treaty.

I would suggest that all of my colleagues read both Mr. Possony's arguments and the consequences Senator Dirksen referred to in his press release, and I ask that Senator Dirksen's release be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement on Walter Lippmann's Article "Test Ban Foes Short of Solid Arguments"

(By Stefan T. Possony)

Mr. Walter Lippmann's assertion that test ban foes are "short of solid arguments" is based on inadequate information. The opposition to the test ban, inter alia, was based on the fact that underground cheating is feasible. At long last, this point is now generally conceded and the draft treaty does not prohibit underground tests.

Mr. Lippmann writes that "theoretically, it is possible to shoot a nuclear device a million miles into outer space * * * and then to explode it without its being detected." But "no proposal has ever been made, or could have been made, to insure that a violation in outer space would be detected." This just is not so: One of the technical Geneva agreements dealt with this problem, and proposed to establish a system of earth and sun satellites to police a test ban in space. The fact is that cheating in space is practical, and at far shorter distances than 1 million miles. Whether such shots are necessary depends largely on the manner in which space will be used for military purposes.

Mr. Lippmann alleges that the real purposes of the test ban opponents is to keep on testing until "we shall invent the absolute weapon." No person versed in military matters ever advanced such a childish proposition. Absolute weapons cannot exist in periods of rapid technological change. But just as the nuclear weapon superseded "conventional armaments," so new weapons continually render existing arsenals obsolete. A strategy of planned obsolescence cannot but lead to disaster.

Opposition to the test ban is based on five basic propositions:

1. Reduction or elimination of fallout can be achieved by a fallout and clean test convention and does not require a ban on testing.
2. A ban on atmospheric, space, and under water tests now is harmful to U.S. security. We still need such tests to determine, for example, the vulnerability of missile sites and Polaris submarines, to develop antimissile weapons, and to match the firepower of existing Soviet superyield weapons—in brief to enhance, at a moment when the power of the offensive is reaching its apogee, our capability of executing a second strike strategy.
3. The draft treaty precludes the effective defense of Europe against nuclear blackmail and ground-air attack. It also sets up the United States and U.S.S.R. as a worldwide military duopoly and therefore tends to transform all other states into mere satellites. Thus, the test ban treaty ultimately will destroy NATO, or else prove an ephemeral gambit in the warfare of deception and self-deception.
4. The draft treaty seems to exclude Plowshare shots, and thus by fiat tries to destroy one of the potentially most productive resources of mankind.
5. Technology advances like an impersonal force. Certainly, it would be useful to bring order into the dynamism of technology, but the present draft treaty, even if it were to preclude subterfuge or cheating, seeks to stop technology—a futile undertaking. King Herod "sent and slew all the boys in Bethlehem." In Oscar Wilde's version, Herod also said: "Hear then: I forbid that by Him the dead should be awakened. It would be terrible if to life the dead came again."

The test ban may or may not help the Soviets to "reach and overtake" the United States militarily, but the fantastic illusion that history can be stopped or turned back, precludes the elaboration of genuinely constructive national and international security policies.

Statement by Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen

Further examination of the treaty draft for a partial nuclear test ban reveals that, in addition to the clause giving the original signatories, including the Soviet Union, a veto over amendments, there is another provision of considerable consequence.

This provision can only be discovered by careful reading of sections 1, 2, 4, and 5 of article III.

Section 1 provides that "any state which does not sign this treaty before its entry into force * * * may accede to it at any time."

Section 2 designates the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union as "despositary governments" and provides that "instruments of ratification and instruments of accession shall be deposited" with the depositary governments.

Section 4 provides that "for states whose instruments of ratification or accession are deposited subsequent to the entry into force of this treaty, it shall enter into force on the date of the deposit of their instruments of ratification or accession."

Section 5 provides that "the depositary governments"—meaning the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union—"shall promptly inform all signatory and acceding states of the date of each signature, the date of deposit of each instrument of ratification of and accession to this treaty."

Thus, any nation can become a party to the treaty automatically simply by notifying the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union that it accedes to or has ratified the treaty.

There is a need to examine two possible consequences under this provision:

1. Since the Soviet Union in 1949 imposed on East Germany its puppet government known as the German Democratic Republic, the United States and the United Kingdom have refused, despite repeated Soviet urging, to acknowledge East Germany as a state because its boundary claims violates the Potsdam agreement.

Under the treaty draft for a partial test ban, East Germany, by the simple and, at present, meaningless act of depositing with the United States and the United Kingdom instruments of accession to the treaty would compel them under section 5 to notify all other signatories that this "state," which neither the United States nor the United Kingdom recognizes as a "state," had become a party to the treaty. There would be no recourse under the treaty's language.

2. Communist Cuba, by complying with procedures under Article III, could, of course, qualify automatically as a party to the treaty. The treaty would prohibit Cuba from nuclear testing underwater, in the atmosphere and in outer space, but would permit—with the United States a party to the permission—underground testing in the caves of Cuba.

The United States, which only 9 months ago was on the brink of war because of the presence of Soviet nuclear warheads in Cuba, would now find itself in the role of a copartner extending sanction by treaty to the underground development of nuclear warheads by Cuba.

WHERE WE STAND TODAY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a recent column by Mr. Joseph Alsop, carrying the title, "Where We Stand Today," discussed in a reassuring way the weapons variance between the Soviets and ourselves.

Mr. Stefan Possony, director of the international political studies program of the Hoover Institution, has discussed this column in a very cogent manner and because it does bear upon the coming debates on the test ban treaty, I ask unanimous consent that his discussion be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENT ON JOSEPH ALSOP'S ARTICLE "WHERE WE STAND TODAY"

(By Stefan T. Possony, director, international political studies program, Hoover Institution)

In his article "Where We Stand Today," Joseph Alsop argues reassuringly that the United States is way ahead in the kind of weapons we want, while the Soviets are ahead in the kind of weapons they want. We have a lead in warheads and bombs up to 10 megatons; the Soviets, it is now admitted, are leading "in the development of weapons of very high megatonnage." However, the present Soviet rocket delivery system allegedly cannot use 100-megaton warheads. The second generation of Soviet ICBM's can deliver 30-megaton warheads but these vehicles are very large and cumbersome and require liquid propellants. By contrast, the military advantages of our more dependable and accurate solid propelled missiles outweigh the disadvantages of the smaller yields. Hence, Mr. Alsop concludes, "it is hard to see why the United States will lose by the ban." Unfortunately, things are not that cozy.

1. The Soviets announced that they have a 100-megaton warhead for use in missiles as well as a 160-megaton aircraft bomb. Soviet announcements of this type usually are premature but they are rarely mendacious. Hence the wishful hope that the Soviets will not have 100-megaton missiles will be sorely disappointed.

2. The Soviets presently are deploying a 30-megaton missile system. Mr. Alsop belittles this momentous threat by arguing that Soviet liquid fueled missiles are ineffective. Yet attacks against hardened missile sites require yields so large that liquid fueled missiles are indispenable. Moreover, liquid fueled missiles, while dubious for second strikes, are perfectly usable for a first strike strategy.

3. Mr. Alsop implies that we now have a force consisting of 10-megaton missiles. The fact is that only a limited number of liquid fueled missiles carry warheads of several megatons. The firepower of the solid fueled Polaris and Minuteman is believed to be about 1-megaton, or about one-thirtieth of the yield of the new Soviet ICBM.

4. "American military theorists * * * have consistently held that 10 megatons was about the limit of the really useful explosive power of the nuclear weapon." If this were so, the United States, with its second strike strategy, should continue to test until it achieves a 10-megaton warhead that is deliverable by a solid fueled missile. Actually, Mr. Alsop might ask his theorists whether, as targets are being hardened, the yield requirement does not rise? In a military world where all factors change constantly, there is no such thing as a constant limit of "really useful explosive power."

5. Even if we were to attain an American warhead "comparable to the Soviet 30-megaton type, we would not have any rockets capable of delivering it unless we made the step of returning to a liquid fueled delivery system." Atlas and Titan are remaining in commission and we do not have to return to them. Successful testing might allow us to replace present Atlas and Titan warheads with devices equal to or better than the Soviet 30-megaton warhead.

The Soviets now have weapons that are suited to their strategy: they can launch an effective disarming first strike, attack American cities, and through fallout threaten the entire population of the United States. Our own missiles are suitable for a second strike but relatively useless against military targets and hence unsuitable for our announced counterforce strategy. Relatively low yield weapons cannot effectively deter a possible Soviet anti-population strategy. Lastly, our growing impotence against military targets will make it increasingly difficult to honor our NATO obligations.

Khrushchev's willingness to sign a limited test ban agreement is entirely in line with the key purpose of orthodox Soviet disarmament policy, as defined by Lenin: to disarm the bourgeoisie and arm the proletariat.

ERNEST E. ROOT HIGH SCHOOL BAND, NORTH ROYALTON, OHIO

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am pleased to learn that the Ernest E. Root High School Band of North Royalton, Ohio, has been invited to participate in the 75th Annual Tournament of Roses Parade, Pasadena, Calif., on New Year's Day, 1964. Mr. Chris B. Carrino, director of this outstanding band, has been informed of the invitation in a communication from Mr. Walter L. Benedict, chairman of the music committee, Pasadena Tournament of Roses Association.

I join with the citizenry of Ohio, and particularly those of North Royalton, in extending congratulations to Director Carrino and the members of this band.

Mr. President, this is not the first time this outstanding band has gained national recognition. The E. E. Root High School Band Majorettes and Royalettes were recipients of the 1962 Grand Prize Trophy in the National Cherry Blossom Festival Parade of Princesses held in Washington.

Mr. President, in his invitation to the E. E. Root High School Band to participate in the forthcoming Tournament of Roses, Mr. Benedict said:

> Your band has been chosen to represent your area of the United States in the belief that your band is a superior organization, certain to reflect credit upon your home community and prove popular with millions of parade viewers.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today we are faced with one of the great crises in our history because we did not act sooner to bring the promise of America to all Americans. Our Nation is being asked to provide to a large number of its people civil rights to which they have always been entitled, but which in far too many instances are still being withheld from them.

America demands esentially the same responsibilities from all her citizens. We must all obey the law, pay taxes, and answer the call to duty when the Nation is endangered. Our servicemen who fell on foreign battlefields died without regard to race. But because of their race, some Americans today cannot vote, cannot get a job, cannot enter a decent school—frequently cannot even get a meal or a night's lodging.

The present crisis in civil rights has made a great many more people aware of the extent and the seriousnes of this problem to the national welfare. But for me it is only the most recent stake in a long, long battle. I have been fighting in the Congress for strong, responsible civil rights legislation for over two decades, and I have not done so for partisan political purposes.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a quotation from the Philadelphia Tribune of November 19, 1946.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Philadelphia's six Republican Congressmen are all pledged to support in the next Congress an effective fair employment law.
>
> We have every reason to believe that they will keep their respective pledges individually and collectively.
>
> Congressman HUGH SCOTT, who was in Congress prior to joining the U.S. Navy, has an excellent record on FEPC legislation. His record is exceptionally good, since he has comparatively few colored voters in his dis-

trict. It is a matter of principle with him and not smart politics simply to get votes.

Mr. SCOTT. For me, civil rights has always been a matter of principle, not politics. I believe in the dignity of the human being. I believe that when that dignity is violated, it is necessary to enact laws to protect it.

During my years in both the House and the Senate I sponsored or cosponsored more legislation on civil rights than on any other one subject. Following is a list of civil rights bills I have submitted since 1956:

YEAR 1963, 88TH CONGRESS (SENATE, 1ST SESS.)

Senate Resolution 118, housing, loans without discrimination.

S. 1732, public accommodations.

S. 1731, administration civil rights proposal.

S. 1693, U.S. citizens rights.

S. 1591, prohibits discrimination in furnishing facilities for business under State licenses.

S. 1590, public schools.

S. 1219, make Civil Right Commission permanent.

S. 1218, hospitalization.

S. 1217, accommodations at hotels.

S. 1216, Federal assistance law enforcement.

S. 1215, criminal civil remedies.

S. 1214, voting.

S. 1213, housing.

S. 1212, prohibits discrimination in employment in Washington, D.C.

S. 1211, equal employment opportunity.

S. 1210, discrimination in employment.

S. 1209, school desegregation.

S. 1117, extends Civil Rights Commission.

S. 773, prohibits racial discrimination in interstate employment.

S. 772, public school desegregation.

S. 666, protects citizens right to vote.

YEAR 1962, 87TH CONGRESS (SENATE, 2D SESS.)

Senate Resolution 313, loans without discrimination.

S. 2983, prevents exclusion of members of minority groups from jury service, 1957, title III.

S. 2981, Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, prohibits discrimination by labor unions.

S. 2980, desegregation of public schools.

S. 2979, protects voting rights.

YEAR 1961, 87TH CONGRESS (SENATE, 1ST SESS.)

S. 478, prohibits poll tax in Federal elections.

S. 479, establishes a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity.

S. 480, prohibits literacy requirements for voting.

S. 481, authorizes the Attorney General to bring civil injunctive proceedings to safeguard rights.

S. 482, guarantees the rights provided by the 14th amendment.

S. 483, extends indefinitely the Civil Rights Commission.

S. 484, assists the State and local government to meet cost of school desegregation.

S. 1253, discrimination in public conveyances.

S. 1254, protects against bodily attack.

S. 1255, amends existing civil rights statutes.

S. 1256, Federal Anti-Lynching Act.

S. 1257, Indefinite extension of Civil Rights Commission.

S. 1258, Federal Equality of Opportunity in Employment Act.

S. 1259, Federal Anti-Poll Tax Act.

Senate Resolution 5, amends cloture rule of Senate.

Senate Joint Resolution 58, poll tax.

Five amendments (to H.R. 7371) on Civil rights.

YEAR 1960, 86TH CONGRESS (SENATE, 2D SESS.)

S. 435, Civil Rights Commission.

S. 456, amends Civil Rights Act of 1957.

S. 942, establishes a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity.

S. 960, similar to S. 456.

S. 2868, poll tax.

S. 3001, provides enforcement of civil rights.

S. 3821, strengthens civil rights.

S. 3823, amends Civil Rights Act of 1960.

S. 3829, enforcement of civil rights.

YEAR 1957, 85TH CONGRESS (HOUSE)

H.R. 1254, further secures and protects the civil rights of persons within the United States.

H.R. 3088, similar to H.R. 1254.

YEAR 1956, 84TH CONGRESS (HOUSE)

H.R. 10349, establishes a bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government.

H.R. 10426, provides means of further securing and protecting the right to vote.

H.R. 10428, strengthens the civil rights statutes.

I also supported civil rights measures from the 77th through the 83d Congress, including my testimony on FEPC before the House Education and Labor Committee in 1943.

It has taken the Congress a long time to come to grips with these issues. I hope we now may be approaching the time for meaningful legislation.

Back in 1959 I told the 50th annual convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People: "I intend to fight for civil liberties—win, lose, or draw."

But I do not want us to lose or draw. I want to win. Because if we lose, all America loses.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD some of my earlier statements on civil rights.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM A SPEECH BY SENATOR SCOTT IN THE SENATE ON JULY 2, 1963

When speculation arises about the course to be taken by the Republican Party, there seems to be a serious omission about those of us who have for years and do now support further civil rights legislation.

In the past Congress, for instance, I sponsored 32 civil rights bills. This year I sponsored 16 such bills—including the famous part 3, or title 3. I am a cosponsor of the President's recent proposals.

Indeed, I have introduced more bills on civil rights than on any other single subject.

It is a moral issue, and it requires a moral commitment. I made that commitment long ago.

It is also a practical issue. I have long felt that our Nation cannot possibly realize its ultimate potential divided as it is from within.

It is time, I believe, to stop the speculation, the rumors, and get back to the facts; get on with the unfinished business of Abraham Lincoln, the founder of the Republican Party.

EXCERPT FROM A SPEECH BY SENATOR SCOTT IN THE SENATE JUNE 11, 1963

Mr. President, eight Republican Senators have today joined in the introduction of a bill which is a broad version of part III of the Civil Rights Act, updated to present conditions.

I should like to say that those of us who join in introducing the bill, plus a number of other Members of the Senate, have been seeking to secure action on so-called part III, giving the Attorney General the right to intervene in individual cases. Numerous instances of violations of these civil rights have occurred. We have pursued this effort for many years, certainly since 1957. Many of us are of the opinion that without so-called title III, the power presently vested in the Federal Government is inadequate to do justice to an individual whose rights are being trampled upon or abused, because of the present law's requirement, for example, for consent of the Governor of a State to the intervention by Federal forces, or the existence of a situation indicating a breakdown of law and order, or because of other limitations and inadequacies which we were not able to get enacted as a part of the 1957 or 1960 Civil Rights Act.

Ever since the beginning of this year I have been active, along with a number of other Senators, in seeking to persuade the Department of Justice that, unless action were taken along these lines, they would be confronted with continuing outbreaks of violations and by ultimate recognition by a large segment of our people of the inadequacy of the law; that it would lead to frustration, and that frustration would lead to violation of the law; that unless we could get the provisions of the law firmed up, so that an individual may feel he has the full and due protection of the law of the United States, and therefore is justified in working out his rights within the framework of law and within our courts, the individual would resort to means outside the law, and that those means would continue to increase.

It is to avoid this situation that we are very hopeful that action can be had on the enactment of title III.

EXCERPT FROM A SPEECH BY SENATOR SCOTT IN THE SENATE ON MAY 10, 1962

Accomplishments in basic civil rights are not realized through a few selected governmental appointments but rather in measures under which all our citizens who are now denied their rights can benefit by the recognition that the rights are indeed rights to which they are fully entitled as American citizens.

EXCERPT FROM A SPEECH BY SENATOR SCOTT IN THE SENATE ON AUGUST 29, 1961

I would like to say what is obvious to Members of this body, and I think to the press at large. Amendments supported by the two Senators from New York, my senior colleague from Pennsylvania, and many other Senators, which would add provisions that would implement the civil rights proposal, are important amendments, amendments promised by the platforms of both political parties, amendments which would enlarge and dignify the rights of human beings. But, Mr. President, we know that proceedings here are cut and dried; that the planning, groundwork, and footwork have all been done. Whenever a measure of this kind is permitted to be introduced, we know that general staff work has been done. We know this administration does not intend to have civil rights legislation acted upon. It feels the executive department can handle all these matters. It does not believe in its platform. It does not believe that civil rights legislation should be adopted. Therefore, let not any of us be deceived by the subsequent oratory which will be heard in this Chamber. The measure has been foreclosed. The defeat of these civil rights amendments has been foreordered. Their fate is foredoomed. Nothing is going to happen except the extension of the Civil Rights Commission. But the ritual dance must be performed. The process of going through the motions must be endured. The public must be advised that some are for and some are against these amendments.

And then, after we have gone along for a suitable time, which I gather the majority leader thinks will be about an hour, suitable motions will be made, and the attempts for the corpse to rise and walk will be frustrated; the body will be buried; the casket will be locked; appropriate funeral ceremonies will be maintained; a suitable funeral and funeral statements will be entered of record; and the Senate will then resume its traditional and customary ways. It will proceed with legislation and appropriation. It will have the usual nongermane and irrelevant discussions. We will waste the time which we said was so essential to be conserved. We will throw time away on matters of less portent.

So, rather than wait for the funeral, I would like to make my eulogy before the body is buried, before the services are entirely complete.

I favor these amendments. I favor the legislation. I know that it is not planned to allow them to become law. I know that the tombstone has been engraved and that the words fittingly prepared for the civil rights amendments are, as they so often before have read: "Requiescat in pace."

Excerpt From a Speech by Senator Scott in the Senate on March 10, 1960

Mr. President, freedom is franchise. I recall that during the Korean war, when I was on temporary duty with the carrier *Valley Forge*, I visited a hospital ship in Pusan harbor. Soldiers of the 24th Regiment, then a Negro regiment, were lying on the dockside. Many were badly injured and were waiting for surgery, but they were stoical and were smoking cigarettes. The thought which filled my mind at that time was, "If these men are good enough to fight alongside other Americans and with them, and if these men are good enough to die for us, why, indeed, are they not good enough to vote with us?"

That was my thought at that time, and that is my belief, because I believe that any citizen who is good enough to fight for the security of all the States of the Union is good enough to vote in any of them.

Excerpt From a Speech by Senator Scott in the Senate on September 9, 1959

I believe—and I am sure the distinguished Senator from West Virginia will agree with me—that every day there is heard in this land and in this Senate Chamber the long, quavering, mournful sigh of the expiring life of John Brown, and the voice of that strange man, part fanatic, part religionist, part idealist; perhaps wrong, perhaps right, but a man who set a Nation to self-examination which has not yet ended, by any means; a man whose voice was raised, and will not die. The sound of his voice sweeps across our land from boundary to boundary, from shore to shore, and challenges the conscience of America, and says to us that, somehow, some day, this good land, with its heritage, may yet find the solution to its problems—to the problem to which John Brown and his adherents gave their allegiance, and to all the other problems which affect the American kind.

REAFFIRMATION OF THE POSITION OF THE MEMBER HOSPITALS OF THE GREATER NEW YORK HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the most heartrending aspects of discrimination is the unfair treatment to which both Negro doctors and patients are subjected in hospitals in many sections of our Nation.

The Federal Government has condoned these unfair activities by refusing to police the nondiscrimination provisions of the Hill-Burton Act and by its insistence on continuing to adhere to its unconstitutional separate but equal provision. I have brought this situation to the attention of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on many occasions but have yet to receive a satisfactory explanation of why this agency refuses to insist upon compliance with a policy of equal treatment in programs it supports with Federal tax funds.

In light of this background, I am deeply gratified by the statement recently adopted by the Greater New York Hospital Association. This statement reaffirms the association's support of a policy of nondiscrimination in the treatment of patients, the appointments to hospital staffs, and in appointments to the board of trustees. I commend the association for its position and ask unanimous consent that the association's statement be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Reaffirmation of the Position of the Member Hospitals of the Greater New York Hospital Association on Human Rights

In recognition of human equality and in the right of all men to equal opportunity, members of the Greater New York Hospital Association reaffirm their belief in the following practices:

That care be provided to all in need of medical attention regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin;

That there shall be no segregation of patients in our hospitals, on the basis of race, color, creed, or national origin;

That appointments to our hospital staffs shall be based on qualification regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin subject to the number of physicians who can be accommodated and the bed capacity of the hospital;

That appointments to our administrative staffs shall be based on qualification regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin; and

That appointment to our boards of trustees shall be based on community participation and leadership regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 1703) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

THE GESELL REPORT AND PERVERSION OF THE MISSION OF THE MILITARY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, those of us who have long insisted that our military people be confined to their historic and traditional roles and missions are greatly disturbed by the fact that there has recently been introduced a new, different, and added mission which can only be detrimental to military tradition, discipline, and morale.

This new and previously unheard of mission is designed to shape our military force as an instrument for social reform and can only result in irreparable injury to the military profession. In addition, it is a grave and serious challenge to the long established and traditional concept of complete separation of the military from all political matters and activities.

The action of the Secretary of Defense which I shall discuss is but the latest step in the current massive and widespread assault upon constitutional principles in the misguided and so-called civil rights drive. It is now proposed that the military profession itself be utilized as a driving force in the establishment of a new social and political order which involves race relations and individual associations in off-base areas surrounding our military establishments.

This latest directive is based in large measure upon the so-called Gesell report, which came from a Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, appointed several months ago by the President.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I, of course, do not expect to be consulted about matters of this kind. However, I feel that we cannot perform our function unless we are advised to some extent when committees are appointed with such far-reaching and sweeping powers and opportunities.

I believe, too, that the chairman of the committee, who devotes so much of his valuable time to the real problems of the military services, was not informed and knew nothing about the activities of this committee until the report was issued. Of course, he can speak for himself.

I mention it because it is a source of great concern to me, as a member of that committee, that he was not informed. I know there was no opportunity for anyone in Congress to be heard or to present any idea or to consult with any of the members of the committee which made the far-reaching recommendations as to what should be the duty of a base commander. None of the members of the committee had any military service; that is, they are not in the military service now. The members of the committee are:

Mr. Gerhard Gesell, of Washington, D.C., Chairman; Mr. Nathaniel S. Colley; Mr. Abe Fortas; Mr. Louis J. Hector; Mr. Benjamin Muse; Mr. John H. Sengstacke, and Mr. Whitney Young, Jr. They compose the membership of this group. But back to the activities that have taken place.

It has been apparent for some time that the more extreme exponents of revolutionary civil rights actions have wanted to use the military in a position of leadership to bring about desegregation outside the boundaries of the military bases, and have desired that the full economic weight of military bases be manipulated by the base commander to reverse local laws, customs, and policies. It has even been suggested and specifically recommended that the economic coercion to attain these political objectives go to the extreme of curtailing or terminating activities at military installations near communities where desegregation is particularly prevalent.

The Secretary of Defense was called upon to take action in this field as the result of the work of a civilian committee consisting of seven members, not one of whom is a member of the armed services or recognized as a seasoned constitutional lawyer. This Committee, known as the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, on June 13, 1963, filed with the President its initial report dealing with "Equality of Treatment and Opportunity for Negro Military Personnel Stationed Within the United States." This report is popularly known as the Gesell report, after the name of Committee Chairman, Gerhard Gesell, a Washington attorney. The report was forwarded by the President to the Secretary of Defense for attention and action. However, the attention and action which should be given the report seems to have been predirected by the President by the following admonition:

> The Committee's recommendations regarding both off-base and on-base conditions merit your prompt attention and certainly are in the spirit that I believe should characterize our approach to this matter.

On July 26, 1963, the Secretary of Defense, responsive to the admonition of the President, issued a directive—incorrectly entitled "Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces"—based upon the recommendations of the Gesell Committee.

Mr. President, the directive referred to is so far reaching and drastic in its nature and effect that I believe every Member of the Senate should be familiar with its terms. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks the entire directive be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, paragraph B of the directive provides:

> 1. The military departments shall, with the approval of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower), issue appropriate instructions, manuals, and regulations in connection with the leadership responsibility for equal opportunity, on and off-base, and containing guidance for its discharge.
>
> 2. The military departments shall institute in each service a system for regularly reporting, monitoring, and measuring progress in achieving equal opportunity on and off base.

Paragraph C places clear and heavy responsibility upon the military commander in the field of social reform. It provides:

> **Every military commander has the responsibility to oppose discriminatory practices affecting his men and their dependents and to foster equal opportunity for them, not only in areas under his immediate control, but also in nearby communities where they may live or gather in off-duty hours. In discharging that responsibility a commander** shall not, except with the prior approval of the Secretary of his military department, use the off-limits sanction in discrimination cases arising within the United States.

I shall explain that in greater detail later.

This is not all. The following is a paragraph from the July 24, 1963, memorandum from the Secretary of Defense to the President, which responded to the Gesell report and transmitted the directive which I have previously discussed:

> The Committee also suggested the possibility of closing bases near communities where discrimination is particularly prevalent. I do not regard this as a feasible action at this time.

That is a statement by the Secretary of Defense in a communication directed to the President. He declined to say that he would remove bases from communities that did not conform to this requirement. He merely said he did not consider their removal feasible "at this time." Nevertheless, the threat remains. The recommendation of his Committee stands. It has been commended by the President of the United States. The Secretary said it is not feasible to close the bases at this time.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. May I finish this point, first? Then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

The background for this statement by the Secretary of Defense is that the President's Committee had recommended that military bases be closed or moved in those cases where the off-base business establishments did not submit to the politically inspired requirements. In this recommendation the Committee advocated the most extreme and brutal form of economic coercion.

The Secretary of Defense declined to follow this recommendation "at this time." The use of this phrase indicates, of course, that the threat of such action is still very much in existence. The very clear threat is that, if all else fails, the weight of the military purse will be used, not to increase our combat readiness and military striking power, but as a means of economic strangulation of local peoples and local communities in order to bring about the social and political revolution which the civil rights extremists so ardently desire.

I shall mention some round figures showing that the locations of military installations by the armed services, Congress, and the President are based upon military considerations. What will best serve the defenses and the security of the Nation? What about the air pattern, when the Air Force selects locations for the training of pilots? What about the considerations of the Navy for suitable locations? These are military considerations. That is why we have poured billions of dollars into the construction of military bases throughout the Nation. Missile sites are selected because of their relation to strategic requirements.

Based upon studies and surveys that have been made by teams of investigators, the Government has invested considerably more than $10 billion in military installations which might be affected by this directive. I venture to guess that to transfer, to move, or to recreate those bases elsewhere would cost in the neighborhood of $30 billion. In many cases, there is no other sound military location to which to go.

So this recommendation strikes at the very vitals, the very fundamentals of our military plans, purposes, and strategy. It is no ordinary recommendation. It goes to the very vital and technical parts of our military program.

I shall state later that I believe it would destroy the standards by which we select and promote officers in the armed services and the morale of many fine career officers.

I now yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I desire to compliment the distinguished Senator from Mississippi on the able speech he is making. I concur in his statements and share his views completely.

Our Nation is a Nation of civilian control; a Nation of law, not of military control. The Senator has read paragraph C of the order. The order is so far reaching that it directs military commanders to foster equal opportunity for people not only in areas under immediate military control, but also in nearby communities, where the military may live or gather in off-duty hours.

Does the distinguished Senator from Mississippi believe that the military has any control over a civilian area outside the military base?

Mr. STENNIS. Absolutely no control.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does the Constitution give them any authority to act in civil areas beyond the Military Establishment?

Mr. STENNIS. Absolutely none. As the Senator knows, there are certain working arrangements between the police departments, the civilian authorities, and the civic clubs and groups. But when it comes to legal jurisdiction and legal rights, there are absolutely none.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does a military base commander have authority to act as the Governor of a State or as a State legislator in dealing with areas beyond the jurisdiction of his Military Establishment?

Mr. STENNIS. Certainly not; in fact, the very contrary is the theory of our Government.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does a military base commander have authority to act as county commissioner, mayor, city council, or policymaking authority beyond the boundaries of his Military Establishment?

Mr. STENNIS. Of course, he does not have such authority.

Mr. TALMADGE. But does this order not purport to authorize military commanders to exercise authority beyond the boundaries of the military bases?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; it would put them right in the middle of the current of domestic partisan matters; and it could lead them right into elections. It would set them up as a special force; and they would be considered for promotion on the basis of their compliance with it.

Mr. TALMADGE. In short, their future promotion would depend upon that, would it not?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. I shall discuss that point later, and shall show how near they got to it.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is this order not strangely reminiscent of the orders in Reconstruction days when the South was occupied by troops and was divided into military districts under troop commanders who exercised authority in those areas?

Mr. STENNIS. I think the Senator from Georgia is correct as far as he goes; but this matter goes even farther than that. It invades the province of more than the civilian authorities and the State authorities; in addition, it would put this officer—who is trained and prepared to prepare us for war and to win that war, if it comes—and also puts his career right in the middle of the most controversial political debates and discussions and the most violent eruptions of partisan matters which exist in the Nation today. I think that is the most serious single phase of the entire matter.

Mr. TALMADGE. Furthermore, it purports to substitute, in those areas, military control and decision, for civil law and civil decision, does it not?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, that is its effect—attempted coercion through threats to remove bases, as I shall show later, and to mark stores or other establishments "off limits," with the result that no member of the Military Establishment would be permitted to enter them. Such economic coercion would be a crushing blow, a death blow, to many of the establishments in these areas.

Mr. TALMADGE. I fully agree with the able Senator from Mississippi. I think this is the most uncalled-for order in connection with a Military Establishment that I have ever heard of in my lifetime.

We live in a nation of laws, not of men. The fact that we live under civilian law, not under military dictatorship, has always been part and parcel of our system of government. However, the purport and effect of this order is to encourage military commanders in charge of various military areas in the Nation to participate in local politics and to attempt to inject the authority of the Military Establishment into civilian control; is that not true?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct. If it is permitted to start, naturally it will grow in its impact.

Mr. TALMADGE. That is correct.

In fact, does this order not strike at civil control of our established system of government, and does it not attempt to inject therein military control in civilian areas?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that in his State there are a large number of military installations; but this order is not confined to one area or one State of the Nation. The order is national in its significance; and when attempts are made to disturb and upset the military pattern and the method of promoting officers, a blow is struck at the vitals of the entire Military Establishment.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his important statement and for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, Mr. President, I warmly congratulate the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for calling the attention of the Senate to this very dangerous approach to this matter, which does involve national security in the most complete way.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me ask whether the Senator from Mississippi has placed in the Record—if he has not done so, I hope he will—the names of the members of the Committee which made this recommendation to the President and Secretary McNamara.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, the Record already discloses their names.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then let me say, for myself—for I did not hear the Senator's comment on the personnel of the Committee—that I think it was as completely unrepresentative of the Nation, and particularly of the areas against which the order is directed, as it would have been possible to make it.

Mr. STENNIS. As I understand, not one member of the Committee is from the area to which the order is obviously directed; and no seasoned constitutional lawyer is on the Committee; and, so far as I understand, no military man is on the Committee—no one presently in the military service; some of them may have served for some periods in the Military Establishment during the war.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think the personnel of this Committee contrasts completely with the requirements of the Civil Rights Commission membership, as illustrated by the appointments made by two Presidents, who by their appointments have indicated at least that that was a national responsibility, and that members from all parts of the Nation, representative of all groups in the Nation, should be appointed to it.

Let me say that I am intrigued by another suggestion the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has made and I regard it as entirely correct; namely, that the decisions in connection with the location of military bases were based solely on military facts and military reasons, not desires to help or hurt some community.

To refer briefly to some of the bases in Florida—and I know how familiar with them the distinguished Senator from Mississippi is—I ask him whether, for example, he thinks an order for abandonment of the guided missile base and the establishments in connection with it at Cape Canaveral would tend to ignore the importance of the geographical advantages of a base located at Cape Canaveral, whereas those geographical advantages constitute the primary reason for the location of the base there. Would it be likely that a person with any degree of military discretion would even consider abandoning that base, inasmuch as the decision to locate it there was based entirely on geographical reasons, and in view of the further fact that no similar location—a place with a shooting gallery of 8,000 miles of relatively clear water—is available.

Mr. STENNIS. Of course not. It is unthinkable; and the removal of many other bases would be equally unthinkable. In short, there would be no such basis for removing any of them.

Mr. HOLLAND. In this connection, I think of two other bases. One is the great carrier and destroyer base at Mayport, which, as the Senator from Mississippi knows, is located barely within the coastline; it is just off the mouth of the St. Johns River. The water there is 42 feet deep, the carriers can come there, and it is the only port south of Norfolk which can be used as a base for carriers which will have control of the entire South Atlantic and the Caribbean area. Would there be any semblance of reason for abandoning that base for any reason such as the one suggested by the terms of this recommendation or order?

Mr. STENNIS. There could not possibly be. In addition, it would greatly weaken the essential military defense of the Nation, as was illustrated so graphically less than a year ago in connection with the Cuban crisis.

It is unthinkable that the Norfolk base would be abandoned. It is equally unthinkable that the naval base and area in Florida to which the Senator from Florida has referred would be abandoned. It is equally unthinkable that one of the air bases there would be abandoned. At the time of the Cuban crisis this base was one of the most critical spots on the face of the globe.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Strategic Air Command base at Homestead is the one to which the Senator from Mississippi refers, is it not?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. Its abandonment would be unthinkable.

Mr. HOLLAND. Certainly it would be unthinkable that any responsible military authority would advocate the abandonment of such a critically strategic base for some reason similar to the one advanced in this case, would it not?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. And to refer to Key West, the only place where deep, clear water is so closely available that the sonar school and the various other antisubmarine operations of our far-flown Navy are located there.

Would anyone of any reason or discretion think that because of some little racial disturbance on Key West, a limited area of approximately 2 miles by 4 miles, as I recall, that such a base should be abandoned, despite the critical place that the base occupies in the security of our Nation?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. The directive is not based upon the fact that the State of Florida or any other State is involved. It is not based upon any consideration around the base. The military bases mentioned have been indispensable for us. They paid off 100-fold in a matter of hours and days during the Cuban crisis. They have, as well, supplied a great function during past years.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, again expressing my deep appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, I merely wish to say that I have made these illustrations because I am more familiar with them. I could make similar illustrations of other locations in the Nation. It seems to me that the Senator has placed his finger upon the point—which is the critical thing in this whole discussion—that to mix the military security of our Nation with the question of solving a troublesome segregation problem—troublesome for the moment—is unthinkably unreasonable. I commend the Senator for bringing the subject to our attention.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much.

This threat—if carried out—would not only ravage and destroy the very purposes for which our Military Establishment exists but it would vest in the military unthinkable power and authority over the local civilian authorities who desire to abide by their own laws and political requirements.

Not one military man, from the Chief of Staff down, would wish that the military should be charged with such a responsibility. A year ago, when we were holding the so-called muzzling hearings, representatives of the military told us:

> Save us. Save us from the local political and partisan matter. We cannot carry out our function if we are to have responsibility in that field.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have not heard all of the Senator's address. I am not sure whether the point about which I wish to speak has been covered. Is it suggested that the capital of the Nation be moved in the event some racial trouble should occur in the city of Washington on the 28th of August when we are to be greeted with a demonstration?

Mr. STENNIS. No, I have not reached that point in my address. In fact, it is not in my statement. There is nothing in that respect in the report yet, but there are other reports covering that situation. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, military bases are located by our military authorities on considerations of military effectiveness and strength. There is no other valid test.

Aside from its impact upon local communities and local social customs, the most tragic and perilous aspect of the Secretary's directive is that it is entirely inconsistent with and destructive of the primary obligation, responsibility, and mission of the military to be prepared for war and to fight and win if war should come. Instead of confining the military to its traditional and vital role of building up the defenses of the Nation, it is now proposed to use them blatantly and openly to intervene in local political and social controversies and to use the economic persuasion that local base expenditures carry with them to coerce, intimidate, and compel the commercial establishments of the area to conform to a social pattern which is alien to the habits and traditions of the local people. It is difficult to imagine that a more dangerous and divisive practice could be introduced into our Military Establishment.

I point out that my remarks are addressed to the off-base activity. On-base activities are integrated, and that subject can be considered a military question. My points are directed to the off-base activities.

This is not theorizing. The directive of July 26 expressly authorizes the commanding officer, with the prior approval of the Secretary of his military department, to use "off-limits sanction" in cases of alleged discrimination.

That language would not leave the base commander standing alone at the mercy of the coercion, intimidation, and pressure that could build up from various sources throughout the Nation against him, a lonely colonel, in relation to something off the base. The approval must come from the Secretary of the service. I commend the Secretary of Defense for making that requirement. But at the same time the threat is present, and the pattern of operation is now announced: "If you do not do what we say, we will place you off limits."

The directive means that not a single man from the 15,000-man military base may enter the door of that businessman, much less trade a dime with him. The military base commander and the Secretary of the service involved are the only two men who make such a decision. That is according to the directive.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The rule is not being made because of trouble in areas where troops are segregated.

Mr. STENNIS. The directive would not be based on that point at all. That is another question entirely. The Secretary has such authority now and we do not object to it.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Is it not true that where the military has tried to integrate there has been trouble?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The reverse could have occurred. Where the troops had been integrated, the action might have been considered off base. There would be some reason for that, would there not?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I would agree with the Senator from Mississippi that, so far as the military is concerned, they should have nothing whatever to do with anything outside the military zone, a camp, or whatever it might be, and wherever it might be located.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I agree with the Senator. The military authorities have a right to make rules and regulations, but they do not have any right to say what will go on in a city which is normally outside the limits of the military zone.

Mr. STENNIS. The military rightly has command inside the limits of the Military Establishment. They carry out that right. They have been ordered to integrate and they have integrated. But now the commanders have been ordered to go beyond that limitation into private businesses. For no reason in the world, except that the social customs and habits of the people are contrary to what this Committee thinks they ought to be, they are permitted to declare businesses off limits. In other words, the directive would be an economic bludgeon with which a businessman could be hit over the head. If a businessman got on the black list, it would mean death to his business. There has been no mandate of the Congress on that point, and no law has been passed with respect thereto. It has not been brought up here in that way. But that is an Executive order: "Do it."

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. On the contrary, has not every court of the United States, from the Supreme Court down and including the Federal district courts, from 1883 to the present time, held exactly the opposite?

Mr. STENNIS. Without exception, the courts have held as the Senator has said.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is not the effect of the order, then, to empower the military to do diametrically the opposite of what the Supreme Court and other Federal courts have said the Congress itself could not do?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is absolutely correct. If the Executive order applies in the present case, the concept or idea could apply on other subjects with the same force.

As the Senator from Georgia has said, the Supreme Court of the United States said, "Congress shall not do this." But the executive branch goes ahead and does it anyway.

Under the provision to which I have referred, the local commander, with the approval of his Secretary, is authorized to control the off-base patronage of business establishments by military personnel and their dependents and to prohibit them from doing business with an establishment unless it meets with the approval of the commander.

The high priority which is being given to mobilizing the military might for civil rights proposals is indicated by the fact that the Secretary's directive provides for the creation of a new Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Rights. Since the activities in this field and the political motives which inspire them are so far removed from established military functions it is reasonable to believe that the occupant of this new position will take his directions, not from the Secretary of Defense, but from the Attorney General of the United States or one of his deputies. I do not make this statement lightly. I say it deliberately and with full knowledge of my solemn responsibility as a Member of the Senate. This is the only possible inference from the facts which have developed over the last few years.

Mr. President, since I came into the Chamber I have been handed a quotation from the Washington Star of July 30, containing a statement attributed to Mr. Fitt, who has been elevated by the Secretary of Defense to the newly created position of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Rights.

Mr. Fitt is quoted as saying:

> I came over to this building because I was excited at the prospect of doing something about eliminating discrimination in the Army.

That is what he told reporters.

> Now I will have a chance to do this throughout the whole Defense Establishment.

He was previously assigned to the Army. He is not limiting the application only to the Defense Establishment. He also contemplates taking over jurisdiction of all surrounding areas.

This illustrates what I have said. This is a plan. The mysterious papers move around and move around, and finally culminate in orders.

I am not attacking Mr. McNamara. I have had little opportunity to talk with him about this problem. I know he considers it to be a serious matter. I infer from other facts with which I am familiar that he did not originate this order, but that the mysterious movement came from somewhere else.

These developments and others which I shall not discuss today thrust the Military Establishment—against the will of its top uniformed leaders, I believe—directly into the middle of the strongest and most explosive current of American politics. Is there a Member of the Senate who disagrees with that statement? If there is, then he need only look around him. Pending at the very top of the Senate Calendar for the committee hearings are the most extreme and far-reaching civil rights bills which have ever been submitted to the Congress. The Chief Executive is demanding that he be vested with almost unlimited power in the fields of education, qualifications of electors, public accommodations, employment opportunities, and the power to withhold Federal grants, loans, and guarantees to States and individuals. Clearly the action taken by the Secretary of Defense is part and parcel of the powerful drive to vest the Government with the power to regiment and control the most sensitive phases of our society and economy.

Make no mistake about it. This directive will place the members of our Armed Forces in the mainstream of swirling political currents and, unless rescinded, will keep them there for years to come.

What will become of our military strength in the meantime?

It will have a most serious and detrimental effect upon our entire Military Establishment and can only be destructive of long-established military traditions and discipline.

All this action comes when there is pending before Congress the matter of making appropriations for our vast Military Establishment and widespread military programs. It comes at a time also when there is pending before the Congress a proposal to increase the pay of military personnel. What is the purpose of the military pay proposal? I believe it is to make the military stronger in the military field. Is it to weld a stronger military force and to bolster the morale of members of the Armed Forces, or is it for the purpose of building a more efficient agency to create and enforce a new, different, and unwanted social and political pattern in areas surrounding our military bases?

We should consider the military pay bill as strengthening the forces we have and building even stronger ones in the future. I refer to this subject to show that the Congress is now engaged in consideration of the vital parts of the vast military program. The Executive order is then put before us.

Let me remind the Senate, Mr. President, that just about a year ago the Senate Special Preparedness Subcommittee had concluded its lengthy hearings on the alleged "muzzling" of the military. Almost without exception those persons in positions of responsibility in our Military Establishment—in and out of uniform—took a strong and unequivocable position that military personnel should be wholly aloof from political matters and should not be called upon to take part in local or national activities or programs which might involve them in political matters, local issues, and other partisan or controversial issues and areas.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina. I know the Senator is vitally interested in this question, not only as its relates to South Carolina, but also because of his interest in the military program.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the Senator. I commend the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for the appropriate remarks he is making on this subject.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THURMOND. This is a very vital subject which concerns our national security. I am sure the Senator from Mississippi will agree that a commander has his hands full merely looking after the training of our troops, looking after the base or Army camp or fort, as the case may be, looking after morale, doing the things he must do as a military man, without having to try to change the social patterns of the surrounding community.

I feel confident the Senator would agree with me that that is the way a commander should spend his time, in military ways, rather than to try to change the social customs of a community and, in a great many instances, at places where it could seriously affect the economy of the community and act to the inconvenience and detriment of the troops involved.

Mr. STENNIS. I agree with the Senator wholeheartedly. I thank the Senator for his comments.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks by the Senator from Mississippi a statement I have made on this subject and editorials from the Columbia Record and the Augusta Chronicle may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished friend from Mississippi. I think the Senator is doing a great favor to the country and to the Senate by bringing these matters to the attention of the people of the United States.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I do not think the people understand it. I do not think they know what is going on. I do not think they realize the seriousness of the situation.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I say again that I am trying to present this question from the standpoint, not of any sectional area of the country, not of any State, but rather from the standpoint of the military itself and our military strength and effectiveness.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I understand that. I was a soldier in the First World War. I went in as a private, and I came out the same. There was nothing very private about my life at the time, for somebody always directed it.

I remember that at times I was sent to various locations and camps. Certain places were designated "off limits." I would ask, "What is wrong?" And I would be told, "There is disease" or something detrimental. I would be told, "You should not go there, because it will hurt you."

Now it is said that situations like that can exist around certain places merely because somebody does not like what is going on, when there is nothing wrong at the particular place but good citizenship.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Such a policy is completely beyond the authority of our military forces.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his fine comments.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I think we should make it abundantly clear, at the outset of this discussion, that while in the minds of some people this may have a relationship to civil rights in my mind it does not. In the minds of some people those of us who object to this move will be held up as segregationists. To my mind that is completely false.

The step which has been taken—and I feel taken reluctantly, I might say in his defense, by the Secretary of Defense—was pushed on the Secretary of Defense by someone else, and is a complete flip-flop from the administration's concept of the danger of a military man taking over.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I remember the words, "Don't let them taste the meat." Now we are asked to put the whole chunk in their mouths, and then to order a commander to bite it off. I am sure the Senator agrees.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is the Senator aware of the fact that Mr. Fitt, the man in charge, is traveling around to the bases of this country to promote this kind of action?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi has been so informed, yes. I have not had a contact with him, but he is the gentleman who has been going around.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is the Senator aware of the fact that when the committee goes into a community it goes in completely armed with dossiers on the businessmen of the community, dossiers complete with every figure the committee can get out of income tax returns?

Mr. STENNIS. Would the Senator mind repeating that question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I asked if the Senator was aware of the fact that the committee which Mr. Fitt heads, the name slips me now, though it has a Spanish connotation—visiting the bases around the country in the preliminary efforts to get the commanding officers to act in a way commanding officers have never acted before—goes into the communities with complete dossiers on every businessman.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. With facts and figures gleaned from Internal Revenue reports.

It started in the Attorney General's office. They have used the full force of the Internal Revenue documents. I think this goes much further than what we are talking about here today; namely, the threat of a military takeover should things change in this country and we find that the military commanders have become used to running politics and the social life of the community—I do not care where it is. It goes further than a discussion of the civil rights question. In my capacity as a Reserve officer in the Air Force, I was assigned the tour of duty to visit bases. I questioned about the base relationships. I found as much trouble in this field on the northern Canadian border as anywhere else. Yet I may say these bases have not been approached by these teams.

I suggest as a followup to the Senator's point—and I have suggested this to the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Mr. RUSSELL—that I would give my full support to a complete investigation into Mr. Fitt and Mr. Yarmolinsky and other persons in the Pentagon who are forcing Secretary McNamara—I am convinced, against his will—to take this dangerous step.

I do not think there is a Senator who will defend that directive. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for the speech he is making on the subject.

Mr. STENNIS. First, let me thank the Senator for his services and for contributing his fine knowledge of this subject matter. The Senator has shown how it affects the first point the Senator from Mississippi made, as it bears upon the question of our military might, planning, and strategy. I thank the Senator for his willingness to stand up, with his fine knowledge in this field, to make this point, which is characteristic of him. The Senator from Mississippi did not know this group was armed with this information about individual persons. It shows this plan and singles out the coercion and intimidation and the telling people that "we are going to put the mark on you," and that it will break many of them.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In partial answer to the question put by the Senator from Florida as to the makeup of the committee, I believe an investigation will show that every one of these people can be identified with this type of thing from college days to the present time. This is a "stacked" committee, if Senators will excuse the use of the word. It strengthens my suggestion that a complete investigation be made into the effort and the directive and those people who have pushed it and the full use of the power of the police state by the Attorney General.

Mr. STENNIS. I heartily agree with the Senator from Arizona. We are not fulfilling our duty to the American people—to all the people; this is not a civil rights issue, and we are not fulfilling our duty as custodians of the military program and military preparedness unless we investigate it to the full and lay it on the table, so there will be seen the design and the plan proposed to be carried out along this line. I may say that the military is going to be the most to suffer.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I warmly commend the Senator from Mississippi for the timely and splendid speech he is making in behalf of the welfare of our country.

I point out that on July 31, 1618, the colonists at Jamestown elected a group to govern them. That was the first legislative assembly on this continent. That group developed a program of representative democracy that eventuated in the formation of a document in Philadelphia in 1787 which the historian Gladstone said was the greatest instrument ever struck off by the hand and purpose of man.

Behind that instrument was the work of the great George Mason of Virginia and his Bill of Rights. Behind it was the political philosophy of Thomas Jefferson, one of the greatest political philosophers we have ever had. Behind it was the work of James Madison, the real architect of the fundamental law under which we have been operating.

Yet, following the unfortunate War Between the States, when Virginia and other States were crushed by superior force, the Senate adopted a resolution which said Virginia was not capable of self-goverment. Virginia, it said, will be designated as Military District No. 1. So the Army was sent into Virginia and, at the point of the bayonet, after all Confederate veterans and all who sympathized with the Confederate cause had been disenfranchised, that Army elected a general assembly and, at the point of the bayonet, the general assembly was forced to ratify both the 13th and 14th amendments.

This was the first time, and the only time, the U.S. Army has ever been brought into the political arena.

When Virginia regained its independence, it enacted a law, which we have enforced ever since, that no length of residence in Virginia by a military man would qualify him to vote. Why did we do that? We did not want men temporarily stationed in Virginia to be put in the position of playing party politics. So we said, "You cannot vote."

Now it would appear that our Army, in this grave emergency, when we need the highest morale and the highest loyalty to our Nation, united and undivided, has proposed to push our military men into the most controversial issue which has faced our Nation since the War Between the States.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may make one further comment?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida, but I have an engagement to keep.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be very brief.

I have just seen in the New York Times an editorial which I never expected to see in that newspaper during the segregation discussion. I wanted to call it to the attention of the distinguished Senator, because it seems to me so clear that the philosophy announced in that editorial applies to the military security matter which the Senator is discussing. The title of the editorial is "Breakthrough or Breakdown?"

The first paragraph reads as follows:

> In the name of good sense and better race relations, what in the world do the leaders of the integration movement in this city hope to gain by the tactics they now are using to attract public attention?

I think the editorial applies so completely to the situation which the Senator is discussing, though it is addressed to the tactics being used in the city of New York, and not to the military situation, that I wonder if the Senator would agree that I may insert it in the RECORD, to emphasize the point I have made?

Mr. STENNIS. Very well. The Senator may ask unanimous consent.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BREAKTHROUGH OR BREAKDOWN?

In the name of good sense and better race relations, what in the world do the leaders

> of the integration movement in this city hope to gain by the tactics they now are using to attract public attention?
>
> Item: Eighteen Negro children aged 2 to 13 years being placed by their elders at the entrance to the site of the Downstate Medical Center in Brooklyn;
>
> Item: Seven older demonstrators jumping on a construction truck at the same location and entwining themselves around a portable crane so tenaciously that 20 policemen were required to pry them loose;
>
> Item: A white couple and a Negro man blocking access to Mayor Wagner's office in City Hall;
>
> Item: Others maintaining an around-the-clock sit-in at Governor Rockefeller's New York City office on West 55th Street.
>
> It can be doubted that these and similar unlawful sit-ins, lie-ins, stand-ins that have been carried out in recent weeks in New York City have advanced the cause of equality under the law by an iota. Or speeded up action to bring about a redress of just grievances. They may very well have had the adverse effect of alienating some old friends. They can hardly have won many new ones.
>
> There comes a time in any campaign when the law of diminishing returns begins to operate. That time seems to have come, and to have been passed.
>
> A recent statement by the Public Affairs Committee of Freedom House is commended to the campaign leaders for careful reading. The members of that committee hardly can be accused of being hesitant whites or Negro "Uncle Toms." The statement points out that it is at the conference table where settlements must be reached in a democratic society, not in the streets. That is where they must be reached if "breakthrough" is not to become "breakdown."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, while the subcommittee did not approve of some of the restrictions which had been placed upon some of the military officers, the majority of the subcommittee emphatically concluded that it was of major importance that rigid adherence be given to the traditional and time-honored concept that the military shall under no circumstances become involved in partisan and controversial matters. The majority report of the subcommittee solidly upheld this position.

What has happened since then? There is no valid answer.

The directive will affect the promotion and career advancement of officers affected, including the base commanders. The Gesell report proposed that "officers showing initiative and achievement in this area"—this is highly important—"will enhance their performance ratings and obtain favorable consideration for promotion and career advancement."

I point out with emphasis that the Gesell Committee went about the country, with no military members on it, or anyone who had any attainments in that field, and it actually recommended, in connection with the off-base activities, that officers will enhance—those officers are the base commanders—their performance ratings and obtain favorable consideration for promotion and career advancement.

That is one of the most injurious recommendations that I have ever seen in print regarding our great military profession. Most of us know that these selections are made by a very carefully chosen group of men. Those men walk the floor at night, I understand, deciding between many worthy choices as to who shall be promoted to major or to lieutenant colonel or to colonel or to major general. Still, this group, in the Gesell report, would propose that there be a rating based on this qualification, and that that be given favorable consideration for promotion and career advancement.

Imagine a man like Jack Pershing in World War I, or a man like General MacArthur in World War II, or General Eisenhower in World War II, carrying the responsibility of leading millions of men, if his promotion and career advancement had depended upon activities of this kind beyond a military base. God save us and our Nation from such a day.

Every officer in uniform knows that that recommendation was in the report, whether or not it was specifically adopted and accepted by the Secretary of Defense. How can a base commander, in the back of his mind, at least, escape the inference that necessarily arises?

While the Secretary's directive does not expressly go this far, it does provide for a system of "measuring progress" in the civil rights field. That is the way it is covered by the Secretary's directive. It does not say that promotion will be based on it, but it does speak of a system of "measuring progress" in the civil rights field.

Every base commander knows of the original recommendation of the Gesell committee and knows that he will be on the spot in this respect. I can hardly conceive of any step which could be taken which would be more destructive of officer morale.

In any event, the executive department does not have the final say as to what shall be considered "fitness and efficiency" entitling an officer to promotion. The final power rests with the Senate and only those are promoted who are confirmed by the Senate. Those who might be ranked high by the President's Commission when it comes to "measuring progress" might not be ranked quite so high by those who finally act on proposed promotion. I emphasize this point to show that this directive clearly proposes to throw the military directly into political activities of the most sensitive nature and to introduce a strictly nonmilitary factor into the promotion system.

The consequences can only lower—and I emphasize "lower"—the military efficiency and morale, and injure numerous able and conscientious military officers. What about the great LeMay? Could we think of his coming up the ladder on any such point as this?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should like to call the Senator's attention to a comment on this situation by a man who is not from the South. He made his reputation as a writer and as a correspondent for the New York Times. His name is William S. White. This is what he says:

> The latest and most cutting was the order by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, in effect, inviting military base commanders to declare "off limits" to the troops any community practicing "relentless discrimination" against them. "Relentless discrimination," of course, is refusal of private business to serve Negro customers.
>
> To put a town off limits means to strike at its economic life with all the power of the Federal Government. It is a bald effort to force integration of private business by Executive fiat at the same moment the same administration is asking Congress to do the same thing in a lawful way—by act of Congress.
>
> Ironically, southerners in Congress have repeatedly saved this same Secretary of Defense. Senator STENNIS notably did it by a temperate investigation drawing the heat from charges that Mr. McNamara was muzzling high officers. The Senator supported Mr. McNamara because the Senator believes in the Constitution, including that part which puts the civilian defense head superior to the military.
>
> But Senator STENNIS also believes in the rest of the Constitution, which to him does not mean that the Armed Forces, supported by the billions provided by southerners and other conservatives as well as civil rights extremists, are to be used to force social changes even before Congress has had a chance to say whether they are lawful changes.

I wish the Senator to know that he is not alone—and Mr. White is not from the South—in expressing his resentment and alarm at this new development in our military program.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. It is certainly true that this situation is causing the deepest concern in every area of the country.

The only manner in which such consequences can be avoided is to take action to insure that our military people are confined to their proper and legitimate function. Theirs is the job of maintaining military might at the highest state of combat readiness and insuring that we will win in any contest that may come.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, and as chairman of its Preparedness Subcommittee, I have constantly come in contact with the immense problems which confront the Secretary of Defense, the Department Secretaries, the Joint Chiefs, and the other civilian and military officials who are responsible for our military security.

I do not believe that any of them initiated the action which resulted in this directive. They cannot carry out such missions and still perform their primary duty and function.

I am convinced that it is the duty of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other high ranking military officers to urge that the directive in question be reconsidered and rescinded. I have not conferred with any of these gentlemen about this point. That is my opinion. Our military men must not be cast in the role of political zealot and social reformer.

For the same reasons it is the duty of the Secretary of Defense to reconsider his position. The President, I believe, should give his personal attention to this matter and avoid pushing the military into this unheard-of political role. This may only be the beginning. If political activity is condoned and encouraged in this field the President some day may not be able to extricate the military from other political activity that could follow.

I warn the Members of the Senate and the American people that it will weaken our defenses and imperil our safety and survival if we commit our Military Establishment to this mission. This is the first and only time in our history that our military commanders have been given to understand that the process of "measuring progress" for themselves and their installations will depend on how strongly they enforce a political policy and upset and disturb off-base social orders. This understanding is coupled with the knowledge that their promotions and career advancement are necessarily involved. I repeat that that is the saddest part of this entire directive.

My purpose today is to expose the meaning and implications of this directive with the hope that its implementation, which is now scheduled for August 15, can be prevented. My further purpose is to appeal to the President and the Secretary of Defense to reconsider the position to which they have committed themselves. I hope that the Members of Congress and the American people will immediately express their opposition to this dangerous innovation which will lead our military men in uniform down the road to outright official intervention in the political and social affairs of the Nation.

Mr. President, if the power of the military base commander can be used to influence the social and political life of the people in the area where the base is located, he can also influence a particular election in the area when it comes. If he can use the tremendous economic power which he commands by withholding purchases himself or by prohibiting servicemen from becoming customers of certain businesses by marking them off limits, then he has a punitive power over citizens who pay taxes to support the military services—punitive power that can mean life or death to the businesses involved.

Thus, a base commander could soon amass social, political and economic power of sufficient strength to be the dominating force in a community or area. Such a system operating in a chain of base commanders could generate dictatorial powers beyond recall. God save the military and the country from such a fate.

Furthermore, under this directive, a base commander can be awarded promotions in proportion to his zeal and effectiveness in this field.

The military services and the country must be saved from such a fate.

Mr. President, this is just one phase of the entire pattern for control of the Nation through Federal expenditures. It is the most serious.

Legislation pending here—Senate bill 1731—carries a sweeping provision that seeks to repeal all existing formulas as to expenditure of Federal funds and vests the President with authority not subject to review by the courts or by the Congress, to withhold all Federal expenditures of all kinds should he think there exists any kind of discrimination in the administration of any of the funds.

I refer to the civil rights bill solely because it is a part of the pattern. I have on my desk copies of forms used by elevator operators or warehousemen who put a few bales of cotton into the cotton loan plan. They have to agree in the contract, in order to get it, that they will fulfill certain conditions. If they violate that clause, they forfeit the entire contract; there can be no recourse to the courts. They are forced to agree that as to all future contracts they will not even be eligible for consideration, if they violate that particular clause in the contract.

I understand that directives containing a similar provision have been issued to the highway departments of the various States.

This is all a part of a pattern which is rapidly leading us down the road of control, not by Congress, but by executive orders with reference to the expenditure of funds.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator has very properly described the proposed military order which is to become effective, I believe, on August 14, as leading to dictatorship, or potential dictatorship. Is it not true that in the history of the world no dictator has ever come to power except by force and by the use of the armed services?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Virginia is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not true that all dictators have maintained themselves in power by the use and control of the military?

Mr. STENNIS. So far as I know, that is largely true.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not true that the dictators of our day and generation have used the military not only as a means of aggression against other nations, but also to implement their own domestic policies?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. I thank him for his contribution to the discussion.

I shall conclude in a few words.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall take a view contrary to the Senator's view. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's speech now. I believe he is well acquainted with my views. Nevertheless, I think something should be said on this subject. I shall be very brief. I understand the Chair proposes to recognize next the Senator from Florida rather than me; but I ask the indulgence of the Senator from Florida for 5 minutes to enable me to reply to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from New York that I am overdue at a meeting which I must attend. I shall conclude my remarks in about a minute. Perhaps the Senator from Florida would then yield to the Senator from New York for a few minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I am sorry that I cannot remain.

Mr. President, if such a pattern is followed our constitutional form of government will be no more. Essentially, we will be on the road to a dictatorship.

If this pattern is inaugurated and continued, we will, of course, continue to have a military organization of a kind. But it will not be one devoted to its primary mission of national security and defense. The military will be given political missions and assignments which could be the first step toward a military dictatorship.

I shall do what I can to alert the Nation and all Members of Congress particularly the membership of the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, to these alarming facts and their consequences.

I appreciate the indulgence of the Senate.

Exhibit 1

Department of Defense Directive—Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces

I. POLICY

It is the policy of the Department of Defense to conduct all of its activities in a manner which is free from racial discrimination, and which provides equal opportunity for all uniformed members and all civilian employes irrespective of their color.

Discriminatory practices directed against Armed Forces members, all of whom lack a civilian's freedom of choice in where to live, to work, to travel, and to spend his off-duty hours, are harmful to military effectiveness. Therefore, all members of the Department of Defense should oppose such practices on every occasion, while fostering equal opportunity for servicemen and their families, on and off base.

II. RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Office of the Secretary of Defense

(1) Pursuant to the authority vested in the Secretary of Defense and the provisions of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) is hereby assigned responsibility and authority for promoting equal opportunity for members of the Armed Forces.

In the performance of this function he shall (a) be the representative of the Secretary of Defense in civil rights matters, (b) give direction to programs that promote equal opportunity for military personnel, (c) provide policy guidance and review policies, regulations, and manuals of the military departments, and (d) monitor their performance through perodic reports and visits to field installations.

(2) In carrying out the functions enumerated above, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) is authorized to establish the Office of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Civil Rights).

B. The military departments

(1) The military departments shall, with the approval of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower), issue appropriate instructions, manuals and regulations in connection with the leadership responsibility for equal opportunity, on and off base, and containing guidance for its discharge.

(2) The military departments shall institute in each Service a system for regularly reporting, monitoring, and measuring progress in achieving equal opportunity on and off base.

C. Military commanders

Every military commander has the responsibility to oppose discriminatory practices affecting his men and their dependents and to foster equal opportunity for them, not only in areas under his immediate control, but also in nearby communities where they may live or gather in off-duty hours. In discharging that responsibility a commander shall not, except with the prior approval of the Secretary of his military department, use the off-limits sanction in discrimination cases arising within the United States.

III. IMPLEMENTATION

Not later than August 15, 1963, the military departments shall forward for the approval of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) an outline plan for implementing this directive.

IV. EFFECTIVE DATE

This directive is effective immediately.

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense.

EXHIBIT 2

NEWS RELEASE FROM THE OFFICE OF U.S. SENATOR STROM THURMOND OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The new order by the Secretary of Defense authorizing entire communities and cities to be placed off limits because private businessmen do not choose to have integration on their private property is preposterous and represents economic blackmail in its rawest possible form. This could mean that entire cities such as Charleston, Columbia, Sumter, Augusta, Beaufort, Myrtle Beach, and surrounding communities could be boycotted by Defense Department edict. This would be detrimental not only to the local economy but also to individual servicemen and their families, and the entire defense program. What we are witnessing today is the imposition in America of a second era of Reconstruction. The American people resent blackmail at the hands of Government and are generally opposed to coercion in any form. This order will not be accepted by the American people and will be particularly resented by military commanders who understand their mission to be defense of their country, rather than creation of domestic turmoil and strife by engaging themselves in sociological and political activities at the behest of a power-mad administration.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, July 27, 1963]

MILITARY TO ASSUME CONTROL OF LOCAL RACIAL PRACTICES

Civilian communities will be subjected to military dictation to achieve complete racial integration patterns acceptable to Federal Government monitors.

Commanders and their subordinates will be ordered to effectuate desegregation near military bases. Their promotions and assignments will depend on the degree of success they attain in securing civilian compliance.

Government race-mixing demands will cover the entire spectrum of community life, including restaurants, hotels, housing, theaters, golf courses, swimming pools, poolrooms, bowling alleys, schools, dancehalls, and social centers.

Base commanders will be ordered to liquidate present military-civilian community councils and appoint new ones composed of white integrationists, Negroes who are "not subservient to white interests," and white and Negro military personnel.

The program in each community near a military base will start with a campaign of persuasion. If voluntary compliance is not forthcoming, business places that refuse to sign a pledge for complete integration will be placed "off limits" to military personnel and their dependents. Pledge signers will be constantly monitored. If the boycott system does not get satisfactory results, commanders will be required to initiate litigation against private enterprises in the name of the Federal Government. As a final resort, military operations will be curtailed or bases will be closed.

Secretary of Defense McNamara, in his recent memorandum countermanding his earlier directive encouraging military personnel to participate in racial demonstrations, pointed out that the Defense Department "is implementing the recommendations of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces relating to off-base discrimination."

The forced mixing plan is detailed in the initial report of the President's Committee, which is published in a 93-page book entitled, "Equality of Treatment and Opportunity for Negro Military Personnel Stationed Within the United States."

Since some of the major Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Force installations are based in South Carolina, and racial segregation is practiced in every community of the State, the Federal Government's military offensive against existing social customs are of primary importance to this area.

The following analytical summary is based on the President's Committee's report, with quoted words taken from the report itself:

Universal integration of civilian communities will be "the policy of the Department of Defense and part of the mission of the chain of command from the Secretaries of the services to the local base commander.

"A different concept of the base commander's function in the racial field must be evolved. * * * Explicit orders and more detailed directives" will be provided. Base commanders will be measured by their performance in effecting community integration. They will be monitored and must report progress.

"It should be made clear that officers showing initiative and achievement in this area will enhance their performance ratings and obtain favorable consideration and promotion and career advancement. * * * They will receive the support of all echelons of command if their programs are attacked by local interests. A constant showing of serious, intense effort is the minimum performance accepted.

"A sense of responsibility for problems of off-base discrimination replaces the prevalent notion that matters outside the gate are of no concern to the base commander."

Base commanders must study "the history of the Negro's struggle to achieve equality," must attend seminars and conferences on integration techniques and success, and must cooperate with other Federal agencies to achieve integration.

Commanders will be required to appoint new military-civilian community relations committees for their bases. "Satisfactory results cannot be obtained by relying on the types of committees which have heretofore existed." The new racially mixed committees will have specific objectives and timetables.

The approach of the base commander to the civilian community must be that he is "correcting forms of discrimination which interfere with morale and efficiency of members of his command. The pattern the community chooses to follow as to its own civilians cannot be accepted as the pattern which must be imposed upon men in uniform or their dependents." By this strategy the commander must make it appear that the significant tradition of noninvolvement by military authorities in local political matters will be unimpaired.

Since bases are "economically important to the communities that surround them" and because of the "economic dependence of the community upon the base," the base commander "should lead patriotic citizens to join together, where their business interests are common, to find appropriate solution.

"Where efforts to achieve progress by persuasion and discussion are unsuccessful," the base commander may initiate "litigation, brought in the name of the Federal Government." As this method is "piecemeal and time-consuming at best," the commander must take more direct action "under which military personnel of all races would be permitted to patronize only those facilities which receive his express approval."

In other words, the commander would impose a boycott against all establishments that refuse to comply. Firms which took the pledge would be constantly monitored under threat of disqualification. All other businesses would be off limits to military personnel.

Should this method fail, "the Services must consider a curtailment or termination of activities" at the nearby base.

"Such relocation of activities is particularly important at bases that play an important role in the training of new recruits or officers or in the orientation of representatives of foreign governments."

Where punitive action is taken against communities, it must be proclaimed that the objective is "preservation of morale, not the punishment of local communities which have a tradition of segregation."

New installations will be opened only in communities where "explicit guarantees" against segregation are given.

Implementation of the new program of controls on the civilian communities will require a new bureau in the Department of Defense and offices in each Service to "monitor developments and provide assistance." All resources of the Federal Government will be made available and "brought to bear on the intelligent solution of specific problems." Commanders will be under surveillance and special officers will be appointed at each base to receive Negroes' complaints and take them up directly with the commander.

The President's committee anticipates that suits initiated by the Department of Justice will "compel the integration of the other schools (not on bases) serving military dependents, including dependents who live off base." Where there is only token integration, local commanders must place children of military personnel promptly in desegregated schools, put the full force of the military "squarely on the side of Negro parents as they attempt to overcome administrative barriers," and continue efforts "until dispersion of children of Negro military personnel within the local school system is complete."

Under the new program, ROTC and National Defense Cadet Corps units will be withdrawn from segregated schools and colleges, military personnel requiring special college training will be enrolled only in integrated institutions. Recommendations for integration of National Guard and Reserve units will be contained in a subsequent report.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, July 30, 1963]

A CASE OF PLANNED BLACKMAIL

A Defense Department order authorizing base commanders to declare off limits to troops businesses which do not serve or cater to Negro servicemen and their families is an insult to the character and the integrity of every owner of a private concern in the Nation who refuses to knuckle under to governmental blackmail.

There can be no other connotation placed on the infamous effort of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara to dictate this offensive policy, for the sanctions which he plans to impose may be likened, he said, to those invoked in "vice-ridden areas."

This equating of a privately operated business in the public domain to a house of ill repute not only flies in the face of all that is sacred in the commercial life of this Nation, but, as we have previously said, threatens a rupture in the morale of America's Armed Forces and a devastating blow to the national economy.

McNamara's sadistic order is based upon his compliance with recommendations made by the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces. That it was one weighted against the white was early indicated in its report.

While admitting that Negroes within the armed services are on equal plane with their white counterparts, the committee—as though it were intent upon creating dissension—declared that "the great progress made is not enough."

It is unwilling to let this "great progress" set the pace for further and harmonious advances for the Negro. It prefers, evidently, to move on a course that will antagonize almost every white businessman in the Nation, none of whom hereafter may feel any security in the free operation of his business.

Worse still, if that be possible, is the almost complete lack of concern the committee evidences for the irreparable harm that can befall the Nation as a result of its socialistic and unholy presentments. By giving greater credence to color of skin than to merit—an example of which is its demand that "energetic efforts must be made" to increase the number of Negroes in the service academies so as to boost the number of Negro officers—the Gesell Committee is playing a major role in determining the makeup and, as a consequence, the effectiveness of America's Armed Forces.

Its recommendation that base commanders be wary of groups and clubs and functions that practice their constitutionally guaranteed right of freedom of choice and assembly denies to these commanders the intimate civilian-military relationship so valuable to the well-being of the community and the installation. It places on them, too, a morale-breaking burden which could destroy their effectiveness as commanders of all their troops, colored as well as white.

Failure of a community to fall in line with the Defense Department's dictatorial tactics not only, then, might lead to off-limit sanctions and to the destruction of its economy, as we have noted, it could tear down the morale of white troops at whom it would be aimed just as much as at Negroes, and it could mean—if the committee recommendations are followed—loss of promotion to highly qualified military commanders whose failure to advance because of nonmilitary actions over which they would have absolutely no control might work against the survival of the United States in some future war.

It was on such a report that the Secretary of Defense now moves to blackmail businessmen in the area of military installations into accepting Government dictation of their business practices.

Loss of their liberties, just as surely as night follows day, will react to the loss of individual freedoms for all Americans in the years to come. The loss will be as great to the Negro as it will be to the white.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, first, I express my deep appreciation to the Senator from Mississippi for calling to the attention of the Nation the very somber facts which he has mentioned. I concur completely in his point of view. When the time comes that extravagant people, having an ultraliberal philosophy, such as that which now dominates those who are behind this effort, seek to control all the rest of the country, with the vast power of the Federal Government to control it to the degree that they will have the power to destroy, we will not have the same kind of America that we now have.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have no intention of monopolizing the floor. The reason why I am being recognized is to make the opening remarks with reference to the pending business.

I announce that I have agreed to yield first to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]; second, to the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]; and third, to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. If other Senators have brief remarks to make, I shall be happy to yield to them. I believe the debate on which we are about to enter may take some time.

I now yield briefly to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

DEFENSE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida. I appreciate his courtesy.

Mr. President, on July 18 I took the floor to defend the Republican Party organization against self-serving and destructive attacks by a small handful of ambitious men. I said then and I say now that a man who would take such desperate and destructive measures against his own party in a gamble to gain some temporary personal advantage has already forfeited any claim to loyalty from any part of the Republican Party organization.

I said then and I repeat now that this so-called Republican leader is using exactly the tactic that the northern Democrats have adopted to tar the whole conservative movement with the brush of extremism. He is using exactly the strategy that the Democrats themselves have decided would be the most destructive of Republican chances in 1964, right down the line, right down to the local offices.

Mr. President, I am not surprised that this attack on the Republican Party organization has been condemned in editorial comment on a broad scale. I believe it is important to draw direct attention of the Senate to some of the excerpts from the editorial outpouring. Here are some of them:

From the New York Daily News, July 22, 1963:

> The dirty tactics consist in sly hints that GOLDWATER is anti-Negro, and that he runs around with the John Birch Society if not with the Ku Klux Klan. GOLDWATER is not anti-Negro and he never has been anybody's captive throughout his political career. His published speeches, book and syndicated column make idiotic any assertion that he is an extremist or a pal of extremists.

From the Fort Lauderdale News, Fort Lauderdale, Fla., July 16, 1963:

> That the liberals of both parties are fearful of what might happen should the GOP nominate Senator GOLDWATER can now be seen from what has all the appearance of a planned campaign to make it appear that the Arizona Senator and his followers are trying to convert the GOP into what they call a "white man's" party. This is a smear of the worst type for Senator GOLDWATER's record in public office and his private life is as clean as a whistle on the racial issue.

From the Cincinnati Enquirer, July 18, 1963:

> Some political figures—among them Senator BARRY GOLDWATER—were kind enough to describe Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller's "policy statement" as an announcement of his candidacy for the Presidency. But inasmuch as Governor Rockefeller's overwhelming desire to sit in the White House is a secret to no one, we saw between the lines—and in the lines of the statement a certain counsel of desperation.

From Newsweek magazine, July 29, 1963:

> But Rockefeller made little hay with the GOP professionals, who are dedicated conservatives almost to a man. Most of them thought Rockefeller's statement was an act of desperation that backfired.

From Gould Lincoln in the Washington Star of July 19, 1963:

> The Democrats are chuckling with appreciation at the Rockefeller attack on the champion of Republican conservatives.

From the San Francisco Examiner, July 18, 1963:

> As concerns the Republican Party it was a disruptive statement. As concerns Senator GOLDWATER it was grossly unfair.

From the Knoxville Journal, July 17, 1963:

> Rockefeller proposes at one stroke to eliminate the whole South and part of the Midwest and West as part of the national electorate.

From the Los Angeles Herald Examiner, July 17, 1963:

> But if the Republican Party wants to win the White House next election, then it must face the facts of life. The candidate most likely to succeed should be somebody who does not parrot the J. F. K. oratory. Let's have a real choice.

From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, July 17, 1963:

> Senator GOLDWATER's choice for his country is for self-reliance instead of abject dependence upon Government, and for Government doing only those things which Government must do, and which no one else can do.

From the Sun-Sentinel, Hollywood, Fla., July 16, 1963:

> Governor Rockefeller has launched what appears to be the eastern bankers' attempt to retain control of the GOP nominations through another convention.

From the Pittsburgh Press, July 21, 1963:

> In other words, Rocky believes in party unity only when he's the frontrunner. Otherwise, he would be willing to split the party—and perhaps guarantee a Democratic victory—unless he has his way.

From the Indianapolis Star, in a recent edition:

> A calm reply to an invitation to debate has shown that Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican from Arizona, is more interested in the welfare of his party than personal advancement.

From Newsweek magazine, July 29, 1963:

> Essentially, GOLDWATER believes in attaining reasonably conservative ends through supporting the Republican Party and all its candidates. His moving speech at the Republican convention seconding the nomination of Richard Nixon urged his followers, who were crying out for his nomination, instead to get into the Republican ranks and work and support the ticket. In the campaign which followed, GOLDWATER made innumerable speeches supporting the Republican Party and all its candidates.

From the Redlands Daily Facts, Redlands, Calif., July 16, 1963:

> Rockefeller, who couldn't even remember Nixon's middle initial at Chicago, probably can't remember what GOLDWATER said for the good of the party in 1960. But that is the way it goes in the jungle of politics. Tear

> down, knock off the leader if you can, and hope that from the wreckage will appear a new face that can accomplish the job of winning the White House.

From the Derrick, Oil City-Franklin-Clarion, Pa., July 18, 1963:

> Moreover, such a wailing cry, whether it be used against Mr. GOLDWATER or any other potential candidate, implies a defeatist attitude and squarely ignores the fact that public opinion polls show the popularity of the present White House incumbent sharply on the decline.

Again I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. It has been a pleasure to yield to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. President, pursuant to my previous statement, I yield now to the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GRANTS TO STATES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, much has been said during the past 12 months about the great generosity of a benevolent Uncle Sam as he handed out thousands of dollars in Federal grants to various communities on the Eastern Shore.

But what was not explained with these announcements was that during the past 12 months our Government has taken away $5 for every $1 that has been given to either Maryland or Delaware.

On October 13, 1962, under the Accelerated Public Works Projects and Community Facilities Act, Congress appropriated $400 million; and as of June 1, 1963, $389,293,000 of this amount had been pledged in the form of grants.

Of this total amount, Delaware, on 7 projects, had received a total of $368,000; and Maryland received a total of $1,493,000, for 15 projects.

Based upon Treasury Department reports, fifty-two one hundredths of 1 percent of all the revenue collected by the Federal Treasury comes from the taxpayers of the State of Delaware. That means that Delaware's share in the cost of the $389,293,000 of total grants made under this program last year cost the taxpayers of our State $2,024,000. We received in return only $368,000, or a ratio of $1 for every $5.

Based upon the same Treasury statistics, Maryland pays 1.94 percent of all the income collected. This means that the taxpayers of Maryland paid $7,552,000 in the Federal Treasury as its share of the overall cost while it received back as grants only $1,493,000—again, a ratio of one for five.

Yes, Maryland and Delaware taxpayers paid into the Federal Treasury an extra $5 for every $1 Delaware and Maryland communities received as grants last year under the program.

Where did this other $4 go? Part of it went to pay the cost of the Washington bureaucracy that was set up to to run the new agency and the rest to States which have greater political pull.

For instance, New Jersey, which is certainly not a poor State, collected in grants under this same program a total of $18,495,000. New Jersey pays 4.29 percent of all our taxes, which represents a payment of $16,700,000. This means New Jersey had a net gain of $1.8 million, or about what Delaware taxpayers lost under this program.

Where did Maryland's extra $4 go? Maryland's tax bill to support its portion of this program last year was $7,552,000, and she collected only $1,493,000 in grants, thus representing a loss of $6 million.

Pennsylvania, another of our so-called poor neighbors to the north, received grants, under the same program, totaling $35,417,000 against a tax payment of only $26,939,000. Pennsylvania pays 6.9 percent of all Federal taxes.

This gave Pennsylvania a net gain of around $8.5 million. Why should Delaware and Maryland taxpayers be forced to subsidize work in Pennsylvania and New Jersey?

In making this report I want to make it clear that I am not criticizing the communities which have received grants under this program. Their elected officials would have been negligent in discharging their responsibilities had they not taken advantage of a law which has been passed by Congress and for which our taxpayers will have to pay regardless of to what extent we may benefit. If they can show equal need, they are entitled to equal treatment.

What I am criticizing very strenuously is the erroneous impression that the Washington bureaucracy tries to create when it claims that these many giveaway programs are economically sound.

In my opinion this boondoggle program is nothing more than a political pork barrel, and it should be abolished.

In particular, our State cannot afford the luxury of these free grants which cost us five times as much as we get.

The moral to this story is that you cannot get something for nothing from Washington. Whenever the taxpayers of Delaware or Maryland hear the pleasant announcement from their Congressmen or Senators that the Federal Government is giving a certain community in their State a sizable grant, they should remember that for every dollar that community is receiving it will cost the taxpayers of that State $5 in extra taxes.

I ask unanimous consent to insert a chart showing a breakdown for all of the States.

This chart shows the number of projects that were approved for each State prior to June 1, 1963, the total amount of dollar grants, along with the percentage of the overall cost that will be paid by the taxpayer of each State.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Dollars in thousands]

State	Number of projects [1]	Estimated APW cost [1]	Proportionate overall cost [1] paid by each State	Percent of Federal taxes paid by each State [2]
Alabama	107	$9,862	$3,776	0.97
Alaska	36	4,777	428	.11
Arizona	37	5,778	2,413	.62
Arkansas	167	7,732	1,751	.45
California	133	13,611	43,445	11.16
Colorado	32	2,905	3,776	.97
Connecticut	36	4,289	8,642	2.22
Delaware	7	368	2,024	.52
Florida	54	6,385	9,810	2.52
Georgia	118	7,863	5,177	1.33
Hawaii	6	545	1,323	.34
Idaho	59	3,897	1,012	.26
Illinois	124	12,313	26,978	6.93
Indiana	64	6,652	8,914	2.29
Iowa	2	528	4,476	1.15
Kansas	9	655	3,737	.96
Kentucky	149	19,380	4,009	1.03
Louisiana	107	14,657	4,788	1.23
Maine	30	2,529	1,712	.44
Maryland	15	1,493	7,552	1.94
Massachusetts	47	8,999	13,742	3.53
Michigan	332	30,782	17,401	4.47
Minnesota	106	6,732	6,384	1.64
Mississippi	83	7,263	1,790	.46
Missouri	121	5,607	8,875	2.28
Montana	54	3,946	1,167	.30
Nebraska	20	1,321	2,530	.65
Nevada	5	452	817	.21
New Hampshire	$9	$1,129	$1,284	.33
New Jersey	58	18,498	16,700	4.29
New Mexico	150	8,671	1,440	.37
New York	96	13,379	52,710	13.54
North Carolina	119	8,726	5,644	1.45
North Dakota	7	502	817	.21
Ohio	72	11,302	22,345	5.74
Oklahoma	98	8,772	3,659	.94
Oregon	66	7,185	3,698	.95
Pennsylvania	216	35,417	26,939	6.92
Rhode Island	21	6,154	2,024	.52
South Carolina	86	5,822	2,530	.65
South Dakota	7	1,064	856	.22
Tennessee	82	10,347	4,632	1.19
Texas	90	10,490	16,583	4.26
Utah	60	4,077	1,440	.37
Vermont	5	410	661	.17
Virginia	34	2,326	6,617	1.70
Washington	114	8,481	6,150	1.58
West Virginia	143	20,112	2,647	.68
Wisconsin	103	3,980	8,058	2.07
Wyoming	16	784	700	.18
Guam	1	105	(3)	
Puerto Rico	123	9,909	(3)	
Virgin Islands	3	330	(3)	
Total		389,293		

---

[1] Source: P. 7 of Department of Commerce report of June 1, 1963 (Area Redevelopment Administration).

[2] Based on the proportionate part of Federal taxes collected from each of the respective States. Source: Tax Foundation based on Treasury Department data, p. 112.

[3] Not available.

THE GESELL REPORT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, pursuant to my previous statement, I yield at this time, for 3 minutes, to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits].

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Florida. I shall not be long.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to answer the recent remarks of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], who in the last few minutes has had to leave the floor, but who, nonetheless, knew that I would reply to his remarks.

Mr. President, it is almost taken for granted that a Member of the Senate from the State of Mississippi would protest against an action of the Federal Government such as the Defense Department directive, which I feel is intended to enforce the Constitution insofar as the civil rights of U.S. citizens are concerned; and many speeches of that nature have been made. I suppose those who have made them expect us to make, in reply, speeches in which we set forth our views in regard to civil rights.

However, Mr. President, when an important Member of the Senate who serves on the Armed Services Committee addresses himself to a question of the promotion of military officers and to the question of what the Senate can do in that connection, certainly it is time for Senators to speak out.

Are we to understand that an effort will be made to impose sanctions against military officers who obey directives issued by the Department of Defense? Is that what we are to understand from the speech of the Senator from Mississippi? If so, such a doctrine would be shocking.

Mr. President, I have served in the Armed Forces, as have many other Members of the Senate. All who have served in the Military Establishment have seen places of business declared "off limits" because improper conduct has been allowed in them or because members of the Military Establishment have been victimized or "rolled," as the expression goes, in such places of business. But, Mr. President, how much more serious is it when one who wears the uniform of his country is barred—solely because his color is black—from admission to a place of business. The persistence in such action is in many cases the fault of Congress which has not yet adopted laws to implement constitutional guarantees; not the fault of the Negro involved, who is told that he will not be admitted to a place where his white buddy is admitted.

Mr. President, I understand that today the Senate was asked whether any Member of the Senate would rise to defend the action taken by the Department of Defense. I rise to defend it, Mr. President, and I am proud to do so; and I am proud that the Secretary of Defense has sufficient insight to issue such an order and to direct that it be complied with.

Mr. President, certainly it is the duty of the Armed Forces to observe the provisions of the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the United States and to defend the dignity of the members of the Armed Forces; and, in that connection, the commander of a base has a duty to maintain a high standard of morale. However, could there be anything more shattering to the maintenance of a high standard of morale than to have a soldier ordered—merely because of his color—to stand in the rear of a bus, and to be threatened with a beating if he does not do so—even though he is wearing the uniform of his country—or to be denied admission—solely because of his color—to a restaurant, a drugstore, or any other civilian establishment located near a base.

However, Mr. President, in the absence of State law or State cooperation, Congress cannot direct such establishments in all communities to admit them until Congress passes a law to deal with that situation to the extent it can act. That is the situation and the difficulty we face.

However, the Secretary of Defense under appropriate conditions can direct the officers of the Military Establishment to declare "off limits" private establishments which take action of that sort. This order merely states to the soldiers of the United States that action of that sort is not compatible with the dignity of our Military Establishment or with the dignity of those who serve in it.

So, Mr. President, I sustain and honor the directive issued by the Department of Defense, and I think it is high time that it was issued.

Furthermore, I do not conceive that the promotion of any officer will depend on that. I simply do not believe that, Mr. President, and I do not believe any officer will believe it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before I get to my discussion of the pending business, I wish to express my disappointment that the Senator from New York was not present to hear in full the statement of the Senator from Mississippi. If he had been, he would not have gone so far afield as he has.

The Senator from Mississippi quoted from the recommendations of the Gesell Committee. I agree with the Senator from Mississippi completely in the words that he used. The Committee had recommended to the President and to the Defense Department the subjects which have been mentioned casually by the Senator from New York. A part of that recommendation was that the attitude of the commanding officers of the several bases that operated under the very drastic course of action recommended would become a part of their official records, and thereby would have important influence upon their promotion or their lack of promotion. I am sorry that the distinguished Senator from New York, which is not in accord with his general custom, has not done his homework on this particular subject, probably due to the fact that the Senator came in near the end of the very fine address of the Senator from Mississippi.

If the Senator from New York will take the time, which I think he will, to read the address of the Senator from Mississippi, he will probably desire to make some comments by way of apology tomorrow to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Hr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope it will be a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. If it is not a question I will decline to yield. I tell the Senator that I have been waiting since noon to start my discussion of the pending business.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator has made pretty sharp accusations against me, and the Senator understands the courtesy of Senators in yielding.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida has told the truth about what the Senator from New York said. The Senator from New York came in for the last few minutes of the very able comments of the distinguished and highly moderate Senator from Mississippi.

The Senator from Florida happened to hear those comments. He happened to read the report of the Gesell Committee, and he knows what was said. He knows how far afield his friend from New York went in making the impassioned statement which he has just made.

The Senator from New York is like a good many people now. They are like locomotives running toward a precipice. They do not realize that the precipice is there ahead of them, but they are about to go over the brink. In this particular instance that committee threw completely overboard any question of maintaining the security of this country and placed in the document recommendations which no thinking person—and the Senator from New York is a highly intelligent person—could possibly accept and approve. For that reason the Senator from Florida said what he has said. I yield again to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from New York was present in the Chamber. The Senator from New York heard the statement, to which I refer, made by the Senator from Mississippi, who is a high-minded man of the highest character. I have said nothing in my statement—whether it was or was not impassioned—which would derogate from that. That is my judgment. I say it in the most deliberate way. I may differ with the Senator as to the merits of what he said, but I certainly do not charge him with any less sincerity than I hope he will charge me with. I think he is a very sincere, honorable, and high-minded man.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be printed in the Record the excerpt from the prepared text of the Senator from Mississippi to which I refer.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> In any event, the executive department does not have the final say as to what shall be considered "fitness and efficiency" entitling an officer to promotion. The final power rests with the Senate and only those are promoted who are confirmed by the Senate. Those who might be ranked high by the President's Commission when it comes to "measuring progress" might not be ranked

quite so high by those who finally act on proposed promotion. I emphasize this point to show that this directive clearly proposes to throw the military directly into political activities of the most sensitive nature and to introduce a strictly nonmilitary factor into the promotion system. The consequences can only lower military efficiency and morale and inure numerous able and conscientious military officers.

Mr. JAVITS. In other words, he did say that it is not only the military officers and the President who have to do with Army promotions, but the Senate specifically must pass on the confirmation of those nominations, too. I believe that statement coming from a Senator who stands so very high in the Committee on Armed Services has an implication which even the Senator from Mississippi would not wish to place on it. One does not understand one's own implications unless they are laid out on the table and stated, so that perhaps on the morrow both the Senator from Mississippi and I may both have something else to say on the subject. But I did not wish the Senator to think I had spoken on a point of the speech that I did not hear. It was only that fact which brought me to my feet. I would not have risen on the general proposition about which the Senator from Mississippi spoke because, as I have said before, and as the Senator from Florida knows, we all make speeches on that particular subject based upon our general views. It was that one point that I wished to call to his attention and to the attention of my colleagues and to mark as a special thing, because I think that the statement has special implication.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend. I invite his attention to the lead editorial appearing in today's issue of the New York Times, which I asked to have printed in the RECORD during the debate of the able Senator from Mississippi. The editorial entitled, "Breakthrough or Breakdown," is applicable to the position taken a few minutes ago by the distinguished Senator from New York. The first paragraph of the editorial, which was emphasized later by recalling and listing actual cases, made it very clear that the able editorialist thought that the impassioned advocates of integration, of whom the distinguished Senator from New York is one of the ablest, were going far afield and hurting their cause. As the editorialist suggested, they were breaking down their case by the extreme positions which they were taking. The Senator from Florida happens to know that the distinguished Senator from New York was not present during all the speech of the Senator from Mississippi. I do not believe that the Senator from New York was here as the Senator from Mississippi read from the report of the Gesell Committee. It is from that report and upon the terms of that report that the Senator from Mississippi was commenting as he did that the expectation of promotion of high-ranking officers having command of the various posts throughout the United States was very definitely involved in the recommendations of the Committee.

That was the point which the Senator from Mississippi made over and over again. The Senator from Florida recalls that the Senator from New York stated that he expected, and others expected, the Senator from Mississippi always to make addresses of a certain kind on this subject which, at the very least, I would say he meant would be interpreted as extreme. I believe the Senator from Mississippi is a moderate man. If the Senator from New York was excoriating the Senator from Mississippi, he was excoriating many others of whom the speaker is one. I could never give my consent to the military department taking over the power of destroying communities—businesses, churches, clubs, and various other activities in a community—near Army, Naval, or Air Force bases, for the simple reason that segregation was the rule in such communities instead of integration. I think such action would be destructive of the security of our Nation.

When I think of the great leaders who have defended our Nation who came from a part of the country that could never support that kind of philosophy, and think of the place they occupied in the winning of World War II and every other war in which we have engaged, it seems to me that it is clear that people get so enthused over the objective that they are working toward that they forget the tragic destruction which they are inviting to be placed upon the security program of our Nation.

To state a few from my own State whose names will be well known to the distinguished Senator, I mention General Geiger, who led in the recapture of Guam, General Landrum, who led in the recapture of Attu, and General Van Fleet, who led in the surrounding and the capture of the Ruhr. I could name a dozen others from my State alone. I have not mentioned the Pattons, the Courtney Hodges, the Patches, and all the others, from the South.

Can our Nation afford to take a position in this matter of giving such vast power to military commanders which runs counter to the philosophy and the deep convictions of a great part of our country? Are we going to eliminate from military service and say that we do not desire the services of the boys and the girls, the men and the officers, from that great part of the Nation which does not view this problem through the same eyes that the distinguished Senator from New York views it?

Mr. President, I do not think we can afford to take that position.

I support enthusiastically and wholeheartedly the comments of the Senator from Mississippi. This program, if carried further, in the field of military control of our communities will be destructive of our military security and of our military morale. I would not be satisfied in my own conscience if I did not voice that belief. If the Senator from New York has had military experience, so have I. The Senator from New York knows it. There are a great many other Senators here who have had military experience and who, I believe, will support the position which I have stated. What I am now asking is that the Senator from New York examine carefully the prepared remarks of the Senator from Mississippi. He was not speaking spontaneously. He had carefully prepared and documented his remarks. I hope the Senator will read and examine those remarks tomorrow in the printed RECORD.

I predict that he will then come to the floor and offer an apology to my distinguished friend from Mississippi.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield again.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall read with the greatest care every word the Senator from Mississippi has said. Second, I was addressing myself to a particular statement about a particular thing. Third, and most important of all, I was not excoriating anybody. I do not intend to do so. For that I would apologize, because I had no such design.

Mr. HOLLAND. I anticipated that the Senator would apologize, and I appreciate the Senator's apology, but I hope he will make the apology to the Senator from Mississippi and not to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. JAVITS. We are talking about excoriation, and that is not what I had in mind. I was excoriating no one, and I apologize to no one. I say to the Senator—because he raises an interesting point about those who serve in our Armed Forces from the South—that I hope very much that there will never be a change in the patriotism of those men. I have never heard of an instance in which anyone from the South refused to serve or was inhibited from service or was encumbered in his service by what the United States might do to eliminate racial segregation or discrimination. I hope that day will never come. I do not think it will.

I say, affirmatively, with respect to any person in the South who has the patriotism to serve his country in the Armed Forces, and many heroes have come from there—I say, with pardonable pride, that we from New York have had our share of heroes, as have other States in which the people do not feel the same about these matters as do such persons. I shall always believe, as I believe now, that no southern person who is able to serve this country in the Armed Forces would withhold that service or diminish that service one whit because of what the United States might do in pursuance of this very deep and trying issue in which we are engaged. I deeply feel that way.

I understand the Senator's feeling on the subject. I often wish that we could be given as much credit for sincerity in this particular controversy at issue as Senators from our Southern States feel we should give to them. I find that we are always assumed to be speaking politically, always assumed to be extreme, and always assumed to be going over a precipice; but that is not considered to be true of our southern friends, notwithstanding the fact of tremendous disorder, tremendous protests, to say the least, and tremendous measures of repression which we see now not in the North—where we have our share of troubles, too—but in the South.

I believe that history and the facts are on our side.

Be that as it may, I say only that I wish to affirm my deep feeling for the patriotism and the sincerity of any southerner, no matter what may happen in this controversy, and my deep feeling that the sincerity and patriotism for our Nation, in and out of the armed services, will continue, regardless.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement by the distinguished Senator. Insofar as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he thinks he understands the situation. The editorial to which he has referred came from the New York Times. It referred to what was happening on the part of integration leaders in the city of New York.

It is that reference which the Senator from Florida has placed in the RECORD; and he hopes that his distinguished friend not only will read that but also will ask himself the question—as to whether the extreme character of the activity complained of by the editorialist, which he says is making for a breakdown of a movement in which that paper deeply believes—whether that comment might or might not apply to him and others who have taken some rather extreme positions on the floor of the Senate.

AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1703) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, anticipating the fact that other Senators will wish to be present for the debate which will follow, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that suggestion briefly?

The Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], who is across the hall, and I have been trying to obtain the floor all day. We wish to speak for only 15 or 20 minutes. Our names are on the quite informal, illegal list at the desk. I wonder if the Senator could give us the benefit of a few minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I certainly do not wish to be discourteous to my friend. I have been waiting since 12 o'clock for the Senate to consider a bill on which I am acting merely on the mandate of the committee to which I belong, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, under instructions to suggest the absence of a quorum, so that a number of Senators who are much more interested in the subject than I can be present. It is now 3 hours and 25 minutes later, and I think my friend will agree that is rather a large showing of courtesy to associates.

I would prefer to have the quorum call and then to move ahead. When I complete my remarks, which will not take more than 15 or 20 minutes, I shall be glad, of course, to have the Senator take the floor on his own time. If the Senator has a comment of 3 minutes or so, I have yielded to other Senators for such comments.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator's name is on the list before mine. I withdraw my request.

Mr. HOLLAND. My name was not put on the list at my request. It was put on the list because I was expected to speak on the bill, I suppose. I assume that is what the Senator refers to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be discontinued.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for the purpose of my making a point of order?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin so that he may make a point of order.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I make a point of order that the bill which is now under consideration is not properly before the Senate because, at the time the vote to report the bill was taken in committee, a quorum was not actually present. I have checked this with the clerk of the committee, and it is my understanding that only six Senators answered to their names.

It is true that there had been a quorum of the committee earlier in the day and that that quorum had been present during the discussion of the bill. The fact is that there was not a quorum physically present at the time the vote was taken, and for that reason I feel that the bill is not properly before the Senate.

I wish to make one further point in discussing my point of order against the bill; I do not make this point of order merely to delay the bill. I do it because I feel very strongly that S. 527, the so-called Williams bill, should receive consideration before this bracero bill is acted on. S. 527 would give domestic agricultural workers—American citizens—the same protections that we provide in the pending bill for the braceros—Mexicans.

In the second place, I make this point of order because the committee acted on the bill without giving it any significant consideration. Although several of us on the committee pleaded for hearings, no hearings were held. Hearings were desired. The situation regarding the braceros program has changed dramatically in the past 2 years since this matter was last before the committee. The bill should be returned to the committee to permit the Senate to have the benefit of hearings.

Mr. President, the committee has failed to secure the opinion of the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Labor.

Why should the Senate be afraid of determining where the administration stands on this bill before we act? I will tell you why; because the administration is against this bill in its present form.

Mr. President, I ask for a ruling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must inquire of the chairman of the committee as to what the facts are. The Chair is not conversant with the facts, and must depend on the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the Chair sustains the point of order of the Senator from Wisconsin, I should say 50 percent of the bills that come from committee would be in the same category as the one that is now before the Senate.

Ever since I became chairman of the committee, I have made it a rule to have a quorum present and, after a quorum is present, if any member of the committee desires to leave because of some other meeting, a proxy is left, and I am usually told how to vote that proxy.

In this case at the time of the actual voting to report the bill, I believe six members of the committee were present. The others had left proxies that were cast by me pursuant to instructions by Senators who were present at the meeting.

As I have said, committees have been proceeding in that manner for many years—in fact, ever since the act was put on the statute books in 1946. I am very hopeful that the Chair will rule with us.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator recall that, before the committee began the discussion of this bill, there were some 11 or 12 members of the committee present, one of them being the Senator from Florida?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. There were 12 members of the committee present when discussion of the bill began. All members of the committee voted in person or by proxy, and the vote was 12 to 5 in favor of reporting the bill. Every member of the committee had the chance to express his views and to vote on the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator recall that, after substantial discussion, the Senator from Florida, and perhaps other Senators who had critical appointments—I, for instance, had an appointment for the markup of the space bill, which had been going on for about an hour at the time I had left—left the committee, and with full knowledge of the issue before the committee, left with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana his proxy to be cast, as I am sure he cast it, for reporting the bill? Does the Senator recall that?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do. That is the same thing that obtained with respect to a number of other Senators. It would seem to me that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin had ample opportunity to make a point of no quorum when the bill was actually voted out. He was present at the time. I cannot understand this situation.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to inquire specifically if a point of no quorum was made by any of the members of the committee who were present and who opposed the passage of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. No. They voted, without raising any question as to the presence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the chairman of the committee inform the Chair specifically whether a quorum was present at the time the vote was taken on S. 1703?

Mr. ELLENDER. At the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At the time.

Mr. ELLENDER. By proxies, yes; but not actually.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. The committee record shows that a quorum was present. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. No point of no quorum was made at the time the bill was reported.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. The record shows that a quorum was present, and no point of order was made at that particular time, and members drifted in and out. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. That is exactly the way it happened, and it happens in all committees.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. A majority of the committee voted to report the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I was present at the meeting when the bill was called up. A majority of the committee was present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin press his point of order?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes; I press my point of order. I wish further to point out that it has now been disclosed and stipulated and agreed upon by the chairman of the committee that a quorum was not present at the time the vote on the bill was taken. It is true that a quorum was present earlier. It is true that a substantive majority was present earlier, but at the time the vote was taken no physical quorum was present in the committee room to vote.

Mr. ELLENDER. The records of the committee show that a quorum was present at the meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By proxy?

Mr. ELLENDER. A quorum was present at the time the meeting began, when the question of a quorum arose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Was a quorum present at the time the vote was taken on S. 1703?

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In view of the point of order that has been made, and the rule which necessitates that a ruling be made, the Chair rules that under section 133(d) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which operates as a rule of the Senate, and provides that: "No measure or recommendation shall be reported from any such committee unless a majority of the committee were actually present," the Chair sustains the point of order.

If the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported the bill (S. 1703) in question without a majority of the members being actually present, the action of the committee in ordering the bill to be reported to the Senate was in contravention of the above section of the Legislative Reorganization Act, and therefore such action was without authority and void.

Being "actually present" means the member would have had to be present in committee, and a poll does not present a compliance with the rule.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. What is the status of the bill following the ruling of the distinguished Presiding Officer?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The status of the bill is that legally it has never left the committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. The status of the bill is that it is still in the custody of the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in the custody of the committee.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I do not question the ruling of the Chair in this respect. The Chair is entirely correct in his ruling. It has been my understanding that this is the rule of the Senate. It is my understanding that the Chair has ruled in accordance with a rule of the Senate. I have no quarrel with that ruling. However, I have certain facts that I believe should be made clear to the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin knows, as does every other Member of the Senate, that in using this extra-legal maneuver to defeat the bill, he is employing an artifice which could keep 90 percent of the bills in the Senate off the calendar the day they are reported to the Senate.

This morning the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported three bills. All three of them are here illegally according to the artifice employed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I will not yield at this time. I have been waiting since noon. It is now 3:40 o'clock, p.m.

I believe the facts in the case should be known to the Senate and to the public. The work of Senators on committees is so voluminous that it is impossible to remain in a meeting of a committee all the time. If the work of the committee is to be accomplished, it must be accomplished in the way the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] has accomplished the work here, and as the distinguished Senator from Florida has stated it.

As an example, this morning I had one committee meeting at 9:30. Two other of my committee meetings were being held in adjoining rooms at 10 o'clock. I talked with another Senator, who said he had five committee meetings to attend this morning. It is obvious that no Member of the Senate can attend every one of his committee meetings.

However, the Chair has stated the rule. I would like to suggest the modus operandi nevertheless, because the modus operandi of the committees of the Senate has been, for the 9 years that I have been a Member of the Senate, exactly in conformity with the manner in which the distinguished Senator from Louisiana stated it today. If this is to be the rule from now on, we can use the rule. However, there will have to be a drastic change in the way the Senate is operated, or about 90 percent of the bills will have to be sent back to committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, I gladly accede to the ruling of the Chair, which I understand is based on the advice of the Parliamentarian. I wish the Record to show quite clearly what is accomplished by this delay. Hearings on the bill were held in the House of Representatives. Printed hearings show a record of nearly 400 pages. They show that even in the last year, though the number of the Mexican laborers on the farms of the West has been declining, substantially 200,000 were relied upon and were necessary to move the highly perishable crops in that great part of the country. I wish the Record to show the names of the minority members of the committee who signed the minority report. I understand there were 4 of them—4 out of the entire membership of 17. I wish to do this so that farmers throughout the country may know who is holding up the consideration by the Senate of this measure which is of such great importance to them.

I ask unanimous consent that the names of the four signers of the minority views appear in the Record at this time, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

William Proxmire.
Eugene McCarthy.
Maurine Neuberger.
George McGovern.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in reply to the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], let me say that there was nothing extralegal about this procedure. My action is not an artifice as the Senator from Colorado said. Every Senator is free to use the rules of the Senate. The fact is that 90 percent of the bills are passed by the Senate on the so-called Consent Calendar. Any Senator is free to object to the passage of any bill when the calendar is called, and no Senator feels that it is wrong or unfair for any Senator to object. What I have done in making a point of no quorum is the same kind of thing.

This very point of order was raised against one last year in connection with the appointment of the collector of customs in Superior, Wis. The Committee on Finance reported the nomination of John G. Green, for collector of customs. My distinguished friend the then senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. Wiley, made the point of order on the floor of the Senate that the nomination was improperly before the Senate, inasmuch as a quorum was not present at the time the nomination was reported by the committee.

I did not complain; I did not say it was unfair. He had every right to do so. He was against that nomination; I am against this bill. I will do anything I possibly can to kill the bill. The bill is morally wrong; it is economically wrong; it is unsound.

I hope that the extra time that will be afforded will give Senators an opportunity to study the hearings which were held yesterday, and to give deep consideration to the measure.

The bill was killed in the House. It was killed, as the distinguished Representative from Rhode Island, Mr. FOGARTY, put it, because it was a slave-labor bill. It would be very bad legislation. It would be bad for the Mexicans, who are brought here as peons, and separated from their families for months. It would be bad for American domestic farm laborers, who are the most depressed people in the country, having no representation, really, in Congress, because they drift from State to State and therefore have no political force. They are people who earned last year an average of $900 a worker. Their wages are being artificially cut down because the Government of the United States maintains a program of importing Mexican workers to compete with them to perform this labor at a very low wage—70 cents or 60 cents an hour.

I make no apology for the part I played in delaying the bill. I earnestly hope that it will result in the death of the bill.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Would the Senator from Wisconsin like to clarify one point? He commented about hearings held yesterday. I believe no hearings were held in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is absolutely correct. The only hearings that were held to get information on this bill were hearings on another bill, S. 527, which was before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] courteously notified some of us who are members of the Agriculture Committee, so that we could appear and ask questions of the Secretary of Labor about the bill now before the Senate. The Secretary of Labor was vehemently opposed to the bill in the way in which it is drafted. He proposed the adoption of a far-reaching amendment before he would endorse a year's extension. The language of Under Secretary of Labor Henning was particularly strong. Let me read to the Senate what he said, in two or three short sentences:

> Essentially, Senator, it is because of this that we submit Public Law 78 is a broad law—

That is the one proposed to be extended—

> it is a wretched law that should be buried. Being an American citizen places one at a serious disadvantage under the option of this law, because the simple fact is that under the present system an employer can refuse to offer domestic workers the same terms and conditions that he is required to offer alien workers. If the domestic worker refuses to accept the job at less favorable terms, the employer is permitted to bring in Mexican workers who are then afforded the very terms and conditions which were denied to our own workers.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Has the Chair ruled on the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The Chair has sustained the point of order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then I see no need of continuing the discussion.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I had almost concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish I had been informed about the situation ahead of time, because I assure Senators that the proposed legislation would not have been placed before the Senate. I knew nothing about the situation until I was called in my office and informed that a point of order had been made and that it had been upheld. The reason why I asked the Chair for a ruling now was to confirm what I had been told.

I hope that if things like this ever happen again, the leadership will at least be given the courtesy of being notified. If we had been notified, I assure the Senator from Wisconsin that the measure would not have been laid before the Senate; nor would the Senate have been notified last week that on Wednesday of this week the bill would be the pending business.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, 25 minutes ago, I had no notion of making the point of order; but another Senator, gifted in parliamentary procedure, suggested that this might be a way to dispose of the bill. So I checked with the clerk of the committee and then with the Parliamentarian, and found that it was a possibility. As a courtesy, it was suggested that we should wait until the chairman of the committee was on the floor of the Senate.

I think Senators are aware that points of order are sometimes made when the consideration of proposed legislation is underway.

The majority leader has every reason to request Senators, when it is proposed to make points of order, to notify the leadership, provided the action is contemplated a day or more in advance. But many, many times in fact, I would say it is the rule, not the exception, a point of order is made impromptu, without previous plan and no one is notified. Certainly it has not been a common practice in the Senate to notify the leadership when a point of order is made, as the point was made in this case.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand. But in this instance, the action was a little uncommon. I have been placed in a very difficult position. The leadership has been accused of trying to railroad the bill through the Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Not by me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have responded to the questions asked by Senators in good faith—I always assume—and answered in good faith—I always know—as to when the proposed legislation would be taken up. I assure the Senate that had I been informed that the bill had not been considered by a quorum of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and that a point of order would be raised against the bill, it would not have been laid before the Senate; the leadership could have made other plans.

I say this not in criticism of the Senator from Wisconsin, because I understand his position perfectly; he knew about it only a short while ago; I make this statement in explanation of the position of the leadership on this proposal.

Now that the Chair has rendered its decision—and it is a correct one—I hope that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will, at the most appropriate time, call the committee together, if he so desires, make certain this time that a quorum is present, and either report the bill to the Senate or retain it in committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to correct one impression the distinguished majority leader may or may not have. There had been more than a quorum present when the earlier discussion of the bill took place. Some members of the committee had to leave because of important assignments elsewhere. For instance, the Senator from Florida, speaking only for himself, was assigned to participate in the markup of the important space bill at the same hour that the meeting of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was held. The Senator from Florida remained 45 minutes, perhaps an hour—I am approximating—and when it became apparent that we all knew what the bill provided, I announced that I was for the bill and left my proxy to vote for the bill with the distinguished chairman of the committee.

It developed that I held the proxy of another Senator, so I called the Senator whose proxy I held and got his consent for me to leave his proxy with the distinguished chairman of the committee.

The only thing that could be properly said to have been out of order—of course, I bow to the opinion of the Parliamentarian, upon whose advice the Presiding Officer ruled—was that a majority was not present at the precise moment of the vote. So the point of order is well taken.

I have no criticism to make of the Senator from Wisconsin or of any other Senator who might raise the point of order. I thoroughly agree with the distinguished majority leader that, as a matter of courtesy and cooperation with the majority and minority leaders, in such a case advance information should be given. Whenever the Senator from Florida has been in such a situation, he has followed that practice in connection with his own matters.

I have never raised a point of order in such an instance as this, because I know from long practice that in most cases committee reports are finally acted upon after some members of the committee, who had to go to other pressing assignments, when they knew what the issue was and had heard enough of the debate to be certain of what they wished to do, left their proxies either with the distinguished chairman or some other member of the committee.

I would not want the RECORD to indicate that a majority of the committee had not been present during the discussion of the bill, because that was not the case. I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin will recognize that statement to be true.

The Senator from Florida, having presided a good many times himself, knows pretty well on what the decision of the Chair is based. I am trying to relieve my friend the distinguished Presiding Officer, from any responsibility of having had to draft this decision out of thin air, which he did not do; he acted upon the advice of the Parliamentarian. The Senator from Florida was trying not to have any erroneous impression embedded in the RECORD. If anything I have said might be considered a discourtesy to the distinguished Presiding Officer, the Senator from Florida would be glad to withdraw that remark.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am sure that no discourtesy was meant to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, who, during this proceeding, has been the Presiding Officer of the Senate, because he is the soul of honor and dignity.

I am certain that every Senator has acted honorably; but I express the hope that if this idea is ever contemplated again, at least the leadership will be given the advantage of advance notice, so we can protect the Senate and can avoid any such situation.

At this time I wish to make another personal appeal to the chairmen of all the committees; namely, please to get busy on the proposed legislation on which they are holding hearings or on which they intend to hold hearings, and to report some bills to the Senate, so that they will be available for floor consideration, if they wish them to be considered at this session. Time is short.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am very much embarrassed by this situation. Not since 1946, when the Legislative Reorganization Act was placed on the statute books, have I known such a point of order to be made.

As the Senator from Florida indicated a moment ago, I wish to state that at all times in the committee when we discussed this bill, except when we were voting, as many as 12 Senators were present. It was suggested that any Senators not present be polled on the question; and the record shows that all members of the committee voted either one way or the other. Twelve voted in favor; five voted against. The only unfortunate thing is that a quorum was not present at the time when the vote was actually taken.

I have no quarrel with the Chair, although I do have with the Senator who raised the point of order. He should have notified us, or he should have made the point of no quorum at the time when the reporting of the bill was voted by the committee. But he did not do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me say that I helped write the rule in 1946, and it is as unequivocal and as clear as crystal. It is the fruit of abuses which used to take place when there were 32 Senate committees and 43 House committees. Subsequently we streamlined that number to 15 Senate committees and 19 House committees. But bills used to be reported from committees when only one or two members were present.

I recall very definitely—for I was a member of the joint committee—that in writing that rule we used the words "actually present"; and a quorum of the members must be present.

So I think this rather embarrassing situation comes as a timely reminder that when the vote on the question of reporting a bill is taken in a committee, the members should be certain that a physical quorum is present. In fact, on occasion I try to make sure that a quorum is present—having in mind that I might make use of that very rule with respect to bills to which I am opposed.

However, the situation which has developed here is not irrevocable. Following such a ruling by the Chair, at a time when no bill is before the Senate the majority leader can move that the Senate adjourn; and when the Senate adjourns, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana can quickly convene a meeting of the committee—even in the cloak room, for that matter, for five or six members of the committee are now present—and then the committee can order the bill to be reported; and then it can be reported, and can again be placed on the calendar.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that the colloquy which has occurred during the past hour indicates the great interest in the bracero bill, and I believe it behooves the chairman of the committee to consider having some testimony submitted by the Department of Labor. On the prior occasion, the committee refused to hold hearings; but now there is much evidence that perhaps hearings should be held before the bill is summarily reported.

INCLUSION OF DISTRICT JUDGE OR JUDGES ON JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF EACH CIRCUIT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 244, Senate bill 979, so that the bill will be laid before the Senate and will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 979) to amend section 332 of title 28, United States Code, in order to provide for the inclusion of a district judge or judges on the judicial council of each circuit.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5207) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, I announce that no further business will be transacted this afternoon. Calendar No. 244, Senate bill 979, has been laid before the Senate because there is no other measure to lay before the Senate. At the moment, the entire calendar of legislative business comprises only one page of the calendar; therefore, we have no choice but to do what we have done.

It may be that some Senators will wish to address the Senate later this afternoon.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session today, it stand in adjournment until Friday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATUS OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I compliment the majority leader on keeping a streamlined calendar. I have never served in a session in which the calendar was so short, as regards the number of bills on the calendar. This is testimony to the dispatch with which the majority leader continues to dispose of the legislative business which finds its way to the calendar of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The compliments of the Senator from Illinois should be extended also to the minority leader and to the Senate as a whole.

PROGRAM FOR AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to ask a question: In the event that Senate bill 1703 is reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, is there a possibility that the bill might be made the business before the Senate during the following week?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It will not be made a matter of business for the Senate until the leadership is 100 percent certain that a quorum was in attendance when—and if—the bill is ordered reported from the committee.

Mr. ALLOTT. Suppose the distinguished majority leader were assured that a quorum was present—all the bodies counted and blood-tested, and all accounted for. Would the majority leader think the bill might then become the business of the Senate for the following week?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is that possibility for the following week; but I would not want to make a hard and fast commitment now, and I am sure the Senator from Colorado would not want me to, because I could not. But if the bill is reported, ample notice should be given. Personally, I would wish to make sure that a quorum was actually present at the time when the committee voted to have the bill reported.

READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I invite the attention of the majority leader to Calendar No. 319, Senate bill 5, to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Texas need go no further.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I wish to assure the majority leader that a quorum of the committee was present when the committee voted to have the bill reported.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am sure of that; but, as the Senator from Texas knows, the majority leader is under instructions as to certain questions he should ask in certain quarters; and at the moment he is in process of undertaking that quest.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I desire to thank the distinguished majority leader for the inquiries he is making, and I sincerely hope they are successful.

I point out that 39 Senators have joined in sponsoring Senate bill 5; and that bill—which is of great importance, in view of the fact that 5 million veterans are not going to school, and in view of the further fact that the number of veterans in that category who are unemployed is more than twice as great as the number of nonveterans in that age category—is in a critical status.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate what the distinguished Senator from Texas has said.

HUMANE TREATMENT OF ANIMALS USED IN EXPERIMENTATION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] and I are joint sponsors of Senate bill 533, known as the bill for humane treatment of animals used in experimentation.

Recent editorials published in magazines and other periodicals have focused attention on the fact that the bill is quietly resting in one of the Senate's committees.

I, myself, have been the recipient of a great deal of mail on the subject of humane treatment of laboratory animals. Not all of that mail has been in support of my position; in fact, some of the negative mail I have received has come from persons in the scientific world whom I respect very highly.

But in nearly every case I have noted that they obviously have not read the bill. I am sure that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] and sponsors of similar proposed legislation in the House, including myself, do not feel that we wish to deter the advancement of medical science by preventing medical science from experimenting on animals. But because a great deal of progress is being made in that field all the time, our attention has been called to the need for some rules and guidelines for the handling of the animals. A person whom I respect highly and who has taken issue with me in my support of the measure admits that there is a need for some kind of control. I quote part of his letter:

> I think what we must keep clearly in mind is a distinction between the humane care of animals, and the regulatory control of scientific experiments which are spelled out in these bills. Most responsible investigators will welcome inspection procedures which insure adequate housing, the use of trained animal-care personnel and the availability of proper facilities for the humane care of the animals.

That is what the sponsors of the bill hope will be accomplished by our proposal.

One of the prominent doctors of the world is Dr. Albert Schweitzer, a Frenchman who 50 years ago went to what was literally then deepest and darkest Africa. He became a medical technician, a doctor, and a lover of the people of West Equatorial Africa. He has devoted his life to working with those people. Therefore, it was a great delight for me to receive a letter from Dr. Schweitzer when he heard—not from me—of the proposed legislation in the Senate. The letter is written in German, and since I do not read German—and I doubt if many Senators do—I had the letter translated. I should like to read the translation at this time:

> My Dear Senator: As you feel it right for me to give my support to the law for compassion toward laboratory animals, I do so gladly. The ethic of reverence for life obliges us to be watchful always to treat animals with compassion, and all the more so when it concerns those creatures that serve medical research. If you pass such a law in the United States, it will have important meaning for the world. The law will then gain recognition in other nations, too.
>
> "In the beginning was the deed" is an old saying. I am happy that you and the animal welfare institute are taking the initiative.
>
> Faithfully yours,
>
> Albert Schweitzer.

I emphasize the fact that Dr. Schweitzer refers to concern for creatures that serve medical research, which is indicative of the fact that neither he nor the supporters of the bill are opposed to the use of animals in medical research.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to emphasize what seems to me to be the great importance of having Albert Schweitzer, one of the great philosophers of the world, as well as one of the leading doctors in the world, with a career in helping to cure people of illness, support the measure which I was happy to sponsor and of which my good friend from Oregon is the principal cosponsor.

I hope that the Senator will have printed in the Record the letter from Dr. Schweitzer which she has just read, so that we can obtain reprints and have them widely distributed. If the Senator does not object, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the letter from Dr. Albert Schweitzer which the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] has read.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Lambarén, Gabon,
> *West Equatorial Africa, May 6, 1963.*
> Senator Maurine Neuberger.
>
> My Dear Senator: As you feel it right for me to give my support to the law for compassion toward laboratory animals, I do so gladly. The ethic of reverence for life obliges us to be watchful always to treat animals with compassion, and all the more so when it concerns those creatures that serve medical research. If you pass such a law in the United States, it will have important meaning for the world. The law will then gain recognition in other nations, too.
>
> "In the beginning was the deed" is an old saying. I am happy that you and the animal welfare institute are taking the initiative.
>
> Faithfully yours,
>
> Albert Schweitzer.

Mr. CLARK. I ask my friend, the Senator from Oregon, how her mail has been running on the bill?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. My mail has been running 5 to 1 in support of the bill which the Senator and I have cosponsored. Even the negative mail in most cases admits that there is reason for the introduction of some kind of control measure, though the writers of such letters do not go the entire way with the bill. Responsible workers in research laboratories admit that there are abuses which need to be looked into.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I would like to advise Senators that since the first of this year, and through July 12, I received 1,070 letters supporting S. 533, and only 345 letters in opposition; the opposition coming, I regret to state, largely from doctors, medical students, and scientists.

One could tell from reading their letters that the writers had not read the bill. One could tell how terribly misinformed they were as to what the bill contains. I am confident that if those highly intelligent people had not been so misinformed, they would certainly have written very different kinds of letters.

I have received 412 letters in support of, and 362 letters in opposition to a bill introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative Randall, H.R. 4856. In my opinion the Randall bill is not as good a bill, from the point of view either of orderly administration or of the proper protection of animals from unnecessary cruelty, as the bill the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] and I are supporting. Therefore, some of the letters against the Randall bill come from proponents of our bill.

I ask my friend, the Senator from Oregon, if she would briefly outline, so readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will get the truth, what our bill would do.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am glad to comply by summarizing what is stated in the introduction to the bill. It is proposed to provide for the humane treatment of vertebrate animals used in the experiments and tests by recipients of grants from the United States, and by agencies and instrumentalities of the U.S. Government, and for other purposes. One of the most important provisions of our bill is that it would require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to issue certificates of registration to persons applying for licenses to work on animals, and that they show that they have proper facilities and personnel, such as proper kennels and treatment for the animals; that they have some experience that gives them the equipment to comply with the requirements of the act; and that the animals shall receive adequate food and water, and shall not be caused to suffer unnecessary or avoidable pain.

The point that those who criticize the bill fail to note is that we have a provision that the animals used in any experiment which would result in pain shall be anesthetized so as to prevent the animal feeling the pain during and after the experiment, except to the extent that the use of anesthetics would frustrate the object of the experiment. Throughout the bill there are a number of safeguards to indicate that the sponsors of the proposed legislation are encouraging experimentation that would be of benefit to mankind.

The other point that worries some of our detractors is that they seem to think a great many uninformed, do-gooder sort of laymen will come marching through the laboratories and attempt to criticize and expose the inhumane treatment of animals.

The bill provides that a scientific authority or board shall determine the facts and make reports to the Secretary. An annual report would be required to outline the type of experiment, and to receive approval, but I do not see why there need to be much worry about needless reporting and inspection under the terms of the bill. Many laboratories and research centers with which I am familiar would not have a qualm in the world, because they are caring for the animals and conducting their experiments according to the very best we would expect of them.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not a fact that the bill is modeled on legislation which has been in effect in Great Britain ever since 1876?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. That is true.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not true that that legislation, so far as one can tell, not only has been accepted by the general public in Great Britain as salutary, but also has received no serious condemnation by the medical profession of Great Britain.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. That is quite correct.

Mr. CLARK. I ask my friend whether she does not agree with me that we ought to press very strongly for prompt hearings on the bill before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I think that is where the points on which the Senator and I are commenting today should be properly presented.

Again, one of my detractors, who is a close friend, a man I admire a great deal, has indicated that he is aware that there is some need for some legislation, because he says, in his letter:

> You could introduce legislation to improve the facilities for laboratory animal care. These urgent needs have been outlined by Dr. Hiram Essex, emeritus professor of physiology at the Mayo Foundation, who heads the group of distinguished scientists making up the National Society for Medical Research.

This doctor and other doctors who recognize the need for some legislation suggest that these measures be included:

> 1. Research in animal husbandry.
> 2. Training of animal care technicians.
> 3. Building of better animal care facilities.
> 4. Communication of the latest information about animal care methods, and so forth.

I think this bears out the contention that there is a real need for legislation.

Mr. CLARK. I agree. There is one point I should like to clarify. Some of my mail takes the quite erroneous position that this is a bill sponsored by antivivisectionists. The antivivisectionists oppose the bill, do they not?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. That is correct, because they think it would encourage research on animals by providing good facilities for them.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not clear also that the bill contemplates a continuation of scientific experiments on animals, in the interest of improving the findings of science and improving the medical profession, and that the Senator from Oregon and I and everyone else behind the bill knows that we must continue to conduct experiments on animals in the interest of science?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. That is correct. The Senator and I support appropriations for the National Institutes of Health, which make grants to primate centers and laboratories for research on animals. The Senator and I and our colleagues approve that sort of research.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is quite correct. All we are trying to do is to see that, in the course of conducting the necessary experiments, unnecessary cruelty will not be imposed on helpless creatures, but that instead, if a painful operation is necessary, the animals will be anesthetized; and, if, after the operation, they are in suffering and pain and cannot recover, that they will be painlessly killed.

In general, we wish to give to the animals of our country who unwittingly and unwillingly, to be sure, are making such a great contribution to scientific development, the kind of decent treatment we would unhesitatingly give to our own cats and our own dogs.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I quote once more from my friend who has written me such a wonderful letter on this subject, because he makes a point which I think is of interest, which we should consider. He says:

> The only scientists who are affected by this legislation are the recipients of Government grants and are the men in the large research institutes and universities who are doing the finest work, with the best equipment and facilities. These are the people who use the most humane techniques. The incompetent or careless worker with poor facilities would not be affected at all.

If that is true, I should like to see the bill go further, so that all would be licensed. All through the letters it is admitted by the opponents that there are places where such abuses are being continued. The scientists who conduct the proper kinds of laboratories really bemoan the others. It seems to me that if we could have appropriate regulation, it would be a guideline to which all could subscribe.

Mr. CLARK. As the Senator well knowns, Mr. Cleveland Amory, a noted author who has written many fine books, has taken up the torch and is a strong supporter of the bill. In the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post Mr. Amory has an article entitled "Science Is Needlessly Cruel to Animals." I wish to read a couple of paragraphs from that article in order to emphasize what the Senator from Oregon has said:

> In an experiment at Creighton University, for example, researchers starved dogs to death. Some took 65 days to die. It was later found that researchers at the same institution had performed exactly the same experiment 3 years earlier.

Presumably there had been extracted from the earlier experiment all the scientific value, if any, which could come from starving dogs to death.

> At Harvard University—

I say this with shame, being a graduate of Harvard myself—

At Harvard University, scientists forced dogs to inhale flame and then did not kill them until 3 to 5 days afterward. In Dallas a humane-society worker discovered that high-schoolers were performing "survival surgery" on live dogs.

But the incident that stirred up real nationwide indignation occurred 1 cold day last March in Gainesville, Va., not far from Washington. A chance visitor to a farm there discovered scores of dogs in an unheated barn, dead animals lying among the live ones. Many of the latter seemed to be starving. Outside the barn the bodies of hundreds of dogs and cats were found heaped and half-buried in bulldozed trenches.

Investigators learned that the farm had been leased to a firm that supplied animals to laboratories. One of its customers was the National Institutes of Health, the vast research arm of the Federal Government. As the official Santa Claus through which Congress gives almost a billion dollars a year to research institutions—your tax money—the National Institutes pays for enormous numbers of lab animals. The firm, quaintly entitled Zoologicals Worldwide, Inc., had made a shipment of animals to the National Institutes just 10 days before the discovery at Gainesville. When questioned, officials of Zoologicals Worldwide tried to explain away conditions at the farm and said they were "trying to do the right thing."

This is only a small amount of the voluminous evidence which could be brought before a Senate committee, once we get hearings on the bill and establish the need for the legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Mr. Amory's article, entitled "Science Is Needlessly Cruel to Animals," appear at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Kennedy in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Science Is Needlessly Cruel to Animals

(By Cleveland Amory)

The era of big science is new, but it has already brought one hideous result—cruelty to animals on a staggering scale. In the laboratories of U.S. hospitals, medical schools, and industries an estimated 300 million animals are currently in use in every conceivable, and in many cases inconceivable, way that can be devised by the mind of man.

So shocking has the situation become that calm and reasonable men, including many Members of Congress, are up in arms. There are, in fact, six bills on the subject before Congress. And not one of them is an antivivisectionist measure. On the contrary, the bills' supporters accept experimentation on living creatures as essential to scientific progress. What appalls these persons, and what has begun to appall the whole Nation, is the needless pain, the suffering, that serves no scientific purpose.

In an experiment at Creighton University, for example, researchers starved dogs to death. Some took 65 days to die. It was later found that researchers at the same institution had performed exactly the same experiment 3 years earlier. At Harvard University, scientists forced dogs to inhale flame and then did not kill them until 3 to 5 days afterward. In Dallas a humane-society worker discovered that high-schoolers were performing survival surgery on live dogs.

But the incident that stirred up real nationwide indignation occurred one cold day last March in Gainesville, Va., not far from Washington. A chance visitor to a farm there discovered scores of dogs in an unheated barn, dead animals lying among the live ones. Many of the latter seemed to be starving. Outside the barn the bodies of hundreds of dogs and cats were found heaped and half buried in bulldozed trenches.

Investigators learned that the farm had been leased to a firm that supplied animals to laboratories. One of its customers was the National Institutes of Health, the vast research arm of the Federal Government. As the official Santa Claus through which Congress gives almost a billion dollars a year to research institutions—your tax money—the National Institutes pays for enormous numbers of lab animals. The firm, quaintly entitled Zoologicals Worldwide, Inc., had made a shipment of animals to the National Institutes just 10 days before the discovery at Gainesville. When questioned, officials of Zoologicals Worldwide tried to explain away conditions at the farm and said they were "trying to do the right thing."

The day after the story broke in the Washington papers Representative Thomas Ashley, of Ohio, a man with no previous connection with humane work, introduced a bill calling for regulations to prevent cruelty to animals used in research supported with Federal funds. Almost immediately he received thousands of letters of encouragement from Americans across the country who had read of the Gainesville incident and were horrified.

And suddenly there was renewed interest in the hearings held last fall before a House subcommittee. For documented testimony at these hearings had shown even before the Gainesville outrage that all was not well behind the locked doors of this Nation's laboratories. Helen Jones, for example, the small, slender executive director of the National Catholic Society for Animal Welfare, told the subcommittee that she had visited many of this country's most "respected" laboratories. It would take "days of testimony," she declared, to describe "even in the briefest form" the "atrocities that are routine" in scientific research going on today. "Animals," she said, "are truly beaten, starved, burned, frozen, blinded, drowned, forced to swim and run until they die, accelerated, deprived of sleep, irradiated, skinned and subjected to other methods of inducing pain and fear in infinite variety.

"Often after undergoing burning, major surgery, the crushing of muscles, the breaking of bones and other mutilating injuries," she continued, "they are given little or no postexperimental care to relieve their pain and terror. In most laboratories the animals are simply returned to a wire-bottom cage to suffer unattended. It is not unusual to find animals housed in cramped cages, without even a solid place on which to sit or lie, for as long as 5 or even 10 years."

Another witness was tall, aristocratic looking Christine Stevens, head of the Animal Welfare Institute. Herself the daughter of a distinguished medical scientist, the late Dr. Robert Gesell (brother of the famed Arnold Gesell), Mrs. Stevens had visited hundreds of laboratories all over the country, and she described one such visit for the subcommittee directly from her notes:

"All dogs caged, never released for exercise. Three emaciated dogs curled up and uninterested even though most of the dogs were barking furiously. A gray poodle did not respond in any way, but stood mute and motionless in its cage. * * * Many were too sick to rise; some had had two operations. One heart-surgical case was emaciated, had a tremor and lacked one eye. Red flesh extruded from the socket. Apparently this did not deter its use for heart surgery."

Another witness was author-and-scientist Rachel Carson. And, in a letter to the subcommittee, Dr. Charles Breed, a practicing New York surgeon, took issue with his own profession:

"Some animal research is, of course, most essential. Experimental dog surgery by medical students is absolutely needless. Furthermore, in many of our outstanding teaching medical centers there are so many surgeons who are doing experimental animal surgery more to keep the surgeons busy than to accomplish anything of value. This is a disgrace. Repeating already proved sound surgical procedures is only a form of sadism on the surgeon's part."

Then Madeline Bemelmans, president of the Society for Animal Protective Legislation in New York, and widow of author Ludwig Bemelmans, placed on record a brief portion of testimony by the eminent naturalist, Sally Carrighar. Miss Carrighar quoted a young doctor. "It is the prevalent attitude in medical schools now," he told her, "that dogs don't feel pain—that dogs do not suffer."

Perhaps the most gruesome testimony was delivered by Alice Wagner, editor of the magazine Popular Dogs. Mrs. Wagner put into the record an article by a student of "one of Chicago's well-known and wealthy medical schools." He described a great Dane that had been kept in a small cage for 8 months. ("He was a blood donor for a heart-lung machine that required blood to prime it.") The dog was in "terribly poor condition," and was badly tormented by the caretaker boys who believed it high amusement to poke at the animal to make him lunge at the door. The student also wrote of dogs which grew extremely long toenails because the dogs were never exercised. One dog had been for 2 days actually fastened to the wire-mesh floor of his cage by his long, curved nails. "About 60 percent of them," the student's report said, "had their nails grown completely around and into the foot. * * * A puppy there had finally chewed its foot off to free it from the wire. He died 2 days later, his leg swollen like a balloon."

The student told of encountering an untrained technician who had been instructed to inject compounds into the thigh veins of a fully conscious dog at timed intervals. She had only an idea where the veins lay, and she often hit a nerve, causing great pain. The dog visibly resisted crying out, until it could no longer stand the pain.

The most damning indictment of the laboratories was delivered by Fred Myers, whose Humane Society of the United States is the largest organization of its kind in the world. Credited with having almost single handedly rejuvenated the humane movement, Myers has steered it away from the emotionalism and fuzzy futilities of the old antivivisectionist societies. "My society," he told the Congressmen, "is opposed to cruelty of every kind under every circumstance, but we recognize that animals are going to be used in medical research for as long as anyone can foresee. We bring you no vivisection issue. We submit to you only a question of morality."

Myers argued that besides curbing cruelty, the proposed legislation would actually improve medical research and save large sums of money now being poured into unnecessary experimentation. He introduced into the record the names of more than 200 nationally prominent citizens, including 24 university presidents and 46 professors of medicine and surgery, all of whom had signed a statement that the use of animals in research and teaching should be brought under control of law.

There was opposition testimony, too, of course, most of it from spokesmen of the organizations the proposed legislation would control. This opposition was rebutted by Senators and Congressmen who have sponsored control bills. Senator Joseph Clark, of Pennsylvania, for example, put the matter on a business basis. "Just as responsible investment bankers in time found that the SEC is in their best interest," he said, "so responsible scientists would find this legislation will benefit them by controlling the acts of the few irresponsible and thoughtless individuals among them." Senator Maurine Neuberger recalled her conversation with a member of the faculty of the Oregon Medical School who had told her that no good research can be carried on on an animal that is not well treated.

"Well, then," said Senator Neuberger, "you surely would not mind legislation which just guarantees that treatment."

There is no way of knowing which, if any, of the six bills now pending will pass. Roughly, each provides for—

1. Unannounced inspection of laboratories that use animals;

2. Licensing of all scientists desiring to use live, vertebrate animals, the licenses revocable for cruelty;

3. Painless killing of animals that still are suffering after an experiment;

4. Humane care and housing, and

5. The requirement that student work, as distinguished from research conducted by qualified scientists, be painless.

Veteran observers on Capitol Hill are somewhat incredulously predicting that at long last Congress will defy the powerful medical lobby and vote legislation. If the Congressmen do, it will be in large part because over the past 10 years such groups as the Humane Society have helped erase the stereotype of themselves as slightly funny clubs of little old ladies who have 16 cats each and hate people.

ANIMALS' FALSE FRIEND

They also have dramatically presented the fact that there is at present literally no protection for the animals. Even the so-called American SPCA (actually it is New York only) is not only completely ineffective in the field but under its current president, William Rockefeller, is given to pious pronouncements that humane societies ought to sell animals to laboratories. Other SPCA's, independent of the American, are better, notably the Massachusetts SPCA.

One thing is certain. If Congress does nothing, the animals will not be the only ones to suffer. So will medical research. For the American public is rapidly reaching the point where, without specific assurances that its money is not going for inhumanity in the laboratories, it can no longer be counted on to continue to write out check after check for cause after cause.

And the public is also rapidly reaching the point when it will not ask, but demand, that its Government and its scientists obey the highest law of all. The Right Reverend Monsignor LeRoy McWilliams, at the hearings, put it best. "St. Thomas, the great doctor and theologian," he said, "warns about the proper use of animals, lest they appear at the final judgment against us." Here Monsignor McWilliams paused. "And God himself," he said quietly, "will take vengeance on all who misuse His creatures."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me once more? This is the last time.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I wonder if my friend from Oregon has seen the column "First of the Month" which appeared in the Saturday Review of Literature for August 3, 1963, also written by Mr. Amory.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Yes; I have followed the Saturday Review discussion on the bill with great interest.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator will recall that on the first of June Mr. Amory wrote a very strong article in the Saturday Review, taking the same position he took in the Saturday Evening Post article. He points out in the August 3 article that as a result of the June 1 article, he received 10,000 letters, 9,000 of them in support of his position and the position the Senator from Oregon and I take. What surprises him is that, with respect to the critical portion of the letters—one-tenth of the total number—very few letterwriters seemed to understand that Mr. Amory was not opposed to medical experimentation with animals, but what he was opposed to was unnecessary cruelty to animals in experimentation.

In a sardonic vein, he refers to his "doctors mail." He says among the most stupid letters are those from doctors. I quote from the article:

> Among those who pulled out all the old anti-antivivisectionist arguments was none other than Dr. Morris Fishbein himself who, although happily no longer the mouthpiece of the AMA labeled both us and the bills in Washington "antivivisectionist."

I am sure my friend from Oregon is far too young to remember Dr. Fishbein, but I can remember when I was a middle-aged man the complete disrepute he came to for taking the American Medical Association down the garden path of opposition to the medical care program. In due course, he was let out as the head of the American Medical Association, because of the position he took. I am afraid this kind of mail on antivivisection is being publicized for the people of the country with respect to the issue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the August 3 article from the Saturday Review be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Saturday Review, Aug. 3, 1963]

First of the Month

(By Cleveland Amory)

Our column of June 1, broke, we believe, the Olympian record of Saturday Review's writer-righters. We received more than 10,000 letters, 9,000 favorable. What surprised us most about the critical portion of the mail was that very few of the letterwriters seemed to understand that we are not opposed to medical experimentation on animals; we are opposed to unnecessary cruelty in such experimentation. Quoting nothing but our "doctors mail," however, Dr. Donald Hayes of Wake Forest College, N. C., suggested "that all individuals who are opposed to animal experimentation should sign a pact in which they would agree not to avail themselves of antibiotics, antihistamines, and anticancer drugs." (The personal approach of these researchers to research would itself make a fascinating article.) Another who signed himself just "Dr." couldn't wait, he said, "until you, Mr. Amory, are being wheeled into an operating room. I wonder then if you would care about the animals." Still another dedicated unsignee wanted to know how much differently we would feel "if your mother had cancer." (As a matter of ironic fact, she has.)

Among those who pulled out all the old anti-antivivisectionist arguments was none other than Dr. Morris Fishbein himself, who although happily no longer the mouthpiece of the AMA, labeled both us and the bills in Washington "antivivisectionist"—despite the fact, as even he knows, (1) of the seven bills being considered, not a single one is an antivivisectionist bill, and (2) not a single one of them is being supported by a single antivivisectionist organization. (For further discussion on this point, see our article in the current Saturday Evening Post.)

We enjoyed, too, our medical student mail. "People like yourself," wrote Joy Schildkraut, of the NYU Medical School, "not engaged in scientific research, cannot comprehend the purpose of experiments on animals." Joseph Becker, a student at MIT, went further. "The very fact that we do kill animals," he wrote, "proves that we have the right."

Several doctors, among them Dr. Sheldon Adler of Cambridge and Dr. Richard Nystrom of Delaware, both pointed as evidence of the necessity for unrestricted experimentation to, of all things, the recent thalidomide case—yet hardly were their letters received when Dr. Widukand Lenz, of Hamburg, Germany, who first noted the link between thalidomide and infant deformities, told the International Conference on Congenital Malformation meeting in New York, that "no method of testing with animals allows us to say with assurance that a drug would be wholely safe in pregnancy." And Dr. Clarke Frazer of McGill went further. "You cannot assume," he said, "that because a drug appears safe in animals that it will be safe in man."

Dr. Thomas Brock of Indiana University told us flatly that "most experimental animals are bred specifically for experimentation" and, "since such animals would never have otherwise existed, it is hard to imagine that their deaths, however induced, should be of any particular importance." Yet in the same mail came a letter from a doctor at MIT who admitted that he was revolted by the fact that the animals are "frequently stolen home pets. They are supplied by dealers dealing directly with the thieves and purchased from them by the research laboratories. No questions are asked and no records kept."

The letters came, too, from Harvard, Yale, and Princeton. From Harvard, Dean Berry declared that the proposed legislation would "seriously impede the progress of science" because it was "rarely possible to carry on a significant series of experiments without the ability to modify, change, and redirect the work as it progresses." (Obviously, Dean Berry has not read even one of the bills, because not a single one would rob any scientist of any such power.) Yale's Dr. Kline declared that "virtually every State of the Union already has laws to punish irresponsible cruelty to animals and children." (The fact is—again research would have helped—virtually every State exempts laboratories from anticruelty laws. In some States the exemptions are created by the implied meaning of statutes, and by previous judicial rulings. In other States, the exemptions for "scientists" are explicit and absolute. For example, the Wisconsin statute: "As used in this section 'torture' does not include bona fide experiments carried on for scientific research." Princeton's Dr. Harvey Rothberg's research on the subject was equally extraordinary. He wrote to us of the "positive efforts" of the National Society for Medical Research and its so-called animal care panel. Yet again, even the barest attempt to get his facts would have told him that the latter is actually a public relations front in front of another public relations front—the NSMR itself is neither a medical society nor a research society but merely the paid whitewasher of the animal-using laboratories.

But the real dilly came from a lady doctor, Dr. June Greenspan, of Riverton, N.J., who first declared that we should "offer ourselves as a laboratory experiment," then added:

"I note with interest most of your published replies are from women agreeing with Mr. Amory. But naturalment. Women are fine protecting babies and house pets and some husbands. This is their job. It is to be expected that they would be the first (obviously along with some so-called intellectuals) to raise a cry against such goings-on with poor little pussy cats and doggies and those cute little ole' white mice. Let's keep these women out of the labs and let the scientists work. Ask some women scientists for their opinion."

As a matter of fact we will—we can hardly wait to get any other opinion than that one. In conclusion, however, we should like to quote from a doctor who asked that his name be withheld but declared: "I hold a Ph. D. degree and I am working at one of the most highly regarded academic institutions of the United States * * * The facts are not consistent with the oft-repeated claim that all is well in biological research. * * * I have indeed witnessed cases of callous indifference, as well as unnecessarily cruel experiments, on numerous occasions. I wish to mention only examples which I myself have encountered repeatedly:

"(1) Operations on unanesthetized animals because anesthesia was inconvenient to the investigator.

"(2) Undergraduate students dissecting unanesthetized but drug-immobilized animals for 'practice' in their spare time.

"(3) Animals in cages too small to turn around in (some of these animals were pregnant).

"(4) Animals dead from thirst and starvation when their care over the weekend had not come to work and had not notified a substitute.

"(5) Graduate students who professed their pleasure in performing painful experiments. There is no reason to assume that these students, after receiving their doctorates, will not set up research programs of their own."

The doctor also pointed out that all this commotion is to get the same kind of bill that a country named Great Britain passed in 1876.

Mr. CLARK. I congratulate the Senator from Oregon for cosponsoring this legislation. I pledge my support to attempting to have hearings and getting the bills to the floor. If we do so, perhaps we can meet the desire of the majority leader to act promptly and get bills to the floor for early consideration.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Oregonian of November 5, 1962, on this subject, be included in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian, Nov. 5, 1962]

ANIMALS IN PAIN

That laboratory animals must often be subjected to some measure of pain, even a painful death, to enable medical researchers to discover ways to prevent human suffering and death, is understood. Yet it is not conceivable that unnecessary suffering and discomfort by these animals could in any way further the cause of medical science.

Two bills now pending in Congress call for the licensing and inspection of individuals and institutions who conduct laboratory experiments on living animals and who receive Federal grants for research.

The bills, H.R. 1937 and S. 3088, are sponsored by Senators MAURINE NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, and JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, and Representative MARTHA GRIFFITHS, Democrat, of Michigan. First introduced 2 years ago, the bills have been since bottled up in Senate and House committees.

Testimony and evidence offered at September congressional hearings on the bills indicated gross and unnecessary abuse of laboratory animals in several instances.

Identical in structure, the bills in no way hinder legitimate, responsible research involving living animals. They would insure humane housing and treatment of laboratory animals, including adequate and comfortable resting and exercising areas, proper feeding, sanitation, and ventilation.

More important, "animals used in any experiment which would result in pain shall be anesthetized so as to prevent the animals feeling the pain during and after the experiment except to the extent that the use of anesthetics would frustrate the object of the experiment, and in any event, animals which are suffering severe and prolonged pain shall be painlessly killed."

Both bills are patterned after legislation adopted in England nearly 90 years ago. Passage would mark only the second time that humane laws have been enacted on the Federal level. The first governs the slaughter of meat animals in processing plants holding Federal Government contracts. Oregon adopted a similar State law in the 1961 legislative session.

An objective and unemotional study of H.R. 1937 and S. 3088 reveals that the bills do not attempt to prohibit experimental research. Enactment would of course increase the administrative costs of such research, since records would have to be kept and reports submitted periodically to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. But we do not need to count our research pennies as closely as that. These are good bills, and should be adopted.

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS SUPPORTS NUCLEAR TEST-BAN TREATY

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am heartened by the news that the Federation of American Scientists has announced its endorsement of the nuclear test-ban treaty recently initialed in Moscow. This endorsement was announced at a press conference held in Washington this morning.

The Federation of American Scientists is a national nonpartisan professional organization of more than 2,500 scientists concerned with the impact of science on national and international affairs. The federation was established in 1946.

As I have indicated in earlier statements in the Senate, it is most important that we take full advantage of the scientific information that will be developed in regard to the technical considerations involved in ratifying this treaty. The Federation of American Scientists expressed the following opinions concerning certain matters of a technical nature:

First, there is almost no chance that a nation could perform a series of militarily important nuclear test explosions without being detected.

Second, that testing in the far reaches of outer space, while technically feasible, was likely to yield little information that could not be obtained through permitted underground explosions on earth, or through use of the "escape clause" contained in the treaty to test in the atmosphere. All attempts to test illegally in outer space would be extremely expensive and involve considerable risk of detection. In regard to atmospheric testing, techniques have been developed during the past years which permit detection of tests at all altitude ranges.

Third, the federation points out further atmospheric nuclear testing is not essential to the development of the antimissile missile. In fact, nuclear weapons technology is only one of the many fields that must be mastered if an effective missile defense is to be achieved. The federation pointed out that last weekend General Wheeler, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, stated in a television interview that the U.S. could not develop an antimissile system without further atmospheric nuclear explosions.

I note the opinions of the Federation of American Scientists on these matters because they represent a scientific judgment considerably at variance from others that have been expressed in regard to this treaty. These are respected, able, and professionally qualified scientists and their scientific judgments must be given great consideration and weight.

I do not wish to discuss these matters at length this afternoon. I suspect that we will have ample time for such discussion and debate in the weeks ahead. However, I do commend the Federation of American Scientists for their forthright statement in regard to the nuclear test ban. Since I know every Member of the Senate will want to read the federation's statement, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no obection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS ON THE NUCLEAR TEST-BAN TREATY

The three-power nuclear test ban agreement recently initialed in Moscow is strongly endorsed by the Federation of American Scientists. Our members who have participated in the development of nuclear weapons welcome this first step in the control of the nuclear arms race. The federation believes that this treaty is in the overall interest and that the risks involved are small compared with those in a world without such an agreement. We hope that this agreement may contribute to the reduction of international tensions and lead to more substantial arms control and disarmament agreements. Those of us who know from our work the capabilities of nuclear weapons and the risks of annihilation to which mankind is exposed believe that our Nation should make every reasonable effort to achieve a system of effective international disarmament under proper safeguards. We are greatly encouraged by the test ban agreement and believe it deserves prompt and overwhelming support from the American people as a demonstration to the world that our Nation plans to lead in the path away from nuclear destruction.

President Kennedy's speech last Friday night summarized eloquently the great risks of a continued arms spiral and the spread of nuclear weapons. We feel that the public may wish to have more information about possible risks of the nuclear test ban agreement, and we therefore discuss briefly here some relevant technical questions.

There is almost no chance that a nation could perform a series of military important nuclear test explosions without being detected. Techniques which have been developed during the past few years allow the detection and identification of nuclear explosions at all altitude ranges out to very great distances in space. For example, new electronic techniques for measuring perturbations in the ionosphere provide a very sensitive means of detecting explosions at upper altitudes. Methods of sampling for radioactivity, including both capture of actual debris on filters and observations of delayed gamma rays, provide a very sensitive method of identifying low-yield nuclear explosions.

It is conceivable that nuclear test explosions could be conducted so far out in space as to escape detection. However, present ground-base equipment can detect megaton tests taking place 1 million kilometers from the earth, and larger tests can be detected at correspondingly larger distances. If the U.S. decides to deploy satellite detection systems, then megaton tests could be detected at distances greater than the distance to the sun, out to several hundred million kilometers. Similarly, a megaton test behind the moon could be detected by delayed gamma radiation.

There are other reasons why tests at these distances must be considered unlikely. They would be difficult to conduct, would be very expensive, and might require months to elapse between the launch and the explosion. There is a high probability that the launchings would be noted and special efforts made to identify or to follow the space vehicles. The lack of experience of both the United States and the U.S.S.R. in conducting such experiments, would be another hindrance to such a program.

It has been suggested that the Soviet Union might attempt to shield multimegaton explosions in space by interposing shields containing lead dust between the explosion and the earth. Shields could reduce the detection range by perhaps a factor of 10. Such a shielded test in deep space could cost on the order of a hundred million dollars and, like all untried systems, would involve considerable risk of failure and detection. In view of the costs and uncertainties involved, it seems unlikely that the Soviet Union would consider it worthwhile to carry out such tests. Smaller tests could be far more easily conducted underground on earth.

Because of the great expense and difficulty of methods of concealing useful nuclear test explosions in the prohibited environments, any signatory nation that decided that it needed to conduct further tests would probably use the escape clause rather than embark on secret tests in violation of the treaty. Yet there is good reason to expect that none of the major nuclear nations will wish to end the agreement, for the continued ban on tests offers more advantages to the nuclear powers than a period of renewed testing.

If the Soviet Union should resume nuclear testing in the prohibited environments, our Nation would be prepared to conduct then such tests as required to maintain our position of nuclear deterrence. No decisive change in relative defense postures could be achieved by a sudden resumption of tests. Thus, since no major nuclear power can gain greatly by testing, we can hope that the test agreement will endure. Our Nation's weapon development laboratories can be maintained by a program of underground test explosions until satisfactory arrangements are found to ban these tests also.

It is sometimes asserted that further testing is necessary for the United States to develop a defense against missiles. In fact, nuclear weapons technology is only one of many fields that must be mastered if a missile defense is to be achieved, and it appears that these other areas represent far more significant barriers to the achievement of such a system than does the area of weapon technology. Thus, the problem of discriminating between an incoming missile warhead and various decoys that might be accompanying it is exceedingly difficult, as is the related problem of handling a large number of incoming vehicles at the same time. If these critical technical problems are solved, warheads for the antimissile missile can be developed underground. It is only measurements of radar blackout, warhead vulnerability, and actual live system tests that might require atmospheric testing. Measurements of blackout were made in recent tests in the Pacific. While atmospheric tests could assist in these developments, General Wheeler, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, stated in a television interview last weekend that the United States could now develop an antimissile system without further atmospheric nuclear explosions.

Similarly, the development of missile systems to penetrate any Soviet missile defense can proceed without atmospheric nuclear testing. Here is involved the development of smaller warheads and penetration aids such as new guidance, communication, decoy, and jamming techniques, and all these can proceed under the test ban agreement.

It has been suggested that the United States must develop a very high yield nuclear weapon to keep pace with the Soviet Union. On the contrary, there does not appear to be any justifiable military reason for the United States to have such a weapon. Our arsenal of nuclear weapons is already much more than adequate for any probable military targets. Smaller weapons, when used in sufficient quantity, provide a more reliable, more effective, and perhaps cheaper method of attacking targets than do a few high yield weapons. This is in fact the direction in which the United States has been moving in its weapon development and for which its present delivery systems are designed. If the United States had a military requirement for such large yield weapons, it would have tested them during the past years when there have been many nuclear explosions.

There are firm indications that other nations will soon sign the test ban agreement. All mankind is exposed to the dangers of radioactive contamination, and there will be great pressure from public opinion in all countries to urge governments to sign the agreement.

The Federation of American Scientists believes that it would be a national catastrophe if the pending test ban agreement were not ratified by the U.S. Senate. Ratification is clearly in our national interest. Moreover, peoples throughout the world would be deeply disapponted if our Nation should reject this chance to halt the dangers of radioactive contamination of the atmosphere, and to improve the chance for further agreements. Rejection by the Senate would have a disastrous effect on U.S. prestige. On the other hand, prompt ratification by a very substantial margin will demonstrate to all the world that the United States stands ready to join in further steps to control nuclear armaments and to reduce the worldwide dangers of the arms race.

The Federation of American Scientists is a national, nonpartisan organization of more than 2,500 scientists concerned with the impact of science on national and international affairs. Formed in 1946 as a combination of various groups of scientists who had worked on the development of nuclear weapons, the FAS membership has gradually broadened to include persons from all fields of science and engineering. Many federation members have been active in nuclear weapon development and in studies of the problems of nuclear defense and control of armaments.

Present officers of the federation are: Chairman, Robert R. Wilson, Cornell University; vice chairman, Louis B. Sohn, Harvard University; secretary, Marvin I. Kalkstein, Air Force Cambridge Research Center; treasurer, Jack Orloff, National Institutes of Health. Other members of the executive committee are: Freeman Dyson, Institute for Advanced Study; Allen Janis, University of Pittsburgh; Martin and Leslie Gellert, National Institutes of Health; and John S. Toll, University of Maryland.

PRESIDENT DE GAULLE AND THE COMMON MARKET

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned and disturbed by the statement of President de Gaulle in Paris on Monday expressing his attitude regarding the Common Market and its agricultural policy. I am sure that every Member of Congress is well aware of the important press conference which President de Gaulle of the French Republic held on Monday, July 29.

There was much in that press conference which should be reassuring to Americans, because the great President of the French Republic again expressed his friendship for the United States, and of course referred to the great historic friendship between the peoples of France and the United States. President de Gaulle also reiterated his strong support of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the commitments of France to that Organization.

I have not been one of President de Gaulle's caustic critics. To the contrary, I have a high regard and respect and admiration for this unusually able and distinguished man. However, I disagree with President de Gaulle on some of his attitudes relating to Common Market policies, particularly its relationship to the United States, to Great Britain, and to the European free trade area. I also find myself at variance with President de Gaulle with respect to the singular role of Europe in the struggle with the Communist forces. I believe that a strong Europe is required, and I believe that a strong Europe must be in the closest cooperation with the United States and other free nations. Therefore, it appears to me that President Kennedy's concept of an Atlantic partnership is much more desirable and much more practical and much more meaningful in terms of the kind of world we want than the mere building of a so-called third force in Western Europe.

However, if the strengthening of Western Europe means closer cooperation with the United States, Canada, Great Britain, and other free countries, then indeed the strengthening of Europe makes a distinct contribution to the strengthening of freedom.

Returning to President de Gaulle's comments on the policies of the European Economic Community, I should like to quote what he had to say at his press conference with respect to the Common Market. He said:

> It is not worth talking of the European Economic Community if it must be understood that Europe does not obtain its food essentially thanks to its own agricultural products, which can be largely sufficient.

This statement, Mr. President, accompanied by the continued failure to adjust the sharply increased duties on poultry and flour imports from the United States, is an indication that the EEC will be approaching its goal of a common agricultural policy within the framework of narrow, nationalistic interests.

The only hope we have of changing that trend is in firm resistance on the part of the United States and for reconsideration of the policy on the part of our friends and allies in the European Economic Community. Certainly, the future of all international trade rests on the basic decisions which the Community is making with respect to agriculture. If this is the direction, then we are witness to a deliberate effort to achieve self-sufficiency in a closed system, not the open competitive system we had visualized.

I digress for a moment to note that between now and 1966 each of the countries in the Common Market—that is, the so-called Inner Six—has the right to exercise a veto on agricultural policy, but that after January 1966, agricultural policy, including duties and levies and gate prices, and tariffs, and so forth, will be established by a majority of the Common Market members.

Therefore, it is important that we use the time between 1963 and 1966 and try to avoid having established a farm policy with relation to agriculture which is inward looking in the Common Market area and which tends to exclude a normal amount of commerce with the outside areas, particularly the United States.

However, no matter what the future may offer, I feel that we in the United States will be faced with tough competition in the Common Market area, and we will be hard put to maintain our share, in terms of historic figures or amounts, of the food consumption of the Common Market countries.

Last year we exported about $1.2 billion worth of food products into the Common Market countries—the Inner Six. From 1958 to 1962 we have had a rather steady increase in American agricultural exports to the Common Market countries. However, with the policies which are now being adopted, and with the expressions of view that are so evident in the discussion among ministers of agriculture in the Common Market countries, it appears that we will not share as well in the coming years in terms of agricultural exports as we did in the past years.

This is only a way of saying that we will lose some of our trade in Common Market countries. If the expression of General de Gaulle of last Monday becomes official policy, Western Europe will tend to become self-sufficient in agriculture. Americans need to contemplate such a situation, because with our problem of balance of payments, our commitment of troops in Western Europe, and our loss of exports amounting to millions of dollars—which could be the case—we could be in a difficult political and economic situation. What could happen in terms of the American economy might be catastrophic.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Minnesota suggests that the United States may be in for some trouble, so far as exports to the Common Market are concerned. What bothers me, and has bothered me all this year, is that the administration has not utilized a provision which the Senate wrote into the trade expansion bill last year, namely, that if Common Market nations imposed discriminatory, variable import duties upon our products, the President would have authority to take retaliatory action.

The Senator from Minnesota may recall that the Secretary of Agriculture made it very clear in his Paris speech earlier this year that that is what we would do. Still, I have seen nothing except speeches on this subject. I suggest that if we take action in line with the policy that Congress established last year, perhaps the dark future for the export of our agricultural commodities to Common Market countries will not occur.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Iowa. He has underscored a point that I intend to make in my speech, one that I made in my discussions about 2 weeks ago in Brussels with the Commissioner of Agriculture for the European Economic Community, Dr. Mansholt; in my discussions with Dr. Walter Hallstein, who is president of the European Economic Community; and in my discussions with our representatives in Brussels who are responsible for our negotiations with Common Market countries.

I believe that Congress needs to study the case once again and should call upon the executive branch of the Government to take the necessary action. I shall outline what I mean.

Let us examine the implications of General de Gaulle's statement.

First, it would mean he assumes there will be uneconomically high level international target prices sustained by high minimum import prices and variable levies.

Second, many of our farm exports will be subject to an economic wall so high that the result will be a sharp decrease in our shipments and dollar earnings.

Third, behind that wall the twin forces of high prices and modern technology will expand production so fast there will be a decrease in the need for imports.

Dr. Mansholt has called for a "code of good behavior in agricultural policy." He is seeking thereby a means for benefiting both producing and consuming countries.

I believe he is sincere in this effort, and I commend him for it. I found Dr. Mansholt to be one who spoke out vigorously for the Community's concept of an Atlantic partnership, as contrasted with General de Gaulle's position in favor of a Europe that is somewhat removed from or independent of the rest of the Atlantic community. Dr. Mansholt is seeking a means for benefiting both the producing and the consuming countries. I think it is fair to state that we, too, are seeking a code of good behavior when it comes to trade policies, and particularly within the area of trade with our Western European friends and allies.

However, as a part of that code of good behavior, we feel that uneconomic production by the European Economic Community should not be substituted for imports from friendly supplying nations.

We believe that a code of good behavior should provide more reasonable consumer prices for animal products and poultry than now prevail within the Community.

We believe that a code of good behavior should not result in a divergent policy of a strongly protectionist attitude in the agricultural sector and a liberal trade concept in the industrial sphere.

We believe that a code of good behavior, such as that suggested by Dr. Mansholt, should not lead to a misallocation of resources within the European Economic Community.

We believe that a code of good behavior should not adversely affect the balance-of-payments position of friendly supplying nations.

We believe that a code of good behavior should not sacrifice sound production and trade practices in order to precipitate or induce unrealistic and unsound domestic farm programs.

Mr. President, in passing the Trade Expansion Act, we have served notice to the world that in the next round of tariff negotiations, we will require that agricultural trade be an integral part of the process. This is of no small direct consequence to the farmers of this Nation. We must hold these export markets.

As a matter of fact, it is in the European interest that the costs of its basic foods should not be unnecessarily high, and that this in turn requires reasonable freedom for efficient producers to sell in international trade and, of course, to Europe.

In view of General de Gaulle's statement and the failure to restore equity to poultry producers, I urge the executive branch to act. I say this reluctantly but forcefully. It is only by action, such as the withdrawal of some trade concessions, that we can make our concern felt. We must stand behind our farmers in this struggle.

I call to the attention of the officials of our government in the executive branch, as well as to the attention of those in the legislative branch, the fact that our agricultural economy already has plenty of troubles; and unless we can maintain export markets for the abundance of our farms, there will be an economic catastrophe for American agriculture. This is not an academic subject; it is a subject of economic survival.

I fully realize that our friends and allies in Western Europe wish to improve their agricultural system and expand their production. They can do that because a higher standard of living is coming in Western Europe, and there is a greater consumption of food, including high-quality foods. As that situation improves and as individuals there improve their economic situation, there will be a larger consumption of the quality foods such as meat products, dairy products and processed food products. Therefore, there can be ample business for all. We can maintain our agricultural export levels, and at the same time our Western European friends and allies can increase their agricultural production and can improve their agricultural efficiency.

But, Mr. President, if the policy of the Common Market is going to be one of self-sufficiency, to be paid for by uneconomic measures—by holding on the land people who should be engaged in industrial life, by having unnecessarily high prices, and by forcing European consumers to pay high prices—if that is the policy—then I think we would do Europe a service by giving notice now that we intend to take action and to withdraw certain trade concessions, because Europe needs a strong America and an America that is not constantly under the threat of a dwindling gold reserve. We have a terrific problem with our balance of payments, and that problem exists primarily because of the fact that we have helped finance the reconstruction and rehabilitation of Europe and of vast areas elsewhere in the world, and also because of the fact that today we have hundreds of thousands of our troops stationed in Europe in order to protect Western European freedom, as well as our own freedom.

Mr. President, there arrives a time in the affairs of men and nations when they need to take the big, broad look. Yes, temporarily European nations can get along by squeezing out American exports. But, Mr. President, let them not forget for a moment that the Members of Congress have authority, under the Constitution, to take whatever action is necessary in order to revise tariff laws and trade agreements; and we can, if we need to, in order to protect the solvency of this country, reduce the number of our Armed Forces stationed overseas, and can rely upon the Europeans to man their own ramparts and their own defenses. I do not recommend that this be done; I believe in cooperation and in understanding, and I believe we have a mutuality of interests.

But I believe it needs to be forcibly driven home that the United States will not stand by like a friendly, good neighbor and absorb punishment just because of the declared policy and attitude of one or more countries or their officials which would result in protectionist, nationalistic developments contrary to the enhancement and the advancement of the concept of the Atlantic community and of partnership and of a strong NATO.

So, Mr. President, today I again raise my voice on this issue, because I believe that time after time we need to remind ourselves, as well as our friends, of the seriousness of this situation.

THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at this time I wish to comment on an address delivered in the Senate the other day by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. His address concerned the rural electrification cooperatives and the interest rate on loans made to them. His address was well reported in the local press and, I imagine, in the national press. I hold in my hand a copy of the Thursday, July 25, issue of the Washington Post; and in the business section appears the following headline:

SENATOR LAUSCHE ATTACKS REA'S LENDING AT 2 PERCENT

The first sentence of the article reads as follows:

> Two percent money came under sharp attack by Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio, yesterday. His target was the system under which rural electric cooperatives borrow money.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 25, 1963]

SENATOR LAUSCHE ATTACKS REA'S LENDING AT 2 PERCENT

(By Julius Duscha)

Two percent money came under sharp attack by Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio, yesterday. His target was the system under which rural electric cooperatives borrow money.

Why, LAUSCHE asked in a Senate speech, should rural co-ops be able to get money from the Federal Treasury at 2 percent interest rates when the Government itself must pay 4 percent for the money it borrows?

The question he raised has been asked with increasing frequency in recent years by many Members of Congress.

LAUSCHE also questioned the emphasis the Rural Electrification Administration has been placing on loans to finance the construction of their own generation and transmission facilities.

Until the Kennedy administration took office 2 years ago, most REA loans were made to finance the building of lines and other facilities to bring electricity purchased by the co-ops to individual farmers and other users of electricity in rural areas.

MARKET RATES

LAUSCHE introduced a bill which would require the REA to obtain funds for loans to co-ops in the open market at current interest rates. Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, Democrat, of Utah, is a cosponsor of the bill.

Since the REA was established in 1935, it has used Federal funds as the source of its loans. More than $4 billion has been loaned to co-ops.

The REA system, which was one of the pioneer New Deal programs, stimulated the expansion of electric service to rural areas. When the agency was set up in 1935 less than 11 percent of the Nation's farms had electricity; today nearly 98 percent have it. More than half of the farms are served by REA-financed co-op systems.

The 2-percent interest rate on REA loans was written into law in 1944 in exchange for an agreement that REA co-ops would serve all customers in their areas regardless of the cost or the possible return on the investment.

The low interest rate has been vigorously defended by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, an astute and powerful lobby, and by former Arkansas Congressman Clyde Ellis.

PRIVATE COMPETITION

But the interest rate has come under increasing attack on Capitol Hill as the rural co-ops have started to compete with private power companies. Rural areas are turning into suburbs and industry is moving into the countryside. An REA co-op can serve any consumer in the area it is authorized to operate.

Private power companies argue that they cannot compete with rural co-ops when the co-ops have the advantage of 2-percent loans.

The Senate and House Appropriations Committees have warned the REA about the increasing amount of money being devoted to generation and transmission loans. The committees have also cautioned the agency to make absolutely certain that REA's do not build their own generating plants unless they are unable to get power from private sources at fair prices.

Because of the long history of animosity between the REA and the private power companies, most REA co-ops want their own sources of power.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me make clear that I have the highest regard for the views of all my colleagues, and particularly for those of the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. On this issue we have an honest disagreement of opinion. I wish to state my position, and to do so in a very respectful way, without casting any personal reflection upon the able Senator from Ohio or any other Senator.

At this time I wish to speak of our rural electrification program. I believe this program has been exceptionally good for our country, and I know it has been good for the State of Minnesota.

When the rural electrification program was started in 1935, fewer than 14,000 farms in my State had electricity. That was less than 7 percent of the farms in Minnesota, and at the time it did not look as if any of the other farms were going to get electricity soon.

The country was just beginning to come out of the great depression. Rural electrification was one of the great ideas that eventually helped to bring the country back to prosperity and to spread through the rural areas some of the benefits of our growing industrial economy.

In the process, nearly all of the farms and rural areas in Minnesota were electrified. By 1959, nearly 163,000 farms in my State had electricity. Only 1.4 percent of the farms did not have electricity.

What is more, the rural areas of Minnesota are using more and more electricity. They are making full use of the benefits brought by rural electrification. In just 8 years, for example, the number of kilowatt-hours of electricity consumed on the farms of my State has more than doubled.

Down through the years, the Congress has supported the rural electrification program, ever since it was brought into being by Democrats such as Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, and Republicans such as Senator George Norris, of Nebraska. President Kennedy, when he was a Member of Congress, supported the rural electrification program. He campaigned in 1960 for the 2-percent interest rate on REA loans; and I am pleased that our President continues to maintain that position and to fulfill his commitment, as I knew he would.

Mr. President, as a direct result of the rural electrification program, 5 million farms and homes have electricity. The output of the American farmer has doubled. REA borrowers have invested $4 for every $1 loaned by the Government. Rural electric consumers have spent $16 billion for appliances, plumbing, wiring, and equipment. Rural electrification is a great accomplishment, a tremendous, profitable program.

Each year, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association surveys the buying plans of rural electric cooperative consumers. I have before me a copy of the results of the 1963 survey, which shows that these consumers expect to spend $1.25 billion for appliances, plumbing, wiring, and equipment. The figure is the highest in the 4 years of these surveys. I ask unanimous consent that the survey results be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Rural Electrification magazine, March 1963]

RURAL ELECTRIC MARKET OUTLOOK

(By Dr. Charles R. Aiken, education and research specialist, Power Use Services, NRECA)

A bright outlook is in prospect for the rural electric market in 1963. Several factors combine to give nothing but an optimistic view.

The rural electric consumers have made known their buying intentions in the amount of $1¼ billion. This is the highest in the 4 years that the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association has been taking an annual survey. A verification of last year's intentions to buy shows a close correlation with the actual sales. The huge number of appliances that are more than 10 years old, and still being used, assures a substantial replacement market. More than one-fourth of the rural residences are equipped with a 100-ampere or larger service entrance, allowing the purchase and installation of new appliances without an additional wiring investment.

These facts learned from the survey taken during November and December 1962, coupled with the aggressive coordinated appliance promotion program planned by the rural electric systems and the electrical manufacturers, gives firm assurance of a good year.

This rural appliance market will provide a healthy assist to the Nation's business for the year. The Nation's top prediction economists said there will be some improvement in business conditions over 1962 but no drastic change. The agricultural economists say there will be increased sale of products by the farmer but the net result will be almost the same as he fared in 1962. They summarized their predictions at the November 16 Outlook Conference in this statement: "We see no reason to expect any significant change either up or down in realized net income for the farm operator next year."

In spite of these not-so-optimistic views of the forecasters, there are good reasons for strong faith in the rural appliance market. There is bound to be some influence on the number of appliances purchased, from both the national business conditions and the farm income. This group of nearly 4½ million rural family consumers, however, is in several respects different from the Nation's average group of consumers in electrical appliance purchases.

One of the principal reasons that rural electric members are a special group of appliance purchasers is their relative newness as an electrical purchasing group. The average rural electric consumer has had electricity no more than 15 years. The electric appliance educational and promotional programs conducted in the last few years by the rural electric systems have been a definite factor in the increased appetites of these consumers for new electric appliances. The desires for new appliances among the urban consumers have been more fully satisfied due to their greater exposure to the pressures of merchandisers.

A further factor which makes this a potentially good market is its confinement to the membership of rural electric systems with their own publications for reaching this membership. The State associations of these rural electric systems have 27 publications covering 29 States. These States together have 87 percent of this rural electric market.

Does the fact that buying intentions are greater really mean that there will be more sales? Can we actually rely on the intentions to buy as an indicator of electric appliance sales in 1963? Verification of sales made during 1962 was made by means of a survey of the ages of appliances in use. A count was made of all appliances 1 year old or less. These appliances added since the last rural market survey are, in effect, the sales made during 1962. From this data, the following was established. For six of seven major appliances, there were from three to four times as many of each appliance purchased during 1962 as consumers said they definitely would buy.

Refrigerators amounted to 83 percent of all the definite and possible intentions to buy as reported in the previous survey. Freezers amounted to 80 percent of all buying intentions reported.

A check on small appliances showed even more startling figures. Television purchases totaled 180 percent of reported total buying intentions, electric blankets 114 percent, electric saws and drills showed 93 percent and 82 percent respectively, while fry pans were 70 percent of total buying intentions.

On the basis of these figures and the extremely conservative price figures used in computing the dollar sales potential forecast for last year's market, there is good evidence that the $1 billion-plus market forecast for 1962 was achieved.

The $1¼ billion market forecast for 1963 is within reason if extra effort is put into the programs outlined in the nationally coordinated rural electric sales promotion plan.

The already large replacement market continues to increase in size as the number of appliances over 10 years old increases. The average life of several of the major appliances is between 10 and 12 years. Experience has shown that, although most people own a certain appliance, sales of that appliance will not drop. Refrigerators, for example, when combined with refrigerator-freezers, have a 96.7 percent saturation, yet the buying continues to accelerate.

The survey indicated that more than one-fourth of all rural electric consumers have 100-ampere service entrance, a fact which will have a favorable effect on the immediate market. Rural electric systems have been actively promoting the increased sized services. The larger service entrance will make it possible for these consumers to purchase additional electrical appliances without incurring extra wiring costs. This means that at least 1⅓ million rural homes already have adequate electrical capacity for adding major electrical appliances.

Aside from house heating, gas appears to be a substantial competitor for operating only two appliances. The survey shows that 38.4 percent of the ranges are operated by gas and 22.8 percent of the water heaters. This compares to 52.1 percent electric ranges and 47.5 percent electric water heaters.

Practically all rural electric systems in the country today are actively promoting electric home heating. The 66,000 total buying intentions for resistance heating and heat pumps emphasizes the exceptionally strong interest in purchasing the convenience and comfort of automatic electric heating.

The all-electric kitchen promotion beginning in February promises the largest dollar volume sales potential among the promotions scheduled for 1963. All kitchen appliances show a healthy increase in buying intentions. The range is the standout with the highest number of units on the buying intention list for any item in the survey. The kitchen appliance potential, if all buying intentions for range, refrigerator (one- and two-door), dishwasher and garbage disposer are realized, will result in sales well over a quarter of a billion dollars.

The water heater was singled out for individual promotion this year since many rural electrics have already been conducting either continuous or intermittent promotions on this appliance alone. Buying intentions, if all are converted to sales, would mean 460,000 units.

Water systems continue high on the list of intended purchases by rural electric consumers. The water system is strongly promoted by many rural electric systems because water is recognized as a basic necessity for modern, healthful living in rural residences. The water system is also basic to many electric-using appliances.

Housewares had an amazing sales record during 1962 in terms of expressed buying intentions. The five housewares items, as previously mentioned, ranged in sales from a high of 180 percent to a low of 70 percent of the total buying intentions. With the addition of four items to this year's survey, which is still only a part of the important housewares items, the dollar sales potential reached nearly a quarter of a billion dollars.

The freezer, which has only a 25-percent saturation nationwide, shows a 56-percent saturation among the rural electric consumers. They have expressed interest in buying another one-half-million freezers during 1963.

Air conditioning, which until a few years ago showed little growth potential in the rural areas except in a few locations, is rapidly growing in prominence in the thoughts of rural consumers. They indicate that they may buy up to 41,000 central units and 388,000 room units this year. Another 21,000 indicated the heat pump among their intended purchases.

The dehumidifier is another item growing in popularity. It adds summer comfort and prevents the destruction of summertime moisture. A total of 61,000 rural consumers expressed an interest in the dehumidifier.

Laundry appliances all show substantially increased buying intentions with the exception of the combination washer-dryer. This appliance recorded a slight decrease. This has been the problem child of the industry. Sales of the combination unit have decreased in each of the last 3 years.

Photocell controlled outdoor lights, which go on at dusk and off at dawn, were included in the survey for the first time this year. This item is already enjoying tremendous success. The future for outdoor lighting looks even better. These lights are giving the rural people their own private outdoor lights similar to street lighting enjoyed by town people. The buying intentions reach nearly a half-million units, which attests to the popularity of this fast growing item.

The bright outlook for the 1963 rural appliance sales appears to extend well into the future. Several additional factors besides those affecting the 1963 market give promise for the years ahead. The increasing population, with the resulting new households in the areas served by the rural electric systems, will be a good appliance market builder. The growing demand for change to new models before the old ones wear out and the trend to "second" appliances in some households will create more sales. Appliances such as the dishwasher and garbage disposer, which have reached only a low saturation in the rural areas, will increase in sales as they become better known.

Each year there has been a growth in number of systems participating in the coordinated promotion program, and an increase in the use of advertising to support the promotions. More promotion and advertising mean increased sales.

Rural consumer ownership and buying intentions of electric appliances

	Number who own	Percent who own	Definitely will buy	Possibly will buy	Total buying intentions
All-electric kitchen:					
Range	2,258,100	52.1	143,000	530,000	673,000
Refrigerator	3,785,000	87.3	103,000	436,000	539,000
Refrigerator-freezer	407,000	9.4	32,000	132,000	164,000
Dishwasher	147,000	3.4	24,000	128,000	152,000
Garbage disposer	73,000	1.7	2,000	85,000	87,000
Water heater	2,058,000	47.5	89,000	374,000	463,000
Housewares—Gifts:					
Television	3,790,000	87.4	124,000	529,000	653,000
Radio	4,090,000	93.2	90,000	351,000	441,000
Record player	1,732,000	40.0	53,000	313,000	366,000
Coffeemaker	2,603,000	60.0	69,000	399,000	463,000
Fry pan	2,085,000	48.1	109,000	518,000	627,000
Blanket	1,446,000	33.4	133,000	553,000	686,000
Vacuum cleaner	2,828,000	65.2	71,000	372,000	442,000
Saw	1,422,000	32.8	84,000	358,000	443,000
Drill	1,804,000	41.6	69,000	334,000	403,000
Freezer	2,435,000	56.2	130,000	476,000	606,000
Air conditioner and dehumidifier:					
Central air conditioner	37,000	.9	8,000	33,000	41,000
Dehumidifier	84,000	1.9	7,000	54,000	61,000
Room air conditioner	574,000	13.2	52,000	336,000	388,000
All-electric laundry:					
Automatic washer	1,338,000	30.9	97,000	367,000	464,000
Wringer-washer	2,393,000	55.2	66,000	214,000	280,000
Dryer	838,000	19.3	97,000	464,000	561,000
Washer-dryer	61,000	1.4	3,000	53,000	56,000
Electric heat:					
Whole house electric heat	204,000	4.7	9,000	40,000	49,000
Portable heaters	1,080,000	24.9	42,000	254,000	296,000
Heat pump	41,000	.9	4,000	13,000	17,000
Pressure water system	3,128,000	72.2	59,000	220,000	279,000
Dusk-to-dawn automatic lights	218,000	5.0	50,000	424,000	474,000

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the report indicates that consumers expect to spend $1,250 million on appliances, plumbing, wiring, and equipment.

The 2-percent interest rate on REA loans is a most important tool. It is designed to help the rural electric cooperatives in providing to all who desire it in their areas the kind of quality electric service taken for granted by town and city dwellers.

The cooperatives must have this help in order to overcome four problems inherent in their operations: Low density of population, light electric loads, isolation from one another which prevents the pooling of facilities, and exposure to pirating of customers or territory.

The cooperatives serve about three members to each mile of line. Class A and B power companies have about 33 customers to each mile of their lines. In other words, a mile of power company line serves more than 10 times as many customers as does a mile of electric cooperative line.

This makes a great difference between the revenues of cooperatives and those of the power companies. In 1960, a mile of electric cooperative line produced an average of $414 in revenue. But a mile of power company line produced an average of $6,580 in revenue, almost 16 times as much as that from an electric cooperative line.

Members of rural electric cooperatives pay more for interest in their electric bills than do the customers served by power companies. In 1961, 7.4 percent of the gross revenues of REA borrowers was used to pay interest charges. In the same year, power companies spent only 6.2 percent of their gross revenues on interest charges.

This was true, even though the REA borrowers paid 2 percent interest on their loans and the power companies paid varying rates which they said were much higher.

We must remember, too, that the electric cooperatives are nonprofit organizations. The capital contributed by members to the growing equity they have in their own electric systems does not draw interest. The rate is not 6 percent, or even 2 percent. It is zero.

One of the best analyses of these problems was made by REA Administrator, Norman M. Clapp. I ask unanimous consent that this analysis be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Rural Electrification magazine, May, 1963]

RURAL ELECTRIC EQUALIZERS, WHY THEY ARE NECESSARY

(By Norman M. Clapp, Administrator, REA)

People are asking "Why a rural electrification program, 28 years later, when central station electric service has been made available to nearly 98 percent of the Nation's farms?" Rural people have a big stake in seeing that the public knows the answer.

If rural people had been willing to disregard price and quality of service, most could have had electric service in 1935. I can recall in my home State of Wisconsin a farmer could get electric service if he was willing to pay around $2,000 a mile for the construction of the line to serve his place, and willing to dig into his pocket each month to pay a similar premium for the service itself.

Under such conditions rural electrification was available to farmers in 1935. The problem was that for 9 out of 10 rural people the price was more than they were willing and able to pay.

This was not rural electrification. The need which President Franklin Roosevelt, and Senator George Norris and Representative Sam Rayburn tackled as sponsors of the Rural Electrification Act, was to make it possible for people in rural areas to have electric service at rates and on terms comparable to those prevailing in urban areas.

INDISPENSABLE KEY

Electric service is an indispensable key to greater convenience, comfort and better living. Simple fairness would say that it should be as abundantly and reasonably available to rural people as it is to city people. Electric power is also a key to economic opportunity and development—new jobs, better living standards, better community services. Thus rural areas need to achieve a practical parity with urban areas in electric power supply and service if they are to participate in national growth and realize their full economic potential.

Numerical progress in rural electrification has obscured the fact that rural areas still have a long way to go before parity is achieved. The fact that the consumer on the lines of an REA borrower system still has to pay about 20 percent more for 250 kilowatt-hours used in a month than the average city consumer is just one measure of the rural disadvantage.

The truth is it costs more to provide quality electric service in rural areas. Even today the rural systems financed by REA have on the average only 3.3 consumers to each mile of line. The class A and B commercial utilities, and this includes all but the very small companies, have on the average 33 consumers to each mile of their line. The comparison from the standpoint of revenue is even more dramatic. The REA-financed systems in 1960 averaged $414 in annual revenue per mile of line, compared to $6,580 for the commercial companies.

MAJOR HANDICAPS

This low density of consumers—particularly in an industry of high capital requirements—is one of the major handicaps of rural service. It is the product not only of the relative population density—or lack of it in rural areas—as compared with urban areas, but also of the historic development of the industry through which the commercial utilities skimmed off the cream of the rural areas themselves, leaving the REA-financed systems the task of picking up what was left. This resulted in the development of many small rural electric systems, relatively isolated from one another. This isolation itself has become another factor in the high-cost handicaps of rural service.

When the investment must be high, as in modern electric practice, the only practical way to achieve low rates is by maximum utilization of costly facilities. Development of high-load factor, the interconnection and pooling of plant facilities, large-scale generation, and the integration of hydro and steam capacity are principal means of bringing power costs down. Unfortunately, the rural systems have had little opportunity to use these economizers because of the very conditions under which they operate—low density, lack of diversity, absence of protection against pirating of customers or territory, and isolation from one another.

EQUALIZERS

Under such conditions, borrowers had to use the available "equalizers," such as long-term, 2-percent REA loans, in their struggle for electrical parity.

The necessity of 2-percent loans is apparent from the fact—surprising to many REA critics—that rural consumers served by REA borrowers pay more for interest per dollar in their power bills than the city consumers served by commercial power companies. In 1961, 7.4 percent of gross revenues of REA-financed systems was required to pay interest charges. Whatever the rate the commercial utilities pay on their bonds, only 6.2 percent of their revenues were required, on an average, for interest charges.

Another equalizer has been supplied by the rural people themselves in the nonprofit operation of the cooperative systems they have built. By organizing into cooperatives they have voluntarily waived the normal claim to profit from their investment, except in terms of lower cost service. The capital they contribute to their growing financial equity in their systems does not draw interest at 6 percent, nor even at 2 percent, but zero percent.

The final major equalizer designed to help overcome the present high cost of rural service is the REA-financed generation and transmission program. The wholesale cost of power accounts for 43 percent of the average cost of providing service through the REA-financed rural electric distribution systems. The rates for which power is available at wholesale are tremendously significant in determining the ability of the distribution cooperative to deliver electricity to its members at retail rates comparable to urban rates. A reduction of a single mill in the average wholesale cost of power for the REA-financed systems across the country would produce an annual saving of over $36 million for their consumer members.

SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS

From one source or another, the rural electric systems must obtain 100 million kilowatt-hours every day—worth about two-thirds of a million dollars at wholesale. This is substantial business, and it is a growing market for power companies as well as generation and transmission cooperatives. Recently a rural power system, in paying its wholesale power bill, turned over to a commercial power company the billionth dollar which power companies have received for supplying power to rural electric systems. This is the part of rural electrification they like.

But many of their spokesmen are among the longtime critics of rural electrification who are saying again that it is time to consider the job of rural electrification finished. They argue that rural electric systems financed by REA are simply stopgap devices to serve areas and loads the commercial companies did not choose to serve at one time. Their solution is to dismantle the rural electric systems, section by section as they become attractive to the power companies, leaving the fragmented rural electric systems weak, small, and plagued with high costs.

EQUALIZERS IN THE FUTURE

If the rural systems serve only the leftover loads and territories at the sufferance of the commercial utilities then there will never be an end to the need for equalizers, such as 2-percent loans. In fact, it is more likely they will need even greater equalizers in the future to serve their remaining areas of high cost if this is the course we pursue.

The other way to approach the job of rural electrification is to undertake a vigorous and determined program to strengthen the systems that have undertaken to serve the rural areas, to make them strong enough to stand on their own feet without any special assistance.

This kind of program must include territorial protection. The rural systems must be able to retain the portions of their service territories that experience population growth and provide the benefits of consumer density. They must be able to serve all loads in their territory, developing greater load diversity through large power sales as well as the smaller ones. They must develop greater access to larger scale generation and wider pooling of plant facilities, both public and private, with maximum utilization of power sources.

With the kind of climate where rural systems can do these things, the need for equalizers such as REA's 2-percent financing and technical assistance will diminish and, I am confident, ultimately disappear. This is the course we are pursuing in REA. This is the right course.

While it is possible to approach this job of rural electrification in either of these two fashions, it can't be done both ways at the same time. We cannot expect the rural systems to stand on their own feet while they are denied access to the maximum technological benefits of the industry and left to be cannibalized by the commercial power companies.

CONTRIBUTIONS WILL INCREASE

Where these systems are given the opportunity to develop, their impact in contributing to the total national economy will increase. In opening new markets for sale of electric power, they create a growing market for the sale of new appliances and equipment. For a number of years now, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association has published surveys indicating that such purchases by members of these rural systems have developed into a billion-dollar annual market. During the present year, NRECA reports an expectation that these sales will reach a record $1,250 million. Tens of thousands of new jobs have been created both in the city factories producing this equipment, on Main Street of our small towns and in the operation of the power systems. Electricity has had a big hand in the growing efficiency on American farms.

Most of all, as use of electricity grows in rural areas, the areas themselves can offer new opportunity for people living in them.

These are the basic issues facing rural electrification in the United States today. If rural electrification is going to move forward toward parity with urban service, toward lower power rates and high standards of service, there must be public understanding of the job that lies ahead.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, rural electric cooperatives are independent, nonprofit organizations chartered in the States in which they operate. They are locally owned and they are locally controlled—yes, owned, managed, and controlled by the Rural Electric Cooperative members.

The cooperatives are responsible for the management of their own affairs, for the successful construction and operation of their electric systems and for the repayment of their REA loans.

REA and the rural electric cooperatives see their relationship in the same light. The REA is a lender; the cooperatives are borrowers, and the borrowers decide all of their own management questions without REA review or approval. REA neither owns nor controls any part of any rural electric cooperative system.

There is no better proof that cooperatives are free, private enterprises than the annual meeting of rural electric cooperatives. At these meetings, each member has just one vote. A member who uses the most electricity has no more votes than a member who uses the least.

Some people insist, however, that the cooperatives, because they can get 2-percent money, are competing unfairly with the power companies. They say the cooperatives are reaching into urban areas—the larger towns and cities—to lure commercial and industrial customers away from the power companies.

There is no evidence that power companies are being hurt by any kind of competition. In the life of the REA, power company total operating revenues have more than tripled, their investment in plant has more than tripled, and their earnings on common stock have more than tripled.

It does not appear to me that rural electric cooperatives have been injurious to the private utilities. In many areas of America the private utilities are working cooperatively with the rural electric cooperatives. That is the case in my own State of Minnesota, where there is a friendly, healthy, and efficient working relationship between the private power companies, on the one hand, and the rural electric cooperatives on the other. I believe that a little more of such cooperation and a little less antagonism and the whole country would be better served.

I ask unanimous consent that a recent report on power company net income, reprinted from Electrical World, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Electrical World, Apr. 8, 1963]

WEST-SOUTH-CENTRAL UTILITIES TAKE THE LEAD AS INDUSTRY NET INCOME REBOUNDS IN 1962

Last year was the best ever for utility net incomes. Based on a sampling of 142 companies, representing roughly 95 percent of the total electric revenues for the utility industry, net incomes posted a 10.02-percent gain over 1961, as compared with a 5.4-percent gain in 1961 over 1960. The increase in 1962 got a boost from the new 3-percent investment tax credit, and the Internal Revenue Service's liberalized depreciation guidelines.

Every section of the country showed an increase in net income. However, the Mountain States, after spurting to the lead in 1961 with a 14.8-percent gain, relinquished its top position by dropping off to a 6.8-percent gain last year. Here's the region-by-region roundup of 1961 and 1962:

Region	Percent gain	
	1962	1961
New England	9.2	2.2
Middle Atlantic	10.3	8.9
East north central	8.5	4.5
West north central	5.7	5.0
South Atlantic	11.0	2.7
East south central	8.9	4.8
West south central	16.4	1.2
Mountain	6.8	14.8
Pacific	11.2	7.4

The area showing the biggest increase was the West South Central, which was low region last year. In that 1 section, 11 utilities registered net income gains of over 10 percent, the largest being the 28 percent posted by New Orleans Public Service. The Mountain States, which showed an 8-percent drop from 1961, contained 2 of the 7 utilities which registered declines in the 1962 net income sample of 142 companies. These two companies were Idaho Power (−8.4 percent) and Sierra Pacific Power (−2.8 percent).

Here are net incomes for 142 operating electric utilities for the 12 months ended Dec. 31, 1961 and 1962

[In thousands of dollars]

Company	1962	1961
Alabama Power [1]	22,856	21,646
Appalachian Power [1]	24,337	21,494
Arizona Public Service [2]	13,643	11,319
Arkansas Missouri	1,554	1,352
Arkansas Power & Light [1]	11,375	11,173
Atlantic City Electric	9,088	8,211
Baltimore Gas & Electric	23,500	22,772
Bangor Hydro-Electric	1,708	1,593
Blackstone Valley Gas & Electric [2]	2,296	2,084
Boston Edison	15,669	14,939
Brockton Edison	1,702	1,617
California Electric Power	5,746	5,506
California-Pacific Utilities	1,181	1,177
Carolina Power & Light	16,345	14,709
Central Hudson G&E	6,452	6,008

See footnotes at end of table.

Here are net incomes for 142 operating electric utilities for the 12 months ended Dec. 31, 1961 and 1962—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Company	1962	1961
Central Illinois Electric & Gas	4,698	4,393
Central Illinois Light	6,504	5,186
Central Illinois Public Service	13,110	12,235
Central Louisiana Electric	4,570	4,028
Central Maine Power	8,811	8,652
Central Power & Light [1]	12,879	11,179
Central Vermont Public Service	1,991	1,861
Cincinnati Gas & Electric [3]	22,710	21,726
Cleveland Electric Illuminating [2]	24,670	24,357
Columbus & Southern Ohio [2]	11,142	10,884
Commonwealth Edison	88,470	82,664
Community Public Service	2,351	2,160
Connecticut Light & Power	16,661	14,514
Consolidated Edison of New York	90,636	76,352
Consumers Power [2]	45,097	40,241
Dallas Power & Light [3]	13,339	10,693
Dayton Power & Light	13,664	12,549
Delaware Power & Light	9,938	9,005
Detroit Edison [2]	42,911	39,765
Duke Power	29,997	27,234
Duquesne Light	24,192	23,330
Edison Sault Electric	371	331
El Paso Electric	4,470	4,087
Empire District Electric	2,530	2,319
Fall River Electric Light [3]	984	862
Florida Power	15,620	13,601
Florida Power & Light	33,065	30,254
Georgia Power [1]	24,460	20,801
Green Mountain Power	853	746
Gulf Power [1]	4,466	4,013
Gulf States Utilities	18,951	16,047
Hartford Electric Light	8,046	6,729
Hawaiian Electric	5,963	4,818
Houston Lighting & Power	27,397	21,532
Idaho Power	8,856	9,668
Illinois Power	23,114	22,217
Indiana & Michigan Electric [1]	14,600	12,029
Indianapolis Power & Light	10,833	10,090
Interstate Power	5,032	4,786
Iowa Electric Light & Power	5,863	5,496
Iowa-Illinois Gas & Electric [2]	7,116	6,551
Iowa Power & Light	6,056	5,568
Iowa Public Service	5,409	5,030
Iowa Southern Utilities	2,532	1,978
Jersey Central Power & Light [1]	9,944	9,309
Kansas City Power & Light	12,282	11,337
Kansas Gas & Electric	8,101	7,581
Kansas Power & Light	9,441	9,093
Kentucky Power [1]	3,170	1,881
Kentucky Utilities	8,937	8,417
Kingsport Utilities [1]	494	424
Long Island Lighting	25,184	21,953
Louisiana Power & Light [1]	9,221	8,470
Louisville Gas & Electric	12,313	11,339
Madison Gas & Electric	2,080	1,987
Maine Public Service	913	913
Metropolitan Edison [1]	11,779	10,439
Minnesota Power & Light	4,916	4,703
Mississippi Power [1]	4,517	3,896
Mississippi Power & Light [1]	6,154	6,003
Missouri Power & Light	2,224	2,009
Missouri Public Service	3,040	2,737
Missouri Utilities	877	808
Monongahela Power [1]	6,935	6,580
Montana-Dakota Utilities	5,746	5,162
Montana Power	14,477	13,310
Nevada Power	2,328	2,257
New England Electric System [4]	18,948	17,324
New England Gas & Electric [4]	5,075	4,743
New Jersey Power & Light [1]	3,367	3,235
New Orleans Public Service [3]	6,076	4,747
New York State Electric & Gas	18,529	17,487
Newport Electric	331	335
Niagara Mohawk Power	41,714	36,079
Northern Indiana Public Service	20,546	18,513
Northern States Power (Minnesota)	28,509	27,408
Northern States Power (Wisconsin)	2,623	2,662
Northwestern Public Service	1,415	1,449
Ohio Edison [5]	34,978	30,841
Ohio Power [1]	26,662	24,677
Oklahoma Gas & Electric	14,456	12,135
Orange & Rockland Utilities	4,495	4,146
Otter Tail Power	2,791	2,546
Pacific Gas & Electric	110,692	102,241
Pacific Power & Light	20,842	18,076
Pennsylvania Electric [1]	18,032	17,994
Pennsylvania Power & Light	25,984	25,525
Philadelphia Electric	47,581	46,596
Portland General Electric	9,025	7,880
Potomac Edison [1]	5,456	5,310
Potomac Electric Power	19,187	17,442
Public Service Electric & Gas	65,563	57,410
Public Service of Colorado	18,683	18,521
Public Service of Indiana	19,756	17,921
Public Service of New Hampshire	6,033	5,682
Public Service of New Mexico	4,489	3,954
Puget Sound Power & Light [3]	8,589	7,746
Rochester Gas & Electric	11,751	10,563
San Diego Gas & Electric	11,615	8,623
St. Joseph Light & Power	1,412	1,350
Savannah Electric & Power	1,967	2,154
Sierra Pacific Power	2,103	2,163
South Carolina Electric & Gas	10,621	10,116
Southern California Edison	60,569	54,183
Southern Indiana Gas & Electric	3,551	3,273
Southwestern Electric Power [1]	8,901	7,871
Southwestern Electric Service	497	480
Southwestern Public Service	13,584	11,234
Tampa Electric	8,261	6,890
Texas Electric Service [1]	20,371	18,351
Texas Power & Light [1] [2]	19,713	16,972
Toledo Edison [2]	9,370	8,266
Tucson Gas, Electric Light & Power	4,257	3,373
Union Electric	29,053	28,455
United Illuminating	6,452	5,828
Utah Power & Light	10,350	9,561
Virginia Electric & Power	38,358	33,443
Washington Water Power	7,063	6,819
West Penn Power [3]	16,416	15,718
West Texas Utilities [1]	6,324	5,969
Western Light & Telephone	2,555	2,312
Western Massachusetts	4,595	4,171
Wheeling Electric [1]	536	574
Wisconsin Electric Power	19,848	18,515
Wisconsin Michigan Power	2,254	2,142
Wisconsin Power & Light	9,342	8,807
Wisconsin Public Service	8,054	6,925
Total, 142 companies	2,007,583	1,824,594

See footnotes at end of table.

Here are net incomes for 142 operating electric utilities for the 12 months ended Dec. 31, 1961 and 1962—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

---

[1] All common shares owned by a holding company.

[2] Revised.

[3] Most common shares owned by a holding company.

[4] Holding company controlling operating companies.

[5] Includes Pennsylvania Power Co.

Total increase in net income for the industry was almost $183 million, as compared with the $94 million increase in 1961, and the $114 million increase in 1960. The utility showing the biggest jump last year was Consolidated Edison of New York, which boosted its net income by $14 million. Runner-up for the second year in a row was Pacific Gas & Electric with an $8.4 million increase. In third place was Public Service Electric & Gas, which registered an $8.1 million gain.

These 7 companies made the largest net income gains

	Percent increase
Kentucky Power	68.5
San Diego Gas & Electric	34.7
Iowa Southern Utilities	28.0
New Orleans Public Service	28.0
Houston Lighting & Power	27.2
Tucson Gas, Electric Light & Power	26.2
Central Illinois Light	25.4

Other companies showing a 20-percent-or-over net income gain were: Dallas Power & Light, 24.7 percent; Hawaiian Electric, 23.8 percent; Indiana & Michigan Electric, 21.4 percent; Southwestern Public Service, 20.9 percent; Arizona Public Service, 20.5 percent.

While these companies showed a net income decline

	Percent decline
Savannah Electric & Power	8.7
Idaho Power	8.4
Wheeling Electric	6.6
Sierra Pacific Power	2.8
Northwestern Public Service	2.3
Northern States Power (Wisconsin)	1.5
Newport Electric	1.2

These were the only companies showing declines in net income for 1962. One company (Maine Public Service) showed no change, and three companies showed a less-than-1-percent increase. They are: Pennsylvania Electric; California Pacific Utilities, and Public Service of Colorado.

On a percentage basis however, Consolidated Edison posted an 18.7-percent income gain, well down on the list of those companies showing the largest net income gains for 1962. Pacific Gas & Electric registered an 8.3-percent increase, and Public Service Electric & Gas showed a 14.2-percent gain.

The greatest percentage increase was shown by Kentucky Power, which upped its net income by 68.5 percent—from $1,881 million in 1961 to $3,170 million in 1962. The reason behind this increase was that interest during construction credit was about $1.7 million in 1962 as against approximately $380,000 in 1961—making an increase of $1.3 million in 1962 in this category.

It's interesting to note that in the 142-company sample, only 7 showed a decline, while 12 showed a 20 percent or over increase, and 49 companies showed increases of 10 percent or over, in their 1962 net incomes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, that report indicates that our private utilities have done very well economically and are continuing to grow and expand at a very rapid rate in order to meet the power needs and electrical needs of the American people and the American economy.

Mr. President, no cooperative can get an REA loan to implement an invasion of an urban area. The Rural Electrification Act says specifically that cooperatives may bring service to rural areas of fewer than 1,500 population which are not already getting central station service.

What is happening is that the towns and the cities are moving into the areas developed by the cooperatives. I believe everyone knows that to be the case. That is what we call suburban development. Today the old cities have satellite communities around them. Many of the industrial plants have moved out of the large cities into what was once rural areas. Those rural areas were being served and are being served by the REA—the rural electrical cooperatives.

But even so, an REA study shows that less than 3 percent of all the consumers served by REA borrowers live in towns of more than 1,500 population. In most cases, these consumers live in rural areas; they were taken in by urban expansion.

There are some who criticize electric cooperatives on the ground that the co-ops do not pay enough taxes. Most cooperatives, however, simply are not as big as most power companies; they do not sell nearly as much power. Therefore they do not have the large gross or net revenues that rural electric cooperatives have. They pay property taxes. They pay local taxes. If members of the cooperatives have sufficient income to justify paying income taxes, they pay income taxes.

Again, the cooperatives operate at cost, even though they are expected to provide quality service in thinly populated areas. Any excess over the cost of service is returned to the co-op members, and that is subject to normal taxation—Federal, State, and local.

But the cost of service does include all taxes, other than income taxes, which are paid by the cooperatives as well as the power companies and the income tax is collected from the co-op member.

Income taxes are on net income or profits. Rural electric cooperatives pay no income taxes because they make no profits. Any business, and this includes a power company, which chooses to operate at cost will pay no income tax.

What is overlooked is that rural electrics probably pay heavier property taxes per capita than do power companies. Where property taxes are based upon miles of electric line, this is bound to be true. In a rural area, this burden is shared by fewer consumers; the per capita taxes are heavier.

A tax burden shared by 20 customers is only one-tenth as great as the same tax burden shared by two members of a rural electric cooperative. The cooperatives and the power companies merely collect the taxes from their customers. The companies are guaranteed a reasonable rate of return over and above all costs, including taxes.

It also is said that the co-ops are unfair competitors because they are turning to REA for loans to finance their own generation and transmission facilities. Statistics show this is false.

Power companies are selling electricity to 80 percent of the Nation's electric power consumers. By 1980, the companies' customers are going to be using three times as much power as they are using today.

But cooperative generation and transmission systems are serving only 8 percent of the electric power consumers. And cooperative distribution systems are buying 38 percent of their power supply from private power companies.

The cooperative generation and transmission systems generate less than 1 percent of all the power generated annually in this country. From this small output, the co-ops get just 16 percent of all the power they distribute. They buy more than twice that much power from the power companies. This may be competition, but it certainly is not unfair competition.

Mr. President, the loads of electric co-ops are doubling every 7 to 10 years. The co-ops must have dependable supplies of power at reasonable rates if they are to do the job assigned by the Congress. If they cannot get such supplies and such rates, they must generate their own power.

The fact that they have the authority to obtain what we call G. & T. loans—generation and transmission loans—to establish generation plans gives them a lever, so to speak, to obtain power from the private companies at reasonable rates.

The situation is precisely as President Kennedy described it in his budget message last year. The amount needed for generation and transmission loan funds depends upon the willingness of private power suppliers to sell enough power at reasonable rates to the electric co-ops.

Not every REA borrower is going to come to the Rural Electrification Administration for a generation and transmission loan. Not every co-op is going to build its own plant. It just would not be feasible. But the availability of a generation and transmission loan, as a lever upon the bargaining process between cooperatives and power companies, should remain in the REA Act. The Congress properly can continue to rely upon the discretion of the REA Administrator in his use of this bargaining tool.

Mr. President, the job of rural electrification is not finished; not for the power companies, not for the REA, not for the rural electric cooperatives, and not for the Congress. The growth of our rural areas must be encouraged.

We need small industries in rural areas. We need to diversify the economy of our small rural areas. Such development will require a greater amount of electrical energy, and a rural electric cooperative surely has a very significant role to play in providing that energy.

We must have adequate financing; we must have an adequate supply of wholesale power; we must continue efficient, reliable electric service throughout our country.

Furthermore, rural electrification is a benefit not merely to the rural areas. It is a benefit to the entire country, to all electric consumers, urban and rural, and of great benefit to American industry.

The service provided by a rural electric cooperative is a yardstick against which consumers may measure the service provided by the regulated private power companies.

Let us consider what has been happening in the electric industry during recent years. Since 1954, power companies have been enjoying unprecedented prosperity and very high profits. More than half of the new construction by private power companies is being financed by retained earnings, which is the money consumers pay in their electric bills over and above the cost of doing business and providing a fair return on investment.

Mr. President, there is an urgent need to strengthen the rural electric cooperatives, not weaken them. They provide an important yardstick. Our economy requires at least a small segment whose incentive is to provide dependable, low-cost service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address on the REA program delivered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] to the Green River Rural Electric Cooperative annual meeting on July 20 at Owensboro, Ky., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR GAYLORD NELSON TO GREEN RIVER RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ANNUAL MEETING, OWENSBORO, KY., SATURDAY, JULY 20, 1963

I believe in investing in the future of America, and that's why I consider the Rural Electrification program one of our most valuable and effective national programs.

The REA stands today as one of the great, lasting accomplishments of an amazing era in American history. To appreciate the REA I think you have to reflect just a moment on that era—and on some similarities you might notice today.

The REA came into being because a great crisis seized our country and shocked our Government into a new and dynamic concept of its responsibilities.

We had had a succession of what we called businesslike administrations. There was a fairly widespread acceptance of an old dogma which Calvin Coolidge put into words: "The business of the country is business."

The marketplace had become a shrine. Whatever happened there, from natural causes, was right and proper and good. Nothing else was supposed to happen. The U.S. Government stood and watched, a kind of halfhearted observer.

The Government was, in Franklin Roosevelt's words, frozen in the ice of its own indifference.

Then the whole edifice of business came tumbling down in disaster. And out of the ruins came a new American spirit which welded a Nation together, helped us to win the greatest war in history and to emerge as the strongest industrial economy on earth.

This new spirit—expressed in programs such as the REA—is something we should not forget, for it represented a great turning point in American history.

We discovered this spirit when we stopped sitting around and waiting for good things to happen and began, instead, to mobilize our people and develop our resources to make things happen.

Until then, we weren't supposed to think about such things. True, only one farm in 10 had electricity, and farmers lived a life not much different from that of their grandfathers. It would have cost them some $2,000 a mile to bring in electric power. It was a life of kerosene lamps and horse drawn plows and backbreaking manual labor. There wasn't much sanitation or education or recreation.

But this was the way it was meant to be. I never quite understood who meant it to be that way, but it was meant to be.

Then we suddenly found ourselves in such a crisis that even the captains of industry demanded that something be done. And in an amazingly short period of time, the American people, frightened into action and united by their fear, set the U.S. Government onto an entirely different course.

Obviously, one way to rebuild a shattered nation was to electrify the farms and extend for the first time the full benefits of our industrialized economy into rural areas. Naturally, a few called this socialism or communism. But as any historian can tell you, the really striking thing about this era is that the American people did not turn to socialism or communism, as people did in some other nations. Instead they chose something distinctly democratic and American.

They created independent, home-owned cooperatives, with capital provided on a strict loan basis from the Federal Government. The program was in the finest traditions of a free democracy—and the results were spectacular.

Today, the greatest testimonial to this inspired program comes from its bitterest enemies—the owners of the big private utilities who announce triumphantly that 98 percent of the farms of America are now electrified.

That's right—they are; the farms which American business leaders and the Government once thought it was better to leave in peasantlike poverty than to lift a hand to help—because they said there was no profit in it.

No profit to whom?

No profit in throwing a switch to send vital electric power into 5 million farms and homes? No profit in more than doubling the output of the American farmer? No profit in stimulating $4 worth of investment by REA customers for every $1 the Government loaned? No profit in triggering $16 billion in consumer spending for appliances, plumbing, wiring and equipment—a spending spree which continues at the rate of a billion dollars a year?

Any man who tells you there is no profit in such a program doesn't know what profit is. Or else he means to say that the profit was spread around a little too much.

In my opinion, the REA program was one of the most profitable ventures ever undertaken by America, and I think we should keep its shining example before us.

Today, America is the leader of the free world, locked in an endless struggle with the forces of oppression. In this struggle, every resource we have must be used to the fullest if we hope to win. It isn't enough to build armies and missiles and pile up enough nuclear weapons to incinerate the world. We have got to build a strong economy and a strong society.

We have got to educate our children, and train scientists and engineers. We have got to maintain full employment. We have 40 million people living on the edge of poverty. We have 4,800,000 unemployed. We need 22 million new jobs in the next decade just to absorb new young people entering the labor market. We have got to conquer ignorance and poverty and disease. We have got to save and develop our priceless natural resources. We have got to conquer outer space.

The nation that emerges on top in this struggle is the nation that does that job best. We cannot do that job if we sit back as we did in the twenties and wait for some mystical economic force to do the job for us.

I consider the REA program a vital, continuing part of this absolutely crucial effort to strengthen and expand the American economy to meet the needs of our people and to preserve our place in the world. Electric energy is a keystone of economic growth. India, for instance, produces about one-twentieth of the goods and services we produce—and its energy consumption is also one-twentieth of ours. In the Soviet Union, half the population must work at raising the food to feed the nation. In America, with electrified farms, less than 9 percent of our total work force is occupied in farming.

Yet the REA program is under bitter attack today from some of the same hidebound people who fought it a generation ago on narrow ideological grounds; from a comparatively few fast-buck artists who think they could make a killing if they could get REA out of the way; and from some well-meaning people who just don't understand the need for such a program.

I want to deal with some of the arguments used in this attack.

They say that the REA was a great success but its job is done so now it should be liquidated. Anyone who says that simply does not understand the REA program.

Its job was to supply the rural areas of America with electricity. It is doing that job and we hope it will continue to do it. This job did not consist of throwing up a few poles and stringing a few wires. It takes all the ingenuity and resources of our local REA cooperatives to supply the growing demand for electricity in rural areas. REA loads have been doubling every 7 or 8 years.

Or they say that it was all right to allow cooperatives to distribute electricity but not to generate and transmit it. Here again you see the attitude of some businessmen wearing blinders.

The private power companies were so prejudiced against the REA—or so anxious to exploit it unfairly—that they lost some of their best customers. They chiseled with the dual rate device—making co-ops pay a higher rate when they used extra amounts of power—just the opposite of the usual practice in the industry. And they used their position as a supplier to punish the co-ops in every way they could.

Generation and transmission of electricity by rural electric cooperatives was the obvious and logical answer in cases where this happened.

There is no question as to its legality. It is written into the law and it has been upheld in the courts. Strict standards are set, and the amount of power so generated is only seven-tenths of 1 percent of the power generated in America today.

But where private power is not available, or where the rates are unduly high, or where some hostile power company is out to "get" the cooperative, generation and transmission becomes a necessity.

It brings electric power to the places where it is most needed—and at reasonable rates. It provides a valuable yardstick for electric rates throughout the area. And most important, it removes the last barrier to rural area development and the creation of new jobs.

Some businessmen wearing blinders may oppose such a program, but we must not let them impose their blinders on the Nation. We have an obligation to look at the total needs of an area and of our country, and not just at the needs of one so narrow that he would never realize that you can stimulate the sale of lemonade by working with a man who sells salted peanuts.

They also say that the REA Administrator in Washington has too much leeway in approving loans. They seem to want every one to be approved by act of Congress. Well, I happen to know Norman Clapp, and there is no more dedicated, no more enlightened, no better informed executive in America today in business or in Government. Both the public interest and the interests of the rural electric cooperatives will be well served by this outstanding man.

And, of course, they say that the Government should not make loans to rural electric cooperatives—not at all, some say, and others say that, at least, the interest rate should be raised. They say the present program gives cooperatives an unfair advantage over private power companies—the same companies which long ago refused to serve anyone in the areas now served by the co-ops.

Congress gave the co-ops a favorable interest rate, it's true, in order to make the whole thing possible. In exchange, the co-ops were given heavy responsibilities. They had to serve everyone in their areas. They couldn't just pick the profitable customers. This led to high costs. Rural electric cooperatives have one-tenth the customer density along their lines and earn about one-fifteenth as much revenue per mile of line as private power companies. That is the very reason why private power companies decided it was not profitable—for them—to serve these areas. That is the very reason why we created an REA loan program at reasonable interest rates.

The private power companies complaining about REA competition are not suffering. Their profits are higher than ever before—because of an advancing economy.

But rural electric cooperatives should not become too discouraged at the attacks made on them. Many people see through the old slogans and the hidebound dogma.

As you know, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has opened an all-out assault on the REA program, saying it should be—no, not destroyed—just phased out.

But I have businessmen in my State who would rather phase out the chamber of commerce.

I received a telegram recently from the board of directors of the local chamber of commerce in Richland Center, Wis., which said "We believe that the economic well-being of this area can best be served by the continuation and completion of rural electrification, rather than by its elimination. We wish to make it known that the stand taken by the State and National chambers of commerce does not reflect the feeling of our local chamber of commerce, and that we actively support the activities of the REA program."

As you can see, not all businessmen wear blinders.

One businessman wrote that he was particularly angry at the chamber of commerce attack on REA because the local REA co-op was one of the most active members of the local chamber of commerce.

I also had a letter from an engineer in Milwaukee, our largest city, who told how an anti-REA petition was circulated in the office of the corporation for which he works.

"Please do not pay too much attention to the signatures," he wrote. "Under the eyes of the boss' son, they may not represent true opinion."

He went on to say, "Extending the benefits of electricity to the people who open up the remote areas of our country is one of the worthy uses of Federal funds."

In Big Rivers cooperative, you are putting this powerful tool to work for the development of your area. I understand that your $18 million REA loan will bring electricity to a vast area at a saving of $3,300,000 over 10 years. Instead of restricting power, as your private suppliers previously did, you plan to extend power.

In Wisconsin, farmers faced up to a similar decision back in 1937. Eventually 28 local systems joined together in Dairyland Power Cooperative, and it is now the largest cooperatively owned power system in the world. It has proven its worth. It provides the lowest net power costs available to rural systems in the State. It saves these systems millions of dollars annually in power costs from the rates quoted for wholesale supply when it was organized. Total kilowatt hours to be furnished by Dairyland this year to these systems is expected to reach a billion kilowatt hours. And the impact of Dairyland as a yardstick of practical rates will become even more important in the years ahead.

Here in Kentucky I am told that you need only look to the success of the East Kentucky Rural Electric Cooperative as an example of what can be accomplished through your own generation. I understand East Kentucky fought for 4 long years through the courts to win its right to operate. It now has the lowest wholesale power costs in Kentucky outside the TVA area while its member cooperatives are building a substantial equity in this system.

I understand that your great project already has attracted a major new industry to the area—and that has been the story almost everywhere.

I am informed that the total power input in rural electric systems in Kentucky will double by 1970, and by 1975 the three cooperatives served by your new plant will need almost three times the power you needed in 1961.

Whether rural areas get this power they are demanding—at reasonable rates—will determine whether our country will grow and develop as it should, and whether our country will continue to expand as it must if America is to be strong.

We live in a strange economy today, where employment and unemployment increase at the same time; where many families reach new heights of prosperity and many others slip backward; where automation takes more jobs each day, and where some great areas of our country live in a state of perpetual depression.

We faced up to our problems in the thirties, and the REA was one of the tools we developed to work with. Our problems are just as great today, and they may be even more baffling. We cannot lay down our tools. We have just begun to work.

THE WRONG RACE WITH RUSSIA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the lead article in the August edition of the Reader's Digest magazine entitled "We're Running the Wrong Race With Russia," is a thought-provoking review of what the race to the moon may entail to the United States. Regardless of anyone's opinion, the article is well worth the examination of everyone. It was written by the magazine's authoritative military editor, Francis Vivian Drake. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in connection with this timely article, I think it is appropriate to call attention to an excellent and very informative study which had been prepared by the staff of the Senate Republican policy committee, of which my distinguished colleague is the chairman.

The policy committee staff study, entitled "A Matter of Priority," is an examination of the budget and benefits of the moonshot in relation to other national problems. No policy position is contained in this study; it merely stimulates thinking on the subject. I understand that this staff study, one of the first made in the Nation, has received wide attention and since its publication many articles have appeared which contain some of the same matters contained in the original paper. The study was prepared under the able direction of David S. Teeple, our policy committee staff director. I ask unanimous consent that the study be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MATTER OF PRIORITY

AN EXAMINATION OF THE BUDGET AND BENEFITS OF THE MOON SHOT IN RELATION TO OTHER NATIONAL PROBLEMS

(Prepared by the staff of the Senate Republican policy committee, BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, chairman, David S. Teeple, staff director, May 10, 1963)

INTRODUCTION

The history of mankind has been that of expanding horizons, from cave mouth to farmstead, until now we stand at the rim of the universe. It has been a long and tortuous development and few reasonable men seriously advocate a pulling back at this point in human development.

The question is not, then, whether man will ultimately reach the moon and beyond. The question is, rather, how shall it be done, and whether other aspects of human needs should be bypassed or overlooked in the one spasmodic effort to achieve a lunar landing at once.

Space exploration must and will come. But what priority should be applied to it in the total national effort? The decision of priorities must be made on the basis of overall benefit to the free world and not on the adolescent desire to beat the Russians in a space race.

For an American to set foot on the moon is a proper objective of national policy, but whether it justifies the major concentration of scientific talent to the exclusion of other endeavors is a matter open to debate.

No fruitful discussion can be held unless the emotional trappings, the verbal excesses are removed. A cold, careful examination is past due.

Our generation must ask itself—and answer—some basic, unpleasant questions:

Is it more important to have a man on the moon than to conquer cancer which will take the lives of 40 million Americans now living?

Is lunar exploration more important to mankind than freeing ourselves from the tragic chains of mental illness, which now accounts for one of every four American hospital beds?

Is a fistful of lunar dust meaningful to the 17 million Americans who, we are told, go to bed hungry each night?

Is a pathway to the moon more vital than a highway system devoid of the slaughter which now claims 40,000 lives annually?

Is seeing the other side of the moon more important than seeing our children free of leukemia?

Of what value are the charts of the moon to the 129 Americans now entombed in an uncharted ocean?

Is being there first more important than insuring an adequate water source for our great metropolitan centers?

Is applying our national intellect to a moon race more valid than educating our heirs so they can become useful, productive members of society?

Is putting a man on the moon more important than developing techniques for making use of our stored natural resources?

Is manned lunar flight of more value than bringing order to a world of emerging nations?

The United States has been committed to a race for the moon, partly at least due to our own emotional drive always to be first, always to be best in whatever we try. This race, for which the prize is perhaps a propaganda triumph over the Soviets will cost us up to $40 billion (estimates vary from day to day and scientist to scientist).

Top priority has been assigned to Project Apollo, our moon shot, designed to place three astronauts on the moon before the end of this decade. Priority decisions are political and are not made by the scientists and technicians.

For momentary transcendence over the Soviet Union we have pledged our wealth, national talent, and our honor.

IN SUPPORT OF MANNED LUNAR EXPLORATION

Those in favor of a crash program and an all-out immediate effort to place an American on the moon during this decade usually support their belief with four basic advantages to be gained. These are:

1. Military: It is maintained that the first nation to explore and "conquer" the moon will have a distinct military advantage. It is pointed out that missiles located on the moon would dominate the entire terrestrial globe. It is also pointed out that the moon would serve as a large stable observation post from which the "conquering" nation could observe freely and accurately all happenings on earth.

2. Propaganda: The proponents of speeded-up manned lunar exploration maintain that the propaganda advantage for the first nation placing one of its citizens on the moon would be tremendous and lasting. The United States, they say, cannot afford to allow any other country to obtain this advantage over us. The shock to the free world, they say, would be permanent and traumatic if the Soviets were to accomplish this manned exploration before the United States. By inference, they say that the same thing would be true of the Communist bloc should the United States be first.

3. Technological fallout: This phase describes the side-effect benefits to science and humanity through the experiments and the research necessary to place a man or men on the moon. These side effects, the proponents maintain, involve all fields of scientific endeavor, medicine, communications, radiation, astronomy, etc. For example, they point out, the communications system which will be necessary to maintain contact between our lunar explorers and earth will greatly enhance the on-earth communications network. The facts which we learn in this research will ultimately benefit the homeowner who wants to telephone the grocery store.

4. Scientific advantage: This is perhaps the most important of the arguments by the proponents of a crash lunar race. The immediate data brought back by our space travelers is not the essential scientific gain. It is pointed out that earth's atmosphere so interferes with light rays that our astronomers are seriously handicapped in their efforts to study the universe around us. There is no atmosphere on the moon and therefore the astronomers could set up the kind of observatory which would enable human eyes to penetrate many millions of light years beyond our present limitation. This, proponents say, would enable mankind to unlock many more of the doors which have barred us from knowing and understanding what has been going on and is going on in the far reaches of outer space. This, they say, obviously would permit us to make even further gains in exploring space and new worlds.

IN OPPOSITION TO A CRASH PROGRAM

There is a body of American and European scientific thought which discounts the four basic arguments as reasons for a crash program to place an American, or for that matter a Soviet, citizen on the moon. Their arguments generally run like this:

1. Military: Scientists point out that a missile placed on the moon and aimed at an earth target is 240,000 miles away. It is, they say, infinitely more difficult to place a warhead on target and any slight miscalculation could be disastrous. These scientists also say that the cost of such a missile is approximately a thousand times more than a missile located on earth. As for observation, astronomers who oppose the crash moon exploration program say that 240,000 miles of space makes the kind of observation necessary for military surveillance very difficult, even impossible.

Another significant and perhaps imperative consideration is the effect upon our national defense program caused by the diversion of electronic and missile experts to the far outer space probes.

Many maintain it is essential that the U.S. produce and stockpile the most efficient and reliable system of intercontinental ballistic missiles to guarantee the security of the United States and the free world from any conceivable aggressive move.

At the present time this has not been accomplished to the satisfaction of many military experts.

Intrinsic prudence, according to some, demands that we concentrate on the development of families of missiles operating in the suborbital and orbital areas rather than to devote such a large proportion of our effort to lunar shots.

To allow the Soviet Union to dominate the atmosphere 100 miles above the earth's surface while we seek to put a man on the moon could be, in the opinion of many, a fatal error.

2. Propaganda: Opponents of the crash program concede that there would be momentary advantage to whichever nation first lands a manned spacecraft on the moon. However, they note that after the Alan Shepard suborbital flight, there was only a temporary exhilaration in the United States; and this same held true for the John Glenn orbital flight. World reaction, they say,

soon cooled off after both the Soviet triumphs and the American exploits. This orbiting of the earth, they point out, has become practically routine. The same reaction, they say, will prevail after the first enthusiasm engendered by a landing on the moon. They feel it is hardly worth $40 billion to get a few weeks of headlines.

3. Technological fallout: Opponents of the crash program maintain that this is highly overrated. Dr. Philip H. Abelson, editor of Science magazine, published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, in an April 19 editorial had this to say: "The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has sought examples of technological fallout in its program. To date, those cited have not been impressive. The problems of space are different from the earthly tax-paying economy."

Others in the scientific field have contended that whatever fallout occurs is more than offset by the tremendous raid on the scientists and technicians being made in the name of Project Apollo. A group of scientists is quoted in hearings before the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences (transcript of hearings, Apr. 24, 1963, p. 26) as saying that if NASA's program is carried out "at least 60 percent of the men in the physical sciences will be working as Government employees for NASA." This point was argued and NASA spokesmen conceded the figure would be between 7 and 10 percent. Even this lower figure, scientists say, may cripple efforts in other vital fields of research.

4. Scientific advantage: Here, even opponents of the crash program concede, lies the only major benefit to be achieved. However, they point out that, as does Mr. Polycarp Kusch, Nobel laureate in physics at Columbia University, "instrument exploration is almost certainly more effective and cheaper." Instruments are more accurate than humans, and are more sensitive to light, heat, and cold than would be a spaceman in his insulated, pressurized suit. Dr. Kusch adds: "I'd rather see us explore space in a more temperate and well-thought-out way."

5. Lack of order: Opponents to our crash program point out that in our exploration of outer space we must be careful not to make the same mistake that apparently has been made in the development of atomic power. In this field, instead of proceeding in a scientific orderly fashion by constructing and testing various types of atomic reactors, we hastily began to install in populated areas uneconomic and perhaps hazardous reactors just so we could brag that we were producing electricity through atomic fission. The billions of dollars thus far expended in this area undoubtedly would have vastly enriched our knowledge of reactor technology and perhaps even produced a safe economical product (which we do not now have) if more orderly scientific procedures had been used.

Summing up, opponents to a $20 to $40 billion crash lunar program maintain that the arguments for such a program are either specious or not important. They do say that eventually man, if he follows an orderly and logical course, will reach the moon. However, they contend that there is no hurry and that it would be a lot less costly, and far greater values would accrue to mankind, if we take it easy and try to accomplish our ultimate purpose step by step. We have by no means exhausted the scientific gains to be made from orbital flights and space platforms. Crash program opponents suggest that instead of putting all of our wealth into Project Apollo we concentrate on developing an orderly approach to space exploration and try to assimilate some of the scientific data which we have already acquired through such projects as Mariner II.

In connection with Mariner II the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has admitted to the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee that most of the scientific data acquired has not been distributed. As far as the general public is concerned, all we know now with greater certainty about Venus, that we didn't know a year ago, is that Venus is hot. A great deal of valuable information was sent back to earth by the spacecraft but only NASA scientists have had access to this information to date.

Scientists who oppose the lunar exploration race also make the point that five Ranger shots at the moon by the United States have failed. Their contention is that only second-rate technicians have been used for the Ranger program because all of the top, good scientists have been put on Project Apollo.

To date NASA has spent approximately $8 billion. Over $4 billion has been spent on the Apollo project, much of it devoted to building a rocket, the Saturn series, which at best is not as good as a 6-year-old Russian rocket which first put a sputnik in orbit.

By the end of fiscal year 1964, NASA will have spent $8.6 billion on Apollo and we will still be a long way from the moon. NASA administrators maintain total cost of Apollo will be about $20 billion. They say that the heavy construction costs are in the past and that a great deal of basic research—very expensive research—has already been done. NASA's budget has doubled each year under the Kennedy administration, from $1.8 billion in fiscal 1962 to $5.7 billion in fiscal 1964. NASA's budget is now fourth largest for the Federal Government, trailing only those for Defense, Treasury, and Agriculture.

This $5.7 billion figure represents one-twentieth of our total Federal budget. In other words, of every $100 our Government spends for all purposes, $5.75 goes for the moon race.

NASA's 1964 budget exceeds by over $1 billion the total Federal budget for 1933 ($4.5 billion) and exceeds by $500 million the total receipts of our Government in 1940 ($5.1 billion).

Of each year's budget, approximately $3.9 billion will be spent for Apollo. It is hard, administrators say, to see how this money can physicaly be spent. Scientists, they say, will be sitting on one another's laps.

NASA concedes that there may be some duplication between what it is trying to accomplish and what the Department of Defense is doing. It also concedes that there has not been adequate communication between the two agencies. For instance, medical test centers for astronomers are being operated by Defense and new ones will be constructed by NASA. The Senate committee was puzzled as to why one such center couldn't do for both.

It was also brought out in hearings in late April that NASA plans to build its own navy. The agency told the committee it needed three communications ships at a cost of $30 million each located at strategic points around the globe to track and contact the Apollo astronauts on their long day's journey to the moon. The Senators asked agency spokesmen if they had ever considered contacting the Department of Defense to see if perhaps some of our surplus naval vessels might not be adequate for the job. Subsequently, a Defense Department spokesman told the committee that the Navy could provide five tracking ships completely adequate for the job at a total cost of $80 million. NASA will have its navy, a bigger one than originally planned but at a saving of $10 million to the taxpayer.

This example, according to both scientists and business administrators demonstrates the kind of waste which must be present in a vast, crash program of any kind, whether in space, oceanography, or in atomic energy.

Opponents of Apollo also contend that there is a serious danger that the pathway to the moon may become America's own Maginot Line.

PROBLEMS IN SEARCH OF A SOLUTION

As the world moves through the 20th century, new and perplexing problems have developed in every field of endeavor. On many of these we have been working for generations but have yet to find the answers.

The problems are not new, but have been complicated by an expanding and more mobile population. The shift from a predominantly rural to an urban society has brought with it new medical, technical, and social problems to both the urban centers and the abandoned rural areas. Increasing lifespan has introduced all the problems concerning the aged.

Many civic and scientific leaders feel that these problems have an equal right with moon travel to the best talent available in this country. It is their contention that without resolving these problems on earth, lunar exploration will have little ultimate meaning.

Unlike the ocean tides, the ebb and flow of human problems are not controlled by the moon and neither should be their solutions.

In outlining some of the basic problems of our civilization, no advocacy of large government spending programs is intended. However, within the framework of fiscal responsibility, these problems should, perhaps, be examined side by side with the moon shot program. It is felt by many scientists, among them most of the American Nobel Prize winners, that there are other areas as important to the future of the United States as a crash program of lunar exploration. Among the problems:

DISEASE

It has been estimated that 40 million Americans now alive will die of cancer. This disease is not new nor are its dangers unrecognized.

The fiscal 1964 Federal budget for cancer research totals $145 million. This is equivalent to the cost of four Saturn V rocket motors. Each of these motors will flame for 2 minutes and then be forever lost.

One of every four hospital beds in the United States is today occupied by someone who is mentally ill. Some few of them can today expect to return to a normal life and to take up once again their duties and responsibilities in society. Too few of them will ever become useful citizens again unless a first-rate program of research and development is pushed on a national level and pushed hard.

For fiscal 1964 mental health programs in the National Institutes of Health will receive $190 million. This is equivalent to the rocket motors alone for six Saturns to be used eventually to put three men on the moon.

Each year in the United States alone 900,000 persons die of heart diseases.

There are 10 million Americans now suffering from some form of heart disease.

The National Government through the National Heart Institute in 1964 will spend approximately $13 for each of these Americans to develop cures, new surgical techniques and new medicines. The fiscal 1964 budget for the National Heart Institute is $133 million, the equivalent of three or four Saturn rocket firings with a total useful life of 8 minutes.

Some scientists and medical men of sound reputation feel that far too many of our medical researchers are being channeled into a space medicine program devoting their undivided attention to developing safeguards for a handful of astronauts while the medical sciences are not devoting enough time or talent to find solutions to diseases now killing or crippling millions of men, women, and children in our own country and even greater numbers in other parts of the world.

EDUCATION

During the decade in which we are concentrating our national wealth in getting three men to the moon, 7.5 million young Americans will enter society without a high school education and thus without the basic skills needed to become productive citizens with a secure future.

For these 7.5 million, the future will be a long struggle on the brink of economic and social disaster.

For these 7.5 million Americans the moon will only deepen the shadow in which they will walk.

Our Government's space race effort in fiscal 1964 will spend in 5 days the total proposed budget for vocational education of all types. While willing to spend $15 million daily on the space race, the Government has recommended a total vocational education budget of $73 million.

It is difficult for many educators and scientists to equate the hoped-for benefits to be gained from being first on the moon with the obvious benefits to human individuals and our Nation as a whole if these 7.5 million young people could be educated to take their place in society, to add to our economy, rather than be a burden on it. We either have to employ them, or through some social welfare program, provide for them.

NUCLEAR WASTE

Among the most serious problems facing us today is the one involving the question of what to do about the waste products of the world's nuclear programs.

As nuclear programs expand, the problem becomes more serious and the potential for disaster more pressing. We have stored in this country alone nuclear waste with a radioactive capacity approximately equal to 200 million grams of radium.

Scientists concerned with this problem point out that few top-quality scientists are assigned to the problem. In our society garbage disposal, although essential, is neither glamorous nor well paying.

In this particular case, however, such disposal is vital to civilization's future.

WATER RESOURCES

By the time, at decade's end, a moon traveler has reached his goal, many American urban centers will be in serious trouble. Some of our cities already face a serious water problem; for most of our major cities this problem will be of crisis proportions within a very few years. The problem is not uniquely American but affects most nations and cities of the world.

To meet this problem we may well have to turn to the seas around us to develop an economic and workable method of extracting potable water through a desalinization process. So far, every process developed either through Government research or by private enterprise has been far too costly.

Experts in the area estimate it will cost in the vicinity of $110 million for basic research by 1970. This is exclusive of actual equipment costs for cities facing water shortages.

One week of our moon race expense would cover a 5-year saline water development program—and possibly save our drought-confronted cities.

CONCLUSION

The problems outlined here have not gone unnoticed by the Kennedy administration. They are obviously of concern to the President and his top advisers.

Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges has pointed out that the Federal Government spends more than $15 billion a year for research, of which more than three-quarters goes for defense and space work. He added: "The national research and development effort is not the incubator of demand and productivity increases that people think it is, or that the country needs for a growing, healthy economy."

Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, the President's top science adviser, last August, told a House committee that "military research is pricing private research out of existence."

In his Economic Report to the Congress this past January, President Kennedy said: "The Federal Government is already the main source of financial support for research and development in the United States. The defense, space, and atomic energy activities of the country absorb about two-thirds of the trained people available for exploring our scientific and technical frontiers. * * * In the course of meeting specific challenges so brilliantly, we have paid a price by sharply limiting the scarce scientific and engineering resources available to the civilian sectors of the American economy."

This problem of where and how the total national scientific intellect should be utilized is one of serious proportions, both now and for the future.

Manifestly the ultimate responsibility for administrative decisions in the space program lies in the hands of the President of the United States. It is his duty to assert leadership in this area.

A decision must be made as to whether Project Apollo is vital to our national security or merely an excursion, however interesting, into space research.

If our vital security is not at stake, a less ambitious program may be logical and desirable. Greater emphasis might be placed on the multitude of human problems we face here on earth. Since our resources in dollars and manpower are not inexhaustible, the entire question becomes a matter of priority.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the August 1963 Reader's Digest]

WE'RE RUNNING THE WRONG RACE WITH RUSSIA

Some weeks ago in Washington, D.C., a number of prominent politicians were asked this question: "What, in your view, is the most urgent project facing the United States today?" Without hesitation each named the moon shot, costliest—perhaps $40 billion can pay for it—most dramatic and most complicated program ever to be waved along with so much support from Congress and the White House. Added one Congressman: "The prestige of pioneering that maiden voyage across outer space will be incalculable. Whatever the cost, we've got to beat the Russians to the moon."

The sincerity of these replies is not in question. What is sending shivers up the spines of topflight military advisers is the assumption (shared, due to the flamboyant publicity, by millions of U.S. citizens) that the nation which achieves the first moon landing will automatically become top dog.

This is wildly dangerous thinking. It is dangerous because it ignores the warning that our military have tried to drive home to civilian planners from the very first conception of a moon shoot; i.e., in lavishing our money and scientific brainpower on the effort to beat the Russians to the moon, we run the grave risk of losing the free world's battle for survival.

To understand why, we must understand the difference between inner space and outer space. These two zones relate quite differently to our security.

Outer space engulfs the limitless reaches of the universe, an infinite void in which billions of planets and celestial bodies spin rhythmically. Project Apollo is beamed at reaching the nearest of these bodies, the moon, 238,800 miles away—much more by the curved path spacecraft must take. A landing on its bleak and inhospitable surface will indeed bring fame to the nation which first accomplishes this feat, glory greater even than scaling Mt. Everest. It will be a triumph for man's indomitable spirit of adventure; but, from the very remoteness of the moon, it can have little or no military consequence.

Inner space is the term used to represent that belt 100 to 500 miles above us recently invaded by the astronauts and manmade satellites. Since the appearance 6 years ago of Sputnik I, at least 134 satellites have occupied inner space, and 57 of them are still in orbit, some Russian, more American. Whoever is first to dominate this critical area will from then on occupy the driver's seat in world affairs.

The reason is this: Before long, before any moon-landing can be achieved by either Russia or the United States, it will be possible to introduce into inner space armed satellites capable of extinguishing any country below in a matter of seconds. Marshal Sergei S. Biryuzov, commanding Russia's strategic rocket forces, promises categorically that Soviet rockets could be launched from satellites "at any desirable time and at any point in the satellite trajectory."

The danger to the free world lies in the profound difference in national objectives. The stated policy of the U.S. space program, as put forth by the President, is that it is "for peaceful purposes." To that end we have developed weather and communications satellites, and have kept our sights steadfastly on a moon adventure. The Russian effort, on the other hand, is first, last and unblushingly military. The Soviet Union is therefore racing to win inner space, the only element in which it is still unopposed; where, unlike land, air, on and beneath the sea, it is not confronted by formidable deterrence.

For 6 years Russian satellites have been designed with this goal in view. Four or five times larger than ours (astronauts can move around inside them), vostoks are built specifically for weight carrying. Already they can lift off, and orbit with loads much heavier than any we can carry. Already they have contrived a rendezvous between two vostoks, have shot an astronaut through 81 consecutive orbits and placed one directly above both our National Capital and our heartland.

If this is not sufficient to ring alarm bells, we have Khrushchev's warning that vostoks can "carry other freight than man. We will hold a sword of Damocles above the earth." If we remain high-mindedly wedded to our policy of peaceful purposes, our vast reservoir of native horsesense drugged with moonshine, he may well live to see his prophecy fulfilled.

What makes a reappraisal of our inner-space objectives of imperative concern is the fact that right now an atomic development of immense military significance is taking place. It is this:

The Russians have recently achieved an increase in the effectiveness of nuclear explosions so devastating that it dwarfs all previous records. Confirming this, our own atomic experts have warned that such stupendous forces, let loose above us from a satellite, could, in a few seconds, literally cremate a large part of the United States. There would be nothing left below, no man, beast, vegetation, buildings, nothing at all but the glare of white-hot cinders.

In face of such a dire threat, it must come as a stunning shock to all thoughtful Americans to learn that the United States has no top-priority programs beamed at preventing, anticipating, or deterring such a terrifying prospect. Our top priorities are all tied up with steamrollering through the moon shot. Many billions of public money, together with the rich cream of scientific talent, are lavished on an effort that could well be aborted in midstride by Soviet enterprise and realism.

There is a crying need for a reappraisal of our space aims, for more specific public information, especially since statements from those highly placed in Washington are so contradictory that they blur rather than clarify our understanding. Less than a year ago, for instance, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara declared that "attack from enemy satellites is not a very likely threat for the immediate future. At the present time we see no advantage to space-based systems."

On the other hand, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, tough-minded Chief of the U.S. Air Force, expressed a different view before the House Armed Services Committee: "the Russian space program is entirely military. I am sure that space systems will come."

Evidently small heed was paid to Air Force Secretary Eugene Zuckert's expressed dissatisfaction with "the tone and pace of our military space program," since 8 months later we find C. D. Perkins, former Deputy Air Force Secretary for Research and Development, complaining that "our military space programs are floundering badly."

Unlike Americans, the people of Russia have no such reasons for confusion. One of their leading strategists, Marshal V. D. Sokolovsky, has summed up the situation for them simply and concisely: "An important problem now is warfare with artificial earth satellites, which can be launched for diverse reasons, even as carriers of nuclear weapons."

How serious is this Russian threat?

First, their achievement of a vast increase in nuclear power, which could be directed against us via inner space, is technically feasible. Scientists tell us that given enough raw material there is no reason why bombs of unlimited power cannot be made. We have only to look at the record. The Hiroshima uranium bomb, which destroyed a city and caused 200,000 casualties, had a force of 20 kilotons—each kiloton equals 1,000 tons of TNT. Next came the hydrogen bomb, increasing the explosive factor of the Hiroshima weapon by 1,000 times—its power is reckoned in megatons, each equal to 1 million tons of TNT.

Now something even more sinister has occurred. In 1961 the Russians, violating the test moratorium, exploded a 55- to 60-megaton bomb. "You do not have 50- or 100-megaton bombs," exulted Khrushchev. "We have stronger than 100 megatons." (That is more than 5,000 times the strength of the Hiroshima bomb.)

Why, speculated the West, was this fantastically powerful bomb detonated? The answer came in a terrifying revelation by famed mathematician Dr. Donald G. Brennan, head of the Hudson Institute in Harmon-on-Hudson, N.Y., and associate of key atomic physicist, Dr. Herman Kahn.

Brennan said in part: The possibility of orbital weapons covers a great range. They could be aimed chiefly at the cities, in which case they would have relatively modest yields in the region of 1 megaton. "Another possibility that appears much more disturbing would involve placing in orbit a limited number of devices of very large yield, a few of 100 megatons or more, which could be detonated at orbital altitude rather than being brought down to earth. The thermal effect from such a high-yield device could set fire to a large fraction of the continent."

Air Force-Space Digest magazine, the highly informed voice of the Air Force, rammed home the same point: "It is possible to place very large-yield devices in orbit which have virtually instantaneous delivery time. Detonated at orbital altitude, such a weapon could set fire to a large part of the United States."

Atomic speedup has thus reached this frightening climax: an aggressor nation can orbit satellites carrying unimaginable power, which can be triggered simply by a remote radio key. Set off above our heartland, the explosion would generate heat as incandescent as the sun's—but with this difference: the heat would strike not from a source 93 million miles distant, but from merely 150 miles away, incinerating hundreds of thousands of square miles in a single flash without any possibility of warning. Precision of target aim is no longer a factor.

What are we going to do about it? Efforts to bring about an end to nuclear testing have been sabotaged consistently by the Soviet Union; so have Western efforts, initiated in 1960, to achieve the prohibition of all orbital weapons for mass destruction. Have we any alternative but to take the most immediate and realistic steps to protect the safety of the free world?

Here are the measures urged by military planners:

Perfect a method of detecting foreign satellites wherever they may appear. At present our ballistic missile early warning system (BMEWS) is tied to weapons that might show up in northern latitudes. We need a globe-girdling system, scanning all directions and sufficiently accurate to pinpoint a satellite so that we could send up a defensive vehicle to intercept it.

Pioneer inspector satellites, poised on launching pads and ready to lift off within minutes. Our moonshot experimental firings have been dependent on one big launching pad, Canaveral, and curtain-raising preliminaries there have required as many as 68 days. We must acquire the same hair-trigger, round-the-clock alertness that we have achieved with our nuclear bombers, missiles and submarines.

Place human observers in inner space. Despite radar systems, computers and other electronic miracles, science has still not come up with anything equal to the intelligence and judgment of a man. The Russians have already pointed the way to interception by bringing their vostoks so close together that the two astronauts could actually see each other. The next stage must include lock-on, perhaps by magnetic means, and physical inspection of the enemy satellite.

Achieve means of destroying, disarming or diverting a satellite if it is armed. In World War II British pilots pioneered a means of diverting London-heading V-1's, nudging the buzz-bombs with their wing tips to angle them away from the target into open country. To destroy a satellite would be infinitely more subtle and complicated, but scientists believe that they could be destroyed by electronics or radiation or even be directed back to their point of origin.

Coupled to all these precautions we must establish deterrence inside inner space, fortifying it with armed satellites of our own capable of confronting an aggressor with matching destructive force. Deterrent strength is the overwhelming reason our bombers and missiles have been able to preserve the peace despite incessant Soviet threat and belligerence.

Form a top-level space commission to redefine priorities and activate these measures so that defense comes before exploration.

It is futile to assume that the imagination-capturing moon program will aid us herein. Knowledge of tremendous value is being gained, but national defense against a hostile, racing Soviet Union has more urgent and exacting requirements than the peaceful exploration of space.

The urgent importance of an effective inner-space military program has aroused a storm of controversy in Washington. Representative Robert Wilson, chairman of the Republican advisory committee for space and aeronautics, has declared, "The administration's negligence in military space development is a disastrous course for the future of America," and his alarm is echoed by such noted Senators as Barry Goldwater and Margaret Chase Smith, both members of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Nor can their criticisms be dismissed as partisan politics; as much alarm or more is being voiced by Democratic leaders such as Senator Richard B. Russell (chairman of the same committee), Senator Howard W. Cannon, of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, and Representative Chet Holifield, head of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

The warning of top military planners could hardly be more emphatic. Here is what two of the front rankers have to say: Lt. Gen. James Ferguson, Deputy Chief of Air Force Research and Development, which has the prime responsibility for keeping ahead of Russia: "The most lethal threat posed against the United States today is missiles through space. Space is no longer remote. We wish to operate both manned and unmanned systems in the near-earth environment. Our objectives include detection, tracking, inspecting and means of disabling hostile satellites."

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay: "We must not risk the danger of waiting for the enemy to demonstrate capability before we undertake development of our own. The visible threat requires a vigorous military program."

Luckily, we do not have to start from scratch. A military space program does exist. We also have a magnificent instrument in NASA, and we have the hard-won experience of our astronauts.

The greatest practical difficulty is cost. The price of accelerating the military occupation of inner space would be about a billion dollars this year, with more to follow. This is far less than NASA is spending on outer-space experimentation. A reallocation of funds in view of present dangers will undoubtedly be necessary.

The safety of our country and of the free world commands top priority, and no other project, however sensational, should be allowed to compromise security.

It is the duty of all Americans to ponder the words of Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., chairman of MIT and adviser to the White House, when he surveyed the advance of missile systems: "This is one race we dare not lose."

CONFLICT OF INTEREST—TFX INQUIRY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of today appears an editorial entitled "Conflict of Interest," which suggests that Navy Secretary Korth should have "been more sensitive about the possible reproaches of impropriety" in the TFX case and that "it would have been better, in this case, if Secretary Korth had passed this particular decision to a subordinate or a superior."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 31, 1963]

Conflict of Interest

The testimony given the TFX inquiry of the Senate Committee on Governmental Operations has not disclosed that Secretary of the Navy Fred Korth would profit by the contract award to General Dynamics or that he would suffer any loss if the award were not made. That would seem to dispose of the conflict-of-interest matter, so far as the technicalities are concerned.

In the conduct of Government officials, however, there are matters of impropriety that do not ascend to the level of conflict of interest. In this case, one cannot help but wish that the Navy Secretary had been more sensitive about the possible reproaches of impropriety. He knew that the bank of which he had been the president had made a loan to General Dynamics. And he knew that he still held stock in the bank. This implies no direct financial interest in the rise or fall of General Dynamics. It is inconceivable that he would have been governed in a matter where the Defense Department interest was so large by a personal consideration in which private interest was so indirect and so relatively remote and small.

The Government cannot hope to recruit men of large affairs to handle its major departments and enterprises without resorting to the world of private business where managerial capacity of this kind is to be found. It is wise to begin with the premise and to start with the assumption that such men will have to deal, frequently, with matters that touch their past commercial affiliations, their present private interests, or their future business prospects. In these cases, the individual officeholders ought to regard that even remote connection as the occasion for disqualification. It would have been better, in this case, if Secretary Korth had passed this particular decision to a subordinate or a superior.

FRENCH-AMERICAN RELATIONS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the Sioux City Journal of July 31, 1963, appeared an editorial entitled "A Fence in Need of Mending," which draws attention to the fact that France is our oldest ally; that Mr. de Gaulle's intransigence which has made its appearance on several occasions in the past year or two, is not without some reason; and that it would behoove our Government to seek a way out of difficulties presently existing between the two countries. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Sioux City Journal, July 31, 1963]

A Fence in Need of Mending

Although Washington naturally does not appreciate President de Gaulle's refusal to join the test ban treaty, his remarks on that subject make a good deal of sense. And the tone of his press conference was anything but truculent or anti-American.

On the contrary, the general dwelt at some length on the historic Franco-American ties, reaffirmed France's determination to be at the side of the United States if war should come, and expressed sympathy for such current U.S. problems as the balance-of-payments deficit. All this hardly conforms to the picture, sometimes painted by officials in this country, of a man almost impossible to deal with and seemingly bent on weakening the Western alliance.

As for the test ban, the French President said it has France's approval, especially if it turns out to be a starting point for broader agreements. By itself, however, the agreement among the United States, Britain, and the Soviet Union changes nothing about the threat of nuclear war; the two nuclear superpowers' capacity to annihilate the world remains undiminished. In such circumstances, General de Gaulle believes it is in France's interest to continue its own nuclear weapons development.

That position seems to us neither illogical nor unduly skeptical. Indeed, skepticism about Soviet intentions is even more essential here, if this Nation is to avoid the fateful pitfalls of past dealings with the Kremlin.

The French position also seems to us one which the U.S. Government can gracefully live with. It is unfair and insulting to compare it, as some are doing, with the homicidal belligerence of the Red Chinese; they reject the test ban for the opposite reason, because it might possibly reduce East-West tensions and the likelihood of war.

In all the bickering with France, United States diplomacy has by no means been free of fault; sometimes it has seemed to go out of its way to aggravate the difficulties. Now would be an appropriate time, while we seek a more peaceful relationship with a self-declared enemy, to work for a better understanding with our oldest ally.

LITTLE SIOUX RIVER FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, my county of Woodbury, Iowa, is the leading county in the State of Iowa when it comes to soil conservation work, and certainly one of the leading counties in the entire Nation. The county has several watersheds on which soil and water conservation work has been done. One of those exists on the Little Sioux River in the vicinity of Anthon, Iowa.

An example of how this has benefited the community and surrounding territory is set forth in an editorial published in the Anthon Herald on June 5, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that this splendid editorial may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Comment

(By Violet Lundquist)

Flood control and preventive medicine have much in common. When either one is completely effective, nothing happens. Unfortunately, there is nothing dramatic about a community enjoying an entire summer without one case of polio for example. Even here in Anthon we tend to forget that a decade ago every family lived in terror throughout the summer due to this dread disease. The fortunate ones were those who were only afraid. Some families felt the full cruel force of the disease itself.

This past Saturday evening the rainfall in Anthon totaled 6¾ inches. Although water may have washed into a few basements, no flooding occurred in town.

What a similar downpour would have done to the town 10 years ago, prior to the watershed work, isn't hard to imagine. Muddy waters from the inadequate drainage ditch would have spilled over onto the streets, into basements and possibly onto buildings and houses. The ditch itself would have become so clogged with silt that another cleanout would have been imperative, although the town was limited by law on the amount of money it could expend for this purpose.

For the benefit of more recent arrivals in Anthon I can report that it took much effort, time and money to convince all groups concerned that Federal funds should be expended on the Anthon watershed to hold the fast-running water back in the hills. It was a cause which some of us brought to officials on the district level, to the State, to the regional office in Milwaukee, and even to our Nation's Capital.

We cited examples of the ruinous floods of 1951, we showed pictures of it, we described the adverse effect of such flash floods on the future of Anthon, we told of the wholehearted cooperation of the farmers within the Anthon watershed to do their part.

We were jubilant when we saw the effect of the first hard rain after the water-retaining structures had been constructed. The ditch did not run even half full. Nor was there any silt deposited in the bed of the ditch.

We were so pleased, so happy, so grateful that the Little Sioux River flood control program's efforts in Anthon had been so successful. We thought we would always remember how terrible it had been before the watershed was constructed.

Alas, we forget. We tend to take hard-won blessings for granted. More recent settlers here are not even aware of the constant flood threat which used to hang over Anthon.

Wouldn't it be worthwhile for each of us to take a brief look again at the structures west of Anthon which retard the runoff water from the hills so they can proceed into the drainage ditch in unhurried fashion?

Those water-retaining devices, plus the terraces on the upland acres, stand as sentinels keeping watch over us, our homes and businesses down here in the valley.

THE GREAT GRAIN ROBBERY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Mason City Globe-Gazette appeared a lead editorial entitled "The Great Grain Robbery." The editorial comments on the disclosures which took place on the floor of the Senate recently, on the part of the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] and myself. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Great Grain Robbery

The loss of 24 million bushels of grain somewhere between the United States and Austria is being treated as casually as a raid in a watermelon patch.

The grain was valued at $32 million. That should count for something.

And it took 3 years to find out the grain was gone. That should provide a conversational kernel.

After all, the celebrated Brink's armored car robbery of 1950 involved a measly $1,200,000 and it got lots of international attention.

Just what did happen to the grain?

Well, nobody seems to know for sure. More than a year ago it was discovered by an agricultural attaché in Austria that only 16 million bushels of grain had reached that country between 1959 and 1962, while 40 million bushels supposedly had been shipped.

This triggered a quiet investigation that didn't get into the open until Senator John J. Williams, of Delaware, made a speech about it recently.

Iowa's Senator Jack Miller also was interested. He sent a letter of inquiry by special messenger to the Agriculture Department on June 4, but still hadn't received an answer a month later.

"So far the silence has been deafening," reported Miller, wryly.

There has been some small intelligence. Seven Austrian grain importers are awaiting trial on charges of mislabeling or diverting the grain to other countries.

The State Department says no American official is to blame—and the United States did get bartered goods in return.

The Agriculture Department adds that it intends to make sure such shipments reach their destinations in the future.

This is nice.

But it doesn't answer questions that should be answered.

How can such massive shipments disappear and the loss remain undiscovered for such a long period of time?

What officials in the Agriculture Department or the State Department, or both, are responsible for grain barter transactions?

What do these officials say about the incredible heist?

Surely the American taxpayer has a right to hear the explanation rather than a brief dismissal on the grounds that no Americans are involved.

Senator Williams wants a Senate investigation. It should be ordered. The Agriculture Department investigation, supposedly still in progress, hasn't told much as yet.

COMMON MARKET IMPORT RESTRICTIONS ON U.S. POULTRY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President at long last the Kennedy administration appears to be moving to take action as the result of the Common Market's refusal to lower import restrictions on U.S. poultry. It is too bad that the administration did not "leak" this intent sooner because it could have had a bearing on discussions which took place and are taking place in Europe. I would like to remind Senators that on February 21 of this year, I, along with several other Members of Congress, became so alarmed over the developments that we dispatched a telegram to the President in which we urged that immediate action be taken to contact the Council of Ministers of the European Common Market to make clear that Common Market gate prices, supplemental levies, and variable levies placed on U.S. poultry products were highly discriminatory and would freeze out our poultry export trade to Common Market nations. We also urged further that unless this action was rescinded we would take retaliatory action in line with the policy on this point clearly set forth in the trade expansion bill passed in the last session of Congress.

On March 14, I took the floor of the Senate to again warn that the discriminatory action against our poultry exports would destroy a $50 million annual poultry export business unless this Administration took prompt retaliatory action. I suggested that failure of the administration to act would be an open invitation to the Common Market to take similar action against beef and other agricultural exports from this country.

I only hope that the "may curb" headlines in today's newspapers, reflecting possibly Administration action, will be translated into actuality. I ask unanimous consent that two articles bearing on this matter—one from the New York Times, entitled "United States Will Counter Common Market on a Tariff Rise," and the other from the Wall Street Journal, entitled "White House May Curb Trade Concessions to Common Market as Retaliatory Move"—be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 31, 1963]

United States Will Counter Common Market on a Tariff Rise—Ready To Start Legal Steps Toward Retaliatory Action on Poultry Imports—Washington Rebuffed—Call for Reversal of Policy Hurting Sales to Germans Turned Down by Bloc

(By Eileen Shanahan)

Washington, July 30.—The United States is nearly ready to initiate retaliatory action against the European Economic Community for the tariff increases that have blocked almost all exports of American poultry to West Germany.

Government officials indicated that preliminary legal steps would be taken in the next few days.

The decision to act was made today, officials said, after it became clear that the European Economic Community, or Common Market, would not reverse its earlier policy on the tariff on chickens, which is regarded here as a test case for all U.S. agricultural exports to the Common Market.

The Council of Ministers of the Common Market rejected the U.S. request for a reversal of the policy at a meeting in Brussels today.

LOSS PUT AT $46 MILLION

Retaliation would come after a series of legal steps required under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). It would take the form of a tariff or other measures that would exclude from the United States imports from the Common Market area equal in value to the exports of American chickens that have been excluded from the Common Market. The United States says that the loss runs to $46 million a year.

The members of the Common Market are France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg.

Because some of these countries never did import much American chicken, the recent tariff changes had important consequences only in the case of West Germany. There the effect has been to make American chickens more expensive than those raised anywhere inside the Common Market.

MEASURES UNDECIDED

The precise form U.S. retaliation would take has apparently not yet been decided. Officials stressed, however, that they would take care to follow to the letter the provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in any moves they made.

There is only an outside chance that the United States might not go ahead with retaliatory action, officials said. That would occur if the Council of Ministers were to make a firm promise that it would resolve the problem in a short period of time.

The Council instructed the Common Market's Executive Commission to produce a solution by September, but the United States regards this move as inadequate because the Commission has said that it could not conduct meaningful negotiations with the United States without specific new instructions from the Council, the top governing body of the Common Market.

FEARS RAISED IN UNITED STATES

The poultry issue has raised widespread fears in this country that a number of other U.S. farm products might, in the future, be excluded from the Common Market. The question figured importantly in hearings today before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Committee members closely questioned W. Michael Blumenthal on the problem before voting to approve his nomination as deputy to Christian A. Herter, President Kennedy's special representative for trade negotiations.

Three Democratic Senators who generally support the administration's policy expressed the hope that the United States would insist that the Common Market be left open to American farm products. The three were J. W. Fulbright, of Arkansas, the chairman; John J. Sparkman, of Alabama, and Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota.

Senator Sparkman expressed the view that the United States must let the Common Market know "in no uncertain terms that we are prepared to retaliate—that we will retaliate." He asked Mr. Blumenthal whether he agreed with that position and Mr. Blumenthal said that he did.

President Kennedy named today a second deputy to Mr. Herter, William Matson Roth, whose job it will be to assemble information from American industry on the tariff concessions it would like to get from the Common Market in the "Kennedy round" and those it is willing to see the United States give to the Common Market.

Mr. Roth, a San Franciscan, is a member of the board of the Matson Navigation Co., chairman of the board of the Pacific National Life Assurance Co., and a director of a number of other concerns.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 31, 1963]

White House May Curb Trade Concessions to Common Market as Retaliatory Move

Washington.—Kennedy administration officials are moving toward withdrawing some trade concessions as a way of retaliating against the European Common Market's refusal to lower import bars on U.S. poultry.

A key U.S. policymaker said the White House would announce its intentions "in a matter of days."

The administration views the poultry argument as a test of the Common Market's determination to pursue protectionism in agriculture. U.S. exports of poultry to the Common Market totaled $50 million last year, but annual U.S. sales of $400 million altogether in wheat, livestock feeds and poultry are threatened by the six nations' tariff policies.

The discussion of retaliatory action results from the Common Market's rejection of a proposal to lower its poultry tariffs to 10.8 cents a pound from the current 13.5 cents. The rejection is being interpreted here as a sign that the other Common Market members are likely to yield to French President de Gaulle's demand for farm policies that would make the six-nation economic union self-sufficient in grain and meat production.

At his press conference Monday in Paris, General de Gaulle declared.

DISSENSION AMONG MARKET MEMBERS

"It is not worth talking of the European Economic Community if it must be understood that Europe does not obtain its food essentially thanks to its own agricultural products, which can be largely sufficient."

"We gave them until the end of July to come up with a solution to the poultry problem and they didn't do it," a high ranking administration advisor complained. In Congress, Chairman Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee said, "If they refuse to take our agricultural products, I don't see how we can possibly avoid retaliation."

The poultry furor points up dissension among Common Market members over agricultural matters. A West German government spokesman, for one, pointedly disagreed with Mr. de Gaulle's proposals. He said, "In matters of European cooperation, the interest of everyone should be considered. The idea of autarchy is not in the Common Market treaty."

Autarchy means economic self-sufficiency. The high-tariff policies required for such self-sufficiency are the antithesis of the freer trade policies enunciated in the 1957 Treaty of Rome, which created the Common Market, made up of West Germany, Italy, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg.

THIRTY DAYS' NOTICE REQUIRED

A retaliation list of imported commodities, both industrial and agricultural, is being prepared by the staff of Christian Herter, the President's chief trade negotiator. It is understood the list includes French wines, German trucks and chemicals from various Common Market lands.

White House advisers emphasized, however, that any trade concessions would be withdrawn only after consultation with domestic industries that might be affected and only after all other probable effects had thoroughly been considered. The concessions that would be withdrawn were granted over the years by the United States under the terms of the 50-nation General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which went into effect in 1948.

Under GATT procedures President Kennedy need only give signatory nations 30 days' notice to withdraw a trade concession. It is understood U.S. policymakers aren't inclined to give the Europeans a chance to reconsider, or to ask merely for compensation from the Common Market for damages suffered as a result of the higher tariff on poultry.

"Whatever we do," explained a Presidential adviser, "we have to remember that under GATT we have to withdraw concessions not only to Common Market nations but to all other GATT countries as well." He said this meant the United States would try to avoid retaliatory measures that might unduly hurt nations outside the Common Market. Thus concessions might be removed on motor vehicles whose description would fit only the German-made trucks.

The United States has been pressing the Common Market to leave the door open to further negotiations on poultry tariffs since August 1, when West Germany, under Common Market tariff policies, abruptly raised duties to about 13.5 cents a pound from 5 cents a pound. West Germany is the principal market for U.S. exports of chicken and turkey.

As a direct result, exports of broilers, the chief poultry commodity sold abroad by the United States, are sagging sharply. Broiler exports fell to 50 million pounds in the January–June period, far below the 107 million pounds exported in the like 1962 months. West Germany usually buys 54 percent of all U.S. poultry exports, but no country-by-country breakdown of exports in the 1963 first half is available yet.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY, AUGUST 2, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, under the previous order, I move that the Senate now stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Friday, August 2, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 31, 1963:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Eugene P. Foley, of Minnesota, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

John E. Horne, of Alabama, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the term expiring June 30, 1967.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

James I. Loeb, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Guinea.

Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., U.S. Navy, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

Claude G. Ross, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Central African Republic.

Howard Rex Cottam, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Kuwait.

Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Vietnam.

Donald A. Dumont, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Burundi.

W. Michael Blumenthal, of New Jersey, to be a Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Dr. Walter Adams, of Michigan, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for a term of 3 years expiring May 11, 1966, and until a successor is appointed and has qualified.

Dr. Mabel M. Smythe, of New York, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for a term of 3 years expiring May 11, 1966, and until a successor is appointed and has qualified.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The nominations beginning Francis O. Allen, of Pennsylvania, to be a consul general of the United States of America, and ending Jacob Snyder, of Maryland, to be a consul of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 24, 1963.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 31, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Nahum 1: 7: *The Lord is good, a stronghold in the day of trouble, and He knoweth them that trust in Him.*

Most merciful and gracious God, by whose bountiful providence we are surrounded and sustained, grant that daily we may put our trust in Thy presence and power which will make us equal to every task and responsibility.

May all the nations of the earth be united by the bonds of concord and cooperation in bringing to fulfillment and fruition those noble moral and spiritual values and aspirations which Thou hast planted within the soul of humanity.

Manifest Thy grace and favor to our President, our Speaker, and our Members of Congress as they seek to solve the difficult economic, political, and social problems, and may they be assured that universal peace is not an idle dream but a state of blessedness which Thou hast divinely inspired and ordained.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1642. An act to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, to extend disclosure requirements to the issuers of additional publicly traded securities, to provide for improved qualification and disciplinary procedures for registered brokers and dealers, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6016. An act authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

The message further announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. FONG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 3872) entitled "An act to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CLARK, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. JAVITS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

GIRLS NATION

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HECHLER**. Mr. Speaker, I would like to use this occasion to call attention to the tremendous contribution which the program of Girls Nation makes to the development of citizenship among our young people.

This program, which brings to Washington, D.C., two outstanding young women from each State in the Union and gives them experience in parliamentary procedure and the principles of citizenship, deserves the highest commendation.

I want to congratulate the representatives of Girls Nation who have been chosen to spend this week in Washington, D.C. The great State of West Virginia sent two outstanding representatives—Miss Jodell Deem, of Parkersburg, W. Va., who has been chosen as secretary of state, and Miss Ruann Ernst, of Beckley, W. Va., who has been elected majority leader. I extend my best wishes to these outstanding young women as they visit the Nation's Capitol.

DEMOCRATIC VICTORY IN PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. **RHODES** of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. **RHODES** of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in his column of last Monday Fulton Lewis, Jr., wrote:

> President Kennedy, admittedly fearful that his popularity has badly slipped in recent months, will get his first real clue tomorrow night.

He was referring to the special election in Pennsylvania to fill the House vacancy caused by the death of our beloved colleague, Francis E. Walter.

Now we have the clue which came as a surprise and disappointment to Fulton Lewis. If it was a popularity contest, President Kennedy emerged stronger than ever. Yesterday the voters in Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District elected the Democratic candidate, Fred Rooney.

It was a most significant victory because the odds favored the Republican candidate who ran with the blessing of Gov. William Scranton with big money support from the ultraright wing elements from all over the Nation.

As Fulton Lewis said, Democrat Rooney pledged himself to the support of the administration. He repeatedly boasts that President Kennedy has endorsed his candidacy. Republicans made foreign policy a major issue and charged the administration with what they call a "do nothing policy."

In a special election, in a close district, timed to favor the Republican candidate, the victory for Rooney and President Kennedy is most significant. It should also be a clue to Members of Congress who oppose the administration's program to meet the needs of our people and our country.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. **HALEY**. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 107]

Ashley
Blatnik
Buckley
Celler
Clausen, Don H.
Cramer
Davis, Tenn.
Duncan
Evins
Flynt
Fraser
Gavin
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Hansen
Healey
Hébert
Holifield
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Macdonald
Martin, Mass.
Miller, N.Y.
Moore
O'Brien, Ill.
Powell
Quillen
Rains
Robison
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Taft
Teague, Tex.
Willis
Winstead

The **SPEAKER**. On this rollcall 395 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS—PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE CLAIMS

Mr. **BOLLING**. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 453 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report on the bill, H.R. 5207, to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes, and all points of order against the conference report are hereby waived.

Mr. **BOLLING**. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. Speaker, those Members who were listening to the reading of the resolution know that it provides for the consideration of and waives all points of order against the conference report on the Foreign Service buildings and Philippine war damage claims bill. This is an extremely complicated legislative situation with a long history. I now yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays] so that he may explain the details.

Mr. **HAYS**. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Service buildings authorization passed this body almost unanimously, went over to the other body and in the other body there was added an amendment which affected the Philippine war damage claims bill. As you know, the Philippine war damage claims bill was once considered by this House. I led the opposition to it. The House voted it down. Later the House reconsidered its action in another bill with some safeguards in it, and passed it.

Subsequent to the passage of the bill by the House an investigation was had by the Senate that brought out that two former members of the Philippine War Damage Commission had been responsible for selling this idea to the Congress. They said in their correspondence, which was subpenaed by the Senate, that there was no real enthusiasm for any further damage payments either here or in the Philippines.

I think it is important to bear in mind that we already, more than 10 years ago, paid 52.5 percent of each and every claim for war damage in the Philippines. I mean we appropriated $400 million, which covered the claims to the extent of 52.5 percent of each claim. In addition to that, every claim of under $500 has been paid in full.

It was said on the floor of the House at the time both these bills were up that there was an implied responsibility on the part of this Government to pay these claims up to 75 percent, and the $73 million which was appropriated was that.

We went to conference with the Senate. The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee sat in the conference for the most part with a pocketful of proxies and we had to negotiate with him. They wanted to give the whole $73 million to the Philippine Government. The House conferees took the position that we should pay the small claims, that we should make some allowance to the small claims and revert the balance to the U.S. Treasury, a position which I thoroughly supported. As a matter of fact, if I had my will, I would see none of the money go to anybody except back to the United States, but that we could not do.

So the reason we are asking to waive points of order is because, frankly, in order to get agreement we had to go beyond the scope of the legislation before the conferees. In a thumbnail sketch, this is what we did. We said every claimant who had earlier been paid 52.5 percent of his claim can claim an additional amount up to a maximum of $25,000. This will take care of all but 287 of the total of thousands of claims.

We then said that, if the conference report is accepted, the difference between $73 million and what would have been paid shall revert to the U.S. Treasury. The Foreign Claims' Settlement Commission shall certify what that amount should have been. We got that much of a concession from the other body. Then we said the difference—and there is disagreement about how much this will be—shall be paid into a special fund to be administered by the President of the United States and the President of the Philippines for the purpose of furthering educational exchange and other educational programs of mutual advantage to the United States, and the Republic of the Philippines.

Let me make the position the House is in clear. If we turn down this move the present law stands, and the big claimants who hired these lobbyists and who promised to pay them millions of dollars will get all the money and they will be able to pay the lobbyists. If we adopt the conference report, everybody will get at least $25,000 if they have that much coming. The difference will be the amount they have coming. I have a letter from an American who was in prison who has $1,032 approved. That person will get the full amount. If there is a real demand to help the Philippines, you can look at any literature about the Philippines you want to and you will find that one of their paramount problems is lack of educational facilities.

If it is our purpose to help them, what better thing could you do with this money than to take it away from the brewery and gold mining companies and the others who hired these lobbyists and put it in a fund which will really help the Philippines?

Let me just read some of this correspondence that was uncovered by the Investigating Committee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations which brought this about and which caused this rider to be added on the buildings bill.

Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Delgado who were former members of the Philippine War Damage Commission, and they are the lobbyists involved, had this correspondence, and I would just like to read what Mr. Delgado in the Philippines wrote to Mr. O'Donnell in Washington. I am not going to read it all, but I want to read enough to give you an idea of what was going on. This was in December 1952.

He says:

> Your letter of December 23, 1952, was duly received and have noted its contents with great interest. I believe you are quite right in your appraisal of the situation there—

Meaning here in Washington—

> but I am afraid that the enthusiasm on the part of interested parties and the Government here—

Meaning in the Philippines—

> has cooled off.
>
> Nothing has been done and no one seems to be interested enough to take the initiative in having some action by the Government on the matter of additional war damage compensation. However, I am today writing to Mr. Lino Gutierrez, president of the Private Claimants Association, and other interested parties on the subject. In addition, in the broadcast which I am scheduled to make on the 18th of this month over the station, DEBB, I will discuss the subject in an effort to arouse enthusiasm and start the ball rolling.

Start the ball rolling for what? Start the ball rolling to get 73 million more dollars from the Treasury of the United States.

Then we have a letter dated February 9, 1952, addressed by Mr. O'Donnell to Mr. Delgado. I will read you a paragraph of that letter. He says he is unsuccessful in securing the 120,000 names of the claimants—I will just tell you briefly what the big part of the letter says—to solicit all these people to represent:

> But significantly he says "In connection with the war damage claimants, I discussed this matter thoroughly with Ambassador Romulo, who feels that if the final 22½ percent is to be realized, it can be accomplished, if at all, from this Congress."

That was way back in 1952. He added:

> I know that the Ambassador would give us unqualified support in such an endeavor.

Now get this—

> Needless to say, I—

Meaning Mr. O'Donnell, the former Commissioner—

> would like to make a good Philippine connection on a retainer basis since I am confident I could do a good job.

And what a good job he did—$73 million worth.

> I know that you will keep me in mind if any opportunities should present themselves.

Well, they kept up their correspondence. They did not quit easily.

In 1954 this is what Mr. O'Donnell said to Mr. Delgado:

> Insofar as the administration is concerned, the spotlight is now being put on the Far East rather than Europe. Considering Magsaysay's popularity here, it would be my recommendation at this time that you work toward Magsaysay making a request upon our Government for this 22½ percent which has been promised as a matter of law.

It had not been promised at all—it was not even implied—but they use this language:

> All of those actions together with our work here, can keep this proposed legislation in the limelight and ready to move at the appropriate time.

The appropriate time turned out to be 8 years later.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. There has been an aroma from this $73 million claims bill. From the time it was first considered here, it seemed to us, to some of us at least, that everything was not as it appears on the surface. The letter that the gentleman has just read, over the signature of Mr. O'Donnell, is further confirmation of that.

There are some of us here today who were opposed to this thing from the start, but who find ourselves in quite a predicament. I do not see how today someone is going to be able to convince me that I ought to vote for this bill. I can see some virtue in it in that perhaps O'Donnell and the rest of these people will be cut out. But I am not sure about that—that perhaps they will not find some way by which to sneak in and get some money out of it as it is now set up.

Mr. HAYS. Let me say to the gentleman that I am in exactly the same boat as he is. He and I opposed the bill on the floor, as I remember. But unless this conference report is adopted, in my opinion, certainly unless something is done affirmatively, the money will go to the claimants that these two people were working for. It is not a question of voting for or against the Philippines. It is not this simple. It is a question of voting for this rule in order to consider legislation which was beyond the scope of the conferees and taking away the bulk of the money from the big claimants and from the fellows who hired these lawyers.

As I said at the time this bill was under consideration, "gentlemen, if you take away the sugar the flies will leave automatically." Obviously, if you cut down the claims of $100,000, $200,000, $500,000, to $25,000 they will not have much money to pay Mr. Delgado and Mr. O'Donnell. Further than that, we put a specific prohibition, for whatever it is worth, in the law to prevent these two gentlemen from collecting anything.

So I would say to the gentleman from Iowa while this will not cure the situation it will make it less malodorous.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. May I say to the gentleman that I am in the same position as the gentleman from Ohio. I voted against the original bill both times. The gentleman who is now in the well of the House made a splendid fight here to try to alert the Congress of the United States to the fact that we do not owe one dime to the Philippines. The Congress upheld him in that position the first time, as I recall, but now here is the situation as I see it: The Congress, through probably misinformation or through being misled—and I say that advisedly—is now in a position where it has appropriated $73 million to go to these various claimants over there. The gentleman and his committee now are trying to reduce the figure or the amounts which will go to some of these claimants so that the balance, if any is left after that, and after they get through paying off, will go to the Philippine Government to be used for educational purposes. In other words, we have now given away $73 million. There is no hope of saving that. But we can, to some extent, control the expenditure of the money that is left. In either event, the taxpayers of the United States are now stuck with a total of $73 million, regardless of how we vote on this conference report.

Mr. HAYS. I say to the gentleman that the gentleman is right. If we do not act affirmatively today the $73 millon is going to go to pay the big brewery over there, the IXL gold mining company, and others of that ilk who hired these lobbyists to build up a case for something that did not exist. Or, do you want to give the small claimants the small amount and do something which I think might turn out to be constructive and useful with the balance?

If this rule is adopted and this conference report is adopted everyone will get everything that is coming to them which the War Damage Commission said was coming to them. I do not like to say "was coming to them" because I do not believe that is the case. That will be true with the exception of 287 big corporations.

Mr. Speaker, let me make it clear that all of the churches involved, all of the religious orders involved have already been paid in full.

Let me also make it clear that all of the people with $500 claims or less have been paid in full. Let me point out to the Members of the House that a man with a $100,000 claim, or a corporation, has already received $52,500 of that claim, and under this bill will get up to a maximum of $25,000 more.

In the case of the $100,000 claim, he would actually get $23,000 more, because there is another limitation in the present law of 75 percent of the total claim. So the fellow with the claim of $100,000, or under, would be paid in full, and the money is being taken away from the big corporations who hired Mr. Delgado and the other gentleman to build up this thing in order to sell it to the Congress and to get us to give them the money.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. How can we control funds over $25,000? If we can do that, why can we not retroactively control 100 percent of the claims?

Mr. HAYS. We are going to control everything over $25,000 by not giving it to them. They do not get it.

Mr. PELLY. Why can we not do that with 100 percent?

Mr. HAYS. We cannot because the Senate would not buy it. If I had my druthers, I would druther not give anybody anything. I try to do the best I can. But we cannot do that.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I think that the House here owes the gentleman in the well of the House a deep sense of appreciation for what he has done here today. He tried to alert the House on what is going on in connection with this particular thing. I do not think that we owe the people of the Philippines or anybody else one dime. I think the gentleman agrees with me on that. He is now trying to do the best he can when the Congress has been misled into appropriating $73 million of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. HAYS. In my view I am trying to correct to the best of my ability a bad situation.

If there are any questions about exactly what this proposed conference report does, I will be glad to answer them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate deeply the remarks made by my very able colleague from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] as to the contents of H.R. 5207, as amended by the other body. I, too, joined him in opposition to the original bill granting funds in payment of certain Philippine war claims and war damages when it came before the House some time ago.

However, the issue we have before us at the present moment is not as to whether the conference report on H.R. 5207, carrying the Philippine claims settlement as an amendment, is to be approved, but, rather, the question before the House at the moment is whether this body shall adopt House Resolution 453 which, if approved by a majority of this body, provides for taking up the conference report and for its debate and a final vote upon it.

The first vote in this body will come on the question whether or not the House of Representatives wants to change its position again, once more march up the hill bravely, with drums beating and flags flying, to say to the U.S. Senate, if you please, the other body, that it cannot add to House measures, when they reach that body, amendments that would not be germane if offered in the House, that do not deal at all with the subject contained in the original House bill, as it cleared this body, and sending it back here and thus forcing and compelling the House of Representatives, as has been done so many times in the past, to accept the judgment, the desires, and the wishes of the other body, or, as it happens to be in this particular case, primarily the wishes and desires of one individual Member of the other body, as the gentleman who just preceded me has stated, sitting in conference committee with a pocketful of proxies, and saying, in an arrogant way, "House of Representatives, you do what I tell you to do. You pass the kind of legislation I want. You accept the amendments whether they are germane or not, that I add to your House bill, whether they deal with the same subject you discussed and legislated in the House or not. You accept, you take it. I am jamming it down your throats, or there will be no legislation."

So we are faced with the issue here today of whether we will again furl our flag, drag it down through the dust, and beat a hasty retreat down the hill once more, or whether we will stand up and say to the other body that we are going to protect our own prerogatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has consumed 4 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional minute.

We are going to protect our own rights. We can exercise our own judgment as we please on the basic legislation we pass in the House. We can amend it, we can change it, so long as the amendments that we offer are germane, but we cannot permit anyone to write new law that is not germane to any bill we pass in the House, and then expect us docilely to take dictation from such a body. The House passed on this particular subject once before.

The House, this body, turned this proposal down once and it was sent to the Rules Committee. The objection was made and this is the old, old story, if you please, of adding, in new language something that has nothing to do with the original bill that passed the House, H.R. 5207, which amended the Foreign Service Building Act of 1926.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The same thing is true of the Philippines war claim's provisions. Here, they were making an appropriation, for another matter entirely, absolutely not germane, and in an effort to protect the rules of this body and the rights of this body, the House of Representatives, in its wisdom supported the position of those who oppose sending this matter to conference. Then at the last minute, under pressure, this resolution was brought out, so now you can vote as you see fit. You can decide for yourselves whether or not you want to adopt it. As for me, I am not for adopting this resolution. I am not for marching up that hill with my flags flying, and then trooping back down in retreat once more just because somebody says that is what I am supposed to do.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I certainly respect my colleague from Ohio and his right to have his own opinion, but I think it would be fair to point out that if we had docilely accepted what the Senate put in we would not be here asking to waive points of order. We rewrote the language the way the House conferees wanted it and went beyond the scope of what is before us, and that is why we are here asking to have it waived.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I will not yield further so as hastily to reply and say that in the end you have adopted an amendment in your conference committee, which the Senate added, and which was not at all germane to the bill. You should never have agreed to do so.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. Does not the gentleman from Ohio in the well now recall it was stated to the Rules Committee if the Committee on Foreign Affairs really wanted to do it now, this minute, in the way they should, they could bring out another bill, and there is nothing here to preclude that action at all. This seems to be an action they could take if they feel it is more convenient.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. They can do so in 24 hours, and the Rules Committee would clear it immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and hope that we may discuss this on the basis of the prerogatives of the House of Representatives as well as what is best for the Nation.

I congratulate my distinguished friend from Ohio, [Mr. HAYS], on the statement he made. It was fair and accurate. I know his position. I joined with him on the original Philippines war claims bill in a debate to defeat that bill. I was opposed to the second bill which passed. After it had passed the House it came before my Subcommittee on Appropriations to appropriate $73 million to pay these war damage claims. I voted for that and supported it in the House. But the appropriation was for the payment of war damage claims, not for the creation of an educational fund in the Philippines.

May I point out one additional vote that has not been mentioned here today, on this same subject, whether or not we should pay the lobbyists their commissions. This came on the supplemental appropriations bill. I happen to be the ranking member of the committee that submitted that report. The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] brought the report to the House and there was a provision that none of the funds should be used for the payment of any money to any of the lobbyists who had worked on these claims. I voted for that amendment which the Senate had attached. But I say to you that the House voted against it. Now they say that we should throw out all the rules in the book in order to satisfy a few men. This House voted against it by a vote of 168 to 207, on May 14, 1963.

Now, it could have been done. You could have put this limitation in under the rules of the House. And you could do it today if the great Committee on Foreign Affairs would bring out a bill with this same language.

Now, let us see what is being done. The Constitution of the United States provides that appropriations shall originate in the House of Representatives, and shall be made in the House of Representatives, not in a conference committee with the Senate. By the adoption of this conference report you will be permitting the Senate of the United States to originate appropriations in a conference committee.

Under rule 21, section 4, it is provided:

> Legislation that directs funds previously appropriated to be used for a purpose not specified in the original appropriation was held to be an appropriation in contravention of this provision (2147, vol. VII, Commission's Precedents).

In the conference report there is set forth the text of the proposed bill and in section 3c thereof it says, and I quote:

> Any balance of the appropriation made pursuant to section 8 remaining after the payment is authorized by the first section of this act has been made and after any administrative expenses incurred by the Commission in connection with such payments have been paid shall be paid into a special fund in the U.S. Treasury to be used for the purpose of furthering educational exchange and other educational programs to the mutual advantage of the Republic of the Philippines and the United States in such manner as the Presidents of those two Republics shall from time to time determine.

This language makes an indefinite appropriation for the purposes of furthering the educational exchange programs. Such a proposition was not in the bill as it passed the House nor was it in the bill as it was amended in and passed by the Senate. Therefore the bill as proposed in the conference report goes beyond the scope of either the House or Senate version.

Furthermore, even if the Senate amendment had proposed an appropriation for such purpose, it would not be in order to incorporate such proposal in the conference report because of the provisions of paragraph 2 of rule XX of the House rules. Rule XX says, and I quote:

> No amendment of the Senate to a general appropriation bill which would be in violation of the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI, if said amendment had originated in the House, nor any amendment of the Senate providing for an appropriation upon any bill other than the general appropriation bill, shall be agreed to by the managers on the part of the House unless specific authority to agree to such amendment shall be first given by the House by a separate vote on every such amendment.

Of course the House did not first give to its managers specific authority to agree to such an amendment. It could not have done so because the Senate amendment did not make such a proposal. The proposal of this appropriation for the additional purpose of promoting educational exchange originated in the conference room and not in either body.

The action contemplated in providing funds for the educational activities concerned is clearly an "appropriation" and there is a precedent clearly dealing with this very proposition. In volume VII of Cannon's Precedents, paragraph 1466, it says:

> A proposition to make an appropriation payable from funds already appropriated was held not to be in order on an appropriation bill. The payment from a fund already appropriated of a sum which otherwise would be charged against the Treasury was held not to be a retrenchment of expenditure.

So here you have the Senate in conference appropriating for a purpose not in the original appropriation bill, to create a $30 million fund. For what? Let me read to you what the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate said this $30 million was going to be used for, that would be set up in this bill. Here is what he said:

> This special fund is to be used for educational exchanges and other educational programs to be established by agreement between the Presidents of the United States and the Philippines.
>
> To avoid any misapprehension on the score that use of this special fund for educational purposes would not assist the Philippines in its program of economic rehabilitation and development, I would like to devote some time to this provision of the amendment. The special fund would be available not only for educational exchange but for other educational programs in the mutual interest of the Philippines and the United States.
>
> For the record, I wish to make clear that it is our intent that these other educational programs should be broadly conceived, imaginative in scope, and where feasible, linked to the purposes of the original Philippine claims legislation. There are many uses for the special fund, such as increased school construction, assistance to teachers' salaries, providing training, salaries, and equipment for community development specialists, and to provide support for the youth movement which has a high educational and training quotient to it. The fund could be drawn on to support training of vocational and specialists in other fields and for agricultural extension work among farmers.

Listen to this. Those of you who oppose Federal aid to education and those of you who are for Federal aid to education, mark you well this, that it is stated in here that this $30 million in the Philippines can be used for the construction of schoolhouses, the payment of teachers, vocational training, all of the other features of aid to education. This is $30 million, and your worldwide educational program, which you have passed in this House worldwide, is $42 million. But here in one area you are going to set up a $30 million fund of the American taxpayers' money.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. If this does not pass, $1 million of it will go to build an extension of a brewery. What we are doing is taking it away from them and saying you can use it for some more beneficial purpose.

Mr. BOW. I know the distinguished gentleman from Ohio was opposed to this bill originally, but it is a remarkable thing to see the change that has taken place. When we defeated the original bill what happened? Why, the great Foreign Affairs Committee of the House wrote new legislation. The committee wrote a bill that they passed that came out of the great Foreign Affairs Committee, and practically the entire report which I hold in my hand is made up of editorials spanking the House for having defeated the Philippines bill. The editorials have headlines like this: "Repay Your Friends." "Mistreating the Philippines." "Dishonor or Just Debt." "Not Aid, Just Debt." And on through this report. This was legislation by editorial comment. But the bill passed after we once defeated it, after we found it was wrong. Now in order to correct that bad legislation you come in and throw out all the rules of the book.

Why do we not legislate by rule if we are to be a responsible legislative body, not by expediency? The Foreign Affairs Committee that was able to bring out this bill and to pass it for $73 million with a report by editorial, if we defeat this rule, that committee could come out tomorrow with a bill containing the same provisions we had in the supplemental act which the House defeated, containing the same provisions that are in this conference report, and you could pass it in the House.

I am not pleading here at all for any lobbyists. I will vote for a bill, I will sponsor it, I will do anything to bring it out, as I did on the supplemental to prevent such payments. What I am pleading for here is the integrity of the House of Representatives. You are violating the rules of a conference, going beyond the item sent to it for conference. This is one reason. One of the rules you are voting against is the rule that provides for appropriations going to the Appropriations Committee, not on legislation.

The other is that a Senate amendment which is not germane to the original House bill should come into the House and be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, where it could be debated and where you could have a full opportunity to consider it. Let me say to you that neither the House of Representatives nor the Senate has ever had this legislation before it except on a conference report. The bill passed by the Senate for the $73 million and the bill written in the House, neither one is in this conference report.

This is completely new legislation. It is completely new legislation written in conference. Are we going to abdicate the prerogatives of the House of Representatives to a few men from the other body who sit in conference and change the law? Is this House going to take the position that we will waive this point of order and that we will waive our rules and legislate on the basis of expediency rather than on the time-tested rules of this great parliamentary body?

Let me say to you, in looking over the rules and studying the rules on this, I opened the front page of the "Rules of Procedure of the House of Representatives" and I found a very interesting quotation on the first leaf of that book. If I may, we will quote Shakespeare because it is in the "Rules of Procedure of the House of Representatives." In these Rules of Procedure, they go to the "Merchant of Venice":

Bassanio says to Portia:

> And I do beseech you wrest once the law to your authority; to do a great right, do a little wrong.

But Portia was a brilliant woman and she gave good advice.

She said:

> It must not be; * * * 'twill be recorded for a precedent, and many an error by the same example will rush into the state.

I believe that is just as true as it applies today on the basis of the rules of procedure of this House as at the time when it was first written. We, to do a great right and do a little wrong of this type are establishing a precedent today which will be recorded as a precedent and many an error by the same example may rush in to affect the state.

I hope the House will defeat this rule—I sincerely hope it will defeat this rule.

Let me say this one thing further: There is a procedure by which this conference report could have come up. If a point of order had been made against it, it would be proper to move to suspend the rules and pass the conference report. That would have taken a two-thirds vote, but that is the regular way by which this should have been done and not by throwing our rules completely to the wind and delegating our authority to a conference committee.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to say that I am in agreement with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio in opposing this rule waiving all points of order. This huge fund would be set up without any hearings at all by the proper committees of the House and Senate and would increase the present program for educational exchange with the Philippines from the amount of about $600,000 a year to about $30 million a year. Is that correct?

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. This unorthodox procedure would increase the so-called Fulbright program from $600,000 a year to $30 million a year, and would also include the payment of teachers' salaries—which is something we do not even do in our own country—with Federal funds. I am going to join with the gentleman in voting against the granting of this rule.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from New York.

May I say, in setting up this fund for our friends in the Philippines for $30 million, and as I say, worldwide it is $42 million, then what is the next friendly country going to say? They will say, "Look what you did for the Philippines; we need $30 million, too." So it will go on down the line.

I have heard it said that there has been some objection—propaganda against the foreign aid program. This is a part of it; $30 million. We can withhold this. We can bring in a bill from the Committee on Foreign Affairs limiting claims to $25,000 and cutting out anything that is to go to the lobbyists and then let us send the rest of it, as the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] so properly said—let us put the rest of it in the Treasury of the United States.

Can we add this to our national debt of $308 billion? Can we afford this when we are paying close to $20,000 a minute in interest on our national debt? Remember further, we are going to have to borrow this $30 million; remember that.

Let me say to you in closing, this bill provides that we pay the Philippines on the basis of 2 pesos to the dollar. I think you will find, although I have not checked it, but not long ago or at least a few days ago the rate of exchange was 4 pesos to the dollar.

So what you are doing in this is you have set up in this bill a payment of 2 pesos to the dollar. It is actually 4. So what you are doing is doubling it. Therefore, let us not fool ourselves in the thought that we are saving money. Let us defeat the rule and protect the integrity of this great House of Representatives.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the conference report.

Regardless of what may be said about procedural matters here, the fact remains that we are talking about specific recommendations. The question is not whether we are trying to save $73 million. That money has been authorized and appropriated.

Mr. Speaker, we are trying under this procedure here today, as has been said, to set some guidelines, to write some protective words into this legislation, to indicate our distrust of, our distaste for improper lobbying activities that have taken place.

Mr. Speaker, these are the things we are trying to do. These are the things which the Members of the House will be voting for if we adopt the rule and the conference report.

It has been inferred here that the conferees on the part of the House meekly gave in and acquiesced in the demands of those of the other body. That is certainly not the case. This was a hard, tough conference, and what has come forth is what we believe—those of us who were conferees—to be the best solution possible.

In voting upon this rule and in voting upon the adoption of the conference report the question is this: Do you want to write restrictions into this legislation against improper lobbying? Do you want to use this money, which is already appropriated, in the proper way? If you do, then vote for the rule and for the conference report.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I stand here as a traditional foe of paying one dime to any claimant in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment a year ago would have restricted the amount that any claimant could receive, after my first amendment a year ago was defeated that would pay this money to the Government of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of the House know my position since that time, through memorandums which have been sent to their respective offices. But I would like to say this in connection with the baring of our souls in relation to the Senate of the United States that it was the House that was deceived by the lobbyists and not the Senate. It was the Senate that took it upon itself to conduct the hearings and to investigate abuses under the act, and not the House of Representatives. And, finally it has been the Senate which has insisted upon paying this money over to the Government of the Philippine Islands, which is exactly in accordance with what President Eisenhower agreed to do when he was President of the United States. And that is exactly what the Secretary of State in this administration wanted to do, until the House twisted the arm of the Secretary of State who forced the Senate to recede from their position and go back to giving this money directly to the claimants.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has now given us this opportunity to straighten our own house. Under the former bill when it came up under an appropriation act we receded from the position of the conferees and I agreed with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] that this measure should come on an authorizing bill rather than an appropriation bill.

Today you have that before you. This bill is an authorizing bill. Now he objects to the fact we are appropriating $30 million under an authorizing bill. When it was before this body he objected that it was an authorization under an appropriation bill. You cannot have it both ways. There is no chance that this bill will come back to this body unless we pass this legislation now. It is not the House that has taken the lead in correcting this situation, it is the Senate, and we should not miss this opportunity or the $73 million will most assuredly be paid out by direction of one man if he so orders should we defeat this resolution at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, after many months of negotiations, House-Senate conferees have finally reported agreement concerning the Philippine war damage claims bill. This compromise is a reasonable one. The obligations of the United States are fulfilled; while the specter of large windfalls for lobbyists is removed.

All Congressmen hold in reverence the rules and traditions of the House. These rules and traditions, developed over the years, provide orderly methods for conducting the business of this great body.

The other body has rules which differ from ours. I believe our rules as they apply to germaneness of legislation and debate are far superior. Our rules clearly label legislation under consideration by the House. We do not subscribe to the method of tacking on major legislation to minor bills. I believe our position is in the best interest of the Nation. The Rules Committee, to its everlasting credit, has recently taken steps to prevent the recurrence of a situation of this type.

This should be the last time that the House, except in an emergency, should have to consider legislation that is not germane in form.

May I respectfully suggest to my colleagues that the matter of form is secondary in considering the matter before us today. This is probably the last chance we will have to correct legislation that is obviously wrong. By approving House Resolution 453, we can give legislative evidence that the House holds honor and principle above all else.

Failure to act favorably on this resolution will only aid and comfort those who are trying to undermine our democratic institutions through charges of payola and inaction. I am sure I do not need to remind my colleagues that the pace of this session of Congress has caused comment throughout the land.

What are we today being asked to approve?

The conference report on H.R. 5207 limits payments to individual claimants to a maximum of $25,000. This provision goes a long way toward assuring that no lobbyists will receive a windfall arising out of acts of Congress. This is probably the most important point agreed to by the House-Senate conferees, because it meets the principal fear expressed by those who opposed payment to individual claimants—a fear which reached national proportions as the activities of lobbyists were exposed.

PHILIPPINE-AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP ENHANCED

By adoption of the House-Senate conference report friendly Philippine-American relations will be maintained. The report provides for amounts over the authorized $25,000 to individual claimants be reserved in a special fund in the U.S. Treasury for educational purposes. The conferees have provided for a special fund in the U.S. Treasury to further educational exchanges and other educational programs of mutual advantage to the Philippine Republic and the United States. This fund would be created by depositing all sums over the $25,000 authorized for individual claimants with the U.S. Treasury until agreement as to their use is made by the President of the United States and the President of the Philippines.

Moreover, under this fund many high impact projects could be given educational and technical backup. For instance, a Philippine Institute of Land Reform might be created to provide technicians and specialists for agricultural progress in the Philippines. To a large extent the Philippines is a showcase for American-style democracy. If the Philippine economy shows greater progress than those of countries under dictatorships, of one form or another, then the attraction of the uncommitted nations for freedom will be all the greater.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the commonsense of the House will overcome procedural roadblocks however well intentioned, and that this resolution will be agreed to.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. Barry] say that the House had been lax and that by this procedure the Senate is straightening out the House; straightening out our affairs.

Let me say to the gentleman as others have well said before me—the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow]—there has been nothing to prevent the House Committee on Foreign Affairs from bringing out a bill that would meet the objections of many Members of the House to the procedure that is here being attempted.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. Does the gentleman now speaking to us think that the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives would ever reconsider a bill to do what the gentleman wants to have done?

Mr. GROSS. It is not a question of reconsideration. It is a question of bringing out a bill that would meet the objections that have been raised and extricate the House from the position of being used as a doormat by the other body. If you vote for this, you should hold your nose when you do, knowing that you have swept the rules of the House completely under the rug.

Mr. BARRY. There are times when you are already in the fire with both your feet and in order to take them out you have to grab hold of something. This is a way of our grabbing hold. If this fails, I would like to ask the gentleman if he can assure this body that he will see to it that a bill comes out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives?

Mr. GROSS. Let me say that there is no valid reason why a bill could not have been brought out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs long ago to properly and fairly meet this situation.

Mr. BARRY. Why was it not brought out?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman was on the committee at the time the original hearings, if they can be called hearings, were held on this bill. I was not.

Mr. BARRY. I have had a bill in the Committee on Foreign Affairs to do just exactly what the gentleman wants done; to do exactly what the original agreement of August 5, 1959, provided, but there has been no attention paid to that bill, there has been no attention paid to any companion bills, and the gentleman should know that.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman agrees there is no reason why a bill could not have been brought out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to rectify the sorry situation that now exists.

Mr. BARRY. If the gentleman had the necessary votes in the committee this would have been possible—however, since the gentleman knows that no bill has been considered by the committee even though several have been introduced it should be obvious to him that now and only now is there an opportunity to correct this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I do not agree, as others have stated that there was a hard and tough conference with the Senate. This is not the bill approved by the House. It is a product of the Senate, being rammed down our throats as a rider to another bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to sustain the rules of the House, and vote down the pending resolution waiving points of order.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot pretend to be expert on this subject. I am not on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I could not give you a detailed chronology of all the events that have taken place, but I paid a good deal of attention to what was said in the Committee on Rules when the rule was requested, and have also listened with great care to this debate. It seems to me from the comment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays], and that of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Adair], that the people who have been most heavily involved in this matter, men who have been opposed to the whole $73 million being expended, feel that this is the most practical way in which we can best solve the problem. Now one thing I do know a little bit about is the rules of the House.

We have had many a fine-spun argument about how we are destroying the rules of the House. The procedure under which we are acting is provided in the rules of the House so it is impossible for us to be destroying the rules of the House. It seems to me that the best way for all of us to improve an extremely bad situation is to vote for this rule.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I will be delighted to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Missouri on what he has said in this regard. We are operating under a special rule which has come from the Committee on Rules, which is standard procedure in this House day after day. I think the House is entitled to consider this proposition on the merits. Therefore, I urge the adoption of the rule and the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I think one thing ought to be cleared up. I am sure my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], made the statement inadvertently, because he was honest and fair in his presentation of his point of view, but he said that this would be paid at the rate of 2 pesos to the dollar. The going rate is approximately 4 pesos to the dollar. I would like to read from the report, and this is what the law provides:

> Payments authorized under this act shall be made in U.S. dollars or in Philippine pesos at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Either in dollars or in pesos.

> If paid in pesos the payments shall be made at the free market rate of exchange.

Whatever that is, on the given day of payment.

Of course, section 5 of the act passed last year refers to the awards being based on the rate of 2 pesos to the dollar. Since those awards were made by the old Commission, the peso has been devalued, and in fairness it was necessary to provide for payment at the new rate which is approximately 4 to the dollar.

If the gentleman will yield further, I would just like to point out again that in spite of the heat of the argument that has been made on both sides, Mr. Gross, my friend, across from whom I sit in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and sometimes we agree and sometimes we disagree, has said that he did not think the House conferees bargained in a tough fashion.

I do not violate any of the rules of the House, but it was put up to one of the Senate conferees before we got an agreement, that if they agreed to this language which the House proposed and which we are bringing back to you, that the Philippines would not like it, and he said, "Blank," a four-lettered word beginning with H, "With the Philippines? I couldn't care less after dealing with the House conferees." So I think he thought we were tough, and we were, and we did uphold the House position. But I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, that when the House dealt with this problem last year we were ignorant of these letters which I quoted, from these two men who are former Philippine War Damage Claims Commissioners, about their plans to milk the taxpayers, and collect big fees for doing it.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Berry] put in the Record a long history of this, if you have taken the trouble to read it, of these machinations and negotiations between two former War Claims Commissioners to get this paid. I say to you that this is the only chance I know of that we are going to have to rectify, partially at least, something that I think we would not have done if the whole complete situation and facts had been before us.

I have had many Members come to me privately and say, "I was with you when we beat this the first time; what position am I in now?" I think they are in the same position I am in, trying to salvage whatever we can from a bad situation. My friend says that he wants to protect his rights as a member of the Appropriations Committee. If I may express an opinion, maybe he goes a little beyond that in this case. He talks about appropriating money. We are not appropriating anything. The money has been appropriated by those very gentlemen, and by the House, to the claimants. All we propose to do, if we can get this conference report called up, is to take away part of those appropriations, put some of it back in the Treasury and keep some of it for the President of the United States to decide what to do with it. And if he never decides to do anything it will always stay in the Treasury.

So it is not a question of appropriation, it is a question of saving something.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman, briefly.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman read from the report of the committee. I should like to read from the law itself, what it says about pesos.

> Sec. 5. (a) Each award made under this Act shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury in terms of United States currency on the basis of the rate of exchange (that is P/2 equals $1) which was applied in the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, for payment out of sums appropriated pursuant to section 8 of this Act.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. The argument that this rule is brought up in violation of the Rules of the House is an erroneous one. This rule is brought up in accordance with the Rules of the House.

We are faced with a very difficult and practical situation. Unless this conference report is agreed to, the bill is on the statute books with $73 million appropriated and the Commission has got to make the payments in accordance with the law.

The conferees on the part of the House, in my opinion, did a very excellent job under most trying circumstances. This bill in substance represents the viewpoint of the House and not the viewpoint of the other body. I hope the rule will be adopted and that the conference report will be agreed to.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 234, nays 166, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 108]

YEAS—234

Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Ashley
Aspinall
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bonner
Brademas
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Carey
Chelf
Clark
Cleveland
Cohelan
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Hagan, Ga.
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Herlong
Holland
Horton
Hull
Ichord
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Landrum
Lankford
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
MacGregor
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Rains
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Secrest
Selden
Shelley
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Toll
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wydler
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—166

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Alger
Anderson
Andrews
Arends
Ashbrook
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Betts
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dowdy
Findley
Fino
Ford
Foreman
Forrester
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Grant
Gross
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hemphill
Henderson
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hutchinson
Jarman
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Knox
Kornegay
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McLoskey

McMillan
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Michel
Milliken
Minshall
Montoya
Morton
Mosher
Natcher
Nelsen
Norblad
O'Konski
Ostertag
Pelly
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff

Pool
Quie
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, S.C.
Rooney
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Short
Sikes
Siler

Skubitz
Snyder
Steed
Stinson
Talcott
Taylor
Tollefson
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Watson
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Wyman
Younger

NOT VOTING—32

Ashmore
Belcher
Blatnik
Buckley
Celler
Cramer
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Evins
Flynt
Griffin

Hagen, Calif.
Hawkins
Holifield
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Leggett
Macdonald
Miller, N.Y.
Moore
O'Brien, Ill.

Quillen
Robison
Senner
Sheppard
Smith, Iowa
Taft
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thornberry
Winstead

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Cramer against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Winstead against.

Mr. Daddario for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.

Mr. Belcher for, with Mr. Robison against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Moore against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Taft.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Quillen.

Mr. Evins with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Leggett.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mrs. Kee.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Ashmore.

Mr. Hagen of California with Mr. Flynt.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Senner.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Smith of Iowa.

Mr. HULL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. FULTON, HARSHA, COLLIER, and MAHON changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS—PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE CLAIMS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 5207) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 497)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5207) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 3. (a) The first Section of the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize the payment of the balance of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946, and to authorize the appropriation of $73,000,000 for that purpose', approved August 30, 1962 (50 App. U.S.C. 1751–1785 note; Public Law 87–616), is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the second sentence thereof a comma and the following: 'or $25,000, whichever is the lesser'.

"(b) Section 6 of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before the first sentence therein the letter '(a)'; by striking the word 'section' in the last two sentences therein and inserting the word 'subsection'; and by adding the following new subsection:

"'(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), no sum shall be paid by any claimant directly or indirectly to, or received or accepted by, any former commissioner or employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission or their assigns, or any person employed by or associated with any such former commissioner or employee in connection with the preparation, filing, allowance, or collection of any claim under this Act, as compensation on account of services rendered or as reimbursement on account of expenses incurred in connection with any application filed under this Act. Whoever, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, makes a payment in violation of the provisions of this subsection shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year or both. Whoever, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, receives or accepts a payment in violation of this subsection, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years or both. Whoever, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, receives or accepts a payment in violation of this subsection, shall forfeit to the Government of the United States a sum equal to three times the amount of such payment, and the Commission shall take action to recover such sum from the person receiving the payment.'

"(c) Section 5(a) of such Act is amended by striking out the next to the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'Any balance of the appropriation made pursuant to section 8 remaining after the payments authorized by the first section of this Act have been made and after any administrative expenses incurred by the Commission in connection with such payments have been paid shall be paid into a special fund in the United States Treasury to be used for the purpose of furthering educational exchange and other educational programs to the mutual advantage of the Republic of the Philippines and the United States in such manner as the Presidents of those two Republics shall from time to time determine. There shall be withheld from the payment authorized by the preceding sentence a sum equal to the difference between $73,000,000 (less administrative expenses) and the total amount which would have been paid to the claimants under the provisions of P.L. 87–616, which sum shall revert to the general funds in the United States Treasury. The acceptance by any claimant of a payment under this Act shall be considered to be in full satisfaction and final settlement of all claims of such claimant arising out of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

WAYNE L. HAYS,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
EDNA F. KELLY,
E. ROSS ADAIR,
WM. MAILLIARD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5207) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

SENATE AMENDMENT

The Senate amendment added at the end of the House bill a new section 3 amending existing law (the act entitled "An act to authorize the payment of the balance of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946, and to authorize the appropriation of $73,000,000 for that purpose", approved August 30, 1962 (Public Law 87–616)), to provide for a lump-sum payment (not to exceed $73,000,000) by the Government of the United States to the Government of the Republic of the Philippines of the balance of awards for war damage compensation heretofore made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of title I of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, upon receipt by the Secretary of State of assurances satisfactory to him that such payment would be received in full satisfaction of all claims arising out of such awards and that no part of such payment would be paid, directly or indirectly, to any former Commissioner or employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission as compensation for services rendered as agent or attorney in connection with any such claim. The Senate amendment also provided for the transfer to the Government of the Republic of the Philippines of all documents (other than internal documents of any agency of the United States) currently held by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission relating to unpaid claims arising out of war damages in the Philippines.

EXISTING LAW (PUBLIC LAW 87–616)

Under existing law (Public Law 87–616), the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission is required to provide for payment to individual claimants of the balance of awards for Philippine war damage compensation. In addition to appropriate administrative provisions included to facilitate the task of the Commission, existing law provides that the balance of any appropriations made to pay the balance of such awards (after payment of all approved claims) shall revert to the U.S. Treasury, and prohibits any payment of remuneration for services rendered to any claimant which exceeds 5 percent of the amount paid to the claimant on account of his application. Any agreement to the contrary is declared to be unlawful and, in addition to a penalty of $5,000 or imprisonment for one year (or both) which is applicable to any violation of such prohibition by anyone subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission is required to take action to recover any payment made in violation of such prohibition. The sum of $73,000,000 was appropriated by title V of the Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1963, for the payment of the balance of awards for Philippine war damages.

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

The committee of conference agreed to a modification of the Senate amendment which retains the approach adopted by existing law of making payments of the balance of awards for Philippine war damages directly to individual claimants through the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission and amends existing law to include the following new provisions:

1. Notwithstanding the maximum amount of any payment to which a claimant otherwise would have been eligible to receive under Public Law 87-616, as originally enacted, no payment in excess of $25,000 will be made to any claimant under the conference agreement.

2. The conference agreement continues the prohibition in existing law against payment or receipt of an amount in excess of 5 percent of any claim as remuneration for services rendered in connection therewith, together with the penalties applicable thereto. In addition, however, the conference agreement specifically provides that no former Commissioner or employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission or their assigns, and no person associated with any such Commissioner or employee in connection with any claim filed under Public Law 87-616, will be eligible to receive any remuneration whatever in connection with any such claim. Anyone who pays remuneration in violation of this prohibition will be subject to a fine of $5,000 or imprisonment for one year, or both. Anyone who receives remuneration in violation of such prohibition will be subject to a fine of $5,000 or imprisonment for five years, or both, and, in addition, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission will be required to take action to recover from anyone receiving such remuneration an amount equal to three times the amount of remuneration received. These penalties will be applicable to any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

3. The acceptance by any claimant of a payment under the provisions of Public Law 87-616 will be considered to be in full satisfaction and final settlement of all claims of such claimant arising out of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission.

4. After payment of all approved claims, and administrative expenses incurred in connection therewith, the balance of sums appropriated pursuant to Public Law 87-616 will be placed in a special fund in the U.S. Treasury to be used for the purpose of furthering educational exchange and other educational programs to the mutual advantage of the Republic of the Philippines and the United States, except that there shall be withheld from such special fund a sum equal to the difference between $73,000,000 (less administrative expenses) and the total amount which, except for the $25,000 maximum payment permitted under the conference agreement, would have been paid to claimants who file applications under Public Law 87-616, which sum will revert to the general fund of the U.S. Treasury. The effect of this change in existing law is to provide that the amounts in excess of $25,000 originally authorized to be paid to claimants will be reserved for the special fund for educational purposes, and to assure that the funds which would have reverted to the Treasury under Public Law 87-616, as originally enacted, would still revert to the Treasury.

WAYNE L. HAYS,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
EDNA F. KELLY,
E. ROSS ADAIR,
WM. S. MAILLIARD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to take the time of the House to rehash all these arguments. The Rules Committee was most generous in giving us on the committee of conference time to explain what the committee of conference did.

I merely point out again that if we do not take this action, if we do not accept this conference report, the money will be paid to the claimants. The big claimants who hired these lobbyists will get their funds and will pay the lobbyists. As I said before, I was against this whole thing. I think this is the best we can do to solve it. I really think this will be far better than letting the existing law stay in effect and in force.

I realize that some people are against waiving points of order. That is perfectly all right. Everyone has a right to his own opinion. But now that that has been settled, and I was prepared to accept it if it went the other way, I hope the House will consider the conference report on its merits. I think the House confereees have gotten their viewpoint across that the small claimants will be paid, that the people who have claims of $25,000 or less will be paid in full, and those who have larger claims will get at least $25,000. I think the balance of the money will be put to use as stipulated.

I do not propose to take any more time. I will try to answer any questions, but I shall not attempt to drag this out.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and yield 5 minutes to the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I, too, urge the House to adopt this conference report. It ought to be said again, I think, that the $73 million about which we are talking here has been authorized and appropriated. By this action we are laying down certain guidelines with respect to it. We are setting up certain safeguards. These safeguards relate to the disposition of funds already appropriated. These funds will be divided into three categories: First, the funds which will go to pay the claimants and which will be subject to an individual ceiling of $25,000; second, those which will revert to the Treasury of the United States; and third, those which will be saved as a result of the application of the $25,000 ceiling and which will constitute the scholarship fund.

I would say further that by adopting this report you are writing a criminal penalty against those who give or take bribes in this connection, and I am sure that is the thing which the Members of this House want to do. This is the best solution, in my opinion, of a very difficult situation. I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report and urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to commend the chairman of the House conferees for his determined effort to sustain the position of the House on this legislation.

As all of my colleagues know, as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have certain responsibility for legislation affecting that area of the world. Legislation dealing with the Philippine war damage claims falls into that category. My only interest in the measure before us today is to see to it that the intent of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, an act approved before I was elected to the Congress and finalized by the 1962 amendments, be carried out as efficiently, as economically, and as honestly as possible.

I believe that the conference report works in that direction and has real merit. It upholds the principle of direct payments to claimants approved by the Congress in 1946 and again last year. It inhibits potential abuses by limiting the amount of individual payments to $25,000 and by placing stiff penalties for violations of the proposed restrictions on lobbyists and those who would attempt to secure improper profit under this program. And it conforms to the intent of the 1946 law by promoting the rehabilitation and economic development of the Philippine Republic.

Mr. Speaker, I am not entirely happy with the provision of the conference report which sets up the special educational fund. I would much rather see all of the money saved by the $25,000 limitation revert to the Treasury of the United States. However, the Senate conferees were adamant on this point and we had to accept this compromise or come back to the House without any agreement.

Even with this reservation, I strongly support the conference report. I believe that a vote for the conference report is a vote reiterating our desire to discharge our obligation to the Filipino claimants, and a vote to curtail abuses. A vote against the conference report will point in the opposite direction. Such a vote can be interpreted as indicating that this body is not interested in curtailing abuses. Let there be no mistake about it. A failure to adopt the conference report can possibly permit certain individuals whose activities have been exposed recently to profit unduly from this program.

For these reasons, I strongly urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the Foreign Service buildings—Philippine war damage claims legislation.

As we all know, the basic issue dealt with in this report goes back to 1946.

The Congress at that time decided to pay certain war damage claims directly to individual claimants in the Philippines. In 1962, we passed legislation to pay off the balance outstanding on these claims. This legislation is on the statute books today. The conference report modifies it in three important respects:

First, it limits the payments to $25,000.

Second, it imposes stiff penalties on anyone who will pay any fee in conjunction with these claims to former members and employees of the Philippine War Damage Commission—and penalties on those accepting such fees; and

Third, it puts aside the funds which will be saved by the application of the $25,000 limit into a special fund to be used for educational purposes in the Philippines.

I am not entirely happy with this conference report. I accept the $25,000 limitation and the penalties imposed on lobbyists. At the same time, I would much prefer to see the savings resulting from the application of the $25,000 maximum revert to the Treasury of the United States.

As the chairman of the House conferees has explained, however, it was impossible for us to obtain this concession from the other body. We have held meeting after meeting, and we insisted on the House position. In the end, however, faced with a complete deadlock, we accept this compromise.

I believe that from an overall view, the compromise contained in the conference report is a good one. The limitations and the penalties can be applied and the money which will be put into the special fund will be used for a purpose directly connected to the intent of the original 1946 act. There is no better way to promote the economic development of a nation than by improving its education.

For these reasons I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I do, however, urge that the House Committee on Rules report the rule referred to by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] which would prevent future action by the other body to attach to bills passed by the House amendments which are not germane to bills passed by the House of Representatives and sent to them for action.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on the subject of the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

IT IS TIME WE RESTRICTED THE REA A BIT

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced a bill, H.R. 5065, proposing that borrowing from the Government by rural electrification cooperatives must be at the rate of interest that the Government itself has to pay for money in the open market, instead of at the 2-percent rate that the REA co-ops now pay under a law which was passed by the Congress nearly 20 years ago.

No one questions the good work that the Rural Electrification Administration has done in the past. It has brought electric power and light to rural areas all over the United States. But it is a well-known fact that 98 percent of its appointed job is now finished—that only about 2 percent of our rural areas remain in darkness.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the REA cooperatives continue to be a terrific drain upon the Treasury as they expand their field of operation into generation and transmission activities and into suburban areas, often in direct competition with established taxpaying utilities.

And this expansion is with 2-percent money, because an old law says so, even when the Government itself must pay 4 percent in the open market. It is estimated that, because of this rate-of-interest preference, the REA's have profited by an extra $240 million and the taxpayers are out of pocket to the tune of nearly a quarter of a billion dollars.

This should not be, and my original bill, H.R. 5065, sought to correct the situation.

Somewhat to my surprise, Mr. Speaker, a tremendous interest has developed in the matter. Other bills have been introduced in the House and in the Senate. One of them, S. 1926, introduced by Senator Lausche of Ohio—with the cosponsorship of Senator Bennett of Utah—appears to me to cover the whole matter far more adequately than my first bill.

I therefore today introduce a bill duplicating Senator Lausche's proposed amendment of the Rural Electrification Act.

The bill, too, will eliminate the 2-percent rate of borrowing and require the REA's to pay the same rate paid by the Government on its borrowings.

It will further require the REA's to confine their activities to the rural areas, as was provided in the act of 1936.

It is obvious that adoption of this proposal will save money for the Government—and, therefore, for all taxpayers. It will continue to provide for the extension of electric power and light into those rural areas that have not yet been serviced, but it will, I hope, end a growing and quite needless competition with and duplication of existing generation and transmission facilities.

Public funds will be saved, Mr. Speaker, if the Congress will act on the matter at the present session.

TFX WARPLANE CONTRACT

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, there has been much conversation of late about the unusual factors behind the decision on the multimillion-dollar TFX warplane contract.

In the July 24 issue of the Washington Evening Star there appeared a most disturbing article concerning Navy Secretary Fred Korth's actions before the Senate committee investigating the TFX contract.

Korth stated that he very much resented being asked by a member of this committee, namely Senator Karl Mundt, of South Dakota, what safeguards he might have taken to avoid any conflict of interest. In light of the fact that Secretary Korth was the president and is currently a stockholder of the Continental Bank in Fort Worth which approved a loan of several hundred thousand dollars to General Dynamics who was awarded this contract, I think the Senator's question was most pertinent.

Also I think it is interesting to note that only last week our distinguished colleague from Iowa, Representative Gross, brought to the attention of this House some most shocking facts concerning Secretary Korth's personal involvement in the background of General Dynamics and the awarding of this contract to them. Because of Korth's unethical practices and personal involvement, Gross stated that he should be fired.

The record of the Senate committee reveals that this summer Secretary Korth stated:

> I am aware that public confidence in our public processes demands not only impartiality, but also the appearance of impartiality. Conscious that my home is in Fort Worth and recognizing the minor part that the Navy has in the total procurement, I therefore deliberately refrained from taking a lead role in reaching the decision and consciously viewed the two proposals with complete objectivity.

If Secretary Korth wanted to retain public confidence in the governmental processes, he should have:

First. Divorced himself completely from the TFX decision because of the close relationship with General Dynamics.

Second. Told the Senate committee of his stock ownership in the Fort Worth bank which has a large amount of money tied up in the future of General Dynamics, the TFX contract holder, instead of making the misleading statement that he was "conscious that my home is in Fort Worth."

Third. Instituted safeguards to assure that defense contracts are awarded impartially.

The entire TFX affair has many complex ramifications. Even so, one thing is clear—there were conflicts of interest, and the public is entitled to have safeguards in decisionmaking to protect the integrity of the governmental processes. It is proper for Congress to inquire into safeguards being instituted to assure the honesty and integrity of not only the system but also the men administering it. Navy Secretary Fred Korth was completely off base when he suggested otherwise.

In view of these many inconsistencies and the ultimate awarding of the TFX contract to General Dynamics, I think that the article that appeared in the Washington Evening Star is most timely and should be brought to the attention of each Member of Congress. Under unanimous consent, I ask that this article be included in the Record today.

Korth Angrily Defends Honesty in TFX Award

Navy Secretary Fred Korth angrily told Senate investigators he will resign if they find reason to challenge the integrity of his role in the TFX warplane contract award.

And he fired back at Senator Mundt, Republican, of South Dakota: "I resent, sir, even your asking me what safeguards I might have taken to be an honest man."

Mr. Korth testified he is a former president and still a stockholder of a Fort Worth, Tex., bank which loaned money to the General Dynamics Corp., the company which won the TFX contract. He agreed also he is a friend of several of the firm's past and present top officials.

NOT INFLUENCED, HE INSISTS

But he denied that the loan, made shortly before he became Navy Secretary, was any reason for him to disqualify himself from participating in the subsequent negotiations in which General Dynamics won the TFX contract.

He also swore there was no influence involved in his recommendation that General Dynamics should get the contract despite military evaluations that a rival design and proposal by the Boeing Co. promised a better, cheaper version of the TFX (tactical fighter, experimental) plane.

He told the Senate Investigations Subcommittee he had discussed the TFX project privately with officials of both General Dynamics and Boeing, but added:

"I certainly hope it is clear—certainly I intend for it to be clear—that there was no, repeat no, influence of any character exerted on me by any of the individuals who called upon me, or by any group who called upon me."

ON STAND 8 DAYS

Winding up 8 days of testimony, he renewed his insistence that the contract was awarded on merit alone. The subcommittee made public a censored transcript of the last of his testimony today.

"I am a man of integrity," Mr. Korth blazed out in one heated exchange with Senator Mundt, who had asked about the ethical standards the Secretary had used in the negotiations.

"If you find, or this committee finds that I am not, certainly you should so recommend to the President, and I will promptly hand in my resignation," Mr. Korth declared.

The Secretary testified he was president of Continental National Bank of Fort Worth when the bank loaned money to General Dynamics not long before Mr. Korth's appointment to his Pentagon post. No specific date was mentioned and the subcommittee left out of its public transcript the amount of the loan, which Mr. Korth said was less than $600,000. He said he still owns stock in the bank.

General Dynamics' Fort Worth division is to perform much of the TFX contract, with the Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp. of Bethpage, N.Y., as its chief subcontractor.

Senator Mundt referred to Mr. Korth's business interest in Fort Worth, and his role in negotiating a big Fort Worth contract.

"I don't say it is impossible but I think it would stagger a Solomon to look objectively at a contract that meant as much to your community as this one would," Senator Mundt said. He asked Mr. Korth to state "what safeguards you surrounded yourself with to be sure that you were actually acting objectively."

Persons who were in the room said Mr. Korth clearly showed anger as he replied: "Senator Mundt, it didn't stagger me at all because I knew that I had a responsibility in taking an oath to my Government to discharge my responsibilities in a fair, impartial, and proper manner.

"I resent, sir, even your asking me what safeguards I might have taken to be an honest man," Mr. Korth added.

LAKE ASHLEY, UTAH

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution to name the lake created by the Flaming Gorge Dam in northeastern Utah, Ashley Lake. This name was selected as the most appropriate after much research and consulting with various people in Utah.

The name Ashley would be a tribute to the great explorer and fur trader, William Henry Ashley, who played a significant part in opening up the West. It was Ashley who first made the trip down the Green River through the Flaming Gorge, a feat that few since have succeeded in accomplishing. It has been navigated less than half a dozen times, and usually with specially constructed craft, while he descended its turbulent waters in buffalo-skin boats. In his diary, Ashley reported:

> We passed along between these massy walls, which to a great degree excluded from us the rays of heaven and presented a surface as impassable as their body was impregnable, and I was forcibly struck with the gloom which spread over the countenances of my men. They seemed to anticipate (and not far distant, too) a dreadful termination of our voyage; and I must confess that I partook in some degree of what I supposed to be their feelings, for things around us had truly an awesome appearance.

A study of Ashley's life shows him to be a courageous explorer, and a Congressman who proved himself to be an active champion of western measures.

The beauty surrounding Utah's new lake is truly a sight to behold. The majestic mountains surrounding the lake provide, by their brilliant red canyons, the name by which the dam is known—Flaming Gorge. I firmly believe that the name Congress chooses for this outstanding scenic attraction should be worthy of its magnificence. To my knowledge, the only name which meets this standard is Ashley. If I may, as a Utahan, be permitted to paraphrase—Ashley was a man to match our mountains.

This would also correspond with action taken on that other great structure of the upper Colorado River project—Glen Canyon Dam. The 180-mile-long lake behind Glen Canyon Dam is named Powell Lake after John Wesley Powell, the first man to navigate the Colorado through Glen Canyon.

FAIR SHARE LAW

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of the act of July 14, 1960—Public Law 86-648—the so-called fair share law, enabling the United States to participate in the resettlement of certain refugees, the Attorney General is directed to forward to the Congress every 6 months a report on administrative operations authorized under that law.

In view of the continuous interest of my colleagues in the House and for their information, I wish to include in the Record at this point the Sixth Semiannual Report of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization covering the operations from January 1 to June 30, 1963, together with a summary covering the preceding five semiannual periods.

Detailed case reports on each person paroled into the United States are in the custody of the Committee on the Judiciary and are available for inspection by any Member of the House at the office of Subcommittee No. 1 at 327 Cannon Building.

The report which is addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives is as follows:

July 25, 1963.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: Refuge operations under the act of July 14, 1960, as amended by the act of June 28, 1962, were continued in Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, and Lebanon during the 6-month period ending June 30, 1963. This was the 6-month period of operations under the act. Based upon report of the Secretary of State as to the number of refugee escapees who during the preceding 6-month period availed themselves of resettlement opportunities offered by other nations, the number authorized by statutory fair share during the period covered by this report was 1,923. During the period, 1,954 refugees registered under the act, and 1,649 were found qualified for parole.

Including the period ending June 30, 1963, the total number of refugee escapees authorized by statutory fair share totaled 20,898.

The total number of refugees who had registered since the beginning of the program exceeded this number by only 2,868. Statistics for the program are tabulated below:

	1st through 5th periods	6th period	Total
Authorized by statutory fair share	18,975	1,923	20,898
Pending beginning of period		457	
Registered during period	21,812	1,954	23,766
Total registered (pending plus received)	21,812	3,411	
Found qualified for parole	[1] 12,918	1,649	14,567
Rejected or otherwise closed	[1] 8,437	559	8,996
Pending end of period	457	203	

[1] During the 6th period, 1,108 cases, previously reported as found qualified for parole, were closed because the applicants had taken advantage of resettlement in other countries, had abandoned or withdrawn their applications, or for other reasons. Accordingly, the number previously reported as "found qualified for parole" has been reduced by this number, and the number previously reported as "rejected or otherwise closed" has been increased by a like number.

Section 2(b) of the act provides for a numerical limitation of 500 difficult-to-resettle cases. Necessary assurances having been received, 344 refugees have been approved under this section as difficult to resettle and have been referred to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration for transportation. An additional 20 have been referred to the voluntary agencies for documentation under this section.

Assurances of housing and employment having been received, a total of 13,354 refugees, including the 344 approved under section 2(b) of the act, have been referred to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration for transportation to the United States. As of June 30, 1963, a total of 11,823 had arrived in the United States, as follows:

Country of flight	During 1st 5 periods	During 6th period	Total
Albania	371	12	383
Bulgaria	173	8	181
Czechoslovakia	12	1	13
East Germany	4	1	5
Estonia	14	0	14
Hungary	1,149	74	1,223
Iraq	6	6	12
Jordan	0	2	2
Latvia	66	1	67
Lithuania	39	0	39
Poland	824	47	871
Rumania	1,793	303	2,096
Syrian Arab Republic	39	1	40
Turkey	7	1	8
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	1,797	561	2,358
U.S.S.R.	87	3	90
Yugoslavia	3,941	480	4,421
Total	10,322	1,501	11,823

Continuation of established screening procedures resulted in the rejection of 364 applicants during the period, on the following grounds:

Ineligible	187
Security risks	17
Criminal	10
Medical rejects	2
Immorality	1
Undesirability	28
Split families (spouses and children left behind in country of origin)	19
Firmly settled	38
Spouses and children of above principals	62
Total	364

Registrations of applicants in the various countries, since the beginning of the program, have been as follows:

Country	In camp	Out of camp	Total
Austria	905	2,049	2,954
Belgium		1,480	1,480
France		7,760	7,760
Germany	593	2,977	3,570
Greece	840	229	1,069
Italy	3,464	887	4,351
Lebanon		2,582	2,582
Total	5,802	17,964	23,766

During the sixth period, registrations of refugees were as follows:

Camp residents	460
Out-of-camp residents	1,494
Total	1,954

The following number of aliens, who have been in the United States for at least 2 years after their parole as refugee-escapees, have been inspected and examined for admission, and accorded the status of permanent residents under section 4 of the act:

During 5th period	242
During 6th period	1,520
Total	1,762

In compliance with the provisions of section 2(a) of the act, detailed reports on individuals paroled into this country are attached.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND F. FARRELL,
Commissioner.

FOREIGN AID ATTACK

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, I think that it is important that the Members of this body note what appears to be the beginning of a massive propaganda campaign against the concept of foreign aid. Such a campaign could, if successful even in part, seriously cripple the efforts of the United States to maintain and improve its influence and position in world affairs.

On Wednesday, July 24, each Member of the Congress received a copy of a Reader's Digest magazine article, reprinted in advance of its actual publication. It was accompanied by a letter advising us to read the article and be guided thereby. If someone wanted to cripple the foreign aid bill, this article could not have been distributed at a better time.

This article is a clever collection of distortion, half-truth and innuendo.

It takes quotations out of context. It quotes unsubstantiated charges in such a way as to present them as facts. It omits vital aspects of a foreign policy question, twisting the situation to such lengths that a course of action soundly based on foreign policy considerations appears ridiculous. It is an excellent hatchet job. Its implication is that we who support this program, including four Presidents, are either dupes or fools.

Next to our Defense Establishment, foreign aid is the single best tool of our Government in its efforts to fortify our national security. It is vital in our efforts to bring peace and stability in a troubled world, to influence other nations toward a course of independence and freedom, and in some places, in truth, to fight the very cold war battle that this article accuses us of shirking.

I would like to compare this article with President Eisenhower's own most recent statement on foreign aid, made in an article in the Saturday Evening Post, in which he advocated reductions in the Federal budget in almost every area of Government activity. The sole exception to his demands for spending cuts—the sole exception—was this matter of foreign aid.

This is what General Eisenhower said:

> Finally, a few words about the most misunderstood and controversial of all Federal expenditures—foreign aid. Never has there been any question in my mind as to the necessity of a program of economic and military aid to keep the free nations of the world from being overrun by the Communists. It is that simple. Such a program, if well-run and kept within the limits we can afford, offers the United States one of its best bargains in national security.
>
> Unfortunately, foreign aid has suffered through its history from political maneuvering and lack of stability. Congressmen seeking reelection have found it a handy issue to kick around. They go back home and stir up voters with speeches saying, "You can be sure I'm not going to vote to give your money to Timbuktu when you good people so badly need more schools and hospitals." Because of this and other political factors, foreign aid never has been planned or administered on a long-range basis, although we know the Communist threat is going to be with us for a long time to come. Back in 1953, we inherited a foreign aid budget of $7.6 billion and we cut expenditures to a more reasonable $4.8 billion, hoping to build a steady-going program. But we never were able to get Congress to assure the program the continuity in funds and personnel that is absolutely necessary if this important work is to attract and hold experienced, dedicated people.
>
> That is why I agree with the recommendations of the Committee to Strengthen the Security of the Free World, headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay. The Clay report follows the guidelines of rule of reason that I have been talking about. It recognizes that we should not increase the burden of foreign aid at this time but should strengthen the program in areas where our purposes are best served while phasing it out in areas where it is not effective. I applaud the administration for accepting the terms of the report and hope that Congress will act favorably on it.

A reading of this article, entitled "Let's Stop Sending U.S. Dollars To Aid Our Enemies," shows that much of its attack is directed at the food-for-peace program. It states that sales of food under title I of Public Law 480 are not sales, and proceeds from there to denounce these sales as foreign aid without regard for humanitarian, political, or economic reasons for these sales. It completely ignores any mention of the advantage to the United States of disposing, in a productive way, of the vast stocks of farm surpluses which we are storing at great expense to the taxpayers.

I will not attempt to argue this article's attacks point by point, but those familiar with the foreign aid program can see at a glance a few glaring examples of the biased technique used.

It quotes, for example, a single sentence from a long essay on foreign aid by Dr. Hans Morgenthau of the University of Chicago. That sentence was: "The United States has yet to develop an intelligible theory of foreign aid." It followed this sentence with unrelated quotes from others which lead the reader to think that Dr. Morgenthau was advocating abolition of foreign aid. That is not the case. Dr. Morgenthau was advocating his own theory of foreign aid, a theory which involved greater recognition of the political uses of aid as against economic uses; his air was to strengthen, not destroy, the program.

The article describes the Clay committee, whose report has formed the basis for much of this year's opposition to foreign aid, as a "proaid" group.

This is hardly an objective description of a committee comprised chiefly of conservative businessmen whose views on aid have been opposed by most of the traditional supporters of foreign aid.

Again, in discussing the controversial and undecided Bokaro steel mill proposal for India, the article states that the project was investigated by "150 technicians, appointed by AID." These 150 technicians were officials or contractors of the United States Steel Corp., operating under contract, which is significantly different. Even the United States Steel conclusion was distorted. The article said the "technicians" were "unable to prove that the venture is feasible," whereas the facts are that United States Steel did find that the venture was feasible, without recommending whether it should be done.

Another clear instance of exaggeration involved the discussion of the expropriation of American interests in Ceylon. The article indicated that the U.S. Government timorously delayed 6 months in enforcing the Hickenlooper amendment in Ceylon, whereas the fact is that the law provides for a 6-month period during which negotiations for settlement of expropriation claims are to take place.

The article talks about "aid" to Algeria, and charges that this promotes socialism. It does not mention that this aid was food relief to starving people, administered by U.S. charitable agencies. Nor does it mention that, perhaps as a result of this aid communism has been outlawed in Algeria.

There are dozens more of these examples.

Perhaps the most amazing aspect of this article is its conclusion. After lambasting the use of foreign aid funds by the U.S. Government, and claiming that all of this has helped our enemies, it ends up by advocating that we turn over to international banks and organizations the administration of this program.

This is a course of action in which many sincere people believe. But it is not a logical outgrowth of the earlier attacks on the program, unless the aid opponents take the position that international organizations are better able and more determined to protect the security of the United States than is the U.S. Government itself. And, consistently inconsistent though this article may be, I do not think they meant to go that far.

No one can argue against the right of the magazine to print this discussion of foreign aid, although I believe a good case can be made against the writer's objectivity.

I do not suppose we should object, either, to the magazine tossing premature reprints of the article on our desks in an attempt to influence legislation. They have to build readership.

I do suggest, however, that in the interest of fair reporting, Reader's Digest subscribers should have an opportunity to hear the other side of the case, perhaps from Secretary of State Rusk or AID Administrator David Bell.

I look forward to this possibility.

PETITION FOR THE 24TH AMENDMENT

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House now knows by correspondence from me and statements I have made on the floor that I have Discharge Petition No. 3 at the desk and have asked Members to sign it, in order to bring before this House legislation that would amend the Constitution to permit prayer in public schools and public places, in an attempt to preserve the spiritual heritage of this Nation as exemplified in "In God we trust," and in the Pledge of Allegiance the expression "under God."

I am asking the Members to sign that petition. We have quite a number now and we are getting more every day. I shall include in the Record an article from the Catholic Free Press, the official paper of the diocese of Worcester, Mass., from which I am going to read a short excerpt. This article expresses the reason why we should bring a resolution to the floor and why we should adopt such an amendment.

This article reads in part:

> We hope, therefore, that the sponsors of "prayer amendment" resolutions in the House will give serious consideration to the proposal of Representative Frank J. Becker, Republican, of New York, that they meet and agree on the language of one resolution and then support a discharge petition to bring it to the floor of the House for debate.

That is all I am attempting to do, bring this to the floor of the House. I am sure it would be adopted so that it would be submitted to the people of this country to help preserve our spiritual heritage that we so badly need at this time.

The article follows:

Twenty-fourth Amendment

It would seem that the only way to stem the tide which threatens to banish any reference to God from American public life is the passage of an amendment to the Constitution clarifying the first amendment. It would also seem, however, that any amendment designed to state in unequivocal terms our belief in man's reliance upon God, while at the same time safeguarding the individual's right to his own religious belief—or disbelief—must be precisely worded lest the cure be more disastrous than the disease. Similarly, it would seem that any campaign designed to secure passage of such an amendment must be well coordinated, lest its failure be decisive.

We are not anxious to see the Constitution become a patchwork, amended each time a grievance cannot be resolved to everyone's satisfaction by the Supreme Court of the land in this instance, however, the implications of the high court's recent pronouncements on the relationship between church and State are so patently contrary to the intent of the Founding Fathers that a clarification by the people seems in order. For that reason we applaud the activity of the newly formed Citizens for Public Prayer in Rutland and other similar groups across the country whose aim it is to assure that America continues to hold a revered place for God in public life.

We applaud also the gesture of the several Senators and Congressmen who have filed resolutions in the Congress requesting that a "prayer amendment" be made to the Constitution. Past experience should have revealed, however, that some of those resolutions may have been filed simply as a gesture to placate indignant constituents back home, with the congressional sponsors caring little or not at all whether their proposals ever are acted upon. It should also be obvious that the congressional committee charged with the responsibility of clearing one of the more than two score resolutions for general debate, could decide as has happened before—that it would be politically more prudent to sidetrack them all.

We hope, therefore, that the sponsors of "prayer amendment" resolutions in the House will give serious consideration to the proposal of Representative Frank J. Becker, Republican of New York, that they meet and agree on the language of one resolution and then support a discharge petition to bring it to the floor of the House for debate. Proponents of a "prayer amendment" are all agreed on one basic principle—that the Founding Fathers never intended to identify the separation of church and state with the separation of God from the state. Fragmentation among these proponents however, could result in inaction on the floor of Congress and frustration among members of groups like the Citizens for Public Prayer who are ready to work for the protection of our religious heritage "back home."

SOUTH AFRICA'S STATUS IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak for a moment on the subject of South Africa's status in the United Nations. Of late the climate of opinion on this subject has become hot and with justice. There has been no indication that South Africa intends even in the distant future to alter her policy of apartheid even when the attention of the whole world is focused on this matter of equality and discrimination.

At the ILO Conference from which I have recently returned, at which no less than 102 nations were represented, a resolution was passed on June 21 which invalidated the credentials of the South African workers' delegates. It was also decided that the Secretary General of the International Labor Organization, Mr. David A. Morse, should go to New York to consult with the Secretary General of the United Nations on the grave concern expressed by the ILO and its governing body on the subject of apartheid and the problems posed by South Africa's continued membership in the United Nations.

Proposals that were earlier brought before the governing body of the International Labor Conference for consideration were that all diplomatic relations with South Africa be broken off, that all ports be closed to South African ships and all airports closed to South African planes, and that South African goods be completely boycotted. And may I add that these proposals were embodied in a resolution passed in the United Nations last year, though the implementation of these measures was left up to the discretion of the member states. Some of these measures I am sure sound extreme to you. I have called them to your attention to emphasize the proportions and urgency which this matter of apartheid has assumed in the minds of other nations and to emphasize the need for a firm position on the part of the United States.

The Communists have played up their support of African freedom, and there are many stronger non-Communist organizations who now eagerly look to the West for encouragement in their struggle against oppression. Up until this point, and to the advantage of the Communists, these non-Communist groups have not had the encouragement they desire and deserve. In Angola, for instance, Holden Roberto, who is anti-Communist, has recently come to power, and the Pan-Africanist Congress, also anti-Communist, and other anti-Communist groups seek the reassurance which only a strong position on the part of the United States can give them.

I wish to make it clear that I understand and appreciate Governor Stevenson's reluctance to use the extreme measure of expulsion against the South Africans. But I believe there is an important alternative to expulsion, that is, the suspension of South Africa from the United Nations and the expression of strong sanctions. I do not believe that suspension would have the disruptive effects of expulsion, and at the same time, this measure would demonstrate to the Africans who seek freedom that we are sincere in our concern—that we consider the South African policy of apartheid to be dangerous, intolerable, and deserving of our immediate action. Delay or weakness in this matter will cost us much in the way of international prestige, and discredit the steps we ourselves are taking to remove the stain of discrimination from our society. The Africans who have lived for too long already under the injustices of colonialism must have a way to distinguish us from those who are tolerant of the evil in their land, and must be able to look to friends other than the Communists, who, of course, exploit every such situation.

REVISION AND MODERNIZATION OF OUR IMMIGRATION LAWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with others of my colleagues who have indicated their support of the President's program to revise and modernize our immigration laws.

The President's proposals are a much-needed substitute for the discriminatory statute now in force. The enactment of this legislation, will effectively eliminate one of the most abusive laws now resting heavily on the conscience of this country.

The key to these proposals is the elimination of immigration quotas based on national origins. Not only are these quotas discriminatory; they are also arbitrary and obsolete. The 1920 census figures on which they are predicated no longer reflect a valid image of the ethnic composition of this country's population.

Since 1957 I have been presenting legislation that would eliminate these national quotas by replacing them with a system that would discriminate against no individual because of his country of birth. This system would provide, without respect to nationality, for the immigration of people possessing skills needed by this country, of individuals whose close relatives are U.S. citizens, and of refugees who have been suddenly uprooted from their native lands. The enactment of this legislation will undoubtedly have a salutary effect on this country, for, by facilitating the entry of highly skilled individuals, by reuniting families, and by assisting refugees, we can only strengthen the fabric of our already diverse and talented population.

The President's proposals embody, to a large degree, those ideas which I have advocated since I first entered the Congress. Consequently, I am delighted at the prospect that these proposals now carry the influence of the President behind them. I am certain the country is prepared to accept them and I sincerely hope that our citizens will make known their wishes to their Representatives in Congress in order that the President's legislation may meet with early favor.

Because of my belief in the overwhelming necessity and desirability of this legislation, I am proud to count myself as one of the numerous Members who have introduced the President's bill.

SALE OF WARPLANES TO REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Department of State is considering approving the sale of warplanes manufactured in the United States to the Republic of South Africa. On June 14, 1963, the story was reported by Laurence Barrett in the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, I have protested this proposed sale to the Secretary of State. The Department of State has acknowledged that the matter is under active consideration at this time.

I believe that the sale of these planes to the Republic of South Africa would be unconscionable. Approval of an export license by the Department of State would mean in effect that the United States is supporting the racist government of Verwoerd. Documentary proof is not required to show that the South African Government is dedicated to the policy of apartheid—strict segregation of the races. In implementing its apartheid policy, the Government has engaged in some of the most repressive measures ever undertaken by any government against its own population. To the other countries of Africa the Republic of South Africa is synonymous with colonialism. To all the world this Government is synonymous with racial fascism.

It is inconceivable to me that there can be any question concerning this sale. However, it is suggested that these planes might be designed for purposes of defense against external attack and possible aggression by the Sino-Soviet bloc. I suppose that it is possible that the Sino-Soviet bloc someday may attack South Africa. But the greater possibility is that the human beings who are so ruthlessly repressed by their government will revolt. If this happens, and the proposed sale is approved, military aircraft manufactured in the United States will be used to suppress the revolution for freedom in South Africa.

At a time when we are struggling to protect and advance freedom at home and abroad, it would be ironical to approve the sale of warplanes to the dictatorial government of South Africa. I urge the Department of State to deny an export license for these planes.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the article from the New York Herald-Tribune and an exchange of correspondence between my office and the Department of State:

SOUTH AFRICA WANTS TO BUY OUR JETS—BUT

(By Laurence Barrett)

WASHINGTON.—South Africa is shopping for warplanes in the United States and for 3 months the State Department has been trying to decide whether to say yea or nay.

In view of South Africa's policy of rigid racial segregation and white supremacy, the indications are that the answer will be no. The State Department insists that no final decision has been made. However, reports reaching here from South Africa indicate that the government there believes the deal is dead.

The State Department fears that the planes might be used someday to intimidate or actually combat South African Negroes. Aside from the moral question involved, employment of made-in-U.S.A. planes used for this purpose would be a heavy blow to U.S. relations with the nonwhite nations of the world. It would also add to the administration's already great racial problems at home.

Three different planes are on the South Africans' shopping list. Each could be used for antiguerrilla operations.

Naturally, the State Department does not wish to reject perhaps tens of millions of dollars of sales. With the country spending more abroad for all purposes than it takes in from foreign countries, Federal agencies have a firm policy to encourage sales of American goods.

The sales of most kinds of armaments by private interests here to foreign countries requires the approval of the State Department. This takes the form of an export license that is issued when a transaction is about to be consummated.

In practice, a company that has an arms sale in prospect asks the State Department's munitions control division at an early stage for an informal go-ahead.

This the Grumman Co., of Bethpage, Long Island, did in March. The plane involved is the A-6A Intruder, a new craft that will soon be deployed on American aircraft carriers. The plane can be used on land. It is a subsonic, low-level, all-weather fighter-bomber that can handle both conventional and nuclear weapons.

More recently, Douglas Aircraft was approached for A-4D Skyhawks, a present mainstay of the attack carrier force. Also, North America has asked the State Department what it thinks about selling T-28 Trojans to South Africa.

In all three cases, it is understood, it was the South African Government that initiated the discussions with the American companies.

The Skyhawk is similar in some respects to the A-6A except that it is not an all-weather craft. Although both are jet powered, they are able to perform low-level maneuvers at relatively slow speeds.

The T-28 is a World War II type plane that has been used for training purposes here. However, it can be rigged for combat. Today it is being used to bomb and strafe Communist guerrillas in South Vietnam.

Last year the State Department approved the sale of seven C-130 noncombat transport planes to South Africa. It could not be ascertained whether earlier requests for combat planes were rejected.

Relations between the two countries have been strained. The United States has joined other countries in condemning apartheid—the South African euphemism for white supremacy—and South Africa has rejected such statements as improper interference with its domestic affairs.

Just yesterday the State Department ordered its Embassy in South Africa to hold its July 4 reception on an integrated basis. In Pretoria, the U.S. Embassy announced it would hold two Independence Day receptions. One in the morning for leaders of the South African Government and the diplomatic corps will be for whites only, while a reception later in the day for Americans in Pretoria and for other guests will be on an integrated basis. The State Department order obviously was dictated by the administration's concern for racial equality rather than by normal diplomatic practice. Normally, embassies observe the host country's rules, at least in public.

Despite the friction, South Africa is an anti-Communist nation which, in cold war terms, is considered part of the Western bloc. But there are no specific military agreements between the two countries and there does not appear to be any external threat to South African security.

JULY 10, 1963.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have recently read newspaper reports concerning South Africa's desire to purchase warplanes in the United States. I understand that the Department of State is considering whether to permit such purchases. In light of South Africa's deplorable apartheid policy, I believe it would be highly inadvisable for the United States to sanction the sales of warplanes to South Africa.

I would appreciate it if a report on this matter were sent to me.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. RYAN,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., July 17, 1963.

Hon. WILLIAM F. RYAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RYAN: Thank you for your letter of July 10 regarding the purchase of military aircraft by the Republic of South Africa.

The Department of State has had inquiries from various U.S. aircraft manufacturers asking for permission to discuss the possible sale of their products with representatives of the South African Government. These requests are under review and no final decision has been made. You may be assured that your views and those of others who have written to the Department on this subject will be given full consideration.

The policy of the U.S. Government toward South Africa has been to consider, and not to refuse outright, proposed exports of types of equipment designed essentially for purposes of defense against external attack and, particularly, those items which could strengthen defenses against possible aggression by the Sino-Soviet bloc. Applications for the export of weapons or equipment for use by the police or other security units for the enforcement of apartheid are denied.

If I can be of further assistance to you in this matter, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

WHO'S ANTIBUSINESS

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, more than once the suggestion has been made that the Kennedy administration is not sensitive to the needs of American business enterprise and is not responsive to the advice of the executives who manage this segment of the U.S. economy.

This opinion, in my view, is completely without foundation. Regardless, however, of the soundness of this judgment generally, there is one specific example where the contrary has been true. In the field of taxation, the administration has sponsored successfully two measures which have proved beneficial to U.S. business and which have provided increased funds for investment.

The first was the accelerated schedule of depreciation allowances which was prepared and put into effect by the Treasury Department, itself. These provided faster writeoffs of capital investment and therefore required less taxes and freed more corporate funds for other purposes.

The other measure was a legislative one. It was the investment tax credit which was passed into law in the 87th Congress. This provision permits a subtraction of up to 7 percent of the cost of new equipment from the company income tax bill.

We have not heard very much of the benefits of this provision. The companies have not trumpeted the news from the housetops by any means, yet a perusal of the annual reports of companies which pass across the desk of every Congressman shows that the benefits of this provision have been widespread and substantial.

Several companies in my district have recorded the beneficial effects of this governmental policy in their annual statements. One of these is a long established manufacturer of machinery in Ansonia, Conn. Under the tax revision, this company was able to save $300,000 in taxes, a figure that represents nearly 25 percent of the net income of the company. It chose to treat these reductions as deferred tax liabilities to be spread out over the estimated life of the assets.

A brass manufacturing concern in my home town benefited measurably from the new tax laws. In 1962, its 160th year of operation, it showed net earnings of $3.1 million. This amount excludes $616,375 that were saved due to the new tax adjustments and will appear on the balance sheet as net income in future years.

Elsewhere in Connecticut, a prominent hardware factory noted in its 1962 annual report that income tax benefits under the new 1962 guidelines amounted to $389,000, while under provisions of the Revenue Act of 1962, the company and its domestic subsidiaries obtained an investment credit of $94,000 against income taxes payable for the year 1962.

These savings have been realized in corporations all over the country. The annual report of the United States Steel Corp. shows that $44 million was added to the wear and exhaustion account in the year 1962, while the investment credit resulted in a reduction in Federal income tax of $8.2 million.

Sylvia Porter, the well-known economist and columnist, described the results of these investment incentives in a recent newspaper column as follows:

> The fact is that the investment incentives given by Congress and the Treasury in 1962 to spur business spending on plants and equipment have substantially boosted this vital type of spending. Businessmen report a full $1 billion of the increase in their spending scheduled for 1963 and 1964 is a direct result of the new tax credit and liberalized depreciation rules, and plant-equipment spending in the final quarter of 1963 is slated to run 8½ percent ahead of this spending in the same months of uncertainty about its direction.

The New York Times on July 10, 1963, carried an article which indicated that corporations during 1962 reaped a cash benefit of $2.3 billion from the investment tax credit and revision of depreciation rules:

TAX WRITEOFFS MATCH FORECAST—CORPORATIONS IN 1962 GAINED $2.3 BILLION ON INVESTMENT CREDIT AND DEPRECIATION—U.S. ESTIMATE ACCURATE—SAVINGS ALMOST EXACTLY WHAT TREASURY PREDICTED A YEAR AGO, STUDY INDICATES

WASHINGTON, July 9.—Corporations reaped a cash benefit totaling $2,300 million last year from the investment tax credit and revision of depreciation rules.

The tax saving was almost exactly what the Treasury predicted a year ago, when the investment credit was still pending in Congress and the revision of depreciation rules was first announced. For the investment credit, the tax saving was slightly larger than the Treasury's forecast.

Figures on the benefits to corporations from the two tax changes were made public today by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges. They are based on a Commerce Department study of corporate tax returns.

ALLOWANCES UP A BILLION

The study showed that total corporate depreciation allowances increased by $4,100 million in 1962, compared with those taken in the preceding year. Of this amount, the Department said, $2,400 million was attributable directly to the use of the new and shorter depreciable lives permitted under the revised rules.

The tax saving resulting from the extra depreciation charges was $1,250 million.

Use of the 7-percent tax credit by corporations in 1962 resulted in tax savings of a little more than $1 billion.

The new depreciation guidelines were used the most by large corporations, the study found. For manufacturing companies with assets of $100 million or more, the increase in depreciation writeoffs amounted to 18 percent. For medium-sized companies, the increase was 15 percent, and for corporations with assets of less than $10 million, only 7 percent.

HOW IT WORKS

More rapid depreciation of equipment brings tax savings to business because depreciation allowances are deducted from taxable income. Faster depreciation means larger deductions in any given year.

Transportation, manufacturing, and mining industries showed the greatest increases in their depreciation allowances, compared with 1916—17 percent for transportation and 14 percent for the other two.

Among manufacturing industries, only aircraft companies showed no appreciable increase in depreciation deductions as a result of the new depreciation guidelines. The primary metals, paper, chemicals and stone, clay, and glass products industries were heavy users of the new shorter depreciable lives.

The new depreciation rules affected least the public utility and commercial group of industries, the bulk of whose capital investment is in buildings. The liberalized depreciation standards applied only to machinery and equipment, and not to buildings.

FIFTY-FIVE PERCENT SWITCHED

Overall, companies accounting for 55 percent of total depreciation charges switched to use of the new depreciation guidelines.

Industries that made the least use of the new guidelines made the most use of the investment credit.

Companies in the communications, public utility, trade, and service industries each reaped tax savings of more than $150 million from the investment credit. The taxes of transportation firms were reduced by $100 million as a result of the credit.

For all manufacturing and mining companies, the tax benefits realized from the credit totaled $500 million.

The Commerce Department study covered only corporate businesses. Earlier Treasury estimates indicated that savings to unincorporated business would amount to $200 million from the credit and $250 million from the depreciation revision.

It should be noted that the amount that the corporations saved because of the newly introduced investment credit was larger than the Treasury Department's prediction of a year ago, while the overall tax saving was exactly what the Treasury had predicted when the investment credit legislation was still pending before this body.

I am very happy about these developments and I am pleased that the legislative and executive branches of our Government have cooperated so successfully to provide a stimulus to business investment which will produce more jobs and benefit our economy generally.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLLING). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of this body the remarkable work and achievements of the National Institute of Dental Research, which recently observed the 15th anniversary of its establishment. Since its creation by the U.S. Congress in 1948, the Institute has assumed leadership for dental research that has widely influenced the great contribution of dental science to the conquest of disease. This favorable trend has brought not only important advances in clinical dentistry but has added significantly to our basic biological knowledge. The traditional separation of dental research from the total body of the biological sciences is changing and the Institute today is not only carrying on research in disease-oriented programs but has expanded its interest into fundamental areas of knowledge which have applicability to all disease problems.

Refinement of research techniques, particularly in connection with the Institute's large colony of germ-free animals and in such fields as biochemistry, genetics, and crystallography have had broad effectiveness in the basic sciences. Important work in enzyme chemistry, X-ray diffraction, and the crystal structure of mineralized tissues have provided to scientists throughout the world fundamental data and advanced concepts underlying many kinds of pathologic situations.

At the same time, the Dental Institute, in pursuing its mission to study the origins, prevention, and treatment of oral diseases, has given us new knowledge of the mechanisms of tooth decay, periodontal disease, malocclusion, cleft palate, and reconstructive techniques.

It is less than 100 years since the first American dental school was admitted to membership in the university family. For almost all that century the dental schools discharged their teaching and service obligations most creditably, but their research activities were limited and relatively ineffective. It was not until the Dental Institute's grants programs provided the dental schools with resources and impetus that the American dental schools began to fulfill their long-neglected research objectives.

The critical manpower situation in the dental profession has been highlighted in many reports. It is to the credit of the Dental Institute that this acute problem—the necessity of increasing the number of dental teachers and researchers—has been more widely understood and that steps have been taken to cope with it.

Prior to 1940, there were only 20 persons in all the history of the United States who held both the D.D.S. and Ph. D. degrees. In the decade from 1940 to 1950, 27 more such persons were added.

In contrast, at the present time, the National Institute of Dental Research is today providing training opportunities for 177 persons, 67 of them seeking the Ph. D. in addition to the D.D.S.

There has now evolved what is essentially a partnership between Government and the university, between the Dental Institute and the dental schools, and this relationship has become one of mutual interdependence and mutual productivity.

This partnership has produced a revolution in dental practice and a vastly improved level of dental health in our population. The development of fluoridation of community water supplies has reduced tooth decay in children by two-thirds in those communities where it has been put into effect. Dental Institute scientists have shown that this protection by fluoride lasts into adult life.

Other research with germ-free animals has proved that tooth decay is in animals a transmissible and infectious disease, caused by a strain of streptococcus. This discovery has tremendous implications for future treatment, since knowledge about bacterial disease and its control is well advanced. The same kind of research is being carried on now in the causes of periodontal disease, major cause of loss of teeth in adult life.

These are just a few examples of the outstanding work being done by the National Institute of Dental Research and by the non-Federal research institutions taking part in its programs. I am confident that the National Institute of Dental Research will achieve even greater success in the years ahead.

THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM FOR THE COMING FISCAL YEAR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, we will soon be considering the foreign aid program for the coming fiscal year.

The Alliance for Progress is of great interest and significance to us all, for it holds great promise. I think it would be good for us to know what some of the beneficiaries of the Alliance think of the program. For example, one of the outstanding newspapers of Latin America, La Prensa of Lima, Peru, had this to say:

[From the La Prensa, Lima, Peru, July 4, 1963]

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(By Manuel Aguirre Roca)

The misunderstandings about the Alliance for Progress are, in good part due to prejudice. Since the development of Latin American countries depends in great part upon the United States, and as the Alliance for Progress project was announced by President Kennedy himself, a conclusion was unduly reached that the Alliance for Progress was a massive aid program, offering money and equipment from the United States to the underdeveloped countries of that part of the globe.

There have been previous U.S. programs of bilateral aid, such as point IV, and, in a less strict economic sense, the good neighbor policy, through which Latin American countries received assistance from Uncle Sam for their progress.

All this contributes to confuse the new and unique aspect of the Alliance for Progress, making it difficult to comprehend.

The first thing that must be done, I believe, to understand the meaning of the Alliance is to throw overboard all prefabricated ideas. Let us therefore discard them and understand that the Alliance for Progress is not a program of assistance offered by the United States to the Latin American countries. It is not a flow of dollars in a unilateral sense, or in any other sense.

For this reason the repeated criticism "the gringos are fooling us with the Alliance, because in reality they give us very little" lacks truth. They have not offered us a deluge of dollars or equipment, so we cannot accuse them of idle boasting.

What is, then, the Alliance?

It is a commitment contracted by all countries of the hemisphere, through which each country offers to undertake development efforts, according to political and economic criteria and following a minimum pace.

Let us imagine a family going through a bad economic period. Let us imagine that one day the members of the family get together and agree to solve their grave problems through the persistent and rational effort of each. This is the Alliance. We see therefore that it is a promise between all the members of the Latin American family, or, as said very wisely by Manuel Seoane Corrales in a TV interview, an authentic honor pact between the countries, and not a program of foreign aid.

There then would be two principal ideas in the Alliance: (a) a development commitment entered upon by each of the member countries, and (b) the acceptance of uniform and well-defined political and economic rules to which the method or modus operandi of development should be subjected.

Which are these rules? This is a most interesting point, since its study will allow us to X-ray the prevailing political and economic thinking of the continent and, at the same time find out which members of the Alliance comply or not with the solemn promise of Punta del Este.

The fundamental economic rule, as seen in the Charter of Punta del Este consists in "maintaining price stability, avoiding inflation and deflation with its consequences of social losses and bad distribution of resources." This rule is complemented by the development plans which each country must submit, in order to achieve the concrete objectives chronologically programed by the Alliance.

The Alliance stipulates that its members shall formulate development plans in which will be observed "the basic orientation of a fiscal and monetary policy to achieve the program with price stability."

In conclusion, the Alliance for Progress is a development commitment entered into by the countries of the continent, who promise to promote price stability and anti-inflationary techniques through the elaboration of plans which would be based on these same principles of stability. This means that the Alliance condemns subsidy methods, exchange controls, inflation, and, finally, state domination of private enterprise (estatismo) and points out the importance of private enterprise.

TESTIMONY OF UNDER SECRETARY OF LABOR JOHN F. HENNING ON THE DESIRABILITY OF EXTENDING PUBLIC LAW 78 IN ITS PRESENT FORM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Senate Subcommitte on Migratory Labor heard testimony from Under Secretary of Labor, John F. Henning, on the desirability of extending Public Law 78 in its present form. Secretary Henning said that an extension of Public Law 78 without amendments to protect our own workers would be "unthinkable."

Secretary Henning testified that the bracero program most certainly has an adverse effect on the domestic labor market. I quote:

> The availability of a large supply of alien workers has created an anomalous situation in our agricultural labor market seriously interferring with the free interplay of supply and demand. The certification which permits the admission of any alien workers into the United States for temporary employment must essentially be conditioned upon a shortage of available domestic labor. It is axiomatic that in such a normal labor shortage situation the bidding for available domestic labor would produce more competitive job offers. In these circumstances we could generally expect better terms and conditions of employment than would prevail in labor surplus areas.
>
> With an inexhaustible supply of alien workers at our very borders we find, conversely, that the terms and conditions of employment offered domestic workers not only remain static but in many cases are less favorable than those offered domestic workers in areas where no alien workers are employed. We find, further, the incredible situation where alien workers are offered better terms and conditions of employment than are afforded our own agricultural workers competing for the same jobs. The simple fact is that under the present system an employer can refuse to offer to domestic workers the same terms and conditions that he is required to offer alien workers. If the domestic worker refuses to accept the job at less favorable terms, the employer is permitted to bring in Mexican workers who are then afforded the very terms and conditions which were denied to our own workers.
>
> We realize all the unemployed cannot be used in agricultural activities. At the same time, we must exercise every caution to assure that qualified domestic workers are given preference for all available job opportunities. That this has not been the case is highlighted by the fact that in the State of California in 1962, 127,000 Mexican workers were contracted and recontracted. During this same period there were an estimated annual average of 395,000 domestic workers unemployed in that State. In Arizona, 16,906 Mexicans were contracted while 23,900 domestic workers were unemployed. In the State of Arkansas, 12,410 Mexicans were contracted; 42,400 domestic workers were unemployed. Texas used 36,289 Mexican workers while 174,600 domestic workers were unemployed.

NORTHEAST AIRLINES

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, amid the flurry of concern and indignation generated by the Civil Aeronautics Board's decision to remove Northeast Airlines from their most profitable New York-Miami run, there appear to be only two parties expressing jubilation. These are the two competitors in that run, Eastern and National Airlines who can expect millions in additional revenue if the Northeast service is discontinued.

The fact, as pointed out by the two dissenters on the CAB, that Northeast has worked hard for the past 7 years to develop good service on the Florida route seems to have been forgotten by the three members who voted to decapitate the airline. Northeast's entry into the market has caused noticeable improvements in the service of all three—proving one of the greatest advantages of healthy competition. Now, these improvements may well be lost, stated the dissenters.

Because of its profits from the New York to Florida run, Northeast has borne the burden of unsubsidized service to many New England communities, saving the Federal Treasury $15 million, while similar services have been subsidized in many areas of the country. The Board will now give subsidies to support the New England routes and take away their only profitable long-haul run.

Mr. Speaker, I fail to see how this best serves the public interest. To remove a company from a competitive market where its very presence has improved the services offered the public, thus obliging it to operate its other essential runs at a loss, is no public service. But to expect the same taxpaying public which suffers from that curtailment of service to pick up the tab for the losses is actually a public disservice to everyone except the jubilant rivals, Eastern and National Airlines.

Two additional facts make the CAB's decision even less understandable. Their recent policy has been to get the smaller, regional airlines off subsidies. That was its major reason for giving Northeast the New York-Miami run in the first place. Second, their decision came after the Hughes Tool Co. assumed airlines debts amounting to $23 million, thus giving Northeast hopes of operating once again on a solvent basis.

Mr. Speaker, it is significant that the major and most vigorous arguments for the removal of Northeast Airlines from the Florida run came from National and Eastern Airlines. They claim that the route cannot support 3 airlines—yet 2 other comparable routes each support 4 carriers and 12 others are serviced by 3 carriers each.

Eastern Airlines has attributed much of its financial distress to Northeast's competition. Yet Northeast, despite its troubles with the New England routes has managed to make the Florida route a profitable one and has increased its services, compelling the others to do likewise. This, Mr. Speaker, is the heart and soul of our system of free enterprise and competition—that rivals for the same market will strive to improve services and costs to the benefit of the public. If Eastern cannot stand up to the competition provided by Northeast and operate at a profit, why should the more successful Northeast be the one to lose the franchise? Can it be that the CAB is trying to salve its conscience for turning down Eastern's application to merge with American several weeks ago?

Mr. Speaker, the decision of the CAB should be scrutinized more carefully to determine why the arguments of two competitors should persuade the board to act in such direct opposition to the public interest.

MIGRANT LABOR PROGRAMS ARE EXPENSIVE AND WASTEFUL

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, some Members of Congress have dismissed the tragic crisis to small agricultural towns caused by the discontinuance of the bracero program by saying in effect "we hope to get Federal aid to promote a migrant system for furnishing the necessary supplemental farm labor."

Before such a plan is promulgated, the cruel sociological and emotional consequences should be understood.

The cost of any such program would be enormous and wasteful. But even if every agricultural area were provided with free public family housing and if equipped with community theaters, parks, libraries, swimming pools, and so forth—and even if the Federal Government generously built, supplied and staffed the necessary schools, jails, hospitals and public service facilities, the nomadic life of following the crops—living 2 months here, 3 months there and then migrating to some other place—would be unimaginably unhealthful and disruptive. The movement of the migrant families, no matter how handsomely housed and provisioned, will be detrimental to the educational, social and economic welfare of each community through which they pass as well as to the migrant family.

It is highly doubtful that teachers, doctors, welfare technicians, or governmental officials could be induced to follow the migrant family from harvest to harvest. Logically these technicians—and their families—should not be exempt from the nomadic life, if the poor farm laborer—and his family—is required to migrate with the crops.

Another suggestion that the farm laborer family should stay in some rural community all year, even though only 1 to 5 months farm employment is available nearby, is irrational and not practicable. Farm labor skills are the least interchangeable with skills required in other industries. The skills are among the lowest of any industry.

No one with a higher skill will work on a row crop—primarily because an unemployed skilled worker need not accept farm work, at any wage, to claim generous unemployment compensation. Row crop work is onerous and available only when work in other industries is also at or near annual peaks.

Few communities can support an unemployed family for the 6 to 11 months' period during which crops do not grow and there is no farm work.

Is there a community, town, city, or county in America which could provide facilities to support, house, feed, and care for an influx of 20 to 200 percent more unemployed than its normal population for 3 to 9 months of the year? I trust no Member of Congress desires to force this predicament and this imposition on any other community.

I trust that each Member of Congress will consider thoroughly the chaotic consequences such a program would create in his own district before he votes to impose it upon another district.

We need solutions for our problems—not just more problems. The bracero program was an effective, humanitarian, moral, economical solution.

THE TERRIBLE TRUTH

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the fast moving events of the past several weeks are full of fearful foreboding for the American people and the free world. There is more convincing evidence daily that President Kennedy, in his dangerous flirtation with Khrushchev, for whatever reason, is failing to protect the security of the United States.

His proposed test ban treaty, the weakening of our defense potential, the cowering before Communist aggression, and the constant appeals for peace, peace at any price, are putting this Nation in grave peril and strengthening the world position of Soviet Russia and international communism.

America must be awakened to the danger which the President is creating through lack of leadership, lack of courage to face the problems of this day. If we cannot save the United States from the follies of the Kennedy administration until the people have had an opportunity to express themselves, we may find it necessary to take other measures to prevent an incompetent administration from destroying us before the next election.

This morning I attended a briefing on the test ban treaty, given by Averell Harriman for Members of the House. Whatever fears I had were strengthened by the thoroughly innocuous statements of the Assistant Secretary of State who admitted that all scientific facts are ignored as relatively unimportant in the anxiety of the administration to reach a political agreement with the Soviet Union on a test ban.

What will the test ban mean to the United States? At this point I would like to include an excerpt from the Newsgram page of the August 5 issue of U.S. News & World Report:

> Nuclear test ban does not mean disarmament. Nuclear weapons still will be the weapons of future war. Weapon testing will not come to a full stop.
>
> Tests will continue underground. France will go on testing in the air. Red China will test in the air, too, if and when she gets the bomb.
>
> Test ban of 1958, not in treaty form, was broken by Russia in 1960. Test ban at that time was used by Reds to prepare for 1960 tests. New agreement, once approved, can be ended on 3 months' notice—a loophole for cheating.
>
> Test agreement, now being entered into, favors Russia. Russia, behind in smaller nuclear weapons, can catch up by testing underground. United States behind in bigger weapons and in an antimissile missile, will be hindered in her effort to catch up by the bar against testing in the atmosphere.
>
> United States, even before the new agreement, was slowing her pace in the arms race, hoping that Soviet Russia would follow the U.S. example.
>
> Just bear this in mind: As long as Russia is a closed country, ruled by a dictatorship, possessed of weapons capable of destroying United States, there can be no real disarmament, no real end to the arms race without great danger.
>
> Test agreement, actually can serve a political purpose. In United States it can help in a 1964 campaign based on theme of "peace and prosperity." In Russia it can calm war

fears and help keep the people quiet and contented.

Mr. Speaker, in view of that indictment of the treaty, and remembering the dire warnings of Dr. Teller that there is every evidence the Russians are ahead of us in the development of nuclear weapons, and that we cannot develop an antimissile missile without testing in the atmosphere, should we not demand of the President to answer the question, What earthly good can be accomplished by this treaty?

Coupled with the dangers to U.S. security involved in the test ban treaty, I would like to point to two articles in the same issue of U.S. News & World Report which indicate how far we have already gone and how much further we are planning to go in abandoning our military strength and in unilaterally disarming. Incidentally, the statements made in these articles can be backed up by the testimony of Secretary of Defense McNamara and other spokesmen from the Pentagon in hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on Department of Defense Appropriations for fiscal year 1964. Apparently we are abandoning many of our present weapons systems, if they are provocative. We are abandoning our military superiority, reducing the United States to a position of assured equality. This compounds the existing danger of no new weapons systems. In the area of military strength, standing still is going backward as the enemy updates his equipment.

These articles, which I include at this point as a part of these remarks, show that the United States under President Kennedy's leadership, may be giving up in the arms race, and that we are courting disaster in pursuing present Pentagon policies.

Is United States Giving Up in the Arms Race?

(United States has already started disarming, on its own, and at a fast clip. Bases are being dismantled, bombers scrapped, new weapons cut back or shelved. Project to build a U.S. arsenal of overwhelming superiority has been abandoned. It's official policy—based on this theory: "The more we arm the less secure we get.")

A major upheaval in U.S. defenses is now taking place.

A vast and varied arsenal of strategic weapons, planned by the Eisenhower administration, is being in large part canceled out or dismantled. A new and nonprovocative kind of arsenal is being emphasized in its place.

The official record shows the following:

Bombers are being sent to the scrap heap. Thor and Jupiter missiles are being removed from bases in Europe. Navy carriers are headed for a cutback. Some big bases overseas are being closed.

Funds for future weapons, moreover, have been reduced or eliminated—as in the cases of the RS–70 bomber and the Skybolt missile. Future production of nuclear materials is to be slowed. Nuclear arms are being frozen at their present stage of development through a partial test ban just worked out with Russia.

The Kennedy administration, responsible for the drastic change, sees this change as vital and necessary, and is convinced it will not endanger security. The United States, it is claimed, is entering a period of unavoidable nuclear stalemate requiring new strategy. As described by some administration officials, the strategy has a theme: "The more we arm the less secure we get."

QUALMS FROM HISTORY

Many authorities in the Military Establishment, who now are silenced, think the new strategy adds up to a type of intentional and one-sided disarmament.

They point back to the 1920's, following World War I, and to the late 1940's, following World War II. In 1922 the United States entered into an agreement to limit navies, only to have Japan violate that agreement. United States decided, even so, that "disarmament by example" on its part would lead others to disarm.

Events then led toward World War II. After World War II, the United States again disarmed—this time without any agreement.

The Korean war followed when Communists decided the United States was too weak to resist aggression.

Military authorities now express concern that the United States may be repeating the mistakes of the past—endangering its own security in pursuit of a fancy slogan. Heads of U.S. armed services simply do not buy the slogan, "The more we arm the less secure we get."

Instead, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, often with unanimity, have opposed almost all of the arms cutbacks now being put into effect. Opposition is beginning to build in Congress as well.

CRITICS' POINT: WHY SWITCH TO A NUCLEAR STALEMATE?

Concern, in large measure, comes down to this:

Why abandon known superiority over Russia to settle for a nuclear stalemate—or less? Is it safe to rely only on missiles for long-term defense? Is enough stress being placed on future weapons to prevent a technological Pearl Harbor? In short, is the Nation being imperiled by quick-look decisions?

Behind the concern is a set of facts, now fully emerging, of the changes being made in the Eisenhower strategy that was designed to carry this country through the decade of the 1960's.

General Eisenhower, in a succession of eight defense budgets totaling $315 billion, started building a shield of overwhelming strategic power. Bombers were produced by the many hundreds, and others were rushed to the drawing boards. More than 1,300 long-range missiles were provided for to complement the bomber force.

Money was provided for work on missile-firing submarines and bomber-launched missiles. Funds were invested in research on nuclear planes, antimissile missiles and neutron bombs.

Many avenues of research were opened. Money was placed where experts thought it would do most good. Some of this money was shown to be wasted. Other investments returned immense dividends.

The result, overall, was to be an unrivaled array of U.S. strategic power, assuring nuclear superiority at all costs. A full look at the arsenal planned during the Eisenhower years is shown in the table following this article.

Mr. Kennedy's view of strategy differs sharply from that of his predecessor. General Eisenhower, it is charged by present officials, overemphasized nuclear warfare and badly neglected conventional forces. The idea now is to reduce the U.S. potential for "overkill" with nuclear weapons, and to beef up nonnuclear forces.

WHERE UNITED STATES HAS CUT BACK NUCLEAR WEAPONS SYSTEMS

Radical cutbacks, as a result, have been put into effect where nuclear weapons systems are concerned. What the record shows:

B–47 bomber: Already cut back from 1,100 to 650. Will be down to 300 by next summer, entirely abandoned by 1966. Power of the B–47 bomb load is more than 10 megatons; this is equal to more than 10 million tons of TNT.

B–52 bomber: Production has halted despite congressional desire to continue, and the operational fleet was frozen at 630 planes. Some models will be scrapped inside 5 years; others presumably can be kept flying a few years after that. In the latest model, the H-series, the B–52 will carry more than 50 megatons over a 10,000-mile range.

B–58 bomber: The production line was shut down last autumn—also over congressional opposition—after about 80 planes were earmarked for combat-type duty. This plane carries a 15-megaton load at supersonic speeds.

RS–70 bomber: Planned by the Air Force as bomber of the 1970's, but held up in development stage. The Joint Chiefs of Staff and many Members of Congress went to see it in production, but chances are slim.

Thor missile: Four bases in England, with 60 medium-range missiles capable of reaching into Russia, were ordered dismantled shortly after Soviet Russia withdrew its missiles from Cuba.

Jupiter missile: Bases in Italy and Turkey, with a total of 45 missiles, were ordered abandoned. They had just become operational at a cost of $555 million.

Skybolt missiles: Designed to extend the life of the bomber force well into the 1970's, this project was killed, although Britain, which was to share the missile, protested strongly.

Nike-Zeus "missile killer": Army requests to put this antimissile missile around U.S. cities were refused, over strong protests from Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The project has been scrapped in the search for a substitute.

Military satellites: The Midas "spy satellite" was killed after a decision that 15 extra minutes' warning of missile attack was not worth the millions still required to perfect it. Numerous other military space projects have been abandoned or delayed.

Navy carriers: Signs point to a cut of as much as one-third in the Navy's fleet of 15 attack carriers. Construction is being delayed on an additional new carrier authorized by Congress last year.

Oversea bases: Flying bases in England, Morocco, Spain, France, Guam, and elsewhere have been or will be shut down. Prospects are for further withdrawals from overseas, possibly involving 1 of the 2 Army divisions in Korea and some 50,000 men in Europe.

Atomic production: The aim is to shut down half of the Nation's 14 major plants manufacturing nuclear materials for weapons. The administration feels that the present stockpile is bigger than any demand it can foresee.

Nuclear test ban: The United States alone took the initiative in suspending atmospheric tests in June as evidence of good faith before formal test ban talks with Russia. Military requests to continue testing were set aside.

VIEWS OF MILITARY LEADERS—WORRIES ABOUT FUTURE

What does this add up to?

Testimony released after closed-door hearings of Congress tells one part of the story. Worry about the future U.S. military position is being expressed on a scale not equaled in recent years.

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff, challenged Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara on the new strategy. He disclosed also that he had appealed directly to Mr. Kennedy—to no avail—after almost $5 billion were cut from the original Air Force budget.

Service rivalries were set aside by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in opposing cuts by the administration's top civilians in the Pentagon.

Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Army Chief of Staff, told Congress that he had recommended continuing both the Air Force's RS-70 and the Skybolt. He was not "horse trading" with the Air Force in giving this support, he said. These were "purely military judgments."

Adm. George W. Anderson, then Chief of Naval Operations, supported Air Force programs and the Army's Nike-Zeus. He favored extending the life of bombers, he explained, because of doubts about the reliability of missiles.

It was General LeMay who came forward with the most emphasis. He disclosed that the budget as sent to Congress had been shorn by the administration of $321 million sought for 100 more Minuteman missiles, $543 million for the RS-70, and $454 million for the Skybolt.

This exchange then took place before the House Subcommittee on Defense Department Appropriations:

Representative GERALD R. FORD, Republican, of Michigan: "With the decision on the RS-70 and with the decision on Skybolt, with the decision in the Minuteman area, as you look down the road, General LeMay, to 1968 and years thereafter, do you feel our strategic posture will be as strong, relatively speaking, as it is today?"

General LEMAY: "You have to visualize what the threat is going to be at that time. At this moment, I would say no, and that is what worries me. * * * You cannot buy back time, Mr. Ford."

Representative FORD: "Do you accept the philosophy that mutual deterrence or nuclear stalemate is inevitable?"

General LEMAY: "No, I do not accept that philosophy at all.

"I think it is a dangerous philosophy to say: Well, a stalemate is going to exist, we cannot do anything about it; therefore we do nothing. If we accept mutual deterrence, this will, I think, inevitably lead to defeat."

A "MAGINOT" MENTALITY?

Main opposition of General LeMay and others to the cutback in U.S. strategic forces is this: An all-missile "stalemate force" is inflexible. It represents "dangerous Maginot Line thinking" that could leave the United States open to disaster if an enemy came up with an antimissile defense or dramatic, new offensive weapons.

Reliability of missiles, testimony makes clear, is far from proven. Accuracy is not up to standards originally set. The second table following this article gives an indication of today's missile reliability.

General LeMay insists that claims made in behalf of Soviet defenses against U.S. bombers are far overstated. Argument is made that manned-weapons systems will always be needed—in the air or in space. Dissatisfaction is expressed at cuts made in Air Force projects that look forward to possible space warfare.

All that is on the record, as released by committees of Congress.

Not on the record—censored from publication on "policy grounds"—is another side of the story.

This other side concerns what many top military men consider to be a "soft-headed philosophy" about relations with Russia: The idea that the United States can lead Russia to disarmament by first partially disarming itself, to set an example.

Military men in large numbers contend that President Kennedy and his chief aide for defense, Mr. McNamara, are "beguiled" by this philosophy.

THE "PEACE STRATEGISTS" AND THE "SPIRAL THEORY"

Just what is this philosophy—and whose is it?

One civilian witness before Congress described it in these words:

"An arms race is very much like an argument. The spiral will never turn downward until one party reduces its armaments, even by a small amount at first. In the main area of military spending, it would appear that the United States as the country with by far the greatest overkill capacity, has to be the first to take this step. Certainly, the party that is behind in the race is not likely to be the first to do so."

John T. McNaughton, General Counsel of the Department of Defense, and an arms-control expert, says that "arms control" measures need not necessarily be negotiated and based on formal treaties. He feels that arms control can be achieved by starting with "unilateral acts"—one country taking the lead.

Essentially the same view is shared by other top civilian advisers. Among them are several key members of Mr. McNamara's team of "whiz kids" at the Pentagon, as well as Jerome B. Wiesner, Presidential science adviser; Carl Kaysen, White House arms-control expert; and Walt Whitman Rostow, policy planner at the State Department. These men are sometimes called the "peace strategists."

Outside the Government, physicist Hans Bethe, of Cornell, is credited with being the most influential strategist for peace. Dr. Bethe plays a role of unofficial adviser similar to one played by Dr. Edward Teller—exponent of a "hard line" toward Russia—during the Eisenhower administration.

These men are described by military leaders as being extremely influential in altering national strategy.

"NONPROVOCATIVE" ARMS

"In 2 years," explains one military man, "there has emerged in this country a military philosophy developed by civilians that predicts a nuclear standoff—with both United States and Russia possessing absolute ability to destroy the other.

"Arms controllers think the risk of war can be lessened by making our forces 'nonprovocative.' Hardened missiles, to be used only in retaliation, are nonprovocative. But antimissiles are not to be pushed hard because they could only serve to provoke the arms race. Space weapons are very provocative. And bombers must be abandoned because they are good only as a 'first strike' weapon and are therefore extremely provocative.

"If this philosophy is pursued without restraint of any kind on the Russians, the result could be disastrous. You end up with the United States unilaterally disarming itself of everything except Minuteman and Polaris missiles in the strategic field. You assume a lasting stalemate, but this supposes that the Russians are standing still on antimissiles, giant warheads, space weapons. "This is the road to a second-class military posture in just a few years."

An expert on military affairs adds this note:

"The influence of civilian arms controllers has been tremendous and it accounts, in large part, for the defense-only nature of our strategic outlook, our depreciatory attitude toward any thought of winning and our attitude of resignation toward further increases in Russia's relative military position.

"We have a great force today—a superiority. But while enjoying this superiority we are making all kinds of decisions about the future that will reduce our firepower by a very wide percentage. In other words, we are deciding to get along without the vast firepower of bombers, but giving no serious effort to a next generation of weapons to make up the difference."

Civilian arms controllers, brought under fire, reply that they recognize there is a risk involved. But they consider the risk of a continuing arms race to be much greater. The arms race, in their view, can lead either to national bankruptcy or to a war of annihilation.

ADMINISTRATION'S POSITION: U.S. POWER IS GROWING

Secretary McNamara decries the charge that the United States is in any way weakening its defenses. He sees American power growing, not decreasing, in overall effectiveness.

It is a rapid increase in numbers of missiles that gives the administration confidence. As bombers are phased out, new missiles are coming in at the rate of one a day. More than $30 billion has gone into this missile force.

That picture in more detail—

Atlas: A force of 126 Atlas missiles is now in position, all within range of the Soviet heartland. They carry warheads of 4 to 8 megatons. Because some are "soft" and especially vulnerable, and none react instantaneously to firing orders, they will be replaced in another few years.

Titan: Now in "silos" in Western States are 54 Titan I missiles. By the end of the year 54 Titan II's will be added. Titans are America's mightiest missiles, with warheads of close to 20 megatons each. Outlook is for phasing out the slower reacting Titan I and retaining only the instant-firing Titan II.

Minuteman: A first wing of 150 solid-fueled Minutemen is installed in Montana, and others are now going into place in North and South Dakota. By 1966 the United States will possess 950 Minutemen in "hard" sites. The Air Force is asking for several hundred more.

Polaris: The program underway calls for a force of 41 Polaris-firing submarines. Already at sea are 10 of these, with 16 missiles each. By 1967—a total of 656 missiles, ready to be fired from deep under the sea. Advances in warhead technology have increased the punch of both Minuteman and Polaris to more than 1 megaton.

U.S. nuclear forces, it is held, will never lack the power to destroy Russia many times over. This is held true by Mr. McNamara even though the trend is away from bombers and missiles with a "big bang" to Minuteman and Polaris missiles with a relatively "small bang."

Secretary McNamara, at the same time, insists that the security of the United States depends on more than an arsenal of strategic weapons.

He wants a "flexible response" that will enable this country to stand up to a limited-war crisis without having to resort—at the first shot of a rifle—to all-out nuclear warfare.

In recent months, Mr. McNamara points out, there has been an increase of 60 percent in U.S. tactical nuclear forces in Western Europe; a 45 percent increase in combat-ready Army divisions; a 30 percent expansion of the number of Air Force tactical squadrons, and a 200-percent increase in guerrilla-type forces.

Military spending has gone from $41.5 billion in the last year of the Eisenhower administration to $51 billion for the fiscal year just starting.

Cutback of the RS-70, cancellation of Skybolt, withdrawal of bombers were made, administration officials say, not primarily because these weapons are "provocative" or have no usefulness—but because even a $51 billion budget won't buy everything that military men ask for.

A SOVIET THREAT: DANGER OF AN ARMS BREAKTHROUGH

A growing worry to military men is the danger that Russia may be moving faster than the United States toward breakthroughs to new weapons. The main areas of worry:

Antimissile defense: Russia is thought to be spending as much on defenses against missiles as on offensive missiles. At stake is the future effectiveness of virtually the entire U.S. strategic force, if Russia succeeds in perfecting a missile killer.

Superterror weapon: A single 100-megaton warhead dropped on New York would destroy practically everything for roughly 20 miles in all directions and create firestorms and fallout covering whole States. Heavyweight nuclear tests and rocket shots in the Pacific last Autumn indicate the Soviets are developing missiles to carry warheads of mammoth proportions.

THE BIG WORRY NOW—SHRINKING SUPERIORITY OF U.S. POWER

The Russians, it is conceded, already have the capability of orbiting and bringing down hydrogen bombs on targets. Experts say this is an inefficient way to wage war. Others maintain it is just a start—that there is no telling what types of new weapons are being worked on for as yet unknown military use by Soviet Russia.

The United States, by contrast, is described as going slow with weapons of the future that tend to appear speculative and costly. No new strategic-weapons system is under serious development at this time in the United States.

Stefan T. Possony, of Stanford's Hoover Institution, a leading authority on military affairs, claims that America's failure to modernize its weapons places the Nation in danger of a "nuclear and technological Pearl Harbor." Dr. Possony's view, shared by numbers of others, is given in detail in the article appearing immediately below.

Concern, over all, is growing rapidly at this time over the upheaval in U.S. defenses.

America's declining power in relation to Russia is the big worry now.

Another—for the future—is Red China's approaching status as an atomic power. That is just a matter of time. The prospect of a nuclear-armed and unrestrained Red China creates additional concern in a period when the United States appears to many to be cutting back, not beefing up, for danger ahead.

How America's nuclear arsenal is to be "streamlined"

	From this—as planned by the Eisenhower administration for the mid-1960's	To this—as planned by the Kennedy administration for the late 1960's
B-47 bombers	1,100.	0.
B-52 bombers	630.	0.
B-58 bombers	80.	0.
Thor missiles	60.	0.
Jupiter missiles	45.	0.
Atlas missiles	126.	0.
Titan missiles	126.	54.
Polaris missiles	464.	656.
Minuteman missiles	600.	950+.
Nuclear weapons and delivery systems equaling.	30 to 40 billion tons of TNT.	2 billion tons of TNT.

WHY MANY MILITARY MEN ARE CONCERNED

In addition to sharp cutback in available U.S. nuclear punch, there is this fact: No new strategic bomber, missile, or space-weapons system is now under serious development for the late 1960's.

MISSILES—MAINSTAY OF THE FUTURE: HOW RELIABLE ARE THEY?

Test record of long-range U.S. missiles

Missile	Total firings	Complete success	Rate of success (percent)
Atlas	181	130	71.8
Titan	80	56	70.0
Minuteman	48	34	70.8

Source: U.S. Air Force records, through July 18, 1963.

WHAT THE EXPERTS SAY [1]

Adm. George W. Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations: "I have some doubts as to the reliability of the missiles in the period we are talking about. I do not have the same confidence in any of the missile systems as do some of the technicians who attest to the performance of the missiles."

* * * * *

Representative Gerald R. Ford, Republican of Michigan: "Has any one of these three missile systems been tested on site with operational crews, with a nuclear warhead?"

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff: "No."

Representative Ford: "Are any programed?"

General LeMay: "Not with a nuclear warhead. We tried to get authority during the last series of tests to fire an Atlas with a warhead. It was disapproved."

* * * * *

General LeMay:

"A missile is like an airplane. It has a propulsion unit, it has an airframe, and it has a guidance system, and so forth. We know from past experience how much work is necessary to go into an aircraft system to get it reliable enough to guarantee carrying out the mission. We know from thousands and thousands of sorties exactly what the reliability is.

"For instance, in an airplane we have an abort rate of less than 5 percent in carrying out combat missions. With the missile, we will never have the degree of experience that we have with the manned airplane."

* * * * *

Representative Daniel J. Flood, Democrat, of Pennsylvania:

"I am seriously concerned about this problem having to do with the percentage of reliability of all of the ICBM missiles, regardless of which generation.

"The average guy in the street is undoubtedly of the opinion that every missile we have, regardless of sophistication, degree, or generation, or name, is 100 percent operational and 100 percent reliable. This, of course, is not the case."

THE PENTAGON "COURTS DISASTER"

(By Dr. Stefan T. Possony, director of international political studies program, Hoover Institution, Stanford University)

It is being suggested in Washington that a technological plateau has been reached, which allegedly allows us to pause before we decide on acquiring new weapons systems.

Evidence on continuing and accelerating technological advances in the Soviet Union is pooh-poohed systematically or passed over in silence. It may be useful, therefore, to take a short look at some of the weapons which the Soviets seem to be developing in order to insure our "burial."

Chief Marshal of Aviation Konstantine Vershinin has reiterated frequently that, though the decisive role in war henceforth will be played by long-range missiles, no future military operations will be feasible without the participation of large numbers of aircraft. The main role in aviation, according to Vershinin, will be assigned to rocket-carrying bombers capable of striking not only stationary but also moving land and sea targets from a long stand-off range. The Soviet Badger and Bear bombers, which have been overflying our carriers, are known to be equipped with air-to-surface missiles.

Insofar as the Pentagon is concerned, it has canceled our long-range Skybolt missile and would like to kill the RS-70. Our B-52 bombers will be phased out in 1968. Without the RS-70, there will be no replacement.

Chief Marshal Vershinin also disclosed:

"The further perfecting of new types of aircraft is intended to increase their ceilings, speed and range. With this goal in mind, work is being done to create atomic engines."

One of Mr. McNamara's first acts as Secretary of Defense was to cancel the atomic jet engine.

Col. Gen. V. F. Tolubko, First Deputy Commander in Chief of Strategic Rocket Forces, disclosed (February 20, 1963) that the Soviet Union already possesses antimissile defense weapons.

Nevertheless, the Pentagon has put the quietus on the Nike-Zeus system and is now embarked on a substitute project, the Nike-X, which will take many years to complete, and which in the end might not be approved, either.

The well-known aircraft designer Artem Mikoyan predicted a "semicosmic" airplane, with variable-geometry wings, an extended range of several times 100,000 miles, and a speed of 6 to 8 mach.

The Pentagon is most anxious to kill our experimental orbital plane, the X-20 or Dyna-Soar, because it allegedly duplicates a NASA project.

We still are paying lip service to the ridiculous dogma that space is good only for peaceful purposes and we are deflecting most of our massive space budget away from using space as a medium to enhance the security of the United States.

The commander of the Soviet Union's Strategic Rocket Forces, Marshal S. S. Biryuzov, disclosed (Feb. 22, 1963) that it "has now become possible to launch, at a command from earth, rockets from a satellite, and this at any desirable time at any point in the satellite trajectory." Privately, Khrushchev has made a similar statement, although he declared that the first such device developed by the Soviets will not be put in operation because his scientists are working on a better model. The Cosmos series of Soviet-launched satellites—this is the type with which they carried out their first rendezvous experiment—may be related to this development.

Yet the Pentagon continues to insist that it makes no sense to place nuclear bombs into orbit. It even goes so far as to assert that, at the present time, there is no discernible military function in space, not even a need to defend the United States against nuclear weapons which the Soviets might launch from orbital vehicles.

It will be said that statements by Soviet marshals or even Khrushchev are nothing but "Communist propaganda." But experience has proved, time and time again, that the Soviets talk about new weapons systems only when they have such weapons under development. Perhaps the Soviets will prove unable soon to build a nuclear jet engine. Perhaps the semicosmic plane will appear only in 15 or 25 years. There is no question, however, that the orbital bomb is entirely feasible now. And there is no doubt that the Soviets have tested antimissiles and could be deploying them now as an antimissile defense system. Such an initial system might be relatively ineffective, but its propaganda effect would be enormous.

There are a number of additional facts which the Pentagon never disputed but which it is anxious to keep concealed. Colonel General Tolubko derisively compared the biggest American warheads installed in Titan with Soviet missile warheads "whose powers attain 100 megatons." Some skeptics may dispute that the Soviets have 100-megaton warheads now, but hardly any expert denies that their warhead capability is in the 50-megaton range and will reach the 100-megaton level in the future. General Tolubko is absolutely right: Yieldwise, U.S. warheads are limping behind Soviet warheads by one full order of magnitude.

---

[1] From hearings before the House Subcommittee on Defense Department Appropriations.

Yet the Pentagon has announced no decision to correct this deadly deficiency.

Even more frightening is the fact that, according to Lieutenant General of the Air Force N. Sbytov, the Soviets possess a bomb with a yield of 160 megatons. This claim may be somewhat inflated as yet, but, to judge from the Soviet tests of 1961, such a bomb is fully within Soviet capabilities. Our biggest bombs have only about half the yield of the biggest devices tested by the Soviets, and they are smaller than several of the bombs which the Soviets tested during 1962.

As things stand today, the Soviets have tested twice as many high-yield devices as the United States. Hence they should be ahead of us in the technology of high-yield bombs and warheads. In March 1962, this was almost admitted by President Kennedy himself. But, there again, nothing is undertaken to correct the deficiency.

This policy of "no" decisions has been creating almost unmanageable problems for the United States. Under Mr. McNamara's administration, missiles with small rather than large warheads are preferred and bomber aircraft which carry the largest firepower are to be phased out.

By hook or crook we are abandoning the nuclear race.

The pattern has been that, with the exception of a minor beefing-up of our guerrilla capabilities, the ordering of a joint Air Force-Navy fighter, and the contracting of Titan III—not for a military space program but as a "building block," should such a program become necessary in the dim future—Mr. McNamara, during more than 2 years in office, has not authorized a single new weapon system. He is slowing down our technological progress deliberately.

If we allow the Soviets to acquire vastly superior nuclear firepower; if we confront a mixed Soviet strategic force, consisting of missiles as well as aircraft, with only missile force; if we do not have the missile defenses while the Soviets possess a capability to shoot down our missiles; and if the Soviets achieve military space capability against which we cannot defend ourselves and for which we have no offensive equipment—then there is no doubt that we would be defeated or could win only at the price of excessive American casualties.

The fact that we presently are investing in research and development 50 cents for every dollar we are spending on procurement means that we are financing many exploratory research programs. It does not mean that we are modernizing our decisive weapon systems.

Perhaps the philosophy of "the biggest bang for the buck" had its faults. But the present philosophy of "the least bangs for the most bucks" courts disaster. All things considered, it does not look as though, under the stewardship of Robert Strange McNamara, the United States is being equipped to forestall a nuclear and technological Pearl Harbor.

At the same time we are being told to celebrate the test ban treaty, we read Soviet statements of increased strength in their nuclear armed submarines and while we talk of a nonaggression pact American boys are being murdered by Communist aggressors in Korea in clear violation of a treaty.

Whatever aggression there is in the world is being encouraged, in most cases financed and directed by Moscow, and President Kennedy and Mr. Harriman tell us how grateful we should be because Khrushchev is smiling. He should be laughing out loud at our stupidity, at the complete naivete of our leaders. There is no profile of courage in the President's policies in dealing with the Communists; there is only weakness, indecision, fear and confusion which greatly increases the danger of war by miscalculation.

Mr. Harriman admitted at a congressional briefing that United States and Russian views are irreconcilable, that Russia wants the treaty and that we stand to lose nothing. Yet we gain nothing but whatever Khrushchev wants, as to keeping the agreement, since our goals are irreconcilable. We all know Communists have failed to keep 50 of the 53 agreements entered. We also know Mr. Harriman has been a party to many agreements that failed.

The only sure road to peace is in the strength of America and a determined policy which makes it clear that we have the means and the will to defend our freedom and President Kennedy is proving more and more that he is not competent to enunciate or carry out such a policy. Therefore, it is up to Congress to protect the American people against the inadequacies of the Kennedy administration by refusing to go along with policies which border on appeasement and to demand an end to secret deals with the Soviets or agreements dictated by Khrushchev and acceptable only to him.

As a final article I would like to include a UPI news item from the Dallas Morning News of July 29, regarding Soviet boasts of nuclear submarine strength.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, July 29, 1963]

SOVIET NAVAL LEADERS BOAST ABOUT NUCLEAR-ARMED SUBS

MOSCOW.—Top Soviet naval commanders Sunday said the Soviet fleet has been rebuilt around atomic-powered submarines armed with nuclear missiles that could obliterate any target in the world.

The statements came in navy day messages by Fleet Adm. Sergei Gorshkov and Vice Adm. M. Grishanov published in the official Soviet Communist Party newspaper Pravda and the official government publication, Izvestia, respectively.

Gorshkov said aircraft carriers were becoming obsolescent and vulnerable to Russian naval rockets. He derided Western military theoreticians who, he said, "make a fetish" of aircraft carriers.

Just as aircraft carriers replaced battleships, the admiral said in Pravda, aircraft carriers are "increasingly losing their value as compared to the new rocket forces of the modern navy."

In this connection, Gorshkov said Western naval men should not overlook "nuclear warheads that are inevitably delivered to their targets by rockets."

The admiral's remarks, as well as those in a similar vein by other Russian naval officers, were considered standard declarations of strength and readiness on an occasion such as navy day.

But he also stressed that "aggressive intentions are alien to the Soviet Armed Forces."

Soviet naval forces, the admiral said, are capable "of fighting the enemy at great distances from bases, of destroying surface ships and submarines in the ocean, of dealing blows at any targets on the enemy's territory."

Grishanov, writing in Izvestia, said "in recent years as a result of a wide-scale introduction of nuclear rocket weapons our navy has undergone a qualitative change and has become a mighty modern military force."

He said "its basis is submarines armed with powerful nuclear rocket weapons and atomic power installations."

Grishanov added that other arms also have been developed—"a rocket-carrying naval air force and surface craft equipped with rocket weapons."

However, Grishanov added, "the Soviet Union is a peace-loving state. The Navy threatens no one, intimidates no one. It was created for reliable protection of the peace and freedom of peoples from encroachments by zealous enthusiasts for military adventures."

Soviet Defense Minister Marshal Rodion Malinovsky issued an order of the day in which he called on servicemen "to be ever ready to smash any aggressor."

Malinovsky ordered artillery salutes to be fired in Moscow, in the capitals of Soviet Republics, in the "hero cities," and in "the fleets and flotillas," to commemorate navy day.

Mr. Speaker, the Russians will continue to develop their weapons, as they prevent us by treaty from doing the same. Meanwhile, we are reducing and eliminating other weapons systems. After reducing our arms and tying our hands on testing, the only other pact needed is some sort of nonaggression agreement to completely eliminate the United States as a threat while they complete the world takeover without war.

Obviously, at the least, Mr. Harriman, and the President and administration which he represents, has capitulated to "Better Red than dead."

Well, some of us, indeed most Americans I know, put freedom first, then peace. We do not intend to capitulate to Communist demands because of fear of a nuclear holocaust. This attempted blackmail will not intimidate most Americans. It should not scare Mr. Harriman and the President.

We must develop the antimissile missile and continue our advance research and development of weapons. Under no circumstances should we disarm or tie our hands. We must not approve this nuclear test ban.

BONNEVILLE INVADES SOUTHERN IDAHO

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the eighth of a series of articles entitled "Bonneville's Multimillion-Dollar Annual Losses and Areas of Substantial and

Persistent Unemployment Are Not Wanted in Southern Idaho."

In fairness to my colleagues and others who have been following this series of articles, I feel an explanation is in order relative to the change in the heading. Here is the story. Yesterday, July 30, 1963, I was informed by the gentleman from southern Idaho [Mr. HARDING] that the heading on my earlier articles, "Southern Idaho's New Slogan: 'Bonneville—Please Include Us Out'," was personally offensive to him.

Actually, the slogan "Bonneville—Please Include Us Out," was not my own composition but was coined from a remark made by a southern Idahoan who has no connection whatsoever with the power companies. The slogan immediately appealed to me. However, I shall respect my colleague's delicacy of feeling and change the heading of this and future articles on the same subject from "Southern Idaho's New Slogan: 'Bonneville—Please Include Us Out'," to "Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho."

I only wish the gentleman from southern Idaho had been as considerate of my feelings before he went ahead with his attack on me in his speech to the House on July 25, 1963, after having been advised only 30 minutes earlier by my office that I was out of the office and could not be reached until around 5 o'clock.

According to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the proceedings for July 25, 1963, the gentleman from southern Idaho was joined by the gentleman from northern Idaho in expressing their objection to my speech in this House on July 8, 1963, and to this series of articles on why there is widespread opposition in southern Idaho to the unwarranted and untenable action of Secretary of Interior Udall in extending the Bonneville power-marketing area into southern Idaho.

I do not question the right of my colleagues to differ with my position on the matter. But I am a firm believer in Bernard Baruch's famous remark:

> Every man has a right to his opinion but no man has a right to be wrong in his facts.

My colleague says that through my speech of July 8, 1963, and my series of articles that I am, and I quote:

> Attempting to give my colleagues in the Congress the impression that the people of Idaho do not approve of the executive order of Secretary Udall which included southern Idaho in the BPA marketing area.

He then goes on to say:

> This is simply not true. However, the thing that I object to the most about this current series of articles by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is the title which he is giving them: "Southern Idaho's New Slogan: 'Bonneville—Please Include Us Out.'"

"Let's look at the record." As ranking minority member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee I feel I have a right and a duty to expose and oppose the actions of the Secretary of the Interior when I believe, as I do in this case, that such action is unjustified, unwarranted, and inimical to the best interest of the country as a whole and to the area involved. This extension of Bonneville's socialistic Federal power empire into southern Idaho by executive fiat is not the American way of doing business. This invasion of an area well served by a taxpaying utility, at reasonable rates considerably below the national average, is indefensible.

I am not, as my colleague charges, "attempting" to give the impression that the people of Idaho do not approve Secretary Udall's action. On the contrary, my articles constitute a solid factual presentation black on white of the articles, editorials, and letters from southern Idaho which express widespread and continuing opposition to the extension of the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho. I leave it up to my other colleagues to judge whether these articles, editorials, and letters from southern Idaho present valid opposition to Secretary Udall's action or whether, as the gentleman from southern Idaho says, "This is simply not true."

When the Idaho Farm Bureau Federation with a membership of some 12,000 farm families advises committees of Congress of its emphatic opposition; when the president of the Idaho State reclamation expresses his opposition; when the Payette Chamber of Commerce passes a unanimous resolution opposing Secretary Udall's order; when a veritable deluge of editorials express emphatic opposition to Bonneville, I am sure my colleagues from Idaho would like to close their eyes and dismiss all these concrete evidences of opposition with the phrase, "This is simply not true." I suggest they open their eyes and take heed of actuality.

The gentleman from southern Idaho said in his speech in the House that the thing he objects to the most is the heading of my articles, "Southern Idaho's New Slogan: 'Bonneville—Please Include Us Out.'" As I noted earlier, in view of the fact that the gentleman considers this heading personally offensive I have changed the heading, even though it was coined from a remark made by a southern Idahoan who has no connection whatsoever with the power companies.

Another example of the failure of my colleagues from Idaho to do their homework properly is in regard to the following colloquy on page 13375 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where the gentleman from southern Idaho asked the gentleman from northern Idaho:

> I would like to ask my colleague at this point, "Do you know of any elected official in the State of Idaho in either party who has been critical to the point of demanding that the Bonneville Power Administration not include southern Idaho in its marketing area?"

And the gentleman from northern Idaho replied:

> I will say to the gentleman I know of no such elected individual in the State of Idaho who has been so critical.

In closing his speech the gentleman from southern Idaho said:

> Elected officials in Idaho who have not supported BPA have remained on the fence or remained silent on this great issue.

"Let's take a look at the record." An article in the Idaho Daily Statesman for March 15, 1963, disclosed that 34 Idaho State representatives and 19 Idaho State senators had signed a letter to Secretary Udall protesting most emphatically against the extension of the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho. The article quoting the letter is as follows:

LETTER HITS SOUTH IDAHO BPA POWER—REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF HOUSE, SENATE PROTEST EXPANSION

> Republican members of the Idaho Legislature have signed a letter protesting the proposed expansion of the Bonneville Power Administration into southern Idaho, Representative W. Larry Mills, Republican, of Ada, said Thursday.
>
> Mills said the letter was sent to Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall and that he was advised any expansion of BPA powerlines into southern Idaho was "unnecessary, wasteful, and a threat to the sound economy of Idaho."
>
> "The letter was signed by 34 GOP representatives and by 19 of the 23 Republican State senators," Mills said.
>
> Several weeks ago, it was announced that the Democratic members of the legislature had signed a petition asking Udall to extend the BPA marketing area into southern Idaho.
>
> The letter to Udall reads:
>
> "We are greatly concerned about the welfare of Idaho reclamation, present and future, in which the Bureau of Reclamation, an agency of the Interior Department, has for so many years been a soundly constructive partner with State agencies and thousands of irrigators in reclaiming desert lands, making them into productive farms and homesites. In southern Idaho, nothing is more valuable to the economy than irrigated agriculture.
>
> "For more than half a century the Bureau of Reclamation has worked and built solidly. From the beginning it has found ways to make hydroelectric power a paying partner of reclamation projects across the State. The feasibility of many projects would have been affected, and their chances of congressional approval for authorization and appropriations almost nil, without the use of maximum power revenues to reduce the obligation of irrigators.
>
> "Now, the proposal before you is to supplant the Bureau of Reclamation as the marketing agent for reclamation power, replacing it in this role by the Bonneville Power Administration. The damage to be done to reclamation by this action arises from the fact that the Bureau of Reclamation's power sales provide revenues to assist irrigation projects whereas Bonneville Power Administration rates do not.
>
> "Assurances that Bonneville's gross revenues would somehow be used to protect reclamation and 'keep it whole' have a hollow sound in view of Bonneville's admitted operating deficits over the past 5 years. Irrigation assistance can't come from operating deficits.
>
> "And what of reclamation's future in southern Idaho? When a new reclamation project, soundly conceived and worthwhile in purpose, is submitted for congressional approval and appropriations, what will be its chances when deprived of maximum power revenues as afforded by the Bureau of Reclamation's present resale rates? Bonneville power might well prove to be a millstone around the neck of every future reclamation project in Idaho.
>
> "The introduction of Bonneville power, which pays no taxes, into southern Idaho would have a debilitating and possibly devastating effect upon every taxing district affected. The effect would be translated into higher taxes levied against the overwhelming majority of taxpayers in order to make tax-free power available to a handful. This is diametrically opposite from the unanimous expression of the Idaho Legislature this year to foster a good business climate and to encourage equity and fair dealing among all segments of the Idaho economy.

> "It is obvious that the case for Bonneville power rests upon subsidy, a subsidy provided by taxpayers. This is a peculiarly vulnerable point to members of the Idaho Legislature, whose prime concern lies in financing the pressing requirements of State government and of the public schools.
>
> "We, the undersigned members of the Idaho Legislature, protest the proposed expansion of Bonneville Power Administration into southern Idaho as unnecessary, wasteful and a threat to the sound economy of Idaho."

I have in my office a photostatic copy of the letter referred to and the 53 signatures thereto.

The most charitable conclusion I can make is to assume that the gentlemen from Idaho were not aware of these expressions of opposition from 34 Idaho State representatives—including the speaker of the house—and 19 Idaho State senators.

One thing that stands out in the speech of my colleagues from Idaho and some of the others who took part in the discussion, is the reference to the "people of Idaho" rather than to the "people of southern Idaho," who are the subject of my articles. For instance, the gentleman from northern Idaho whose district has mostly been in the Bonneville power marketing area for years says:

> A sprinkling of editorials is presented to the Congress as an accurate representation of Idahoans' convictions concerning BPA. In order to correct this inaccurate portrayal of my constituents' consensus, I hereby offer an example of a more accurate expression of their opinion by Mr. Sam Day of the Lewiston Morning Tribune.

This was followed by an extended editorial from this northern Idahoan paper, supporting Secretary Udall's action. Perhaps misery likes company and these north Idahoans want to share Bonneville's multimillion-dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment with their southern brethren.

The gentleman from southern Idaho inserted in his remarks a letter to the editor signed by a Mr. Hal Baker, saying that he did not know Mr. Baker but complimented him on his knowledge and his courage. I do not know Mr. Baker either, but an analysis of his letter discloses no basis for complimenting him on his knowledge or courage. Mr. Baker speaks of BPA being ahead of schedule on payout and says:

> Private power companies constructed powerplants to displace purchases from BPA which during the past 5 years has had $125 million worth of unsold power, that the private power companies could have bought all they needed at cost less than at their own plants.

Actually, on a proper payout and interest cost basis, BPA even now is millions of dollars behind schedule. Here is an excerpt from page 652 of the House hearings on public works appropriations for 1963:

> Mr. Jensen. Mr. Luce, last year you told us that you were ahead of schedule on payout on June 30, 1960, by $53,056,573. With your indicated deficit of $15,271,834 for fiscal year 1961 and an estimated deficit of $18 million for fiscal year 1962 and $13,400,000 for fiscal year 1963, you will, at the end of fiscal year 1963 be down to around $6.4 million above the required payout under 2.5 percent interest rate.
>
> Of course, as you agreed last year, if you used an interest rate of 3 or 4 percent, which is more in keeping with the present cost on long-term money, the payout schedule would be considerably in the red. On a 4-percent interest basis, the deficit would be in excess of $100 million by the end of fiscal year 1963.

With regard to the purported $125 million worth of unsold BPA power, almost all such BPA power has been surplus or dump power that is of no value to any utility for serving their regular load. The record also shows that nearly all of the aluminum plants that use such a large share of the BPA power made substantial curtailment in the purchase of interruptible or dump power from BPA during this 5-year period. Here is what Mr. Luce, BPA Administrator said about it on page 648 of House hearings on the public works appropriation for 1963:

> A third reason, a third explanation of why our revenues have not been increasing as they should, is the fact that the aluminum industry in the Pacific Northwest has had substantial idle capacity. For instance, this year, had aluminum been operating at 100 percent of capacity, our revenues would have been some $8 million more than they were. In terms of power they could have used about 400,000 kilowatts of this secondary power more than they did.

Furthermore, planned new construction of aluminum plants, a new steel mill and other industrial expansion for which Bonneville had made firm power commitments has failed to materialize. Another factor in Bonneville's multimillion dollar annual losses and failure to dispose of all its potential dump power was Bonneville's refusal to sell large blocks of dump power to California utilities.

I note that my colleague from southern Idaho accuses the private utilities in that area of "spending thousands and thousands of dollars to put forth a barrage of newspaper advertisements containing distortions, half-truths, exaggerations and outright falsehoods." I am wondering if this accusation is based on any more solid ground than the reference to the position of the elected officials of Idaho on the Bonneville power market extension into southern Idaho.

I shall continue my series of articles on southern Idaho's opposition to Bonneville as long as that opposition continues; that is, if Congress stays in session that long.

BOWNE HOUSE—A NATIONAL SHRINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of this House to a joint resolution which I introduced today calling for the recognition of a most significant landmark, the Bowne House in Flushing, N.Y., as a national shrine. Identical resolutions have been offered in the other body by the distinguished Senators from New York, Mr. Keating and Mr. Javits.

This house, an outstanding example of early Dutch architecture, was built in 1661 by John Bowne who played an historic role in the early fight for religious freedom in the New World.

In such times as these, when we are so arduously seeking tolerance on many frontiers, it is only fitting that this house, which symbolizes John Bowne's renowned fight for the establishment of religious tolerance be designated as a national shrine so that all who look upon it will remember the great concept of religious liberty it symbolizes.

It is significant to point out that the roots of religious freedom in America were established in Flushing over a hundred years before our Bill of Rights. In 1657 the people of Flushing signed the Flushing Remonstrance which attacked the religious intolerance of Gov. Peter Stuyvesant. These brave people were then thrown in jail by the Government. It was not until 1664 when John Bowne successfully pleaded the case for religious freedom that the hopes of the Remonstrance actually came to full bloom. In this house John Bowne was arrested for defying the Governor's edict that forbade freedom by allowing Quakers to worship there. John Bowne was jailed and exiled for this offense. After several years away from his family and having successfully pleaded his cause before the authorities in Holland, he returned to his home. This, therefore, marked the establishment of the principle of true freedom as embodied a century later in the first article of the Bill of Rights.

A dedicated group of citizens recognizing the tremendous significance of this historic site organized the Bowne House Historical Society in 1945. While significant recognition has come to the house and it has long been considered a national shrine of religious freedom, this has all been unofficial. It has still to be officially designated by our Government as a national shrine. That is the objective of the goal Senator Keating and I have been seeking through the Department of the Interior which approves such designations.

The Department has advised us that Bowne House is included as one of the many sites being considered in its national survey but that the report will not be completed until 1964. There is considerable basis to urge separate and earlier action in this instance. It is still not certain that the report will be ready by late 1964. And, even if it does make a favorable recommendation regarding Bowne House it may prove to be too late to properly plan the 300th anniversary of John Bowne's success gaining religious liberty from Holland for the colonists in the New World. Another important reason for urging early action is the fact that the New York World's Fair will open in April of 1964 and hundreds of thousands of people, even millions from all over the world will visit the fair site in Flushing Meadows only a short distance from the Bowne House.

Most considerations for national shrine recognition are based on the site's architectural values. This house unquestionably qualifies under this standard. But, our appeal for recognition is based on even broader reasonings. Its religious significance, I believe, gives it a unique distinction, surely worthy of particular consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the resolution, which was prepared with the cooperation of the board of trustees of the Bowne House Historical Society, will win quick committee and floor approval. The full text follows:

Whereas by the Flushing Remonstrances of 1657, the freeholders of Flushing in defiance of measures of religious persecution undertaken by Gov. Peter Stuyvesant, insisted on the right to have and enjoy liberty of conscience and to welcome in their homes "any sons of Adam who come in love among us;" and

Whereas Bowne House was constructed in 1661 from timbers hand hewn by John Bowne who moved to Flushing in his determination to find a community and a home where he could worship God according to his convictions; and

Whereas despite the promise of religious liberty originally contained in the charter of the town of Flushing, John Bowne was arrested in 1662 and fined with a warning to abstain in future from religious meetings of the Society of Friends; and

Whereas he was transported to Holland for further sentencing and offered such an eloquent plea for tolerance and liberty of conscience that he was released, the governing body of the province declaring that "the consciences of men, at least, ought to remain free;" and

Whereas the trial and acquittal of John Bowne is one of the landmarks of religious freedom in this Nation, comparable to the trial of John Peter Zenger in the history of freedom of the press, one of the stepping stones that led to the drafting of the Bill of Rights in the U.S. Constitution; and

Whereas Bowne House, in which the prescribed religious meetings were held, was acquired by the Bowne House Historical Society in 1945 in celebration of the tercentenary of the community of Flushing, dedicated by Mayor Fiorello La Guardia on October 10, 1945, as a national shrine to religious freedom and tolerance, and opened to the public on Independence Day, 1947; and

Whereas Bowne House today stands with much of its original construction and with contemporary furnishings intact and has been designated in the journal of the American Institute of Architects as one of the twenty "structures of national importance in New York City which should be preserved at all costs": Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to provide, with the consent of the Bowne House Historical Society, for appropriate recognition by the Federal Government of the national historical and architectural significance of the Bowne House, Flushing, N.Y.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. VINSON, for 10 days, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RYAN of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. COLLIER), for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MULTER in two instances.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GIAIMO in two instances.

Mr. MOSS.

Mr. HANNA.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COLLIER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. JOHANSEN in two instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1642. An act to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, to extend disclosure requirements to the issuers of additional publicly traded securities, to provide for improved qualification and disciplinary procedures for registered brokers and dealers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 1, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1085. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the inadequate administration of military budget support funds provided to Iran under the foreign assistance program; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1086. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, relative to furnishing certain information on research grants awarded by the Agricultural Research Service during fiscal year 1963, pursuant to Public Law 85-934, dated September 6, 1958; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 6997. A bill to provide for a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated national program in oceanography, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 621). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 467. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 7500, a bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 623). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of Committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. Senate Joint Resolution 51. Joint resolution to authorize the presentation of an Air Force Medal of Recognition to Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, retired; without amendment (Rept. No. 622). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 7846. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 7847. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 7848. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special U.S. postage stamp in commemoration of the crusade against cancer; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 7849. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 7850. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 7851. A bill to provide that certain activities of nonprofit blood banks and of physicians and pathologists undertaken to protect the health of recipients of blood and blood plasma shall not be deemed to be acts in restraint of trade under laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 7852. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7853. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 7854. A bill to provide for an increase in the maximum amount of insurance coverage for bank deposits and savings and loan accounts, to protect further the safety and liquidity of insured institutions, to strengthen safeguards against conflicts of interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7855. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7856. A bill to authorize the transmission in the mails of lottery tickets and other matter relating to a lottery operated by a State or political subdivision thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 7857. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to require that motion pictures photographed outside the United States, and any advertisements thereof, shall set forth the country of origin; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 7858. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7859. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 7860. A bill to authorize an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $50,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed national parkway in the States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York from the vicinity of Stroudsburg, Pa., northeast to Kingston, N.Y.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 7861. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to make more specific the purpose for which loans may be made under sections 2 and 4 of such act, and to modify the provisions relating to interest rates on loans made under such act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 7862. A bill to prohibit the use of measuring or timing devices to measure the work of an individual employee in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 7863. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to require that motion pictures photographed outside the United States, and any advertisements thereof, shall set forth the country of origin; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.J. Res. 592. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 593. Joint resolution providing for appropriate Federal recognition of the Bowne House, Flushing, N.Y.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.J. Res. 594. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONAS:

H.J. Res. 595. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the offering of prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD (by request):

H.J. Res. 596. Joint resolution to guarantee to displaced businesses of the Southwest waterfront, District of Columbia, their prior rights to resettlement in that area; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.J. Res. 597. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.J. Res. 598. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.J. Res. 599. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.J. Res. 600. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.J. Res. 601. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.J. Res. 602. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.J. Res. 603. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve and protect references to reliance upon God in governmental matters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.J. Res. 604. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Flaming Gorge Dam, Utah, as "Ashley Lake"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. Con. Res. 210. Expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the matter of general disarmament and arms control; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 7864. A bill for the relief of Margaret Feldstein, nee Koffler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H.R. 7865. A bill for the relief of Francisca Cueto-Martinez de Maturana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 7866. A bill for the relief of Max Kahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 7867. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo, Clelia Pitta, and Giovanna Branchinelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 7868. A bill for the relief of Rocco Maiorano, Gerarda Maiorano, Alfred Maiorano, and Anna Maiorano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of Michigan:

H.R. 7869. A bill for the relief of Dimitra Irini Dimitroulias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 7870. A bill for the relief of Pa Ho Hsu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 7871. A bill for the relief of Tam Wai King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Shakespeare Summer Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most enjoyable evenings of theater that Washington has ever offered is the Shakespeare Summer Festival presentation of "Much Ado About Nothing" at the Sylvan Theater. The performances are uniformly excellent, the costumes are enchanting, the setting is superb, the lighting and musical effects are magnificent—in short, the entire production is a sheer delight.

Shakespeare's crisp and witty play is a perfect vehicle for the versatile cast and their virtually ideal setting. I should add that another of this production's virtues is the fact that there is no admission charge, thanks to the sponsoring organizations, the Department of the Interior, and the District of Columbia Recreation Department. The polished, professional touch, however, was made possible by the liberal financial support from many private organizations and individuals.

The Sylvan Theater, at the foot of the Washington Monument, is the perfect spot for such a performance, and Ellie Chamberlain, the producer, and Director Don Driver have utilized every natural and technical advantage at their disposal. I would also like to commend the exceptional cast, headed by Marian Mercer, and Robert Mandan.

Since the opening night, July 13, thousands of District residents and tourists have flocked to the theater. The weather has been ideal, the reviews were excellent, and I understand that the attendance has averaged 1,500 per performance.

Unhappily, "Much Ado About Nothing" will run through August 11 only. It is seldom that the public is treated to such a thoroughly delightful theatrical experience, and I urge my colleagues, and all others who have the opportunity, to make every effort to attend one of the final performances. It is a rare opportunity and one which should not be missed.

I hope that next year Mrs. Chamberlain and her deft, magic touch will again turn the Sylvan Theater into Washington's most popular attraction. She is to be commended for her vision and imagination. Washington is indeed fortunate to have the benefit of her talents.

Nuclear Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the preliminary negotiations have been, in the view of Mr. Harriman and his English counterpart, successfully concluded. They do not mark as the President has so rightfully expressed anything like "peace in our times" a phrase with some unfortunate history. The test ban now accomplished is to the British observer like the girl who has awaited overlong a proposal and is therefore not the catch she once was. One southerner I know said the treaty negotiation results reminded him of the story of the rebel holdout in the War Between the States who held off a Yankee patrol for about a week from a hillside cave. Finally out of food, out of water, out of ammunition, and out of spunk, the rebel's stronghold was finally and successfully rushed and when the Union sergeant towered over the emaciated holdout and shouted "We got ya reb." He replied, "Yeah, and a helluva gettin' ya got."

Well, regardless of the appraisal of what kind of "a gettin' we got" in this proposed test ban and giving due credence to the validity of calls for caution in affirmatively counting on any presentments by Khrushchev this much is to be said: the continuing, jointly expressed compassion for a world divided against itself is not a very satisfactory substitute for some affirmative action, however limited. Unless and until the two major camps in this division can weld one or two points of agreement the bridge across the schisms of doctrines and interest that now are so wide and deep will not start abuilding. The peace that is war will remain with the ever-present threat that it could start on the escalator to the nuclear weapon.

The debate in the Senate will run a heavy tide of reasons why we dare not sign this treaty. Any person even slightly informed or aware of our past disappointments would have to admit to some risks involved in the signing. But it is our belief that the greatest risk we take in this small step is one of complete disappointment by Khrushchev's failure to honor the pact. We know of this risk going in. Can we not therefore in the face of possible improvement hope that we can change from a peace that is war to a peace that is conflict, realizing that even this degree of change could be for the better and provide a possible beginning for a bridge that ultimately must be built.

Eleventh Anniversary of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express thanks to the Members of the House and Senate who spoke in the respective Chambers, or elsewhere, in commemorating the 11th anniversary of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

I regret most exceedingly that the extreme demands on my time because of pressing legislative work on July 25, prevented me from appearing in this Chamber to invite you personally to join in observing the Commonwealth's birthday.

As you may know, on the occasion of the 11th anniversary of the founding of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT spoke to the people of Puerto Rico, in San Juan, as the personal representative of the President of the United States and as an old friend returning to Puerto Rico to join in anniversary festivities. The people of Puerto Rico felt deeply honored by the visit of the distinguished Senator on this very important occasion.

I am sure that my distinguished colleagues will find in Senator FULBRIGHT's speech, which I include here, genuine appreciation of Puerto Rico's progress on many fronts and of Puerto Rico's inspiration to the inter-American community:

TEXT OF AN ADDRESS DELIVERED JULY 25 BY SENATOR J. W. FULBRIGHT IN SAN JUAN, P.R., MARKING THE 11TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RATIFICATION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH

Governor Muñoz-Marín and distinguished guests, it is a great honor to represent the President of the United States on this memorable occasion and to bring to your Governor and the Puerto Rican people his cordial greetings and best wishes. It also gives me great personal satisfaction to return as an old friend who deeply admires the outstanding record which Puerto Rico has made as a progressive, forward-looking community of fellow citizens engaged in the vital task of making democracy work in this part of the world.

Eleven years ago the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was proclaimed. The Constitution was conceived by Puerto Rican minds and drafted by Puerto Rican hands. It expressed noble intentions and great ideals. It devised one of the most enlightened systems of representative democracy in this hemisphere, looking forward to a period of social and economic achievement within an institutional framework deeply responsive to the people's will. It proudly inserted in its preamble its "loyalty to the value of the human being regardless of social position, racial differences, and economic interests; and the hope for a better world based on these principles."

In the past 11 years Puerto Rico has matched the inspired words of its Constitution with inspired deeds. It has shown that democratic ideals can be translated into great achievements by resolute and imaginative effort, by hard work and a dedication to self-help. The record is here for all to see. It is a sober, dramatic, unassailable record which should give renewed hope and confidence to the people of this island as they prepare for the tasks ahead.

In many fields Puerto Rico has become the model and pioneer for the Western Hemisphere. When the American Republics met at Punta del Este, Uruguay, in the summer of 1961, the task they undertook was nothing less than the charting of a new course for the people of the new hemisphere. In the words of the "Declaration to the Peoples of America," which was there adopted, the Alliance for Progress was to be founded "on the basic principle that free men working through the institution of representative democracy can best satisfy man's aspirations, including those for work, home and land, health, and schools." The declaration added, "no system can guarantee true progress unless it affirms the dignity of the individual which is the foundation of our civilization."

This declaration, as well as the Charter of Punta del Este, summarized the aspirations of the peoples of Latin America for a better life and a better world. The documents framed at Punta del Este envisaged a peaceful, democratic revolution based on self-help measures and free external assistance. To these objectives the United States has pledged its wholehearted support.

It is altogether fitting and proper on the occasion of this community celebration to point out how Puerto Rico, by its own self-help measures, by its wise and imaginative use of all available resources—including its trade relationship with the mainland United States—has actually pioneered in many of the areas of social and economic development to which the Alliance for Progress is dedicated.

The Charter of Punta del Este looks forward to a rate of economic growth in Latin America of not less than 2.5 percent per capita per year. Puerto Rico has achieved a current growth rate of nearly 5 percent per capita per year—one of the highest in the Western World. This increase in productivity has been accompanied by a substantial effort to make available the benefits of economic progress to all the citizens of the Commonwealth. This, of course, is one of the basic objectives of the Charter of Punta del Este. The growth of purchasing power and economic well-being among all sectors of the population of the island has been achieved through farsighted legislative and executive action and through the growth of enlightened labor-management relations. Puerto Rico ranks only after Great Britain, Canada, and the mainland United States in the percentage of national income that goes to wage earners in the form of salaries and services. The progress of the Commonwealth is truly a striking example of democratic achievement.

The reform that Puerto Rico undertook of its tax laws, its efforts to avoid tax evasion and to provide the basis for an efficient public administration, committed to honest government and the general welfare, are other signal landmarks in the Commonwealth's success. These achievements, far more than noble words and intentions, are a living inspiration for other countries now struggling to modernize their political and economic institutions.

At Punta del Este the Latin American Republics committed themselves to national development programs based on self-help and the choice of basic priorities for the promotion of human and material progress. This is one of the fields in which Puerto Rico has been a pioneer for the Americas. Economic planning in Puerto Rico has involved both Government action and effective private participation. It has been democratic planning at its best, conducted largely on the municipal and local level. It has generated a sense of common purpose in the community effort, a sense of confidence and hope for the future. It has created a generation of planners, many of whom are now lending their experience and techniques to other governments as well as to international institutions.

A land of meager natural resources with neither coal nor oil, with no important mineral deposits and with limited forest preserves, Puerto Rico has demonstrated that human resources and dignity can overcome the obstacles of nature. Largely through judicious fiscal and trade relationships with the continental United States, the Commonwealth has created a favorable industrial climate and achieved an amazing expansion in its manufacturing activities. The basic source of these accomplishments is the initiative and vision of the people of Puerto Rico. The creative, enterprising spirit of the present generation of Puerto Ricans has produced in a single decade of effort one of the world's most successful development programs. The Puerto Rican story is uniquely one of the triumphs of human resources over natural obstacles.

As in other fields, Puerto Rico has become a model for all Latin America in dealing with the difficult problems of land reform. Puerto Rico has left far behind its heritage of a one-crop economy and has moved ahead with its own agrarian reform. Agriculture has been greatly diversified, as exemplified by the striking growth of the poultry and livestock industries during the last decade and the considerable expansion of the production of fruits and vegetables for the domestic market. The resettlement of 73,000 families on their own plots, with essential community service available, is a striking illustration of the Commonwealth's concern for the welfare of the campesino and his family. And this has been achieved in the best democratic manner with neither social upheaval nor loss of productivity.

At Punta del Este, the inter-American community wisely stressed the improvement of human resources and the widening of educational and cultural opportunities as a key priority target of the Alliance for Progress. Investment in education was rightly considered to be a preeminent factor in national development.

Of all the achievements of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, none is more impressive, or more encouraging, than its progress in the field of education. The Puerto Rican people have clearly understood that the acquisition of knowledge and skills is the indispensable prerequisite to economic improvement and spiritual fulfillment. The wiping out of illiteracy and the availability of primary education for all children of school age—two basic targets of the Charter of Punta del Este—are close to being accomplished realities on this island. Progress in higher education has made Puerto Rico a center of learning for the entire Caribbean area.

Nor has education been limited to the schoolroom: vocational training has been extended to the community and put to work as a basic factor in community development. In its emphasis on vocational training—which is probably the most neglected field of education in the United States—Puerto Rico is setting a valuable example, not only for Latin America, but for the continental United States as well. This pioneering spirit in so many fields has turned Puerto Rico into a laboratory of social experiment and creativity. Both in symbol and in substance, this island is an eminently suitable training ground for the young men and women of the Peace Corps. On this island the Peace Corps trainee is able to see the benefits and the promise of self-help as living, growing realities.

As Governor Muñoz-Marín pointed out a few years ago, "There has been nothing automatic about Puerto Rico's progress to date. Only hard, uphill work has brought it about."[1] The success of the Puerto Rican people in their hard, uphill effort has commanded the respect of their fellow citizens in the United States and of the entire free world. On this occasion of its 11th anniversary, the Commonwealth is entitled to take great pride in its achievements and in its prospects. When one contemplates the poverty, the illiteracy, the social injustice and the political instability which afflict so much of the world today, it is natural to wonder why, in contrast to the world about her, Puerto Rico has been so successful.

After 20 years of political experience, it is my conviction that one of the indispensable and most significant ingredients of your success is the discriminating judgment which you have repeatedly shown in the selection of your chief executive, the Governor. As free citizens of this Commonwealth, you have exercised the power of the franchise responsibly and intelligently, for which you are to be commended most highly.

It is my privilege today to convey to the Puerto Rican people the admiration and regard of all Americans for their progress toward the goal defined by Gov. Muñoz-Marín as a society based on the "maximum respect for that minimum minority which is the individual."[2]

To Authorize the Mailing of Lottery Tickets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday July 31, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 7856, which would authorize the transmission through the mails of lottery tickets and other material relating to a lottery operated by a State or political subdivision thereof.

I have introduced this bill because I believe that the Federal law prohibiting the transmission through the mails of lottery information should be amended so as to exclude State and local governments.

I am very much in favor of the recent action of the New Hampshire State Legislature in establishing a State lottery for the purposes of raising revenue to provide that State with more and better schools and hospitals and public debt amortization.

Governor King and the people of New Hampshire are to be congratulated for adopting a sensible solution to some of the fiscal problems facing all of our State and local governments.

As an example of the kind of proposal which would be possible if my bill were adopted, I would cite the resolution put before the New York City Council by Councilman Morris Stein which would provide for the sale of non-interest-bearing bonds by the city of New York with a substantial prize if the purchaser's bond number is picked in a lottery. If the New York State law is amended to permit this, the lifting of the Federal prohibition would aid greatly in the sale of such bonds.

New Chairman Discusses Role of the House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of last week, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, Hon. Edwin E. Willis, the new chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, delivered two outstanding addresses in New Orleans, La., in which he discussed the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The first of these addresses was delivered before the annual convention of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation and dealt particularly with the role of the Committee in relation to national security.

Both because of the important subject matter of this address and because it reflects the broad viewpoint and philosophy which Mr. Willis brings to his new and heavy responsibilities as chairman of the committee, I am happy to include the address in the Record. I hope it will receive the thoughtful attention of all our colleagues:

The Committee and National Security

(By Representative Edwin E. Willis, Democrat, of Louisiana)

I would first like to say how pleased I am to be here in New Orleans to address you, the delegates to the annual convention of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, your friends, and distinguished guests. I love Washington, but I love Louisiana—the grassroots of America and its people—more. It is always a pleasure for me to return to my home State, to meet and talk with its people, to get down to earth again—if I may use that phrase—after some time in the rarified atmosphere of Washington.

It was most fortunate that I was able to be here for the presentation of your Freedom Awards. I say with all sincerity that it has been inspiring to be a witness to this program, to see the awards being given, to know that many Americans are devoting themselves, their time and effort to their country. It is heartening to know that organizations such as the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation are alert and perceptive enough to encourage and award those who work for freedom's cause.

My congratulations to each of the award winners—and to you, the members of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, for initiating this program. I hope you will continue it for many years to come.

Freedom is everybody's job. It is the job of farmers, the job of educators, the job of clergy, the job of Members of Congress—and of every man and woman in our country. This morning, I have seen something of what the people of Louisiana are doing for freedom. I think, therefore, that it would be appropriate for me to tell you something of what the Congress and, more particularly, the Committee on Un-American Activities, is doing for this same cause.

---

[1] Luis Muñoz-Marín. "Puerto Rico Does Not Want To Be a State," New York Times magazine, Aug. 16, 1959.

[2] Godkin Lecture, Harvard University, Apr. 28, 1959.

Early this year the House of Representatives voted overwhelmingly not only to continue the Committee on Un-American Activities, but to give it the largest appropriation it has ever had. As the newly elected chairman of the committee, by the unanimous vote of the House, I assure you that I will do all in my power to see that the funds appropriated to the committee will be well spent, that any unneeded funds will be returned to the House, and that I will do all I can to see that the committee is strengthened in every way possible and its life continued for as long as it is needed.

Why do we need the committee? Why has the House, for 25 years, voted funds for its continuing operations?

It is because the House knows—just as you and I do—that freedom in every part of the globe is today challenged by the most deadly enemy it has known since the dawn of civilization. That enemy, the world Communist movement, has fifth columns in over 80 nations of the world, including these United States. The aim of this movement is to seize control of the entire earth. It uses every conceivable weapon to achieve that aim—military forces, espionage, sabotage, terrorism, treachery, deceit, and infiltration into governmental and other groups. This is the finding of the Congress of the United States. It is a finding that has been upheld by the Supreme Court.

We know that we must build and maintain powerful military forces to protect this country from the tremendous military might created by the forces of world communism. By the same token, we know, too, that because Soviet leaders openly proclaim that the United States is their No. 1 enemy—and because they have a fifth column within our border—that we must have adequate internal safeguards. That, basically, is why the House continues its Committee on Un-American Activities.

What is the Committee on Un-American Activities? And what is its function?

Is it a spy-catching agency? No, that is the job of the FBI which has the responsibility of collecting evidence against those who break our Federal security laws, though the hearings of the committee have actually assisted them in this respect. The committee is not a counter-espionage agency, though it has uncovered some spies.

Is the committee supposed to convict people of being Communists or violating security laws? Again, the answer is "No." The committee is not a prosecuting agency like the Department of Justice. Nor is it a court of law, set up to pass judgment on legal guilt or innocence. Again, however, the committee's investigations and hearings, through the facts which they develop, are helpful in this connection.

What then is the committee and what is its function, if it is not supposed to catch spies or convict Communists?

Stated simply, it is the eyes and ears—and the principal legislative advisor of the House of Representatives—on matters concerning subversion and internal security.

It is a nine-member, standing committee of the House, commissioned to investigate subversive activities and propaganda within this country—whether of foreign or domestic origin—and to report its findings to the House.

There are 20 standing committees in the House. All have the power to investigate in specified areas, as may be granted to them by the House from one session to another. But with the exception of the Government Operations Committee, the Committee on Un-American Activities is the only one which has permanent, continuing investigative power.

It can hold hearings in any part of the United States, whether or not the House is in session. Other committees need special authorization from the House to conduct investigations.

Like all other committees, the Committee on Un-American Activities has a basically legislative function. It is its duty to hold hearings on, and weigh the merits of, bills relating to subversive activities and internal security which are referred to it for consideration. In the same area, the committee has the duty of recommending new legislation where it sees a need for it. It also has the duty of proposing amendments to existing legislation when its hearings, investigations, and study reveal weaknesses in our laws which need correction.

Again, like all other committees, the Committee on Un-American Activities has an oversight or watchdog function. That is, it should keep an eye—"exercise continuous watchfulness," the rules of the House say—on the administration of security legislation by the executive branch.

What is the jurisdiction of the committee? Are there any limitations on the areas in which it can investigate?

The Supreme Court held in the Barenblatt decision of 1959 that in the field of national security the House has given the Un-American Activities Committee pervasive authority to investigate Communist activities in this country.

In other words, no matter where the committee finds Communists operating, no matter where it finds subversive efforts being made against the security of the United States, it has the right to investigate.

Lloyd Barenblatt, whose contempt conviction was upheld in the Supreme Court decision I have just mentioned, claimed in his appeal that the field of education should be excluded from the committee's authority. The Supreme Court rejected his claim. It held that the committee's right to interrogate him—even though he was a college professor—was unassailable.

I want to point out here, while touching on the Barenblatt case, that the committee does not investigate educational institutions as such. It does not investigate churches. It does not investigate unions, business firms, or any other bona fide organizations or institutions.

Communist fronts, however, are a different matter. When the committee has compelling evidence that an organization is Communist-controlled or a front, as defined in the Internal Security Act, then it may properly investigate the organization.

When dealing with individuals, the committee's policy is that it will not be deterred from investigating their subversive activities simply because they happen to be labor, church, or business leaders, college professors or whatever.

The committee's interrogation of Professor Barenblatt is an illustration of its policy in this respect. When it questioned him, it was not investigating the college with which he was affiliated. It did not concern itself in any way with the overall activities or policies of the college or what it was teaching. It concerned itself only with Barenblatt's individual activities as a Communist.

This is what the committee has always done in the past. It is what it will do in the future. The courts have unequivocally upheld the committee's right to follow this policy.

No citizen of this country, because of his trade, profession or calling, can claim that he is somehow different from, or superior to, other citizens, and that he is therefore exempt from and beyond the power of the Congress when he engages in activities which are violative of our laws or designed to help a foreign power destroy our Government.

Now, let me illustrate the role the committee plays in protecting our national security by citing facts about some of its current and recent investigations and hearings.

Over the past 3 months, in 6 separate days of hearings, the committee has taken testimony from over a score of witnesses on the subject of illegal travel to Cuba. Generally, American citizens have been barred from visiting Cuba since the severance of diplomatic relations on January 1, 1961. Special passport validations are given, however, to those who have a legitimate, compelling reason for such travel. Despite this, committee investigation has uncovered the fact that many Americans have been going to Cuba without validation.

These people are violating this country's laws. The committee has learned that many of these people have Communist backgrounds. It has also learned that a considerable number of them, after returning to the United States, have gone about lecturing on the glories of Castro's Cuba without registering as agents of his government.

What is the purpose of these hearings? Of what use are they?

First, they have had a definite legislative function. They're developing facts which will assist the committee in judging the merits of a travel and passport control bill which has been referred to it for consideration. They will also help the Judiciary Committee weigh the merits of several bills which have been referred to it and which also deal with the problem of controlling travel in times of national emergency.

Second, it is the committee's hope—and belief—that the facts developed about the propaganda activities in behalf of the Castro regime carried on in this country by these lawbreakers, will enable it to propose amendments to the Foreign Agents Registration Act. These amendments will be designed to compel the registration—and thus force the disclosure—of many Communist propagandists who are today succeeding in thwarting the intent of Congress when it passed that Act 25 years ago.

Third, a necessary, unavoidable and useful offshoot of these hearings, of course, is the fact that they reveal to the American people the current activities of the Communist Party and its agents. This is a part of the informing function of Congress. By doing this, the hearings are making it more difficult for the party to mislead the American people and achieve its goal of destroying your freedom and mine.

Fourth, in these hearings the committee is also carrying out its watchdog or oversight function. Specifically, it is overseeing the administration of our country's travel control regulations and the Foreign Agents Registration Act by the executive branch of the Government.

Finally—though this is by no means the least result—because of the facts developed in these hearings, I have referred the cases of 14 witnesses to the Department of Justice for prosecution on the grounds that they are in violation of travel regulations.

Another example: two employees of our supersecret National Security Agency disappeared in the summer of 1960. The committee immediately began an investigation of the background of these men, Bernon F. Mitchell and William H. Martin. Later, on September 5, 1960, they surfaced in Moscow at a highly publicized press conference—to publicly defame and vilify their country. Undoubtedly, they also told all they knew about NSA's activities to Soviet intelligence officials. By this time, the committee's investigation had convinced it that they never would have been hired by the NSA—or retained in its service for any length of time—if the Agency had been following adequate security procedures. A full-scale NSA investigation was then instituted.

Because of the highly sensitive nature of NSA operations, the committee made no inquiry into its activities. It did, however, hold 16 executive hearings in which it thoroughly explored NSA's personnel and security procedures. The committee's investigators spent 2,000 man-hours—and covered 15 States—developing the facts for these hearings.

What were the results? Twenty-two reforms in security and personnel practices were instituted by the NSA.

The Director of Personnel was dismissed.

The Director of Security resigned upon request—as did two other officials in his office.

Twenty-six other NSA employees were dropped for reasons of sex deviation.

In addition, the committee drafted a bill which will establish sound security practices in the agency for all time. That bill was passed by the House just a few weeks ago.

Can there be any question about the fact that, by inquiring as it did in this case, into the administration of security practices by an agency of the executive branch, the committee made a very real contribution to our Nation's security and welfare? It found a shockingly lax situation in NSA when it began its inquiry. Today, I believe the NSA's security procedures are as tight and effective as they can be made.

The Communists and other enemies of the committee are forever charging that the committee has done little or nothing in the legislative field and that it concentrates on exposure and defamation of witnesses, who often aren't even Communists but merely people who oppose the committee.

The truth is that the committee has been responsible, over the years, for over 40 security laws or amendments to existing laws enacted by the Congress. This is a legislative record of which any committee can be proud.

The Communists have demonstrated by their own actions that one of the laws they fear most today is the Internal Security Act, a law drafted by the committee. In June 1961, the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the key element in this law, its registration provisions. Just last week a special three-judge court in Washington upheld another of its provisions—the one denying passports to members of the Communist Party.

After the Supreme Court's decision, Gus Hall, leader of the Communist Party, said the party would refuse to comply with the law because it "asks the Communist Party to commit suicide."

This statement was quite a tribute to the committee. It was an admission by the top Communist in the United States that the committee knows how to hit the conspiracy where it will hurt most.

How did the committee do this in the Internal Security Act? It did it by drawing up a law that compels the party to be honest—to reveal the identities of its members and the organizations it controls. It drew up a law that strips the party of its major weapons—deceit and concealment.

To what extent has the party used these weapons successfully in the past?

You will know that nearly all party members have always concealed their membership. They have known they could get nowhere with most people if they openly proclaimed they were Communists. It is as secret, hidden Communists that they have been able to carry out their undermining activities.

Have they successfully used false labels, deceit and concealment in the organizational sense?

Here is a copy of the "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications," published by the Committee on Un-American Activities. This 250-page document lists nearly every organization and publication in this country which, as of December 1961, had been cited as Communist or subversive by Federal legislative and executive agencies and by various State and territorial investigating committees. The names of 663 organizations or projects and 122 publications are contained in this volume.

This is an indication of the extent to which the Communist Party relies on, and has successfully used, the false label to peddle its wares.

The Communists themselves have referred to these front organizations as "innocents' clubs" and "transmission belts." They are outfits through which the party has spread its line and won acceptance for it from many thousands of non-Communists. Through them the party has also taken millions of dollars from the pockets of non-Communists and made widespread use of their time and talents, to help destroy America.

What distresses me—and this is a sad commentary on our times after years of exposure of this front device—is the way the party, through these organizations, can still entice good people into doing its dirty work. It gets them to lend the prestige of their names, to give their time and money, to promote communism and undermine freedom. What is wrong with some of our citizens? Can't anything shake them out of their carelessness and irresponsibility?

But now, let's get back to the committee. Before closing, I would like to say a few more words about what it does and what it does not do.

The committee does not subpena witnesses for its hearings unless it has evidence that they possess information about the matter under investigation. It does not accuse any witness of being a Communist Party member—or even ask them if they ever were or are one—unless it has documentary evidence or reliable confidential information they are or have been members of the party.

It does not call witnesses to expose or harass them, but rather, as I indicated before, because it knows that they are in a position to give Congress information which will help it in developing remedial or needed legislation.

Naturally, because the committee deals primarily with Communist activities, it must call Communists as witnesses. Because the Communist movement is secret and conspiratorial, they are the only ones who have first-hand knowledge of its operations. That this results in the exposure of certain Communists, I grant. This, however, is something that cannot be helped. It is a basic part of the legislative process, and the committee can no more carry out its function without calling Communists as witnesses than the House Education and Labor Committee can carry out its function without calling educators and labor leaders as witnesses.

Serving on the committee and being its chairman is not a pleasant task. You are subject to a continuous barrage of vilification and false accusations. You are compelled by the very nature of your task to deal repeatedly and continually with the activities which border on the treasonous.

However, it is not always the knowingly and deliberately disloyal we are dealing with. In some cases, I feel that our troubles stem primarily from ignorance and lack of knowledge about communism, rather than from treason. This is particularly true in regard to foreign policy positions where some tragic mistakes have been made, both in and out of government.

That is why it is so important to study communism, to know our enemy well, in addition to having effective security laws and agencies—such as the committee—to cope with the internal subverters.

This is why I have been discussing with you the subject of the committee and national security and why, in a few moments, I will be talking to another audience in another room of this hotel on the subject of "Education for Victory," meaning, of course, education about communism.

Frankly, as regards both the field of law and of education, and all other fields, I think I can say with complete truth that every member of the committee wishes that there was not need for it; that all of them will be glad if the day ever comes when the committee is abolished because there is no longer a Communist fifth column in this country and thus no need for a Committee on Un-American Activities.

That day however—I am afraid—is a long way off. And until that day comes I can assure you that each member of the committee will do his utmost to see that the committee is not deterred for any reason from carrying out the function assigned to it by the House of Representatives.

Each year, of course, an effort is made by the Communists, their stooges, and some misguided but well-intentioned liberals to abolish the committee. Naturally, this creates a problem. Despite this, I am convinced that there is no need to fear that this move will ever be successful. I have too much faith in the Congress to believe that, as long as we have a real internal security problem, its Members would fail to carry out their duty of protecting this Nation from those who would destroy it.

The committee's life is in the hands of the Congress and of the people of this country. It is in good hands. I am certain that they will preserve the committee—and that the committee will continue its vital role in the preservation of our Nation.

A Fair, Impartial, and Controlled Test for Krebiozen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday July 31, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced House Joint Resolution 598, which would authorize and direct the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen and would direct the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such a test. The resolution would further authorize the appropriation of $250,000 to conduct the test.

The arguments and discussions over Krebiozen have been going on now for many years; I believe it is now time to end the controversy by having the National Cancer Institute conduct the necessary tests immediately and without further delay so that we may determine whether Krebiozen serves any useful purpose in the treatment of cancer. It seems unnecessary to mention the pain and suffering caused by cancer and the number of people who lose their lives each year because of this dread disease. All of us are familiar with it; all of us know from personal experience, either through family or friends, the fearful toll taken by cancer.

I strongly urge that this resolution be given immediate consideration by the

Congress so that those now using Krebiozen may continue to use it until the completion of the National Cancer Institute's tests. If there is the slightest chance that Krebiozen is helping those now using it, we must not allow the Food and Drug Administration to keep the drug from them.

President Should Ban the Test Ban Bandwagon Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last when President Kennedy addressed the Nation on the partial test ban treaty he called for full discussion and debate, not only in the Senate, but amongst the American people. However, Kennedy strategists appear to be attempting to choke off such debate and full scrutiny of the pact. The Senate majority leader [Mr. Mansfield] has made optimistic statements both about support for the treaty and the shortness of time in which it will be considered. Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman have claimed very widespread support for it amongst the public and in the other body. Administration-inclined columnists and commentators also have taken it upon themselves to assert to the effect that "almost everybody is for the pact." The administration has given out stories that it is popular in capitals all over the world.

Obviously, these statements are not based on any widespread and accurate information on just what is the state of opinion either amongst the public or in the other body. Senator after Senator has stated he is reserving judgment on the matter until more facts are in.

Despite the President's words last Friday, consciously or unconsciously, administration stalwarts have adopted the strategy of rushing consideration of the treaty as fast as possible, before thoughtful consideration can be given to it. This is a strategy of choking off debate and discussion, both by limiting it in time and by stampeding public opinion. Before the average person even gets to consider the matter, he is being told everybody is for it. This is the old bandwagon technique so effective in political campaigns. It is calculated at getting support by implying anybody on the opposite side is out of step.

I call upon the President to match his words last Friday with action. To do so he must order his subordinates and associates to cease and desist their shabby tactics and give the Nation the opportunity he has promised for full and fair evaluation of the claimed advantages and claimed disadvantages of the partial test ban treaty.

Diamond Jubilee Celebration of St. Vincent de Paul Parish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last Sunday to have participated at the diamond jubilee celebration of my parish church in Milwaukee, St. Vincent de Paul Parish.

St. Vincent de Paul's has established a reputation during its 75 years for outstanding achievement in spiritual, civic and cultural activities. Twenty-seven sons of the parish and 57 of its daughters have answered the call to the religious life. The parish has sponsored cultural activities in the fields of art, music, and drama.

The day of celebration began with a solemn high mass of Thanksgiving at which the Most Reverend William E. Cousins, archbishop of Milwaukee, presided in cappa magna. Celebrant was St. Vincent de Paul's distinguished pastor, the Right Reverend Monsignor S. J. Studer. Deacon and subdeacon were the able parish assistants, the Reverend Albin Sowinski and the Reverend Edward Wawrzyniakowski.

The diamond jubilee also was observed with an evening banquet. Upon that occasion, I gave the following address, for which I ask permission to insert in the Record:

Remarks of Hon. Clement J. Zablocki at Diamond Jubilee Celebration, St. Vincent de Paul Parish, July 28, 1963

It is a singular honor for me to be a part of this celebration today, as we commemorate the diamond jubilee of our parish, St. Vincent de Paul's.

This is, indeed, a happy and memorable occasion. The words of the gradual of the mass for Easter are particularly appropriate today: "This is the day which the Lord has made. Let us rejoice and be glad." As is customary on birthdays and anniversaries: Congratulations are in order.

First, I want to extend sincere congratulations to our beloved pastor, the Right Reverend Monsignor Studer. Monsignor Studer truly has followed in the footsteps of our Lord as the good shepherd of our flock.

All of us who have had the privilege of knowing him, and working with him, share the same esteem for his character. We are all indebted to him for his spiritual counsel and advice. We cherish him in our affections as a venerable man of God.

In recent years, Monsignor Studer, you have had many trials and tribulations, particularly with respect to your health. All of us have been concerned for your physical well being. We thank God for granting us your continued services. May our Good Lord further grant us our prayers that you may be with us for many more years to come.

Next, on behalf of all the parishioners past and present, and in my own behalf, I want to express sincere appreciation to those who have dedicated themselves in a special way to St. Vincent's Parish: To the assistant pastors, present and past; to the venerable and beloved sisters who teach in our school; to the lay people who work at the church; to the numerous organizations and societies, particularly the ushers, choir, altar society, church committee, and altar boys; to all of these, go our sincere gratitude and earnest prayers.

Third, it is appropriate to pay tribute to you, the members of the parish.

Our beautiful church, our school, and participation in 75 years of honor to Almighty God and service to fellow men stand as concrete evidence of the strong faith of this congregation. You have been willing to sacrifice in order to devote your best efforts to the glory of God.

As a Member of Congress, I have—through the years—spoken to hundreds of groups. None of them, however, has held for me the personal and heartfelt association which this occasion presents. As a member of this parish, and its former humble servant, I am particularly honored that you have asked me to say a few words at this diamond jubilee celebration.

I would like to address my remarks this evening to the challenges which face the world today—and the opportunities which thereby are presented to every citizen, but especially to every Catholic man, woman, and child.

Let us therefore, briefly review the past and its lessons, the present and its problems, the future and its portents.

First, the past. Since this parish was founded 75 years ago, there have been truly amazing advances in science and technology.

Diseases like cholera, smallpox, typhoid, and diphtheria which once ravaged whole continents, snuffing out the lives of millions, have been conquered. The invention of the internal combustion engine has made possible the vast array of automobiles, trucks, and buses that ply the highways of the world. It has created millions of new jobs and revolutionized our society.

Man has learned to fly. And with that knowledge has tried to fly faster and higher, until today he aims at the very stars themselves.

Laborsaving devices in our homes, in our businesses, and in our factories have made life easier and more healthy for millions of us.

The atom—that building block of all matter—has yielded up its secrets. Harnessing the energy of the atom has made possible many new advancements. They brought about achievements that promise a prosperity that would have been dismissed as a wild dream 75 years ago.

But the atom has also loosed other forces in our world—forces which likewise would have been beyond the belief of our forefathers. The cracking of the atom has made possible—for the first time in history—universal destruction and annihilation.

The possibility of a nuclear holocaust is not a remote one. It is a very real threat to the lives of each of us, to Western civilization, to the very existence of life on this planet.

Man has evolved a Frankenstein's monster which could some day destroy man.

Why has this terror entered our lives at a time when so many positive achievements have been gained? Because men have forgotten God.

As men learned more about the physical universe, they neglected the spiritual universe. Along with discoveries in science and technology came new philosophies which rejected God as an outworn myth. Man and the material universe became the sole concern.

What a Pandora's box of evils these errors loosed on the world. In Germany, a man named Karl Marx used these ideas to formulate the philosophy of atheistic communism—the philosophy which threatens to bury us today.

The scourge of communism can, in my opinion, be directly traced to the rejection of God.

In our own country, we experienced a rise of materialism. It took a different form here. It infected people with the insane desire for money and possessions. It gnawed at the very moral fiber of our citizens. This materialism led to a self-centered individualism which rejected moral values in a search for cheap thrills, and worthless pleasures.

Through it all the Catholic Church stood as a beacon of faith in a sea of strife and error. The church, buffeted by wave after wave of denunciation, denial and outright persecution, continued to teach those moral truths laid down for it by its founder, Jesus Christ, the Son of God.

With error all about, the church, of necessity, was put on the defensive. Its principal efforts were directed to protecting the faith of Christians against the evils of atheism, secularism and materialism. It was felt that the less contact Catholics maintained with the world around them, the better off they would be.

Today the situation is changing. Men are coming to reject the sterile existence of life without spiritual meaning. The world has been frightened by the cruelty and terror loosed on the world by fascism and nazism.

Freedom-loving people are alarmed by the steady march of communism, with its barbaric, police-state methods.

Mankind fears instant death under a hail of hydrogen bombs. And they have no place to turn.

All see the poverty, ignorance, disease, hunger and unrest in the world about us, and yearn for an answer.

We, as Christians, have the answer. But too often we have been content—even smug—in our faith. Although we realize that we embrace the truth, we have been slow to communicate it to others. We have, in some instances, failed to recognize that the problems of the world are our problems and that we have the responsibility to aid in their solution.

It should be of concern to us as Christians that in many countries the per capita annual income is less than $50 a year.

It should be of concern to us that thousands of babies die of starvation each day in Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

It should be of concern to us that the people of Thailand are ravaged by disease for lack of proper sanitary facilities.

It should be of concern to us as Christians that there are millions of people who have never had the opportunity to learn to read or write, who will never hear the name of God.

If we truly believe in the teaching of the church or the brotherhood of man and the mystical body of Christ, then we must be concerned for the welfare of people all over the globe. It makes no difference whether their skins are black, or their eyes are slanted or their customs are alien to ours. We have an obligation in Christian charity to care for—to help—those less fortunate than we are.

Our example in this endeavor should be the late Pope John XXIII. His charity and goodness gained him worldwide love and reverence. At his death he was sincerely mourned not only by Catholics, but by Protestants, Jews, Buddhists, Moslems, and even those of no religious belief.

Why? Because the inner peace and wisdom which Pope John radiated touched a responsive chord in the hearts of men everywhere. His impact on the world is proof that—as never before in recent history—men are ready for Christ's message.

Pope John realized this. He convened the Ecumenical Council and thereby showed the world that the Catholic Church is capable of a healthy self-examination and—where needed—progressive reform.

Pope John's encyclicals, "Mater et Magistra" and "Pacem in Terris," once again put the Catholic Church in the forefront of advanced social thought. These brilliant documents demonstrated that the truths of catholicism are as relevant today as they were in the middle ages or in early Christian times.

"Pacem in Terris," the most recent encyclical, asserts the right of every human being to security in cases of sickness, inability to work, widowhood, old age, unemployment, or any other case in which an individual is deprived of his livelihood through no fault of his own.

The encyclical proclaims that all men are equal by reason of their natural dignity and that racial discrimination cannot be justified.

"Pacem in Terris" declares that every trace of racism must be eliminated.

This great encyclical condemns the terrifying contest between nations to amass bigger and more destructive weapons.

"Justice, right, reason, and humanity," it asserts (and here I am quoting) "urgently demand that the arms race should cease; that the stockpiles which exist in various countries should be reduced equally and simultaneously by the parties concerned; that nuclear weapons should be banned; and that a general agreement should eventually be reached about progressive disarmament and an effective method of control."

These are words to remember as the Nation debates the ratification of the test ban agreement recently negotiated with Russia.

"Pacem in Terris" expresses support for the purposes and goals of the United Nations and other international organizations, such as United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) which seek to bring peace and prosperity among peoples.

The splendid work begun by Pope John XXIII is being carried on by Pope Paul VI. Under his direction, the Ecumenical Council will resume its work this coming September. The results of the council will profoundly affect the future of the church—and perhaps of the world.

For us as Catholics and children of St. Vincent de Paul Parish, the challenge is clear. We must cast away old defensive attitudes about our religion. Unafraid and unashamed, we must take our Christianity into the world to share it with our fellow men.

What, you ask, can we as individuals do to prepare ourselves for this encounter?

First, quite obviously, we mst know the dogmas and teachings of holy mother the church. The texts and interpretations are available in Catholic books, newspapers, and periodicals. Our church organizations are a good source for this information Knowing the teachings of the church, we must live by them. Unless we practice what we preach, our efforts will be fruitless.

Uppermost in our minds must be the key virtue of charity. Let us have charity for all men, regardless of race, color, nationality, or religion.

Second, we should have a thorough knowledge of the recent pronouncements of the Popes in their encyclicals. These, too, are available from Catholic sources. Further, we should be able to discuss the encyclicals with others in order that they, too, may learn the exciting and significant ideas these papal documents contain.

Third, we must continue to support our parish as we have in the past.

It would be extremely foolish, I am sure you will agree, to set out to change the world and neglect our starting point and home base: our parish church. For here is to be found the fountainhead of God's graces. If our efforts to implant the seeds of Christ's truth in the hearts of men are to be successful, we will need those graces.

Our efforts will be futile unless we continue to serve God through our parish and our parish priests, following the leadership of our beloved monsignor.

Many of us are the descendants of the founders of this parish. Those men and women faced grave problems, but they forged ahead with faith to establish a parish, to build a church and then a school. Their sacrifices have worked to our great benefit.

Let us, therefore, remembering their religious fervor, rededicate ourselves today to the future progress and well-being of this parish so that our children and our children's children will have the same rich heritage that we are privileged to possess.

Then truly can we rejoice and be glad on this day which our Lord has made.

Education for Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, as I have noted in another extension in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, our able colleague, Hon. EDWIN E. WILLIS, successor to the lamented Francis E. Walter as Chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, delivered two addresses in New Orleans, La., last week.

His second address, "Education for Victory," was delivered at a luncheon meeting of the Americanism Committee of the Chamber of Commerce of the New Orleans area.

In this excellent speech, Chairman WILLIS discusses the importance of public information and education regarding the threat of international communism and calls attention to the contributions which the House Committee on Un-American Activities has made and is continuing to make in acquainting the American people with the threat posed by this alien and hostile system.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the text of Mr. WILLIS' address:

EDUCATION FOR VICTORY

(Address by Representative EDWIN E. WILLIS before the Americanism Committee, Chamber of Commerce of the New Orleans Area, July 23, 1963)

I feel truly privileged in being invited to address this luncheon meeting of the Americanism Committee of the Chamber of Commerce of the New Orleans Area. Mr. Rhodes, your chairman, was kind enough to send me some information about the accomplishments of the committee in the brief 2 years of its existence. You have carved out an impressive record with your lectures, film showings, and distribution of literature on communism.

You are to be congratulated for what you have done. You are also to be congratulated for the basic approach you have taken to the problem. Through it, you have demonstrated your appreciation of the fact that the first step toward victory over communism is the study of communism, along with effective internal security laws. Just an hour ago, I addressed another group on the subject of "The Committee and National Security." Now, I want to discuss with you the problem of education and victory.

Knowledge is the beginning, the essential first step, in licking any problem. This is true whether we are searching for a cure for disease, economic disruption, crime—or for the means of protecting our freedoms from destruction by the Communist fifth column.

As an example, look at the progress we have made in recent years in fighting cancer. The disease was once incurable. Today many thousands of people are saved by treatment or surgery. Soon we will have a cure for it, and then a preventative.

Why? Because we have fought this evil calmly and intelligently. The American people have contributed millions of dollars for research. Our best doctors, scientists and hospitals are learning everything they can about the disease. This is the way the cure will be found and this enemy of mankind eliminated.

Now, we must do the same thing about what is today mankind's deadliest enemy—communism. This is a political, social and ethical cancer. It not only destroys men's bodies; but degrades, warps, and corrupts their minds—and kills their souls.

This cancer, too, must be destroyed—and it will be. In the past, we have tended to fight communism on the basis of instinct and emotion rather than knowledge. Now the picture looks brighter. We are beginning to act more like competent military commanders in the field. We are abiding by the first rule of warfare—know your enemy.

We realize that we are faced with a formidable adversary who threatens our country, our civilization and the very concept of freedom. We perceive that we will not have any real security until the bulk of our citizens and public officials know this enemy well. Until this condition prevails, we cannot be assured of victory.

What do we have to know about him? We must know his basic philosophy and doctrines, his objectives and the means he has used—and will continue to use—to achieve those objectives.

And—let's not kid ourselves—this is a big order. It's going to take a lot of serious study. Communism is not a simple thing. It is attempting to undermine us on many fronts; military, economic, diplomatic, propaganda, cultural, and scientific, as well as political. Its strategy is carefully planned; its tactics clever and varied. It has thousands of tricks, ruses, and deceptions. It makes abundant use of lies and half-truths. It is not something we can learn all about quickly and easily.

But, as I said before, things are looking up. Here in Louisiana and in many other States, we are teaching about communism in our schools. In many parts of the country, seminars and study conferences are being held. In hundreds of communities, Americanism committees such as yours are working at the grass roots level and doing a very effective job.

And here is something that should be of interest to you on this point. A bill has been introduced in Congress to establish a national Freedom Academy, where key leaders from every walk of life in our country can be sent to get a solid, thorough grounding in the essential facts about communism. The Senate has completed hearings on the bill. The House version of the bill has been referred to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

It is too early for me to predict—or even hazard a guess—about what will be the outcome of Congress consideration of this measure. Whether or not the academy is established, however, it is significant that such a bill should be introduced in the Congress with strong bipartisan support, and support that is not only bipartisan, but both conservative and liberal.

This is an indication of how much serious consideration is now being given to a matter that is so vital to our national survival—the study of communism.

Here in the New Orleans area, you are doing what you can to promote knowledge and study of communism. I hope you will continue this important work.

And now I would like to outline for you some of the things the Committee on Un-American Activities has done in this field. Some of the facts I will cite will surprise you, but they will give you an idea of the help the committee's work can be to you in your educational efforts. They will also give you a better idea of the overall contribution it has made to our country.

The committee has been in existence for a quarter of a century. We celebrated our 25th birthday on May 26 of this year.

During these years the committee has heard the testimony of over 3,500 witnesses; has published over 500 separate volumes of hearings, consultations, and reports; has distributed over 7½ million copies of these documents to the American people; has been the initiator of over 40 security laws and amendments thereto enacted by the Congress; and has had over a dozen of its policy recommendations accepted by the executive branch of our Government.

Despite this record, there are some people—in addition to the Communists—who want the committee abolished. In an effort to support their demand, they make all kinds of false charges against the committee—charges which, I hope, are based on ignorance and misinformation rather than evil intent.

I challenge these people to name any institution in the United States, governmental or private—and other than that grand organization, the FBI, which cannot publish its information—that can match this record of accomplishment. I know of no agency that has given the American people so much solid, substantial information on every phase of communism. To the extent that the American people, over the last 20 years, have been informed about communism and the threat it presents, I say that the Committee on Un-American Activities can claim major credit for it.

What about the committee? How does it operate?

There are those who claim that the committee does not operate in a very laudable manner. When pressed, they will grudgingly admit the committee's accomplishments which I have just mentioned, but then they will claim that it has amassed all this information by procedures and methods that are unfair and which violate constitutional rights. They claim the committee harasses, persecutes, and abuses the witnesses who appear before it.

The truth is that in the area of fair procedures, the committee has been a pacesetter for the Congress. It was the first committee to have written and printed rules of procedure. A copy of these rules is presented to each witness when he is subpenaed. The committee is bound by these rules.

The committee went further than that. It created its own subcommittee on rules to study and refine its procedures. This subcommittee took another step. It wrote to every Member of the House of Representatives, asking them if they had any constructive suggestions to offer. This was first done years ago, and it has been continued over the years. The scarcity of replies and constructive suggestions received from Members of Congress is an indication of how carefully and fairly the committee has devised its methods of operation and rules of procedure.

Another point on this issue: Some years ago, each member of a Special Committee of the American Bar Association reviewed a varied selection of the committee's hearings. The purpose of this study was to analyze and make a finding about the committee's methods and hearing procedures.

I am not going to read the full report of the Bar Association Committee on this subject, but these last two sentences from the report are sufficient to refute the charges made about the committee's alleged unfair methods:

"Your committee is impressed with the fairness with which hearings before that committee have been conducted. * * * We are satisfied that the witnesses called to testify before the committee are being treated fairly and properly in all respects and we also feel satisfied that each witness is accorded full protection so far as his constitutional or other legal rights are involved."

Now, as I said before, the committee's primary duty is investigation for legislative purposes. Despite this, the committee is also really a kind of educational institution. This is because the purpose of a congressional hearing is to develop facts. Now, facts are facts, and facts are educational, for whatever purpose they are developed. The committee's hearings, reports, and consultations therefore serve an educational need and are useful tools in the study of communism.

Attempts have also been made to create the impression that the information published by the committee is not really very informative. It is claimed to be shallow, on the extremist or flamboyant side, and therefore of little value to anyone who wants to study communism seriously.

Again, the truth is the very opposite of this. The committee's publications are used as sources of speech material by Members of Congress, clergymen, civic and business leaders, educators, and many others. The committee's documents are also used as texts and supplemental reading material in schools and colleges. As a matter of fact, they are also used in our Government training program—and the committee has had the honor of having foreign governments order them so they, too, can use them as aids in equipping foreign service and security employees for their jobs.

I don't want to take the time to do it now but, if I were so minded, I could read at this point a list of a few dozen recognized authorities who, in writing scholarly works on communism, have used the committee's publications as source material.

The work you are doing—education on the subject of communism and Americanism—is controversial. I am neither surprised nor dismayed at this. Many innovations and new concepts meet with resistance. They are opposed by the uninformed and by persons who have an ax to grind. This should not worry you too much. This resistance will be overcome, and before long I feel certain that there will be overwhelming acceptance of the educational work you are doing.

I would like to comment here about one point that has been made on the subject of teaching about communism. Some people are placing great stress on the fact that this teaching must be thoroughly objective, that there must be no indoctrination in it.

Generally speaking, I agree with this. Instruction on communism must be factual and objective. If it is not, we are misinforming ourselves and our students about our enemy, and therefore aiding him and his evil designs instead of helping ourselves.

No rational person can object to the idea that education on communism must be thorough, objective, and sober—and that it should not be mere indoctrination or ranting against communism. At the same time, I cannot help viewing with caution the excessive warnings against indoctrination made by some persons.

After all, in any study—even in mathematics—there must be some indoctrination in basic principles if the student is to learn anything at all and be able to find the answers to problems. Without this indoctrination, he would be helpless.

Similarly, there must be some indoctrination, some value judgments offered and advanced, when teaching about communism.

Let me illustrate what I mean: communism proposes a way of life vastly different from our own. The students are presented with the way of life offered by the Communists. Questions naturally arise in their minds.

"Is their way of life as good as, better, or inferior to, our own?"

"Is our judicial system better, equal to, or inferior to that of the Soviet Union?"

"Is our system of private property and private enterprise superior, or inferior, to the Soviet system of collective ownership?"

These and manifold other questions must be answered by the student. He has to make a judgment. Given all the facts on many of these issues, our students will be able to come up with the right answers.

But not all the questions are as simple as those I have just mentioned. Some are much more complicated. The Communists have devised clever propaganda arguments for their side, and young students cannot always readily see through them.

What happens?

He turns to his teachers, his parents, and other adults for help and guidance.

Are you going to turn him down? Or will you go so far as to talk about principles and ethics—not mere facts—in talking with him? When this point is reached, I say that we have an obligation to help—even if it means what some people call "indoctrination."

The claim of the anti-indoctrinators that many matters concerning communism are gray, rather than black and white, is actually an argument for indoctrination. The more gray area there is, the less black and white there is, the more difficult the problem and the more the student needs help in making a value judgment.

A final point: Hand in hand with the study of communism, we must have study of Americanism. How can you expect students, our youth, to be patriotic, to have a deep love for our country and its institutions if they are ignorant about it? How can we expect them to stand up for and defend our country, if they don't know what it stands for?

No one can appreciate what he does not know. Our youth must know and thoroughly understand the principles on which this Nation is founded, its history, its great traditions and—though this may seem trite—its heroes. Only if they know these things, will they be able to appreciate the value and worth of our institutions. Only then will they be able to understand what a terrible loss it would be for them if these institutions were ever to be destroyed by communism or any other ism.

I am no advocate of jingoism or extreme and excessive nationalism. But I know one thing; that knocking and debunking our heroes and institutions is no way to develop loyalty. That kind of so-called education can only weaken loyalty and undermine patriotism.

Our country is not perfect. No country is. Our country has its weaknesses, some blotches in its history. But, at the same time, when compared with any other country on earth, I say that there is nothing for us to be ashamed of and much for us to be proud of. In its principles, history, its accomplishments, there is no other country like it.

I am not appealing for suppression, even with students, of anything in our past that is not admirable. I only appeal for objective teaching of both the good and the bad, with special emphasis on neither.

Why do I make this appeal? It is because I know that the good and the great and the glorious in our history so far outweigh the bad that objective teaching cannot help but instill pride and love of country.

Unfortunately, in the past, we have often neglected instruction in American history and government. In addition, when this instruction has been given, it has sometimes not been objective. There has been undue emphasis on debunking. There has been failure to give adequate consideration to all that is great in our past.

As a result of this faulty teaching, we have seen the development of the apathetic, indifferent, uncommitted citizen—the political neutralist who exists in a vacuum as far as patriotism is concerned.

We must face the reality that a man who stands for nothing, can fall for anything.

We must face the fact that nature abhors a vacuum.

We must face the fact that Communists—and other totalitarians, too—are always eager to fill politically empty minds with their insidious philosophy.

We must realize that they can fill these empty minds much more easily than minds which have something in them that has to be destroyed before there is room for communism.

Our youth want and need belief. If we don't give it to them, someone else will. We cannot let them down.

We face a great challenge today. But we are a great Nation, and I don't fear the future. We do have great public officials, great educators, great citizens. We will meet that challenge in a great way—as we have met all such challenges in the past. I am absolutely convinced that through education—and educated action—in the areas of Americanism and communism, we will achieve victory in the cold war.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, seldom has the death of anyone been felt as a personal loss by an entire country. When Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt died last fall, a nation and, indeed, the whole world mourned.

Such affection and respect are not extended to every man and woman. Such sentiments are reserved for those who do not seek them, who in their daily living have exhibited the purest virtues, who know no prejudice, whose greatest love is mankind.

What Mrs. Roosevelt saw in 1948 as the ideal for a Declaration of Human Rights is what should guide men of all nations, races, and creeds. "Personal rights, such as freedom of speech, information, religion, and rights of property; procedural rights, such as safeguards for persons accused of crime; social rights, such as the right to employment and social security, and the right to enjoy minimum standards of economic, social, and cultural well-being; political rights, such as the right to citizenship and the right of citizens to participate in their Government."

Millions who knew such misery and dejection during the depression will long remember the humanitarian spirit which Mrs. Roosevelt brought to the White House. Those millions of us who have been so eager for the United Nations to succeed are well aware of and thankful for the hopeful enthusiasm which she has infused in that organization tirelessly and magnificently.

Eleanor Roosevelt will be remembered not because she sought fame, or reward, but because she had a deep sense of what she knew to be right and she spent her life seeking that goal.

Broadcasting and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on July 26, 1963, Chairman Oren Harris, of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, addressed the first National Broadcast Editorial Conference. This conference which lasted 3 days was sponsored jointly by the Georgia Association of Broadcasters and the School of Journalism at the University of Georgia, and was held on the campus of the University at Athens, Ga.

The subject of broadcasting and politics is of particular interest not only to Members of Congress but also to public officials and candidates for public office in State and local governments.

The Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been conducting hearings on broadcast editorializing in general and on my bill, H.R. 7072, in particular. The purpose of my bill is to amend section 315 of the Communications Act to give candidates for public office who are attacked in a broadcast editorial an opportunity to reply in person over such station. Similarly, if a broadcasting station editorializes in favor of a candidate, other candidates for the same office would have, under my bill, a right to reply in person. Chairman Harris' address went in considerable length into some of the problems presented by broadcast editorializing, and raised many questions to which answers must be sought in the public interest. Therefore, I am enclosing the text of the address at this point in the Record:

Broadcasting and Politics

(Speech of Hon. Oren Harris)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, participants and honored guests of the National Broadcast Editorial Conference, there is an old saying that a statesman is a dead politician. I am glad to be alive; I am proud to be a politician; and I am gratified that you have invited me to participate in this conference on broadcast editorializing to talk to you on the subject "Broadcasting and Politics."

The assignment is not an easy one. But then a man does not choose to be a politician because he prefers an easy life. A successful politician considers problems not so much as difficulties to be avoided but as challenges to be met.

The subject "Broadcasting and Politics" is certainly a challenging one. In discussing it with you, I do not expect to provide you with easy answers to many difficult questions. My hope is to suggest some pertinent questions for your critical consideration.

In recent years there have been several Supreme Court decisions with which I have disagreed emphatically. However, I must say I concur fully with a statement by Justice Frankfurter in a decision involving the first amendment that "Broadcasting * * * has produced its brood of complicated problems hardly to be solved by any easy formula about the preferred position of free speech."

About 3 months ago I had occasion to speak to another group of southern broadcasters. (Incidentally, I am gratified that this conference proves once again that southern broadcasters are not in the rearguard of the profession but in the very forefront.) Today when this region of our country is being challenged by our Federal Government and often criticized unfairly by persons living in other regions of this great Nation, it is vitally important that we should be able to demonstrate to ourselves and to the Nation that as in the past the South is still capable of producing leaders in all walks of life who are an asset to the entire Nation and of whom we in the South can be proud.

In speaking to the Mississippi broadcasters, I entitled my talk, "Broadcasting and Tightrope Walking." I expressed the thought that those persons who are engaged in the field of broadcasting whether as broadcasters or as Government regulators of broadcasting must make skillful tightrope walking a regular habit if they aspire to become successful broadcasters or regulators.

In no area of broadcasting is this more true than in that area of programing and program control which seeks to deal with broadcast editorializing. Perhaps it might be said that in that area broadcasters and regulators have to acquire the skill of dancing tiptoe on the tightrope. The tightrope which I have in mind stretches between public needs and private interests and more particularly between the first amendment and section 326 of the Communications Act at the one end and the licensing standard of the public interest at the other end.

As you well know, our Subcommittee on Communications and Power has been conducting hearings during the past week on broadcast editorializing. You may not be familiar with the occasion for these hearings.

In the course of the hearings on the House resolution proposing to suspend section 315 for presidential and vice presidential candidates during the 1964 campaign, frequent reference was made to broadcast editorializing. During the committee consideration of the bill in executive session several members of our committee urged adoption of amendments to the resolution aimed at dealing with the rights of candidates in case of broadcast editorializing for or against political candidates.

I urged my colleagues not to attempt to tack on any highly controversial amendment dealing with broadcast editorializing to the somewhat less controversial temporary suspension of section 315 limited to presidential and vice-presidential candidates for 1964. I promised that our Subcommittee on Communications and Power would hold hearings on the entire subject of broadcast editorializing in the course of which all aspects of this problem would be gone into carefully. Subsequently, in the course of the debate on the floor of the House on the suspension resolution, I advised the membership of the House of our plans to conduct these hearings.

Now, there has been some open criticism of our decision to hold congressional committee hearings on this highly sensitive subject, and I understand there has been a good deal of not-so-open grumbling and a great deal of apprehension among broadcasters.

It has been suggested that these hearings were being conducted for the purpose of intimidating radio and television broadcasters so that they would think twice before editorializing over their facilities, and particularly with regard to political candidates.

Let me state to you emphatically that in my opinion the appropriate committees of the Congress have not only the right but the duty to go into this admittedly highly sensitive subject. We will not avoid our responsibility because it happens to be a delicate problem.

The Communications Act of 1934 does not have any specific provision which sets forth a congressional policy toward broadcast editorializing. The act does not specifically permit or specifically prohibit broadcast editorializing nor does it lay down any ground rules for such editorializing.

The Commission tried to deal with the problems of editorializing first in 1941 in the Mayflower decision by applying the general provisions of the act that a broadcast license may be granted only if it serves the public interest, convenience, or necessity. The Commission construed that provision as precluding broadcast editorializing by licensees because the Commission felt that licensee editorializing could not be reconciled with the interest of the public in having broadcast operations conducted fairly and impartially.

Later, in 1949, after extensive hearings on the subject, the Commission, with one Commissioner dissenting, reached the opposite conclusion and determined that licensee editorializing was compatible with the public interest, provided licensees affirmatively aid and encourage the airing of opposing views.

Thus, the statutory language of an act of Congress has been construed to reach diametrically opposite results. As the practice of broadcast editorializing becomes more frequent, the Congress would be derelict if it did not exercise its oversight function to examine into the practices and policies relating to broadcast editorializing and the possible need for further clarifying legislation.

The purpose of such an examination is to establish what the facts are and to identify such problems as may exist which are of public concern. I submit—and I trust you will agree—that there are few things, if any, in the area of broadcast editorializing which are exclusively matters of private concern.

After all, broadcast editorials are concerned with public issues, are addressed to the public, and the public airways are used to disseminate them to the public.

By no stretch of the imagination can they be considered the private outpourings of individuals destined to reach only a preselected group. The participants in broadcast editorializing cannot, in my opinion, claim any right of privacy seeking to screen the circumstances from public scrutiny. However, there may be limits which should be imposed upon such scrutiny, and I trust your conference may want to explore what these limits should be.

Personally, I have been for some time a strong advocate of broadcast editorializing. In a speech in May 1958 before the Connecticut Broadcast Association, I had this to say on the subject of editorializing—and I quote:

"In reading the reports on the recent NAB convention at Los Angeles, which many of you may have attended, I was glad to see that the key speakers appealed to you, the broadcasters, to make use of your right to editorialize. I agree with the speakers on it and I hope you will do so and will do so freely, and in so doing you will of course observe the rules of fairness which the Communications Act imposes on broadcasters as a part of the requirement that broadcasters must operate in the public interest. * * * In editorializing you will not be able to look at 'ratings' in order to decide whether your efforts at editorializing are successful. * * * In editorializing you will find that to a large extent you must shoulder responsibility for your editorials yourself and you cannot pass that responsibility on to the listeners or the viewers. Having shouldered this responsibility yourself in the case of editorializing, you may rely to a lesser extent on 'ratings' and to a greater extent on your own proper sense of values."

If the Commission at different times reached different conclusions with some Commissioners dissenting with respect to editorializing, it should not surprise anybody that individual broadcasters and individual politicians differ when it comes to the "brood of complicated problems" inherent in broadcast editorializing.

In order to discuss complex problems halfway intelligently we first must be reasonably certain that we give approximately the same meaning to the terms which we use in our discussions. When we talk about "editorializing" we must realize that there is the narrower concept of editorializing referred to by the Commission as "overt editorializing" which consists of advocacy by broadcast licensees identified as such.

In fact, there is the type of broadcast editorializing by means of licensee selection of news editors and commentators sharing the licensee's general opinions.

There is also broadcast editorializing by making available the licensee's facilities to persons and organizations reflecting the licensee's viewpoint either generally or with respect to specific issues.

In order to have a fruitful discussion it will be necessary at all times to bear in mind these different types of broadcast editorializing and we shall have to specify which type we have reference to when we talk about broadcast editorializing.

Chairman Henry, in his prepared statement before our subcommittee, suggested that the Commission and the Congress are most concerned about the "overt" type of editorializing. I cannot agree at all that this type of editorializing is the main concern of the Congress in this area, and I believe that the Congress and the Commission would be remiss in their duties if they concerned themselves only with this particular aspect of editorializing.

I venture to guess that many political officeholders—and I am not speaking only of Members of Congress—are likely to be apprehensive with regard to broadcast editorializing for or against political candidates. Their apprehensions are not based so much on lack of trust in the fairness of broadcasters but on the certain knowledge that radio and television broadcasting are today among the most powerful mass media of influencing public opinion in general and the voters at election time in particular.

Therefore, the first choice of many politicians might be to avoid this new threat and to prevent broadcast editorializing for or against political candidates. On more mature consideration, however, most politicians may come to the conclusion that their first choice might not be a wise one, quite apart from the fact that a prohibition of this particular kind of broadcast editorializing might be attacked in the courts on the grounds that it violates the constitutional prohibition of the first amendment.

Thus, their second and probably wiser choice might be to attempt to bring about the enactment of an amendment to the Communications Act to assure fairness to politicians in the use of radio and television facilities when used for purposes of editorializing for or against particular politicians.

Incidentally, your conference may want to explore the question whether fairness to politicians and fairness to the public are necessarily one and the same. I may be prejudiced and, therefore, not a good judge. As George Bernard Shaw has remarked: "The love of fairplay is a spectator's virtue, not a principal's." I can assure you, however, that politicians, as a rule may object to having their "rights" of answering broadcast editorials depend on the discretion of broadcasters.

Congressman Moss' bill constitutes an attempt in setting up some ground rules in the limited area of editorializing with regard to political candidates. It would make applicable the equal opportunity provisions of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 to editorializing by broadcast licensees for or against political candidates.

As was testified in the course of hearings before our subcommittee there are some difficulties inherent in the approach proposed by the bill. These difficulties, however, can be corrected and our committee will have occasion to consider the bill after the hearings have been completed. Whether or not the bill becomes law, however, Congressman Moss ought to be congratulated on his efforts to place before the public a concrete proposal designed to deal with one important aspect of broadcast editorializing.

While it may be difficult to lay down hard and fast rules with regard to broadcast editorializing we must nevertheless strive to do so. The very fact that the Georgia Broadcasters have called this conference seems proof to me that you agree with that proposition. Discussion of the problems in this area is wholesome and constitutes a valuable and important aspect of our democratic processes.

Let me attempt to make some observations which I hope will focus attention on some aspects of editorializing which I happen to believe are of transcending importance.

Broadcast editorializing is but one aspect of broadcast programing. Regulation of broadcast programing is a most difficult and elusive subject. This is true of regulation by government as well as self-regulation by industry through voluntary codes, etc.

Since all broadcasters require a government license before they are permitted to engage in broadcasting, there is a natural tendency to base regulations—governmental as well as private—on the fallacious assumption that broadcasters are pretty uniform when it comes to aspirations, interests, capacity, outlook, and other human traits. This assumption is factually incorrect and as supposition it is not in the public interest.

If there has been a regrettable tendency towards uniformity among broadcasters, this tendency ought to be counteracted to the utmost, and especially by organizations which purport to represent broadcasters.

I wonder whether many persons would suggest that newspapers are pretty uniform or that magazines are, and that standards with regard to their contents could be established by establishing minimum standards for their personnel or facilities.

Similarly, would it not be inappropriate to attempt the establishment of standards for broadcast programs, including broadcast editorials, by establishing minimum standards with regard to personnel or facilities?

The NAB committee on editorializing seeks to encourage editorializing as broadcasters become—and I quote—"properly equipped to perform the editorial function with the highest degree of professional skill and integrity." Chairman Henry stated before our subcommittee—and I quote: "We have cautioned that the licensee should not do so [namely, editorializing] if he is not prepared to act fairly and to employ an adequate staff as the foundation for meaningful and intelligent editorialization."

Are the NAB and FCC getting ready to establish minimum standards with respect to staffing? I hope not. I doubt that meaningful minimum standards in this respect can be established for all broadcasters.

Please do not misunderstand me. I am not trying to say that there are not and should not be standards of procedure to be followed by all broadcasters with regard to broadcast editorializing in order to assure performance in the public interest. But is exclusive or primary focusing on the question of staffing going to be helpful?

For example, I submit that a radio broadcaster who operates an electronic juke box and who does not give any time for the discussion of public issues either by political candidates or by spokesmen for different points of view on such issues, has not equipped himself in any sense of the word to editorialize on such issues or candidates even if he should hire a qualified person to write the editorials for him.

I submit that the right to editorialize must be earned and this right should be properly exercised only within the context of other exposures of the issues or the candidates over the facilities of the station.

Furthermore, your conference may well desire to discuss the application of the principles underlying section 317 of the Communications Act to broadcast editorializing—the overt type of licensee editorializing as well as other types of editorializing.

Section 317 provides substantially that all matter broadcast by any radio station for which any money or other valuable consideration is directly or indirectly paid or promised to the station by any person shall at the time the matter is so broadcast be announced as paid for or furnished by such person.

The broad principle on which this statutory provision is based is that the listeners or viewers have the right to expect that matters broadcast are broadcast because of the independent editorial judgment of the broadcast licensee rather than because of some consideration paid or promised to the licensee for broadcasting this matter. Listener and viewer reliance on the broadcaster's editorial integrity is an important public interest factor which is entitled to protection.

Of course, section 317 would be applicable if a broadcaster were to broadcast an editorial for which he receives compensation from any other person. However, should not the listeners and viewers also be apprised of the fact, if such fact happens to be the case, that a particular editorial was prepared by a source not controlled by the licensee himself; such as, for example, an editorial service to which the broadcaster happens to subscribe? Or that the editorial was furnished free of charge by some organization or another?

The existence of editorial services is a well known fact and many newspapers avail themselves of these services. True enough, no newspaper is required to disclose to its readers the fact that some or most of its editorials are derived from such a source. Many newspapers, however, do so anyway.

I would like to leave with you, however, the question whether the public interest does not require such disclosure in the case of radio and television broadcast editorials.

Our committee's payola and ratings investigation have demonstrated the tremendous power which organizations not licensed by our Government, such as phonograph records manufacturers and distributors, and rating services have exercised over the programs broadcast by many licensees. If, unbeknown to viewers and listeners, persons not controlled by individual licensees, such as editorial services were to achieve similar control over broadcast editorializing, the potential harm to the public could be infinitely greater than it has been in these other situations.

Therefore, as the practice of editorializing grows, in order to forestall any harm to the public should we not require certain disclosures with regard to the sources of editorials and, perhaps, other circumstances which surround the origin of editorials?

Questions of how the public interest can best be protected in the area of broadcast editorializing are just beginning to be asked. In no area of broadcast programing is the public interest more difficult to protect. In no area will protection be needed more as the practice of editorializing assumes greater prevalence.

I am glad that you are aware of the urgent need to discuss these problems, and I hope that I have left with you a little food for thought for the impending dialog in this important area.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, AUGUST 1, 1963

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Joel 2: 21: *Fear not, O land; be glad and rejoice: for the Lord will do great things.*

God of all majesty and mercy, create within us during this moment of prayer, those longings and desires which Thou dost delight to satisfy.

Grant that integrity of character, devotion to duty, and reverence for Thy law may be the cardinal virtues whereby we are known among our fellow men.

May we listen in on the life of struggling humanity with those noble attitudes and feelings of sympathy and charity, of kindness and good will.

Show us how we may encourage the hearts and strengthen the hands of our Members of Congress who are safeguarding the good name of our beloved country and extending its influence as a mighty power in establishing universal peace.

Help us to lay hold of Thy divine power and gird us with that indomitable faith which will enable us to meet our adversaries fearlessly and valiantly.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina

[Mr. Bonner], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CONDITIONS OF BUSINESS SHOWN TO BE IMPROVING

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note in the Wall Street Journal of today the report that the profits of 496 firms in the second quarter of 1963 rose almost 16 percent from those of the 1962 period.

Quite obviously, the spurt in corporate income is the proximate result of the administration's revision of the depreciation schedule last year coupled with the action of Congress in authorizing the 7-percent investment credit.

It is about time that the business community of America recognize the tremendous effort that President Kennedy and this administration has made to improve the conditions of business. By the same token, the business community should recognize the great need for cooperation in important administrative programs to bring about full employment and meet the problems of distressed areas and distressed people throughout the country.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, ANNUAL PAYMENT BY THE UNITED STATES, INCREASE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6177) District of Columbia, annual payment by the United States, increase, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. Whitener, Dowdy, Hagan of Georgia, Broyhill of Virginia, Harsha, and Horton.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington makes a point of order that a quorum is not present, and evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 109]

Bass
Battin
Berry
Blatnik
Brotzman
Broyhill, N.C.
Buckley
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Cramer
Davis, Tenn.
Dent
Dingell
Evins
Flynt
Fulton, Tenn.
Gathings
Grant
Griffin
Harsha
Healey
Huddleston
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Macdonald
Miller, N.Y.
Nedzi
O'Brien, Ill.
Pilcher
Roberts, Ala.
Robison
Shelley
Smith, Iowa
Staebler
Steed
Thornberry
Vinson
Whitener
Whitten
Winstead

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 387 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the Committee on Banking and Currency may be allowed to sit in executive session today during the debate on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MANPOWER

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Manpower of the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit today during general debate on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. For some time, Mr. Speaker, I have been concerned with the way in which our postmasters are appointed. This concern has been prompted by a number of factors. The postmaster holds a most responsible position in every hamlet, town, and city; it seems to me that the appointment and the resulting work of the postmaster should be free of any political influences—divorced from the patronage system.

I, therefore, introduce legislation, Mr. Speaker, which would provide for the appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices through competitive civil service.

This legislation would properly place the appointment of postmasters in the selective civil service and away from the political influences of the past, and in addition would eliminate a burdensome job, one that we are sure is all too familiar to the Members of this Congress. This bill would terminate the influence of the so-called congressional advisory system. We are asked to recommend applicants that we may not even know, and in effect we disqualify persons whose experience and qualifications are too often not even considered. It seems to me that advancement and appointment based on merit would also raise the morale of personnel and result in strengthening the postal service.

INTERSTATE SHIPMENT OF KREBIOZEN

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, for at least 13 years the substance Krebiozen has been produced as an intended aid in the treatment of cancer. Its value in this treatment is and has been in dispute: but the nontoxic nature of the drug does not appear to be in dispute. On July 24 I submitted House Resolution 573, to provide a fair, impartial, and controlled test of the drug.

A recent incident in the dispute around the merits of this drug has induced Dr. Durovic, its proponent, to withdraw his application for experimental status from the Food and Drug Administration. The automatic consequence of the termination of this status is that interstate shipment of Krebiozen is thereafter illegal.

In the meantime many cancer patients undergoing treatment by Krebiozen are passionately convinced that their lives are contingent on further procurement of the drug. These people, whatever the merits of the dispute, are taking the consequences of the change in status of the drug, and are deeply upset at being deprived of it.

Therefore I am introducing a resolution which would allow the interim interstate shipment of Krebiozen for the treatment of any patient now being treated with the drug, or for any patient who is in the terminal stages of cancer, until a fair and scientific test of Krebiozen has been carried out.

BAD LEGISLATION

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Senate had before it S. 1703, a bill that would extend the bracero program for 1 year. The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. PROXMIRE, had some things to say about the bracero program.

The bill, he noted, would be very bad legislation. It would be bad for the Mexicans, who are brought here as peons, and separated from their families for months. It would be bad for American farm laborers, who are the most depressed people in the country. They are people who earned last year an average of $900 per worker.

I have no doubt that the Senator will have more to say about extending Public Law 78.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 467 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7500) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations; and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed five hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE]; and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution 467 provides for the consideration of H.R. 7500, a bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations; and for other purposes.

The resolution provides for an open rule with 5 hours of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 7500 is to authorize appropriations totaling $5,238,119,400 to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year 1964. The money is allotted as follows:

Research and development, $4,037,575,000.

Construction of facilities, $692,359,400.

Administrative operations, $508,185,000.

This means a total expenditure of $5,238,119,400.

Since this bill came out of the committee unanimously and was unanimously approved by the Committee on Rules, I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 467 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 7500.

I think that we have rarely had a bill that is more important and probably less understood than H.R. 7500. It is a bill that cannot properly be understood by any but a very advanced scientist. I do not think we have any very advanced scientists in the House of Representatives.

It has been admitted by all those who have testified on this bill that it is something that we have to take on faith. Mr. Speaker, in the past we have had to take many things on faith. I have no doubt at all that when the first man invented the wheel his neighbors all stood around and said, "What a very foolish thing this is, and what an awful lot of time he has wasted."

I know for a positive fact that when the Wrights first flew their rather miserable-looking little crate, because that is all it was, and it is now down in the Smithsonian, people said, "What a foolish thing that is. Why did these two grown men waste all their time and their friends' money on it?"

We do not know today what is going to come from the probe of outer space. It may bring us untold blessings. On the other hand, it may prove that it can accomplish very little. People say, "Why send a man to the moon?" There is absolutely no guarantee we will send a man to the moon. We are going to send instruments. We are going to try to find out. We are going to probe outer space. I believe this is going to be useful.

Another thing I like about this bill and that I commend to the House is that all of this is going to be in the nature of the advancement of science and also the advancement of the peaceful uses thereof. We do not talk very much in this bill about defense or the warlike advantages to be gained therefrom. We do not talk about keeping up with the Russians, which to me is always a little bit like keeping up with the Joneses. We even have considered that we may pool some of our resources and scientific knowledge with them.

The one thing we can understand about this bill, and it has already been alluded to, is the price tag, and it is very high. We are asked in this bill for an authorization to spend, to appropriate, $5,238,119,400.

That is a great deal of money, but we have authorized and appropriated a great deal of money for other things without so much as a tremor. We have appropriated vast sums over the years for foreign aid so that at the present time, I believe, the grand total practically hits $100 billion. That money has been spent abroad. It has been spent in other countries. It has done a great deal of good but it has been an outflow of money. I would like to call your attention to the fact that the money involved in this bill will be spent in the United States, in wages, in services, in buildings—right here in our own country; and that only 2 percent of this vast amount will be spent possibly abroad in the various tracking centers that will be needed.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this legislation to the House and I trust that the rule will be unanimously granted and that after due deliberation—and I am thankful that the Committee on Rules has given all of 5 hours because even 25 hours would not be enough to describe all that is in this bill—the House will pass the bill by a sizable vote.

There are two schools of thought, and I realize that, and both have their virtues. But I still think this is a great measure and that in the generations to come people may look back on this day and say, "They wrought well."

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE TO USE EXHIBITS AND MODELS ON THE FLOOR

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee may be permitted to use certain models and exhibits on the floor this afternoon to better present the information that we will try to present to the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the growing wave of questions, in Congress and out of Congress, concerning the value of our pursuing the program to put a human being on the moon. Many Americans wonder whether victory in the race for the moon will be worth the $20 billion or so that the effort will cost. There have been many instances in which thoughtful men have wondered whether this vast sum of money could not be better spent on earth—on better housing, food, education, welfare, roads, defense, or what have you.

I think it can be fairly said that, all during my career in the Congress, I have never been extravagant with public funds. There are many distinguished Members of this body who have fought hard and consistently against any and all attempts to spend appropriations foolishly. My record shows that during the 17 years I have been in Congress, I have always been lined up with the antispending bloc.

And yet, it is my firm and unshakable opinion that we must continue to work and plan toward placing a man on the moon. We must continue the race—and we must win it.

The cost is secondary in this case. Naturally, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight I intend to battle, as best I can, against any tendency toward wastefulness in this program. All the members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics are equally determined to cut costs wherever possible. But I feel very strongly that we must spend every dollar that is needed to achieve victory in space. We cannot afford to lose.

I quite realize that there are some highly respected persons—some of them scientists—who oppose this venture and claim that the results will not be worth the effort.

I disagree entirely.

I do not favor the program because it is a glamorous technological exercise, or simply because it would flatter our vanity to beat the Russians at the space game. There would be no excuse whatsoever for such a frivolous expenditure of the taxpayers' money.

No, Mr. Speaker, I am heartily and completely in favor of this program because it is an essential part—but only one part—of our entire space program.

Because the idea of putting human beings on the moon is so glamorous, too many people think of it as an entire program in itself. This is wrong. Our goal is to be first in every area of space research, development, and exploration. Our goal is to be the leader in space, just as we have always been on land, in the air, and on and under the sea.

As Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON said in a recent speech:

> Space is clearly the great breakthrough of human knowledge—for centuries to come. We do not know—and the Soviets do not know—what the stars will tell us. We do know that to default the exploration of the universe of space would surely be as catastrophic in its consequences as if we had defaulted exploration of the universe of the atom. Our superiority in any scientific field will be brief and fading if we do not win and hold competence in this new and decisive realm of discovery.

As a Nation we have always ridden the first waves of progress—in the field of invention, in the field of industry, in the field of weaponry, in the field of nuclear power. Our past record of glorious achievement in these fields will be as nothing if we do not continue the effort in the realms of space.

There is an even more impressive reason why we must be first in the field of space. As President Kennedy has said:

> Only if the United States occupies a position of preeminence can we help decide whether this new ocean of space will be a sea of peace or a new, terrifying theater of war.

We are not exploring space for vainglorious reasons. We are seeking peace. We want to make space an instrument for the peaceful development of mankind. If we default on this, then space can be seized and dominated by others as an instrument of aggression.

Our whole future as a nation—and, indeed, as a race—depends upon our mastery of space. I do not think it is necessary to dwell upon the bleak future we would be handing to our progeny if we permitted the Soviet Union to build an Iron Curtain across the skies and thus make space the means by which she could inflict tyranny on the world.

The mastery of space will not be won by any single achievement, no matter how dramatic. It will be won by the nation that first accumulates all the scientific knowledge, all the technology, all the experience and all the facilities necessary for regular service.

But, why is the moon so important?

To me, the most important reason for going to the moon is that our national security demands that no hostile power will be able to use space as an unchallenged avenue of aggression against us. The world can be ruled from the skies above. Both the Russian and the American military leaders generally concede this point. The nation who dominates space will have the ability to dominate the earth.

Frankly, if the defense of our Nation did not depend upon our going to the moon, I would not be quite as favorable about this program as I am. But, in view of this consideration, I say to those who claim we cannot afford the expense of the effort: "We must afford it. We have no choice, no safe alternative. Our future, our security, our freedom and the freedom of our posterity all demand that we make the sacrifices necessary to attain this goal."

The job that must be done on the moon cannot be performed by machines, or by robots. The most sophisticated machines mankind has developed are still limited by what man knows here on earth. Machines cannot think. They cannot make on-the-spot judgments. They cannot select between alternatives that have not been anticipated by their creators. The ability to adapt to an unexpected situation is essential to successful exploration. This is a job for man. It cannot be done by machinery.

There is a further reason why moon exploration is so important to us. In making the prodigious effort to put a man on the moon we are going to have to move forward dramatically in many important fields: science, engineering, industrial development, design, mathematics, biology—the whole spectrum of scientific and technological accomplishment.

The program will provide an enormous stimulus to our intellectual growth. Right now, about 90 cents out of every space dollar is being spent with private industry. The byproducts of this program will have a tremendous influence on our daily lives.

We have many such byproducts with us today. One that comes to mind is a new kind of glass which the Corning people have developed. The space program demanded the development of a glass that could stand the extremes of heat and cold that are found in space. Corning came up with the answer and the same glass is proving invaluable in thousands of American kitchens today.

This is just one example. The program will be responsible for the production of fantastic fabrics undreamed of by the average layman today. Ordinary fabrics when exposed to the conditions of space, are inclined to disintegrate. An entirely new fabric, impervious to space conditions must be found. It will be found—and it will have many uses on earth, as well.

The program will develop new fuels. These fuels will eventually be used to move traffic on earth more swiftly, more economically and more effectively.

New metals and alloys will be developed. Some metals—in the virtual vacuum we have in space—literally boil away and evaporate. Others become as brittle as glass. The metals and alloys that emerge will be of great usefulness to us on earth.

The same goes for plastics. Even our most remarkable plastics today change their molecular structure when exposed to radiation and lose the properties that make them useful on earth. American industry must—and will—develop new plastics that will serve mankind in his own element as well as in the element of space.

The list is virtually endless. Almost every aspect of our daily life—from refrigerating and heating systems to the kind of shoes we wear and the kind of cars we drive—will be basically affected by our lunar exploration program.

Think for a moment what vast and basic changes have been made in our civilization just because a couple of mechanics named Orville and Wilbur Wright decided to experiment with a flying toy on the sands of Kitty Hawk. The entire world was changed in a few years. The effects of lunar exploration will make the effects of the flying machine seem minor by comparison. We shall move forward a full century in a few short years.

And, lastly, Mr. Speaker—lunar exploration is essential to our leadership in the free world—in the so-called uncommitted world—and eventually, in the entire world. I am not referring to the military aspect of this, I am referring to the intellectual and moral leadership which, after all, is the only kind of leadership that is permanent.

Our structure in the eyes of the world does not depend upon a few isolated, spectacular achievements. It depends upon the resolution, patience, and skill we devote to enduring purposes.

We have always been the dominant nation in mechanical competence and adventure. From the time of Benjamin Franklin and his kite and Eli Whitney and his cotton gin, we have been, in the eyes of other people, the embodiment of ingenuity and know-how. The rest of the world has looked to us to supply these virtues—and to combine them with a morality and high ethical values all our own.

We have not been as dominant in these areas in recent years as we were in the past. If we flunk the space test, our prestige will dwindle away to nothing.

I have a feeling that the United States was beginning to suffer from premature middle age before the race for space began. We had done so much—invented so much—produced so much—that we were inclined to rest on our oars and make do with what we already had.

We felt there were no more new frontiers— no more challenges that were really first class.

This feeling of complacency is fatal to a nation devoted and dedicated, as we are, to the free enterprise system. You cannot stand still. If you try it, you find yourself being carried swiftly backward.

I sincerely believe that the space program—and particularly the aspect of the program involving lunar exploration—has reawakened the spirit of adventure and achievement in every segment of our civilization. It has stirred the imagination of science and industry. It has started the blood coursing a little more fervently through the arteries of our economy. It has started the pulse of our industry to start beating like a drum.

From the stimulus of the space program an entire new industrial revolution will be born.

Nothing quite like this has happened to us since the days of the pioneers. The vast spirit of adventure—which has been lying dormant among us in a period of comparative softness and ease—has been awakened like a sleeping giant.

It is just about time. We were in danger of abdicating our greatness. That danger is passing.

The decisions we make on space—including the placing of a man on the moon—will determine the shape of our world for many decades, perhaps for many centuries, to come. The position the United States will hold in the community of nations will in future years be determined by the position we hold in space.

The program is expensive. Nobody denies that. But, Mr. Speaker, if we decide to default in this program, that decision will prove to be the most expensive mistake mankind has ever made. The cost of such a mistake would be greater than we could possibly afford to pay.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from New York expressed gratification that the rule provides for 5 hours of debate. I want to express my regret that it does not provide at least 6 hours because not only does this represent the authorization of a vast sum of money, but also the technicalities and the multiplicity of projects covered by the bill could well require more time.

So far as I am concerned, I have filed separate views which are in the report and I certainly hope my time will be sufficient so that I will be permitted to make my full statement.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of the regular order.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the warning by a distinguished admiral, Arleigh Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations, that the TFX warplane contract investigation discloses practices that could result in the "destruction or political perversion" of our entire military procurement system.

Admiral Burke's warning is pointed directly at the decision of Secretary of Defense McNamara in which he overruled the Pentagon's source selection board and awarded the $6.5 billion to $8 billion TFX contract to the General Dynamics Corp.

Secretary McNamara has admitted he had no independent cost studies available on the low bid by the Boeing Co., but instead used figures out of his head and "rough judgment" to throw out the Boeing bid, which was $100 million to $415 million lower than General Dynamics.

Admiral Burke expressed serious concern over a memorandum prepared by John H. Rubel, one of McNamara's top aides, which proposes an end to recommendations of the source selection boards. Rubel's memorandum proposes that source selection boards be abolished. Substituted would be a source evaluation board which would make a report but have no power to recommend.

Burke insisted that the TFX decision and Rubel memorandum could promote a pattern of arbitrary decisions under a policy that is admittedly designed to avoid the embarrassment of overruling the recommendations of persons with expert knowledge and experience.

Admiral Burke said:

> Such a pattern can destroy the integrity of the source selection system. * * * Integrity in military procurement is vital to the morale of the military and civilian experts in the Pentagon, and vital to the industries that do business with the Pentagon.

The former Chief of Naval Operations insisted that above all there must be a conviction that arbitrary action will not prevail and that political influence or other improper influence cannot be successfully used to obtain multibillion-dollar contracts.

Mr. Speaker, I insist as I did a few days ago that in view of the evidence of conflict of interest that has been obtained by the McClellan investigating committee, President Kennedy ought to fire Secretary of the Navy Korth for the position he had taken in connection with the TFX contract manipulations.

I predict, Mr. Speaker, that evidence yet to come will tie the knot of conflict of interest even tighter around Korth, and that at least one other top official in the Pentagon ought to be summarily ousted.

I further predict, Mr. Speaker, that the Kennedy administration will find it has a Dixon-Yates conflict-of-interest case on its hands in connection with the TFX contract award.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we have here for debate the science and astronautics authorization bill for 1964 which has been studied very thoroughly by our Science and Astronautics Committee. The Committee on Science and Astronautics has worked as hard as any congressional committee on which I have had the honor to serve, under the leadership of our fine chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. Speaker, there have been many compliments which have been paid to the chairman of the committee and to the work of the committee. We have heard 3,000 pages of testimony on these many subjects, it has been a rewarding experience to have been on the team and to come up here with the unanimous committee action report.

Mr. Speaker, the committee did not take in full the recommendations the present administration sent up to Congress. We have visited the space installations all over the country. For myself, I spent a week in California visiting those various installations. And, of course, I have been to Cape Canaveral, Fla., Marshall Space Flight Center, Ala., Houston Manned Space Flight Center, Houston, and various other places where these projects and experiments are being conducted. We have followed these projects very closely. Therefore, our committee members are very familiar with the projects.

Mr. Speaker, if any Member should need any specific information on what is happening in the space programs, the Member can check with us at the committee tables on the House floor, and obtain such information.

Mr. Speaker, I have a tabulation, should any Member like to see it which shows the committee action in cutting the bill and the provisions where the bill has been cut. The administration request to the Congress at $5,712,000,000. We cut off $473,880,600. This represents an 8.3-percent cut, leaving the balance which we recommend to you unanimously in the committee report of $5,238,119,400.

Summary of committee modifications by NASA organizational function

Program	Requested	Change	Percent change	Approved
MANNED SPACE FLIGHT				
Research and development	$2,931,800,000	−$183,700,000	−6.3	$2,748,100,000
Construction of facilities	564,538,000	−75,422,000	−13.4	489,116,000
Total	3,496,338,000	−259,122,000	−7.4	3,237,216,000
APPLICATIONS				
Research and development	119,300,000	−9,925,000	−8.3	109,375,000
Construction of facilities	4,103,000	−170,000	−4.1	3,933,000
Total	123,403,000	−10,095,000	−8.2	113,308,000
SPACE SCIENCES				
Research and development	737,900,000	−89,200,000	−12.1	648,700,000
Construction of facilities	25,509,000	−7,731,300	−30.3	17,777,700
Total	763,409,000	−96,931,300	−12.7	666,477,700
ADVANCED RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY				
Research and development	331,200,000	−16,500,000	−5.0	314,700,000
Construction of facilities	78,250,000	−20,817,300	−26.6	57,432,700
Total	409,450,000	−37,317,300	−9.1	372,132,700
TRACKING AND DATA ACQUISITION				
Research and development	231,500,000	−14,800,000	−6.4	216,700,000
Construction of facilities	117,600,000	−18,500,000	−15.7	99,100,000
Total	349,100,000	−33,300,000	−9.5	315,800,000
Personnel costs and operation of facilities [1]	560,300,000	−52,115,000	−9.3	508,185,000
Advanced design	10,000,000	+15,000,000	+150.0	25,000,000
Grand total	5,712,000,000	−473,880,600	−8.3	5,238,119,400
RECAPITULATION				
Total research and development	4,351,700,000	−314,125,000	−7.2	4,037,575,000
Total construction of facilities	800,000,000	−107,640,600	−13.5	692,359,400
Total personnel costs and operation of facilities [1]	560,300,000	−52,115,000	−9.3	508,185,000
Grand total	5,712,000,000	−473,880,600	−8.3	5,238,119,400

[1] Under committee amendment "Personnel cost and operation of facilities" will be carried in the bill as "Administrative operations."

The committee has made a full report in detail. The report, which contains separate views, consists of 206 pages. We have these reports available.

I have a sheet here which will be available at the desk, containing six pages and showing the programs that have been changed since the bill was acted on last year in the House, and likewise we have the previous figures as to what has been done.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

We need and strongly recommend the establishment of an Inspector General in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. NASA's many and varied objectives have been characterized over the past 5 years by ever-increasing complexities and ramifications. The management problems that have arisen as a result of expanding roles and missions dictate the vital requirement for objective examination and evaluation of NASA's programs and operations.

My bill, H.R. 7770, establishes the Office of Inspector General in NASA and specifies the duties of the Inspector General. It is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title II of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 is amended by redesignating sections 205 and 206 as sections 206 and 207, respectively, and by inserting after section 204 the following new section:

"INSPECTOR OF PROGRAMS AND OPERATIONS

"SEC. 205. (a) There shall be in the Administration an Inspector of Programs and Operations (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Inspector') who shall be appointed by the Administrator (under clause (A) of section 203(b)(2)) and who shall be responsible directly to the Administrator and Deputy Administrator.

"(b) It shall be the duty of the Inspector to conduct a continuing study and review of the operations of the Administration, with specific reference to its contractual relations with private industry. In the discharge of this duty the Inspector shall—

"(1) arrange for, direct, or conduct such reviews, inspections, and audits of programs being conducted or participated in by the Administration as he considers necessary for the purpose of ascertaining the efficiency and economy of their administration, and of promoting the expeditious attainment of their objectives;

"(2) maintain continuous observation and review of programs with respect to which he is discharging such duty to determine the extent to which such programs are in compliance with applicable laws and regulations; make recommendations for the correction of deficiencies in, or for improving the organization, plans, or procedures of, such programs; and evaluate the effectiveness of such programs in attaining United States national space policy objectives; and

"(3) review and evaluate all contractual relations which the Administration has or may enter into with private organizations (profit and nonprofit), and require the cooperation of all such contracting organizations therein.

"(c) The Inspector shall have authority to suspend all or any part of any project, operation, or program with respect to which he has conducted or is conducting an inspection, audit, study, or review, provided he has first given written notice thereof to the Administrator and Deputy Administrator. Any such suspension shall remain effective until such project, operation, or program or part thereof is ordered resumed by him or by the Administrator or Deputy Administrator.

"(d) In carrying out his functions under this section, the Inspector shall use to the fullest practicable extent the auditing, investigation, and inspection facilities of the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government, including those of the General Accounting Office and of the inspectors general of the Armed Forces."

It was deemed by the chairman that such a matter should receive the attention of the committee and be the subject of hearings. In expressing my views here, I wish to emphasize that the importance of such an office to the efficiency of NASA operations and programs cannot be underestimated. Other agencies of the U.S. Government have benefit of such offices. The Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force have by law Offices of Inspector General as does the Department of State. The Department of Agriculture has an Office of Inspector General established by the Secretary in January 1963. I consider it of vital importance for NASA to have such an office in view of the ever-increasing complexities now existing within the programs of NASA.

VENUS PROGRAM

The country should be gratified by the impressive results achieved by the Mariner II program in the probing of Venus, its atmosphere, and its surface. I believe strongly that the Venus research program should be continued to include additional probes of the Venus environment and the surrounding space. The fact that we found surface temperatures of 800° from 21,000 miles away should not discourage us from further exploration. The surface of the Earth might also appear equally uninhabitable from a similar distance. It is my opinion that there is much more new scientific information that can be obtained that will be of vital importance to future interplanetary explorations.

COMMITTEE STAFFING

The legislative oversight of this committee over NASA's expanding missions places a requirement upon our committee for well-developed and continuous channels of information on NASA's operations. I therefore recommend and urge that the committee employ five field inspectors competent in such disciplines as engineering, electronics, biology, and so forth. Each of the five inspectors should be assigned areas of examination and inquiry and should be assigned on a continuing basis to various NASA field stations as the committee should direct. This should result in the continuing flow of information back to the committee on the current status and efficiency of NASA's programs and operations. It should also result in giving to the committee a greater capacity to evaluate future NASA budget presentations for fiscal authorizations.

COMMITTEE MINORITY STAFFING

I strongly believe that three staff members should be employed to take care of the needs of the minority. There is no question in my mind that the requirements of the committee minority demand the special attention of staff members who can devote all their time to such purposes.

Under the present arrangement, and because of the burden of work that is being carried by the present staff, the minority feels that its needs could be more adequately met. It is my view that a minority staff could fill out the inadequacies presently being experienced by the minority and therefore provide to the Congress, in conjunction with the present staff, a well-integrated team of competence and ability. It will be thus that the House can be benefited by well-balanced views, conclusions, and recommendations.

The Reprograming and Transfer Authority of NASA

The budget requested for National Aeronautics and Space Administration is submitted by the President to Congress approximately 6 months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year for which these funds are requested. Between the time of the submission of the budget to Congress and when the funds are actually appropriated, some modifications normally are required between the items for which funds were requested and those for which they are then required. On the fiscal year 1963 NASA budget request, for example, approximately 10 months expired between its submission to Congress and the enactment of the appropriation bill on October 3, 1962.

This timelag, according to Dr. Seamans, made some changes necessary in the budget request as originally submitted. It resulted from management decisions made during that period and from NASA's continuous evaluation of the programs in the light of mission successes, mission failures, new developments and breakthroughs, and unexpected developmental roadblocks. Likewise, during the fiscal year itself, similar impacts upon the programs may require additional changes in program direction or effort.

Congress has recognized that due to the "exploding technology" inherent in the national space effort, some changes are necessary and provision has been made in the annual authorization and appropriation acts to provide this flexibility.

In a letter of April 11, 1962, to Chairman George P. Miller, Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Deputy Administrator of NASA, stated concerning this flexibility that: "It can be categorically stated that America's civilian peaceful space program would be nowhere near its present level of accomplishment if it were not for the elasticity which the Congress built into its program in the emergency reprograming provisions. They have been invaluable tools in accelerating and synchronizing the program."

The authority of the Administrator of NASA to transfer funds, and the requirements he must meet when doing so, are set forth in the two acts. A discussion of this authority is contained in appendix D. The fact that the Administrator presently has certain authority to reprogram and transfer funds, however, does not necessarily indicate that this same authority will be granted in future authorization acts. As the space program progresses, the committee may find it necessary to enlarge or curtail this authority to meet changing conditions.

REPROGRAMING ACTIONS DURING FISCAL YEAR 1963

Below are the principal reprograming actions made by NASA during fiscal year 1963 as outlined in the testimony of Dr. Seamans.

For fiscal year 1963, the President presented a budget request to Congress for $3,787.3 million made up of $2,968.3 million for research, development, and operations, and $819 million for construction of facilities.

Congressional actions during the authorization and appropriation proceedings resulted in a decrease in the R.D. & O. request of $70.4 million and in the CoF request of $42.8 million, for an overall decrease of $113.2 million.

After the above action by Congress, according to Dr. Seamans, NASA transferred $38.8 million from the CoF program to R.D. & O. in accordance with the 5-percent transfer authority granted in the appropriation act. NASA also applied $13.6 million from prior year R.D. & O. appropriations to current R.D. & O. to arrive at the operating plan of $2,950.3 million for R.D. & O., and $737.4 million for CoF, making a total operating budget of $3,687.7 million.

Dr. Seamans stated that during the time that elapsed between the preparation of the fiscal year 1963 budget in December 1961 and the final congressional action on the budget request in September 1962, certain modifications of individual budget items became necessary "as a consequence of dynamic activity in our programs." The operating plan arrived at was structured to meet current program needs, and in view of the reductions made by Congress, certain reprograming of funds became necessary.

Fiscal year 1963 gross program status

[In millions of dollars]

	Research development and operations	Construction of facilities	Total
President's budget request	2,968.3 −70.4	819.0 −42.8	3,787.3 −113.2
Appropriation	2,897.9 +52.4	776.2 −38.8	3,674.1 +13.6
Operating plan	2,950.3	737.4	3,687.7

For new R. & D. projects which were not described in the fiscal year 1963 budget submission, $167 million was added. This included $103 million in the area of manned space flight for such items as the Saturn I-B, systems engineering, integration and checkout, and the operational implementation of an integrated mission control center for Gemini and Apollo. In the area of applications, $3 million was added to accelerate the transfer of acquired technology to industry, and secondly, to look at potential satellite applications other than communications and meteorology, as for example, data gathering. In space sciences, $49 million was added for several planetary and interplanetary flight projects, and for increased launch vehicle development support. In advanced research and technology, $12 million was added for a number of small technological flight projects.

In addition to the deletion or addition of whole R. & D. projects, the rest of NASA's R. & D. program underwent a number of detailed changes which resulted in a gross addition of $17.4 million to the amounts requested last year in the budget.

In the operation of installations, it was necessary to increase the number of personnel at the centers for a net cost increase of $6 million beyond the budget figure.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES SUMMARY

The President's budget request of $819 million for CoF was reduced by Congress to $776.2 million. Of this amount, NASA transferred 5 percent, or $38.8 million, to R.D. & O., leaving an operating plan of $737.4 million. The major reprograming actions in CoF are shown below:

Construction of facilities

Project deletions	$105.1
Nova facilities	76.9
Location changed	13.0
Miscellaneous	15.2
Project reductions	47.4
Nuclear rocket development station	23.0
Miscellaneous (net)	24.4
Project additions	103.7
Replacement facilities	28.3
Test and launch facilities	60.0
Utilities and access	8.1
Support facilities	7.3

The strength and security of this Nation is not based only upon how well our Armed Forces are equipped, or upon how many men we have under arms, or upon how many nuclear weapons we have in our arsenal. Strength and security is based upon our scientific knowledge, our technological capabilities, and upon the ability to translate in a superior and timely manner that knowledge and capability through industry into reality. Our space program, conducted as a peaceful venture, contributes to that strength.

In our lunar exploration program: Involved in this is the gathering of scientific information through unmanned satellites that will eventually make possible the landing of Americans on the moon and insuring their safe return. The knowledge required to do this should obviously be of great importance to our military space planning. The area of rendezvous in space, and the techniques involved, is an example of the kind of knowledge the Department of Defense must have if it is to mount an effective defense capability in space. If the Air Force gains that knowledge through its present association with NASA programs, we have accomplished a double end. We have through NASA contributed directly to the defense of our country. And yet, we will not have violated our basic article of faith to explore space for peaceful purposes.

If we consider ourselves as a member of a community of free nations, then anything positive we do to enhance that union is to our benefit. Furthermore, our acknowledged leadership of that community is based very clearly upon our technological and industrial superiority.

Therefore, when we send up a communications satellite that brings direct television broadcasts into the homes of people in Europe and in the Americas all at the same time, that is not a reaffirmation of that leadership.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Recapitulation—Reprograming NASA construction of facility, fiscal year 1963

Letter No.	Date	Location and project	Source and amount		
			Sec. 3, Public Law 87-741		Sec. 1(c), Public Law 87-741
			R. D. & O.	C. of F.	
1	Sept. 28, 1962	To provide facilities for testing 2d stage advanced Saturn at following: (1) AF Plant No. 16, Downey, Calif. (2) AF Plant No. 57, Santa Susanna. (3) Navy Ammo Depot, Seal Beach, Calif.			$11,207,558 from advanced Saturn R.D. & O. funds.
2	Oct. 29, 1962	Access road construction at Langley	$780,000		
3	do	For construction of 4 multi purpose warehouse-type buildings at Goddard.		$1,375,000 from construction items at Goddard, i.e., Applied Science Laboratory, Dynamic Test Chamber and Tracking and Telemetry Laboratory.	
4	Oct. 30, 1962	Solid suborbital vehicle launch facility at White Sands Missile Range.		$1,617,000 location transferred from AMR.	
5	Nov. 5, 1962	R. & D. support of North American Apollo contract at AF Plant No. 16, Downey, Calif.			$7,655,000.
		Additional facility for development of Apollo propulsion system at White Sands Missile Range.			$9,084,000.
6	do	Additional funds for the 4 multipurpose buildings at Goddard.		$21,000 from Dynamic Test Chamber at Goddard.	
7	Nov. 23, 1962	Static test facility for Saturn S-IV-B in support of Douglas contract (16,582,000 at Douglas Sacramento, and 1,993,000 at Douglas Santa Monica plant).			$18,575,000 from Saturn C-V launch vehicle account.
8	Nov. 20, 1962	For construction of Mission Control Center at Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Tex.	$16,956,700		
9	Nov. 28, 1962	Participation in road construction at Nuclear Rocket Development Station, Nevada.		$4,500,000 from radiation effects facility at Nuclear Rocket Development Station.	
10	Dec. 18, 1962	To modify vertical test stand No. 3 for J-2 engine at Propulsion Field Laboratory, Santa Susanna, Calif.		$615,000 from modifications to Demta 3 stand at same site.	
11	Dec. 26, 1962	Modifications for Saturn S-IC facility at Michoud.		$6,617,000 from advanced Saturn 1st stage static test facility.	
12	Dec. 31, 1962	Advanced Saturn 2d stage (S-II) static test facility at Mississippi Test Facility.		$7,000,000 from construction and support facility previously authorized for this site.	
13	Jan. 10, 1963	Modification of AF Nuclear Aerospace Research Facility, Fort Worth, Tex.		$3,125,000 from Radiation Effects Laboratory, nuclear rocket development station.	
14	do	Construction of 2 railroad spur lines at launch operation center, Florida (AMR).		$2,200,000 from Nova launch complex project.	
15	Jan. 15, 1963	Newly projected additional construction and modernization to buildings at Plum Brook Station, Ohio.		$558,000 from funds appropriated for this site.	
16	Jan. 22, 1963	Construction of administrative and service building at Government-owned contractor-operated S-II stage facility, U.S. Naval Ammunition Depot, Seal Beach, Calif.	$720,000 from advanced Saturn development account.		
17	Jan. 29, 1963	For construction of development engineering annex, Lewis Center.	$835,000, human factor systems program.		
18	Feb. 5, 1963	Partial construction costs for northwest Australia tracking station, Carnarvon, Australia.	$1,100,000, manned flight network equipment and component account.		
19	do	Construction of meteorological radar facility at launch operation center (AMR).		$2,372,000, Nova launch complex project.	
20	do	Construction of engineering building at Michoud plant, New Orleans.	$10,150,000 from advanced Saturn launch vehicle project.		
21	Jan. 31, 1963	Construction of Advanced Saturn, 2d stage static test facilities at Mississippi Test Site.	$17,328,000 from advanced Saturn funds.		
22	Feb. 7, 1963	Modification of the E stand at Plum Brook Station for testing Centaur with Atlas.	$870,000 operational vehicle support project.		
23	do	Modification to space power chamber tank No. 1 at Lewis Center.	$316,500 operational vehicle support project.		
24	Feb. 21, 1963	Expansion to city of Cocoa waterplant for water supply at Merritt Island, Fla.	$1,100,000 range support account		
25	do	Construction of Saturn V ground support equipment test facility at Marshall.	$5,203,000		
26	Mar. 6, 1963	Construction of electronics instrumentation and materials laboratory at Mississippi test site.	$2,437,000 from Saturn V project		
27	Apr. 13, 1963	Addition to physics building, University of Minnesota.			$704,000.
28	Apr. 17, 1963	Additional funds for "Advanced facility planning and design.	$4,417,500 Saturn V account		
29	Apr. 18, 1963	Supplements letter No. 16 dated Jan. 22, 1963, re construction of administration building at Naval Ammo Depot at Seal Beach to reprogram $600,000 only and not $720,000.			
30	Apr. 22, 1963	Addition to space flight operations facility at Jet Propulsion Laboratory.	$572,000 from funds appropriated for Surveyor project.		
31	Apr. 26, 1963	Addition to utility installations at Marshall Center.	$1,304,000 from institutional support account.		
		For service support building at Edwards Air Force Base.	$1,050,000 from F-1 engine program		
32	Apr. 30, 1963	Construction of combined systems test stand for Centaur-Atlas-Surveyor at General Dynamics plant No. 71 at San Diego.	$6,754,350 from Centaur project account.		
		Totals	$71,774,050	$30,000,000	$47,225,558.

If through our Tiros weather satellites we can discover the spawning of hurricanes and typhoons that threaten the lives and property of millions of people and if we can warn them of threatening danger, of floods and locust plagues, we have demonstrated our concern for the welfare of man.

I believe that the money already authorized for NASA, and this budget authorization we are considering here, has and will be returned to us many times over in tangible as well as intangible terms.

The space program has already shown that it has injected into the national economy great new stimulus. The funds that have been appropriated have been invested into our own community. They can be realistically translated down through Government and industry into increased material wealth that is presently affecting every aspect of our society.

The national space program draws upon almost every scientific discipline. It makes urgent demands for more knowledge from science and technology. It demands greater capabilities from industry.

The space program has confronted our universities and colleges with the necessity of demanding higher scholastic achievement through greatly improved curriculums in order that graduates can be useful to NASA, the Department of Defense, to government, and to our society as a whole.

Because of the unique requirement of highly specialized talents, and products, the space program has stimulated the creation of thousands of new industries, producing materials and devices which can be utilized through other forms and other applications by the general public.

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1963 President's budget	Fiscal year 1963 plan in fiscal year 1964 President's budget	Net change
Personnel costs	234, 316	257, 655	+23, 339
Operation of installations costs	193, 667	177, 251	−16, 416
Total, operations	427, 983	434, 906	+6, 923
Grand total, research, development, and operation	2, 968, 278	2, 950, 255	−18, 023

In respect to new programs there are only $50 million worth of new programs proposed by NASA. There are seven such projects. They are:

	1962	1963	1964
RANGE INSTRUMENTATION			
Advanced instrumentation			$3, 300, 000
Design, data, and measurement			4, 800, 000
Safety instrumentation			3, 450, 000
Launch support instrumentation			3, 890, 000
Range telemetry expansion for MILA			4, 560, 000
Total, range instrumentation			20, 000, 000
IONOSPHERE MONITORS			
Spacecraft			2, 200, 000
Experiments			500, 000
Ground operations			150, 000
Test and support			150, 000
Total, spacecraft and support			3, 000, 000
GEODESY (ANNA)			
Spacecraft			3, 400, 000
Launch vehicles			2, 800, 000
Total			6, 200, 000
INTERNATIONAL SATELLITES			
Scout launch vehicles			$3, 000 000
Total follow-on international satellites			4, 000, 000
ADVANCED FIRE			
Spacecraft and support services			5, 600, 000
Velocity package			1, 200, 000
Launch vehicle			1, 700, 000
Total, advanced fire			8, 500, 000
SPACE VEHICLE RECOVERY			
Flight vehicles and support services			950, 000
SECONDARY ENVIRONMENTAL EXPERIMENTS			
Experiments and support services			550, 000
Scanner			1, 750, 000
Electronics Research Center			$5, 000, 000

New projects total only $50 million worth out of $5.2 billion total recommended by the committee. On May 23, 1962, which was a Wednesday, this House voted on these current space programs and authorized them unanimously. We voted 342 to nothing to carry these projects on through a recorded vote. The leadership of the House on both sides voted for these programs.

Let me finish by saying that this is not a crash program. This is a program to meet efficiently the projects proposed by President Eisenhower and President Kennedy to have the United States preeminent in space. Only one part of that project or program of the President is the moon program. Many projects of science and research are such that we cannot tell whether they are military or civilian at the present time, so that many of those projects have military or civilian application yet to be determined. NASA has the responsibility of science in all fields in Government. When you think that we have Cuba 90 miles away you must also remember these space vehicles orbit at 17,500 miles an hour 89 to 500 miles over our heads.

I include herewith a comparative analysis of the fiscal year 1963 President's budget with fiscal year 1963 operating plan shown in fiscal year 1964 budget:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1963 President's budget	Fiscal year 1963 plan in fiscal year 1964 President's budget	Net change
Manned spacecraft systems	781, 284	708, 521	−72, 763
Launch vehicle and propulsion systems	795, 943	734, 057	−61, 886
Aerospace medicine	18, 000	7, 000	−11, 000
Integration and checkout	0	38, 500	+38, 500
Systems engineering	0	26, 500	+26, 500
Subtotal, Office of Manned Space Flight	1, 595, 227	1, 514, 578	−80, 649
Geophysics and astronomy	151, 900	144, 500	−7, 400
Lunar and planetary exploration	246, 300	221, 179	−25, 121
Bioscience	7, 093	21, 000	+13, 907
Launch vehicle development	64, 200	108, 000	+43, 800
Facility, training and research grants	10, 000	30, 600	+20, 600
Subtotal, Office of Space Sciences	479, 493	525, 279	+45, 786
Meteorological satellites	44, 300	57, 315	+13, 015
Communications satellites	78, 900	43, 715	−35, 185
Advanced applications satellites	0	800	+800
Industrial applications	0	2, 370	+2, 370
Subtotal, Office of the Administrator	123, 200	104, 200	−19, 000
Space vehicle systems	45, 885	45, 931	+46
Electronic systems	20, 300	20, 696	+396
Human factor systems	3, 345	10, 060	+6, 715
Nuclear-electric systems	40, 500	43, 531	+3, 031
Nuclear rockets	82, 850	71, 826	−11, 024
Chemical propulsion	14, 175	14, 469	+294
Space power technology	10, 250	10, 859	+609
Aeronautics	4, 905	18, 078	+13, 173
Subtotal, Office of Advanced Research and Technology	222, 210	235, 450	+13, 240
Tracking and data acquisition, Office of Tracking and Data Acquisition	120, 165	135, 842	+15, 677
Total, research and development	2, 540, 295	2, 515, 349	−24, 946

These orbiting vehicles can, according to a Russian general's statement last year, carry nuclear weapons. Therefore, we must quickly learn how to operate in space, both for peacetime use of space as well as for the military strategic necessity this country faces.

The Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight began hearings on NASA's 1964 authorization on March 6, 1963, and concluded on June 6, 1963. During this 3-month period the subcommittee held 31 open hearings plus 12 executive sessions; it took testimony from more than 100 witnesses. This included, in addition to NASA witnesses, those from other Government departments such as the Defense Department and the Air Force, from half a dozen industrial organizations, from the National Aeronautics and Space Council, and from the astronauts themselves.

At the same time, the subcommittee traveled as a group for discussions with those most concerned with doing the actual work on manned space flight throughout the country. This meant meeting with both industry and Government people in the Los Angeles area, in Sunnyvale, at Edwards Air Force Base, at Cape Canaveral, at Daytona Beach, and at Houston. In addition, individual members of the subcommittee, both prior to and during the course of our hearings, spent similar time at NASA centers involved in manned space flight, including Huntsville, Michoud, and the Mississippi test facility.

For the most part the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee has approved NASA's budget requests as being well planned, the need for which is supported by the evidence. In fact, all NASA witnesses emphasized over and over with unshakable conviction, that any cut in their requests would slow or damage the manned space flight program. Nonetheless, the subcommittee did find a number of areas in which reductions in the budget requests could and should be made. In many instances these reductions amount simply to deferrals, inasmuch as NASA was not able to show that all the money requested could be used within the 1964 fiscal year time period.

The changes made by the subcommittee in NASA's requests are as follows:

TOTAL REDUCTION

The total reduction amounts to $259,122,000. This amount represents 7.4 percent of the total manned space flight portion of the budget, not including costs for personnel and operation of installations.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The total reduction in research and development amounts to $183,700,000. This is 6.3 percent of the research and development budget for manned space flight and is distributed as follows:

Project Apollo, $120 million: This is the largest part of the reduction made in research and development. While it is a substantial reduction in terms of dollars, it is in fact slightly less than a 10 percent cut in the $1.2 billion requested by NASA for Project Apollo in 1964. The Apollo figure does not include development costs of the Saturn vehicles and engines, for which another $1 billion is being requested. This reduction was agreed upon after investigation by the subcommittee in California and interrogation of NASA witnesses showed that the use of the amount in question could not be wholly identified. This was particularly true in connection with the development of the command and service modules, for which $661 million had been requested.

The M–1 engine, $30 million: The M–1 engine is a 1½-million-pound thrust oxygen-hydrogen engine originally intended to serve as an upper stage in the Nova. There is now no specific mission for the M–1 engine, but the advantages of its higher specific impulse makes it a potentially useful engine for some future vehicle. The subcommittee felt that the $45 million being requested for the M–1 was excessive in view of the very long leadtime envisioned for this engine, plus the fact that present concepts of this type may be outmoded or in need of revision by the 1970's when the M–1 would become operational. At the same time, the subcommittee did not wish to eliminate completely development of the engine. It, therefore, decided to recommend that $15 million of the $45 million be retained for continued study and development.

Integration and checkout, $28 million: NASA has requested $153 million for 1964 to be used for integration and checkout of all systems connected with Project Apollo. The major part of this money is to be used to fund the GE checkout contract. However, NASA could not say specifically how much would be required for GE. It estimates a minimum of $100 million and a maximum of $125 million. The NASA testimony on what would be done with the balance of $28 million was also vague and uncertain. The subcommittee, therefore, recommends the elimination of the balance.

Aerospace medicine, $5.7 million: NASA requested $16.7 million for biomedical engineering in connection with its manned space flight program for 1964. This is more than a 100 percent increase of the funds allocated in 1963 for this purpose. Subcommittee investigation disclosed that the rate of progress required, together with the bioscience capability existing within other Government agencies, primarily the Air Force and the Navy, should make it possible to find this project at the level of $11 million instead of the total amount requested.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

NASA requested a total of $564,538,000 for construction of new manned space flight facilities in its 1964 budget. Of this amount, the subcommittee recommends reductions totaling $75,422,000. The reduction is a 13.4-percent cut in the total requested. However, more than 90 percent of this amount represents either deferrals where the money can be funded incrementally over several years rather than 1, or the elimination of a request for advanced design money which NASA has already funded from past budgets.

A detailed breakdown of the projects reduced or eliminated is attached to this report.

PERSONNEL AND INSTALLATIONS

While this subcommittee has not been specifically charged with evaluation of NASA's needs for personnel and for operational costs, the subcommittee believes that it may be possible to reduce some of these costs in appropriate proportion to reductions made in research and development and in construction of facilities.

The subcommittee, therefore, wishes to call to the attention of the proper subcommittee that if recommendations made here are adopted by the full committee, a 7.4-percent reduction will have been made in the manned space flight budget. It may be that adjustments are in order which would recognize this fact.

Research, development, and operation

Program	Requested	Reduction	Balance	Program	Requested	Reduction	Balance
Project Apollo (RDO 1–10)	$1,207,400,000	$120,000,000	$1,087,400,000	Aerospace medicine (RDO 3–1)	$16,700,000	$5,700,000	$11,000,000
M–1 engine (RDO 2–22)	45,000,000	30,000,000	15,000,000	Integration and checkout (RDO 4–1)	153,000,000	28,000,000	125,000,000

Science is skilled curiosity. It functions through imagination and training.

Science advances from knowns to probabilities, to possibilities.

Science rises on rare occasions with intuitive foresight that permits rare intellects to leapfrog the ascending steps of the pyramid of scientific knowledge.

The United States must keep open the path of science and development.

I therefore strongly urge the passage of H.R. 7500.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent

Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 387, nays 1, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

YEAS—387

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Alger
Anderson
Andrews
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Bates
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Ford
Foreman
Forrester
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Rains
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shelley
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Toll
Tollefson
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
White
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger

NAYS—1

Siler

NOT VOTING—44

Arends
Barrett
Bass
Battin
Bennett, Mich.
Brotzman
Buckley
Cahill
Colmer
Cramer
Davis, Tenn.
Dent
Diggs
Evins
Flynt
Fraser
Gavin
Gray
Griffin
Hébert
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Libonati
Macdonald
Miller, N.Y.
Nedzi
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olson, Minn.
Robison
Scott
Sheppard
Skubitz
Smith, Iowa
Talcott
Thornberry
Trimble
Vinson
Watts
Whitener
Whitten
Winstead
Zablocki

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Bass with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Libonati with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Vinson with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Olson of Minnesota.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Watts.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Zablocki.
Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Flynt.
Mr. Whitener with Mr. Smith of Iowa.
Mr. Winstead with Mr. O'Hara of Michigan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7500) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations; and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7500.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, the bill scheduled for consideration today is H.R. 7500, the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1964. The total amount recommended by the committee in H.R. 7500 is $5,238,119,400. This is a reduction of $473,880,600 from the original request of $5.712 billion. In terms of percentages, the committee's action amounts to an 8.3 reduction.

Now, briefly, let me tell you the reductions in the main NASA programs. We reduced manned space flight, $259,122,000; space sciences, $96,931,300; advanced research and technology, $37,317,300; applications, $10,095,000; tracking and data acquisition, $33,300,000; and, finally, administrative operations, $52,115,000.

At the outset, let me say that this bill was reported from the committee by unanimous vote.

Now we all recognize that this is a large authorization. Because of this, and the importance of the program from a national viewpoint, this has received the most careful and searching scrutiny.

Permit me to take a moment to explain how the committee proceeded with its work on the bill. First, of the 31-member committee, 3 subcommittees were formed and assigned major portions of the NASA budget. These subcommittees held almost continuous hearings on all phases of the budget for more than 4 months and after that the full committee held many hearings on the recommendations of the subcommittees. Seventy-nine witnesses appeared before the subcommittees and of this number many appeared on numerous occasions. A total of 3,540 pages of testimony was taken during the hearings on this bill.

I do not recount these matters for the purpose of attempting to establish a record for committee action in the number of hearings, witnesses heard, or pages of testimony taken but rather to impress on you that the committee has taken its responsibility most seriously.

This becomes immediately apparent when you are privileged to witness Members of Congress, with all of their pressing duties, sitting day after day, week after week, for long hours with near perfect subcommittee attendance, going over each of the programs and items with a dedication to searching out the facts so that the Science and Astronautics Committee—as your representatives—could bring to you this most thoroughly studied legislative measure.

I have already mentioned that the committee recommends a total reduction of $473,880,600. This figure does not comprise across-the-board cuts.

When the committee believed that reductions should be made, it was done only after the greatest study and deliberation.

We tried, in all cases, to cut fat and not muscle and every effort was made to be certain that reductions or deferrals would not slow down the overall space program.

We deliberately searched for areas where we believed the requests could not be funded in fiscal year 1964, and when found, we deferred them.

The reductions and deferrals recommended by the committee are, in our estimation, completely justified. But by the same token, I want to emphasize that I believe we have gone as far in reducing NASA's budgetary requests as we safely can. Any across-the-board cuts of the committee's recommendations, any indiscriminate actions or economy moves to cut more and more merely because this is a large budget request would, in my opinion, not only be unwise but foolhardy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am certainly one who does not need to be reminded of the tremendous cost of the space program. After all, I live with this subject on a daily basis and I will repeat what I said on the floor last year when the 1963 authorization request was being considered. This request is only a part of the overall 10-year program designed to eventually land men on the moon and accomplish their safe return to earth. But the decision has been made on behalf of the Nation to accomplish this within the decade and if we are to be successful in the program, we must be prepared to pay the price. That decision was reemphasized by this House last year when it authorized approximately $3.7 billion for NASA by unanimous vote.

But we must not overlook the other areas covered by this bill. This is not just a lunar program, but one that will give tangible benefits to all mankind. Satellites for communication, weather, navigation for scientific experiments are covered by the funds requested in this bill.

We must also recognize the significance and impact the space program is having and will continue to have on our domestic program. Consider, if you will, the economic and technological developments, the advances in science, knowledge, and the effect on education. All of these are direct fallouts from our space programs.

In addition, I want to make it crystal clear that we have not overlooked our national security programs. Actually, we have little choice but to explore space. We must conquer it to insure our own national defense, for I am certain that as sure as I stand in the well of this House, there is not a Member of this body who would not agree that if we do not pursue a vigorous and calculated and successful space program, other nations will do so. And if we allow a potential enemy to control space because of our inability or our reluctance to get on with the job, it will bring down on our citizens the most serious national defense consequences.

I recognize there are some who feel that more emphasis should be placed on military space programs but NASA's charter—the National Aeronautics and Space Act—provides that NASA will proceed with the exploration of space for peaceful purposes and there can be no question of the tremendous value to the military of NASA's peaceful space operations.

Now, since NASA is engaged in efforts to probe outer space, we must also remember that it is not NASA's responsibility to compete with other governments. NASA does not establish its schedules and programs in order to compete with the Soviet Union, and we are not here asking for these funds in order to establish a crash program to place men on the moon and return them safely to earth. Although this is an expensive program, it is in no sense a crash program.

On the other hand, NASA has very carefully laid out a 10-year program, and although we cannot be oblivious to the accomplishments of the Soviet Union in space, this program is not geared to attempt to duplicate everything done by the Soviet Union.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize there is a wide variety of opinion concerning the lunar program. There are highly respected scientists who have differences of opinion concerning the program. Some say that we should not attempt to land men on the moon at this time but that landing instruments would serve the purpose. Other well-intentioned people say, "Why go to the moon at all?" The pessimism of those who seek to downgrade our efforts for a lunar landing remind me of the days in the early part of the last century when Americans were wondering what to do about the vast desert wasteland that lay beyond the Mississippi. One only has to read our history to see what one of our greatest statesmen, Daniel Webster, had to say about exploring the West. Permit me to quote this far-sighted Senator when he said, on the floor of the Senate:

> What do we want with this vast, worthless area, this region of savages and wild beasts, of shifting sands and whirlpools of dust, of cactus and prairie dogs?
>
> To what use could we ever hope to put these great deserts or those great mountain ranges, impenetrable and covered to their base with eternal snow?
>
> I will never vote 1 cent from the public Treasury to place the Pacific coast 1 inch nearer Boston than it now is.

And I happen to be reading President Truman's memoirs the other day and I ran across this passage:

> The next day Jimmy Byrnes, who until shortly before had been Director of War Mobilization for President Roosevelt, came to see me, and even he told me few details, though with great solemnity he said that we were perfecting an explosive great enough to destroy the whole world. It was later when Vannevar Bush, head of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, came to the White House, that I was given a scientist's version of the atomic bomb. Admiral Leahy was with me when Dr. Bush told me this astonishing fact. "That is the biggest fool thing we have ever done," he observed in his sturdy, salty manner. "The bomb will never go off, and I speak as an expert in explosives."

Mr. Chairman, I merely call these matters to your attention to show that history bears out that even some of the greatest minds of their time lacked foresight. We must not make this error.

We must have the foresight that some of our own great minds of this century apparently lacked.

The road will not be easy. We will make mistakes. It will be expensive. But there should be no turning back. We must not slack the tempo. We must not duplicate that which has been done in our military so often. Large appropriations one year, small appropriations the next. Large forces one year, small forces the next. Up and down, feast or famine.

Now we have set the course. We know what we must do. Let us get on with it.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the proposed reductions by the Science and Astronautics Committee in the NASA budget should in no sense be regarded as reflecting a lack of confidence in NASA's people, their performance, or their programs. Their repeated successes in the new, vastly difficult and uncharted exploration of space have been most impressive and have had, in our opinion, a very salutary effect on this country's world prestige.

We appreciate the dedication of the many NASA people supporting the national space program in devoting many extra hours to ensure the repeated space successes which we have had. The well-publicized space shots are only the culmination of the tedious process of development. Even so, our space shots often seem to take place at the oddest hours of the day or night. The people of NASA have cheerfully accepted such inconveniences in the knowledge that they were contributing to a program enhancing this country's standing as a leading spacefaring power. The committee supports, and I believe it reflects the sentiments of the House, the efforts of the dedicated NASA people striving to push forward the frontiers of space.

Our committee's action on the NASA budgetary program has rather reflected our feeling that it is maturing and stabilizing after the initial period of rapid growth. In this current phase, the program can be established on a firm basis from which it can push on to new space successess redounding to this country's reputation for vitality and ingenuity. In this period, we feel that NASA can take stock of the progress it has made in the space program, and how best to push ahead efficiently and expeditiously, but economically toward the Nation's space goals. A continuing management examination of the space program is essential in order to take advantage of fresh knowledge of this new frontier which becomes available only through experience.

If, after further experience and added careful reexamination, NASA decides that vital current programs have been adversely affected by congressional actions, the committee will be receptive to well-documented suggestions for supplemental funding.

Moreover, the committee is always receptive to NASA's ideas for well-conceived, solidly planned and thoroughly coordinated new programs aimed at advancing the country's primacy in space. New space projects there should be. The space program is a growing feature and, I believe, a permanent feature of our economy. New projects should be planned and administered so as to make the most economical use of our national resources. The space program is now grown up and should be able to meet the test of competing for scarce resources on the basis of the overall national interest. We can afford all that is needed, but not one cent more.

Before closing, may I pay my respects and my tribute to the 30 other members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics who worked so diligently through the long period of time to bring this bill to the floor. I think if you will look at the books that constitute the hearings on this bill, and if you have time to go through them, you will find that a thorough workmanlike job was done.

I want also to congratulate the staff, the technical staff of the committee for a job well done.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee handling this bill before this body today for yielding. I compliment the gentleman on his remarks particularly for laying out very clearly the policy guidelines for the consideration of this program. I think this is very important and it is a wonderful precedent to set in the consideration of measures of this kind.

I would also add my congratulations to the committee members as well as to the staff for the oversight exercised by this committee on a program which is burgeoning as fast as this one is.

If the gentleman will yield further, the concern I have in the questions I am about to ask the gentleman is regarding the large engine—that is the 156-inch and 260-inch engine solid fuel propellant program. Am I correct that sometime ago a very difficult matter was resolved in an agreement involving NASA requirements and military requirements; and that with respect to these particular engines the 156-inch and the 260-inch, using solid propellant, the Air Force was given responsibility for research and development contracts?

Mr. MILLER of California. That is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. Am I correct that in this bill there is no authorization for this particular type of program?

Mr. MILLER of California. That is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. Am I further correct in stating that under the agreement which was previously reached, the Air Force did negotiate contracts for the development of 156-inch and 260-inch solid fuel propellant engine?

Mr. MILLER of California. Because of our great interest in this, we have no immediate problem or use for this engine, but as a standby, and as one possibility of the future, we are greatly interested in it; and what the gentleman says is correct. The Air Force was given the responsibility of developing the big, solid booster engines.

Mr. FASCELL. If the gentleman will be kind enough to yield further, to develop this point: Reference has been made recently that under the previous Department of Defense appropriation bill, which passed the House and which is now pending in the other body, because of the roughly 3 percent cut which was made, that one of the programs which will be eliminated or will suffer a reduction as a result of this cut, is this particular program of the 156- and 260-inch solid fuel propellant program.

In other words, it is being made quite clear that because of higher military requirements that this NASA requirement may not be met. Mr. Chairman, all of this, notwithstanding that the President, in his message to Congress in May of 1961 stated that there would be an accelerated program to investigate large solid rockets, and on January 28, 1963, stated that the development of large solid propellant motors which diameters of 156 inches and 260 inches are being investigated; and notwithstanding that the Secretary of Defense proceeded to undertake a program for the large solid 260-inch rocket; and notwithstanding that the Air Force earlier this year solicited competitive proposals from industry, and as a result of the competition has completed negotiations on contracts to perform feasibility demonstrations.

The 156-inch motor is the largest segmented solid propellant motor capable of rail transportation from current production facilities to coastal launching sites. The 260-inch motor may demonstrate the feasibility of very large monolithic motors and provide technical foundations for further developments. Development of this large motor will also provide pertinent background data and procedures and processes for fabrication, propellant production, and handling, testing and facility requirements.

It seems to be very important to the country's future in space that this feasibility investigation into very large solid rockets go ahead with full vigor. Events of the last few years have graphically demonstrated that large booster capability is a vital keystone in a strong national space program. Considering the outstanding success of the solid fueled Polaris and Minuteman, it would seem most important to determine the feasibility of this type of propulsion for the large space booster of the future.

There may be a discussion as to whether there is a military requirement at the present time for that program, but it is obvious, since contract negotiations have been completed that there is for deep space probes a very definite requirement of NASA for these large engines with solid propellant.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. And if the gentleman will yield one step further: the Air Force has already selected the contractors for this program and the companies Thiokol and Aerojet General have invested millions and millions of dollars for this program. If the Air Force were to terminate or cut back this program, does the chairman have in mind that his committee would take up the fight for and support the continued authorization, and the funding of this program for the needs and the requirements of NASA?

Mr. MILLER of California. It is my intention to bring this to the committee when it has been definitely established that the Air Force is going to terminate those contracts. I had the privilege of being out at San Jose, Calif., in my good friend's district, the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] along with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] about 10 days ago when the first big solid booster, the 120-inch booster, was fired, developing about 1 million tons of thrust and fulfilling all of the requirements that were set up for it. It was highly successful. I said at that time that I was going to talk to Mr. McNamara to determine whether or not this has been cut. If it has been cut, I am going first to the Space Council and then through the committee to see what can be done in restoring it.

We need this alternate-type booster. It has great potentialities. That is what I meant to imply in my opening statement when I said that we could not allow this program to get into the same doldrums that the defense programs sometimes get into, when it is peaches and cream one day and dry bread crust the next.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. I would like to add that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has raised an extremely important point; that the program involving the solid propulsion techniques which was to be developed through the 120-, 156-, and 260-inch motors and if properly supported is one which will give us a propulsion capacity which will serve us in the years ahead.

I had been somewhat concerned about the need of having three programs of this kind including varying sized boosters. But I was advised by the people who have been developing the 120-inch system to which the chairman of the committee has referred, that the knowledge which can be obtained from the 120-inch will not satisfy the increased technological and scientific knowledge which can come through a 156-inch and 260-inch program.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the concern of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] is well founded and that this program should go ahead.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from California yield further?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. I am grateful, extremely grateful, for the assurance which the chairman of this committee has given us and I am grateful for the remarks which have been made by the gentleman from Connecticut. I regret that there is any discussion that there may be a military determination that they do not have, do not want or could not use these large solid propellant engines for immediate military requirement and that NASA requirements would suffer as a result.

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to hear that the chairman of this committee intends to pursue the matter to the Secretary of Defense level, and higher, if necessary, so that the 156-inch and 260-inch engine, solid propellant program previously authorized, in the process of being funded and for which contractors have been selected will not be cut back or terminated.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I merely want to join others in this body in congratulating the distinguished chairman of this committee and the very able members of this committee for an outstanding job and for a most comprehensive report which gives to all of us a fine picture of our space program.

I think the members of the committee have contributed in a very significant way to the leadership which our Nation occupies in the race for space.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to commend them for the long hours and hard work which they have given to this task.

Mr. Chairman, I particularly appreciate the leadership of this great committee in the all-important matter of high energy propellants and accelerated development of engines utilizing high-energy fuels.

The language of your report, at page 194, is emphatic on this point:

> If NASA is to meet the demands of future mission requirements, it will be vitally necessary for its program of research in high-energy chemical propulsion to be accelerated as early as possible. The committee feels that such research and development should be concentrated in the area of such high-energy propellants as boron, diborane and fluorine compounds.

The committee action in providing funds to assure such acceleration is continued evidence of a congressional determination to make as certain as possible American preeminence in space, which could be as vital to our future security as preeminence of American airpower and seapower has been in the 1940's and the 1950's.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the chairman for the very fine statement he has made, I further would like to compliment the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] for his position in connection with the solid-fuel booster which we badly need, and what this program should have when you look at the greater requirements for a larger booster. The solid-fuel field should not be overlooked and should not be closed down by action of one Government department. This committee, the last time we had the solid-fuel booster programs up for consideration, increased the request of NASA by $10 million. So we gave them more money than even NASA requested by emphasizing the solid-fuel boosters.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the former Speaker of the House of Representatives, one of the very fine members of our Science and Astronautics Committee of the House, and our genial friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Martin].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to be associated with the Committee on Science and Astronautics in support of the pending legislation. I have been a Member of this House for many years, as you all know, and I can vouch for the thorough and careful consideration given this bill.

I am very happy to be a member of this committee. One of the real pleasures of my long legislative service is my association with this committee. I never saw a better committee, a more diligent, a more dedicated committee than is the present Committee on Science and Astronautics. In the past I have been accustomed to being forced to drum up quorums. That is not the case with this committee. The committee is ready to start the minute the gavel of the chairman falls. That is a stimulation to me, and most encouraging.

I have also noticed, Mr. Chairman, that the members of this committee dig very deeply into their subjects. They know their subject thoroughly and they come prepared to answer questions; nor do they take things for granted. They must be shown and vigorously question the witnesses.

So I am glad to be associated with this bill. It is a good bill, not all that everyone wants, but on the whole it is a progressive piece of legislation; one that will insure that America will maintain its place in the battle for control of space.

Mr. Chairman, we are very fortunate in having the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller] as chairman of this committee. He is not a bitter partisan, which is another thing I like about the committee. It is not a partisan committee. They give equal treatment to all, no matter what party may be involved. The decisions are fair and impartial. The gentleman from California [Mr. Miller] has always been fair and generous, and he is a good leader.

I also want to congratulate the acting minority leader of the committee. I call him such although he really does much of the work for which I get the credit. I refer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton]. He is a dedicated student of this subject and we are very fortunate on the Republican side to have such a man as a member of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, there will probably be some criticism, one of which comes to my mind at the moment involving the location of a research laboratory. This emphasizes the fairness of the committee. The bill does not bar a single community in the country from presenting whatever claims it desires. We gave everybody what I consider is a fair chance. So I think this is a well-rounded-out bill. It gives everybody a chance on merit and without political pull.

I know this is a lot of money, and I know what money is, because I started at the bottom and fought my own way up. I have had to work my way from boyhood and I know the value of money. I would not spend it unless I believed it was a good gamble. When you get into this space effort, of course, you are making a gamble. I do not know how much money is going to be needed for this. This may not be enough. However, I know it will keep everything moving properly and I know that we will not lose out.

Some people complain because we are not military minded enough in this Legislature. I am not a military man. I want civilian life to have the full benefits of anything that comes out of this and I know that the military will not be neglected, because, as this program unfolds its advantages we do not want to sacrifice anything and we want all to benefit, military as well as civilian—the United States and all of its people. I am not worried over that. I am worried more over what the country and the world might think if we fail to pass this measure. This battle has been faced and it is still going on. The only question is, Are we going to keep America up where it belongs in that fight? I recall some of our committee members saying that we were up in orbit because we recommended an extremely large sum. Well, my friends, they called the Wright brothers a couple of nuts, but that did not stop them. They went on with what they had to do. They followed through, and America won the First World War in large measure through the development of the airplane. So how do we know what is going to develop from the space bill?

I am supporting the bill because I am an American. I am supporting it because I believe it is to the interest of my country. As a matter of fact, I do not think the question is whether we should pass this bill or not. I think the question that a man must answer to himself is, "Can I afford not to pass it? Can I afford not to give the administration a chance to keep the American flag up in the forefront?" Such little things as where a few people or a few installations are placed are, after all, minor things. They will be evaporated in the space of time. I will be frank enough to say that I hope that this survey which they are going to make of this installation will be supported by the scientists and they will agree it should be in New England. However, I would not want it there if it were not for the benefit of the whole country. That is what we are looking for.

The fact that they have to do this all over again, make another recommendation and then come back to the Congress is another point; that is, come back to the Congress instead of to the committee. You are not going to find anyone who knows more about this subject than the Science and Astronautics Committee. That is the committee to which it should come back, because it knows what it is all about and can make a proper proposal.

So, Mr. Chairman, let us pass this bill as it is; perhaps not as it is, because there may be some amendments to correct it. But the point is to pass the bill, a proper space bill and keep the American flag up front.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, the concentration of the space and defense industries on the east and west coasts of this country has been a matter of great concern for those of us living in the Midwest.

A recent publication entitled, "A Report on Economic Growth in the Midwest," published by the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, points out that the Midwest has suffered heavily in the placement of prime military contracts since the Korean war. Our States have suffered heavy losses as indicated by the following figures:

In Michigan the percentage of total awards went from 9.5 to 2.7 percent; in Indiana, 4.5 to 1.46 percent; in Illinois, from 5 to 2 percent; in Ohio, from 6.3 to 4.5 percent; and Wisconsin, from 2 to 1 percent.

A major reason for this geographic shift is that greater emphasis is placed on the missile industry and the electronics industry and, more particularly, for research, development, testing, and evaluation. While California was receiving 41 percent of such RBT and EX contracts in 1961 and New York was receiving over 12 percent and Massachusetts nearly 6 percent, Indiana was receiving only 0.5 percent.

The question why has been asked of Defense Department and NASA officials on many occasions. Dr. Robert Seaman, in testifying before our committee, claimed that one of the main reasons for the location of the proposed electronics research center near Boston was that there was a concentration of scientists and engineers in the Massachusetts area. Dr. Jermone B. Wiesner, the President's special assistant for science and technology, stated that the reason for diverting defense contracts away from the Midwest was that there was "an intellectual vacuum" in the Midwest. We take serious exception to these statements; and I would like to call, as forcibly as possible, to the attention of NASA and the Defense Department officials the following facts:

First. Midwestern schools—Illinois, Purdue, Michigan, Wisconsin, Ohio State, and Northwestern—granted nearly 30 percent of all the Ph. D. degrees in engineering in the United States.

Second. Some half dozen schools, including Illinois, Purdue and Michigan currently account for over half the doctorates in engineering in the United States.

Third. Purdue, Illinois, and Michigan combined grant nearly as many masters degrees—926—as Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Stanford, and the University of California at Los Angeles combined—7,045.

Fourth. Purdue, Illinois, and Michigan grant more bachelors degrees in engineering than all the University of California's campuses combined and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, California Institute of Technology, Stanford, and New York University. Purdue and Illinois rank first and second in the Nation in output of B.S. degrees in engineering.

It would seem to me that the contention that the scientific and engineering talents are concentrated on the two coasts is not valid. The Midwest is engaged in exporting scientific and engineering talent on a major scale.

A major effort should be made to distribute our activities over the country so as to not only provide additional security for this very sensitive activity but also to more equitably affect the economy.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a comment on a speech by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I want to say at this point that the Members all feel we were very much helped by the comments of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker MARTIN, because he put his recommendations on such a high level. It is always a pleasure to have our Speaker give us guidance and light on the committee. We thoroughly appreciate his comments.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, the personal honor and integrity of the Secretary of the Navy were attacked on the floor of the House today. In good conscience I cannot allow this to go unanswered. Earlier, during the debate on the rule, the gentleman from Iowa obtained permission to speak out of order and in the course of his remarks said that Secretary of the Navy Fred Korth had engaged in a clear conflict of interest and called on the President of the United States to fire Secretary Korth.

Mr. Chairman, in a situation of this kind a Member is always in a quandry as to whether he should consider the source and let it drop, or whether in good conscience and good honor he must defend his friend, his constituent, an honorable officer of the U.S. Government.

Mr. Chairman, in 10 years in the U.S. House of Representatives I have never impugned the integrity or the personal honor of any Member of this House or of any member of our President's Cabinet in the previous administration or in this administration, nor would I permit it to be done in my presence if within my power to prevent it.

Fred Korth not only is my constituent, he is my friend. I know him and know him well. I know him as a man of deep personal honor. I know him as a man of sterling patriotism. I know Fred Korth as a profoundly sincere Christian man. And for his honor to be attacked on the floor of the House in such an intemperate way must not go unanswered.

Today Fred Korth is giving tirelessly of his efforts, of his time, of his talents, in answer to the call of his country.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand that the gentleman's words be taken down.

The CHAIRMAN. What words does the gentleman from Iowa demand be taken down?

Mr. GROSS. That the gentleman from Iowa made an intemperate statement.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, permit me to suggest——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend temporarily.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, may I be recognized for a unanimous-consent request?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the words that the gentleman demanded be taken down.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOLEY. Why cannot the gentleman who has the floor ask unanimous consent to amend the words he has uttered?

The CHAIRMAN. He may do so if he desires.

Mr. COOLEY. He wants to be recognized for that purpose but he has not been recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman wants to submit a unanimous-consent request the Chair will recognize him for that purpose.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the word "intemperate" as used to describe the remark of the gentleman from Iowa be stricken, and that I may substitute for the word "intemperate" the word "unfortunate."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. GROSS. I object to that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Ojection is heard. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. WRIGHT. And for his honor to be attacked on the floor of this House in such an intemperate way must not go unanswered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMAS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7500) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations; and for other purposes, certain words used in debate were objected to and on request were taken down and read at the Clerk's desk, and he herewith reported the same to the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. WRIGHT. For his honor to be attacked on the floor of this House in such an intemperate way must not go unanswered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair feels that in debate latitude should be given to Members of the House in expressing their views; and the Chair would construe the word "intemperate" might be used just as the word "improper" might be used.

Therefore, the Chair is of the opinion that the language used is not objectionable under the rule.

The Committee will resume its sitting.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 7500, with Mr. THOMAS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I have tried to proceed in a most temperate way, circumstances permitting. But there can be no constructive excuse whatever for the futile flutter of personal vilification by which a little handful of self-appointed critics have been straining at gnats in a weak effort to attack the integrity of Secretary Korth. Only by the most tortured logic could anyone assess impure motives of personal financial gain to Secretary Fred Korth in connection with any contract for the General Dynamics Corp. Certainly, Mr. Korth owns no stock in that corporation; he sells no supplies to that corporation; he has never been on its payroll in any way.

To contend, as has been contended, that he would have a personal financial interest in the awarding of a contract simply because the recipient corporation at one time borrowed funds from a bank with which Mr. Korth formerly was employed, is extremely farfetched. One might as reasonably question the honor of a public official on the ground that his cousin might own stock in a vending machine corporation which sold cigarettes to the workers in a plant of another corporation where a contract was given. It is entirely farfetched.

In order for anything meaningful to be made of these circumstances, we would have to indulge two extremely untenable assumptions. The first, of course, would have to be that Fred Korth himself, as a man and as a human being, is fundamentally dishonest and is serving his Government for the purpose of his personal financial gain. This clearly is disproven by the fact that he is making a considerable financial sacrifice to serve his country as Secretary of the Navy. He is making considerably less money than he was before he accepted that responsible post.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman inasmuch as part of his time was taken up.

Mr. WRIGHT. Now the second assumption would have to be this.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. No, I do not yield at this time. There are some things, I think, which need saying.

Mr. Chairman, the second assumption would have to be that this huge corporation with holdings all over the country was going to welsh on that loan if it had not received that particular contract. This corporation has never defaulted on an obligation and has a net worth fully ample to justify loans many times the amount of the one in question, and this is such a farfetched conclusion that it is utterly beyond reason to discuss it.

But the serious question, it seems to me, is—how are we going to attract the services of decent, honorable, and able administrators to serve this Government of the United States at a financial sacrifice if, when they do so, we then subject them to the personal harassment, the partisan vilification, and abusive charges against their personal honor and integrity? This, I think, is a serious question.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the House and the Congress indeed would do well to bridle its own tongue and to exercise some sense of self-restraint in the things it says about the leaders of our Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON].

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order in order to ask a question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. I would ask the gentleman from Texas if he is familiar with the hearings that are being held by the Senate Government Operations Committee wherein testimony has been received to the effect that the bank in Texas in which Secretary Korth has served as an officer had loaned several hundred thousand dollars to the General Dynamics Corp.? And did the gentleman know that Secretary Korth has retained his stock ownership in this bank after he has become the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. WRIGHT. I would say to the gentleman from Washington, first, that I am quite familiar with this testimony and that this is exactly what I was addressing my remarks to earlier. I think it is far-fetched and has no connection. I know Secretary Korth stands to make no personal financial gain by the widest stretch of the imagination. If the TFX contract had not gone to the corporation, it still would have paid the note to the bank. This corporation owns, in addition to the Fort Worth plant, several other successful enterprises including Electric Boat Co., and has built several big plants on the west coast. I say to the gentleman that it would be nothing short of ridiculous to assume that this bank loan was ever in any way in danger of default, or that it ever would have had any remote bearing whatever upon Secretary Korth's decision on the TFX contract. That decision was based on comparative technical evaluations which Secretary Korth very fully and adequately set forth in the hearing to which the gentleman refers.

The very same decision was reached by Secretary Zuckert and Secretary McNamara. They certainly could not be said to have been influenced by any loan made to anyone by this bank. Neither was Fred Korth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. STINSON. Does not the gentleman think there is a possibility that Mr. Korth's objectivity might not be quite the same as if he did not hold stock in this particular bank? Do you not think this bank would tend to lose a great deal if the General Dynamics Co. was unable to acquire this contract?

Mr. WRIGHT. Well, I certainly do not. I know Fred Korth and I am quite sure his objectivity was not in any way compromised by this fact. Furthermore, I think the gentleman draws an utterly unwarranted conclusion when he thinks that the bank was going to suffer if the company did not get that particular contract. The company would have paid its note whether or not it had received that contract, or any other of a dozen contracts. The company is quite solvent. I think the two contingencies are utterly disconnected. The Continental National Bank of Fort Worth also is a thoroughly solvent institution. This is only one loan out of many thousands which it has made. And, further, to assume that a gentleman of the character and of the stature of Fred Korth, who is big enough to be Secretary of the Navy, would let a matter of this kind interfere with his judgment as to what is best for the United States, would be far too petty for words. Fred Korth is amply big enough to make up his mind and use his best judgment regardless of a small matter of that kind. If he were not, he would not be big enough to be Secretary of the Navy in the first place.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to pay a brief but sincere tribute to each of the members of the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight, with whom I had the pleasure of working this year as subcommittee chairman.

The members of the subcommittee are the Honorable EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, Hon. JAMES G. FULTON, Hon. BOB CASEY, Hon. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, Hon. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR., Hon. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, Hon. EDWARD J. PATTEN, Hon. ALPHONZO BELL, Hon. DON FUQUA, and Hon. EDWARD J. GURNEY.

This subcommittee has worked as hard on the current NASA authorization bill as any group I have witnessed in my years in Congress. Each of them has been digging into the complex problems of manned space flight since early in the year, and each has gone without letup right down to the present day. They have been at it morning, noon, and night. They have traveled thousands of miles in order personally to visit each of NASA's centers which is concerned with manned space flight. Their efforts to familiarize themselves with all aspects of the program at the working level have been unstinting.

It has taken 1,500 printed pages of testimony to record the hearings held by the subcommittee, and even that does not tell the whole story. For, in addition, many weeks of hard work have been spent in executive session in making decisions regarding this very important national program.

I feel constrained to say also that the work of the subcommittee has been completely bipartisan and nonpolitical. There has never been a time when any member of the subcommittee put the interests of his party or his district ahead of the national interest. Neither has any member sought to subvert or alter the goals of the national space effort for selfish or partisan reasons.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the record to show that I have the highest admiration and regard for the subcommittee and for the work they have turned out. I sincerely believe it to be a dedicated effort which has few parallels in recent history.

Finally, I cannot close these comments without a note of tribute to the chairman of the full committee, the Honorable George P. Miller. The gentleman from California [Mr. Miller] acted in my judgment with complete fairness and permitted the subcommittees all necessary time and latitude to do the job required of them. His counsel and patience have been instrumental in getting the job done.

Mr. Chairman, the Manned Space Subcommmittee had the responsibility of the money that goes to the installations at Huntsville, Ala.; at Cape Canaveral, Fla.; at the Mississippi Test Center, as well as the plant which is located in New Orleans; and the installation at Houston, Tex. Under these installations come a number of programs; namely, the Mercury program, the Gemini program and the Apollo program.

Our Mercury program is completed and of course it was completely successful. Certainly all America owes a great debt of thanks to the entire Mercury team that made it so successful.

Mr. Chairman, we have recently seen the completion of America's first man-in-space program—the pioneering and highly complex Project Mercury. This has been a completely successful undertaking, and the remarkable thing about it is that it was accomplished virtually on schedule and with less than 5-percent cost overrun.

Few research programs can show such a record.

The Mercury project did not begin in earnest until 1960. After the first shot showed that the Atlas missile would have to be strengthened and modified to handle the 3,500-pound Mercury capsule, the story of Mercury proceeded without a major hitch.

Eight successive shots went off very close to schedule and each accomplished its designed mission. The fourth Mercury shot carried Astronaut Alan B. Shepard on a 15-minute suborbital flight in May 1961. Two years later, the ninth and last of the Mercury flights carried Astronaut Gordon Cooper around the world 23 times in 32 hours.

This, I believe, is a truly fine accomplishment.

It is especially so since Project Mercury first, demanded the complete coordination of a worldwide communications and recovery network in addition to performing a most difficult engineering task; and second, since the basic know-how developed in the course of Project Mercury is essential to the success of the follow-on programs—Project Gemini and the manned lunar landing program itself.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who have been close to these programs for a number of years realize how much has been accomplished in an area which at times appears to be virtually impossible.

I would like to extend the highest commendation to all members of the Mercury team beginning with D. Brainerd Holmes, the retiring Director of the Office of Manned Space Flight, who was the chief overseer of this program—and including Joseph F. Shea, Deputy Director, Systems, Office of Manned Space Flight; George M. Low, Deputy Director for Programs at NASA; Mr. William E. Lilly, Director, Program Review and Resources Management, Office of Manned Space Flight, NASA; Dr. Kurt H. Debus, Director, NASA Launch Operations Center, Cape Canaveral; Dr. Robert R. Gilruth, Director, NASA Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Tex.; Mr. Walter C. Williams, Associate Director, NASA Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Tex., and many others who played equally important roles in the success of Mercury.

Of course these compliments extend also to the hard and devoted work of the astronauts themselves and particularly to the seven original astronauts, Comdr. Malcolm S. Carpenter, Maj. L. Gordon Cooper, Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., Maj. Virgil I. Grissom, Comdr. Walter M. Schirra, Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., and Maj. Donald K. Slayton.

Finally, I cannot overlook the contributions of Dr. Wernher von Braun, head of the Marshall Space Flight Center at Huntsville, Ala. While Dr. von Braun was not directly associated with Mercury, it has been his work in rocket engines and techniques which has been responsible to a considerable degree for the reliability of equipment used in the Mercury project.

Mr. Chairman, I asked permission earlier in the day to bring these models and exhibits onto the floor of the House in order to give the membership a better feeling of what is going to happen in our manned space program in the next few years.

The small model on your left is the Atlas which placed the Mercury capsules in orbit. The Mercury capsule weighs approximately 3,000 pounds.

The next model is of the Saturn, which will place approximately 22,000 pounds in earth's orbit.

The next model is the Saturn 1-B, which is due to place about 32,000 pounds in earth's orbit.

Then there is the giant Saturn V which will place 240,000 pounds in earth's orbit and 90,000 pounds into outer space.

Mr. Chairman, our subcommittee has divided its programs among members of the subcommittee who will speak individually about these programs.

The gentlewoman from New York made a very appropriate remark in the fact that we have no scientists in Congress. Because of that fact our subcommittee went to the different companies involved in this program. We questioned every witness we could think of that might contribute to our coming to a better decision as far as the House is concerned. I am sure that some of our scientists and engineers became more frustrated over the hundreds and hundreds of questions that we threw at them, than the space frustration.

Our committee—I am sure I can speak for all of them—had a tremendous interest in the whole Mercury program. We had to take much of the matter submitted and base it on faith in this group of men, but I would like to assure you this subcommittee has done everything it could possibly do to learn the truth of this program. We have made some reductions, some deferrals, but we do not think they are going to cripple the program.

I hope the House will accept this bill as the committee has reported it.

Mr. Chairman, the manned space flight portion of this fiscal 1964 budget is the largest yet presented to Congress. As you can see from the report, it comes to $3.2 billion—which is roughly about $1 billion more than was authorized last year.

This is an overall figure and includes funds for the construction of facilities and costs related thereto, as well as for research and development.

Before proceeding further, I would like to take a moment to try to dispel several extreme notions that a lot of people have about our man-to-the-moon program.

One of these notions is founded on the allegation that we are proceeding on a crash basis, that we are thereby spending a lot more money than we otherwise would need to and are greedily consuming the bulk of the Nation's scientific talent in the process.

The other notion is based on the allegation, which we have recently heard from NASA's Administrator, that the amount of money requested for the manned lunar landing is a sacrosanct bare minimum which must be left totally intact if we are not to slip badly in our lunar landing schedules and lose money in the bargain.

In my opinion, neither of these allegations will win any awards for accuracy. Let me explain why I think this.

The Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight, which I serve as chairman, has been investigating the manned flight part of the 1964 space budget ever since the 1st of March.

During this period the subcommittee held 33 open hearings plus 12 executive sessions; it took testimony from more than 100 witnesses. This included, in addition to NASA witnesses, those from other Government departments such as the Defense Department and the Air Force, from half a dozen industrial organizations, from the National Aeronautics and Space Council and from the astronauts themselves.

At the same time, the subcommittee traveled as a group for discussions with those most concerned with doing the actual work on manned space flight throughout the country. This meant meeting with both industry and government people in the Los Angeles area, in Sunnyvale, at Edwards Air Force Base, at Cape Canaveral, at Daytona Beach and at Houston. In addition, members of the subcommittee, both prior to and during the course of our hearings, spent time at other NASA centers involved in manned space flight, at Huntsville, Michoud, and the Mississippi test facility.

For the most part we found the manned space flight program to be well organized, planned and managed—particularly in relation to the relatively short time it has been underway.

Those involved in it are certainly not loafing, but neither is the program proceeding on a crash basis with lots of overtime, duplication of effort, and excessive demands for personnel, hardware and facilities. What we recommend here is needed. It is true that we could slow the program down; but we would not save any significant amount of money by doing it. In fact, we would be apt to spend a good deal more in the long run due to the inefficiency which always accompanies idle pacing. This program is like a gasoline engine. You do not get your best mileage from 80 miles an hour—but you do not get it from 15 miles an hour either.

At the same time, we cannot accept the argument that NASA's original requests for fiscal 1964 are inviolable.

For one thing, the nature of NASA's work requires it to draw up its budget far in advance. Long leadtimes must be accommodated. The budget we are considering here was put together 18 months ago. The 1965 budget has already been in formulation for some time. Between the time these budgets are made and the time Congress considers them, a lot has happened and many plans have changed. It does not, therefore, make sense to say that the funding requests themselves cannot be changed.

Secondly, as I have indicated, our committee has gone straight to those doing the work in order to get complete information on budget problems. This meant detailed discussions with private contractors as well as Government officials. And in the end, we were not satisfied that the requests for money were justified in every case. We were not satisfied that all of the money requested could be wisely spent in the time period involved. We were not satisfied that some of it could be obligated at all during the fiscal year.

So it is a considerable exaggeration to say that any reduction of NASA's requested budget will result in dire consequences to the manned space program.

It is true, of course, that unexpected problems turn up in research and development programs. Budgeting for research and development in astronautics is particularly complex and uncertain. But it is also true that Congress will be here most of this year and again next January. If NASA runs into serious difficulty due to funding deficiencies, we will be glad to consider justified supplemental requests at any appropriate time.

And I would point out that any potential delay which might materialize because of this procedure can easily be compensated for by the flexibility of funding which we permit in NASA's research and development undertakings.

NATURE OF THE PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, other committee members will describe the detailed aspects of the manned space flight program. I would like to give a brief overall view of just what this program entails at the present time.

First, there is no money in this budget for Project Mercury. That program is ended—very successfully, I might add. It consisted of nine major space shots—the last six of them manned and the last four ranging from 3 to 23 orbits. I am sure you all remember the final 32-hour flight of Maj. Gordon Cooper in May. The total cost of Project Mercury was about $358 million, and it is worth noting that this cost was only $14 million, or 4 percent, more than the projected cost as estimated when Mercury got underway.

Then there is Project Gemini, the top-priority manned space flight program of the moment. This is the two-man spacecraft which will undertake flights of a week or more and develop the highly critical techniques of rendezvous and docking between several spacecraft. To date we have spent about $290 million on Gemini, exclusive of rocket boosters, and the committee has approved the request of $306 million for fiscal 1964. Gemini will probably about double the sum of these figures before it concludes in 1965 or 1966.

Finally, there is Project Apollo, which is our manned lunar landing program. This project calls for a three-man spaceship to be launched by the giant Saturn-5, to orbit the moon, to send two men to the surface of the moon in a special landing vehicle, to return to the mother ship and then head back for earth.

Apollo, exclusive of rocket development, has cost about $500 million to date and the committee recommends here a commitment of a little over $1 billion for this fiscal year—that is, 1964.

We cannot give a firm estimate of the total cost of Apollo. There are just too many imponderables to overcome. Our best guess at present is that the final cost of the manned lunar landing effort, assuming it occurs in late 1969 or 1970, will be just under $20 billion. We believe that Apollo costs will increase somewhat during the next several years and then begin to taper off about 1967. It seems likely that the average cost over the next 5 years will run about $2.6 billion per year for this particular project.

Aside from these programs as I have outlined them, the bill before us carries an additional $1.1 billion for launch vehicles and propulsion systems which includes the various forms of the Saturn rocket and its engines, $11 million for aerospace medicine, $125 million for development of integration and checkout systems for the lunar landing program, and $37 million for systems engineering.

What new programs of manned space flight may be added to our lunar landing effort cannot be told at present. The decisions have not yet been made. Very likely, however, they will involve orbiting space stations or laboratories as the next step. And, eventually, a manned flight to Mars seems the probable first candidate for planetary exploration.

BUDGET REDUCTIONS

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to summarize for the House the findings made by the committee relative to manned space flight and explain the budget reductions agreed upon.

The total reduction in research and development is $183,700,000. This is 6.3 percent of the requested research and development budget for manned space flight and has been distributed as follows:

Project Apollo, $120 million: This is the largest part of the reduction made in research and development. While it is a substantial reduction in terms of dollars, it is in fact slightly less than a 10-percent cut of the amount requested by NASA for Project Apollo in 1964. Parenthetically, it should be noted that the Apollo figure does not include development of the Saturn vehicles and engines—for which approximately another $1 billion is being requested. The reduction in this area was agreed upon after investigation by the committee in California and interrogation of NASA witnesses showed that the use of the amount in question could not be wholly identified. This was particularly true in connection with the development of the command and service modules, for which $661 million had been requested.

The M–1 engine, $30 million: The M–1 engine is a 1½-million-pound-thrust oxygen-hydrogen engine originally intended to serve as an upper stage in the Nova. There is now no specific mission for the M–1 engine, but the advantage of its higher specific impulse makes it a potentially useful engine for some future vehicle. The committee felt that the $45 million NASA requested for the M–1 was excessive in view of the very long leadtime envisioned for this engine, plus the fact that present concepts of this type may be outmoded or in need of revision by the 1970's when the M–1 would become operational. At the same time, the committee did not wish to eliminate completely development of the engine. It, therefore, decided to recommend that $15 million of the $45 million be retained for continued study and development.

Integration and checkout, $28 million: NASA requested $153 million for 1964 to be used for integration and checkout of all systems connected with

Project Apollo. The major part of this money is to be used to fund contractor services. However, NASA could not say specifically how much would be required for this purpose. It estimates a minimum of $100 million and a maximum of $125 million. The NASA testimony on what would be done with the balance of $28 million was also vague and uncertain. The committee, therefore, eliminated the balance.

Aerospace medicine, $5.7 million: NASA requested $16.7 million for biomedical engineering in connection with its manned space flight program for 1964. This is more than a 100 percent increase of the funds allocated in 1963 for this purpose. Committee investigation disclosed that the rate of progress required, together with the bioscience capability existing within other Government agencies, primarily the Air Force and the Navy, should make it possible to fund this project at the level of $11 million instead of the total amount requested.

Construction of facilities: NASA requested a total of $564,538,000 for construction of new manned space flight facilities in its 1964 budget. From this amount, the committee cut $75,422,000. The reduction is a 13.4 percent cut in the total requested. However, more than 90 percent of this amount represents either deferrals where the money can be funded incrementally over several years rather than one, or the elimination of a request for advanced design money which NASA has already funded from past budgets.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN].

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I should like also to allude to a statement made when we were considering the rule in the House today by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE]. That is, that none of us on the committee are completely proficient in this great field of endeavor. I assure you that the Member speaking to you from the well of the House takes that position today. But, although we do not pose as experts in this field, we have arrived, in my estimation, at a level of experience which has permitted a very thorough and incisive evaluation of NASA's request.

This is a complicated subject, one which has taken the best of every member of our committee. May I say to you this has not been gone into in an idle manner but in a serious manner. We have spent not weeks, but months, studying the provisions of this bill, and we did our level best in coming up with a bill that we feel is not alone good for the program which this country has developed to put a man on the moon, but also good for the other fields of activity which this program is bound to be interwoven with.

So I say to you who are here this afternoon, when this committee cut from the program certain amounts, we did it with the knowledge and with the assurance, at least in our own minds, that the Apollo project would be kept on the track and that we would accomplish the goal we set out to accomplish in our authorizations of last year and the year before.

Now, the subcommittee that I serve on was assigned the responsibility for this man-in-space program, and we carried out this responsibility under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman who just spoke previous to me, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. The portion which I would like to speak about very briefly is that which deals with Apollo, the spacecraft which will take man to the moon and land him safely there, I hope, and bring him back to earth.

In our procedures and in our deliberations, we did cut this Apollo program to the extent of $120 million.

To those who say we have cut this program too deeply, my answer is, after being intimately involved with it for the past 5 months, that NASA can live with this cut and can keep Apollo on schedule.

By supporting this bill, you will be supporting our national goal in space.

To those who say we have not cut deeply enough, I say that to cut the authorization for Apollo much below committee levels will be tantamount to saying not only that this body no longer accepts this important national goal but also that it no longer feels U.S. supremacy in space to be of paramount importance.

You cannot make drastic cuts in this bill without seriously hampering both pursuits.

We are fighting for scientific and technological leadership in space, and this is very closely related to our total security.

The resulting stimulus to science generally, to science education, to basic research, to technology, to industry, and to the economy cannot help but strengthen our total national security, which is certainly comprised of all these elements.

Our gains in technological know-how will have military applications. This was touched on by the chairman.

Two of the more obvious will be the great increase in booster capacity and in knowledge of what it takes for man to survive and function during long periods in space environment.

Our committee gave diligent study to the role of the manned space flight program in the strengthening of our military posture. There is little doubt about its importance and little doubt that we will be jeopardizing knowledge of great value to the military if we cut this Apollo program back. For a fuller treatment of the committee's position in this area I refer you to the report accompanying this bill.

These achievements I have mentioned depend on the timely success of this program, and that, in turn, depends very much on your support of this bill.

I would like to touch briefly on the Apollo configuration, the flight plan, the overall timetable and then what is scheduled for Apollo in fiscal 1964.

The Apollo spacecraft is made up of three separate units or modules.

The first is the command module, which houses the three-man crew, serves as the control center for spacecraft operation and also as the vehicle for reentry into the earth's atmosphere.

Inside it men will be able to work, eat and sleep without wearing pressure suits. Its basic configuration will be very much like that of the Mercury capsule.

The service module houses many of the spacecraft support systems and also contains the necessary propulsion system so that the spacecraft can be propelled into and out of lunar orbit and can change course during the flight.

The command and service modules are under contract to North American Aviation.

The third unit of the spacecraft is called the lunar excursion module.

It will be entered by two members of the crew, after the craft is in lunar orbit, then detached from the mother craft and flown to the surface of the moon.

Then, when the 24-hour exploration of the moon's surface is completed its propulsion system will lift it from the moon, it will rendezvous in lunar orbit with the mother craft, the two crew members will reenter the command module and the lunar excursion module will then be cast loose into lunar orbit just prior to the return flight to earth.

This module is under contract to the Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp.

The flight plan for Apollo is, briefly, this: A three-stage Saturn V will boost the spacecraft from Cape Canaveral. Its first two stages will be used to place the spacecraft and the third stage of the booster into orbit around the earth.

From the earth orbit the Saturn third stage will propel the spacecraft into lunar trajectory. The third stage will then be jettisoned. When the craft reaches the vicinity of the moon, the service module retro rockets will be fired, placing it in orbit around the moon.

Two of the crew members will then transfer from the command to the excursion module. The latter will separate and descend to the moon while the mother craft continues to orbit. The excursion module is equipped so that it can hover and move laterally, permitting the pilots to select the best landing site.

After exploration, the pilots will blast off the moon and return to lunar orbit where the excursion module will rendezvous with the mother craft. They will transfer back into the command module. The excursion module will be jettisoned and remain in orbit around the moon. The service module will then propel the craft into earth trajectory and will be used to make necessary directional changes during the flight back to earth.

When the craft has reached the entire corridor the service module will be jettisoned. The command module will then reenter the earth's atmosphere in much the same fashion as the Mercury capsule, but it has been developed so that its parachutes can bring it down on land as well as water.

Now, the timetable for Project Apollo. The spacecraft modules will be qualified in various unmanned suborbital and earth orbital missions during this and the next calendar years.

During 1965 and 1966, manned earth orbital flights in Apollo will be used to further develop reliable spacecraft systems and train flight crews

During 1966 and 1967 various manned earth orbital flights in Apollo will be used to further develop reliable spacecraft systems and train flight crews.

During 1966 and 1967 various manned earth orbital flights will be used to perfect the rendezvous technique.

Then from 1967 on will come such manned circumlunar or lunar-orbital flights as will be necessary to develop operational techniques in the lunar environment.

Then follows the lunar landing.

Now let us look for a moment at what will be accomplished on Apollo during fiscal 1964.

It is planned to build up to 12 development spacecraft this year and to undertake the actual building, testing, and qualification of the various module components and subsystems.

The first two spacecraft for long-duration manned orbital flights will be built this year.

Other spacecraft will be in various stages of manufacture to support a delivery schedule in fiscal 1965 of a man-qualified craft every 3 months.

There will be three Saturn launches to determine spacecraft and launch vehicle compatibility.

Further tests will be conducted to develop the high reliability needed for the command and service module propulsion system and the abort sensing systems.

Design of the ground support equipment will be completed and construction begun.

Complete ground support equipment for the first manned orbital Apollo flight will be developed and delivered.

All flight simulation and other crew training equipment will be operational.

For the lunar excursion module, 1964 will see the construction of a structural model and extensive testing of the module propulsion system, structural design and landing gear.

In fiscal 1964 prototype guidance and navigation systems are to be developed and intensive ground testing will be underway.

Effort will be directed to the design, procurement, fabrication and testing of the vast and intricate system of instrumentation and specialized scientific devices that will be required for Apollo.

It can readily be seen that Apollo is no longer a drawing board concept.

Basic design studies have all been completed on the three spacecraft modules, and they will go into various stages of construction this year.

Let us take one look very quickly at what is anticipated as far as the cost of this program is concerned and what it will cost us really to put a man on the moon. I am sure that every member of the committee will agree with me that NASA has not given us in definite dollars and cents exactly what that cost will be, but I think we have had enough experience, and the information that we have been able to gather has shown that we can make a fair estimate of what the cost of achieving our goals in this decade is going to be. It is estimated that the cost of Project Apollo and all the related and associated programs will be something in the neighborhood of $19.76 billion. Today if we approve the bill that is before the House, we will have given to NASA and they will have either obligated most of the funds or authorized the obligation of them, a sum of something over $6.75 billion. My understanding today is that the requests that are going to be made to us in the next 4 years will average in the neighborhood of $3.2 billion annually, which will add up to another $13 billion. Therefore if we add the two figures together, we will get a total amount of roughly $19.75 billion. That does not include the overall cost of the NASA program, just the manned space flight portion.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIEHLMAN. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I would like to compliment the gentleman because I know how hard he has studied this matter and worked on it and how interested he has been in the man-in-space flight program. Can you assure the committee that this money is necessary and that none of it is being wasted and that we by authorizing and appropriating this money are watching out for the taxpayers and the U.S. Treasury as well as the space program?

Mr. RIEHLMAN. I would assure the gentleman and every Member of the House that this committee has had in mind exactly what he has suggested, ever since we started our hearings back in January. This was alluded to by the chairman of the committee in his initial remarks here on the floor today.

Mr. Chairman, let me close with these brief remarks. The question before the House today is whether we as a body shall continue to endorse and pursue the goal of a lunar landing in this decade. May I say to you, no one knows all the spin-off and the benefit that is going to be derived by mankind from this program in addition to the obvious strengthening of our total national security. I could allude to other statements that were made, but I want to go back again to what my distinguished colleague from New York said, something about the inventions and the accomplishments that can be made in this great Nation of ours. We are a pioneering people, a pioneering nation. We cannot sit by idly and allow any nation on the face of the earth to overcome us in the field of technology and knowledge in as important a field as this adventure into space.

My hope is that the House today will decide favorably upon the recommendations that have been made by our committee. I commend every Member who served with me on the committee for the earnest and conscientious endeavor to bring the best possible bill here today for our consideration.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I share the growing concern that the United States is spending too much money in space. To me there is room to believe that we are in a race for the outer reaches of space without any clear idea of why or where this race will take us. Space exploration is important and military applications in space can be highly important. These have nothing to do with being first on the moon. I am deeply concerned with the fact that being first on the moon appears to be the primary objective of our space effort. I am equally concerned that this may very well not be the kind of program that would best serve the interests of the United States.

A principal reason for being first on the moon seems to be our desire to go there ahead of the Russians. A cold analysis of the situation would indicate little chance of beating the Russians to the moon if indeed they want to get there. They have had many firsts in space. These have given them a measure of prestige. However, that prestige has not meant the end of the world for the United States; nor will a Russian landing on the moon. However, English scientists who have studied Russian activities say the Russians doubt the feasibility of a moon landing and indicate they are not really trying to beat this country to the moon. Obviously, neither we nor any other country outside of Russia knows the true facts. But if this is indeed the Russian attitude they are showing better sense than the United States.

I have wondered many times why we have not made a concerted effort to achieve a joint space exploration program which would include ourselves, the Russians and any other nation which has a genuine interest in such an effort. We have just concluded negotiations leading to a nuclear test ban which most of us thought would never come. It may be that we have indeed reached a turning point in the cold war and that the Russians are in the mood for additional understanding with the West. To me there is much to be said for a joint effort which would enlist the best efforts of all interested countries in the new and costly field of space exploration. If we could save ourselves half the fantastic cost to which the space race is subjecting us, it would be a laudable achievement indeed. A joint effort would take away the unfortunate implication that "He who gets there first gets all."

Let us realize that the sea of space upon which we are embarked is broad and very largely unknown. By and large, our moon probes have contributed little. This would indicate a need for more orderly planning with less haste. I do not know anyone who says that a race to the moon is the most rational way to gain knowledge in space. I would prefer to see us build space capability on a broad front. This broad front should carefully seek out and study applications of economic, military, or scientific significance.

Actually, the military applications in space do not now appear particularly significant. Whatever we can do from space in the immediate future we can do better from the earth. Nevertheless, this could be an area where a breakthrough in achievement by the Russians could be extremely dangerous to our safety. We dare not neglect this field. Rather than the present program, I prefer to see a more vigorous effort to explore military applications in space and to see equal emphasis on the development of scientific knowledge about space. And I cannot ignore other aspects of human needs not associated with space which must be bypassed or overlooked to permit one vainglorious effort to get to the moon.

Let us put the space race in place. It is important, but not as important as its present tempo would indicate. I trust that we may soon have a realistic reappraisal of our real aims in space.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH].

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 7500. I join my colleagues with the feeling very firmly embedded upon my mind that no more extensive, no more intensive hearings were held on any bill during this session of Congress than were held upon the bill that is now before this Committee for consideration.

However, before I engage in any specifics on that portion of the budget that I was privileged to handle as subcommittee chairman, may I extend my sincere thanks and personal appreciation to all of the other subcommittee members for having done a really magnificent job under very trying circumstances, with very little, if any, fanfare, on a most tedious and most difficult job; because there is nothing really exciting or glamorous about basic research and technology and I might add there is nothing really glamorous about space sciences, either.

Inasmuch as these were the two offices of NASA that we covered, I do, Mr. Chairman, at this time offer my very sincere personal thanks and appreciation to each of the subcommittee members that served day after day, week after week and month after month for 4 long months hearing the evidence, taking the testimony, and writing the report that was accepted by the full committee. The subcommittee members I refer to are Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico, Mr. RANDALL of Missouri, Mr. DOWNING of Virginia, Mr. STAEBLER of Michigan, Mr. CHENOWETH of Colorado, Mr. VAN PELT of Wisconsin, Mr. MOSHER of Ohio, and Mr. WEAVER of Pennsylvania. In fact, so exhaustive and so intensive, Mr. Chairman, were the hearings before our subcommittee that in the final analysis as we voted on the many projects that came before our subcommittee there were only two dissenting votes and these two dissenting votes were on two different subject matters, or I should say on two different projects before the committee.

One was a minor vote, or a lone vote, if you will, to increase the budget proposal that we were making to the full committee by $28 million. The other vote was a single vote to decrease the budget proposal we were to make to the full committee, by $5 million. So certainly I think this is evidence of the fact that there was no partisanship flavor on the subcommittee which I was privileged to chair. On the contrary, I think the record is replete with evidence that all of the members keenly appreciate the importance, if not indeed the necessity, for American preeminence in space.

Previously I stated, Mr. Chairman, that there was little glamor in the Office of Space Sciences and in the Office of Advanced Research and Technology, but there are no programs in the overall space program that are in my opinion any more important than those being sponsored by those two offices. The fact of the matter is that to fulfill the U.S. destiny as the leading nation in space, the space sciences and advanced research and technology programs are absolutely indispensable.

The research conducted by these two offices is highly technical. It involves a great many programs. It involves many different projects. Therefore, I will endeavor not to review each of them in detail, but suffice it to say that there are more than 50 highly technical, highly scientific, and grossly difficult to understand programs before the subcommittee on which I serve. These 50-some-odd programs and projects are exclusive of construction and facilities.

Just to give you a feel for the diversity of projects before the committee, let me call to your attention that they range through energetic particle explorers, ionospheric monitors, orbiting solar observatories, geophysical and astronomical observatories to propulsion systems of all types, chemical, nuclear, and electric, research grants and facilities to universities and colleges, space programs of all kinds, human-factor systems, the supersonic transport, international satellites, and so on.

Without attempting to give a definite summary of each of these, I will try to summarize the activities of each of the main offices involved.

The Office of Space Sciences is engaged primarily in small, medium-sized rockets, unmanned earth orbit instrumented spacecraft, and interplanetary, instrumented spacecraft.

Their specific jobs are to investigate the phenomena and properties of earth, to investigate the properties of the atmosphere, to investigate the properties of near space, and the entire solar system. Their responsibility is to do this from the vantage point of space, because neither telescopes or radar, due to the heavy atmosphere of the earth, are capable of doing this kind of job.

Space sciences research has unlocked many secrets. Secrets about space systems technology, about booster power reliability, about electronic systems and their reliability, and about the earth's magnetic field, space hostility, and so forth. Yes, Mr. Chairman, the work that has been done by this Office of Space Sciences has given us a new appreciation of what the world really looks like, because it was not too long ago we thought it was round. Today we know that it more accurately resembles a pear.

I might say that this one determination, that is, what the size and shape of the earth really is, Mr. Chairman, has many important significances, because it affects worldwide accuracies.

If we are thinking of making our ICBM's accurate, this then becomes a very important technological breakthrough indeed. Of course, it affects worldwide communications and oceangoing ship locations and so on.

So, indeed, in this one area alone, I suppose we could honestly agree that this whole program has paid for itself.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the Office of Space Sciences has a direct effect upon the space development program and a very direct effect on space knowledge and technology applications.

Let me also briefly summarize the work of the Office of Advanced Research and Technology.

Their basic purpose is to lay the foundation, the building blocks if you please, for advancing this Nation's space technology in all areas, and that includes the area of aeronautics. In part their work is a continuation of NASA's predecessor, the old National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics. Their objectives, I might state, at this point are designed to meet both civilian and military needs for those who might be doubters in that area. They do basic research on aerodynamics including vertical takeoff and vertical landing.

They do basic research on all materials, structures and propulsions in joint effort with the Defense Department and the FAA.

Another major program in aeronautics is the X–15, a hypersonic velocity aircraft with designated speeds of more than 4,000 miles per hour and heights reaching into weightless space.

In space oriented research, Mr. Chairman, OART is doing extraordinary work in the fields of propulsion, and high energy, high specific impulse cryogenic fuels, and the new solid propellant fuels, and I am glad the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] expressed interest in it moments ago, and electric and nuclear propulsion fields as well. All with the purpose in mind of developing greater efficiency, greater reliability, and longer endurance for flights lasting weeks, months, and even years and most important of all, perhaps, ways of reducing the high cost of building these tremendously large boosters today.

The Office of Advance Research and Technology is doing extensive work in creating materials that heretofore were unknown materials and will create materials tomorrow, I suppose, that are unknown even today; materials in all fields—metals, ceramics, plastics as well as others.

Still another most important area includes auxiliary power sources, electric power for space vehicle engines and control instrumentation and communications and life support systems.

These developments will efficiently capture the sun's energy, for example, and convert it directly into electrical energy. I might say the development of nuclear reactors to produce electric power in space is probably the ultimate answer of our real objective to go into outer space for long periods of time.

Finally, OART does research and technological development on vehicle materials to withstand micrometeoroid impacts in space and still remain of light weight; to technologically develop materials and sealing out of heavy radiation and to protect against enormous temperature changes that vary from temperatures as high as plus hundreds of degrees Fahrenheit in 1 minute to minus hundreds of degrees Fahrenheit the next minute or certainly, at most, in a matter of hours.

It is worthy to recall, Mr. Chairman, that our scientific and technological developments which we take for granted today have their roots deep in the basic research of yesterday. I do not care if it is the automobile or the airplane or the telephone or the radio or TV or what, but always this country or whoever was developing some of the modern conveniences of today—always it was a fact that first came the tedious, expensive and unglamorous basic research which provided the technological breakthroughs.

I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, if and when we cease in this country to do research in our Government laboratories, if we cease research in our universities and our colleges and in our private industries, then, and then for sure, we will cease to be a great Nation. Make no mistake about it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, how does the work of the Office of Space Sciences and Advanced Research and Technology tie in with this Nation's defense? I think it is a fair question. Frankly, our space program is a peaceful one.

Mr. Chairman, I could not help but appreciate remarks of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George], when she indicated that maybe what we needed more of, if you please, were peaceful competitions between leading nations. But the matter of the fact is, the space program does tie in with our national security, and it ties in with our national security so closely that it should be embarrassing for those who seek to divide it or should be embarrassing for those who seek not to recognize it. Not because of any ulterior motive, nor do I charge such, because I know they are sincere in their thinking but, rather, from what is obviously a complete lack of knowledge or understanding of the space program.

Mr. Chairman, our interplanetary monitors, our ionospheric explorers, our orbiting geophysical instruments, our solar and our astronomical observations as well as our sounding rockets are doing well. Our geo probes are at work. Our structures and materials, our plastics and ceramics, our research in the field of chemical, nuclear and electrical propulsion, our development of auxiliary powers—how to keep a man alive in space, how to boost him up and bring him back alive, the hostilities of space such as radiation, its magnetic fields, its meteoroids and its solar eruptions, all these things, Mr. Chairman, are directly or indirectly applicable to this Nation's security and, again, make no mistake about that. For, if ever a war is to be fought in outer space or from outer space, all of this technology, all of these scientific investigations and the knowledge that we have gained from them will need to be applied to a military system to protect this country against the enemy.

So, Mr. Chairman, with nearly every project, with nearly every program, there may be or will be directly or indirectly a military application.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by saying—and I shall not dwell on the whole proposition of prestige, because I think it is too nebulous if not too meaningless for many to understand, but I will say that in all cases it is more often true than not that the weak generally gravitate to the strong and that nation which is strong in science and technology commands the respect of friend or foe alike, because that is the test of strength for the future. Therein, I think, lies the answer to future progress.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, our budget reductions are as follows: The committee recommends to the House a reduction of $89.2 million, or approximately 12.1 percent, in the Office of Space Sciences. In addition, the committee refused to authorize $7.7 million of the Office of Space Sciences request for construction of facilities. This amounts to approximately a 30.3-percent reduction in their budget request for construction.

Thus we recommend the House authorize a total of $666,477,700 for the Office of Space Sciences.

Similarly, the committee reduced the budget request for the Office of Advanced Research and Technology some $16.5 million, or 5 percent; 26.6 percent of the requested funds were disallowed for construction and facilities.

These recommendations were made after careful study, Mr. Chairman, and I think are appropriate in order to carry on the work of these offices. They were not made arbitrarily, but they were made after many months of hard work.

Mr. Chairman, we recommend, and I personally recommend, that the House accept H.R. 7500 in its present and existing form.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Chenoweth].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending bill, H.R. 7500. I am not particularly happy with all of the provisions of the bill. I was hoping that some further reductions could be made. I had hoped there would be a reduction of perhaps at least 10 percent in the estimated budget of about $5.7 billion. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller], has indicated the cut is about 8.3 percent. I sincerely feel some further reductions could be made without in any way jeopardizing our space effort.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to follow the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Karth] who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Space Sciences and Advanced Research and Technology. I serve as the ranking Republican member of this subcommittee. It has been a great pleasure and privilege to serve on this subcommittee. I want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Karth] on doing a fine job, and for his patience and consideration over the long period during which hearings were held. I am sure you recognized his intimate knowledge of the many technical and scientific subjects under the jurisdiction of his committee. I was also happy to serve with the other members of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. Morris], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Randall], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Downing], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Staebler], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Van Pelt], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Mosher], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Weaver]. I thought we had a splendid subcommittee and I greatly enjoyed my association with the other members.

As the gentleman from Minnesota mentioned, we made some rather substantial cuts in the appropriations with which we dealt. The cuts are something like 12 percent. If the other subcommittees had reduced their budgets on the same ratio we would have achieved a reduction of more than 10 percent in the overall budget which I was hoping we might attain. I have never been convinced that we should spend so much time and money on the manned lunar program. I feel here is one activity where we could make a substantial saving. However, I am not on the subcommittee handling the manned spacecraft program and I do not have the technical knowledge to point out just where the cuts should be made.

Mr. Chairman, no useful purpose is served by discussing the necessity for this bill today. We are in the space age, and there is no other course to follow. We must continue to explore outer space in order to keep up in this race, and we do not want to finish second in this contest. It is my personal opinion that we are ahead of the Russians in most of the space effort. There has been a tendency to exalt the feats of the Russians and minimize the importance of our own achievements. I do not subscribe to this theory, and I contend that the United States is now leading the space race, with possibly one or two exceptions. Of course we do not know just what the Russians are doing, as they do not advertise their activities, as we do. We do know they are working hard to excel in this space race, and we cannot afford to relax our efforts. We have some very distinguished members on our committee. The Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], was one of the original members of our committee, and made a most valuable contribution to the work of the committee. We have on our committee a former Speaker of the House, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], who is the ranking Republican member of the committee. We are also proud to have on our committee the distinguished majority leader of this House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]. This is the newest standing committee of the House and has made great progress in the 5 years of its existence.

I want to take a moment to commend the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], who has presided over the committee with great skill and ability. The committee has had many difficult problems to solve, and the chairman has always conducted the meetings in a fair and impartial manner. I have never heard the slightest criticism of any favoritism being shown to any member of the committee or to any group.

Mr. Chairman, the responsibilities of this committee have grown very rapidly. I believe the first budget of the committee was something less than $1 billion 3 years ago. Two years ago the budget was about $1.3 billion. Last year the budget was about $3.7 billion. This year the sum of $5.7 billion was requested which the committee has reduced to $5.2 billion. We are moving up our expenditures at the rate of about $2 billion a year, and I understand there will be another increase next year.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that our Committee on Science and Astronautics has a definite responsibility to hold down expenditures wherever possible. I have the feeling that all of the items in this bill are not of the utmost and urgent importance. Some could be deferred, or perhaps be abandoned.

This is an expensive program. I am not going to say there is not some duplication and some waste in this program. I am sure that no member of the committee will give you such an impression. We are not scientists and experts skilled in detecting all of these overlapping functions, but we have made an honest and sincere effort to eliminate waste wherever possible. This committee has done a tremendous job, has made great progress in advancing the space effort.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take just a minute to discuss the supersonic transport situation. I have been very much interested in the development of commercial supersonic transports which would fly at the rate of around 1,400 miles per hour. We are aware of the fact that just recently one of our leading domestic airlines purchased six of these transports from England and France. It appears that these countries are far ahead of us in this program. The name of this new transport is the Concorde. Delivery of these transports are expected in this decade.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very keenly that we should exert every effort to match the performance of the British and the French in this program. I want to see the United States retain superiority in aeronautics. This is a divided responsibility, I might say, and does not fall entirely on NASA. However, NASA does cooperate with the Federal Aviation Agency and the Department of Defense. Funds are made available in this bill for NASA to continue this program, and I hope that a year from now we can report substantial progress on the development of an American commercial supersonic transport.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important measure and one of the largest authorization bills which will come before the House this year. As I said at the start of my remarks I feel some further cuts could be made in this bill, and particularly in the manned lunar program. However, this is the best bill that the committee could present to the House at this time.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH].

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7500, a bill to authorize expenditures for our national space effort for fiscal year 1964.

This legislation to provide a total appropriation of about $5.2 billion, actually represents a rather sizable reduction in the amount requested by NASA, amounting to about $5.7 billion. The actual cut made by the House committee is just under one-half billion.

Actually, the function of this committee was divided into three subcommittees for consideration of this greatly expanded budget. It was my pleasure to serve under the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], and this particular subcommittee handled those programs associated with manned space flight.

We commenced our consideration of this portion of the budget on March 6, 1963, and concluded hearing testimony of witnesses on June 6, 1963.

In this interim of 3 months, our committee held 31 open hearings, plus 12 executive sessions. We listened to more than 100 witnesses from NASA, industry, other government agencies, and from many leading universities. We actually visited and inspected several of the sites where work peculiar to our assignment was being accomplished.

After careful consideration of all testimony as well as evidence gathered by our staff, plus our own observation, we have recommended a total reduction of just over one-quarter of a billion dollars in our manned space effort.

This, percentagewise, amounts to about 7½ percent of the budget requested by NASA.

Other members of our committee have addressed themselves to reduction rendered in the fields covered by our two additional subcommittees, and I feel that they are substantial.

I do not want to impose on the time of the House membership, to again cover this ground.

Instead, I feel compelled to inform the House of certain features of this legislation in which I find myself in honest and sincere disagreement.

On at least one of these features, I will offer an amendment at the proper time. Perhaps, I shall do so on others.

May I respectfully invite your attention to the additional viewpoints contained in the committee report. I refer, at this point to one of these viewpoints, specifically. The point I attempt to make here is disagreement with tremendous growth in facility, training, and research grants. For this endeavor NASA asks $55 million for fiscal year 1964. And, again, as is pointed out in these additional viewpoints, this is an increase of $25 million over the last fiscal year and between four and five times as much as was allowed for fiscal 1952.

I also wonder about the feasibility of the authorization of $3.9 million, for further study and justification regarding the so-called Electronics Research Center, for which NASA asked for $5 million for actual land acquisition.

I think it is common knowledge that NASA's intent and purpose of this request was to purchase land in Massachusetts for construction of this facility.

I wonder, too, about the location of this laboratory in Massachusetts. I have reviewed the testimony by NASA witnesses and the justification is rather weak, both for its establishment, as well as for the selected location. I recall the remarks of the Secretary of Defense concerning the lack of Research and Development Facilities in the Midwest and areas of the South. Then I must pose the question, Does this not further aggravate this badly balanced condition?

I believe the committee generally shares this apprehension as to both need and location. That was the evident purpose behind the disallowance by the committee, of the $5 million item to purchase a landsite. I certainly do not quarrel with the further study recommended by the committee being made. If you will note page 4, line 16, subtopic (H) of the bill, this act proposes to vest in the committees of the House and Senate, full authority to proceed, with this, I think, rather poorly justified project. Here I would prefer a change in the legislation to provide that the authority to proceed should be enacted by regular legislative procedures and allow Congress as a whole to work its will and pleasure.

If such project is needed and properly justified as to its location, I am sure that Congress will grant the needed authority by separate enactment of legislation.

As a whole, I commend my chairman [Mr. MILLER] and the members of this committee on a very diligent job well done. I think this committee has done just as good a job as was possible, considering that this function of government deals largely with the unknown and untried frontiers of science.

It is not a decision for our committee to make, as I see it, whether or not this Nation is wisely or correctly committed to a space effort of this magnitude. Much debate has been generated as to the extent and costs of this program. Even persons of great authority and stature in this Nation are in honest disagreement as to the proper scope and direction of our space efforts.

Again, I refer to the additional viewpoints, which appear in the printed report.

I must voice honest misgivings as to whether the program outlined by NASA and authorized by this legislation provides adequate return, in a security sense, to our people. It would seem to me that the safety and security of our citizens, and that of the freedom-loving people of the world, should be the paramount test for funds expended in our space efforts.

Secondly, I feel that next preference should be directed to those accomplishments that will benefit mankind. Here I refer to material benefits, such as weather satellites, which will allow a longer leadtime in forecast of weather. I also think of our highly successful communication satellites which electrified the world with their successes. And, our very important new approach to both air and sea navigation, through the use of satellites.

None of these benefits require exploration of distant outer space but rather in so-called inner space, the immediate area that surrounds our earth.

One final admonition, if I may put these closing remarks in that form.

We find ourselves committed to a program of peaceful use and exploration of outer space. This committment, as a national goal, was voiced by our President. I would say that we are in the space business, whether we like it or not, because we have compelling reasons to continue these efforts. I would observe further that the safety and well-being of our citizens are dependent upon these efforts.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, most of us like to think we have the most interesting and the most exciting job in the world, and after the past 6 months of chairing a subcommittee concerned with the NASA authorization, I am sure of it.

The subcommittee over which I presided has a long and somewhat cumbersome title. It is called the Subcommittee on Applications and Tracking and Data Acquisition. When you take out manned space flight and research and technology in the space sciences—both handled by other subcommittees—you might think that little is left but miscellaneous cats and dogs. On the contary, the subject matter is inherently challenging, and vitally important because it deals so directly in how the space program benefits the people of America and all over the world.

Weather satellites, communications satellites, the huge tracking network, industrial applications, and administrative operations—these are the subjects handled by the subcommittee under our jurisdiction.

Every chairman probably feels he has the finest members in the world on his committee—but I am dead sure of it. During the course of our extensive hearings, we followed a practice which is perhaps unprecedented in Congress. We reached down into the subcommittee and had different presiding officers for the several subjects considered. My colleague from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH] presided over the hearings on tracking and data acquisition and industrial applications; the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] presided over the hearings on meteorological satellites; the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] presided over the hearings on communications satellites; and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] presided over a portion of the hearings on procurement policies. I presided over the hearings on administrative operations.

The minority members of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY]; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD]; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] did a brilliant job of questioning witnesses, clarifying the issues, and helping the entire subcommittee to throw the searchlight of thorough inquiry into NASA operations. In my years in the House, I have never seen a group work in greater harmony and dedicated effort toward a common objective.

Our thanks goes also to W. H. Boone, technical consultant to the committee, and Edward Wise of the Legislative Reference Service.

I might add that since there has been a lot of discussion about whether there is enough military influence in space, certain facts might be brought out for the record. The chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] was a lieutenant of field artillery in World War I. All three of our subcommittee chairmen won combat decorations in the European theater of operations. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] was decorated 11 times as a battalion commander of the famous "Cross of Lorraine" 79th Division in World War II. And the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH] was recommended for a battlefield commission in the European theater of operations in World War II.

ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

NASA requested $560,300,000 for administrative operations. The committee cut this by $52,115,000—or 9.3 percent.

The largest item in this request was for personnel compensation and personnel benefits, for which NASA requested $319,460,000. In terms of people, NASA asked for an increase from present strength of 28,358 to 32,500—or an increase of 4,142 people. Over half of this increase is planned for Huntsville, Houston, Cape Canaveral, and the Goddard Space Flight Center out here in Maryland. The committee scaled down the $319 million authorization by $25 million, to bring it down to $294,468,000. In making this reduction, the committee did not specify any number of people NASA should or should not hire, but gave some latitude to NASA to apply the reductions where it was deemed best for the planned programs.

The other items beside personnel compensation and personnel benefits cover nine other classifications. The greatest reductions recommended by the committee were made in travel and transportation of persons, rent, communications and utilities, supplies and materials, equipment and other services.

The general feeling of the committee was that NASA must follow some belt-tightening in its administrative operations. Every new organization which has any national glamor associated with it gets a kind of honeymoon during which even friendly critics rarely speak out or ask questions. The honeymoon is now over for NASA. The major objectives of this Nation's space program will be given solid and enthusiastic backing, while at the same time a thorough justification is demanded by Congress and the people, particularly on the administrative side of the space program. We intend to prune away the bureaucratic fat, and keep this administrative organization lean enough so it does not bog down on the launching pad.

Congress must be equipped with better tools to do a more adequate job of oversight with respect to the rapidly expanding NASA administrative activities. In former years, the authorization bill was drawn up in such a way that a lump sum was authorized for the category "Research, Development and Operations." This year's bill has altered this approach, and H.R. 7500 which is being considered today separates out "administrative operations" from the funds authorized for "research and development." These administrative operations funds are made available for only 1 year. In reducing the funds available for reprograming, this will give Congress a tighter control and check, as well as providing closer management control within NASA on budget estimates as well as commitments and expenditures.

WEATHER SATELLITES

Mr. Chairman, last year Congress authorized $57,315,000 for weather satellites. For fiscal 1964, NASA requested a slight increase to $63,700,000. Believing that this is one of the most valuable portions of the space program and that the request was fully justified, the committee recommended that the entire amount of $63,700,000 be authorized.

The old standby of weather satellites is Tiros. Seven straight successes have been scored in launching Tiros satellites since April 1960. A total of over a quarter of a million photographs have been sent back to earth. Tiros has done a good, sturdy job in the past 3 years in identifying many hurricanes and typhoons and relaying advance warnings. Improvements in weather predictions in the future carry vast implications for farmers and businessmen. These improvements will be of prime importance in underdeveloped areas of the world.

Tiros is spin-stabilized and space-oriented, which means that many of the Tiros photographs of the earth are taken at an oblique angle. The newly developed Nimbus satellite, the first of which it is planned to launch before the end of the calendar year 1963, is earth-oriented and will look at the earth vertically at all times. Nimbus will be able to photograph a wider band of the earth and through automatic picture transmission will be able to transmit photos quicker to small weather stations on earth. Its infrared sensors will be better able to penetrate nighttime cloud cover.

In this fiscal year Congress authorized $21,200,000 for Tiros, which will be phased down to only $7,200,000 in the amount authorized by this bill. Nimbus will be financed by an increased funding, rising from $30,290,000 in fiscal 1963 to the recommended amount of $43,800,000 for fiscal 1964.

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITES

Last Friday occurred the dramatic and apparently successful launch and orbit of Syncom, the new communications satellite which hangs 22,500 miles above the earth and rotates the same speed as the earth in a 24-hour orbit. This constitutes one step toward developing worldwide communications on an operational basis.

NASA requested $51 million to support research, development, and flight testing in communications satellites. The request was for about $2 million more than was expended last year. The Communications Satellite Corp. has been established to exploit the private use of these satellites. After extensive hearings, the committee recommended a cut of close to $9 million in next year's communications satellite program. Some of this cut came out of supporting research and technology, but the bulk of it came out of the advanced Syncom program, which was reduced from $40 million down to $33 million—largely because the committee felt that some launch vehicles and spacecraft could be purchased in future years.

The funds for communications satellites in the next year will be spent primarily on research, development, and flight testing of new communications satellite systems. There will be several additional launches of Relay and Syncom, as well as the passive satellite Echo. The Syncom which was launched last week does not contain television capability, as in Telstar or Relay, but NASA is working toward an advanced Syncom which will be able to transmit color television internationally.

TRACKING AND DATA ACQUISITION

Telemetry is a common word you hear during the manned space flights. Whether we are sending out scientific satellites, space probes, developing rockets, or engaged in manned space flight, the tracking network, plays an all-important role in transmitting command signals, receiving and recording telemetered or voice data, and tracking the spacecraft to determine its position.

For supporting research and technology, network operations and equipment and components, NASA asked for $231,500,000. This compares with $135,852,000 provided for the fiscal year 1963. We are recommending $216,700,000 for the next fiscal year, a cut of about $15 million in this category.

A large part of the increases in the coming year are directly related to support of the manned space flight program and the worldwide tracking network necessary to sustain that program.

There is an item which appears under "Construction of facilities" which relates to the tracking network, and which I would like to pinpoint at this time, Mr. Chairman. NASA requested an authorization of $90 million to provide new tracking and data acquisition equipment to be installed on three ships to be modified for use in the Apollo program. After hearing extensive testimony from both NASA and the Department of Defense, the committee decided to accept a proposal made by the Department of Defense. The Defense proposal involves the modification of four existing range tracking vessels, and the purchase of new equipment for and the refurnishing and modification of one new vessel. This plan would cost $80 million instead of $90 million; it would make five ships available; and it would mean an annual saving of approximately $4,500,000 in ship operating costs.

INDUSTRIAL APPLICATIONS

To me, one of the exciting developments in the space program is the way in which the new discoveries and technological advances are applied to industry. The industrial applications, or technology utilization, program is very modest. Only $3.5 million is involved. Up to now, efforts have been concentrated on identifying, documenting, and evaluating potential applications to industry. For the fiscal year 1964, these pilot programs will be expanded. We hope that the space ideas and innovations will be quickly placed into the hands of industry, resulting in many new products, processes, techniques, and devices for the benefit of private enterprise and the national economy.

CONCLUSION

A total of $1,032,803,000 was included in the NASA requests considered by the Subcommittee on Applications and Tracking and Data Acquisition.

Of this amount, the committee recommended an approved authorization of $937,293,000—a reduction of $95,510,000. This represents a cut of 9.25 percent.

We believe that with such a reduction a number of economies can be achieved, and that the central objectives of the program will be supported.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to add my words of commendation to the excellent job that I believe the chairman of our committee has done in his fairness and his depth of understanding in delving into the work of this committee. I would also like to commend the very fine effort of the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], for his fine work and the amount of work and hours that he spent in studying the efforts of NASA.

Mr. Chairman, this is the third year I appear before you to advocate passage of the annual National Aeronautics and Space Administration budget.

My assignment today in supporting H.R. 7500 is a specific discussion of that aspect of the appropriation dealing with the Apollo manned space flight program.

Of the $5.2 billion recommended by your Committee on Science and Astronautics for NASA for fiscal 1964, $2.4 billion will be applied to the Apollo effort.

It was in the summer of 1961 that your Science and Astronautics Committee first recommended, and Congress approved, a budget for manned space flight.

That first allocation covering fiscal 1963 amounted to $487 million.

The following year approximately $1.1 billion was earmarked for Apollo by Congress.

Each year the budget has increased because each year we come closer to vitally important breakthroughs in our assault on the mysteries and challenges posed by the Apollo project.

We understood this would be the case when we initiated the program.

Today three barriers impede the performance of the United States in space. They apply equally to military and to scientific progress. They limit hope for advanced American exploration in the farthermost reaches of the universe. They restrict us in the 100 to 500 miles of so-called inner space where national security must be considered.

Barrier No. 1 is booster capability.

Barrier No. 2 is rendezvous capability.

Barrier No. 3 is precision-timing capability.

Mr. Chairman, impossible to ignore in our budgeting to overcome these barriers is an assessment of the relative success of the Soviet Union with the same problems.

Booster capability of the United States in manned flight as demonstrated in Project Mercury, is 360,000 pounds thrust.

Russia is presently presumed to be capable of 850,000 pounds of thrust.

Unclassified published studies suggest, however, that the Soviets may now be developing a new system of engines and clustering which would increase their booster capability by more than 50 percent.

Some American scientists believe that a new basic engine will be produced in Russia soon and may double the thrust of their present engine.

The response of our space technicians to this challenge is represented in engines designated Saturn I, Saturn IB, and Saturn V. Each is part of the Apollo program.

Booster potential of these Saturn vehicles ranges from 1.5 to 7.5 million pounds of thrust.

Rendezvous capability and precision-timing capability must, of course, be equated with thrust. But they also represent technical sophistication quite apart from thrust power.

No American achievement in these two areas matches the Vostok flights of August 11 and 12, 1962, and June 14 and 16, 1963.

Project Apollo, for which rendezvous and precision-timing capacity are absolutely essential, is currently the best hope of our Nation in overcoming clearly demonstrated Russian superiority.

To the aeronautics and astronautics coordinating board of NASA and the Department of Defense, established in 1960 and actively functioning today, will be assigned many considerations involving application and development of Apollo research.

Manned and unmanned space stations, of interest to both science and the military, are examples of areas in which Apollo will be the trailblazer.

Even in the absence of international competition and political tension, however, Apollo would be needed to break down the three barriers which place intolerable limitations on every aspect of our potential in space.

It may be a disadvantage rather than an advantage that Apollo is best known as the project by which the United States seeks to accomplish the 768,000-mile lunar expedition within this decade.

In point of fact, it is estimated that between 50 and 60 percent of the proposed Apollo budget constitutes basic research and development on space flight.

This means that more than half of what is done in the name of Apollo can be applied to any space activity in which our Government might become engaged, now and later.

Mr. Chairman, valuable previous discussions concerning the feasibility and desirability of the Apollo program can be reviewed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of April 28 and May 24, 1961; and May 23 and July 10 and 11, 1962.

Hearings of the Committee on Science and Astronautics especially useful in assessing the program can be found in reports dated May 12, 1961; May 15, 1962; and July 25, 1963.

No new technical information has been acquired since the Apollo budget authorizations for fiscal 1963 which now cast doubt on the feasibility of the program. All development has proceeded as planned.

Arguments which originally justified Apollo appropriations and programing, and were considered acceptable by the Congress in 1961 and 1962, still apply.

To continue the Apollo program on its present schedule to July 1, 1964, we will commit ourselves to the expenditure of $2,475,900,000.

This total can be broken down in the following way:

First. For the spacecraft, described on page 9 of your report, $911,400,000.

Second. For operations, described on pages 9 and 16 of your report, $16 million.

Third. For procurement of launch vehicles, described on pages 9 and 17 of your report, $135 million.

Fourth. For support development, described on pages 9 and 18 of your report, $25 million.

Fifth. For development of launch vehicles, described on page 22 of your report, $1,138,500,000.

Sixth. For proportional allocation of the costs of shared construction and facilities, described on pages 127 through 160 of your report, an estimated $250 million.

Viewed solely from the standpoint of technology and methodology, these items have not, to my knowledge, come under question.

It is in the ever-changing area of public policy that project Apollo and, indeed, the entire NASA budget, rightfully deserve close scrutiny by the Congress.

In this regard I call your attention to a supplementary opinion on page 201 of the report submitted by six distinguished members of our Science and Astronautics Committee.

In essence the supplement deals with the significant question of whether the United States is intelligently balancing Federal space expenditures between programs which contribute to national security and programs of pure scientific research.

The signers of this supplement, while not advocating rejection of the NASA budget this year, express a concern which many of us feel.

There is clearly a need for more and better information about the annual $14 to $15 billion of Government research spending as it relates to scientific priorities, national goals, and the need for congressional and executive budgetary discipline.

Such concern, however, is not incompatible with support of the NASA budget today.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Science and Astronautics is not afflicted by either moon madness or space obsession.

It has been for many months involved with a businesslike consideration of the financial requirements of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1963-64.

From the NASA budget proposal first submitted to us, $120 million was cut from Apollo research and development alone.

Beyond this, reductions of more than 8 percent of the total of the original request of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration were imposed by your committee.

Such a cutback is unprecedented in the experience of this agency.

We give you a hard budget but certainly not a crippling budget.

Mr. Chairman, on this basis I speak in behalf of the proposed allocations of both Apollo and NASA and urge passage of H.R. 7500 now before you.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO].

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, the authorization bill we have before us today is to sustain an effort which is aimed at making the United States the leadership nation in space. It is one which we have already embarked upon by decisions made by the Congress in the past years. How well we meet this challenge will depend on how we support this program today and how we sustain it over the course of the years to come. Our success will reflect itself in the schedule which is on page 4 of the report that shows that if the progress continues as it is now based, if it is funded as we hope it will be, if this year's budget is supported as it is our intention that it will be, somewhere between 1967 and 1970 three Americans will successfully go to the moon and that this achievement will precede that of any other nation.

How far we have come in these years can be well illustrated by the fact that these models to my left are in scale and that the success of the Mercury program has depended upon a vehicle that is mounted on a booster of this size, the model to your extreme left. It is obvious by viewing the Saturn V, the model which is on your extreme right and by comparing it to the first model that great advances are underway.

If we were to analyze the Apollo program, we can look to the report which accompanies the bill and we can see the intricacies and complexities of our space program. I especially call the committee's attention to pages 9 to 16.

It is a fact that there has been a great deal of discussion here today as to how closely the committee has looked at this program and how much it has cut it back. Although the overall cut is something in the order of 5 percent, if you will turn to the schedule on page 9 you will notice that the amount being requested for research and development of Apollo comes to $1,087,400,000.

This is over $100 million less than was originally requested, and it is one which represents a 10 percent cut. Therefore, the attitude of the committee has not been just to make a broad gaged cut evenly across the board but, rather, to analyze the program closely and to add to the efficiency of NASA by taking corrective steps which would be constructive and helpful. I think this is what has been done. I would urge that the program be supported in full. The committee actions indicate that the job of looking closely into this entire program has been effectively done and that it is the kind of action which does warrant your support.

Mr. Chairman, the ultimate objective of the U.S. manned space-flight program is to achieve a capability for a broad program of manned space exploration, which will result in a position of leadership in space for the United States. A specific goal in this program is to land a man on the moon and return him safely to earth under the Apollo program. The Apollo spacecraft and mission will play a substantial role in establishing the United States as the leader in the major space science and engineering fields. Further, it will establish a background of knowledge and experience to be used for future space exploration and for the development of technological benefits to mankind. Our exploration of the moon will be the beginning, not the end, of a program that will expand over the years into a wider program of exploration of the universe of which we are a part.

As the Apollo is now designed, it will be a three-part spacecraft: with a command module, a service module, and a lunar excursion module. The command module will have approximately 300 cubic feet in which to house the three astronauts. This section is a most complex manned space-flight device which is demanding the best of our industrial skill. It will include the environmental control system needed to provide the proper atmosphere for the duration of the flight; a communications center for contact between the craft and the earth control center; a guidance and control system, along with associated computing devices and pilot displays to allow for the proper execution of the mission; and a landing system for a touchdown at a fixed point on return to earth. This 5-ton, 13-foot-in-diameter section must also be designed to withstand the loads of the boost phase and to provide protection against meteorites and radiation during the flight in space. It must also provide heat protection for reentry at speeds up to 25,000 miles per hour; this will be done by a special material applied to its external surface, which ablates—or boils to a gas—on exposure to very high temperatures. These heating rates are 8 or 10 times higher than those encountered in the Mercury program. This module will also have to be equipped with small pitch control engines to stabilize the craft in orbit, and rockets to kick the module out of orbit in order to allow it to descend into the earth's atmosphere when the mission is completed. Thus, the command module must be equipped to house three men on an extended trip through space; lightweight, high performance, and high reliability will be basic requirements.

The next section will be the service module. This module will contain a 21,900-pound thrust rocket propulsion system, which will have the reliability to meet emergency conditions anywhere along the trip to the moon. The circumlunar voyage will normally last about 5 days, but the service module will have the flexibility to change course and return to earth if an emergency arises. Also, an orientation control system, hydrogen-oxygen fuel cells for electrical power supply, radiators for spacecraft cooling, radar, and supplies of oxygen will be located in the service module. This section will also be used to make midcourse corrections on the way to the moon, and to provide the propulsion from moon orbit back to earth. The engine has the remarkable capability of being turned off and on as many as 50 times. This section which is 14 feet long, 13 feet in diameter and 25 tons in weight will be jettisoned before the command module reenters the earth's atmosphere.

The third section will be the lunar excursion module, used to land two of the three crew members on the surface of the moon. This will require that it have engines enabling precise crew control in order to carefully lower the craft to the surface of the moon. Throttable engines allowing such a landing are planned to be tested in 1964. Such a landing maneuver will also require a specialized landing gear; this will be a six-legged stand with its own propulsion stage. There will be a separate propulsion stage for lunar ascent, with the lunar descent gear being left on the surface of the moon. Another requirement will be a manmade environment to house the crew members while they are on the moon's surface. The lunar excursion module will be a self-contained unit, weighing about 12 tons, with its own electrical power, guidance and control, communications, propulsion, and crew support systems. Due to the fact that the moon's gravitational field is only one-sixth that of the earth's and there is a general lack of atmosphere, this module does not need the structural and heat provisions that are required for a similar mission on earth. This module has been under construction since January 1963 by Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp. and various tests will be started on certain parts of this section during 1964. Testing must be done with the lunar excursion module to make sure that it will protect the crew from the dangers of meteorites and radiation, which are much more prevalent on the moon than the earth because of the lack of atmosphere. The most hostile condition on the moon is these bumping meteors, which strike the moon at the rate of 1,000 strikes per hour. Since there are different requirements for this section and the job that it must perform, one of the distinctive features will be the broadview windows that will provide extensive visual reference for the crew during critical maneuvers, which they will have to perform in the lunar excursion module. Special types of glass are being experimented with now in order to fulfill the requirements of the moon environment on the craft. Further provisions must be made for the easy handling of this module as a spacecraft in order that the crew can dock the craft with the command and service modules that will have continued to orbit the moon, while the others were on its surface.

All three modules together will weigh about 42 tons, fully loaded, including the launch escape system similar to the one used on Project Mercury. These sections alone without the boosting rocket will be 80 feet tall, which is only 16 feet shorter than the entire Mercury Atlas spacecraft and rocket.

It was decided in July 1962, by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, after extensive study, that the most economical as well as the quickest way to get us to the moon was to use a lunar orbit approach. Although there had been some thought given to proceeding simultaneously with two moon programs, the decision to go with one was a wise one.

NASA is now in the launch vehicle and spacecraft systems development phase which will grow into crew training and operational development upon which the lunar operations will be based. After the proper development program has been established, manned orbital flights will be conducted. In this way, the Apollo spacecraft systems can be tested and evaluated in a space environment; astronauts can be trained; certain operational techniques can be developed and practiced; and there will be the continuation of accumulating information on the effect of extended space flight on both men and machinery.

The second step in this program is the circumlunar flight. Under this procedure, the astronauts will make a trip to the moon without landing on its surface. This step will sharpen the procedure through which midcourse corrections and careful navigation are accomplished for the ultimate lunar landing itself.

The lunar landing will, of course, be the end accomplishment of the Apollo program. On this flight, once in orbit around the moon, all the spacecraft systems will be checked out. Two of the three crew members will enter the lunar excursion module at which time all the systems will be checked out again and the final decision will be made as to whether to descend to the moon's surface. The lunar excursion module will ignite an engine providing about 8,800 pounds of thrust. This impulse will place the lunar excursion module into an approach orbit that has the same time period of revolution as the command module. An eliptical orbit will be established so that the low point will bring the capsule to within 10 miles of the surface of the moon. In the event it becomes necessary to abort before landing, the equality of orbital periods assures a rendezvous of the lunar excursion module and the command module every 2 hours. At this stage of the operation, the lunar excursion module will be traveling at 4,000 miles per hour. The decision being made to land, the engines will be fired to slow the rate of speed, so as to approach and hover over the surface of the moon and then to make a landing. The engine to be used has already undergone static firing at a test stand and has demonstrated tremendous flexibility. It can be throttled as low as 1,100 pounds thrust, giving the crew engine control and some choice as to a point of landing. It is expected that this will allow the crew to maneuver in any direction as much as 1,000 feet in its choice of a landing site. The craft will then slowly descend and land on the surface of the moon at a speed of less than 7 miles per hour.

Once on the moon, the two crew members will first check out the lunar excursion module and prepare the system for takeoff procedure. One of the crew members will explore the moon's surface within the immediate vicinity of the craft in a space suit which will allow him a 2-hour period of activity. The other member will also participate in turn in this operation. This entire stay will last for 24 hours during which the astronauts are expected to perform certain assigned tasks including a period for sleeping. The ascent stage of the LEM will lift off leaving landing gear on the moon. It will assume a speed of 4,000 miles per hour in a predetermined orbit which matching that of the mother capsule will bring the two craft together. The astronauts will return to the command module, jettisoning the lunar excursion module. The mother craft has the power to pull itself out of the lunar orbit and accurately hit a 40-mile-wide reentry corridor to earth. Just before hitting the corridor, after the final flight path adjustments have been completed, the service module will be discarded and the command module will enter the earth's atmosphere by itself at 25,000 miles per hour. This part of the operation is similar to the reentry of Mercury as we have already experienced it.

In December of 1962 a model mockup of the command and service module was completed by North American Aviation Corp. which is the prime contractor for Apollo. The overall configuration of the command and service modules has been decided upon and firmed in design. All major subsystem interface requirements were defined in the same period. Preliminary design of the lunar excursion module has been decided upon by Grumman Engineering Corp. and all subcontractors are now working on their own subsystem designs. Contract requirements have been quickly undertaken and work has proceeded to the point where the tooling for the production of the command module has been 75 percent completed.

In fiscal 1964, the command module will undergo intensive component and subsystem fabrication, testing and qualification and spacecraft fabrication. A tight manufacturing schedule is expected to be maintained to prepare for the necessary testing and development of the spacecraft. An important phase of this activity will be the flight testing of the RL-10 engine which can be turned off and on and throttled back from full power. Structural models will also be built to test the basic design and their ability to withstand the rigors of space flight.

Important work is already underway in the construction of the Apollo guidance and navigation systems. Since fiscal year 1962, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has been developing this system which consists of three major parts: The inertial subsystem, the guidance computer, and the optical subsystem. As a result of the groundwork already laid, industrial contractors have already been selected to manufacture the equipment through which the position, velocity and trajectory of the spacecraft on its flight to the moon will be determined.

There are many parts to a project as large as Apollo, which in setting the moon as its goal is only part of a broader program that will, without doubt, affect the course of history for man. Taking a look at the future of space exploration and the role Apollo will play in this, the multimanned space station appears as the next step in space development. Most of the basic hardware needed for such a platform is already being developed. Such a station would have a variety of uses for both military and civil purposes. It could provide a scientific laboratory with an opportunity to study both man and his universe. It could provide an engineering and test laboratory for materials, hardware, and techniques for space operations. It could provide a command post for military operations. It could be used as a base for future space exploration, possibly beyond the moon. Apollo will play a major role in this since with minor modifications the present Apollo capsule could be used as a scientific laboratory and has the ability to orbit two men around the earth for 100 days or more in order to extend our knowledge of both man and equipment.

There is developing around the Apollo program a great fund of new technology which will unquestionably affect the development of our industrial potential. Involved, of course, is the prestige of the United States and it is our hope that Apollo will be the means through which the first man who places his foot on the moon will be an American.

Added to that is the necessary implication that the security of our country is also affected for man is about to conquer the media of space and in the near future building on the knowledge we are now accumulating we will develop the ability to go in and out of space at will. Without doubt, this will include the ability to inspect satellites in space and to neutralize them as well if they include a destructive capability. Yet we should not confine our thinking to prestige and national security alone, for the benefits to industry, to education, and to the increase of scientific and technical knowledge are incalculable. Although this space program is newly with us and has developed enormously in size and cost, the prospects for the future should encourage us to sustain this effort in the years ahead.

We are now on the threshold of space development, and beneath that threshold lie many possibilities which cannot even be imagined. It is certain, however, that while we proceed with such a project as Apollo because it is in our interest to do so, that from it will come immeasurable good to mankind.

Mr. Chairman, one part of the authorization bill which we are now considering represents an area of specific interest to man, for in seeking the ways in which man can function within our space program it holds hope for improved care of his health by increasing our knowledge of the human system.

Ever since the founding of the republic, our people have supported medical research and experiments designed to protect our men in battle or in strange environments. The history of the Army, Navy, and Air Force medical sections is a proud one, and the experience on which they have built their current medical capability is strong.

When the Space Act of 1958 was passed, Congress put a strong reminder in the basic law so that NASA would make full use of the scientific and engineering resources of the United States, with close cooperation among all interested agencies in order to have the most effective program and one which would avoid unnecessary duplication. This has continued to be an item of major concern in our committee. The record is full of reference to coordination of activities and this committee report enjoins NASA time and time again, as it has in the past, to work out better cooperative procedures with other agencies of the Government.

Medical research is sponsored throughout our Government, where there is special need. Not only does this make any single effort susceptible to duplication, but it also requires each sponsor to manage its program well, to insist upon justification in every instance, and to coordinate with others in the field so that maximum benefits may be assured.

As the space program developed, estimates were placed before this committee some years ago of the total effort needed. With the new goals approved by Congress in 1961, this effort has necessarily been increased. The committee has followed closely and personally the development of the program. The initial organization for accomplishment of the research was adjusted on November 1, 1961, to set up three new divisions. One is called the aerospace medicine; the second, bioscience; and the third, human factor systems. Each falls under different major offices of NASA. To contemplate the total life sciences effort in NASA, it is necessary to consider them as a whole.

The definitions of these three offices explain them more fully. Aerospace medicine provides operational support for the manned space flight missions, and conducts development and tests of systems and components to assure effective performance and safety of the astronauts. This affects the moon program most specifically since it is in the accrual of our bioengineering knowledge that the success of man in the Apollo program will depend.

Bioscience is directed at learning more about biological knowledge in space. It studies the effects on living organisms of weightlessness and radiation, both major obstacles which man will encounter and which he must overcome. Bioscientific studies are also aimed at searching for any evidence of life in outer space, and for any information concerning how life on earth may have developed.

Human factors, the third section, considers how man fits into advanced aerospace systems and how these systems can be improved. Right now, such research is largely ground based. Fundamental direct studies of the heart and circulatory system are being analyzed. Department of Defense, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Atomic Energy Commission and nongovernmental university and industrial groups are contributing to this knowledge.

With the structural division of life sciences research into these three areas, it has placed a strong responsibility on the committee to keep an eye on the direction and management of the effort. A substantial result from this examination is demonstrated by the reduction in the authorizations of all three sections in an attempt by the committee to guide further coordination. The continued improvement of research facilities in other areas of the Government, such as what has been described as the most modern and well-equipped bioastronautics research center in the country at the School of Aviation Medicine, Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex., makes it necessary to work toward even greater cooperation and coordination in the use of these facilities and these resources. The tenor of the committee report in respect to the space program and military security also supports this desire.

It should be noted, parenthetically, that NASA has also appointed a new consultant to conduct a total review of the diverse programs which are carried on in this field. This is a welcome step, as it can lead to consolidation and a sharper effort. But NASA cannot consider its own program and its own mission without reference to the other Government programs. In this respect, it must take into account the past White House studies and the coordination which can and should be conducted through the Office of the Science Adviser to the President.

The research and development in aerospace medicine which will be underwritten by this bill in the coming year is directed primarily to learning more how to protect man on the longer space flights of Apollo and Gemini. Our longest flight so far has been the 34-hour flight of Maj. Gordon Cooper. As longer flights are conducted, more can be learned about the prolonged effects of weightlessness on our astronauts.

The aerospace medicine funds help manage the design of crew equipment and systems, plus a development and test program to make sure that equipment and techniques are capable of sustaining men during the Apollo and Gemini missions. The aerospace medicine program also is geared to train physicians and others in necessary specialized skills to meet the ground and operational needs of the program.

Projects are underway to design and develop astronaut crew equipment for Gemini and Apollo. This includes space suits, life support atmospheric control and distribution systems, survival equipment, restraint systems, and devices to manage food, water, and waste in flight. It can test environments which will be found in the space vehicles and during the missions and determine psychological effects on the astronauts. This information, which is derived from the ground testing phase, is fed back into the drawing boards to improve the capsules and the mission plans.

The space medicine program is a prerequisite to the flight schedule. It has to be done promptly and effectively, so that the information is ready in time. For example, it is now known what forces will govern the impact of the space vehicle when Project Apollo lands on the moon. This is being used to shape the flight crew couch and restraint system to protect the astronauts.

Knowing the forces, it is also necessary to know what man can stand. This calls for a thorough review of information obtained from prior tests, some further experiments if necessary, and the definition of tolerances to be met by the new equipment. In fiscal 1964, much of this work is programed to be handled at military testing laboratories. All the data we can secure, all the information we can obtain, helps rub out unknowns in the final program.

In flight for longer periods, man may also be subject to more illnesses or injuries. Aerospace medical planning must work out ways to treat them, as well as to identify them, possibly through new miniaturized equipment which can be built into the capsule. As we proceed into the bigger missions, new boosters are coming into use, with greater lifting power and acceleration. All of these factors have greater importance in the longer missions than they did in Project Mercury.

In the coming fiscal year, development of the space suits to be worn in the advanced missions is another important program. In the Mercury program, the space suit was basically a protective device to benefit the wearer if pressurization was lost. In the longer Gemini flights, and in the lunar landing trip, which will take 3 days out to the moon, a premium is placed on its wear while performing the basic missions. During the lunar landing, for instance, the rugged pressure suits must contain individual life support and communications systems for maximum mobility. The Apollo life suit is not just an emergency garment; it has got to sustain the man's life. It must fit into the environmental design of the capsule, and work with portable life support systems both inside and out. It can well be the most complex suit and supporting equipment ever developed.

Contracts have already been let for preliminary work on what this generation may well regard as America's greatest scientific challenge. Studies are under way to design the sensors which are used in recording the various physical functions of an aerospace pilot. The use of telemetering devices to transmit and collect information on men in space has been remarkable, and its use in hospitals is already being developed. It is of special importance in keeping track of the cardiovascular system as man undergoes extreme conditions, and we have learned a great deal.

Medical information is also critical to the longer stays in space. Study of life support over 6 months, or in connection with a possible orbiting space laboratory are essential. These reports will have a bearing on our security, no less than on the exploration of space itself. This combination of responsibility compels us to continue this momentum.

In the future, there are still decisions to be made that will shape this program. Congress must determine how we can take advantage of what we learn, within our resources, to increase our knowledge of the solar system and the universe. From that decision, defining our program beyond the lunar landing, we will best guide our future biomedical research.

As these programs develop it becomes increasingly imperative that we demand the most efficient operation possible for this is one area in which we must add to our concern over the cost of facilities and equipment the added factor of drawing away from our resources of medical manpower where we already find ourselves in short supply.

Mr. Chairman, it is because the Space Committee has been objective and constructively analytical in arriving at its recommendations that I can stand here and assure you this is an authorization bill which you should support in its entirety. I urge you to do so.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, the 1964 fiscal year NASA authorization bill, H.R. 7500, was reported unanimously by the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. I would be less than honest, however, if I did not say that I had considerable misgivings in voting with the other members of the committee, in view of the amount of money involved; namely, $5,238 million.

In this connection, I hasten to add that one of the compelling reasons that caused me to join with my colleagues on the committee was out of respect and, indeed, admiration for the very conscientious way that the members studied this year's legislation, and I may add, too, that not only did the members of the committee screen the NASA request carefully, but also, as a result of committee scrutiny, I think many improvements have been made which I strongly favor.

First, I want to commend the committee chairman, and likewise the subcommittee chairmen, especially the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Hechler], under whom I served, for their patience and impartial conduct at the hearings, which allowed all Members on both sides of the aisle to pursue in detail the many questions we had concerning the program.

As I said, I voted in committee for this bill in spite of the differences I expressed and which appear in the report. I feel that space is certainly an important area of research and I recognize that it requires large sums of money to do this. This does not mean, however, that the space agency program should not be coordinated with other similar programs. By this I mean, for example, that space research should not be allowed to subordinate the full importance of the military aspects of the work that is being carried out. Nor do I think this agency should be in the same field as, for example, the National Science Foundation.

In particular, Mr. Chairman, I have stated my view in the report as to the priority of the Apollo landing programs. I sincerely believe that we need an overall reappraisal as to the priority of various national needs, including a tax cut, and I feel a stretchout of costly programs such as the Apollo, which are contributing so to our national debt, is desirable. I do not want any of this program at the cost of devaluation of our dollar or other catastrophies which could result from overspending and continuing Federal deficits.

Mr. Chairman, on the other hand, I am impressed with the progress NASA is making in the meteorological satellite field. NASA is accomplishing a great deal in the way of weather evaluation through the Tiros series of weather satellites. Also, the spectacular success of the recent Syncom communications experiment is gratifying, as has been the successful Relay and Telstar projects. These are truly significant accomplishments and indicate areas where mankind can benefit by scientific achievement.

The space committee has made significant strides this year in improving its oversight capabilities and in pressing NASA to improve its management processes. This is particularly true in the reprograming of funds, in requiring uniform design criteria and construction standards, and in separating out administrative operations. The separation of operating funds from research and development and the new requirement that any unspent moneys revert to the Treasury at each fiscal yearend on June 30 is a case in point. Likewise, in future, under this bill, unused authorizations will expire after 3 years. All of these actions will improve the budgetary processes and I hope will cause NASA to seek committee approval for major program views and will generally improve their operations.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself to a further explanation of my separate views which appear on page 206—the last page—of the printed committee report on H.R. 7500.

Therein I expressed misgivings as to whether the cost of landing men on the moon was commensurate with the potential scientific rewards. I urged the House Committee on Appropriations to ascertain if in their judgment the amount of the authorization was warranted. I called for a stretchout in the manned lunar project to achieve savings, because, as I said, I believed there are higher priority national programs, including a tax cut, which would strengthen rather than weaken the Nation's economy.

Need I say that the United States' so-called moon-shot project, Apollo, to land two men on the moon and return them to earth has great and exciting appeal for many people, but with real justification, I think, it has drawn more than its share of criticism. In this latter connection, some, like former President Eisenhower, feel spending such an amount of money in a race to the moon is—to use his actual expression—"nuts." Also the initial glamour of the race with Russia seems to be vanishing, and a high percentage of the scientific fraternity find fault with the Apollo program on many specific scores.

A former president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Dr. Warren Weaver, summed up such feeling not long ago, when he said:

> I believe that most scientists consider the proposed expenditures quite unjustified on the grounds of scientific considerations; and also the frantic pace of the program to be wasteful.

Landing instruments on the moon, it is felt by many knowledgeable persons, would accomplish adequate scientific data faster and cheaper, and many students of the Soviet space effort believe this is the course Russia will follow.

Many scientists suspect that while we have emphasized exploration of the moon, the Soviets have concentrated their efforts on achieving military supremacy in space. Premier Khrushchev himself said on April 20, 1962, that his country had not decided whether to make a man-to-the-moon effort, adding that "it will cost a lot."

Sir Bernard Lovell, the great British radio astronomer, having visited the Soviet Union where he saw the Soviet deep-space tracking stations, says the Soviets are not even going to try to reach the moon. He said:

> The Russians take a very realistic view about the value of putting a man on the moon.

He suggested that instead, what the Soviet space probers intend to do is land instruments on the moon, or they may send a man around it for prestige reasons.

As to our own scientists, Dr. J. C. Warner, president of Carnegie Institute of Technology, on June 2 described the space program as vain, naive, silly, and dangerous.

This is an actual quote of Dr. Warner:

> The difficulty is that we are not involved in space exploration for the scientific or military values to be derived, but for the aggrandizement of national prestige that is somewhat naive and that requires such a concentration of our resources in both men and money that it could seriously jeopardize the Nation's future.

A physicist who is director of the Geophysics Laboratory of the Carnegie Institution, Dr. Philip H. Abelson, is another scientist who had taken the position that space can better be explored with unmanned vehicles. Dr. Abelson was quoted recently as saying that most scientists are opposed to sending a man to the moon by 1970. He said the administration's Apollo program will "have a direct and indirect damaging effect on almost every area of science, technology, and medicine," by diverting scientists from these fields. Dr. Abelson criticized the program on the basis that it might well delay the conquest of cancer and mental illness, and also on the basis that it would detract from our defense effort.

He said he believed a man should be sent to the moon eventually, but that he saw "nothing magic about doing it in this decade." His testimony was given before the Senate Space Committee in connection with this same bill that we are considering today. Dr. Abelson, besides being associated with the Carnegie Institute, is editor of Science. He told the Senate he conducted an informal straw poll among scientists not connected with NASA. The vote was 110 to 3 against the manned lunar program. Dr. Abelson said man's space exploration has limited scientific value.

Another poll occurred earlier this year, when a majority of 25 of America's 55 living Nobel Prize winners gathered in St. Peter, Minn., for the dedication of the first American memorial to Alfred Nobel, expressed serious reservations about a crash space program because of the waste involved.

While on the subject of waste, let me read a letter on this subject:

> I am a NASA employee and I know that in the area of economy there is little or no thought devoted to this effort of saving of the funds appropriated for the space effort.
>
> Many of the top management people have had little or no formal education in business management but are people promoted from the old NACA organization. Modern accounting methods are being approached haphazardly by letting each center design its own system and in some cases has gone completely out of bounds. In the manning levels prescribed by headquarters, NASA administration positions are limited, so to accomplish what the local centers desire they have entered into service contracts. One with General Electric at Huntsville, Ala., to design their accounting system, is costing at least $1.5 million. This same operation could be accomplished at half this if grades and positions were made available to hire competent people who would be permanent employees.
>
> This is not just common to Huntsville but is duplicated in Houston and in Canaveral. Further the applications of the accounting systems far exceed the need of the organization. This approach allows GE to build a system so great that their services will continue to be in demand.
>
> In other places management is reluctant to exert administrative control to require the employees to follow good time or job recording for cost applications for fear the employees will quit. They are well paid tradesmen and they aren't about to quit.
>
> Cost-plus contracts are also another area of bleeding the Government.

Speaking of waste, we are told, Mr. Chairman, that NASA is not even making the best use of its own scientists, nor is it consulting with those outside the agency. Dr. Warren Weaver, a member of the National Science Board, and a member of the National Academy of Sciences, insists that scientific considerations fail to justify the magnitude of the program. He says ours is a costly and disastrous pace, and Mr. William H. Meckling, director of the economics division of the Operations Evaluation Group Center for Naval Analysis, Franklin Institute, disputes claims that the technological developments growing out of big space programs will more than pay for themselves.

In my own congressional district, at the University of Washington, Dr. John H. Bollard, chairman of its aeronautical and aerospace program, recently made a speech saying the Government's urge to reach outer space appears to be more political than scientific. He said the present ambitious program is especially alarming in view of the dangerous sun spots which will be at the top of their 11-year cycle in 1970, the year this Nation's space flights are presently directed toward reaching the moon. Dr. Bollard said there had been relatively little scientific feedback that is of benefit to the populace, from the tremendous studies connected with space and its effects on man. He said that all-out attention is focused on the space flights instead of the long-range benefits to mankind.

Early in June, I read an interesting article in the Christian Science Monitor which told of the onetime criticism of a Boston engineer, Richard S. Morse, of the then Nation's technically lagging space effort. This occurred before the first Soviet manned space flight, in the mid-1950's. The article said that today, after 4 years in a key Defense Department post, Mr. Morse feels quite differently, and on the contrary, that swelling Government research money threatens to drown industrial research and impair the Nation's economic future.

This former Assistant Secretary of the Army during both the Kennedy and Eisenhower administrations, told a congressional committee:

> The present environment of federalized research and development is rapidly becoming a scientific WPA, not conducive to the development of commercially practical ideas or the education and training of management talent.

Mr. Morse is another of the group of scientists and engineers who have been publicly deploring the Nation's vast effort to put a man on the moon before the Soviet Union. This onetime head of the Cambridge National Research Corp., before coming here to Washington in 1959, has taken the position that overspending is having harmful effects on the many major American corporations, on universities, and on new scientific talent. He expressed this view to the Senate Small Business Committee and urged a reappraisal of the research and development effort. Mr. Morse is a technical adviser to the Commerce Department and teaches at the MIT School of Industrial Management. His criticism includes the following:

> 1. Too large dependence on defense work has made "the great majority of our large defense contractors totally unequipped to engage in successful and highly competitive commercial business at home or abroad."
>
> 2. "Our current tendency to expand Government facilities to house Government-operated research and development activities (drains off) experienced engineering and management talent" from business.
>
> 3. "Under the impact of Federal funding, many of our larger universities, influenced by their desire for growth, are operating business activities which could be undertaken more appropriately by industry."
>
> 4. Political overtones play an important part in establishing the locations of federally financed business enterprises, the increasing number of nonprofit research organizations working hand in hand with Federal laboratories. These compete with industrially oriented business corporations engaged in essential non-Government work.

Mr. Chairman, this explains my misgivings and why I filed separate views.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to imply that all our scientists, by any means, are opposing the lunar landing project, or favor a slowdown in this program, but I have raised the issue because I think a great many thinking people are questioning whether the projected date of landing a man on the moon could not be delayed to better advantage. I have not tried to accumulate a full list of testimony which supports my view in favor of a stretchout of the program, but as the committee has been holding hearings, from time to time I have been noting statements here and there which are critical of the Apollo project. For example, Dr. Polycarp Kusch, chairman of the physics department at Columbia University, questioned the top priority given the manned moon shot. Dr. Kusch, Nobel Prize winner in physics, questioned the merits of the Apollo program as compared with other national goals and interests. He is quoted as saying:

> I continue to believe that the new exploration should be undertaken only with the full awareness of other important goals and purposes. The emphasis on it should not exclude the solution of problems that are equally pressing, equally challenging, and no less exciting.

Among these problems, Dr. Kusch cited the dangerously low water supplies on this continent, as well as the future needs for fuel when present supplies of fossil fuels are exhausted.

Dr. Harold Urey, Nobel Prize-winning chemist and University of California professor, says the race to the moon is really being paid for because people wish to be excited. He says vicarious adventure is the real reason.

On the other hand, Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Deputy Administrator of NASA, says this project is to develop the ability to do whatever space jobs—civilian or military—need to be done.

Whether this is "leaf raking" or needed technological advance, a current appraisal for Congress by experts of costs and evaluation of benefits should be undertaken. The priority of reducing expenditures to justify a tax cut should be carefully weighed in a nonpartisan and objective basis.

Mr. Chairman, as I said in my separate views, I find it hard, if not impossible, to justify the $1,087 million allowed in this bill for the Apollo moon project in relation to and commensurate with scientific benefits. So, as I say, I have serious misgivings as to the project's urgency and the resulting increased cost, which, as I understand it, will level off at $4 billion a year, or thereabouts, in the future. In my views, I have strongly urged the Committee on Appropriations to see if such a large cost is warranted and whether, in the overall national economic interest, substantial additional cuts are not desirable under a slowdown policy. To me, $20 billion is just too much money to spend for landing a man on the moon, when for a great deal less money, we could place instruments there that would give us much of the same scientific information.

The lunar landing project need not be abandoned. It could be programed for, say, 1980. In the meanwhile, we would have developed the basic skills, knowledge, hardware, and experience to make it much less expensive, without the real risk that we may be wasting great sums on winning a race when there is not any race. After all, the planning and design of the moon landing craft, itself, as I understand, was to be based on findings of some of the moon probes. However, in 11 tries to send probes to, or close by the moon the United States has had 11 failures. I wonder if we should not know more about the surface of the moon before we finalize the nature of the landing craft? This craft may have to be completely redesigned. So, I have favored a stretchout of the Apollo manned lunar landing project, which I think would save money and not, as I said in my report, do violence to other aspects of the program.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7500 should have the support of Congress and I shall vote for it, at the same time reserving to myself the right to vote for various amendments to cut the bill. Later on, when the appropriation bill is considered, I hope it will be considerably below the amount in this authorization bill.

In all, the House Science and Astronautics Committee's cutback amounts to less than 10 percent of the $5.7 billion requested by NASA for fiscal 1964, and much of the reduction is a deferral and not a saving. The exploration of the universe is going to cost a great deal of money and take a very long time. This is a program for orderly progress and not blank checks. I think this agency budget, with its multiplicity of projects, will require continuing and increasing oversight. Meanwhile, I am sure a very hardworking committee has done about the best they can under the circumstances.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Jensen].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amount requested in this bill; specifically that part to try to land a man on the moon. We are being asked today to authorize the spending of $5,238,119,400 out of the many empty pockets of our already overburdened taxpayers. This amounts to more than $100 for each American family, on an average, to pay in fiscal year 1964, mainly for the purpose of trying—just trying mind you—to put a man on the moon. For what? I ask in all sincerity, for what?

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. I shall yield the gentleman additional time, such time as I take up.

Mr. JENSEN. Good.

Mr. MILLER of California. You are putting a man on the moon as part of the exploration of outer space, and merely as a plateau in the development of this process.

Mr. JENSEN. I favor the exploration of outer space so long as it is sensible.

Mr. MILLER of California. If putting a man on the moon purely for the sake of putting a man on the moon was the object of this thing——

Mr. JENSEN. OK.

Mr. MILLER of California. I am going to give the gentleman some additional time when we have completed this colloquy.

Mr. JENSEN. I am listening.

Mr. MILLER of California. Wait a minute. The gentleman asked for an explanation. I am sick and tired of this type of approach. Does the gentleman want an explanation? Does the gentleman actually want one?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. However, I doubt you are going to give me much enlightenment.

Mr. MILLER of California. There are some people who would not be enlightened by it.

Mr. JENSEN. I remember the times when it was quite difficult to enlighten the gentleman, but the gentleman has improved since that time.

Mr. MILLER of California. I wish I could pay the same compliment to the gentleman from Iowa. This is a plateau. It does not mean that the objective is getting to the moon. We do not know whether we can ever land a man on the moon, as yet. It means, though, that this is a process of getting into outer space to develop the techniques that are necessary for rendezvous, the techniques that will give us an application in the military field which has not as yet taken place. Just a few minutes ago the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly], quoted Sir Bernard Lovell as being opposed to this. Maybe, he has received the Air Force Space Digest for July 1963 in which Sir Bernard Lovell points out the reasons why we should land a man on the moon. They are purely scientific.

Sir Bernard Lovell is one of the greatest scientists in this field in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman from California. This world is full of dreamers. Some of their dreams come true, but too often they wake up and find that they have just been dreaming.

Mr. Chairman, I may be wrong on this subject, but I have not convinced myself yet and neither has the gentleman from California convinced me that we should spend over $5 billion for this purpose.

Mr. MILLER of California. I tried.

Mr. JENSEN. Now, I hope and pray that the Members of this Congress will not lose their God-given commonsense in the consideration of this bill or in considering any bill which comes to the floor of the House or the other body, which seeks to spend billions or even millions of our taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. Chairman, we have a Federal debt today of over $305 billion. It is difficult to comprehend just what a billion dollars really is. Let me give you a little idea of what $305 billion amounts to. That, Mr. Chairman, is more than the actual value of all the land in America, all the cattle and poultry, hogs and sheep, all of the farm buildings, and all of the machinery on all the farms in the United States. That gives us a good idea of what $305 billion amounts to. Think of it my colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I ask this simple question in all sincerity: What will it profit us and the peace-loving peoples of this wide world when our dollar shrinks to possibly 10 percent of its present value, and it will just as sure as we are sitting or standing here today unless we make an about-face, and soon. Why, Mr. Chairman, most every nation in this world has lost confidence in the stability and the value of the American dollar, to the end that they have demanded gold in payment of their export to the United States to the end that we have lost over $7 billion of our gold during the past decade. Does that mean anything to you who vote for all these huge expenditures of your people's dollars? Remember this, my colleagues, it is not only the rich that pay the bill for these huge Federal expenditures. It is the ultimate consumer of goods that pays all of the bill, every dime of it, because every tax is piled onto the price of every commodity which the ultimate consumer buys. Who are these ultimate consumers? Seventy percent of them are people whose income is less than $6,000 per year, hence they pay 70 percent of the entire bill.

Mr. Chairman, I do not stand here and plead with you, my colleagues, just for the sake of talking. I have been on this job for almost a quarter of a century. I have tried to be reasonable, I have tried to be fair with my colleagues, and more especially with the people of America and this great blessed country of ours, which you and I love. But we are losing everything for which our brave youth served, fought, and died, and we are losing it fast, the competitive, free, private enterprise system. That is what they served, fought, and died to protect and preserve. They did not fight for socialism or the New Frontier concepts. They fought for America, for the things which made America great, were they white, black, yellow, or brown. And let us not forget it for 1 minute, and I hope and pray we act accordingly.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH].

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague spoke of dreamers. I think it has been the dreamer who has made America the country it is today. If I must make a confession I would confess I would hope I might be classed with one of these dreamers.

Back in the spring of 1956 I was running in a primary contest seeking the nomination of my party for the very office I now hold. At that time I made a couple of speeches in which I made the statement that the United States should engage in activities which would prepare it for the day when interplanetary travel and the exploration of outer space would become a reality. Of course, my suggestions were very coldly received. I was naive enough to think they would be very warmly received. I dropped this topic from the subject matter of my speeches because my people thought that the statements were rash and inappropriate for any serious-minded candidate who was seeking this high office. Then what happened? On October 4, 1957, the Soviets electrified the world with an announcement that they had placed in orbit a satellite named Sputnik. Not only did this accomplishment arouse the scientific community, but the psychological impact was felt throughout the world. I am sure my colleagues on the committee remember the day when Mr. George V. Allen, Director of the U.S. Information Agency under President Eisenhower, appeared before the committee and testified as to the impact that this Soviet accomplishment had on the entire world. These are his words:

> The successful launching of Sputnik I created an intensity of reaction throughout the world which has rarely been paralleled by any other single discovery or invention. The public awareness of the first sputnik was almost universal. People in remote areas of even the most remote countries knew of this sensational event within a few days.

This marked the beginning of a new era—an era of exploration and exploitation of the wonders of space and universe.

Mr. Chairman, the country was justly aroused and we also engaged in an intensified effort to place ourselves in this race. Today we are discussing perhaps the most complex bill we have discussed since I have been on the Committee on Science and Astronautics for some 5 years now. In addition to the moneys involved and the programs involved, I believe we are involved in a much larger issue. Again I would like to refer to one of Mr. Allen's statements, because his statement really aroused me and pointed up to me what we were actually endeavoring to do in this space effort. He stated as follows:

> Probably the most significant result of the Soviet success is a change in the overall impression of the people of the world about the Soviet Union. In public opinion parlance we speak of this as the revised Soviet image. The change goes beyond the field of space technology. It covers all of Soviet science and technology plus Soviet military power and general standing.

I do not think it can be disputed that before sputnik very few people believed that the Soviet Union could possibly challenge America in any scientific or technical endeavor, but now Soviet successes in space are taken as an indicator that the Soviet Union can challenge us. Much was made of the fact that we are spending over $5 billion in this effort. I would call your attention to the fact that we are spending over half of our budget, over $50 billion, in the defense of our country. We are concerned about the advances of communism. We appropriated billions of dollars and sacrificed thousands of lives in Korea as a defense against communism. We are concerned about Cuba, Laos, Vietnam, Thailand, China, and other areas of the world where we are defending against communism. This is as it should be, but now we have the chance to go on the offensive in a peaceful way in this great battle in the cold war. I think it is time for us to undertake this endeavor. But now we have the chance to go on the offensive and prove to the world that a free country, that a democracy, that a competitive system cannot just survive but can lead the world in scientific and technical achievement.

This is a battle in the cold war. It is an effort which not only commends itself to the great adventuresome American spirit but to the betterment of our way of life. The victory will not be in landing on the Moon or exploring Mars but the victory will be that the spirit, ingenuity, and determination of a free people have prevailed.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD].

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time to discuss some of the aspects of H.R. 7500, the 1964 National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act.

The committee has labored diligently to bring to the floor the best possible bill. During the course of lengthy deliberations, there naturally have occurred differences of opinion and approach. I would state, however, that the space program and, particularly, its impact on national security, is certainly not a partisan matter. Where individuals, including this Member, have differed with the committee, we have set forth these views as additional views in the report. But before discussing some of the specific differences, I want to commend the chairmen of the committee [Mr. MILLER] and of the Subcommittee on Applications and Tracking and Data Acquisition [Mr. HECHLER] for their courtesy and fairness, and the members on both sides on their determination to explore, to the extent possible, all of the many aspects and complexities of our civilian space program. It is my belief that in view of the time and staff assistance available to the committee, they have done a good job. Hopefully, in future years, with additional staffing, and I know that this subject will be covered in greater detail by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY], we will be able to do an even better job of reviewing the ever-growing NASA expenditures.

The administration request for 1964 was approximatly $5.7 billion. The bill on the floor today proposes authorization of slightly in excess of $5.2 billion. This, it should be pointed out, compares with the $3.6 billion authorization in fiscal year 1963, so while there have been some cuts from the administration's request, the total authorization in this bill is still substantially in excess of the 1963 level. It should be pointed out further that in both committees and in subcommittee, many amendments were offered by various Members to further cut and revise the various programs in this budget. I sincerely believe that it could be cut more and am hopeful that the Appropriations Committee will see fit to take action in this direction.

Mr. Chairman, I should at the outset state that I intend to support amendments which will be offered today by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH] to reduce facility training and research grants, by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] to reduce the authorization for advance design development, by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] to delete authorization for the proposed Electronic Research Center in Boston, Mass., and by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER] to reduce the authorization for the Life Sciences Research Laboratory.

With respect to the Electronic Research Center, it should be pointed out that the committee has wisely decided to delay construction of this facility pending further report from NASA as to both the justification for such a facility and also the desirability of placing that facility in Boston, Mass. My only point of difference with the committee action is that it is my hope that upon receipt of the report from NASA the matter will be considered by the Congress as a whole, in view of the $50 to $60 million that is involved, rather than simply be directed to the House Science and Astronautics Committee for approval or rejection as the committee may deem advisable.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to turn to a necessarily brief discussion of national space goals. We are being asked to provide $5.2 billion for the programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1964, or over 5 cents of every Federal tax dollar. For the past 4 days, I have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statements questioning the logic of our national space goals and, in addition, have submitted additional views to this report.

The focal point of the criticism is the Apollo project for a manned lunar landing, which, according to NASA officials, absorbs approximately $3.2 billion of this authorization bill. To quote from an article in the August issue of Atlantic by Dr. Robert Jastrow, Director of the Goddard Institute for Space Studies, and Dr. Homer E. Newell, Director of the Office of Space Sciences in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration headquarters, I quote:

> The Apollo budget which has produced the current outcry stems from a decision taken in 1961. At that time, the man-in-space program was expanded beyond the limited Mercury effort to a full-scale attack on the problems of manned flight to the moon and planets. The impetus for the decision came from a series of Soviet achievements in February and March of 1961, when the U.S.S.R. launched in rapid succession four spacecraft, each weighing 10,000 pounds or more. These were followed on April 12, 1961, by the successful orbiting of Major Gagarin in a 14,000-pound spacecraft and his safe recovery after a circuit of the earth in 1 hour and 47 minutes. Thus the world saw the Soviet Union achieve man's first flight in space.
>
> On May 26, 1961, President Kennedy laid the Soviet challenge before the American people. He urged the Nation to commit itself to the goal of landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to earth before the decade was out. The President's message suggested the reasons underlying this recommendation: we faced the gloomy prospect of standing second to the U.S.S.R. in manned flight for years to come; the manned lunar landing would be the first major space achievement in which the U.S. effort could reach its full strength; a vigorous effort could achieve a manned lunar landing by the end of this decade; and if the United States set 1970 as its target date for the lunar landing, it would have a good chance to reach this goal before the U.S.S.R.
>
> President Kennedy asked for a careful examination of the proposed commitment: "I think every citizen of this country as well as the Members of Congress should consider the matter carefully in making their judgement * * * there is no sense in agreeing or desiring that the United States take an affirmative position in outer space unless we are prepared to do the work and bear the burdens."
>
> In July, 1961, the Congress voted overwhelmingly for the funds requested to move the space program into high gear. In 1962 Congress reaffirmed its support by doubling the budget of the previous year.

Today, in 1963, we are again asked to reaffirm our support of that decision. I, for one, am reluctant to do so. The principal reason for support of this bill is that, unfortunately, there is no other program, comparable to the moon program, to develop space techniques at this time. Specifically, my concern is the emphasis of this Nation on nonmilitary space programs involving outer space, on the one hand, and, on the other, the fact that this Nation has not authorized a single military space weapons system. To quote Air Force Chief Gen. Curtis E. LeMay:

> We must not risk the danger of waiting for the enemy to demonstrate capability before we undertake development of our own. The visible threat requires a vigorous military program.

Despite the clear and present danger of the cold war, this Nation is continuing to give top priority to the prestige of the moon program for peaceful purposes, while we are failing to make any attempt to comprehensively reevaluate and reappraise our national space posture and national space goals in the light of the cold war in 1963.

Moneys authorized by this bill, as previously, are basically for nonmilitary, scientifically oriented programs. Military space programs are authorized through the House and Senate Armed Services Committees. The roles of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Defense and the extent to which national security is involved in the civilian space program have been difficult to define. It is my conviction that the space goals of this Nation must be directed toward national security as well as to peaceful development of space. I believe that a clear definition of space-age responsibilities between NASA and DOD, and vastly improved coordination between those agencies, are necessary to the development of an effective program if the military role in space is to be properly implemented. The Congress and the country are properly concerned about the present course of the U.S. space program as we consider this $5.2 billion NASA authorization bill. Perhaps nothing is so portentous for the future security of the United States as the proper emphasis on space developments.

The one aspect of the space program of which all Americans are aware is the so-called moonshot, programed at a cost of $20 billion to $40 billion or more. Frequently, comments are heard as to the potential "prestige" of the moonshot and the urgent need to "beat the Russians to the moon." These expressions are, to be sure, sincere. There is little doubt but that by successfully completing the moon shot, the United States will gain vast prestige. But, while gaining such prestige in our efforts to beat the Russians to the moon, this Nation runs the risk of jeopardizing our national security. Specifically, I find it difficult to justify the expenditure of this amount of money, over $1 billion of which is authorized by this bill, for the Apollo moon project in relation to what I believe to be its technological, scientific, and military benefits, when compared with other alternatives available to us.

The crux of the argument falls on the distinction between the areas of space surrounding earth to a distance of 100 to 500 miles, called inner space, and the far reaches of space, hundreds of thousands of miles away, called outer space. Exploiting either of these vast areas will result in much knowledge which could be employed in exploiting the other in addition to adding substantially to national scientific know-how. However, the result of the manned moon landing will be largely prestige, while the result of achieving supremacy in inner space will be the ability to introduce or prevent the introduction of nuclear-armed satellites, together with other significant national security factors, such as the possibility of influencing or controlling the command and control systems of a potential enemy, or of preventing such influence or control of our own command and control systems as well as communications, reconnaissance, and surveillance capabilities. If the Russians orbit a military space platform, even if it were not employed militarily, they could use the 2- to 5-year lead time to press their advantage at the bargaining table. Given an absolute weapon superiority, it is possible for a nation to implement its policies for peace or war, on its own terms.

The present announced goal of this Nation is to develop space for peaceful purposes to assure that we are not preempted in this new dimension. The determination to proceed with the moonshot indicates that this goal refers in large part to outer space. This is a noble ambition, but, I believe, it ignores the main thrust of the Soviet space aim, which is to dominate inner space through the ability to exercise control over the surface of the earth.

Every indication leads a prudent man to the belief that the Soviet goal in space is no different from Russian goals in other media, namely, world domination. The missile ambush in Cuba of but a few months ago shows categorically Soviet ambitions. Specifically, Soviet space successes demonstrate that they possess good capability with heavy payloads, some capabilities in rendezvous techniques, and excellent endurance performance, all of which emphasize their greater concern with inner space. Together with this, one must consider continued Russian successes in the field of nuclear testing and their explosion of a vastly powerful 50-megaton bomb, which, if detonated from space could conceivably devastate hundreds of square miles of the earth's surface.

In short, the Soviet potential in inner space could, in the immediate future, pose a significant new fourth-dimensional threat to our national security. Perhaps equally significant is the way in which such a threat from space, assuming this potential military capability is not used, could be employed to advance and buttress the known Soviet techniques of nuclear and missile blackmail.

With this distinct possibility—this threat facing us as a Nation—what course should we pursue? Should we continue a major effort, at great expense, to place a man on the moon? Should we continue to deemphasize the national security aspects of inner space? I suggest that such a course imperils national security.

To my knowledge, the United States does not, today, have a top priority program to achieve military superiority in inner space. The United States is not proceeding rapidly with a single military space weapons system. In addition, there is no high-priority, comprehensive attempt being made to reevaluate and redefine our national space goals. While I appreciate that the military aspects of space do not fall within the jurisdiction of this committee, I believe that military space programs are not proceeding at a responsible pace, principally because of the vast sums being expended on the moon program and the resulting drain of technical and scientific talent which the "urgent" quest for the moon causes. Specifically, we have committed ourselves to less desirable and less urgent national space goals.

The Congress, in the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958—Public Law 85–568—described the policy and purpose of the act as follows:

> SEC. 102. (a) The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States that activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind.
>
> (b) The Congress declares that the general welfare and security of the United States require that adequate provision be made for aeronautical and space activities. The Congress further declares that such activities shall be the responsibility of, and shall be directed by, a civilian agency exercising control over aeronautical and space activities sponsored by the United States, except that activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems, military operations, or the defense of the United States (including the research and development necessary to make effective provision for the defense of the United States) shall be the responsibility of, and shall be directed by the Department of Defense; and that determination as to which such agency has responsibility for and direction of any such activity shall be made by the President in conformity with section 201(e).

Clearly, the emphasis, as between NASA and Department of Defense, of our national space program is determined by the President. I suggest that the emphasis as indicated by a military space request of slightly more than $1.5 billion for fiscal year 1964 as opposed to a NASA request of $5.7 billion, has not properly reflected the national security aspects of space exploration.

What course should be taken if we are to concern ourselves with national security aspects of space? I suggest that the first step, through an urgent note sounded by the Congress, is to establish immediately a top priority select committee of the House of Representatives, composed of members from both the Armed Services and Science and Astronautics Committees, to reevaluate, reappraise, and, if the facts warrant, as I sincerely believe they will, redefine our national goals in space, and then take prompt action to achieve revision of the emphasis, approach, and allocation of funds in our civilian and military space programs. Until such a report is submitted and this question has been fully aired, current civilian programs should move ahead at a reasonable rate.

The United States has achieved a high level of competence in space disciplines and techniques. We have a start toward a military space program. We have, in addition, the National Aerounautics and Space Administration, representing a high degree of space competence. The question is one of emphasis. Bluntly, the question is national security. In short, I think that it is essential for space military superiority and hence survival as a nation to put far greater emphasis on innerspace programs.

Mr. Chairman, as a nation, we could perhaps afford to lose the race to the moon, if, indeed, there is presently such a race. But even if there were such a race, it would be a race of prestige, a race for the dramatic demonstration of scientific and technological space competence. On the other hand, for our very survival, we cannot afford to lose the race with the Soviets involving the national security aspects of space.

In the document authored by Drs. Jastrow and Newell which I cited earlier, titled, "Why Land on the Moon?" which is currently being circulated as a NASA document the administration has set forth its reasons and justifications for the $20 to $40 billion expenditure on the Apollo project. As sound as the decision may have been in 1961, the arguments today are unconvincing. The first point cited—on page 4—builds up the strawman argument against the moon program that the funds might better be spent on medical research, education, and so forth, and then proceeds to point out that space money cannot readily be rerouted. This, of course, is not the question involved.

The next point—on page 5—states that the following positive values can be derived from this investment, and I quote:

> The fruits of research into fundamental problems of science, economic returns from the application of satellites to communications and weather forecasting, long-range technological benefits accruing to industry, a general stimulus to science and science education, and, most important, the security which comes from leadership in space.

I would respectfully suggest that the so-called "positive values" would accrue to this Nation regardless of whether or not our space program was aimed at supremacy in inner space or the manned lunar landing in outer space. This, again, is not the question. On pages 5, 6, and 7, they superficially discuss the advantages of manned lunar exploration as opposed to less expensive unmanned lunar exploration, stating that "the heart of the program is man in space, the extension of man's control over his physical environment," and conclude by saying:

> Thus the pace of the program must be set not by the measured pattern of scientific research but by the need for vigorous response to the national challenge.

This frequent reference to the "national challenge" is indeed an illusory concept. If prestige seeking is the "national challenge," then possibly we could all learn a good deal by reading Al Capp's "Li'l Abner" comic strip and studying the psychological motivation behind the "shtoonk," the worthless animal that achieved its desirability simply because it was worth nothing at all. Pages 8 through 17 profess to discuss the scientific objectives of lunar exploration, yet nowhere do these administration spokesmen come to grips with the national security aspects of inner space. They point out that out of this interest and activity of the moon race a separate discipline is forming with a distinct entity and integrity, called "space science," and that "this revival of the spirit of catholicity in science is an important accompaniment to space research." I submit that much of what they say is equally applicable to exploration of inner space.

They conclude, and I believe that it is important to understand the supposed theory behind this $20 to $40 billion expenditure of the taxpayers' dollars; and I quote:

> Even more valuable for the future welfare of the Nation, the space program has a pronounced effect on young people. It appeals to the imagination of the student, and provides him with an additional stimulus to remain in school, to discipline his energies to the attainment of constructive ends, and to acquire the training necessary for advanced scientific and technical work. This can be one of the great contributions of space research—that through its general interest it may assist in the transformation of values which is so badly needed for the realization of the full potential of talent and energy in the United States.
>
> These are the specific values of space exploration: the benefits of basic research, economically valuable applications of satellites, contributions to industrial technology, a general stimulus to education and to the younger generation, and the strengthening of our international position by our acceptance of leadership in a historic human enterprise. The current discussion of these values in the space program has served the United States well in directing its attention to questions of national purpose. But, however we may try to break the program down into its elements and to attempt a detailed balancing of debits and credits, the fact remains that the space effort is greater than the sum of its parts. It is a great adventure and a great enterprise, not only for the United States but for all humanity. We have the power and resources to play a leading role in this effort, and it is inconceivable that we should stand aside.

To summarize briefly, I believe it can be said that the principal reason for supporting the moonshot portion of this bill, for voting for $5.2 billion for fiscal year 1964, is the lack of a well-defined alternative today and the hope that a select committee of the House will be appointed to immediately study the logic of our national space goals. The argument is made that this program has military implications. To be sure, it does. But the question is the relative extent of these implications when compared with inner space emphasis. When pressed for an argument favoring the moonshot, the comment is frequently made that it is a trip similar to that made by Columbus, exploring in the unknown, with great prestige involved. Well, that is fine. But there also would be prestige and knowledge of the unknown gained by achieving supremacy in inner space. And the exploration and supremacy of inner space has the added national security advantage, which I believe to be of utmost importance. When further pressed for an argument for the moonshot, I have heard the statement, "Well, we have started the moon program and we cannot stop." I reject this argument and suggest that we cannot afford to continue to deemphasize the military implications of inner space. We cannot risk our national security and the freedom of the whole world by continuing to drain the dollars and scientific and technical talent available in this country by continuing the race to the moon, which very likely is no race at all, and ignoring the very urgent and vital race for supremacy in inner space.

Mr. Chairman, for this Nation, today, in 1963, to publicly alter our aproach to the space age would require a major and significant change in national policy. One obvious deterrent to such a dramatic change of policy is that inevitably the personal prestige of those who have made the initial decision and those who have vigorously supported this original policy would be in jeopardy. This, of course, would touch both the present administration, the past administration, and members of both political parties here in the Congress. However, I am convinced that both the administration and the Members of Congress are more concerned about the course of this country and the security of the free world than they are about personal prestige. And, further, I am hopeful that regardless of any personal opinions on this complex subject, all Members will assist in seeking a select committee of the House to study these national space goals and, if the facts warrant, make recommendations to revise these goals. I have today introduced a House resolution calling for a select committee of the House to study our broad national goals in space; a task that no congressional committee is now performing, and urge the support of each Member.

Mr. Chairman, any problem of such complexity and uncertainty is subject to varied interpretations. It would be excellent if we could wait until all the facts were in. But all the facts are never in, and national security must not wait. I know that every Member of the Congress is vitally concerned with national security. I claim no secret intelligence or special knowledge. My one purpose in this statement is to express my concern—indeed, alarm—about the logic of our national space goals. I dare not, in good conscience, both as a Member of Congress and as a citizen of this country, fail to raise these serious questions for the consideration of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, there has been much talk of dreamers today. I would suggest that unless we as a Nation promptly address ourselves to the national security aspects of supremacy in inner space, the dream of the moon landing may well turn into a nightmare.

Mr. FULTON of Pennylvania. May I compliment the gentleman from Illinois on his fine presentation and his good work on the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, in the light of the proposal in this bill to locate an electronics center at Boston, Mass., I should like to review a little of the history of the space laboratory at Houston, Tex. I have before me the Washington Sunday Star of November 18, 1962, from which I propose to quote briefly. The article is entitled, "Moon Flight Plans Cause Houston's Surging Boom." The newspaper says:

> In mid-August the criteria were approved by Space Administrator Webb and his Deputy, Hugh L. Dryden, although this fact was not made public at the time.

This apparently was in mid-August of 1962. The article continues:

> Even before its inspection was completed, the committee said through a spokesman that Houston "more than meets the agency's criteria."
>
> Dr. Dryden has denied that there was any irregularity in the selection process, but he has conceded that political considerations may have been involved.
>
> "There were no political deals involved—none at all," Dr. Dryden told an interviewer. "But we live in a real world; we are aware of political realities."

The article continues:

> At any rate, Houston was indeed selected.
>
> Then came the actual land selection and acquisition.
>
> Of the three Houston area sites examined, two—Ellington Air Force Base and San Jacinto Ordnance Depot—

And Members will remember how the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot was abandoned, although the military said it was the best ammunition outloading facility in the United States. The point is that tract, already owned by the Government, was not made the site of this expensive laboratory. Instead the space outfit went out and bought land, expensive land, according to this article.

Continuing to quote from this Washington Star article:

> Ellington Air Force Base and San Jacinto Ordnance Depot—already were owned by the Government.
>
> Both had been extensively developed and both were closer to Houston than was Clear Lake. The ordnance depot was quite close to deep water.
>
> But Clear Lake was selected even though its choice involved purchase by the Government of nearly a square mile of land—at a price about 12 percent above the highest appraisal made of the site's fair market value. This land, incidentally, had to be drained before construction of the Space Lab could begin.
>
> NASA has not let outsiders see the minutes of its site selection committee. So it is not known precisely what factors were considered in passing over San Jacinto and Ellington in favor of Clear Lake.

Continuing, the article says, and I am excerpting it, because of lack of time:

> But within 6 months after the NASA announcement, land values in the area jumped to more than $5,000 an acre. Since then they have virtually doubled again. Potentially Humble's West Ranch holdings are easily worth a quarter-of-a-billion dollars, compared with the $9.2 million Humble paid for it in 1938.

What I am trying to say here and using this article to prove, is that these space installations are pretty plush deals, either for Houston or Boston.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Would not the gentleman be fair to other Members of the House——

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I just want to point out one thing.

Mr. GROSS. I want to point out one thing to you. On my time, I am not going to be very amenable to any of this fair or unfair statement business.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. All right, then I will put it in a different way.

Mr. GROSS. All right.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Would not the gentleman give the House better information, if he took our hearings of last year when Members on the Republican side and the Democratic side heard every person involved in this? There is a complete hearing of last year on the Houston site. Would not the gentleman give us better information if he took that and quoted from that hearing instead of quoting some newspaper article that nobody knows who wrote it or why?

Mr. GROSS. I will give you the name of the man who wrote the article, and I have not seen any denial of it.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. But would it not be better information to give to the Members to get all the hearings and read just what was said?

Mr. GROSS. You do not deny the information that is contained in this article that is written by Mr. William Hines, the Washington Star science writer; do you?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I would deny the implication of what is written in it—very much so. If the gentleman would read the hearings, he would read what was said before our committee last year. We had the people before our committee and that will tell you the story of what was done. The gentleman ought to take something more accurate than some newspaper story. I do deny the implication that there was skulduggery and crookedness in picking a site.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman does not believe this article, and if he takes issue with it, why did he not deny it long ago?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I do deny it. We called people in. I was chairman of the subcommittee and other members of the committee were there and the witnesses before the committee were asked why the site of Houston was being picked.

Mr. GROSS. You do not deny this article in the Washington Star and you are not saying that you do.

Mr. Chairman, before I vote to launch the building of a $50 million electronics center for the Space Administration at Boston, Mass., and in the light of the information contained in this article, I want a full and complete bill of particulars. I want to know who and what is responsible for these huge spending programs. Too long has the Space Administration been treated as untouchable.

This business of probing into space and shooting for the moon started with an appropriation of $338 million in fiscal year 1959. Today, in this bill, the taxpayers are being asked to cough up $5,200 million, more than $2 billion of which is for this moon business. We are already borrowing billions of dollars each year to operate this Government. How much longer can the citizens of this country endure these burdens?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER].

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 7500.

I want to add my words of compliment to our fine chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], and our subcommittee chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH], who was so helpful to me in this first year on his committee.

I would like to emphasize the problem of national security and add a word of concern and caution although I speak in favor of this bill, H.R. 7500.

I would like to say a few words about my concern based on the Soviet space program.

Mr. Chairman, while the United States dramatically races to the moon, can it be the Russians have set their goal for space control? A clear definition of our mutual objectives is difficult. The United States has placed international prestige and a manned lunar landing as its primary goal. We have placed space control for national security or peaceful use secondary.

Let us take a look at the Soviet space program.

The U.S.S.R.'s space program and military missile program have been closely linked from their inception and it is probable that many of the scientists, engineers, and technicians work on both. According to Soviet Academician L. I. Sedov, a leading scientist and spokesman on aerospace matters:

> There is one large team in Russia that handles all space projects. The same keymen are in charge of guidance, tracking and other segments for each of the projects. It is a very large team and it can well take care of several projects in parallel. We have no distinction between military and civilian projects.

Below the level of central executive control and coordination a wide variety of organizational components probably handle assigned portions of the work. There are undoubtedly a number of research-design institutes working exclusively on space vehicle and guided missile design development and fabrication. In addition, supporting projects are carried on in classified project sections of research establishments of the Academies of Sciences and higher educational institutions. The Chief of Artillery Directorate of the Ministry of Defense probably establishes military specifications for advanced weapons systems and oversees the launching and testing of vehicles.

Within the Soviet Union the state committees coordination of scientific research has been made responsible for:

First. Determining the key areas for research and development work and defining the most important problems for immediate and for long-term research;

Second. Drafting an overall plan for scientific research and development;

Third. Supervising the implementation of key problem research regardless of the subordination of the institutions involved;

Fourth. Coordinating research and development activities in regard to major projects of all institutions or agencies engaged in scientific research;

Fifth. Introducing new technology throughout the country;

Sixth. Authorizing establishment of new scientific research institutions, regardless of subordination;

Seventh. Coordinating international relations of all governmental and scientific bodies in the scientific field;

Eighth. Supervising the dissemination of scientific and technical information;

Ninth. Advising the Council of Ministers on all problems and issues which in any way involve scientific research and development work.

The committee has a permanent staff of 400 to 500 people, a good many of whom came to it from the State Scientific-Technical Committee when it was abolished. A considerable amount of work, however, is done through ad hoc commissions and councils comprised of scientists, engineers, and technicians drawn from various sectors of the scientific community and loaned to the committee for a specific task. These commissions and councils study particular scientific and technical problems or fields of science and technology and make recommendations to the appropriate department in the staff of the State Committee for Coordination of Scientific Research.

Contradictions occur when these comments are compared with the results of a recent U.S. Senate study.

Concerning the military implications of space, the Soviets continue to insist, as the Senate Space Committee study points out, that their intentions are peaceful while those of the United States are militarily oriented. They have seized upon public pronouncements of American leaders, especially in the Air Force, relating to the military application of space to prove their contention.

Yet, in their own public pronouncements they have been careful to maintain the fiction of innocence concerning the military value of space exploration. Still, Soviet leaders continue to boldly assert the global capability and superiority of their rockets and have not hesitated to threaten their use against aggressors, clearly meaning the United States and its allies. As the Senate study points out, it can be safely assumed that the Soviets, who are extraordinarily realistic in ascertaining power realities in world affairs, fully appreciate and indeed take into consideration in their military strategy the military assets of space exploration.

The recent textbook on Soviet military doctrine prepared under the direction of Marshal V. D. Sokolovsky stressed the importance of meeting alleged American attempts to turn the cosmos into a theater of war. A review by Gen. P. Kurochkin appearing in the Soviet military newspaper Red Star said that one of the chapters in the book dealt with the military use of outer space for military purposes. According to Kurochkin, the authors introduced a number of facts showing that the United States was already engaged in this activity.

Kurochkin said:

> The Soviet people are engaged in the peaceful conquest of space. But it is perfectly clear that if the imperialists continue to conduct research for means of using the cosmic space for military goals, then the interests of guaranteeing the security of the Soviet state demand definite measures from our side.

It is possible that we have been distracted by the Soviets into this glamorous moon race while they are in the process of developing military control of space.

It is true that there is a certain fallout from technological advances that can be made from this expensive race to the moon. But could this money be more readily spent in U.S. national security inherent in earth's atmosphere? If we have separate objectives then perhaps we are at a disadvantage in this competitive role.

Lt. Gen. James G. Ferguson, Deputy Chief of Staff, Research and Technology, stated that "there can be little doubt that the Soviet Union has military applications in mind for the space region."

He quoted Marshal of the Soviet Union Sokolovsky as saying:

> An important problem now is warfare with artificial earth satellites, which can be launched for diverse reasons, even as carriers of nuclear weapons. Soviet military strategy takes into account * * * the use of outer space and aerospace vehicles.

He also quoted Soviet Premier Khrushchev as saying after Titov's flight:

> If you want to threaten us from a position of strength, we will show you our strength. You do not have 50- and 100-megaton bombs. We have stronger than 100 megaton. We placed Gagarin and Titov in space and we can replace them with other loads that can be directed to any place on earth.

The Russians, who have succeeded in an unmanned lunar landing in the past, only made one abortive publicized attempt recently and this failed. They, likewise, have given no evidence to us, as reported by Dr. Seamans, of their concern with developing the necessary boosters for such a moon launch. There have been restrictions placed for security reasons on information concerning the Russian space program. If they are concentrating on control of the world's atmosphere, that is within a hundred miles of earth, it is likely that our country's security is additionally threatened. Therefore, I feel that we should have an immediate total reevaluation of the comparative positions and objectives of the U.S. and U.S.S.R. program.

The Department of Defense, through its spokesman Dr. Kavanau, has stated:

> It is important to understand that within DOD itself a space program does not exist as a separate entity. The basic objective in any functional area is to develop and exploit those capabilities which will provide the maximum military effectiveness for the foreseeable future.

Those space efforts which do not contribute directly to such objectives must compete for support with other military programs which do contribute to the national security. Certain space related projects have emerged as contributing to our military effectiveness in such areas as observation, communications, navigation, meteorology, and defense against hostile satellites. Such space systems now absorb about one-half the total annual fiscal outlay for space activities by the DOD.

He went on to say that:

> Concurrently, we are faced with the difficult problem of defining accurately, in the light of unknown or possibly hostile space activities, the specific characteristics and performance parameters of future military systems of many kinds. Consequently, we must continue to develop an adequate competence in space technology—including vehicles, components, and subsystems likely to be important for future military application—even though the precise requirements for these are not yet completely clear.
>
> Only in this way can we offset the handicap of development leadtimes which can be as great as 5 or 10 years—or longer—for a useful operational space system. These building blocks of technology, knowledge, and experience are being carefully assembled in order to provide the insurance we need against future military surprise in space. Our annual "premium," if you like, for this "insurance" now amounts to about 40 percent of our annual Department of Defense space effort, when measured in terms of dollar expenditures. The objective of these efforts is the advancement of space technology with likely military utility.

The total Department of Defense research and engineering effort in programs or projects classified as "space" or "space related" amounted to $1.62 billion in fiscal year 1963 and is expected to amount to $1.67 billion in fiscal year 1964. This is about 20 to 25 percent of the DOD's total research, development, test, and engineering program dollars.

The statement by Marshal S. S. Biryuzov, chief of Soviet strategic rocket forces that the U.S.S.R. has the capability of launching missiles from satellites brings up a compound question: "Does the United States have this capability and, if so why are we not actively developing such a system?"

We must face the reality that in this cold war fight with the Communists, the new battlefield is space. Within this potential battlefield we question whether our space program is truly alined to national security. We find that the U.S.S.R. had 375 hours of manned space flight in contrast with the United States 53½ hours. We see the strange contrast of the demand that we must have manned lunar landings, while at the same time we are told that we must have unmanned military systems in space.

We find there are no military space weapon systems projects authorized. This is because no mission requirement has been developed by the armed services which satisfies the Department of Defense. There is the constant fear of antagonizing Russians through our NASA program, but it seems evident that the recent Soviet shots are in the direction of developing manned space stations orbiting the earth. If this be indeed true, the Russians have about a 2-year jump on us. They have talked about satellite missile launchers as quoted previously by Biryuzov. Dr. Edward C. Walsh, the executive secretary of the National Association of Science and Space Committees, has said "we have taken a policy position against orbiting weapons of mass destruction in space unless forced to do so by the hostile action of others."

Meanwhile, our program for NASA proceeds and our information and findings are available for all to see and to follow. All of our shots are available for public scrutiny and yet we find no such reciprocity from the Russians. Can it be that all the work we are doing and the money we are spending is being made available in forms of research to the Communists, who in turn will use this upon us?

We receive no information from them except those facts which they think we already know or which they want us to know.

It is my feeling the major role of national security in the space program has been clouded in the hearings of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. It has been difficult to define clearly the mutual roles of NASA and the Department of Defense in the development of our national security in its relationship to space. Our military posture and the Communist threat are a bipartisan matter.

Moneys allotted this year are set forth basically for nonmilitary and scientifically oriented programs of NASA. The question of how much national security is involved has never been specifically clarified.

The NASA space program calls for peaceful exploration of space led by the United States in cooperation with other nations and for the benefit of all nations. Nowhere have I found evidence of any emphasis on national security or a U.S. military mission in space. If we do have one, it is hidden behind security measures.

I feel that the military, through the Department of Defense, is being phased out of the space program. The agreements between the Department of Defense, NASA, and the Air Force no longer seem to be applied. NASA is a civilian, scientifically oriented program. The Department of Defense has left the emphasis there to the detriment of the Armed Services. Unless there is a reevaluation and a realinement of this policy it would appear the Armed Services connection to the space program will become less and possibly phased out. This, in my opinion, is not in the best interest of this country. Therefore, I ask for a reevaluation and realinement of the role of the Armed Services in the U.S. space program.

It is my opinion that our space goal be directed primarily toward national security, and secondarily to peaceful development of outer space. By so doing our military space program can then be given proper perspective, new emphasis and new direction. At the same time, the benefits of space technological advancement will accrue for peaceful development of science and industry.

I recognize that there is a technological war with communism, and feel that our space program must now be given proper perspective in relation to our military space mission.

I, therefore, recommend that this and future budgets be evaluated to place emphasis on national security. Thus, the military role in space through the Department of Defense can be properly and fully implemented and the fear of unilateral space disarmament allayed.

I feel that a clear definition of space age duties and roles of the Department of Defense and NASA is necessary to develop an effective program. The cold war we are engaged in with the Communists can only be properly waged if our space program progresses with national security as its prime goal.

Mr. Chairman, a manned orbital development system space station should be a part of our fiscal year 1965 budget, but before we reach this budget let us take a good, cold look at the whole space program and let us see that the Department of Defense and NASA not only cooperate but have a coordinated program which places national security as its predominant goal.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY].

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I also rise as a member of the committee and of the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight in support of H.R. 7500, with reservations to support some amendments which I understand are going to be offered later.

It has been my assignment as a member of the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee to explain about the Saturn boosters and the engine program of NASA. This hardware here on the table is the heart of the Apollo program.

The Saturn boosters are three in number, designated as S-1, S1B, and S5.

The engines in the Apollo program are five in number: H-1, and A-3, in Saturn-1; H-1, and J-2, in Saturn 1B; F-1, and J-2, in Saturn 5.

There is one other engine, the M-1. This engine is in the developmental stage only—an engine of the future. It is a very large, upper stage, liquid hydrogen and oxygen engine of high performance, planned for missions in space in the future—the 1970's. It has a thrust of 1½ million pounds.

Now let us talk a bit about the Saturn family of boosters.

Development of Saturn 1 began in 1958, to provide the Nation with a large thrust booster, capable of putting big weights in earth orbit. Using the state of art then existing, Saturn 1 first stage, clusters eight H-1 engines with liquid oxygen fuel, which total 1½ million pounds of thrust—payload—20,000 pounds in low earth orbit.

The upper stage is powered with eight A-3, hydrogen-oxygen engines, with total thrust of 90,000 pounds.

Saturn 1 is capable of putting 11 tons, 22,000 pounds, in low earth orbit.

When the decision was made in 1961 to go to the moon, it was natural to plan the mission, in part, around this booster, already in development.

Saturn 1 does not go to the moon. Its mission is to fly in 1965 the first Apollo command modules, for flight testing and spacecraft configurations.

Next comes Saturn 1-B. This launch vehicle uses the same first stage as Saturn 1. The upper stage is the same stage as the upper part of Saturn 5, the moon rocket. It is powered by one J-2 engine—hydrogen-oxygen with a thrust of 200,000 pounds.

The mission of Saturn 1-B will be to fly the complete Apollo spacecraft in low earth orbit in 1966—that is the command module, the service module, and the lunar excursion module. Saturn 1-B can put 16 tons, 32,000 pounds, in low earth orbit. Its mission will be to flight test the whole spacecraft and permit orbital maneuvers.

To use lay terms, the crews can get practice and proficiency by using this booster and thus prepare for the moon flight.

To do the moon trip required a vehicle of much greater ability than Saturn 1 or 1-B. Saturn 5 is the vehicle for this job. It consists of three stages, the first powered by five F-1 engines, total thrust of 7½ million pounds, a second stage of five J-2 engines, total thrust of 1 million pounds, and a third stage powered by one J-2 engine.

Saturn 5 is capable of orbiting 120 tons about the earth, or sending 45 tons on to the moon at escape velocity of 25,000 miles per hour.

I have intermingled the descriptions of the vehicles and the engines. It is hard to talk about one and not the other.

The three main engines of the Saturn vehicles are the H-1, a liquid oxygen and kerosene engine of 188,000 pounds of thrust, the J-2, an upper stage engine of liquid oxygen and hydrogen of 200,000-pound thrust, and the big daddy, the F-1, a liquid oxygen-kerosene engine of 1½-million-pound thrust.

Incidentally this last engine gobbles up 3 tons of fuel per second.

It is interesting to note that all three of these engines were conceived and development begun before it was decided to go to the moon. They are simply improvements upon engines which preceded them, actually the H-1 and F-1 engines have the same basic design as the early engines in the early Thor and Jupiter ballistic missiles.

This is a fact worthy of note. It points up the importance of continuing research and development in this field of space. This country and Russia may not be in a race to the moon, but we certainly are in a space race overall.

No particular mission, as for example, the moon journey, had been picked for these engines when their development began. Still it was of utmost importance to go ahead with large engines and boosters, as the people back in 1958 well knew.

Today, this Nation is working on the development of atomic power and other means of propelling rockets. I do not doubt that the ingenuity of mankind will break through one day, and discover the means of reliable and inexpensive travel in space.

To sum up the Saturn and engine program of NASA, it is quite obviously a building block program of improving vehicles and engines with a basic goal of the development of a reliable launch vehicle to boost large payloads in space, to catch up with and exceed the Russians in this capability.

I should like to point out two other items in closing, which I think are vitally necessary in this overall space program.

First, the problem of committee staffing. This space business has increased almost in geometric proportions. From a budget of a good deal less than $½ billion in 1958, the year of the birth of NASA, we are now considering a budget of $5.2 billion, the fourth largest in the Government. Yet our committee has a staff of only 10, one of the smallest of any committee in Congress. Although no department of Government is more technical or scientific in scope, our committee has only one staff member of technical background, a Corps of Engineers colonel who helped us in checking over construction figures. He did valuable work here and many millions were cut out of this budget because of his careful checking of plans and figures, and inspection of facilities in the field.

There is no possible way for Congressmen, laymen, and neophytes in this sophisticated world of space technology, to intelligently supervise the spending of these billions of the taxpayers money.

Now I think the committee worked long, hard and diligently on this budget. I think we have done a creditable job with the tools we had.

But there is no way to do the proper job without a far larger staff than at present, and one that includes a fair percentage of people who are experts in this business of space technology.

To do less, is to fail to do our job as Congressmen.

Congress is criticized for having old-fashioned ways. I am sure that much of this criticism is unwarranted or misconceived. But in the area, I am talking about, we should be justly criticized. For the people look to us to protect their tax dollar. They have no say over who works in NASA and what NASA does with their money. They do have a great deal to say about who represents them in Congress. And they certainly look to us to handle the purse strings carefully.

Now I say, if we in Congress let these agencies escape our watchful eye because they are experts and we are babes in the wood here in this space business, then we are not doing our job. For all we need to do is to hire some experts so we, too, can be experts through their eyes and ears. Only in this way can we responsibly perform our job on this space committee.

I sincerely hope we will have an adequate staff next year.

I speak of one other point. In a sense it is the most important in my mind. I regret that it will receive the lightest treatment. In the committee report, there are additional views which I signed. One aspect deals with the emphasis of our space program.

I am deeply troubled about this emphasis. So are others.

I support a strong space program for this Nation. I think it essential for our survival. If we had the time to review, it could be proven that we nearly lost our shirts in this missile and rocket race with Russia, because we had such a late start.

But the point now is where are we headed?

Sometimes, one can have superior skill and strength, but because of misdirection, not always do the strongest prevail, sometimes it is the cleverest that come out ahead.

Make no mistake, we are in a space race with Russia. She nearly beat us on the IBM program, but we woke up in time and the great technical skill and productive capacity of this country brought us there—by the skin of our teeth. However, it cost this Nation untold wasted billions in crash programs.

We won that race.

In space, we are now racing with Russia in large launch vehicles and space technology in general.

We are off to the moon.

Russia? We do not know. No evidence is available to indicate she is moon bound.

Where else might she go?

In an area called inner space close to earth. In the area that her military people appear to be most interested in.

We are putting our major emphasis on outer space; we are putting far less emphasis on inner space.

There are many kinds of military possibilities in inner space reconnaissance and inspection, communications, weather detections, nuclear bombing from an orbiting vehicle, and most important, man in space, a manned space station, or a manned weapons system.

I charge the Members of the House of Representatives to alert themselves to the importance of military applications in space, to the end that we may properly orient the space programs of this country. National security is the first requisite of this Nation in space. We should make certain that our space dollars are being used to full advantage, to attain this goal.

I say national security first, today, and space tomorrow.

This space business is like an infant in swaddling clothes. It should do first things first, like any other endeavor.

It occurs to many people who follow this space business closely that a very important area is that of inner space, close to earth orbit. In this area lies the military potential. In this area we cannot afford to fall behind Russia.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say in closing that I certainly join with the new Members of Congress in expressing my gratitude to the chairmen of our committees, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] and especially the chairman of the Subcommittee of Manned Space Flight, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], who were so generous in allowing the freshmen members of the committee to enter into its discussions and its work.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7500. Before proceeding further, let me compliment our chairman and each of the subcommittee chairmen for a job well done. They have worked long and hard on this bill over a period covering the last 4 months. May I pay particular commendation to my subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH].

As a rebuttal to the criticism of the preceding speaker, the gentleman from Florida, about the size of our committee staff, I would answer him and say that there will be a larger staff before very long. It is a question of lack of space, presently, for a large staff. I suspect the gentleman who was critical knows that at the present time we have part of our committee staff in the George Washington Inn, part of them in the basement of the House Office Building and part of them going back and forth in between. A new House Office Building is to be completed shortly and then there will be ample housing for additional committee staff.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to my chairman, the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I feel this attack on our staff is a direct reflection on the chairman personally. I have always felt if we had the room, and every effort has been made to find room in the Capitol and in the facilities there—I even tried to get rented quarters on the outside—I would get the staff, but I was not going to furnish a staff where these people had to sit on one another's lap. We have people on the fifth floor of the old George Washington Inn where they have to walk up and down five flights of stairs.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I decline to yield. I have only 5 minutes. We are near the end of the time provided under the rule. If my chairman will grant me additional time, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I grant the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, I want to make it quite clear that my remarks were intended as no personal reflection on the chairman of our committee, for all my life I have dealt in facts, and they make sense to me. When a committee of Congress deals with the fourth largest budget in this Government, one composed of $5.74 billion, from which we have taken out something and which is now down to $5.2 billion, then I think that this fact should be pointed out because this Congress cannot do an adequate and proper job unless it has the proper staff to do it with.

I want to say another thing also. I have heard criticism again and again when I go back to my district about the fact that Congressmen are not properly supervising the agencies and the Federal Government. That is another reason why I bring this out now. If we are going to maintain our crucial role as a part of the U.S. Government in the Congress of the United States, then in order to do this job we have to have experts that are our eyes and ears so that we in turn can oversee the agencies that we are responsible for.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I would like to direct my further remarks to the gentleman from Florida. I agree with him, and I have talked about this long before the gentleman came to Congress. I know the value of staff. That is why we borrow staff from the Defense Department when we can get it on a reimbursable basis, and we pay their salaries. This is not a new thing. But on the other hand I do not agree with him and I cannot see where hiring staff, when you have no place to put them to work and when it is just impossible to get quarters for them, is going to solve this problem.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. RANDALL. Now, Mr. Chairman, may we get back to an overall view of this authorization bill and see what has been done here in the matter of reductions by the committee. NASA sent up here a request for $5.7 billion. Now the gentleman, our colleague on the committee from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH], said that he had hoped that there would be a 10 percent overall cut and he would be satisfied if there was a 10-percent cut. I am sure the gentleman very well knows that in the Office of Space Sciences overseen by the subcommittee of which he was a member, there was a 12.7-percent reduction and in the Office of Advanced Research and Technology, also under our subcommittee there was a 9.1-percent reduction. The average of all subcommittees or the average for the full committee was 8.3 percent, which is very close to the 10 percent. The Subcommittee on Space Sciences is not considered a glamor committee as is the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight, but it is the subcommittee that has to find some of the answers preliminary to manned space flight including the hazards of radiation in space to manned space flight. This must be done before manned space flight can be successfully and safely accomplished. Our subcommittee accomplished every cut that could possibly be made before having to send our astronauts out into space without knowing something about what conditions they will be subjected to and the hazards they may encounter. Those of you who may think there were no substantial reductions should listen to the following big cuts of money. We reduced the Ranger project not just a million dollars or $2 million, but $25 million, although some of the subcommittee dissented. We completely eliminated the Surveyor orbiter for a total of $28 million. We reduced Mariner by $15 million and reduced biosciences program, despite the protests of some of our subcommittee members by $14 million for a total of $134 million.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I will yield to my friend for just a moment.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I think the gentleman will remember that I also mentioned if the other subcommittees had been as effective as we have been in our subcommittee, we would have achieved the 10-percent reduction. I again say I am greatly in favor of there being a 10-percent reduction.

Mr. RANDALL. I think anyone can observe we did a good job in our subcommittee in the matter of reduction in what could be considered as nonessential expenditures. Turning now to another matter, we heard a moment ago criticism of insufficient committee staff. I think this gives us an opportunity to bring up something that may be considered in the form of an amendment after awhile here.

It was indicated on the floor here a few moments ago there would be an amendment offered to reduce the authorization for facilities, training and research grants. Let us look carefully to see if the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH] is not going in the opposite direction from his colleague on the same side of the aisle, the gentleman from Florida. As I see it the gentleman from Florida was saying a moment ago that most of us are laymen and need help, that is, scientific help, which is provided by staff and suggests a larger staff. It is equally true the administrators of NASA also need a larger staff in the sense they need a greater pool of trained scientists. There is a severe strain on our pool of available manpower at the present time, and that is the reason why our subcommittee allowed the full amount of the request for laboratory facilities, training and research grants. The space program requires highly trained personnel, and if one of our fellow committee members believes the House Space Committee should have more staff he and all fellow members who believe similarly should oppose a proposal to reduce training and research grants because the product of this program means a larger and more adequate staffing of scientists and engineers for NASA.

All members should realize a scientist or engineer cannot be trained in a short time. This thing must be done in anticipation of need. You cannot turn on a tap, like a water faucet, and out comes trained scientists. There has to be a leadtime of 3 or 4 or 5 years. You may have heard of what is called the 10-square program. This meant 10 scientists being trained in 10 universities which is far too few a number. The urgent need of NASA for more technicians and engineers is the same sort of need you have heard mentioned just a few moments ago, when one of the committee was asking for additional staff beyond the present 10. Yet we are talking about training only 100 nationwide per year, and yet there has been an indication that there will be an amendment offered to reduce even this small number. I hope the membership of the House on both sides of the aisle will join to defeat such an amendment and sustain the amounts which have been allowed here by the committee, for facilities, training, and research grants.

Now Mr. Chairman, in the limited amount of time I may have left I would like to sound a warning to all of the membership to be upon the alert for other amendments that may be offered which may cripple the space program. It won't be long now until we will hear the bill read for amendments and go on the 5-minute rule. I don't know what some of those not in sympathy with the space program may propose, but I am certain that if there are additional reductions over and beyond the half-billion dollars which has already been cut by the House Space Committee it will injure and slow down this very important space program. To throw up a road block in the way of this program as some of those critics would do, is naive, shortsighted and quite unrealistic. I am sure I cannot and I do not think any member of the committee can say what the total cost will be, but even if the cost is large the question is not whether we can afford it, but instead we are at the point where we cannot afford not to proceed with space exploration. It is no longer a matter of choice and whether we like it or not we are engaged in a battle of survival with the Soviet Union. Both sides are striving for military and prestige advantages. The successful conquest of space can easily decide whether the cold war becomes a hot war. There will be great peril in a substantial reduction beyond that presently proposed by the Committee. The fact of the matter is we just cannot be second in space because if we concede preeminence to the Soviets in the race to the moon and the other planets, we are in fact conceding preeminence to the Soviets on this planet. If it happens that we should not be first in space, the time will very quickly come when we will not be first on earth. We cannot be shortsighted. We cannot suffer from myopia today while we consider the space authorization act for fiscal year 1964.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, the years which stretch behind us in time are but the twilight of the new dawn. The time is now close at hand when young Americans and their counterparts, will stand upon this earth as one stands upon a footstool and reach their hands out among the stars, for we are living in a world of space. I use that description, not merely as a play on words. Rather, it is intended to catch some of the spirit of our times.

If we concede preeminence to the Soviet Union on the way to other planets, we will be conceding preeminence to the Soviet Union on this planet.

If we do not make it our objective to achieve mastery of outer space, we will not be first in inner space and the time will come when we will not be first on earth and then, finally, the problem will be survival under the worst of all conditions, for the world will someday be ruled from the skies above.

I support this legislation today and I support it because of its all-round value. No man can deny the military value of this program. National security is involved and this is of primary importance to me. All else is secondary. A race to the moon is of no consequence to me. This is true first in inner space and then in outer space. Cooperation between the civilian and the military is an absolute must and steps are being taken to insure this but must be emphasized to a greater degree than has thus far occurred. More cooperation in the use of available Government facilities must also be achieved if waste is to be eliminated in this program. Conflict of interest must not be permitted.

In presenting this legislation today, I shall discuss in some detail Project Gemini.

The next major step after Mercury in the U.S. manned space flight program is Project Gemini, named for the twin stars Caster and Pollux. This project's goals are:

First. To determine man's performance and behavior during prolonged orbital flights of as much as 2 weeks, including his ability as a pilot and controller of his craft.

Second. To develop and perfect techniques for orbital rendezvous and docking, the bringing together and coupling of craft in orbit.

Third. To carry out scientific investigations of space that require participation and supervision of men aboard a spacecraft.

Fourth. To demonstrate controlled entry into the atmosphere and landing at a selected site.

The Department of Defense is participating with NASA in Project Gemini. The Secretary of Defense and the NASA Administrator have agreed on joint arrangements for the planning of experiments, the conduct of flight tests, and the analysis and dissemination of results.

The two-man Gemini spacecraft externally resembles the Mercury spacecraft. It is 1½ feet wider than Mercury at the base and lengthened proportionately. It provides about 50 percent more cabin space than Mercury and weighs about 7,000 pounds. Two men will pilot the Gemini spacecraft.

In contrast to Mercury, many Gemini components will be outside the crew compartments and arranged in easily removable units, thereby facilitating checkout and maintenance.

Included in Gemini equipment are docking apparatus for coupling with another vehicle in space; a life support system for maintaining pressure, temperature, and atmospheric composition of the crew cabin; instruments to collect, transmit, and record data on conditions of the spacecraft and astronauts; guidance and controls systems operating in conjunction with a computer to aid in navigation, rendezvous with another craft, entering earth's atmosphere, and landing; radar to aid in rendezvous operations; and a landing and recovery system including a small parachute to stabilize the craft, the paraglider mechanism, landing gear, and recovery aids such as tracking beacons, flashing lights, and two-way voice radios.

Unlike the Mercury spacecraft, Gemini will have no escape tower. Instead, each astronaut will have an ejection seat, similar to that used in a fighter aircraft, for escape during launch or for emergencies in the recovery phase.

Rollout couches and hinged doors will facilitate pilot entry into and exit from the craft. Two windshields, one for each astronaut, supplant the single porthole of Mercury.

Gemini's resemblance to Mercury is partially obscured by the two-piece adapter section which is attached to the heat shield at Gemini's base. The adapter section is 7½ feet in diameter at the top, 7½ feet long, and 10 feet in diameter at its base. It weighs about 2,200 pounds. It is made up of the equipment and retrograde modules. As an aid in distinguishing the Gemini parts, the crew section has been designated the reentry module.

The equipment module contains fuel, fuel cells, oxygen for breathing, and a propulsion system for orbital attitude control—orientation—and maneuvers. The retrograde module, sandwiched between the equipment and reentry modules, contains the braking rockets that decelerate Gemini and enable it to descend from orbit. It also contains a propulsion system to aid in orienting and maneuvering the spacecraft.

The astronauts jettison the equipment module during preparation for return to earth. They discard the retrograde module just before entry into the atmosphere.

Gemini will be the first spacecraft to utilize fuel cells for electrical power. Its two fuel cells will create electricity through a chemical reaction of hydrogen and oxygen. A byproduct of this reaction is a pint of drinking water per kilowatt-hour.

The fuel cells are located in the equipment module which is jettisoned when the spacecraft is readied for atmosphere entry. An array of silver zinc batteries located in the reentry module provides power after the equipment module is discarded.

Early Gemini flights will employ parachutes for landing. Eventually, the parachutes will be replaced by a 45-foot-wide wedge-shaped paraglider, based on a concept developed by Francis Rogallo, of NASA's Langley Research Center.

The paraglider will be part of the equipment of the reentry module, the only part of Gemini designed to return to earth. The device, deployed at about 40,000 feet, will enable the astronauts to maneuver the module to any desired landing point within a 20-mile radius. Moreover, the paraglider will permit the module to land like an airplane with the pilots sitting upright and looking forward.

When the paraglider is deployed, a spoon-shaped nose ski will automatically extend from the module. The crew will then lower two outrigger skids. The spacecraft will be designed to land with a forward speed of about 45 miles per hour.

For launching the Gemini spacecraft, NASA has chosen the Titan II booster, a U.S. Air Force vehicle. Titan II utilizes a type of liquid propellant which can be stored indefinitely in the fuel tanks. Thus, unlike other liquid-fuel boosters whose propellants must be held at cryogenic—intensely cold—temperatures, Titan II can be fueled in advance of a launch countdown and need not be drained of propellants if a launch is postponed. Flight tests of Titan II started March 16, 1962, and are continuing.

Titan II has a 430,000-pound thrust first stage and 100,000-pound thrust second stage. It is 90 feet high and 10 feet in diameter at the base. The Atlas employed to launch Mercury generates 367,000 pounds of thrust.

In the Gemini orbital rendezvous mission, an Atlas will first launch an Agena rocket, modified to link up with the Gemini spacecraft, into a near-circular orbit. Ground stations will track Agena and determine the best time to launch Gemini. Later a Titan II will propel Gemini into an elongated orbit with an altitude generally lower than that of Agena but with apogee—highest altitude—at the same altitude of the Agena orbit.

Because its altitude is lower, Gemini will be able to circle the earth more quickly than Agena and gradually overtake the rocket. When the two are most favorably located relative to each other, a Gemini rocket will be fired to increase Gemini's speed and to thrust the spacecraft into a circular orbit almost identical with that of Agena.

As soon as Gemini's radar acquires Agena, the so-called closing phase of rendezvous begins. Radar information is fed into Gemini's computer which tells the pilots which rockets to fire and when and how long they must operate them to keep the craft stabilized and gain on their target. When the two craft are about 20 miles apart, the astronauts are expected to sight Agena and supplement radar information with visual observation. A high-intensity flashing light on Agena will help the astronauts keep their target in sight. By the end of the closing phase, Gemini and Agena will be 10 to 100 feet apart and traveling in the same orbit.

The final phase of rendezvous is docking, the linkup of the two vehicles. In this phase, much of the sensing, computing, and decision requirements are within the capability of man. Using visual observation, the astronauts will carefully maneuver Gemini into contact with Agena. They are aided by an aiming bar on the Gemini spacecraft and a notch in the rocket's receiving cone.

As they near their target, the astronauts must reduce the relative velocities between the two craft to less than 1½ miles per hour, although both are whirling around the earth at about 18,000 miles per hour. Moreover, they must aline the conical nose of their craft with the docking socket of the Agena.

They will accomplish this by using the attitude controls to pitch Gemini—move its nose up or down—yaw the craft—turn its nose to the right or left—or roll it around the long axis, as conditions demand.

Docking will be accomplished when the cone-shaped nose of Gemini is gently nudged into the matching slot of the Agena. Coupling of the craft will be automatic, and the astronauts will be able to operate the joined vehicles as a single unit, adding the Agena's propulsion system to that of the Gemini spacecraft.

At the conclusion of their mission, the astronauts will detach Agena and jettison the equipment module. Then, they will turn the spacecraft around, fire the retrorockets to slow down and descend to earth, and discard the retrograde module. After reentry they will deploy a small parachute called a drogue to stabilize the spacecraft. At about 40,000 feet, they will unfurl the paraglider and pilot their spacecraft to an airplane-style landing at a selected ground location.

Before man can truly call himself the master of space, he must master orbital rendezvous. This technique may ultimately make it possible to assemble the huge space stations and the massive interplanetary craft required for manned expeditions to Venus, Mars, and perhaps as far as Pluto on the outer rim of the solar system, much sooner than if direct flight were necessary. Rendezvous may also enable astronauts of the future to refuel, repair, and resupply spacecraft, rescue other astronauts from disabled craft, and ferry crews between the earth and space stations or between space platforms and planets.

Moreover, mastery of orbital rendezvous is needed to fulfill the U.S. timetable for landing men on the moon and returning them safely to earth. By means of rendezvous in lunar orbits, the Saturn V, which is under development, can meet the lunar power requirements of the lunar mission. On the other hand, a direct earth-moon flight and a similarly direct return would require a launch vehicle about 50 percent larger and generating some 60 percent more thrust than Saturn V.

The first rendezvous of craft in space will represent a significant accomplishment in positioning and timing. To be practicable, however, rendezvous must be reduced to the routine and commonplace instead of the demanding and unique—and become a thoroughly reliable operation.

During advanced stages of the Gemini program, its pressure-suited crew may open the hatches and emerge from the spacecraft while in orbit. Moreover, they may push themselves from the craft, and appear to float in space as they speed around the earth at about 18,000 miles per hour. For this operation, they will be tethered to the craft to insure their return. Gemini will store sufficient oxygen to refill its cabin when the astronauts return.

This experiment will help pave the way for future operations in which man can make repairs, assemble orbiting stations, and perform other functions in space.

In fiscal year 1964, the Gemini spacecraft will be in the development and test phases. The need for the development of alternate subsystems will be more critical during these phases in order to prevent schedule slippages. Project Gemini costs for fiscal year 1964 will be:

Spacecraft	$196,200,000
Operations	14,600,000
Launch vehicles:	
Titan II	46,900,000
Atlas	15,900,000
Agena	32,000,000
Supporting development	700,000
Total research and development costs	306,300,300

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Chairman, man will explore the moon and the other planets. He will add to his knowledge of science. He will observe weather patterns, the airglow, the aurora, the zodiacal light, the gegenschein, the sun's corona, and the astronomical objects. There will be many practical applications, both civilian, and military, of the space knowledge and technology. I have heard testimony that we will leave an airfield and go to the moon cheaper than we now go to the west coast by jet plane.

One can foresee large space laboratories, huge antennas, and stations for interplanetary flight into deep space.

The United States has always had the courage and the intelligence to explore—to learn and to develop. I know the American people want us to go forward with this program because it is very likely that the country that dominates space will control the world.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a curious group in this country whom I can best describe as "cheerers." Whenever the United States makes an accomplishment in space, these cheerers hail the accomplishment the loudest. They say how proud they are to be Americans and they point to the great accomplishments that are possible under the democratic way of life.

These same cheerers, however, seem to be the ones who bewail the cost of space conquest the loudest. They remind me of the type of person who waits around for someone else to put a coin in the juke box so that they can enjoy the music. They are looking for a free ride. Unfortunately, there can be no free ride into space.

I have also detected another group who might be designated as what former President Roosevelt called "yes but-ers." These people say that space exploration is very fine, but they point to the many other unmet needs in the United States. The curious thing about these "yes but-ers" is that they are usually the very ones who decry and oppose expenditures for other unmet needs such as massive slum clearance and housing, urban renewal, Federal aid to education, and so forth.

If I thought for a moment that by foregoing the substantial space appropriation under consideration, we would adopt a schedule of priorities under which these other needs would be faced, I would be more than willing to do so. However, let us not kid ourselves. Those who oppose this appropriation have successfully destroyed necessary social and economic programs.

They do not believe either in first things first nor first things last. They believe in first things never.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, the proposal by NASA to establish a centralized headquarters for electronics research is a most sound and practical decision, and experience proves that it is vitally important if we are to obtain maximum efficiency and control of this very important Federal program.

This is no time to be looking back, or questioning the methods to be employed, or to raise the idea that such a tremendous undertaking can be better conducted by some untried system of decentralization, when all of our experience proves over and over again that the key to this type of operation is centralization of administration and management, in the best possible place we can find.

Every department of the Federal Government no matter how large and well organized reports to one central control point. How much more important this system is when we are exploring new and wide fields of science, venturing out into unknown areas.

It is only commonsense that as discoveries large and small are made that the new knowledge be brought to a central point where proper administration and management can evaluate it and make the most efficient use of it. Because of the importance of the broad fields of electronics to the success of our space program, as one of the most important divisions of the major project, it must be concentrated in the best possible place for it, and NASA, after the most thorough study of every area in the country, selected the Boston area as the best. Why not give the NASA scientists and experts the approval their unbiased and thorough studies recommend? Certainly they want the best place they can find to do their work successfully, and are not affected by any narrow or selfish motives.

One of the most dangerous situations that can develop in our Federal research programs is a lack of competent, centralized, scientific supervision over the extremely large contracts that we place with either private companies or institutions. One of the great weaknesses in proper management of military research occurred when we set up our military research programs following World War II. Our qualified scientists left the military research programs and laboratories in large numbers, and for awhile we were in serious administrative trouble because we did not have enough or capable enough scientists to insist on proper performance of contracts, or who were recognized as qualified to compel full compliance.

Probably the strongest reason that can be advanced in justification of centralization of electronics research in our NASA program is that it establishes the strongest and best qualified organization to supervise performance of all contracts in the electronics field. In this great venture the interests of the United States comes first, and our most serious obligation is to provide proper administration and management in order that the tremendous amounts of money will be spent with the greatest possible efficiency and without waste. This is the principle objective NASA hopes to accomplish by establishing the Electronics Research Center in the Boston area.

Many misleading and inaccurate statements have been made in opposition to the establishment of the NASA Electronics Research Center in the Boston area, arising from superficial examinations and hasty conclusions. The space program which we so recently wholeheartedly approved and which carries with it the obligation to see it through to success, is one of the largest undertakings we have ever entered into. Our prestige and standing before the whole world is involved in our achieving complete success. We have selected the best possible scientific brains to lead the way; we have carefully recruited the best scientific administrators to manage the program; we have given them authority to go ahead, and subject to the normal precautions we always take to make them justify their programs, the directions they plan to follow, and the budgets they can expend, we become obsessed with interfering with technical problems.

The idea that the Boston Electronics Research Center will rob private companies of their leading scientists to staff the new Center is nonsense. At the present time there are more than 600 qualified scientists, engineers, and electronics technicians out of work and looking for work in the Boston area alone. It is true that when fully established several years from now possibly a dozen or 20 qualified top men may be offered jobs in the new Center, or maybe less, but there are many thousands of scientists, engineers, and technicians engaged in space contracts all over the country today and the number is constantly growing.

The complaint that centralization of electronics research will hurt or impede the success of the many thousands of companies now engaged in NASA contracts is equally ridiculous. The truth is just the opposite. NASA, by gathering together its electronics leadership in a central facility, is doing so not alone to achieve greater efficiency itself, but to help private companies in the completion of their contracts. The better NASA is administered and managed the better off the contractors will be.

NASA electronics research must be administered and managed from one central point which will be adequately staffed and have sufficient research capacity to do its job properly. This is all that NASA proposes and the President recommends. Compared with other NASA facilities already established in all sections of the country, the proposed Boston Center is very small.

The proposed operation is purely research, they will not manufacture anything there, its establishment will not change the system of ordering or contracting for materials in the slightest degree, the same suppliers and contractors all over the country will remain undisturbed in their opportunities to get business. As a matter of fact the operation of this centralized research operation is going to make it easier for the contractors everywhere to do business with the Federal Government, and the U.S. Government will be the greatest beneficiary.

In recruiting of personnel by NASA for the proposed Boston area Center, present plans indicate that new employment will be steady but rather slow, and at first chiefly involve transfer of present NASA employees.

Anyone who has examined NASA employment policies and procedures up to date will quickly discover that new employees and even top people have come from all over the country. This is a countrywide program, NASA recognizes it as such. This is the best evidence that NASA, in filling its supervisory positions, will do so on a countrywide selective plan, and that no preference will be given to local candidates. Wherever the selected site for the Center will be, citizens of Rhode Island, Connecticut, Maine, and New Hampshire whose services may be engaged can commute daily, while those from New York, New Jersey, and Vermont can readily commute weekly.

Here are some of the advantages the Boston area offers which no doubt favorably influenced NASA's decision.

Over 12 percent of the Greater Boston work force is professionally or technically trained, outranking all other Atlantic coast or midwestern cities.

Engineering work force doubled in last 10 years, now total 25,000.

About 2,000 engineers graduate yearly from the 34 major colleges and universities in Greater Boston, more than 50 percent remain in area; more than 60 percent of them continue to advanced degrees and 12 percent becoming doctors.

No other area in the country offers such concentration of higher education with research operations and companies experienced in technical subcontract work.

Approximately 1,900 new engineers graduating from Boston schools each year, by 1965 expected to increase to 2,200 annually.

There are 189 major colleges and universities in the 6 New England States, all within a 200-mile arc of the center of Massachusetts, 100 alone in Massachusetts and 34 in Greater Boston—leading consulting engineering area in United States.

Close to supporting technical and engineering industries—military, basic, applied, development research facilities, and technical servicing organizations.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 7500, authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1964.

In the past few years we have overcome many obstacles in probing space. Through research and experiment we have advanced our technology in space flight to a point that we have cracked open the shell of ignorance to burst forth into a totally new and unknown area of mystery, which has perplexed man since the beginning of time. An area which may enable us to discover new minerals, new food substances, and new ideas in improving and extending life for man. The door has been opened and it is now our decision as to whether we should step through it and continue on the path which lays before us. I hope you will agree that our only choice is to move ahead.

The bill before us authorizes additional money for continuing our program of space exploration. It is a bill that has been thoroughly inspected by the Science and Astronautics Committee, and I believe they have reported a concise, precise measure which will produce a maximum effort at a minimum cost.

Not only has the committee objectively researched the suggested proposals for the advancement of our space program, but they have openly declared the necessity of coordination in our space programs. It is true that the basic objective of NASA's program is for peaceful exploration of space, and yet, the lessons gained should benefit the military aspects of space use. The advancements achieved by NASA are in the interest of the Nation's welfare as well as national security. By coordinating their findings with those of other Government agencies, who are engaged in specific programs for the common good of the United States, we will be in accord with the meaning of "united" in protecting our land.

Several theories have been advanced by both military and scientific personnel that space control is essential to national defense. As we are engaged in a struggle to maintain the position of the free world, and we have seen fit to pay the cost of an adequate defense, then space control is necessary to protect our investment to date. We must support the means to achieve this end. As a leading nation in scientific technology, we must assume the role as the free world's leader in conquering the problems of space flight in order to deter any hostile nation's desire for world domination. Superiority in space could very well checkmate world enslavement.

This bill before us is urgently needed and cannot be abandoned. Its approval should not be challenged but endorsed. I, therefore, urge this body to agree to its passage.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, this bill authorizes some $5¼ billion for the space program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1964.

Only real necessity, security, and compelling national interest would warrant and justify the approval of such a huge monetary outlay by the Congress at this time.

That these reasons exist is amply and abundantly demonstrated by the committee report and other available evidence. Desirable cuts in total dollar amounts have been made.

There are vital, military considerations and security questions involved in this legislation which I will not elaborate upon in my remarks and mention only to indicate that they are present and are such that they must be seriously considered by the House.

This bill is, however, primarily concerned with space science and space exploration which have deepest implications for our Nation, if we do not wish to fall behind in the forward march of knowledge and civilization—man's incessant search and need for expanding his horizons as far as his capacity and potentials permit in any given area.

While there are definite limits to our conquest of space because of its seemingly infinite nature, we must press ahead, as far and as fast as we reasonably can, to insure that our national security and interests are safeguarded and our progress and advancement in so many complex and obscure fields of knowledge so vital and desirable in so many respects will be assured.

The proper location of the proposed Electronics Space Center of this administration is a question that must be approached and determined on the merits of the case, on the basis of what is best for the overall space program and not upon narrow, sectional political factors.

Admittedly, such a center must be strategically placed where it is favored by those intellectual institutions, facilities, and personalities so essential and of imperative concern to the speedy, expeditious, expert completion of the extremely difficult, novel, and truly challenging tasks of the space program.

Unless the Center is close to adequate, highly trained, top-level scientific personnel, great universities and technical schools, endowed with the best available research and training facilities, in an atmosphere conducive to efficient performance of the work, accessible to appropriate industrial units where highly skilled specialists and suitable technological and technical equipment and machinery are available. If such a complex filling these basic requirements is not selected, the space program, through political jockeying and manipulation, could well fall flat on its face at the very outset. This must not happen.

The Government must not allow this dire possibility to come to pass. Since there is one area in the Nation that stands out above all others on the basis of merit and superlative qualifications, it is to be hoped that area may be chosen at an early date, and I urge this early action upon the Executive and the Congress. Any other decision could well be harmful to our chances to win the crucial battle for space that is now going on.

Mr. Chairman, I compliment the great chairman of the committee, my very dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], and his able committee for their constructive work and I propose to support the pending bill.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to quote from page 176 of the report accompanying H.R. 7500. The section entitled Flight Research Center reads as follows:

> Flight research support laboratory high temperature loads calibration facility. The request for these two facilities in the amounts of $2,924,000 and $1,157,000, respectively, were denied by the committee. Intensive questioning of witnesses and separate investigation failed to reveal any firm projects assigned to this Center involving high-speed research aircraft beyond the current X–15 project. The committee notes that the X–15 project is scheduled to be completed at the close of fiscal year 1965. In the absence of any firm programs to justify the continuance of this Center, the committee considers that no new construction should be initiated. Total reduction $4,081,000.
>
> The committee notes that no known future aircraft projects will specifically require the continued existence of the Flight Research Center beyond the date when the X–15 project will be completed. Therefore it is recommended that NASA give serious consideration to an orderly, planned program to close the Flight Research Center by the end of fiscal year 1965.
>
> The committee observes that more and more personnel at the Flight Research Center are being assigned to tasks related to missions which are the primary responsibility of other NASA centers. The committee does not desire to see the creation of isolated cadres of personnel at the Flight Research Center who are associated with projects of other NASA centers, simply to maintain a workload at the Flight Research Center.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the action of the committee deleting these two capital cost items to be in error and that the source of the error is the faulty conclusions evidenced in the foregoing quotation.

First they assume that these facilities would contribute nothing to the full development of the X-15 program. My reading of the testimony leads me to believe that they would make a great contribution to the X-15 program by greatly increasing the knowledge which can be gained from the remainder of the programed tests with that aircraft. It should be noted that the tests remaining in that program are substantial in both number and character.

Second, they must assume either that there will be no testing of the X-B70, the TFX, the V-STOL, the F-104, the X-20—Dynasoar—the supersonic transport, and other high performance aircraft and space vehicles identified in the hearings or that testing of all of them will occur at places other than the Edwards Flight Test Center. Neither of these assumptions are valid. All of these planes and vehicles will be tested because their development and production is programed. I am confident that they will be tested at Edwards. Heretofore Edwards has been the prime flight test facility in the United States and has been utilized by all of the services for testing both high and low performance aircraft. There is no reason to assume that this situation will change. Edwards possesses perfect flying weather and cloud conditions which cannot be duplicated elsewhere. The dry lake, which is supplemented by an extremely costly manmade airstrip in being is the largest usable landing area in the United States and possibly the world. The Government has a huge investment in flighttesting facilities which are duplicated nowhere else. It is a remarkable assumption to predict that the Government would attempt to duplicate them elsewhere.

The requested additional facilities are needed to fully utilize the state of the art of flight testing high performance aircraft and lift-type space vehicles. Edwards is their necessary situs because it is from Edwards that the test craft takeoff and it is to Edwards that they return and the maximum efficiency demands that the instrumentation involved be at the place of takeoff and return. In addition the pilots of such test vehicles make their home at Edwards and derive value from this situs of testing equipment connected with their flights.

The amounts of money for these additional facilities is patently small in comparison with the value of aircraft and other vehicles which will inevitably be tested at Edwards.

I am advised that these facilities will be used in the following programs: Supersonic transport—both the high-temperature facility and the Flight Support Laboratory; the variable sweep plane—both facilities; the V-Stol plane, the Flight Support Laboratory; lifting-body research, the Flight Support Laboratory; recoverable booster research—both facilities; hypersonic propulsion—both facilities; hypersonic aerodynamics—X-15, X-20 and HRAC—the high-temperature facility; hypersonic propulsion—both facilities; structures flight research—X-15, F-104, X-20, and HRAC—the high-temperature facility; flight display research—X-15, F-104, Jetstar—the Flight Support Laboratory; biotechnology—X-15, F-104, F-100C—the Flight Support Laboratory, control system research—the Flight Support Laboratory; and electronic system research—F-104—the Flight Support Laboratory.

I am not advised as to whether or not the committee was informed of these proposed uses of these facilities. I feel confident that they were not, otherwise the committee action would have included authorization for them. I am hopeful that the Senate will include both of them in its version of the NASA authorization bill and that the House conferees will agree with such decision.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, I heartily agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts, former Speaker MARTIN, and I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is defeated.

The amendment smacks of politics. Some time ago NASA announced that it was going to build its electronics laboratory in the Greater Boston area. During the development of nuclear power and guided missiles, Massachusetts had about 9 percent of the electronics business. There are 364 firms in the area. In fiscal year 1963 we did about 1 percent of the business connected with the NASA program. With 166 schools in New England, including the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Harvard, Boston College, Boston University, Holy Cross, Worcester Tech, and Brandeis, to mention a few of the outstanding universities, the Members from Massachusetts and New England are agreeable to the bill as it is presently worded that NASA review all of the sites throughout the Nation that are interested in such an electronics laboratory. We are willing to abide by the decision of NASA for the reason that we are fully confident that we have the locale and technical know-how and the superior talents of the Nation and that NASA will make a final recommendation to the Science and Astronautics Committee to locate the laboratory in the Greater Boston area.

It is my hope that the present amendment which would delay the building of this laboratory for at least another year is defeated.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, this is the third year I appear before you to advocate passage of the annual National Aeronautics and Space Administration budget.

My assignment today in supporting H.R. 7500 is specific discussion of that aspect of the appropriation dealing with the Apollo manned space flight program.

Of the $5.2 billion recommended by your Committee on Science and Astronautics for NASA for fiscal 1964, $2.4 billion will be applied to the Apollo effort.

It was in the summer of 1961 that your Science and Astronautics Committee first recommended, and Congress approved, a budget for manned space flight.

That first allocation covering fiscal 1962 amounted to $487 million.

The following year approximately $1.1 billion was earmarked for Apollo by Congress.

Each year the budget has increased because each year we come closer to vitally important breakthroughs in our assault on the mysteries and challenges posed by the Apollo project.

We understood this would be the case when we initiated the program.

Today three barriers impede the performance of the United States in space. They apply equally to military and to scientific progress.

They limit hope for advanced American exploration in the farthermost reaches of the universe.

They restrict us in the 100 to 500 miles of so-called inner space where national security must be considered.

Barrier No. 1 is booster capability.

Barrier No. 2 is rendezvous capability.

Barrier No. 3 is precision-timing capability.

Mr. Chairman, impossible to ignore in our budgeting to overcome these barriers is an assessment of the relative success of the Soviet Union with the same problems.

Booster capability of the United States in manned flight, as demonstrated in Project Mercury, is 360,000 pounds.

Russia is presently presumed to be capable of 850,000 pounds of thrust.

Unclassified published studies suggest, however, that the Soviets may now be developing a new system of engines and engine clustering which would increase their booster capability by more than 50 percent.

Some American scientists believe that a new basic engine will be produced in Russia soon which could double the thrust of their present engine.

The response of our space technicians to this challenge is represented in engines designated Saturn 1, Saturn 1B, and Saturn V.

Each is part of the Apollo program.

Booster potential of these Saturn vehicles ranges from 1.5 to 7.5 million pounds of thrust.

Rendezvous capability and precision-timing capability must, of course, be equated with thrust.

But they also represent technical sophistication quite apart from thrust-power.

No American achievement in these two areas matches the Vostok flights of August 11 and 12, 1962, and June 14 and 16, 1963.

Project Apollo, for which rendezvous and precision-timing capacity are absolutely essential, is currently the best hope of our Nation in overcoming clearly demonstrated Russian superiority.

To the Aeronautics and Astronautics Coordinating Board of NASA and the Department of Defense, established in 1960 and actively functioning today, will be assigned many considerations involving application and development of Apollo research.

Manned and unmanned space stations, of interest to both science and the military, are examples of areas in which Apollo will be the trailblazer.

Even in the absence of international competition and political tension, however, Apollo would be needed to break down the three barriers which place intolerable limitations on every aspect of our potential in space.

It may be a disadvantage rather than an advantage that Apollo is best known as the project by which the United States seeks to accomplish the 768,000-mile lunar expedition within this decade.

In point of fact, it is estimated that between 50 and 60 percent of the proposed Apollo budget constitutes basic research and development on space flight.

This means that more than half of what is done in the name of Apollo can be applied to any space activity in which our Government might become engaged, now and later.

Mr. Chairman, valuable previous discussions concerning the feasibility and desirability of the Apollo program can be reviewed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 28 and May 24, 1961; and May 23 and July 10 and 11, 1962.

Hearings of the Committee on Science and Astronautics especially useful in assessing the program can be found in reports dated May 12, 1961; May 15, 1962; and July 25, 1963.

No new technical information has been acquired since the Apollo budget authorizations for fiscal 1963 which now cast doubt on the feasibility of the program.

All development has proceeded as planned.

Arguments which originally justified Apollo appropriations and programing, and were considered acceptable by the Congress in 1961 and 1962, still apply.

To continue the Apollo program on its present schedule to July 1, 1964, we will commit ourselves to the expenditure of $2,475,900,000.

This total can be broken down in the following way:

First. For the spacecraft: Described on page 9 of your report, $911,400,000.

Second. For operations: Described on pages 9 and 16 of your report, $16 million.

Third. For procurement of launch vehicles: Described on pages 9 and 17 of your report. $135 million.

Fourth. For support development: Described on pages 9 and 18 of your report, $25 million.

Fifth. For development of launch vehicles: Described on page 22 of your report, $1,138,500,000.

Sixth. For proportional allocation of the costs of shared construction and facilities: Described on pages 127 through 160 of your report, an estimated $250 million.

Viewed solely from the standpoint of technology and methodology, these items have not, to my knowledge, come under question.

It is in the ever-changing area of public policy that Project Apollo and, indeed, the entire NASA budget, rightfully deserve close scrutiny by the Congress.

In this regard I call your attention to a supplementary opinion on page 201 of the report submitted by six distinguished members of our Science and Astronautics Committee.

In essence the supplement deals with the significant question of whether the United States is intelligently balancing Federal space expenditures between programs which contribute to national security and programs of pure scientific research.

The signers of this supplement, while not advocating rejection of the NASA budget this year, express in a single area a general concern which many of us feel.

There is clearly a need for more and better information about the annual $14 to $15 billion of Government research spending as it relates to scientific priorities, national goals, and the need for congressional and executive budgetary discipline.

Such concern is, however, not incompatible with support of the NASA budget today.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Science and Astronautics is not afflicted by either moon madness or space obsession.

It has been for many months involved with a businesslike consideration of the financial requirements of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1964.

From the NASA budget proposal first submitted to us, $120 million was cut from Apollo research and development alone.

Beyond this, reductions of more than 8 percent of the total of the original request of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration were imposed by your committee.

Such a cutback is unprecedented in the experience of this agency.

We give you a hard budget but certainly not a crippling budget.

Mr. Chairman, on this basis I speak in behalf of the proposed allocations of both Apollo and NASA and urge passage of H.R. 7500 now before you.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to join in paying tribute to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Tracking and Data Acquisitions, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER]. The entire membership of this committee, regardless of party affiliation, has worked diligently and conscientiously in reviewing the proposed NASA budget. The hearings conducted by the three subcommittees have been thorough and detailed. The unanimous action of the committee in reporting out the authorization bill, H.R. 7500, is the result in no insignificant way of the fairness and objectivity displayed by the three subcommittee chairmen, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH], and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER], throughout the long and exhaustive hearings.

The committee reduced the $5.7 billion budget request by some $474 million. Despite the anguished outcry of protest from NASA, the lunar landing should proceed on schedule provided NASA exercises greater prudence in its management.

Mr. Chairman, I believe our space program is vital to our national interest. Not only is national prestige involved, but there are clear benefits to our economy as we push forward the frontiers of scientific knowledge. The exploration of the moon, planets, and stars will unlock the secrets of the universe. The program already has yielded great gains both through scientific satellites and manned space flight.

The latest space accomplishment is the launching of the Syncom II on July 26, 1963. This space communication satellite has had phenomenal success. Now in orbit at 22,300 miles, it is operating as expected and is almost continuously available for retransmission purposes. The launching of Syncom II is one of the most difficult space accomplishments to date, if not the most difficult. NASA deserves praise for carrying out this major step toward U.S. preeminence in space.

Since Sputnik I the Nation has set succeedingly ambitious goals in space and has seen them accomplished. Each year Congress has increased the NASA appropriations as follows:

Fiscal year:	
1960	$523,575,000
1961	964,000,000
1962	1,825,250,000
1963	3,674,115,000

And now we are authorizing $5,238,119,400 for fiscal year 1964.

In any program of such scope and rapid growth there is a need for close scrutiny by the Congress of its management and administration to make sure that moneys appropriated are spent wisely and without waste.

There is also a need for an understanding of the economic effects and consequences of pursuing given policies. In our rush for the moon we should not ignore policy problems which are inherent in the peculiar relationship developing between Government and industry in this vastly expanding program.

I want to call the attention of the committee to the report accompanying H.R. 7500 and my separate views set forth on pages 196–198 on the question of communications satellites. Last year Congress created the Communications Satellite Corp., a private monopoly for profit, which it was said would lead to the expeditious development of a commercial communications satellite system. It was widely assumed by sponsors of the Communications Satellite Corp. bill that its enactment meant that private industry would do the job, including research and development. However, it is apparent from the record of this year's NASA authorization hearings that the private corporation is sitting back and waiting for the Government to finance research and development. It is further apparent that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has made no effort to require or induce the corporation to undertake a fair share of the risk and expense.

Mr. Chairman, last year in opposing the creation of the private corporation I called it a giveaway of a vast taxpayers' investment and also warned that the private profitmaking corporation would be reluctant to invest in advanced research and development. The corporation's course so far bears out this prediction. I suggest that the Government is involved in a continuing giveaway for the benefit of the stockholders of this private corporation. I believe that Congress should provide a formula for reimbursement to the Government by this corporation. I would hope that those Members who so often declare their concern for economy and budget cutting would exercise diligence in making this private monopoly pay, in part at least, for the Government financed research which will be of substantial benefit to its stockholders.

Mr. Chairman, I might point out that the $125,000 per year chairman of the Communications Satellite Corp. testified on April 30, 1963, that there were no plans to issue stock for 15 to 18 months, the second half of 1964. The corporation's reluctance to undertake any major research and development out of its own pocket is reflected in this lack of interest in an immediate issuance of stock because, without a stock issue, it will have no money for substantial research expenditures. The failure to plan for a stock issue was recently censured by the Federal Communications Commission which declared on July 24, 1963:

> We are now disturbed by current indications that the corporation no longer has definite plans for an early issue of stock and the apparent lack of progress by the corporation in arranging for such an issue.

A similar concern has recently been expressed by many Representatives and Senators who originally voted for the Satellite Act.

I include at this point in the RECORD the July 24, 1963, letter from Federal Communications Commission Chairman, E. William Henry, to Mr. Leo D. Welch, chairman of the board, Communications Satellite Corp.:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., July 24, 1963.

Re file No. ABM-2-CSA.
Mr. LEO D. WELCH,
Chairman of the Board, Communications Satellite Corp., Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WELCH: The Commission, by order adopted today, has granted the application of the Communications Satellite Corp. for authorization to borrow an additional $600,000 under the line-of-credit agreement previously authorized by the Commission on February 26, 1963.

The Commission, however, is concerned with the indefiniteness of the corporation's future plans as they relate to the matter of financing and particularly the initial offering of voting stock, contemplated by section 304(a) of the act. We, therefore, feel we should now express the basis for our concern in order that the corporation may be guided accordingly, and that subsequent applications for financial authorizations will not encounter difficulties that might otherwise arise in satisfying the applicable statutory standard of section 201(c)(8). This concern stems from the fact that after the Commission authorized the corporation, on February 26, 1963, to enter into the line-of-credit agreement and to borrow initially $500,000 thereunder, there was an apparent change in plans by the corporation with respect to the timing of the public offering of the initial issue. In applying for such authorization, and consistent with public expressions of corporate planning as of that time, it was represented to the Commission that all borrowings under the line-of-credit agreement would be repaid from the proceeds of the initial stock issue at a date prior to the maturity date of February 28, 1964. In fact, the terms and conditions of the agreement clearly indicate that the parties intended the loans to be repaid by the maturity date. Thus, the agreement indicated that notwithstanding the maturity date, the corporation agreed to repay the notes on the 10th day after receipt of the proceeds of the initial stock offering. The corporation further agreed, as an inducement to the banks to make the loans, it would use its best efforts to arrange for the initial issue.

Recognizing the practical problems involved in planning for and effectuating the initial stock offering, we considered that a period of approximately 1 year from the date of incorporation (February 1, 1963) was not an unreasonable time within which to take the various steps required for the resolution of these problems.

We are now disturbed by current indications that the corporation no longer has definite plans for an early issue of stock and the apparent lack of progress by the corporation in arranging for such an issue. Thus as you have advised us, until further research and development effort clarifies the type of communication satellite system that is likely to be employed as the initial system, and until a more definite picture emerges as to the character and scope of foreign participation in the system, no meaningful decision can be reached by the corporation with respect to the nature and extent of its capital requirements and its permanent financing.

The corporation, as it is now constituted, is in the custodianship of the incorporators appointed by the President pursuant to section 302 of the Satellite Act. By the terms of this provision, these incorporators are to serve as the initial board of directors until the first annual meeting of stockholders or until their successors are elected and qualified. It is further provided that:

"Such incorporators shall arrange for an initial stock offering and take whatever other actions are necessary to establish the corporation, including the filing of articles of incorporation as approved by the President."

Thus, the principal duty assigned by the act to the incorporators is "to establish the corporation." Articles of incorporation approved by the President have been filed. But until the initial stock offering has been arranged the corporation, although created, has not been established within the meaning and intent of the legislation. This does not mean that the incorporators have been foreclosed by the legislation from taking any actions other than those specifically enunciated in section 302. Clearly, as the "initial board of directors" they are not so limited. The important work involved in carrying out the policy and purposes of the act to establish a commercial satellite system "as expeditiously as possible" (sec. 102 (a)) cannot be delayed or deferred until establishment of the corporation has been completed by the initial stock offering contemplated by the act. Research and development must be continuously and aggressively pursued together with other measures that must be taken in order to advance this most critical national program.

However, the Commission deems it to be of equal urgency and importance that the incorporators fulfill their statutory responsibility of completing the establishment of the corporation by the initial stock offering at the earliest practicable date. Congress intended that the many vital technical and policy decisions involved in the development and establishment of an operational commercial communication satellite system would be made, not by the incorporators, but by the representatives of the owners of the corporation within the framework carefully structured by the Congress for this purpose. In providing for the establishment of a corporation for profit, the Congress at the same time provided for a balanced representative body of six directors to be elected by the stockowning public, six to be elected by the stockowning communications common carriers and three to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. We believe it is within this amalgam of variegated representation that Congress intended that the policies and objectives of the Communications Satellite Act would be given expression and that the important decisions shaping the destinies of the corporation would be made. Undue delay in the establishment of the corporation may force the present board of directors to engage in activities and to make decisions which should be left to the representatives of the owners of the corporation.

The Commission is fully cognizant of the problems and time involved in arranging for a stock offering. The corporation, in planning and executing this particular issue—the initial issue contemplated by the act—must take into account not only the normal problems associated with a new enterprise, but must also seek solutions to problems which are unique to this corporation. Capital requirements must be estimated under circumstances not normally present at this stage of a new enterprise.

Resolution of this problem, as well as that of providing other information required for a prospectus, must be correlated with the mandate of section 304(a) of the act that the stock "shall be sold * * * in a manner to encourage the widest distribution to the American public." Nevertheless, considering the design and intent of the legislation, it is our view that the principal focus of the incorporators should be upon discharging as soon as practicable their only remaining major duty of effectuating an initial stock issue. The need for prompt action in this respect is further emphasized by the time involved in the preparation and completion of the issue and the installation of a board of directors representing the owners of the business as contemplated by the act. Therefore, in passing upon future applications for authorization to borrow money, we do not believe that we will be able to make the required finding that the activities of the corporation "are consistent with carrying out the purposes and objectives" of the act unless the corporation shows that positive steps are being taken which will insure an issue of capital stock to the public and to authorized communications common carriers at the earliest practicable date. Future applications will be examined from this viewpoint.

The corporation is accordingly requested to file on or before September 30, 1963, a statement with the Commission setting forth fully the steps taken and to be taken by the corporation to insure the issue of the capital stock referred to in section 304(a) of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 at the earliest practicable date.

The foregoing views were adopted by the Commission on July 24, 1963.

By direction of the Commission:

E. WILLIAM HENRY,
Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of my colleagues I include at this point in the RECORD the full text of my separate views which appear in the report:

SEPARATE VIEWS OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM F. RYAN

In 1962 Congress established the Communications Satellite Corp., a private profit-making corporation, to develop, own, and operate a communications satellite system because, for one reason, it was felt that "private enterprise would have more flexibility, greater speed, more initiative, and greater risk taking than the Government would." The record of this year's NASA authorization hearings demonstrates that (1) the private corporation apparently intends to rely almost entirely on Government risk taking and financial support for research and development; and (2) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has shown absolutely no concern with requiring or inducing the corporation to accept a fair share of the risk and expense.

The proposed NASA research and development budget for communications satellites for fiscal year 1964 was $51 million, $8 million more than was programed in fiscal year 1963. Although the Congress authorized $85.3 million for fiscal year 1963, $43.7 million was utilized. The committee reduced the fiscal year 1964 request to some $42 million. Despite persistent and repeated questioning, at no time did NASA spokesmen indicate that they had given any substantial thought to an appropriate allocation of work between NASA and the corporation. NASA spokesmen never explained what was not in the budget because of the establishment of the satellite corporation, even though several subcommittee members repeatedly sought an answer. Although it was frequently said that NASA would concentrate on the synchronous system, NASA is continuing work on the medium altitude system, the type that the corporation seems to be favoring.

In short, NASA is proceeding with research and development which is essential to the establishment of an operational system and has given no substantial thought to what research and development projects should be carried on by the corporation. This is contrary to recent statements by those who sponsored and supported the bill. When the question was raised before the Senate Commerce Committee, Senator MIKE MONRONEY said:

"What I am wondering about is where and how will these costs, that will precede your final incorporation and stock issues, be handled so that the Government will not be continuing for 2 or 3 years to pay the major cost of your operation which would be in research and testing of communications satellites." [1]

And Senator JOHN PASTORE, who managed the bill on the Senate floor, declared:

"I think a serious question would be raised by those who sponsored the legislation—if the Government was going to do the research and render this whole mechanism operable and then have it turned over to the corporation. We felt the better job could be done by private industry; this included research." [2]

The Communications Satellite Corp. chairman, Leo D. Welch, and its president, Joseph Charyk, apparently have made no plans for the corporation to assume the responsibility for research and development. Mr. Welch seemed impatient at the thought that the committee should even be concerned about who was footing the bill for the success of an enterprise, the direct beneficiaries of which would be private stockholders. Indeed, on April 30, Mr. Welch testified that the corporation did not even plan to issue stock for 15 to 18 months, which will be the second half of 1964. During this period NASA will budget $42,175,000 for fiscal year 1964 in research and development. It is clear that for the next year and a half the corporation plans to finance almost none of the vast amount of research necessary to provide an operational system.

The corporation's strategy seems to be to let the Department of Defense do the work for an operational medium-altitude system and to let NASA do the research for a high-altitude system. The Department of Defense plans to have an operational medium-altitude system by the end of 1965. The Department of Defense budgeted $95 million in fiscal year 1963 for communications satellites and is asking $76 million for fiscal year 1964. Although it will differ from a commercial system with respect to capacity and expense, obviously it will solve many technical problems common to both.

Congress did not intend a continuing governmental subsidy to the corporation. The corporation should pay for work directly beneficial to it in the period prior to the organization of its own technical staff and should take over much of the research thereafter. About 90 percent of NASA's research in this area is contracted out to industry, and on these contracts NASA really serves as little more than a contracting officer or middleman. The corporation could easily replace NASA with respect to these contracts—it would have to do little more than pay the bills.

It is interesting to note that incorporator Bruce Sundlun testified before the Senate Space Committee that the corporation might do research and development for others at a profit. Thus, the corporation definitely has considered doing some research and development, if only on a profitmaking basis for others.

In these first years, however, until the corporation is established, there seems to be a legitimate role for NASA. But during this period NASA should be reimbursed for research and development. It should not be too difficult to work out a formula for reimbursement. Every research corporation in this country goes through the process in billing its clients.

The corporation argues, however, that it would be inequitable to make it pay for research because other private companies may benefit from NASA's research program. But this corporation, unlike other private companies, was created as a private monopoly for the specific purpose of turning over to private enterprise communications satellite development, operation, and ownership. In the aircraft and other industries, where the Government does finance a great deal of research, the companies are competitive and also invest a great deal of their own risk capital on research and development. National security and the air safety of human life are involved in the Government's aircraft research program, and these purposes have the highest priority.

As for the corporation's argument that NASA research will benefit manufacturers of satellite components, the corporation itself will be the ultimate beneficiary, for the component companies will be contracting with the corporation.

Last year Congress made a decision to rely on private enterprise to develop an operational communications satellite system. At that time I said that the action amounted to a giveaway of a vast taxpayers' investment. I also warned that the proposed private, profitmaking corporation would be reluctant to invest in advanced research and development.

It is clear from the testimony before the committee this year that NASA and the Communications Satellite Corp. expect the Government to finance future research and development in a continuing giveaway. Apparently the corporation intends to sit back and take advantage of NASA's program for the benefit of its private stockholders. Congress should face this issue squarely, accept the consequences of turning over communications satellites to the corporation, and require some form of reimbursement to the Government.

WILLIAM F. RYAN.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of other areas in which NASA should exhibit greater concern for the public interest. I am pleased that in the report under committee views the conflict-of-interest question is raised. NASA should not put any contractor in a preferred position and should be constantly alert to the implications of concentrating know-how and technology in the hands of a few giant corporations.

We say in the report that NASA should provide a fair and equitable opportunity for all firms to compete for NASA contracts. Congress should insist on competitive bidding wherever possible. Let us look at how NASA has handled the letting of the contract for a communications system at complex 39, Merritt Island, Fla., from which Apollo will be launched to the moon.

NASA invited bids for this communication system. Some 48 contractors submitted bids which were to be opened on or about June 17. Before the bids were opened, NASA reversed itself and announced that 20 percent of this system would be awarded to A.T. & T. or its subsidiary and only 80 percent would be open for competitive bidding. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the committee will investigate the circumstances surrounding this decision and find out why NASA suddenly determined that the competitive bidding process should be abandoned in order to insure 20 percent of the system for a corporate giant.

Mr. Chairman, during the 1962 debate on the NASA authorization I questioned the tendency of NASA to contract with outside corporations for personnel services. Both the Bellcom and General Electric contracts in effect augment NASA personnel. Bellcom provides systems engineering advice and competence and General Electric provides integration, reliability and checkout services as well as hardware. I believe NASA should develop this competence in-house. In-house capability will result in greater economy and will avoid the undesirable consequence of concentrating vital know-how in a few companies.

NASA should come to Congress and ask for the necessary funds to hire sufficient scientists and engineers so that it will not have to go outside and set up private corporations in order to pay salaries comparable to industry.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say another word about the GE contract. For some inexplicable reason, after testifying on April 9, 1963, that the GE contract would be approximately $100 million for fiscal year 1964 and that no other expense was anticipated, NASA on April 16, 1963, issued a press release announcing the extension of the GE contract to provide services at the Mississippi test facility for guard services, cafeteria services, parking lot service—hardly competences associated with the General Electric Co. And this was done without competitive bidding.

Mr. Chairman, I have related a number of examples of areas in which I believe close legislative oversight must be exercised. When any agency has $5.2 billion to spend, 90 percent to be contracted out to industry, the public interest must be protected with vigilance. I hope that NASA will not lose sight of the broad policy questions which transcend the specific techniques of space flight.

---

[1] "Communications Satellite Incorporators," hearing before the Committee on Commerce, U.S. Senate, 88th Cong., 1st sess., p. 68.

[2] Id. at p. 70.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration the sum of $5,238,119,400, as follows:

(a) For "Research and development", $4,037,575,000.

(b) For "Construction of facilities", including land acquisitions, $692,359,400, as follows:

(1) Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California, $11,044,000.

(2) Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland, $17,032,500.

(3) Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, California, $2,998,200.

(4) Langley Research Center, Hampton, Virginia, $8,204,700.

(5) Launch Operations Center, Cape Canaveral, Florida, $279,677,000.

(6) Lewis Research Center, Cleveland and Sandusky, Ohio, $18,634,000.

(7) Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Texas, $35,102,000.

(8) Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Alabama, $28,980,000.

(9) Michoud Plant, New Orleans, Louisiana, $8,688,000.

(10) Mississippi Test Facility, Mississippi, $92,696,000.

(11) Nuclear Rocket Development Station, Nevada, $15,650,000.

(12) Various locations, $148,653,000.

(13) Facility planning and design not otherwise provided for, $25,000,000.

(c) For "Administrative operations", $508,185,000.

(d) Appropriations for "Research and development" may be used (1) for any items of a capital nature (other than acquisition of land) which may be required for the performance of research and development contracts and (2) for grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities; and title to such facilities shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in any such grantee institution or organization. Each such grant shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall determine to be required to insure that the United States will receive therefrom benefit adequate to justify the making of that grant. None of the funds appropriated for "Research and development" pursuant to this Act may be used for construction of any major facility, the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $250,000, unless the Administrator or his designee has notified the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

(e) When so specified in an appropriation Act, any amount appropriated for "Research and development" or for "Construction of facilities" may remain available without fiscal year limitation.

(f) Appropriations made pursuant to subsection 1(c) may be used, but not to exceed $35,000, for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

(g) No part of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(c) for maintenance, repairs, alterations, and minor construction shall be used for the construction of any new facility the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $100,000.

(h) No part of the funds authorized by this section may be expended for the establishment of an Electronic Research Center unless the Administrator has transmitted to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate and to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives a detailed study of the geographic location of, the need for, and the nature of, the proposed Center, and (1) each such committee has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the establishment of such Center, or (2) forty-five days have passed after the transmittal by the Administrator of such study to those committees.

(i) Until such time as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall establish uniform design criteria and construction standards for facilities for which appropriations are authorized pursuant to this Act, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall utilize for such facilities design criteria and construction standards established either by the General Services Administration, the United States Navy Bureau of Yards and Docks, or the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

Sec. 2. Authorization is hereby granted whereby any of the amounts prescribed in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), (11), and (12), of subsection 1(b) may, in the discretion of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, be varied upward 5 per centum to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work authorized under such paragraphs shall not exceed a total of $667,359,400.

Sec. 3. Not to exceed 2 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(a) hereof may be transferred to the "Construction of facilities" appropriation, and, when so transferred together with $30,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(b) hereof (other than funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (13) of such subsection) shall be available for expenditure to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations at any location (including locations specified in subsection 1(b)), if (1) the Administrator determines such action to be necessary because of changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities or new scientific or engineering developments, and (2) he determines that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. The funds so made available may be expended to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No portion of such sums may be obligated for expenditure or expended to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations until the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of such construction, expansion, or modification, (2) the cost thereof, including the cost of any real estate action pertaining thereto, and (3) the reason why such construction, expansion, or modification is necessary in the national interest.

Sec. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program or item deleted by the Congress from requests as originally made to either the House Committee on Science and Astronautics or the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences,

(2) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program or item in excess of the amount actually authorized for that particular program or item when the authorization originally requested of either such committee for such program or item has been specifically reduced by the Congress, and

(3) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program which has not been presented to or requested of either such committee,

until the Administrator or his designee has secured the prior approval of each such committee. If, within thirty days after the transmittal of a request for such approval by the Administrator or his designee, no objection has been raised by either committee, their approval shall be deemed to have been secured.

Sec. 5. The Administrator is hereby authorized to transfer, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, funds appropriated pursuant to this Act (other than funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (13) of subsection 1(b)), to any other agency of the Government whenever the Administrator determines such transfer necessary for the efficient accomplishment of the objectives for which the funds have been appropriated. Not more than $20,000,000 of the funds authorized by this Act may be transferred by the Administrator under this section, and no transfer in excess of $250,000 shall be made under this section unless the Administrator has transmitted to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate and to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives a written statement concerning the amount and purpose of, and the reason for, such transfer, and (1) each such committee has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to that transfer, or (2) thirty days have passed after the transmittal by the Administrator of such statement to those committees.

Sec. 6. Section 307 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorization of any appropriation to the Administration shall expire (unless an earlier expiration is specifically provided) at the close of the third fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the authorization was enacted, to the extent that such appropriaton has not theretofore actually been made."

Sec. 7. This Act may be cited as the "National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1964."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PELLY

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PELLY: Page 2, line 25, strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$15,000,000".

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce the amount in the bill for facility planning and design. The administration asked for $10 million. The subcommittee which considered this part of the bill did not change this figure, but when the matter came up in the full committee an additional amount of $15 million was added to the original $10 million, making a total of $25 million. In committee at the time, I offered a substitute motion to fix the amount at $15 million, but it did not carry.

I urge support of this amendment. Surely $15 million is adequate.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this is the advance design amendment money; and your amendment would still give $5 million more than the President has requested, when he requested $10 million?

Mr. PELLY. That is correct.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I would support the amendment and would request the chairman likewise to accept the amendment.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WEAVER

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEAVER: Page 5, after line 11, insert the following new subsection:

"(j) Of the amount authorized to be appropriated pursuant to paragraph (13) of subsection (b), $2,000,000 shall be for use in the expansion of the existing life sciences research facilities at Wright-Patterson Field, Ohio, or Brooks Medical Center, Texas, as determined by the Administrator."

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,238,119,400" and insert "$5,235,479,400".

Page 1, line 8, strike out "$692,359,400" and insert "$689,719,400".

Page 2, line 2, strike out "$11,044,000" and insert "$6,404,000".

Page 2, line 23, strike out "$148,653,000" and insert "$150,653,000".

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this amendment refers to installations and the construction of facilities which are not set out in the original bill, H.R. 7500. The paragraph (b) on page 1, line 7, which goes over on page 2 of the bill, you will note, has the list of facilities that are the subject of this bill. The Wright-Patterson Field is, first, not mentioned nor is the Brooks Air Force Base in Texas mentioned in this list of facilities.

Second, the amendment is defective in that these are both Department of Defense installations.

Third, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this amendment would have the decision as to where to put the $2 million between these two Department of Defense facilities. Obviously, it is not germane to the bill nor is it within the jurisdiction of the Science and Astronautics Committee for the legislation now before us to determine authorization for Department of Defense facilities such as these two facilities are.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER] desire to be heard?

Mr. WEAVER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I want to speak to the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, this is intended to maintain a life sciences research unit but to remove the funds allocated for the Ames Research Center and apply them at existing facilities either at Wright-Patterson Field or the Brooks Medical Center, Tex. That is the purpose of this amendment. It is related to the bill and, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully consider that it is germane to this bill.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further? This would obviously be an authorization of $2 million beyond the budget and it would be an authorization for the use of two facilities which are Department of Defense facilities. One of the facilities is the Wright-Patterson Field which is under the jurisdiction of the Air Force at Dayton, Ohio, and the other is the Brooks Airfield located in Texas. Likewise, it puts within the discretion of the Administrator of NASA the determination as to how to allocate the $2 million between the two Department of Defense facilities which, in my opinion, is clearly beyond the jurisdiction either of the Science and Astronautics Committee dealing with the peacetime uses of space and clearly beyond the jurisdiction of the bill, because neither one of these facilities is mentioned under the facilities listed in H.R. 7500, under subparagraph (b).

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair asks the gentleman to repeat that statement. Are these facilities mentioned in H.R. 7500?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. They are not.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they under the jurisdiction of the Space Agency at the present time?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. They are not. They are under the jurisdiction of the armed services, and they are not peacetime agencies. So that under no circumstances could we in this bill legislate for the Committee on Armed Services nor for the armed services themselves.

Mr. Chairman, further, it is particularly bad because this amendment puts in the power of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration the authority to administer a defense agency, a defense installation, and likewise it gives him the power, does it not Mr. WEAVER, to determine as between these installations how much money shall be spent on either?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania indulge the Chair for just one further question? Are there any funds in H.R. 7500 for the Edwards Air Force Base in California?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. No, this does not have anything to do with the Edwards Air Force Base in California. But we do have an installation there for the X-15 and the X-17, which is under lease, just as Patrick Air Force Base is under lease with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration does not run Patrick Air Force Base, nor does it run Edwards Air Force Base.

We likewise have, if I could say this, at Ames Laboratory, Moffett Field, a program which would be affected by taking away $2 million from the space agency. This program is operated by the space agency and it is not a military installation.

Mr. Chairman, it is that part that we are authorizing in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. It is the opinion of the Chair that the amendment is germane. It deals with the same subject matter. Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment proposes that the sum of $4,640,000 be deleted and that $2 million be substituted for the Ames Research Center Life Sciences Laboratory.

At present, there is about $40 million invested in Air Force facilities at Wright-Patterson Field in Ohio and Brooks Medical Center in Texas involved in aeromedical space programs. It is felt that although there are special requirements of NASA in the field of outer space, it would be best to coordinate these facilities under the two existing facilities. In this way, it should be possible to cut down on personnel requirements, duplication of facilities, and to centralize aeromedical efforts. With the shortage of scientific personnel in this country, attracting scientists away from other necessary scientific programs into the Life Sciences Research Laboratory expansion proposed at Ames should be avoided.

The Air Force presently has in excess of 2,100 highly experienced people—279 scientists, 142 masters of science, 194 bachelors of science. There are engineers, technicians, and direct administrative support working in in-house bioastronautic agencies. These people work in highly specialized laboratories, located principally at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base and Brooks Air Force Base.

It is apparent that expansion of bioastronautics capabilities is a necessity for the success of the space program. This necessarily must meet NASA requirements and hence should be funded by NASA. However, testimony before the committee revealed that the proposal for the Life Science Research Laboratory was made in spite of savings that might have been accomplished through use of DOD facilities.

A new joint NASA-DOD Committee recently established as a subpanel of the Supporting Space Research and Technology Panel of the Aeronautics and Astronautics Coordinating Board could serve in resolving many such problems arising from bioastronautics efforts of NASA and DOD. It is hoped that this committee will take into full recognition the great number of experienced personnel who are already doing work in this field through the DOD. The newly expanded facilities at Houston's Brooks Medical Center and Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, could make a coordinated centralized site for such activities.

We cannot afford the luxury of the dispersion of our scientific talent throughout duplicating facilities.

Actual experience with the fiscal year 1963 funds for direct research and development in the human factor systems program is reported by NASA to be:

	Percent
NASA in-house R. & D.	19.38
Ames Research Center	12.25
All other centers	7.13
Transfer to DOD and AEC for R. & D.	21.00
Contracts with industry, hospitals and research organizations for R. & D.	59.62
Headquarters	21.00
Ames Research Center	22.75
All other centers	15.87
Total	100.00

It would seem to many of us that greater utilization of existing facilities in the DOD and in the scientific community are indicated rather than gradually increasing in-house NASA research programs.

To quote General Roadman before the committee:

> Indeed we feel completely confident that the biomedical needs of the currently approved series of manned space flight projects can be met by the application of existing technology.

Admiral Haywood said:

> I would say they [NASA] should not get into aerospace medicine. The Department of Defense will do any of the aerospace medicine they need. There are people involved, and we have the people and the facilities and documents involved and the work force at the present time in the Navy and Army. I think the decision, between the Secretary of Defense and doctors, would be the Department of Defense would do it, that NASA would not get in it.

COMMENTS ON GENERAL ROADMAN'S TESTIMONY BY MAJ. GEN. THEODORE C. BEDWELL

> There is no question tht NASA is uniquely experienced in seleced areas associated with launch, flight, and recovery phases of Project Mercury. However, from General Roadman's testimony, the mistaken impression could be gained that all aerospace medicine competence for space flight is to be found within NASA. I don't believe General Roadman intended this implication. That he did not is borne out by his later elaboration. However, I would like to point out the following:
>
> Continuing medical evaluation of the Mercury crewmen is performed at the SAM (School of Aviation Medicine) and Wilford Hall USAF Hospital. The medical monitors for the Project Mercury tracking stations were trained at the SAM. Over the entire period of the various Mercury flights the Air Force, Navy, and the Army supplied medical monitors for tracking stations throughout the world. The DOD supplied highly skilled medical support personnel for the Mercury recovery teams. After each Mercury flight, the astronaut was medically evaluated and debriefed by flight surgeons of the schools of aerospace medicine of the Air Force and Navy. In addition, the Air Force and Navy have been an important source of scientific manpower to staff key positions in the NASA organization as, for example, General Roadman and many others.
>
> In any program as large and complex as that of aerospace medicine, in support of DOD activities and in NASA, it is obvious that it will be difficult, if not impossible, to get uniform and complete agreements on the solutions. It is however, the desire of the Aerospace Medical Division laboratories to cooperate fully and completely with NASA. It is believed, in order to take full advantage of the capabilities existing within our Division, that early coordination should be effected before a program is finalized. This would afford an opportunity to prevent any unwarranted duplication either in the in-house type of research or that done by contract. Since there is a relative shortage of qualified personnel to conduct research in the overall field of aerospace medicine, this would afford an opportunity to properly utilize the capabilities of existing laboratories and personnel.

It would seem to me that now is the time to consolidate facilities and develop a truly coordinated aerospace medical program between DOD and NASA.

We propose that the $2 million be used for expansion of facilities at Wright-Patterson Field or Brooks Medical Center in the life sciences field. This will provide a concentrated, coordinated aeromedical program with a minimum of dispersion and displacement of scientific personnel.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. I shall not take my full time because I know there are other Members who feel as strongly in opposition to this amendment as I do who will have many things to say about why the amendment should not be agreed to.

Let me say first of all, Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee dealt with NASA rather harshly in this whole life sciences area. As soon as the subcommittee was aware of the fact that the Air Force, the Navy, and NASA, all three, were doing some work in this area, we took a good hard look at it and took testimony from all three agencies of the Government.

We found during the hearings that while some of the work was being duplicated perhaps it was in areas where duplication is warranted but in other areas where NASA had work to be done and did not have the facilities to do it, that they actually contracted with the Air Force to do the work. They submitted a list of some 28 or 30 different areas where NASA did not have the capability to do the research work, and asked for assistance from the Air Force. If I recall correctly, the Air Force responded that they could assist in some 13 areas. So a contract was made between the two agencies of Government turning this work over to the Air Force.

I would merely conclude, Mr. Chairman, by saying we dealt very harshly with NASA in putting the lid on, further expansion of the NASA agency in this particular life science area.

I would conclude that irrespective and because they do have a very unique need for life science research in the field of outer space, they certainly should have a place for the people to do the research work in. For that reason we authorized the $5 million laboratory at Ames Field. I certainly hope that this amendment will be defeated.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, while a good deal of this research work is being done and while NASA has the ability and competence in that field to do the research work, they have no tools with which to do the work. This $5 million item that is now being asked to be stricken from the bill is merely for tools to do the work that needs to be done. I do not think under any stretch of the imagination should we deny this agency of our Government the facilities to do the necessary research in life sciences.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is trying to be constructive in an attempt to further bind together the scientific and medical resources of the Government so that we can have a better life science program in NASA. I would like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that this has already been done. If you will turn to three sections of the committee report, the "Aerospace Medicine" section at page 170, shows how the committee, in order to force coordination between NASA and the Department of Defense, has already eliminated $5 million in facilities alone and there is a commensurate and proportionate reduction in personnel.

Under biosciences, and if you will turn to page 173, you will note that there has been a reduction of from $35 million to $21 million in this part of the program. Under the human factors system section, at page 174 which is the third section through which NASA operates its life sciences program, there has been a further reduction of about $5 million. It is well recognized that the School of Aviation Medicine at Brooks Air Force Base has the foremost life sciences capability in the biosciences field. It is a facility which should be used and admittedly can be used better. Our committe has often brought NASA and the Department of Defense before it so that there could be a more effective program in the medicine area. It is our belief that we have taken the necessary steps already and this additional cut, as reflected in the offered amendment, will be a crippling and harmful one. It should be defeated and we should allow the Space Committee to continue its surveillance which has already shown itself to be so constructive in binding together these resources in the most efficient manner.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I have enjoyed serving on the same committee as the author of this amendment, the gentleman from Pennsylvania. We have talked about this subject many times. As the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Karth], has said, this matter has already been handled. The question of possible duplication has been raised with the Department of Defense, with NASA, and machinery has been set in motion to take care of any possible duplication of effort.

The author of the amendment quoted Mr. Brown, Harold Brown, of the Department of Defense. Harold Brown is one of the signatories to an agreement dated June 24 with NASA and with the Department of Defense in which a Life Sciences Subpanel Coordinating Committee is established. That committee has already begun meeting. I read one of the responsibilities of that committee which is described as follows:

> Periodically to review NASA, Department of Defense, and, wherever applicable, other national industry and university life sciences research facilities and requirements on a regular basis in order to provide up-to-date information for planning and budgeting purposes as well as appropriate coordination.

I think in the light of the fact that we have already established a coordinating agency for this purpose, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is beating a dead dog and I suggest that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Weaver].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Weaver) there were—ayes 63, noes 67.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Weaver and Mr. Karth.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 102, noes 107.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROUDEBUSH

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Roudebush, of Indiana: Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,238,119,400" and insert "$5,213,719,000."
>
> Page 1, line 6, strike out "$4,037,575,000" and insert "$4,013,175,000."
>
> Page 3, line 17, after the period, insert the following: "Of the funds appropriated under subsection (a) of this section, the amount authorized for facilities, training and research grants shall not exceed $30,600,000."

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment I think is quite clear. However, I would like to explain just briefly what it proposes to do.

The bill authorizes the amount of $55 million for fiscal year 1964 for "Facility, training, and research grants." This is actually an increase of about $25 million over fiscal 1963 and is more than four times the amount allowed for fiscal 1962, since at that time the authorization was $12 million.

The purpose of these facility, training, and research grants is to help universities in their scientific research and college graduate students throughout the Nation in the fields of science, and especially those sciences peculiar to our space program.

If this money is granted by the Congress, it would result in the number of students enrolled in this program being increased from 900 in September of 1963 to an anticipated level of 1,500 students in 1964.

And then it is the plan of NASA—according to testimony in committee—to continue increasing the number to an anticipated level of 4,000 total student enrollees.

I think we are all aware of the financial participation by the Federal Government in the field of education. I would like to just single out one agency in addition to NASA as an example of this point.

The National Science Foundation alone spent about a quarter of a billion dollars in fiscal year 1962, and in 1963 this was increased to $322 million. And it is my understanding that they are asking $589 million for fiscal 1964.

I think we in the Congress are faced with the dilemma of having more than 40 separate and distinct Government agencies having programs with subsidies for education, without any effective means of coordinating these programs.

The purpose of my amendment is not to cut this program, but rather to stabilize it. My amendment gives NASA exactly the same amount of money for fiscal year 1964 which it had in fiscal 1963.

Therefore, to repeat and make it crystal clear, this is not a reduction of the some $25 million but rather the allowance of the same amount the program had last year.

To give you an example of the size and extent of this program, if we permit NASA to reach its estimated goal of 4,000 graduate students, it would represent about 13 percent of the current number of NASA employees, and would mean that for about every nine employees in NASA there would be one college student supported with Government funds.

In closing, let me make it perfectly clear that I fully appreciate the value of research in our country, and I know that the proponents of this legislation will tell you of the tremendous drain NASA has been on scientific personnel from private industry. I believe this problem is greatly overemphasized.

May I tell you that I have carefully studied the subcommittee hearings concerning these funds, and I simply don't think that expansion of the program is justified.

I was most pleased to note that several scientific publications in their recent issues have agreed with my stand that the size of this training program and facility grants is getting completely out of hand.

I ask that this amendment be adopted and that we save about $25 million for the taxpayers of the United States. I assure you that this will not in any way affect our space program or the announced efforts of our Nation concerning our space goals.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. As the gentleman knows, he and I, together with others, have discussed this amendment. I do want to say I think the amendment is very much in order and it should be adopted. I think it will carry on the programs that the gentleman has pointed out with all necessary speed and diligence, and it may very well avoid some waste and, certainly, a lot of duplication that otherwise might occur.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. The gentleman refers to 42 Government departments and agencies that have various educational programs. I am informed that the total cost of these programs is in excess of $2 billion. I would like to point out that our colleague, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] headed a committee which has made a study of the interlapping and overlapping of these various educational programs. The recommendation that has been made in that connection is the creation within the executive branch of an interagency council on education to coordinate the educational activities of all Federal agencies.

I shall support the gentleman on his amendment.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if there are further economies to be effected in this particular bill, I suggest that they not be done in the section suggested by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Roudebush].

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee must realize that the program we are talking about deals only with predoctoral grants. There are no other educational grants involved in the NASA training program. It is only predoctoral, 3-year predoctoral, training grants in the scientific disciplines.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Roudebush] says he does not want to cut this program; he does not want to cripple it; he merely wants to stabilize it. Let me tell you why his amendment cannot possibly do it. In the first instance this program was developed several years ago by NASA and it has already been adopted or at least the philosophy or the theory has been adopted by the House to the effect that by school year 1967–68 we should be graduating approximately 1,000 doctoral students in the scientific disciplines every year.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is true that by the 1967–68 school year we will have

4,000 trainees taking their predoctoral courses, but we will never graduate more than 1,000 per year.

Mr. Chairman, the cut which is proposed by this amendment is $25 million. Let me just call to the attention of the members of the Committee the fact that insofar as training grants are concerned for fiscal year 1964 the total request is $25 million. Inasmuch as the gentleman who offers the amendment is only concerned with these grants, the individual predoctoral grants, it would mean that all of the predoctoral grant money is taken from the fiscal year 1964 budget. If this is not the intention, then let me call to the attention of the members of the Committee, Mr. Chairman, that what the gentleman is doing is cutting not only the predoctoral grant section but he is also cutting the universities facilities section. This I say would be a real tragedy. Obviously, the universities today do not have the kind of wherewithal, the financial resources, to develop the new capabilities, buy the new machinery and purchase the new facilities necessary to cope with the racing technologies of the sixties.

But it is extremely important, Mr. Chairman, that we continue to educate. The only way we can educate in the new scientific disciplines is to, No. 1, have the proper facilities at the universities. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that insofar as the total U.S. Government support of all graduate students is concerned—that is, student support, education, new facilities, and so on for the fiscal year 1964—it will amount to about $580 million and in 1970 will amount to about $700 million. This is only about 3 percent of the Federal Government's expenditures in research, development, test, and evaluation.

Mr. Chairman, I really do not think it is too much to ask that this Government invest 3 percent in brainpower to do all of the research, all of the development, all of the tests and all of the evaluation in the various fields of research in which today we are making space history.

In addition to that the President's Scientific Advisory Board and the Bureau of the Budget have very well evaluated whatever duplication might exist, and are apparently satisfied with the results.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, with the racing new technology of the sixties and seventies, it is very important that we train people in the new disciplines. It is well understood that the Soviet Union is graduating about three times as many engineers today as the United States is graduating.

I think it would indeed be one of the very falsest of economies if we cut in this particular area.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Roudebush]. His complaint seems to be that the total of $55 million for the construction of laboratory facilities and the training of scientists, technicians and engineers in our universities and the research grants to our universities is too large an amount. He would propose to return the funding to the level of 1963, or from $55 million to $35 million. Before the close of this debate I think we should analyze some of the items in this authorization because the subcommittee spent a lot of time and held extensive hearings before it recommended the full $55 million.

The fact of the matter is you cannot train these predoctoral scientists very well unless you have adequate facilities, and this means laboratory facilities and equipment which in turn must be housed. Fiscal year 1963 had money for the construction of only 222,000 square feet in seven universities. Our fiscal year 1964 authorization proposed only 400,000 square feet at 11 universities, nationwide. This is a modest program. It is not a big program; it is not beyond what can reasonably be expected to provide the needed facilities.

Now let us look at the training grants. The program provides for only a limited supply of highly trained scientists and engineers. This training program provides a 3-year training opportunity to graduate students offering Ph. D.'s in space-related areas.

These trainees will—after their training—become high caliber scientists and engineers. These stipends are on a competitive level with other sources including other Federal agencies. They will not draw students away from other departments in these institutions of learning. It is hoped 1,250 students can be added in the fall of 1964 and another 1,300 in the fall of 1965. As has been mentioned here before, lead time is important and the goal of graduating 1,000 students a year will not be reached until the spring of 1967. If the proposed amendment is adopted here today, it will seriously damage the projected program which calls for a stabilized figure, of the graduating of 1,000 students per year. Every phase and feature of this program is reasonable. The stipend is $2,400 for a full year of graduate study.

Now, just a word about the proposed research grants. This is a more flexible program, than that where NASA contracts with industry for its research requirements. It is a plan whereby there is a consolidation of related research projects within a university and a multidisciplinary approach. This means that where a university has received a research grant and a project is outlined, then instead of following the traditional approach of dealing with several departments in several universities, a sort of package approach is followed.

This means that full efforts of a group will be focused on one objective and the group may include perhaps biologists, geologists, physicists, chemists, electronics specialists, meteorologists, and engineers who will work together as a closely knit group with one object in mind. I suppose this sort of approach might even be comparable to a miniature Manhattan project or a small scale Polaris project in which all eyes are focused upon obtaining fast results and reaching the objective as quickly as possible through the elimination of any possible time lags or administrative redtape by a multidisciplinary approach. This sort of an approach has the advantage that if there is a gap in research it may now receive quick attention and the gap will be filled in without any possible artificial distortion by traditional organization.

Mr. Chairman, there may be those who would make light and poke fun at some of these research activities as being offbeat, simply because some of this research has to do with investigation of such things as frog's eyes, flys, bats, dolphins, homing pigeons, and beetles, but all of this is not funny or as offbeat as it may seem upon first consideration. The frog's selective eye can see small objects as possible food and large objects as possible enemies. RCA's applied research laboratories thought enough of such an investigation that $200,000 has been spent to create a 500-pound electronic replica of a frog's eye. Many corporations and research institutions are trying to find out how nature does better in many fields than man's devices.

Someone has facetiously and in an effort to be funny criticized the study of the mating call of a Central American toad, but there are research institutions that think this will have a practical application. A few years ago there was some money spent on the love life of the worm fly. It was learned that they mate only once in a lifetime, and by sterilizing the males by irradiation it was possible to eradicate a disease of cattle in Florida that is estimated to have saved $20 million a year.

Some of our critics turned funny-man have jested about research into bats, but a lot has been learned about their system of radar which keeps them from slamming into walls. Some would-be humorists and self-styled jokesters have a lot of fun talking about experiments with dolphins. They should inform themselves that dolphins use sonar and these funny people should also remember that a homing pigeon is a better navigator than man. These wits and wisecrackers should take the time to find out that flying beetles have an eye that can measure landing speed so that they can slow down for the approach and that perhaps their system can be adopted for airplanes. Those who would lampoon some of the research done by NASA should know that many industries would be delighted to learn more about how nature performs its wonders and for that reason it is a proper pursuit for Federal research.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, let me say that if there are some sincere Members who may honestly believe that there is no urgency in this race to the moon and may even believe that there should be a reduction in this year's total authorization then even these persons should not join in the approval of this amendment, which would reduce the authorization for training and research grants: I say this is so because among those who would oppose a lunar landing there is a substantial number who recognize the scientific value of a great part of the space exploration program. I say additionally that even those who are not at all in favor of the space program and give as their reason that more money should be spent upon research that will lead to new discoveries and breakthroughs in the field of medical science, then even these persons should oppose this amendment because some of these research grants and some of these trained scientists will be working in the field of biosciences and the life sciences and may very well come upon a discovery or accomplish a breakthrough that will free the world from the curse of cancer. I hope that this proposed amendment will be defeated and the recommendation of the Subcommittee on Space Sciences sustained.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Roudebush] stated that there was a great drain on the scientific personnel of the Nation by NASA. It seems to me at a time when there is a great drain on scientific personnel of NASA it is incumbent upon us in Congress to try to enrich the wellsprings of that scientific talent by doing the very thing we are trying to do here today in providing for additional scientific fellowships and scholarships through NASA. People like Van Allen and our other great scientists of today will not last forever. We must train new people to take their place. That is the purpose of this NASA scientific fellowship program.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the able gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I appreciate the gentleman from West Virginia yielding because while I am not a member of the committee, I am keenly interested in this particular field of activity.

In 1950 the United States had a clear margin of superiority over the Soviet Union in the number of engineers and scientists that graduated every year. We were graduating about 16,000 more a year than was the Soviet Union in 1950. That completely reversed itself in the period of 1950 to 1960. By 1960 the Soviet Union at that time had 111,000 graduated annually as compared with 38,000 in the United States. It seems to me that this is right at the core of the problem that we ran into in the 1950's when they put sputnik up in the air ahead of us. This is vital to our preeminence in space. If we are going to have this superiority we need this trained scientific manpower. This goes right to the heart of the problem of space leadership.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma is absolutely right. It is easy to vote a billion dollars for a manned space flight program, something that has glamour, but it is very difficult to get a little money to train the brainpower to operate the program. The only way we can keep this program moving forward is by strengthening those universities that train the talent to keep America first in space. I trust the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it grieves me to have to stand up in opposition to my colleague from Indiana. We Hoosiers have a tendency to stick together except when it comes to politics. Then some of us seem to stray from the Republican leadership that the State of Indiana has provided in this House.

I must oppose the amendment which my beloved colleague who represents Indiana so ably on our committee has offered to the House today. Anticipating this move on the part of someone, I decided it would behoove me to check and see what university presidents in Indiana would say about this particular move and how they felt about the training program which NASA is providing through the great universities and colleges of this country.

I wrote to Dr. Hovde, of Purdue University, and to Dr. Stahr, of Indiana University, and asked them how they felt about a reduction of this $55 million amount. I received a very courteous and detailed reply from each of these two distinguished university presidents.

Dr. Stahr, president of Indiana University, said this:

> As for Indiana University, we could easily have used twice as many traineeships as were allotted to us in 1963 with no diminution of quality in the graduate students so supported.

Dr. Hovde, president of Purdue University, who, by the way, wrote a very detailed letter of five pages in length supporting this request for an appropriation of $55 million, said this:

> The projected 1964 expenditure of $55 million by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for facility, training, and research grants for universities and colleges throughout the United States is extremely important to our country as well as to Purdue University. Should these funds be cut back in any significant amount, the consequences will be most serious.

At an appropriate time, Mr. Chairman, I will ask the House for permission to include these letters as part of my remarks.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Lafayette, Ind., July 6, 1963.

Hon. J. EDWARD ROUSH,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROUSH: Thank you for your recent letter relative to the action of the House Science and Astronautics Committee. The projected 1954 expenditure of $55 million by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for facility, training, and research grants for universities and colleges throughout the United States is extremely important to our country as well as to Purdue University. Should these funds be cut back in any significant amount, the consequences will be most serious.

The United States is rich, indeed, in material resources. So rich, in fact, that total involvement in World War II caused only minor rationing of goods at home and the effort to put a man on the moon will require only a small part of our financial resources. But, unfortunately, we have run into a new and entirely different obstacle that will limit our race with the Soviet Union to reach the moon or explore the universe—an obstacle that will limit our ability to compete in the market place and provide jobs for our children—an obstacle that may well prevent us from deterring nuclear annihilation. This obstacle is a shortage of highly educated scientists and engineers. The symptoms and consequences of this shortage are clear for all to see.

1. Since 1900 the economic growth of the United States has been closely related to the rate at which new technologies and science are discovered and made available to civilian industry by scientists and engineers. Today the rate of growth of productivity and the rate of growth of the standard of living in the United States fall far behind nearly every other industrialized nation of the world. Part of the reason is that our shortage of engineers and scientists requires that we devote less of their time to civilian industry than many of the other nations of the world. For example, Western Europe and England combined devote more technical effort to their civilian economy than all of the United States.

2. By 1970 the potential need for engineers is expected to exceed the supply by 250,000, according to the National Science Foundation and the Bureau of Labor statistics. It would take all the engineering colleges and schools in the United States nearly 8 years to graduate this number of men at the present rate of output.

3. The number of scientists and engineers capable of doing research and development work increases by only about 7 percent per year, while total appropriations for research and development have grown at the rate of approximately 15 percent per year. Therefore, the expenditure per technical man-year has grown from roughly $19,000 in 1950 to $36,000 in 1962 and is a measure of the rate at which the supply of highly trained people is falling behind the funds of research and development.

4. During the last decade the shortage of well-qualified technical people has increased the cost of research and development to the point where there has been little, if any growth in civilian research and development supported by firms with fewer than 5,000 employees.

A shortage of manpower clearly exists in engineering, mathematics, and the physical sciences at all levels from the technician to the Ph. D., but it is the greatest at the higher levels of training.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the responsibility which NASA should assume for the education of more students in the areas of knowledge related to our space effort. It has been estimated that the anticipated growth of the space program alone would absorb the total output of engineers, mathematicians, and physicial scientists from our colleges and universities for the next few years with nothing left over for the needs of defense, our civilian economy, and more teachers to handle a growing population with increasing needs for the highest of educational opportunities. The NASA program cannot grow at the expense of these activities.

To produce more college-trained engineers, mathematicians, and scientists, we need more students, more teachers, more facilities.

A tidal wave of students is on its way to college. We must be prepared to attract greater numbers and percentages of them into these critical areas and to educate them. We have evidence on our campus that this can be done.

The most critical need is for teachers whose education has gone beyond the level of the undergraduate and graduate students whom they will teach. This accentuates the already terrific pressure of demand for those who have had the educational and research experience leading to the Ph. D. degree—a demand reflected in current salary offerings by industry of $12,000 and up for Ph. D. graduates, reported by the Purdue Placement Service.

During the next decade institutions of higher education in the United States will need at least 400,000 new teachers to cope with bright young people who will need as much education as they can profit by. Yet, if the present rate of completions of graduate study continues, we will fall short some 90,000 college teachers possessing the doctorate, if minimum acceptable standards of a faculty consist of only 30 percent doctorate holders.

Intimately related to the above is the need for large-scale financing of capital improvements and of graduate study and research.

There are two reasons for such financial need. In the first place, original research by graduate students is indispensable, not not in adding to our fund of basic knowledge, but equally in giving the student the depth of understanding that comes only with experience in discovering and attacking significant problems not yet solved. The capital investment needed for research laboratories per graduate student is vastly greater than for undergraduates.

In the second place, financial support in the form of fellowships is usually required for this rigorously selected corps of able and scholarly people, for parental support is usually not provided at the graduate level.

It is a fact that this year the Purdue Schools of Engineering are turning away hundreds of well-qualified applicants for graduate enrollment for lack of the above types of financing.

If the graduate schools in the United States are to accept the obvious challenge of increasing predoctoral enrollment in engineering and science without lowering standards, then the needs are clear.

1. Since the Federal Government now supports about 75 percent of the dollar value of university grants and contracts in the area of science and engineering, a large increase in the dollar value of university grants and contracts is necessary to increase the output of advanced degree holders over the next 10 years.

2. Since present academic facilities are already overcrowded, graduate academic facilities, including buildings and scientific equipment, must be provided through facilities grants such as proposed by the NASA. Appropriations through State and local sources fall far short of the total university needs. For instance, to provide for additional students, replace obsolete structures, and modernize usable buildings, institutions of higher learning should invest $2,300 million annually over the next decade. Current expenditures annually fall short $1 billion. In its last biennial session, the General Assembly of the State of Indiana cut the heart of Purdue University's capital requirements by providing appropriations of only $7 million to meet a requested need of $17 million. Thus universities can no longer share with the Federal Government the cost of educating predoctoral students for Federal programs. And facility, training, and research grants from the Federal Government for universities must bear a reasonable relation to the equipment, building, and overhead or indirect cost of the university.

3. Support must be provided promptly for graduate work before the tidal wave of undergraduate students hits the universities. The distractions created by either program will be difficult for the university to bear and any delay must be added to the 3 or 4 years necessary for predoctoral work.

I submit that these are urgent reasons why pending NASA appropriations should reflect greatly increased support for universities. The $55 million requested by the NASA for facility, training, and research grants for universities and colleges in 1964 is not large when it is considered that last year NASA recruited for its own staff over 2,000 professional personnel with previous research and development experience, 80 percent of whom were engineers, and 800 engineers and scientists coming directly from their college work. It is apparent that NASA is a seeker of a major fraction of the Nation's topflight professional talent and that major development costs must be a necessary and legitimate part of its program.

Purdue University's experience with the current NASA program for encouraging graduate work in engineering and the space-related sciences has been limited but nevertheless very satisfactory. We have found the general objectives of NASA research and traineeship support to be well stated and flexible enough to enable us to meet the objectives of the university, as well as those of NASA.

An outstanding example has been our experience with the NASA predoctoral research training grant program. The university has considerable freedom under this program in establishing its method of selection of trainees, their replacements, if any, and the selection of eligible areas of study in the university.

The continuity of support in the predoctoral traineeship program is a highly desirable feature. Through this continuity, the production of Ph. D.'s is substantially accelerated. Students who would otherwise seek support through part-time employment are supported as full-time students for the 3-year period.

The number of traineeships allotted to Purdue University has been much smaller than we now find we can accommodate. For the coming academic year the university proposed 20 traineeships as a starting number and was allotted 12. Applications from well-qualified students for traineeships totaled 109. Twenty-one offers were finally made to obtain 12 acceptances. While this may seem to be a high ratio of declinations to offers, it is almost exactly the same ratio experienced in our other fellowship programs. It is apparent, therefore, that of the 109 well-qualified applicants, 88 were left without offers in this program. As a result of this experience, Purdue University will most certainly request considerably more traineeships for the next academic year.

I hope that the Congress will reflect on our current critical shortage of highly talented engineers and scientists and the expanding manpower needs of the NASA program as good reasons to accept the recommendations of your House Science and Astronautics Committee.

Yours sincerely,

Frederick L. Hovde,
President.

Indiana University,
Bloomington, Ind., July 23, 1963.
Hon. J. Edward Roush,
House of Representatives,
1407 New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Roush: I am most happy to learn that you oppose the cutback in funds requested by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the support of predoctoral work in space-related sciences and technology from the $55 million approved by the subcommittee to the $30,600,000 programed in fiscal year 1963, as indicated in your letter of June 27.

The 10 traineeships granted to Indiana University in 1963 were of inestimable help in making it possible to hold top young predoctoral scientists in the Midwest who otherwise might have been drained away to prestigious eastern and western universities. We think that a better distribution of scientific talent over the United States is desirable not only for ourselves but for the entire Nation. As for Indiana University, we could easily have used twice as many traineeships as were allotted to us in 1963 with no diminution of quality in the graduate students so supported.

A particularly attractive feature of the NASA traineeship is the provision for 3 years of uninterrupted support. This makes it possible for the young scientist to progress to his degree in the shortest possible time, tending thereby to guarantee completion of the degree, and conserving what has been demonstrated to be the most productive years of the scientist for work after the degree is awarded. Over a period of years this arrangement should bring about a steady increase in the number of Ph. D.'s who will become available to the profession in each succeeding year.

To broaden the basis of your argument for the larger appropriation, it might be helpful to cite our experience at Indiana University in this year's competition for university fellowships, of which we gave 78 supplemented by 8 Edwards fellowships and 13 Woodrow Wilson Supplementary Fund fellowships. After all unqualified candidates for university fellowships were carefully screened out by departmental selection committees, we still were left with seven times the number of qualified candidates as compared to the number of available fellowships. Further, there is impressive evidence in our files of the high quality of those who were not successful in the fellowship competition. Of course many, possibly most, of those rejected obtained another support of one kind or another for study somewhere in the United States, but almost inevitably the nature of this support necessitates a slowing down in the progress toward completion of a degree. And, if past experience is borne out, many who might have finished will be forced out before completing the degree by the unrelenting drain on personal economic resources.

Although progress is undoubtedly being made in attracting top talent to scientific and scholarly careers, the increasing demand for such trainees leaves the Nation still in the position of a significant imbalance between the numbers entering these professions and the need. Our own experience in recent years convinces us of the greatly increased potential for graduate study among students coming up from the high schools today. If support of these people is forthcoming, the greatly expanded need for scientists can be met.

While I am writing you, let me add that it is our hope that increased funds can be made available to NASA for grants to colleges and universities for facilities, training, and research. It has only been during the past year that Indiana University has received support from NASA. We have four projects totaling $375,000 plus the above-mentioned fellowship program supporting 10 students. You can see that this is a modest amount. However, the need is here, and we like NASA's policies; and if more funds were available, we would greatly benefit.

We especially need funds for facilities (laboratories and scientific equipment) and NASA supports these needs to a greater degree than other agencies. We could also use substantially more fellowship assistance, as I have said.

We have recently submitted a most imaginative application from our medical school for funds with which to do research on problems encountered in space exploration. This we are certain cannot be supported unless NASA receives increased funds.

The Department of Defense agencies have leveled off in their support to universities. In fact, it amounts to a reduction, since their support has remained more or less fixed while costs have increased. So, if it were not for the increased funds which have been appropriated to NIH, NSF, and NASA, the universities would be haplessly behind in the training of graduates required by industry, education, and Government.

We appreciate very much your own enlightened interest and insight into the problem of support for graduate education.

With warm regards.

Sincerely,

ELVIS J. STAHR, Jr.,
President.

A reduction of requested funds for facility, training, and research grants may not be detrimental to present activity but it can have a far-reaching effect next year and the years after.

We are rich in material resources in the United States. We have the financial resources as well to insure our continued and vital progress and leadership in space. But we have run into a new and entirely different obstacle which will limit our ability to compete not only in space but in the marketplace, in our ability to provide jobs for our children.

This is a shortage of highly educated scientists and engineers.

Frederick L. Hovde the distinguished president of Purdue University to whom I previously referred, warns that the potential need for engineers in 1970 will exceed the supply by 270,000. He points out that a shortage of manpower clearly exists in engineering, mathematics, and the physical sciences at all levels from the technician to the Ph. D., but it is the greatest at the higher levels of training.

Dr. Hovde also emphasizes we will need at least 400,000 new teachers in institutions of higher learning in the next decade to meet the tidal wave of students on its way to college. And yet, he warns, if the present rate of completions of graduate study continues we will fall short some 90,000 college teachers possessing a doctorate degree. We will fall short this great number even if we are to adhere to minimum acceptable standards of a faculty of only 30 percent doctorate holders.

Dr. Elvis Stahr, former Secretary of the Army and now president of Indiana University, points out the NASA traineeship program provides 3 years of uninterrupted support. This makes it possible for the young scientist to progress to his degree in the shortest possible time. This conserves the most productive years of the scientist for work after the degree is awarded as well as provides a steady increase in the number of Ph. D.'s who become available to the profession in each succeeding year.

Financial support in the form of fellowships is most generally required for this rigorously selected corps of able and scholarly individuals because parental support is usually not provided at the graduate level.

Dr. Stahr emphasized the case at Indiana University in regard to the potential number of potential graduate students compared to the fellowships available. Last year the university was still left with seven times the number of qualified candidates as compared to the number of available fellowships.

Dr. Hovde also stressed that of the 109 well-qualified applicants for NASA traineeships at Purdue, 88 were left without offers in this program.

The space program is just as much a part of our efforts to win the cold war as are our other efforts. We cannot relax our vigilance, we cannot do other than our utmost.

We have an abundance of the material and financial resources to fight this war. We must insure the intellectual capability to use these resources.

I ask that the House defeat the amendment of my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the basic objective of the meteorological systems program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is to develop meteorological satellites and sounding rocket technology to provide accurate and continuing weather information. NASA, in cooperation with the Weather Bureau, is working toward the fulfillment of this objective. This program is in keeping with our national policy of the peaceful use of space for the benefit of all mankind, and is dedicated toward maintaining and enhancing the leadership of the United States in the development and operation of space meteorological systems.

The NASA effort in the meteorological systems is divided into two areas: the satellite and sounding rocket programs. The meteorological satellites provide cloud photographs and infrared data pertaining to the earth's heat balance. The sounding rockets are used to obtain atmospheric data up to about 60 miles. This region is not covered by satellites or balloons and is necessary for study of the dynamics of our atmosphere.

Since the launch of the first Tiros on April 1, 1960, seven Tiros weather satellites have been launched—a record of seven successes out of seven launches. Further, with the exception of a total of about 9 months, these satellites have been producing cloud photographs continuously to the present. Tiros VI launched on September 18, 1962, continues to operate with one of its two cameras, and has been transmitting cloud photographs for over 10 months—7 months beyond the designed expectancy. Tiros VII is in orbit with both cameras and other experiments operating successfully.

Tiros has provided extensive operational support to the Weather Bureau based on over a quarter million cloud photographs, in addition to infrared meteorological data. From these pictures, over 5,000 cloud cover analyses were prepared, over 700 special storm advisories have been issued, and there have been 300 specific instances where weather analysis has been improved. Ten hurricanes and 21 typhoons were observed, reported and tracked. This type of support has proven invaluable to the Weather Bureau and the Department of Defense in their day-to-day operations. Lastly, but not least, Tiros has provided a wealth of very useful data to research meteorologists not only in Government agencies but to universities and research institutes throughout the world and has thus increased our Nation's knowledge and advancement in the understanding of atmospheric phenomena.

During the fiscal year 1964, and especially to cover the hurricane-typhoon season, additional Tiros satellites will be launched. An improved, second generation weather satellite, Nimbus, now nearing completion will also be placed in orbit. Nimbus will have wider capabilities than Tiros as a result of its improved sensors and its near polar orbit.

Incorporated into the next Tiros to be launched is an automatic picture transmission—APT—system. This system will televise local cloud pictures for local use. This means weather people will be able to get cloud pictures over their immediate area anywhere in the world. The Department of Defense and Weather Bureau are installing receiving equipment for this system in various parts of the world.

Since Tiros is space oriented, that is, it faces the earth only on a portion of its orbit, and is inclined at 58° to the equator, it is limited in its coverage of the world. Therefore, a polar orbiting, earth oriented cartwheel Tiros is planned for the near future and this spacecraft will also carry the automatic picture transmission system for local users. This means weather people equipped with low-cost ground equipment will be able to obtain cloud pictures over their immediate area anywhere in the world.

To acquire necessary atmospheric data from the earth's surface to an altitude of about 60 miles, 110 small sounding rockets of the Arcas and Loki class will be launched during the current fiscal year. Forty-eight large sounding rockets of the Nike-Cajun class are scheduled. Temperatures, wind velocity, and direction, air density and pressure and other useful data will be measured or collected.

It is desirable to extend the meteorological coverage capability beyond that of the Tiros and Nimbus satellites by providing continuous cloud coverage of the earth. It is planned to continue work already initiated which will lead to the eventual development of a synchronous meteorological system. This system will be earth oriented and will continuously view an assigned portion of the earth. Three such satellites properly positioned in an orbit having an altitude of 22,300 miles will cover essentially the entire globe.

In order to furnish necessary information for the synchronous satellite, two Tiros satellites will be launched in eccentric orbits to test sensors and other equipments, and to gain knowledge on the effects of radiation on components at synchronous altitudes.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, the authorization bill before the House includes $489,116,000 for the construction of new facilities and the modernization and expansion of existing plant in support of the manned space flight program. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration requested $564,538,000 for this purpose. An exhaustive review of the requirements for new facilities by the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight resulted in a reduction of $75,422,000 or 13.4 percent.

The very careful scrutiny of this program has paid dividends. In general, the committee has tried to avoid elimination from the program of any item included therein which would in any way impair the effectiveness of our national space effort. However, where deferral seemed reasonably possible, we felt it to be in the national interest to do so.

The achievement of a 13.4-percent reduction in this part of the Nation's space program is without precedent in the history of NASA. To achieve such a reduction without in any way adversely affecting the space effort required a painstaking line item review of 64 individual budget requests, as well as numerous onsite inspections in the field by various members of the committee. Of the 64 projects for which new authorization was requested, only 19 survived without some adjustment having been made by the committee.

The amount remaining in the bill will provide the minimum essential facilities in fiscal year 1964 to realize an orderly, planned increment of the physical plant necessary to achieve our national goal of placing a man on the moon and returning him safely to earth within this decade. The authorization will provide vital construction at five NASA centers and eight contractor installations, in eight States. The States of Oklahoma, California, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, New Mexico, and Texas will benefit from this effort. The construction to be provided by this year's increment is primarily operational, developmental, and support type facilities.

Over half of the fiscal year 1964 construction effort—$274 million—in manned space flight is programed for the further buildup of launch and launch supporting facilities at the launch operations center, Cape Canaveral, Fla. Here, construction is continuing at a rapid pace on the unique facilities required for the preflight assembly, checkout, and the launching of the manned space flight vehicles. With the advent of the Saturn class of launch vehicles, launch and ground support facilities moved to a new level of significance, owing chiefly to their increased complexity. The new launch complex No. 39, which will provide the assembly building, launching pads and other facilities for the manned lunar landing program, is now under construction, and the fiscal year 1964 increment will complete 90 percent of the requirement.

Construction of new developmental testing installation, the Mississippi Test Facility, was started this past spring. This program includes the second increment of these facilities—$92.7 million—which are so vital to the success of the manned space flight program. Here, test stands and other testing devices are being constructed to provide for the static testing of heavy rocket stages and engines required to launch the Apollo lunar missions. The Advanced Saturn S-1C and S-II stages with their clustered F-1 engines, to be assembled at the Michoud plant, will be transported by barge from the plant and static test fired at the Mississippi Test Facility, prior to final assembly and mating with the Apollo spacecraft for the lunar mission at Cape Canaveral.

This program also includes the second increment of facilities—$35.1 million—for the Manned Spacecraft Center near Houston, Tex. This Center, the home of America's astronauts, has as its primary mission the development of spacecraft for manned space flight, the training of astronauts and the conduct of manned flight operations. The fiscal year 1964 program will provide only the minimum operational, developmental, and support facilities needed to meet early development and training objectives.

Another increment of construction at the Marshall Space Flight Center—$29 million—is being provided in fiscal year 1964. At this Center launch vehicles and space transportation systems to meet the space program requirements are being developed. The facilities to be provided are primarily of an operational and developmental nature. The Marshall Center supervises the Mississippi Test Facility, and also the Michoud plant near New Orleans, La., where additional production facilities are being provided in fiscal year 1964—$8.7 million.

In addition to the major program elements I have mentioned, contractor facilities necessary for the research and development of spacecraft, launch vehicles, rocket engines, and other components, are being provided in California, Missouri, New Mexico, and Florida—$49.7 million. These facilities include further testing and evaluation devices, manufacturing equipment, and a lunar excursion module testing area.

Time has permitted only a brief outline of the construction of facilities included in the manned space flight program. The committee has subjected this portion of the program to an exhaustive analysis. I believe that we have included for fiscal year 1964 only those items which are absolutely essential to the success of the program.

Mr. **FULTON** of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago President Kennedy and Congress committed this Nation to a position of preeminence in the conquest of space. At that time the United States was dangerously trailing in this field. In these 2 years we have made great strides.

Credit for the achievements of these years, culminating with Major Cooper's dramatic flight and the successful completion of Project Mercury must be given to many. Certainly the President's decision was of immeasurable value. To the men of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration this Nation owes a real debt of gratitude for their vision, ability, teamwork and tenacity in getting the job done in a generally rapid and efficient manner.

A great deal of credit must go to the Members of the Congress who recognized the challenge of outer space and moved without hesitation to meet that challenge.

Finally, and in the last analysis, the bulk of the credit must be given to the people of this Nation. For, without their realization of the need for this program and without their dedicated support, there would have been no progress. When the Congress gave legislative approval to the space program, it was reflecting the overwhelming sentiment of the people of the United States.

Some are puzzled as to why the United States would spend the necessary billions to go to the moon and into outer space. Some ask: "Why go there at all?" Why indeed? The drive to explore the unknown led to the building of our great Nation, it led to its discovery. Christopher Columbus sought a passage to the east by sailing west. His voyage was a failure, but the most profitable failure in the world's history. Columbus, of course, to many was insane. Everyone knew there was nothing to be gained by his voyage, and that his ships would probably sail right to the end of this flat old earth and cascade into eternal blackness.

After Columbus came a long line of so-called madmen—Hudson, De Soto, Crocket, Boone, Lewis and Clark. It was men like these who blazed the trail to a great America. Today we have a new breed of so-called nuts—those affected with lunar madness—the von Brauns, the Gilruths, the Webbs—and the Gordon Coopers and the John Glenns. It is such men as these who will lead a great America in the conquest of outer space.

When I came to the Congress in January I was honored with a seat on the Committee for Science and Astronautics. In these short months I have watched the drafting of this NASA authorization, and I have participated in it. The members of this committee have worked long and diligently at this task. The $5.2 billion approved is nearly half a billion dollars less than requested, a substantial saving in tax dollars. But this authorization is adequate to let the United States fill the role in the conquest of space to which this Nation is committed.

Gentlemen, I fully support H.R. 7500. I support this bill because the program of exploration and conquest of outer space is vital to the national interest of the United States, I support it because it is in keeping with the pioneer spirit of this great Nation, I support it because the American people support this program, and I support it because if ever a Russian cosmonaut lands on the moon I want him to be greeted by an American flag planted by an American astronaut.

SPACE IS OUR CHALLENGE

Mr. **FUQUA**. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 7500 which authorizes $5.2 billion for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

As a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House, I have had the privilege of assisting in a careful study of this budget, and in my opinion it is a good one.

Long hours of careful study have gone into this proposed authorization. I feel that we have made all of the necessary economy measures needed, and that this is a realistic authorization to meet the goals of this Nation in space.

We realize that we are in a race with the Communists to be first in space. This Nation must be first, for just as the Nation that once could control the skies, could control the outcome of armed conflict, so can the Nation today that can control space have military superiority in the years to come. We dare not do less. We do so not to conquer, but rather to have the might that will deter aggression. We seek superiority in space not for conquest, but to stand as a bulwark for free men everywhere against the forces of tyranny.

Space is the challenge of our time. We stand on the threshold of advancements such as the world has never seen. As Columbus charted new worlds, as the Wright brothers ushered in a new era, so the American people today, united in a gigantic effort, are charting new worlds of scientific advancement.

I think the reasons that this Nation has dedicated itself to superiority in the space race is obvious. I think this is one of the most momentous decisions that this Nation has made, and I am confident that we will succeed.

This budget or authorization which we are voting on today is our method of speaking for the American people that we are meeting this challenge. I know that those of you who have had the opportunity to following the hearings and study that went into this proposal know that we have made the needed economy moves, while maintaining all of the needed and necessary programs.

I trust that we will pass this authorization with an overwhelming vote in another chapter in this tremendously important program for Americans of today and tomorrow, and in truth for all mankind for ages yet to come.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Chairman, the portion of the program dealing with geophysics and astronomy consists of a dozen different studies concerned with the problems we will encounter as we move farther from the surface of the earth.

The space surrounding the earth can be divided into three regions: the upper atmosphere, the ionosphere, and the magnetosphere. The upper atmosphere begins at an altitude of about 18 miles, where the mix of components of the atmosphere changes significantly from that at sea level. The upper atmosphere extends from 18 miles out to approximately 60 miles, where the significant components are no longer neutral atoms and molecules but consist of electrons and ions. The ionosphere begins at about 60 miles and extends to about 300 miles. It is this layer which forms the mirror against which radio waves bounce and return to earth. The magnetosphere extends from 300 miles to a region many thousands of miles distant from the earth.

So far, our space travel has taken place in the upper atmosphere and the ionosphere. Our next significant travels will take us into the magnetosphere. We have been studying the upper atmosphere, for some little time but there is much that we do not know and much that we will need to know before we begin our programs of travel beyond the immediate vicinity of the earth. We need more information on radiation, on the magnetic phenomena in space, on the characteristics of the ionosphere and magnetosphere as they affect radio communication, on the many kinds of particles that will be encountered in space, and on the tremendous variations in temperature which occur, ranging from around 400° Fahrenheit to more than 2,000°. Such variations have an important effect upon the orbits of satellites. As temperature increases, it raises the height of the atmosphere and changes its density.

To study these and the many other phenomena we have a rapidly increasing collection of scientific tools. One of the most productive and least expensive is the sounding rocket. It is a device which has been utilized over many years and is very reliable. Its peculiar advantage is that it provides a horizontal cross-section sampling of the atmosphere and ionosphere. Another tool is the satellite, which has now been developed in a wide range of capabilities. Satellites, placed in orbit around the earth at various altitudes, provide long-term capabilities for gathering data. In the committee report you will see these referred to as "explorers," "monitors," "observatories," or other designations. Explorers are designed to look for things which are completely unknown; monitors are used for the continuous collection of data needed for checking on behavior and phenomena which are known to exist; and observatories are the larger, heavier, and more expensive satellites designed to carry out more intensive and more accurate experiments.

Most of the phenomena in our atmosphere, the ionosphere, and the magnetosphere are connected with the sun and with variations in its behavior. Much of the geophysics and astronomy program is devoted to a study of the sun. In view of the fact that all terrestrial life depends upon the sun, it is rather astonishing to discover how little we know about it and how inadequate our understanding of it really is. We know its size—approximately 1,300,000 times the size of our globe. We can make some estimates of its temperature, which in some of the processes that occur in the sun may go as high as 20 million degrees centigrade.

The sun, which affects a wide variety of activities on this earth, has an equally profound relation to all space travel. As is well known, solar activity bears some relation to the emergence of sun spots. These have been studied over a period of years and we find that they occur in a fairly regular 11-year cycle. We are near the end of one of these 11-year cycles and next year, 1964, will be the low point of sunspot activity, the so-called year of the quiet sun. It is a period of unusual opportunity for research and study.

Much of the program will be devoted to a study of earth-sun relationships, solar emissions, and a correlation of solar phenomena with changes in magnetic activity, the intensity of radiation and particles in space.

One of the twelve studies included in the geophysics and astronomy program will deal with the earth gravitational field, designed to refine our calibrations for space travel. In our measurements of our globe, our points of reference are accurate enough for earth travel, but a very small inaccuracy multiplies many times over in the long distances encountered in space travel.

The development of orbiting satellites has made possible another breakthrough in the study of more distant stars, planets, and other bodies. All observation from the earth's surface is restricted by our atmospheric cover. Consequently the development of the new orbiting observatories is permitting a very fruitful, deeper and more accurate look at the bodies around us.

Finally, one further part of the program provides for cooperative participation in international exploration of space. By cooperating with scientists in the United Kingdom, Canada, Italy, and France, we are securing an increase in the body of knowledge open to everyone at modest cost to ourselves.

What we are learning through the geophysics and astronomy program is an indispensable prerequisite to space travel but it has far greater significance than that. It will provide the indispensable body of knowledge on which to base future developments in communication, weather forecasting, and the conversion of energy. But the full effect of what we learn will go far beyond these immediate applications: We are unlocking some of the great secrets of the universe and they will provide building blocks of knowledge for an infinite variety of uses.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I would like to direct a few questions to those who have risen in opposition to this amendment, particularly the gentlemen from Minnesota and West Virginia. I have here some correspondence I have had with NASA, and I am particularly interested in knowing whether or not supporting this amendment would prohibit additional grants for studies of ways to communicate between humans and dolphins. These are fish, as I understand it. I am interested in knowing whether or not this particular appropriation that is here attempted to be cut is the one which includes things like this.

Mr. MILLER of California. I believe that if the gentleman will go into this, he will find that this is a project that the Navy is carrying on and not NASA.

Mr. SNYDER. If the gentleman would like to see my correspondence, I have a copy of the contract which NASA entered into for $80,700. Their explanation of the contract is as follows:

> Acknowledging the possibility of encountering life forms in exploration of the planets, research into various means of communication is within the theoretical concepts of the space research program.

We have NASA conducting research with dolphins and apparently they want to talk to dolphins on the various planets. My question is, will supporting this amendment be voting to cut out things like this.

Mr. MILLER of California. No, I do not think you will, because this is not the school program. If the gentleman is interested in this subject, may I say that for many years I served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Oceanography of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and I cannot think of a program that is of much more value than this dolphin program. There are great strides that have been made in it, and it is something that has been kept under wraps.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman tell me what they have been able to find out from these dolphins?

Mr. MILLER of California. I think they found out that the dolphins can communicate and that the dolphins can be trained to do a lot of things that you and I have no conception of. I would suggest that if the gentleman wants to go out to the naval laboratory, I think they would give him some information that I am not privileged to give him but which would be very interesting to him. This program has all been carried on at Bimini for quite some time.

Mr. SNYDER. I can conceive of the dolphin program within the concept of the Navy, but I have a little difficulty in conceiving of a program such as this within the NASA authorizations.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman to yield so that I could correct something that might be a misapprehension or a misstatement, unintentionally, I am sure, on the part of the gentleman from Minnesota. First, the purpose of my amendment is not to cut the appropriation at all. It continues at the same amount that was in existence for 1963, which is $10 million for facility grants, $15 million for training grants, and $5,600,000 for research grants. Therefore, I believe the dolphin-type programs will be included.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one observation. The gentleman from Indiana, our esteemed colleague [Mr. Roush], pointed out that in Indiana the one thing we never agree on apparently is politics. I would point out that the easy way to play politics would be for us on this side to acquiesce to the requests of educators. The difficult role is to rise above politics and stand in opposition to requests which we think are unsound.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Roudebush].

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Roudebush and Mr. Karth.

The committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 140, noes 129.

So the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WYDLER

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Wydler: Page 4, strike out line 16 and all that follows down through page 5, line 2, and insert the following:

"(h) No part of the funds authorized by this section may be expended for the establishment of, nor hiring personnel connected with, an Electronic Research Center. The Administrator (prior to the consideration of the next authorization Act by the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate and the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives) shall transmit to the Congress a detailed study of the geographic location of, the need for, and the nature of the proposed Center, together with such request for an authorization of appropriations for such Center as may be appropriate in the light of such study."

Page 2, line 23, strike out "$148,653,000" and insert "$144,753,000".

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this amendment because I agree with my colleagues on the committee that the evidence before Congress is inconclusive and that the establishment of an electronic research center is not now justified.

In spite of this finding in the report, the bill now before the Congress provides that we should authorize the money at this time, before the facts are presented, and leave the determination to the few of us on the committee to make later as we see fit.

In other words, you are being asked to give up your prerogatives and avoid your responsibilities and to give us a blank check. I submit there is no reason in logic for this to be done. You should not vote to authorize money, the need for which the committee reports has not been shown.

My amendment merely states that the funds should not be authorized until the need for them is proven. My amendment deletes the funds at this time and directs the Administrator of NASA to submit his further report to Congress justifying the program and site selection, together with an appropriate request for an authorization of appropriations for such a research center.

Under my amendment, when you vote on that request you will know what you are voting for. In the meanwhile, you will reduce the proposed spending in this budget by $3.9 million and retain control over future spending which will amount to at least $56 million, the estimated cost of the project completion.

For those of us who campaigned on a slogan of cutting unnecessary spending—a group which includes us all—this is a rare and perfect opportunity for performance.

I am sure that most of you by this time are thoroughly confused by the purposes of the drafters of this particular section of the bill. This is just the last example of the strange behavior of those dealing with this proposal to build an electronic research center. Those dealing with the question seem at times to be possessed of a demon, and some have suggested that the mysteries surrounding this proposal compare favorably with those to be found in outer space.

To begin with, the usual two-step procedure of first asking Congress to authorize the project and then determining where it should be built was not followed. Here the site selected, namely Boston, was included as a part of the original authorizing proposal. From the start the proposed center and its location were treated with equal importance. It was only with the greatest reluctance that any witness would admit there was another choice location in the whole United States of America. When NASA requested an electronic research center in Boston, it made clear it meant just that.

I do not intend to rehash all the innuendos of "undue influence" that have been leveled against this proposal. By this time nearly every responsible official of NASA has denied vehemently that the President's brother before last fall's election or the junior Senator from Massachusetts after the election played any part in the determination of the site selected. In fact, we are assured by the Administrator himself that the secret was kept from him for months.

On the other hand, the Director of the Electronics and Control Office of the Department of Advance Research and Technology, the man who suggested Boston, when asked why he chose Boston as a site, testified that it was a "hot house environment" necessary for a "little orchid." There are some of us who take exception to calling a $50 million research center a "little orchid." When pressed as to why it could not be built anywhere else in the United States, he stated you could not grow an orchid in the "desert."

And I do not find reassuring this explanation by NASA on how this matter was handled before the Bureau of the Budget. When asked for an explanation of what happened NASA submitted the following, and I quote:

> In the process of presenting NASA's fiscal year 1964 budget to the President for approval, the Administrator of NASA initially discussed the proposed electronics research center and the suggested Boston location in mid-October 1962. It was decided at that time that the proposed center would be handled discreetly within the executive department until a reasonable time had elapsed after the November elections in order to obviate the impact this proposal might have had. The NASA Administrator reviewed the proposed center with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in the first half of December 1962 during detailed discussions of the total NASA budget. These discussions included the requirement for the center, the role of the center within and without the agency, the proposed location, and other details. After review of proposals for the national budget, taking into consideration the recommendations of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and agency heads, the President included the proposed center in the fiscal year 1964 budget sent to Congress.

It is, indeed, strange that this matter which had been under consideration for 10 months was decided upon so late that it had to be inserted in the budget estimate books of NASA after the books had been originally ordered and printed.

However, let us get clear what the issue is today. The committee agrees that the need for the center has to be fully established. I asked the Associate Administrator what specific research projects would be performed at this center, and he told me that they were going to get 25 to 30 people together who would "plan out in detail what projects should be carried out in the Boston area." This was on March 20, long after the proposal to build the center had been submitted to Congress. It is even more revealing to find that NASA has two completely different site concepts under study even now. Originally a vast 1,000-acre site was requested in the budget, but now they have ordered a $10,000 study of a site, to be built on stilts over a highway, of about 100 acres. This indicates to me that the committee is right in concluding that this suggestion needs more thoughtful objective consideration. The question of the need for this center should be established first, independent of the question of its location.

There is, I believe, a serious constitutional question whether Congress can, as this bill now provides, delegate authorizing authority to its committees under these conditions. In any case, and more important, there is no reason to do so.

This is a vast and long-range proposal. The center will gradually employ people, and it is planned that this will reach at least 2,000 or more. The center will cost at least $56 million to build. It will cost at least $30 million a year to operate.

I am not against Boston as a site. I am of the opinion that Congress should know all the facts before it embarks on such a vast project. To me the center is so important that I do not believe it should come into existence under a cloud with a bad name like an illegitimate child. Boston may be the right choice, but we should be sure. Whatever site is selected, the center will be a boon to any area in which it locates. It will direct procurement of hundreds of millions of dollars every year and will act as a magnet to attract industrial development. All areas should be considered fairly, squarely, fully—including even other areas in New England. I am sure there are many men here who wish to be heard from in this connection.

As it stands now, we are being asked to authorize $3.9 million for this purpose and then to conduct a study to determine if some of us believe that we need it. The fact is that we may not need it at all, or we may need less, or we may need more. Whatever happens, we are almost sure to be wrong.

Under my amendment we will be sure to do what we want and intend to do and will have all the facts before us when we act.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wydler], for that very fine and factual statement which he has made on the floor of the House this afternoon.

Mr. WYDLER. I thank my colleague.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that so much hysteria has been built up here concerning this suggested authorization. To my knowledge there is not as much politics in this proposal as they are trying to make out.

I never knew Senator Kennedy until after the elections. But he was elected. I do know politics to a certain extent, and I am around where I hear the gossip. I do not think Senator Kennedy had the slightest thing to do with this until after he was elected Senator. Overtures might have been made, but to my knowledge there is no politics like they suggest. The allegation is a red herring being drawn to defeat the New England proposal.

I know of course, Senator Kennedy is in favor of the Massachusetts research laboratory. If he did oppose it he would not be Senator now, or probably would not be the next time, because any Senator or Representative must stand up for his State and work for his State when he is in office.

I do not think the Republicans opposed to the Massachusetts site are making much political hay by trying to create this issue.

I want to say one thing more, and then get to my own State. There were only one or two people on that committee who were not convinced that the group of scientists that selected this had selected the right place for the site. There was a spirit of fairness in the committee. They did not want to run over any other person who might have had a site to offer who had not had the opportunity to present their views. So they came to an understanding that they would not recommend the site, that they would put it where it had to be reviewed again by the scientists, who presumably know more about the program than we who are here know about it. Then the proposal had to come back to the committee.

What committee would it come back to if it would not go back to the Science Committee? This Science Committee consists of a good group of men and they all know their stuff, speaking in the language of the street. They could send it to the Committee on Foreign Affairs or some other committee, but the committee would not be acquainted with the situation. Therefore, we named the right committee.

So I think the opposition is being built up on reports and false theories. I heard about the Kennedy business ever since I have been here this year because the papers have been printing a good deal about it, but I do not believe that is a proper charge to be made against the administration. I would not knowingly offend the President of the United States. I know him. He is a friend of mine. And I dislike to be forced by my Republican friends to come to his defense.

I say I do not believe the charge is true. I know that Massachusetts can present a case before any jury, any fair jury, any jury that is not politically minded, and win it. I want, as I hope everybody else does in Massachusetts, and in the country as far as that is concerned, to do that which is best for the space effort. We want to do that which is best for the conquest of space. I believe in leaving it to the scientists to make this selection. We present our case and the gentleman from New York can present his case or the gentleman from California or wherever he may be from. However, let us not rebuke this committee. This committee is made up of intelligent men and women. Let us not rebuke our own committee and take it away from them. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleagues from Massachusetts in stressing the importance of the proposed electronics research center in the Greater Boston area.

It is certainly true that all New England would benefit from this center.

There is a critical need for a research-development effort in space-related electronics and control. For this reason, it is important that the center be placed in an area rich with academic achievement and close to a budding industrial region.

The NASA commitment requires coordination at all levels, and this research center will provide impetus in this area, and will contribute greatly to the space efforts of the United States.

The center will provide a focal point for scientists, engineers, technicians, and other personnel participating in electronics and related physics research required for our future space explorations.

Specified in-house research and development, which is essential to the lofty U.S. space goals, will be performed at this center.

It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that New England and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is ideally equipped educationally and industrially for this center.

In Massachusetts, Mr. Chairman, we have the greatest concentration of brain power in the world. As the Science and Astronautics Committee report suggested, it is essential that this center be in close proximity to this great abundance of talent, brains, and industrial know-how.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MacDonald] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman, when President Kennedy recommended expansion and acceleration of the national space program in his first state of the Union message, he described the program as part of "the battle that is going on around the world between freedom and tyranny—the battle for men's minds." He made it clear to the Congress that a difficult, expensive, and comprehensive program, in space sciences and technology, would be necessary. In this connection he stated: "This decision demands a major national commitment of scientific and technical manpower, material and facilities, and the possibility of their diversion from other important activities where they are already thinly spread." This continues to be the problem of the space program. It is absolutely essential that H.R. 7500, the legislation we are considering today which authorizes appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, be given most serious and objective attention.

This authorization bill reflects the many facets of the scientific, research, and development work of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Each part is essential to the proper functioning of the total NASA program. In the past, NASA has been able to build on known technology or to accelerate previously instituted programs of research and development. For example NASA was able to expand on the talents available from the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. It was able to integrate into its program certain of the work of the Army Ballistics Missile Agency, under Dr. Wernher von Braun, at Hunstville, Ala., the Vanguard team from the Naval Research Laboratory, and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory which had been under Army contract. NASA has been able to integrate the work of these separate teams and on them to build sound and forward-looking space programs in the aeronautical and propulsion fields.

However, a less satisfactory foundation has existed with respect to electronics and its related physics disciplines. Extraordinary steps were deemed necessary to keep this vital phase of the space sciences in pace with the rest of the program. The major importance of electronics components, technology, and instrumentation, in all space endeavors, made it doubly necessary to broaden NASA's space electronics research base as rapidly as possible.

An extensive study of the best way to approach this problem was inaugurated by NASA, in which various approaches were explored. After careful analysis, NASA decided that the most effective solution was to establish a new research center, specifically devoted to research in electronics and related physics disciplines. This research center would permit a concentration of scientific talent in one place; it would avoid conflicts between development missions and research efforts in other fields; and it would provide a variety of research facilities under a singleness of direction. NASA officials told members of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics that such a center would lead to a rapid development of a critical mass of electronics research data. I wish to point out to my colleagues that this center is for research and not for development of hardware or for production of electronic components or subsystems. The results of its research will be available to all. It should be a factor in the growth of electronic and related industries in every section of the country. There are estimates that about three-fourths of the cost of spacecraft goes for electronics. However at present, members of the industrial community undertaking spacecraft contracts spend no more than 5 percent of their resources for electronic research.

Once this decision was made, further studies were conducted as to the proper location of such a facility. These studies included consideration of a host of criteria. One paramount consideration was the availability of adequate utilities and services such as power, water, communications, and sanitary facilities. Another involved the proximity of institutions of higher scientific and engineering education. I wish to emphasize that such institutions serve not only as a basis for the interchange of ideas but also provide facilities for additional study by members of the research center's staff. Still other considerations included the need for the new center to be located in an industrial community in which interests with similar technical work were available. It was essential, because of the proposed size of the center, that the new installation would have available to it satisfactory community facilities such as housing, recreation, schools, colleges, and a variety of transportation services.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, after careful consideration, decided that the best place to locate the electronics research center was in the Greater Boston area. The conclusion that the Greater Boston area represented the single most desirable location for the center was reached only after thorough scrutiny of potential areas throughout the country. NASA authorities found that Greater Boston contained the best overall combination of university and industrial strength, accessible community and transportation facilities, and capability for electronics and guidance research. In addition, Boston has long been known for its concentration on electronics and related physics research, both in industry and universities. NASA officials felt that this would provide a stimulating atmosphere for the new center. After weighing all these factors, the final decision was reached and Greater Boston was selected as the most suitable location.

On behalf of myself and the entire Massachusetts delegation, I should like to commend the foresight, vision, and decision of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in this matter. I would also like to commend to my colleagues the favorable consideration of H.R. 7500, the authorization before us today which initiates this very important phase of America's space effort.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly urge my colleagues here to thoroughly and conscientiously examine the meaning and effect of this proposed amendment and when that has been done I am confident the great majority of the House will reject it.

The meaning and purpose of this amendment is to eliminate from the committee bill, section (h) and reduce, by several million dollars, the recommended appropriation for various locations, item 12, in section (b).

In truth and reality the result of any acceptance of this amendment would be an enforced delay, of at least a year, not of the actual start of construction of an electronic research center, anywhere, but also of the further study, by NASA of the need of such a research center in the public and national interest.

Let us bear in mind that the officials of this vitally important agency have, in fulfillment of their directed and public responsibility, already recommended, after considerable study, the construction of such a center and presented impressive evidence as to the need for it. This is their job, this is their sworn duty. It is, indeed, the duty of congressional committees to review departmental recommendations and scrutinize the evidence presented by departmental witnesses. I submit that the record before us clearly shows that the NASA witnesses conscientiously attempted to fulfill their duty and, certainly, the distinguished chairman and dedicated members of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics have fully discharged their onerous responsibility of insuring that this Nation maintains its competitive position in space exploration and related projections, with good sense and economical expenditures. In accord with this wise attitude the committee instructed, in this bill, the agency to further study the need for an electronic research center and to justify, further, the recommended location. Pending the congressional committees review, over a 45-day period, of these additional agency reports the agency shall take no implementing action; could anything be fairer or more protective of the legislative duty and responsibility involved?

Mr. Chairman, I submit that space exploration and its associated activities is of vital importance to national security and development; that the subject itself is a highly technical one requiring intense and persevering study; and that the acclaimed chairman and respected members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics are the most qualified judges and advisers in this difficult legislative field. Let us, therefore, accept their studious judgment and patriotic recommendations, as presented in this bill, and reject this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WYDLER) there were—ayes 64, noes 111.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMAS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7500) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations; and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 467, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SILER

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SILER. I am, sir, in its present condition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. SILER moves that the bill (H.R. 7500) be recommitted to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 335, nays 57, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

YEAS—335

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Alger
Anderson
Andrews
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bates
Becker
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton,
  Frances P.
Bolton,
  Oliver P.
Bonner
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Denton
Derounian
Diggs
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Ford
Foreman
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gavin
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Landrum
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Norblad
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Powell
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shelley
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Snyder
Springer
Staebler
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tollefson
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
White
Whitener
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
  Charles H.
Wright
Wydler
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—57

Abele
Arends
Ashbrook
Beermann
Berry
Betts
Bow
Brown, Ohio
Byrnes, Wis.
Clausen,
  Don H.
Collier
Cunningham
Curtis
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Findley
Gathings
Gross
Hall
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Jensen
Johansen
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Knox
Laird
Langen
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Michel
Minshall
Morton
Nelsen
O'Konski
Pillion
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Short
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Thomson, Wis.
Utt
Wharton
Wilson, Ind.
Wyman
Younger

NOT VOTING—40

Bass
Battin
Blatnik
Brotzman
Buckley
Colmer
Cramer
Davis, Tenn.
Dent
Dingell
Everett
Evins
Fino
Flynt
Gonzalez
Gray
Griffin
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Libonati
Macdonald
Miller, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
Poage
Price
Rains
Robison
Scott
Sheppard
Smith, Iowa
Stafford
Thompson, La.
Thornberry
Trimble
Vinson
Whitten
Winstead

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Trimble with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Brotzman.

Mr. Libonati with Mr. Stafford.

Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Robison.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Nix.

Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Price.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Gonzalez.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Evins.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Colmer.

Mr. Bass with Mr. Everett.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Whitten.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Smith of Iowa.

Mr. Winstead with Mr. Flynt.

Messrs. JOHANSEN and HUTCHINSON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed, H.R. 7500.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, although I am very pleased that this bill has been passed by such an overwhelming majority, I deplore the fact that the bill makes such deep cuts in the recommendations of the committee for NASA support of university grants. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH] very properly pointed out that his amendment only retained the program at last year's level, but I vigorously dispute his contentions concerning the effect of such a reduction. The gentleman from Indiana would have this valuable program stand still at a time when we are trying to surge forward in the space effort. If we stand still in providing talent for the future, how can America hope to maintain future leadership in space?

I have the greatest admiration and sympathy for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] in the attacks which they made on certain silly sounding projects sponsored by NASA. The New York Herald Tribune and other newspapers deserve great credit for bringing to light these unfortunate projects. I have no doubt that much good has emerged in the past from studies which sounded a little stupid when they started. I have no doubt that some scientific justification could be mustered to support some of these studies. But for the life of me I cannot figure out why these ridiculous sounding studies cannot be financed by universities, private foundations, or individuals outside the Government.

The space program is too vital to America's future to be hurt so much by those who administer it. The blame for this situation lies right on NASA's doorstep. At a time when the need is so desperate for training the scientists and engineers needed to carry on the space program in future years, NASA is really hurting that vital effort by using taxpayers' money for a few questionable projects which are difficult if not impossible to defend. You can scarcely blame some Members of Congress for getting stampeded when it turns out that Government funds are being used for studies which are on the face ridiculous.

What NASA really ought to do is to detail one of its staff from West Virginia to go through these projects and throw out the silly ones. All this needs is a down-to-earth person with a sense of humor. We may not have many NASA contracts in West Virginia, but we sure know how to pick a few rotten apples out of a barrel.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Saturday to file a report on the bill S. 1163.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

STRENGTHENING AND IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. SISK, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 469, Rept. No. 632), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

PETROLEUM STUDY COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have requested a 2 hour special order for next Tuesday for the purpose of a bipartisan discussion of a Petroleum Study Committee report to the President. This study, or report, on the petroleum industry was submitted to the President early in September 1962, but was not made public until last month.

This study was submitted on behalf of the Departments of State, Treasury, Defense, Justice, Commerce, Labor, and Interior. It reveals the thinking of those in Government whose philosophy would lead to complete control of the petroleum industry. The conclusion and recommendations of this study group are quite misleading and dangerous indeed. They constitute an open invitation to paralyzing Government controls and threaten the liquidation of the competitive oil and gas industry.

Domestic oil prices are low, not high, by any standard. During the period of import controls, prices have been reduced. State conservation programs and percentage depletion have resulted in more oil and gas at lower prices to the consuming public. During the time we have had an import control program, crude oil prices have declined 3.2 percent while prices on other commodities, excluding farm products and foods, increased 1.6 percent.

The relatively low price at which oil is presently sold may also be demonstrated by the fact that crude oil today sells for less than 7 cents per gallon and is the cheapest liquid bought and sold in our economy. Because of this low cost some 2,500 petroleum products are available at prices within the means of all Americans. A gallon of gasoline, for example, not including taxes, costs less than two cups of coffee, about half as much as a gallon of distilled water and one-fifth as much as a gallon of milk.

Mr. Speaker, additional Federal controls cannot assure national security as to oil or adequate supplies at low prices for the consuming public. It is my belief—and apparently the belief of a great majority of this Congress—that the highest national interest is served by maintaining a healthy dynamic oil industry. We cannot accomplish this through greater control and Federal regulation of this vital industry. I invite my colleagues to join a group of us in this very important bipartisan discussion next Tuesday.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, every year since coming to the Congress it has been my practice to submit a questionnaire to the people of the Sixth District of Florida asking their views on matters of national importance.

This year over 52,047 people responded to the poll. I believe this to be the largest return to a congressional poll in the country. Because of the size and makeup of the district, it reflects a good cross section of American opinion.

Florida's Sixth District has a population now estimated at 800,000. During the period 1950–60 the largest county grew 297.9 percent, the second largest 98 percent. This growth indicates that residents have come from all over the Nation and their opinions reflect to great extent those views which were acquired in other areas. Southern Florida is therefore all-American in origin and background.

An adequate sampling, then, of the residents of this district is most significant—52,047 represents 10 percent of the estimated adult population, considerably beyond the standard for most opinion polls.

Tabulation has been completed on the question, "Do you believe the United States should work for a nuclear test ban treaty with adequate controls?" and 81.6 responded yes, 13.4 responded no, 5 percent did not answer.

I know this result will be of interest to all, as it is a clear expression of the views of over 52,000 representative Americans.

The Sixth District of Florida is basically conservative. The 81.6 percent supporting a treaty with adequate controls are not "leftwingers," "ban-the-bomb" marchers, or even disarmament champions. They are average Americans, concerned about the nuclear arms race and its effects on our present generation and of generations yet unborn. They will support a test-ban treaty with adequate controls.

The Senate of the United States will have the responsibility to insure that the present treaty adequately provides for the security of our country. If in their wisdom they determine that it is such a treaty and give the President their advice and consent, the American people will support their decision.

PENNSYLVANIA VOTERS FOR AREA REDEVELOPMENT

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I again direct your attention to the special election held in the 15th District of Pennsylvania to fill the vacancy created by the death of our distinguished colleague, Francis Walter.

The outcome of this election was an overwhelming endorsement of President Kennedy and the administration program. The man who will replace our late colleague campaigned on the President's program and he campaigned as a "liberal, Kennedy Democrat."

Unlike other special elections where the turnout has been comparatively light, 60 percent of the voters turned out for this one. They elected the Democratic candidate by more than 6,500 votes.

An important point in the campaign of our new colleague was his contention that the area redevelopment program is good, that it has benefited Pennsylvania, that it should be expanded.

The Democratic candidate repeatedly stressed his belief in this effort to create more jobs, to provide needed public facilities, to combat automation, to diversify local economies.

The voters endorsed his position.

They endorsed area redevelopment.

Those of you who have said the administration program is lacking in popular support obviously have missed your mark.

I believe it is also important to note that the far right through its mouthpiece Human Events loudly acclaimed the merits of the Republican candidate. This election is indicative of the revulsion the American people feel toward this extremist movement whose leader has called democracy a fraud.

Area redevelopment is important to Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District, and the voters knew it. The program has already creatd 8,000 jobs in Pennsylvania. It is of vital importance to the Sixth Pennsylvania District which I represent and where there are many coal region communities suffering economic distress.

Under the area redevelopment program studies have already begun in the 15th Congressional District. From these studies have come proposals for projects, projects which depend on the passage of the President's ARA proposals, which would mean 500 jobs to the people of the 15th District, 366 coming directly as the result of the ARA projects.

We can begin to realize the importance of these jobs to the district when we consider that any time you bring into a community an industry with 100 jobs, on the average you bring in 359 people, $710,000 of additional spending power, $229,000 in new bank deposits, $330,000 in spending in local stores and about 100 more autos.

And, of course, the well-being of the 15th Congressional District is closely tied to the well-being of the entire State of Pennsylvania.

The voters are aware of the importance of a program which could bring their State 47,641 new jobs—of which almost 29,000 would come directly from the programs of area redevelopment.

Mr. Speaker, too often, when recited on the floor, these figures emerge as just cold statistics. They are not cold statistics to those benefited by this program.

To the voters of Pennsylvania's 15th District—and other voters in my district and other districts in every State in the Union—they are new job opportunities that mean a chance for human beings to live in dignity and to lead lives that are useful to themselves, their families, and their community. They are new or expanding industries that mean survival, growth, progress to the communities in which these people live.

Mr. Speaker, the voters do not forget these things, even if many of us occasionally do, as we did by rejecting ARA extension last June 12.

The overwhelming turnout came despite the fact that a Republican Governor had deliberately scheduled the election in the midsummer to reduce the size of the vote and thereby allow his party's political apparatus to push through its candidate. They came to give a victory of more than 6,500 votes to the candidate who championed the programs that are so important to them, and they soundly repudiated the Republican candidate who, ignoring the needs of his district, opposed these programs.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the new Representative of Pennsylvania's 15th District, Fred Rooney, on his resounding victory, and I look forward to working with him here.

I know that his voice will be heard frequently here. I only hope that the voice of his constituents, who spoke so clearly yesterday, will not be ignored by this body when we next consider the area redevelopment program.

APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL IN COMPETITIVE CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would provide for the appointment of postmasters by the Postmaster General in the competitive civil service and, accordingly, removes these offices from the field of congressional patronage. I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague, Congresswoman Green, in proposing this change which, in my opinion, will strengthen the postal services, relieve Members of Congress from a time-consuming task for which we are ill-equipped and, further, will aid in strengthening the political organizations by eliminating what all too frequently is a most disruptive influence.

The postal service, as everyone knows, has become a most complex department of Government. As the Postmaster General recently said, it is not only a big business but it is one of the most important services rendered by Government to the American people. Good Government and sound business practices demand that the executive management of the many post offices be in the hands of experienced well-trained people appointed in an atmosphere free from the clash of partisan political considerations. Further demanded is the encouragement and reward for work well done to members of the postal service who will have an opportunity to advance on the basis of merit rather than on the winds of political change.

It may be said that more rather than less patronage would strengthen the political parties. I am sure that there is not a Member of Congress who has been concerned with these matters who would not agree that the intense competition for these positions engenders bitterness between party workers which results in far more disunity than it does harmony. Many officials of my own Democratic Party have so expressed themselves to me. The great Postmaster General and master politician Jim Farley's pithy comments on the subject of political patronage are too well known to bear repeating.

I introduce this proposal with no disrespect at all intended to those fine people from both political parties who have and are filling postmaster offices with distinction and devotion under the system in effect today. I am sure that many of them would agree that the series of recommendatory procedures commonly used—that is, a patronage committee makes a recommendation to a central committee which makes a recommendation to the Congressman who makes a recommendation to the Postmaster General who makes a recommendation to the President who makes an appointment to which, in most instances, the Senate must give its advice and consent—is unnecessarily complex and outmoded.

The savings in time alone of the many officials involved would justify the changes proposed, for time and redtape cost money. The Members of Congress will find that they have more time to better perform their job of representing their districts on local, national, and international issues on which we already have too little time to spend.

I respectfully commend this bill to the consideration of my colleagues in both parties.

DISTINGUISHED SCIENTISTS SUPPORT TEST-BAN TREATY

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter and an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, a very distinguished constituent of mine—the recipient of a Nobel Prize in physics—Prof. Owen Chamberlain of Berkeley and the University of California, has spoken out decisively, in a letter to the President of the United States, in support of the nuclear test-ban treaty initialed in Moscow last week. Professor Chamberlain is one of this country's most noted and knowledgeable experts in the field of nuclear physics. His letter carries a thoughtful but penetrating message which I believe our colleagues will find of importance.

Professor Chamberlain has been joined in his position by the Federation of American Scientists—a national, nonpartisan organization of more than 2,500 scientists concerned with the importance of science on national and international affairs. In a statement released yesterday, the federation stressed that:

> Those of us who know from our work the capabilities of nuclear weapons and the risks of annihilation to which mankind is exposed believe that our Nation should make every reasonable effort to achieve a system of effective international disarmament under proper safeguards. We are greatly encouraged by the test ban agreement and believe it deserves prompt and overwhelming support from the American people.

The federation's paper provides a thoughtful and informed critique to the voices which have been raised in opposition to the limited test ban treaty. It is a critique which deserves the full attention of the Congress.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *July 25, 1963.*

President JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is my hope that you will very soon be putting before Congress a test ban agreement. I want you to know that I am an enthusiastic supporter of the administration in this matter.

Besides the substantive value of a test ban agreement in slowing the arms race, it has taken on great symbolic value. Ratification of the agreement will indicate to the world the acceptance by the great powers of their responsibility to maintain the present uneasy peace and to build for a firmer peace.

I am aware that you will be bombarded with literature from those who still say that the United States is behind in the arms race and cannot catch up under a test ban, or who say that the United States is ahead and could not maintain its lead under a test ban, or that the United States has urgent need for such and such weapon development that could not proceed under a test ban. Of course some of these statements are true, and, to a degree, will always be true. There will never be a time when we can expect to negotiate what are essentially military limitations on the Soviet Union without simultaneously accepting military limitations for ourselves. We must remember that complete freedom of action by all nations means continuation of the arms race. Only by tempering that freedom can we hope to improve the climate in this troubled world.

I am not familiar with the details of the contemplated new agreement, but I am familiar with the thinking within the administration that is behind such an agreement and I respect it highly.

At the present time there are only three nuclear powers of military significance. No one can foresee what the world might be like if there were many more strong nuclear powers, but it is clear that international tensions could be much worse than they are now. While few would argue that a test ban agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union would be sufficient to halt nuclear developments in other countries, it is clear that the test ban is a necessary first step toward discouraging other countries. In this sense it is a first step toward a more rational world order.

According to newspaper reports, the new agreement may be very similar to that proposed by both the present and the previous administrations in the United States. If the Soviet Union has finally become reasonable on this point, I hope we are prepared to capitalize on the situation.

I commend you, Mr. President, on your test ban policy and I hope the Congress can be counted on to give solid support.

Sincerely yours,

OWEN CHAMBERLAIN.

STATEMENT OF THE FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS ON THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

The three-power nuclear test ban agreement recently initialed in Moscow is strongly endorsed by the Federation of American Scientists. Our members who have participated in the development of nuclear weapons welcome this first step in the control of the nuclear arms race. The federation believes that this treaty is in the overall interest and that the risks involved are small compared with those in a world without such an agreement. We hope that this agreement may contribute to the reduction of international tensions and lead to more substantial arms control and disarmament agreements. Those of us who know from our work the capabilities of nuclear weapons and the risks of annihilation to which mankind is exposed believe that our Nation should make every reasonable effort to achieve a system of effective international disarmament under proper safeguards. We are greatly encouraged by the test ban agreement and believe it deserves prompt and overwhelming support from the American people as a demonstration to the world that our Nation plans to lead in the path away from nuclear destruction.

President Kennedy's speech last Friday night summarized eloquently the great risks of a continued arms spiral and the spread of nuclear weapons. We feel that the public may wish to have more information about possible risks of the nuclear test ban agreement, and we therefore discuss briefly here some relevant technical questions.

There is almost no chance that a nation could perform a series of militarily important nuclear test explosions without being detected. Techniques which have been developed during the past few years allow the detection and identification of nuclear explosions at all altitude ranges out to very great distances in space. For example, new electronic techniques for measuring perturbations in the ionosphere provide a very sensitive means of detecting explosions at upper altitudes. Methods of sampling for radioactivity, including both capture of actual debris on filters and observations of delayed gamma rays, provide a very sensitive method of identifying low-yield nuclear explosions.

It is conceivable that nuclear test explosions could be conducted so far out in space as to escape detection. However, present ground-based equipment can detect megaton tests taking place 1 million kilometers from the earth, and larger tests can be detected at correspondingly larger distances. If the United States decides to deploy satellite detection systems, then megaton tests could be detected at distances greater than the distance to the sun, out of several hundred million kilometers. Similarly, a megaton test behind the moon could be detected by delayed gamma radiation.

There are other reasons why tests at these distances must be considered unlikely. They would be difficult to conduct, would be very expensive, and might require months to elapse between the launch and the explosion. There is a high probability that the launchings would be noted and special efforts made to identify or to follow the space vehicles. The lack of experience of both the United States and the U.S.S.R. in conducting such experiments, would be another hindrance to such a program.

It has been suggested that the Soviet Union might attempt to shield multimegaton explosions in space by interposing shields containing lead dust between the explosion and the earth. Shields could reduce the detection range by perhaps a factor of 10. Such a shielded test in deep space could cost on the order of $100 million and, like all untried systems, would involve considerable risk of failure and detection. In view of the costs and uncertainties involved, it seems unlikely that the Soviet Union would consider it worthwhile to carry out such tests. Smaller tests could be far more easily conducted underground on earth.

Because of the great expense and difficulty of methods of concealing useful nuclear test explosions in the prohibited environments, any signatory nation that decided that it needed to conduct further tests would probably use the escape clause rather than embark on secret tests in violation of the treaty. Yet there is good reason to expect that none of the major nuclear nations will wish to end the agreement, for the continued ban on tests offers more advantages to the nuclear powers than a period of renewed testing.

If the Soviet Union should resume nuclear testing in the prohibited environments, our Nation would be prepared to conduct then such tests as required to maintain our position of nuclear deterrence. No decisive change in relative defense postures could be achieved by a sudden resumption of tests. Thus, since no major nuclear power can gain greatly by testing, we can hope that the test agreement will endure. Our Nation's weapon development laboratories can be maintained by a program of underground test explosions until satisfactory arrangements are found to ban these tests also.

It is sometimes asserted that further testing is necessary for the United States to develop a defense against missiles. In fact, nuclear weapons technology is only one of many fields that must be mastered if a missile defense is to be achieved, and it appears that these other areas represent far more significant barriers to the achievement of such a system than does the area of weapon technology. Thus, the problem of discriminating between an incoming missile warhead and various decoys that might be accompanying it is exceedingly difficult, as is the related problem of handling a large number of incoming vehicles at the same time. If these critical technical problems are solved, warheads for the antimissile missile can be developed underground. It is only measurements of radar blackout, warhead vulnerability, and actual live system tests that might require atmospheric testing. Measurements of blackout were made in recent tests in the Pacific. While atmospheric tests could assist in these developments, General Wheeler, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, stated in a television interview last weekend that the United States could now develop an antimissile system without further atmospheric nuclear explosions.

Similarly, the development of missile systems to penetrate any Soviet missile defense can proceed without atmospheric nuclear testing. Here is involved the development of smaller warheads and penetration aids such as new guidance, communication, decoy, and jamming techniques, and all these can proceed under the test ban agreement.

It has been suggested that the United States must develop a very high yield nuclear weapon to keep pace with the Soviet Union. On the contrary, there does not appear to be any justifiable military reason for the United States to have such a weapon. Our arsenal of nuclear weapons is already much more than adequate for any probable military targets. Smaller weapons, when used in sufficient quantity, provide a more reliable, more effective, and perhaps cheaper method of attacking targets than do a few high yield weapons. This is in fact the direction in which the United States has been moving in its weapon development and for which its present delivery systems are designed. If the United States had a military requirement for such large yield weapons, it would have tested them during the past years when there have been many nuclear explosions.

There are firm indications that other nations will soon sign the test-ban agreement. All mankind is exposed to the dangers of radioactive contamination, and there will be great pressure from public opinion in all countries to urge governments to sign the agreement.

The Federation of American Scientists believes that it would be a national catastrophe if the pending test ban agreement were not ratified by the U.S. Senate. Ratification is clearly in our national interest. Moreover, peoples throughout the world would be deeply disappointed if our Nation should reject this chance to halt the dangers of radioactive contamination of the atmosphere, and to improve the chance for further agreements. Rejection by the Senate would have a disastrous effect on U.S. prestige. On the other hand, prompt ratification by a very substantial margin will demonstrate to all the world that the United States stands ready to join in further steps to control nuclear armaments and to reduce the worldwide dangers of the arms race.

WILDERNESS BILL

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am proposing a wilderness bill in support of Mr. SAYLOR's bill, H.R. 930, the many similar bills in the House of Representatives, and S. 4 in the Senate.

The wording of this bill incorporates 7 years' work of many contributors. The present bill does not depart from that work. The time has come to save wilderness areas, "not temporarily by administrative decision, but permanently by law." Our remaining wilderness is an impermanent asset requiring immediate protection.

This is not a complicated bill. It pinpoints responsibility for wilderness areas in the Congress, where by the Constitution the responsibility must be.

This means that the preservation of wilderness must be governed by law. It cannot be governed by the discretionary powers of administrators, subject as they are to the extraordinary pressures that have always existed in this area.

It is the constitutional duty of Congress to protect the Nation's wilderness. By article IV, section 3, clause 2:

> Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

The areas dealt with in this bill constitute "territory" within the meaning of this clause. But pending enactment of a wilderness bill, Congress is without an enabling law by which to observe this power. No detractor or obstructor of this bill ever goes so far as to deny the basic need for subjecting to the congressional control stipulated by the Constitution an activity which has become de facto a matter of executive discretion. The broad present limits of this discretion were set out by Mr. SAYLOR, addressing the House on June 27:

> In present circumstances, in the absence of positive congressional action regarding wilderness, a Secretary of Agriculture, if he wished to, could put 7.1 million acres of presently unclassified national forest land within wilderness areas that he could now establish. Or, if he wished to, he could abolish areas within which there are now preserved more than 14 million acres of wilderness. The fate of 21 million acres of wilderness is in his hands, in the absence of congressional directives.

But by section 3(h) of this bill, wilderness areas, once established as such according to the bill, can only be changed by law. This is a legal guarantee for wilderness areas.

Further, anyone considering this bill must consider this characteristic of wilderness: each year it erodes. Each year there is less of it. Once gone, it cannot be brought back. As time goes by, the opportunity to save the wilderness evaporates. To delay this subject indefinitely is to kill it.

Three points might be expressed in argument against the bill at the present time. These are:

First. There should be a review of primitive areas before they are declared protected by the wilderness bill. Find out what sort of resource we have here, before we "lock 'em up."

Second. Preserve existing uses—chiefly water resources development and mining—now allowed.

Third. There should be a requirement of affirmative action by Congress to approve change in wilderness areas.

The answer to the first point—that there should be a review of all primitive areas before they are declared wilderness—is contained in the bill. The bill says that wilderness, wild, and canoe areas shall be protected immediately. That is just as definite as though Pennsylvania, New York, and Maryland were named. These categories are known, mapped, and surveyed as such. Then the bill says the primitive areas will also be protected, but orders a 10-year review of primitive areas. About 6 million acres of the rough total of 14 million acres protected by this bill are primitive.

The second point—that existing uses should be preserved—is also in large measure contained in the bill. This bill is careful about reasonableness. The most important existing uses—mining and grazing rights—are preserved. Wilderness areas are protected against the acquisition of further rights.

The third point against the bill—that Congress should act affirmatively in the case of each proposed change in the wilderness area—is specious. Section 3(f) in the bill specifically reserves to Congress the right of veto over any change. The subsection advocates machinery which long inquiry has established as practical. This is a probable focus point of opposition to the bill, for it can be attacked here on the grounds of violation of the dignity of Congress, instead of the probable real basis of hostility to the bill, the desire not to sequester 14 million acres of useful property as sacrosanct wilderness. Any reasonable reading of section 3(f) will recognize that there is no violation of the supervisory powers of Congress therein.

It may be objected that the only wilderness I represent is Central Park. But the sparseness of wilderness in my district makes the need for it all the greater. That need is common to many of us Americans. It does not depend on means. Americans either find the time or good shape or inclination to go to the wilderness themselves, or remain in some way glad that our country still produces people who can live in a wilderness for a while, and glad that the country still keeps this wilderness preserved for any future American to turn to. Sooner or later those values are indispensable to us.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I in my turn submit a wilderness bill to this Congress.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF AUGUST 5

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader if he will please inform the House of the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we have concluded the legislative business for this week. The program for next week is as follows: Monday, Consent Calendar. There are seven bills under suspension of the rules:

S. 874, to design, construct, and equip buildings required for the Bureau of the Mint.

S. 1652, amending the National Cultural Center Act.

H.R. 82, to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses.

H.R. 1157, to exclude cargo which is lumber from certain tariff filing requirements under the Shipping Act, 1916.

S. 1194, to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard.

H.R. 5623, to amend the provisions of title 14, United States Code, relating to the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of officers of the Coast Guard.

H.R. 6997, to provide for a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated national program in oceanography.

On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday we have the Private Calendar and H.R. 4955, the Vocational Educational Act of 1963, on which there is an open rule with 3 hours of debate.

Next we have H.R. 7824, to continue for the period ending November 30, 1963, the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

This announcement, of course, is made subject to the general reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program may be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, AUGUST 5

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday next week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE SOURCES OF A SO-CALLED CUBAN EXPERT, OR WHAT DO WE MEAN BY CONFIRMATION?

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on July 16, 1963, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date on page 12708, I had occasion to bring to the attention of the House a published report to the effect that a certain well-known self-styled expert on Cuba in another body actually did not have the special, inside mysterious intelligence information he has tried to suggest he had, but instead had gotten his information from newspaper stories which had already been in print before he spoke to newspapers not regularly read in Washington.

This report was made in a syndicated column which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of July 12, 1963, by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak. I challenged that Cuban expert in the other body either to institute suit for libel against these two reporters or else apologize to the American people and to the Congress of the United States.

To date that Cuban expert has not sued, he has not apologized, but he also has been careful not specifically and unequivocally to deny the published report.

Mr. Speaker, since reading that report I have done some research of my own on the speeches of that expert, and I have compared them with certain newspaper reports. I think Members may be interested in the result of this research.

Of course there has been a lot of interest in the sources of this expert's information.

From the outset the sources of the information out of which his charges arose have been surrounded with much secrecy. On "Meet the Press" on May 12, 1963, the Senator said:

> All of the information that I have received and have ever used * * * has come from either one of two sources: (1) Government sources, or (2) other sources later confirmed by official Government sources, and most of it was directly from official Government sources.

Again on June 25, 1963, an editorial in the Binghamton Sun-Bulletin based on an interview with the junior Senator from New York contained the following:

> We asked where he had gotten the information last year. It came, he said, mostly from middle and lower level officials within the Government who were somehow unable to get their intelligence reports across to the high-level decisionmakers in the administration. A small amount of information—perhaps 5 percent—came from Cuban exiles, and the rest from American officials.

On the "Today" television show on September 4, 1962, Senator KEATING said:

> I certainly am not going to compromise my sources.

And again on "Meet the Press" on May 12, 1963, the Senator said:

> I would not reveal the names of the dedicated and patriotic people in government who have given me this information. I think that would be a disservice to them and would result in injury to fine, patriotic Americans.

Now on July 12, 1963, in a syndicated column which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune written by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, the following statement was made about the junior Senator from New York:

> To this very day, the White House is dying to know the identify of KEATING's Government leak.
>
> The answer is hilariously simple: He had no Government informants. At least no direct Government informants.
>
> KEATING's chief source was a friendly newspaper correspondent who gave his remarkably reliable tips to KEATING after—not before—the information appeared in his own newspaper back home.

On July 16, 1963, I challenged the Senator either to sue these two columnists for libel or else to apologize to the Congress and the American people for this massive scissors and pastepot hoax over Cuba. The Senator has not apologized, but neither has he sued, and neither has he specifically denied the Evans and Novak charges.

A careful comparison between several key Keating speeches and some newspaper stories already in print before the Senator spoke will be enlightening.

Take, for example, the speech which Senator KEATING made in the Senate on Cuba on August 31, 1962. It appears in the RECORD for that date in volume 108, part 14, page 18359. This speech bears a number of very remarkable similarities to an article by Nat Finney which appeared on the front page of the Buffalo Evening News of 2 days earlier, August 29. For example, compare the following direct quotations:

> 1. Finney: "It was not until reports had accumulated about a landing August 2 and 3 at the former Marania docks at Mariel and could be checked and double checked that American intelligence had to accept as fact that Soviet troops were arriving in Cuba in force and that a new pattern had developed. * * * From 10 to 12 Soviet ships unloaded."
>
> KEATING. "I am reliably informed—when I say 'reliably informed,' I mean that has been checked out from five different sources, and I am certain I can state it as a fact—that between the dates of August 4 and August 15, 10 to 12 Soviet vessels anchored at the Marante dock area at Mariel.
>
> 2. Finney. "A high cinderblock wall had been built around the dock area in Mariel and the unloadings were handled under heavy security guard."
>
> KEATING. "The dock area previously had been surrounded by the construction of a high cinderblock wall."
>
> 3. Finney. "From 10 to 12 Soviet ships unloaded. They ranged from 6,000 to 10,000 tons burden. A contingent of 1,200 Soviet troops wearing fatigue uniforms disembarked from these ships and helped unload them under strict military discipline."
>
> KEATING. "The Soviet ships unloaded 1,200 troops. Troops is what I mean, not technicians. They were wearing Soviet fatigue uniforms."
>
> 4. Finney. "Soviet torpedo boats, suitable for the support of Central American insurrectos, were unloaded August 2 and 3 at Mariel, Cuba, and are now moored at LaBase, near Mariel."
>
> KEATING. "On August 13, five Soviet torpedo boats unloaded from Soviet ships, and are now moored at LaBase."
>
> 5. Finney. "A large Soviet convoy—reliably observed August 3 on the Carretera Central, between LaEsperanze and Jicotea, west of Santa Clara—contained a number of amphibious vehicles in addition to other military supplies. * * * This convoy was manned by Soviet military personnel and unmistakably military order."
>
> KEATING. "On August 3, a large convoy of military vehicles manned by Soviet personnel was observed on the highway in Las Villas Province. The convoy moved in military order and contained the first amphibious vehicles observed in Cuba; also jeeps, 6 by 6 trucks, and tracked trucks."
>
> (NOTE.—LaEsperanze, Jicotea, and Santa Clara are in Las Villas Province.)

The Senator was proud of his special contribution here. He said this:

> If the President has no evidence, I'm giving him the evidence this afternoon.

Four days after that speech which was, of course, a publicity sensation, the junior Senator appeared on the "Today" television show on September 4, 1962. See how closely his remarks there paralleled a front page story that had appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of just the day before, September 3, 1962, by Keith Morfett, of the London Daily Mail. Incidentally, these statements were made by the Senator as "new information which will document his contention":

> 6. Tribune: "I watched the Russians in two separate encampments."
>
> KEATING: "Many of them are located in two camps, just outside of Havana."
>
> 7. Tribune: "Many of the Russians at this encampment were billeted in what was the

former boys reformatory at Torrens, about 14 miles from Havana."

KEATING: "One group is billeted in a former boys' reformatory, 14 miles from Havana."

8. Tribune: "10 more Soviet vessels are at this moment Havana-bound on the high seas."

KEATING: There are 10 ships now on their way to Cuba, now on the high seas."

9. Tribune: "From Soviet ports also now Havana-bound are the East German *Westfalen*, the Norwegian *Tive Lillian*, the Greek cargo ship *Parnow*, the Italian *Airone*, the West German *Atlas*, and half a dozen ships flying the Liberian flag."

KEATING: "One East German, one Norwegian, one Italian, one Greek, one West German, and four to six ships carrying the Liberian flag."

10. Tribune: "A number of British vessels are on the way to Russian ports to begin the long haul to the Caribbean."

KEATING: "There are several British ships on their way from English ports to the Black Sea."

11. Tribune: "A continuous 'armada' of cargo ships is now stretched out between Russia's Black Sea ports and Cuba, carrying trucks, jeeps, machinery, food, guns, and ground-to-air missiles."

KEATING: "These ships that are now on the high seas, like the ones which have been landed there, carry trucks, jeeps, some food, guns, ground-to-air missiles, electronic equipment, and other material."

12. Tribune: "The contrast between the El Cano crowd and the next lot I looked at was so great that it became clear Cuba's Russians fall into two distinct categories. The El Cano Russians were recruited into 'labor battalions' rather like the British Army's Pioneer Corps."

KEATING: "These camps that are located that house these personnel near Havana are divided into—there are either two or three—one of them is a labor battalian. Now those are the types that we use in our Army."

13. Tribune: "Hundreds more military trucks, jeeps, and command vehicles were lined up five deep for quarter of a mile along the street called San Pedro on the Havana waterfront. These vehicles are all marked in Russian 'Goriskovsky Avtozavod' and are being moved quickly to all parts of the island."

KEATING: "Why they're a quarter of a mile along San Pedro Street in Havana. There are Russian military vehicles, with Russian markings on them, parked five deep, for a quarter of a mile, and those are taken all over the island, as needed."

Senator KEATING made another speech on this same subject in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 17, page 22957. Oddly enough, the verbal parallels with another published newspaper story are remarkable. This time it was a story by Hal Hendrix which appeared on the front page of the Miami News 3 days earlier, on October 7, 1962. It was this speech, you will recall, which really established the Senator's reputation as a great intelligence expert. But notice the parallels with a story already in print in a newspaper not generally read in Washington:

14. Hendrix: "Construction has begun in Communist Cuba on at least a half dozen launching sites for intermediate range tactical missiles. U.S. intelligence authorities have advised the White House."

KEATING: "Mr. President, yesterday I spoke on the subject of Cuba. At that time I did not have fully confirmed the matter to which I shall address myself now. I now have it fully confirmed. * * * Construction has begun on at least a half dozen launching sites for intermediate range tactical missiles."

15. Hendrix: "Although official U.S. spokesmen have declined to disclose the intelligence reports, the Miami News has learned that experts have advised President Kennedy that the ground-to-ground missiles can be operational from inland Cuba within 6 months."

KEATING: "Intelligence authorities must have advised the President and top Government officials of this fact, and they must now have been told that ground-to-ground missiles can be operational from the island of Cuba within 6 months."

16. Hendrix: "From the type of construction underway it has been determined that the launching pads will have the capability of hurling rockets that could penetrate deeply into the United States in one direction and reach the Panama Canal Zone in the opposite direction."

KEATING: "The fact of the matter is, according to my reliable sources, that six launching sites are under construction—pads which will have the power to hurl rockets into the American heartland and as far as the Panama Canal Zone."

Of course, after that the U–2 plane came back with its picture on October 14, and the Cuban crisis was on. But the junior Senator from New York had tasted the heady wine of mysterious prophecy. He made another speech in the Senate on January 31, 1963—RECORD, page 1462—and his information, referred to as "continuing, absolutely confirmed and undeniable evidence" almost rocked the Nation. But, unknown in Washington, Nat Finney had written another page 1 story in the Buffalo Evening News 2 days earlier, on January 29. How remarkably similar to Mr. Finney's language is the Senator's:

17. Finney: "The second Soviet ship arrival, last Friday."

KEATING: "On Friday, January 25, a second large vessel arrived."

18. Finney: "Two large Soviet ships have docked in the island during the past 10 days and are unloading military cargo. * * * High security dockage facilities in Cuba are being used by the ship [the second ship]."

KEATING: "Under maximum security conditions, it [the second ship] unloaded a cargo of armaments."

19. Finney: "This route is not specified by intelligence sources, but it is described as a 'high-security route' that can be followed with the least exposure of secret cargo to free world espionage."

KEATING: "The route followed by these two ships is generally termed a 'maximum se. curity route,' a passage traveled by the Soviets through areas where the United States is least able to maintain adequate surveillance of ships' contents."

20. Finney: "The route followed by this ship in reaching Cuba is the same that was used by Soviet ships that carried the first medium-range ballistic missiles brought to the island during the final weeks of September 1962."

KEATING: "It [the route] is also, ominously enough, the identical route followed last summer by the first of the Soviet vessels carrying medium-range, ground-to-ground missiles into Cuba."

21. Finney: "The event of this ship's arrival has been made more ominous by the fact that Soviet forces on the island have been observed doing routine maintenance work on the MRBM sites from which the Soviets removed their missiles while close U.S. aerial surveillance of the island continued."

KEATING: "There is continuing, absolutely confirmed and undeniable evidence that the Soviets are maintaining and guarding the medium-range sites they had previously constructed in Cuba. There has been no Soviet move to dismantle these concrete sites or withdraw the launching bases."

And so it rather looks as though Nat Finney of the Buffalo Evening News is the "friendly newsman, who works for an Eastern newspaper not generally read in Washington" to whom Messrs. Evans and Novak referred. In fact a column by Kenneth Crawford in the February 18, 1963 issue of Newsweek, almost 5 months before the Evans and Novak column appeared, says this:

> Just where KEATING got his information is still his secret. However, it is a fact that a series of dispatches by Nat Finney, Washington correspondent for the Buffalo Evening News, closely paralleled and anticipated KEATING's early pronouncements, which is suggestive of his source.

In any event, the Keating speeches certainly bore an amazing similarity to the page one news stories already in print before he spoke. Such deadly parallels in so many instances would be virtually impossible for any fairminded observer to dismiss as mere coincidence. Indeed they do amount to solid proof of the earlier Evans and Novak charges.

Finally, we have the claim by the Senator that, whatever his sources might have been, all his information had been confirmed by official Government sources. This claim to official Government confirmation for his newspaper cribbing is of course absurd. The plain fact is that all of the Senator's major alleged inside private intelligence about Cuba has now been refuted by all the solid evidence available, including the unanimous report of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, which the junior Senator from New York has tried to suggest really supports his charges.

The Senator really made three sensational charges. The first, on October 10, was that the Russians had long-range missiles in Cuba.

However, the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee report on Cuban intelligence, unanimously approved on May 9, 1963, says flatly on page 7:

> None of these reports [of long-range missiles in Cuba] were confirmed prior to October 14, 1962.

So the Senator obviously cannot have had the substance of his October 10 speech confirmed by the Government.

The second sensational charge was the one made on January 31, 1963, and described as "absolutely confirmed and undeniable evidence," to the effect that the concrete Cuban long-range missile sites had not been dismantled and were still being maintained. This charge was completely refuted on nationwide television by Secretary McNamara on February 6, 1963, and was not even considered worthy of examination by the Senate subcommittee. Obviously, it, too, was never confirmed by official Government sources, and once again the Senator is wrong.

Third is the charge made on April 18, 1963, before the American Society of Newspaper Editors:

> Several thousand more [Russians] have arrived [in Cuba] * * * there is no reliable evidence whatsoever of a decline in Soviet military strength or capability since those first withdrawals in November.

However, once again, the unanimous Senate subcommittee report, states on page 3:

> A net of 4,000 to 5,000 additional have been withdrawn since the first of the year, our intelligence people say.

They make no reference to any substantial Russian troops going back into Cuba, certainly not by the "thousands." So once again, the Senator obviously could not have had his information confirmed by official Government sources when, as the Senate report shows, it is so wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the people of America are entitled either to an apology or to an explanation. How long must we wait?

THE IMMIGRATION LAWS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has urgently called upon the Congress to implement long overdue and sorely needed changes in our immigration laws.

Five years ago the then Senator Kennedy wrote a pamphlet entitled "A Nation of Immigrants," pointing out at that time that the post-World War I immigration law was discriminatory because of its national origins quota system, whose only test was whether or not an immigrant was born in the right place. Now as President he has offered legislation, whose most important proposal is the gradual elimination of the "national origins" system for selecting immigrants.

It seems almost inconceivable to me that our present annual quotas are based not upon the national origins of our population of 1950 or even 1960, which I might add, is an odious concept at any time for determining who should come to the United States, but upon the national origins of our population in 1920.

Because of the composition of the population at that time, favor was given to immigrants from northern Europe while limiting immigration from southern and eastern Europe and from other parts of the world. Forty-three years later we are still following a system of immigration based on a 1920 census. Why this should be at a time in world history when it is so incumbent upon us to be an example to the world of a nation which is doing its best to be fair, equitable, and nondiscriminatory, continues to elude me.

And as far as I can see, it eludes many many thousands of other Americans too, not least among them our own esteemed President, who has clearly stated in his message to Congress:

> The use of a national origins system is without basis in either logic or reason. It neither satisfies a national need nor accomplishes an international purpose. In an age of interdependence among nations such a system is an anachronism, for it discriminates among applicants for admission in the United States on the basis of accident of birth.

I could not agree more completely.

Mr. Speaker, today, in another area of great concern to us, among the Members of Congress and the people across the Nation, are many of us who are attempting to correct the intolerable and longstanding conditions of discrimination against the Negro in this country. Through the introduction of strong civil rights legislation, including equal employment opportunities legislation, we are attempting to put an end to a deplorable situation that has racked many a conscience and kind heart, and which on a very practical political level, has always lowered the prestige of the United States in the eyes of the rest of the world.

Now, I say, it is time to put an end to another deplorable and discriminatory situation, that of inequitable and outmoded immigration procedures. Because we have been basing our immigration on this 1920 census, we find ourselves denying admission to this country of so many persons, especially of Greek, Italian, Polish and Asian origin. These nations for many years have had way oversubscribed quotas and backlogs up to 100,000 persons trying to gain entrance to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, there are those among us who might fear that the passage of these new immigration laws would result in an indiscriminate flood of immigrants to this country. This is not so. All it would mean is that we would probably fill our present quota of around 157,000 with the addition of a possible few thousand more, and that we would be in a position to allow persons from the countries I have mentioned as well as others, to make use of the unused quota allotments by such countries, for example, as Britain and Ireland, who for years have not filled their immigration quotas.

To me, this is the very least we can do to fulfill our promise of long ago and to justify to ourselves and to the rest of the world the eloquent message of welcome and hope, written on the base of the Statue of Liberty, which greets so many of those who come to America for the first time.

In offering others an opportunity to live in America we are also offering many of our own American citizens the chance to be reunited with many of their relatives of other countries, from whom they have long been separated.

With the passage of new immigration laws, we could end the kind of situation in which an American citizen of Greek origin must wait a year and a half to be reunited with his mother and father, or his brothers and sisters, or as happened in my own congressional district, an American citizen of Turkish origin faces an indefinite waiting period to have her sister join her in the United States.

We have another reason for opening our gates a little wider, a reason that has long been part of the American tradition. This great country was built, as we all know, by immigrants and is today the country of their children and their children's children, whether their parents originally came in the 18th century or the 20th century. We are a melting pot of many people from many lands. What is it we have to fear by adding a little more fresh variety to the melting pot?

My esteemed colleague, the gentleman from New York, the Honorable Emanuel Celler, who as the longstanding chairman of the Judiciary Committee has had years and years of experience with the immigration problem has expressed his views in no uncertain terms in a report he recently released to the American people, and I quote:

> The system of national origins has, over the years shown itself to be completely unworkable and unrealistic.
>
> For humanitarian reasons, for emergency purposes, and under pressure of world events, there has been, through a variety of acts of Congress, superimposed upon that principle, a structure of special laws, special exceptions, special private laws, and a contrived technique of seeking and finding loopholes in the law until the law itself has become a maze of contradictions. It is my considered opinion that the President's bill offers a broad and firm basis for a long overdue revision of our policies and practices in this most important area of domestic and foreign human relations.

I am in complete accord with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], and I would like to strongly urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting with as little delay as possible this new and far-reaching immigration proposal of the President's, introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], as H.R. 7700. I have today introduced a similar bill to indicate my full support of the bill of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler].

REPORT ON ILO CONVENTION

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time merely to say that on Monday next, under my unanimous consent request, I intend to make a report to the House on the ILO Convention which I had the honor of attending, representing the House of Representatives.

NORTHEAST AIRLINES

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, twice before this week, I called the attention of my colleagues to the recent 3-to-2 CAB decision which has decapitated Northeast Airlines by taking away its

New York-Miami run. I have pointed out, during the course of my remarks, the shocking fact that the decision will reduce competition by Government edict and graciously offers to the bleeding corpse a tranquilizing but unnecessary Government subsidy. This is waste at its worse. It has always been my understanding regulatory agencies are meant to control competition but not to obliterate it.

As the decision is scrutinized further, Mr. Speaker, its enormity becomes more apparent. This decision is based upon a finding that there is no present need for a third carrier in the New York-Florida run. As I pointed out yesterday, there are at least two comparable routes that support four airlines and twelve that support three. Removing Northeast will leave this important, and one of the most heavily traveled routes, in the possession of just two airlines, Eastern and National.

Northeast in a period of 7 years increased its share of the market to 60 percent in competition with Eastern and National, at the same time carrying the burden of the profitless New England hauls. If there are only going to be two airlines on this run, why is the most successful the one to be kicked out? Why not take Eastern or National out of the picture? There is an aroma prevading this decision that is cause for concern.

Of the three airlines handling the east coast passenger service, Northeast carried 60.2 percent of the Boston-Miami traffic—35,544 passengers—in the first quarter of 1963 and over half of this business in 1962. It also carried a majority—61.9 percent—of the passengers flying from Boston to Philadelphia and 52.4 percent of the Boston-to-Washington trade.

Compare this, Mr. Speaker, to the number of passengers served on those runs by one of the two airlines which the CAB considers more capable of competing—National Airlines. Only 47 round-trip passengers have been carried from Boston to Miami by that company in 1963—one-tenth of 1 percent of the total. National carried only 1 percent of the passengers between Boston and Philadelphia. Yet the CAB questions whether Northeast can compete with its rivals.

In April a CAB examiner recommended that Northeast be denied the Florida franchise, stating that the Hughes Tool Co., which had controlling interest in the airline, was not interested enough. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how much the CAB considers enough, but the Hughes Tool Co. has put $31,400,000 into rehabilitating the finances of Northeast Airlines. On the very day that the CAB dealt the deathblow to Northeast, it approved another $1 million loan from Hughes. The two members of the CAB who delivered the dissenting opinion pointed out that the Hughes investments more than proves their interest and ability.

Mr. Speaker, if the route's two major airlines cannot compete successfully with Northeast in the market, why should the company which has just won its struggle to overcome acute financial difficulties, caused in part by the weight of the New England short-haul runs, be grounded? For a regulatory agency to thus penalize success is as unfair as it is unwise. Eastern and National of course are delighted as I pointed out yesterday. Laughing heirs always are.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned yesterday, a CAB examiner recently turned down the proposed merger betwen Eastern and American. At that time, it was suggested that this type of merger would reduce competition. CAB now takes away a route suggesting that leaving it with Northeast has created too much competition. This flagrant inconsistency is appalling; there must be more to this than meets the eye. I think the decision and its effect on New England and healthy competition should be most carefully examined by the appropriate committees of this House and by the Department of Justice.

THE PEACE-LOVING REDS

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to pause in the midst of the administration-sponsored victory dance because of the test-ban treaty with the Soviet Union, to consider what the peace-loving Reds are still doing to wreck our country. President Kennedy and Averell Harriman seem to be readying us for the nonaggression pact Mr. Khrushchev is so anxious to get as his next step in disarming and weakening the United States for the final Communist takeover, but they have either forgotten or simply will not admit the Communist subversion and agitation constantly going on in America as part of the Communist conspiracy directed from Moscow.

Two articles from the August 3 issue of Human Events, serve to remind us the Reds have changed neither their color nor their program to destroy us. The first, "Reds Want Negro Unrest," by Holmes Alexander, should serve to remind us that, in spite of denials by the Attorney General, Bobby Kennedy, the Communists have a stake in creating racial tensions here and it will be a grave mistake to underestimate what Red agents may do on August 28 when the Negro march on Washington may easily be turned into a tragedy of death and destruction.

The second article, by Fulton Lewis, Jr., outlines the Communist program to seize the minds of American youth as "Red Recruiters Concentrate on Youth."

The articles follow:

REDS WANT NEGRO UNREST

(By Holmes Alexander)

On January 16, 1958, when Director J. Edgar Hoover was asking a House Appropriations Subcommittee for funds to run the FBI during the next fiscal year, he said:

"The Negro situation is also being exploited fully and continuously by Communists on a national scale. Current programs include intensified attempts to infiltrate Negro mass organizations. The party's objectives are not to aid the Negroes—but are designed to take advantage of all controversial issues on the race question so as to create unrest, dissension, and confusion in the minds of the American people."

Mass demonstrations by Negroes in the North and South, to be culminated with a huge march on Washington next month, were not in the news, as they are now, when Director Hoover gave this dispassionate, succinct, and informed statement of Communist intentions. Last week southern Governors Barnett, of Mississippi, and Wallace, of Alabama, flapped the Red flag in words much like Hoover's. But the Barnett-Wallace testimony before the Commerce Committee's civil rights hearings was too self-interested to be effective.

Another Red object—the Red herring of McCarthyism—came scurrying into the caucus room where McCarthy once performed. The subject of Communist complicity soon got lost amid pious horror of "smearing" the Negro race and its leaders. Somebody suggested that J. Edgar Hoover be summoned as a star witness on the subject, but Chairman WARREN MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, was against it.

Fortunately, it is hardly necessary to call Hoover. A little page leafing through House appropriations hearings show that the FBI Director has several times asked Congress for money for the very purpose of investigating Communist incitation of the Negroes. On March 3, 1961:

"The sit-in demonstrations in the South were a made-to-order issue which the party fully exploited to further its ends."

By now the Director was giving names, places and dates. He mentioned James E. Jackson and Joseph North, "national Communist Party functionaries," who came around for the demonstrations at Richmond, Va., in February 1960. He quoted the Negro Communist, Ben Davis, "the party's national secretary," as stating in March 1960 that Negro demonstrations are the next best thing to "proletarian revolution."

Again, on January 24, 1962:

"Since its inception the Communist Party, U.S.A., has been alert to capitalize on every possible issue or event which could be used to exploit the American Negro in furtherance of party aims. In its efforts to influence the American Negro, the party attempts to infiltrate the legitimate Negro organizations for the purpose of stirring up racial prejudice and hatred. In this way, the party strikes a blow at our democratic form of government by attempting to influence public opinion throughout the world against the United States."

RED RECRUITERS CONCENTRATE ON YOUTH

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

Under consideration in ruling circles of the Communist Party, U.S.A., is a proposal that party membership be extended to youngsters under 18 years of age.

It is only one plank in a proposed program designed to pump new blood into the party, according to J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

"The party's aggressiveness in the youth area is so great," Hoover recently told Congressmen, "that it is now considering for membership individuals who meet only some of the qualifications heretofore required."

Prior exposure to Marxist-Leninist teachings, for instance, is no longer required. All that is needed is an "interest" in the party.

Communist speakers have fanned out across the country, addressing youth groups and student claques in an attempt to recruit new members and to make communism "respectable."

There have been few efforts to combat the massive invasion of U.S. schools by Communist orators. Only in Ohio has the State legislature acted to ban Communist speakers from State-supported schools. Such a bill was signed by Gov. James Rhodes 2 weeks ago.

G-man Hoover insists the Communist danger has not ebbed. He quotes party boss Gus Hall to the effect that 10,000 Americans are official members of the Communist Party while another 100,000 are "state-of-mind" members described as persons sympathetic to the party line and objectives. He says:

"The Communist Party, U.S.A., wields an influence and constitutes a security danger far out of proportion to its membership. It is organized to penetrate with its ideas and tactics almost every segment of our society. The party need not be nor does it want to be a large mass organization. It prefers to remain small, developing mass strength through front organizations it controls and directs in its own interest."

Under Hoover's direction, the FBI now has under investigation some 165 known or suspected Communist-front or Communist-infiltrated organizations.

Some of these groups are Communist-created. In many instances, however, the party urges its members to join and infiltrate legitimate nonsubversive organizations and gain control.

Communists infiltrated the New York branch of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, gaining considerable influence before they were exposed by a Senate subcommittee. The national organization then purged the New York chapter of all known Reds.

Communist Party members have joined Women Strike for Peace in droves. They have tried to infiltrate organizations working for civil rights, such as the NAACP and Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

ADMINISTRATION TURNS PLANNED SURPLUS INTO LARGE DEFICIT

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, July 17 President Kennedy announced that the final figures for the fiscal year ending June 30 showed an administrative budget deficit of $6.2 billion—or $2.6 billion less than estimated in January 1963. The administration cited increased sales of Government-owned financial assets, expenditure reductions, and increased Federal tax collections as the three primary reasons for reduction in the size of the deficit.

However, neither the Presidential statement nor the joint statement issued by Treasury Secretary Dillon and Budget Director Gordon the next day, made any mention of the original fiscal 1963 budget estimate made in January 1962. It should be recalled that at that time the administration predicted a 1963 budget surplus of $463 million. Contrasting the final results to the original estimates casts an entirely different light on the administration's fiscal performance over the past year.

I have had a table prepared comparing the original budget estimates with the final figures for fiscal 1963. I ask unanimous consent that this table be included in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. The table shows that despite the administration's claim to have made "widespread" expenditure reductions, spending actually increased $53 million over the original estimate.

The major increases were in the Agriculture Department, which spent $1 billion more than originally estimated. Post Office expenditures increased by nearly a half a billion dollars. Interest on the public debt was $9.8 billion, $600 million more than estimated in January 1962.

It is interesting to note that military and space expenditures, which the administration generally cites as the primary reason for higher overall spending totals, were actually lower than originally estimated. This means that domestic spending—principally for agriculture—increased sharply over the year.

Also, the President's report emphasized increased tax collections. Although the amount of revenue collected during the second half of the year is in excess of January 1963 expectations, we should note that receipts for the entire year were $6.6 billion below the January 1962 estimate.

Mr. Speaker, the original January 1962 budget figures should be borne in mind when evaluating the administration's budgetary performance during the past year. On this basis, the administration turned a predicted surplus of half a billion dollars into a $6.2 billion deficit, and this would have been worse except for large sales of Government-owned financial assets.

Administrative budget, fiscal 1963, original January 1962 estimate compared with actual expenditures

[In millions]

	Original estimate	Actual	Actual as changed from original estimate
Receipts:			
Individual income tax	$49,300	$47,596	−$1,704
Corporation income tax	26,600	21,567	−5,033
Excise taxes	9,956	9,914	−42
Miscellaneous receipts	4,192	4,423	+231
All other receipts	3,645	3,371	−274
Subtotal	93,693	86,870	−6,823
Deduct interfund transactions	693	513	−180
Net receipts	93,000	86,357	−6,643
Expenditures by major agencies:			
Military and space agencies:			
Department of Defense, military	49,700	48,249	−1,451
Foreign assistance, military	1,400	1,711	+311
Atomic Energy Commission	2,880	2,758	−122
National Aeronautics and Space	2,400	2,552	+152
Total, military and space	56,380	55,270	−1,110
Civilian agencies (selected):			
Agriculture	6,709	7,763	+1,054
Commerce	815	667	−148
Health, Education, and Welfare	5,183	4,904	−279
Labor	386	253	−133
Post Office	261	755	+494
Treasury	10,431	11,024	+593
Housing and Home Finance Agency	1,383	400	−983
Veterans' Administration	5,285	5,173	−112
Total, all agencies	92,537	92,590	+53

WHAT IS WRONG WITH THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM?

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I have long been an advocate for legislation designed to aid the truly depressed areas with problems of chronic unemployment. I offered bills during the Eisenhower administration and sponsored the substitute bill when the Area Redevelopment Agency was created in 1961. The members of the minority in both the House Banking and Currency Committee and on the floor of this Chamber has consistently stated that the present depressed areas program does not accomplish and cannot accomplish its alleged goal. For this reason, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to a very pertinent editorial in today's Washington Post.

In tracing the unfortunate dilution of a good idea by political maneuvers, the Post observes:

> First, the scope of the program was diluted by including under it a large number of rural counties, whose problems are essentially different.

Mr. Speaker, this has since been recognized implicitly by the new rural development program by the Department of Agriculture. The Post continues:

> Next, the standards of admission were lowered, so that areas not clearly in distress got into the program. About 1,000 counties, one-third of the United States, with 36 million people, are now classed as in need of redevelopment. Of the total funds 60 percent are being assigned to rural counties.

This is the aid to underemployed areas part of the present law which would have been eliminated under my alternative bill in 1961. According to the Post:

> As a result, the program has been so diluted that no real impact can be made on the areas that need it most.

I am happy to see the press taking a look at the facts, and I am sure that any Member of this body doing the same can only come to a similar conclusion.

We have also heard a great deal, in testimony before the House Banking and Currency Committee on two separate occasions and also on the floor of the House, that the Area Redevolopment Administration is sorely in need of funds. The reason for this is, as the Post also points out, the inclusion of two times the number of appropriate areas under the loosely worded and even more loosely administered Area Redevelopment Act.

Unfortunately, we have not heard the last of the efforts to deposit the taxpayers' money down a mohole built by bad legislation, bureaucratic incompetence and political favoritism. Another attempt will be made in the near future. No doubt the proponents of the measure will tell this body, which has already voted the bill down once this year, that this is a new bill with amendments made to correct past errors. Glossed over will be the fact that the Senate version has even more errors than before which will be carried to a conference no matter what is done in the House. In point of fact, however, the Washington Post editorial makes no delineation between the two bills. The basic fallacies are still there, and will remain there until the present politically motivated approach to solving our Nation's depressed areas problem is junked and replaced with a bipartisan effort to find a reasonable and workable solution.

The Washington Post editorial of August 1, 1963, follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 1, 1963]

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

The House Banking and Currency Committee has approved with cuts of some magnitude the area redevelopment bill. An earlier version failed to pass the House by a margin of five votes earlier in the session, but a similar measure has been passed by the Senate. Unfortunately, the fate of this bill, which has been sadly diluted in the logrolling process, appears to hinge upon the passage of a thoroughly reprehensible cotton subsidy measure.

The purpose of the area redevelopment program is to reduce pockets of unemployment that have come into being because industries have declined, or moved away, or automated severely. It is to help the "structurally" unemployed, who might not find jobs even if the economy should begin to boom. This is an attractive idea, and one would have little difficulty recommending the bill if the program had stuck to its original concept. But what has happened?

First, the scope of the program was diluted by including under it a large number of rural counties, whose problems are essentially different. This was done to get the southern vote behind it. Next, the standards of admission were lowered, so that areas not clearly in distress got into the program. About 1,000 counties, one-third of the United States, with 36 million people, are now classed as in need of redevelopment. Of the total funds, 60 percent are being assigned to rural counties. As a result, the program has been so diluted that no real impact can be made on the areas that need it most. As a further result, the ARA in 2 years has run through its original appropriation of $375 million, which should have carried it for 4 years. That is why it is now coming in for an added $456 million.

This is a classical case of logrolling, in which congressional acceptance of a modest amount of high priority expenditures has had to be purchased with a larger amount of low priority items. The process has reached the point where the low priority purposes have substantially diluted those of high priority, but it is not yet at an end. It is now reported that the passage of the bill through the House is to be linked informally with the cotton bill. The southern votes needed for the area redevelopment bill are to be obtained by a promise of northern votes for the bill dear to southern interests. The cotton bill is undesirable on several counts, its principal features being a subsidy to cotton mills of 25 percent of the cost of cotton, plus a further subsidy of 10 percent to keep the smallest and least efficient producers of cotton in operation.

The passage of the thoroughly objectionable cotton bill certainly would be too high a price to pay for an ARA bill that has already been freighted with damaging departures from the initial purpose.

ARA AND THE POTATO BUSINESS

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that the Area Redevelopment Administration could put some areas of my home State of Minnesota out of business if its present policy is not reversed.

Earlier this year I called your attention to an ARA effort, with the help of the Department of Agriculture, to raise sugarbeets in Cayuga County, N.Y., in direct competition with established growing areas such as our own Red River Valley of the North. Now we find ARA considering the possibility of setting up a potato processing plant in one section of Minnesota to compete with processing plants in the very same State—plants that are presently operating well below capacity and are in serious trouble financially.

There are similarities between this potato proposal and the sugarbeet fiasco. The Area Redevelopment Administration and the Agriculture Department want to grow beets in a New York county where they do not even know if beets can be raised profitably—and ARA is now considering processing potatoes in Grasston, Minn., located in an area where there is some doubt as to a sufficient supply of potatoes.

The cost of the project was listed at $2,270,000, with ARA furnishing $1,378,000 of the total.

For every job created by ARA projects such as these, a job would be eliminated in the Red River Valley area of Minnesota and North Dakota, where similar industries are already overexpanded.

The proposed plant at Grasston has created so much dissension that even the Democrats are criticizing it. The Democrats in Polk County, Minn., for instance, passed a resolution to protest any Federal aid for the plant.

The people of the Grasston area are to be praised for wanting to improve their economy. But I am sure that industries can be found that will not compete with existing industries already in trouble. You just cannot rob Peter to pay Paul, which is exactly what the Area Redevelopment Administration has attempted to do up to this point. We need a reevaluation of the whole ARA program so that taxpayer money will be used to help our people instead of hurt them.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF FORT STEPHENSON

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOSHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, on this Saturday, August 3, 1963, the citizens of Fremont and Sandusky County, Ohio, will conclude 10 great days of celebration in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Fort Stephenson.

The four-county area I have the honor of representing in the U.S. Congress is very rich in history, but of all the noteworthy historical facts of which my district can boast, none is more significant than the Battle of Fort Stephenson.

In fact, of all the battles fought during the War of 1812, this battle, was perhaps the most significant.

I make such a statement, not because I lack appreciation for the many other important events of that war, but because the Battle of Fort Stephen was the first, really decisive victory for our young Republic in those desperate days. Had it not been for those 160 stubborn Americans, the ingenious and courageous planning of their 21-year-old leader, George Croghan, not to mention the skillful use of the now famous little "six-pounder" cannon, "Old Betsy," the course of our United States could have been vastly altered.

That famous victory at Fort Stephenson was truly the turning point of the war. It freed a young America from the longtime harassment of British and Indian forces in the Northwest Territory. It was the first real sign of ultimate victory. No longer were the Americans at a psychological disadvantage.

Mr. Speaker, it was a great moment in American history.

Briefly, the actual course of that battle deserves review here. Fort Stephenson was a 1-acre fort, built in 1812 at Lower Sandusky, now known as Fremont, Ohio. It had three blockhouses, a stockade 14 to 16 feet in height, and was protected by a deep ditch. Its main function was to serve as a supply depot and communications post for the other U.S. forts in the territory.

George Croghan, who commanded the fort, had little previous military experience. Born in Kentucky, the young major came from fighting stock of Irish ancestory. His father had fought in the Revolutionary War, and he was the nephew of Gen. George Rogers Clarke.

The American forces in the Northwest were headed by William Henry Harrison, hero of the Battle of Tippecanoe and later President of the United States. When Harrison received word that the British were moving on Fort Stephenson, he ordered Croghan to abandon and burn the fort.

Despite this command, Croghan replied:

> We are determined to hold this place, and by heavens, we can.

As Croghan expected, British troops, 500 in number, and gunboats, part of Commodore Barclay's fleet, were soon moving up the Sandusky River, which the fort overlooked. British General Henry "the Barber" Procter's ultimatum was that unless Croghan surrendered the small fort, a massacre from his restless Indian allies was imminent.

Croghan felt that this was another one of Procter's scare techniques, and boldly replied that the Indians would find no one to slay when the fort fell because every man had sworn to die before surrender.

The young major didn't really have much to carry out his bluff, just one cannon, "Old Betsy," a small supply of ammunition, and a group of fellow Kentucky "sharpshooters." The Americans used their ammunition sparingly, and Old Betsy was moved from one side of the fort to the other, in an effort to convince Procter that they had more than one cannon.

Impatient and frustrated with their inability to hit the fort with their cannons, the British advanced under a haze of gunsmoke, and concentrated their fire on the northwest corner of the fort. Anticipating such an attack, Croghan had the little "six pounder" camouflaged and tightly packed with grapeshot, 12 pounds of lead slugs, and scraps of metal.

When the British forces came within 30 feet, Croghan's men fired with such unison and accuracy that the enemy became confused, panicked, and headed for the ditch surrounding Fort Stephenson. Little did Procter's forces realize that "Old Betsy's" muzzle was pointed directly at the ditch.

Before the British had a chance to get reorganized, Old Betsy's brazen voice ripped through the atmosphere. She sent a fiery blast of her death-dealing contents into the close-packed mass of enemy. This was followed by yet another blast.

The British and the Indians retreated in such a hurry that they left behind 150 dead and wounded, a gunboat, much ammunition and many weapons. One American was killed and seven wounded, despite being outnumbered almost 10 to 1.

Once word of Croghan's victory reached the outside world, praise for the gallant 21-year-old soldier and his fighters poured in, including congratulations from the President and the Congress of the United States. Croghan was immediately brevetted lieutenant colonel by President James Monroe. Years later, on January 27, 1835, the House of Representatives passed a joint resolution asking the President to present a gold medal to Croghan for his brilliant defense and gallantry at Fort Stephenson.

Austere, but glowing with well-earned dignity, Old Betsy has remained in Fremont, Ohio, on the site of the battlefield that made her famous, now the grounds of the Birchard Public Library. In 1906, the Sandusky County chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution had the body of George Croghan transferred from a grave in Kentucky and placed near the little cannon.

Side by side, the two remain as silent reminders to one of the most significant battles of the War of 1812.

Hundreds of tourists are attracted to the location yearly, as well as to Fremont's other famous landmark, the library and museum, home and burial place of U.S. President Rutherford B. Hayes.

Mr. Speaker, in these days when the tensions of the cold war are paramount in the minds of all of us, and when the mood of the country often seems so chaotic, the commemoration of an heroic event in our Nation's past, such as the Battle of Fort Stephenson, serves as an important and valuable reminder of the courage and determination with which earlier generations of Americans met their own great crises. They worked tirelessly and heroically in defense of our Republic and of the freedoms we are privileged to enjoy today, and so must we.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition of the House Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, conducted official public hearings and sessions on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of this week in Knoxville, Tenn. In carrying out my official duties as a member of this subcommittee I was not present when the House voted on the conference report on H.R. 3872, the Export-Import Bank Act extension, and House Resolution 453, which provided for the consideration of, and waiving points of order against, the conference report on H.R. 5207, the Foreign Service Buildings-Philippine War Damage Claims Act.

Had I been present during these votes I would have voted "aye" in support of the motion of the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency to sustain the position of the House conferees opposing the back-door spending provision inserted by the other body in the bill, H.R. 3872, the Export-Import Bank Act extension.

On House Resolution 453, I would have voted "no" which would be consistent with my previous votes in the House opposing the authorizing or appropriating of funds for Philippine war damage payments.

THE COURT DECISION

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the body of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Baptist Digest on July 6, supporting the recent Supreme Court decision on Bible reading and prayer in the public schools.

Although I am not in complete agreement with the views reflected in this editorial, I do recognize it as being very well written and it will be of interest to many persons who read the editorial, even though it is not in total conformity with their views.

This editorial was brought to my attention by C. Emanuel Carlson, executive director of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs.

THE COURT DECISION

"We can't pray in school any more," the junior boy solemnly told his training union fellows.

His statement, which is only half-true, points up the fact that we Baptists have a lot of educating to do—educating ourselves and our children.

First, we need to study carefully the recent Supreme Court decision regarding required Bible reading and prayer in the public schools. We need to be sure we know what it says, and what it does not say. In this issue of the digest, there is an article which answers many questions about the decision. It is the dynamic sermon which Wayne Dehoney preached to his congregation in First Baptist Church of Jackson, Tenn., immediately after the Supreme Court decision was announced. Dehoney, who is the president of the SBC Pastors Conference, is respected throughout the convention. We suggest that you read the article carefully. Don't let newspaper headlines convince you that the Court has ruled God out of the public schools.

Second, we need to know ourselves as Baptists, and to search our hearts to be sure we are being honest. We are a people who demand religious freedom for ourselves and for others. Can we honestly insist that our schools, supported by public taxes, and attended by children from homes of all faiths, do the work of the church and the home by having Christian devotions? "But Bible reading and prayer aren't sectarian," many people cry. To the Moslem, Buddhist, atheist and agnostic they are. And these people, whether we like it or not, are a part of our Nation, paying school taxes and sending their children to public schools.

In arguing these cases, there has been the claim that Bible reading and prayer are not religious exercises, but only an influence toward morality. Can there be any statement more untrue, or more nauseating to the Bible-reading, praying Christian?

Of course, religious exercises enforced by the State do have a tendency to become mere formal rites, without spirit and without meaning. Is this what we want? The form without the spirit? Christianity has never lost a thing by refusing to force itself onto others. But it has lost a great deal when it alines itself with the state, and depends upon the power of the state to carry out the evangelizing and teaching that should be carried out under the power of God.

This decision will ruin our schools, many are saying. On the contrary, perhaps this will save our public school system. The efforts of strong parochial school interests to invade the public treasury have become more frenzied in recent years. Just this year, one powerful interest after another has endorsed the unconstitutional principle of state support for parochial schools. Perhaps this decision has come just in time. If public school money cannot be used to promote the reading of the Bible and prayer as devotional exercises, then surely it cannot be used for schools that teach the beliefs of a particular sect. Public support for private schools would be the best way to insure the downfall of our strong public school system.

In its opinion, the Supreme Court speaks of the "wholesome neutrality" which the Government must observe in its contacts with groups of religious believers and nonbelievers. Surely Baptists can say "amen" to that.

Let's not fall into the blind and selfish ways of other groups, who want freedom for themselves, but not for others; and freedom only as long as it promotes their particular interests. Let us carefully teach our children the facts of true freedom. There will be no confusion in their minds about the supremacy of God, if we will intelligently explain to them the reasons for this decision, and if we will live before them positive Christian lives.

The really sad fact isn't that prayer and Bible reading have been ruled out as devotional exercises in the school. It is the fact that in many Christian homes, the Bible is never opened from week to week, and the only prayers are hasty petitions mumbled at the Almighty just before the petitioner drops off to sleep.

BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION TO COMMEMORATE THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [JOHN O. MARSH, Jr.], has introduced House Joint Resolution 463, calling for the establishment by the Congress of a Bicentennial Commission to Commemorate the American Revolution.

In connection with his resolution, he has drafted a statement which outlines with exceptional clarity and insight the momentous events that shaped and framed the Revolution, and forged the concepts and ideals of our great Nation. I consider Congressman MARSH's document of such significance that I have asked unanimous consent for its insertion in the body of the RECORD.

The statement is as follows:

TO FORGE A STRATEGY FOR FREEDOM

The purpose of a Bicentennial Commission is to observe the American Revolution as not primarily a historical commemoration but rather a reexamination of the issues and idea forces which produced the American Revolution. In our Western heritage, the American Revolution was the fire that took the dross out of much of the 18th century English social-political institutions and refined many Western ideas. Concord Bridge did more than start a local conflict; rather, as Toynbee has said, it began a revolutionary era. The lamentable thing today is that we have permitted the Communists to opt the ideas and ideals of our revolutionary past.

We know that in nearly all of the great movements that have shaped history, there is a body of theory including certain idealistic goals that provides an inspiration and a framework in which the participants of the cause operate. In many instances, those involved are never aware of the broad spectrum of ideals or ideas which their cause involves.

Communism, as we know it, is an idea force, marked by many lofty aspirations and ideals, which has resulted in intense motivation and dedication of its disciples even though much of the theory is false.

Cursory examination of Fabian socialism points to a dedication of an intellectual elite to such causes as economic justice, greater opportunities for the poor and achievement of better working conditions through modern legislation to improve the lot of the English workingman.

Too often, I think, in our present approach to the Sino-Soviet challenge, if we are not negative, we frequently resort to sterile objectivity without promulgating some of the basic concepts of one of the greatest idea movements man has witnessed.

We need, in my opinion, to inject into U.S. policy more of the goals and purposes of the American Revolution which crystallize the issues of some of the best thinking of a momentous age. Frequently, we say in our country that we need more "Americanism" and, although I agree with this, what I am referring to is somewhat broader than this term, or even "patriotism," worthwhile though it may be. Too often, in some of our presentations these two concepts are treated in a "Fourth of July" oratorical sense, which has its place but which I feel sometimes fails to go to the substance of what this Republic is all about.

If anything, I would describe my own thoughts on this problem more in the sense of a renaissance of the concepts and ideas of the American Revolution and the application of the same to the problems of a changing world. As I mentioned, there are exemptions to the general trend of sterile objectivity in cold war discussions and there is sought to be injected a grasp of the values of our system that really stand in jeopardy.

I feel, however, there is a greater need to define more sharply a philosophy of freedom that will give us a positive framework of ideas wherein this Nation might operate in an ideological offensive. In short, we must forge a strategy for freedom.

To me, a great opportunity seems to be presented beginning in 1963 to focus national attention on a critical period of American history occurring 200 years previously, for 1963 marks the bicentennial anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Paris. This treaty, signed on February 10, 1763, not only ended the Seven Years' War but cost France all of her colonial possessions in North America. Little did Wolfe realize on the Plains of Abraham that the capture of Quebec in 1759 would ultimately cost the Crown her richest colonial possession in the New World.

The Treaty of Paris also marks the beginning of the American Revolution. The 12 years from 1763 to 1775 have been described as the Golden Age of the American Revolution. These might be called the idea years.

The year 1763 marked the turning point in Anglo-American relations that grew progressively worse for a number of reasons.

First, England sought to reassert colonial control that had slipped from its grasp because of military necessities of the Seven Years' War.

Secondly, there was a question of economics and repayment of a huge war debt which had been incurred by the Crown in defense of the colonies.

Third, 1763 marked the end of what is termed the "old colonial period" and ushered in the "new colonial period" that got off to an inauspicious start under George III and Grenville who became Prime Minister in April of 1763.

Fourth, historians say in 1763 there can be discerned the emergence of what has been termed "the American character," symbolic of the breed of individual that was to conquer the West and endure the hardships and rigors of what was actually a terrifying wilderness. Later this temper or character would be described as we know it today by the soubriquet "the pioneer spirit."

Clearly, the 12-year span from 1763 to 1775 would develop the issues of legality and constitutional rights that became peculiar to the American Revolution. Many of the great Englishmen, such as Burke, Pitt, and others, would find in the colonial cause, prior to armed conflict, a struggle by Englishmen living in the Americas to protect the rights of Englishmen living in the British Isles. Burke, in the House of Commons in 1775, attributed to the colonial bar a substantial role in having produced the American temper and paid tribute to what the legal profession did in formulating and defining the issues of the Revolution. Perhaps of all the hallmarks that distinguished the American Revolution none is more prominent than the emphasis placed on "legality" and the need for civil authority to accomplish revolutionary ends. Historians point out that there was never associated with this conflict, bloody as it was, the terrorism, anarchism, and radicalism which accompanied the French and Russian revolutions.

As in our own age, we see the confluence of revolutionary changes, so the 1760's would feel the impact of the industrial revolution, the passing of mercantilism as a national economic policy and the emergence of the ideas of human rights and liberty espoused by Montesquieu, Rousseau, and Voltaire. Though their own countrymen listened to them, it took the English to learn from these great French thinkers and the American Colonies to apply the principles they advanced.

Events moved rapidly through the golden age, and there were no geographical limits in the American Colonies within which the revolutionary battle of ideas was fought. Not only did the Sugar Act of 1764, which was a reenactment of the Molasses Act of 1733, cripple the prosperous rum industry of New England, but it was accompanied by a strict enforcement of the custom laws which the American colonist viewed as serious danger to his personal liberty because of the manner in which the offenders were tried. Trial by jury became a thing of tremendous value to the American of that day. He feared the admiralty court which tried custom violators, because it required his being transported to Halifax—there to stand trial under a system of jurisprudence which did not recognize the presumption of innocence but rather condemned men on the probability of guilt.

The quartering of 10,000 British regulars in North America pursuant to a policy decision of the Crown to control the western frontier and discourage the French from seeking to reestablish lost colonial possessions would plague the royal governors and representatives of the Crown here and in England long before hostilities began. The cost of these troops would lead to a bitter clash between the royal governors and the legislature in the Colony of New York resulting in dissolution of the general assembly in 1767.

In the hated stamp tax of 1765, the Colonies saw an infringement upon the freedom of the press and the slogan of "taxation without representation" would also lead to the famous Virginia Resolves of 1765 and Patrick Henry's memorable speech: "If this be treason, then make the most of it." The Virginia Resolves swept through the Colonies and were adopted or cited favorably in nearly all of the 12 other Colonies.

Aside from being oppressive in the economic sense, the Townsend Act, which dealt with an enumerated list of items of import that gave Britain favored treatment, really angered the colonist because of the writs of assistance which were, in effect, blank search warrants to aid in the enforcement of the act. It was the unwise acts of Parliament that would cause Massachusetts to call for the convening of a Congress of all of the Colonies in New York in 1765.

The sixties would see the boisterous groups that complained so loud and bitterly about actions of the Crown. Groups of brash young men frequently resorted to burning and other types of violence to frustrate royal action. In the sixties they were to be identified as the "Sons of Liberty."

Events moved rapidly through the latter part of this fateful decade and in the first years of the next. The Boston Massacre, the tax on tea to save the bankrupt West Indian Company and the ensuing Boston Tea Party, would all take place before Concord Bridge.

Yet accompanying and supporting these acts of protest and petitions of wrongs and grievances was the brilliant writing and reason of such men as Jefferson, Franklin, Washington, Sam Adams, and a host of others. Dickinson, of Pennsylvania, in his famous "Farmer John's Letters" would expose the inequities, fallacies, and injustices of colonial policy. Such leadership as his would inspire the committees on correspondence that probably made the American Revolution the most clearly defined and best reasoned struggle that was ever fought.

If the Revolution was to be based on reason, it nevertheless was not a struggle between the "haves" and the "have nots." Men of wealth and influence could be found with the patriots or equally with the Tories. Merchantmen, clerics, educators and innkeepers cast their lots equally on one side or the other. Some of the poor were just as loyal to George III as those of similar estate were loyal to the patriots' cause.

The point I am trying to emphasize is that perhaps through this reexamination of the American past, we can better appreciate the values of our Republic and better understand the stakes involved in the present world struggle. After all, the words, "liberty," "freedom," and "justice," that are crudely painted on the posters carried by those who riot today through southeast Asia, Latin America and Africa do not have their origins in the Communist Manifesto but rather have their inspiration in the American Declaration of Independence. I also know that in looking back we can see great lessons in courage of the human spirit; willingness to sacrifice for principle; a sense of dedication to a great cause, and an inspiration to present Americans which would contribute to national will.

I have hardly touched on some of the great events that were to shape not just the destiny of 2½ million people who lived in the Colonies but rather, as Washington would say, "the destiny of unborn millions." The shot fired at Concord Bridge echoes today. I submit that before it was to signal the beginning of an armed conflict, men and women here and in England clearly understood why that sound would be heard. Today we need that same understanding.

DR. JOSEPH E. SMADEL

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, medical science has suffered a great loss with the death of one of its outstanding leaders, Dr. Joseph E. Smadel. Few of us are able to contribute to society in such a way as to benefit all mankind. Yet Joseph Smadel was such a man.

Because of his work, tens of thousands of people throughout the world have been cured of typhoid fever, plague, scrub typhus, epidemic typhus fever, and Rocky Mountain spotted fever. He and his colleagues have prevented the occurrence of these diseases in untold numbers throughout the world.

His work has in no small measure paved the way for the transition of medical science from concern with the acute, infectious diseases to concern with the chronic killers such as cancer which, ironically, was the disease that took his life on July 21.

Joseph Smadel, born in Vincennes, Ind., 56 years ago, received his doctor of medicine degree from the Washington University Medical School in St. Louis. Soon after leaving medical school, and while still a resident physician, he helped to investigate the first recognized outbreak of a rare form of sleeping sickness—St. Louis encephalitis. Thus began his lifelong interest in virological research.

During his 12 years with the Rockefeller Institute, Dr. Smadel continued his research on virus diseases. He was particularly interested in a family of viruses known as the rickettsiae.

By 1948 he had demonstrated that the antibiotic, chloramphenicol, could effectively treat typhoid fever. Before his discovery 12 percent of all those who contracted the disease died. Today, fewer than 2 percent die.

Joseph Smadel's selfless dedication to science is illustrated best by his use of his own body as a testing ground for discoveries. And there were many discoveries. He made significant contributions toward the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of a long and impressive list of diseases, working with the viruses of influenza, Venezuelan equine encephalitis, Russian spring-summer encephalitis, poliomyelitis, vaccinia, variola, lymphocytic choriomeningitis, psittacosis, and myxomatosis.

After serving in the Army during World War II, Dr. Smadel devoted much of his efforts to the typhus fevers and to spotted and Q fevers, demonstrating that the latter too could be effectively treated with chloramphenicol.

He traveled throughout the world. After serving in Europe and North Africa during World War II, he investigated epidemic and murine typhus in Mexico, scrub typhus and typhoid in Malaya, leptospirosis in Puerto Rico, pneumonic plague in Madagascar, and epidemic hemorrhagic fever in Korea.

Just before his death, the laboratory which he headed at the National Institutes of Health completed a measles research project in Upper Volta, Africa, where more than 730,000 West African children were vaccinated painlessly with jet injectors. Dr. Smadel had helped design the needleless inoculator which can immunize over 300 persons in an hour.

At the time of his death he was studying the bacterial organisms that cause cholera. The study was part of the SEATO Cholera Research program which he had helped to establish.

Joseph Smadel liked to teach. He held regular classes at the Army Medical School while on the medical staff of the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research from 1946 to 1956. He taught at a number of universities and particularly enjoyed giving preceptor training to young people who worked with him.

In 1962 he received one of the highest recognitions given to scientists when he received the Albert Lasker Clinical Research Award. The citation called special attention to the critical importance of his discoveries to America's military and civilian personnel and allies in southeast Asia.

The citation described him as "one of the outstanding scientists of this generation, a tireless investigator, creative and critical thinker, and an inspiring leader." This accolade only emphasizes the enormity of the loss that his death has brought to mankind, medical science, and to his wife, Elizabeth, to whom I extend my deepest sympathy.

Words spoken in praise of Joseph Smadel are a poor tribute to one who gave so much of himself.

SIXTH MEETING CONSUMER ADVISORY COUNCIL

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, next Monday, August 5, 1963, the Consumer Advisory Council is scheduled to hold its sixth meeting. In addition to an organizational meeting last July, the council has held five 2-day meetings. The President attended the first meetings and also one meeting in January. But despite the manifest interest of the President in its program, the Consumer Advisory Council has displayed excessive timidity and administrative ineptitude during its brief history. It should stiffen its spine or be abandoned.

This judgment is not made hastily. I have followed closely the work of the Consumer Advisory Council and have patiently awaited indications that it will fulfill the intent of the consumer plank in the 1960 platform of the Democratic Party and the superb speech on consumer protection made in New York by the President, as a candidate, a few days before the 1960 election.

Thus far I have been disappointed, and so have millions of consumers, by the performance of the Consumer Advisory Council. Sylvia Porter, the widely respected economic columnist of the New York Post, has resigned from the council. She has not been replaced. Dr. Robert J. Lampman, the official overseer of the Consumer Advisory Council, has publicly stated that the council's activities will be leisurely and restrained, which perhaps explains why no progress has been made in filling the vacancy created by Miss Porter's resignation.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed also by the fact that the Council of Economic Advisers, which incongruously keeps the Consumer Advisory Council on a tight checkrein, has adopted a policy of releasing to the public some, but not all, of the position statements adopted by the subordinate advisory body. For example, endorsements of the truth-in-lending bill and the truth-in-packaging bill were made public, but we were not permitted to know the position taken by the Consumer Advisory Council on alleged overcharges by 30 electric utilities, on the public-interest aspect of securities issued by public utilities, nor on the operations of the Food and Drug Administration, an extremely important and sensitive consumer protection agency.

If the work of the Consumer Advisory Council is to be confidential, so be it; although this to me would be a deplorable, ineffectual policy. But if the recommendations of the council are to be public property—as I believe they should be—then I submit that all the recommendations and reports of these public-spirited citizens should be released, and let the chips fall where they may. Why should honorable and experienced representatives of the consumers come down to Washington to render advice and then have some of their conscientious recommendations stifled and others trumpeted? I would not be surprised to hear of further resignations, if this arbitrary and capricious policy is continued.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I believe the weak-kneed attitude of those currently in charge of the Consumer Advisory Council, as well as the great and growing need for better consumer representation in the structure of the Federal Government, both argue forcefully for enactment of my bill, H.R. 6865, which would establish an independent Office of Consumers. It would be extremely interesting to know the opinion that the members of the Consumer Advisory Council hold regarding this particular bill, the counterpart of which is sponsored in the other body by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, as staunch and proved a friend as the consumer has in the United States today.

I trust that time will be found during the council's meeting next week to discuss this bill and to take a stand on it. I trust also that the judgment of the council on this bill, if one is formed, will be made known to Congress and the public so that we may act in the consumer interest.

RAILWAY LABOR DISPUTES

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, July 29 I introduced House Joint Resolution 579, which is a bill to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain railroads and their employees.

I believe it is a fitting substitute for House Joint Resolution 565. As you recall, House Joint Resolution 565 would have the effect of turning over the issues in dispute to the Interstate Commerce Commission for arbitration. Now these disputes involve the basic work rules of the men who run the trains, and I do not agree that the ICC would be the proper forum for such a subject even if I favored this type of arbitration, which I do not.

I believe irreparable damage would result from the passage of House Joint Resolution 565, and in the end result, the parties would still be in dispute at the end of a 2-year period—possibly under worse circumstances than they are today.

This dispute on the railroads must be settled and it must be settled by the parties in collective bargaining. House Joint Resolution 579 will provide the setting for such bargaining.

The bill first provides for an indefinite status quo so that no changes may be made in existing rates of pay, rules, or working conditions encompassed by any of the notices in dispute, nor could the parties engage in any strike or lockout over any dispute arising from any of such notices.

Next, under section 2, the bill puts the disputing parties back into collective bargaining, with provision for any assistance necessary by the Secretary of Labor and the National Mediation Board.

To guarantee that these parties will actively work to dispose of the dispute between them, a Special Joint Emergency Railroad Committee consisting of five Members of the House of Representatives to be designated by the Speaker of the House and five Members of the Senate to be designated by the President of the Senate is provided.

At 10-day intervals, the Secretary of Labor and the National Mediation Board will report to the Special Joint Emergency Railroad Committee the progress of the negotiations.

If, at any time, the Special Joint Emergency Railroad Committee finds the procedures being followed afford no prospect of resolution of the disputes within a reasonable time, it may report to Congress together with recommendation for further action in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill because I am convinced this dispute can and should be settled between the parties.

Public interest opposes a nationwide railroad strike, but to deprive the employees of a right to strike is unfair. To balance the scales, the railroads must refrain from arbitrarily making the changes they seek. The parties must settle their differences face to face, as they have always done in the past, and I think House Joint Resolution 579 will provide the way.

A SECTION 213 HOUSING MUTUAL INSURANCE FUND

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have joined today with my distinguished colleagues, the gentlemen from New York Mr. HALPERN, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. FINO, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. MURPHY, in sponsoring legislation to amend the National Housing Act to create a separate mutual insurance fund for section 213 cooperative housing.

The condition of the fund warrants the putting of the fund on a mutual basis and I hope that the Housing Subcommittee will take action on the measure in the near future.

The result of the separate mutual fund will be to reduce insurance premium costs, something that we have long advocated. We have long looked for a solution to the problem of premium reduction and this bill will, I believe, provide the means to that end.

TO AUTHORIZE THE MAILING OF LOTTERY TICKETS

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 7856, which would authorize the transmission through the mails of lottery tickets and other material relating to a lottery operated by a State or political subdivision thereof.

I have introduced this bill because I believe that the Federal law prohibiting the transmission through the mails of lottery information should be amended so as to exclude State and local governments.

I am very much in favor of the recent action of the New Hampshire State Legislature in establishing a State lottery for the purposes of raising revenue to provide that State with more and better schools and hospitals and public debt amortization.

Governor King and the people of New Hampshire are to be congratulated for adopting a sensible solution to some of the fiscal problems facing all of our State and local governments.

As an example of the kind of proposal which would be possible if my bill were adopted, I would cite the resolution put before the New York City Council by Councilman Morris Stein which would provide for the sale of non-interest-bearing bonds by the city of New York with a substantial prize if the purchaser's bond number is picked in a lottery. If the New York State law was amended to permit this, the lifting of the Federal prohibition would aid greatly in the sale of such bonds.

A FAIR, IMPARTIAL, AND CONTROLLED TEST FOR KREBIOZEN

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 598, which would authorize and direct the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen and would direct the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such a test. The resolution would further authorize the appropriation of $250,000 to conduct the test.

The arguments and discussions over Krebiozen have been going on now for many years; I believe it is now time to end the controversy by having the National Cancer Institute conduct the necessary tests immediately and without further delay so that we may determine whether Krebiozen serves any useful purpose in the treatment of cancer. It seems unnecessary to mention the pain and suffering caused by cancer and the number of people who lose their lives each year because of this dread disease. All of us are familiar with it; all of us know from personal experience, either through family or friends, the fearful toll taken by cancer.

I strongly urge that this resolution be given immediate consideration by the Congress so that those now using Krebiozen may continue to use it until the completion of the National Cancer Institute's tests. If there is the slightest chance that Krebiozen is helping those now using it, we must not allow the Food and Drug Administration to keep the drug from them.

KORTH'S BANK HAD SMALLEST PART OF GENERAL DYNAMICS LOAN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Wright] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, in order that the matter earlier discussed concerning Secretary of the Navy Fred Korth may be seen in its proper perspective, I am including here a newspaper article which appeared in the Fort Worth Press on Wednesday, July 31:

Continental Got Smallest Part of General Dynamics Loan Before Korth Took Office

(By Delbert Willis)

If Navy Secretary Fred Korth used his political influence to get loans for his bank, he was a piker.

If Republican Senators are truthful in saying he had a "conflict of interest" in the TFX plane contract, then Mr. Korth probably will go down as the most ineffective influence peddler in history.

General Dynamics Corp., parent company of General Dynamics/Fort Worth, negotiated with Chase Manhattan Bank of New York in 1961 to borrow up to $200 million.

Chase Manhattan spread the $200 million credit among 20 banks from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific coast, including some in the Midwest, one in Dallas and three in Fort Worth. One of those three Fort Worth banks was the Continental National, of which Mr. Korth was president before he resigned in 1962 to become Secretary of the Navy. But Continental finished in last place in money volume among the 20 banks who gave credit to General Dynamics. Total amount of the Continental credit, according to local bankers, was two-tenths of 1 percent.

Continental advanced less than half as much as did the next lowest bank down the list—19th from the top. Both the Fort Worth and the First National in Fort Worth loaned considerably more than did Continental. So did a Dallas bank.

Monday Mr. Korth was attacked on the floor of the Senate by Senator Milward Simpson, Republican of Wyoming, who said that the former Fort Worth banker and lawyer was involved in "political interest and favoritism" in the TFX contract.

He said that Korth's testimony before the Senate investigators last week was "shocking almost beyond belief."

The Wyoming Senator's blast was the third Republican, antiadministration blast at Korth leveled on the floor of Congress within the past 6 days.

The record of the General Dynamics loans or "credit agreements" is clearly pointed out in all of the corporation's annual reports.

As explained in the 1961 report, the agreement provided for borrowing a maximum of $200 million. But this total was never reached. The total of the short-term notes amounted to $169,171,264 at the end of 1961, but was reduced to $90,044,119 by the end of last year.

The last 6-month report revealed that all of the short-term loans were completely paid off as of July 1, 1963.

The agreement with Chase Manhattan Bank was made in the second half of 1961. At that time Mr. Korth was president of Continental and John Connally was Secretary of the Navy. The agreement between Chase and the 20 banks was made long before Mr. Korth became Secretary of the Navy on January 3, 1962.

Senator Karl Mundt, in a transcript of testimony before the Senate investigating committee, made quite a point that Mr. Korth was president of the bank at the time the loan was made.

"Senator Mundt. Were you the officer of any business institution which at the time you were officer of the institution did business with either Boeing or General Dynamics?

"Secretary Korth. I have so testified. I was president of the Continental National Bank of Fort Worth. I previously in response to the third question before this last one testified that I had owned and do own stock in the Continental National Bank which did business on a very small scale with the General Dynamics Corp.

"Senator Mundt. Did business with General Dynamics at the time you were a stockholder, having no control over who does business with General Dynamics, or Boeing, or anybody else, or did they do business at the time you were, did you say president or vice president? [sic]

"Secretary Korth. I was president of the bank at the same time I was a stockholder in the bank. At the time I was president, the bank did business with General Dynamics on a modest scale.

"Senator Mundt. While you were president?

"Secretary Korth. Yes, sir. I have so stated three times now.

"Senator Mundt. All right. Will you define what a modest scale is, because I don't know. Did they have a checking account with the bank?

"Secretary Korth: Yes, sir; they had a checking account with the bank. The precise figure I am not aware. And I don't really know whether I should properly so testify here as to the amount of money."

Mr. Korth later testified under persistent questioning by Senator Mundt, that the loan limit at the bank was $600,000.

The questioning then went off the record as Mr. Korth insisted that the amount of any loan was confidential between banker and client, just as information between a doctor and a patient, a lawyer and his client. But in the off-the-record discussion he did try to give the committee members some idea of the size of the loan.

Local bankers say Continental advanced credit up to $400,000, but this amount was never completely drawn. The next largest bank doing business with General Dynamics allowed credit almost up to $1 million.

When General Dynamics Corp. made the credit agreement with Chase Bank, it was for all of the General Dynamics subsidiaries, not just General Dynamics, Fort Worth. This includes Electric Boat Division, Electro Dynamic Division, General Atomic Division, General Dynamics/Astronautics, General Dynamics/Convair, General Dynamics/Fort Worth, General Dynamics/Pomona, Liquid Carbonic Division, Material Service Division, Stromberg-Carlson Division and Canadair, Ltd., Montreal, Canada. That was why it was such a big loan.

Continental still has a checking account with General Dynamics/Fort Worth, but it is much smaller than the accounts with Fort Worth National and First National.

KREBIOZEN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the House on the subject of Krebiozen.

The legal entanglements relating to the testing and continued use of Krebiozen should not obscure the fact that hundreds of people believe they owe their lives to this drug. Nonetheless, numerous people who rely on Krebiozen are beginning to find it unavailable. This is so because, since July 15, compliance with the Kefauver-Harris drug amendments has prevented its movement in interstate commerce. Under present laws, Krebiozen cannot be shipped in interstate commerce until plans are filed with the Food and Drug Administration, or until lengthy tests have been completed.

Thus the problem facing us today is twofold. First, we must seek to assure those who depend on Krebiozen that they will continue to receive it. Second, we must end the scientific hassle concerning Krebiozen's curative powers by providing that it be conclusively and safely tested.

I am today introducing a resolution to promote the achievement of these ends. This resolution is in accord with my previous activities, for, as early as May 23 of this year, I called upon the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to ensure the drug's continued availability to those now receiving it.

What I am asking is not that special treatment be given to Krebiozen by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, nor that the Kefauver-Harris drug amendments be set aside. Rather, I am urging the Congress to pass legislation to provide funds for an effective test. Also, I ask Dr. Durovic to file plans with the Food and Drug Administration so that the distribution of Krebiozen in interstate commerce can be resumed. Finally, I express the hope that the organizations and individuals involved in this controversy will settle their personal differences and act in the best interests of medical advancement.

The urgency of the problem requires that Congress take immediate steps for its alleviation. We must not remain deaf to the cries of those who feel that the unavailability of Krebiozen poses an ever-increasing threat to their existence.

COOPERATIVE ACTION FOR COOPERATIVES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today I am privileged to join with the able gentleman from Brooklyn [Mr. MULTER] and a group of our distinguished colleagues in introducing legislation to set up a mutual insurance fund for section 213 housing cooperatives.

The other Members who have teamed up for this collective sponsorship include the highly respected dean of the Queens County delegation [Mr. DELANEY] and our outstanding Representatives [Mr. ADDABBO and Mr. ROSENTHAL]. The other sponsors are two of the able Members from the Bronx [Mr. FINO and Mr. GILBERT], and Staten Island's fine Representative [Mr. MURPHY].

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, is designed to reduce the mortgage insurance costs for the residents of 213 cooperative housing.

There should be little argument against the merits of the objective this legislation seeks. The superb insurance record enjoyed by this type of Government-insured housing certainly justifies any benefits that may be realized from the application of the mutual insurance principle.

It is significant that the sponsors of this legislation are from New York City. Greater New York leads the Nation in 213's, and the success of the program there exemplifies what can be done throughout the country to provide reasonable, comfortable, and desirable middle income housing. The owner-occupants of 213 units represent the finest examples of American community life. They take much pride in their ownership and in the collective interest they take in their communities.

Cooperative housing is not just a high sounding ideal as it was not too many years ago—a dream of model living that applied to Sweden or other nations of the world—it is now an accepted and important segment of the housing scene in America. And if ever any program epitomized democracy in action, it is 213 housing. More and more its significance is being realized in relationship to the general welfare of our nation. It provides the most feasible answers to the serious and growing problems confronting urban centers. It is the only housing program that offers real protection to middle income families. There is no question that section 213 has proven successful—more so, I feel, than any other section of the Housing Act. Little did the fathers of the concept of cooperative living in America ever dream of the success it would enjoy. And to think that the program is only 13 years old. Young, yes, but old enough to have a full evaluation given to its experience.

We cannot emphasize enough the contribution made by housing cooperatives and we urge officialdom on all levels to recognize the principle that the program should be enhanced and encouraged instead of being taken for granted, or neglected; moreover, that it should be kept current and up to date according to the changing realities of everyday situations.

With this in mind, there are certain conclusions based on the housings co-ops' 13-year history that are excellent and must be recognized. Outstanding among them is the superb mortgage insurance record enjoyed by the housing cooperatives. They have paid over $17 million into the housing fund and have had virtually no losses. Yet, the housing cooperators still pay one-half of 1 percent in mortgage insurance premiums—the same as 13 years ago. Ordinarily, good insurance experience brings direct reductions in premiums—or, under mutual programs, dividends are prorated on experience. Housing cooperatives have received neither. Co-ops have proven their superb, unmatched experience and any denial of a reduction in rates is inequitable to say the least. They have earned it and they are entitled to it.

That is why I am so greatly disappointed that the congressional authorization to the FHA to reduce insurance premiums from one-half to one-fourth of 1 percent has not been implemented. I feel the intent of Congress has obviously been ignored here. I am sure that is the motivation of the bill introduced earlier in the session by the hardworking gentleman from Brooklyn [Mr. MULTER] who has been relentless in the effort to win reduction in carrying costs for 213 cooperators. As one who has long advocated such a reduction and who has sponsored the present authority given to the FHA Commissioner to reduce the premiums to one-fourth of 1 percent, I enthusiastically joined the gentleman in sponsoring legislation calling for the mandatory approach. This effort was buttressed by our colleague, Mr. ROSENTHAL, who introduced an identical measure.

But the mandatory reduction of insurance rates by statute meets considerable administrative and legislative resistance. The administration contends that actuarially rate reduction cannot be justified. More time, it says, is needed to prove its soundness under actuarial formulas. Further, it maintains that co-ops are a part of the overall housing fund and that a reduction for 213's could jeopardize the fund itself. It also states that mandatory rate reduction is contrary to basic insurance principles—that rates must be discretionary, based on experience and the relationship of that experience to the reserves. What is more, it is argued that the Administrator has the power given under last year's law to which I referred, to reduce the premium to one-fourth of 1 percent.

When warranted, we must resist these arguments, insisting that the proven experience most certainly does justify a reduction; that as long as the co-op insurance is incorporated within the Housing Fund, it is victimized by the tremendously greater loss ratio of other FHA-insured sections, thereby diminishing hopes for a voluntary reduction. That is why mandatory legislation was offered.

This fight for MIP reduction must go on and we should leave no stone unturned to achieve it. Meanwhile, we must not lose sight of another means to accomplish a reduction in costs—insurance mutuality.

Following the basic insurance principle that rates are based on experience, this approach should result in decided reductions. Under the proposal two separate mutual funds would be established—the cooperative management insurance fund and a cooperative sales insurance fund. Under the mutuality program, the sales fund and the management fund would each have two separate accounts. The two accounts for each fund would be handled in the same manner as the section 203 mutual account that sets the precedent for this type of separation.

There is interesting legislative background for this legislation about which I would like to remind the House. In 1959 an amendment I proposed was approved by committee and included in the Housing Act. But, unfortunately the act itself was vetoed by the President. It was contained in the 1960 act which, regretfully, died in the Rules Committee. Also, it is with much regret the principle was not accepted in the housing bill enacted in the 87th Congress. Although there appeared to be general agreement that the principle is reasonable and sound, technical and other considerations to properly expedite its implementation came up, and it was recommended that a little more time was needed before it could be accomplished. What's more it was pointed out that the 213 program was making strong advances in the 87th Congress through the approval of two amendments, one to reduce the premiums of one-fourth percent, and the other to provide means for supplemental financing for capital repairs and improvements.

Now here we are in the thick of the 88th Congress, and despite the optimism generated by the authorization to reduce the insurance premiums, the rate still remains the same as it was 13 years ago.

The time has come for action. And while the issue of reducing the rate by statute, or implementing existing authority to do so, is being debated, there is no sound reason why a separate mutual fund could not be established. It is conceivable that under mutuality the reduction in premiums will even be greater than hoped for. This may seem optimistic but I have every reason to believe that the unequalled successful experience of 213's will be maintained. And as time goes on, with a longer base of actuarial history, the benefits will increase even more. I can see no inconsistency with this approach and with advocating reduction to one-fourth of 1 percent. Both could be effectuated. As a matter of fact, if the MIP were lowered, and a mutual fund were in effect and the experience still warranted further reduction through refunds, then there would be no reason why this could not be done.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely urge that this legislation be given early committee and floor approval. I wish to commend the cosponsors of the measure for their cooperative effort toward the realization of this equitable and reasonable goal. In particular, I wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Brooklyn [Mr. MULTER], for his outstanding dedication and relentless efforts in behalf of housing cooperators. It is a privilege indeed, to be at his side and to work with our colleagues in this concerted effort. I want, also, to commend the Federation of 213 Cooperatives, its president, Irving Sherman, and its officers, for providing outstanding and alert leadership for their cause. They are not only carrying on a determined fight to better conditions for the present occupants of 213's but they are making conditions more conducive for the advancement of this program, thereby helping to meet America's ever-growing problem of middle class housing. The federation has shown that co-ops can give leadership to themselves. They reflect a commendable fighting spirit, a civic consciousness which is too often lacking in this country of ours today.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mr. KARTH), for today, August 1, 1963, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FOREMAN, for 2 hours, on Tuesday, August 6, 1963.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina, for 2 hours, on Wednesday, August 7.

Mr. WAGGONNER, for 60 minutes, on Wednesday, August 7.

Mr. ROOSEVELT, for 30 minutes, on Monday, August 5.

Mr. WRIGHT, for 10 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. SHRIVER), for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. FARBSTEIN (at the request of Mr. WAGGONNER), for 10 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY, the remarks he will make in the Committee today on H.R. 7500 and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROUSH to revise and extend his remarks on the Roudebush amendment to H.R. 7500 and to include letters from Dr. Stahr, president of Indiana University, and Dr. Hovde, president of Purdue University.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SHRIVER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ALGER.
Mr. WESTLAND.
Mr. SAYLOR.
Mr. COLLIER.
Mr. HOSMER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WAGGONNER), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FASCELL.
Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana.
Mr. TOLL.
Mr. O'HARA of Michigan.
Mr. SHELLEY.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5207. An act to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, August 5, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1087. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish a nutritionally adequate, well-balanced, and uniform ration for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury to regulate the issuance and sale of the ration and to prescribe special rations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1088. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the unnecessary planned procurement of 36,000-British-thermal-unit air conditioners by the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1089. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of the orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1090. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which certain authority was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1091. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on additional costs resulting from procurement of test equipment as special tooling under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts awarded to Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Missile and Space Division, Sunnyvale, Calif., by the Departments of the Air Force and Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1092. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overprocurement by the Department of the Navy of spare guidance components for the shipboard repair of Improved Tartar missiles; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WATSON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 6396. A bill to permit certain Government employees to elect to receive compensation in accordance with section 401 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 in lieu of certain compensation at a saved rate, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 624). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Interim report on use of electronic data equipment; without amendment (Rept. No. 627). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee on Public Works. S. 874. An act to authorize the construction and equipping of buildings required in connection with the operations of the Bureau of the Mint; with amendment (Rept. No. 628). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee on Public Works. S. 1652. An act to amend the

National Cultural Center Act to extend the termination date contained therein, and to enlarge the Board of Trustees; without amendment (Rept. No. 629). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1157. A bill to exclude cargo which is lumber from certain tariff filing requirements under the Shipping Act, 1916; with amendment (Rept. No. 630). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on Un-American Activities. Report pursuant to House Resolution 5, 88th Congress, pertaining to the Communist Party in southern California; without amendment (Rept. No. 631). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 469. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 4955, a bill to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation; without amendment (Rept. No. 632). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2928. A bill for the relief of Marika N. Vatakis; with amendment (Rept. No. 625). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6097. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pedro B. Montemayor, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 626). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 7872. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase from 2 to 2½ percent the retirement multiplication factor used in computing annuities of certain employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7873. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 7874. A bill to provide for the appointment in the competitive civil service by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 7875. A bill to provide for the appointment in the competitive civil service by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 7876. A bill to provide for the appointment in the competitive civil service by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 7877. A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN (by request):

H.R. 7878. A bill to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371) relating to certain limitations on real estate loans by national banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 7879. A bill to establish a Department of Consumers in order to secure within the Federal Government effective representation of the economic interests of consumers; to coordinate the administration of consumer services by transferring to such Department certain functions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Labor, and other agencies; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 7880. A bill to establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Community Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 7881. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 7882. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, with respect to exemptions from attachment and certain other process in the case of persons not residing in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia;

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 7883. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit the naturalization as citizens of the United States of persons over 50 years of age who have been living in the United States for periods totaling at least 20 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7884. A bill to provide for appointment of temporary employees to career positions in postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 7885. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.R. 7886. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a credit against income tax or a deduction from gross income for certain expenses of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 7887. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue, after he attains age 18, for so long as he is regularly attending high school or college; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 7888. A bill to amend the joint resolution of June 15, 1934, to enlarge the functions of the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission to provide for the encouragement of public appreciation of the inspiring heritage given to our country by the explorers and developers of the American West; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 7889. A bill to prohibit the use of measuring or timing devices to measure the work of an individual employee in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 7890. A bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 7891. A bill to establish a uniform system of time standards and measurement for the United States and to require the observance of such time standards for all purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 7892. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to place the Federal Housing Administration cooperative housing mortgage insurance program on a mutual basis; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7893. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to place the Federal Housing Administration cooperative housing mortgage insurance program on a mutual basis; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 7894. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to place the Federal Housing Administration cooperative housing mortgage insurance program on a mutual basis; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 7895. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to place the Federal Housing Administration cooperative housing mortgage insurance program on a mutual basis; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 7896. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to place the Federal Housing Administration cooperative housing mortgage insurance program on a mutual basis; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 7897. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to place the Federal Housing Administration cooperative housing mortgage insurance program on a mutual basis; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 7898. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to place the Federal Housing Administration cooperative housing mortgage insurance program on a mutual basis; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 7899. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to place the Federal Housing Administration cooperative housing mortgage insurance program on a mutual basis; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 7900. A bill to provide for the amortization of fixed assets of the Panama Canal Company that are classified as nondepreciable; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 7901. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 7902. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 7903. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 7904. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 7905. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 7906. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 7907. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 7908. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 7909. A bill to amend section 2306(f) of title 10, United States Code, relating to the adjustment of certain contract prices; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 7910. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to restore the granting of step increases on the basis of performance ratings of satisfactory in lieu of the standard of acceptable level of competence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 7911. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to make more specific the purpose for which loans may be made under sections 2 and 4 of such act, and to modify the provisions relating to interest rates on loans made under such act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 7912. A bill to amend in order to clarify the provisions of law authorizing the commitment of a defendant to the custody of the Attorney General for a study after conviction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.J. Res. 605. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.J. Res. 606. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.J. Res. 607. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the appointment of a committee to develop plans to assure impartial and efficient job placement service for all who seek employment and for all employers, as a public service; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.J. Res. 608. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.J. Res. 609. Joint resolution authorizing the continued shipment of the drug Krebiozen in interstate commerce in order to insure the continued availability of such drug for the treatment of patients now being treated with such drug and for terminal cancer patients; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.J. Res. 610. Joint resolution providing for appropriate Federal recognition of the Bowne House, Flushing, N.Y.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.J. Res. 611. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.J. Res. 612. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.J. Res. 613. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.J. Res. 614. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.J. Res. 615. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.J. Res. 616. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 617. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting nonsectarian prayer in public schools or other public places if participation therein is not compulsory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.J. Res. 618. Joint resolution authorizing the continued shipment of the drug Krebiozen in interstate commerce in order to insure the continued availability of such drug for the treatment of patients now being treated with such drug and for terminal cancer patients; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.J. Res. 619. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States pertaining to the offering of prayers in public schools and other public places in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.J. Res. 620. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Res. 468. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H. Res. 470. Resolution creating a Select Committee on National Space Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Res. 471. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate expenditures for research programs conducted by or sponsored by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 7913. A bill for the relief of Mirianna Varsic Zanotti and her minor child, Bruno Luigi Zanotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 7914. A bill for the relief of Prof. Visweswara L. Madhysatha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 7915. A bill for the relief of Jose Sanchez Zarco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 7916. A bill for the relief of Doraiswamy Varadachar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.R. 7917. A bill for the relief of Kazuko Nishioka Dowd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 7918. A bill for the relief of Kyoko Kobori Brigham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Day They Shook the Plum Tree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I call attention of the House to a current bestseller. It is "The Day They Shook the Plum Tree," the story of Hetty Green, the "witch of Wall Street," written by Arthur H. Lewis, who resides in my district in Philadelphia.

Mr. Lewis, a former newspaperman, deserves commendation for his diligence and research in the life and times of Hetty Green, who amassed a fortune, estimated at $300 million, with a complete disregard for her fellow citizens.

She lived in squalor, deprived her son and daughter of a proper home life, and left not 1 cent to charity. Her fortune ultimately was squandered by her son in aimless and riotous living, and finally disposed of in a senseless fashion by the daughter.

It is of interest to note that only a few hours after Mrs. Green's death in 1916, William Jennings Bryan, then a Congressman, noting that she had lived in a cheap boardinghouse and contributed only a few hundred dollars a year to the national economy, stated:

> This woman, under our indirect method of taxation, did not pay as much toward the

support of the Federal Government as a laboring man whose income of $500 is spent on his family.

The reason for bringing this book to the attention of the House is to put in proper focus the danger of accumulation of mammoth fortunes without regard for public welfare. Hetty Green's "public be damned" attitude is still with us. It exists in the case of multimillionaires who misuse their vast fortunes in a selfish grab for power. Some set up so-called foundations which provide the funds for hate peddlers. Great sums are spent by them to fight progressive legislation and to weaken the fabric of our democracy.

On the other hand, there are a number of wealthy individuals who have dedicated their fortunes to noble ends. Those, like the Rockefeller and Ford foundations, annually spend millions to help eradicate disease, support the pursuit of knowledge, feed the hungry, and build a better life for victims of misfortune.

America must ever be alert that the public welfare be guarded from the greed of the Hetty Greens. We must revise our tax laws so that venal money lords do not find loopholes to evade their rightful tax responsibilities. We must encourage legitimate foundations set up for the public good, but we must not allow foundations to be used as devices to spread hate propaganda in an effort to divide our people in the guise of education.

The story of Hetty Green should be a warning to America that money can be a curse when misused, and a blessing when it is spent for the good of mankind.

An Outstanding Political and Civic Leader Passes to His Final Reward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, this week sadly marked the passing of one of Illinois' outstanding political and civic leaders. On July 30, 1963, Jerry Dolezal, member of the Cook County Board of Commissioners and popular Republican leader in my congressional district, died in the Presbyterian-St. Luke's Hospital in Chicago.

Few men in the long and impressive history of State politics will leave as indelible a mark of achievement as did Commissioner Dolezal. His contribution to all of the people in his community, to his country and to the Republican Party will always be remembered.

Unlike many men who enter politics, Commissioner Dolezal was not a man with selfish, personal ambitions; for if he had been so, he could not have been denied a much higher public office because of his ability and the great respect which was accorded him by both Republicans and Democrats alike. Instead he chose the course of helping others in the common cause of strengthening his own political party while insisting on better government in the process.

The name of Dolezal is symbolic of the great civic progress which has been made in the town of Cicero, now a community of more than 70,000. As a resident and leader in this community, which once carried the stigma of the old days of gangsterism, Dolezal enlisted the aid of good citizens, church, business and industrial leaders in establishing a program to improve the town and its standards at every level. With the cooperation of public officials and other civic-minded leaders, he accomplished projects which today have made Cicero a fine residential area in which to live—in which the residents take great pride in their homes as well as their educational and civic achievements.

At the same time, Dolezal contributed to the progress of adjacent suburbs, served as Superintendent of the Illinois Industrial Home for the Blind, and more recently did an outstanding job as one of the Commissioners of Cook County, as a member of the board which serves its more than 4,800,000 citizens. Jerry Dolezal's untiring efforts and accomplishments will not stand alone in the memory of those who have been privileged to know and associate with him, as have I. For, indeed, there was a warm personal side to this man, which none of us will forget. To have known him was to love and respect him.

He was a man of deep conviction, yet never ill-tempered or intolerant. The gentlemanly qualities he possessed were recognized by friend and political foe alike.

He lived by the precept he so often quietly voiced to his political proteges, of which I am proud to be one, "Promises are made to be fulfilled for a man is judged by the way he keeps his word."

Just as Commissioner Dolezal was an inspiration to so many while he lived, so may his memory provide an inspiration to those who will follow in pursuing the hopes and ideals of an outstanding leader and an esteemed gentleman.

Goethe Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on August 28 we observe the anniversary of the birth of Germany's greatest poet, Johann Wolfgang van Goethe. Goethe's name symbolizes the highest achievements of culture and humanism. He was as aware as any writer in his century of the dark abyss of the human heart and the follies and tragedies of history. Yet unlike many of his contemporaries, this knowledge did not make him despair. Although he lived in an age when the word "culture" suggested the sheltered life, the ivory tower, and frequently contempt for the problems of the real world, Goethe participated in active and creative pursuits. A man who has become immortal because of his magnificent prose and poetry, he also devoted himself to science, to the history of art, and to the administration of the state in which he lived—all without compromising his independence as an artist. "Never, in my vocation as an author," he once said, "have I asked what would the people like and how I could (through my poetry) serve the whole. I have always striven to improve myself, to raise the standard of my personality, and to express only that which I recognized as good and true."

The noble cultural tradition of Goethe has been perpetuated by many German artists. As evidence of the continued influence of Goethe's devotion to culture I need only mention two artists who have lived in my own State of California, Arnold Schoenberg and Otto Klemperer. Both the composer, Schoenberg, and the conductor, Klemperer, came to California as exiles from Nazi Germany. Schoenberg was known throughout the musical world for his revolutionary use of "atonal" scales in his music; Klemperer, because he was one of the great conductors of the century. These two great artists have demonstrated, in the spirit of Goethe, that the German people remain leading contributors to the world's music. Like the great 18th century poet, also, their lives and works indicate that art and music knows no national boundaries.

Fiftieth Anniversary of Girl Scouts of the U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Miami Beach is one of the communities in Florida's Fourth District, which I am privileged to represent. I need not go into its justly famed beauties and attractions which draw visitors from every State in the Union and practically every country in the world. None of these visitors will be more hospitably welcomed as bestowers of distinction and honor to the community than the members of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, who will hold their national convention at Miami Beach next October 21 to 25. Seven thousand delegates and vistiors are expected to attend this triennial meeting.

Mr. Speaker, as you and my colleagues know, the Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. is chartered by the Congress and all members receive an annual report. After examining the material which recently came to me, I am prompted to pay a sincere tribute to this fine organization and the contribution it has made to our Nation and to the youth of the world.

A gentlewoman of the Deep South, Juliette Gordon Low of Savannah, Ga., organized the first troop of 12 girls on March 12, 1912. Since that time there have been a total of 18½ million members of the Girl Scouts—more than 14 million girls and 4 million adults. The guiding purpose is to help girls develop as happy, resourceful individuals, willing to share their abilities as citizens in their homes, their communities, their country and the world. Membership is open to all girls between the ages of 7 through 17 years who accept the Girl Scout Promise and Laws. Membership dues are $1 per year. Adults, both men and women, are eligible for membership if they subscribe to the Promise and Laws and pay the same dues as girls. They work as leaders, council members, troop committee members, program consultants, finance advisers or in other positions of voluntary leadership.

The type of citizenship engendered by Girl Scout training is clearly shown forth by the Girl Scout Promise:

> On my honor, I will try: To do my duty to God and my country, to help other people at all times, and to obey the Girl Scout Laws.

The Girl Scout laws, designed to inspire the highest ideals of character and conduct, outline a code of behavior for young people which will stand them in good stead as citizens and mature adults. They are laws of which all of us can afford to be reminded:

> A Girl Scout's honor is to be trusted.
> A Girl Scout is loyal.
> A Girl Scout's duty is to be useful and to help others.
> A Girl Scout is a friend to all and a sister to every other Girl Scout.
> A Girl Scout is courteous.
> A Girl Scout is a friend to animals.
> A Girl Scout obeys orders.
> A Girl Scout is cheerful.
> A Girl Scout is thrifty.
> A Girl Scout is clean in thought, word, and deed.

Through Girl Scout activities, girls put these laws into action and learn to develop a wide range of personal interests. The program activities are based on 11 fields of interest: Agriculture, arts and crafts, community life, health and safety, homemaking, international friendship, literature and dramatics, music and dancing, nature, out-of-doors, sports and games.

All Girl Scout activities are designed to carry out the motto: "Be Prepared" and to help the girls develop ability to cope with a variety of situations, to meet emergencies, and to lead stimulating and constructive lives.

The very essence of the democratic ideal is set forth in the Girl Scout slogan, "Do a good turn daily." Service to an individual, a group or the community is the inherent principle of scouting.

The troop is the basic unit of government in scouting. The girls meet weekly with adult leaders to plan their activities. There are a total of 163,000 Girl Scout troops in the United States and at U.S. military and civilian locations in 48 countries around the world. Scouts belonging to U.S. troops overseas are called TOFS—Troops on Foreign Soil.

As may well be expected, the strength and growth of the Girl Scouts of the United States is the result of judicious guidance and foresight. Its program throughout its 50-year history—the 50th anniversary is being celebrated this year—has been shaped by the changing needs of girls in a changing society. Although the fundamental values of Girl Scouting have remained unaltered there has been a series of adaptations in the program to keep it current. The Girl Scout leadership is deeply aware, in this era of unrest and mounting social problems, of its responsibility to provide for all girls the most stimulating and constructive program possible, geared towards the development of fine character and good citizenship.

This coming September 9, there will simultaneously be released four new Girl Scout handbooks, launching a new contemporary design in the program. This will provide a total and continuous program of informal education and recreation for girls from 7 through 17. It is based on the most recent findings in the fields of child psychology and curriculum development. This program provides for four age levels—instead of the former three—to correspond with the development of today's girls:

Brownies, age 7 and 8.
Juniors, age 9, 10, 11.
Cadettes, age 12, 13, 14.
Seniors, age 15, 16, 17.

Each age level has its own handbook and the progression from the Brownie to the Senior handbook reflects the increasing ability of girls, as they grow from 7 through 17, to understand more difficult concepts and accomplish more difficult tasks.

Each of the four age levels will build on what has gone before, so that a girl who joins at age 7 can continue to grow in Girl Scouting through the age of 17—always with a sense of widening horizons and new goals for endeavor. At the same time, the structure within each age level will be such that a girl can begin in Girl Scouting at any age from 7 through 17, joining in the activities of her troopmates without going back to fulfill requirements the others have finished.

At each level, learning what lies ahead in Girl Scouting will be an integral part of the program, and older girls will be expected to assume definite responsibility for showing and explaining activities to troops of the next younger group. In these ways Girl Scouts of all ages will learn to recognize that the meaning of Girl Scouting in their lives can grow deeper with every year of membership.

In addition and as a corollary of the new four-step program, Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. are also implementing a new council coverage plan designed to provide the strong councils, by merger and consolidation, which are essential to realization of the infinite possibilities of the 1963 redesigned program. These local councils will touch border to border, thus achieving total coverage of the United States. At the present time, approximately 90 percent of the girl membership is in councils where coverage has been completed or in councils which have voted their willingness to become part of a changed or enlarged jurisdiction.

Among the benefits credited to the plan are greater camping opportunities, improved leadership training, increased volunteer participation and more efficient use of funds through elimination of duplication. It is estimated that when this plan is completed there will be no city, village, or hamlet in this country that is not included in the jurisdiction of a Girl Scout council that has the potential of personnel, finances, and access to community resources to carry out its own total responsibilities and provide a Scouting program of opportunities diversified and challenging enough for the present and the future.

With the streamlined approach and "new look" of the coverage plan, Girl Scout membership has increased since 1946 from 958,000 to 2,688,000, and adult membership from 256,000 to 747,000. Lone troops in the United States now represent only 1 percent of the total girls membership as compared with 14.8 percent 17 years ago.

Under council coverage, Girl Scouting continues to have firm and enduring roots in the neighborhood, whatever the size of the council jurisdiction. Girls still experience the personal satisfaction of troop activities in their own communities, plus the exhilarating and rewarding camaraderie provided through joint activities with troops from quite different areas which, however, are within the same council jurisdiction. Completion of council coverage has been set for December 1963, to coincide with the initiation of the new four-step Girl Scout program.

Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing and encouraging in these troublous times to be reminded of an organization of young people and adults who are daily working to express more fully the ideals of our great democracy and to contribute their share toward freedom and peace for all nations on earth. Such, I believe, is the contribution made by the leaders and members of the Girl Scouts of the U.S.A.

Income Sources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it has been called to my attention that a number of my colleagues led by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] earlier in this session inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statements of their sources of income. They did so because they believed that the public was entitled to such information from its elected representatives who daily must make decisions affecting a wide variety of interests. I wish to commend my colleagues for having taken such action. I believe as they do that such disclosures are in the public interest.

My principal income is derived from my congressional salary and allowances. My only other sources of income consist of rent received on my Washington residence during the months of each year that my family and I spend at our home in Michigan, dividends of less than $50 a year from a small investment in American Telephone & Telegraph stock, and speaking fees of less than $1,000 per year received by me from various organizations outside of my own district to which I have spoken.

Second District Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the best means available for me to determine the views of my constituents is the annual questionnaire I mail to each household in my district. I am pleased the people of the second district have the interest they do in national and world affairs.

Of the 92,500 questionnaires I mailed, 12.7 percent were returned, many with interesting and constructive comments. Actually the percentage of returned questionnaires was higher when you consider that some could not be delivered because of address changes. If you allow for this nonforwardable mail, 14.4 percent of the questionnaires were answered.

Several persons who answered my poll asked me why I had not sent an extra copy for their wife or husband. I sent only one to each household because it is impossible to determine how many adults reside at a given address. These addresses were obtained from the various telephone directories in the district. However, if there are those who would like to have additional copies of the questionnaire, I shall be happy to send them.

When the answers to my questionnaire reached my office, Mr. Speaker, they were grouped into six categories by occupation. These categories included business, farmer, labor, professional, white collar, and miscellaneous. This last group included unsigned questionnaires, housewives, retired persons, students, and others who could not be readily classified in one of the other categories.

As I said before, many questionnaires were returned with interesting and constructive comments. I am grateful to those who took the time and the trouble to comment in detail on the issues and problems we face. The ratio of answers with comments was about 3 in 7. These remarks are a great help to me in determining how best to represent the people who sent me here to represent them. Of course, I wish there had been enough time for me to give a more detailed reply to each person who answered the questionnaire, for I should like to have done so.

Mr. Speaker, the views of the majority who answered generally parallel my own. I know the Members of Congress will be interested in the outcome of my questionnaire, so under leave to extend my remarks, I include the detailed results in the RECORD. The figures I use here represent percentages, not the number of persons who answered a particular question:

1. In order of importance to you, number the six most important issues today:

	Business	Farmer	Labor	Professional	White collar	Miscellaneous	All
National defense	20	14	23	14	20	20	19
Foreign policy	12	15	8	22	16	15	15
Cuba	17	10	13	10	13	10	12
Federal encroachment	15	21	7	8	10	12	11
Budget	11	4	8	13	9	10	9
Taxes	10	7	10	7	10	8	9
Employment	6	1	14	3	8	6	7
Education	3	1	4	13	4	5	6
Nuclear test ban	4	1	5	4	4	3	4
Medical care	(1)	3	2	(1)	2	6	3
Farm problems	(1)	16	2	(1)	(1)	1	2
Berlin	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
De Gaulle	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Vietnam	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Other	3	5	3	4	3	4	3

[1] Less than 1 percent.

2. The President has proposed cuts in income taxes, but at the same time has submitted a $12 billion deficit budget. Should Congress (A) cut taxes regardless of the deficit; (B) cut taxes only if spending is reduced; (C) balance budget and reduce national debt?

	A	B	C
Business	12	52	36
Farm	12	45	43
Labor	17	42	41
Professional	11	55	35
White collar	13	51	36
Miscellaneous	18	39	43
All	14	47	39

3. Should Mount Baker and Snoqualmie National Forests areas continue to be operated under the multiple-use concept or should they be restricted to recreational use only?

	Multiple use	Single use
Business	83	17
Farm	79	21
Labor	81	19
Professional	77	23
White collar	72	28
Miscellaneous	75	25
All	78	22

4. De Gaulle has refused the President's offer to give the Polaris submarine to France. Should we: (A) Pressure France to accept our Polaris; (B) sell some subs to NATO; (C) assign them to NATO with multination control?

	A	B	C
Business	10	30	60
Farm	7	42	51
Labor	8	36	56
Professional	4	31	65
White collar	4	36	60
Miscellaneous	9	25	66
All	7	32	61

5. Should the U.S. contribute to United Nations funds from which it draws cash to pay for programs extended to Cuba such as the agriculture project?

	Yes	No
Business	13	87
Farm	12	88
Labor	14	86
Professional	34	66
White collar	27	73
Miscellaneous	19	81
All	20	80

6. Do you favor a voluntary medical care program for our senior citizens over a compulsory program?

	Yes	No
Business	85	15
Farm	83	17
Labor	85	15
Professional	82	18
White collar	73	27
Miscellaneous	76	24
All	79	21

7. Should we revise our military and economic assistance program to cut off so-called neutral countries which receive Russian aid?

	Yes	No
Business	76	24
Farm	86	14
Labor	81	19
Professional	62	38
White collar	73	27
Miscellaneous	76	24
All	75	25

8. Do you favor establishment of a Domestic Peace Corps?

	Yes	No
Business	44	56
Farm	48	52
Labor	51	49
Professional	52	48
White collar	45	55
Miscellaneous	45	55
All	47	53

9. Should the U.S. take a firmer stand toward Cuba, even at the risk of war?

	Yes	No
Business	88	12
Farm	86	14
Labor	84	16
Professional	82	18
White collar	88	12
Miscellaneous	78	22
All	83	17

10. Should Congress pass my bill to place import quotas on Canadian lumber?

	Yes	No
Business	79	21
Farm	85	15
Labor	84	16
Professional	67	33
White collar	74	26
Miscellaneous	76	24
All	77	23

11. Do you favor an increase in earning limits of social security recipients?

	Yes	No
Business	78	22
Farm	72	28
Labor	80	20
Professional	79	21
White collar	81	19
Miscellaneous	66	34
All	76	24

Mr. Speaker, the results again show that many people of my district are concerned with national defense. Closely tied to this issue is foreign affairs which ranked second. However, the thinking of the people back home is shifting. Thirty-six percent rated national defense the top issue in 1961. Last year 42 percent chose defense as the key issue. This year the results show that 19 percent selected national defense for the No. 1 spot.

On the other hand, foreign affairs received only 8 percent of the vote in 1961 and only 6 percent in 1962. This year, foreign policy polled 15 percent and Cuba 12 percent. This indicates to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is growing concern in my district over the way the foreign affairs of our Nation are being run.

Also, there is growing concern over Federal encroachment, which ranked third this year, having moved up from fourth place in 1962. I received a large number of comments related to this issue as well as comments on national defense, spending and foreign affairs.

The fact that taxes and the budget ranked as fifth most important issue, that 47 percent believe taxes should be cut only if spending is reduced, and that 39 percent believe the budget should be balanced is a real strong indication the people of my district see the relationship between fiscal responsibility and a sound dollar.

Employment ranked sixth this year, having replaced education and medical care of previous years as most important issues. All of us recognize the problems created by unemployment. I hope efforts can be made in my own district to level the peaks and valleys caused by seasonal fluctuations.

Mr. Speaker, the majority in each category in effect expressed the same view toward all major issues. As I have pointed out in the past, this means the people of the Second District are in agreement when it comes to what is good for our country.

Statement in Support of S. 108, Making Columbus Day a Legal Public Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. A. THOMPSON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the story of Christopher Columbus is an inspiration to all men. His intellectual, physical, and moral courage; his persistence in planning and carrying out his ambitious enterprise against apparently overwhelming odds; the vast scope and far-reaching consequences of his discovery—all are surely worthy of commemoration in the most thorough and wholehearted fashion. A great majority of the States, amounting to almost four-fifths of the States of the Union, and representing a preponderance of the population of the United States, already observe the anniversary of Columbus' landing by the closing of banks and public offices, and by appropriate community ceremonies. It is surely proper that the will of the people of the United States, thus visibly and unmistakably expressed, should be carried out by a corresponding observance on the part of the Federal Government.

Such public, national recognition paid to Christopher Columbus would be of value as a gesture of solidarity with our Latin-American neighbor republics, most of which observe Columbus Day as a national public holiday. It would, further, be a significant recognition of the important part played by Spanish and other Latin explorers, colonists, missionaries and settlers, in the formation of the United States, and, as such, would be warmly welcomed not only by the Latin elements in our population but by all of us. I strongly recommend, therefore, that S. 108, making Columbus Day a legal public holiday, be given an early hearing by the Committee on the Judiciary, and urge that both the committee and the Senate take prompt and favorable action upon the bill.

Legal Effect of Partial Test Ban Pact Only That of Unilateral Moratorium Under Provisions of Soviet Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, article IV of the partial test ban treaty negotiated in Moscow provides the treaty shall be of unlimited duration but provides for withdrawal if "extraordinary events" are believed to "have jeopardized the supreme interests" of the withdrawing country. The treaty stipulates 3 months' advance notice of withdrawal.

The provisions of article IV of the treaty are in direct conflict with article 49–0 of the Soviet Constitution which entitles the Soviet Government to abrogate any treaty instantly, with or without cause.

There is no provision of Soviet law which provides for the Soviet Constitution to be overridden by the provisions of a treaty.

Based on article IV's inconsistency with constitutional provisions, the Soviets may at any future time declare the treaty invalid from its beginning and the effect of such declaration will be instantaneous.

As an alternative, the Soviet Government, acting in secret session of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. may, under authority of article 49–0, denounce the treaty. This act would operate instantaneously to release the Soviet Government of its obligation to deliver 3 months' advance notice or withdrawal, or any notice at all. Under these circumstances, the U.S.S.R. could keep secret from all other parties its renunciation of the obligations of the treaty until such time as appeared most advantageous to the U.S.S.R. suddenly to reveal it.

Under either alternative, all parties to the treaty other than the U.S.S.R. in actual practice are committing themselves fully to the pact in exchange for what, in actual practice, amounts to no more than a unilateral moratorium on the part of the Soviets.

An American Manifesto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a magnificent speech, in the true American manner, by our colleague from New Hampshire, LOUIS C. WYMAN. Congressman WYMAN's "An American Manifesto," sets forth in clear terms what is needed in the United States to replace the tolerance of the Communist philosophy so alien and dangerous to our freedom.

AN AMERICAN MANIFESTO

(Address of Hon. LOUIS C. WYMAN)

Reverend clergy, fellow Legionnaires, and distinguished guests, I appreciate the honor of your invitation to address you briefly this evening. I assure you my remarks will not be longer than 20 minutes.

The country seethes with growing pains. The world has a similar affliction. Men of conviction and sincerity differ markedly in their opinion as to the course we should pursue. It is to the problem of the general direction of our national fortunes that I address myself tonight.

The American Legion is a great organization. Its recommendations concerning national policy are heard in Washington. Many of them are enacted into law by the Congress. Many more have been adopted by the executive branch of the Government. The contributions of the Legion to American thought and action, particularly with respect to its firm stand against subversion from within and aggression from without, have been invaluable. I congratulate you all for a constructive and dynamic record of pro-Americanism. We could use more American Legion policy in the conduct of national affairs.

We have witnessed profound changes in the United States in recent years. There has been a great migration from the fields and the farms to the cities, a tremendous expansion of population, vast and rapid advances in the field of scientific technology, in space, in television, in communications, in weapons of war. We have devised all manner of horrible means of destruction, from hundred-megaton atomic bombs to nerve gases and bacteria. Plans to land a man on the moon are tempered by a realization that in the process of getting there we must maintain military supremacy in outer space between the earth and the moon or we may never be allowed to get to the moon at all.

All these things are greatly complicated by the fact that they cost added billions and billions of dollars when the Nation is already burdened by a huge national debt of over $305 billion, which the Congress is regularly asked to increase. Many of us believe that in good times we should operate the Federal Government on a pay-as-you-go basis and make some reduction in this huge national debt. Yet, there is little evidence that either the executive branch or the liberal majority of the Congress is prepared to risk popular disfavor by rejecting expensive program after expensive program that will increase this debt perhaps to a point of no return.

Huge western farmers continue to demand to be paid for farm products they do not grow. Particular groups, many of them justifiably so, urge that they should receive Federal payments and benefits on a grand scale without regard to the effect upon the Treasury. The great cities plead for hundreds of millions of Federal dollars for mass transit facilities. There is rising demand for Federal aid to education of billions more. In our efforts to impress peoples in faraway lands of the sincerity of our desire to achieve understanding and world peace, we have established a national Peace Corps of volunteer citizens that in the present budget involves a cost of more than $100 million. It is suggested that, to meet the challenges of juvenile delinquency, we should now have a domestic peace corps costing more millions. Foreign aid rolls on to the tune of billions more.

In the meantime, interest of the national debt alone exceeds $10 billion a year, each year, and our defense appropriations are at a level in excess of $50 billion a year.

With but $15 billion worth of gold left at Fort Knox, foreign creditors hold $24 billion worth of claims on this gold. Our balance of payments—the ratio between what we pay for goods imported and what we receive for goods exported—is steadily declining.

This is a serious, even urgent, fiscal crisis. It is worse in detail—which time does not permit. But I would observe that if we continue much longer to spend more than we take in, to operate the Federal Government at a huge deficit, to refuse to face up to the requirement that government, to avoid bankruptcy, must be operated as must any business or home, we invite runaway inflation and advance the day of probable devaluation of the dollar. The disastrous effect of either of these eventualities is written large on the pages of history in what has happened in other nations that have taken such a road. The caution light is clearly lit and the red light is not far away.

In the meantime, on Monday of this week, in a series of opinions in a single case running to more than 130 pages, the U.S. Supreme Court solemnly announced that, in its view, the American Constitution does not permit required recitation of the Lord's Prayer in the public schools, even under circumstances wherein any student who so wishes may refrain from participation in the prayer. This opinion follows the outlawing by the Court of another voluntary prayer prescribed by the board of regents in the New York school system. To me, the pattern of such decisions is a portent of disaster for America.

In the Congress we were asked to comment upon this decision and I observed that "In a morass of legal verbosity the High Court has lost perspective and now even humility before God. Americans are deeply concerned."

While the Constitution clearly prohibits a state religion, it is urgently important that we not become an irreligious state.

In the quiet hours before going over the top—to use the words of Arthur Guy Empey—or in the moment of crisis as the engines of a bomber warmed up for a mission over Germany in the last war, or in the silent moments before D-day in Normandy, or even in Cooper's space capsule, each of these true American heroes turned to prayer for comfort and for confidence. Our Pledge of Allegiance affirms that we are one nation under God. The daily sessions of the House and Senate are opened with prayer. Perhaps the greatest strength of this Nation, composed as it is of many differing theologies, is that it is humble in recognition of a Divine Being.

Refinements in the field of jurisprudence derived from a constitutional prohibition that Congress or the States shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, ought never to indulge themselves in the impertinence of the provocative suggestion that young people in the public school system should not also be encouraged, if they want, to recognize God.

Despite protestations of indifference based on technicality that we may not have a state religion, we are a Christian nation under God, dedicated to religious freedom and to belief in God. The Court's unnecessary restraint upon voluntary recitation of prayers in the public schools is, to me, an invitation to disintegration, because implicit in such decision is a measure of material self-confidence that approaches a condition of cockiness before the great dispenser of infinite justice. It is sort of like asking for it.

As I said on the floor of the House earlier this week:

"The real question in determining the eventual success or failure of democracy in the world is not whether God is on our side but whether we are on God's side. The pattern of these decisions of the Supreme Court do not help us to be on God's side."

Seven years ago, I had the privilege of addressing you at Newport, N.H., on June 23, 1956. In that talk, I referred to several problems that were then of grave concern to the country and particularly to the American Legion. These included (1) Communist military supplies to Nasser; (2) Soviet buildup around the world toward a shift in the balance of power to the Soviet Union; (3) the ineffectiveness of the United Nations; (4) the stalemate in Korea and violations of the armistice thereafter by the Communists; (5) Communist military buildup including at that time from Janes Fighting Ships more than 400 submarines, 20,000 bombers, and so on, while the cocktail party diplomatic corps urged further appeasement upon this country; (6) that neutrality in the face of communism was an invitation to disaster; (7) that our example in refusing to help in Hungary and elsewhere was scarcely encouraging to those nations undecided between the East and the West; (8) that a Soviet steamship in the Caribbean, loaded with arms and ammunition and destined for a country in Central America, should have been turned around or sunk; (9) that in the face of communism's phony peace offensive lay the greatest danger as more and more Americans might be persuaded to believe it. These concerns then apparent are of even greater magnitude today—7 years later.

I quoted from the great English scholar, Macaulay, who a hundred years ago said of America:

"Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reigns of government with a strong hand; or your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the 20th century as the Roman Empire was in the 5th; with this difference, that the huns and vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, and that your huns and vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions."

Friends, the urgence of decisively meeting the Communist thrust is imperative. Those who believe that by turning the other cheek we can assure peaceful coexistence in perpetuity are living on borrowed time in a fool's paradise.

Let's face some dismal facts. We have been losing every year ever since the end of World War II, with a few small exceptions. What we have claimed as victories have, at best, only amounted to holding an uneasy status quo. We surrendered China through a policy of coalition governments. The stalemate in Korea was, in fact, a defeat for Korea is indefensible today. In calling off the British and the French in their defense of Suez, we created the Soviet protege, Nasser. In Hungary, we talked big and then let thousands of courageous Hungarians die like sheep in the face of Russian tanks. With the U–2, we had no plan for the contingency of a crash or a shoot-down.

So inadequate was our policy here that we even lied when first faced with the pictures. Now, we have Communist guns, bombs, planes, and military personnel in Cuba. When the President courageously imposed a quarantine last fall the country cheered—only to see this position quickly abandoned without curing the cancer—a cancer that is rapidly spreading in this hemisphere.

The tragedy of most of these things is that they never needed to have happened had we been willing to do then what we must do eventually, to risk war in standing firm for peace and freedom. Had we done this earlier the probabilities of war were minimal. Even today, I am convinced that if we show the Soviet Union we are willing to fight for freedom and justice, for our allies, there will be no war. This is the best way to avoid war. But human beings what they are and morale being what it is, there comes a time when if one side or one team loses long enough the will to win evaporates. I wonder if we have lost the will to win. I wonder if, instead, there has developed a new national policy of coexistence with the devil. We all know—or should know—what such a policy will mean in the long run. Certainly it is not victory.

The Communists today, whether their leader's name is Khrushchev or Stalin, use every event, every happening, every unfortunate incident in the world to encourage dissension, distrust, and conflict within the Western World and its allies. They charter allied ships, they trade in strategic materiel around the world, they subsidize Canadian purchases of chickens for transshipment to Cuba, they profit from the Cuban sugar market in world trade, they erect pipelines to ship oil to European markets at less even than their slave labor cost to undersell and obviously to ruin American companies. All this and more is their economic warfare which, accompanied by their propaganda of the big lie and the massive indoctrination of propaganda that American imperialism aims at the destruction of the Soviet Union through germ warfare if need be, intentionally aggravates an explosive world situation.

They even indoctrinate the young people of other nations with the same anti-American hatred venom. Young Cubans are sent in Soviet ships to Russia for their indoctrination in hatred toward us.

Here in America, what has been our policy? We have had Yugoslav Army officers attend our Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.—officers whose military discipline and philosophical training constitutes them captives of the Communist bloc, whether or not they are members of the Communist Party. We trade with Communist satellite nations and accept their products for sale in our stores in competition with our own; we abandon the Monroe Doctrine and permit Communist military aggression in this hemisphere.

On June 10 the President of the United States, in announcing new talks with Britain and Russia on atomic test-ban agreement, said: "History teaches us that enmities between nations as between individuals do not last forever * * *. Let us reexamine our attitude toward the Soviet Union."

With all due respect to the Office of the Presidency—of whatever political persuasion—I say to you tonight that this is perilous talk. It is so contrary to historical fact in its dreaminess that it is frightening. It reflects advices and advisers that endanger the national security.

We are in a struggle to the death with communism, everywhere in the world. No amount of being nice to Communists will alter their fanatical goal of American destruction. It cannot, for such is the essence of Marxist-Leninist doctrine. It is not our attitude toward the Soviet Union that is at fault. It is the Soviet Union's Communist program for subversion and conquest of the free world. If an American President does not know this, something is radically wrong and at pretty high levels.

We do not know what potential destructive capacity there is in Cuba. Make no mistake about this. We cannot know unless we take a look. Unless we inspect. There has been no inspection, and apparently it is not the official policy of the United States to demand it. These facts are an awful indictment of a government, no matter its party name, that professes to accept the responsibility for leadership of the American people.

On several occasions, I have met privately with a group of Congressmen of both political parties for discussions with leaders of this country, past and present, to discuss the possibility of devising a workable program to meet the Cuban problem. The other day, a high official of my political party suggested that it was poor politics for me to work with members of the opposition party to achieve such a program, on the basis that if the problem remained unsolved in 1964 it would be a great issue for Republicans. I told this man, and I say to you here tonight, that I represent all of the people of my district and that when it comes to the security of America and the survival of this Nation I am not going to think or act in terms of political advantage. If we can devise a satisfactory, workable, reasonable, practical solution, I will not hesitate to join other members on both sides of the aisle in urging it upon the President at the earliest possible moment. We cannot afford to wait until 1964. Nor will I hesitate to support the President if he acts to implement it, regardless of political considerations. To me this is of the essence of responsibility in government.

I know you are asking what kind of a program are they thinking of. What is a possible solution? I will tell you that, on the drawing boards, on the working sheets at the moment we have outlined a tentative start. It is as follows:

(a) Firm determination and announcement to our people and to the world of the determination that we are in this worldwide struggle called the cold war—to win.

(b) Demand of Castro full and free inspection of the Island of Cuba on a continuing basis at a very early date, with the announcement that if our inspection teams are refused we will inspect by force.

(c) Announcement and adherence to a policy that the United States of America will not tolerate Communist governments in this hemisphere and will use force if necessary to prevent them.

You have been patient and I appreciate your courtesy. I share with you an abiding conviction that we live in the most wonderful land in all the world, that we are fortunate indeed to be American citizens, and that if we are to insure for those to follow us anything like the blessings which the good Lord has seen fit to allow us, we must prepare now to stand firm and decisively for freedom. The American people owe much to the American Legion for its dedication to this cause.

Aid to Education Without Federal Interference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, many people in my district have written to me expressing criticism of the U.S. Supreme Court ban on religious practices in public schools. The same position has been reiterated by many clergymen who are concerned over the outlawing of the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading in our public school system. Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish spokesmen have been vehement in denouncing the strange dictum of the highest court of our land.

One of the most thought-provoking editorials prompted by the Court decision appeared in the Washington Evening Star on June 17. I quote herewith its concluding paragraph:

> In the process God and religion have all but been driven from the public schools. What remains? Will the baccalaureate service and Christmas carols be the next to go? Don't bet against it.

It is not a pleasant notion, Mr. Speaker, but it is a question that must be faced realistically in view of the assortment of Supreme Court decisions that seem to give emphatic preference to atheism and agnosticism over the philosophy that there is a Divine Being and Americans should be encouraged to worship Him. In view of this opprobrious inclination on the part of the Court, supporters of any program to extend the power of the Federal Government—and in particular those who advocate Federal aid to education—should make a cautious and extensive reappraisal of their position.

In opposing Federal aid to education, I have over the years warned that bureaucratic control would inevitably follow bestowal of U.S. funds to State and local school systems. This consideration is in itself sufficiently repugnant to reject any legislation that would permit Washington bureaucrats to get a foot in the door of our public and parochial school systems. Such a plan is all the more odious in view of the truism that all funds which come from Washington represent but a portion of revenue collected. In every instance an important percentage of the total must be deducted to pay the salaries of the hordes of Government workers and for the maintenance of their plush offices. From the time that the so-called school construction bill was introduced in 1957, I insisted that the more reasonable and more economic way to provide necessary school buildings and better teachers' salaries would be a tax reduction to enable our citizenry to meet these problems at the local level.

The economic consideration holds as true today as it did in 1957, or in 1907, or as far back as you may care to go. For this reason I have introduced H.R. 5680, which is now before the Committee on Ways and Means. It would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer increased personal exemptions for his children while they are attending a school. The deduction for the parent of a child in grade school or high school would amount to $800 and the parent of a college or university student would be allowed a deduction of $1,000. This increase from the usual $600 exemption would apply to parents of all students, regardless of what schools they attend—public, parochial or private.

Mr. Speaker, the job of providing for the education of America's youth was not assigned to the Federal Government by our Founding Fathers. It is true that financing our schools has become more burdensome with the passing of years, and parents who choose to send their children to denominational institutions encounter exceptional obstacles because they are in effect contributing to the support of two school systems. Behind these fiscal difficulties is the very bureaucracy which so many other aid-to-education measures propose to enlarge. The average parent has experienced less buying power with each dollar because of inflation created by a profligate and irresponsible Federal Government. Inflation, in addition, serves as a cruel encumbrance on retired teachers and other pensioned men and women as well as on everyone who depends upon savings or insurance to finance his children's education or to see him through his twilight years. High taxes are a further detriment to his ability to provide the necessities of life, including an education for his children.

H.R. 5680, in allowing the parent to retain a greater share of the wages he earns, opens the way for him to support the schools of his community and gives him a little more of the wherewithal to send children to college.

Mr. Speaker, I have been confounded by the various bills introduced this year to allow increased exemptions from income tax in the cases of parents whose children are in institutions of higher learning but which completely disregard those boys and girls who are in grade school or high school. Unless the American parent can afford to support local primary and secondary schools and to pay teachers the high wages that they merit, there will be no need for colleges and universities. Our first responsibility is the grade and high school. They must be kept in good repair, we must continue to build them, laboratories and needed supplies must always be available, and the salaries of faculty members must never be permitted to lag. Too often there has been a poverty of principle in the aid-to-education issue. Any legislation providing Federal grants would be particularly unfair to Pennsylvania, which must pay $1.23 to the U.S. Treasury for every dollar it receives in return, whereas Texas—whose economy is booming through Uncle Sam's multibillion-dollar defense and space programs—makes a 20-percent profit on every exchange with Washington.

H.R. 5680 invites a solution of our school problems. In the process, it will have a tendency to check the extravagance of an already too big bureaucracy, for it will make available for education a portion of the revenue that is now squandered without regard to the needs of the men and women back home who pay for the upkeep of the Federal Government.

I offer this legislation in substitute for the variety of bills to provide Federal money for school systems. One of the measures that has received particular attention this year is H.R. 320, whose supporter is the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Delaney]. Its provisions would include an annual appropriation of $20 to each school pupil for the purpose of defraying part of the cost of his education.

While I respect the intent of my friend from New York, I would challenge his approach as impractical if not inadequate, although I must commend him for his attempt to provide assistance for educational purposes without involving the Federal bureaucracy to the degree involved in many of the other proposed school programs. The Delaney bill nevertheless provides a measure of intrusion by the Commissioner of Education, thus opening the door to Federal prescriptions that could ultimately bring control by the Federal Government.

God and religion have all but been driven from the public schools. If parochial institutions become beneficiaries of Federal grants—that is, public funds—how could they expect to escape from a similar fate?

Outlaw religion in religious schools? Incredible, one might say on first impulse. Yet those who oppose recognition of God in public school systems would institute action to take Him out of parochial schools the minute that public grants were accepted. In the light of its current behavior, the Supreme Court would be inconsistent if it did not extend the prohibition of religious practices to every school and every school system receiving public funds.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that H.R. 5680 is the logical answer to these economic problems facing both the public, private, and parochial schools today. Through it, perhaps we can keep God in at least some of America's educational institutions.

SENATE

Friday, August 2, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God and Father of us all, amid the national and global concerns which drain our strength and devour our hours, somehow, sometime, lest we lose our way, the necessity is upon us to take time for commerce and communion with the unseen and eternal where, in an oasis of quietness, there may be daily restored the inner resources of our pressured lives.

May the obtrusive secularism which assumes that we can nourish our souls on bread alone—the materialism which blocks the door of our hearts—be pushed back and the way cleared, that the highest and best may enter and meet no obstacle.

For those who here serve as representatives of the people who have put their trust in them, we pray for deliverance from the subtle lures of office and from the arrogance which lurks in power, knowing that when we forget Thee, whatever we attempt to build or to frame is labor lost, and that only in Thy will is our peace and is our victory.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 31, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 30, 1963, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 546) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant easements for the use of lands in the Camp Joseph H. Pendleton Naval Reservation, Calif., for a nuclear electric generating station.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6177) to amend section 2(a) of article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 relating to the annual payment to the District of Columbia by the United States; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Whitener, Mr. Dowdy, Mr. Hagan of Georgia, Mr. Broyhill of Virginia, Mr. Harsha, and Mr. Horton were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7500) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations; and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 5207) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 7500) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations; and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of February 11, 1963, Mr. Hill, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported favorably, with amendments, on August 1, 1963, the bill (H.R. 5888) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 383) thereon, which was printed.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

THE PROPOSED NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the proposed nuclear test ban treaty holds two promises for the welfare of the people of the United States and the world. One is immediate and tangible. The proposed treaty offers the hope that there will be an effective curtailment of the pollution of the atmosphere—the environment in which all human life is lived—by manmade radioactivity. While scientists may argue about the extent of the danger, they are all agreed that radioactivity, however small the exposure to it may be, is not good for the human organism, and that it is especially bad for children, prenatal and postnatal. And it does not matter whether these children live in Communist countries, free countries, or disinterested countries. The adverse effect of radioactivity is completely indifferent to political ideology.

For those who doubt the potency of this menace because radioactivity cannot be seen, felt, or tasted, I would suggest that they note carefully where the dentist or his assistant stands when teeth are being X-rayed. In removing himself as far as possible from the machine, the dentist is seeking to avoid the kind of exposure to radioactivity which cannot very well be avoided when, after bomb tests, it rains down from the heavens, is taken into the soil, and then into plants, finds its way into meat, vegetables, milk, and drinking water and, from them, into the human system.

So, Mr. President, if this test ban is signed and ratified and if it acts to some extent as a restraint on the indiscriminate, unilateral, and dangerous nuclear testing of the past, it represents an immediate advantage to the well-being of the human race and to the people of this Nation, living and yet to be born. One may argue that this is a great advantage, or that it is a negligible advantage; but I do not know of a single reputable scientist anywhere in this Nation or in the world who will argue that an increase in manmade radioactivity is good for the human species.

If there is an immediate and tangible advantage, then there may also be another—a less certain advantage, but an advantage which would be of even greater significance in the long run. That is the hope, Mr. President, that this first, small step will lead to others in a direction away from the competition to achieve ever more perfect scientific forms of human annihilation. In short, Mr. President, there is the long-range hope that this treaty will set in motion a chain reaction for peace which will in time lift the clouds of a repressive fear and uncertainty which now hang so heavily over the earth.

Let me say at once, Mr. President, that there is no certainty that this hope will be realized. Indeed, there are understandable doubts on this score. There are many questions, as there must be in any issue of such fundamental importance. These are the doubts which must be resolved in the weeks ahead during the ratification process, resolved on the basis of reason.

But may I say, too, Mr. President, that one can see—even now—the possibilities which emerge from this treaty, in terms of further progress toward peace. I would refer, first, to one such possibility close at hand, a possibility which predates the initialing of the proposed treaty, but which is closely linked with it. I refer to the declaration, signed on April 29 by several nations of this hemisphere, which would declare Latin America a nuclear-free zone.

In that declaration, Mexico, Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, and Ecuador pledged to commit themselves "not to manufacture, receive, store, or test nuclear weapons or nuclear-throwing devices." In short, Mr. President, it is a commitment that nuclear bombs and missiles for their delivery will never be found in these nations.

This highly significant development, Mr. President, came from the initiative of the farsighted President of Mexico, Adolfo Lopez Mateos. In a letter to President Joao Goulart, of Brazil, and later in correspondence with the heads of the other nations, President Lopez Mateos stated the Mexican position in these terms:

> To our way of thinking, denuclearization could, can, and should be effected, while a world agreement is being obtained by spontaneous decision of the nations.

The President went on to express his conviction that:

> We find ourselves living through dramatic hours; hours which demand of each and every one of us—but especially of those of us who have been given the mandate of interpreting the will of our peoples—a determined and unwavering course in support of survival.

Mr. President, these are profound and immensely human words. They are indicative of the devotion of the President of Mexico to the welfare of his own people and to the cause of peace and enlightenment in the Western Hemisphere and in the world.

May I suggest most respectfully, Mr. President, that the time could be ripe, now that the nuclear test ban treaty has been initialed, for the Mexican Government, in conjunction with Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, and Ecuador, to consider the possibility of pursuing this declaration, this pledge, this significant initiative. May it not be possible for these nations to begin to move to consolidate their declaration in formal agreement with the other Latin American nations, including Cuba. I would assume that the United Nations would be fully prepared to lend technical advice and assistance, out of its long experience, to the Latin Americans in the formulation of such an agreement.

If among the Latin American nations, the foundation of a nuclear-free zone could be established by treaty with adequate provision for inspection and verification, a great and tangible step beyond the present proposed nuclear test ban treaty would have been taken.

The verified assurance that there are not now, and will not be, nuclear weapons or missiles for their delivery in any nation in Latin America would do much to reduce present tensions in this hemisphere. It could do much to release creative forces for progress, which now are held in the grip of mutual fears and uncertainties. It could do much, by example, to advance the cause of peace in other regions of the world which are similarly plagued.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the letter from the President of Mexico, Honorable Adolfo Lopez Mateos, to the President of Brazil and the statement issued by the Presidents of Mexico, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, and Bolivia.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF MEXICO TO THE PRESIDENT OF BRAZIL

Inspired by the fraternal relations successfully linking our countries, and with absolute faith in the gifts of statesmanship which I am so delighted to recognize in you, I am now addressing the first magistrate and friend to discuss with him a subject which is important for the well-being of this region of the earth in which we are destined to live. I refer to a matter in which it has formerly been incumbent on your country's diplomacy to play an important role: the denuclearization of Latin America.

Permit me, Mr. President, to refer, before properly entering into the subject, to three antecedents which will no doubt serve to outline more clearly the possibilities of action which I firmly believe the present moment offers for making substantial progress on such a vital question.

When Mexico had an opportunity for the first time to make her voice heard in the 18-nation Disarmament Committee, I requested the Secretary of Foreign Relations to express the following ideas:

To our way of thinking, denuclearization could, can, and should be effected, while a world agreement is being obtained by spontaneous decision of the nations.

This is how the Government of Mexico resolved not to possess, nor to admit into the national territory nuclear arms of any kind or the means that might be used for transporting them. Of course we have no technical or economic possibilities therefor, but, even if we had them, our position would be the same. We have constantly supported, with our opinion and with our vote, those resolutions which have been presented for the purpose of preventing the diffusion of nuclear arms.

I was led to issue those instructions to the leader of the Mexican delegation not only by the conformity of their content with the strong pacifist [sic] beliefs of the people of Mexico, but by my firm conviction that we find ourselves living through dramatic hours; hours which demand of each and every one of us—but especially of those of us who have been given the mandate of interpreting the will of our peoples—a determined and unwavering course in support of survival.

It was, therefore, with singular pleasure that I learned—and I am now passing on to the second of the antecedents which I mentioned before—that the delegations of Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, and Ecuador to the 17th Ordinary Session of the United Nations General Assembly had cosponsored a draft resolution designed to satisfy an aspiration so dear to the Latin American as is the denuclearization of our region.

Recognizing at the same time the worth and the importance of the draft referred to, I opportunely ordered that the delegation of Mexico be instructed to give it every possible support. Unfortunately, elements of merely circumstantial character presented themselves, which you no doubt know as well as I do, which made it advisable for the sponsoring delegations to postpone the discussion of that document whose noble purposes were recognized by all.

For my part, and with this I am terminating this introductory statement, I deemed it desirable to give new vigor to the efforts made heretofore and stated openly that the Government of Mexico is willing to sign the commitment, if a large group of Latin American Republics, or all of them, would agree jointly—either through unilateral statements or through a specific multilateral convention—not to acquire on any pretext, nor to permit for any reason nuclear arms to be stored and transported or bases for their launching to be installed within the national territory.

I am thus coming, Mr. President, to the problem which is now posed to the Latin American leaders: the problem of selecting adequate means for achieving the aspiration which, in light of the above, I do not hesitate to characterize as common to you and to me.

After thinking it over carefully, I deemed it appropriate to call the attention of the illustrious leaders of the nations, sponsoring the draft aimed at denuclearization of Latin America to be truncated. I was prompted thereto by the conviction that those four countries, together with mine, are those on whom it is incumbent now most directly to take the initiative.

I am addressing you, Mr. President, as the statesman who has proved his political maturity to his people so many times, confident that the experience which distinguishes you so singularly, should prove of special value in the choice confronting us.

One method which in my opinion, presents possibilities of success in this undertaking would be that we Presidents of Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, and Mexico would issue a joint declaration whereby we would announce our willingness to sign a multilateral agreement with the other countries of Latin America, in which the commitment would be established not to manufacture, receive, store or test nuclear arms or nuclear launching devices. Such declaration would project the desire that eventually the rest of the Latin American nations could adhere to it, with the aim of constituting a kind of charter of liberation from all nuclear threat. I do not think I am excessively optimistic if I manifest to you now that such a document would also have very salutary effects on the efforts which are going to be made in the United Nations General Assembly as well as in the disarmament committee to remove forever the specter of nuclear war.

The generations who have preceded us have secured for our America special claims to fame of which we may be justly proud; not the least among them that of having formed the group of States which for the first time has successfully initiated that great adventure of peaceful coexistence which is multilateral cooperation through international organizations. If our generation achieves, in its turn, the denuclearization of Latin America—as a first step toward the denuclearization of the earth and, beyond that, toward universal and complete disarmament—it will be able to enjoy the assurance that the judgment of history will not be adverse to it. Certainly there are many difficulties to be overcome, but I would like to believe—and for that I base this on the experience of our past as peace-loving nations—that neither our will, nor our ability to overcome them are lacking. A concrete first step toward overcoming these difficulties might be, to my way of thinking, the issuance within the shortest possible time of the declaration which I have taken the liberty of suggesting in this letter.

Confident that you will be so kind as to lend this cause the splendor of your experience and knowledge, I convey to you, Mr. President, my most cordial greetings and expression of my wishes for your personal well-being and prosperity.

ADOLFO LOPEZ MATEOS.

STATEMENT OF THE PRESIDENTS OF MEXICO, BOLIVIA, BRAZIL, CHILE, AND ECUADOR ISSUED APRIL 29, 1963

The Presidents of the Republics of Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, and Mexico, deeply concerned with the present development of the international situation, which favors the diffusion of nuclear weapons; taking into consideration that in view of their invariable pacifist tradition the Latin American States must join in their efforts so as to transform Latin America into a denuclearized area, thus contributing also to reduce the dangers threatening world peace; desirous of safeguarding their nations from the tragic consequences that a nuclear war would bring, and encouraged by the hope that the concluding of a Latin American regional agreement would contribute to the adoption of an instrument of a contractual nature of worldwide scope, on behalf of their peoples and governments, they have agreed to the following:

(1) To announce forthwith that their Governments are ready to sign a Latin American multilateral agreement by which the nations would commit themselves not to manufacture, receive, store, or test nuclear weapons or nuclear-throwing devices.

(2) To bring this statement to the situation of the Chiefs of State of the other Latin American Republics, in the hope that their Governments may subscribe to it through the procedure they may deem appropriate.

(3) To cooperate with each other and with the other Latin American Republics that subscribe to this statement, in order that Latin America be recognized, as soon as possible, as a denuclearized area.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, certain Senators and others have already said, "We are for the treaty." Others have already said, "We are against the treaty." However, I believe I speak for the overwhelming majority of Senators and people of the Nation when I say that we desire to wait and see.

ADVISE AND CONSENT: A SENATOR'S DUTY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I choose my words with extreme care. The question which will confront 100 Senators in the next several weeks is of transcendent and crucial importance to the people of the United States, and, indeed, to the entire world. Yesterday at his press conference the President said that he had no quarrel with Senators who desired "to wait and see." Neither have I. That is what "advise and consent" presupposes.

I regret that I do not have the prescience of wisdom immediately to make up my mind on a subject of as grave importance as the nuclear test ban treaty, when it is first announced and which will be signed officially in Moscow sometime next week.

For 11 years I have spoken in favor of a continuation of negotiations with the Soviet Union in the field of dependable nuclear test ban agreements and first-step arms control. I hope to vote in favor of the treaty, but only if, after all the questions are asked and all the answers are given, it then appears to be abundantly clear that ratification of the treaty would be in the interest of the American people and, beyond that, in the interest of the cause of a just peace on this globe. Speaking for myself and, for most other Senators, I believe that is how we must approach this vitally important issue, if we are to fulfill the American constitutional responsibilities our oath of office requires.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have listened with interest and approval to the eloquent statement of the distinguished senior Senator from California. The junior Senator from Tennessee is one of those who have already concluded and announced their intention of supporting the treaty. In fairness I should say that, having been a delegate to the Conference on Nuclear Test Weapons, and having had the privilege of serving on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and on the Committee on Federal Relations and, moreover, having been briefed step by step during the negotiation of the treaty, I have been in a position to have more and better information. I recognize fully that Senators who have not been so privileged, by committee service and otherwise, need and deserve more time to consider the question so aptly described as one of transcendent importance.

I call the attention of the distinguished Senator to the statement yesterday of President Kennedy, a former Member of this body, which I thought generously recognized not only the constitutional responsibility of the Senate to act, but also to act with deliberateness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend very much.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the test-ban treaty, which is about to be signed in Moscow, calls for advocacy as well as for sideline observers and listeners who have not made up their minds but wish to listen to the historic debate which is about to take place.

The President of the United States, in a great message to the American people, has made the case for the treaty. Some Members of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate have followed the historic implications involved in the treaty, and we advocate it. We have an obligation to take our advocacy of the treaty to the American people and present to the American people the facts about that treaty as we know them to be. We have been briefed by the Secretary of State and other officials of our Government and we are convinced that the treaty is in the vital interests not only of our country but of all mankind.

Let the American people, through their elected officials in the Congress of the United States, speak their will on this treaty. I am convinced that the great majority of the American people will favor the treaty.

The breath of American public opinion needs to go down the political necks of some who are uncertain as to whether or not this great proposal—which, in my judgment, opens up the possibility of a new day for mankind so far as peace is concerned—should be ratified. The breath of public opinion should go down the political necks of those who are still in doubt as to whether we ought to take the gamble, if it is a gamble, in support of a step forward to seek to bring to an end this mad, insane nuclear armaments race. It is an armament race in which all of mankind is presently engaged, and which is bound to bring about the downfall of mankind if we do not stop it.

The President has made very clear the limitations of the treaty. The President has made very clear that it is only a beginning step toward eventual total disarmament, which must be the objective of mankind if we are to have permanent peace.

I say to my colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Relations that I believe we have an obligation of advocacy, to take the merits of this treaty to the American people and let them speak to the Congress the will of the American people in regard to laying a beginning foundation stone for a temple of permanent peace in the world.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, as nearly all the world knows by now the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union have entered into an agreement banning the testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, in space, and under water.

Despite some evident opinions to the contrary that agreement will not become binding upon the United States until the Senate, in accordance with constitutional provisions, gives its approval, many people in the Nation, evidently content to grasp at the straws of Soviet promises, would have us rush posthaste to Moscow, grateful for little Kremlin favors.

Others would have us take a long and searching look at the treaty, so that we might be sure it is to our advantage before we give it our approval. Included in this group is the Military Order of the World Wars, which has just passed a resolution urging extreme caution on this subject. The resolution was passed unanimously by the organization's executive committee in an official meeting in Washington, D.C., on July 27, according to Joseph H. Harper, major general, U.S. Army, retired, chief of staff of the Military Order of World Wars.

I ask unanimous consent to place the resolution in the RECORD, and call it to the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Proposed Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Resolution

Whereas the U.S. Senate is to be called upon by the executive branch of our Government to ratify a partial nuclear test ban treaty recently negotiated in Moscow; and

Whereas this proposed treaty will paralyze any effort on the part of the United States in the testing of high yield weapons, a field in which the U.S.S.R. is admittedly superior; and

Whereas this proposed treaty will permit unlimited testing in tactical nuclear weapons in which the U.S.S.R. is admittedly inferior; and

Whereas this proposed treaty will curtail, or seriously hamper, our efforts to develop an antimissile weapon at a time when, according to Khrushchev, the Soviets have "solved the problem of antimissile defense";

Whereas this treaty appears to be based on secret negotiations of undisclosed scope: Therefore, be it

Resolved, by the executive committee of the Military Order of the World Wars, at an official meeting in Washington, D.C., on July 27, 1963, That we urge the U.S. Senate to withhold ratification of this treaty until extended and thorough hearings determine its effect upon our national defense posture; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff be consulted individually and freely regarding their professional opinion on the advantages and disadvantages of this proposed treaty; and be it further

Resolved, That Dr. Teller, other scientists and military experts, be also called upon to testify; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all Members of the U.S. Senate; and be it further

Resolved, That all chapters of the Military Order of the World Wars and individual companions be urged to contact their Senators requesting a careful and thorough evaluation of the proposed treaty.

DETROIT NEWS FAVORS TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, as a sample of enlightened press reaction to the limited test ban proposal which will shortly be before the Senate in treaty form, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Detroit News of July 30, 1963, entitled "Political Dynamite in A-Test Vote."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Political Dynamite in A-Test Vote

Both the advocates and the opponents of a limited nuclear test ban treaty soon to come before the U.S. Senate for ratification will run substantial political risks.

Looking at the domestic political implications, we think that the advocates will run the risk that the Soviet Union will cheat on the agreement not to test nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, in outer space, or underwater. They also will run the risk that the Soviet Union will denounce the treaty, or pull out on short notice, in order to resume testing at a time appropriate to its own needs.

If either of those events occurs shortly before an American election, it could have a profound effect on the outcome. It could have that effect in 1964 if President Kennedy runs for reelection—as expected—and if the treaty were ratified only over the opposition of a majority of Republicans in the Senate. For then any Soviet act to resume testing or abrogate the treaty would be regarded as evidence the Soviets tricked the President, and Republicans who had opposed the treaty could say, "I told you so."

Yet there are political risks for those who oppose the treaty, too. And we think those risks are greater. For the American people by and large are inclined to accept the risks of signing the agreement. And thus the politicians who are opposed may find themselves out of favor with the public and thus out of office in the future.

There is a special political risk for the Republican Party, because several of its leaders in the Senate have either indicated their opposition to the treaty or have straddled the issue. The risk for the Republican Party, if a majority of its Senators takes a position against the treaty, is that the GOP may revert once more to the kind of isolationism that followed the Senate's rejection of the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations in 1919.

Eventually the Republican mistake in voting against the Versailles treaty because of GOP qualms about the league was rectified when a great majority of Republicans joined the Democrats in ratifying the United Nations Charter in 1945. But precious time had been lost and another World War had been fought. For there are those who believe that U.S. membership in the league might have made it strong enough to have prevented World War II.

Thus we believe that the best attitude for the majority of Democrats and Republicans in the Senate to take—on the basis of what we know about the treaty up to now—would be to support it. Bipartisan support not only would make U.S. endorsement of the test ban stronger in foreign lands, it would help us avoid a repetition of the post-World War I domestic-political wrangel over the league that helped persuade the country to adopt an isolationist attitude between the wars.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Amendment of Title 10, United States Code, Relating to a Uniform Ration for the Armed Forces

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish a nutritionally adequate, well-balanced, and uniform ration for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury to regulate the issuance and sale of the ration and to prescribe special rations, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Procurement Receipts for Medical Stockpile of Civil Defense Emergency Supplies and Equipment Purposes

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, on actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes, for the quarter ended June 30, 1963; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment of Section 204 of Communications Act of 1934

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 204 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Federal Power Commission Publication

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a publication entitled "Hydroelectric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1961" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Research Grants Awarded by Department of Agriculture

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on research grants awarded by that Department, during fiscal year 1963; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Overprocurement by Department of the Navy of Spare Guidance Components for Shipboard Repair of Improved Tartar Missiles

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overprocurement by the Department of the Navy of spare guidance components for the shipboard repair of improved Tartar missiles, dated July 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Certain Unnecessary Annual Expenditures by Departments of the Air Force and Navy

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary annual expenditures by the Departments of the Air Force and the Navy for leasing commercial facilities to store petroleum products in the San Francisco, Calif., area instead of using excess Government-owned petroleum facilities at the Navy Fuel Department, Point Molate, Richmond, Calif., dated July 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON ADDITIONAL COSTS RESULTING FROM PROCUREMENT OF TEST EQUIPMENT AS SPECIAL TOOLING UNDER CONTRACTS AWARDED TO LOCKHEED AIRCRAFT CORP.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on additional costs resulting from procurement of test equipment as special tooling under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts awarded to Lockheed Aircraft Corp. Missile and Space Division, Sunnyvale, Calif., by the Departments of the Air Force and Navy, dated July 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON UNNECESSARY PLANNED PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN AIR CONDITIONERS BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary planned procurement of 36,000-B.t.u. air conditioners by the Department of the Army, dated July, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Governor, Canal Zone Government, Balboa Heights, Canal Zone, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Government, for the fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered, granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order entered adjusting the status of Dong Baek Yook and Sang Won Yook (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FINANCIAL REPORT OF JEWISH WAR VETERANS, U.S.A., NATIONAL MEMORIAL, INC.

A letter from the treasurer, Jewish War Veterans, U.S.A., National Memorial, Inc., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a financial report of that corporation, for the 12-month period ended March 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

Resolution relative to including Black Butte Dam and Reservoir in the Federal Central Valley project

Whereas inclusion in the Federal Central Valley project provides a substantial reduction in the price of water to the users, and consequently results in savings to the people of the State of California; and

Whereas there is a need for an additional water supply in the area south of Stony Creek in the Sacramento Valley, and there is presently available from storage in Black Butte Reservoir some 80,000 acre-feet of water: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to include the Black Butte Dam and Reservoir in the Federal Central Valley project; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). On behalf of the Vice President, the Chair announces the following appointments to the NATO Parliamentary Conference, to be held in Paris, France, November 4 to 9, 1963: Senator FULBRIGHT, Senator KEFAUVER, Senator TALMADGE, Senator DODD, Senator McGOVERN, Senator McINTYRE, Senator MUNDT, Senator CURTIS, Senator JAVITS, Senator MORTON, Senator DOMINICK, Senator BAYH, and Senator CANNON.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S.J. Res. 33. Joint resolution granting consent for an extension of 4 years of the Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas (Rept. No. 384).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 67. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States (Rept. No. 386); and

S.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution favoring the holding of the Olympic games in America in 1968 (Rept. No. 386).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, with an amendment:

H.R. 7500. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 385).

Mrs. SMITH subsequently said: Madam President, with the filing of this report there are several observations that I would like to make as the ranking minority member of the Senate Space Committee. First, I would like to commend the chairman, the committee, and the members of the staff for the bipartisan approach that has been evident all through the long hearings and discussion in connection with this bill. I would like to particularly commend the chairman because it was through his leadership, patience, understanding, and cooperation that we are reporting what I consider to be an excellent bill.

There is, in connection with the authorization, one area disparagingly and inaccurately referred to as "pork" which has been a subject of misunderstanding and misinformation. I refer, of course, to the so-called Boston facility. It has not been until now, when our hearings, both open and executive session, have been concluded, that I felt it wise and propitious to comment on what transpired in connection with this facility. At the first tentative vote on the Electronics Research Center in the Boston area, the tally was 6 to 5, and it was not on, as our chairman has previously stated, a partisan basis. The question before the committee at that time was: Should the entire $5 million requested by NASA for the Electronics Center be cut out of the bill? That vote did cut the $5 million and, in effect, eliminated for this year the proposed Electronics Center. I want to make it clear that both the chairman and I voted for the Boston facility both on the first vote and on the vote yesterday.

In the executive session held yesterday, a reconsideration of the tentative action previously taken by the committee in connection with the Electronics Center and other matters was a subject of considerable discussion. Since the previous action on the electronics facility, considerable new information had been brought to the attention of the committee.

In order to understand that final action on the electronics facility in the context of the tentative turndown by the committee during its previous consideration of an electronics facility, it is important to note that the questions generally distilled down to two questions: First, would this facility contribute to the needed technology for the Apollo program when one considers the Apollo timetable and the date this facility would become fully operational, and second, the question of a site selection.

With reference to item 1 there was some question in the minds of the members of the committee that this requested facility which would not become fully operational until 1968, could perform meaningful electronic missions in support of the Apollo and, therefore, would not be needed. This statement was based upon the lack of specific programs beyond the Apollo program which would require the sophisticated electronics to be developed by the electronics facility. In the same context, the question arose as to whether or not the construction of an electronics facility of this character, coupled with the lack of support to the Apollo program, would, in fact, provide a capability which had no mission in the long-term national space programs. In discussing these questions it was concluded, based upon further statements by NASA and further staff analysis, that the electronics facility would, in fact, make meaningful contributions to the Apollo program either by this facility or in temporary quarters. A structure does not make an electronics facility. It is the availability of qualified people.

Site selection was discussed at great length, and it boiled down to the fact that obviously the Greater Boston area was of one of the prime areas for this kind of facility. The wishes of the Agency which would operate such a facility in terms of specific area would have to be seriously considered. It is important to note that no one questioned the Greater Boston area as one of the prime locations for this undertaking. It had the characteristics of educational institutions, commercial and Government research establishments, and electronic manufacturing capabilities.

With reference to the question of specific location within the Greater Boston area, the Space Agency had not stated clearly whether they would seriously consider the site over the Boston Freeway and build a high-rise structure in this airspace, or whether they would insist upon buying 1,000 acres in the general Boston area for the construction of this complex. Additional information was obtained from the Agency that they would seriously consider the airspace approach prior to deciding upon the larger acreage concept and also they would fully explore the possibility of obtaining the airspace at no cost to the Agency, or for as little cost as possible.

On the basis of this additional information related on both points which clarified many of the questions in the minds of the committee members, some members changed their minds, and the committee reconsidered and authorized the facility, and restored the entire $5 million. NASA must, however, report back to the committee justifying the specific location as to where the center will be constructed.

Madam President, innuendo and unsubstantiated allegations being bantered about concerning this voting action by the members of our committee are both irresponsible and harmful. They are irresponsible because they show lack of familiarity with the facts concerning the necessity of this electronics center to the success of our national space effort. They are harmful because they put a stamp of "pork" on an otherwise respectable undertaking which will ultimately require the cooperation of thousands of the finest minds in the electronics field. Indeed, it will require close cooperation from our colleges and universities of the highest order.

I want to say in closing, Madam President, that 6 months ago when this proposal for an electronics center was submitted to our committee with the Greater Boston area designated as a site for the project, that I, too, was skeptical. Since that time, in addition to the pages and pages of justification from NASA, and the hours of testimony, I personally made extensive inquiries outside the confines of the hearing room to remove from my mind beyond a shadow of a doubt any of the continuing allegations that this project was "pork" and "politics."

Madam President, I am satisfied that our space program needs an electronics facility. I am satisfied that the general area in which the facility will be located is highly justified. I am satisfied that the motivations of the committee members in their voting on this project were not political motivations, but rather was based on their best judgment as to furthering our national space effort.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the distinguished Senator from Maine yield?

Mrs. SMITH. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. First, let me commend the Senator from Maine on the clarity of her statement on an issue that has troubled us for some time.

It is my understanding that the committee's report provides $5 million for the purchase of land and for planning and designing, but that before any land is purchased, the authorities must come back to the committee, to determine where the site is to be, and to give reasons for the site. Am I correct?

Mrs. SMITH. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes. So far as we in Massachusetts are concerned, we must prove that Massachusetts is the proper place for the location of the research laboratory, both from the standpoint of the site, from the standpoint of the personnel, from the standpoint of the institutions surrounding it, and so forth. If we cannot prove that, it should not be located in our State. But certainly the committee's report gives us an opportunity to show that Massachusetts—and, specifically, Boston—is the proper place and is a helpful place for the location of the research laboratory. Am I correct?

Mrs. SMITH. Madam President, I deeply appreciate the words of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, and I am very glad that the people of Massachusetts are ready to prove the need for the location in their State of this electronics center. However, I am already convinced that NASA and others associated with this program have given sufficient proof that the Greater Boston area is the proper place for this installation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, I am glad to hear the distinguished Senator from Maine make that statement. When it comes from one who represents the hard-boiled State of Maine, where everything has to be proved, I am particularly encouraged.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

Bruce R. Thompson, of Nevada, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Nevada.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, for the Senate Committtee on Agriculture and Forestry, I wish to report favorably two nominations from the President for appointment to the Federal Farm Credit Board.

The gentlemen whose nominations are recommended by the committee are Mr. Kenneth T. Anderson, of Kansas, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, District No. 9; and Mr. Lorin T. Bice, of Florida, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, District No. 3.

I ask unanimous consent that abstracts of information furnished by the Federal Farm Credit Board to the committee with reference to the qualifications of these two nominees be included in the Record as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the abstracts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Abstract of Information Furnished by Candidate for Designation as Nominee for Consideration by the President for Appointment as a Member of the Federal Farm Credit Board

Name: Kenneth T. Anderson.

Home address: 1121 Neosho Street, Emporia, Kans.

Home phone: DI 2–1842.

Business address: Box 399, Emporia, Kans.

Business phone: DI 2–0330.

Age and education: Born 1909, Kansas; University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., B.S. degree, majors in biology, French, English.

Occupation: Cattle feeding and farming; operates a cattle feed yard with capacity of 21,000 head. Handled about 50,000 cattle in 1960 and 1961. Farms about 2,500 acres and operates about 10,000 acres of grazing country. Has been primarily engaged in agriculture since 1940; owned and operated two plantations in Mississippi from 1951 to 1956.

Affiliation: Member, Federal Land Bank Association; Farmers Union.

Former affiliation: Manager and part owner: Universal Butane Corp., 1938–40; salesman, Skelly Oil Co., 1935–38; manager, Broadway Hotel, 1931–32.

Abstract of Information Furnished by Candidate for Designation as Nominee for Consideration by the President for Appointment as a Member of the Federal Farm Credit Board

Name: Lorin T. Bice.

Address: 1107 Peninsular Drive, Haines City, Fla.

Phone: HA 2–1461.

Age and education: Born 1903, Nevada; high school graduate; attended University of Florida for 2 years in school of business administration.

Occupation: Farming—producing and marketing citrus. With son now operates 365 acres of citrus groves for family. Formerly operated 700-acre cattle ranch, now under lease.

Affiliation: Director-at-large, Farm Credit Board of Columbia, since 1956 (term ends Dec. 31, 1964); director, Central Bank for Cooperatives since 1961 (term ends Dec. 31, 1962); West Coast Growers Coop., Dade City, Fla. (handled 7 million boxes citrus last season); board member, Florida Citrus Production Credit Association; Federal Land Bank Association of Lakeland, 10 years.

Former affiliation: Vice president, Florida Citrus Production Credit Association, 16 years, Federal Land Bank Association of Lakeland; vice chairman and member, District NFLA Stockholders Committee, 2 years; chairman, Farm Credit Board of Columbia; member, Florida Citrus Commission (both shipper and grower), citrus marketing agreement committees, Governor's Citizen Committee of Five, charged with writing and helping to enact present citrus code, 1948–49; executive vice president and general manager, Lake Hamilton Cooperative, Inc., 1943–51; general manager, Haines City Citrus Growers Association, 1935–43; plant superintendent, Florence Citrus Growers Association, 1924–35.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. Case, Mr. Clark, Mr. Javits, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey):

S. 1971. A bill to authorize an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $50,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed national parkway in the States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York from the vicinity of Stroudsburg, Pa., northeast to Kingston, N.Y.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Keating when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 1972. A bill to provide for appointment of temporary employees to career positions in postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Johnston when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON (by request):

S. 1973. A bill to amend the act of July 8, 1940, relating to the transportation of the remains, families, and effects of Federal employees dying abroad, so as to restore the benefits of such act to employees dying in Alaska and Hawaii, and for other purposes; and

S. 1974. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act, as amended, with regard to filing designation of beneficiary; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 1975. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dodd when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1976. A bill for the relief of Dr. Gabriel Antero Sanchez (Hernandez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1977. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Elizabeth Wallace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 1978. A bill for the relief of Lillian P. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1979. A bill for the relief of Miss Sang-Aroon Choopunta; and

S. 1980. A bill for the relief of Dr. Kim Yong Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 1981. A bill for the relief of Vilisav Markovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

S. 1982. A bill for the relief of Francesco Mira and his wife, Maria Mira; and

S. 1983. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vedil Ayyildiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRUENING:

S. 1984. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act regarding the timely payment of rentals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Gruening when he introduced the above bill, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 1985. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Cacciani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 1986. A bill for the relief of Hattie Lu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S.J. Res. 108. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. BURDICK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 178); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended by—

(1) striking out subparagraphs 10 through 13 in paragraph (h) of section (1);

(2) striking out subparagraphs 16 through 19 in paragraph (l) of section (1); and

(3) inserting in section (1) after paragraph (p) the following new paragraph:

"(q) Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of nine Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Veterans' measures, generally.

"2. Pensions of all the wars of the United States, general and special.

"3. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

"4. Compensation of veterans.

"5. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"6. Veterans' hospitals, medical care and treatment of veterans.

"7. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"8. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life."

Sec. 2. Section 4 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out "and Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences" and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences; and Committee on Veterans' Affairs".

Sec. 3. Section 6(a) of rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to the designation of ex officio members of the Committee on Appropriations), is amended by adding at the end of the tabulation contained therein the following new item:

"Committee on Veterans' Affairs—For the Veterans' Administration."

Sec. 4. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall as promptly as feasible after its appointment and organization confer with the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for the purpose of determining what disposition should be made of proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters theretofore referred to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the Eighty-eighth Congress which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PROPOSED NATIONAL PARKWAY, PENNSYLVANIA, NEW JERSEY, AND NEW YORK

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, on behalf of myself and Senators Javits, Williams of New Jersey, Case, Clark, and Scott, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize a survey of a route for a national parkway, similar to the Skyline Drive in Virginia and Blue Ridge Parkway extending roughly northeast from Stroudsburg, Pa., east of Port Jervis and on toward Kingston, N.Y.

Madam President, in 1961, Congress authorized the survey of an extension for the popular Blue Ridge Parkway southward. Just last month the Department of Interior recommended a 190-mile extension of this parkway southward, through North Carolina and Georgia. In light of this recommendation and the success of Skyline Drive, this proposal of a northward extension is especially timely.

Although a northerly route of a similar nature was first studied in 1935, the route then reviewed is probably no longer suitable. A different route, recently discussed, would probably traverse parts of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York, and generally follow the line of the Kittatinny and Shawangunk Mountains from the Delaware Water Gap northward toward Kingston.

Madam President, the success and popularity of the Blue Ridge Parkway and the Skyline Drive, which is in Shenandoah National Park, are now well established. The idea of a park there was first conceived in the 1920's. Through Federal-State cooperation and the active support of citizens, the park and drive construction was begun in the early 1930's. In 1936 the park and drive were dedicated. During the first year it was opened, 173,664 people visited the park.

By 1961, that figure had jumped to 1,929,300 and in the following year, 1962, attendance increased to over 2 million. During this same period, the Blue Ridge Parkway had an attendance of over 6 million persons. This is greater than any other national park in the country. Yet there is no comparable Federal recreational facility in the entire Northeast.

Interest in a similar parkway to the north was first expressed to me in 1961 by residents of several southern New York counties. More vigorous measures were pushed this spring. In June, the regional chamber of commerce, comprising seven tristate counties—Orange, Ulster, Rockland, and Sullivan in New York; Sussex and Passaic in New Jersey; and Pike in Pennsylvania—adopted a resolution urging a study of the feasibility of the construction of a national parkway and recreational facilities from the Shenandoah National Park through the Shawangunk-Kittatinny region northward.

Both the Sullivan and Ulster County Boards of Supervisors in New York and the Town Board of Wawarsing have adopted similar resolutions.

Other groups and individuals as well, have also expressed their interest in this project. The Noonday Club of Ellenville, N.Y., adopted a resolution June 29 supporting the creation of a national recreation area in the Shawangunk-Kittatinny region. In expressing their support of this project the Sullivan County Hotel Association strongly endorsed the Noonday Club resolution.

The popularity of outdoor recreation and the need for additional facilities was graphically demonstrated last weekend. As temperatures soared, thousands of people in the New York metropolitan area sought escape from the city heat at nearby beaches and parks. According to the New York Times, over a million persons were reported at Coney Island on Saturday. Cars were lined up for 9 miles at the approach to Jones Beach where a record 240,000 persons gathered. By 11 a.m. Bear Mountain State Park reported the largest crowd of the year, 100,000. Another record was broken at Sunken Meadow State Park on Long Island, where attendance was reported at 42,000. I can think of no better testimonial to the need and desire for an easily accessible national parkway and recreational area than that which these figures provide. Two-thirds of the people in the United States live in metropolitan areas and there is an increasing demand for different types of recreational facilities within a reasonable distance.

As envisioned, this northward extension of Skyline Drive would be within 50 miles of the densely populated area of New York City and even closer to the suburbs of northern New Jersey. The route is also within an easy day's travel of numerous other metropolitan areas in the Northeast, including those of Philadelphia, Hartford, and Boston.

In accord with our efforts to preserve wilderness areas throughout the country, this park would conserve the wealth of scenic views and natural wonders found in the Shawangunk-Kittatinny mountain region. There could easily be lookouts with views of the Catskills and the Delaware Valley. Glacial action has left streams, waterfalls, lakes, crevasses, and ice caves. An exciting geological history of the region is revealed in these mountains whose peaks reach as high as 2,200 feet above the level of the sea. A parkway along the crest of the Shawangunk-Kittatinny Mountains would be dramatic, educational, and pleasurable. At the same time, it would not touch the lands of the New York forest preserve, lands that by the act of 1894 are "forever wild" and free of roads and buildings. These lands should remain undeveloped, even for most recreational uses.

Nevertheless, the growing interest in outdoor recreation such as hiking and camping calls for an eye to the future and the expansion of current recreational facilities. Currently some 90 percent of all Americans participate in some form of outdoor activity. As well as providing new opportunities for a wide region, the northward extension of Skyline Drive would permit greater usage of those facilities now existing or planned for. The parkway would facilitate access to the recreational center and reservoir planned for Tocks Island.

As you know, authorization for the construction of the Tocks Island Reservoir was granted last year. The dam, to be built near Stroudsburg on the Delaware River, is part of the plan projected by the Delaware River Basin Commission. This Commission was established in 1961 to study long range plans for the development of the Delaware River Basin, with special attention to conservation and recreation. Certainly a national parkway passing through this region, as has been proposed, would profitably supplement projected plans for the area.

What is more, it would have substantial and continuing impact on the unemployment situation in the area. During construction, the project would provide additional jobs and business for a large number. Later, economic gains would ensue from increased tourist and recreation activities.

The report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission last year stated that, "outdoor recreation has cultural values that are essential to the health of the Nation. Today's challenge is to assure all Americans permanent access to their outdoor heritage.

I submit that this proposal can be a real contribution to this challenge. It has, to the best of my knowledge, enthusiastic support from the areas which would be most directly affected—areas which in many cases have traditionally relied on tourists for revenue. I believe that strong local support is a prerequisite for our Federal park or other projects of this sort, and I strongly urge the Senate and its appropriate committees to give favorable consideration to this bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed as part of my remarks the text of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1971) to authorize an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $50,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed national parkway in the States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York from the vicinity of Stroudsburg, Pa., northeast to Kingston, N.Y., introduced by Mr. Keating (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a sum not exceeding $50,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of the Treasury of the United States, to be used by the Department of the Interior through the National Park Service and by the Department of Commerce through the Bureau of Public Roads, with which to make a survey, now directed, of the route of a proposed national parkway extending from the vicinity of Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania, entering the State of New Jersey north of the Delaware Water Gap, and continuing in a northeasterly direction toward Kingston, New York, following where feasible the route of the Shawangunk-Kittatinny mountains, the survey to recommend the most desirable point of origin and termination of said parkway. An estimate of the cost of construction of an appropriate national parkway, comparable with the Blue Ridge Parkway, over the indicated route, together with such other data as may be of value, shall be obtained through the said survey, hereby authorized, for the purpose of determining the feasibility and desirability of constructing the proposed national parkway, or any portions thereof. Final report of such survey, accompanied by full information and data, with recommendations, shall, at the earliest possible date, be made and submitted to the Congress of the United States for its consideration.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I am most pleased to join my colleague [Mr. Keating] and Senators Williams of New Jersey, Case, Clark, and Scott in introducing a bill to authorize an appropriation of a sum not in excess of $50,000 to make a survey of a proposed national parkway in the States of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, reaching from Stroudsburg, Pa., northeast to Kingston, N.Y.

There has been of late a good deal of interest in reexamining the proposal to extend the Skyline Drive northward through parts of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York. The Regional Chamber of Commerce Council, representing the seven tristate area counties—Orange, Ulster, Rockland, and Sullivan, in New York; Sussex and Passaic in New Jersey; and Pike in Pennsylvania—has adopted a resolution urging a study of the feasibility of extending such an interstate highway. In 1935, the National Park Service made a preliminary study of possible parkway locations through the Appalachian Mountains, extending from Shenandoah National Park northeast through the Shawangunk-Kittatinny region. The study consisted of a possible map location and reconnaissance. It is believed that a reexamination would reveal new areas for economic growth and recreational opportunities.

The boards of supervisors of all the affected New York counties, as well as other New York groups, have indicated their interest in such a study. The development of this parkway, with its proximity to metropolitan areas, would attract great numbers of tourists and add to the scenic and recreational facilities close to large population centers of the eastern part of this country as well as to the employment and economic development of the areas. It hardly needs restatement that the improvement of outdoor recreation and the development of a national parkway program in conjunction with recreational areas of the populated northeast have been a long range objective of both the Congress and the Department of the Interior.

I am hopeful that this study may result in a meaningful interstate highway project which would contribute to the economic growth of the communities concerned and to the overall improvement to the national highway system.

TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES IN THE POSTAL FIELD SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, I introduced, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to temporary employees in the Postal Field Service. Since World War II, there has been a rather unsettled situation, as far as temporaries are concerned in the postal service. Originally there was a real reason for the condition that existed, because of the necessity of holding positions open for men who were in the military service and, following that, there was a good deal of delay in holding civil service examinations.

At the present time, about one-tenth of all of the employees in the postal service are temporary employees. I believe that situation has to be corrected, both for the good of the service and for the welfare of the employees.

Temporary employees do not have a chance to be appointed to regular positions and many of them, after serving for a number of years, find that they are further down on the eligible register, because of reopened examinations, than they were when they started out. In the meantime, they have worked for several years.

The bill that I have introduced today will take care of these employees by giving them an opportunity to take a noncompetitive examination and be given career positions. After that situation is corrected, the legislation will prohibit the appointment of temporary employees for longer than a 3-month period.

Throughout the history of the postal service, except in times of emergency, the service has largely been manned by career employees. The present conditions existing relative to the use of temporaries is unfair to the temporary employees, and most unfair to the postal service itself. This legislation is urgently needed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1972) to provide for appointment of temporary employees to career positions in the postal field service, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL FIREARMS ACT

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act.

This bill, if enacted into law, would curtail the shipment in interstate commerce and delivery by common carrier of "mail order" handguns to juveniles under the age of 18 years; increase the Federal Firearms Act dealer's license fee from $1 to $10; provide that firearms dealers and manufacturers give written notice to common carriers of handguns being transported in interstate commerce; provide that a purchaser of a mail order handgun enclose a sworn affidavit with his purchase order to establish his bona fide age, felony convictions, or criminal record.

In addition, the bill contains language that clarifies present inconsistencies in the Federal Firearms Act.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be allowed to lie on the table for 5 days, so that additional Senators who so desire may join as cosponsors; and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

The bill (S. 1975) to amend the Federal Firearms Act, introduced by Mr. DODD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DODD. Madam President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, I have recently concluded hearings into the problem of the interstate shipment of mail-order handguns to juveniles and adult criminals. Those hearings culminated a 2-year investigation into this traffic by the subcommittee, the results of which present a national scandal of growing proportions. We uncovered a situation that has been described as "Murder by Mail Order," and I feel our findings conclusively prove the need for amending the Federal Firearms Act.

In Fairfax, Va., a 16-year-old boy accidentally shot and killed his 14-year-old companion. Investigators of our Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency found out that he had purchased the weapon—a .38 snub-nosed revolver—from a Los Angeles mail-order house. The boy sent off the money and the mail-order house shipped the gun to the Alexandria freight office. The boy picked it up with no questions asked. When told about the tragedy in this instance, the reaction of the Los Angeles dealer was:

> I didn't break the law, did I? If they've got the money, I sell them the gun. I'm not responsible for what they do with it.

In Philadelphia, Pa., a 14-year-old boy ordered and received a mail-order handgun. When this fact came to the attention of the police, the handgun was confiscated.

In Houston, Tex., an adult male with a long criminal record purchased a mail-order handgun.

In Pittsburgh, Pa., a young male age 16 shot a playmate with an out-of-State mail-order handgun. When the courts decided that this boy was to be remanded to a detention home for shooting his companion, he secured .22 caliber ammunition, went to an upstairs room of his home, and after loading his father's rifle, he committed suicide.

In Canton, Ohio, a 17-year-old boy used an address of a friend to purchase two mail-order handguns, because his parents would not approve. The guns were confiscated when the boy drove his father's car to Kentucky. He is now on unofficial probation.

In Los Angeles, Calif., a mentally ill youngster read a gun advertisement in a magazine. He sent in the money and eventually received a revolver. He then shot and killed his 14-year-old brother. When asked why, he said:

> My brother was an inferior person.

A major phase of the subcommittee inquiry concerned the investigation of recipients of mail-order handguns in the District of Columbia. Records of delivery of mail-order guns were subpenaed from REA Express, the principal common carrier of these firearms.

The results of our investigation showed the following:

That 25 percent of the 200 consignees investigated have records of arrest with the Metropolitan Police Department ranging in seriousness from misdemeanors to such felonies as assaults with dangerous weapons, assaults on police officers, narcotic violations, and homicide.

That at the time of our study, the five police precincts which had the highest incidences of mail-order gun deliveries also had the five highest crime rates in the metropolitan area.

Since the completion of the District of Columbia phase of inquiry, the Metropolitan Police have instituted a working agreement with common carriers whereby all mail-order handgun deliveries in this city are withheld from the purchaser pending completion of a police investigation of the consignee. This has proved helpful, but it is only a stopgap measure and does not have the force of law.

In testimony before the subcommittee, police officers from Los Angeles, New York City, Pittsburgh, and Washington, D.C., documented the need for Federal legislation to curtail the mail-order traffic in firearms to juveniles, felons, narcotic addicts, and others unable to bear the burden of their responsible use. Independent investigation by the subcommittee clearly substantiates this contention. I therefore believe this need to be real and pressing and that the Congress should act without any further delay.

We have been told by witness after witness that these mail-order type handguns are useless for sport or recreation. Experts in the field of firearms have echoed the same sentiments. These firearms serve no purpose other than to kill, maim, or injure. Case histories submitted to the subcommittee by law enforcement officials depict crimes of violence, armed robberies, homicides, and accidental shootings. Many of these cases included maimings and death inflicted by persons possessing mail order handguns, persons who normally would not be able to buy a gun in their own communities.

The police in virtually every large city have repeatedly found weapons in the hands of juveniles and juvenile gangs. The youngsters bought some of the guns from fly-by-night dealers who are willing to pander to any customer no matter what his age or background. Other weapons were easily purchased by mail order.

Some of the mail order dealers, our subcommittee learned, conduct their business operations with calculated carelessness. The coupons in their advertisements may specify that the purchaser must be 18 or 21 with no criminal record. However, no effort is made to check that the person who signs a coupon and orders a gun does, in fact, fit the specifications. These dealers evade postal regulations by shipping guns by express, as only four States have any regulations against gun shipments by this process. All too often the packaged guns are unmarked, and express company employees are unaware of the contents that they must deliver to the youthful purchasers.

Under present Federal statutes, the traffic in mail order guns to juveniles is, for all practicable purposes, virtually unrestrained. Unless some effective action is taken to halt this highly dangerous trade, the tragedies I have recounted will be repeated again and again.

There already exists a substantial body of opinion which deplores the weaknesses of the Federal Firearms Act. Present law does little more than establish procedures for licensing dealers in firearms. A Gallup poll conducted on the subject of firearms control in the United States indicated that 75 percent of the adults surveyed around the country favored stricter regulations of handguns. Similar findings by independent poll takers have been made in individual cities such as San Francisco and Philadelphia. In the wake of 15 juvenile gang murders, the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee received testimony from Governor Rockefeller of New York, Mayor Wagner, and the police commissioner of New York City. They recommended more Federal control of handgun transactions, particularly where interstate commerce is involved.

Justice John E. Cone, of the State supreme court in New York, and also chairman of a committee to discourage sales of weapons to juveniles, pointed up the inadequacy of local regulations to deal with the problem:

> Certainly it is of no value if the weapons outlawed within the borders of this State or city are advertised in numerous magazines and then may be lawfully shipped from some other State to purchasers in New York.

The nature of the traffic in mail order handguns is such that it allows circumvention of State and local laws in many jurisdictions. The District of Columbia and Pennsylvania are two examples. In both jurisdictions, the present law states that a concealable handgun can be sold only after the bona fides of the purchaser have been established by law enforcement officials in the locale in which he resides. However, the Federal Firearms Act makes no provision for the common carriers to make any such determination. Thus, in five States, and the Nation's Capital, the delivery is accomplished in circumvention of local law. My bill is intended to remedy this situation.

The mail-order traffic in concealable firearms has other ramifications. Most of these firearms are foreign imports and are relatively inexpensive. The design and quality have been described as inferior to our domestically manufactured handguns and, in fact, are dangerous to the user. As a matter of policy, the National Rifle Association's official publication, the American Rifleman, refuses to carry advertising for such weapons.

Although much effort and time was expended by the staff of the subcommittee to determine the total number of these weapons imported into this country over a period of several years, only incomplete figures are presently available. These figures indicate that 5 million weapons have been imported during the past 5 years. This is a minimal figure, with an estimated 7 million considered to be a more accurate appraisal. A prime reason for the incomplete figures is that many have been imported as scrap metal or parts of firearms and nowhere are they recorded as firearms. It has been stated in testimony that such practices are employed to circumvent the tariff duties on firearms.

The national statistics on crime underscore the need for bringing more responsibility into this firearms traffic within the United States. Of 7,261 murders committed in 1962, 54 percent were committed by guns in the hands of mentally ill or criminals. Of the nearly 1 million robberies and burglaries committed annually, most are committed with the assistance of firearms. Of the more than 18,000 annual suicides, fully half are committed with the use of firearms, and last year the individuals wielding these guns on their way to a suicidal death killed more than 700 defenseless persons without warning before turning the gun on themselves. And, according to the FBI, during the 5 years between 1955 and 1960, when the juvenile population increased by 25 percent, the number of youngsters arrested for carrying guns went up nearly twice as fast.

There are those who honestly argue that regulations and laws alone will not keep deadly weapons out of the hands of those most inclined to use them in crime. There is no essential disagreement with this argument. However, statistics show that the availability of weapons in and of itself contributes to crime, that there would be fewer crimes of passion committed if the weapons were not available.

Federal figures show that in the 18 States which have bare minimum control laws over firearms, 65 percent of the murders were committed with guns. In the seven States with the most stringent firearm laws, 42 percent of the murders involved the use of guns. In other words, the States with some form of permit regulation had a felonious death rate from guns 23 percent lower than the States without these regulations.

Actual statistics show that death results to 21 percent of the victims of assault where guns are used, and to only 3 percent of the victims of assault where other weapons are used. According to our subcommittee studies in 1962, more than 3,200 persons met violent deaths by a gun in the hand of a noncriminal. It cannot be denied that the availability of guns is a large factor in many, many deaths, which strict controls could eliminate.

In particular, the law enforcement officer has a vital interest in this matter. In the last 3 calendar years for which complete figures are available, there were 112 law enforcement officers killed in criminal enforcement work, and 109 of them were at the hands of gun-wielding felons.

The extended studies and hearings of the subcommittee confirm, regrettably, the fact that we have in our communities many juveniles who are potentially capable of committing crimes similar to the recent tragedies in Fairfax County and Alexandria, Va., New York City, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Washington, D.C.

Mentally ill, rebellious, fascinated by handguns and other weapons of violence, they need protection for their own sake and for the sake of society. We cannot go on tolerating the unrestrained sale of handguns to these juveniles. To perpetuate the present loopholes in the Federal Firearms Act is to doom other individuals to a senseless death from a gun wielded by fingers responding to the whims and impulses of a disordered mind.

Madam President, this situation exists nowhere else in the world. The United States is the only nation that has virtually no control over lethal concealable weapons. My bill is an attempt to inject some sanity into this scandalous situation that began when millions of cheap foreign weapons were dumped into our country.

The bill I introduce today is not designed or intended to infringe upon the rights of law-abiding citizens who own and use firearms responsibly. I would like to emphasize that these law-abiding citizens constitute the vast majority of firearms users.

This bill is designed primarily to prevent the interstate shipment and delivery of mail-order handguns to those who desire and need the anonymity of the mails. It is designed furthermore to insure that all purchasers of mail-order handguns are law-abiding, mature individuals. The increase of the license fees for dealers licensed under the Federal Firearms Act is intended to eliminate certain fringe elements, fly-by-night dealers, and juveniles from the firearms traffic.

The proposal, of course, is not the entire solution to our firearms problem. But its requirements should halt the mail-order sales of handguns to juveniles. It should discourage the many lurid advertisements presently to be seen in the pages of cheap pulp and girlie magazines, all aimed at the juvenile trade. It should also make clear to parents that no juvenile can legally acquire a handgun through mail order and express shipments.

With the enactment of the bill, the coupons signed and sent by juveniles to mail-order dealers will no longer be taken at face value. Express company employees will know what the packages contain, and will have to make certain that the persons who receive them are 18 years of age or more. Certainly any express company employee, confronted with a customer of dubious age who calls to pick up a package containing guns, would insist upon highly dependable identification and further verify that identification if need be.

The subcommittee, it should be restated, has no intention or desire to deprive mature and responsible citizens of their right to purchase or possess firearms. Its objective is only to protect the public by providing some assurance that handguns are kept out of the hands of youngsters, the mentally ill, and criminals. I can think of no group in America, least of all the responsible groups of gun makers and owners, who would argue otherwise.

The legislation, as a matter of fact, has been thoroughly discussed with the gun industry and the gun clubs, as well as with the common carriers to whom it would give additional responsibilities.

To the credit of all, they have approved and endorsed the provisions of our proposal.

The gun manufacturers feel that the bill would help to eliminate a disreputable and undesirable element from an industry which has so proudly served our country.

The gun owners commendably take the position that the provisions of the bill would do much to protect and preserve their own right to possess guns.

The common carriers in their turn have long been concerned over the carelessness in firearms traffic and have long sought a solution.

The need for additional legislation in this area is demonstrated; the inadequacy of present legislation is clear. The remedy is available. There is no controversy about this legislation among the responsible groups affected.

We hope that the bill will receive a reasonably prompt hearing in the Commerce Committee and on the floor of the Senate. Each day of added delay may cost a human life.

I urge that this legislation receive the grave and thoughtful consideration of every Member of this body.

Madam President, I would like to add a special commendation to the National Rifle Association, which is the traditional spokesman for the 20 million citizens in the United States who use guns and rifles for sporting events, hunting, and target practice.

This organization has worked closely with the committee throughout its investigation and has participated willingly in the development of the bill I introduce today. The most recent issue of the official publication of the National Rifle Association, the American Rifleman, contains an editorial which is highly complimentary to the committee's investigation and to the bill I introduce today amending the Federal Firearms Act. I would like to commend the leadership of the National Rifle Association and all its members for the responsible stand it has taken in this editorial. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mail-Order Guns

A few unscrupulous gun merchants are creating a serious situation for law-abiding citizens who believe in the right to keep and bear arms. Mail-order guns have become a national issue.

Shocking reports are being published in newspapers and magazines exposing the tactics of a small number of mail-order houses involved in interstate shipment of cheap handguns to juveniles, criminals, and mental defectives. These junk guns are being imported into America and offered for sale mostly through advertisements in comic books and pulp magazines. Orders are handled by mail, often addressed to a post office box. Shipments usually are made by common carrier since Federal postal regulations prohibit the shipment of firearms by mail except to certain specified military and enforcement officers or to bona fide dealers and manufacturers.

Most of the information being publicized relative to these gun merchants and their customers has been made available by studies and hearings conducted during the past several years by the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency. Much of the testimony of witnesses and reporting by writers borders on sensationalism, with the usual emotional reactions. Nevertheless, there is concrete evidence that a serious problem does exist and responsible leaders intend to do something about it.

The latest proposal, aimed at irresponsible purchasers, is to amend the Federal Firearms Act to make it unlawful for any manufacturer or dealer to ship a handgun in interstate or foreign commerce to anyone without a Federal firearms license unless that person has submitted a sworn statement, attested by a notary public, to the effect (1) that such person is 18 years or more of age; (2) that he is not a person prohibited from receiving a firearm in interstate or foreign commerce; and (3) that there are no provisions of law, regulations, or ordinances applicable to the locality of the purchaser which would be violated by such person's receipt or possession of the handgun. It also would be unlawful for any person to cause to be transmitted by mail or in interstate or foreign commerce such a sworn statement which contains any false statement as to any material fact for the purpose of obtaining a handgun.

Another proposal, aimed at the unprincipled gun merchant, is to increase the fee for obtaining a Federal firearms license to $50 for a manufacturer or pawnbroker and to $10 for a dealer. Manufacturers and dealers would be required to give written notice to the common or contract carrier when a handgun is being shipped in interstate or foreign commerce. It would be unlawful for the carrier to deliver such a handgun to any person with knowledge or with reasonable cause to believe that such person is under 18 years of age.

Steps must be taken to stop the traffic of mail-order guns into unauthorized hands. At the same time, due caution must be exercised so that law-abiding citizens are not severely penalized or deprived of their individual rights. Reputable gun owners long have contended that accidents and crimes with firearms cannot be prevented by passing laws aimed at the gun. It is reassuring that proposed solutions to this particular situation are being directed at irresponsible merchants and purchasers. With this approach, steps can be taken toward a reasonable solution to the problem of mail-order guns.

The bill (S. 1975) to amend the Federal Firearms Act, introduced by Mr. Dodd, is as follows:

Exhibit 1

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Federal Firearms Act (52 Stat. 1250), is amended to read as follows:

"That as used in this Act—

"(1) The term 'person' includes an individual, partnership, association, or corporation.

"(2) The term 'interstate or foreign commerce' means commerce between any State or possession (not including the Canal Zone), or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof; or between points within the same State or possession (not including the Canal Zone), or the District of Columbia, but through any place outside thereof; or within any possession or the District of Columbia. The term 'State' shall be held to include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia.

"(3) The term 'firearm' means any weapon, by whatsoever name known, which will, or is designed to, or which may be readily converted to, expel a projectile or projectiles by the action of an explosive, the frame or receiver of any such weapon, or any firearm muffler or firearm silencer.

"(4) The term 'handgun' means any pistol or revolver originally designed to be fired by the use of a single hand, or any other firearm originally designed to be fired by the use of a single hand.

"(5) The term 'manufacturer' means any person engaged in the manufacture or importation of firearms for purposes of sale or distribution; and the term 'licensed manufacturer' means any such person, licensed under the provisions of this Act.

"(6) The term 'dealer' means (a) any person engaged in the business of selling firearms at wholesale or retail; (b) any person engaged in the business of repairing such firearms or of manufacturing or fitting special barrels, stocks or trigger mechanisms to firearms or (c) any person who is a pawnbroker. The term 'licensed dealer' means any dealer who is licensed under the provisions of this Act.

"(7) The term 'fugitive from justice' means any person who has fled from any State, the District of Columbia, or possession of the United States, (a) to avoid prosecution for a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year; or (b) to avoid giving testimony in any criminal proceeding.

"(8) The term 'pawnbroker' means any person whose business or occupation includes the taking or receiving, by way of pledge or pawn, of any firearm as security for the repayment of money loaned thereon.

"(9) The term 'Secretary' or 'Secretary of the Treasury' means the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate.

"(10) The term 'indictment' includes an indictment or an information in any court of the United States, the several States, possessions or the District of Columbia under which a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year may be prosecuted.

"(11) The term 'crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year' shall not include any Federal or State offenses pertaining to antitrust violations, unfair trade practices, restraint of trade, or other similar offenses relating to the regulation of business practices as the Secretary may by regulation designate."

Sec. 2(a). Subsections (a), (b), (d), (e), (g), and (h) of section 2 of the Federal Firearms Act are amended by striking out the words "or ammunition" wherever they appear.

(b) Subsection (d) of section 2 of said Act is amended by deleting the word "Territories".

(c) Subsection (f) of section 2 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(f) It shall be unlawful for any person who has been convicted by any Court of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year, or who is a fugitive from justice, to receive any firearm which has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce,"

(d) Subsection (i) of section 2 of said Act is amended by striking out the words, "and the possession of any such firearm shall be presumptive evidence that such firearm was transported, shipped, or received, as the case may be, by the possessor in violation of this Act."

(e) Section 2 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(j) It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer or dealer knowingly to deliver, or cause to be delivered, to any common or contract carrier for transportation or shipment in interstate or foreign commerce, to persons

other than licensed dealers or manufacturers, any package or other container in which there is any handgun as defined in this Act, or any firearm as defined in section 5848(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 without written notice to the carrier that handguns are being transported or shipped.

"(k) It shall be unlawful for any common or contract carrier to deliver, or cause to be delivered, in interstate or foreign commerce any handgun as defined in this Act, or any firearm as defined in section 5848(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to any person with knowledge or with reasonable cause to believe that such person is under eighteen years of age.

"(l) It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer or dealer to ship any handgun as defined in this Act, or any firearm as defined in section 5858(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in interstate or foreign commerce to any person other than a licensed manufacturer or licensed dealer or person exhibiting a license as prescribed in subsection (c) of this section, unless the person to whom such handgun or firearm is to be shipped has submitted to such manufacturer or dealer a sworn statement in such form and manner as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe, attested to by a notary public, to the effect that such person (1) is 18 years or more of age; (2) that he is not a person prohibited by this Act from receiving a firearm in interstate or foreign commerce; and (3) that there are no provisions of law, regulations or ordinances applicable to the locality to which the handgun or firearm will be shipped, which would be violated by such person's receipt or possession of the handgun or firearm. It shall be unlawful for any person to cause to be transmitted by United States mail, or to cause to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce such a sworn statement which contains any false statement as to any material fact for the purpose of obtaining a handgun or such a firearm."

Sec. 3. Section 3 of the Federal Firearms Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. (a) Any manufacturer or dealer desiring a license to transport, ship, or receive firearms in interstate or foreign commerce shall file an application for such license with the Secretary, in such form and containing such information as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe. Each such applicant shall be required to pay a fee for obtaining such license as follows:

"(1) If a manufacturer of firearms, a fee of $50 per annum;

"(2) If a dealer (other than a pawnbroker) in firearms, a fee of $10 per annum; or

"(3) If a pawnbroker, a fee of $50 per annum.

"(b) Upon filing by a qualified applicant of a proper application and the payment of the prescribed fee, the Secretary shall issue to such applicant the license applied for, which shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, entitle the licensee to transport, ship and receive firearms in interstate or foreign commerce during the period stated in the license. Except that, no license shall be issued pursuant to this Act (1) to any applicant who is under twenty-one years of age; or (2) to any applicant, if the applicant (including, in the case of a corporation, partnership, or association, any individual possessing directly or indirectly, the power to direct or cause the direction of the management and policies of the corporation, partnership, or association) is prohibited by the provisions of this Act from transporting, shipping, or receiving firearms in interstate or foreign commerce.

"(c) The provisions of section 2 (d), (e), and (f) of this Act shall not apply in the case of a licensed manufacturer or licensed dealer who is under indictment for a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year, provided that such manufacturer or dealer gives notice to the Secretary by registered or certified mail of his indictment within 30 days of the date of the indictment. A licensed manufacturer or licensed dealer who has given notice of his indictment to the Secretary, as provided in this subsection, may continue operations pursuant to his existing license during the term of such indictment, and until any conviction pursuant to the indictment becomes final, whereupon he shall be fully subject to all provisions of this Act and operations pursuant to such license shall be discontinued.

"(d) Each licensed manufacturer and licensed dealer shall maintain such permanent records of production, importation, shipment, and other disposal of firearms as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe."

Sec. 4. Section 4 of the Federal Firearms Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 904. Exemptions.—(a) The provisions of this Act shall not apply with respect to the transportation, shipment, receipt, or importation of any firearms sold or shipped to, or issued for the use of (1) the United States or any department, independent establishment, or agency thereof; (2) any State, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or any department, independent establishment, agency, or any political subdivision thereof; (3) any duly commissioned officer or agent of the United States, a State, or possession or the District of Columbia, or any political subdivision thereof; (4) to any bank, public carrier, express, or armored-truck company organized and operating in good faith for the transportation of money and valuables, which is granted an exemption by the Secretary; (5) to any research laboratory designated as such by the Secretary; or (6) to the transportation, shipment, or receipt of antique or unserviceable firearm (other than a 'firearm' as defined in section 5848(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) possessed and held as a curio or museum piece.

"(b) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to prevent shipments of firearms to institutions, organizations, or persons to whom firearms may be lawfully delivered by the Secretary of Defense or his delegate, nor to prevent the receipt or transportation of such firearms by their lawful possessors while they are engaged in military training or in competitions."

Sec. 5. (a) Subsection (b) of section 5 of the Federal Firearms Act is amended by striking out the words "or ammunition".

(b) Subsection (b) of section 5 of said Act is further amended by striking out the words "title 26" where they first appear and inserting in lieu thereof the words "the Internal Revenue Code of 1954", and by striking out the words "section 2733 of title 26" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "section 5848 of said code."

Sec. 6. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective on the first day of the second month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 7. The Federal Firearms Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 10. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as modifying or affecting the requirements of section 414 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, with respect to the manufacture, exportation, and importation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. Yes; I am happy to yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I want to compliment the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary for the introduction of this bill and for his continuing and active and effective efforts in trying to see that the youth and the people of the Nation are protected from firearms and other devices capable of doing bodily harm which may be shipped in interstate commerce. His contribution has been substantial, his vigilance has been great, and he deserves the thanks of our citizens for the leadership he has shown in this field.

Mr. DODD. I am deeply grateful for the kind remarks of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I would like to be a cosponsor.

Mr. DODD. I appreciate that, too.

MINERAL LEASING ACT AMENDMENT REGARDING TIMELY PAYMENT OF ANNUAL RENTALS

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, for myself, together with Senators McGee, Holland, Engle, Simpson, Moss, Bible, Cannon, Kuchel, and Mechem, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, to provide that the date of payment of rentals on lease renewals will be the date of the postmark on an envelope containing payment.

The Minerals, Materials and Fuels Subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has had its attention called to circumstances in which mineral leases have been terminated by operation of law because the payment of an annual lease rental is late in arrival at the responsible land office, although the lessee mailed his payment within time which under ordinary circumstances would be sufficient for its receipt by the anniversary date. Under the law as it is now administered, a prudent lessee may suffer substantial hardship because of abrupt termination of his lease for failure of timely payment of rental, even though the lessee has acted with due care.

The bill I have introduced would provide general legislation to establish payment of mineral lease rentals as timely if the postmark on the envelope is no later than the date payment is due. This provision would obviate cases of hardship in which lease rentals are received after the anniversary date, through no fault of the lessee. I believe this is a needed amendment which will preclude unwarranted hardship and manifest injustice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1984) to amend the Mineral Leasing Act regarding the timely payment of rentals, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Gruening, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MEMBERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific joint resolution to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this joint resolution, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution along with a letter from the Secretary of State, dated July 20, 1963, be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and letter will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 108) to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission, introduced by Mr. Fulbright, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(a) of Public Law 403, Eightieth Congress (62 Stat. 15), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Such sums as may be required annually for the payment by the United States of its proportionate share of the expenses of the Commission and its auxiliary and subsidiary bodies, as set forth in article XIV of the agreement establishing the South Pacific Commission."

The letter presented by Mr. Fulbright is as follows:

The Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C., July 20, 1963.

The Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate.

Dear Mr. Vice President: I submit herewith a proposed draft amendment to Public Law 403, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 15) as amended to remove the statutory limitation of $100,000 placed upon U.S. contributions to the South Pacific Commission.

The South Pacific Commission is an international organization composed of five governments—the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Australia, and New Zealand—which administer 15 territories in the Pacific area. The Netherlands, one of the original members, withdrew from the commission on December 31, 1962, because that government had ceased to administer Netherlands New Guinea. The secretariat is located at Noumea, New Caledonia and numbers about 60 technical, administrative, and clerical personnel. At the time of its establishment in 1947, the Commission's activities were confined to areas south of the Equator. On the U.S. side only American Samoa, with a population of approximately 20,000, was covered. In 1951, the territorial scope of the Commission was extended to include Guam and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, both north of the Equator.

The Commission's work is divided into three main parts. The economic development section is currently concerned with improvement of basic crops (coconut, breadfruit, etc.), with fisheries and boatbuilding, and with eradication of plant diseases and pests. The social development section's program at present deals with community education, language teaching, cooperatives, urbanization, housing, labor, library development, literacy, and reading aids. The health section's present program is in health education, maternal and child care, rural health, and research on fish poisoning, nutrition, and meningitis. The Commission has no political function.

The work is carried on in a number of ways:

1. Training courses to develop new skills or to strengthen old traditional skills;
2. Technical conferences at several levels, both regional and subregional, on specific subjects;
3. Direct technical advice by staff to local governments, particularly at the village level;
4. Collection and regular publication of specialized and technical informational material.

These activities are usually financed by the Commission with some assistance from the local governments. Some of the larger projects have been held in collaboration with, and financial assistance from, the United Nations or one of its specialized agencies. Aside from this occasional collaboration with the Commission, the United Nations has not operated in this region because of the large geographic area covered and the small scattered population.

The U.S. territories of American Samoa and Guam, as well as the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, are covered by the Commission's projects and activities. These islands have received direct benefits from the Commission by participation in its many activities. They have sent trainees to long-term courses held for the region; have used the services of experts in conducting short-term courses in their own territories; attended technical conferences; and sent specialists for on-the-spot study to other Pacific territories. U.S. territories have been supplied technical information on a regular basis through such publications as basic pamphlets, technical papers, and newsletters. This clearinghouse function is one of the most useful and inexpensive methods by which the South Pacific area can keep abreast of scientific and technical developments elsewhere which have relevance to that area.

Some of the more significant current activities of the Commission, from which the U.S. territories will receive direct benefits, include a campaign, to be financed in large part by the U.N. Special Fund, to control the foremost pest of the coconut tree—the rhinoceros beetle. In collaboration with the FAO and the Australian committee of the freedom-from-hunger campaign, the Commission is establishing a community education training center in Fiji. The first training offered will be a 1-year residential training course in home economics. Two boatbuilding courses for French and English speaking trainees are being conducted jointly by the Commission and the United Nations. In addition, a number of technical conferences and seminars are scheduled for this year on maternal and child health, low-cost housing, and nursing education.

The statutory limitations of $20,000, $75,000, and the existing statutory limitation of $100,000 on the U.S. annual contribution were adequate during the formative years of the South Pacific Commission's existence, both because the organization was able to function fairly effectively on a very low budget during its early years while it was developing rather than implementing its plans, and because our share of the total budget was only 12½ percent. The South Pacific Commission has in recent years developed its work to a point where larger budgets can be used with good effect, and the withdrawal of the Netherlands has necessitated distribution of that country's 15 percent share of the budget among the remaining governments. Since the United States original budgetary share of 12.50 percent was based on the inclusion of only American Samoa in the area covered by the Commission's activities and since the Commission, in 1951, included Guam and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, it is considered equitable that the United States assume one half of the Netherland's share, which would bring the U.S. share to 20 percent, or one fifth of the total. Given the present limit of $100,000, this would have the effect of holding the total assessment budget to $500,000, considerably below the $598,988 approved for 1963, and the $830,000 proposed for calendar year 1964. Under the present ceiling, the United States could not pay its assessed share of the budget. Consequently, many worthwhile practical projects would have to be curtailed or abandoned.

The Department of State believes that experience over the past 15 years has demonstrated that the Commission is an effective instrument of promoting economic and social development throughout this region. Three Pacific island territories are under the U.S. Government's administration. Furthermore, the U.S. Government is interested in improving the economic and social structure of the many scattered islands which are of strategic importance to the United States. The South Pacific Commission is a small organization whose activities are especially adapted to the Pacific area. It complements and supplements the individual territorial work of the administering authorities. The overall development of the area can thus be more uniform. The Department of State believes that the work of the Commission should be strengthened by modest and regular increases in the budget over a period of 5 years—to a total of approximately $2 million. Even with such a budget, the Commission would be a small organization operating a modest program.

As between the raising of the current statutory limitation and eliminating it entirely, the Department is recommending the latter. Other governments consider the existence of such a limitation as a unilateral veto by the United States on the size of the South Pacific Commission budget and hence a veto on the whole program. The other member countries have not enacted such legislation. They have preferred to relate their financial support of the Commission to the program and effectiveness of its operation. If other countries were to enact similar legislation, it would result in complete financial chaos for the Commission since the size of the budget would be determined by a series of unilateral actions and not by multilateral negotiations. In addition, the U.S. Commissioners are unable to participate effectively in directing the work program since we cannot respond to even the most urgent and justified projects if they breach the U.S. limitation by even a slight amount. It should be noted that the elimination of the statutory limitation would not result in excessive increases in the budget, since the remainder of the members have to pay their share of increased costs as well. In the last analysis, the United States contribution is still dependent on the appropriations process and the amount required must be adequately justified in the Department's presentation to the Congressional Appropriations Committees. It is hoped that the removal of the ceiling will remove the necessity of the Congress having to enact legislation for small annual increases in the Commission's budget. It is also hoped that the Congress will be able to give favorable consideration to this request during the present session so that the United States Representative will be able to participate in the discussion and enactment of the programs to be included in the calendar year 1964 budget.

A similar communication is being sent to the Speaker of the House.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

RAILROAD LABOR DISPUTE—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR AMENDMENT TO LIE ON THE DESK FOR ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. ENGLE. Madam President, on July 31, I submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, for Senate Joint Resolution 102, relating to the railroad labor dispute, which was ordered to lie on the desk until today for additional cosponsors. I now ask unanimous consent that the amendment be held at the desk for additional cosponsors until next Tuesday, August 6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 332, TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PROVIDE FOR INCLUSION OF A DISTRICT JUDGE OR JUDGES ON JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF EACH CIRCUIT—AMENDMENT

Mr. HAYDEN. Madam President, the bill (S. 979) to amend section 332 of title 28, United States Code, in order to provide for the inclusion of a district judge or judges on the judicial council of each circuit, has been made the unfinished business of the Senate. I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me to the bill, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

AMENDMENT OF CLAYTON ACT—REPRINT OF SENATE BILL 1935

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for a reprint of my bill, S. 1935, to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, to correct certain errors in the original printing thereof. The bill, as introduced, was intended to be written to transfer exact language of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act into the Clayton Act, to be known hereafter as section 3(a) of the Clayton Act. There was an error made in the printing of the bill.

It may seem rather small, but it is significant, particularly since it was the desire to use identical language. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent for a reprint to correct this error. The correction would be to insert the word "a" after the words "to be" in line 9, page 2.

If the bill is reprinted in accordance with this request, I also ask unanimous consent that a correction of an error be made in the list of cosponsors at the head of the bill. By mistake the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] was listed as a cosponsor rather than the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. The error is regretted. I ask unanimous consent to substitute the words "Mr. LONG of Louisiana" for the words "Mr. LONG of Missouri" in the list of cosponsors on the star print.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF NOMINATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Mr. Frank K. Hefner, of Virginia, to be deputy representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency, and that the nomination be referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and resolution:

Authority of July 24, 1963:

S. 1935. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BIBLE, and Mrs. NEUBERGER.

S. Res. 176. Resolution to create a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs—for the Veterans' Administration: Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. FONG, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. RANDOLPH.

Authority of July 25, 1963:

S. 1942. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America: Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. RIBICOFF, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana, to be Ambassador to Burma.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS LEGISLATION HEARINGS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, on behalf of Senator PROXMIRE, chairman of the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, I wish to announce that the additional hearing on S. 298, a bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, originally scheduled for August 6, 1963, in order to receive testimony regarding possible self-dealing by SBIC's has been postponed until August 21, 1963.

The hearing will begin at 10 a.m., Wednesday, August 21, 1963, in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

All persons who wish to appear and testify on this matter are requested to notify Mr. Reginald W. Barnes, assistant counsel, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921.

PRINCE EDWARD UNSCHOOLED—NEW YORK TEACHERS

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, nowhere in the United States is the struggle over civil rights taking a greater toll than in Prince Edward County, Va., where about 1,100 Negro children of school age have had no formal schooling since 1959.

Many of these children, who come from poor farm families, did not know how to hold a pencil recently when a federally sponsored research team tried to determine their intelligence and educational status.

The only formal instruction these children have been exposed to is crash summer and holiday volunteer programs. I am proud that the volunteer teachers this year include 17 students from Queens College, New York, and 19 New York City professional schoolteachers. The students raised money for the project by sponsoring baseball games and concerts at their college.

I feel that this is the type of tedious, unglamorous work which proves that the teachers of this Nation, despite their detractors, have not lost their great humanitarian spirit and concern for the individual student, especially students who need special attention.

An article in this morning's edition of the Washington Post, I think, illustrates the personal, human tragedy that can be caused by prejudice, and the personal, human efforts that are being made by some individuals in an attempt to surmount it, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LESSON ONE FOR PRINCE EDWARD'S UNSCHOOLED: HOW TO HOLD A PENCIL

(By Jean White)

FARMVILLE, VA.—"Before we could even get to the test we had to show some of them how to hold a pencil. We had to show 7-, 8-, and 9-year-olds how to hold a pencil for the first time."

The children who do not know how to hold a pencil have not been able to attend public schools since 1959. Four years ago Prince Edward County deliberately closed its public schools rather than comply with court-ordered desegregation, and achieved a unique status. It became the only community in the United States without public schools.

A group of psychologists and sociologists are here studying the unusual phenomenon under a federally sponsored research project with the title, "The Educational Status of

Children in a District Without Public Schools." Robert Lee Green, a Michigan State College of Education professor and head of the project, anticipated some problems in giving tests to youngsters who have never been inside a schoolroom.

"But we didn't expect to have to show them how to hold a pencil," said Green. "And these are not retarded children. They scored well on readiness tests where they had to mark "x" on multiple choices. It's hard to believe."

About 1,100 of the 1,700 Negro children of school age in Prince Edward County have had no formal education since 1959. The survey found 503 youngsters under the age of 11 who had never been to school. Their only exposure to education has come in summer "crash" school and winter "morale" class sessions run informally in churches. Meanwhile, some 1,200 white children had been attending classes in a private, segregated school set up by the white citizens.

The Michigan State project will tell the story of a community without public schools in the statistics of a research study. The story can also be told by what has happened to youngsters like these:

Twelve-year-old Pearl Toney, who was slowly forming words on a lined school tablet one day last week during a recess in the summer classes at the Negro Baptist church.

Pearl had just finished second grade when the schools were closed 4 years ago. A sister, 7 years old, and two brothers, 9 and 6, have never been to school.

"But I've been helping teach them at home," Pearl said. "I want to be a nurse. I'm writing my aunt in New York that I want to come there and live with her and go to school there."

Two 13-year-old boys, already grown gangling tall, who can barely read and write their own names.

Yesterday they slouched down in the back row with a class of 7- and 8-year-olds learning to recognize simple words on flash cards. They obviously were embarrassed and uncomfortable with the younger pupils.

The 13 boys and girls, who were asked by their volunteer college student-teacher what they knew about the Declaration of Independence. Only one had heard of it.

The 10-year-old boy from a farm family who has to ask friends what coin to give when he buys a candy bar at a store. He hasn't learned to count money.

Green and his 18 project workers here have located 1,725 school age Negro children in Prince Edward County who do not have schools to go to. The closed public schools now bear signs: "School Property—No Trespassing Under Penalty of Law—Prince Edward County School Board." At nearby Prospect, one of six rural districts in the county school system, the front door of the school is boarded up, and desks are piled in an adjoining maintenance building.

In Prospect, the volunteers are running a branch of their summer school program. Altogether, about 500 youngsters are showing up for the informal classes in the county seat of Farmville and at the rural branches.

The Negro youngsters come eagerly to classes obviously not believing that ignorance is bliss. On sticky, hot, summer days, they sit on hard church pews for school sessions from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. The volunteer teachers—17 students from Queens College and 19 professional teachers from New York City—try to do their best to give them a brief glimpse of school.

"I noticed that some boys were just sitting and staring at me in class the first day," said Leonard Hausman, a 20-year-old economics major. "It took a while to realize I just was not getting through to them. They did not understand what I was saying. Sometimes I wonder how they even communicate to each other."

School deprivation works a double handicap on the youngsters from farm families, Professor Green feels.

"Many of these kids come from families who do not talk much," he observes. "They are out in the fields all day. Their parents only talk to them to give them directions. They grow up in a nonverbal world except for schools. They have lost much more than just 4 years of schooling. In school you spend a lot of time in the first years getting attuned to others and learning to follow directions and working in groups of 35 or so."

In the survey, Green and his fellow workers on the project reached 1,038 Negro families. They located 1,725 Negro children of school age in Prince Edward County. Of this number, 269 were attending school outside the county at the time the families were contacted in May. Of the 1,725, more than 1,000—about 61 percent—had not had any formal schooling since 1959.

The survey workers found 1,018 Negro children who were in class in 1959, when the schools closed (the youngsters 10 years and younger were not attending classes obviously because there were no schools to go to). Of these 1,018, only 25—5.6 percent—have been able to get their regular 4 years of schooling by going away to attend classes outside the county.

Some 448 Negro youngsters have done this, but most of them have just been able to attend classes a year or two away from home. More than half of those not in school have been "just around home," the interviewers discovered.

EIGHTY-ONE PERCENT WOULD RETURN

In answer to questions, 81.4 percent said they wanted to return to school if the schools were reopened in Prince Edward County. Most of the no-returns were among those in the 17- to 22-year-old age bracket (included because they would have been in school classes if in the 4-year closed interim). Most of the older pupils, Green points out, feel they are now "too big" for school and face the need to work to help their families make a living.

The volunteer teachers here have no illusions about what their instant-summer school can accomplish. They just feel that it is important to do what they can.

Bonita Leeds, who teaches fourth grade in New York City, puts it this way:

"I read in the paper about Farmville and Berlin, about Farmville and nuclear testing. I thought, what is important that I can do? So I'm here. We're extremely serious about this. Don't ask me what we hope to accomplish in 6 weeks."

Most of the Queen College students are not education majors. Hausman is an economics major, and 20-year-old Phyllis Padow is a sophomore major in anthropology and sociology. They are volunteering their summer without pay.

BENEFIT CONCERT HELD

They raised money for travel and expenses by selling tickets to a faculty-student baseball game and sponsoring a Dick Gregory concert at Carnegie Hall. They are here under the direction of Rachel Weddington, an assistant professor of education, who taught at Howard University until 1956.

The professional teachers are here under the sponsorship of the United Federation of Teachers, again without pay for their services.

Once this summer is over, the Negro students here face their fifth schoolless year. The county board of supervisors voted again last month to cut off all funds to operate public schools, except for maintenance of buildings. The 1,260 white children will go to their private, segregated classrooms.

C. G. G. Moss, dean of Longwood College and one of the few white citizens who have spoken up for the opening of the public schools, points out that the tragedy of the closed schools is not only that of the Negro children.

"They should also study the white children who do not have public schools and must attend the private facilities here," he said. "They also will suffer from educational blight."

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I wish to invite attention to the 10th anniversary of the USIA.

Ten years ago President Eisenhower established the U.S. Information Agency by the President's Reorganization Plan No. 8. The new agency was given the oversea information activities of the International Information Administration, the Mutual Security Agency, and other functions. The past 10 years have witnessed the growth and development of our International Information Agency to a point that it is now a vital part of our oversea operations through the world.

Today USIA broadcasts over the Voice of America 789 hours a week in 36 languages. For special events coverage, such as the orbiting of Gordon Cooper, it broadcasts in as many as 62 languages. Every week, for use on oversea domestic stations translated into their native languages, USIA posts place locally 14,000 hours of taped broadcasting.

USIA makes moving pictures. Six hundred million people a month see USIA films produced in 52 languages.

Today our Information Agency supplies film and tapes to hundreds of oversea television stations, beamed to millions of television receivers that did not exist when the Agency was established 10 years ago.

The USIA tells the American story abroad through 66 magazines and 20 newspapers in 25 languages. Its cartoon strips and pamphlets are published in 87 countries.

I shall not bore Senators with further statistics but I am sure they will share my opinion that the cause of freedom is strengthened and advanced by the work of dedicated USIA employees diligently at work in 239 posts and 106 countries throughout the world.

In many areas of Vietnam and Korea, in Laos and other trouble spots, USIA information teams are zealously expounding the message of freedom amid hardships and dangers.

Unhappily I was a Member of the Senate at the time the Agency was torn to bits in terms of appropriations. I believe that was my first year in the Senate. It was a blow from which the Agency has suffered ever since.

I know of no particular effort of the United States in what is euphemistically called the cold war, more important than the work of the Information Agency. I know of none in which the United States is farther behind not only the Russian competition but also the general demands of the world situation.

Within the limitations of what the Agency has been given in terms of money, resources, and people, it has done an excellent job. That must be said in all fairness.

Especially, I wish to pay tribute to Ed Murrow, a fellow townsman from New York. The stature and prestige of our Information Agency reflects the dedication and personality of the famous professional who has guided its progress since early 1961. Under the direction of Edward R. Murrow, whose name is known throughout the world, the USIA has attained an enhanced professional standing that has increased its effectiveness to the advantage of the free world. Ed Murrow brought to the Information Agency abilities and experience in communications that are possessed by few men.

I am told that morale in the Agency has responded to Murrow's presence in a way impossible with anyone else. He has accomplished changes at the Agency that reflect the depth of his vision and the breadth of his person. This man is a passionate believer in the ideals of our democracy; if he succeeds in infusing his Agency and their product with only a small portion of his idealism, this country will be far the better for his having come to Washington.

There are 2,700 Americans employed at home, and 1,300 overseas by this Agency. They are heroes in many difficult spots, facing many difficult decisions. Many are personally uncomfortable in various situations, and often in danger. They hold aloft the finest traditions of our country.

Also, there are 7,000 local foreign nationals who work for the USIA who are entitled to recognition.

As we celebrate the 10th anniversary of this Agency, let us remember that we are far behind the parade. Of the elements of our struggle in the cold war, this is one of the weakest. It is one of the weakest because we have failed to give the Agency the necessary resources with which to operate. The direction it should take is evidenced by the fact that Ed Murrow has done an outstanding job. The private enterprise system in America has not yet been tied in adequately with the information activities of the United States. That is the big task yet to be accomplished.

Sufficient unto the day is the praise thereof. The USIA has done a good job with what it has had. Ed Murrow is an outstanding Administrator. I take great pride in paying tribute to him and his Agency today on its 10th anniversary.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, the U.S. Information Agency has come a long way during the 10 years of its existence in its efforts to convey to the world the kind of people we are, the kind of Government we have, the hypothesis upon which this country was founded, the achievements we have made, the aspirations we share in common with other countries in the free world.

USIA was created to further the achievement of U.S. foreign policy as enunciated by the President and the State Department and this is being done most effectively by influencing public attitudes abroad in support of these objectives.

USIA seeks to present the United States as a strong, democratic, dynamic nation qualified to lead the nations to a peaceful world community of free and independent states, free to choose their own future and their own system so long as it does not threaten the freedom of others. We should help them in every way possible.

Persuasion is one of the most important tools available to USIA and that arsenal must be as ready as our nuclear arsenal and used as never before. But this arsenal cannot be most effective unless the stature of the Agency is raised in this country. This, I believe, can be best accomplished by the Congress and, I further believe, that Congress can do this best by providing USIA with an adequate budget. Yet the voice of the greatest country in the world is not being outspent, outpublished, and outbroadcast.

During its short but effective existence USIA has had the benefit of well qualified leadership, but with the appointment of Edward R. Murrow as its Director it is rising to a new professionalism. He has brought to this position a professional handling of its responsibilities which may well mean the difference between confusion and understanding by peoples overseas of what this country is and means.

I am told that this rising professionalism with which Mr. Murrow has indoctrinated USIA has also resulted in rising standards for new persons joining the Agency, with a resultant long-term increase in proficiency. This bodes well for this country and its oversea information program.

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, I can add very little to what has already been said about the USIA. Ten years ago this Agency came into being and, like all infants, had to learn to creep before it could walk. During this period of time, as has been pointed out by the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], it has had five Directors. I do not know which is the more hazardous occupation—being Director of the U.S. Information Agency or being Secretary of Agriculture. However, I congratulate the present Administrator of the USIA, Ed Murrow, on his success in avoiding any missiles, guided or otherwise, that may have been cast in his direction. He has done excellent work.

Many think only of the Voice of America when they think of USIA. However, that is only a small part of its operations.

The Agency operates 182 libraries and 79 reading rooms, and supports 154 binational centers in many foreign countries. I can attest to the good they have done, from firsthand knowledge. I have visited several libraries in Latin America. Those libraries were all well patronized by the local people. I was in Panama on the day when the USIA library was reopened after the riots of 1955. The way the young people of Panama were pouring into the library seeking material was a real revelation to me.

The libraries throughout South America have been well patronized by the local people, and a high percentage of them are teenagers. In some places I found that they were suffering from an acute shortage of material; and magazines that were 6, 8, and 10 months old were still in great demand.

I was able to visit binational centers in such places as Caracas, Rio, and La Paz, and I was impressed with the work they were doing and with their potentialities for doing even greater good. I believe it is fitting that this Agency take a bow for the work being done to communicate to our neighbors our messages of good will.

Mr. CARLSON. Madam President, on the occasion of the establishment of the U.S. Information Agency on August 1, 1953, President Eisenhower, in speaking of the mission of USIA, said:

> The purpose of the U.S. Information Agency shall be to submit evidence to peoples of other nations by means of communication techniques that the objectives and policies of the United States are in harmony with and will advance their legitimate aspiration for freedom, progress, and peace.

During the short 10 years the Agency has been in existence this purpose has been carried out by explaining and interpreting to foreign peoples the objectives and policies of the Government of the United States; by imaginatively depicting the relationship between these policies and the legitimate aspirations of other peoples of the world; by revealing and countering hostile attempts to distort or frustrate the aims and policies of our Government; and by showing the important aspects of the life and culture of our people to facilitate the understanding of the policies and objectives of our Government.

The U.S. Information Agency has done a tremendous job of carrying out the purposes for which it was established. This has not been any easy task, for, as Mr. Edward R. Murrow, present Director of the Agency, said earlier this year:

> No cash register rings when a man changes his mind, no totals are rung up on people impressed with an idea. There is no market listing of the rise or fall in the going rate of belief in an ideal. Often, one's best work may be merely to introduce doubt into minds already firmly committed. There are no tallies to total or sums to surmise when you've finished a day of explaining disarmament or discussing with the disenchanted the hope of an Alliance for Progress.

On March 14, 1961, Mr. Murrow was confirmed by the U.S. Senate to be the Director of USIA. Today I am convinced that this body acted wisely on that date, for Mr. Murrow has given USIA his ability to communicate, and without this ability the original aims and objectives for which the Congress established the Agency could not be met.

This Agency must continue to build our Nation's image in foreign countries in behalf of our interest in world security and peace.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, August 1 marks the 10th anniversary of the U.S. Information Agency, more commonly known as the Voice of America. In one sense, this is the second birthday which this Agency has had this year, since, just 15 years ago it was officially created with the passage of the Smith-Mundt Act—an act which I had the honor of sponsoring with that fine American statesman, Senator Alexander Smith, of New Jersey.

That act had as its purpose the objective of increasing mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries—to win the hearts and minds of other peoples.

As originally set up, the international information and cultural exchange programs were in the Department of State, but, in 1953, following the recommendations of special commissions investigating the program, the information program was set up in a separate agency, and it is the birthday of this reorganization plan that we commemorate today.

I have frankly admitted that, when the plan was initiated, I had some very serious reservations about the move. I felt—and many other Senators shared my doubts—that by removing the Agency from the direct jurisdiction of the Secretary of State we might find our foreign policy and our oversea information taking differeng routes. Fortunately, that has not occurred and I am happy to have had my doubts dispelled in this respect. As Ambassador George V. Allen, the man who ran this Agency for more years than anyone else, explained to me, the head of the Agency has almost Cabinet status and has direct access to the White House and the President and to top echelon people in the Department of State, and is thus able to keep abreast of every international development.

I am sure that this success in avoiding strained relations with the Department of State and in stifling any ambitions to "make policy" rather than to report on policy has come from the good sense shown by the Administrators of the programs. I should like to recall the names of the men who have headed the Agency in the past 10 years:

Theodore C. Streibert, from August 1953 to November 1956.

Arthur Larson, from December 1956 to October 1957.

Ambassador George V. Allen, November 1957 to December 1960. Ambassador Allen was also the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs and was in charge of this program in the Department of State prior to the time the Agency was made a special operating unit.

Abbott Washburn served as Acting Director from December 1960, to the end of January 1961. While this position of Director was a very short term, it is only fair to point out that Abbott Washburn served as Deputy Director under George Allen. In that capacity, he did trojan service, and made many important contributions to the program.

Edward R. Murrow was appointed in 1961 and serves at the present time.

There are others, too, who deserve commendation for their efforts to improve, expand, initiate, and refine our oversea information program. One special list of persons who should be mentioned are those who comprise that patriotic group serving on the Advisory Commission on Information. I would like to recall the names and dates of service for each of these men who has given so much of his time, thought, and effort to aid our country in improving our oversea image. They are:

Mark F. Ethridge, publisher, Louisville Courier Journal, January 28, 1948; December 15, 1950—resigned.

Ben Hibbs, editor, Saturday Evening Post, January 28, 1951; January 27, 1954.

Judge Justin Miller, president and chairman of board, National Association of Broadcasters, January 28, 1948; January 6, 1956—resigned.

Erwin D. Canham, editor, Christian Science Monitor, January 28, 1948; January 27, 1961.

Philip D. Reed, chairman of board, General Electric Co., January 28, 1948; January 27, 1961.

Dr. Mark A. May, director, Institute of Human Relations, Yale University, January 28, 1948; January 27, 1962.

Lewis W. Douglas, former Ambassador to Great Britain, January 28, 1957; January 27, 1962.

Jonathan W. Daniels, editor, Raleigh News and Observer, January 28, 1961; May 22, 1962—resigned.

J. Leonard Reinsch, executive director, WSB, January 28, 1961; January 27, 1964.

John L. Seigenthaler, editor, the Nashville Tennessean, October 10, 1962; January 27, 1964—appointed to fill vacancy created by resignation of Jonathan Daniels.

Clark R. Mollenhoff, journalist, Cowles Publications, January 28, 1962; January 27, 1965.

Morris S. Novik, public service radio consultant, January 28, 1962; January 27, 1965.

Sigurd S. Larmon, chairman of board, Young & Rubicam, January 28, 1954; January 27, 1966.

I am sure there is no need to tell the Senate that the purpose of the U.S. Information Agency is to tell America's story abroad. It seeks to make our national policies everywhere intelligible and, wherever and whenever possible, palatable. Its purpose is also to associate our people, in their daily lives, their progress and their yearnings, with the legitimate aspirations of all people everywhere.

To accomplish this task, the U.S. Information Agency employs all the techniques of modern mass communications: press, radio, film, television, libraries, exhibits, the arts, and, most important, personal contact by its personnel and their families overseas. These officers man 239 posts in 106 countries throughout the world. They carry on legitimate information work—devoid of deception, telling the truth about our country—even when that truth may not be flattering to us—showing the progress we are making, and giving good example for others to follow if and when they find something good in our system which they can utilize in their national life. Often, the good work which is done goes undetected for a long length of time, because it consists of the intangible assets of good will, deep understanding, and intellectual sympathy.

This Agency produces the basic written and illustrative materials which oversea officers place in local newspapers and magazines and publish in their own periodicals. It has a worldwide radioteletypewriter communications system. It operates foreign language printing plants at Manila, Mexico City, and Beirut.

The finished products, such as magazines, periodicals, and booklets, are translated and adapted locally for use by librarians, teachers, and students, as well as government leaders, members of parliament, and opinion leaders within a nation. The anti-American propaganda, and the poisonous words of ideological enemies, are offset by the outpourings of our information centers.

Some 30 million people overseas participated last year in information center activities in the 174 libraries functioning in 85 countries and in the 160 USIA-supported binational centers around the world.

These libraries combine the functions of library, classroom, community, and adult education centers. Their various programs include film showing, exhibits, concerts, lectures, and seminars. There is a constant influx of new students at these centers and libraries to attend the English-teaching classes. The Agency uses all media, the television series, "Let's Learn English," books, films, radio, and live instruction to meet the great demand.

Finding enough qualified teachers of English as a foreign language overseas to serve in USIA-sponsored programs is a continuing problem, and efforts are constantly made to train new teachers. These English-teaching programs are successfully carried on in 72 countries, with some 230,000 students participating.

These libraries and centers present exhibits of materials which tell the American story abroad. The Telestar exhibit, which demonstrated to the world the unusual achievement of making transatlantic communications possible, has drawn hundreds of thousands of people, supplementing the live network programs which Telstar is able to transmit.

Films are used extensively for information and training, and are highly effective. The Agency covers in detail all the methods of communications and information, adapting and moulding each to fit the needs of the areas which are served.

On the 10th birthday of USIA, it is fitting to remind ourselves that we have this Agency with its group of specialists serving on the international frontiers to tell the story of freedom.

It is effective—if it were not, the Communists would not be using 2,000 jamming transmitters to try to stop the flow of information. The Sino-Soviet bloc spends several times as much money trying to muffle the Voice of America as the broadcasts themselves cost.

Some evidence that the Voice of America is listened to is demonstrated by the 18,000 letters received from listeners in Yugoslavia alone during a single week.

I firmly believe that this Agency has a great future, and I believe that studies should be held both by Congress and the Executive on further expansion of the responsibilities of the Agency, especially in view of indicated changes in the international picture. I believe that a regrouping of some of our oversea activities could provide USIA with new responsibilities which it can adequately handle in its capacity as information and public relations agency of the United States.

The present Director of USIA has said:

> The voice of this country should at all times be steady—firm but not bellicose—carrying the conviction that we will not flinch nor falter in the face of threats or provocations.
>
> In the end of the day it may well be that the example of this Nation will be more important than its dollars or its words. If we, in this generous and capacious land, can demonstrate increasing equality of opportunity, social justice, a reasoned concern for the education, health, and the equality under law of all our citizens, we will powerfully affect and probably determine the destiny of the free world.

If the Agency continues with these objectives and high goals, I predict that it will enjoy many more birthdays, and that it will be complimented and commended again and again for the important service it is rendering to America and the free world in the cause of freedom, justice, orderliness, and peace.

Mr. HART. Madam President, a friend of all Americans—and a friend of millions of friends of America—is having a birthday this month. It is the 10th anniversary of the U.S. Information Agency.

Most of us, I think, know fairly well the statistics on this Agency and could judge its work by running off such facts as: It operates in 106 countries; in its 10 years it has provided English instruction for more than 1 million foreigners; it operates libraries in 88 countries and 159 binational information centers, and such.

But, too often, of necessity, we Members of the Senate must judge programs only on the basis of cold statistics.

Therefore, I am pleased today to be able to add a personal note to these statistics and tell you what USIA means in personal terms to the residents of at least one country.

Earlier this summer, I had the honor of representing the Senate Commerce Committee at the Poznan Trade Fair. Doing so enabled me to spend 7 days in Poland.

Naturally before arriving in the country I was aware that Voice of America, part of the USIA program, sent 2 hours daily of bradcasting into Poland. The questions which remained were: do the Poles listen and do they give any importance to the broadcasts?

The answer to both is an enthusiastic "yes".

The response of the Poles to these broadcasts put me in the strange position of being informed at each turn by the Polish of events taking place back here at home.

On the schedule I was following, I was seldom in a position to hear the broadcasts. But the Poles, apparently, made sure they did not miss them.

Therefore—for that week, at least—the Poles knew better what was occurring in the United States than one of the U.S. Senators.

Is USIA effective and worthwhile? There certainly is no question of that—especially in Poland.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the United States is a great Nation. Our people are dedicated to goals of international progress and peace. Our yearly record as a Nation and a people is filled with dramatic and solid efforts for peace, noble achievements in the cause of freedom, compassionate deeds to help the peoples of underdeveloped lands, spectacular accomplishments in science, and steady progress in securing the dignity and equality of the individual at home and throughout the world.

We, as Members of Congress and—indeed—as politicians, should realize above all others that achievement and success should not be buried in record books. We want others to hear about our achievements and successes, to understand them, and—yes—to be impressed by them.

But human beings do not learn by osmosis. The bells do not ring automatically and the people do not applaud instinctively throughout the world every time this Nation does something effective to advance the cause of peace, the principle of freedom, and the progress of man. The peoples of other nations must be given the facts of our achievements, through every device and technique of modern communication at our command.

This is the purpose of the U.S. Information Agency.

Today, I rise to emphasize the intrinsic worth of USIA and its purpose and to commend USIA's work.

Yesterday was a significant milestone for the U.S. Information Agency—its 10th anniversary.

On August 1, 1953, USIA was established by the President's Reorganization Plan No. 8. This plan provided that the Agency would be in charge of the Government's overseas information activities and would receive foreign policy guidance from the Department of State.

It is difficult to measure the influence and the effectiveness of the U.S. Information Agency. Ideas, knowledge, and attitudes cannot be weighed or summarized statistically. But I have no doubt that the understanding of the United States, its policies and achievements throughout the world because of the efforts of USIA is widespread, deep and enduring.

We can measure the specific activities and scope of the Agency through the various forms of modern communication. Personally, I am impressed that USIA, at an annual cost of a single Polaris submarine, is able to do so much in so many areas of the world.

The Agency's radio arm, the Voice of America, now broadcasts 789 hours weekly in 36 languages. More than 14,000 hours a week on tape go to foreign AM stations. We have 99 radio transmitters—57 overseas and 42 in the United States.

Every month, 600 million people see USIA films produced in 52 languages. The Agency has placed 7,500 projectors all over the world and established 220 film libraries in 104 countries.

For television, USIA sends 500 films a year to 65 countries. In Latin America alone, our programs are sent to 50 stations in 17 countries. A special program titled "Let's Learn English" is seen in 35 countries over 55 stations.

For the press and various publications of other nations, USIA files 10,000 words a day by wireless. These messages and articles go to 109 USIA posts, 66 magazines, and 20 newspapers in various languages produced locally at USIA posts. The Agency also publishes two major magazines—"America Illustrated" for the Soviet Union and Poland and "Al Hayat" for Arabic countries.

With the State Department, USIA helps to sponsor 5,000 exchanges of students and leaders each year.

At any one time, almost 300 exhibits are circulating throughout the world.

The Agency sponsors 183 libraries in 88 countries and 154 binational centers—119 of them in Latin America. Thirty million people a year visit these libraries and centers.

Since 1953, more than 1 million persons have been taught English through USIA's live instruction program.

The messages and news sent through USIA facilities to the world, in the past year, have informed others of such achievements as the historic space flight of Maj. Gordon Cooper, U.S. policy and action during the Cuban crisis, the continuing problem of free Berlin, and our efforts for a nuclear test ban treaty.

USIA's reporting of the spaceflight by Major Cooper, incidentally, is estimated to have drawn the largest world radio audience for a single event in the history of broadcasting.

With USIA, right now we have the opportunity to tell the people of the world of U.S. initiative for peace in our efforts for the nuclear test ban treaty negotiated in Moscow.

I have personally seen the work of the Agency in Europe, the Middle East, and Latin America.

During the past year, in particular, I had an opportunity to examine extensively the activities of the U.S. Information Agency in Latin America. In my report on the Alliance for Progress issued in late March of this year, I noted the improvements in the work of USIA that had taken place over the previous year. Progress has been made during the past year in Latin American universities in combating communistic student activity and propaganda. The Voice of America has been strengthened both in terms of its signal strength and in terms of service to local broadcasters.

As President Kennedy has stated about Latin America, "this area is the most critical area in the world" as far as U.S. foreign policy is concerned.

At a time when Communist influence in Latin America is increasing, the threat of Communist penetration of the student and intellectual movements, into the propaganda media, labor and agricultural fields is growing, the educational and propaganda activities of the U.S. Government must be stepped up. We have increased our foreign aid program in Latin America substantially but have not made proportionate increases in the budgets for educational and propaganda activity. And yet if one has to choose, there is a good argument to be made that it is even more important to increase our expenditures in the educational, propaganda, and cultural fields than in the purely economic field. Both are needed, but we still tend to underestimate the importance of the first.

In deciding on the scope of our effort in the educational and propaganda field, we must remember always that the continued Marxist grip on the minds of Latin American university professors and the students is due to the fact that the ideological basis of communism is its principal attraction for educated groups, not its economic critique. It is for that reason, as I stated in my report on the Alliance for Progress "that communism captures the university before the slum." "This is one more reason," I continued, "why more emphasis must be placed on education, on propaganda, on exposing both the elite groups and the public at large to liberal democratic ideas and institutions."

Since our obligations in Latin America in the propaganda and information fields are eminently greater than before, and because the same is true generally in the underdeveloped areas of the world, it makes no sense whatsoever to cut back on USIA appropriations. I am disturbed to note that the House Appropriations Committee has cut the proposed USIA budget by $15,200,000. The administration's request for $157,900,000 was cut to $142,700,000. I have seen no convincing argument to justify this cut. If the Senate allows this cut to stand, it would in my view be a grave error. I know that this Senator will work to restore the full amount and I am confident that I will be joined by many of my colleagues in this attempt. The U.S. Information Agency has earned a vote of confidence, it has demonstrated that it is capable of meeting the greater challenges which the United States faces in Latin America, in Africa, and in Asia, and it is my view that Congress should provide the funds that are needed to do the job.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN D. RHODES, UPON HIS RETIREMENT AS OFFICIAL REPORTER OF DEBATES, U.S. SENATE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, on July 31 many of my colleagues spoke in the Senate Chamber about a man who has served many years in this very Chamber.

I regret very much that I was unable to be here when these remarks were exchanged about John D. Rhodes, Official Reporter of Debates in the U.S. Senate. I take this opportunity to add a few of my own words about John Rhodes and his 44 years of outstanding service to the Senate.

It is with extreme pleasure that I commend Mr. Rhodes for his devotion to a difficult task and for the unusually fine patience and talents he has always brought to his assignment.

It is also my pleasure to refer to this exceptional public servant as Brother John D. Rhodes. As a member of the Kappa Sigma fraternity, I am proud to point out that Brother John Rhodes is a member of the Alpha Eta Chapter of George Washington University, which was established in 1892. Brother Rhodes has been a member of this chapter of our fraternity since December 14, 1901.

I wish John Rhodes well in his many years of fruitful endeavor ahead, and hope that he will return to visit often in this Chamber where he has made so distinguished a career.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, while I was away in Peru, the word came to the Senate of the retirement of Mr. John Rhodes, who is the Chief Reporter of our professional reporting staff. I know of no one who owes Mr. Rhodes more thanks than does the senior Senator from Oregon, because his patience and understanding over the years in connection with pages of remarks that I have made on the floor of the Senate, and which have been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, really exceed all understanding on the part of a servant of the Senate. He has been gracious, he has been understanding, he has at all times been helpful, and I shall forever be grateful to him. In fact, he has been a wise adviser of the senior Senator from Oregon, because he has, on many occasions, helped me avoid what otherwise would have been mistakes in the presentation of material that I have submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I engage in no overstatement when I say that Mr. Rhodes has given a great example of what a dedicated public servant and a wonderful civil servant should be. He leaves with us a record of service to the Senate that will be forever a great monument that his many friends will point to with pride; and all of us in the Senate, I can assure Mr. Rhodes, are proud to be able to say that we consider him one of our cherished friends.

Mr. PROUTY. Madam President, there are few callings which hold a greater fascination for me than that of stenographer or reporter of debates as we call these wizards who sit among us and record so accurately what we say. Often as I have watched John Rhodes and his colleagues at their business, I marvel at this magic which they have so capably mastered.

I think of David Copperfield trying to learn shorthand. In utter frustration and perplexity, after practicing most of the night with the help of Aunt Betsey, Traddles, and Mr. Dick, he remarked, looking at his notes:

> As to reading them after I had got them, I might as well have copied the Chinese inscriptions on an immense collection of tea-chests, or the golden characters on all the great red and green bottles in the chemists' shops.

Madam President, it might very well be that John Rhodes felt despair when he was learning the art of reporting. If so, it was our good fortune. For it probably contributed to his determination to excel, which was responsible for his 43 years of faithful and devoted service to this Nation and her people.

I wish for John Rhodes many years of happiness in retirement. He so richly deserves our high praise, our best wishes and our sincere thanks.

CHARTER HESLEP

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, in the untimely passing of Charter Heslep, Washington has lost one of its finest citizens and Government one of its most dedicated and capable public servants. Charter Heslep, at the age of 59, passed away in Berkeley, Calif., following a heart attack. Charter came to Washington as a reporter on the Daily News and became its managing editor in the early forties. Thereafter he did an important assignment with the National Broadcasting Co. and became Washington manager of the Mutual Broadcasting System. Before coming to the Atomic Energy Commission he was editor of the Congressional News Quarterly. He was well known and highly respected by many Members of the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, where he had a very broad acquaintance. To many of us he was a thoughtful adviser on public affairs. He had a wide knowledge of the workings of government and of international problems. Over a considerable period I had the privilege of having his advice in connection with proposals to reorganize Congress and in the preparation of a book in the early forties, "Twentieth Century Congress." I shall greatly miss him as a close personal friend. My wife, Nancy, and I extend to his wife, Margaret, and to their two fine children, Sarah and Thomas, our sympathy and affection.

UNDERMINING THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, during these critical times, it is more vital than ever for people in other parts of the world not to misunderstand the motives of the United States. Our country and our people want them to live better and we are doing all that we can to help them improve their standard of living. Whoever distorts that impression is doing a disservice to the United States.

With this in mind, I highly recommend an editorial appearing in today's Washington Post entitled "Undermining the Alliance." The editorial expresses very clearly the harm being done by some American drug manufacturers who are blocking efforts to sell low-priced drugs in Latin America.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, I am trying to bring the facts of this case before the American people. American firms should have the right to compete in any market, here or abroad, without being subject to concerted harassment and restraints on the part of their competitors. In this instance, as the Post so rightly says, these practices "would tarnish the reputation of American business in Latin America." In a larger sense, they will hurt our efforts to make the Alliance for Progress succeed, as well as distorting the image that the United States is trying to project in Latin America and elsewhere.

This is recognized by the Agency for International Development which, in a recent letter to the chairman [Mr. Fulbright] of the Foreign Relations Committee, declared:

> Private enterprise efforts which reduce the cost and broaden the availability of remedial and life-saving drugs are distinctly within the Alliance program. And, by the same token, if anticompetitive concerted efforts by U.S. firms were to frustrate such efforts, this would disappoint the hopes for economic and social development which the Alliance program has already inspired in Latin America.

The editorial in the Post warns that efforts by some American drug manufacturers "to prevent the distribution of low-priced drugs under generic names in the Republic of Colombia seem likely to prop up anti-American charges of Yankee imperialism." It states that the Colombian generic drug program is "an alternative to the establishment of a nationalized drug industry," and that an American drug company is now selling drugs "at fractions of the prices of their trademarked counterparts," yet "it is earning very satisfactory profits."

The Post editorial goes on to say, "Clearly, this is an issue which should not be left in limbo." The investigation should go forward not only to preserve the right of American free enterprise to compete anywhere, but to eliminate any possible impression that the U.S. Senate would capitulate to pressure by American drug manufacturers and would cooperate to any extent in sweeping this inquiry under the rug. Without question, the stature and dignity of the U.S. Senate are now involved in this case. Only a full and complete investigation will be satisfactory.

The subcommittee has issued subpenas to a number of drug companies and trade associations for documentation about their role in this matter. Because of requests by the companies for more time, these subpenas have again been extended, this time to August 29. When the documents are received, the subcommittee will make them available to the State Department, at its request, to guarantee against any possible complications to American foreign policy. Subsequently, the subcommittee will decide in what manner to make the facts available for all to see and judge.

I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post editorial of August 1, "Undermining the Alliance," be printed in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Undermining the Alliance

The efforts of certain American pharmaceutical manufacturers to prevent the distribution of low-priced drugs under generic names in the Republic of Colombia seem likely to prop up anti-American charges of Yankee imperialism.

Bernard D. Nossiter, in Sunday's Washington Post, analyzed the issues in a struggle between McKesson & Robbins, the largest distributor of ethical drugs which is cooperating with the Colombian Ministry of Health in making low-priced drugs available there, and other leading American manufacturers. The Colombian Government has published solid evidence which supports the charge that a number of leading American manufacturers met and formulated plans to enlist the support of the U.S. Government in an effort to prevent the distribution of low-priced drugs.

Colombia is a poor country. Its Minister of Public Health, Dr. Jose Felix Patino, a world-renowned surgeon, has stated that four-fifths of the population is unable to purchase vitally needed drugs at the list prices quoted by American manufacturers. And as an alternative to the establishment of a nationalized drug industry, the Ministry of Health entered into an agreement with McKesson & Robbins to supply low-cost drugs under generic names.

McKesson is now selling chloramphenicol, an important antibiotic, and isoniazide, a drug used in the battle against tuberculosis, at fractions of the prices of their trademarked counterparts. But even at prices which are far below those charged by competitors, McKesson reports that it is earning very satisfactory profits.

In an attempt to head off a formal investigation into the activities of the drug manufacturers, the case developed by the staff of Senator Kefauver's Antitrust Subcommittee was transferred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. And the latter committee has recommended that the matter be turned over to the Justice and State Departments.

Clearly this is an issue which should not be left in limbo. Practices which would tarnish the reputation of American business in Latin America have been alleged and they should be fully investigated.

PASSAMAQUODDY TIDAL POWER-ST. JOHN RIVER PROPOSAL STUDIES

Mrs. SMITH. Madam President, this morning I conferred with the staff of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works with respect to my request of July 18, 1963, to the chairman of the subcommittee for obtaining the necessary additional funds required by the Army Engineers to expedite and complete the Passamaquoddy tidal power-St. John River proposal studies.

I am happy to report good news for the people of Maine as the staff reported to me that the matter had been pursued with the Army Engineers and that favorable and prompt action on my request was expected.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter of July 18, 1963, to Chairman Ellender and his reply of July 23, 1963, be placed in the body of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., July 18, 1963.

Hon. Allen J. Ellender,
Chairman, Public Works Subcommittee, Appropriations Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: At a White House conference on July 16, 1963, the President commented favorably on the recently completed Department of the Interior report on the international Passamaquoddy tidal power project and upper St. John River hydroelectric power development. The President directed the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior to proceed immediately with such additional studies and plans as are necessary with a view to an early authorization.

As you know, the fiscal year 1964 budget request for the Corps of Engineers includes $85,000 for continuation of the comprehensive study of the St. John River basin. An increase in this request appears to be needed in order to provide funds for the added studies directed by the President.

I have supported for a number of years the appropriation of funds for an adequate study of the economic feasibility of developing the hydroelectric potential of the international Passamaquoddy tidal power project and of the St. John River. I believe that we should expeditiously carry these studies forward to the point where a determination can be made as to the economic feasibility of this project. Therefore, I urgently request that you ask the Corps of Engineers to inform the committee as to the additional funds needed for the further engineering studies directed by the President. I believe that the Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1964 should include a sufficient amount to cover the cost of these engineering studies as well as to continue the St. John River basin comprehensive study.

Sincerely yours,
Margaret Chase Smith,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., July 23, 1963.

Hon. Margaret Chase Smith,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Smith: I have received your letter of July 18, 1963, concerning the need for an increase in the appropriations for the St. John River basin study in order that the Corps of Engineers can carry out the directive of the President to proceed immediately with certain additional engineering investigations of the proposed international Passamaquoddy tidal power project and the upper St. John River hydroelectric power development.

In accordance with your request, I shall obtain from the Corps of Engineers their requirements and capability for undertaking these investigations in fiscal year 1964.

Sincerely yours,
Allen J. Ellender,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Works.

CONSTRUCTION OF POLARIS SUBMARINES

Mr. DODD. Madam President, earlier this week the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] expressed dismay over the announcement that of six Polaris submarines to be built during fiscal 1964, three of the contracts would go to the Electric Boat Co., in Groton, Conn., two would be constructed at another private shipyard at Newport News, Va., and one at a Government shipyard in California.

I can well understand the disappointment of my colleague that none of these contracts went to the naval shipyard at Portsmouth, N.H., in which he is so deeply and properly interested. In fact, my colleague stated that he was "amazed and shocked by the developments today," because five of the six Polaris submarines are to be constructed at private shipyards.

I wish to applaud the decision of the Defense Department to award these contracts to private companies. If a private shipyard can build a Polaris submarine, as good or better, at less cost to the American taxpayer, then, by all means, it should get the contracts.

Naturally, I am proud and pleased by the fact that a company in my State is doing such a good job that it can win 50 percent of the Polaris submarine construction work during a particular year.

This is a great tribute to both the management and the workers at Electric Boat Co., and one which I think they richly deserve.

It was only recently, during my first 2 years in the Senate, that the Electric Boat Co. was not winning many new contracts.

Some workers had to be laid off; others were on short hours. The situation was serious, and I well recall my concern and that of others over the possibility that skilled employees would be permanently lost to an important segment of our defense industry.

The same concern has been expressed now, because the Government-owned yard at Portsmouth, N.H., and Kittery, Maine, only built one attack submarine last year, and is not slated to construct any of the six Polaris submarines in the new fiscal year.

But we should not award work to any yard, whether privately or Government owned, simply to keep it going. I think the experience at Groton shows a better way to keep a yard going.

During the short period of time when the Groton yard was not getting enough work, the Navy Department said that the bids were not competitive enough. Electric Boat was underbid on a number of occasions, and since the Navy Department was unwilling to award a contract to Groton under these conditions, the company lost business, and workers and their families suffered economic hardship for a period of time.

The future may have seemed uncertain then, but we all know what an outstanding job has been done since.

Last year, fiscal 1963, for example, Electric Boat launched four Polaris submarines and one nuclear-powered attack submarine.

The merits of the private enterprise system have been shown in this case. Competition must be met, in order to survive in the business world, and this has been done in my State, as is evidenced by the announcement this week that one-half of the Polaris submarines to be built in fiscal 1964 will be contracted for in Groton.

This is good news for many people in my State, especially in southeastern Connecticut where Groton is located.

I do not believe that defense contracts should be awarded on a geographic or political basis. There are many Connecticut companies that bid for defense work, and I will continue to try to help out so they will receive a fair share of this multibillion dollar expenditure each year.

But I do expect these companies, and businesses in other States as well, to give the Defense Department the most for each dollar it spends.

In the case of the Polaris submarine contracts, Electric Boat Co. is doing just that, and for this reason I think the awarding of three contracts is fully justified and praiseworthy.

APPOINTMENT OF DR. ROBERT M. WHITE AS CHIEF OF THE WEATHER BUREAU

Mr. DODD. Madam President, earlier this week the President named Dr. Robert M. White, of Hartford, Conn., to succeed Dr. Reichelderfer as Chief of the Weather Bureau.

The appointment of Dr. White is an excellent one, for he has had a long and distinguished career in the field of weather research. Graduating with a bachelor of arts degree in geology from Harvard, Dr. White received a master of science degree in meteorology from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and in 1950, a doctorate in meteorology also from MIT. During World War II, he served as a captain in the Air Force, with duties in weather forecasting.

From 1952 to 1958, Dr. White was Chief of the Large Scale Process Branch of the Atmospheric Analysis Laboratory at the Cambridge Research Center. At Cambridge he directed a study program of the dynamics of the general circulation of the atmosphere, long-range forecasting, and statistical weather prediction.

In 1958, Dr. White became chief of the Meteorological Development Laboratory at Cambridge. In this position, he was responsible for the technical direction of an extensive research program in weather prediction, atmospheric dynamics, applied climatology and meteorology, and meteorological equipment.

In July of 1959, Dr. White came to Connecticut to head the Weather Research Center of the Travelers Insurance Co., and to supervise its research and development program in meteorology. He soon became associate director of the Travelers Research Department, and at the present time he serves as its president.

I am very pleased with the appointment of Dr. White. His work at Travelers and his wide range of experience makes him eminently qualified to be Chief of the Weather Bureau.

PROPOSAL BY CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD TO REDUCE SUBSIDIES FOR LOCAL AIRLINES

Mr. CARLSON. Madam President, many areas of the United States, and particularly the Middle West, are greatly concerned about a plan being proposed by the Civil Aeronautics Board which would drastically reduce annual subsidy for local airlines.

The recommendations proposed by the CAB and which, I am advised, are now being studied by the Bureau of the Budget, could bring about a serious curtailment of air service to communities which must depend on feeder airline service. Feeder airline service is most important to areas that are not heavily populated and are great distances from metropolitan centers with their transcontinental air service.

The CAB in its early days promoted and encouraged the use and growth of airlines. This was essential in order to establish air transportation in our Nation. Now it proposes, through recommendations to slash subsidies, to curtail service under the so-called use-it-or-lose-it policy, which requires cities to have at least 1,800 passengers annually boarding feeder line planes.

Under this policy, Kansas cities such as Goodland, Hays, Great Bend, Garden City, and Dodge City, would be penalized. Air transportation is expanding rapidly in this section of our State, and I sincerely hope no action will be taken, either through the CAB or the Bureau of the Budget, which will affect this service which is so vital to Kansas. The same situation prevails in many other States.

I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in a recent issue of the Wichita Eagle be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIRLINE SERVICE FACING SLASH

(By John Zimmerman)

Local airline service to hundreds of U.S. cities—including five in Kansas and three in Oklahoma—hangs in balance.

Possible loss of airline service to Goodland, Hays, Great Bend, Garden City, and Dodge City in Kansas and Guymon, Muskogee and Duncan, Okla., came to light Sunday as the Wichita Eagle learned of a Civil Aeronautics Board plan to effect drastic annual reductions in local airline subsidies. The CAB plan, now under study by the Budget Bureau, would reduce feeder line subsidy by as much as $25 million by 1968.

REPORT STILL CONFIDENTIAL

The still-confidential report is being readied in Washington for submission to President Kennedy.

In his 1962 transportation message President Kennedy asked the CAB for its views. Because of the impact of CAB's proposal on roughly one-fourth of the 481 points served by the Nation's 13 local service airlines, the report is fast becoming political dynamite.

Basically, CAB proposes to cut the annual subsidy bill by $3.5 to $5 million which, in 5 years, would mean reduction in subsidy by 35 or 40 percent.

Local airlines have based their progress in reducing subsidy on growth in traffic and revenues plus greater economy through improved aircraft.

CAB's approach to subsidy reduction is viewed as diametrically different, namely, reduced airline service to fit the subsidy allotment. Flights over a given number would not be subsidized.

Under the proposal CAB's use-it-or-lose-it policy would come in for stricter enforcement. Under the use-it-or-lose-it policy CAB expects cities being served to have 1,800 passengers annually (average 5 per day) boarding aircraft of the feeder line.

It is on this particular point that cities in Oklahoma and Kansas have airline service which hangs in balance. The cities of Goodland, Hays, Great Bend, Garden City, and Dodge City in Kansas and Guymon, Muskogee and Duncan in Oklahoma are numbered among the 89 cities in the Nation which boarded less than 1,800 passengers in 1962 and were still being served in May 1963.

CENTRAL SERVES ALL

All of the cities in the two States are served by Central Airlines.

It appears the Budget Bureau will have the report ready for submission to the President in 2 to 3 weeks. Public release of the report details, if decided upon, would be handled through the White House.

Cities on the Central Airlines route structure, other than in Kansas and Oklahoma, not meeting minimum CAB requirements include Paris, Tex., and Lamar, Colo.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. TOWER. Madam President the manner in which America distributes its foreign aid has long been a subject of concern for our citizens. Indeed, the value of the program itself has been questioned by a great many people. Part of that questioning has been precipitated by revelations that our Government, in many cases, seems more intent on influencing the development of socialism in so-called "emerging" countries than in the development of the free enterprise system that built our own country. The Wall Street Journal, in an editorial today, discusses the probability of our financing a government-owned steel mill in India in an effort to match an earlier steel mill built there by Russia. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SYMBOLS OF SELF-DEFEAT

In defending the current foreign aid bill before a House committee, Administrator David Bell spent much of his time discussing whether the United States should help India finance a government-owned steel mill at Bokaro.

Well he might. For the Bokaro proposal, though it accounts for only a small share of the $4.5 billion the administration is seeking for fiscal 1964, does point up some of the major questions about our foreign aid.

For one thing, do we really want to engage in a giveaway race with Russia? Both the United States and the Soviet long have been wooing the Indians with aid of many kinds. While America is well in the lead in total spending, Russia has built India a steel mill and we haven't. Must we try to "catch up"?

The futility of this sort of exercise should now be apparent. The United States since World War II has loaned or given $100 billion to around 100 Nations, and our dollars have done little to win friends and influence people. Instead, Nations have grown accustomed to the aid and are acutely resentful if we propose any diminution in the dollar flow.

India provides a prime example of this peculiarity. Though that Nation has received more U.S. aid than any other country, its economic troubles and its demands for outside assistance are not decreasing but increasing. A major reason is the bungling of India's government planners—their insistence of emphasizing industry at the expense of badly needed food output, their reliance on tangled networks of controls, their stress on socialistic projects designed more for political profit than for economic gain.

We, of all people, should know that real economic growth stems not from tinkering with socialistic planning but from encouraging private business. Yet President Kennedy thinks we "ought to" help finance Bokaro, which not only would be a socialistic venture but would actively compete with private enterprise.

If this instance were unique it would be unfortunate enough. But the fact is that in other underdeveloped lands our aid program has been proceeding in much the same way. So, in reality, Bokaro and India are only symbols of our self-defeat.

SOME NEW THEORIES IN GOVERNMENTAL BUDGETING

Mr. TOWER. Madam President, I believe it would be quite an understatement to say that within recent years we have seen the evolvement of some entirely new theories in matters of governmental budgeting. And, almost overnight, these new theories have become somewhat rigid, despite the fact that they have never been tried successfully. Quite simply the new approach is an all-out assault upon old-fashioned concepts of thrift and budget balancing. The Wall Street Journal, in an editorial appearing today, discusses this situation most ably. Without objection I would like to place the editorial in the RECORD, and call it to the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW DOGMATISTS

"Somewhat wryly, the President has frequently asked his ex-professorial advisers where the several million college students who have taken Ec 1 in the past 20 years have gone."

That little insight was provided earlier this year by a member of the Council of Economic Advisers. It is an interesting thought: Despite all the indoctrination in the "new economics" in many of the Nation's schools, millions of Americans today are incurably old fashioned in their views about Federal budgets and public debt. For a Government dedicated to economic "sophistication," it must be quite vexing.

But we suspect there are some sound reasons for the difficulty of winning wide popular acceptance of the new economics. One is that it is not just a case of sophisticated Federal economists versus the allegedly unsophisticated masses. Whether the Government believes it or not, there are considerable numbers of eminent professional economists throughout the world who also disagree with the teachings of the new economics.

Specifically, they question the miracle-working powers of perpetual planned deficits, constantly rising Government spending, ever-growing public debt, all accompanied by easy money and a confusing and often internally contradictory assortment of economic regulations and controls. On the contrary, such economists view this melange as very bad business, because it distorts the economy, impedes economic growth, aggravates the balance-of-payments problem, leads to inflation and hence risks a serious slump.

Such views, we submit, reflect not economic illiteracy but knowledge fortified by the teachings of experience. It is tempting to speculate what some of the Federal economists think did cause the world's great inflations and subsequent depressions, or whether they ever heard of history's bleak experiments with the managed or semimanaged economy. Perhaps they do not believe in historical analogy; if so, the more pity for the Nation.

In point of fact, even the realm of economic theory offers little or no support for the new economics as practiced by this Government. The earlier prophets of the new economics, for all their bias toward Government spending and control, nonetheless insisted on certain restraints.

For example, the so-called compensatory theory of budgeting holds that deficits can be a stimulus in slumps but that budgets must be balanced in prosperous years. Those older new economists would not have subscribed to deficits as a way of life in all economic conditions. Nor would they have failed to note, as our Washington friends seem to, the connection between these persistent domestic deficits and the persistent deficits in our balance of payments.

Now no responsible people, including today's orthodox economists, are proposing anything particularly extreme as an alternative to the new economics. The need is not to dismantle Government but to limit it in the way it was supposed to be. A Government which presumes to take on all individual responsibilities is less a guardian of the national interest than a potential threat to it.

In such a calmer climate, much would be possible. The conditions would exist for safe tax reduction and the increased economic activity the Government professes to want so much. Maximum individual and economic freedom consistent with order is, at any rate, the historical path to economic and political well-being.

While we naturally don't expect the Federal economists to change their views, we could wish they were a little less dogmatic in their assumption that theirs is the only valid economic position. We wouldn't be all that cocksure if we found arrayed against us a respectable body of professional opinion, the teachings of the past and the ordinary man's commonsense.

THE REA PROGRAM, A DYNAMIC TOOL FOR RURAL AMERICA

Mr. BURDICK. Madam President, on July 20, the junior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. GAYLORD A. NELSON, delivered an eloquent address to the annual meeting of the Green River Rural Electric Cooperative at Owensboro, Ky. Although Kentucky is some distance from my home State of North Dakota, I am well acquainted with the Green River Cooperative through its manager, Mr. J. R. Miller, who is an outstanding member of the REA movement.

Senator NELSON's speech points out why the REA program must continue to grow if our Nation is to develop the dynamic rural America that we desperately need. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I believe in investing in the future of America, and that's why I consider the rural electrification program one of our most valuable and effective national programs.

The REA stands today as one of the great, lasting accomplishments of an amazing era in American history. To appreciate the REA I think you have to reflect just a moment on that era—and on some similarities you might notice today.

The REA came into being because a great crisis seized our country and shocked our Government into a new and dynamic concept of its responsibilities.

We had had a succession of what we called "businesslike" administrations. There was a fairly widespread acceptance of an old dogma which Calvin Coolidge put into words: "The business of the country is business."

The marketplace has become a shrine. Whatever happened there, from natural causes, was right and proper and good. Nothing else was supposed to happen. The U.S. Government stood and watched, a kind of halfhearted observer.

The Government was, in Franklin Roosevelt's words, frozen in the ice of its own indifference.

Then the whole edifice of business came tumbling down in disaster. And out of the ruins came a new American spirit which welded a nation together, helped us to win the greatest war in history and to emerge as the strongest industrial economy on earth.

This new spirit—expressed in programs such as the REA—is something we should not forget, for it represented a great turning point in American history.

We discovered this spirit when we stopped sitting around and waiting for good things to happen and began, instead, to mobilize our people and develop our resources to make things happen.

Until then, we weren't supposed to think about such things. True, only 1 farm in 10 had electricity, and farmers lived a life not much different from that of their grandfathers. It would have cost them some $2,000 a mile to bring in electric power. It was a life of kerosene lamps and horse drawn plows and backbreaking manual labor. There wasn't much sanitation or education or recreation.

But this was the way it was meant to be. I never quite understood who meant it to be that way, but it was meant to be.

Then we suddenly found ourselves in such a crisis that even the captains of industry demanded that something be done. And in an amazingly short period of time, the American people, frightened into action and united by their fear, set the U.S. Government onto an entirely different course.

Obviously, one way to rebuild a shattered nation was to electrify the farms and extend for the first time the full benefits of our industrialized economy into rural areas. Naturally, a few called this "socialism" or "communism." But as any historian can tell you, the really striking thing about this era is that the American people did not turn to socialism or communism, as people did in some other nations. Instead they choose something distinctly democratic and American.

They created independent, home owned cooperatives, with capital provided on a strict loan basis from the Federal Government. The program was in the finest traditions of a free democracy—and the results were spectacular.

Today, the greatest testimonial to this inspired program comes from its bitterest enemies—the owners of the big private utilities who announce triumphantly that 98 percent of the farms of America are now electrified.

That's right—they are; the farms which American business leaders and the Government once thought it was better to leave in peasant-like poverty than to lift a hand to help—because they said there was no profit in it.

No profit to whom?

No profit in throwing a switch to send vital electric power into 5 million farms and homes? No profit in more than doubling the output of the American farmer? No profit in stimulating $4 worth of investment by REA customers for every $1 the Government loaned? No profit in triggering $16 billion in consumer spending for appliances, plumbing, wiring and equipment—a spending spree which continues at the rate of a billion dollars a year?

Any man who tells you there is no profit in such a program doesn't know what profit is. Or else he means to say that the profit was spread around a little too much.

In my opinion, the REA program was one of the most profitable ventures ever undertaken by America, and I think we should keep its shining example before us.

Today, America is the leader of the free world, locked in an endless struggle with the forces of oppression. In this struggle, every resource we have must be used to the fullest if we hope to win. It isn't enough to build armies and missiles and pile up enough nuclear weapons to incinerate the world. We have got to build a strong economy and a strong society.

We have got to educate our children, and train scientists and engineers. We have got to maintain full employment. We have 40 million people living on the edge of poverty. We have 4,800,000 unemployed. We need 22 million new jobs in the next decade just to absorb new young people entering the labor market. We have got to conquer ignorance and poverty and disease. We have got to save and develop our priceless natural resources. We have got to conquer outer space.

The nation that emerges on top in this struggle is the nation that does that job best. We cannot do that job if we sit back as we did in the twenties and wait for some mystical economic force to do the job for us.

I consider the REA program a vital, continuing part of this absolutely crucial effort to strengthen and expand the American economy to meet the needs of our people and to preserve our place in the world. Electric energy is a keystone of economic growth. India, for instance, produces about one-twentieth of the goods and services we produce—and its energy consumption is also one-twentieth of ours. In the Soviet Union, half the population must work at raising the food to feed the nation. In America, with electrified farms, less than 9 percent of our total workforce is occupied in farming.

Yet the REA program is under bitter attack today from some of the same hidebound people who fought it a generation ago on narrow ideological grounds; from a comparatively few fast-buck artists who think they could make a killing if they could get REA out of the way; and from some well-meaning people who just do not understand the need for such a program.

I want to deal with some of the arguments used in this attack.

They say that the REA was a great success but its job is done so now it should be liquidated. Anyone who says that simply does not understand the REA program.

Its job was to supply the rural areas of America with electricity. It is doing that job and we hope it will continue to do it. This job did not consist of throwing up a few poles and stringing a few wires. It takes all the ingenuity and resources of our local REA cooperatives to supply the growing demand for electricity in rural areas. REA loads have been doubling every 7 or 8 years.

Or they say that it was all right to allow cooperatives to distribute electricity but not to generate and transmit it. Here again you see the attitude of some businessmen wearing blinders.

The private power companies were so prejudiced against the REA—or so anxious to exploit it unfairly—that they lost some of their best customers. They chiseled with the "dual rate" device—making co-ops pay a higher rate when they used extra amounts of power—just the opposite of the usual practice in the industry. And they used their position as a supplier to punish the co-ops in every way they could.

Generation and transmission of electricity by rural electric cooperatives was the obvious and logical answer in cases where this happened.

There is no question as to its legality. It is written into the law and it has been upheld in the courts. Strict standards are set, and the amount of power so generated is only seven-tenths of 1 percent of the power generated in America today.

But where private power is not available, or where the rates are unduly high, or where some hostile power company is out to "get" the cooperative, generation and transmission becomes a necessity.

It brings electric power to the places where it is most needed—and at reasonable rates. It provides a valuable yardstick for electric rates throughout the area. And most important, it removes the last barrier to rural area development and the creation of new jobs.

Some businessmen wearing blinders may oppose such a program, but we must not let them impose their blinders on the Nation. We have an obligation to look at the total needs of an area and of our country, and not just at the needs of one so narrow that he would never realize that you can stimulate the sale of lemonade by working with a man who sells salted peanuts.

They also say that the REA Administrator in Washington has too much leeway in approving loans. They seem to want every one to be approved by act of Congress. Well, I happen to know Norman Clapp, and there is no more dedicated, no more enlightened, no better informed executive in America today in business or in government. Both the public interest and the interests of the rural electric cooperatives will be well served by this outstanding man.

And of course, they say that the government should not make loans to rural electric cooperatives—not at all—some say, and others say that, at least, the interest rate should be raised. They say the present program gives cooperatives an unfair advantage over private power companies—the same companies which long ago refused to serve anyone in the areas now served by the co-ops.

Congress gave the co-ops a favorable interest rate, it's true, in order to make the whole thing possible. In exchange, the co-ops were given heavy responsibilities. They had to serve everyone in their areas. They couldn't just pick the profitable customers. This led to high costs. Rural electric cooperatives have one-tenth the customer density along their lines and earn about one-fifteenth as much revenue per mile of line as private power companies. That is the very reason why private power companies decided it was not profitable—for them—to serve these areas. That is the very reason why we created an REA loan program at reasonable interest rates.

The private power companies complaining about REA competition are not suffering. Their profits are higher than ever before—because of an advancing economy.

But rural electric cooperatives should not become too discouraged at the attacks made on them. Many people see through the old slogans and the hide-bound dogma.

As you know, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has opened an all-out assault on the REA program, saying it should be—no, not destroyed—just "phased out."

But I have businessmen in my State who would rather "phase out" the chamber of commerce.

I received a telegram recently from the board of directors of the local chamber of commerce in Richland Center, Wis., which said:

"We believe that the economic well-being of this area can best be served by the continuation and completion of rural electrification, rather than by its elimination. We wish to make it known that the stand taken by the State and National chambers of commerce does not reflect the feeling of our local chamber of commerce, and that we actively support the activities of the REA program."

As you can see, not all businessmen wear blinders.

One businessman wrote that he was particularly angry at the chamber of commerce attack on REA because the local REA co-op was one of the most active members of the local chamber of commerce.

I also had a letter from an engineer in Milwaukee, our largest city, who told how an anti-REA petition was circulated in the office of the corporation for which he works.

"Please do not pay too much attention to the signatures," he wrote. "Under the eyes of the boss's son, they may not represent true opinion."

He went on to say, "Extending the benefits of electricity to the people who open up the remote areas of our country is one of the worthy uses of Federal funds."

In Big Rivers cooperative, you are putting this powerful tool to work for the development of your area. I understand that your $18 million REA loan will bring electricity to a vast area at a saving of $3,300,000 over 10 years. Instead of restricting power, as your private suppliers previously did, you plan to extend power.

In Wisconsin, farmers faced up to a similar decision back in 1937. Eventually 28 local systems joined together in Dairyland Power Cooperative, and it is now the largest cooperatively owned power system in the world. It has proven its worth. It provides the lowest net power costs available to rural systems in the State. It saves these systems millions of dollars annually in power costs from the rates quoted for wholesale supply when it was organized. Total kilowatt-hours to be furnished by Dairyland this year to these systems is expected to reach a billion kilowatt-hours. And the impact of Dairyland as a yardstick of practical rates will become even more important in the years ahead.

Here in Kentucky I am told that you need only look to the success of the East Kentucky Rural Electric Cooperative as an example of what can be accomplished through your own generation. I understand East Kentucky fought for 4 long years through the courts to win its right to operate. It now has the lowest wholesale power costs in Kentucky outside the TVA area while its member cooperatives are building a substantial equity in this system.

I understand that your great project already has attracted a major new industry to the area—and that has been the story almost everywhere.

I am informed that the total power input in rural electric systems in Kentucky will double by 1970, and by 1975 the three cooperatives served by your new plant will need almost three times the power you needed in 1961.

Whether rural areas get this power they are demanding—at reasonable rates—will determine whether our country will grow and develop as it should, and whether our country will continue to expand as it must if America is to be strong.

We live in a strange economy today, where employment and unemployment increase at the same time; where many families reach new heights of prosperity and many others slip backward; where automation takes more jobs each day, and where some great areas of our country live in a state of perpetual depression.

We faced up to our problems in the thirties, and the REA was one of the tools we developed to work with. Our problems are just as great today, and they may be even more baffling. We cannot lay down our tools. We have just begun to work.

GEORGE F. KENNAN

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, as both a scholar and practitioner of diplomacy, George F. Kennan has served his country and the free world with rare distinction. His resignation as Ambassador to Yugoslavia, where he has served with high competence, is a major loss to American diplomacy. With his return to the Institute of Advanced Studies at Princeton, we can expect further important contributions to contemporary scholarship in international relations.

Over the past 20 years, George Kennan has pursued two separate careers with equal distinction. As Ambassador to the Soviet Union in the early postwar years and as Ambassador to Yugoslavia in the last 2 years, he has brought unique qualities of wisdom, perception, and judgment to challenging assignments. Between these ambassadorial posts, he wrote "Russia Leaves the War, the Decision to Intervene," and "Russia and the West Under Lenin and Stalin," establishing himself as a major contemporary historian. Mr. Kennan is an outstanding example of the dedicated and effective career Foreign Service officer.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point two editorials regarding Mr. Kennan, one from the Washington Post, the other from the Washington Star, for July 31.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNAN ON CAMPUS

U.S. Ambassador George F. Kennan has left his post in Yugoslavia to return once again to the private life of a scholar. He merits the thanks and best wishes of his countrymen for all that he has done in the Foreign Service. Certainly he has been a hard and brilliant worker in diplomacy's sometimes sterile vineyards.

All told, Mr. Kennan has spent 29 years of his life in those vineyards. Back in 1953 he retired from them, but President Kennedy, almost a decade later, persuaded him to get back in harness for the important Belgrade assignment. The Ambassador performed as usual. That is to say, he performed with high competency, so much so that Marshal Tito and the Yugoslav people have made clear even amid the disaster of Skopje, that his successor will have big shoes to fill.

Mr. Kennan has been one of our country's best and most articulate experts on the meanings and intentions of Red totalitarianism. As the famous Mr. X—a chief architect of the containment policy against the U.S.S.R.—he has shown over the years a perceptiveness that stands by itself. It has been a thing of incalculable value to the United States in the never-ending effort to beat back the menace that emanates everlastingly from Peking and Moscow, even though both are at odds at the moment.

Few members of our Foreign Service have had a career as distinguished as Mr. Kennan's. Wholly apart from his ambassadorship to Moscow under Stalin, he has made impressive contributions to the cause of peace in an exceedingly dangerous world. As the State Department's first chief of policy planning, he deserves special applause for having played a vital role in preventing the U.S.S.R. from gobbling up what remains of free Europe.

Mr. Kennan returns now to the campus in his enviable academic role at Princeton's Institute of Advanced Studies. But this is not a retreat from reality. On the contrary, in some respects, the institute is closely related to the cold war, or a possible hot one. And so also is Professor Kennan.

ON "LIBERALISM" AND "COEXISTENCE"

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, it is a welcome relief, during these muggy, sticky, frustrating summer days, to be diverted even momentarily from the serious problems of Government and public policy. We are indebted to the junior Senator from Arizona for providing us with such a diversion in his recent remarks to the Human Events Conference here in Washington.

I read the Senator's speech with interest and enjoyment. It is indeed a remarkable speech. At no point does it burden the reader with the complexities of current foreign and domestic problems.

The Senator has a rare gift of clarity. So lucid is his discourse that he makes us wonder what all the fuss has been over nuclear weapons and international tensions and unemployment and all the other stubborn problems that perplex the American people. In the Senator's penetrating analysis, all these problems can be made to evaporate if we will only declare a "bold" and "courageous" policy abroad and return to "fundamentals" at home. It is regrettable that, for whatever excellent reasons, the Senator did not see fit to elaborate on his noble sentiments or to spell out how and where and by what means he proposes to take "bold" action abroad or to explain to us which precise "fundamentals" he would have us return to in our domestic life.

Undoubtedly, the Senator from Arizona intends to do these things in some future pronouncement. I think it only proper to assume that he will and, as a Democrat, I think I can assure the Senator that we on the majority side are prepared to wait patiently for the time when he will see fit to translate his brave theories into prescriptions for public policy. It would indeed be rude and ungrateful for a Democrat to join in the intemperate criticisms that have been directed at the Senator from Arizona by prominent members of his own party.

We owe the Senator this forbearance because of his own gracious and generous attitude toward the Democratic Party. In his speech the Senator unequivocally expressed his opinion that Democrats are not Communists and that the Communist Party has not captured control of the Democratic Party—even though, in the view of the Senator from Arizona, the program of the Democratic administration is viewed with favor by the Communists.

I thank the Senator for his generous—I hesitate to say liberal—view of the Democratic Party. In return, I am prepared to state my own unequivocal opinion that the Senator from Arizona is not a Communist either—despite the similarity of some of his views to those of the rulers of Communist China. I am sure this is purely coincidental.

The Senator from Arizona is opposed to coexistence; so are the Chinese Communists. The Senator is opposed to the nuclear test ban treaty; so are the Chinese Communists. The Senator thinks it is cowardly to try to avoid nuclear war; so do the Chinese Communists.

I am confident that no fairminded American will misinterpret the interesting parallel between the Senator's views on these matters and those of the Chinese Communists. The Senator, without doubt, is a loyal and patriotic American.

I was particularly interested in two themes that run through the Senator's remarks: his views on liberalism and on coexistence.

The Senator is foursquare in his opposition to liberalism, which he regards as feeble and exhausted and at the same time—somehow—dangerously aggressive and predatory. Liberalism, in the Senator's view, represents a whole category of evils that the Democratic administrations of the last 30 years have invented to destroy the freedom of the American people. Liberalism stands for such wickedness as social security, which has destroyed the freedom of the aged to be destitute or dependent; rural electrification and farm price supports, which have destroyed the freedom of the farmer to live in poverty and deprivation—by candlelight; public housing and urban renewal, which have destroyed the freedom of many of our people to live in rural shacks and urban slums; public works and Government fiscal policy, which have destroyed the freedom of most—but not all—of our people to be blissfully unemployed; and Federal aid to education—the most diabolical plot of all—which threatens to destroy our freedom to be ignorant and unemployable.

The Senator from Arizona is opposed to all these incursions on the "freedom" of the American people. He opposes them for many reasons, but most of all because they violate certain unspecified ethical "fundamentals." No doubt, in the fullness of time, the Senator will spell out these "fundamentals." The Senator has been unjustly belabored by prominent members of his own party who have failed to understand that he has been far too busy with his chronicle of things that he opposes to have had time to explain his own distinct philosophy of "illiberalism."

I, for one, am prepared to wait. It is rumored that the Senator from Arizona may be prevailed upon to seek higher office. Should that prove to be the case, he will undoubtedly spell out a dynamic program of national action under some stirring title like "the Fundamentals of Illiberalism" or "Let's Get the Government Out of the Business of Government."

As intriguing as the Senator's opinion of "liberalism" are his views on "coexistence." "To coexist," according to Webster, is "to exist together or at the same time." The Senator, as we all know, is unalterably opposed to such an arrangement between the Communist countries and the free world. It would seem to follow that the Senator considers it essential for one side or the other—presumably the Communist side—to stop existing at once.

The problem of course—which the Senator has not yet seen fit to comment on—is precisely how the Communists can be persuaded or coerced to terminate their existence. It seems reasonable to suppose that they will not do so voluntarily, so the problem is really one of compulsion. It is precisely at this interesting point that the Senator leaves us in suspense.

He is absolutely clear, however, in his conviction that "coexistence" is craven, cowardly and un-American. It is, in fact, a Communist idea, based on Khrushchev's apparent confidence that if the two sides engage in peaceful competition for the allegiance of mankind, his side will win. For an American to favor coexistence, he would have to believe that democracy is far stronger than communism, that a free society can create a far better life for the individual than a totalitarian society, that freedom has a magnetism and promise for mankind that communism can never hope to match.

Of this heresy no one can accuse the junior Senator from Arizona. He has stated unequivocally that he favors "boldness and courage and determination" over craven "coexistence." These words, of course, are a bit vague and the Senator has not yet seen fit to translate them into specific proposals for a "bold" and "courageous" foreign policy.

But perhaps we can speculate. Both the United States and the Soviet Union possess hydrogen bombs and intercontinental missiles with which to destroy each other's societies. Neither has the means of preventing the other from doing so. Under these circumstances the only alternative to "coexistence" is mutual destruction. This, perhaps, is the key to the foreign policy favored by the Senator from Arizona—a "bold," "courageous," and "determined" policy of "coannihilation."

This, of course, is speculation because the Senator has not yet chosen to reveal his foreign policy proposals. It may be some time before he does so. In the meantime, there is nothing for us to do but restrain our eagerness and contemplate the delay with equanimity.

Madam President, I notified the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] that I would comment on his speech. I understand he is out of the city. Unfortunately, I shall have to leave the city this evening, and I thought I could not wait until his return.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the text of the remarks of the Senator from Arizona, delivered before the Human Events Conference on Friday, July 12, 1963, to which my comments are directed.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpts of Remarks by Senator Barry Goldwater, Republican, of Arizona, Before the Human Events Conference, July 12, 1963

Speaking a short time ago to a Young Republican Convention in San Francisco, I examined at some length the complete bankruptcy of the liberal position in American political life. And today, I should like to extend that discussion and deal with what I believe are some of the root causes of the decline and fall of American liberalism. Basically, I believe it is important to understand that the liberal approach to the problems that beset us both at home and abroad has been given every conceivable chance. It has been tried, and tried and tried—over and over and over again. And it has never worked. We saw the whole rigamarole in the 1930's when this Nation was caught in a deep depression. We were told then that the answer to all of our problems was the massive intervention of the Federal Government. We were told that the answer rested in Government spending—bigger and bigger Government spending accompanied, of course, by higher and higher taxes. We were told that the pump needed priming; that leaves needed raking; that we were all children under the paternalistic fatherhood of the Federal Government.

We were told many things in those dark and desperate days—at a time when this Nation was prepared to try almost anything to overcome the ravages of hunger and unemployment and economic stagnation. Well, we took what we were told to heart. The Nation and the Congress went along with the whole bag of tricks. A great profusion of new laws was passed. Heavy new appropriations were provided. Taxes soared. But it still took World War II to get this country out of the depression. And we were almost last among the nations of the world to emerge from that depression.

Now today we find the American liberals offering the same old tricks in an effort to lower unemployment, accelerate business activity and—if you'll pardon the expression—"get the Nation moving." What do we have today in the way of proposals from the administration that differ, except in size, from what the New Deal offered 30 years ago? We have nothing different. We have public works projects, a new version of the old CCC camps, more unemployment compensation, area redevelopment, and so on and on. The only difference, I suggest, is that today the liberal has progressed to the stage where he no longer makes any pretense of supporting fiscal responsibility. You know, we used to be told that recurring emergency and constant crisis were the only things that prevented New Dealers and Fair Dealers from striving toward the goal of a balanced budget. In the craziest days of New Deal and Fair Deal innovation, at the very peak of the drive for more and greater social engineering and tampering with the lives of the American people, none of the liberals ever attempted to sell us the idea that deficits were desirable. In this respect, at least, they were hewing to the line of intellectual honesty.

But what do we find today? We find that anyone who retains a belief in fundamentals, anyone who feels that there should be a relationship between Government income and Government spending; anyone who fears that we are mortgaging the lives of our children and our grandchildren with exorbitant and unnecessary Government spending; any such person is suffering from a new disease called the Puritan ethic. Today, if we are to believe the New Frontiersmen, there is something dishonorable about being either a Puritan or retaining some ethics in the field of fiscal affairs. We are actually told that deficits are not only necessary but imperative to the well-being of the American society. We are led to believe that anything which calls for further Government spending, regardless of whether such spending is needed, is a blessing in disguise because it might spur business activity.

In effect, we are being told that things are not as they seem, not as they actually are, but only as the New Frontier says they are. We are asked in every area of Government policy to base our judgment, not on achievement but on Presidential rhetoric. We are supposed to overlook the unsolved problems, the looming threats, the lack of decision and abject failures and devote our time instead to marveling at sweet-sounding verbal assessments emanating from the White House.

This is particularly true in the field of foreign affairs. We are to "ask not" why it was necessary for the President of the United States to travel over Europe promising that the United States would honor its commitment to defend Western Europe in the event of a Communist attack. Our task is to take our cue from cheering thousands in Europe and join the chorus. We are not supposed to ask why other American Presidents never had to give such resounding personal assurances. We are not supposed to see that personal assurances were all the President had to give because the record of his administration does nothing—let me repeat, does nothing—to reassure the people of Western Europe that we would react strongly and affirmatively to a Communist attack. How can we expect Western Europe to take us at the President's word when they have only to look at Cuba to realize that we haven't reacted strongly enough to meet a Communist threat on our own doorstep?

I suggest that those Europeans who had read the President's speech at American University must have wondered at his promises that the United States would not hesitate to defend Europe from Communist attack. In that speech, you may remember, the President credited the Soviet Union with having a deep interest in "a just and genuine peace." He urged the American people to reexamine their attitude toward the Soviet Union and pointed out that our two nations had never waged war against each other. He drew attention to Soviet losses in World War II—as though this had some special bearing—and urged an effort to "make the world safe for diversity."

Now that last—make the world safe for diversity—is a nicely turned phrase. It has a statesmanlike ring to it. It is the kind of rhetorical expression we have learned to expect from the President. But what does it mean? I would suggest that you think long and hard on that phrase—make the world safe for diversity. For diversity, as practiced by the Soviet Union, means many things. It means slavery and oppression and tyranny and bigotry. It means Godlessness, a lack of honor, the degrading of human dignity, a national policy of falsehood. It means pogroms and purges and concentration camps. It means mass murder and aggression. Why, in the name of everything that is honorable, should the United States strive to make the world safe for that kind of diversity?

I suggest that the President's plea is just another way of saying that the New Frontier is determined to coexist with international communism wherever it thrives—even in the Western Hemisphere. This is merely an extension of the liberal fallacy which can never seem to realize that there can be a serious threat to the security of the United States and the freedom of the world coming from the left of the political spectrum. Apologists for the Communist way and Communist objectives continue to abound in the liberal circles of America despite the years of experience we have had with Soviet duplicity. I suggest that there is something wrong—something radically wrong—with the liberal orientation for the cold war. And I am beginning to despair of its ever being able to overcome what amounts to a deep-seated prejudice in favor of far leftists' objectives.

In this connection let me draw your attention to the fact that the Moscow-trained secretary general of the American Communist Party is urging the defeat of all Republicans in 1964. Gus Hall, in a 10,000-word statement in the Sunday Worker of June 23, laid down the marching orders for American Communists. He found much that was praiseworthy, in his view, with the approach of the New Frontier.

Hall served notice that the Communist Party of the United States would not put up candidates of its own in the 1964 elections and that it will not support any movement for a new political party. His rationale and blueprint for Communist action on the domestic front found that both of America's major political parties are tools of capitalism. But he said that although President Kennedy had engaged in "imperialist adventures" such as the blockade of Cuba last October, he had nevertheless kept the "lines of communication open" with Russia and atoned for the blockade by quarantining the Cuban exiles, banning raids, bombing and the invasion of Cuba.

The Communist leader seemed particularly interested in what he called "the broad movement which has relationships with the administration." He said the broad movement included labor organizations, peace movements and youth and civil rights groups which are engaged in "ever more militant mass actions" and which keep a "constant line of contact with administration forces."

According to Hall—and mark this—almost all "peoples political movements" are operating within the orbit of the Democratic Party and must be supported by what he termed "the serious left." Of course, in the Communist verbiage a "peoples political movement" is one which is oriented to far-leftist Communist objectives.

Now let me make myself entirely clear. I am not suggesting that Democrats are Communists. And I am not suggesting that the Communist Party has captured control of the Democratic Party. I am not saying that anyone in the New Frontier is a Communist. I am merely giving you the Communist Party's official appraisal of American political parties and its proposals for action in 1964. I think they are of extreme interest to anyone who concerns himself with the American political scene.

Be that as it may, my contention is that today's liberals have taken us too far to the left for the good of the Nation, particularly when we find ourselves in a worldwide struggle with the forces of the extreme left. They have deserted the lessons of history and perverted the real meaning of the word "liberal." A true liberal today should be in the forefront of the fight for individual liberty. He should be opposing, at every turn, the further extension of Federal Government power. He should be battling the corrupt big city machines instead of doing business with them. He should be committed without reservation to the defeat of tyranny and oppression as exemplified by international communism. In other words, if today's liberals were true liberals in the tradition of Thomas Jefferson, they would be doing the work that has fallen to the lot of today's conservatives.

Far from being dedicated to the conserving of everything we remember of the past, today's conservative is committed to the conservation of liberty. His devotion is to sound progress, based on proven values—the same kind of progress that permitted this Nation, in the space of only 200 years, to become the most powerful Nation and the most prosperous Nation on the face of the earth.

Today's conservative, I am proud to say, is standing where history once placed the true liberal. He is standing for freedom in its true meaning both at home and abroad. He is standing for individual rights, for justice and order, and honor in a world which the modern day liberal says is changing so fast that we must erase even the virtues and traditions which have withstood the test of many thousands of years.

I believe today's liberal is so frightened of the future that he is incapable of acting in the present. Why else are we confronted today with a virtual paralysis of policy? Why else does Cuba remain a festering, Soviet powerbase on our very doorstep? Why else are we trying to pretend that international communism is mellowing and not out to enslave the entire world? Why else are we pushing, ever more frantically, for an accommodation with the Soviet Union on disarmament and a nuclear test ban?

I say that the cause for our indecision and inaction is a deep-rooted fear on the part of the liberal establishment which forecloses the possibility of any action at all that may contain a slight element of risk. And I don't have to tell you that such craven fear is completely out of character with the American spirit. I have no doubts about the American people. They know that to stand for principle, to oppose oppression, to fight tyranny involves a certain risk. This is nothing new. Think of the risk our revolutionary forefathers ran at Lexington and Concord. I doubt if we will ever see the day when you and I live in a risk-free world, where our every action is guaranteed absolutely safe before we take it. The good things in this life do not come easily and without risk. They require boldness and courage and determination on the part of those who seek. So it is with the United States of America. To lead the free world, we must measure up to the demands of leadership—yes, even to the taking of risks in the name of freedom and justice.

NOMINATION OF HENRY CABOT LODGE TO BE AMBASSADOR TO THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, the President has appointed Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge to be Ambassador to the Republic of Vietnam, and the Senate has confirmed the nomination. Ambassador Lodge will serve in a country that is beset with difficulty and danger. Since its constitution as a sovereign government, South Vietnam has been under constant attack from the North Vietnamese. It is burdened with grave internal problems. I believe it is because of those difficulties that Mr. Lodge has been appointed Ambassador to the Republic of Vietnam. His past experience, derived from his service in the Senate and as chief delegate of the United States to the United Nations, his qualities as an administrator, his qualities of mind, and his decisiveness in thought and action, will be needed in his newest appointment.

I know that in these troublous times Ambassador Lodge will faithfully serve the interests of the United States. We who served with him in the Senate remember his qualities as a Member of this body. Since that time, we have observed his career with admiration. We are glad that he has been appointed to this high, though difficult, position. Above all, his service in Vietnam will be of great value to our country.

IMPLICATIONS OF PROPOSED NUCLEAR TEST-BAN TREATY REGARDING RECOGNITION OF EAST GERMANY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, questions have been raised by Members of this body, in the press, and in West Germany as to the implications of the proposed nuclear test-ban treaty for the question of recognition of East Germany.

It is, as the Senate knows, the policy of this Government and our Western European Allies not to extend formal recognition to the East German Government. This does not mean, of course, that there are no contacts with East Germany. West Germans, for example, are in substantial contact with East German officials, largely in connection with the trade between the two zones, which amounts to several hundred million dollars a year, and with travel of Germans between the zones. In the course of this contact, Madam President, countless documents are signed by both West and East Germans, or are stamped by East German officials, although this in no way constitutes recognition by the West German Government of the East German regime. Similarly, Madam President, Americans and Western Europeans have frequent contact with East German officials. Obviously, in this contact, we recognize that these East German officials exist. If we did not, we would bump into them at the checkpoints at the border. But this in no way constitutes recognition of East Germany in a formal legal sense.

I should also point out that under President Eisenhower and Secretary John Foster Dulles and now under Presidenty Kennedy and Secretary Dean Rusk numerous conversations have been carried on, first by a special U.S. official representative in Geneva, and later by our Ambassador to Poland with his Chinese counterpart, seeking to bring about a solution of certain specific, practical problems between Peking and ourselves. Indeed, both the Chinese Communist representative and those of the United States signed the Geneva agreement on Laos. One may raise questions about the effectiveness of this agreement but I do not think anyone has raised the question that the two signatures among many on the agreement constituted recognition by one nation of the other.

What this suggests, then, Madam President, is that the real question which apparently exists in the minds of Members of the Senate, West German officials, and the press is whether or not East German adherence to the treaty would represent formal, legal recognition under international law or, in truth, a change of U.S. policy on the German question. It seems to me, Madam President, that at his press conference yesterday, President Kennedy gave a full, reasoned, and unequivocal answer in the negative to this question. It should serve to set at rest any reasonable doubts which may exist on this score. And in any event, further clarification could be forthcoming, if necessary, during the hearings on the proposed treaty. But I do think that there are so many real and relevant questions which we must resolve in this process of ratification that we ought to be most careful about precipitate assumptions or snap judgments which will sidetrack us from the thorough examination which must be made.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the section of the transcript of the President's press conference on yesterday which refers to this point be printed at this point in the RECORD. Also, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point an extremely well balanced and well reasoned editorial on this subject from the Baltimore Sun of August 2, 1963.

There being no objection, the section of the transcript and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT OF TRANSCRIPT OF PRESIDENT'S PRESS CONFERENCE

Question. Senator DIRKSEN and some West German officials have expressed concern that if the nuclear test ban is signed amongst others by this Government, by the Federal Republic of Germany and by the East German regime, that this will amount to a tacit recognition of East Germany. What is your thinking on this point?

Answer. Well, that's not correct. This matter was discussed and the position of the United States and Britain was made very clear to the Soviet Union and, as a matter of fact, the Soviet Union mentioned a regime which it did not recognize and did not wish to recognize.

So that a procedure was developed whereby a regime which is not recognized by one of the other parties to the treaty can file its dissent with one of the three parties. This act would not constitute recognition by the remaining signators.

The fact of the matter is that we signed a part of a multilateral treaty on Laos. The Red Chinese also signed. But we do not recognize the Red Chinese regime.

This is a matter of intent. Diplomatic procedure, custom, law, provides that recognition is a matter of intent. We do not intend to recognize the East German regime. And therefore the language which is in the treaty, was part of the treaty when it was tabled more than a year ago—it's been in force for a year—does not provide for recognition of East Germany; we will not recognize it.

We believe strongly in the unification of Germany as a free, democratic country. And that is our policy in the past, our present policy and our future policy, and would not be affected by this test-ban agreement.

I do think that it's important that we have as great a participation in this nuclear test-ban agreement as possible. We have received no encouragement, but we'd like the Red Chinese to come into the agreement. It looks like they will not—but it would obviously be in the interests of world peace.

But that does not constitute recognition.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Aug. 2, 1963]

TREATY SIGNERS

The decision by Walter Ulbricht, boss of Communist East Germany, to accede to the terms of the nuclear test-ban treaty recently negotiated in Moscow has set off far more excitement than his announcement warrants. In the United States a sour chorus is proclaiming that the United States has been tricked into back-door recognition of Ulbricht's puppet government. West Germany, which a week ago had welcomed the agreement as a step toward disarmament, now is beating a retreat. Bonn's zeal in boycotting any endeavor—political, social, or athletic—which carries the faintest trace of accepting the division of Germany is almost obsessive. Too often, Bonn policy is formulated as a reaction to Pankow, and Ulbricht assumes an importance he would not have if he were ignored altogether.

Under the terms of the Moscow draft the test-ban treaty "shall be open to all states for signature." Ulbricht can accept its terms simply by depositing "instruments of accession" with Moscow. The United States has made it clear repeatedly in the last decade that it does not recognize East Germany. It can make it clear on this occasion that Pankow's acceptance of the treaty does not imply American acceptance of Pankow. Indeed, President Kennedy made it fully clear yesterday in his press conference.

There is ample precedent; with Albania the United States is a cosigner of the United Nations Charter, but it does not recognize Albania and there is no assumption that it does; at Geneva the United States signed an Indochina agreement to which Red China was a party, but there has been no consequent acceptance of Peiping. And if Nationalist China filed documents of accession to the test ban in Washington, there is little likelihood that the atmosphere between Chiang and Moscow would be altered (and little possibility that the capitalists would be credited with tricking Khrushchev).

While these nuances have significance to the diplomats, the cardinal issue here is whether the treaty, imperfect as it is, has any value. There is no magic in it, no cure-all for the ills of the world. Time undoubtedly will uncover loopholes and surely will test good faith. At this crucial point in history, however, it is the best that contending nations have been able to produce. It simply binds the nations not to carry out or to participate in nuclear experiments in the air, in outer space, or under water. That pledge and its significance should get the attention—not whether the second-round signers are worthy of holding the pen.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to file reports during the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FINANCING OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I invite attention to an advertisement of ominous significance. The following advertisement appeared in the May 1963 issue of Rural Electrification, a magazine published by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association:

AN IMPORTANT MESSAGE TO RURAL ELECTRIC CO-OP MANAGERS

(From a member firm of the New York Stock Exchange)

We can conveniently place, free of charge to you, any amount of your surplus and reserve funds in high-yielding, safe, insured savings and loan accounts.

UP TO 4.85 PERCENT CURRENT YIELD

Our experienced savings and loan department has performed these specialized services for rural electric systems and other institutional investors for almost a quarter of a century. All accounts placed are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, an agency of the U.S. Government.

We would welcome the privilege of placing your organization's funds where they may earn more.

For complete information write or call us collect: Telephone 212–BA7–4880.

AMOTT, BAKER & CO., INC.,
Members, New York Stock Exchange,
American Stock Exchange.

The advertisement of Amott, Baker & Co. points up the fact that it solicits rural electrification co-op managers to borrow money from the U.S. Government at an interest rate of 2 percent and then reinvest in other legitimate private enterprise systems at the rate of 4 percent or more. It is hard to go wrong with a setup like that where you borrow money at 2 percent and invest at 4 percent.

However, if you want to borrow money from the Federal Government at an interest rate of 2 percent and invest it at an interest rate of 4 percent, you are placing an unjustified tax upon the general citizens of the United States to provide the moneys under which the borrower is able to obtain loans at an interest rate of 2 percent, and after he has received them to loan them out and expend them at a profitable interest rate of 4 percent.

Every word, phrase, and sentence written into the Constitution of the United States contemplates fair treatment of the citizens of our country.

In our country we believe in fair competition among the private enterprises. I ask how there can be fair competition amongst private enterprisers when one group is required to borrow money for business establishment and expansion at the market rate of 4 percent or more, and another group borrows it from the Federal Government at the rate of 2 percent.

We do not want a socialized system of government in the United States. If we allow the Rural Electrification Administration to borrow money from the Federal Treasury at an interest rate of 2 percent, while the Federal Government is paying 4 percent in its borrowings, our system of free enterprise is on the way to destruction and finally to death.

SPECIAL TRADE CONCESSIONS TO YUGOSLAVIA AND POLAND

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I would like to commend the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for recommending, in its newly reported bill, that the President once again be given power to confer special trade concessions to Yugoslavia and Poland.

I have never been convinced of Congress' wisdom in withdrawing that authority. Oversimplified, the problem is this:

Is it ever prudent—whatever our motive—to do that which, whatever else it may accomplish, has the effect of assisting a country whose allegiance—direct or otherwise—is to the Soviet Union?

Based on my observations during a recent study trip to Poland, I say "Yes."

Certainly, I do not pretend to be an expert on foreign affairs after a 7-day trip abroad. But a man does not have to spend many days in Poland to discover that this is a nation of people intensely fond of America.

In part, this could be because of family ties between the 2 nations—7 million Americans claim Polish ancestry. But I also believe it is due to the freedom with which our magazines, newspapers, and tourists circulate in Poland. And to the 2 hours a day of unjammed Voice of America broadcasts they receive.

As I traveled the country, I kept up on current events at home by getting reports from Polish people who were listening to these broadcasts.

It is questionable whether this would continue if Poland was forced to look to Russia for the majority of her trade and foodstuffs—if she had to turn to the East for her commercial survival.

And this is the situation Poland would be in if we denied her most-favored-nation treatment. Tariff concessions allow her a solid, strong tie with the West.

In considering the question of most-favored-nation treatment for Poland—a Communist-dominated country—we must be as realistic as the Poles themselves. We, too, must recognize, tragic as it is, that the Poles are in no position today—nor will they be, likely, for years—to choose between democracy or communism.

Their choice is between a government dominated wholly by the Communist system and a government that is and may continue to be Communist, but reserves and exercises the right to a measure of independence in its own national interest.

We all know how dearly the Poles have traditionally held their nationalism, no matter what has befallen them or who has occupied their homeland.

Add to this fact the knowledge that of the 31 million Polish people, 30 million are not members of the Communist Party—and that the country is 95 percent Roman Catholic, strongly opposed to communism.

Based on all this, I think the Foreign Relations Committee is entirely right in recommending that we choose to gamble on Poland—not on her government, but on her people.

Admitting that it is a gamble, I think that when the day comes—albeit many years or generations from now—that the Poles themselves choose to throw their lot with the East or West, the die will fall in our direction.

If granting most-favored-nation treatment will show them we would welcome them aboard, I feel it is a small price.

OUTLOOK FOR THE POULTRY INDUSTRY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a phenomenal development in this country since World War II has been the rise in the productivity of American agriculture.

The broiler chicken industry supplies a case in point.

In 1940, a total of but 142.7 million broiler, or frying, chickens were raised in the United States.

Last year, the total was over 2 billion.

This enormous increase has been marked by great advances in production efficiency, especially better quality; and the everyday price to the consumer is half what it was 20 years ago.

One problem in this success story, however, is the fact that every 2 or 3 years, for the past decade, the broiler chicken industry has suffered a severe price collapse.

It happened in 1954, 1956, 1958, and 1961, and was because of overproduction.

Statistics from the Department of Agriculture indicate the consumer market will absorb an increased production of broilers every year; but there is a practical limit to the amount of increase.

In years when production was up more than about 5 percent over the previous year, prices have often dropped below production costs.

Such was the case in 1954, when production was increased 11 percent over the previous year; and in 1956, when production increased 23 percent; also in 1958, when the increase was 15 percent; also in 1961, when an 11-percent increase destroyed profit.

In Missouri and the major broiler-growing States of the South, the producer's price fell to 11 cents a pound in the last half of 1961—some 3 to 4 cents under the estimated production cost.

Conditions righted themselves when production settled back to a reasonable level. But this is a costly way to keep supply in line with demand. Many individuals and firms went bankrupt with every turn of this boom-and-bust cycle.

Twelve States now outrank my own State of Missouri in production of broilers. But this is a very important industry in some counties of Missouri, especially in those where resources to raise other crops are limited.

Our growers suffered such heavy financial losses in 1961 that a substantial number were put out of business. As a result, last year's broiler production in Missouri was only 87 percent of the previous year; but in the Nation as a whole it was 2 percent more.

During the crisis of 1961, many growers appealed to the Congress for authority to consider production controls; whereupon the Secretary of Agriculture called in a national advisory committee, representing various interests in the industry.

That committee decided the industry did not desire Government-administered controls; felt the industry would handle the problem if any threat of overproduction arose again.

On July 1, and again July 31, the Department of Agriculture has sounded warnings that trouble is brewing again; and has advised that the broiler industry put itself on guard against another year of overproduction and consequent depressed prices, this for 1964.

This warning is based on evidence that flocks producing broiler-hatching eggs are getting too large. Clearly this could lead to an excessive production of broilers by next year, along the pattern of 1961.

Notice to this effect was served by the Department in a statement July 1.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STORM CLOUDS ON THE HORIZON FOR BROILER PRODUCERS

A significant buildup is currently taking place in the Nation's broiler-hatching egg supply flocks. If this trend continues, reports the U.S. Department of Agriculture, a massive price-depressing expansion in broiler production late this year and early next year is in prospect.

Pullet chicks added to broiler hatchery flocks were up from a year earlier by 22 percent in April and up by 40 percent in May.

In the first quarter the indicated number of layers producing broiler-hatching eggs was 7 percent under a year earlier, but because of the great increase in pullet chicks placed on farms over the past several months the number of layers producing broiler-hatching eggs by October is expected to be up about 9 percent from the 1962 level.

A similar buildup in hatching egg supply flocks accompanied the overproduction and disasterously low prices that prevailed during much of 1961.

At the beginning of 1961 the broiler-hatching egg supply flock was indicated to be about the same size as a year earlier, but by late summer it was 27 percent larger. Greatly expanded broiler output beginning in February of 1961 steadily drove down broiler prices to U.S. producers to record low levels.

By June 1961 prices had fallen below 13 cents per pound where they remained for six consecutive months—averaging 26 percent lower than in the same period a year earlier. In important southern producing areas, prices were below 11 cents per pound much of the time from June through November 1961.

The increasing supply of hatching eggs above the 1962 level already is finding its way into expanded hatchery activity. Because of the recent spurt in hatchery output and in egg settings, broiler slaughter in the third quarter is expected to be about 5 to 10 percent greater than in the same period of 1962. In April–May the liveweight of federally inspected young chicken slaughter was up from the 1962 level by 2 percent while prices to producers for broilers at 15.2 cents per pound were 0.7 cent higher.

Because of the larger production as well as more plentiful supplies of red meats, U.S. broiler prices in the third quarter are likely to average lower than the 15.6 cents of July–September 1962. These prices in themselves, however, are unlikely to be low enough to discourage a further expansion in the Nation's broiler-hatching egg supply flock and related facilities—and a resultant further upward surge in broiler production from a year earlier is expected late in 1963 and early 1964.

Such an expansion in output could lead to a prolonged period of extremely depressed broiler prices such as occurred in the second half of 1961.

To avoid such a price situation, the broiler industry could begin to reduce to year-earlier levels the number of pullet chicks added to supply flocks, and to delay in enlarging capacity to produce and market broilers in other sectors of the industry. Preparation could be made to rapidly reduce hatching egg supply flocks in the event the impending overproduction cannot be averted.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, that warning is renewed in the bimonthly bulletin Poultry and Egg Situation, as issued July 31 by the Economic Research Service of the Department of Agriculture.

On page 7 of this new bulletin is a statement which I ask unanimous consent be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bulletin was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In recent years, the broiler industry has been fortunate in having an "early warning system" to indicate changes in the hatching-egg supply flock several months before the changes actually occur. The warning system was made possible by the development of a USDA statistical series dating back to 1956, entitled: "Placements of Pullet Chicks for Hatchery Supply Flocks."

Table 1 indicates that the expansionary phase in the number of layers producing hatching eggs will be well underway by November. Indications are that by November there will be 10 percent more of these layers on hand than a year earlier. In January 1963 the indicated number was 6 to 8 percent less than a year earlier. Contributing to this trend are the great increases in the number of pullet chicks added to broiler-hatching egg supply flocks in recent months Such additions were up from a year earlier by 22 percent in April, 40 percent in May, and 37 percent in June. If the trend continues, a great expansion in broiler production will occur. This could lead to a prolonged period of extremely depressed broiler prices late in 1963 and especially in early 1964.

To avoid such a situation, the broiler industry could begin to reduce the number of layers added to supply flocks at least to year-earlier levels. This may require the diversion to slaughter of some pullet chicks already started. Further, the industry could delay enlarging capacity to produce and market broilers.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It would seem, Mr. President, that ample notice has again been given for the poultry industry to act and minimize in that way the disastrous results of another round of excessive production.

In Missouri, where broiler production accounts for 2 percent of the national supply, we recognize that conditions in this industry may be determined by actions in other large producing States—Georgia, 17 percent of national production; Arkansas, 12 percent; Alabama, 11 percent; North Carolina, 10 percent; Mississippi, 7 percent; and the combined Delaware-Maryland-Virginia area, 15 percent.

I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a letter to me July 11 from the Department of Agriculture, containing pertinent facts about this broiler industry, its ups and downs during recent years.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington D.C., July 11, 1963.

Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SYMINGTON: This is in reference to a letter dated July 2, 1963, from Mr. McGhee of your office, to Mr. Richard C. Larkin of our Poultry Division. The letter is concerned with the prospective broiler situation as was indicated in a July 1 press release of the Department titled "Storm Clouds on the Horizon for Broiler Producers." Mr. McGhee asks for certain statistics relating to a number of questions he raises in his letter.

Statistics on the number of farms selling (producing) broilers are collected by the Bureau of the Census only at 5-year intervals. The last census was in 1959. At that time there were a reported 977 farms in Missouri selling broilers and 41,611 in the Nation. Similar information will not be available until the 1964 census has been taken and the data released.

A break in broiler prices generally occurs, to some degree, each year and usually sometime after the July 4 holiday. In 1958 and 1961, these breaks were unusually severe, taking prices well below production costs, and lasted longer than usual. Following these unusual price breaks there was a slowing down of the upward trend in production but not an absolute reduction in production. The table below indicates the number of broilers produced and farm price received, and percentages of a year earlier, for the past 10 years.

	Broilers produced				U.S. average farm price	
	Number (millions)		Percent of year earlier		Cents per pound	Percent of year earlier
	United States	Missouri	United States	Missouri		
1953	946.5	21.6	110	115	27.1	94
1954	1,047.8	25.8	111	119	23.1	85
1955	1,091.7	25.8	104	100	25.2	109
1956	1,343.7	31.7	123	123	19.6	78
1957	1,447.5	28.2	108	89	18.9	96
1958	1,659.5	33.9	115	120	18.5	98
1959	1,736.9	39.2	105	116	16.1	87
1960	1,795.0	31.8	103	81	16.9	105
1961	1,992.1	42.6	111	134	13.9	82
1962	2,025.1	37.1	102	87	15.2	100

National production and prices so far in 1963 have been as follows:

	Production (based on broiler chicks placed)				U.S. farm price	
	United States		Missouri			
	Number (millions)	Percent of 1962	Number (millions)	Percent of 1962	Cents per pound	Percent, year earlier
1st quarter	438.2	109	7.8	95	15.3	93
2d quarter	508.3	99	8.3	80	14.9	103
3d quarter (estimated)	540.0	106	8.3	86	------------	------------

It is clear from broiler production and price statistics that lower farm prices have generally accompanied increases in production. Instances where farm prices have advanced with an increase in production, such as in 1962, are somewhat unusual and can usually be traced to the supply and price of competing foods, such as the red meats. This fact makes it difficult to estimate the market demand for broilers very many months in advance.

The current alarm, which prompted the July 1 press release, was the very rapid buildup in flocks to supply hatching eggs. Experience indicates a reluctance to move excess hatching eggs into market egg outlets because of the substantially lower prices. Excess hatching eggs thus tend to move to hatcheries for chick production and the resulting chicks to farms for meat production. The statistics available to date certainly indicate the future possibility of a serious broiler price problem but we are in no position at this date to predict another 1961.

The restriction on imports of American broilers into the Common Market countries is clearly being felt by our broiler industry but the prospective difference in total quantities exported this year and as compared to last year will not be a prime cause for a decline in broiler prices. Although exports are important, in total they represented less than 5 percent of U.S. production in 1962.

Broiler production capacity is not measured by the Department but is indicated by broiler chick placements. During the months January through May chick placements for broiler production were the following percentages of the same period a year earlier in the various regions of the country.

	Percent
New England	100
Middle Atlantic	91
East North Central	78
West North Central	98
Missouri	96
South Atlantic	100
East South Central	107
West South Central	105
Mountain	99
Pacific	97
United States (48 States)	101

As concerns "Government loans," the Farmers Home Administration has not changed its longstanding policy not to make loans to establish new operators in large-scale commercial poultry enterprises or to finance large-scale expansions of existing operations.

Farmers who are producing broilers in 1963 are, with but few exceptions, producing under contracts which shift the risk of low prices on the contractor. Independent producers, as distinct from contract producers, are few in number and generally are very large producers with various other facilities, such as to manufacture their own mixed feed, to produce hatching eggs for their own needs and to incubate eggs. Contracts to grow broilers are not uniform as to their provisions but generally provide for a schedule of returns to the grower at so much per pound or per head depending on one or more indexes of production efficiency. The grower is thus only very indirectly concerned with the farm price of broilers. If broiler prices are depressed over an extended period of time, such as in 1961, the terms of the contract with the grower tend to become less favorable to the grower. There comes a point when returns are so reduced that growers leave the business and find alternative sources of employment.

We appreciate that we have barely scratched the surface of the probing questions in your letter. We hope, however, that our answers have been sufficient to satisfy your immediate needs.

Sincerely yours,
LINLEY E. JUERS,
Acting Deputy Administrator,
Regulatory Programs, AMS.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF GEORGETOWN, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this week Georgetown, Mass., is marking the 125th anniversary of its incorporation as a town in 1838. But Georgetown's proud history dates back 294 years to 1669, when it was a parish under the name of New Rowley. Its first settlers were a band of weavers from Yorkshire, England, who started their lives there as farmers. The country offered many streams as a source of power, and soon they set up grist and sawmills. The herds of cattle in the locality brought about the establishment of a tannery, and at one time it was said that 30 tanners were doing a good business.

In the early 1700's a boot and shoe factory was established. It was in Georgetown that the first pegs were made, and where the first pegging machine ever used in the world was employed. The introduction of this machine revolutionized the art of shoemaking which had before been done completely by hand. At this time it is said that nearly every farmer had his little shoeshop connected with his farm, and worked in it in winter as regularly as he planted his crops in the summer.

Shipbuilding flourished in this little town for a short time in the latter part of the 18th century, and although it did not last long, a number of vessels were built for Chebacco fisheries. In 1798 the oaks from one of Georgetown's hills provided timber for the construction of *Old Ironsides*.

Today Georgetown is primarily a residential community. Situated with its quiet dignity, beauty, and variety of landscape, it boasts the highest point of land in Essex County.

It is with pride that I salute Georgetown's citizens of yesterday and of today who have worked together for many years to make their contribution to the good of their State and to the good of their country.

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF WELLFLEET, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this Sunday the town of Wellfleet on Cape Cod will celebrate the 200th anniversary of its incorporation. Wellfleet is one of the outermost towns on Cape Cod and has stood in the forefront of America's history since 1620. Before the Revolution 30 whalers sailed from Wellfleet Harbor. The little town sent 18 of its sons to fight in the Revolution, and the bombardment of Bunker Hill could be heard in Wellfleet. It was from this same harbor that L. D. Baker sent two sloops to Jamaica, establishing the banana trade and what has become the United Fruit Co. It was from the cliffs above the great outer beach in Wellfleet that Marconi's new wireless was first used to send a transatlantic message from President Theodore Roosevelt to King Edward VII.

Wellfleet has always been liberal in its support of schools. Its first town meeting voted to raise more money than had yet been given for education and for the salary of a teacher. I take some pleasure in noting that Wellfleet is one of the few towns that has lived within its means and that its voter registration is 85 percent Republican.

I take great pleasure in extending my congratulations to the town of Wellfleet on this significant anniversary.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JOSEPH E. SMADEL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, Dr. Joseph E. Smadel, one of America's most brilliant scientists, who had devoted almost his entire professional life to medical research, died in Baltimore on July 21. His distinguished service to the Nation and to humanity at large include significant personal achievements and outstanding leadership as a director of research.

I knew Dr. Smadel well. While my association with him was not that of an intimate friend, I feel his loss as keenly as though the bond between us had been one of kinship. He helped me in so many ways.

Dr. Smadel, a native of Vincennes, Ind., received his baccalaureate from the University of Pennsylvania and his medical degree from Washington University Medical School. While still a medical student, he showed great interest in experimental pathology and immunology. As a resident, his future abiding interest was forecast as a member of the virological team which successfully studied the first recognized outbreak of St. Louis encephalitis in 1933. A year later, he joined the Rockefeller Institute and for more than a dozen years directed and conducted research on virus diseases. On leave from the Rockefeller Institute, Dr. Smadel spent 4 years in the military service, and was chief virologist for more than 2 of these years with the Army's medical general laboratory in the European theater.

After V-E Day he became Chief of the Department of Virus and Rickettsial Diseases at the Army Medical School, maintaining this position upon return to civilian life. In 1950, Dr. Smadel was named Director of the Division of Communicable Diseases at the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research. In 1956 he joined the National Institutes of Health as Associate Director for Intramural Research. After 4 years of administration, he returned, at his own request, to his first love as Chief of the Laboratory of Virology and Rickettsiology in the Division of Biologics Standards, NIH, a position he held until his untimely death.

Dr. Smadel was a prolific writer, and scientific publications from his hand dot the medical literature. From his initial work with the agent of St. Louis encephalitis, he moved to equally authoritative work with the viruses of vaccinia, variola, psittacosis, myxomatosis, influenza, Venezuelan equine encephalitis, and encephalomyelitis in a list that continued to grow while he lived.

Dr. Smadel's career was truly an international one. In addition to World War II experiences in Europe and North Africa, he investigated epidemic and murine typhus in Mexico, scrub typhus and typhoid in Malaya, leptospirosis in Puerto Rico, pneumonic plague in Madagascar, and epidemic hemorrhagic fever in Korea. As Chairman of the NIH Cholera Advisory Committee since 1959, he was instrumental in developing the SEATO cholera research program. With the international spotlight presently focused on southeast Asia, and in view of our commitments in that vital area, the importance of his inspired leadership and management of that ongoing program cannot be overemphasized.

His most notable contribution to international research was his demonstration of chemoprophylaxis and chemotherapy of typhus fever. His original laboratory studies with the antibiotic, chloramphenicol, led to successful clinical trials in cases of scrub typhus, during which he found chloramphenicol to be the specific antibiotic for typhoid fever.

Dr. Smadel received many awards and honors. From the Federal Government came the United States of America Typhus Commission Medal and the Exceptional Civil Service Award; from the University of Chicago, the Ricketts Award; from the American College of Physicians, the Bruce Medal; and from the Association of Military Surgeons, the Stitt Award. Honorary degrees were conferred by Yale University, Jefferson Medical College, and the University of Maryland. In 1962 he received the Lasker Award for Clinical Research. A member of many professional societies, including the National Academy of Sciences, he was past president of the American Association of Immunologists.

He had an intangible something that challenged description, which made his service to the Nation unique and did much to improve our scientific image in foreign countries. In his person he symbolized the deepest convictions and highest aspirations of the research community. He remained a silent partner in many endeavors, caring little who received the credit, caring much that research moved ahead. Among those who knew him, it is the consensus that his capable management and direction urged many programs and courses of action to greater effort and accomplishment.

The achievements, purpose, and reputation of every organization with which Dr. Smadel was associated profited from his outstanding ability as a scientist and director of research. There are tragic overtones in the realization that humanity will no longer reap the benefits of his knowledge, ability, and dedication. But that such a man should be taken from us while in his physical and intellectual prime is a calamity for all mankind.

Surely he will rest in peace.

A GI CAUGHT IN A PERIOD OF TIME

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, during the past 4 years I have received letters in support of the cold war GI bill from men and women from every section of the country and from every walk and station of life, but few have matched the one which I received yesterday from an ex-GI, Mr. Douglas E. Matthews, of 1202 West Palmyra Street, Orange, Calif. Mr. Matthews included an essay in which he presented his views in support of the cold war GI bill. Due to the content and the clarity of expression of this essay, I believe that the Senate will find it to be of interest.

I ask unanimous consent that the essay be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

An Argument for the Extension of the GI Bill

(By Douglas E. Matthews)

The purpose of this essay is to show that the extension of GI bill educational benefits, through the legislative process, is a valid action, founded on reason and historical fact and reflects the fine points of American tradition. In the writer's opinion, the extension of GI bill educational benefits is an issue of paramount national importance and cannot be ignored by our Representatives in Congress, our President, nor any citizen of the United States who is responsibly concerned with the future of our country. It is not the writer's purpose to forecast gloom and ruin if the contents of this essay are not taken critically and seriously; rather, it is his purpose to propose that the extension of the GI bill is an action that can and should supplement our national advantage and will provide an assurance that the young men of today, who will be the leaders of tomorrow, will be well informed and adequately prepared to practice the art of being good citizens.

The following points will explain and substantially illustrate why the writer so strongly feels that the extension of the GI bill is a just and responsible action to be taken:

PRECEDENT ESTABLISHED IN GRANTING EDUCATIONAL AID

It is a well-known historical fact that Federal aid was granted to veterans returning from service life to civilian life following World War II, and that these benefits were extended to provide aid to those servicemen who served during and after (up to January 1955) the Korean crisis. During those times in the history of our country there seemed to be no question that the servicemen who defended our American way of life and our moral institutions were entitled to assistance in the pursuit of an education following their return to their normal way of life, regardless of their duty stations. The criterion which rendered these men eligible was not a matter of geographical location but was based on a period in time. Those who served during this period of time were considered eligible for Federal aid, provided their service was honorable. Therefore, the issue is not a matter of hardship or geographical location, but is based on time. Had the opinion of the public of the United States been that the men of these two crises were not deserving of reward for honorably defending the institutions of our American way of life, there would be no issue today. But the fact remains that public opinion determined that these young men, who either willingly or begrudgingly forsook their personal ambitions and fortunes in order to preserve our American traditions, were entitled to just reward for their inconvenience and personal sacrifice. In direct line with this patriotic thinking is the idea that he who gave his all, his life, or his limbs, is the most deserving of all those individuals. But the question now arises—how much does a man need give in service to his country in order to be considered a defender of American tradition? Are not members of our peacetime services dying in Vietnam today? Has not the United States amassed a great arsenal of defensive weapons in order to preserve our traditions? Has not the purpose of our defensive buildup been to deter war and maintain our country, as well as the peace of the free world? And, most significantly, are not, and have not, the young men of our country, who served the country following the Korean armistice (due to no choice of their own), but as a matter of fate—have they not served the country in a manner which is equally as important, if not as potentially dangerous, as those who served during the hostilities? The writer feels that they have served well and are now serving well, and he feels that had it not been for these young men serving in their capacity, in their way, the peace of the world would be in a much higher degree of jeopardy than it is today. Do we need be reminded of the crises that developed at Lebanon, Quemoy, Matsu, and Berlin (not to mention Vietnam and Cuba), in order to realize that the men who served the country following Korea served to the best of their ability and are presently prepared to defend the country against attack? Their very presence and their knowledge of their weapons is the prime deterrent to nuclear war.

In the writer's opinion, the fate of an individual being placed in a specific period of time should have no bearing upon his eligibility for GI educational benefits. It is his attitude of service and the importance of his task that are the criteria to be considered.

FEDERAL DRAFT PROVISIONS

Following the Korean war it has been the policy of succeeding administrations to extend the compulsory draft law to encompass all able-bodied young men in order to maintain a ready defense force. It seems to the writer that a young man faced with a mandatory military obligation of some sort is faced with a situation not dissimilar to the dilemma faced by the young man of World War II or Korea who had the draft imposed upon him. Hazardous duty existed then, hazardous duty exists today—lonely, inconvenient duty existed then, as it does today. In each period of time a man was required to relinquish a portion of his formative and productive years in service to his country, a mandatory requirement of the Federal Government. Today, in facing the problem of when to serve the military obligation, before or after college, a young man often selects to serve his country first and have the obligation out of the way so that he may feel free to fulfill his potential without interruption. It is also wise to remind that the psychological implications of going to college first and having the thought of pending military service in mind are quite prevalent. This condition can and does promote a lack of incentive in college students. Many students attend 1 or 2 years of college and then select to enter the service, never to resume their education due to the increased responsibilities of maturity and 3 or 4 years of age.

In short, the young man of today faces a very similar situation as did the young man of World War II or Korea. Every young man today faces a disruption of his private life due to a Federal law requiring compulsory military service. Why isn't he rewarded or compensated as was the man of World War II or Korea?

MATURITY OF THE EX-SERVICEMAN

The writer can speak from personal experience when contending that the ex-serviceman is more mature and has a more flexible mind than he possessed prior to his military service. Many good traits are learned from military experience—self-discipline and humility not being the least of these favorable qualities acquired.

With this in mind, it is the writer's contention that the ex-serviceman is a better disciplined, more sincere and serious student than the person making the transition to college without service experience. An education means more to the ex-serviceman, and he is more eager to truthfully reap the harvest of education. He is grateful for the opportunity. It seems that this attitude produces a responsible, informed, and more mature college graduate; and this is the type of person the country badly needs in order to maintain the advantage we have in terms of educated and dynamic citizenry.

In personal conversation with college instructors the writer has made a point to solicit the opinion of professional educators in regard to the quality of students. With almost unanimous regularity the response has been that the ex-serviceman is a preferred student, more receptive to learning and more productive as a result.

AN INVESTMENT WITH SUBSTANTIAL RETURN

During the decade since the armistice in Korea, great strides have been made in the United States in technological knowledge, art, literature, and other fields. Seldom, (if ever), has Western civilization experienced such great advances in knowledge as we have experienced in the past 10 years. It is the feeling of the writer that a very large portion of these contributions is due to the maturity of the educational investment which was granted to the ex-serviceman following World War II and Korea. The reward to the individual has been substantial, and the return to the country as a whole has been priceless. What is to happen in the coming 10 to 20 years? Can our country really afford to sacrifice those young minds which are eager to learn but must decide between pursuit of education or acceptance of such things as family responsibilities and other responsibilities that come with maturity and the addition of 3 or 4 years of age? If aided by Federal funds, what heights can your young men of 20 to 25 years of age today reach during the next 10 to 20 years? The precedent has been established; the return in the past has been of considerable value. Why not continue? Our ex-serviceman of today needs assistance as much as ever before. The transition from service to civilian life is as difficult as it ever has been. And many young men who enter the service and serve in a conscientious manner knowingly place themselves at a disadvantage when compared with their peers, because quite a few young men are able to avoid military service for one reason or another. Why shouldn't the serviceman be given incentive or at least have as equal an opportunity as his friend who remains at home? I am sure that the services in general would benefit in the caliber of personnel they could procure in a more attractive manner.

Let's face reality and see to it that today's serviceman has the same opportunity to contribute his talents and satisfy his potential as did his predecessors. Let's continue with the good, rich America.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Mr. Matthews' essay speaks for itself and is an excellent and eloquent testimonial in support of the cold war GI bill.

ARE RACIAL RIOTS COMMUNIST INSPIRED?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there has been much discussion lately in the halls of Congress as to whether the Communists have any connections with the Negro demonstrations which are turning into race riots in various cities across the country. Considerable material showing Communist connections with the riots has been placed in the record of the hearings being conducted by the Commerce Committee on the President's proposal to permit the Federal Government to infringe on private property rights of businessmen by forcing them to serve and sell to whom the Federal Government dictates. In view of the fact, however, that these hearings will not be printed for a few weeks and this issue is receiving such prominent attention, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the following materials:

An article from the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C., dated July 23, 1963, entitled "Reds Active in Sit-Ins?" by Holmes Alexander.

An article from the Nashville Banner, Nashville, Tenn., of July 26, 1963, entitled "Despite Kennedy Claim Thurmond Cites Leftist Ties Among March Group" by Frank van der Linden.

An article printed in the Nashville Banner, Nashville, Tenn., entitled "Kennedy Aids Working With Leaders of March" by Frank van der Linden.

A column from the Associated Press which was printed in the Memphis Press, Memphis, Tenn., entitled "Riders' Linked to Communists."

An article printed in the Dallas News, Dallas, Tex., entitled "Mississippian Says Reds Behind Rides."

A narration of a television newsreel heard over station KTTV in Los Angeles, Calif., on June 25, 1963, entitled "Racial Demonstrations Communist Inspired?"

An editorial from the Birmingham News, Birmingham, Ala., on July 26, 1963, entitled "Reds and Race Issues."

A series of four articles which appeared in the Atlanta Constitution, Atlanta, Ga., in July 1963, written by Bill Shipp.

An article printed in the Columbus Evening Dispatch, Columbus, Ohio, on July 12, 1963, entitled "CORE To Keep Pickets at Governor's Home."

An editorial from the Augusta Chronicle, Augusta, Ga., on July 27, 1963, entitled "A Bar to Racial Progress."

An editorial from the News and Courier, Charleston, S.C., which appeared on July 28, 1963, entitled "The O'Dell Case" and an article from South magazine entitled "Martin Luther King's Traveler" which appeared in the News and Courier the same day.

An article from the Sacramento Bee, Sacramento, Calif., on July 23, 1963, entitled "North State Communist Draws Crowd of 1,400 at UC Speech."

An article from the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C., entitled "Man Linked to Reds Worked Twice for King."

An editorial from the State, Columbia, S.C., on July 27, 1963, entitled "A Communist Voice."

An editorial from the Augusta Chronicle, Augusta, Ga., on July 24, 1963, entitled "Red Tinge in Savannah."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, July 23, 1963]

REDS ACTIVE IN SIT-INS?

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—On January 16, 1958, when Director J. Edgar Hoover was asking the House Appropriations Subcommittee for funds to run the FBI during the next fiscal year, he said:

"The Negro situation is also being exploited fully and continuously by Communists on a national scale. Current programs include intensified attempts to infiltrate Negro mass organizations. The party's objectives are not to aid the Negroes—but are designed to take advantage of all controversial issues on the race question so as to create unrest, dissension, and confusion in the minds of the American people."

Mass demonstrations by Negroes in the North and South, to be culminated with a huge march on Washington next month, were not in the news, as they are now, when Director Hoover gave this dispassionate, succinct and informed statement of Communist intentions. Last week southern Governors Barnett, of Mississippi, and Wallace, of Alabama, flapped the Red flag in words much like Hoover's. But the Barnett-Wilson testimony before the Commerce Committee's civil rights hearings was too self-interested to be effective. Another red object—the red herring of McCarthyism—came scurrying into the caucus room where McCarthy once performed. The subject of Communist complicity soon got lost amid pious horror of "smearing" the Negro race and its leaders. Somebody suggested that J. Edgar Hoover be summoned as a star witness on the subject, but Chairman MAGNUSON was against it.

Fortunately, it is hardly necessary to call Hoover. A little page lifting through House Appropriations hearings shows that the FBI Director has several times asked Congress for money for the very purpose of investigating Communist incitation of the Negroes.

On March 3, 1961, Hoover told the House money raisers:

"The sit-in demonstrations in the South were a made-to-order issue which the party fully exploited to further its ends."

By now the Director was giving names, places, and dates. He mentioned James E. Jackson and Joseph North, "national Communist party functionaries," who came around for the demonstrations at Richmond, Va., in February 1960. He quoted the Negro Communist, Ben Davis, the party's national secretary, as stating in March 1960 that Negro demonstrations are the next best thing to proletarian revolution.

Again, on January 24, 1962, Hoover came to the House Appropriations Committee for funds, and one of his arguments was:

"Since its inception the Communist Party, U.S.A., has been alert to capitalize on every possible issue or event which could be used to exploit the American Negro in furtherance of party aims, in its efforts to influence the American Negro, the party attempts to infiltrate the legitimate Negro organizations for the purpose of stirring up racial prejudice and hatred. In this way, the party strikes a blow at our democratic form of government by attempting to influence public opinion throughout the world against the United States."

Nothing could be clearer than that. I have names for future columns showing proved Communists ferrying between Havana and the demonstration sites in American cities, and showing known Communists at the dirty work of teaching Negroes and whites to hate one another.

But the point which Warren Magnuson's Commerce Committee ought to be honest enough to discover is already laid bare, and this is it:

The unhappy American Negro, generally immune to Communist blandishments and greatly preferring the American way, is now being solicited and tempted, organized and incited as never before by the worst enemy our country ever had.

[From the Nashville Banner, July 26, 1963]

DESPITE KENNEDY CLAIM THURMOND CITES LEFTIST TIES AMONG MARCH GROUP

(By Frank Van Der Linden)

WASHINGTON.—Although the Kennedy brothers claim there is no evidence of Communist interest in the Negro equality campaign, Senator STROM THURMOND has files that show definite leftwing links among some leaders of the planned August 28 march on Washington.

The New York Times said Thursday that Bayard Rustin is deputy director of the committee planning the Capital march by 100,000 or more Negroes to press for passage of President Kennedy's civil rights bills.

The Daily Worker said a man named "Bayard Rustin" attended the 1957 Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A. According to the files of the South Carolina Senator, the Daily Worker identified Rustin as secretary to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and a prime mover of the August 28 March, and racial demonstrations generally.

Rustin was one of eight "impartial observers" at the Communist Party's 16th National Convention, according to Thurmond, and a member of the American Forum for Socialist Education, cited by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee December 19, 1957, as a Communist front.

THE 1958 MARCH

Rustin helped Dr. King's 1958 march on Washington, which the Worker called a Communist project. Now Rustin turns up again in New York City as deputy director of the committee making detailed preparations for the mass march on Washington.

The coordinating committee consists of: Dr. King; A. Philip Randolph, president of the Brotherhood of Pullman Sleeping Car Porters and only Negro vice president of the AFL–CIO; Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; James Farmer, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE); Whitney Young, Jr., of the National Urban League; and John Lewis of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee.

The Times quoted Dr. King as saying the committee would request a meeting with Kennedy when the marchers converge on the White House, and would ask the President to create a Federal civil rights police force.

HUAC RECORD

The House Un-American Activities Committee also has a large file on Randolph, showing he has worked closely with various leftwing groups for many years. He has called for a radical labor movement to promote "interracial brotherhood and the cause of the American working class and world peace."

An investigating committee of the Texas House of Representatives in 1961 said that Farmer, the CORE director, and Dr. King are members of the national board of the committee for a sane nuclear policy, which advocates that the United States stop all nuclear testing, and "which has many Communist-fronters among its guiding personnel."

The Texas legislative report incorporated into the Senate Judiciary Committee's official hearing record on the confirmation of the NAACP lawyer, Thurgood Marshall as a Federal circuit judge last year also said this about Farmer:

"He served as field secretary for the Student League for Industrial Democracy (SLID) visiting many college campuses. * * * The SLID publication Revolt, says 'The League for Industrial Democracy is a militant educational movement which challenges those who would think and act for a "new social order based on production for use and not for profit." That is a revolutionary slogan. It means that members think and work for the elimination of capitalism and the substitution of a new order.' "

[Washington.—Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy's office said one of his top aids would meet here this afternoon with Negro leaders and Metropolitan Police to plan the civil rights march on Washington August 28. The Justice Department said John Douglas, assistant attorney general and son of Senator Paul Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, would represent the Attorney General at the conference. The New York Times today quoted Cleveland Robinson and Bayard Rustin, two leaders of the march, as saying they would meet today with the Attorney General himself. However, Kennedy's offices said this "was not correct."]

[From the Nashville Banner, Nashville, Tenn.]

KENNEDY AIDS WORKING WITH LEADERS OF MARCH

(By Frank van der Linden)

Washington.—Top aids to Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy are working closely with Negro leaders of the projected civil rights march on Washington August 28 in hopes of preventing violence.

Assistant Attorney General John Douglas, who conferred Friday with the march leaders and Metropolitan Police Chief Robert Murray, said: "We are concerned that everybody realize this is quite an undertaking, and made it as orderly as possible."

Douglas, son of Illinois liberal Democratic Senator Paul Douglas, heads the Justice Department's Civil Division.

Chief Murray said the conferees discussed "minute details" for moving the estimated 100,000 marchers through the Capital City. He has notified all metropolitan policemen to be on hand for duty that day, and has canceled all leaves. The Third Infantry at Fort Myer, Va., has a battle group of soldiers standing by for emergency calls, if necessary.

A special office will be set up at Washington headquarters of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, to register the marchers in advance. The cooperating Negro, labor, and church groups hope by this means to know the identity of the marchers and to screen out any considered undesirable.

The civil rights groups and the Kennedy administration are supersensitive to charges that some integration leaders have links with leftwing or Communist-front outfits.

Bayard Rustin, deputy director of the organizing committee for the march, and Cleveland Robinson, chairman of the policy committee, said in New York that they would meet the Attorney General here Friday. Kennedy's office said they would see Douglas, but not Kennedy himself.

"Fellowship," the official publication of the "Fellowship of Reconciliation," printed a profile of Rustin in its January 1963 issue calling him "executive secretary of the War Resisters League and race relations secretary, FOR, 1943–53."

"Milestones in Bayard's later life include his 5-year association with Martin Luther King, Jr., as secretary, adviser and organizer, his coordination of two youth marches for integrated schools in Washington, D.C., and a year earlier, a prayer pilgrimage to the same place that drew 40,000; work to establish a center for nonviolence at Dar Es-Salaam, Tanganyika, for the World Peace Brigade, the magazine said.

"To this we might add his participation with Michael Scott and others in a protest team to attempt to stop the French H-bomb tests and * * * opening of a New York office for the Student Nonviolent Coordination Committee."

"Fellowship" calls Rustin a "friend" of Ghana's Communist President, Nkrumah.

[From the Atlanta Constitution]

ONETIME RED ORGANIZER HEADS N.Y. OFFICE OF REVEREND KING'S SCLC

(By Bill Shipp, Constitution State News Editor)

A 39-year-old Negro, who has been identified as a district organizer for the Communist Party, USA, is now director of the New York office of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC).

He is Jack H. O'Dell, who resides at 488 St. Nicholas Avenue, New York City.

Dr. King said on October 31, 1962, that O'Dell had resigned from SCLC. He said again on December 1 that O'Dell was no longer with SCLC. And one of Dr. King's top aids told the Constitution on July 18, 1963, that O'Dell was no longer with SCLC.

O'Dell, who works in the New York SCLC office at 312 W. 125th Street, has in recent months been engaged in fund-raising activities and mailing literature for Dr. King's organization.

Once in December 1962, and on three occasions in January 1963, O'Dell registered at the Waluhaje apartments in Atlanta as a representative of SCLC

In January 1963, O'Dell, Dr. King and other officials of SCLC flew together to Savannah on a Delta Air Lines plane.

O'Dell expenses for at least one of his trips to Atlanta were paid by SCLC.

Among those working out of the SCLC office in New York is Benjamin Van Clarke, 19, executive secretary of the Chatham County Crusade for Voters and a leader of recent massive night street demonstrations in Savannah.

Dr. King announced O'Dell's resignation last fall after news stories appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat and the New Orleans Times-Picayune labeling O'Dell a Communist.

Dr. King said at the time that O'Dell had worked briefly and temporarily as a technician in SCLC voter registration projects, but "ceased functioning there long before this publicity appeared."

King denied that O'Dell had served as southeastern director of SCLC.

"He has never had any administrative post in SCLC," King said.

O'Dell, born in Detroit, was identified with the Communist Party as late as 1958.

O'Dell, who also is known as Hunter Pitts O'Dell, has been identified by Robert Morris, counsel for the Internal Securities Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate, as an organizer for the Communist Party, U.S.A., in the New Orleans, La., area.

At the time he was an organizer, O'Dell was employed as a waiter in New Orleans. O'Dell also has been identified as a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Morris said that O'Dell also has given directions for Communist activities under the names, John Vesey and Ben Jones.

AT RIGHTS SCHOOL

He attended SCLC's civil rights school at Dorchester Center in Liberty County in 1962.

The SCLC "Citizenship Workbook," used at the SCLC school at Dorchester, lists J. H. O'Dell as a staff consultant on the voter education project.

The Reverend Andrew Young, administrator of the SCLC school at Dorchester, said O'Dell resigned from SCLC last fall, pending an investigation of his activities by SCLC.

"Nothing was found to indicate that he was a Communist," the Reverend Mr. Young said. "But the resignation was made permanent."

SAYS HE CUT LINK

O'Dell said in January of 1962 that he had severed all ties with the Communist Party.

O'Dell was an organizer of a "Freedom Rally" in Macon in 1962 at which Dr. King was the announced speaker.

The National Guardian, a leftist newspaper, carried an advertisement November 20, 1961, announcing that Jack O'Dell of SCLC would address a civil rights conference. O'Dell did not show up for the meeting.

In July 1958, O'Dell was called to testify before the House Committee on Un-American Activities which was then convened in Atlanta.

TERMED "ZEALOT"

O'Dell was identified by a committee counsel at the hearing as a dedicated zealot to the Communist cause.

At that time, O'Dell gave his employment as an insurance agent in Montgomery, Ala. His name was listed as Hunter Pitts O'Dell.

At the hearing, O'Dell contended "all the immunity the Constitution gives me as a Negro—the first and fifth amendments and any others" in refusing to say whether he was a Communist.

Richard Arens, chief counsel for the committee, displayed a Communist plan for activities in the South for the years 1955 and 1956. He said the plan was taken from the premises occupied by O'Dell in New Orleans.

Arens also said O'Dell was identified in 1957 as the top man in Louisiana communism since 1950 and as a former seaman who had been expelled from the CIO National Maritime Union for circulating a peace petition.

[From the Memphis Press]

"Riders" Linked to Communists: Jackson Police Name Two Women

Jackson, Miss.—Police connected two white freedom riders with a Communist lawyers' group in Los Angeles.

The two, Rose Rosenberg, 55-year-old lawyer, and Jean Pestana, 43-year-old Hollywood lawyer who uses the professional name of Jean Kidwell, were arrested July 15 in the Greyhound Bus Terminal with 10 other riders.

Police gave newsmen copies of a report by the House Un-American Activities Committee on Communist legal subversion. It said:

"Rose S. Rosenberg was identified as a member of the Communist Party by former Communist Party members, Milton S. Tyre on December 14, 1951, and A. Marburg Yerkes, January 24, 1952, when they testified that they had known Mrs. Rosenberg as a member of a Communist lawyers' group in Los Angeles.

"Rose Rosenberg testified before this committee on October 1, 1952, at which time she invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to answer questions concerning her Communist Party membership."

The report said testimony of David Aaron before the committee on January 23, 1952—entitled "Communist Activities Among Professional Groups in the Los Angeles Area"—indicated Mrs. Pestana was a member of the Communist lawyers' group.

Mrs. Pestana said, in testifying this week in an assault case involving another freedom rider, that she was the wife of Frank Pestana and they made up a law firm, Pestana & Kidwell.

[From the Dallas News]

Mississippian Says Reds Behind "Rides"

Jackson, Miss.—Brig. Gen. T. B. Birdsong, head of the Mississippi Highway Patrol, charged Thursday "freedom rides" were "directed, inspired, and planned by known Communists."

The charge brought an almost immediate denial from a New York official of the Congress of Racial Equality.

Birdsong told a press conference at least two riders arrested during efforts to desegregate Jackson transportation facilities attended a Soviet-directed seminar in Cuba last February.

He said 202 American students made the trip to Havana and heard addresses by 9 officials of Soviet Russia "to teach the students how to make sit-ins, walk-ins, kneel-ins, and freedom rides."

Birdsong told newsmen the Congress of Racial Equality was responsible for the freedom rides and was a Communist-front group.

Earlier this week, Gordon Carey, of New York, field director of CORE, told newsmen here he planned the rides in February.

Birdsong said the two riders who had attended the Havana meeting were:

Katherine Pleune, 21-year-old white Mimeograph operator from Chicago, arrested on breach-of-peace charges when she arrived as a freedom rider June 19, and James Robert Wahlstrom, 24-year-old University of Wisconsin student from Madison, Wis., arrested with a group of riders June 6.

Both were convicted and Miss Pleune is serving a 4-month sentence at the State penitentiary. Wahlstrom received a 4-month sentence, with 2 suspended, and is free on a $500 appeal bond. Each also was fined $200.

[From KTTV Television Newsreel, June 25, 1963]

Racial Demonstrations Communist Inspired?

There are growing indications of possible Communist influence in the nationwide racial situation. Today, Caleb Peterson, Negro president of the Hollywood Race Relations Bureau, states, "I suspect there is directly or indirectly Communist motivation behind the nationwide wave of demonstrations." And he adds, "Certainly here in Los Angeles there is no cause for protest marches." The recently formed United Civil Rights Committee now walks arm in arm with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Representatives of both groups appeared yesterday before the Los Angeles Board of Education. The chairman of the United Civil Rights Committee is Attorney Thomas G. Neusom, and the head of the United Civil Rights Committee's legal committee is Jack Tenner. Tenner also has been a member of the executive board of the NAACP.

Jack Y. Tenner, an attorney, of 7416 Rosewood, Los Angeles, was identified as a member of the Communist Party by David Aaron, attorney, in a hearing before the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, 82d Congress, on January 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and April 9, 1952.

I now read from page 2507 of that official document:

"Question. Mr. Aaron, will you give us, in the pages of your statement, how you know Mr. Jack Tenner was a member?

"Aaron's answer. I believe he became a member of that group when he became a member.

"Question. Did you ever collect dues from him?

"Answer. Yes, I did."

And again, on page 2575 of that same House report:

"Question. Was Jack Tenner a member of the Communist Party?

"Answer by Mr. Yerkes: As I now recall, yes, sir."

This testimony from the official document of the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

"Jack Tenner was born in Russia; became a naturalized citizen through the naturalization of his father. Continues to be active in liberal and progressive organizations, has been a member of the executive board of the NAACP."

"October 1 of 1952, Jack Tenner appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a witness; took the fifth amendment on all the questions relative to Communist activity and membership. But Jack Tenner now puts himself in the position of asking questions of law-enforcement agencies. Yet he, himself, refused to answer questions propounded to him by a duly constituted agency of the Congress of the United States.

"The same year Jack Tenner was identified as a member of the Communist Party, Attorney Thomas G. Neusom appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities along with other attorneys seeking to quash subpenas sent to the following clients by the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

"Neusom represented Fred Steinmetz, Ben Margolis, John W. Porter, William B. Esterman, Sam Houston Allen, Fred M. Snyder, Pauline Epstein, Esther Shandler, Robert D. Katz, Charles J. Katz, Richard L. Rykoff, and others. Neusom was representing identified Communists before the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

"And now the two, Jack Tenner and Thomas G. Neusom, are members of the newly formed United Civil Rights Committee, standing in judgment of law-enforcement agencies."

[From the Birmingham News, July 26, 1963]

Reds and Race Issues

Yesterday Attorney General Robert Kennedy in a statement said that "based on all available information from investigation and other sources," he has found no evidence that "any of the top leaders of the major civil rights groups are Communists or Communist controlled."

That is a statement which helps partially to clear up doubts. It is easily enough understood why some, perhaps even many, think Reds are or may be behind Negro activist movements. Disruption of the United States, of which there has been a terrible amount, clearly serves Communist purposes; whatever happens here indicating Negro versus white dissension or even, at times, open conflict, is rich material for the Communist propaganda machine.

But it would be misleading for reasonable whites to assume that in its basic organization or philosophies the Negro drive for a sometimes vague, sometimes concrete set of goals is fundamentally Communist contrived.

THE RED APPARATUS

To draw this conclusion would lead whites astray. It would malign Negro leaders on the local level, who in many cities have joined in the Negro effort and supported it. To call it Communist in genesis reveals failure to understand the nature of much of the Communist apparatus. For it is less clever than sometimes it is credited with being, and certainly not clever enough to organize this massive eruption.

But Communists are, on the other hand, adept at infiltrating, at using such an effort especially when thousands are involved, almost everywhere. Moreover, Negro campaigns for equality, as described by one or multitudes of Negro leaders and writers in the past, always have attracted both professional and amateur liberals. Among these have been Reds and other people who at times, though not actual Communists, have touched the Communist or Communist-front mechanisms. Thus it would be and is possible to draw connecting lines which show Communist or Red-front taints here and there.

THE O'DELL EVIDENCE

That this is the case was demonstrated by the good newspaper reporting of the Birmingham News' James Free, in Washington. He showed last year that a man named Jack or Hunter Pitts O'Dell has been charged with Red connections, and that he has been on the payroll of Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Mr. Free also has revealed that, though Martin Luther King "accepted the resignation" of O'Dell, records show he had drawn SCLC funds after that "resignation." The Atlanta Constitution in a copyrighted article reports O'Dell now heads the SCLC New York office.

Reverend King's explanation of all this is pitiably weak.

The Atlanta Constitution State editor, Bill Shipp, this week has been running a series of articles on page 1 which show that the Savannah-based "Southeastern Georgia Crusade for Voters" has had ties with the Highlander Folk School in Monteagle, Tenn. That organization is declared by the Justice Department not to be a Red front. But it is common knowledge that through Monteagle school have passed people who generally were regarded either as Reds or members of Red-involved agencies.

Moreover, the Constitution series also reports that the "Crusade," which is behind violent Negro demonstrations in Savannah, has headquarters in offices of the International Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers Union, rent free. MMSW also has contributed to the "Crusade." The union in 1950 was expelled from the CIO on grounds it was controlled by Communists. In 1955 the Justice Department charged with the Subversive Activities Control Board that the union "is and has been made into an instrument for the promotion and advancement of Communist objectives. * * *" An appeal in the case is set for Federal court hearing in December, this year.

Seven members of the union are to be tried in Federal court in Denver next month on charges they fraudulently obtained National Labor Relations Board services through false non-Communist affidavits.

DANGER TO NEGROES

The "crusade" is headed by one Hosea Williams, a Negro Government employee who the Constitution says, was expelled as an NAACP vice president 2 years ago.

The Atlanta paper this week editorially noted that "communism has always fished in troubled waters," which is evident. But it added that "Negro groups that carelessly permit Communist-related contingent to hitch its shoddy little trailer to their bandwagon are doing a dangerous disservice to the Negro American's cause and should steer clear." The evidence suggests Negro groups have not always done so. Even now there seems footdragging on action to eliminate any suspicion.

This matter of the Negro and communism is not new. But the Negro in America, despite what he considers provocation for bitterness, has had an FBI-certified record of resistance to Communist lures generally. Even so, the matter yet evidently requires public and governmental attention to reassure all, including many Negro citizens, as to no such infiltration.

SOME LONDON ADVICE

Writing in the New York Times from London, C. L. Sulzberger a few days ago said that Communists showed in anti-Greek demonstrations there how they "can penetrate a protest group." Mr. Sulzberger added: "If this can occur in a relatively placid country like England * * * imagine how much more dangerous a similar experiment in human engineering might be in our own country and on an issue that can be excited by racist emotions." Mr. Sulzberger emphasized the danger of such Red intrusion in such as the Washington march.

That Communists are alert to this opportunity is certain. This now commands international headlines. Red China, by even the Soviet Union's official statements, has begun a campaign to divide the world on basis of race. It is no comfort that Red Chinese are using this device against the U.S.S.R., trying to win Asian and African backing through calling Russians part of a white power structure.

JOB FOR CONGRESS

It ought to be brought prominently to the fore in all civilized people's minds, white and Negro, that communism can find advantage in exploiting color conflict.

Mr. Kennedy's statement on the "top leaders" of Negroes therefore is less than wholly comforting. There is evidence that communism is not inactive in this matter. Alabama's Governor Wallace and others have raised the question of such infiltration. While Mr. Wallace may be suspected in Washington of trying to cloud any effort toward Negro achievement of declared goals, the question thus raised yet stands by itself as not fully answered. It is a matter the Congress should explore at once. And no politics, fear of antagonizing Negro votes, should retard such effort. Negroes themselves will gain by fullest revelations which do more than cover top leaders.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, July 22, 1963]

Red-Linked Labor Union Gives Free Rent to Crusade

(By Bill Shipp)

Savannah.—The Chatham County Crusade for Voters, the organization responsible for massive desegregation demonstrations here, is headquartered, rent free, in the offices of a labor union that has been found by a government agency to be Communist-controlled.

The union, the International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers, has contributed money to the Chatham Crusade for Voters, and two of the union's officers are members of the 70-man executive board of the crusade.

The Chatham County Crusade for Voters is an affiliate of Dr. Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

The crusade is headed by Hosea Williams, 37, a Negro Government employee who was ousted 2 years ago as vice president of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

The crusade is financed largely by "freewill" donations and a recent grant from the Southern Regional Council in Atlanta. The Southern Regional Council stipulated that none of its funds could be used for financing demonstrations.

The crusade's activities have included encouraging Negroes to register to vote and, more recently, massive night street marches which have ended in race riots. Dozens have been injured in the street fighting and thousands of dollars worth of damage has been inflicted.

In addition to the crusade, others operating out of the Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers Union offices at 416 Park Avenue West have included representatives of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the Crusaders Freedom Now Movement and the Rev. Andrew Young, program director for Dr. King's organization.

Reverend Young, the guiding force of the crusade's activities while Williams was in jail on peace warrant bonds during the past 2 weeks, said he has seen no evidence of Communist or union influence in the civil rights work of the crusade—or in other civil rights movements he has dealt with.

EXPELLED FROM CIO

The International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers was expelled in 1950 from the Congress of Industrial Organizations. The CIO said the Mine, Mill Union was ousted because it was controlled by Communists.

In 1955, the Department of Justice filed a petition with the Subversive Activities Control Board charging that the union "is and has been made into an instrument for the promotion and advancement of Communist objectives and has been so used without the knowledge of the great majority of its union members."

Hearings began in 1957 and were concluded in May 1961.

Francis A. Cherry, an examiner for the control board, recommended in December 1961 that the board label the mine-mill union Communist infiltrated and bar the organization from bargaining under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Board Act.

Cherry said in his findings that the Mine, Mill Union is "substantially directed, dominated or controlled by individuals who are (or have been) actively engaged in giving support to the Communist Party of the United States."

"The aid and support flowing to the Communist Party (U.S.A.) from the union and its controlling leadership have been real, substantial, and significant," Cherry said in the report.

The board concurred and on May 4, 1962, officially labeled the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers as "Communist infiltrated."

UNION APPEALS

The union has appealed the decision to the Federal court of appeals in the District of Columbia. The court has set a hearing on the appeal "on a date as soon after December 5, 1963, as possible."

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy outlined the Government's battle against subversive activities in a report to the President and Congress dated June 1, 1963. The Mine, Mill Union is the subject of a three-page section of the report titled "Communist Infiltrated Organizations."

Seven officials or former officials of the Mine, Mill Union are scheduled to be tried in Federal court August 26 in Denver, Colo.

They are charged in a Federal indictment with conspiring to fraudulently obtain and use the services and facilities of the National Labor Relations Board through the medium of false and fraudulent non-Communist union office affidavits.

The seven, including one from the Southeast, Charles Wilson of Columbia, Tenn., were convicted of the charge previously, but the trial was overturned on a legal technicality by the court of appeals.

No officers of Savannah Local 870 are mentioned in the criminal proceeding.

The president of Savannah Local 870 is James Edwards. Edwards, along with Jesse Doster, the local's representative to the international union, are members of the executive board of the Chatham County Crusade for Voters.

Reverend Young said he has never met either man and he understands that they seldom attend board meetings because "they are out of town much of the time." Neither local union officer could be reached for comment.

Reverend Young said the union provides rent-free office space for the civil rights movement, but the crusade pays the utility bills.

Reverend Young said the union contributes "sometimes $50, sometimes $100" periodically to the crusade. But he added, "It is no more than a large church would give."

Reverend Young said he did not know the total amount donated by the union during the past year.

Public records in the Bureau of Labor Management reports in Atlanta show that local 870 of the Mine, Mill Union gave a total of $579 to the crusade and the NAACP during the fiscal year ending June 1962. A current report is not yet available.

KING NOT AVAILABLE

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was not available for comment about the relationship of the Mine-Mill Union to the civil rights drive. An aid told a reporter that Dr. King is "busy writing and won't have time" to discuss the union-crusade-SCLC relationship.

Reverend Young, however, discussed the civil rights drive in southeast Georgia freely and made available his personal file to a reporter.

During the questioning of Reverend Young, a youthful member of the crusade interrupted: "Any time that the Negro tries to get his rights as a first-class American citizen somebody tries to say he's a Communist."

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, July 23, 1963]

HIGHLANDER SCHOOL HELPED SET UP NEGRO VOTE CRUSADE

(By Bill Shipp)

SAVANNAH.—The Southeastern Georgia Crusade for Voters, which aims to register and organize Negro voters in the 18 counties of the First Congresional District, had ties with the controversial Highlander Folk School in Monteagle, Tenn.

The Southeastern Georgia Crusade was organized here in January 1961 at a meeting attended by Miles Horton, director of the Highlander School, and 54 persons representing all counties in the district.

Horton was keynote speaker at the meeting which set the tone for the future of Southeastern Georgia Crusade for Voters, according to Hosea Williams, president of the crusade.

Prospective adult citizenship school teachers from each county in the district were sent by the crusade for training at the Highlander School, Williams reported.

The school, which was closed when its charter was revoked in April 1961, has since reopened and has a new charter as the Highlander Research and Education Center in Knoxville, Tenn. Horton is director.

A Tennessee legislative investigation committee, which recommended the revocation of Highlander's charter in 1959, reported: "There were * * * admissions on the part of Miles Horton that he, himself, had been a member of some organizations listed as subversive" although he said he did not know at the time that they were subversive.

The Southeastern Georgia Crusade for Voters is headquartered in offices at 416 Park Avenue West, Savannah. These offices are provided, rent free, by the International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers.

This union has been found to be Communist-controlled by the Subversive Activities Control Board. The Board's finding is now under appeal to the Federal appeals court.

The Southwestern Georgia Crusade for Voters grew out of the Chatham County Crusade for Voters, which has recently been involved in massive desegregation demonstrations here and which also operates from the offices of the Mine Mill Union in Savannah. Williams also is president of the Chatham Crusade.

The Southeastern Georgia Crusade for Voters is an affiliate of Dr. Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference. The crusade is supported largely by free-will donations and by recent grants for the voter education project of the Southern Regional Council in Atlanta.

The Southern Regional Council is directed by Leslie W. Dunbar, an honorary lieutenant colonel on the staff of Gov. Carl Sanders.

The Savannah chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People gave financial support to the crusade until it received the Southern Regional Council grant.

Then the NAACP voted to withdraw its support of the crusade. The reason for the withdrawal was not announced.

In a report to Wiley A. Branton, project director of SRC's voter education project, Crusade Leader Williams wrote:

"After the Crusade for Voters made public that it had received a $4,000 grant from the VEP for a 3-month voter registration program, the executive board of the local NAACP met and voted to stop sharing its funds with the Crusade for Voters. Officials of the Crusade for Voters objected due to the fact the grant was for only 3 months, but the NAACP board voted 20 to 10 to no longer share its funds.

"The passing of the NAACP's stop-sharing-fund motions actually matured the CCCV (Chatham Crusade). The situation demanded that the public become informed without a big display as to the real nature and purpose of the Crusade for Voters. The Crusade for Voters executive board voted to charter the organization and later apply for tax-exempted status."

Two officers of the International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers are members of the executive board.

Information concerning the crusade was made available to the Constitution by the Reverend Andrew Young, program director of Dr. King's organization and the guiding force behind the crusade while Williams was in jail on peace warrants.

The Southern Regional Council suggested that $3,000 of a $4,000 grant made last fall be spent in Chatham County and the remainder should be spent on organizing crusade structures in seven other First District counties. Jack Minnis, research director for SRC's voter education project, said, "We were very careful to be sure that the money was not spent" on direct action demonstrations.

When the first grant was made, there were 11,200 Negroes registered to vote in Chatham County. By March 1963, Williams reported that 14,000 Chatham Negroes were registered.

Williams also reported that the grant enabled the area crusade to organize or strengthen voter registrations in Liberty, Tatnall, Wheeler, Emanuel, McIntosh, and Burke Counties.

In May 1963, the Southern Regional Council approved a second grant of $4,000 to be paid in four equal installments to the crusade, according to SRC Director Dunbar.

When demonstrations erupted in Savannah, Dunbar said SRC asked Williams to account for the money and to show that none of it had been used in direct action campaigns. Williams' office assured SRC that the money was not used for demonstrations.

When Williams failed to answer formally SRC's queries, the grant was frozen with approximately $600 unexpended, Dunbar said. SRC did not contribute to the crusade in June and will not contribute in July, Dunbar said.

The aims of the crusade in the first district, according to Williams' report, are: (1) To get every eligible citizen registered to vote; (2) to get all registered voters to vote; (3) to interview all candidates; (4) to keep daily records on all public issues, public officials, political parties, etc.; (5) to operate adult citizenship schools and carry on continuous political education projects; (6) to coordinate the positive drive of all individuals so as to produce an effective political action program.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, July 24, 1963]

LIBERTY SCHOOL AID PLAYS BIG ROLE IN CHATHAM CRUSADE

(By Bill Shipp)

SAVANNAH.—The administrator of the Dorchester Center in nearby Liberty County played a leading role in the desegregation activities of the Chatham County Crusade for Voters.

The administrator, the Reverend Andrew Young, who also is program director of Dr. Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference, received training at the old Highlander Folk School at Monteagle, Tenn.

Before its charter at Monteagle was revoked, the Highlander School received support from the International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers.

An officer of the union, now under indictment on a charge of filing a false non-Communist affidavit, was one of the directors of the Highlander School.

The Reverend Young has been headquartered rent-free in Savannah in the offices of the International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers. The Subversive Activities Control Board, an agency of the Federal Government, has found the union to be Communist infiltrated. The Mine-Mill Union has appealed the finding to a Federal court of appeals.

The Reverend Young, who was jailed during demonstrations here, has directed much of the activities of the Chatham Crusade while its president, Hosea Williams, has been in jail.

The Reverend Young has said repeatedly that he has never encountered any Communist activity in Savannah—or at the Highlander Fair School—or at the Dorchester Center.

Among the old Highlander school directors was Charles Wilson of Columbia, Tenn., international representative of the mine-mill union in Tennessee, who was indicted by a Federal grand jury in Denver, Colo., on November 16, 1956.

He was charged with some other mine-mill officers with conspiring fraudulently to obtain and use the services of the National Labor Relations Board through the medium of false non-Communist union officer affidavits.

ON SCHOOL'S BOARD

Wilson was convicted December 17, 1959, but the conviction was overturned on appeal. He is scheduled to be retried August 28 in Federal court in Denver, Colo.

Wilson was listed in 1958 as a member of the 27-man board of directors of the Highlander School.

Two officials of the Savannah mine-mill local serve on the 70-man board of directors of the Chatham Crusade.

SCLC OPERATES

The Dorchester Center, a civil rights school administered by the Reverend Young, has trained leaders of the Chatham Crusade and the Southeastern Georgia Crusade for Voters, both headed by Hosea Williams.

The center is operated by Dr. King's SCLC and the Southern Missionary Association Division of the United Church of Christ.

Its students have included pupils who were expelled from Albany State College as a result of racial demonstrations there.

The center is under investigation by Georgia Attorney General Eugene Cook.

NO EVIDENCE

Cook said Tuesday that the investigation has turned up no evidence of subversive activities. He added that Myles Horton, executive director of the Highlander School, had been to the Dorchester Center and to Savannah.

The center is currently financed by a $250,000 grant from Marshall Field Foundation. The grant is for 2 years.

The supervisor of teaching at the center is Mrs. Steptima Poinsette Clark, 65.

Mrs. Clark served at the Highlander School as director of workshops, 1956–57, director of education, 1957–61, and director of the literacy training program in 1961.

LONG IN STRUGGLE

She lists the affiliations in her biographical sketch, made available to the Constitution by SCLC.

She has a long history of involvement in civil rights struggles.

At the end of her biography, Mrs. Clark wrote: "In 1918–1919, I went door-to-door for the NAACP, getting signatures to petition the South Carolina Legislature that Negro teachers be placed in the public schools of Charleston. We got the teachers in, in 1920."

LOST TEACHER JOB

"Then in 1956 I refused to disown the NAACP and lost my job as a public school teacher in South Carolina as a result of my membership and interracial activities. Finally, in 1959, while directing the educational program at the Highlander Folk School, I was arrested for allegedly possessing whisky (which was found by the courts to be untrue, and the case dismissed). This attack was made on me, I feel to scare me, the only Negro resident, so I would leave. I stayed."

According to the Reverend Young, Mrs. Clark is the only former staff member of Highlander working at Dorchester.

The Reverend Young said, however, that he attended classes at Highlander. Before joining Dr. King's organization, the Reverend Young said he retained a New York law firm to investigate Highlander. He showed the firm's report to the Constitution. The report says that Highlander has never been labeled subversive by any Federal agency, although a Tennessee legislative committee recommended that the school's charter be revoked.

The goal of the Dorchester Center is to train teachers to establish "Adult Citizenship Education" programs throughout the South.

In the 2 years it has operated for that purpose between 500 and 700 teachers have been trained.

One purpose of the citizenship program, according to the SCLC, is to teach reading and writing to aid Negroes in passing literary tests for voting.

The schools also are aimed at giving "an all-round education in community development."

The SCLC furnishes the cost of travel to the training center, and pays tuition.

MUST ORGANIZE

Teachers graduated from the center are required to organize schools in their areas, provide a place for the classes to be held and select a "community coordinator" for the schools in their area.

The Dorchester Center already has established branch "Saturday Citizenship Clinics" in each of Georgia's 10 congressional districts and several clinics in South Carolina and Alabama.

Courses at Dorchester are conducted for 1 week during the third week of each month, according to the Reverend Young. Classes run from about 9 a.m. until as late as 10 p.m., the Reverend Young said.

Teachers who have been trained at Dorchester have gone on to establish "citizenship classes" in Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Evening Dispatch, July 12, 1963]

CORE TO KEEP PICKETS AT GOVERNOR'S HOME

Fair housing pickets will keep up their demonstrations at the Ohio Governor's mansion "indefinitely," a spokesman for the Congress on Racial Equality said Friday.

The Reverend Arthur A. Zebbs, of 1204 Windsor Avenue, a leader of the CORE-organized pickets who have ranged widely through the statehouse during the past several weeks, said:

"We're trying to develop bigger and bigger demonstrations. We have more and more people joining us and we plan continuous, sustained activity at the mansion."

Among those who joined the 30 or more marchers at the mansion in a several-hour demonstration Thursday night was Oscar Smilack, Columbus junk dealer, who was dubbed "the financial angel" of the Communist Party in Ohio a decade ago.

Zebbs said the pickets are "asking Governor Rhodes to call a special session of the legislature this summer to act on a fair housing law."

The clergyman, a former Cleveland resident, said that in addition to picketing activities at the mansion in Bexley, "we're going to be looking into housing developments, real estate agencies, and banks where there is clear-cut racial discrimination."

Mr. Zebbs said the activities of the Columbus CORE group are being reported to CORE's national headquarters in New York.

However, "there is no actual coordination" with any other CORE demonstrations across the Nation, he asserted.

Mr. Zebbs said the local group is expecting the Reverend Elton Cox, CORE field representative from Chicago, to meet with them, probably next week, on the Ohio program.

The picket leader said he did not know whether Smilack was among the Thursday night pickets.

Mr. Zebbs asserted definitely that Smilack was not a member of CORE.

However, when Smilack was questioned by the Disptach Friday he acknowledged that he had been among the pickets and said he is a member of the Columbus CORE chapter.

Smilack would not discuss the controversy-laden days of the early 1950's when he was found guilty of nine counts of contempt of the Ohio Un-American Activities Commission.

Smilack had refused to answer questions bearing an affiliation with the Communist Party and the late Ralph J. Bartlett, then Franklin County prosecutor hung the "financial angel" tag on him.

Friday, Smilack told the Dispatch, "I think it's very bad taste to bring up a matter like that—a political question—at this time."

Asked if he cared to answer the Communist affiliation question now, Smilack chuckled and said: "Of course not."

Smilack said he planned to join the marchers again Friday night.

The demonstrators may be one member shy Friday. Columbus police Thursday picked up on Ohio State University graduate student, Robert Henes, 24, of 110 West King Avenue, for investigation of grand larceny.

Henes, police said, has been among pickets recently at the statehouse.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, July 27, 1963]

A BAR TO RACIAL PROGRESS

Hunter Pitts O'Dell's association with both the Communist Party and Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference, revelation of which is now creating a storm of controversy in Atlanta, was noted by the Chronicle in an editorial last October.

We charged at that time that the Communist Party, U.S.A., after a multiplicity of unsuccessful attempts to win southern Negroes over to communism, had succeeded in getting O'Dell, one of its most experienced organizers, into a key position with the SCLC. Latest developments in the O'Dell case have yet to prove that he is not still in such a position.

Atlanta Constitution State editor Bill Shipp, in a copyrighted story Thursday, said O'Dell—alias Jack H. O'Dell—is currently director of the SCLC office in New York City. Lending support to his story was the report of United Press International that an inquiry at the New York office Thursday morning produced the reply that O'Dell is still with the office as "administrator" of the New York operation.

King denied both stories, insisting that O'Dell's most recent association with SCLC was terminated on June 26. But Shipp and UPI stood by their reports. And a subsequent Constitution story noted that King twice before—on October 31 and December 1, 1962—reported that O'Dell had resigned from the organization.

According to highly authoritative information possessed by this newspaper, O'Dell is a concealed member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A. During hearings before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on the scope of Soviet activity in the United States in 1956, he took refuge in the fifth amendment. He refused to answer questions concerning his activities as a Communist Party organizer for the New Orleans and gulf area. Nevertheless, hundreds of documents seized by New Orleans police at O'Dell's residence in March of that year clearly established his key position in the Communist movement.

That O'Dell has been linked beyond reasonable doubt with the Communist Party does not necessarily mean that any of his SCLC associates are guided by Red ties or motives. But his continued association with King's organization after last fall and the uncertainty over his present status inspire distrust of the organization and harm the cause of racial progress.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, July 28, 1963]

THE O'DELL CASE

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy persists in saying that he can't find any Reds in the civil rights movement. The reason he can't find them is that he won't look for them.

Anyone who is willing to dig can uncover ties between the Communist Party, USA, and the racial agitation that has hit America. Only last week, the Atlanta Constitution, the liberal newspaper of which Ralph McGill is publisher, revealed a close link between a man identified as a district organizer of the Communist Party and the Reverend Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Last Thursday, a headline on the front page of the Atlanta Constitution said: "Onetime Communist Organizer Heads Reverend King's Office in New York."

The Constitution reported that O'Dell, a former member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, USA, has been a part of Reverend King's movement during the last 2 years. He was engaged in fundraising for the SCLC. In December 1962, and January 1963, he registered at the Waluhajae Apartments in Atlanta as a representative of SCLC. Early this year, he flew with Reverend King to Savannah on a Delta Air Lines plane.

Among those working out of the New York office directed by O'Dell is Benjamin Van Clarke, 19, a leader of massive night street demonstrations in Savannah. The Constitution also says that O'Dell in 1962 attended SCLC's civil rights school at Dorchester Center in Liberty County, Ga. The SCLC "Citizenship Workbook," used at the SCLC school in Liberty County, lists J. H. O'Dell as a staff consultant on the voter education project.

When questioned at a press conference in Atlanta, Dr. King accused Ralph McGill's newspaper of "McCarthy tactics" and of "yielding to the pressures of reactionaries." He confessed, however, that O'Dell had worked for the SCLC on two occasions, but "purely in the capacity of a technician." King angrily denied that O'Dell is now employed by the SCLC's New York office or that he had held an administrative post.

When a reporter for United Press International called Reverend King's New York office Thursday morning, he was told that O'Dell was an "administrator" with the "civil rights" organization. Later in the day, the same office told the UPI that O'Dell was not connected with SCLC and that SCLC had no knowledge of his whereabouts.

Attorney General Kennedy immediately rushed to Reverend King's defense, saying that the Justice Department had no evidence that the "civil rights" leader was Communist controlled.

The American public would like to know whether the Justice Department had evidence that O'Dell was on Martin Luther King's payroll. Did Bobby Kennedy have such evidence when he went before a committee of the U.S. Senate and gave the "civil rights" leaders a clean bill of health?

We urge Senators THURMOND and JOHNSTON to put the question to Attorney General Kennedy the next time he testifies before a congressional committee.

Bobby Kennedy should be pinned down on this point. Either the Justice Department had the evidence, and withheld it from the Senate and the public, or it was shockingly negligent in not knowing that a veteran worker in Communist causes was an official of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. O'Dell has been in the news for years. If the Department of Justice is negligent in this case, how much more of the overall pattern of Communist infiltration is it missing? O'Dell is not the only "civil rights" official with a Red record. The House Un-American Activities Committee has voluminous records of persons who have been affiliated with Communist fronts.

The Justice Department is required by law to investigate Communist infiltration in the United States. Its job, contrary to what the Kennedys seem to think, is not to whitewash political allies of the administration.

The Senate should hang the O'Dell case around Attorney General Kennedy's neck until he makes full disclosure of the records concerning Communist activity in the "civil rights" movement.

[From South magazine]

Martin Luther King's Traveler

Almost 9 months ago a major associate of cash and glory seeking Martin Luther King was identified in press reports as a longtime, if sometimes surreptitious, functionary of the Communist Party.

This was one Jack H. O'Dell, alias Hunter Pitts O'Dell, alias John Vesey, alias Ben Jones, executive in agitator King's so-called Southern Christian Leadership Conference. As of last October, according to Birmingham News' Washington correspondent James Free, O'Dell was a busy king bee pushing SCLC activities in the South.

O'Dell was busy at other chores earlier. He was kicked out of National Maritime Union at Galveston for circulating pro-Soviet anti-United States propaganda. He later turned up as a New Orleans waiter, "took the fifth" when questioned by Senate probers, was identified by police in that city as a key Communist organizer in the South. Two years later he showed up at Atlanta, called himself Hunter Pitts O'Dell, a Montgomery insurance man, again took refuge behind the fifth amendment when asked about his Communist activities.

Last December 1, when asked about O'Dell's record, King said he'd looked into the matter, didn't believe the bulk of allegations but was tentatively accepting his associate's resignation pending further inquiry.

Less than a month ago, newsman Free reported that O'Dell had been on SCLC's payroll as late as January of this year, had been to Atlanta on SCLC business and was King's companion on a flight to Savannah, site of past and present SCLC depredations.

King himself is no stranger to commie-affiliated activities, spent much time in "workshops" at now outlawed Highlander Folk School, onetime mountain area for fellow travelers and such.

King hasn't been quoted on the disparity of dates between O'Dell's designation and continued chumminess of record. It takes time, of course, to check into a person's Communist background, especially when it's a matter of public record.

Maybe it's like King keeps saying, we all ought to be colorblind.

[From the Sacramento Bee, July 23, 1963]

North State Communist Draws Crowd of 1,400 at UC Speech

BERKELEY.—An overflow crowd of 1,400 persons turned out at the University of California to hear Albert J. "Mickey" Lima, the first Communist to speak on the campus in 13 years.

Lima, northern California chairman for the Communist Party, was permitted to speak as the result of action by UC regents last June 21 in removing the long-time ban on Communist addresses on the campus.

The speaker yesterday touched on such subjects as the civil rights movement, U.S. Cuban policy, U.S. Senate Dixiecrats, "far right" Republicans, and the late Pope John's peace on earth encyclical. The audience responded with polite applause and quiet demonstrations.

Lima admitted Communists had a hand in organizing the recent freedom march in San Francisco but said most of the 30,000 who participated were mobilized by others.

He called for a new charter for the United States to provide for uniform voting laws in all States with 18 the minimum voting age. He also asked for the reapportioning of all electoral districts on the basis of population, forbidding of all forms of discrimination, and the establishment of uniform minimum wage, unemployment and pension laws for all States.

"We believe that, in time, and in the light of their own experience, a majority of Americans will be persuaded to socialism as, indeed, the answer to the country's basic needs," Lima said.

He called the Communist Party the "touchstone in the fight for Democratic rights."

He attacked United States Cuban policy as "resistance to revolutionary change that threatens U.S. monopoly interests in Latin America."

In his comment on Pope John, Lima hailed the late pontiff as "one of the most remarkable figures of our time."

During a question and answer period after his speech, Lima answered a half dozen generally antagonistic questions.

One student asked if the Communist Party were the "shovel" Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev had in mind when he spoke of burying the West.

"I hope not," Lima laughed. "He has more substantial tools than that."

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News]

Man Linked to Reds Worked Twice for King—Left Organization by Mutual Agreement, Says Mixing Leader

ATLANTA.—Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said Thursday that a 39-year-old technician who was linked by congressional committees to the Communist organization worked twice for his Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

King said the Negro, Jack H. O'Dell, of New York, left the Southern Christian Leadership Conference the second time June 26 by mutual agreement because of concern that his affiliation with the integration movement would be used against it by segregationists and race baiters.

The Senate Internal Securities Subcommittee and the House Un-American Activities Committee have linked O'Dell with Communist work.

At an Atlanta hearing of the Un-American Activities Committee, a committee counsel called O'Dell a dedicated zealot for communism.

At a New Orleans hearing of the Senate group, Richard Arens, chief counsel, said O'Dell was the top man for Communist activity in Louisiana.

King acknowledged at a news conference that O'Dell "may have had some connections in the past" with communism but "we were convinced that he had renounced them and had become committed to the Christian philosophy of nonviolence in dealing with America's social injustices."

EMPLOYMENT DENIED

He denied repeatedly a recently published report that O'Dell was currently employed by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in any capacity.

The newspaper said he was director of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference's New York office. A staff employee who answered the telephone Thursday morning told United Press International O'Dell was still with the office as administrator of the New York operation. Later in the day the same office said he was not connected with the agency and had no knowledge of his whereabouts.

King told reporters he could not understand why anyone in his office would say O'Dell worked there "when he doesn't."

King said O'Dell worked for the group on two occasions—the second time after the Southern Christian Leadership Conference satisfied itself he was not a Communist as charged—but that his connections were severed for good June 26.

King said O'Dell first came to the Southern Christian Leadership Conference after work on the Bronx Committee of Citizens for Kennedy in 1960 and that a letter of commendation for O'Dell was received from Robert M. Morgenthau. He is a U.S. attorney in New York who ran against Nelson M. Rockefeller for the New York governorship.

King said O'Dell was asked to resign temporarily after published reports that he had had some relationship with the Communist Party. After an investigation, he said, "we concluded he had no present connection" and he was returned to the Southern Christian Leadership Conference staff.

MUTUALLY AGREED

He said it was mutually agreed that O'Dell should leave the Southern Christian Leadership Conference again when "it became evident in Birmingham that the crusade for civil rights had reached the conscience of America and that Mr. O'Dell's employment could be used against the organization by segregationists."

King said the O'Dell issue was being used "in another attempt to forestall and hamper the true essence of today's civil rights struggle.

"It is another McCarthy-like tactic to destroy the movement," King said.

He acknowledged that communism can use the integration movement against the United States but he felt that efforts to prevent Negroes from full rights would be used even more.

"When they realize there is a determined struggle to get rid of segregation and that the citizens of good will are behind it, the Communists will then know that one of their best tools in destroying the American image is gone," King said.

He said the Southern Christian Leadership Conference will continue to screen staff members but that we are not an investigative agency and we will not witch hunt.

"I am not going to be intimidated by some committee," King added.

In testimony before both Senate and House groups, O'Dell refused to say whether he was a Communist.

[From the State, July 27, 1963]

A Communist Voice

Denials and derision have followed the allegations by Governors Barnett, of Mississippi, and Wallace, of Alabama, that Communists have played a part in the antisegregation demonstrations currently marring the American scene.

Without further comment on that score, we offer the testimony of an expert witness, James E. Jackson, editor of the Worker, successor publication to the Daily Worker, of the Communist Party of the United States.

In an editorial of July 21, 1963, the Worker has this to say:

"The selfless, and often pioneering role, of the Communists in the struggle for the freedom and equal rights of the people is unmatched by the members of any other political party in American life. The Communists, Negro and white, set a standard of leadership and service in the fight for the just rights of the Negro people that is only now being matched by numerous other forces and organizations.

"It was the Communists in the International Labor Defense who first made the issue of Scottsboro and the Jim Crow oppression of Negro Americans a cause that rang around the world. It was the Communists in the trade unions who raised the banner of struggle against racist exclusion practices and discrimination in employment. It was the Communists who were foremost among the organizers of the unorganized workers and sharecroppers in the South in the CIO's pioneering days. It was the young Communists who lit torches of hope and led exemplary struggles of the World War II generation for jobs and voting rights.

"Indeed, in the entire phase of the modern history of the Negro freedom struggle, the Communists have always played, and always will play, an honorable and dedicated role. The Communist Party of the United States wholeheartedly and selflessly supports the just struggle of the Negro people for freedom and integration in the political, economic, and social life of the Nation."

The socialist state always operates on the theory that the general run of the people are just too stupid to know what's good for them, and therefore the elite socialists must determine what's best for everyone. Then, of course, force must be applied to make them do what has been adjudged best for them. In short, the individual has little choice in the matter, and without freedom of choice there can be no real freedom.

But the most amusing thing is that the leftist socialist hates the rightist socialist more than anything else in the world. Witness the unpleasantness between the Hitlerites and Stalin's legions in the 1940's. Nevertheless, rightist or leftist, socialists are socialists and have little regard for property rights and individual liberty.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, July 24, 1963]

RED TINGE IN SAVANNAH

A current series of articles by Atlanta Constitution State Editor Bill Shipp offers added insight into communism's exploitation of the American Negro's drive for equal opportunity.

In his first two articles, Shipp (1) described an arrangement under which the Chatham County Crusade for Voters in Savannah is headquartered in rent-free office space of a labor union that has been found by a Government agency to be Communist-controlled; and (2) documented a connection between the Southeastern Georgia Crusade for Voters and the controversial Highlander Folk School in Monteagle, Tenn.

Activities of the two crusade organizations sparked the mass demonstrations and rioting that have plagued Savannah for several weeks.

The labor union which has provided office space and contributed money for the Chatham Crusade is the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers. The Department of Justice has charged that the union "is and has been made into an instrument for the promotion and advancement of Communist objectives." In 1950, the union was expelled from the Congress of Industrial Organizations because, the CIO said, it was controlled by Communists.

The Southeastern Georgia Crusade, an outgrowth of the Chatham organization, was formed in 1961 at a meeting addressed by Miles Horton, director of the Highlander School. Hosea Williams, president of the crusade, was quoted by Shipp as saying that that meeting, with Horton as keynote speaker, "set the tone for the future of SGCV."

The Highlander School's charter was revoked by Tennessee in 1959; it has since reopened with a new charter, new name and new home in Knoxville. But Horton is still director.

It was at a session of the Highlander School that the now well-publicized picture of Martin Luther King in the company of several known Communists was taken. The Chatham County Crusade is an affiliate of Dr. King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

In calling attention to Communist associations of some Negro leaders and Negro organizations, we do not suggest that belief in communism is the motivation of the Negro's push for equal treatment. This is the mistake made by many whites who blind themselves to the fact that most Negroes sincerely seek to remove the stigma of racial discrimination, without needing any additional motive.

But there is another side to the coin. The Negro's responsibility is to make certain his quest for equality is not directed—or even tinged—by the hand of Communist agitators. Obviously, communism seeks to capitalize upon racial turmoil—in Savannah and throughout the United States.

Responsible Negroes will shun the leadership, money and membership infiltration attempts of questionable organizations. Unfortunately, in Savannah and many other cities, the more irresponsible element has prevailed. This is reflected in the nature of their activities. It is reflected in their association with Red-tinged organizations and individuals.

KHRUSHCHEV SHOULD GIVE THE WORLD AN ACT OF GOOD FAITH

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the U.S. delegation leaves today to sign a test ban treaty with the Soviets. According to news reports, Secretary of State Rusk will remain in Moscow for a few days after the treaty is signed to probe for the real motives of the Soviets in agreeing to this treaty.

Mr. President, this is like shutting the barn door after the cows have gone. The time to find out the Soviet's real motive, if we do not already know, is before the treaty is signed, not after.

All we have had from Khrushchev and his Kremlin crowd are soft words and bad deeds. His words without exception have proved a mask for deceit, treachery, and villainy.

The American Government has repeatedly stated, immediately following each new act of duplicity by Khrushchev, that before any new agreement was reached with Khrushchev, an act of good faith would be required. Khrushchev has yet to do an act of good faith. If his motives are peaceful, then Khrushchev should be willing to perform a peaceful act.

The American people do not trust Khrushchev's words and neither do I. The treaty to be signed next week is words. Heaven help us if Khrushchev's actions under the treaty are as treacherous as his other actions.

Let Mr. Khrushchev give to the world one act of good faith, and I believe that Americans will be less skeptical of a treaty.

Khrushchev is asking for a nonaggression pact. Before we agree, we should have a nonaggression act.

There are a number of opportunities for an act of good faith by Khrushchev. I, for one, could not support a treaty with the Soviets until after, and only after, one of the following acts by Khrushchev:

First. Let Khrushchev withdraw Soviet personnel from Cuba and carry out his promise for U.S. on-site inspections in Cuba to prove the Soviets are gone.

Second. Let Mr. Khrushchev tear down the Berlin wall and permit ingress and egress between this Soviet-occupied territory and the free world.

Third. Let Mr. Khrushchev cause the Communists to lay down their arms in Laos and Vietnam and stop the Communist war of aggression in southeast Asia once and for all.

It would not be unreasonable to ask Khrushchev to prove his good faith by doing all of these acts, for a really peaceful motive by Khrushchev would require these and much more. Surely, however, it is not at all unreasonable to ask for just one of the three. If Khrushchev will do just one of these acts of good faith, I, for one, would be more inclined to vote to ratify the test ban treaty which he offered.

The American people should not be asked to trust Khrushchev on the basis of his soft words. Their trust of Khrushchev should not even be asked unless the Reds come through with an act of good faith.

The time to find out Khrushchev's real motive is before the treaty is signed, not afterward. The only way to find out Khrushchev's real motive is to demand an act of good faith. His words are useless.

TRIBUTE TO THE U.S. ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, quite often these days, we read of the anniversary of some organization, which, in many cases, has established a long and distinguished record of service to the American people going back to the very beginning of our Nation. An example was the celebration on June 14 of the 188th anniversary of the U.S. Army. Thus, it comes as somewhat of a surprise to find a governmental organization which is noting not its 25th, or 50th, or 75th anniversary, but its 1st.

I am referring to the U.S. Army Materiel Command, which completed 1 year of operations on August 1. Established last year as a result of a major reorganization of the Army, the Army Materiel Command performs the wholesale logistics mission for the Army, including research, development, procurement, production, supply, and maintenance. It is commanded by Lt. Gen. Frank S. Besson, Jr.

General Besson, while commanding the Military Railway Service in Iran during World War II, was promoted to brigadier general, and until the end of that war, was the youngest general officer in the Ground Forces.

Skilled in logistics planning, and one who has pioneered a number of concepts aimed at attaining greater speed and efficiency in the Army's transportation system, General Besson's present position is the same type of job that General Goethels, of Panama Canal fame, had in World War I. His organization was called Services of Supply, aptly abbreviated to S.O.S. In World War II, these functions were again brought together in the Army Service Forces, only to be given back at the end of the war to the Technical Services. The Army Materiel Command, though different in approach from its predecessors, represents this same basic need for unified materiel services.

During its first year of unified operations under General Besson, the U.S. Army Materiel Command has made some significant step forward in Army materiel management, which have been summarized in a recent Department of Defense news release.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, this release on progress of the Army Materiel Command during its first year of operations.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

The U.S. Army Materiel Command, which provides the Army with its fighting hardware, will complete its first year of operation August 1, 1963, with cost reduction type savings of $252 million. It will also begin its second year with 6 percent less personnel and a 7-percent increase in workload as measured by the annual funding program.

In a year-end report of its major accomplishments, the Army Materiel Command under Lt. Gen. Frank S. Besson, Jr., was credited with exceeding by $25 million the $227 million goal assigned by the Department of Defense cost reduction program. Cost reductions were effected by (1) buying only what was needed, (2) buying at the lowest sound price, and (3) reducing operating costs by increasing efficiency.

The number of civilian and military personnel authorized for AMC was reduced from approximately 191,000 to 179,000 by the consolidation of activities, streamlining of operations, reduction in overhead, and the realinement of operating headquarters. In the process, more than 5,000 people were adjusted or moved to fit the new command structure.

A planned increase from the fiscal year 1963 $7.5 billion to an $8 billion expenditure projection for the coming year reflects the emphasis being given for more modern weapons and equipment for the Army.

Of primary consideration during AMC's first year was the molding of six different organizations of the technical services into one directing headquarters. Under the Army reorganization of 1962, responsibility for developing, producing, supplying, maintaining, and storing weapons and equipment was placed under one field command, AMC. This new organization supervises the diverse activities of some 240 installations throughout the United States.

A major innovation of the new command was the introduction of a number of project managers to exercise full-time authority over high priority or high-dollar-value weapons and equipment systems. Under this departure from traditional military management techniques, 34 AMC project managers now account for nearly 50 percent of AMC's research and development expenditures and more than 50 percent of its production outlays.

Two critical tests of AMC's ability to react under pressure were successfully met during its first few months of operation—accelerated support of logistical operations in southeast Asia and the emergency buildup during the Cuban crisis.

Typical of AMC's problems was the requirement (received just 11 days after AMS became operational) to put armament on helicopters to be used in Vietnam. Under the project manager for aircraft weaponization, the guns and helicopters available were compatibly designed, joined on production lines, tested at proving grounds, and shipped to combat forces—all in record time and with no disruption to other supply operations.

During the Cuban crisis, immediate and across-the-board logistical support was required for all types of Army units being alerted or repositioned throughout the United States. More than 30 AMC depots housing supplies of the Army and the Defense Supply Agency participated in the operation on a 24-hour, 7-day-a-week basis.

CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS' CONVENTION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to announce that the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America will hold their 28th annual national convention at Miami Beach, Fla., August 18 through August 25 of this year.

We in Florida welcome this great organization and its members which espoused the ideals of Americanism since its inception in 1935.

On behalf of myself, and I am sure I can speak for all Floridians, I sincerely trust that their stay in Florida will be a pleasant one.

As many of us know, the Catholic War Veterans of the United States was founded by the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward J. Higgins, LL.D., to promote zeal and devotion to God, country, and home. The constitution of this outstanding organization in part reads as follows:

(a) For God: to promote through aggressive organized Catholic action a greater love, honor and service to God: an understanding and application of the teachings of Christ in our every day life: recognizing the wisdom of the church in all matters of faith and morals.

(b) For country: through a more vivid understanding of the Constitution of the United States of America and through active participation in the promotion of the ideals of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, develop a more zealous citizenship; to encourage morality in government, labor, management, economic, social, fraternal, and all other phases of American life; to combat aggressively the forces which tend to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free institution.

(c) For home: to promote the realization that the family is the basic unit of society; to aid in the development of an enlightened patriotic American youth; to assist all veterans and widows and dependents of deceased veterans.

In the course of its almost three decades of existence the Catholic War Veterans has been part of the fierce war of ideologies seeking to capture the minds of men. It is to the commendable credit of this organization that it has spotted and fought totalitarian and brutalitarian philosophies of both the right and left, and stood firm on the solid ground of the freedom of the individual and the personal independence of citizens under the law.

This organization is recognized by the Veterans' Administration and holds accolades from many American statesmen. It has also been commended by each U.S. President in office since its founding.

The activities of the Catholic War Veterans through this Nation has proven fruitful to the cause of freedom. There is no question but that the future of America is assured when public spirited patriotic citizens who have fought for their Nation in war and continue to serve it in peace.

The current program of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America is strictly positive. The Catholic War Veterans are not anti anything; they are protagonists of right, truth, and justice. Their whole philosophy is based on the recognition of man's dignity and rendering "to God the things that are God's."

This organization was organized to serve the individual and the Nation which it has done and continues to do with distinction. The size of the Catholic War Veterans is no measure of its reputation, service, loyalty, faith, and spirit of fellowship.

Let me take this opportunity to express my hearty congratulations to the great work it has done toward preserving our American heritage and extend my sincere best wishes for its success on all future occasions.

AXEL LINDH ENDS 32 YEARS OF SERVICE WITH U.S. FOREST SERVICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a good friend and a long-time associate in matters pertaining to our national forests is retiring after 32 years with the U.S. Forest Service. Axel G. Lindh, Director of the Forest Service Land Adjustments Division here in Washington, D.C., retired at the end of July to return to Missoula, Mont., where he was assistant regional forester for many years.

While Axel Lindh is a native of the State of Oregon, we have come to know Axel as a Montanan because of 20 years with the Forest Service in Missoula and his earlier studies at Montana State University. Axel Lindh was honored at a banquet here on July 23 at which time he was presented the U.S. Agriculture Department's first milestone award in recognition of his work in changing the management regulations for national forest development roads.

Both Senator LEE METCALF and I wish to extend our congratulations to Axel Lindh and his wife and to express the hope that they will enjoy many pleasant years in their retirement. Needless to say, we are especially pleased to know that they have chosen to return to the Treasure State.

Mr. President, I ask that a news story appearing in the July 26, 1963, issue of the Missoulian, Missoula, Mont., be printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the news story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINDH ENDING 32 YEARS OF SERVICE

Axel G. Lindh, Director of the U.S. Forest Service Land Adjustments Division in Washington, D.C., since 1959, is retiring this month after 32 years with the Forest Service and with his wife will return to Missoula in August.

Lindh worked in the northern region headquarters here from 1939 to 1959. He was assistant regional forester in charge of timber management in this region from 1944 to 1959.

At a banquet July 23, Lindh received the U.S. Agriculture Department's first milestone award from Edward P. Cliff, Forest Service Chief. It recognized Lndh's work in changing the management regulations for national forest development roads.

A native of Morrow County, Oreg., Lindh first worked seasonally for the Forest Service in 1923. He attended Montana State University, the University of Washington and received a degree in forestry from Oregon State College in 1930.

Appointed an assistant forest ranger on the Willamette National Forest in 1931, Lindh was promoted to ranger a year later. Tours of duty in Missouri and in Milwaukee regional office on land acquisition were followed by appointment as supervisor of the Nicolet National Forest in Wisconsin.

In 1937 Lindh was named Chief of the Land Acquisition Division in the Forest Service Washington, D.C., offices.

He was assigned to Missoula as assistant regional forester in charge of the Fire Control Division in 1939. Under his supervision the Forest Service smokejumper program developed from an experimental project.

In 1944 he was named assistant regional forester in charge of the Timber Management Division. It spearheaded a battle against the spruce bark beetle. At that time the beetle threatened 6 billion board feet of standing timber.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

If not, morning business is closed.

INCLUSION OF DISTRICT JUDGE OR JUDGES ON JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF EACH CIRCUIT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 979) to amend section 332 of title 28, United States Code, in order to provide for the inclusion of a district judge or judges on the judicial council of each circuit.

LAKE MEAD NATIONAL RECREATION AREA, ARIZ., AND NEV.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 355, Senate bill 653, and that it be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 653) to provide an adequate basis for administration of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Ariz. and Nev., and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "7058-A, revised January 1957" and insert "7060-B, revised July 17, 1963"; at the top of page 3, to insert:

In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property located within the boundaries of the recreation area and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, notwithstanding any other provision of law. The properties so exchanged shall be approximately equal in fair market value: *Provided*, That the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged.

On page 5, line 10, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "may, subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of this section," and insert "may"; on page 6, line 5, after "Sec. 5.", to strike out "The Secretary of the Interior shall permit hunting, fishing, and trapping on the lands and waters under his jurisdiction in accordance with the laws and regulations of the respective States. The Secretary, in consultation with the respective State fish and game commissions, may designate zones where and establish periods when no hunting shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, or public use and enjoyment. The Secretary and the respective fish and game commissions of the two States concerned shall approve and issue regulations consistent with this section, as they may determine necessary to carry out the purpose of this section." and insert "The Secretary of the Interior shall permit hunting, fishing, and trapping on the lands and waters under his jurisdiction within the recreation area in accordance with the applicable laws and regulations of the respective States: *Provided*, That the Secretary, after consultation with the respective State fish and game commissions, may issue regulations designating zones where and establishing periods when no hunting, fishing, or trapping shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, or public use and enjoyment."; on page 8, line 3, after the word "Indians", to strike out "on" and insert "within that part of the Hualapai Indian Reservation included in"; in line 17, after the word "mineral", to strike out "laws, and with the further exception that other fees and revenues obtained from mineral development and from activities under other public land laws within the recreation area shall be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of the applicable"; and on page 9, line 18, after the word "commissioners", to strike out "The rules of procedure, set forth in title 18, section 3402, of the United States Code, shall be followed in the handling of cases by such commissioner." and insert "The provisions of title 18, section 3402, of the United States Code, and the rules of procedure and practice prescribed by the Supreme Court pursuant thereto, shall apply to all cases handled by such commissioner."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representative of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in recognition of the national significance of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, in the States of Arizona and Nevada, and in order to establish a more adequate basis for effective administration of such area for the public benefit, the Secretary of the Interior hereafter may exercise the functions and carry out the activities prescribed by this Act.

SEC. 2. Lake Mead National Recreation Area shall comprise that particular land and water area which is shown on a certain map, identified as "boundary map, RA-LM-7060-B, revised July 17, 1963", which is on file and which shall be available for public inspection in the office of the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior. An exact copy of such map shall be filed with the Federal Register within thirty days following the approval of this Act, and an exact copy thereof shall be available also for public inspection in the headquarters office of the superintendent of the said Lake Mead National Recreation Area.

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to revise the boundaries of such national recreation area, subject to the requirement that the total acreage of that area, as revised, shall be no greater than the present acreage thereof. In the event of such boundary revision, maps of the recreation area, as revised, shall be prepared by the Department of the Interior, and shall be filed in the same manner, and shall be available for public inspection also in accordance with the aforesaid procedures and requirements relating to the filing and availability of maps. The Secretary may accept donations of land and interests in land within the exterior boundaries of such area, or such property may be procured by the Secretary in such manner as he shall consider to be in the public interest.

In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property located within the boundaries of the recreation area and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, notwithstanding any other provision of law. The properties so exchanged shall be approximately equal in fair market value: *Provided*, That the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged.

Establishment or revision of the boundaries of the said national recreation area, as herein prescribed, shall not affect adversely any valid rights in the area, nor shall it affect the validity of withdrawals heretofore made for reclamation or power purposes. All lands in the recreation area which have been withdrawn or acquired by the United States for reclamation purposes shall remain subject to the primary use thereof for reclamation and power purposes so long as they are withdrawn or needed for such purposes. There shall be excluded from the said national recreation area by the Secretary of the Interior any property for management or protection by the Bureau of Reclamation, which would be subject otherwise to inclusion in the said recreation area, and which the Secretary of the Interior considers in the national interest should be excluded therefrom.

Sec. 3. The authorities granted by this Act shall be subject to the following exceptions and qualifications when exercised with respect to any tribal or allotted lands of the Hualapai Indians that may be included within the exterior boundaries of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area:

(a) The inclusion of Indian lands within the exterior boundaries of the area shall not be effective until approved by the Hualapai Tribal Council.

(b) Mineral developments or use of the Indian lands shall be permitted only in accordance with the laws that relate to Indian lands.

(c) Leases and permits for general recreational use, business sites, home sites, vacation cabin sites, and grazing shall be executed in accordance with the laws relating to lease of Indian lands, provided that all development and improvement leases so granted shall conform to the development program and standards prescribed for the Lake Mead National Recreation Area.

(d) Nothing in this Act shall deprive the members of the Hualapai Tribe of hunting and fishing privileges presently exercised by them, nor diminish those rights and privileges of that part of the reservation which is included in the Lake Mead Recreation Area.

Sec. 4. (a) Lake Mead National Recreation Area shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior for general purposes of public recreation, benefit, and use, and in a manner that will preserve, develop, and enhance, so far as practicable, the recreation potential, and in a manner that will preserve the scenic, historic, scientific, and other important features of the area, consistently with applicable reservations and limitations relating to such area and with other authorized uses of the lands and properties within such area.

(b) In carrying out the functions prescribed by this Act, in addition to other related activities that may be permitted hereunder, the Secretary may provide for the following activities, subject to such limitations, conditions, or regulations as he may prescribe, and to such extent as will not be inconsistent with either the recreational use or the primary use of that portion of the area heretofore withdrawn for reclamation purposes:

(1) General recreation use, such as bathing, boating, camping, and picnicking;

(2) Grazing;

(3) Mineral leasing;

(4) Vacation cabin site use, in accordance with existing policies of the Department of the Interior relating to such use, or as such policies may be revised hereafter by the Secretary;

(5) For public parks and recreational facilities of any State, political subdivision thereof, or any local governmental agency which may be given preference to lease the various tracts of land.

Sec. 5. The Secretary of the Interior shall permit hunting, fishing, and trapping on the lands and waters under his jurisdiction within the recreation area in accordance with the applicable laws and regulations of the respective States: *Provided*, That the Secretary after consultation with the respective State fish and game commissions, may issue regulations designating zones where and establishing periods when no hunting, fishing, or trapping shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, or public use and enjoyment.

Sec. 6. Such national recreation area shall continue to be administered in accordance with regulations heretofore issued by the Secretary of the Interior relating to such areas, and the Secretary may revise such regulations or issue new regulations to carry out the purposes of this Act. In his administration and regulation of the area, the Secretary shall exercise authority, subject to the provisions and limitations of this Act, comparable to his general administrative authority relating to areas of the national park system.

The superintendent, caretakers, officers, or rangers of such recreation area are authorized to make arrests for violation of any of the regulations applicable to the area or prescribed pursuant to this Act, and they may bring the offender before the nearest commissioner, judge, or court of the United States having jurisdiction in the premises.

Any person who violates a rule or regulation issued pursuant to this Act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and may be punished by a fine of not more than $500, or by imprisonment not exceeding six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Sec. 7. Nothing in this Act shall deprive any State, or any political subdivision thereof, of its civil and criminal jurisdiction over the lands within the said national recreation area, or of its rights to tax persons, corporations, franchises, or property on the lands included in such area. Nothing in this Act shall modify or otherwise affect the existing jurisdiction of the Hualapai Tribe or alter the status of individual Hualapai Indians within that part of the Hualapai Indian Reservation included in said Lake Mead National Recreation Area.

Sec. 8. Revenues and fees obtained by the United States from operation of the national recreation area shall be subject to the same statutory provisions concerning the disposition thereof as are similar revenues collected in areas of the national park system with the exception, that those particular revenues and fees including those from mineral developments, which the Secretary of the Interior finds are reasonably attributable to Indian lands shall be paid to the Indian owner of the land, and with the further exception that other fees and revenues obtained from mineral development within the recreation area shall be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of the applicable mineral laws.

Sec. 9. A United States commissioner shall be appointed for that portion of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area that is situated in Mohave County, Arizona. Such commissioner shall be appointed by the United States district court having jurisdiction thereover, and the commissioner shall serve as directed by such court, as well as pursuant to, and within the limits of, the authority of said court.

The functions of such commissioner shall include the trial and sentencing of persons committing petty offenses, as defined in title 18, section 1, United States Code: *Provided*, That any person charged with a petty offense may elect to be tried in the district court of the United States, and the commissioner shall apprise the defendant of his right to make such election, but shall not proceed to try the case unless the defendant, after being so apprised, signs a written consent to be tried before the commissioner. The exercise of additional functions by the commissioner shall be consistent with and be carried out in accordance with the authority, laws, and regulations of general application to United States commissioners. The provisions of title 18, section 3402, of the United States Code, and the rules of procedure and practice prescribed by the Supreme Court pursuant thereto, shall apply to all cases handled by such commissioner. The probation laws shall be applicable to persons tried by the commissioner and he shall have power to grant probation. The commissioner shall receive the fees, and none other, provided by law for like or similar services.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BIBLE. Do I correctly understand that the pending business is Senate bill 653?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendments, which were unanimously approved by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the pending proposed legislation is to create a Lake Mead National Recreation Area in the States of Arizona and Nevada.

The nearly 2 million acres within the reclamation withdrawal for Lake Mead and Lake Mohave, created behind Hoover and Davis Dams, have been a national recreation area since 1936. The area was established by an interbureau agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Park Service.

The area had 5,792,530 visitors in 1962 and was the second most visited area administered by the Park Service.

In checking with the Superintendent of the Lake Mead National Recreational Area this year, I find that visitation is up approximately 40 percent for the first 6 months of 1963 as compared to the same 6 months of 1962.

The bill would give to the Lake Mead National Recreation Area statutory recognition and provides authorities needed for an adequate basis of administration.

Authority is provided to negotiate administrative arrangements with the Hualapai Indians, owners of part of the land in the reclamation withdrawal involved. Authority is also provided to acquire certain inholdings that have prime recreation character. Hunting is provided for under State law, except for areas where public safety, administration, or use and enjoyment by recreationists make it inadvisable.

The Boulder Canyon Act of December 21, 1928, did not provide for the development of the recreation resource. However, the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Park Service, on October 13, 1936, executed an interbureau agreement under which the Park Service would administer the recreation area. In 1937, when the Park Service took over the recreation resource there was already an established use of some 552,000 visitors.

The use has grown in the Lake Mead area—as contrasted to Davis Dam and Hoover Dam—to an annual visitation of 2,688,700 visitors in 1962 within the recreational area proper. In addition, 3 million people crossed Hoover and Davis Dams in 1962.

During the 25 years of Park Service administration many recreation facilities and interpretive services have materialized. The visitor can now enjoy the full gamut of recreation, swimming, hiking, motoring, fishing, camping, and water sports in the many free and concessionaire facilities. The visitor does not need his own transportation to either get to or get around in the area. Public and private modes of transportation are readily available to anyone who wants to recreate: Planes to fly over, boats to journey up the 115-mile-long Lake Mead, and camping facilities to stay along the 550 miles of its shoreline are already available to those who do not have their own equipment. The 67-mile length of Lake Mohave offers some of the most spectacularly beautiful scenes along its shores.

The area abounds in historical interest. Jedediah Smith, a white fur trader, first traveled down the Virgin River to the Colorado in 1826. For many years thereafter the area was an almost unexplored land. In 1858, Lt. J. C. Ives, on the Federal Government's Colorado River exploration expedition, brought a 50-foot steamboat, the *Explorer*, up the river to the lower end of Black Canyon. A rugged Army major, John Wesley Powell, conducted the first expedition down the Colorado River through the Grand Canyon in a rowboat in 1869. Other exciting phases of Colorado River history centered around steamboating, early mining, settlement, and the eventual construction of Hoover and Davis Dams.

The geologic story is written chapter by chapter in 18,000 feet of sediments laid down in seas, lakes, and flood plains, and is retold little by little as the Colorado River excavates the Grand Canyon. Most of the divisions of geologic time are presented here as well as many examples of the geological processes.

The Grand Wash Cliffs near Pierce Ferry mark the western termination of the high plateaus through which the Colorado River carved the Grand Canyon. From a distance, these cliffs appear as an unbroken vertical wall several thousand feet high. Closer examination reveals rugged, steplike shapes whose upper edges recede and advance along sharply incised canyons. Layers of limestone and shale that were deposited in ancient Paleozoic seas rest upon an even older granitic land surface. The surface features to the west of the Grand Wash Cliffs form a sharp contrast with the nearly level plateaus to the east. Broad valleys lie between high but narrow, north-south trending folded mountain ranges. Lake Mead stretches across these valleys, and numerous caves and peninsulas form an irregular rugged shoreline.

Adding character and interest, promontories and monoliths, such as Napoleon's Tomb, Delmar Butte, and the Temple, rise precipitously above the lake level. Elsewhere, rocks resembling mushrooms, sphinxes, and phantom ships are common features. These were created about 10 million years ago by the erosion of soft clays and silts deposited in the ancient seas.

Through the mountain ranges which separate the broad valleys, Lake Mead follows narrow but deep gorges that were cut by the Colorado River into steeply tilted rock formations. Several of these gorges are of outstanding beauty, showing a myriad of colors, with gray, yellow, and tawny-red predominating.

From the Boulder Basin of Lake Mead, southward, the exposed bedrock of lava rests upon the ancient granite. In an epoch of mountainmaking, a wide area was uplifted and erosion swept away great thicknesses of sedimentary rocks. However, remnants can still be seen in the Virgin and Muddy Mountains. Evidence of volcanic activity can be seen in the thousands of feet of lava in the walls of Black Canyon. Most of this widespread lava has eroded away, but a large remnant forms the cap of Fortification Hill, the imposing and prominent feature near Hoover Dam. At the top of this hill, a vent through which part of the lava was erupted is marked by a dark plug. Around this plug are preserved quantities of brown, slaggy, volcanic cinders and bombs. Below this lava formation the sedimentary and altered igneous rocks created the brilliant formations called the Paint Pots.

Many of the sedimentary rocks forming the walls of the Grand Canyon contain fossil shells in abundance. At other localities north of Lake Mead, the later sediments contain fossil trees. In those same rocks the fossils of large amphibians and reptiles tell the story of the "age of dinosaurs."

Over 10,000 years ago, during the Ice Age, mammoths, camels, ground sloths, and giant beavers were inhabitants of the area.

Below Black Canyon, where Lake Mohave is confined to the narrow and spectacular gorge, the country opens into several broad valleys which characterize its lakeshore near Davis Dam.

In this desert land of "extremes" where rainfall is less than 6 inches, plant and animal life has become quite specialized. The perennials send out vast root systems to obtain water, while the annuals grow, flower, and produce seed in a few short weeks following the sporadic rains.

The flowering species of cactus, brittlebush, aster, desert chickory, salt heliotrope, ocotillo, and yucca herald spring as it progresses up the mountain slopes. On the high Shivwits and Hualapai Plateaus the piñon, juniper, and ponderosa pine forests are found. The Pierce Ferry area contains one of the largest Joshua-tree forests in the Southwest.

The interesting desert bighorn and the large muledeer are at home here. Common to the entire recreation area are the universal mountain lion, bobcat, coyote, and fox, in addition to the specialized kangaroo rat, badger, and ringtail cat.

The bird enthusiast can watch the majestic golden eagle in its native habitat along with 250 other species including waterfowl and wading birds, many of whom, like man, are only temporary visitors.

Reptiles and amphibians in a great number of species and specialties make this their home.

The native rough fishes have been greatly overshadowed by the introduction of game fish, such as the largemouth bass, catfish, crappie, and bluegill into Lake Mead and Lake Mohave. Because of the cold water release from Lake Mead an excellent rainbow trout fishery has been created in the upper part of Lake Mohave.

The white man is a recent visitor although man has inhabited the area for thousands of years. Pre-Columbian Indians had many campsites along these rivers. "The Lost City," a name given to a group of pueblo ruins along the Muddy River, is now covered by Lake Mead. Salvage and study of this early civilization was made before it was inundated. Lost City Museum at Overton, Nev., tells much of the story of the early Indians' way of life in this harsh land. Much of the culture of the more recent Paiute, Hualapai, and Mohave Indians, some of whom still live within the recreation area, is interpreted for the visitor.

The project is a landmark creation—a pattern—for national recreation areas. I am hopeful it will set the pattern for the creation of many other recreation areas behind reservoirs and dams throughout the entire United States.

At present our committee has before it a number of recreation area bills patterned somewhat after the bill now before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah.

The motion was agreed to.

CANYONLANDS NATIONAL PARK, UTAH

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 356, Senate bill 27, which was introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 27) to provide for establishment of the Canyonlands National Park in the State of Utah, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 1, after line 8, to strike out:

Beginning at a point on the east line of section 2, township 27 south, range 17 east, Salt Lake base and meridian; on a westerly prolongation of the north line of said township 27 south, range 20 east;

thence east along the north line of township 27 south, through ranges 18 and 19 east to the west line of township 27 south, range 20 east; thence south along said west line of said township 27 south, range 20 east to the south line of the north half of section 7, said township 27 south, range 20 east;

thence east along said south line of said north half of said section 7 and along the south line of the north half of section 8, said township 27 south, range 20 east, and along the south line of the north half of section 9, said township 27 south, range 20 east, to the west line of the east half of said section 9;

thence south along said west line of the east half of said section 9 and the west line of the east halves of sections 16, 21, 28, and 33 of said township 27 south, range 20 east, and the west line of the east halves of sections 4, 9, 16, and 21 of township 28 south, range 20 east, to the north line of section 28, said township 28 south, range 20 east;

thence west along the north line of said section 28 and of section 29 of said township 28 south, range 20 east, to the west line of said section 29;

thence south along said west line of said section 29 and the west line of section 32 of said township 28 south, range 20 east, and the west line of section 5 and 8 of township 29 south, range 20 east, to the north line of the south half of section 7, said township 29 south, range 20 east;

thence west along said north line of the south half of said section 7, said township 29 south, range 20 east, and along the north line of the south half of unsurveyed section 12, unsurveyed township 29 south, range 19 east, to the west line of the east half of said section 12;

thence south along said west line of the east half of said section 12 and the west line of the east half of unsurveyed sections 13 and 24 of said township 29 south, range 19 east, to the north line of unsurveyed section 25, said township 29 south, range 19 east;

thence west along said north line of said section 25 to the west line of said section 25; thence south along said west line of said section 25 and the west line of unsurveyed section 36, said township 29 south, range 19 east, to the north line of unsurveyed township 29½ south, range 19 east;

thence east along the said north line of said township 29½ south, range 19 east to the west line of the east half of unsurveyed section 36 of said township 29½ south, range 19 east; thence south along said west line of the east half of said section 36, and the west line of the east half of unsurveyed section 1, partially surveyed township 30 south, range 19 east, to the south line of the north half of said section 1; thence east along said south line of the north half of said section 1 to the west line of township 30 south, range 20 east; thence south along the west line of section 6 of said township 30 south, range 20 east to the south line of said section 6;

thence east along said south line of said section 6 of the west line of section 8, said township 30 south, range 20 east; thence south along said west line of said section 8 to the south line of said section 8;

thence east along said south line of said section 8 to the west line of section 16; said township 30 south, range 20 east; thence south along said west line of said section 16 to the south line of said section 16;

thence east along said south line of said section 16 and the south line of section 15, said township 30 south, range 20 east, to the west line of section 23, said township 30 south, range 20 east; thence south along said west line of said section 23 and the west line of sections 26 and 35 to the south line of said township 30 south, range 20 east;

thence east along said south line of said township 30 south, range 20 east, to the west line of unsurveyed section 35, partially surveyed township 30½ south, range 20 east;

thence south along the west line of said section 35, said township 30½ south, range 20 east, and the west line of section 2 and of unsurveyed sections 11, 14, 23, and 26 of partially surveyed township 31 south, range 20 east, to the north line of unsurveyed section 34, said township 31 south, range 20 east;

thence west along said north line of said section 34 to the west line of said section 34; thence south along said west line of said section 34 to the southwest corner of said section 34; thence west along the south line of sections 33, 32, and 31 of township 31 south, range 20 east, and along the south line of section 36, township 31 south, range 19 east, to the southwest corner of said section 36;

thence north along the west line of sections 36, 25, and 24 of township 31 south, range 19 east, to the southwest corner of section 13;

thence west along the south line of sections 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18, township 31 south, range 19 east, and along the south line of sections 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 of township 31 south, range 18 east, and along the south line of sections 13, 14, and 15, township 31 south, range 17 east, to the southeast corner of section 16, said township 31 south, range 17 east;

thence north along the east line of said section 16, said township 31 south, range 17 east, the east line of unsurveyed sections 9 and 4 of said township 31 south, range 17 east, to the north line of township 31 south, range 17 east;

thence east along the north line of township 31 south, range 17 east, to the northwest corner of unsurveyed section 5, township 31 south, range 18 east; thence north through partially surveyed township 30½ south, range 18 east, to the north line of said partially surveyed township 30½ south, range 18 east;

thence east along said north line of partially surveyed township 30½ south, range 18 east, to the southwest corner of section 34, township 30 south, range 18 east; to the southwest corner of section 34, township 30 south, range 18 east; thence north along the west line of said section 34, township 30 south, range 18 east, and the west line of section 27, said township and range, to the northwest corner of said section 27; thence east along said north section line of said section 27, to the southwest corner of section 23, township 30 south, range 18 east;

thence north along the west line of section 23, township 30 south, range 18 east, and the west line of sections 14, 11, and 2, township 30 south, range 18 east, and the east line of section 34, township 29 south, range 18 east, to the northeast corner of said section 34, partially surveyed township 29 south, range 18 east;

thence west along the north line of said section 34 to the southeast corner of section 28, said partially surveyed township 29 south, range 18 east; thence north along the east line of said section 28 and the east line of section 21, partially surveyed township 29 south, range 18 east, to the southeast corner of section 16, said township and range; thence west along the south line of said section 16 to the southwest corner of said section 16;

thence north along the west line of section 16, and the west line of section 9, said partially surveyed township 29 south, range 18 east, to the southeast corner of section 5, said township and range; thence west along the south line of section 5 to the southeast corner of section 6, said township 29 south, range 18 east; thence north along the east line of said section 6, and the east line of section 31, township 28½ south, range 18 east, to the northeast corner of said section 31; thence west along the north line of said section 31 to the east line of partially surveyed township 28 south, range 17 east;

thence north along said east line of said township 28 south, range 17 east, to the northeast corner of the southeast quarter of unsurveyed section 24, said township 28 south, range 17 east; thence west along the north line of the south half of said section 24 and the north line of the southeast quarter of unsurveyed section 23, said township and range, to the northwest corner of the southeast quarter of said section 23; thence north along the west line of the northeast quarter of section 23 and the west line of the southeast quarter line of section 14, said township 28 south, range 17 east, to the northwest corner of the southeast quarter of said section 14; thence west along the south line of the northwest quarter of said section 14 and the south line of the north half of section 15, said township 28 south, range 17 east, to the east line of section 16, said township and range;

thence north along said east line of said section 16 and the east line of unsurveyed sections 9 and 4, said township 28 south, range 17 east, the east line of unsurveyed sections 33, 28, and 21, and of section 16, partially surveyed township 27 south, range 17 east, to the south line of the north half of unsurveyed section 15, said township 27 south, range 17 east;

thence east along said south line of the north half of said section 15 and the south line of the north half of unsurveyed section 14, said township 27 south, range 17 east, to the east line of said section 14;

thence north along the east section line of said section 14, the east line of section 11, and the east line of section 2, township 27 south, range 17 east, to the point beginning, containing approximately 257,000 acres.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

Beginning at a point on the left or east bank of the Green River on the north township line of township 27 south, range 17½ east (partially surveyed), Salt Lake base and meridian:

thence easterly along the north township line through township 27 south, range 17½ east (partially surveyed), and township 27 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed), to the northeast corner of section 6, township 27 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence southerly along the east line of section 6 to the southeast corner of section 6, township 27 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence easterly along the north line of sections 8, 9, and 10 to the northeast corner of section 10, township 27 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence southerly along the east line of section 10 to the southeast corner of section 10, township 27 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence easterly along the north line of sections 14 and 13 to the northeast corner of section 13, township 27 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence continuing easterly along the north line of sections 18, 17, 16, and 15 to the northeast corner of section 15, township 27 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence southerly along the east line of sections 15 and 22 to the southeast corner of section 22, township 27 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence easterly along the north line of sections 26 and 25 to the northeast corner of section 25, township 27 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence continuing easterly along the north line of sections 30, 29, and 28 to the northeast corner of the west half of section 28, township 27 south, range 20 east;

thence southerly along the east line of the west half of sections 28 and 33 to the southeast corner of the west half of section 33, township 27 south, range 20 east;

thence continuing southerly along the east line of the west half of sections 4, 9, 16, and 21 to the southeast corner of the west half of section 21, township 28 south, range 20 east;

thence westerly along the south line of sections 21 and 20 to the southwest corner of section 20, township 28 south, range 20 east;

thence southerly along the east line of sections 30 and 31 to the southeast corner of section 31, township 28 south, range 20 east;

thence continuing southerly along the east line of sections 6 and 7 to the southeast corner of the north half of section 7, township 29 south, range 20 east;

thence westerly along the south line of the north half of section 7 to the southwest corner of the north half of section 7, township 29 south, range 19 east;

thence continuing westerly along the south line of the northeast quarter of section 12 to the southwest corner of the northeast quarter of section 12, township 29 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence southerly along the east line of the west half of sections 12, 13, and 24 to the southeast corner of the west half of section 24, township 29 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence westerly along the south line of section 24 to the southwest corner of section 24, township 29 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence southerly along the east line of sections 26 and 35 to the southeast corner of section 35, township 29 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence easterly along the south line of township 29 south, range 19 east, to the east line of the west half of section 36, township 29½ south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence southerly along the east line of the west half of section 36 to the southeast corner of the west half of section 36, township 29½ south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence continuing southerly along the east line of the west half of section 1 to the southeast corner of the northwest quarter of section 1, township 30 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence easterly along the north line of the southeast quarter of section 1 to the northeast corner of the southeast quarter of section 1, township 30 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence southerly along the east line of section 1 to the southeast corner of section 1, township 30 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence easterly along the north line of section 7 to the northeast corner of section 7, township 30 south, range 20 east;

thence southerly along the east line of section 7 to the southeast corner of section 7, township 30 south, range 20 east;

thence easterly along the north line of section 17 to the northeast corner of section 17, township 30 south, range 20 east;

thence southerly along the east line of section 17 to the southeast corner of section 17, township 30 south, range 20 east;

thence easterly along the north line of sections 21 and 22 to the northeast corner of section 22, township 30 south, range 20 east;

thence southerly along the east line of sections 22, 27, and 34 to the southeast corner of section 34, township 30 south, range 20 east;

thence easterly along the south line of township 30 south, range 20 east, to the east line of section 34, township 30½ south, range 20 east (partially surveyed);

thence southerly along the east line of section 34 to the southeast corner of section 34, township 30½ south, range 20 east (partially surveyed);

thence continuing southerly along the east line of sections 3, 10, 15, 22, 27, and 34 to the southeast corner of section 34, township 31 south, range 20 east (partially surveyed);

thence continuing southerly along the east line of section 3, 10, and 15 to the southeast corner of section 15, township 32 south, range 20 east (partially surveyed);

thence westerly along the south line of sections 15, 16, 17, and 18 to the southwest corner of section 18, township 32 south, range 20 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of section 18 to the northwest corner of section 18, township 32 south, range 20 east (partially surveyed);

thence westerly along the south line of section 12 to the southwest corner of section 12, township 32 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of sections 12 and 1 to the northwest corner of section 1, township 32 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence westerly along the south line of section 35 to the southwest corner of section 35, township 31 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of sections 35 and 26 to the northwest corner of section 26, township 31 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence westerly along the south line of sections 22, 21, 20, and 19 to the southwest corner of section 19, township 31 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence continuing westerly along the south line of sections 24, 23, 22, 21, 20, and 19 to the southwest corner of section 19, township 31 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence continuing westerly along the south line of sections 24, 23, and 22 to the southwest corner of the east half of section 22, township 31 south, range 17 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of the east half of section 22 to the northwest corner of the east half of section 22, township 31 south, range 17 east (partially surveyed);

thence westerly along the south line of section 15 to the southwest corner of section 15, township 31 south, range 17 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of sections 15, 10, and 3 to the northwest corner of section 3, township 31 south, range 17 east (partially surveyed);

thence easterly along the north line of sections 3, 2, and 1 to the northeast corner of section 1, township 31 south, range 17 east (partially surveyed);

thence continuing easterly along the north line of section 6 to the northeast corner of section 6, township 31 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence north through partially surveyed township 30½ south, range 18 east, to the north line of partially surveyed township 30½ south, range 18 east;

thence easterly along the north line of partially surveyed township 30½ south, range 18 east, to the southwest corner of section 34, township 30 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of sections 34 and 27 to the northwest corner of section 27, township 30 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence easterly along the north line of section 27 to the northeast corner of section 27, township 30 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of sections 23, 14, 11, and 2 to the northwest corner of section 2, township 30 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence continuing northerly along the west line of section 35 to the northwest corner of section 35, township 29 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence westerly along the south line of section 27 to the southwest corner of section 27, township 29 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of sections 27 and 22 to the northwest corner of section 22, township 29 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence westerly along the south line of section 16 to the southwest corner of section 16, township 29 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of sections 16 and 9 to the northwest corner of section 9, township 29 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence westerly along the south line of section 5 to the southwest corner of section 5, township 29 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of section 5 to the northwest corner of section 5, township 29 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence continuing northerly along the west line of section 32 to the northwest corner of section 32, township 28½ south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence westerly along the south line of section 30 to the southwest corner of section 30, township 28½ south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of sections 30 and 19 to the northwest corner of the south half of section 19, township 28½ south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence westerly along the south line of the north half of sections 24 and 23 to the southwest corner of the northeast quarter of section 23, township 28 south, range 17 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of the northeast quarter of section 23 and the west line of the southeast quarter of section 14 to the northwest corner of the southeast quarter of section 14, township 28 south, range 17 east (partially surveyed);

thence westerly along the south line of the north half of sections 14 and 15 to the southwest corner of the north half of section 15, township 28 south, range 17 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of sections 15, 10, and 3 to the northwest corner of section 3, township 28 south, range 17 east (partially surveyed);

thence continuing northerly along the west line of sections 34, 27, 22, and 15 to the northwest corner of the south half of section 15, township 27 south, range 17 east (partially surveyed);

thence easterly along the north line of the south half of sections 15 and 14 to the northeast corner of the south half of section 14, township 27 south, range 17 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of sections 13, 12, and 1, township 27 south, range 17 east (partially surveyed), to the right or west bank of the Green River;

thence northerly across the Green River to the point of beginning, containing approximately 258,600 acres.

On page 19, line 13, after the word "of", to strike out "thirty" and insert "one hundred and twenty"; and on page 21, after the word "prior", to strike out "thereto." and insert "thereto and the continued exercise of such rights thereafter, including the right of ingress and egress and the use of roads within the park and outside of the park where reasonably necessary for production and marketing of minerals from within the park. Nor shall it affect the right to drill additional wells or sink additional shafts to complete exploitation of established discovery of minerals. Any patent issued pursuant to an application made after July 31, 1963, under the mining laws of the United States affecting lands within the boundaries of the Canyonlands National Park shall convey title to the mineral deposits within the claim, but such patent shall reserve to the United States all title in or to the surface of the lands and products thereof, and no use of the surface of the claim or the

resources therefrom not reasonably required for carrying on mining or prospecting shall be allowed."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve an area in the State of Utah possessing superlative scenic, scientific, and archeologic features for the inspiration, benefit and use of the public, there is hereby established the Canyonlands National Park which, subject to valid existing rights, shall comprise the following generally described lands:

Beginning at a point on the left or east bank of the Green River on the north township line of township 27 south, range 17½ east (partially surveyed), Salt Lake base and meridian:

thence easterly along the north township line through township 27 south, range 17½ east (partially surveyed), and township 27 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed), to the northeast corner of section 6, township 27 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence southerly along the east line of section 6 to the southeast corner of section 6, township 27 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence easterly along the north line of sections 8, 9, and 10 to the northeast corner of section 10, township 27 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence southerly along the east line of section 10 to the southeast corner of section 10, township 27 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence easterly along the north line of sections 14 and 13 to the northeast corner of section 13, township 27 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence continuing easterly along the north line of sections 18, 17, 16, and 15 to the northeast corner of section 15, township 27 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence southerly along the east line of sections 15 and 22 to the southeast corner of section 22, township 27 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence easterly along the north line of sections 26 and 25 to the northeast corner of section 25, township 27 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence continuing easterly along the north line of sections 30, 29, and 28 to the northeast corner of the west half of section 28, township 27 south, range 20 east;

thence southerly along the east line of the west half of sections 28 and 33 to the southeast corner of the west half of section 33, township 27 south, range 20 east;

thence continuing southerly along the east line of the west half of sections 4, 9, 16, and 21 to the southeast corner of the west half of section 21, township 28 south, range 20 east;

thence westerly along the south line of sections 21 and 20 to the southwest corner of section 20, township 28 south, range 20 east;

thence southerly along the east line of sections 30 and 31 to the southeast corner of section 31, township 28 south, range 20 east;

thence continuing southerly along the east line of sections 6 and 7 to the southeast corner of the north half of section 7, township 29 south, range 20 east;

thence westerly along the south line of the north half of section 7 to the southwest corner of the north half of section 7, township 29 south, range 19 east;

thence continuing westerly along the south line of the northeast quarter of section 12 to the southwest corner of the northeast quarter of section 12, township 29 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence southerly along the east line of the west half of sections 12, 13, and 24 to the southeast corner of the west half of section 24, township 29 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence westerly along the south line of section 24 to the southwest corner of section 24, township 29 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence southerly along the east line of sections 26 and 35 to the southeast corner of section 35, township 29 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence easterly along the south line of township 29 south, range 19 east, to the east line of the west half of section 36, township 29½ south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence southerly along the east line of the west half of section 36 to the southeast corner of the west half of section 36, township 29½ south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence continuing southerly along the east line of the west half of section 1 to the southeast corner of the northwest quarter of section 1, township 30 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence easterly along the north line of the southeast quarter of section 1 to the northeast corner of the southeast quarter of section 1, township 30 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence southerly along the east line of section 1 to the southeast corner of section 1, township 30 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence easterly along the north line of section 7 to the northeast corner of section 7, township 30 south, range 20 east;

thence southerly along the east line of section 7 to the southeast corner of section 7, township 30 south, range 20 east;

thence easterly along the north line of section 17 to the northeast corner of section 17, township 30 south, range 20 east;

thence southerly along the east line of section 17 to the southeast corner of section 17, township 30 south, range 20 east;

thence easterly along the north line of sections 21 and 22 to the northeast corner of section 22, township 30 south, range 20 east;

thence southerly along the east line of sections 22, 27, and 34 to the southeast corner of section 34, township 30 south, range 20 east;

thence easterly along the south line of township 30 south, range 20 east, to the east line of section 34, township 30½ south, range 20 east (partially surveyed);

thence southerly along the east line of section 34 to the southeast corner of section 34, township 30½ south, range 20 east (partially surveyed);

thence continuing southerly along the east line of sections 3, 10, 15, 22, 27, and 34 to the southeast corner of section 34, township 31 south, range 20 east (partially surveyed);

thence continuing southerly along the east line of sections 3, 10, and 15 to the southeast corner of section 15, township 32 south, range 20 east (partially surveyed);

thence westerly along the south line of sections 15, 16, 17, and 18 to the southwest corner of section 18, township 32 south, range 20 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of section 18 to the northwest corner of section 18, township 32 south, range 20 east (partially surveyed);

thence westerly along the south line of section 12 to the southwest corner of section 12, township 32 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of sections 12 and 1 to the northwest corner of section 1, township 32 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence westerly along the south line of section 35 to the southwest corner of section 35, township 31 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of sections 35 and 26 to the northwest corner of section 26, township 31 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence westerly along the south line of sections 22, 21, 20, and 19 to the southwest corner of section 19, township 31 south, range 19 east (partially surveyed);

thence continuing westerly along the south line of sections 24, 23, 22, 21, 20, and 19 to the southwest corner of section 19, township 31 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence continuing westerly along the south line of sections 24, 23, and 22 to the southwest corner of the east half of section 22, township 31 south, range 17 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of the east half of section 22 to the northwest corner of the east half of section 22, township 31 south, range 17 east (partially surveyed);

thence westerly along the south line of section 15 to the southwest corner of section 15, township 31 south, range 17 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of sections 15, 10, and 3 to the northwest corner of section 3, township 31 south, range 17 east (partially surveyed);

thence easterly along the north line of sections 3, 2, and 1 to the northeast corner of section 1, township 31 south, range 17 east (partially surveyed);

thence continuing easterly along the north line of section 6 to the northeast corner of section 6, township 31 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence north through partially surveyed township 30½ south, range 18 east, to the north line of partially surveyed township 30½ south, range 18 east;

thence easterly along the north line of partially surveyed township 30½ south, range 18 east, to the southwest corner of section 34, township 30 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of sections 34 and 27 to the northwest corner of section 27, township 30 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence easterly along the north line of section 27 to the northeast corner of section 27, township 30 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of sections 23, 14, 11 and 2 to the northwest corner of section 2, township 30 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence continuing northerly along the west line of section 35 to the northwest corner of section 35, township 29 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence westerly along the south line of section 27 to the southwest corner of section 27, township 29 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of sections 27 and 22 to the northwest corner of section 22, township 29 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence westerly along the south line of section 16 to the southwest corner of section 16, township 29 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of sections 16 and 9 to the northwest corner of section 9, township 29 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence westerly along the south line of section 5 to the southwest corner of section 5, township 29 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of section 5 to the northwest corner of section 5, township 29 south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence continuing northerly along the west line of section 32 to the northwest corner of section 32, township 28½ south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence westerly along the south line of section 30 to the southwest corner of section

30, township 28½ south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of sections 30 and 19 to the northwest corner of the south half of section 19, township 28½ south, range 18 east (partially surveyed);

thence westerly along the south line of the north half of sections 24 and 23 to the southwest corner of the northeast quarter of section 23, township 28 south, range 17 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of the northeast quarter of section 23 and the west line of the southeast quarter of section 14 to the northwest corner of the southeast quarter of section 14, township 28 south, range 17 east (partially surveyed);

thence westerly along the south line of the north half of sections 14 and 15 to the southwest corner of the north half of section 15, township 28 south, range 17 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of sections 15, 10, and 3 to the northwest corner of section 3, township 28 south, range 17 east (partially surveyed);

thence continuing northerly along the west line of sections 34, 27, 22, and 15 to the northwest corner of the south half of section 15, township 27 south, range 17 east (partially surveyed);

thence easterly along the north line of the south half of sections 15 and 14 to the northeast corner of the south half of section 14, township 27 south, range 17 east (partially surveyed);

thence northerly along the west line of sections 13, 12, and 1, township 27 south, range 17 east (partially surveyed), to the right or west bank of the Green River;

thence northerly across the Green River to the point of beginning, containing approximately 258,600 acres.

SEC. 2. Within the area described in section 1 hereof or which lies within the boundaries of the park, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire lands and interests in lands by such means as he may deem to be in the public interest. The Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property within the park, including State-owned school sections and riverbed lands, and in exchange therefor he may convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under his jurisdiction within the State of Utah and adjacent States, notwithstanding any other provision of law. The properties so exchanged shall be of the same classification and the Secretary shall take administrative action to complete transfer on any lands in a proper application by the State of Utah on or before the expiration of one hundred twenty days following the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided*, That the Secretary may accept cash from, or pay cash to, the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged. Federal property located within the boundaries of the park may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, without consideration, for use by him in carrying out the purposes of this Act. Any lands within the boundaries of the park which are subject to Bureau of Reclamation or Federal Power Commission withdrawals are hereby freed and exonerated from any such withdrawal and shall, on the date of enactment of this Act, become a part of the Canyonlands National Park subject to no qualifications except those imposed by this Act.

SEC. 3. Where any Federal lands included within the Canyonlands National Park are legally occupied or utilized on the date of approval of this Act for grazing purposes, pursuant to a lease, permit, or license issued or authorized by any department, establishment, or agency of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior shall permit the persons holding such grazing privileges on the date of approval of this Act, their heirs, successors, or assigns, to renew the privileges from time to time subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe: *Provided, however*, That no such privilege shall be extended beyond the period ending twenty-five years from the date of approval of this Act except as specifically provided for in this section. The Secretary shall permit a holder of the grazing privilege to renew such privilege from time to time during the holder's lifetime beyond the twenty-five-year period, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, if (1) the holder is the person who held such privilege on the date of approval of this Act, or (2) the holder is the heir, successor, or assign of such person and was a member of that person's immediate family, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, on the date of approval of this Act. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as creating any vested right, title, interest, or estate in or to any of the Federal lands. The Secretary, by regulation, may limit the privileges enjoyed under this Act to the extent that they are appurtenant to the private lands owned by the persons who held such privileges on the date of approval of this Act, and may adjust such privileges to preserve the park land and resources from destruction or unnecessary injury. Grazing privileges appurtenant to privately owned lands located within the Canyonlands National Park established by this Act shall not be withdrawn until title to lands to which such privileges are appurtenant shall have vested in the United States, except for failure to comply with the regulation applicable thereto and after reasonable notice of any default.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this Act shall preclude the continued application of the mining and mineral leasing laws of the United States within the Canyonlands National Park; except that (1) the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe such general regulations for the control of these activities as he deems necessary to preserve the scenic, scientific, and archeologic values of the area, and (2) such laws shall cease to apply with respect to the area comprising such park upon the expiration of twenty-five years following the date of enactment of this Act, but such termination of application shall not affect any valid rights established prior thereto and the continued exercise of such rights thereafter, including the right of ingress and egress and the use of roads within the park and outside of the park where reasonably necessary for production and marketing of minerals from within the park. Nor shall it affect the right to drill additional wells or sink additional shafts to complete exploitation of established discovery of minerals. Any patent issued pursuant to an application made after July 31, 1963, under the mining laws of the United States affecting lands within the boundaries of the Canyonlands National Park shall convey title to the mineral deposits within the claim, but such patent shall reserve to the United States all title in or to the surface of the lands and products thereof, and no use of the surface of the claim or the resources therefrom not reasonably required for carrying on mining or prospecting shall be allowed. The provisions of the Act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), as amended, shall have no application within the Canyonlands National Park.

SEC. 5. (a) In order to provide suitable access to the Canyonlands National Park and facilities and services required in the operation and administration of the park, the Secretary may select the location or locations of an entrance road or roads to such park and to points of interest therein from United States Route 160 and State Routes 24 and 95, including necessary entrance and related administrative headquarters sites upon lands located outside the park, and he may select a suitable location or locations outside the park for connections between entrance roads and between roads lying within the Canyonlands National Park.

(b) To carry out the purposes of this section, the Secretary may acquire non-Federal lands or interests in lands by donation, purchase, condemnation, exchange, or such other means as he may deem to be in the public interest: *Provided*, That lands and interests in lands acquired outside the park as rights-of-way for said entrance roads and connections shall not exceed an average of one hundred twenty-five acres per mile. Rights-of-way and entrance and administrative sites acquired pursuant to this authority shall be administered pursuant to such special regulations as the Secretary may promulgate in furtherance of the purposes of this section.

(c) The Secretary may construct, reconstruct, improve, and maintain upon the lands or interests in lands acquired pursuant to this section, or otherwise in Government ownership, an entrance road or roads and connections of parkway standards, including necessary bridges and other structures and utilities as necessary, and funds appropriated for the National Park Service shall be available for these purposes.

SEC. 6. Subject to the provisions of this Act, the administration, protection, and development of the Canyonlands National Park, as established pursuant to this Act, shall be exercised by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 and the following), as amended and supplemented.

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I wholeheartedly commend the bill to the consideration of the Senate. The area involved is truly one of the most spectacular areas of our entire United States. It passes all the rigid criteria, as I view it, for another great national park. I have been privileged to visit the area on foot and in a jeep. I have flown over it many times. It is an area which I personally and wholeheartedly endorse as of national park stature along with the finest.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with a unanimous vote of approval, which shows the response of members of that committee to this great area.

I desire particularly to commend the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] for his vigilance, perseverance, and enthusiasm for the project. This project has been before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for several years. I am hopeful that it is on the last mile of its journey to enactment into public law. The vigilance of the Senator from Utah and his ceaseless patience and persistence over the last 2 or 3 years have brought the project close to reality. I commend him for his efforts in preserving for future generations this great area so it can be shared by the thousands who will visit it in the years to come.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate today, S. 27, would establish Canyonlands National Park in southeastern Utah. The park would encompass a geographical entity of 258,000 acres surrounding the confluence of the Green and Colorado Rivers in southeastern Utah.

That the Canyonlands area is of national park stature and quality is undisputed by anyone who has seen it. It is the scenic heart of a region so visually compelling that everyone who sees it wants to push the boundaries back and back again. The area is the world's most massive exposure of red-rock canyons and windswept sculpture.

The bill before us is a compromise, a scaled-down version of a park which originally would have embraced about 330,000 acres. I introduced my first Canyonlands bill on August 8, 1961, after having ridden, walked, "jeeped," and flown over the area many times. Over the Fourth of July weekend in 1961 Secretary of the Interior Udall, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, our two Utah Representatives in Congress, David S. King and Blaine Peterson, Gov. George D. Clyde, representatives of the National Park Service, and local residents made a boat, jeep, air, and foot trip through Canyonlands. Hearings were conducted on my bill on March 29 and March 30, 1962, in Washington, D.C., and on April 20, 21, and 23, in Utah. During this period the boundaries of the bill were further revised, and a bill was subsequently reported by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on September 24, 1962. Because of the lateness of the session it was not brought to a vote in the Senate.

On the first day for introduction of bills in the present session, I again introduced my Canyonlands bill, with further modifications in the boundaries which reduced the overall acreage to 257,000 acres. As the result of a conference in Salt Lake City on April 6 with the other members of the Utah congressional delegation, and with Governor Clyde, the boundaries were adjusted to their present status by removing some 18,000 acres from the extreme northeastern corner of the park, and adding a corresponding number of acres in the south—some 19,000 acres along the southern boundary of the park. The northern deletion took out a bank across the corner which is part of the salt wash geologic member in which potash occurs. A shaft is now being sunk for a potash mine about 15 miles from the area which was deleted.

There is no doubt that some of the area adjacent to the proposed Canyonlands National Park, as recommended in the bill before us today, is also of national park caliber. I regret, as do many of the members of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee who have visited the area personally, that those areas are not included in the park under this bill. But I am confident that most of the people of Utah agree with me that we should not now place 1 million acres of our State into a national park, since Utah's land is already roughly 75 percent in Federal ownership.

However, I am convinced that the park as presented in S. 27 has the overwhelming support of the people of Utah. I have just returned from a 10-day visit to the State, which took me from one end to the other, and I think I am safe in saying that Utah is about 98 percent in favor of a Canyonlands National Park.

I will not take the time again of this body to discuss the truly remarkable area we want to establish as the Canyonlands National Park. Sufficient it is to say that it is without doubt one of the world's most spectacular scenic areas. It is also an area of invaluable prehistoric ruins, and of great geological, scientific, and archeological significance. And it is almost untouched.

The very inaccessibility of most of the area which Canyonlands will encompass has kept it pristine and inviolate. It is probably one of the few areas in the United States which has sections and canyons which no white man has ever visited. However, there is now a fairly good road in from the north to the Grandview Point overlook, and there are some jeep trails in from the south. This means that more and more people are seeing this remarkable area every year. And the vast publicity given it by visits to it by the Secretary of the Interior, and by Members of the Senate, and by others, will pull more and more people into southeastern Utah. In fact, the chamber of commerce at Monticello, the Utah town closest to the southern border of the park, reported to me that last year the number of inquiries and visitors doubled over the previous year.

This means that remoteness is no longer an adequate protection. At hearings held last year in the Canyonlands area, people reported with chagrin what is happening. Several superb formations have been desecrated by vandals.

The area is dotted with 25,000-year-old campsites, granaries, and ruined villages of the Anasazi. There are also many superb Indian pictographs and other relics of early Indian habitation and civilization. Some of these are being distributed and multilated. At hearings held last year in Monticello, one woman reported visiting an Indian campsite several years ago to find it just as it had been left thousands of years ago when the Indians departed. When she returned a year or two later some insensitive and thoughtless person had desecrated it by sweeping and kicking aside the priceless relics there.

This means, of course, that the passage of this bill has become urgent. We must give this remarkable area the protection it deserves before it is too late. In fact, I felt it is safe to say that Canyonlands represents one of the last opportunities in the United States to establish a national park in an area in which nature and long-departed Indians have been the only architects. We cannot move too soon.

In conclusion, let me point out that there will be absolutely no costs for the acquisition of land for Canyonlands National Park. All of the land is owned either by the Federal Government or by the State of Utah, and my bill contains provision for the orderly exchange of the State lands for other Federal lands within a prescribed time. The only cost of establishing Canyonlands will be that of building access roads and trails to open the area up, and of constructing tourist accommodations and park maintenance buildings.

Mr. President, the people of America need the Canyonlands National Park. This awesome and splendid place bequeathed to us by a loving Creator must be preserved. We must set it aside now for play and communion with nature. We want Canyonlands not merely for the people of Utah, or for the people of the West, but for the people of the entire Nation.

We now have only 31 national parks. Last year Americans made over 88 million visits to these national parks. By 1970 that number is expected to increase at least 50 percent.

The National Park Service has built a fine tradition, and has given the people great pleasure. But not even the finest esprit de corps can accomplish the miracles that will soon be required if we do not add and develop more national parks.

This bill has the strong support of the Secretary of the Interior and of President Kennedy. The reports on it are all favorable. It was warmly and unanimously reported by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. I hope it will pass.

I wish to say a word about the chairman of the subcommittee, who conducted hearings not only in Washington, D.C., but also in Utah, and who has been quite diligent in getting on with the work of the committee. I refer to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]. A few moments ago the Senator paid tribute to the persistence I had shown in following the bill. I assure the Senate that it was matched by the cooperation and persistence of the chairman of the subcommittee, who constantly sought to expedite the work of the committee.

I hope that the bill will pass today and will soon become law; and that there will be created in southeastern Utah a great new national park of the caliber of Yellowstone, Grand Canyon, Sequoia, and others. so well known in this Nation.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, one of the most magnificent and varied scenic areas in the world is the Canyonlands country along the Green and the Colorado Rivers in southeastern Utah. I join with the overwhelming majority of the people of Utah in strongly supporting establishment of a Canyonlands National Park. There is no question that this national asset surely deserves national recognition, development, and preservation, so that all of the people of our land may enjoy its splendor. It has taken more than a decade to make the necessary studies and lay the background for the proposal which is before us today.

In the intervening years many studies have been conducted regarding the area. As early as March 1961, my bill to develop the 72,000 acres of the Needles country as a recreational area was the first introduced in Congress affecting the area which is now called Canyonlands. I call this to the Senate's attention to highlight my support for the Canyonlands National Park bill before us today.

REPORTED ON WEDNESDAY

In addition, I also would like to point out that this bill was reported out of the committee on Wednesday and was set for floor action some 48 hours later. No text of the bill was available as of last night, so I can only make general comments today.

Over the past few months I have been working with Utah's Governor, George D. Clyde, and other key State officials in Utah and here in Washington who have responsibilities that will be affected by the creation of a park. As a result of these conferences, I offered a number of amendments to the Senate Interior Committee. I am sorry to say all of them were rejected. I am not going to offer these amendments on the floor again, because if I did so, I am sure my action would be interpreted as opposition to the basic park idea. As I have said many times before, the Governor and I always have favored creation of a Canyonlands National Park.

To keep the record clear and to give my colleagues an opportunity to see what these amendments were, I ask unanimous consent to introduce into the RECORD at this point an explanation of the amendments that I proposed to the committee when I introduced them.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENTS PROPOSED TO S. 27, THE CANYONLANDS BILL, AND TO SENATOR MOSS' AMENDMENT 58, OFFERED APRIL 22, 1963

(Statement by Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT)

Attached are my proposed amendments to S. 27, the Canyonlands National Park bill, and to the amendment, No. 58, offered on April 22, 1963, by my junior colleague, Senator FRANK E. MOSS. These are the amendments that I promised to submit "within the next few days" when I sent my statement to the committee on May 17.

The amendments were not submitted with the statement for two reasons: first, Senator Moss was in Utah and had been for some time, and I was sure that the subcommittee would not wish to consider amendments during his absence. Second, I wanted to clear the precise text of the amendments with key officials in Utah and here in Washington rather than merely to rely on the general ideas previously discussed. It did not seem wise to act unilaterally without consultation on such a vital matter. I now can report that Utah Gov. George D. Clyde and other key State officials join me in support of these amendments.

AMENDMENTS TO THE MOSS AMENDMENT 58 OF APRIL 22, 1963—PARK BOUNDARIES

I fully support the Moss amendment, No. 58, of April 22, 1963, which revises the boundaries of the proposed Canyonlands National Park, with but two exceptions.

The first change proposed is the deletion of 960 acres in the northeast corner of the proposed park. I am advised that this area is known to have rich potash deposits, and is under potash lease. Therefore, it should be deleted. Other than that, I support the boundaries in the north proposed by Senator Moss.

The second change calls for the deletion of a 30½-section strip across the southern end of the proposed park. These sections were not included in Senator Moss's bill introduced in January, but were added in his amendments of April 22.

This southern addition consists of approximately 19,500 acres of land. According to the Utah State Fish and Game Department, it is deer hunting country which is not needed in the park, as is evidenced by the fact that Senator Moss left it out of his January bill.

Under my proposal the park would be approximately 238,140 acres in size. This compares to 258,600 acres in the amended Moss bill, a reduction of less than 9 percent.

AMENDMENTS TO S. 27, INTRODUCED JANUARY 14, 1963

The first proposed change in S. 27 is to eliminate the language on page 1 which establishes outright a national park by use of novel and, to my knowledge, entirely unprecedented language. My amendment when coupled with the amendment proposed as new subsection 2(e) restores the traditional manner of creating a national park, including notice in the Federal Register. This is a more orderly procedure.

The second change is solely of a technical, clerical nature.

State and school lands

The remaining two changes on page 1 of my amendments, coupled with the proposed new subsections 2(b), 2(c), and 2(d), are vital to protect the interests of Utah's school children who are entitled to the benefits arising from the thousands of acres of State lands, including school lands, that could be locked up within the park unless the changes are made. We have had sad experience in Utah with school sections being locked into national parks where they are no use whatever to our schools. The Moss bill attempts to meet the problem; but to do so completely, in my opinion, requires the adoption of these amendments.

All reference to equal value are eliminated from the Moss bill, since endless disputes arise over interpretation of this phrase. My amendment provides that the land exchanges shall be of the same classification, which fully protects the interests both of the Federal and of the State Government, and this is all that is required under the present law.

In summary, these State land amendments provide that no park shall be created until all State lands are exchanged out for Federal lands elsewhere in the State. They also establish a procedure under which differences between the State and Federal Government may be arbitrated in effecting these changes.

Mining and mineral protection

The next basic amendment appears near the top of page 3 of the changes I am proposing. It would strike from page 11 of the Moss bill the additional authority given to the Secretary of Interior to establish broad "general regulations" within the park above and beyond those which he has already on the public domain. Immediately before this provision, the Moss bill purports to continue the application of the mining and mineral leasing laws. But then, the bill gives the Secretary of Interior authority to, by "general regulations," negate, in part or in whole, these same mining and mineral leasing laws. Therefore, I propose to strike this language from the bill in keeping with the expressed intent of Senator Moss. The Secretary would still be able to apply the same regulations that he now may use on the lands which comprise the public domain. Thus, truly important areas would be protected fully, but the broad new discretionary authority granted under the Moss bill would be significantly narrowed.

If this change is adopted, it would obviate many problems that otherwise would arise under the Moss bill. For example, this change clearly would permit full development of oil fields after the 25-year period where only one well had been discovered by exploration prior to that time but where no developmental wells had been sunk. This is in doubt under the Moss bill. The full field could be developed and all equipment, pipelines, buildings, etc., necessary to do so would be permitted. The same would hold true for related mining activities. I respectfully urge the Committee to both adopt my amendment and to make this understanding clear in the committee report on the bill.

Roads

The next change calls for commercial use of roads authorized by the Moss bill outside the park. If the amendment is not adopted, these roads could become "Chinese walls" barring commercial activity in substantial areas of mineral-rich lands outside of the park.

Under my new proposed section 5(d), the mining, mineral leasing, and grazing laws of the United States will be permitted to continue in effect on the 1,000-foot right-of-way along roads built outside of the park which will be authorized by the Moss bill. If this is not done, thousands of acres could be tied up needlessly.

Under the new section 5(e), those who have established rights or privileges in the park, both before and after the 25-year period, will be assured of use of park roads built both within and outside the park. Such rights and privileges would have little value without the opportunity to use the roads. This amendment is offered in keeping with the intent of Senator Moss, but is in doubt under the terms of his bill.

Hunting

The proposed new section 7(a) permits carefully regulated hunting within 200 yards of either bank of the Colorado and Green Rivers, covering only a small area within the park. I am offering this amendment at the request of the fish and game people in Utah, who inform me that deer are hunted from the rivers in the deep canyons that comprise the Canyonlands area and that this amendment is necessary to assure adequate management of the game. Because of the geography, administration of the area should be relatively simple.

Predator control

Local cattlemen and others living adjacent to the area are concerned that the Park Service will not control predators in the park. The new section 8 is offered to direct the Park Service to undertake a control program for this purpose.

I fully support creation of a new Canyonlands Park in Utah. Because of the opposition in the House to multiple use in national parks, the Moss bill could delay by months or years the creation of a park. However, I have agreed to support the bill if amended, and will do so, even though a smaller "pure park" bill would in all likelihood have a much better chance of gaining congressional approval.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, at this point, I can only hope that if and when the bill reaches the House the proposals which I have made again will be studied; and I hope that some or all of them may be adopted. The amendments were simply a guard against losing more mineral and other recoverable resources than necessary.

We of the West have a great deal of public land, it is true, but we must protect our economic rights as well as the rights of others to enjoy scenery. I, therefore, felt that we needed broader multiple development of these lands.

Some may ask, "What are 260,000 acres to a State which is eleventh in size, having a total area of 84,916 square miles?"

Utah already has economic problems resulting from the fact that 73 percent of the lands are federally owned. Therefore, the other fourth of the State must support the whole. My proposals not only expressed the wishes of those interested in recreation, but also protected Utah's schoolchildren, cattlemen, oilmen, miners—in short, Utah's education and economy.

AMENDMENTS NOT CIRCULATED

But there sometimes comes a time in the legislative process when, in spite of one's efforts, one's proposals have not been accepted. Had there been more time between the day the bill was reported by the Interior Committee and this moment, I might have had an opportunity to present my proposed amendments individually to Members of the Senate who, like myself, are not members of the committee. But I realize that the calendar is empty and that the leadership welcomes any bill from any committee in order to keep the store open.

There is no question that a new national park in the remote and neglected red rock desert canyon country of southeastern Utah is exciting. The tourist potential for this magnificent area is tremendous.

I shall support the bill; and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 27) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BIBLE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE AND RELATED AGENCIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, even though it is not yet the hour of 2 o'clock, I ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 2 o'clock the unfinished business, S. 979, to amend the United States Code, go back to the calendar and that the pending business be Calendar No. 358, H.R. 5888.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5888) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY, AUGUST 6

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ANNUAL U.S. PAYMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6177) to amend section 2(a) of article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 relating to the annual payment to the District of Columbia by the United States, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BIBLE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. BEALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, most of the discussion which has already taken place over the partial nuclear test ban treaty has, it seems, concentrated only on the advantages to be gained by its ratification. It is said that the treaty as proposed will tend to slow down the nuclear arms race, will prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to nations which do not now possess them, will create a favorable climate for entering into other agreements designed to reduce world tensions, and, of course, will prevent any further contamination of the air we breathe from lingering radioactive fallout.

Conspicuous by their absence thus far in these discussions are the disadvantages which will accrue to the United States should this treaty be ratified by the Senate. These disadvantages relate to the risks which we must be willing to assume by entering into a treaty which is not self-executing in all of its provisions and to the evaluation of the need of the United States to conduct further atmospheric tests in the interests of its own national security.

The Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, of which I am proud to be a member, has been conducting hearings on this very vital subject for quite some time and we have heard many witnesses express grave concern over the impact which this treaty would have upon our national security. These expressions of deep concern have not been confined only to witnesses who represent the Military Establishment. They have been voiced by many others, including prominent members of the scientific community.

The difficulty, of course, lies in the fact that the information, apart from being very technical, is so highly sensitive that most of it cannot be made public. In comments which I propose to make later in the course of the debate over ratification, I would hope to be more specific in enumerating the disadvantages of this treaty for they must be weighed against the advantages to be gained in arriving at an informed decision whether to support or oppose ratification.

In view of the testimony which I have heard thus far, I am constrained to reserve judgment on this treaty until all the evidence is in and we can then take a cold, hard, impassionate appraisal of the treaty and all its consequences.

I am prompted to make this statement at this time because of the comments of witnesses who appeared before the Preparedness Subcommittee both yesterday and again today.

NEW PERSPECTIVES ON AMERICAN SECURITY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, 18 years ago, as the pilot of an American B-24 bomber, I completed the last of 35 missions in the European theater of World War II. A few days after the completion of that tour of duty the war in Europe ended.

Our crew climbed into a battle-scarred bomber to return to the United States with the grim knowledge that we had used the most devastating weapons in the long history of warfare. Our four-engine bomber had day after day dumped 5 tons of TNT on its targets below.

But we had scarcely reached home before news stories told of a fantastic new bomb that had incinerated 100,000 Japanese men, women, and children in a single searing flash. Suddenly, our 5-ton monster lost its significance in the shadow of that 20,000 ton destroyer of Hiroshima.

Although the new dimensions of death were beyond comprehension, book titles in the afterglow of Hiroshima—"One World or None," "Modern Man Is Obsolete," "Five Minutes to Midnight"—attempted to assess the meaning of the nuclear age.

Recognizing that humanity stood in deadly peril, we drew comfort only in the conviction that the new techniques of destruction were so terrifying that man surely would never use them—would he?

Five years later, the A-bomb of Hiroshima passed into obsolescence, not because it was too fearful to use, but because it had been replaced by the H-bomb—a thousand times more powerful than the bomb that had devastated Hiroshima.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Union became a nuclear power, and in 1957, Sputnik I ushered in the space age. Today, the two great powers, America and Russia, have piled up nuclear weapons with an explosive power of 60 billion tons of TNT—enough to put a 20-ton bomb at the head of every human being on the planet.

A single warhead from the American or Russian stockpile if exploded over a great city would instantly transform it into a raging fireball 3 miles in diameter with a direct heat and blast capable of burning human flesh and collapsing buildings 25 miles from its center. Above a smoking crater a mile wide and several blocks deep, a gigantic, poisonous radioactive cloud would rise 20 or 25 miles to rain down torturous death on millions of human beings not fortunate enough to be incinerated quickly in the initial firestorm.

In spite of this grim prospect, the accumulation of more and more devastating weapons continues. The great powers are spending over $100 billion yearly on arms—each side justifying its investment in the name of defense. Yet, modern science supports the ancient Biblical wisdom, "there is no place to hide."

Speaking to the United Nations assembly in 1961, President Kennedy said:

> Today, every inhabitant of this planet must contemplate the day when it may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman, and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident, miscalculation, or madness. The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us * * *. The risks inherent in disarmament pale in comparison to the risks inherent in an unlimited arms race.

We accept the logic of Mr. Kennedy's words, just as we accepted the earlier warning of former President Eisenhower "There is no longer any alternative to peace." Why, then, does the arms race with its mounting military budgets continue?

Doubtless, a major factor is the uncertain quest for security through superior military strength. The Congress and the Nation have willingly responded to the architects of our military security and have granted them unprecedented sums to insure the defense of our shores. Americans have felt that the growing technical complexity of the military art has required leaving the main judgments about security to our military officers.

As a freshman Congressman in 1957, I was tempted to raise some questions about what seemed to me to be a staggering military appropriations bill. But I lapsed into silence when one of the most respected Congressmen took the floor to say:

> If our military leaders are wrong and we listen to their advice, it will cost us some money. But if these experts are right, and we do not heed their requests, it may cost us our country.

Given that grim choice, it is a reckless man indeed who would challenge the demand for more military spending. Every patriotic citizen desires that his country be prepared to defend itself against attack. Even the most ardent economizers—men who vote with zeal to cut funds for education, conservation and health—are quick to shout "Aye" for more billions for arms.

I share the conviction that America ought to have a defense force which is second to none, and fully adequate to meet any need.

But, Mr. President, has the time not come to question the assumption that we are adding to defense and security by adding more and more to the nuclear stockpile? I suggest that we need to examine carefully the assumptions on which our military budget rests. We need a thoroughly honest discussion and debate, not so much about competing weapons systems, but rather about the basic postulates of our defense strategy.

Have we remembered that the defense of a great nation depends not only upon the quality of its arms, important as that is, but also on the quality of its economic, political, and moral fabric?

Have we considered the impact upon these other sources of strength of our vast military investment?

Is there a point of diminishing returns in the race for security through arms?

Have we made the wisest possible allocation of our material and human resources to insure maximum security?

Are we building national strength by creating a higher pile of nuclear bombs and adding to our overkill capacity while failing to match our millions of idle, untrained youth with the Nation's needs for constructive economic growth?

Is our national security jeopardized by an outflow of gold that weakens the international value of the dollar?

Is the size of our military budget the chief criterion of effective international leadership and national strength in today's world?

What is the mounting arms race doing to our freedom and the quality of our lives?

And most important of all, are we following a blueprint for peace or racing toward annihilation?

For this fiscal year, we are asked to approve a Department of Defense budget of $53.6 billion, plus additional billions for the Atomic Energy Commission and the space program. That is well over half of our entire Federal budget. It represents more than the combined cost of all the social and economic programs of the New Deal period from 1933 through 1940.

Soon, we will be called upon to vote on the appropriation of funds for this enormous arms budget. This is a tremendously important vote for all of us, not only because it represents a great deal of money, but because it can give us an opportunity to examine some of the basic assumptions that now guide our national life. A Federal budget is, after all, a careful listing of the public priorities and goals of the Nation. When we devote more than half of that entire budget to one purpose, we certainly need to be reasonably sure of our ground.

My limited effort to prepare myself for this forthcoming vote as a Senator whose chief concern is the security of our country and the peace of the world has led me to certain tentative conclusions. I set them forth now, not as final judgments, but simply as one person's convictions about a most complex problem. It is my hope that these suggestions may stimulate in some way the larger debate which needs to be waged by those Senators and Representatives having greater experience and knowledge than mine. Perhaps the insights of others may lead me to abandon or modify some of my present judgments.

In that spirit, I suggest the following propositions:

First. The United States now has a stockpile of nuclear weapons in excess of any conceivable need.

Second. Bringing the arms race under control involves risks less dangerous than the proliferation of nuclear warheads and the acceleration of the arms race.

Third. Present levels of military spending and military foreign aid are distorting our economy, wasting our human resources, and restricting our leadership in the world.

Fourth. Diverting some of our present and proposed military spending to constructive investments both at home and abroad will produce a stronger and more effective America, a more secure America, and will improve the quality of our lives and strengthen the foundations of peace.

CURRENT DEFENSE ASSUMPTIONS

To place these convictions in better perspective, I would like to sketch some of the considerations which seem pertinent to our defense policy decisions.

Those who advocate surrender or passive submission to the forces of international communism will find little or no support in the United States. Most of us are willing to risk death rather than give the world over to a tyranny that is alien to all that we hold of value.

Likewise, few, if any, Americans would support the concept of an all-out military onslaught initiated by ourselves to wipe out the inhabitants of the Communist world. This, in another equally fundamental sense, would be a surrender of our values and traditions.

As a nation we have rejected both the concept of aggressive war and passive surrender. We have operated from the premise that the Communist threat is checked only because of our awesome military machine. This is the theory of deterrence which has guided our thinking for most of the period since World War II. When one looks for a more specific answer as to how that policy would be applied in the form of military strategy, he encounters some rather confusing and conflicting assumptions.

It has generally been believed that the deterrent or retaliatory power of America's strategic airpower was targeted on the great cities of Russia to be used in the event of a major Soviet attack.

On June 16, 1962, however, Defense Secretary McNamara, one of the ablest and most courageous men to come into Government in modern times, made an important speech at Ann Arbor, Mich. In this address Mr. McNamara spelled out the "controlled counterforce" or "no cities" doctrine. The Ann Arbor speech set forth the theory that instead of seeking first the mass destruction of the Russian populace, we would aim our missiles and bombers at Soviet nuclear weapons in an effort to cripple their capacity to hit the United States. Only if the Soviets attacked our cities would we strike at theirs.

This speech touched off a wide-ranging controversy, partly because its success would seem to depend upon the

United States launching a first strike against the Soviet Union.

If the United States were aiming at the effective destruction of Russia's nuclear forces, how could we apply such a strategy unless we knocked out the Soviet missiles before they were launched from their silos? What military objective could we achieve by knocking out empty missile launchers after their rockets had hit American targets?

Secretary McNamara flatly denied that the United States has any intention of launching a first strike, but the "no cities" or "controlled counterforce" theory seems a most unlikely and impractical strategy.

In lengthy testimony before the House Armed Services Committee early this year, Mr. McNamara said:

> What we are proposing is a capability to strike back after absorbing a first blow. This means we have to build and maintain a second strike force. Such a force should have sufficient flexibility to permit a choice of strategies, particularly an ability to: (1) strike back decisively at the entire Soviet target system simultaneously; or (2) strike back first at the Soviet bomber bases, missile sites, and other military installations associated with their long-range nuclear forces to reduce the power of any follow-on attack—and then, if necessary, strike back at the Soviet urban and industrial complex in a controlled and deliberate way.

The Secretary's own testimony, then, seems to make the above strategy highly unlikely. Mr. McNamara pointed out that the Soviets have always insisted that their nuclear power is aimed at the great urban, industrial, and government centers of America. He then stressed the virtual impossibility of either side destroying the other's hardened ICBM weapons or Polaris-type submarine missiles. And then the Secretary added a third point which would seem to remove any real feasibility of concentrating our nuclear power on Soviet missile sites rather than cities. In his words:

> Furthermore, in a second strike situation we would be attacking, for the most part, empty sites from which the missiles had already been fired.

It might be reassuring to draw the conclusion from the "no cities" strategy that it is possible to fight a nuclear war centered on destroying missiles rather than people—if only we could build enough missiles to destroy the enemy's nuclear capacity. But anyone who is laboring under the impression that our Defense Department believes this to be feasible should read the congressional testimony of Secretary McNamara of last February. The following brief excerpts from that important 163-page statement should be pondered carefully, especially by the Members of Congress who are responsible with the President for the defense policies of our Nation.

Secretary McNamara said:

> Even if we were to double and triple our forces we would not be able to destroy quickly all or almost all of the hardened (Russian) ICBM sites. And even if we could do that, we know no way to destroy the enemy's missile-launching submarines at the same time. We do not anticipate that either the United States or the Soviet Union will acquire that capability in the foreseeable future. * * * We could not preclude casualties counted in the tens of millions.

Secretary McNamara said further:

> The expanding arsenals of nuclear weapons on both sides of the Iron Curtain have created an extremely dangerous situation not only for their possessors but also for the world. As the arms race continues and the weapons multiply and become more swift and deadly, the possibility of a global catastrophe, either by miscalculation or design, becomes more real.

One final quotation from the Secretary of Defense is as follows:

> More armaments, whether offensive or defensive, cannot solve this dilemma. We are approaching an era when it will become increasingly improbable that either side could destroy a sufficiently large portion of the other's strategic nuclear force, either by surprise or otherwise, to preclude a devastating blow. This may result in mutual deterrence but it is still a grim prospect. It underscores the need for a renewed effort to find some way, if not to eliminate these deadly weapons completely, then at least to slow down or halt their further accumulation, and to create institutional arrangements which would reduce the need for either side to resort to their immediate use in moments of acute international tension.

REALITIES OF SOVIET-AMERICAN OVERKILL

I think it is imperative that every American fully understand what our Secretary of Defense has told us. If nuclear war comes—no matter who strikes first—both sides will count their losses in tens of millions of human lives. There is no such condition as true nuclear superiority in the sense that either the United States or Russia could escape mass destruction should it attack the other. Hardened ICBM sites and nuclear-armed submarines have made the so-called counterforce and no cities doctrines obsolete before they were fully expressed.

Even before Mr. McNamara spelled out the Ann Arbor doctrine of a nuclear strike confined to military installations, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee warned that this notion was an empty hope. Said Senator RUSSELL on April 11, 1962:

> There have been some estimates and some so-called mathematical computations of the casualties that would result from a nuclear war under various assumptions, including a positive attempt by the adversaries to limit targeting to military installations and facilities. I have no hesitancy in saying, however, that to me these extrapolations, or projections, or hypotheses are exceedingly unrealistic.

The highly respected Senator from Georgia concluded:

> In my opinion, if nuclear war begins, it will be a war of extermination.

The unprecedented condition of today's strategic military power is this: neither the United States nor the U.S.S.R. can prevent the other from wielding a society-destroying blow, regardless of who attacks first. Offensive military power has been made so varied and strong that all conceivable defensive systems can be overwhelmed or bypassed by the power of offensive nuclear weapons.

Under these conditions, the classic military task of defending the shores of our country can no longer be performed. The present array of military doctrines gives a design for emerging from a nuclear exchange with more missiles than the opponent. But this sort of win would be paralleled by the loss of our society.

The Russians do not have a nuclear capacity equal to ours, but our superiority is largely a meaningless concept in view of their relative parity. In the days when warfare was limited to rifles and cannons and tanks and conventional aircraft, the side with the most weapons and soldiers had a great military advantage. But in today's age, when a nuclear exchange of a few minutes' duration means instant death and indescribable devastation to both sides, what consolation is there to the dazed survivors to know that there remains under the poisoned skies somewhere in the rubble some unused overkill capacity?

When asked at the congressional hearings what the military situation would be after a nuclear exchange between Russia and the United States, Secretary McNamara replied:

> This is a question we have considered. And I can't answer it. I think probably the fatalities in Western Europe would approach 90 million, the fatalities in the United States would approach 100 million, and the fatalities in the Soviet Union would approach 100 million.
>
> Now when you consider on the order of 300 million people dead in those areas, it is very difficult to conceive of what kind of military weapons * * * would continue to exist. We have nonetheless faced that issue, and we have systems provided that we believe would survive.
>
> But it exceeds the extent of my imagination to conceive of how those forces might be used and of what benefit they would be to our Nation at that point.

It might be argued by some that our excessive nuclear spending serves an indirect purpose in that it forces the Soviets to strain their less affluent economy to match our effort. But the Russians, from all indications, seem to be avoiding construction of highly sophisticated weapons beyond what they regard as enough to destroy the United States in the event of war.

During the late 1950's when the Soviets could have built hundreds of the latest types of long-range bombers they constructed less than 200 as against our more than 1,600. There is no indication that they intend to try to narrow this gap. At the present time, while we have a capability of a thousand ICBM's—perhaps considerably more—and are building many more, the Russians have built only a minor fraction of that number. Indications are that they will improve and replace rather than greatly increase the number of their missiles.

The question is whether the United States can afford the vast "overkill" capacity which seems to underlie much of our military budget.

I want to make it clear I am not underestimating the enormous nuclear power of the Soviet Union. Certainly they have an overkill capacity.

My own conviction is that we cannot afford this policy of adding to overkill capacity economically, politically, or morally and that if we persist in following it we will weaken our Nation both at home and abroad.

The United States has used its great power in the period since World War II with a sense of responsibility and restraint. We have done a remarkable job of providing a defense shield to war-torn Europe and assisting the rebuilding of that continent, whose welfare is so important to our own. We have shared our human and material resources with the developing countries around the world. We have strengthened the peacekeeping functions of the United Nations. There is no parallel in world history for the generous, farsighted manner in which the United States has provided world leadership and assistance since 1945.

But if our leadership is to remain effective, we must make certain that we do not fall into a rigid pattern that ignores new conditions and new challenges in the world. I submit that the continuing quest for an ever larger measure of nuclear overkill capacity makes no sense in the perspective of today.

No informed person doubts that we have the power to destroy Soviet society several times over, or that they have the capacity to destroy us. One recent study concluded that we could now erase the bulk of the Russian populace more than a thousand times. Even if that estimate is 100 times too high, we would be able to destroy the Soviet Union with only a partial use of our existing weapons.

Before the substantial increases in our military power of the past 2 years, Secretary McNamara testified that "there is no question but that today, our Strategic Retaliatory Forces are fully capable of destroying the Soviet target system, even after absorbing an initial surprise attack."

We have been building missiles, bombs, and other weapons steadily since then so that our capacity to destroy is much greater today than when the Secretary made that statement early in 1962.

Speaking of our present capability, Mr. McNamara said, on February 6 of this year:

> Allowing for losses from an initial enemy attack and attrition en route to target, we calculate that our forces today could still destroy the Soviet Union without any help from the deployed tactical air units or carrier task forces or Thor or Jupiter IRBM's.

Now, Mr. President, I ask what possible advantage there can be to the United States in appropriating additional billions of dollars to build more missiles and bombs when we already have excess capacity to destroy the potential enemy? How many times is it necessary to kill a man or kill a nation?

If the Secretary is correct—and I think his estimates are conservative—that one quick nuclear exchange would now leave 100 million Americans dead, an equal number of Russians, and nearly as many West Europeans, is that not enough to deter anyone other than a madman from setting off such a catastrophe?

And if either side yields to madness or miscalculation, can any number of arms save us?

A PROPOSED ARMS BUDGET ADJUSTMENT

I think we need to take another careful look at our enormous arms budget, asking ourselves: What part of this budget represents additions to an already surplus overkill capacity? What alternative uses can be made of surplus military funds for strengthening the economic and political foundations of our society?

Our highly able Secretary of Defense has effected many needed economies and efficiencies in operation of the Defense Department. For that he should have the gratitude and praise of all. Congress can encourage him to make much larger savings by limiting the further pileup of overkill capacity.

I have pored over the complicated tables and charts of the defense budget for hours. I certainly do not pretend to understand all of the implications. Indeed, the data as made available to Congress in the Defense budget does not enable one to perceive the full functional pattern proposed.

But I am fully convinced that there is enough talent and brainpower among our military and civilian arms experts to eliminate $5 billion of proposed spending that goes beyond our real defense needs.

A front-page story in the Sunday New York Times of June 30 reports:

> The administration is giving serious consideration to ordering the first substantial cutback in the production of atomic weapons since the United States began building up its nuclear arsenal after World War II. Behind the current study is a belief that the United States with an arsenal of tens of thousands of atomic weapons has a sufficient and perhaps an excessive number of nuclear arms to meet its military needs.

The same article reports:

> Rising concern is felt in high administration circles over the multiplying number of warheads that have been assigned to the military forces in the last 5 years. The major fear is that continuing profusion would only increase the chances of accidental explosion or unauthorized use of the weapons.

The Times reported a growing fear of the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that the production of atomic weapons is "coming to be based more on the capabilities of the Atomic Energy Commission to manufacture them than on the actual requirements of the military."

The Atomic Energy Commission now has an annual budget of $1.8 billion to produce new warheads to add to our already enormous stockpile. The Times asserts that at a recent Pentagon press briefing "a highly placed Defense Department official" estimated that it might be desirable to make a $1 billion cut in this expenditure. Another policymaking official said:

> We have tens or hundreds of times more weapons than we would ever drop even in an all-out war, and we have had more than we needed for at least 2 years.

None of the sections in this important news article have been challenged by any administration spokesman so I think it is safe to assume that they are well-grounded.

I believe that, in addition to a cut of $1 billion in the Atomic Energy Commission's weapons procurement program, we could wisely cut an additional $4 billion from the proposed budgets of the Air Force, Navy, and Army without reducing the security of the Nation. Indeed, such reductions could enable us to strengthen our overall national security. Any such substantial cut should, of course, be applied and administered with the expertise of the Secretary of Defense. I will listen thoughtfully to the presentation of our Appropriations Committee and others. I intend to follow the coming debate and discussion with a frank willingness to change my views if there is compelling contrary evidence.

It may be argued that the economy of many of our communities has become so intertwined with military spending that an arms cut of several billion dollars which I have proposed would result in a painful economic dislocation.

It is true that many American communities have come to lean heavily on the economic stimulus of arms production and military installations. We need to accelerate and expand our efforts on the Federal, State, and local level to prepare these communities for a conversion to a more permanent economy appropriate to the conditions of peace.

Competence for converting from a military to a civilian economy is a basic requirement for the economic and political security of the United States.

PLANNING THE CONVERSION TO A PEACE ECONOMY

Capability for economic conversion must be developed at all establishments—manufacturing, research, and others—engaged in fulfilling contracts or otherwise working for the Department of Defense or the Atomic Energy Commission.

In order to minimize dislocation; facilitate industrial expansion; reduce regional dependence on single markets; reduce regional dependence on single government markets; and plan for growth in employment, I recommend the following procedure:

First, all establishments that fulfill Defense Department or Atomic Energy Commission work for at least 1 calendar year and whose personnel are 25 percent or more so engaged, should henceforth be required—as a condition of contract fulfillment and acceptable administration—to establish in their managements an operating conversion committee. This committee should actively engage in planning for conversion of the facility from military to civilian work as required in the event of termination, cutbacks, stretchout, or other curtailment of Defense or AEC requirements.

Second, in order to estimate the support that may be required to complement local and regional conversion, an Economic Conversion Commission should be established by the President under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce and including experts from other concerned Government departments. Our Arms Control and Disarmament Agency already has a small but able group of people giving thought to this matter.

The Economic Conversion Commission shall have responsibility for blueprinting appropriate action by departments and agencies of the Federal Government that are required to facilitate conversion from a military to a civilian economy.

In addition to such activities as it should deem necessary, the Commission would prepare schedules of possible private and public investment patterns and the employment and income effects to be expected therefrom. The information would be reported to the President and to the Congress in preliminary form within 6 months after the enactment of authorizing legislation and in final form within 12 months.

The Commission would take counsel with the Governors of all States to encourage appropriate and timely studies and conferences by the States in support of conversion from a military to a civilian economy.

Third, the Commission would, within 12 months of establishment, convene a National Conference on Economic Conversion and Growth to focus nationwide attention on the problems of conversion and economic growth and to encourage appropriate study and organization in all relevant parts of the Nation's economy. This conference should include invited representatives of trade associations, trade unions, professional societies, representatives of appropriate agencies of the Federal and State Governments, and selected individuals with specialized knowledge.

Through intelligent planning we can make a satisfactory transition to an economy less dependent upon arms spending.

WEAKNESSES IN AN ARMS ECONOMY

A closer look at our present level of arms spending will show that it is not an unmixed blessing now as a stimulus to our economy.

First of all, we have distorted our economy in allocating such a high percentage of our highly trained manpower, research, and technology to weapons production at the expense of our other industry. Japan and our West European Allies have all modernized their civilian industrial plants at a much higher rate than the United States, largely because of our concentration on arms production. This has added to our civilian production costs, decreased our efficiency, undercut our competitive position in international trade, and aggravated the balance-of-payments problem.

American machine tool production was once the envy of the world, but today we have slipped to fourth or fifth rank among the nations. Our best scientific and technical competence is going into arms, not to the modernization of our civilian plant.

Building weapons is a seriously limited device for building the economy—partly because it cannot be counted upon as a permanent system and partly because a military item leads to no further production; it is an end in itself. Disarmament chief William C. Foster said recently that "defense spending of the type we now have has no intrinsic merit in terms of its ability to create production and income as compared to other forms of demand."

Many U.S. industries are losing their capacity to compete not only in world trade but also in the United States. The concentration of capital and technical skill in arms production is a basic cause of our declining competitive ability.

As matters now stand, the U.S. Government is financing 65 percent of all research and development, and most of that is for military purposes. In Germany, by contrast, 85 percent of research is privately financed, and nearly all of it is being used to modernize civilian industries which compete with ours. Those who view military spending as an unmixed blessing to our economy should take a look at the gleaming up-to-date civilian plants in Germany, Belgium, Holland, Italy, and Japan—plants that are surpassing our own neglected civilian production in both quality and low-cost operation. Where will this kind of imbalance leave us in the toughening competition of international trade?

The U.S. economy is jeopardized further by the flow of our gold overseas and the undermining of the dollar as a unit of international exchange. Today, we have a favorable trade balance, but because of our military investments overseas and the flight of investment capital we are suffering an unfavorable balance of payments. Heavy arms spending has aggravated a U.S. fiscal situation that has led many American investors to seek more attractive oversea outlets for their capital.

Our traditionally strong currency has been a powerful instrument in American economic and political leadership in the world. But the strain imposed on our gold reserves as a result of heavy military commitments abroad and excessive arms spending at home is a threat to our international position. The loss of American gold can be halted by reducing some of the burden we have been carrying for the defense of now prosperous allies and by encouraging the conversion of foreign claims on our gold into investments to modernize our industrial system.

While retaining our massive military power, the overriding present need of American security is prompt reinforcement of the economic and political aspects of security at home and abroad.

THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX AND AMERICAN LIFE

It is admittedly difficult to calculate the impact of the arms budget on our civilian economy. It is even more difficult to measure the impact of what former President Eisenhower called "the military-industrial complex" on our moral strength and the climate of freedom. Americans have always feared that any trend toward militarism was a threat to the quality of our democracy. I believe that this is still a legitimate concern. Mr. Eisenhower, whose life has been devoted to military matters, was so concerned about the growing impact of the military-industrial combination on American institutions that he devoted his farewell address to this danger. "We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes," he warned.

Democracy is based on a fundamental respect for the dignity and worth of human life. Its great strength is that it opens the way for the full flowering of man's intellectual, moral, and cultural development.

When a major percentage of the public resources of our society is devoted to the accumulation of devastating weapons of war, the spirit of democracy suffers. When our laboratories and our universities and our scientists and our youth are caught up in war preparations, the spirit of freeman is hampered.

America must, of course, maintain a fully adequate military defense. But we have a rich heritage and a glorious future that are too precious to risk in an arms race that goes beyond any reasonable criteria of need.

We need to remind ourselves that we have sources of strength, of prestige, and international leadership based on other than nuclear bombs.

Conversely, we need to remember that the greatest Communist victories, including the Chinese Communist takeover, came at the moment of our greatest nuclear superiority.

The global contest raging before our eyes today will doubtless continue for as long as we can see into the future, but it need not, indeed cannot, be settled by nuclear warfare.

The United States must be prepared to lead that contest into areas that draw on our true sources of greatness—politics, economics, and morality. There is a growing indication that the course we follow may play a major part in determining the course which our adversaries take for good or ill.

The self-defeating nature of the arms race is that each side reacts to the other's moves in a constantly rising scale of armaments. In his congressional testimony earlier this year, Secretary McNamara explained how the United States tries to evaluate expected Soviet arms moves so that we can plan to counter their efforts by moves of our own. "We are, in effect," said the Secretary, "attempting to anticipate production and deployment decisions which our opponents themselves may not yet have made."

Is it not reasonable to assume that, just as we attempt to counter arms moves by the Soviets, so do they try to gear their efforts to counter ours? Could we not then well afford to make a serious effort to put the arms race in reverse by carefully calculated moves designed to shift the competition with Russia away from arms spending into more peaceful pursuits.

OUR UNMET PUBLIC NEEDS: AN ALTERNATIVE TO OVERKILL

We have millions of idle youth who could be employed in existing job vacancies if only they had sufficient training and education. A sizable proportion of these are Negroes and their idleness is at the base of the explosive civil rights crisis now convulsing the Nation. What better use could we make of some of our excess military spending than to divert it to an expanded program of vocational and technical training?

Our civil rights problems require for their solution a major expansion of employment opportunity. The economically depressed regions of the country require fresh capital and technical talent. Both these basic problems of economic development require sizable productive investment.

We have an urgent need for more classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and capable teachers.

We have millions of citizens, particularly among our older people, who need more adequate hospital and nursing home care.

Some of our present defense installations might in the future be converted into vocational schools, community colleges, or health centers.

We have rivers and streams to be saved from pollution and waste—a task calling for considerable engineering and technical manpower.

We have a growing number of farm youth who can no longer make an adequate living on the farm, whose lives would be enriched by an expanded rural area development effort.

And for years to come there will be hungry, afflicted people abroad who look to us for help. As the former director of our Nation's food for peace program, I came to a keen realization that most of the people of the world are undernourished rural families who are trying to scratch an existence from the soil by incredibly primitive methods.

We have an opportunity with our amazing agricultural know-how to use an increased volume of farm products and agricultural assistance as development tools abroad. The recent World Food Congress held in Washington underscored the fact that mankind now has the scientific capacity to eliminate hunger from the world.

I think that we should seriously consider diverting $5 billion of our arms budget into the kind of worthwhile programs at home and abroad which I have just sketched. Perhaps some of the military reductions should be expressed in tax reduction. This move would not only result in a stronger and better America, but it might invite a constructive response from the Soviet Union. The Soviets have more to gain than we from a reduction of military spending. They have deprived themselves of the appliances, automobiles, attractive clothing, and personal comforts which we take for granted.

The cold war is now showing some signs of a possible limited thaw. In his inspired address to the Nation last Friday evening, President Kennedy described in cautious but hopeful terms the larger meaning of the proposed nuclear test ban as a first important step to peace. I trust that after careful consideration the Senate will lend its support to this initiative for peace.

As we weigh the proposed test-ban agreement, we can usefully take into account three factors that I have discussed today.

First, when both sides already possess overkill capacity, that lessens the temptation for either side to break the test ban.

Second, some Americans may wonder if the next steps, after a test-ban agreement, might not mean declining military spending and a sag in our economy. I am confident that practical steps which I have outlined for preparing and supporting economic conversion will reassure our people on this count.

Third, the test-ban agreement can lead to savings of many millions of dollars from the funds hitherto used for large-scale testing.

There are hopeful signs other than the proposed test ban. The myth of a solidly united, monolithic Communist bloc was long ago thrown in doubt by Tito. But how much more significant is the mounting evidence of a major convulsion of the Sino-Soviet bloc. We should watch these new developments with caution, knowing well that while Communist powers may differ with each other, they continue to follow a tyrannical system that is alien to American democracy.

But we must also keep free from a rigid diplomacy or excessive reliance on arms that might jeopardize our capacity to exploit for peace these fast-developing changes in the international climate.

Thirteen years ago, the late Senator Brien McMahon, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, made two memorable addresses from the floor of the Senate. The Connecticut Senator warned that a continuance of the arms race would lead sooner or later to catastrophe, and in any event would induce a climate of fear and a Government-controlled allocation of resources that would dry up the wellsprings of American freedom and dignity. The Senator concluded, on March 1, 1950, with this warning:

> Mr. President, the clock is ticking, ticking, and with each swing of the pendulum the time to save civilization grows shorter. When shall we get about this business? Now, or when Russia and the United States glower at one another from atop competing stacks of hydrogen bombs?

We have arrived at the point in history where we indeed "glower at one another from atop competing stacks of hydrogen bombs." And if the present trend continues, in a few short years, a half dozen, and then a dozen, new powers will climb atop their hydrogen stockpiles to glower at their frightened neighbors.

The clock which Senator McMahon heard ticking 13 years ago is still ticking, but our ears have become so accustomed to the sound that we scarcely hear it. Yet, scientists of our day flatly assert that if we do not reverse the arms race, a major nuclear accident will occur before this decade ends even without the intent of the nuclear powers. And how can we rest secure knowing that any one of three, six or a dozen national defense ministries or subordinate military officers could set off a nuclear holocaust through miscalculation, impulsive madness, or simply human wickedness.

There are powerful options of peace as well as options of war. Still alive in the world is a faith that can move mountains if we will only seize upon it. From our own heritage the philosophy of Jefferson and Lincoln speaks with a voice that is more effectively heard in Asia, Africa, and Latin America than any number of nuclear explosions or moon shots. A conscientious effort on our part to eliminate excessive nuclear stockpiling will give that voice of peace and reason an even clearer tone.

I pray that our country will in every possible way use its unique power and influence on the side of peace. I know that is what President Kennedy and his administration seek. I am sure that is the sense of the Congress and the American people. I even dare to believe that is what Mr. Khrushchev and his people have come to accept as the only condition of their survival.

Both Americans and Russians must make a choice betwen the quick and the dead. Negotiators of the test-ban proposal have cast their lot on the side of hope and life. The further steps to peace will be torturous and hard, but they lead, however slowly, away from catastrophe toward salvation.

If we hold fast to that course, taking into account the new conditions of American security, generations to come will call us blessed, and, as peacemakers, we shall know the Scriptural promise:

> The Lord will give strength unto his people; the Lord will bless his people with peace.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I have had the advantage of reading the address delivered by the scholarly junior Senator from South Dakota, this privilege having been given to me last night.

Mr. President, the scholarly junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] certainly has focused attention on the realities of our times. He has placed in perspective aspects of American security which are timely, thought-provoking, and, in my opinion, valid. I congratulate Senator McGovern and assure him that I consider his position to be logical. It is a privilege to associate myself with his cogent and rational remarks.

Is there competent refutation of the Senator's suggestion that "the United States now has a stockpile of nuclear weapons in excess of any conceivable need?" If so, the picture should be clarified for those of us who hold the view that our country's present nuclear warhead stocks include a substantial "overkill" capacity.

The Senator from South Dakota has correctly stated that "present levels of military spending and military foreign aid are distorting our economy, wasting our human resources, and restricting our leadership in the world." And he has said with insight that "diverting some of our present and proposed military spending to constructive investments both at home and abroad will produce a stronger and more effective America, improve the quality of our lives, and strengthen the foundations of peace." Perhaps there is a difference in degree between the views of the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from West Virginia, now speaking, on the extent and the nature of our investments abroad. I would have no reservations, however, about diverting considerable present and proposed military spending to constructive investments here at home.

It is my conviction that the security of our country rests on economic and political, as well as military competence. Unsurpassed military power in combination with areas of grave economic weakness is not a manifestation of sound security policy. The net result can be domestic and international political weakness.

Let us not overlook the fact that the population census of 1960 disclosed that 38 million Americans were living in poverty on incomes of $1,000 per year per family, or less. This means that 20 to 25 percent of our citizens are without acceptable consumer buying power in this country; it means deficient education—insufficient skills—inadequate nutrition—substandard housing—and a less than adequate quality of medical care. Another result is a rising proportion of rejects from the Selective Service System because of literacy defects. For too many citizens it means erosion of hope for a decent life and a meaningful future.

The wasting of human capabilities represents a depletion of the basic resource of our Nation. This spells insecurity at home and an unacceptable society for emulation abroad.

The States of the Appalachian region include major areas—numerous in West Virginia—that are in urgent need of economic development. The time has come—in truth it is overdue—to regard this as part of the priority agenda for our Nation's security.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from South Dakota has handled the current defense assumptions phase of his presentation with skill. He has set forth with clarity the stresses of the Soviet-American "overkill." In his discussion of "a proposed arms budget adjustment," the Senator from South Dakota expressed confidence that "there is enough talent and brainpower among our military and civilian arms experts to eliminate $5 billion of proposed spending that goes beyond our defense needs." I share his confidence in this respect, and I agree with his observation that the careful pruning of upward to $5 billion of excess from the defense budget "could enable us to strengthen our overall national security." There must be capable planning for conversion to a peace economy even in this so-called period of peace, and the Senator's recommendations in this area are commendable. There are weaknesses in an arms procurement dominated economy. Surely the military-industrial complex does need to be brought into perspective sufficiently to remind us that we have "sources of strength, of prestige and international leadership based on other than nuclear bombs." We do have the numerous unmet public needs so carefully delineated in the Senator's forthright speech. The giving of substance to these unfilled public needs is certainly a laudable and logical alternative to budgeting and wastefully spending our resources on "overkill" capacity.

If we wonder out loud about this "overkill" and ask the pertinent question posed by Senator McGovern, we are not alone in being of inquiring nature concerning the defense budget. In fact, we are really expanding on a significant comment by the President of the United States at the 50th anniversary dinner of the Department of Labor. The President said:

> I don't know why it is that expenditures which deal with the enforcement of the minimum wage, that deal with the problem of school dropouts, of retraining workers, of unskilled labor—all the problems that are so much with us in the 1960's—why they are always regarded as the waste in budget, and the expenditures for defense are always regarded as the untouchable items of the budget.

Mr. President, I share the attitude of discerning citizens who desire that this country be prepared to defend itself—that we have a defense force second to none. But my response is in the affirmative to our colleague's inquiry if the time has come "to question the assumption that we are adding to defense and security by adding more and more to the nuclear stockpile."

In fact, in my travels and in meeting with numerous and varied groups, I have detected a common denominator in a new note of seriousness and gravity of purpose. It is doubtless related to some extent to the generally somber atmosphere of world affairs and the crossroads at which we find ourselves today. Yet this feeling is not solely in response to any temporary emergency.

It stems from the growing awareness of the need for reappraisal in all sectors of our society, and certainly for reevaluations of many policies and practices of government. It is as though we know that we are approaching—or have already reached—one of the great watersheds of history, and that it is now time for us to take stock of ourselves, to reexamine our basic assumptions, and clearly to define our individual and—perhaps more important—our national goals.

I thank the Senator from South Dakota. I am most grateful for his presentation in this form.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I should like to express my thanks to the Senator from West Virginia for what he has said this afternoon. I think any one of us who launches into a subject as complex as our defense budget does so with a certain amount of hesitation, because admittedly it is a difficult area for us to appraise and understand. So, Mr. President, the support of the Senator from West Virginia, who long has had great interest in and concern with the defense of our country, is certainly reassuring to me, for he speaks with unique appreciation of one of the basic points which I am trying to make; namely, that the overall strength of our society depends not only on the condition of our armaments, but also on the health of our economy.

The Senator from West Virginia has been a leader in the Congress in working for a healthier and a stronger economy for his State and for the entire Nation. Therefore, Mr. President, I especially appreciate his remarks, and I thank him for them.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield briefly to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Nelson in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Unlike the Senator from West Virginia, I have not had an opportunity to read—I want both to read it and to study it carefully—the address which my good friend, the Senator from South Dakota, is now making.

Unfortunately, I have an appointment which will take me out of town, and at this point I shall have to leave the Chamber. But I wish to say I am taking his speech with me; and, judging from what I have heard so far, I certainly want to commend the Senator from South Dakota for his courage in attacking this very complex subject. I thoroughly agree that our military budget needs most careful scrutiny on the floor of the Senate, and that in former years it has not received that scrutiny.

I myself expect to have something to say on the matter at a later date. Meanwhile, I thank my friend for yielding to me; and again I congratulate him.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his generous and helpful remarks.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, may I say that the junior Senator from South Dakota is today rendering our Nation a real and needful public service.

For nearly 5 years I have been serving on the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and I am presently a member of the Armed Services Committee. As a member of those committees, I have also been attending the preparedness hearings which now are in progress, and this afternoon I shall continue to attend them. What the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota is saying confirms what we are learning through our efforts and our studies.

Throughout the latter 2 years of the Eisenhower administration, I supported practically in its entirety the defense program of the President. I have done likewise during this administration and shall always vote to maintain the United States as the most powerful Nation that ever existed under the bending sky of God. The Senator from South Dakota has most impressively laid the facts before the Senate, before the citizens of his State, and the citizens of every State in the Union. The situation he has discussed is almost self-evident; and I am quite persuaded by what he is saying today. In past years we have appropriated huge sums of money for the defense of our country and for the exploration of outer space, which is interrelated, of course, with our defense program. However, the amount of money requested for the coming fiscal year is so stupendous—for defense alone we are asked to appropriate the sum of $1 billion for every week in the year—that, led by the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota, I want him to know that the junior Senator from Ohio will be glad to be a follower in the ranks. We should be thankful to our great leader in the White House that we are about to take that hopeful first step toward peace and that perhaps the necessity for these stupendous appropriations will not be as real in the future.

I am glad to pay my respects to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

He knows, as all the rest of all us do, that the taxpayers are sweating and sweating. Certainly we are overspending, as he is pointing out, in the space and defense effort; and I know that later on he and other Senators will take a sharp look at these expenditures and also at those for the foreign assistance program.

During the Eisenhower administration, the program was called mutual security. I feel that the people of our country should be thankful that the present administration has been absolutely honest and is calling the program by its proper connotation—"foreign assistance"—instead of "mutual security."

There is promise of a breakthrough which would eventually save the taxpayers of our country billions of dollars. From what the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has said, we know that this can be done. I shall fight alongside or behind him later in this session when he takes further leadership, as he has taken leadership today, in reappraising in a realistic manner the appropriations for our Armed Forces and the appropriations requested for the space program.

As stated at the outset, an opportunity is being presented by the distinguished Senator. He is rendering a real and needful service to the people of the United States. His constituents in that great State of South Dakota have every reason to be proud and glad that they sent GEORGE MCGOVERN to the Senate. I congratulate him indeed for what he is doing today.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I certainly wish to express my gratitude to the Senator from Ohio for his very inspiring and helpful remarks. What he has said comes with particular cogency, not merely because of his background, experience, and knowledge as a member of those committees that are charged particularly with the defense of our country, but also because he himself has been a soldier in time of war. I cannot think of anyone whom I would rather have by my side as a friend, either in peacetime or wartime, than the Senator from Ohio. So I am deeply grateful for what he has said.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, first of all I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for his challenging address, for the forthrightness and courage of his remarks, and for the provocative nature of his discussion. The Senator from South Dakota is one of our most gifted Members. When he speaks in the Senate on matters of high public policy, everyone should give serious thought to his utterances.

I know him to be a scholar and a great student of history and of current political, social, and economic events.

I also commend the Senator on his support of the nuclear test ban treaty, which, as he has indicated, is a significant step forward in the process of securing a just and enduring peace. As the Senator has so well noted and documented in his remarks, peace is a process, which requires constant effort, endless patience, and resolute purpose.

The nuclear test ban agreement, which has been initialed in Moscow, and is to be signed by the Secretary of State, and then brought to this body for debate and, I trust, overwhelming ratification by the Senate, represents initiative by the United States in the cause of peace.

How refreshing and encouraging it is to note that our President, our Government, and Members of Congress have urged repeatedly that we have the fortitude and courage and sense of confidence and justice to proceed with these negotiations in an effort to find the path to peace. The President of the United States, in his address at American University, offered to the world a formula for peace, just as he had before the United Nations in September of 1961, in a speech which has become known as the address on the peace race. Every American ought to read that speech.

I am hopeful that in this year, 1963, the President of the United States will once again go to the United Nations General Assembly and outline step by step the program that America places before the world to reduce the unbelievable burden of arms, and to bring about steps and processes which can lend themselves to peaceful settlements of disputes and to a more peaceful world.

I am sure the Senator would be interested in an article which was brought to my attention not long ago. The article reminds us of the incredible cost of military budgets. It reads:

> ARMS RACE COSTS $14 MILLION HOURLY—UNITED STATES AND SOVIET ACCOUNT FOR 73 PERCENT OF SUM—ARMIES TOTAL 15 MILLION MEN
>
> WASHINGTON, February 25.—The world is spending $14 million an hour—on arms and armies.
>
> The United States and the Soviet Union together spend about 73 percent of the total—$88 billion a year.
>
> The cost of the arms race is about $40 a year for each man, woman, and child now living.
>
> If the world were to pool this money for peaceful purposes, the average annual cash income of 1,200 million people who make less than $100 a year could be more than doubled.
>
> Adequate housing could be provided for 240 million families in underdeveloped nations. In some places houses are being built for as little as $375 to $500 each. The money goes for material only.
>
> The hungry among the world's 3 billion people could be fed, the sick provided with medical care.
>
> WOULD FREE 15 MILLION MEN
>
> An absolute end to the arms race would release the constructive energies of at least 15 million men now in training to kill each other.
>
> This, however, does not tell the whole story. One of the world's rules-of-thumb is that at least four men must labor to keep one soldier armed, fed, and supplied.
>
> Thus, an end to the arms race would enable 75 million men to turn to peaceful tasks.
>
> An uncounted number of scientists, now bending their brains to bigger and better means of mass destruction, could turn their thoughts to the stars or dig into the secret of life itself.
>
> The United States is spending more on armaments than any other nation—$46 billion a year for missiles, manpower, tanks, guns, ships, atomic explosives, and military aid to allies.
>
> FIFTY-FIVE PERCENT OF BUDGET
>
> That figures out to 55 percent of the Federal Government's total budget. It is roughly 9.2 percent of the United States' gross national product—the value of all goods and services—which is now about $500 billion a year.

Although the arms race is costly, the people of this country are prepared to pay the cost, until we can obtain the conditions and the commitments which will make possible a just and enduring peace.

I noted that the Senator from South Dakota carefully stated that national security and national preparedness are essential even as we seek the peace. To achieve true and lasting peace we must remain sufficiently strong to defend our vital interests and the vital interests of the entire free world.

I wish to thank the Senator once again.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from Minnesota, the distinguished majority whip, for the remarks he has made today with reference to what I have had to say.

In a very real sense the test ban proposal that is about to be signed in Moscow, in which ceremony the Senator from Minnesota will participate, is a monument to him and his leadership. No Senator has worked more diligently or over a longer period time on the banning of nuclear tests than has the Senator from Minnesota. I particularly appreciate what he had to say about my remarks, because I know he places first and foremost, as we all do, the successful negotiation and signing and ratification of the nuclear test ban.

I sincerely hope and pray that nothing I have said today will be interpreted in any way to indicate that I would raise any question about the signing of this all important agreement.

I thank the Senator for his remarks and wish him well as he goes with our colleagues on this important mission.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I wish to join with the distinguished assistant majority leader in extending my compliments to the junior Senator from South Dakota. I think he may have made, this afternoon, the most important address of this session. I wish the Chamber had been filled with Senators. I hope that their absence does not indicate that we have become so far caught up in the tornado of the nuclear arms race, which spirals us ever closer to catastrophe, that the Senator speaks only to the wind. But, no matter, it was a courageous speech which we should take to heart.

I cannot say, nor would the Senator from South Dakota want me to say, on so short an appraisal of his remarks, that I find myself in complete agreement with each proposition he has made. However, the basic issues he has raised have troubled me deeply for a long time. If Napoleon was right when he said, in the age of black gun powder, that war is much too important to be left up to the generals, then how much truer that is today, in this nuclear age, when total war may well mean the extinction of civilization.

Congress must begin to better discharge its responsibility for passing upon the defense budget. We cannot leave it up to the civilians who preside over the Pentagon, to the President himself, or, indeed, to the men in uniform. We want the counsel of the Chiefs of Staff; it will have great influence with us. We want the judgment of the President, who bears the heavy responsibility of being the Commander in Chief. But the Constitution vests in Congress the power to determine the size of our military budget, and I feel we have tended too much to rubberstamp the recommendations that come to us from the Pentagon, without making the kind of critical analysis that the Senator from South Dakota has attempted this afternoon. We cannot any longer shirk this responsibility. The questions the Senator has raised are much too central, much too fundamental to the future of this country and to all civilization, for us to dismiss them lightly.

In saying that, I do not mean to disparage in any way the depth of the President's own commitment to peace, or the great effort he has made to find a way out of mankind's dilemma. He has given us strong leadership. I hope the Senate will respond to that leadership by ratifying the limited nuclear test ban treaty which could be the first step toward a saner and safer world.

Nevertheless, the agenda before Congress, in terms of the future of the defense program is much broader than the issues posed by the test ban treaty. The service rendered by the Senator from South Dakota today is to call our attention to the bigger questions that relate to our national security and the kind of defense program we ought to sustain in the years ahead to give us all possible security and, at the same time, to confine our course to the realities of the nuclear age in which we live.

The Senator from South Dakota has performed a notable service. Now that his speech is in the Record, I hope it will be widely circulated. I hope that every Senator will give it close attention. I hope the press will report it, that the columnists will weigh it, and that the American people themselves may have an opportunity to assess it. I am proud that the Senator from South Dakota, who comes so recently to this body, has dared to look a sacred cow in the teeth.

Now others must begin to look too. He is to be commended for his courage.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I should like to join the Senators who have preceded me in making a brief observation about the speech of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern]. I join in commending him for a thoughtful and penetrating analysis and evaluation of the all-consuming issue of our time.

The Senator from South Dakota came to the Senate with a long and distinguished record as a bomber pilot in the Second World War; as a distinguished professor; and as a Director of Food for Peace. He is using his considerable talents in making a fruitful contribution to the discussion of the issues that face our country.

Ever since World War II, unfortunately, it seems to me that the central core of the discussion of America's role in the world has revolved around the military-scientific viewpoint. It ought to be understood by the public and by Members of Congress that the military-scientific complex is but a piece of the total reality; that the total reality in the world involves considerations of politics, religion, sociology, economics, and philosophy; and that the role to be played by Congress in the evaluation of the military budget involves a much broader role than merely consideration of military and scientific matters. This issue must be discussed as part of the total picture. The responsibility of the military is much narrower.

The finest part of the contribution made by the Senator from South Dakota was to call to the attention of the public and Congress much broader aspects of the total picture than have been given consideration in the past.

Since January, I have been engaged in a series of discussions, conferences, and luncheons, with the Senator from South Dakota about the very issues he discussed today.

I have been pleased and it has been helpful to me to have the benefit of his thoughtful ideas. I wish to say to the Senator from South Dakota that in a few days I intend to join in the debate on the issue which has been discussed today by the Senator. I shall do so in the hope that I may be able to make a modest contribution to a broader discussion of the issues at stake today in the world.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Minnesota very much.

Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in paying high compliments to the Senator from South Dakota for his notable speech this afternoon. I am familiar with its contents, and I associate myself with them.

I say to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] that it is a matter of great gratification to those of us in the Senate who for some years have been battling for a frontal attack on the problem of American military aid, to find in the new group of Senators men such as the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Wisconsin, who are giving to us a new and fresh point of view in regard to this very old and troublesome question.

Later this afternoon I shall speak at some length in regard to the problem of military aid. I have just returned from Peru, where I represented the President as his Special Ambassador at the inauguration of the new President of Peru. I was there for 5 days, and had an opportunity to speak with representatives of a good many Latin American countries, as well as with the U.S. Government representatives connected with our various foreign service programs abroad. I also had an opportunity to carry on a considerable number of conversations with American business groups in Peru.

I have come back more determined than ever before to press the fight I have been making in the Senate for a cutback in our military aid, not only in Latin America, but around the world, because in my judgment it is a shocking waste—to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars—of the American taxpayers' money.

We shall have a stronger security program if we spend less, and if we face the fact that, after all, much of the military aid—for which we are spending huge sums of money—would be of no help whatever to us in time of war, for this military aid pertains to a military situation in the world that now is passé; all it is doing in many particulars is maintaining in certain countries a status on the part of the military class. But it is doing irreparable damage to the prestige of the United States, for we cannot reconcile these millions of dollars of military aid with the needs of the mass of the people in these parts of the world, that have to be won over to freedom. We should be spending the money for bread, rather than for military aid.

So I am very glad the Senator from South Dakota has, in his eloquent and magnificent way, taken the floor of the Senate this afternoon really as a great teacher, for we are talking about an educational problem. We must teach the American people the facts in regard to the matter of military aid; and next week I intend to discuss—within the restrictions of secrecy—some of the things the Comptroller General has been advising us as our officer—for he is a congressional officer—concerning the shocking waste that exists around the world in connection with American military equipment, for which the American taxpayers have been paying, to their great detriment.

So, Mr. President, I shall close these comments now—to pick them up again later this afternoon. But I wish to go on record now—at the earliest possible moment—to compliment the Senator from South Dakota and to thank him for the great assistance he is giving to the cause for which we have been fighting for some time, here in the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin spoke about his intention to discuss this matter next week or later. I want to assure the Senator from Wisconsin that I am going to give him an opportunity to discuss it in connection with a series of Morse amendments to the foreign aid bill, for these Morse amendments, which will be offered country by country, for the time has come to name them, although the State Department does not want them named. I am going to give the Senator from Wisconsin and all other Senators an opportunity to stand up and be counted on the question of making reductions in military aid in country after country. If we reduce that aid, we increase the chances of peace in the world, and, in my judgment, we thus perform a great service to our Government's foreign aid program.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to take a moment to ask the majority leader if he will give the Senate some indication of the program for next week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As the distinguished Senator from Minnesota knows, when the Senate completes its business today, it will adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The pending business is Calendar No. 358, H.R. 5888, the appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

Following that, next week, the Senate will take up at appropriate times the NASA authorization bill, which I understand has been reported; Calendar 357, the so-called Domestic Peace Corps bill, or National Service Corps bill; the bracero bill, which I understand the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported yesterday, this time with a full quorum present in person; and the military pay bill.

So while the Senate will adjourn from today until Tuesday, I urge Senators to be on hand for the remainder of next week, because there will be important proposed legislation to consider, and there will be votes beginning on Tuesday.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the majority leader.

THE LATIN AMERICAN COMMON MARKET

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to commend to my colleagues an article excerpted from Latin American Business Highlights, a quarterly publication of the Chase Manhattan Bank. This article points out another important step that is being taken in the Central American program of economic integration—the establishment of a Central American Common Market. This organization came into being in slow stages, over a period of 12 years; and its progress has not been easy. But today there are five countries participating—Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua. In a relatively short time, this group has accomplished the elimination of trade barriers from about half the trade of member countries, with more to be freed by 1965 or sooner; the standardization of external tariffs on over 80 percent of all commodities; the beginning of a regional development bank; and machinery for resolving disputes arising among members of the new union.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the rewards to be reaped from such a union. The difficulties are many and varied, to be sure, and growth will be hampered by the necessity to develop transportation, power, and education; but the economic pattern has been cut efficiently, and I am confident that this organization will follow it to economic prosperity.

I ask unanimous consent that the article "The Central American Common Market and Country Highlights—Central America," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CENTRAL AMERICAN COMMON MARKET AND COUNTRY HIGHLIGHTS—CENTRAL AMERICA

THE CENTRAL AMERICAN COMMON MARKET

The signing this summer by Costa Rica of the General Treaty for Central American Economic Integration marks another important step in the development of the Central American program of economic integration (CAPEI)—the so-called Central American Common Market. This brought the membership to five countries: Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua.

In the few years since its beginning the Central American Common Market has accomplished the elimination of trade barriers on about half the trade of member countries, with more to be freed by 1965 or sooner; the standardization of external tariffs on over 80 percent of all commodities; the beginning of a regional development bank; and machinery for resolving disputes arising among members of the new union.

Untangling the treaties

This substantial accomplishment is the result of numerous treaties, agreements and protocols signed during the past 4 years. Although the most recent and important of these documents is the General Treaty on Central American Integration, it is helpful to review some of its precursors—not merely for historical interest, but because the general treaty contains, or refers to, much that went into earlier accords.

The first major step toward Central American integration came in June 1951 at the yearly meeting of the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America. At that time, and at the request of the Central American representatives, the Central American Economic Cooperation Committee was set up to study the problems of economic union. It held its first meeting in 1952.

Over the next 6 years the Committee hammered out two draft treaties, one dealing with elimination of internal customs barriers and setting up common external tariffs, and the other defining the so-called integration industries. These drafts, with some revisions, were signed by the presidents of the five countries on June 10, 1958.

The first of these was the multilateral treaty, which provides for setting up a customs union among the five countries and defines a unified customs nomenclature for the area. It listed some 200 commodities of which the import and export duties between the member countries were to be eliminated. The expressed intention was that this list should be expanded by later agreements.

The second of the 1958 agreements was the agreement on the regime for Central American integration industries, designed to encourage new industries—as well as promote expansion of existing industries—in the area. The Central American Industrial Integration Commission, which was set up to administer the program, was empowered to designate as integrated those industries which require access to the whole Central American market in order to operate under reasonably economic and competitive conditions. These industries are given special concessions such as freedom from tariffs within the area, preferential outside tariff protection, tax exemptions or reductions, and preferences in government purchases.

At its sixth session in 1959, the Central American Cooperation Committee proposed a treaty to deal more thoroughly than earlier treaties with establishing uniform external tariffs for the Central American Common Market. And in September, the five countries signed the Central American agreement of equalization of import duties and charges.

This treaty provided for immediate equalization of external duties on 272 tariff items, with further items to be added. The main purpose was to set up a unified Central American tariff consistent with the integration and economic development requirements of Central America. This treaty was later incorporated into the General Treaty. Other protocols, which increased the number of items on the schedules, were added later.

During 1960, representatives of Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras met with the aim of speeding up the process of economic integration and increasing trade in goods produced within the region. These meetings resulted in the tripartite treaty for economic association.

The most important aspect of the treaty is that it applied immediate free trade among the three countries to all products originating among them, excepting only 56 commodities designated in a special annex. Under the provisions of this annex, trade in most of the 56 commodities was to be free within 5 years or less. The treaty also called for full unification of external tariffs within 5 years and looked to a customs union with complete freedom of trade.

The general treaty

The main difficulty with the tripartite treaty was that it had only three signatories. Therefore, in April of 1960, the Economic Cooperation Committee held a special meeting at which all five countries were represented. At this meeting the Secretariat of ECLA was authorized to prepare a draft treaty of accelerated economic integration, along the lines of the tripartite treaty, but also including the integration industries program. This led to the preparation and adoption of the General Treaty on Central American Economic Integration. Under this treaty, signed in December of 1960, the member nations agreed to bring a Central American free trade area into full operation within a period of 5 years and to adopt common tariffs on goods from other countries. It eliminated tariffs and quotas on all but a small number of items produced in the member countries.

The general administration of the Central American Common Market laid out in the general treaty, with headquarters in Guatemala City, involves three administrative groups:

1. The Central American Economic Council, which will direct and coordinate economic integration. Members are the ministers of economy of the respective signatory countries.

2. The Executive Council, which is charged with the administration of the General Treaty and is composed of a delegate and an alternate from each member country.

3. The Permanent Secretariat, which has juridical responsibility to serve both the Economic and Executive Councils. The Secretary General of the Secretariat will be elected for a 3-year term by the members of the Economic Council.

A new bank

At the same meeting at which the general treaty was signed, the agreement establishing the Central American Bank for Economic Integration was also signed. The bank, with headquarters at Tegucigalpa, Honduras, came into existence in May of 1961. Its main function is to help finance economic growth on a regional basis. The bank's initial authorized capital was $16 million: $4 million each from the original four member states. The AID, in addition to earlier grants totaling $3 million, recently announced a loan of $5 million to the CABEI. So far the bank has authorized credits worth nearly $3 million to finance plants to manufacture such products as metal tubing, insulated wire, and processed meat.

Although all Central American countries were eligible to become members of the bank, they could not obtain loans or guarantees without ratifying the major treaties at the base of the Central American Common Market, that is: the general treaty of 1960; the multilateral treaty of 1958; the agreement on integration industries of 1958; the agreement of equalization of import duties of 1959, and the protocol signed on December 13, 1960.

By July of this year all five countries had signed all these instruments and had become members of the Central American Bank.

What the treaties mean

What this adds up to is the basis for a unified area with common external tariffs and the removal of all trade barriers among the member countries. It will have a common trade policy and monetary, fiscal, and institutional adjustments which will lead to the economic unification of the respective countries.

Although inspired by the highly successful European Common Market, the Central American version is quite different in nature and purpose. The European market is composed of highly industrialized, economically mature nations with a tradition of economic interdependence; and the underlying goal of the EEC is political in nature. On the other hand, the Central American nations have underdeveloped, agricultural economies in which intraregional trade is only a small percent of the total; and the primary goal of unification is economic in character.

Some of these differences can be pointed up with a few figures: the five countries' combined annual output of goods and services is only about 1 percent of that of the EEC; total exports are about 1 percent of the EEC's. Moreover, in contrast to Europe's vast communications and transportation network, Central American internal transportation facilities are restricted to a few major highway segments, short and divided rail lines, a few important air links, and intercoastal shipping. Furthermore, the region has little mineral resources of value and must import most industrial materials.

But the five Central American nations have shown an intense desire to push ahead with a common market despite these difficulties. To be sure, the change will be slow; for the countries must deal with such bottlenecks as transportation, power development, and education. However, the economic framework for integration has been set up in a way that suggests it will become increasingly effective.

A broader market needed

The potential advantages to the Central American nations of a common market are great. Each of the countries are small and the individual markets are not large enough to support rapid industrialization. By uniting into a common market area the Central American countries will have a broader base for industrial expansion. The area as a whole has an estimated population of around 13 million and an area of around 203,000 square miles, about the size of France. Total purchasing power in the area, as measured by the gross national product, was $2.8 billion in 1960, or somewhat less than that of Colombia. Moreover, growth in this market has averaged about 6 percent a year since the early 1950's.

The process of unification will involve investments in expanded and new industries; it has already created a spur for an improved transportation network to weld the market together; and it will aid the process of agricultural diversification and thus help solve one of the serious problems facing most nations of the region.

Indeed, one of the first major problems the area faces is that of increasing intraregional trade and lessening dependence on a very few agricultural exports.

Dependence on farm exports

In the postwar period the five Republics have tended to depend for the bulk of their export earnings on three major commodities: coffee (El Salvador, Guatemala, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and Honduras); cotton (El Salvador and Nicaragua); and bananas (Costa Rica, Guatemala, and Honduras). During the 1950's these commodities provided about 80 percent of total export earnings of the area as a whole.

Although during the earlier postwar years these crops provided adequate income for the area, world oversupplies of these goods in recent years have tended to depress the value of exports. Basic requirements for export diversification are improved transportation and storage facilities, improved technology, and a stronger industrial base that can employ and process the area's farm and forest products. These requirements are much more likely to be met with a common market than under the present system of small divided markets.

Intratrade is small

A major key to the new market's success will be expanded intraregional trade. During 1961, the trade between Central American countries absorbed only about 7 percent of the total imports of the area—area imports were only $37 million of the $483 million import total. However, this percentage is growing. In 1950, intertrade was only $8 million, or about 3 percent of the area's total.

Intratrade now consists mainly of border trade in locally produced consumer goods. Future growth on a large scale will depend on expansion of industrial production—both of completed manufactures and of processed materials produced locally. It is this need for industrialization that is behind the system of integrated industries.

Industrial problems

While each Central American country has some law to encourage private investment, the common market treaties are designed to spur investment in the area as a whole, with particular industries concentrated in each country.

However, there have been fears that the new treaty arrangements would increase rather than diminish the existing inequalities. It was felt that migration of both labor and capital would tend to flow to the already more developed areas at the expense of the others. Despite these difficulties, four industries have been—or are far along toward being—designated as integrated: tires for Guatemala, copper extrusions for El Salvador, sulfuric acid for Honduras, and insecticides for Nicaragua.

Further measures

Other small but significant steps have been taken toward the creation of a common market. These include: an agreement, ratified in April by El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua, to adopt a new monetary unit called the peso centro-americano, to be used in transactions among the member countries; establishment of a Central American clearing house that began operating in October 1961; consideration—but no action as yet—of passport-free travel within the area.

The need for economic integration in Central America has long been recognized. Although earlier efforts have failed, none have had the broad support, or been so carefully planned, as the present one. So long as the nations of this important region continue to cooperate as closely as they now do, the CABEI is likely to grow in importance as a focus of economic development.

COUNTRY HIGHLIGHTS—CENTRAL AMERICA

Costa Rica

Costa Rica's signature on the General Treaty of Central American Economic Integration marks a shift in the nation's policy regarding economic cooperation with the rest of the Central American Republics. In part, the shift was the outcome of the peaceful and decisive presidential election held last February in which the Central American Common Market was one of the campaign issues. Also, there has been growing recognition of the potential gains from economic union and concern over the relatively poor business showing during the previous year.

The balance-of-payments position of the country has improved in the past 6 months. Gold and foreign exchange reserves at the end of July totaled $23.3 million, more than three times their July 1961 level. Betterment came partly from a decline in imports resulting from low levels of economic activity. But coffee exports have also risen. During the first quarter of this year, imports totaled $23.5 million and exports totaled $29.4 million. This surplus of $5.9 million compares with a negligible surplus in the first quarter and a deficit of $11.6 million in fourth quarter 1961.

The Costa Rican Coffee Office estimates the 1961–62 crop at about 1.04 million bags, with some 960,000 exportable bags. This represents an 8-percent drop from the previous year, though actual exports for 1961–62—at about 970,000 bags—will probably exceed those for 1960–61 due to a slight drawdown of coffee stocks. The outlook for the 1962–63 crop is for a possible increase because of more favorable weather during the current flowering period.

Since passage of the industrial encouragement law of 1959, the Government reports that it has signed 52 contracts for new industries or expansion of existing industrial facilities. The Government, with a view to increasing incentives to foreign firms, is contemplating a reorganization of the National Council of Production. The council will promote industries that can qualify as integrated industries within the Central American Common Market.

El Salvador

Economic conditions in El Salvador point to 1962 as a better business year than 1961. The new administration has set up institutions designed to assist industrial and agricultural development and has pursued monetary and fiscal policies that appear to have restored a measure of business confidence.

Gold and foreign exchange holdings at end of June totaled $37.5 million, up $13.7 million from mid-1961. During the same period El Salvador repaid over $9.2 million owed to the IMF. This improvement reflects the increased cotton and coffee exports in the second quarter. Exports for the first half of 1962 came to $89.2 compared with $74.0 million in the same period of 1961. So the trade balance improved despite some rise in imports.

Some of the more important institutions set up by the new administration are:

The Council for Economic Planning and Coordination, which will draw up a development program to be incorporated into the program for Central American economic integration.

The Instituto Salvadoreno de Fomento Industrial, which was reorganized to speed promotion of new industries, provide technical assistance, and obtain or provide industrial credit. For 1962 it has been allocated about $2.6 million for leading purposes.

The Peasant Welfare Administration, which will conduct various research and development projects for the farm sector of the economy.

With its approval of a new rural water facilities program, the AID has financed a total of about $4.3 million worth of projects in 1962.

Guatemala

Depressed coffee prices and political events have contributed to the slackening in the domestic economy. However, the emergence of the Central American Common Market and renewed efforts by the Government to stimulate the economy have tended to increase business confidence.

Foreign trade, which declined in 1961 because of lower coffee prices, has shown signs of picking up as coffee prices increased somewhat during the first part of this year. At the end of June, gold and foreign exchange reserves were $54 million, still below the May 1961 level of $62 million.

The head of the national school building program has stated that 1,000 school buildings will be built during the next 2 years. During the first 4 years of the present administration about 500 schools have been built.

Following the other Central American countries, the Guatemalan Congress recently ratified the investment guarantee agreement with the United States. This agreement permits U.S. citizens to insure new investments in Guatemala against expropriation and convertibility risks.

The Inter-American Development Bank has granted Guatemala a $3.5-million loan from the Social Progress Trust Fund to finance water and drainage projects. Another $5.3 million from the Fund is slated for construction of 5,260 low-income housing units. The 27-year loan, at 1¼ percent interest, will cover almost half the total cost of the $10.7 million project.

Honduras

Steady economic improvement has been evident in Honduras this year. Increased banana exports along with construction activity associated with several loans by international agencies have contributed to this improvement. Also new investments from both internal and external sources are increasing.

Gold and foreign exchange reserves have been moving seasonally upward since the end of last year, though at the end of June they totaled $13.4 million, down some $600,000 from mid-1961. Banana exports have increased, more than offsetting a drop in coffee and lumber sales.

The United Fruit Co. is considering an extensive banana-planting program in order to eventually supplement the Gros Michel—which is highly susceptible to Panama disease—with the disease-resistant Valery strain. Under this program, 5,600 acres would be planted this year with 7,500 acres to be planted in each of the following 4 years. If adopted, this plan would increase production 85 percent by 1966, as well as provide 2,000 new jobs in the north coast, where unemployment remains a problem.

The International Development Association is to provide a credit of $9 million to cover part of the construction costs of the Western Highway and connecting roads and also for the preparation of future investment plans in road construction. The IADB loaned $1 million for a study of the Honduran road and air transport system.

A special mission from the IADB visited Honduras early this year and announced that the Bank will consider financing four projects totaling nearly $15 million. The projects would involve loans of $2.3 million for the construction of low-cost housing, $2.5 million for credit to small farmers, and $8.5 million to the National Development Bank for project loans in agriculture, cattle raising and industry.

Nicaragua

Recent trends point to 1962 as a year of economic growth for Nicaragua. Improvement in the nation's balance-of-payments position and a good crop year have stimulated optimism in business circles.

Gold and foreign exchange reserves have risen steadily and at the end of June stood at $29.1 million, considerably above the June 1961 level of $19.7 million. Growers of most agricultural commodities are optimistic about a good volume of production and foreign sales this year. However, price weaknesses on coffee and other crops may tend to reduce the dollar value of exports from the predicted levels.

New port facilities at Corinto, in use since May, have greatly facilitated the international movement of goods. Three-quarters of the $4.5 million improvement was financed by the World Bank.

Among the most important pieces of legislation passed this year in Nicaragua were six measures raising taxes on income, real estate, personal property, transfers of real estate, inheritances, and stamps required on legal documents.

As part of a Central American plan to develop the tourist trade, the Nicaraguan Government plans to build new hotels in Managua. Granada, and Tipitapa and to improve tourist attractions. These plans call for an expenditure of from $3 to $4 million.

Panama

During 1962 Panama's economy has continued the upturn which became evident in 1961 as agricultural output, the construction industry and tourism have all shown good growth. The National Planning Bureau reported that the gross national product jumped 8 percent in 1961 to $460 million. This gives an average national income of $415 per capita, a gain of 5 percent over 1960.

One result of heavy Government spending has been the further advance of imports, thus enlarging the nation's usual trade deficit. Figures for the first quarter of this year show imports at $33.4 million and exports at $8.5 million. The resulting deficit of $24.9 million compares with $21.9 million for the first quarter 1961. Receipts from the Panama Canal have not been sufficient to offset these deficits in the past few years. While capital inflows have been reasonably high, the major adjustment has been through reduction in the dollar assets of the private foreign banks operating in the country. Since this source has definite limits, other measures to reduce imports, increase exports or to stimulate a larger inflow of private capital will be required.

The United States recently made available to Panama a $9.9 million grant under the Alliance for Progress program. A total of $8.7 million was committed to high priority projects such as school construction, health and sanitation facilities, and aerial surveys.

Other credits to Panama include a $4 million World Bank loan for electric power development, a $2.5 million loan from the AID for low-cost housing and two loans by the Inter-American Development Bank—$2.9 million for agricultural development, and $2.8 million for expanding urban water supply systems.

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the coming debate over whether the Senate should advise and consent to the treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, underwater, and in outer space, it is essential that the fundamental questions relating to this decision be kept in clear and accurate focus.

What are these fundamental questions? As suggested by President Kennedy in his recent address to the Nation in support of the treaty, there are four basic areas of concern.

THE FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS

First, is this treaty a first step toward reduced world tensions and broader areas for agreement? For many years the testing of nuclear weapons—with the resulting contamination of the atmosphere—has represented a constant reminder of antagonisms existing between the Communist and the free world. Three U.S. administrations have doggedly pursued the objective of an enforcible treaty to achieve the cessation of these tests.

After 15 years of effort, such an agreement has now been achieved. It has not been achieved through capitulation or weakness on behalf of the West. To the contrary, it was only after Chairman Khrushchev became convinced of the U.S. determination to defend its vital interests in Berlin and Cuba, that the wisdom of taking the first step toward reduced world tensions became acceptable to the Soviets. It was the United States and Great Britain, not the Soviets, who initiated and sustained the negotiations that eventually brought this treaty into being.

American military strength and national determination were a vital element in securing this long sought objective. Continued strength and determination may—after long and difficult negotiation—produce other areas of mutual agreement. Whether or not additional steps toward peace will be possible depends primarily upon the Soviet Union; nevertheless, the pending treaty represents a step back from the approaching brink of mutual nuclear annihilation. As such, it is a step worth taking.

Second, is this treaty a means of freeing the world from the fears and dangers of radioactive fallout and contamination? Clearly one of the principal benefits of this treaty accruing to mankind everywhere is the gradual reduction of the levels of radioactivity present in our atmosphere, food, water, and bodies. Since the dawn of the atomic age, hundreds of atmospheric tests have radically increased levels of radioactive contamination in many areas of the world. If unrestricted atmospheric testing continued indefinitely, particularly if atomic devices fell into the hands of irresponsible nations, the eventual effect of rising fallout levels on the human race could be catastrophic. The agreement of the three principal nuclear powers to halt atmospheric testing represents a major step toward freeing the world from the grip of nuclear contamination.

Third, does acceptance of this treaty, on balance, strengthen the security of the United States more than an unrestricted continuation of the nuclear arms race? For years the Soviet Union and the United States have been unable to agree on the need for and number of onsite inspections that would be essential to a treaty which included underground tests. This disagreement still exists. But the present treaty specifically exempts underground tests and, moreover, President Kennedy has indicated that the U.S. underground tests would continue and that other testing facilities would be kept on ready-alert. This treaty covers the types of tests which can be detected by scientific instruments outside the borders of the Soviet Union. In short, the number of onsite inspections is not relevant to effective enforcement of this treaty.

The treaty specifically provides for withdrawal by any signatory if "extraordinary events—have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country." Therefore, if it becomes essential for the United States to resume atmospheric testing, it can do so without violating the terms of the treaty. If we have reason to believe the Soviet Union has resumed testing, we would be free to undertake our own program of nuclear tests. Finally, the treaty would be a first and important step toward halting the proliferation of nuclear weapons among other nations.

It is necessary to compare the slight theoretical risk of a future violation of this treaty with the almost certain risks of a continued and unrestricted arms race. On balance, it is clear that the national security interests of the United States are protected far more by adhering to the treaty than by rejecting it.

WIDESPREAD SUPPORT

The overwhelming response of the American people in favor of this treaty is most heartening. Over the past week there have been literally hundreds of favorable editorials appearing in papers from coast to coast.

I shall introduce many of these editorials in the RECORD this afternoon.

On July 8, 1963, the Louis Harris poll reported that 73 percent of the American public supports a limited test-ban agreement and only 17 percent were in outright opposition. This confirms the 77 percent in favor as reported by the Gallup Poll several years ago.

Dozens of the Nation's leading businessmen, religious leaders, scientists, and civic leaders have recently demonstrated their support of the test-ban treaty through newspaper advertisements and official pronouncements. Executives of such companies as Inland Steel, Eastman Kodak, the Pennsylvania Railroad, the R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., the Illinois Central Railroad have publicly endorsed the treaty. The Federation of American Scientists recently issued a statement urging ratification by the Senate. Many individual scientists, including three Nobel laureates, have indicated their support. Clearly there is a large body of informed scientific opinion in favor of the test ban.

The issue of U.S. ratification transcends considerations of party or politics. Republicans and Democrats alike have joined in active support of the treaty. Such Republican statesmen as Ambassador James Wadsworth, former U.S. test-ban negotiator, and former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur Flemming are prominent members of the Eisenhower administration who are urging an overwhelming vote for ratification by the Senate.

WHY A TREATY WAS POSSIBLE

Many reasons can be advanced as to why it was possible to reach agreement with the Soviet Union on a nuclear test ban. I believe the most important reason is the careful, prudent, persistent effort of the United States toward this objective during the past 7 years. What prompted the Soviet Union now to agree to the treaty? It is not my purpose today to examine Soviet motives, but I am convinced that the Soviet Union is serious about this treaty, that it is in the mutual interests of the Soviet Union and the United States to adhere to it, and that the Soviet Union is aware of the international commitment and responsibility included in its provisions.

What is important today is the fact that we have an agreement. It has been carefully negotiated, initialed, and is about to be signed by representatives of the United States, along with those of Great Britain and the Soviet Union. This agreement is the first major breakthrough in the area of arms control since World War II.

As such, it is a first, practical step for the cause of peace and control of the massive weapons of destruction which man has developed.

The Senate soon faces the process of ratifying the nuclear test-ban treaty. A careful and responsible discussion is needed, both for the Senate and for public understanding. I am confident that this treaty—in a sense initiated by the United States—is in the interest of the United States and consistent with our national security policy. And there can be no doubt that this treaty is in the interest of mankind and an imperative for the safety of our children and all future generations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the treaty itself be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I also have had prepared a comprehensive series of questions and answers relating to the treaty, and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD following the text of the treaty itself. In the coming debate on the question of whether the Senate will advise and consent to the treaty banning these tests, I believe it essential that fundamental questions relating to this decision be kept in clear and accurate focus. It is for this reason that these questions and answers are being placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the treaty and the questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF TEST-BAN TREATY INITIATED JULY 25

Following is the text of the test-ban treaty initiated in Moscow July 25:

TITLE

Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons Tests in Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Underwater

PREAMBLE

The Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, hereinafter referred to as the "Original Parties",

Proclaiming as their principal aim the speediest possible achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international control in accordance with the objectives of the United Nations which would put an end to the armaments race and eliminate the incentive to the production and testing of all kinds of weapons, including nuclear weapons,

Seeking to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time, determined to continue negotiations to this end, and desiring to put an end to the contamination of man's environment by radioactive substances.

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

1. Each of the parties to this Treaty undertakes to prohibit, to prevent, and not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion at any place under its jurisdiction or control:

a. in the atmosphere, beyond its limits, including outer space, or underwater, including territorial waters or high seas; or

b. in any other environment if such explosion causes radioactive debris to be present outside the territorial limits of the state under whose jurisdiction or control such explosion is conducted. It is understood in this connection that the provisions of this subparagraph are without prejudice to the conclusion of a treaty resulting in the permanent banning of all nuclear test explosions, including all such explosions underground, the conclusions of which, as the Parties have stated in the preamble to this Treaty, they seek to achieve.

2. Each of the Parties to this Treaty undertakes furthermore to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in, the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, anywhere which would take place in any of the environments described, or have the effect referred to in paragraph 1 of this article.

ARTICLE II

1. Any party may propose amendments to this Treaty. The text of any proposed amendment shall be submitted to the Depository Governments which shall circulate it to all Parties to this Treaty. Thereafter, if requested to do so by one-third or more of the Parties, the Depository Governments shall convene a conference, to which they shall invite all the Parties, to consider such amendment.

2. Any amendment to this Treaty must be approved by a majority of the votes of all the Parties to this Treaty, including the votes of all of the original Parties. The amendment shall enter into force for all Parties upon the deposit of instruments of ratification by a majority of all the Parties, including the instruments of ratification of all the original Parties.

ARTICLE III

1. This Treaty shall be open to all States for signature. Any State which does not sign this Treaty before its entry into force in accordance with paragraph 3 of this article may accede to it at any time.

2. This Treaty shall be subject to ratification by signatory States. Instruments of ratification and instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Governments of the original Parties—the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—which are hereby designated the Depository Governments.

3. This Treaty shall enter into force after its ratification by all the original Parties and the deposit of their instruments of ratification.

4. For States whose instruments of ratification or accession are deposited subsequent

to the entry into force of this Treaty, it shall enter into force on the date of the deposit of their instruments of ratification or accession.

5. The Depository Governments shall promptly inform all signatory and acceding States of the date of each signature, the date of deposit of each instrument of ratification of and accession to this Treaty, the date of its entry into force, and the date of receipt of any requests for conferences or other notices.

6. This Treaty shall be registered by the Depository Governments pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

ARTICLE IV

This Treaty shall be of unlimited duration.

Each Party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from the Treaty if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this Treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other Parties to the treaty three months in advance.

ARTICLE V

This Treaty, of which the English and Russian texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Depository Governments. Duly certified copies of this Treaty shall be transmitted by the Depository Governments to the Governments of the signatory and acceding States.

In witness whereof the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Treaty.

Done in triplicate at Moscow, this ——— day of —————, one thousand nine-hundred and sixty-three.

TEST BAN TREATY—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. What kind of tests are banned by the agreement?

Tests in the atmosphere, underwater, including territorial waters or high seas, and in space are banned, but not underground tests.

2. Why are underground tests not included in the agreement?

This is the most difficult testing environment to police, because it is not always possible to distinguish seismic waves produced by earthquakes from those caused by nuclear explosions. In these cases it is necessary to conduct onsite inspections. This means going directly to the location where the event occurred to determine the cause of the tremor. The Soviet Union will accept only a token number of these inspections. Moreover, the Soviet representatives have refused to discuss ways in which these inspections could be most effectively conducted.

3. Are there any restrictions on underground testing?

Any number, any size, and any type nuclear explosion, for peaceful or military purposes, may be conducted in the underground environment as long as such explosion does not cause radioactive debris to be present outside the territorial limits of the country conducting the explosion. This means that testing of peaceful uses of atomic energy may continue.

This limitation takes into consideration a certain amount of venting of nuclear debris in an underground explosion. It is not unusual for some radioactive material to reach the surface of the earth through cracks or fissures in the ground following a subsurface test. However, such debris generally remains within a local area near the point of detonation. Under the terms of the treaty, there would be no violation of the treaty if venting occurs and the debris remains within national borders.

4. The agreement refers to a ban on underwater tests including territorial waters or high seas. What does this mean?

It means that underwater nuclear explosions cannot be conducted in the oceans up to the shoreline nor can they be conducted in rivers or inland lakes.

5. Is it true that the treaty in no way restricts our use of nuclear weapons in time of war?

Yes. The treaty is designed to limit the testing of nuclear weapons, not their use in time of war.

6. Is any party to the treaty precluded from giving information or technical assistance on nuclear matters to other countries?

The treaty simply prevents signatory states from causing, encouraging, or participating in any way in a nuclear explosion in the three prohibited environments. This does not mean that a party to the treaty could not provide technical assistance and information to another state on nuclear matters. However, if, for example, this same information contributed materially to a programed series of atmospheric tests, it would not be in keeping with the treaty obligations.

7. Does the Soviet Union have a veto power over amendments to the treaty?

The three original parties to the treaty—the United States, United Kingdom, and U.S.S.R. have the power to veto treaty amendments. Any amendments to be adopted must be approved by a majority of all the signatory nations including the affirmative votes of these three nations. Any amendment that varied the rights of the United States under the treaty would, of course, require Senate approval.

8. As a depositary government, would the United States be compelled to recognize all regimes which adhere to the treaty?

No. The fundamental factor in determining recognition is intent. If we do not intend to recognize a regime, the rule of international law is that such an intent cannot be deduced merely because we are party to a multilateral treaty by which the unrecognized regime is also bound. Multilateral treaties often have a great many parties not all of which recognize the governments of all of the others, such as the armistice negotiations in Korea.

9. Is provision made in the treaty for a party to withdraw if it believes its security interests are being threatened?

The treaty does contain a withdrawal clause. This provides that a party can withdraw if it feels that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of the treaty, have jeopardized its supreme interests. The decision as to whether a state's supreme interests were being jeopardized by a test or a series of tests is for that state alone to make. If it believes this to be the case, it gives 3 months' notice of its intention to withdraw. No further obligations are entailed.

The 3-month notice would not apply if the Soviet Union were to test in plain violation of the treaty. In such circumstances we would proceed to test immediately if this was considered necessary.

10. Why is this limited test-ban agreement in our national interest?

There are a number of reasons. This treaty can: Act as a deterrent to the spread of nuclear weapons to many additional countries, thereby lessening the danger of nuclear war; drastically reduce or end the hazards of radioactive fallout; have the practical effect of slowing down the pace of the arms race; be a first step toward reduced world tensions and broader areas of agreement on the control of nuclear weapons.

11. What are the risks of secret testing and sudden withdrawal?

Actually, the danger of clandestine testing in the prohibited environments, the atmosphere, space, and underwater, is minimal. In addition to the fact that we have good verification capabilities in these environments, there would be little value in attempting to carry out types of tests in these environments that could be freely conducted underground.

The risk of a nation suddenly breaking off the treaty and testing is also small. We will maintain on a standby basis those testing facilities affected by the ban. This is a strong deterrent to any nation which might contemplate gaining the upper hand in this way.

12. How do we know if a state violates the agreement?

The system for policing the agreement is really a "reciprocal inspection system"—you police me, I police you. The United States has a national detection network that permits detection and identification of nuclear tests in the atmosphere, underwater, and in space. Since we own and operate our own monitoring system we can make any changes we wish in the system to increase its effectiveness.

13. Is it possible to detect tests if they are conducted in far outer space?

Since fairly large tests can be conducted underground, the primary concern centers on space tests of several megatons or more.

Our verification capability for such tests is good. A 1-megaton test detonated about one million miles from the earth will be picked up by our present national detection system. This ability could be increased to a hundred million miles or more, if necessary, by establishing a satellite detection system around the earth or the sun.

But a party contemplating clandestine tests in space has more to reckon with than the possibilities of being caught. Not only is it an extremely expensive undertaking but it is time consuming. To obtain results from a test millions of miles away could take weeks or months. This is further compounded by any number of technical difficulties that would have to be overcome to gain even limited knowledge from the explosion.

14. The Soviet Union has tested large megaton weapons. We haven't. From a military standpoint, aren't we going into this treaty at a disadvantage?

We have in our stockpile a large number of nuclear weapons with different amounts of explosive power. These can be used for a variety of strategic or tactical purposes. Complementing this is a sophisticated system of delivery vehicles. This mix in our nuclear arsenal permits us to respond in an infinite number of ways to any overt aggressive act.

The possession of 50- to 100-megaton bombs would not increase, to any significant degree, the deterrent we now possess. By choice, we have concentrated on mobile and efficient weapons with, not a large, but rather a sufficient yield. This we have done by choice. Should we wish to possess larger weapons than we now have in our stockpile, this could well be done under the treaty by techniques we have used successfully in the past.

In these circumstances it certainly cannot be said we are at a disadvantage in terms of nuclear weapons development.

15. What about development of an antiballistic missile? Don't we need further tests in the atmosphere to test out this system?

The development of an antiballistic missile is proceeding. However, to date there has been no decision as to whether we should attempt to deploy such a system. In part, this is due to the fact that the effectiveness of the ABM is questionable. Any ABM defense is susceptible to saturation—incoming missiles launched in such quantities as to overwhelm the defensive missiles, or decoys—launching of dummy missiles along with the real McCoy to lead defensive missiles astray. These are real problems. In any case, it is quite unlikely that tests connected with this problem would further materially advance our security.

16. We are evidently ahead of the Soviet Union in the development of tactical nuclear

weapons. Under the terms of this treaty testing can be conducted in the underground environment where such weapons are proven out without violating the treaty. Doesn't this afford the Soviet Union an opportunity to catch up in this important area?

Testing is legal in this environment for the United States, United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R. We can match the U.S.S.R. test for test in this area if need be. But, without such agreement the rate at which the Soviet Union could catch up with us would certainly be greater since in the absence of an agreement it could test in all environments.

17. Suppose France or Communist China tests in the prohibited environments. How would this affect the agreement?

Initially, it is well to recognize that with this treaty in effect, there would certainly be greater pressures on these two countries to desist in any testing program than would exist in the absence of an agreement. But even with continued testing by France or the initiation of tests by Communist China, there are a dozen or so other technically able countries which, in light of this action by the three nuclear powers, may well forego development of an individual nuclear capability. This alone is a significant gain in efforts to halt the spread of nuclear weapons to many countries.

In any event, should a signatory state consider its national security seriously jeopardized by testing by others, it would be free to withdraw from the agreement.

18. Isn't there a real danger that with this agreement in hand we may now feel we can relax our guard against further attempts by the Communists to encroach on free world nations?

This may be the greatest danger we face.

It would be a great mistake to assume that because the Soviet Union is a party to this limited test-ban agreement the millenium has arrived.

The Communists have in no way given up their avowed objective of world domination even though the Soviet Union may use means other than nuclear war to achieve it. While we must continue earnestly to seek further arrangements designed to reduce international tensions and limit and control armaments, we must not so relax our guard as to invite aggression.

19. Does the treaty in any way inhibit the Atomic Energy Commission's plowshare program—the peaceful uses of atomic energy?

AEC officials have said that this agreement will not seriously inhibit their plowshare program.

A few projects may be affected. But most of the experiments—underground excavations, mining and resource development—and certain other experiments in pure science would not be disrupted.

20. What are some of the reasons the Soviet Union might believe this agreement to be in its interest?

Some of the advantages of such an agreement that would accrue to us would accrue to the Soviet Union as well. Continuation of radioactive fallout is, in the long run, as serious a hazard to the Soviet people as it is to Americans. The danger that other countries, some of which may act in an irresponsible fashion, might acquire nuclear weapons poses as great a threat to the security of U.S.S.R. as to the security of the United States.

Then there's the matter of economics. An unrestricted testing program is very costly.

There is reason to believe the Soviet Union is aware of these points, just as there is reason to believe that it sees the agreement serving its interests in the ideological dispute which now plagues the Communist camp.

WIDESPREAD EDITORIAL SUPPORT FOR TEST-BAN TREATY

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a number of articles and editorials—which recently have been appearing in the press—concerning the proposed nuclear test-ban treaty.

As the U.S. delegation embarks for Moscow, to sign the historic treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, underwater, and in outer space, it is reassuring and heartening to note this widespread editorial support for the treaty that has been appearing in all sections of the country.

In his address to the Nation on Friday evening, President Kennedy urged every American to participate in the debate related to whether the Senate will advise and consent to this treaty. I am sure that each one of us recognizes the importance of this debate, and also recognizes that it will be far reaching in its effect upon our Nation in terms of public opinion and public education on the all-important issue of American foreign policy.

The editorial notice accorded the question of treaty ratification demonstrates that this is, indeed, a matter of great concern to a large majority of our citizens. How heartening and refreshing it is, Mr. President, that the American people are demonstrating this keen interest in a matter of such importance, which is so complex and so intricate in its provisions.

As a Senator who has publicly indicated his support for the treaty, it is particularly heartening to read the editoral support coming from such newspapers as the Houston Chronicle, the Dallas Times-Herald, the Little Rock (Ark.) Gazette, the Des Moines Register, the Atlanta Constitution, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, the Denver Post, the New York Journal-American, the Miami News, the Milwaukee Journal, the Portland Oregonian, the Charlotte News, the Salt Lake City Tribune, the Omaha World-Herald, the Greensboro News, the San Francisco Chronicle, the Nashville Tennessean, the Louisville Courier-Journal, and the Dayton Journal Herald—to mention only a few of the hundreds of newspapers throughout America that are editorializing favorably on this most important issue of foreign policy and peace.

These newspapers are only a small percentage of those carrying editorials generally in favor of the test-ban treaty. But this selection serves to indicate the strong support that exists in all sections of the country—North, South, East, West, and the central portions of our Nation—that such support is nonpartisan in nature, that it is voiced by papers of both liberal and conservative persuasions, and that a sensible and realistic appraisal of the treaty exists among these editors.

Let me note briefly certain of the principal themes running through these editorials:

First, that the treaty represents a minimum first step on the road to peace. It does nothing to limit the size or effectiveness of the U.S. Military Establishment; that point needs to be underscored. I can hear the critics of the treaty now saying that it would limit our military effectiveness and national security. Fortunately, thoughtful editors and commentators are setting that bit of fiction at rest.

The editorials continue to point out that the treaty would merely bring about a halt of the unrestricted and unlimited testing of nuclear weapons in the three environments that are noted in the treaty. Furthermore, the treaty does not signal an end to the cold war but, rather, is at least an opening toward further negotiation.

Then the editors note that the increasing danger of radioactive fallout will be controlled. Clearly no American family is immune from the rising dangers of radioactivity resulting from atmospheric tests; therefore, the entire Nation should rejoice at the opportunity to bring such atmospheric testing to a halt.

I paraphrase what editors are saying.

Third, that the technical risks relating to Soviet cheating are far outweighed by the certain grave risks of continuing the testing, development, and proliferation of nuclear weapons. That is, on balance, the security of the United States is protected far more effectively by ratifying the treaty than by not ratifying.

The Senate will weigh these opinions and arguments with care and objectivity in the weeks ahead.

I wish to underscore the importance of a detailed, deliberate, great debate on the entire subject of our relationships with the Soviet Union, and particularly the test-ban treaty. Those persons voicing doubts and reservations about the treaty should be given, and will be given, full and complete opportunity to make their case, first before the Senate committees that will hear the testimony, and particularly the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and then before the Senate itself. But I am confident—and this outpouring of favorable editorials bolsters this confidence—that when all the evidence is in, that when all facts have been carefully weighed, the Senate will vote overwhelmingly in favor of this first small step toward a more peaceful world.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I rise to tell the Senator how pleased I am that once again I follow his leadership. Earlier this afternoon I said that I had no objection to Senators sitting on the sidelines waiting and listening, if they found it was necessary for them to do so, before they made up their minds; but that it was also an hour for advocacy. The President has made the case. The Senator and I serve on the Foreign Relations Committee. We have had the benefit of the briefings on the treaty. I think he will share my view that the case has been made on the merits.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thoroughly agree.

Mr. MORSE. We have the responsibility of being advocates of the treaty because we are convinced that it is in the interest not only of the United States, but also of all mankind. We have a responsibility to the American people to take the facts in support of the treaty to the American people and let them speak to representatives who are sitting on the sidelines.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a number of editorials commenting on the limited test-ban treaty.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Lancaster (Pa.) News, July 28, 1963]

The Ban Pact

Initialing the nuclear test ban as a "first step" should be firmly kept in mind in any other negotiations; a second step could involve more than we bargain for. This is, admittedly, a predictable reaction to anything that the Soviets might agree to in any preliminary act. For it is still difficult to see from the experience of the past that any agreement with Russia could be that uncomplicated. This is a case where the solid advantages must not be allowed to wait for time to tell. Time, the nuclear bomb age has convinced us, is the least of all the commodities we have.

[From the Lancaster (Pa.) Intelligencer Journal, July 27, 1963]

The President Reports

President Kennedy was candid, blunt, and most persuasive as he reported to the American people Friday evening on the nuclear test ban accord.

He minced no words in saying the treaty did not mean the end of the cold war, that it did not mean the Communists would give up their ambitions; that it did not resolve all conflicts. It is no concession to or from the Soviet Union, he asserted, it is not a victory for one side or the other.

What the treaty is, the President went on solemnly, is a "victory for mankind" in that it "reflects our common recognition of the dangers in further testing." He said the treaty cuts a shaft of light into the darkness, that it is a welcome sign of hope, that it is a step away from a war that could wipe out 300 million lives in less than 60 minutes.

We would hope that the President's words were heard by millions of Americans. We would hope too that those who may have missed his address on television and radio, would take the time to read the text, published today in this newspaper. Every American should make himself familiar with the issues involved, then write his Senator making his attitude known.

The Senate soon will take up the treaty, conduct hearings, then vote on its ratification. Undoubtedly, this debate and the vote will be one of the most important decisions the U.S. Senate will take in many years. They deserve and need the help of the Nation's citizens.

[From the York, Pa., Gazette and Daily Morning, July 27, 1963]

Test Ban

The most important reason for and result of the test-ban agreement initialed Thursday by the representatives of the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain is the one that has been hardly mentioned in all the printed comments on this historic event. That is that, at least for the time being, the barbaric practice of lethally poisoning the atmosphere which is the home of all the world's peoples will be ended.

It is one thing for a people to decide to jeopardize, or even sacrifice, their own health and well-being for some purpose, like "national security," they consider important enough for such extreme measures. But it is a supreme offense against any conception of human morality to risk the lives of other peoples for the sake of one's own conceived national interests. And this is the criminal activity the nuclear powers have been carrying on in their testing programs—namely the massive dosing of the air everybody everywhere must breathe with lethal radioactivity.

The three-nation treaty comes at a time when the extensiveness of the deadly effects of this dosing had become no longer a matter of speculation and surmise. As programs for measuring the effects have grown, it has been demonstrated that critical amounts of radioactive elements such as strontium and iodine have accumulated in soil, air, and water in many areas around the globe. And few scientists doubt that the damage will be even greater to those yet unborn than to the present generation.

The accord is thus a great boon to mankind on these grounds alone. But it also comes at a time—and this is what the nuclear governments were most concerned about—when the spread of nuclear weapons to many other nations, large and small, has become an increasing possibility. Unfortunately, the accord can be said to have halted testing only for the time being because France and China have indicated their intention of continuing with their own nuclear weapons development, including testing, despite the new treaty. But it is to be hoped that the United States-Soviet-British pact will persuade the rest of the world to abandon any thought of building nuclear arsenals and that, with this as the first step, further peace moves will discourage the French and Chinese from carrying their own programs much further.

It is to these further steps that we must look at once. The test-ban agreement could well be in vain if it is not used as the foundation on which to start constructing the real edifice of peace. The Russians have made it plain that this is what they want the pact to mean, and they have urged a number of steps to follow it up with. We on this side must see to it that we, too, keep moving ahead on the road so eventfully opened up at last.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, July 29, 1963]

Not for Military Gain

In its drive to obtain ratification of the test-ban treaty, the Kennedy administration will no doubt argue that the treaty should be accepted because it assures a military advantage for the Nation. We are far ahead of the Russians in overall nuclear technology and stockpiles, it can be said, and freezing the technology will prevent the Soviets from catching up.

There is truth in this argument, but it can be pressed too far. The Russians might claim that since they have produced the biggest nuclear explosion, freezing the technology will prevent the United States from catching up at least in big-weapon design. And, of course, if either side believed that the treaty would give the other a significant military advantage, neither would have signed it.

The basic and compelling case for the test ban is not that it helps one side or the other in the arms race, but that it may help both to throttle down the arms race. We have more than enough nuclear power to destroy the Russians, and they have more than enough to destroy us. But neither can afford nuclear war since neither can hope to escape devastation. It is commonsense, in these circumstances, to call a halt to nuclear weapons development in the hope that a start toward disarmament can be achieved before other nations acquire the destructive potential which those who now possess it dare not use.

[From the Champaign (Ill.) Courier, July 24, 1963]

Credit to Mr. Kennedy

When President Kennedy announced the new approach to the test ban problem which now seems to have yielded results in Moscow, legitimate doubts could well have been raised about the value in this, in view of the dismal Geneva record. But as it turns out, the move may have been more statesmanlike than it seemed at the time. It is conceivable that its greatest value was that it provided the Russians with a face-saving device from which the world may now profit.

The reason why accord has now been reached is a major Soviet concession: The agreement to separate underground tests from the other types and sign an initial treaty covering only the latter. This is what the West has asked for all the time in Geneva but what the Soviet Union steadfastly resisted without seeming to offer a rational explanation why.

What are the reasons behind this sudden shift? The world can only speculate, for Mr. Khrushchev reveals nothing. It may have to do with the demonstrated impossibility of coming to an ideological understanding with the Chinese. It may be the results of a change in the Soviet Premier's personal position, for there can be no doubt that Mr. Khrushchev would have been unable to perform this turnabout if his position had been nearly as weak as was feared a couple of months ago. Thus the test ban treaty might be an indication that the Premier has won out over the more militant factions of the Soviet leadership. Once again the Red army marshals have been forced into a back seat.

Another possible factor that may have eased the way for the agreement is the indicated shift with regard to investment priorities. There have been rumors recently that the Soviet Government is anxious to step up the production of consumer goods and place more emphasis on light industry, a field trationally slighted in favor of heavy industry and armaments. For this reason, the more coexistence-minded of the Soviet planners might welcome a chance to channel off some of the capital and energy that have gone into the costly production of nuclear devices.

But whatever it may be, it is now evident that this change in atmosphere was sensed by President Kennedy when he took the initiative for a new effort at the old problem; maybe he even had received hints about it from the Soviet side. But in order to save the Russians from possible embarrassment the effort was set in at another level and in a novel environment. The Russian switch is not now so glaringly obvious as it would have been if it had been performed in Geneva.

It was an imaginative move, and the President deserves credit.

[From the Bristol (Tenn.) Herald Courier, July 29, 1963]

Nuclear Test Treaty: Great Turning Point

The initialing of a partial test ban by the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union constitutes a great turning point in the cold war. Though it does not assure a further easing of East-West tensions, though it does not guarantee that progress will now be made on substantive arms control, such possibilities have been markedly heightened by this treaty.

It now behooves the Senate of the United States to get on quickly with the business of ratifying the treaty. This is not a matter requiring, at this point, any elaborate and prolonged discussion.

The details of the agreement to prohibit further nuclear test explosions under water, in the atmosphere or in space must be considered with care, obviously. The implications of excluding underground tests from the ban must be gone into. The impact of this agreement on national security must be shrewdly weighed. But these things should not take a long time, for the whole matter has been the subject of the most exhaustive discussion and analysis during several years, and Congress ought to have its mind pretty well made up on all pertinent considerations.

This is all the more true since the agreement initialed in Moscow is not a wholly new approach, but is in salient respects roughly the same as the treaty we proposed about a year ago. In effect, it will halt all readily detectable nuclear test explosions. The one notable gap is the exclusion of underground testing from the ban. This can be dealt with later. The important thing now is to ratify the present treaty and go on from there—hopefully, toward a world no longer shadowed by the constant threat of nuclear destruction.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, July 28, 1963]

BANNING NUCLEAR TESTS

The arguments against U.S. Senate ratification of the treaty banning nuclear tests underwater, in space, and in atmosphere are extensive and impressive. The arguments for ratification appear, on the basis of information now available, to be even more extensive and more impressive.

One good sign may be the very fact that everybody seems to recognize the pitfalls and weak points. President Kennedy's urgent appeal Friday night for public and Senate sanction of the agreement was heavy with caution. The forthcoming debate in Washington will underline all the disadvantages that have been mentioned thus far, and probably more.

We have got to decide whether this "step away from war," as the President called it, outweighs the chances involved. Having reached this early point of agreement on a painful, frustrating road, do we put the United States in the role of rejection, or now attempt to move toward a second step?

By halting tests ourselves and by obtaining guarantees from Russia and Great Britain to do the same, we achieve two goals. We cut down on radioactive pollution of the air we live in. We reduce the risk of unplanned or accidental nuclear war.

There is a possible third advantage, too. Achievement of a formal agreement with Russia, the first since the Austrian Treaty was signed in 1955, may open the way to further easing of the cold war and, thus, to peace.

Some experts claim the Russians know more about the effects of giant H-bombs than we do; with a test ban, the Russians would retain this advantage, which is useful in antimissile warfare.

Moreover, a test ban might relieve the Russian economy—which is far more pressed than our own—of the burden of pressing forward with nuclear development. Is it in the national interest of the United States to free the Russian economy of any burden?

Alternatively, a test ban agreement might allow the Russians to prepare in secret for new nuclear tests, giving them an edge in development that we could never overcome.

Then, too, the test ban does not include France, which already has elemental nuclear weapons, nor China, which soon will have them. Can the United States afford to stand still in these circumstances?

Clearly, a test ban treaty involves risk of unmeasurable quantity. But so does continued nuclear testing by Russia, Great Britain, and the United States. And this risk is known. The spreading of nuclear tests can mean annihilation, not only for Americans but also for all persons on the planet.

[From the Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post, July 27, 1963]

TEST-BAN PACT IS A STEP FORWARD

Formal agreement reached in Moscow on a partial nuclear test ban treaty must be regarded as a step toward a peaceful solution to cold war difficulties, though the struggle is far from over.

The ground covered, dealing with a ban on nuclear tests under water, in the air and outer space, is extremely important. Insofar as it halts radioactive poisoning of the air, the world is able to breathe at least that much more easily, both figuratively and literally.

We don't know Premier Khrushchev's motives, of course, but taken at face value the treaty signalizes hopes for further improving relations between the United States and Russia.

In his television address to the Nation, President Kennedy also pictured the treaty as an important first step toward the reduction of international tension and the strengthening of peace, and he made it clear that all parties to it look forward to further progress in this direction.

While calculated to marshal congressional support for ratification, the President's speech also was aimed at domestic critics of too much coexistence with communism.

Kennedy acknowledges, too, that the treaty is only a first step and has cautioned the Nation against expecting too much to result from the limited nuclear test ban.

It is the President's hope now that French President de Gaulle will adhere to the nuclear pact, too, and a note from Kennedy to De Gaulle on the Moscow negotiations expresses that wish.

The theory that the Soviet is engaging in a clever scheme to delude and disarm us, while certainly a possibility, is not a certainty. And it doesn't enlighten the public or help the Senate reach a wise decision on whether to ratify the treaty.

A clear advantage can be found, however, in the immediate prospect that the world may be spared further nuclear fallout. Those fears about strontium in milk and the effects which may bring deformed bodies in future generations should be alleviated.

There is clear indication, too, that the Soviet Union and the Western Powers prefer to fight out their political, economic, and ideological differences within a framework of peace. And this is good because those advantages accrue to both sides.

There has been more exploration, too, of collateral measures on the ways to reduce tension between the Russians and the West.

Thus the treaty could be a forerunner to a genuine peace, although that doesn't have to be taken for granted. We don't think, for example, that Khrushchev is about to abandon the aim of communism to take over the entire world.

All is not aid and comfort because of the Sino-Soviet rupture either. But that split obviously is widening, and there have been demands by Peiping since the latest talks began that the Kremlin break off negotiations with the "sinister" West.

There are indications the Pentagon is not exactly happy about the test ban agreement. But if members of the military community possess convincing arguments against the move, they have been remiss in not being more outspoken.

In the absence of such arguments, the evidence appears to weigh clearly in favor of a treaty to halt the types of nuclear tests covered. And military men certainly haven't always been the best authorities to follow in situations like this.

Other persons, including those in and out of Congress who preach isolation, may flatly oppose any dealings with the Soviets at all. But the advantages of the treaty overshadow that thinking, and the gains to be made in reducing tensions emerge clearly.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) News, July 27, 1963]

THERE'S NO OTHER PATH

President Kennedy made out a good case for the treaty with Russia to curb nuclear testing.

In his speech to the Nation last night, he pulled no punches, gilded no lilies, offered no delusions.

This is only a start, he said. It could be a good one or we could be walking into a Communist delusion, he felt.

But at least, we must learn to sniff out Communist bids for peace. This appears to be one. If we don't accept it, if the world goes on unrestrainedly testing and building more and bigger bombs, the inevitable end is easy to envision now: Wholesale death in the world.

There will be opposition to the treaty, much of it sincere in distrust of Soviet Russia, another segment of it political.

We've got to make a start toward world peace to end the horrible dream of nuclear destruction.

This is a beginning. It is worth essaying. And we're for it on that basis, but always, and we say this with emphasis, always with our defenses up and our missiles poised.

We need not be pushovers for a sucker punch so long as we keep our international eyes open.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post, July 28, 1963]

A VICTORY FOR MANKIND

In his address to the Nation on the partial nuclear test-ban treaty which has been initiated in Moscow, the President spoke with profound eloquence. He had an air of earnestness that could not be mistaken. And while calling the move a victory for mankind, he had in mind the fact that a nuclear war—and one is possible—could wipe out 300 million lives and devastate the world in less than 60 minutes.

His remarks were heard by millions, but particularly by the 100 U.S. Senators who must act on the treaty before it can be effective. Senators will have much to say about this "step toward reason," and the American people will be kept fully informed while it is analyzed and debated.

It is clear that the threat of nuclear war is not dispelled. This pact does not halt the production or the stockpiling of nuclear weapons, or their use on some dismal day in the future. But the President sees this step as a shaft of light in the darkness, without concessions by either side, but a common recognition of the dangers in continued testing.

The Soviet still has its stockpile, and its 50-megaton nuclear device, the worst machine of death ever put together by man. There are always risks in doing business with the Communist rulers of Russia. We have no way of knowing, despite Khrushchev's smiles, hugs and warm words to Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman, whether he meant a word of it.

But for the sake of peace, of U.S. policy, and the hope that one day there will be a permanent ban on testing, producing and stockpiling of such weapons, will surely lead the Senate to approve the initiated agreement.

While Khrushchev and the two Western nuclear powers were taking this step away from nuclear war, the Chinese Communists were scorning the rest of the world, predicting that they would have nuclear weapons soon. And there lies a threat even greater than the one which has been posed by Khrushchev for the last several years. It is obvious the Russians do not want their people slaughtered and their nation in ruins. The Red Chinese do not seem to care. If they had nuclear weapons now, no treaty would stop them from using them. Today they are helpless without them and their publicly avowed determination to make war against capitalism is held at bay only because they lack the weapons.

That is a matter which the Senate will consider fully in its analysis and debate on the treaty. We believe there will be ratification, as there must be if we are to save the race and prevent the entire earth from scorching, but there are many things to be considered first.

One of these is our security, having in mind a reckless, inhuman force which demonstrated in Korea that human beings, their own, or ours, mean nothing to them.

If this single small step is a "victory for mankind," mankind must take many more, before learning to walk properly, with strength and human dignity.

[From the Newark (N.J.) News, July 28, 1963]

The Greater Reason

As debate moves forward on the wisdom of ratifying a limited nuclear test-ban treaty, it is important to delineate exactly what the treaty can and cannot do.

Surely it is not the millenium signifying permanent peace on earth. Military men still will want to go banging away in search of the ultimate weapon—defensive, offensive or both. But the treaty would put their experimentation underground where it cannot continue to poison the air and the water or deform children yet unborn.

A three-power treaty joined by nations with neither the capability nor desire to participate in the nuclear arms race will not keep other nations, notably France and Red China, from trying to build their own nuclear arsenals. But the signatories agree to discourage others. It is within their interest to do so. And they are not without means of making their influence felt.

It may be said the treaty falls disappointingly short; by failing to provide for inspection and on-site controls it lacks any real basis in trust. In this respect, it represents but a beginning.

But the overriding point is that a beginning must be made before the nuclear arms contest spirals man into oblivion. The three nations best able to understand this are now ready to join in some slight measure of control. They are united in the fundamental belief that even a preventive nuclear war would be suicidal.

Inner motives of seeking advantage within this psychological framework cannot be ignored or discounted. President Kennedy has made clear he has no intention of letting the agreement reached in Moscow weaken us or divide us from our allies.

This is not to say we cannot join Russia in turning our backs on a world in which, in Premier Khrushchev's words, "the living would envy the dead." We must strive for a world controlled by reason. And toward this the treaty now before the Senate can contribute.

[From the Chester (Pa.) Delaware County Times, July 27, 1963]

Step Forward Worth Taking

No one can say that the proposed nuclear test ban treaty is not fraught with risks. It is.

But the risk involved in calling a temporary halt, if only in part, to the nuclear race is less than the risk involved in an all-out nuclear race.

And the greatest risk of all would be simply to do nothing—to embrace neither peace nor war.

As President Kennedy himself is the first to warn, it is "not the millenium" in solving East-West differences. But it is a moment of respite.

The treaty as devised does not mean that Mr. Khrushchev has any less intention of "burying us." But it does mean that the world is at least partly stepping off the nuclear escalator, at a time when both this Nation and the Soviet Union have enough nuclear might to destroy each other, totally, several times over.

The most critical objection raised to the ban is that, in the opinion of some of our top experts, the military advantage—in stopping all but underground testing at this point—would be theirs and not ours.

Certainly this has been carefully taken into account, weighed in cautions balance, by our President. Certainly Mr. Kennedy would not call for the pact were this not a lesser consideration than others.

This is only a temporary step; it is no longer binding when other great powers make tests. But it will slow, rather than rush, the nuclear race.

Red China has not yet devised even an atom bomb; France is an estimated 3 years away from its own H-bomb. There is an interval, in between, which can be a heightened opportunity to work for peace.

Debate on this issue there will be. Key information must be brought out. The key question is whether the Senate will approve or if there will be another block as in the days of Woodrow Wilson. It is to be hoped such Senate debate be confined to the issue alone, without political overtones.

It is ironic that this is the only Nation in the world where one man can issue the order which would lead to nuclear holocaust—but hasn't the authority alone to give the word to lead to peace.

[From the Johnson City (Tenn.) Press Chronicle, July 28, 1963]

Don't Damn It Too Hastily

The nuclear test ban must be viewed with caution, of course.

It is true that in the past, agreements with Russia have not been worth much.

Actually, there have not been many agreements.

However, we must not assume arbitrarily that this particular agreement is not worth anything—or is weighted the way the Soviets want it.

Man must continue to hope. He cannot resign himself to cynical defeatism.

To be sure, the agreement makes good propaganda for Russia. Khrushchev can use it as evidence he is a man devoted to peace.

He can also use it as evidence his policy of peaceful coexistence can be made to work. He will mark it for the attention of Red China, which insists nuclear war is inevitable.

Moreover, a suspension of tests will save Russia much in the way of money and manpower—money and manpower sorely needed in other areas. It will save us, too, but there is reason to believe we are not as hard pressed in this respect as Russia is.

It will be said the Russians signed out of no altruistic motive but out of dictates of pure selfishness. What if they did?

The agreement is at least a pause in the rush toward war. It is a breathing spell. It gives the world an opportunity to look, to explore, to examine—to work for a way to avoid the deluge.

Such a pause benefits us as well as the Russians. We would be foolish to believe otherwise.

Some will say Khrushchev has tricked us. Maybe he has. Time will tell.

But the Red Chinese will say we have tricked Russia.

It all depends upon which side of the Iron Curtain one is on.

The fact the Russians were willing to sign the ban, after refusing for years, is worth something.

It could be, might be, the beginning of a thaw—a thaw not in ideology but in reality. It could be that Russia now regards Red China as enemy No. 1 and is acting accordingly. Khrushchev is too smart a man to try to wage a cold war on two fronts.

So let us not brush aside this pact as meaningless or a deception. Let us give it a chance.

Matters could not possibly be any worse with the treaty than without it, as we see it.

[From the Amsterdam (N.Y.) Recorder, July 27, 1963]

Test Ban Treaty

While the test ban agreement initialed in Moscow by the United States, Britain and Soviet Russia does not guarantee peace on earth, it could be an important step in that direction. If nothing else, it is the first concrete achievement of many efforts to contain the awesome atom. East and West have finally agreed on something.

In one sense, the United States and Great Britain have nothing to lose and everything to gain. If the Soviet Union keeps its word, all mankind will have gained peace of mind. If the Russians break the agreement—and this would not surprise many in the West—we will be no worse off than we were before the Moscow meeting.

It is generally agreed that the United States and Soviet Russia have enough nuclear power to keep each other pretty much in line. The real fear now is the unknown, the effects radiation in the atmosphere could have upon us and future generations.

Thus the ban on all except underground testing is vitally important. It would eliminate fallout, subject of widespread fear and intense technical controversy. Viewed from that angle, the treaty, which now awaits approval by Congress and Parliament, could be of significance far beyond its specific terms.

For the first time in several years all the the facts seem to have been faced across the Moscow conference table. We realize that talk is cheap and a favorite Khrushchev tactic is to zig when everyone expects him to zag. So even if the pact is ratified and becomes a fact of life it will not guarantee peace. But it will be a foot in the door, and that is of major importance now.

[From the Janesville (Wis.) Gazette, July 27, 1963]

The Great Hope of Mankind

A first step toward banning of nuclear weapons tests has been taken by the United States, Great Britain, and Soviet Russia. It reflects the hope of mankind for peace on earth, for the promise of the Christian faith. At the same time, long experienced in dealing with dictatorships, free men must accept the agreement with cautious hope mixed with doubt.

The Communists have never given us reason for confidence in their word or their signed agreements. They have broken every treaty and agreement made in the past, on one pretext or another, regardless of the import of the mutual understanding. It is neither wise nor prudent, therefore, to accept this turn of the cheek as worthy of full faith.

In years past, representatives of the West have never been greeted with such joviality, such show of cordiality as they were for this meeting. And looking about the world one finds reason for the Moscow red carpet—Red China. China's obdurate and bristling attitude toward the West, her bitter criticism of Moscow for letting down the bars toward the free world and her mounting rivalry with Soviet Russia for leadership of the Communist world—all these surely influenced the Kremlin.

In the past there have been times when Moscow warmed slightly to Western proposals for disarmament or the nuclear arms ban, but they were only lapses in the cold war. We recall Moscow's last agreement for an arms ban, and the subsequent flouting of that agreement with resumption of nuclear tests in the 100-megaton range.

It is simply unnatural for the Kremlin bosses to melt toward any proposal of the

West. We may well remember that communism's goal is ultimate world conquest, and time is no immediate factor; also that every move which Soviet Russia makes is dictated by one motive—what it sees as good for Soviet Russia.

With all these doubts and all our incredulity, man must hope that this agreement—historic in its import—is truly the first step toward world peace, even if it is only a partial ban and even though any member may withdraw.

In the light of today's weapons of mass destruction, it seems incredible that Red China still calls for nuclear war on the West.

President Kennedy's report to the Nation on this achievement in negotiations certainly raises the hopes of all Americans, without promising ultimate peace. Neither did he suggest that we lower our guard nor reduce our vigilance. Indeed, this is a test of Kremlin veracity. We are ready to listen and wait, but not to believe until we have reason to believe.

Nevertheless, if this agreement holds up and we are able to move toward the second step without weakening our protective strength, the world will benefit immeasurably. Peace is what free men desire and need—peace with honor. May God grant us the wisdom to make it and to keep it.

[From the Burlington (N.C.) Times-News, July 27, 1963]

A Limited Test-Ban Treaty Is Better Than None at All

Initialing of the nuclear test-ban agreement in Moscow is only the first stage of the plan becoming reality, but it is a big step which has been taken.

Millions of people on both sides of the Iron Curtain, in fact, see for the first time in cold war years that there is real hope for a coexistence between the Moscow version of communism and democracy of the West.

It isn't the type of hope and joy which causes mass demonstrations and tells us that all will be well in the future.

But there is hope, and that's a good start.

The ban agreement would eliminate nuclear testing in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water. It could virtually eliminate the rising threat of radiation from the atmosphere, which is causing governments of the free and Communist worlds more concern than is outwardly admitted. It, too, could be the forerunner to other treaties developed in the interest of the preservation of mankind.

President Kennedy, in his address to the Nation last night, presented the administration's case to the people. He cited his support, among other details, of the risk that Russia actually will respect the agreement over the threat to the world of radioactive penetration and undetermined harm to all of mankind if there were no treaty at all.

There will be many questions raised in Congress and by others in Government. Neither the Joint Chiefs of Staff nor top officials of the Atomic Energy Commission previously have shown enthusiastic support for the treaty. There, too, are some Senators, with considerable influence, who want more information before they give their approval.

This questioning, and suspicion, is in order. There have been occasions when the Soviets did not keep their word, and the East-West differences have been too great for too long for a sudden and decisive meeting of minds to come without prompting some thought on Russian strategy and long-range intent.

Still, the President is right in his approach. No one knows at this point how long, and how effective, the treaty would hold and maintain its purpose. What we do know is that without a treaty, even if it be limited, there is no limit to the amount of destruction which nuclear contamination can initiate and produce.

We can be cautious, but we also can be realistic. There is now enough nuclear power available to destroy humanity. The hope for humanity, then, rests in its control through mutual understanding and respect for what can happen not to just one nation but to all nations that want to survive.

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Eagle, July 27, 1963]

Historic First Step

The success of the Moscow negotiations for a nuclear test-ban treaty had been so well telegraphed ahead of time that the formal signing Thursday came as anticlimax. Only if a hitch had developed at the last minute would the occasion have been notable.

Despite this, the formal ceremony of initialing the pact did represent a historic change. Being the first major treaty reached between the Soviet Union and major western nations since the Austrian pact of 1955, it obviously has tremendous importance.

Details are much as predicted. There is no linkage to any further agreements—that is, the test ban is not made dependent upon any unacceptable conditions. But it also does not include any kind of prohibition of underground testing.

The latter must be considered regrettable, for underground testing is where the Western powers had insisted on having an inspection system. The Soviets rejected anything of the kind, so this was dropped from the treaty. Negotiations on this question will continue.

A Soviet official at the United Nations said that the treaty was "only a beginning." Hopefully he is correct, for it actually is more a symbol of a possible change in the cold war, not of as much substance as other changes needed.

Somehow, perhaps because of the major split in the Communist world, the interests of the Soviet Union and the major Western powers are coinciding on two points: First, the desire to prove to an anxious world that limited collaboration is possible between adversaries, and, second, the desire to halt the spread of nuclear weapons to other nations.

The real question is whether other areas of coinciding interest between East and West can be found. These must involve the status of Berlin, reunification of Germany, ending of international subversion and a myriad of other conflict points.

A world so long torn by total division between East and West will hail this first step toward accord, even on a limited basis. And the United States need not do any differently, for any move toward peaceful relations—as long as U.S. interests are protected—is worth while.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) News, July 27, 1963]

Test-Ban Treaty Calls for Maturity

Seven years of muddled negotiations have ended in a partial nuclear test-ban treaty that will soon go before the U.S. Senate for approval. Curiously, opposition to the treaty has been sparse so far, and there is a general feeling that the Congress will ratify the agreement. We think it should. Apart from its political implications, which are only implications at this point, the treaty will temporarily end the testing of nuclear weapons on the suface, underwater, and in the air.

Moreover, experts seem to agree that this Nation is not on the short end of the treaty, that neither the Soviet Union nor the United States derives any special advantages from halting tests at this time.

But beyond this are the implications—political obstacles to anything resembling a permanent nuclear test ban. Premier Khrushchev has stressed the relationship between this treaty and a nonaggression pact between the NATO nations and the Communist Warsaw Treaty nations—something the West does not now want. He has again raised the question of Germany and Berlin, insisting that the good spirit of the test-ban talks be used to do something about these problems—and the West would rather let the test-ban treaty stand alone, free from the other cold war problems.

Mr. Khrushchev believes that the spirit of the negotiations can lead on to total disarmament. But the treaty poses an important question in the minds of all Americans. With years of mistrust and stalemate beyond us, does this Nation have the maturity to open the door for further negotiations with the Soviet Union? There are no great expectations implicit in the test-ban treaty, but there is an opportunity to go forward and explore the problems of the cold war. This we can do, and it ought to be done, while maintaining—as Mr. Khrushchev certainly will—the military and political vigilance necessary to protect our interests.

Treaties have a way of inviting waves of optimism and pessimism which, too often, cut down on a nation's clearsightedness. But if the United States can bring itself to examine this treaty in terms of the future, and to look with clarity beyond the immediate implications, it may find that its best interests will be served by proceeding in a spirit of good will.

It costs nothing to listen, to explore, to find out what Khrushchev wants—if this Nation maintains its strength and its resolution to protect the free world.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, July 27, 1963]

Nuclear Test Ban Is a Breakthrough

For the first time since dawn of the atomic age there is optimism that genuine progress is being made in controlling nuclear weapons that could destroy mankind and all his achievements. Initialing the treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, under water and in space by the United States, Britain, and the Soviet Union is the first breakthrough, albeit only a beginning.

Urging ratification of the treaty, President Kennedy warns that it is only a beginning—a small one at that—toward ending the cold war. Until all issues are settled that prolong the conflict, with adequate safeguards against cheating and doubledealing, the United States and other Western powers must maintain the necessary strength to meet any threat to their security. The important thing is that we are negotiating seriously and Moscow seems to be in the mood to remove some of the roadblocks that made even limited agreements impossible.

There will, of course, be skepticism in and out of Congress because of our past dealings with the Soviets. There is a new factor, however, in the widening split between Moscow and the Red Chinese. The test ban has been attacked bitterly in Peiping as an attempt by Khrushchev to barter away the interests of the revolution. This bitter split that is bringing on a direct confrontation of the two great Communist powers no doubt has had a bearing on this first limited accommodation with the West.

There is no guarantee, of course, that other nations will not develop and test atomic weapons. Red China is believed on the verge of such development. France will insist on going ahead. Yet existence of the ban will tend to deter proliferation of such weapons and the nuclear superiority of the United States and the Soviet Union cannot be overcome in the conceivable future. The abrogation clause—something new in treaties—applies to both East and West.

Equally significant is Premier Khrushchev's insistence that negotiations proceed on other issues, such as the question of a divided Germany which he acknowledges to be the greatest bar to peace. By all means, we should explore every means of liquidating the cold war but with precautions and with determination not to surrender any vital positions or interests of the West.

[From the Dayton (Ohio) Journal Herald, July 27, 1963]

FIRST STEP AND 1,000 MILES

There can be only one answer to the question the President posed us last night and that answer, of course, is "Yes."

This country must take, without question or hesitation, the first step. We must do so, determined that, even if it takes us 1,000 miles, we must keep the world going along the road with us until we've got to the end—peace.

This treaty does not call upon us to drop our guard. After past experiences, mentioned by the President, we are not likely to place too much trust in it nor too much trust in the reincarnated Khrushchev.

Indeed we ourselves did not feel completely easy about the President's presentation, as a matter of fact. He was so studiedly solemn that it had a slight air of unreality about it. Still the facts were there. Still he is the leader we have chosen.

The fact is, as he said, that the path may not get us where we want to go. The fact is also, although these are not quite his words, that we damned well don't go anywhere unless we take a first step.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, July 28, 1963]

THE TEST BAN'S LESSONS BUILD UTOPIA ONE BRICK AT A TIME

In the 18 years since nuclear weapons first began to sprout in their grisly mushroom patch we have met with the Soviets, as President Kennedy says, "at the summit and on the brink."

Neither meeting place has brought meaningful accord. Summits are places for slogans and threats. The brink—as we learned last autumn—is a desolate and terrifying cliff, for us as well as for them. It is a travesty on statesmanship to have to threaten to foreclose on the future of the human race.

The grim logic that must move the possessors of nuclear power has sent us one more place—perhaps the last place. We have negotiated, and the U.S. Senate will be asked to ratify, a nuclear test ban.

Testing nuclear weapons has nothing to do with keeping them or with using them. We will keep those we have, and the complex systems for using them and guarding against their accidental use will remain in our hands. Ditto for the Soviet Union.

We will continue to test weapons underground, if we believe such tests to be necessary. So will the Soviet Union. The nature of underground testing cannot be clear to a layman, but it is apparent that it involves small nuclear weapons, rather than cataclysmic ones.

We now possess, and can deliver, enough nuclear destruction to wipe the world clean of people. So does the Soviet Union. This capability is not affected by the test ban.

Why bother with a test ban at all? There is a reason for doing the best we can, when we can.

We won't handcuff the nuclear beast. We may stroke its back; calm it down.

The history of the nuclear arms race has been one of ever-growing terror. As the nature of weapons has been refined and improved they have become more and more destructive. Whether we can ever eliminate the nuclear threat itself remains to be seen. Utopias cannot be built on conference tables.

However, there is a chance we can hammer out a mutually useful agreement with the Soviets to make do with the terror we have, instead of reaching for a worse terror we might devise. That is the genesis of the test ban.

Will the Soviets keep their side of the bargain? Their record for living up to agreements is bad, but their self-interest in this case is great. We cannot predict what they will do; we can only be vigilant.

We have detection devices that will warn us instantly when prohibited tests are made, and it is a fair guess that we can devise devices that will keep pace with any attempt to hide future tests in novel ways—say by carrying them out in space, millions of miles from earth.

If they break the agreement, we will know it. We can resume testing, in that case, as well as they can. There is a distinction between agreeing to forbear, which we have done, and agreeing to give up something, which we have not done.

Will the test ban—if it works—open further areas in which we can come to terms with the Soviets? Who can tell? If there should be opportunities, we are bound to pursue them. But the test ban just negotiated sets a precedent we must never ignore.

Find areas of mutual self-interest and exploit them. Avoid vague promises and high phrases. Build utopia a brick at a time.

[From the Levittown (Pa.), Times-Courrier, July 30, 1963]

LOGIC AND THE TEST BAN

The U.S. Senate plunges this week into hearings on the monumental nuclear test-ban treaty with Russia and Great Britain and already the welkin is ringing from alarmist and alarming pronouncements by Members of what should be an august and sincere deliberating body.

The treaty, these ultraconservatives are saying, will help Russia alone; it will bind us to a piece of paper no more than a scrap to the Reds; it involves multiple under-the-table sideline concessions that would just about sell this Nation down the river.

Senators, and everyone who is interested in this significant development of the cold war, would do well to ignore such John Birch-like claptrap and listen instead to the well-chosen words of statesmanlike EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, the minority leader. His colleagues, Senator DIRKSEN has said, should give every word of that treaty "the closest scrutiny possible." They should not oppose it blindly; they should instead scrutinize it.

This is indeed the function of the Senate and for this purpose the Constitution has called for a two-thirds majority in the Senate to ratify any such treaty.

However, to leap into discussion on such a vitally important issue with a clear negative view is to do this country and the cause of peace a distinct disservice. If there is any joker in the treaty, Senators should find it; if the wording is vague or could be twisted to our disadvantage, this should be corrected. Other than this, their approval is clearly called for.

In actuality, the arguments against this treaty disappear completely once the cold light of logic is applied to them.

It is true that the Soviets could break the agreement, as they have broken many an agreement before. But if they did, we would know it instantly through our proven detection network.

It is also true that the signatories have no control over two other potential nuclear powers, France and Red China. Again, our system of detection would reveal immediately any tests these two nations might make. And the treaty provides, in such a case, that full testing then could be resumed.

Also possible, say the detractors, is the fact that since the treaty does not ban underground tests and we cannot detect them, Russia could develop a super-super-super bomb such as we now cannot manufacture. Through such a hypothesis, opponents of the ban truly reveal their own insincerity. For already the Big Three powers have an immeasurable supply of overkill. What good would it do Russia, or us, or anyone, to kill that which is already dead or destroy that already destroyed beyond recovery?

The truth is that the noisiest objection to the test ban comes from those who want not peace or negotiation but full surrender from any nation or any individual who opposes their demagoguery.

The Senate should, as DIRKSEN has said, give full and close scrutiny to the agreement. But in doing so it should not lose sight of the objective that was ours in this and all disarmament discussions—the building of a peace that gives promise of becoming permanent.

[From San Francisco Chronicle, July 26, 1963]

THE TEST BAN AND THE SENATE

There is nothing complicated or abstruse in the text of the nuclear test-ban treaty: It pledges the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union "to prohibit, to prevent, and not to carry out" any nuclear-weapon-test explosion (or any other nuclear explosion) in the atmosphere, in space or underwater, or "in any other environment" which would result in depositing radioactive debris outside the state where the explosion is conducted.

The meaning of the last clause above is that you can't even test underground if radioactivity is going to spill out and spread.

The treaty is open to other states and is of unlimited duration, but a signatory may withdraw from it, with 3 months' notice, if it decides its supreme interests are jeopardized by "extraordinary events."

Such an "extraordinary event" might be, obviously, a series of underground explosions conducted by Country A which caused Country B to suspect it could no longer keep up with A by testing underground (not prohibited), but only by testing in the atmosphere.

This is a promising achievement after 7 years of proposals and discussions on test-ban controls. Indeed, it has already become a cliche to say that it may be the great turning point in East-West relations. We are almost drowning in speculations on further steps that might follow.

The question now facing, and we suspect perplexing, President Kennedy is whether, having Khrushchev's signature prospectively on the line, he can get the Senate's. No one should underestimate the capacity of the Senators to make trouble on this issue. Senator GOLDWATER has gone on the record against a treaty, which is at least consistent with his vote against continuing the Arms Control Agency. Others can be expected to join him. The Dr. Teller group will doubtless be in the act.

Granting all these difficulties, prospects for ratification of the treaty still appear to be fairly good. Members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee evidently think support for it will even be overwhelming. We like to believe that matters will turn out that way, and promptly.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times Herald, July 28, 1963]

A STEP ON A JOURNEY

President Kennedy is cautious but elated over the nuclear test-ban treaty. The Nation is justified in feeling some of that elation, but some of the caution, too.

The ban, if adhered to, would be, as the President stated, "a victory for mankind." The cloud hanging over everyone's acceptance of this is, of course, the frailty of Communist pledges. Russia has chosen to honor its vows in terms of opportunity and convenience too many times in the past.

There will never be a meeting of the two philosophies of communism and democracy. This proposed ban treaty is not a step in that direction. It is not a nonaggression pact or part of a nonaggression pact. We would oppose its ratification if it were.

The President's message on the treaty made several things clear: that the battle between communism and the West has not abated, that the treaty as such is no stronger than the determination of any party to observe it, that it "is not the millennium."

Perhaps the strongest thing in favor of the treaty is that it is a treaty of expediency. Both sides want it and it is to the advantage of both sides to keep it.

Russia, even more than America, is burdened with its armaments budget. Red China's split puts Moscow in a precarious position in relation to the rest of the Red world. And Russia always knows that her destruction lies only minutes beyond the first nuclear rocket she launches toward America.

It is also significant that President Kennedy, in his message, made the strongest reference any head of state has made on the matter of nuclear fallout. He admitted that fallout from nuclear testing had reached a dangerous spot, "befouling the air of all men and all nations."

Must we deny him the decency of consideration for life itself?

Sane people know that this civilization cannot survive a nuclear war. The President put the American, European, Russian death figure at 300 million.

Not being afraid to die and wanting to commit suicide are not comparable tenets. We believe enough people in the United States would be willing to sacrifice their lives if it were necessary to preserve our Nation, but there is no need for being either Red or dead if human intelligence can surmount fear and mistrust—and insanity.

There must be a beginning. This treaty seems the best start the world has seen to date. Quoting the President again, it "will radically reduce nuclear testing" and is "a step away from war" if observed. It is "a shaft of light."

In the battle between our philosophies and those of the Soviets, the West is still ahead.

The Berlin Wall still stands as a symbol to the world that freedom of choice is nothing but irony in the Soviet sphere. Premier Khrushchev himself, only last summer, stated "the peoples themselves must choose the social system which suits them best." The wall is the monument to peoples' choice.

It is our firm position that this question of choice should be decided in peaceful competition, and not by war.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, July 27, 1963]

COMMONSENSE TREATY

The limited test ban treaty initialed in Moscow by the negotiators for the United States, Soviet Union and Great Britain is a victory for commonsense, whether or not it is the forerunner of other East-West agreements to reduce cold war tensions.

It is suicidal to continue testing nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, in outer space and in the oceans of the world. The fallout of deadly materials in Portland, Oreg., this summer has doubled as a result of rains bringing down the residue of last year's tests. Most other inhabited areas of the earth are similarly affected. The end result of nuclear testing, persistently continued, would be the equivalent of nuclear war. Men in power must control the seeds of destruction of mankind.

Continued testing by the three signatory powers had reached a point of absurdity. The United States and the U.S.S.R. already have many times the capacity to destroy each other with hydrogen blasts, and most of the rest of the world as well. This is known, in the grim new terminology of the nuclear age, as "overkill."

The acceptance of an agreement to end nuclear testing, except underground testing, which does not threaten the health and existence of mankind with fallout or poisoning of water, also is sensible in that none of the three nations can afford this unnecessary expense. The Soviet Union, particularly, is in hard economic straits because of its concentration on military and space technology. Premier Khrushchev may be expected, if he remains in power, to pay more attention henceforth to the needs of Soviet citizens.

There is opposition among the military leaders, some scientists, and some Members of Congress to any such treaty with the U.S.S.R. Nevertheless the U.S. Senate would be totally unreasonable should it reject the treaty which will be sent up for ratification after it is signed in Moscow by the Soviet and British Foreign Ministers and the U.S. Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk. The Nation, we believe, supports the test ban treaty, and most of the people of the world demand it.

It is futile to assert we cannot trust the Russians, or that the treaty is valueless because it does not include France and Red China. No treaty is more valid than the performance of its signers, and this treaty permits each signatory to abrogate it if its interests are threatened. But one must assume some degree of sincerity by Khrushchev in withdrawing his earlier opposition to a limited test ban, and in not making a nonaggression treaty a condition of signing this one. The hope, furthermore, is that the test ban pledge will be signed by many other nations who will help to bring pressure to bear on France and China. A start must be made somewhere, and the logical place is among the present nuclear powers.

If the test ban treaty with Russia, the first substantial resolution of differences since signing of the Austrian Peace Treaty in 1955, leads to other steps to reduce the dangers of the cold war, well and good. If not, nothing has been lost.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) News, July 28, 1963]

THE PRESIDENT AND THE TREATY

While the more technical lines of debate on the nuclear test treaty just initiated at Moscow must await fuller discussion, President Kennedy's Friday night speech caught the spirit of the occasion well—hope tempered by great caution.

If as he said "a ray of light" has now penetrated skies almost uniformly overcast since Hiroshima, this is far from a total clearing. Yet in the words of his apt Chinese proverb—it is a good season, it seems, for Chinese proverbs—"A journey of a thousand miles is begun with a single step."

Will the U.S. Senate now be beguiled by Confucian wisdom? We believe it will, although it will doubtless take the "single step" after a fairly extended time of testing the political air, and no doubt after some rambunctious and possibly enlightening debate.

The largest single reason why the Senate will probably ratify the treaty is that, as Walter Lippmann cogently argued the other day, the treaty in most detail is of American vintage. It has been before the world without substantial domestic challenge for almost a year; and the sudden emergence of opposition would be strange and certainly embarrassing to the administration's presumed ability to negotiate in good faith in behalf of the American people.

The significance of the treaty is, in our view, almost wholly political, not military. It carries an easy escape hatch for any signatory who grows dissatisfied. The adherence to its provisions of the French and Chinese is at present an open question. And the treaty itself, far from being a token of actual "trust" between Russia and the Western nuclear powers, simply bespeaks a willingness to experiment in mutual control of the arms race. The perils of the arms race to all mankind have long since outweighed its advantages. As long as the competition to devise an infallible delivery system, or an infallible weapon, continues, that long will the nations involved saddle themselves with spiraling expenditure of their goods.

And all along, the governments who must test and develop these dreadful devices of destruction have known, if they had hearts at all, of the immense moral burden they assume in jeopardizing the future of the planet with the unforeseeable effects of radioactive fallout. This is a burden that can be laid down only by finally ceasing to test nuclear weapons altogether—the distant goal toward which this tentative and limited treaty looks.

The President, wisely we think, refrained from holding the treaty up as flawless. It may have flaws. It may, for instance, be violated without detection in the distant reaches of space; but such violations would be so expensive, so remote, so difficult to control, and so easy to verify if they were detected, as to render them virtually useless.

The Russians may, too, have developed a better missile defense. That possibility seems to haunt some Senators. But this is a matter which the Senate must probably judge behind closed doors, in the face of highly classified intelligence, and the private citizen must simply trust its judgment.

From all evidence, there is little reason to fear for the present effectiveness of American delivery systems or missile defenses. When Defense Secretary McNamara proposed, a year ago, to exclude Russian cities from devastation in the event of nuclear holocaust, he was implying, according to the best opinion, that the U.S. delivery system is of such precision that it may actually discriminate and offer options to an enemy.

At all events, a nuclear arms race has the disadvantage of being unending. One might recall in this connection that the advocates of bigger and better missiles, including the President himself, rode the "missile gap" of the late fifties a long way, only to find, to their great embarrassment, that it was largely a myth fostered to keep a large share of the defense budget in Air Force hands.

So while one must agree with Mississippi's Senator STENNIS that the Senate must ask hard, factual questions about the treaty, the Nation must also beware of those perennial opponents of all treaties and all test suspensions who clothe their opposition silkily in unchallengeable technical-military jargon. The issues concerning this treaty are primarily political and moral, and the public should not forget it.

In the last analysis those who support and vote for this treaty will assume a certain risk, but they know it. Without such risks, the world is doomed to a dreary and unending arms race in which there will be no final winner.

[From the Troy (N.Y.) Times-Record, July 27, 1963]

SMALL BUT SIGNIFICANT

The limited nuclear test-ban treaty concluded by the United States, Russia and Britain, still to be ratified, is but a small beginning toward reaching an end to the cold war, but after 18 years of frustration each time a similar effort was made, it is still significant.

Fortunately the discussion of the treaty by the Senate will do more than give the skeptics a chance to raise their objections. It will give each of us time to pause and realize that an end to the threat of nuclear war is still in the distant future. But at least the East and West may be encouraged to go on by the realization that limited collaboration may be possible.

While all humanity will benefit from the reduced threat of lethal nuclear fallout we can expect some debate about whether the test ban treaty will shift the balance of nuclear power in favor of the Soviet Union. Divergent views will be expressed by scientists and military leaders but it is at least encouraging to note the military chiefs are said to feel the advantages from the treaty outweigh its risks.

Testing by France and Communist China may upset the test-ban treaty. Nor do we have any guarantee against cheating or underground testing. Even if, despite these drawbacks, we were tempted to consider the treaty as encouragement to relax our guard we must remember the recent words of Premier Khrushchev who assured his followers: "Peaceful coexistence is the best means of achieving world communism."

Viewed with the proper caution the test ban treaty reminds one of the saying: "It is better to light a single candle than to curse the darkness." The test-ban treaty could be a candle providing not only a light for forward vision but heat for warmer human relations.

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Tribune, July 27, 1963]

Next Negotiations: In the Senate

The U.S. Government, having achieved a "victory for mankind" in negotiations with the Soviet Union, now faces the task of ratifying the victory in negotiations with the U.S. Senate.

President Kennedy ably expressed the meaning of the nuclear test-ban treaty in his report to the Nation last night:

"This treaty is not the millennium. It will not resolve all the conflicts or cause the Communists to forgo their ambitions, or eliminate the dangers of war. It will not reduce our need for arms or allies or programs of assistance to others. But it is an important first step—a step toward reason—a step away from war."

The treaty conceivably still could be repudiated by the governments which negotiated and initialed it. Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev is pressing for an East-West nonaggression pact to accompany the test ban. Thus far he has refrained from insisting that a nonaggression pact, which might involve a form of recognition of East Germany unacceptable to the United States and Britain, should be tied directly to the test ban. Unless he changes from smiles to scowls with a speed unprecedented even for him, the test-ban treaty seems assured of final signing by the three governments which negotiated it. The nonaggression conversations then could proceed separately.

However, the treaty outlawing nuclear tests in the atmosphere, under water and in space still must be ratified by two-thirds of the Members of the U.S. Senate. Rumblings already are being heard that the U.S. Government might have difficulty persuading two-thirds of the Senators to support the first international agreement to bring nuclear forces under international control.

The treaty certainly will have the support of an overwhelming majority of the Senators. A two-thirds majority is difficult to muster, however, for any major proposal. And the test-ban treaty, as "an important first step toward reason," obviously is a major proposal.

Some few Senators who put racial prejudice even ahead of international peace may attempt to play politics with the test-ban treaty to combat the administration's civil rights program. Right wing extremists in and out of the Senate may be so pathologically distrustful of any negotiations with the Communists that they refuse even to recognize that this treaty would widen the gulf between the Chinese and Russian Communists and reduce the dangers of global war. A few Senators, basing their objections on technical grounds, may flatly reject the President's assurance that "this Nation now possesses a variety of techniques to detect the nuclear tests of other nations which are conducted in the air or under water." They may insist that no form of test-ban treaty should be adopted unless the Russians accept entirely the U.S. demand for on-site inspections to prevent cheating, a demand now limited to any future negotiations on underground testing.

Senator repudiation of the Government's agreement naturally would shatter the whole U.S. position of leadership in the Western World, so it is unlikely that the treaty would be rejected. It is not impossible, however. Some forces in the Nation and the Senate would welcome any opportunity to get the United States out of its "entangling alliances" abroad and return to a "fortress America" concept of isolationism. These forces may be expected to initiate a concerted campaign to discredit the test ban treaty. The "victory for mankind" is not yet quite assured.

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune, July 28, 1963]

Only the First Step on a Long Journey

President Kennedy began his campaign for ratification of the nuclear test-ban treaty with a calm and cautious appraisal of its meaning.

The treaty, said the President, is a sign of hope. It represents the first agreement on nuclear matters between the West and the Soviet Union in 17 years of argument and negotiation.

In 1946, Bernard Baruch, speaking for the United States, proposed an international atomic authority which would have "complete managerial control of the production of fissionable materials."

This was one of the most sweeping offers ever made. At that time the United States possessed the atomic bomb, the rest of the world did not. But the Soviet Union chose to say "Nyet," and the nuclear race followed.

The treaty just negotiated in Moscow by the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union is nothing like the Baruch plan.

It is a very limited affair. It provides for no controls. It simply says that the three parties involved agree to cease nuclear testing in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water.

But it is an enforceable treaty since violations can be detected.

In his address to the Nation Friday, President Kennedy acknowledged the possibility of cheating through a nuclear explosion set off far out in space. He added, however, the magnitude of the preparations needed for such a test would make it virtually impossible to conceal.

Mr. Kennedy also noted one of the most likely arguments of the treaty opponents when he gave solemn assurance that the Nation's security will not be impaired. While some tests will be ended, underground testing can continue and weapons development will not come to a halt. The Senate undoubtedly will carefully explore this point through the questioning of U.S. military leaders.

The President took pains to emphasize that the treaty is only a first step, and a limited step at that.

No agreement was reached with the Soviets on any other issue, including a nonaggression pact greatly desired by Premier Khrushchev, nor is the treaty itself linked to any other issue.

Though Mr. Kennedy called the treaty "a victory for mankind," he balanced this glowing phrase with realistic analysis. The millenium is not just around the corner, nor will the treaty resolve all conflicts between East and West. The danger of war continues. But a change for the better in the international climate may be in the making.

How far and how fast the nations of the world can travel on the path toward peace depends on many factors.

The Moscow treaty involves only three nations. France, which hopes to become a great nuclear power, has yet to be heard from. Perhaps President De Gaulle will supply the answer at his Monday press conference.

Mr. Kennedy tried to bring pressure on De Gaulle by asserting that France, along with the three signers of the treaty, has an obligation to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. We hope the message gets through to De Gaulle on his lofty peak of solitary grandeur. For whether or not De Gaulle will admit it, France is a member—not the leader—of the community of nations.

The President hopes for speedy Senate ratification of the treaty.

We favor ratification preceded by careful consideration and full debate.

But, please, no haggling and, above all, no politicking.

This first step is well worth taking. At the same time, the limited nature of the first step must be completely recognized. As Bernard Baruch has so rightly said, "Peace does not follow disarmament; disarmament follows peace." And peace lies at the end of a long, long journey which as yet has hardly begun.

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) Journal Gazette, July 28, 1963]

Realize the Ancient Dream of Peace

Men have dreamed of peace and the end of war since the dawn of civilization.

Four hundred years before Christ, Herodotus, the historian, was quoting Croesus as saying: "No man is so foolish as to desire war more than peace; for in peace sons bury their fathers, but in war fathers bury their sons."

And, 400 years later, the Man known as the Prince of Peace, speaking from the Mount, said: "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God."

But the bright dream has never come to pass.

In our own 20th century the two greatest wars of all time have been fought.

The ultimate weapon today is so terrible that it can destroy the largest city with one blast and in the batting of an eye.

What are those who inhabit the earth now to do about peace?

It should be the subject foremost in their minds and hearts.

The atomic weapons have made war impossible to all but madmen.

They have taken any possible profit out of international conflict. Nobody who participated in atomic conflict could possibly win it. Everybody would lose.

Future progress and prosperity depend upon peace.

Last week, in Moscow, representatives of the three great atomic powers signed their initials to a piece of paper which could become a historic document of the first importance.

It can become important if it is made to usher in a new era of thinking.

If the world is to have peace, let it begin now.

This is the age when mankind can do itself the greatest of favors, if it has the will to do so.

Why wait to bring the moral, ethical, and political progress up to the advance of science? Science has rushed ahead at a rapid pace since our Nation began.

Compare the ox-drawn cart to the jet plane.

Compare the muzzle-loading muskets of George Washington's day to the hydrogen bombs today.

Then ask yourself whether morals and ethics and politics have made comparable progress in the same period.

This is an age which calls for a reawakening.

Mankind should leave its old destructive past behind, and march into the light of a new and better day.

[From the Little Rock Arkansas Gazette, July 27, 1963]

A Conservative Appraisal of New Nuclear Treaty

W. Averell Harriman and the American delegation in Moscow will not be returning with the promise of "peace for our time" for that was not what they were sent after. What they were sent after was a limited agreement covering the categories of nuclear weapons tests that are the most gratuitously injurious to the world's health and peace of mind, the kind of test-ban treaty that might have been signed at any time within the past 5 years without serious prejudice to this country's comparative position in the nuclear arms race.

If it also should prove in time to have been the start of something bigger—"the end of the beginning," as Winston Churchill once expressed it, at another, sharply differing turning point in history—well, then, fine. But, as everyone in authority from President Kennedy on down continues to warn us, perhaps excessively, none of us should expect too much from the Moscow agreement. All right, we shan't; it's a promise.

The hope and attention of the world now will shift to another arena—the Senate of the United States—where so much history of this sort has been written before, sometime by "a little group of willful" men, who succeeded in arresting the flow of history only for the briefest of periods, sometimes by a larger group of willful men, who were able to divert the flow of history for a full generation or, put another way, the space between two great World Wars.

We do not presently know the size of the Senate opposition to the test ban treaty. We cannot know how many members of the opposition that does materialize will choose to involve this issue with wholly extraneous domestic issues in the hope of personal or partisan advantage; or, indeed, whether any will.

To any Member of the Senate who may be contemplating such a course of action, we will offer a few words of advice, in the sincere hope that they will prove to have been unnecessary:

First, anyone who opposes this particular test-ban treaty in too reckless a fashion will inevitably lay himself open to the suspicion that he is opposed to any test-ban treaty; i.e., any serious attempt to put the lid back on the box. The American people have made it quite clear that they are not for "peace at any price," but it does not follow from this that either they or history will look kindly upon persons who appear to have set themselves up in the business of "preventing peace."

And, finally, lay off the "appeasement" bit, fellas, because we don't think anybody really is buying. As we recently remarked, an indispensable precondition of the appeasement of the 1930's was the thought, assiduously cultivated in this country by the "America Firsters," of how preponderant the German arsenal in being already was. Such a precondition simply does not exist today. Even the casual newspaper reader is aware by now that our ICBMs now are being put into place at an average rate of one a day, and that a single Polaris submarine packs more explosive potential than everything fired off by both sides in World War II.

We can, if we choose, read some pretty ominous things into statistics such as these, but none of them smells anything at all like "appeasement."

[From the Enid (Okla.) News, July 27, 1963]

Test-Ban Pact Initialed

Few, if any, can argue with the arrival at agreement on a partial nuclear test-ban pact between the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union. All mankind can rejoice that both friend and foe recognize the horrors in nuclear warfare and are willing to work together to curb the danger it imposes.

Certainly, if the pact is ultimately approved by all parties, we should not expect this initial step to solve all our problems but consider it only as benchmark from which negotiators can review the past and plan for the future in their quest for peaceful settlement of other disagreements.

The test-ban pact requires ratification by two-thirds of the U.S. Senate for American participation. We hope all Senators will consider the ban treaty in the light of its significance, yet not forgetting the necessity of thorough study and understanding of all the minute details involved.

We look with anticipation to ratification, not as an end within itself but, rather, that the treaty can serve as a turnwheel from which troubles of the world can be scanned, studied, discussed and eventually be solved in peace.

Perhaps, this time Khrushchev seeks to bargain in sincerity. Only the future will tell. But one thing we do know is that things are not all well at home with the men in the Kremlin. A troublesome problem, yet unsolved, is agricultural production in the Soviet Union. A healthy agriculture takes money and a degree of freedom for the farmer—both of which are impossible so long as all efforts and means are directed toward production and planning destructive nuclear weapons.

On the eve of the nuclear test-ban treaty discussions, we hold quiet optimism for its success. Its ratification by all the participants will serve as a base of operations for other discussions and as long as leaders of nations continue to talk there is a likelihood that one day they will stumble onto grounds of agreement—and peace. That's the basis of our hopes in a nuclear test ban treaty.

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) News, July 29 1963]

It's Only a Tiny Step, so Bear in Mind: Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty—Don't Expect a Miracle

It is not, as President Kennedy pointed out, "the millennium."

But for all the reservations that must be made concerning it, the nuclear test-ban treaty, initialed last week in Moscow, is a significant first step toward sanity and stability in the world.

In his address to the Nation on the treaty, Mr. Kennedy struck the right note. His message was one of hope but not of illusion. He outlined the uncertainties and limitations of the treaty. He told his nationwide audience exactly what the treaty is not capable of doing. He made sure to note that the treaty's escape clause provides an honorable exit for any of the participants, including the United States, if unforeseen developments alter the nuclear stalemate.

Then, point by telling point, he got to the heart of the matter: For all the risks in this or any treaty, there are greater risks in unrestricted testing and the nuclear arms race. Said President Kennedy:

"This limited test ban in our most careful judgment is safer by far for the United States than an unlimited nuclear arms race."

If it holds up, this treaty will be the first concrete achievement in the long, often hopelessly frustrating effort to defuse the world's nuclear powderkeg. To hope that it does hold up is not to forget the many lessons of dealing with the Communists. The President, his advisers, and the great majority of Americans know full well that the Soviets are not giving up their intention of victory over the West. What's more, Premier Khrushchev knows that we know that.

What reason, then, would the Soviets have for living up to the treaty? The answer is national interest. As evidenced by their all but open break with Communist China, the Soviets don't want a nuclear war any more than we do. They probably agree that unlimited testing and development of new bombs is an invitation to disaster. They have economic reasons for wanting to curtail the pellmell armaments race. They may even be a little alarmed about the dangers of radioactive fallout, which knows no national boundaries.

The door to the treaty certainly was opened wider by the Soviet-Chinese rift. It was no accident of timing that the Harriman-Hailsham delegation arrived in Moscow just about when the Chinese were leaving. Neither is it an accident that the Chinese announced just after the treaty was signed that they expected to have nuclear arms "in the not-too-distant future." That's not likely to comfort the Soviets any more than it will cheer the rest of the world. It's all the more reason why nations that have everything to lose from an all-out nuclear war should find mutual interest in lowering the risks of such a war.

Mr. Kennedy took pains to answer just about all the critical reservations that will be raised about this treaty. And he made an all-out bid for public support.

There are compelling reasons for the public, and the Senate, to provide that support.

[From the Miami (Fla.) News, July 27, 1963]

Step Away From War: Even This Partial Gain Outweighs the Risks

President Kennedy's plea yesterday for acceptance of the partial test-ban agreement was all the more persuasive because of his admission that the draft treaty is not foolproof.

Candidly, the President conceded that "secret violations are possible and secret preparations for a sudden withdrawal are possible," and he said "our own vigilance and strength must be maintained, as we remain ready to withdraw and to resume all forms of testing, if we must."

In this scientific age, and with the Soviet's historic propensity for deceit, it would be all but impossible to convince the American people that any such agreement is ironclad.

Yes, there are risks involved. And if the purpose of the treaty had been to put the United States one up on the Russians, you can be sure there would be no Soviet initial on the treaty today.

The test ban, if it is concluded, will represent no great strategic victory for either East or West. It will, however, represent a significant addition to the security of all mankind, and it will hold out the hope that even more meaningful steps away from nuclear war are possible.

What we face is a choice between the very minimal risks involved in this treaty and the very great dangers of continuing the nuclear race unchecked. On balance, we think the treaty is much to be preferred, and we think the public and the U.S. Senate will agree.

[From the Whittier (Calif.) News, July 27, 1963]

The Ban, a Hesitant Start

The text of the nuclear test-ban agreement initiated by the United States, Russia, and Great Britain recites that each of them will refrain from carrying out any nuclear weapon test explosion in the air, in outer space, or under water.

In addition it says that if such tests are made in any other environment (such as underground) they will be conducted so that no debris will be present outside the territorial limits of the testing country.

This is a simple agreement. The terms are understandable. They do not go very far, as is quickly apparent, in the direction of inspections to make certain that such tests do not take place. But the agreement does offer a hesitant start in the direction of controlling the vast powers of the atom.

Perhaps this—a hesitant beginning—is all that the three powers contemplate at this time. They may feel that if the beginning is simple enough the agreement can be expanded for greater usefulness in the future. In this respect, provision is made for additional signers. It also allows any nation to withdraw if it feels its national interest has been violated.

But from the long and experienced walk it has had since World War II down the hallway of history, the U.S. Government will have to look upon the treaty with some measure of misgiving.

Remembering Yalta we must ask whether there has been any side agreement not yet disclosed. Chairman Khrushchev is reported to have been urging a nonaggression pact on divided Germany as a trading point on the nuclear ban.

How will the treaty be policed, if at all? What will its value be if nations not signatories to the agreement test in the atmosphere? Meaning China and France and possibly, in the future, others? What will be the specific limitations on our own nuclear developments, even for peaceful purposes?

We look upon the new agreement with great hope, as surely must many millions all over the earth. We trust the document can live up to its own minimum provisions.

[From the Jersey City (N.J.) Jersey Journal July 27, 1963]

MANKIND'S VICTORY

Who can quarrel with President Kennedy's description of the agreement between the Soviet Union and the West to eliminate atmospheric and underwater nuclear fission tests? "A victory for mankind." Certainly it is. Anything to check polluting the air we all breathe is such a victory.

But does that mean a nuclear war has been averted? Of course not. The nations could stop all testing and still blow each other from the face of the earth.

The victory which may prevent a war is a psychological one. We finally have agreed with the Russians on something—an agreement hastened by Nikita Khrushchev's necessity to be friends with us because China will not be friends with him. If we and the Russians both live up to our pledge, the experience may make the next agreement easier and the one after that still easier.

If we merely have served to ease the strain on Khrushchev because of his Chinese complications, then mankind's victory will prove to have been a slim one.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times, July 25, 1963]

GOOD NEWS—WE HOPE

An agreement to stop polluting the atmosphere or the territorial waters or the high seas with the testing of nuclear weapons appears on the threshold of acceptance by the United States and the Soviet Union. If this can be achieved in treaty form and ratified by the U.S. Senate, the event will be one of the expression of solemn gratitude and high hope.

Not since 1955, when the East-West negotiations resulted in the Austrian Treaty, have the two major powers come so closely together in amicable spirit. They were headed toward an era of good feeling after the Eisenhower-Khrushchev meeting at Camp David, Md. But the spirit of that occasion was obliterated in May of 1960 when the Russians bagged an American U-2 reconnaissance plane. Now we have a new opening and possibility for peace.

The record, of course, suggests caution. A government that is unreservedly devoted to peace would not rationalize indirect aggression as justified "wars of liberation." And as long as Communist policy supports guerrilla activity in Africa, Asia, or Latin America, the Soviet Union itself is vulnerable to the suspicion that its endorsement of a test ban treaty is a means of stabilizing the nuclear front while fomenting trouble elsewhere.

Still, there are starkly grim reasons why the two major powers should seek ground rules of competition and stick by them. The New York Times observed recently that Washington and the Kremlin must "devise forms of collaboration" to "contain the expansion of Communist China, to settle the frontiers of Central Europe, to avoid overcommitments to feuding nations in the Middle East" and to guard against "being drawn into wars that neither intends to fight."

The "spirit" of present negotiations could, therefore, be a common recognition of heightened danger in the expansion of the "nuclear club" and the spread of military power—to Communist China, to France, to India, to West Germany, to Egypt, to Israel. The Times' analysis suggests that in Washington, the test ban is being viewed as the start of a "belated drive to curb the spread of weapons," more than as a means of "arresting the poisoning of the atmosphere with radioactive fallout."

Some will dismiss a treaty with the Soviet Union as a worthless gesture, intended only to beguile the West and to cover the Russians' cold war maneuvers elsewhere. We accept the view, however, that a ban on atmospheric and underseas testing is good news for mankind. And we hope it comes to pass.

[From the Jersey Shore (Pa.) Evening News, July 29, 1963]

PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

There is no practical alternative to ratification of the new three-power test-ban treaty agreed upon in Moscow by agents of the United States, Great Britain, and Russia. We may reserve our doubts about the good faith of the Soviets, we may have our qualms about what may happen if other nations go ahead with testing of nuclear weapons, and we may wonder if the pact is worth more than the paper it's written on. But there are overriding reasons why the pact must be signed, why we must do our best to make it work, even while refusing to surrender all our skepticism, and why we must transfer as much as possible of our rivalry with communism to the realm of nonmilitary action.

These reasons can be lumped into one package. We have reached the point where neither we nor the Russians can take the responsibility for continuing unregulated tests which can release unknown amounts of radiation.

Since that radiation can have effects we cannot estimate, which will affect people over the whole world, without regard to their nationality or politics, sane people of all advanced countries must recognize the need for some method of halting further contamination of the earth and its atmosphere.

Only the Chinese refuse to see the logic of self-preservation which is the underlying factor that has brought the test-ban treaty to the point it has now reached.

The reason why the Chinese are reluctant may very well be only that they have not yet grasped the scope of the radiation danger. The peasants of China have a pretty hazy notion of it, except as they have been taught that it is a threat from the imperialists, and the men at the head of Red China are resolutely ignoring it because they want their own nuclear bombs.

Vast changing forces seem to be at work in the world, and we must safeguard ourselves against two great hazards. One is the danger that we may be alert only to obsolescent threats, so that we ignore more serious new perils. The other is that we may be too slow in adjusting our defenses to the changing threats.

Our participation in the test ban treaty does not mean that we trust the Russians, but that we share with them a responsible fear of what radiation can do, and recognize, as they must do, also, that the world can be ruined for the future by reckless release of nuclear contamination. It means that, under the compulsion of this mutual fear, we shall work together to see if we cannot fend off the danger of mutual destruction.

No one can deny, and the Russians themselves do not try to deny, that Soviet compacts have been broken, time after time, and that there is no good record of precedent to guarantee the sanctity of the new treaty. The strength of the treaty lies, however, in the immensity of the danger it is designed to contain, not in the good faith of those who sign.

It is all too true that the Russians have violated their agreement to keep hands off the Nations of Eastern Europe and that this is only one of many agreements they have flouted when their own self-interest was at stake.

It is also true, however, that, in the case of this nuclear test agreement, what is at stake is the habitability of the world, which is the same world for the Russians as it is for us.

Our best guarantee that the new pact will be maintained is the growing realization that the tremendous fact of radiation danger forces all signatories to adhere to the pact, rather than break it, not to gain any passing advantage, but in their own permanent self-interest.

[From the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press, July 27, 1963]

SENATE MUST RATIFY NUCLEAR TREATY

Since Soviet Russia sees advantages in the nuclear test-ban agreement it must be disadvantageous to the United States, says Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California, a member of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. This argument may have some popular appeal but its logic is faulty. It rests on the implied premise that everything advantageous to the Soviets is disadvantageous to us and that's not so. For example, purity of the atmosphere—it's advantageous to both the Soviets and to us to avoid further pollution from radioactive fallout, and that's one thing the test-ban would do.

There are other advantages to be anticipated from this agreement too and it's a good thing HOSMER's vote will not be cast against it since only the Senate votes on ratification of treaties.

The pact binds the United States, Britain, and Russia "not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion * * * in the atmosphere, beyond its limits including outer space, or under water" or "in any other environment if such explosion causes radioactive debris." It doesn't bar underground nuclear tests but it says the parties seek to achieve "the conclusion of a treaty resulting in the permanent banning of all nuclear test explosions, including all such explosions underground." And it proclaims that the "principal aim" of the three powers is "the speediest possible achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international control." Any party can withdraw from the agreement on 3 months' notice "if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interest of its country."

There is nothing in this agreement that the United States cannot accept. Nuclear explosions above ground can be detected without the on-site inspection necessary for underground tests to distinguish them from earthquakes, so if the Soviets violated the treaty we would know it and could make the necessary response. From the military standpoint, what the agreement does is freeze the existing American and Soviet nuclear warfare capabilities except in the limited areas where progress can be made by underground testing. The Soviets may be ahead of us in very big bombs; they have tested a 100-megaton bomb which is so heavy no rocket can deliver it. But we are definitely ahead in the useful bombs and warheads up to 10 megatons, which is plenty to devastate even a country as big as Russia. So the freeze is perfectly OK with us.

This agreement, while strictly limited in itself, may well be an opening wedge to further understandings with the Soviets aimed at easing the cold war tensions. If we believe that nuclear war is avoidable, as we must, then we must not believe that negotiations are inherently undesirable; we must not fear to negotiate with the Soviets, nor consider it a sign of weakness or surrender to do so. This treaty could be a turning point, and if the Senate should fail to ratify it for any such reason as Senator Goldwater's objection that any treaty with Russia is a concession of weakness on our part, it could disastrously undermine our leadership of the free world.

[From the Glen Falls (N.Y.) Post-Star, July 27, 1963]

The Test Ban Treaty

The kind of world we live in is like this: We spend 10 or 15 years trying to get the Russians to agree to something and when they do, we have the awful feeling that we've made a mistake. Thus it is with the agreement between the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union to ban nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in space, and under water.

Members of the Senate, who hold ratification of this treaty in their hands, have declared that they are going to study its wording backward and forward. That is a good idea with any treaty. But after they have studied, what?

Several Senators have specifically objected to the clause giving signatories the right to withdraw from the treaty 3 months after due notice, if they suspect it is being violated or that testing by nonsignatories is jeopardizing their national interests. This clause, it is argued, will set us up to be victimized by the Soviets as we were when they broke the moratorium, an act that led to prolonged testing by themselves and the United States.

This clause is not analagous to the veto power embedded in the United Nations Security Council procedures. The veto power requires unanimity of the five permanent members or at least an absence of their opposition. The veto has been roundly denounced as the Russians have employed it; but the veto power included in the U.N. treaty is what persuaded the Senate to approve it. The question we may now ask is whether the Senate would approve this test ban treaty without the escape clause.

While that is being pondered, let's consider the merits of the case. The treaty will not remove the danger of nuclear conflict but, as long as the pact is observed, it will reduce it. Existing atomic powers cannot, under it, cooperate with countries like France and Red China that are trying to become atomic powers. It will slow the spread of the atomic potential.

And, as long as the treaty is honored, it will prevent the air we breath from being further contaminated by nuclear fallout. That is what millions of persons are interested in. They can conceive of an atomic stalemate but they would hate to see a race of human mutations—the result of poisoned atmosphere—come into being under such a stalemate.

Meanwhile, Richard Nixon, traveling in Europe, has warned us that Premier Khrushchev has not mellowed. Who thought he had? He is thoroughly untrustworthy but he is also near the end of his career. He has his reasons for wanting this treaty but if the treaty works his reasons might not correspond with the results. The next generation in Russia might be more receptive to the idea of progress through peace than Khrushchev's has been. Time has definitely discredited Marx-Leninism.

It might pay the Senators to be as concerned with what steps come after this treaty as with the treaty itself.

[From the Scottsbluff (Nebr.) Star-Herald, July 27, 1963]

Read Nothing Else Into It

The agreement by the United States, Britain, and the Soviet Union to end nuclear testing in the atmosphere, space, and under water is being hailed as a major break in the cold war. Time will tell whether this is fact or fancy and on the basis of the Soviet Union's record of smashing past agreements, is certainly open to a great deal of suspicion.

But all mankind can be thankful if this accord brings to a halt the pollution of the earth's atmosphere brought about by intermittent testing of nuclear weapons on a large and prolonged scale. Scientists are not in complete agreement as to the amount of harm already done by radioactive fallout. Some results may take years and generations to prove. But they are in agreement that a very real and unknown danger does exist.

If this can be eventually extended to a worldwide ban on nuclear weapons testing by all nations, then great good will have been accomplished. Certainly the use of poison gas in warfare has been held in abeyance ever since World War I.

There is nothing to warrant the leaders of the free world relaxing defenses or turning naive. The Communists turn their attitudes on and off as readily as a water faucet whenever it suits their purposes. And their blueprint for conquest carries a plan for peaceful gestures prior to their big blow.

Adlai Stevenson, the U.S. representative at the United Nations, during the Cuban crisis delivered one of the most comprehensive indictments of the Soviet Union and communism ever delivered. In case you have forgotten, this was what he said in part:

"I have often wondered what the world would be like today if the situation at the end of the war (World War II) had been reversed—if the United States had been ravaged and shattered by war, and if the Soviet Union had emerged intact in exclusive possession of the atomic bomb and overwhelming military and economic might. Would it have followed the same path and devoted itself to realizing the world of the charter?

"To ask this question suggests the central paradox of the U.N. For among the states which pledged fidelity to the idea of a pluralistic world in San Francisco were some who had an incompatible vision of the future world order.

"Has the Soviet Union ever really joined the U.N.? Or does its philosophy of history and its conception of the future run counter to the pluralistic concept of this Charter?

"Against the idea of diversity, communism asserts the idea of uniformity; against freedom, inevitability; against choice, compulsion; against democracy, dogma; against independence, ideology; against tolerance, conformity. Its faith is that the iron laws of history will require every nation to traverse the same predestined conclusion. Given this faith of a monolithic world, the very existence of diversity is a threat to the Communist future.

"I do not assert that communism must always remain a messianic faith. Like other fanaticisms of the past, it may in time lose its sense of infallibility and accept the diversity of human destiny."

Mr. Stevenson went on to say that the conflict between absolutist and pluralistic conceptions of the destiny of mankind remains the basic source of discord within the U.N.

Yes, the world can be thankful for a test ban agreement between the principal antagonists. But to see something more in it than actually is there could be fatal to the free world.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean, July 28, 1963]

Test Ban Poses a Choice and All Must Help Choose

In his sober speech to the American people Friday night, President Kennedy called for public debate on the test ban accord with Russia, noting that this treaty "is for all of us."

If ever there was a subject for great debate by all people, this is it. But it will not be a very enlightened debate if the tendency is to jump to conclusions that the treaty is either ushering in the millenium or that it is a cunning scheme by the Soviet to mislead and disarm us.

The treaty will not end the cold war. It will not, as President Kennedy noted, "resolve all conflicts, or cause the Communists to forgo their ambitions, or eliminate the dangers of war. It will not reduce our need for arms or allies or programs of assistance."

The treaty will not reduce nuclear stockpiles or prevent either side from adding to them at will. Any member can withdraw if it feels its national interest or security is impaired.

What it can do is put the major nuclear powers on record as saying they realize their personal responsibility in the matter of trying to break out of the vicious circle of spiraling nuclear arms, of bigger and bigger and more horrifying weapons.

It can curb the further pollution of the atmosphere with radioactive fallout—a deadly rain that threatens the health of this generation and generations yet unborn. It will contribute to a better political climate, and it can lead to more progress in reducing tensions below the threshold of friction which could ignite nuclear conflict.

There are already those who cry out that the Russians can't be trusted; that the record is full of examples of broken Soviet pledges. It is quite true that frequent violations of word and deed have occurred in the past where the Kremlin believed its national interests were threatened. But this does not mean necessarily that no agreements are possible at any time.

The administration did not go into this with eyes closed, nor does it intend to take the accord on blind faith. "We have learned in time past," said Mr. Kennedy, "that the spirit of one moment or place can be gone in the next. We have been disappointed more than once, and we have no illusions now there are shortcuts to peace."

The Nation will not rely blindly on Soviet good faith. It will rely on a far-flung and constantly improving detection network which can warn of explosions in the atmosphere or underwater. There are, of course, faint possibilities that our detection system might miss an explosion in the remoteness of outer space, or even a tiny explosion under water.

But the question is whether the greater risk does not come from an unlimited nuclear arms race and unlimited testing by the major powers, along with the proliferation of nuclear arms by the smaller countries. Each step epresents added danger to humanity, both from radiation and the possibility that war might be set off by accident or miscalculation.

The test-ban accord may not stop France from pursuing its own road to being a nuclear power. It is unlikely to stop Communist China from trying to build a nuclear arsenal. But both of these are some years away from completion of such arsenals. The force of the example of the United States, Britain, and the Soviet, and the consequent thrust of world opinion cannot be discounted as meaningless to nations—even China.

As for the major powers themselves, there are cold, practical reasons for viewing the accord. Nuclear armaments are a fantastic drain on economies, and testing for both sides may have reached the point of diminishing returns. Both sides have an oversufficiency of weapons, and in a nuclear conflict, as Chairman Khrushchev has told the Chinese, the survivors of the world "would envy the dead."

Mr. Khrushchev, faced with the prospect of war over Cuba and virtual extinction from a nuclear conflict, has staked his policy on maneuvers short of nuclear battle and in providing affluence for the Russian people. In summing up all these things, undoubtedly he has reached the conclusion that a limited test ban is to his political and national interest.

Ratification now by the governments of the three countries could open the door to progress in other areas of disagreement, and the Soviet break with Communist China offers an opportunity to push forward on the diplomatic level.

In this country ratification rests upon the U.S. Senate. It must judge the treaty on its merits and its language, but it will also need some guidance from the people of this Nation who are able to look beyond petty partisanship to the somber horizons of our perilous world.

There are those whose first concern is partisan, who hate to see Mr. Kennedy take any credit for relieving cold war tensions. Former Vice President Nixon now characterizes as "woolly thinking" what the Eisenhower-Nixon administration itself sought so long. Senator Goldwater has a whole wheelbarrow full of objections, including one that "it was worked out too fast."

The pros and cons must be weighed, of course, but the debate should be free of quibbling contentiousness. Peace is a bipartisan affair, just as fallout rains on all alike and as a nuclear war threatens us collectively, not as Democrats or Republicans.

The test ban can amount to a historic milestone in the cold war and along the road to peace. Or, it can be the point where mankind chooses the same old path to peril, shattering hopes that it can ever break free of the Frankenstein's monster it has created and doubts it can long control.

There is hope that, collectively, we will choose to fashion a milestone and not a gravestone.

[From the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, July 27, 1963]

Elation, Yes, but With Caution

One cannot avoid a feeling of elation—nor, in our estimation should one try to—over the initialing of the partial nuclear test-ban treaty in Moscow.

It is a breakthrough in the cold war.

It is a positive step to limit the sometimes exaggerated, but nevertheless real, danger from fallout imminent in uncontrolled atmospheric testing of nuclear devices.

It is proof that men of ideological differences can sit down and work out an accord on matters vital to their nations.

It is probably, coming after so many failures in the past to agree on almost the same proposals from the West, further evidence of the reality of the rift between Communist China and the Soviet Union.

But once those causes for elation have been cited, there should also be cause for caution. This caution should be in two directions.

First, the Senate of the United States must show caution. The accord, already initialed, will be signed next week by the Foreign Ministers of Great Britain and the U.S.S.R. and by the Secretary of State of the United States. It does not, however, become a treaty until it is ratified by the respective governments, and such ratification in this country is the prerogative of the Senate.

There will be a temptation on the part of some in the Senate to quibble. Some may seek partisan advantage or personal notoriety. In this direction lies the danger of reopening a wound that is only partly healed.

The Senate, of course, cannot and should not abdicate its duty to look carefully at the proposed treaty. However, it should recognize it as an accomplishment and not quibble over minor things which doubtless already have been quibbled about in Moscow and in years of talks in Geneva before.

But the second necessity for caution is on the part of those in charge of American diplomatic policy.

This is a breakthrough in the cold war, but it is not the end of the cold war.

Soviet communism still holds an iron control over many of the peoples of East Europe. We cannot in any future negotiations afford to indicate any relaxation of our belief in their right of self-determination.

Soviet communism—whether by military or economic means—still clings to its intent to "bury the West." We cannot indicate any dropping of our guard to permit further extension of Soviet conquests, peaceable or otherwise.

At the announcement of the initaling, Britain's Lord Hailsham called the accord "the beginning of many good things." Russia's Andrei Gromyko echoed him with "Let us consider this as a basis for further steps."

Those sound like hopeful words, but as they are spoken by a Russian diplomat we must remember the tendency of the U.S.S.R. in the past to appear to give a little only for the purpose of getting a lot.

Certainly there should be further negotiations over other real world ills, but negotiations cannot mean surrender.

The elation is inescapable. It is real. But the elation is not a signal for sleep, either diplomatically or on the military fronts.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, July 27, 1963]

Treaty Should Be Ratified

The Plain Dealer believes the partial nuclear test ban treaty that was initialed in Moscow, Thursday, should be ratified by the U.S. Senate.

President Kennedy, in a televised report to the Nation last night, made a comprehensive, forceful and deliberately dispassionate appeal for ratification. The President said the risks are slight, the potential rewards, enormous. He made the telling argument that "history and our own conscience will judge us harsher if we do not now make every effort to test our hopes by action, and this is the place to begin."

The treaty is not a cure-all for the ills that beset the world, but it is a positive step toward easing world tensions and relieving anxiety about nuclear fallout. And it may lead to more encouraging developments in the future.

Yes, we will be taking a risk if the treaty is ratified—the same risk we take in any agreement with the Soviet Union, the risk that it may be violated. But there is every indication that Soviet Premier Khrushchev is genuinely anxious to end contamination in the atmosphere and proliferation in the development of nuclear weapons, and the test ban would help bring these about.

Some Senators, including Ohio's Frank J. Lausche, want assurance from the Joint Chiefs of Staff that our security will not be endangered by the treaty, but if reports from the Pentagon are true, the chiefs of staff are expected to withdraw objections they had expressed earlier. The escape clause gives the United States, as well as other signatories, the right to withdraw from the treaty if "extraordinary events" are deemed to jeopardize the safety of the country. And if conditions required it, we could always conduct undrground tests as long as they did not cause radioactive debris to be deposited outside our territorial limits.

Other nations have been invited to sign the treaty. Most are expected to do so, but France and Communist China have already said they will not be bound by it. France has decided it must become a first-class nuclear power at whatever cost in world opinion. Red China brags that it will produce its own nuclear weapons in due time, but this seems extremely unlikely without outside help.

The treaty is not perfect, but it is better than nothing, and it is the most significant agreement the Soviet Union has entered into since the Austrian treaty of 1955.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, July 27, 1963]

In America, a Great Debate Begins

If there could be a worldwide vote on the proposed test ban treaty, who can doubt the result? It would be endorsed by a vast majority of human beings, as the start of a process that may save them from nuclear destruction.

In limited areas, however, strong and almost automatic opposition has already appeared. It has three main sources:

1. Communist China, at least at the government level. The Red mandarins call the treaty "a United States fraud." These men really believe in nuclear warfare as a desirable objective. Their spokesmen have quarreled in Moscow with Premier Khrushchev who holds that after a nuclear war "those who survive might envy the dead." China, too, very likely depends on Soviet technical help in developing its own atom bomb. If such aid is cut off, Red China may miss membership in the exclusive nuclear club.

2. France, again at the governmental level. President de Gaulle, like the Chinese leaders, wants his own nuclear armory, for use at his own discretion.

3. Certain circles within the United States. These include:

(a) Groups and individuals committed to the position that any agreement with the Soviet Union is worthless because the Reds can't be trusted. It is up to the proponents of the treaty to demonstrate to those whose minds are not entirely closed that there is no question of trust in this document on either side, since both we and the Russians have means of detecting violations in the fields the treaty covers, and an open escape from the treaty terms if such violations occur.

(b) People such as GOP Congressman Craig Hosmer, of California. He contends that if the treaty contains advantages for the Russians, "it must contain substantial disadvantages to us." This argument denies that human beings have a mutual interest in survival, regardless of the kind of government under which they live. Carried to its logical conclusion, Mr. Hosmer's reasoning would lead us to suspend our laws against murder, since the Russians find it to their interest to have similar laws.

(c) Politicians who simply cannot bear to see the Kennedy administration get credit for easing the terrible tensions of the cold war. This group includes both Republicans such as Senator Goldwater and antiadministration Democrats such as Senator Thurmond. Mr. Goldwater has already trotted out a whole stable of arguments, such as that the treaty should have been negotiated in Washington instead of Moscow, and that it was worked out too fast, after the years of effort expended for this purpose in both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations. Fortunately, there are leading Republicans such as Kentucky's Senators Morton and Cooper, as well as many Democratic leaders, who declare themselves fully open to persuasion on the treaty's merits.

There will be millions of Americans who will want to suspend judgment until they have learned as much as they possibly can about the treaty's terms. Such an approach is completely logical, in a matter of such importance.

The task of convincing these men and women whose minds are open is one for the administration, and of course for the President himself. There can be no hint of pressure to huddle the issue through the Senate without all reasonable time for discussion.

There must be no attempt to represent the treaty as a final solution of East-West troubles, or as a document that avoids all risks. The preamble of the treaty presents it simply as the first step toward a far wider objective, "an agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international control." The treaty is to some degree a gamble. Its proponents must show that its potential benefits far outweigh its limited dangers.

If ever there was a subject for a great American debate, this is it.

Our Constitution puts the responsibility for international pacts in the hands of the U.S. Senate. But before the Senate can act with mature judgment, there must be testimony from men of experience and prestige in both parties who are competent to speak on the issue. Former President Eisenhower is a notable example.

There is an obligation on the President to muster his fullest resources, as he gives every indication of doing.

There is a duty on the free media of communications in America to use their magnificent facilities to give the public both information and explanation on this complex issue.

There is an obligation, too, on plain American citizens themselves. It is their duty to seek out the facts, and to guard themselves against propaganda, against emotionalism, against petty partisanship on either side.

It is for just this kind of responsibility that the American people have been given the boon of free education. It is for just this kind of responsibility, above all, that the American people have been given the boon of freedom. We must now use these priceless assets.

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times, July 27, 1963]

De Gaulle, Red Chinese, "Kooks" Unite Against Bomb Ban

Walter Lippmann notes elsewhere on this page today that the historic test ban agreement signed by the United States, the Soviet Union and Great Britain is roughly the same one offered by the Eisenhower administration and later by the Kennedy administration.

The President made the same point in his superb address to the Nation last night urging support for the treaty.

Yet there are indications that considerable Republican opposition will be marshalled in the Senate to oppose the treaty, obviously to attempt to exploit the thesis that the Kennedy administration is appeasing the Communists.

Senator Goldwater has indicated that he will fight the treaty, a position that has the fanatic support of the political element in this Nation which Dick Nixon has called the "kooks and nuts."

There is no issue that more clearly dramatizes the irrationality of the far right than this insensate opposition to any plan to end the poisoning of the atmosphere and earth.

What, one inevitably asks, is to be achieved by further testing if both the East and West already have the nuclear power?

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, July 27, 1963]

Trying To Bottle the Genie

The three-power test-ban treaty, soon to be formally signed and then submitted to the Senate for ratification, would not take a single kiloton of destructive force away from the Soviet Union, the United States, or Great Britain. It would pound no bombs into plowshares. It sidesteps the issue of underground testing that has snarled all recent negotiations.

It does, however, mark a first step toward nuclear weapons control—toward putting the genie back in the bottle. It would halt the pumping of radioactive debris into the atmosphere, outer space, and the oceans by the three nations. It would open the way for cutting back on the production of nuclear weapons.

The United States has been striving for some form of nuclear control since 1946, when Bernard Baruch, speaking for this country, told the opening meeting of the United Nations Atomic Commission: "We are here to make a choice between the quick and the dead."

The United States had an atomic monopoly when Baruch submitted his plan for putting atomic energy under international control. The Soviet Union rejected the plan.

Then and since, the story of efforts to achieve a nuclear test ban separately or as part of a broader disarmament plan has been mainly one of frustration. President Eisenhower proposed the banning of tests in the atmosphere, under water, and in space, but Moscow insisted upon a comprehensive treaty including underground explosions. It did, that is, until President Kennedy recently revived the proposal.

Since the first test at Alamogordo, N. Mex., in wartime 1945, this country has set off approximately 250 nuclear devices. A precise breakdown is not available, but about 75 of these were underground, a very few were under water and several were in or at the threshold of outer space.

The United States has announced approximately 135 Russian test explosions, virtually all in the atmosphere. Britain is credited with 22 tests and France with 5.

World concern has grown, amid these explosions, over the danger to man of the radioactivity emitted by nuclear explosions and contaminated debris. Although scientists do not agree on just what constitutes serious radiation hazard, many believe that any increase in radiation should be avoided because of the danger of cancer and damage to human genes that would produce more retarded and disfigured children in future generations.

Well before the current treaty talks, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Pentagon were reported considering a cutback in weapon production. While still a Senator in 1960, John Kennedy said: "The world's nuclear stockpile contains an estimated equivalent of 30 billion tons of TNT—about 10 tons for every human being on earth."

According to another estimate, this Nation has enough nuclear weapons to deliver the equivalent of a Hiroshima bomb (20,000 tons of TNT) on every one of the 2,000 cities of the world with 100,000 population or more, and do it not once but 175 times.

The test ban treaty might bring a halt in nuclear weapon production and, eventually, a reduction in the massive stockpiles of destruction.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, July 27, 1963]

Weak, but a Beginning

The nuclear test ban treaty initialed in Moscow is a weak document, porous with escape clauses.

In essence it is little more than a resumption of the voluntary moratorium which Nikita Khrushchev broke peremptorily 2 years ago. The principal difference is that the treaty is a written agreement in which the three signatories agree to give each other, and additional nations which may join, 3 months' notice before resuming tests in the atmosphere, under water, or in space.

The treaty is weak because it depends upon the good faith of Nikita Khrushchev in order to make it workable. It is weak because it cannot stop or even discourage a nuclear war. It is weak because it does not include France, which has already tested and which plans to do more testing, or Red China, which is believed to be on the verge of exploding its first nuclear device.

These and perhaps other frailties should be freely admitted.

This is not a document to send the spirit soaring. By the same token, we cannot regard it as a menace to the security of the United States if the American Government remains alert and does not allow this limited trust to be abused by the Communists.

It would be a grave mistake for opponents of the treaty to regard it as Communist victory simply because Nikita Khrushchev wanted it. The American Government and the American people have wanted such a treaty, too, for 17 years and through three administrations.

We believe it would be a mistake also to underestimate the intensity of feeling, in America and the world around, concerning the dangers of radioactive fallout.

If this treaty can prevent the unnecessary explosion of nuclear devices in the atmosphere, if it can help to prevent the accumulation of radiation in the air, in drinking water, in the milk supply, it will have served a useful purpose.

Sometime, somewhere, if the world is to survive, it will have to make a start toward controlling the deadly atom. If the first, faltering step can be made without compromising the security of the United States, we believe that step should be taken.

[From the New York Journal-American, July 29, 1963]

A Hope

The limited test ban treaty initialed in Moscow could be a cautious step in the right direction, an expression of the yearnings of millions throughout the world, and a glimmer of hope for the future.

There is little doubt that W. Averell Harriman affixed his initials to the document only after unqualified technical assurance that it can in no way prejudice the security of the United States.

Thus the Senate should ratify the treaty on a broad bipartisan basis. No political considerations should be permitted to intrude on so crucial an issue.

The success of the treaty depends, of course, almost totally on the good faith of the Soviet Union. It cannot be forgotten that a "moratorium" on testing was once brazenly and unilaterally broken by the Kremlin. And while a resumption of tests can be immediately detected, the vital factor of honoring a solemn, written pledge is at stake.

Whether or not the treaty will lead to further reduction of East-West tensions will not be known for some time. Meanwhile the hair trigger military face-off between the United States and the Soviet Union continues. This will only be relaxed when the desirable goal of disarmament can be approached on a realistic and security-tight basis.

But all things have a beginning, and this treaty could possibly be just that.

If you believe that the Senate after careful scrutiny should ratify the limited test ban, clip the following coupon and mail it to Editors, The Editorial Page, New York Journal-American, 220 South Street, New York 15, N.Y. Whether you live in New York, New Jersey or Connecticut we will see that your expression of opinion is forwarded to the Senators who represent your State.

"DEAR SENATOR: I hope that you will give serious consideration to the welfare of future generations and if, after careful scrutiny, you are confident that the limited test ban treaty will not endanger our security, you will support this measure.

Name_____________________________________
Address_________________________ Zone______
City and State_____________________________

"NEW YORK JOURNAL-AMERICAN."

[From the Milwaukee Journal, July 21, 1963]

HISTORIC TEST BAN PACT

"Cautious optimism" is still the term to apply in viewing the treaty initialed in Moscow Thursday to ban nuclear testing in the atmosphere, in space, and under water.

It is historic. It is the first major agreement between the United States, Britain and Russia since the Austrian peace treaty in 1955. If the treaty is adopted and honored it will be a major step toward ending nuclear pollution of our planet. So there is reason for optimism.

Caution is necessary because of past experience with the Soviet Union. We have little reason to trust the Russians. However, the treaty bans tests that are checkable—we have techniques for discovering any violations. And there is reason to believe that the Russians are as concerned about the horrors of nuclear war and the dangers of radioactive pollution as we. They seem to have decided that it is in their interest as much as ours to find a way to end the nuclear race and sustain a balance of power.

Two major powers are outside the agreement—France and Communist China. President de Gaulle has already let it be known that France will go on building its nuclear force and will test when and where it wishes. Communist China is not known to have nuclear weapons yet, but it will. It has frequently ridiculed the idea that nuclear power is dangerous to anyone—one of the reasons for its break with Russia.

The new agreement pledges the signers to do what they can to stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons. If a ban is to be truly effective, persistent efforts must be made to induce others to join in the treaty.

There will be a struggle in the U.S. Senate when the treaty is presented for ratification. Some Senators are already on record against any test ban—a few on the ground that Russia can't be trusted, others because they feel (along with some scientists and some military leaders) that testing is vital to insure our continued nuclear superiority. Some Republicans have charged that any kind of test ban agreement indicates a weakness in opposing Russia and communism.

Fortunately there is a nucleus of 34 Senators, 27 Democrats and 7 Republicans, already publicly joined in advocating a partial test ban much along the lines of that worked out in Moscow. One is Senator DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, long an opponent of any test ban.

The issue involved here is too big for politics. It involves, with its opportunity to end poisonous fallout, the very future of mankind. If this agreement can be made to work, it could lead to further nuclear controls and to other steps to ease tensions between East and West. The alternative could be disaster.

[From the Denver Post, July 26, 1963]

SENATE SHOULD RATIFY TEST BAN TREATY AFTER BEING ASSURED AS TO THE RISKS

We would like to believe that the partial nuclear test ban treaty signed Thursday in Moscow by the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union will, in the words of the test ban negotiators, "constitute an important first step toward the reduction of international tension and the strengthening of peace."

If it does represent such a step, the treaty will be one of the very significant historic documents of our times.

However, the history of our side's dealings with the Communists and other would-be world conquerors makes us cautious and skeptical. Peaceful gestures have been used in the past to deceive leaders of the Western democracies; at times, indeed, these leaders have seemed to be eager accessories to their own deception.

Therefore, in the light of history, we urge prudent caution. The new treaty, which bans nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water, is important. And—if honored—can bring important gains to mankind. But it would be foolish—perhaps even fatal—to assume that because we want the treaty to be kept, and because it seems to serve Soviet purposes now to pledge to keep it, it will be kept indefinitely.

It would be foolish also to regard the treaty as more than it really is. It is not a cold war panacea; it doesn't even really abolish nuclear weapons testing. Because of the apparent impossibility of drafting an inspections formula acceptable to the Russians, the West agreed to a limited test ban, which leaves the treaty signatories free to test underground.

It is reported that the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff will not oppose the ratification of the new treaty in the Senate, not because they believe the treaty important in "easing cold war tensions"—whatever that overused term means—but because they know that the treaty will leave the United States free to do about 80 percent of the nuclear testing deemed necessary by resorting to underground explosions.

It can thus be seen that the treaty will not necessarily halt the nuclear arms race between the West and the Soviet Union. It will, however (so long as it is abided by), keep radioactive materials from being released in the atmosphere by American, British or Soviet tests.

It is quite likely that such fallout will continue to be produced by French nuclear testing—and by Red Chinese tests, once Communist China is ready to explode nuclear devices. But the fallout from such tests would be only a small fraction of the amount produced by tests by the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union.

It seems certain that France and Communist China will not—in the next few years at least—add their signatures to the treaty initialed in Moscow Thursday. But it is probable that other nations will soon become parties to the treaty.

This could have the effect of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the creation of new nuclear powers.

Because of the possible gains, and in the hope that our Government will keep its eyes open to the risks and actually take steps now to minimize them, this newspaper urges the Senate to give the treaty its approval.

The administration would do well to assure the Senate that it is well aware of the military risks should the Russians break the ban and to outline for the Senators how these risks would be countered.

We believe it is particularly important, for example, that research in military applications of nuclear power be continued and that we be prepared quickly to resume weapons testing in the atmosphere if the Russians should do so. To do otherwise would be to set the stage for a technological Pearl Harbor in which the Communists could conceivably gain a decisive advantage in nuclear power.

[From the Des Moines Register, July 25, 1963]

THE SENATE AND THE TEST-BAN

The nuclear weapons test ban is not initialed yet, much less signed, still less ratified. But right now the most difficult step ahead seems likely to be advice and consent to its ratification by two-thirds of the U.S. Senators present and voting.

To prepare for this, President Kennedy is considering a traditional resource of Presidents: sending a group of Senators to join in the final phase of the treaty negotiations in Moscow. He is definitely recruiting a blue-ribbon list of friendly witnesses (including ex-President Eisenhower) to appear in favor of Senate approval of the treaty before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The United States is one of the few countries in the world where ratification of a treaty presents a problem. Most countries have provisions for some sort of legislative check on executive treaty-making powers—but normally the same party or coalition which controls the executive controls also the national legislature, and party discipline is tight enough to assure approval.

Hassles over important treaties (and sometimes unimportant ones) have been common in the United States, from George Washington's administration on. By far the most fateful past instance was the long fight in 1919–20 (ending in rejection) over approval of the treaty ending World War I and establishing the League of Nations, precursor of the present U.N. organization.

Something roughly comparable occurred in France in the 1950's over ratification of the treaty to set up a "European Defense Community" which would have merged French, Germans, and others into a common army. A French proposal, the treaty was left unratified by successive French Cabinets, until finally Premier Pierre Mendes-France brought it to a vote and it was defeated.

There is some question whether bringing Senators into the test ban negotiations at this late date will accomplish anything. Participation could hardly change Senator BARRY GOLDWATER's mind. Most or all of the wording of the treaty was agreed on by the professional negotiators some days ago.

But it would be a ghastly thing if, after all these years of earnest negotiations by both Republican and Democratic administrations, this mild little first-step agreement toward limiting ever so slightly the tumultuous nuclear arms race should fail by action of the U.S. Senate.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Aug. 1, 1963]

WHERE ARE THE GOP LEADERS?

Thanks to the participation of Senators AIKEN and SALTONSTALL, the Senatorial delegation accompanying Secretary Rusk to Moscow will be bipartisan. Had it been otherwise, it would have been a travesty of the spirit of bipartisanship—and the blame would have rested squarely on the shoulders of the Senate Republican leadership.

Even as it is, Senator Dirksen has hardly done himself much credit. His approach to the test-ban debate, and quite notably his advance anouncement that he would not go to Moscow if invited because his presence might be construed as support of the treaty, has been a typically frustrating exercise in fusty Old Guardism.

The Moscow signing is a historic occasion, but a ceremonial one. Membership in the delegation is not an advance commitment to support of the treaty. It does signal a willingness to look at the evidence; the only commitment it represents is one not to reject the treaty out of hand before there is any reason to.

The Senate should certainly explore all the ramifications of the treaty. It's clear that there will be objections raised. But there is no room in the debate for partisanship, and any Senator who tries to play politics with it for partisan advantage does both his country and his party a disservice.

By joining the delegation, Senators Aiken and Saltonstall have at least helped create an atmosphere in which the upcoming hearings can proceed more effectively and more dispassionately. It's too bad Senator Hickenlooper, who should logically have represented the Republicans, also chose not to go. It's too bad that Senator Dirksen, for whatever reason, has added to the prevalent impression that a lot of the Republican Old Guard have cobwebs behind their eyes.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, July 31, 1963]

Waiting for the Breeze

Senator Dirksen and Senator Hickenlooper seem to be waiting for a sign before they commit themselves to a position on the Moscow nuclear testing treaty, but whether it is a sign from heaven, from the mail pouch, or from their colleague Barry Goldwater is uncertain. They have declined to attend the signing of the agreement but they have not said they will oppose it when the vote for ratification is taken. They strike the pose of cautious men who are scanning the text and striving to read the future of events; the impression they give is that of watching the political scales.

While they do so they play with hypotheses and conjectures. Suppose Communist East Germany chooses to sign the treaty, Senator Dirksen says uneasily; would that not involve American diplomatic recognition of Pankow? Or suppose, he asks shudderingly, Cuba adhered to it and then undertook to test nuclear warheads in its underground caves? In point of fact the United States, as one of the three depositories of the treaty, can accept or reject the instruments of ratification and accession of any signatory and therefore could rule out East Germany if it saw fit to do so. As for Cuba, if it had warheads to test it would not need to subscribe to the treaty in order to explode them.

Probably nobody is expected to take these supposed objections very seriously. They are raised only to give Senators Dirksen and Hickenlooper time to see which way the wind is blowing and to take a place where the breeze will favor Republican interests. There is a danger in such hesitation however. By refusing to have a hand in approval they run the risk of making the treaty look like a Democratic achievement. A man waits overlong and is caught in a gale blowing from the wrong direction. The draft can be very chilling indeed.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, July 27, 1963]

As We See It: The First Shackling of Atomic Era Perils

Only ratification by the U.S. Senate remains necessary for a very major abatement of whatever peril to mankind exists in testing nuclear weapons elsewhere than beneath the earth's surface.

Just how great that danger is has been a matter of dispute as well as concern—but why risk any at all if agreements between nations can avoid it?

It cannot be said that the danger will be abated entirely because so far only the United States, the Soviet, and Great Britain have initialed the treaty, which pledges that the signatory nations will refrain from exploding nuclear devices under water, on the earth's surface or in the sky above it.

France has indicated that it will go on with its Sahara Desert tests—for the glory of President de Gaulle and such contamination of the atmosphere as the French may be able to accomplish.

And of course it isn't to be supposed that Red China will participate.

But every nation on the earth is privileged to join the three originators in the treaty, and we imagine that great numbers will. Or at least they will if they have been sincere in their expressions of alarm over what the United States and Russia have been doing in the course of preparing their nuclear arsenals.

The momentous treaty so speedily arrived at in Moscow deals with nothing else than nuclear testing. It doesn't pledge anything concerning aggression, forbid the use of nuclear arms in a war nor touch on disarmament.

In light of practicality, that cannot be repined. The way to solve these vast, complex and controversial problems is a bit at a time. If we wait for the one grand panacea, then we will wait forever.

Perhaps the readiness and good will which gave swift agreement on the test ban can be read as a promise that now another bit of progress toward a safer world can be attained rather sooner than later.

Perhaps not, too, but at least we have one good thing in hand.

There are, on the dreary side, some rumblings of discontent in the Senate. For instance, Illinois' Senator Everett M. Dirksen says he has found a "gimmick" in the treaty. Perhaps there is one. It is a greater likelihood that Senator Dirksen feels called upon to make obstructive noises because he is a Republican bellwether and the treaty was arrived at under the auspices of a Democratic administration.

In light of disagreement among experts, our worry over radioactive poisoning has not been particularly oppressive. But we know we are very much in a minority on this.

And we can tell any Senator who votes against the treaty this. Millions of Americans will regard him as a man in favor of blood cancer and birth deformities.

For ratification, the treaty must be accepted by two-thirds of the Senate. When the Senators begin to hear from the country on the subject of radioactive contamination there should be no trouble mustering that support.

The treaty is as good as in the bag. When it is, we will have taken the first step since the atomic age's onset toward fettering its threats.

[From the West Chester (Pa.) Local News, July 27, 1963]

The President's Plea for a Saner World

President Kennedy's plea to the people of the United States last night was different from that of any other President in history.

He called upon the people, and indirectly the Senate which eventually will be the deciding factor in the adoption or rejection of the partial nuclear test ban treaty, to save their country and themselves from the horrors of a thermonuclear war.

Reminding his nationwide audience in a radio-television report that while "it is not the millenium", the agreement with Russia and England, is "a step toward peace, a step toward reason, a step away from war."

Never before in history has a President addressed such a vast audience with one thought in mind—the urgent need to do something to avert annihilation on a scale never before witnessed by man.

And that "something" in the mind of the President is the debating and the understanding of all the issues involved in the proposed nuclear test ban which has a meaning for every member of the human family.

While the problem is fraught with grave risks, Mr. Kennedy spoke in the spirit of hope. "Now for the first time in many years," he said, "the path of peace may be open. No one can be certain what the future will bring. No one can say whether the time has come for an easing of the struggle. But history and our own conscience will judge us harsher if we do not now make every effort to test our hopes by action, and this is the place to begin."

Thus spoke the President at a time in history when nuclear stockpiles hang above the world like the sword of Damocles. His voice was a call to reason, a call to sanity and possibly a call to peace.

This is the initial step. It is the step that must be taken if ever the world is to escape the horrors of another war.

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, July 28, 1963]

Ratifying the Treaty

President Kennedy's address to the Nation on the nuclear test ban treaty—in effect arguing in favor of its ratification by the U.S. Senate—was realistic and objective.

With complete candor, the President pointed out the limitations and the shortcomings of the agreement reached by the United Kingdom and ourselves with Soviet Russia. He said:

"This treaty is not the millenium. It will not resolve all conflicts, or cause the Communists to forgo their ambitions, or eliminate the dangers of war. It will not reduce our need for arms or allies or programs of assistance to others."

On the other side of the coin, however, Mr. Kennedy called the agreement "a shaft of light cut into the darkness." It is, he said, "an important first step—a step toward peace—a step toward reason—a step away from war."

The new treaty, of course, falls far short of the plan advanced to the United Nations by Bernard Baruch, speaking for the United States, in June 1946, which proposed complete control and inspection authority by a U.N. Atomic Energy Commission.

It does not go as far as President Eisenhower's "atoms for peace" proposal to the U.N. in December 1953.

Because it does not include France, already a minor "atomic power," and Red China, almost certain to become such a power in the very near future, it has a great weakness.

The President openly invited France, in his Friday evening address, to join in the pact and, by implication, left the door open for Red China, if that hostile and belligerent state ever awakens to the suicidal certainties of a nuclear war.

The public, we feel reasonably certain, and the Senate we hope, will accept the agreement for the "shaft of light" and the step away from war which Mr. Kennedy called it.

As the President said, in the terms of the ancient Chinese proverb, "a journey of 1,000 miles must begin with a single step."

The American people, we are confident, earnestly want to take that first step.

[From the La Porte (Ind.) Herald-Argus, July 27, 1963]

Test Ban Treaty

Although it does qualify as modest and limited, the nuclear test ban treaty shaped up and agreed to by the United States, Great

Britain, and Soviet Russia is certainly one of the most encouraging actions in world politics in many a long year. And as such it is welcomed everywhere.

The treaty says nothing about underground testing, which can be carried on by the signatories if they so desire, but at least there is now an agreement to halt further contamination of the atmosphere, outer space, and the waters of the earth. This determination not to scatter nuclear fallout anywhere gives assurance to a global population which, despite some scientific reassurances, has been worried persistently by possible ill effects to all life of atmospheric poisoning.

More than that, of course, the treaty represents the first major effort to level off the cold war which to date has been a never-ending, pressure-packed race involving the United States and the U.S.S.R. It says, in effect, that the nuclear powers now stand on a plateau of weapon achievement beyond which it is not necessary to go. To push on without cessation would be to heighten dangerously the chances of a holocaust which would cremate civilization.

The treaty is more than a mere gesture toward peace, it does provide for changes of national policy of the three signers which can be opening wedges to still further agreements on disarmament and peaceful settlement of major international political problems. It may be the first step toward a later agreement in banning of even the underground tests. From the momentum of this initial step there may flow some other good.

As our qualified national leaders tell us, the treaty will not diminish this Nation's security. Both the United States and Russia possess nuclear arsenals of fantastic size and might. In our own case our "overkill" capacity, the power to destroy Russia several times over, is candidly admitted. Likewise, enough testing has been done to provide solid foundation for future weapon development which our defense experts might decide is essential.

Also, the treaty is for an indefinite period, but each signer has the right of withdrawal 3 months after giving official notice of withdrawal. Any nation is welcome to sign the agreement, which will be under the United Nations sanction.

Only one thing remains: The U.S. Senate must ratify the treaty in order to make the U.S. participation binding. This should be done without undue delay. Seldom, if ever, have our Washington lawmakers in this nuclear age had a better chance to strike boldly for the building of world peace.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, July 30, 1963]

President de Gaulle Is Not Impressed

Unless it contains some blockbuster that has not yet gone off, President de Gaulle's press conference yesterday was modest compared to the last one. That was the famous session of January 14 in which the general vetoed Britain's entry into the Common Market. This time he was content with rejecting the Moscow agreement to end atomic tests, which has cheered the world because of what it may promise. And he would have no talk of a possible East-West nonaggression pact in Europe, which the United States and Britain undertook at Moscow to discuss with their allies.

President de Gaulle's press conferences are unlike the give-and-take sessions familiar to us. These are a formal seance, at which the great man speaks while the world listens. It is a little like the oracle at Delphi in classical Greece, though President de Gaulle is clear and precise about what he does say. Yesterday he addressed not only reporters but also cabinet officers, legislators, and other Government officials to a total of about 800, sitting in rows of gilded chairs in the elaborate reception room of the Elysee Palace.

This qualified as a press conference because President de Gaulle did group those questions he was willing to accept, and then he answered them with what he was going to say anyway. There was no nonsense about any followup questioning to pin him down. Thus one question was whether France would be willing to forgo testing nuclear weapons if the United States shared its hydrogen-bomb know-how with France. The general simply ignored the question, saying that if one day the Americans and Russians scrapped their nuclear weapons, then France would "refrain from procuring them herself."

This was as expected. And it has a basis in realism, in terms of the warring Europe of the past. The question is if that compartmented Europe is adequate to what lies ahead.

President de Gaulle stressed continuing friendship between his country and ours, despite present differences, and announced that he would call a meeting at which France would make disarmament proposals before the end of the year. But mostly this was merely a rejection of Moscow's bid for France to stop testing, and a reaffirmation of the decision to block the miracle of a united Europe and a growing Atlantic community that had been the most hopeful development on the free world's side since the war. Mr. de Gaulle spoke again on behalf of a little Europe headed by France and Germany, with tariffs to protect its agriculture—notably French agriculture.

It was now or never to achieve this little Europe, he said, and there must be no nonaggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Pact because France could never consent to a deal made by "the Anglo-Saxons" and Russians "over France's head." The idea is, of course, to get France in on it, in the hope of achieving security based on something less precarious than the atomic stalemate.

President de Gaulle may of course be right when he says the Moscow Pact changed nothing. But it could be the beginning of a new era in East-West relationships. If so, then that era will not be made easier in the coming by the man who saved France, but who wants Europe to go his own way or not at all.

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) Journal Gazette, July 29, 1963]

President's Address to the Nation

President John F. Kennedy's address to the Nation Friday evening on the nuclear test ban pact was calm, reasoned, and factual.

He did not claim that the millennium had dawned or that the dangers of the past 18 years had suddenly vanished.

The President saw the initialed pact of Moscow only as a freshly lighted candle in the dark world of diplomacy.

He hoped that it was a real start toward a safer era in which other problems which have been causing tension might be considered with a view to agreements which would lessen the East-West cold war.

There was a stark and grim reminder of the awful consequences of an atomic war.

He said that a full-scale nuclear exchange of less than 60 minutes "could wipe out more than 300 million Americans, Europeans, and Russians, as well as untold numbers elsewhere."

We hope that the debate which will follow in the United States will be as reasonable as his utterances.

We know that those who may throw political dust in the public's eyes and who drag in again all of the old irrelevancies have no contribution to make except confusion.

The President has a heavy responsibility in this treaty matter. So does the U.S. Senate. So do the American people.

We hope that all will rise to the occasion and do what is best for America in this age of danger and promise.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, July 23, 1963]

A Step Toward Peace

The silence and tension surrounding the nuclear test ban talks in Moscow are expected to bring in a day or two the announcement that the United States, Britain, and the Soviet Union have reached accord on a treaty to bar several kinds of atomic explosions.

The United States and Britain have been working toward this end since 1946, when Bernard M. Baruch first suggested that an international policing organization be established to secure the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

The Soviet refused, largely because her participation in such an organization would prevent her from developing an atomic bomb, or from catching up with the United States in military knowhow.

The Soviet now realizes the odds are great against her matching the American arsenal, and seeks to end the nuclear race. Also, since Red China is on the verge of exploding an atomic device, the Soviet tacitly admits the need to sign an acceptable treaty with the West before Peiping joins the exclusive atomic club.

All sides agree the nuclear arms race got them nowhere. But the United States could not commit this attitude to paper until the Soviet had made an ironclad agreement assuring this country that tests by the Kremlin would be stopped.

Preliminary reports are that the treaty covers a ban on testing under the sea and in the atmosphere, but underground explosions will still be permissible because adequate detection devices have not been agreed upon.

There also is a general feeling that the test ban pact is not tied to any other understanding on cold war issues, but that East-West talks will continue for some time.

If these preliminary reports prove accurate, the United States will not have given up much in order to reach an accord with Moscow. But until the pertinent and specific details have been released, the American people will withhold judgment on what may prove to be a historymaking agreement.

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, July 26, 1963]

World Opinion Will Help Make Nuclear Ban Stick

We have refrained from commenting on the nuclear test-ban proceedings in Moscow, because in the past, when we wrote about similar efforts to make sense of this anxious age, our optimism invariably proved to be short lived and ill conceived.

Now, however, it does appear the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union have reached agreement on forbidding nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water. Although most persons of good will undoubtedly sigh for more, certainly this is a beginning that had to be made.

Indeed, from this beginning other pacts to assure peace in our time may be arrived at. Breakthroughs in one direction often produce lively and consequential results elsewhere.

The sole remaining stumbling block to the nuclear agreement at hand appears to be the U.S. Senate, which must ratify it by a two-thirds majority.

A majority seems assured, but the two-thirds provision may present an insuperable barrier.

It would be irony beyond comparison, were this Nation—the Nation which has been continually pressing for peaceful solutions to atomic dilemmas since the day World War II ended—to fail to sign the first treaty the Russian Government has agreed to on nuclear testing.

Nor do the overwhelming majority of American citizens wish this to happen.

Granted, there are complications. France and President de Gaulle on our side and Red China and Premier Mao Tse-tung on the Communist aren't parties to the treaty, and their capacity for mischief is well known.

Still, if Russia and Great Britain are prepared to accept such complications, so, too, should the United States.

Furthermore, world opinion is increasingly becoming a factor in determining national conduct. Neither France nor Red China can afford to lose friends, which surely would occur, were either to persist in testing atomic weaponry in the teeth of this agreement.

And speaking of world opinion, what will be its response, should a minority of U.S. Senators nullify this Nation's attempts—to say nothing of the world's hopes—to decrease opportunities for nuclear war?

[From the Watertown (N.Y.) Times,
July 27, 1963]

VICTORY FOR MANKIND

President Kennedy's eloquent advocacy of the treaty for a limited nuclear test ban in his Friday evening television address is a reflection of the corrosive effect which the cold war has had on public confidence in any progress toward understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States and our allies.

Mr. Kennedy spoke of the proposed agreement in a way that was designed to help win its approval, as if it were in danger of being struck down by the country and the Senate. The approach was appropriate, for there are almost 20 years of misgivings, shattered dreams, and dashed hopes for a real agreement with Soviet Russia about any kind of disarmament or nuclear weapons control.

But the President's case for this treaty was not overstated, nor was his language overwrought. He called it "a victory for mankind," and indeed it is. He acknowledged that it "is not the millenium" and indeed it is not.

Some, perhaps many, have already spoken to denigrate the importance of such an agreement, which is limited and follows upon nearly a generation of disappointment, disillusion, and bitter frustration in trying to come to terms with the Soviet Union on any political or military understanding. "Victory for mankind" will be set down as highflown rhetoric and naive optimism.

But mankind can use a victory of this kind, however small, and a reading of the full text of the President's address should suffice to reveal that he is under no illusions about its scope. Mankind has won few enough victories in political or military realms in recent years. Reason, it seems, still rules in the minds of some men. This treaty may nourish its further recovery in the world.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner,
July 27, 1963]

THE TEST BAN—CAUSE FOR HOPE

The limited test ban treaty initialed in Moscow could be a cautious step in the right direction, an expression of the yearnings of millions throughout the world, and a glimmer of hope for the future.

There is little doubt that W. Averell Harriman affixed his initials to the document only after unqualified technical assurance that it can in no way prejudice the security of the United States.

Thus the Senate should ratify the treaty on a broad bipartisan basis. No political considerations should be permitted to intrude on so crucial an issue.

The success of the treaty depends, of course, almost totally on the good faith of the Soviet Union. It cannot be forgotten that a moratorium on testing was once brazenly and unilaterally broken by the Kremlin. And while a resumption of tests can be immediately detected, the vital factor of honoring a solemn, written pledge is at stake.

Whether or not the treaty will lead to further reduction of East-West tensions will not be known for some time. Meanwhile the hairtrigger military face-off between the United States and the Soviet Union continues. This will only be relaxed when the desirable goal of disarmament can be approached on a realistic and security-tight basis.

But all things have a beginning, and this treaty could possibly be just that.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News,
July 26, 1963]

VERDICT ON TEST BAN—SENATE SHOULD SAY "YES"

After Khrushchev's "Yes," will the Senate say, "No," to the limited test ban treaty? One-third of the Senate is already on record for the affirmative. Two-thirds is needed for ratification.

First, a major point for approval is that radioactive fallout from tests will be eliminated because testing will be confined to underground caves and tunnels. The world wants fallout stopped, and in a cold war where so often the world has not got what it wanted, count this as a plus for humanitarianism.

Second, approval opens up an avenue for other accommodations between West and East. These could ease tensions, though not wipe out distrust. There have been instances previously when we thought we were achieving this sort of breakthrough—for example, the spirit of Camp David in 1959 and the first "summit" in 1955, both now pretty tarnished symbols of peace seeking. We may be disappointed again. But not to try is never to achieve.

Third, the pact could help stop proliferation of weapons among other nations. The treaty is open to the world. Anyone can sign it, France and Red China included. The world, as represented by the U.N., spurns the Chinese, and the Chinese may retaliate in kind by testing. They probably will. But nothing they may get up to can nullify the current value of what we and the Russians have agreed to.

Fourth, the pact will cut arms costs and slow the arms race, and—according to what we have been told for years—freeze our nuclear lead over the Russians.

Against the treaty in this country are scientists such as Dr. Teller, many in the military brass and quite a number of Senators. BARRY GOLDWATER has put it: "I am apprehensive. Why didn't we go all out for a treaty banning all tests, with inspection and controls?"

GOLDWATER is not so naive that he doesn't know why. The Russians wouldn't let us inspect. So it's been a matter of half a loaf being better than no bread at all.

Opponents also say the treaty will permit us to test underground, where we have a big lead in tactical weapons, but stops us testing above ground where, they say, we're behind in weapons development. They claim the Russians stole a jump on us in their big 1961 space explosions. The theory is that the Russians as a result are ahead in devices that could disrupt our radar defenses, fool our other antimissile penetration devices, and keep them ahead in antimissile missiles.

This hasn't been proved, and our Chiefs of Staffs will get their chance to sound off at closed hearings.

But the treaty doesn't stop our weapons research and development. Our laboratories won't close. Our experts can still test underground. And every year detection devices are developed to see what the other side's up to.

In fact, the pact will only confirm what Mr. Kennedy said 6 weeks ago, that we wouldn't test above ground if the Russians didn't. Now the Russians have fallen in line with that understanding, and we've an out if they break their word. In addition, something concrete has been agreed to which others can adhere. If the others refuse, we can take steps under the treaty to insure they don't threaten our supremacy. The genie isn't back in the bottle yet, but his activities now are limited.

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) American,
July 27, 1963]

NUCLEAR TEST BAN

An extraordinary amount of propaganda has emanated from the just completed talks among the United States, Britain, and Russia about a ban on nuclear testing.

To the uninitiated it may appear that the pact recently initialed in Moscow will, once it has reached real treaty status, largely remove the danger of nuclear war. It isn't so.

The best that can be said for it is that it is a step in the right direction, but it is far from being anything like an ironclad guarantee of peace forever and an end to the nuclear threat hanging over the whole world.

There are divergent opinions already as to what has actually been accomplished in Moscow ranging from one U.S. Senator's joyful prediction that it means a turning point in our relations with the Soviet Union, to the warning of others that it is nothing but a Soviet trap. Somewhere between the two, we believe, lies the truth.

In essence, the treaty means that the three great nuclear powers have agreed to suspend—temporarily—nuclear testing in all areas except underground. We say temporarily, because there are escape clauses in the pact available to all signatories. It is evidence of good intent, most surely, and of a friendly state of mind among the nuclear powers at this precise moment. It will, at least for a time, remove the danger of nuclear fallout—in itself a substantial accomplishment.

But it will not keep other nations, such as France and Red China, from continuing their own little experiments. Other countries may continue theirs, such as Israel and the Arab States.

Averell Harriman and his British and Soviet counterparts have achieved much in a short space of 10 days; more, indeed, than many people believed was possible. When Mr. Harriman returns to the United States bearing this piece of parchment, it must then face the ordeal of trial by the U.S. Senate, which has the power to ratify or reject.

It is to be hoped that the necessary two-thirds vote will be mustered shortly and with no undue delay. This may not be a perfect solution, but surely we have nothing to lose and much to gain by its ratification.

We must, however, not deceive ourselves into thinking that all's right with the world.

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican,
July 27, 1963]

WE SHOULD SIGN

Even those cynical observers of the international scene realize the advantages of sanctioning the test ban treaty.

The U.S. Senate—graveyard of some historic treaty proposals—appears to be the only obstacle to total agreement to the limited nuclear test ban worked out between this Nation, Britain and the Soviet Union after years of frustrating efforts.

Whether the Senate will approve the plan will be seen shortly. The consensus is that it will be adopted without too much bother, but as insurance President Kennedy has thrown his full weight behind it, especially to calm those who might think the United

States would be giving up a military advantage.

The so-called escape clause of the treaty, the provision that signatories may renege if other nations test nuclear weapons, is its weak point. But it is so only because of the refusal of France in the West and Red China in the Communist camp to enter or abide by the accords hammered out in Moscow.

This point may be lamented, but it should not affect the decision to sign. Outright rejection by the Senate would nullify those bargaining advances made at great cost of opportunity, advances that could be used as stepping stones to pacts presently impracticable but not impossible.

Above all the Nation should realize that the two major testers of thermonuclear weapons have agreed to stop polluting the atmosphere, outer space and the seas with radioactive fallout. They have made initial agreement to put a stop to invisible poison before poison puts a stop to them.

[From the Auburn (N.Y.) Citizen-Advertiser, July 27, 1963]

A STEP TOWARD PEACE

President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev have called the conclusion of a treaty for a partial nuclear test ban a step toward peace but have warned that it is only a step.

In his address to the Nation last night, President Kennedy cautioned that it will not resolve all conflicts, turn the Communists away from their ambitions or eliminate the dangers of war.

But he did call it "a shaft of light" cutting into what had been the darkening prospects of mass destruction on earth—"an important first step—a step toward peace—a step toward reason—a step away from war."

Similarly, in an interview published by Pravda and Izvestia, Premier Khrushchev stressed that although the treaty is an event of great international importance, "it does not mean an end of the arms race and hence by itself cannot avert the danger of war."

KHRUSHCHEV SEES POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

The Soviet leader went on to say that the conclusion of the test ban treaty would contribute to a general relaxation of international tension and should produce "a situation favorable to the long overdue solutions of international problems." Above all, he said, it is necessary to conclude a nonaggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, adding:

"The Soviet Government is convinced that the conclusion of such a pact would have a favorable effect on the entire situation inasmuch as the states belonging to the two antagonistic alinements would solemnly express before the whole world their determination not to use force against each other, not to threaten each other with war."

Mr. Khrushchev has sought such a nonaggression pact to gain Western acceptance of the status quo in Eastern Europe. While such an agreement would provide an opportunity for guaranteeing the security of West Berlin, it also could establish the permanent partition of Germany and official recognition by the West of the East German puppet regime.

But Mr. Khrushchev emphasized there would be no shortage of good will on the Soviet side "as regards the question of how to formulate the nonaggression pact" and said there are no "insurmountable obstacles."

SUGGESTS SPECIFIC STEPS TO BE TAKEN

The Soviet leader went on to say that the Soviet Union was ready for businesslike drafting of agreements on the other East-West security measures as he proposed in a speech a week ago. These included a reduction of military budgets, an exchange of observers to prevent surprise attacks and a thinning of foreign troops in Germany.

And the U.S. negotiator at the nuclear test-ban talks, W. Averell Harriman, concurred with Mr. Khrushchev's conclusion that the test-ban agreement opens up new areas of possible East-West agreement when he said:

"A wide range of political and military matters can be exploited as time goes on."

This, of course, is true only if the partial test ban treaty is ratified by the U.S. Senate. Failure to do so at this time would be tragic, indeed. It would wipe out the new progress toward peaceful resolution of East-West problems and renew cold war tensions.

[From the Long Island Press, New York, N.Y., July 27, 1963]

THE CASE FOR RATIFICATION

The Senate should ratify the nuclear testing treaty.

The treaty as written leaves much to be desired. Its scope is extremely limited. It cannot be a real deterrent to nuclear war unless all other nations which have atomic potential, notably France and Red China, also agree to become cosigners.

Obviously if any country, anywhere in the world, persists in testing till it catches up with the present atomic powers, all signers will have to resume the nuclear race.

With that thought in the background, the United States, Britain, and Russia have reserved the right to withdraw from the compact on 3 months' notice whenever they think their "supreme interests" require it.

This then is a treaty without any teeth in it. Solemn ratification by the U.S. Senate, the British Parliament, and the Supreme Soviet will leave the world just about where it was after East and West first made their simple unilateral statements of their intention to stop testing.

Russia, as we well remember, walked out on that understanding the moment it suited Moscow to do so. That act of 50-megaton trickery greatly strengthened the already prevalent belief that Khrushchev cannot be trusted. This time we ourselves publicly serve notice we too will walk out when our own judgment tells us to.

Under such circumstances, why trouble to ratify so inconclusive a document? Even if there isn't any risk, where is the gain?

These were the questions the President dealt with directly last night.

Mr. Kennedy disdained to fence with his opponents in the Senate. He conceded fully that the treaty was no earthshaking thing, that communism would still continue its attempt to take over the world, that Moscow might try to doublecross us, that we would have to go on bolstering our defenses and suspecting our foes.

But he dealt chiefly with the possibility that this treaty, our first formal agreement with Russia in many years, might conceivably lead to better and broader agreements; might be the first step on a long, long road to disarmament; might free the world from the dangers of atmospheric fallout; might set a pattern for adjustment of other differences between the free world and the Red one.

Mr. Kennedy asked his fellow citizens to weigh the slight risks inherent in ratification against the perils of the existing and spiraling arms race. He recalled that three times in his administration he has been required by events in Laos, Berlin and Cuba to report to the country that the United States and the U.S.S.R. were on the brink of war. Now, he said, we have a small opportunity to reduce world tension.

Opportunity is the key word. Is it an opportunity to reduce the chance of nuclear war? Hardly that not just yet, though perhaps later.

Our present opportunity is much more limited. It is, however, the opportunity to take the first step toward keeping the human race from blowing itself to bits.

Only the first step—but it's the first step that counts most, and the man or nation which shrinks from taking it will perish. Keeping our eyes open for tricks and our weapons ready, let us step forward with courage.

[From the Pontiac (Mich.) Press, July 27, 1963]

WORLD TENSIONS LESSEN WITH NUCLEAR TEST BAN

With three-power initialing of the nuclear test ban treaty in Moscow, the cold war thermometer indicates a thawing temperature.

If ratified by the respective legislative bodies of the United States, Britain, and Russia, nuclear testing in the atmosphere, outer space and under water will be proscribed by these countries. Negatively, the Russian position on on-site inspection foreclosed inclusion of underground testing in the ban.

It is hoped that other countries now in development stage of nuclear weaponry—notably France and Red China—can be induced to add their signatures to the pact.

No one, however, but a starry-eyed visionary would see in the nuclear agreement an end to the cold war and the related tensions that encircle the globe.

But the treaty, as finally hammered out, is the first state document of accord to be negotiated between the free world and the Communists since hopes soared 8 years ago with the signing of the Austrian state treaty.

Moreover, since this treaty largely follows the lines of American proposals at the Geneva Disarmament Conference a year ago—which came to naught—it could be seen as indicative of a more conciliatory attitude on the part of the Kremlin.

Ahead lie discussions on an East-West nonaggression agreement, strengthening of the West's access and occupational rights to and in West Berlin, and formalizing national boundaries in Eastern Europe.

But the ice has been broken and a pattern set for effective negotiation, in an atmosphere of harmony and good will, between nations diametrically opposed in many areas.

The world, we believe, breathes a bit easier today.

[From the Saginaw (Mich.) News, July 25, 1963]

WORLD AWAITS FATEFUL TEST BAN DECISION

A moment of hushed expectation has descended over much of the world: A moment of fearful hope that competitive nuclear testing—the further poisoning of the atmosphere, the further search for still more killing power—will be halted in agreement between civilized nations that mankind must not be destroyed in the process of resolving its disputes, so puny by comparison.

Word from Moscow that United States, Russian and British negotiators have completed a nuclear test-ban treaty along lines thoroughly explored in past discussions contains the body of that hope.

It may become a reality through ratification by the United States Senate. Or it may be dashed to earth if the Soviets should seek to play on human yearnings and attach a nonaggression pact between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Communist Bloc as a treaty condition.

They have done as much in past nuclear ban overtures in efforts to divide the West and to solidify their hold and their standing behind the Iron Curtain. Premier Khrushchev would like to be assured that there will be no disturbance of his western front. He would like a guarantee of the status quo.

This he will not get from the United States, which has made its position repeatedly clear that East Germany, for example, never will get juridical recognition as a sovereign state separate from West Germany.

The West can tolerate the Soviet's drumbeating about the "justice" of a nonaggression pact as a way toward international peace as Moscow would design it. If Khrushchev feels he must extract some propaganda gain by reiterating his position without demanding that the world accept it, the way to progress will remain open.

Guarded hope for a nuclear test-ban is raised now because it seems clear that Khrushchev wants no nuclear war with the West. When the Soviet-Red Chinese ideological strategy talks collapsed in belligerent disagreement, there was good reason to believe that Peking had counted on Russia's warring with the United States—and that the Soviet pullback in Cuba had infuriated Mao Tse-tung as much as it had convinced Khrushchev that he was on a course of incinerating folly.

If the Soviets now see the Red Chinese as the greater threat to a world conflagration, one which could cost Russia dearly in lives and land area, the genuineness of their desire for a nuclear test-ban with the West as a basis for accommodation and easing of tensions is at least plausible.

One thing is certain—millions of people throughout this world want an end to the terror this pursuit of nuclear might brings with every dramatic new testing. There is a yearning, too, for a relaxation of relations between peoples living on opposite sides of the Iron Curtain. The test ban could be a start toward talks and explorations of agreements among Europeans.

Ultimately, the tedious road to restored freedom for millions now rigorously controlled by statist communism's dictates will be built upon evolving social changes which themselves lay bare the falseness and fundamental failure of communism when human aspirations emerge toward reality. Advancing Russian society has transfigured Stalinist communism, steadily forcing concession and backdown in the Kremlin. With the terror of nuclear suicide assuaged by treaty, a chance to make a beginning toward world civility could be realized.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) News, July 27, 1963]

A First Step?

Touching all bases in his appeal for support of a limited nuclear test-ban treaty, President Kennedy has asked the Nation to judge it as an important first step, a step toward peace, but a step that should not lure us into false hopes or a letting down of our guard.

"This treaty," declared the President, "is not a millennium. It will not resolve all conflicts, or cause the Communists to forgo their ambitions, or eliminate the dangers of war.

"It will not reduce our need for arms or allies or programs of asistance to others."

Moreover, he acknowledged, secret violations as well as secret preparations for a sudden withdrawal are possible, and consequently our own vigilance and strength must be maintained, as we remain ready to withdraw and to resume all forms of testing, if we must.

Significantly, the President reassured our allies that the Moscow talks reached no agreement on any other subject, nor is (it) conditioned on any other matter.

For those who pin false hopes upon a formal pledge not to test, the President had this caution: "Nothing could more greatly damage our cause than if we and our allies were to believe that peace has already been achieved."

It is, in short, as a welcome sign of hope in reducing tension that the administration is staking its appeal to the Senate, and beyond to the public, for support. But it can be only a hope, of course, that other powers with nuclear capacity will join in a moratorium on unrestricted testing and a buildup of atmospheric contamination.

[From the Phoenixville, (Pa.) Republican, July 29, 1963]

Answer President's Plea

Patient negotiation for man's ultimate desire—World Peace—is a painstaking, often frustrating, path. When a section of the road is smoothed out by a favorable step forward, the struggle seems more worthwhile and an extra push of energy is volunteered.

There is reason to glow a bit with the "smoothing out of the road" by Russia, United States, and British negotiators in recent days, culminating in initialing an atomic test ban treaty. And there is incentive to add an extra push of energy to further the cause of warmer feelings. While it is necessary to debate thoroughly all the intricacies of such an agreement, we should remind our senators that we are expected to bend a little and provide more than lip service in our wish to create a climate of cooperation.

We support President Kennedy's view that this is the first important step toward peace and should not be considered as a millennium or a cure-all for the world's problems.

Our President, Russia's Premier, and Britain's Prime Minister are all profoundly aware of the horrors which an atomic war would bring. The West's diligence, patience, and earnest attitude toward peace seemingly is paying off.

We sincerely hope and pray that the momentum of goodwill can continue right through to our ultimate goal.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier-Express, July 27, 1963]

Give Test-Ban Agreement a Chance

Dispatches have referred to the Moscow test-ban treaty as a historic breakthrough and it certainly is from the point of view that it has taken 5 years of negotiation to produce it. It is true that only 10 days were devoted to preparing the final draft, but leading up to that period were virtually interminable discussions at Geneva and in the United Nations.

What has emerged from Moscow is an agreement committing the United States, the Soviet Union, and Britain to refrain from nuclear testing in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water. It is a limited agreement in that it permits the continuation of nuclear testing underground and allows any signatory to withdraw upon 3 months' advance notice if it decides that "extraordinary events" have jeopardized its supreme interests.

But despite its limitations, there is reason to welcome it if only from the standpoint of world health. As long as it is in effect and honored by its signatories it provides a guarantee against further contamination of the air by nuclear fallout, and that is a consideration of undeniable importance.

Beyond that angle the pact offers more possibilities than actual accomplishments. In the opinion of many diplomats, it represents the most hopeful accord between East and West since 1945 and could be the first real thaw in the cold war. As an expression of an intent to decrease tensions and improve East-West relations, it could lead to further efforts to settle outstanding differences on a basis of mutual benefit.

Time will have to tell that story, of course, but we believe a worthwhile beginning has been made and that the treaty ought to be given a chance to shed light on future prospects. The necessary step now is Senate approval and we trust the two-thirds majority needed to bestow it can be mustered.

[From the Troy (N.Y.) Record, July 27, 1963]

A Candle

The limited nuclear ban treaty concluded by the United States, Russia, and Britain reminds one of the saying, "It is better to light a single candle than to curse the darkness." To a world which has seen frustration greet almost every effort at East-West agreement for the last 18 years, the nuclear test ban is a candle of hope.

There are many things the proposed treaty, which must still be ratified by the signatories, will not do. It does not bar war nor does it bar the use of nuclear weapons. Neither does it ban underground testing nor provide firm guarantees against cheating. By no means does the limited test ban mean the dove of peace will replace the American eagle or the Russian bear as national symbols. But despite its limitations the agreement is reason for rejoicing.

The treaty is a small beginning. It reminds all of us there is opportunity for at least limited collaboration between East and West. It could help retard if not prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. France and Communist China may persist in their threat to ignore the pact but they will risk the disapproval of world opinion should they do so. Without help from the major nuclear powers it might be France and China will decide nuclear weapons are not worth the price.

Certainly we must have expected the test ban to be greeted with skepticism in some quarters. Perhaps this is all to the good. By putting the agreement to searching examination we can remind ourselves and the world the fight to overcome national tensions and suspicions is far from being won. Humanity has simply been victorious in one little skirmish designed principally to reduce the danger of increased lethal fallout.

Much will be said of the effect of the limited test ban treaty on the balance of atomic power between East and West. There are areas in which we are said to have the advantage now and areas in which the Soviet Union is said to lead. Whether such status will be frozen by a treaty remains to be discussed by competent scientific and military experts. But it is significant to note the military chiefs are said to feel the benefits from the limited treaty are worth the risks involved.

Chiefly because it encourages the hope that East and West can proceed from this small agreement toward other advances in the cause of living in peace the limited test ban treaty is a major achievement. It must be approached with caution for it is no guarantee of an end to the cold war. As Premier Khrushchev reminded the world last week, the Soviet Union simply feels that, "Peaceful coexistence is the best means of achieving world communism." Let's hope the struggle can be kept in the areas of ideas and economy rather than military combat, which would mean nuclear war and no victors, just losers.

[From the Syracuse (N.Y.) Post-Standard, July 27, 1963]

U.S. Must Not Relax Vigilance

Any move toward East and West control testing is a step toward world sanity.

That is the best which can be said for the test-ban treaty which has just been negotiated in Moscow.

Obviously, continued unrestrained rivalry in development of more and more terrible nuclear weapons could lead only to eventual world suicide. It is hard to believe that man could be so mad, but both the Western Powers and the Communist world have been bankrupting themselves to outclass each other in means of total destruction.

On the argument alone that the Moscow pact is at least a move in the right direction, the U.S. Senate should ratify the treaty on a bipartisan basis.

It would be insane indeed for anyone to imagine that this signals either the end of the cold war or a new era of trusting Moscow.

Nikita Khrushchev and his advisers agreed to the present proposal (which is almost the same as the United States had suggested and they had rejected months ago) only for their own selfish reasons.

The Russians now realize that they have a far more ruthless enemy snarling at their backs than they ever faced in the West. Unless and until they can make common cause with the Chinese Communists, the Soviets know only too well that they had better try to patch up part of their dispute with the United States, Britain, and the rest of the free world.

Self-interest alone guided the Russian Reds in agreeing to stop nuclear testing in the atmosphere, in space and under water.

A Communist lies when it serves his purpose best, and there is no reason to place faith in any pledge which Russia makes in this treaty. But at the first evidence that the pledge has been broken, there is nothing to prevent the Western Allies from renouncing the pact.

In a column on this page today, Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane warns that the NATO nations should not proceed now to negotiate a nonaggression pact with the Warsaw Pact countries which are presently enslaving millions of captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

If we should agree with Russia not to take any hostile action toward each other in Europe, this would automatically seal the fate of any potential revolutionary movement which might break forth against the Communists, General Lane points out, for there would be no hope of aid from the West.

This is a vital point, but it should not block the ratification of the test-ban treaty itself.

If we as a nation realize that this is merely a gesture toward a more civilized system of international affairs and if we at the same time maintain our guard against any treachery by the Communists, we should certainly attempt to reach a common ground.

This is not a policy of "better Red than dead." If we stay alert, there is no reason to become "Red" at all.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, July 25, 1963]

THE SMALL SMILES OF MOSCOW

In Moscow, where secrecy seems to be congenital, progress of the nuclear test ban talks is measured by the warmth of the negotiators' smiles. Yesterday, as they left the conference chambers the satisfaction was unmistakable. Word spread that all pieces were finally in place and the treaty properly initialed.

It was obvious from the start that something more than disagreement would come out of these tripartite talks. Premier Khrushchev made a conciliatory speech at the outset. Russia obviously needs a show of amity with the West to offset its disarray in the East. The United States and Britain were eager to get some kind of ban.

Now, it seems, a treaty has been drawn. Details are lacking but these will be thoroughly examined when the U.S. Senate is called on for advice and consent. Already it is pledged to a degree since a 33-Senator bipartisan group recently called for a test ban and a senatorial committee will journey to Moscow for the actual signing ceremonies.

East-West agreement on anything is rare indeed. Any kind of a test ban treaty establishes a precedent. It recognizes the deadly threat of fallout to all people, the senselessness of the arms race, the deep-rooted desire of all thinking men for peace.

It assures world opprobrium for the abrogator.

To be sure this is no panacea for the world's ills. But it is a first step. Agreement breeds agreement and the thunderheads over Berlin and Laos and other danger spots appear slightly less menacing today.

The work at Moscow, yet to be implemented, could be a major break in the cold war, even if past disappointments have taught us not to scale the heights of hope.

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times, July 28, 1963]

RISING SUPPORT FOR THE PACT

The President's message to the Nation Friday night, cautious but hopeful, was in its simplicity and directness one of his most effective presentations.

He did not overstate the Nation's hopes. His assessment of the now-initialed partial test-ban treaty with the Soviet Union, in our view, was precise and accurate. He asked, and added powerfully to the chances for getting, overwhelming popular approval of the step as small but potentially important.

In a significant point, Mr. Kennedy made it clear—in order to avoid any possible ambiguity—that the treaty "will not restrict" the use of nuclear weapons in time of war. Unfortunately, the language of the text might make it possible for the Soviets later to claim that wartime usage had been prohibited.

Perhaps the President could have stressed more fully that one cardinal aspect of the disarmament and test-ban question has seen little progress indeed. That is the question of inspection. But at least we have moved a little closer to a frank exploration of the issue.

The reported acceptance of the treaty by all of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, after prior reports of their opposition, should help pave the way for strong Senate endorsement. The pact in no way compromises the security of the United States. Senator GOLDWATER could do himself, his followers and the country a service by conferring with the Joint Chiefs and joining in their approach, revising his position.

The most significant effect of wholehearted backing for the treaty would be its impact on the Russian people. Despite all the tyrannical machinery at the Communists' command to manipulate it, there is the fact of a strong Russian public opinion for peace. Now established beyond doubt is that gradually, the end of the Stalin era has seen the development of this opinion as a force in international affairs. The Russian in the street is bone weary of cold war tension and nuclear terror. He wants a lessening of these tensions and a better life. He clearly supports Mr. Khrushchev in the dispute with China on this score.

A confident expression from the people of the United States, through their representatives in the Senate, can assist in the maintenance of Russian public opinion as a factor with which the Kremlin and Khrushchev will continue necessarily to deal.

[From the Springfield (Ohio) News, July 27, 1963]

TEST BAN GIVES HOPE

The partial ban on nuclear tests which Averell Harriman and Lord Hailsham initialed with Soviet officials is no panacea. It doesn't guarantee to end the cold war, or even greatly to moderate it.

But it does give ground, in ascending order, for the following hopes:

That the world can be spared an intensity of atomic fallout which could become a threat to human health and safety.

That the agreement covering test in the air, on the ground and under water can, one confidence has been established, be expanded to cover underground tests.

That a test ban somehow can be used to discourage would-be recruits for the nuclear club in Peking and Paris.

That the agreement betokens, on Nikita Khrushchev's part, sufficient fear of Red China to lead to still broader accommodations with the West. As time goes on, this hope can be tested against Soviet actions and attitudes on Cuba, West Berlin, the Middle East and Central Africa.

With the possible exception of the first named, none of these rosy expectations may be justified by events. The Soviets even could break the ban specifically covered in the present agreement, as they have broken dozens of other treaty commitments.

But there is enough chance of a change in front to warrant an open-minded approach by the West. Obviously, Russian communism has not given up its conspiratorial ethic or its expansionist goals. But it seems to have developed a genuine caution about risking everything on a throw of dice that pack enough megatons to incinerate victors along with vanquished.

This is an element we can work with, however, warily. It offers a chance to stabilize though not to dissolve the cold war. If we fail to take advantage of the opportunity, it may not recur.

That is why President Kennedy has decided to take great pains to preserve a bipartisan approach to treaty ratification. He is reported to be weighing a plan to invite leading Senators of both parties to participate in the concluding phases of the Moscow talks. The idea here would be to skirt an ancient catastrophic mistake of Woodrow Wilson's. It is a sensible proposal. If the President does make it, it will deserve to be met in the spirit which prompted it. If we don't stumble this could be the still, small turning away from the path that leads to destruction.

[From the Middletown (Conn.) Press, July 27, 1963]

WHAT ABOUT THE TEST BAN?

President Kennedy's address to the Nation last night was an eloquent, restrained plea to his countrymen to support the provision of the test ban treaty just negotiated in Moscow by the United States, Great Britain, and the U.S.S.R.

As a newspaper that has long and consistently said and believed that such a treaty was possible and that the risks did not outweigh the advantages, we can only now greet the new treaty in this spirit.

Nations, in the phrase of Winston Churchill, have always armed to parley, because they could in the last analysis use the arms if they could not negotiate. Today, war is unthinkable, even if it may be argued that some might survive. Today, this single fact occurs quickly to those who have nuclear weapons. We have hopes that as the world community of nations acquires such weapons this same view will become theirs.

Such a viewpoint cannot be proved at this time, nor can it be said with assurance that the Russians will not at some time change their minds and begin testing again. It is, on the other hand, possible that this is an enduring treaty. The U.S.S.R cannot win the world by force of arms. It can lose all the world, even those parts of it now under the sway of communism, unless to these people can be brought the better life that is enjoyed by the West.

This is not a fact that has escaped the leaders of the Soviet Union. They have made progress in space, they have made progress in nuclear weapons, they have raised rapidly the standard of living of their country, and even some of the satellites, but they are behind the West. The appetites of their people are only temporarily assuaged. There is no guarantee in the Soviet Union, or in Poland, or in Hungary, or even Rumania, that desire will not outrun the facts of life. For the moment a truce exists, for tomorrow only progress will suffice.

It is therefore fair to say that Premier Khrushchev and the men around him may be more concerned about the battle for men's minds and stomachs than protecting their bodies against fallout—although this undoubtedly enters into their thinking—as do the risk of accidental war and other customary arguments. But two things may well be paramount. The first is the necessity to provide a growing standard of living, and the second is the Sino-Soviet contest.

Vast nuclear and space expenditures do interfere with the domestic tranquility of the people of the U.S.S.R. Indeed, there is considerable evidence that the Soviet Union's vaunted growth rate is slowing under this pressure. One of course must be cautious in gauging such figures, because as it once was fashionable to maximize the Soviet growth rate, at the present time it will become the one thing to say that the Soviet Union cannot burn the candle at both ends and has thus economically slowed to a walk. The truth lies somewhere in between. Nonetheless, it is fair to say that Premier Khrushchev probably believes that the world Communist movement can best be advanced by performance at home than by nuclear stockpiling.

This single fact, challenging as it may be, still should be welcomed by the United States, not only because we are up to the game, but because no contract, no treaty, can ever endure unless it is to the mutual advantage of both parties. We may now have come to that time.

There have been, of course, long periods of world peace, even though this generation has known two world wars. A balance of power has always been the essential condition. Today we stand at a moment of history when there never has been a great balance of power, nor have we ever stood at a moment when less could be gained by war. This is, in essence, the argument for saying that we may have arrived at the beginning of something. This we do not know. It is rash to say that the Communists overnight will become something that they have not recently historically been. It is also rash to say that the Russians, a nation challenged by the Chinese, would not respond to this new arrangement of power.

A number of observers trace the beginning of a new Soviet foreign policy to the Cuban crisis of last October when Khrushchev was forced to retreat before a determined United States. The Cuban compromise intensified the attacks of the Chinese Communists, whose objections had long smouldered, but it also convinced Khrushchev that there were limits to the patience of the United States. At the same time, the correspondence that President Kennedy started with the Russian leader at that time, which is essentially secret, also led him to the conclusion that agreements between East and West were possible and genuinely desired by the President. From these events have come, for better or for worse, a change, apparent or real, in the international climate.

We have now before us the calculated risk of accepting or rejecting the test-ban agreement. We can only urge that the Senate accept the treaty that has been negotiated, not because it is a guarantee of peace, but because it is the most attainable step that can be taken at this time along that roadway.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, July 27, 1963]

Hope but No Millenium in A-Ban Pact

A strong, closely reasoned speech by President Kennedy last night opened the national debate over the limited test ban treaty. The power of Mr. Kennedy's presentation lay in its caution and its spare eloquence. In our judgment it is the most effective presentation the President has made. The President made no exaggerated claims for a crucially important agreement with Russia which, as he said, still "is not the millenium."

Indeed it is not. The fundamental conflict will remain between the Soviets and the free world. A single pact to stop most forms of nuclear testing will not induce the Communists to give up their ambitions to dominate the world.

Neither can this one treaty blot out the dangers of war. Since this is not a disarmament measure, it most definitely will not lessen our need for U.S. military might and for effective, well-armed allies. This country is not signing away the right to use its most potent weapons, if either its own safety or that of other free nations is threatened.

On the positive side, Mr. Kennedy emphasized that the treaty is "a shaft of light cut into the darkness." For the first time it promises to bring under international control the appalling destructive forces of the atom that have haunted mankind for 18 years. Russia has finally recognized that her interests, too, can be best served by drastically reducing the tests that have paced the menacing arms race.

"It reflects," as the President summarized, "our common recognition of the dangers in further testing."

Surely all mankind stands to gain by being relieved of the dread of radioactive fallout, with its known hazards in terms of health, longevity and heredity. Surely there can be benefit for all in even one small step toward reducing the long-nagging tensions of the cold war. Whether this first step will lead to others no man can say. But a start must be made sometime, somehow, if sanity is to prevail on a nuclear-imperiled planet. Now the all-important starting point is in sight.

Of course, the nearly two decades of postwar mistrust between East and West cannot be ended instantaneously. Under our system of government, the U.S. Senate must consider the treaty and give its consent by a two-thirds majority. No doubt, there will be some vigorous opposition. A debate in the Senate and throughout the Nation is both necessary and desirable. But President Kennedy has opened this discussion on a high plane. In a world where the only real victories must be for the benefit of all nations, large and small, the terms for beginning to move toward a still-distant nuclear peace have been clearly defined.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, July 27, 1963]

Weak, but a Beginning

The nuclear test-ban treaty initialed in Moscow is a weak document, porous with escape clauses.

In essence it is little more than a resumption of the voluntary moratorium which Nikita Khrushchev broke peremptorily 2 years ago. The principal difference is that the treaty is a written agreement in which the three signatories agree to give each other, and additional nations which may join, 3 months' notice before resuming tests in the atmosphere, under water, or in space.

The treaty is weak because it depends upon the good faith of Nikita Khrushchev in order to make it workable. It is weak because it cannot stop or even discourage a nuclear war. It is weak because it does not include France, which has already tested and which plans to do more testing, or Red China, which is believed to be on the verge of exploding its first nuclear device.

These and perhaps other frailties should be freely admitted.

This is not a document to send the spirit soaring. By the same token, we cannot regard it as a menace to the security of the United States if the American Government remains alert and does not allow this limited trust to be abused by the Communsts.

It would be a grave mistake for opponents of the treaty to regard it as Communist victory simply because Nikita Khrushchev wanted it. The American Government and the American people have wanted such a treaty too, for 17 years and through three administrations.

We believe it would be a mistake also to underestimate the intensity of feeling, in America and the world around, concerning the dangers of radioactive fallout.

If this treaty can prevent the unnecessary explosion of nuclear devices in the atmosphere, if it can help to prevent the accumulation of radiation in the air, in drinking water, in the milk supply, it will have served a useful purpose.

Sometime, somewhere, if the world is to survive, it will have to make a start toward controlling the deadly atom. If the first, faltering step can be made without compromising the security of the United States, we believe that step should be taken.

[From the Miami (Fla.) News, July 28, 1963]

Start of a Journey—Which Risk Is Greater, Treaty or Arms Race?

The excitement generated by the prospect that even a partial nuclear test ban treaty will be achieved has given us a measure of the public's deep yearning for a way out of the cold war.

Led by President Kennedy's cautious assessment of the risks versus the advantages of the treaty, the public, however wary, seems genuinely hopeful that this may lead to the respite we have been seeking.

It has been 18 years, as President Kennedy said Friday, since Bernard Baruch first advanced the case for disarmament to the Soviet Union, and it has been 5 years since serious negotiations began on a nuclear test ban.

Now we are back on the verge of the first step to the first disarmament target, which is to outlaw nuclear weapons. Even this tiny advance has taken a great deal of perseverance and optimism. Further progress will require a lot more of both.

In the face of all the known hazards of negotiating with the Communists, it is easy to understand the reservations of some Members of the U.S. Senate, and their determination to learn the full implications of the draft agreement from diplomats, scientists, and military men who will appear before their committees. The Senate cannot do less under the Constitution.

What is all but impossible to understand is the mounting resistance from the far right to arms-limiting agreements of any kind, or even beyond that, to any sort of discussions with the Communist leaders. Project this pessimistic attitude to its logical conclusion and you proceed through a wasteful arms race to an inevitable war.

A more subtle, but almost equally pessimistic note is being slipped into the discussion by those who are wondering if we can afford peace. These persons are concerned about disrupting the vast weapons industry, and subsequent unemployment.

Taking the long view again, the real question is how much longer can we afford the cold war? Weaponsmaking is an unproductive business. In the face of the growing needs of our own population and others around the world for food, clothing, and shelter, can we continue to assign better than three-fourths of the national budget to military and related needs?

We are now considering the first step on the thousand-mile journey to a general disarmament. Many of us may not see the end of the journey in our lifetime. But it is important that we head in the right direction, and for now, it is most important that despite the known risks, we begin the journey by signing the partial nuclear test ban treaty.

[From the Schenectady (N.Y.) Union Star, July 26, 1963]

Small Sign of Hope

Every human being in his right mind wants to see everything possible done to reduce the risk of nuclear holocaust. To them the initialing of a limited test ban treaty by the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union is a step in the right direction. Why Russia's Khrushchev finally decided to do what could have been done years ago remains anybody's guess. That means a shadow over what is now not more than a hope. The attitude of France and the Red Chinese casts another shadow.

But with all this, it still is better than no attempt at all. We doubt the United States and Britain have been hoodwinked. Mr. Harriman is a shrewd diplomat, with longtime knowledge of the ways of the Russians. But he may have a tough job selling the treaty to the Senate. Mostly ultimate decision will come from public opinion, once that begins to jell.

Not everybody is going to be happy. There will be generals in all camps who will have wished for more knowledge, more perfectibility, more security. There will be statesmen and politicians on both sides who are so profoundly distrustful that they will live in fear.

All the rest—and so many more—will agree with Pope Paul VI, who said that he saw signs "of some hope" on the world's horizon.

[From the El Dorado (Ark.) News, July 27, 1963]

Ban Agreement Forward Step

It looks like at least a partial test ban agreement is finally going to become reality.

The proposed agreement was initialed in Moscow Thursday and final signing is scheduled next week by officials of the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union.

Chief Negotiator W. Averell Harriman and Soviet and British foreign ministers hailed the agreement in the initialing meeting.

Under terms of the proposal there will be a ban on nuclear weapons test in the air, in outer space, and under water.

Although the agreement is only a partial ban, the signing next week should be a definite forward step for the world.

The actual ban agreement comes as something of a surprise after many fruitless efforts toward that end.

Since it became possible for the great powers to get together on such an important undertaking as the test ban, it may be possible to reach agreements on other things that have an important bearing on relations between nations and world peace.

We believe the East-West situation can be said to be looking up but with more to be accomplished in the years ahead.

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Eagle, July 28, 1963]

Senate Rejection of Nuclear Treaty Would Rival 1919 Tragedy

If, as seems obvious, the major value of the nuclear test ban treaty drawn in Moscow is symbolic—as indicating a new willingness of the world's two major powers to act together to limit the dangers of a new war—then what happens in coming days in the U.S. Senate will be the same.

A person with any sense of history cannot help recalling another, similar situation 44 years ago. By coincidence, it was this very day (July 28) in 1919 that the Versailles Treaty was signed and the next day that President Woodrow Wilson sailed for the United States.

Wilson had negotiated a peace treaty that fell far short of what he wanted in conciliation of the warring nations. But he did get his grand concept of a League of Nations accepted by the world's powers. When he returned to Washington he thought he had achieved a great advance in international affairs.

Then the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee, headed by the late Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Sr., took over. The League became a partisan issue and this, coupled with personal feelings of animosity between Lodge and Wilson, doomed it for American participation. Wilson was repudiated by the Senate and eventually suffered a severe break in health.

But what happened to Wilson personally was not nearly as important in the long run as the symbol that rejection of the League became to both this country and foreign nations. That one act turned the United States back in upon itself for 30 years—until World War II. How different the world might be today if the United States had joined the League and used its power and influence to keep world peace.

On the current scene, according to counts made of Members of the Senate, from 50 to 57 seem disposed to support the nuclear test ban treaty with Russia. But 67 are needed for the two-thirds rule, and the additional 10 to 15 votes may be difficult to get.

Senator Barry Goldwater has announced his opposition. If any individual could rally a strong enough coalition in the Senate to defeat the pact, he is the one. So what he does may well be decisive.

The nuclear treaty is not as important in substance as the League Covenant of 1919. But as a symbol, it too could be of great significance. If the U.S. Senate should reject the treaty by refusing to consent to its ratification, America would be telling the world that it prefers to continue the cold war.

Such would be a tragedy comparable to that of 1919, for again the United States would earn the blame for poisoning the chances for peace at a crucial time in world history.

[From the Fredericksburg (Va.) Free Lance-Star, July 30, 1963]

Great Turning Point

The initialing of a partial nuclear test ban by the United States, Britain, and the Soviet Union constitutes a great turning point in the cold war. Though it does not assure a further easing of East-West tensions, though it does not guarantee that progress will now be made on substantive arms control, such possibilities have been markedly heightened by this treaty.

It now behooves the Senate of the United States to get on quickly with the business of ratifying the treaty. This is not a matter requiring, at this point, any elaborate and prolonged discussion.

The details of the agreement to prohibit further nuclear test explosions under water, in the atmosphere, or in space must be considered with care, obviously. The implications of excluding underground tests from the ban must be gone into. The impact of this agreement on national security must be shrewdly weighed. But these things should not take a long time, for the whole matter has been the subject of the most exhaustive discussion and analysis during several years, and Congress ought to have its mind pretty well made up on all pertinent considerations.

This is all the more true since the agreement initialed in Moscow is not a wholly new approach, but is in salient respects roughly the same as the treaty we proposed about a year ago. In effect it will halt all readily detectable nuclear test explosions. The one notable gap is the exclusion of underground testing from the ban. This can be dealt with later. The important thing now is to ratify the present treaty and go on from there—hopefully, toward a world no longer shadowed by the constant threat of nuclear destruction.

[From the Norwich (Conn.) Bulletin, July 30, 1963]

Test Ban Reality

After almost 5 years of talk and talk and more talk on the question of a nuclear test ban agreement, the initialing of such a treaty by the United States, Britain, and Russia comes as a bit of a shock. Such an agreement was a dream, one whose realization would, hopefully set the world on a new path toward peace. Now, all at once, the dream is reality.

It will be reality, that is, when the U.S. Senate exercises its cherished and wise prerogative; it holds the power of final decision as to whether this country is to be a party to the agreement. We say "when," rather than "if," because of a perhaps overoptimistic belief that the Senate will surely not reject this momentous step—"an important first step," as the joint communique said, "toward the reduction of international tension and the strengthening of peace."

It is indeed only a first step, and a partial one at that. Underground testing is excluded from the ban. No system of international inspection and control is provided. Any anxiety over the latter point is mollified, however, by the fact that tests of the sort included in the ban—that is, explosions in water, air, and outer space—can be detected by sensitive instruments, so that on-site inspection is not necessary. Most underground tests can also be detected at great distances, and there is hope that as instruments are perfected such tests can be added to the ban.

The thing of overriding importance is that at tedious long last the Soviet Union has been persuaded to agree to a ban substantially along the lines proposed by the West in August 1962. The chances are excellent that many other nations will join in the agreement. This may be, this can be, the start of an effective movement toward broader arms control and the rejection of war as an instrument of policy.

[From the Newport News (Va.) Press, July 28, 1963]

Treaty's Use as Lever Seen Big Benefit

The real signficance of a nuclear-test ban lies in its side effects—i.e., on the other dominoes that can be expected to topple once the first one has fallen.

One of the most important derivative effects of the agreement, assuming it is carried through to ratification, will be a hardening and perpetuation of the Sino-Soviet split. Red China has made abundantly clear she resents both the pact and Russia's part in drafting it.

The whole idea is a "U.S. fraud," Peiping cried indignantly July 19.

"The United States can use this treaty to create a pressure of public opinion to prevent Socialist countries other than the Soviet Union from conducting nuclear tests and possessing nuclear capability * * *."

Except for the reference to "Socialist" countries, this is, of course, precisely what Washington will hope to do. The principal purpose of the test ban is to deter the proliferation of nuclear capabilities—not just in the Communist world, though that is highly important, but elsewhere as well.

It is understandable that Red China should resent this pressure. Moscow's willingness to help apply it is a revealing measure of the depth and intensity of the Sino-Soviet quarrel.

Whether such pressure will in fact prevent Peiping from developing the bomb is, of course, highly doubtful. Almost certainly Peiping will go ahead, just as Gen. Charles de Gaulle will go ahead.

But to the extent that Peiping squirms under world pressure and condemnation, its relations with Moscow will be exacerbated. Moscow is responsible in large part for that pressure.

Red China's relations with other countries also will be affected. A Peiping holding out against an overwhelming surge of world criticism would be one isolated from Japan, from such southeast Asian neutralists as Burma and Indonesia, and from several African countries hitherto receptive to Chinese overtures. In all these places, atomic testing is an anathema.

The political damage to Peiping could be considerable. Her effectiveness in popularizing revolutionary doctrines in Asia, Africa, and Latin America could be seriously undermined.

The effect of the treaty on Soviet-Western relations is less easy to predict. Surface indications are that the effect may be good, conceivably even sensationally good, leading to possible accords on Berlin, Germany, and such arms-control measures as prevention of surprise attack. Even De Gaulle seems impressed with the possibilities.

But all this remains to be negotiated, and East-West chickens cannot safely be counted before the incubator is warm.

Soviet spokesmen were busy in the U.N. this past week trying to equate NATO with Portugal in the eyes of Africans—an exercise not calculated to endear Moscow to Washington and cultivate the mir i druzba spirit.

The effect of the treaty on the world balance of military power is also speculative, since neither side can know for certain just where the other stands in the atomic arms race.

Both the Kennedy and Eisenhower administrations, however, have adjudged such a ban to be in the national interest of the United States, and the Macmillan government has made a similar assessment in Britain.

India, which was the first to propose the ban in 1954, has seen its project come to fruition, at least in part. But curiously India, faced with an antagonistic China which soon may be nuclear armed, may have mixed feelings about the triumph. It inhibits her, should she ever feel the need to match Red China's firepower.

As a first step toward disarmament, the treaty has one important shortcoming: It includes no provision for international inspection.

None is technically necessary; national detection systems are adequate for the aboveground testing which is prohibited. Still, Western disarmament specialists would have preferred to set a precedent by including an inspectorate in the world's first significant arms-control pact.

This shortcoming will soon be forgotten if an accord on mutual inspection in central Europe now follows. Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev has reached back to 1955 and revived a set of proposals on the subject—on surprise prevention, disengagement, and mutual inspection across the Iron Curtain.

This act, perhaps more than any other, tantalizes students of East-West relations. The period from 1955 to 1957 is remembered as one in which arms control in central Europe came surprisingly close to realization.

Harold E. Stassen, President Eisenhower's disarmament adviser, believed he was within sight of agreement in the spring of 1957 when the Allies—Britain and France because they wanted to test a-weapons, West Germany because it feared acceptance of the partition of Europe—got John Foster Dulles to pull the rug from under him.

If Khrushchev now wants to pick up where Stassen left off—and that is the implication of what he said in Moscow July 19—the months ahead may see some highly interesting and meaningful negotiation. Already, of course, Averell Harriman and Lord Hailsham have explored the ground.

Thus the test-ban domino may very possibly tip over a number of other, sizable pieces. In addition, of course, it will have a direct and immediate effect on the radioactive poisoning of our globe. Historians are likely to regard it as one of the major events of our time.

[From the Hackensack (N.J.) Record, July 24, 1963]

Big Action on a Small, Growing Hope

Perhaps the great miracle of these times is that we always seem to get another chance. By refusing to join, the United States contributed largely to the failure of the League of Nations after World War I. When the United Nations was born out of Warsaw and Pearl Harbor and Hiroshima, the United States not only became a charter member but perhaps, in a plasma way, has been responsible for the continuing life of the 18-year-old organization. When this country stood toe to toe with Premier Khrushchev over Cuba last fall, both sides gave way and the horror of nuclear catastrophe for then was repulsed.

Now in the Moscow talks between Under Secretary of State W. Averell Harriman and Mr. Khrushchev there is hope again. If an accord can be reached—and it appears highly likely that there will be some limited agreement on banning nuclear testing—the Senate will have to approve the package. President Kennedy is putting maximum pressure on the upper house to obtain an overwhelming majority. This there should be. This would not be a solution, but it would be a beginning, a new step on the path away from nuclear war. Not incidentally, this would at the least reduce the danger from nuclear test fallout.

Nothing would mean an end to the battle with communism. There are and presumably always will be the economic competition and abrasion of differing ideologies. This could be just as fatal to capitalism. Lenin could no more foresee the total destruction of nuclear war than could Marx foresee the rise of a prosperous nonbourgeois middle class. Each event has considerably altered Communist thinking, at least Soviet Communist thinking. Red China still clings to the irresponsible policy of war, hoping Russia and the United States will do each other in and leave China the major world power. The Peiping-Moscow split has caused furor in China not so much because of ideological disparities but because now Russia and the United States may each remain as competition for Red China in its long-range push toward world domination.

There will be no party politics in the U.S. Senate in regard to a negotiated nuclear test ban treaty. But we will need statesmanship of a high order. How many more chances can there be?

[From the Elizabeth (N.J.) Journal, July 27, 1963]

A Nuclear Pact Is Mandatory

The U.S. Senate will be within its rights and performing its duty in being penetrating in its analysis of the nuclear test ban treaty, initialed in Moscow by representatives of this country, England, and Russia. But unless the Senate can find some real flaws, it has an obligation on behalf of the American people and the free world to accept this compact.

Senators already have hinted at a rash of questions. The document is not perfect from the American viewpoint; doubtless the British also have reservations, and it certainly reflects a drastic shift in the conventional Kremlin position. However, the Senate necessarily must be somewhat liberal.

The agreement appears to be more in line with American proposals, dating from President Eisenhower's in 1959, through a similar proffer last August by President Kennedy. This country has advocated a cessation of testing and that has been achieved, except for subterranean explosions, which contaminate neither atmosphere nor sea.

To contend that this accord falls short of the world's need for restriction on armaments is senseless. Such an accomplishment cannot be reached in a single act. The termination of nuclear testing in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water is a material first step and embodies the added benefits of clearing the air of fallout and stopping kindred contamination of the seas.

Some will scoff at the thought that Russia will abide by her agreement. But the Soviet state is realistic. It has committed itself to a new order for reasons we do not yet perceive.

Realization of the futility of another atomic war; fear of the reckless course of Chinese communism and the widening schism between Moscow and Peiping, the certainty that the domination of atomic weaponry now held by the signatory governments soon will disappear; the Soviet economy, lagging by western standards, may be undermined by the fiscal burden of the current program—any or all may have swerved the Kremlin from its seeming urge for physical domination of the universe.

Whatever motivated Russia was a powerful and realistic force. The change in position on nuclear matters is too great to have been undertaken for propaganda purposes or as a subterfuge for new trickery.

Unfortunately the treaty can only be a precedent, not binding on France, already indulging in fundamental experiments, or on the Chinese, reportedly only months short of atomic armament. Both Egypt and Israel are advancing, as others are too, in rocketry. The Russians are as aware of this as are the English or the Americans.

The Moscow conference has produced what may be the last opportunity to put the genie back in the bottle. It is a prospect that cannot be wasted.

[From the Quincy (Mass.) Patriot-Ledger, July 26, 1963]

Step Toward Peace

Initialing of a treaty banning tests of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water by the representatives of the Soviet Union, the United States, and Britain yesterday is a significant step toward the reduction of international tensions.

However, it should be pointed out that it is a limited agreement in that it does not bar underground testing, nor has it resolved the knotty issue of international control and inspection connected with underground testing—an issue which must be resolved before much progress can be made on the larger problem of disarmament.

Nevertheless this treaty breaks the ice and provides hope for further progress on amicable solution of other cold war problems. With all its limitations, the pact is a hopeful first step that has been thwarted too long by shifts in Soviet policy, with the result that tensions have remained high.

The world will acclaim, in particular, the banning of atmospheric tests which have long concerned many because of the possibility of the harmful effects of radiation.

Unfortunately, a cloud hangs over the treaty. The treaty is open to all states. But at present one nuclear power, France, has indicated that it will continue its testing. France did not take part in the Moscow talks, nor in the discussions at Geneva which preceded the successful negotiations.

The treaty also contains an escape clause, article IV, which states: "Each party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from the treaty if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other parties to the treaty 3 months in advance."

Under this clause, there is nothing to prevent the Soviet Union from withdrawing from the treaty if France should go ahead with nuclear testing, probably in 1968 but perhaps sooner.

The burden thus falls squarely upon French President Charles de Gaulle, who apparently could wreck all this careful work by going ahead with testing. De Gaulle holds a press conference Monday at which his answer could be forthcoming. His decision will inform the world whether De Gaulle is more interested in the grandeur of France or in world peace.

Much the same decision will face the U.S. Senate, which must ratify the treaty. We hope the Senators will meet their responsibilities, to the Nation and to the world, by recognizing this agreement as being necessary for the reduction of international tensions.

[From the Asbury Park (N.J.) Press, July 27, 1963]

NUCLEAR TEST BAN

The nuclear test ban agreement reached by the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union is a step toward peace. The proposed treaty in itself contains many loopholes that limit any assurance that the great powers may not continue testing nuclear devices. But the amicable atmosphere under which it was negotiated is a pleasant relief from the tensions of the past.

The treaty prohibits the testing of nuclear devices in the atmosphere, in space, and underwater. Such tests can be readily detected and the United States was thus encouraged to withdraw its demand for on-site inspections. Inasmuch as underground tests are difficult to detect and the Western delegates were unable to persuade the Soviet Union to yield to on-site inspections, the ban does not include tests beneath the earth's surface.

The exclusion of the underground tests from the ban represents a major weakness in the agreement. For many scientific theories involving nuclear warfare can be studied with even low-power underground tests. This suggests that objections to the treaty may arise in the Senate, which must ratify it before it becomes effective, and the Pentagon, where it is feared that the Soviet Union may further develop its nuclear power with underground tests while this country discontinues the studies needed to improve its nuclear strength.

There will also arise questions as to the degree of reliance we can place in any treaty signed by the Soviet Union. Its record is far from an example of good faith. Rather it shows that Russia complied with solemn agreements when it was convenient to do so, and violated them when expediency dictated. It broke a previous gentlemen's agreement for a moratorium on nuclear tests and it refused to comply with the agreement for onsite inspection of Soviet rocket bases in Cuba. These circumstances, coupled with the fact that the test ban treaty contains an abrogation clause with a 60-day notice provision, casts doubt on its strength. And there will be concern, too, over the fact that France and Red China, which are developing nuclear forces, are not signatories to the pact. How much nuclear progress could Russia score by studying tests conducted under Red Chinese auspices?

But to acknowledge weakness in the test ban treaty is not to detract from its value as the first step toward more amicable relations between the West and the Communist bloc. It marks a new spirit of good will that may nurture far more concrete contributions to peace. Prime Minister Macmillan accurately appraised the treaty when he suggested to the House of Commons "that we regard this not as something in itself, but as a step to something very valuable."

[From the Racine (Wis.) Journal-Times, July 26, 1963]

AN ENCOURAGING FIRST STEP

A major breakthrough in international relations, perhaps the most significant single point of departure since World War II, came in Moscow Thursday with the completion of a nuclear test ban treaty involving the three major nuclear powers, the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain.

The treaty is significant for what it actually does—protecting the atmosphere of the world from further pollution and significantly slowing down the international arms race.

It is more important for what it means to the near future of East-West relations—a first significant step toward a relationship between the European Communist bloc and the Western Powers that will permit them, at least, to compete without the fear of precipitating nuclear war and mutual destruction.

The test ban talks, according to the communique issued at their termination, included far more than the discussion of the points covered in the treaty. They included discussion of a nonaggression pact between the NATO nations and the Warsaw Treaty nations (the Communist governments). These discussions will now be carried back to all the signatories of both international blocs. Thus, the test ban treaty has already produced something in the way of international agreement beyond its own scope.

The treaty must come, within a few weeks, before the Senate of the United States for its ratification, and Senate leaders appear confident that at least two-thirds of the Senators will agree.

There have already been objections to the treaty in general and in certain particulars. General opposition is to be expected from the conservative Senators of both parties who have long since indicated that they would rather fight Russia than live in the same world with her. We do not believe they constitute a significant segment of the Senate.

More particular objections will also come forth. Already, some Senators have questioned the treaty provision permitting the signatory nations to abrogate the treaty (that is, resume testing) if a fourth power engages in testing. This means that the United States could resume testing if China starts, and the U.S.S.R. would be freed from the test ban provisions if France should engage in further testing.

The only answer to that objection is that we must take that hurdle when we come to it. The fact is that neither China nor France are testing at the present moment. All the signatory powers to the treaty must take whatever measures are available to them to prevent these nations from going further in the nuclear race. The accomplishment of the treaty is that it is banning further testing by the three nations which have nuclear weapons and are capable of testing them—or using them.

The treaty omits reference to underground testing—in effect, permits its continuance—for two reasons. First, the long months of discussion at Geneva showed that it was impossible to reach an agreement on a type of testing that necessitated international inspection for enforcement; the United States insisted on inspection and the Soviet Union absolutely balked at it, so the Moscow negotiations were carried on in the area of what could be done rather than what could not be done. Second, underground nuclear explosions do not present the same kind of a threat to health and safety of whole populations. There is a humanitarian reason for banning environmental tests, but only a military reason for banning underground tests.

The accomplishment of the Moscow conference was, in the words of the communique, "an important first step toward the reduction of international tensions and the strengthening of peace."

We would expect the positive cooperation of the U.S. Senate on that basis alone.

[From the Jamestown (N.Y.) Post-Journal, July 27, 1963]

SOME GAINS IN NUCLEAR TEST BAN

The limited nuclear test ban agreement reached by the foreign ministers of the United States, Britain, and Russia in sessions held in Moscow over a period of several days may be welcomed as a step forward.

But it falls far short of bringing an end to all tests. The ban applies to tests in the air, space and under water, but leaves Soviet Russia free to continue experiments underground. That Russia will continue such tests, there would appear to be no room for doubt in view of the fact it adamantly refused to sign a pact that would authorize on-site inspections to guard against cheating.

Even though Soviet Russia successfully resisted the demands of the United States and Britain for an all-out ban, including underground tests, the treaty, if Moscow actually complies with it, will eliminate the awful menace of radioactive fallout from tests in the air conducted by the three powers. But the pact has no binding force on France, which has made clear it will continue its tests, nor on Red China which may be expected to engage in such experiments whenever it is ready.

Moreover, it contains a revocation clause providing that each of the signatory nations may withdraw from the treaty if it decides that extraordinary events have jeopardized the supreme interest of the country. That, of course, would be seized upon by the men in the Kremlin if they decided to resume tests.

The treaty will have no binding force on the United States until it has been ratified by the Senate by a two-thirds vote of the entire membership. Dispatches from Washington forecast a stormy debate when the pact is submitted by President Kennedy for approval. Some influential Senators of both parties have already made it clear they are not satisfied with the concessions made by Under Secretary of State W. Averell Harriman and Viscount Hailsham, the British negotiator. It should not be made a partisan issue, and it seems unlikely it will be.

While it would be risky to forecast action by the Senate, it will not be surprising if the Kennedy administration should muster the required two-thirds votes on the ground that even a limited ban removing the danger of radioactive fallout as far as the three major nuclear powers are concerned is a long step toward an eventual ending of all nuclear tests.

There, also, is another major factor to be considered. The United States has been spending hundreds of millions of dollars in making tests. Much of it would be saved if the test ban accord goes into effect and Soviet Russia complies with its terms.

[From the Holyoke (Mass.) Transcript-Telegram, July 26, 1963]

ENCOURAGING BEGINNING

The beginning of a new phase of East-West relations occurred in Moscow on Thursday. Perhaps it is only a beginning; there may be no second step. Nevertheless it is the most promising breakthrough in the cold war so far. It signifies the first Russian willingness to negotiate seriously with the West since the Austrian agreement.

By itself the agreement initiated at Moscow must be hailed on its own merits, for halting nuclear testing everywhere except underground. This provides the world relief from deadly nuclear fallout. Although there may be arguments put forward in the Senate to oppose this on military grounds, the pressure of world opinion, in which many Americans share, to stop contaminating the air may be expected to produce the required vote. It is to be hoped that this same pressure will move France to reconsider her go-it-alone determination to keep testing nuclear devices.

The agreement was made possible by two things—technical advances which have made on-the-spot inspection unnecessary, and the rift between China and Russia. To a very large degree, the agreement has come because Russia is now ready for it. This circumstance justifies the policy of continuing to talk, no matter how futilely, when major issues are involved, in the hope that changing events will change the position of stubborn adversaries.

The fact that Russia serves her own self-interest by this agreement, and by the demand to talk substantively about the world relief from deadly nuclear fallout, an East-West nonaggression pact encourages hope that the agreement will be kept. International agreements are not philanthropic. We surely believe the test ban agreement to serve the interest of the United States too.

What raises expectations as a result of the Moscow agreement is the fact that both sides want it. It seals recognition that negotiation must replace force. This does not mean that disarmament will follow, that the crucial problem of Germany will be solved, that communism will abandon its global aims. It means, though, that East and West are seeing some common purposes.

Most encouraging of all is the indication that the great powers accept the responsibility of the nuclear monster and are, at last, working together to keep it confined.

[From the Clarksville (Tenn.) Leaf-Chronicle, July 26, 1963]

A STEP TOWARD SANITY

What could be a historic step forward in the cause of peace was made in Moscow Thursday when representatives of the United States, Britain, and the Soviet Union initialed an agreement to ban nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water.

Of course the treaty may be discarded, or it may not even be ratified by one or all of the three Governments as represented by the U.S. Senate, the British House of Commons or the Soviet Presidium. But at least it is a step that points toward sanity and lends hope that the cold war will finally be ended.

The heart of the 800-word agreement reads: That each of the three powers undertakes to prohibit, to prevent and not to carry out any nuclear weapon test or any other nuclear explosion at any place under its jurisdiction or control—atmosphere, outer space and under water or high seas. Further it bans tests in any environment if such explosion causes radioactive debris to be present outside the territorial limits of the state under whose jurisdiction or control the explosion is conducted.

Here in the United States, warnings will be voiced, perhaps not without merit, against trusting Khrushchev too far. Such a warning was volunteered by former Vice President Richard Nixon Thursday after he has made a short visit into East Berlin. But it stands to reason that if any progress is to be made it must start with some show of confidence not only by us but by Soviets. The alternative might be much worse even than breaking of the pledge later.

True, Premier Khrushchev is probably motivated entirely by selfish reasons due mainly because of his split with Red China. Also true, he probably wants time to mend his political fences at home and boost Russia's economic health by raising the Soviet standard of living. But even if these were his sole motives the treaty ban is justified for it certainly should not mean that its adoption would push us closer to war. The stark truth of continued nuclear testing is that all of humanity could be harmed by too much nuclear debris in the air—radioactive fallout. Even a pause in testing is helpful.

The encouraging development in the nuclear test ban is that the way has been opened for further measures of peaceful coexistence. It does not mean that Khrushchev has scuttled his dream of world communism and has suddenly become a friend and ally of the West. But it may mean that Khrushchev is sincere in his belief that a great nuclear war would leave nothing for the victor. It may mean that he spoke his convictions recently when he warned the Red Chinese that in event of a nuclear war "the living might envy the dead."

[From the Pittsfield (Mass.) Berkshire Eagle, July 26, 1963]

A HISTORIC FIRST STEP

Initialing of the three-power treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in space, and under water is a historic occasion that raises large hopes for the future.

As the first substantial step toward harnessing nuclear destructiveness since the first bomb was dropped 18 years ago, the treaty slows to a crawl a nuclear arms race that has threatened to rocket out of control and plunge the world into disaster. It greatly reduces the immediate dangers of the continuing arms rivalry.

At the same time, the agreement virtually erases the threat of more worldwide radioactive fallout in the close future. Fallout contamination, now at record highs in the New York area, will not be increased by the big Soviet, American, and British bombs that have caused most of the trouble so far.

Most important of all, the treaty demonstrates that ideological foes like the United States and the Soviet Union can come to agreement where their vital interests are parallel. It proves to doubters like the Communist Chinese that coexistence works. It thus points the way for other East-West arms-control pacts and provides a breathing spell during which they can be negotiated.

This is not to say, of course, that the treaty is an ideal document assuring peace in our time. It is a limited agreement with some worrisome loopholes. Principal of these is the so-called "abrogation clause" under which any one of the three countries can withdraw from the treaty if it decides that "extraordinary events" have jeopardized its supreme interests. That is, if the Soviet Union decides that French nuclear testing is a threat, or if the United States decides that Chinese nuclear testing is a threat, either can abrogate the treaty and resume testing on its own. Inasmuch as France evinces a determination to continue testing its atom bomb, and China is reportedly on the verge of testing, this is a real possibility.

Another weakness of the pact is that it contains no provision for an experimental inspection program and international control agency for underground tests. With underground tests still permitted, it is conceivable that fears that one nation may be forging ahead will lead to pressures for renouncing the entire treaty. A total ban on nuclear testing is still something to be worked out, along with other arms-control measures.

Whether they will be worked out before a major war ensues, no one can say for sure. But it is certain that initialing of the test-ban treaty yesterday in Moscow offers more hope for peace than the world has dared to entertain in many long years.

[From the Bloomington (Ind.) Herald-Telephone, July 25, 1963]

PURELY A MATTER OF ECONOMICS

There are two ways in which the average citizens can react to the talks in Moscow on a test ban treaty.

The first, an instinctive reaction, is "Ho, hum, here we go again."

The second reaction can be one of restrained excitement over the very possibility that President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev have actually decided to put an end to mankind's daffy race toward incineration.

This is not to assume that the two world leaders who have their finger on the trigger for the nuclear bomb have undergone a spiritual experience which has turned them into peace mongers.

Instead, the rising hope for some better understanding between the United States and the Soviet Union must be based on the premise that the two leaders in the cold war are like a couple of rakes who have decided that it costs too much to keep up the wild pace.

Take a few figures from the U.S. budget and you get the idea.

In fiscal 1964 this country plans to spend $1,262 million on medical and health research.

Sounds pretty good. Our public expenditure on this wholesome project of bettering human life has been increasing annually, from $833 million in 1962 and $1,072 million in 1963.

But hold. Take a look at another section of the budget, and see what we spend for "kill and overkill," for research and development of new and better methods of exterminating the human race.

In 1964, research and development for defense ("kill and overkill") will amount to $7,653,300,000. In other words, we are going to spend six times as much studying how to destroy life as how to preserve it.

These expenditures for studying about "kill and overkill" likewise have been expanding. In 1962 they totaled $6,780,700,000 and in 1963 $7,088,900,000.

The future calls for more and more research. The refinements of nuclear weapons call for refinements in defense, new discoveries in offense, in a never-ending merry-go-round.

The money is only part of the wasteful process, as some of our most studious people are beginning to assert.

The expenditure of 10 percent of our gross national product on defense means that the arts of war are sucking up the best intellectual talent in the scientific fields. Men whose brains could be lengthening life are devoted to the study of how to shorten the lives of our enemies.

The same process is going on in the Soviet Union. As a matter of fact, the "hard line" of the United States, developed as a patriotic motif by the late John Foster Dulles, was predicated on the belief that the Soviet Union would collapse under the economic burden of armaments before our own mature economy began to feel serious stress.

Some well-trained minds, in scattered corners of Washington, like the Disarmament Agency in the Department of State and the foundation-financed Peace Research Institute founded in 1961 by former Ambassador James J. Wadsworth, have been studying the implications of the arms race.

And these studies seem now to have gained at least a temporary ascendency over the alarums of the weapons groups in the Pentagon and the proponents of bigger and better nuclear devices in the Atomic Energy Commission and elsewhere.

The growing economic burden of weapons development, plus the danger of nuclear "proliferation" (already real for us in France and for the Soviet Union in China) have apparently brought President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev closer than they have ever been to what diplomats call a "detente," or relaxation of tensions. The next couple of weeks will tell.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) News, July 26, 1963]

A START TOWARD WORLD PEACE

History was written yesterday when three great nuclear powers—the United States, England, and Russia—initialed the treaty banning nuclear tests in the air, outer space, and under water.

Underground testing is not affected by the treaty, since this involved a condition the Soviet would not agree to because it feared inspection might lead to surveillance in Soviet land which the Reds call espionage. We might add: Look who's talking.

It is on this latter phase that a break may come in this country's solid front. Senator **BARRY GOLDWATER** gave a hint of the opposition which will arise in Congress. He maintains we yielded to the Russians on the most important point in all the negotiations.

The Moscow agreement came after a diplomatic tug-of-war lasting almost since the atomic age began.

Before the United States, Britain, and the Soviet Union achieved this understanding, their negotiators piled up mountains of words at United Nations headquarters and in Geneva, Washington, London, and Moscow.

Over and over again the negotiators wrestled with this problem. Sometimes they took a few steps on the road to agreement. Then months went by in deadlock.

Geneva, where most of the maneuvering for the past 5 years took place, became a second home to test ban experts for the three countries.

In the end the experts themselves fought to keep from becoming dizzy and out of touch with reality. Some gave the impressions they had almost lost sight of the goal. For them the negotiations had become a way of life.

And in the end the three powers settled for half a loaf rather than none. They agreed to end testing everywhere except underground, where cheating is most difficult to detect without inspection.

Yet, limited agreement and all, it is an occasion for rejoicing, most diplomats agree. The Moscow understanding, in their view, represents the most hopeful East-West accord since 1945.

The United States and Britain originally wanted 170 to 180 international control posts scattered throughout the world and international inspection teams to go to the site of suspicious disturbances. But the Russians would not have this, saying the West was really trying to plant spies in the Soviet Union.

The talks were conducted during a voluntary moratorium on testing by the three powers. They were blasted when the Russians on September 1, 1961, began a series of around 40 tests, including 1 of over 50 megatons.

The Moscow talks with new negotiators for the West—W. Averell Harriman for the United States, and Lord Hailsham for Britain—simplified the problem by putting the underground test question aside.

The tests in the other environments, which the Moscow accord prohibits, are the ones which would cause health hazards and produce genetic damage.

If this treaty operates without breach, it could be meaningful for the world. We can hope and pray—and keep our fingers crossed.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star, July 26, 1963]

EAST-WEST PACT AT LAST

Initialing of a nuclear test ban treaty by United States, British, and Soviet negotiators is a significant development in East-West relations. Conceivably, it could be the big turning point in the cold war.

Premier Khrushchev wanted to tie the agreement to a nonaggression pact between the NATO and Warsaw powers. The United States resisted this plan because it would mean the recognition of East Germany as a separate sovereign state and would add stature to the whole satellite setup.

That Khrushchev gave way—though he probably hopes to get the NATO-Warsaw treaty later—seems to indicate a real desire for new working arrangements with the democratic world at a time when Russia-Red Chinese relationships are deteriorating.

Red China now may try to show its independence of Moscow and prove its point about the necessity of aggressive action by new moves in southeast Asia. The United States already has recognized that possibility with word that aggression there will be met with force. But whatever Peiping decides in that direction, it almost certainly will be done without any cooperation from Moscow.

There are many warnings about a cautious approach to the new deal with the Kremlin—voiced by the national commander of the American Legion on his visit to Minneapolis, by Richard Nixon in Berlin, by various Senators and Congressmen.

Experience teaches that the Soviet dictatorship may change course suddenly. Yet some years ago it finally agreed to a peace treaty for Austria and has lived up to the bargain. The test ban treaty can be far more important, in itself and as a signal of other peacemaking adjustments.

Isn't that what the free world has been praying for?

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, July 29, 1963]

TWO BEGINNINGS

The treaty limiting nuclear tests came 2 days before the 10th anniversary of the Korean armistice. Both events marked significant steps. The Moscow pact demonstrated that great powers could make a beginning toward bringing atomic energy under control. In Korea a United Nations army compelled an aggressor to sign a truce at his aggression's starting point, without conceding him any political rewards.

Both successes were limited. The Moscow treaty reduced no armaments; neither did it cover nonsignatories nor underground tests. The Panmunjom armistice has not wholly prevented successful aggression, direct and indirect—by subversion. But it has shown what can be done.

The decade between these two events reveals how slow, painful and dangerous is the business of substituting peaceful processes for war. Humanity now has weapons capable of destroying itself, and also, as Carleton Coon noted in "The Story of Man," "the biological equipment of the hunter." The future, obviously, is far from certain, but at least beginnings have been made.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, July 29, 1963]

J.F.K. ON THE TEST BAN

The mood in which the President addressed the Nation Friday night on the nuclear test ban agreement with Russia was one of carefully restrained optimism.

"This treaty," he said, "is not the millennium." He did not claim that it would "resolve all conflicts, or cause the Communists to forgo their ambitions, or eliminate the dangers of war." He saw the agreement, rather, as "an important first step—a step toward peace—a step toward reason, a step away from war."

We believe that Mr. Kennedy made a strong case for the test ban treaty and its ratification by the Senate. We agree with him that any risks inherent in the agreement are outweighed by the risks of unrestricted testing.

The President's list of benefits promised to the world by this proposed ban on all nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and underwater was an impressive one:

First, it holds forth the hope of reduced world tensions and broader areas of agreement.

Second, it is a step toward freeing the world from the fears and dangers of radioactive fallout.

Third, it may help to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to nations not now having them.

Fourth, it may strengthen the United States' security far more than would the continuation of unrestricted testing.

In addition to reciting such potential benefits the President offered the Nation two important reassurances.

The treaty, he said, is not conditioned on "any other matter," nor was an agreement reached on any other subject in the Moscow talks. Here there is an oblique appeal for the confidence of those Senators—or any Americans for that matter—who may fear that some secret understandings are attached to the test ban treaty.

Mr. Kennedy also emphasized the importance of the treaty provision which would permit the withdrawal of the signatories after 3 month's advance notice. If events should endanger our supreme interests, and it became plain that those interests would be well served by our withdrawal, the escape door would be open. Our right to self-defense would not in any way be jeopardized.

We are convinced that the best interests of the Nation would be served by the ratification of this treaty. The horrors of nuclear war which the President described weigh heavily upon the world. In this agreement there is some measure of hope—if no firm guarantee—that we may yet escape those horrors.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, July 26, 1963]

THE GENIE IS PARTLY BOTTLED

One of the senior knights of President Kennedy's roundtable has been partially successful in carrying out his assignment; to storm the Kremlin fortress and, within a period of 10 days, to bottle the evil nuclear genie which has been haunting a worried world.

Averell Harriman, exactly 10 days after the opening of negotiations with Britain and the Soviet Union, initialed a treaty in Moscow yesterday which did not entirely recapture the genie but at least got the head and part of the body back into the bottle.

What kind of a creature is Mr. Harriman bringing back from Moscow? Even before the treaty was initialed, one Senator joyfully predicted that it could be a turning point in Soviet-American relations. Others warned of a sinister Soviet trap.

The extraordinary thing about the object in the bottle is that neither President Kennedy, nor his emissary, nor anyone else in the outside world knows exactly what it is. And we shall not know until the Soviet Union is put through a series of specific tests on specific international issues.

The treaty may mean something or it may mean nothing. As it stands it may be reduced to this simple statement: The United States, Britain, and the Soviet Union will temporarily suspend nuclear testing in all areas except under ground as an expression of a desire to improve East-West relations and negotiate a settlement of outstanding differences. We are ready to discuss but we are not bound to conclude a nonaggression pact between the NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries.

Either side can denounce the treaty if it feels that its security has been threatened by the other's nuclear advances. There is nothing absolutely permanent and unalterable about any treaty, and much less about this one.

The world will be relieved of nuclear fallout, but both parties will be free to continue testing under ground. And this right, while it might smooth some of the ruffled feathers of the military and the atomic experimenters of both sides, could easily blow up the entire treaty if it is exercised to the extent of creating the very threat to which we have just referred

Furthermore, we must not deceive ourselves into thinking that the document will halt the proliferation of little nuclear devils in other parts of the world. France and Red China certainly won't halt their experiments. Other countries, such as Israel and the Arab States, may continue theirs.

In short, the treaty represents little more than a loosely binding legal formulation of President Kennedy's offer of June 10 to suspend tests in the atmosphere if the Soviet Union would do likewise. It is a declaration of good intent, reflecting a friendly state of mind of the two great nuclear powers at this particular moment.

We have much to gain and nothing to lose by ratifying this declaration and then testing the Soviet Union in Berlin, Laos, Cuba and other sensitive points to learn whether Russia really is ready to end the cold war and make peace with the West.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Post, July 29, 1963]

TEST BAN FLIGHT: THE SNIPING BEGINS

The national—and worldwide—sense of hope evoked by the initialing of the limited test ban treaty has visibly shaken the American right. President Kennedy's earnest and often eloquent statement of the case for the agreement has won a warm response from his countrymen; the ordinary citizen in Moscow is described as equally stirred by this glimpse of daybreak.

But let no one confidently assume that the battle for quick, decisive Senate ratification is over. The "reservationists" have begun to make themselves heard in a whisper that could become a roar if they detected any sign of real national division.

Within the last 24 hours Dr. Edward Teller has voiced his "doubts" about "some aspects" of the treaty. Senate Republican leader DIRKSEN has expressed his own "doubts." Only a few scattered valiants have so far dared to urge bluntly that the Senate repudiate the agreement. But the process of quiet undermining has begun. There will be no frontal attack; there will be an exercise in devious sabotage.

Now is the time for the American people to continue to speak out in resolute, unequivocal terms in support of Mr. Kennedy's stand, and to reject the overtures of the weaponeer lobby. Let there be no confusion about the sound of America's voice in this moment that could foreshadow so many more meaningful chapters in history.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, July 27, 1963]

RATIFY TEST-BAN TREATY

The test-ban treaty negotiated in Moscow raises a welter of conflicting opinions and emotions. Relief and hope are counterbalanced to a large extent by suspicion and fear.

The long and tortuous course of efforts to control the atom, dating back to the end of World War II, provides ample warning against discarding all restraint in greeting this achievement. We have been burned before, when hopes were permitted to rise too high. It could happen again.

In advising caution, however, as President Kennedy and other leaders are doing, the scales should not be tipped to the point of endangering the ratification of the treaty by the Senate. The Senators have the duty to advise the President on treaties, and full discussion is in order; but we hope consent will be forthcoming without undue delay.

The draft of the treaty initialed Thursday is essentially what the United States and Britain proposed to Russia many months ago. To repudiate it would be far more damaging to the United States than any foreseeable consequences of the treaty itself.

Objections are possible on either of two grounds: That it does not go far enough, in that it will still permit underground testing, or that it goes too far in restricting U.S. tests of large-yield weapons where the Russians may be ahead.

It should be apparent from the lengthy negotiations on this issue that no treaty will be perfect. No agreement on underground testing is possible as long as Russia regards inspection as a form of spying. Moreover, setting up machinery for ferreting out suspected cheating on underground tests has proved so complex that many U.S. experts also despair of making it work.

There can never be a complete answer to those who oppose any restrictions whatever on nuclear testing, or those who protest that the safeguards against cheating are not ironclad. Conceivably, bigger or better weapons could be developed with continued testing, and it is theoretically possible for the Russians to set off a blast behind the moon that we could not detect.

We are told that our present nuclear weapons will be obsolete in a few years unless tests continue. But in an age when existing weapons have the potential of destroying all life on earth, and when "overkill" is debated as a serious problem, we find it hard to credit the argument of possible obsolescence.

Detection of atomic blasts in the air, in space, or under water is sufficient to insure that cheating could be successful only at enormous expense—as in the case of behind-the-moon testing. Yet it is agreed that testing has already passed the point of diminishing returns. Each test brings less in the way of new results. The incentive for cheating would seem to be small.

Any treaty must rest to some degree on trust. Granted that the Russians have earned a minimal degree of trust in our relations with them, a start has to be made somewhere, sometime, if a disastrous collision is to be avoided.

The draft treaty expresses the hope that this is but the first step toward ending the arms race, and the communique from Moscow speaks of "other questions of mutual interest" to be discussed later. We retain the hope that it does mark a turning point. There is a long way to go, but this could be a good beginning.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press and News, July 27, 1963]

"OUR CHILDREN HAVE NO LOBBY"

President Kennedy put the full prestige of his administration back of the nuclear test ban treaty last night in an address which should rank among the most eloquent of his career.

While turning his persuasive powers on the Senate, where a two-thirds majority vote is required for ratification, he also appealed for support from the rank and file of citizens and from an audience which is worldwide.

Inviting popular aid in the decision, he remarked that our children and grandchildren "have no lobby here in Washington." And in a still wider field he suggested, however indirectly and diplomatically, that other nations may help persuade France, lone present holdout among the four nations he listed by name as nuclear powers.

The President obviously sought to avoid overstating his case, admitting secret violations may be possible, emphasizing nations cannot rely "simply on the good faith of their adversaries."

He termed the treaty only a small step, "a shaft of light cut into the darkness in the patient effort to persuade the Soviet Union to renounce aggression—in the best interest of the Soviet Union as well as the rest of the world."

These relative risks will be the subject of hearings and debate in the Senate. The President's invitation to discussion and debate across the country should be taken seriously. For this is one of the crucial decisions in our national history.

Before final action is taken, every responsible citizen should make himself fully informed and be prepared to share this solemn responsibility with the President and Senate.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, July 27, 1963]

THE SENATE AND THE TREATY

President Kennedy's address to the Nation last night effectively stated the case for prompt U.S. ratification of the tripartite partial nuclear test-ban treaty, a move which could be, in his words, "the first step" on the long road to a real peace.

The argument over this question now moves into the Senate, where we trust it will be decided affirmatively and soon. At least one-third of the membership of the Senate has already gone on record in favor of the principles of the proposed treaty. Two months ago 34 Senators under the leadership of Senators DODD and HUMPHREY joined in sponsoring a resolution asking the U.S. Government to offer the Soviet Union a treaty banning nuclear test explosions in the atmosphere and under water.

This was one of the moves that undoubtedly helped lay the groundwork for the achievement in Moscow when representatives of the United States, Britain, and the Soviet Union reached their agreement this week.

The basic considerations which each Senator must weigh in considering this treaty point overwhelmingly to the conclusion that it would be in the best interests of the United States and the world that it be ratified. Any Soviet test of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere or under water would be immediately detectable; such a test in remote space—say in the neighborhood of the moon—might not be, but it is difficult to see how such a test could do Moscow sufficient good to justify the risk of being caught in violation of a treaty.

The end of above-ground testing by the signatories will terminate their contribution to the radioactive contamination of our planet's environment, of the air we breathe, of the food we eat, and of the water we drink. The gain to humanity will be immense. Moreover, it is to the economic interest of the Soviet Union as well as that of the United States to bring to an end this ultraexpensive nuclear arms race. Both of us have better uses for our resources.

The escape clause of the treaty provides an honorable exit for any signatory, including the United States, if future developments—say, some sensational nuclear weapons progress by the Chinese—should alter the present nuclear stalemate and require the resumption of atmospheric testing. Another major concession to those on both sides who oppose any test ban is the non-prohibition of underground testing, which permits further development of some aspects of nuclear armament technology and continued existence of the research laboratories working in this field.

Both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations have been pressing for precisely the kind of partial test ban which has now been reached. The Senate can best serve the interests of our country and of all peoples by ratifying the new treaty, which represents a historic agreement by the Soviet Union to a long-sought American goal.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, July 27, 1963]

SHACKLING THE DJINN—"AS ONE SMALL CANDLE MAY LIGHT A THOUSAND"

The treaty agreed upon at Moscow by the three great nuclear powers prohibiting tests in the air, in space, and under water, is properly hailed by President Kennedy as an achievement of major importance, despite its limited objectives.

For the first time in the 18 years elapsed since Hiroshima an attempt is to be made to diminish nuclear peril by international agreement. For the first time since 1955, when the Austrian Peace Treaty was ratified, Russia and the West have found a basis for mutual accord, however narrow, on an issue of major international significance.

When this treaty is ratified—and prospects appear excellent that it will be regardless of critical rumblings from some in the U.S. Senate—most of mankind will enjoy respite for some time from the hazards of radioactive fallout, a boon absent since the nuclear race began.

It would be rash not to recognize that this is a strictly limited pact. One leg of the djinn is to be powerfully shackled; but the evil genii has not yet been thrust back into the bottle of safety.

Underground tests are to continue on both sides. France, determined to go her own way, will press her development of the weapons of terror. Communist China, temporarily disabled by economic and other drawbacks, will undoubtedly follow suit, when and as she finds the means to do so.

In sum: though the cold war is momentarily eased it is in no sense ended. While it persists so will the potential of major disaster for humanity in the nuclear deterrent. Yet the terms of this treaty look beyond the immediate problem facing its negotiators. In addition to proposing to halt three types of nuclear testing themselves, it seeks to achieve nuclear slowdown wherever else that may be possible.

The clauses that bind all three to block proliferation of nuclear weapons, and to refrain from giving advice, nuclear know-how, or nuclear materials to any other government, deserve especial notice.

That pledge not only charts a broad policy for Asia, Africa, and the Americas. Most pointedly it seeks to allay concern here and abroad about Germany's possible future recourse to weapons of this kind. The West German Federal Republic has itself already forsworn any such aspiration in its treaties with the West. The new treaty pledge would diminish one of the Soviet Union's and Europe's nightmares.

Finally, by agreeing to discuss later the possibilities of some kind of nonagression pact between NATO and the Warsaw alliance, the negotiators have left the door ajar for the future.

That is the course of wisdom. Such a proposal, provided the basic interests of the West, especially those of their West German partner are adequately safeguarded, should not be impossible. It would conform with the pledges given by all three of these powers under the United Nations Charter. It could also well serve the hard realities of today's Europe.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, July 28, 1963]

A CALL FOR HELP

The President's comments on the test ban agreement were not addressed exclusively to the Senate, which must ratify it. He was also appealing directly to the people of the United States—in a sense, perhaps, going over the Senate's head in the course of his call for help. If so, there was nothing wrong with this.

Mr. Kennedy was careful not to claim too much for this agreement. It is what he called it, "an important first step—a step toward peace—a step toward reason—a step away from war." But it does not end the threat of nuclear war, reduce nuclear stockpiles, stop the production of nuclear weapons or restrict their use in event of war. Still, it is a step which should be taken, and in the words of the Chinese proverb which the President recited: "A journey of a thousand miles must begin with a single step."

The outlook for ratification of the agreement is good. That it will be attacked, however, is certain. One line of attack is likely to be directed to the possibility that tests might be made far out in space and thus go undetected. Mr. Kennedy anticipated this and undertook to meet it with two main arguments. First, he said, we already have the capability to construct a system of observation that would make such tests almost impossible to conceal. Second, the risk of cheating in outer space must be weighed against the risk of rejecting this agreement, with all of the consequences that could be expected to follow.

Among these are the resumption of testing by both the United States and Russia with attending radioactive fallout, the probable proliferation of nuclear weapons as other countries aspire to join the nuclear "club," and, finally and perhaps inevitably at the end of this road, a nuclear war—touched off by accident, design, or sheer madness.

The President spoke of such a war in chilling terms. "A full-scale nuclear exchange lasting less than 60 minutes," he said, "could wipe out more than 300 million Americans, Europeans, and Russians, as well as untold numbers elsewhere. And the survivors, as Chairman Khrushchev warned, 'would envy the dead.' For they would inherit a world so devastated by explosions and poison and fire that today we cannot even conceive of all of its horrors."

An exaggeration? We do not know, but we doubt it. There can be no doubt, however, respecting another proposition set forth by Mr. Kennedy. He said that "this limited test ban, in our most careful judgment, is safer by far for the United States than an unlimited nuclear arms race."

This is so manifestly true that we do not think it is even open to question. And the opportunity to seize upon this limited test agreement is at hand. If the opportunity is permitted to slip away through small-minded opposition or public indifference, then one may well believe that "history and our own conscience will judge us harshly"—if there is anything left to judge when judgment time rolls around.

[From the Macon (Ga.) Telegraph, July 27, 1963]

ARGUMENTS FOR TREATY OUTWEIGH ITS DRAWBACKS

The limited nuclear test ban treaty is bound to call forth mixed reaction from the American public, from the U.S. Senate and, indeed, from any individual who ponders it in the light of history.

For the sake of the future of mankind, adulteration of the atmosphere by fallout from testing must be curbed. But also for the sake of the future of mankind, our enemies must not gain a victorious advantage over us by this or any other agreement. The President of the United States and a preponderance of learned opinion believe such a treaty as is now being laid before the Senate would reduce the fallout menace to national defense.

Moreover, the treaty itself provides that any party to it may withdraw if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country. The life of the treaty therefore depends far more upon the attitudes of the participants than upon any words written into the treaty itself.

Mr. Averell Harriman has said the tentative agreement was possible because Premier Khrushchev wanted it so. It can also be said that the agreement will remain in force only so long as Mr. Khrushchev wants it so. But neither are we bound if we see, by Russian action, that our supreme interests are jeopardized.

Some Americans may be uneasy over ratification of the treaty, but we judge there is far more uneasiness that, for some unforeseen reason, the treaty won't be ratified.

"A treaty entering the Senate," a harassed Secretary of State once declared, "is like a bull going into the arena. No one can say just how or when the final blow will fall. But one thing is certain—it will never leave the arena alive."

The statement of course is exaggerated. But it contains enough truth to make the Kennedy administration use all its considerable powers of persuasion to assure final Senate approval. Last night's report to the people by Mr. Kennedy was the opening big gun in his campaign.

In neither of the other nations which are parties to the treaty will legislative ratification be necessary. Indeed, the restraints on a U.S. President's treaty powers are virtually unique.

One must hope that Ray Stannard Baker was not prophetic when he wrote more than 40 years ago:

"The deadlock between the executive and the Senate every time we face a really critical foreign problem is intolerable. It not only disgraces us before the nations, but in some future world crisis may ruin us."

[From the Butte (Mont.) Montana Standard, July 26, 1963]

TEST BAN TREATY—WORLD BECOMES SAFER

With American diplomats professionally cautious and American people unbelieving much of the coolness was taken out of the United States-Soviet cold war in the test ban conference in Moscow. The talks must go down as the most momentous in recent history as we take a new turn in the Atomic Age.

The Big Three—United States, Britain, and Russia—have initiated a partial treaty to ban tests in the air, under water and in space. Formal announcement had been held up by protocol differences. The treaty does not include underground experiments, because of the Soviet refusal to accept what the West considers adequate inspection.

The treaty has a long way to go to become effective. As U.S. Chief Negotiator W. Averell Harriman said, treaties are finished when they are signed and not before. As all should know, Senate approval is necessary in our country.

While the feeling of relief has swelled in Western nations to the point of joy, there remains a nagging suspicion of Soviet actions.

Americans cannot forget that in negotiations in Russia back in 1939, Stalin made a public deal with Britain and France to stop Hitler and at the same time made an undercover pact with Hitler on dividing the world between them.

It was Stalin, the militant revolutionary, then. Today it is Khrushchev, who preaches peaceful coexistence. Nevertheless, Americans are wary. This test ban pact is one of convenience for Russia. Faced with hostility from Commie China and the inexorable realities of the Nuclear Age, Khrushchev is using the test ban in playing off the West against Chinese Reds to bring them to their knees. Too, Nikita has been getting alarmed about the aggressive appetite of the Chinese Commies and wants a secure Western front.

Although it appears Russia is deliberately using the West in this test ban treaty, in accepting terms it repeatedly has rejected, the world becomes a safer place in which to live. In that all peoples should be thankful.

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Mail, July 29, 1963]

By a Moment or So, the Test Ban Treaty Halts the Headlong March to the Abyss

It is almost, but not altogether, true that a treaty with the Soviet Union is not worth the paper it is printed on. The great and hopeful exception is the treaty which freed Austria of Russian domination. It took 10 years to negotiate, but no Austrian and few Europeans would argue that it was a waste of time. Here, for once, the Soviets moved back from a position they had taken and could easily afford to hold.

This is the first of the reasons for hoping that the treaty banning nuclear testing can in one small area minimize the danger of war. The second is this: No one smart enough to construct and explode a 100-megaton nuclear bomb can conceal from himself what is certain to happen if this escalating game is continued indefinitely. Sooner or later, without or with a war, mankind will be doomed by this perversion of his intelligence.

Knowing this, we can and must assume that the Soviets know it as well. It is the ultimate contradiction of their theory that in the otherwise normal evolution of economic and political forces they will live to bury us. With indiscriminate increases in the radiation hazard, there will be no one left to make up the burial party.

The third reason, of course, is that the world is no longer what it was as recently as 5 years ago. Much as George Orwell predicted, the great division is not entirely between East and West, but between East, West, and the emerging Chinese. This, too, is fact (how big a fact is uncertain), which does not conform to the Communist theory. The Chinese are supposed to accept Moscow's leadership, not to reject it, and if they defect, Khrushchev may have to make other arrangements.

The United States and its allies need not recognize the test ban treaty as the greatest document since the Magna Charta to see in it the possibility of the first, tentative pause in the headlong rush toward the abyss. And they need not rely wholly on the good faith of the Soviets to explore its possibilities. However remotely, it improves the chance that the world need not be converted into its own funeral pyre.

[From the Fresno (Calif.) Bee, July 27, 1963]

Nuclear Treaty Is Vital Stride Toward Peace

The treaty banning certain nuclear tests by the United States, Great Britain, and Russia is somewhat like the first step of a child; its significance lies not in the size of the step but rather in the fact that a start has been made.

The carrying out of the provisions of the agreement will achieve an immediate benefit to mankind by halting any further radioactive pollution of the world's atmosphere by the three major nuclear powers.

Yet other than this vital gain the terms are limited. No provision is made for the ending of tests underground. No plan is outlined for disarmament in the field of conventional or that of nuclear weapons.

However, when it is remembered that this is the first agreement of any importance which has been negotiated successfully between the East and West since the 1955 treaty which gave Austria its independence, it is realized how barren of hope have been the years of the cold war.

This document is the first tangible success in the whole history of attempts to control the destructiveness of the atom which has placed all of mankind in the shadow of annihilation.

Thus, even though the breakthrough may be limited, it is of immense importance. The ice is broken. Further negotiations will take place which will permit the Russians to demonstrate whether their acceptance is only a brief maneuver in the continuing cold war or an expression of a real desire to find a road to peace.

The U.S. Senate should give prompt approval. The military leaders of the Nation have endorsed the pact. The President has appealed for bipartisan backing.

It is clear no danger to national security is involved. Opposition can come only from those who permit obsessive fears to blind them both to reality and the longing for peace throughout the world.

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal, July 28, 1963]

The Test Ban Treaty Warrants Approval

There is only one really valid criticism that could be leveled against the limited test-ban treaty that has been initiated in Moscow—that it is too little too late.

The world already may have traveled too far along the road toward nuclear devastation to turn back. The agreement reached by American, British, and Russian negotiators does not represent a turning back. It is only a pause, and only a partial pause at that.

The nuclear powers already have warheads sufficient to wipe each other off the face of the earth, and probably, in the process, to make the whole world unfit for human habitation, or at least for civilization as we know it for many years. This accord will not even halt the growth of these frightful arsenals.

Nuclear technology has advanced to the point where the proliferation of nuclear arms among other nations is an imminent possibility. The treaty prepared by the Big Three may encourage a temporary slowdown in this proliferation, but the two powers most likely to join the nuclear club in the near future, France and China, already have indicated they will not be restrained by the document that has been drawn up in Moscow.

Nevertheless, the Moscow accord is a beginning, a small beginning as the President has conceded, but a beginning the world desperately needs. The hope it raises is a small hope, but better than no hope at all to end the grim race which, as both Mr. Kennedy and Khrushchev have pointed out, could end only in mutual annihilation. A first step is better than no step at all.

Critics contend that even this timid beginning at a rapprochement with the Soviet Union is risky. Probably they are right. No doubt, as Senator Pastore has predicted, there will be "serious objections by some sincere and well-informed individuals." We only hope those critics who are sincere and informed will not ignore the greater risk of doing nothing to try to bring the devastating power of the atom under control.

More invidious is criticism like that voiced by Representative Craig Hosmer, Republican of California, who says: "The Soviets would not have negotiated a treaty unless they thought it provides substantial advantage to them; if so, it must contain substantial disadvantages to us." This syllogism is patently false. It does not follow that one man's gain is another's loss. The agreement that was reached after careful deliberation and bargaining in Moscow was initialed by both sides because both saw advantages in it. Because both are increasingly aware of the threat of nuclear war to their security and way of life, both stand to gain from any step toward reducing the danger of such a war.

There is one additional and immediate benefit of this test ban treaty, a benefit not only to the signatories but to all men. That is, that it will halt at least temporarily the radioactive poisoning of the earth's atmosphere. If for nothing else, this alone would be reason enough for Americans, as well as Russians, to applaud and hasten to approve the agreement to prohibit tests in the atmosphere, in space, and under water.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Times, July 27, 1963]

Testing Poses the Greater Risks

Only time can tell with certainty what the limited agreement to stop nuclear testing will mean. Perhaps it will be the longed-for first step toward more general disarmament, toward a true easing of tensions between East and West. Conceivably it could be the start of a genuine new era.

Perhaps it will be none of these things. Maybe all of our hopes will be disappointed. We don't see how anyone now can look ahead and be absolutely sure about what is going to happen, whether for the best or the worst or something in between.

What we can do, however, is give the agreement a chance to work. It has been said—and is being said—that the agreement entails risks. Of course it does. But the choice here is not between safety on the one hand and danger on the other. The choice is between the risks inherent in continued and ever-wider testing and those involved in this agreement.

We believe that the risks in uncontrolled testing outweigh greatly those of the proposed treaty. Scientists may not agree on exactly how much radioactive fallout is fatal, but they do agree that the danger is real. It seems inescapable that the more testing, the greater the danger. At some point, whose existence if not location is known, danger will become disaster. But fallout is not the only danger involved in uncontrolled atmospheric testing. There is also the risk of error or misinterpretation which could result in war.

On the other side of the argument is the familiar cry, once again resounding through the land, that "you can't trust the Russians," meaning that the Russians cannot be trusted to live up to the terms of the treaty. And those who voice this cry list the many agreements the Soviets have in fact broken since the end of World War II.

But it seems to us there is at least one thing the Russians can be trusted to do: To act in what they believe to be their national interest. As the St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorialized recently: "That the Soviets have violated what the West considered to be firm understandings in the past is quite true. But it does not follow that therefore no understandings whatever are possible. Instead of trying to divide nations into evil ones (theirs) and virtuous ones (ours), sensible men realize that all nations of whatever ideology will tend to abide by international agreements which will serve their vital national interests."

A MATTER OF INTEREST

Lest the United States become too self-righteous about all this, let it be remembered that this country has violated treaties conflicting with what it considered its vital interests. For evidence, ask the American Indians.

The point is whether the Soviets believe the test-ban agreement is in their interest. The best evidence is that the men now in the Kremlin are just as apprehensive about this problem as we are. Khrushchev settled in this instance for much less than he wanted. He had sought a ban on all tests, including those underground which could not be detected without on-site inspection. But he agreed to a partial ban covering only above-ground tests, which can be detected with some degree of assurance from afar. He can have little hope of breaking this kind of treaty without discovery.

Moreover, nearly everything Khrushchev has said recently—and, far more important, nearly everything he has done—indicates that he has a real interest in preventing a nuclear war and in discouraging the spread of nuclear weapons. It was he who backed off in Cuba. It was he who affronted the more belligerent Red Chinese.

ALERT FOR CHANGES

All in all, we believe it can be said that now the Soviet Union feels that a ban on testing is in its national interests, and as long as it feels that way it will abide by the agreement. That does not mean we need not be alert for changes in attitude.

Of course, even if the treaty is ratified by the Senate, a project to which we hope former President Eisenhower will give his enormous prestige, not all testing problems will be eliminated. Underground tests will remain. More menacingly, neither France nor Red China will feel bound by the agreement. France has announced it will test. China will test as soon as it develops something to be tested.

Thus this agreement cannot be cheered as the certain sunrise of a bright new day. But it is the first glow of what could be a new day.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Post, July 27, 1963]

Encouraging Statements

The statements issued Friday by President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev on the new limited agreement between the East and the West on nuclear testing were encouragingly similar in one respect.

Both statements stressed that the agreement is only a first step, but that conditions seem favorable for considering other steps that will carry the world closer to the objective of stabilized peace.

It is possible, of course, to dismiss both these statements as being merely formal and ceremonial, and the future course of events may support that dismissal.

But for the moment at least, tensions seem definitely to have been reduced and the spirit of mutual distrust and enmity quieted. And that must be counted on the plus side.

[From the Greenville (N.C.) Reflector, July 27, 1963]

Wide Significance in Ban Accord

Years of negotiating between East and West for a nuclear test ban treaty have now borne fruit in the form of the agreement initialed this week by officials for the United States, England, and the Soviet Union.

It represents the greatest stride yet taken by the major powers to assure control of nuclear weapons and to reduce the dangers of nuclear fallout to the world as a whole. The atmosphere in which the treaty was hammered out in a few short days also holds the promise of better relations between the Soviet Union and the major Western Powers. Superficially at least, the Soviets have moved into a new phase of the long-talked-of peaceful coexistence era.

By banning the testing of nuclear weapons in the air, outer space and under water, the agreement leaves only the question of underground nuclear explosions to be dealt with. Presumably parties to the treaty will respect the ban on other tests as including underground tests for which no effective devices for positive detection have been developed.

It is of significance that the test ban does not provide for on-site inspection of nuclear test installations. This, long a point of major contention between the two parties, must be regarded as a victory for the Soviets. Apparently, however, the Western nations likewise gained concessions from the Soviets on other points which heretofore had been stumbling blocks to obtaining a final agreement.

It is also of significance that the new Soviet willingness to effect a test ban agreement comes at a time when the relationship between it and its most powerful ally, Red China, is at the lowest ebb in Communist history. It strongly suggests a desire by the Soviets to improve relations with the West as a possible defense against the Red Chinese.

Time alone will tell whether the Soviets intend to live up to the test ban agreement. Time alone will also tell whether the agreement will usher in a new period of greater stability in East-West relationships.

In spite of the factors which at the moment remain matters of conjecture, the importance of this first nuclear test ban treaty between the major nuclear powers cannot be minimized.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, July 29, 1963]

The President's Assurances

If there is anything the world can use right now it's a step away from war and a little optimism even if cautious. There were phrases used by President Kennedy in his talk to the Nation about the nuclear test ban initialed—at least—in Moscow last week. They were indeed nothing more than had been said around the country editorially before the President had his radio-television date with the people, or by thinking persons everywhere. Nevertheless, in racked times like these, no bit of heartening news wears out its welcome by being repeated. "Say it again," as the old song went—we like to hear it.

President Kennedy of course was saying it again for the special benefit of the U.S. Senate, which must ratify the Moscow agreement before American commitment to it becomes official. How the Senate will jump we shall have to wait and see. It is well known that some of our military authorities consider a halt in nuclear testing just playing into Soviet hands. They probably will not buy Mr. Kennedy's assurance that the treaty could check the nuclear arms race in a manner which, on balance, will strengthen this country's security far more than a continuation of unrestricted testing.

Then there is in the back of almost everyone's mind the recollection that the Russians are gifted at making scraps of solemn papers. Someone counted up just recently that out of 53 major agreements, they have walked out on 50. The dream of freedom from nuclear tests may therefore blow up with a bang. However, the bursting of a hope probably will not bang so loudly as the breaking of a war—and it is hard to see how an arms race, in which nuclear testing is a capital element, could go on forever without some itchy finger eventually pulling the trigger.

Unless there are things the public does not know, it does not seem as if either side will have a chance to sneak very far ahead of the other, so long as the ban does hold up. In a whirling world, we might as well give the Moscow treaty at least a whirl. In the years since Hiroshima a whole generation has grown up that has never been out from under the shadow of the mushroom cloud. The treaty will not defuse the bombs already made, but it does perhaps admit a ray of light in a melancholy world. It should not blind us creatures of darkness, but it could light our footsteps out of the cave. We can always go back.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 1, 1963]

Mission to Moscow

The limited test ban treaty initialed in Moscow is not a victory for party or for country but is a victory for the world. For this reason it is gratifying news that a bipartisan delegation of Senators will be present in Moscow next week when the document is signed. Two Republicans, Senator AIKEN and Senator SALTONSTALL, will be in the group along with ranking Democrats. This augurs well for Senate ratification of the treaty by a strong bipartisan margin.

When the President goes to the brink of war, he can count on support from the opposition party. Surely he should get the same bipartisan support when he goes to the conference table on a matter of such moment as the limited test ban treaty. The agreement, in its essentials, is similar to a proposal made by President Eisenhower and is therefore as much a Republican as a Democratic policy. Secretary of State Rusk, when he formally signs the treaty next week, will be acting for the entire Nation, and the presence of two distinguished Republicans will underline the point.

[From the Woonsocket (R.I.) Call, July 27, 1963]

Will the Senate Advise and Consent?

The U.S. Constitution is clear and specific in the matter of treaties. It gives the power to make such treaties to the President—but with Senate approval. That approval means that the President can enter into foreign agreements by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and that consent can be given only "provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

President Kennedy, of course, has already made his pitch for this consent, and up to this point Members of the Senate have been cautious about making public their thoughts on the matter. Except for Senator GOLDWATER most of them have reserved their opinions, although reports indicate the proposed three-power nuclear test-ban agreement will win U.S. approval.

The agreement must also be approved by the British Parliament and the Supreme Soviet, although as reported yesterday there should be no trouble from these quarters.

The agreement is, as has been said, a marvel in conciseness. It can be easily understood and is free from jargon and excess verbiage. It provides for other signatories. It also provides an escape clause should one of the signatories feel it is in imminent danger of attack.

Actually there is probably no more that could be done in Moscow. Certainly it is a step forward. But it is only a step as of course Red China, moving farther away from the Soviet Union, had criticized the agreement in advance. And General de Gaulle thinks he is on the threshold of becoming a nuclear power himself and declines to join any agreement.

As we pointed out the other day, the Soviet Union is not averse to tossing agreements into the wastebasket and, as emphasized before, the treaty includes only the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union, thus far the major nuclear powers. Neither Red China nor France is of concern at the moment, but there is no one who doubts they will themselves master nuclear armaments in the foreseeable future.

Getting the approval of the U.S. Senate may not be easy, although it will probably be forthcoming. The matter will be discussed in committee before reaching the floor, where tradition calls for a rollcall vote. Before that happens, however, there will be searching questions, as there should be. But it is unlikely that President Kennedy will suffer the disappointment that President Wilson did when he attempted to weave the covenant of the League of Nations into a peace treaty.

[From the Orlando (Fla.) Star, July 27, 1963]

A Spark of Hope for Peace

Although the test ban agreement will be opposed by some responsible leaders in this country, it is a significant step toward a tolerable peace in the world and the world is ready for the easing of tensions.

That those directly connected with the negotiations in Moscow expressed hope and expectancy that the test ban agreement is the beginning of more agreements to come, seems to indicate that the world is moving into a new phase, and a better phase.

The new agreement provides, with some escape hatches, that all nuclear testing in the air, in space, and under water be banned. Only underground testing will continue. Testing underground does not poison the air or space or the seas. Continuation of the open tests could make life on this planet impossible.

By allowing the underground testing to continue, the negotiators avoided a need for inspections which had caused other negotiations to fail.

Khrushchev wants this agreement to be followed with a nonagression pact between the Atlantic alliance and the Soviet bloc of nations. This type of pact won't be as easy to achieve as the test ban pact.

But even this nonaggression pact between East and West will be hard to oppose, unless those who dislike it have something else to offer the peace-hungry peoples of the world. If the only other alternative to a nonaggression pact is a continuation of the cold war or a hot war it too can be some sort of step forward toward peace.

Those who want no truck with the Russians of any sort have a basis for their distrust, but they must remember that there is little hope of peace without some kind of agreement. Maybe we wouldn't feel too safe with a nonaggression pact with the Russians, but neither are we too safe without it.

If the Russians really want peace as it clearly appears they do, they will abide by a pact which enables them to have peace. We believe the Russians want peace, because they need peace. War cannot solve their problems, just as it cannot solve the problems of the free world.

The East and the West find themselves in the same boat, a frail craft loaded to the gunnels with nuclear death, riding the precarious waves of a restless sea. Is it too unthinkable that they both should agree not to rock the boat?

If politics makes strange bedfellows, certainly the threat of doom can bring potential enemies closer together, despite a difference in aims and ideologies.

Maybe there is hope in the world. If so we should not destroy it through hate, doubt, or fear. We should do our part to encourage a spark of hope, be it ever so faint and flickering. Even an unsure peace is better than war and certain annihilation. We should proceed with care, but we should proceed.

[From the Norfolk (Va.) Virginian-Pilot, July 27, 1963]

THE MOSCOW AGREEMENT: 1963

It is well to keep in mind that in point of goals the proposed above-ground nuclear test ban is a modest document. If this is a sobering thought, it is also a useful one: it tells us how far we have come toward the realization that the day when men lay down their arms is in the dim future if it awaits at all.

When Czar Nicholas II welcomed 26 nations to the Hague Peace Conference in 1899, he hoped to prohibit the development of new weapons and limit the use of those already developed. When President Wilson drew up his Fourteen Points, he included a reference to the reduction of armaments to the "lowest point consistent with domestic safety." This was the goal again in the Geneva Disarmament Conference of 1932 and disarmament principles are written boldly into the Charter of the United Nations. Much of the discussion between the signatories of the present agreement in the intervening years has dealt with the progressive elimination of all armaments that could be used to make war.

In this historical context, an agreement simply to cease testing certain kinds of weapons in certain ways must be regarded as unassuming. In place of broad-scale disarmament or even limitation of present weapons we have merely a partial test ban. In place of a conclave of nations agreeing upon this action, we have only three signatories.

Even measured by recent standards of test ban architecture, lowered considerably with the dawning of pessimism, the present agreement is loose. It provides that any signatory can get out with only 3 months' notice simply by stating that its supreme interests are in jeopardy. And, of course, it does not affect underground testing.

None of this is meant to belittle the agreement. It is, as President Kennedy told the Nation Friday, a historic document. The Hague Conference, the League of Nations, and the Geneva talks all were failures. The United Nations Charter is an empty vessel when it preaches disarmament. The Moscow agreement has a chance to succeed; indeed, it has already succeeded in bringing together the three nuclear powers for the first time.

One of its strengths is its modesty. A broader agreement might not win the approval of the U.S. Senate for one thing. A broader agreement—let us say one banning underground testing—would heighten the natural fears in this country that the Soviet Union would once again be able to cheat on its public intentions.

As matters stand now, the United States leads the Soviet Union in the area of nuclear development in which it has concentrated—smaller missiles with more accurate and various delivery systems—and the Soviet Union leads the United States in the development of the bigger missiles. Neither lead is likely to be affected by the ban, another reason why it was possible to reach agreement on it.

And while the agreement is modest, it is forward-looking. Its text makes it plain that the three signatories consider themselves merely the first to sign. If France and Red China are not likely to sign now they will be among many who must sign later, if the treaty is to prevail.

If it does not prevail, if in its present form it is unacceptable or abrogated, the talks at Moscow that ended the years of frustrating conferences need not have been in vain. The significance of the first Hague Conference in history is not that it was a failure, but that it inaugurated a new method of dealing with international problems of this kind. In the same way, the Moscow Conference may be remembered: there the nuclear powers in the year 1963 first concluded that more risks were involved in continuing to test than in ceasing to test.

But all this lies in the future. President Kennedy was right to hail the agreement as a first step toward a higher goal. That is what it is, hopefully, today. That is why it deserves a solid vote of ratification from the Senate. For the rest, history will have to answer.

[From the Maryville (Tenn.) Times, July 29, 1963]

NUCLEAR TEST BAN PROPOSALS ARE SOUND

Friday night the President of the United States approached one of the key problems of mankind in the nuclear age when he addressed the Nation to plead for the acceptance of the proposed test ban treaty with the two other key powers with nuclear capability. The treaty must be approved by the Senate of the U.S. Congress before it will be binding on this country.

The merits of the case against nuclear testing have been discussed again and again in this column as well as across the Nation. The fact of the matter is that we know that some harm is being distributed to unborn generations by some of the testing in the past but just how much and what its true effects will be is subject to considerable debate.

Some have felt that the need to develop nuclear power and the blessings brought by this achievement will more than offset the minor damage that may possibly occur in the future. Others have felt that we cannot morally leave a legacy of unknown destruction to posterity and that any further testing will cause future generations to curse our names.

At stake in this debate is our ability to protect ourselves from obliteration from some power stronger in nuclear weapons than ourselves. Our defense has been to have enough power to destroy, that would serve as a deterrent to any who would attack us.

Then we reached the age where we were developing the antimissile and the anti-missile-missile and we heard that the Russians were attempting the same thing. We have felt that Russia would not sign any test ban treaty that she would keep until she had developed a nuclear weapon that would serve as a guard against missile attack.

If this is true, then we must face the treaty with full knowledge that she either has developed this capability, can finish its development under the limited testing left or will just break the treaty when it suits her purpose. Under the ban proposals, each nation which signs will have the same rights to continue underground testing and be able to back out of the treaty when its national defense is threatened.

We think that the treaty is good and we say this at the risk of having the wrath of fired-up enthusiasts descend on us with all their accusations. We know that we are ahead of the Russians in capability, we know that we can discover any move of theirs to abrogate the treaty secretly, we can continue our own testing in a limited way and we are not signing away any sovereign powers that we cannot back out of when we feel our well-being is in jeopardy.

Even those who developed the atomic bomb and first cracked the atom have said that something must be done to stop the continued nuclear explosions or the human race would be in serious danger. Therefore we cannot just put this treaty in the category of just a disarmament program but it must be placed in a special niche reserved for the propagation of our species.

Because we will maintain our power to act in any direction under its terms and because we must accept some responsibility for the poison we distribute in the atmosphere, we hope that the treaty worked out by Harriman, Lord Hailsham, and the Russians will be ratified by the Senate.

[From the Trenton (N.J.) Times, July 28, 1963]

INITIALING AT MOSCOW

A beginning has been made. This, perhaps more than the actual terms of the test-ban agreement signed by the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union, is the welcome meaning of the initialing in Moscow.

How far we have moved along the road toward avoiding nuclear holocaust depends much less upon the new written words than upon the future attitude of Nikita Krushchev and his colleagues in the Kremlin.

For the moment that attitude seems propitious. And truly, on any basis of orthodox logic, Moscow has reason to seek earnestly for more relaxed relations with the West.

Communist China, to Russia's East, no longer is the great ally in Marx-Leninism;

it is an angry critic of what Peiping sees as Moscow's apostasy from the true faith. China itself is on the way to a position of nuclear challenge; Russia cannot ignore the threat that lies here if the bitterness of recent months continues.

At home, no one can doubt that Khrushchev has vast problems. Soviet industry and agriculture have been faltering for 2 or 3 years. Not critically, perhaps, not in any way as to suggest failure—but still there has not been the economic growth rate so vital to giving the Soviets the basic strength needed to exert world leadership.

Yet orthodoxy, in Western terms, often has been ignored by Moscow. Hence, what the Soviets do in coming months in Berlin, in Vietnam, and Laos to whatever extent they control there, and in other world trouble spots, will be a vital guide to their intentions. Often before Khrushchev has soft-talked 1 month and then provoked a cliff-hanger and crisis the next month.

Still, as of today, the Kennedy-Harriman step toward cessation of nuclear testing in the atmosphere, under water and in space—but leaving vital underground testing untouched—is a clear and we hope historic advance. Whether it leads to a breakthrough toward broader disarmament remains to be seen.

Now ahead is the U.S. Senate debate on treaty ratification. It could be, if not undermined by exaggerated partisanship, a great and constructive debate more clearly defining, for Americans and the world, this country's foreign policy posture at a critical moment in history. We hope it will be.

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune, July 28, 1963]

APPROVE THE BAN—AND STAY ALERT

Two temptations flutter around the limited nuclear test ban treaty draft initialed last week in Moscow like moths around a porch light on a July night. One is to overestimate the importance of this cold war agreement; the other is to underestimate it.

The significance of the event is precisely this: Soviet Russia, apparently influenced by its open and serious break with Red China, has finally accepted a minimal agreement on nuclear testing that the West has plugged for more than 4 years.

First offered under the Eisenhower administration and then reoffered after Kennedy took office, the agreement avoids the thorny issue of inspection because it involves only atmospheric and underwater tests, which can be detected from afar by currently available instruments. (It also covers tests in space, which are of no special concern because any test that would be of value to the tester would have to be held close enough to the planet to be easily detectable.)

That's all the agreement covers. It is not in any sense a major step toward disarmament. There is no reason to believe it heralds any global power realinement or any significant move "westward" on Russia's part.

There is, in fact, no real reason to believe Russia will even abide by its terms any longer than it suits her purposes to do so.

On the other hand, the agreement is not meaningless. It does put the brakes on the nuclear race. Equally important, it ends for the moment the radioactive pollution of the atmosphere, a matter that ought to concern all men living on the planet, even though scientists argue over how much damage this pollution threatens to the race.

And finally the very fact that Russia said "da" to anything the West proposed must be considered at least a tiny improvement in cold war relations.

The treaty is yet to be approved by the three signatory nations. Russia, having come this far, probably will approve without further fuss. Britain's assent seems certain. There is a real question only in the United States, where the Senate has been asked to give its blessing to the pact.

We believe the Senate should consent. The treaty carries some risk, but not a great deal. The United States, so far as laymen can judge, holds the edge in all phases of nuclear development except extra-big 50 and 100 megaton bombs, which are of dubious strategic value. The only weapon breakthrough in sight in either the United States or the Soviet Union is an anti-missile missile, and that's some distance down the road for both, according to best military and scientific estimates.

If the test ban treaty is approved, however, the administration must do two things: It must encourage the continued laboratory development of nuclear weapons right up to the testing point, and it must remain ready to resume tests in short order if the Russians break the treaty. In addition, of course, it must be constantly alert for Red cheating.

Russia, after all, did not become trustworthy because it agreed to a treaty. The Soviets have seldom kept their word—never when it was not in their interest. The administration, having been burned before, must surely remain shy of the fire.

If Russia should resume testing, we must be ready to follow suit as national security dictates—and without delay.

Senate approval of the test ban would place enormous responsibility on the administration. Let the executive branch not forget it.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald, July 27, 1963]

BLIND-ALLEY AGREEMENT

If the nuclear test-ban agreement intended a renunciation of nuclear weapons, if it were anything but an emotional cul-de-sac, an alley leading nowhere, it would be an exceedingly dangerous instrument. Instead it is a fairly harmless expression of disapproval of nuclear weapons and a formalization of the present restraint on the spreading of fallout.

It should be ratified because it gives millions of worried people a kind of comfort, however insubstantial, that something is being done toward a prevention of nuclear disaster. It should be ratified because the United States, with questionable wisdom, has been seeking such an accord. It should be ratified because it is a symbol of Soviet reorientation away from China and toward the West.

But it is not a treaty that leads onward toward world government and nuclear disarmament. It is not, in fact, a treaty that adds to our national security. It is a treaty that will not survive the nuclear challenges of other countries when their testing becomes formidable. The escape clause may prove the most effective clause of the entire treaty.

The treaty seems to fling wide the door for other nations to come in on the the test ban. But it does not let them come in on the same footing as the original three signatories—the late arrivals will lack the veto power over amendments granted the original parties. Even more forbidding, to possible later adherents is the submission to nuclear inferiority entailed in joining the test-ban group. Without tests in the air, no other nation can ever hope to attain the parity of deterrence so necessary for diplomatic weight in the world's councils.

The heart may prophesy that this business in Moscow on July 25, 1963, introduced the age of disarmament and the peace of world law; that having found a way to block out most testing, the nations then proceeded step by step to lay aside their armaments and to turn that worse-than-waste into the solace of mankind. But the head knows this cannot be so.

The peace kept by the sanction of the bomb must still be kept by that same compulsion for an indefinite time to come. Until the nations learn to live together in peace there will be no peace by disarmament.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, July 28, 1963]

THE CASE FOR NUCLEAR TEST TREATY

President Kennedy put the full prestige of his administration back of the nuclear test ban treaty in an address which should rank among the most eloquent of his career.

While turning his persuasive powers on the Senate, where a two-thirds majority vote is required for ratification, he also appealed for support from the rank and file of citizens and from an audience which is worldwide.

Inviting popular aid in the decision, he remarked that our children and grandchildren "have no lobby here in Washington."

And in a still wider field he suggested, however indirectly and diplomatically, that other nations may help persuade France, lone present holdout among the four nations he listed by name as nuclear powers.

As if speaking directly to General de Gaulle, who up to now has refused to have anything to do with test ban negotiations, he asserted that "all four nuclear powers have a great obligation to use whatever time remains to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, to persuade other countries not to test, transfer, acquire, possess, or produce such weapons."

The President obviously sought to avoid overstating his case, admitting secret violations may be possible, emphasizing nations cannot rely "simply on the good faith of their adversaries," referring to present nuclear stockpiles and continuing tensions not dealt with in the agreement.

But he termed the treaty only a small step, "a shaft of light cut into the darkness" in the patient effort to persuade the Soviet Union to renounce aggression—in the best interest of the Soviet Union as well as the rest of the world.

Basically his argument is that while there are risks in signing, there are vastly greater risks in not signing.

These relative risks will be the subject of hearings and debate in the Senate. The President's invitation to discussion and debate across the country should be taken seriously. For this is one of the crucial decisions in our national history.

Before final action is taken, every responsible citizen should make himself fully informed and be prepared to share this solemn responsibility with the President and Senate.

[From the Auburn (N.Y.) Citizen Advertiser, July 26, 1963]

J.K.F.'S TALK TONIGHT

President Kennedy, in his radio and TV address tonight, is expected to caution the Nation against expecting too much to result from the initialing of a treaty for a partial nuclear test ban.

Informed sources have indicated that he will say that the treaty is "an important first step toward the reduction of international tension and the strengthening of peace" and that all parties to it "look forward to further progress in this direction."

But he is expected to warn that the treaty is only a first step.

However, although limited in scope, it is a most important first step. It represents the successful conclusion of many months of negotiations and is the first concrete achievement of its nature since the signing of the Austrian peace treaty on May 15, 1955.

It is fervently hoped that this new treaty can lead to additional steps toward eliminating the danger of a nuclear holocaust that could bring no victory, but which could destroy our civilization.

Already some new progress has been made toward such an achievement. On Soviet insistence, Britain and the United States have agreed to start substantive negotiations on an East-West nonaggression pact.

Fortunately, the Russians have refrained from making such a treaty conditional on a nonaggression pact between the North Atlantic alliance and the Warsaw bloc, which would, in effect, establish immediately the permanent partition of Germany and recognition by the West of the East German puppet regime.

There is no reason, however, that both sides cannot permanently renounce the use of force to change the status quo. Once this is achieved, then perhaps the problem of permanent boundaries will become less acute and any desirable future changes can be effected through peaceful negotiation.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, July 30 1963]

There Will Come a Night

In this age the nuclear missile is as much the badge of power as the holstered Colt in the frontier town, and Charles de Gaulle intends to have one.

The French President made this clear yesterday in his press conference comments on the agreement between the United States, Britain, and Russia to forgo further atomic tests except those underground.

"None of the signers has renounced the use of atomic weapons and under these conditions the world situation has not been changed in any way," said De Gaulle, in making his expected announcement that France would not join the test-ban pact. Without its own nuclear arsenal, he said, France could "bid goodbye forever to security and independence."

De Gaulle said he would call a conference of the Big Four later this year to discuss his own disarmament proposals, indicating these would concern limitation of nuclear delivery vehicles. Since France has atomic bombs but no missiles, such a disarmament program would work to its advantage. It would be like the man with the six-shooter saying to the man with the machine gun: "Let's agree to throw away all but six bullets." The United States and Russia are unlikely to show any more enthusiasm for this proposal that De Gaulle did for their limitation on testing.

As for Khrushchev's suggestion for a nonaggression pact between the NATO nations and the European Communist bloc, De Gaulle said any such treaty was meaningless. France, he declared, does not intend to strike the first blow against anyone. This is a logical objection, which could be made equally well by the United States.

The sum of Charles de Gaulle's comments is that he will continue to pursue the course he thinks will give France greater influence in world affairs and reduce its dependence upon the United States for protection against Soviet aggression.

Irritating as De Gaulle's attitude may be, the fact remains that he is working for the advancement of national interest. If the United States were in the same situation as France today, who can say our own Government would not take the same attitude?

And this is exactly the problem with nuclear weapons.

Red China, of course, is working as hard as her backward industry permits to fashion an atomic bomb. Mao Tse-tung may say it is for the glory of international Marxism but it is really to give China a bigger fist in Asia.

How much longer will it be before the echoes of old trumpets stir West Germany to reach for its arsenal, to gain a stronger voice in world councils? Then there is little Israel—much too poor to afford atomic arms but, surrounded as it is with hostile and overwhelmingly superior Arab forces, what country has a better claim to missiles for defense?

No, as Charles de Gaulle said, the world situation has not changed, more is the pity. Nor have human nature and national feeling, with its prides and fears and follies, changed.

But man must try, by even such imperfect and dubious measures as the limited test ban, to work toward a world in which nations will not feel impelled to carry nuclear six-shooters for protection. Otherwise, there will come a night when someone will fire a shot in a crowded saloon, and the roof will come tumbling down on our civilization.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Aug. 1, 1963]

Senator Dirksen's Objection

Senator Everett M. Dirksen, Republican, of Illinois, has declined an invitation to participate in the formal signing of the nuclear test-ban treaty in Moscow. While not in actual opposition to the treaty, Senator Dirksen says that he has reservations with regard to the test-ban agreement.

One of Dirksen's reservations is that the United States has refused to recognize East Germany as a sovereign nation; but if East Germany should sign the treaty the United States would be obliged to notify other signers of the treaty that the "state" of East Germany was a party to the treaty.

Would Senator Dirksen object if every nation in the world were to come forward and sign the nuclear test-ban treaty?

Surely such an event would be a most desirable state of affairs.

Yet if every nation did come forward, as President Nasser of the United Arab Republic has already done, and ask to be a party to a nuclear test-ban treaty, one of the signers would have to be Red China.

Would Senator Dirksen object? Any state may adhere to the treaty without necessarily obligating the United States to recognize it.

Senator Dirksen also has reservations regarding Cuba. If Cuba should sign, the United States, says Dirksen, would be a party to permitting underground nuclear tests on the Communist-ruled island.

This, too, is a shallow objection. It puts the cart before the horse. The treaty is an agreement not to test in the atmosphere, in space or under the sea. It is not a permit to test underground. It simply doesn't cover underground testing which may be conducted now in any nation.

Certainly, the proposed test-ban treaty is not the whole answer to the problems facing the world. It is, as we pointed out on this page July 28, a beginning; it signifies, for the moment, that the infernal din of nyet, nyet, nyet has been stilled and that at least one agreement can be reached with Russia. It serves to lessen tension, and this is a desirable state of affairs.

Senator Dirksen is entitled to have reservations about any treaty. Indeed, it is his sworn duty to examine it carefully.

The reservations he has raised about the test-ban treaty, however, indicate a superficial examination. It is to be hoped that these expressions of doubt he entertains can be set at rest by members of his own party and will not serve as the means of blocking ratification of the test-ban treaty.

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal, July 29, 1963]

Other Voices Are Speaking on the Test Ban Treaty

Soldiers and statesmen will have their say, and rightly, while the U.S. Senate subjects the test ban accord to what opposition leader Everett Dirksen promises will be "the closest scrutiny."

But there are other voices that ought to be heard, voices whose echoes could be discerned above the gay background of singing guitars and splashing waters during the hot southern New England weekend just past.

On a beach near Newport where thousands of world-weary young people had fled for a few days of song and gaiety, there was the voice of a college dropout trying to explain what he and his contemporaries were running away from:

"It's the pattern, man, the pattern. You just can't bust out of it. What used to make it important was raising children. That made even the commuter train worthwhile. But why raise children with the bomb?

"Nobody talks much about the bomb, but you think about it."

East of Newport, off the breakwater at Hyannis Port, another voice was heard from last weekend. It was the happy voice of a little girl, leaping off the deck of a boat toward the waiting arms of her father. She wasn't thinking of the bomb. But the man who waited in the water for her was. Two days before, the little girl's father, President Kennedy, had declared in a solemn address to the Nation:

"This treaty is for all of us. It is particularly for our children and our grandchildren, and they have no lobby here in Washington." Fortunately, the frustrated young man, the carefree little girl do have a lobby in Washington. There are plenty of fathers and grandfathers in Congress who, like the President, have been thinking about the bomb. Coming generations may even have a lobby in the Kremlin where Premier Khruschchev has given unmistakable evidence that the thoughts that trouble American youth are haunting him and some of his colleagues.

"Do these men [the Chinese] know that if all the nuclear warheads were touched off, the world would be in such a state that the survivors would envy the dead?" Khrushchev declared the other day.

There is a regular hootenanny for peace abroad in the world today. It will be a very deaf Congressman or Commissar who fails to hear it.

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, July 26, 1963]

Senate Should Ratify Test Ban Treaty After Being Assured as to the Risks

We would like to believe that the partial nuclear test-ban treaty signed Thursday in Moscow by the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union will, in the words of the test-ban negotiators, "constitute an important first step toward the reduction of international tension and the strengthening of peace."

If it does represent such a step, the treaty will be one of the very significant historic documents of our times.

However, the history of our side's dealings with the Communists and other would-be world conquerors makes us cautious and skeptical. Peaceful gestures have been used in the past to deceive leaders of the Western democracies; at times, indeed, these leaders have seemed to be eager accessories to their own deception.

Therefore, in the light of history, we urge prudent caution. The new treaty, which bans nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water, is important. And—if honored—can bring important gains to mankind. But it would be foolish—perhaps even fatal—to assume that because we want the treaty to be kept, and because it seems to serve Soviet purposes now to pledge to keep it, it will be kept indefinitely.

It would be foolish also to regard the treaty as more than it really is. It is not a cold war panacea; it doesn't even really abolish nuclear weapons testing. Because of the apparent impossibility of drafting an inspections formula acceptable to the Russians, the West agreed to a limited test ban, which leaves the treaty signatories free to test underground.

It is reported that the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff will not oppose the ratification of the new treaty in the Senate, not because they believe the treaty important in "easing cold war tensions"—whatever that overused term means—but because they know that the treaty will leave the United States free to do about 80 percent of the nuclear testing deemed necessary by resorting to underground explosions.

It can thus be seen that the treaty will not necessarily halt the nuclear arms race between the West and the Soviet Union. It will, however (so long as it is abided by), keep radioactive materials from being released in the atmosphere by American, British or Soviet tests.

It is quite likely that such fallout will continue to be produced by French nuclear testing—and by Red Chinese tests, once Communist China is ready to explode nuclear devices. But the fallout from such tests would be only a small fraction of the amount produced by tests by the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union.

It seems certain that France and Communist China will not—in the next few years at least—add their signatures to the treaty initialed in Moscow Thursday. But it is probable that other nations will soon become parties to the treaty.

This could have the effect of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the creation of new nuclear powers.

Because of the possible gains, and in the hope that our Government will keep its eyes open to the risks and actually take steps now to minimize them, this newspaper urges the Senate to give the treaty its approval.

The administration would do well to assure the Senate that it is well aware of the military risks should the Russians break the ban and to outline for the Senators how these risks would be countered.

We believe it is particularly important, for example, that research in military applications of nuclear power be continued and that we be prepared quickly to resume weapons testing in the atmosphere if the Russians should do so. To do otherwise would be to set the stage for a technological Pearl Harbor in which the Communists could conceivably gain a decisive advantage in nuclear power.

[From the Strasburg (Va.) Northern Virginia Daily, July 27, 1963]

TEST BAN TREATY

The civilized world very naturally feels a sense of elation at the news of the nuclear test ban treaty, agreed upon in Moscow by Averell Harriman representing the United States, Lord Hailsham for Britain, and Andrei Gromyko for the Soviet Union. The initialing of the treaty is a signal victory, and now copies will be sent to the respective capitals of the signatories for approval.

Thus, the treaty begins a long and sometimes tortuous journey, through review by the respective heads of state, the signing by proper government officials (in the case of the United States by the Secretary of State), then—in this country—to be submitted to the Senate for hearings, debate, and finally, the vote on ratification.

While some partisan sniping can be expected, there is no indication that the treaty will run into any real trouble here, or in Britain or Russia.

The apparent change in attitude on the part of the Soviets, and the evidence of a desire for a new approach with the West regarding control of nuclear weapons testing which led to the relatively unencumbered agreement, are good and welcome signs in a bomb-weary world. The possibilities of lasting peace which it promises will be embraced by all civilized countries.

But we should not be lulled into the false assumption that all our problems are solved. While the atmosphere is vastly improved, all is not sweetness and light.

While we celebrate what appears to be a major breakthrough in understanding between the East and the West, it is well to keep intact a hard shell of practicality. It is well to remember, for instance, that of the 52 treaties which have existed between the United States and the Soviet Union, the Soviets have broken 50 of them without compunction.

Previous agreements for a moratorium on nuclear testing in the atmosphere were rudely broken by Russia, when it suited her purpose to do so, without regard to treaty obligations.

Don't misunderstand us; we're for the treaty. We hope it works. We hope Mr. Khrushchev means it this time and that the treaty ushers in an era of good feeling. We even hope, as we have previously suggested in this space, that the new Soviet attitude, their seeming eagerness for a new understanding with the West, could be the beginning of Russia's return to her history-honored reliance on military and economic alliances with the Western European Powers.

Perhaps all of this is in prospect, but no one can be sure. In the meantime, it is well to operate on the theory that the cold war is still cold, and that Khrushchev is still a shrewd and calculating, if sometimes blustering, Communist who not too long ago said that "he would bury us."

[From the Beloit (Wis.) News, July 27, 1963]

THE TEST BAN TREATY

The partial nuclear test ban treaty that has been initialed by negotiators representing the United States, Britain, and Russia faces some formidable opposition in the Senate.

The proposed treaty would ban nuclear testing in the atmosphere, in outer space and underwater. Not included is underground testing.

Two factors in opposition stand out. One is that the Russians have a reputation for not keeping their end of an agreement. The other is the fear our testing is inadequate in comparison with that of the Soviet Union.

President Kennedy went before the Nation Friday night to ask public support for the treaty, which, to become effective, must have a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

Although there is some unwillingness on the part of many Senators to commit themselves one way or the other, observers believe the treaty, if a vote were to be taken now, could muster 50 to 57 favorable votes. However, if all 100 Members of the Senate were to vote, 67 aye votes would be necessary. Winning those last 10 or so votes could be more difficult than negotiating with the Russians over the test ban agreement.

Khrushchev undoubtedly had an ulterior motive in seeking a test ban at this time. He was anxious for such an agreement with the United States and Britain as a means of showing up Chinese Communists, who were in Moscow at the same time attending an idealogical conference, and who are far from being in accord with the Soviet Union's policy of peaceful coexistence.

Administration spokesmen, although beating the drums for the treaty, are quick to warn that it is not a guarantee that the cold war issues are about to be resolved.

It's not difficult to understand why many Senators are reluctant to approve the treaty, still, in view of the rift between Moscow and Peiping it would seem that approval is the sensible course to follow.

[From the Miami (Fla.) News, July 26, 1963]

TEST BAN NEEDS OPEN MINDS

There may be good reason for the caution expressed by many U.S. Senators over a nuclear test ban treaty with the Soviet Union, as there is reason for caution in any negotiation with the Soviet Union.

But caution is a long way from the kind of closed mind denunciations we are beginning to hear from Senator BARRY GOLDWATER and his rightwing followers in and out of the Senate.

A growing segment of the conservative camp seems to regard any lessening of tension between East and West as a peace threat to be feared more than the war threat. GOLDWATER, THURMOND, and a few others can be counted on to articulate this viewpoint in the Senate.

If the world is ever to see a test ban agreement among the three major nuclear powers, the time for it was never riper. As columnist Joe Alsop has pointed out on these pages, the United States is ahead in the light, highly deliverable type of weapons it has chosen to develop, and the Soviet Union has an edge in the heavyweight division. Each power has the capacity to destroy the other many times over.

Thus we have a sort of Mexican standoff. The benefits to be derived from the ban are both psychological and practical. War fevers would be lowered and the way may be opened to further disarmament agreements. The very real danger of contamination from nuclear fallout would be vastly reduced.

We think public opinion in the United States is overwhelmingly in favor of a test ban, and the public will not welcome having this agreement picked apart by those who would never approve any test ban, however reasonable.

[From the Garden City (N.Y.) Newsday, July 27, 1963]

A TOKEN OF GOOD WILL

Since nobody knows what correspondence and conversations have privately occurred between the White House and the Kremlin, and since no one but the Kremlin knows how much of a threat the rise of the Chinese Communists may pose for the Soviet Union, it is impossible to read behind the lines of this simple treaty. The most modest estimate must be that it is an expression by the United States and Great Britain on one side and Russia on the other, to work out mutual problems on a more amicable basis than before. Beyond and behind this, no doubt, is the awareness of Washington that General de Gaulle will soon have a nuclear force and the awareness of Moscow that China is on the verge of having one.

In this sense the treaty may be read as an indirect warning to both those nations to go slow. How much effect this will have is problematical. The President of France is a monumentally stubborn man with an obsession wound up with national glory. The leaders of China appear to feel that no matter how many bombs are dropped, some millions of their people will survive to rule the world.

This is the most modest possible document. Sanctions are absent. There is no provision for inspection. This should be the next step. We are willing to have international inspection of all our military/missile sites. The Russians should be prepared to offer the same. In this way both sides have a positive assurance that the treaty is being lived up to. If indeed we trust each other then inspection is the obvious method of proof. From this step, over a long and probably tortuous roadway we can approach the goal of universal disarmament—and in that case inspection will be crucial and sanctions must be agreed upon. The Washington disarmament treaty of the 1920's, which carried no sanctions, was cynically violated both by the Japanese and the Germans, with results we all know.

HAVE FAITH

In essence what this treaty tells us is: Have faith in Russia, but keep our missiles dry. Be eternally optimistic but eternally cautious. Be trusting but not gullible. It is so crucial that the world avoid a nuclear Armageddon that even the tiniest steps forward ought to be welcome.

The President stated this simply and effectively in his broadcast last night. He made it very clear that the nature of this agreement was a limited one, but he made it very apparent that the consequences might be tremendous. As he said, this was the product of more than one administration; it was President Eisenhower who first demonstrated the sincere intentions of this country. Now it is essential that the Senate ratify the treaty, and that we move forward bravely into the next phase.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) American, July 27, 1963]

CHEERS: WITH CAUTION

As Assistant Secretary of State W. Averell Harriman observed in Moscow Friday, the reason a test-ban treaty was signed this time is that Premier Khrushchev wanted it. For reasons of his own—no doubt including the hostility of Communist China to his policy of coexistence—Khrushchev had decided it was time for a reduction of tensions between East and West, and he followed up on the agreement Friday by appealing to the West for talks intended "to liquidate the cold war."

The United States can welcome the agreement and live with it, but need not accept it as a reason for believing unsuspiciously that Khrushchev has had a genuine change of heart. Fortunately, the U.S. Senate must ratify this treaty and the Senate's duty, which we are sure it will perform meticulously, will be to examine every implication of the treaty and to consider every objection to it with the greatest care.

The Senate must not forget, nor must the people of the United States, that we've had 53 agreements with the Russians and 50 of them have been violated. Also, we're engaged in a hot war with Russian-backed communism in Vietnam right now; certainly the Reds are trying to undo us from their new Cuba base, and they may be expected to stir up trouble in Berlin and elsewhere.

They will try to bury us, as Lenin said they should if they get a chance, and it's up to us to see that they don't get the chance. And we must keep the pressure on them by means short of war.

Khrushchev's acceptance of a test-ban agreement seems to us to demonstrate that nuclear power finally has forced even Russia to face the facts of life. If we and Russia tried to use this power, we'd only destroy ourselves to benefit other people, as this newspaper has often said. Right now we'd benefit Red China a good deal. The U.S.S.R. has finally recognized its mistake in helping the Chinese Communists too much—contrary to the advice of Karl Marx, incidentally; a century ago, Marx called China and Russia the eternal, implacable, natural enemies.

The United States and Russia have now achieved a nuclear stalemate which we may be able to maintain unless China and France upset it. And since we now have power—and can deliver it—to destroy all of Russia, we can afford to skip certain kinds of tests—in atmosphere, underseas, and in space—so long as we keep on developing our technical knowledge, particularly in the area of delivering bombs and intercepting bombs that may be thrown at us.

We can still research and be ready to resume testing if the Russians violate this written agreement as they did the earlier unwritten one. And we should go on testing underground, as the treaty permits. Most important, we should be developing interceptor gear to stop any possible enemy bombs from reaching their targets in this country.

It is not necessary to be naive or childish to believe that the partial ban might work out. And, meanwhile, we can make it plain that we want to help satellite nations get out from under Russian domination; to pretend that we will go to war to do it would be simple hypocrisy. We didn't go to the aid of Hungary, East Germany, or Poland in their uprisings, and we haven't followed through with aid to Cuba. We wouldn't be kidding anybody, therefore, if we said we were ready to go to war on behalf of the captive nations. We can only keep trying to contain communism, for the present.

Politically, the test ban can't be claimed as a Kennedy and Democratic feat. It's almost the identical plan put forth by the Eisenhower administration. Actually it is a bipartisan achievement. It may really be a breakthrough in the cold war, and heaven knows the world needs one.

[From the Lakeland (Fla.) Ledger, July 26, 1963]

THE FLICKERING LIGHT OF PEACE

The flickering light of peace, a delicate light easily buffeted, was turned up to more encouraging brightness yesterday as the United States, Russia and Britain agreed to end nuclear testing.

It was a contingent agreement in the form of a treaty yet to be ratified by the respective nations but it already can be reached in history as a giant step toward world security.

Before ratification, there will be the closest scrutiny in each of the participating countries, and there should be such scrutiny. Skepticism was being expressed in the United States even while the diplomatic spokesmen for the three nations were signing their names to the agreement. But the agreement in its entirety offers great hope that peace has been made more secure.

The agreement was discussed at the Moscow meeting as one that should lead eventually to general disarmament. The bringing of this long-cherished dream to reality may be a long way off but the progress is in that direction.

The signatory nations had taken a solemn look down into the dark abyss of nuclear destruction and decided the time had come to get together and establish a reliable safeguard against what at times appeared to be the inevitable.

If this treaty finally gets the stipulated approval at home and proves effective, then President Kennedy will have to the credit of his administration one of the most significant achievements in human history. He alone will not have achieved. Many minds have collaborated. But it will have been achievement under his leadership.

This he will be able to use during his campaign next year as he faces the storm of censure in regard to civil rights, Cuba and other matters of deep concern to the American people.

But the banning of nuclear tests and the struggle toward disarmament are of far greater importance in human destiny than politics generally and the political destiny of any single individual, Democrat or Republican, American, Russian or British. For here is a matter that concerns survival for hundreds of millions of people and preservation of civilization's progress to date.

It is enough for the moment that the big step taken in Moscow yesterday has taken place. Next come microscopic scrutiny, discussion, possibly debate and, if all proves satisfactory, formal agreement.

Much too soon it is to rejoice without reservation. But the light of peace unquestionably is shining more brightly today.

[From the Manchester (Conn.) Herald, July 29, 1963]

A SHOW OF COMPETENCE

President Kennedy's report to the Nation last Friday night on the initialing of the limited nuclear test ban at Moscow was an admirable piece of calm statesmanship and salesmanship.

It was such an effort because it avoided extravagant claims or hopes; because it gilded nothing; because it itself openly stated the limitations of the treaty it was discussing; because it wisely avoided any untoward emphasis of the pressure it was trying to exert toward eventual ratification of the treaty by the U.S. Senate.

The Kennedy administration, it should be observed, is running and managing this present phase of world diplomacy very well. From the first open appearance of the present theme in the President's memorable address at American University on June 10 through the selection of the tough and wise Harriman to be chief negotiator at Moscow on to the present atmosphere in which the specific issue of the nuclear test ban treaty is being presented to the American people and to the Senate, the Kennedy administration has given an impression of competent planning and execution of a major policy effort to do something about the issue of peace.

As one watches such a policy effort unfolding, one holds one's breath—remembering. Specifically, one remembers that, by the spring of 1960, Dwight Eisenhower seemed about to bring his presidency to a climax by entering upon a period of possible harvest of all the good things he had been trying to sow and nurture and promote during his first 7 years of office. He had broken the cold war ice more than once; he had hosted Khrushchev in this country; he had proclaimed the impossibility of war; he had tried to strike some of the rigid chains from the minds of people on both sides of the world division. But, with all this to his credit, he had somehow neglected to give full appreciation to what it meant to be flying spying missions directly across the central portion of Russia, and, when that practice suddenly hit the world news front, he vacillated betwen an early instinct to admit and regret what had been going on and a later tactic of something defiant about it, and even claiming a right to do it.

And there, by that one oversight or mistake, went that peace crusade which had more of Eisenhower's heart and mind than anything else.

So, today, one watches the Kennedy administration, heading into the same kind of effort, with the ice of the cold war once more broken, with one apparently tangible and symbolic success within reach, and with all the sweeping good Eisenhower once dreamed of perhaps conceivable once again, and one holds one's breath for the quality and consistency of the performance.

From what we can see, the Kennedy administration is managing, pacing, and balancing the policy and the news, the action and the propaganda as if it had finally come into some unpressured competence. Let us hope it continues its calm, measured pace both at home and abroad and that, above all, it does not rip the hull of such a new peace voyage on some old mine put out for purposes of waging the cold war.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Christian Science Monitor, July 29, 1963]

INITIALS AT MOSCOW

The self-policing test ban agreement initialed at Moscow is important for so many reasons that one has to draw a long breath and examine them all.

The suppressed excitement in Washington is very impressive. Men who have suffered through years of grim policymaking, managing the cold war and seeing no smallest genuine relaxation in sight, are struggling to control a feeling that the great change may have begun. Their intelligence tells them that nothing is certain, that in any case the cold war will continue, that communism remains communism, that China has thrown up a whole new volcano of problems. But the great Russian world may nevertheless be entering a new phase of what might be called reentry from early communism. It may have given up trying to set Communist fire to the globe in view of the successful resistance by nations and humanity. It may now find that it stands to gain far more by stability than by the almost inconceivable risks of high temperature conflict.

We can only note this sense of possible impending shift in the tides of history and wait with both patience and the utmost hope.

The Western World and the Soviet Union now stand committed to far more than the document initialed at Moscow. The communique says it in writing. The powers will consult with their allies and return to further negotiation on a European nonaggression pact "with the purpose of achieving agreement satisfactory to all participants." All participants include both West and East Germany. The negotiators would not have used such purposeful language if their tentative talks on this much wider topic had not been promising.

Further arms control talks, on much more fundamental aspects of the nuclear cold war, are now more possible. Like the history of the partial test ban, there is a long history of broken negotiations for the complete test ban, control of surprise attack, cutoff of nuclear production and other such. These are the substance of basic stability in a nuclear world.

As to fallout, this may be the end of it. The Brookhaven Laboratory reports that fallout contamination in the New York area has risen to a record high because of the latest atmospheric tests. Compared with the permissible Federal Radiation Council limit of 10 milliroentgens a week, the count reached an average of 4.7 for the first half of this year. That is nearly half. The level is now expected to fall to the natural average of 1.7 within 2 years.

The Senate will surely ratify the treaty. The risk from approving it is minimal by comparison with the risk of losing what might be history's turning point away from nuclear catastrophe. There is a minor cost to be paid in terms of leaving the Soviet Union with a possible advantage in the biggest bombs and an opportunity to catch up with tactical weapons which can be tested underground. But the relative strengths of both sides are far more than adequately stable.

Humanity will now speak to France and Communist China. The right step was to agree with Moscow first. The world can now take part in piling the highest persuasion on the two who dissent. This is no longer an issue between communism and the great powers of the West. It is everyman's responsibility.

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald-Statesman, July 27, 1963]

It's a Major Step, but Only a Step as Three Nations Initial A-Test Treaty

The nuclear test-ban agreement initialed, but not signed, by negotiators for the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union is an important step, but only a step and, indeed, only a preliminary step, toward saving the world from radioactive contamination and a holocaust.

The proposed treaty, if and when it is formally ratified by the conferring nations, will rule out nuclear testing by those nations in the earth's atmosphere, in outer space, and beneath the seas.

Underground testing will not be proscribed.

In any case, the agreement will apply only to nations which sign it—those nations which have originated it and any others which may, as time passes, affiliate themselves with it.

And even a signatory country must, by specific provision, be permitted to withdraw from the agreement on 3 months' notice if "it decides that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of this treaty have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country."

Even more significantly, two major nations, France, and Red China, which have evidenced their determination to develop their own nuclear weapons systems, can't be expected, at this juncture, to join the treaty group. They thus will be free to test in the air or under the oceans—and to contaminate the atmosphere.

None of this, of course, minimizes the historic importance of the first step which has been taken at Moscow.

Nor does it presume to constitute conclusive reasoning against the treaty as it will be presented to the committees and general membership of the U.S. Senate and to President Kennedy for formal ratification.

All it attempts to say is that the agreement, if it ultimately is adopted, will afford us only relief, not release, from peacetime nuclear contamination. It will not be a safeguard against either the aggressive or defensive use of nuclear weapons in a declared or undeclared war.

It only in a degree will minimize, not eliminate, the danger of a final war. That step is yet to come—and appears to be a long way off. Toward that step, a lot of decently inspired, good-will negotiating still is needed.

[From the Peekskill (N.Y.) Star, July 27, 1963]

A Major Step, but Only a Step

The nuclear test-ban agreement initialed, but not signed, by negotiators for the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union is an important step, but only a step and, indeed, only a preliminary step, toward saving the world from radioactive contamination and a holocaust.

The proposed treaty, if and when it is formally ratified by the conferring nations, will rule out nuclear testing by those nations in the earth's atmosphere, in outer space and beneath the seas.

In any case, the agreement will apply only to nations which sign it—those nations which have originated it and any others which may, as time passes, affiliate themselves with it.

And even a signatory country must, by specific provision, be permitted to withdraw from the agreement on 3 months' notice if "it decides that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of this treaty have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country."

Even more significantly, two major nations, France and Red China, which have evidenced their determination to develop their own nuclear weapons systems, can't be expected, at this juncture, to join the treaty group. They thus will be free to test in the air or under the oceans—and to contaminate the atmosphere.

None of this, of course, minimizes the historic importance of the "first step" which has been taken at Moscow.

Nor does it presume to constitute conclusive reasoning against the treaty as it will be presented to the committees and general membership of the United States Senate and to President Kennedy for formal ratification.

All it attempts to say is that the agreement, if it ultimately is adopted, will afford us only relief, not release, from peacetime nuclear contamination. It will not be a safeguard against either the aggressive or defensive use of nuclear weapons in a declared or undeclared war.

It only in a degree will minimize, not eliminate, the danger of a "final war." That step is yet to come—and appears to be a long way off. Toward that step, a lot of decently inspired, good-will negotiating still is needed.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Journal, July 27, 1963]

Test Ban—Only a Beginning

The test-ban treaty initialed at Moscow Thursday is limited in scope, but it certainly is what President Kennedy called "the first step on a 1,000-mile journey." It can bring some reduction of tensions in a world shaken by fear of thermonuclear holocaust, and it gives reason to hope that further progress toward arms reduction and an East-West detente now will be possible.

It must be recognized, as the President clearly stated, that the treaty will give no protection from nuclear war. It does bind the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union not to resume testing in the atmosphere, under water, or in space. They are free to continue testing underground. And neither Red China nor France is a party to the pact, although other countries may, at anytime they wish, become signatories.

To the U.S. Senate now falls the duty of determining whether ratification of the treaty will adversely affect the position of the United States in the cold war. In their considerations, they must also remember that this treaty was first proposed by our own Government in 1959 and again in 1962. To reject it now would be to give substance to Russian propaganda claims that this country is not interested in finding peaceful solutions to world problems.

The pact provides that any signatory, upon 3 months' notice, may withdraw if it feels its "supreme national interests" are threatened. That escape clause may be used. Nevertheless, the accord is the best that can be obtained now. The parties will be reluctant to break it, once ratified. It then can become a foundation for something more ambitious.

There may be risks inherent in the treaty, but we must agree with President Kennedy that "the far greater risks to our security are the risks of unrestricted testing, the risk of a nuclear arms race, the risks of new nuclear powers, nuclear pollution, and nuclear war. This * * * test ban is safer by far for the United States than an unlimited nuclear arms race."

If the presence of Red China's rising star drove Chairman Khrushchev to seek this pact, that very presence is our hope that it will be honored. It may well be that Khrushchev feels the need to stabilize one front as he struggles to consolidate his position in the Communist world.

The next logical step is negotiation, to which all parties have bound themselves, aimed at nonaggression undertakings between the NATO nations and the Warsaw Pact bloc. Some such mutual assurances may now be possible, without recognition of East Germany, since Khrushchev has stated that substance, not form, of such an agreement is what counts.

The test-ban treaty will not take the world far from the balance of terror that has preserved the shaky peace we know, but it will eliminate the fallout problem—and that alone is sufficient justification for its ratification. Moreover it makes a beginning—and it represents the first positive step taken away from atomic war since World War II.

The gap between East and West is still very wide, and this treaty closes only the smallest part of it. But the Senate should not underestimate the importance of this beginning. Unless it can be shown that there are clear and compelling reasons for considering this pact as dangerous to the Nation's security, the Senate should ratify it.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, July 27, 1963]

Bid for Support

The public and the Senate must support, as the President last night earnestly asked them to do, the limited test ban treaty initialed on Thursday in Moscow. There are dangers in this agreement as there are dangers in anything—most of all, in an uncontrolled armaments race with nation after nation participating—but the possible dangers are not such as to overbalance the possible advantages.

Mr. Kennedy's purpose in his address to the Nation was to persuade critics of the treaty that we go into it with our eyes open, and that in his firm and informed belief the security of the country will not be endangered if we keep our eyes open. His further purpose was to gain public understanding of the opportunity that has been offered for an easing of world tensions, if we are quick and bold and confident enough to take it.

Just how the opportunity will develop cannot now be foreseen. Nor can the pace of events ahead be guessed at. They may move fast. They may move slowly. They may indeed not move at all; we would be ignoring the lessons of the years since World War II if we suddenly took for granted this manifestation of what seems to be a Soviet desire to reach some degree of East-West accommodation.

The genuineness of that desire will be tested, and perhaps tested soon. If the Soviet Union will now accept a nonaggression understanding that avoids Western recognition of East Germany, the acceptance may be taken as a further sign, though still far from a sure one, that the terrors of nuclear war about which Mr. Khrushchev talks have in fact convinced the Soviet Union that a great war must by any means and all means be averted.

Even granted Soviet good will, continued three-power accords will not do the whole job that needs doing. They will not keep China from going ahead with its own plans for nuclear armament (a goal whose achievement lies well to the future), or swing France away from General de Gaulle's wrongheaded obsession for going it alone.

At very best, we are a long, long way from safety; but safety is not, and must not be permitted to become, a hopeless dream.

[From the Freeport (Ill.) Journal-Standard, July 29, 1963]

To Ratify the Test Ban Treaty

Ratification by the Senate of the nuclear test ban treaty—and by a wide margin—is important for the future of our international relations. Our diplomacy was long disabled by the determination of the irreconcilables in the Senate to ratify the Versailles Treaty, reasonable though the rejection now seems in retrospect. It was, however, disabling, because it created the impression that the United States is at a disadvantage in all diplomacy, with the executive and the Senate constantly at odds.

It is not possible to say whether President Kennedy's broadcast appeal of last Friday has helped or harmed the cause of obtaining Senate ratification. Nothing could be more sensible or self-evident than the agreement to stop nuclear test bans, in the interest of cleaning the atmosphere and stopping a portion of the arms race. But there will be a powerful argument raised against it in Senate debate, and great suspicion has been created by stressing the fact that this is to be the first step of many toward world peace.

A next step requested by Khrushchev and so insistently that he wanted it signed at the same time as the test ban treaty, was a nonaggression pact. But this offends American principle, which assumes that nations do not entertain aggressive designs against one another, and that it is pure surplusage to say so. In addition, the nonaggression pact is regarded by many as a trick by Communist or other totalitarian powers to throw opponents off their guard, while retaining the opportunity for a real aggressor to pursue his plans covertly. That has been the history of past nonaggression pacts.

Therefore, ratification of the test ban treaty, which is truly necessary and in the national interest, will not be helped by creating suspicion, however unintentionally, that this is the first item of a Communist program to get something out of us without giving a dependable consideration.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Record American, July 29, 1963]

A Hope?

The limited test-ban treaty initialed in Moscow could be a cautious step in the right direction, an expression of the yearnings of millions throughout the world, and a glimmer of hope for the future.

There is little doubt that W. Averell Harriman affixed his initials to the document only after unqualified technical assurance that it can in no way prejudice the security of the United States.

Thus, the Senate should ratify the treaty on a broad bipartisan basis. No political considerations should be permitted to intrude on so crucial an issue.

The success of the treaty depends, of course, almost totally on the good faith of the Soviet Union. It cannot be forgotten that a moratorium on testing was once brazenly and unilaterally broken by the Kremlin. And while a resumption of tests can be immediately detected, the vital factor of honoring a solemn, written pledge is at stake.

Whether or not the treaty will lead to further reduction of East-West tensions will not be known for some time. Meanwhile, the hair-trigger military face-off between the United States and the Soviet Union continues. This will only be relaxed when the desirable goal of disarmament can be approached on a realistic and security-tight basis.

But all things have a beginning, and this treaty could possibly be just that.

[From the Newark (N.J.) News, July 26, 1963]

At Last, an Accord

The nuclear test ban treaty negotiated in Moscow represents a victory for mankind. Observance by the parties to this agreement could eliminate and most certainly will minimize the major sources of radioactive contamination that man has created. That of itself will serve to remove the nagging fear of human deformation that attends such experimentation.

Nor does there appear to be justification for fears that our national self-interest has been jeopardized or negotiated away. Terms of the draft treaty closely follow proposals set forth by both Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy.

Further, there is no visible attachment to a nonaggression pact that would freeze undesirable arrangements in Europe or grant recognition where none is intended. In this respect, an accompanying communique states that all partners and allies will be consulted before a pact between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty nations is discussed.

Above and beyond the test ban treaty itself, there is hope that henceforth relations between the Soviet Union and the West may turn away from the brink of war and toward a more stable peace. Certainly the West is not deluded into expecting that communism will renounce its predatory ways, and Moscow would not have participated in these negotiations unless it found advantage in doing so. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to assume that inevitably, therefore, disadvantage must accrue to us.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Gazette, July 27, 1963]

Agreement on Nuclear Tests

The nuclear test ban treaty initialed in Moscow is less than the United States sought but more than it expected a few months ago to get.

Soviet adamancy stalled the Geneva talks for months. But the Russians have finally agreed to halt any further nuclear tests in the air, under water, or in outer space for an indefinite period, provided the United States and Britain do the same. The treaty is comparable to one proposed by the Eisenhower administration 4 years ago.

This is a limited agreement. It does not cover underground testing. It does not establish the important principle of on-site inspection. It does not provide for any actual measures of disarmament.

It may be that President Kennedy, in his eloquent and earnest appeal to the Nation last night, overestimated the historic impact of the agreement. Notwithstanding all the great hope he and his chief negotiator, W. Averell Harriman, have voiced, the shadow of Red Chinese threats and French obstructionism hangs over both optimist and pessimist. The Soviet record is an uneasy factor.

Yet hope there is, however modified, and we are all up against the single fact that if wholesale catastrophe is to be avoided, a start must be made somewhere. This agreement is no more than a start. But it does provide an opportunity—at some risk—to test the attitude of the Russians toward further agreements, of more substance. If the Soviets honor this, as they have so far honored the Austrian treaty of 1955, there will be a foundation for progress in easing the cold war. The new agreement unquestionably has grown out of the still-secret correspondence between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev. Whether these continuing exchanges make more accommodations possible remains to be seen.

Let us not be blind to the dangers. There is risk, as the forthcoming Senate debate will emphasize. For one thing, the Soviets may seek to seize an advantage by surprise testing. We canot allow our program of nuclear development to wither, even though it may have to depend more on limited, underground tests, or on other checking that produces no radioactive fallout.

The argument may also be made that the Soviets have passed us in defenses against nuclear missiles, and that we need to continue testing to catch up. These are extremely complex questions on which men of good intentions and reasonable judgment can differ.

But the dangers of doing nothing—of letting radioactive fallout increase and nuclear weapons multiply—are so great, that alternatives have to be considered. This treaty is a modest step, but one that may lead the way to more significant developments.

[From the Syracuse (N.Y.) Herald-Journal, July 28, 1963]

The Fallout Scare Is Over

(By Alexander F. Jones)

Even the most cautious observers of the international scene are agreeing that the nuclear test ban treaty signed by the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain is a tremendously significant breakthrough in the direction of peace and eventual total prohibition of military use of atomic weapons.

Naturally all the expected objections to it will be heard from the Pentagon and from headline seekers in Congress—it will prevent progress in perfecting nuclear weapons and thus injure national security, etc., etc., etc.

The objections should be treated by the American public with the derisive scorn they deserve.

For while there has never been the slightest chance that nuclear weapons would ever be used in war—any more than death dealing gases and biological poisons were used in World War II—the constant testing of nuclear bombs that could destroy civilization has caused people everywhere to know a new fear—the effect of fallout on the human race.

With this treaty that period of anxiety is over.

When the three greatest nations in the world agree that nuclear military tests are a menace even in peacetime, it is fairly good evidence that an all-embracing military ban is not far away.

President Kennedy's speech Friday night urged caution and asked the American people not to expect too much.

That is what a winner should say—the modesty bit.

Actually he probably would have liked to break into a soft shoe dance for the first breakthrough in negotiations with Moscow on the subject of nuclear restrictions and inspections has come in his administration.

The elation in his voice was understandable.

No one expects that the Soviet Union has suddenly abandoned its world domination for communism policy.

No one is lightheaded enough to conclude that Nikita S. Khrushchev has succumbed to the Kennedy charm.

The Soviet Union knows that nuclear war is unthinkable if civilization is to continue.

It knows, in its break with Red China, that Mao has little or nothing to offer the Kremlin, but that everything Russia needs to strengthen the Soviet Union domestically is in the West and, capitalism or no capitalism, is to be acquired in peaceful trade if mutual confidence is established.

That, in my opinion, is one reason why the Soviet signature is on the test ban treaty.

The United States has a stockpile of nuclear fission of mountainous proportions.

It was produced, and is being produced, at a cost of countless billions of dollars.

It has served its purpose, for no enemy has dared major aggression.

And it can be converted to peaceful uses.

Thus, there is no total loss. In fact, great good can come of it.

But I cannot help but think back, at this moment of American victory, when courage and persistence and determination in our best tradition has triumphed, on the men in our public life who were so frightened by the nuclear menace that they wanted to dig a hole in the ground and slink down in it.

Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, not so many years ago, proposed a law making a fallout shelter compulsory in every residential and commercial building in the State of New York.

Failing to impress the legislature with this expression of fear, he called a special session of the lawmakers later and jammed through a $100 million appropriation providing the State would match dollars with any school district building such shelters.

Only three small school districts ever applied for such State funds.

Proving, I think, that most of us feel the way to meet an enemy is face to face, able to return blow for blow, and without the slightest indication of fear.

Viewing the world through a subsurface periscope is for submarines.

Well, the fallout threat is over, unless the U.S. Senate goes stark raving mad.

If it does there will be a new Senate for this treaty is the most heartening document to be up for consideration in 15 years. The American people will not tolerate politics here.

The peace gate is ajar and it can swing wide open.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is my intention next week to present again to the Senate further editorial comment, because I believe that that type of editorial commentary deserves the attention of Senators and those who read the RECORD as a means of informing themselves on questions of public policy on the great public issues.

TAX CUTS AND CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now wish to take the time of the Senate to discuss the issues of tax cuts and civil rights. I do so because while the Senate has before it a host of issues, I can think of none more important than the two that I have just mentioned—the proposed tax adjustment and the broad program of civil rights presented by the President of the United States to the Congress.

Fourteen months ago I advocated a prompt and substantial tax cut as the most effective means to invigorate and improve the performance of this Nation's economy. After an analysis of the economic indicators in succeeding months, President Kennedy delivered a special address to the American people on the subject of the economic situation. The President stressed the subject of tax reduction and promised to submit a comprehensive tax plan to the new Congress convening January 1963, the 88th Congress.

It is a half year since the President fulfilled that obligation in his urgent and compelling tax message.

In the main, I supported the President's proposals in that message—at least the purpose of the President's tax proposals—and I continue to support that purpose.

At no time during those 14 months has the senior Senator from Minnesota wavered in his belief that a tax cut is, was, and continues to be urgently needed. In January of 1963 a consensus appeared to be developing behind the President's request for a tax reduction, but now in July 1963, 6 months later, the future of tax legislation is heavily weighted down with uncertainty and cross-purposes. We do not yet know what kind of tax bill the House will be called upon to consider. We know even less about what kind of tax bill will be sent over to the Senate. We do not know even approximately when the Senate hearings may be started and concluded on the tax subject. There are many who seem less certain of the immediate need for tax reduction than they were a year ago, or even in January of this year.

What is responsible for this apparent weakening of the determination? Even though today's press indicates that considerable progress is being made in the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives toward processing a tax program, has our great national purpose on the tax subject, so strong in January, been softened by subsequent developments in other areas? If so, is there good sense in such softening?

RECENT INDICATORS CAUSE CONCERN

It is time for the Congress to face those questions frankly and honestly. The factors of a sluggish economic growth and persistently rising unemployment which have accumulated over the past decades and which were virtually responsible for the prompt and substantial tax reduction proposed in January have not developed in August, despite the fact that an unprecedented number of people are employed—more than 70 million as of July 1—but even so, there are still substantial numbers of unemployed.

The figure of 70 million must be related to the vast increase in our population.

Today I shall not attempt to retrace in detail this economic record of the past decade. Viewed as a whole, these 10 years have manifestly been marked by low economic growth, with excessive idleness of manpower and plant and other productive resources. During these 10 years we have been dangerously outpaced by some of our competitors in Western Europe; indeed, by some in the Far East; and, more importantly, by our strongest adversary, the Soviet Union. We have been seriously outpaced by several friendly competitors in the Western European market.

We cannot avoid the hard facts of this record of inadequate economic growth. Nor should we attempt to avoid them.

What about even more recent events? Why have we been falling away from that significant degree of purposefulness exhibited at the start of 1963, when the current tax program was proposed?

The first extenuation offered by some is that our economic situation has improved in recent months. And so it has, by a few important indexes. But as a recent editorial in the Washington Post points out, there has been a sharp decline in the proportion in which these indicators are currently rising. Last year the same situation foreshadowed the production plateau reached during the second half of 1962. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, "Sour Indicators," which appeared in the July 27 edition of the Washington Post be printed at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the recent statistics issued by the Council of Economic Advisers also give little reason for long-term optimism. While the economy continues to advance, it does so at a listless and uninspiring pace. Dr. Walter Heller, Chairman of the Council, put his finger on the critical fact when he was quoted in the New York Times as saying:

> This is no boom. It's a solid but moderate expansion, one that won't eat into our unemployment problem until we have a tax cut.

I would like also to quote at length from the editorial appearing in the June 22, 1963, edition of Business Week:

> The fact is that the case for tax reduction is as strong today as it always was. And it has been compellingly strong for the past 5 years to anyone who would take the trouble to ask why the United States has been plagued with faltering economic growth and persistent unemployment. The need for a tax cut did not arise from the threat of a recession, and the administration's original endorsement of tax reduction was not an antirecession measure.
>
> The fact that business looks a bit better now cannot alter the fact that the United States still is not growing fast enough. Since 1957, the country's growth rate has slowed by about one-fourth, compared to the preceding postwar years. There is no problem that now besets this country—balance of payments, unemployment, Federal finances—that would not be easier to solve if the United States were growing as fast as it should be and were realizing its full economic potential. There has been and still is wide agreement among businessmen, labor leaders, and economists—both in this country and abroad—that the United States must cut its oppressive tax rates if it is to realize that potential. A tax cut is not the only measure that should be undertaken. It is not a cure-all and it is not a substitute for wise and courageous policies designed to deal directly with specific problems. But it is a thing that can be done and should be done without delay.

Mr. President, that is from Business Week magazine, June 22 edition. That editorial makes good sense.

There are other indications, from sober business journals, that our current economic growth is far from adequate. In the July 1963 issue of Fortune it is forecast that we will achieve a $633 billion economy by fourth quarter 1964, contrasted with $583 billion in second quarter 1963. This forecast involves an average annual growth rate of 5.7 percent. Moreover, Fortune estimates that the annual growth rate will slow down to 4 percent by late 1964. As I intend to demonstrate in these remarks, this annual growth rate, even if accurate, will mean barely holding the line against the existing rate of unemployment and will represent no headway at all in restoring maximum employment and production.

RISING UNEMPLOYMENT

The most important single index of the deficiencies in our economic performance is the level of unemployment. Despite the economic upturn which commenced almost 2½ years ago and has not yet been interrupted, the chronic increase in unemployment over the years is still continuing. By chronic increase, I mean the long-term upward movement of unemployment, even excluding the recessionary years. Looking only at years in which there was no general economic recession, full-time unemployment, the customary measurement, rose from 4.2 percent of the civilian labor force in 1956 to 5.5 percent in 1959, and 5.6 percent in 1962. It rose further to 5.8 percent on the average during the first 5 months of 1963. And despite the quickening of the economic upturn in recent months, the May unemployment figure of 5.9 percent was higher than in any month in 1962. To gain further perspective, full-time unemployment averaged only 2.9 percent in 1953, or only half as high as thus far in 1963, although a recession started near the middle of 1953.

The figure representing the rise in the percentage of unemployment related to the total labor force should also be kept in mind. The number of persons employed is at an alltime high, with more than 70 million employed. It seems contradictory to point out that the number of persons employed is at an alltime high and yet the percentage of unemployment in the labor force continues to increase. That contradiction is resolved and fades away when one understands that the economy is being sharply affected by automation. Between now and 1970 more than 27 million jobs will be affected by automation. Between now and 1970 8 million persons will be added to the labor force.

We must provide 35 million new jobs between now and 1970. These are the simple facts of automation and population growth. It seems to me neither the Congress nor the public comprehends the magnitude of this task.

This recapitulation of economic forecasts does not take into account the rate of part-time unemployment translated into its full-time equivalent. If this is done, the total rate of unemployment approaches 7 percent.

One fact is unassailable in light of these figures: unemployment is far, far too high, and is still rising. Unemployment, expressed in its full-time equivalent, would need to be reduced to 3 or 3.5 percent to be consistent with the maximum employment objectives to which we are committed as a Nation under the Employment Act of 1946.

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that we must use statistics to describe unemployment. Unemployment is not statistics—it is people. And above all, it is the people who are hit first and hurt longest by unemployment because they are especially vulnerable. According to the official figures, as I have already stated, full-time unemployment was about 6 percent of the civilian labor force in May 1963. But unemployment among teenagers is now about three times as high—about 18 percent. And this estimate is probably too low, because it counts only the teenagers who are classified as being in the civilian labor force. It does not count those who, for one reason or another, are not classified as able and willing to work, even though they are not going to school or engaged in other constructive pursuits.

The parents of America and the public officials of this country ought to understand that an 18 percent unemployed rate among teenagers eligible for work is an explosive situation. We cannot avoid trouble when approximately one-fifth of the total number of young people between the ages of 15 and 19 are out of work, walking the streets, if doing anything, and letting their restless energy boil over into antisocial conduct.

How much longer can we tolerate an economic condition which introduced these young people to the American economic system by telling them that they are unusable and rejected? How long can we close our eyes to the rising tide of crime and social aberration among the young, which have their roots in not being wanted and having nowhere to go? And who can tell us how much larger this unemployment problem among the young can be allowed to grow, before it takes on a terrible and uncontrollable explosive force? Shall we wait until this unemployment among the young, now hitting almost one in every five, hits one in every four, or one in every three, or one in every two? When, if not now, is the time to start rolling back this evil thing?

When, if not now, is the time to do something about school dropouts, when we know that school dropouts result in a larger number of unemployed than in any other single group in the Nation?

It is as obvious as the time of day that a school dropout is a good risk or is a sure bet to be unemployed. The facts have been laid before the committees of Congress, but this same Congress that is so concerned about the trip to the moon, that is so concerned about foreign aid, and is so concerned about a host of projects apparently fails to comprehend that the rise in school dropouts means a rise in unemployment, and that the rise in teenage unemployment is a major economic and social problem of the Nation.

We have done nothing to combat it; and the Youth Employment Act passed by the Senate rests in the other body with no action. Our programs to aid education are blocked in committee. Apparently Congress can act only when the world seems to be crushing in upon us. I hope we do not wait that long, because it may be too late.

The need for broadly expanded vocational education and manpower training facilities are also clearly indicated by the rising tide of unemployed and often unemployable young people.

But unless job training and vocational education takes place in an expanding, growing, and developing economy, the end results—that is, productive and sustained employment—will be inadequate and discouraging. I remember that, even during the depths of the great depression. There were some who said that anybody could get a job who really wanted one badly enough, or who did not suffer from some insurmountable personal deficiency. But unemployment was never reduced, except by programs which created a nationwide economic environment in which the total number of jobs came closer to the total number available for work. Only in this kind of economic environment can the more specialized problems of individuals be reduced to manageable proportions, and treated accordingly.

There is nothing fundamentally wrong with our people, or with our young people. Let us give them a chance to be useful, and they will rise to the opportunity.

What is wrong with our economic thinking and action? We are acting, in our economy, as if the age of automation had never arrived. We are acting, in our economic structure, as if the rate of investment should remain as it was 20 years ago. Everyone knows these conditions no longer prevail.

SLUGGISH ECONOMIC GROWTH

The excessively personalized explanation of unemployment falls short because there is a close correlation between the chronic rise in unemployment and the chronically unsatisfactory performance throughout the economy generally. The best single explanation of excessive unemployment is that economic activity is not expanding rapidly enough—that our economy is not growing fast enough—to use our productive resources fully.

The refined debate among economists as to exactly how fast the U.S. economy should grow is of only secondary significance. There is general agreement that we need an average annual economic growth rate somewhere between 4 and 5 percent a year, even to maintain our economic health after it is fully restored. There is likewise agreement that we need a very much higher economic growth rate, until this restoration is achieved. For until then, we must grow fast enough not only to absorb the natural growth in the labor force and the accelerating advances in automation and technology, but also to absorb the excess idleness of manpower and plant which now exists. This will require a growth rate substantially in excess of what presently exists.

Measured against the task of restoration, or even against the size of the task after restoration is achieved, our economic growth rate has remained far too low. During the past decade to date, it averaged only 2.7 percent annually, contrasted with the 4 or 5 percent required annually from a heathy base. Our annual growth rate was 5.4 percent from 1961 to 1962, and only 3.3 percent from first quarter 1962 to first quarter 1963. It was at an annual rate of 4.1 percent from fourth quarter 1962 to first quarter 1963, despite the overall quickening of the economic upturn. Tested by actual developments, we have barely had, during the past year and a half, enough economic growth to prevent unemployment from rising, much less to reduce it substantially, and this has taken place during the longest period of sustained economic recovery since 1953.

I wish to underscore that statement, because we have had the longest period of sustained economic recovery which this Nation has experienced in 10 years. That is why I believe everyone should be aware of the fact that the downturn could take place at any time. The facts of history cannot be ignored. We have had an unprecedented economic forward movement—not of large enough proportions, but constant—for almost 2½ years. This is the longest economic upturn in the past decade. Therefore, unless prompt action is taken, the year 1964 may well see a sharp rise in unemployment and a reduction of the gross national product, with serious consequences to this Nation.

Let none of us believe for a moment that only the unemployed are hurt by idle manpower and plant. The Council of Economic Advisers tells us that our annual rate of production is now $30 to $40 billion short of maximum production. Other estimates of the production gap, also worthy of consideration, are much higher than this, some of them about twice as high. Taking the midpoint of various competent estimates, we have during the past decade, in consequence of the low economic growth rate, forfeited about $330 billion worth of total national production.

In other words, we wasted that amount of money. If my colleagues in the Congress would become concerned about the waste of $330 billion in the past 10 years, caused by failure to use available manpower, I believe we would be getting at the base and root of the problem.

Waste anywhere should not be condoned. However, the waste of manpower and plant capacity to the tune of $300 billion in 10 years is unpardonable.

Let us not forget that this production, these wages, and these jobs are irretrievably lost regardless of what action the 88th Congress takes in regard to tax reduction.

We can guarantee that the future economic potentials of this Nation are realized and not just abandoned to the statistical tables of the economists.

Where we are today is the platform from which we shall grow slowly or vigorously in the years ahead. A midpoint of competent estimates is that, if the economic performance of the past decade is repeated, we could forfeit, during the 4-year period 1963–66 as a whole, another 16 million man-years of employment opportunity and another $206 billion worth of total national production. In that event, by 1966, unemployment could be a full 50 percent higher than it is now.

I remind Senators that these are conservative estimates, made by conservative economic sources. Yet we are deeply concerned over the possibility of a railroad strike, which if it should happen, might cost the country a few billion dollars. That situation is serious enough to justify consideration in Congess of unprecedented legislation. Yet here we have a situation where in the next 4 years, from 1963 to 1966, unless conditions improve, we will have lost more than $200 billion of total national production.

What could this mean? It could mean untold human suffering; Federal finances in disarray; further starvation of our domestic public needs; poverty and deprivation among more and more millions of our citizens; a mounting distrust of responsible leadership; a free field for political and economic demagogues in every State and in Washington too; and the precipitate decline of the United States from its role of worldwide leadership and esteem.

The balance of payments problem will be staggering.

(At this point Mr. BURDICK took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

TAX CUT AND CIVIL RIGHTS: BOTH NEEDED

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the strongest reasons for moving at once toward a restorative economic program is the very issue now being used by some as a basis for turning away from the economic front. The rising racial tensions and disturbances have, at long last, turned the Congress to full consideration and how we can quickly and surely implement with legislation the civil rights and liberties which our Constitution guarantees to all. We can be grateful that at long last the Congress is moving on this front.

But the plea that this enterprise in the cause of civil rights and liberties should turn us away even momentarily from our economic problems is doubly defective. It is defective because it fails to recognize that a great Nation, in great times, cannot afford to do only one thing at a time. And it is defective because it fails to recognize that the economic problem is a major and massive element in the whole build-up of racial tensions and disturbances.

Let me not be misundersood on this score. As the great Louis D. Brandeis said more than half a century ago, before he rose to the Supreme Court:

> Even if men were well fed, they would still struggle to be free.

No amount of economic satisfactions could take away from any human being in the United States the irrepressible determination to be free from disability and discrimination in the exercise of civil rights and liberties. Nonetheless, it is equally true that people do not feel free, even when secure in their civil rights and liberties, so long as they are denied jobs and their families are in want. They do not feel equal, when they persistently suffer poverty in the midst of plenty. It is hard for them to retain their faith in the American political system, when the American economic system displays so little faith in them.

It is essential, therefore, to eliminate all inequalities in employment opportunities. I have recently introduced legislation (S. 1937) capable of mobilizing the full resources of the Federal and State Governments in this important task. It is also essential, however, to remember that this or related FEP legislation cannot in itself be a sufficient remedy to existing job discrimination unless the Nation's economy is producing enough jobs for persons who are seeking work. We can never stem racial tension and discord in this land so long as a man or woman of one color can get a job only by taking it away from a man or woman of another color. The same thing might be said in terms of age or sex.

It is a happy circumstance that the extension of the right to vote to one who has not previously enjoyed it does not take the right away from anyone who has enjoyed it all along. On the contrary, the extension of the right to vote to more and more people enriches the practice of democracy among all the people. The extension, to a person of one color, of the right to eat a sandwich at a counter does not take that right away from anyone else. But when people in huge numbers are unemployed because there are not jobs enough to go around, they cannot in large numbers obtain jobs without taking them away from others. Gain by one, under these circumstances, is loss by another.

In short, when we talk about extending the promises of America to all citizens of this Nation regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin, we must realize that a burgeoning economy is absolutely essential in achieving this objective.

In other words, prosperity is essential for the fulfillment of civil rights. We can legislate civil rights until we fill the statute books, but until there are jobs which provide an opportunity for a man or a woman to use talents for constructive work, those rights will be in a sense only legal or theoretical rights.

The right that people want, above all, is the right to live in dignity; the right of equal opportunity; the right of equal protection of the laws; the right of political participation and social equality. But all those rights must be fortified by the opportunity for work, for investment, for gain, for constructive work and purpose.

Moreover, as President Kennedy indicated in his civil rights message, the problem of inadequate educational opportunities for Negroes of all ages is an integral part of the total civil rights challenge. The doctrine of separate but equal educational facilities that existed as a law of the land for over half a century resulted in separate but patently unequal educational facilities for most Negro Americans and, regrettably, for many whites—for both races.

The remnants of this pernicious doctrine are the unequal educational opportunities that are the lot for Negroes in all sections of the country today.

One must not think solely in terms of formal academic training. There is an equally urgent need for expanded vocational and training opportunities for all persons. The radical transformation in the nature of the national employment market means that only skilled workers will have any assurance of sustained and worthwhile employment. It is essential that immediate steps be taken to provide full vocational and job training opportunities to previously deprived persons. In this particular time, that refers primarily to our Negro people.

"One thing at a time," we are told. When could any great nation survive and prosper, and grow in its material and moral achievements, by attempting only one thing at a time? Are our adversaries behind the various curtains attempting only one thing at a time, or are they active on a hundred fronts at home and all over the world? We cannot afford, without mortal peril, to discard one essential purpose every time we pick up another.

We must be able to do many things at the same time, and do them well.

We cannot afford to talk one year about the worldwide education race, the next year about the scientific race, the next year about the moon race, the next year about the economic race and, finally, the citizenship race. The whole human race is involved simultaneously in all of these races, and in the final analysis all of these races are part of one race. They are all part of a race to determine what system of government, of economic life, of social and human values, is most appealing to mankind in the second half of the 20th century.

Do I seem to have drifted far away from the tax issue? Not at all. The President's tax proposal is not a narrow fiscal measure. It is a powerful and thoughtful effort, at long last, to deal with the economic problem—a problem which touches the life of every American and bears down ominously upon the lives of millions of our fellow citizens—a problem which commingles the economic and the social, the political and the civil—a problem as big as the fate and fortune of the United States.

TAX REDUCTION NEEDED NOW

So I say tax reduction is needed now, and that means at this session of Congress. There are always differences of informed opinion as to the proper size and composition and timing of tax cuts, and as to the proper blend between tax reduction and tax reform. In our democracy, a fair amount of airing of these differences of informed opinion is a necessity; but overindulgence in this necessity can turn it into a luxury which paralyzes action.

During the past year, I have ventured to express some of my own thoughts about how we may constructively resolve this dilemma—a dilemma which is becoming more apparent with the fleeting weeks and months. I venture today to reiterate once more what I have said before.

First, tax reduction deserves a higher priority than the so-called tax reforms, because it is more urgent to relieve the economy from the burden of excessive tax rates than to create a theoretically more perfect tax structure. In fact, a sharp distinction between tax reduction and tax reform tends to be unrealistic. The purpose of any change in our tax structure is fundamentally to improve our economic performance. And if we like the crusading connotation of the word "reform," I ask what reforms in the tax system are more imperative than those which bear most directly upon the reduction of unemployment through acceleration of economic growth? If there is any reform in our economic life more needed than the eradication of the economic burden and social iniquity of massive unemployment, I do not know what that reform may be. When we add to these prime considerations the fact that tax reduction is less controversial, and subject to less difference of opinion, than the technical reforms, I urge that we achieve the tax reduction first, and turn subsequently to the important but secondary tasks identified by the reform proposals.

Second, there is also widespread agreement, among informed people in all walks of life, that we should not again commit the grievous error of doing too little too late. All of the arguments induced in favor of tax reduction as an economic stimulant apply with great force to consolidating the entire tax reduction into one step, to take effect immediately, and preferably retroactively to the beginning of the calendar year 1963 or at least to the beginning of the fiscal year 1964.

We need many other stimulative measures besides tax reduction. The quicker we put the tax reduction into effect and measure its consequences, the more promptly we can turn to these other measures, and the more adequately we can appraise their needed scope.

Third, if the so-called reforms are deferred in whole or in part, the distribution of the tax reductions will need to be quite different from that originally proposed. Otherwise, the tax reduction without the reforms would be grossly inequitable in social terms, and would be severely unbalanced from the viewpoint of its potential contribution to economic growth. I believe that the most useful tax reduction would be that which concentrated as heavily as feasible upon increasing the disposable or aftertax incomes of the consumers in the low and middle income groups who constitute the preponderance of our total population. We suffer more from inadequate demand for ultimate products than from any other dearth of incentives to business expansion and investment. In the face of existing overcapacity, the best way to encourage businessmen to invest still more is to enlarge their sales.

I submit that these three basic propositions may provide a first workable formula for reducing the areas of controversy and uncertainty, and thereby may promote the swift enactment of effective tax legislation.

Mr. President, there has been much talk about a march on Washington scheduled for August 28. Without attempting to assess the wisdom of this particular endeavor, let me candidly say that the sensible way to avoid marches upon Washington is for Washington itself to get on the march. It is high time for the greatest legislative body on earth, the U.S. Congress, to get on the march. And this march must not only be against things we deplore, but also toward the goals to which we aspire.

The reduction of unemployment, the acceleration of economic growth, is not a negative goal. It is a positive goal. It reflects our awareness that, with the new science and the new technology, we can within a few short years solve "the economic problem" in the United States. We can eliminate poverty; house all of our people decently; educate all up to the limits of their capabilities; and improve our health services to all the people, in line with the advances, in medical science. In an economy of abundance, we can remove the distress among those who have not, without taking anything away from those who have. Without anyone being held back by adverse economic conditions beyond his control, every individual can be enabled to advance as far as his capabilities will carry him.

The 1st session of the 88th Congress must not—and they will not—adjourn until the President's proposals on tax reduction and civil rights have been successfully enacted.

Let those words be inscribed in the Record. Congress will not adjourn until the civil rights program and the tax program have been enacted. That may mean that Thanksgiving and Christmas will be spent in Washington by Members of Congress: but if that be the case, prepare for it. We cannot fail in the responsibility of doing what we are required to do by the events and circumstances of our time, and, I hope, by our own ideals and convictions.

I repeat what I said earlier in this speech; namely, that the reason why some people are going to march on Washington is that Washington has failed to march to the solution of the problems that beset the Nation.

So, Mr. President, we have no priorities, except that both the tax law and the civil rights program must be passed at this session. They are companions. Neither has higher priority than the other; both have top priority.

Moreover, we must also meet our clear responsibilities in the closely allied areas of youth employment, manpower retraining, higher education, and vocational education. The time has come to stop compartmentalizing these various programs, viewing them from separate perspectives, imagining they are not all part of the total problem of providing every American citizen with the opportunity to live a secure, challenging, productive, and meaningful life.

With such possibilities within our grasp, Congress should need no marching orders. We know what must be done. And now is the time to get on with it.

Exhibit 1

Sour Indicators

The rise of the gross national product by more than $7 billion between the first and second quarters of this year is now a matter of nearly ancient history for the economic pulse takers whose attention must always be directed toward the future. Peering into the economic future is a field in which amateurs compete freely against professionals, which is probably as it should be, and at this juncture the prevailing opinion in both camps points to another slowdown, if not a termination, of the economic expansion which began in February 1961. And once again, the shape of the future is likely to be determined by what are known as exogenous factors in the jargon of economic analysis and Government actions in the vernacular of the laity.

One of the principal causes for concern about the future is the danger signal that is emitted by the leading statistical indicators, the measures of those activities which tend to move upward or downward in advance of business as a whole. Frank C. Porter's chart of the leading indicators, which appeared in Wednesday's Washington Post, shows a very steep decline in the proportion which are rising. The performance of the indicators are harbingers of slowdowns and recessions is far from perfect, but they did foreshadow the production plateau of the second half of 1962 and the mild upturn in economic activity that began early in this year.

Assuming that the current downturn of the indicators is not a statistical aberration, it is useful to compare the present period with last year's narrowly averted recession. In the second half of 1962 a precarious balance between the forces of expansion and contraction was maintained by a combination of Government action and fortuitous events. The conscious acts of Government included the Treasury's reform of the depreciation allowance rules, the passage of the investment credits, and the sharp increase of Federal expenditures which offset the decline in the volume of private investment. Among the fortuitous factors there was the Cuban crisis which reversed the decline of industrial materials prices and thereby bolstered business optimism.

Will there be another concatenation of favorable factors in the event that current upturn tapers off? There is now no backlog of freshly enacted legislation which might improve the climate of business expectations, and while the ratification of the test ban treaty will improve the longrun prospects for mankind, it could have a depressing effect on economic activity in the short run.

The inescapable conclusion to which these considerations point is that tax reduction holds the key to the near-term future. Business can react quickly to good news, and nothing would more effectively dispel the current mood of uncertainty than the Ways and Means Committee's approval of a $10 billion tax cut.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his timely speech. It is very much needed for the long weekend and I wish to associate myself with it.

On most issues, I am accustomed to find myself in agreement with the Senator from Minnesota. I am accustomed to standing on the floor of the Senate and thanking the Senator from Minnesota, because he is right most of the time. However, like the senior Senator from Oregon, sometimes the Senator from Minnesota is wrong—but not often. Of course, my record will have to speak for itself as to how frequently I may be wrong.

But, Mr. President, I am waiting for the day when the Senator from Minnesota will stand on the floor of the Senate and will say, "Wayne, you have convinced me, at least, by your criticism of foreign aid"; and I hope that I will then get his support for at least some of my efforts to revise and reform the foreign aid bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bayh in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The gentle, kind demeanor, and pleasing manner of the Senator from Oregon, plus the persuasiveness of his argument, have had a considerable influence upon me. There are times when I literally run away from the Senator from Oregon, lest he overwhelm me with his arguments, particularly when I think I am being tempted into paths that it would be better to keep out of.

But I shall give the Senator a bit of encouragement: The Senator from Oregon wants to restore the opening paragraphs of the statement of policy in the foreign aid bill. About a week ago he made a brilliant speech on that subject in the Senate. I joined him in that endeavor, and I think he will succeed.

Mr. MORSE. And the Senator from Minnesota voted with me on it today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. And I shall be interested in other changes. I shall be interested to read the Senator's speech on the reports of the Comptroller General.

I want the Senator from Oregon to know that I shall be joining him in some of the debate, because I happen to have come to the conclusion that the amount of waste in some of these military aid programs has reached the point where it is going to take congressional surgery to save the patient. So I ask the Senator not to be in too much of a hurry, but to be patient—be patient, dear teacher—and at the proper time we shall have a few passages of Psalter and Scripture to bring this faltering Senator along.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am always appreciative of pittances, too; and I want the Senator from Minnesota to know that he could not have made me happier for this weekend than he has by the speech he has just made.

But now, Mr. President, all repartee aside, I say to the Senator from Minnesota that he, together with other Senators and with representatives of the executive branch of the Government, is about to enter upon a very important and historic mission in behalf of our country; and I want him to know that my prayers will be with him as he flies from the United States to Moscow as an observer of what I think will be a great, historic event, not only in the history of this Republic, but also in the history of the world—for, as I indicated earlier today, I foresee the possibility of the signing of the test ban treaty in Moscow, and also, I am sure, as the Senator from Minnesota has pointed out so eloquently earlier this afternoon, the subsequent approval of that treaty by an overwhelming vote by the U.S. Senate, one far in excess of a two-thirds vote, for in all probability more than 80 Senators will vote in support of it. In these events, I believe we may be witnessing the beginning of a new millenium in the history of mankind.

So I want the Senator from Minnesota to know that I appreciate his leadership; and I am proud that he and the other Senators who will go with him will go, really, as ambassadors of the Senate to Moscow. They will greatly strengthen the favorable impressions which I know that millions of the Russian people really have in their hearts for the American people.

THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, now I turn to my comments for the day—those in regard to United States foreign aid.

Mr. President, I have heard reports of few events in recent years that disturb me so much as the news that the United States is dickering with General de Gaulle over his price for signing the nuclear test ban treaty. That we are doing so even as he is stepping up his campaign to exclude American farm products from the Common Market is surely the ultimate in doormat diplomacy.

It apparently is the view of the administration that if the United States makes a sufficiently meek doormat of itself, we can induce General de Gaulle to wipe his feet on us.

So far, it has been De Gaulle himself who has saved us from the folly of handing our nuclear weapons over to France. I frankly hope he will continue to reject our offer. If it is really the policy of France to be a nuclear power in its own right, it would not make much sense to attain that position by courtesy of the United States.

Moreover, the United States has given France economic and military aid in the amount of $9½ billion. We sent troops to Europe in the early 1950's at great and continuing expense to ourselves because it was France that wanted them there to make her feel really secure. Now it is being proposed—in this country at least—that we accommodate the French longing to join the Great Powers as a nuclear power by giving her the techniques she needs to perfect her independent nuclear deterrent.

I think it is time to let France off our coattails, especially since it is increasingly apparent that she is going to use her position there to forestall the United States both economically and politically.

I say to my administration that I oppose any sharing of nuclear secrets with France. Most certainly I oppose such sharing as a price to get her to sign the test ban. Most of all I oppose sharing of nuclear information with France as an inducement to induce her to go along with a multilateral surface fleet under NATO.

It is a sad and disheartening fact of American foreign policy that more and more we are relying upon the "purchase" of friends and allies. More and more we are told that the goal of American security can be reached only by buying up and by buying off other countries. For the most part, this takes the form of economic or military aid; in the case of France it is the offering of nuclear secrets; in the case of the nonnuclear members of NATO it is the offer of a multilateral surface fleet.

In all these cases, it is the American taxpayers who are footing the bill. We no longer approach our friends on the basis of what might be the mutual interest of our countries. We merely ask them: How much do you want? What is your price?

After they have taken our money, or our nuclear secrets, they go their own way, and pursue national interests that they would have pursued if we had never given them anything. Why not? They have ample evidence that the United States will simply come through with another payoff, because that is what we have done year in and year out since the end of World War II.

We have done it to the tune of $100 billion. In return we have received so little that our Government propagandists have tried to mislead the American people in what amounts to a program of deception.

A few moments ago the Senator from Minnesota expressed an interest in the position that I shall take next week in a speech about the confidential reports which the Comptroller General of the United States has been making to the Congress for some time past. They deal with the shocking waste in American military aid, particularly in respect to American military equipment. I shall be handicapped in that speech because I shall not be able to give the American people the facts marked "Top Secret." But I protest it, for it is the American taxpayers' money that is being wasted. The only body that can change that restriction—the seal that has been placed upon the lips of the representatives of a free people—is the Congress itself. Congress should serve notice on the administration that information which really belongs to the American people should have lifted from it the label of top secrecy. If the American people knew the facts about the shocking waste in military aid that has been going on for years under the military aid program, Members of Congress would either vote to end it this year, of those who voted against it would remain at home the next time they ran for office. Let the RECORD show that the senior Senator from Oregon believes they should be kept at home if they do not take action at this session of Congress to end the shocking waste of the taxpayers' money in connection with the military aid program.

I am glad that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] made the speech that he made today on the subject of military expenditures, both in connection with our domestic defense program and our foreign aid program. I am glad that so many Senators remained in the Chamber and went on record in support of the thesis and the objectives set forth in the speech of the Senator from South Dakota. But the test will be, How will Senators vote, when they have an opportunity to do so, amendment by amendment, as the amendments will be offered when the foreign aid bill is before the Senate in the weeks ahead?

How will they vote when they have an opportunity to carry out the objectives, the goals, and the ideals set forth in the speech of the Senator from South Dakota?

I assure Senators that the Senate will have an opportunity to vote on such amendments, because the senior Senator from Oregon will offer them. The senior Senator from Oregon has been making these daily speeches in the Senate in opposition to various parts of the foreign aid bill because, as an old teacher, he knows that this is an educational problem. We must get the lessons out to the American people. We must get the facts out to the jury boxes of America, because once the people understand the facts about the waste in our foreign aid program—the great damage that it is doing to the greatest defense weapon which we have, which is our economy—they will hold the politicians accountable for their failure to stop this drain upon the economy of our country. It does not follow that those of us who support the amendments are against sound foreign aid. But we are against a foreign aid program that is distinguished by so many pockmarks of waste, inefficiency, and maladministration as have characterized our foreign aid program for many years.

As I have said, starting with my first speech on the French situation on January 16 of this year, the time has come to start with France in changing this program. The time has come to make clear to Mr. de Gaulle that if he wants to follow a nationalist French line, he must follow it with French money, and not American money. The time has come to offer and support an amendment to the foreign aid bill that will bring to an end the financing of the nationalism of Mr. de Gaulle, for the nationalism of Mr. de Gaulle is basically anti-American.

I have been reading the alibiing editorials of the past few days. I have been reading the interviews with prominent Americans seeking to excuse De Gaulle. But I can reach only one conclusion from most of those interviews and editorials. In effect, they say, "Make peace with De Gaulle at any price."

Here is one vote against it. Here is one Senator who will give other Senators an opportunity to make a public record as to how they vote. Then let their constituents in their own States be the final determiners as to the quality of the votes.

I will be told, "Senator, you must not bring this subject into politics."

I know of no political issue more vital to the welfare of the American people than the issue of foreign aid. It is a political issue, and the senior Senator from Oregon intends to do everything he can to keep it a burning political issue across the land, because we must get the facts to the American people about foreign aid. We must let the American people tell us their decision. That is representative government.

It is not representative government when, under the label of "top secret," there are denied to the American people the facts the people need to know about the major economic policy of our Government, because that is what foreign aid has become.

The time has come for us to cut deeply into the financing of French policies.

On the basis of what he has gotten from us in the past, De Gaulle expects we will hand over nuclear secrets if he plays hard enough to get. He even expects that he can knock out $1 billion worth of American farm products from European customers without drawing any response from the United States because it has been our policy not to retaliate for any injury done to U.S. exports.

When we meet with State Department officials in connection with the problems of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and we point out that France has violated GATT, and point out that the United States has rights under GATT—that when there is a violation, we have a right to retaliate by placing restrictions upon the products of the offending country—what are we told by the State Department? We are told, "That will only mean that France will retaliate more."

That is probably correct. But France also restricts our products more when we do nothing.

I do not intend to sit in the Senate of the United States and let one-third of our total exports to Europe—which our farm products constitute—be sold down the river because there are great industrial powers in the East, Middle West, and elsewhere who argue, "If we retaliate for French action on our farm products, there will be retaliation against industrial products."

We need to take a look at our entire export trade from the standpoint of its totality. The Congress and this administration cannot justify a program whereby they stand idle and permit American farmers to be irreparably damaged by the policy of France and other European countries in connection with Common Market problems which have developed, vis-a-vis the United States.

I do not propose to sit in the Senate and vote a single dollar to Europe under foreign aid programs so long as this anti-American economic policy is being followed by France and other countries in Europe. Neither do I intend to contribute in any way to their independent nuclear forces, which is but another form of foreign aid.

It is long past time for American citizens to begin to ask what there is in this giveaway policy for us. What advantage is gained for the United States if nuclear forces are proliferated by our giving away nuclear information? What advantage is gained in having France sign a test ban treaty when she becomes a nuclear power, anyway, through American generosity? What advantage is there for the United States in paying close to half the cost of a Polaris-carrying missile fleet that adds absolutely nothing to the already vastly excessive nuclear power of the United States?

As the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] pointed out in his brilliant speech this afternoon, the nuclear power of the United States is far beyond the necessary minimum required to protect the security of the United States, and of its allies. It is already a force many times more powerful than is needed to destroy most of the world, to say nothing of the Soviet Union. From the standpoint of having adequate weapons to fight a nuclear war, we have them. The Polaris program being made available to other countries either individually or in groups, will not enlarge in any way the defense potential of the United States.

The answer that official sources would give to all these questions is the same. It is that these are the payoffs we are making to induce France and the other countries in Western Europe to let us stay in Europe, to induce them to let us protect them.

Much has been made of how to bring nonnuclear Western European countries into the charmed circle of nuclear command and control. But I have never heard any explanation whatever of why they should be brought in at all. Neither have I heard any demands from Norway, Denmark, Canada, Greece, Turkey, Portugal, or any other members of NATO that they be allowed to contribute to a nuclear force, and share in its command. Apparently, West Germany is the country for which the multilateral nuclear force is being organized. But most of the pressure for it is still coming from the United States, not from West Germany.

I think the real truth is that the United States is so anxious to keep our European partners pacified that we are willing to pay any price for their acquiescence in our leadership. Our part of the price is the multilateral surface fleet. Another part of the price is going to be the sharing of nuclear information with France. I assume that we are offering this information as an inducement to France to go along with the test ban and to go along with the multilateral nuclear force.

It is a real paradox of American policy that in exchange for a test-ban agreement we are creating new nuclear forces and new nuclear powers in the Western World over which we will have only partial control at best and no control whatever at worst. Our voluntary dispersing of nuclear weapons to other countries is not, in my opinion, going to further the security of the United States, and certainly not on the basis of anything we are getting in return.

It is more than likely that our doing so will only give the Soviet Union a reason for divulging nuclear information to her satellites, and possibly even to Red China.

IMPACT OF FRENCH POLICY ON AMERICAN FARM PRODUCTS

Of course, after 19 years of service on the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate, I know it is pipedream to do so, but I often wonder what type of conditions or requests we might put to other countries if we reversed the usual procedure, and asked them what they were willing to do in return for American aid or nuclear secrets.

No doubt the State and Defense Departments will laugh at the very thought. But I wonder whether the American people are one day not going to ask France what she is willing to do to assure continued American participation in the defenses of Europe. I suspect they may start asking, though, when the action Western Europe has taken against our poultry begins to spread to the other products that make up the $1.2 billion in farm commodities that are now the target of the Common Market.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey] alluded to this situation on Wednesday. I am sorry that my attendance at the inauguration of the President of Peru prevented my being here to endorse his remarks. As he knows, I think that much of our present difficulty, however, is the result of a policy toward France in recent years, especially with regard to trade, which can only be called a doormat policy. It has been a policy of toadying. It has been a policy of allowing France to impose any discrimination she cared to without effective response on our part.

During the postwar years when France was recovering from the war—with the help of the Marshall plan—we agreed to a quota which France put on our fruit. We did so because of her great dollar shortage. She had a bad balance-of-payments problem.

But her balance-of-payments problem disappeared, thanks to all the accommodations we extended her. Yet her quota on our fruit did not disappear. It has not disappeared yet, even though France is now one of the world's largest holders of American obligations, and one of the principal buyers of our dwindling supply of gold.

The time came when we had the right to retaliate. I though we should retaliate. But we got the doormat diplomacy from the State Department, which insisted that if we just remained patient, perhaps France would one day come around. The plight of American producers, of course, never enters into the considerations of the State Department.

So the next issue arose over American poultry and flour. West Germany and The Netherlands have led the exclusion of these products from their countries. They have prevailed, too, as we know from the recent action by the European Economic Community.

And on Monday, we heard General de Gaulle draw bead on the entire $1.2 billion worth. In his words:

> It is not worth talking of the European Economic Community if it must be understood that Europe does not obtain its food essentially thanks to its own agricultural products, which can be largely sufficient.

Today's New York Times carries a column by C. L. Sulzberger that spells out a little more plainly the meaning and timing of the general's statement. It should be noted first that France occupies a middle position between Germany and the United States in its farm costs, and hence in the prices for its commodities. Germany has the highest-cost producers. Its subsidies maintain producers of an expensive food supply. It is the German tariffs that are the highest, in terms of the large producers of foodstuffs.

American foodstuffs, especially in the category of wheat and wheat products and feed grains are the lowest priced. France believes she is in a position to become the food supplier of western Europe if she can obtain a common European tariff that will be high enough to keep out American goods and low enough to knock out German producers.

France is mechanizing her farms. She can greatly expand her wheat production to supply Europe, if she can obtain a common tariff that will eliminate both low-price American and high-price German competition. Her object is to put all the vast food market of the EEC at her own price level.

Then she expects to expand her agricultural production on the basis of mechanization, and become the food supplier of the Common Market.

As the Senator from Minnesota pointed out, this can only mean an uneconomic distribution of resources within the Common Market. It will force European consumers to pay higher prices for French foodstuffs than they have been paying for American foodstuffs. It will mean subsidizing a French agriculture that France is trying to drive out of business in Germany. It requires a protectionist policy on the part of the Common Market to protect—not Germany, not the United States—but France.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article from today's New York Times, under the heading "Foreign Affairs—All the Roads That Lead to Bonn," by Mr. Sulzberger, which discusses the problem I have just raised, and particularly discusses the comments of Mr. de Gaulle.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL THE ROADS THAT LEAD TO BONN

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS, August 1.—And once again the key to East-West relationships lies in Germany. If the Russians will cease pressing for implied recognition of their East German puppets; if we can induce our West German allies to accept a nonaggression pact, why, then, the diplomatic thaw should gather force.

But West Germany itself nears a time of decision. Old Chancellor Adenauer departs this autumn and with him the assumption that alliance with France is paramount, that Germany without France cannot exert a significant world role. The new men, Erhard, Schroeder, Hassell, are in no sense against the French bond; but they would subordinate it both to NATO and to the United States.

This, at least, is their initial inclination, and during the initial phase of their power they express it by a pro-American policy, by support of England in its Common Market efforts and by restraining enthusiasm for France. They like the idea of intimacy with their Rhineland neighbor—but not at the expense of bigger friends.

With Adenauer's endorsement De Gaulle had sought to make a Franco-German counterbalance to the "special" Anglo-American relationship the general so much detests. Adenauer embraced this approach; his successors do not. Foreign Minister Schroeder, who already dominates Bonn diplomacy, thinks the idea of a "special" Franco-German counterweight is unrealistic for the simple reason that France is not a superpower and the United States is.

To this reality, which Adenauer had been less inclined to acknowledge, is added a masked German suspicion. While the Germans immensely admire De Gaulle, they suspect that one cardinal point of Gaullist policy is the old Richelieu tenet that Germany must be kept divided.

A subtle change in Bonn's attitude was first hinted to De Gaulle when he made a working visit to Germany last month. The Germans startled him by strongly arguing he should get his Atlantic fleet back in NATO within 6 months and by demanding closer Common Market ties with Britain.

A SHREWD STATESMAN

De Gaulle is a bland, shrewd statesman who masks his reactions. Nevertheless, he issued an indirect warning by insisting on a uniform Common Market agricultural policy this year. In plain talk, this means the Germans had better reduce their artificially high farm prices promptly or face loss of French backing.

The threat is deliberately timed. The Germans know they are entering a delicate period. They imagine the Soviet project for a nonaggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Alliance is implicitly favored by Washington as a means of achieving further rapprochement. Bonn heartily dislikes such a pact in principle and is worried about its form.

Yet France is the only NATO ally ready to second such German views. Therefore, realists like Erhard and Schroeder who value the American tie nevertheless see that this could be a poor moment to weaken existing bonds with France. De Gaulle is aware of his hold on Bonn as gently hinted in his remarks on agriculture. For they are aimed only at Germany and they are coldly given a terminal date this year. And this is the year of critical United States-Russian negotiations in which Germany must ultimately emerge as a key topic.

A competition is thus developing to influence Adenauer's successors. The initial advantage seems to lie with Washington and logic also favors Washington because of its enormous strength. Yet De Gaulle has chosen an apt moment to force the issue and play his own cards. During the past 20-odd years the world has taken note of the general's talent as a cardplayer.

Meanwhile, in the background remains the affable, active, wily figure of Khrushchev. He is now in the process of tidying his western border in order to look eastward toward Chinese troubles and inward toward economic headaches and the slowing of Soviet industrial growth.

But even in the present glow of warmth and friendship, he hasn't forgotten Germany, the bugbear of Russia's European policy.

Some day, he confided to a very recent visitor, the time will come again when the Germans want another Rapallo, another pact with the U.S.S.R. The time, he forecast, would not arrive under Adenauer's successor or even under the latter's successor; maybe still later. Khrushchev didn't pretend to know just when. But he was confident. And Russia was prepared to wait.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the course of this article, Mr. Sulzberger says:

> De Gaulle is a bland, shrewd statesman who masks his reactions. Nevertheless, he issued an indirect warning by insisting on a uniform Common Market agricultural policy this year. In plain talk, this means the Germans had better reduce their artifically high farm prices promptly or face loss of French backing.
>
> The threat is deliberately timed. The Germans know they are entering a delicate period. They imagine the Soviet project for a nonaggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Alliance is implicitly favored by Washington as a means of achieving further rapprochement. Bonn heartily dislikes such a pact in principle and is worried about its form.
>
> Yet France is the only NATO ally ready to second such German views. Therefore realists like Erhard and Schroeder who value the American tie nevertheless see that this could be a poor moment to weaken existing bonds with France. De Gaulle is aware of his hold on Bonn as gently hinted in his remarks on agriculture. For they are aimed only at Germany and they are coldly given a terminal date—this year. And this is the year of critical United States-Russian negotiations in which Germany must ultimately emerge as a key topic.

Mr. Sulzberger has written a very keen analysis of De Gaulle's tactics and of the German problem that has been created by the De Gaulle tactics.

I ask the State Department, "What do you propose to do about it?" I ask the Sercetary of State, "Give your answer to the American farmers with respect to the question that some of us representing the people of this country have put to you, Mr. Secretary. When, as Secretary of State, are you going to recommend to this administration that we proceed to exercise our rights under GATT? When, Mr. Secretary, do you propose—as in my judgment it is the solemn obligation of your administration to do—to take the necessary retaliatory steps that will make clear to France and West Germany that they cannot impose these discriminations against the United States and expect us to take them without retaliation? I want you to know, Mr. Secretary, that I do not propose to give you any votes in connection with your economic policies toward Europe until you start protecting the rights of the American people—their treaty rights under GATT."

This is no time for Democrats in Congress to join in sweeping under the rug these economic foreign policy problems. To the contrary, I believe that I best serve my administration by making clear to it: "You have lost this vote for any continuation of your economic policies toward Europe with De Gaulle carrying on his anti-U.S. drive against the economic best interests of our people."

As Mr. Sulzberger points out, France is putting the pressure on Germany to go along with this squeeze play on both Germany and the United States. Her pressure is taking the form of playing on the German fears of a detente between the United States and the Soviet Union that may possibly involve some kind of recognition of East Germany.

As we know, De Gaulle made clear in the same press conference his opposition to a nonaggression pact with the Warsaw Alliance. His excuse was so flimsy and transparent as to be meaningless. He said that France gave her word she would not commit an aggression, and that should be enough. This is a strange statement, coming from a man whose agent said only recently that President Kennedy's pledges were meaningless, because they would not bind the United States 10 years from now.

However, De Gaulle has established himself as Germany's guardian against any relaxation of tension with the Soviet Union. In exchange, he expects to get German support for a French economic program that will mean great damage to the United States, as well as to Germany.

In my opinion, these objectives of the French leader require a serious reappraisal of our alliance with France. In light of them, I am shocked that the United States is still playing toady by offering nuclear weapons to De Gaulle.

It is French policy to drive our farm goods out of Europe; to do so, she is willing to maintain tensions in Europe that are costing us billions of dollars in defense measures.

I submit that these economic objectives of France, and the political objectives she is apparently pursuing along with West Germany, are directly contrary to the interests of the United States.

We should make that fact clear to De Gaulle. France and Germany seem to think they can have their cake and eat it, too, at the expense of the United States. Apparently they think they can eliminate $1.2 billion of our exports, and at the same time force us to maintain defense forces in Europe that are costing us a minimum of $2 billion a year, and probably closer to $5 billion, exclusive of our aid programs to other countries and our payments for bases we use in the defense of Europe.

I am in favor of any reduction in tension with the Soviet Union that we can reach without jeopardizing American security. If France wants to block such a policy in the interests of her economic policies, then I think it is time we deal her out.

The great ex-Vice President, Mr. Nixon, thinks that France and General de Gaulle are essential to any East-West negotiations. I ask Mr. Nixon if he is ready to explain to the American taxpayers who are maintaining a colossal $56 billion Military Establishment, and a $4.5 billion foreign aid program, and a $5.7 billion space program, all because of our apprehensions over Soviet aggressions, that all these must continue because France wants it that way. I hope he is also ready to explain to American farmers and exporters that they must give up their markets in Europe because France wants it that way, too, and France wants those markets for herself.

The press says that Mr. Nixon met with General de Gaulle. I assume that the conversation took the form of Mr. Nixon asking what more the United States could do to accommodate France. Apparently the answer was that we could give France nuclear weapons, too, because I see Mr. Nixon is advocating it.

Like the State and Defense Departments, Mr. Nixon would laugh at the thought of asking De Gaulle what he is willing to do to accommodate American interests before we give him something more.

These recent events are convincing me that the interests of the United States and Western Europe are becoming so divergent that I seriously wonder whether there is still a basis for the NATO Alliance. Although these comments I am making today and the doubts I am expressing will be ignored by the policymakers downtown, I think the day is not too far off when the impact of events will cause the American people to demand some changes in our relations with Western Europe.

The politicians and editorial writers who do not know any policy other than one of accommodating Western Europe at any cost, are going to be forced some day to face facts. That day will come first when the full force of European exclusion hits American agriculture. Then there will be some changes in our policy toward Europe.

There will be some changes in the Congress. There can also be changes in the White House.

This is a political issue. The realities make it a political issue. The security of America makes it a political issue. Let the politicians take notice.

Those changes could also come from the discovery that we are being kept in an artificial state of defense spending to protect the political interests of Germany and France, rather than our own.

Those issues will have to be faced by the Senate very soon. Individual Senators will be called upon to vote on amendment after amendment seeking to modify the foreign aid bill in both its military aid and economic aid aspects, in a way that in the opinion of many of us is necessary to protect the best interests of the United States.

A LOOK AT HUMAN CAPACITIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point an article entitled, "A Look at Human Capacities," written by Margaret Mead, Associate Curator of Ethnology of the American Museum of Natural History. It is a brilliant article. It sets forth a thesis that needs to be given great heed.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Look at Human Capacities

(By Margaret Mead)

(Editor's Note.—In doing business around the world, Jersey affiliates encounter as customers, suppliers, and employees the widest possible variety of people, from the most advanced to the most primitive. Oilmen have frequently remarked on the surprising speed with which some of these people, previously unacquainted with Western technology, are able to adapt to it. In this article Dr. Mead, the distinguished anthropologist and author, gives some of her own observations on the learning capacity of primitive man. She suggests that citizens of highly developed nations should perhaps worry less about the "emerging" people and think more about the adjustments we all must make in order to survive. The article is condensed from an address given by Dr. Mead at the semicentennial celebration of Rice University, in Houston, Tex., last October.)

Every time that man is confronted either with a tremendous change inside his own society or with the uncomfortable experience of meeting other men who differ from himself, one of those crises arises in which we wonder about human capacities.

These crises almost always consist of wondering about other people's capacities—other races, other nations, the other sex, old people, children—some group that doesn't seem able to deal with the state we're in, whatever it is. This has been going on for a very long time.

We're facing such a situation today, because of two things that are happening. For the first time we have to share political action abroad with people of extraordinarily different levels of civilization and extraordinarily different historical pasts. The world forum of the United Nations includes people who a generation ago were without any written language and without any knowledge of the wider world, as well as people of very ancient civilizations—all of them coming rapidly into the modern world. So there is a great deal of worry about what is happening, pretty much expressed in terms of time. Will the new countries learn in time—quickly enough—the sorts of technology and political behavior that we think desirable? Can they graft this knowledge rapidly enough on their very different past?

In addition, we're facing a related crisis within our own society with its very rapid technological revolution. This is the most staggeringly rapid progress that man has ever made, and human beings have had to live through, absorb, and deal with greater changes than ever before.

Both of these developments present us with the question: What are the potentialities of the human mind? Are they good enough to cope with these tremendous advances in knowledge, or has civilization outstripped the ability of its users to use it? There is a fear that maybe we haven't got enough available intelligence and that we may have to improve it in some way—a fear promoted by the state of the physical sciences at present. There is anxiety about "computers taking over." This, of course, is really a way of saying that the physical scientists are going to take over while the rest of us become exploited creatures called human components. And we have, of course, the legitimate fear that science is going to destroy the entire world which it was designed to protect and advance.

But we have something else we didn't have in the past. We have a great deal of scientific information to bring to bear on these problems. We know enough about the way in which ideas have been diffused in the past and about the way in which children learn in the present to make quite a good many responsible propositions about human behavior. We know that the difference between what an Arapesh tribesman in the mountains of New Guinea is able to learn and what an American college student can learn is not because of a difference in their brains. The brightest Arapesh is probably as bright as the brightest undergraduate. Just the same, when I would ask an Arapesh questions that had never been asked before in his culture, where no one counts beyond 24, his head would ache. There is no reason to believe that this was because he was not born with the same sort of brains that we have; it was because he had not been given the cultural equipment for thinking.

If we look at the very simplest people that we know, who can count to two or three, who have no calendar, and then compare what can be done in any of our university laboratories, we realize that this progress is the result of culture. It comes from the accumulation of new methods of transmitting knowledge to new generations and to members of other societies laterally. This is scientifically based information that makes it possible to take another look at human capacities when we consider, "Has the human race, as it stands, in all its divisions, the capacity to deal with what is happening today?"

We also have scientific estimates of how much of his brain the brightest person uses today—and it is something like a tenth. That being the case, we have only begun to tap the ability of human beings to learn. And as we develop, each new development makes us brighter. The American IQ has been rising steadily only because every child today is exposed to a more complicated world than were yesterday's children. Our children now learn at 5 what others once learned at 10 or 20, or only a very few people learned at all.

As we watch some of the most primitive people beginning to learn, we must try to imagine what it means to grow up in a world where, for example, there are no right angles to buildings. Thinking geometrically is not easy for someone who lives in a circular hut that is not very circular, with a roof that is not very conical, slanting slightly under a breadfruit tree. Our increasing scientific knowledge is built into our culture, so that the people who live in it absorb it, and it becomes easier and easier for them to master. We have to take into account the inexplicit and inarticulate learning that goes on, as well as all our formal learning. This is one contribution that the sciences of anthropology and comparative psychology can make to our estimates of the capacities of human beings.

We have learned, also, that extraordinary transformations can be made in a people's thinking. The people of the Admiralty Islands, when I first knew them in 1928, were in the Stone Age, with no alphabet, no knowledge of history or geography, no political organization that could hold together more than 200 people. When I went back in 1953 I could say to the man who had been a houseboy in 1928, "Start the generator and get ready to make a bilingual tape on the magnecorder." They were even critical because our electronic devices were encased in boxes, and said that if they could see the circuits they could understand them.

This happened in a period of 25 years. Equally, in 25 years, these people moved from complete ignorance of the world beyond their own islands to an understanding of their place in a trusteeship under the United Nations, and their relationship to Australia, to London, and to the rest of the world. This is a cognitive transition. We know it can be done because we've seen it done.

I really don't think we need to worry about the ability of the Admiralty Islanders, or other primitive "emerging" people, to make whatever adjustments to modern technology are necessary. We should worry more about the capacity of all of us, sophisticates and primitives alike, to make the further adjustments that are required if humanity is to survive. Actually, we know very little about the new forms of society that must be invented if we're going to control scientific warfare in time so that we don't destroy ourselves.

One thing we do know: every culture that has survived has found ways of taking the "biologically given" in human beings and channeling it so that they're able to learn and to mature and to become members of that culture. But no culture has ever done this perfectly. In changing cultures, particularly, it is almost as if we have to stitch two kinds of material together; in some cases the stitching fails. A problem for the future is to bring into line impulse-structures that were appropriate when man had no culture but are not relevant to our survival in the world today. This is one aspect of man that makes it so difficult to change his political behavior, which is based on emotion rather than reason. Actually, we are very far from knowing to what extent it's possible to reeducate people emotionally.

To a considerable degree we are uncertain, for example, about the basis for aggression in human behavior. A great deal of our present research leads to the general position that the danger of war comes from man's good instincts, and not from his bad. We see that right through history men have been willing to die for the things they value—their women and children, their land, their country, their religion, their ideals. What we have to worry about is not simply aggression—the will to power, destructiveness, violence—but man's agelong habit of dying for things he values more than himself.

Through the ages we've perfected the weapons by which larger and larger groups have been able to defend themselves against others. Can we expect that human beings will learn, in time, that the values they have died for can no longer be served by dying? Some say that we can trust in man's instinct of self-preservation. Yet, over and over again throughout history, human societies have pursued a course that was suicidal, while defending values that they regarded as more important than survival. What confronts us now is the problem of devising new political institutions that will make it possible for us to transmute our biological capacities for sacrifice.

This is an exceedingly pressing task. We have seen that man has enormous capacity to learn. We know that we can set up the kind of learning situation that will bring people who are thousands of years behind us into the modern world. But we must also change our own agelong loyalties, so that we don't fight and die for the things we value, but live and work for them. If we can do it, then the journey ahead of man is incredibly more magnificent than the journey that brought us from the stone age into the present.

THE PEARSON GOVERNMENT IN CANADA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the recent past Mr. Eliot Janeway wrote a series of columns which I believe are worthy of special note and are deserving of publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. One is an article published in the Chicago Tribune of June 24, 1963, in which Mr. Janeway makes some very keen observations in regard to the situation under Lester Pearson's new liberal government. The article is entitled, "Pearson A Friend? Who Needs Enemies." I ask unanimous consent that this penetrating and thought-provoking article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEARSON A FRIEND? WHO NEEDS ENEMIES

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, June 23.—Official Washington cheered when Lester Pearson's Liberal government won the hard-fought Canadian election last April 9. John Diefenbaker, the Conservative Prime Minister, had feuded with President Kennedy and campaigned on an anti-U.S. platform. As soon as Pearson put his Cabinet together, he paid a visit to Hyannis Port which left the impression that the United States had consolidated a relationship and made an alliance more firm.

Then, a month later, the strong man of the Pearson government, Walter Gordon, Finance Minister, announced a new program to strengthen the Canadian economy. It "out-Diefenbakered" Diefenbaker. "Yankee go home," is the plain meaning of the new decrees from Ottawa; and though Finance Minister Gordon has now pulled back—temporarily—from the 30-percent tax on securities sold to "foreign controlled interests" his proposals are still discriminatory and his ultranationalistic intent is all too plain. It's as if Pearson had never rushed to Hyannis Port, but had instead refused to receive Kennedy in Ottawa. For this program to strengthen the Canadian economy sets out to do it by weakening Canada's link with the U.S. economy.

The Pearson government has moved to crack down on U.S. products moving into Canada, and on U.S. investment already there. A key objective of the new program is to cut the Canadian market for U.S. manufacturers and to cut it massively. Something like $350 million of U.S. auto parts move into Canada annually, and the Pearson government would like to see the total slashed by two-thirds; this in stated hope of making 3,000 Canadian jobs. Taxes are to be raised on any business with less than 25 percent of Canadian ownership, as well as on dividends and interest earned in Canada and paid south of the border to U.S. investors. Businesses with more than 25 percent Canadian ownership will profit by cuts in withholding paid on dividends, as well as by eased depreciations rules.

HAVEN'T PROVOKED ACTION

This is the sort of protectionist nationalism that we U.S. citizens have criticized ourselves for having practiced in the past; that we have been trying ot outgrow; and that we deplore when practiced by others. Certainly, we have not provoked this extreme measure by imposing discriminatory quotas against Canadian shipments into the United States—although Canada, since she cheapened her dollar, has been undercutting our own wood, food, and metal product industries.

On the contrary, our reaction to the Canadian devaluation of 1962 was to arrange a short-term loan not over $1 billion for Canada, putting up most of it ourselves, despite our own strained situation.

The worst thing about this outburst of bad neighborliness is not its meanness but its silliness. The Canadian dollar, like the British pound, depends for its stability upon our own dollars and on this fairminded Canadian opinion has been quick and articulate in expressing its agreement. So, at the moment, does the entire structure of free-world solvency and credit. If the U.S. dollar should go bad, no currency will be worth having. And our hope of holding the dollar steady rests in turn upon the take-home pay we earn abroad from our exports and our investments—especially in the countries from which we buy and to which we owe money.

CANADA BEST CUSTOMER

Canada is at the top of the list. She is our best customer—or, at least, she has been up to now. We are her best customer—despite the protests of powerful U.S. industries (like the timber producers) which have been hurt by her export offensive. We have sent more investment dollars to Canada than anywhere else in the world, and this flow has been a major prop to her wobbly currency. Unless the flow of U.S. investment and trade earnings continues to move freely across the border, Canada, may face another currency crisis like the one from which the United States rescued her last summer. The Pearson government, in its on-again, off-again way, has just moved to erect a roadblock in the way of the rescue squad.

Last year, Congress passed the administration's trade bill. Its specific purpose is to empower the president to negotiate new trade arrangements with countries to which we need to increase our exports. It was hailed as the measure which would arm us against the sort of discrimination that Canada is organizing against us. This is the first test case. It will be interesting to see how effectively the trade bill of 1962 can be used.

FOREIGN AID BATTLER RETURNS TO LIMELIGHT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Chicago Tribune for June 17, 1963, contains an article entitled "Foreign Aid Battler Returns to Limelight," written by Eliot Janeway, which deals with foreign aid problems and comments upon Representative PASSMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AID BATTLER RETURNS TO LIMELIGHT

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, June 16.—June, the last month of the fiscal year, is when Representative OTTO PASSMAN, Democrat of Louisiana, moves into the limelight for his annual fight to cut foreign aid appropriations and to limit and control foreign aid expenditure. It's a fight that has become truly nonpartisan. For Representative PASSMAN has battled Presidents and State Departments without regard to party label.

But the background for this year's fight is different. For the first time, the President and the State Department are clearly on the defensive, while PASSMAN's position commands more support than ever before from a wider segment of congressional opinion—liberal as well as conservative, Democratic as well as Republican.

One obvious reason is that nothing succeeds like success, and PASSMAN has been getting bigger cuts each year; and momentum is therefore building up on his side of the argument. Meanwhile, the Treasury is tighter for money this year than it has been at any time since Passman began his campaign for foreign aid economies.

The administration, moreover, has contributed to the increasing suspicion that not all of our foreign aid spending has been wise or necessary. The White House commissioned Gen. Lucius Clay, the President's own adviser on Berlin, to audit the foreign aid record, and Clay's findings and recommendations were for cutbacks. The administration promptly cut its foreign aid request for fiscal 1964, and David E. Bell, foreign aid administrator, subsequently conceded that there is reason for considerable tightening up.

WON BIGGEST VICTORY

To this recurrent summer haggling over how much foreign aid is to go to which countries, a new element has been added. This is the Hickenlooper amendment. Last year, when Passman won his biggest victory to date, over President Kennedy and Secretary of State Dean Rusk, the Democratic Congress not only cut $1 billion out of the administration's foreign aid appropriation request, but tacked on a Republican Senator's amendment.

What this does is make it mandatory to cut off aid funds to countries which expropriate the property of U.S. nationals without due compensation.

Last year's debate over how much foreign aid to cut ended with the adoption of the Hickenlooper amendment. This year's debate is starting amidst a congressional search for ways and means to broaden the reach of the Hickenlooper amendment. One widespread method for putting the squeeze on U.S. business abroad, short of expropriation, is the use of a double standard in tax and currency exchange rates. Resentment of such discriminatory practice is provoking the suggestion that governments which impose penalty tax and exchange rates against U.S. nationals should be automatically cut off from foreign aid funds, too.

Of course, this wouldn't preclude foreign aid recipients from giving a reasonable and moderate break vis-a-vis foreigners to their own taxpayers and currency exchangers.

This method of broadening the reach of the Hickenlooper amendment has an obvious appeal to Congress. With State and local taxes on the rise all over the United States, with unemployment an issue, with members up against stiff resistance to spending bills for the home folks, they are looking harder than ever for foreign aid economies.

HURT BY DEBT SERVICE

Latin America, for instance, is getting roughly $1 billion a year in aid, but she is losing more than that in debt service and fleeing capital funds. This runaway capital is often lent back where it came from at usurious rates, which is itself a reason for the backbreaking load of debt service that prevents these countries from helping themselves. If governments getting foreign aid were to charge their own nationals the same rate for foreign exchange that they charge U.S. business, more native money would stay at home and less foreign aid would be needed.

STEEL MILLS FOR INDONESIA AND INDIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Chicago Tribune for June 10, 1963, contains an article entitled "Sukarno Gives a Bit To Gain a Steel Mill," written by Eliot Janeway. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Sukarno Gives a Bit To Gain a Steel Mill

(By Eliot Janeway)

New York, June 9.—President Sukarno of Indonesia might well be described as a latter-day Huey Long. He has been able to make a pretty good thing of the workrule that what is good for Sukarno is good for Indonesia. But recently the career which has taken him so far ran into a roadblock—in fact, into the same roadblock which stopped Huey Long a full generation ago. This is the Congress of the United States. It has been, and it still is, a patient and ingenious builder of roadblocks against flamboyant politicians with a penchant for making their own rules.

Sukarno has been involved in a dispute with Washington. Like the leaders of many other "emergent nationalisms," he is anxious to get as much as he can out of the international companies operating in his country. His targets are the oil companies. The issue has been whether he should take them over (and, along with their properties, the burden of financing and maintaining them); or whether, under this threat, he would do better merely to squeeze, tax, and regulate.

By all previous calculations—that is, before Congress got into the act—harassment of the international oil companies figures to be winning politics for Sukarno. He played this game for 2 years, and it would still be winning politics for him if he didn't need something from us.

This something is a steel mill, capable of producing the simple sort of material which Indonesia needs (for making wire, nails, hand tools, etc.). The problem of poverty there, like the problem of progress, centers in agriculture. The people who work the land need simple materials and rudimentary tools in order to feed their expanding population and meet rising social demands.

To import rod and wire and nails drains off foreign exchange which Indonesia can't spare (and necessitates onerous import restrictions). A merchant mill to produce these general purpose necessities would not only give Sukarno a domestic political dividend but would also take pressure off his strained exchequer.

SUKARNO FACED ROADBLOCK

This mill is up for consideration in our next foreign aid budget. But here is where Sukarno found himself facing a new congressional roadblock, the Hickenlooper amendment. Under this appendage to the last foreign aid bill, countries expropriating property of U.S. nationals without due process and fair compensation are barred from receiving Government funds.

This cutoff is automatic. No appeal to Presidential discretion and no pressure on the State Department can set up compromise negotiations or produce emergency grants. And this automatic cutoff on aid to expropriating countries is here to stay. In addition, there is considerable bipartisan sentiment for extending it to cover cases of discriminatory tax and exchange rates.

Sukarno has just recognized the effectiveness of this simple congressional device. Baiting Yankee imperialism and the imperialist oil companies is winning politics in neutralist countries; while, contrariwise, going along with them invites risky political competition. Nonetheless, Sukarno has just settled for a continuing deal with the oil companies.

INCREASED ROYALTY TAKE

He has, it is true, regularized his earlier de facto increase in the royalty take from the old rate of 50 percent to the new norm of 60 percent. He is justifying this back home by claiming he is taking over the oil companies on the installment plan (which, indeed, he is; but, at least, he is paying for it). The Hickenlooper amendment has provided an automatic sanction, which neither Sukarno nor the Kennedy administration could ignore. Sukarno has recognized the line Congress has drawn, and he has not dared to step across it.

Heretofore, the Sukarnos of the world have been able to present their demands to our Government with a powerful "or else" as a persuader—"or else we'll stop playing it down the middle and head for the Communist side of the road." But now Congress has given the administration a balancing "or else"—"behave yourself or else you'll have no place to go but to the Communists." Sukarno doesn't want this, and he does want a steel mill. Maybe the United States will figure out ways and means to get back into business around the world.

WORLD STEELMAKERS FACE BIG CHALLENGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I asked to have Mr. Janeway's article printed at this point because I think it is a very fitting introduction to an article entitled "World Steel Makers Face Big Challenge," written by Conrad Fink, and published in the Washington Sunday Star of July 28, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Fink's article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Smoke Over Japan—World Steelmakers Face Big Challenge

(By Conrad Fink)

Tokyo.—Clouds of dirty smoke over Japan's cities tell the story: This industrious island nation is challenging the steelmakers of the world.

What's more, the statistics show the smoke clouds over Kawasaki, Osaka, Yawata and a host of other cities are getting bigger and bigger in the eyes of Western steelmakers.

For Japan now is the world's fourth largest steel producer and gaining fast on the leaders—the United States, the Soviet Union and West Germany.

In addition, the Japanese are demonstrating remarkable ability to export at prices often lower than those offered by the leaders.

The amazing thing about all this is that Japan must import the raw materials that go into steelmaking and then ship the finished products back across the vast ocean isolating it from steel-consuming nations.

TREMENDOUS GROWTH

"Explosive growth" is a term overworked in describing Japan's economic progress since World War II but nothing else tells the steel story quite as well. Consider this:

In 1945, when the last American bomber had left the skies, Japan's steel industry was a rubble heap. Hardly one blast furnace was still lighted.

But things were rolling again by 1950 and in 1953 production hit 4.5 million tons of pig iron and 7.6 million tons of steel, both of which exceeded World War II production records.

Last year, Japan produced 27.6 million tons of steel, compared with the United States' 89.1 million tons, Russia's 76.3 million and West Germany's 32.5 million.

Of Japan's 1962 production, 4.1 million tons, worth $580 million, were exported. Exports and their total values increased 64 percent and 38 percent, respectively, over 1961.

UNITED STATES BEST CUSTOMER

The United States is Japan's biggest customer, followed by the Soviet Union. And Japanese salesmen are having increasing success in international competition for markets in many other countries—Argentina, the Philippines, Thailand and in Europe.

Senator SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, said in Pittsburgh in May the Japanese have gone beyond fair competition and formed a secret cartel with European producers to divide the American market.

Japanese steelmen said certain agreements were made to avoid excessive competition in the U.S. market, but asserted the success of Japanese steel in America is due to attractive prices.

The Japan Iron-Steel Federation says British steel is Japan's closest price competitor but U.S. steel is almost always much higher than Japan's.

The federation says, for example, that most producers sell thick steel plate for shipbuilding at about $140 a ton. British producers are low bidders, with about $115, the federation says, and the Japanese are second lowest, in the neighborhood of $127.

PRICES ARE LOWEST

Japanese prices for bar and angle and ordinary wire rod are lowest in the world, at least $40 under U.S. prices, the federation says.

Japan's competitors maintain Japanese producers have an unfair advantage because they pay extremely low wages.

This question has been clouded in charges and countercharges for years, but the Japanese—without really publishing all the data—maintain their labor costs are not the only important factor in determining a low price structure.

Pointing out that Japan had to completely rebuild its steel plants in the past 18 years, the Japanese say they developed a modern, efficient industry second to none in technical and labor skills.

Anyway, the Japanese add, Japan's industry operates under the crushing handicap of having to import raw materials so the wage controversy is not too meaningful.

Japan imported 22.1 million tons of ore last year from Malaya, Chile, Peru, Goa and India, and 9.6 million tons of coking coal from the United States and Australia.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the article by Mr. Fink discusses the world steel manufacturing problem that has arisen. It is a problem to which I feel both the administration and Congress are paying too little heed, for the greatest steel mills in the world are no longer in the United States. Many American steel mills are obsolete. Recent news tells us that 11 or more steel mills are being closed in the United States. There are many reasons why. One is obsolescence. The other is that American taxpayer dollars have built the most modern steel mills in the world abroad, including Japan, as is brought out in the Fink article.

As I speak this afternoon in the Senate, thousands of fellow American citizens are paying for it with unemployment, after they had previously paid for it monetarily, along with other taxpayers, in foreign-aid money. There was a time when we could justify appropriating money to help rehabilitate a war-destroyed Europe under the Marshall plan, which I supported, and would support again. But I did not know that we were initiating an economic program in perpetuity.

I think it is fair to say that in the Committee on Foreign Relations this morning there was a battle royal over whether we should authorize an appropriation for the fantastic sum of $1 billion to India to build a steel mill. The steel mills India already has are not operating at anywhere near capacity, and the fact is indisputable that India does not have the trained personnel to operate any such steel mill, and could not possibly have them for many years. In my judgment, the fact is indisputable that India does not have the raw materials to supply the needs of such a steel mill. Yet to date, the Committee on Foreign Relations has not been able to get from the State Department an unequivocal commitment that the United States will not supply India with the money.

When the senior Senator from Oregon suggests in the Committee on Foreign Relations that a prohibition be written into the foreign-aid bill, he is met with an attitude on the part of many of his colleagues: "Naughty, naughty. How could you be so impolite?"

I served notice in the Committee on Foreign Relations this morning that committee members will have an opportunity to go on record, and it will not be a record that will be kept behind closed doors, either, because the American people are entitled to know how their Senators vote on this pocket-picking proposal; for this is a proposal to pick the pockets of American taxpayers to the tune of $1 billion.

The senior Senator from Oregon proposes to see to it that the responsibility for such pocket picking is placed upon the shoulders of those who vote for it, although he hopes that reason will prevail and that the committee will vote a ban on this project.

Let me send from this desk today another message to Mr. Rusk. I am not interested in the kind of letter that was sent from the State Department, which, as I said in the Committee on Foreign Relations room this morning, is so much hogwash. It contained typical State Department equivocation and evasion. It threw language at us, hoping that Senators will be too busy to dig beneath it and find that it is meaningless; for the State Department has made no commitment to members of the Committee on Foreign Relations and to the Senate, and has made no commitment in that hogwash letter, that the proposed pocket picking to the tune of $1 billion will not be consummated by the State Department in connection with a steel plant in India.

I listened to the non sequitur argument this morning, "The steel companies, when they get through with their surveys, may recommend it."

So what? I can well imagine that a deal may be worked out between American steel companies and the Indian Government to assist in the operation of a $1 billion steel plant in India, a plant producing products made by Indians who work for a pittance by way of wages, the products to be shipped back to the United States, thereby increasing unemployment in the United States and further weakening our economy. I am not interested in any such unpatriotic deals between American business concerns and foreign governments, deals which do not put American interests first.

So, Mr. President, I was not in the slightest impressed by the argument that the administration may get the backing of some American concerns for this appropriation. The sad thing is that in the name of foreign aid the American people have been set upon and imposed upon by too many deals between American business concerns and the Government of the United States and foreign goverments in respect to the pouring of billions of dollars—since 1946, almost $100 billion—of the American taxpayer's money into foreign lands, to the great economic detriment of the American people.

So, as a lawyer, let me say that I am not impressed by special pleader witnesses whom the administration may drum up to spread in the United States a lot of propaganda that a $1 billion steel mill might be feasible in India. I would ask, would it be feasible from the standpoint of the internal economy of the United States? It is about time that in connection with our foreign aid bill we start thinking about the effects of these huge foreign aid investments in industries abroad, that are increasing American unemployment and American economic disjointure. There is a need for foreign aid, but not that kind of foreign aid.

We need more emphasis upon a foreign aid program that will help the educational development of underdeveloped countries. We need to develop trained people, literate people, enlightened people. If we train their minds and prepare them with skills, we give them a seed bed of economic freedom; and they will develop their economic institutions. We must stop transplanting steel mills from the United States to India, Japan, France, Western Germany, and other places in the world; and that also goes for a good many other similar economic installations.

Of course it is very difficult to get people to realize that the time has come to terminate certain types of foreign aid. The reason why it is so difficult, Mr. President, is that so many have permitted themselves to be victimized by dogma. So much of the thinking in this field, by so many persons, particularly those associated with Government, has become dogmatic. What we need to do, and what I have been trying to do by means of this series of speeches, is to challenge some of these sacred cows, question many of these dogmas, and point out that the foreign aid program, as presently constituted, is not in our national self-interest. Mr. President, if we do not protect our national self-interest, we can be sure no one else will protect it.

So, Mr. President, this morning, in the Foreign Relations Committee, a few of us—and I do not want the impression to go abroad that I speak alone on this matter—succeeded in making clear that this morning was not the time to vote, but that this matter should be postponed, for further consideration, and to give the American people an opportunity for further reflection.

I have been interested in the accelerated drive of the last 10 days to get the foreign aid bill out of committee and to the floor of the Senate. If that acceleration effort is successful, Mr. President, then the drive for acceleration here on the floor of the Senate will begin. But let my leadership know, here and now, that the foreign aid bill is going to be debated at great length in the Senate—speech by speech by many of us, and amendment by amendment; and at no time will there be any giving of unanimous consent to limit debate on any phase of the foreign aid bill, for the American people are entitled to just that kind of debate, and I assure them they will get it. Furthermore, Mr. President, I will not be alone in giving that assurance.

Some weeks ago, I suggested that the wisest and soundest course for the administration to follow would be to revise its proposals before the bill reached the floor of the Senate; it still is not too late for that to be done, for I think the administration will still have time to revise its proposals before the final vote in the Foreign Relations Committee is taken.

The evidence is accumulating at such a voluminous rate, Mr. President, that I should think the administration should recognize it is only wise to revise the bill, because I do not think there is any chance at all that the Senate will pass the bill that will come out of the Foreign Relations Committee. Mr. President, I will tell you the kind of bill that is going to come out of the Foreign Relations Committee. In the opinion of the majority of those who will vote for it, it will not be what they will think ought to be the final bill. It will be a bill of parliamentary strategy; and, in my judgment, no committee of the Senate can ever, at any time, justify, on any ground, sending such a bill to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, let me tell you what some of the strategy is: "Well, we are going to have to compromise with the House in conference, anyway. Therefore, in some sections you have to have larger figures, so you can cut down the amounts, in conference."

Mr. President, what a way to pass legislation. I do not reflect on the conception which anyone else has of political ethics when I say I would not think of voting for a bill on the basis of that principle. What the House does makes no difference to me; it will have to answer to its constituency for its own course of action.

But I do not propose to vote for a bill that is different from the bill that I really think I ought to vote for, on any such theory that I must vote for more because we shall have to compromise with the House. Some admit that such action is pulling the chestnuts of the House out of the political fire. We were not elected to do that. We were elected to vote for measures on the basis of their merits and in accordance with the facts presented.

There is another strategic argument being made in the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is said that the higher authorization is necessary because even after the final authorization bill is passed and a compromise downward with the House is made, the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, and the conferees who follow always cut the amount below the authorization. So we pad the bill some more. I have not even mentioned that it was already padded by the administration on the theory that Congress would cut it. It is a padded bill. It is a cream puff bill. I do not believe that is the way to pass a foreign aid bill. The Committee on Foreign Relations should send to the Senate a bill with the identical amounts that the members of that committee believe should be authorized and appropriated, and not one cent more or less.

As a member of that committee, I consider that to be our trust. I reject the arguments that what is proposed is the way it has always worked in the Congress. That statement I challenge. To the extent that it has been a common practice in the past, it is a bad practice and we ought to stop it right now. As I indicated in the committee, all that such an attitude does is to invite the Senate to turn itself into a committee of the whole on foreign relations. When the foreign aid bill reaches the floor of the Senate, that is exactly what we will do. I predict now that the Senate will become a committee of the whole on foreign relations, because the bill that comes from the Committee on Foreign Relations will not deserve very much consideration by the Senate. It will not be a bill that represents the facts, nor will it be a bill that represents the real convictions of the majority of the members of the committee.

At the next meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations I shall not win a popularity contest for my speech today. But no one in the committee will deny the truth of what I am saying. Members may be kind enough to ignore me, which would be a disappointment, because I shall be very glad to debate the premises I have stated at that committee meeting. The Senator from Oregon does not intend to take it lying down in that committee in respect to his amendments. He will expect reasons for the rejection of his amendments. I shall not accept, as having any materiality, relevancy, or reason of parliamentary strategy, such arguments as I have heard to date: "Oh, there is much to what the Senator from Oregon says; I agree with the Senator from Oregon, but—"; or "I am sorry, I cannot vote for your proposal because the House will vote less"; or "We must have a larger figure in the bill so we can arrive at a compromise in conference."

That is some way to pass proposed legislation.

Mr. President, we shall receive a bill that does not contain specific prohibitions in respect to foreign aid amounts for individual countries. We are told that the negotiations in respect to AID requests must be worked out between governments. Then they think they slay us with the rhetorical question, "Don't you have confidence in the State Department and the Pentagon?"

The answer of the senior Senator from Oregon is, "No, a million times no, not on this subject."

As was commented on this morning in the Foreign Relations Committee by a colleague, the most powerful lobby in Washington is the State Department and the Pentagon. In the outer room of the Foreign Relations Committee all morning long seven officers from the State Department and AID were available to supply the lobbying information that any proponent of the bill might desire. There is no manpower shortage down in the State Department or in AID. That was demonstrated this morning. It is demonstrated every time the retinue arrives at the committee room.

One would think that one or two officials would be sufficient to supply the committee with any information that the committee officially requested during the markup period; and one would think that the telephone connections between the Foreign Relations Committee and the State Department would still be in full operation, so that if some point were raised a mere telephone call would bring us the information. I do not know who they think they are kidding. Certainly not the Senator from Oregon.

I know what they were doing there. They were lobbying, and the bill that comes up will be their product.

I could say other things about that bill, but I shall reserve other comments until Tuesday.

I close this part of my speech this afternoon with the following statement: It has not been a happy experience for the Senator from Oregon over the weeks to stand on the floor of the Senate day after day and utter criticisms of my administration in respect to foreign aid, for I always want to support my administration, but I best serve my administration when I oppose it any time I think it is wrong. And it is wrong in its foreign aid proposals in respect to the amounts, in respect to some of the projects contained, and in respect to the adamant opposition of the administration to make any needed reforms or modifications in the bill.

Much as I should like to support my administration, I owe a greater responsibility to the people of my country. The people of my country are entitled to a better foreign aid bill; and the senior Senator from Oregon will do the best he can to try to help them get it.

THE IBEW PENSION BENEFIT TRUST FUND

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is my distinct privilege to be the public member of what I consider to be the soundest, most forward looking pension benefit trust fund in the United States. It is really the bellwether trust fund. It is the trust fund which exists between the electrical contractors of the United States and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

Two great industrial statesmen who are wonderful, dedicated men in the field of management-labor relations—Mr. Paul M. Geary, of Washington, D.C., trustee representative of the electrical contractors; and Mr. Joseph D. Keenan, representing the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the trustee of the union—are trustees of the fund.

This trust fund has been in existence since 1940. It is a good example of what management and labor can do when each side lives up to its responsibility with respect to collective bargaining, for there has not been a strike in this industry—that is, an approved strike—since the formation of the fund. I suppose the main reason for that has been the existence during many years of the Council on Industrial Relations. It is a very novel council. It is composed of representatives of the union and representatives of the employers, and there is no middleman. This is an employer-union group which has found it unnecessary to select a middleman with respect to the settlement of individual labor disputes which arise. They reserve the right to do so, but they have never found it necessary to use one, for their own board of arbitration has succeeded in ironing out all the difficulties without the use of a middleman.

My predecessor as chairman of the National Employees' Benefit Board was a great teacher of mine when I was a graduate student. I refer to Prof. Edwin Witte of the University of Wisconsin economics department, who frequently has been referred to as the father of our social security system, for he was a recognized scholar in this field of economics. I do not believe anyone would dispute the statement I now make; that during his active professional career he had no peer in the academic world or, for that matter, in the industrial world in this country in respect to welfare funds, pension funds, and social security programs. He served as the public member of the 25-man National Employees' Benefit Board until 2 years ago, when death took him from us.

It was a great honor to be selected to take his place by the Secretary of Labor—who, under the agreement between the parties, selects the chairman of the board for the parties. I can never fill the place, but I shall do my very best to honor the great record that Professor Witte made as the public member of the board.

On May 22, 1963, the annual meeting of the National Employees' Benefit Board was held at Hot Springs, Ark. At that time, Mr. Paul Geary, president of the board, and Mrs. Joseph Keenan, treasurer, submitted their annual report. Because there is so much discussion these days about procedures which ought to be followed in resolving differences between management and labor; because there has been so much comment about the Kaiser plan in California, entered into with the steelworkers of America, and the various agreements that have been reached by the United Automobile Workers of America and their managements, and the west coast longshoremen agreement of some months ago, that likewise set a new precedent in that industry for an agreement between management and labor in respect to automation problems, I shall ask in a moment for the the insertion in the Record of the report on the IBEW pension benefit trust fund for 1963.

There is much information in it that will be of benefit to Senators, particularly in view of the fact that undoubtedly before we adjourn there will be considerable debate in the Senate on management-labor problems, but more particularly because the electrical industry has been years and years ahead of other industries in the plans to which I have just referred. Here, in my judgment, there is no denying the fact, is the bellwether industry, and great credit is due to its leadership. Great credit is due to Mr. Geary and Mr. Keenan; and great credit is due to Professor Witte for the impartial advice on leadership that he has given to representatives of industry over the years.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed at this point in the Record, to be followed by the statement I made at the annual meeting of the board this year, as public chairman of the board in regard to certain subject matters that I thought would be of interest to members of the board.

There being no objection, the report and statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Report on the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Pension Benefit Trust Fund

(By the board of trustees)

The following report is made on this May 22, 1963, in conformity with article III–A, section 3, paragraph (g) of the employees' benefit agreement by which the pension benefit trust fund was created and under which it operates. This particular section of the agreement specifies that the trustees annually "make a full and complete report to the national board."

Of course, annual reports have been made since the inception of the employees' benefit agreement. They were mimeographed reports of financial statements and included some explanation and comment. However, 11 years ago, a suggestion was made by Dr. Edwin E. Witte, who served as the highly respected public member of the national employees' benefit board from its inception in 1940 until his death in 1960. Dr. Witte said simply this: "The National Electrical Contractors Association and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers should talk more about the areas of cooperation which exist between them. Let the public know that labor-management relations can be good, in your case are good."

WIDE DISTRIBUTION OF REPORT

With that in mind then, we expanded our report into a printed edition and began to give it wide distribution. And because we began to distribute it widely, we added material and comments perhaps extraneous to a review of the National Electrical Benefit Fund but certainly apropos to the electrical construction industry and to the part played by the partners in that industry—NECA and the IBEW.

The number of copies of the trustees' report now being distributed annually, is approximately 850,000. In addition to members of the National Electrical Contractors Association and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Government personnel, teachers, students, librarians, editors of daily and labor newspapers, heads of industrial concerns and persons associated with, and interested in labor-management relations are now receiving copies of our report.

We mention this as prologue, and we continue our policy of reviewing items in this report on which labor and management in the electrical contracting field have cooperated, in the hope that a better all-around understanding will result.

In the past year, as has been the custom, at NECA district meetings, representatives of the IBEW have been invited to present brotherhood views on various problems, while at IBEW district progress meetings, chapter managers and other NECA representatives have been in attendance to present the employer point of view.

Then at NECA's national convention and the IBEW convention, both held last fall, the respective presidents of both organizations visited the other's convention and made a principal address.

Readers of this report not connected with the electrical field, might be quite interested in remarks made at those conventions.

PRESIDENT WEBSTER IN MONTREAL

NECA President Harold A. Webster said to the IBEW convention delegates gathered in Montreal:

"With our mutual interest in mind, it is not difficult to understand why NECA and the IBEW are usually found to be on the same side of legislative issues in Congress and frequently in the State legislatures.

"Some of you will remember that the National Electrical Contractors Association was the only employer or association of employers that appeared before congressional committees in 1947, and again in 1949, and entered a public protest on the air against the enactment and the continuation of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. We also opposed the Landrum-Griffin Act, and appeared in support of the common situs picketing bill. I believe that up to now our association is the only business interest that has raised its voice in the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in opposition to its legislative policy designed to weaken or repeal the Davis-Bacon Act, and we have made numerous appearances before congressional committees and various agencies of Government in support of that act, and its proper application to federally financed construction."

The contractors' president continued, setting forth areas of cooperation and voicing necessary criticisms. We only wish space would permit more extensive quotes from his address. A significant point was made directly under the heading of "Labor Relations" itself.

"Since more than 97 percent of NECA's members are IBEW employers, it follows that the only labor relations which the association has are between it and the IBEW at the national level, and between NECA chapters and IBEW local unions at local levels. These relations at the national level are about as favorable for growth and a prosperous, peaceful industry as the law of the land and varying attitudes of the chapters and local unions will permit. From time to time, we become frustrated by our apparent inability to bring about effective local understanding and use of nationally developed procedures which have proven their worth."

PRESIDENT FREEMAN IN MINNEAPOLIS

Moving on to IBEW President Gordon M. Freeman's address to the Minneapolis convention of the National Electrical Contractors Association, we find that he spoke of many factors which unite NECA and IBEW as a team, stating, "for the more jobs we hold together, the more progress and prosperity will accrue to our two organizations; and another important end result will be better service to the public we are both dedicated to serve."

After commending the contractors for their work of "selling" the live better electrically program to the public, President Freeman pledged a part of a newly voted per capita increase acquired by the IBEW, to aid the contractors in many of the programs they have undertaken. He said in part:

"We intend to hire more international representatives, to carry on more organizing campaigns, to establish more training programs, to carry on more active public relations programs. Now that the funds will be provided, we intend to earmark some of those funds and some of the working hours of our additional personnel, for those programs mentioned above, which you people have been carrying on with little more than moral support from us.

"We plan to train more and better men, with your help, to perform the jobs which must be done, and we intend to fight for those jobs which we believe belong to us and to you, our contractors."

These brief comments we believe give our members, as well as members of the general public, a fair idea of the aura of cooperation and good will which surrounds our organizations in a day and age, when to read the daily newspapers or listen to the reports of certain congressional committees, labor strife is the rule and not the exception in day-to-day labor-management relations.

Well, in our case we are proud to say labor strife is the exception.

"NEW IDEA"—OLD TO NECA-IBEW

While we are on this subject, we have noted in a number of newspaper articles and management publications in recent months, articles concerning what one well-known national publication terms a gradual change in the relations between labor and management. It describes this change as a kind of "continuous bargaining" on a regular basis, taking up matters of conflict as they arise, analyzing, eliminating irritants, dealing with problems ahead of time, instead of all at once in the heat of contract negotiations.

The steel industry is commended for its practice of such a program, underway for "about a year."

The auto and rubber industries and others have also been mentioned as willing to give this "new idea" a try.

In the vernacular, we would like to say to the reporters on this subject, that "we have news for you." As far as the electrical construction industry is concerned, we have been practicing this "new idea" for roughly 35 or 40 years.

It was specifically to accomplish the objectives of peace in labor-management relations that our local joint conference committees—NECA and IBEW—were set up years ago, and why, of course, our Council on Industrial Relations was created.

We say let us have more of this enlightened labor-management relations policy, but in all modesty feel we should mention in this report that the idea, while certainly not widespread, is not new. It is not untried. It has worked quite well in the electrical construction industry for many years.

TRAINING IN THE ELECTRICAL FIELD

Now we would like to review very briefly two of the major areas of cooperation for which NECA and IBEW are noted. One of these is the field of apprenticeship and journeyman training.

A joint apprenticeship committee at the national level was set up in 1941 at which time a set of national standards was developed. In an industry which has become not only the fastest growing, but of all in the Nation the one most subject to rapid change, the standards had to be revised in 1945. At this time the committee assumed the name by which it continues to operate today—The National Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee for the Electrical Industry. Since 1952 the committee has had a national office with a full-time director to aid in its program of improvement and expansion in apprentice training.

Growth of local joint committees and adequate financing through proper clauses in the labor agreements have been extremely good—all stimulated by the national committee.

Under direction of NECA and IBEW's joint committee, the national standards have been revised three more times—in 1953, 1957, and 1962. A national electrical course for apprentice inside wiremen was developed, the first year of which was put into use in September 1961, with subsequent years completed on schedule. A course of study was also developed for apprentice linemen which was well received and is being widely used.

With the need for training and more training in the electrical field, an intensive drive has been made by both the IBEW and NECA to have journeymen wiremen enrolled in skill improvement training classes, with marked success. Because of the rapid advances made in the field of electronics, nuclear energy and automation, and with the emphasis today on missiles for defense, and man's race to conquer outer space, it is imperative that skilled wiremen be available to do the work which must be done. Last year, in our trustees' report we stated that to the best of our judgment there were some 50,000 IBEW members then taking, or who had completed some phase of journeymen skill improvement training. That figure is increasing every day, and more and more advanced courses are being added to curricula setup. As with apprentice training, much of the skill improvement training program, is a joint enterprise promoted by NECA and IBEW through their local joint committees.

ON AUTOMATION

We spoke above of automation as a reason for skill improvement training. There has been much written on this controversial subject in recent years. The IBEW has been extremely concerned about its members in areas other than construction, those in manufacturing, utility, and communications work chiefly. The brotherhood has acted to aid these members thrown out of work or displaced, through security and retraining clauses in its collective bargaining agreements. However, in the construction branch automation is not a curse but a boon. All automated processes are electric, and installation and maintenance of automated devices have created work for NECA and IBEW, and with more and more wiremen taking advanced electronics courses and improving construction methods, automation will undoubtedly create additional work for NECA contractors and IBEW members in the future.

Incidentally, it might be well to mention here, in this section on training, that last month the IBEW graduated 25 in its third institute to train instructors in "industrial atomic energy uses, hazards, and controls," and another class is scheduled for June. While more IBEW members from the utility field have been trained than those in the construction branch, this training is needed by construction wiremen also, and a number of them have been trained as teachers and are conducting classes for their fellow journeyman wiremen.

FIELDS FOR EXPANSION

Another new field which has created expanded avenues of employment to the partners in industry, is electrical heating.

During the year which has elapsed since our last report, this area has expanded tremendously, creating more work for employer and employee.

We are also happy to report an improvement in the residential wiring field. NECA has carried on an intensive drive to control more of this work for some time, and its efforts and the considerable support given to the project by officers of the IBEW at both the national and local level, are beginning to pay off.

An analysis of the potential in residential construction last spring showed it to be the largest single segment in dollar volume for the industry—about 39 percent. It is no wonder then that the promotional efforts of NECA and IBEW in this field continue, and we are glad to say, with considerable success. However, half of this work is still being done by those outside NECA and IBEW, so the drive must continue.

COUNCIL ON INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

We move now to the second area of cooperation—NECA and IBEW—which has won recognition for our industry. We speak of our 44-year-old "supreme court of the electrical industry," our council on industrial relations. As this report was being sent to the printer, the CIR was holding its quarterly meeting in Pittsburgh and there were 51 cases scheduled to be reviewed, the largest number in the council's history.

For the benefit of those who may be reading a report on NECA and the IBEW for the first time, the council is made up of 12 members, 6 from the contractors and 6 from the union. The council handles those cases in which the normal collective bargaining processes between local contractor and local union have bogged down and become deadlocked. This is the electric industry's answer to strikes and lockouts. The council decisions must be unanimous and it has never had a decision violated. This organ, unique in the labor-management field, has brought peace and security to the electrical construction industry and uninterrupted service to the general public.

We think it important to mention here, in connection with our council on industrial relations, a court case in which the IBEW has been engaged for the past 2 years, in which preservation of the CIR was an important factor.

THE 28 CASE

Briefly, local union 28 in Baltimore, Md., went on strike without permission of the parent union, the constitution of which definitely states that authorization of the international president must be obtained before a local union can cause or allow a work stoppage in a controversy of general nature. Local 28 had a council on industrial relations clause in its agreement with the Baltimore division of the Maryland chapter of the National Electrical Contractors. Local union 28 went on strike against the Baltimore contractors and continued the strike even when ordered back to work by the international union.

President Gordon M. Freeman, after public hearings and repeated warnings to members of LU 28, had no choice but to revoke LU 28's charter and install a new local to service the public of the city of Baltimore.

In the court action which resulted, the U.S. district court ruled that the international president could not revoke the charter of LU 28. However, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals reversed the decision of the district court, an action subsequently upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States. President Freeman's comment on this final decision is significant:

"We especially welcome the action of the U.S. Supreme Court in leaving undisturbed the decision of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals because we had to proceed despite difficulties posed by the Landrum-Griffin Act and the psychology it has engendered, creating the mistaken belief that the international union's disciplinary powers had been completely disintegrated.

"The position of the council on industrial relations has been strengthened by this decision. This 40-year-old labor-management institution has been settling disputes in the electrical contracting industry with a minimum of fanfare. The IBEW made an all-out legal effort in this case to preserve its reputation as the union partner in the 'strikeless industry' as the electrical contracting industry has come to be known."

Before proceeding to the pension fund which is the reason for this report, but which historically now only makes up the minimum portion of it, we would like to mention another area of progress which is certainly of concern to employers and employees everywhere. We refer to safety.

SAFETY

A safety department with a full-time director was set up a few years ago and while the utility field has commanded perhaps the most attention, injuries in construction, especially line construction, have come in for considerable review also, and NECA and IBEW have attempted to lower the rate. We are pleased to report the following figures which are the latest available at this writing, and which show an excellent trend.

In 1961 there were 23 fewer fatal accidents to IBEW workmen than in 1960 and 32 less than the number occurring in 1959.

In 1961 all disabling injuries occurring to IBEW members were reduced by 882.

In the field of collective bargaining, according to information provided on the national electrical benefit fund payment report forms, the national journeyman wireman's wage rate is calculated to run a range of from $2.25 to $5.80 an hour. The average at the end of 1962 was $4.43. This compares with $4.21 at the end of 1961.

Now to move on to the title material of this report, the pension benefit trust fund, and for the benefit of those who are perhaps reading about the PBTF for the first time, we present a very brief summary.

HISTORY OF FUND

The IBEW began providing a pension for its members back in 1928 by action of its 1927 convention. Initially the benefit paid was $40 per month and was payable to a retired member who had attained age 65 and completed 20 years or more of continuous IBEW membership. This figure was increased to $50 per month in January 1947.

Until 1946, the NECA and IBEW agreed to establish a jointly administered trust fund to provide pension benefits to IBEW members, financed by contributions of 1 percent of the gross labor payroll of employees working under the terms of the employees' benefit agreement.

For the first 10 years of operations under the employees' benefit agreement, members of the IBEW going on pension reecived their $50 a month from the pension benefit trust fund.

By ruling of the National Labor Relations Board, the employees' benefit agreement was amended to provide, effective June 1957, that for the next 10 years, all new members going on pension, would receive their $50 monthly check from the IBEW fund.

In 1968, when the joint program's third 10-year cycle begins, payment will be made—$25 from the pension benefit trust fund and $25 from the IBEW pension fund.

Readers will find here in this pamphlet, tables and charts which show receipts and disbursements of the pension benefit trust fund since its inception.

We are pleased to report the compliance figure on the collection of the 1 percent of the payroll of the individual contractors, by which the pension fund is financed, still stands at the high percent of 91 or better. In the first few years after the fund was established, the compliance figure was less than 70 percent.

In the 16 years of the history of the IBEW pension benefit trust fund, more than $107 million has been collected and turned over to the board of trustees. The sum of $10,600,000 was collected from employers in 1962 and deposited in the fund, an increase of $700,000 over 1961. This is encouraging because there were certain widespread areas of unemployment last year.

AMENDMENTS PROPOSED

As the fund continues to grow, it has been the hope of the officers and many members of NECA and the IBEW that the employees' benefit agreement could be amended to include establishment of a national health and welfare plan for those included under the pension benefit fund, and also that we might look forward to increasing the amount of our pension payments.

In our trustees' report of last year we set forth a proposed plan and stated that it would be under discussion at the district meetings of the contractors association as well as at the progress meetings of the brotherhood, and that we hoped to bring you a decision on the proposed national agreement in our report presented at the annual meeting of 1963.

Because of objections on the part of both some NECA chapters and IBEW local unions, plus a decision of the National Labor Relations Board which would interfere with sections of the agreement, it has not been adopted. Neither has it been rejected. It is still under discussion and a further report will be made by your trustees whenever possible.

Another subject which has been under discussion, and which will be considered at the annual meeting at which this report will be presented, concerns the "Definition of continuous employment for purpose of pension eligibility," in other words criteria for determining who shall or who shall not be eligible for payments from the pension benefit trust fund. (Art. III–B, sec. 5, requires that the board of trustees define the terms "continuously employed" and "continuous employment" by rules and regulations of equal and uniform application.)

Your trustees will bring you further information on this subject in their report for the 1964 meeting.

In our report for 1962 we announced the appointment by the Secretary of Labor of the Honorable WAYNE MORSE, Senator from Oregon as the public member of the national employees' benefit board, and the Senator attended our 1962 annual meeting. (For the benefit of those who may not be familiar with our board, the NEBB is composed of 25 members—12 from the National Electrical Contractors Association and 12 from the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and one public member.)

Both NECA and the IBEW were gratified to have such a distinguished public servant as Senator MORSE serve on the benefit board. It is good to know that the Senator has mutual feelings in this regard. Witness the following comment by the Senator.

COMMENT OF SENATOR MORSE

"Let me assure you again of my sense of pride and responsibility toward the electrical industry as a result of the position you have given me. I am more convinced than ever, that the electrical industry of the United States is deserving of great credit for its pioneering in the field of a benefit trust fund. The industry has demonstrated industrial statesmanship of which you can all be proud, and I am proud of the opportunity to serve you."

Before concluding this section of the trustees report, there remains one more observation, which we believe to be important, to be made.

We feel we should point out that the national benefit fund provides additional services to the industry, in addition to collecting funds. It provides the only reliable statistics on business volume and employment in the industry. In addition, meetings of the board provide a forum for the exchange of information and views on economic problems confronting the industry. The national board, therefore in its annual meeting has a broad, general planning function.

However, even more important, and we want to stress this point here, are the meetings of the local benefit boards. These sessions, required for each quarter, serve as an excellent opportunity for labor and management representatives to get to know each other and work effectively with each other on problems which affect the industry on a local basis. Regular meetings where both labor and management representatives sit down with their public member and handle NEBF problems can be expanded to most profitable and enlightening sessions from which only better understanding and worthwhile plans for the industry can result.

We now bring you the figures and charts [charts omitted in RECORD] which will give the full financial picture on the pension benefit trust fund.

Your trustees met monthly in conformity with article III–B of the employee's benefit agreement to approve applications for pension and review the pension situation as reflected in the following table:

Statement re number of members on pension, 1962

Date	Admitted	Returned to trade	Deaths	Received pension	Net decrease [1] in number	Admitted to IBEW pension
Dec. 31, 1961				5,936		
1962						
January	3		50	5,889	47	325
February	2		44	5,847	42	361
March	1		56	5,792	55	310
April		1	40	5,751	41	330
May		1	48	5,702	49	342
1962—Con.						
June		2	34	5,666	36	351
July			50	5,616	50	429
August	1	2	39	5,576	40	384
September	1		34	5,543	33	343
October		1	35	5,507	36	424
November	2		46	5,463	44	386
December			45	5,418	45	387

---

[1] Readers will note the net decrease in pensions being paid from the pension benefit fund. This is due to NLRB ruling as explained in the text.

However, the actual number of IBEW members admitted to pension increased, but their pensions are now being paid from the IBEW pension fund. So all may know the trend, the number of members admitted to pension in 1962 is printed in the last column.

1962	
Total admitted	10
Returned to trade	7
Deaths	521
Net decrease	518

Comparative analysis—Members going on pension

1961:	
Total admitted	7
Returned to trade	9
Deaths	487
Net decrease	489
Total admitted	10
Returned to trade	7
Deaths	521
Net decrease	518

The following table illustrates the number of members who were drawing pensions from the pension benefit trust fund each quarter:

Members on pension

October 1948	2952
December 1948	2984
March 1949	3034
June 1949	3122
September 1949	3224
December 1949	3346
March 1950	3434
June 1950	[1] 3775
September 1950	3888
December 1950	4024
March 1951	4100
June 1951	4189
September 1951	4283
December 1951	4355
March 1952	4404
June 1952	4437
September 1952	4594
December 1952	4697
March 1953	4821
June 1953	4933
September 1953	5092
December 1953	5264
March 1954	5467
June 1954	5652
September 1954	5898
December 1954	6134
March 1955	6394
June 1955	6589
September 1955	6797
December 1955	6991
March 1956	7167
June 1956	7329
September 1956	7594
December 1956	7816
March 1957	8037
June 1957	8545
September 1957	8352
December 1957	8151
March 1958	7961
June 1958	7810
September 1958	7664
December 1958	7533
March 1959	7378
June 1959	7249
September 1959	7099
December 1959	6972
March 1960	6808
June 1960	6664
September 1960	6546
December 1960	6425
March 1961	6315
June 1961	6173
September 1961	6047
December 1961	5936
March 1962	5792
June 1962	5666
September 1962	5543
December 1962	5418

[1] In June 1950, payment of Canadian pensions out of the pension benefit trust fund was begun.

Statement of receipts and disbursements

Cash on hand Jan. 1, 1962	$331,734.11
Cash receipts:	
Contributions from NEBB	10,600,000.00
Payments—real estate loans	12,058,229.39
Interest:	
Real estate loans	$2,988,544.47
Securities	252,690.22
Sale of Securities	11,411,720.10
Dividends	118,483.90
Rent	15,000.00
Commitment fees and discounts (net)	61,466.53
Total	37,506,134.61
Grand total	37,837,868.72
Cash disbursements:	
Pensions paid	3,384,468.62
Securities purchased:	
Real estate loans	20,724,775.59
Stock	1,555,962.39
Securities	11,042,121.76
Land	500,000.00
Investment expense	222,131.60
Postage and supplies	2,867.22
Total	37,432,327.18
Balance	405,541.54
Cash, Dec. 31, 1962:	
American Security & Trust Co.	229,616.15
American Security & Trust Co. agency	49,527.74
In transit	76,397.65
Bank of Nova Scotia	34,000.00
In transit	16,000.00
Total	405,541.54

Receipts from the national electrical benefit fund

For quarter ending—	Amount
1947:	
June	$284,489.98
September	424,867.73
December	548,265.84
1948:	
March	459,789.49
June	598,898.12
September	534,026.90
December	554,136.25
1949:	
March	548,528.46
June	612,633.43
September	485,260.70
December	427,602.24
1950:	
March	391,057.87
June	526,448.06
September	680,989.66
December	470,511.04
1951:	
March	573,773.54
June	603,385.69
September	832,518.92
December	1,122,832.84
1952:	
March	1,418,242.35
June	1,397,827.78
September	1,837,450.49
December	1,458,439.70
1953:	
March	1,458,876.96
June	1,650,052.47
September	1,723,872.01
December	1,594,851.00
1954:	
March	1,794,740.46
June	1,872,843.05
September	1,820,376.39
December	2,862,011.58
1955:	
March	1,917,154.98
June	1,904,222.16
September	2,199,701.55
December	2,085,007.26
1956:	
March	4,465,000.00
June	1,915,000.00
September	2,085,000.00
December	2,265,000.00
1957:	
March	$2,015,000.00
June	2,305,000.00
September	2,475,000.00
December	2,600,000.00
1958:	
March	2,150,000.00
June	2,180,000.00
September	2,220,000.00
December	2,275,000.00
1959:	
March	2,200,000.00
June	1,975,000.00
September	2,350,000.00
December	2,400,000.00
1960:	
March	2,200,000.00
June	2,250,000.00
September	2,500,000.00
December	2,650,000.00
1961:	
March	2,350,000.00
June	2,300,000.00
September	2,500,000.00
December	2,750,000.00
1962:	
March	2,450,000.00
June	2,600,000.00
September	2,750,000.00
December	2,800,000.00

You will note that in the "Statement re number of members on pension—1962," that 10 members were admitted to pension. These were IBEW members admitted to pension prior to the NLRB ruling, and who later returned to the trade. They have now again asked to receive their pension.

The net decrease in number of electrical workers receiving pensions from the pension benefit trust fund in December 1962, was 518. In December 1961, it was 489. The total number of persons receiving pensions from the pension benefit trust fund in December 1962, as shown in our statement, was 5,418. However, it should be pointed out here that the actual number of members receiving pensions from this fund and the IBEW pension fund was 18,636.

At the time that this report went to press that figure had increased to 19,497.

CONCLUSION

That concludes the statistical report and the observations which your trustees feel should be a part of this annual report to the National Board. May we say, as we have done in other previous reports that statistics always seem cold and impersonal. However, the people they represent in this report are the warm, living individuals who helped to build the electrical industry to the place of tremendous importance which it occupies in today's economy. The money in millions collected, divided into $50-a-month portions represents no impersonal statistic either. Translated into a supplement to a retiree's income, it often makes the difference between "living" and merely "existing" to which the hundreds of letters received each year from recipients will testify.

In closing this report for 1962, presented this May 22, 1963, may we say that the future of the electrical industry is bright—the brightest of any on the industrial and economic horizon. We believe that the years of opportunity ahead will find the National Electrical Contractors Association and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers joined in all areas of cooperation which spell progress for members of NECA and IBEW and better service to the general public.

Henry S. Owens & Co., certified public accountants, have audited the books of the trustees for the year 1962 and a copy of this audit has been furnished to all members of the board.

Your trustees wish to extend to the members of the National Board, to the officers and members of the National Electrical Contractors Association and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and especially to Mr. Wilfred D. Howell, Executive Secretary of the Pension Benefit Trust Fund, their sincere thanks for the cooperation, interest, and help extended throughout the past year.

Respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH D. KEENAN,
Trustee.
PAUL M. GEARY,
Trustee.

Comments Made by Senator Wayne Morse, Public Member of the National Employees Benefit Board, at the 1963 Annual Meeting of the Board at Hot Springs, Ark., May 22, 1963

Gentlemen, I wish to thank you again this year, as I did last year, for giving me the opportunity to sit with you as a member of this board. I come here in the spirit of a student attending a seminar because, in a real sense, that is exactly what we have all been attending this morning.

The annual report on the IBEW pension benefit trust fund submitted to us by our two dedicated trustees, Joseph Keenan and Paul M. Geary, would be a credit to any scholarly monograph submitted to any graduate seminar on labor-management relations. It not only is informative, but it is another documented chapter in the outstanding record which has been made in this industry since 1940, when the IBEW pension benefit trust fund was first established.

As the report points out, we have been reading recently a good many articles about a kind of continuous bargaining on a regular basis, taking up the matter of conflicts as they arise as a new idea or a new look in American management and labor relations. Thus, we read about the Kaiser plan in the steel industry, the program in the west coast longshore industry, and the continuous bargaining practices in the auto and rubber industries.

However, as the annual report of the trustees points out today, the electrical industry has been operating under a continuous bargaining program for 35 or 40 years. The local joint conference committees and the council on industrial relations which have prevailed in the electrical industry for many years have provided the industry with a stability and mutual respect and confidence relationship between representatives of management and labor for well over a quarter of a century.

I am so favorably impressed with the report of the trustees and so convinced that its standards of industrial statesmanship are so sorely needed in so many other industries in our country at the present time that I intend to insert the report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it will be available for historic reference.

I am sure that every member of the board appreciates the fact that Mr. Wilfred D. Howell, executive secretary of the pension benefit trust fund, who you will remember I called Professor Howell last year because of the fine educational job he does for us, deserves the thanks of each one of us on the board for his very fine efforts and able services.

Some of the implications of this year's report, particularly its reference to the complex problem of automation and its account of the work of the council on industrial relations, prompts me to give you a brief report on an experience I had in the field of labor-management relations since we last met.

You will recall that on January 16, 1963, President Kennedy asked Prof. James Healey of the Harvard Business School and Mr. Theodore Kheel, a lawyer and national arbitrator from New York City, and me to be members of a Special Presidential Mediation Board charged with the responsibility of trying to bring to an end a very costly maritime strike which closed, for a period of weeks, all shipping in the east and gulf ports. Collective bargaining had completely broken down since the shipping industry did not enjoy the advantages of a labor-management council on industrial relations such as exists in the electrical industry. Mutual confidence among management and labor did not exist, and the relations became so bad that it was impossible to get the negotiating committees representing the shipowners and the longshoremen to even meet in the same room for mediation conferences, to say nothing about collective bargaining negotiations. Our Board met with the parties of the negotiating committees separately, and at our first meeting with each side, we made clear that we expressed the view that the parties owed it to themselves to try to reach a negotiated collective bargaining agreement between themselves or reach a mutually acceptable agreement based upon the mediation. We pointed out that the evidence was indisputable that the strike was costing the parties in the dispute a minimum of $25 million a day and was estimated to be costing the economy of the country about $100 million a day. We also pointed out that the facts showed our foreign policy was suffering seriously in various parts of the world. Ecuador, for example, had already suffered a grave financial loss in spoiled bananas, greater than all the foreign aid the United States had pumped into Ecuador over all the years of the foreign aid program. Similar losses were being suffered by one Latin American country after another. Many of our foreign aid shipments to other parts of the world had been stopped by the strike, and increasing ill will toward the United States was developing around the world.

We told the parties that the President had asked us to make a report to him with recommendations for the settlement of the dispute in 5 days if we failed to lead the parties to a mediated settlement of the dispute by that time. It probably would not be an exaggeration to say that the parties were in dispute on practically everything that the employers and labor could possibly disagree about in the labor contract. On one occasion, I told the parties that if there was anything they were not in dispute about other than their agreement to disagree, I would like to be told what it was.

However, the major disagreements were over wages and hours, working rules, and various aspects of automation problems. We were unable to bring the parties together even for a negotiated settlement.

Finally, at the end of the fourth day, after almost continuous discussions with first one side and then the other, the President's Board made clear to the parties that they proposed to submit to them a set of findings and recommendations for the settlement of the dispute, and if they did not see fit to agree to the settlement of the dispute on the basis of the Board's recommendations or their own mutually agreed modifications of those recommendations, the Board planned to submit the recommendations to the President of the United States with the further recommendation that the time had come for him to take whatever steps were necessary to protect the public interest by returning the ships to the channels of commerce.

It was then that the representatives of the two sides acknowledged that the Board really had no other course, and they agreed to receive the proposals of the Board for a settlement of the dispute, with the understanding, of course, that neither side must necessarily be bound by them.

The shopowners had stood out for a maximum wage increase of 22 cents an hour. The union asked for wage increases of what would have amounted to 86 cents an hour the first year and $1.03 the second year. The recommendation of the President's Board called for a package wage increase of 37 cents an hour for a 2-year period which was to be the length of the new contract.

The very troublesome featherbedding issue which had been raised by the employers was handled by the Board through a recommendation that the Department of Labor should make a manpower utilization study of every job on the waterfront over a period of 15 months and then submit a report setting forth its findings of fact and recommendations with respect to steps the parties should take to remove the manpower utilization controversy from the waterfront. The parties were then to be given 3 months to negotiate a settlement based upon the Department of Labor's recommendations, and failing in that, it was recommended that a neutral tribunal should be set up, similar to an emergency board under the National Railway Labor Act. This neutral board would be charged with the responsibility of hearing the parties on the merits of the controversy over working rules and would make recommendations and decisions with respect to the merits of the position taken by the respective parties on each phase of the controversy.

The Board's report also made recommendations with respect to pension funds, health, welfare, and clinic policies, and various other issues that were in controversy.

I think it is fair to say that both sides to the dispute reluctantly accepted the program of settlement of the dispute as recommended by the President's Special Mediation Board, following a few days of probing public opinion, congressional attitudes, industrywide and laborwide reaction to the Board's proposals and clearly expressed intention of the national administration to take whatever steps might become necessary in order to stop the creeping paralysis that would soon immobilize the national economy unless the strike ended.

Out of this experience, I became more convinced that the greatest value of a strike or a lockout to labor and employers is to be found in the threat to the strike or lockout. This observation is probably especially true in connection with labor disputes of widespread regional or national significance. Once the strike or lockout occurs, the parties usually find themselves on the defensive. They soon find themselves in great need of a substitute for the rules of reason on the part of the impartial representatives of the public as to the best way out of the dilemma they have created for themselves. It was true in the east coast dock strike as it is true in most major labor disputes characterized by the fact that in a very real sense, it was both a strike and a lockout.

It was interesting to note that many of the shipowners seemed to think that the best way out for them would be by way of legislation that would impose upon the industry some form of compulsory arbitration or some mandatory legal procedure that would empower a third party, be it a court or a board of arbitration, to render a final and binding decision in the settlement of the various issues involved in the dispute.

Our Board sought to show the shipowners that from a straight financial standpoint, such a procedure would not be in their best interests. We told them that the case would undoubtedly be settled through mediation at a cost much less than one-half what it would cost them if a board of arbitration had jurisdiction over the dispute. I am very much surprised over the number of people who do not seem to realize that under compulsory arbitration each and every issue must be ruled upon by the Board as though it were a court.

For example, we pointed out to the parties that as a mediation board, our responsibility was to try to lead the parties to a conscionable compromise of their differences, and in trying to do that, we had dismissed from consideration a good many issues which would involve great sums of money if we were required to try them on the merits, but nevertheless were issues which we thought the parties should drop from immediate controversy and thereby limit themselves only to the consideration of what we believed were a very few major issues that should be agreed upon. We pointed out to them that the issues we were dismissing from consideration were issues which they should be able to settle between themselves in good-faith collective bargaining once the major issues were determined.

I think we succeeded in convincing a goodly number of employers that compulsory arbitration was not the answer to their labor troubles. We particularly stressed the fact that compulsory arbitration, in a very real sense, destroys economic freedom for both management and labor in that it proposes in the jurisdiction of a third party in the last analysis, control of the business.

It may very well be that in a time of great national crisis a labor dispute can so affect the health, safety and welfare of the Nation, as a whole, that Government has no other choice but to exercise the democratic processes of government and call for the imposition of what amounts to a procedure of finality for the settlement of a labor dispute by representatives of the Government. However, any industry or labor union that pushes Government to the point where it becomes necessary to take such a course of action to protect the public interest has only itself to blame for the loss of economic freedom that it imposes upon itself.

On the other hand, I am a strong advocate of voluntary collective bargaining agreements that provide for procedures such as this industry has in its council on industrial relations or as some other industries have in various plans for one form or another of voluntary arbitration or the appointment of impartial industry chairmen or emergency boards as they exist in the railroad industry. However, the essence of such plans is to be found in their voluntarism, and their real strength is to be found in the self-restraint which the parties to such agreements exercise.

Out of my experience as a member of the President's Special Mediation Board dealing with the recent east coast dock strike has come a deepened conviction that we must stop delaying the taking of national action on the many complex labor-management problems that are being created by the rapid advance in technology which falls under the heading of automation.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate, I have been presiding for the past several weeks over public hearings on our country's educational problems. I want to give you a vital statistic that disturbs me very much because it is out of such statistics that great social and economic problems arise to plague us.

The evidence before my committee shows that if we were able to call a halt to all automation so that technological progress would not be carried on beyond what it is today, it would require 35,000 new jobs per week for a good many years to take care of the unemployment being caused by automation. When we add that to another vital statistic; namely, that our population increase makes it necessary for us to find at the present time 65,000 new jobs per week to take care of the new workers that are coming into the labor market each week, we see that there is already a need for 90,000 new jobs per week.

We know that we are not going to stop technological advance, and we shouldn't want to if we could. Technological advance is capable of creating more new jobs than we have people to fill those jobs if, and only if, we are wise enough to prepare our new workers and retrain many of our old workers in the type of skills that our modern economy calls for.

There is just as much a need today for progressive legislation dealing with management-labor problems in the field of automation as there was in the era of 1900–1920 for progressive legislation in the field of the 8-hour day, minimum wage, safety legislation, workmen's compensation and all the rest of the so-called progressive labor reforms of that era. At first, they were fought but now, American management as well as American labor and in fact, the public generally, strenuously opposes going back to the economic conditions that prevailed prior to what has become known as the progressive economic era in the 20th century.

Complex problems of automation call for the same sort of industrial statesmanship, keen insight and foresight that the business, labor and political leaders of our country demonstrated in the early period of our century. The leaders in the electrical industry, I think, are far ahead of most industries in respect to the oncoming automation era.

One of the basic principles which I think needs to be recognized by the American people, as a whole, is that our entire population is the chief beneficiary of technological progress and economic progress through automation. Therefore, it is not fair or right that management should assume most of the costs or the losses that labor suffers through automation. Similarly, it is not right that labor should assume most of the losses which otherwise would be suffered by management as jobs are destroyed by automation and unemployment leaps forward. We must work out some sensible, equitable, and balanced adjustment between management, labor, and the general public, whereby technological progress will be put to work with economic benefit to the many and not just the few.

Because of my concern about this problem, I have recommended the appointment of a National Presidential Commission on Automation. I made the recommendation in a joint letter which I sent to the Secretaries of Commerce, Agriculture, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, under date of April 30, 1963. These four Cabinet departments have, at least, symbolic jurisdiction over a wide cross section of American economic life, and they are all greatly concerned about the effects of automation.

It is my thought that the appointment of a National Presidential Commission on Automation would bring together a group of the most recognized experts on the subject matter, and after an exchange of their expert knowledge, such a group could draft a program, including recommendations for legislation that would help us turn the rapid automation changes that are now taking place from being a cause of a great deal of human misery and unhappiness to a new millennium of economic progress for all of our people and a greater economic stability for our Nation.

I have already spoken longer than I intended and longer than I should have, but in closing, let me say that I have made these observations to this group because on your record of performance in this industry ever since 1940, the leaders of the National Electrical Contractors Association and the IBEW have demonstrated over and over again, as the trustee's report again this year proves, that this industry puts into practice the guarantee of economic freedom for both management and labor. It recognizes that unless there is economic health on both sides of the management-labor table within this industry, then the contagious virus of economic insolvency and unemployment will afflict all members on both sides of the labor-management table.

Again, I want to thank Mr. Geary and Mr. Keenan for their never-failing assistance to me, and in behalf of each one of you, as well as myself, I extend to Wilfred Howell our sincere thanks for his effective work as executive secretary, and to each of you on the board, I thank you for lending me your ears.

UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR OF MERCHANDISING DISCUSSES PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it has sometimes seemed to me that the small, independent businessman in America faces an increasing danger of extinction in the economy of the Nation. Admittedly, there is, and has been, a trend of merger and consolidation in the national economic community. Actually, the reason, I take it, why the U.S. Senate created a Committee on Small Business was, by legislation, to attempt to protect and to resuscitate the independent entrepreneur in the life of the American business community. The independent businessman sells not simply products—he sells service. He has a reputation in his home city or town. He stands behind the sales to his customers. He participates in the activities of the community. The price of the products which he sells is not the single, sole basis for his success.

Recently, before the Senate Commerce Committee, Mr. James Lloyd Fri, a man who has specialized for more than 40 years in problems of marketing, testified with respect to S. 774, the quality stabilization bill:

> The retail price does not, per se, give dependable indication of its real quality.

Said Mr. Fri:

> It is only when such price is related to a known quality or grade that the consumer can use price as a guidepost. These guideposts are meaningful and useful to the consumer only when a manufacturer (or a distributor or retailer) clearly identifies the product by trademark or brand name and when he also establishes or suggests a realistic retail price, for each quality or grade. By such identity the seller voluntarily assumes responsibility for satisfactory performance in open competition with other products within the same price range. Thus, competition to maintain these values must of necessity be primarily in the laboratories and testing departments before the goods are offered for sale.

Mr. President, the entire statement which Mr. Fri made before our colleagues on the committee is an extremely thought-provoking and persuasive one. I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the statement appear in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of James Lloyd Fri Before the Special Subcommittee on Quality Stabilization of the Senate Commerce Committee in Support of S. 774

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my name is James Lloyd Fri of Bronxville, N.Y. My statement here is based on more than 40 years of close study and research in marketing of consumer goods beginning with the Harvard graduate school where I majored in marketing with a degree of master of business administration.

For 5 years thereafter I was professor of merchandising at the graduate school of retailing, New York University; for 5 years manager of the merchandising division of the National Retail Dry Goods Association (now the National Retail Merchants Association); and for 30 years managing director or president of trade associations of manufacturers of consumer goods.

For more than 20 years I was lecturer on retailing at Columbia University. I am the author of the textbook "Retail Merchandising," and have written or edited a number of books on merchandising, and numerous articles and monographs on marketing. Since the early 1920's I have followed closely the many hearings before congressional committees on proposed legislation aimed at the control of the marketing of consumer goods. It is from this longtime interest and experience as student, teacher, trade association executive and consumer that the following conclusions and recommendations are drawn.

From a careful reading of testimony at prior hearings on the quality stabilization bill, a reasonable conclusion is that the conflict is not so much between opponents and proponents, as it is between actual knowledge of the realities of present-day marketing, and outmoded theories and concepts.

If there were a more even spread of factual information on actual merchandising processes—with particular reference to the competitive environment—debate would most certainly be more productive.

The primary purpose of the following statement is to identify some of these more basic issues, and evaluate the relative significance of the facts and the theories as expressed by opponents of the quality stabilization bill.

It will be shown that price stabilization of trademarked products at the retail level under the quality stabilization bill and the concept of free and open competition are completely compatible.

It will be shown that an economy requiring unrestricted price competition at the retail level is destructive of the consumer's best interests; that price of product is meaningless unless related to quality of product; and that the discount form of merchandising puts into reverse practically all of the creative and constructive quality-building forces inherent in the brand-name system of distribution.

Further it will be shown herein that opponents of the quality stabilization bill, whether representatives of the Department of Justice, or professors of marketing, or economists, have themselves been deceived or otherwise are a party to the deception of Congress and the consumer, when they cite "estimates" and "projections" allegedly showing that enactment of this bill would result in increased prices to consumers.

Unfortunately an aura of authority and responsibility is attributed to the assertions of the Department of Justice. Never was it more wrong than in its economic pontifications about the quality stabilization bill. Much of its testimony is not based on facts. Instead it is largely based on theoretical notions and unsupportable contentions that do not square with the realities of the marketplace. For that reason the Department of Justice's statement will be dealt with first.

A FALSE PREMISE LEADS THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE INTO AN ERROR OF BILLIONS OF DOLLARS

The Department of Justice asserts it "has found by economic surveys that consumers in States with price maintenance, or so-called 'fair trade,' laws pay from 19 to 27 percent higher prices than consumers in States without such laws. Projecting an average price increase of 20 percent for all sales that may be covered by the operation of a national price maintenance law shows that it would cost the American consumer billions of dollars and have a powerfully inflationary effect."

This statement, which has appeared repeatedly in the record of hearings in one form or another, is typical of the many misconceptions due to lack of knowledge of the realities of present-day merchandising, particularly promotional techniques.

The nature of the above cited survey was not explained in the testimony, but a similar study by the Department, made in 1954, received wide distribution in the trade press. In that study it was reported that if customers had purchased 736 advertised drug products in a group of District of Columbia stores, they would have "saved" 28 percent as compared with list prices. A similar study of appliances showed that a "saving" of 27.7 percent could have been realized.

These figures were presented at a hearing in 1954 on a Fair Trade Act for the District of Columbia. They were used again by a witness last year as part of his "evidence" that passage of the quality stabilization bill might cost the American consumers as much as $14 billion annually.

Estimates of huge price increases to consumers, if this bill is passed, are based almost entirely on the unwarranted assumption that consumers are enjoying billions of dollars of net "savings" under the present form of merchandising in which there is little price stabilization of national brands at the retail level.

That such estimates of "savings" are in large part mythical can convincingly be demonstrated by simply examining the procedures used to obtain the results of such surveys.

Anyone acquainted with the discount form of merchandising should know that if this study of the Department of Justice had included all of the items sold by these same stores, customers would have contributed an average of about 25 cents out of every dollar of the stores' volume. The reason is simple: this type of store operates on a margin of about 25 percent. True, consumers would have made "savings" on some branded items, but they would have lost most of these "savings" on nonbranded products.

Therefore, it is a serious disservice to assert that huge "savings" accrue if purchases are made in discount stores, without at the same time pointing out that unless purchases are limited solely to the identifiable loss-leader items, customers will pay about the same price in the discount store as in the regular limited service stores.

There are two general types of discounts or markdowns which stores take in the ordinary course of business. The one is the customary markdown or "sale" to close out seasonal goods or stocks that are imbalanced for any merchandising reason. The other is the type of discounting that is done to create an "image" of low-cost operation and low prices throughout the entire store.

The former is a necessary and desirable part of efficient merchandising. The latter is intended to mislead the consumer.

A retailer using this deceptive form of promotional appeal would explain his methods this way: "Deeply discounted products (loss leaders) are nothing more than tools * * * to build traffic and create an illusion about our store. By featuring brand-name goods at a value people recognize, I'm telling my customers that all my prices on all my products are cheap. I will make back my losses on the deeply discounted products by also selling those items of furniture, luggage, sporting goods, jewelry, and other merchandise which are not nationally advertised. On these 'blind' products I can make a reasonable profit, while giving the customer the impression he is always getting a bargain when he comes to my store."

The dividing line between customary markdowns and predatory discounting is not exact, but when it is the policy of a store to systematically make markdowns on well-known brands substantially below the margin needed for the whole operation, that practice is loss-leader selling. It is intended to be deceptive to the consumer and it is. It is also predatory to the manufacturer who owns the brand.

The fact is that all deeply discounted items are sold well below the store's required markup. Consequently there is a loss on these goods which, of necessity, must be balanced by a higher markup on other goods.

Opponents of the quality stabilization bill contend that it would prevent low-margin retailers from passing on to consumers the savings resulting from a more efficient form of distribution. This at most is only a theory—an allegation. For no creditable evidence to support such a claim has been submitted in testimony. Nor does such evidence appear to be available from any source to indicate that the total gross margin of stores operating under the discount appeal are any lower than other nonservice stores carrying similar types of merchandise.

What has been shown convincingly is that there are savings on specific products. Yet according to the comparative lists submitted by opponents of this bill as their evidence, it is very illuminating—but really not surprising—to note that more than three-fourths of such products are offered for sale or are sold with a markup of less than 15 percent.

Responsible merchants, whose buyers have shopped discount stores extensively, can give this committee convincing evidence that the wide majority of discount houses have to get gross margins of at least 25 percent on their total sales. If a store thus needs 25 percent gross margin, then for every dollar he sells below this required markup, he must sell an equal volume above this markup.

It can safely be concluded therefore that the visible "savings" on the individual discounted items cannot be added together and projected on a nationwide basis as "net savings" to the consumer.

Those who make such estimates are either uninformed in regard to the mechanics of discount selling or are attempting deception.

There can be no basis in logic or in relevant marketing experience to use such an unsupportable premise as a reason to justify opposition to the quality stabilization bill. Rationalization of such opposition is impossible.

OBJECTIVE STUDY BY ENGLISH ECONOMISTS SHOWS RESALE PRICE MAINTENANCE DOES NOT RAISE CONSUMER PRICE LEVELS

Evidence that (a) resale price maintenance does not raise consumer price levels, and that (b) it operates to benefit the consuming public, may be found in a book entitled "Fair Trade, Resale Price Maintenance Reexamined," published in 1960 by English economists, P. W. S. Andrews, a lecturer on economics at the University of Oxford, and Frank A. Friday of the University of London.

Their evidence and findings are based primarily on what actually happened in countries when resale price maintenance was abandoned. They are thus comparing, in a postmortem way, certain theories and concepts with the realities of the marketplace. As a result of their comparative analysis, the authors found that "there is no evidence at all of a general downward pressure on gross margins after resale price maintenance was prohibited in Canada. In fact, margins have risen (in Canada) to a similar extent as in the United Kingdom. It is clear that the basic assumption of the opponents of resale price maintenance that the practice raises gross margins is quite wrong. The general claims that the abolition of resale price maintenance will benefit consumers by reducing the price level and will improve distribution by lowering gross margins is a great illusion."

Economists Andrews and Friday conclude that the abolition of resale price maintenance would mean (a) a decline in the number of independent merchants; (b) a reduction in competition between private brands and manufacturers' brands; (c) an increase in the size of large retailers; (d) a trend toward forward integration with the large manufacturer going into the retail business as well; and (e) the squeezing out of the small manufacturer.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ERRS AS TO CAUSE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF BUSINESS FAILURES

The Department of Justice asserts that the rate of business failures is higher in States which have fair trade laws than in those States without such laws. Therefore, the Department concludes that small business will be hurt by the enactment of the quality stabilization bill.

Although statistics were submitted showing the rate of business failures in States having resale price maintenance laws compared with States without such laws, there was no accredited information or convincing argument presented by the Department to show any causal relationship between the failure rates and the status of resale price maintenance laws in the various States. This, of course, is a very important consideration if such data, per se, are to be used to substantiate such a broad conclusion that the small businessman will be hurt by the enactment of the quality stabilization bill.

Many reasons might well influence the failure rate much more than the presence or absence of resale price maintenance laws. The following considerations indicate that the conclusion of the Department of Justice was not based on sound reasoning or dependable statistics.

A high rate of business failures resulting from the crippling of State fair trade laws is broadly obvious, but cannot be accurately proved (or disproved) statistically. The impact on small business of lawful "loophole" transshipments, mail order house shipments, etc., into fair trade States—thus crippling the effectiveness of the fair trade statute—cannot be accurately weighed. The Dun & Bradstreet report is too general—too broad—for the specific use given it by the Department of Justice.

First. This Dun & Bradstreet report represents only approximately one-half of the total number of businesses in the United States. Whereas practically all large businesses are included by Dun & Bradstreet, a staggering number of small businesses are not. These businesses "omitted" from the Dun & Bradstreet report are, in all probability, those with the least economic power to survive price wars, and therefore the ones most affected because Congress as yet has not enacted the quality stabilization law. Further, no weight is given by the Department of Justice to the undetermined number of small businesses exterminated without bankruptcy or other proceedings that would bring their failures to the attention of the courts or of Dun & Bradstreet.

Second. To determine the relationship, if any, between fair trade laws or lack of fair trade laws and the rate of failure of small business, some minimum steps should have been taken by the Department of Justice before the Dun & Bradstreet's statistics could be used. For example, the amount and the type of commercial activity in the State, the nature of the State's economy, the population growth of the State, the number of new businesses being established in the State, the rate of failure of such new businesses, etc., are significant and influential factors given no weight by the Department of Justice.

PRICE STABILIZATION UNDER THE QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL AND EFFECTIVE COMPETITION ARE COMPLETELY COMPATIBLE

One basic concept that has hampered productive debate and realistic consideration of this bill is the persistent contention of some governmental representatives and economists that there cannot be free and open competition when there is price stabilization at the retail level. At the recent hearings an economist and teacher said with considerable finality that "price maintenance at the retail level and an effective competitive system are incompatible."

If the proponents of this theory would go into the marketplace and see the competitive forces in action they would find that the most rugged competition in today's market is to be found among large distributors, such as chainstores, mail-order houses and cooperative buying organizations. For years these large distributors have been marketing under their own house brands, with price stabilization at the retail level, and with complete control of merchandising policies from the manufacturer to the consumer. Under such a policy, competition for consumer patronage is on "value for money" rather than on the lowest price for the same trademarked item.

As far as the marketing processes and competition are concerned, the brand names of these large distributors perform the identical function as the brand names of manufacturers.

For most distributor house brands, there is nationwide promotional effort and distribution, and consumer prices are determined by adding to the manufacturer's costs the averaged costs of the retailer, plus a reasonable profit, just as is done by the national brand producers.

These controlled distributor brands represent more than one-third of all trademarked goods sold in the United States. Certainly, this is tangible evidence of "effective" free and open competition at the retail level, as far as the consumer is concerned. Under the provisions of the quality stabilization bill, the same unrestricted forces of competition would be in effect on national brands.

"PRICE" ON A PRODUCT IS MEANINGLESS UNLESS "PRICE" IS RELATED TO "QUALITY"

Opponents of the quality stabilization bill further contend that "the only real and effective competition is that which is on a strictly price basis, at the retail level." The theory that price is the sole basis of competition is unsound and efforts to evaluate this bill by such an outmoded concept tend to throttle constructive consideration of it.

Those experienced in actual production and marketing know that for most consumer goods the retail price does not, per se, give dependable indication of its real quality. It is only when such price is related to a known quality or grade that the consumer can use price as a guidepost. These guideposts are meaningful and useful to the consumer only when a manufacturer (or a distributor or retailer) clearly identifies the product by trademark or brand name and when he also establishes or suggests a realistic retail price, for each quality or grade. By such identity the seller voluntarily assumes responsibility for satisfactory performance in open competition with other products within the same price range. Thus, competition to maintain these values must of necessity be primarily in the laboratories and testing departments before the goods are offered for sale.

Under such a policy, there is aggressive competition to build up to a quality or value rather than down to a price, and consequently in both national trademarked products and distributor house brands the consumer gets much more real value for her money. This is the basic concept which motivates and governs all effective brand-name merchandising and promotion down to the retail level.

The discount form of merchandising puts into reverse practically all of the creative and constructive forces inherent in the brand-name system of distribution. By its very nature it is admittedly predatory in that its motivating force is sapped from the energy and goodwill developed by brand-name manufacturers and retailers by heavy investments, research, and promotion.

From the marketing point of view, the primary purpose of this bill is not only to encourage manufacturers and retailers to compete openly on quality rather than just on price, but more importantly to give them specific protection on their investments in establishing quality and developing more helpful guideposts for the consumers in evaluating quality.

That price stabilization at the retail level and effective competition are compatible is convincingly demonstrated every day in the market. How then could anyone, except a person insulated from the actual competitive environment of today's market, continue to put forward such a theory?

CONCLUSION

From the record of hearings it may safely be concluded that a wide majority of all objections to this bill originate from a relatively few basic misconceptions regarding (a) the true significance of some current marketing policies and practices and (b) what would actually happen if there was more price stabilization at the retail level.

First. In evaluating the significance of objections to this bill, serious consideration must be given to the fact that it is evolutionary and not revolutionary as the testimony of many of the opponents would seem to indicate. It is evolutionary because its primary purpose is simply to extend to trademarked products the same rights that have been enjoyed for many years by large distributors of house brands. Those rights would entail permission to establish a retail price and maintain control of merchandising policies and operations through to the consumer. During the past few years the forces of free competition in the markets have clearly demonstrated that for the long range the consumer gets more real value for her money on her total purchases when manufacturers and distributors compete to build quality into a stabilized retail price.

Second. Those who theorize that "the only true competition is that which is on a price basis at the retail level," will find a positive and realistic answer to the contrary in the market itself. For under the controlled brand form of marketing, all of the forces of free and open competition are in full effect, and this same rugged competition would be in action on national brands under the provisions of this bill.

Third. Another stated objection to this bill, in the same area, is that "it would deny the consumer a right and an opportunity to share in any savings made possible by lower cost merchandising." This contention is based on the erroneous assumption that discount merchandising is a new type of distribution in which retailers operate on lower margins.

But no evidence whatsoever was offered in the hearings to indicate that the price cutting of branded products has resulted in lower total gross margins for such stores nor is such evidence available from any known source. On the contrary, it is the opinion of widely experienced marketing men that stores using the discount appeal operate on about the same gross margin as other nonservice stores that carry the same type of merchandise.

Fourth. Polls of businessmen "for" or "against" the bill are meaningless unless those who are asked to vote clearly understand the proposed act. The Department of Justice asserted at the hearings that an organization of small businessmen made a survey in 1962 of some 179,000 small businessmen of whom "51 percent voted in opposition to quality stabilization legislation, 45 percent in favor and 4 percent undecided."

Although the results of this poll have been widely quoted as evidence against passage of the bill, the person making the assertion, in later testimony, admitted that: "It is, of course, very difficult to say that there is a majority one way or the other. This would require a very careful and rigorous survey; and so far as I know, this sort of thing has not been done."

National, trade and professional organizations have found that when polls are taken among businessmen who do not understand what the bill means and how it will operate, the results are meaningless. On the other hand, many organizations have conclusive evidence that after the proposed act has been explained, the vote is overwhelmingly in favor of such legislation. For example, a representative of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc. stated at the hearings that in one section of the country "the vote was 10 to 1 in favor of the act." The Pennsylvania Association of Independent Business reported "that 90 percent of its members were in favor, 5 percent against," and similar ratios were found in the hardware associations, bicycle industry and others.

The representatives of small business—the 70 national trade and professional organizations that have endorsed the quality stabilization bill—clearly demonstrated that polls are meaningful only when those who are asked to vote clearly understand the proposed act.

Fifth. The contention that this bill would result in increased prices to consumers and in lessened competition between manufacturers and retailers is not only the basis of most of the unwarranted opposition, but more importantly it is the most difficult to rationalize.

It is understandable that there is deep concern when the uninformed public is told by representatives of the Government, by economists and by representatives of farm bureaus and labor unions that if this bill is passed these visible—but phony—"savings" would be taken away and the price of the goods might increase by as much as $14 billion annually.

What the consumer does not realize is that most of these "savings" are nullified by higher markup on other less-known products, because every retail store has to realize a certain minimum gross margin on total sales.

In conclusion, the type of opposition above recited gives emphasis to the major difficulty of getting practical legislation in this area of marketing. This is very pointedly summed up by a former Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission who says that "even if the heavy facts of life are on your (business) side, rest assured that in the scales, one feather of governmental inference is worth a ton of private citizen's facts."

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in adjournment until Tuesday next at 12 noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.) under the previous order, the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, August 6, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 2, 1963:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

William Matson Roth, of California, to be a Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana, a Foreign Service Office of the Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Burma.